

Yasna Haptanghaiti 35.8

YHapt. 35.8 is very close to Zarathushtra's thought. The ideas it expresses are simple, beautiful, profound. They give us another dimension of the ideas we have already seen in YHapt. 35.2 and 3 (in a preceding chapter).

YHapt. 35.8 has both a simple meter and alliteration, so I refer to it as a verse. I think it was originally chanted in a metrical way, and I footnote here its meter, for those who chant it, or just may be interested.¹

I have chosen it for translation and discussion, because I love it, because it is related to the thoughts expressed in YHapt. 35.2 and 3, and also to support my translation of this verse (YHapt. 35.8) in other chapters of this web-book, so that you can have confidence that my translation in those chapters has a sound linguistic basis, and therefore supports the conclusions for which I have cited this verse in such chapters.

In this chapter, I will also discuss the translations of Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 for comparative purposes, and I give you their translation in full at the end of this chapter, so that you can see their translation choices in context. I do not have translations of YHapt. 35.8 by any of the other linguists in our group, (and do not know if any such translations exist). To avoid repeated citations, I footnote here all linguistic references, translations, and commentaries, that I use in this chapter.²

YHapt. 35.8

aṣahyā. āaṭ. sairī. aṣahyā vərəzənē. kahmāicī. hātqm. jījiṣqm. vahištqm. ādā. ubōibyā. ahubyā. •• YHapt. 35.8, Geldner 1P p. 130.

My translation.

'To anyone among living beings (who has) the desire to win the most good, He has said, for both existences (it is) in the association of truth, then in the union of truth.' YHapt. 35.8.

Discussion.

The first thing one notices, is that the teaching described here is for all mortals ('To anyone among living beings'). This is in accord with the Gathas and other Avestan texts, in which the teachings are universal.

This verse expresses in a nutshell Zarathushtra's teaching for all the living, about an evolution to the ultimate good end, and what that good end is ~ a union with truth ~ personifying the true (correct, wholly good) order of existence (which is the existence of the Divine).

In Zarathushtra's thought, truth (*aṣa-*) means more than simply not telling factual lies. It means an order of existence that includes all that is honest, good, right, in both existences ~ in the existence of matter, and in the existence of mind/heart/spirit,³ ~ as our verse (YHapt. 35.8) tells us, '*... He has said, for both existences ...*'!

And how do we attain this union with truth? How do we personify it? This verse says that if we are in association with truth *aṣa-* (in our day to day thoughts, words and actions) in both existences ~ the material existence being the matrix for spiritual growth ~ we evolve to a union with truth, our existence will become the true (correct, wholly good) order of existence (*aṣa- vahišta-*) ~ the ultimate good end, the superlative degree of intrinsic goodness ~ winning '*the most good*' existence (*ahu-*

vahišta-), which is one of Zarathushtra's terms for paradise ~ a state of being that is wholly good, that has no admixture of bad/evil preferences, thoughts, words or actions.

In short, in Zarathushtra's teachings, the reward for truth is truth itself, which is a most good existence.

So in this verse (YHapt. 35.8), we may at first glance, think that the author is using *vahištqm* 'the most good' for the ultimate good end (winning the most good, as our verse says) which is a union with truth. But perhaps we should be open to a broader view because of the ways in which Zarathushtra uses *vahišta-* 'most good' in the Gathas (detailed in another chapter).⁴

Specifically, he uses *vahišta-* 'most good' ~ the superlative degree of intrinsic goodness ~ to describe the Divine, Its qualities (truth and its components, later called amesha spenta), Its teachings, (the path of truth, the path of the qualities that make a being divine), the thoughts, words and actions that implement this teaching, and the reward for taking that path ~ a wholly good existence (*ahu-vahišta-*) ~ paradise.

Now, let us read YHapt. 35.8 again, keeping in mind all these meanings for *vahištqm* 'the most good' and see what you think.

'To anyone among living beings (who has) the desire to win the most good, He has said, for both existences (it is) in the association of truth, then in the union of truth.' YHapt. 35.8, my translation.

