How to kill a cow in Avestan

Jost Gippert
Frankfurt am Main

In one of his most elucidative articles[1], Calvert Watkins dealt with a rather martial aspect of Proto-Indo-European social life, tracing its residues throughout the literary products of various daughter languages. He argued convincingly that poetic formulae such as Rigvedic *áhann áhim* "(he, Indra) slew the serpent" witness to a central motive of PIE folklore which reflects, to put it shortly, some kind of ritualization of the killing of mighty enemies by heroes. The essential linguistic feature of the formulae involved is the usage of the verbal root *$g^{wh}en$-* as represented in Ved. *áhann* (3.sg.impf.act., < *$é$-$g^{wh}en$-t*), Hittite *kuenta* (3.sg.pret.act., < *$g^{wh}en$-t*), or Greek ἔπεφνεν (3.sg.plup.act., cf. perf. *$g^{wh}e$-$g^{wh}on$-e*). The verb in question was thus demonstrated to have had special connotations, preventing it from being used in everyday speech.

The usage of *$g^{wh}en$-* was not restricted to the killing of enemies such as dragons, serpents, "anti-heroes", or "anti-guests", though. Both in Greek and in Indo-Iranian, the same root could be used when people talked about the killing of cows. This can hardly be accidental, given that in all those languages the combination of *$g^{w}ou$-* and *$g^{wh}en$-* yielded compounds such as Ved. m. *gohán-* "cow killing" (referring to a "weapon", *vadháḥ,* of the Maruts: nom.sg. *gohā́* RV 7,56,17c beside *nr̥hā́* "man killing"; derived nom.sg.ntr. *goghnám* in RV 1,114,10a beside *pūruṣaghnám*), Avestan *gaojan-* (gen.sg. *gaojanō*, referring to the winter: Vd. 7,27, cf. below), or the Greek verb βουφονέω (3.pl.impf.act. βουφόνεον H 466; cp. the voc. βουφόνε in the first Hermes hymn, 430). The Homeric tradition and its background were discussed in great detail by J. Bechert (1964). In the following pages, I shall examine the Avestan material in question concentrating upon Zarathustra's teachings.

The most intriguing Avestan passage that deals with the killing of the cow explicitly is Y. 32,14c. The verse belongs to a context where Zarathustra complains about the practices of the *karapan*s and *kavi*s appearing as a *grə̄hma-*[2] to him:

Y. 32,14:   *ahiiā. gərə̄hmō. ā.hōiϑōi. nī. kāuuaiiascīt. xratūš. [nī.]dadat̰.*
        varəcā̊. hīcā. fraidiuuā. hiiat̰. vīsə̄ntā. drəguuaṇtəm. auuō̃.
        hiiat̰cā. gāuš. jaidiiāi. mraoī. yə̄. dūraošəm. saocaiiat̰. auuō̃.

Although the context is far from being clear in all details, the interpretation of the forms in question was never debated about: *gāuš* is the nom.sg. meaning "cow", and *jaidiiāi*, an infinitive with the suffix *-d^hi̯āi̯* built from *jan-* < *$g^{wh}en$-* "to kill". The greatest divergences in the different interpretations of the present verse concern the form *mraoī* and the syntactical analysis depending on it. As this is basic for the understanding of the whole passage in question as well as for gaining an insight into the situative background involved, it is worth while recollecting the proposals made so far.

---

[1] Watkins 1987, 270-299.

[2] Following Humbach (1991: II, 86) I take this word as a collective noun designating a group of persons.

In a 1985 article, I adopted the view expressed by Chr. BARTHOLOMAE in his Wörterbuch (1904, 1193) who considered *mraoī* as a finite 3.sg. passive injunctive form of the root *mrū-* "to speak". Comparing the syntactic constellation thus established with other occurrences of **mrū-* plus infinitives in Vedic and Avestan, I arrived at the conclusion that the sentence in question could be interpreted as denoting the speech act leading to the killing of cows: "und wenn die Kuh als zu töten(de) genannt wird", i.e., "and when the cow is ordered to be killed" (1985, 43). The clause would thus represent a passivized equivalent of Vedic sentences like *áśvam ā́netavai brūyāt* "(he, the Adhvaryu) should order a horse to be brought about" (ŚBM 2,1,4,16).

BARTHOLOMAE's own interpretation differed only partially from this in that he regarded *gāuš jaidiiāi* as a clause of direct speech: ".. und daß es heiße: das Rind ist zu töten .." (1905, 31). A similar analysis of the infinitival clause was proposed by S. INSLER in his Gatha edition (1975, 208 sq.). This author, however, regarded *mraoī* as an infinitive formation of its own, depending on *vīsəntā* in the preceding verse and thus being arranged parallel with *auuō* "help(ing)". The syntagm consisting of *gāuš* and *jaidiiāi* is taken as a formula of direct speech then, together with the closing half verse: ".. since they (the Kavis) have begun to aid the deceitful person and to say: '*The cow is to be killed (for him) who has been kindling the Haoma ...*'" (1975, 49).

This interpretation is doubtful in several respects. First, INSLER had to suggest that the attested form, *mraoī*, "somehow reposes on an orig. reading inf. *mruyōi (= *mruvōi)" (o.c., 209). Given that a form *mruiiē* (this is what we should expect from **mruuai̯*) is well attested several times in Old Avestan as well as Young Avestan contexts (as a 1st sg. pres.ind.med.: Y. 49,3d; Y. 9,17; 12,4; 19,10), this conjecture is hard to believe, all the more since none of the variants listed in GELDNER's edition is nearer to *mruiiē* than to *mraoī*: *mraoī* itself is the reading of nearly all manuscripts pertaining to the Iranian Pahlavī Yasna (Pt4, Mf1; Mf4 may be added[3]), the Sanskrit Yasna (J3; S1 is "defective" in the present context), the (Indian) Yasna Sāde (C1, K11; H1, J6, J7), and the Iranian Vendidād Sāde (Mf2, Jp1); from the latter branch, only K4 has *mrōi*. *mraoī* is further attested in the Khorde Avesta ms. Pd. The mss. assigned to the Indian Vendidād Sāde mostly read *mraouuī* (L2, K10, L1) or, with a neglectable difference, *mraōuuī* (P1)[4]; B2 and L3 from this branch have *mraoī* again. Another ms. belonging here, O2, agrees with the reading of the Indian Pahlavī Yasna, which has *mraomī* (J2, K5); the same holds true for the Iranian Khorda Avesta ms. K37 and the Yasna Sade ms. L13 (where the *m* was secondarily added). GELDNER was certainly right in rejecting this as the lectio difficilior, all the more since a 1st sg. "I speak" could hardly be motivated in the given context.

Another point that has to be objected against S. INSLER's interpretation is that the two forms he assumes to depend from *vīsənta* as infinitives are basically distinct: *mraoī*, if it had replaced **mruiiē*, would represent a dative root infinitive, thus being

---

[3] This ms. was not used by GELDNER because it "did not reach (him) until after the entire Yasna was completed" (Prolegomena: 1896, xxiv); nevertheless GELDNER had to acknowledge its importance as a sister ms. of Pt4. Mf4 is nowadays easily accessible via the facsimile edition prepared by JAMASP ASA / NAWABI (1976e) where it is named "D90".

[4] This reading is not mentioned in GELDNER's apparatus but can be taken from the facsimile edition prepared by BURNOUF (1829-1843).

equivalent to a certain extent with *framrūitē* depending on **vīsaitē* in Y. 8,4 which INSLER quotes as a parallel. *auuō,* on the other hand, is the accusative of an *s*-stem noun, **áu̯as*. Although such a syntactic disjuncture cannot be ruled out with certainty, it would nevertheless be hard even if we could regard *vīsəṇtā* as a verb of motion ("to enter").

