

### **The Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo), An Analysis.**

This chapter is for those who want to dig into the linguistics of the Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo) and modern and ancient translations and interpretations, so that you can evaluate them and arrive at your own conclusions regarding what the Zarathushtra had in mind when he crafted this foundational poem. This chapter supplements (but does not replace) the discussion of this manthra in *Part One*. To place ideas in context, a little repetition may be necessary, but I will keep it to a minimum. Some ancient commentaries on this manthra are discussed in a following chapter.

The Ahuna Vairya is in pure Gathic Avestan. Taraporewala 1951 says its meter is the same as that of the Ahunavaiti Gatha (Yasnas 28 - 34).<sup>1</sup> Insler 1975 says it is in the same verse form as Y51.21 and 22,<sup>2</sup> and he thinks that this poem was composed by Zarathushtra himself because in language, style, and content, it cannot be separated from the Gathas.<sup>3</sup> I completely agree. The Asha Vahishta and the Ahuna Vairya complement each other, encapsulating core ideas that we find in the Gathas. And both are composed in the same multi-dimensioned style of poetry as the Gathas. No other Avestan text comes even close. The only one that is somewhat similar (in a multi-dimensioned style) is the Yenghe Haatam which was composed some centuries later, in Archaic Younger Avestan.<sup>4</sup>

All these factors support the conclusion that the Ahuna Vairya was composed by Zarathushtra himself.

Some scholars think it was composed by a member of Zarathushtra's close circle shortly after his death, based perhaps on their interpretation of either *ahū* or *ratuš* in line a. to mean Zarathushtra. but (with respect) I think this interpretation is inaccurate because it is inconsistent with the Gathas (demonstrated below).

In all Avestan texts, this manthra is called the Ahuna Vairya (Pahlavi *Ahunavar*). But when the Avestan texts came to be recited as part of the ritual, the instructions which state when to recite this manthra (during recitations of Avestan texts) call it by its first three words Yatha Ahu Vairyo.

Translations of this manthra vary greatly ~ in part because at least one of its words has not yet been decoded, in part because of ambiguities inherent in the Avestan language itself, and in part due to Zarathushtra's cryptic, multi-dimensioned style ~ all of which make it difficult to translate and interpret this manthra.

Is it then worth bothering about?

Well, that is for you to decide. The ancients regarded the Ahuna Vairya as a pronouncement of pre-eminent value, the Word of Wisdom which if understood and implemented provides the key to defeating evil, the key to redeeming existence from mortality.<sup>5</sup> And today, the Avestan language has been de-coded enough, I think, to enable us to glimpse its meanings, despite a few uncertainties. I therefore think it is worth making the effort, while bearing in mind the uncertainties of our conclusions.

Just think! If astronomers and physicists had been discouraged by uncertainties, we still would be thinking that the sun revolved around a flat earth, and the wonders of the universe(s) would be a closed book to us. So in tackling the Ahuna Vairya (and evaluating available translations), think of it as working on a jig-saw puzzle (without a picture!) ~ trying to see what pieces fit where, and what kind of a whole emerges as a result.

I have made translation choices in accordance with the following (self imposed) guidelines.

1. *Consistent with the Gathas.*

This manthra is in pure Gathic Avestan and was considered by the ancients to articulate core teachings of Zarathushtra. Therefore in evaluating translation alternatives, we should make choices based on the ideas and linguistics of the Gathas. With one exception. In the Gathas, the syntax is often a bit complicated (for many reasons). But for a manthra which was intended to be recited and understood by all ~ even children ~ I think Zarathushtra would have kept the syntax of the Ahuna Vairya reasonably simple ~ the kind of syntax that would have been well known to all who spoke Gathic Avestan fluently, with perhaps just a touch of puzzlement to evoke interest in its multi-dimensional meanings that could be understood by those who wished to meditate on it, with some knowledge of the puzzles and paradigms of the Gathas.

## 2. *Implied words.*

In the Gathic Avestan language,

(1) Certain words are routinely implied.<sup>6</sup>

(2) Certain words are necessarily implied because the context requires an implied word.<sup>7</sup> To give you a simple English example (English, like Avestan, being in the Indo-European family of languages), if a parent were to ask her son, *Do you know where my book is?* The son might reply: *No clue*, meaning *(I have) no clue (about where it might be)*.

(3) And sometimes a word or phrase that has been expressly stated in one part of a verse, is implied in another part. This is a characteristic of GAv. syntax, and of Zarathushtra's poetic technique. Linguists call it ellipsis.<sup>8</sup> Such implied words play an important part in translating and understanding this manthra. They would have been easily understood by all those who spoke the language fluently (scholars and non-scholars alike), and may also have been indicated by musical phrases when the Gathas (and this poem) were sung.

Except for the foregoing three kinds of implied words ~ well known in GAv. ~ I do not think one should introduce into the manthra a lot of implied words and phrases, simply to make a given translation work, as (with respect) many translators have done. You will see examples in some of these translations given below.

## 3. *Double entendre.*

In Zarathushtra's time period, when there were no books, movies, or various forms of electronic amusement, people entertained themselves by (among other things) memorizing, reciting, singing, and listening to, poetry and songs. Being fluent in Gathic Avestan, the people of Zarathushtra's time would have been well aware that certain words could be used for two (or more) different meanings. And spotting the use of double (or triple) entendre in their poetry and songs would have been a form of entertainment ~ sometimes in a funny way, sometimes in a satirical way, sometimes in a thought-provoking (or mind-delighting) way. Such word plays would have been deeply appreciated, adding interest to any poem or song. The Ashem Vohu is full of double entendre ~ in both word and concept.<sup>9</sup> So too is the Ahuna Vairya.

\* \* \* \* \*

Let us now look at the grammar and meaning of each word ~ both indispensable if we wish to understand the manthra ~ and then discuss how these words might be put together (syntax).

In the following discussion, I will sometimes use the short hand English equivalent 'truth' for *aša-* when the context needs a one-word English equivalent because the longer, but more accurate, 'true order of

'existence' is sometimes too cumbersome for an English translation. So when you read 'truth', if you will remember the longer definition, the resulting meaning of a given phrase (and indeed the manthra as a whole) will be more meaningful.

Here is the manthra in its entirety. The diagonal lines show the caesura,<sup>10</sup> (the poetic (metrical) division of each line), as generally accepted by linguists. These diagonal lines do not appear in the manuscripts, but in a poem made to be sung or recited by everyone, the rhythm/meter and its breaks (caesura) would likely bear some relationship to the sense, and therefore to the translation of the manthra, which is why I show the caesura.

To enable you to see more easily the balancing and alternating of expressed words (in red font) which in other places are implied (in round parentheses and black font), I have divided lines a. and b. into their segments (as created by the caesura).

- a. *yaθā. ahū. vairyō. / aθā. ratuš. ašātcīt. hacā.*  
b. *vaṅhēuš. dazdā. manavhō. / šyaōθananqm. aṅhēuš. mazdāi.*  
c. *x šaθrāmcā. ahurāi.ā.<sup>11</sup> / yim. drigubyō. dadaṭ. vāstārām. ♪ Y27.13.<sup>12</sup>*

- a. 'Just as the Lord/existence (is) to be chosen (in accord with truth itself),  
so also (is) (correct) judgment in accord with truth itself (to be chosen),  
b. (so also) the establishment /gifts of (this) good thinking,  
(the establishment/gifts) of actions stemming from an existence (in accord with truth itself, to be chosen), for wisdom/Wisdom,  
c. and the rule (in accord with truth, to be chosen), for the lord/Lord whom they have made pastor for the ones in need.

\* \* \* \* \*

Line a., *yaθā ahū vairyō / aθā ratuš ašātcīt hacā*

*yaθā ... aθā ...* 'just as ... so also ...'

*yaθā* can be used as a conjunction (a part of speech that joins words or phrases) which is sometimes is used with *aθā* giving us the combination of these two words in line a. *yaθā ... aθā ...* meaning 'just as ... so also ...', or various English equivalents.<sup>13</sup>

*ahū* 'Lord/existence'

The applicable masc. stem has been conjectured as both *ahu-* and *aṅhu-*, and is used for both 'lord' and 'life/existence'. So did Zarathushtra intend *ahū* to mean 'lord' and if so, did he intend a human 'lord' (religious or secular) or the Divine? Or did he intend *ahū* to mean 'existence'. Or (with double entendre) both?

In the Gathas, *ahu-* (in its various case forms) often is used for 'existence',<sup>14</sup> and once (without the suffix -*ra*) for 'lord'.<sup>15</sup>

To determine Zarathushtra's intent in using *ahū* in line a. we need to understand its grammatical function.

As a general proposition, in GAv., for *u-* stem nouns (like *ahu-*) the inflection *-ū* (as in *ahū*) is instr. sg. ('with/by/through \_\_\_'), and also is nom. dual.<sup>16</sup>

Many good linguists have construed *ahū* in line a. as nom. sg. 'lord' (or various English equivalents). But as a general proposition, the nom. sg. inflection for *u-* stem nouns (like *ahu-*) is *-uš*,<sup>17</sup> (which for *ahu-* would be *aṅhuš*). So *ahū* 'lord' as nom. sg. (rather than nom. du.) does not accord with general linguistic rules.

Insler 1975 who in line a. translates *ahū* as nom. sg. "lord", offers an historical explanation based on a probable linguistic evolution, stating his opinion that *ahū* originated from an old dual dvandva<sup>18</sup> *\*ahū ahvī* 'lord (and) lady'. Insler explains that since the fem. part of this pair *\*ahvī* (later *aṅuhī*) *~* was the form used for both sg. and du. (giving examples), the same ambiguous use came to be applied to its companion term *ahū*, whereby it became susceptible for use as both nom. sg. and nom. du.<sup>19</sup> As corroboration, he points to the Gatha verse Y29.6, where, in his opinion, *ahū* is used as nom. sg. (although not all linguists agree that *ahū* is nom. sg. in Y29.6).<sup>20</sup>

Humbach 1991, translated *ahū* in line a. as 'by the world' *~* instr. sg.,<sup>21</sup> ('world' being used as a synonym for existence/life). But by 2010, he had changed his mind (indicating a thinking mind and a scholarly integrity which I find admirable *~* even though I do not agree).

Humbach/Faiss (2010) translate *ahū* in line a. as nom. sg. "patron" (another way of saying 'lord' in English), explaining that although the instr. sg. 'by the world' is linguistically correct, they now prefer to translate *ahū* in line a. as nom. sg., without offering any linguistic explanation.<sup>22</sup>

Taraporewala (1951) also construes *ahū* as nom. sg. "Sovereign-Lord", following Bartholomae, but without a linguistic explanation.<sup>23</sup>

We can dismiss the idea that *ahū* is 'with the Lord' (instr. sg.) because that would not fit the context ('just as with-the-Lord (is) to be chosen' clearly does not fit). And the same applies to 'with existence' used alone ('just as with-existence- (is) to be chosen' clearly does not fit).

So the questions arise:

What meaning and grammatical value did Zarathushtra intend for *ahū* in line a.?

- (1) 'lord' (nom. sg.)? and if so, did he intend the Divine? a mortal? In Avestan script there are no capital letters such as would indicate his intent.
- (2) 'lord/existence' (both nom. du.) *~* used with double entendre?
- (3) 'lord/with existence' ? (nom. sg./instr. sg.) *~* used with double entendre?

Humbach/Faiss (2010) conclude that the translator must pick either the nom. sg. ('lord') or the instr. sg. ('with existence').<sup>24</sup>

But (with respect) I disagree. In my view, Zarathushtra uses *ahū* in line a. with double entendre, to include the ideas of both 'Lord', and also 'existence'. Let us think this through for a moment. The linguistics of *ahū* (if used with double entendre) give us two alternatives,

'Just as the lord/with existence (is) to be chosen', (*ahū* = 'lord' nom.sg./'with existence' instr. sg.); or

'Just as the lord/existence (is) to be chosen', (*ahū* = 'lord' nom. du./'existence' nom. du.<sup>25</sup>). One might question how a perception of the dual (in one word) could be used with the nom. sg. *vairyō* 'to be chosen'.

Well, it is interesting that eminent linguists have surmised that the two stems (*ahu-* 'lord', and *ahu-* 'existence') likely had the same origin ~ an idea which itself repays meditation.<sup>26</sup> And in the Gathas, we frequently see an interplay between the existence of the Divine and man ~ two aspects of one existence ~ the Divine being completely good, and mortals still being a mix of more good and bad (Y30.3), but capable of attaining complete goodness,<sup>27</sup> ~ the seeming plurality being a unity of identity.<sup>28</sup>

Applying this idea to line a. of the Ahuna Vairya, we see that if Zarathushtra uses *ahū* with double entendre, ~ *ahū* 'lord' representing the epitome of existence in quality, and *ahū* 'existence' representing unperfected existence (in quality), the double entendre for *ahū* is an integrated whole, representing the first choice ~ existence ~ the existence of the Divine (whom we worship), and the existence that is our lives (how we live our lives) ~ both to be chosen in accord with truth. This interplay between the human and the Divine is found in the most ancient commentary on the Ahuna Vairya (although not specifically commenting on *ahū*).<sup>29</sup>

This idea of understanding *ahū* as both 'lord' and 'existence', in the context of human choice ('(is) to be chosen'), is supported by the Gathas as the following demonstrates.

*ahū* as 'Lord'. This first choice of the Ahuna Vairya ~ the choosing the 'Lord' 'in accord with the true (correct) order of existence itself (*ašātātē hacā*)' ~ reflects Zarathushtra's re-thinking of the nature of the Divine, his rejection of the divinity of the local 'gods' of his culture, portrayed in the Gathas as full of 'rage' 'cruelty', 'violence', 'tyranny', 'greed', et cetera, which cause suffering in mortal existence (which qualities Zarathushtra views as 'evil' in the Gathas), and his conclusion that to be Divine, to be worthy of worship, the quality of a being had to be the true order of existence ~ a wholly good existence (*aša- vahišta*).

Thus *ahū* is 'Lord' in the sense of the Divine ~ a being whose existence personifies the wholly good, true order of existence (*aša-*).

Some translators have interpreted *ahū* to be a human lord (religious or secular). This is not consistent with the ways in which Zarathushtra uses *ahu-/ahura-* in the Gathas.<sup>30</sup> It is true that in certain YAv. texts, Zarathushtra is called 'lord',<sup>31</sup> but in the Gathas, he never calls himself 'lord'. Indeed, he makes it quite clear that he himself is not a perfected being,<sup>32</sup> but one who is engaged in a continuing search for the true order of existence.

"...as long as I shall be able and be strong, so long shall I look in quest of truth [*aša-*]. Truth, shall I see thee, as I continue to acquire both good thinking and the way to the Lord?..." Y28.4 - 5, Insler 1975. The way to the Lord is the path of truth, the path of His divine qualities, each of which is some aspect of the true order of existence. So here again, the path of truth leads to ... truth itself.<sup>33</sup>

It is true that in the Gathas, Zarathushtra does not use *ahu-*, for the Divine. He uses only *ahura-* the augmented form<sup>34</sup> of *ahu-*, as a name for the Divine. He does use *ahu-/ahura-* 'lord' for a perfected (human) being, but no unperfected being is unambiguously called *ahu-* or *ahura-* 'lord' in the Gathas.<sup>35</sup>

And the most ancient commentary on the Ahuna Vairya (Yy19) sees *ahū* in line a. as a reference to the Divine (Yy19.12), as does the YAv. *Visperad*, and its Pahlavi commentary.<sup>36</sup>

In light of all this evidence from the Gathas and the later texts, it would be reasonable to conclude that *ahū* in line a. does not mean a human 'lord' ~ religious or secular.

*ahū* as 'existence'. There is no dispute that a central feature of Zarathushtra's teachings in the Gathas is to bring *existence* (life) into sync with the true order of existence (*aša-*), with our good choices in thought, word and action ~ a path which he calls the *path(s) of truth, the path(s) of good thinking*, the path(s) of the attributes of the Divine, (*amesha spenta*) ~ each of which is some aspect of the true order of existence.<sup>37</sup>

Thus in the Gathas the standard by which Zarathushtra chooses both the nature of the 'Lord' he worships, and the nature of 'existence' (its path and its goal), is *aša-* the true order of existence ~ which choice is precisely what we find in line a. of the Ahuna Vairya through a double entendre (which is actually a single underlying idea) for the word *ahū* ~ as 'Lord' (representing perfected existence), and as unperfected 'existence' in general ~ each of which is to be chosen in accord with the true order of existence itself (*ašātcī hacā*). A conclusion which fits the nom. dual *ahū* perfectly.

A lovely interplay of ideas.

Parenthetically, we also see this kind of multi-dimensioned interplay in the Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu), with *aša- vahišta-* the most-good true order of existence,<sup>38</sup> and it is typical of Zarathushtra's poetic style in the Gathas ~ a compelling piece of evidence (in my view) that Zarathushtra is the author of these two manthras.

*vairyō* '(is) to be chosen'.

(is) here is implied in accordance with normal Av. usage.

*vairyō*. The verb stem is *var-* 'to choose', with the added suffix *-ya*.

Jackson 1892 states that the suffix *-ya* added to some verbs, forms a gerundive,<sup>39</sup> a derivative adjective, in the form of a future passive participle (such as 'to be chosen'). One of the examples given by Jackson is *vairya* ~ which is formed from the verb root *var-* 'to choose' + the suffix *-ya*. (§ 716, p. 197). Jackson goes on to say that gerundives with the suffix *-ya* are regularly inflected according to *a-* stem declensions (*-ya* being a suffix that ends in *a-*). The nom. sg. inflection for *a-* stem nouns/adjectives is *-ō* (Jackson § 236, p. 70). This gives us the nom. sg. *vairyō* ~ describing a thing that '(is) to be chosen'.

Therefore, to translate the Gathic Avestan *yaθā ahūairyō aθā* into English we would say,

'Just as [*yaθā*] the lord/existence [*ahū*] (is) to be chosen [*vairyō*], so also ...'.

*ratuš* '(correct) judgment'.

There is no dispute that *ratuš* is nom. sg. of the stem *ratu-*.<sup>40</sup> The problem lies in its meaning.

Some translators have translated *ratuš* in line a. of the Ahuna Vairya as a (human) spiritual leader. But this does not accord with the Gathas, in which the concept of humans choosing a priestly ruler or pontiff is not only absent, but alien to Zarathushtra's thought.

The Gathas do not set up any kind of a priestly hierarchy between man and the Divine. The focus of Zarathushtra's thought is on individual choices ~ choices between good thinking and its opposite, truth and its opposite, good words and actions and their opposites, good rule and its opposite ~ all made by individuals in their day to day lives.