A final thought. In my opinion, the Avestan words *kahmāicī̄t̄ hātqm* which I translate as 'To anyone among living beings' is not limited to living beings who are mankind. In the Gathas, Zarathushtra most often refers specifically to human beings, when articulating his teachings. But there are many parts of the Gathas (and later Av. texts) which imply that the process of spiritual evolution to the most good existence is not limited to humans.⁵ Perhaps he implies this conclusion (in so many ways), because we cannot know for certain how and what other life forms think and feel, how they communicate, what language(s) they use, how they interact with each other and other life forms etc. So although his conclusions (in this respect) are fairly clear (and even more clear in later Avestan texts), they would necessarily be tentative, which may have been why he implies them.

The author of this verse of the Yasna Haptanghaiti (YHapt. 35.8) understood Zarathushtra's teachings well. So the Avestan text of this verse, which speaks of *living beings*, allows for an understanding that all living things are involved in this process of spiritual evolution to the most good ~ *in the union of truth*, its personification.

* * * * *

The Linguistics.

Here is a linguistic analysis of each word, and also the syntax (how the words should be put together).

Implied words: I have added implied words (shown in round parentheses) only in accordance with the ways in which words are usually or frequently implied in GAv.

Articles: There are no articles ('the', 'a', 'an') in Avestan, but to make a translation into English fluent, we have to add articles. This occurs so frequently that I have not placed the articles in round parentheses ~ which I normally do show an English word that is not in the Avestan text.

Stems: Because we have no surviving ancient Avestan grammars identifying the stems of words, all Avestan stems are conjectured (based on their inflections, which when compared with Vedic

inflections, suggest what the Avestan stems may be, based on corresponding Vedic stems ~ which are known).

Syntax: As with all translations from Avestan to English, one of the difficulties is to figure out how the word order in Avestan generates a word order in translation, which reflects the author's intended meaning. The syntax of this verse is difficult. In fact, there are differences in syntax even between the translations of Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010. But in both translations the first five words in Avestan belong at the end of the sentence in English. And I agree.

Here are how the following 3 translations handle syntax. I have used different colored fonts to show which Avestan words belong together (to form a phrase). But the other two translations have differing views.

aṣahyā āaṭ sairī aṣahyā vərəzəñē kahmāicīṭ hātqm jījiṣqm vahištqm ādā ubōibyā ahubyā
 • YHapt. 35.8, Geldner 1P p. 130.

My translation 'To anyone among living beings (who has) the desire to win the most good [*kahmāicīṭ hātqm jījiṣqm vahištqm*], He has said, for both existences [*ādā ubōibyā ahubyā*] (it is) in the association of truth [*aṣahyā vərəzəñē*], then in the union of truth [*aṣahyā āaṭ sairī*].' YHapt. 35.8.

Humbach 1991 "He has declared [*ādā*] the best search for refuge [*jījiṣqm vahištqm*], for anyone among those who exist [*kahmāicīṭ hātqm*] (to be) in the shelter of truth [*aṣahyā ... sairī*] (and) in the community of truth [*aṣahyā vərəzəñē*], for both existences [*ubōibyā ahubyā*]." YHapt. 35.8. He leaves *āaṭ* untranslated.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "He has declared [*ādā*] that the search for refuge [*jījiṣqm*] for both existences [*ubōibyā ahubyā*] is best [*vahištqm*] (possible) for anyone among the existing [*kahmāicīṭ hātqm*] in the shelter of truth [*aṣahyā ... sairī*], in the enclosure/custody of truth [*aṣahyā vərəzəñē*]." YHapt. 35.8. They leave *āaṭ* untranslated.

Let us now consider the linguistics and meaning of each word. I give them in the order of my English translation, so that you can see how the translation unfolds.

kahmāicīṭ 'to anyone'

The suffix *-cīṭ* added to the interrogative pronoun *kahmāi* forms an indefinite pronoun, (the form of which here is dat. sg. masc./ntr.⁶ the gender is grammatical, not actual). An indefinite pronoun is one which does not stand for any particular person, place or thing. Thus *kahmāicīṭ* (dat. sg. 'to/for ___') would mean 'to/for whomever/whomsoever', whatever/whatsoever, anyone, someone, everyone, anything, something et cetera). A translator's choice would depend on how he translates the words which provide the context in which the indefinite pronoun occurs.