Although all interpretations connecting *mraoī* with the root *mrū* "to speak" are supported by the Pahlavi translation which uses *guft* "spoken"[5], several quite divergent proposals were published as to the form in question. In a 1957 article, H. HUMBACH argued that *mraoī* cannot represent a 3rd sg. form of the passive aorist of "*mrū/mrav* 'sprechen'" because this root is supplied by *vāc* in the aorist throughout, the 3sg. aor.pass. being *vācī*. Instead he proposed to connect *mraoī* with the YAv. adjective "*mrūra-* 'gewalttätig (?)'" which is used in Vd. 2,22 as an epithet of the "winter", just as the compound *gaojan-* "cow killing" is used in Vd. 7,27. Accordingly, he proposed the tentative translation "die Kuh wird, um getötet zu werden, gewalttätig behandelt"[6]. Note that here, the infinitival syntagm is regarded equivalent with a passive final clause, "for being killed". In HUMBACH's first Gatha edition (1959: I, 99), his translation was a bit more concise: ".. während die Kuh zu Tode gequält wird .."

This view according to which *mraoī* is a 3.sg. aor.pass. of a root [2]*mrū* "to torment" was adopted by J. KELLENS in his study on the Avestan root nouns (1974, 325) as well as — hesitatingly — by K. HOFFMANN and B. FORSSMAN in their "Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre" (1996, 228). It was KELLENS who extended the basis for the alleged [2]*mrū* by relating to it both **amrū-*, the name of a saint occurring in Yt. 13,109, interpreted by him as "qui ne maltraite pas", and *mrauuaiiā̊sca* appearing as a variant reading in Yt. 1,15. Taking the latter as a gen.sg. of a fem. *ā*-stem *mrauuā-* "la violence", KELLENS explicitly tried to improve BARTHOLOMAE's Wörterbuch entry "*mrvī-* f. etwa 'Hader, Zwist'" based on GELDNER's reading *mruaiiā̊sca* (1904, 1197). One further derivation of the root in question had been claimed before by G. KLINGENSCHMITT in his 1968 dissertation on the Farhang-ī ōīm according to whom *mruta* appearing in F.11 (491) is the "einziger Beleg des PPP. der Wz. *mrū*" [!], its meaning being "'vernichtet, geschädigt' (o.ä.)"[7]. The interpretation of *mraoī* as a passive form of [2]*mrū* "maltraiter" has been upheld by KELLENS ever since: It is repeated both in "Les textes vieil-avestiques", edited together with E. PIRART (KELLENS-PIRART 1991, 289) and in a recent article dealing about the Avestan infinitives (KELLENS 1994 [1995], 57); the translation agrees with the one proposed by HUMBACH in 1957: ".. lorsque la Vache est maltraitée pour être tuée" (KELLENS-PIRART 1988, 121).

HUMBACH himself, however, has meanwhile changed his mind again. In his second Gatha-edition published in collaboration with J. ELFENBEIN and P.O. SKJÆRVØ (1991),

---

[5] As usual, this is an interlinear rendering of the Avestan words rather than a translation: W AMTč ᵓw' TWRA znšn gwpt' i.e. *ud ka-z ō gāw ɀanišn guft* "and also-when to the cow killing (is) spoken".

[6] HUMBACH 1957, 91 with fn. 26.

[7] KLINGENSCHMITT 1968a, 149; the "Teildruck" (1968b) does not contain any commentary on the form in question.

he now regards *mraoī* not as a finite passive form of *mrū²* but as an "instr.sg. of an *ī*-stem noun *mraoī*- 'destructive action, destruction, enfeeblement', derived from the same root (1991: II,89). Taking *gāuš jaidiiāi* as a direct speech clause, he arrives at the following translation for the verse in question: ".. when, with the destructive action (called) 'let the ox be killed' .." (I: 135). HUMBACH felt it necessary once again to explicitly state that "*mraoī* cannot be for **mrāuuī* [sic; see n. 42 below], 3rd sg.aor pass of *mrau/mrū* 'to speak, recite', since the aor. of this root is supplemented by the root *vac* 'to speak, say'" (II: 89).

Considering this amount of divergent opinions, it seems worth while reinvestigating the arguments put forth in detail[8]. If we start with contrasting the two roots in question, ¹*mrū* and ²*mrū*, we are struck by the fact that the former only is well attested in Avestan and elsewhere: With its Vedic counterpart, *brū*-, it shares both its meaning and its formal pecularities, i.e. the existence of an athematic root present, the non-existence of an aorist stem, and its suppletion by **u̯ač*-. And it can be traced to a Proto-Indo-European **mluH*- by identification with Slavonic **mlŭv*- "to speak"[9].

The case for ²*mrū*, on the other hand, is rather weak, at least if it is postulated to be a verbal root. In this case, the form *mraoī* would remain the only finite form attested — provided the analysis as underlined by KELLENS and HOFFMANN / FORSSMAN can be maintained at all. But the nominal derivatives invoked as witnesses are not beyond doubt either.

The most serious problem is posed by the alleged attestation of a noun **mruuī*- or **mrauuā*- meaning "Hader, Zwist" or "la violence" in Yt. 11,15. In the context in question, it is just the verse containing this word which shows the greatest variation in manuscript tradition. This was studied in great detail by J. KELLENS (1968, 43) in connection with a second hapax legomenon appearing alongside with **mrauuā*- here, viz. *parət*-. For the present investigation, the complex situation may be summarized as follows.

Taking GELDNER's edition as a basis, the text of Yt. 11,15-16 can be rearranged into syntactical units in the following way:

(11,15) *sraošəm. ašīm. [huraoδəm. vərəϑrājanəm. frādaṯ.gaēϑəm. ašauuanəm. ašahe.*
                                           ratūm.]¹⁰ yazamaide:
          yim. daϑaṯ. ahurō. mazdā̊. ašauua. aēšmahe. xruuī.draoš. hamaēstārəm:
     āxštīm. hąm.vaiṇtīm. yazamaide.
          parətasca. mruuaiiā̊sca. hamaēstāra.
(11,16)   *haxaiia. sraošahe. ašiiehe.*
          haxaiia. rašnaoš. razištahe. ...

___

[8] I shall not discuss the name *amru*-, appearing in Yt. 13,109 in the genitive form, *amraoš*, rhyming with the following name, *camraoš*, nor the Old Persian proper name *Gaubruva* ⟨g-u-b-ru-v⟩ interpreted by HUMBACH (1991: II, 89) as "bull-killer". They have no argumentative value.

[9] Cf. MAYRHOFER 1986-, II, 235 sq. for O.Ind. *brū*- (*BRAV¹*) and VASMER 1955, II, 148 sq. s.v. Russ. молвá. The Slavonic -*i*-present (Czech *mluviti*, Pol. *mówić* etc.; a "čech. *mluvati*" as quoted by MAYRHOFER seems never to have existed) can immediately reflect the athematic root present if it was remodelled after the 3.pl.pres.ind.act. **mlŭvętĭ < *mluh₁énti* ≈ Ved. *bruvánti*.

[10] The text in brackets is suppleted from Yt. 11,1.

The contents are clear for the first sentence which concerns Sraoša ("obedience"), the *yazata* Yt. 11 is dedicated to in general[11]:

> "We worship Sraoša, the one (receiving) allotments, [of beautiful build, victorious,
>   supporting the (living) world, a righteous Ratu ('ruler') of truth],
> whom Ahura Mazdā created, the righteous one, as a destroyer of Aēšma ('blood-
>   thirstiness'), the one having a cruel wood(en weapon)."

The following sentence is less clear as it stands. According to normal Avestan usage, we should expect *hąm.vaintīm* to be an epithet ("winning, overwhelming") of *āxštīm* "peace": "We worship overwhelming peace"[12]. But *hamaēstāra* as well as *haxaiia* which introduces every line in 11,16 have to be interpreted as dual forms, thus forcing us to take *āxštīm* and *hąm.vaintīm* as two independent nouns, arranged in an asyndetic way: "peace (and) victory, the two destroyers .., the two friends ..". The dual forms cannot be assumed to cover *sraoša-* plus *āxšti-* ("obedience and peace") because of the first line in 11,16 talking about "the two friends of Sraoša, the one receiving allotments": Sraoša could hardly have been called his own friend.

The situation becomes more complex if we consider the manuscript tradition concerning the two elements depending on *hamaēstāra*.

