

## Yasna 44.16

During Sasanian times, when Avestan was no longer used as a spoken language, (nor its grammar and vocabulary well understood), in order to make their prayers more meaningful, the Sasanian religious authorities created prayers in the language of their times, and incorporated into those prayers, some verses or phrases from the Gathas. The Kemna Mazda prayer is one such example. The first and second paragraphs of that prayer are from the Gathas ~ the 2d paragraph being lines b. through e. of Y44.16, which indicates how important this Gatha verse must have been to Zoroastrians, centuries (perhaps more than 1,000 years) after Zarathushtra's time.<sup>1</sup> In light of translation differences ~ even amongst eminent linguists ~ and because this verse has some rather lovely things to say (as I understand it), I offer this discussion of Y44.16.

I will tell you what I think, give the evidence on which my opinions are based, followed by a word by word analysis of the grammatical values and meanings of each word in this verse, as well as the interpretations and translations of our group of linguists, whose translations and comments are referenced here to avoid repeated references.<sup>2</sup> Each of their translations is also given in full at the end of this chapter so that you can see, and compare, their translation choices in context.

- a. *taṭ ǰwā pərəsā arəš mōi vaocā ahurā* ∴
- b. *kā vərəθrəm.jā ǰwā pōi sənghā yōi hantī*
- c. *ciθrā mōi dqm ahūm.biš.ratūm cīzđī*
- d. *aṭ hōi vohū sərəošō jantū manajhā*
- e. *mazdā ahmāi yahmāi vaši kahmāicīṭ* ∴ Y44.16, Geldner 1P p. 153.<sup>3</sup>

My translation.

- a. 'This I ask Thee, tell me truly, Lord.
- bc. What (is) victorious (over untruth) to protect through Thy teaching, (the) bright ones that exist in my house? Teach life healing judgment,
- d. then to it, let listening come through good thinking
- e. O Wisdom! ~ for this for which You wish, howsoever (accomplished).! Y44.16.

*Discussion.*

Throughout the Gathas, Zarathushtra asks questions of the Divine ~ many of them rhetorical, containing their own answers. Y44.16 is one such example. The question in line a. is one that is repeated verbatim in this Yasna 44, in every verse except the last one, 'This I ask Thee, tell me truly, Lord', the linguistics of which are generally agreed to. Some have objected to the translation 'truly' on the grounds that Wisdom (to whom this verse is addressed) could hardly speak falsely. But as Dastur N. D. Minochehr-Homji has explained<sup>4</sup> it is used here in the sense of 'disclose to me the truth of this matter'.

The next rhetorical question is in line b and the first half of line c. 'What (is) victorious (over untruth) to protect through Thy teachings, the bright ones that exist in my house?'

The literal and historical meanings of *vərəθrəm.jā* as 'smashing the obstacle' and 'victorious' are discussed below in the linguistic analysis. Here let us consider the nature of what is 'victorious'; the

nature of the 'obstacle' that is smashed. In the Gathas, Zarathushtra speaks of delivering "deceit [*druj-*] into the hands of truth [*aša-*]" Insler 1975, (or as I would translate it, delivering 'untruth [*druj-*] into the hands of truth [*aša-*]).<sup>5</sup> And in many verses, the obstacle, the enemy to be overcome, is what is false, wrong ~ the opposite of the true (good, correct) order of existence ('truth' for short). In addition, line b. speaks of protecting 'through Thy teachings'. Wisdom's 'teachings' are the path of truth, ~ the true order of existence (*aša-*), and its component qualities ~ its good comprehension (*vohu- manah-*), its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action (*spənta- ārmaiti-*), its good rule (*vohu- x šaθra-*), comprising a beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*) ~ qualities that make a being Divine (*amesha spənta*).<sup>6</sup> Thus, *vərəθrəm.jā* 'smashing the obstacle' or being 'victorious' refers to the victory of truth (and its component qualities) over its opposite ~ untruth (for want of a better word).

And in this verse Wisdom's teachings protect 'the bright ones [*ciθrā*] that exist in my house'. What does Zarathushtra mean by this phrase? Well, throughout the Gathas (and later texts), light (in its various forms) is used to describe the truth, and its comprehension,<sup>7</sup> ~ an enlightened existence (personified wisdom). In the Gathas, truth and its components are treated a few times as allegorical entities, but most often as concepts, qualities of the Divine, which (except for completeness and non-deathness) also exist in man (although not completely).<sup>8</sup>

The word *ciθrā* here is pl. If 'light' is used as a metaphor or symbol for truth, it would be reasonable to conclude (as discussed below) that the term 'bright ones' here includes the true order of existence and its components ~ its comprehension good thinking, its beneficial embodiment, its good rule, comprising a beneficial way of being. And in lines b.c., these 'bright ones' (truth and its component qualities) exist in Zarathushtra's 'house'. The word 'house' and related terms are often used in the Gathas as a metaphor for a state of being.<sup>9</sup> Thus the '(those) that exist ~ (the) bright ones ~ in my house', (*yōi hənī ciθrā mōi dām*) would mean the illumination of truth and its component qualities which exist in Zarathushtra's being ~ Zarathushtra standing for all mortals here, because these are qualities that all mortals have (although in varying degrees and not completely).

To summarize: the rhetorical question in lines b.c. asks ~ what will be victorious (over untruth) ~ to protect, with Wisdom's teaching, the illumination of truth and its component qualities, which exist in Zarathushtra (and all mortals)? The protective force here is Wisdom's teaching, which is the path of truth, its comprehension, its embodiment, its rule. So in essence, the question contains its own three-fold answer ~ each answer being the true (good, correct) order of existence.

~ Truth is what is victorious (over untruth).

~ The path of truth is the protection of Wisdom's teaching; and

~ The thing protected is the illumination of truth and its components, which exist (however incompletely) in Zarathushtra (and all mortals).

The rest of line c. and line d. echoes and supplements this answer in the form of a request to Wisdom, c. '... Teach life-healing judgment (*ahūm.biš.ratūm cīždī*), then to it, let listening come through good thinking (*aṭ hōi vohū səraošō jantū manayhā*).

So the answer to overcoming what is false/wrong and bringing about the victory of truth, is Wisdom's teaching (the path of truth) which requires us to acquire life healing judgment and then

listen to it ~ implement it with thoughts, words and actions. In GAv. (as in English) the word 'listening' (*səraošō*), means 'hearing and implementing what is heard'.<sup>10</sup>

But what is 'life-healing judgment'? The word 'judgment' is used here (as it is in the Ahuna Vairya) as an activity of the mind, an exercise in thinking and arriving at conclusions. In Zarathushtra's thought, 'life-healing judgment' is the kind of judgment that comprehends and accords with the true (good, correct) order of existence (which is another way of saying 'good thinking' *vohu- manah-*).

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

"...so also the judgment in accord with truth [*aθā ratuš ašātēt hacā*]..." Y27.13, the Ahuna Vairya Insler 1975.<sup>11</sup>

And what does he mean by 'life-healing' [*ahūm.biš*]?

A 'life-healer' [*ahūm.biš*] is a person who is loving [*kāθa-*], beneficial [*spānta-*] through the true (correct, good) order of existence, who watches over the well being of all existence, and is, in his way of being, an ally of Wisdom.

"...the loving man [*kāθa-*]<sup>12</sup> ... For such a person, [*spānta-*'beneficial'] through truth, watching over the heritage for all, is a world-healer [*ahūm.biš* 'life-healer'] and Thy ally in [*mainyu-* 'in (his) way of being'], Wise One." Y44.2, Insler 1975.<sup>13</sup>

What does Zarathushtra mean by "watching over the heritage for all,"? What is this "heritage"? We see the answer in Y49.5, where Zarathushtra speaks of the "lineage with truth",

"But that man, Wise One, is both milk and butter (for Thee), namely, the one who has allied his conception with good thinking. Any such person of [*ārmaiti-*] is of the (same) good lineage with truth and all those (other forces) existing under Thy rule, Lord." Y49.5.

In other words, truth is the lineage of a person who embodies truth in thought, word and action (a person of *ārmaiti-*). And in light of the fact that all the living have these 2 qualities, however imperfectly, truth is our common lineage, the heritage of all that exists.

And how does a 'life-healer' watch over this heritage for the benefit of all that exists? How does he heal life, existence?

Existence is healed through good thinking ~ through comprehending the true (correct, good) order of existence ~ (an exercise of good judgment),

"...Through good thinking the Creator of existence shall promote the true realization of what is most healing according to our wish." Y50.11, Insler 1975.<sup>14</sup>

Existence is healed through His rule "...By your rule, Lord, Thou shalt truly heal this world in accord with our wish." Y34.15, Insler 1975.

And what is His rule? It is the rule of truth (*aša-*), its beneficial embodiment (*spānta- ārmaiti-*), its most good comprehension (*vahišta- manah-* ~ which is the exercise of good judgment).

"Where shall there be protection instead of injury? Where shall mercy [*mərəždikā* 'compassion']<sup>15</sup> take place? Where truth [*aša-*] which attains glory? Where [*spānta- ārmaiti-*]? Where the very best thinking [*vahišta- manah-*]? Where, Wise One, through Thy rule? Y51.4, Insler 1975. Rhetorical questions which contain their own answer.

So, (returning to our verse Y44.16 "...Teach life-healing judgment ...") the judgment that overcomes what is false/wrong (lines bc.), that heals life, heals existence when 'listened to' (*səraoša-*) ~ when

heard and implemented in thought, word and action (line d.) ~ is the judgment that accords with the true order of existence (an existence that is Divine).

Which brings us to key differences of opinion in translations of this verse ~ the interpretations of *ratūm* and *səraošō*.

Eminent linguists agree that in Avestan, the stem *ratu-* is used for a concept ('judgment') and they believe that it is used also for a person who has this concept (sometimes translated as 'judge', sometimes as 'teacher').<sup>16</sup> So the question arises: In Y44.16, in using *ratūm*, does Zarathushtra intend a concept ('judgment'), or a person? And does *səraošō* mean 'listening' or 'obedience'.