In this context, I think *kahmāicīṭ* means 'to anyone' (although 'to everyone' also fits the context).

hātqm 'among living beings', (more literally 'of beings').

Skjaervo 2006 shows *hātqm* as present participle gen. pl. masc./ntr. of the verb *ah-* which means 'to be, to exist'. It therefore would literally mean 'of beings'. The word *hātqm* appears once in the Gathas, in Y29.3, in which Insler 1975 translates *hātqm* as "of ... beings" ("...of yonder beings [*hātqm*], that strongest one is not to be found..." Y29.3, Insler 1975). As Taraporewala 1951 (commenting under Y29.3) notes, the genitive ('of___') is used there in the sense of 'among' beings.⁷ And it is used in the same sense in the Yenghe Hataam. The linguistics and meaning of *hātqm* are detailed (with references) in the chapter analysing the Yenghe Haatam.⁸

Thus, *kahmāicī̄t̄ hātqm*

Literally 'To anyone of beings ...'

More fluently, 'To anyone among living beings ...'

ḡjišqm vahištqm '(who has) the desire to win the most good'

ḡjišqm

Grammatical Value. Skjaervo 2006 conjectures the **fem. noun** stem *ḡjišā-*, showing *ḡjišqm* as one of its declensions, (without identifying the declension). However, the *-qm* inflection of *ḡjišqm* fits the acc. sg. fem. inflection for *-ā-* stem words.⁹ As an accusative noun, *ḡjišqm* would have to be the direct object of a verb. But there is no verb expressed here of which *ḡjišqm* could be the direct object. I therefore have added an implied verb ~ '(who has) the desire to win'.

Meaning. *ḡjišqm* is a rare word. Skjaervo 2006 shows our verse (YHapt. 35.8) as the only instance of its use in **GAv.** texts, and he shows its verb form *ḡjišənī̄*, in YHapt. 39.1 as the only instance in which that verb is used in **GAv.** texts.

The word *ḡjišqm* also occurs in a surviving YAv. text ~ Yy21 which is the YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Hataam.

ḡjišqm has been translated variously by linguists (summarized here and detailed in this footnote),¹⁰ based on Vedic noun and verb cognates which have been variously translated:

As a noun: 'the desire to win', 'the endeavor to win', 'the desire for gain', 'the search for refuge', and

As a verb: 'to try to win', 'to try to obtain', 'to resort', 'to seek refuge'.

As you can see, these are not simply flavors of the same underlying meaning. The 'desire/endeavor/effort to win', is quite different in meaning from a 'the search for refuge', or 'to resort'. So either we have one root with more than one meaning (which sometimes happens in Vedic and Avestan, as it does in English), or only one of these different opinions is valid.

For the reasons given in the linguistic footnote (above) on *ḡjišqm*, and in the context of our verse, YHapt. 35.8, I follow Skjaervo in taking the fem. noun stem *ḡjišā-* to mean the 'desire to win', and I think the declension *ḡjišqm* is acc. sg.

vahištqm. *Grammatical Value.* The stem of this word is an adjective. In Avestan, an adj. must be in the same case, number, and gender, as the noun it describes. The masc. form of this adj. stem is *vahišta-*; its fem. form would be *vahištā-*. And *vahištqm* is the **acc. sg. fem.** declension for *-ā-* stem words.¹¹ In Avestan, an adj. can also be used as a noun, and in this context, I think that is how these two **acc. sg. fem.** nouns *ḡjišqm vahištqm* are used ~ both belong together as direct objects of the implied verb '(who has)'.

Thus I translate *kahmāicī̄t̄ hātqm ḡjišqm vahištqm*

"To anyone among living beings [*kahmāicī̄t̄ hātqm*] (who has) the desire to win the most good [*ḡjišqm vahištqm*] ..."

ādā 'He has said'

Skjaervo 2006 shows a verb stem *ād-* pres. perf. act.: meaning 'to say' and he thinks the conjugation *ādā* is 1p sg. (citing our verse YHapt. 35.8 as the only place in surviving **GAv.** texts in which this word *ādā* appears. The 1p sg. present perfect would give us 'I have said'.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *ādā* in this verse (YHapt. 35.8) as "He has declared", noting that it's conjugation is 3p. sg. perfect, and offering the possible alternative 'He declares (that)'. They do not show the verb stem, nor do they explain their 3p sg. preference.

