

Adverse Consequences, Not Punishment.

In the Gathas, one of Zarathushtra's foundational teachings is the law of consequences ~ that we reap what we sow. There is no dispute that in his teachings the consequences of wrongdoing are adverse. What I dispute (with respect) is the fact that many eminent linguists have chosen English words such as 'punishment', 'retribution', and other revenge-based notions, to describe such adverse consequences. These translation choices reflect ideas in certain Pahlavi texts, as well as the paradigms of some dominant religions of today ~ neither of which existed in Zarathushtra's time. And these translation choices are at odds with the evidence of the Gathas themselves.

In the Gathas, the law of consequences is a part of the true order of existence which is wholly good (*aša- vahišta-*). Its purpose is not punitive, but to increase understanding, as part of a process of spiritual evolution.¹

In this chapter I will show you that:

1. In many instances in which GAv. words have been given meanings that are punitive, vengeful, cruel, destructive, the applicable GAv. word has not yet been decoded, that translators are in (sometimes spirited) disagreement, and that sometimes the same linguist translates some of these words differently in different verses;
2. Translating the applicable GAv. word as 'punishment' or 'retribution' does not fit the micro or macro contexts; and
3. All applicable words can be translated
 - (a) in a linguistically defensible way which expresses the notion of adverse consequences without the added idea that they are given for 'punishment', 'retribution', and other revenge-based meanings, and
 - (b) in a manner that accords with the micro and macro contexts of the Gathas.

And here (once again!), I ask you to forgive my short hand use of the words 'good' and 'bad'. In the Gathas, these words are described in various ways that enable us to understand what Zarathushtra means when he uses these words.² But it is not feasible to recite a string of all such ways each time I want to express the idea of 'good' and 'bad'. I therefore use these (inadequate) short hand words.

Justice is certainly a part of the true order of existence (*aša-*), but vengeance is not. We already have explored in another chapter,³ the historical factors in ancient (secular) human societies, which generated the mind-set of equating 'justice' with vengeance ~ adopted first by (secular) rulers, and then extrapolated on to the divine ruler(s) of such societies. And indeed this paradigm of revenge-based 'justice' is pervasive even today ~ in both secular justice, and the religious justice of certain dominant religions ~ all of which have colored the mind-set of many translators of the Gathas, even though the evidence of the Gathas themselves is contrary to this mind-set of 'justice' as revenge based.

In addition, when considering the meanings of GAv. words let us recall that such meanings are not static. As the late Mr. Justice Holmes (of the United States Supreme Court) said, almost a century ago (in another context),

"A word is not a crystal, transparent and unchanged, it is the skin of a living thought and may vary greatly in color and content according to the circumstances and the time in which it is used."⁴

Words are used with different flavors of meaning, even within a given culture. And their meanings can also change over time ~ both within a culture and also across related cultures. This is true in all languages, as the Vedic *devá-*, GAv. *daēva-*, demonstrates. That word started out meaning 'god' in Vedic and Gathic Avestan. But both the Indic and Iranian meanings changed over time. In ancient Iran, because of the practices of the priests of these *daēva-*, their 'personalities' were seen as predatory and Zarathushtra mentions *daēva-* only in a pejorative way, concluding that they were not worthy of worship,⁵ ~ so much so that in later Avestan texts the word *daēva-* which meant a deity in Zarathushtra's time came to mean a 'demon' during YAv. times.

If we want to understand as accurately (and objectively) as possible, Zarathushtra's intent in using a given word, the safest and most productive way is to:

1. Consider the opinions of linguists as to its meaning, based on comparable words in other ancient Indo-Iranian languages; and
2. Consider whether a given (linguistically defensible) meaning fits the micro context of the verse, the macro context of the song in which it appears, as well as the macro context of the rest of Zarathushtra's thought on the subject ~ taking care to not allow our own mind-sets, nor the mental conditioning of other religious paradigms, to color our thinking.

Let us first recollect 2 fundamental aspects of Zarathushtra's thought.

The first is his rejection of the cruel deities of his culture who were a mix of 'good' and 'bad' qualities. For example, Mithra is described as being both 'good' and 'bad' and he inflicts cruel, painful punishments (in this life) on those who lie to him in his Yasht 10.

§ 29 "Thou, O Mithra! art both bad and good to nations; thou, O Mithra! art both bad and good to men; thou, O Mithra! keepest in thy hands both peace and trouble for nations."

§ 26: [referring to Mithra] "Who ... is most cruel in exacting pains; the punisher of men who lie unto Mithra...", Darmesteter's translation.⁶

In the Gathas, Mithra is not mentioned as a deity;⁷ nor are any of the other deities of Zarathushtra's culture. His perception of the Divine is personified Wisdom (*mazdā-*). In Zarathushtra's thought, to be worthy of worship, a deity's nature has to be wholly good, the true (correct) order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*).⁸

The second fundamental concept is the law of consequences. And Zarathushtra's perception of the Divine as a being that is wholly good, is entirely consistent with his idea that the law of consequences ~ that we reap what we sow. In the Gathas, the law of consequences is implemented by Wisdom through His 'good thinking' and His 'beneficial way of being', in a way that brings about spiritual growth, understanding ~ an end that is 'good', and brings 'satisfaction' for everyone ~ for those who choose what is true and right, as well as (eventually) for those who choose what is false and wrong, as the evidence of the Gathas so clearly, and specifically establishes.⁹ Here are a few verses which do so.

"...May He dispense through His good thinking [*vohū ... manaṇhā*] (each) reward corresponding to one's actions." Y43.16, Insler 1975.

"Wise Lord, together with this [*spənta- mainyu-* 'this beneficial way of being'],¹⁰ Thou shalt give the distribution in the good [*vaṇhāu*] to both factions [*rānōibyā* 'for both types (of conduct)],¹¹ through Thy fire, ..." Y47.6, Insler 1975. Fire in the Gathas is never used as an instrument of punishment ~ not even in later texts that specialize in punishment.¹² Fire in the Gathas and all later texts is the material metaphor for the true order of existence and its comprehension (enlightenment), which Wisdom personifies.¹³

"That satisfaction [*x šnūtəm* acc. sg.] which Thou hast created for both factions [*rānōibyā* 'for both types (of conduct)] together with Thy [*mainyu-* 'way of being'] and hast promised through fire and truth [*aša-*] ..." Y31.3, Insler 1975.¹⁴

Keeping in mind these 2 fundamental principles in the framework of Zarathushtra's thought (the macro context), let us now look at the applicable words. Parenthetically, all stems are conjectured.

yāh-

In the Gathas, we have the words *yāṇhō* (Y30.2), *yāṇhəm* (49.9), and *yāhī* (Y46.14), ~ each a grammatical form of the stem *yāh-*.¹⁵ Linguists disagree about what the root of this stem might be, what Vedic cognates might apply, and therefore what meaning to ascribe to these words which have been translated variously as,

- ~ "retribution" (a revenge based punishment),¹⁶
- ~ a horse-racing term used metaphorically by Zarathushtra;¹⁷
- ~ "share or sharing (of good things)";¹⁸
- ~ "apportionment";¹⁹
- ~ "consummation",²⁰
- ~ "ushering-in (of a new age)",²¹
- ~ "audition",²² and
- ~ "crisis, decision; closing work; girdle, thread."²³

As you can see, each translation of these *yāh-* words ~ even by eminent linguists ~ is no more than a guess. Obviously therefore, these *yāh-* words cannot be evidence that revenge based punishment for wrongdoing forms a part of Zarathushtra's teachings. Nor does the micro context of the verse in which Zarathushtra uses these *yāh-* words support "retribution" ~ a revenge based punishment ~ as its meaning. Insler 1975 is the only linguist who has translated *yāh-* words as "retribution". He thinks that *yāhī* in Y46.14 is a scribal error, which he emends to *yā ahī*, so let us look at his translation of the other 2 verses (Y30.2 and Y49.9) in which *yāh-* words are used.

Y30.2.

"Listen with your ears to the best [*vahišta-*] things. Reflect with a clear mind ~ man by man for himself ~ upon the two choices of decision, being aware to declare yourselves to Him before the great retribution [*yāṇhō*]." Y30.2, Insler 1975.

With respect, if we translate *yāṇhō* as retribution, there is a disconnect between the first part of the verse and the last part. The first part requires us to listen to others, reflect with our own minds, and

make choices ~ each person for himself. If we follow the teaching of this first part, we are bound to make mistakes ~ and (by reflecting) learn from them. How do we square that with the requirement (in the second part of the translation) that we must "declare ourselves" to Wisdom in order to avoid "retribution" (*don't punish me, I am your man*). No place in the Gathas does Zarathushtra say that Wisdom requires our allegiance to Him as a condition for avoiding "retribution". The allegiance Zarathushtra repeatedly advocates is an allegiance to truth (*aša-*). So "retribution" for *yāñhō* simply does not fit the micro context of this verse.

I am persuaded by Schmidt's opinion that *yāñhō* here is a racing term, used as a metaphor, and I translate this verse as follows (and here let us recall, 'light' is used as a metaphor for truth and its comprehension),²⁴

- a. 'Listen with (your) ears to (all that is) most good [*vahištā* pl.]; reflect with a light-filled mind [*sūcā manañhā*]
- b. upon (the) two choices of decision, man by man for himself,
- c. being attentive to declare our (selves) for it (truth) by means of (the) great race/contest [*yāñhō*].' Y30.2, my translation.²⁵

Don't get annoyed by the translation of *ahmāi* 'for it (truth)' in line c. The ambiguity is inherent in the GAv. language; *ahmāi* is a dat. sg. masc./ntr. demonstrative pronoun, which in Av. is also used for 3p pronouns. Therefore, in English, *ahmāi* can mean any one of the following ~ 'to/for this', 'to/for that', 'to/for him', and 'to/for it'. Naturally, the question arises: to what or whom does this pronoun refer? In *Part Six: Yasna 30.2*, I demonstrate (with evidence) that the ambiguity inherent in this pronoun is used by Zarathushtra as a mini puzzle to stand for the many aspects of the true order of existence ('truth' for short), all of which are most good (hence the pl. for *vahištā*). And in *Part One: The Puzzle of the Most Good, Vahishta*, I demonstrate that in the Gathas, Zarathushtra equates truth (*aša-*) with what is most good (*vahišta-*).

Returning to *yāñhō*, we have to question: What is the idea behind this metaphor of the 'great race/contest' in line c.? Well, this song (Y30), speaks of two conflicting ways of being within each of us ~ the (incrementally) more good (*vahyah-*), and the bad (*aka-*) ~ as well as the different consequences of choosing between these two ways of being, and how they affect our lives.²⁶ In our verse (Y30.2), he likens the course of our lives to a race course, in which the contest is between these two ways of being (within ourselves). And he tells us to commit to ('declare our (selves) for') to what is wholly good, true order of existence. So that as we run the race, incrementally, the more we choose what is 'true/right/good', the more our existence becomes the true order of existence (*aša-*), until we reach the finish line in victory ~ victory being an existence that is the superlative degree of intrinsic goodness *ahu- vahišta-*, which is another way of saying the true (wholly good) order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*), and its comprehension, a state of enlightenment (the house of good thinking ~ wisdom), which is the existence of the Divine 'Wisdom' *mazdā-*. Quite a victorious finish line!

