

The Yenghe Haatam, An Analysis, & Ancient Commentaries.

As I have continued to study the Gathas and the Yenghe Haatam (*yeŋhē hātqm*),¹ I have discovered insights of which I was not aware when I first put this chapter on my website. So I have revised this chapter to add such additional understandings, correct some inaccuracies, and simplify it so that important ideas are not drowned in a sea of information in which you may or may not be interested (some of which I have now relegated to sections of their own or to footnotes, so that you can decide for yourself what parts you wish to read).

As you go through the many translations, interpretations and commentaries, you may become frustrated and tired of it all. Don't be discouraged. Skip whatever details (or parts) seem tiresome (you can always go back to them later, if you wish). But hang in there. I think you will find very worthwhile this glimpse of Zarathushtra's teachings in the mind-sets of ancient Zarthushtis, and the kinds of things that pleased and inspired them.

In *Part One: The Manthra of the Human and the Divine, Yenghe Haatam*, I have given a simple overview of this manthra, focusing on its core idea ~ worshipping the Divine in all the living, but with no evidence on which its conclusions are based.

This chapter is for those want to see the evidence ~ including other opinions besides mine.

I acknowledge my deep indebtedness to my friend, High Priest Kersey Antia, for his luminous insight in resolving the dispute as to whether the Yenghe Haatam pertains to the human or the Divine. He suggested that it is about both the human and the Divine. I think he is absolutely right.

I acknowledge my deep indebtedness to the YAv. commentary (Yy21),² on the Yenghe Haatam, for its clues and insights without which I would still be speculating in the dark. Because the insights of this YAv. commentary are a necessary part of this Analysis, I have included it (and the Pahlavi commentary) as part of this chapter, instead of giving the commentaries a separate chapter. As a result, this chapter is a bit longer than I would wish, for which I ask your indulgence. It is necessary to include the commentaries here (instead of in a separate chapter) because the YAv. commentary has played so large a part in informing my analysis of the Yenghe Haatam.

We will consider and compare the Pahlavi 'translation' of this manthra and some modern translations and commentaries as well. Insler has not published a translation of the Yenghe Haatam (so far as I am aware). So we will compare the translations of Humbach/Faiss 2010, Humbach 1991, Hintze 1994, Taraporewala 1951, Bartholomae, Darmesteter 1882, Mills 1894, and a synopsis of Gershevitch's commentary on this manthra (1967). All these translations, interpretations, and comments are referenced here to avoid repeated citations.³

In short: After this little introduction, and after giving you the Yenghe Haatam in Avestan and my translation of it, this chapter is now divided into the following sections.

1. *Discussion (of the Yenghe Haatam).*
2. *Yasna 21: The most ancient commentary on the Yenghe Haatam* (which commentary is in Younger Avestan).
3. *Linguistics.*
4. *Different Translations (the Pahlavi translation and modern ones).*
5. *A Pahlavi commentary on the Yenghe Haatam.*

We do not know who composed the Yenghe Haatam. Avestan texts do not normally identify their authors by name. The Yenghe Haatam (that we have) is not in the Old Avestan language of the Gathas. It has come down to us in an archaic form of Younger Avestan.⁴ This suggests that it was composed long after the Gathas, but earlier (by perhaps a few generations) than other Younger Avestan texts.

However it is worth considering that sometimes in later Avestan texts, verses from the Gathas are quoted but in later forms of the Avestan language (instead of in their original Old Avestan form). In fact, the YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Haatam (Yy21) itself quotes the first two lines of the Gatha verse Y43:1, but writes it in the Younger Avestan forms of the words (and also one scribal error) ~ not in the original Old Avestan form.⁵ Other quotations from the Gathas, but in later forms of the Avestan language, occur in other instances as well, all of which lead me to wonder if the Yenghe Haatam may have been composed by Zarathushtra, but that the only surviving form of it is in archaic YAv. It may surprise you to know that according to Geldner, only a few manuscripts set out in full, the two most important manthras in Zarathushtra's thought ~ the Asha Vahishta (ashem vohu), and the Ahuna Vairya (yatha ahu vairyo). If these few manuscripts had not survived, we would have no manuscripts that set out these two manthras in Old Avestan (except for the Khordeh Avesta).

I haven't a shred of evidence to support the view that the Yenghe Haatam may have been composed by Zarathushtra ~ other than its multi-dimensional poetic style (and the importance with which the Yenghe Haatam was viewed by ancient Zarathushtis). One of Zarathushtra's poetic signatures in the Gathas is his use of double (and triple) entendre, intentional ambiguities, and the multi-dimensional ways in which he expresses his ideas. To my great surprise, the Yenghe Haatam does exactly the same (although it took me a long time to realize and appreciate that fact). Was the Yenghe Haatam composed by Zarathushtra? Did it survive only as an archaic YAv. quotation of an Old Avestan original which did not survive? We simply do not know.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 have a poor opinion of the Yenghe Haatam, believing its words were "artificially archaized" to make it appear older.⁶ But they provide no supporting evidence of such duplicity. They also think the Yenghe Haatam was "artless". I do not find these views persuasive; nor did many generations of ancient Zarthushtis during Avestan times, (who naturally were fluent in Avestan).

The following facts give us some idea of the importance with which the Yenghe Haatam was viewed by ancient Zarthushtis for many centuries when people were fluent in Avestan. The Yenghe Haatam appears in full in some manuscripts as Yy27:15,⁷ immediately after the Ahuna Vairya (Y27:13) and the Asha Vahishta (ashem vohu Y27:14). And the earliest YAv. commentaries on these three manthras also follow each other in the same way ~ Yy19 on the Ahuna Vairya, Yy20 on the Asha Vahishta (ashem vohu), and Yy21 on the Yenghe Haatam ~ all three commentaries being referred to in the tradition, as the *Baghan Yasht* (which means *the Yasht of the Divine* ~ most appropriate!).

And in the centuries that followed, when the Avestan texts came to be chanted as part of the ritual, we find in numerous instances throughout these texts, instructions to recite the Yenghe Haatam (often with other prayers) at various parts of such ritual chants ~ which was the way the surviving Av. texts were chanted in Pahlavi times. So we see that the reverence for this manthra in Avestan times, was carried over into Pahlavi times even though Avestan *as a language* ~ its grammar and vocabulary ~ was no longer understood by Pahlavi times.

All of the foregoing evidence ~ the Yenghe Haatam's use of double entendre, its multi-dimensional technique in conveying Zarathushtra's teachings in the Gathas, and the fact that ancient Zarthushtis valued

its importance alongside that of the Ahuna Vairya (yatha ahu vairyo) and the Asha Vahishta (ashem vohu) ~ would seem to suggest that it was composed by Zarathushtra himself. In fact, the YAv. commentary on this manthra starts with a statement that this manthra is the worship Word of Zarathushtra (leading Gershevitch to conclude that the Yenghe Haatam was indeed composed by Zarathushtra ~ discussed below). However, this introductory statement could equally mean that the Yenghe Haatam expresses Zarathushtra's Word about worship (which in fact it does) ~ not necessarily that Zarathushtra composed its actual words.

Here is this introductory statement.

Yy21:1 *yesnīm. vacō. aṣaonō. zaraθuštrahe•• yej̄hē. hātqm. āaṭ. yesnē. paiī••*

'(I give you)⁸ the worship Word [*yesnīm vacō*] of truth-possessing Zarathushtra: *yej̄hē. hātqm. āaṭ. yesnē. paiī••*' (my translation).

Here is the Avestan text of the Yenghe Haatam (in Yy27:15) transliterated from Geldner. The arrangement in 3 lines of its Avestan words, is from Humbach 1991 ~ with which I agree (the line breaks in the manuscripts vary ~ possibly because down through the centuries, copiers needed to save space in the use of parchment, which doubtless was expensive.

*yej̄hē. hātqm. āaṭ. yesnē. paiī. vañhō.
mzdā. ahurō. vaēθā. aṣāṭ. hacā. yāñhqmā.
tqscā. tāscā. yazamaidē •• •• ••* Y27:15, Geldner 1P p. 98.

To keep you from unnecessary puzzlement, here are three simple things that may be of help to begin with.

First, the *-cā* tacked on to a word simply means 'and'.

Second, according to Insler,⁹ in the syntax of the Gathas, when two words which belong together (like *yej̄hē* and *yāñhqmā*), frame or encapsulate other words, all such words ~ the framing and framed words ~ belong together, forming a unit of sense, or a unit of thought. I have not researched whether or not this particular rule of syntax is found in Younger Avestan texts. However, there is no dispute that this rule is found in the Gathas, in the Old Avestan *A Airyema Ishyo* (Y53:4) and in the (archaic YAv.) Yenghe Haatam. All linguists (of which I am aware) agree that *yej̄hē* and *yāñhqmā* belong together and as you can see, these two words frame or encapsulate a number of other words, all of which ~ the framing and framed words ~ form a unit of thought.

Third, Avestan is a language in the Indo-European family of languages. And in Avestan (as in French and Spanish) *all* nouns, pronouns, and adjectives have *grammatical* gender ~ fem., ntr., and masc. ~ regardless of whether or not a given word has *actual* gender (like *daughter*, *son*, etc.). If we keep that in mind we may more easily understand the author's intent, and avoid becoming entangled in unsupported interpretations not found in Zarathushtra's thought.

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

'In the worship
of which (one) [*yej̄hē* masc. sg.] and of which (ones) [*yāñhqmā* fem. pl.],
of (the) existing [*hātqm*],
the Lord, Wisdom, already knows (what is) more-good in accord with truth,
them (*tqscā* masc. pl.) and them (*tāscā* fem. pl.) we worship.' Y27.15, my translation.

Not inspiring? Not even sensible? Well ... let's see.

Discussion.

This is a manthra whose light and inspiration are revealed by unravelling its beautiful puzzles ~ which are apparent only in a translation that is as (grammatically) accurate and literal as possible. Some scholars have expressed the opinion that because the people of Zarathushtra's society did not read or write, and lived 'simple' lives, riddles and puzzles could not have formed a part of their lives. But in fact, ancient Zarthushtis (who were fluent in Avestan), delighted in riddles and puzzles. One has only to think of the legendary figure *Yoishta of the Fryanas* who (according to the YAv. *Aban Yasht*) begged a boon of the spirit of waters, that he might answer "the ninety-nine hard riddles" that his adversary Akhtya "asks me maliciously",¹⁰ to appreciate the entertainment value that riddles and puzzles had for ancient Zarthushtis.

And (as we already have seen) there is no dispute about the high esteem in which the Yenghe Haatam was held by ancient Zarthushtis for more than 1,000 years.

So we have to wonder: Why? Why was this manthra by an unknown author ranked in importance, right after the Ahuna Vairya and the Asha Vahishta ~ both believed to have been composed by Zarathushtra himself? What are its puzzles that so delighted and inspired ancient Zarthushtis?

Well, the most obvious ones are that the Yenghe Haatam contains four pronouns, in two parallel (but asymmetrical) sets:

yej̥hē ('of which (one)' masc. sg.), and *yāñhqm̥cā* ('and of which ones' fem. pl.)
tqscā ('them' masc. pl.), and *tāscā* ('and them' fem. pl.)

Yet this manthra does not identify for whom these pronouns stand, except that they are a part of *hātqm* which means (literally) 'of (the) existing' or 'of beings' (detailed in the *Linguistics* section below) ~ which is also enigmatical ~ telling us only that these pronouns stand for something living without identifying who or what such living things might be.

In addition the word order of this manthra is crafted in a way that is (intentionally) ambiguous.

'In the worship

of which (one) [*yej̥hē* masc. sg.] and of which (ones) [*yāñhqm̥cā* fem. pl.],
of (the) existing [*hātqm*], ..."

Here, are *yej̥hē* and *yāñhqm̥cā* worshippers, or objects of worship?

There are no capital letters in Avestan script such as would indicate the author's intent. This (intentional) ambiguity gives us some lovely multi-dimensioned thoughts, as you will see, (which the ancients who were fluent in Avestan would have appreciated).

Many of us (including many professional linguists) tend to suffer from the mind-set that *if it is this, it cannot be that*. And opinions differ regarding the answer(s) to the foregoing question. Translations of our group of professional linguists are given in full, later in this chapter. Here I will summarize:

Gershevitch 1967 and Darmesteter 1882 think the pronouns *yej̥hē* and *yāñhqm̥cā* stand for the *amesha spenta* of the Younger Avestan texts ~ living Entities who, centuries after Zarathushtra, were objects of worship.

Humbach 1991, Taraporewala 1951, Bartholomae, and Mills think these pronouns stand for human beings, who are worshippers.

By 2010 Humbach had changed his mind (demonstrating courage and integrity for which one can only admire him, even though I disagree with his opinion). He thought that these pronouns were intended to stand for divine Entities.

Hintze 1994 also thinks these pronouns stand for divine Entities. But if you remove the capital letters in her English translation, it shows well the ambiguities regarding for whom these pronouns stand ~ as the object of worship or as the worshipper. There are no capital letters in Avestan script.

So what did the unknown author of the Yenghe Hataam have in mind by creating this ambiguity. And to what end? Let us consider this step by step.

In the Gathas, the beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*) is the Divine way of being, which personifies the true, wholly good, order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*), its good comprehension (*vohu- manah-*), its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action (*spənta- ārmaiti-*), its good rule (*vohu- xšaθra-*), its complete attainment (*haurvatāt-*) and the resulting state of being that is not bound by mortality (*amərətāt-* non-deathness). In the Gathas, all these words (collectively called *amesha spenta* in later texts) are treated:

(1) as concepts,
(2) as qualities of the Divine,
(3) the first five of them as qualities that mortals also have (although incompletely, imperfectly), and
(4) some of them (far fewer times) as allegories.¹¹ For example, "Truth, shall I see thee, as I continue to acquire ... good thinking ..." Y28:5, Insler 1975. Here, truth is addressed as a person. But we know that this can only be an allegory, because in the Gathas, truth (most often) is a concept, and also a quality ~ of the Divine (completely); and of mortals (incompletely).¹² So if we look past the image of truth as a person, to the meaning behind the image, we see the idea expressed by this quotation, which tells us (in the form of a rhetorical question) that as we continue to acquire good thinking we incrementally understand (see) truth.

Many centuries later,¹³ probably by the time of certain Younger Avestan texts (and definitely by the time of the Pahlavi texts), these qualities of the Divine came to be thought of as living Entities, (then called *amesha spenta*, Pahl. *amshaspand* and variations), who were objects of worship in such later YAv. (and Pahlavi) times and whose names were these qualities that (in the Gathas) are concepts and qualities of the Divine, all but 2 of which mortals also have (but not completely).

So what did the author of the Yenghe Haatam intend its unidentified pronouns to stand for ?

Well *all* the ideas in the Yenghe Hataam are ideas that we specifically find in the Gathas (as you will see). And the YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Haatam not only quotes the first two lines of a Gatha verse (Y43:1) but states that the Yenghe Haatam itself, expresses,

yesnīm. vacō. ašaonō. zaraθuštrahe•• Geldner 1P pp. 81
"... the worship Word of truth~possessing Zarathushtra ..." Yy21:1, my translation.

And indeed, we need to be aware that the Avestan words *aməša-* ('non-dying') and *spənta-* ('beneficial') first appear (in surviving Av. texts) ~ not as entities, but as adjectives that describe the true order of existence ('truth' for short) detailed below with quotations.

So (absent evidence to the contrary) in making translation (and interpretation) choices we should not be guided by Younger Avestan texts which treat the *amesha spenta* as entities, and which may or may not have

existed when the Yenghe Haatam was composed (in archaic YAv.). We should be guided by the Gathas which did in fact then exist. The Yenghe Haatam is all about worship. And the Gathas tell us to worship the Divine with Its own qualities, with thoughts, words and actions that are in accord with truth.¹⁴ And indeed, worship, in the Yenghe Haatam is also described as being in accord with truth [*ašāt hacā*].

Therefore, any translation/interpretation of the Yenghe Haatam, should satisfy the following criteria.

1. The interpretation of its ambiguities should be consistent with the ideas we see in the Gathas and other Old Avestan texts;
2. The translation must be grammatically accurate, linguistically defensible, and
3. It must not ignore Avestan words (that have been decoded), which do not fit a given translator's interpretation (which is what even some first class linguists have done, as you will see).

By the time you are done looking at all the puzzles and double entendres in this manthra and its YAv. commentary, you may think the author of the Yenghe Haatam overdid things ~ that there are just too many of them. But bear in mind, those who sang or recited this manthra would have discovered these puzzles and double entendres bit by bit, over a period of time (not all at once, as you will do, reading this chapter), so this manthra would have been a continuing source of delight and discovery, which the ancients would have appreciated.

So let us see if we can unravel these puzzles. Let us start by considering some open questions about these two sets of (unidentified) pronouns.

yejñhē (masc. sg.) / *yāñhqmā* (fem. pl.)

Pronouns stand for nouns. So what nouns did the author intend these two pronouns to stand for ~ the **masc. sg.** *yejñhē* and the **fem. pl.** *yāñhqmā* ~ both among living beings *hātəm*?

1. We might question whether *yejñhē* (masc. sg.) could stand for generic man, because if the composer intended *yejñhē* to stand for generic man (which includes all humans), why did he feel the need to tack on *yāñhqmā* 'and of which (fem. pl.)'? Let us set this question on the back burner of our minds, as an open question.

2. Could *yejñhē* and *yāñhqmā* stand for: Living divine Entities? Or qualities of the Divine? Or divine qualities in mortal beings? It is true that three of the qualities of the Divine ~ *ārmaiti-* (embodied truth), *haurvatāt-* (completeness), and *amərətāt-* (non-deathness), are *grammatically fem.* nouns which could be represented collectively by a **fem. pl.** pronoun such as *yāñhqmā* 'and of which'. But if that is so, how does *yejñhē* which is **masc. sg.** fit in? There is no dispute (among linguists) that in the Avestan language, the three divine qualities ~ *aša-* (truth), *vohu- manah-* (its comprehension, good thinking), and *vohu-x šaθra-* (its good rule) ~ are grammatically **ntr.** nouns.¹⁵

True, *yejñhē* is the genitive form for both **masc.** and **ntr.** But *yejñhē* is not **pl.** The masc./ntr. genitive **pl.** form of this pronoun is *yaēšqm*.¹⁶ Therefore *yejñhē* cannot stand collectively for the ntr. nouns ~ truth, good thinking, and good rule (whether as qualities or as Entities).

There is a possible **masc. sg.** candidate for *yejñhē*, which the Divine personifies completely, and mortals personify incompletely. The noun *mainyu-* is *grammatically masc.*, which with its adjective *spənta- mainyu-* means '(the) beneficial [*spənta-*] way of being [*mainyu-*]'.¹⁷ In the Gathas, the 'beneficial way of being [*spənta-mainyu-*]' is the true, wholly good, order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*) and its components (its good

comprehension, its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action, its good rule) ~ *in being* ~ personified in the Divine (completely) and in mortals (incompletely). Therefore the (grammatically) **masc. sg. *spānta-mainyu-*** personifies all 7 qualities of the Divine, which is why *spānta-mainyu-* is Wisdom's beneficial way of being in both the Gathas and later texts. And in the Gathas *spānta-mainyu-* is also the beneficial way of being of mortals (although imperfectly).¹⁸

But if *yej̥hē* (**masc. sg.**) stands for the beneficial way of being (*spānta-mainyu-* **masc. sg.**) which includes the other 6 qualities of the Divine, the question again arises: why then did the composer tack on *y̥ñhqm̥cā* 'and of which (**fem. pl.**)' since the three grammatically fem. divine qualities are components of the true order of existence (*aša-*), which is the beneficial way of being (*spānta-mainyu-*). Therefore the beneficial way of being (*spānta-mainyu-*) already includes the three grammatically fem. amesha spenta. Let us set this question also on the back burner of our minds, and look at the next set of pronouns.

tqscā (**masc. pl.**) / *tāscā* (**fem. pl.**)

In the Yenghe Haatam, both these pronouns (*tqscā* and *tāscā*) specifically are objects of worship/celebration. And both of them refer to the preceding pronouns *yej̥hē* and *y̥ñhqm̥cā*. These facts needs to be kept in mind, and they generate the following questions.

1. Does the fact that *tqscā* and *tāscā* are objects of worship/celebration mean that *yej̥hē* and *y̥ñhqm̥cā* cannot stand for mortals and can only stand for the Divine?
2. On the other hand, if both sets of pronouns (*yej̥hē* / *y̥ñhqm̥cā* and *tqscā* / *tāscā*) stand for mortals, did the author intend to worship/celebrate mortals in their entirety ~ including their harmful, cruel, tyrannical, destructive, 'bad', 'wrong' qualities? If not, can these pronouns stand for mortals?
3. And how could the **masc. pl. *tqscā*** refer back to the preceding **masc. sg. *yej̥hē***?

With respect, none of the translations / interpretations (of which I am aware) resolve all of the foregoing questions without (incorrectly) changing the grammatical value of *yej̥hē* or *y̥ñhqm̥cā* in their English translations (which some of them do! as you will see).

The YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Haatam (Yy21) does not mention *tqscā* and *tāscā*, although, perhaps as originally composed, it may have commented on *tqscā* and *tāscā*, but that part of the commentary may have been lost after the fall of the Achaemenian empire, or the later Arab invasion of Iran.

It may be argued that the Yenghe Haatam itself does not answer these questions because it is simply a flawed, awkward (or as Humbach/Faiss 2010 say "artless") piece. But that argument is not consistent with the importance which the ancients attached to this mantra over a very long period of time ~ many centuries ~ placing it in importance right after the Ahuna Vairya (yatha ahu vairyo) and the Asha Vahishta (ashem vohu).

I think that any translation and interpretation of the Yenghe Haatam must satisfy all of the above questions regarding *yej̥hē* / *y̥ñhqm̥cā* and *tqscā* / *tāscā*.

So let us consider this mantra, step by step.

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

We know that in the Gathas, Zarathushtra changed the nature of worship from the highly ritualized worship of his culture, (in which a qualified priest was the required intermediary between the worshipper and the

Divine), to the kind of worship in which each individual worships the Divine with It's own divine qualities ~ the true, wholly good, order of existence, its good comprehension, its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action, its good rule, the beneficial way of being, its complete attainment ~ with no intermediary between man and the Divine.¹⁹

And we know (from YAv. texts) that during YAv. times ~ centuries after Zarathushtra ~ worship once again became highly ritualized, and once again the priest was a required intermediary between man and the Divine.

But the Yenghe Haatam would have predated such YAv. texts (this mantra being in an archaic form of YAv.). And there is no evidence in the mantra itself that this later (YAv.) kind of worship ~ with its complicated (and expensive) rituals performed by a priest ~ was intended by the author of the Archaic YAv. Yenghe Haatam when he uses the worship words *yesnē* and *yazamaidē*. In fact the evidence is to the contrary, because he describes his notion of worship as intrinsic goodness ~ 'more-good' *vanhō* (which in archaic YAv. is the comparative degree of *vohu-* 'good') ~ and as being 'in accordance with the true order of existence (*ašāt hacā*). This is exactly the kind of worship we find in the Gathas. Hold this thought. It weaves in and out of various aspects of this mantra.

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

1. The worshipper or
2. The object of worship, or
3. The way to worship;

Or all three.

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

'In (the) worship [*yesnē*]
of which (one) [*yejñhē* masc. sg.] and of which (ones) [*yāñhəmcā* fem. pl.]
of (the) existing [*hātəm*],
Wisdom, the Lord, already knows
(what is) more-good [*vanhō*] in accord with the true order of existence [*ašāt hacā*],
them [*təscā* masc. pl.] and them [*tāscā* fem. pl.] we worship.' My translation.