Nor do the Gathas contain any notion of choosing a spiritual teacher in the sense of a guru. On the contrary, the Gathas tell us to make our choices independently, each person for himself, after listening and reflecting with a clear mind.<sup>41</sup>

It is true that in later times, as the religion became institutionalized, a hierarchical clergy with a chief priest dominated the religion. And this religious establishment of priests became powerful and utterly controlling.<sup>42</sup> The idea of allowing all the people to choose the chief pontiff would have astonished and appalled them. It simply did not exist.

So let us look at the ways in which Zarathushtra uses *ratuš* in the Gathas, for an accurate translation of *ratuš* in the Ahuna Vairya.

In the Gathas, according to Insler 1975 *ratu-* (in its various grammatical forms) is used for both 'judgment' and 'judge'. Humbach/Faiss 2010 agree that this is so.<sup>43</sup> In the Insler 1975 translation of the Gathas, in most instances the word is used for 'judgment'. And this is easy to understand, in that 'good thinking' (which involves good judgment) is the comprehension of truth, and is at the core of Zarathushtra's teaching. The search for truth, making good choices, implementing such choices, all involve good judgment ~ 'judgment in accord with the true order of existence itself' (*ratuš ašātcīt hacā*, line a. of the Ahuna Vairya).

Based on the evidence of the Gathas, I agree with Insler 1975 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 that *ratuš* in line a. is '(correct) judgment'. In fact, I think a good argument could be made that all instances of *ratu-* in the Gathas are used in the sense of '(good, right, correct) judgment' ~ the notion of the correctness of the judgment being inherent in the genesis of the word ~ the root *ar* from which Av. *aša-*, Old Persian *arta-*, Vedic *ṛta-*, derive.<sup>44</sup>

*ašātcīt hacā* 'in accordance with the true order of existence itself.'

*hacā* is a preposition/postposition which (depending on the context in which it appears) means 'from', 'out of' 'in accordance with'.<sup>45</sup>

*ašāt* is the abl. sg. case form of the ntr. stem *aša-*.

And the suffix *-cīt* is a particle of emphasis which, tacked on to *ašāt* means 'truth indeed' or 'truth itself'.<sup>46</sup> So in a more literal sense, the phrase *ratuš ašātcīt hacā* means the '(correct) judgment [*ratuš*] that derives from truth itself [*ašātcīt hacā*],' which exactly fits the root *ar* from which *ratuš* is derived.

Or in more fluent English, *ratuš ašātcīt hacā* means '(the) (correct) judgment in accord with the true order of existence itself.' The phrase *ašātcīt hacā* also appears (with and without *-cīt*) in many Gatha verses.<sup>47</sup>

Let us now see how these words in line a. may be put together (syntax) in English.

Insler has pointed out,<sup>48</sup> that in translating the two halves of line a., the word *vairyō* '(is) to be chosen' which appears in the first half, is implied in the second half; and that the phrase *ašātcīt hacā* 'in accord with truth itself' which appears in the second half, also is implied in the first half. And I completely agree. This elliptical syntax gives us (in my translation),

*yaθā ahū vairyō*

'Just as the Lord/existence is to be chosen (in accordance with truth itself)

*aθā ratuš ašātcīt hacā*

So also (correct) judgment in accord with truth itself (is to be chosen).'

I am grateful to Insler for this insight, which (in my view) gives us a key to understanding this manthra as a whole, because I think these two phrases (and others) are implied ~ not only in lines a. and b. but throughout this manthra, and solve many translation puzzles.

\* \* \*

Line b. *vañhəuš dazdā manañhō / šyaōθananəm añhəuš mazdāi*

Line c. *xšaθrəmcā ahurāi ā / yim drigubyō dadat vāstārəm*

There is some dispute as to whether lines b. and c. are each a separate unit of meaning, or whether a word from line c. belongs in line b., so let us consider all the words in these two lines, and you can decide for yourself.

*dazdā* is a Gatha verse that has not yet been decoded, and there are material disputes amongst linguists regarding its correct translation. So let us first consider the other words in lines b. and c., about which there are only minimal (grammatical) disputes. We will discuss *dazdā* last, and then consider how all these words fit together.

*vañhəuš ... manañhō* 'of good thinking'

Linguists do not dispute the grammar and meaning of *vañhəuš ... manañhō*. However in Avestan these two words are the form for more than one case ~ an ambiguity inherent in the language.

*vañhəuš* is a form of the adjective stem *vohu-* 'good'. It describes the noun *manañhō*.

*manañhō* is a form of the ntr. noun stem *manah-* which, as Insler has pointed out, is used in the Gathas in three ways ~ 'mind' (the faculty), 'thinking' (the process), and 'thought' (the object) depending on the context.<sup>49</sup> In this context I think it means 'thinking' ~ because it concerns the process of making choices, and generating the resulting actions, existence, and rule.

But *vañhəuš ... manañhō* are the forms used for both gen. sg. ntr. ('of good thinking'), and also abl. sg. ntr. ('from/in consequence of /because of/ good thinking').<sup>50</sup> These two words *vañhəuš* and *manañhō* go together (the adjective describing the noun). Therefore GAv. grammar requires that they both be in the same declension (case, number, gender). So they both could be gen. sg. Or they both could be abl. sg. And we have to decide: in the context of this manthra which did Zarathushtra intend these two words *vañhəuš ... manañhō* to be

(1) gen. sg. ('of good thinking')?

(2) abl. sg. ('from/in consequence of /because of good thinking') ?

(3) both ? (which is what Insler 1975 thinks ~ discussed below).

Let us put these questions on the back burner because their grammatical value can only be decided in the context of *dazdā*, which we will be looking at last.

*šyaōθananəm* 'of actions'

*šyaōθananəm* is gen. pl. of the ntr. stem *šyaōθana-*.<sup>51</sup> It therefore means 'of actions'.

*añhəuš* 'stemming from (an) existence'

As discussed under line a., there are two masc. noun stems *ahu-* ~ one meaning 'life/existence' and the other meaning 'lord', and *aṇhəuš* is a grammatical form of these two stems. In the context of line b. translators agree that *aṇhəuš* is a grammatical form of the masc. stem *ahu-* 'existence/life' and not *ahu-* 'lord' (which fits my view, that *existence* is a part of the double entendre of *ahū* 'lord/existence' (in line a). But here again, we have an ambiguity inherent in the Avestan language.

*aṇhəuš* is the form for both gen. sg. form ('of existence'),<sup>52</sup> and also abl. sg. ('stemming from (an) existence').<sup>53</sup>

So which did Zarathushtra intend in line b.?

Whichever choice is made, *aṇhəuš* (in the context of line b.) requires some implied word or phrase to make the 2d half of line b. intelligible.

But first, let us turn to the Gathas to see what Zarathushtra's intent may have been in using *aṇhəuš* in the Ahuna Vairya. In the Gathas, the 'existence' that is desired, is described as an existence that is in accord with the true (correct) order of existence (several times), and as an existence of good thinking (once). There is no contradiction here, because good thinking is the comprehension of the true (correct) order of existence, so an existence in accord with truth would include its comprehension (good thinking) ~ and would also include words and actions of truth (*ārmaiti*), and the rule of truth (Y51.4) (Hold those thoughts). Here is the evidence from the Gathas.

"... an existence in harmony with truth [*ašā aṇhəuš*]." Y44.8, Insler 1975;

"... for the maintenance of the world of truth [*aṇhəuš ... ašahyā*]." Y46.3, Insler 1975;  
(or stated another way, '... for the maintenance of (an) existence of truth.')

"Now, I shall speak of the best thing [*vahištəm* 'most good (thing)'] of this existence in accord with truth [*aṇhəuš... ašāt hacā*], ..." Y45.4, Insler 1975.

"acquire for yourselves ... an existence of good thinking [*ahūm ... vaṇhəuš manaṇhō*]..." Y53.5, Insler 1975;  
The word *ahūm* is acc. sg. of the stem *ahu-* 'existence'.

Each of these ways of describing the desired existence fit the context of line b. very well. And (following Zarathushtra's ellipsis in line a.) the implied words modifying *aṇhəuš* in line b. would be the previously stated *ašāt cēt hacā* 'in accord with the true (correct) order of existence itself', which parallels the Gatha examples above.

So if we translate *aṇhəuš* as abl. sg. , we get *šyaoθananqm aṇhəuš* 'of actions stemming from an existence (in accord with the true order of existence itself)...

*mazdāi* 'for wisdom'

The stem *mazdā-* means 'wisdom'. Zarathushtra's most used name for the Divine is *mazdā*.<sup>54</sup> And Insler's teacher, Thieme, is of the opinion that *mazdā* as a name for the Divine means 'personified wisdom'.<sup>55</sup> There is no dispute that *mazdāi* is dat. sg. of the stem *mazdā-* and therefore means 'to/for wisdom'. There are no capital letters in Avestan script such as would enable us to determine if here Zarathushtra intends the concept (wisdom) or the name of the Divine (Wisdom). In this context, I think he intends both (a double entendre) ~ intending 'for wisdom' the concept (complementing *ašāi vahištāi* in its companion manthra, the Asha Vahishta or Ashem Vohu), with perhaps a secondary meaning 'for Wisdom' (naming the Divine).

*x šaθrāmcā* 'and (the) rule'

In GAv., as Insler 1975 has pointed out, the ntr. noun *x šaθra-* is used in three ways: as faculty ('rulership, mastery'), as process ('rule'), and as object ('realm, dominion').<sup>56</sup> In this context, I think *x šaθrām* means 'rule' (process), because in the Ahuna Vairya, 'rule' is to be generated and established through the process of making choices that accord with an existence of truth, ~ an existence that consists of good judgment, (good words), and (good) action (which is the concept of *ārmaiti-*).

*-cā* is a conjunction 'and' which in Avestan normally is tacked on to the end of a word.<sup>57</sup> Thus *x šaθrāmcā* would normally mean 'and (the) rule'.

*x šaθrām* is both the nom. sg. and acc. sg. form for the ntr. stem *x šaθra-* (Skjaervo 2006). Here there is no undisputed expressed verb of which *x šaθrāmcā* could be the subject (nom. case) or object (acc. case). Humbach 1991 sees an implied verb of which *x šaθrāmcā* would be the subject (nom. sg.) "and the power [*x šaθrāmcā*] (is assigned)...".<sup>58</sup> Humbach/Faiss (2010) see an implied verb as well "and the power [*x šaθrāmcā*] (is committed to Him)...".<sup>59</sup> Insler sees *x šaθrāmcā* as acc. sg., the direct object of *dazdā* which he translates as an imperative verb "institute ye the rule...". But this is not an undisputed translation of the enigmatic *dazdā*, and it would require us to account for the *-cā* 'and', which Insler does by moving it to *ahurāi.ā* as discussed in more detail when we look at *dazdā*, at which time I will explain my own view.

*ahurāi.ā* 'for the Lord'

*ahurāi* is dat. sg. of the masc. stem *ahura-* meaning 'to/for the Lord'. And many translators (including Insler 1975, Humbach 1991, Humbach/Faiss 2010, Darmesteter and Bartholomae) do indeed translate the word as dat. 'to/for Ahura' (as detailed below).

Taraporewala 1951 comments that *ahurāi* is dat. but used in the sense of genitive and thus 'of Ahura', which he says is a "usual construction" in both Av. and Vedic Skt.<sup>60</sup>

Geldner shows *ahurāi. ā.* as two words and does not footnote any mss. variations.<sup>61</sup>

Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010 think that the original form was *ahurāi.ā* and not two words *ahurāi. ā*.<sup>62</sup> In his commentary, Humbach 1991 points to *ahurāi.ā* in Y29.5a, but offers no other comment or explanation.<sup>63</sup>

Insler 1975 believes that in this context the proper reading is one compound word *ahurāi.ā*. His translation is dat. sg. 'for the Lord'. He states that *ahurāi.ā* accords with the usual Gathic Avestan type *magāi.ā* Y29.11, *x<sup>v</sup>arəθāi.ā* Y34.11, *fradaθāi.ā* Y45.9, and that these forms represent older *\*ahurāyā* (and therefore also *\*magāyā*, *\*x<sup>v</sup>arəθāyā*, *\*fradaθāyā*) noting Vedic equivalents, and thinks that the change was made by the redactors because this form of the thematic dative was unknown in Young Avestan. He states that in this context, *ā* cannot be a postposition because it "never follows the dative of any other inflectional type (only *mazdāi* etc. and *ahmāi* occur)".<sup>64</sup> Y29.5a also has *ahurāi.ā* but Insler 1975 gives no explanation or comment on it. In that Gatha verse (Y29.5a), Geldner shows two mss. that have *ahurahyā*, which is close to Insler's emendation *\*ahurāyā* (above) in the Ahuna Vairya.<sup>65</sup> I find Insler's emendation and explanation persuasive, and it has been accepted by other linguists.<sup>66</sup>

*yim* 'whom'

*yim* is the acc. sg. case form of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*, ('who/which/that').<sup>67</sup> In this context, it means 'whom', (because it is acc. sg. ) and refers to the preceding \**ahurāi.ā* (or *ahurāi. ā*).

Thus, *x šraθrāmcā ahurāi.ā yim ...* 'and the rule, for the Lord/lord whom ...'

*drigubyō* 'for the ones-in-need',

The stem *drigu-* is classified as an adjective by Skjaervo (2006) who translates the word as 'poor'.<sup>68</sup> Here, this adj. is used as a noun ('poor-ones'). Insler 1975 agrees with Lommel's explanation that *drigu-* is "the needy one, dependent," but he does not give any etymology or other explanation.<sup>69</sup>

*drigubyō* is the dat. pl. masc. form of the adj. stem *drigu-*, and therefore means 'to/for the ones-in-need', or 'to/for the poor-ones' (the masc. being used generically here).<sup>70</sup>

What does Zarathushtra mean when he uses the term *drigubyō* 'for the poor-ones', or 'for the ones-in-need'? The Pahlavi translators interpret it to mean material poverty. But (once again) we need to look to the evidence of the Gathas.

In Y34.5, Zarathushtra asks Wisdom (*mazdā-*), "... have ye the power, Wise One [*mazdā-*], ... to protect your needy dependent [*drigūm*] ~ as I indeed am ~ with truth and with good thinking?..." Y34.5, Insler 1975. Now it is true that Zarathushtra was not wealthy. In Y46.2, he says, "I know that (reason) because of which I am powerless, Wise One [*mazdā-*]: by my condition of having few cattle, as well as (that) I am a person with few men..." Y46.2, Insler 1975. But in Y34.5 (quoted above), his need as *drigūm* is for the protection of 'truth' and 'good thinking'. So in the context of this Gatha verse (Y34.5) *drigūm* cannot mean only material poverty.

*drigu-* also appears in the last line of the last Gatha, Y53.9, in a context that is very close to line c. of the Ahuna Vairya. Although it is not used in a way that specifically identifies the nature of the need or dependency, what is given by Wisdom, to fill the need is goodness "... Such is Thy rule, Wise One [*mazdā-*], through which Thou shalt grant what is very good [*vahyō*] to Thy needy dependent [*drigaovē* dat. sg.] who lives honestly." Y53.9, Insler 1975. The word *vahyō* is the comparative degree of *vohu-* 'good', so literally it means 'more good'. So what is given in Y53.9 by Wisdom, to fill the need that is *drigu-*, is an incremental (or increasing) goodness.

In both the Gathas, and in the Ahuna Vairya, I think Zarathushtra uses *drigu-* 'poor', or 'needy' as the opposite of the way he uses 'wealth'. In Y43.12 he speaks of "wealth-granting [*mazdā.rayā*] reward [*ašī*]"<sup>71</sup> And in multiple instances, he shows that 'reward' is the attainment of truth (*aša-*) and its components (*amesha spenta*).<sup>72</sup> Therefore his notion of 'wealth' is the wealth of truth.<sup>73</sup> Thus, it needs must follow (as the day the night), that a person who lacks this 'wealth' is 'poor' or 'needy' in the sense that he has not yet made it. He has not yet attained completely, the true order of existence.

But that is just one dimension. Zarathushtra speaks of the existences of matter and of mind as two sides of the same coin (at least in our present reality).<sup>74</sup> So in my view, *drigubyō* 'for-the-ones-in-need' or 'for-the-

**poor-ones'** in line c. of the Ahuna Vairya applies to **'need'** in both existences ~ in the existences of matter and of mind.

So the **ones-in-need** are those who have not yet attained the wealth of truth (*aṣa-*), whose existence and judgments are still flawed ~ who have not yet acquired an existence in accord with truth (*aṣāṅcīṭ hacā* lines a. and b.), ~ and therefore are in need of help. And the **ones-in-need** are also those who may be in material poverty, in material need. The required nurture (being a **pastor**) in line c. of the Ahuna Vairya would therefore address both needs ~ which is eminently sensible.

In the context of line c., I think a closer English equivalent (in meaning) for *drigubyō* is **'for the ones-in-need'**, because in English **'the poor'** is normally used only for material poverty, or for pity, (and often in a condescending way), none of which accurately express Zarathushtra's full thought in using *drigubyō*.

*dadaṭ* 'they have made'

The verb *dā-* means 'to give, make, produce, establish, ordain', and related English equivalents.<sup>75</sup>

With two exceptions, translators agree that *dadaṭ* is a 3p. pl. verb form deriving from *dā-* ~ the pronoun 'they' being implicit in the verb form (assuming the verb form is 3p. pl.), Taraporewala 1951 and Skjaervo 2006 see *dadaṭ* as 3p sg. and the translators differ somewhat in other respects as well ~ except for Taraporewala and Humbach/Faiss 2010, each translation of *dadaṭ* in our group is one of the flavors of *dā-* 'to give, make, produce, establish, ordain', and related English equivalents.

Insler 'they established',<sup>76</sup>

Bartholomae 'they have made'(as it appears in Tarap. 1951),

Humbach 1991 'the people appoint',<sup>77</sup> without comment.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 '(people) commend',<sup>78</sup> without explanation. I am not familiar with the use of 'commend' as one of the meanings of *dā-*.

Taraporewala 1951 3p ~ him who 'becomes'.<sup>79</sup>

In the context of line c. (based on how I see the identity of **they**), I find Bartholomae's translation the most persuasive ~ **'they have made'**, which raises the interesting question:

To whom does **'they'** refer? Well, in Yasna 29, it is Wisdom and His Divine attributes who select Zarathushtra to be the **'pastor'**, nurturer, of the beneficial in mortal existence (the allegorical 'cow').<sup>80</sup> Now, if we look past the allegories ~ the images ~ in Y29 what do we see? We see that Wisdom/wisdom and its qualities truth, good thinking, a beneficial way of being, are the qualities that enable us to be (**make** us) nurturers (**pastor**) of the beneficial in each unit of mortal existence.

