Yasna 43.12.

This verse Y43.12 is discussed (in part) in *Part Three: Rae, Rayah*. But in order to place ideas in context here, some repetition is inevitable, for which I hope you will forgive me.

I have selected this verse for us to study, for 2 reasons. First, it is quite lovely in and of itself itself. When you first read it, it may not impress you. But like so many Gatha verses, it is the ideas that are beautiful. And it rewards a closer look. Just as truth runs through Zarathushtra's teachings in kaleidoscopic ways, so too does truth run through this verse (like a sunlit stream) ~ first expressed, then implied ~ a poetic technique in the Gathas (originating perhaps in GAv. syntax which has this same feature. A good example is the Ahuna Vairya manthra).[1]

But this verse is important for another reason. It is another of those verses into which translators have inserted the ideas of a final judgment, damnation, and punishment in hell ~ even though such words and ideas are not stated in this verse, ~ just as they are not stated in any other Gatha verse, nor in any later Avestan text. So this verse is part of the evidence needed to expose and demolish the myth that Zarathushtra created the idea of 'hell'.

In the first 7 pages of this (rather long) chapter, I summarize this evidence (in the *Discussion* section below), and discuss it in more detail in the word by word analysis (below), so here again, there will be a little repetition (for which I ask your indulgence). If you are not interested in the word by word analysis, you may prefer to read just the first 7 pages, and the translations of the linguists in our group, at the end of the chapter. To avoid repeated references to the translations, commentaries and opinions of our group of linguists I footnote them here.[2]

In the immediately preceding verse, Zarathushtra expresses his anguish about whether he will ever be successful in overcoming the indifference of people to Wisdom's teaching. Then our verse follows.

a. *hyaţcā. mōi. mraoš.   ašəm. jasō. frāx šnənē.*
b. *aţ. *tū *mōi. nōiţ.   asruštā. pairyaoγžā.*
c. **uzirəidyāi.   parā. hyaţ. mōi. ā.jimaţ.*
d. *səraošō. ašī.   mązā.rayā. hacimnō.*
e. *yā. vī. ašīš.   rānōibyō. savōi. vīdāyāţ* ⁛ Y43.12, Geldner.[3]

My translation. (Zarathushtra speaking to Wisdom):
a. 'But then You said to me, "*you have come to truth for instruction,*
b. *you moreover, to Me, have not declared yourself to the contrary, through not listening (to truth).*"
c.d. (So it is) for me to arise, before listening (to truth) may come, followed by the light giving reward (of truth),
e. (For it is truth) through which He will distribute, in salvation, the rewards (of truth), for (all) types (of conduct).'
Lines c. and d. literally
c. (So it is) for me to arise, before may come
d. listening (to truth) with (the) light giving reward (of truth) following.

Discussion.

Many of the difficulties in translating this verse fall into place, if we make (linguistically defensible) translation choices that are consistent with certain basic teachings of Zarathushtra ~ the macro context of the Gathas. So let us start by recalling these teachings, to provide the macro context for

our translation choices. The evidence that these are indeed Zarathushtra's teachings is detailed in other chapters.[4] In the Gathas:

- Wisdom's path is the path of the true (good, correct) order of existence (*aša-* 'truth' for short) and its components ~ its good comprehension (*vohu- manah-*), its beneficial embodiment in thought word and action (*spənta- ārmaiti-*), its good rule (*vohu- xšaϑra-*), comprising a beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*);

- We choose Wisdom's path by searching for what is true, good, right, and implementing it in our lives ~ an on~going search for truth;

- The freedom to make choices is not just something nice. Making choices, experiencing their consequences, and learning from such experiences is necessary, required, for spiritual growth ~ the perfecting process ~ which cannot occur without the freedom to choose as part of this process;

- The reward for taking the path of the true order of existence (and its components) is the complete attainment of the true order of existence (and its components) ~ a perfected existence;