Given this difference in the opinions of two such excellent linguists ~ Skjaervo and Humbach/Faiss ~ I can only choose between them, based on the context. In our verse YHapt. 35.8, the author purports to give us a teaching of Zarathushtra, expressed here as the word of the Divine. I therefore do not think the author would announce here "I say". So I follow Humbach/Faiss 2010 in taking *ādā* as 3p sg. perfect, (which requires the addition of 'has/have' to the verb form), and I agree with the comment of Humbach/Faiss 2010 that the 3p sg. refers to Ahura Mazda (Wisdom the Lord), so I have capitalized the first letter (there are no capital letters in Av. script).

The 3p sg. present perfect would give us *ādā* 'He has said ...'.

ubōibyā ahubyā 'for both existences'

ubōibyā Skjaervo 2006 shows *ubōibyā* as the form for instr., /abl. / dat. **du. masc.** of the pronoun stem *uba-* 'both'. In this context, only the dat. ('to/for ____') **du. masc.** fits because *ubōibyā* belongs with *ahubyā* and therefore has to be in the same case, number and gender as *ahubyā*.

Skjaervo 2006 shows *ahubyā* as the form for instr., /abl. / dat. **du.** of the **masc.** noun stem *ahu-* which means "life, existence". In this context, once again, only the dat. **du.** fits this **masc.** noun. Thus literally *ahubyā* alone would mean 'for (dat.) **the two** (du.) **existences**'. But here, the dat. du. pronoun *ubōibyā* 'for both' already has the dat. 'for' and the du. number 'both', so in English translation, the case and number are not repeated in translating *ahubyā*.

Thus, *kahmāicīṭ hātqm jījišqm vahištqm ādā ubōibyā ahubyā*

"To anyone among living beings [*kahmāicīṭ hātqm*] (who has) the desire to win the most good [*jījišqm vahištqm*], He has said, for both existences, [*ādā ubōibyā ahubyā*] ..."

ašahyā vərəzānē '(it is) in the association of truth'

(it is), declensions of the verb 'to be' often are implied in Avestan, and the context here requires that we imply it.

ašahyā (in GAv.) is gen. sg. ('of ____') of the ntr. stem *aša-* thus 'of truth'.

vərəzānē

Grammatical Value: Skjaervo 2006 says that *vərəzānē* is loc. sg. of the ntr. noun stem *vərəzāna-*. The loc. declension is translated into English as 'in/on/under/at' and other such English prepositions which have the flavor of location. In this context, 'in' is the only fit.

Meaning: Skjaervo 2006 thinks the stem *vərəzāna-* means 'household'. In the Gathas, in the contexts in which it appears, Insler 1975 translates *vərəzāna-* words as 'community' (with which I agree in those contexts). Here, in YHapt. 35.8, Humbach 1991 translates *vərəzānē* as loc. sg.; and *ašahyā vərəzānē* as "in the community of truth"; Humbach/Faiss 2010 as "in the enclosure/custody of truth". So we see that the stem *vərəzāna-* can have different flavors of the same underlying meaning. And we have to pick a flavor that best fits the context.

My take? Well we have the verb stems

var- 'to choose' (Skjaervo 2006, Reichelt 1911)

varz- 'to produce' (Skjaervo 2006),

vərəz- 'to work, do, perform, effect, ... beget' (Reichelt 1911),

vərəzāna- 'activity', from the verb *vərəz-* (Reichelt 1911); and the related *hu-varəšta-* literally 'good performing', and

vərəzāna- 'community' (Insler 1975, Humbach 1991).

In the context of our verse, the next phrase *aṣahyā āat sairī* 'then in the union of truth', is an end result that is a state of being. And our phrase *aṣahyā vərəzānē* is what produces that end result. So I think *aṣahyā vərəzānē* would have to be a state of being as well ~ a state of being that produces or begets the union of truth. I therefore take *vərəzānē* to be 'community' in the sense of 'in the association of truth' ~ an association which encompasses choosing truth, producing truth, begetting truth, becoming truth with each thought, words and action of truth, and so evolving to a state of being that is the union of truth ~ truth personified.

