

Yasna 44.11

I have chosen this verse for us to consider for 3 reasons:

1. To support my translation of this verse in *Part Three: Is Wisdom a God of Wrath, Enmity?*
2. To consider other worthwhile thoughts, which it contains and
3. It is followed a few verses later by Y44.16, which is quoted in the *Kemna Mazda* prayer. So this verse provides some context for my translation of Y44.16.

The long history of human religions has been marked by intolerance and strife, often based on ignorance of other religions, or a fanatical conviction that one's own religion (or one's own 'God') is the only true religion and 'God'. And a person today reading our verse (Y44.11) might think that it's last line is an expression of religious intolerance. This is not accurate. We need to consider this line (and the whole verse) in the context of Zarathushtra's mind-set, culture and society in order to understand what he was saying.

Zarathushtra's mind-set is that life, religion, is an on-going search for the true (good, correct) order of existence,¹ and that 'God' personifies this order of existence (think about that for a minute!). A 'search' means that the searcher does not already know everything ~ which of necessity requires tolerance for other points of view.

In the Gathas, the things about which he is intolerant are such things as dishonesty, cruelty, predatory violence, tyranny, bondage, greed, murder, theft, harming, injuring, destructive activities which are intrinsically 'wrong' or false, which he describes as the practices of the religions of his society, and the characters of their deities (as depicted by their priests).

And he had the courage to oppose those religions, their priests and their practices. Indeed, the suffering and oppression caused by those religions is what motivated him to question and re-think the nature and identity of what is 'divine' ~ what is worthy of worship.²

But equally important is his notion of *how* we should oppose what is false, wrong ~ which appears throughout the Gathas. We should change what is 'wrong', false, by opposing it with truth and what is good and right. We should (try to) embody the true (good, right) order of existence in thought, word and action.

Our verse (Y44.11) has some translation uncertainties, but I think we can arrive at a reasonably accurate understanding of Zarathushtra's intent, based on available evidence. To avoid repeated references to the translations, commentaries and opinions of our group of linguists, I footnote them here.³

- a. *taṭ. θwā. pərəsā. / əṛəš. moī.⁴ vaocā. ahurā.:*
- b. *kaθā. tāng. ā.⁵ / vījəmyāṭ. ārmaitiš.*
- c. *yaēibyō. mazdā. / θwōi. vašyetē. daēnā.*
- d. *azəm tōi āiš / paouruyō.⁶ fravōivīdē*
- e. *vīspəng. anyəng. / mainyāuš. spasyā. dvaēšaṅhā.:* Y44.11, Geldner 1P p. 151.

My translation.

- a. 'This I ask You, tell me truly Lord:
- b. How might truth embodied in thought, word and action extend now far and wide to those
- c. to whom Your envisionment, O Wisdom, is proclaimed?
- d. I, (together) with these, commit myself to You, (who are) the First One.
- e. All others, I look upon with the opposition of (my) way of being.'

Discussion.

At first thought, the meaning of this verse seems simple enough. But, as with so many Gatha verses, upon reflection we see that it tells us more than what is obvious at first thought.

Lines a. through c., tell us that Zarathushtra proclaimed Wisdom's envisionment [*daēnā*] far and wide, to enable anyone who wished to do so to live a life that is beneficial, that embodies the true (good, correct) order of existence in thought, word and action (*spānta- ārmaiti-*) ~ the proverbial good thoughts, words and actions of the later texts.

This teaching of Wisdom's Word is what the later texts call 'wisdom acquired by the ear', which together with the 'wisdom within' help us in our search for truth.⁷ Lines a. through c. are not consistent with the idea that Zarathushtra's teachings are off limits to anyone.

And what is Wisdom's envisionment [*daēnā*] that Zarathushtra proclaimed *far and wide*? It is the envisionment of the wholly good, true order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*), its comprehension good thinking, (*voḥu- manah-*), its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action (*spānta- ārmaiti-*), its good rule of ourselves and our social units (*voḥu- xšaθra-*) its complete, undying attainment (*haurvatāt- amərətāt*).

And how do we know what is the true (good, correct) order of existence? We use our minds/hearts to search for it, on-going.⁸

Line d. expresses Zarathushtra's commitment to a deity who is personified Wisdom, whom he calls the 'First One'. What does he mean by 'First One'? It is doubtful that he could have meant 'first among other deities' because we know from other verses in the Gathas, that he did not think the deities of his culture were worth worshipping ~ he demoted them from 'godhood', because of their cruel, predatory teachings (as proclaimed by their priests) and in fact he does not mention any of them by name in the Gathas.⁹

As in English, *paourvya-* 'first' is used in several ways in the Gathas ~ including 'first in time (primal, primordial), and 'first in quality' (just as in English we might say *a diamond of the first water* to describe a jewel of the highest quality).¹⁰ Here, I think 'First One' is used as first in quality ~ as one who has attained completely the qualities that make a being divine (the amesha spenta),¹¹ because in Zarathushtra's thought, it is not *who* a being is that makes It Divine, it is *what* a being is ~ the nature of the being, One who is all-good, a Being of reason, intelligence, in whom there is no cruelty, violence, hatred, harming, whose existence is the true (good, correct) order of existence (*aša-*), its good comprehension (*voḥu- manah-*), its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action (*spānta- ārmaiti-*), its good rule (*voḥu- xšaθra*).¹²

This brings us to the controversial line e. in which there are some uncertainties ~ both in translation and interpretation.