- 'Salvation' is not being saved from damnation. In Zarathushtra's thought, salvation is being saved from untruth (from ignorance, from all that is false, wrong). Salvation is the perfected end ~ the complete attainment of the true (correct, wholly good) order of existence, its good comprehension, its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action, its good rule ~ comprising the wholly beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*), which is wisdom personified, which is the true (correct, good) order of existence personified;

- A perfected existence (truth personified) is an end that all the living will ultimately attain ~ an idea so foundational in Zarathushtra's teachings that it survived in YAv. and Pahlavi texts;

- There is no 'hell' as a place of punishment for making wrong choices ~ not in the Gathas nor in any Avestan text ~ other than the 'hells' we experience in mortal existence through earned and unearned experiences, as part of spiritual growth ~ the perfecting process.

All the linguists in our group have concluded that in this chapter, Zarathushtra speaks of the necessity for obedience and the resulting reward (for obedience) and punishment in hell (for disobedience), after some final judgment.

But 'obedience' is an interpretive translation of *səraoša-*, which actually means 'listening' ~ hearing and implementing (Wisdom's Word),[5] ~ and the words 'final judgment', and 'punishment in 'hell' are neither expressed, nor (reasonably) implied ~ not in this verse, nor in any Avestan texts (composed during Avestan times).[6] It was not until more than 1,000 later in certain Pahlavi/Pazand texts, that the idea of a temporary hell of torture and punishments was brought into the religion by the religious establishment of that time.[7] True, in this verse, there are some Avestan words that have not yet been decoded with any degree of certainty. But there is no (linguistically defensible) evidence that any such words mean 'final judgment', and 'punishment in 'hell'. Such ideas are all interpretations.

It is inevitable that the meanings of words that have not yet been decoded with certainty will require some guess work ~ chosing between available possibilities. I have chosen (linguistically defensible) translation options that are consistent with, and corroborated by, not only the micro context of the verse itself and macro context of the Gathas, but also other YAv. texts (and for some of these words, even Pahlavi texts).

Let us first see how truth flows through our verse in its different roles ~ first expressed, and then implied.

In the immediately preceding verse (Y43.11) Zarathushtra expresses his anguish about whether anyone will ever listen to his attempts to explain Wisdom's teachings. Then in the first 2 lines of our verse, he in effect comforts himself with his understanding of Wisdom's response (to his anguish), expressed as Wisdom reassuring him that he has already taken the necessary first steps. He has come to truth for instruction (lines a.) and he has not refused to listen to truth (line b.).

Y43.11 "...when I was first instructed by your words, painful seemed to me my faith in men to bring to realization that which ye told me is the best [*vahišta-* 'most good'] (for them)." Insler 1975.

Y43.12 'But then You said to me, "*you have come to truth for instruction,*
you moreover, to Me, have not declared yourself to the contrary, through not listening (to truth).
...' my translation.

Coming to truth for instruction, means wanting truth to be his teacher, wanting to learn from truth. So here we have the on-going search for truth and the desire to comprehend it which is a fundament of Wisdom's teaching (as conveyed by Zarathushtra in the Gathas).

He then concludes that it is up to him to get going ~ to persevere in teaching Wisdom's path (of truth); so that people can be brought around to listen to and implement Wisdom's Word (the path of truth), resulting in the enlightenment that is the reward (the attainment of truth).

c.d. (So it is) for me to arise [*uzirəidyāi*] before listening [*səraošō*] (to truth) may come, followed by the light giving reward (of truth),
e. (For it is truth) through which He will distribute, in salvation, the rewards (of truth), for (all) types (of conduct).' Y43.12 my translation.

In lines c. and d. 'listening' cannot refer to Zarathushtra because lines a. and b. establish that Zarathushtra has already come to truth for instruction, and is already listening to it. In effect, in lines c. and d., Zarathushtra tells himself what he has to do to overcome the indifference of the people mentioned in the preceding verse, whom he wants to impassion, so that they will listen to Wisdom's Word ~ hear it and implement it. The idea of arising [*uzirəidyāi*] is used in the sense of *get up and get going*.