GELDNER's text agrees with the one present in K20, a codex mostly containing plain Pahlavi texts[13]. The most similar readings can be found in younger collective manuscripts of this type (partially at least descending from K20), viz. M4, P7, P14 and Ml2, as well as some Khorde Avesta mss.[14], viz. J10, J15, K18, K36, W1, L12. To this group we may add the Khorde Avesta mss. published under the names of R 411, "J1", MU 27[15], and TD23[16] by JAMASP ASA / NAWABI (1976f/b/g/a).

Quite a different tradition reveals itself in a third group of manuscripts mostly containing the text of the Yasht sequence proper (i.e., not as part of a Khorda Avesta collection) or single Yashts. The leading one of these mss. is F1[17] which reads *astarǝtaca. amuiia.mana.*; it shows no trace of **hamaēstāra* but continues immediately with 11,16 (*haxiia*). The same text is present in E1 but also in the Khorde Avesta mss. Pt1, Mb1, J16[18]; an equivalent tradition is further met with in the mss. L18, P13, Jm4,

---

[11] For a complete translation of Yt. 11 cf. KREYENBROEK 1985, 59 sqq.

[12] Cf. WOLFF 1910, 224 n. 5 according to whom the present usage is "im Gegensatz zu den sonstigen Stellen, wo die Worte *āxštīm hąmīvaintīm* 'siegreichen Frieden' bedeuten".

[13] K20 is easily accessible through the facsimile edition published by A. CHRISTENSEN (1931); the passage in question appears on p. 304 / fol. 157v. The codex was neatly descirbed in HAUG / WEST 1872, V sqq.

[14] The following readings are taken from GELDNER's apparatus if nothing else is indicated.

[15] "J1", p. 119 / MU 27, p. 137 of the facsimile editions; the second ⟨i⟩ in *mrauuaiiåsca* is added above the line in "J1". This is certainly not the J1 as used by GELDNER.

[16] p. 165 of the facsimile edition; the peculiar (defective) reading may be due to the ornamental writing style of the slanted lines it is contained in.

[17] F1 is now easily accessible through the facsimile edition by K.M. JAMASPASA (1991); the text passage in question appears on p. 161.

[18] From GELDNER's apparatus it is not clear whether this ms. omits *hamaēstāra* as the others do. — The reading *astarǝtaca amuiiamana* is also found in the Yasht ms. R 115 (ed. JAMASP ASA / NAWABI 1976c, 656).

O3, L11. A special case is M35, a collective ms. which contains two versions of the text of Y. 11, starting from 11,15; here, we find both wordings side by side[19]. And a peculiar position is maintained by K22 which contains *patarətasca* alongside with *amauiia*, thus standing somewhat in between the two traditions. For easy convenience, the ms. readings are listed here according to the two groupings (the mss. not collated by GELDNER are marked by parentheses):

K20-group		F1-group	
K20	*parətasca. mruuaiiā̊sca hamaēstāra.*	F1	*astarətaca. amuiia.mana. + haxiia.*
M4	*parətasca. maruuaiiā̊sca ??*	E1	*astarətaca. amuiia.mana.*
P7	*parətasca. ?? ??*	Pt1	*astarətaca. amuiia.mana.*
P14	*parətasca. ?? ??*	Mb1	*astarətaca. amuiia.mana.*
Ml2	*parətasca.mrauuaiiā̊scahamaēstārəm.[!]*	J16	*astarətaca. amuiia.mana.*
(R411	*parətasca. mruuaiiā̊sca hamaēstāra.)*	(R115	*astarətaca. amuiiamana.)*
("J1"	*parətasca. mrauuaiiā̊sca. hamēstāra.)*	P13	*astrətaca. amuiia.mana.*
(MU27	*parətasca. mrauuaiiā̊sca. hamēstāra.)*	L18	*astirətaca. amuiia.mana.*
(TD23	*parətasc[!]mrauuaiiā̊sca° hamaēstara.)*	Jm4	*astirətaca. amuuiiamna.*
J10	*pərətasca. mraoiiā̊sca hamaēstāra.*	O3	*stirətaca. amuiia.mana.*
J15	*pərətasca. mrauuaiiā̊sca hamaēstara.*	L11	*astaraϑica. amuiia.mana.*
K18	*parəstas̱ca. maruuaiiā̊sca hamaēstāra.*		
K36	*parəštasca. mrauuaiiā̊sca hamaēstāra.*		
W1	*parəštasca. ?? ??*		
L12	*parataca. mrauuāiiā̊sca. hamaēstāra.*		
M35A	*parətasca. marauuaiiā̊sca.*	M35B	*astarətaca. amuiia.mana.*

K22 *patarətasca amauiia.*

J. KELLENS was right then in pointing out that the wording of the second ms. group is equivalent to a passage in Vispered (Vr. 7,1). According to GELDNER, this runs as follows:

(Vr. 7,1) *vaca. aršuxδa. yazamaide:*   *āxštīm. hąm.vaiṇtīm. yazamaide:*
           sraošəm. ašīm. yazamaide: *astərətaca. amuiiamna. yazamaide:*
           ašīm. vaŋuhīm. yazamaide: *ašāunąmca. frauuašaiiō. yazamaide: ...*
           nairīm. saŋhəm. yazamaide:

Here, we find both Sraoša and *āxšti- hąm.vainti-* again, followed by a sequence *astərətaca. amuiiamna.* which looks nearly identical with what the F1-group has in Yt. 11,15. From this fact KELLENS concluded that the latter was secondarily adopted ("interprétation secondaire") to the wording of Vr. 7,1, maintaining that the tradition of the K20 group represents the lectio difficilior.

There can be no doubt that both passages are connected in a way. But given that the verses in question contain hapax legomena in both versions, we may ask whether these might not represent one original wording lastly, the divergences having developed only secondarily.

---

[19] From GELDNER's edition, it is not clear whether *hamaēstāra* appears in M35.

From the Vispered manuscript tradition, no further information as to this question is deducible at first glance: Besides *astərətaca* as represented by K7a, K7b, M4, M6, J15, Kh1, J8, Pt3, Jm5, L1, L2, Os, Br1, B2, Dh1 and in the repetition of Vr 7 in Mf2, Jp1 and Kh1[20], GELDNER notes *astarətaca* for Jp1, K4, Fl1$_1$ and Fl1$_2$, H1$_1$ and H1$_2$, P14, and S2; *astrətaca* in Mf2; and *astartaca* in L27. For *amuiiamna* as appearing in K7b, K4, Mf2, Jp1, Fl1, Pt3, L1 and L2, a variant *amuiiamnəm* is noted for K7a, M6, J15, and P14[21]. It is worth while considering the following observations, though.

First, *amuiiamna-*, best interpreted as a negated participle pertaining to the passive present stem *$*m\bar{u}$-i̯á-, from a root √*mū* equivalent to Vedic √*mīv/mū* "to move, to seduce"[22], is well supported by three other occurrences in the Yašts: In Yt. 13,35 and Yt. 17,17, it is combined with *razištanąm*, gen.pl. of *razišta-* ≈ Ved. *rájiṣṭha-* "the straightest", normally used as an attribute of *pantā̊* ≈ Ved. *pánthāḥ* "way". If we admit that the gen. is used instead of an abl. here, *amuiiamna-* means "not to be lead astray (from the straightest paths)", talking about the Fravašis of the righteous and Aši, respectively. The third occurrence is in Yt. 13,133 where a gen.sg.fem. *amuiiamnaiiā̊* appears as an attribute of *saŋhū-* (gen. *saŋuhas-ca*) "command"[23], alongside with *husastaiiā̊* "well proclaimed"[24] and *auuanəmnaiiā̊*, med.pres.part. from √*van* "to conquer". This reminds of the parallelism between *amuiiamna-* and *hąmvaiṇtīm* in Vr. 7,1.

