The Yenghe Haatam, An Analysis, & Ancient Commentaries.

Many of us are emotionally invested in one or another translation (or interpretation) of the Yenghe Haatam (*yeŋ́hē hātąm*).[1]   I ask that you (temporarily at least) set aside such attachments, and consider this chapter with an open mind.

The chapter in *Part One* entitled *The Manthra of the Human and the Divine, Yenghe Haatam*, gives us a simple overview of this manthra, which is meaningful for us in the way we live our lives, without giving any evidence on which its conclusions are based.

This chapter is for those want to see the evidence ~ including other opinions besides mine. Here, we will take a look at the linguistics of this manthra, and consider and compare the most ancient translation of it (in Pahlavi), and as well as some modern translations and commentaries. So far as I am aware, Insler has not published a translation of the Yenghe Haatam.   So we will look at the translations of Humbach/Faiss 2010,[2] Humbach 1991,[3] Hintze 1994,[4] Taraporewala 1951,[5] Bartholomae,[6] Darmesteter,[7] and a synopsis of Gershevitch's commentary on this manthra (1967).[8]

We will also look at two ancient commentaries on the Yenghe Haatam ~ the most ancient one in Younger Avestan (Yy21) and a later one in the Pahlavi *Dinkard*. I have opted to not give these ancient commentaries in a separate chapter, because the YAv. commentary gave me the key to understanding this manthra.   As a result, this chapter is quite long (around 28 pages ~ the rest are footnotes, which you can always skip if they do not interest you!).

I end this chapter with my own understanding of the Yenghe Haatam, which has been influenced by wiser souls, and which suggests answers to many open questions.

I wish to acknowledge my deep indebtedness to High Priest (Dastur) Kersey Antia for his luminous insight in resolving the dispute as to whether the Yenghe Haatam pertains to the human or the Divine. He suggested that it is about both the human and the Divine.

I also wish to acknowledge my deep indebtedness to the YAv. Commentary on the Yenghe Haatam (Yy21) for its insights, without which I would still be speculating in the dark.

As you go through the many translations and interpretations, you may become frustrated and tired of it all. Don't get discouraged.   If it helps, skip whatever details seem tiresome on the first reading (you can always go back to those parts later, if you wish). But hang in there. I think you will find it so very worthwhile ~ even though you may not (or may) agree with my conclusions.

The Yenghe Haatam contains many questions and puzzles.   And no one has all the answers. So we need to keep an open (but not vacant) mind, and arrive at conclusions that seem the most reasonable to each of us, while not being intolerant of other opinions.

The Yenghe Haatam is not in Gathic Avestan. It is in an archaic form of Younger Avestan.[9] Therefore we know that it was composed long after the Gathas,[10] but earlier (by perhaps a few generations) than other Younger Avestan texts.   Humbach/Faiss 2010 had a poor opinion of the Yenghe Haatam, believing it to have been "artificially archaised" to make it appear older. But they provide no supporting evidence of such duplicity. They also think the Yenghe Haatam was "artless".   With respect, I do not find these views persuasive.[11]

The Yenghe Haatam (like the Ahuna Vairya and the Asha Vahishta) is found in full only in a few mss.[12]

Even though the Yenghe Haatam is not in Gathic Avestan, we can see the esteem in which it was held by ancient Zoroastrians over many centuries, by the fact that it appears in Y27.15, immediately after the two most important manthras which are in Gathic Avestan ~ the Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo Y27.13), and the Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu Y27.14). And the earliest YAv. commentaries on these three manthras also follow each other in the same way (Yy19 on the Ahuna Vairya, Yy20 on the Asha Vahishta, and Yy21 on the Yenghe Haatam).   In addition, when the Avestan texts came to be recited as part of the ritual, we find in numerous instances throughout these texts, instructions to recite the Yenghe Haatam (often with other prayers) at various parts of such texts. All these things give us some idea of the importance, the reverence, with which the Yenghe Haatam was viewed by ancient Zoroastrians.

So we have to wonder: Why?   Why was it universally, through many centuries, deemed so important? Well, let's try to figure that out.

Here is the text of the Yenghe Haatam in Avestan (transliterated) from Geldner in Yy27.15, (with line breaks in the Avestan from Humbach 1991 ~ with which I agree).

yeńhē. hātąm. āaṯ. yesnē. paitī. vaŋhō.
mazdå. ahurō. vaēϑā. ašāṯ. hacā. yåŋhąmcā.
tąscā. tåscā. yazamaidē ⁝ ⁝ ⁝
Y27.15.[13]

Here is my translation (with line breaks in English which may help in understanding this manthra).

'In the worship
of which one [*yeńhē* masc. sg.] and of which ones [*yåŋhąmcā* fem. pl.], among those who exist [*hātąm*],
the Lord, Wisdom, already knows (what is) more~good in accord with truth,
them (*tąscā* masc. pl) and them (*tåscā* fem. pl.) we worship.' Y27.15, my translation.

Not particularly enlightening?   Or inspiring?   Very true.

But this is a manthra whose light and inspiration are revealed by unravelling its puzzles ~ an exercise that must have delighted ancient Zoroastrians, to whom riddles and puzzles were a form of entertainment in a time period before the advent of books, movies, television, and other forms of electronic entertainment.

The Yenghe Haatam contains four pronouns, in two parallel (but asymmetrical) sets:

yeńhē (masc. sg.), and *yåŋhąmcā* (fem. pl.)
tąscā (masc. pl.), and *tåscā* (fem. pl.)

But it does not identify the person(s) or concept(s) for which these pronouns stand, except that they are a part of *hātąm* which means 'of (among) beings' or 'of (among) those who exist' ~ which tells us that these pronouns stand for something living (without identifying who or what that living thing might be). In addition the word order of this manthra is crafted in a way that is (intentionally) ambiguous, resulting in some lovely multiple meanings.

All of which are a part of the mystery of this thought-provoking manthra, and why it was so valued by the ancients.

Intentional ambiguities are also one of the techniques which Zarathushtra uses in the Gathas. The author of the Yenghe Haatam may have tried deliberately to use this ambiguous, multi-dimensioned technique from the Gatha verse Y51.22 which is generally thought to be its genesis. However, there are some material differences between the Gatha verse Y51.22 and the Yenghe Haatam, as we will see.

In studying the Yenghe Haatam, I have come to the conclusion that it is not an "artless" attempt to copy Y51.22 by someone who had little understanding of that Gatha verse. I think rather that the author knew the multi-dimensioned meanings of Y51.22, but wanted to show its ideas from another perspective, taking us a step further, but in a way that is also consistent with ideas we see in the Gathas. For this reason, (and also because the Yenghe Haatam is in archaic Young Avestan), in making translation choices, I think we should be guided by the Gathas, and not by later Avestan texts which may not have been a part of *mazdayasna* ('Wisdom-worshipping') thought when the Yenghe Haatam was composed.

<div align="center">* * *</div>

For those who complain about "too much linguistics", we have to consider that the author of the Yenghe Haatam composed this manthra in Avestan, not in (today's) English. So we can understand what the author was trying to convey in composing this manthra, only if we know the meanings of the words he used. So let us first look at the grammatical value and meaning of each word. And let us recall, that (like many other Indo-European languages) in Avestan all nouns and adjectives have *grammatical* genders ~ even for things that do not have actual genders ~ a key to understanding this manthra.

yeŋ́hē 'of which (one)' (masc. sg.)
yeŋ́hē is a relative pronoun (a brief explanation of relative pronouns is footnoted).[14] *yeŋ́hē* means 'of which', 'of whose', 'of whom'. (In GAv. the word is *yehyā*). Linguists generally agree that *yeŋ́hē* is the masc. genitive sg. form of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*. Hintze 1994 alone translates *yeŋ́hē* as masc. gen. pl., but according to Jackson 1892 the masc. gen. pl. is *yaēšąm*.[15]

hātąm 'among those who exist'
hātąm literally means 'of existing (ones)' or 'of beings'. Skjaervo's shows *hātąm* (under the verb *ah-* which means 'to be, to exist'), as its present participle,[16] masc./ntr. genitive pl. Taraporewala 1951, commenting under the Gatha verse Y29.3, in which *hātąm* also occurs, agrees (but does not state its gender), he notes that the genitive ('of') is used in the sense of 'among' beings. Taraporewala 1951 p. 47.
In literal English *hātąm* means 'of those who exist' (gen. pl. masc./ntr.) in the sense of 'a part of those who exist'; or in more fluent English, 'among those who exist'

The word *hātąm* appears once in the Gathas, in Y29.3, used in the same sense.

Taraporewala 1951, commenting under Y29.3, states that *hātąm*, like Skt. *sat-*, is used to mean 'living' or 'existing' human beings (but cites no Av. or Skt. texts in support of this conclusion).[17]

Insler 1975 translates *hātąm* in the Gatha verse Y29.3 as "of ... beings". In context, he has "...of yonder beings [*hātąm*], that strongest one is not to be found..." Y29.3. While the identity of "that strongest one"

in Y29.3 is not specifically disclosed, the words "...of yonder beings [*hātąm*]," in this Gatha verse probably refers to mortal beings, whose suffering (and its solution) is the subject of this Yasna.[18]

So a number of questions arise: In the Yenghe Haatam, whom did the author intend to include in the word *hātąm* 'of (among) beings' or 'of (among) those who exist'? In the Gathas, the terms that comprise the amesha spenta are concepts ~ truth, good thinking, embodied truth, good rule, completeness, non-deathness, the beneficial~sacred way of being. The terms that comprise the amesha spenta are qualities of the Divine, some of which also exist (incompletely) in man, and some of these concepts are treated as allegorical entities only a few times in the Gathas. But by the time of certain later texts, the amesha spenta were regarded as living entities, to be worshiped.

So did the composer of the archaic YAv. Yenghe Haatam intend *hātąm* to mean (1) mortal beings (as in Y29.3)? or (2) beings who once were mortal, but now personify the qualities of the divine (amesha spenta) completely? or (3) the amesha spenta as allegorical beings? or (4) the amesha spenta as living entities? Let us set these questions on the back burner of our minds for the time being. With respect, I think Mary Boyce was not correct in her opinion that *hātąm* referred to the Indo-Iranian divinities (yazatas) of later Zoroastrianism.[19]   The Yenghe Haatam draws its inspiration from the Gathas, and the Indo-Iranian divinities are not mentioned in the Gathas. Indeed, Zarathushtra's notion of the Divine was radically different from the deities of his culture whom he rejected.[20]

āaţ 'already' (?)

Linguists have various views on the meaning of *āaţ* which appears to be one of those flexible Avestan words which can be rendered into various English equivalents depending on the context.   Of the following linguists, all but Taraporewala see *āaţ* (and GAv. *āţ*) as an adverb.

Martinez & DeVan 2001 offer the following possible translations of *āaţ*, 'then', 'already', 'but'.[21]

Jackson 1892 shows *āaţ* (and GAv. *āţ*) as an ablative adverb meaning 'then'.[22]

Beekes 1988 shows the GAv. *āţ* as an abl. adv. which he says means 'then, but, and'.[23]

Hintze 1994 in the Glossary appended to her translation of the YAv. *Zamyad Yasht* shows *āaţ* as an adverb, 'then',   but the word 'then' does not appear in her translation of the Yenghe Haatam which appears in the *Zamyad Yasht.*[24]

Indeed, an English equivalent for *aāţ* does not seem to appear in any of the translations of the Yenghe Haatam considered here except for Taraporewala's.

Taraporewala 1951 comments that *āaţ* is a mildly emphatic particle, which he translates as 'indeed' and as applying to a conjectured 'Him' ("(Him), indeed [*āaţ*] of-those-that-are [*hātąm*], of-whom [*yeńhē*] in every act-of-worship Mazda Ahura knoweth...").[25]

āaţ (as an adv.) does not seem to fit with the loc. sg. verb *yesnē* 'in (the) worship'.

If *āaţ* (as an adv.) belongs with the verb *vaēθā* '(he) knows' it would likely mean 'already'.

Thus *āaţ ... mazdå ahurō vaēθā*

In literal translation 'already ... Wisdom the Lord knows...'. I (tentatively) favor this alternative.

yesnē paitī   'in (the) worship'

yesnē and *paitī* belong together.

yesnē is locative sg. of the noun *yasna-* which derives from *yaz* 'to worship'.[26]

paitī   'in every'?   'in return for'?   Linguists are not in agreement. *paitī* generally is a preposition or a postposition (paired with a noun).

Skjaervo 2006 classifies GAv. *paitī* as "loc. postp." (i.e. locative postposition) and he thinks it means 'in return for'; his 2003 YAv. Glossary shows that the meaning of *paitī* is affected by the case of the word which follows; here *paitī* follows *yesnē* which is loc., and Skjaervo 2003 states that *paitī* plus a loc. means 'on, in return for';

Hintze 1994 also says that the meaning of *paitī* depends on the case of the word with which it is paired, and shows that *paitī* + a loc. means 'for, in, at'.[27]

Jackson 1892 says Vedic *práti* = YAv. *paiti-* which means 'to, at, for, with' depending on the case of the noun it precedes or follows.[28]

Reichelt 1919 says (in his Glossary) that *paitī* with an acc. or loc. means "to, towards, against; in, at, on (of space and time);"

Linguists seem puzzled as to how these two words should be translated together in the Yenghe Haatam.

Humbach 1991 acknowledges that the meaning of *paitī* + loc. in the phrase *yesnē paitī* is not quite clear. He translates *yesnē paitī* as "at worship", but acknowledges that "in recompense for the worship" is equally possible.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *yesnē paitī* as "(recompense) for the sacrifice",[29] (but 'for' is not a locative translation).

Taraporewala 1951 translates *paitī* as 'every', but his long and detailed commentary shows the uncertainty that exists.

In the Gathas *paitī* appears in many Gatha verses (but with translation differences), including Y51.22 believed to be the inspiration for the Yenghe Haatam.[30]

If Jackson and Hintze are correct, *yesnē paitī* could simply mean "in worship". Which makes one wonder: If loc. sg. *yesnē* is 'in worship', why would we also need *paitī*?   Its presence must have some function.

If Taraporewala has read the supporting evidence correctly, *yesnē paitī* could mean 'in every worship', or in more readable English 'in every (act of) worship'.

The word 'every' certainly adds depth to the idea of 'worship' but inserting it into the translation makes it cumbersome, distracting and difficult to read in English. In any event, many translations simply translate *yesnē paitī* as 'in/at worship' without adding any additional word for *paitī*.

vaŋhō 'more good',
vaŋhō is an adjective, the comparative degree of *vohu-* 'good' and so literally means 'more-good' (sometimes translated as 'better' or 'very good' ~ neither of which accurately convey the meaning of intrinsic goodness in the comparative degree);[31]   *vaŋhō* is a later form of GAv. *vahyō* (from the stem *vahyah-*).

But what does this adjective *vaŋhō* describe. To what does it apply?   Translators disagree:
~ to man? (so Taraporewala);
~ to man's worship? (so Hintze and possibly Humbach 1991);
~ to man's reward for worship? (so Bartholomae and Humbach/Faiss 2010).

yesnē paitī vaŋhō   With respect, I do not think, in the context of the Yenghe Haatam, that *yesnē paitī* could mean "in return for" because that would require a translation which makes the comparative degree of good, (*vaŋhō*) the return (reward) for worshipping in accord with truth (*ašāṭ hacā*), as the translation of Humbach/Faiss 2010 demonstrates, "...whose very good [*vaŋhō*] (recompense) for sacrifice [*yesnē paitī*]...".[32]

This idea is not consistent with the Gathas and many YAv. texts which consistently describe the reward as *vahišta-* 'most-good' ~ the superlative degree of 'good'. Indeed *ahu- vahišta-* '(the) most-good existence' is one of the terms for paradise in the Gathas and even more frequently in the YAv. texts.[33]

In the context of the Yenghe Haatam, I think the comparative *vaŋhō* 'more good' applies, to man's worship (with thoughts, words and actions of truth) ~ which worship is imperfect, and therefore does not yet warrant the epiphany of the superlative 'most good' *vahišta-*.

mazdå ahurō vaēϑā   'Wisdom (the) Lord knows'

mazdå ahurō: both words are nom. sg., ~ the name 'Wisdom (the) Lord' or the 'Lord Wisdom' (both choices of Thieme 1993), or 'Wise Lord' (Insler 1975) ~ the subject of the verb *vaēϑā* 'knows'.[34] Thieme is of the opinion that in the two~word name, the word *mazdå* is not an adjective, but a noun, Wisdom.[35] And it is interesting that this form of the two word name ~ *mazdå ahurō* ~ in the Yenghe Haatam, is the form found more frequently in the Gathas whenever these two words are used together, whereas in the YAv. texts the two word name became standardized in the form *ahura- mazda-*,[36] an indication (perhaps) that the Yenghe Haatam (in archaic YAv.) may indeed have been composed in an earlier time period than the YAv. texts.

vaēϑā   (GAv. *vaēdā*)   '(he) knows',
This verb form is used for 3p sg. ('(he/she/it knows') and also for 1p sg. ('(I) know'), but in this context, most translators are agreed that it is 3p sg. and refers to *mazdå ahurō* as the subject of the verb.[37] Thus, *mazdå ahurō vaēϑā* 'Wisdom the Lord knows'.

ašāṭ hacā   'in accordance with truth'
There is general agreement about the translation of this phrase;   *ašāṭ* is abl. sg. of *aša-* (as in 'originating from truth'), and *hacā* is a preposition/postposition instr. sg.[38] Here again, the literal meaning adds more depth, than its translation in fluent English 'in accordance with truth'.   In the Yenghe Haatam, Humbach/Faiss 2010, Hintze 1994, Taraporewala 1951, and Bartholomae all translate *ašāṭ hacā* as 'in accordance with *aša-*'.   Humbach and Hintze translate *aša-* as 'truth', Bartholomae as 'Right', Taraporewala as 'Righteousness'. Each of these translations of *aša-* reflects an aspect of the true (correct) order of existence, which is the more literal meaning of *aša-*.[39] In short, there is no disagreement about the translation of *ašāṭ hacā* as 'in accordance with truth/right'. The disagreements here are about to whom, or to what, this phrase applies:

~ to man? (so Taraporewala 1951);
~ to man's worship? (so Hintze 1994);
~ to man's reward for worship? (so Bartholomae);
~ to the knowledge of Wisdom the Lord? (so the Pahlavi translator(s), Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010).