I think it applies to all three ~ an interpretation which is corroborated by the YAv. commentary itself, which in § 2 contains the following two statements.

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

A moment's reflection makes it clear that these three teachings ~ the object of worship, the worshipper, and the way to worship ~ do indeed comprise the entire worship Word of Zarathushtra ~ a conclusion which helps to inform our understanding of what nouns the two sets of pronouns in the Yenghe Haatam ~ *yejñhē/yāñhəmcā* and *təscā / tāscā* ~ stand for, among living beings (*hātəm pl.*).

Let us now consider what the author's intent may have been in using these 2 sets of pronouns, taking it step by step ~ starting with the identity of the first set:

'of which (one)', *yej̄hē* (masc. sg.)
'and of which (ones)', *yā̄nhqmcā* (fem. pl.)

Both are *hātqm* ~ literally 'of (the) existing', or 'of beings'. The word *hātqm* is found also in a Gatha verse where it stands for mortals (detailed in the *Linguistics* section below). But in the Gathas, there is also specific evidence that Divine has existence, being; and there is quite a lot of implied evidence that mortals and the Divine are parts of the same being.²⁰

Therefore we can conclude that the pronouns *yej̄hē* and *yā̄nhqmcā* do not stand for concepts or allegories. They stand for living beings, *hātqm*.

And the YAv. commentary (Yy21) on the Yenghe Haatam, throws additional light on *hātqm*. It tells us that *hātqm* in this manthra, is used for living beings who want to heal existence. Here are the words of this YAv. commentary (Yy21).

"... *hātqm. yasnəm. cinasti. yaθa. hadbīš. j̄jišqm. ...*" Y21:1 - 2, Geldner 1P p. 81.

"... *hātqm* attributes (the) worship (of beings), as [*yaθa*] (the) desire to win [*j̄jišqm*]²¹ (what is) altogether healing [?] [*hadbīš*].²² My translation.

So how do living beings heal existence? In the Gathas, existence is healed through personifying (embodying) the qualities of the Divine ~ by (unperfected) mortals, and by the (perfected) Divine ~ a joint enterprise.

By mortals: "Therefore may we be those who shall heal this world! ..." Y30:9, Insler 1975.

By the Divine: "... By your rule, Lord, Thou shalt truly heal this world in accord with our wish." Y34:15, Insler 1975.

And what is the Lord's rule that heals this world (existence)? It is the rule of truth, its embodiment in thought, word and action, its most good comprehension. Teaching through rhetorical questions, Zarathushtra defines Wisdom's rule as follows.

"Where shall there be protection instead of injury? Where shall [*mərəždikā* 'compassion'] take place?
Where truth which attains glory? Where [*spənta- ārmaiti-* 'beneficial embodied truth']?
Where the very best thinking [*vahišta- manah-* '(the) most good thinking']?
Where, Wise One, through Thy rule?" Y51:4, Insler 1975.

So we see that three qualities of the Divine ~ the true order of existence (truth), its beneficial embodiment, its most good comprehension, are components of Wisdom's rule ~ a rule that heals existence ~ that protects existence from harm, that is compassionate.

Let us now consider how the YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Haatam (Yy21) adds to our understanding of these two pronouns *yej̄he* and *yā̄nhqmcā*.

Here is the YAv. commentary's explanation of *yej̄he*, (bear in mind, this commentary is an explanation, not a translation ~ because the commentary itself is in Avestan).

... *yej̄he. ida. mazdā. yasnəm. cinasti. yaθa. dāta. ahurahe...* (Yy21:1).

'... *yej̄he* here [*ida*]²³ attributes [*cinasti*]²⁴ (the) worship [*yasnəm*]²⁵ of Wisdom [*mazdā*] (to be) as [*yaθa*] with (the) established [*dāta*]²⁶ (teaching) of the Lord [*ahurahe*]²⁷...' Yy21:1, my literal translation.

That sounds a bit awkward, but (in more readable English) it simply states that *yejhe* attributes (the) worship of Wisdom to be in the way established by the Lord. The Gathas specifically (and more than once) show that the way to worship the Divine is with Its own divine qualities,²⁸ which are aspects of the wholly good true order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*), which is the wholly beneficial way of being (*spanta- mainyu-*).²⁹ And the Gathas specifically (and more than once) use 'Lord' to mean One who is Lord of the qualities that make a being Divine ~ personifying these qualities completely ~ (I have footnoted applicable quotations from the Gathas for your convenient reference).³⁰ Therefore, the way to worship in the Yenghe Haatam ~ a worship that is *ašāt hacā* 'in accordance with truth' ~ is consistent with the Gathas, and would be the way to worship established by the Lord as the commentary states.

This explanation of *yejhe* does not identify any one particular masc. sg. living being (who heals existence) for which this masc. sg. pronoun (*yejhe*) stands. Instead, (with intended ambiguity) it suggests two possibilities. Let us read these words of this commentary twice ~ once for each of the following possibilities in understanding *yejhe*, and see if you agree.

First possibility: The pronoun *yejhe* 'of which (being)' as the worshipper.

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

In Avestan, a generic worshipper would masc. sg. because the masc. gender is used generically for all genders (just as in English *mankind, man, he, him* are used generically to include all genders).³¹ And in the Gathas, mortals have within them the beneficial way of being (*spanta- mainyu-* a divine quality) although incompletely. (This possibility does not render *yānhamcā* superfluous, as you will see when we discuss the commentary's take on this pronoun, below).

Second possibility: The pronoun *yejhe* 'of which (being)' as the object of worship, which in this commentary is Wisdom, the Lord [*mazdā- ahura-*], who is described and referred to, throughout the Gathas and the YAv. texts, as *spanta- mainyu-* '(the) beneficial way of being'.³²

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

In short, the pronoun *yejhe* (masc. sg.) could (with double entendre) stand for both of the following:

As the object of worship: *yejhe* could stand for the **masc. sg. spanta- mainyu-** 'the beneficial way of being' of Wisdom (who is) Lord (*mazdā- ahura-*) ~ a purely grammatical masc.,³³ because the Divine and Its beneficial way of being are genderless; and

As the worshipper: *yejhe* could also stand for the **masc. sg. spanta- mainyu-** 'the beneficial way of being' of the generic worshipper ~ an unperfected mortal (a generic **masc. sg.**), who has within him/her (imperfectly) this quality of the Divine ~ the beneficial way of being, *spanta- mainyu-*.

In the Gathas, the beneficial way of being (*spanta- mainyu-*) is specifically used to describe the way of being of the Divine (completely) and mortals (incompletely).³⁴ And both are living beings, and existence-healers, and therefore are in accord with the YAv. commentary's explanation of *hātqm*.

Now if we factor these two possibilities for *yejhe* (from the commentary) into the applicable words of the Yenghe Haatam itself, they both apply ~ for *yejhe* as the object of worship, Wisdom the Lord, the beneficial way of being; and for *yejhe* as the worshipper's beneficial way of being, (each the grammatically masc. sg. *spanta- mainyu-* ~ a divine way of being). Judge for yourself.

1. 'In (the) worship [*yesnē*] of which one [*yej̥hē* masc. sg. ~ the beneficial way of being of the Divine] ... of (the) existing [*hātqm*], ... Wisdom the Lord, already knows (what is) more good [*vanhō*] in accord with the true order of existence [*aṣāt hacā*], ...' Yenghe Haatam, Yy27:15, my translation.

2. 'In (the) worship [*yesnē*] of which one [*yej̥hē* masc. sg. ~ the beneficial way of being of the generic worshipper] ... of (the) existing [*hātqm*], ... Wisdom the Lord, already knows (what is) more good [*vanhō*] in accord with the true order of existence [*aṣāt hacā*], ...' Yenghe Haatam Yy27:15, my translation.

So *yej̥hē* stands for the beneficial way of being (*spanta- mainyu-*) ~ the way of being of the Divine, and of the Divine in mortals (albeit not perfected). Of all available options, this is the only one that fits in every respect. The **masc. sg.** gender of *yej̥hē* (standing for **masc. sg.** *spanta- mainyu-*) is purely grammatical (in the genderless Divine) and purely generic (in mortals).

As for the way to worship: In the Gathas, the way to worship the Divine is with Its Own divine qualities. The beneficial way of being (*spanta- mainyu-*) is, (it **personifies**) the true, wholly good order of existence (*aṣa- vahišta-*, 'truth' for short) and its component qualities ~ its good comprehension, its beneficial embodiment, its good rule, its (incremental and eventually) complete attainment.

In short, the beneficial way of being is both an object of worship (in the perfected Divine and in imperfect mortals) and it is the way to worship by imperfect mortals ~ a worship that is in accord with truth [*aṣāt hacā*] as the Yenghe Haatam says ~ the kind of worship we find in the Gathas.

How does this conclusion fit with the tacked on **fem. pl.** *yāñhqmā* 'and of which ones'? Well, let's take a look.

The YAv. commentary on *yāñhqm* mentions *ārmaiti-*. There can be no dispute that *ārmaiti-* (a *grammatically* fem. noun) is a quality of the Divine. But its meaning has not yet been decoded ~ linguists are in total disagreement about it. The only meaning that fits each use of *ārmaiti-* in the Gathas is 'embodying the true, good order of existence (truth) in thought, word and action',³⁵ which is another way of saying **personifying** truth ~ in living beings. The Divine personifies (embodies) truth completely. Mortals personify (embody) truth incompletely.³⁶ And *ārmaiti-* is a *grammatically* **fem.** noun.

Could the author of the Yenghe Haatam have intended a **fem. pl.** pronoun (*yāñhqm*) to stand for something to do with *ārmaiti-* 'embodied truth'? This is where the insight of the YAv. commentary (Yy21) is so helpful. Once again, let's take it step by step.

The YAv. commentary explains *yāñhqm* (first step) as follows,

Yy21:2. *yāñhqm. ida. aṣaoninqm. ārmaiti.paoiryānqm. yasnəm. para.cinasti. ...•• ...••*

My translation (as literal as possible).

'...(The word) *yāñhqm* here [*ida*] forthwith-ascribes [*para.cinasti*] (the) worship [*yasnəm*] of (the) truth-possessing [*aṣaoninqm*], first-ones-of-embodied-truth [*ārmaiti.paoiryānqm*] ...' Yy21:2.

A key to understanding this explanation of *yāñhqm* is to understand the phrase *aṣaoninqm ārmaiti.paoiryānqm*'. I think the commentary uses this phrase with double entendre ~ as worshippers, and as the object of worship (although ~ as in the Yenghe Haatam itself ~ this commentary's use of '(the) worship [*yasnəm*]' can mean 3 things: the object of worship, the worshipper, and the way to worship!). Let's start with the compound noun *ārmaiti.paoiryānqm*, after which we will consider the adjective *aṣaoninqm* which

describes this noun and then consider rest of the sentence. (Compound words are discussed in more detail in other chapters).³⁷

In this compound noun, the first member *ārmaiti* (a **fem.** noun) means 'truth embodied in thought, word and action' (for short 'embodied truth'). Surely we can agree that there is nothing intrinsically feminine about embodying truth ~ all mortals are capable of embodying truth (with their thoughts, words, and actions) ~ albeit incompletely. And the genderless Divine embodies truth completely. So we can conclude that that the **fem.** gender of *ārmaiti*. (the first member of our compound word) is purely grammatical.

In Avestan, the second member of a compound word usually determines the grammatical value of the whole compound word. The second member, here *paouryanqm* is **genitive pl. fem.** of the stem *paourvya-* 'first' ~ an adjective which in Av. can also be used as a noun ~ 'first (one)' or 'first (ones)' indicating one or more persons who have the qualities of the adjective. So the compound noun *ārmaiti.paouryanqm* (**genitive pl. fem.**), translated as literally as possible into fluent English, means 'of-(the)-first-(ones)-of-embodied-truth'.

In Avestan (as in English!), *paourvya-* 'first' has different flavors of meaning including 'first' chronologically, and 'first' in quality ~ as in the highest quality.³⁸ And here (with double entendre), I think both meanings are intended. Hold that thought. We will see how well this two-fold meaning for *paouryanqm* fits *ārmaiti.paouryanqm*, as this discussion unfolds. Let us now look at *ašaoninqm*.

ašaoninqm 'truth-possessing' is an adjective. Its stem *ašaonī-* is the **grammatically fem.** form of this adjective (the **grammatically masc.** form of which is *ašavan-*). Both *ašaonī-* and *ašavan-* mean the same thing ~ the adj. 'truth-possessing'.³⁹ So why do we have both a fem. and masc. form for the same adj. ~ 'truth-possessing'? Well, in Avestan, an adjective must be in the same case/number/gender as the noun it describes. There is no dispute that the noun *ārmaiti.paouryanqm* is **gen. pl. fem.**, so the adjective which describes it ~ *ašaoninqm* ~ has to be **gen. pl. fem.** as well.

It is true that adjectives (like *ašaonī-* / *ašavan-*) can be (and are) also used as nouns that are concepts, 'truth-possessing (things),' as well as nouns that are people, 'truth-possessing (ones)', and in other Avestan texts, *ašaonī-* sometimes has indeed been used as a noun for women who are 'truth-possessing (ones)'.⁴⁰ But here, the context does not allow this adjective *ašaoninqm* to be treated as a noun 'of the truth-possessing (women)' because this adjective describes the noun *ārmaiti.paouryanqm*. Avestan has more than one word for 'woman' ~ *gənā-*, *jainī-*, *nāiri-*,⁴¹ ~ words that are not in the commentary's explanation of *yāñhqm* (Yy21:2). In this instance, giving *ašaoninqm* its normal grammatical value (a **gen. pl. fem.** adj. describing the **gen. pl. fem.** noun *ārmaiti.paouryanqm*) fits well, giving us the following translation that is as literal as possible (in readable English),

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

Next question: What did the author of this commentary (Yy21:2) have in mind when s/he⁴² explained *yāñhqm* as *ašaoninqm ārmaiti.paouryanqm* 'of (the) truth possessing first-(ones)-of-embodied-truth' (Yy21:2)? To whom does this phrase refer? ~ to mortal females as worshippers? To the three (grammatically) **fem.** amesha spenta (*ārmaiti-* *haurvatāt-* and *amərətāt-*) as objects of worship? To mortals who have attained the qualities of the Divine completely, forming a plurality which is the Divine union?⁴³ To something else?

Well, the author of this YAv. commentary chose one Gatha verse to quote from ~ Gatha verse Y43:1 (in which *ārmaiti-* is specifically mentioned),⁴⁴ ~ warranting the conclusion that the author of this commentary must have thought that this Gatha verse has some bearing on the commentary's understanding of the Yenghe Haatam. The commentary quotes only the first two lines of this Gatha verse. But in ancient times (before the modern system of numbering chapters and verses), quoting the beginning of a verse was the only available way of identifying a given verse, because in the manuscripts there are no numbers for chapters and verses. I will give you the lines of this Gatha verse Y43:1 which speak of *ārmaiti-* in the Insler translation so that you can feel assured that I am not molding the evidence to suit my purpose.

Zarathushtra says " ... I (therefore) wish enduring strength to come, in order to uphold the truth. By reason of my [*ārmaiti-* 'embodied truth'],⁴⁵ grant this to me: the rewards of wealth [*rāyō* 'light'],⁴⁶ and a life of good thinking." Y43:1, Insler 1975. There is no 'and' in the Av. text.

How does one "uphold (the) truth" Y43:1? One can do so only with thoughts, words and actions that embody truth (which is the meaning of *ārmaiti-*). And by the way, what gender is the person who, in this Gatha verse Y43:1, possesses this (grammatically fem.) quality *ārmaiti-*? He is a man ~ Zarathushtra.

Which brings us back to the question in the YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Haatam:

Who are these '*...truth-possessing first(ones)-of-embodied-truth...*' (*aṣaoninqm ārmaiti.paoiryanqm*)? In answering this question, let us take these words as they are, and not try to stuff additional ideas into them which the commentary does not contain, and which are not required by the language itself, or its context. The following is my opinion, based on the following evidence.

In the Gathas the stem *paourvya-* 'first' is used in different flavors of meaning (as it is in English). And in the YAv. commentary (Yy21) the word *paoiryanqm* 'of (the) first (ones)' (which is compounded with *ārmaiti*) expresses with double entendre two meanings of 'first' ~ *first in chronological time* and *first in quality* ~ two flavors of the meaning of *paourvya-* 'first' words that we also see in the Gathas.⁴⁷

First in chronological time represents the plurality of mortal existence in which the divine quality, embodied truth (*ārmaiti-*) is still incomplete, unperfected, sporadic ~ the *first (early)* stages of the perfecting process.

First in quality (the highest quality) represents perfected existence ~ the complete embodiment of the true, wholly good order of existence, the existence of the Divine which (the Gathas and certain later texts imply) is the Divine union of a plurality of perfected fragments of existence, which previously were mortal, imperfect).⁴⁸

Thus, the plural (*aṣaoninqm ārmaiti.paoiryanqm*) represents '(the) truth-possessing first-(ones)-of-embodied-truth' ~ not as an abstract quality, but in existence ~ perfected and unperfected ~ a conclusion consistent with *hātqm* 'of (the) existing'. Am I being fanciful? Well, here is the first part of Yy21:2 again. Read *paoiryanqm* both ways.

Yy21:2. ... *yāñhqm. ida. aṣaoninqm. ārmaiti.paoiryanqm. yasnəm. para.cinasti. ...* •• Geldner 1P pp. 81 - 82.

Yy21:2. '*... yāñhqm* here forthwith-ascribes the worship of (the) truth-possessing first ones of embodied truth [*as unperfected worshippers*], ...'

Yy21:2. '*... yāñhqm* here forthwith-ascribes (the) worship [*yasnəm*] of (the) truth-possessing first-(ones)-of-embodied-truth[*as perfected objects of worship ~ the Divine union of a perfected plurality ~ perfected fragments of existence*], ...'

Which brings us to the rest of section which (in my opinion) combines these two ~ the perfected and unperfected Divine. Withhold jumping to conclusions, and keep an open mind, until you see each step in my reasoning. Here is section 2 in its entirety.

Yy21:2. ... *yāñhqm. ida. ašaoninqm. ārmaiti.paoiryānqm. yasnam. para.cinasti. yaθa. vahmām. amāšaēibyō.∴ θrāyō. fkaēša.∴ vīspām. vacō. yesnīm.∴ cīm. aoi. yasno.∴ amāšā. spāntā. paīti. yasnahe.∴* Geldner 1P pp. 81 - 82.

Yy21:2. ... *yāñhqm* here attributes the worship of (the) truth-possessing first ones of embodied truth; as glorification (is) for (the) non-dying [*amāšaēibyō* dat. pl.]. Three teachings. (They comprehend) the entire worship Word. Whom does this worship address? The beneficial [*spāntā* acc. pl.], the non-dying [*amāšā* acc. pl.],⁴⁹ in every act of worship."

The words *amāšaēibyō* [dat. pl.] and *amāšā* [acc. pl.] are simply two grammatical forms of the stem *amāša-*.

In understanding the words *amāšaēibyō/ amāšā* and *spāntā* in this YAv. commentary (Yy21:2), let us recall that in the Avestan language these two words *amāša-* and *spānta-* are not nouns. They are adjectives. And the first time they appear in (surviving) Av. texts, is in the Old Avestan *Yasna Haptanghaiti* 37:4, in which these two words are used as adjectives to describe the true, wholly good order of existence (*aša-vahišta-*) ~ which the Divine personifies completely, and which mortals personify incompletely. In the following quotation (YHapt. 37:4), the two adjectives *spāntām* and *amāšām* are ntr. because the noun they describe ~ *ašām* ~ is ntr. Here is the whole verse,⁵⁰ so that you can see the way these two adjectives are used in context.

'We celebrate, ... the true order of existence (which is) most good,	[<i>ašām at vahištām yazamaidē</i>]
which (is) most beautiful,	[<i>hyaṭ sraēštām</i>]
which (is) beneficial, non-dying	[<i>hyaṭ spāntām amāšām nom. sg. ntr.</i>], ⁵¹
which (is) light-filled,	[<i>hyaṭ raocōñhvaṭ</i>]
which (is) all good	[<i>hyaṭ. vīspā. vohū</i>].'

YHapt.37:4, my translation (detailed in another chapter).⁵²

As you can see, here the words **beneficial** [*spāntām*], **non-dying** [*amāšām*] are simply two adjectives, among a string of other adjectives, which describe the true, wholly good, order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*). And here in YHapt. 37:4, *spāntām* appears first ~ unlike the later angel-entity term *amāša- spānta-* 'undying beneficial (ones)', in which *amāša-* appears first.

This Old Avestan verse (YHapt. 37:4) is quoted (in its entirety) in other YAv. texts, (for example, in Yy5:4), indicating that even in YAv. times, the authors of at least such YAv. texts were familiar with the use of *spāntām amāšām* as two adjectives, describing the true order of existence (*ašām* ~ an order of existence which the Divine personifies completely, and which mortals personify incompletely). The only other early instance (in Old Avestan texts) in which these two words *spānta-* and *amāša-* are used together is in YHapt. 39:3, in which both words are also used as adjectives, with the *spānta-* word used first as well, and the *amāša-* word used second (a translation and discussion of which is footnoted here, if you are interested).⁵³

And here it is important to not confuse *amāša-* an adj. 'non-dying', with the state of being that is *amərətāt-* 'non-deathness' ~ a state of being which is no longer bound by mortality, no longer mortal, because the perfecting process is complete.

In the YAv. commentary, (Yy21:2) I think the words *amāšaēibyō/amāšā* 'non-dying', and *spəntā* 'beneficial', apply to both the Divine, and to (unperfected) mortals ~ if we think it through.

These two adjectives ~ *amāša-* and *spənta-* ~ describe qualities of the Divine personified in existence. Even when personified incompletely by mortals, these divine qualities cannot die. It is only the material, mortal shell that dies. The qualities of the Divine, themselves (even though imperfectly personified) are non-dying (*amāša-*), beneficial (*spənta-*).

This conclusion is required by an idea unique in Zarathushtra's thought ~ one that we have mostly forgotten, but which was remembered even in Pahlavi times ~ and would certainly have been known to the author of the YAv. commentary on the Henghe Haatam. In Zarathushtra's thought, everyone will eventually make it.⁵⁴ For this to happen with certainty (as Zarathushtra teaches), the Divine within unperfected existence can never be eliminated, it cannot die. Therefore the Divine within existence ~ however imperfect, however incomplete ~ is *amāša-* 'non-dying', *spəntā* 'beneficial'.

With this understanding, let us read again the YAv. commentary Yy21:2.

Yy21:2. ... *yāñhqm*. *ida. ašaoninqm. ārmaiti.paoiryānqm. yasnəm. para.cinasti. yaθa. vahməm. amāšaēibyō.•• θrāyō. ūkaēša.•• vīspəm. vacō. yesnīm.•• cīm. aoi. yasnō.•• amāšā. spəntā. paīti. yasnahe.••* Yy21:2, Geldner 1P pp. 81 - 82.

Yy21:2. '... *yāñhqm* here attributes the worship of (the) truth-possessing first ones of embodied truth [the unperfected and the perfected], as glorification (is) for (the) non-dying [in perfected and unperfected existence]. Three teachings [the object of worship, the worshipper, the way to worship]. (They comprehend) the entire worship Word. Whom does this worship address? The non-dying, the beneficial [the Divine in all the living, perfected and unperfected], in every act of worship.' Yy21:2.