*vāstārām*

*vāstārām* is the form for both nom. sg. and acc. sg. of the stem *vāstar-* and means **'pastor'**. In this context, it is acc. sg. because it refers to the preceding *ahurāi.ā* 'for the lord' (sg.), thus *yim dadaṭ vāstārām* 'whom they-have-made pastor'.

The literal meaning of *vāstārām* is a **'pastor'** in the sense of **'one who cares for cattle'**. In the Gathas, **'pastor'** and **'cattle'** are both used (metaphorically). The **'cow'** is an allegory for the beneficial in mortal existence. So the metaphoric **'pastor'** is one who nurtures the all that is beneficial in mortal existence (the allegorical cow).

And in the Gathas, this 'pastor' is used for the Divine, Its attributes (amesha spenta) and humans whose good choices bring these Divine qualities to life ~ all of which nurtures what is good in mortal existence. In a related way, the allegorical cow is nurtured by the "pasture of truth and good thinking" Y33.3. The evidence which supports this network of metaphors and allegories is discussed in detail in another chapter.<sup>81</sup>

If we read the Ahuna Vairya's *vāstārām* 'pastor' in line c., in light of how Zarathushtra uses 'pastor' in the Gathas, it would be consistent to conclude that *pastor* in line c., is a metaphor for the Divine and for humans who nurture what is beneficial (the amesha spenta) in mortal existence.

Let us now look at the difficult *dazdā*, and in so doing, see how all these words in lines b. and c. fit together.

### *dazdā*

This word does not appear in any other (surviving) GAv. texts.<sup>82</sup> I do not know if it appears in any YAv. text (other than in commentaries on the Ahuna Vairya). No linguist has pointed to the use of *dazdā* in any YAv. text (so far as I am aware) ~ perhaps because it is not used in any YAv. text. And, except for Taraporewala, no translator of the Ahuna Vairya (of whom I am aware), has pointed to any Vedic cognate. So in *dazdā* we have a word form which may not have been rare to the people of Zarathushtra's time, but is not used in any other surviving text. We therefore cannot get a sense of its grammatical value and meaning, based on its use in the Gathas and other Av. texts, or Vedic parallels.

Eminent linguists all agree that *dazdā* is derived from the verb stem *dā-* but they are in full disagreement about its grammatical value and meaning, and have made various guesses. We need to be aware that all such opinions ~ even from the most eminent linguists ~ are conjectures. There is no certainty (or near certainty) in the translations of *dazdā*, the use of which in this manthra Insler calls 'enigmatic'.

Yet its meaning is key to translating lines b. and c., and to the sense of the manthra as a whole. So what do we do? Well, let's take it in steps ~ first seeing what we do know, and then looking at the educated guesses of eminent linguists, to see if we can select a tentative meaning that fits linguistic norms, Zarathushtra's thought in the Gathas, and available ancient commentaries.

In Gathic Avestan, the verb *dā-* is used for each of the following concepts ~ 'to give, make, produce, create, establish, ordain,' and related English equivalents. So this one verb stem *dā-* gives us a wide range of (related) meanings. And *dā-* has generated various noun stems, such as *dāh-* 'gift', and *dātar-* 'giver, establisher, maker, creator.'<sup>83</sup> Some linguists have translated *dazdā* as a noun. Others as a verb. And they also differ as to its meaning.

### *dazdā* as a noun.

The Pahlavi translators (whose full translation is given below) translate *dazdā* as a noun, nom. sg. 'gift'.<sup>84</sup> They translate *vanjhēuš dazdā mananjhō* as "The gift of Wahman", (Av. *vohu-* *manah-*) although they are puzzled to see how it fits with the rest of the line.

Taraporewala translates *dazdā* as a noun, nom. pl. 'gifts' from a conjectured ntr. stem *dazda-* 'gift', (which would make *dazdā* its correct nom. pl. form in GAv.).<sup>85</sup> In his commentary he explains the existence of the stem *dazda-* 'gift' based on the following line of reasoning. He says "In Skt. we find three forms of the p. pt. of *dā-*, ~ *dātā* (Vedic), *datta* and *dāda*. This last, he says, is from a secondary root *dad-*." He says the Av. *-azd-* sometimes represents Skt. *ād-* or *adh-*, giving as an example Av. *θrazdūm*, Skt. *trādhvam*

(citing Jackson 1892 §171) in support of this rule). He concludes that the nearest Skt. form therefore would be *dāda* (*dad + ta*). He says that this word means 'gift' and is used as such in the "Mbh. [Mahabharata]."<sup>86</sup>

Taraporewala's translation of *dazdā* as nom. pl. 'gifts' is consistent (in concept) with both the Pahlavi translation (given below), and the ancient Avestan commentary on this manthra,<sup>87</sup> both of which speak of the idea of a 'gift' in the Ahuna Vairya (although they could have been referring to the gifting of nurture in line c.). And the Younger Avestan Yy27.7 (a few sections before the Ahuna Vairya itself), calls the Ahuna Vairya itself a gift (although this quotation does not see the idea of a 'gift' in the the text of the Ahuna Vairya). It says,

"We are offering the saving acts of wisdom and of worship with the sacred gift of the Ahuna Vairya ..."  
Yy27.7, Mills translation.<sup>88</sup>

In this passage the 'gift' is the recital of the Ahuna Vairya. However, I think the idea of 'gift(s)' may have been an underlying double entendre intended by Zarathushtra in the manthra itself. We will discuss this possible double entendre later in this chapter, after we have finished looking at the opinions of linguists regarding *dazdā*.

Bartholomae takes *dazdā* as nom. sg. of a conjectured agent noun stem *dazdar-* and he translates *dazdā* as 'bringer', (thus *vañhəuš dazdā manəjhō* 'the bringer of good thought') believing that it refers here to Zarathushtra who brings the life-works of his good thoughts to Mazda, citing Y33.14.<sup>89</sup>

What does Bartholomae mean by an 'agent noun'? Well, an 'agent noun' is simply a noun that performs the action of a verb. In English, such nouns are formed by adding to a verb, the suffix *-er* or *-or*. For example, *teacher*, *worker*, *manufacturer*, *actor*, *instructor*.<sup>90</sup> According to Jackson, in Avestan, an agent noun can be formed by adding the suffix *-tar* (*-dar*) to a verb. For the verb stem *dā-* 'to give', Jackson shows only *dātar-* "giver", and does not express an opinion as to what factors might govern the use of *-tar* instead of *-dar* in creating agent nouns in Avestan.<sup>91</sup> According to Jackson, the *-ā* inflection is nom. sg. for *-ar-* stem nouns in Gathic Avestan.<sup>92</sup> So if *dazdar-* is a valid agent noun stem, as Bartholomae surmises, then *dazdā* would be its correct nom. sg. form.

Haug and Benveniste also have translated *dazdā* as an agent noun ('giver'). Their full translations are given below.

Gershevitch (1967) sees *dazdā* as nom. sg. of the agent noun stem *dazdar-* as well. But he translates it "do-er", thereby seeking to distinguish it from (the more common agent noun stem) *dātar-* which he translates as 'giver, creator'. But he does not explain the linguistics which inform his understanding of this difference between these two agent nouns derived from *dā* (*dātar-* and the conjectured *dazdar-*), or how the meaning 'to do' derives from *dā-*,<sup>93</sup> ~ (possibly a flavor of 'to produce?') His translation is given below.

Mary Boyce also translates *dazdā* as "do-er" (her translation is given below).

It is interesting that the most ancient Commentary on the Ahuna Vairya (Yasna 19 in YAv.) seems to regard *dazdā* as an agent noun as well. It explains the words *dazdā manəjhō* as 'teacher of thought' (Humbach 1991 translation),<sup>94</sup> or 'creator of mind' (Mills 1887 translation),<sup>95</sup> ~ perhaps in the sense of 'giver of thought'. But according to the author(s) of this ancient Commentary, *vañhəuš* (which they are puzzled to

explain) does not belong with *manan̄hō*, ~ a grammatically flawed conclusion,<sup>96</sup> indicating a serious lack of accurate linguistic knowledge by the author(s) of this section of the Commentary.

Insler 1975 states that *dazdā* cannot be an agent noun, and that Bartholomae's opinion is a "forced analysis" which he says has been rejected by Humbach and Duchesne-Guillemin. Insler states that the correct formation of an agent noun (from *dā-*) is *dātar-* which is attested in the Gathas and down through the youngest portions of the Avesta. He therefore concludes that the translation of *dazdā* as an agent noun by Bartholomae, Gershevitch, and Benveniste "cannot be accepted".<sup>97</sup>

When it comes to a word like *dazdā* which is found nowhere else in the comparatively small corpus of surviving texts, I am not comfortable taking as a 'fact', a conclusion based on the absence of evidence in Avestan texts (as Insler does).<sup>98</sup> However, I am not persuaded that *dazdā* is an agent noun, 'bringer' or 'doer', or 'giver', because it does not fit contextually with the other words in lines a. and b. There is no verb or action word of which it could be the subject, unless we change the interpretation of line a. to make Zarathushtra the lord or judge who is to be chosen, which is not consistent with the Gathas, (as we already have discussed under *ahū* and *ratus̄* above).

*dazdā* as a verb.

Duchesne-Guillemin<sup>99</sup> translated *dazdā* as a verb 'has ... been given' with *ratus̄* as its subject ("Just as he is to be chosen by the world [*ahū*], so has the judgment [*ratus̄*] according to Justice itself [*ašāt̄cīt̄ hacā*], of the deeds [*šyaoθananqm*] of the world [*anjhāuš*] been given [*dazdā*], from Good mind [*vajhāuš ... manan̄hō*] to Mazda [*mazdāi*]...").

Although he has given each word its correct grammatical value and meaning, I do not (with respect) find this translation persuasive in the context of lines a. and b. Given the two words at the start of each half of line a., *yaθā ... aθā* 'just as ... so also' there has to be a logical connection between the two phrases that follow each of those words. There is no logical connection between the first statement (just as (he) must be chosen by the world), and second statement (so also the judgment of deeds is given from good mind to Mazda).

In addition, the focus of Duchesne-Guillemin's translation is Divine judgment of human conduct (a Biblical mind-set).<sup>100</sup> Although the Gathas do speak of Wisdom's judgments (made with "solicitude" and with the assistance of His "clever advisor truth" Y46.17), they contain no expressions of Divine judgment as a precursor to punishment in 'hell' or reward in 'heaven' ~ although this interpretive mind-set has been read into the Gathas by many translators.<sup>101</sup> Zarathushtra's focus throughout the Gathas is on the Divine (in quality and in being) as the key to human transformation. The path of truth, the path of the attributes of the Divine (the amesha spenta) each of which is some aspect of the true (correct) order of existence, which is also the reward for taking that path ~ the means and the end.<sup>102</sup>

Humbach 1991 translated *dazdā* as a verb 'is assigned' seeing *ratus̄* 'judgment' as its subject. But because he has since changed his mind about the first part of line a. (which affects the context of *dazdā*), let us just consider his 2010 translation with Faiss. Parenthetically, in the process of de-coding a language that for many centuries had become unknown, any good scholar is bound to change his mind, and I respect and admire the integrity of those who do so ~ and acknowledge it.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *dazdā* as a verb "is committed", without explanation, seeing *ratuš* as its subject. Their translation is as follows, words in round parentheses are in their translation, indicating words that are not in the GAv. text but which they think should be implied ~ although not all implied words have been placed in round parentheses. The Avestan words in square brackets have been inserted by me so that you can see their opinions of the English equivalents for these Avestan words.

"Since (He is) the patron [*ahū*] worth choosing [*vairyō*], therefore the judgment [*ratuš*] (to be passed) in accordance with truth itself [*ašātcēt hacā*] on the actions [*šyaoθananqm*] of good thought [*vanhāuš ... manahō*] of the world [*anahāuš*] is committed [*dazdā*] to the Wise One [*mazdā-*], ...". Humbach/Faiss 2010 p. 73.

Here again, there is no logical connection between the two phrases which follow *yaθā ... aθā* which they translate as "Since ... therefore". In addition, *vairyō* is not given its normal grammatical value, and this translation takes *šyaoθananqm* as loc. pl. (on the actions), whereas it is generally agreed that *šyaoθananqm* is gen. pl. 'of actions' (the loc. pl. would be *šyaoθanaēšū*, Skjaervo 2006). While the gen. is sometimes used in ways other than as possession, the loc. is not one of those ways.<sup>103</sup> With respect, if each word is given its generally agreed to grammatically value, this translation would not work.

And here again, the focus is on Divine judgment (a biblical mind-set), with the added problem that such judgment is passed "on the actions of good thought of the world" which puzzles me. If indeed judgment is to be passed, would it not be passed on all actions, not just those of good thought? And who would have the authority to commit to *mazdā- ahura-*, the right to pass judgment? I have seen no parallel ideas expressed in the Gathas.

Skjaervo 2006 shows *dazdā* as a verb, Injunctive, 3p sg. in mid(dle) voice of the verb stem *dā-*. He translates the mid. of *dā-* as 'to take, receive'. But (with respect) I am puzzled to see how this would fit in this context.

Insler (1975),<sup>104</sup> is not persuaded by the translations of Humbach<sup>105</sup> and Duchesne-Guillemin. He concludes that *dazdā* is a 2p pl. imperative verb form which he translates as "institute ye" (another way of saying 'establish (ye)'). He does not identify a verb stem which generates this imperative form. In the Gathas, he sees *dātā* as the 2p pl. imperative form of the verb *dā-* "grant ye" Y29.10a and "give ye" Y34.6b. So his translation of *dazdā* reflects either a rare imperative form, which he uses as a synonym for the more commonly used imperative form *dātā*, or he conjectures another verb stem (derived from *dā-*) which he has not identified or explained.

Insler's translation of *dazdā* as an imperative verb would require a direct object (acc. case), ~ something that is to be instituted ~ which Insler says is *x šaθrāmcā* (in line c). Now if the conjunction *-cā* 'and' belongs with *x šaθrām*, this would (literally) give us 'institute ye and the rule'. But Insler resolves this problem by contending that the *-cā* grammatically belongs with *ahurāi.ā[cā]* not with *x šaθrām*, and that the *-cā* has migrated to second place in the line (tacked on to *x šaθrām* which is in first place) according to "the well known law of enclitic<sup>106</sup> placement,"<sup>107</sup>

Insler gives one example of this type of enclitic migration in Gathic Avestan, and he gives two examples from the Vedas. His Gathic Avestan example involves another conjunction *vā* 'or'<sup>108</sup> a stand alone word, not attached to the first word in the line, but which has gravitated to 2d place in the line. His Vedic examples do indeed involve *-ca* (which in these Vedic examples is a stand alone word. In Av. mss. it is sometimes a stand alone word, and sometimes a suffix).

However, in the Gathas, there are many instances in which the conjunction *-cā* (belonging to another word) has not migrated to the first word of the line (or the first word after the caesura).<sup>109</sup>

So Insler's 1975 translation of line b. and a part of line c. is as follows,

"in consequence of this good thinking [*vañhəuš ... manəñhō*], institute ye [*dazdā*] the rule [*x šaθrəm*] of actions [*šyaοθananəm*] stemming from an existence [*añhəuš*] of good thinking [*vañhəuš ... manəñhō*] for the sake of the Wise One [*mazdāi*], and for the lord [*\*ahurāi.ācā*]..."

As you can see, Insler's translation requires the use of *vañhəuš ... manəñhō* twice ~ once with *dazdā*, and the second time (implied) with *añhəuš*.

He points to the fact that *dazdā* is framed by *vañhəuš ... manəñhō*, and says that this kind of framing occurs in the Gathas when the framing words modify the word framed,<sup>110</sup> giving the following examples (to which I have added his 1975 translation).

*vahištā išasā manəñhā* Y31.4b ("...through the very best thinking I shall seek...");

*vohū šyavāi manəñhā* Y33.8a ("...I shall enact with good thinking").

In each of these instances the words *vohū* (or *vahištā*) and *manəñhā* (both instr. sg. 'through/with/by \_\_\_\_') belong with the action of the verb framed. And in fact this type of framing or encapsulation occurs so frequently in the Gathas ~ both with verbs and nouns ~ that it must have been a well known element of Gathic Avestan syntax,<sup>111</sup> of which I was not aware, but it has solved many problems in understanding other Gatha verses, so I am grateful indeed to Insler for pointing out this element of Av. syntax.

Insler thinks that *vañhəuš manəñhō* in line b. of the Ahuna Vairya functions as a *šleša*,<sup>112</sup> and therefore, although stated only once, would (as a *šleša*) be read twice. You may recall, *vañhəuš manəñhō* is both the correct abl. form and the correct gen. form for the two stems *vohu-* *manah-*. And Insler reads them twice as follows.

The first time as abl. with *dazdā*, "in consequence of (this) good thinking establish ye [*vañhəuš dazdā manəñhō*] ").

And the second time he reads the implied *vañhəuš ... manəñhō* as gen. (with *añhəuš* as abl.) "stemming from an existence [*añhəuš*] (of good thinking *vañhəuš ... manəñhō*) ".<sup>113</sup> He sees this second use as necessary to describe the desired existence, which he says in the Gathas is an existence of good thinking, citing Y53.5, where Zarathushtra says,

"...acquire ... an existence of good thinking [*ahūm ... vañhəuš manəñhō*]..." Y53.5; the word *ahūm* is acc. sg. of the stem *ahu-* 'existence, life'.

So (in context) the Insler 1975 translation of lines a. b. and c. is as follows (I have placed the elliptic implied words in black font because Insler does not place them in round parentheses),

*yaθā ahu vairyo aθā ratuš ašātcēt hacā*

a. "Just as the Lord in accord with truth must be chosen, so also the (correct) judgment in accord with truth."

*vañhəuš dazdā manəñhō šyaοθananəm añhəuš mazdāi*  
*x šraθrəmcā ahurāi.ā yim drigubyō dadaṭ vāstārəm*

bc. "In consequence of (this) good thinking [*vanhəuš ... manəjhō*], institute ye [*dazdā*] the rule [*\*x šraθrəm*] of actions [*šyaoθananəm*] stemming from an existence [*aṇhəuš*] of good thinking [*vanhəuš ... manəjhō*] for the (sake of the) Wise One [*mazdāi*], and for the lord [*\*ahurāi.ācā*] whom they established as pastor for the needy-dependents." Insler 1975.<sup>114</sup>

Of all the translations that I have studied, Insler's (to my mind) accords best with the ideas in the Gathas, and (setting aside the linguistics of *dazdā*, *x šraθrəm*, and *ahurāi.ā*), his translation is one of the few that gives an indisputably accurate grammatical value to each word of the manthra without adding a lot of words not previously stated to make the translation work. But I am troubled by a few things.

