

MEDEDELINGEN DER KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE
AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN, AFD. LETTERKUNDE
NIEUWE REEKS – DEEL 41 – No. 4

ON ZARATHUSTRA'S LANGUAGE

F. B. J. KUIPER

ISBN 0 7204 8462 6

AANGEBODEN IN DE VERGADERING
VAN 9 JANUARI 1978

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	—	5
2. <i>aodərəš</i>	—	11
3. <i>hizvā.uxδāiš</i>	—	12
4. <i>tanūm</i>	—	16
5. <i>xšma-</i>	—	19
6. <i>dužazōbā</i>	—	21
7. <i>darəgāyū</i>	—	22
8. <i>āvarənā</i>	—	25
REFERENCES	—	37

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS*

In the following notes on the Gathic language words have been transcribed, where this seemed desirable, into what seems the closest approximation of Zarathustra's form of speech (as has been done in former articles over the past twenty years). A few words in explanation of the purpose of these reconstructions will not be out of place. First, it should be stated that they are not meant to replace a text-critical approach, which aims at establishing, if possible, the reading of the archetype of our manuscripts. Secondly, they are not an end in themselves but only serve to visualize, whenever necessary, the stage of linguistic development that a critical study of the Vulgate compels us to assume for the language in which Zarathustra composed his hymns. It goes without saying that they are not a re-writing of the text in a reconstructed Proto-Iranian, which would hardly be possible and, in any case, would not serve any useful purpose. They do not claim to be exact in such details as sandhi and *cy* or *šy*, *vr-* or *rv-*, etc. In such cases the later stage (*šy*, *rv-*) has been chosen so as not to archaize the text beyond necessity, although my personal guess would be that the older stage is nearer to the truth. Thirdly, this kind of reconstruction is only justified for the Gathic language but not for the later texts, because the Gathas represent a synchronic state of a (not entirely homogeneous) *Kunstsprache* and because their metrical structure provides a much more reliable basis for historical reconstructions than that of Later Avestan texts.

There is no denying that the earliest stage of the text that rests on a solid *philological* basis, in so far as it can be reconstructed with philological methods, is the text that was written down, presumably in the fifth or the sixth century A.D., by the inventor of the Avestan alphabet. It is clear, however, that it would be entirely unrealistic to regard this as identical with the authentic text composed by Zarathustra. Some 1000 years or more had elapsed before his words were reduced to writing. It must be stressed that this gap cannot be bridged by means of philological methods and that for this interval historical linguistics is our only guide. Linguistic research shows beyond question that in phonetic respect Zarathustra's form of speech was sometimes far removed from what has been handed down in the Vulgate. However, the situation is intricate and full of contradictions. As a general rule it may be stated that the consonant system has been preserved more faithfully than that of the vowels. Thus the well-known

* I am indebted to Prof. H.-P. Schmidt and Dr. R. S. P. Beckes for critical comments.

distinction between the voiced plosives in the Gathas and the Yasna Haptan̄hāiti, where they are consistently written as *b*, *d*, *g* in intervocalic position and, on the other hand, in Later Avestan texts, which have the fricative allophones β , δ , γ in that position, can hardly be explained in any other way but by a very faithful oral transmission, for more than thousand years, of Zarathustra's own words and the YH. In this respect later developments which characterize the Later Avestan dialect did not affect the text of the Gathas. Still, faithful though this transmission may have been as regards the consonants and the words, it clearly cannot compare with that of the Veda. Thus the spelling *-aē/-ōi/-ē* in final position against LAv. *-e* guarantees that Proto-Iranian *-ai* was still a diphthong in Zarathustra's form of speech, but it shows at the same time, in such orthographic variants as *dragvāitē : dragvataē-cā* (etc.), *piθrē : fədrōi*, *yavē : yavōi*, *garazē : garazōi*, how inconsistent the notation of this diphthong is. In Zarathustra's language these forms can only have been [drugvatai], [piθrai, fθrai], [yavai], [grzai], with the ending *-ai* that has been preserved intact in *mazdāi* [mazdā'ai].

It may seem that in these reconstructions the role of the laryngeal into which, in the Proto-Indo-Iranian period, the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals must have merged, is rather over-stressed. This is, however, only due to the fact that, on the one hand, the evolution of this phoneme has in some cases changed the form of a word more drastically than that of other phonemes and that, on the other hand, the impact of the laryngeal theory on the Gathic language has not yet sufficiently been recognized, nor has all the new information which it provides yet become common knowledge. As a consequence, words are, even in the latest translations, interpreted in a way that linguistically seems impossible (see, e.g., p. 14).

Since the historical implications of the theory for our insight into Zarathustra's language are not yet fully realized, it is necessary to sketch in this introduction the main conclusions that can be drawn from it. They are to serve as a general background for the following notes. In this survey some repetitions were inevitable because it had to be based on material that has been discussed in earlier studies, spread over two decades. References are only given where they may be useful for the reader.

An illustrative case is the gen. sing. of *mazdā*- 'wise'. A combination of metrical and linguistic considerations leads to the conclusion that in Zarathustra's speech this form must have been **mazdā-ah*. In the same manner the metre shows that the subjunctive *dāi* was still distinct from the injunctive *dāi* in that the former was

a disyllable [da-at], the latter monosyllabic [dāt]. The basic point in these and all similar cases is that the hiatus indicated by the metre occurs *without any exception*. This shows that the hiatus, which points to the earlier (?) existence of a laryngeal between vowels, is not a theoretical fiction but must be accepted as a linguistic reality. Clearly, there is no way of knowing how exactly such vowel groups as *aa were pronounced. There is no positive proof for the survival of a laryngeal in this position, nor could there possibly be. Nothing, on the other hand, prevents us from interpreting the hiatus as indicative of a laryngeal phoneme that was still pronounced between vowels—and possibly in other positions, too, where it has left no trace in the metrical structure of the verse. Such considerations admittedly run counter to traditional beliefs about Zarathustra's language. Since, however, the laryngeal phoneme must still have existed in Proto-Indo-Aryan until a late pre-Vedic period (e.g. in *deviH, *purúH, even in the analogical new formation *námaH), it would not be surprising if it still existed in Gathic, which is in this respect much more conservative. However, as this cannot be proved or disproved, it is preferable to use a different symbol for what manifests itself as a hiatus. In this study it will be indicated by a simple apostrophe ['].

In later centuries the hiatus disappeared and the two vowels, if similar, were contracted. This stage, *mzdāh, underlies the Old Persian genitive -mzdāh-a(h), which is a new formation, introduced in order to differentiate again the gen. *-mzdāh from the nominative -mzdāh, with which it had coincided as a result of the contraction of *aa. Since -mzdāha(h) must have arisen before 500 B.C., it follows that all the four stages *mzdāHah, *mzdāah, *mzdāh and -mzdāha(h) are anterior to that date. This may give us some idea of how far back we must date the stage *mzdāHah. As for GAv. mzdā, the inventor of the Avestan alphabet always uses a ligature of ā + ə (traditionally transcribed as ā in Roman script) for what must have been Old Iranian āh (and analogically -āscā for [-ās ca], etc.). This raises the question as to how [āh] was pronounced, in the priestly recitation of texts handed down in a dead language, between the 4th and the 6th century A.D. However, interesting though this problem may be, it will be clear that the spelling introduced at that time cannot teach us much about the phonetics of Zarathustra's language and is irrelevant for a historical reconstruction of the earlier evolution of the language. A few points must be stressed. First, some ten centuries before the invention of the script *mzdāHah must already have become a disyllabic *mzdāh, and it is a disyllabic word which the inventor of the script rendered as mzdā. Secondly,

we owe it to the vowel contraction that *mazdā* has preserved the authentic genitive ending of Zarathustra's form of speech. This was [-ah] after consonants, consequently also after the consonantal *H. In all other cases the Vulgate reads -ē or -ō but in **mazdāHah*, owing to the loss of *H, the ending [-ah] coalesced with the preceding vowel and survived in disguise. It may therefore be stated as a general rule that -ē and -ō, when standing for Old Iranian *-ah, were still pronounced as [-ah] by Zarathustra. This shows once more how wide a gap separates the Vulgate from Zarathustra's language.

This conclusion is also important in another respect. When the Gathas were written down in the newly invented Avestan script, the object of its creator clearly was to note the text (for reasons that can only be guessed) in a *phonetic* spelling. It reproduced as exactly as possible the form of recitation that was at that time considered authoritative. The detailed phonetic observations that underlie this notation certainly deserve our admiration. It may also be admitted that, within certain limits, this orthography points to a consistent systematic character of the 'Gatha-Avestan' phonology. On the other hand, it will be clear that an oral transmission, for some 1000 years or more, which had led to a pronunciation *mazdā* for [mazdā'ah] cannot be expected to have preserved such niceties of Zarathustra's pronunciation as, e.g., possible allophones of *a* before certain consonants. Thus the spelling -an- for -an- in the Gathas shows how in the solemn psalmody of the priests -an- had come to pronounced in the first centuries A.D., but there is not the slightest reason to suppose that this pronunciation dates back to Zarathustra and, besides, it can and must be ignored in a transcription that is meant to be by and large phonemic. The same is true of, e.g., the pronunciation of intervocalic -h- in -aṇha- as against -ahi-, even if it would reflect an actual development of later dialects. In these cases it is the much more phonemic spelling of Old Persian that leads us to the conclusion that in the, doubtless much earlier, East Iranian language of the Gathas such developments had not yet taken place. Inevitably, our transcription is closer to reconstructed Proto-Iranian than the Vulgate because it is historically more realistic.

A further confirmation of this conclusion can be seen in the representation of *-uHa- in Gathic. All singular case forms of *tanū-* that are attested are trisyllabic: acc. *tanvēm* [tanu'am], dat. *tanuyē* [tanu'ai], gen. -*tanvō*, *tanvas-* [tanu'ah, tanu'as]. (Only 53.6c *tanvō* is uncertain because the metrical structure of this line is irregular). This is exactly what historical grammar leads us to expect for **tanuH-am*, **tanuH-ai* and **tanuH-ah*/**tanuH-as*. As

will be seen below, the same is true of the oblique cases of the sing. of *kizū-*. Just as in the case of [mazdā'ah], [da'at], there is a hiatus *without exception*. In the light of this observation the present stem of *zū-* "to call" deserves close consideration. The corresponding Rigvedic present of *hū-* is *hū-áyati*, which shows a hiatus in the following two passages:

VI.26.1a *śrudhī na indra hváyāmasi tvā*

VI.33.4c *svàrṣātā yád dhváyāmasi tvā*

As has been pointed out by Grassmann and confirmed by Oldenberg, we must here read [huáyāmasi tvā], apparently an old formulaic phrase, preserved in the cadence in the old family collection of the Bharadvājas. It is exactly what must be expected as the representative of a PIE. present formation **ǵhuH-éy-eti*, viz. **huH-áyāmasi*. Since the Gathic language has without exception [a'a, u'a] for **aHa*, **uHa*, the Gathic correspondence of *hváyati* must be [zu'ayati], which actually occurs in the participle at 49.12ab:

kaṭ tōi aṣā zbayentē avaṇhō

zaraθuštrāi . . .

"what help by truth hast Thou for Zarathustra who calls?"
(Insler).

The same is true for *zbayā* "I call" in the following three passages:

33.5a *yastē vīspā.mazištəm sərəošəm zbayā avaṇhānē*

"I who, at the Conclusion, summon thy all-greatest Obedience".

46.14e *təng zbayā vaṇhəuš uxδāiš manəṇhō*

"Upon those I call with words stemming from good thinking".

51.10c *maībyō zbayā aṣəm vaṇhuyā aṣi gaṭ.tē*

"I summon truth to me, to come to my good reward"
(Insler).