Which ties into why he calls this race 'great'. In our lives, we run many different kinds of races, and engage in many different kinds of contests. But the race, the contest, between truth and its opposite, between goodness and its opposite, is the most significant, the most important, ~ for our own selves/souls, for those around us, for our world. In the Gathas, great (*maz-*) is used in the sense of a greatness of quality. When used in a positive sense, it is used in the same sense as 'great heart',

'great mind'. In our verse (Y30.2) it is used in a positive sense, and the race or contest is 'great' because it is between the qualities that make a being divine, (truth, its good comprehension, its beneficial embodiment, its good rule, the beneficial-sacred way of being ~ **great** in that sense), and their opposites.

To summarize: line c. does not threaten **retribution** for failing to give allegiance. Line c. views life, existence, as a contest, a race, between what is (incrementally) 'more good' and 'bad' (Y30.3), more beneficial and harmful (Y45.2), true and false, right and wrong. In line c. we have the 3d piece of advice given in this verse ~ the first being to listen and reflect (line a.); the second being to choose between the two alternatives, each person for himself, (line b.); and the third advising us to commit ourselves to truth ~ to the 'good' side of the race (however imperfect and incremental our commitment might be) ~ to help win the race for wisdom, and the Divine that personifies it ~ Wisdom. Let us now look at the other verse with a *yāh-* word.

Y49.9.

"Let the cultivator [Insler's ft. 5 "Metaphor for the truthful adherents."] being one fashioned to save, listen to these instructions: *'The truly speaking man has never [nōiṭ 'not'] expounded alliance with the deceitful one, since those who are yoked with truth [aṣa-] have yoked their conceptions on the best [vahišta-] prize when the retribution [yāhī] comes.'* Yes, Jamaspa." Y49.9, Insler 1975. Insler has not placed in round parentheses some of the words he has added, in this translation. But setting that aside, here again there is a disconnect between a threatened retribution in the last line, and all the good activities that precede it. And here again, the verb "yoked" is consistent with a chariot race. Skjaervo 2006 translates the applicable verb stem *yaog-/yūj-* as "to harness". If we follow Schmidt and translate *yāhī* (loc. sg.) as 'in (the) race/contest', the last 2 lines of Y49.9 would say,

'... since those yoked with truth have yoked (their) envisionment on the most good prize in the race/contest [yāhī].' Y49.9, my translation,²⁷ ~ linguistically accurate and a good contextual fit. Notice, **truth** (the true order of existence *aṣa-*) is called **most good** (*vahišta-*) ~ the two are equated in this verse; and truth is both the path and the reward for taking that path ~ another fundamental principle of Zarathushtra's thought.²⁸

In short: In light of the wide disagreements on the meanings of *yāh-* words (these meanings being just guesses) and the fact that 'retribution' is not a good contextual fit, these verses are not evidence that in Zarathushtra's thought, a revenge based punishment ~ "retribution" ~ is a part of Wisdom's nature, or His teachings.

kaēnā- (and incidentally *aēnāh-*)

kaēnā and *aēnah-* both appear in the Gatha verse Y30.8; *aēnah-* words appear in many Gatha verses, but *kaēnā* (a declension of *kaēnā-*),²⁹ appears only once in all surviving GAv. texts ~ in Y30.8. We therefore cannot get any sense of the meaning of *kaēnā* based on how Zarathushtra uses *kaēnā-* in other contexts. Let us first look at *kaēnā*.

Once again, a review of the translations and comments of linguists indicates that there is no certainty, (but much speculation), regarding the meaning of *kaēnā* ~ as they themselves admit (with an integrity that requires respect). Notice the "seems to", "apparently" and other such words with

which at least some linguists acknowledge the uncertainty of their opinions. Here are some translation choices for *kaēnā* by linguists.

kaēnā- as "retribution",

Skjaervo 2006. So also Taraporewala 1951 who comments,³⁰ that the idea of revenge seems to be absent from the original Avestan word. By 'original' I presume that he means the meaning of the word in GAv. But he nevertheless translates the word in Y30.8 as "retribution" which means a revenge based punishment. However, Taraporewala offers a valuable piece of information. He says that Bartholomae derives *kaēnā* from *ci-* (Skt. *ci-*), 'to sort out, to distinguish'. But Taraporewala speculates that "Perhaps like the Vedic *ci-* one of the meanings of the Av. root was also 'to repay', 'to bring to retribution' (p. 157).

kaēnā- as "repay" or "repayment",

A repayment can be 'good' or 'adverse', which is in keeping with Zarathushtra's idea of the law of consequences (that we reap what we sow) without the added meaning that an adverse consequence is 'retribution' ~ a revenge based 'punishment'. The latter is not consistent with the ways in which Zarathushtra describes the workings of the law of consequences (described above).

kaēnā- as "atonement", (as in a penalty);

Humbach 1991 comments that *kaēnā* "seems to denote atonement (for a crime or an injury), consisting particularly of cattle and slaves" believing the word to be etymologically related to Greek *poené* (Latin *poena*) "blood-money, fine, penalty" and Slavic *cena* "price".³¹ (Greek, Latin, Slavic, and Avestan are all within the Indo-European family of languages). So Humbach 1991 uses "atonement" in the sense of paying a "penalty". However, in the Gathas, there is nothing even remotely resembling any penalty or punishment in the form of cattle, slaves, or blood money ~ in any context.

Humbach 1991 also states that in YAv. instances, *kaēnā*- is used in the sense of "revenge (for someone)", citing 2 examples: "Yt. 15,28 'that I can come down (upon ...) in [inst.] revenge [*kaēna*] for my brother';" and "Yt.9,18 'let Kavi Haosrava, the son, kill him in revenge [*kaēna*] (for his father) Siyavarsan'."³² These 2 YAv. sections, are good examples of how the meanings of words can be used with more than one flavor. In these two instances 'repayment' (as the meaning of *kaēna*) is used in the sense of a revenge based repayment. However, neither of these 2 YAv. examples uses *kaēnā* in connection with the law of consequences. Both are instances of human repayment (in revenge) for harm done to a family member. In those days, taking this type of vengeance was not only a duty and a right, it was required of as a matter of 'honor'. So in these YAv. examples, the meaning of *kaēnā* as 'repayment' is a 'bad' repayment ~ one that is motivated by vengeance.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *kaēnā* as "penalty", commenting "Here *kaēnā* apparently means 'penalty (in head of cattle). ..." p. 171. Once again, any concept of having to pay a "penalty" in heads of cattle is totally absent from the Gathas.

kaēnā- as "punishment", "penalty";

Insler 1975 translates *kaēnā* as "punishment" in his main translation, and as "penalty" in his commentary (p.171). Reichelt 1919, Bartholomae and Moulton 1912 translate *kaēnā* as "punishment".³³

Before we look at Y30.8 (the only verse in which *kaēnā* appears) let us look briefly at *aēnāh-*, which appears with *kaēnā* in that verse.

aēnah- in its various declensions (sg. and pl.),³⁴ has been translated as:

conduct ~ 'sins', 'harm', 'crimes', 'outrages', 'offenses'; and also as

persons ~ (those who engage in such conduct), 'sinners', 'harmers', 'criminals', 'offenders', 'persons who commit outrages'.

So once again, we have more than one translation option. I have footnoted a few different translations of *aēnahqm* (a declension of *aēnah-* in Y30.8) for comparative purposes ~ most of which have opted for **conduct** instead of **persons**.³⁵

Here is the Insler 1975 translation of Y30.8 ~ he has opted for **persons** in translating *aēnahqm*.

"And thus, when the punishment [*kaēnā*] for these sinners [*aēnahqm*] shall come to pass, then, for Thee, Wise One, shall the rule of good thinking be at hand, in order to be announced to those, Lord, who shall deliver deceit into the hands of truth." Y30.8. Insler 1975.

The translation choices "punishment" and "sinners" are very biblical in their connotations and evoke the paradigm of damnation and punishment in hell for **sinners**. But that interpretation cannot have been Zarathushtra's intent because it does not fit the context ~ neither the micro context of this verse, nor the macro context of the entire song Yasna 30 in which this verse appears, nor the macro context of Zarathushtra's descriptions of the ways in which the law of consequences is administered (in a good, beneficial way, to accomplish a good end and satisfaction for all). Let us first look at the macro context of Yasna 30.

The song Yasna 30 does not divide mortals into two groups ~ the sinners and the good. It speaks of two opposing ways of being in our ways of being ~ in thought, word and action ~ which can be more good or bad,

'Now there (are) two primeval ways of being, which (are) twins, renowned in conflict.

In thought and in word, in action they (are) two ~ the more good and the bad.

And between these two, the beneficent have chosen correctly, not the maleficent.' Y30.3, my translation. Insler's is footnoted for comparative purposes.³⁶

So this Yasna tells us that when we are beneficent (good, generous, loving), we make correct (right) choices in thought, word and action; and when we are maleficent, our choices in thought, word and action are not correct (right).

Under the law of consequences, it is **conduct** that generates consequences. Returning to Y30.8, I therefore think (along with many linguists in our group) that 'for wrongdoings' (**conduct**) is a better contextual fit for *aēnahqm* (in Y30.8).³⁷

In short: In Y30.8 if we select the translation option 'repayment' for *kaēnā*, and 'for wrongdoings' for *aēnahqm* (gen. pl. with a dat. pl. flavor),³⁸ ~ each of which is a linguistically accurate alternative ~ we can see how the focus of Y30.8 changes from the biblical paradigm of punishing sinners, to Zarathushtra's paradigm of the law of consequences ~ that we reap what we sow, and that the consequences of our wrongdoings are adverse, but without the added notion that such adverse consequences are given for punishment.

Here are my alternatives for *kaēnā* and *aēnaṇḥqm* (in black font) plugged into the Insler 1975 translation, so that you can feel assured that I have not molded the micro context of the rest of the verse, to support my argument.

"(to the Wise Lord). And thus, when the [*kaēnā* ... *aēnaṇḥqm* 'repayment for these wrongdoings'] shall come to pass, then, for Thee, Wise One, shall the rule of good thinking be at hand, in order to be announced to those, Lord, who shall deliver deceit [*druj-*] into the hands of truth." Y30.8, Insler 1975.

With this alternative, there is no contextual misfit between the first and second parts of the verse. In fact, the first part is indispensable for the second part, because it is only when we experience the adverse consequences of wrongdoings (repayment *kaēnā*), (first part of the verse), that such experiences (along with Wisdom's 'protection', mentioned in the last line of the immediately preceding verse Y30.7),³⁹ increase understanding ("then ... shall the rule of good thinking be at hand" Y30.8) changing what is false, wrong [*druj-*], (in our thinking and preferences) into what is in accord with the true order of existence ("deliver deceit [*druj-*] into the hands of truth [*aṣa-*]" Y30.8).