(1) *dazdā* He does not identify the verb which he says generates the 2p pl. imperative form *dazdā* 'institute ye'. If it is *dā-*, he does not explain why the 2p pl. imperative of *dā-* is *dātā* in the Gathas (Y29.10a and Y34.6b) and *dazdā* in the Ahuna Vairya. There may well be two forms of the 2p pl. imperative of *dā-*. There may well be another verb derived from *dā-* which would generate the imperative *dazdā*. The problem is that Insler just does not explain how he arrives at his conclusion that *dazdā* is a 2p pl. imperative verb form, or how it squares with the commonly used imperative form *dātā*.

(2) *x šraθrəm* It is true that in the Gathas, to accommodate poetic requirements like meter (and sometimes alliteration), words frequently are found in arrangements which do not accord with prose Avestan syntax, including the placement of words in one line which might otherwise belong in another line. But in a manthra like the Ahuna Vairya, which was crafted to be recited by everyone ~ farmers, artisans, warriors, children ~ not just by the learned, I think Zarathushtra would have kept the syntax simple ~ as with the Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu). But moving *x šraθrəm* from line c. to the middle of line b., does not keep the syntax simple. I think we should favor a simple syntax alternative if such a (linguistically defensible) solution can be found.

(3) *ahurāi.ā[cā]* In light of the many instances in the Gathas in which *-cā* does not migrate to the first word, it would be reasonable to conclude that such a migration was not necessarily a common occurrence in Gathic Avestan. And once again the migration of *-cā* from *x šraθrəm* to *ahurāi.ā* would not keep the syntax simple. I am therefore reluctant to conclude that Zarathushtra would have arranged his words (chosen a form of syntax) that involved an uncommon migration of *-cā* 'and', in a manthra which was intended to be recited by all, and not just by the learned.

*A proposed solution.*

So what did Zarathushtra have in mind? Well, I will propose a solution for *dazdā*. If it is correct, it fulfils the following requirements.

(1) It allows all the other words to fall into place in a way that gives each word its correct grammatical value while keeping the syntax simple.

(2) With it, the Ahuna Vairya reflects, and indeed encapsulates, basic teachings of Zarathushtra (which the ancients thought was its purpose).

(3) It is based on aspects of the opinions of eminent linguistics, and fits a particular idea we see in the Gathas, ~ an idea that has been associated with the Ahuna Vairya in commentaries from Younger Avestan through Pahlavi times.

(4) It results in a manthra that is crafted in a simple yet skillful, multi-dimensional (and beautiful) way.

(5) And it complements the Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu) ~ the two being crafted for the purpose of conveying for everyone's use, the essence of Zarathushtra's teachings.

I think Zarathushtra uses *dazdā* with double entendre. Let us first consider its primary meaning.

There is no dispute that *dazdā* derives from the stem *dā-* which is used for many related meanings including, 'to make, give, produce, establish'. Bartholomae conjectures a stem *dazdar-* from which he derives the nom. sg. *dazdā* which he and other eminent linguists have translated as 'bringer', 'giver', but which could as accurately be 'establisher' (a person who establishes) based on the meanings of its stem *dā-*.

Now according to scholars who are eminent linguists, *ratu-* is used in the Gathas for both a person who judges ('judge') and also the concept 'judgment', without any (known) linguistic rule to explain the choice of when one or the other is used ~ the choice being based solely on the context. So I suggest that in the same way, nom. sg. *dazdā* could be used for both 'establisher' and 'establishment'. But in the context of line b., *dazdā* would mean 'establishment', which with 'judgment' in line a., and *x šaθrāmcā* in line c., impliedly share *vairyō* '(is) to be chosen' in line a. Bearing in mind that the judgment that is *ratuš* is a mental activity, a thought process that intrinsically is straight, correct, good (not a one shot Divine judgment of people or their actions before sending them to 'heaven' or 'hell'). So essentially, '(correct) judgment' is another way of saying good thinking. Thus we get,

- a. ... *aθā ratuš ašātcēt hacā*  
... so also (is) (correct) judgment in accord with truth itself (to be chosen),
- b. *vanhəuš dazdā manəjhō* ...  
(the) establishment of (this) good thinking ...

So if *dazdā* means '(the) establishment' where does the double entendre come in?

Well, we have the puzzling fact that both the earliest YAv. commentary and the Pahlavi translation of the Ahuna Vairya contain the idea of a 'gift'. The Pahlavi translation translates *vanhəuš dazdā manəjhō* as 'the gift of Wahman' (Av. *vohu-* *manah-*)

The Younger Avestan Commentary (Yasna 19) says

"And this saying, uttered by Mazda, ... has a conclusion ending with a gift [*rāiti*]..." Y19.16.

It is true that *dazdā* does not appear at the conclusion of the Ahuna Vairya, and probably the 'gift' to which the Younger Avestan Commentary refers, is the gift of nurture for those in need, mentioned at the end of line c., but the YAv. Commentary nevertheless speaks of a 'gift'.

That these two ancient views came from different original sources (or schools of thought) is apparent from the fact that the Younger Avestan commentary (erroneously) severs *vanhəuš* from *manəjhō*, whereas the Pahlavi translation (accurately) does not.<sup>115</sup> We cannot ignore the fact that these two different sources ~ extending over several centuries, if not more than a millennium ~ both thought that the idea of a 'gift' was in the Ahuna Vairya. I am inclined to think that they were transmitting a more ancient understanding which, as the centuries went by, they could not quite explain grammatically.

So let us consider this idea. Is it linguistically defensible? If Taraporewala 1951 is correct, it is. More important, does it have a basis in the Gathas? It does.

*Linguistic basis.* As we have already seen, Taraporewala translates *dazdā* as a noun, nom. pl. 'gifts' from a conjectured ntr. stem *dazda-* 'gift', for which he offers a linguistic explanation based on a Vedic parallel. The fact that all may not agree with him, does not make his explanation linguistically indefensible.<sup>116</sup>

If Taraporewala's translation of *dazdā* as 'gifts' is linguistically defensible, we might get the following translation for line b., (although Taraporewala translates the other words differently).

'the gifts of (this) good thinking [*vaṇhēuš dazdā manaṇhō*], (the gifts) of actions [*šyaoθananqm*] stemming from an existence [*aṇhēuš*] (in accord with truth itself is to be chosen) for Wisdom...'

This, in my view, is a reasonable fit.

*Gatha parallels.* It is corroborated by Zarathushtra's idea that we worship the Divine with Its own qualities (amesha spenta).<sup>117</sup> Worship offerings (in their pure form) are in the nature of gifts (although all too often they are closer to bribes).

But more importantly, this idea has lovely parallels in the Gathas which involve a mutual gifting.

In the Gathas, the attributes of the divine (truth, good thinking, embodied truth, good rule, a beneficial way of being) redeem us from mortality (as the Ahuna Vairya is said to do).<sup>118</sup> They are the path to the Divine, and the end result of taking that path ~ the Divine itself. As such, they are gifts from the Divine to us, and from us to the Divine (both necessary for perfecting existence), an interplay we see in Y29.10 and 11, (and other verses which are footnoted),<sup>119</sup> where the attributes of the Divine are both given (gifted) to mortals, and also are our gifts to the Divine.

Y29.10 "Lord, grant ye [*dātā*] to these (mortals) strength and the rule of truth and good thinking, ..." Insler 1975. The things granted (gifted) are attributes of the Divine, given to mortals by the Divine and its attributes.<sup>120</sup>

Y29.11 "Where are truth and good thinking, and where their rule? Yes, come ye now to me. ... Lord, (come) now to us here in consequence of our gift [*rātōiš*] for you." Insler 1975. Insler surmises in a footnote that this 'gift' in Y29.11 is the "gift of piety and faith".<sup>121</sup> But (with respect) I disagree. "Faith" is not the prime ingredient in Zarathushtra's thought. His focus is on questioning, searching for truth with good thinking. And in Zarathushtra's thought, the worship we give to Wisdom is an act of free choice (a gift), and is the worship of the Divine with Its own qualities ~ with truth, its comprehension good thinking, its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action, its good rule, its complete and undying attainment ~ our own self-realization, the beneficial-sacred way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*) ~ which also completes existence as a whole (collective *haurvatāt-*) of which the Divine is a part. A mutual gifting of the same thing for the same end result ~ one which is reflected in the Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu) and in the Gatha verse Y46.10 (*ašəm / ašāi* 'truth for the truth') and in the Ahuna Vairya (good thinking, actions (of truth) for wisdom/Wisdom, and rule for the lord/Lord). We the same idea in the GAv. Yasna Haptanghaiti, a later text.<sup>122</sup>

And indeed, we see the idea of a gifting again, in the nurture given to the ones in need, at the end of this manthra. How does the Lord, Wisdom, nurture, support, protect, in the Gathas? With His Divine attributes.<sup>123</sup>

Therefore, even though neither the Younger Avestan Commentary nor the Pahlavi translation give us a grammatically accurate rendition of the words of the manthra, each of these sources were likely transmitting

at least some ideas from a more ancient understanding of the Ahuna Vairya, which reflected the mutual gifting of divine attributes between the Divine and man, and between man and man (and all that exists), that we see in the Gathas.

From this line of reasoning, and assuming that Taraporewala's analysis is linguistically defensible, I am inclined to conclude that Zarathushtra uses *dazdā* with double intent, meaning 'the establishment/gifts', of the attributes of the Divine which would generate the following translation.

- a. *yaθā ahū vairyō*  
'Just as the Lord/existence (is) to be chosen (in accord with truth itself),  
*aθā ratuš ašātcīt hacā*  
so also (is) (correct) judgment in accord with truth itself (to be chosen),
- b. *vañhāuš dazdā manañhō*  
the establishment /gifts of (this) good thinking,  
*šyaοθananqm añhāuš mazdāi*  
(the establishment/gifts) of actions stemming from an existence (in accord with truth itself to be chosen),  
for wisdom/Wisdom [used with double entendre],
- c. *x šraθrəmcā ahurāi.ā yim drigubyō dadaṭ vāstārəm*  
and the rule (in accord with truth itself to be chosen) for the Lord/lord [used with double entendre]  
whom they have made pastor for the ones in need.

Here, the choosing of the Lord/existence and (correct) judgment in accord with truth (line a.) ~ are both an exercise in good thinking. The establishment of (this) good thinking, and of actions stemming from an existence of truth (which is *armaiti-*), and the resulting good rule, are the gifts. Each of these is an attribute of the Divine. Each of these is an aspect of the true order of existence (line a.). Each is a gift from the Divine to us, and from us to the Divine. The path and its end.

In line c., the implied phrase after *x šraθrəmcā* 'and the rule (in accord with truth to be chosen)' has ample corroboration in the Gathas and in the later texts. It restates what appears in verses 1 and 18 of the Vohu Xshathra (Good Rule) Gatha.

*vohū x šraθrəm vairīm* "That good rule must be chosen [*vairīm*]..." Y51.1, Insler 1975.

"... One chooses [*varəntē*] that rule of good thinking allied with truth in order to serve..." Y51.18, Insler 1975; *vairīm* and *varəntē* are grammatical forms of the verb *var-* 'to choose' (Skjaervo 2006). And the notion of ruling to serve in Y51.18, is also echoed in line c. of the Ahuna Vairya, which speaks of a 'rule' which involves being a pastor to the ones in need, i.e. a rule that serves ~ corroborated in the Avestan version of the legend of Yima to whom rule was given so that he could serve, protect, nurture existence.<sup>124</sup>

In the Gathas, the components of good rule are set forth in Y51.4 (in rhetorical questions which contain their own answers). These components include not only protecting from injury and being compassionate, but also truth, its the beneficial embodiment in existence, (in thought, word and action, *spənta- armaiti-*), and the very best thinking.

"Where shall there be protection instead of injury? Where shall mercy [*mərəždikā* 'compassion']<sup>125</sup> take place?

Where truth [*aša-*] which attains glory?

Where [*spānta- ārmaiti-* 'beneficial embodied of truth'] ?

Where the very best thinking [*manō vahištəm*] ?

Where, Wise One [*mazdā-*], through Thy rule?" Y51.4, Insler 1975. I have divided the lines in a way that highlights each separate idea, rather than the 3 lines in which this verse was crafted.

Lines a., b. and c. of the Ahuna Vairya, mention the same ideas that we see in Y51.4 of the Gathas (although not in the same order), as the following Table shows.

Y51.4	Ahuna Vairya
protection instead of injury, compassion	being a 'pastor' <i>vāstārəm</i> to the ones in need
truth which attains glory	choices in accord with truth itself <i>ašātēti hacā</i>
<i>spānta- ārmaiti-</i> the beneficial embodiment of the true order of existence in thought, word and action	(the establishment) of actions from an existence (in accord with truth itself) for wisdom/Wisdom <i>šyaōđananqm aṅhəuš mazdāi</i>
the most-good thinking	choosing the Lord/existence, and (correct) judgment in accord with truth itself, <i>ratuš ašātēti hacā</i> the establishment of (this) good thinking <i>vaṅhəuš dazdā manajhō</i>
through Thy rule, Wisdom [ <i>mazdā-</i> ].	and the rule for the Lord <i>xšaθrəmcā ahurāi.ā</i>

There remains to be discussed, one other question. What does Zarathushtra mean by *ahurāi.ā* (or perhaps what Insler calls the thematic dative *\*ahurāyā*) 'for the lord'? To whom is Zarathushtra referring? To 'the Lord' (as in the Divine, the Lord Wisdom)? To a human being who has acquired lordship over the attributes of the Divine? There are no capital letters in the Avestan script such as would indicate his intent. Most translators see *mazdāi* and *ahurāi.ā* in the Ahuna Vairya as the two names of the deity ~ *mazdā-* and *ahura-* ~ and indeed, in the Gathas, Zarathushtra most often uses *mazdā-*, 'Wisdom', and *ahura-* 'Lord', as two separate names of the Divine ~ sometimes in the same verse.

But there are seeming inconsistencies which raise the question: Even if Zarathushtra intends these two words *mazdāi* and *ahurāi.ā* to be read separately, to whom is he referring?

Insler concludes that *ahurāi.ā* 'for the lord' refers to Zarathushtra, because in the Gatha verse Y29.2c, the question is asked *kām hōi uštā ahurəm* "Whom do ye wish to be her master [*ahurəm* 'lord']..." Y29.2c, Insler 1975, referring to the allegorical 'cow' [an allegory for the beneficial in mortal existence], and Insler concludes that "the lord or master of the cow is someone who must belong to the world of men, and is, of course, Z. himself."<sup>126</sup>

But this line of reasoning (with respect) overlooks the fact that in the very next verse (Y29.3), truth (as an allegorical entity) answers the preceding question by saying "... Of yonder beings, that strongest one is not to be found through whom the lofty are to activate the lowly..." Y29.3 Insler 1975 ~ the "strongest one" in truth's answer refers to the 'lord [*ahurəm*]' mentioned in the preceding question. Yet, Zarathushtra, an unperfected being without worldly power ~ but one who *thinks* ~ is chosen (in this Yasna 29) by Wisdom

and Its attributes to teach mortals to search for truth with good thinking, as the solution to the problems, grief, and suffering, caused by violence, cruelty, bondage, rage, greed, tyranny, and all the other wrongful qualities that are not in accord with the true (correct) order of existence ~ indicating that Zarathushtra could not be the 'lord [*ahurəm*]' (mentioned in Y29.2), the "strongest one" who could not be found (in Y29.3).<sup>127</sup>

Neither in Yasna 29, nor in any other verse of the Gathas, is Zarathushtra unambiguously called 'lord' (as we already have discussed under *ahū* above).

Insler, in further support of his conclusion that *ahurāi.ā* 'for the lord' in line c. of the Ahuna Vairya, refers impliedly to Zarathushtra, points to two additional pieces of evidence from the Gathas.

In the Gatha verse Y31.10, he says "*ahurəm ašavanəm* 'the truthful lord' of the cow is a mortal (implicitly Z. again)."<sup>128</sup> (The 'cow' is an allegory for the beneficial in mortal existence).<sup>129</sup> The identity of this *ahurəm ašavanəm* 'the truthful lord' of Y31.10 ~ whether a human lord or the Divine ~ is ambiguous. A good argument could be made for either conclusion, although I am inclined to think that Zarathushtra intended, with double entendre, to refer to the Divine ~ which includes mortals who have acquired lordship over (attained completely) the attributes of the Divine (i.e. perfected being).<sup>130</sup>

Insler also points to the fact that the 'lord' in line c. of the Ahuna Vairya is the one "...whom they established as pastor for the needy-dependents",<sup>131</sup> at the end of this line, and in Yasna 29, it is Zarathushtra who was so chosen. This is undeniably accurate.

But it also is true that in more than one verse of the Gathas, 'pastor' is used both for the Divine, and also for an unperfected human being (including Zarathushtra).<sup>132</sup> It cannot be doubted that in Yasna 29, Zarathushtra was chosen by Wisdom and His Divine attributes (in allegorical form), ~ not to be 'lord', but - - to bring to mortals the teachings of Wisdom (the path of truth), and thereby nurture (be a pastor to) all that is good in mortal existence.<sup>133</sup> And it cannot be doubted that in line c. of the Ahuna Vairya, we see a parallel thought expressed 'for the lord whom they have made pastor for the ones in need' (except that in the Gathas, Zarathushtra is never called 'lord').

On the other hand, line c. of the Ahuna Vairya also parallels the thought expressed in Y53.9 (without using the word 'pastor'), but in Y53.9 the parallel thought refers to Wisdom, not to Zarathushtra. Here is a comparison of line c. of the Ahuna Vairya and the last line of Y53.9.

The Ahuna Vairya line c.: "and for the lord whom they established as pastor for the needy dependents [*drigubyō* dat. pl.]" Insler 1975.

Y53.3 "Such is Thy rule, Wise One [*mazdā-*], through which Thou shalt grant what is very good to Thy needy dependent [*drigaovē* dat. sg.] who lives honestly." Insler 1975.