The verb form *spasyā* can be translated in either one of two ways. Linguists contend that it is the form for both the first person 'present' tense 'I look upon', and also for the second person imperative '(do thou) look upon'. But regardless of which option we might select, our group of translators are agreed that the 'looking upon' is done 'with hostility, enmity, hatred' ~ *dvaēšahā*, (from the conjectured ntr. stem *dvaēšah-*). If these translations are accurate, then 'hostility, enmity, hatred' would be qualities that it is good for Zarathushtra to have (if he does the 'looking upon') or for the Divine to have (if Zarathushtra asks Him to do the 'looking upon'). But the evidence is legion ~ not only in the Gathas,¹³ but also in later Avestan texts, that 'hostility, enmity, hatred' are not 'good' qualities. They are not qualities of the wholly good, true (correct) order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*), which is the existence of the Divine, and the path that Wisdom asks us to follow.¹⁴

In fact (according to Bartholomae) the GAv. word *angra-* (which in the Gathas is a quality, not a name) was derived from an Arya word **asrá*, (**ans*), meaning 'hate-filled, harmful, pain-causing, inimical' (when used as an adjective) and 'enemy' (when used as a noun).¹⁵ And we know that *angra-* in the Gathas and *angra-* in the YAv. texts is the opposite of the Divine. Thieme has pointed out that in a religion such as Zarathushtra's, which knows no images or idols, the name given to a deity reveals the personality, the essence, of the deity.¹⁶ The YAv. *Hormezd Yasht* has many names of the Divine ~ revealing His nature ~ two of which establish that 'hostility, enmity, hatred' are not part of the nature of the Divine ~ that indeed, the nature of the Divine is one that resists and overcome such qualities.

Hormezd Yasht, Yt. 1.8, ... *caθrudasō imaṭ vīdvaēštīvō* ... '... Fourteenth, One (who) resists hatred/hostility/enmity ...'.¹⁷

Commenting under another Gatha verse (Y34.11), Humbach/Faiss 2010 state that *vī-dvaēšah-* means 'resisting enmity/enemies,' comparing "YAv. *vī-tbaēšah-*, Ved. Skt. *vi-dvesas-*...", (p. 177).

Hormezd Yasht, Yt. 1.14, ... *tbaēšō.taurvā nqma ahmi...* '... I am named One (who) overcomes enmity...'.¹⁸

So resisting and overcoming 'hostility, enmity, hatred' are a part of the nature of the Divine in the YAv. *Hormezd Yasht*. Indeed, throughout the YAv. texts, although other Indo-Iranian deities (like Mithra) are described as hostile and inimical, I cannot recall a single reference to the Lord (who is) Wisdom as hostile, inimical, having hatred. On the contrary, there are many passages in which qualities of the Divine destroy 'hostility, enmity, hatred', or are the opposite of these, or similar qualities.¹⁹ In light of all the evidence (and absence of evidence!), in Avestan texts, to ascribe 'hostility, enmity, hatred' as an approved quality of either Zarathushtra (and other humans) or the Lord Wisdom, is so totally contradictory to the teachings of Zarathushtra, and the later texts, that we have to re-examine the meaning ascribed by translators to *dvaēšahā* in our verse Y44.11.

This I have done in *Part Three: Is Wisdom a God of Wrath, Enmity?* So I will not repeat all that evidence here. Suffice it to say that for *dvaēšah-* words, the only English equivalent which contextually fits the Gathas and the later texts is 'opposition', which can be 'good' opposition (opposing with truth, its comprehension, its embodiment, its rule, etc.) and 'bad' opposition (opposing with hatred, hostility, enmity). We know from other verses, that in the Gathas, evil is opposed and defeated with truth, with what is good, right (*aša-*).²⁰

And it is not without interest that in the last line of this verse, Zarathushtra speaks of opposing with his *way of being* (*mainyu-*). In the Gathas, the 'good' way of being ~ whether in man or the Divine ~ is described as *spənta-* 'beneficial' ~ corroborating that the nature of his opposition is good, beneficial.

So whether it is Zarathushtra or the Divine, their opposition to evil could not be 'hate-filled, hostile, enimical'. We also know that under the law of consequences, when the 'bad' we do comes back to us, it is not an expression of hostility or hatred by the Divine. Its purpose is educational ~ to increase understanding.²¹

Finally, we have to ask, who are the 'all others' who are looked upon by Zarathushtra (or the Divine) 'with opposition'. Well, in the preceding lines, Zarathushtra commits himself to an envisionment that embodies the true, good, order of existence ~ in man, and in a deity who is enlightened ~ Wisdom. So it would be reasonable to conclude that 'all others' in line e. refers to the other deities of his culture and their followers who are portrayed in the Gathas as being violent, cruel, tyrannical, greed-driven, etc.

It is important to not read into lines d. and e., ideas from our times, or from other religious paradigms which are not consistent with Zarathushtra's teachings. Lines d. and e. do not express religious intolerance ~ 'my god vs. your god'. There is no thought expressed in all of the Gathas and YAv. texts to the effect that if you don't believe in my God, you are damned in eternal hell, regardless of how good a life you may have led. Zarathushtra's opposition is to a quality of being (in man and the divine) ~ untruth, all that is false, harmful, wrong ~ the wrathful, cruel, destructive nature of the deities of his culture (as described by their priests), as well as the predatory practices of their followers, and the resulting suffering inflicted on the people of his society in the name of its deities, which he describes in another verse as "...they then rushed into fury [*aēšma-* 'wrath, rage'], with which they have afflicted the world and mankind." Y30.6, Insler 1975.

* * * * *

Let us now look at the linguistics of the words and how they are put together.

Line a. *taṭ. θwā. pərəsā. əṛəš. moī. vaocā. ahurā*
a. 'This I ask Thee, tell me truly Lord.'

There is general agreement about the translation of this line.

taṭ 'this'

taṭ is a demonstrative pronoun, nom./acc. sg. ntr. of the stem *ta-*, Skjaervo 2006. In this context it can only be acc. sg. ~ the direct object of the verb 'ask'.

