Yasna 32.9

This chapter is offered in support of my translation of this verse in *Part Three: Xratu-*. It also shows Zarathushtra's early struggles against the priestly establishment of his time period. And it is useful in demonstrating that the decoding of Avestan is both difficult and incomplete. Not only do manuscripts differ, but eminent linguists disagree about the meanings of many words in this verse and also about the ways in which these words should be put together (syntax), ⁓ each relying on different Vedic cognates and other linguistic considerations, and each essentially selecting translation alternatives that reflect their mind-sets. And yet I think we can translate it with reasonable assurance. And it is worthwhile because it shows us that reason and good thinking are priorities in Zarathushtra's teachings. I reference the translations and comments of our group of linguists here to avoid repeated citations.[1]

a. *duš.sastiš sravå mōrəndaṯ / hvō jyātə̄uš sə̄nghanāiš x ratūm*
b. *apō mā īštīm apayantā   / bərəx δą̄m hāitīm vanhə̄uš manaŋhō*
c. *tā ux δā mainyə̄uš mahyā / mazdā aṣ̌āicā yušmaibyā gərəzē•* Y32.9.[2]

My translation.
a. 'The person of evil teaching distorts (true) words, he by (his) teachings, (distorts) the reasoning of life.
b. He thus thwarts (my) wish ⁓ the precious attainment of good thinking.
c. I lament these words of my (very) being, to you Wisdom, and to truth.' Y32.9.

Discussion.

These words indicate that this verse was probably composed at an early stage of Zarathushtra's career ⁓ perhaps before he had won over King Vishtaspa. It reflects the opposition he faced in his struggles to persuade people to think for themselves, to search for truth, to use reason (rather than being trapped in fear) in dealing with life, and so to attain good thinking (a divine quality).

It is worth noting how Zarathushtra identifies his adversaries here (and throughout the Gathas) ⁓ not as competing religions, or tribes, or races, but rather as those who teach a distorted view of life ⁓ one that is not based on reason, and thus a view that prevents them from attaining good thinking ⁓ the incremental (and eventually complete) comprehension of truth ⁓ which is Zarathushtra's most ardent with. This verse also demonstrates his priorities. His wish is not that people should obey him (instead of the other fellow). His wish is for the attainment good thinking through reason by the people of his society.

Finally, consider to whom his lament is addressed. It is not addressed just to the Divine. It is addressed to the Divine and truth. Throughout the Gathas, we see this form of addressing the Divine ⁓ in tandem with Its characteristics ⁓ sometimes together with truth, and sometimes with truth and its comprehension, good thinking,[3] demonstrating that his allegience is not to a specific deity, but rather to the quality if Its nature, its being. His allegience is to the true (good, correct) order of existence, and to the life force that comprehends and personifies it ⁓ Wisdom (*mazdā-*) his most frequently used name for the Divine.

* * * * *

Let us now consider the grammatical value and meaning(s) of each word in this verse and how they are put together, starting with line a. in two parts.

a. *duš.sastiš sravå mōrəndat̯   / ...*
a. (the) person of evil teaching distorts (true) words, / ...

duš.sastiš '(the) person of evil teaching';
The prefix *duš/duž* means 'bad', 'evil'; (for example *duš.šyaoϑana-* 'bad actions', *duš.x šaϑra-* 'bad rule', *duž.vacah-* 'bad words', *duž.varəna-* 'bad choices', to name a few).

Skjaervo 2006, says that *duš.sastiš* is nom. sg. of *duš.sasti-* an adj. which he says means 'who makes bad announcements' deriving from *sąh* 'to announce'. He also shows *sąstra-* 'instruction' deriving from *sąh* 'to announce'.

In the context of line a., this adj. is used as a noun, thus literally, '(the) evil-pronouncing-one', or '(the) evil-teaching-one'.   In more fluent English, '(the) person of evil teaching'.

Taraporewala 1951 translates the word as "False-Teacher", commenting "i.e. a teacher of false doctrines";
Humbach/Faiss 2010 as "The blasphemer", which by definition can only be a human being;
Moulton 1921 as 'The teacher of evil", so also Bartholomae;
Insler 1975 translates *duš.sastiš* as 'the one of evil doctrine'.   But he interprets *duš.sastiš* to mean the "evil spirit" or "*angrō mainyuš*." I am not persuaded by this interpretation as detailed in another chapter.[4]

The key to interpreting *duš.sastiš* 'the person of evil teachings' in line a. of this verse (Y32.9a), is line a. of the very next verse (Y32.10a). Here they are. (Insler's translation of the full verse Y32.9 is footnoted so that you can see the context).[5]

Insler 1975. "The one of evil doctrine [*duš.sastiš*] has ruined the (true) words [*sravå*]..."Y32.9.

Insler 1975. "Each such man has ... ruined Thy teachings [*sravå*] ... " Y32.10.

In the Gathas, the evil spirit (as in the Devil, rather than an evil way of being) is conspicuous by its absence, and *angra- mainyu-* is not used as a name in any verse.[6] By contrast, Zarathushtra frequently complains (especially in Yasna 32) about human beings who do evil -- primarily people in positions of secular and religious power -- including priests, whose job it would have been to make pronouncements regarding the desires and intentions of the local gods, in whose names these priests demanded extravagant sacrifices, tried to control people's behavior through fear, and in general made their lives a misery.[7]   For example, in this same Yasna 32 Zarathushtra says

"By reason of that teaching with which they deflected men from the best action [*vahištāt̯ šyaoϑanāt̯* 'from most good action'] ... the rich Karpan [a type of priest] chose the rule of tyrants and deceit rather than truth." Y32.12. Insler 1975; *vahišta-* is the superlative degree of intrinsic goodness, thus abl. sg. *vahištāt̯ šyaoϑanāt̯* 'from (the) most-good action'.

I therefore think that *duš.sastiš* in our verse Y32.9a, refers generically to this type of priest -- one who makes bad pronouncements in the name of the local gods. True, translating *duš.sastiš* as 'the person of evil teachings' may not be the most exact English equivalent, but to a reader in English, 'the person of bad pronouncements' would not convey the intended meaning, which here is to

contrast such 'pronouncements' of the local priests with Zarathushtra's words about the teaching of Wisdom, which is to use reason in the search for truth in order to comprehend it.

sravå '(true) words'

Skjaervo 2006 identifies *sravå* as nom./acc. pl. of the ntr. stem *sravah-*, translating it as 'fame'. (Insler 1975 in another verse translates *srāvahyeitī* as 'fame').[8] But translators disagree regarding the meaning of *sravå* in Y32.9a.

Skjaervo 2006 shows *sravå* as deriving from *srao-* 'to hear, to listen to'.

I think the literal meaning of *sravah-* is 'that which is to be heard' ~ hence 'words', or 'teachings'.

Here (in Y32.9) Insler 1975 translates *sravå* as "(true) words". But in the next verse, Y32.10, he translates *sravå* as "teachings" (so also in Y32.12a *sravaŋhā* instr. sg. "by reason of that teaching").

As a practical matter, in the Gathas, the teachings of Wisdom (*mazdā-*) are indeed called His 'word(s)' ~ using the synonyms *ux δa-* and *vacah-*. For example,

"... in accordance with Thy lofty words [*ux δāiš*]..." Y28.6, Insler 1975;

"... that word [*vacə̄*] which is to be heard as the best [*vahištəm* 'most good'] for men..." Y45.5, Insler 1975; 'most good' meaning intrinsic goodness.

"... when I was first instructed by your words [*ux δāiš*], painful seemed to me my faith in men to bring to realization that which ye told me is the best [*vahištəm* 'most good'] ..." Y43.11, Insler 1975.