In addition, how do we reconcile the seeming inconsistencies in determining the identity of the 'lord' in lines a. and c. in the Ahuna Vairya ~ an inconsistency based on the fact that in the Gathas, on the one hand Zarathushtra never refers to the Divine as *ahu-*,<sup>134</sup> but always uses only the augmented form *ahura-* for the Divine, and yet in the Ahuna Vairya he refers to the Divine as *ahū* in line a.?<sup>135</sup>

How do we reconcile the fact that neither Zarathushtra nor any (unperfected) mortal is unambiguously called 'lord' in the Gathas, with the fact that the Ahuna Vairya, line c. echoes the selection of Zarathushtra as pastor in Yasna 29, but the pastor in line c. is called 'lord' which in Y53.9 refers to the Divine?

I am inclined to think that Zarathushtra deliberately engaged in these seeming inconsistencies, to alert us to the idea that he was using *ahū* in line a., *mazdāi* in line b., and *ahurāi.ā* in line c. in an interplay of ideas ~ an interplay between the human and the Divine, each in the sense of a double entendre ~ a flowing of ideas into and out of each other.

We already have discussed that Zarathushtra's primary intent in using *ahū* in line a. is to refer to the Divine 'Lord', but that he uses the word with dual intent to mean 'Lord/existence' ~ which is to be chosen in accord with the true (correct) order of existence (*ašātcēt hacā*) ~ in that the Divine is perfected existence, and mortal existence (also involved in the choice) is unperfected existence ~ so the nom. dual *ahū* is simply 2 aspects of one existence that is the subject of the choice in line a., ~ a choice to be made in accord with the true order of existence (*ašātcēt hacā*). So in line a., we have an interplay between the Divine and mortal (unperfected) existence.

In using *mazdāi* and *ahurāi.ā* in lines b. and c., Zarathushtra does not use the dual form for these two words. So I think his primary intent is to refer to the Divine ~ 'for Wisdom' and 'for the Lord'; but that with double entendre he also means all mortal existence ~ each unit of which is capable of acquiring wisdom and lordship over the attributes of the Divine (which is perfected existence) by making the choices described in this manthra.<sup>136</sup> So here again, we have an interplay between mortal existence (which makes the choices) and the Divine.

This double entendre (or interplay) is consistent with the fact that in the Gathas, both the Divine and unperfected beings are 'pastors', nurturers, of mortal existence.

This double entendre reconciles the fact that *ahurāi.ā* 'for the lord' is the same person as *yim ... dadaṭ vāstārəm* 'whom they have made pastor', which in Yasna 29 is an unperfected mortal ~ exemplified by Zarathushtra but referring to all mortals, because throughout the Gathas a mortal pastor does not refer to Zarathushtra alone.<sup>137</sup>

This double entendre parallels the double entendre in using *ahū* in line a. to mean 'Lord/existence', and explains why Zarathushtra uses *ahu-* in line a., instead of *ahura-*.

In light of all this evidence, I think that Zarathushtra intended *mazdāi* and *ahurāi.ā* in lines b. and c. to refer primarily to the Divine, but also, with double entendre, to the acquisition of wisdom and lordship through the path of truth, the path of the attributes of the Divine, by choosing them.

I have already discussed in *Part One* other beautiful, multi-dimensional ideas, and the meaning of the title of this manthra ~ Ahuna Vairya ~ which I will not repeat here.

*Some other translations.*

Here again is my translation together with are some other translations both ancient and modern, for your consideration and comparison. I have already given you the linguistic information which will enable you to evaluate these translations for yourself. Indeed, if you make a list of just the grammatical values and meanings of each word (given above), and compare how a given translator has translated it, you will see the accuracies, inaccuracies, and 'free' translations more easily. As you can see, many of these are highly interpretive versions that do not always accord with the grammatical values (or meanings) of various words

in the Ahuna Vairya. And some throw in a lot of words which are not in the Gathic Avestan text, in order to make their translations work.

*My translation.*

- a. 'Just as the Lord/existence (is) to be chosen (in accord with truth itself), so also (is) (correct) judgment in accord with truth itself (to be chosen),
- b. the establishment /gifts of (this) good thinking, (the establishment/gifts) of actions stemming from an existence (in accord with truth itself to be chosen), for wisdom/Wisdom,
- c. and the rule (in accord with truth itself to be chosen) for the Lord/lord whom they have made pastor for the ones in need.

And here are some others. I have inserted nothing into these translations. All words in round parentheses have been inserted by a given translator to indicate words which are not in the Gathic Avestan text, but which the translator has added because he thinks they are implied by the text. Unfortunately, not all translators insert such added words in round parentheses ~ probably because their focus was on conveying what they thought was its meaning, more than on linguistics.

*The Pahlavi translation:*<sup>138</sup>

Humbach 1991 has translated into English, line by line, the Pahlavi translation of the Ahuna Vairya. The words in square brackets are Humbach's translation of the Pahlavi commentary or explanation of a given line or phrase. I have placed these commentaries in green font so that you can distinguish them from the attempted translation

- a. *yaθā ahū vairyō aθā ratuš ašātcit hacā*

"As it is the desire of the lord [i.e. as it is the desire of Ohrmazd], so it is decent, [so it is honest] in accordance with any truthfulness [meritorious work] whatever [to perform meritorious work, as is the desire of Ohrmazd].

- b. *vañhēuš dazdā manañhō šyaōθananqm añhēuš mazdāi*

"The gift of Wahman [i.e. one grants him that prize and recompense which Wahman grants; there is (a commentator) who says: his recompense for Wahman], which is the action of Ohrmazd (performed) in the world [i.e. he does that which is fitting for Ohrmazd; there is a commentator who says: the gift by Wahman, i.e. they grant him the reward (consisting of) the prize of Wahman; Adurbad i. Zarduxštan said: from the recompense of Wahman].

- c. *x šaθrəmcā ahurāi ā yim drigubyō dadaṭ vāstārəm*

"The sovereignty (is) for Ohrmazd [i.e. his sovereignty is maintained by the profit of Ohrmazd] who provides clothing for the poor [i.e. who acts as intercessor for them].

As you can see, the Pahlavi is not so much a translation as it is an explanation of what the author(s) thought might be the meaning of the Avestan, with the views of additional commentators given as well ~ a lack of

arrogance and a collegiality which I very much admire (even though I might not agree with the translations and opinions expressed).

This translation shows that the Pahlavi translators had no clear understanding of Avestan grammar and vocabulary e.g. they translate *ahū* in line a., as gen. sg. 'of the lord', whereas there is no dispute amongst linguists that *ahū* is not the gen. sg. form for *u-* stem words (the gen. sg. of which would be *aṅhāuš*). Indeed, based on the efforts of linguists over the last 130 or so years, in decoding Gathic Avestan, using the grammar and vocabulary of its close cousin language Vedic Sanskrit and other ancient Indo-European languages, it is clear that today we have a better understanding of the grammar and vocabulary of Avestan than did the Pahlavi scholars. Even so, they cared enough to think about the Ahuna Vairya, and to record and transmit their best understanding of it, including varying opinions, for which I honor them indeed (and feel a deep affection for them).

*Inslar 1975.*<sup>139</sup>

"Just as the Lord in accord with truth must be chosen, so also the judgment in accord with truth. In consequence of (this) good thinking, institute ye the rule of actions stemming from an existence of good thinking for the (sake of the) Wise One and for the lord whom they established as pastor for the needy-dependents."

*Humbach 1991.*<sup>140</sup>

"Just as (a judgment) is worthy of being chosen by the world, so the judgment, (which) in accord with truth itself, (is to be passed) on the actions of good thought of the world, is assigned to the Wise One, and the power (is assigned) to (Him), the Ahura, whom (people) appoint as a shepherd to the poor."

*Humbach/Faiss 2010.*<sup>141</sup>

"Since (His is) the patron worth choosing therefore the judgment (to be passed) in accordance with truth itself on the actions of good thought of the world is committed to the Wise One, and the power (is committed to Him), the Lord, whom (people) commend<sup>142</sup> to the poor as a shepherd."

*Gershevitch 1967.*<sup>143</sup> (Notice the ellipsis! which I have placed in purple font, and which he has placed in round parentheses)

"As the (or an) *ahu-* is to be chosen (in accordance with Truth, to be the doer of the actions of Good Mind), so the (or a) *ratu-* (is to be chosen) in accordance with Truth (to be) the doer of the actions of Good Mind, and Ahura Mazda's power over the world (is to be chosen [because he, Mazda, is the one]) whom they have given as a shepherd to the poor (or to whom they have given [= entrusted] the poor as to a shepherd."

*Taraporewala (1951).*<sup>144</sup>

"Just-as the Sovereign-Lord (is) all-powerful, so (is) the Spiritual-Teacher by-reason-of the-store-of-(his)-Asha; the gifts of Vohu Mano (are) for deeds (done) for the Lord of Creation; and the Xshathra of Ahura (descends) indeed upon (him) who becomes a Shepherd to the meek."

*Bartholomae.*<sup>145</sup>

"Even as he (Zarathushtra) is the Lord for us to choose, so is he the Judge, according to the Right, he that bringeth the life-works of Good Thought unto Mazda and (so) the Dominion unto Ahura, even he whom they made shepherd for the poor."

*Boyce (1975)*<sup>146</sup>

"He (Ahura Mazda) is as much the desired Master (*ahu-*) as the Judge (*ratu-*) according to Asha (He is) the doer of the acts of good intention, of life.  
To Mazda Ahura (is) the kingdom, whom they have established as pastor for the poor."

*Haug (1887).*<sup>147</sup>

"As a heavenly lord is to be chosen, so is an earthly master (spiritual guide), for the sake of righteousness (to be) the giver of good thoughts, of the actions of life, towards Mazda; and the dominion is for the lord (Ahura) whom he (Mazda) has given as a protector of the poor."

*Darmesteter (1887).*<sup>148</sup>

"The will of the Lord is the law of holiness; the riches of Vohu-mano shall be given to him who works in this world for Mazda, and wields according to the will of Ahura the power he gave him to relieve the poor."  
Darmesteter footnotes the phrase "the riches of Vohu-mano" as follows "Of paradise, as Vohu-mano (Good Thought) is the door-keeper of heaven (cf. Farg. XIX, 31)".<sup>149</sup>

*Mills (1887).*<sup>150</sup>

"As the Ahu is excellent, so is the Ratu (one who rules) from (his) sanctity, a creator of mental goodness and of life's actions done for Mazda; and the Kingdom (is) for Ahura, which to the poor may offer a nurturer."

*Kanga (1880).*<sup>151</sup>

"Just as a King acts according to his will, so does the Dasturan Dastur by means of righteousness etc. (acts according to his own will).  
The gift of Vohu-manah (i.e. Good mind) is for those working for Hormazd of this world; he who constitutes himself to the protector (or the nourisher) of the poor (accepts) the sovereign rule (of the entire world) (as it were) of Hormazd."

*Jafarey.*<sup>152</sup>

"Both the lord and the leader are to be chosen because of their righteousness. These two appointments are made with good mind, so that the acts of life are done for the Wise One, and the dominion of God is well established, in which the chosen person becomes the Rehabilitator of the rightful who are oppressed."

Taraporewala 1951 has given us for comparative purposes, additional translations by other scholars of earlier generations,<sup>153</sup> whose works are not available to me. Here are a few of them. Some of these translations were originally in languages other than English, but have been translated into English by persons unknown to me.

*Anklesaria, B. T.*

"Like the-great lord so-even the priest by-means-of the-Law-immutable alone, may-dedicate unto Ahura Mazda the-gift-of-the-deeds of-the-Good Mind performed during-his-life-time, and-the-authority which protects the-poor."

*Anquetil du Perron.*

"It is the desire of Ormuzd that the Chief (of the law) might do pure and holy works. Behman gives abundance to him who behaves saintly in the world. You appoint king, O Ormuzd, him who comforts and feeds the poor."

Anquetil du Perron's translation was purportedly based on the meanings conveyed to him by the priest who gave him the Avestan texts which he brought to Europe in the 1700s. That occurred before anyone was aware of the close linguistic connection between Avestan and Vedic Sanskrit, and therefore occurred before the decoding of Avestan, based on linguistics, had occurred.

*Beneveniste, E.*

"He is as much Ahu desirable as the Ratu according to Arta (Asha). He gives the deeds of Good Mind from his existence of Mazdah and his power is for Ahura: he (Zarathushtra) whom they have established as the Pastor of the Humble."

As you can see, this translation shows *dazdā* as "He gives", which is a verb, which may be a faulty translation because according to Insler, Benveniste sees *dazdā* as a noun 'giver' (as explained above).

*Cama, K. R.*

"Just as God wills so also will (the man), who conducts himself truthfully on the path of virtue. (God) is the bestower of the Good Mind (the wisdom) and of deeds. The sovereignty of this world is also (pertaining to) God. (God) procures for the distressed (for men needy and out of employ) whosoever is Lord of farms (as their employer)."

*Dhalla.*

"As Zarathushtra is our lord temporal, so is he spiritual through his righteousness. Through the deeds of Good Thought done by man in the world He, the shepherd of the poor, makes for the Kingdom of Ahura Mazda."

*Duchesne-Guillemin.*

"Just as he is to be chosen by the world, so has judgment according to Justice itself, of the deeds of the world been given, from Good Mind to Mazda and Dominion to Ahura, whom they have given as shepherd to the humble."

*Geldner.*

"Even as he is the chosen Ruler so also is he (appointed) by Asha (himself) as Instructor of the World in the works of Good-Mind for Mazda. And the Kingdom belongs to Ahura, who for the needy has appointed a Shepherd."

*Greenlees, Duncan.*

"Just as a Ruler is mighty, so is the Teacher because of his store of Righteousness: the gifts of love are (a return) for works (done) for God, and the Power of the Lord is surely upon him who gives help to the poor."

This concludes our analysis of the linguistics and meanings of the Ahuna Vairya, and the opinions of so many good minds who cared enough about it to invest time and effort to give us their best translations and understandings. I honor each of them for their efforts and generosity. True, there are material differences. But these differences are only steps in the search for truth ~ each step benefiting (in one way or another) the on-going search.

\* \* \* \* \*

---

<sup>1</sup> Tarap. 1951 p. 864.

<sup>2</sup> Insler 1975 *The Ahuna Vairya Prayer*, (in Monumentum H. S. Nyberg, Acta Iranica, E. J. Brill), p. 421.

<sup>3</sup> Insler 1975 *The Ahuna Vairya Prayer*, p. 420.

The Ahuna Vairya is not a part of the Gathas, as described in YAv. texts, such as *Visperad* Ch. II, §§ 7 - 9, SBE Vol. 31, pp. 339 - 340, and as scholars today identify the Gathas.

It is interesting, however, that the author(s) of the very late *Vendidad* Ch. X, (written after YAv. times, in grammatically faulty Avestan) considered the Ahuna Vairya to be a part of the Gathas, indicating perhaps more ancient traditional knowledge that thought the Ahuna Vairya composed by Zarathushtra himself. This part of the *Vendidad* is in the typical format of a question (purportedly) asked of Ahura Mazda, and an answer (purportedly) given by Him ~ a technique well established in many (older) YAv. texts ~ through which the authors of a given text attempted to give authority and authenticity to their own views, by placing them in the mouth of Ahura Mazda. Darmesteter, who in round parentheses identifies each 'prayer' by the chapter and verse numbers given to them by modern scholars.

"11 (19). O Maker of the material world, thou Holy One! Which are those words in the Gathas that are to be said four times?

12 (22). Ahura Mazda answered: 'These are the words in the Gathas that are to be said four times, and thou shalt four times say them aloud: ~

yatha ahu vairyo ... (Yas. XXVII, 13),

mazda ad moi...dau ahum (Yas. XXXIV, 15)

a airyama ishyo ... masata mazdau (Yas. LIV, 1)." *Vendidad* Ch. X, §§ 11 - 12, Darmesteter translation SBE Vol. 4, p. 136. Darmesteter in round parentheses identifies each 'prayer' by the chapter and verse numbers given to them by modern scholars.

Each of these three 'prayers' is in pure Gathic Avestan (Humbach 1991 Vol. 1, p. 7), but only the second ~ Y34.15 ~ is a part of the Gathas, ~ a beautiful verse which has been translated by Insler (1975) as follows, "**Wise One, therefore tell me the best [vahišta-] words and actions, namely those allied with good thinking and truth, as the just claim for my praises. By your rule, Lord, Thou shalt truly heal this world in accord with our wish.**" Y34.15, Insler 1975. Taraporewala thought that the *A Airyema Ishyo* (Y54.1) was originally the last verse of the last Gatha, (Y53), discussed in *Part Six: Yasna 54.1, A Airyema Ishyo*.

<sup>4</sup> See *Part One: The Manthra of the Human and the Divine, Yenghe Haatam*, and *Part Three: The Yenghe Haatam, An Analysis*.

<sup>5</sup> The high value placed by ancient Zoroastrians on the Ahuna Vairya is discussed with evidence in *Part One: The Manthra of Choices, Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo)*; and in *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo), Ancient Commentaries*.

<sup>6</sup> For example, the verb "to be" in its various conjugations usually is implied, as discussed in *Part Three: Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu), An Analysis*. Linguists call this metonymy (Humbach 1991 Vol. 1, pp. 102 - 103).

<sup>7</sup> Here are some examples of implied words not previously stated but required by the context, when translated into English.

"Thee, Best One [vahišta-], ... do I lovingly entreat for the best for Frashaoshtra, the hero, and for me, and (for those others) to whom Thou shalt grant it, the best for a whole lifetime of good thinking." Y28.8, Insler 1975.

---

"... Thou didst grant the way to her to go either (to him who) shall act as pastor or (to him) who shall not be pastor (for her)." Y31.19, Insler 1975.

"... And may that man reach what is better than good, namely, the one who would instruct us to the straight paths of the Mighty One ~ (to those) of this material existence and (to those) of the mind..." Y43.3, Insler 1975.

"... Him who left to our will (to choose between) the virtuous and the unvirtuous..." Y45.9, Insler 1975.

"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.

"I know that (reason) because of which I am powerless, Wise One: by my condition of having few cattle, as well as (that) I am a person with few men. I lament to Thee. Take notice of it, Lord, offering the support which a friend should grant to a friend. Let me see the power of good thinking allied with truth!" Y46.2, Insler 1975.

"Glorious Jamaspa Haugva (has displayed) this understanding of His power: 'One chooses that rule of good thinking allied with truth in order to serve ...' Y51.18, Insler 1975.

And there are many more such examples.