θwā 'thee'

θwā is a personal pronoun 2p sg. and one of the acc. sg. forms of the stem *tu-*, Skjaervo 2006; (*θwā* is also the form for certain ntr. possessive pronouns 'thy', but they do not fit in this context).

pərəsā 'I ask'

1p sg. indicative (present) of the verb stem *pars-* (Skjaervo 2006).²²

vaocā 'tell'

vaocā is 2p sg. aor. imp. of the verb stem *vaoc-* which derives from *mrao-* 'to say', 'to speak', Skjaervo 2006. In this context 'tell' conveys the intended meaning more accurately, as most translators agree.

mōi literally 'to me'

mōi is a 1p personal pronoun, and in GAv. it is one of the forms (enclitic) for gen. sg. ('my') and also dat. sg. ('to/for me') (M&dV 2001 p. 69). In this context, it can only be dat. sg. If we were to translate the verb *vaocā* as 'say' or 'speak', then in fluent English, dat. sg. *mōi* 'to me' would fit well ('say to me' or 'speak to me'). But if we translate *vaocā* as 'tell' fluent English requires that dat. sg. *mōi* be translated as 'me' ('tell me' instead of the more literal 'tell to me').

arəš 'truly'

Skjaervo 2006 shows *arəš* as an adv. deriving from *arəzu-* which he says means "straight (not crooked)".²³ He also shows the stems *arəš.vacah-* which he translates "whose words are straight"; *arəžux da-* "straight utterance"; *arəžjī-* an adj. "living a straight life". Insler 1975 translates *arəš.vacah-* and *arəžux da-* in their various declensions as "true-speaking" (in Y31.12, Y31.19) and *arəžjī-* as "the man who lives honestly" (Y29.5), and "lives honestly" (Y50.2 and Y53.9).

In our verse (Y44.16),

Insler 1975 translates *arəš mōi vaocā* as "tell me truly".

Humbach 1991 "tell me plainly".

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "tell me truly".

Taraporewala 1951 "tell me truly".

Moulton 1912, and Bartholomae "tell me truly".

Geldner shows the two words *arəš.mōi* as a compound word (with no mss. variations footnoted), thus literally, *arəš.mōi vaocā* 'truly-to-me tell'. But Insler 1975, Humbach/Faiss 2010, Humbach 1991, and Taraporewala 1951 show the two words as separate, without comment ~ perhaps because compound words in Avestan are governed by certain rules,²⁴ none of which seem to fit the grammatical values and meanings of *arəš.mōi* as a compound, so it is likely that grammatically, the two words originally were separate, and the compound word either developed as an anomaly or was a (universal?) scribal error. In any event, it makes no difference to the meaning of this line.

ahurā 'Lord'

voc. sg. of the masc. noun stem *ahura-*, Skjaervo 2006.

Thus, line a. *taṭ ʔwā pərəsā arəš mōi vaocā ahurā*

Literally: 'This [taṭ] I ask [pərəsā] Thee [ʔwā], tell [vaocā] truly to me [arəš mōi], Lord [ahurā],'

In more fluent English: 'This I ask Thee, tell me truly, Lord,'

* * *

Line b. *kaθā. tāng. ā. vījāmyāṭ. ārmaitiš.*

b. 'how might the true (good, correct) order of existence embodied in thought, word and action now extend far and wide to those...'

In this line, translating the Avestan verb *vījāmyāt* takes several English words, which cannot be kept together if we are to translate the line into fluent English, as you will see. Also, an abbreviated translation of *ārmaitiš* is 'embodied truth', but here, to get the full meaning of the verse, I have used its unabbreviated meaning. So once again, one Av. word (*ārmaitiš*) generates more than one English word in translation.

kaθā. 'how'

kaθā is an adv. 'how' Skjaervo 2006.

vījāmyāt 'might extend far and wide to'

Skjaervo 2006 shows the stem verb *gam-* 'to go, come', which (he says) with *vī* means 'to go out wide and far to'; he shows *vījāmyāt* as its 3p sg. aor. optative form which translates into English as 'might extend far and wide to' (here referring to *ārmaitiš*). Our group of linguists translate *vījāmyāt* as follows.

Insler 1975, "might ... separately come to" (optative) without comment on this verb;

Humbach 1991, "might ... extend to" (optative) without comment on this verb;

Humbach/Faiss 2010, "could ... spread over" (optative) without comment on this verb;

Taraporewala 1951, "shall ... enter completely within". Although he does not translate the verb in an aor. opt. way, he comments that it is aor. opt. of *gam-* and that with *vī*, Barth. translates 'to extend into', 'to penetrate'. He comments that *vī-gam-* is not found in the Rig Veda.

Moulton 1912, and Bartholomae, "will extend to".

The Avestan form (aor. optative) of the verb *vījāmyāt* is such that its English equivalent consists of multiple words 'might extend far and wide to' which in this line cannot all be together. Thus, 'how might the true (correct) order of existence embodied in thought, word and action extend now far and wide to those...'

ārmaitiš. 'the true (good, correct) order of existence embodied in thought word and action'

There is wide disagreement amongst linguists (and non-linguists) regarding the meaning of the fem. noun *ārmaiti-* which includes such English words as 'piety', 'devotion', etc. But there is no dispute that *ārmaiti-* is an attribute of the Divine, (an amesha spenta), and as Thieme has pointed out, such words as 'piety', 'devotion', etc. have no relevance to the Divine, so 'piety', 'devotion' etc. cannot be the meaning of *ārmaiti-*. The meaning of this word has been discussed in detail, in *Part One: Embodied Truth, Aramaiti*, where I have shown, with evidence, that based on the ways in which Zarathushtra uses the word in the Gathas, it means 'the true (good, correct) order of existence embodied in thought, word and action' ('embodied truth' for short). The form *ārmaitiš* is nom. sg., the subject of the verb *vījāmyāt*.

Thus *kaθā ... vījāmyāt ... ārmaitiš*

Using the **short** definition of *ārmaitiš*: 'how might embodied truth extend far and wide to...'

Using the **long**, more accurate definition of *ārmaitiš*: 'how might the true (good, correct) order of existence embodied in thought, word and action, extend now far and wide to...'

