Two Avestan words

Keigo Noda

I. *avā̊*

Yašt 10.46 reads as follows according to Geldner's text:

> *avā̊ pavā pasca pavā*
> *parō pavā̊ spaš vīδaēta*
> *aδaoyamnō frā aŋhe vīsaiti*
> *miϑrō yō vouru.gaoyoitiš*

Gershevitch's (1967:97) translation runs as follows: "... Mithra, the undeceivable grass-land magnate, is ready to help and protect, protecting behind, protecting in front, a watcher and observer around." Here the word *avā̊* creates a difficulty in interpretation.

Bartholomae (1904:166) thought that *avā̊* is the nominative singular masculine of the demonstrative pronoun *ava-*. This is certainly not the expected form. The expected nominative singular is LAv. *hāu,* OAv. *hvo,* OP *hau,* Vedic *asau*. Here we have the suppletion of the stem in which the nominative and the oblique have different stems and *ava-* forms are used exclusively for the oblique (except the neuter). Thus *avā̊* cannot be a nominative to be fitted in the demonstrative system (cf. detailed discussion by Kellens 1974: 187f.).

Gershevitch (1967:201), following Darmesteter (1892-93: 2.455) and Lommel (1927: 72), thought that *avā̊* is the nominative singular of the present participle *avant-* from the verb *ū-* "to help." Though this solution is grammatically irreproachable, it is somatically unsatisfactory.

More recently Kellens (1974:189) proposed to see in *avā̊* an adverb *avarə* "downwards." He pointed out the parallelism between the Yašt passage and a RigVedic passage (8.61.15). The passage runs as follows:

> *indra ... sa no rakṣisac caramaṃ sa madhyamaṃ sa pascāt pātu naḥ puraḥ*
> "Indra ... il protège le dernier et celui du milieu; qu'il nous protège derrière et devant"

Here the parallelism between *sa pascāt pātu naḥ puraḥ* and *pasca pavā̊ parō pavā̊* is apparent. *pascāt* corresponds to *pasca* and *purah* to *parō,* the formula being "adverb + *pavā̊.*" From this Kellens concluded that *avā̊* must be an adverb and he regarded *avā̊* as a reduced form of *avarə* "downwards." His explanation of the change of *avarə* to *avā̊* is that the letter "r" was shortened and combined with the preceding letter "a" to form the letter "å."

I think Kellens' conclusion is basically correct but I would like to propose a slight modification to his idea. *avarə* corresponds to Vedic *avar,* but Vedic has also an adverb close to *avar* in form and meaning, namely *avas*. I would like to see in *avā̊* an adverb **avō* instead of *avarə*. **avō is* an Iranian equivalent of Vedic *avas*. As Kellens showed, *pavā̊,* as the present participle of *pā-* "to protect" should be corrected to **payā̊. I* think the original **avō* was transformed into *avā̊* due to the following **payā̊,* which in turn changed to *pavā̊* because of the preceding *avā̊*.

This explanation has the advantage of dispensing with graphic alterations. Moreover, the adverb *avarə* is strongly associated with the meaning of movement as, for example, can be seen from Y. 29.11:

> *ahurā nū avarə̄*   "O Ahura, (come) down to us now!" (Humbach 1991: 122)

Consider also the Manichean Middle Persian phrase *dryst 'wr* [dristōr] "welcome!" (< *drist awar,* literally "healthy down (here)"). However, the Yašt passage where *avå* appears does not have anything to do with movement and so the positing of *avarə* is semantically unsatisfactory. Thus the original text must have been:

> **avō *payå pasca *payå*   "protecting from above (downwards), protecting in back,
> *parō *payå spaš vīδaēta*   protecting in front the spy, the watcher"

II. °*karšta-*

In Yt. 13 there appear many compounds with °*karšta-* as the second component:

> *aēšmo karšta-* "von den *Daēva* bewirkt, veranlaast":
> *paitištātəe aēšmō.karštahe t̠baēšaŋhō* (Yt. 13.138)
> "in order to resist hostility caused be *Aēšma*"

> *ašava karšta-* "von (einem) Gläubigem bewirkt, veranlaast":
> *paitištātəe ašava.karštahe t̠haēšaŋhō* (Yt. 13.105, 129)