The hemistichs may be reconstructed as [zu'ayantai avahah], [sraušam zu'ayā avahānai], [taḥ zu'ayā] and [mabya zu'ayā ṛtam]. In 33.5a and 46.14e, however, most translators (e.g. Bartholomae, M. W. Smith, Humbach, Lommel, Insler) assume a subjunctive form ("will ich rufen", "I shall call"), although there is no cogent reason for this interpretation. A serious argument against it is the fact that in the Rigveda there is in the corresponding formulae for the 1st p. sg. not a single instance of a subjunctive against 94 instances of an indicative (*huvé*, *huve* 65, *hāve* 2, *hváyāmi* 3,

hvae 11, *jūhvē* 2, *jōhavīmi*, *johavīmi* 11). The same is true of the 1st p. pl. and it can even be stated in general that among the 367 finite forms of *hū-* in the Rigveda there is not a single subjunctive form. Still, there remains the interesting dilemma that if, in spite of the Rigvedic evidence, *zbayā* is taken as a subjunctive, and if, in spite of *zbayentē* (where a hiatus in *u'a* can hardly be questioned), *zbayā* is read as [zbayaā], it might be used as an argument to prove that **uHa* is not consistently represented by [u'a]. This dilemma can only be solved by the publication of the whole Gathic material, which is to appear in the near future. As far as I can see, it shows that, apart from the cases discussed below on p. 22ff., in *all* those where we must reconstruct **H* between vowels, these vowels were in Zarathustra's speech separated by a hiatus, which may possibly have been a laryngeal phoneme. Old Persian offers the same picture as seen above in the case of *-mazdāh-*, in that it has a (Median) present [zbayati] (attested in *patiy-azbayam*) which presupposes the stages **zuHa-* > **zua-* > **zva-* > *zba-*. Again, they must all be dated *before 500 B.C.* For generations it has been customary to argue that, since languages do not develop at the same rate, Zarathustra's date need not have been much earlier than Darius'. This argument could be used at a time when it was not yet realized how much more antique, in a certain respect, Zarathustra's language is than that of the Rigveda. Nowadays such sweeping statements, which miss the point, should no longer be used. Zarathustra must have lived a considerable time before 500 B.C. (*IJJ.* 5, p. 43). My personal guess would be that, apart from other considerations, his date can for purely linguistic reasons not have been much later than c. 800 B.C. but may have been much earlier. Therefore, the East Iranian dialects need not have reached the fourth stage *zbay-* much later than 500 B.C. and it is *zbay-* that was pronounced by the priests some thousand years later, when the text of the Gathas was finally reduced to writing.

There is only one form, as far as I can see, that might be quoted as an exception to the rule of the hiatus. It is *hvarē* at 50.2c:

ərəžəjīš ašā pourušū hvarē pišyasū

which is commonly translated "honestly living in harmony with truth among the many who see the sun". However, just as Rigvedic *svār* [súar], Gathic *hvarē*- "sun" is disyllabic at 32.10b:

gām ašibyā hvarēcā yascā dāθēng drəgvatō dadāt

where the first hemistich stands for [gām ašibyā hu'ar ca]. Insler has rightly concluded that the monosyllabic *hvarē* in *hvarē pišyasū* (v.l. *pišyasū*) cannot mean "sun". For the possibility of assuming

a hypersyllabic verse see p. 23. The correct interpretation of this obscure passage has still to be found. See p. 36.

In the following notes my main intention has been to illustrate three features which, often combined in one word, characterize the Gathic language. They are the rôle of the laryngeal (in those positions in the word where the metre still enables us to discern it), the new formations in the noun inflection (contrasting with the older forms in Later Avestan, which is more conservative in this respect), and the traces of different dialectal components of Zarathustra's *Kunstsprache*. This aim has mainly determined the choice of the words discussed.

2. *aodərəš*

One of the most remarkable features of the Gathic language, besides the archaic character of its phonology, is the tendency towards innovations in its morphology. Whereas the verb system is still much more archaic than that of Later Avestan, the Gathic noun inflection shows numerous traces of analogical new formations. Well-known instances are *ptā*, *tā* "father" for LAv. *pīta*, dative *piθrē* beside *ƒəθrōi*, gen. *pasēuš* for LAv. *pasvō*, *xratēuš* for LAv. *xraθβō*, acc. sing. *paθqm* for *pantqm*, and the inflection of *vīspa*.

In *aodar*- "the cold" the innovation is not limited to Gathic, but the Gathic form is particularly remarkable. It occurs at 51.12c

hyaṭ hōi īm caratascā aodərəšcā zōišənū vāzā

"Although his two draft animals were trembling from wandering and from the cold" (Insler).

As LAv. *aota*- "cold" and Rigvedic *omán*- "the cold" show, *aodar*- is a formation in *-dhar*-. Since the possibility of a proterodynamic inflection is ruled out by LAv. instr. *aodra* and by RV. *ūdhanī* "in the coolness" (Neisser 1924, 181), the latter of which has the ablaut grade and the stem in *-dhan*- that may be expected, the form *aodərəš* admits of only one explanation. As it cannot reflect an old type of inflection, it must be a new formation that has taken the place of **ūdnah* and that has been created on the basis of the nominative **audr*-. The PInIr. prototype was, accordingly, **ūdhr*-, gen. **ūdhnás*. The long *ū* of RV. *ūdhná* is hard to explain (confusion with *ūdhar* "udder"?).

The uncommon formation of the genitive is reminiscent of the acc. sing. of *ātar*- "fire", viz. 34.4 *ātrəm* [ātrm], also LAv. Apparently an old neuter, nom. **ātr*-, gen. **āθrah* has been turned into a masculine word by adding *-š* to the nom. sing. ([ātrš], only in LAv.) and *-m* in the acc. sing. ([ātrm]). The artificial character of these case forms suggests that they originated in the priestly idiom.

3. *hizvā.uxdāiš*

The word group *hizvā uxdāiš* occurs as two separate words in two passages where, in the well-known way, words are opposed to actions (*šyaothana-*); cf. 47.2

. . . *vahištəm*
hizvā uxdāiš *vaŋhēuš ēānū manajhō*
āmatōiš *zastōibyā šyaothanā vərəzayə*
 "the best, one shall effect through words according to good
 thinking, (and) with the hands through activity according
 to piety"

and 51.3:

. . . *yōi vā šyaothanāiš sūrəntē*
ahurō ašā hizvā *uxdāiš vaŋhēuš manajhō*
 "who unite themselves with you (plur.) through their deeds,
 (and) through words (stemming from) good thinking, [O Ahura
 and Aša?]" Schlerath 1974, 219 here prefers the v.l. *hizvā*,
 which is hard to account for metrically [ahurah r̥tā hizu'ūh].

That these passages, which seemed to contain two instrumentals, presented difficulties to the translators is understandable. It must first be stated that *uxda-* is not equivalent to *uxta-* "spoken" (Bartholomae 1894, 110; 1904, 381 but not 1330), although in LAv. *uxdəm vacō*, etc. there may have been a confusion: *uxda-* corresponds to Vedic *ukthá-* and is a "Verbalabstraktum" (Debrunner 1954, 717). Therefore the free translation "words pronounced by the tongue" (Duchesne-Guillemin 1948, Humbach 1959) is not recommendable, even for purely syntactical reasons, since a word group "words by the tongue" offers difficulties. For *xšmā uxdāiš* see below. In the first passage it may seem natural to take the words *hizvā uxdāiš*, translated "with his tongue, through words" (M. Wilkins Smith 1929, Lommel 1935, Barr 1954), as opposed to *zastōibyā šyaothanā* "with his hands, through activity" of the following line. However, an interpretation of *hizvā* as an instrumental is ruled out for formal reasons.

In the latest discussion of *hizvā-*, Insler 1975, 265 quotes it as proof for his theory that "the contraction of the sequence **-zuvā-* results in *-zvā-* in Avestan and never in **-zbā-*. Cf. the enlargement of *hizū-* "tongue" as **hizū-ā-* resulting in *hizvā-* (not **hizbā-*) and note Benveniste's appropriate remarks (1954b, 30f.)". Since Insler's remarks call for some comment and Benveniste's analysis of the evidence (1954, 30–32) is unsatisfactory, it is necessary to consider the facts more closely. The Gathic forms attested are:

instrumental sing.:

28.5c /vāurōimaidī xrafstrā hizvā [vavraimadi xrafstrā hizu'ā]

31.3c hizvā θbahyā āḡhō [hizu'ā θvahya āhah]

genitive sing.:

31.19b /xšayamnō hizvō vasō [xšayamnah hizu'ah vasah]

50.6c /hizvō raiθīm stōi [hizu'ah rai'ām stai]

51.13c x^vāiš šyaothanāiš hizvascā [hvāiš šyauθnāiš hizu'as ca]

As for 45.1e *hizvā āvərətō* (v.l. *hizvā*), this is entirely obscure (see below).

From this survey it follows that Insler's statement about **zuvā-* having become *zvā-* is not correct, as it is contradicted by *hizvā* : *hizvas-*. His brief comment, it is true, leaves several details unexplained. In writing **zuvā-* for **zuHā-* or [zu'ā-], he ignores the parallelism between [zu'ā-] and [mazdā'ah]. As for the curious restriction of the rule to **zuvā-*, if intentional, it would imply two different representations of **zuv-* (= **zuH-*), dependent on the quantity of the following *a-*. Anyway, the retention of *-zv-* in *hizvā*, *hizvas-* is obviously due to the analogy of the normal pattern of noun inflection (e.g., *tanū-*, gen. *tanvas-*). We are here faced with the well-known phenomenon of morpheme boundary, which prevented *zv* from becoming *zḥ*, just as it prevented, e.g., *rt* from becoming *ṣ* in certain verb forms. The situation was different in dialects in which *zv-* was no longer followed by a case ending, as in **hizbān-am* (Parth. 'zb'n, NP. *zabān*) or **hizbāka-* (Oss. *ævzag*, *yvzag*).

Since it so happens that in the Gathas only the oblique cases are used, the nom. and acc. sg. *hizva* and *hizvaqm* are only attested in Later Avestan. For these two forms Bartholomae 1904, 1816 posited a feminine word *hizvā-* (but with some hesitation, see 563 n. 1). Benveniste 1954,31 followed him in this respect: "Il est même probable que la finale **wā* propre à la plupart des formes indo-européennes de ce mot (lat. *lingua*, arm. *lezu*, etc.) est une féminisation en *-ā* du thème en *-ū*". (The text has *-u* for *-ū*, which is a misprint). This explanation, which Benveniste apparently put forward with some diffidence, cannot be correct, first, because an enlargement *hizū-ā-* would have been represented in Gatha-Avestan by a trisyllabic form **hizu'ā-* (which, as we shall see, is ruled out by the evidence) and, secondly, because LAv. *hizvā-* is, just like *hizū-*, masculine. Cf. Y. 62.4 *xšviθrēm hizvaqm* "a quick tongue" and 49.4 *x^vāiš hizubiš* "with their own tongues". The "féminisation" of Ved. *jihvā-* can, indeed, be shown to have a different origin.

In assuming a PIE. stem in *-ū-*, Benveniste disregarded Bartholomae's earlier view, published nine years before (1895,230), according to which LAv. *hizva*, *hizvaqm*, instr. *hizva* and gen. *hizvō*

belonged to one paradigm, and also the analogous interpretation of these forms (K. 1942, 16) as reflecting a PIE. hysterodynamic inflection: nom. $*(s)ig̃hwéH_2$, acc. $*(s)ig̃hwéH_2m$, instr. $*(s)ig̃huH_2é$, gen. $*(s)ig̃huH_2és$. This prototype allows us to reconstruct the Gathic inflection of this word as follows: nom. sg. $*[hizvā]$, acc. $*[hizva'am]$, instr. $[hizu'ā]$, gen. $[hizu'ah, hizu'as-]$, instr. pl. $[hizūbiš]$. In Vedic Sanskrit the nom. and acc. sg. gave rise to an \bar{a} -inflection, just as in *medhā-* and *śraddhā-* (see IIJ. 18, p. 29), which involved a change of gender. A last trace of the older inflection seems to have been preserved in RS. VI.16.2 *sá no mandrábhīr adhvaré jīhvābhīr yajā mahāh*, where $[jihuābhīr]$ may be due to the analogy of the older instr. sg. $*jīhvā$ $[jīhūā]$. The instr. sg. and pl. have often analogically worked upon each other (cf. IIJ. 10, p. 114).

Apparently it has never been observed that, although the nom. sg. $*[hizvā]$ is not attested in the Gathas, the full grade of the stem actually occurs in the disyllabic form *hizvā* in *hizvā uxđāiš*, quoted above. The consistent occurrence of a hiatus wherever there had been (or still was!) a laryngeal between two vowels prevents our taking *hizvā* as an instrumental. Therefore, *hizvā uxđāiš* must be a compound (lit. "tongue-words") with the full grade stem of the first member. The closest parallel is OP. *haxā-mani-* "Achaemenes", which, however, has the nominative *haxā-* (LAv. *haxa*, Ved. *sákhā*) as its first member. A dialectal variant of *hizvā.uxđā-*, with the normal zero grade of the stem, is LAv. *hizuxđā-* (from $*hizū-uxđā-$), which will be discussed below. At 51.3 the two members of the compound are split by the caesura, just as in 48.6 *hu/šōiθemā*. As for 46.15 *vī/cayathā*, the place of the so-called verbal prefix *vī*, before the caesura, is unusual but it is a separate word.