By contrast, the translation choice *punishment* does not fit the micro context of the verse. *Punishment* does not change bad preferences into good ones. It just inhibits the expression of bad preferences while the fear of punishment lasts. Therefore *punishment* cannot enlarge understanding. It cannot bring about the *rule of good thinking*. And how could the "*rule of good thinking be at hand*" as long as the cruelty and injustice of a punitive hell for fallible beings exists? Nor is the creation and maintenance of a hell of punitive torture consistent with an order of existence which is true, wholly good (*aṣa- vahišta-*), beneficial (*spānta-*), nor with the action of a Being whose existence personifies this true, wholly good, beneficial, order of existence.

būj-

A declension of the stem *būj-*, (*būjīm* acc. sg. of *būj-*),⁴⁰ appears only once in all surviving GAv. texts ~ in the Gatha verse Y31.13. So once again, we cannot get a sense of its meaning based on how it is used in other contexts. Y31.13 is a difficult verse to translate. The word *būjīm* itself has been translated by linguists as "*punishment*", "*penalty*", and "*penance*". But the footnoted translations show how the context of the verse is materially changed by the ways in which a given translator arranges the Avestan words (syntax). In one translation, this "*punishment*" is part of the law of consequences (and therefore presumably delivered by the Divine). In others, this "*punishment*" seems to be an unjust act by a mortal ~ delivering a great punishment for a very little offense. And in yet others, I can make no sense of the translation. These translations are footnoted so that you can judge for yourself, and also to demonstrate that the uncertainties in translation are such, that this verse cannot be cited as evidence that in Zarathushtra's thought, punishment is part of the law of consequences, or a part of the nature of Wisdom.⁴¹

ādāna-

In the opinion of Skjaervo 2006, a declension (*ādānāiš*) of the stem (*ādāna-*) occurs only once in all surviving GAv. texts ~ in the Gatha verse, Y30.7, where it has been translated differently by linguists ~ indicating that it has not yet been decoded with any degree of assurance. This verse is translated (and commented on) in *Part Two: Molten, Glowing Metal*, and it is also discussed in

detail in *Part Six: Yasna 30.7* with other translations given for comparative purposes, (you can tell I think it is an important verse!). I therefore will not footnote here comparative translations of the entire verse, but I will summarize the meanings that our linguists have ascribed to *ādāna-* (without showing here the prepositions indicating its declension (*ādānāiš* is instr. pl. 'by/with/through ____').

Summary: *ādānāiš* in Y30.7 has been translated by linguists as " *assignments", "fettering", "allotments", "ordeal", "retribution", and "requital".

" *assignments" is the meaning given by Skjaervo 2006, who shows the ntr. noun stem *ādāna-* deriving from *dā-* (which means 'to give, produce, assign, establish').⁴² Notice his asterisk. An asterisk before an *Avestan* word generally means an emendation. But I do not know what Skjaervo intends to convey by an asterisk before an English translation ~ perhaps uncertainty?

"fettering" or "apportionment": Humbach 1991 chose the translation option "fettering"; but in his commentary, he said the word could mean "fettering" or "apportionment" ~ two entirely different meanings ~ comparing this stem with Av. *ādā-* which he thinks means 'apportionment' (however, linguists disagree about the meaning of *ādā-* as well). He shows several possible Vedic cognates ~ *ādāna-* "bridle"; *ādāna-* "binding, fettering," and a Ved. word which has two different meanings *ādāna-* 'seizing', and *ādāna-* 'crushing'.⁴³ He shows no Vedic cognate which might generate the meaning 'requital' or 'punishment' for the *Avestan* *ādāna-*.

"allotments" (?): Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate the word as "allotments" (p. 82) but comment that their choice of "allotments" depends on "if the meaning of *ādāna-* is similar to that of *ādā-* 'apportionment', otherwise *ādāna-* is to be connected with Ved. Skt. *ādāna-* 'binding/fettering,'" (p. 171). Once again, uncertainty, and two completely different meanings.

"ordeal": Taraporewala 1951 translates *ādāna-* as "ordeal" ~ the so-called ordeal of testing whether someone is telling the truth, by pouring molten metal on his chest, but he cautions, "Whatever the later Pah.[lavi] symbology of the 'ordeal of (molten) metal', in the Gathas this ordeal means definitely our life in this world." He arrives at the meaning 'ordeal' by thinking that *ādāna-* derives from *dā-* with *ā* which he says means 'to put upon, to apply' (pp. 151, 155). However, (with respect) this does not fit the micro context of the verse, which has nothing to do with testing whether or not someone is telling the truth.

"retributions" Bartholomae translates the word as "retributions" (Tarap. 1951 p. 155); and so too does Moulton 1912 (p. 350).

"requitals" Insler 1975 translates the word as "requitals". The verb 'to requite' simply means 'to repay'. A 'repayment' can be good or adverse. As such, a "requital" that is adverse does not require the added meaning that it is given for 'punishment'. Therefore "requitals" is consistent with the law of consequences as described in the macro context of the Gathas. Insler's comment does not show the stem, nor does he comment on its meaning. He simply states that instr. pl. *ādānāiš* is "an instr. of temporal extent" giving examples in which such instrumentals are translated as "during the times of ..." (p. 170).

As you can see, the meaning of *ādānāiš* is so linguistically uncertain that it cannot be evidence that in Zarathushtra's thought, punishment is part of the law of consequences, or the nature of the Divine.

Here is Y30.7 ~ the only Gatha verse in which *ādānāiš* (instr. pl. of *ādāna-*) is used. This time, I give it to you in my translation. I have opted to follow Insler 1975 in translating *ādānāiš* because that linguistic option is the only one that fits the micro and macro contexts. Implied words in round parentheses have been added in accordance with Avestan usage. In the Gathas, 'molten, glowing metal' is used as a metaphor for the soul refining process (detailed in another chapter).⁴⁴

- a. 'But to this (mortal existence) He comes, with (good) rule, with good thinking, and with the true order of existence',
- b. 'and enduring embodied truth gives (them) form, breath'.
- c. He shall be here for the protection of these (mortals), just as (He shall be) the first (to so protect) during the repayments [*ādānāiš*] through (molten) metal.' Y30.7,⁴⁵ my translation.

In the context of this verse Y30.7, the **repayments** are clearly adverse consequences.⁴⁶ However, it would be a contextual misfit to read these **repayments** as having the added quality of **punishment**, because line c. says that the Divine will be the first to protect us during these repayments, and He would hardly be the first to offer protection from His own punishments.

And how does the Divine protect? With the true order of existence ~ a generous, loving, caring order of existence ~ and helping us to understand it (good thinking).⁴⁷ Therefore the translation choice '**during the repayments**' for *ādānāiš* (without the added flavor of 'punishment') is linguistically accurate and a good micro/macro contextual fit.

ādā-

ādā- in its various grammatical forms (declensions) is used in 3 Gatha verses, and Skjaervo 2006 thinks that *ādā-* words are used also in 2 sections of the *Yasna Haptanghaiti*, which is in GAv. but composed by unknown authors.⁴⁸

ādā- words have been translated variously as: 'apportionment', 'presentation', 'recompense', and 'requital' ~ none of which require the added meaning of 'punishment'. And *ādā-* words are also used in some verses with the adj. 'good', (and therefore cannot mean 'punishment'). I footnote here the opinions of the linguists in our group in translating *ādā-* words.⁴⁹

With respect, I do not think that "presentation", or "apportionment" fit the contexts of the verses in which *ādā-* words appear. In each of these Gatha verses, *ādā-* words are used in ways that suggest some connection with the law of consequences ~ in which the 'good' and 'bad' we do comes back to us as good and adverse consequences. The translation choices "recompense" and "requital" can be either a good consequence or an adverse consequence, and are a good contextual fit.

Here are Y33.11 and 12 (two foundational verses, which form a beautiful complementation). The remaining verse Y49.1 is footnoted.⁵⁰

"The Wise One who is the Mightiest Lord, and [*ārmaiti-*], and truth which prospers the creatures, and good thinking, and (good) rule ~ listen to me, have mercy on me [*mərəzđātā mōi* 'give-compassion to-me'] when there is any requital [*ādāi*]." Y33.11, Insler 1975. Here Zarathushtra asks the Divine for compassion during any **requital**, so we know that **requital** here refers to any adverse consequence, but does not require the added meaning that it is given for 'punishment'.

"Rise up to me Lord. Along with Thy [*spāništā mainyū* 'most beneficial way of being'], Wise One, receive force through (our) [*ārmaiti-*], strength through (every) good requital [*vanhuyā ... ādā*], powerful might through truth, protection through (our) good thinking." Y33.12, Insler 1975.

Let me digress for a moment before discussing good requital [*vanhuyā ... ādā*]. Notice the beautiful complementation in these two verses. In verse 11, truth, its embodiment, its comprehension, its rule, are qualities through which the Divine hears us, gives compassion to us ~ in effect, helps us.⁵¹ In verse 12, it is we (mortals) who give Wisdom force, strength, when we embody truth (*ārmaiti-*), powerful might through truth, and protection through good thinking (think about that for a minute ... or two ... or three ...). How does the Divine receive "protection through (our) good thinking." Y33.12, Insler 1975? I often am appalled by the horrid characteristics and behavior we humans project on to the Divine ~ defining and clothing the Divine with our own prejudices, cruelties, meanness, (perhaps fears) ~ all bad (small) thinking. It is only through an incrementally enlarged understanding ~ good thinking ~ that we can free the Divine from the imperfect images we create of It ("protection through (our) good thinking"). How cool is that?!⁵²

Returning to the *ādā-* word requital, what does Zarathushtra mean when he says that we give Wisdom "strength through good requital [*vanhuyā ... ādā*],"? Well, in more than one verse (Y47.6, Y31.3, quoted above), Zarathushtra says that the law of consequences (which includes both good and adverse consequences) delivers "satisfaction" and the "good" for both types of conduct ~ to those who make 'good' choices and to those who make 'wrong' choices. Experiencing both types of consequences, are necessary to enlarge understanding, which increases wisdom in all the living, and therefore strengthens the Divine whose existence is Wisdom personified. So in light of the macro context of the Gathas (and with a play on words) we see that even adverse consequences ~ eventually ~ are a good requital [*vanhuyā ... ādā*].

maēini-

maēiniš appears in 2 Gatha verses. Y31.15, and Y44.19.

Skjaervo 2006 says *maēini-* is a fem. noun stem which he thinks means 'requital'. He shows *maēiniš* as a declension of this stem but does not identify this declension. The notion of 'punishment' is not inherent in the meaning of 'requital', which essentially is a payment in consequence of something - a repayment which can be 'good' or adverse.

Our linguists have translated *maēiniš* as 'requital', 'payment', 'punishment', 'chastisement' and 'penalty'.

Humbach 1991 translates *maēiniš* as 'chastisement' in both Y31.15 and Y44.19. He comments that he thinks the Avestan word parallels Ved. *mení-* 'wrath, vengeance, punishment', and adds "considered a missile like a thunderbolt" citing a Rig Veda example.⁵³

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *maēiniš* as 'punishment' in both Y31.15 and Y44.19, without comment.