I am inclined to think that *ašāṯ hacā* applies to the worship (with thoughts, words and actions of truth) that is (incrementally) more-good 'in accordance with truth', about (every act of) which the Lord Wisdom already knows.

yåŋhąmcā   'and of which'

yåŋhąmcā means the same as *yeńhē* except that it is a fem. pl. relative pronoun (gen. fem. pl), with the suffix *-cā* 'and' tacked on.[40] It therefore means 'and of whose', 'and of whom', 'and of which'. In this context, *yåŋhąmcā* belongs with *yeńhē*. The two words are at the beginning and end of the sentence which they encapsulate or frame, indicating that the framing and framed words form a unit of sense.

We know that *yeńhē* and *yåŋhąmcā* belong together because
(a) they both are relative pronouns from the stem *ya-*,
(b) they both are in the genitive case and have the same meaning 'of which',
(c) they are linked by the conjunction *-cā* 'and' at the end of *yåŋhąmcā*,
(d) they both stand for 'of (among) those who exist' (*hātąm*), and
(e) they frame or encapsulate the in-between words with which they form one unit of thought ~ a technique of Avestan syntax frequently found in the Gathas.[41]

The only differences between these two pronouns are that:

yeńhē is masc. sg. whereas *yåŋhąmcā* is fem., pl.

tąscā   tåscā 'them and them.'

tąscā   is a demonstrative pronoun acc. pl. masc.   (The ntr. form is *tā*).[42]

tåscā   is a demonstrative pronoun acc. pl. fem.[43] We know that *tąscā* and *tåscā* belong together because,

(a) they are joined by the suffix *-cā* which means 'and',
(b) they both are the same case ~ accusative ~ objects of the verb *yazamaide*),
(c) they both are plural,
(d) they both are demonstrative pronouns, and mean the same 'and them' or 'and these',
(e) in context, they both refer back to *yeńhē* and *yåŋhąmcā* and therefore stand for 'of (among) living beings'.

The only difference between these two pronouns is that *tąscā* is masc. and *tåscā* is fem.

yazamaidē   'we worship/celebrate'

There is no dispute that the verb form is first person plural, so the 1p pl. pronoun ('we') is implicit in the verb form *yazamaidē*, thus 'we worship/celebrate'.

The word *yazamaidē* does not appear in the Gathas, but it does appear quite frequently in the *Yasna Haptanghaiti* which is in Gathic Avestan (and of course it frequently appears in YAv. texts, in its YAv. form *yazamaide*).

And there is no dispute that both *yazamaidē* in line c., and *yesnē* in line a., derive from *yaz-* 'to worship' (Skjaervo 2006). The differences lie in the English equivalents, which translators seem to select based on the object of the verb. But there are many ways 'to worship':

~ with thoughts, words and actions which embody qualities of the Divine (amesha spenta) as in the Gathas;
~ with rituals and material sacrifices as in many YAv. texts.

In the Gathas, Humbach/Faiss 2010 (who see the Gathas as ritually oriented) translate *yaz-* words sometimes as 'worship', sometimes as 'sacrifice', and sometimes as 'celebrate', without comment or explanation for the different English equivalents.

In 1991, in the Gathic Avestan *Yasna Haptanghaiti*, Humbach translated *yazamaidē* as 'we worship' (in YHapt.37.1 - 5, YHapt.38.1 - 4, YHapt.39.1 - 4).[44] By contrast, Humbach/Faiss 2010 have translated *yazamaidē* as 'we celebrate' in each of those instances ~ most of which have various (domestic and wild) animals, plants, waters, the earth, concepts, people, other good things, as well as the Divine and Its attributes, as the objects of *yazamaidē*.[45]

In English today, 'worship' is used only for the Divine, whereas 'revere' and 'celebrate' may be used for the Divine as well as people and other good things.   But that was not always so. Today's ideas have modified the way in which the English word 'worship' was more anciently used.   As late as 200 years ago, 'worship' was also used by ordinary people as a title for the powerful or wealthy. (Thus an innkeeper might have said to an aristocrat, *Would your worship step this way...*).   And going back a few centuries more, in older English usage, 'worship' was originally 'worth-ship' and was used to apply to an eminence gained by one's personal qualities of courage or honor. As such, the idea of 'worshipfulness' was based on the worth of a person's character and actions.[46] So we should not automatically impose on Avestan, our modern notions regarding 'worship' which even in English did not mean what it means now.

In Zarathushtra's culture, 'worship' was ritual oriented. Zarathushtra changed that notion of 'worship' to one of worshipping with the currency of truth ~ with thoughts, words, and actions that embody the true order of existence. So under the influence of Zarathushtra, the Avestan notion of 'worship' came to include a living 'worship', a 'celebration' of the divine. In the Gathas, the object of this worship/celebration, is the Divine, ~ in being, and in the qualities that make a being divine (amesha spenta) ~ which (in my view) includes those who have attained these qualities of the Divine completely, and therefore are part of the Divine in being and quality.[47]   In the GAv. *Yasna Haptanghaiti,* and also in later YAv. texts, this idea of worship/celebration included worshipping the Divine, immanent in (unperfected) existence ~ in man and nature.[48]

So what did the author of the Yenghe Haatam intend, when he used the *yaz-* words ~ *yazamaidē* (line c.) and *yesnē* (line a.)?   I think he intended 'worship' ~ but in the Av. sense of 'worshipping/celebrating' the Divine ~ in perfected and unperfected existence.   Hold that thought.

Humbach 1991 and *Hintze* 1994 translate both *yaz-* words (*yesnē* and *yazamaidē* as 'worship' words, perhaps because they saw the two sets of pronouns standing for divine entities (who are to be worshipped in the conventional sense of the word).

Humbach/Faiss 2010 thought that the first set of pronouns stand for human beings engaging in "sacrifice" (*yesnē*).   And they see the last set of pronouns also as standing for human beings whom 'we celebrate' (*yazamaidē*).

Taraporewala 1951 also sees the first set of pronouns standing for human beings engaging in "worship" (*yesnē*). And he also sees the last set of pronouns as standing for human beings whom 'we revere' (*yazamaidē*).

Perhaps these translators used celebrate and revere respectively because they believe that the objects of these *yaz-* words (*yesnē* and *yazamaidē*) are human beings -- men and women -- and (I speculate) they may not have been comfortable with human beings as the objects of worship.

<div align="center">* * *</div>

Translations and interpretations.

Some translators interpret the pronouns as standing for divine entities. Others think they stand for human beings. Yet others see a mix. And the most ancient YAv. Commentary (Yy21) offers some welcome light.

Just a reminder. Unless otherwise indicated, in all the following quotations, the words in round parentheses do not appear in the Avestan text. They are words added by the translator which he thinks are implied, or which reflect (his interpretation of) the composer's intent. Words inserted in square brackets in the Pahlavi translation, are the Pahlavi translator's commentary or explanation. And (unless otherwise stated), words in square brackets in other quotations are insertions by me, either to show the applicable Avestan word or give an explanation or sometimes my translation of a given word or phrase.

Here again is the Avestan text of the Yenghe Haatam.

a: *yeṇhē hātąm āaṯ yesnē paitī vaŋhō*
b: *mazdå ahurō vaēϑā ašāṯ hacā yåŋhąmcā*
c: *tąscā tåscā yazamaide*

Divine Entities.

Humbach 1991 thought that the pronouns stood for divine entities. Here is his translation.

> ab: "Of which male [*yeṇhē*] (divine entity) among those who exist [*hātąm*], and of which of the female ones [*yåŋhąmcā*]
> "the Wise Ahura [*mazdå ahurō*] in accordance with truth [*ašāṯ hacā*], knows [*vaēϑā*] (which is) the better [*vaŋhō*] (accomplishment of them to be displayed) at worship [*yesnē paitī*],
> c: "those male [*tąscā*] and those female [*tåscā*] (entities) we worship."[49]

As you can see, he adds a lot of words not in the Avestan to make his translation work.

Hintze 1994 also thinks the pronouns stand for divine entities. But I will discuss her translation under the '*Ambiguous interplay*' section below for reasons that will become apparent.

Gershevitch 1967 has an interesting note on the Yenghe Haatam (with comparisons to the Gatha verse Y51.22). His does not translate the Yenghe Haatam, but he thinks that both sets of pronouns stand for the amesha spenta based on the YAv. commentary (Yy21) a part of which he translates (somewhat freely) as

follows. Words in round parentheses are his explanations; words in square brackets are my insertions to show the applicable Avestan words.

"*yåŋhąm*: here he (*scil.* Zarathushtra) teaches the worship of the female Truth-owners headed by Armaiti, because it is the prayer to the Immortals..."

And Gershevitch states that the words "... *yåŋhąm* ... hence also *tås*(*cā*) refer to the female Amesha Spentas Armaiti, Ameretat and Haurvatat."

He sees the masc. sg. *yeŋ́hē* as standing for *spənta- mainyu-* which "must have stood at the head of the group."[50] (i.e. the group of the amesha spenta; *mainyu-* is a grammatically masc. noun).

And he concludes, "Inevitably then, both *hātąm* and *tąscā tåscā* 'each refer to all the Amesha Spentas together, and he states that "From the question and answer at the end of *b* [Yy21.2] we learn that the prayer is dedicated to the Amesha Spentas, who in the prayer are called 'Entities' (*hātąm*)."

He sees corroboration for his conclusion in the later Yasna, Yy4.25 ~ 26. He states that Yy4.25 ends with the following reference to the amesha spenta, and is immediately followed by the full Yenghe Haatam.

"...we worship the well-ruling [*hux šaϑrā*] beneficent [*huδåŋhō*] Amesha Spentas" Yy4.25,

'of which (male entity) among Entities ... ' Yy4.26.

Gershevitch lays out Yy4.25 and Yy4.26 in Avestan as follows (abbreviating the Yenghe Haatam in Yy4.26):

"Y4.25   . . .
aməšā spəntā hux šaϑrā
huδåŋhō yazamaide
4.26 *yeŋ́hē hātąm ... tąscā tåscā yazamaide*".[51]

He concludes that the amesha spenta in Yy4.25, is the (collective) noun which is referred to by the pronouns *yeŋ́hē hātąm ... yåŋhąm ... tąscā tåscā* in Yy4.26, suggesting that the objects of worship (*yazamaide*) in each of these two sections is the same ~ the amesha spenta mentioned in Yy4.25.

I have a high regard (and affection) for Professor Gershevitch, and it is indeed possible that *yeŋ́hē hātąm ... yåŋhąm ... tąscā tåscā yazamaide* in Yy4.26 were intended to stand for the preceding amesha spenta mentioned in Yy4.25. But it is only fair to point out that although the Yenghe Haatam is given in full in Yy4.26 in a few manuscripts, Geldner states that "generally it is abbreviated" here,[52] just as it is abbreviated in numerous instances, (along with the "Yatha Ahu Vairyo", the "Ashem Vohu", and other prayers) scattered throughout the Avestan texts, which texts were recited as part of the ritual. And such abbreviations (mentioning one or more of these three, among other prayers) simply indicated that the prayer mentioned in the abbreviation should be recited at that point of the ritual. Such abbreviations may indeed indicate that the applicable prayer bears a contextual relationship to the sections which precede it, and was chosen to be recited at that point, for that reason. But there are also instances in the Avestan texts, where the Yenghe Haatam is set forth in full, following a section, or preceding words, which do not mention the amesha spenta (used as a collective noun). A few examples are footnoted.[53]

Darmesteter 1882. Although the words of his translation are ambiguous enough to apply to human beings, his footnotes make it clear that in his view, the "beings" are the Amesha Spentas.[54] He makes no linguistic

comment or explanation on the pronouns *yeŋ́hē* and *yåŋhąmcā*, and does not translated these two words separately. His translation "of whom" includes both words. Like others in his generation of scholars, he translates *aša-* words as 'holiness', rather than 'truth', and so translates *ašāṯ hacā-* as 'in holiness', instead of 'in accordance with truth'. Here is his translation.

"Yenghe Haatam: All those beings of whom Ahura Mazda knows the goodness for a sacrifice [performed] in holiness, all those beings, males and females do we worship." Darmesteter translation.[55]

Darmesteter has inserted the word "[performed]" in square brackets, indicating an addition by himself that he thinks should be implied, because he thinks the worship word here (*yesnē*) is a ritual sacrifice.

Human Beings.

Humbach/Faiss 2010. By 2010, Humbach had changed his mind, as indeed all thoughtful persons often have done. They see the object of 'worship' as human beings. Humbach/Faiss 2010 give the following translation.

    a: "The male one among the existing whose [*yeŋ́hē*] very good [*vaŋhō*] (recompense) for the sacrifice [*yesnē*]

    b: "the Wise Lord knows in accordance with truth, and the female ones [*yåŋhąmcā*] as well,

    c: "those male ones [*tąscā*] and those female ones [*tåscā*] we celebrate [*yazamaide*]." (p. 73).

Humbach/Faiss do not explain why *yeŋ́hē* is sg. and *yåŋhąmcā* is pl. Nor do they explain why the masc. *tąscā* is plural, although it refers back to the masc. *yeŋ́hē* which is sg. They see all the pronouns as standing for human beings who receive "(recompense) for the sacrifice". They see the phrase *ašāṯ hacā* "in accordance with truth" as qualifying the Wise Lord's knowing, instead of the worship that is "very good" ('more good' *vaŋhō*). And they do not explain why the two *yaz-* words (*yesnē* and *yazamaide*) are translated differently ~ "for the sacrifice [*yesnē*]" and "we celebrate [*yazamaide*]".

Taraporewala 1951 sees all the pronouns as standing for human beings (the capital 'H' in "Him" simply indicates the start of the sentence which is capitalized in English). His translation is as follows:

    ab: "(Him), indeed of-those-that-are [*hātąm*], of-whom [*yeŋ́hē*] in every act-of-worship [*yesnē*] Mazda Ahura knoweth (to be) of-higher-worth [*vaŋhō*] by-reason-of (his) Righteousness [*ašāṯ hacā*] (also) the woman-of-whom (He knoweth) likewise [*yåŋhąmcā*].

    c: "(all such) both these-men [*tąscā*] and these-women [*tåscā*] do-we-revere [*yazamaide*]."[56]

Although he translates *yåŋhąmcā* as sg., he identifies the word as pl. in his commentary. Taraporewala interpretively translates *vaŋhō* as "of higher worth", but in his comments acknowledges that it is the comparative form of *vohu-* used here to describe the man who is "better" because of *ašāṯ hacā* (which he translates as "by reason of (his) Righteousness") in every act of worship ~ ascribing *ašāṯ hacā* to man's worship (not to Wisdom's knowledge).

Bartholomae's English translation (as it appears in English in Taraporewala 1951), sees all the pronouns as standing for human beings. His translation is somewhat free, as follows:

    ab: "That man amongst all that are, the woman too, to whom for his prayer [*yesnē*] the wise Lord knows the better [*vaŋhō*] portion doth fall in accordance with Right [*ašāṯ hacā*],

c: "these men and women do we revere [*yazamaide*]."[57]

Bartholomae translates *yåŋhąm* as sg. 'the woman'. But the fem. sg. form would be *yeŋhå*, and not *yåŋhąm*.[58] Bartholomae translates the comparative *vaŋhō* "better" as the reward given "in accordance with Right" [*ašāṯ hacā*] for prayer (*yesnē*).

Mills 1894 sees the pronouns as standing for human beings. His translation of the Yenghe Haatam is quite interpretive. And the exclamation marks (!) are his as well. There is no exclamation mark in Avestan punctuation. He gives his translation at the start of the YAv. Commentary (Yy21), placing it in parentheses to indicate that he has inserted it here.[59]

> "(The Yênhê. (To that one) of beings do we offer, whose superior (fidelity) in the sacrifice Ahura Mazda recognises by reason of the sanctity (within him; yea, even to those female saints also do we sacrifice) whose (superior fidelity is thus likewise known; thus) we sacrifice (all, to both) the males and the females (of the saints)!)."

A mix of human and divine.

The Pahlavi translation/interpretation and commentary is given to us in Humbach's commentary on the Yenghe Haatam. This Pahlavi effort would have been written many centuries after the YAv. commentary (Yy21 given below) ~ most probably a few centuries after the Arab invasion of Iran when so many other Pahlavi texts were written (circa the 9th century CE or later). Humbach does not identify the mss. source(s) of this Pahlavi translation and interpretation, except to say that he obtained it from Dhabar.[60] The round parentheses and square brackets are exactly as they appear in Humbach's translation into English of the Pahlavi translation and commentary. The words in square brackets are the Pahlavi commentary. I have added nothing.