Insler in his comment on our verse (Y32.9) says that *sravå* requires *vohū* or the like because of the contrast with *duš.sastiš* "the one of evil doctrine". He therefore translates *sravå* in Y32.9 as 'the (true) words'. I agree. Zarathushtra frequently calls his teachings 'the path of truth'.[9] I therefore think the implied word "(true)" most accurately reflects Zarathushtra's intent here ~ distinguishing it from the teachings of those who distort truth.

Taraporewala 1951 translates *sravå* as "Scriptures". He comments that in Younger Avestan texts (such as Yy57.4), Zarathushtra's teachings are called *sravå zaraθuštri*. But (with respect) I think the interpretive 'scriptures' reflects institutionalized religion and would have been a later development ~ just as *daēnā-* 'envisionment' in the Gathas later came to mean 'religion'.[10]

mōrəndaṱ '[he] distorts'
In Avestan, the form of the verb tells us whether its subject is 1p (I, we), 2p (you), or 3p (he, she, it). Therefore these pronouns are not separately stated. They are implicit in the form of the verb. Translators generally agree that the verb form *mōrəndaṱ* is 3p. sg. ~ referring to the person who is *duš.sastiš*, but they disagree on the English equivalent which most accurately conveys the meaning of the verb.
Insler 1975 translates *mōrəndaṱ* "has ruined";
Humbach/Faiss 2010 as "spoils";
Moulton 1912 as "destroys".
Taraporewala 1951 as "distorts". He comments that Bartholomae sees *mōrəndaṱ* as a form of the verb *mərəd-* 'to distort, to destroy', citing Skt. roots and a conjectured Arya root.

Skjaervo 2006 thinks that *mōrəndaṯ* is Inj. 3p. sg. of the verb *mard-* 'to divert'. If Skjaervo is correct, then 'divert' in the context of this verse (Y32.9) would be used in the sense of 'diverting from truth', which would give us '(the) person of evil teaching diverts (true) words'.

As an attribute of the Divine, truth (the true (good, correct) order of existence) is non-dying (*aməṧa-*), and in the Gathas, it is more than once associated with the Divine attribute non-deathness (*amərətāt-*).[11] Truth therefore is eternal, immutable. It cannot be destroyed, or ruined, but a person may distort the truth, or divert others from it.

I think 'distorts' is the most accurate English equivalent in the context of this Yasna (Y32), in which this word (in two different conjugations) appears in 4 consecutive verses ~ *mōrəndaṯ* in Y32.9a, Y32.10a, and *mōrəndən* in Y32.11a and Y32.12; in all of which 'to distort' fits well contextually. I translate these words in context as follows,

Y32.9a. *duš.sastiš sravå mōrəndaṯ*
  'The person of evil teachings distorts the (true) words...'

Y32.10a. *hvō mā nā sravå mōrəndaṯ*
  'That man indeed distorts Thy teachings...'

Y32.11a. *taēcīṯ mā mōrəndən* [3p. pl.] *jyōtūm yōi drəgvantō...*
  'Those who are deceitful [*taēcīṯ ... yōi drəgvantō*] ... they indeed distort life [*mā mōrəndən jyōtūm*]...'

Y32.12b   *...yōi gə̄uš mōrəndən ... jyōtūm*
  '(those) who distort the life of the cow...' (i.e. they distort the beneficial in mortal existence)

Other translations of these phrases are footnoted for comparative purposes.[12]

Now at first thought, the last phrase above (in Y32.12b) may seem to make no sense, and all 4 phrases may seem to say different things. But indeed, I see them as different ways of expressing the same underlying thought.

In the first two verses above (Y32.9a and 10a), it is Wisdom's teachings, Its words, that are being distorted. And what are Its teachings? They are the path of truth,[13] the path of the amesha spenta ~ true (correct) order of existence (*aṧa-*), refracted into its component parts ~ its comprehension good thinking (*vohu- manah-*), its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action (*spənta- ārmaiti-*), its good rule (*vohu- x ṧaϑra-*), its complete, undying, attainment (*haurvatāt- amərətāt-*) all of which comprise the beneficial-sacred way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*).

In the fourth verse above (Y32.12b), it is the 'life of the cow' that is being distorted. The 'cow' is an allegory for the beneficial-sacred (the amesha spenta) in mortal existence,[14] therefore if we look past the (allegorical) image of the 'cow', this line would mean 'those who distort the life of the beneficial-sacred in mortal existence'. And what is the beneficial-sacred in mortal existence? It is the true (correct) order of existence (*aṧa-*) refracted into its component parts, all attributes of the Divine ~ which are also the teachings of the Divine in a nutshell (the first two verses Y32.9a. and 10a.) ~ the path of the true order of existence (*aṧa-*).

In the third verse above (Y32.11a), it is 'life' that is being distorted. And what is undistorted life? It is the true (correct) order of existence (*aṧa-*), ~ the beneficial-sacred in mortal existence (and perhaps with double entendre, life as non-deathness).[15]

* * *

Line a. ... (2d half)   / *hvō jyātəuš sānghanāiš x ratūm*
Line a. ... (2d half)   / he, by (his) teachings, (distorts) the reasoning of life,

More literally, he, by (his) teachings, the reasoning of life (distorts)...'. The implied (distorts) is explained below, when I discuss how the words of this phrase should be put together (syntax).

hvō   'he' / 'that one'
hvō is nom. sg. masc./ntr. of the demonstrative pronoun stem *ha-* 'that one'; which in Av. is also used as a 3p personal pronoun 'he/it'.[16]   In this context, *hvō* can only be 'he' ~ referring to the previously mentioned 'person of evil teaching'.

sānghanāiš   'by (his) teachings'
sānghanāiš is instr. pl. of a conjectured ntr. stem *sāŋhana-* (Skjaervo 2006), which is related to *sāngha-*, which Insler 1975 states is used in three ways 'to declare', 'to teach', 'to decree';[17]

x ratūm '(the) reasoning'
Skjaervo 2006 shows *x ratūm* as acc. sg. of *x ratu-*, and therefore is the object of the implied verb (distorts). But translators disagree widely about the meaning of *x ratu-* in the Gathas. These differences are explored in *Part Three: Xratu* where I show why I think the word has the following meanings. I am indebted to Insler 1975 for demonstrating that in Avestan, the same word is often used in 3 ways ~ as faculty, as process, and as object, which has been discussed in some detail in another chapter.[18]

As faculty it means the 'ability to reason/discern' or a 'reasoning-faculty',
As process it means 'reasoning, discerning',
As object it means 'reason(s), reasonings(s), discernment(s)'.

In the context of this verse, I think *x ratūm* is used as process ~ the process of using reason (as a part of good thinking) in addressing how we live our lives ~ our beliefs, our activities, our reactions to events, etc. ~ in contrast to obeying without question, the dictates of the religious establishment, which is what Zarathushtra opposed in his day.

jyātəuš   'of life'
jyātəuš is gen. sg. of the masc. noun *jyātu-* 'life'.[19]

Now how should we put these words together to form a coherent phrase or sentence?

It is apparent that this phrase *hvō jyātəuš sānghanāiš x ratūm* has no verb. But it requires a verb to work ~ having both a subject (he), an object (the reasoning of life), and an indirect object (by (his) teachings).   In GAv. a verb that is expressed in one phrase (or sentence) often is implied in a subsequent phrase (or sentence). I therefore think the previously expressed verb in the first half of line a., *mōrəndat* '[he] distorts' is implied in the second half of line a. Thus,

hvō jyātəuš sānghanāiš x ratūm   'he, by (his) teachings, (distorts) the reasoning of life,'

* * *

Line b. *apō mā īštīm apayantā   / bərəxδəm hāitīm vanhōuš manaŋhō*
Line b. 'he thus thwarts (my) wish ⁓ /   the precious attainment of good thinking.'

