

GAv. *azāθā* and *asrū(ž)dūm*

1. In Y 50.7d *azāθā* is generally interpreted as a subjunctive, from the root *zā-* (for which 30.10c is to be compared). A subjunctive, however, would give [*zaaθa*] < \**zah-a-θa*, which would give five syllables before the caesura, while Y 50 everywhere has four syllables there (the forms 4a *yazāi* and 8b *jasāi* are problematic, but that they are disyllabic is shown by the total of their occurrences (cf. Mrs. M.C.MONNA, *The Gathas of Zarathustra. A Reconstruction of the Text.* Diss. Leiden 1978). Also it would require emendation to \**ā* \**zāθā*, which is the most obvious way to interpret *a-*, though neither HUMBACH nor INSLER pronounce themselves. (Augment is excluded, because it would require the secondary ending *-tā*.) This emendation is not very probable. While originally short *a* is often written long, the reverse is rare. Specially at the beginning of the word short for long would be strange.

HUMBACH therefore considers the root *az-* "wobei allerdings dann der Instr. *yāiš* auffällig wäre". However, the present stem is *aza-*, which would give [*azaθa*] in the subjunctive, which is also one syllable too long. An indicative, which is not excluded by the context, would have had [*azaθa*], which would imply reading a long *ā* short.

I think we must keep to the root *zā-* (for which 30.10c is a strong argument). This could be done by understanding \**ā* \**zāθā* < \**zahθa*, an indicative with *ā* instead of *a-*. But a subjunctive is more probable, it would be strange if *ā* was not retained, and in 30.10c there is no *ā*. Therefore I suppose that *a-* is not original, but is a 'glide' between *yāiš* and \**zāθā* (cf. MONNA 101). We know these glides well enough: *yāme spašūθā* 53.6b (the only one not between two sibilants), *paitišə sahyāt* 44.9c, *huzəntušə spəntō* 43.3e, *azə sarədanā* 43.14d. In

the interior of a word they appear as *a* in *išasa-* (3 times), *dužazōbah-* and, less certain, *qsašutā* 48.1b. There seems no difficulty in the assumption that this vowel could also appear as *a* between two words. We must read, then, *yāiš* [a]zāθā, [*yāiš* zaaθa] < \*zaHaθa.

2. Y 32.3c *yāiš aērū(ž)dūm būmyā haptaiθē* might have another instance of such an inorganic *a-*. INSLER (Gathas 199) states that emendation to \*ā \**srūdūm* is required in view of 28.11c *yāiš ā*, 32.15a *anāiš ā*, etc. 'by reason of...'. I cannot see that this is necessary, as e.g. (32)6a has *yāiš srāvahyeitt* which he translates 'by which one attains fame'. As ā is not necessary, it seems that INSLER does not want an augment, but he does not say why. His emendation requires ā for *a*, which I think is improbable.

A reason for striking *a-* is that we expect [*būmyāh*] according to Sievers' Law, which would give ten syllables here. But there are two objections. One is that perhaps more lines in Y 32 had ten syllables: 6a, 9a (unless we strike *mazdā*), 12c (when we must read [*išnaam*]). Another objection is that Sievers' Law has three exceptions (in this category) according to Mrs. MONNA, p.105: *sarəidyā-*, *aojya-* and *xrūnya-*, of which the latter, when the *ū* is really long, is equal in structure to *būmyā*.

3. ā for *a-* has also been proposed for 51.4a *mərəždikā(i) axštāt*. HUMBACH is right in remarking that *-āi* as the lectio difficilior is preferable: the context favours *-ā*, while it is quite understandable from where *-āi* could have been introduced. *-āi* is also attested by the majority of the manuscripts (20) and of the manuscript families, *-ā* only by five manuscripts. The blameless form *mərəždikāi* is the best attested reading, given by eleven manuscripts. Everything points to an original *mərəždikāi*, with a number of corruptions, one

of which is  $-\bar{a}$ . (A more cogent argumentation I cannot find in the distribution. The Sanskrit-Yasna ( $J_3$ ) and the persian Pehlevi-Yasna ( $Pt_4$ ) have  $-\bar{a}i$  (the latter also  $-\bar{a}$ ,  $Mf_1$ ), the indian Pehlevi-Yasna has  $-\bar{a}$  ( $J_2.K_5$ ). It is remarkable that  $J_3$  has *miždakāi*, which resembles  $K_5$  *miždakā*; as  $K_5$  has influenced  $J_3$ , this might indicate that the indian Pehlevi-Yasna too originally had  $-\bar{a}i$ .) If we had indeed a dative here, it could have been one in  $-\bar{a}ya$ . Thus it is not necessary to change  $a-$  in  $\bar{a}$ .

In 46.4c INSLER changes *ahəmustō* in  $*\bar{a} *h$ . But it is only after that that he sets out to find an explanation for  $*h\bar{o}-mustō$ . I cannot see therefore that it has been proven that  $a-$  cannot be the negative element.