> "(That one) among the existing ones who thus for the worship (of Ohrmazd) is better [i.e. that worship is good which (people) perform for Ohrmazd], Ohrmazd knows (that one) in accordance with whatsoever rightmindedness [i.e. He makes manifest any meritorious work and prize and reward]. I worship the members of the congregation males and females [i.e. the *Aməša Spəntas*]."[61]

As you can see, the Pahlavi translation shows *yeíⁿhē* to be a human worshipper, ignores *yåŋhąmcā*, and translatates *tąscā / tåscā* as "of the congregation of males and females" which could equally apply to the "congregation" of human males and females, but the Pahlavi interpretation in the commentary in square brackets, is that it applies to the amesha spenta (which in the actual Pahlavi text is written *amahraspandān*).

Ambiguous interplay between the human and the divine.

Hintze's 1994 translation the Yenghe Haatam appears in her translation of the *Zamyad Yasht* as follows:

> ab: "In the worship [*yesnē paitī*] of which (male Entities) [*yeíⁿhē*] of those who exist [*hātąm*] and
>   in the worship of which (female Entities) [*yåŋhąmcā*]
>   the Wise Lord knows what is better [*vaŋhō*] according to Truth [*ašāṯ hacā*],
> c: "we worship these [*tąscā*] (male) and these [*tåscā*] (female)."[62]

Hintze's use of the capital 'E' in 'Entities' implies that in her view, these pronouns stand for divine entities. (There are no capital letters in Avestan script). Hintze translates masc. *yeńhē* as gen. pl. which (with respect) is not accurate (the masc. gen. plural is *yaēšąm*, as we have already seen).   In her translation, the phrase *ašāṯ hacā* "in accordance with truth" qualifies the kind of worship which is "better" (*vaŋhō* 'more good') ~ with which I agree. In all other respects, (if we remove her interpretative additions) her translation shows the great value of one that is as literal as possible.   If you read her actual translation of lines a. and b., (without her interpretations) you can see the ambiguities ~ in that the phrase "in the worship of which male ... female entities" could mean that

~ the entities are the worshippers, and/or

~ the entities are the objects of worship, and/or

~ the phrase is about the way to worship (in accord with truth).

In the same way, line c. could mean that

~ the qualities that make a being divine (amesha spenta) are worshipped, or

~ the divine in men and women ~ are worshipped.

In my view, Hintze's actual translation (without her interpretive additions) has captured the ambiguities in the original Avestan ~ ambiguities which (in my view) were intended by the composer. Ambiguities which reflects the divine in perfected and unperfected existence, as the worshipper, as a way to worship and as objects of worship.

This is a key to understanding the unidentified pronouns in this manthra, and (in my view) is also the reason for its popularity among the ancients, exceeded only by the Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo) and the Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu). This same ambiguity is suggested (with some differences) in the Gatha verse Y51.22 which is said to be the inspiration for the Yenghe Haatam.[63]

Is this ambiguity to be found in the earliest commentary on the Yenghe Haatam? Well, let's take a look.

* * *

YAv. Yasna 21, the most ancient Commentary on the Yenghe Haatam.[64]

When you first read this YAv. Commentary you may be inclined to brush it off as trite and useless (as I first did). Resist the temptation. I think it was an attempt to convey more ancient teachings about this manthra, from a time when it was well understood. I will lay the evidence before you, so that you can judge for yourself.   First, an overview.

Sections 1 and 2 purport to explain the words *yeńhē*, *hātąm*, and *yåŋhąm* which appear at the beginning of the Yenghe Haatam. Section 2 ends with a statement 'Three teachings." (*ϑrāyō. ṯkaēša·⁚·*), and a question and answer.

Sections 3 - 4 contain more questions and answers, and **§** 5 concludes with a statement of worship/celebration for this manthra about the divine (the Yenghe Haatam).

This Commentary gives no explanation of the other two unidentified pronouns in the Yenghe Haatam ~ *tąscā* and *tåscā*. Nor does it comment on any other word or phrase such as might solve the differences in

translation (detailed above). Nor does it comment on the manthra as a whole, (except as hinted in its questions and answers). These omissions suggest to me that this YAv. Commentary (Yy21) represents a collection of incomplete fragments (and perhaps recollections) of more ancient explanations of the Yenghe Haatam, which were collated by the Sasanian religious authorities (and perhaps edited by Tansar!) into the form that we now have as Yy21. But these Sasanian collators nevertheless were motivated by a desire to convey and keep alive, ancient teachings about this manthra (that they thought worthwhile). So let us see what these more ancient teachings might have been, as reflected in the Younger Avestan Commentary Yy21.1 - 2. Bear in mind, the Commentary is not a translation, but an explanation.

For those who would like to see **§§** 1 - 2 in their entirety, have footnoted them in Avestan (transliterated from Geldner) together with the translations of Humbach 1991 and Mills 1887, for comparative purposes.[65] Here, I will give you my translation of pertinent parts which I think help to solve some (though not all) unanswered questions about the Yenghe Haatam. Let us start with the Commentary's explanations of *yeṇhe* and *yåṇhąm*.

The Commentary's explanation of *yeṇhe*

> ... *yeṇhe. iδa. mazdå. yasnəm. cinasti. yaϑa. dāta. ahurahe...* (Yy21.1)

> '...(the word) *yeṇhe* here [*iδa*][66] attributes [*cinasti*][67] (the) worship [*yasnəm*][68] of Wisdom [*mazdå*] (to be) as [*yaϑa*] with (the) established rules [*dāta*][69] of the Lord [*ahurahe*][70]...' Yy21.1, my literal translation.

That sounds a bit awkward, but (in more readable English) it simply states that *yeṇhe* attributes (the) worship of Wisdom to be in the way established by the Lord. In the Gathas, the way to worship the Divine is with Its own divine attributes (the amesha spenta),[71] each of which is an aspect of the true order of existence (*aṣa-*), which is the wholly beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*).[72] Therefore, the way to worship in the Yenghe Haatam ⁓ which is a worship that is *aṣāṯ hacā* 'in accordance with truth' ⁓ is consistent with the Gathas, and would be the way to worship established by the Lord (as the Commentary states).

This explanation of *yeṇhe* does not identify any one particular masc. sg. noun for which this masc. sg. pronoun (*yeṇhe*) stands. Instead, (with intended ambiguity) it suggests two possibilities. Let us read these words of the Commentary twice ⁓ once for each of the following possibilities in understanding *yeṇhe*, and see if you agree.

First possibility: *yeṇhe* 'of which (being) as the worshipper (the masc. sg. being generic).

> Commentary Yy21.1 '...(the word) *yeṇhe* here attributes (the) worship of Wisdom [by the worshipper] (to be) as with (the) established rules of the Lord.' Yy21.1, my literal translation.

In Avestan, a generic worshipper would masc. sg. because the masc. gender is used generically for a word that includes more than one gender (just as in English we say *man, he, him* when used generically to include men and women).[73]

Second possibility: *yeṇhe* 'of which (being) as the object of worship, which in this Commentary is the Lord (who is) Wisdom [*mazdā- ahura-*], (who parenthetically, is described and referred to, throughout the Gathas and the YAv. texts, as *spənta- mainyu-* '(the) beneficial way of being').[74]

   Commentary Yy21.1   '...(the word) *yeŋhe*   here attributes (the) worship of Wisdom [the one worshipped] (to be) as with (the) established rules of the Lord.' my literal translation.

Jackson 1892 and other linguists of his generation, see *mazdā-* as a fem. noun.[75]   Skjaervo and his generation of linguists, see *mazdā-* as a masc. noun. If the latter are correct, then the masc. sg. pronoun *yeŋhe* could (with double entendre) stand for two things:

yeŋhe   could stand for the masc. sg. *mazdā̊ ahurō* (who is also called the masc. sg. *spənta- mainyu-* 'beneficial way of being') as the object of worship; and

yeŋhe could also stand for the generic worshipper (masc. sg.).

Now if we factor these two possibilities for *yeŋhe* in the Commentary **--** as worshipper and as the object of worship ~ into the applicable words of the Yenghe Haatam itself, they both apply.   Here is the Yenghe Haatam itself (in pertinent part). Read it twice ~ once for *yeŋhe* as the worshipper, and once for *yeŋhe* as the worshipped Lord Wisdom, the beneficial way of being, and see if you agree.

yeŋhe hātąm

   1. 'In (the) worship [*yesnē*] of which [*yeŋhē* masc. sg. ~ the Lord Wisdom, the beneficial way of being) ... among those who exist [*hātąm*], ... the Lord Wisdom, already knows (what is) more good [*vaŋhō*] in accord with the true order of existence [*ašāṱ hacā*], ...' Yy27.15, my translation. Parenthetically, 'of whom' is an equally accurate translation of *yeŋhē* a relative pronoun, (gen. masc. sg.) explained under the linguistic section above. The English 'of whom' probably fits better for this possibility.

   2. 'In (the) worship [*yesnē*] of which [*yeŋhē* masc. sg. ~ the generic worshipper) among those who exist [*hātąm*], ... the Lord (who is) Wisdom, already knows (what is) more good [*vaŋhō*] in accord with the true order of existence [*ašāṱ hacā*], ...' Yy27.15, my translation.

The YAv. Commentary's explanation of *yå̊ŋhąm*

   Yy21.2. *yå̊ŋhąm. iδa. ašaoninąm. ārmaiti.paoiryanąm. yasnəm. para.cinasti. yaϑa. vahməm. aməšaēibyō•⁚*

Humbach 1991:

   "(By reciting) *yå̊ŋhąm* one describes the worship of the truthful women [*ašaoninąm*] (who are) the prime ones of right-mindedness [*ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*] as a laudation (offered) to the immortal ones [*aməšaēibyō*]..." Yy21.2.

Mills 1887:

   "Yaunghām. Here he indicates and offers the sacrificial worship of those holy females [*ašaoninąm*] who have Aramaiti at their head [*ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*] [Mills' footnote 3: "The Ameshospends whose names are in the feminine; so the Zandist erroneously"], as homage to the Immortals."

I translate it differently. The key to understanding the Commentary's explanation of *yå̊ŋhąm* is the phrase '*ašaoninąm ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*'.   Let's take it step by step, starting with the second word (a compound word).

ārmaiti.paoiryanąm.

In Avestan, the 2d member of a compound word carries the inflection (for case/number etc.) for the whole word. The first member (here *ārmaiti*) generally is not inflected.[76]

In this compound word, the first member *ārmaiti* (a *grammatically* fem. noun) is a concept (in the Gathas). It means 'the true (good, correct) order of existence embodied in thought, word and action' ('embodied truth' for short).[77] The second member *paoiryanąm* is gen. pl. fem. of the stem *paourvya-* 'first' ~ an adjective (which in Av. can also be used as a noun indicating a person or thing that has the quality of the adjective, as it is here ~ compounded with the noun *ārmaiti*).   So the compound noun *ārmaiti.paoiryanąm* (translated as literally as possible into fluent English) means 'of~(the)~first~ones~of~embodied~truth'. As used in the Av. texts, *paourvya-* means 'first' in different ways, including 'first' chronologically, and 'first' in quality.[78] And here, I think both meanings are intended. Hold that thought and see how well this two-fold meaning for *paoiryanąm* fits *ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*, as this discussion unfolds.

aṣaoninąm is an adjective ~ the gen. pl. form of the stem *aṣaonī-* which is the (grammatically) fem. version of the (grammatically) masc. adj. *aṣavan-*,[79] ~ both the fem. and masc. forms of this adjective mean the same ~ 'truth possessing' or 'truthful'.   In Avestan an adjective must be in the same case/number/gender as the noun it describes, and here there is no dispute that *aṣaoninąm* (gen. pl. fem.) matches the case/number/gender of the noun *ārmaiti.paoiryanąm* (gen. pl. fem.). It is true that adjectives (like *aṣaonī-* / *aṣavan-*) also can be (and are) used as nouns that are concepts or nouns that people, and *aṣaonī-* has indeed been used as a noun for a truthful woman in other Av. texts.[80]   And this is how both Humbach 1991 and Mills 1887 have translated *aṣaoninąm* in our Commentary (Yy21.2) ~ as a noun that is a woman. But here (in Yy21.2) the context does not require *aṣaoninąm* to be treated as a noun 'truth~possessing woman', therefore the decision to do so is an interpretative choice. Avestan has more than one word for 'woman' ~ *gənā-*, *jainī-*, *nāiri-*,[81] ~ words that are not in the the Commentary's explanation of *yå̊ŋhąm* (Yy21.2).   In this instance, giving *aṣaoninąm* its normal grammatical value (an adj. describing the noun *ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*) fits well, giving us the following translation that is as literal as possible (in readable English),

aṣaoninąm   ārmaiti.paoiryanąm   '... of (the) truth possessing [*aṣaoninąm*] first-ones-of-embodied-truth [*ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*]...'.

Next question: What did the author of this Commentary (Yy21.2) have in mind when he explained *yå̊ŋhąm* as *aṣaoninąm   ārmaiti.paoiryanąm* '(the) truth possessing first~ones~of~embodied~truth' (Yy21.2)? Let us look at the Commentary on *yå̊ŋhąm* in context, to ascertain his intent. Here are the words in § 2 explaining *yå̊ŋhąm*. (I have omitted only the words before *yå̊ŋhąm* which belong with § 1, and the two sentences that immediately follow ~ *ϑrāyō. t̰kaēša•:•   vīspəm. vacō. yesnīm•:•* 'Three teachings. (They comprehend) the entire yasna word' which do not impact *yå̊ŋhąm* alone, and which I discuss later).

Yy21.2 ... *yå̊ŋhąm. iδa. aṣaoninąm. ārmaiti.paoiryanąm. yasnəm. para.cinasti. yaϑa. vahməm. aməṣaēibyō•:• ...•:• ...•:•*

   cīm. aoi. yasnō•:•   aməṣə̄. spəṇtə̄. paīti. yasnahe•:•

My literal translation of the foregoing parts of Yy21.2.

> '...(The word) *yåŋhąm* here [*iδa*] forthwith-ascribes [*para.cinasti*] (the) worship [*yasnəm*] of (the) truth possessing [*ašaoninąm*], first-ones-of-embodied-truth [*ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*] just as [*yaϑa*] (one ascribes) glorification [*vahməm*] to (the) non-dying [*aməšaēibyō*].[82] ...•‧ ...•‧
>
> Whom is this Yasna addressed to [*cīm. aoi. yasnō•‧*]?
> (It is addressed to) (the) non-dying, (the) beneficial-sacred, [*aməšə. spəntə.*] in every (act) of worship [*paīti. yasnahe•‧*].' Yy21.2

So to whom does the phrase '(the) worship of (the) truth possessing first-ones-of-embodied-truth' (above) refer? ~ to mortal females as worshippers? To the three fem. amesha spenta as objects of worship? Something else? Let us think it through in light of what we see in the Gathas.

ārmaiti- means 'the true (correct, good) order of existence embodied in thought, word and action' ('embodied truth' for short). Mortal beings (male and female) embody truth sporadically and incompletely. The existence of the Divine (genderless) is the complete embodiment (or personification) of the true (correct) order of existence.[83]

So in the Gathas, *ārmaiti-* is a quality of the divine *in existence* ~ both unperfected (mortal) and perfected (Divine).

Therefore, there can be no dispute that the gender of *ārmaiti-* (a fem. noun) can only be grammatical (not actual) because it is a quality (amesha spenta) of the (genderless) Divine, and a quality that all mortals (male and female) presently have (incompletely) ~ this is true regardless of how one translates *ārmaiti-*.[84]

This explanation is consistent with the Commentary's adjective 'truth possessing' (*ašaoninąm*) which describes '(the) first-ones-of-embodied-truth' (*ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*). The true order of existence (*aša-*) is also a quality of the divine *in existence* ~ both unperfected (mortal) and perfected (Divine). Therefore gender of *aša-* (a ntr. noun) is also grammatical only. Its adjective only takes on grammatical gender (*ašaonī-* fem. *ašavan-* masc.) only because an adj. has to match the grammatical of the noun it describes (in this case fem. because *ārmaiti.paoiryanąm* is *grammatically* fem.).

So much for gender. Let us next consider who these '...truth-possessing first-ones-of-embodied-truth...' (*ašaoninąm ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*) might be. In so doing, let us take these words as they are, and not try to stuff additional ideas into them which the Commentary does not contain, and which are not required by the context.[85]

The word *paoiryanąm* 'first' compounded with *ārmaiti* expresses the two-fold meaning of 'first' ~ first in time and first in quality. First in chronological time represents the first stages of (mortal) existence in which the divine quality, embodied truth (*ārmaiti-*) is still incomplete, unperfected, sporadic (mortals). First in quality represents perfected existence ~ the complete embodiment of the true (correct) order of existence, the existence of the Divine.

Thus, the plural (*ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*) represents '(the) first-ones-of-embodied-truth' ~ not as an abstraction, but in each unit of existence (perfected and unperfected), ~ a conclusion required by *hātąm* 'of (among) beings', 'of (among) those who exist'.