Taraporewala 1951 translates *maēiniš* as 'punishment' in both Y31.15 and Y44.19. He comments, "The word has been trans. 'reward' or 'punishment' ...". He says that Mills thinks "Greek *mēnis* is cognate suggesting that 'this may have been a dart hurled in just vengeance'." Taraporewala himself says "The Skt. *mení-* (fem.) occurs in RV [Rig Veda] ... and means 'hurling a dart'. ..." (p. 226).

Bartholomae translates *maēiniš* as 'punishment' in both Y31.15 and Y44.19;⁵⁴ so too does Moulton 1912 (pp. 354, 369).

Insler 1975 translates *maēiniš* as 'payments' in Y31.15, but as 'punishment' in Y44.19.

The translation choices 'payments' (Insler 1975), and 'requisites' (Skjaervo 2006) do not carry the added meaning that they are given for punishment, and therefore are consistent with the law of consequences as described in the Gathas. All the other words ~ 'punishment', 'chastisement', 'penalty', are not. Here are both these verses, so you can see that 'payments' is a good contextual fit in both these verses, and that the Indo-European examples ~ 'hurling a dart, or a thunderbolt' ~ do not in any way fit the micro contexts of these 2 Gatha verses.

"Likewise, I ask about which payments [*maēiniš*] shall be (for him) who shall promote the rule for the ['a'] deceitful one of evil actions, Lord, for that one who finds no means of living apart from harming the cattle and men of the undeceiving pastor." Y31.15, Insler 1975. Here, the consequences (payments) would clearly be adverse (without the added notion of 'punishment'), because the conduct which generates the payments is "evil actions" and "harming". Parenthetically, there are no articles 'the', 'a', in Avestan. An equally accurate translation is '(a) deceitful one of evil actions'. So this verse does not refer to 'the devil'.⁵⁵

"This I ask Thee. Tell me truly, Lord. The person who shall not give that prize to the one winning it, namely, to the man who should receive it in accord with (our) promise [*ərəžux δā instr. sg.* 'in accord with (the) straight word'] ~ what shall be the first punishment [*maēiniš* 'payments'] for such a person I know the final one [*apāmā*] which shall befall him." Y44.19, Insler 1975. Here also the consequence is adverse, and 'payments' (Insler in Y31.15 above) or 'requisites' (Skjaervo 2006) for *maēiniš* (without the added flavor 'punishment') fit the micro/macro contexts well. This last verse (Y44.19) is a difficult verse in terms of understanding what ideas Zarathushtra intends to convey. It needs to be read together with the 2 verses that precede it,⁵⁶ and I translate the last two lines a bit differently.

line d. *kā tām ahyā maēiniš aṇhaṭ paouruyē*

line e. *vīdvā avam yā.tm aṇhaṭ apāmā ••* Y44.19,

d. 'what shall be the first requital [*maēiniš*] for such a person?

e. The end [*apāmā*] which shall befall him eventually, I know." Y44.19, my translation.

Parenthetically, in line e., the end [*apāmā*] is the house of worst thinking, the house of untruth ~ a temporary wrong-headed state of being (in mortal existence), which the law of consequences (and mutual, loving help) will enable the wrongdoer to overcome, change.⁵⁷

išud-

The words *išudam* and *išudō* (declensions of the stem *išud-*),⁵⁸ appear in 2 Gatha verses ~ Y34.15 and Y31.14.

Our group of linguists have variously translated *išud-* words as 'due', 'debt', 'payment', 'claim', 'invigoration', 'compensation', 'requital', and 'silent yearning'. As you can see, not only is there uncertainty regarding its meaning, but even those translation choices that suggest some sort of

consequence do not carry the added meaning that the consequence (payment, debt, due, requital) when adverse is given for punishment. Additional details are footnoted.⁵⁹

raš-, rašah-

raš- is a verb which is used in only 2 Gatha verses (in Y49.3, and Y51.9) in its infinitive form *rāšayejḥē* (Skjaervo 2006). The linguists in our group have translated *rāšayejḥē* in these two verses as,

- "to be destroyed/to destroy" Insler 1975,
- "to harm" Humbach 1991; Humbach/Faiss 2010; Skjaervo 2006;
- "shall be frustrated/shall have frustration" Taraporewala 1951;
- "for ruin/bringing of ruin" Bartholomae;⁶⁰ and
- "for ruin/bringing of ruin" Moulton 1912.

rašah- is a ntr. noun stem (derived from the verb *raš-*). The noun *rašah-* appears in only in 1 Gatha verse (Y30.11) in its nom./acc. sg. form *rašō*. The linguists in our group have translated *rašō* in this verse as,

- "destruction" Insler 1975;
- "harm" Humbach 1991; Humbach/Faiss 2010; Skjaervo 2006;
- "punishment" Taraporewala 1951; Bartholomae;⁶¹ and Moulton 1912.

As you can see (above) translations of the verb *raš-* do not include 'to punish'. But translations of the noun *rašah-* which is derived from the verb *raš-* include 'punishment' by the older generation of linguists in our group.

The contexts of the verses in which these words appear establish that the verb *raš-* and its noun *rašah-* are not evidence that the law of consequences is given for punishment. Here, I will give you the Insler 1975 translation and footnote the others.

In Y51.9, *rāšayejḥē* is used in connection with the law of consequences. In Y49.3, it is not. But the way *rāšayejḥē* is used in Y49.3 is important for our purposes, so we need to consider it as well.

Before we look at these two verses (Y49.3 and Y51.9), you need to be aware of the following. In Avestan *druj-* is a noun, (a **concept**). It has been variously translated as 'the Lie, falsehood, deceit, wrong, and untruth', and in the Gathas, *druj-* is used for all the qualities that are the opposite of the true (correct, good) order of existence (*aša-* 'truth' for short).⁶² So I will translate *druj-* as 'untruth' for short. And the adjective of *druj-* is *drəgvañt-* (which literally means 'possessing untruth'). But in Avestan, an adj. can also be used for a noun that is a **concept** (that has the quality of the adjective) or a **person** (that has the quality of the adj.). So *drəgvañt-* can, with equal accuracy be translated as '(what is) untruthful' or 'untruthfulness' (a **concept**); or 'untruthful (one)' (a **person**).⁶³

In Y49.3 the harm or destruction that is *rāšayejḥē* applies to the noun *druj-* 'untruth' (a **concept**). "However, it has been fated for this world, Wise One, that the truth [*aša-* **concept**] is to be saved for its (good) preference, that deceit [*druj-* **concept**] is to be destroyed [*rāšayejḥē*] for its (false) profession. ..." Y49.3, Insler 1975.⁶⁴ So here it is untruth *druj-* that is destroyed ~ not a person who

has that quality. (Hold that thought). Other translations are footnoted for comparative purposes.⁶⁵ Insler offers no comment on how he arrived at the meaning of *rāšayeījhē* as "to be destroyed".

Y51.9 has been discussed in more detail in other chapters.⁶⁶ Here I will just summarize what is pertinent for our purposes. In Y51.9 the harm or destruction that is *rāšayeījhē* applies to the adjective *drəgvantəm* and adj. which here is used as a noun (there being no noun here which this adj. could describe). So the question arises: In Y51.9, is *drəgvantəm* (sg.) used as a noun that is a quality 'untruthfulness' (**concept**), or an 'untruthful (one)' (**person**)? All our linguists have opted to translate *drəgvantəm* (sg.) as **person(s)**. So in all these translations it is **people** who are **to be destroyed** (*rāšayeījhē*), instead of the **quality/concept** of untruthfulness.

But to translate *drəgvantəm* as **person(s) to be destroyed** (*rāšayeījhē*) is inconsistent with the micro context of this verse (Y51.9), as well as the macro context of the Gathas. I translate this verse somewhat differently, but let us first look at the Insler 1975 translation. The other translations by our group of linguists are footnoted for comparative purposes.⁶⁷ And for the time being, let us put on the back burner the translation of *rānōibyā* as "to both factions". We will get to it later.

"The satisfaction [*x šnutəm*] which Thou shalt give to both factions [*rānōibyā* 'for both types (of conduct)] through Thy pure fire,⁶⁸ and the molten iron, Wise One, is to be given as a sign among living beings, in order to destroy [*rāšayeījhē*] the deceitful [*drəgvantəm*] and save the truthful [*ašavanəm*]." Y51.9, Insler 1975.

Micro context. First, **fire** is a metaphor for truth (the true order of existence), and the Divine Who personifies this order of existence. **Fire** is never used as an instrument of harming or destroying people ~ not in the Gathas, nor in any Avestan or Pahlavi text (that I am aware of). **Fire** is used in the Gathas as an instrument of destroying or harming untruth. It is a metaphor for enlightenment.

Insler comments that this last phrase "...to destroy the deceitful and save the truthful corresponds to Y49.3b ... 'the truth is to be saved and **deceit** is to be destroyed'." (p. 315). And I think he is exactly correct. But in the parallel he offers (Y49.3) it is *druj-* 'deceit' (or 'untruth') ~ a quality (**concept**) that is destroyed, not people. Yet in Y51.9 he translates its adj. *drəgvantəm* *sg.* as persons "the deceitful" **pl.** instead of as a concept.

In addition (with respect), if in Y51.9 we translate *drəgvantəm* and *ašavanəm* as **persons**, instead of qualities (**concepts**), there is a contextual disconnect between the first and last parts of the verse. If (as the last part says) the law of consequences destroys "the deceitful" (i.e. **persons**) it can hardly give **satisfaction** [*x šnutəm*] (as the first part says) to the deceitful and to the truthful ("to both factions [*rānōibyā*]" (staying with the Insler translation). But that disconnect is resolved if we follow the Y49.3 parallel and translate *drəgvantəm* as 'untruthfulness' a **quality** or **concept** "... truth is to be saved and deceit [*druj-* **concept**] is to be destroyed." Insler 1975.

Returning to Y51.9, the dat. du. *rānōibyā* has not yet been decoded and all translations of it (and its stem) are simply guesses.⁶⁹ I think its stem means 'type', and its dual declension in Y51.9 gives us 'both types (of conduct)'. I think the two types referred to are 'conduct' because this verse deals with the law of consequences, which generates consequences for conduct. And in Y51.9 **fire** is a metaphor for truth and its comprehension, and **molten metal** is a metaphor for the soul refining process. Thus 'untruthfulness' for *drəgvantəm* fits the micro context in all respects.

If in Y51.9 the destruction of **people** had been intended, then everyone would be destroyed, because as the reality of mortal existence establishes, and as Zarathushtra specifically states (in the verses of Yasna 30, in Y45.2, and in many other verses), all mortals are a mix of good/bad, true/false, right/wrong ~ at least until we attain completeness *haurvatāt-* but that perfected existence is no longer bound by mortality *amərətāt-* and is not our current, mortal, mixed state of being.