This line has both linguistic uncertainties and mss. variations which have generated translation differences.   Let us puzzle it out, starting with the verb phrase.

apō mā … apayantā   'he thus thwarts'
A difficult phrase. Let us start with *mā*, becaue the verb phrase itself is *apō … apayantā*.   All our linguists except for Taraporewala have ignored *mā* in their translations.

In GAv. *mā* has more than one grammatical value and meaning, but the only generally accepted one that fits this context is its use as an emphatic particle which in GAv. as in Ved. can emphasize a pronoun, noun, or verb phrase. In Ved. it can also (in certain circumstances) be used as a word that denotes continuing or repeated action, but none of the Avestan grammars available to me show that *mā* is used in that way in Avestan.[20]   In our verse, I think the Ved. use of *mā* to denote continuing or repeated action is the best contextual fit.   But absent more definitive evidence, I am not comfortable adopting that view.   For the next best contextual fit (my 2d choice), I am persuaded by Taraporewala that *mā* emphasizes the verb phrase, which could be translated in a number of ways ⁓ 'so', 'thus', 'just', 'indeed' ⁓ especially since we see this use of *mā* as an emphatic particle in two verses following ours, in this same Yasna (Y32.10 and 11), as follows.

Y32.9 (our verse) *apō mā … apayantā*   'he thus thwarts', my translation ⁓ used to emphasize how 'he thwarts'.

Y32.10 *hvō mā nā sravå mōrəndaṯ   yə acištəm … aogədā...* 'That man indeed distorts Thy teachings who has professed the worst ...' my translation. Here *mā* is framed or encapsulated by the pronoun *hvō* 'that', and the noun *nā* 'man', indicating that the three words form one unit of thought.[21] Thus, *mā* emphasizes the pronoun and its noun *hvō mā nā*   'that man indeed', (although in English it could be said to emphasize the verb 'indeed distorts').

Y32.11   … *mā mōrəndən jyōtūm* …   "...They indeed distort life..." my translation. Here *mā* emphasizes the 3p pl. verb *mōrəndən*.

Comparative translations of these phrases in Y32.10 and Y32.11 have already been previously footnoted (with *mā* in red font) which show that in these verses, except for Taraporewala, none of the translations in our group account for *mā*. And the same is true in our verse (Y32.9), where (except for Taraporewala, who translates *mā* as an emphatic particle), none of the other translations account for *mā*. True, sometimes it is not possible to account for a GAv. emphatic particle in a fluent English translation, but I do not think this is one of those instances.

Which brings us to the verb phrase *apō mā … apayantā*.

Our group is unanimous in thinking that *apa* in the word *apayantā* should be removed as redundant, because it repeats *apō* and is therefore inaccurate ⁓ presumably added later as an error in copying (or chanting). They indicate this opinion by placing *apa* in round parentheses, or square brackets, to show that it should be omitted. Taraporewala 1951 leaves *apa* out entirely. I question whether this may not be unduly arbitrary for the reasons footnoted.[22]

Insler 1975 translates *apō mā … (apa) yantā* as "he has robbed". He gives a detailed comment in support of this translation which I have footnoted (in summary).[23] (His translation does not comment on, or account for, *mā*).

Humbach 1991 translates *apō mā … [apa] yantā* as "he robs" giving no comment on these words. (His translation does not account for *mā*).

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *apō mā … (apa) yantā* as "he robs", without comment. (Their translation does not account for *mā*).

Taraporewala 1951, translates *apō mā … yantā* as "he removes [*yantā*] indeed [*mā*] far [*apō*] (from us)...". His comments on his translation choices are footnoted (in summary).[24]

Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae translate the phrase as "...he prevents...".   (Their translations do not account for *mā*).

Skjaervo 2006 (under the verb *yam-*) shows *apa.yam-* as "mid[dle voice]: 'to rob' (+ 2 acc.)"; and cites only one conjugation *apō … apayantā* aorist injunctive 3p sg. which appears only once in all extant GAv. texts ⁓ in our verse Y32.9.

The differences amongst linguists seem to be irreconcilable, and their choices depend on their understanding of Ved. cognates and texts, and on how they translate and put together the other words in line b. of our verse.   But one thing is clear. None of them translates, accounts for, or comment on, *mā* except for Taraporewala who translates it as a particle that emphasizes the verb.

In the context of this verse and line b. in particular, I find persuasive, Bartholomae's understanding of the meaning of the verb, and Taraporewala's choice on *mā* as a particle of emphasis.
Thus I translate *apō mā … apayantā* as 'he thus thwarts'.
Based on my discussion in a previous footnote, I actually prefer 'he continuously thwarts', which is the best contextual fit, but that is based on speculation, so I have not adopted that view in my translation.

īštīm '(my) wish'
Most linguists give *īštīm* an acc. sg. value, but differ as to its meaning.
Skjaervo 2006 shows a fem. noun *īšti-* with *īštīm* as one of its declensions without identifying which declension (case/number).   But Jackson 1892 § 251 shows the *-īm* inflection to be acc. sg. for masc. and fem. *i-* stem nouns.   So the acc. sg. form of the fem. stem *īšti-* would indeed be *īštīm*. If this is correct, then here in line b. *īštīm* would be the object of the verb, 'he thus thwarts (my) wish'.

The meaning of *īštīm*: In Avestan (as in English) a given word may have two or more completely different meanings. For example in English, *case* is a lawsuit; *case* is a container; *case* is an eventuality (*in any case; in either case*).   And it is possible that *īšti-* is a word with more than one meaning.   So the question is, what is its meaning here.

Skjaervo 2006 thinks that *īšti-* means "wish (ritual(?)," deriving from *aēš-* which is used in several related senses ⁓ 'to be able/capable of, to control, to desire'. He does not show any other meanings for *īšti-*. But other linguists do.

Taraporewala 1951, gives Bartholomae's view, that *īštīm* can mean 'possession' and also 'power' deriving it from *īš-* 'to rule, to have power', giving an almost identical Skt. cognate. Bartholomae's

English translation of Y32.9 (shown by Taraporewala) translates *īštīm* as 'possession', as does the translation of Moulton 1912. But Taraporewala himself (without further explanation) translates *īštīm* as 'heritage'.

Insler 1975 translates *īštīm* as 'power' here, commenting (under a different verse) that both *īš-* and *īšti-* may consistently be translated as 'power' throughout the Gathas, and are characteristically employed beside the allied concept *xšaϑra-* 'mastery, sovereignty', giving a detailed discussion of related words and many examples of their use.[25] Without doubt, in many of the verses in which it appears, *īšti-* as 'power' does indeed fit the context well. However, Insler himself translates *īštiš* as 'wish' in Y53.1 "The best wish [*īštiš* nom. sg.][26] of Zarathushtra Spitama has been heard if the Wise Lord shall grant to him those attainments in accord with truth ..." Y53.1 Insler 1975. And indeed, the "attainments in accord with truth" (Y53.1a) approximates (in our verse) the "attainment of good thinking" *hāitīm vaŋhə̄uš manaŋhō* Y32.9b, because 'good thinking' is the comprehension of 'truth'.[27] Thus his 'wish' in Y53.1a. approximates his 'wish' in Y32.9b.

In Y32.9b, Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *īštīm* as 'command' (without comment).