This explanation is also consistent with the fact that the YAv. commentary (Yy21.2) parallels the worship of *ašaoninąm. ārmaiti.paoiryanąm* with the worship of (the) non-dying [*aməšaēibyō*], and states that this 'Yasna' (the Yenghe Haatam) is addressed to *aməšā spəntā* '(the) non-dying, (the) beneficial' ~ each of which, (including embodied truth *ārmaiti-*) is an aspect of the true (correct) order of existence (*aša-*).

In understanding the words *aməšaēibyō* and *aməšā. spəntā* in Yy21.2, let us not view them through the mind-set of those later texts which see the amesha spenta as living entities ~ somewhat like 'angels'.   Let us instead recall that in Avestan each of these two words is simply an adjective, and that the first time they appear in the Av. texts is in the GAv. *Yasna Haptanghaiti*, in which they are used as adjectives to describe the true (correct) order of existence, *aša-*,

> "We worship then the true (correct) order of existence (which is) most-good
> *ašəm aṯ vahištəm yazamaidē, ...*
>
> which (is) beneficial-sacred, non-dying ...
> *hyaṯ spəntəm aməšəm...*'. YHapt.37.4, my translation.[86]

 And this section of the *Yasna Haptanghaiti* is quoted (in its entirety) in other YAv. texts, (for example, in Yy5.4), indicating that authors of such YAv. texts were familiar with the use of *spəntəm aməšəm* as two adjectives, describing the true order of existence [*ašəm*].

Here again is the first part of the Commentary's explanation of *yåŋhąm*.   Read it twice. The first time, read *ašaoninąm ārmaiti.paoiryanąm* '(the) truth-possessing first-ones-of-embodied-truth', as worshippers (reading 'first' chronologically). The second time, read it as the object of worship ('first' in quality). See if you agree that it can be read both ways.

> Yy21.1. '...(The word) *yå̊ŋhąm* here [*iδa*] forthwith-ascribes [*para.cinasti*] (the) worship [*yasnəm*] of (the) truth-possessing [*ašaoninąm*], first-ones-of-embodied-truth [as worshippers],' my translation.

> Yy21.2. '...(The word) *yå̊ŋhąm* here [*iδa*] forthwith-ascribes [*para.cinasti*] (the) worship [*yasnəm*] of (the) truth-possessing [*ašaoninąm*], first-ones-of-embodied-truth [as objects of worship],' my translation.

And here is the 2d part of the explanation which parallels the first part (and follows right after it).

> 'just as [*yaϑa*] (one ascribes) glorification [*vahməm*] to (the) non-dying [*aməšaēibyō*]...' Yy21.2, my translation.

Clearly here 'glorification' (worship) is done by the worshipper. And the object of worship here is the 'non-dying [*aməšaēibyō*].

To summarize: Who is included in this description of *yå̊ŋhąm* in the Commentary? It is the Divine.

* The Divine, which is perfected existence ~ comprising all the units of existence ('of (among) beings', 'of (among) those who exist' *hātąm*) that have attained the qualities of the divine completely, and therefore are 'non-dying' [*aməšaēibyō*] in the sense that they are no longer bound by mortality.[87] And (with double entendre)

* The Divine in unperfected existence, in mortals, all of whom presently have within them (incompletely) certain divine qualities ~ truth, its good comprehension, its beneficial embodiment in thought word and action, its good rule, the beneficial-sacred way of being. And all of whom are

capable of attaining the attributes of the Divine completely (including non-deathness, *amərətāt-*). In addition, the Gathas (and later texts) imply that the Divine is immanent (in being) in all things.[88]

So *yåŋhąm* ~ '(the) truth-possessing [*ašaoninąm*], first-ones-of-embodied-truth [*ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*],' stands for the Divine *in existence* ~ 'among living beings' ~ perfected and unperfected, as worshipper and as what is worshipped.

Next, in this section (§ 2) of the Commentary, after the words describing *yåŋhąm*, there is an Av. punctuation mark indicating the end of what was said before this mark. And then we have two sentences (here in purple font) that follow, each of which is punctuated at its end by the same mark.

> Yy21.2 ... *yåŋhąm. iδa. ašaoninąm. ārmaiti.paoiryanąm. yasnəm. para.cinasti. yaϑa. vahməm. aməšaēibyō.*∵ *ϑrāyō. t̤kaēš̌a.*∵ *vīspəm. vacō. yasnīm.*∵ ...
>
> "... Three teachings. (They comprehend) the entire yasna Word.'

What three teachings did the Commentator intend? How do these three teachings comprehend the entire sum total of the Word pertaining to worship? These 2 sentences are discussed below (giving my interpretation) so I will not repeat it all here.

The final part of Yy21.2 (immediately following the above quotation) is a comment on the entire Yenghe Haatam, in the form of a question and its answer which also throws light on *yeńhē* and *yåŋhąm* and corroborates the foregoing conclusions.

> ... *cīm.*[89] *aoi. yasnō*∵ 'Whom is (this) Yasna addressed to?'
>
> *aməš̌ə. spəntā.*[90] *paīti. yasnahe*∵ '(It is addressed to), (the) non-dying [pl.], (the) beneficial-sacred [pl.], in every (act) of worship.' Yy21.2, my translation.

1. Does the Commentator mean that the Yenghe Haatam is addressed to Divine, Wisdom, whose nature is non-dying, beneficial-sacred ~ reflecting the object of worship?

2. Does the Commentator mean all those beings in existence who have attained the qualities that make a being divine (amesha spenta), and therefore are non-dying, beneficial-sacred ~ reflecting the object of worship?

3. Does 'in every (act) of worship' mean worshipping the Divine with its own qualities (amesha spenta) with every thought, word and action?

I think he intended all three. With regard to the first two: in Zarathushtra's thought (as I understand it) the Divine, Wisdom is a unity of being that comprises the plurality of each part of existence that has made it ~ that has attained the true order of existence completely (*haurvatāt-*) and who therefore is no longer subject to mortality (*amərətāt-* 'non-deathness'),[91] ~ which is what I also see implied in the Gatha verse Y51.22, believed to have been the inspiration for the Yenghe Haatam.[92] The 3d alternative is simply a function of the syntax (word order) which enables this sentence to be understood all three ways.

The YAv. Commentary Yy21, §§ 3 - 5.

The remaining sections of this YAv. Commentary on the Yenghe Haatam (Yy21.3 - 5) consist of questions and answers which may have been intended as a commentary on the entire Yenghe Haatam (or may simply

have been tacked on to this Commentary during Sasanian times, as being associated with traditional explanations of the Yenghe Haatam). I have footnoted these sections in their entirety in Avestan with Mills' (1887) translation for those who are interested.[93] These questions and answers also show an interplay between the human and the Divine, and are similar to certain questions and answers in the YAv. commentaries of the Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo) and the Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu).

I find it significant (and a good fit) that although the Yenghe Haatam itself does not contain the word *vahišta-* 'most-good', the last 'Answer' of the Commentary summarizes the manthra as the Word

(1) of the Most-Good One [*vahištō*],

(2) about the most-good thing [*vahištəm*],

(3) for the most-good and truth-possessing-person [*vahištāi ašaone*].

The three teachings which comprehend the entire Word pertaining to worship, mentioned in Yy21.2

> *ϑrāyō. t̲kaēša•.•   vīspəm. vacō. yesnīm.•.•*
> 'Three teachings. (They comprehend) the entire yasna word'.

How so?   Well, in the Gathas, *vahišta-* the superlative degree of intrinsic goodness, is used in three ways:

*   the superlative degree of intrinsic goodness (*vahišta-* 'most good') is used as a name for Wisdom (*mazdā-*) ~ 'Most-Good One' ~ and to describe the qualities (amesha spenta) that make Him divine, most-good,

*   the superlative degree of intrinsic goodness (*vahišta-* 'most good') is used for His teachings (His Word), and for the thoughts, words and actions which implement these teachings, ~ the path of truth, which is the way to worship the Divine,[94] and

*   the superlative degree of intrinsic goodness (*vahišta-* 'most good') is used for the reward for so doing ~ the incremental, and ultimately the complete attainment of the true (correct, wholly good) order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*) and the qualities that comprise it ~ qualities that are non-mortal (*aməša-*), beneficial (*spənta-*), the most-good existence (*ahu- vahišta-*), the paradise of living beings.[95]

The questions and answers in this Commentary (Yy21.2, and 4) ~ especially those pertaining to *vahišta-* ~ seem to corroborate the interplay between the Divine and mortals in the Yenghe Haatam

*   as the worshipper (who has qualities of the Divine in unperfected mortal existence),

*   who worships with the qualities of the Divine, and

*   as the object of worship ~ the Divine in perfected and unperfected existence.

How cool is that ?!?

* * *

A Pahlavi commentary on the Yenghe Haatam.

The Pahlavi text, *Dinkard* Book 9 was composed a couple of centuries after the Arab invasion of Iran ~ around the 9th century CE (or later). The Younger Avestan language was no longer spoken or used as a

current language after the advent of Alexander the Macedonian (331 B.C.E.) and probably even before that time.[96]

The Pahlavi *Dinkard* Book 9, Ch. 4, purports to summarize the commentary of the YAv. *Sudkar Nask,* (a text which has not survived), on the Yenghe Haatam.   It represents one school of thought ⁓ very different from the Pahl. translation/commentary on the Yenghe Haatam itself (above), and also very different from the YAv. Commentary Yy21 (above) ⁓ demonstrating yet again that the Pahlavi texts represent more than one school of thought ⁓ not one monolithic belief system.[97]

But this Pahlavi summary is so far removed from the language and meanings of the Yenghe Haatam, that it is of no help in attempting to understand the meaning of this manthra.   I have footnoted the entire (very short) purported summary, so you can judge for yourself.[98] I cannot tell whether this deeply flawed understanding of the Yenghe Haatam accurately represents this Pahlavi text's understanding of the YAv. *Sudkar Nask,* or whether the *Sudkar Nask* itself was inaccurate.   What is certain is that the resulting summary was based on (several centuries of) hearsay, irrelevant sermonizing, and very little understanding of the Yenghe Haatam itself, and demonstrates that the Commentary Yy21 would have had to be a much earlier YAv. text than was the *Sudkar Nask.* The *Vendidad* is the only surviving Nask, and we know that although it is in YAv., it was written long after Avestan times, because its grammar is deeply flawed, and therefore it's author could not have been fluent in Avestan.[99]   Was the *Sudkar Nask* also composed in deeply flawed Avestan ⁓ long after Avestan times?   We have no way of knowing.

<div align="center">* * *</div>

My translation and interpretation of the Yenghe Haatam.

The YAv. Commentary Yy21 has (in many respects) informed my understanding of the Yenghe Haatam, therefore the following will contain some repetition (which I will keep to a minimum). The repetition is necessary because I need to show separately the ideas in the Commentary (above), and my interpretation of the Yenghe Haatam itself (which follows). And it made me so happy, to see a perspective of my thinking corroborated by Gershevitch (in his comments on *yeṅhē*).

I translate the Yenghe Haatam as follows, as literally as possible (consistent with readability in English). The only word I could not fit in, without making the English more convoluted, and therefore less clear, is *paitī.* If Taraporewala is correct that *paitī* means "every", then *yesnē paitī* would mean (very literally) 'in-every-(act) in-(the) worship'.   I simply opted for the straight locative 'in (the) worship'. Here is my translation.

a: *yeṅhē hātąm āaṯ yesnē paitī vaŋhō*
b: *mazdå ahurō vaēϑā ašāṯ hacā yåŋhąmcā*
c: *tąscā tåscā yazamaide*

ab: In (the) worship/celebration [*yesnē*] of which [*yeṅhē* masc. sg.) and of which [*yåŋhąmcā* fem. pl.), among those who exist [*hātąm*],
Wisdom (who is) Lord, already knows (what is) more good [*vaŋhō*] in accord with the true order of existence [*ašāṯ hacā*],
c: them [*tąscā* masc. pl.] and them [*tåscā* fem. pl.] we worship/celebrate.

Let us start by considering some open questions about the two sets of pronouns.

yeŋ́hē (masc. sg.) / *yåŋhąmcā* (fem. pl.)

To whom is the unknown composer of this manthra referring when he uses the masc. sg. *yeŋ́hē* and the fem. pl *yåŋhąmcā* (among living beings *hātąm*)? Is the author speaking of mortal existence? Divine existence? Concepts ~ (the qualities that make a being divine, amesha spenta)?

1. At first thought, it might seem unlikely that *yeŋ́hē* stands for generic man, because generic man includes both male and female among the living. If the composer intended *yeŋ́hē* to stand for generic man, why did he feel the need to tack on *yåŋhąmcā* 'and of which (fem. pl.)'. Let us set this question on the back burner of our minds, as an open question.

2. Could *yeŋ́hē* and *yåŋhąmcā* stand for the amesha spenta? It it true that *ārmaiti-* (embodied truth), *haurvatāt-* (completeness), and *amərətāt-* (non-deathness), are grammatically feminine nouns which could be represented by a fem. pl. pronoun such as *yåŋhąmcā* 'and of which'.   But then what of *yeŋ́hē* which is masc. sg.? There is no dispute (among linguists) that the three amesha spenta ~ *aša-* (truth), *vohu- manah-* (good thinking), and *vohu- x šaϑra-* (good rule) ~ are grammatically ntr. nouns.[100] Therefore (in Avestan) the genders of the pronouns which stand for them would have to be ntr. as well, as we see in GAv. texts.

Now *yeŋ́hē* is the genitive case for both masc. and ntr. But it cannot stand collectively for the ntr. nouns ~ truth *aša-*, good thinking *vohu- manah-* and good rule *vohu- x šaϑra-*, because any such pronoun would have to be pl. (*yaēšąm*),[101] whereas *yeŋ́hē* is sg.

There is a possible masc. sg. candidate for *yeŋ́hē*, which is an amesha spenta;   *mainyu-* is a grammatically masc. noun), which, with its adjective ~ *spənta- mainyu-* means '(the) beneficial-sacred way of being'. A way of being that includes within it all the other qualities of the Divine (amesha spenta), and is the benefical-sacred way of being of Wisdom the Lord (*mazdā- ahura-*) Himself.[102]

But if *yeŋ́hē* (masc. sg.) stands for the beneficial-sacred way of being (*spənta- mainyu-* masc. sg.) which includes all the amesha spenta, the question again arises: why then did the composer tack on *yåŋhąmcā* 'and of which (fem. pl.)' since *spənta- mainyu-* already includes the three grammatically fem. amesha spenta. As you can see, this is the same question that arises under 1 (above), if *yeŋ́hē* stands for generic man.   Let us set this question also on the back burner, and look at the next set of pronouns.

tąscā (masc. pl.) / *tåscā* (fem. pl.)

In the Yenghe Haatam, both these pronouns   (*tąscā* and *tåscā*)   specifically are objects of worship/celebration. And both of them refer to the preceding pronouns *yeŋ́hē* and *yåŋhąmcā*.   That fact needs to be kept in mind.

1. Does the fact that *tąscā* and *tåscā* are objects of worship mean that *yeŋ́hē* and *yåŋhąmcā* cannot stand for mortals and can only stand for the Divine?

2. If both sets of pronouns (*yeŋ́hē* / *yåŋhąmcā* and *tąscā* / *tåscā*) stand for mortals, did the author intend to worship/celebrate mortal beings in their entirety ~ including their harmful, cruel, tyrannical, destructive, 'bad', 'wrong' qualities? If not, can these pronouns stand for mortals?

3. And how could the masc pl. *tąscā* refer back to the preceding masc. sg. *yeŋ́hē*?

With respect, none of the translations / interpretations (of which I am aware) resolve the foregoing questions without (incorrectly) changing the grammatical value of *yeńhē* or *yåŋhąmcā*. It may be argued that the Yenghe Haatam itself does not answer these questions, because it simply is a flawed, awkward (or as Humbach/Faiss say "artless") piece. But that argument is not consistent with the importance which the ancients attached to this manthra over a very long period of time ~ many centuries ~ placing it in importance right after the Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo) and the Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu).

I think that any translation and interpretation of the Yenghe Haatam must satisfy all of the above questions regarding *yeńhē* / *yåŋhąmcā* and *tąscā* / *tåscā* and must also satisfy the following criteria.

(1) It must reflect, or be consistent with, the ideas we see in the Gathas;

(2) It must be grammatically accurate.

And if it is consistent with the interplay between the human and the Divine which we see in the YAv. Commentary (Yy21), that would be strong corroboration.

Central to the Yenghe Haatam is the idea of 'worship'.

We know that the nature of 'worship' changed from worshipping the Divine with its own divine qualities (the true order of existence (*aša-*) and its components ~ the amesha spenta) in the Gathas, to a return to the pre-Zarathushtrian practices of sacrificing horses, oxen and lambs to gain favors, as well as other highly ritualistic forms of worship, as we see in the YAv. texts.

But there is no evidence that this later kind of worship ~ sacrificing animals and performing complicated rituals ~ was intended by the author of the Archaic YAv. Yenghe Haatam when he uses the worship words *yesnē* and *yazamaide*, because he describes his notion of worship as intrinsic goodness 'more-good' *vaŋhō* and 'in accordance with the true order of existence (*ašāṯ hacā*). This is the worship we find in the Gathas, in which the Divine is worshipped with Its own attributes, the true order of existence (*aša-*) and its components (amesha spenta). Hold this thought. It weaves in and out of various aspects of this manthra.

The interplay between the human and the divine in the Yenghe Haatam is enabled by the loc. sg. *yesnē* 'in (the) worship' which results in (intentional) ambiguities as to whether it applies to:

(1) the worshipper or
(2) the object of worship, or
(3) the way to worship;

Or all three.