All of our translators interpret *ratūm* as a person, and *səraošō* as 'obedience' (even though they all agree that *səraoša-* derives from *srao-/sru* 'to listen').<sup>17</sup>

Taraporewala 1951 translates *ratūm* here (in Y44.16) as "Teacher", commenting (under a different verse)<sup>18</sup> that in the Gathas and other YAv. texts *ahu-* is used for a "temporal sovereign", and *ratu-* is used for "the Supreme Spiritual Teacher". But (with respect) this conclusion is not supported by the evidence of the Gathas or other the Avestan texts. Indeed, in some YAv. texts, *ratu-* is used for both religious and secular persons, for persons in authority and not in authority, and for concepts as well.<sup>19</sup> In 1991, Humbach translated *ratūm* in this verse (Y44.16) as "judgment". But by 2010, he and Faiss preferred "judge", as did Bartholomae, Moulton 1912, and Insler 1975. All of these translations interpret this verse (Y44.16) as requiring obedience (*səraošō*) to a judge or Teacher (*ratūm*).

With respect, requiring obedience to a judge or teacher is an interpretation that reflects the mind-set of other religious paradigms. This interpretation (1) contradicts the thought of the Gathas, (2) does not fit the context of Y44.16 itself, and (3) does not fit the context of the verses which precede and follow it, as the following evidence demonstrates.

(1). In the Gathas, the relationship between man and the Divine is not only that of a Friend to a friend,<sup>20</sup> but it is a direct one ~ with no priestly hierarchy (or guru) to whom man must give obedience. The interpretations in Y44.16, of *ratūm* as "judge" or "teacher" to whom 'obedience' (*səraošō*) must be given, contradict this essential element of Zarathushtra's thought. A key verse in the Gathas is, "Listen with your ears to the best things. Reflect with a clear mind ~ man by man for himself ~ ..." Y30.2 Insler 1975. So we are told that after listening and reflecting, ultimately, each person has to make decisions for himself ~ independently.<sup>21</sup> The interpretation in Y44.16 that *ratūm* means a 'judge' (or 'teacher') to whom 'obedience' (*səraošō*) must be given, contradicts this key verse, and other verses which express the same thought.<sup>22</sup>

Two fundamentals of Zarathushtra's thought are the independent (but not insular) search for truth, and the freedom to choose (both generating the experiences that enable spiritual growth and both necessary for bringing about the desired end, the attainment of the true (correct, good) order of existence), neither of which can be accomplished by requiring 'obedience' (*səraošō*) to a 'judge' (or 'teacher') ~ interpretations which contradict these two fundamental teachings.<sup>23</sup>

(2). Let us next consider the micro context of the verse itself. In this verse itself, the protection in line b. is Wisdom's teaching (*θwā pōi sēnghā* 'to protect through Thy teaching'), which in other verses is the path of truth and its component qualities, including good thinking (*vohu- manah-*),<sup>24</sup> which fits the request that follows, 'Teach life healing judgment', ~ judgment that accords with truth

(which is 'good thinking'). This request is paralleled in other Gatha verses ("... instruct through good thinking (the course) of my direction..." Y50.6, Insler 1975; "...Instruct us to those paths of good thinking,..." Y34.12, Insler 1975). The 'instruction' requested is from the Divine ~ not from other human beings.

Moreover, by definition, 'obedience' means doing what you are told, whereas Y44.16 says '*... let [s̄raoṣ̄ō] come through good thinking*'. Good thinking involves reflecting, evaluating, pondering, and arriving at conclusions ~ all of which can only be done by the person who is doing the 'thinking'. Therefore to translate the phrase *vohū s̄raoṣ̄ō jantū manajhā* as 'let obedience come through good thinking' is a contradiction in terms (among other impolite things).

However 'let listening come through good thinking' presents no inherent contradiction. Indeed, 'good thinking' would be essential to determine the thoughts, words and actions which hear and implement (listen to) life healing judgment ~ the judgment which accords with truth (good thinking).

(3) Finally, let us look at Y44.16 in the context of the verses in which it is embedded ~ the two verses that precede it, and the verse that follows it (Y44.14, 15, 16, 17) ~ all of which, through rhetorical questions which contain their own answers, address the question of how untruth is to be destroyed. And here, I will use the Insler 1975 translation so that you need have no concern that I am moulding the evidence to fit my conclusion.

In Y44.14, a rhetorical question is asked which contains its own answer. "This I ask Thee. Tell me truly, Lord. How might I deliver deceit into the hands of truth, in order to destroy it in accord with the precepts of Thy teaching [*ḍwahyā maḍrāiš s̄nghahyā*]..." Insler 1975. Here, as in our verse Y44.16, the destruction of what is false is accomplished through Wisdom's teaching ~ which is the path of truth, its comprehension, its embodiment, its rule. There is no mention in this verse of the inconsistent idea that requires 'obedience' to a person (a 'judge' or 'teacher') in order to destroy what is false.

In Y44.15, the rhetorical question is asked from a slightly different perspective ~ whether the Lord has the ability to protect an existence of truth ~ but again, the protective force is His precepts (His teaching). "This I ask Thee. Tell me truly, Lord. If Thou hast the (necessary) mastery to protect [*pōi*] the world allied with truth in accordance with those commandments [*avāiš urvātāiš*]<sup>25</sup> Thou dost seek to uphold..." Y44.15 Insler 1975. In his commentary, Insler translates *urvātāiš* as "precepts" instead of "commandments", commenting that the phrase *avāiš urvātāiš* ('with those precepts') is parallel to the phrase *ḍwahyā maḍrāiš s̄nghahyā* 'with the precepts of Thy teaching' in the preceding verse Y44.14, and parallels the phrase *ḍwā pōi s̄nghā* "to protect in accord with Thy teaching" in the verse that follows Y44.16, our verse (pp. 249 - 250).

So in these 3 verses (Y44.14, 15, 16) we have parallel rhetorical questions, which contain their own answers ~ that the protection of truth in existence, and the destruction of what is false and wrong, is accomplished through Wisdom's teaching, the path of the true (good, correct) order of existence ~ teaching mortals to comprehend truth, acquire life-healing judgment (good thinking), and implement it. Obedience to any other human being ~ who by nature is necessarily fallible ~ would be incapable of protecting an existence of truth ~ especially not in accord with Wisdom's teachings, which require us to think for ourselves in an on-going search for truth.

Finally, we need to consider the verse that follows (Y44.17). "This I ask Thee. Tell me truly, Lord. Wise One, how shall I, with your accord, impassion your following, so that my voice might be

powerful (enough) to strive for alliance with completeness and immortality ...<sup>26</sup> in accordance with that precept which adheres to the truth?" Insler 1975. Clearly here, in Zarathushtra's view, the way to get people to follow the path of truth is to ignite their minds, inspire them, "impassion" them ~ all involving persuading people to follow the path of truth, of their own free will. An idea that is the opposite of requiring 'obedience' to a 'judge' or 'teacher'.

I (respectfully) question: How can we reasonably interpret Y44.16 in a way that has Zarathushtra asking Wisdom for a 'judge' to whom 'obedience' must be given, in light of what is said in our verse, in the two verses that precede it and in the one verse which follows it, that in effect untruth is defeated through the path of truth, the on-going search for truth and its comprehension, good thinking, which we learn from Wisdom ~ which accords "...Teach life healing judgment,..." in our verse.

For the foregoing reasons, I translate *ratūm* in Y44.16 as a concept 'judgment', and *səraošō* as 'listening' ~ both of which are linguistically correct (discussed below), are consistent with the framework of Zarathushtra's thought in the Gathas (and the Ahuna Vairya), and result in an interpretation of Y44.16 which fits its own context, as well as the context of the verses that immediately precede it, and follow it ~ Y44.14, 15, 16, and 17.

Which brings us to the last line in this verse. The translations in our group either do not account for each word in line e., or do not give each word its correct grammatical value. So we need to figure out what Zarathushtra's intent. Here I will give you only my translation choices. The translations of the linguists in our group are discussed below in the linguistic analysis of line e. Here is line e., with the lines that precede it, to give it context (in my translation).

bc. 'What (is) victorious (over untruth) to protect through Thy teaching, (the) bright ones that exist in my house? Teach life healing judgment,

d. then to it let listening come through good thinking

e. O Wisdom! ~ for this, for which You wish, howsoever (accomplished).

*mazdā ahmāi yahmāi vaši kahmāicīṭ ' '*

The enigma in line e. is caused by the unidentified pronouns *ahmāi yahmāi* 'for this, for which' and *kahmāicīṭ* 'to/for howsoever/whatsoever/whomsoever'. In GAv. all 3 words are dative ('to/for'), but in English translation, the preposition 'to' or 'for' is not repeated with the last word (explained below.

~ *ahmāi* 'for this' is a demonstrative pronoun. Such pronouns (when not used as an adjective) normally stand for something previously mentioned. So in line e. we have to ask: What does this pronoun stand for? To what does it refer?

~ *kahmāicīṭ*. We need to ask: In this context, which translation option fits best: 'howsoever'? 'whatsoever'? 'whosoever/whomsoever'?

Let us first consider 'for this [*ahmāi*]'. To what does this pronoun refer?

1. Does it refer to the desired end ~ being victorious over what is false (line b.), ~ which is the attainment of the true (correct) order of existence?
2. Does it refer to the previously mentioned 'life-healing judgment' (line c.) ~ which is judgment that accords with the true (correct) order of existence?

3. Does it refer the path ~ **listening to** (hearing and implementing) this judgment with thoughts, words and actions (line d.),  
 ~ which is the path of the true (correct) order of existence?