But if we translate *drəgvantəm* (sg.) as a noun that is a **concept/quality** ~ 'untruthfulness' the ideas in Y51.9 fall into place and are both logical, and also consistent with the macro context of the Gathas in which the law of consequences as described by Zarathushtra, **destroys** what is untruthful ~ in our preferences, and therefore in the thoughts, words and actions that our preferences generate. The following translation choices in Y51.9 are consistent with both the micro and macro contexts, and are linguistically accurate alternatives.

- a. 'The satisfaction [*x šnutəm*] which you give, O Wisdom, for both types (of conduct) [*rānōibyā*], through Your bright fire,
- b. through molten metal, (is) to be given for clarification among living beings,
- c. '(is to be given) to destroy [*rāšayejḥē*] untruthfulness [*drəgvantəm* sg.]. (Thus) You save truthfulness.' Y51.9, my translation.⁷⁰

In essence this verse tells us, it is in living beings that the law of consequences destroys untruthfulness and save truthfulness, thus eventually giving satisfaction through enlightenment (**fire**), through the soul refining process (**molten metal**), for both good and bad conduct.

Let us move on to *rašō* (nom./acc. sg. of *rašah-*, a noun derived from the verb *raš-* Skjaervo 2006). It appears only in one Gatha verse, Y30.11.

rašō (in meaning) also has been translated in roughly the same ways as *rāšayejḥē*, with the addition of 'punishment' by the older generation in our group of linguists. In Y30.11, *rašō* is used in connection with the law of consequences and *drəgvant-* (in its dat. pl. form *drəgvō.dəbyō* Skjaervo 2006). The dat. pl. would be translated into English with one of the prepositions 'to/for ____'.

Humbach 1991 translates *rašō* as "harm", which is consistent with his translation of the verb *raš-*. He does not comment on its meaning. His translation is footnoted.⁷¹

Humbach/Faiss 2010 also translate *rašō* as "harm" without comment on its meaning. Their translation is footnoted.⁷²

Taraporewala 1951, Bartholomae, and Moulton 1912 translate *rašō* as "punishment". Their translations and Taraporewala's comments on *rašō* are footnoted.⁷³

Insler 1975 translates *rašō* as "destruction", without comment on its meaning ~ a translation which is consistent with his translation of the verb *raš-*. Here is his translation. Parenthetically, the GAv. word which Insler translates as "Men" is *mašyāṅhō*, nom./voc. pl. of the masc. noun stem *mašya-*,⁷⁴ which literally means a 'mortal'. The gender is generic because 'mortals' includes both males and females.

"(to the adherents). Men, [*mašyāṅhō*] when ye learn those commandments [*urvātā*],⁷⁵ which the Wise One has posed, when ye learn (there is) both a way of easy access and one with no access, as well as long destruction [*darəgēm ... rašō*] for the deceitful [*drəgvō.dəbyō*] but salvation for the truthful [*ašavabyō* pl.], then each one (of you) shall abide by (all) these commandments. Wish it

so [uštā]." Y30.11, Insler 1975. I think **access** here means access to the ultimate goal of existence ~ truth (the true order of existence aša-), which enables transition to a non-mortal state of being (crossing chinvat, the bridge of discerning), a transition which cannot be made (**no access**) by one who possesses wrongdoing in his being.⁷⁶

Here again, **long destruction** [darəgām ... rašō] is used in the sense that it takes a long, long time for the law of consequences (and mutual, loving help) to destroy all that is untruthful (in us). And **long destruction** [darəgām ... rašō] is for all the many kinds of untruthfulness ~ drəgvō.dəbyō dat. pl. of the adjective stem drəgvant-, which here is used as a noun. Here also our group of linguists all have chosen the translation choice **people** for drəgvō.dəbyō thus **for the deceitful/untruthful/liars** etc. But once again, this is not consistent with Zarathushtra's teachings. Under the law of consequences it is not people who are destroyed. But (over a long time) it does effectuate the complete destruction of bad qualities ~ all that is false, deceitful, wrong, dishonest (druj- and its adj. drəgvant-) ~ the many kinds of untruth. Thus with different (linguistically accurate) translation choices, we get,

'When mortals [mašyānhō] learn these principles which Wisdom has given [dadāi] ~ a way of good access and one of no access; as well as long destruction [darəgām ... rašō] for (all that is) deceitful [drəgvō.dəbyō pl.], but salvation for (all that is) truthful [ašavabyō pl.], then each one shall exist with these (principles). Wish it so.' Y30.11, my translation (with much indebtedness to Insler 1975 for his ideas on certain difficult words). I have added the implied words (**all that is**) to express the pl.

In conclusion: The above evidence establishes the following:

1. There are no GAv. words that, without dispute, mean 'punishment' or 'retribution' or 'destruction of people' or 'vengeance'. Such translations are best guesses that are personal to a given translator, because the applicable words have not yet been decoded. Such translations are not consistent with the context of the verses in which they appear, and reflect a mind-set that is based on religious paradigms that are alien to the Gathas.

2. All such GAv. words can be translated in linguistically defensible ways (acknowledging that our knowledge of Avestan is presently not complete) which show

(a) that in the Gathas the consequences of wrongdoing are certainly adverse, but that they are not given for 'punishment' or 'retribution' or 'revenge'; and

(b) that these (linguistically defensible) meanings are consistent with the micro context of the verses in which they appear, and with 2 of Zarathushtra's foundational teachings:

That the nature of the Divine is wholly good, and

That the law of consequences is administered by Wisdom through His **good** thinking, through His **beneficial** way of being, and will (eventually) bring about an end that is **good** and **satisfaction**, for everyone ~ for those who choose wrongfully, and for those who choose what is true and right.

* * * * *

¹ The law of consequences ~ how it works, how it is given, and the end it enables ~ is detailed in *Part Two: Asha and the Checkmate Solution*; and *Molten, Glowing Metal*.

² Detailed in *Part One: Truth, Asha*; and *Good & Evil*.

³ See *Part One: Truth, Asha*.

⁴ Opinion of the Court by Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes in *Towne v. Eisner*, 245 U.S. 418, 425 (1921).

⁵ As discussed in *Part One: The Nature of the Divine*.

⁶ SBE 23, pp. 126 - 127. There are additional examples of Mithra's cruelty in a ft. in *Part One: Truth, Asha*.

⁷ *miθra-* means 'contract', and *miθrōibyō* is the abl. pl. form of the stem *miθra-* (Skjaervo 2006). In the Gathas the plural word *miθrōibyō* 'because of contracts' appears in Y46.5; and therefore cannot be a reference to the deity.

⁸ Detailed in *Part One: The Nature of the Divine*.

⁹ Detailed in *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution*.

¹⁰ That 'beneficial' as the meaning of *spanta-* is detailed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu*.

¹¹ *rānōibyā* is dat. du. of the stem *rāna-*, the meaning of which has not yet been decoded. The dat. gives us 'to/for___'. Linguists' translations of *rāna-* (in its various grammatical declensions) are simply guesses ~ including such guesses as 'thigh', 'leg', 'balance', 'faction', 'parties' etc. But these translations do not fit either the micro or macro contexts.

I think the stem *rāna-* means 'type'. Insler 1975 thinks the stem means 'faction', and he has translated the dat. dual form *rānōibyā* as "to both factions". Two 'factions' are two types of people.

In Y47.6 and all other verses in which a dat. du. *rāna-* word appears, I translate it as 'for both types (of conduct)', because it parallels the idea expressed in "...May He dispense through His good thinking [*vohū ... manajhā*] (each) reward corresponding to one's actions." Y43.16, Insler 1975. It is 'conduct' that generates consequences, not 'people'.

To translate the word (when in dual form) as two types (of conduct) ~ as I do ~ is also a guesstimate, but one that fits well all of the verses in which *rāna-* words are used in the Gathas (the micro context) as well as the macro context of the Gathas as a whole. Therefore, I would translate this phrase in Y47.6 as follows,

'Lord Wisdom, together with this beneficial way of being [*spanta- mainyu-*], You will give the distribution in the good [*vajhāu*] through Your fire for both types (of conduct),...' Y47.6, my translation.

In the Gathas, fire is a metaphor for truth and its comprehension. So the phrase, 'through Your fire' in Y47.6 indicates the enlightenment of the soul refining process, see *Part Two: Molten, Glowing Metal*. A detailed look at *rāna-* and the ways in which it is used in the Gathas (in its various grammatical values) is discussed in *Part Six: Yasna 43.12*, and with less detail in *Part Six: Yasna 51.9*.

¹² For punishments in this life ~ none of which involve fire ~ see *Part Five: The Vendidad, & Its Lessons For Today*. For punishments in the afterlife ~ none of which involve fire ~ see *Part Three: Heaven & Hell In Pazand & Pahlavi Texts*. And for Avestan texts, see *Part Three: The Absence of Damnation & Hell in Other Avestan Texts*.

¹³ See *Part Two: Light, Glory, Fire*.

¹⁴ In this verse Y31.3, Zarathushtra uses both 'fire' and 'truth' as the agent which delivers the end result of satisfaction, "That satisfaction which Thou hast created for both factions [*rānōibyā* 'for both types (of conduct)] together with Thy [*mainyu-* 'way of being'] and hast promised through fire and truth ..." Y31.3. You well may ask: if fire is the material metaphor for truth and its comprehension, why does Zarathushtra use both fire and truth here? Perhaps he does so because fire (a material metaphor for truth) represents the soul refining process (*aša-*) in mortal (material) existence, and truth represents the resulting (incrementally) personified state of being ~ the true order of existence (an enlightened state of being).

¹⁵ These words appear in the Gathas: *yāñhō* in Y30.2; and *yāhī* in Y46.14 and Y49.9. Another declension of the word (*yāñhqm*) is used in the *Yasna Haptanghaiti* (YHapt.36.2) which is not a part of the Gathas, but is composed in GAv.

¹⁶ Insler 1975 believes the stem to be *yāh-* which he conjectures is a word of "legalistic origins" and he "combines" it with Vedic *yātār* 'revenger, repayer', thus taking the Avestan stem *yāh-* to mean 'retribution', (p. 163 - 164), which is how he translates the words in Y30.2c (*mazē yāñhō* 'the great retribution'), and Y49.9d (*yāhī* 'retribution'). But in Y46.14, he believes that *yāhī* is a scribal error which he emends to **yā* **ahī*. pp. 84, 273. His translations of Y30.2 and Y49.9 are discussed in the main part of this chapter. In his 1975 work, he does not translate or comment on *yāh-* words in the *Yasna Haptanghaiti*.

¹⁷ This is H. P. Schmidt's view. Insler explains Schmidt's view in his comment on Y30.2 stating that Schmidt has concluded that *yāh-* (the stem for *yāñhō*) must be a horse-racing term used metaphorically, because Zarathushtra (in other verses) uses *urvaēsa-* 'turning point' (of a race-course) (in Y43.5e, Y43.6a, Y51.6c), and *zā* 'race ahead' (in Y30.10c, Y50.7d) in speaking of the moment of decision. Insler agrees that the root *yā* means 'to travel or race' in Vedic, and states that if *yāh-* belongs to the root *yā* then we should expect the word to mean 'race, contest' and in view of Y44.15, where the question of a decisive contest between truth and deceit is envisioned, Insler says that the meaning 'contest' would be fully defensible. But Insler is not persuaded that GAv. *yāh-* words mean 'race/contest'. He prefers 'retribution', p. 163.