Here is the Yenghe Haatam again. Read it three times ~ once for each of the above 3 ways of understanding *yesnē* 'in (the) worship', ~ as the worshipper, the object of worship, and the way to worship ~ and see what you think.

> 'In (the) worship [*yesnē*] of which [*yeńhē* masc. sg.) and of which [*yåŋhąmcā* fem. pl.) among those who exist [*hātąm*],
> the Lord (who is) Wisdom already knows (what is) more-good [*vaŋhō*] in accord with the true (correct) order of existence [*ašāṯ hacā*],
> them [*tąscā* masc. pl] and them [*tåscā* fem. pl.] we worship.' my translation.

I think it applies to all three, an interpretation which is corroborated by two statements in the YAv. Commentary itself, which starts with the following words.

> 1. *yesnīm. vacō. ašaonō. zaraϑuštrahe•••*   Geldner 1P pp. 81
> '(I give you),[103] the worship Word of truth~possessing Zarathushtra'; Yy21.1, my translation.

And § 2 contains the following statement.

> ... *ϑrāyō. ţkaēša•••   vīspəm. vacō. yesnīm•••* ...
> '... Three teachings.   (They comprehend) the entire worship Word. ...' my translation.

And this triple conclusion (that the Yenghe Haatam pertains to the worshipper, the way to worship and the object of worship ~ the entire worship Word of Zarathushtra) helps to inform our understanding of what nouns the two sets of pronouns in the Yenghe Haatam ~ *yeńhē/yåŋhąmcā* and *tąscā / tåscā* ~ stand for, among living beings (*hātąm*).

Let us first clear away a few major uncertainties regarding the author's intent in using *yeńhē /yåŋhąmcā* and *tąscā / tåscā*.

First, these pronouns cannot stand for concepts or qualities such as the attributes of the Divine (amesha spenta). It is true that in the Gathas, certain amesha spenta are sometimes treated as entities, but this treatment can only be allegorical because far more frequently they are shown as concepts, as qualities of the Divine, some of which mortals have (incompletely) and all of which they can attain completely.[104] And as we already have seen, the words *aməša-* and *spənta-* are both adjectives; and the first time they are used in (surviving) Avestan texts, they are used as adjectives to describe the true order of existence, *aša-* (YHapt.37.4 quoted above).   In the Yenghe Haatam, the pronouns are qualified by *hātąm*, 'of (among) beings' or 'of (among) those who exist' which by definition can include only living beings ~ beings that exist.   Therefore (in keeping with the Gathas), these pronouns cannot stand for allegorical beings or concepts, or qualities, (which later became the entities of the YAv. texts).

Second, these pronouns cannot stand for mortals in their entirety (including their bad qualities). The language of the Yenghe Haatam itself (and the YAv. Commentary Yy21.1) links these pronouns to 'worship' that is 'in accordance with the true order of existence (*ašāţ hacā*)'. Therefore, whether they stand for the worshipper or the object of worship, these pronouns would have to be limited to what is in accord with the true order of existence (completely in the Divine, incompletely in mortals).

Third, the 2d set of pronouns *tąscā* and *tåscā* refer to the 1st set *yeńhē* and *yåŋhąmcā*. Therefore the nouns for which *tąscā* and *tåscā* stand cannot be different from the nouns for which *yeńhē* and *yåŋhąmcā* stand.   There has to be some underlying unity of the identity of being (*hātąm*), for which these four pronouns stand.

Let us now consider what the author's intent might have been in using these pronouns in a way that removes all inconsistencies and applies to Divine and mortal existence.

yeńhē 'of which' (masc. sg.)

The explanation of *yeńhē* in the YAv. Commentary (Yy21.1) identifies the object of worship as Wisdom [*mazdā-*]. In the Gathas, the only noun that is grammatically masc. sg., and applies to both Divine and mortal existence, is *spənta- mainyu-* 'the beneficial~sacred way of being' which in the Gathas, is Wisdom's

way of being,[105] and is also a way of being that mortals presently have sporadically and imperfectly (not completely). And the beneficial~sacred way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*) also describes a worshipper who (albeit imperfectly) worships 'in accordance with the true order of existence'. In the Gathas, the true order of existence (*aša-*) is beneficial~sacred (*spənta-*).[106]

So in essence, *yeńhē* stands for the beneficial~sacred way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*) in existence ~ in the worshipped and in the worshipper, in perfected (genderless) non~mortal existence, and in unperfected mortal existence (male and female). The masc. gender of *yeńhē* is only grammatical (*mainyu-* being a masc. noun), and its number is sg. because it stands for a beneficial~sacred way of being.

yåŋhąmcā 'and of which' (fem. pl.).

I have already discussed in detail the YAv. commentary on *yåŋhąm* which was a Eureka! moment for me in understanding the Yenghe Haatam. The gender of *yåŋhąm* is only grammatical; embodied truth (*ārmaiti-*) is a genderless quality of being, (as explained in the discussion on Yy21.2 above).

As the object of worship *yåŋhąm* stands for all those beings (units of existence) who have come to embody the true order of existence completely ~ the Divine, perfected existence, the 'truth~possessing first~ones~of~embodied truth [*ašaoninąm ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*]' of the YAv. commentary Yy21.2 ('first' here being used as first in quality, indicating perfected existence). And *yåŋhąm* also stands for all mortals who sporadically, imperfectly, (and therefore incompletely) are the 'truth~possessing first~ones~of~embodied truth [*ašaoninąm ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*]' of the YAv. commentary Yy21.2 ('first' here being used chronologically, indicating all those beings (units of existence) in earlier, mixed (more~good/bad) stages in the evolutionary process.

Thus *yåŋhąm* represents an unperfected and perfected plurality that is the many faces of an underlying unity that is the beneficial~sacred way of being ~ in existence.

So we see that the pronouns *yåŋhąm* (fem. pl.) and *yeńhē* (masc. sg.) which are seemingly different ~ asymmetrical ~ in fact are not so. These two pronouns do not represent an ill-conceived, ill-fitting parallel, "artlessly" expressed. *In essence*, they both stand for the same thing ~ the divine in existence that is unperfected (male and female) and perfected (genderless), but described by nouns which are grammatically masc. sg. *spənta- mainyu-* 'a beneficial way of being', and grammatically fem. pl. '(the) truth~possessing first~ ~ones~of~embodied truth [*ašaoninąm ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*]' (which is a beneficial~sacred way of being). They are two sides of the same equation, just asymmetrically expressed (to provide a puzzle, to enlighten, delight and entertain).

... yesnē paitī vaŋhō ... ašāṯ hacā ...

The Yenghe Haatam speaks of worship.

In the Gathas, the way to worship the Divine is with the true order of existence and its components (amesha spenta).

In the Yenghe Haatam, the way to worship is 'in accordance with the true (correct) order of existence [*ašāṯ hacā...*]', which is the same as worshipping the Divine with Its own attributes (amesha spenta), because each divine quality (amesha spenta) is an aspect of the true order of existence (*aša-*). But in the Yenghe Haatam, recognizing that such worship is performed by (unperfected) mortals, the author calls such worship (and perhaps the worshipper as well) only 'more-good' *vaŋhō* (archaic YAv.), the comparative degree of *vohu-*

'good' ~ not yet perfected (an echo of Y30.3 in which Zarathushtra uses GAv. *vahyō* 'more-good' to describe the primordial two ways of being.[107]

So now we see that this manthra has three dimensions, each of which includes the true order of existence (*aṣa-*) ~ the worshipper (unperfected divine), the way to worship (unperfected divine) and the object of worship ~ the Divine in existence (perfected and unperfected).

Which brings us to the last two pronouns.

tąscā 'and them' (masc. pl.), and *tåscā* 'and them' (fem. pl.).

These two pronouns refer back to *yeńhē / yåŋhąm*, so it needs must follow (as the day the night) that *tąscā* and *tåscā* reflect the same intended ambiguity which applies to *yeńhē / yåŋhąm*. As such,

tąscā / tåscā stand for the divine within (unperfected) mortal men and women, as well the (perfected) Divine which is genderless, but which is identified by its qualities (which have grammatical gender) ~ the (grammatically masc.) beneficial~sacred way of being (masc. sg.) *spənta- mainyu-*, which comprises all the qualities that make a being divine (*tąscā* masc. pl.), and the truth~possessing first~ones~of~embodied~truth (*tåscā* fem. pl.) (the fem. gender being grammatical, not actual).

Therefore *tąscā* and *tåscā* are simply (!?!) an inclusive way of standing for the divine ~ perfected and unperfected ~ in the plurality of existence (which is in fact a unity) and which in essence is what the pronouns *yeńhē hātąm … yåŋhąmcā* also stand for.

To understand this mind-set, (reflecting Zarathushtra's notion of the identity of the Divine),[108] think of 'being/existence/life' as one straight line continuum. Perfected existence is the end of the continuum. Unperfected existence comprises all other parts of the continuum. But each part of the continuum ~ from beginning to end ~ is nevertheless a part of one being/existence/life. There are no 'others'. Setting aside the material shells that house living beings, in the essence of existence there are no differences in kind, only in quality ~ different stages of *one* existence in a transformational process ~ an idea that we see in 1,001 ways in the Gathas, and which is captured in the Yenghe Haatam, in the interplay between mortal existence (which has within it the unperfected Divine), and perfected existence (the complete Divine which is no longer bound by mortality).

Does the foregoing interpretation of the Yenghe Haatam reflect what its author had in mind?

Well, it answers all of the unanswered questions, and satisfies all of the criteria, which I set forth above. But who can say for sure?   I can only express my opinion.   I think it does.

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

The Gatha verse Y51.22.

One of the keys to understanding the Yenghe Haatam and its popularity amongst ancient Zoroastrians, is to understand how it agrees with, and differs from, its (reputed) genesis, the Gatha verse Y51.22 (which is analyzed in another chapter).[109]

It agrees with the Gatha verse 51.22 in the idea of worshipping the divine with its own attributes (the amesha spenta) ~ a form of worship we see not only in Y51.22, but throughout the Gathas (and even in some YAv. texts).   A worship which does indeed accord with the true order of existence *aṣāṭ hacā*.

It agrees with the Gatha verse Y51.22 in identifying the object of worship as Wisdom the Lord, (comprising those units of existence (living beings) who personify Wisdom, and Lordship ~ having attained the qualities that make a being divine completely ~ a perfected unity that has evolved from a temporary plurality.[110]

One difference is that Y51.22, is an expression by Zarathushtra of his own knowing (belief), "I know[111] in whose worship there exists for me the best [*vahišta-* 'most good'] in accordance with truth. It is the Wise Lord as well as those who have existed and (still) exist..."Y51.22 Insler 1975.   Whereas in the Yenghe Haatam, it is Wisdom the Lord who already knows what is 'more-good' (*vaŋhō*) in every act of worship that accords with truth ~ however imperfectly. Even though no one else may be aware of any such act of worship, He already is aware of it.

But the major point of difference between these two, is that in Y51.22, the focus in worship is on the perfected Divine (which unit of existence impliedly includes the plurality of perfected beings ~ those who have attained the amesha spenta completely), whereas in the Yenghe Haatam, the focus is on the divine in (perfected and unperfected) living beings,[112] with an interplay between:

* the divine in the living as worshipper;

* the divine in (perfected and unperfected) living beings as objects of worship,[113] and

* the divine (amesha spenta) as the way to worship ~ a worship that (strives to be) in accord with the true order of existence, *ašāṯ hacā*, but which (with the mistakes of beings who are not yet perfected) is still only the comparative 'more good' (*vaŋhō*) way. It does not (yet!) express the ultimate epiphany of the superlative 'most-good' (*vahišta-*) end that is expressed in Y51.22). The superlative in Avestan functions as a crescendo, not as a difference in kind.[114]

This interplay between the divine in unperfected (mortal) and perfected (non~mortal) existence is like a piece of shot silk ~ the warp of which is blue and the woof of which is green. It looks more blue if you turn it one way, and more green if you turn it another way. Yet, no matter which way you turn it, you still can see that the colors of the silk is an interplay of blue and green.   I think the author of the Yenghe Haatam achieves a similar interplay by using words in ways that gives them two possible meanings (the unperfected and perfected divine) in the fabric of existence ~ (i) the worshipper, (ii) the object of worship, and (iii) the way to worship.

This lovely interplay ~ achieved through unidentified pronouns and the ways in which the words of the manthra are put together ~ would have teased and intrigued the people who lived in archaic YAv. times when the Yenghe Haatam was composed, and who took the time to enjoy figuring out riddles and puzzles, not only for the ideas they contained (for enlightenment), but also for entertainment ~ the sheer fun of it.

I first read the YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Haatam at an early stage of my studies.   I was not impressed with the commentary's explanation of *yeı̄hē hātąm ... yåŋhąmcā*.   I also brushed off (as obviously senseless, patently ridiculous) the words of this commentary identifying the first two lines of the Yenghe Haatam as

'...Three teachings[115] [*ϑrāyō ṯkaēša*] (They comprehend)[116] the entire worship Word [*vīspəm. vacō. yesnīm*][117]...', Y21.2, my translation.

But after becoming aware of the puzzles in the Gathas (detailed in *Part Two*), and as I studied and puzzled over the Yenghe Haatam, in as literal a translation as possible, I have come to realize (to my surprise) that this manthra does indeed encapsulate 'three teachings which comprehend the entire nature of 'worship'.

When I first considered the perception in the Yenghe Haatam that we worship the divine in (imperfect) mortals, I was displeased. My mind-set was still conditioned by the environment in which I grew up, which saw the Divine as separate and apart from the rest of existence. And I concluded that the Yenghe Haatam was badly flawed because in the Gathas, only the (perfected) Divine is worshipped ~ not the divine in unperfected beings. But on reflection, I think it is my initial opinion that was badly flawed.

True, in the Gathas, the objects of 'worship' are Wisdom the Lord and His divine attributes ~ the qualities that make a being divine ~ and (impliedly) those who have attained these attributes completely. But I think this emphasis and limitation were necessary in the Gathas, because Zarathushtra rejected the 'worship' of the many deities of his culture, and wanted to focus on, and re-define, his re-thinking of the nature and identity of the Divine, and the way to worship.[118] But by the time the Yenghe Haatam was composed, Zarathushtra's ideas regarding the nature of the Divine were well established and understood (in Zoroastrian communities), as was the teaching in the Gathas that truth, good thinking, embodied truth, good rule and a beneficial-sacred way of being ~ all qualities of the Divine ~ also exist (imperfectly) in mortals.

The Yenghe Haatam (I now realize), was not intended as a theological statement about the allowed objects of worship. The Av. notion of 'worship' in any event includes the notion of 'celebration'. It was intended as a manthra to be pondered as a prescription for living (and therefore worshipping in accordance with the true order of existence (*ašāṯ hacā*) with each thought, word and action in the temple of life ~ as are the Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu) and the Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo). Its purpose was to help us to focus on certain ideas that we do indeed find in the Gathas ~

* that the true order of existence is the existence of the Divine, the object of worship,

* that the Divine also exists in (unperfected) mortals ~ in being, and also in Its qualities (which mortals have imperfectly),

* that the way to worship is with thoughts, words and actions that are in accord with the true order of existence (*ašāṯ hacā*) and its component qualities ~ which are qualities that comprise divinity (amesha spenta).[119]

But as a prescription for living, the Yenghe Haatam takes us a step further that is entirely consistent with the teaching of the Gathas. It tells us that we should perceive and worship/celebrate the Divine in all that exists, as a way to live our lives. When we do so, it changes the way in which we relate ~ to one's own self, to each other, to other life forms, to our environment, to all that exists.[120] We cannot hate, harm, trash or destroy any part of existence without harming ourselves, and the divine within all things, (even though the realities of life are such that sometimes we may indeed have to choose between the lesser of two evils!). I think this is why the Yenghe Haatam was valued so highly by the ancients. And we see its flowering in the celebration/worship of the many aspects of the material existence (each of which contains the divine) described in the *Farvardin Yasht,* and other YAv. texts.

So now, I agree with the ancients. I too think that the Yenghe Haatam is a manthra that is beautiful, valuable, transformational. It deserves the place the ancients gave it ~ placing it right after the Ahuna

Vairyo (Yatha Ahu Vairyo) and the Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu).   And I (now) feel great affection, gratitude, and respect for its composer, and for all those who (down through the long, long passage of time (millennia), and despite centuries of repeated destruction and persecution, have attempted to keep it alive.

* * * * * * *

---

[1] In the word *hātąm* the first *ā* is pronounced long, the second *ą* is pronounced long and nazalized as in the Hindi 'naam' meaning 'name' (or 'aam' meaning 'mango').   In Avestan script, a long *ā* is written ᰀ; the nazalized long *ą* is written ᰁ. Two different letters, for two different sounds.

Geldner said that if the Yenghe Haatam is metrical at all, it can only be divided into three lines, each of eleven syllables, with the caesura after the seventh, a meter which he says is not found elsewhere. But in fact (as he himself notes) the manuscripts divide its lines in a various number of other ways, Geldner 1P, p. 26, ft. 1 of Yy4.26. Geldner points out, the three lines of the manthra are divided differently in different manuscripts.

[2] Humbach/Faiss 2010 p. 73; with a brief, dismissive comment on p. 167.

[3] Humbach 1991 Vol. 1, p. 116; and Vol. 2, pp. 13 - 15.