All three are mentioned in the preceding lines, and clearly all three reflect Wisdom's wish (line e.). But the addition in line e. of '**howsoever/whatsoever/whomsoever** [*kahmāicī*]', implies that Wisdom's wish has options. This disqualifies 1. and 2. above, in that ~

~ '**for this** [*ahmāi*]' cannot refer to the desired end, being **victorious** over what is false (1. above) because this end is the attainment of the true order of existence. So Wisdom's wish has no options here ~ Wisdom cannot wish for anything that is false, wrong ~ for anything that is not the true (good, correct) order of existence.

~ '**for this** [*ahmāi*]' cannot refer to Wisdom's life-healing judgment (2. above) because Wisdom's judgment cannot be anything other than truth ~ the true (good, correct) order of existence. So again, Wisdom's wish has no options here;

But '**for this** [*ahmāi*]' can indeed refer to the immediately preceding line d. (3. above), '**then to it, let listening come through good thinking**' ~ the path which implements life healing judgment in thought, word and action ~ because although the path advocated by Zarathushtra is the path of truth, the ways of implementing this path are many and varied ~ both by our choices and by the events which confront us (presumably as wished for by the Divine, to bring about the desired end). And such wishes of the Divine, are often expressed in ways that we cannot understand ('*why does 'God' allow this to happen?*'). But by adding to Wisdom's wish, the idea of '**howsoever (accomplished)**', I think Zarathushtra (once again!) expresses his belief in the nature of the Divine as one that is not arbitrary or capricious, not a mix of 'good' and 'bad', but one that is all-good,<sup>27</sup> and as such, will help us on our path towards the desired end in ways that are good, even though they may not seem so to us at the moment. I therefore conclude, '**for this, for which You wish ~ howsoever (accomplished)**' refers to the path in the preceding line d. ~ the path we must take ~ listening to (hearing and implementing) life-healing judgment in the many and varied circumstances of our lives ~ including those beyond our control (which presumably reflect Wisdom's wish).

*In conclusion*, this verse (Y44.16) tells us that the way to overcome what is false, wrong, is through Wisdom's teaching (the path of truth, its comprehension, its embodiment, its rule); asking Wisdom to teach us life healing judgment, and then listening to it with good thinking ~ hearing and implementing it (with each beneficial thought, word and action that embodies truth ~ which (incrementally) becomes an existence of truth, an existence in which what is false, wrong, has been overcome.<sup>28</sup> A path in which we can trust, ~ whatever it brings ~ because the nature, and therefore the wish, of the Divine is all good. To me, this is very beautiful. We see these same thoughts throughout the Gathas ~ expressed in kaleidoscopic ways ~ reflecting the same component parts, in different, beautiful designs.

In light of translation differences, you should question: Are my conclusions (detailed above) linguistically valid? Do they accurately reflect Zarathushtra's intent? Well, there is only one way to find out. You can judge for yourself, by considering the following word by word discussion of the grammatical values and meanings of each word, how they are put together, and by comparing different linguistic opinions (and interpretations!) in light of the micro and macro contexts. If you are not interested in such things, you may wish to skip to the end of this chapter, and just read for

comparative purposes the translations of this verse by each of the linguists in our group. But if you do, you will never know for certain, whether what I have told you (above) accurately reflects Zarathushtra's thought. The following linguistic discussion also illustrates the difficulties and ambiguities inherent in the Avestan language itself, our incomplete knowledge of it, and Zarathushtra's cryptic poetic style, all of which may help to explain why translations by eminent linguists differ so much, ~ sometimes in selecting English equivalents, and sometimes in how the words should be put together (syntax).

\* \* \* \* \*

Line a.

a. *taṭ ǰwā pərəsā arəš mōi vaocā ahurā.*

a. This I ask Thee, tell me truly, Lord.

This verse appears at the start of every verse in Yasna 44 except the last one. There is no substantive disagreement amongst linguists about the meaning or syntax of this line. This [taṭ] I ask [pərəsā] Thee [ǰwā], tell [vaocā] me [mōi] truly [arəš], Lord [ahurā]. The grammatical value and meaning of each word in this line has been detailed in *Part Six: Yasna 44.11*.

\* \* \*

Linguists differ on the syntax of the two lines that follow. Insler 1975 translates line b. and the first half of line c. as one syntactic unit. Our other translators do not. In this respect I find Insler's opinion persuasive, but I will show other opinions as well.

Line b and the 1st half of line c.

b. *kā vərəθrəm.jā / ǰwā pōi sənghā yōi hantī*

c. *ciθrā mōi dqm / ...*

bc. 'What (is) victorious (over untruth) to protect through Thy teaching, (the) bright ones that exist in my house? ...' my translation.

*kā* 'what'

*kā* is an interrogative pronoun. It is nom. sg. masc. of the conjectured stem *ka-* (Skjaervo 2006). Interrogative pronouns can stand for a person, place or thing (such as a concept). Skjaervo 2006 translates the stem *ka-* as 'who'. But Jackson 1892 shows that it means "who, which, what,"<sup>29</sup> (depending on whether it stands for a person, place, or thing). In this verse (Y44.16) all the translators shown here have translated *kā* as 'who' ~ standing for a person (a 'judge' or 'teacher'). I think it stands for a concept ~ '(good) judgment'. I therefore take *kā* here to mean 'what'. Both 'who' and 'what' are linguistically correct (examples of *ka-* words used for 'what' in many Gatha verses are given below under *kahmāicī*).

*vərəθrəm.jā*, 'victorious'

A difficult term which does not have a literal English equivalent, but we can arrive at a reasonably accurate alternative, based on its linguistics and historical usage in Av. texts.

Geldner shows *vərəθrəm.jā* as a compound word, and all translators in our group agree. Geldner footnotes many mss. variations none of which shows *vərəθrəm.jā* as a compound word in this verse. Mss. S1 shows it as one word, and all other mss. (available to Geldner) show *vərəθrəm* as separate



from *jā*. But these are scribal differences. Compound words often originated as two separate words, then evolved to compound words, and then frequently to one word.<sup>30</sup>

Skjaervo 2006 shows a GAv. noun stem *vərəθra-* (deriving from *var-*) 'obstruction' and a verb stem *gan-/jan-/gn-* 'to smash, strike'. For *-a-* stem nouns (like *vərəθra-*), the *-əm* inflection is acc. sg. *-* which in this compound word makes sense, because 'obstruction' or 'obstacle' is the object (acc.) that is smashed (*jā*).

Insler 1975 translates *kā vərəθrəm.jā* as "Who shall smash the obstacle (of deceit)", without comment.

Taraporewala 1951 comments that in YAv., the compound stem *vərəθra-jan* is the usual form, that it is used as an adjective 'victorious', and that a related YAv. ntr. noun is *vərəθra-γna* which means 'victory'. He takes *vərəθrəm.jā* as a compound adj. used as a noun and translates *kā vərəθrəm.jā* as "Who (shall be) the Victor...".

Humbach 1991 commenting on this verse (Y44.16) mentions the YAv. stem *vərəθrajan-* 'victorious'. On *vərəθrəm.jā* he notes that the two words could either be separate, or a compound, conjecturing the compound stem to be *vərəθrəm.jan-* which he thinks means 'resistance-breaker'. Like Geldner he takes it as a compound and translates *kā vərəθrəm.jā* as "Who (is) a resistance-breaker".

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *kā vərəθrəm.jā* as "Who (is) the victorious (hero...)".

Bartholomae and Moulton 1912 translate *kā vərəθrəm.jā* as "Who is victorious ...".

These differences can be reconciled. In the Gathas, the obstruction, the obstacle, the enemy, primarily is untruth *~* what is false, wrong, the opposite of the true (good, correct) order of existence. So it is easy to see how the idea of 'smashing the obstacle (of untruth)' came to mean 'victorious' in the later texts in which being 'victorious' included victory over the many things that are the opposite of the true order of existence (and also over other, unrelated things).<sup>31</sup> Did the stem adjective. *vərəθrəm.jan-* also mean 'victorious (over untruth)' in GAv. times? Probably so, because the word has ancient (Indo-Iranian) origins.<sup>32</sup>

The closest translation of the GAv. phrase *kā vərəθrəm.jā* which is consistent with the thought of the Gathas would probably be "What smashes-(the)-obstacle (of untruth)...". However, in fluent English, I think "What (is) victorious (over untruth) ..." more accurately conveys the meaning found in the Gathas and YAv. texts.

*pōi* 'to protect'

The infinitive form of the verb stem *pā* 'to protect' (Skjaervo 2006).

*θwā* 'through Thy'

A 2p possessive pronoun instr. sg. masc. ntr. of the stem *θwa-* (Skjaervo 2006). It is grammatically masc. because it belongs with the grammatically masc. noun *sānghā*.

*sānghā* 'through teaching'

instr. sg. of the masc. noun *sāngha-* which Skjaervo 2006 says literally means 'announcement', but which Insler 1975 says is used in the Gathas in a number of related senses, one of which is 'teaching'.<sup>33</sup> I take *θwā pōi sānghā* to mean 'to protect through Thy teaching'. Others translate *θwā pōi sānghā* as follows,

Insler 1975 "to protect in accord with Thy teaching",

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "to protect by your sentence",  
 Humbach 1991 "to protect ... by Thy proclamation",  
 Taraporewala 1951 "protecting through Thy teaching",  
 Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae "to protect by thy doctrine".

*yōi* 'that'

*yōi* is a relative pronoun nom. pl. masc. of the stem *ya-*.<sup>34</sup> Relative pronouns in GAv. can refer to a person, place or thing (such as a concept), so *yōi* can be translated as 'who/whom', 'which' or 'that' based on, to whom, or to what, the pronoun refers.<sup>35</sup>

So an open question in this verse is ~ to what pl. noun does *yōi* refer? All the translators considered here except for Insler 1975, think that *yōi* refers to beings who exist. They take *yōi hantī* as a unit. And to make their translations work, they all add an implied word (which in Av. is often required with a relative pronoun such as *yōi*).

Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *yōi hantī* as '(those) who [*yōi*] exist [*hantī*]'.  
 Taraporewala 1951 translates *yōi hantī* as '(all those) that [*yōi*] exist [*hantī*]'.  
 Bartholomae and Moulton translate *yōi hantī* as '(all) that [*yōi*] are' [*hantī*].

Insler 1975, adds no implied word (in this instance). He takes as one syntactic unit, the words *yōi hantī ciθrā mōi dqm*. And in his translation, the pl. *yōi* refers to the pl. *ciθrā*, translating the phrase *yōi hantī ciθrā mōi dqm* as "the pure ones [*ciθrā*] who [*yōi*] exist [*hantī*] in my house [*mōi dqm*]...".

In this context, I find Insler's syntax persuasive. I think that *yōi hantī ciθrā mōi dqm* is a unit, and the pl. *yōi* refers to the pl. *ciθrā*, but I translate *ciθrā* as 'bright ones', and *yōi* as 'that', because I think the 'bright ones' refers to the illumination of the qualities of the Divine (amesha spenta) that exist in man (exemplified in Zarathushtra).

*ciθrā* 'bright ones'

Let us start with the meaning. Skjaervo 2006 says that *ciθrā* is an adj. from the stem *ciθra-*, and means "brilliant, distinctive". There is also a noun stem *ciθra-* which means 'seed', but that (alone) does not fit this context. In this context however, *ciθrā* 'bright' cannot function as an adj. because there is no noun (of matching declension) which it could describe. Therefore, many translators agree that this adj. is used here as a noun (a frequent occurrence in Av.).

Insler 1975 translates *ciθrā* in this verse as a noun 'pure ones' (without comment). But in Y33.7, he translates *ciθrā* (nom. pl. fem. of *ciθra-*) as an adj. "bright" (without comment).

Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010, translate *ciθrā* in this verse as a noun "bright things" (without comment).

Moulton 1912 following Bartholomae translates *ciθrā* here as an instr. sg. noun "by vision".

Taraporewala 1951 translates *ciθrā* here as an adv. "clearly", describing the verb *cīždī*. (In Y33.7, he translates *ciθrā* (nom. pl. fem. of *ciθra-*) as an adj. "clear").

In this context, I take *ciθrā* as a pl. adj. which is used as a pl. noun, 'bright-ones', or 'bright-things' ('that exist in my house'). Which brings us to the question, ~ who or what are these 'bright-ones' or 'bright-things'? Believe it or not, understanding the linguistics (and context) of *ciθrā* help us to tease out its intended meaning (as you will see). So bear with me.

The stem *ciθra-* is an *a-* stem word; and the *-ā* inflection (as in *ciθrā*) is the form for more than one case/number/gender. For *a-* stems Jackson 1892 shows the YAv. *-a* inflection (the GAv. *-ā* inflection) for the following declensions §§ 236, 237, 238, p. 70,

- ~ for instr. sg. masc./ntr.,
- ~ for voc. sg. masc.
- ~ for nom./acc./voc. dual masc. and
- ~ for nom. pl. masc./ntr.

From this abundance of options ~ each of which affects the meaning ~ how do we pick the one which Zarathushtra intends, in this verse? Well, the relative pronoun *yōi* is the form for only one declension ~ nom. pl. masc. So if *yōi* refers to *ciθrā*, then in this context, *ciθrā* can only be nom. pl. masc. as well. Which raises some interesting consequences in puzzling out what Zarathushtra means by 'bright ones'.

The pl. indicates that the 'bright-ones' number more than two. If only two 'bright ones' had been intended (e.g. truth and good thinking ~ both ntr. nouns), the relative pronoun referring to them would have been nom. du. ntr. *yā*<sup>36</sup> ~ instead of *yōi* (nom. pl. masc.).

The masc. gender also sheds light on the intended meaning. The qualities of the Divine that exist in man are a mix of grammatical genders ~ ntr., fem., and masc.

- ~ truth (*aša-* a ntr. noun),
- ~ its comprehension good thinking (*vohu- manah-* a ntr. noun),
- ~ its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action (*spənta- ārmaiti-* a fem. noun),
- ~ its good rule (*vohu- x šaθra-* a ntr. noun),
- ~ a beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-* a masc. noun).

In GAv. when the pl. includes nouns of different grammatical genders, the masc. pl. is used generically.<sup>37</sup> (In addition, *spənta- mainyu-* 'a beneficial way of being', a masc. noun, includes within its meaning all the other amesha spenta).<sup>38</sup> So interpreting the 'bright ones' as these qualities of the Divine is a good fit with the grammatically masc. gender of both *ciθrā* and the pronoun that refers to it *yōi*. We see something grammatically similar in Y51.22b.

*mazdā ahurō yōi āṅharəcā hənticā*

In the Insler 1975 translation "... It is the Wise Lord as well as those who [yōi ] have existed and still exist..." Y51.22b.

In Y51.22, Insler 1975, Humbach 1991 and others, interpret "those who [yōi ] have existed and still exist..." to be the qualities of the Divine (amesha spenta), for many reasons, including that the nature of these qualities is non-dying ("have existed and still exist"), and because of parallels in YAv. texts.<sup>39</sup> Yet in Y51.22b, these Divine qualities (which include a mix of grammatical genders) are referred to by the masc. relative pronoun *yōi* ~ a generic masc.

To summarize: The interpretation that 'bright ones' here includes all the qualities of the Divine that exist in man (incompletely), is supported by the following facts,

- ~ 'light' words are often used for these qualities of the Divine (amesha spenta), in the Gathas and later texts ~ hence 'bright ones',
- ~ *yōi* and *ciθrā* are pl. indicating more than two qualities of the Divine,

- ~ the generic masc. pl., indicates the inclusion of all the grammatically different qualities of the Divine which exist in man (3 ntr. 3 fem. and 1 masc.); and
- ~ it is these qualities of the Divine (truth and its components) that smash the obstacle of untruth.

And these facts also flow into and inform our understanding of *səraošō* in line d. which speaks of 'listening' (hearing and implementing). What should be heard and implemented entails more than just two qualities ~ truth and its comprehension good thinking. Implementing also includes embodying the true (good, correct) order of existence with beneficial thoughts, words and actions (*spənta- armaidī-*), and bringing about its good rule (*vohu- x šaθra-*), in ourselves, and in our social units.

Perhaps a translation which is awkward, but which most accurately conveys the *meaning*, of *yōi hənī ciθrā mōi dqm* into English, would be 'the illuminations that exist in my house' ~ referring to the illumination of truth and its component parts which exist in Zarathushtra's being (albeit incompletely). How do we make the translation fluent, and still accurate? I think it is imperative that we translate Zarathushtra's words with as little interpretation as possible, consistent with meaning and readability. The translation 'bright-things' does not really convey the idea of intangible concepts, qualities. For that reason, and because these qualities of the Divine that exist in man are sometimes treated as allegories in the Gathas, I choose the translation of *ciθrā* as the 'bright-ones'.

*hənī* 'exist'

*hənī* is the form for 3p. pl. indicative (present tense) of the verb stem *ah-* (Skjaervo 2006). This stem verb means 'to be, to exist'. In this context, the 3p. pl. form of the verb ~ *hənī* ~ refers to *ciθrā* 'the bright ones'. Thus, *yōi hənī ciθrā* literally 'the bright ones [*ciθrā*] that [*yōi*] exist [*hənī*]'.

*mōi* 'my'

*mōi* is a 1p personal pronoun, and in GAv. it is one of the forms (enclitic) for gen. sg. ('my') and dat. sg. ('to/for me') (M&dV 2001 p. 69). In this context, those translators (shown below) who translate *mōi dqm* as 'in my house', take *mōi* as gen. sg. 'my'. Other translators (shown below) take it as dat. sg. 'to me'. In either event personal pronouns like *mōi* have no grammatical gender and are not required to match the case of the nouns they describe (unlike possessive pronouns, which is another story).

*dqm* 'in (my) house'

Skjaervo 2006 shows a ntr. stem *dam-* 'house', with *dqm* as its loc. sg. form. In English, the loc. is shown by the prepositions 'in/on/under/at' etc.). In this context, I agree.

Insler 1975, Humbach/Faiss 2010, and Humbach 1991 agree that *dqm* is loc. sg., translating *mōi dqm* as 'in my house'.

Taraporewala 1951, comments that Bartholomae takes *dqm* as acc. inf. of *dā-* 'to set up', [or 'to establish'] but Taraporewala himself translates the word as "Wise".

I translate line b. and the first half of c. as follows,

b. *kā vərəθrām.jā / θwā pōi sēnghā yōi hənī*

c. *ciθrā mōi dqm / ...*

bc. 'What (is) victorious [*kā vərəθrām.jā*] (over untruth) to protect [*pōi*] through Thy teaching [*θwā ... sānghā*], (the) bright ones [*ciθrā*] that exist [*yōi hantī*], in my house [*mōi dām*]?'

\* \* \*

Line c. 2d half.

c. ... / *ahūm.biš.ratūm cīždī*

*cīždī* 'teach'

There is no dispute that *cīždī* is a verb.

Beekes 1988 shows the verb stem *ciš-* 'to teach', with an imperative form *cīždī*.<sup>40</sup> I think the context supports Beekes.

Taraporewala 1951 comments that the verb stem is *ciš-* used in the sense of 'to reveal'.

Skjaervo' 2006 does not show a stem *ciš-*. He shows *cīždī* as aorist imperative of the conjectured verb stem *kaēš-* which he says means 'to assign'.

All the other translators in our group also translate *cīždī* as an imperative verb, but give it a different meaning without comment on its grammatical value, stem, meaning, or derivation. In light of these differences, one can only conclude that eminent linguists have engaged in a certain amount of interpretive guess work in their translations of the imperative verb form *cīždī*.

Beekes 1988 "teach";

Insler 1975 "promise";

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "direct";

Humbach 1991 "accord";

Taraporewala 1951 "reveal";

Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae "assure".