In light of the above, it seems clear that *īštim* can have more than one valid meaning ~ 'wish', 'power', 'command', (and perhaps 'possession').

In our verse Y32.9b. I think *īštīm* means 'wish', (acc. sg. fem.) because throughout the Gathas, the 'attainment of good thinking' (*hāitīm vaŋhə̄uš manaŋhō*) ~ of which 'reasoning' is a part ~ is indeed Zarathushtra's most ardent and continuing wish, which the entrenched priestly bureaucracy was trying to thwart.

hāitīm 'attainment'

Jackson 1892 § 251 shows the *-īm* inflection to be acc. sg. for masc. and fem. *i* stem nouns. So *hāitīm* would be acc. sg. of the fem. stem *hāiti-*.

But our group of linguists is in material disagreement about its meaning.

Skjaervo 2006 is uncertain about both the declension and meaning of *hāitīm*. He does not identify its declension and shows its stem as *hāiti-* a fem. noun which he thinks may perhaps mean "gain(?)", and may derive from *han-* 'to gain'.

Taraporewala 1951, disagrees with Bartholomae's opinion that *hāitīm* is acc. sg. pres. participle fem. of *ah-* 'to be' (thus 'being'). Instead he expresses agreement with Andreas that *hāitīm* means 'attainment', from √*hā-* (Skt. *sā-*, *san-*), 'to bind, to unite'.[28] Taraporewala translates *hāitīm* as "realization".

Moulton 1912 translates *hāitīm* as 'being', following Bartholomae.

Insler 1975 prefers the reading *haitīm* which is supported by mss. J2, Kp1, and K4, and concludes that *haitīm* is an expression of belonging. Thus he translates *haitīm vanhə̄uš manaŋhō* as "belongs to good thinking" (giving the gen. *vanhə̄uš manaŋhō* a dat. value, 'to ___', which is sometimes found in GAv.).

Humbach/Faiss 2010 seem to translate *hāitīm* as 'ward', without comment. Their meaning is not clear to me.

Andreas' view reflects parallel thoughts expressed in other Gatha verses, and it fits the context of this line (and verse). I therefore find it persuasive. Literally, the idea expressed here is being bound together or united with good thinking, or in more fluent English, the 'attainment' of good thinking, as Andreas sees it.

In Y30.10 we see the same idea, using the verb 'yoked' in a racing metaphor "...and there shall be yoked from the good dwelling place of good thinking, the swiftest steeds, which shall race ahead unto the good fame of the Wise One and of truth." Insler 1975.

And from a slightly different perspective, we see a parallel idea expressed in Y53.4 "... the sunlike gain [*haŋhuš*] of good thinking..." Y53.4, Insler 1975.[29]

Thus, *hāitīm vanhə̄uš manaŋhō* 'the attainment of good thinking'.

bərəx δąm   'precious'

Skjaervo 2006 shows *bərəx δąm* as an adj. ~ acc. sg. fem. of the adj. stem *bərəx δa-*. As such it could describe the acc. sg. fem. noun *īštīm*, or the acc. sg. fem. noun *hāitīm* 'attainment' (because in GAv. an adjective's form has to be in the same case/number/gender as the noun it describes). Taraporewala, Bartholomae, Andreas, and Moulton, think that *bərəx δąm* describes *hāitīm*, whereas Insler and Humbach 1991 think it describes *īštīm*. I think it is less likely that *bərəx δąm* describes *īštīm*, because *īštīm* is framed or encapsulated by the verb phrase, and therefore belongs with it as a unit of thought (of which *bərəx δąm* is not a part). Which brings us to its meaning.

Taraporewala 1951 cites Bartholomae's opinion that *bərəx δąm* means 'precious', 'prized'. (although he disagrees with Bartholomae's grammatical analysis of the word). Exploring various Skt. word forms, he concludes that *bərəx δąm* means 'precious', 'highly esteemed' and he translates *bərəx δąm hāitīm* as "the precious realization", giving Andreas' translation 'valued attainment', with which he agrees.

Moulton 1912 translates *bərəx δąm hāitīm* as 'being prized'. His translation is the same as that of Bartholomae.

Skjaervo 2006 shows *bərəx δa-* as "esteemed, exalted(?)", indicating an element of uncertainty as to meaning.

Insler 1975 translates *bərəx δąm* as 'esteemed', translating *īštīm … bərəx δąm* "the esteemed power".

Humbach 1991 comments that the adj. *bərəx δa-* is related to the root noun *bərəg/bərəj* 'esteem' and translates *īštīm … bərəx δąm* as "the command (which is) esteemed)"

The word *bərəx δąm* also appears in other Gatha verses in which the meaning 'esteemed' fits well, as do the meanings 'valued' and 'precious/prized'.[30]

Here in Y32.9, I think that *bərəx δąm* describes *hāitīm vanhə̄uš manaŋhō* 'the attainment of good thinking, because in Zarathushtra's thought, this attainment is both the incremental path to paradise, and ultimately paradise itself (the House of Good Thinking). The attainment of good thinking is a state of being that comprehends truth (first incrementally, and then completely). Thus in his system of thought, 'the attainment of good thinking' is all three ~ 'esteemed', 'valued' and 'precious/prized' ~ greatly desired. None of these English equivalents alone adequately describes the role that 'the attainment of good thinking' plays in Zarathushtra's thought. Yet, for a fluent

translation, we have to pick one. In this context, 'esteemed' and 'valued' do not adequately reflect his passionate desire for, and commitment to promote, the attainment of good thinking ~ a desire that is thwarted by the dictates of the local priests who see the exercise of reason and goodness as a threat to their power. I therefore (reluctantly) select 'precious' ~ wishing I knew of one English equivalent that combined 'esteemed', 'valued' and 'precious'.

vanhə̄uš manaŋhō   'of good thinking'

Both words are the forms for gen./abl. sg. ntr. of their respective stems ~ *vohu-* 'good' (an adj.), and *manah-* 'thinking', which all linguists agree is a ntr. noun in GAv. (Skjaervo 2006). In this context I doubt that the abl. ('from/because ___') would work regardless of how the other words are translated so I take both the noun and its adj. to be gen. sg. ('of ___).

Insler 1975 "to good thinking" gives these gen. words a dat. flavor, which sometimes is found in GAv.

Humbach/Faiss 2010, Taraporewala 1951, Bartholomae, and Moulton 1912 all translate *vanhə̄uš manaŋhō* as gen. sg. ("of good thinking").

Let us next consider how all the words in line b. should be put together in English syntax, to reflect (as accurately as we can) Zarathushtra' intent.

b. *apō mā īštīm apayantā / bərəxδąm hāitīm vanhə̄uš manaŋhō*

The verb and its subject are 'he thwarts' (*apō … apayantā*). a
And (as I read it) the acc. words ~ '(my) wish', and '(the) attainment', are objects of the verb 'he thwarts'.

Here for comparative purposes are my translation, and the ways in which our linguists have translated this line.

Line b. *apō mā īštīm apayantā   bərəxδąm hāitīm vanhə̄uš manaŋhō*

My translation 'He thus thwarts (my) wish ~ the precious attainment of good thinking".
Insler 1975 "He has robbed the esteemed power which really belongs to good thinking".
Humbach 1991 "He robs (people) of the command (which is) esteemed by good thought".
Humbach/Faiss 2010 "He robs (people of their) command, the ward of good thought".
Taraporewala 1951 "he removes, indeed, far (from us) (our) heritage ~ the precious realization of Vohu Mano".
Moulton 1912 "He prevents the possession of good thought from being prized."
Bartholomae's translation of line b. is identical to that of Moulton.