To summarize our conclusions so far, (following the clues of the YAv. commentary):

In the Yenghe Haatam, the pronouns *yeñhē* (masc. sg.), and *yāñhqm* (fem. pl.) do not represent an ill-conceived, ill-fitting parallel, "artlessly" expressed.

In essence: *yeñhē* stands for *spənta- mainyu-* 'the beneficial way of being' in living beings ~ the Divine in existence ~ perfected and unperfected. And *yāñhqm* stands for the same thing ~ the Divine in existence ~ the 'first ones of embodied truth' ~ perfected ('first' as the highest quality) and unperfected ('first' chronologically):

1. As the object of worship ~ the (perfected) Divine, and the (unperfected) Divine in mortals;
2. As the worshipper (who has the Divine within, imperfectly), and
3. As the way to worship (by personifying (incrementally) the qualities of the Divine in thought, word and action ~ an imperfect worship that strives to be 'more good' [*vānghō*], and is in accord with the true order of existence [*ašāt hacā*] ~ worshipping with the currency of truth ~ which is the way to worship established by the Lord, in the Gathas.

These two pronouns, *yeñhē* and *yāñhqm* ~ their numbers, their grammatical/generic genders ~ are riddles to tease, to entertain, to teach ~ Eureka! moments (to fill us with delight).

With these two unidentified pronouns *yeñhē* and *yāñhqm* this mantra teaches us to worship the Divine in being ~ the beneficial way of being, the true, wholly good order of existence personified in thought, word and action ~ in the perfected Divine and in mortals all of whom personify (however incompletely) this divine way of being. And these two unidentified pronouns *yeñhē* and *yāñhqm* in this mantra teach us

to so worship *with* these divine qualities ~ by being beneficial, by embodying the truth order of existence with each thought, word and action, incrementally, and eventually completely, ~ the kind of worship that is specified in the Gathas ~ the worship that is "established by the Lord" as the commentary says.

How cool is that?

Which brings us to the last two pronouns, *tāscā* 'and them' (masc. pl.), and *tāscā* 'and them' (fem. pl.).

Here is the translation of the Yenghe Haatam again, so that you can see these last two pronouns in context.

'In the worship

of which (one) [*yej̄hē* masc. sg.] and of which (ones) [*yāñhāmcā* fem. pl.],

of (the) existing [*hātqm*],

Wisdom the Lord, already knows (what is) more-good in accord with truth,

them (*tāscā* masc. pl) and them (*tāscā* fem. pl.) we worship.' Y27.15, my translation.

These two pronouns ~ *tāscā* 'and them' (masc. pl.), and *tāscā* 'and them' (fem. pl.) ~ refer back to *yej̄hē* / *yāñhāqm*, so it needs must follow (as the day the night) that the meanings of *tāscā*/*tāscā* are also governed by *hātqm* 'of (the) existing', and reflect the same intended ambiguities which applies to *yej̄hē* / *yāñhāqm*.

As such, *tāscā* / *tāscā* stand for the Divine ~ a union that is a perfected plurality of being, as well as the Divine within the plurality of unperfected mortals (temporarily fragmented to enable the perfecting process) ~ both of which personify (completely and incompletely) ~ the beneficial-sacred way of being (*spānta-mainyu-*) ~ a way of being that embodies the true, good order order of existence and its components ~ personified qualities of the truth-possessing first-(ones)-of-embodied-truth ~ 'first' chronologically (incomplete), and 'first' in quality (complete).

Therefore *tāscā* and *tāscā* also are an inclusive way of standing for the divine ~ perfected and unperfected ~ in the plurality of existence (which is a unity of being), which in essence is what the pronouns *yej̄hē* *hātqm* ... *yāñhāmcā* also stand for.

To understand this mind-set, ~ reflecting Zarathushtra's notion of the identity of the Divine as a union (sg.) of perfected fragments (pl.) ~ think of 'being/existence' as one continuum. Perfected existence is the end of the continuum. Unperfected existence comprises all the other fragments of existence (fragmented in material shells to enable the perfecting process) strung along the rest of the continuum. But each unit of existence in the continuum ~ from beginning to end ~ is nevertheless a part of one being/existence.⁵⁵

There are no 'others'.

In the essence of existence (setting aside the material shells that temporarily house living being), there are different fragments of *one* existence, *one* being, at various stages of a transformational process ~ an idea that we see in 1,001 ways in the Gathas, and which is captured in the Yenghe Haatam and its YAv. commentary (including particularly, its questions and answers), in the interplay between:

- ~ mortal existence (the unperfected divine in being, non-dying, although incomplete), and
- ~ perfected existence (the perfected Divine in being, non-dying, complete).

And this explains why the author of this mantra uses unidentified pronouns. Pronouns are words that can stand for anything in existence. In other words Avestan (so also English!) does not have certain *types* of pronouns that are used exclusively for different races, or different life forms. And (as we have seen) the

genders of the pronouns in this manthra are just grammatical ~ their meanings flowing into and out of each other.

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

Well, it is based on what we see in the Gathas, it answers all of the unanswered questions, and satisfies all of the criteria, which I set forth above. And it is informed by the YAv. Commentary on this manthra. But who can say for sure? You must decide for yourself. I can only express my opinion. I think it does. (Although I may not have discovered all that its author had in mind!)

Let us consider some corroborating evidence.

The Gatha verse Y51:22. One of the keys to understanding the Yenghe Haatam and its popularity amongst ancient Zarthushtis, is to understand how it agrees with, and gives us variations of, its (reputed) genesis, the Gatha verse Y51:22 (which is translated and discussed in another chapter).⁵⁶

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

The Yenghe Haatam agrees with the Gatha verse Y51:22 in (impliedly) identifying the object of worship as Wisdom the Lord ~ the beneficial way of being in perfected and unperfected existence.

A point of difference between the two is that Y51:22 is an expression of belief. Zarathushtra expresses his own knowing (his own belief),

"I know⁵⁷ in whose worship [*yesnē paitī*] there exists for me [*vahištām* '(the) most good'] in accordance with truth [*aṣāṭ hacā*]. It is the Wise Lord as well as those who have existed and (still) exist [*ayharacā hənticā*]. ..." Y51:22 Insler 1975. Whereas in the Yenghe Haatam, it is Wisdom the Lord who *already knows* what is 'more-good' (*vanhō*) (the comparative degree of *vohu-* 'good' in archaic YAv.) in every act of worship that accords with truth [*aṣāṭ hacā*] ~ however imperfectly. Even though no one else may be aware of any such act of worship, the Divine is aware of it.

But the major point of difference between these two, is that in Y51:22, the *primary* (but perhaps not sole) focus of worship seems to be on the perfected Divine (an existence which impliedly includes the plurality of perfected beings ~ those who have attained the qualities of the Divine completely), whereas in the Yenghe Haatam, the focus is on the divine in (perfected and unperfected) living beings,⁵⁸ with an interplay between:

- * the divine in (perfected and unperfected) living beings as objects of worship;
- * the divine in (unperfected) living beings as worshippers; and
- * the divine (its personified qualities) as the way to worship ~ a worship that (strives to be) in accord with the true order of existence, *aṣāṭ hacā*, but which (with the mistakes of beings who are not yet perfected) is still only the comparative 'more good' (*vanhō*) way. The archaic YAv. *vanhō* 'more good' is *vahyō* 'more-good' in the Avestan of the Gathas (Old Avestan). So we see that the *vanhō* 'more good' of the Yenghe Haatam is an echo of the *vahyō* 'more-good' of the Gatha verse Y30:3 in which *vahyō* 'more-good' describes one of the two primordial (unperfected) ways of being ~ the more good and the bad.⁵⁹ The worship in Y51:22 is expressed with the ultimate epiphany of the superlative 'most-

good' (*vahišta-*). The superlative in Avestan (as in English!) functions, sometimes as a crescendo of expression,⁶⁰ and sometimes also as a progression to the highest degree of a given quality.⁶¹

In the Yenghe Haatam this interplay between the divine in unperfected (mortal) and perfected (non-mortal) existence is like a piece of shot silk ~ the warp of which is blue and the woof of which is green. It looks more blue if you turn it one way, and more green if you turn it another way. Yet, no matter which way you turn it, you still can see that the color of the silk is an interplay of blue and green ~ an interplay we often see in Gatha verses. I think the author of the Yenghe Haatam achieves a similar interplay by using words in ways that give them two possible meanings ~ the unperfected and perfected divine in the fabric of existence ~

- (1) as the object of worship,
- (2) as the worshipper, and
- (3) as the way to worship.

"Three teachings" (as the YAv. commentary tells) ~ comprising Zarathushtra's entire worship Word.

This lovely interplay ~ achieved through unidentified pronouns and the (intentionally ambiguous) ways in which the words of the manthra are put together ~ would have teased and intrigued the people who lived in Avestan times, who were fluent in Avestan and who (in the absence of electronic and other forms of entertainment) took the time to enjoy figuring out riddles and puzzles, not only for the ideas they contained (for enlightenment), but also for the sheer fun of it. I think Zarathushtra uses intentional ambiguities in the Gathas for the same reason ~ to instruct in a way that intrigues, entertains.

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

'...Three teachings⁶² [*θrāyō tkaēša*]. (They comprehend)⁶³ the entire worship Word [*vīspəm. vacō. yesnīm*]⁶⁴ ...', Yy21:2, my translation.

How could any three teachings possibly comprehend the entire 'worship Word' of Zarathushtra? I was totally skeptical, totally dismissive.

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

True, in Y51:22, at one level, the objects of 'worship' are (specifically) Wisdom the Lord and (impliedly) those who have attained completely ~ who personify completely ~ the qualities that make a being divine, and are in union with the Divine. But I now realize that in fact, the Gathas are full of implied evidence that the Divine in all things is revered, celebrated. The only Gatha verse mentioned in the YAv. commentary is Y43:1 ~ a verse that is (impliedly) full of the interplay between the human and the Divine.⁶⁵ And this is what the Yenghe Haatam brings out (also impliedly!).

The Yenghe Haatam was not intended as a theological statement about the allowed objects of worship. The Av. notion of 'worship' in any event includes the notion of 'celebration'.⁶⁶ The Yenghe Haatam was intended as a manthra to be pondered as a prescription for living and therefore worshipping in accordance

with the true order of existence (*aṣṭāt hacā*) with each thought, word and action in the temple of life ~ as are the Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu) and the Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo).

As a prescription for living, the Yenghe Haatam tells us that we should worship/celebrate the Divine in all that exists, as a way to live our lives ~ a way of worship that brings the Divine to life with each thought, word and action. Zarathushtra's way to worship in the Gathas.

When we do so, it changes the ways in which we relate ~ to one's own self, to each other, to other life forms, to our environment, to all that exists.⁶⁷ We cannot hate, harm, trash or destroy any part of existence without harming ourselves, and the divine within all things, even though the realities of life are such that we do indeed have to choose ~ constantly! ~ between the lesser of two evils, including the necessity of killing plants and animals for food ~ which also (much as I dislike it, much as I rebel against the idea) plays a part in the perfecting process.⁶⁸

I think the foregoing is why the Yenghe Haatam was valued so highly by the ancients. And we see its flowering in the celebration/worship of the many aspects of the material existence (each of which contains the divine within) described in the *Yasna Haptanghaiti* (which is in Old Avestan), the *Farvardin Yasht* (which is in YAv.) and other YAv. texts.

So now I agree with the ancients. I too think that the Yenghe Haatam is a manthra that is valuable, transformational, beautiful. It deserves the place the ancients gave it ~ placing it right after the Ahuna Vairyo (yatha ahu vairyo) and the Asha Vahishta (ashem vohu). And I feel great affection, gratitude, and respect for its unknown author, and for all those who (down through the long, long passage of time (millennia), and despite centuries of repeated intermittent destruction and persecution, have attempted to keep it (and its YAv. commentary!) alive.

* * * * *

YAv. Yasna 21, the most ancient commentary on the Yenghe Haatam.

We have already discussed this commentary in bits and pieces ~ discussions that I will not repeat here. But this is where you can see it in its entirety.

The first thing to bear in mind is that both this commentary and the Yenghe Haatam itself are in Avestan (although the commentary is in a younger form of Avestan). So obviously, the commentary was not intended as a 'translation' of the Yenghe Haatam.

Yet, as a commentary, when we first read it, it does not seem to explain much. So what was the intent of this cryptic YAv. commentary (Yy21)?

Well, when my grand-children were little, we sometimes played a game *Animal, Vegetable Or Mineral* in which one person thought of an object, and the other players asked for clues in order to guess what that object was. And I sometimes wonder if the original (unknown) author of the Yenghe Haatam may not have posed clues (to his/her contemporaries) to understanding the puzzles of this manthra, which clues the YAv. commentary later incorporated, because the clues of the YAv. commentary (especially its questions and answers) are so exact ~ right on the mark. But this is pure speculation on my part.

I will lay the evidence of this commentary before you, so that you can judge for yourself.

[Sections 1 and 2.](#)

In Section 1, the words in blue font are quotations of the first five words of the Yenghe Haatam (because Avestan manuscripts do not number their chapters, verses, sections or paragraphs, which are divided (sometimes differently!) into paragraphs, or separated (often differently) by symbols (like small or large bunches of grapes as in J2, K5, or flowers as in L17 ~ these three are the only manuscripts of which I have copies. Sections 1 and 2 comment on the three words *yej̄hē*, *hātqm*, and *yāñhqm*. And Section 2 ends with a statement, and one question and answer. Here are sections 1 and 2 as divided in Geldner.

Section 1. *yesnīm. vacō. ašaonō. zaraθuštrahe*•• *yej̄hē. hātqm. āaṭ. yesnē. paiṭi*••
yej̄he. ida. mazdā. yasnəm. cinasti. yaθa. dāta. ahurahe. hātqm. yasnəm. cinasti.

Section 2. *yaθa. haḍbīš. j̄jišqm. yāñhqm. ida. ašaoninqm. ārmaiti.paoiryanqm. yasnəm. para.cinasti. yaθa. vahməm. aməšaēibyō*•• *θrāyō. tkaēša*•• *vīspəm. vacō. yesnīm*•• *cīm. aoi. yasnō*•• *aməšā. spəntā. pāiti. yasnahe.* •• Geldner 1P pp. 81 - 82.

As you can see, according to Geldner (based perhaps on the mss. available to him) the commentary on *hātqm* (*hātqm yasnəm cinasti yaθa haḍbīš j̄jišqm*) starts at the end of (what Geldner calls) section 1 and continues through the first three words of (what Geldner calls) section 2. This paragraphing (whether by Geldner or in the manuscripts available to him) is clearly incorrect (unless perhaps by splitting the comment on *hātqm* between sections 1 and 2, it was the commentary's intent to show that *hātqm* is applicable to both *yej̄he* in § 1, and to *yāñhqm* in § 2).

Here is my translation of Yy21 §§ 1 and 2 (but for convenience in discussing *hātqm* I have moved the first three words of Geldner's § 2 *yaθa. haḍbīš. j̄jišqm.* into § 1).

1. *yesnīm. vacō. ašaonō. zaraθuštrahe*•• *yej̄hē. hātqm. āaṭ. yesnē. paiṭi*••
yej̄he. ida. mazdā. yasnəm. cinasti. yaθa. dāta. ahurahe. hātqm. yasnəm. cinasti. yaθa. haḍbīš. j̄jišqm.

2. *yāñhqm. ida. ašaoninqm. ārmaiti.paoiryanqm. yasnəm. para.cinasti. yaθa. vahməm. aməšaēibyō*•• *θrāyō. tkaēša*•• *vīspəm. vacō. yesnīm*•• *cīm. aoi. yasnō*•• *aməšā. spəntā. pāiti. yasnahe.* •• Geldner 1P pp. 81 - 82.

"1. (I give you) the worship Word of truth-possessing Zarathushtra: *yej̄hē hātqm āaṭ yesnē paiṭi*. *yej̄he* here attributes (the) worship of Wisdom (to be) as with (the) established rules of the Lord. *hātqm* attributes (the) worship (of beings), as (the) desire to win (what is) altogether healing [?].

2. *yāñhqm* here attributes the worship of (the) truth-possessing first ones of embodied truth, as glorification (is) for (the) non-dying. Three teachings. (They comprehend) the entire worship Word. Whom does this worship address? The non-dying [*aməšā*], the beneficial [*spəntā*], [the Divine in all the living, unperfected and perfected,] in every act of worship."

The translations by Humbach 1991, Mills 1887 are footnoted for comparative purposes.⁶⁹ I have already discussed my understanding of these two Sections in the discussion (above) on the Yenghe Haatam, so I will not repeat it here.

Section 3 (Yy21.3) includes a quotation of the first several words of the Gatha verse Y43:1 (shown here in blue font) but written with some YAv. spellings (detailed in a preceding footnote), and with many mss. differences in the spellings.⁷⁰ Here is section 3 in its entirety.

3. *āaṭ mraoṭ mazdā*•• *ušta. ahmāi. yahmāi. ušta. kahmāicīṭ. vasa.x šayqs. mazdā. dāyāṭ. ahurō*•• Geldner 1P p. 81.

Here is my translation of the first three words of the commentary, and my translation of the full Gatha verse Y43:1, (which the commentary identifies by quoting its lines a. and b.).

[Yy21:3] "Thus speaks Wisdom."

- [Y43:1] a. Happiness! /bliss! /enlightenment! [*uštā*] for that one ~ whomever ~ for whom (happiness bliss/enlightenment) (are) desired/willed [*uštā*].
 b. Ruling at will, the Lord Wisdom shall establish (it)."
 c. I (therefore) will [as an exercise of will power] enduring strength to come
 d. to uphold/sustain truth. This to me give, through embodied truth [*ārmaitī*] J2 etc.),
 e. The rewards of light, a life of good thinking.
 My translation (detailed in another chapter).⁷¹

In this Gatha verse (Y43:1) in Geldner, ten manuscripts show *ārmaiti-* in vocative form 'oh embodied truth' [*ārmaitē*]; nine manuscripts show *ārmaiti-* in instrumental sg. form,⁷² 'through embodied truth' [J2 in GAv. *ārmaitī*]; the rest in the YAv. instr. sg. form *ārmaiti*. Insler prefers the instrumental sg. here.⁷³ But actually it makes no material difference to the ideas expressed, because if we look past the allegory (the image of *ārmaiti-* as a person) we see the same meaning: the 'rewards' for embodying truth in thought, word and action (*ārmaiti-*) are:

'light' (the comprehension of truth ~ enlightenment),

'a life of good thinking' (the comprehension of truth ~ enlightenment) ~ the attainment of enlightenment incrementally through life experiences (in the material existence), until its attainment is complete (an enlightened state of being that in certain YAv. and later texts is called Endless Light(s) ~ a term for the ultimate good end, the paradise that mortals attain, and a name of the Divine in a Pahlavi text.⁷⁴ We have already discussed (above) how the idea of embodied truth (*ārmaiti-*) in this Gatha verse (Y43:1) informs an understanding of 'the truth-possessing first ones of embodied truth' in Section 2 of the YAv. commentary on *yāñhqm* in the Yenghe Haatam, so I will not repeat that here.

Sections 4 of the Yy21 commentary contain a question and answers, which include a play of words on *vahišta-* 'most good' ~ exactly as *vahišta-* 'most good' is used in the Gathas. Here is the full section.

[Question:] *cīm. *aētayā. *paiti.vacā. paityā.mraoṭ* ∴

[Answers:] *uštātātəm. paityā.mraoṭ. uštātāityaca. vīspəm. ašavanəm. həntəmca. bavanṭəmca. bīšyaṇṭəmca.*

vahištəm. vahištō. paityā.mraoṭ ∴

vahištō. mazdā. paityā.mraoṭ. vahištəm. ašavanəm. vahištāi. ašaone ∴ Yy21:4, Geldner 1P pp. 81 - 82.

Here is my translation of Section 4 (a few linguistic comments are footnoted, followed by Mills' translation).⁷⁵

'[Question:] Of this-two-fold reply whom did He answer (with it)?

[Answer:] A state of happiness/bliss/enlightenment [*uštātātəm*], He answered [*paityā.mraoṭ*]; and in happiness/bliss/enlightenment [*uštātāityaca*],⁷⁶ (He answered) every truth-possessing (one) [*vīspəm. ašavanəm*] who exists [*həntəmca*], and who is coming into existence [*bavanṭəmca*], and who shall exist in the future [*bīšyaṇṭəmca*].

The Most-Good (One) [*vahištō*], answered [*paityā.mraoṭ*] the most-good (Word) [*vahištəm*].

The Most-Good Wisdom answered [*paityā.mraoṭ*] the most-good [*vahištəm*], truth-possessing (Word) [*ašavanəm*], for the most-good truth-possessing (person) [*vahištāi. ašaone*].'

First, why is Wisdom's reply called **two-fold**? Well, central to the Yenghe Haatam is the interplay between the (perfected) Divine and the (unperfected) divine in mortals.

Second: About **vahišta-**: You may object that the Yenghe Haatam itself does not use the superlative degree **vahišta-** 'most-good'. That is true. It uses the comparative degree (in archaic YAv.) **vajhō**, but in connection with the (unperfected) worship of (unperfected) mortals ~ both (incrementally) more good.

And while the context of this Section 4 of the YAv. commentary shows that the adj. **vahišta-** is used as a noun, it does not say, in a given instance, for what noun **vahišta-** stands: ~ For Wisdom? For Wisdom's Word (the path of truth)? For a mortal who follows Wisdom's Word?

So how did I arrive at the choices that I think the author had in mind (and which I have placed in round parentheses)?

Well, my choices have been informed by the contexts in which **vahišta-** 'most-good' is used in this Section 4, and also by the ways in which **vahišta-** 'most-good' is used in the Gathas ~ almost as a word of art, or code word (detailed in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of The Most Good, Vahishta*),

- ~ for the Divine (Who is 'most-good'),
- ~ for the qualities that make a being Divine (each of which is described in the Gathas as 'most-good'),
- ~ for the Word of the Divine (the path of Divine qualities, the path of truth ~ which is described as 'most-good'),
- ~ for mortal words and actions that implement this path (albeit not perfectly, which are nevertheless described in the Gathas with the crescendo of the superlative 'most-good'), and
- ~ for the reward for taking this path, which is a 'most-good' existence (*ahu- vahišta-*) ~ one that personifies the true order of existence which is 'most-good' (*aša- vahišta-*), an existence which houses the bliss of enlightenment (the house good thinking, the house of song), which here is described as *uštātāt-* a happy, blissful, enlightened state of being.⁷⁷

Applying the foregoing ideas from the Gathas to section 4 of the commentary on the Yenghe Haatam, we see that:

- ~ the **Most-Good (One) [vahištō]**, answered with
- ~ the **most-good truth-possessing (Word) [vahištəm ašavanəm]** for the
- ~ the **most-good truth-possessing (person) [vahištāi. ašaone].'**

How beautiful is that? Is it any wonder that ancient Zarthushtis for many centuries valued the Yenghe Haatam so highly?

Section 5 of the YAv. commentary is simply a concluding section of praise.

bayqm. yejñhē.hātqm. hufrāyaštqm. ašaonīm. yazamaide••
yejñhē. hātqm. āt yesnē paiī •• •• Geldner 1P pp. 81 - 82.

The words in blue font are the first five words of the Yenghe Haatam and may have meant that the full mantra should be recited here ~ a fitting conclusion to its own YAv. commentary.