Second, *astərəta-*, although being a hapax in Avestan, is well supported by its Vedic counterpart, *ástr̥ta-*, which appears several times in the RV with the meaning "insuperable". The non-negated stem of the participle, *stərəta-* "slain down", is attested two times in YAv. texts, viz. in Vd. 19,2 (*druxš*) and Yt. 19,34 (*yimō*). The interpretation of the sequence consisting of *astərəta-* and *amuiiamna-* as "insuperable and unmoveable" is based on solid ground like this. We have to consider then that the forms as attested in Vr. 7,1 represent objects to *yazamaide* so that we expect them to be accusatives. We can leave the variant *amruiiamnəm* (K7a, M6, J15, and P14) as a lectio facilior aside, all the more since it is not confirmed by any one of the mss. of the F1-group in Yt. 11,15. Accordingly, we have to choose between a neutre (nom.-)acc.pl. and a masc. or neutre (nom.-)acc.dual.

Third, we have to take into account that for *āxštīm* in Yt. 11,15, a variant reading *āxšti* is well attested in several mss. of the K20 group (K20, K18, J15, L12; "J1", TD23). This was noted by J. KELLENS (1974, 46) as an indication of an underlying dual syntagm joining *āxšti-* and *hąmvaiṇti-* in a similar way as in Vr. 11,16 where we read *āxštibiiāca hąm.vaiṇtibiiā*; in this case, the latter word would have to be interpreted as a fem. verbal abstract in *-ti-*, not a participle in *-ntī-*. This analysis would fit

---

[20] Cf. GELDNER'S edition, preliminary note to Vr. 7, according to whom Vr. 7 is repeated within the text of Y. 25 in the V(en)d(idad-)s(āde) mss.

[21] From the mss. edited in the "Pahlavi Codices and Iranian Researches" series (ed. JAMASP ASA / NAWABI), the following readings may be added: *astərətaca. amuiiamna.* TD4a (vol. 52, 1978, 632); *astərətaca. amuiiamanəm.* MU 35 (vol. 38, 1976h, 75); *astarataca. amuiiamanəm.* "J2" (vol. 16, 1976d, 220).

[22] Cf. BARTHOLOMAE 1904, 147 who refers to Ved. *kā́mamūta-* (RV 10,10,11c).

[23] Thus according to BARTHOLOMAE 1904, 1558: "Gebot, Befehl"; the word occurs only here.

[24] This reading is preferred to *hutastaiiā̊* because it implies a figura etymologica with *saŋhū*.

well with the fact that in Yt. 11,16 the dual form *haxaiia* follows which can be understood as resuming *āxšti* plus *hamvaintī* as a dual dvandva[25].

Lastly we have to consider that in the tradition of Yt. 11,15 as represented by the F1 group, there is no trace of either *yazamaide* (as present in Vr. 7,1) nor of *hamaē-stāra*. As it stands, the text rather suggests that *astərəta-* plus *amuiiamna-* are appositions to *āxšti-* plus *ham.vainti-* — or attributes joint to the following *haxaiia*. The latter possibility is preferable because it explains the change of gender: *haxay-* ≈ Ved. *sákhi-* "friend" is a masc. throughout[26].

On this basis, we may seriously wonder whether the text of Yt. 11,15 as conserved in the F1 tradition might not be reliable as it is. Furthermore, it becomes conceivable that the wording of the K20-branch of tradition might be due to a corruption of *astə-rətaca amuiiamna* as the prototype reading. The similarities of the written forms are indeed striking, and the testimony of K22 reading *patarətasca amauiia.* might indicate an intermediate step. In this case, *m(a)r(a)uu(a)iiāsca* would have to be regarded as a ghost word. But as long as the manuscript tradition for such texts as the Srōš Yašt Haδōxt has not been established with certainty, this remains conjectural of course.

Unfortunately, the Pahlavi translations of the passages in question do not give any further hints. In Vr. 7,1, it reads ⟨ʾstltkyh w ʾmwtkyh mynwg Y ʾwšydʾlyh ycwm⟩[27], thus adopting the Avestan words in question as abstract nouns in Middle Persian disguise: *astardagīh* renders *astərəta-*, and *amūdagīh, amuiiamna-*, just as *āštīh* renders *āxšti-*, and *amāwandīh, hamvainti-*. *amūdagīh* alone is glossed by *mēnōg-ī ōšyārīh*, i.e. "spirit of consciousness"[28]. The Pahlavi translation of Yt. 11,15, styled as "undeutlich" by BARTHOLOMAE (1904, 891 s.v. *pərət-* and 1197 s.v. *mrvī-*) runs quite different from that. HUMBACH (1991, 89) notes the reading *aštīh amāwandīh, wtʾnʾh ud nkȳlʾȳ*, leaving the interpretation of the two words in question open. These may well represent MPers. *wad-xwāh* (to be transliterated as ⟨wtxwʾh⟩[29]) and *nak-kīrā*, both met with as juridical terms in the Mādigān-i Hazār Dādestān with the meanings "malevolent" and "denying"[30]; the latter also appears in religious Pahlavī and Pāzend texts as the denotation of a sin[31]. But within the given passage (the

---

[25] Cp. Y. 16,8 where the dual dvandva consisting of *xšuuīδa* and *āzūiti*, "milk and fat", is resumed by the dual *hamōistri* "the two destroyers".

[26] Note that in RV 1,15,5c, *ástr̥tam* is used as an epithet of *sakhyám* "friendship". In RV 1,4,4 and 1,41,6-7 *ástr̥ta-* and *sakhí-* occur side by side, but with no narrow relationship between them.

[27] Cf. DHABHAR 1949, 304 sq.; the same reading appears in K7a, cf. the facsimile edition by BARR (1944), fol. 125r.

[28] In "J2" and MU35, we read ⟨xwyškʾlyh⟩ *xwēškārīh* "sense of duty" instead of *ōšyārīh*; TD4a has ⟨stʾlynyh ʾmʾwkyh⟩ (*astārēnīh *amāwandīh?*) instead of *astardagīh amūdagīh*.

[29] This reading seems first to have been suggested by DHABHAR 1963, 204 n. 15 (non vidi); it was accepted by KREYENBROEK 1985, 66 and 103 n. 15.[4]

[30] Cf. MHD 83,11 in the new edition by MACUCH (1993, 539) where both words occur side by side: MN psymʾr pt ZK y nkyrʾy bwḫtʾ pyšymʾr wtḫwʾh, i.e. *az pasēmāl-i pad ān-i nakkīrā bōxt pēšēmāl wadxwāh* "as against a defendant who has been cleared of what he had denied, the plaintiff (is declared) malevolent". Cf. MACUCH, o.c. 63 sq. for a detailed analysis of *nakkīrā*.

[31] Cf., e.g., Mēnōg-i xrad, Pahl.-Vs., 36,13 (ed. SANJANA 1895, 53): *dahom kē tis ī-š pad nigāhdārīh padīrift bē xʸarēd ud *nakkīrā bawēd* "the tenth (sin), if (he) consumes a thing he has taken charge of and (if he) denies (this)".

complete wording is ⟨ʾštyh w hmwndyh ycwm *wtʾwʾh wnkylʾy hmystʾl⟩, i.e. *āštīh ud amāwandīh yazom *wad-xwāh *ud *nakkīrā hamēstār* in K20, "J1", TD23), *wadxwāh* and *nakkīrā* do not necessarily witness to the meaning of the Avestan words they represent; as often, they may have been inserted by the translator as mere stand-ins, suggested to him by the context. In the present case, we cannot but suspect that either *āštīh* or *amāwandīh* (or even *hamēstār*) was used in comparable juridic environments. It must be underlined, however, that by now, the Pahlavi translation can only be quoted from mss. belonging to the K20-group; F1 contains a *sāde* text (as well as R115), and for the other mss., it is not clear from GELDNER's description whether they have Pahlavi versions or not. It seems that the F1-tradition is restricted to *sāde* mss. at all.