And this view of *vərəzānē* is somewhat corroborated by related noun and verb forms used a few verses earlier ~ in YHapt. 35.2 and 3 ~ which speak of the performance of good thoughts, words and actions. And YHapt. 35.3 does so in a context which also uses *hātqm*, *vahištā*, and *ubōibyā ahubyā*,¹² (as our verse YHapt. 35.8 does).

Thus, *aṣahyā vərəzānē* '(it is) in the association of truth'.

aṣahyā āat sairī 'then in the union of truth'

aṣahyā is gen. sg. ('of ____') of the ntr. stem *aṣa-*, thus 'of truth'.

sairī is loc. sg. of the fem. noun stem *sar-* which has been variously translated.

Skjaervo 2006 as 'association';

Reichelt 1911 as 'union, league';

Hintze 2009 as 'union';¹³

Inslar 1975 as 'allied with';¹⁴ and

Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 as 'shelter'.

Although I do not agree with Humbach's translation, I think his 1991 commentary gives us some insight into what the author of YHapt. 35.8 intended in using *sairī*, the loc. sg. form of *sar-*.

He states that the "current etymology" involves a connection with a Vedic verb which means "mixes, mingles, cooks," and a Ved. noun which means "mixing, mixture" used especially for a mixture of milk and the Soma juice. However, he thinks both of these are "kitchen terms", and that *sar-* "has a sociological dimension" which leads him to conclude that *sar-* here means 'shelter', and in YAv. 'enclosure'. He cites no text or other basis for his conclusion, except to say that it is related to Ved. *sarman*, 'shelter, protection, refuge, safety' giving Ved. examples. He therefore concludes that *aṣahyā ... sairī* here means 'in the shelter of truth'.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate these 2 words in the same way.

I am persuaded by Reichelt's and Hintze's view of the noun *sar-* as 'union', because (as Humbach 1991 has explained) the Vedic cognates are used for the mixing of milk and Soma juice (to form one drink), and 'union' fits the context of this verse, reflecting Zarathushta's thought that the ultimate good end is the personification of truth ~ which is another way of saying 'in the union [*sairī*] of truth [*aṣahyā*]'. Which brings us to *āat*.

āat is one of those flexible Avestan words which can be translated into various English equivalents depending on the context ~ 'then', 'already', 'but' etc. YHapt. 35.8 is in GAv., yet *āat* is usually the YAv. form of GAv. *āt* (at least in the GAv. texts that have survived; and GAv. also has the form *at*). So I am puzzled that the author did not use the GAv. form *āt* (or *at*). Perhaps the difference represents a period of transition into later usage. Or perhaps YAv. *āat* is simply a scribal error for GAv. *āt* (or *at*)~ which occurred when mss. were copied by scribes who were more familiar with the YAv. form. I do not know the reason. But the difference does not affect the meaning.

Skjaervo 2006 shows a GAv. particle *āt* which he says means 'then, so, thus, but' which either connects a statement with what precedes it, or functions as a contrast.

Reichert 1911 does not show *āt*; he shows a GAv. particle *at* meaning 'then; but; and'. And he shows an abl. adv. *āat* meaning 'then, thereon, thereupon; since that time; and; but; for', without specifying whether it was used in GAv. or YAv.

Beekes 1988 shows the GAv. *āt* as an abl. adv. which he says means 'then, but, and'.¹⁵

Jackson 1892 shows YAv. *āat* (and GAv. *āt*) as an ablative adverb meaning 'then'.¹⁶

Hintze 1994 in the Glossary appended to her English translation of the YAv. *Zamyad Yasht* shows *āat* as an adverb, 'then', (but the word 'then' does not appear in her translation of the Yenghe Haatam which has the word *āat* in it, and appears in full in the *Zamyad Yasht* where she translates it).¹⁷

Martinez & DeVan 2001 offer the following translations of *āat*, (in Spanish) 'then', 'already', 'but'.¹⁸

Taraporewala 1951 commenting under the (archaic YAv.) Yenghe Haatam in which *āat* appears says that it is a mildly emphatic particle, which he translates as 'indeed'.¹⁹

Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 have not translated the word *āat* in their translations of our YHapt. 35.8, and do not comment on it.