And in line d. the 'light giving reward (of truth)' (enlightenment) is equated with salvation' (in line e.) which is the reward for (all) types (of conduct), reflecting Zarathushtra's thought that through the refiner's fire of mortal experiences, the good end ~ the true order of existence (the 'light giving reward') ~ will ultimately be attained by all the living;[8] an idea that survived through YAv. texts (*fraṣō.kərəiti-*),[9] even to Pahlavi times (*frashgard/frashkart*). As Zaehner states, speaking of the Pahlavi texts,

> "... The last ~ the *Frashkart* or 'Making Excellent' ~ is the end to which the whole of creation looks forward; it is regarded as being the inevitable consummation of a rational process initiated by God, and it is never suposed for one moment that there is any doubt that it will come to pass. The phrase used for this process is *patvandishn i o Frashkart*, which can be translated as the 'continuous evolution towards the Rehabilitation.'.[10]

You may object that lines c. d. and e. do not specifically identify what earns the reward, what gives the reward, or the reward itself. That is true. And you should question my conclusion that 'truth' is implied in each of these instances. So how do we know that the 'reward(s)' mentioned in lines d. and e. are the rewards of 'truth'? Well, for 2 reasons found in the verse itself (the micro context).

First, in line d., 'reward' is described as 'light giving [*mązā.rayā*]'. And throughout the Gathas and other Avestan texts, 'light' words are associated with truth ~ sometimes as a metaphor, sometimes as a simile, sometimes as a symbol. Linguists differ on the meaning of *mązā.rayā.* And all the linguists in our group have translated it as 'wealth~granting', or 'treasure~laden'. But the linguistic and contextual evidence that *raē-* words are 'light' words throughout the Gathas and many Younger Avestan instances (and have been paralleled even in Pahlavi texts) is strong. This evidence is detailed in the chapter in *Part Three: Rae, Rayah,* which explores the meaning of *mązā.rayā* in detail, (and is summarized below under *mązā.rayā* in the word by word linguistic discussion).

Second: in line e., the word 'rewards' is equated with 'salvation'. And in the Gathas, 'salvation' is the complete attainment of truth ~ the true (correct, good) order of existence and its component qualities.[11] For example, addressing the Divine (the amesha spenta as allegories and I think all those who have attained these qualities completely and thus are a part of the Divine),[12] Zarathushtra says,

a. 'All (you) of the same temperament, that salvation [*savō*] of yours, let (it) be given to us ~
b. the true order of existence through good thinking, words [*uxδā*] through which embodied truth [*ārmaitiš*] (exists),[13]
c. the worshiping of Wisdom with reverence, (who) gifts support.' Y51.20, my translation. Insler's translation is footnoted for comparative purposes.[14] In the Gathas, we worship Wisdom with the qualities that make a being divine (amesha spenta), with each thought, word and action. So in Y51.20 we see that the true order of existence and its components, are both the definition of salvation, and the path to salvation (the way to worship) ~ an interweaving of ideas.

Returning to our verse (Y43.12), its line e. (as composed, not as interpreted) is consistent with Zarathushtra's unique solution for eliminating evil, which is to change minds, change preferences, through the way in which existence is ordered (*aša-*), which includes the law of consequences (that we reap what we sow) as well as unearned experiences, and mutual, loving help ~ all necessary for bringing about a good end. So through a long, slow process of making choices, earned and unearned experiences, and mutual loving help, minds and preferences are changed from a mix (of more~good and bad) to a state of being that is an epiphany of goodness ~ the true, wholly good, order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*),[15] ~ which is Zarathushtra's notion of 'salvation' (and the state of being that is paradise!).[16]

Therefore (returning to 'reward'), although the intermediate consequences for making 'bad' choices may be painful indeed, the ultimate 'end', the ultimate 'reward' for (all) types (of conduct) ~ good, bad, and amoral, listening to truth and not listening ~ will eventually be the same, the true order of existence, 'salvation'.