The idiomatic phrase "to speak with the tongue" is well known from the Avesta, cf. 31.3 *taṭ nē mazdā vīdvanōi vaocā/hizvā θbahyā āyjhō* "Tell us that, O Wise One, with the tongue of thy mouth so that we may know", Aog. 26f. *hizva mrūidi hūxtəm ... zastaēibyō varəza hvarštəm šyaobnəm* "speak a well-spoken (word) with thy tongue, ... perform a well-done deed with thy hands". The opposition of word and deed is so natural that it can arise anywhere. With 48.4 *šyaobanācā vacayhācā*, 53.1 *uxđā šyaobanācā* cf. e.g. in the Old Saxon Heliand 2612 *uuordo endi uuerco* (etc.), 5289 *uuord endi dādi*, Old Engl. Bēowulf 289 *worda ond worca* (Sievers 1878, 465). For the triad "thought, word, action" see Schlerath 1974, 201–221. In view, however, of the conclusions which some scholars have drawn from the phrase "speaking with the tongue" (e.g. Nyberg 1937, 184) it may be useful to stress its traditional character. It can be placed in a wider context of

Indo-European poetic phrases, although there is no reason to explain them as traces of Proto-Indo-European poetic language. Rüdiger Schmitt, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit* (1967), has rightly ignored them. The use of the instrumental in this type of expressions was noted by Delbrück, 1867, 58f. In the following list only a few illustrative examples are quoted:

a) "to speak with the tongue/mouth": RS. VI.59.6 *jihváyā vāvadac cārat*, AS. I.10.3 *yád uvákthā 'nrtam jihváyā vṛjinám bahú*, VIII.2.3 *váda jihváyā 'lapan*, Hēliand 818 *mid is mūdu gimēnian* (M., *gimahlean mid is mūdu C.*), 830 *gimēnda mid is mūthu*, 1760–61 *that hie simla mid is uuordu gisprikid/man mid is mūdu*.

b) "to act with his hands": 33.2 *zastōibyā vā varəšaiti*, 47.2 *zastōibyā šyaobanā vərəzyaṭ*, LAv. P28 *zastayasca varšti* (etc.), Hēl. 3608 *thena the sie mid is handun giscop*, 5508f. (5506f.) *uuirkian mid iro handon*, Gen. 35 *habda im mið is handun haramuwerk mikil/uuamdādiun giuuarakt*. Cf. Old English *hondum gewyrcean*, *folme wyrcean* (Sievers 1878, 434).

c) "to see with the eyes": 32.10 *yē acištəm vaēnarihē aogədā, gəm ašibyā hvarēcā* (cf. 45.8 *nū ziṭ cašmaini vyādarəšəm*), RS. I.89.8 *bhadrām pašyemā 'kšābhiḥ*, 128.3 *śatām cākṣāṇo akṣābhiḥ*, Hom. *Γ* 28 *ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδὼν*, 169 *ἰδὼν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν*, P 646 *ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι*, Hāvamāl 7 *eyrom hlýðer, en augom skoðar*, Hēl. 476 *thes hie ina mid is ōgun gisah*, 4129f. *quāthun that sia quican sāuwun*, *thena erl mid iro ōgun*, Bēowulf 1781 *ēagum starige*, 1935 *ēagum starede* (Gen. 820 *mīnum ēagum geseah*), Serbian (*i ušima jeku poslušati*) *i očima seir pogledati* (Kravcov 1933, 158), Lith. *akim's matyti* (Delbrück 1867, 59).

d) "to hear with the ears": 30.2 *sraotā gēuš.āiṣ vahištā*, RS. I.89.8 *bhadrām kārnebhiḥ śṛṇuyāma devā* (*bhadrām pašyemā 'kšābhīr yajatrāḥ*), Hom. M 442 *οἷ δ' οὔασι πάντες ἀκονον*, Cato, *De re rustica* 157,16 *auribus si parum audies*, Hāvamāl 7 *eyrom hlýðer*, Hēl. 2608f. *eftha gihōrean mugi*, *erl mid is ōrun*. Cf. Old Engl. *mid earum gehýran* (Sievers 1878, 425).

A confirmation of this interpretation of *hizvā.uxdāiṣ* can be seen in the parallel formation *xšmā.uxdāiṣ*. It occurs at 43.11c

hyaṭ xšmā uxdāiṣ didaiḥē paourvīm

which line also seems to contain two instrumentals.

Attempts at a literal rendering resulted in such awkward translations as "als ich zuerst von euch in euren Sprüchen unterwiesen wurde" (Bartholomae 1904 and 1905, similarly Wilkins Smith 1929, Markwart 1930, Nyberg 1937). Others had recourse to a free

translation, such as "wenn ich durch Aussprüche von euch ... erfahre" (Humbach 1959) or simply "by your words (Lommel 1934, Barr 1954) or even omitted "words" (Lommel 1971). Insler has drawn the obviously correct conclusion that *xšmā uxδāiš* is a compound, comparable to 44.10 *θβā.īštiš* "dein Gut" (Bartholomae), "deine Wünsche" (Lommel) or "thy powers" (Insler), 29.11 *āhmā.rātōiš* "our gift", YH. 40.3 *āhmā.rafaṇaḡhō* "lending us support (?)". Although it would be tempting to take *xšmā-* as the stem form (corresponding to *yusmad-* in ŠB. VIII.3.1.6 *yusmad-devatyā-*), with *-ā* for *-a* at the end of the first member, (cf. Duchesne-Guillemin 1936, 13), nevertheless, in view of *āhmā.rāti-* "durch uns (vollzogene) Beschenkung" (Karl Hoffmann 1961, 51 n. 6), *θβā.īšti-* (Humbach 1956, 80) and OP. *uvāmṛšiyuš*, the first member of which is the instrumental of the Iranian pronominal stem *hva-* (Wackernagel-Debrunner 1930, 478, Meillet-Benveniste 1931, 88, 167, 172, Thieme, KZ. 85,298) *xšmā(.)uxδāiš* must be taken as "words (spoken) by you".

The meaning of LAV. *hizuxda-* must have been identical with that of *hizvā.uxda-*, since a bahuvrihi compound is very unlikely. Unfortunately it occurs only once in a "wertlose Stelle" (Bartholomae 1904, 683, 1815), where it seems to be a misunderstood quotation. The approximate meaning of Yt. 15.40 *yvānō ... yō ... daṅrō dantō hizuxdō* may have been "a wise, learned, ready-tongued husband" (Darmesteter). Cf. Vr. 3.3 *yvānəm uxδō.vacaṅhəm*, F. 3f. *yatha daṅrō uxδō.vacā* (but see Duchesne-Guillemin 1936, 270). As for 45.1 *hizvā* (K4. C1) *āvarētō* (v.l. *āvarētō*, etc.), no suggestion can be made. The reading *hizvā* (Geldner with all other MSS.) must be corrupt (just as in 51.3 *hizvā uxδāiš*). In spite of all that has been written on this passage (e.g. Lommel 1934, 96f., Nyberg 1937, 455, Schaeder 1940, 401 n. 8: "der vermöge übler Wahl als Trughafter durch (seine) Zunge bekannt geworden ist") it remains obscure. The word(s) may be read as [hizvā-āvṛtah] or as [hizu'ā vṛtah]. Since all translations are inevitably vague guesses, Lommel 1971, 124 wisely refrained from suggesting a translation.

4. *tanūm*

It has long been known that the language of Zarathustra's songs contains elements from different dialects. Dialectal differentiation manifests itself in the field of phonology (e.g. representation of consonantal **H* by zero as well as by *i*), morphology and vocabulary, e.g. *hujīti-* "whose way of life is good" beside *hujyāti-* "good way of life" (cf. *dužjyāti-*, *darəgō.jyāti-* and *jyātu-*). An instance of a dialectal form which at the same time was morphologically a new formation is 44.7 *piθrē* "to the father". It must stem from a dialect

which was different from the main dialect that underlies the Gathic *Kunstsprache* as well as from the Later Avestan dialect. Whereas in Gatha-Avestan the weak stem *pt-* without a vowel has been extended to the strong cases, and in the later dialect the distinction between the strong and the weak stem was strictly maintained, *piθrē* must stem from a third dialect in which the *i* of the strong cases was extended to the weak cases.

Another dialectal feature is the acc. sg. *tanūm* in the line 33.10c

vohū uxšyā manayhā xšaθrā ašācā uštā tanūm

Insler takes the last two words as an adverbial form *uštā[na]tanūm* "with respect to body and breath", but an adverbial use of (apparently) a dvandva compound in *-ūm* raises some questions which remain unanswered.

The original inflection of *tanū-*, as is shown by *hizvā-*, may, (or must) have been nom. **tenwéH₂*, acc. **tenwéH₂-m*, dat. **tenuH₂-éi* gen. **tenuH₂-és*. The general tendency in the IE. languages has been to replace **-wéH₂-* by *-uH₂-* of the weak cases but it is difficult to determine at what time this normalization has taken place. On the one hand such cases as Ved. *śvaśrúh*, Latin *socrus* and OChSl. *svekry* may lead to the conclusion that this was an innovation dating back to Proto-Indo-European. On the other hand Avestan *hizvā* shows that one should not project too lightly stems in *-ū-* (as in *hizubīš*, OChSl. *językŭ*) back into the PIE. prehistory and assume a PIE. inflection of the type nom. sg. **-ū-s*.

Anyway, at a certain time, probably (but not certainly) in Proto-Indo-Iranian, the inflection had become nom. **tanúH-s*, acc. **tanúH-am*, dat. **tanúH-ai*, gen. **tanúH-as*, with generalization of accented **-úH-*. The sigmatic nominative must be analogical, since in the older type of inflection, as preserved in LAv. *hizva*, the nominative was still asigmatic. The Gathic forms are in perfect agreement with the prehistoric paradigm reconstructed above: acc. sg. 46.8 *tanvēm* [tanu'am], dat. 30.2 *tanuyē* [tanu'ai], gen. 53.9 (*pəsō*.)*tanvō* [-tanu'ah], 33.14 *tanvas-* [tanu'as-]. As for 53.6c *drūjō āyesē hōiš piθā tanvō parā*/, the metrical pattern (13 + 7 + 5 instead of 7/8 + 7 + 5) is quite irregular. A similar irregularity at 8c (12 + 7 + 5) may be due to the interpolation of a gloss. At 6c Nyberg 1937, 450 deletes the first two words *drūjō āyesē*. Anyway, Bartholomae's interpretation (1886, 153; 1904, 906, 1808), which implies a disyllabic *tanvō* has rightly been rejected by later scholars. See also Geldner 1887, 410, etc. In the Rigveda, too, the corresponding forms are still trisyllabic (apart from a few exceptions in late hymns): nom. *tanúh*, acc. *tanvām* [tanúam], dat. *tanvè* [tanúe], gen. *tanvāh* [tanúah]. Still, the fact that **-aHa-* is only in a

minority of cases represented by a disyllabic *-ā-* and that **huHay-* has become *hway-* (with only two exceptions) shows that the preservation of disyllabic [ua] in [tanúah] etc. must be due to the morpheme boundary. In post-Rigvedic poetry it soon became [va].

The main problem is, however, when **tanúHs* became *tanūs*. It must be borne in mind that in Indo-Aryan the **H* in word-final position was dropped late enough for allowing **náma-H* to arise in analogy to **bhári-H*, **purú-H*, but early enough for *vāji* to adopt the prevocalic shortening of *devi* in [devi etu] (K. 1961, 17). Before consonants, **-uH-* survived for some time in Proto-Indo-Iranian and, perhaps, in Proto-Indo-Aryan. Such cases of so-called compositional shortening as RS. *súṣuti-* "easy birth" (against *súti-* "parturition, delivery") can only be explained by the loss of a laryngeal phoneme at the prehistoric stage **sú-šuHti-*. The different explanation proposed by H. Rix 1972, 186 disregards, I am afraid, the total Vedic evidence of which it is part. A similar loss in composition is well known from other languages. In Danish the *stød* is not pronounced in compounds, and in those Munda languages which have a glottal stop in their phonemic inventory, it also disappears in compounds (K. 1961, 30). Since, then, Skt *pūtá-* "pure" must have been **puHtá-* in prehistoric times, the possibility that Finnish *puhdas* "pure" is a loan-word which preserves a trace of **puHta-* (Tryggve Sköld 1959, 37–42) is of particular interest.