As you can see, line b. in particular demonstrates that GAv. has not been fully decoded, that many uncertainties still remain, and that the conclusions of even eminent linguists sometimes contain some (educated) guesses ~ illustrating how foolish it is to be intolerant of differing opinions (that have a defensible linguistic basis). These differences should be placed on the back burner against the day when an evolving understanding of GAv. may resolve them. And so we come to the last line.

* * *

Line c. *tā uxδā mainyə̄uš mahyā   mazdā ašāicā yušmaibyā gərəzē* ⁚•

Line c. Literally, 'With this utterance of my way of being, I lament, to you Wisdom, and to truth.'
Line c. More fluently, I lament these words of my (very) being, to you Wisdom, and to truth.

Let us start with the verb, which will help us to puzzle out the remaining words, and how they fit.

gərəzē 'I lament'
All translators conjugate this verb as 1p. sg. indicative (present). And their translations of this word
(in Y32.9c.) are different shades of the same underlying thought.
Insler 1975 'I lament';
Humbach/Faiss 2010 'I complain';
Skjaervo 2006 'I complain', under *garz-* 'to complain';
Taraporewala 1951 'I do appeal' as a conjugation of *gərəz-* (Skt. *gaṛh*) 'to complain, to appeal';
Moulton 1912 'I wail'; so also Bartholomae.

This verb appears (in different conjugations), in 3 Gatha verses.

1. In Y29.1 where the soul of the allegorical cow (the beneficial in mortal existence),[31] cries out in
anguish ~ laments (*gərəždā*) ~ about the torments she is enduring.[32]

2. In our verse Y32.9c., in which Zarathushtra is anguished about a religious authority who distorts
the truth and thwarts what Zarathushtra is trying to accomplish ~ promoting the attainment of good
thinking.

3. In Y46.1, Zarathushtra cries out in anguish "To what land to flee? Where shall I go to flee? They
exclude (me) from my family and from my clan..." Insler 1975. And in the next verse Y46.2 he says
"...I lament [*gərəzōi*] to Thee. Take notice of it, Lord, offering the support which a friend should
grant to a friend." Insler 1975.[33] Skjaervo 2006 shows both forms *gərəzē* and *gərəzōi* as 1p sg.
indicative (I do not know if originally there was a difference in meaning, or how these 2 forms came
about).

The English equivalent 'to lament' combines two shades of meaning ~ a deeply felt complaint that is
made in anguish ~ and fits the contexts of all three verses ~ Y29.1, Y46.2 and Y32.9 ~ whereas to 'to
complain' or 'to appeal' could be serious or petty and need not be anguished at all. I therefore think
'I lament' is the closest English equivalent for *gərəzē*.

tā uxδā 'these words'
uxδā. Skjaervo 2006 shows *uxδā* as the form for 2 declensions ~ instr. sg. and nom./acc. pl. ~ of
the ntr. stem *uxδa-* which he says means 'utterance'.
In the Gathas, the pl. of *uxδa-* is also used for 'words' ("... in accordance with Thy lofty words
[*uxδāiš*]..." Y28.6, Insler 1975 (*uxδāiš* is instr. pl.).
tā also is the form for instr. sg. and nom./acc. pl. (among other things)[34] of the
personal/demonstrative pronoun stem *ta-* 'he, that' (Skjaervo 2006) which fits the two possible
declensions of *uxδā* (instr. sg. and nom./acc. pl.).

Humbach 1991 translated *tā uxδā* as acc. pl. but felt that an implied 'with' was required "(With)
these statements ... I complain ..." but in 2010 he changed to instr. sg.

As instr. sg. *tā uxδā ... gərəzē*
Humbach/Faiss 2010 "with this statement ... I complain..."

Taraporewala 1951 "with this expression ... do I appeal"

As as acc. pl. *tā ux δā … gərəzē*

Insler 1975, "I lament these words..."
Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae "these words ... I wail unto you..."

As a practical matter, these differences do not affect the underlying meaning. The phrase *tā ux δā* refers to Zarathushtra's preceding words in which he laments about a person who distorts the truth and reason, and prevents the attainment of good thinking. I think the instr. sg. is the more literal translation.   But the acc. pl. gives us a more fluent English version of his thought. The meaning however is the same.
Line c. Literally, 'With this utterance [instr. sg.] of my way of being, I lament,   to you Wisdom, and to truth.'
Line c. More fluently, I lament these words [acc. pl.] of my (very) being, to you, Wisdom, and to truth.

mainyə̄uš mahyā   'of my (very) being'
mahyā   is a possessive pronoun 1p. gen. sg. masc./ntr. of the stem *ma-* (Skjaervo 2006). As gen. sg. masc., it belongs with gen. sg. masc. *mainyə̄uš*, thus *mainyə̄uš mahyā*   'of my way of being'.

mainyə̄uš The meanings ascribed to *mainyu-* by various translators (spirit, mind, mentality, etc.) have been discussed in great detail in another chapter, in which I explain the reasons why I think that *mainyu-* as faculty means 'nature/being', and as process it means a 'way of being'.[35]   In this line (Y32.9c) I think *mainyə̄uš* is used as faculty, 'of my nature/being' ~ the idea being conveyed is that his lament is from the very depths of his being ~ the kind of person he is (committed to reason, good thinking, the path of truth).
mainyə̄uš is gen./abl. sg. of the masc. stem *mainyu-* (Skjaervo 2006 ~ spelling the stem *manyu-*), thus 'of___' (gen.), or 'from/because___' (abl.). Here, *mainyə̄uš* has to be gen. sg. because of its gen. sg. pronoun *mahyā* 'my'.   The sense in English is more ablative in flavor ~ in that the lament is from the depths of Zarathushtra's being, but that is difficult to translate (accurately) into English.

Thus *tā ux δā mainyə̄uš mahyā … gərəzē*
Literally, 'I lament these words of my way of being'
More fluently and to bring out the depths of Zarathushtra's anguish, 'I lament these words of my (very) being'.

All the other translations in our group translate *mainyə̄uš mahyā* as 'of my spirit'.

Here for comparative purposes are their translations of this phrase.
tā ux δā mainyə̄uš mahyā … gərəzē,
My translation 'I lament these words of my (very) being ...'
Insler 1975 "... I lament these words of my spirit ..."
Humbach 1991 "(With) these words of my spirit I complain..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010 "With this statement of my spirit I complain ..."
Taraporewala 1951 "With this expression of my (inner) Spirit, ... do I appeal."
Moulton 1912 "These words of my spirit I wail unto you..."
Bartholomae "These words of my spirit I wail unto you...".

yušmaibyā 'to you'
dat. pl. of the personal pronoun 2p pl. *yūš*, *yūžə̄m* 'you' (Skjaervo 2006).

If *yušmaibyā* is pl. then the phrase *mazdā ašāicā yušmaibyā* poses an interesting puzzle.

Zarathushtra often alternates between using the sg. and the pl. for Wisdom (*mazdā-*), in instances which indicate the inclusion with Him of His Divine attributes (the amesha spenta), and also those who have attained these attributes,[36] ~ a plurality which forms a unity. And that may be why he uses the pl. here.

Insler 1975 attempts to solve the grammatical problem by inserting an implied "(to Thee)" for Wisdom, while translating the plural 'you' *yušmaibyā* separately as "to all of you" (although there is no *vīspāi* 'to all' in the GAv. text, and 'you' is not gen.). Thus he translates this phrase, "I lament these words of my spirit (to Thee), Wise One, and to truth ~ to all of you!" Insler 1975.