So why am I making such a big deal about the word *āat*? Well, as Insler has demonstrated (in his commentary on the Ahuna Vairya), in Avestan syntax, when 2 words that belong together (like *ašahyā ... sairī* 'in the union of truth') frame or encapsulate a 3d word (like *ašahyā āat sairī*), that indicates that these framing and framed words form one unit of thought.²⁰ In other words, *āat* must have been an important part of the unit of thought the author was trying to convey, for the author to have framed it with two words that belong together *ašahyā ... sairī*; giving us, *ašahyā āat sairī* 'then in the union of truth'.

So we see that *āat* 'then' is a material part of the entire verse because it indicates the progression between being in association with truth (choosing it, producing it in our thoughts, words and actions), which *then* results in our personifying it.

Thus, '... (it is) in the association of truth [*ašahyā vərəzənē*], then in the union of truth [*ašahyā āat sairī*].'

* * * * *

Here is the entire GAv. text of YHapt. 35.8, with 3 translations for comparative purposes ~ mine and those of Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010.

ašahyā āat sairī ašahyā vərəzənē kahmāicētī hātqm jījišqm vahištqm ādā ubōibyā ahubyā
 •• YHapt. 35.8, Geldner 1P p. 130.

My translation.

'To anyone among living beings (who has) the desire to win the most good, He has said, for both existences (it is) in the association of truth, then in the union of truth.' YHapt. 35.8.

Humbach 1991

"He has declared the best search for refuge, for anyone among those who exist (to be) in the shelter of truth (and) in the community of truth, for both existences." YHapt. 35.8.

Humbach/Faiss 2010

"He has declared that the search for refuge for both existences is best (possible) for anyone among the existing in the shelter of truth, in the enclosure/custody of truth." YHapt. 35.8.

* * * * *

¹ My view of the chanting meter of YHapt.35.8; x = light emphasis; 1 = heavy emphasis.

x 1 x 1 x 1 x / x 1 x 1 x 1 x / x 1 x 1 x 1 x 1 x 1 x / 1 x 1 x 1 x 1 x
ašahyā āaṭ sairī / ašahyā vərəzānē / kahmāicīṭ hātqm jījīšqm vahištqm / ādā ubōibyā ahubyā

² Skjaervo 2006 Old Avestan Glossary <http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~iranian/OldAvestan/index.html>
 Humbach 1991 for YHapt. 35.8 Vol. 1, p. 144; Vol. 2 p. 119 - 120. For YHapt. 39.1, Vol. 1 p. 148; Vol. 2 p. 127.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 for YHapt. 35.8 pp. 106, 178. For YHapt. 39.1 p. 180.

³ Zarathushtra's use of 'both existences' as the existences of matter and mind, is detailed in *Part One: Truth, Asha*. That the meaning of *manah-* includes not just intellect, but the full spectrum ~ mind/heart/spirit ~ is detailed in *Part One: Good Thinking, Vohu Manah*.

⁴ Detailed in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of The Most Good, Vahishta*.

⁵ See for example, *Part Two: A Question Of Immanence*, and Zarathushtra's use of the 'cow' as an allegory to represent all that is beneficial (good) in mortal existence detailed in *The Puzzle Of The Cow & Its Network*.

⁶ Jackson 1892 § 408, pp. 116 - 117, and Beekes 1988 pp. 140 - 141 generally agree about the formation of indefinite pronouns in GAv.

Beekes' explains that indefinite pronouns are formed in various circumstances by adding what Jackson calls particles, (like the suffix *-cit*) to the stem of the interrogative pronoun *ka-*. Thus (Beekes says) the dat. sg. masc. interrogative pronoun *kahmāi* ('to/for whom/what') becomes the dat. sg. masc. indefinite pronoun *kahmāicit*, ('to/for whomever/whatsoever' etc.) which in mss. is written *kahmāicīṭ*.