In the light of these considerations the form *tanūm* gives some valuable information. As the metre shows, it is not merely a LAV. spelling that has intruded into the Gathas, as in the case of 31.6,8, 34.6, 46.19 *haiṭim* beside 34.15 *haiṭyēm*, 50.6 *raiṭim* for **raiṭyam* [**raiṭi'am*], 53.5 *ainīm* beside 34.7, 46.7 *anyēm*, or 29.8 *aēm* beside 44.12 *ayēm*. Whereas *ainīm* and *aēm*, in spite of their divergent spelling, must stand for [anyam] and [ayam], *tanūm* cannot be a later spelling for *tanvēm* but must be read as [tanūm]. This form cannot be the result of a phonetic development of [tanu'am] but represents a morphological new formation. This points to two conclusions. First, the substitution of an accusative [tanūm] for [tanu'am] was tantamount to a change from the inflection of a consonant stem in *-H-* to that of a vowel stem in *-ū-*. This change can only have been due to the analogy of the *u*-stems, e.g. *xratuš*, acc. *xratum*. Therefore, [tanūm] could not emerge and take the place of [tanu'am] before the nom. sg. **tanuHs* had become *tanūs*. Secondly, in the Vedic language *tanūm* did not arise before the Atharvaveda and the Vājasaneyisaṃhitā but in the synchronic system of the Gathic language *tanūm* and *tanvēm* existed side by side. Like 44.7 *piṭrē* and 53.4 *ḡḡrōi*, they point to two different dialects underlying Zarathustra's language.

5. *xšma-*

For the oblique cases of the pronoun for "you" (plural) Later Avestan and the language of the Yasna Haptanḥāiti have, apart from the atonic forms, only one stem *yūšma-*. The Gathas differ significantly from both LAv. and the YH. in that they have two stems with the same function: *xšma-* and *yūšma-*. The only instance of *xšma-* in Later Avestan, viz. Y. 20.3 *xšmāvōya*, occurs in a commentary on the *Ašəm vohū* prayer (Y. 27.14) and shows the regular transposition of GAv. *xšmaibyā* into [xšmaβya]. Cf. LAv. *māvōya* as against GAv. *maibyā-*. In the Gathas we find 21 forms with *xšma-* as against 6 with *yūšma-*, which can be specified as follows: *xšma-* 8, *xšmāka-* 7, *xšmāvant-* 6, and *yūšma-* 2, *yūšmāka-* 3, *yūšmāvant-* 1. It is clear that the latter forms, although the only ones in use in Later Avestan, are comparatively rare in Gathic. They are evenly spread over the Gathas: Y. 29¹ 32¹ 34² 50², which does not differ notably from the occurrences of *xšma-*: 28¹ 29² 33¹ 34⁴ 43¹ 44³ 46³ 49² 50² 51¹ 53¹. Only the places they occupy in a verse show a marked difference: in 5 out of the 6 occurrences *yūšma-* is used as the last word of a hemistich, that is, it is as a rule followed by a pause (#) or a caesura (/) and never occurs at the beginning of a hemistich: 29.11c *ēhmā.rātōiš yūšmāvatqm#*, 34.5b *θrāyōidyāi +drəgūm yūšmākəm#*, 34.7c *naēcīm tēm anyēm yūšmat|*, 50.5b *hyaṭ yūšmākāi|*, 50.7b *vahmahyā yūšmākahyā#*. The only exception is 32.9c [*mazdā*] *ašāicā yūšmaibyā gərəzē#*. In contrast with the three occurrences of *yūšmāka-* just quoted, all before a pause, six of the seven instances of *xšmāka-* are the first word of a hemistich (34.14c, 34.15c, 46.18d, 49.6b, 50.10d, 51.2c), the only exception being 44.17c. Cf. also 29.1c, 53.5b *#xšmaibyā ...* and 46.10d *|xšmāvatqm vahmāi.ā*. On the other hand, the conventions of versification set no limitation to the places where *xšma-* and its derivatives could occur. Thus they are found six times before the caesura or a pause: 44.17b *xšmat|*, 50.5a *xšmā*, 44.17c *xšmākqm*, 33.8b, 34.2c, 44.1b *xšmāvatō*. From these facts it may be concluded that *xšma-* was the common pronoun of the Gathic language, *yūšma-* being rarer and with much more restricted possibilities of employment. It is also clear that the traditional poetic language that Zarathustra used in the Gathas had a composite character. The common pronominal stem being [šma-], the alternative stem [yušma-] must have originated in a different dialect. Both stand for an older pronoun **ušma-*. The variant *yušma-* has an analogical initial *y-* from the nom. pl. *yūš*, *yūžəm*, just as the corresponding Indo-Aryan oblique stem *yusmā-* owes its initial *y-* to the analogy of the nom. *yūyám*. However, as *xšma-* shows, substitution of *yušma-* for **ušma-* was not a common development of Proto-Indo-

Iranian. Old Iranian [šma-] must have evolved directly from *ušma- through elision of *u*-.

It seems not yet to have been noticed that in Indo-Aryan, parallel to the elision of *v* in *kṣip-* from **kṣvip-*, *ṣiti-pád-*, *u* was also elided in similar circumstances, that is, *between* a sibilant and a labial phoneme. It should be noted that this development was entirely different from *-uv->-v-* in compounds (Wackernagel 1896, 59, 321), which, according to Ingrid Kühn 1970, 97, is post-Vedic, and one of the earliest instances of which is (according to Debrunner 1957, 36) PB. I.9.8 *anvā 'si* for TS. *anuvā 'si*.

A clear instance of a Proto-Indo-Aryan (or, at all events, pre-Vedic) elision of *u* in **suv-* is *svásara-*, n. "pasture", which in all its 13 occurrences in the Rigveda has a trisyllabic stem. The contrast with *syoná-* [sioná-] is instructive. This stands for **su-yoná-*, where *u* was not followed by a labial phoneme and therefore remained syllabic, although assimilated to **si-yoná-*. This shows that Renou's obviously correct analysis of *svásara-* as **su-vásara-* requires a specification to the effect that *u* was elided in pre-Vedic times. Other Rigvedic compounds with *su-* do not show traces of this elision because they dated from later times and were still analysable as compounds. Cf., e.g., *su-vájra-* I¹ VII¹, *su-várcas-* I¹ X², *su-vásas-* I¹ III¹ IV¹ X⁴, *su-várṇa-* X¹ as against *s-vásara-* I² II⁴ III² V¹ VI¹ VIII² IX¹. Other cases are doubtful: RS. *smát* (: *sumát*?) and *svádḥiti-* "axe" (but also "knife"!) cannot be explained from **sum-*, **suv-*, and class. Skt. *svarṇa-* "gold" from Ved. *suvárṇa-* (Wackernagel 1896, 59, Mayrhofer 1976, 567) is late. Equally late are ŚB. VI.8.2.3 *srábhīṣṭhe* (for **surábhīṣṭhe*) beside *surabhaú* and *-ṣv-* for *-ṣu-* in JB. II.156 *cukṣvāmsam* "having sneezed" (Debrunner 1957, 36). Such cases seem to have been incidental.

In like manner *u* was sometimes elided *before* a cluster of sibilant plus labial. A possible (but doubtful and late) case for *-uṣv-* is TS. TĀ. *pr̥ṣvā* "a drop of water" for *pr̥uṣvā* (MS. etc.). However, it can be explained in various ways; see Bloomfield-Edgerton 1932, 312 and cf., e.g., Oertel 1926, 241. For *-uśm-*, however, there is the well-known instance of a pre-Vedic loss of initial *u-* in the Rigvedic *hapax legomenon* *śmasi* "we wish" (II.31.6), corresponding to *vaśmi* "I wish" in the following stanza (Geldner). For references to previous discussions see Debrunner 1957, 38 and Mayrhofer 1976, 331. The form *uśmasi*, *uśmāsi*, with analogical restoration of *u-* (in *uśanti*, etc.), is, apart from a single occurrence in a family book (V.74.3), only attested in later books: I⁷ VIII² IX² X⁴. Probably, therefore, *śmasi* represents the genuine phonetic development of *uśm-* in the pre-Vedic language.

In a similar manner **ušma-* has become **šma-* in Iranian (Meillet, *MSL*. 22, p. 140f., Wackernagel-Debrunner 1930, 467). The modern dialects do not give any clue to the provenance of Gathic *xšma-* and *yūšma-*. According to D. I. Èdel'man 1968, 87 the shorter form **šma-* is common in all the West Iranian languages (Pahlavi *šmāk*, Persian *šumā*, Tajiki *šumo*, W. Baluchi *šumā*, *šmā*, E. Baluchi *šawā*, *šā*), in East Iranian in all the "smaller languages and dialects", and in NE. Iranian: Oss. *smax*, *symax*, Yaghnobi *šumōx*. So Gathic and LAv. *yūšma-* represent special East-Iranian developments from **ušma-*. Again, Gathic *xšma-* and *yūšma-* point to two different dialects underlying Zarathustra's language. In view, however, of what has become known about the dialectal components of the Gathic language, and because Later Avestan is definitely not a later stage of development of Gathic, there is no reason to assume that the source of LAv. *yūšma-* was necessarily identical with that of the Gathic form.

In conclusion a passing reference may be made to Pagliaro's explanation (1954, 155) of Av. *spāda-* "army" from **(u)zvāda-* "defence", Av. *spāma-* "saliva, etc." from **(u)zvāma-*, and of Av. *spā-*, OP. *sā-* "to throw" from **(u)zvāy-*. Elision of *u* in **uzv-* (from **uts-v-*) would be entirely in line with that in **ušma-* but one would expect **zv-* to have developed in the regular way into *zb-*, not *sp-*. Since *uz-* (not *us-*) is required before the sonant *v*, the development **zv->sp-* is hard to account for phonetically.

6. *dužazōbā*

In IIJ. 15, p. 194ff. it has been argued that 46.4 *dužazōbā* must have been [dužzu'āh] in Zarathustra's language. Insler 1975, 265f. rejects this for three reasons.

First, **zuvā-* (= **zuHā-*) becomes according to him *-zvā-* and never *zbā-*. As we saw on p. 13, this rule is at variance with the facts. His second argument is that a svarabhakti vowel never appears between two sibilants. However, although it may be readily admitted that no conclusion can be drawn from the readings *dužzō.bā*, *duždōbā* (*duždō.bā*), this theory is refuted by 31.4 *išasā*, 32.13 *hišasaṭ*, 50.2 *išasoṭ* and 51.19 *išasqš*, which are commonly taken to stand for [išsā], [hišsat], [išsait] and [išsas]. See also Insler 1975, 16 (and 161, 182, 206, 303, 321). As for my objection to the assumption of a Gathic root noun *ā-zbā-* on the basis of classical Sanskrit *āhvā-* (Suśruta), I fail to see that a reference to *zbāta-* "called" (a new formation for **zūta-*, Ved. *hūtá-*) justifies the theory that a root noun **ā-zū-* (corresponding to the Rigvedic hapax legomenon *āhū-*) has secondarily been transformed into *-āzbā-*

(as seems to be implied). Cf. YH. *yavaēsū-*, LAv. *zavanō.sū-*. Av. *zbātar-* is of course quite regular, cf. JB. I.356 *abhi-hvāt-*.

Apart from these remarks, it must be stated that if we should assume that **-azbā-* was the older reading of *-azōbā-* (thereby disregarding *dužzō.bā*), and if we should take **-azbā-* as standing for **-āzbā-* (although in word-medial position *a* for *ā* is rare in the Gathas), and if, finally, we should posit, in spite of the scanty evidence (see *IJJ.* 15, p. 197 n. 11), a Proto-Indo-Iranian noun inflection nom. **(ā)-žhvāH-(s)*, acc. **(ā)-žhvāH-am*, gen. **(ā)-žhuH-ās*, the real problem would be: Is it probable that a Proto-Indo-Iranian root noun in *-ā-* as the second member of a bahuvrihi compound is inflected according to the root inflection? In Later Avestan such compounds have normal masculine stems in *-a-*; cf. Yt. 10.70 *ayaṇhō.jya-*, 10.30 *sraogəna-*, possibly also YH. *paiti.vyāda* (Y. 38.5 *apascā . . . paiti.vyādā* is ambiguous). In the Rigveda the determinative compound *gopā-* retains its root inflection in the bahuvrihis *su-gopāh*, *āhi-gopāh*, *indra-gopāh*, etc., whereas *bahu-prajāh*, *su-prajāh* are analogical (Wackernagel-Debrunner 1930, 127). So the only Rigvedic instance is, it seems, *parama-jyā* (VIII²) "von höchster Gewalt", a bahuvrihi (cf. ŚB. *jyā-*, Debrunner 1954, 37) but a late formation on account of its accent; cf. RS.X.91.2 *darśata-śrī-* (Wackernagel 1905, 301). Therefore, the assumption of an Old Iranian bahuvrihi **duž-āzvā-* with root inflection (nom. sg. **dužāzvāh*) is not sufficiently supported by the Old Indian and Old Iranian evidence. On the other hand, none of the three arguments quoted prove that the interpretation as [dužzu'āh] is impossible or improbable. It would seem the only natural explanation. As a consequence, the translation "difficult to challenge" must be given up, as it is based on a Rigvedic connotation of *ā hvayati* "to invoke, invite".