My translation of **Section 5**. (A few linguistic details are footnoted, followed by Mills' translation).⁷⁸

Literally: 'We celebrate [*yazamaide*] the truth-possessing [*ašaonīm*] (worship) of the Yenghe Haatam [*yejñhē.hātqm*], of the good(ness)-forwarding-worship [*hufrāyaštqm*] of the Divine [*bayqm*] ~. Yy21:5.

Or more fluently: 'We celebrate the truth-possessing (worship) of the Yenghe Haatam, the worship of the Divine (that) forwards the good.' ~ Yy21:5, my translation.

All of the questions and answers in this YAv. commentary:

- ~ may have been clues posed during YAv. times regarding the meanings of this manthra, or indeed they
- ~ may have been clues posed by the original unknown author of the Yenghe Haatam, to help solve its puzzles, and were simply recorded in this YAv. commentary.

We have no way of knowing for certain.

But this YAv. commentary ~ especially its questions and answers ~ certainly shows that the puzzles of the Yenghe Haatam were well understood during YAv. times, and that this manthra was highly valued as encapsulating the interplay between the human and the Divine in Zarathushtra's teachings ~ in the object of worship, in the worshipper, and in the way to worship ~ all the complexities of this manthra distilled to a beautiful simplicity ~ worshipping the Divine in all things.

* * * * *

Linguistics.

Let us now consider the linguistics of this remarkable manthra, because our conclusions are only as worthwhile as our linguistics are accurate.

Let us consider lines a. and b. together, because *yejñhē* and *yāñhqmčā* belong together and encapsulate or frame the words inbetween, so that these two lines form a unit of sense (thanks Professor Insler's insight into syntax in the Ahuna Vairya and the Gathas).

Line a: *yejñhē hātqm āat yesnē paiñ vanhō*

Line b: *mazdā ahurō vaēθā ašāt hacā yāñhqmčā*

Lines ab: 'In (the) worship/celebration, of which (one) [masc. sg.], and of which (ones) [fem. pl.], of (the) existing, Wisdom (the) Lord, already knows (what is) more good in accord with the true order of existence!'

I will discuss the Avestan words in the order necessary for a fluent English translation, so that you can see the sense of the manthra develop. There are no articles ('the', 'a', 'an') in Avestan, but we need to insert them to make an English translation fluent.

yesnē paiñ 'in (the) worship'

yesnē and *paiñ* belong together.

yesnē is locative sg. ('in (the) worship'),⁷⁹ of the noun *yasna-* which derives from the verb *yaz* 'to worship'. And in the Gathas, in the Old Avestan *Yasna Haptanghaiti*, and also in a few YAv. texts, like the *Farvardin Yasht*, *yaz-* (and words deriving from it like *yasna-*) are used in the sense of a worship that is a celebration. This has been detailed in another chapter,⁸⁰ and has been summarized here under *yazamaidē* (below) ~ another *yaz* word.

In Avestan, the locative case generally is translated into English with the prepositions 'at, on, under, in' etc. So which of these English alternatives should be used depends on the context of the Avestan text.

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

Skjaervo's *Old Avestan Index* classifies GAv. *paii̯* as "loc. postp." (locative postposition). His YAv. Index shows that the meaning of *paii̯* is affected by the case of the word which follows; here *paii̯* follows *yesnē* which is loc., and Skjaervo 2003 states that *paii̯* plus a loc. means 'on, in return for';

Hintze 1994 also says that the meaning of *paii̯* depends on the case of the word with which it is paired, and shows that *paii̯* + a loc. means 'for, in, at'.⁸¹

Jackson 1892 says Vedic *prāti* = YAv. *paii̯*- which means 'to, at, for, with' depending on the case of the noun it precedes or follows.⁸²

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

Here 'in' is already a part of the translation of loc. sg. *yesnē* 'in (the) worship', so we have to wonder what meaning *paii̯* adds to *yesnē*. Linguists seem uncertain as to how these two words should be translated together.

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

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *yesnē paii̯* as "(recompense) for the sacrifice",⁸³ (but 'for' is not a locative translation). And "sacrifice" here is an interpretation that does not fit, because the Yenghe Haatam, neither describes nor mentions any ritual sacrifice. It mentions only a way to worship that is in accord with truth (*ašāj hacā*) ~ as do the Gathas.

With respect, I do not think that *yesnē paii̯* could mean "in return for". In the context of the Yenghe Haatam, there is no place for the notion of a recompense or reward (nor does the YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Haatam contain any idea of recompense or reward). The Gathas, ~ so also the Asha Vahishta (ashem vohu) ~ teach us to follow the path of truth for its own sake, and also consistently describe the reward as the superlative degree of intrinsic 'good' ~ *vahišta*- 'most-good' ~ a standard epithet of truth (*aša- vahišta*).⁸⁴

Taraporewala 1951 translates *paii̯* as 'in every act-of-worship', but his long and detailed commentary shows the uncertainty that exists. If he has read the supporting evidence correctly, *yesnē paii̯* could indeed mean 'in every worship', or 'in every (act of) worship', that the Lord Wisdom knows is in accord with truth.

In the Gathas *paii̯* appears in many Gatha verses but with many different translations, including differences in translations of Y51.22 believed to be the inspiration for the Yenghe Haatam.⁸⁵

So on the present state of our knowledge of Avestan, we cannot state what meaning *paii̯* adds to *yesnē*.

Many translations of the Yenghe Haatam simply translate *yesnē paii̯* as 'in/at worship' without adding any additional English word(s) for *paii̯*. But then we have to question: What function does *paii̯* serve? Its presence must have some function, some meaning.

Taraporewala's choice seems to be the only good contextual fit for *yesnē paii̯*. But in light of all this uncertainty, I think it is better to not translate *paii̯* rather than to translate it incorrectly.

In my translation of this manthra, in order to keep it simple, I have focused on 'worship' and have left out the added flavor of meaning '/celebration', but you will experience better the richness of this manthra if you remember that Zarathushtra's notion of a [worship in accordance with truth](#), is a joyful celebration (in the way we live our lives). Thus ... *yesnē paitī* ... Literally, 'In (the) worship/celebration ...'.

yej̥hē 'of which (one) [masc. sg.]'

Linguists generally agree that *yej̥hē* in archaic YAv. is the genitive masc. sg. form of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*, (in Old Avestan the word is *yehyā*). A brief explanation of relative pronouns is footnoted for your convenience.⁸⁶

Hintze 1994 alone translates *yej̥hē* as gen. masc. pl. I do not have access to her reasons for so doing.

But according to Jackson 1892 the gen. masc. pl. is *yaēšqm*.⁸⁷

In archaic YAv. (the language in which the Yenghe Haatam has come down to us) the gen. masc. sg. pronoun *yej̥hē* can be translated as 'of whose', 'of whom', 'of which', 'of which (one)'. In this context, the only good fit (in my opinion) is 'of which (one)'.

Thus *yej̥hē ... yesnē paitī ...* 'In (the) worship/celebration [*yesnē paitī*] of which (one) [*yej̥hē* masc. sg.] ...'

yāñhqmā 'and of which (ones) [fem. pl.]'

Linguists generally agree that *yāñhqmā* is genitive fem. pl. of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*, with the suffix *-cā* 'and' tacked on.⁸⁸ It therefore literally means 'and of which (ones) [fem. pl.]'.

In this context, we know that *yej̥hē* and *yāñhqmā* belong together because:

- (a) they both are relative pronouns ~ grammatical forms of the stem *ya-*,
- (b) they both are in the genitive case and have the same meaning 'of which',
- (c) they are linked by the conjunction *-cā* 'and' at the end of *yāñhqmā*,
- (d) they both are identified by *hātqm* 'of (the) existing', and
- (e) they frame or encapsulate the in-between words with which they form a unit of sense ~ a technique of syntax frequently found in the Gathas.⁸⁹

The only differences between these two pronouns are that:

yej̥hē is **masc. sg.** whereas *yāñhqmā* is **fem., pl.** As discussed above, I think the gender is purely grammatical.

Thus *yej̥hē ... yesnē paitī ... yāñhqmā* 'In (the) worship/celebration of which (one) [masc. sg.], ... and of which (ones) [fem. pl.] ...'

hātqm 'of (the) existing'

Skjaervo 2006 shows *hātqm* under the verb stem *ah-* 'to be, to exist', as its present participle. A present participle generally is translated into English by adding an 'ing' to the verb stem (as in *dancing*, *singing* etc.). So the present participle of the verb stem *ah-* 'to be, to exist', would be 'existing' or 'being'. A present participle can be used as a noun, and when it is so used, the form *hātqm* is **masc./ntr. genitive pl.**⁹⁰

Gender/Number: The **masc.** gender of *hātqm* here cannot be actual, because existing beings are of all genders, and genitive pl. *hātqm* describes both *yej̥hē* which is **masc. sg.** and *yāñhqmā* which is **fem. pl.** Therefore, *hātqm* can only be a **generic masc. pl.** ~ including both *yej̥hē* **masc. sg.** and *yāñhqmā* **fem. pl.** If we give this present participle *hātqm* a **genitive pl.** value, it becomes:

More literally 'of (the) existing', or 'of beings'.

The word *hātqm* appears once in the Gathas, in Y29:3.

Insler 1975 translates *hātqm* in the Gatha verse Y29:3 as "of ... beings". In context, Insler has "...of yonder beings [*avaēšqm ... hātqm*], that strongest one is not to be found..." Y29:3. While the identity of "that strongest one" in Y29:3 is not specifically disclosed, the words "...of yonder beings [*avaēšqm ... hātqm*]," in this Gatha verse probably refers to mortal beings, whose suffering (and its solution) is the subject of this Yasna.⁹¹

Taraporewala 1951, commenting under the Gatha verse Y29:3, (in which *hātqm* occurs), agrees it is genitive ('of___'), used in the sense of 'among' beings, but does not state its gender. He states that *hātqm*, like Skt. *sat-*, is used to mean 'living' or 'existing' human beings (but cites no Av. or Skt. texts in support of this conclusion that the 'living' or 'existing' is limited to humans).⁹²

I prefer to translate *hātqm* more literally, as 'of (the) existing', (although 'of beings' is equally accurate).

Giving us, *yejñhē hātqm ... yesnē paiñ ... yāñhqmčā*

'In (the) worship/celebration [*yesnē paiñ*] of which (one) [masc. sg. *yejñhē*], ... and of which (ones) [fem. pl. *yāñhqmčā*], of (the) existing [*hātqm*] ...'

mazdā ahurō vaēθā 'Wisdom (the) Lord knows'

mazdā ahurō: both words are nom. sg. which means that here, this name (generally translated by Thieme ~ Insler's teacher ~ as 'Wisdom (the) Lord' or the 'Lord Wisdom') is the subject of the verb *vaēθā* 'knows'.⁹³

Thieme demonstrates (with linguistics) that in this two-word name, the word *mazdā* is not an adjective ('Wise'), but a noun, *Wisdom*.⁹⁴ And it is interesting that this form of the two word name ~ *mazdā ahurō* ~ in the Yenghe Haatam, is the form found more frequently in the Gathas whenever these two words are used together, whereas in the YAv. texts the two word name became standardized in the form *ahura-mazda-*,⁹⁵ once again indicating that the Yenghe Haatam (in archaic YAv.) may indeed have been composed during a time period that was before the name became standardized in YAv. texts.

vaēθā (GAv. *vaēdā*) 'knows',

This verb form is used for 3p sg. ('(he/she/it knows)') and also for 1p sg. ('I know'), but in this context, most translators are agreed that it is 3p sg. and refers to *mazdā ahurō* as the subject of the verb.⁹⁶

Thus, *mazdā ahurō vaēθā* 'Wisdom (the) Lord knows'.

āat 'already' (?)

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

Reichert 1911, shows that *āat* is an adv., (the abl. sg. of *a-*), and gives its meaning as 'then, thereon, thereupon; since that time; and; but; for.'

Martinez & DeVan 2001 offer the following possible meanings (in Spanish) of *āat*, 'then', 'already', 'but'.⁹⁷

Jackson 1892 shows *āat* (and GAv. *āt*) as an ablative adverb meaning 'then'.⁹⁸

Beekes 1988 shows the GAv. *āt* as an abl. adv. which he says means 'then, but, and'.⁹⁹

Hintze 1994 in the Glossary appended to her 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 in the *Zamyad Yasht*.¹⁰⁰

Indeed, an English equivalent for *āaṭ* does not seem to appear in any of the translations of the Yenghe Haatam considered here, with one exception.

Taraporewala 1951 comments that *āaṭ* is a mildly emphatic particle, which he translates as 'indeed' ~ applying to a conjectured 'Him' ('(Him), indeed [*āaṭ*] of-those-that-are [*hātqm*], of-whom [*yejñhē*] in every act-of-worship Mazda Ahura knoweth...').¹⁰¹

āaṭ (as an adverb) does not seem to fit with the loc. sg. verb *yesnē* 'in (the) worship'. Its proximity to the verb *yesnē* is not necessarily conclusive that it can only describe *yesnē*.

But if *āaṭ* (as an adverb) belongs with the verb *vaēθā* '(he) knows' I think the best fit is 'already'.

Thus *āaṭ ... mazdā ahurō vaēθā*

In literal translation '... already ... Wisdom the Lord knows ...';

More fluently '... Wisdom the Lord knows already ...'.

Thus, *yejñhē hātqm ... āaṭ yesnē paiṭ ... mazdā ahurō vaēθā ... yāñhqmā*

'In (the) worship/celebration [*yesnē paiṭ*] of which (one) [masc. sg. *yejñhē*], ... and of which (ones) [fem. pl. *yāñhqmā*], of (the) existing [*hātqm*] ... Wisdom the Lord already knows [*āaṭ ... mazdā ahurō vaēθā*] ...'

vañhō ... ašāṭ hacā ...'(what is) more good in accord with the true order of existence;'

'(what is)', the verb 'to be' frequently is implied in Avestan, and the relative pronoun '(what)' is required to make the English translation fluent.

vañhō is an adjective. In archaic YAv., it is the comparative degree of *vohu-* 'good' and so literally means 'more-good' (sometimes translated as 'better' or 'very good' - but neither of these 2 translations (with respect) accurately conveys the meaning of intrinsic goodness in something less than the superlative degree); *vañhō* is the archaic YAv. form of GAv. *vahyō* (from the stem *vahyah-*) which appears in the Gatha verse Y30:3.¹⁰²

ašāṭ hacā 'in accordance with truth'

There is general agreement about the translation of this phrase; *ašāṭ* is abl. sg. of *aša-*.

The abl. sg. *ašāṭ* literally means 'originating from truth'. Here again, the literal meaning adds more depth, than its translation in fluent English. And *hacā* is a preposition/postposition instr. sg.¹⁰³ which, when paired with abl. *ašāṭ* is generally translated as 'in accordance with truth'.

In the Yenghe Haatam, Humbach/Faiss 2010, Hintze 1994, Taraporewala 1951, and Bartholomae all translate *ašāṭ hacā* as 'in accordance with [*aša-*]' (in the Gathas and the *Ahuna Vairya*, Insler 1975 does so as well).

Humbach and Hintze translate *aša-* as 'truth', Bartholomae as 'Right', Taraporewala as 'Righteousness'. Each of these translations of *aša-* reflects an aspect of the 'true (correct, wholly good) order of existence', which is the more literal meaning of *aša-*.¹⁰⁴ In short, there is no disagreement about the translation of *ašāṭ hacā* as 'in accordance with truth/right'. The disagreements here are about, to whom, or to what, this phrase applies:

~ to man? (so Taraporewala 1951);

~ to man's worship? (so Hintze 1994);

~ to man's reward for worship? (so Bartholomae);

~ to the knowledge of Wisdom the Lord? (so the Pahlavi translator(s), Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010).

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

Here this phrase has the same meaning that it has in the Ahuna Vairya (but without the emphatic particle *cī*), I therefore translate it in the same way, which in fluent English gives us 'in accordance with truth'.¹⁰⁵

Thus, *yejñhē hātqm āat yesnē paiñ vanhō mazdā ahurō vaēθā ašāt hacā yāñhqmācā*

'In (the) worship/celebration [*yesnē paiñ*] of which (one) [*yejñhē* masc. sg.], and of which (ones) [*yāñhqmācā* fem. pl.], of (the) existing [*hātqm*], Wisdom the Lord already knows [*āat ... mazdā ahurō vaēθā*] (what is) more good [*vanhō*] in accordance with truth [*ašāt hacā*], ...'

Line c. *tqscā tāscā yazamaidē* 'them (masc. pl.) and them (fem. pl.) we worship'.

The two suffixes *-cā* in each of these words *tqscā tāscā*, simply mean 'and'. In the Gathas, when two or three words are grouped together, we often (but not always) see *-cā* tacked on to both words. And that is the situation here with *tqscā tāscā*. (The added *s* simply makes the pronunciation smoother ~ called *sandhi* by linguists). But in English translation, we only say 'and' once.

The words *tqscā / tāscā* are grammatical forms of the pronoun stem *ta-* (Skjaervo 2006) which is a demonstrative pronoun 'that'. Demonstrative pronouns in Avestan are also used for 3p pronouns like 'them'. The words *tqscā / tāscā* refer to the two preceding pronouns (*yejñhē / yāñhqmācā*) which refer to living beings. So in this context, they would be 3p pronouns.

tqscā 'and them'. The word *tq* is the acc. pl. masc. form of the pronoun stem *ta-* (Skjaervo Old Av. Index). It is accusative because it is the direct object of the verb *yazamaidē*.

tāscā The word form *tā* is nom./acc. pl. fem. (Skjaervo Old Av. Index). In this context, *tāscā* is the object of the verb *yazamaidē*, so its grammatical value can only be acc. (the nom. case is only used for the subject of a verb, and for its direct object only when the verb is a form of 'to be'). So, *tāscā* means 'and them (acc. fem. pl.)'.

Thus *tqscā tāscā* 'them (masc. pl.) and them (fem. pl.)'.

yazamaidē 'we worship/celebrate',

There is no dispute that *yazamaidē* is 1p pl. indicative (present) of the verb stem *yaz-* (Skjaervo 2006). And there is no dispute that the 1p pl. pronoun ('we') is a part of the verb form *yazamaidē*.

There is no dispute that *yazamaidē* in line c. is a *yaz-* word, and that the noun *yesnē* in line a. of the Yenghe Haatam derives from the verb stem *yaz-* as well (Skjaervo Old Av. Index). The disputes (or differences) lie in the English equivalents, which translators select for such *yaz-* related words ~ based on the object that is 'worshipped' ~ influenced by their own mind-sets.

In Zarathushtra's culture, 'worship' was ritual oriented. Zarathushtra changed that notion of 'worship' to one of worshipping the Divine with thoughts, words, and actions that embody the true order of existence ('truth' for short). No rituals (or sacrifices) are described in the Gathas as Zarathushtra's way to worship the Divine, which worship is a joyful celebration of thoughts, words and actions that personify the qualities of the Divine ~ the beneficial way of being, which is the true (correct) wholly good order of existence, its comprehension, its embodiment, its rule, its complete attainment ~ a worship/celebration of the Divine in all that exists, as we also see in the Old Avestan *Yasna Haptanghaiti*, and in parts of the YAv. *Farvardin Yasht*.

I was delighted to see that by 2010 Humbach had (somewhat) changed his mind. When translating *yaz*- words in the Gathas (and words deriving from *yaz*- like *yasna*-) he still used 'worship' (which is entirely appropriate), but still clung to 'sacrifice' in certain instances, and added 'celebrate/celebration' in other instances ~ without comment or explanation for the different English equivalents.

Which brings us to the Yenghe Haatam and what meaning its author intended when s/he used a grammatical form of *yaz*- ~ *yazamaidē* (a verb form, in line c.), and the *yaz*- related word *yesnē* (a noun form in line a.).

Humbach 1991 and Hintze 1994 both give the meaning 'worship' for these *yaz*- words (*yazamaidē* and *yesnē*).

Humbach/Faiss 2010 thought that the first set of pronouns stand for human beings engaging in "sacrifice" (*yesnē*). And they see the last set of pronouns also as standing for human beings whom 'we celebrate' (*yazamaidē*). They offer no explanation for their translation preferences for these two *yaz*- words.

Taraporewala 1951 also sees the first set of pronouns standing for human beings engaging in "worship" (*yesnē*). But he sees the last set of pronouns as standing for human beings whom 'we revere' (*yazamaidē*). He also offers no explanation for his two different English choices for these two *yaz*- words.

Perhaps these last translators used *celebrate* and *revere* respectively in different parts of this manthra because they believed that the objects of these *yaz*- related words (*yesnē* and *yazamaidē*) are human beings ~ men and women ~ and (I speculate) their pre-conditioned mind-sets may not have been comfortable with human beings as the objects of actual *worship* (as I also was not for a long time).

I have translated these *yaz*- related words in the Yenghe Haatam as 'worship'. But we need to keep in mind, that this is 'worship' as a 'celebration' in accordance with the Gathas' perception of worshipping, celebrating, the Divine (in perfected and unperfected existence) with the currency of truth ~ rather than 'sacrificing' to the Divine in accordance with (some translators' perceptions of) the rituals of later YAv. texts, which in any event do not describe ritual 'sacrifices' as in killing anything as an offering to the Divine.

Thus *tąscā tāscā yazamaidē* 'them (masc. pl.) and them (fem. pl.) we worship'.

* * * * *

Different Translations.

Let us now look at the different translations of this manthra. Generally, (in the texts of translations), words in round parentheses indicate words that are not in the Avestan text, but translators do not always place such words in round parentheses. Based on the word by word translation in the *Linguistics* section above, you can see for yourself to what extent these translations do (or do not) comply with the grammar of the Avestan original (based on principles of Avestan linguistics that are generally accepted by professional linguists).

Here is the Yenghe Haatam in archaic YAv., along with my translation, and the translations of the linguists in our group.

yeñhē. hātqm. āat. yesnē. paiī. vañhō.

mazdā. ahurō. vaēθā. ašāt. hacā. yāñhamcā.

tąscā. tāscā. yazamaidē ∴ ∴ ∴ Y27:15, Geldner 1P p. 98.

My translation, Y27:15.

- a.b. 'In the worship of which (one) [masc. sg.] and of which (ones) [fem. pl.], of those who exist,
Wisdom, the Lord, already knows (what is) more-good in accord with truth,
c. them (masc. pl.) and them (fem. pl.) we worship.'

The Pahlavi translation, Y27:15.

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

The foregoing Pahlavi translation/interpretation is in Humbach 1991, and I assume that the translation into English is by Humbach.¹⁰⁶ The round parentheses and square brackets are exactly as they appear in Humbach 1991. The words in square brackets are the Pahlavi translator's explanations. The words in round parentheses (I assume) have been added by Humbach because he thinks they are implied. I have added nothing. Humbach also gives the Sanskrit translation of the Yenghe Haatam, but does not translate it into English.

This Pahlavi effort may have been written many centuries after the YAv. commentary (Yy21 given above) ~ most probably a few centuries after the Arab invasion of Iran when other surviving Pahlavi texts (shown in SBE) were also probably written (circa the 9th century CE and later). Humbach identifies the mss. sources of this Pahlavi translation/interpretation as "Dhabar, *Pahlavi Yasna and Visperad*, 1927, 38, Yy5,6).

As you can see, the Pahlavi translation/interpretation shows *yejñhē* to be a human worshipper, ignores *yāñhqmā*, and translates *tāscā* / *tāscā* as "of the congregation of males and females" which could equally apply to the "congregation" of human males and females, but the Pahlavi explanation given in square brackets, is that *tāscā* / *tāscā* apply to the living angel entities (Av. *amesha spenta*, which in the Pahlavi text is written *amahraspandān*).