*ahūm.biš.ratūm* 'life healing judgment'

All mss. (available to Geldner) write *ahūm. biš. ratūm.* as three separate words, with two exceptions. K5 has *ahū. biš. ratūm.*<sup>41</sup> And 1 ms. (Pd) shows *ahūmbiš* as one word, which is Geldner's choice. None of these mss. show the words as compounds ~ *ahūm.biš* or *ahūm.biš.ratūm*. But as a practical matter, words that may have started out as separate words, often became a compound, and then sometimes one word, which may explain the one word *ahūmbiš* in ms. Pd.

Why should we care whether or not these 3 words are separate, or compounds? Because it affects the meaning of the line and verse, as we will see. So bear with me.

Jackson 1892, commenting on compound words in general, states that in Avestan, most compound words are written separately in the mss., but that it is often difficult to tell.<sup>42</sup> This is understandable, because in Av. punctuation, each word is separated from the next word by a space, dot, space, and depending on the spacing between words in a scribe's style of writing, one sometimes cannot tell if the scribe intended a compound.

At first thought, one might wonder how compound words were identified as such, in an age before these words were written. Well, in a language of inflections (where the form of a word governs its grammatical value), the grammatical forms of the component parts of the compound word (which otherwise might present a puzzle) require us to conclude that compound words did indeed exist in GAv. times, as Beekes 1988 has demonstrated.<sup>43</sup>

And we would have a grammatical tangle in construing the phrase *ahūm. biš. ratūm. cīždī*. if each word is a separate word (indicating the fallibility of the mss.). Why? Because of their declensions ~ *ahūm* (acc.) *biš* (nom.) *ratūm* (acc.) *cīždī* (imperative verb). Beekes 1988, Insler 1975, Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010 take *ahūm.biš* as one compound word and *ratūm* as a separate word.

Taraporewala 1951, Bartholomae, and Moulton 1912 take all three words as one compound word *ahūm.biš.ratūm*.

Beekes 1988 shows no compound word in GAv. texts which has more than two component words. Jackson 1892 says that compounds of three or more words are rare in Av., but do indeed exist, giving examples (from YAv. texts), and stating that the last part (or member) of the compound word normally provides the inflection which gives the entire compound word its grammatical value.<sup>44</sup> Let us consider these three words ~ their meanings, grammatical values, whether they form a compound, and if so, whether the original intent was a two word compound with *ratūm* as a separate word, or a three word compound *ahūm.biš.ratūm*.

Each of these 3 alternatives affect the meaning of the context differently.

*ahūm* is acc. sg. of the masc. noun *ahu-* 'life, existence' (Skjaervo 2006); Insler 1975 sometimes translates *ahu-* words as 'world'.

*biš* is derived from the verb stem *baēš-* 'to heal' (Skjaervo 2006). And *biš* is nom. sg.

Beekes 1988 translates *ahūm.biš* as a compound adj. 'life-healing' (p. 105).

So in a sense we can see the logic of *ahūm* being acc. sg. The accusative denotes the object of the verb-generated noun (here 'healing'), and life/existence (*ahūm* acc.), is the object that is healed.

*ratūm* is acc. sg. of the masc. noun stem *ratu-* (Skjaervo 2006). It therefore has to be the object of the verb *cīždī*. And in fact, all translations considered here show *ratūm* as an acc. sg. noun, the object of *cīždī*.

I think that in the Gathas, every instance of a *ratu-* word is used for a concept ('judgment', as the ability to arrive at mental conclusions). But Insler 1975 and Humbach think that in the Gathas, *ratu-* words are used for both a concept ('judgment') and a person who has that concept ('judge'). Let us assume (for the sake of argument) that they are correct. If so, the question arises ~ what did Zarathushtra intend in using *ratūm* in this verse (Y44.16) ~ a concept? a person? The reasons why I think Zarathushtra intended *ratūm* in this verse (Y44.16) to mean a concept ~ 'judgment' ~ and not a person, have been discussed in the *Discussion* section (above). But to understand the beauty of this verse, we need to look at the meaning of *ratūm*. Its meaning(s) and the ways in which it is used in the Gathas and later texts have been discussed in some detail in another chapter.<sup>45</sup> Here, I will summarize.

*ratu-* is derived from the root *ar-* which also generated Ved. *rta-*, Old Persian *arta-*, Avestan *aša-*. So the 'judgment' that is *ratūm* is intrinsically true, good ~ in accord with the true order of existence (*aša-*). In the Gathas, no *ratu-* word is used for 'bad' judgment,<sup>46</sup> which enables us to see how well *ahūm.biš* fits as a description of *ratūm*, because in the Gathas, it is truth and its components that heal existence. Let us now consider how these three fit with the imperative verb *cīždī*.

Jackson 1892 says that in Av. compounds, it is the last word of the compound that receives the inflection (which determines the case/number of the compound word), and that the preceding word(s) are also subject to some modification in form (§ 859, p. 236). Here the stem *ahu-* is so modified (to its acc. sg. form *ahūm*), and

Skjaervo 2006 shows *ahūm.biš* as a compound adjective nom. sg. masc. (indicating his view that *biš* is nom. sg. masc.) of a conjectured stem *ahūm.biš-*

If *ahūm.biš* is an adjective, it would normally describe a noun. But *ratūm* is the only noun in the phrase *ahūm.biš ratūm cīždī*, and if *ahūm.biš* is nom. sg., it cannot describe an acc. sg. noun (*ratūm*). To describe acc. sg. *ratūm*, the adj. *ahūm.biš* would have to be in acc. sg. form ~ not nom. sg.<sup>47</sup>

Insler 1975 solves this problem by taking the nom. sg. adj. *ahūm.biš* as a noun 'world-healer' (adjs. often are used as nouns in Avestan), adding an implied "As" to make the nom. sg. translation work with the imperative verb *cīždī*. Thus (words in red font are not in the GAv. text), *ahūm.biš ratūm cīždī* "As world-healer [*ahūm.biš*], promise [*cīždī*] us a judge [*ratūm*]", Insler 1975.

If *ahūm.biš* is taken as a nom. sg. noun, I would translate the phrase '(As) world-healer teach (true, good) judgment'. However, I do not think it is necessary to take this adj. as a noun.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 also takes *ahūm.biš* as a noun, but voc. sg., (thus literally 'O existence-healer' but they give it in English as) "O healer of existence". They think the entire line c. is one unit, translating

*ciθrā mōi dqm ahūm.biš ratūm cīždī* "Direct [*cīždī*] a judge [*ratūm*] (to put down) bright things [*ciθrā*] in my house [*mōi dqm*], O healer of existence [*ahūm.biš*]."

Taraporewala 1951 explains that Bartholomae solves the puzzle of the enigmatic *ahūm.biš* being nom. sg., by combining all three words *\*ahūm.biš.ratūm* into one compound, arguing that the compound would then be acc. sg. (governed by its acc. sg. last word *ratūm* and therefore the object of the verb *cīždī*). Taraporewala 1951 and Moulton 1912 follow Bartholomae. And all three also see line c. as one unit.

Taraporewala 1951 "Clearly [*ciθrā*] unto me [*mōi*] reveal [*cīždī*] the Wise [*dqm*] Soul-healing-Teacher [*ahūm.biš.ratūm*].

Bartholomae and Moulton 1912 translate *ciθrā mōi dqm ahūm.biš.ratūm cīždī* as "By vision assure me how to set up the judge who heals the world" ~ which would make *ahūm.biš.ratūm* literally the 'world-healing-judge'.

At first thought, I was skeptical when I read the argument in support taking *ahūm.biš.ratūm* as one compound word, thinking that it was an attempt to mould the evidence to fit the desired conclusion (a temptation that should be resisted). But after studying Jackson's explanation of compound words I agree that *ahūm.biš.ratūm* is not only linguistically accurate and also best fits the context (although I translate it differently).

The phrase *ahūm.biš.ratūm cīždī* is a key one ~ the beginning of the answer to the questions in Y44 verses 14, 15, and 16. As such, the three-word compound fits very well indeed. It reflects a key teaching of Zarathushtra, and generates a rather lovely, meaningful, translation, without the necessity of adding implied words that are not in the GAv. text. I am grateful to Bartholomae for his insight, and I am grateful to Jackson for his explanation of compound words. I follow

Bartholomae, Moulton and Taraporewala in taking *ahūm.biš.ratūm* as one compound word, which I translate 'life~healing~judgment' ~ the object (acc. sg.) of *cīždī*. In GAv. syntax the verb often (but not always) is placed at the end of the sentence or phrase.

Thus, I translate *ahūm.biš.ratūm cīždī* as 'Teach [*cīždī*] life~healing~judgment' [*ahūm.biš.ratūm*].

\* \* \*

Line d.

d. *aṭ hōi vohū səraošō jantū manajhā*

d. 'then to it, let listening come through good thinking'

*aṭ* 'then'

*aṭ* is a particle which Skjaervo 2006 says connects a statement with what precedes it, giving as examples, the following English equivalents 'then, so, thus, but'. In this context, I think 'then' fits best.

*hōi* 'to it'

*hōi* is a 3p personal pronoun gen./dat. sg. of the conjectured stem *hi-* (Skjaervo 2006). In Avestan, personal pronouns are not gender specific.<sup>48</sup> The gen. sg. does not work in this context. As dat. sg. *hōi* (not being gender specific) means 'to him/her/it' or 'for him/her/it'. Here, *hōi* refers to 'life~healing~judgment' (in line c.), which is what is 'victorious (over untruth)' (in line b.). In English, 'life~healing~judgment' has no intrinsic gender, so I translate *hōi* as 'to it'.

In Avestan the masc. gender of *ratūm* 'judgment' is purely grammatical.

However, all the translators in our group see *ratūm* as a person ~ a 'judge', or a 'teacher' ~ and they translate *hōi* as 'to him'.

*səraošō* 'listening' (in the sense of hearing and implementing what is heard).<sup>49</sup>

*səraošō* is nom. sg. of the masc. noun *səraoša-* which derives from the verb *srao-* "to hear, to listen" (Skjaervo 2006).