<sup>8</sup> We see many examples in the Gathas of necessarily implied words that have been previously (or subsequently) stated. Linguists (ever wanting to simplify things !) call this 'ellipsis'. Humbach 1991 shows a few examples (Vol. 1, § 15.12, pp. 105 - 106). Insler 1975 has many more. Here are a few simple examples from the Insler 1975 translation of the Gathas, of implied words which have been previously stated, in which Insler has put the implied words in round parentheses and which I show in black font. I show the expressed words in red font.

"...'A master has not been found by a single one (of us) ... Who has (been found) by thee, good thinking, who might give these things to the mortals below?' Y29.6 - 7, Insler 1975.

"For Zarathushtra does give the breath of even his own person as a gift, in order that there be for the Wise One predominance of good thinking along with (predominance) of the action and the word allied with truth, that there be obedience and His (good) rule." Y33.14, Insler 1975.

"... I ... wish enduring strength to come, in order to uphold the truth ... Moreover, (I wish) for this person the best of all things, that by which a man might place a person of good purpose in happiness..." Y43.1 - 2, Insler 1975.

"... Give ear now, listen now, ye who seek from both near and far. (Listen) now, all of you, to this ..." Y45.1, Insler 1975.

"Who has set his mind on the good, Wise One, and (who) on the bad, (each) such person follows his conception in action and in word; also his pleasures, his desires, and his preferences..." Y48.4, Insler 1975.

"What is the power of Thy good rule, Wise One? What of Thy reward for me, Lord? What (reward) of Thine is to be sent by truth to those who are certainly sincere as an incentive for actions stemming from good spirit?" Y 48.8, Insler 1975.

And there are many, many other such examples.

<sup>9</sup> See *Part Three: Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu), An Analysis*.

<sup>10</sup> A 'caesura' is a pause or break within a line of poetry required by rhythm, syntax, or sense, in Latin, Greek and Old English poetry. McArthur, *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. We also find this kind of line break in the Gathas, which is usually required by the meter, and linguists have adopted the Latin term 'caesura' for it (because we

---

do not know what it was called in Avestan). Avestan, Latin, Greek and English are all within the Indo-European family of languages.

<sup>11</sup> Geldner shows *ahurāi.* and *ā.* as two separate words. Insler 1975, Humbach (1991) and Humbach/Faiss (2010) believe that the proper reading is the compound word *ahurāi.ā.* (Insler 1975 *Ahuna Vairya* p. 409. Humbach 1991 Vol. 1, p. 115; Humbach/Faiss (2010) p. 73,) for reasons which we will explore when we consider our word by word analysis. It is easy to see how those who copied and re-copied the mss. may have made a compound word into two words because a compound word is one in which two words are joined by a dot (without any space between the words). Whereas two separate words are separated with a dot, with space before and after a dot.

<sup>12</sup> Transliterated from Geldner 1P p. 97.

<sup>13</sup> Beekes 1988 and Jackson 1892 both classify *yaθā* under the general category 'Indeclinables' (indicating that its form is not changed for case/number/gender). According to Beekes (p. 146) *yaθā* can be used as an adverbial conjunction (a part of speech that joins words or phrases) and can mean 'in which manner' or 'just like'. Jackson 1892 shows *yaθā* as an adverb of manner and degree meaning 'as'; and also as a subordinate conjunction (§§ 730, 740 pp. 202, 205).

*yaθā ... aθā* are often used together to mean 'just as ... so also', and that is how these two words are used in line a.

<sup>14</sup> There are many, many examples of *ahu-* (*aṇhu-*) used as 'existence' in the Gathas (in its various case forms), sometimes descriptive, sometimes for collective existence, sometimes for individual existence, and a few times its use is ambiguous ~ individual? collective? For example,

*Descriptive.*

Y28.2 *ahvā* "... of both existences...", Insler 1975; describing the existences of matter and mind. (*ahvā* is the gen. dual case form of the stem *ahu-* or *aṇhu-* Skjaervo 2006);

Y44.8 *ašā aṇhəuš* "...from an existence in harmony with truth ...", Insler 1975;

Y53.5 *ahūm ... vaṇhəuš manəḥō* "... an existence of good thinking...", Insler 1975; *ahūm* is the acc. sg. case form of the stem *ahu-* (or *aṇhu-*) Skjaervo 2006.

Y28.11 *aṇhuš paouruyō* "...the foremost existence...", Insler 1975; (*aṇhuš* is the nom. sg. case form of the stem *ahu-* or *aṇhu-* Skjaervo 2006); so also Y33.1 *aṇhəuš paouruyehyā* "...of the foremost existence...", Insler 1975;

Y30.4 *aṇhuš acištō* "...the worst existence...", Insler 1975;

Y43.3 *aṇhəuš astvatō* "...of this material existence...", Insler 1975;

Y44.2 *aṇhəuš vahištahyā* "... of the best existence...", Insler 1975; or more literally 'of the most good existence'.

*ahu-* as collective existence.

Y31.8 *aṇhəuš ahurəm* "...Lord of existence...", Insler 1975; *aṇhəuš* is the gen. sg. case form ('of-existence') of the stem *ahu-* (or *aṇhu-*) Skjaervo 2006;

*ahu-* as individual existence.

Y31.20 *ahūm* "... a long lifetime of darkness ... to such an existence [*ahūm*] shall your conception, along with its (corresponding) actions, lead you, ye deceitful ones." Insler 1975; Here *ahūm* is the individual existence of each wrongdoer.

*Ambiguous.*

---

Y51.19 *ahūm* "... that man assumes for himself this rule, namely the one who continues to seek for existence to be (in accord with what) the Wise Creator said is better for life through its actions." Insler 1975; Individual existence ("...to seek for (his) existence to be...") ? Collective existence ("...to seek for (all) existence to be...") ? Probably both.

<sup>15</sup> The one use of *ahū* as 'lord' appears in Y29.6b, but not all translators translate *ahū* in that verse as 'lord' nom. sg., as discussed in a footnote below.

<sup>16</sup> Jackson 1892 §§ 262, 264, pp. 77 - 78, shows that for *-u-* stem nouns in GAv., the *-ū* inflection is used for both nom. du. and instr. sg. (which would make *ahū* the correct form for nom. du. and also instr. sg.).

<sup>17</sup> Jackson 1892 § 262, p. 77.

<sup>18</sup> A dvandva is a Sanskrit term, one of the meanings of which is a pair of words (which in Skt. may also be shown as one word or a compound word) but which in English would be 2 words joined by 'and'. For example, one type of 'dvandva' is Skt. *mātārā-pitārā* (literally 'motherfather') but in fluent English 'mother and father'. Macdonell *A Vedic Grammar for Students* (2000 reprint), § 186 A. 1., pp. 268 - 269.

<sup>19</sup> Insler 1975 *Ahuna Vairya*, pp. 411 - 412.

<sup>20</sup> Insler 1975 *Ahuna Vairya*, pp. 411 - 412. Even in Y29.6, there is disagreement as to whether *ahū* is nom. sg. or instr. sg. Other linguists have translated *ahū* in Y29.6 as instr. sg. "by the world" Humbach 1991, Vol. 1, p. 121; although by 2010, Humbach changed his mind as to meaning, but not case and, with Faiss translates *ahū* in Y29.6 as instr. sg. "by the Patron" p. 79. However, in the *Ahuna Vairya* they (in 2010) translate *ahū* as nom. sg.

The Insler 1975 defends his choice in Y29.6 that *ahū* is nom. sg. 'master' (which is another way of saying 'lord') based on a contextual analysis of how Y29.6 fits in with Yasna 29 as a whole. And he believes that the use of *ahū* as nom. sg. in Y29.6b, is somewhat parallel to its use in the *Ahuna Vairya* (pp. 152 - 153).

<sup>21</sup> Humbach (1991) Vol. 1, p. 115.

<sup>22</sup> Humbach/Faiss (2010) pp. 73, 165. They point out that the translation in Humbach (1991) of *ahū* in line a. as instr. sg. "by the world" indicating mankind, was linguistically correct, but did not accord with Younger Avestan "reinterpretations". But Humbach/Faiss (2010) point to only one YAv. example of *ahu* which they say is used as nom. sg. in Yt. 13.91 the Farvardin Yasht. In YAv., the long final vowel of GAv. is usually shortened. Thus GAv. *ahū* (with a long final *ū*) would be YAv. *ahu* (with the short final *u*).

*ahu ratušca gaēθanqm* Y13.91

"(Zarathushtra) patron and judge of the worldly possessions/world" Humbach/Faiss (2010) p. 165.

Humbach/Faiss offer no linguistic explanation as to how this form (*ahu*) became nom. sg.

<sup>23</sup> Tarap. 1951 pp. 19 - 20.

<sup>24</sup> Humbach/Faiss (2010) p. 165.

<sup>25</sup> I have not researched the question of whether a single word, used with double entendre is expressed in the du. number in other instances in the Gathas, because double entendres are necessarily interpretive. Perhaps in the *Ahuna Vairya* the dual is used because Zarathushtra expresses a foundational teaching, rather than simple a play on words as with other double entendres in the Gathas. However, *astī* 'it is' in the Asha Vahishta line b. is definitely sg., although *uštā* is used with double entendre.

---

<sup>26</sup> Taraporwala 1951 expresses the opinion that perhaps both words (*ahu-* 'lord' and *ahu-* 'existence') are connected (p. 20). And Humbach/Faiss (2010) express the opinion that it is possible that both stems are of the same origin (p. 165, in their comment under line a. of Y27.13). If these three scholars are correct, then we see in the structure of the language itself, the pre-existing Indo-Iranian view that deities were the spiritual essences of existence ~ a view which I think is reflected also in Zarathushtra's mind-set, except that in his view, the spiritual essence is one (not many) and to be worthy of worship, is no longer a mix of good and bad qualities ~ discussed in *Part One: The Identity of the Divine*.

<sup>27</sup> Detailed in *Part One: Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat*.

<sup>28</sup> Detailed in *Part One: The Nature of the Divine*.

<sup>29</sup> Detailed in *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo), Ancient Commentaries*. The same interplay between Divine and human existence is detailed in *Part Three: The Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu), Ancient Commentaries*.

<sup>30</sup> Regarding Zarathushtra's use of 'lord' for humans,

*Religious authority:* he calls no human religious authority 'lord'.

*Secular authority:* In the extant Gathas, neither King Vishtaspa, nor his prime minister Jamaspa, nor the champion Frashaoshtra, are called 'lord'.

In Y32.11 Zarathushtra refers generically to corrupt secular aristocrats as 'lords and ladies' ("Those deceitful ones who appear in grandeur as lords and ladies [*aṇuhīšcā aṇhavaścā*], even they have ruined this life by stealing the property of the (true) inheritor,..." Y32.11, Insler 1975). Here, lords and ladies simply refer to the aristocrats of his society. But when 'lord' refers to the Divine, he uses it (more than once) as a word of art to mean one who has acquired 'lordship' over the qualities that make a being Divine (see in *Part One: Nature of the Divine*; and in *Part Two: The Lords and the Equations of Y31.4*) ~ which usage is quite different from 'lord' as a secular aristocrat.

True, it would be reasonable to conclude that if in his view, even the object of our worship ~ the Divine ~ is to be chosen in accord with the true (correct) order of existence (*aša-*), then logically our secular rulers also should be chosen in accord with truth. But the process of choosing secular rulers is not specifically mentioned in the Gathas.

In his day, the right to secular rule was a family business. Kings normally had to be the descendants of kings (note the anxiety of Darius in the Behistun Inscription to establish his right to rule by pointing to the fact that he was descended from a long line of kings).

But it is interesting that in ancient Media, the choice of who should be king could be decided by an assembly. What this assembly consisted of is not known for certain (a popular assembly? an assembly of village or provincial or tribal leaders? We do not know. Diakonoff states that (after Media was conquered by Assyria) the oath of allegiance which Median rulers had to give to Assyrian rulers described one of the "treacherous" actions as follows, the words in round parentheses and square brackets are in Diakonoff's translation of the oath and represent words inserted by him:

"if you convoke a (popular) assembly, swear to one another and confer the royal power on one from your [own] midst". Diakonoff, in his essay *Media*, in *Cambridge History of Iran* Vol. 2, p. 109.

And Diakonoff concludes "Apparently such cases did occur in Media. In fact, according to Herodotus (I. 97 - 8), this was how the first Median king was elected." CHI Vol. 2, p. 109 (see also p. 114). Diakonoff notes that the capital of Media built by this king, was called Agbatana, or Ecbatana, in Old Iranian Hangmatana, "which apparently means 'meeting place' or 'place of assembly', now Hamadan." *ibid.* p. 109, ftn 2.

<sup>31</sup> Indeed, in the *Farvardin Yasht*, Zarathushtra is called both *ahu-* and *ratu-*, which may have been why some translators translate *ahū* and *ratuš* in line a. of the Ahuna Vairya as a reference to Zarathushtra.

---

*zaraθuštrəm vīspahe aṅhāuš astvatō ahūmca ratūmca ...*

"We worship Zarathushtra, the lord [*ahūmca*] and master [*ratūmca*] of all the material world [*vīspahe aṅhāuš astvatō*]..."

Yt. 13.152, Darmesteter translation, SBE 23, p. 229; Avestan words from Geldner 2P p. 204.

So apparently by the time of the *Farvardin Yasht*, *ratu-* had evolved in meaning to be something of a spiritual chief (one having (correct) judgment).

<sup>32</sup> Discussed in *Part Two: The Solution of Yasna 29*.

<sup>33</sup> See *Part Two: A Question of Reward and the Path*.

<sup>34</sup> Jackson 1892 § 853 (#26), p. 234.

<sup>35</sup> At one time, I thought differently (in *Three Prayers & The Name of God*), but now, on further study and reflection, I think that Zarathushtra does not use *ahura-* or *ahu-* for an unperfected being (discussed in *Part Two: The Lords and the Equations of Y31.4*). Moulton however, sees the word *ahura-* in Y53.9, the last verse of the Gathas to refer to a human king.

"To men of evil creed belongs the place of corruption. They that set themselves to condemn the worthy, despising righteousness, forfeiting their own body ~ where is the Righteous Lord [*ahurō*] who shall rob them of life and freedom? Thine, Mazda, is the Dominion, whereby thou canst give to the right-living poor man the better portion." Y53.9 Moulton (1912) EZ, p. 390.

Moulton footnotes the word *ahurō* as follows,

"*ahurō*, here apparently of the human king who executes judgement on earth, as Mazda will at the Last Day." p. 390, fn. 2.

I have great respect for Moulton, but his translation of Y53.9 is not consistent with more recent translations and is not corroborated by any other Gatha verse, because no place else in the Gathas is *ahura-* or *ahu-* used unequivocally for any unperfected being. And the idea of a Final Judgment is absent from the Gathas and YAv. texts (demonstrated in the following chapters: in *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise & Hell*; and in *Part Three: The Absence of Damnation & Hell in Other Avestan Texts*; *Aṇema, One of Many Ends*; and *Chinvat, The Bridge of Discerning*).

<sup>36</sup> The author(s) of the Younger Avestan *Visperad*, speaks of the Ahuna Vairya's Ahû and Ratu which the Pazand commentary identifies as Ahura Mazda. Here is Mills' translation of the applicable section. The words in square brackets and round parentheses are Mills'.

"Also we worship the Ahuna-vairya, ... with its Ahû and Ratu, [(Pazand); for He is the one with the title Ahû and Ratu, who is Ahura Mazda] ..." Visperad Ch. 14, § 3, SBE 31, p. 357, Mills translation.

Mills however, thinks that this Pazand commentary is "Erroneous". *ibid.* fn. 3. As Mills' translation of the Ahuna Vairya demonstrates, he thinks the *ahû* and *ratuš* in line a. are human beings. I agree with the Pahlavi commentary on *ahû*, but (with respect) disagree with its view on *ratuš* as a title (in the GAv. Ahuna Vairya).

<sup>37</sup> See *Part One: The Nature of the Divine*; and *Part Two: A Question of Reward and the Path*.

<sup>38</sup> As discussed in *Part One: The Manthra of Truth, Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu)*.

<sup>39</sup> Taraporewala 1951, states that *vairyō* is derived from the stem *var-* 'to choose, to select' to which the suffix *-ya* has been added (p. 20). To understand the linguistic function of this word *vairyō*, a short grammatical explanation is necessary.

In grammar, a 'gerund' is a noun (or adjective) that is formed by adding a suffix to the root of a verb. (McArthur, *The Oxford Companion to the English Language* (Oxford University Press, 1992); and Goldman, Norma *English Grammar for Latin Students* (Olivia and Hill Press, 2004) pp. 86 - 88).

To give an English example, 'to dance' is a verb. Add the suffix 'ing' and you make it a noun (*dancing is an art form*), or an adjective (*the dancing children performed last week*). So 'dancing' would be a gerund ~ a noun (or adj.) derived from the verb 'to dance' by adding the suffix 'ing'. Linguists use such words (as 'gerund') not to be difficult (as I sometimes teasingly comment), but as a short hand way of expressing a concept that otherwise would require a long description.

<sup>40</sup> Skjaervo 2006. And Jackson 1892 § 262, p. 77, shows that the nom. sg. inflection for *u-* stem nouns is *-uš*.

<sup>41</sup> See *Part One: The Freedom to Choose*.

<sup>42</sup> Discussed in *Part Five: The Vendidad, An Overview*; and *The Vendidad & Its Lessons for Today*.

<sup>43</sup> Humbach/Faiss 2010 p. 166, where they express the opinion that the masc. noun *ratu-* can mean 'judge' and 'judgment', but that in the context of line a. (of the Ahuna Vairya), the choice of 'judgment' is unavoidable.

<sup>44</sup> Discussed in *Part Three: Ratu*. One Gatha verse in which many linguists have translated *ratūm* as 'judge' is Y44.16 (lines b. through e. of which are the 2d section of the Kemna Mazda prayer). But (with respect) I disagree. In Y44.16 'judge' simply does not fit ~ neither the micro context of the verse nor the macro context of the Gathas as a whole. This verse, which is quite lovely, is discussed in detail in *Part Six: Y44.16*.

<sup>45</sup> Beekes 1988 p. 145; Skjaervo 2006.

<sup>46</sup> Skjaervo 2006, Beekes 1988 p. 145 (although Beekes spells it *cit* believing that to have been its original form). Taraporewala 1951 (p. 20) has a completely different take on *cī̄t*. He states that its Skt. equivalent is limited almost exclusively to the interrogatory pronoun, but that sometimes it is found in the sense of 'piling up' or 'collection'. He states that the Avestan *cī̄t* is used in many places in the sense of 'to collect, to gather'. But the only example he cites is *azāmcī̄t* in Y29.10, which he translates as 'I and others like me' but which Insler (1975) translates as "I indeed"; and Humbach (1991) as "I myself" ~ both as a particle of emphasis.