Line e. (For it is truth) through which He will distribute, in salvation, the rewards (of truth), for (all) types (of conduct).' Y43.12e, my translation.

Perhaps you may have wondered: Why is 'reward' sg. in line d., but pl. ('rewards') in line e.?

Well, the true order of existence consists of component parts ~ its good comprehension, its beneficial embodiment, its good rule, its complete attainment, the beneficial way of being. And in the Gathas, in 1,001 complementary, incremental ways, truth and each of its components are stated to be both the path and its reward. I therefore think that the 'light giving reward [sg.] (of truth)' (line d.), is a collective sg. ~ the true order of existence (*aša-*) ~ whereas the plural 'rewards' (line e.) reflects its component parts, each of which, individually, is shown in the Gathas to be a reward in kaleidoscopic variations.[17]

4

So in essence, in our verse, Y43.12, the sunlight of truth (*aša-* the true order of existence) mentioned specifically in line a., runs (impliedly) throughout the other lines of this verse as well,

- from coming to truth for instruction (specified in line a.)

- to Zarathushtra 'listening' to it ~ hearing and implementing it (implied in line b.),

- to others listening to it ~ hearing and implementing the path of truth ~ as a result of Zarathushtra's efforts to spread Wisdom's Word (implied in lines c.d.)

- which ultimately is followed by the reward ~ the illumination of truth for truth's own sake (implied in line d);

- which is Zarathushtra's notion of salvation, a state of being that personifies the true order of existence and its components completely (implied in line e).

The grief, the suffering, caused by wrongdoing, lies, corruption, greed, cruelty, tyranny, etc. eventually will end. Ultimately, through a long process of experiences, everyone will attain a wholly good order of being. No one is left behind.

Which brings us to the final question.   Where in the world (or more to the point, where in this verse!) are the GAv. words which have been interpreted as implying a final judgment, or the rewards/punishments of 'hell'?   And for what reasons have these words been so interpreted?

There are two words in line e. which have generated such interpretations. Here, I will not discuss the linguistics of these words (they are detailed below). I will just summarize the meanings that have been ascribed to them by our group of linguists (where ascertainable) and the reasons, if any, they have given for their interpretations.

One such word is *savōi* a form of the conjectured stem *sava-*.   Quite a few Gatha verses have *sava-* words in them, which has also been translated as 'benefit'. Most of these *sava-* words are used in the sense of the ultimate good end (and the rest are consistent with the ultimate good end), so I think Insler's choice "salvation" is a good fit based on how *sava-* words are used in the Gathas, in which the ultimate end, the ultimate benefit, is being saved from untruth.

The other word in our verse is *rānōibyō* (or in some mss. *rānōibyā*) ~ forms of the conjectured stem *rāna-*, which has not yet been decoded with any degree of certainty, even though *rāna-* words are used in 4 other Gatha verses. All translations are just guesses.

No linguist in our group has pointed to any Vedic or other Indo~European cognate which might shed light on the meaning of *rāna-* words, and in our verse (Y43.12) the manuscripts also disagree in how the word is written, which some mss. show in a plural form (*rānōibyō*), and in others in a dual form (*rānōibyā*). But because the word is used in other Gatha verses, I think its meaning can be ascertained (with reasonable assurance) from these many uses, if we pick a translation option that is consistent with each verse in which a *rana-* word appears, and is also consistent with the macro context of the Gathas.   This (with respect), the translators in our group have not done.