ā. 'now'

Skjaervo 2006 shows *ā* as an adv. meaning "here (and now), currently, at present". In this context, (as an adverb) it modifies the verb *vījāmyāṭ* thus, 'might here and now extend far and wide to'. To make the translation more fluent, I simply use 'now'.

tāng. 'those'

tāng is acc. pl. of the demonstrative pronoun *ta-* (Skjaervo 2006). In Av. demonstrative pronouns are also used as 3p pronouns, so here 'those' refers to people. As acc. pl., *tāng* 'those' is the direct object of the verb *vījāmyāṭ*. Our group of linguists do not disagree on translating *tāng*.

Thus, line b. *kaθā tāng ā vījāmyāṭ ārmaitiš*

'how might the true (good, correct) order of existence embodied in thought word and action extend now far and wide to those...'

* * *

Line c. *yaēibyō. mazdā. θwōi. vašyetē. daēnā.*

c. 'to whom, O Wisdom, Your envisionment is proclaimed'

yaēibyō. 'to whom'

Jackson 1892 shows *yaēibyō* as masc./ntr. dat./abl. pl. of the relative pronoun *ya-* (§ 399, p. 114). Skjaervo 2006 agrees that its stem is *ya-*, but does not identify its declension. Here, I take it as dat. 'to whom'. Humbach 1991 takes *aēibyō* as abl. "from whom". Our other translators give it a dat. pl. declension "to/for whom".

mazdā. 'O Wisdom'

mazdā is voc. sg. of the stem which Skjaervo 2006 conjectures as masc. *mazdā-*, and Jackson 1892 conjectures as fem. *mazdah-* (§ 356, p. 102). The gender (which is grammatical) makes no difference in this context.

θwōi. 'Your'

θwōi is nom. sg. fem. of the possessive pronoun stem *θwa-* (Skjaervo 2006). It refers to *mazdā* 'Wisdom'. But the grammatical gender of *θwōi* does not settle the debate regarding whether *mazdā-* is masc. or fem. noun. The pronoun *θwōi* is fem. because it describes the fem. noun *daēnā*. 'envisionment'. Possessive pronouns are one of the headaches in learning Avestan. They are in the same gender and case of the noun they describe, not the person who possesses the noun described (the same is true of French and Spanish ~ both in the Indo-European family of languages).

daēnā. 'envisionment'

The meaning of *daēnā* has been explored in another chapter.²⁵ I will simply summarize here that the Gathas speak of *daēnā* that is good, and *daēnā* that is bad. So in the Gathas it cannot mean either 'conscience' or Zarathushtra's religion, (neither of which could be 'bad'). Here *daēnā* is nom. sg. of the fem. noun stem *daēnā-* (Skjaervo 2006), the subject of the verb *vašyetē* 'is proclaimed'.

vašyetē. 'is proclaimed'

Our group of translators vary widely regarding the meaning (and conjugation) of *vašyetē*. Skjaervo 2006 shows *vašyetē* as indicative (present tense) of the conjectured verb stem *vak-/vašyā-* 'to bulge, well (forth)'.

Humbach 1991 "wells forth"; he comments that Ved. *vacyáte* 'issues forth' is comparable, quoting a few comparable Ved. passages, one of which is "this prayer of mine issues forth [*vacyáte*] to Thee'." But by 2010 he had changed his mind.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "is proclaimed", without comment.

Insler 1975 "is taught"; he comments that *vašyete* is passive of the conjectured verb stem *vac-*, and corresponds in usage to Skt. *ucyate* 'is taught', "(in technical literature)" (I am not sure what he means by "technical literature").

Taraporewala 1951, Moulton 1912, and Bartholomae "shall be proclaimed". Taraporewala comments that *vašyete* is 3p sg. present passive of the conjectured verb stem *vac-*, seeing the Skt. passive *ucyate* as parallel.

As a practical matter, in this context, whether one chooses 'is taught' or 'is proclaimed', makes no material difference. I take *vašyete* as 'is proclaimed' because it seems to better match the idea of extending embodied truth (which is Wisdom's envisionment ~ the path of truth) far and wide.

Thus, *yaēibyō mazdā θwōi vašyete daēnā* 'to whom Your envisionment is proclaimed?'

* * *

Line d. *azəm tōi āiš paouruyō fravōivīdē*

d. 'I, (together) with these, commit myself to You, (who are) the First One.'

The translation of this line is problematic. There is no agreement on the meaning of the verb. It is difficult to account for all the pronouns giving each one its true grammatical value (some pronouns have been ignored in many of the translations in our group). And implied words have been added by translators (without placing them in round parentheses) to make their translations work. Add to all that, the many mss. differences and you can see the translation difficulties that attend this line. But I think we can arrive at a reasonably accurate conclusion.

azəm 'I'

azəm is a personal pronoun, 1p nom. sg. Skjaervo 2006. Normally, a pronoun which is the subject (nom.) of a verb is not stated, because the form of the verb identifies whether it is being used in the 1p, 2p, 3p, sg. or pl. But there are times when (as here) the subject-pronoun is separately stated ~ sometimes for emphasis, sometimes for other reasons. Here, I think the pronoun 'I' is stated because it is coupled with *āiš* '(together) with these' ~ the intent being that the subject of the verb is Zarathushtra, together with all those who follow the teachings of Wisdom ~ embodying truth in thought, word and action (*ārmaiti-*), the path of truth.

āiš '(together) with these'

Skjaervo 2006 shows that *āiš* is instr. pl. masc./ntr. of the demonstrative/3p pronoun stem *a-*. The masc. is generic. The pl. refers to those who follow the teachings of Wisdom.

Insler 1975, "by them" (instr. pl. but as the indirect object of the verb)

Humbach 1991, "(along) with these" (instr. pl. ~ with 'I' as the subject of the word)

Humbach/Faiss 2010, "By these (offerings)" (instr. pl. as the subject of the verb)

Taraporewala 1951, "For this (task)"; in his comment he says that *āiš* is instr. pl., but his translation gives it a dat. sg. value.

Moulton 1912, and Bartholomae: their translations do not account for instr. sg. *āiš*.

fravōivīdē '(I) commit myself'

Once again, our translators are in disagreement.