In line 1 of the Ahuna Vairya, Insler's 1975 translation has no English emphatic particle (although in Y29.6 quoted below, he translates *cī̄t* as an emphatic particle 'indeed'). Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *ašātcī̄t* in the Ahuna Vairya as 'truth itself' ~ thus translating *cī̄t* as an emphatic particle.

<sup>47</sup> The phrase 'in accord with truth' *ašā̄t hacā*, appears (with and without the *-cī̄t*) in the following Gatha verses.

"...a judgment which indeed befits truth [*ratuš ašā̄tcī̄t hacā*]..." Y29.6, Insler 1975.

, "...how shall I, with your accord, impassion your following, ... in accordance with that precept [*mąθrā*] which adheres to the truth [*ašā̄t hacā*]." Y44.17, Insler 1975. The precept [*mąθrā*] is the path of truth.

"The person who, really in accordance with truth [*ašā̄t ... hacā*] shall bring to realization for me, Zarathushtra, what is most healing according to (our) wish ..." Y46.19, Insler 1975.

"...through both action and the word befitting truth [*hacā ašā̄t*]..." Y47.1, Insler 1975.

---

"I know in whose worship there exists for me the best [*vahištəm*] in accordance with truth [*ašāt ... hacā*]..." Y51.22, Insler 1975.

"...if the Wise Lord shall grant to him those attainments in accord with truth [*ašāt hacā*] and a good existence..." Y53.1, Insler 1975.

<sup>48</sup> Insler (1975) *The Ahuna Vairya Prayer*, p. 413.

<sup>49</sup> Insler 1975 p. 118.

<sup>50</sup> For *vahhēuš* Skjaervo 2006, and Jackson 1892 § 265, p. 79;  
For *manahō* Skjaervo 2006. Jackson does indeed show a separate abl. sg. inflection for *ah-* stem words, but not for *manah-* (ibid. §§ 339 - 340, pp. 97 - 98); Beekes 1988 shows no separate abl. inflection (in GAv.) for *manah-* (p. 117).

<sup>51</sup> Skjaervo 2006. Jackson (1892) *Grammar*, §§ 237 - 238, p. 70, shows the inflection *-anqm* to be genitive pl. for *a-* stem nouns (like *šyaodana-*). According to Jackson, *a-* stem nouns have their own abl. case form, so the gen. case form in such nouns is not used for the abl.

<sup>52</sup> Skjaervo 2006.

<sup>53</sup> Jackson 1892 § 265, p. 79.

<sup>54</sup> The evidence in support of this statement is detailed in *Part Three: Evolution of the Name(s) Ahura, Mazda*.

<sup>55</sup> Discussed in *Part One: The Nature of the Divine*.

<sup>56</sup> Insler 1975 p. 118.

<sup>57</sup> Skjaervo 2006; Beekes 1988 p. 144; Jackson 1892 § 739 p. 205.

<sup>58</sup> Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, p. 115.

<sup>59</sup> Humbach/Faiss 2010 p. 73.

<sup>60</sup> Taraporewala (1951) translates *x šaθrəmcā. ahurāi. ā.* as "and the Xshthra of Ahura (descends) indeed...". This translation shows *ahurāi* as gen. 'of Ahura', and in his commentary on the word, Taraporewala states that *ahurāi* is dat., but used in the sense of gen. which "is a usual construction in both Av. and Vedic Skt. Skjaervo 2003 also states that the dat. ('to/for \_\_\_') is sometimes used for what in English would be translated as a genitive ('of \_\_\_'), Lesson 13, pp. 131, 132. But this does not account for the *ā.* - whether as a compound with *ahurāi* or as a separate word. I think Insler's view that the original form of *ahurāi.ā* was dat. *\*ahurāyā*, is the most persuasive explanation (discussed in the main part of this chapter).

<sup>61</sup> Geldner 1P, p. 97.

<sup>62</sup> Humbach (1991) Vol. 1, p. 115; Humbach/Faiss (2010) p. 73.

<sup>63</sup> Humbach (1991) Vol. 2, p. 8.

<sup>64</sup> Insler (1975) *Ahuna Vairya*, p. 409 and ftn. 6.

<sup>65</sup> Geldner 1P, p. 103. In Y29.5a, Geldner shows 5 mss. which have *ahurāi. ā.*, one ms. which has *ahurā. ā.*, and 2 mss. (S1 and J3) which have *ahurahyā.* (Geldner in his *Prolegomena* describes S1 as an excellent ms.). In the Ahuna Vairya, the emendation by Insler (1975) is *\*ahurāyā*.

---

<sup>66</sup> Although Skjaervo does not mention Insler by name, he says that Old Avestan (GAv.) has a form of dative inflection \*-āyā usually written -āi.ā, comparable to Skt. thematic dat. and that this form of dat. is not found in YAv. texts. Skjaervo 2003, *Young Avestan, Lesson 31*, p. 126. This accords with the views of Insler and Humbach in taking *ahurāi.ā* as a compound word, dat. sg. and supports the translation the translation 'for (the) lord'.

<sup>67</sup> Jackson 1892 § 399, p. 114. In his commentary, Taraporewala 1951 acknowledges that *yīm* is acc. sg. (p. 22).

<sup>68</sup> Skjaervo 2006.

<sup>69</sup> Insler 1975, p. 222, in his commentary on Y34.5, where a case form of *drigu-* also appears.

<sup>70</sup> See *Part Five: Avestan Genders, Grammatical & Actual*.

<sup>71</sup> "However, that Thou didst say to me: 'Thou hast come to the truth in thy discernment; ...', ... obedience [*səraoša-* 'listening'] was to come to me accompanied by a wealth-granting [*mązā.rayā*] reward, ... according to which one should distribute the rewards ... at the time of (our) salvation." Y43.12, Insler 1975. The concept of *səraoša-* means listening to and implementing (the Word of Wisdom), detailed in *Part Three: Seraoša*. Here (for Y43.12), I have used the Insler 1975 translation only to demonstrate the use of *wealth-granting [mązā.rayā] reward*. I translate this verse Y43.12 quite differently, detailed in *Part Six: Y43.12* which includes other translations for comparative purposes.

<sup>72</sup> See *Part Two: A Question of Reward and the Path*.

<sup>73</sup> That *wealth-granting [mązā.rayā] reward* refers to the 'wealth' of truth is demonstrated with evidence in a ft. in *Part Two: A Question of Reward & The Path*. In the alternative, *mązā.rayā* could mean the *light-granting [mązā.rayā] reward*, which, in addition to linguistic and contextual evidence in other uses, fits the context of Y43.12 (quoted above) and Zarathushtra's thought, in that the 'reward' is truth, and light is a metaphor for truth in both the Gathas and later texts, (discussed in *Part Three: Rae, Rayah.*). However, many linguists today think *raē-* means 'wealth' only.

<sup>74</sup> The existences of matter and mind are mentioned in the following two Gatha verses.

"... the attainments of both existences - yes, of matter [*astvatasčā*] as well as of mind [*manąhō*] ~ those attainments befitting truth [*aša-*] ..." Y28.2; Insler 1975.

"And may that man reach what is better than good, namely, the one who would instruct us to the straight paths of the Mighty One ~ (to those) of this material existence and (to those) of the mind [*ąhəuš astvatō manąhasčā*] ..." Y43.3, Insler 1975. In the Gathas, the "the straight paths of the Mighty One" are the path(s) of truth (see *Part Two: A Question of Reward & the Path*). So although *aša-* is not specifically mentioned here in Y43.3, it is necessarily implied.

<sup>75</sup> There is a detailed discussion of the meanings of *dā-* in *Part Two: The Puzzle of Creation*.

<sup>76</sup> Insler 1975, *Ahuna Vairya*, p. 420.

<sup>77</sup> Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, p. 8 para. (18).

<sup>78</sup> Humbach/Faiss 2010 p. 73.

<sup>79</sup> Taraporewala 1951, p. 17. He translates line c. as follows 'and the Xshathra of Ahura (descends), indeed, upon (him) who becomes a Shepherd to the meek.' (p. 17).

<sup>80</sup> See *Part Two: The Solution of Yasna 29*.

<sup>81</sup> See *Part Two: The Puzzle of the Cow and Its Network*.

<sup>82</sup> The only surviving texts in Gathic Avestan are

- 
- (a) the Gathas,  
(b) the Ashem Vohu and the Ahuna Vairya,  
(c) the Yasna Haptanghaiti (YHapt.35.3 ~ YHapt.41.7) and  
(d) the A Airyema Ishyo (Y54.1). Humbach (1991) Vol. 1, p. 7.

My inability to find *dazdā* in surviving Gathic Avestan texts is corroborated by the fact that Skjaervo 2006 does not show *dazdā* as appearing in any GAv. text other than the Ahuna Vairya, Y27.13 construing it as a verb form of the root *dā-* "to give, make, establish, assign".

<sup>83</sup> Skjaervo (2006) also shows the following nouns, all of which derive from the root *dā-*.

*dāh-* 'gift',  
*dāta-* 'established rules',  
*dāθra-* 'act of giving'.

<sup>84</sup> According to Jackson 1892 §§ 338 - 347, *h-* stem ntr. nouns in Gathic Avestan have a nom. sg. inflection *-ā* and Skjaervo 2006 shows *dāh-* having a nom. sg. form *dā*, so *dazdā* cannot be the nom. sg. form of *dāh-* 'gift'. The Pahlavi translators have translated *dazdā* in a way that requires it to be nom. sg. so either they believed that there was another stem which generated the nom. sg. form *dazdā*, or they were unacquainted with GAv. grammar.

<sup>85</sup> According to Jackson 1892, the inflection for the nom. pl. of ntr. *a-* stem nouns, in Gathic Avestan is *-ā*, (§§ 237 - 238, p. 70) so *dazdā* would be the correct nom. pl. form for Taraporewala's conjectured stem *dazda-* (although Jackson does not show *dazda-* as a GAv. stem). Skjaervo 2006 does not show a noun stem *dazda-*.

<sup>86</sup> Taraporewala 1951 p. 21.

<sup>87</sup> Discussed in *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya, Ancient Commentaries*.

<sup>88</sup> SBE 31, p. 280.

<sup>89</sup> As stated by Taraporewala 1951, giving Bartholomae's opinion, p. 21. The Gatha verse Y33.14 says (in the Insler (1975) translation) "For Zarathushtra does give [*dadāitī*] the breath of even his own person as a gift [*rātqm*], in order that there be for the Wise One predominance of good thinking along with (predominance) of the action and the word allied with truth, that there be obedience and His (good) rule." Y33.14, Insler 1975.

As you can see, the word *dazdā* does not appear in this verse. But, as in English, there can be more than one word for a given meaning. For example in English 'present' and 'gift' are both synonyms. And Bartholomae is surely correct in thinking that the ideas expressed in Y33.14 (quoted above) are parallel to the ideas in line b. of the Ahuna Vairya.

<sup>90</sup> Chalker & Weiner, *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*, p. 18.

<sup>91</sup> Jackson 1892 # 21 § 787, p. 220.

<sup>92</sup> Jackson 1892 §§ 321 - 323, pp. 93 - 94. Jackson cites "*dātar-* 'giver, creator'," as one of a few examples *-ar* stem nouns, but does not mention *dazdar-*.

<sup>93</sup> Gershevitch 1967, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra*, p. 329. Skjaervo 2006 does not show a stem *dazdar-*.

<sup>94</sup> Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, pp. 2 - 3, translating Yy19.13.

<sup>95</sup> SBE 31, p. 263, Mills translating Yy19.13.

<sup>96</sup> Discussed in *Part Three: Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo), Ancient Commentaries*.

<sup>97</sup> Insler 1975 *Ahuna Vairya*, p. 410.

---

<sup>98</sup> The fact that *dātar-* is well attested as an agent noun, formed from the root *dā-* does not mean that related (and rarely used) near synonyms (whether agent nouns or action nouns) derived from *dā-* could not have existed. Unlike Sanskrit whose grammar is described in at least one ancient text, no ancient Avestan grammars have survived and come down to us.

<sup>99</sup> As shown in Taraporewala 1951 p. xxxi.

<sup>100</sup> In the Gathas, there is indeed a verse in which the Lord Wisdom is described as judging the just and the unjust. "I shall declare to you ... the glories of Him who offers solicitude (to us), the Wise Lord who, together with His clever advisor, truth, has judged the just and the unjust." Y46.17, Insler 1975. But note that here, the Lord Wisdom's judgment is linked with his solicitude, and the standard which informs his judgment is truth.

And in the Gathas, each soul also judges himself "... the conception of the deceitful person misses the true (conception) of the honest man. His soul shall vex him at the Bridge of the Judge surely, in that he has disappeared from the path of truth by reason of his own actions and (the words) of his tongue." Y51.13, Insler 1975.

"During their regimes, the Karpans and the Kavis yoked (us) with evil actions in order to destroy the world and mankind. But their own soul and their own conception did vex them when they reached the Bridge of the Judge, ..." Y46.11, Insler 1975.

This concept of self-judgment is also discussed in *Part One: Buried Treasure In Ancient Stories*, and in *Part Three: Chinvat, The Bridge of Discerning*.

<sup>101</sup> See *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise & Hell*.

<sup>102</sup> See in *Part Two: Asha and the Checkmate Solution*; and *A Question of Reward and the Path*.

<sup>103</sup> Skjaervo 2003, *Young Avestan* Lesson 11 pp. 100 - 102, and Lesson 12 (pp. 115 - 116), and the same is true in his description of the uses of the gen. in Skjaervo 2006 *Old Avestan* Lesson 2 (p. 18).

<sup>104</sup> Insler 1975 *Ahuna Vairya*, pp. 410, 417 - 418.

<sup>105</sup> Insler's 1975 analysis was done after Humbach's 1959 German translation, which was translated into English in 1991.

<sup>106</sup> According to McArthur's *Oxford Companion to the English Language*, an enclitic (from the Greek *enklitikós* 'leaning on') is a word attached to the preceding word, sometimes in a reduced form.

In Gathic Avestan, enclitic words often are separate words, but in a reduced form. For example, in personal pronouns, the 2p gen. sg. pronoun *tavā* 'thy', has enclitic forms *tōi*, and *tē*; and the dat. sg. pronoun *taibyā/taibyō* 'to/for thee' also has the same enclitic forms *tōi*, and *tē* (all of which make learning GAv. so wonderfully easy!). And there are many other such examples of GAv. enclitics, Martinez & de Vaan 2001, *Introduccion Al Avestico*, p. 69.

<sup>107</sup> Insler 1975 *The Ahuna Vairya*, p. 418.

<sup>108</sup> Skjaervo 2006 identifies *vā* as a conjunction meaning 'or'; and when *vā ... vā* appears, it means 'either ... or'. Jackson (1892) § 739, p. 205 identifies *-cā* as a co-ordinate conjunction [i.e. one that links two nouns, as in *truth and beauty*]. And he identifies *vā* as a disjunctive 'or'. In Gathic Avestan *vā* is not tacked on to the end of a word the way *-cā* is.

Insler gives a phrase from the Gatha verse Y46.10 to illustrate the migration of *vā*, to which I have added his 1975 translation, inserting the Avestan words to show you their English equivalents.

Y46.10 *yā vā mōi nā / gəṇā vā mazdā ahurā dāyāṭ*

"Wise Lord [*mazdā ahurā*], whoever [*yā*] ~ be it man [*vā ... nā*] or woman [*gəṇā vā*] ~ would grant [*dāyāṭ*] to me [*mōi*]..." Insler says the normal Avestan syntax (without the migration of *vā*) would be \**yā mōi nā vā / gəṇā vā*, as demonstrated in two sections of the prose Yasna Haptanghaiti YHapt.35.6 *yaθā ... nā vā nāirī vā vaēdā haiθīm*, and YHapt. 41.2 *hux šaθras tū nā nā vā nāirī vā x šaētā*. (Insler 1975 *The Ahuna Vairya*, p. 418). The words *gəṇā-* and *nāirī-* both mean 'woman', Skjaervo 2006.

<sup>109</sup> A search through the Gathas revealed many, many instances (in the Insler 1975 translation) in which *-cā* does not migrate from the word to which it belongs, to the first word in the line and only a few instances in which it does (or perhaps may) so migrate.

*No migration.*

Here are some examples in which the *-cā* 'and' does not migrate to the first word (either at the start of the line, or the first word after the caesura). The diagonal slash / indicates the caesura. The translations are by Insler 1975.

Y28.9c *yūžəm zəvīštyāṅhō / īšō x šaθramcā savanḡqm* "to mighty ones (like you) belong the powers and the mastery [*x šaθramcā*]." Here in the segment after the caesura, the *-cā* 'and' has not migrated to the first word in the segment *īšō*.

Y30.10c *mazdā ašahyācā* "of the Wise One and of truth." Here the two Avestan words appear at the start of the line; *-cā* 'and' has not migrated to the first word *mazdā* "of the Wise One".

Y31.6b *haurvatātō / ašahyā aməratāscā* "concerning the truth of... completeness and immortality". Insler 1975. Here in the segment after the caesura, the *-cā* 'and' has not migrated to the first word in the segment.

Y31.21a / *haurvatō aməratāscā* "completeness and immortality". Here again, in the segment after the caesura, the *-cā* 'and' has not migrated to the first word in the segment.

Y32.5a / *hujyātōiš aməratāscā* "out of the good way of life and immortality". Here once again, in the segment after the caesura, the *-cā* 'and' has not migrated to the first word in the segment.

Y32.9c *tā ux dā mainyēuš mahyā / mazdā ašāicā yušmaibyā gərəzē* "I lament these words of my spirit (to Thee) Wise One, and to truth ~ to all of you!" Here also, in the segment after the caesura, the *-cā* 'and' has not migrated to the first word in the segment.

And there are many, many other such examples.

*Migration.*

I have found only the following one example in which the migration of *-cā* occurs to the first word after the caesura, although Insler's commentary on this verse makes no mention of the migration of *-cā*.

Y50.8c / *arədrahyācā nəmaṅhā* "and with the reverence (worthy) of a sincere person". Here *-cā* 'and' belongs with *nəmaṅhā* "and with the reverence" but is tacked on to the first word after the caesura *arədrahyācā* "of a sincere person". Insler does not comment on the migration of *-cā*. Neither does Humbach 1991, in whose translation also, *-cā* 'and' also belongs with *nəmaṅhā* "and in reverence..." (although he gives *nəmaṅhā* a locative ('in\_\_\_') instead of an instrumental ('with\_\_\_') translation).