Insler 1975 translates *rāna-* words as 'faction(s)' but offers no comment on how he arrived at this meaning. He translates lines c. d. and e. of our verse as follows.
c.d. it was for me to arise before obedience was to come to me accompanied by a wealth~granting reward,
e. (for it is obedience) according to which one should distribute the rewards (of truth) to both factions [*rānōibyō*] at the time of (our) salvation [*savōi*]. [ft. 11]." Y43.12.
And (perhaps influenced by the Pahlavi glosses) he adds footnote 11 as follows,

"11. That is, the final judgment shall bring salvation to the truthful but damnation to the deceitful. Z therefore looks upon the final judgment as the time of salvation." p. 65.

He offers no basis for this interpretation. As you can see, there are no words "final judgment" in this verse, in his own translation. And even in his translation, "at the time of (our) salvation [*savōi*]" is not limited to just the 'good' faction, but specifies the distribution of rewards "to both factions". Therefore there is no place in the micro context of this verse ~ as he translates it ~ for his interpretation that there is a separate reward ~ damnation ~ for wrongdoers. His footnoted interpretation is not supported by the micro context of the verse as he translates it.

Humbach 1991 thinks *rāna-* words mean "thigh" or "leg" and in our verse he translates *rānōibyō* as abl. pl. "according to (the respective) balances", (as in the 'legs' of multiple weighing scales). He translates lines c. d. and e. in our verse as follows.
cd. Let me arise before (Recompense for) Obedience will have come to me, followed by wealth-granting Reward,
e. who at the benefaction [*savōi*] will distribute the rewards according to (the respective) balances [*rānōibyō*]." Y43.12
He does not explain how a 'bad' reward could be distributed "at the benefaction" ~ the meaning of which is (derived from 'benefit'). A 'benefit' can only be 'good' ~ it cannot include a punitive reward.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 take the meaning of (dat./abl. pl.) *rānōibyō* ~ as an "arbitrary number of pairs of scales/balances". They nevertheless translate *rānōibyō* (in our verse Y43.12) as "with the balance" (a translation which is neither dat. pl. nor abl. pl. but instr. sg.),
They translate lines d. and e. as follows.
cd. Let me arise (already) before hearing/obedience has reached me, in company with wealth-granting Reward,
e. who, in the favorable (case) [*savōi*] will distribute the rewards with the balance [*rānōibyō*]." Y43.12.
They express their complete agreement with the glosses recorded by the Pahlavi commentators which (according to them) "unanimously say ... 'it makes manifest the saved/redeemed and the condemned/damned'."; and Humbach/Faiss conclude "which is certainly right.", without offering any supporting Avestan evidence.

Moulton 1912, and Bartholomae. Moulton's translation is identical to that of Bartholomae's English translation and it is difficult for me to determine which of their English words are translations of *savōi* and *rānōibyā* (du.) or *rānōibyō* (pl.).
c.d.e. *'Speed thee ere my Obedience come, followed by treasure-laden Destiny, who shall render to men severally the destinies of the twofold award'."* Y43.12.

Taraporewala 1951 (more than 20 years before Insler 1975!) thought that *rana-* words mean 'faction' or 'party'. In Y43.12 he follows those mss. that show *rānōibyā* (du.) which he translates "to-the-two-parties". And he translates the one word *savōi* as 'both~reward~and~punishment', which (with respect) does not fit the use of *sava-* words in other Gatha verses, and has no support in other Avestan texts (his translation of *savōi* is discussed in more detail in the linguistic section below). He translates lines c. d. and e. as follows.
cd. that-I-bestir-myself until when within-me shall-arise, Sraosha accompanied by the blessing of-Divine-Light,
e. whilst He-apportions what-is-due both-reward-and-punishment [*savōi*] to-the-two-parties [*rānōibyā*]." Y43.12.

In short, the foregoing meanings ascribed to *rāna-* words by the linguists in our group, are not based on linguistics. They simply are guesses.