It is clear that this Pahlavi 'translation' bears no real relationship to the actual Avestan words of the Yenghe Haatam. This Pahlavi 'translation' and its explanation (shown here in square brackets), seems to be more in the nature of recording traditional knowledge, rather than a true 'translation'. But what is even more striking is the great difference between this Pahlavi translation/interpretation (as flawed as it is), and the Pahlavi commentary (given below).

Humbach 1991, Y27:15.

- ab: "Of which male (divine entity) among those who exist, and of which of the female ones, the Wise Ahura
in accordance with truth, knows (which is) the better (accomplishment of them to be displayed) at
worship,
c: those male and those female (entities) we worship."

As you can see, he thinks the pronouns stand for object(s) of worship, and he consistently translates the underlying meaning of the two *yaz-* words ~ *yesnē* and *yazamaidē* as "worship". But he adds a lot of words (in round parentheses) which are not in the Avestan text to make his translation work (for him).

Humbach/Faiss 2010, Y27:15.

- a: "The male one among the existing whose very good (recompense) for the sacrifice
- b: the Wise Lord knows in accordance with truth, and the female ones as well,
- c: those male ones and those female ones we celebrate."

As you can see, Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *yesnē* as dative ('for the sacrifice') instead of locative, (whereas Humbach's 1991 translation is locative 'at worship'). They see all the pronouns as standing for human beings who receive "(recompense) for the sacrifice". They see the phrase *aṣāṭ hacā* "in accordance with truth" as qualifying the Wise Lord's knowing, instead of the worship that is "very good" (*vanhō*). And they do not explain why they translate two *yaz-* words differently ~ *yesnē* as "for the sacrifice", and *yazamaidē* as "we celebrate". They express a poor opinion of this mantra (already discussed above).

Hintze 1994, Y27:15.

"In the worship of which (male Entities [pl.]) of those who exist and in the worship of which (female Entities) the Wise Lord knows what is better according to Truth, we worship these (male) and these (female Entities)."

Hintze's use of the capital 'E' in 'Entities' implies that in her view, these pronouns stand for divine entities. (There are no capital letters in Avestan script). Hintze translates *yejñhē* as masc. gen. pl. which (with respect) is not accurate (the masc. gen. plural is *yaēšqm*) ~ Geldner shows no manuscript variations for *yejñhē* ~ based on the manuscripts available to him,¹⁰⁷ (I do not know on what manuscripts Hintze may have relied). In her translation, the phrase *aṣāṭ hacā* "in accordance with truth" qualifies the kind of worship which is "better" (*vanhō* 'more good') ~ with which I agree. And (except for *yejñhē*) her translation is more literal than most, so that if you remove the words she has inserted in round parentheses and disregard her capital letters, you can see the ambiguities (discussed in the *Discussion* section above) regarding whether these pronouns stand for the object of worship and/or the worshipper and/or the way to worship, or all three.

Gershevitch 1967.

Although Gershevitch has not given us a translation of the Yenghe Haatam, he has an interesting note on this mantra in his translation of the Avestan hymn (Yasht) to Mithra (with comparisons to the Gatha verse Y51.22). He thinks that both sets of pronouns stand for the later living entities called amesha spenta based on (his perception of) the YAv. commentary (Yy21) a part of which he translates (somewhat freely) as follows. Words in round parentheses are his explanations.

"*yāñham*: here he (*scil.* Zarathushtra) teaches the worship of the female Truth-owners headed by Armaiti, because it is the prayer to the Immortals ..." Yy21:2, Gershevitch translation, p. 164.

And Gershevitch concludes that the words "... *yāñham* ... hence also *tās(cā)* refer to the female Amesha Spentas Armaiti, Ameretat and Haurvatat."

He sees the masc. sg. *yejñhē* as standing for *spānta- mainyu-* (a conclusion with which I agree) which "must have stood at the head of the group." (i.e. the group of the amesha spenta; a conclusion with which, with respect, I do not agree).

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

He sees corroboration for his conclusion in the later Yasna, Yy4:25 - 26, stating that Yy4:25 ends with the following reference to the amesha spenta, and is immediately followed by the full Yenghe Haatam. He lays out Yy4:25 and Yy4:26 in Avestan as follows, (abbreviating the Yenghe Haatam in Yy4:26). I have added my English translation for your convenience.

"Y4.25 . . .
aməšā spəntā hux šaθrā
hudāñhō yazamaide
[...we worship the well-ruling [*hux šaθrā*] beneficent [*hudāñhō*] Amesha Spentas]

Y4.26 *yeñhē hātqm ... tqscā tāscā yazamaide*.
[of which (one) (masc. sg.) ... them and them we worship'].

He concludes that the *aməšā spəntā* in Yy4.25, is the (collective) noun which is referred to by the pronouns *yeñhē hātqm ... yāñhqm ... tqscā tāscā* in Yy4.26, suggesting that the objects of worship (*yazamaide*) in each of these two sections is the same - the amesha spenta mentioned in Yy4.25.

I have a high regard (and affection) for Professor Gershevitch, and it is indeed possible that *yeñhē hātqm ... yāñhqm ... tqscā tāscā yazamaide* in Yy4:26 were intended to stand for the preceding *aməšā spəntā* mentioned in Yy4:25.

But it is only fair to point out that (as Geldner states), although the Yenghe Haatam is given in full in Yy4:26 in a few manuscripts, "generally it is abbreviated" here.¹⁰⁸ In the same way, it is abbreviated in numerous instances, (along with the "Yatha Ahu Vairyo", the "Ashem Vohu", and other prayers) in many, many places throughout the Avestan texts, which texts were recited as part of the ritual. And such abbreviations (mentioning one or more of these three, among other prayers) simply indicated that the prayer mentioned in the abbreviation should be recited at that point of the ritual. It is possible (sometimes even probable) that such abbreviations indicate that the applicable prayer bears a contextual relationship to the sections which precede it, and was chosen to be recited at that point, for that reason. But there also are instances in the Avestan texts, where the Yenghe Haatam is set forth in full, following a section, or preceding words, which do not mention the amesha spenta (used as a collective noun). A few examples are footnoted.¹⁰⁹ With respect, I do not find persuasive Gershevitch's conclusion that in the Yenghe Haatam, the pronouns stand for the living angel entities called amesha spenta in later (YAv.) texts.

Taraporewala 1951, Y27:15.

- ab: "(Him), indeed of-those-that-are, of-whom in every act-of-worship Mazda Ahura knoweth (to be) of-higher-worth by-reason-of (his) Righteousness (also) the woman-of-whom (He knoweth) likewise.
c: (all such) both these-men and these-women do-we-revere."

Taraporewala thinks the pronouns in this manthra stand for human beings. (The capital 'H' in "(Him)" simply indicates the start of the sentence which is capitalized in English). Taraporewala's translation gives *yāñhqmā* a sg. value, but his commentary acknowledges that the word is pl. Taraporewala interpretively translates *vāñhō* as "of higher worth", but in his comments acknowledges that it is the comparative form of *vohu-* 'good'. He thinks *vāñhō* is used here to describe the man who is "better" because of *ašāt hacā* (which he translates as "by reason of (his) Righteousness") in every act of worship - ascribing *ašāt hacā* to man's worship.

Bartholomae's English translation (as it appears in Taraporewala 1951).

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

c: these men and women do we revere." Y27:15.

Bartholomae's English translation is somewhat free. He sees all the pronouns as standing for human beings. He translates *yānhqm* as *sg.* 'the woman'. But the *gen. sg. fem.* form would be *yeñhā*, and not *yānhqm*.¹¹⁰ He translates the comparative *vayhō* "better" as the reward given "in accordance with Right" [*ašāt hacā*] for prayer (*yesnē*), but translates *yazamaidē* in line c. as "we revere".

Darmesteter 1882, Y27:15. A very free translation.

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

Although the words of Darmesteter's translation are ambiguous enough to apply to human beings, his footnotes make it clear that in his view, the "beings" are the Amesha Spentas.¹¹¹ Like others in his generation of scholars (when the decoding of Avestan was in its early stages), he translates *aša-* words (as in *ašāt hacā*) as "holiness", rather than 'truth' (giving *ašāt hacā* a locative translation "in holiness", instead of an ablative one "in accordance with truth". In Avestan, ~ Old Avestan, archaic YAv., and YAv. ~ for *a-* stem nouns (like *aša-*) the *abl. sg.* case has its own inflection ~ *-āt*, Jackson §236, p. 70). Darmesteter has inserted the word "[performed]" in square brackets, indicating an addition by him that he thinks should be implied, because he thinks the worship word here (*yesnē*) is a ritual sacrifice ~ an interpretation unsupported by any evidence in the Yenghe Haatam itself, but probably based on the rituals described in YAv. texts (none of which, incidentally, describe killing an animal as part of ritual ~ which is the normal meaning of 'sacrifice').

Mills 1894, Y27:15. A very free translation.

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

Mills gives his translation at the start of the YAv. commentary (Yy21), placing it in parentheses to indicate that he has inserted it here (probably to give context to the commentary). He sees the pronouns as standing for human beings. His translation of the Yenghe Haatam is quite interpretive. And the exclamation mark (!) is his as well. Avestan punctuation has no exclamation mark.

* * * * *

A Pahlavi commentary on the Yenghe Haatam.

The Pahlavi text, *Dinkard* Book 9 was composed a few centuries after the Arab invasion of Iran. The Younger Avestan language was no longer spoken or used as a current language after the advent of Alexander the Macedonian (331 B.C.E.) and probably even before that time,¹¹² (although I think the Avestan language

~ its grammar and vocabulary ~ was understood during Achaemenian times ~ and may indeed have been the *ariya* language referred to in the *Behistan Inscription* of Darius the Great,¹¹³ ~ a speculation on my part).

Here, in its entirety, is the text of the Pahlavi *Dinkard* Book 9, Ch. 4, purporting to summarize the commentary on the Yenghe Haatam in the YAv. *Sudkar Nask* (which has not survived). This translation is by E. W. West.

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

2. And also this, that he who is produced by the demons, or is proceeding to the demons, or has committed falsehood, is the opulent person who gives nothing to the worthy supplicant." SBE 37, pp. 175 - 176. Words in round parentheses are West's and show the applicable Pahlavi word. Words in *italics* are not in the Pahlavi text, and have been inserted by West as implied.

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

We do not know whether this deeply flawed understanding of the Yenghe Haatam accurately represents its summary in the YAv. *Sudkar Nask* (which has not survived), or whether the *Sudkar Nask* itself was inaccurate.

The Pahlavi summary (in the *Dinkard*) seems to have been based on (several centuries of) hearsay, irrelevant sermonizing, and very little understanding of the Yenghe Haatam itself, let alone Zarathushtra's thought in the Gathas. It demonstrates that the commentary Yy21 would have had to be a much earlier YAv. text than was the *Sudkar Nask* ~ if indeed the *Sudkar Nask* was written during YAv. times. Why do I suspect it may not have been?

Well, because the *Vendidad* (*Videvdat*) is the only surviving text that is identified (in a Pahlavi text) as an Avestan *Nask*, but we now know that although the *Vendidad* is in YAv., it was written long after Avestan times, because as certain eminent linguists acknowledge, the grammar of the Avestan *Vendidad* is so deeply flawed,¹¹⁴ that the priestly establishment of that time period could not have been fluent in Avestan. There are other (so-called) Avestan texts that have survived, the linguistics of which are also deeply flawed. Therefore, long after Avestan times, when the religious establishment was no longer fluent in Avestan, it may have been a practice for the religious establishment to write texts in (what they considered to be) Avestan to give authority to their own ideas. Was the *Sudkar Nask* also composed in deeply flawed Avestan ~ long after Avestan times? Since it has not survived, we have no way of knowing.

* * * * *

¹ In the word *hātqm* the first *ā* is pronounced long, the second *q* is pronounced long and nazalized as in the Parsi name 'Antia', or the Hindi words 'naam' meaning 'name', or 'aam' meaning 'mango', or 'kaam' meaning 'work' ~ all with a nasalized long 'a'.

In Avestan script, a long *ā* is written 𐬀; the nazalized long *q* is written 𐬁. Two different letters, for different two sounds. Geldner said that if the Yenghe Haatam is metrical at all, it can only be divided into three lines, each of eleven syllables, with the caesura after the seventh, a meter which he says is not found elsewhere. Geldner 1P, p. 26, ft. 1 of Yy4.26. Different manuscripts divide the lines differently, probably to save parchment costs.

² Yy21 (the YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Haatam) is included in SBE Vol. 31, pp 268 - 269, translated by Mills in 1887 (at an earlier stage of decoding Avestan). Like all YAv. texts, the author of Yy21 is not identified (an absence of egotism which I rather like).

³ The Pahlavi 'translation' is set forth in Humbach 1911 Vol. 2, p.12. Humbach states that Dhabar is his source for the Pahlavi which he gives in full, followed by Humbach's English translation (of the Pahlavi translation). Humbach 1991 Vol. 1, p. 116; and Vol. 2, pp. 13 - 15.

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

Skjaervo's on-line Old Avestan Index, has been updated through May 16, 2022. He has informed me that a copy appears on academia.edu with his *Old Avestan Primer*.

Skjaervo's YAv. Index (or Dictionary) has been updated through August 29, 2022. He has informed me that a copy appears on academia.edu with his *Young Avestan Primer*.

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

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

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

Darmesteter has translated the Yenghe Haatam in full in his translation of the *Hormežd Yasht*, Yt.1:22, SBE 23, p. 30. He notes that the Yenghe Haatam is also found at the end of most chapters of the *Yasna*, and "imitates" Y51:22 of the *Gathas* (ft. 12). So Darmesteter is another scholar who did not think much of the Yenghe Haatam.

Mills' translation is in SBE 31, p. 268. Mills does not translate the Yenghe Haatam at Yy27:15, perhaps because in many mss. it is abbreviated there. Instead, he inserts his translation of the Yenghe Haatam before the start of its YAv. Commentary (Yy21), encapsulating the whole translation in round parentheses to indicate that it is not actually set forth there in its entirety.

Gershevitch's comments on the Yenghe Haatam appear in Gershevitch 1967, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra*, pp. 163 - 166. This Avestan hymn to Mithra is generally known as the *Mehr* (or *Mihir*) *Yasht*. All the *Yashts* are in YAv., but each of their titles is in Pahlavi. And Pahlavi *Mehr/Mihir* is YAv. *Mithra* who was a pre-Zarathushtrian deity of Zarathushtra's culture. He rejected these deities of his culture, and envisioned a new conception of the Divine. But centuries later, the worship of these deities (and others) was syncretized with (came into) Zarathushtra's 'religion' as many YAv. texts demonstrate.

⁴ Humbach 1991 identifies the Yenghe Haatam as one of the surviving Avestan texts that is in archaic YAv. (Vol. 2, p. 14). To illustrate: here are the difference between Old Avestan (the Av. of the *Gathas*), archaic Young Avestan, and Young(er) Avestan in the form of the first pronoun in the Yenghe Haatam.

In Old Avestan, this pronoun is *yehyā*;

In archaic Young Avestan, this pronoun is *yej̥hē*;

In Young(er) Avestan, this pronoun is *yej̥he*.

⁵ Here is the first sentence (lines a. and b.) of the *Gatha* verse Y43:1 (in Old Avestan):

uštā. ahmāi. yahmāi. uštā. kahmāicī̯t. vas̥x.šayqs. mazdā. dāyā̯t. ahurō. Geldner 1P p. 140.

Here is the first sentence of *Gatha* verse Y43:1 as quoted in the *Younger Avestan Commentary on the Yenghe Haatam* Yy21:3:

ušta. ahmāi. yahmāi. ušta. kahmāicī̯t. vasa.x.šayqs. yz̥zdā. dāyā̯t. ahurō. Geldner 1P p. 81.

The short final vowel (here *a*) is YAv. (whereas in Old Av. in which the Gathas are written) the final vowels are usually long (here *ā*). As for *vasa.x šayqs* (in the quotation from YAv. Yy21:3) manuscript variations of this word are shown in Geldner's footnote on p. 82, but none of them is the correct *vasē.x šayqs* in the Old Avestan Gatha verse Y43:1.

⁶ In many places in the Av. texts in which this mantra appears in full, many mss. show the word (correctly) as *yejñhē*. Some mss. may show the word as *yejñhē*, but that is incorrect even for YAv. (as Humbach himself pointed out in 1991) and therefore would have to be a scribal error. It is not evidence that the Yenghe Haatam was "artificially archaized" by the composer.

⁷ Geldner shows the Yenghe Haatam appearing in full in Yy27:15 (in a few mss.), in Yy4:26 (in a few mss.), in Yy5:6 (in a few mss.), in Yy7:27 (in a few mss.), and in the Khordeh Avesta, with various mss. differences in the grammatical forms of its words. Hintze 1994, gives a full translation of the *Yenghe Haatam* at the end of § 13 of her translation of the *Zamyad Yasht*, (p. 16). But Geldner (based on the mss. available to him) states that this mantra is abbreviated there. Today, scholars often used Yy27:15 as the reference or citation for the Yenghe Haatam, where it follows immediately after the Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo Y27:13) and the Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu Y27:14) ~ perhaps because the YAv. commentaries on these three mantras also follow one right after the other. If the order of these three mantras was established during Avestan times, it shows the great value they placed on the Yenghe Haatam. If this order (of these three mantras) in Y27 resulted from the Sasanians' collation of Avestan texts, or even if the Sasanian collators simply maintained the Avestan order, it indicates that the high opinion this mantra enjoyed among the ancients extended even to Sasanian times.

Just a reminder. The chapters, verses, paragraphs and sections of Avestan texts (including the Gathas) are not numbered in the manuscripts. The numbering system was invented by modern scholars to enable identification (and discussion) of a given part of a text. And the arrangement of the Yasnas (at least to some extent) may have been affected by the collation of texts during Sasanian times. So what we have today may, or may not, have reflected the way in which some or all of the Yasnas were arranged in YAv. times.

⁸ In the YAv. Commentary, (Yy21:1) we have the words,

yesnīm. vacō. ašaonō. zaraθuštrahe•• which I have translated as follows:

Very literally: '(I give you), the worship-performance [*yesnīm*] Word of truth-possessing Zarathushtra'; Yy21:1.

Or more fluently: '(I give you), the worship [*yesnīm*] Word of truth-possessing Zarathushtra'; Yy21:1.

You well may question: Why have I added the words '(I give you)' if these words are not in the Av. text (as the parentheses indicate)? I have done so because I *yesnīm* and *vacō* are accusative sg. of their respective (conjectured) noun stems *yesnya-* and *vacah-*. An accusative word is the direct object of a verb. But in the above quotation there is no verb of which *yesnīm* and *vacō* can be the direct objects (accusative). An implied verb (that is not a form of the verb 'to be') is therefore required. In this context, I think the implied verb 'I give (you)' is the best fit. We cannot imply '(Here is)' or '(This is)', because 'is' is a form of the verb 'to be', so its direct object would have to be nom. not acc.

Meanings: (All Av. stems are conjectured).

yesnīm: According to Skjaervo's Old Av. Index the noun stem *yesnya-* derives from the noun *yasna-* which derives from the verb stem *yaz-* .

Skjaervo (2006) translates *yaz-* as "to sacrifice to, worship"; *yasna-* as "sacrifice, ritual"; and *yesnya-* as "sacrificial performance". However, in his *Young Avestan Primer* (2003, updated through Dec. 15, 2018, available on academia.edu), he translates *yesnya-* as "worthy of worship" (Lesson 3, p. 22).

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *yaz-* words variously as "to worship", "to celebrate", and "to sacrifice".

While it is true that YAv. texts do indeed describe rituals (but no sacrifices which describe the killing of animals), there are no rituals (or sacrifices) advocated or described in either the Gathas or the Yenghe Haatam, in both of which, worship is in accordance with truth, [*ašāt hacā*].

I therefore conclude that in the YAv. Commentary on the Yenghe Haatam, *yesnīm* means a performance (or acts) of worship/celebration in accord with truth ~ worshipping the Divine with thoughts, words and actions of truth (the kind of worship described in the Gathas). So in Yy21, I translate *yesnīm* literally as 'worship-performance' but more fluently as 'worship'.

Grammatical value:

vacō: Skjaervo's Old Avestan Index shows *vacō* as nom./acc. sg. of the ntr. noun stem *vacah-* 'word'; so also does Jackson 1892 for YAv. § 339, p. 98.

yesnīm: the inflection *-īm* is acc. sg. for masc./ntr. *ya-* stem words, (Skjaervo *Young Avestan Primer*, Lesson 7, pp. 50 - 51, although he does not use *yesnya-* as one of his examples). And the same is true in Old Avestan. For example *paurvīm* 'first' is acc. sg. masc. of the adj. stem *pauryya-*. And Jackson shows *mašīm* 'mortal' is acc. sg. of the masc. stem *mašya-* (Jackson 1892 §§ 236, 239, pp. 70 - 71).

Neither Jackson 1892, nor Skjaervo 2006 shows the *-īm* inflection for any declension other than acc. sg. of masc./ntr. *ya-* stem words.

⁹ Insler *The Ahuna Vairya Prayer*, (in Monumentum H. S. Nyberg, Acta Iranica, E. J. Brill 1975), p. 419.

In the Gathas, and also in the Old Avestan *A Airyama Ishyo* (Y53:4) there are multiple examples of this technique of 'framing' to encapsulate words that form one unit of thought. Some of these examples are discussed in the following chapters:

In *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo) An Analysis* (discussed in great detail, with Insler's insight referenced, and with many additional examples); and also in the following chapters in *Part Six*:

Yasna 28:5 (discussed in some detail; in this Gatha verse, in one instance, a large group of framed words is encapsulated by the framing words ~ which is what we also see in lines a. and b. of the Yenghe Hataam);

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* (discussed briefly); and the

A Airyama Ishyo (Y54:1) - multiple framings ~ 5 in this verse of three lines.

¹⁰ Darmesteter translation, *Aban Yasht*, §§ 81 - 83, SBE 23, pp. 72 - 73. Although this legend of *Yoishta* in the YAv. *Aban Yasht* is no longer remembered by us today, we know that in ancient times this must have been a famous legendary story, because in addition to the YAv. *Aban Yasht*, we see a version of it even in a Pahlavi text (discussed in a ft. in *Part Three: Heaven & Hell In Pazand & Pahlavi Texts*). In the Pahlavi version of the story, one of the riddles pertains specifically to a theological question.

¹¹ Detailed in the following chapters at the start of *Part One*:

The Beneficial-Sacred Way Of Being, Spenta Mainyu;

Truth, Asha;

Good Thinking, Vohu Manah;

Embodied Truth, Aramaiti;

Good Rule, Vohu Xshathra, & Power;

Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat.

¹² Detailed in *Part One: Truth, Asha.*

¹³ The estimates of linguists of the time it took for Old Avestan to evolve to Young(er) Avestan vary. Some of these estimates are discussed in *Part Four: Zarathushtra's Date & Place.*

¹⁴ Detailed in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of Worship.*

¹⁵ Beekes (1988) shows *aša-* and *xšaθra-* as neuter nouns (p. 131); and *manah-* as a neuter noun as well, (pp. 115, 117);

So also do M&dV (in their Glossary p. 111 (*aša-*); p. 114 (*manah-*); and p. 112 (*xšaθra-*);

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

¹⁶ Skjaervo 2003, *Young Avestan Primer*, Lesson 11, p. 99.