¹⁸ Humbach 1991 translates *mazē yāñhō* in Y30.2 as the great sharing (of good things).

In Y46.14 and Y49.4 he translates *yāhī* as at the sharing (of good things)". In the *Yasna Haptanghaiti* YHapt. 36.2, he translates *mazištāi yāñhqm* as "for the greatest of sharings (of good things). Here are his translations of the foregoing in Vol. 1, pp. 123, 172, 182, and 145). But the lack of agreement amongst linguists demonstrate that these are just best guesses.

¹⁹ Humbach/Faiss 2010 ~ without comment or explanation ~ translate *mazē yāñhō* in Y30.2 as "great apportionment", p. 81. In Y46.14, and Y49.9 they translate *yāhī* as "at the apportionment (of shares)", pp. 137, 148. And in the *Yasna Haptanghaiti* YHapt. 36.2, they translate *mazištāi yāñhqm* as "for the greatest of apportionments", p. 106. Their lack of any explanation as well the lack of agreement amongst linguists demonstrate that these views are also just best guesses.

²⁰ Bartholomae translates *mazē yāñhō* in Y30.2 as "the great consumation". In Y46.14, he translates *yāhī* as "at the consumation", and in Y49.9 as "at the Judgment", (as shown in Tarap. 1951 pp. 135, 621, and 721). Taraporewala comments that Bartholomae understands 'consumation' in the sense of 'crisis' or 'turning point' but is doubtful about the etymology, and gives none. (Tarap. 1951 pp. 134, 621). Once again, these are just guesses.

Moulton's translations of these words are identical to Bartholomae's. Moulton (1912) EZ pp. 349, 375, 381 - 382. Moulton gives no commentary, his translation choice also is a guess.

²¹ Taraporewala 1951 translates each of these *yāh-* words in Y30.2, Y46.14, and Y49.9 (in their appropriate case forms) as "ushering-in". (pp. 134, 620 - 621, 720 - 721). Commenting on Y30.2, he too questions whether the context of this verse lends itself to discussing matters concerning the judgment of the dead, and expresses the opinion that 'turning point' here means the crisis in the religious history of Iran, because Zarathushtra is at this point teaching a new religion, which is to bring in the new age of spiritual culture in Iran, and thus refers to the beginning of this new age as the 'turning point' in the history of his nation. He thus explains his choice of "ushering in". p. 134. As you can see, these opinions are just guesses.

²² Skjaervo in his *Old Avestan Glossary*, has *yā-* meaning 'to implore'; and he shows the stem *yāh-* as a neuter noun (deriving from *yā-*) meaning "audition" with its case forms as follows,

yānhō abl. sg. in Y30.2;

yāhī loc. sg. in Y46.14, and Y49.9; and

yānhqm gen. sg. in YHapt. 36.2.

This meaning also is just a best guess.

²³ Reichelt 1919, from his Glossary ~ a number of best guesses.

²⁴ Detailed in *Part Two: Light, Glory, Fire*.

²⁵ This verse is discussed in detail in *Part Six: Yasna 30.2*.

²⁶ See *Part Six: Yasna 30. 3 and 4*.

²⁷ My translation of Y49.9; here, *yāhī* is loc. sg. (Skjaervo 2006). The *loc.* is expressed in English with prepositions indicating location ~ 'on', 'in', 'under', 'at' etc. In this context I take the *loc. sg. yāhī* to mean 'in the race/contest'. The syntax of the last 2 lines of Y49.9 in GAv. are such that each line does not give us a separate English translation. The two lines (c. and d.) have to be read together. Here is the GAv. text of these 2 lines, and my English translation, with the applicable GAv. words in square brackets.

c. *hyaṭ daēnā vahištē yūjān mīzdē*

d. *ašā yux tā yāhī dājamāspā* Y49.9.

'since [*hyaṭ*], those (who are) yoked [*yux tā*] with truth [*ašā*] have yoked [*yūjān*] (their) envisionment [*daēnā*] on the most good prize [*vahištē ... mīzdē*], in the race/contest [*yāhī*], Jamaspa.' my translation.

Notice, the most good prize and truth are equated.

²⁸ Detailed in *Part Two: A Question of Reward & The Path*.

²⁹ Geldner 1P p. 107 shows no mss. variations for *kaēnā* in Y30.8.

Skjaervo 2006 in his *Old Avestan*, Lesson 2, shows the declensions of fem. *-ā-* stem nouns (*kaēnā-* is a fem. *-ā-* stem noun). The only declensions he shows that have an *-ā* inflection (in our instance *kaēnā*) are nom. sg. and possibly instr. sg. But in his *Old Avestan Glossary*, he shows *kaēnā* in Y30.8 without identifying its declension (indicating perhaps uncertainty). Along with most of our linguists, I take it as nom. sg.

³⁰ Taraporewala 1951, pp. 156, 157, translates *kaēnā* in Y30.8 as a fem. noun (nom. sg.) meaning "retribution". He comments that "Pers. *kīn*, Gujarati *kīno* 'revenge' is the same word, but states that "the idea of 'revenge' seems to be absent from the orig. Av. word", but nevertheless translates the word as "retribution" ~ which means a revenge based punishment.

³¹ Humbach 1991, Vol. 2, p. 53.

³² Humbach 1991, Vol. 2, p. 53. He thinks that *parəθā* in Y48.2 has the same meaning as *kaēnā*-. But here again, linguists ascribe such a wide variety of meanings to *parəθā* ~ some of which have nothing to do with 'punishment' or 'penalty', that it cannot be cited as evidence that Zarathushtra intended the meaning of *kaēnā* to be punishment for wrongdoing, and I have not included *parəθā* in our analysis.

³³ Reichelt 1919 translates *kaēnā* as "punishment".

In Y30.8, Bartholomae and Moulton 1912 also translate *kaēnā* as "punishment" (Tarap. 1951 p. 158; Moulton 1912 p. 350).

³⁴ *aēnah*- words appear in many Gatha verses, in each of which the idea of *wrong/wrongdoer* ~ rather than the biblical 'sin/sinner' ~ fits well. Here are the ways in which the current generation of linguists in our group have translated *aēnah*- words, and the Gatha verses in which they appear (I have omitted the prepositions indicating declensions).

Skjaervo 2006 shows the ntr. noun stem *aēnah*- > Old Indic (Vedic) *éna*s-, which he translates as 'sin' (conduct) in the following declensions, and Gatha verses.

aēnaṅhē dat. sg. in Y32.16, Y46.7, Y46.8;
aēnaṅhō gen. sg. Y31.13, Y31.15,
aēnā nom./ acc. pl. Y32.6
aēnaṅhqm gen. pl. Y30.8; Y32.7; Y32.8.

Insler 1975 translates *aēnah*- words as follows:

as persons: "sinners" Y30.8;
 as conduct: "sins" Y32.6; Y32.7; Y32.8;
 "harming" Y31.15
 "harm" Y32.16; Y34.4; Y46.7; Y46.8;
 "offense" Y31.14.

Humbach 1991 translates *aēnah*- words as follows:

as conduct: "crimes" Y30.8; Y32.6; Y32.7; Y32.8; Y32.16;
 "injury" Y31.13;
 "to injure" Y46.7; Y46.8 (translated into English as if it were a verb)

Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *aēnah*- words as follows:

as conduct: "outrage(s)" Y30.8; Y32.6; Y32.7; Y32.8; Y32.15; Y46.7; Y46.8.
 "sin" Y31.13.

As you can see, there are valid translation options for *aēnah*- words that mean "wrongs" (conduct); and wrongdoers" (persons) ~ without the baggage of the biblical "sins/sinners".

³⁵ Here are the phrases in which our group of linguists have translated *aēnaṅhqm* (gen. pl. of *aēnah*- translated with a dat. pl. flavor) in Y30.8

Humbach 1991 *aēšqm* ... *aēnaṅhqm* "for their (the Daevas') crimes" (conduct); he offers an alternative translation "for those (well-known) crimes [*aēnaṅhqm*] " (conduct) Vol. 2, p. 53;

Humbach/Faiss 2010 *aēšqm* ... *aēnaṅhqm* "for those outrages" (conduct);

Taraporewala 1951 *aēnaṅhqm* "for-(their)-sins" (conduct). He does not think *aēšqm* belongs with *aēnaṅhqm*.

Insler 1975 translates *aēšqm* ... *aēnaṅhqm* "for these sinners" (people).

³⁶ "Yes, there are two fundamental spirits [*mainyu*- 'ways of being'], twins which are renowned to be in conflict. In thought and in word, in action, they are two: the good and the bad. And between these two, the

beneficent have correctly chosen, not the maleficent." Y30.3, Insler 1975. This verse is discussed in more detail in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu*, and in *Part Six: Yasna 30.2*.

³⁷ See *Part Six: Yasna 51.9*, in which the translation of *aēnāṇhqm* as 'of wrongdoings' is also a good contextual fit.

³⁸ In Av., the gen. ('of___') when translated into English, requires a dat. flavor ('to/for ___') as Skjaervo 2003 has pointed out (Lessons 11 and 12). So once again, we have more than one linguistically defensible translation option.

³⁹ Wisdom 'protects', 'helps', with truth and good thinking (detailed in *Part One: Worship & Prayer*); and Y30.7 is translated and discussed in detail in *Part Six: Yasna 30.7*.

⁴⁰ Skjaervo 2006 shows the fem. noun *būj(i)*- which he says means 'expiation' > Ved. *bhūj, bhujī būjim* acc. sg. Y31.13.

⁴¹ Y31.13 is a difficult verse to translate, and different linguists put the words together (syntax) in different ways, resulting in different meanings. This uncertainty alone establishes that this verse cannot be evidence that 'punishment' (as distinguished from adverse consequences) was part of Zarathushtra's spiritual paradigm for wrongful choices. Here are translations of the entire verse by our group of linguists. Words in round parentheses are insertions into the text by the translator.

Insler 1975. "The open deliberation and the one which is deliberated in secret, O Wise One, the person guilty of a small offense [*aēnāṇhō*] (and the one who) shall receive a very great punishment [*mazištqm ... būjim*] ~ regarding with clarity of vision, Thou dost look upon all these things with truth." Y31.13. In this translation, *mazištqm ... būjim* seems to be part of the law of consequences. But it requires the addition of many words that are not in the GAv. text.

Humbach 1991. "(That) which (is) an open counsel, O Wise One, as well as the secrets about which (two persons) take counsel with one another, and (that one) who, (guilty) of a small injury [*aēnāṇhō*], shall incur a very great punishment [*mazištqm ... būjim*], perceiving that with the gleam of Thine eye, Thou seest all (things) through truth." Y31.13. In this translation, *mazištqm ... būjim* seems to be a "very great punishment" unjustly given, and so cannot be part of the law of consequences, nor can it be a part of the true order of existence, given 'through truth'. This "very great punishment" for a "small injury" would have to be the wrongful act of a mortal, which (in this translation) Wisdom sees all with an enlightened eye, through truth.