Skjaervo translates the noun *səraoša-* as "readiness to listen". But all the other translators considered here translate *səraošō* as 'obedience' (even though it does not derive from a verb 'to obey'). Thus 'obedience' (which means 'doing as you are told'), is an interpretive translation, reflecting religious paradigms that are not consistent with the thought system of the Gathas or the context of this verse (as discussed above). The meaning of *səraoša-* has been discussed in detail in another chapter.<sup>50</sup>

*jantū* 'let come'

*jantū* is 3p aor. imp. of the verb stem *gam-* one meaning of which is 'to come' (Skjaervo 2006). All of our translators have translated *jantū* as 'let come', which fits the context. Thus literally 'let (listening *səraošō*) come'.

*vohū ... manajhā* 'through good thinking'

There is no dispute that *vohū* and *manajhā* are each instr. sg. of their respective stems *vohu* and *manah-* (which is a ntr. noun). In Av. both the adj. and the noun it describes must be in the same declension ~ here instr. sg. ntr. which literally would mean 'through~good through~thinking'. But



in English the word that indicates the instrumental ('by/with/through') is used only once for both instr. words. Thus depending on the context, the translator may choose 'through good thinking' or 'with good thinking' or 'by good thinking'. In this context, I think 'through good thinking' is the most accurate English equivalent.

You may notice that in the phrase *vohū səraošō jantū manajhā*, the instr. sg. ntr. adj. *vohū* and the instr. sg. ntr. noun it describes *manajhā*, encapsulate, or frame, the words *səraošō jantū*. This kind of framing is often done in Av. syntax when the encapsulated or framed word(s) have a special relationship, or form a unit of thought, with the two words that belong together (here the adjective *vohū* and its noun *manajhā*) which frame or encapsulate the words in between,<sup>51</sup> ~ *vohū səraošō jantū manajhā*, indicating that these words form one unit of thought ~ the coming of listening is accomplished through good thinking.

Thus line d. *aṭ hōi vohū səraošō jantū manajhā*

Literally 'then [aṭ] to it [hōi] let come [jantū] listening [səraošō] through good thinking [vohū ... manajhā]'

Or in more fluent English 'then to it, let listening come through good thinking'.

\* \* \*

Line e. *mazdā ahmāi yahmāi vaši kahmāicīṭ* ∴

e. O Wisdom! ~ for this for which You wish, howsoever (accomplished).

This line in particular demonstrates the translation uncertainties that are inherent in the Avestan language ~ uncertainties that are magnified by the cryptic style of the Gathas.

*mazdā* 'O Wisdom!' voc. sg. of the stem *mazdā-* (Skjaervo 2006). No dispute here. I think it belongs with the preceding line d., 'then to it, let listening come through good thinking, O Wisdom!' But in translation, it could equally belong at the end of line e. without affecting the meaning, 'for this for which You wish, howsoever (accomplished), O Wisdom!'.

*ahmāi* 'for this'

*ahmāi* is dat. sg. masc./ntr. of the demonstrative pronoun stem *a-*. And in Avestan, such demonstrative pronouns are also used for 3p pronouns.<sup>52</sup> Therefore, (as dat. sg.) *ahmāi* could mean to/for it, 'to/for this, to/for that, or 'to/for him.'<sup>53</sup> Which of these meanings a translator might choose in a given context would depend on what the translator thinks the pronoun stands for ~ a person ('to/for him') or a concept, place, or thing ('to/for it, to/for this, to/for that').

I have already explained (in the *Discussion* section above) why I think, in the context of this verse, *ahmāi* means 'for this' ~ referring to the path in line d., which implements life healing judgment in the many and varied circumstances of our lives, including those beyond our control (which presumably reflect Wisdom's wish).

*yahmāi* 'for which'

*yahmāi* is dat. sg. masc./ntr. of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*.<sup>54</sup> A relative pronoun can stand for a person, place, or thing (including a concept). Therefore, (as dat. sg. masc./ntr.) *yahmāi* can mean any of the following 'to/for whom', or 'to/for which', or 'to/for that' and once again, a translator's choice in line e. would depend on what the translator thinks the pronoun stands for ~ a person, or

a concept (or other thing). Many of the translators in our group do not separately account for *yahmāi* in line e. Taraporewala accounts for it, but does not give it a dat. sg. translation, believing it to be dat. sg. by "case attraction". These translation differences are discussed below when we consider line e. as a whole.

*vaši* 'You wish'

*vaši* is 2p sg. indicative (present) of the verb stem *vas-* 'to wish' (Skjaervo 2006). The 2p pronoun (you) is implicit in the verb form. The 'you' here is sg. (but 'Thou wishest' is awkward in today's English). There are no capital letters in Av. script. But since these words are addressed to Wisdom, I have used an initial capital in English script.

*kahmāicī̄t* 'howsoever'

This is a difficult word to translate, in the context of line e. I will show you my line of reasoning, and you can decide for yourself.

An **interrogative pronoun** is one that raises a question, and the interrogative pronoun stem *ka-* means 'who?', 'what?' (discussed under *kā* in line b. above), and also 'how?'. Now 'how?' has an adverbial flavor because its question is always related to the action of a verb.

For example, *how will you accomplish this?* The question *how* relates to the verb *accomplish*. Or *how could this happen?* The question *how* relates to the verb *happen*.

Yet Skjaervo 2006 shows that the adverb *kaṭa-* 'how?' is derived from "*ka- how?*" And *ka-* is indeed an interrogative pronoun stem. So in GAv. for the word 'how' we seem to have ~ an interrogative pronoun stem that can be used adverbially (just as in GAv. we have adjective and noun stems that can be used adverbially).

*kahmāi* is the dat. sg. masc. form of *ka-* (Skjaervo 2006). Add the *-cī̄t* and what happens?

An **indefinite pronoun** is one which does not stand for any particular person, place or thing. For example, 'anyone, someone, anything, something', 'whatsoever' (literally, 'whatever *it* may be' ~ a pronoun), 'whomsoever' (literally 'whomever *s/he* may be'), 'howsoever' (literally 'however *it* may' ~ indicating the condition of the pronoun), et cetera.

An indefinite pronoun is formed by adding the suffix *-cī̄t* to an interrogative pronoun (usually preceded by a relative pronoun ~ here dat. sg. *yahmāi* 'for which').<sup>55</sup>

Thus dat. sg. *kahmāicī̄t* could be translated as 'to/for whomsoever', 'to/for whatsoever', 'to/for howsoever', etc.

And a translator's choice would depend on how he translates the other words which provide the context in which the indefinite pronoun (here *kahmāicī̄t*) occurs. In this context, those who think *ratūm* means a 'judge', have chosen 'whomever' (or equivalent words) for *kahmāicī̄t*. I think *kahmāicī̄t* and *yahmāi* refer to whatever Wisdom wishes. I therefore translate *kahmāicī̄t* as 'howsoever' (literally 'however *it* may be'), adding an implied verb which this indefinite pronoun requires. Thus 'howsoever' (accomplished).

The word *kahmāicī̄t* is dative sg. masc./ntr. In English the dative case is translated by adding 'to' or 'for' before the pronoun (or noun, or adj.). And you may notice, that I (and some other translators shown here) have not added either of the dat. words 'to' or 'for' before *kahmāicī̄t* even though it is dat. sg. This is because in Av. (with some exceptions) when two words (nouns, pronouns, adjs.) belong together (grammatically), each of them must be in the same case/number/gender as

the other. But when translated into English the dat. word 'to' or 'for' is used only once, before the first of the two dat. words. Here is a simple example: the dat. sg. noun and its dat. sg. adj. *ašāi vahištāi* would literally require 'for truth for (the) most good', but in normal English it would be translated 'for truth, (the) most good' or 'for (the) most good truth' ~ the 'for' being used only once, before the first dat. word. In our verse, *ahmāi* and *kahmāicīṭ* are pronouns (not an adj. and its noun, as in the example *ašāi vahištāi*). But I think they belong together because *kahmāicīṭ* 'howsoever (accomplished)', refers to the 2 preceding dat. pronouns 'for this [*ahmāi*], for which [*yahmāi*]', so in English, the dat. 'for' is not used again with dat. *kahmāicīṭ* 'howsoever'.

Giving us: '... for this [*ahmāi*] for which [*yahmāi*] You wish [*vaši*], howsoever [*kahmāicīṭ*] (accomplished).'

None of the linguists in our group account for all of the GAv. words in line e. with the exception of Taraporewala who accounts for each word but does not give some of them their actual grammatical values. And not all of them place added words (which are not in the GAv. text) in round parentheses. I show such words in red font.

Line e. *mazdā ahmāi yahmāi vaši kahmāicīṭ*

My translation. 'O Wisdom [*mazdā*] ! ~ for this [*ahmāi*], for which [*yahmāi*] You wish [*vaši*] ~ howsoever [*kahmāicīṭ*], (accomplished).'

Inslar 1975. "to him [*ahmāi*] whomsoever [*kahmāicīṭ*] Thou dost wish [*vaši*] him to be, Wise One [*mazdā*]." *yahmāi* 'for which' or 'for whom' is not accounted for in this translation; and the words 'him to be' are not in the GAv. text.

Humbach 1991 "O Wise One [*mazdā*], to him [*ahmāi*], to whomsoever [*kahmāicīṭ*] Thou wishest [*vaši*]." *yahmāi* 'for which' or 'for whom' is not accounted for in this translation.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "to that one [*ahmāi*], to whomsoever [*kahmāicīṭ*] you wish [*vaši*], O Wise One [*mazdā*]." *yahmāi* 'for which' or 'for whom' is not accounted for in this translation.

Taraporewala 1951 "unto-any-one [*ahmāi*] so-ever [*kahmāicīṭ*] whom [*yahmāi*] Thou-dost-love [*vaši*], O Mazda [*mazdā*]." The word *ahmāi* is translated here as an **indefinite pronoun**, instead of as a demonstrative or 3p pronoun; dat. sg. *yahmāi* is translated here as **accusative** (the object of 'Thou-dost-love').