In connection with the other alleged cognates of the Avestan root ^{2}*mrū* "to violate", the Pahlavi tradition gains more weight. *mrūrō*, epithet of the winter in Vd. 2,22, is translated by *mūdag* which in its turn is glossed by ⟨AYK MNDOM tpʾh OBYDWNyt⟩, i.e *kū tis tabāh kunēd* "which makes thing(s) spoilt"[32]. The same word, *mūdag,* is used as the equivalent of *mruta* in the Farhang-ī ōīm (F. XI: 491). As G. KLINGENSCHMITT (1968a, 149) points out, we find two further attestations of both *mūdag* and its gloss in the Pahlavi version of the Hōm Yašt, viz. in Y. 9,32 and 11,6, where the text has the compound ⟨mwtk-krtʾl⟩, i.e. *mūdag-kardār* "spoilt-maker". The former testimony is worthless because here, the compound obviously mirrors Av. *maoδanō.kairiiā*, a bahuvrihi meaning "whose action is lust" (attribute of a whore, *jahikā-*); *mūdag* may have been chosen in this case because of its phonetic similarity, the Av. hapax *maoδana-* reminding of MPers. *mūd-*. In Yt. 11,6, however, *mūdag-kardār* translates Av. *mūrakā* (nom.pl.), one in a series of three names of (Daevic) creatures (beside *dahākā* and *varəšnā*) to be born in the house of somebody who deprives Haoma of his legitimate share. The exact meaning of the Av. word remains unclear, although it might be a derivational form of *mūra-* as appearing in Yt. 5,93, a hapax mostly translated as "wicked" in agreement with Ved. *mūrá-*. Unfortunately, a Pahlavi version of Yt. 5 is not available so that we cannot prove that the Pahlavi translator had this word in mind when rendering *mūraka-* by *mūdag kardār*. There is a hidden indication, however, of the interdependency of *mūra-* and *mūdag* to be found in the Farhang-ī ōīm. The entry following the hapax *mruta* is unusual in the sense that the Av. word in question, *mərəzānāi,* seems to be glossed by two Pahlavi lemmas, one of them written in Avestan script. According to KLINGENSCHMITT (1968a, 1650), the entry reads *mərəzānāi:* $^+$*mwlʾn cygwn* $^+$*KLSH*, i.e. "$^+$*mulān* soviel wie Bauch" (KLSH is the aramaeogram for *aškam(b)* "belly"). While Mpers. *mulān* "belly" and Av. *mərəzāna-*, a hapax again, can easily be identified etymologically (presupposing OPers. **mərdāna-*), there is no reason why the former should have been written in Avestan script, all the more since the writing is defective: what we read is *murā* in both substantial manuscripts containing the Farhang[33]. We may therefore suggest that two items of the prototype manuscript were confused here, viz. (MPers.) *mulān* and

---

[32] Cf. the edition SANJANA 1895, 19; JAMASP / GANDEVIA 1907, 36 have *kunēnd* "they make".

[33] Cf. KLINGENSCHMITT 1968a, I and 1968b, I. Besides K20 and M51, the Farhang is included in TD28 (ed. JAMASP ASA / NAWABI 1976i); here the text is as defective for the entry in question (159) as the one contained in M51, reading only (*mərəzānāi murā* plus) ⟨SE⟩ instead of ⟨čygwn KLSE⟩.

(Av.) *mŭrā*, the latter representing the proper equivalent (and etymological cognate) of MPers. *mūdag* (and *mruta*, a secondary marginal or interlinear gloss[34]).

Returning to *mrūrō* in Vd. 2,22, we may wonder then whether this might have secondarily replaced an original **mūrō* meaning "noxious". In this case, we should have to explain the first *r* in *mrūrō* as an intrusion. A possible source for this can be traced in Vd. 7,27 where, in another lamentation about bad winter, this is called *xrūta-* "cruel" (and, n.b., *gaojan-* "cow killing"). The parallelism of *xrūra-*[35] / *xrūta-* and *mrūra-* / *mruta-* is indeed striking. After all, the adaptation of **mūra-* to *mrūra-* need not necessarily have been restricted to manuscript tradition. It may well have become a feature of the spoken (Young-)Avestan language[36]. But even if it did, this does not mean that we should expect the resulting "root" √*mrū* to have been able to form a passive root aorist, /mraui/, or a feminine *ī*-stem noun *mraoī-* in Gathic times — just as **kreuh$_2$-*, the "root" underlying Av. *xrūra-*, did not develop a primary verbal paradigm in any I.-E. language.

What, then, is *mraoī* in Y. 32,14? The main argument put forward by HUMBACH and KELLENS when rejecting the traditional analysis of *mraoī* as a 3.sg. passive form of √*mrū* "to speak" was that this root formed a present stem only, its aorist being supplied by √*vāc*, and that the expected 3rd sg. passive forms, *vācī* (inj.) and *auuācī* (ind.) are well attested (Y. 43,13 / Y. 36,6: HUMBACH 1991, 89). It is indeed true that the passive formation with the ending *-i* is confined to the aorist in Vedic. This can easily be shown by looking at the attestations of the immediate cognate of Av. *auuācī*, viz. Ved. *avāci*: In five of its six occurrences in the RV, it appears in the last stanza of a hymn, its function consisting in stating that the aim of proclaiming the hymn has just been achieved by reaching its end; cp., e.g., RV 6,34,5b: *índrāya stotrám matíbhir avāci* "(with these words,) a praise song has now been proclaimed to Indra, with (pious) thoughts"[37]. Thus, *avāci* is in perfect agreement with the corresponding 1st

---

[34] Note that in K20, the Mpers. equivalent of *mruta* is written ⟨mwltk⟩ (cf. CHRISTENSEN 1931, fol. 82v). This suggests a (secondary?) identification of *mruta* with *mərəta-* "dead" ≈ Npers. *murda* < Mpers. **murdag*; cp. also n. 36 below.

[35] *xrūrahe* instead of *xrūtahe* is the variant reading of Jp1, Mf2, K10, L2 in Vd. 7,27; other variants are *xratahe* (K1) and *xrūvahe* (! L1, O2). GELDNER's *xrūtahe* appears in Pt2, Ml4, P10, L4a, L3, and P2 (sec. manu).

[36] One further attestation of *mrūra-* may be seen in one of the fragments edited by WESTERGAARD (FrW. 8,2: 1852-54, 334). The text as contained herein is much more parallel to the Pahlavi version of Vd. 2,22 passage than this is itself; note the following equivalences: Vd. 2,22 *haca. staxrō. mrūrō. ziiā̊:* / FrW. 8,2 *haēcā. .. staxrahe. mərətō. zaiia.*; Vd. 2,22 PT with gloss: *stahmagīh (ī-š [⟨ZY-š⟩;* read *ziyā(-ī)?] sturg kū harw gyāg andar šawēd)* / FrW. 8,2 *auuaϑa. staxrō. yaṯ. hā. druxš. aēiti.*; Vd. 2,22 PT with gloss: *mūdag (kū tis tabāh kunēnd)* / FrW. 8,2 *mōirōs. yaṯ. mahrkūšō. auua.mīriiāite.* > Vd. 2,22 PT with gloss: *zamistān rasēd (*markūšān gōwēnd)* (> Npers. gloss in K1 [ed. BARR / IBSCHER 1941, 34] *ism-i zamistān gōyand*). Although the much distorted text of FrW. 8 deserves of further investigation (according to WESTERGAARD, it is found in two mss., viz. K15 and K38 [= M3 WESTERGAARD]), it seems clear that the equivalent of *mrūrō* is concealed both in *mərətō.* (<> *mruta-*? cp. n. 34 above) and *mōirōs* here. Should ⟨mōir-⟩ reflect ⟨mrūr-⟩ directly? — *mruuāca* in N.62 has no context and cannot be taken into consideration (cf. HUMBACH 1991, 89).