Still, this does not solve the problem of *dužazōbā* beyond doubt as there remains a difficulty which will be discussed in the next item.

7. *darəgāyū*

In my discussion of *dužazōbā* I assumed too rashly, on the sole evidence of [dužzu'āh] (see *IJJ.* 15, p. 199), that the loss of **H* in composition was a specifically Indo-Aryan development, which had not taken place in Iranian. In doing so I overlooked an old note of mine on *darəgāyū*, Beekes's discussion (1967, 242ff.) of possible instances of a similar loss in Greek and Latin and Rix's criticisms (1972, 186). As far as I can see, nothing in the Vedic evidence points to a Proto-Indo-European origin but on the other hand the loss of **H* turns out to have been (at least in part) a common Indo-Iranian development.

The adjective *darəgāyu-* occurs once at 28.6a

vohū gaidī manahā dāidī ašā dā darəgāyū

"Come with good thinking, give with Aša a lasting gift"

which must obviously be read

[*vahū gadi manahā dādi rtā da'ah dargāyu*].

It may be noted in passing that in this "conservative" transcription the instrumental endings are written as long vowels as there is no positive proof for [-uH, -aH]. The transcription yields a normal verse of 7+9 syllables. Since, however, the PIE. reconstruction of *āyu* is **H₂óyu*, we are led to the conclusion that in the compound *darga-āyu-* the **H* had disappeared, just as in the Vedic cases of compositional shortening referred to above (p. 18). The possibility of reading [darga'āyu] can be ruled out because this would result in a hypersyllabic verse of 7+10 syllables, for which no parallel can be found (see *Unvala Memorial Volume* 1964, 85). Neither a philological, nor a linguistic approach must ignore the number of syllables (Lommel 1938, 257). The possibility of hypersyllabic and defective verses (Duchesne-Guillemin 1962, 9, Lentz 1967, 212) cannot be questioned but it should not be treated as an abstract problem. The first hemistich of the verses of the Uštavaitī Gāthā (43-46) and the Spēntā.mainyū Gāthā (47-50), where four syllables are required, is handled with some freedom. In the first Gatha, verses of 3+7 instead of 4+7 syllables are not unfrequent (44.3d, 4d, 45.3d, 8b, 46.1e, 3e, 6b, 9b), whereas in the second Gatha hypersyllabic verses of 5+7 syllables (but also lines of 5+6 syllables, Lommel 1935, 128) occur, especially in Y.48. In contrast with these shorter verses the metre of the Ahunavaitī Gāthā is much more stable: exceptions to the rule of 7+9/8 syllables are rare. As for YH. 41.4 *darəgāyāu* it does not allow, as far as I can see, a certain conclusion (in spite of Baunack 1888, 398, 417).

A second instance that must be mentioned in this connection is 29.8 *carəkərəθrā* "hymns of praise", in which Andreas-Wackernagel 1913, 374 recognized the Iranian counterpart to Rigvedic *carkṛti-* "fame" (V.74.9, VI.48.21). The latter word has, ever since 1892, been contrasted with the non-reduplicated word *kṛti-* "fame" (J. Schmidt 1892, 379f.). Gathic *carəkərəθra-* is a verbal noun to LAv. *carəkərəmahī* "we commemorate", just as RS. *carkṛti-* belongs to *carkarmi* "I praise" (imper. *carkṛtāt*, AS. *carkṛdhi*). In this reduplicated present **H* may have been lost in the Proto-Indo-Iranian period. Cf. Ved. *dadmasi*, *dadhmasi* as against perf. *dadhimá* (which can easily be explained from the secondary expansion of -i- in the perfect system). There remains, however, the difficulty,

that in RS. *jōhavīmi* (*hū-*), *dodhavīti* (*dhū-*) a long *i* (due to the preceding *v*) seems to have been preserved and even to have been analogically extended to such cases as RS. *cākašīmi*. Therefore, Helmut Rix's objection that in the intensive formation the distinction between *seṭ-* and *aniṭ-* roots has to a large extent been obliterated and that the loss of **H* in *carkṛti-* is morphologically conditioned (1972, 186) deserves serious consideration. On the other hand, in this very case it cannot be doubted that *carkarmi* stems from Proto-Indo-Iranian, which makes the assumption of a secondary morphological adaptation less plausible. As for *jōhavīmi* etc., the formation of the Vedic intensives is a very intricate problem, cf. *vari-var(t)-ti* beside *vār-var(t)-ti*, *ganī-gan-ti* beside *jan-gam-* (in Up. *jan-gama-*) and on the other hand *dar-darī-mi* beside *dār-dar-ṣi*. I therefore consider *carkarmi* with due caution as an instance of phonetic loss of **H*, which must be dated back to Proto-Indo-Iranian.

A third instance may be the proper name *Spitāma-*, but it presents many difficulties. We can pass over Lommel's theory of an ancient octosyllabic formula **spita-amō zaraθuštrō* because it was based on material from LAv. texts. See Duchesne-Guillemin 1936, 167f., who however read [spita-ama-] at Aog. 51 (*JAs.* 1936, 249). In the Gathas the name occurs 8 times with a trisyllabic stem (written *spitama-* or *spitāma-*). As for 51.11a *kē urvaθō spitamāi/zaraθuštrāi nā mazdā*, the verse, as it stands, is metrically defective. Reading *kē vā* for *kē* (Bartholomae 1879, 61) can only be taken into consideration as a last resource. The assumption of a disyllabic ending *-āi* finds little support in the evidence (*IIJ.* 8, 98), whereas the possibility of reading [kah rvaθah svita'amāi] can be ignored. The name does not look like a "Kurznamē" (Justi) and Σπιταμένης can represent an Iranian patronymic **spitāma-na-*; cf. Ossetic *Sidæmon*, a legendary name (Abaev, *Arch. Or.* 24, 51). If it is not a "Kurznamē", it may be a compound (like *Aršāma-*, Andreas-Wackernagel 1931, 323), which can only be analysed as **svita-ama-*. If so, Lommel's interpretation "der lichte Kraft hat", although semantically anything but plausible, is a possibility that cannot be ignored. (See now also Mayrhofer 1977, 77). In spite of Frisk 1970, 388, Ved. *āma-* "impetuosity" is probably etymologically connected with Greek ὄμωμι (see Leumann 1950, 91). If so, the Attic reduplication in Aesch. ὁμώμοται, Cret. ὁμωμόκαμες induces us to posit a proto-form **H₃ómH₃o-* for *āma-* (Beekes 1969, 131). If all these assumptions are correct, it may be concluded that the trisyllabic character of *spitāma-*, in contrast with the four-syllabic *vīštāspa-* [višta-aspa-], is quite in line with the general tendency in Vedic (Wackernagel 1896, 315), in other words, that no trace

of **H* is left. On the other hand, if one assumes dissimilation, the name **spita-(ta)ma-* (cf. Ved. *gótama-*, also Av. *gaotēma-*?) would offer no difficulties.

Loss of **H* in a derivative is possible in [hvan-] by the side of [hu'ar] "sun" in *x^vēnvat-*, cf. 32.2b *xšaθrāt hacā paitī.mraot/ašā huš.haxā x^vēnvātā* [xšaθrāt hacā pati mraut/rtā huš(h)axā hvanvatā] cf. 53.4c *ašāunī ašavabyō/manaṇhō vaṇhēuš x^vēnvat/hayhuš mēm bēaduš* [rtāvnī rtavabyah/manahah vahauš hvanvat/hahuš mēm? baduš?]. In contrast to *x^vēnvat-*, the gen. sg. *x^vēng* "of the sun" is only attested in two passages where the metre requires a disyllabic form, accordingly [hu'ah]: cf. 44.3c *kasnā x^vēng/starēm-cā-dāt advānēm* [kas nā hu'ah/staram ca dāt advānam] and 50.10c *raocā x^vēng/asnqm uxšā aēuruš* [raucāh hu'ah/asnaam uxšā airuš?]. The differentiation between *hv* and *x^v* must be post-Zarathustrian (cf. *hvarē* for [hvar] and [hu'ar], p. 10 and see p. 36) but this does not explain why *x^vēng* is written instead of **hvēng*.

If the conclusion is correct that **H* was lost in compounds as early as Proto-Indo-Iranian, it follows that we must read *dužazōbā* as [dužzuāh]. Without the intervocalic ['] it may still have been trisyllabic in Zarathustra's language – that is, [ua] (coinciding with the second stage assumed above, p. 9) may have been preserved. An instance of disyllabic [ua] without ['] is *spēn* in 45.9b *yē nē usēn/cōrēt spēncā aspēncā* [yah nah usan/cart suan ca asvan ca]. As is apparent from Ved. *śunā-* "fortune" and *ducchīnā-* "misfortune" we must read [suan] without ['], whereas in the compound and in the derivative (Nyberg 1937, 102) *spēnta-*, *spanyah-* it is [svan-], although the rationale of *ua > va* is not clear. The etymological connection with Ved. *svāntā-* should be given up.

On the other hand, there is no reason why we should reconsider the explanation of *hizvā uxδāiš* and take *hizvā* as the instrumental with loss of ['] in composition. The main objection to such an interpretation would be that compounds consisting of the instrumental of a substantive plus a substantive are extremely rare. The only Vedic instance is apparently the *hapax legomenon* *vācā-stena-* "sorcerer (?)", see *IJJ.* 2, 307. The explanation given above (p. 14) must therefore be maintained.

8. *āvarənā*

This *hapax legomenon* occurs in the well-known passage 30.2–3:

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|--|
| (2) | <i>sraotā +gēuš.āiš vahištā</i> | <i>avaēnatā sūcā manaṇhā</i> |
| | <i>āvarənā viciθahyā</i> | <i>narēm narēm x^vašyāi tanuyē</i> |
| | <i>parā mazē yāṇhō</i> | <i>ahmāi nē sazdyāi baodantō paitī</i> |

- (3) *aṭ tā mainyū paouruyē yā yēmā +xʷafnā asrūtəm*
manahicā vacahicā šyaobanōi hī vahyō akəmcā . . .
 "Hear with (your) ears the best things, contemplate (them) with a pure mind, and also the two parties (?) between which one must discern, man by man for himself, before the great Test (?) . . . And (also) those two spirits in the beginning (?) . . . that which is good in thought, word and action and that which is bad".

These verses have been commented upon innumerable times, from the beginning of Avestan studies in the western world. Here only a few points will be touched upon.

As regards the syntactic construction we may start from Bartholomae's statement that only enclitic accusative forms of *hi-* occur (1886, 121; 1904, 1780 n. 8; 1905, 17). Almost all modern translators disregard this difficulty (but see Lentz 1962, 132). Still, although Zarathustra seemingly left out the transitive verb, the construction must have been sufficiently clear to his listeners. A second point that should be considered is the word *āvarəna*. First, it is a *hapax legomenon*, against five occurrences of *varana-/varəna-* [varna-] and one of *dužvarəna-*. Second, the category of nouns in *-na-*, no longer productive in Vedic (*praśná-*, *yajñá-*, *svápna-*, Lindner 1878, 86f., Debrunner 1954, 732f.), has only a few specifically Iranian formations (*varəna-*, *vasna-*, *varšna-*, etc.), very rarely composed with a verbal prefix: 30.7c *ādānāiš*, LAv. *vyāxana-* [vi-yāxna-]. Third, a verb *ā-var-* from which *āvarəna-* might have been derived, is not attested (see p. 16, but cf. Humbach 1959b, 20). As for the manuscripts, the Pahlavi Yasnas (J2. Pt4. Mf1.) read *āuuarəna*, whereas the Vendidad sades are divided: *āuuarəna* (Jp1. K4.) against *āuuarəna* (Mf2. Bbl. S2.). Since the variant reading *āuuarə na* (in K5. altered into *ā varə na*) may be due to a reminiscence of 29.11c *nū na avarə*, it is not recommendable to adopt *āvarə na* as the correct reading (Nyberg 1937, 221, 461, cf. Westergaard). First, it implies a sandhi contraction of *ā avarə*, which is very rare in the Gathas and, secondly, *na* would be the third word of the sentence, whereas it is always the second (29.11c, 33.7c, 34.7c.8a.12c, 43.3b.10c, 46.18c, 50.5d). Although none of the linguistic arguments is decisive, the existence of a word *āvarəna-* by the side of *varəna-* yet remains doubtful.