Skjaervo 2006 shows the (conjectured) stem *vaēd-* 'to know', and in middle voice, with the suffix *fra-*, he thinks it means "to inform; to present oneself again and again (?)" ~ the question mark is his, indicating his uncertainty regarding the meaning. He shows *fravōivīdē* in Y44.11 (our verse) as 1p sg. indic. [present tense] ~ which (using his meaning) would give us the translation 'I inform' or 'I present myself again and again'.

Insler 1975 in his commentary, translates *fravōivīdē* as "I have been accepted (received)". He cites a Ved. example which he thinks is comparable, "Let us receive [*vevidāma*] thy great favor (benevolence)." In his commentary, he translates line d. *azəm tōi āiš ... fravōivīdē* as "I have been accepted (received)...".

Humbach 1991 "I commit myself..."; he comments that the mid[dle voice]. *fravōivīdē* expresses reflexivity (i.e. 'myself'), but cautions that "no specific meaning of the mid. of *fra-vaēd/vid* is recognizable in another verse Y33.8 (which has the word *fravōizdūm*). He adds no information as to why he translates the verb stem as 'to commit (oneself)', but with that meaning, his translation of this line gives each word its true grammatical value (although, with respect, I do not agree with all his translation choices or his syntax).

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "I present myself..." without comment on this word.

Taraporewala 1951 "[I have] been clearly recognized...". He comments that Bartholomae takes this word as a conjugation of *vid-* with *frā* and translates 'to choose' ~ equating it with Skt. *vid-*, *vind-*, 'to find, to obtain'. Taraporewala himself takes it from *vid-* 'to know'.

Moulton 1912, and Bartholomae "I present myself..."

I think *fravōivīdē* literally means 'I offer myself' in the sense of a commitment, in the same way as Zarathushtra, referring to himself in the 3d person, says (using another word *dadāitī* from the stem *dā-* 'to give') "For Zarathushtra does give the breath of even his own person as a gift, in order that there be for the Wise One predominance of good thinking along with (predominance) of the action and the word allied with truth..." Y33.14, Insler 1975. Each of these verses uses 'offer myself' (Y44.11), and "give the breath of even his own person" (Y33.14) as an offering of oneself, in the sense of making a total commitment. I therefore translate *fravōivīdē* here as 'I ... commit myself'.

tōi 'to You [sg.]'

tōi is a pronoun which has been variously translated. Which option is intended in this line would depend on how the verb *fravōivīdē* is translated (about which, as you have seen, there is disagreement).

tōi is a 2p personal pronoun, (its stem being *tu-*) and is the form for both gen. sg. ('thy'), and dat. sg. ('to/for you' sg.) (Skjaervo 2006). Personal pronouns are not gender specific.

tōi is also the form for nom. pl. masc. of the demonstrative/3p pronoun stem *ta-* (Skjaervo 2006) which would mean 'they, these'.

Which of these apply in a given verse depends on the context.

In this context I take *tōi* as a personal pronoun dat. sg. Thus, *tōi ... fravōivīdē* '(I) commit myself to You [sg.]'

Insler 1975, "Thy"; he translates the phrase "I have been accepted (received) by them as Thy..." (gen. sg.);

Humbach 1991, "I, ... commit myself to Thee" (dat. sg.);

Humbach/Faiss 2010, "I present myself to you" (dat. sg.);

Taraporewala 1951, "...have I been clearly recognized by Thee" (instr. sg.); commenting that it is gen. sg. used in the sense of instr. sg.

Moulton 1912, and Bartholomae, "I was ordained ... by thee" (instr. sg.).

paouruyō. '(who are) the First One'.

Skjaervo 2006 shows *paouruyō* (although he spells it *pouruyō*- without the *a*) as nom. sg. masc. of the conjectured adj. stem *paourvya-* which he says means "first, original". (Insler spells the word with the *a*).

All of our translators think that the adj. *paouruyō* is used here as a noun, and that it refers to Zarathushtra as Wisdom's first follower ~ some taking 'first' to mean 'foremost' (first in quality and importance), others taking 'first' chronologically (as first in time). They translate *paouruyō* in line d. *azəm tōi āiš paouruyō fravōivīdē* as follows,

Insler 1975, "I have been accepted by them as Thy foremost [*paouruyō*] (follower)".

Humbach 1991, "I, along with these, am the first [*pouruyō*] to commit myself to Thee."

Humbach/Faiss 2010, "By these (offerings) I present myself to you (as being) your foremost one [*pouruyō*]."; they add an implied "your" (although not in round parentheses).

Taraporewala 1951, "For this (task) have I been clearly recognized by Thee (as) the First [*pouruyō*];" Moulton 1912, and Bartholomae, "I was ordained at the first [*paouruyō*] by thee ". They give *paouruyō* a loc. sg. translation ("at the first") but *paouruyō* is nom. sg. ~ the *-ō* inflection is not loc. sg. for *a-* stem nouns and adjectives (such as *paourvya-*), Jackson 1892 §§ 236, 238, pp. 69 - 70.

As you can see, there is no noun in this line which the adj. 'first' could describe. But in Av. an adj. (like 'first') can be used as a noun 'first-one'. So who is this 'first one'? It is true that in the *Farvardin Yasht* and other YAv. texts Zarathushtra is referred to as Wisdom's first follower (first in time).²⁶ But (with respect), I do not think applying nom. sg. masc. *paouruyō* to Zarathushtra is a good fit in line d. I think nom. sg. *paouruyō* refers to Wisdom, "I, ... commit myself to You, (who are) the First One', (here, the nom. declension is the object of the implied verb 'to be'; the masc. gender is generic).²⁷ And I think that this naming of the Divine as 'First One' means first in quality (and therefore in importance).

Thus line d. *azəm tōi āiš paouruyō fravōivīdē*.••

'I [*azəm*] (together) with these [*āiš*], commit myself [*fravōivīdē*] to You [*tōi*], (who are) the First One [*paouruyō*].' This accounts for each word in this line, and gives each word its correct grammatical value.