[37] Similarly RV 1,51,15b; 5,3,12b; 8,40,12b; 10,54,6d; 7,58,6c may be added where traditional *sā́ vāci* conceals *sā́ avāci*. Cf. HOFFMANN 1967, 219 sqq. for this restitution and for the function of the

person active forms, *avocam* (1.sg.) and *avocāma* (1.pl.) that are normally used as in RV 1,114,11a-d: *ávocāma námo asmā avasyávaḥ* "(with these words), we have proclaimed the (hymn of) veneration, longing for help"[38]. The same principle can be seen in the use of the Old Av. counterpart of *avocāma* attested in the finishing stanza of Y. 38 in the form *āuuaocāma*[39] which may conceal *ā* plus *auuaocāma:* "(with these words), we have called you hither (the waters ...)".[40]

Thus, the assumption that the 3rd sg. passive forms in *-i* pertain to the aorist system in Indo-Iranian seems well founded. This does not mean, however, that they formed a part of the aorist paradigm proper: There is a clear difference between *(a)vāci* on the one hand and *(a)vocam, (a)vocāma* etc. on the other hand in that the latter only are built from the reduplicated thematic stem (*$*e\text{-}ue\text{-}uk^{u}e/o\text{-}$*) which by comparison with Greek εἶπον can be regarded as inherited from the I.-E. protolanguage. *(a)vāci*, however, must be considered as an athematic formation, consisting of an ending *-i* directly attached to the *o*-graded root[41]. Taking this into account for the case of *mraoī* meaning "it is spoken", I have argued (1985, 55 n. 65) that this could easily have been built by analogy with the passive aorist forms, because √*mrū* had an athematic root present. The analogy would thus have consisted in transferring the ending only, yielding /mraui̯/ with short *-a-* in accordance with the BRUGMANN condition of a closed syllable produced by the root final laryngeal (*$*mrou.H\text{-}i$*)[42].

But such an assumption is not even necessary to justify *mraoī*, given that within Avestan, at least one passive form is attested that is regarded by the *communis opinio*[43] to be built from a marked present stem. This is *ərənāuui* which occurs several times in the so-called Hōm Yašt (Y. 9) in the formula *kā. ahmāi. aṣiš. ərənāuui.* "what an allotment was allotted to him?" (Y. 9,3.6.9.12; the following verses each contain the answering formula *hā. ahmāi. aṣiš. ərənāuui.* "this allotment was allotted to him"). Note that *ərənāuui* and *aṣi-* (< *$*árti\text{-}$, √^{2}ar) are joint in a figura etymologica which reoccurs, with plain medial forms functioning as passives, in Y. 56,3-4 and 65,17: .. *vaŋhuiiā̊scā. aṣōiš. yasnāi. yā. nə̄. āraēcā. ərənauuataēcā. aṣaŋhāxš* ".. for worship(ping) of the good allotment which was allotted to us (formerly: pf. *ārae*) and will be allotted to us (in future times: cj. *ərənauuataē*), accompanying (or accompanied by) truth".

---

aorist indicative in general ("aktuelle Vergangenheit", "resultative Konstatierung").

[38] Similarly: *ávocam*: 1,116,25a; 1,185,10a; 4,45,7a; *ávocāma*: 1,78,5a; 189,8a; 4,2,20b; 5,1,12a; 5,73,10d; 10,80,7b; exceptional: 8,59,5a.

[39] This variant, present in Pt4, K5, J2, S1; Mf2, Jp1, K4, is preferable as against GELDNER's *auuaocāma* taken from Dh1, Lb2, H1, L13, J7, P6 or *auuōcāmā* as represented in Mf4, Mf1, J3, L2, L1, O2, B2, L3, Bb1, C1; cf. NARTEN 1986, 235 n. 145.

[40] For *auuācī*, the last word of Y. 36, a similar analysis is hardly possible; cf. below.

[41] A recent attempt to find an I.-E. perspective for this formation was published in JASANOFF 1992, 129 sqq.; now cf. also KÜMMEL 1996.

[42] Cp., e.g., Ved. *(á)jáni* < *$*(é)\acute{g}ónh_{1}\text{-}i$* from seṭ *jani* "to beget" vs. *átāpi* < *$*étop\text{-}i$* from aniṭ *tap* "to heat"; HUMBACH's *$*mrāuuī$* (1991: II, 89) has no basis.

[43] Cf., e.g., BARTHOLOMAE 1904, 184 f. s.v. ^{2}ar-; KELLENS 1984, 231; HOFFMANN/FORSSMAN 1996, 228.

A second Avestan form that has to be dealt with in this connection is *jaini* which occurs three times in Yt. 19,92-93. This can only be analysed as a passive form belonging to √*jan* "to kill": It appears just in the ritualized context of killing enemies Calvert WATKINS discussed in the article we started from. Cf. his interpretation of Yt. 19,92[44]:

⁺*vaδəm vaējō yim vārəϑraγnəm*	'swinging the weapon which smashes resistance
yim baraṯ taxmō ϑraētaonō	which brave Thraetaona carried,
yaṯ ažiš dahākō jaini	when Aži Dahāka was slain.'

With the object of slaying, *aži- dahāka-*, put in the nominative, this verse represents a clear passivization of the active clause present in Y. 9,8 ... *ϑraētaōnō .. yō janaṯ ažīm dahākəm* '... Thraetaona ... who slew the dragon Aži Dahāka'[45]. Of course we have to note that for the verbal root in question, √*jan* < √*g^{wh}en-*, we should expect not *jaini* but *jāini as the 3rd sg. passive form containing the *o*-graded root, **(e)g^{wh}on-i* — just as we should expect not *janaṯ* but *jan or *jən (< **g^{wh}en-t* ≈ Ved. *hán*, Hitt. *kuenta*[46]) for the 3rd sg. act.inj. form. But nevertheless, there can be no doubt that *jaini* was built directly from a verbal root which shared two important features with √*mrū* "to speak": Both were typical "Präsenswurzeln" in the sense that they formed an athematic root present and never developed an aorist stem of their own.

It is interesting, then, to see that in Vedic too, we find *i*-passives from roots that form present stems primarily or exclusively. One such case is *bhāri* (RV 9,97,23d). Although there are but few traces in Vedic showing that √*bhar* "to bear" once formed an athematic root present (3rd sg. pres.ind.act. *bhárti* in RV 1,173,6d, *bharti* in 6,13,3b; what we normally have is a thematic full-grade root present, *bhárati,* or a reduplicated athematic one, *bibhárti*), and although an *s*-aorist of this root is attested, it is quite probable on comparative grounds that √*bhar* was inherited as a "Präsens-wurzel" into Indo-Iranian[47]. One more such case is √*stu* "to praise" whose *i*-passive, *á/astāvi*, is attested six times in the RV (1,141,13a; 6,23,10b; 8,52,9a; 10,45,12a; 63,17d; 64,17d). Besides being notorious for representing the special "Narten" type of athematic root present, this root too has an *s*-aorist in Vedic; but as with √*bhar*, it seems likely that this is only secondary[48], all the more since it has no counterpart in Avestan.

---

[44] Cf. WATKINS 1987, 275 (where "Yt. 19.32" is a misprint). Although a variant *vaδəm* seems not to be attested in the present place, the emendation of *vaēδəm* (v.ll. *vaiδəm, vaeδəm, vaidəm*: HINTZE 1994, 370) as proposed by SCHINDLER apud WATKINS l.c. is preferable to BARTHOLOMAE's view now supported by HINTZE (o.c., 373 sq.) according to whom this might be a derivative of the root present in OInd. *vídhyati* "to shoot, to hit". Cp. *vadəm* attested in Vd. 14,7 (L4) with variants *vadim* (Jp1), *vaδəm* (L1, M2, O2), but also *vaēδəm* (K1, K10, L2, Dh1), *viδim* (Mf2), *vaiδəm* (B2), or the cognate *vadarə̄* beside *vōiždaṯ* in Y. 32,10c.

[45] WATKINS, o.c., 274.

[46] Cp. Old Av. *ajə̄n* in Y. 48,10 if this represents **ājə̄n* < **ā-j̑^{h}ant* as suggested by KELLENS 1984, 94, HUMBACH 1991, II: 203 or HOFFMANN / FORSSMAN 1996, 201 (BARTHOLOMAE 1904, 492 takes this as a 2.sg., quasi **ā-j̑^{h}ans*).

[47] For the Vedic aorist forms cf. NARTEN 1964, 183 according to whom these "machen .. den Eindruck .. einer Neubildung"; for further literature, cf. MAYRHOFER 1986-, II: 248 sq.

[48] Cf. NARTEN 1964, 276 sqq.