[4] Hintze 1994, *Zamyad Yasht*. The Yenghe Haatam appears at the end of § 13 (p. 16) of Hintze's translation of the Zamyad Yasht. All references to Hintze's 1994 translation will be to this source. This English work is an abbreviated version of her German work on the *Zamyad Yasht*. The author intended the English version for the general reader, therefore, although she has footnoted certain words, unfortunately the footnotes themselves have not been included in this English version, and so are not available to me.

[5] Taraporewala 1951 pp. 26 - 28. All references to his translation and commentaries are to this source.

[6] Bartholomae's English translation appears in Taraporewala 1951, p. 28. All references to Bartholomae's translation are to this source.

[7] Darmesteter has translated the Yenghe Haatam in full in his translation of the *Hormezd Yasht*, Yt.1.22, SBE 23, p. 30.   He notes that the Yenghe Haatam is also found at the end of most chapters of the Yasna, and "imitates" Y51.22 of the Gathas (ft. 12).

[8] As it appears in Gershevitch 1967, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra*, pp. 163 - 166.

[9] Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, p. 14.   But by 2010 Humbach had changed his mind. In Humbach/Faiss 2010 he expresses the opinion that the Yenghe Haatam had been "artificially archaised" to make it appear older, and is an "artless" piece.

[10] Taraporewala 1951 p. 27, agrees that the Yenghe Haatam was written long after the Gathas. Gershevitch 1967 expressed a contrary view, stating that he sees no reason to doubt the earliest commentary (Yy21) on the Yenghe Haatam (written in YAv.), which starts with the words *yesnīm vacō aṣaonō zaraϑuštrahe*, which Gershevitch translates as

   "(Homily on) the devotional utterance of Truth-owning Zarathushtra..." Gershevitch 1967, ft. 6.4, p. 163.

Even though the linguistics of the Yenghe Haatam are closer to YAv. than they are to GAv. Gershevitch thought that YAv. and GAv. were both simply two Avestan dialects which existed at the same time (Gershevitch, *Dissent & Consensus on the Gathas,* in *Proceedings of the First Gatha Colloquium,* 1993, pp. 14 - 22). But the YAv. texts themselves speak of Zarathushtra and the Gathas as existing in a very ancient past. Some YAv. texts speak of him as having lived in the

legendary homeland of the Aryas (airyana vaejah), detailed in *Part Four: Zarathushtra's Date & Place.* So (with respect) I do not find Gershevitch's opinion (on this point) persuasive.

[11] Humbach/Faiss 2010 p. 167.   In most places in the Av. texts in which this manthra appears in full, many mss. show the word (correctly) as *yeńhē*. A few mss. may show the word as *yeŋhē*, but that is incorrect even for YAv. (as Humbach himself pointed out in 1991) and therefore would have to be a scribal error. It is not evidence that the Yenghe Haatam was "artificially archaised".

[12] Geldner shows the Yenghe Haatam appearing in full in Yy27.15 (in a few mss.), in Yy4.26 (in a few mss.), in Yy5.6 (in a few mss.), in Yy7.27 (in a few mss.), and in the Khordeh Avesta, with various mss. differences in the grammatical forms of its words.   Yy27.15 is the reference or citation most often used for it, where it follows immediately after the Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo Y27.13) and the Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu Y27.14). The fact that the Sasanians collated the Yenghe Haatam here, indicates that the high opinion it enjoyed among the ancients extended even to Sasanian times.

Just a reminder. The Yasnas (including the Gathas) are not numbered in the mss. Nor are their verses, paragraphs or sections numbered. The numbering system was invented by modern scholars to enable identification (and discussion) of a given part of a text.   And the arrangement of the Yasnas was a function of Sasanian collation, which may (or may not) have reflected the way the Yasnas were arranged in YAv. times.

[13] Transliterated from Geldner 1P, p. 98.

[14] A relative pronoun is one that stands for a noun (or another pronoun) and introduces a subordinate clause. For example:
'A man whose character is trustworthy.'   The relative pronoun is whose (genitive. sg. masc.). The noun it stands for is 'man'. And the subordinate clause it introduces is 'character is trustworthy.'
In English there are many relative pronouns (who, whose, which, that, et cetera). In Avestan there is only one relative pronoun (the stem) *ya-* which stands for all nouns ~ persons, concepts, places, and things. But of course different forms of the stem are used for different cases, numbers, and genders.

[15] GAv. *yehyā* = archaic YAv. *yeńhē*, = YAv. *yeńhe*.   and Beekes 1988 shows *yehyā* as masc. sg. (p. 140). However, many declensions are the same for both masc. and ntr. and *yeńhe* is one of these.

Masc./ntr. genitive sg.

According to Skjaervo 2003, *Young Avestan,* Lesson 11, p. 99, the YAv. relative pronoun *yeńhē* is masc./ntr. genitive sg. of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*. The genitive masc./ntr. pl. is *yaēšąm*. The gen. fem. sg. is *yeńhå*.

M&dV 2001 (p. 73) show YAv. *yeńhe* as masc. gen. sg. They also show YAv. *yeńhe* as loc. sg. fem. which in the context of this manthra is probably not applicable;

Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010, take *yeńhē* (in the Yenghe Haatam) to be masc. gen. sg. without comment.

Gershevitch 1967, in his discussion on the Yenghe Haatam also takes *yeńhē* as masc. sg.

However, Hintze 1994 translates *yeńhē* (in the Yenghe Haatam) as masc. pl. "of which (male Entities)" in her English translation of the *Zamyad Yasht,* Ch. 1, § 13, p. 16, where the word *yeńhē* has a numbered ft. But unfortunately, the texts of her footnotes were not included in the English version of her book. So I do not know what her explanation might have been for the pl.

Based on the foregoing factors and the general unanimity of linguists detailed above ~ and in the absence of Hintze's explanation ~ I can only conclude that the author of the manthra intended *yeńhē* to be masc. gen. sg. For the reasons discussed in this chapter, the ntr. does not fit this context.

[16] In English, the present participle of a verb is shown by attaching ~ing to the verb, thus the present participle of the verb 'to be' is 'existing', 'being'. And present participles can be used as nouns, 'existing~one(s),' or 'beings'

[17] Taraporewala 1951 p. 47.

[18] Discussed in *Part Two: The Solution of Yasna 29*.

[19] Boyce, quoted by Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, p. 14, para. (6).

[20] Detailed in *Part One: The Nature of the Divine*, and *Part Four: Zarathushtra, Originator or Reformer*.

[21] M&deV 2001 p. 111, offer the following possible translations of *āaṯ* in their glossary:

'entonces' (Spanish for 'then'),

'ya' (Spanish for 'already'),

'pero' (Spanish for 'but').

[22] Jackson 1892 § 53 iv, and § 731 (4).

[23] Beekes 1988 pp. 144, 147.

[24] Hintze 1994 p. 43 (Glossary for the word *āaṯ*), and p. 16 for the Yenghe Haatam (at the end of Yt. 1.13).

[25] Taraporewala 1951 pp. 26 - 27.

[26] Skjaervo 2006;   Taraporewala 1951, p. 28; Jackson 1892 §§ 236, 238, p. 70.
Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, p. 14 para. (4) also sees *yesnē* as loc. He states that he is not persuaded by Henning's 'for worship' which he thinks may have been influenced by the Pahlavi translation.   But his 2010 translation with Faiss has "for worship" p. 158.

[27] Hintze 1994 *Zamyad Yasht*, Glossary p. 47.

[28] Jackson 1892 §§ 735 - 736 p. 204.

[29] Humbach/Faiss 2010 p. 73.

[30] Taraporewala 1951 p. 28. The phrase *yesnē paitī* also occurs in the Gatha verse Y51.22 (believed to have been the inspiration for the Yenghe Haatam). And here again we have differences of opinion as to its translation.

Taraporewala 1951 (consistent with his translation of the Yenghe Haatam) translates *yesnē paitī* as "in-every act-of-worship...". Y51.22, p. 821.
Insler 1975 has not ascribed a separate English word for *paitī* in Y51.22. He translates *yesnē paitī* as "in ... worship...". Y51.22.
Humbach 1991 translates *yesnē paitī* as "at worship" Y51.22, Vol. 1, p. 191.
Humbach/Faiss (2010) translate *yesnē paitī* as "for the sacrifice" Y51.22, p. 158.

The word *paitī* also occurs in other Gatha verses (e.g. Y33.11) where similar uncertainty exists regarding an appropriate English equivalent, resulting in translation differences.

[31] Taraporewala states that Bartholomae takes *vaŋhō* to be an adj., the comparative form of 'good' *vohu-* (*vaŋhu-*) and construes it as acc. sg.

[32] Humbach/Faiss 2010 p. 73.

[33] See in *Part Two: The Puzzle of the Most-Good, Vahishta*; and *A Question of Reward & the Path.*

[34] Hintze 1994, Humbach (1991), Taraporewala (1951) and Bartholomae, all translate *mazdå ahurō* as nominative sg. ~ the subject of the verb *vaēϑā* 'knows'.

[35] Discussed in more detail in *Part One: The Nature of the Divine.*

[36] Detailed in *Part Three: Evolution of the Name(s) Ahura, Mazda.*

[37] *vaēϑā* in the Yenghe Haatam (*vaēdā* in GAv. Y51.22), is the verb form for both 1p and 3p sg. present tense (indicative) of the stem *vaēd-* 'to know' (Skjaervo 2006) thus it could be translated as 'I know' or 'he/she knows' (see the analysis in *Part Six: Yasna 51.22*). In English, the form of a verb is often the same for different persons in sg. and pl (e.g. 'I *know*', 'we *know*', 'you *know*', 'they *know*' etc.). And to indicate which person and number *know* is being used for, we have to add the appropriate pronoun 'I', 'we', 'you' 'they' etc. to the verb form *know*. But in Avestan, there is (usually) a different form of the verb for different person(s) and number(s). Therefore, pronouns indicating person and number ('I', 'we', 'thou', 'you' 'he/she/it', 'they') et cetera, are not necessary and usually are not used with the verb, unless needed for emphasis or required by a particular sentence structure or other reason. Sometimes, however, ~ as with *vaēϑā* (GAv. *vaēdā*) ~ the same verb form is used for different persons. In such cases, the absence of the defining pronoun makes translation problematic, unless the context indicates the composer's intent. In the context of the Yenghe Haatam, *vaēϑā* is probably 3p sg. 'the Wise Lord knows' (*mazdå ahurō vaēϑā*).

[38] So shown in Skjaervo 2006. The phrase *ašāṯ hacā* 'in accordance with truth' appears many times in the Gathas (with and without the emphatic particle *cīṯ* 'indeed'). For example,

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

"...that judgment between two alternatives by which we are going to live in accordance with truth [*ašāṯ hacā*]." Y31.2 Insler 1975;

"...Thy rule that is in accord with truth [*ašāṯ hacā*]..." Y43.14 (Insler 1975);

"... the best [*vahišta-*] thing of this existence in accord with truth [*ašāṯ hacā*]..." Y45.4 Insler 1975;

" The person who, really in accordance with truth [*ašāṯ … hacā*], shall bring to realization..." Y46.19 Insler 1975;

"I know in whose worship there exists for me the best [*vahišta-*] in accord with truth [*ašāṯ hacā*]..." Y51.22 Insler 1975, (the believed inspiration for the Yenghe Haatam);

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

And *ašāṯ hacā* also appears in the Ahuna Vairya.

"... So also the judgment in accord with truth indeed [*aϑā ratuš ašāṯcīṯ hacā*]..." Y27.13, my translation (which is in pure Gathic Avestan).

[39] Detailed in *Part One: Truth, Asha.*

[40] Jackson 1892 **§** 399 shows *yåŋhąm* as the genitive fem. pl. form of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*. Taraporewala 1951 in his commentary (pp. 26, 28) also says that the word is pl., and does not mention any differences of opinion among translators regarding whether *yåŋhąm* is sg. or pl. But in his translation, he translates the word as sg. ('the-woman-of-whom'), and he shows Bartholomae's English translation as sg. also ('the woman too'). However, the YAv.

gen. fem. sg. is *yeŋ́hå̄* (as referenced above) ~ not as *yå̄ŋhąm*.   These facts, make me wonder if the sg. 'woman' in these translation might be a typographical error.

[41] I am indebted to Professor Insler for knowledge of the technique of 'framing' or 'encapsulating' in the syntax of GAv., to give one unit of thought. Following this rule of Avestan syntax in the Yenghe Haatam, I think the fact that *yeŋ́hē* and *yå̄ŋhąmcā* frame or encapsulate the words in lines a. and b. indicates that these 2 lines form one unit of thought.   Thus:

yeŋ́hē. hātąm. āaṯ. yesnē. paitī. vaŋhō.
mazdå̄. ahurō. vaēϑā. ašāṯ. hacā. yå̄ŋhąmcā.

This 'framing' technique in the syntax of the Yenghe Haatam is further evidence that its author understood this syntax technique found so often in the Gathas. This framing technique is discussed in great detail in the following chapter in *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo) An Analysis* (with Professor Insler's opinion given, as well as many examples); and it is also discussed in:
Part Six: Yasna 28.5 (discussed in some detail); *Yasna 30.7* (which has a double framing ~ one within another); *Yasna 32.7* and *Yasna 51.9* (in which the framing extends over the ceasura); *Yasna 28.1* (discussed briefly); *Yasna 32.9* (discussed briefly); and *Yasna 44.16* (discussed briefly).

[42] The word *tąscā* is simply the form which *tą* takes when *-cā* 'and' is tacked on to it. And there is no dispute that *tą* 'them' is the acc. pl. masc. form of the demonstrative/3p pronoun stem *ta-*. Skjaervo 2006; Gershevitch (ibid.) p. 165, and Jackson 1892 § 409. Jackson (ibid.) shows the ntr. form as *tā*. There is no dispute that *tąscā* is masc. pl. and not ntr. pl. (which it would need to be if it stood for the 3 divine qualities that are (grammatically) ntr. ~ *aša-*, *vohu- manah-*, and *x šaϑra-*.

[43] The word *tå̄scā* is simply the form which *tå̄* takes when *-cā* 'and' is tacked on to it.   There is no dispute that *tå̄* 'them' is the acc. pl. fem. form of the demonstrative/3p pronoun stem *ta-*, Skjaervo 2006, Jackson 1892 ibid. in the Table in § 409.   Parenthetically, *tå̄* is also the form for nom. pl. fem., but in the context of the Yenghe Haatam, it can only be construed as acc. because it is paired with *tą* which is accusative only, and both of these words *tąscā* and *tå̄scā* are the objects of the verb *yazamaidē*.

[44] Humbach 1991 Vol. 1, pp. 146 - 149.

[45] Humbach/Faiss 2010 pp. 107 - 109, 110.

[46] John Steinbeck, *The Acts of King Arthur and His Noble Knights,* 1976, p. 320, commenting on the difficulty in finding accurate equivalents in modern English for older English words.

And see *Part Two: The Puzzle of Worship* for ways in which the word evolved in meaning, in Avestan texts from the Gathas to YAv. texts.

[47] Discussed in *Part One: The Nature of the Divine;* and *The Identity of the Divine;*   and in *Part Six: Yasna 51.22*, (said to be the inspiration for the Yenghe Haatam).

[48] Here are two examples of worshipping/celebrating (using *yaz-* words) the divine in unperfected existence, in YAv. texts, and in the *Yasna Haptanghaiti* (the latter was composed some time after the Gathas but long before the Yenghe Haatam). There are many, many more.

Humbach 1991: *Yasna Haptanghaiti* (in GAv.). "We worship [*yazamaidē*] the souls of (those) wild animals that (are) harmless. We worship [*yazamaidē*] the souls of the truthful [*ašāunąm*] men [*narąmcā*] and women [*nāirinąmcā*] wherever they were born, whose [*yaēšąm*] better religious views [*daēnå̄*] do prevail, or will prevail, or have prevailed." YHapt.39.2, Vol. 1, p. 148. The word *daēnå̄* in the Gathas means 'envisionment'.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translates *yazamaidē* in this section as 'we celebrate'.

Mills translation: YA*v.* Y*y*26.4 "... we worship [*yazamaide*] the spirit [*ahūmca*] and conscience [*daēnąmca*], the intelligence [*baoδasca*] and soul [*urvānəmca*] and Fravashi [*fravašīmca*] of those holy men [*ašaonąm* masc. 'truth-possessing-men'] and women [*ašaoninąmca* fem. 'truth-possessing-women'] who early heard the lore ... and loved and strove after Righteousness [*yōi ašāi vaonarə* 'who loved and strove after truth'], ..." Yy26.4 Mills translation, SBE 31, p. 278; transliterated Avestan words in square brackets are from Geldner 1P, p. 93, (Geldner shows *yōi ašāi vaonarə* as the first words of Yy26.5).

There are many, many other such examples in the *Yasnas*, and also in the YAv. *Visperad*, and the YAv. *Farvardin Yasht*.

[49] Humbach 1991 Vol. 1, p. 116.

[50] Gershevitch 1967 p. 166.

[51] Gershevitch 1967 p. 164.

[52] Geldner 1P, p. 26, ft. 1 of Yy4.26.

[53] Here are a some examples of the Yenghe Haatam following sections of Avestan texts which make no mention of the amesha spenta.

The Yenghe Haatam is set forth in full in Yy27.15. The section before it is the Ashem Vohu (Y27.14) which does not contain the words *aməša- spənta-*, so this section is not evidence that the pronouns in the Yenghe Haatam which follows, stand for the *aməša- spənta-*.