The verb *vaēnaiti* is used with reference to Ahura Mazdā's looking upon his creation (31.13 *aibi.vāēnahi*) and his creatures with their complaints (46.2 *ā iṭ avaēnā ahurā*), as well as of men looking with their eyes (*ašibiyā*) at such sacred objects as the cow and the sun (32.10 *gəm . . . hvarəcā*). This is also the connotation

of *avaēnatā* in 30.2. If, for the reasons summed up above, we read

[*sravuta garušāiš vahištā ā vainata sucā manahā*
ā varnā(u) viciθahya . . .]

it is clear that *ā* may be a repetition of the preverb of the type that is well known both from the Veda and the Gathas. Cf. 33.7 *ā mā (ā)idūm vahištā/ā xvaithyācā mazdā darəšaŋcā* "Come hither to me, ye best ones. Hither, both personally and boldly (?)". If so, *varənā viciθahyā* is a second object of [*ā vainata*] and this gives a satisfactory explanation of 3ab: only the assumption of one syntactical structure which runs from 2a to 3b allows us to account for *hī* in 3b (but see Lentz, l.c.). For an analogous construction cf. 43.2a, where *aŋcā* seems to continue, after an interruption in 1de, the sentence *təvišim . . . vasəmi* of 1c (Insler). In quite the same manner 30.3a *aŋ tā mainyū* may be taken to continue 2ab [*ā vainata . . . ā varnā . . .*]: "Hear with your ears the best things, contemplate (them) with a pure mind, and also the two parties (?), between which you have to discern . . . and further those two spirits in the beginning (?) . . . the good and the bad in thought, word and action".

As a consequence of this syntactical analysis (*ā*)*varənā*, traditionally taken as a gen. dual, must be an acc. dual. This was, indeed, already implied by the translations of Andreas 1909, Duchesne-Guillemin 1948, Humbach 1959, Lommel 1971 and Insler 1975, and explicitly stated by Tavadia 1952, 89, Hinz 1961, 209. The assumption of an archaic ending *-ā* for the gen. dual (as against the normal ending *-ayā* in 31.2 *qsayā*, 31.19 *raŋayā*, 33.9 *sarəidyayā*) is not supported by 30.3 *ās-cā* (Lichterbeck 1893, 208 n. 1) but has been defended by a reference to Old Church Slavonic *vŕku* (: *toju*). The Gathic ending for the acc. du. m., however, is always *-ā*: 30.3 *yēmā*, 44.15 *spādā*, 51.12 *vāzā*, 30.3-4 *tā*. LAV. *-ā* (from **-āu*), attested in Yt. 8.22 *tā yūidyathō* (beside *tāciŋ*), 13.78 *tā hē taurvayatəm ŋbaēšā*, Frahang i oīm 39 *arəθnā*, is too weak a basis for the assumption of a dialectal ending *-ā* beside *-ā* in Gathic. Thus (*ā*)*varənā* (v.l. *āvarənā*) must be due to the usual confusion between final *-ā* and *-ā*. Cf. *hizvā/hizvā* (45.1, 51.3), etc.

In passing it may be noted that [*varna-*] in this passage and in 49.4ab

aŋcā ahmāi varənāi mazdā nidātəm
ašəm sūidyāi ŋkaēšāi rāšayerŋhē druxš

"But it has been decided for this *varna*, O Wise One, that *aša* is to be saved, (but) for the (false) profession that *druj* is to be destroyed(?)".

is strongly reminiscent of Vedic *várṇa-*, which denotes the two cosmic moieties, as represented by the two social groups (RS. II.12.4 *dāsa- várṇa-*, III.34.9 *ārya- várṇa-*, I.179.6 *ubhaú várṇau*), their divine counterparts, namely the Asuras and Devas (TB. I.2.6.7, KS. 34.2: 36,20, AB. VI.36.14), and finally the opposition of day and night, e.g. Kāth. S. 9.11 (112, 18ff.) *ahnā devān asrjata, te śuklaṁ varṇam apuṣyan, rātryā 'surāms, te kṛṣṇā abhavan* "In the day-time he created the Devas: they fostered the light *várṇa*; at night, the Asuras: they became black" (cf. MS. I.9.3: p. 132, 14ff.). Note especially Vāj. S. 4.2 (etc.) *bhadrām varṇam pūṣyan* "fostering the good *varṇa*" and ŚB. III.1.2.20 (K. 1969-70, 281f.). Is there sufficient reason for distinguishing two different words [varṇa-]? This would anyway be an *ultimum refugium*, since the two words would semantically be very close to each other. There is, however, an appreciable difference between, on the one hand, the two *varnas*, almost cosmic entities, between which every man has to "discern" for himself and, on the other hand, the many *varnas* of an individual, which stand on a line with his pleasures and desires, as in 48.4 *ahyā zaošōng uštiš varənōng hacaitē* "he follows his pleasures, his desires and his preferences" (Insler) or 45.2

<i>nōiṭ nā manā</i>	<i>nōiṭ sōnghā nōiṭ xratavō</i>
<i>naēdā varanā</i> (pl.)	<i>nōiṭ uxδā naēdā šyaobanā</i>
<i>nōiṭ daēnā</i>	<i>nōiṭ urvqnō hacaiṇtē.</i>

Pahlavi *varan* "Gelüst" (Armenian *varan* "Angst, Erregung"), from **varana-* (Nyberg), is not the same word but it can illustrate the semantic development of a word for "choice". Thus 53.9 *dužvarəna-* is one who has an *aka-varana-* "a bad preference" (45.1). Cf. 49.11 *duždaēna-*, etc.

That the question of whether [varṇa-] is one word or two is relevant is apparent from such definitions of its meaning as "Überzeugung, Glaube, Glaubensbekenntnis" (Bartholomae 1904, 1371) and "die durch Willensentschluss und entscheidendes Urteil ergriffene Parteinahme" (Lommel 1930, 158). They disregard that man follows his *varnas* (48.4), which cannot mean that he follows his "confessions of faith" or his "Parteinahmen". Although it is no doubt possible to find a definition general enough to cover the various usages of [varṇa-], still it may be wondered whether there is a historical link between the two *varnas* of 30.2 (and 49.3?) and the *ubhaú várṇau* of Vedic cosmology. *Non liquet*.

In this connection the translation of *avaēnatā sūcā manayhā* as "contemplate with a pure mind" requires some comment. The first thing one has to decide is, whether *manayhā* is an instrumental of the means or of the circumstances accompanying a process. For

the second possibility cf. RS. II.10.5 *araksāsā mānasā táj jūseta* "may he (Agni) enjoy it with a harmless mind" (Delbrück 1888, 124f.). The first possibility has induced some scholars to conclude that Zarathustra here referred to a contemplation with the *manah*. As has been seen above, to Zarathustra *vaēnaiti* meant the concrete act of seeing with the eyes (*ašibya* 32.10). From the translations (from 1905 onwards) "mit lichtem Sinn", "mit hellem Sinn", "mit klarem Denken", "mit klarem Geiste", "mit brennendem Sinn", "with clear purpose", "med lyst sind", "med lysende sind", "d'une pensée claire", "with a clear mind" it is not always clear whether the translator meant "by means of a clear mind" or "while the mind is clear". Only Humbach and Tavadia 1952, 23 interpreted the words *sūcā manahā* in an entirely different way. See Kellens 1974, 83f. The translation "with a pure mind" (that is, "while the mind is pure") is based on the assumption that one's mind must be purified or "enlightened" in order to be able to apprehend the "best things". Cf. 45.4a *aṭ fravaxšyā aṇhēuš ahyā vahištəm* "Now I shall speak of the best thing of this existence" and 5ab *hyaṭ mōi mraoṭ spəntō.təmō vacē srūidyāi, hyaṭ marataēibyō vahištəm* "the word that the Holiest One spoke to me so as to be heard, which is the best for men". The precept that one should be purified in mind when listening to a sacred text or tradition is well known from later Sanskrit literature. Thus Bharata, at the request of the sages, begins his exposition of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* with the words

*bhavadbhiḥ śucibhir bhūtvā tathā 'vāhitamānasaiḥ
śrūyatām nāṭyavedasya saṁkṣepo brahmanīrmitaḥ*

"Hear ye, in a purified state and with a concentrated mind, the summary which Brahman has made of the Veda of dramatic performance" (BhNS. 1.7).

I will conclude with a few words on *parā mazō yāṇhō* "before the Great Test (?)" in the last line of our stanza because here again there is some reason to ask, just as in the case of *āvarəṇā*, if a trace of an old terminological usage may have been preserved in these words. A similar phrase occurs at YH. 36.2 (*ātarə . . .*) *mazištāi yāṇhəm paiti.jamyā* "(O Fire . . .) come to the greatest of the tests", which clearly implies that there were greater and smaller "tests", and significantly also in conjunction with the obscure word *maga-*: 29.11 *mazōi magāi.ā*, 46.14 *mazōi magāi*, here closely connected with *yāhi* in the next line.

In earlier studies it has been argued that in Later Avestan *yāh-* was a term for an ancient Aryan socio-religious form of contest and that Zarathustra used it in the context of his very specific ideas. This must have involved a certain degree of re-interpretation

since his audience was expected to understand common terms in a new way but it is impossible to say just to what extent the new "theological" meaning differed from the one in current use. For more details about these contests, which apparently formed part of the Aryan new year festival we must turn to the Rigveda, and especially to Book Six, the family collection of the Bharadvājas (*IJJ.* 4, 268–272; 5, 171–177). The characteristic features of this Aryan "winter ritual" can be summarized in the following points: 1) it took place at the end of the year and its object was a) to overcome a period of crisis by winning (or, finding) the sun and the waters, that is, by reiterating Indra's demiurgic act b) to win progeny and prolongation of life c) to win wealth and social prestige, "fame" (*śrávas-*, *yásas-*). 2) It seems to have mainly consisted of a) word duels (verbal contests), Ved. *vívāc-*, LAv. *vyāxman-* b) chariot-races, which served the purpose of deciding who got "fame" as the winner of the "prize proposed" (*dhāna-hitá-*, *mīlhá-*) and, on the other hand, of helping the sun, by a well-known act of imitative magic, to round the "turning point" (see below p. 34). c) distribution of wealth (*vidátha-*), which must have had a potlatch-like character, the sponsors (*maghāvan-*) reiterating Indra's liberality in the beginning of the world.

There is in the Rigveda not a single word that covers all the aspects of this "winter ritual" (a term borrowed from other cultures but that may here serve as a rough approximation of this new year festival). It is denoted by words which either specify the nature of the contest (*vívāc-*, *vidátha-*, *ājī-*) or its aim: *svārṣāti-* "sun-winning", *ārnasāti-* "winning of the waters", *śūrasāti-*, *nṛṣāti-* "winning of (heroic) sons", *dhānasāti-* "winning of the prize", *dyumnāsāti-* "winning of prestige", etc. Characteristic is the technical nature of the terminology: one or two words in the locative, denoting what is at stake, often suffice, e.g. *dhāne hité* "when the proposed prize is at stake", *vidátthe apsu* "at the distribution, when the waters are at stake", *tanūṣv apsu sūrye* "when we ourselves (our lives), the waters and the sun are at stake". One such term is in the Rigveda *mīlhá-*, lit. "the prize for the winner in chariot-racing" (cf. I.63.6 *svārmīlthe . . . ājā*, 130.8 *svārmīltheṣv ājīṣu* "in races which have the sun as their prize"), but it is only used as a general term for "contest". Cf. I.100, which refers to the winning of the sun (2), of the light (8), of heroic sons (7) and wealth (9) and continues in v. 11: *sá jāmbhīr yát samājāti mīlhé 'jāmbhīr vā puruhūtá évaiḥ, apām tokásya tánayasya jeṣé* "when he, who is urgently invoked by many, will bring together, with relatives or not related men [the booty? or the wealth that he is going to distribute?] in the contest, when the winning of the

waters and of one's own progeny is at stake", VI.46.4 *bádhasē jánān vṛṣabhēva manyúnā ghṛṣau mīlhā ṛcīsama, asmākam bodhi avitā mahādhané tanūšv apsu sūrye* "Thou pressest hard, furiously like a bull, the (foreign) men in the excited contest, O *ṛcīsama*; be a protector of us [= of our party] in the (contest) in which a great prize is at stake, now that we ourselves (our lives), the waters and the sun are at stake" and possibly IX.106.12, 107.11 *mīlhé sáptir ná vājayūh* "like a race-horse, eager to win, in the contest". Note *mahādhané* which, like *mīlhé*, has become a general term for "at the contest".