I think 'type(s)' (also a guess!) is the only translation for *rāna-* words which is a good contextual fit in all 5 verses in which *rāna-* words appear. When dual it means 'two-types' and when pl. (as in our verse) '(all) types', and in Gatha verses, it is used for 'types (of conduct)' and also 'types (of alternatives, or choices)'. The other four Gatha verses in which *rana-* words appear are detailed in a footnote in the linguistic discussion below under *rānōibyō*.

Insler's 'factions', and Taraporewala's 'parties' have roughly the same meaning. With respect, I do not think they are a good contextual fit, because in the Gathas, Zarathushtra was well aware that in our reality, no human being is all good, or all-bad (Y30.3, Y45.2) ~ that we all are a mix of 'good' and 'bad' qualities in varying degrees.[18] Now it is true that when referring to groups of people who have acted in predatory ways, he sometimes describes them as untruthful, or 'bad'.[19] But when announcing a principle of his teaching regarding 'reward', I think he would have been more exact. He would not have segregated human beings who are a mix of good and bad qualities, into two factions ~ a good faction to be rewarded and a bad faction to be damned and punished.[20] That simply is neither logical nor reasonable, nor consistent with his macro teachings. And Zarathushtra was a very logical, reasoned thinker. True, the Gathas are poetry. But it is a mistake to conclude that just because something is poetry we cannot expect it to be rational. How can the poetry of the Gathas be divorced from good thinking when in fact they are full of 'good thinking' which in these poems is a quality Zarathushtra speaks of as divine, and the paradise that mortals can attain?

So we return to the question: How does the context in which *rāna-* words are used in the Gathas, inform their meaning? I offer the following line of reasoning.

In the Gathas, the 'enemy' to be overcome is not an opposing tribe, or family, or clan. The enemy is a quality of being ~ what is false, wrong, the ideas and conduct that are in opposition to the true (good, correct) order of existence ~ Zarathushtra's objective is to "deliver deceit [a quality] into the hands of truth [a quality]," (Y30.8, Y44.14, Insler 1975). We even see traces of this idea (that the 'enemy' is the 'bad' qualities that comprise untruth) in later texts.[21]

In his thought, it is types of conduct that generate consequences, not types of people. Therefore, in the context of our verse, I take *rānōibyō* as pl. meaning '(all) types (of conduct).' And just so you can see the context again, here is our verse, with the last part of the immediately preceding verse.

"...when I was first instructed by your words, painful seemed to me my faith in men to bring to realization that which ye told me is the best [*vahišta-* 'most good'] (for them)." Y43.11 Insler 1975.

'But then You said to me, "*you have come to truth for instruction,*
you moreover, to Me, have not declared yourself to the contrary, through not listening (to truth).
c.d. (So it is) for me to arise, before listening (to truth) may come, followed by the light giving reward (of truth),
e. (For it is truth) through which He will distribute, in salvation, the rewards (of truth), for (all) types (of conduct).' (my translation).

<center>* * * * *</center>

Let us now look at the meaning and grammatical value of each word, and consider how they may be put together (syntax), considering also the interpretations of the eminent linguists in our group.

a. *hyaţcā mōi mraoš ...*
a. 'But then You said to me, ...'

hyaṯcā 'but then',

hyaṯ is a conjunction which is flexible in meaning, and can be used for a number of English equivalents, such as 'when, because, as, (so) that'. The suffix *cā* is also a conjunction which most often means 'and', but can also mean 'but'.[22] As a conjunction, *hyaṯ* is indeclinable (it has no inflected forms for different cases/numbers/genders); *hyaṯ* is also a relative pronoun nom./acc. sg. ntr. of stem *ya-*,[23] but in this context a relative pronoun does not fit. I therefore translate *hyaṯcā* as a conjunction 'But then', because our verse (Y43.12) immediately follows the verse in which Zarathushtra says "...when I was first instructed by your words, painful seemed to me my faith in men to bring to realization that which ye told me is the best [*vahišta-*] (for them)." Y43.11, which accounts for the beginning of Y43.12 *hyaṯcā mōi mraoš* 'But then You said to me...'.

mraoš 'you said'

Skjaervo 2006 shows *mraoš* as the injunctive 2p sg. form of the verb stem *mrao-* 'to speak, to say'. In English we add the 2p pronoun 'you', but in GAv. the 2p pronoun is indicated by the verb form *mraoš*.

mōi 'to me'

mōi is a 1p personal pronoun, and in GAv. it is one of the forms (enclitic) for gen. sg. ('my') and also dat. sg. ('to/for me') (Skjaervo 2006, M&dV 2001 p. 69).