> *aži.karšta-* "von (*oder "vom) Drachen bewirkt, veranlaast":
> *paitištātəe aži.karštahe t̠haēšaŋhō* (Yt. 13.131)

> *gaδō.karšta-* "von Räubern, Banditen bewirkt, veranlaast":
> *paitištātəe gaδō.karštahe t̠haēšaŋhō* (Yt. 13.136)

> *jaē.karšta-* "von den Menschern bewirkt, veranlaast":
> *paitištātəe jaē.karštahe t̠haēšaŋhō* (Yt. 13.142) cf Geldner: *jahe.karšta-*

> *daēvō.karšta-* "von den *Daēva* bewirkt, veranlaast":
> *paitištātəe daēvō.karštahe t̠haēšaŋhō* (Yt. 13.137)

> *nāfyō.karšta-* "von Familienangehörigen, Gerchlechtsverwandten bewirkt, veranlaast":
> *paitištātəe nāfyō.karštahe t̠haēšaŋhō* (Yt. 13.120)

> *sāstō.karšta-* "von grausamen Menschen bewirkt, veranlaast":
> *paitištātəe sāstō.karštahe t̠haēšaŋhō* (Yt. 13.135)

Bartholomae translated *daēvo.karšta-* as " von den *Daēva* bewirkt, veranlaast = done or caused by *Daēva*," that is, he derived the second element °*karšta-* from the verb *kar-* "to do, make." He regarded °*karšta-* as an enlarged by-form of *'kərəta-*. And he was followed by Duchesne-Guillemin (1936) and others.

However, if we start with *kar-* "machen", it seems difficult to explain the *-š-* in °*karšta-* because the expected past participle to *kar- is kərəta-* (Skt. *kṛta-,* OP *kṛta-,),* and this does not have an *-š-.* Consider some compounds with ° *kərəta-* as the second component:

> *hu-kərəta-,* OAv. *hū-kərəta-* "wohl gefertigt, schön geformt"
> *tanu-kərəta-* "von der eigenen Person gemacht"
> *dahmō.kərəta-* "von einem Dahma germacht"
> *zaranyō.kərəta-* "aus Gold gefertigt"

These compounds have the expected form *(kərəta-)* and meaning (be made) and do not have an *-š-.*

Now, in Vd. 7.35, there is another °*karšta-* in a compound [1]*a-karšta-* which Bartholomae (1904:47) translated as "nicht ausgesät = not sown." I would like to connect °*karšta-* in *daēvo.ka ršta-* etc. with this °*karšta-* with the meaning "sown." Although Bartholomae does not give the root for °*karšta-* in [1]*a-karšta-,* it seems that he thought it was clearly not from the verb *kar-.* If this °*karšta-* is to be connected with the root *karš-,* we can explain the unexpected *-š-* because in this case *-š-* belongs to the root itself.

Moreover it seems that all of the °*karšta-* compounds cited above are nonce formations and have *t̲baēšah-* "hatred*,* hostility" as the object of °*karšta-.* Bartholomae thought that "hatred" could be made or created. But I would rather think that hatred is something that can be sown in the minds of people and the meaning of "sow (the seed of) hatred" is perfectly plausible in these compounds.

More than thirty years ago Emmerick (1968: 23) pointed out that in Avestan *kāraya-* "to plough, sow" and its ppp. *karšta-* are in suppletion, i. e., they come from different sources: *kāraya- <kar-* and *karšta- < karš-.* This Avestan (and presumably Old Iranian) situation is reflected for example in Khotanese *kər-* "to plant" and ppp. *kilsta-,* and NP *kār-* and *keštan "to* sow, cultivate." I think this suppletive *karšta-* is what we have in *daēvo.karšta-* etc., and [1]*a-karšta-.* This explains the existence of *-š-* in *karšta-* and its lack from *kāraya-* very well.