In the past decades it has become increasingly clear how much of Zarathustra's religious terminology has been taken from chariot racing (the religious character of which has, however, sometimes been misunderstood in recent studies). Characteristic and instructive in this respect is *urvaēsa*- "turning point" (for the chariots and, no doubt, for the sun, that is, for the prolongation of life), which Zarathustra has turned into an eschatological term, cf. 51.6 *apēmē aṇhēuš urvaēsē* "at the final turning point of the world", 43.5 *dāmōiš urvaēsē apēmē* "at the final turning point of creation" (here in collocation with *šyaothanā mīždavān* "actions that are rewarded with a prize").

This may give us a clue to the much debated meaning of *maga*- and *magavan*-. Although I do not pretend by any means to have solved a problem with which generations have struggled, an approximation of the meanings of these two words seems possible. Obviously, they cannot be separated from Ved. *maghá*- "gift" and *maghāvan*- "bountiful, liberal", but all attempts at an interpretation of *maga*- as "gift" have plainly failed. However, Ved. *maghá*- is a very specific term, which is only used with reference to the goods of life distributed by Indra (who is *éko vibhaktā tarānir maghānām* "der einzige pünktliche Verteiler der Schätze" VI.26.4) and to the wealth distributed, no doubt on special occasions, by the *maghāvānah*, who in doing so imitated the demiurgic act of the primordial *maghāvan* Indra. In other words, *maghá*- was the typical word for the distribution of wealth (*vidátha*-), just as *mīlhá*- was characteristic of chariot-racing.

The phraseology of the Gathas confirms that Gathic *maga*- belongs to the "contest terminology", cf. 51.15 *hyaṭ mīždəm zaraθuštrō magavabyō cōišṭ parā* "the prize that Zarathustra previously promised to the members of the contesting party(?)", 53.7 *aṭcā vō mīždəm aṇhaṭ ahyā magahyā* "then the prize of this decisive struggle (contest? test?) will be yours". An element of competition seems to be present in Zarathustra's relation to the "members of (the other?) party" in the lines 33.7ab

ā mā (ā)idūm vahištā ā x^vaiθyācā mazdā darəšaŋcā
aša vohū manahā yā srūyē parē magaonō

"Come to me, ye best ones, hither, O Wise One, personally and boldly (?), together with Aša and Good Thinking, so that I may be famed more than the members of the (other?) party".

If *maga-* was originally a term for "contest", there were implicitly two parties and *magavan-* "participant in the contest" could denote adherents of either party. If so, Zarathustra's victory over the party of Druj is described in the terminology of the contest. Cf. further 51.11 *kē vā vaŋhēuš manahō acistā magāi vərəšvō* "or which lofty man, on the side of Good Thinking, is mindful (?) of the struggle?", 53.7 *ivizayaθā magēm tēm aŋ vē vayōi aŋhaiŋi apēmēm vacō* "if ye abandon this struggle, then woe will be the last word for you". Only 51.16 remains ambiguous: *tqm kavā vištāspō magahyā xšaθrā nqsaŋ* "that (insight) Kavi Vištāspa has reached through (his?) power (over the struggle?)". In view of these passages the two remaining ones, viz. 29.11 *aŋ mā maša, yūžəm mazdā frāxšnənē mazōi magāi.ā paiŋi.zānatā* "do ye acknowledge me (*mām aša*) in accordance with Aša (. . .) for the great struggle" and 46.14 *zaraθuštrā kastē asavā urvaθō, mazōi magāi kē vā frasrūidyāi vašti, aŋ hvō kavā vištāspō yāhi* "Zarathustra, which adherent of Aša is thy helper for the great struggle, who wishes to become famed? Well, the (well-known) Kavi Vištāspa (wishes to be so) in the strife" can be paralleled with *parā mazē yānhō* "before the great test (?)", as Humbach 1959b, 72 has already pointed out. The word *maga-* seems to me to refer to a decisive period of crisis in which man has to take an active part. Insler's translation "task" (1975, 157f.), guessed from the context, is the best approximation proposed so far, but it lacks the notion of fight that I have tried to convey by my translation "struggle, strife" (with the powers of Evil).

As for *yāh-*, its etymology is ambiguous but the analysis as **yaH-ah-* allows us to explain it as an old term for chariot-racing (as proposed by Hanns-Peter Schmidt). I do not wish to stress this point. However, a jurisdictional terminology, proposed as an alternative, hardly existed. The religious background of racing may be illustrated by RS. VI.45.10–15:

- (10) *tām u tvā satya somapā indra vājānām pate,*
āhūmahi śravasyāvaḥ
- (11) *tām u tvā yāḥ purāsiṭha yó vā nūnām hité dhāne,*
hāvyaḥ sá śrudhī hāvam
- (12) *dhībhīr ārvadbhir ārvato vājām indra śravāyyān, tvāyā*
jeṣma hitām dhānam

- (13) *ābhūr u vīra girvaṇo mahām indra dhāne hité,
bhāre vitantasāyyaḥ*
 (14) *yā ta ūtīr amitrahan makṣūjavastamā 'sati,
tāyā no hinuhī rātham*
 (15) *sā rāthena rathitamo 'smākenā 'bhiyūgvānā,
jēsi jiṣṇo hitām dhānam*

(10) "Thee we invoke, desirous of glory, O efficacious Soma-drinker, O Indra, Lord of the prizes (*vāja*)" (11) "Thee, who wert formerly and who art now the one who must be invoked, when the prize has been proposed, do thou listen to this invocation". (12) "Through (inspired) thoughts, with our horses, O Indra, we will (surpass?) the (other) horses and win the praiseworthy booty (*vāja*), with thee the prize that has been proposed" (13) "O hero Indra, who liketh (words of) praise, thou hast become great, now that the prize has been proposed, thou for whom (people) are fighting in the strife" (14) "With that aid of thine, O slayer of enemies, which will be most prompt, impel our chariot" (15) "Thou, the best charioteer, win with the attacking chariot of our (party), O victorious One, the prize that has been proposed".

However, whether or not *yāh*- originally was a term for chariot-racing, in Later Avestan texts it is used with reference to contests in general, including the verbal contest (*IIIJ.* 4, 250ff.) and Zarathustra has turned it, just as *maga*-, into an eschatological term. The phrases "the great *yāh*-" and "the great *maga*-", however, are reminiscent of a similar usage in Vedic. Both Indra's primordial *vṛtra*-slaying or his fight with the Asuras and the annual ritual of the contest are sometimes characterized as "great": RS. X.48.8 *yāt . . . prāhām mahé vṛtrahātya āśuśravi* "when I spread my fame at the great *vṛtra*-slaying", JB. II.79 *yad dha vā asurair mahāsaṁgrāmaṁ saṁyete, tad dha vedān nirācakāra* "In that he (Indra) fought the great fight with the Asuras, he drove away the Vedas", RS. V.59.2 *antār mahé vidāthe yetire nāraḥ* "the men have arranged themselves (taken their respective places) at the great distribution", X.96.1 *prā te mahé vidāthe sāmsiṣaṁ hārī* "I will praise thy bay steeds at the great distribution".

A similar old term of the "contest terminology", which belongs exclusively to the Rigveda, is *mahādhané*, literally "when the big prize is at stake" (*IIIJ.* 5, 177). The free translation "in dem grossen Kampf" (Roth, Grassmann, Geldner) is not, however, incorrect, since the Vedic poets opposed *mahādhané* to *ārbhe* "the small one". What exactly they referred to cannot be inferred from the texts, but it may have been the distinction between the annual "winter ritual" and races held on other occasions. Cf. I.7.5, 40.8, where

mahādhané . . . *árbhe* is clearly parallel to X.91.8 *árbhe haviṣi* . . . *mahé*. In the same manner "the greatest of the *yāhs*' in the Yasna Haptanḥāiti (see p. 29) seems to imply the existence of "smaller" *yāhs*. A few passages may be quoted: VII.32.25 *asmākam bodhy avitā mahādhané, bhāvā vrdhāḥ sákhinām* "Be our protector in the great contest, be a promotor for the members of our party" (cf. VI.46.4 quoted on p. 31), VI.46.13 *yád indra sárge árvataś codāyāse mahādhané* "when thou, O Indra, during the race dost impel the horses in the great contest" and VI.59.7, from which it can be inferred that the prize men hoped to win in such a contest were cows (cf. Thieme 1949, 39): *mā no asmín mahādhané párā vartam gáviṣṭisu* "Cast us not aside in this great contest, in our cattle fray". Cf. VIII.75.12, I.112.17, etc.

Here we are faced with a new aspect of Zarathustra's language. He was firmly rooted in a society in which chariot-racing as a means of winning wealth and social prestige must have been as central as it was in Vedic India. To Karl Hoffmann we owe the insight that in order to express notions of his spiritual world he made use of the terminology of the races. He must also have known from personal experience the annual periods of crisis when the new year was inaugurated by the contests which were also a renewed fight for social prestige of the *magavans* and their parties. Actually, as we learn from the Rigveda, chariot-racing was only one aspect of this "winter ritual" in which a prolongation of life had to be secured by a new winning of the sun and the waters. Zarathustra adopted its terminology, which he may have found in earlier Iranian poetry. Cf. 30.10 *aṭ asištā yaojanṭē*, 50.7 *yaojā zavištyēng aurvatō*, 49.9 *hyaṭ daēnā vahištē yūjēn miždē*, *aḥā yuxta yāhi dājamāspā*, 44.19 *miždēm hanəntē*, *urvaēsa-*, *zā-*, etc. He, however, attached a new, eschatological meaning to it by speaking, e.g. of the "ultimate turning point" (43.5, 51.6). He could do so because these terms were already in use in a socio-religious context, but he also had to do so because his language provided no other means of expressing his message and because he was bound to use the language that was understood by his adherents. Thus we are, it seems to me, taking the first steps in a direction in which we can hope that the world of Zarathustra, and the man Zarathustra himself, will get more concrete outlines. No doubt, when speaking to his adherents of the "great contest" or "the ultimate turning point", he was bringing them the message of a spiritual world that transcended the religious notions familiar to his audience. But to what extent was he "spiritualizing" inherited notions and how far was he merely voicing the ideas of his culture? Since his prophetic ardour left no room for irony, what exactly did he mean when

he asked "who wishes to become famed?" (46.14) or when he expressed the wish that he would be able to surpass the *magavans* in fame (33.7 *yā srūyē parē magaonō*)? Self-assertiveness and aggressiveness were certainly not anathematized in a society in which the fight for fame had so central a place. The conclusion would seem justified that in such words we can still hear a last faint echo of that world of contests. To the priest (*zaoatar*-) Zarathustra, who was rooted in this society, the high tribute paid to self-assertion must have belonged to the realities of life which he certainly did not condemn. He shared the aggressive character of his culture but, whereas the older religion of the Veda required men to take part as a community in the annual fight of the Devas against the Asuras for the prolongation of cosmic life, he turned this aggressiveness, against the background of his eschatological vision, into a personal duty, which was every man's own responsibility.