Moulton 1912 (following Bartholomae), "unto every man [*kahmāicīṭ*] whom [*yahmāi*] thou desirest [*vaši*], O Mazdah [*mazdā*]." The word *ahmāi* is not accounted for in this translation; dat. sg. *yahmāi* is translated here as **accusative** (the object of 'Thou-dost-love').

\* \* \* \* \*

As you can see from the above discussion of lines b. through e., linguists differ both in the meanings of words and how they are put together (syntax), and their translation choices do not account for each word, sometimes do not give a word its GAv. grammatical value. If you enjoy puzzles, you may wish to try different alternatives (keeping in mind the grammatical rules and values and the meanings of each word in lines b. c. d. and e.), to figure out how the various pieces of the puzzle (the words) fit together to give us a meaningful whole ~ because (subject to poetic constraints) Zarathushtra's intent in crafting this verse was not to engage in a linguistic exercise. It was to convey his ideas. On the other hand, to understand his ideas, we have to understand, as accurately as possible, the

language he used. We cannot ignore or change the grammatical values and meanings of his words in ways that do not accord with Avestan usage without doing violence to the ideas he wants to convey.

\* \* \* \* \*

Let us now look at the verse as a whole, in various translations. Read them with a critical (but not hostile) mind. English words that are not in the GAv. text are not always placed in round parentheses by all translators. Not all GAv. words are accounted for in these translations, and sometimes a GAv. word is not given its grammatical value. And you will need to consider whether translation (and interpretation) choices are in accord with the micro and macro contexts.

- a. *taṭ ʔwā pərəsā arəš mōi vaocā ahurā* ∴
- b. *kā vərəθrəm.jā ʔwā pōi sānghā yōi hantī*
- c. *ciθrā mōi dqm ahūmbiš ratūm cīždī*
- d. *aṭ hōi vohū sərəošō jantū manajhā*
- e. *mazdā ahmāi yahmāi vaši kahmāicīṭ* ∴ Y44.16.

My translation

- a. 'This I ask Thee, tell me truly, Lord.
- b. What (is) victorious (over untruth), to protect through Thy teachings,
- c. the bright ones that exist in my house? Teach life healing judgment,
- d. then to it let listening come through good thinking
- e. O Wisdom! ~ for this, for which You wish, howsoever (accomplished)! Y44.16.

Insler 1975

- a. "This I ask Thee. Tell me truly, Lord.
- b.c. Who shall smash the obstacle (of deceit) in order to protect, in accord with Thy teaching, those pure ones who exist in my house? As world-healer, promise us a judge,
- d.e. and let obedience to him come through good thinking, to him whomsoever Thou dost wish him to be, Wise One." Y44.16.

Humbach 1991

- a. "This I ask Thee. Tell me plainly, Lord.
- b. Who (is) a resistance-breaker (able) to protect (those) who exist by Thy proclamation?
- c. Accord (as) a judgment bright (things to be) in my house, O Healer of existence,
- d. Let (recompense for) obedience come to him through good thought,
- e. O Wise One, to him, to whomsoever Thou wishest." Y44.16

Humbach/Faiss 2010

- a. "This I ask you, tell me truly, O Lord:
- b. Who (is) the victorious (hero able) to protect, by your sentence, those who exist?
- c. Direct a judge (to put down) bright things in my house, O healer of existence/world,
- d. (and) let, through good thought, hearing/obedience come to him,
- e. to that one to whomsoever you wish, O Wise One." Y44.16

Taraporewala 1951

- a. "This do-I-ask Thee, tell me truly, O Ahura;
- b. Who (shall be) the Victor protecting through-Thy Teaching (all those) that exist?
- c. Clearly unto me reveal the Wise Soul-healing-Teacher,
- d. and let Sraoša come unto him, with Vohu Mano,
- e. unto-any-one so-ever whom Thou-dost-love, O Mazda." Y44.16

Moulton 1912 (whose translation is the same as that of Bartholomae).

- a. "This I ask thee, tell me truly, Ahura.
- b. Who is victorious to protect by thy doctrine (all) that are?
- c. By vision assure me how to set up the judge that heals the world.
- d. Then let him have Obedience coming with Good Thought,
- e. unto every man whom thou desirest, O Mazdah." Y44.16.

\* \* \* \* \*

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Part Four: Zarathushtra's Date & Place*.

<sup>2</sup> References to Skjaervo 2006 are to his on-line *Old Avestan Glossary*.

Insler 1975: his translation and fts. are at p. 71; his comments at pp. 250 - 251.

Humbach 1991: his translation is in Vol. 1, p. 161; his comments in Vol. 2, p. 158.

Humbach/Faiss 2010: their translation is at p. 126; their comments at p. 184.

Taraporewala 1951: his translation is at p. 513; his comments at pp. 514 ~ 516; and he includes Bartholomae's English translation at p. 516.

Moulton 1912: his translation is at p. 369.

<sup>3</sup> Geldner 1P, p. 153. This verse (Y44.16) itself appears at p. 153, but the footnotes, showing mss. variations are on pp. 152 - 153. I have shown the ceasura (the poetic break in each line) based on Insler 1975, and Humbach/Faiss 2010. Mss. differences in writing the compound word *ahum.biš.ratūm* and the choice of Geldner and other translators is discussed under that term in this chapter.

<sup>4</sup> Dastur N. D. Minochehr Homji, in unpublished lectures given in Chicago many years ago, which for a while I had on tapes. I give his explanation from recollection so these may not be his exact words.

<sup>5</sup> The following examples show that in the Gathas, the victory is of truth; it is untruth that is destroyed (through good thinking),

"... then, for Thee, Wise One, shall the rule of good thinking be at hand, in order to be announced to those, Lord, who shall deliver deceit into the hands of truth." Y30.8; Insler 1975.

"... How might I deliver deceit into the hands of truth, in order to destroy it in accord with the precepts of Thy teaching,..." Y44.14, Insler 1975.

<sup>6</sup> Detailed in *Part Two: A Question of Reward & the Path*; and *The Puzzle of Worship*.

<sup>7</sup> Detailed in *Part Two: Light, Glory, Fire*.

<sup>8</sup> Detailed in the first few chapters in *Part One*.

<sup>9</sup> This evidence is discussed in *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise and Hell*.

<sup>10</sup> Discussed in *Part Three: Seraosha*.

<sup>11</sup> See *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo), an Analysis*, which compares the Insler 1975 and other translations.

<sup>12</sup> Commenting on his translation of *kāθa-* as 'loving' in Y44.2, Insler 1975 points out the correspondence between '*dāθa/dāta-*', '*hiθa/hita-*', and '*urvaθa-/urvata-*', and concludes that this correspondence exists between '*kāθa-*' 'loving' and *kātā-* 'love', pointing to *x ratu.kāta-*, in Yt. 13.16. He also points to a parallel idea in the Gatha verse Y47.4cd which speaks of being loving [*kāθā*] to the truthful. (p. 243).

Parenthetically *x ratu.kāta-* would mean (in YAv.) more literally 'wisdom-love', or in more fluent English 'love of wisdom'. In YAv. *x ratu* had evolved to mean 'wisdom'; but in GAv. its meaning was closer to 'reason'. So if *x ratu.kāta-* were to be used in GAv. it would mean (more literally) 'reason-love', or in more fluent English 'love of reason'. The way in which the meanings and flavors of *x ratu-* words evolved from GAv. to YAv. is discussed in *Part Three: Xratu*.

<sup>13</sup> A somewhat parallel thought occurs in, "[The person who, really in accordance with truth, shall bring to realization for me, Zarathushtra, what is most healing according to \(our\) wish, ...](#)" 46.19 Insler 1975.

<sup>14</sup> See also *Part Two: The Solution of Yasna 29*.

<sup>15</sup> Bartholomae translates *mərəždika-* as 'compassion' (among other things), discussed in *Part One: Good Rule, Vohu Xshathra*.

<sup>16</sup> Detailed in *Part Three: Ratu*.

<sup>17</sup> The meaning of *səraoša-* as 'listening' (hearing and implementing) is detailed in *Part Three: Seraosha*.

<sup>18</sup> Taraporewala 1951p. 41, commenting under Y29.2. For a discussion of how *ahu-* is used in Y29.2 see *Part Two: The Solution of Yasna 29*.

<sup>19</sup> Detailed in *Part Three: Ratu*.

<sup>20</sup> Detailed in *Part One: The Nature of the Divine*.

<sup>21</sup> See *Part One: Meditation & Contemplation*.

<sup>22</sup> Discussed in *Part One: The Freedom To Choose*.

<sup>23</sup> See *Part Two: Asha & the Checkmate Solution*; and in *Part One: The Freedom to Choose*; and *The Search for Truth*; and *Differences in the Spirit of Friendship*.

<sup>24</sup> Detailed in *Part Two: A Question of Reward & the Path*.

<sup>25</sup> Skjaervo 2006 shows the stem *urvāta-* to mean "deal (between gods or gods and men)." Thus, if we substitute this meaning into the Insler 1975 translation, we would "[...in accordance with those \[agreements\] which Thou dost seek to uphold...](#)" Y44.15. But such transactions between 'gods' and men (while relevant to the deities of Zarathushtra's culture) are not found in the Gathas, in which humans do not give the Divine material gifts (such as the horses, oxen, etc. in YAv Yashts) in return for success in battle, and other desired things. Insler's opinion 'precepts' is a better fit in the macro context of the Gathas.

<sup>26</sup> The string of dots indicates that I have omitted the interpretive words "(for Thee)" which Insler 1975 has inserted in round parentheses, indicating that they are not in the GAv. text of Y44.17.

<sup>27</sup> Detailed in *Part One: The Nature of the Divine*.

<sup>28</sup> Detailed in *Part Two: A Question of Reward & the Path*.

<sup>29</sup> Jackson 1892 § 406, p. 115.