* * *

Line e. *vīspāng. anyāng. / mainyāuš. spasyā. dvaēšāṅhā*.••

e. 'All others, I look upon with the opposition of (my) way of being.'

vīspāng anyāng 'all others'

vīspāng 'all' is acc. pl. masc. of the adjective stem *vīspa-* 'all' (Skjaervo 2006). It describes *anyāng* and is therefore in the same declension.

anyāng 'others' is acc. pl. masc. of the adj. stem *anya-* 'other' (Skjaervo 2006), which here is used as a noun. Thus *vīspāng anyāng* 'all others'.

spasyā. 'I look upon'

In our verse Y44.11, Skjaervo 2006 thinks *spasyā* is the 2p imperative form of the verb stem *spas-* 'to see, to look at'; thus '(do thou) look upon'.

Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 both comment that *spasyā* is the form for 2 different conjugations ~ 2p. imperative "look upon" and also 1p. sg. [present tense] "I look upon". So in *spasyā* we have an ambiguity that is inherent in the Av. language. When the Gathas were chanted by Zarathushtra, such ambiguities could have been resolved by the gestures which accompanied the chants. But we have no such guide to his intent, and the translators in our group have translated the word ~ some as 2p imperative "look upon" (Zarathushtra asking Wisdom the Lord to do the looking upon), and others as 1p sg. indicative (present tense) "I look upon" (Zarathushtra doing the looking upon).

Insler 1975, 2p sg. imperative "Do Thou look upon" (Zarathushtra addressing Wisdom the Lord).

Humbach 1991, 1p sg. indic. "I look upon"; but by 2010 he had changed his preference, while acknowledging that both conjugations are linguistically valid.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 2p imperative "Look upon" (Zarathushtra addressing Wisdom the Lord);

Taraporewala 1951, 1p sg. indic. "I shall regard".

Moulton 1912, and Bartholomae, 1p sg. indic. "I look upon".

dvaēšanhā 'with (the) opposition'

Skjaervo 2006 shows *dvaēšanhā* as a declension of the conjectured ntr. stem *dvaēšah-* which he says means 'hostility', without identifying its declension.

Jackson 1892 shows the *-anhā* inflection as instr. sg. in GAv. for *-ah-* stem nouns (like *dvaēšah-*),²⁸ and all our translators have taken *dvaēšanhā* to be instr. sg.

Insler 1975 "with enmity"; but in his comment under another verse Y33.7, he translates it "with hostility".

Humbach 1991 "with enmity"

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "with the hostility"

Taraporewala 1951 "with hostility"

Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae "with hatred".

Regarding its meaning, I take *dvaēšanhā* to mean 'with opposition'. In *Part Three: Is Wisdom a God of Wrath, Enmity?* I have already analyzed in great detail the reasons why the meanings given to this word by the linguists in our group are not consistent the micro context of this verse and the song in which it appears, nor with the macro context of the Gathas. And they are inconsistent even with later YAv. texts, and I have explained, with evidence, why I think that the GAv. meaning of *dvaēšah-* is 'opposition' ~ which can be opposition done in a 'good' way (in accord with truth) and in a 'bad' way (with hatred, enmity, hostility). To keep this chapter from getting too long, I ask that you look at all that evidence in that chapter. So I do not repeat it here. Grammatical forms of *dvaēšah-* words are used in 4 Gatha verses, in each of which 'opposition' (or 'opponent') fits well. These verses, as well as verses that have related words have been detailed in footnotes in *Part Three: Is Wisdom a God of Wrath, Enmity?* There are no other GAv. words that have consistently been translated as 'opposition'.²⁹

mainyāuš 'of (my) way of being'

mainyāuš is abl./gen. sg. of the masc. stem *mainyu-* (Skjaervo 2006, except he spells the conjectured stem *manyu-*). In this context *mainyāuš* is gen. sg., (the abl. does not fit the context) and all our translators except Taraporewala translate it as 'of ... spirit'. By 1989 (on the meaning of *mainyu-*) Insler had changed his mind, and expressed the opinion that *mainyu-* means an elemental nature, character, instinct. In another context, in his 1975 Gatha book, Insler pointed out (p. 118), that some GAv. words are used in 3 ways ~ as faculty, process, and object. Thus (he explained) *manah-* can mean 'mind' (faculty), 'thinking' (process), and 'thought' (object). Although *mainyu-* is not one of his examples, I think his reasoning applies to it as well. I have examined the meaning of *mainyu-* in depth in another chapter.³⁰ Based on *all* the evidence of the ways in which *mainyu-* is used in the Gathas, I think that as faculty it may well mean a person's 'nature, character'. But as process, I think it means the totality of a person's 'way of being' ~ his thoughts, words, and actions. And that is how I translate it here.

* * * * *

Here for comparative purposes are translations of the whole verse by each of our translators, so that you can see their different views in context.

- a. *taṭ. θwā. pərəsā. / əraš. moī. vaocā. ahurā.:*
- b. *kaθā. təng. ā. / vījəmyāṭ. ārmaitiš.*
- c. *yaēibyō. mazdā. / θwōi. vašyetē. daēnā.*
- d. *azəm tōi āiš / paouruyō. fravōivīdē*
- e. *vīspəng. anyəng. / mainyāuš. spasyā. dvaēšaṅhā.:* Y44.11.

My translation.

- a. 'This I ask Thee, tell me truly Lord:
- b. How might the true (good, correct) order of existence embodied in thought, word and action extend now far and wide to those
- c. to whom O Wisdom, Your envisionment is proclaimed?
- d. I, (together) with these, commit myself to You, the First One.
- e. All others, I look upon with the opposition of (my) way of being.' Y44.11.

Insler 1975.

- a. "This I ask Thee. Tell me truly, Lord.
- b. How might piety separately come to those
- c. to whom Thy conception is taught, Wise One?
- d. I have been accepted by them as Thy foremost (follower).
- e. Do Thou look upon all others with enmity of spirit." Y44.11.