Now we come to the problem of the verb root. In Iranian there are several homonymous roots of *kar-* and *karš-,* but how many of these are to be recognized as separate roots seems to be an unsolved problem at least in Iranian (see Mayrhofer 1988-89:320). Bartholomae posited five *ka r-*'s (1. machen = to make, 2. gedenken = to recall, 3. ausschütten = to pour out, 4. einfurchen = to plough, 5. sich einherbewegen = to move about) and three *karš-*'s (1. ziehen = to draw, 2. ausschütten = to pour out, 3. einfurchen = to plough). Recently Hoffmann (1996: 293) posits three *kar-*'s (1. machen = to make, 2. rühmen = to praise, 3. streuen = to scatter) and only one *kar š-* (pflügen = to plough). Likewise Kellens (1995:14-15) posits three *kar-*'s (1. faire = to do, make, 2. célébrer = to celebrate, 3. tracer un sillon = to plough) and one *karš-* (tirer = to draw). On the other hand, according to Mayrhofer (1988-89:307-309, 310-311, 319-320), corresponding Sanskrit forms are: *kar-* "tun, machen = to do, make", [1]*karⁱ-* "gedenken = to remember", [2]*karⁱ-* "ausschütten = to empty, spill; ausgiessen = to pour out; ausstreuen = to scatter" and *karṣ-* "ziehen, schleppen, pflügen = to draw, drag, plough." Here Hoffmann and Kellens are somewhat different in the treatment of [3]*kar-* and *karš-.* Judging from the corresponding Sanskrit forms and also in view of the fact that in Avestan the present *karāya-* (<*kar-*) means "to scatter, sow," it seems better to assign the meaning "to scatter, sow," to [3]*kar-* as Hoffmann does, and the meaning

"to draw" to *karš*- as Kellens does. However, considering that [3]*kar*- and *kaš*- are in suppletion, there must be some overlap in meaning between the two.

There is also a compound *daēvō.frakaršta*- in Yt.13. 130 *paitištātǝe ainištōiš daēvō.frakarštayå* "um der von den Daēva's veranlassen Armut zu widerstehen" and SrB3 (=V. 8.21) *nase daēvī dru xš nase daēvō.ciϑre nase daēvō.frakaršte* "verschwinde daēvische Drug, verschwinde daē vaentstammte, verschwinde daēvageschaffene!" In Yt. 13.130 we seem to have *karšta*- "sown," but it is possible to understand *ainišti*- "poverty" as some-thing that can be made. In SrB3, however, the Pahlavi translation of this compound is *dēwān frāz kirrēnīd* "the dews created forth," and semantically a *druj* can never be "sown," so in this case *frakaršta*- must mean "created." But as we saw above, the verb *karš*- never means "to create." This implies that *frakar šta*- needs correction. As is well known, the daēvic verb "to cut, create" is *kart*-. This verb is well attested with the preverb *fra*- to refer to Aŋgra Mainyu's creation (Bartholomae 1904:453). Thus both attestations of °*frakaršta*- should be corrected to *°*frakǝrǝsta*-.

Finally, as seen from the examples given in Yt. 13 in the compounds such as *daēvō.karšta* the first element denotes the agent (doer) of the sowing. Then we are at a loss to find such a compound as *ašava.karšta*- "sown by the ašavan (righteous)" Regrettably even in our interpretation we do not know why hatred is sown by the ašavan (see Malandra 1971: 214).

References

Bartholomae, C. 1904[1961]. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Darmesteter, J. 1892-93[1960]. *Le Zend-Aveata.* t. 2. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
Duchesne-Guillemin, J. 1936. *Les composés de l'Avesta.* Paris: Librairie E. Droz.
Emmerick, R. E. 1968. *Saka Grammatical Studies.* Oxford: Oxford U. P.
Gershevitch, I. 1967. *The Avestan hymn to Mithra.* Cambridge U.P.
Hoffmann, K. 1996 *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre.* Innsbruck: Institut fur Sprachwissenschaft
Humbach, H. 1991. *The Gathas of Zarathushtra and the Other Old Avestan Texts.* part I Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
Kellens, J. 1974. *Les noms-racines de l'Avesta.* Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
Kellens, J. 1995. *Liste du verbe avestique.* Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
Lommel, H. 1927. *Die Yašts des Awesta.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Malandra, W. 1971. *The 'Fravaši Yašt': Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary.* Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.
Mayrhofer, M. 1988-89. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen,* Band I. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.