The Yenghe Haatam is set forth in full in Yy5.6. The section before it, Yy5.5 does not contain the words *aməša-spənta-*, so this section is not evidence that the pronouns in the Yenghe Haatam which follows, stand for the *aməša-spənta-*. Parenthetically, this preceding section (Yy5.5) is a quotation of YHapt. 37.5, and mentions only 3 amesha spenta -- good thinking, good rule (which are grammatically ntr.), and embodied truth (grammatically fem.) -- along with good envisionment and good reflection. Specifically,

> *vohucā. manō. yazamaidē.•᛬• vohucā. x̌šaϑrəm. vaŋuhīmcā. daēnąm. vaŋuhīmcā. fsəratūm. vaŋuhīmcā. ārmaitīm•᛬•* (quoting YHapt. 37.5) Yy5.5, from Geldner 1P p. 27.

> "And good thinking [*vohucā manō* ntr.] we worship; and good rule [*vohucā x̌šaϑrəm* ntr.], and good envisionment (*vaŋuhīmcā daēnąm* fem.), and good reflection (*vaŋuhīmcā fsəratūm* fem.), and good embodied truth (*vaŋuhīmcā ārmaitīm* fem.). Yy5.5, my translation,

As you can see, although there are 3 fem. nouns in Yy5.5 (quoting YHapt. 37.5), two of them are not amesha spenta (envisionment *daēnąm*, and reflection *fsəratūm*). The 2 amesha spenta first mentioned are grammatically ntr. nouns (*manō* and *x̌šaϑrəm*). And there is no masc. sg. *mainyu-* in this section.

The Yenghe Haatam is also set forth in full in Yy7.26. The section before it Yy7.25 does not mention the words *aməša- spənta-*. And in a long list of things that are worshiped (*yazamaide*) it mentions only two amesha spenta by name -- *haurvatāt-* and *amərətāt-* (both grammatically fem.)

One last example. In the *Zamyad Yasht*, the words *aməša- spənta-* are not mentioned in the text immediately before the Yenghe Haatam (which is set forth in full at the end of Hintz's 1994 translation of § 13 of the *Zamyad Yasht*). The words that immediately precede the Yenghe Haatam in the same section (§13) pertain to the Glory [*x̌arənah-*] of the Kavi dynasty. Hintze 1994 p. 15 - 16. The Glory [*x̌arənah-*] is the divine glory which gives the king his authority to rule, and the divine glory also is within each segment of society, (and also represents the divine glory within each individual).

[54] Darmesteter footnotes the words "All those beings" as follows "The Amesha-Spentas (Pahl. Comm. ad Yasna XXVII fin.)." SBE 23, p. 30 ft. 13; and he footnotes the word 'males' [*tąscā*] as "The first three" (ft. 1), and the word 'females' as "The last three whose names are feminine." (ft. 2) SBE 23, p. 31. But in fact the "first three" are not masc. but ntr. as linguists generally agree.

[55] SBE 23, pp. 30 - 31.

[56] Taraporewala 1951 pp. 26 - 28.   His word-by-word translation is as follows:

ab: "(Him), indeed [*āat̰*], of-those-that-are [*hātąm*], of-whom [*yeńhē*] in every [*paitī*] act-of-worship [*yesnē*] Mazda [*mazdå*] Ahura [*ahurō*] knoweth [*vaēϑā*] (to be) of-higher-worth [*vaŋhō*] by-reason-of [*hacā*] (his) Righteousness [*ašāt̰*] (also) the woman-of-whom (He knoweth) likewise [*yåŋhąmcā*]

c: "(all such) both these-men [*tąscā*] and these-women [*tåscā*] do-we-revere [*yazamaide*]."

[57] Bartholomae's translation in English, in Taraporewala 1951 p. 28.

[58] Jackson 1892 in the Table in § 399, p. 114.

[59] SBE 31, p. 268.   Mills does not translate the Yenghe Haatam at Yy27.15, probably because in many mss. it is abbreviated at Yy27.15. Instead, he inserts his translation before the start of Yy21, which is the YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Haatam, encapsulating the whole translation in round parentheses to indicate that it is not there set forth in its entirety.

[60] Humbach 1991 indicates the sources of this Pahlavi translation as Dhabar, *Pahlavi Yasna and Visperad*. Humbach 1991 Vol. 2 p. 13.

[61] Humbach, 1991 Vol. 2, pp. 13 - 14. The Pahlavi translation/commentary, transliterated into English script by Humbach reads as follows. Words in round parentheses are insertions by Humbach. Words in square brackets are the Pahlavi explanations or commentaries:

kē az hastān ēdōn pad yazišn abar weh [kū yazišn ān weh ī ohrmazd ī x wadāy rāy kunēnd] ohrmazd āgāh az ahlāyīh abāgīh cegāmizēw [(kū) cegāmīzēw kār ud kirbag ud mizd ud pādāšn āgāh dahēd] hanjamanīgān narān ud mādagān yazēm [(kū) amahraspandān].

The word *amahraspandān* is the Pahlavi version of *aməša- spənta-*.

[62] Hintze 1994 *Zamyad Yasht*, p. 16.

[63] See *Part Six: Yasna 51.22*.

[64] Yy21 is part of what came to be known as the *baγān yašt*, (which comprises the three YAv. commentaries on the Ahuna Vairya, the Asha Vahishta and the Yenghe Haatam (Commentaries Yy19, Yy20 and Yy21 respectively). Like all YAv. texts, its author is not identified (an absence of egotism which I rather like).

[65] In the following sections of this Commentary (Yy21) and its translations, the words in blue are quotations from the Yenghe Haatam. In the 2 translations of the Commentary that follow, words in round parentheses have been added by the translator indicating his interpretations, or additions to the text. Avestan words in square brackets have been inserted by me to show you how each translator translates the applicable Av. word.

Yy21, Sections 1 - 2.

1. *yesnīm. vacō. ašaonō. zaraϑuštrahe•: yeńhē. hātąm. āat̰. yesnē. paitī•:*

yeńhe. iδa. mazdå. yasnəm. cinasti. yaϑa. dāta. ahurahe. hātạm. yasnəm. cinasti.

2. *yaϑa. haδbīš. jījišạm. yåŋhạm. iδa. ašaoninạm. ārmaiti.paoiryanạm. yasnəm. para.cinasti. yaϑa. vahməm. aməšaēibyō•• ϑrāyō. ţkaēša•• vīspəm. vacō. yesnīm•• cīm. aoi. yasnō•• aməšā. spəṇtā. paīti. yasnahe. ••* Geldner 1P pp. 81 - 82.

Humbach's 1991 translation of Yy 21 sections 1 - 2:

Humbach' translation omits the first two sentences in § 1, takes the first three words of Geldner's § 2 as a part of section 1, and omits the last three sentences in section 2, ~ his translation ends with the words *ϑrāyō. ţkaēša••* Here is his translation of (such parts of) §§ 1 and 2:

"(By reciting) *yeŋhē* one describes the worship of Mazda as (something following) the Ahura's orders. (By reciting) *hātạm* one describes the worship as a search for refuge (undertaken) by those who exist. (By reciting) *yåŋhạm* one describes the worship of the truthful women [*ašaoninạm*] (who are) the prime ones of right-mindedness [*ārmaiti.paoiryanạm*] as a laudation (offered) to the immortal ones [*aməšaēibyō*]. ~ (These are) three statements." Yy21.1-2, Humbach 1991, Vol. 2, p. 13).

Parenthetically, I translate the first sentence as follows: '(I give you) the worship Word of truth--possessing Zarathushtra'; (*yesnīm* being one of the forms for acc. requires an implied verb that is not 'to be').

Mills' (1887) translation of Yy 21 sections 1 - 2:

Mills also sees the first few words in Geldner's § 2 as belonging to § 1. In his translation (all sections) translates *ašavan-* words as 'saint' and 'holy one' instead of 'truthful' (adj.) and 'truthfull-one' (adj. used as a noun); he translates *aməša- spənta-* words as 'Bountiful Immortals', and *ušta-* words as 'salvation', but see *Part Three: The Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu), an Analysis*, for the various meanings of *ušta-* and *uštatāt-* words, including 'blessed, 'blessedness' and 'happiness'. And Mills translates *vahišta-* words as 'best' (rather than as 'most-good' the superlative of *vohu-* 'good'). If you keep these alternatives in mind as you read his translation, it becomes more meaningful.

1. A word for the Yasna by Zarathushtra, the saint [*ašaonō* 'the truth-filled-one']. [Mills here omits the first few words of the Yenghe Haatam which appear in Yy21.1].
Yênhê, &c. Here the worshipper indicates and offers the Yasna (which is the sacrificial worship) of Mazda [Mills' footnote 1: "Referring yênhê to Ahura(?)"] as by the command (or as the institution) of Ahura. Hâtām. Here the worshipper offers the sacrificial worship as if with the beings who are among those who are destined to live (Mills' footnote 2: "Fit to live, clean.").

2. Yaunghām. Here he indicates and offers the sacrificial worship of those holy females [*ašaoninạm*] who have Aramaiti at their head [*ārmaiti.paoiryanạm*] [Mills' footnote 3: "The Ameshospends whose names are in the feminine; so the Zandist erroneously"], as homage to the Immortals. These are the three sentences which comprehend all the Yasnian speech. (Question.) To whom is this Yasna addressed? (Answer.) To the Bountiful Immortals (in the course of the Yasna)." (SBE 31, p. 269).

[66] Skjaervo (2006) *Old Avestan Glossary* shows GAv. *idā* as an adv. meaning 'here'.

[67] The verb forms *cinasti* and *para.cinasti* are a bit of a puzzle to me. They appear in all three YAv. commentaries -- on the Ahuna Vairya (Yy19), on the Asha Vahishta (Yy20) and on the Yenghe Haatam (Yy21), ~ in contexts which do not seem consistent.

Humbach (1991) and Mills (1887) agree that the verb form is 3p (he/she/it/one) and in the present tense (indicative), but they have not translated the word(s) consistently in these three commentaries. As detailed in a ft. above (for the Yenghe Haatam) and in in *Part Three: The Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu), An Analysis*, and *The Ahuna Vairya, Ancient Commentaries* for the other two commentaries, ~

Humbach (1991) has translated *cinasti* and *para.cinasti* variously as 'ascribes, describes, commits, and appoints; and Mills (1887) has translated these words variously as 'ascribes, attributes, indicates/offers, assigns, and acknowledges.

Skjaervo (2006) *Old Avestan Glossary* shows *para* as an adv. meaning 'forth'. I (tentatively) translate *cinasti* as 3p '(one) ascribes' or '(one) attributes', and *para.cinasti* (3p) as 'forthwith (one) ascribes/attributes'. But in the context of the commentary on the Yenghe Haatam (Yy21) the meaning the author intended to convey by using these words is a bit of a puzzle to me.

[68] *yasnəm* is acc. sg. of the grammatically masc. stem *yasna-* 'worship' (Jackson 1892, **§** 236, pp. 69 - 70); as such it is the direct object of *cinasti* 'one attributes'. Thus, '(one) attributes the worship...'

[69] Skjaervo (2006) *Old Avestan Glossary* shows a ntr. noun *dāta-* meaning 'established rules'. Here (Yy21.1) I take it as instr. sg. 'with (the) established rules'.

[70] *ahurahe* is the YAv. gen. sg. form for masc. *-a-* stem nouns (such as *ahura-*), Jackson (1892) **§** 236, p. 69 - 70. Thus 'of the Lord'.

[71] For example, as a way to worship Zarathushtra says,

"I shall try to glorify Him for us with prayers of [*ārmaiti-*],..." Y45.10 (i.e. with prayers of truth embodied in thought, word and action].

"... Your enduring worshipful offering has been established to be [*amərətāt-*] and completeness [*haurvatāt-*]." Y33.8. In other words, a worship offering that is pleasing to the Divine is our own self realization ~ attaining the true (correct) order of existence completely, resulting in a non-mortal way of being.

"...I shall always worship ... you, Wise Lord, with truth [*aša-*] and the very best thinking [*vahišta- manah-*] and with their rule [*x šaϑra-*], ..." Y50.4.
For a more detailed discussion see *Part One: Worship & Prayer,* and in *Part Two: The Puzzle of Worship;* and *A Question of Reward and the Path.*

[72] The evidence for the conclusion that each quality of the Divine (amesha spenta) is an aspect of the true (correct) order of existence *aša-*, is set forth in *Part Two: The Nature of the Divine.* The notion that the true order of existence () is the beneficial way of being (), which is the essence of the sacred, is set forth in *Part One: Truth, Asha;* and *The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu.*

[73] See *Part Five: Avestan Genders, Grammatical & Actual.*

[74] Discussed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu.*

[75] Jackson 1892 **§** 356, p. 102.

[76] Compound words are discussed in more detail in *Part Six: Yasna 44.16* (which was used verbatim is as the 2d paragraph of the *Kemna Mazda* prayer.

[77] *ārmaiti-* has been translated in various ways by various translators. But regardless of these differences, in the Gathas (and later texts), it is an attribute of the (genderless) Divine, which also exists (incompletely) in man. For a detailed discussion of different translations of *ārmaiti-*, and why I think it means 'truth embodied in thought, word and action, see *Part One: Embodied Truth, Aramaiti.*

[78] *Part Three: Paourvya* discusses the various perspectives of meaning for this word in Avestan, based on the opinions of linguists, and on its contextual uses in the Gathas.

[79] Skjaervo 2006. Beekes also shows *aṧavan-* as an adj., (but in what he thinks was its original form "*ártavan-* truthful" which he classifies as an adjective p. 120).   According to Kent, for the Av. *aṧa-/arəta-* the equivalent in Old Persian is *arta-*, in Skt. *rtá*, (Kent 1950 p. 170).

[80] For example in Yy26.4, *aṧaoninąm* is used as a noun 'truthful-women' (quoted in a ft. above).

[81] According to Skjaervo 2006 Av. has the following words for 'woman', *gənā-*, *jainī-*, *nāiri-*. None of these words appears in the Av. text of Yy21.2.

[82] *aməṧa-*   is an *-a-* stem adj. (Skjaervo 2006). In our Commentary, (Yy21.2) *aməṧaēibyō* is used as a noun. And the inflection *-aēibyō* (of *aməṧaēibyō*) is the dat./abl. pl. for masc. *-a-* stem words (Jackson 1892, § 236, p. 70).   In Av. the masc. gender is used generically when a term includes more than one gender.   The term *aməṧa- spənta-* includes 3 ntr. nouns, 3 fem. nouns, and 1 masc. noun (*spənta- mainyu- ~ mainyu-* is a masc. noun).

[83] See *Part One: Embodied Truth, Aramaiti.*

[84] The various translations of *ārmaiti-* as well as the evidence that it is a Divine quality that mortals have (incompletely) is detailed in *Part One: Embodied Truth, Aramaiti.*

[85] Some modern translators, and also the Pahlavi translation/commentary of the Yenghe Haatam (all given earlier in the main part of this chapter), interpret *aṧaoninąm   ārmaiti.paoiryanąm* '(the) truth-filled, first-ones-of-embodied-truth' to mean the three grammatically fem. attributes of the Divine ~ *ārmaiti*, *haurvatāt-* and *amərətāt-*.   But there can be no dispute that neither the Yenghe Haatam, nor the YAv. Commentary on it (Yy21) mention *haurvatāt-* or *amərətāt- ~* two attributes of the Divine, which mortals do not yet have, but are capable of attaining (see *Part One: Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat*).   Nor does the context of Yy21.2 explaining *yå̊ŋhąm ~* either specifically or impliedly ~ require that we include *haurvatāt-* and *amərətāt-* in the meaning of the words '...(the) truthfilled first-ones-of-embodied-truth...' (*aṧaoninąm   ārmaiti.paoiryanąm*).

[86] This is my translation of YHapt.37.4.   The Avestan has been transliterated from Geldner 1P, p. 133.   The words *spəntāŋg aməšeŋg* (acc. pl. of *spənta- aməṧa-*) are used as adjectives in YHapt. 39.3 to describe good male [*vaŋhūšcā*] and female [*vaŋvhīšcā*] beings. (Humbach 1991 Vol. 1 p. 148).   For a detailed translation supported by a linguistic analysis, see *Part Six: Yasna Haptanghaiti 37.4 and 5.*

[87] See *Part Three: Chinvat, The Bridge of Discerning.*

[88] As detailed in *Part Two: A Question of Immanence.*

[89] The word *cīm* 'whom' is a 3p acc. sg. interrogative pronoun, which tells us that the 'to' belongs with the verb ('addressed to') and not with the pronoun ('to whom' ~ which would require the dat. case).

[90] Skjaervo 2003 shows that the *ə̄* inflection is one of the forms for accusative pl. for *a-* stem words (Lesson 7, p. 52); so also Jackson 1892 §241, p. 71. The words *aməṧa- spənta-* are *a-* stem words.

Therefore, in our text, Yy21.2, the acc. pl. *aməṧə̄ spəntə̄* requires an implied verb which in this context is supplied by the question to which the reply is given.

Expressed verb: '... Whom is (this) Yasna addressed to?';
Implied verb: '... (It is addressed to) (the) non-dying [*aməṧə̄*], (the) beneficial [*spəntə̄*], ...'