Humbach 1991.

- a. "This I ask Thee, tell me plainly, O Ahura:
- b. How might right-mindedness extend to those (such as me)
- c. From whom Thy religion wells forth, O Wise One?
- d. I, along with these, am the first to commit myself to Thee.
- e. All others I look upon with enmity of spirit." Y44.11.

Humbach/Faiss 2010.

- a. "This I ask you, tell me truly, O Lord:
- b. How could right-mindedness spread over those
- c. To whom your view/religion is proclaimed, O Wise One?
- d. By these (offerings) I present myself to you (as being) your foremost one.
- e. Look upon all others with the hostility of (your) spirit." Y44.11.

Taraporewala 1951.

- a. "This do I ask Thee, tell me truly, O Ahura:
- b. How shall Armaiti enter completely within those
- c. to whom, O Mazda, Thy Revelation shall be proclaimed?
- d. For this (task) have I been clearly recognized by Thee (as) the First;
- e. all others shall I regard (as being inspired) with inveterate hostility." Y44.11.

Moulton 1912.

- a. "This I ask thee, tell me truly, Ahura ~
- b. whether Piety will extend to those
- c. to whom thy Religion shall be proclaimed?
- d. I was ordained at the first by thee:
- e. all others I look upon with hatred of spirit." Y44.11.

Moulton's translation is the same as that of Bartholomae in English (as shown in Tarap. 1951).

* * * * *

¹ See in *Part One: The Search for Truth*; and *The Freedom to Choose*.

² See in *Part One: The Nature of the Divine*; and *The Identity of the Divine*.

³ References to Skjaervo 2006 are to his on-line *Old Avestan Glossary*.

Insler 1975 ~ his translation and footnotes are at p. 69; his comments at p. 247.

Humbach 1991 ~ his translation is in Vol. 1, p. 160; his comments in Vol. 2, p. 155.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 ~ their translation is at p. 124; their comment at p. 183.

Taraporewala 1951 ~ his translation is at p. 496; his comments at pp. 497 - 498; and he includes Bartholomae's English translation at p. 498.

Moulton 1912 ~ his translation and footnote are at p. 368. His translation is identical to Bartholomae's English translation.

⁴ Geldner 1P p. 151 shows *arəš.mōi* as a compound word, with no mss. variation for it in this verse ~ Y44.11. But most of the verses in Yasna 44 start with this first line, and in these verses there are mss. variations for *arəš.mōi* in some verses, and not in others.

⁵ Geldner shows *tāng.ā.* as a compound word with 2 mss. showing it as one word. But all our translators except Taraporewala take it as two separate words.

⁶ Geldner and others spell this word *pauryō* and the mss. vary. These differences do not affect the meaning or grammatical value of the word. I follow the Insler 1975 version.

⁷ See *Part One: Meditation & Contemplation*.

⁸ See *Part One: The Search for Truth*.

⁹ See *Part Two: The Nature of the Divine*.

¹⁰ See *Part Three: Paourvya*.

¹¹ See *Part Two: Did Wisdom Choose Too?*

¹² See *Part One: The Nature of the Divine*; and *Part Two: Did Wisdom Choose Too?*

¹³ See in *Part One: Truth, Asha*; and *The Nature of the Divine*.

¹⁴ See in *Part One: Truth, Asha*; and *The Nature of the Divine*.

¹⁵ See *Part One: Does the Devil Exist?*

¹⁶ Thieme, *Reflections on the Vocabulary of Zarathushtra's Gathas*, in *Proceedings of the First Gatha Colloquium*, 1993 (WZO, 1998), page 201.

¹⁷ YAv. words are from Geldner, 2P p. 61; my translation.

In the phrase ...*caθrudasō imaṭ vīdvaēštvō*..., 'Fourteenth, One/He (who) resists hatred/hostility'. *caθrudasō* 'fourteenth' is a form of the stem *caθrudasa-* the number 'fourteen' (Jackson 1892 § 374, p. 108). *imaṭ* 'One' is nom./acc./voc. ntr. of the stem *i-*, a demonstrative/3p pronoun, it is ntr. because it describes the ntr. *vīdvaēštvō*.

vīdvaēštvō 'resists hostility'. Skjaervo 2003 conjectures the YAv. stem *dvaēš-* 'hate, antagonize'.

Humbach 1991 in a comment under the Gatha verse Y34.11 conjectures a YAv. stem *vīdvaēštvah-* which he does not translate. But he also shows YAv. *viṭbaēšah-* which he says means "resisting enmity". Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, p. 112.

Thus, following 'I am named' ...*caθrudasō imaṭ vīdvaēštvō*... 'Fourteenth, One/He (who) resists hatred/hostility'.

Darmesteter thinks that *vīdvaēštvō* means 'no harm', he translates this phrase "My fourteenth name is He in whom there is no harm." SBE 23, p. 25.

¹⁸ My translation. YAv. words from Geldner 2P p. 63.

ṭbaēšah- is a YAv. adj. 'hostility' (Skjaervo 2003);

Humbach 1991 sees it as 'enmity' (as detailed above).

taurvaya- means 'to overcome' (Skjaervo 2003).

Thus ... *ṭbaēšō.taurvā nāma ahmi*... 'I am named One (who) overcomes hostility/enmity' my translation.

Darmesteter translates this phrase "... my name is He who destroys malice..." SBE 23, p. 28.

¹⁹ Here are a few examples from YAv. texts in which the qualities of the Divine, (or qualities that are 'good'), destroy, (or are the opposite of) hatred, hostility, enmity.

In the YAv. *Hormezd Yasht*, in addition to the names quoted in the main part of this chapter, the attributes of the Divine (amesha spenta) destroy "the malice of the Daevas". The author has the Lord, Wisdom (purportedly) saying (Darmesteter translation),

"[§ 3] Ahura Mazda answered: 'Our name, O Spitama Zarathushtra! who are the Amesha-Spentas, that is the strongest part of the Holy Word [*māθrahe ... spāntahe* 'of the beneficial Word']; ...