Taraporewala 1951 translates *yušmaibyā* as dat. sg. "to Thee" but comments that it is dat. du., stating that a literal translation would be "O Mazda, (to Thee) and to Aša ~ to You both". If indeed *yušmaibyā* were dat. du. this would solve the problem. But none of the grammars available to me ~ Jackson, Skjaervo, Martinez & de Vaan, and Macdonell ~ show a word for 2p dat. du. in personal pronouns).[37]

All our other translators simply use "you" which in English can be used for sg. and pl.

mazdā 'Wisdom'
mazdā voc. sg., Zarathushtra's most used name for the Divine.

ašāicā 'and to truth'
ašāicā is dat. sg. of *aša-* with the suffix *-cā* 'and'.

<center>* * * * *</center>

Here, for comparative purposes, are the ways in which the translators in our group have translated the entire verse Y32.9. You can also evaluate their translation choices, in the context of their whole translation. Bear in mind, there are no capital letters in Av. script.

a. *duš.sastiš sravå̄ mōrəndaṯ / hvō jyātə̄uš sə̄nghanāiš x ratūm*
b. *apō mā īštīm apayantā / bərəxδąm hāitīm vanhə̄uš manaŋhō*
c. *tā uxδā mainyə̄uš mahyā / mazdā ašāicā yušmaibyā gərəzē•* Y32.9

My translation.
a. 'The person of evil teaching distorts (true) words; he, by (his) teachings, (distorts) the reasoning of life.
b. He thus thwarts (my) wish ~ the precious attainment of good thinking.
c. I lament these words of my (very) being, to you, Wisdom, and to truth.' Y32.9

Insler 1975
a. "The one of evil doctrine has ruined the (true) words. He has ruined the intention of life by his own teachings.
b. He has robbed the esteemed power that really belongs to good thinking.
c. I lament these words of my spirit (to Thee), Wise One, and to truth ~ to all of you!" Y32.9

<center>13</center>

Humbach 1991

a. "The blasphemer spoils one's reputation. With his pronouncements (he spoils) the intellect of the living

b. He robs (people) of the command (which is) esteemed by good thought.

c. (With) these statements of my spirit I complain to You, O Wise One, and to truth." Y32.9

Humbach/Faiss 2010

a. "The blasphemer spoils (our) eulogies, by his proclamations he (spoils) the intellect of the world/living.

b. He robs (people of their) command, the ward of good thought.

c. With this statement of my spirit I complain to you, O Wise One, and to Truth." Y32.9

Taraporewala 1951

a. "The False-Teacher distorts the Scriptures, he-indeed through-(his)-teaching (distorts) the Scheme of Life;

b. he removes, indeed, far (from us) (our) heritage ~ the precious realisation of Vohu Mano'

c. with this expression of my (inner) Spirit, O Mazda, to Thee and to Aša do-I-appeal." Y32.9

Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae

a. "The teacher of evil destroys the lore, he by his teachings destroys the design of life,

b. he prevents the possession of Good Thought from being prized.

c. These words of my spirit I wail unto you, O Mazdah, and to the Right."

* * * * * * *

---

[1] The translations and comments of our group of linguists for Y32.9 are referenced here.

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

Insler 1975 ~ his translation is at p. 47; his comments at p. 205.

Humbach 1991 ~ his translation is in Vol. 1, p. 134; his comments in Vol. 2, pp. 83 - 84.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 ~ their translation is at p. 93; they offer no comments on this verse.

Taraporewala 1951 ~ his translation is at p. 278; his comments at pp. 279 - 280; and he includes Bartholomae's English translation at p. 280.

Moulton 1912. His translation is at p. 357; he offers no comments or footnotes for this verse.

[2] Geldner 1P p. 117.

[3] In the Gathas, Zarathushtra frequently names the Divine together with truth and/or good thinking, demonstrating through this technique that his allegience is not to any particular deity, but to Wisdom, which comprehends and personifies the true (good, correct) order of existence. Here are a few examples,

"I who shall eulogize ... you [*vå* pl.] as never before ~ thee, o truth, and good thinking and the Wise Lord ..." Y28.3 Insler 1975;

"Come Thou together with good thinking. Along with truth, grant in accordance with Thy lofty words, Wise One [*mazdā-*], the long-lived gift of strong support ..." Y28.6 Insler 1975;

"... Thee and the truth and that thinking which is best [*vahišta-*]..." Y28.9 Insler 1975;

"... unto the good fame of the Wise One and of truth." Y30.10 Insler 1975;

"Come hither to me, ye best ones [*vahišta-*] ... Thou, Wise One, together with truth and good thinking..."
33.7 Insler 1975.

[4] Detailed in *Part One: Does the Devil Exist?*

[5] Here in the Insler 1975 translation are the full verse Y32.9 and the first line of Y32.10 so that you can see there is nothing other than *duš.sastiš* in verse 32.9 which would account for "Each such man" in Y32.10.

Insler 1975 "The one of evil doctrine [*duš.sastiš*] has ruined the (true) words. He has ruined the intention of life by his own teachings. He has robbed the esteemed power which really belongs to good thinking. I lament these words of my spirit (to Thee), Wise One, and to truth ~ to all of you!" Y32.9.

Insler 1975 "Each such man has (also) ruined Thy teachings..." Y32.10.

[6] See *Part One: Does the Devil Exist?*

[7] See *Part One: The Nature of the Divine.*

[8] In Y32.6, Insler 1975 translates *srāvahyeitī* as "fame";
"Shameful are the many sins by which one attains fame [*srāvahyeitī*]..." Y32.6.

[9] See *Part One: The Search for Truth*; and *Part Two: A Question of Reward & The Path.*

[10] See *Part Three: Daena.*

[11] Here are some examples, of truth being associated with non-deathness in the Gathas.

"...That the soul of the truthful person be powerful in [*amərətāt-* 'non-deathness']..." Y45.7 Insler 1975.

"...Whatever one has promised to Him with truth and with good thinking is to be completeness and [*amərətāt-* 'non-deathness'] for Him under His rule, is to be these two enduring powers for Him in His house." Y45.10 Insler 1975.

"The Wise Lord, in consequence of His abounding authority of rule over completeness and [*amərətāt-* 'non-deathness'] and over truth..." Y31.21, Insler 1975.

[12] Here for comparative purposes are translations of these verses, showing how the translators in our group have translated this verb in these verses.

Y32.9a. *duš.sastiš sravå mōrəndaṯ*
  Insler 1975   "The one of evil doctrine has ruined the (true) words ..."
  Humbach/Faiss 2010   "The blasphemer spoils (our) eulogies..."
  Taraporewala 1951 "The False Teacher distorts the Scriptures ..."
  Moulton 1912 "The teacher of evil destroys the lore..."

Y32.10a. *hvō mā nā sravå mōrəndaṯ*
  Insler 1975 "Each such man has (also) ruined Thy teachings..."
  Humbach/Faiss 2010 "That man spoils (our) eulogies..."
  Taraporewala 1951 "Such person assuredly distorts the Scriptures..."
  Moulton 1912 "He it is that destroys the lore.

Y32.11a. ... *mā mōrəndən* [3p. pl.] *jyōtūm*
  Insler 1975 "even they have ruined this life..."
  Humbach/Faiss 2010 "Particularly those spoil (our) life / livelihood..."
  Taraporewala 1951 "Persons like these indeed corrupt the course-of-(our) life..."

15

Moulton 1912 "It is they... who destroy life..."

Y32.12b ...*yōi gə̄uš mōrəndən* [3p. pl.] ... *jyōtūm*
Insler 1975 "for those who have ruined the life of the cow..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010 "to those who spoil the life of the cow..."
Taraporewala 1951 "they distract the life of creation..."
Moulton 1912 "[those] who destroy the life of the Ox...".