[91] Detailed in *Part One: The Identity of the Divine.*

[92] Discussed in *Part Six: Yasna 51.22.*

[93] Section 3 of the YAv. Commentary (Yy21.3) starts with the words *āaṯ mraoṯ mazdå•:* 'thus spoke Wisdom' followed by a quotation from the Gatha verse Y43.1 but with some YAv. spellings, and with many mss. differences in the spellings (as shown in Geldner 1P p. 82 fts. 2) through 4) to Yy21.3).

Here are the first two lines from the actual Gatha verse, Y43.1.

uštā. ahmāi.   yahmāi. uštā. kahmāicīṯ.
vasə̄. x šayąs.   mazdå. dāyāṯ. ahurō.   Geldner 1P p. 140.

which Insler 1975 has translated as follows: "May the Wise Lord, who rules at will, grant wishes to him, to the person whosoever has wishes..." Y43.1, although many Zoroastrians believe an accurate translation of this verse is: 'May the Lord Wisdom, who rules at will, grant happiness to the person who gives happiness (to others).".   The fact that this YAv. Commentary Yy21.3 quotes from the Gatha verse Y43.1 is an indication that this YAv. commentator looked to the Gathas for an interpretation of the Yenghe Haatam, (and not to the later YAv. texts ~ many of which may not have existed when the Yenghe Haatam was composed).

Here is the Avestan text of Yy21.3 - 5. I have placed the quotation from the Gatha verse Yy43.1 in blue, so that you can see it at a glance (the spelling choices from available mss. are Geldner's).

Yy 21, sections 3 - 5.

3. *āaṯ. mraoṯ. mazdå•:*   *ušta. ahmāi. yahmāi. ušta kahmāiciṯ. vasa.x šayąs. mazdå dāyāṯ ahurō•:*

4. *cīm. aētaya. paiti.vaca. paityā.mraoṯ •:*   *uštatātəm. paityā.mraoṯ. uštatāityaca. vīspəm. ašavanəm. həntəmca. bavaṇṯəmca. bīšyaṇṯəmca. vahištəm. vahištō. paityā.mraoṯ •:*   *vahištō. mazdå. paityā.mraoṯ. vahištəm. ašavanəm. vahištāi. ašaone•:*

5. *baγąm. yeńhē.hātąm. hufrāyaštąm. ašaonīm. yazamaide•:*
   yeṇhē. hātąm. āaṯ yesnē paitī •: •:   Geldner 1P pp. 81 - 82.

[this last line is an abbreviation and means that the full Yenghe Haatam should be recited here. Similar abbreviations (for the Yenghe Haatam and other prayers) appear frequently at the end of a passage (or at the end of a Yasna or Yasht) in Avestan texts as explained above].

Mills' 1887 translation of Yy21.3 - 5.

"3. Thereupon spake Mazda [*āaṯ. mraoṯ. mazdå•:*]: Salvation [*ušta*] to this one, whosoever he may be! May the absolute ruler Ahura grant it. [Mills' translation of the first sentence of the Gatha verse Y43.1, quoted here in this YAv. Commentary].

4. (Question.) Whom did He answer with this answer?
(Answer.) He answered: The state of salvation [*uštatātəm* 'blessed happiness']; and with this answer, 'the state of salvation' [*uštatāityaca*], he answered every saint [*vīspəm. ašavanəm.* 'every truth~possessing~one'] who exists [*həntəmca*], every one who is coming into existence [*bavaṇṯəmca*], and everyone who shall exist in the future [*bīšyaṇṯəmca*].
(Question. Who answered thus?)
(Answer.) The best One [*vahištō*].
(Question. What did He answer?)
(Answer.) The best thing [*vahištəm*]. (That is) the best One, Mazda, answered the best and the holy [*ašavanəm* 'truth possessing'] (answer) for the better and the holy man [*vahištāi ašaone* 'for the most-good, truthfilled-one'].

5. We sacrifice to [*yazamaide* 'we worship/celebrate'] this piece, the Yênhê Hâtãm, the prominent, and holy [*ašaonīm* 'truth-possessig'] Yast." Mills translation, SBE 31, p. 269.

As you can see, Mills' translation of the quotation from the Gatha verse Y43.1 is quite different from that of Insler 1975. Here also he translates *uštatāt-* word as 'the state of salvation'. And he translates *vahišta-* words 'best' instead of 'most-good' ~ the superlative of *vohu-* 'good'.

[94] Detailed in *Part One: Worship & Prayer*;   and in *Part Two: The Puzzle of Worship*.

[95] See in *Part Two: The Puzzle of the Most-Good, Vahishta;   A Question of Reward and the Path; and The Puzzle of Worship*.

[96] See *Part Three: Evolution of the Name(s) Ahura Mazda*, and *Part Five: Chronology of the Texts*.

[97] See also the differences of opinion regarding the existence of the 'Devil' in *Part One: Does the Devil Exist?*

[98] Here, in its entirety, is the text of the Pahlavi *Dinkard* Book 9, Ch. 4, purporting to summarize the commentary on the Yenghe Haatam in the YAv. *Sudkar Nask*.

> "1. The third fargard, Yenghe-hatam, is about the formation of mankind by slow increase, and, when they live on *for* fifty years, *their* slowly becoming dust; the coming of death even *to* him who is very pleasantly living, as regards mankind, at the climax (barinō) of his life; and the happiness of the worldly *existence* is given only to the worthy, on account of *their* love of righteousness; the rest are passed by.

> 2. And also this, that he who is produced by the demons, *or* is proceeding to the demons, *or* has committed falsehood, is the opulent person who gives nothing to the worthy supplicant." E. W. West translation, SBE 37, pp. 175 - 176

As you can see, this Pahlavi commentary has nothing to do with the meaning of the Yenghe Haatam ~ not even the plain meanings of its words, let alone its enigmas.

[99] Detailed in *Part Five: The Vendidad, An Overview.*

[100] Beekes (1988) shows *aša-* and *x šaϑra-* as neuter root nouns (p. 131); and *manah-* as a neuter noun as well, (pp. 115, 117);

So also do M&dV (in their Glossary pp. 111 (*aša-*), 114 (*manah-*), and 112 (*x šaϑra-*);

So also does Hintze in the Glossary of her English translation of the *Zamyad Yasht* pp. 42 (*aša-*), 49 (*manah-*), and 44 (*x šaϑra-*).

[101] Skjaervo 2003, *Young Avestan*, Lesson 11, p. 99.

[102] See in *Part One: The Beneficial/Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainy; and The Nature of the Divine.*

[103] *yesnīm* being one of the forms for acc. requires an implied verb that is not some form of the verb 'to be', explained in more detail, in a ft. below.

[104] As detailed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu; Truth Asha; Good Thinking Vohu Manah; Embodied Truth Aramaiti; Good Rule Vohu Xshathra; Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat Ameretat.*

[105] See in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu; and The Nature of the Divine.*

Gershevitch 1967 also sees *yeňhē* as standing for *spənta- mainyu-*, but as an amesha spenta (p. 166), rather than the quality ~ a beneficial way of being ~ which in Zarathushtra's thought is the essence of the sacred and therefore comprises the nature of the Divine and all Its qualities (amesha spenta) perfected;   which man also has (unperfected).

[106] As detailed in *Part One: Truth, Asha.*

---

[107] Discussed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu.*

[108] Detailed in *Part One: The Identity of the Divine.*

[109] See *Part Six: Yasna 51.22.*

[110] See *Part Six: Yasna 51.22.* See also in *Part One: Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat;* and

The Identity of the Divine.   And in *Part Two: The Puzzle of the Singular and the Plural.*

[111] The operative verb form is GAv. *vaēdā* (Y51.22), and archaic YAv. *vaēϑā* (in the Yenghe Haatam), which (in GAv. and YAv.) is the form for both 1p sg. and 3p sg., as detailed above (and in *Part Six: Yasna 51.22.*).

[112] The first few chapters of *Part One* (which discuss the beneficial sacred way of being *spǝnta- mainyu-*, truth *aša-*, its comprehension *vohu- manah-*, its embodiment *ārmaiti-*,   and its good rule *vohu- x šaϑra-*), demonstrate, with evidence from the Gathas, that in Zarathushtra's thought these divine qualities (amesha spenta) also exist in man, (although not completely). And the chapters in *Part One ~ Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat Ameretat,* and *The Identity of the Divine*, demonstrate, with evidence from the Gathas, that man is capable of achieving these divine qualities completely.

In the Gathas we also see implied that the Divine *in being* is immanent in the material existence.

We see some corroboration in later Av. texts of the idea implied in the Yenghe Haatam (of worshipping the (unperfected) divine immanent in living beings), represented by their fravashis (the divine within). The *Farvardin Yasht* has many chapters in which the fravashis of various named human beings are worshipped/celebrated. And it also mentions worshipping/celebrating the fravashis of other living things.

> "... tame animals, ... wild animals, ... animals that live in the water [probably includes fish], animals that live under the ground, ... the flying ones [probably birds], ... the running ones, ... the grazing ones. We worship their Fravashis." *Farvardin Yasht,* Yt.13.74, Darmesteter translation SBE 23, pp. 197 - 198.

But the later Av. texts also worship/celebrate (using *yaz-* words) various inanimate and living things, with and without mentioning their fravashi.   Here are some examples from the *Farvardin Yasht,* in Darmesteter's translation with Avestan words from Geldner 2P. In the examples below, Darmesteter uses the words "primitive law" for Avestan *paoiryō tkaēša-* which more literally means '(the) first law' ~ in the sense of first in time (original law) and first in quality (the true (correct) order of existence), and is sometimes also called *ahura.tkaēša-* 'the law of the Lord' (as it is in Yy12.1, Yy1.23, and other instances).   As you read these examples, think of 'worship' as a celebration.

> "We worship the spirit, conscience, perception, soul, and Fravashi of men of the primitive law [*paoiryanąm tkaēšanąm*]..." Yt.13.149, Darmesteter translation, SBE 23, p. 228; Geldner *Avesta,* 2P, p. 203.

> "We worship the men of the primitive law [*paoiryąn tkaēšǒ*]..." Yt13.150 - 151, Darmesteter translation, SBE Vol. 23, p. 228 - 229; Geldner 2P, p. 204.

> "We worship this earth; We worship those heavens; We worship those good things that stand between (the earth and the heavens)..." Yt.13.153, Darmesteter translation, SBE 23, p. 229.

Who are these men of the first law [*paoirya- tkaēša-*] ?

> "We worship Zarathushtra, ... the man of the primitive law [*paoirīmca tkaēšǝm*]..." Yt.13.152, *Farvardin Yasht,* Darmesteter translation, SBE 23, p. 229; Geldner 2P, p. 204.

> " And I desire to approach the Fravashi ... of Zarathushtra Spitama, and for those of Kavi Vishtaspa, and of Isat-vastra the Zarathushtrian with all the holy Fravashis of the other ancient counsellors as well [*maṯ vīspābyō*

ašaonibyō fravašibyō yå̊ paoiryanąm ṯkaēšanąm]." Yy23.2, Mills translation, SBE 31 p. 275; Geldner 1P p. 87.

It would be reasonable to conclude from this verse Yy23.2 that Zarathushtra and his early disciples were called the "ancient counsellors" ~ the ones of the first (original) law *yå̊ paoiryanąm ṯkaēšanąm*, indicating that a long, long period of time must have elapsed from the time of Zarathushtra and his original disciples, to the time of this YAv. Yasna (detailed further in *Part Four: Zarathushtra's Date & Place*). And see *Part Two: The Puzzle of Worship* for the Avestan take on 'worship' as a celebration.

[113] I have not seen in the Gathas, the idea of worshipping the divine (using *yaz-* words) in unperfected existence (although I may have missed it). The only worship that I see in the Gathas is worship of Wisdom, the worship of the qualities that make a being divine, and (impliedly) the worship those who have attained these qualities completely, and therefore are a part of the divine. By contrast, in later texts we do indeed see the 'worship' of good (but unperfected) men and women ~ sometimes their Fravashis (the divine within ~ see for example the *Farvardin Yasht*) and sometimes expressed just as the worship of good men and women, as well as other good elements of the material existence ~ plants, waters, earth, a few examples of which have already been footnoted.

[114] Discussed in *Part One: The Manthra of Truth, Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu).*

[115] Humbach 1991 and Mills have both translated *ṯkaēša* here as 'sentences'. But the word appears in the Gathas, where Taraporewala 1951 comments that Bartholomae derives the word from *kaēš-* 'to teach, to praise'. Taraporewala notes that the word appears only twice in the Gathas, in Y49.2 and Y49.3, but is quite common in YAv. texts, where the word has the meanings 'teaching' and 'teacher'. Taraporewala 1951 pp. 698 - 699. In the Gathas, Y49.3, Insler has "Yes, the deceitful professor [*ṯkaēšō drəgvå̊*] of this resembles the defiler, as he deflects (others) from the truth...". Here "professor [*ṯkaēšō*]" is used in the sense of one who professes or declares something, which is consistent with 'teacher'. In Y49.3 Insler has "... the truth is to be saved for its (good) preference, that deceit is to destroyed for its (false) profession [*ṯkaēšāi*]...". Here the implied "(false)" refers to the previously mentioned "deceit". And here again, "for its (false) profession [*ṯkaēšāi*]" is used in the sense of something that is professed, believed, declared, all of which is consistent with 'teaching'. A more detailed look at how *ṯkaēša* is used in YAv. texts, is footnoted in *Part Three: Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu) An Analysis.*

[116] An implied verb is required here because of the acc. words *vacō. yesnīm*. Verbs often are implied in Avestan. And I agree with Mills that 'comprehend' (in the sense of 'encompass') best suits the context here because of *vīspəm* which means 'all'.

[117] *vacō yesnīm*:
vacō Skjaervo (2006) shows *vacō* as nom./acc. sg. of the ntr. noun stem *vacah-* 'word'; so also does Jackson 1892 § 339, p. 98.
yesnīm is a bit of a puzzle to construe.
Geldner shows *yesnīm* in at least 9 mss., *yasnīm* in at least 6 mss., and *yasnəm* in 1 ms. Geldner 1P, p. 81, ft. 5 to Yy21.3,).
Skjaervo 2006 and Jackson 1892 both show *yasnəm* as acc. sg. of the masc. noun stem *yasna-*. Neither of them shows a declension *yesnīm* for that stem. But Jackson says that YAv. has the acc. sg. inflection *-īm* for certain other *a-* stem words, such as *mašīm* 'mortal'. Jackson 1892) §§ 236, 239, pp. 70 - 71.

No case form (other than acc. sg.) fits *yesnīm*. (The gen. sg. 'of (the) worship' would be *yasnahyā* in GAv. and *yasnahe* in YAv., and the gen. pl. would be *yasnanąm* in both GAv. and YAv. (Skjaervo 2006; Jackson 1892 ibid.). I therefore take *vacō* (ntr.) and *yesnīm* (masc.) as two nouns ~ both acc. sg. and therefore the objects of the implied verb (referring to the 3 teachings),

'(they comprehend) the entire worship Word'. Yy21.2.

[118] See in *Part One: The Nature of the Divine; The Identity of the Divine;* and *Worship & Prayer;*
And in *Part Two: The Puzzle of Worship.*

[119] As detailed in *Part Two: A Question of Reward & the Path.*

[120]   This worship/celebration of the Divine in all that exists, explains (somewhat) how the worship/celebration of good people, animals, and natural elements may have got started in later Av. texts. It is not without interest (in my view) that the author of the Yenghe Haatam does not mention human beings. He only mentions *hātąm* 'of (among) beings' or 'of (among) those who exist', ~ a more generous, wider, perception than one that is purely homocentric.

Do living beings other than man, worship with the qualities of the divine? We have no way of knowing. But keep an open mind. Recent scientific studies among dolphins, whales, chimpanzees, wolves, elephants, other animals, and even life forms that are not mammals like octopuses, and some birds, have shown that other living things can and do feel, think, and act in beneficial and destructive ways. They can and do help each other (even inter~species help) and harm each other. If Public Television is to be believed, even trees and plants help and harm each other (including inter~species help).

Ancient Zoroastrians may or may not have had access to dolphins, whales, octopuses etc., but they lived in a rural environment ~ one in which both wild and domestic animals, as well as birds and other living things, were within the intimate daily observations of (and interactions with) enquiring human minds.

Having loved, and lived with, dogs all my life, I know for a fact that (some) dogs are intelligent. They think. They have emotions. They act in spiteful and beneficial ways, (including planning and carrying out revenge!). So I have no trouble at all in concluding that they are as much a part of the perfecting process as are human beings.

We tend to judge that we are "superior" to other life forms because they do not have certain human qualities.   But all such qualities are the function of our material shells. The material shells of other life forms have abilities that humans do not have.   If they were to judge us, using the same criteria as we use to judge them, they might think we humans are an "inferior" life form.   We cannot prove (as a fact) that even humans have 'souls'. How then can we (factually) conclude that other living things do not have souls? that we are capable of spirituality, but they are not? that we are part of the existence perfecting process, but they are not?

I admit, my past mental conditioning often gets in the way, but after studying Zarathushtra, I no longer subscribe to such views. I speculate that each material shell (whether human or some other life form) provides a set of tools which the unit of existence temporarily inhabiting that shell needs for its spiritual growth. No one set of these material tools is "superior" to another. Each tool set is useful for the particular experiences necesary for the perfecting process of existence ~ one existence, parts of which are temporarily encased in a great variety of material shall, each with its own tool set.

Of course, I respect your right to disagree.