[§ 4] That is the most fiend-smiting; that is the best-healing; that destroyeth best the malice [*ṭbaēšō.taurvayastām*] of Daevas and Men; that maketh the material world best come to the fulfilment of its wishes; that freeth the material world best from the anxieties of the heart.'..." Yt. 1.3 - 4, SBE 23, p. 24; Av. words from Geldner 2P pp. 60 - 61.

In *Sirozah I and II*, (Darmesteter translation) the following amesha spenta (qualities of the Divine) are associated with qualities that are the opposite of hostility, hatred, enmity. The following are references to *Sirozah 1*, but each is also found in *Sirozah 2*. And these descriptions are also found in the YAv. *Haptan Yasht*, Yt. 2, §§ 1 - 3, §§ 6 - 8, and § 16; SBE 23, pp. 35 - 37, 39 - 40.

aša- (the all-good true (correct) order of existence) is associated with well-being;

ārmaiti- (the beneficial embodiment of *aša-*) is associated with Divine gifts;

Both *aša-* and *ārmaiti-* are described as having "... eyes of love..." SBE 23, *Sirozah I* §§ 3, 5, pp. 4 - 5;

vohu- manah- (good thinking) is associated with peace, "... whose breath is friendly ..." *Sirozah 1* § 9, SBE 23, p. 4;

xšaθra- vairya- (the rule to be chosen, also called good rule) is associated with "... mercy, charity."

In the YAv. *Visperad* 11.13, "And we make known these our celebrations ... for the furtherance of this house, and as benefits for this house, ... as overcoming the harmful malice [*vītarə.θbaēšō*] which may mar this house..." Mills translation, SBE 31, p. 352.

It is true that many YAv. texts also speak of conquering, smiting, destroying various things ~ sometimes other tribes and people, sometimes abstract activities that are 'wrong'. In some instances this reflected a dilution of the Gatha teachings when (some centuries after his death) the religions of his culture were syncretized with his teachings, but in other instances this also reflected the facts of life in those ancient times, in which there was no civilian law enforcement mechanism, and in which the warriors of the society maintained peace and protected its people by smiting, conquering or destroying those who engaged in predatory activities both within the tribe, and also from other tribes.

²⁰ See *Part Two: The Paradox of Bad for the Bad*.

²¹ Detailed in *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution*.

²² Skjaervo 2006 states that the verb stem *pars-* means 'to ask' in active voice; and 'to consult' in middle voice.

²³ 'truth' *aša-* is related to the root *ar* which is seen in some GAv. words. For example, Beekes 1988 p. 104 shows *djit-arta-* which he translates as 'destroying Arta' (Beekes joins his compounds with a hyphen instead of a dot). The word appears (in various declensions) in Y53.9 *dājī. arətā* "violators of truth" Insler 1975 (literally 'truth-violators'); and (dat. pl.) in Y53.6 *dājī. arətāēibyō* literally "to truth-violators" or as Insler 1975 translates it "to ... who violate truth".

²⁴ Beekes 1988, pp. 104 - 109.

²⁵ See *Part Three: Daena*.

²⁶ In the YAv. *Farvardin Yasht* ~ composed some centuries after Zarathushtra's time ~ its states,

[referring to Zarathushtra] "Who first in the material world said the word that destroys the Daevas, the law of Ahura; who first in the material world proclaimed the word that destroys the Daevas, the law of Ahura; who first in the material world declared all the creation of the Daevas unworthy of sacrifice and prayer; who was strong, giving all the good things of life, the first bearer of the Law amongst the nations;" § 90; Darmesteter translation, SBE 23, pp. 201 - 202.

However, this Yasht is inconsistent in that it also identifies Gaya Maretan as "who first listened unto the thought and teaching of Ahura Mazda; of whom Ahura formed the race of the Aryan nations, the seed of the Aryan nations." § 87; Darmesteter translation, SBE 23, pp. 200 - 201. That this is incorrect is shown by the fact that of all the Indo-Europeans, the mention of an 'Arya' tribe is found only in Indic (Ved.) and

Avestan texts. If indeed the mythological Gaya Maretan was the founder of the Arya nations, and was the first to worship Ahura Mazda, there would be some mention of this deity in the Vedic texts. But there is no deity Ahura Mazda (or even Mazda) in the Vedic texts (see Thieme's comment referenced in *Part One: The Nature of the Divine*).

²⁷ See *Part One: The Identity of the Divine*.

²⁸ Jackson 1892 §§ 339 - 340, pp. 97 - 98.

²⁹ There are no other Avestan words in the Gathas which are used consistently for 'opposition' (with or without hatred, hostility). And there is much disagreement amongst linguists on Av. words that have been translated by some as 'opposition'.

maēθā

Commenting on the word *maēθā* in Y30.9 Insler 1975 states that the root *miθ* originally meant 'opposition', which early became 'false'. He therefore translates *cistiš maēθā* in Y30.9 as 'false understanding' (p. 173), but he translates *maēθā* as 'opposition' in Y31.12c. He comments under Y33.9 that *maēθā* in that verse belongs with the root *mī*, 'alter, change'. Not surprisingly, translators who are linguists translate *maēθā* in a wide variety of ways even in these verse ~ even in Y31.12 in which Insler 1975 translates *maēθā* as 'opposition' ~ indicating the uncertainty in de-coding this word.

Humbach 1991, in Y31.12 'present';

Humbach/Faiss 2010 in Y31.12 'wavering';

Taraporewala 1951 in Y31.12 'doubt';

Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae in Y31.12 'wavering'.

The word *tarāməiti-* in Y33.4 is translated by Insler 1975 as 'opposition', but translations vary greatly on the meaning of *tarāməiti-* ~ indicating the uncertainty in decoding this word.

Humbach 1991, and Skjaervo 2006 'scorn';

Humbach/Faiss 2010 'arrogance';

Taraporewala 1951 'perverse-thought'

Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae 'heresy'.

³⁰ See *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu*.