¹⁷ Linguists ~ even now ~ are not in agreement about the meaning of *spənta- mainyu-*. The only translation that fits all of the ways in which *spənta- mainyu-* is used in the Gathas is 'a beneficial way of being'. Detailed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu*.

¹⁸ Detailed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu*.

¹⁹ Detailed in *Part One: Worship & Prayer*;
And in *Part Two: A Question Of Reward & The Path*; and *The Puzzle Of Worship*.

²⁰ Both detailed in *Part One: The Identity Of The Divine*.

²¹ The grammatical value and meaning of *jījišqm* are discussed in the *Linguistics* section of *Part Six: YHapt. 35.8*.

²² *hadbīš* is difficult for me to translate with certainty *as written*.

Skjaervo does not show *hadbīš* in his Old Avestan Index. Nor does he show *hadbīš* in his YAv. Dictionary.

And Geldner shows many manuscript variations for *hadbīš* (in Yy21:2, ft. 1 p. 81) as follows:

hadbīš in 7 mss. (J2; K5; Pt4; Mf1; Mf2; S2; L2),

hada bīš (2 words) in 4 mss. (J6; J7; K4; and Bb1);

hadabīš in 3 mss. (J3; L1; and L3);

had bīš (2 words) in 2 mss. (H1; and L13); and

haībīš in 1 mss. (S1), which probably is a scribal error.

But as you can see, there are no mss. variations for the long *ī* in *bīš*.

I think *hadbīš* originally may have consisted of two words ~ YAv. *had* 'together, altogether' and *bīš* ~ 2 words which became a compound word and then one word.

The meaning I have given *hadbīš* 'altogether [*had*] healing [*bīš*]' is tentative and was arrived at as follows:

had

Beekes 1988 shows *hadā* as an adverb and preposition 'together with' in Old Avestan (p. 145).

Skjaervo's Old Avestan Index shows the preposition/postposition + instr. *hadā* 'together with'. And in his YAv. dictionary he shows 3 compound words in which the first member *hada* means 'together with' ~ *hada.aēsma-* 'together with firewood'; *hada.baoidi-* 'together with incense'; and *hada.ratufriti-* 'together with satisfying the models' (I am not exactly sure what Skjaervo means by that last definition).

bīš

bīš *as written* defeats me. I have not found the word *bīš* in any index, glossary, or vocabulary of Avestan words available to me.

In the Gathas (Old Avestan) we have the word *ahūm.biš* (with a short *i*) the meaning of which is (more or less) generally agreed to (although opinions differ as to whether it is a noun or an adj.).

It literally means 'existence-healer' (*ahūm* 'existence' is acc. sg. of *ahu-* 'life, existence' and is derived from the verb *ah-* 'to be, to exist'; and *biš* 'healer' derives from *baēš-* 'to heal').

Inslér 1975 translates *ahūm.biš* as a noun 'world-healer' in 3 Gatha verses:

"... this knowing world-healer [*ahūm.biš vīdvā*] ..." Y31:19.

"... the loving man ... such a person [*spənta-* 'beneficial'] through truth ... is a world-healer [*ahūm.biš*]..." Y44:2.

"... As world-healer [*ahūm.biš*] ..." Y44:16.

Skjaervo in his Old Av. Index thinks *ahūm.biš* is an "adj.: who heals (this) state".

And in his YAv. Primer, Lesson 18, he shows another meaning for *bīš* 'twice' or 'two-fold', p. 192; but he shows no word *bīš* in his YAv. dictionary, nor in any of the vocabularies appended to his YAv. Lessons.

So why have I chosen to translate *hadbīš* as 'altogether healing'? I have done so because of the context in which it appears ~ as part of the YAv. commentary on *hātqm* (the micro context) and Zarathushtra's teachings in the Gathas (the macro context).

"... *hātqm* attributes (the) worship (of beings), as [*yaθa*] (the) desire to win [*ījīšqm*] (what is) altogether healing (?) [*hadbīš*]. Yy21:1-2.

What is desired to be won: In Zarathushtra's thought, truth (the true, good order of existence which the Divine personifies) is the desired object to be won.

We see this in the racing metaphors of Y30:10. And the verse immediately before it speaks of healing existence.

Y30:9 "Therefore may we be those who shall heal this world! ...

Y30:10 "... 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 [*mazdā* 'of wisdom/Wisdom'] and of truth." Insler 1975.

In the Old Avestan *Yasna Haptanghaiti*, 35:8e see even more clearly that truth (the true, wholly good order of existence) is the desired object to be won.

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

The term 'both existences' are the existences of matter and mind (detailed in *Part Six: YHapt. 35:8*).

What heals existence: In Zarathushtra's thought, existence is healed by truth ~ the true, wholly good order of existence ~ (which is beneficial) and its components ~ its comprehension, its rule (which includes its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action Y51:4).

"... the loving man ... such a person [*spəntō* 'beneficial'] through truth ... is a world-healer [*ahūm.biš*]..." Y44:2, Insler 1975.

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

"... By your rule, Lord, Thou shalt truly heal this world in accord with our wish." Y34:15, Insler 1975.

²³ Skjaervo says *īda* means 'here' (*Young Avestan Primer*, Lesson 4, p.30. And Skjaervo in his Old Avestan Index shows *idā* as an adv. which also means 'here'.

²⁴ The verb forms *cinasti* and *para.cinasti* are a bit of a puzzle to me. They appear in all three YAv. commentaries ~ on the Ahuna Vairya (Yy19), on the Asha Vahishta (Yy20) and on the Yenghe Haatam (Yy21), ~ in contexts which do not seem consistent.

Humbach (1991) and Mills (1887) agree that the verb form is 3p (he/she/it/one) and in the present tense (indicative), but they have not translated the word(s) consistently in these three commentaries.

Humbach (1991) has translated *cinasti* and *para.cinasti* variously as 'ascribes, describes, commits, and appoints'.

Mills (1887) has translated these words variously as 'ascribes, attributes, indicates/offers, assigns, and acknowledges'.

Skjaervo's YAv. Dictionary shows the verb stem *para.cinah-* 'to assign'; and *para* as an adverb, meaning "before, earlier". His Old Avestan Index does not show *para.cinah-*, but shows *para* as an adverb meaning 'forth' [as in 'go forth'].

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

²⁵ *yasnəm* is acc. sg. of the grammatically masc. noun stem *yasna-* 'worship' (Jackson 1892, § 236, pp. 69 - 70); as such it is the direct object of the verb *cinasti* 'one attributes'. Thus, '(one) attributes (the) worship [*yasnəm*]...'

²⁶ Skjaervo Old Avestan Glossary shows *dātā* as a past participle (and when used as a noun) nom./acc. pl. ntr. of the verb stem *dā-* 'to give, make, establish'. In this context, I think the last option is the only fit, the past participle of which gives us 'established (teachings)'.

²⁷ *ahurahe* is the YAv. gen. sg. form for masc. *a-* stem nouns (such as *ahura-*), Jackson (1892) § 236, p. 69 - 70. Thus 'of the Lord'; giving us *yaθa. dāta. ahurahe...* 'as [*yaθa*] (the) established (teachings) [*dāta*] of the Lord [*ahurahe*].'

²⁸ For example, as a way to worship, Zarathushtra says,

"I shall try to glorify Him for us [*yasnāiš ārmatōiš* 'with (the) worship of embodied truth'],..." Y45:10. In other words, with the worship of thoughts, words and actions that embody truth.

"... Your enduring worshipful offering has been established to be [*amərətāt-* 'non-deathness'] and completeness [*haurvatāt-*]." Y33.8. Here, the worship offering that the Divine wants (has established) is our own self realization ~ attaining the true, most good order of existence completely, resulting in a way of being that is no longer bound by mortality, because the perfecting process is complete.

"...I shall always worship ... you, Wise Lord, with truth [*aša-*] and the very best thinking [*vahišta- manah-*] and with their rule [*x šaθra-*], ..." Y50:4.

For a more detailed discussion of Zarathushtra's new way to worship, see *Part One: Worship & Prayer*, and *In Part Two:*

The Puzzle of Worship; and

A Question of Reward and the Path.

²⁹ The evidence for the conclusion that each quality of the Divine is an aspect of the true (good) order of existence *aša-* is set forth in *Part Two: The Nature of the Divine*. The notion that the true order of existence (*aša-*) is the beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*), which is the essence of the sacred, is set forth in the following 2 chapters in *Part One: Truth, Asha*; and *The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu*.

³⁰ Here are some verses which show that Zarathushtra uses 'Lord' as one who has attained lordship (or mastery) over the qualities that make a being divine. This must have been an important part of Zarathushtra's teachings, because so small a corpus of songs (the Gathas) contains so many examples.

"... the very Wise Master [*ahura-* 'lord'] of good thinking ..." Y30:1, Insler 1975. The word that Insler has translated as *Master* is *ahura-* 'lord'.

"... Lord [*ahura-*] of the word and deed stemming from [*vohu- mainyu-* '(a) good way of being'] ..." Y45:8, Insler 1975.

"... Thou art the Lord [*ahura-*] by reason of Thy tongue (which is) in harmony with truth, and by reason of Thy words stemming from good thinking ..." Y51:3, Insler 1975; words of truth and its comprehension, good thinking, are part of the meaning of *ārmaiti-*.

"... [*mazdā-* 'Wisdom'] in rule [*x šaθra-*] is Lord [*ahura-*] through [*ārmaiti-* 'embodied truth']." Y47:1, Insler 1975.

And He has rule (which is another way of saying lordship) over the following qualities that make a being divine, "...His abounding authority of rule [*x šaθra-*] over completeness [*haurvatāt-*] and immortality [*amərətāt-* 'non-deathness'] and over truth [*aša-*] ..." Y31:21, Insler 1975.

So also "By whichever action, by whichever word, by whichever worship, Wise One, Thou didst receive for Thyself [*amərətāt-* 'non-deathness'], truth [*aša-*] and mastery [*x šaθra-* 'rule'] over completeness [*haurvatāt-*],..." Y34:1, Insler 1975.

In the last two examples, Wisdom's 'mastery' or 'rule' (*x šaθra-*) is over truth (*aša-*) which in the Gathas is equated with a beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*) and includes the comprehension of truth, its beneficial embodiment, its good rule, its complete attainment ~ qualities which make a being divine.

³¹ See *Part Five: Avestan Genders, Grammatical & Actual*.

³² Discussed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu*.

³³ Jackson and his generation of linguists believed *mazdā-* to be a *grammatically fem.* noun (*ā-* stem nouns generally are *grammatically fem.*). Skjaervo and the current generation of linguists believe *mazdā-* to be a *grammatically masc.* noun. In this context it makes no difference because if *masc. sg. yejhe* stands for *spənta- mainyu-*, '(the) beneficial way of being', there is no dispute amongst professional linguists that the noun *mainyu-* is *grammatically masc.*

³⁴ Detailed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way Of Being, Spenta Mainyu*.

³⁵ The conflicting opinions of linguists about the meaning of *ārmaiti-*, and the ways in which Zarathushtra uses this word in the Gathas, is detailed in *Part One: Embodied Truth, Aramaiti*, which shows that the only translation that fits each use of *ārmaiti-* in the Gathas is 'truth embodied in thought, word and action'.

The conflicting opinions of linguists about the meaning of *spənta-* and *mainyu-*, and the ways in which Zarathushtra uses these words in the Gathas, is detailed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu*, which shows that the only translation that fits each use of *mainyu-* in the Gathas, is a 'way of being'.

I follow the view of Thieme (Insler's teacher) in translating *spənta-* as 'beneficial'.

³⁶ Detailed in *Part One:*

Truth, Asha,

Good Thinking, Vohu Manah,

Embodied Truth, Aramaiti,

Good Rule, Vohu Xshathra, & Power.

³⁷ Discussed in *Part Six: Yasna 44:16*, a Gatha verse which is quoted in the *Kemna Mazda* prayer (2d paragraph); and is also discussed in *Part Three: Evolution Of The Name(s) Ahura, Mazda*.

³⁸ *Part Three: Paourvya* discusses the various flavors of meaning for this word in Avestan, based on the opinions of linguists, and on its contextual uses in the Gathas.

³⁹ The adj. *ašavan-* is discussed in more detail in *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant*.

⁴⁰ For example in Yy26.4, the adjective 'truth-possessing' in its *masc.* and *fem.* forms (*ašavan-* *masc.*; *ašaonī-* *fem.*) are used as nouns in a context that requires them to be translated as 'of truth-possessing (men) [*ašaonqm* *gen. masc. pl.*] and of truth-possessing (women) [*ašaoninqmca* *gen. masc. pl.*]'.

"[*paoiryānqm tkaēšanqm* 'of the first (original) teachers'] ... we worship [*yazamaide* 'we celebrate'] the spirit and conscience, the intelligence and soul and Fravashi [*ašaonqm* 'of (those) truth-possessing (men)' *ašaoninqmca*, 'and of (those) truth-possessing (women)'] who ... loved and strove after Righteousness [*ašāi* 'for truth] ..."

Mills 1887 translation SBE 31, p. 278; Av. words in square brackets are from Geldner 1P p. 93 with my translations of them.

And did you notice? This section also shows that both men and women were among the *paoiryānqm tkaēšanqm* 'of the first (original) teachers'! A very different practice of gender equality from that of the Pahlavi texts, and even today.

⁴¹ According to Skjaervo 2006.

⁴² In Av. texts, disciples of Zarathushtra, teachers and priests are specifically mentioned as men and women, detailed in *Part One: Gender Equality*.

⁴³ See *Part One: The Identity Of The Divine*.

⁴⁴ This Gatha verse is detailed in *Part Six: Yasna 43:1*, along with other translations, including mine.

⁴⁵ Geldner's mss. differences for *ārmaiti-* in this verse (Y43:1) are referenced in a ft. in *Part Six: Y43:1*.

⁴⁶ In *Part Three: Rae, Rayah*, I detail the evidence which demonstrates that translating *raē-*, or *ray-*, or *rayah-* words as 'wealth' rather than 'light', does not fit ~ neither the contexts in which this Av. word is used, nor its historical parallels. By the way, all Avestan stems are conjectured, hence the differences in the stem word shown here. The last line of Gatha verse Y43:1 reads as follows:

rayō. ašiš. vanhēuš. gaēm. mananhō.: Geldner 1P p. 140.
'the rewards of light, a life of good thinking.' Y43:1, my translation.

The 2 rewards mentioned here are simply different ways of saying 'an enlightened existence'. Throughout the Gathas (and later texts), light is used as a metaphor for truth ~ truth enlightens. And good thinking is the comprehension of truth ~ an enlightened state of being. Thus as we continue to embody truth in thought, word and action, we (incrementally) personify truth, which includes its comprehension, good thinking. So '(the) rewards of light, a life of good thinking' means the rewards of enlightenment, living an enlightened existence ~ which is wisdom/Wisdom (detailed in *Part Six: Yasna 43:1*).

⁴⁷ Detailed in *Part Three: Paourvya*.

⁴⁸ Detailed in *Part One: The Identity Of The Divine*; and in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of The Singular & The Plural; A Question Of Immanence; Did Wisdom Choose too?* (and other chapters footnoted in these chapters).

⁴⁹ Skjaervo's 2003 *Young Avestan Primer*, (updated to Dec. 15, 2018), Lesson 7, p. 50, shows the *-ē* inflection is one of the accusative pl. forms for masc. *a-* stem nouns.

⁵⁰ Scholars generally are of the opinion that the *Yasna Haptanghaiti* is prose, not poetry. But this is to impose our own narrow (modern) view on an ancient culture, in which rhythm, alliteration, repetition, all played a part in the music of words, and therefore is poetry, even though its meters are not those of any Gatha. I think many of the stanzas of the *Yasna Haptanghaiti* qualify as poetry because of the music of their (Avestan) words, created through rhythm, alliteration, repetition.

⁵¹ These two adjectives *spəntəm aməšəm* are **sg. ntr.** because they describe *ašəm* (a declension of the noun *aša-* which is **sg.** and grammatically **ntr.**, so the two adjs. that describe it have to be **sg.** and grammatically **ntr.** as well). Both adjs. are **nom. sg. ntr.** because the implied verb '(is)' takes a **nom.** predicate.

⁵² Detailed in *Part Six: Yasna Haptanghaiti 37.4 and 5*. The Avestan has been transliterated from Geldner 1P, p. 133.

⁵³ The words *spəntāng aməšāng* (acc. pl. of *spənta-* and *aməša-* in Old Avestan) appear in YHapt. 39:3. The context makes it reasonably certain that they are used as adjectives. And in YHapt. 39:3 again (as in YHapt 37:4) the *spənta-* word appears before the *aməša-* word. Therefore these 2 adjectives are not used (in these Old Avestan texts) as the later collective noun *aməša- spənta-* for the angel entities of the YAv. texts. What is ambiguous however is to whom these 2 adjs. apply in this verse (YHapt. 39:3) ~ to mortal men and women mentioned in the preceding verse? To qualities of the Divine which men and women have attained completely as in (my view of) the Gatha verse Y51:22? It is difficult to say, because of two other adjectives in this verse ~ *yavaējyo* and *yavaēsvō* ~ which often are translated as 'eternal' or 'living forever', but in the Gathas other forms of these words (derived from the same root) are also sometimes translated (by Insler 1975) as 'long life', as in the span of a human, mortal life (detailed with quotations from Gatha verses in *Part Two: The Houses Of Paradise & Hell*). Returning to YHapt. 39:3, I will give you both my translation, and that of Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 for comparative purposes.

Placing verse 3 in context:

The immediately preceding YHapt. 39:2 says (among other things), that we worship/celebrate [*yazamaidē*] the souls of harmless animals, and also the souls of truth-possessing men and women (*ašāunəm ... narəmcā nāirinəm ...*)

wherever indeed they were born (*kudō.zātanqmctī*) ~ clearly referring to unperfected mortals ~ animals, men and women.

And then YHapt. 39:3 says

āt. iθā. yazamaidē. vaṅhūšcā. tī. vaṅvhīšcā. tī. spāntāṅg. amāšāṅg. yavaējyo. yavaēsvō. yōi. vaṅhāuš. ā.manahō. šyeiṅtī. yāscā. ūiṅ. •• Geldner 1P p. 135.

My translation YHapt. 39:3

'And in this way we celebrate indeed the good (male ones) [*vaṅhūšcā*] and indeed the good (female ones) [*vaṅvhīšcā*], beneficial [*spāntāṅg*], non-dying [*amāšāṅg*], life-having [*yavaējyo*], life-benefiting/saving [*yavaēsvō*], (the male and female ones) who [*yōi/yāscā*] dwell now with good thinking [*vaṅhāuš ā.manahō*].'

Humbach 1991 translation YHapt. 39:3:

"Herewith we now worship the good male [*vaṅhūšcā*] and the good female [*vaṅvhīšcā*] (entities) who are prosperous [*spāntāṅg*] and immortal [*amāšāṅg*] who are of eternal life [*yavaējyo*] and eternal benefit [*yavaēsvō*], the males who [*yōi*] dwell [*šyeiṅtī*] side by side with good thought [*vaṅhāuš ā.manahō*], and the females who [*yāscā*] (do) so as well." Vol. 1, p. 148.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translation YHapt. 39:3:

"Herewith we then celebrate the good male and the good female Beneficent Immortals of eternal life and eternal benefit/salvation (the male ones) who dwell/settle on the side of good thought and the female ones as well." p. 110.

As you can see, Humbach 1991 shows the two words *spāntāṅg* and *amāšāṅg* as 2 adjectives, and he does not capitalize the implied word "(entities)" ~ there are no capital letters in Av. script. (Skjaervo 2006 also shows these two words as adjectives).

Humbach/Faiss 2010 show these two words as the living Entities of the later texts ~ an interpretative choice. However, it is good to see that they translate *yazamaidē* as 'celebrate'; and *yavaēsvō* as 'benefit/salvation' ~ both of which meanings are consistent with the ways in which these words are used in the Gathas.

So how are we to understand *spāntāṅg amāšāṅg* in YHapt. 39:3? The following factors inform my opinion.

1. In this context these words are used as 2 of a string of 4 adjectives. And *spāntāṅg* appears before *amāšāṅg* so they likely are not the collective noun (*amāša- spānta-*) used for living Entities in certain later (YAv.) texts.
2. The acc. pl. masc. gender of *spāntāṅg amāšāṅg* is generic ~ because these two adjectives describe good beings who are male [*vaṅhūšcā*] and female [*vaṅvhīšcā*]. In Av. (as in English!) the masc. gender is used generically for pluralities that include more than one gender.
3. The words *yavaējyo* and *yavaēsvō* have nothing (linguistically) in them to require the meaning 'everlasting' or 'eternal'. I think their meaning includes the notion of 'life' as another way of saying 'non-deathness' (*aməratāt-*) ~ the way Zarathushtra does in the Gatha verse Y30:4 (detailed in Part Six: Yasna 30:3 and 4). In the Gathas, mortals have 5 qualities of the Divine imperfectly ~ truth (which is) most-good (*aša- vahišta-*), its good comprehension (*vohu-manah-*), its beneficial embodiment (*spānta- ārmaiti-*), its good rule (*vohu- xšaθra-*), the beneficial way of being (*spānta- mainyu-*), and are capable of attaining them all completely (*haurvatāt-*) ~ which is Zarathushtra's notion of 'salvation/benefit', resulting in an existence no longer bound by mortality (*aməratāt-* 'non-deathness'). So (in my view), the unknown author of YHapt. 39:3, used *yavaējyo* and *yavaēsvō* for mortals who have become perfected and therefore have 'life' in the sense that they no longer are bound by mortality and therefore are *spāntāṅg amāšāṅg* 'beneficial (ones), non-dying (ones)' (The linguistics and meanings of *yavaējyo* and *yavaēsvō* are detailed below).
4. Throughout the Gathas, intrinsic goodness is equated with the Divine who is wholly good, reflecting Zarathushtra's new conception of the Divine which rejected the perceptions of his culture in which deities were a mix of good and evil, beneficial and harmful qualities. And in the Gathas the seven qualities of the Divine are variously described as

good, beneficial ~ both in positive (*vohu-*, *spənta-*) and superlative (*vahišta-*, *spəništa-/spəntō.təma-*) degrees ~ the superlative in Avestan can function, sometimes as a crescendo of expression (as in the YAv. *Hormezd Yasht*), and sometimes as the highest degree of a given quality (detailed in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of The Most-Good, Vahishta*). Therefore, 'worshipping/celebrating' the 'good indeed' in living beings, (*vayhūšcā īt /vayvhīšcā īt*) is worshipping/celebrating the Divine in living beings. And,

5. The last part of YHapt. 39:3 speaks of these good male and female beings as those who 'dwell **now** with good mind/thinking/thought' (*manah-* can be translated as 'mind, thinking, thought', Insler 1975 p. 118). The words *vayhūšcā ā.manahō* are simply instr. sg. of the stems *vohu-* *manah-*. As for the added *ā* (*ā.manahō*), Skjaervo 2006 says that *ā* is (among other things) a preposition that means "here (and now) currently, at present." So those who 'dwell **now** with good thinking' is another way of saying those who have attained a perfected state of being ~ a state of being that houses good thinking, paradise ~ a plurality which is a union with the Divine, Wisdom.

I conclude that YHapt. 39: 2 and 3 express the idea that when we worship/celebrate the Divine in unperfected beings (verse 2), then 'in this way we worship/celebrate [*iθā. yazamaidē*]' the Divine in perfected existence (verse 3).