[13] See *Part Two: A Question of Reward & the Path.*

[14] See *Part Two: The Puzzle of the Cow & Its Network.*

[15] See the discussion on *gaēmcā ajyāitīmcā* in *Part Three: Yasna 30.3 and 4.*

[16] Jackson 1892 §§ 409, 416, pp. 117 - 118;   Skjaervo 2006, however he does not show case, number or gender.

[17] Insler 1975 p. 180, commenting under Y31.1. The word *sə̄ngha-* is discussed in more detail, with other opinions, in *Part Three: Yasna 45.2.*

[18] Discussed in *Part One: Good Thinking, Vohu Manah.*

[19] Bearing in mind that all Av. stems are conjectured (based largely on their inflected forms which parallel those in Ved.), Skjaervo 2006 shows the following related stems, which he says have the following meanings,
gaē-/jyā- 'to live'
jyāiti- 'life'
jyāitu- 'life, living, subsistence'

In Y32.9a, with regard to *jyātə̄uš*, the *-ə̄uš-* inflection is gen sg. of *u* stem nouns, (Jackson 1892 § 262, p. 77). In the context of this verse, I think *jyātə̄uš*, means 'of life'.

[20] In GAv. *mā* has more than one meaning and grammatical value;

mā is an emphatic particle. Taraporewala 1951 comments that Bartholomae considers *mā* to be a form (enclitic) of emphatic particle corresponding to Skt. *sma*, which when it emphasizes the verb does so in certain instances similar to its use in our verse Y32.9 ~ i.e. in the middle of the verb phrase, citing a Ved. example, and Macdonell's *Vedic Grammar*.

Macdonell in his *Vedic Grammar* states that Ved. *sma* is an enclitic "slightly emphasizing particle" which is used in two sense in the Rig Veda.
(1) It can emphasize a pronoun or noun, 'just', 'especially', etc., and
(2) it can emphasize a verb 'indeed', giving examples of verb phrases in which *sma* does (indeed!) appear in the middle of the verb phrase.
He also states that in a few instances in the Rig Veda, *sma* appears before *purā* plus a pres. indicative verb to express that an action has habitually taken place in the past down to the present time, giving a Ved. example with the English translation *who have always aided = who aids now and formerly did so.* p. 250.

In GAv. Beekes shows the emphatic particle *ma* Skt. *sma* p. 145, (he spells *ma* with a short *a* but his spellings reflect what he thinks were the original spellings, rather than the mss. spellings).

mā is also a negative particle, Skjaervo 2006 ('do not'); so also Beekes 1988 p. 145; and Jackson 1892 § 732 ('not'), which does not fit the context of our verse and line Y32.9b.

mā 'me' is a personal pronoun ~ one of the forms (enclitic) for 1p. acc. sg., (personal pronouns are not gender specific). Jackson 1892 §386, p. 111. So in our context (Y32.9b.) if *mā* is a 1p acc. sg. personal pronoun, 'me', we would have *apō mā īštīm apayantā* 'he thwarts me, (my) wish, ...' a possible fit.

And *mā* 'my' is a form of the 1p possessive pronoun *ma-* but here again linguists disagree.

Skjaervo 2006 shows *mā* as a 1p. possessive pronoun for two declensions ~ instr. sg. masc. and possibly nom. sg. fem. (with a ? indicating his uncertainty).

M&dV 2001 show *mā* as a 1p. possessive pronoun for two different declensions ~ instr. sg. ntr. and nom./acc. pl. ntr. (§ 22.4, p. 74).

Jackson 1892 shows *mā* as a 1p. possessive pronoun for acc. pl. ntr. only (§ 438, p. 125).

But possessive pronouns are gender specific, and if used to describe a noun (e.g. 'my wish') the pronoun would have to be in the same case, number and gender as the noun it describes (not the gender of the person it represents). The same is true in French and Spanish (both also in the Indo-European family of languages). So in the phrase *apō mā īštīm apayantā* if *mā* were to describe *īštīm* ('my wish'), it would need to be acc. sg. fem ~ the same declension as *īštīm*, which would give us 'he thwarts my wish'. Unfortunately, none of the sources of Av. grammar to which I have access (including Beekes 1988, p. 138 which is one of the most detailed on possessive pronouns) show any declension at all for a 1p. possessive pronoun that is acc. sg. fem. Whether this is an oversight, or results from an interpretive preference, or whether such a declension existed but simply does not appear in surviving Av. texts, I do not know. But absent such information, we would have no sound basis for translating *mā* as an acc. sg. fem. possessive pronoun describing *īštīm* 'my wish'.

Macdonell in *A Vedic Grammar for Students*, (Benarsidas 2000 reprint) says that (in Vedic) possessive pronouns are rare because the genitive of the personal pronoun is generally used to express the sense which the possessive pronouns convey (§ 116, p. 112). But the GAv. 1p. gen. sg. personal pronoun forms are *mə.nā* and *mōi*, (not *mā*) M&dV § 22.1, p. 69.

[21] 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 ceasura); *Yasna 28.1* (discussed briefly); and *Yasna 44.16* (discussed briefly).

[22] In the phrase *apō mā … apayantā*, all of our linguists think that *apa* is redundant, (presumably a later addition) and should be removed. They do not say how the removal of *apa* would affect the meter, and I am not sufficiently knowledgeable about the complex meters of the Gathas to hazard an opinion. But I simply point out that in the verses of Yasna 32, the number of syllables (affecting meter) in the first and second half of each line (divided by the ceasura) vary. Most often it is 8/8 or 8/9, but frequently there are more or fewer syllables in each half, and also in the total for each line. With *apa* there would be 9 syllables in the first half of this line. Without *apa* there would be 7. Either way this is within the ambit of variations in the first half of other lines in this Yasna 32. In English poetry, meter is fairly rigid. But in GAv. poetry it may have been more fluid with the numbers varying back and forth ~ just as musical rhythms can vary back and forth in both classical music and jazz. So I do not think the meter is dispositive ~ one way or the other.

But am I not comfortable with deleting *apa* as redundant for the following reasons.

We cannot ignore one rather striking and unusual fact. Throughout the Avestan texts, Geldner shows an amazing number of mss. variations for most of the GAv. and YAv. words. And he shows mss. variations for most of the words in this verse Y32.9. But he shows no mss. variations ~ none whatever ~ for the words *apō*

mā … apayantā. True, this fact is not dispositive. Insler 1975 has insightfully demonstrated the causes which resulted in certain words being changed from their original forms, thereby resulting in grammatically inaccurate word forms in the mss. But the total absence of mss. variations needs at least to be considered. And I offer the following speculation.

It well may be that this repetition of *apō … apa* was an accepted idiomatic, or stylistic, way of expressing repeated or continuing acts. This would account for the absence of mss. variations. True, we do not have other such instances involving *apō … apa* in GAv. texts (so far as I am aware). But the corpus of such texts is small in which many words appear only once. In English (and other Indo-European languages) we also have idiomatic and stylistic expressions which involve a repetition of words to express repeated actions. Here are three examples in English,

1. *He was running, running, heart pounding, feet crashing through the underbrush...* Would a linguist 3,000 + years from now (attempting to decode an unknown language called English) be accurate in saying that the 2d *running* is redundant, incorrect?

2. *Again and again they threw themselves at the city walls*; (indicating repeated attacks); Would our hypothetical linguist be correct in thinking that one *again* is redundant and inaccurate?

3. *I have explained over and over why we must do this.* The same question applies to the repeated *over*.