Humbach/Faiss 2010. "(That) which is open conversation or on what two (people) converse secretly, O Wise One, or when one for (just) a small sin [*aēnāṇhō*] incurs a very great atonement [*mazištqm ... būjim*], retaining that with the ray of your eye you overlook all (things) through truth." Y31.13. The same comment on Humbach 1991, applies here. And I think the translators here use the word "overlook" to mean 'look over' rather than 'neglect to see something'.

Taraporewala 1951. "When in-open doubts, or when in-secret (ones), O Mazda, She discusses; or when for a small sin [*aēnāṇhō*] one-undergoes the highest penance [*mazištqm ... būjim*]; this, watching through-(Thy)-radiant Eye, all (this) closely Thou-observest in-accord-with-Asha." Y31.13, p. 218. Taraporewala comments that the "she" refers to *ārmaiti*-. But with or without *ārmaiti*- I am unable to make sense of this translation. How could undergoing the "highest penance" for a "small sin" be part of the true order of existence?

Bartholomae. "Whatever open or whatever secret (acts) may be visited with punishment, or whether a person for a little sin demands the highest punishment, ~ of all this through Asha Thou art aware, observing it with Thy flashing eye." Y31.13. (quoted in Tarap. 1951 p. 220). I have trouble understanding this translation,

but in any event, the "highest punishment" appears to be something demanded by a mortal ~ not part of the law of consequences.

Moulton 1912. "Whatsoever open or secret things may be visited with judgment, or what man for a little sin demands the heaviest penalty ~ of all this through the Right thou art ware, observing them with flashing eye." Y31.13, p. 355. I have trouble understanding this translation, and my comment on Bartholomae's translation also applies to this one.

⁴² The meanings of *dā*- words are detailed in *Part Two: The Puzzle of Creation*.

⁴³ Humbach 1991, Vol. 2, p. 53.

⁴⁴ Detailed in *Part Two: Molten, Glowing Metal*.

⁴⁵ Here is Y30.7, in Avestan, with my translation, and also with the Insler 1975 translation ~ given for comparative purposes ~ which (despite some differences) supports my conclusion.

a. *ahmāicā. xšaθrā. jasaṭ. manayhā. vohū. ašācā.*

b. *aṭ. kəhrpəm. utayūitiš.⁴⁵ dadāt. ārmaitiš. qnma.*

c. *aēšqm. tōi. [*pōi] ā. aṇhaṭ. yaθā. ayaṇhā. ādānāiš. paouruyō.⁴⁵* Y30.7, Geldner 1P p. 107, the emendation of *tōi* to **pōi* is Insler's and I find his reasoning not only persuasive, but the only one that fits.

a. 'But to this (mortal existence) He/he comes, with (good) rule, with good thinking, and with the true order of existence',

b. 'and enduring embodied truth gives form, breath (to them) '.

c. 'He/he shall be here for the protection of these (mortals), just as (He/he shall be) the first (to so protect) during the repayments through (molten) metal.' Y30.7, my translation.

The words "(mortal existence)" in line a. is expressly stated in the last line of the preceding verse and implied in line a. of this verse. The English He/he is awkward (there are no capital letters in Av. script), but it forms a rather lovely part of the original meaning of this verse ~ in my opinion ~ discussed in more detail in *Part Six: Yasna 30.7*, where I also give other translations for comparative purposes.

Here is Insler 1975. "But to this world He came with the rule of good thinking and of truth, and (our) enduring piety [*ārmaiti*-] gave body and breath (to it). He shall be here for the protection of these (faithful), just as He shall be the first (to do so) during the requitals with the (molten) iron." Y30.7.

For a linguistic analysis of this verse, and other translations see *Part Six: Yasna 30.7*.

⁴⁶ Discussed in more detail in *Part Two: Molten, Glowing Metal*.

⁴⁷ Examples of verses in which the Divine protects with truth and good thinking are detailed in *Part One: Worship & Prayer*.

⁴⁸ Skjaervo 2006 shows the fem. noun stem *ādā*- fem. < *dā* which he thinks means " *presentation", " (I do not know what his asterisk here means). He shows the following declensions with some uncertainty regarding the declensions. All question marks "(?)" are his:

In the Gathas

ādā instr. sg. in Y49.1, and in Y33.12 (where he questions whether it also may be voc. sg. "VS?");

ādāi dat. sg. in Y33.11

adāiš instr. pl. (?) in Y48.1, (not an *ādā*- word, per Insler 1975, Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010).

In the YHapt.

adāiš instr. pl. (?) in YHapt. 35.04.

adāhū loc. pl. YHapt. 40.1

Regarding these two YHapt. words, Humbach/Faiss 2010 do not think that *adāiš* in YHapt. 35.04 is an *ādā*-word. In YHapt. 40.1 they translate *adāhū* as 'presentations/apportionments' but I am unable to make sense of their translations. I therefore have not quoted these sections of the YHapt. here.

⁴⁹ The linguists in our group have translated *ādā*- words as follows (given without the English prepositions which indicate declensions),

Humbach 1991: "apportionment" Y33.11; "good apportionment [*vaṅhuyā ... ādā*]" Y33.12; "good apportionment [*vaṅuhī ādā*]" Y49.1, without comment on how he arrived at this meaning for *ādā*- words, Vol. 2, pp. 101, 206. In the remaining verse Y48.1, Humbach 1991 does not think that *adāiš* is a declension of the stem *ādā*-, he translates instr. pl. *adāiš* as a pronoun "through these" Vol. 2, p. 196.

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "presentation" Y33.11; "good presentation/apportionment" Y33.12; "good ... presentation/apportionment" Y49.1, without comment on how they arrived at these meanings for *ādā*- words. In the remaining verse Y48.1, they do not think that *adāiš* is a declension of the stem *ādā*-, translating instr. pl. *adāiš* as a pronoun "by these" pp. 98, 141, 145.

Skjaervo 2006: "presentation" in Y33.11, Y33.12, Y48.1 and Y49.1;

Taraporewala 1951: "apportioning" Y33.11 (commenting "in the sense of 'recompense (for deeds done during life).'" He states that he is inclined to take *ādāi* here as dat. inf. of *dā*- with *ā* (Skt. *ā-dhā*) to award." (p. 341); "reward" Y33.12; "at-the-awarding" Y48.1; "with-(Thy)-good reward" Y49.1., pp. 340, 341, 342, 657, 693.

Bartholomae: "recompense" Y33.11; "good Recompense" Y33.12; "at the Recompensings" Y48.1; and "with good Ada" Y49.1, shown in Taraporewala 1951, pp. 341, 344, 696. Taraporewala comments on Bartholomae's view on *ādā* in Y49.1 that "Barth. strangely takes this as a 'personification' and thinks it may be another name for *aṣi-vaṅuhi*." p. 695.

Moulton 1912: "Recompense" Y33.11; "good Recompense" Y33.12; "at the Recompensings" Y48.1; "Good Reward" Y49.1, (footnoting polite disagreement on Bartholomae's notion of personification "... is this necessary?..."); pp. 360, 377, 380 and ft. 4.

Insler 1975: "requital" Y33.11, Y33.12, and Y49.1, without comment on how he arrived at this meaning for these *ādā*- words. In the remaining verse Y48.1, he (like Humbach/Faiss) does not think that *adāiš* is a declension of the stem *ādā*-, but thinks it originally was **ad* **āiš* (a pronoun), and that its declension is "the usual instr. of temporal extent" translating it as "during the times after this" pp. 90, 285.

⁵⁰ In Y49.1 *vaṅuhī ādā* "good requital" is used.

"Yes, throughout my lifetime I have been condemned as the greatest defiler, I who try to satisfy the poorly protected (creatures) with truth [*aṣā*]-, Wise One. If requital is good [*vaṅuhī ādā*], come to me and give support to me. Through good thinking find a means of destruction of this." Y49.1, Insler 1975.

In the first part of this verse Zarathushtra complains that he has been unjustly condemned although he has tried to help the poorly protected with the true order of existence (*aṣā*-) which in other parts of the Gathas is described as most good (*vahišta*-), beneficial (*spənta*-), generous, caring (etc.). In the 2d part of this verse, he in effect requests, if requital (the good and adverse repayments under the law of consequences) eventually brings about a good end, that Wisdom to come to him, support him, find a means (through requital) of destroying the wrongdoings complained of (in the first part of the verse), through enlarged understanding ("through good thinking find a means of destruction of this.").

⁵¹ That the Divine helps, protects, us through truth and its comprehension, is stated repeatedly throughout the Gathas, detailed in *Part One: Worship & Prayer*.

⁵² But then, one wonders: Can our 'perception' of the Divine ever be anything other than our own thinking? Well, it is difficult to say for sure. In Zarathushtra's thought, the existence of the Divine is the true (correct, right, wholly good) order of existence. And he tells us to search for this order of existence with good thinking; and that we are capable of attaining it completely. So I am inclined to think that the true order of existence is an objective thing (in his view), and that as we continue to search for it, our understanding of this order of existence continues to evolve until we understand it completely. But I agree that reasonable minds may differ.

A related question is: Did Zarathushtra believe that the Divine has a nature independent of human perceptions? Well, human beings are not the sum total of all existence. Do other life forms have a perception of the Divine? How could we ever know for sure. Perhaps these are (and will remain?) unanswered questions that have puzzled the mind of man (and possibly other life forms) for millennia.

⁵³ Humbach 1991 Vol. 2, pp. 70, 160.

⁵⁴ Taraporewala 1951 pp. 228, 528.

⁵⁵ See *Part One: Does The Devil Exist?*

⁵⁶ Discussed in *Part Three: Apema, One Of Many Ends*; and in *Part Two: Other Metaphors*.

⁵⁷ Detailed in *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise & Hell*; and *Asha & The Checkmate Solution*. For a discussion of *apāma-* words and how they have been interpretively translated to introduce other religious paradigms into the Gathas, see *Part Three: Apema, One Of Many Ends*.

⁵⁸ Skjaervo 2006 shows the stem and its declensions which appear in 2 Gatha verses.

išud- masc./fem. meaning 'due, debt',

išudəm acc. sg. in Y34.15

išudō nom./ acc. pl. in Y31.14.

⁵⁹ Insler 1975: In Y31.14, he translates *išudō* as 'claims'. In his comments he gives the following more literal translation, saying "... *yā išudō dadəntē dāθranəm hacā ašāunō* is literally 'which claims among the payments shall be taken from the truthful.'" Regarding *išud-* he states "I prefer 'claim, due', ..." seeing a parallel in YHapt. 39.4 in which he thinks a form of "*išūidyaiti* 'pay or give due (to someone),' appears, giving the translation "... we reverence Thee, we give Thee Thy due [*išūidyāmahī*], Wise Lord." He also cites a Ved. parallel which says (referring to a deity) "...Each pays (him) his due [*išudhayati*] for the purpose of wealth.'" (p. 187). Clearly in all these instances, neither 'payments' nor 'claims' carry the added flavor of 'punishment'.