Since the new religion must, like the older one, primarily have been an affair of men, it is striking that Zarathustra's *Urgemeinde* seems from the beginning to have also been open to women. In Zarathustra's Gathas, it is true, only once, amidst references to many men who supported the prophet, mention is made of women as supporters. Cf. 46.10

yō vā mōi nā gēnā vā mazdā ahurā
dāyāt aṇhēuš yā tū vōistā vahištā

"Who, indeed, be it man or woman, O wise Lord, may give(?) me those things which Thou knowest to be best" (the stanza further only refers to these people in the masculine plural). In Y. 53, which cannot have been composed by Zarathustra, there are the well-known references to girls (in 5), to Pourucistā (in 3) and the direct address in 6 *iθā ī haiθyā narō aθā jēnayō* "thus these things are true, O men, and also ye women". Except in these places, however, women are as a rule not specifically mentioned. Zarathustra refers to "the soul of the truthful man" (45.7 *ašaonō urvā*, 49.10 *urunascā ašāunqm*, cf. Vend. 19.30) and in the Later Avesta *ašaonqm . . . fravašayō* is formulaic, e.g. in the Fravardīn Yasht. Curiously, both formulas occur in the Yasna Haptaṇhāiti in an extended form, with */narqm nāirinqmca/* added. See YH. 39.2 (cf. Yt. 13.154) and 37.3. Only at the end of the Fravardīn Yasht (Yt. 13.143–145), after the list of pious women which is probably a later interpolation (Lommel 1927, 111), do we find the doubled formula *narqm ašaonqm fravašayō . . . nāirinqm ašaoninqm fravašayō*. Later additions are no doubt Y.13.149, Y.1.16 *ašaoninqmca* (cf. Y.27.2) and Y.1.6 *γənqnmca* (in *ašāunqm fravašinqm γənqnmca*). The older formulas, however, must silently have presupposed the presence of women.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

P. 7 line 4 (*etc.*), read: laryngeal or pharyngeal.

P. 10 *hvarē pišyasū*: connection with Vend. 13.47 *apišma.xvar(a)*- could be considered. On the last word see Lommel, *ZII*. 7, p. 43f.: "der die Sonne nicht (gern?) sieht", Gershevitch, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra* (1959), p. 255, Kellens 1974, 317. Semantically, however, it is hard to connect it with Yt. 10.105 *apišman-*, if this means "guileless" (cf. Phl. *apišmānd* "without deceit", see H.-P. Schmidt, *Études mithriaques* 1978, p. 377 n. 25 with references). On the other hand, if *apišman-* does mean "guileless", it would support the readings 44.20 *pišyeinti* and 50.2 *pišyasū* against *pišyasū* (H1 J6 Jm1 S2, etc.), which Insler 1975, 304 connects with Ved. *pīṣuna-* "treacherous". Av. *piš-* "deceive" would then remain etymologically obscure, since a reconstruction form **piš-s-* can hardly be taken into consideration. As for *hvarē*, it cannot be related to Ved. *sasvár* "secretly" (= *sas-vár?* Mayrhofer 1976, 449), the Avestan cognate of which occurs in Vend. 4.49 *haṇ^vharəstāt-* "living in secrecy".

P. 19: *θβā.uxdāiš*: since *uxda-* is a substantive, *θβā.uxdāiš* cannot be paralleled with 43.10 *parštēm zī θβā* "what has been asked by Thee" (Bartholomae 1904, 997, Cardona, *Language* 46, 1970, 10).

P. 28: Cf. also Mrs D. I. Èdel'man, "K voprosu o slovoobrazovanii mestoimenij v indoiranskix jazykax", *Indijskaja i Iranskaja Filologija*, Voprosy leksiki, Moskva 1971, pp. 151-180 (esp. p. 151f.). As she kindly pointed out to me in a letter dated February 6, 1978, the contrast between Oss. *smax*, Yaghnobi *šumox* "you" and, on the other hand, Oss. *xsæz*, *æxsæz*, Yaghn. *uxš* "six" and Oss. *xsæv*, *æxsæv*, Yaghn. *xšap*, *xišap* "night" (from **xš(v)aš* and **xšap-* respectively) proves that the earlier form of *xšma-* must have been **šma-* (cf. Bartholomae 1895, 141). Therefore, the authentic form in Zarathustra's language was most likely [šma-] and the initial *x-* may have arisen in the tradition of priestly recitation. The differentiation between initial *hv* and *x^v* must also be post-Zarathustrian. Cf. 32.10 *hvarē* "sun" for [hu'ar], as against the gen. 44.3, 50.10 *x^vəng* for [hu'əh], 44.5 *hvaṇpā* for [huapāh], 53.1 *hvaṇhəvim* for [huahavi'am] as against *x^viti-* for [huiti-], cf. RS. *suvitā-*, 28.10 *x^varaiθyā* for [huarθi'ā] or [huarθiyā]. For Iranian *x^v* see D. I. Èdel'man, *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 1977/4, pp. 79-85, Morgenstierne, *Iranistik* I, p. 158 (on Balōči *w(h)-*). Cf. above, p. 25.

P. 34: A different analysis of **Spitamana-* is given by Mayrhofer, *Iranisches Personennamenbuch* I, 1 (1977), p. 77: **Spita-manah-*; cf. **Spitaka-* (Σπιτάκης).

P. 35: On the question of whether *am-* "fest anfassend" is historically identical with *am-* "to swear" see K. Hoffmann, *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik* (1975), p. 304f.

P. 40: Kellens 1974, 262 renders *varəna-* by "le signe".

REFERENCES

- Andreas, F. C. – Die dritte Ghāthā des Zura^{*}tušthro (Josno 30). *Nachr. Gött. Ges. Wiss.*, pp. 42–49 (1909).
- Andreas-Wackernagel – Die erste, zweite und fünfte Ghāthā des Zura^{*}tušthro (Josno 28, 29, 30). *Nachr. Gött. Ges. Wiss.*, pp. 363–385 (1913).
- Andreas-Wackernagel (idem) – Anmerkungen. *Nachr. Gött. Ges. Wiss.*, pp. 304–329 (1931).
- Barr, K. – *Avesta, oversat og forklaret*. København (1954).
- Bartholomae, Christian – Die Gāthā's und die heiligen Gebete des altiranischen Volkes (Metrum, Text, Grammatik und Wortverzeichniss). Halle (1879).
- Bartholomae, Christian – Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie I. Strassburg (1894–)1895.
- Bartholomae, Christian – Arische Forschungen II. Halle (1886).
- Bartholomae, Christian – Altiranisches Wörterbuch. Strassburg (1904).
- Bartholomae, Christian – Die Gatha's des Awesta, Zarathushtra's Verspredigten übersetzt. Strassburg (1905).
- Baunack, Theodor – Johannes Baunack und Theodor Baunack, Studien auf dem Gebiete des Griechischen und der arischen Sprachen I, 2. Leipzig (1888).
- Beekes, R. S. P. – The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek. The Hague-Paris (1967).
- Benveniste, E. – Notes avestiques: Asiatica, Festschrift Friedrich Weller (Leipzig), pp. 30–34 (1954).
- Bloomfield, Maurice & Franklin Edgerton – Vedic Variants II: Phonetics. Philadelphia (1932).
- Darmesteter, James – The Zend-Avesta, pt II (The Sacred Books of the East XXIII). Oxford (1883).
- Debrunner, Albert – Altindische Grammatik Band II, 2: Die Nominal-suffixe. Göttingen (1954).
- Debrunner, Albert – Nachträge zu J. Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik Band I: Lautlehre. Göttingen (1957).
- Delbrück, B. – Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis im Altindischen Lateinischen Griechischen und Deutschen. Berlin (1867).
- Delbrück, B. – Altindische Syntax. Halle a.S. (1888).
- Duchesne-Guillemin, Jacques – Les composés de l'Avesta. Liège-Paris (1936).
- Duchesne-Guillemin, Jacques – Zoroastre, Étude critique avec une traduction commentée des Gāthā (Les Dieux et les Hommes), vol. II. Paris (1948).
- Ėdel'man, D. I. – Osnovnye voprosy lingvističeskoj geografii. Moskva (1968).
- Frisk, Hjalmar – Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch Bd II. Heidelberg (1970).
- Geldner, Karl – Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung Bd 28 (1887).
- Hinz, W. – Zarathustra. Stuttgart (1961).
- Hoffmann, Karl – Münch. Stud. Sprachwiss. 4² (1961).
- Humbach, Helmut – Die Gathas des Zarathustra Bd I. Heidelberg (1959a).
- Humbach, Helmut – Idem Bd II. (1959b).
- Inslar, S. – The Gāthās of Zarathustra (Acta Iranica 8). Leiden-Téhéran-Liège (1975).
- Kellens, Jean – Les noms-racines de l'Avesta. Wiesbaden (1974).
- Kravecov, N. – Serbskij Ėpos, Perevody N. Berga, N. Gal'kovskogo i N. Kravcova, redakcija, issledovanie i komentarii N. Kravcova. Moskva-Leningrad (1933).
- Kühn, Ingrid – R̥gvedisch anvaritit̥-, Münch. Stud. Sprachwiss. 28, pp. 89–104 (1970).
- Kuiper, F. B. J. – Notes on Vedic Noun-Inflexion (Meded. Ned. Akad. Wetensch., Afd. Letterk. nr. V, 4) (1942).

- Kuiper, F. B. J. – Zur kompositionellen Kürzung im Sanskrit. *Die Sprache* VII (1961).
- Kuiper, F. B. J. – *Indo-Iranian Journal* 12 (1969/70).
- Lentz, W. – Yima and Khvarenah in the Avestan Gathas', *A Locust's Leg, Studies in honour of S. H. Taqizadeh* (London), pp. 131–134 (1962).
- Lentz, W. – Um den Hausherrn der awestischen Gathas (Yasna 45,11), *Festschrift für Wilhelm Eilers* (Wiesbaden), pp. 204–216 (1967).
- Leumann, Manu – *Homerische Wörter*. Basel (1950).
- Lichterbeck, Karl – Die Nominalflexion im Gathadialekt. *KZ.* 33, pp. 169–213 (1893).
- Lindner, Bruno – *Altindische Nominalbildung*. Jena (1878).
- Lommel, Herman – *Die Religion Zarathustras*. Tübingen (1930).
- Lommel, Herman – Gāthā's des Zarathustra. *Yasna* 43–46, *Nachr. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen* (Phil. hist. Klasse, Fachgruppe III. N.F. Bd I), pp. 67–119 (1934).
- Lommel, Herman – Gāthā's des Zarathustra. *Yasna* 47–51, *Nachr. Bd II*, pp. 121–169 (1935).
- Lommel, Herman – *Yasna* 32, *Wörter und Sachen* 19, pp. 237–265 (1938).
- Lommel, Herman – *Die Gathas des Zarathustra*. Herausgeg. von Bernfried Schlerath. Basel-Stuttgart (1971).
- Markwart, Jos – Das erste Kapitel der Gāpā uštavati (Jasna 43). Herausgeg. von Jos. Messina S.J. (*Orientalia Num.* 50). Roma (1930).
- Mayrhofer, Manfred – Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen, Bd III. Heidelberg (1976).
- Mayrhofer, Manfred – *Iranisches Personennamenbuch*, Bd I: Die altiranischen Namen, Fasz. 1: Die Avestischen Namen. Wien (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften) (1977).
- Meillet-Benveniste – *Grammaire du vieux perse*. Paris (1931).
- Neisser, Walter – Zum Wörterbuch des Rgveda I (Abh. f. die Kunde des Morgenl. XVI.4). Leipzig (1924).
- Nyberg, H. S. – *Irans forntida Religioner*. Stockholm (1937).
- Oertel, Hanns – *The Syntax of Cases in the Narrative and Descriptive Prose of the Brāhmaṇas I: The Disjunct Use of the Cases*. Heidelberg (1926).
- Pagliaro, Antonino – *Archivio glottologico Italiano* 39 (1954).
- Rix, Helmut – *Kratylos* 14,2, pp. 176–187 (1972).
- Schaeder, H.-H. – *Zeitschr. d. Deutschen Morgenl. Ges.* 94 (1940).
- Schlerath, Bernfried – *Die Gathas des Zarathustra*. *Or. Lit. Zeitung* LVII, cols. 565–589 (1962).
- Sievers, Eduard – *Heliand*. Halle (1878).
- Sköld, Tryggve – Drei finnische Wörter und die Laryngalthorie, *KZ.* 76, pp. 27–42 (1959).
- Tavadia, J. C. – *Indo-Iranian Studies II*. Santiniketan (1952).
- Thieme, Paul – *Untersuchungen zur Wortkunde und Auslegung des Rigveda*. Halle/Saale (1949).
- Wackernagel, Jakob – *Altindische Grammatik I: Lautlehre*. Göttingen (1896).
- Wackernagel, Jakob – *Altindische Grammatik II, 1. Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition*. Göttingen (1905).
- Wackernagel-Debrunner – *Altindische Grammatik III. Nominalflexion. Zahlwort. Pronomen*. Göttingen (1930).
- Wilkins Smith, Maria – *Studies in the Syntax of the Gathas of Zarathustra, together with Text, Translation, and Notes* (Language Dissertation no. 4). Philadelphia (1929).

[The publication referred to on p. 10 is: M. C. Monna, *The Gathas of Zarathustra, A reconstruction of the text*. (Amsterdam) 1978, 199 pp.]