Jackson 1892 translates dat. sg. *kahmāicīṭ* as 'to whomsoever' § 408, pp. 116). He states that the declension of interrogative pronoun stems (which, with the suffix *-cīṭ* form indefinite pronouns) is identical to that of relative pronouns (where he shows the *-ahmāi* inflection is dat. sg. masc./ntr.). So, following his premises, *kahmāicit* is dat. sg. masc./ntr. as well.

⁷ Taraporewala (1951) p. 47.

⁸ *Part Three: The Yenghe Hataam & Ancient Commentaries*.

⁹ Skjaervo 2006, *Old Avestan*, Lesson 2, p. 12; Jackson 1892 § 243, p. 72.

¹⁰ Skjaervo in his 2006 GAv. Glossary, conjectures the fem. noun stem *jījīšā-* 'desire to win', and shows *jījīšqm* as its only declension, but does not identify its case or number. He thinks the noun stem *jījīšā-* 'desire to win', derives from the verb stem *jaē* 'to win', for which he shows only one conjugation which appears in YHapt. 39.1 *jījīšqm* 3p pl. Indicative (present); which would make its translation 'they win'.

Although *jījīšqm* appears in the YAv. commentary to the Yenghe Haatam, Skjaervo does not show *jījīšqm* or the noun stem *jījīšā-* or anything like it, in his 2003 YAv. Glossary.

Reichelt's 1911 glossary does not show *jījīšā-*, (or *jījīšqm*) or anything like it ~ neither in GAv. nor YAv. (so far as I could tell ~ his Av. glossary is not arranged alphabetically following the English alphabet, so I may have missed it).

Humbach 1991 also conjectures an Avestan noun stem *jījīšā-* which he says means "endeavour to win, search for refuge". Like Skjaervo 2006, Humbach does not discuss or identify the declension of *jījīšqm* in our passage

YHapt. 35.8, (nor does he do so for *jijišqm* in the YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Hataam Yy21.2 (in which he also translates *jijišqm* as "a search for refuge"). And he translates the **verb** form *jijišəntī* in Y39.1 as 3p pl. "... of the domestic animals which **seek refuge** with us". He explains his translation choice in our verse (YHapt. 35.8) by giving a Vedic cognate *jigīṣá-* (for which I do not have accurate fonts, so I approximate) which he says means "**endeavour to win, desire of obtaining**", but also quotes (his translation of) 2 Vedic texts, in one of which he translates the *jigīṣá-* word as "**an endeavour to win**", and in the other as "**a search for refuge**". In translating *jijišqm* in our passage YHapt. 35.8, he chooses the Vedic alternative "**search for refuge**".

Humbach/Faiss 2010 are somewhat inconsistent. In their translation of our **GAv.** verse (YHapt. 35.8) they translate the **noun** form *jijišqm* as "**search for refuge**". But in their commentary on our verse (YHapt. 35.8), they express the opinion that the Avestan **fem. noun stem** *jijišā-* means "**search for gain**", noting that in the **YAv.** commentary Yy21, *jijišqm* means "**search for gain**" (which Humbach 1991 had translated "**search for refuge**"). And they comment that the Vedic cognate means "**desire of obtaining/conquering**".

They also are inconsistent in their translation of the Avestan **verb** form *jijišəntī* in YHapt. 39.1, which in their translation they have as "... who **seek refuge** [*jijišəntī*] with us"; but in their commentary on that same YHapt. 39.1, they translate the applicable Avestan words as "**which desire to win us over, i.e. which desire to win our partnership**". They also point to a **verb** form in the *Vidēvdād* (Vendidad) ~ *jijišənuha* ~ which they translate as "**try to win over**". And they give a few Vedic passages in which they translate the Vedic **verb** forms as "**she may resort**", "**to seek refuge**", "**to try to win**" and "**trying to win**".

My take. I have no way of evaluating the many English translations of the applicable Ved. noun and verb forms, in Vedic texts cited by Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010, nor am I able to reconcile some of their inconsistencies. And (with respect), I do not find persuasive the many different meanings Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 detail.