How beautiful is that?

But the most beautiful idea in YHapt. 39:3 (an idea that appears throughout the Gathas) is that the perfected Divine, having transcended mortality, does not sit in splendid isolation, satisfied with its own perfection. It both *has* life (as in non-deathness *amərətāt-*) and it *benefits/saves* life (*yavaēsvō* 'life-benefiting/salvation'). In Zarathushtra's thought 'salvation' is being saved from untruth (detailed in *Part One: A Question Of Salvation*). Being saved from untruth is certainly a benefit (beneficial) to life. The true order of existence ('truth') is equated with the beneficial way of being. And mutual, loving help ~ between the Divine and other living beings is part of the nature of the true order of existence.

So *yavaēsvō* 'life-benefiting/salvation' is another way of expressing the concept of benefiting others ~ the mutual, loving help that is necessary for everyone to make it (to truth personified, a wholly beneficial way of being ~ Zarathushtra's notion of 'salvation'). So we see once again that the path (the true (wholly good, beneficial) order of existence of which mutual loving help is a part) and the reward for taking that path (the true (wholly good, beneficial) order of existence of which mutual loving help is a part) are the same, although imperfect in the path and perfected in the ultimate end.

There is a lovely mini-puzzle which expresses exactly the idea of perfected life, being 'life-benefiting' (although the word *yavaēsvō* is not used). This mini-puzzle is detailed towards the end of the chapter in *Part Three: Chinvat, The Bridge Of Discerning*. I mention it as corroborating evidence, and also because it is a beautiful, meaningful mini-puzzle which you may enjoy.

I have not written a chapter in *Part Six* on YHapt. 39:2 or 3. So for those who are interested in the linguistics of YHapt. 39:3, the following may be useful.

Skjaervo (2006) shows that:

iθā is an adv. and means 'in this way'; as such it describes the verb 'we worship/celebrate'.

īt has two unrelated meanings, one of which is an emphatic particle "even, indeed".

vayhūšcā is acc. pl. masc. of the adj. stem (which Skjaervo shows as *vahu-*; Insler as *vohu-* 'good'), this adj. is used here as a noun, thus 'good (male ones)'.

vayvhīšcā is acc. pl. fem. of the adj. stem (which Skjaervo shows as *vahu-*; Insler as *vohu-* 'good'), this adj. is used here as a noun, thus 'good (female ones)'.

spəntāng and *aməšāng* are each acc. pl. masc. of their respective adj. stems *spənta-* and *aməša-* ~ a generic masc. here, because it describes both masc. and fem. beings;

yavaējyō is acc. pl. masc. of the adj. stem *yavaēji-* which Skjaervo thinks means 'ever-living', (a generic masc. here, because it describes both masc. and fem. beings), without identifying the component of that stem which means 'ever'.

yavaēsvō is acc. pl. masc. of the adj. stem *yavaēsū-* ~ a generic masc. here, because it describes both masc. and fem. beings. Skjaervo in his Old Av. Index thinks this word means 'ever-vitalizing' He translates *āyu-/yao-* words as 'lifespan', and *sava-* words as '(vitalizing) strength'; as you can see there is no 'ever' in *yavaēsvō* (unless an *āyu-/yao-* word is used with an adj. like *vīspa-* 'all').

Insler 1975 translates *āyu-/yao-* words (with *vīspa-* 'all') as 'for a whole lifetime' *vīspāi yavē* Y28:8; as 'for all his lifetime' *yavōi vīspāi* Y53:1, and (interpretively) as 'forever' *yavōi vīspāi* Y46:11; and he translates *sava-* words as 'salvation' commenting under Y43:12, p. 238.

Humbach 1991 consistently translates *āyu-/yao-* words as 'time' ~ only with *vīspa-* 'all' does he give us an 'ever' or 'eternal' flavor; 'for all time' *vīspāi yavē* Y28:8; 'for all time' *yavōi vīspāi* Y53:1; and 'for all time' *yavōi vīspāi* Y46:11; and he translates *sava-* words as 'benefaction, benefit' (Vol. 2, p. 142 (12).

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *yavaēsvō* as 'benefit/salvation', without explanation.

I translate *yavaēsvō* as 'life-benefiting/saving [from untruth]'.

šyeiṇī I follow Humbach and translate this verb as 'dwell' (3p pl.)

vayhāuš ā.manahā I translate this as 'now with good thinking', because *vayhāuš* and *manahā* are instr. sg. ('with/by/through ___') of their respective stems *vohu-* and *manah-*, and Skjaervo's Old Av. Index shows that *ā* is an adverb meaning "here (and now)", currently, at present" (although he does not show the compound word *ā.manahā*). Insler 1975 says *manah-* is used (in Av.) for 'mind' (faculty), 'thinking' (process), and 'thought' (object), (p. 118). In the Gathas, *manah-* is used to include the full spectrum of conscious capabilities ~ intellect, emotion, creativity, insight etc., (detailed in *Part One: Good Thinking, Vohu Manah*).

⁵⁴ Detailed in *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution*; and in *Part One: Happiness, Joy, Prosperity*.

⁵⁵ Detailed in *Part One: The Identity of the Divine*, and other chapters referenced therein.

⁵⁶ See *Part Six: Yasna 51:22*.

⁵⁷ The operative verb form is GAv. *vaēdā* (in Y51:22), and archaic YAv. *vaēθā* (in the Yenghe Haatam), each of which is the form for both 1p sg. ('I know') and 3p sg., ('he/she/it knows'), as detailed in the *Linguistics* section of this chapter, and in *Part Six: Yasna 51:22*.

Based on the context of Y51:22 it seems clear (to me) that Zarathushtra intended to use this verb form (in GAv. *vaēdā*) as 'I know' (1p sg.), for the reasons set forth in *Part Six: Yasna 51:22*.

Based on the context of the Yenghe Haatam, I think its unknown author intended to use this verb form (in archaic YAv. *vaēθā*) as 'Wisdom the Lord knows' (3p sg.), for the reasons set forth in the main part of this chapter. And perhaps also, as a neat suggestion of the interplay between the human ('I know' Y51:22) and the Divine ('Wisdom the Lord knows' in the Yenghe Haatam).

⁵⁸ The first few chapters of *Part One* (which discuss the beneficial sacred way of being *spənta- mainyu-*, truth *aša-*, its comprehension *vohu- manah-*, its embodiment *armaiti-*, and its good rule *vohu- x šaθra-*), demonstrate, with evidence from the Gathas, that in Zarathushtra's thought these divine qualities (later called amesha spenta) also exist in man, (albeit not completely). And the chapters in *Part One - Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat Ameretat, and The Identity of the Divine*, demonstrate, with evidence from the Gathas, that man is capable of achieving these divine qualities completely.

In the Gathas we also see implied that the Divine *in being* is immanent in the material existence (see *Part Two: A Question Of Immanence*).

We see some corroboration in later Av. texts of the idea implied in the Yenghe Haatam (of worshipping the (unperfected) Divine immanent in living beings), represented by their fravashis (the Divine within). The *Farvardin*

Yasht has many chapters in which the fravashis of various named human beings are worshipped/celebrated. And it also mentions worshipping/celebrating the fravashis of other living things.

"... tame animals, ... wild animals, ... animals that live in the water, animals that live under the ground, ... the flying ones, ... the running ones, ... the grazing ones. We worship their Fravashis." *Farvardin Yasht*, Yt.13:74, Darmesteter translation SBE 23, pp. 197 - 198.

But the later Av. texts also worship/celebrate (using *yaz-* words) various inanimate and living things, with and without mentioning their fravashi. Here are some examples from the *Farvardin Yasht*, in Darmesteter's translation with Avestan words from Geldner 2P in square brackets, sometimes with my translations of those words. In the examples below, Darmesteter uses the words "primitive law" for Avestan *paoiryō tkaēša-*. I think *tkaēša-* means 'teaching' (detailed in a ft. below and in *Part Three: The Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu), Ancient Commentaries*). And *paoiryō* means 'first' ~ used here (in the *Farvardin Yasht*) in a three-fold way ~ first in time (as in 'original'); first as in fundamental; and also first in the highest quality ~ a teaching that is the path of truth, the true order of existence. And this 'teaching' *tkaēša-* is sometimes also called *ahura.tkaēša-* 'the teaching of the Lord' (as it is in Yy12.1, Yy1.23, and other instances). As you read the following examples, think of 'worship' as a celebration (detailed in a ft. in *Part Two: The Puzzle of Worship*).

"We worship [celebrate] the spirit, conscience, perception, soul, and Fravashi of men of the primitive law [*paoiryānqm tkaēšanqm* '(the) first teaching']..." Yt.13.149, Darmesteter translation, SBE 23, p. 228; Geldner *Avesta*, 2P, p. 203.

"We worship [celebrate] the men of the primitive law [*paoiryān tkaēšō* '(the) first teaching']..." *Farvardin Yasht* Yt.13.150 - 151, Darmesteter translation, SBE Vol. 23, p. 228 - 229; Geldner 2P, p. 204.

"We worship [celebrate] this earth; We worship [celebrate] those heavens; We worship [celebrate] those good things that stand between (the earth and the heavens)..." *Farvardin Yasht* Yt.13.153, Darmesteter translation, SBE 23, p. 229.

Who are these people of the first teaching [*paoiryā- tkaēša-*] ? I think they are Zarathushtra and teachers of his envisionment who lived in his time period, or shortly after ~ the early teachers of his wisdom-worshipping envisionment (*mazdayasna-*).

"We worship Zarathushtra, ... the man of the primitive law [*paoirīmca tkaēšōm* 'of the first teaching (first in time, first as in fundamental, first as in the highest quality,)]..." *Farvardin Yasht* Yt.13.152, Darmesteter translation, SBE 23, p. 229; Geldner 2P, p. 204.

" And I desire to approach the Fravashi ... of Zarathushtra Spitama, and those of Kavi Vishtaspa, and [Isat-vastra](#) the Zarathushtrian with all the holy Fravashis of the other ancient counsellors as well [*maṭ vīspābyō ašaonibyō fravašibyō yā paoiryānqm tkaēšanqm*]." Yy23.2, Mills translation, SBE 31 p. 275; Geldner 1P p. 87. Mills translates *ašaonī-/ašavan-* words as 'holy' (among other things) instead of the more literal 'truth-possessing' (linguistics explained in *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant*). In the tradition, [Isat-vastra](#) was Zarathushtra's son (see Insler 1975, p. 111, ft. 3).

⁵⁹ Discussed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu*.

⁶⁰ As in the *Hormezd Yasht*, examples of which are quoted in *Part One: The Manthra of Truth, Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu)*.

⁶¹ Detailed in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of The Most Good, Vahishta*.

⁶² Humbach 1991 and Mills both have translated *tkaēša* here (in Yy21:2, the YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Haatam) as 'statements' (Humbach), and 'sentences' (Mills). But the word appears in the Gathas, where Taraporewala 1951 comments that Bartholomae derives the word from *kaēš-* 'to teach, to praise'. Taraporewala notes that the word

appears only twice in the Gathas, in Y49:2 and Y49:3, but it is quite common in YAv. texts, where the word has the meanings 'teaching' and 'teacher'. Taraporewala 1951 pp. 698 - 699. I agree. In the Gathas, Y49:2, Insler has "Yes, the deceitful professor [*ṭkaēšō drəgvā*] of this resembles the defiler, as he deflects (others) from the truth...". Here "professor [*ṭkaēšō*]" is used in the sense of one who professes or declares something, which is consistent with 'teacher'. In Y49:3 Insler has "... the truth is to be saved for its (good) preference, that deceit is to destroyed for its (false) profession [*ṭkaēšāi*]...". Here the implied "(false)" refers to the previously mentioned "deceit". And here again, "for its (false) profession [*ṭkaēšāi*]" is used in the sense of something (false) that is professed, declared, all of which is consistent with a 'teaching'. A more detailed look at how *ṭkaēša* is used in YAv. texts, is footnoted in *Part Three: Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu) An Analysis*.

⁶³ An implied verb (other than 'to be') is required here because the words *vacō. yesnīm.* are in the accusative case. Verbs often are implied in Avestan. And I agree with Mills that the implied verb 'comprehend' (in the sense of 'encompass') best suits the context here because of *vīspəm* which means 'all'.

⁶⁴ For those who would like to see the linguistics of the phrase *vīspəm vacō yesnīm*, the following may be useful. *vīspəm*: The stem *vīspa-* is an adj. which means 'all' (Skjaervo 2006), and the *-əm* inflection is (normally) acc. sg. for masc./ntr. *a-* stem words (Jackson 1892). This adj. *vīspəm* has to be in the same case/number (acc. sg.) and grammatical gender (ntr.), as the two nouns it describes - *vacō* (ntr.) and *yesnīm* (ntr.)

vacō is acc. sg. of the ntr. noun stem *vacah-* 'word'; and

yesnīm is acc. sg. of the YAv. ntr. noun stem *yesnya-* (both detailed in a ft. above).

These 3 accusatives *vīspəm vacō yesnīm* require a verb (other than 'to be') of which these acc. words are the direct objects. But there is no verb in this sentence, so we have to imply one. Thus:

θrāyō. ṭkaēša•• vīspəm. vacō. yesnīm•• Yy21:2, Geldner 1P pp. 81 - 82.

'... Three teachings. (They comprehend) the entire worship Word.' Yy21:2, my translation.

⁶⁵ Detailed in *Part Six: Yasna 43:1*.

⁶⁶ Detailed in a footnote in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of Worship*.

⁶⁷ This worship/celebration of the Divine in all that exists, explains (somewhat) how the worship/celebration of good people, animals, and natural elements may have got started in later Av. texts. It is not without interest (in my view) that the author of the Yenghe Haatam does not mention human beings. He only mentions *hātqm* literally 'of (the) existing' - a more generous, wider, perception than one that is purely homocentric.

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

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

Having loved, and lived with, dogs all my life, I know for a fact that dogs (like humans) can be intelligent. They think. They have emotions. They make moral choices. They act in spiteful and beneficial ways, (including comforting us when we most need it, and also planning and carrying out revenge against us when we anger them!). So I have no trouble at all in concluding that they are as much a part of the perfecting process as are human beings. Does that apply to other species? Well I have not lived with any other species as intimately as I have lived with dogs, so I can only say *I do not know*.

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

I admit that my past mental conditioning often gets in the way ~ triggering knee-jerk reactions and conclusions. But after studying Zarathushtra, I no longer subscribe to such homocentric views. I speculate that each material shell (whether human or some other life form) provides a set of tools which the unit of existence temporarily inhabiting that shell needs for its spiritual growth. No one set of these material tools is "superior" to another. Each tool set is useful for the particular experiences necessary for the perfecting process of existence ~ one existence, parts of which are temporarily encased in a great variety of material shall, each with its own tool set to enable aspects of the perfecting process. And it was the Gathas (and certain later texts) that caused this change in the mind-set in which I was raised.

Of course, I respect your right to disagree.

⁶⁸ Discussed in *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution*.

⁶⁹ Here again is Geldner's Avestan version with the translations of Humbach 1991 and the Mills 1887. Words in round parentheses have been added by the translator indicating his additions of words not in the text. Avestan words in square brackets have been inserted by me (from Geldner) sometimes with my translation of the word. I have placed the first few words of the Yenghe Haatam (which is how this commentary's author identifies this manthra which has no title of its own) in blue font. I have placed the 3 words which are being commented on in green font.

Yy21, Sections 1 - 2.

1. *yesnīm. vacō. ašaonō. zaraθuštrahe*•• *yejñhē. hātqm. āaṭ. yesnē. paīfī*••
yejñhe. ida. mazdā. yasnəm. cinasti. yaθa. dāta. ahurahe. hātqm. yasnəm. cinasti.

2. *yaθa. hadbīš. jījīšqm. yāñhqm. ida. ašaoninqm. ārmaiti.paoiryānqm. yasnəm. para.cinasti. yaθa. vahməm. aməšaēibyō*•• *θrāyō. tkaēša*•• *vīspəm. vacō. yesnīm*•• *cīm. aoi. yasno*•• *aməšā. spəntā. paīti. yasnahe.* •• Geldner 1P pp. 81 - 82.

Humbach's 1991 translation combines sections 1 - 2, but starts with the commentary on *yejñhe* (omitting all the words that go before it); and he omits the last three sentences in section 2, ~ his translation ends with the words *θrāyō. tkaēša*•• It is possible that these differences may have been caused by Humbach's reliance on different mss. Or he may have intended his translation of this YAv. Commentary to be an excerpt.

Here is the Humbach 1991 translation of (the parts he includes within) §§ 1 and 2:

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

Mills 1887 also thinks (as I do) that the first few words in Geldner's § 2 (commenting on *hātqm*) belong in § 1. In his translation (throughout) he translates *ašavan-* /*ašaonī-* words as 'saint' and 'holy one' instead of 'truth possessing' (adj.) and 'truth possessing (one)' (adj. used as a noun); he translates *aməša-* *spənta-* words as 'Bountiful Immortals', and *ušta-* words as 'salvation'. But for more recent translations of *spənta-* by professional linguists, see *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way Of Being, Spenta Mainyu*. And for more recent translations of *ušta-* and *uštātāt-* words by professional linguists, see *Part Six: Yasna 43:1*, and *Part Three: The Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu), an Analysis*. Mills

translates *vahišta-* words as 'best' (rather than as 'most-good' the superlative of *vohu-* 'good'). If you keep these alternatives in mind as you read his translation, it becomes a bit less problematic.

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

1. A word for the Yasna by Zarathushtra, the saint [*ašaonō* 'the truth possessing (one)']. [Mills here omits the first few words of the Yenghe Haatam which appear in Yy21.1].

Yēnhē, &c. Here the worshipper indicates and offers the Yasna (which is the sacrificial worship) of Mazda [Mills' footnote 1: "Referring *yēnhē* to Ahura(?)"] as by the command (or as the institution) of Ahura. *Hātām*. Here the worshipper offers the sacrificial worship as if with the beings who are among those who are destined to live (Mills' footnote 2: "Fit to live, clean.").

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

As you can see, he translates 'worship' words as "sacrificial worship". A ritual 'sacrifice' by definition means killing something as part of the act of worship. I discuss in a footnote below, why "sacrifice" used in connection with worship in Av. texts is not supported by any evidence.

⁷⁰ Detailed in Geldner 1P p. 82 fts. 2) through 4) on Yy21:3.

⁷¹ My translation of the Gatha verse Y43:1, along with other translations by professional linguists, is detailed in *Part Six: Yasna 43:1*.

⁷² The Gathas are in Old Avestan. Geldner's footnote shows that for this Gatha verse (Y43:1), 10 manuscripts show *ārmaiti-* in voc. sg. form *ārmaitē*; and that of the 9 manuscripts that show *ārmaiti-* in instr. sg. form, only one manuscript (J2) spells the word as *ārmaitī* ~ instr. sg. in Old Avestan; the other 8 spell the word as *ārmaiti* ~ instr. sg. in YAv., (and to that extent are scribal errors). Geldner 1P Y43, verse 1, ft. 9) p. 140.

⁷³ Detailed in *Part Six: Yasna 43:1*.

⁷⁴ Detailed with references in *Good Thoughts, Good Words, Good Deeds*, on the Home Page of this web-book.

⁷⁵ First, a few linguistic comments on the [first sentence](#) of Yy21:4, which is (linguistically) problematic. Then Mills' translation of the full section 4 follows (with some brief comments on it).

[Question:] *cīm. aētaya. paiti.vaca. paityā.mraoŋ* ∴ Geldner 1P pp. 81.

Geldner shows no manuscript variations for *aētaya. paiti.vaca.* (based on the manuscripts available to him).

This commentary (Yy21) is in YAv. So in this footnote all references to Skjaervo are to the Lessons in his on-line *Young Avestan Primer*, updated to Dec. 15, 2018 (unless otherwise stated).

cīm 'whom'. Skjaervo shows no YAv. declension *cīm*. He shows that YAv. *cim* is acc. sg. masc. of the interrogative pronoun stem *ci-* (Lesson 15, p.159). And Geldner shows that ms. K5 has *cim* here. So I conclude that *cīm* (in the mss. preferred by Geldner) may have been a scribal error for YAv. acc. sg. masc. *cim* (as shown in K5).

paityā.mraoŋ literally 'he/she/it answered'. Skjaervo's YAv. dictionary shows the verb stem *paiti.mrao-* means 'to answer', but does not show any declensions. His Old Avestan Index shows that the verb stem *mrao-* means 'to say, to speak', but when *paiti-* is added before *mrao-* the resulting compound word means 'to answer'; and that the word *mraoŋ* is the 3p sg. injunctive form of the verb stem *mrao-* (the 3p sg. pronoun he/she/it, is built into the verb form; Av. verbs are not gender specific). So here I have translated *paityā.mraoŋ* with a 3p (generic) masc. pronoun standing for Wisdom which, with *cīm*, becomes a question.

Thus, *cīm ... paityā.mraoṭ* 'whom did He answer'.

Which brings us to the problematic:

aētaya paiti.vaca 'of this two-fold reply' [?].
'with this reply' [?].

paiti.vaca:

Meaning: The stem *vak-/vac-* is a **masc.** noun meaning 'word, speech' (Skjaervo's vocabulary at the end of Lesson 6, p. 47). The noun stem *paiti.vac-* is not shown in Skjaervo's YAv. dictionary or in any of Skjaervo's YAv. vocabularies (appended to each of his YAv. Lessons). But I reason that (as with the Old Avestan verb *paitī.mrao-* discussed above) the addition of (YAv.) *paiti* to the noun stem *vac-* would give us (literally) 'answer-word' or more fluently, 'reply'.

Grammatical value:

The only declension Skjaervo shows for *vaca* is instrumental sg. (Lesson 15, pp. 148 - 149).

In compound words (like *paiti.vaca*), the grammatical value of the 2d member normally governs the entire word. So the grammatical value of *paiti.vaca* is **instr. sg. masc.**

An instr. sg. declension for *paiti.vaca* would be an excellent contextual fit in Yy21:4 ('with [this] reply whom did He answer?'), if it were not for *aētaya*.

aētaya:

The stem *aēta-* "this" is a demonstrative pronoun; and here, the grammatical form *aētaya* (in Yy21:4) is used (as an adj.) to describe *paiti.vaca*. As such, both words have to be in the same case, number, and gender.

Skjaervo does not show *aētaya* as any grammatical form (declension) of the stem *aēta-* "this".

He shows that the **instr. sg. masc./ntr.** form of the stem *aēta-* is *aēta*. He shows no instr. sg. **fem.** form (Lesson 15, pp. 148 - 151). The closest declension to *aētaya* which Skjaervo shows is *aētayā* **genitive dual masc./ntr.** (Lesson 11, p. 95).

Unlike Skjaervo, Martinez & DeVan 2001 show *aētaya* as the instr. sg. **fem.** form of the demonstrative pronoun stem *aēta-* (p. 72). But in our passage (Yy21:4), the **fem.** form does not fit the **masc.** gender of the noun it describes (*paiti.vaca*). So even if *aētaya* is **instr. sg. fem.**, we would have a mismatch. I have no linguistic explanation for this mismatch, and conclude that we have a scribal error here.

Possible solution:

Martinez & DeVan 2001 (like Skjaervo) show *aētayā* as **genitive dual masc./ntr.** of the stem *aēta-* (p. 72).