There is a difference, however, between Ved. *astāvi* and Zarathustra's *mraoī*. For the former, it can easily be shown that it forms part of the aorist system in the same way as *avāci* does: It always appears in the final (or last but one: 8,52,9a) stanza of a hymn, stating that the praise of the deity the hymn is dedicated to has been accomplished. For Av. *mraoī*, such a function cannot be assumed — which is no surprise, given that it is not augmented, thus lacking the characteristic element of the Vedic aorist indicative forms compared. But even if it has to be considered as an injunctive form from the morphological point of view, we are entitled to ask whether it can be assigned to the aorist rather than the present paradigm. The answer is certainly no: There is good reason to believe that *mraoī* did not pertain to the aorist but to the present system. The evidence can be taken from the context it appears in in Y. 32: Starting from Y. 32,9, Zarathustra complains about the evil deeds (*aēnaŋh-* ≈ Ved. *énas-* "outrage, crime") his opponents commit. Nearly all of the incriminated actions are named by verbal forms that must be classified as present injunctives: between Y. 32,9 and 13, we find *mōrəṇdat̰ / mōrəndən, aogədā, dadāt̰, vīuuāpat̰, vōiždat̰, rārə-šiiąn, rāŋhaiiən, hīšasat̰* (desiderative), *jīgərəzat̰*. The same holds true especially for the immediate context *mraoī* appears in: In Y. 32,14, we read *[nī.]dadat̰* in the main clause, *vīsəṇtā* and *mraoī* in two adjunct subordinate clauses introduced by *hiiat̰ / hiiat̰cā*, and *saocaiiat̰* in the final relative clause[49]. It is well conceivable that in all these cases, the present injunctives were used to express actions that were regularly and usually, if not repeatedly, undertaken by the persons accused (*karapans, kavis* etc.)[50]. In the present context, this is underlined by the use of *fraidiuuā* "day by day". Starting from this assumption, we arrive at the following interpretation of the stanza containing *mraoī*:

> "As a *grəhma-*, even the *kavi*s (continue to) concentrate their (mental) powers in the fettering of this one (*ϑβahiiā mąϑrānō*, "thy prophet": 32,13c), and in (achieving) glamour[51], day by day, whenever they get near the deceitful one to assist (him), and whenever the cow is ordered to be killed, to assist (him) who inflames the one who is hard to burn".

We can contrast this with the use of *vācī* in Y. 43,13e which appears in perfect agreement with the aorist injunctive *dārəšt* of the preceding verse, both forming the predicate of a relative clause:

arəϑā. vōizdiiāi.   kāmahiiā. təm. mōi. dātā.
darəgahiiā. yāuš.   yəm. vā̊. naēcīš. dārəšt. itē.
vairiiā̊. stōiš.   yā. ϑβahmī. xšaϑrōi. vācī.

---

[49] Cp. the listings in KELLENS / PIRART 1988-1991: II, 74.

[50] KELLENS / PIRART (1988-1991: II, 78) even speak of a "mode itératif du réel du présent".

[51] I agree with INSLER 1975, 208 in taking *ā.hōiϑōi.* and *varəcā.hīcā.* as parallel locatives, the latter distorted from *varəcahi-cā.*

".. to take notice of the aims of (my) wish — grant this to me —[52], (viz.) for a long lifetime, (a wish) which nobody keeps you from acceding to[53], (and my wish) for the preferable existence which is said (to be) in your reign."

As against *mraoī* in 32,14, *vācī* and *dārəšt* do not describe usual or repeated actions but denote general statements[54], thus perfectly matching with what K. HOFFMANN worked out as the main function of the aorist injunctive in non-prohibitive sentences in Vedic ("stating of the result of a past action which has a lasting effect": 1967, 218). In German, the difference between *mraoī* and *vācī* can easily be accounted for by translating them with either one of the two different passives, using the "Vorgangs-passiv" for *mraoī* ("wenn die Kuh als zu töten[de] benannt wird") and the "Zustands-passiv" for *vācī* ("die als in eurem Herrschaft[sbereich befindlich] benannt ist").

The two passive forms quoted from Young Avestan, *ərənāuui* and *jaini*, can as well be shown not to have left the present system. Both are used in contexts that are characterized by other forms pertaining to the present stem, viz. *hunūta* in Y. 9,3 sqq. and *barat̰* in Y. 19,92 sq. In contrast with *mraoī*, however, we have a different function of the injunctives here in that the passages in question refer to (mythic) events in the past; cp. Y. 9,3 (Zarathustra asks Haoma):

kasə. ϑβąm. paoiriiō. haoma. mašiiō.	"Who pressed you (Haōma) as the first mortal
astuuaiϑiiāi. hunūta. gaēϑiiāi.	(being) for the corporeal world? What allotment
kā. ahmāi. ašiš. ərənāuui.	was allotted to him?"

Given that a thorough study of the Avestan past tense categories is still wanting, we cannot decide with certainty whether this is a function of the present injunctive proper or whether we have to analyse the forms in question as augmentless imperfects[55]. Nevertheless they prove that there was a tendency in Avestan to extend the use of the passive ending *-i* to the present system, perhaps brought about by contexts that required passive forms of the present injunctive (/ imperfect) such as the ones dis-cussed here. And there is no reason to believe that this tendency could not have emerged in Old Avestan times, *mraoī* being the first example attested.

---

[52] Parenthetical *təm (..) dā-* is an inherited Indo-Iranian formula uttered when speaking about a wish; cp. RV 7,97,4cd *kā́mo rāyáḥ suvī́ryasya tā́ṃ dāt párṣan no áti saścáto áriṣṭān* "the wish (concerning) wealth of good men — this he will grant (us); he will lead us past (all) pursuers without being damaged" where the parenthetical character of *tā́ṃ dāt* is underlined by *kā́maḥ* being a pendent nominative.

[53] As against INSLER 1975, 238, *dārəšt̰* cannot represent a 3rd sg. root aor. of *dṛš* 'dare' because of its vocalism (but *dōrəšt̰* in 49,2c can). If it is an *s*-aorist from √*dar* "to hold" (thus KELLENS/-PIRART 1988-1991: II, 254), we should expect an "ablative infinitive" depending from it, to give it the sense of "keep sbd. from doing sth."; KELLENS / PIRART (l.c.) prefer to translate "contraindre *acc.* à *dat./inf.*". Note that *itē* seems no longer to be regarded as an infinitive by J. KELLENS: As against KELLENS / PIRART (o.c., 222 and 254), it is not mentioned in his more recent article (1994 [1995], 52 and 59).

[54] Cf., for *vācī*, HUMBACH 1991: II, 76.

[55] Cf. HUMBACH 1991: II, 75, according to whom "what in Old Avestan is an inj.pres. has become a preterite in Young Avestan".

There is one final observation that supports the view of *mraoī* as expressed here. Interpreting this as a passive form from √*mrū* "to speak, to order", we have to assume that a speech act was intrinsically involved in the cruel act of cow-killing Zarathustra complains about. And indeed, this speech act is referred to another time in the immediate context. In Y. 32,12b, Zarathustra speaks a first time about the cow-killers who are reproached for their evil deed by Ahura Mazdā: *aēibiiō. mazdā. akā. mraot̰. yōi. gə̄uš. mōrəṇdən. uruuāxš.uxtī. jiiōtūm.* "The Mazdā declares (these) as evil (reputations, *srauuā̊*) to those who spoil the cow's life by speaking *uruuāxš*". On the basis of a comparison with Ved. *námaükti-* "speaking with veneration", HUMBACH (1991: II, 86) was certainly right in identifying the second member of the compound *uruuāxš.uxtī* with the *-ti*-stem abstract of √*vac*, the root supplying √*mrū*; cp. the instr.pl. *námaüktibhiḥ* in RV 8,4,6d, with *ávocāma námaḥ* "(with these words,) we have pronounced veneration" in 1,114,11a and *námaḥ ... bravāma* "we shall pronounce veneration" in 2,28,8ab. Although the actual meaning and status of *uruuāxš* remains unclear, it becomes conceivable that for Zarathustra, the killing of cows as committed by his enemies was essentially accompanied by ritualized utterances.