*Apparent migration.*

In all the other instances (involving a possible migration of *-cā*) that I was able to find in the Gathas, it is difficult to say whether we have a true migration, or simply another style of expression. Here they are, you can judge for yourself.

Y28.4b ... *ašišcā šyaoθananqm / vīduš mazdā ahurahyā* "and (who) knowingly bear in mind the Wise Lord's rewards for (our) actions" (translation from Insler's commentary p. 124). Here *-cā* 'and' is tacked on to the first word *ašiš* 'rewards' although in Insler's translation it belongs with *vīduš* which he sees as an adverb "knowingly ...". Insler's commentary does not mention the migration of *-cā*.

But in the Humbach 1991 translation, there is no migration of *-cā* which Humbach thinks belongs with rewards which partners 'soul [*urvānəm*]' in the preceding line, and which he translates "as well as rewards [*ašišcā*]", an opinion that is unchanged in Humbach/Faiss 2010. Here is the Humbach 1991 translation of the sentence.

Humbach 1991: "I, who together with good thought, note in (my) mind a soul for commendation, as well as rewards [*ašišcā*] for (our) actions, as a witness for the Wise Ahura .." Y28.4ab. (Vol. 1, p. 118; his commentary in Vol. 2, p. 22).

Y33.4. There seem to be repeated migrations in Y33.4 line b (2 times), and line c (2 times). These (apparent) migrations of *-cā* are very much a part of the rhythm of the lines (as is *-cā* in the Ahuna Vairya). Here is the full verse so you can see the possible migrations in context.

- a. *yē θwaṭ mazdā asrušīm / akamcā manō yazāi apā*  
 b. *x'aētēušcā tarēmaītīm / vərəzēnahyācā nazdištqm drujim*  
 c. *airyamnascā nadəntō / gəušcā vāstrāt acištəm mantūm* Y33.4

Insler 1975: "Wise One (it is) I who, through worship, shall turn away disobedience and bad thinking from Thee, and opposition from the family, and the nearest deceit of the community, and scorners from the clan, and the worst counselor from the pasture of the cow." Y33.4. All but the first instance appear to be migrations. However in each of these instances, the Avestan way of saying it could involve no migration if we remember the controlling verb phrase "I ... shall turn away" in line a, which would be implied in each of the following lines.

Y33.4a (no migration) / *akamcā manō ...* "and bad [*akamcā*] thinking [*manō*]".

Y33.4b before the caesura (with apparent migration) *x'aētēušcā tarēmaītīm* "and opposition from the family". As translated here the *-cā* 'and' belongs with *tarēmaītīm* "and opposition". However this phrase could be translated as follows (with no migration), *x'aētēušcā tarēmaītīm* 'and from the family [*x'aētēušcā*] (I shall turn away) opposition'.

Y33.4b after the caesura (with apparent migration) *vərəzēnahyācā nazdištqm drujim* "and the nearest deceit of the community". As translated here *-cā* 'and' belongs with *nazdištqm drujim* "and the nearest deceit". However this phrase could be translated as follows (with no migration), *vərəzēnahyācā nazdištqm drujim* 'and from the community [*vərəzēnahyācā*] (I shall turn away) the nearest deceit'.

Y33.4c before the caesura (with apparent migration) *airyamnascā nadəntō* "and scorners from the clan". As translated here *-cā* 'and' belongs with *nadəntō* "and scorners". However, this phrase could be translated as follows (with no migration), *airyamnascā nadəntō* "and from the clan [*airyamnascā*] (I shall turn away) scorners'.

Y33.4c after the caesura (with apparent migration) *gəušcā vāstrāt acištəm mantūm* "and the worst counselor from the pasture of the cow", (the cow here is an allegory for the beneficial in mortal existence; see *Part Two: The Puzzle of the Cow and Its Network*). As translated here *-cā* 'and' belongs with *acištəm mantūm* "and the worst counselor". However this line could be translated as follows (with no migration), *gəušcā vāstrāt acištəm mantūm* "and from the cow's [*gəušcā*] pasture [*vāstrāt*], (I shall turn away) the worst counselor'.

In short, setting aside the migration of other enclitic words and considering only *-cā*, we have many instances in which the migration does not occur in the Gathas. However, the fact that it does occur in the one clear instance shown above (and possibly others), and in light of the Vedic evidence cited by Insler, such a migration, although uncommon in GA., could indeed have been an available option in Gathic Avestan syntax.

<sup>110</sup> Insler 1975 *The Ahuna Vairya Prayer*, p. 419.

<sup>111</sup> Insler sees *dazdā* as a verb. He therefore gives examples from the Gathas of verbs being framed by *vohu-* and *manah-*.

While not all verbs (and nouns) are so framed, such framing occurs very frequently ~ enough to establish that it is a commonly used element of GAv. syntax as the following examples show. All translations are by Insler 1975.

*Additional verbs so framed.*

*hyaṭ hōi vohū vax šaṭ manañhā* "that one shall increase it for Him through good thinking." Y31.6.

*vanhəuš sīždyamnā manañhō* "they continue to retreat from good thinking" Y32.4.

*vahištā barətū manañhō* "let a person support with good thinking" Y33.9, literally 'with most-good thinking'.

*vohū θraoštā manañhā* "one has nourished with good thinking" Y34.3.

*hyaṭ mā vohū / pairī.jasaṭ manañhō* "when he attended me with good thinking" Y43.7, 9, 11, 13, 15 (here the 'framing' or 'encapsulation' occurs across the caesura).

*vohū jimaṭ manañhā* "it shall come ... with good thinking". Y44.1.

*vohū cōišəm manañhā* "I ... have promised with good thinking". Y46.18.

*Nouns so framed.*

*vanhəuš āyaptā manañhō* Y28.7a "the attainments of good thinking";

*vanhəuš ptarəm manañhō* Y31.8b "the Father of good thinking";

*vanhəuš fšānghīm manañhō* Y31.10b "the cultivator of good thinking";

*vanhəuš fradax štā manañhō* Y31.17c "the revealer of good thinking".

*vanhəuš māyā manañhō* Y43.2d "the wondrous powers of good thinking".

*vanhəuš padəbīš manañhō* Y51.16b "the paths of good thinking".

*vanhəuš paityāstīm manañhō* Y53.3c "the firm foundation of good thinking".

<sup>112</sup> I was not able to find *śleṣa* in MacDonell's *Vedic Grammar For Students* (although I could have missed it). According to Ruth M. Kott, a *śleṣa* is a Sanskrit term which describes various techniques of Sanskrit poetry which (among other things) give a dual function to a single word or term. Ruth M. Kott's essay, *Language Duel* appearing in the University of Chicago Magazine, on line, at <http://magazine.uchicago.edu/1010/investigations/language-duel.shtml>.

Ms. Kott states that the *śleṣa* was used in Skt. literature from the 6th century to as late as the 20th century (the author does not indicate whether the 6th century mentioned is BCE or CE.). However, the Vedas and (in my view) the Gathas are considerably older than the 6th century BCE. See *Part Four: Zarathushtra's Date & Place*.

<sup>113</sup> Insler 1975 *Ahuna Vairya* pp. 419 - 420.

<sup>114</sup> Insler 1975, *The Ahuna Vairya*, pp. 419 - 420.

<sup>115</sup> See *Part Three: Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo), Ancient Commentaries*.

<sup>116</sup> None of the analyses (that are available to me) by western scholars mentions Taraporewala's ideas on *dazdā*. Whether this indicates the silence of a polite disagreement, or simply not being aware of his opinion, I do not know.

<sup>117</sup> Discussed in *Part One: Worship & Prayer*; and in *Part Two: The Puzzle of Worship*.

<sup>118</sup> Discussed in *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo) Ancient Commentaries*. And see also, *Part Three: Chinvat, The Bridge of Discerning*.

<sup>119</sup> Here are some other verses which show this mutual giving (gifting).

*The Lord Wisdom's gifts (of Divine attributes) to us.*

"Come Thou together with good thinking. Along with truth, grant in accordance with Thy lofty words, Wise One, the long-lived gift of strong support to Zarathushtra and to us, Lord,..." Y28.6, Insler 1975. Here support is given by truth, good thinking, and Wisdom. In many verses Zarathushtra makes it clear that the Lord, Wisdom, supports us with His Divine attributes, for example,

"Lord of broad vision, disclose to me for support the safeguards of your rule,..." Y33.13, Insler 1975. The Lord's rule is the rule of truth, its beneficial embodiment, and its most good comprehension (Y51.4).

"... I lament to Thee. Take notice of it, Lord, offering the support which a friend should grant to a friend. Let me see the power of good thinking allied with truth!" Y46.2, Insler 1975. Here, good thinking allied with truth is the support which the Wise Lord grants (gifts) to His friend.

*Man's gifts (of Divine attributes) to the Divine.*

"Through a [*spəntā mainyū*] and the best thinking, through both action and the word befitting truth, they shall grant completeness and immortality to Him..." Y47.1, Insler 1975; *spəntā mainyū* is a beneficial way of being (an attribute of the Divine). Completeness and non-deathness are also attributes of the Divine (amesha spenta) which man gives (gifts) to the Divine.

"For Zarathushtra does give the breath of even his own person as a gift, in order that there be for the Wise One predominance of good thinking along with (predominance) of the action and the word allied with truth, that there be obedience and His (good) rule." Y33.14, Insler 1975. Here, good thinking, truth and rule are mentioned ~ all attributes of the Divine (amesha spenta); and the words in purple are the meaning of *ārmaiti-*, an attribute of the Divine (amesha spenta).

"... As long as I shall be able, I shall respect that truth is to have a gift of reverence." Y43.9, Insler 1975. Read this in light of Y51.22 where he says "...Them (all) shall I worship with their own names, and I shall serve them with love." Y51.22, Insler 1975. Insler explains this in a footnote as follows "That is, *I shall worship truth with truth, good thinking with good thinking*, etc." Insler 1975 *Gathas*, p. 109, ftn. 27. So in Y43.9 giving truth 'a gift of reverence' means worshipping truth with truth itself (Y52.22) ~ giving truth the gift of worship. 'Truth' (*aša-*) is the true (correct) order of existence, which is the existence of the Divine, comprising all the qualities of the Divine (amesha spenta).

"Come hither to me, ye best [*vahišta-*] ones. ... Thou, Wise One, together with truth and good thinking ... Let bright gifts and reverence (for all of you) be manifest amid us." Y33.7, Insler 1975. What are the bright gifts and reverence which Zarathushtra offers to Wisdom, and to truth and good thinking? Well, his notion of giving reverence is to worship the Divine with Its own attributes, which are the 'bright gifts' ~ light being a symbol and metaphor for the truth, its comprehension good thinking ~ an enlightened state of being, which is the Divine (*Part Two: Light, Glory, Fire*).

Other verses in which Wisdom supports, protects, helps with attributes of the Divine (His 'gift' to mortals), and Zarathushtra's worship with these Divine attributes (our gift to the Divine) are collected in *Part One: Worship and Prayer*, and in *Part Two: A Question of Reward and the Path*.

<sup>120</sup> The plural 'grant ye' in Y29 refers to Wisdom and Its divine attributes truth, good thinking, and in masked form a beneficial way of being (the latter comprising all of the attributes of the Divine, amesha spenta). See *Part Two: The Solution of Yasna 29*.

<sup>121</sup> Insler 1975 *Gathas* p. 31, ftn. 14.

<sup>122</sup> YHapt. 39.3 mentions worshipping/celebrating the good amesha spenta, who dwell on the side of good thought. And the very next section, YHapt. 39.4 speaks of the mutual gifting between man and the Divine of all that is "good" ~ a word used in YHapt. 39.4 to describe the attributes of the Divine (amesha spenta).

"Just as you, O Wise Lord, conceive, pronounce, produce, and effect the good (things,) so we offer (them) to you, so we entrust (them) to you, so we celebrate [yazamaidē] you with them, so we revere you (with them,) so we requite you (for them,) O Wise Lord." YHapt. 39.4, Humbach/Faiss (2010) translation p. 110.

<sup>123</sup> *Part One: Worship and Prayer* has the evidence from the Gathas on which this conclusion is based.

<sup>124</sup> This part of the story of Yima is quoted in *Part One: The Freedom to Choose*, and is also mentioned in *Part One: Good Rule, Vohu Xshathra*, and in *Part Four: Ancient Origins & Homelands*.

<sup>125</sup> *Part One: Good Rule, Vohu Xshathra*, gives various translations by linguists of *mərəždikā*, including 'compassion'.

<sup>126</sup> Insler 1975 *The Ahuna Vairya*, pp. 418 - 419.

<sup>127</sup> *Part Two: The Solution of Yasna 29*.

<sup>128</sup> Insler 1975 *The Ahuna Vairya*, p. 419.

<sup>129</sup> *Part Two: The Puzzle of the Cow & Its Network*.

<sup>130</sup> *Part Two: The Lords and the Equations of Y31.4* discusses the identity of *ahurəm ašavanəm* 'the truthful lord' in Y31.10.

<sup>131</sup> Insler 1975 *The Ahuna Vairya*, p. 420.

<sup>132</sup> *Part Two: The Puzzle of the Cow and Its Network*, lays out the evidence showing that 'pastor' is used in the Gathas for both the Divine and (unperfected) humans.

<sup>133</sup> *Part Two: The Solution of Yasna 29*.

<sup>134</sup> When Zarathushtra uses *ahura-* it is most often a name by which he calls the Divine (*ahurā* voc. sg.). But even in those verses in which *ahura-* is used, but not as one of His names, it refers to the Divine. For example,

"... I realized Thee to be (ever) young in mind, Wise One [*mazdā* voc. sg.], when I grasped Thee ... to be the Father of good thinking, the real Creator of truth, (and) the Lord of Existence [*aṅhəuš ahurəm*] in Thy actions." Y31.8, Insler 1975. Here *mazdā* voc. sg., is used as a name for the Divine. But 'Lord' *ahurəm* acc. sg. is not used as a name, but to describe the Divine as someone who is 'Lord of Existence' Yet he still uses *ahura-* not *ahu-*.

"... (For) Thou art the Lord [*ahurō* nom. sg.] by reason of Thy tongue (which is) in harmony with truth and by reason of Thy words stemming from Good thinking, of which Thou, Wise One [*mazdā* voc. sg.], art the foremost revealer." Y51.3, Insler 1975. Here, Zarathushtra does not use *ahurō* as a name, but as a description of the Divine ~ describing His status ~ yet he uses *ahura-* not *ahu-*.

And there are many other such examples. My conclusion that Zarathushtra does not use *ahu-* for the Divine in the Gathas, is corroborated by the fact that Skjaervo does not show any such use in his *Old Avestan Glossary*.

<sup>135</sup> It could be argued that the use of *ahū* in line a. instead of *ahurō* (nom. sg. of *ahura-*) is required by the meter. And it is true that *yaθā ahū vairyō* fits the meter much better than does *yaθā ahurō vairyō*. But the meter of the Gathas (like all poetic meters) is not rigid; and using *ahurō* would not be fatal to the meter; it could be made to

---

work in the way this verse was sung. Besides, with Zarathushtra's passion for the truth, I do not think he would have sacrificed accuracy to meter. I therefore think he had some other reason for using *ahū*, ~ the double entendre explored in this chapter.

<sup>136</sup> See *Part Two: A Question of Reward and the Path*.

<sup>137</sup> See *Part Two: The Puzzle of the Cow and Its Network* for the ways in which Zarathushtra uses 'pastor' in the Gathas.

<sup>138</sup> Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, p. 3 - 4. For the Pahlavi translation he cites as his source Dhabar's *Zand i Khurtak Avistak*, 1929. Humbach also adds a Sanskrit version, which he does not translate. He cites as its source Bharucha, *Collected Sanskrit Writings I*, 1906. As you can see, in the Pahlavi translation it is difficult indeed to match Avestan words with their translated equivalents.

<sup>139</sup> Insler 1975 *The Ahuna Vairya*, pp. 419 - 420.

<sup>140</sup> Humbach 1991 Vol. 1, p. 115; with commentary and analysis in Vol. 2, pp. 3 - 8.

<sup>141</sup> Humbach/Faiss 2010 p. 73.

<sup>142</sup> Humbach/Faiss 2010 do not explain how or why they arrive at *commend* as one of the meanings of the stem *dā-*.

<sup>143</sup> Gershevitch 1967 *Avestan Hymn to Mithra Addenda*, p. 329.

<sup>144</sup> Taraporewala 1951 p. 17. Taraporewala specifically matches the following English words with their Avestan equivalents. But not all words have been translated using their normal grammatical values.

"Just-as [*yaθā*] the Sovereign-Lord [*ahū*] (is) all-powerful [*vairyō*], so [*aθā*] (is) the Spiritual-Teacher [*ratusš*] by-reason-of [*hacā*] the-store-of-(his)-Asha [*ašācētī*];  
the gifts [*dazdā*] of Vohu Mano [*vanhəuš mananhō*] (are) for deeds [*šyaoθananəm*] (done) for the Lord [*mazdāi*] of Creation [*anəuš*];  
and the Xshathra [*x šθrəmcā*] of Ahura [*ahurāi ā*] (descends) indeed upon (him) who [*yim*] becomes [*dadaŋ*] a Shepherd [*vāstārəm*] to the meek [*drigubyō*]."

<sup>145</sup> Shown in Moulton 1912 p. 161. This is Moulton's translation of Bartholomae's German translation, with which Moulton agrees.

<sup>146</sup> Mary Boyce as set forth in *History of Zoroastrianism I*, 1975, p. 260, and referenced by Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, p. 10.

<sup>147</sup> Haug (1878) *Essays*, p. 141, fn. 2.

<sup>148</sup> Darmesteter offers this translation of the Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo) in his translation of the Introductory Invocation to all the Yashts, SBE 23, p. 23. This same translation appears in his translation of the *Vendidad* Ch. VIII, § 19, SBE Vol. 4, p. 98, although the full text of the manthra does not appear there (in Geldner 2P p. 60).

<sup>149</sup> SBE 4, p. 98, fn. 3.

<sup>150</sup> Mills' translation of the Ahuna Vairya appears as Y27.13 in SBE 31, p. 281.

<sup>151</sup> Kanga 1880, *Khordeh Avesta*, (1995 reprint) p. 2.

<sup>152</sup> Jafarey 1989, *The Gathas, Our Guide*, (Ushta Inc.) p. 28.

<sup>153</sup> All these translations that follow appear in Taraporewala 1951 pp. xxx - xxxii.