I find more persuasive Skjaervo's 2006 opinion (that in our passage, the **fem. noun** *jijišqm* means "**desire to win**") because of the following facts:

- (1) it derives from the **verb stem** *jaē-* "to win",
- (2) an established meaning of its Ved. cognate is also "**desire to win**" as everyone agrees, and
- (3) in the context of our passage YHapt. 35.8 *jijišqm vahišqm* (both acc. sg. fem.) belong together and "**desire to win the most good**" is not only the best translation of these two words, but also best fits the context of the entire passage YHapt. 35.8, and also fits the use of *jijišqm* in the YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Haatam, see *Part Six: YAv. Yasna 21*).

I leave it for you to decide what you think.

¹¹ Skjaervo 2006, *Old Avestan*, Lesson 2, p. 12; Jackson 1892 § 243, p. 72.

¹² Here are YHapt. 35.2 and 3. They are detailed in *Part Six: YHapt. 35.2 and 3*.

YHapt. 35.2 'We are praisers in song, not deriders, of good thoughts, good words, good actions ~ here and elsewhere ~ of (those that) are being produced, and of (those that) have been produced; through effort in taking a stand, we are (part) of the good'.

YHapt. 35.3 'O Lord Wisdom, beautiful through truth, that then, we have chosen, which indeed we may think, speak, and perform, through which ~ of the actions of living beings ~ (what is) most good for both existences may exist.'

¹³ In a lecture at the New York Gatha Colloquium in 2009, Hintze expressed the opinion that *sar-* means 'union'. The Colloquium was sponsored by WZO and FEZANA, which organizations did not print the lectures. I do not know if Hintze's lecture has since been published elsewhere. I therefore do not have a reference to give you.

¹⁴ Skjaervo 2006 shows the following declensions of the noun stem *sar-* which appears in various verses of the Gathas. With each declension shown by Skjaervo 2006, I give the Insler 1975 translation (with my preferred translation ~ 'union' ~ in square brackets) so that you can see the context in which the *sar-* words are used.

sarəm acc. sg.

("Do Thou grant the most happy alliance ['union'] of truth to Frashaoshtra ..." Y49.8, Insler 1975; "... To thee He shall grant the firm foundation of good thinking and the alliance [union] of truth and of wisdom..." Y53.3, Insler 1975). This echoes the idea of 'in the union of truth' in our verse YHapt. 35.8.

sarōi dat. sg.

("... how shall I ... impassion your following, so that my voice might be powerful (enough) to strive for alliance [for union] with completeness and [*aməratāt-* 'non-deathness'] Y44.17, Insler 1975).

sarē abl. sg.

("...I am eager for the alliance [for the union] of good thinking ... " 49.3, Insler 1975).

sarō abl. sg.

("The Wise Lord ... shall give the permanence of good thinking's alliance [union] to him, the one who is His ally [*urvaθō*] in spirit and action." 31.21, Insler 1975).

sairī loc. sg. our verse YHapt. 35.8.

¹⁵ Beekes 1988 pp. 144, 147.

¹⁶ Jackson 1892 § 53 iv, and § 731 (4).

¹⁷ Hintze 1994 p. 43 (glossary) for *āaī*, and p. 16 for the Yenghe Haatam (which appears at the end of section 13 of the *Zamyad Yasht*, Yt. 19.13).

¹⁸ In their Spanish book, M&deV 2001 p. 111 (glossary), offer the following translations of *āaī*:
'entonces' (Spanish for 'then'),
'ya' (Spanish for 'already'),
'pero' (Spanish for 'but').

¹⁹ Taraporewala 1951 pp. 26 - 27.

²⁰ This 'framing' or 'encapsulation' is a function of GAv. syntax that was first brought to my attention by Insler, in his essay on the Ahuna Vairya, which I discuss in more detail in *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo), An Analysis*, giving Insler's (and many additional) examples of framing or encapsulation in GAv. syntax. This technique of 'framing' or 'encapsulation' in GAv. syntax, to give one unit of thought, is also discussed in a number of chapters in *Part Six*, including the following:

Yasna 28.5 (discussed in some detail);

Yasna 30.7 (which has a double framing ~ one within another);

Yasna 32.7 and *Yasna* 51.9 (in which the framing extends over the ceasura);

Yasna 28.1 (discussed briefly); *Yasna* 32.9 (discussed briefly);

Yasna 44.16 (the 2d paragraph of the *Kemna Mazda* prayer, discussed briefly).