If the verb phrase *apō mā … apayantā* is correct, and reflects an idiom or style of expression, then (like the examples above) it would literally mean 'he thwarts, thwarts ...'. Or in fluent English 'he continuously thwarts ...'. This is all speculation, so I do not translate this phrase with the word 'continuously' in it. But neither am I willing to agree that *apa* should simply be deleted. We should leave the matter for future linguists who may indeed discover parallels in other Av. or Indo-European texts which reveal a reason for this repetition.

[23] In his comment under Y32.9, Insler offers no Vedic or other Indo-European cognates in support of his translation of *apō mā … (apa) yantā* as "he has robbed", but invites comparison with *apayeitī*, in Y32.11 under which he comments "*apa yam* usually means 'steal'," giving what he believes to be a related example from a Younger Avestan Yasna Yy11.5 as follows, "*yō mąm taṯ draonō zināṯ vā trəfyāṯ vā apa vā *yasāiti* (Mss. *yāsāiti*) 'who shall sack me of my offering, or who shall rob it, or who shall steal it' where the 3 similar verbs *zyā*, *trp* and *apa yam* appear together." And he then cites our verse Y32.9 as follows, "*apō mā īštīm yantā* 'he has robbed the power'." p. 206.

However (referring to his YAv. example above), in Yy11.5, if *zināṯ* means 'shall sack'; and if *trəfyāṯ* means 'shall rob', then (with respect) I do not find it persuasive that *apa vā *yasāiti* would mean 'shall steal' because 'to sack' means 'to destroy', whereas 'to rob' and 'to steal' mean the same thing. It seems more probable that the speaker is speaking of three ways of being deprived of his offering, by asking who 'will sack' his offering, who 'will steal' it, who 'will divert or prevent' it ~ i.e. not give him what he is entitled to. This would lend color to 'divert/prevent' or 'thwart' for the *apa yam* words in Y32.9, Y32.11 and Yy11.5.

[24] Taraporewala 1951 comments that *apō … yantā* derives from *yam-* (Skt. *yam, yacch*) which means 'to restrain, to prevent', but which when partnered with *apō* creates an "*upasarga*", which is used in the sense of 'far' or 'away'. He states that Geldner, Bartholomae and others read *apayantā* as a repetition of the partnering of *apō* and *yantā*, with *apa* being redundant, and that Andreas leaves it out entirely translating *apō … yantā* as 'puts (or holds) afar', with which Taraporewala agrees.

[25] Insler 1975 pp. 127 - 128, commenting under Y28.7, and translating "*dāidī … vīštāspāi īšəm maibyācā* "Grant power to Vishtaspa and to me';" he gives the following examples,;
Y28.9c. *īšō x šaϑrəmcā savaŋhąm* "To mighty ones belong the powers and the mastery";

Y34.5a. *kaṯ və̄ xšaϑrəm kā īštiš* "Have ye the mastery, have ye the power?";
Y46.16d. *yaϑrā vaŋhə̄uš manaŋhō īštā xšaϑrəm* "where the sovereignty is in the power of good thinking..."

[26] In Y53.1a. the Insler 1975 translation gives a nom. sg. value to *īštiš* as 'wish' ~ the subject of the verb 'has been heard'. And the *-iš* inflection is in fact nom. sg. for masc. and fem. *i-* stem nouns, Jackson 1892 **§** 251. In our verse, *īštīm* is the acc. sg. form for masc. and fem. *i-* stem nouns like *īšti-* (Jackson 1892 **§** 251, p. 74).

[27] See *Part One: Good Thinking, Vohu Manah*; and *Part Two: A Question of Reward & the Path*.

[28] Taraporewala does not give us Andreas' opinion regarding the stem for *hāitīm* 'attainment', but *hāitīm* would have to be acc. sg. fem. based on its acc. sg. fem adj. *bərəx δąm*.

[29] *... manaŋhō vaŋhə̄uš x⁽ə̄⁾nvaṯ haŋhuš...* "... the sunlike gain of good thinking..." Y53.4 Insler 1975.

Insler's his translation gives *haŋhuš* an acc. sg. value, "The Wise Lord shall grant (to her) the sunlike gain [*haŋhuš*] of good thinking..." Y53.4. But his comment does not identify the stem.

Taraporewala 1951, p. 839 citing Bartholomae, comments that *haŋhuš* is acc. sg. and derives from *han-* 'to acquire, to gain' although in here (in Y53.4) he translates the word as 'heritage' (as does Bartholomae), whereas in Y32.9 he translates *īštīm* as 'heritage'. Taraporewala's grammatical analyses are often helpful, but the conclusions he draws from them tend to be a bit interpretive.

Skjaervo 2006 is uncertain but thinks that *haŋhuš* may be "gain" nom. sg. of a conjectured noun stem *haŋhuš-* "gain(?)" possibly deriving from "< *han-* ??" (all question marks are his indicating his degrees of uncertainty). In GAv. a verb root frequently generates more than one noun. For example, if you look at the verb root *dā-* in Skjaervo 2006, you will see the large number of nouns it has generated.

[30] For example, in the Insler 1975 translation,
"... Who fashioned esteemed [*bərəx δąm*] [*ārmaiti-*] in addition to rule?..." Y44.7;
"...the esteemed strength [*təvīšīm bərəx δąm*] of good thinking..." Y48.6; (in choosing *bərəx δąm* here Insler follows the mss. "J2 (K4)." p. 90 ft. 5).
"...[*spənta- ārmaiti-*] which is esteemed [*bərəx δąm*] by Thy knowing follower [*vīdušō*]..." Y34.9.

[31] See *Part Two: The Puzzle of the Cow & Its Network*.

[32] "To all of you, the soul of the cow lamented [*gərəždā*]: 'For whom did ye shape me? Who fashioned me? (For) the cruelty of fury and violence, of bondage and might, holds me in captivity. I have no pastor other than you. Therefore appear to me with good pasturage." Y29.1, Insler 1975.

[33] Here are the full verses Y46.1 and 2 in the Insler 1975 translation.

"To what land to flee? Where shall I go to flee? They exclude (me) from my family and from my clan. The community with which I have associated has not satisfied me, nor those who are the deceitful rulers of the land. How, then, shall I satisfy Thee, Wise Lord?" Y46.1.

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

[34] Skjaervo 2006 shows *tā* as the form for the following 3 declensions of the demonstrative/personal pronoun stem *ta-* 'that, he'

~ instr. sg. masc. ntr.;   nom./acc. du. masc.;   and nom./acc. pl. ntr.

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

[36] See *Part Two: The Puzzle of the Singular & the Plural*;   so also, *haurvatāt-* 'completeness', 'wholeness', is attained at an individual and a collective level (detailed in *Part One: Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat*).

[37] None of the grammars to which I have access show any word for dat. du. 2p personal pronouns.

Macdonell's in *Vedic Grammar* § 109A pp. 104 - 105, for 2p personal pronouns, shows du. forms for nom. du., acc. du., instr. du., abl. du., and gen. du. but none for dat. du.

In Av. for 2p personal pronouns,

M&dV (2001) § 22.1, p. 69, show only one du. form ~ gen. du. in YAv. *yavākəm*;

Jackson 1892 § 390 also shows only one du. form ~ gen. du. *yavākəm*;

Skjaervo 2006 in GAv. shows no du. forms in any of the cases.

The corpus of GAv. texts is very small. So this does not mean that no other du. forms existed in GAv (for 2p personal pronouns), although it could mean that by the time their ancestor language had evolved to GAv. and then YAv. the du. form was becoming less and less used.