And Skjaervo also shows that the **-ā** ending (inflection) is **gen. dual** for **masc.** noun stems that ends in a consonant (Lesson 11, pp. 90 - 92); *vak-/vac-* is a **masc.** noun stem that ends in a consonant, so its **gen. dual masc./ntr.** form would be *vacā* (although Skjaervo does not specifically give *vacā* as a gen. du. example).

Which raises the question:

What grammatical value did the author of Yy21:4 intend these two words to have? (bearing in mind, it would have to be grammatically **masc.** in any event because *vak-/vac-* is a grammatically **masc.** noun).

1. Did the author intend the **instr. sg. masc.**? If so, in the original YAv. manuscript, the first sentence of section 4 would have been:

cim.[K5] aēta. paiti.vaca. paityā.mraoṭ ∴ (instead of *aētaya paiti.vaca* as the manuscripts now show)
'With this reply [*aēta paiti.vaca*] whom [*cim*] did He answer [*paityā.mraoṭ*] ?'

The advantage of this (instr. sg.) alternative is that it is a good contextual fit which translates easily into English. But it is not as good a fit with the answer (as you will see below, even in Mills' translation).

Or:

2. Did the author intend the **genitive dual masc.**? If so, in the original YAv. manuscript, the first sentence of section 4 would have been:

[*həntəmca*], and every one who is coming into existence [*bavan̄təmca*], and every one who shall exist in the future [*bīšyaṅtəmca*].

(Who answered thus? Answer.) The best one [*vahištō*].

(Question. What did He answer?)

(Answer.) The best thing [*vahištəm*]. (That is) the best One [*vahištō*], Mazda, answered the best [*vahištəm*] and holy [*ašavanəm*] (answer) for the better and holy man [*vahištāi ašaone*]."

In the last part, Mills interpretively translates the superlative dat. sg. *vahištāi* 'for the most good', as the comparative 'for the better' (the comparative degree of *vohu*- 'good' appears in the archaic YAv.Yenghe Haatam as *vahhō*). Perhaps Mills was not comfortable using the superlative *vahišta*- 'most good' for imperfect mortals. But indeed, in Avestan, *vahišta*- words often are used as a crescendo of expression. And in the Gathas, *vahišta*- words are indeed used for unperfected mortals, (and their unperfected but good thoughts, words and actions), as well as for the perfected Divine. Detailed in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of The Most Good, Vahishta*.

⁷⁶ Jackson 1892 (§ 281, p. 83), shows *uštātāiya* to be the loc. sg. form of *uštātāt*-; thus '... in happiness/enlightenment/bliss, (He answered) every truth-possessing (one) [*vīspəm. ašavanəm*] who exists [*həntəmca*], and who is coming into existence [*bavan̄təmca*], and who shall exist in the future [*bīšyaṅtəmca*]." Yy21:4.

⁷⁷ The meaning(s) of *uštātāt*- are detailed in:
Part One: The Manthra Of Truth, Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu),
Part Three: The Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu) An Analysis; and
Part Six: Yasna 43:1.

⁷⁸ Yy 21 Section 5.

bayqm. yejhē.hātqm. hufrāyaštqm. ašaonīm. yazamaide••
yejhē. hātqm. āaṭ yesnē paiī •• •• Geldner 1P pp. 81 - 82.

My translation of Section 5.

Literally: "We celebrate [*yazamaide*] the truth-possessing [*ašaonīm*] (worship) of the Yenghe Haatam [*yejhē.hātqm*], of the good(ness)-forwarding-worship [*hufrāyaštqm*] of the Divine [*bayqm*].
yejhē. hātqm. āaṭ yesnē paiī.

Or more fluently: 'We celebrate the truth-possessing (worship) of the Yenghe Haatam, the worship of the Divine that forwards the good.' ~ *yejhē. hātqm. āaṭ yesnē paiī*.' Yy21:5, my translation.

Here is an explanation of the Avestan words (if you are interested).

ašaonīm 'truth-possessing' is acc. sg. fem. of the adj. stem *ašaonī-* (Jackson 1892 § 257, p. 76). As such it is the direct object of *yazamaide*. So here, it is an adj. used to describe an implied noun. But why is it fem.? Perhaps because it describes fem. *hufrāyaštqm*.

hufrāyaštqm 'of (the) good(ness)-forwarding-worship'.

The word *hufrāyaštqm* has 3 distinct parts. The grammatical value of the last part of this word *yaštqm* (gen. pl.) controls the entire word.

hu 'good', is a prefix which means intrinsic goodness. It does not change form.

frā 'forwarding'. The prefix *frā/fra-* is used often with other words in the sense of forwarding something. For example, Skjaervo 2006 shows the following,

fra.aēš- under *aēš-* he shows 'to set in motion', and with *frā-* he shows 'to send forth'
fra.dax š- under *dax š-* he shows 'to *hit the mark(?)', and with *frā* he shows 'to launch'
fra.mrao- under *mrao-* he shows 'to say, to speak', and with *frā-* he shows 'to proclaim' [literally speak forth]
fra.par- under *par-* 'to cross', and with *frā* he shows 'to cross (over)'

yaštqm means 'of worshipping'.

Skjaervo He shows a YAv. fem. noun *yašti-* which he says means 'sacrificing' (YAv. *Primer* Lesson 15, p. 160). His mind-set interprets Av. words derived from *yaz-* as 'sacrifice'.

There is no dispute that *yaz-* words are Avestan 'worship' words. And I can accept that *yašti-* is a fem. noun deriving from *yaz-*, and therefore is an Avestan 'worship' word. But with respect, I disagree with Skjaervo's opinion regarding its meaning as an act of 'sacrificing'. (Even Humbach/Faiss 2010 ~ who translate even the Gathas through a ritualistic mind-set ~ translate *yaz-* words as 'worship, celebrate', and also 'sacrifice').

True, the Younger Avestan texts are heavily into rituals (unlike the Gathas). But there is no Avestan text (composed during Avestan times) in which there is a ritual that describes any kind of 'sacrificing' ~ the killing of animals, which is what ritual 'sacrificing' means.

In the Gathas, ritual offerings ~ milk, butter and bread ~ are mentioned (in a play on words) but no rituals are mentioned or described (detailed in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of Worship*).

Rituals in YAv. texts are indeed described, and include food offerings (but to pre- and post- Zarathushtrian deities who are not worshipped in the Gathas). YAv. ritual offerings including 'libations', the 'haoma' drink and 'meat', intended (symbolically) to nourish the Divine. But there is no mention of slaughtering animals as part of any ritual in any YAv. text. So, this ritual 'meat' offering could equally have been meat slaughtered for human consumption, a choice part of which was set aside for an offering to a particular deity. These food offerings (after they had been ritually offered to the deity), probably were consumed by the priests and assembled people ~ just as the foods in the *jashan* ceremony (which do not include meat) are consumed today.

In short, the ritual slaughter of animals is not described in any YAv. text (that appears in SBE, which includes all the major surviving YAv. texts). So to describe Avestan 'worship' words ~ even in YAv. texts ~ as 'sacrificing' is simply not supported by evidence.

But even more important: The YAv. commentary (Yy21) is a commentary on the Yenghe Haatam, in which worship is described as 'more good', and as 'in accord with truth'. The Yenghe Haatam mentions no rituals ~ no 'libations', no 'haoma' drink, no bundles of baresma, no meat offering. And there is certainly no mention in the Yenghe Haatam of sacrificing animals as a way to worship. So it would not be reasonable to translate a *yašti-* word as an act of 'sacrificing' in the YAv. commentary on the Yenghe Haatam.

For all the foregoing reasons, I take the YAv. fem. noun *yašti-* to mean 'worshipping'. For *i-* stem fem. nouns (like *yašti-*), the *-qm* inflection is gen. pl. Thus *yaštqm* would be gen. pl. of *yašti-* and would be translated as 'of worshipping' (but more fluently in English, 'of worship') ~ and its declension (gen. pl.) controls this three-part word, giving us:

Literally *hufrāyaštqm* 'of (the) good(ness)-forwarding-worshipping'.

bayqm means 'of the Divine' gen. pl. of the masc. noun stem *baya-* 'deity' (with cognates throughout the Indo-European family of languages), although it is worth noting that Zarathushtra never uses *baya-* or any other Avestan word (e.g. *daēva-*) for the Divine whom he worships (I think because of the baggage these words carried in his culture ~ ideas that were antithetical to his new envisionment of the Divine).

yejñhē.hātqm. This compound word is just a way of calling the Yenghe Haatam manthra by using its first two words as a title. It would be reasonable to so conclude, because in the manthra itself *yejñhē* and *hātqm* are two separate words, they are not a compound word.

Thus, *bayqm. yejñhē.hātqm. hufrāyaštqm. ašaonīm. yazamaide••* Yy21:5.

Literally: 'We celebrate [*yazamaide*] the truth-possessing [*ašaonīm*] (worship) of the Yenghe Haatam [*yejñhē.hātqm*], of the good(ness)-forwarding-worshipping [*hufrāyaštqm*] of the Divine [*bayqm*]. Yy21:5, my translation.

Or more fluently: 'We celebrate the truth-possessing (worship) of the Yenghe Haatam, the worship of the Divine (that) forwards the good.' ~ Yy21:5, my translation.

Here is Mills' translation of section 5 (he gives *hufrāyaštqm* a pass ~ he translated Av. at an early stage of the decoding process).

"We sacrifice to [yazamaide] this piece, the Yênhê Hâtâm, the prominent, and holy [aṣaonīm 'truth-possessing'] Yast." Mills translation, SBE 31, p. 269.

⁷⁹ Skjaervo 2006; Taraporewala 1951, p. 28; Jackson 1892 §§ 236, 238, p. 70.

Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, p. 14 para. (4) also sees *yesnē* as loc. He states that he is not persuaded by Henning's 'for worship' which he thinks may have been influenced by the Pahlavi translation. But his 2010 translation with Faiss of this manthra (the Yenghe Haatam) has "for worship" p. 158, without explanation.

⁸⁰ Detailed in a ft. in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of Worship*.

⁸¹ Hintze 1994 *Zamyad Yasht*, Glossary p. 47.

⁸² Jackson 1892 §§ 735 - 736 p. 204.

⁸³ Humbach/Faiss 2010 p. 73.

⁸⁴ Detailed in *Part Two:*

*The Puzzle of the Most-Good, Vahishta; and
A Question of Reward & the Path.*

⁸⁵ Taraporewala 1951 p. 28. The phrase *yesnē paiī* also occurs in the Gatha verse Y51:22 (believed to have been the inspiration for the Yenghe Haatam). And here again we have differences of opinion as to its translation.

Taraporewala 1951 (consistent with his translation of the Yenghe Haatam) translates *yesnē paiī* as "in-every act-of-worship...". Y51:22, p. 821.

Inslar 1975 has not ascribed a separate English word for *paiī* in Y51:22. He translates *yesnē paiī* as "in ... worship...". Y51.22. A locative translation.

Humbach 1991 translates *yesnē paiī* as "at worship" Y51:22, Vol. 1, p. 191. A locative translation.

Humbach/Faiss (2010) translate *yesnē paiī* as "for the sacrifice" Y51:22, p. 158. A dative translation, not locative.

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

⁸⁶ A relative pronoun is one that stands for a noun (or another pronoun) and introduces a subordinate clause. For example:

'A man **whose** character is trustworthy.' The relative pronoun is **whose** (genitive. sg. masc.). The noun it stands for is the preceding 'A man'. And the subordinate clause it introduces is 'character is trustworthy.'

In English there are many relative pronouns (**who, whose, which, that**, et cetera). In Avestan there is only one relative pronoun stem *ya-* which stands for all nouns ~ persons, concepts, places, and things. But of course different grammatical forms of the stem are used for different cases, numbers, and genders.

⁸⁷ Many grammatical forms (declensions) for nouns, pronouns, adjectives, are the same for both masc. and ntr. and the YAv. pronoun *yejhe* (archaic YAv. *yejhē*) is one of these.

Masc./ntr. genitive **sg.**

According to Skjaervo 2018, the YAv. relative pronoun *yejhe* is masc./ntr. genitive **sg.** of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*. The genitive masc./ntr. **pl.** is *yaēšqm*. The gen. fem. **sg.** is *yejhā*. The gen. fem. **pl.** is *yājhqm*, (*Young Avestan*, Lesson 11, p. 95), which appears at the end of the 2d line of the Yenghe Haatam (with *cā-* 'and' tacked on).

M&dV 2001 (p. 73) show YAv. *yejhe* as masc. gen. **sg.** (They also show YAv. *yejhe* as loc. sg. fem. But the locative case ('in/at/on/under ____') for *yejhe* in the context of this manthra is not applicable).

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

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

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

Based on the foregoing factors ~ and in the absence of Hintze's explanation ~ I can only conclude that the author of the mantra intended *yej̥hē* to be masc. gen. sg.

⁸⁸ Skjaervo 2018 shows *yāñhqm* as the genitive fem. pl. form of the relative pronoun stem *ya-* (referenced above). Taraporewala 1951 in his commentary (pp. 26, 28) also says that *yāñhqm* is pl., and does not mention any differences of opinion among translators regarding whether *yāñhqm* is sg. or pl. But in his translation, he translates the word as sg. ('the-woman-of-whom'), and he shows Bartholomae's English translation as sg. also ('the woman too'). However, the YAv. gen. fem. sg. is *yej̥hā* (Skjaervo's YAv. *Primer* referenced above) ~ not *yāñhqm*. These facts, make me wonder if the sg. 'woman' in these translation might be a typographical error.

⁸⁹ I am indebted to Professor Insler for knowledge of the technique of 'framing' or 'encapsulating' in the syntax of GAv., to show words that belong together ~ as one unit of sense (referenced in a ft. above). Following this rule in the Yenghe Haatam, I think the fact that *yej̥hē* and *yāñhqmā* frame or encapsulate the words in lines a. and b. indicates that these 2 lines form one unit of sense.

*yej̥hē. hātqm. āat. yesnē. paifī. vanhō.
mazdā. ahurō. vaēdā. ašāt. hacā. yāñhqmā.*

This 'framing' technique in the syntax of the Yenghe Haatam is further evidence of its author's familiarity with (and emulation of) the syntax and poetic style of the Gathas. I have not done a study to determine whether the framing technique is found in all Old Avestan texts (like the *Yasna Haptanghaiti* which according to general belief, was not composed by Zarathushtra) and in any YAv. texts, or whether it is one of Zarathushtra's distinctive poetic techniques which the author of the Yenghe Haatam admired and emulated.

⁹⁰ In English, the present participle of a verb is shown by attaching *-ing* to the verb, thus the present participle of the verb 'to be', 'to exist', is 'being', 'existing'. And present participles can be used as nouns, 'existing-one(s)', or 'being(s)'.

⁹¹ Discussed in *Part Two: The Solution of Yasna 29*.

⁹² Taraporewala 1951 p. 47.

⁹³ Hintze 1994, Humbach (1991), Taraporewala (1951) and Bartholomae, all translate *mazdā ahurō* as nominative sg. ~ the subject of the verb *vaēdā* 'knows'.

⁹⁴ Discussed in more detail in *Part One: The Nature of the Divine*.

⁹⁵ Detailed in *Part Three: Evolution of the Name(s) Ahura, Mazda*.

⁹⁶ *vaēdā* in the Old Avestan of Gatha verse Y51:22, (*vaēdā* in the Yenghe Haatam) is the verb form for both 1p. and 3p. sg. present tense (indicative) of the stem *vaēd-* 'to know' (Skjaervo *Old Avestan Index*) thus it could be translated as 'I know' or 'he/she/it knows' (see the analysis in *Part Six: Yasna 51:22*).

In English, the form of a verb is often the same for different persons in sg. and pl. ('I know', 'we know', 'you know', 'they know' etc.). And to indicate which person (1p. 2p. 3p.) and number (sg., du., pl.) the verb *know* is being used for, we have to add the appropriate pronoun 'I', 'we', 'you' 'they' etc. to the verb form *know*. But in Avestan, the form of the verb includes the person(s) and number(s). Therefore, pronouns indicating person and number ('I', 'we', 'thou', 'you' 'he/she/it', 'they' et cetera), are built into a given verb form, and a separate pronoun is not necessary and usually is not used with the verb form, unless needed for emphasis or required by a particular sentence structure or some other specific reason.

Sometimes, however (just to make things simple!?!), ~ as with *vaēθwā* (GAv. *vaēdā*) ~ a particular verb form is used for more than one person (1p. 2p. 3p.). In such cases, the absence of the defining pronoun makes a translation problematic, unless the context indicates the composer's intent. In the context of the Yenghe Haatam, I think taking *vaēθwā* as 3p. sg. 'the Wise Lord knows' (*mazdā ahurō vaēθwā*), is a better contextual fit.

⁹⁷ M&deV 2001 p. 111, offer the following possible translations of *āat* in their glossary:

'entonces' (Spanish for 'then'),

'ya' (Spanish for 'already'),

'pero' (Spanish for 'but').

⁹⁸ Jackson 1892 § 53 iv, and § 731 (4).

⁹⁹ Beekes 1988 pp. 144, 147.

¹⁰⁰ Hintze 1994 p. 43 (Glossary for the word *āat*), and p. 16 for the Yenghe Haatam (at the end of Yt. 1.13).

¹⁰¹ Taraporewala 1951 pp. 26 - 27.

¹⁰² Detailed in *Part Six: Yasna 30:3 and 4*.

¹⁰³ So shown in Skjaervo's Old Avestan Index.

The phrase *ašāt hacā* 'in accordance with truth' appears many times in the Gathas (with and without the emphatic particle *cīt* 'indeed' ~ *ašātcīt*). And truth (*aša-*) is the core and foundation of Zarathushtra's teachings. So the use of *ašāt hacā* 'in accordance with truth' in the context of the Yenghe Haatam indicates once again, that the author of the Yenghe Haatam looked to the Gathas in composing this manthra. Here are some examples of how *ašāt hacā* is used in Gatha verses,

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

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

"...through Thy rule that is in accord with truth [*θwā xšaθrā ašāt hacā*]..." Y43.14 Insler 1975;

"... the best [*vahišta-* 'most good'] thing of this existence in accord with truth [*aṅhəuš ... vahištəm ašāt hacā*]..." Y45:4 Insler 1975;

"The person who, really in accordance with truth [*ašāt ... hacā*], shall bring to realization ... what is most healing ..." Y46:19 Insler 1975;

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

"... if [*ahurō mazdā* '(the) Lord Wisdom] shall grant to him those attainments in accord with truth [*ašāt hacā*]..." Y53:1, Insler 1975.

And *ašāt hacā* also appears in the Ahuna Vairya with the emphatic *-cīt*. "... So also the judgment in accord with truth indeed [*aθā ratuš ašātcīt hacā*]..." Y27:13, my translation. The Ahuna Vairya is in pure Gathic Avestan and is believed (by many scholars) to have been composed by Zarathushtra.

¹⁰⁴ Detailed in *Part One: Truth, Asha*.

¹⁰⁵ Detailed in *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya, An Analysis*.

¹⁰⁶ The Pahlavi translation/commentary is quoted in Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, pp. 13 - 14. The Pahlavi translation/commentary, transliterated into English script by Humbach reads as follows. Words in round parentheses are insertions by Humbach. Words in square brackets are the Pahlavi explanations or commentaries:

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

The word *amahraspandān* is Pahlavi for Av. *aməša- spənta-*.

Humbach 1991 indicates that he obtained this Pahlavi translation from Dhabar, *Pahlavi Yasna and Visperad*. Humbach 1991 Vol. 2 p. 13.

The English translation (of the Pahlavi 'translation') is of course by Humbach 1991.

¹⁰⁷ Geldner 1P, pp. 97 - 98, Yy27:15.

¹⁰⁸ Geldner 1P, p. 26, ft. 1 of Yy4:26.

¹⁰⁹ Here are a some examples of the Yenghe Haatam required to be recited following sections of Avestan texts which make no mention of the amesha spenta.

The Yenghe Haatam is set forth in full (in some mss.) in Yy27:15. The section before it is the Asha Vahishta (ashem vohu Y27:14) which does not contain the words *aməša- spənta-*, so this section is not evidence that the pronouns in the Yenghe Haatam stand for the *aməša- spənta-*.

The Yenghe Haatam is set forth in full (in some mss.) in Yy5:6. The section before it, Yy5:5 does not contain the words *aməša- spənta-*, so this section is not evidence that the pronouns in the Yenghe Haatam stand for the *aməša- spənta-*. Parenthetically, the preceding section (Yy5:5) is a quotation of YHapt. 37:5, and mentions only 3 amesha spenta ~ good thinking, good rule (which are grammatically ntr.), and embodied truth (grammatically fem.) ~ along with good envisionment [*daēnqm*] and good caring protection [*fsəratūm*]. Specifically,

vohucā. manō. yazamaidē.♦♦ vohucā. x šaθrəm. vaṇuhīmčā. daēnqm. vaṇuhīmčā. fsəratūm. vaṇuhīmčā. ārmaīīm.♦♦ (quoting YHapt. 37:5) Yy5:5, from Geldner 1P p. 27.

"And good thinking [*vohucā manō ntr.*] we worship/celebrate; and good rule [*vohucā x šaθrəm ntr.*], and good envisionment (*vaṇuhīmčā daēnqm fem.*), and good caring-protection (*vaṇuhīmčā fsəratūm fem.*), and good embodied truth (*vaṇuhīmčā ārmaīīm fem.*). Yy5:5, (quoting YHapt. 37:5), my translation.

As you can see, although there are 3 fem. nouns in Yy5:5 (which is a quotation of YHapt. 37:5), two of them are not amesha spenta (envisionment *daēnqm*, and caring protection *fsəratūm*). The 2 amesha spenta first mentioned are grammatically ntr. nouns (*manō* and *x šaθrəm*). There is no masc. sg. *mainyu-* in this section.

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

One last example. In the *Zamyad Yasht*, the words *aməša- spənta-* are not mentioned in the text immediately before the Yenghe Haatam (which is set forth in full at the end of Hintz's 1994 translation of § 13 of the *Zamyad Yasht*). There may be other examples as well.

¹¹⁰ Jackson 1892 in the Table in § 399, p. 114.

¹¹¹ Darmesteter was an outstanding Avestan scholar, but at an early stage of decoding Avestan. Darmesteter appends a footnote to the words "All those beings" as follows "[ft. 13] The Amesha-Spentas (Pahl. Comm. ad Yasna XXVII fin.)." SBE 23, p. 30 ft. 13; and he footnotes the word 'males' [*tqscā*] as "The first three" (ft. 1), and the word 'females' as "The last three whose names are feminine." (ft. 2) SBE 23, p. 31.

But in fact, as linguists today generally agree, the "first three" (*aša- vahišta, vohu- manah-* and *vohu- x šaθra-*) are not masc. but ntr. nouns.

¹¹² See *Part Three: Evolution of the Name(s) Ahura Mazda*, and *Part Five: Chronology of the Texts*.

¹¹³ The Old Persian version of the Behistan Inscription of Darius the Great says (in section V):

"Saith Darius the King: By the favor of Ahura Mazda this inscription in other ways I made. In addition, it was in Aryan [*ariyā* line 89 p. 132], and has been made on leather. ..." Kent translation, § 70, p. 132, in Kent 1950, *Old Persian Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*.

¹¹⁴ For example: Commenting on the *Vendidad* (*Videvdad*):

Zaehner speaks of "the appalling grammatical confusion that characterizes that ... work." Zaehner 1961, *The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism*, (Phoenix Press reprint 2003), p. 162.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 speak of "...the well-known fact that the grammatical endings found in the *Videvdad* are notoriously doubtful..." p. 31.