<sup>30</sup> This evolution of two words to a compound word, to one word is discussed with examples given, in *Part Three: Evolution of the Name(s), Ahura, Mazda*.

<sup>31</sup> In the Gathas the word *druj-* is used for all the things that are the opposite of the true (good, correct) order of existence ~ things that are false, and also things that are 'wrong' such as fury, cruelty, violence, bondage, tyranny, destruction, murder, theft etc. I therefore do not think 'deceit' covers the full meaning of *druj-*. See a footnote *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise & Hell*, for the evidence of how *druj-* is used as the opposite of *aša-* in the Gathas, which is why I opt for 'untruth'.

But unlike the Gathas, in YAv. texts, *druj-* 'evil' was not limited to what was intrinsically evil. It was expanded to include many things in nature that are not intrinsically evil, but were thought to be so in YAv. times because they were (thought to be) harmful to man. And in YAv. texts, 'victory' is used in the sense of overcoming many of these 'evils' in their expanded idea of the meaning of *druj-*.

<sup>32</sup> The Av. *vərəθra-jan* 'victorious', (*vərəθra-yna* 'victory') has Arya origins. Its historical evolution may be summarized as follows.

Taraporewala 1951 notes that the word is the same as the Vedic *Vṛtrahán*, an epithet of the deity Indra.

Skjaervo 2003 says that *vərəθra-jan* means 'obstruction-smashing, victorious'.

Moulton 1912 notes Bartholomae's opinion that *vṛtrahan-vərəθrajan* means "assault-repelling, victorious". Moulton identifies *vərəθrayna* as the "Avestan genius of Victory"; (as such, *vərəθrayna* brings to my mind the beautiful Greek sculpture 'Winged Victory of Samothrace'). Moulton states that originally *vərəθrayna* was the name of one of the "old Aryan gods". He explains that *Vṛtrahan*, a name of the deity Indra "is assumed to mean 'slayer of *Vṛtra*'"; that the Indo-Iranians invented a demon to explain *Vṛtra*, but that "the true meaning of *vṛtra* was lost. (Moulton 1912 pp. 427, 103, 69).

Malandra 1983, states that in a famous Vedic myth, the God *Indra* casts the anticosmic demon *Vṛtra* down into "long darkness" after having separated the cosmos (*sat*) from chaos (*asat*). Malandra 1983, p. 12.

Therefore *Vṛtra* may have been associated with the opposite of true, good, correct order (Ved. *ṛta*, GAv. *aša-*). Hence smashing *Vṛtra* would be smashing the opposite of this (true, good, correct) order.

In the Gathas, the obstacle, the 'enemy' is untruth. This gives us the idea of 'victorious' in the sense of smashing the obstruction, the obstacle, the assault (of evil). And indeed that is how the word is used in the Gathas and YAv. texts ~ as being 'victorious' over evil (which in the Gathas is what is intrinsically 'evil' but in the YAv. texts is what is 'evil' in their expanded sense of the word including things that are not intrinsically 'evil').

<sup>33</sup> Insler 1975, p. 180, commenting under Y31.1, he explains that *səngha-* derives from the root *sanh* and is used in several senses in the Gathas, one of which is the noun 'teaching', (giving examples) which is the way he translates *sənghā* in our verse (Y44.16).

<sup>34</sup> There is no dispute that *yōi* can only be nom. pl. masc. Skjaervo 2006 *Old Avestan*, Lesson 3 pp. 26 - 27; Jackson 1892 §§ 399, 400, pp. 114 - 115; M&dV 2001 § 22.3, pp. 73 - 74.

<sup>35</sup> Jackson 1892 §§ 399, 400, pp. 113, 115.

<sup>36</sup> Jackson 1892 §§ 399, 400, pp. 113, 115.

<sup>37</sup> See *Part Five: Avestan Genders, Grammatical and Actual*.

<sup>38</sup> See *Part One: The Beneficial Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu*.

<sup>39</sup> Discussed in *Part One: Love*, and in *Part Six: Yasna 51.22*.

<sup>40</sup> Beekes 1988 pp. 168, 169. Beekes shows the imperative form *ciždi* with a short final *i*, whereas Geldner 1P p. 152 - 153 shows *ciždī* with a long final *ī*, with no mss. differences footnoted. It is possible that the difference arises from the fact that Beekes spells words in what he believes were the original GAv. forms (although there may be some other reason not known to me).

<sup>41</sup> Geldner 1P p. 153, ft. (6). K5 has *ahū. biš. ratūm*. but *ahū* is the instr. sg. form for masc. *-u-* stem nouns ~ a declension which simply cannot fit the context ~ indicating not only that this is a scribal error, but also that the copyist did not have a working understanding of Avestan. But I am so grateful to him (her?) that s/he re-copied ancestral mss. in any event, because without such efforts, even flawed, we would not have them available to us today.

<sup>42</sup> Jackson 1892, § 858, p. 236.

<sup>43</sup> The linguistic rules governing compounds in Avestan are complicated. Beekes 1988 devotes a whole chapter to compounds (pp. 104 - 109), citing chapter and verse from GAv. texts for some of the types of compounds he discusses. He shows no three word compounds in GAv. texts. However, many of the GAv. words he shows as compounds are written as two separate words or as one word in mss. (which have copied the Gathas) ~ indicating that deciding what words are compounds and how many members (or parts) each compound word has, is today a function of linguistic analysis (of the affected word), rather than a dependence on how they were transcribed, copied and re-copied down through the centuries.

<sup>44</sup> Jackson 1892 §§ 858, 859, 894 pp. 236, 237, 245. Jackson gives four examples of compounds of three or more words (in conjectured stem form) but unfortunately does not give text references for any but one (so I was unable to ascertain the declension of the last word in Geldner). The one example for which he gives a textual citation is from the YAv. *Visperad* 1.5, a four-word compound in which the first three words are nom. sg.

Jackson shows the last member (or part) of the compound word (in stem form) as follows, *pouru.sarədō.vīrō.vqθwa* 'having a crowd of male offspring', citing *Visp.* 1.5. (Jackson p. 245).

Geldner shows it as it actually appears in *Visp.* 1.5 ~ in which the last member (or part) of the compound word is in a genitive pl. declension, as follows *pouru.sarədō.vīrō.vqθwanqm* *Visp.* 1.5., Geldner 2P p. 4 (parenthetically with no mss. variations!).

The first three members (or parts of the compound ~ *pouru*, *sarədō*, and *vīrō* ~ are all nom. sg.; the last member (or part) of the compound *vqθwanqm* is gen. pl. thus establishing that the last word in the compound controls the inflection of the whole compound word, but that the first three words need not be in stem form, and can be inflected in a manner different from the last word in the compound (which controls the declension of the entire compound word).

I was not able to find any grammatical rule inconsistent with the argument made by Bartholomae and Taraporewala that the nom. sg. adj. *ahūm.biš* and the acc. sg. noun *ratūm* could be combined into a three-word compound *ahūm.biš.ratūm* functioning as an the object of the verb *ciždī*.

<sup>45</sup> See *Part Three: Ratu*.

<sup>46</sup> Detailed in *Part Three: Ratu*.

<sup>47</sup> Skjaervo 2006 shows the conjectured adjective stem *ahūm.biš-* with its nom. sg. masc. form as *ahūm.biš*.



The stem *biš-* ends in a consonant. According to Jackson 1892 §§ 279, 280, the acc. sg. inflection for stems ending in the consonant *š-* such as *biš-* (Jackson's example is *viš-* 'village'), is *-əm*, (showing *vīšəm* as acc. sg. of 'village'). So if the compound word *ahūm.biš* follows the general rule, it takes the declension of *biš* and cannot be acc. sg.

<sup>48</sup> Jackson 1982 §§ 394, 395, p. 113.

<sup>49</sup> See *Part Three: Seraosha*.

<sup>50</sup> Detailed in *Part Three: Seraosha*.

<sup>51</sup> This technique of 'framing' or 'encapsulation' in the Gathas' syntax, to give one unit of thought, is discussed in the following chapters: In *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo) An Analysis* (discussed in great detail, with many examples); 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 caesura); *Yasna 28.1* (discussed briefly); and *Yasna 32.9* (discussed briefly).

<sup>52</sup> Beekes 1988, p. 137; Jackson 1892 § 394, p. 113.

<sup>53</sup> There are several stems for demonstrative pronouns; Jackson 1892 § 422, p. 120, M&deV 2001 p. 71. Skjaervo 2006 show *ahmāi* as dat. sg. masc./ntr. of the demonstrative pronoun stem *a-*. He does not give an English translation for this stem in his 2006 *Glossary*.

Jackson 1892 does, translating the stem as 'this'.

M&deV 2001 p. 71, do so as well, translating the stem into Spanish 'éste' (which in the sg. means 'this, that, this-one, that-one').

As Beekes 1988 p. 137, points out, demonstrative pronouns can also be used for 3p pronouns, which in dat. sg. masc./ntr. would be 'to/for him', and 'to/for it'.

<sup>54</sup> Jackson 1892 §§ 399, 400, pp. 114 - 115.

<sup>55</sup> Jackson 1892 § 408, pp. 116 - 117, Beekes 1988 pp. 140 - 141, and Skjaervo 2006 *Old Avestan Lesson 3*, p. 27, generally agree about the formation of indefinite pronouns in GAv.

Beekes' explains that indefinite pronouns are formed in various circumstances by adding what Jackson calls particles, (including *-cit*) to the stem of the interrogative pronoun *ka-*, usually after a relative pronoun. Thus (Beekes says) the dat. sg. masc. interrogative pronoun *kahmāi* ('to/for whom/what/how') becomes the dat. sg. masc. indefinite pronoun *kahmāicit*, ('to/for whomever/whatsoever/ howsoever') which in the mss. is written *kahmāicī̄t̄*. thus making it an indefinite pronoun. And in Y44.16 *kahmāicī̄t̄* comes after the relative pronoun *yahmāi*.