Bibliography

BARR, Kaj (ed.) 1944. *Selections from Codices K7 and K25 .. Published in facsimile by the University Library of Copenhagen with an introduction by K.B.* Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

BARR, Kaj and IBSCHER, Hugo (eds.) 1941. *The Avesta Codices K3a, K3b and K1. Published in facsimile by the University Library of Copenhagen with an introduction by K.B. and a contribution on the restoration of the ms K1 by H.I.* Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

BARTHOLOMAE, Christian 1904. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch.* Strassburg: Trübner.

——. 1905. *Die Gatha's des Awesta. Zarathustras Verspredigten,* übersetzt von Chr.B. Straßburg: Trübner.

BECHERT, Johannes 1964. βουφονέω. *MSS* 17.5-17.

BURNOUF, Eugène (ed.) 1829-1843. *Vendidad Sadé, l'un des livres de Zoroastre. Lithogrphié d'après le manuscrit Zend de la Bibliothèque Royale ..* Paris.

CHRISTENSEN, Arthur (ed.) 1931. *The Pahlavi Codices K20 & K20b containing Ardāgh Vīrāz-Nāmagh, Bundahishn etc. Published in facsimile by The University Library of Copenhagen with an Introduction by A.Chr.* Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

DHABHAR, Ervad Bamanji Nasarvanji (ed.) 1949. *Pahlavi Yasna and Visperad.* Bombay: Shahnameh Press.

DHABHAR, B.N. 1963. *Translation of Zand-i Khūrtak Avistāk.* Bombay.

GELDNER, Karl F. (ed.) 1889-1896. *Avesta. The Sacred Books of the Parsis.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

——. 1923-1957. *Der Rigveda. Übersetzt und erläutert. I-IV.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht / Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich / O. Harrassowitz / Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press. / London: G. Cumberledge / Oxford Univ. Press.

GIPPERT, Jost 1978. *Zur Syntax der infinitivischen Bildungen in den indogermanischen Sprachen (Doktordissertation Berlin 1977)*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

——. 1985. Verbum dicendi + Infinitiv im Indoiranischen. *MSS* 44.29-57.

HAUG, Martin and WEST, Edward William 1872. *The Book of Arda Viraf*. Bombay / London (Repr. Amsterdam 1971: Oriental Press).

HINTZE, Almut 1994. *Der Zamyād-Yašt. Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

HOFFMANN, Karl 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Heidelberg: Winter.

——. 1984. Zur Handschriftenüberlieferung der Gathas. *MSS* 43.123-131 / repr. in *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik* 3.803-811. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

HOFFMANN, Karl and FORSSMAN, Bernhard 1996. *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

HUMBACH, Helmut 1957. Ahura Mazdā und die Daēvas. *WZKS* 1.81-94.

——. 1959. *Die Gathas des Zarathustra. Bd. 1: Einleitung. Text. Übersetzung. Paraphrase. Bd. 2: Kommentar*. Heidelberg: Winter.

——. 1991. *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra and the Other Old Avestan Texts* by H.H. in collaboration with Josef ELFENBEIN and Prods O. SKJÆRVØ. *Pt. I: Introduction - Text and Translation. Pt. II: Commentary*. Heidelberg: Winter.

INSLER, Stanley 1975. *The Gāthās of Zarathustra*. Leiden: Brill.

JAMASP, Hoshang and GANDEVIA, Mervanji Manekji (eds.) 1907. *Vendidâd. Avesta text with Pahlavi translation and commentary ... Vol. I - The Texts*. Bombay: Government Central Book Depôt.

JAMASPASA, Kaikhusroo M. (ed.) 1991. *The Avesta Codex F1 (Niyāyišns and Yašts). Facsimile edition with an introduction by K.M. J.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

JAMASP ASA, Kaikhusroo M. and NAWABI, Mahyar (eds.) 1976-1978. 1976a: *Manuscript TD23. Khorde Avesta & an Incomplete Pahlavi text of the Mēnōy i Xrat*. Shiraz: Asia Institute of Pahlavi University. (*The Pahlavi Codices and Iranian Researches*. 4.) — 1976b. *Manuscript J1. Khorde Avesta With its Pahlavi Translation*. (*Codices .. 6.*) — 1976c. *Manuscript R115. Afrins, Nirangs, Patēts, etc. Pt. 2*. (*Codices .. 15.*) — 1976d. *Manuscript j2. Few Yazishn, Niyayishns, Afarins ...* (*Codices.. 16.*) — 1976e. *Manuscript D90. Yasnā With its Pahlavi Translation. Pt. 1*. (*Codices.. 19.*) — 1976f. *MS. R 411. Few Prayers, Nīrangs, Bājs & Yašts*. (*Codices.. 23.*) — 1976g. *Manuscript MU 27. Khurtak Avistak with its Pahlavi Translation ...* (*Codices .. 24.*) — 1976h. *Manuscript MU 35. The Avesta and Pahlavi texts of the minor and major Siroza and Visperad, etc.* (*Codices .. 38.*) — 1976i. *Manuscript TD 28. Avestan & Pahlavi Texts ...* (*Codices .. 11.*). — 1978. *Manuscript TD4a. The Pahlavi Rivāyat, Dātistān-i Dinīk ...* (*Codices .. 52.*)

JASANOFF, Jay 1992. Reconstructing morphology: the role of o-grade in Hittite and Tocharian verb inflection. *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures, ed. Edgar C. Polomé and Werner Winter,* 129-155. Berlin / New York: de Gruyter.

KELLENS, Jean 1974. *Les noms-racines de l'Avesta*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

——. 1984. *Le verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

——. 1994 [1995]: Retour à l'infinitif avestique. *MSS* 55.45-59.

KELLENS, Jean and PIRART, Eric 1988-1991: *Les textes vieil avestiques. Vol. 1 (1988): Introduction, texte et traduction. Vol. 2 (1990): Répertoires grammaticaux et lexique. Vol. 3 (1991): Commentaire.* Wiesbaden: Reichert.

KLINGENSCHMITT, Gert 1968a. *Farhang-i ōīm. Edition und Kommentar. Inaugural-Dissertation Erlangen-Nürnberg* (unpublished typescript).

———. 1968b. *Farhang-i ōīm. Edition und Kommentar. (Teildruck der Inaugural-Dissertation Erlangen-Nürnberg).*

KREYENBROEK, G. 1985. *Sraoša in the Zoroastrian Tradition.* Leiden: Brill.

KÜMMEL, Martin. 1996. *Stativ und Passivaorist im Indoiranischen (Historische Sprachforschung, Ergänzungsheft* 39). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

MACUCH, Maria 1993. *Rechtskasuistik und Gerichtspraxis zu Beginn des siebenten Jahrhunderts in Iran. Die Rechtssammlung des Farroḫmard i Wahrāmān.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred 1986-. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen. I.-II.* Heidelberg: Winter.

NARTEN, Johanna 1964. *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

———. 1968. Das altindische Verb in der Sprachwissenschaft. *Sprache* 14.113-134.

———. 1986. *Der Yasna Haptaŋhāiti.* Wiesbaden: Reichert.

SANJANA, Darab Dastur Peshotan (ed.) 1895a. *The Dînâ î Maînû î Khrat, or The Religious Decisions of the Spirit of Wisdom.* Bombay: Duftur Ashkara / Education Society

———. 1895b. *The Zand î Javît Shêda Dâd or The Pahlavi Version of the Avesta Vendidâd.* Bombay: Education Society.

SCHINDLER, Jochem 1982. Zum Nom.Sing. der *nt*-Partizipien im Jungavestischen. *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae. Gedenkschrift für heinz Kronasser,* ed. E. NEU. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

VASMER, Max 1955. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. I.-III.* Heidelberg: Winter.

WATKINS, Calvert 1987. How to kill a dragon in Indo-European. *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill*, ed. C. WATKINS, 270-299. Berlin-New York: de Gruyter.

WESTERGAARD, N.L. 1852-54. *Zendavesta or The Religious Books of The Zoroastrians. Vol. I: The Zend Texts.* Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

WOLFF, Fritz 1910. *Avesta. Die heiligen Bücher der Parsen, übersetzt auf der Grundlage von Chr. Bartholomae's altiranischem Wörterbuch.* Straßburg: Trübner.