In Y34.15 Insler 1975 translates *išudəm* as 'just claim for my praises', and in his comment as 'claim (due)', without further comment on its meaning (p. 228). Here also *claim* or *due* does not include the meaning 'punishment'.

Humbach 1991: In Y31.14 and Y34.15 he translates *išud-* words as 'invigoration' (Vol. 2, pp. 69 - 70; 114). I can make no sense of the Ved. cognates he cites, nor do I understand his comments (due I am sure to my own limitations).

Humbach/Faiss 2010: In Y31.14 and Y34.15 they translate *išud-* words as 'compensation', without comment.

Taraporewala 1951: In Y31.14, he translates *išudō* as 'silent-yearnings', and in Y34.15 as "yearning". His comments show the diversity of views amongst linguists of his generation regarding the meaning of *išud-* words (p. 221) commenting under Y31.14, that *išud-* words have been translated as follows:

By Kanga as 'reward';

By Jackson as 'claims, ... what is due ... from another'

By Bartholomae as 'debts, dues'

Taraporewala mentions the Rig Vedic *išudhya-* the "abstract noun (fem)" form of which he says Geldner translates as 'a silent wish for something, a silent yearning'. (p. 222).

Bartholomae: In Y31.14, and Y34.15 he translates *išud-* words as 'dues/due' (Tarap. 1951 pp. 224, 398).

Moulton 1912: He translates *išud-* words as 'requitals' in Y31.14 as 'due' in Y34.15 (pp. 353, 363).

⁶⁰ Bartholomae's translation of Y49.3 and Y51.9 into English as it appears in Taraporewala 1951, pp. 704, 788.

⁶¹ Bartholomae's translation of Y30.11 into English as it appears in Taraporewala 1951, p. 171.

⁶² The various translations of *druj-*, and the fact that in the Gathas, *druj-* is used as the opposite of *aša-* 'the true order of existence', are detailed in a ft. in *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise & Hell*.

⁶³ Detailed in *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant*.

⁶⁴ Here is the full verse in the Insler 1975 translation, with my translation differences in square brackets, in black font.

"However, it has been fated for this world, Wise One, that the truth [*aša-*] is to be saved for its (good) preference [*varənāi*], that deceit [*druj-*] is to be destroyed [*rāšayejḥē*] for its (false) profession [*tkaēšāi* 'for (its false) teaching']. By reason of this, I am eager for the alliance of good thinking, in order to ban all the deceitful persons [*vīspāng drəgvatō* 'all deceitfulness, untruthfulness'] from our company." Y49.3, Insler 1975. In the last line, Insler has chosen to translate the adj. *drəgvatō* (acc. pl. of *drəgvant-*), as a **people** rather than as **qualities/concept**. However Zarathushtra repeatedly advocates spreading Wisdom's teachings, changing peoples' minds, changing their wrongful conduct ~ not banning them.

"... Through His Word, by (giving) tongue (to it), we would turn (around) in the greatest way, those whose reasoning is paralysed.' Y28.5 (my translation, see *Part Six: Yasna 28.5*).

"... speak, Wise One, ... in order for us to know (all) that, by means of which I might convert all the living." Y31.3, Insler 1975;

"Lord, let wisdom come in the company of truth across the earth! ...", Y50.5 Insler 1975;

"...How shall I bring to life that vision of mine,..." Y44.9, Insler 1975;

So in Y49.3 translating *vīspāng drəgvatō* as banning all untruthful persons is not consistent with the macro context of the Gathas. On the other hand, translating *vīspāng drəgvatō* as banning 'all (that is) untruthful' ~ banning all the qualities of untruthfulness ~ is not only an accurate linguistic option, but is also a foundational teaching of Zarathushtra's, and therefore consistent with the macro context of the Gathas. See *Part Four: Ashavan & Dregvant* for a more detailed discussion of this translation option for the adj. *drəgvant-*, when used as a noun.

⁶⁵ Humbach 1991 "... but deceit [*druj-*] (has been imparted) to (his) heresy in order to harm [*rāšayejḥē*] ..." Y49.3 Vol. 1, p. 180; no comment on the meaning of *rāšayejḥē* as "to harm", Vol. 2, p. 207.

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "Truth is implanted in this (our) choice, O Wise One, to benefit/save (us, but) deceit (is implanted in misteaching/heresy to harm [*rāšayejḥē*] (us). ..." Y49.3, p. 146, without comment.

Taraporewala 1951: "... the Teaching (that) Truth shall-prevail, (that) Untruth shall be frustrated [*rāṣāyej̄hē*] ..." Y49.3. He takes *rāṣāyej̄hē* as "dat. inf. from *raṣ-* 'to injure, to prevent,' but translates it here "in the sense of 'prevention' or 'frustration'." (p. 702). However, in his commentary on the meaning of *raṣ-* in Y30.11 (discussed under Y30.11) he says that *raṣ-* means 'to injure, to punish' Both comments include the meaning 'to injure' but he does not explain how he arrives at the added flavors 'to punish' or 'frustrated', which are his translation choices.

Bartholomae translates *rāṣāyej̄hē* in Y49.3 as "for ruin", (Tarap. 1951 p. 704); so too does Moulton 1912 (p. 380).

⁶⁶ Y51.9 is discussed in more detail in *Part Two: Molten, Glowing Metal*; and in *Part Six: Yasna 51.9*.

⁶⁷ Humbach 1991 "...To harm [*rāṣāyej̄hē*] the deceitful one [*drəgvantəm*], Thou dost benefit [*savayō*] the truthful one [*aṣavanəm*] " Y51.9, Vol. 1, p. 188. In his commentary in Vol. 2, he offers no explanation of how he arrives at the meaning of "to harm for *rāṣāyej̄hē*."

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "...to harm [*rāṣāyej̄hē*] the deceitful one [*drəgvantəm*], you benefit/save [*savayō*] the truthful one [*aṣavanəm*] " Y51.9, (p. 154 - 155). They offer no comment on how they arrive at the meaning of *rāṣāyej̄hē* as "to harm".

Taraporewala 1951 "...that the Untruthful [*drəgvantəm*] shall-have-frustration [*rāṣāyej̄hē*], (and) the Truthful [*aṣavanəm*] shall-have-blessings [*savayō*]." Y51.9, (p. 786). His brief comment on *rāṣāyej̄hē* duplicates his previous comment under Y49.3, which has been summarized above.

Bartholomae "... even the bringing of ruin [*rāṣāyej̄hē*] to the Liar [*drəgvantəm*], of blessing [*savayō*] to the Righteous [*aṣavanəm*]." Y51.9.

Moulton's 1912 translation is the same as that of Bartholomae (p. 385).

⁶⁸ Detailed in *Part Two: Light, Glory, Fire*.

⁶⁹ As mentioned in a preceding ft. above, the GAv. word *rānōibyā* is dat. du. of the masc./ntr. stem *rāna-*, (Skjaervo 2006). The fact that this GAv. word has not yet been decoded and all translations of it are simply guesses, is discussed briefly in a ft. above. It is also discussed in detail with evidence in *Part Six: Yasna 43.12* (and more briefly in *Part Six: Yasna 51.9*).

⁷⁰ Discussed in *Part Six: Yasna 51.9*.

⁷¹ Humbach 1991 "... (and when you master) what long-lasting harm [*darəgām ... rašō*] (is in store) for the deceitful [*drəgvō.dəbyō* pl.], as well as (what) benefits for the truthful [*savacā aṣavabyō* pl.], then (the things desired) will in future be available through them." Vol. 1, p. 125.

⁷² Humbach/Faiss 2010 "... the long-lasting/endless harm [*darəgām ... rašō*] (in store) for the deceitful [*drəgvō.dəbyō* pl.] and the benefits for the truthful [*savacā aṣavabyō* pl.], then the (things) desired will be (available) through them indeed." Y30.11 p. 83.

⁷³ Taraporewala 1951: "... age-long punishment [*darəgām ... rašō*] (is) for-the-Followers-of-Untruth, and upward-progress for-the-Upholders-of-Truth ~ then through (Laws) Illumination shall-come nearer (to you)." Y30.11; (p. 168). He comments that the Vedic *raṣas* is cognate, and thinks that "*raṣas*, demon, orig. meant 'injurious, harmful'." He thinks the (conjectured) Ved. root *raṣ-* means 'to injure', but notes that Whitney thought the evidence "too weak to accept" a root *raṣ-* which means 'to injure', while Grassmann "definitely" thinks this root generated "*raṣas* in both the senses of 'evil spirit' and 'injury'. He states that Bartholomae says that the word means 'injury' or 'punishment' (without explaining how 'punishment' came into the

picture). But Bartholomae, Moulton, and Taraporewala themselves translate *rašō* as 'punishment', (without explaining why they prefer 'punishment' to 'injury or harm'). So once again, we see that 'punishment' is an interpretive choice. (p. 170).

Bartholomae, Moulton, Taraporewala, Whitney and Grassman were all of a generation of scholars when the decoding of Avestan was in an earlier stage than it now is. But for all that, Taraporewala's comments show the uncertainty of meanings even in the Vedic words believed to be cognate.

Bartholomae: "... the long punishment [*darəgām ... rašō*] for the follower of the Druj [*drəgvō.dəbyō* pl.], and blessings for the followers of the Right [*savacā ašavabyō* pl.] ~ then hereafter shall it be well." Y30.11, (Tarap. 1951 p. 171).

Moulton 1912: "... the long punishment for the liars, and blessings for the righteous ~ then hereafter ye have bliss." (p. 351).

⁷⁴ Skjaervo 2006 shows *mašya-* as a masc. noun, with *mašyāñhō* as its nom. pl. declension. But Jackson 1892, (§§ 236, 238, p. 70) shows the *-āñhō* inflection can also be voc. pl. for *a-* stem nouns (*mašya-* is an *a-* stem noun). And in Y30.11, some linguists have chosen to translate *mašyāñhō* as voc. pl.

⁷⁵ The word *urvātā* has been variously translated as "rules" (Humbach 1991); "laws" (Taraporewala 1951); "commandments" (Insler 1975, Humbach/Faiss 2010; Bartholomae; Moulton 1912); and "deals" (Skjaervo 2006, who further explains his choice "between gods, or gods and men"). I think the translation choice "commandments" is not consistent with a system of thought in which the freedom to choose is a fundament (detailed in *Part Three: Commands?*).

I think the stem *urvāta-* means 'principles' in the sense of the established order which governs existence ~ established by Wisdom through His beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*) ~ referred to in different words in Y44.7, in which Zarathushtra uses a *dā-* word (*dātārəm*) meaning 'producer, establisher' (which Insler translates as 'creator') "... By these (questions), Wise One, I am helping to discern Thee to be the Creator [*dātārəm* 'producer/establisher'] of everything by reason of Thy [*spənta- mainyu-* 'beneficial way of being']." Y44.7). The ways in which *dā-* words are used in the Gathas, are discussed in *Part Two: The Puzzle of Creation*.

⁷⁶ Detailed in *Part Three: Chinvat, The Bridge of Discerning*.