Thus in line a. *hyaṯcā mōi mraoš ...* 'But then You said to me...' my translation.
And our group of translators are in general agreement,
Insler 1975 "However, that Thou didst say to me ...".
Humbach 1991 "And when Thou tellest me...".
Humbach/Faiss 2010 "And when you say to me...".
Taraporewala 1951 interpretively, "Thou-didst-order", but commenting that the verb means 'to say, to speak'.
Moulton 1912 (following Bartholomae) "And when thou saidst to me...".

As you can see from these first 3 words, *hyaṯcā mōi mraoš ...* 'But then You said to me...' it is apparent that the words that follow are spoken by Wisdom ⁓ a conclusion with which most translators agree. In my view, this was simply a story telling technique ⁓ it does not mean that Zarathushtra heard an actual voice. Translators however disagree greatly about the meanings of the words purportedly said by Wisdom, and they also disagree about when Wisdom stops speaking, and Zarathushtra starts speaking. There are no quotation marks in Avestan script, such as would make it clear which words are ascribed to Wisdom. Here are the first three words purportedly spoken by Wisdom to Zarathushtra.

a.   ...   *aṣ̌əm jasō frāx šnənē*
a.   ...   *you have come to truth for instruction,'*

jasō 'you have come to'

Skjaervo 2006 shows *jasō* as the injunctive 2p sg. form of the stem verb *gam-* which he says means "to go, come". In Avestan, the 2p sg. pronoun 'you/thou' is part of the verb form. Now you may object: How can the same word mean both 'to go' and its (near) opposite 'come'. Well we see something similar in Hindi, where *jaō* means 'go!' (imperative); and *ā jaō* means 'come', but not as an imperative ⁓ more as 'come away', or 'please do come' ⁓ the imperative 'come!' being *aō*).

Our translators disagree somewhat on how they think this verb should be translated in this context.
Insler 1975 "thou hast come to"

Humbach 1991 "thou reachest"
Humbach/Faiss 2010 "you reach"
Taraporewala 1951 "Follow"
Moulton 1912 "shalt thou go".
Moulton follows the translation of Bartholomae (in English) almost verbatim.
In this context, I take *jasō* to mean 'you have come to'.

ašəm   'truth'
ašəm   is nom./acc. sg. of the ntr. noun stem *aša-* (Skjaervo 2006). In this context, it is the direct object of the verb *jasō*, and therefore acc. sg.

frāx šnənē   'for instruction'
Geldner shows *frāx šnənē* supported by many mss.   Translators disagree on both the grammar and meaning of this word.
Skjaervo 2006   shows *frāx šnənē* as loc. sg. ('in/at/on/under___') of the (conjectured) ntr. noun stem *frāx šnəna-* which he says means 'foreknowledge'.   He also shows the stem *frāx šnin-*   but does not give its meaning or show any grammatical value of this (conjectured) stem in any Gatha verse.
Humbach 1991 translates   *frāx šnənē* as "with foresight" (an instr. sg. translation) but he agrees that it is loc. sg. He does not comment on how he arrived at the meaning. He translates the phrase *ašəm jasō frāx šnənē* as "With foresight thou reachest truth".
Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate the word as loc. but with a different meaning "in prudence" without commenting on how they arrived at this meaning, or why Humbach had changed his mind. They translate the phrase *ašəm jasō frāx šnənē* as "in prudence you reach truth".

With respect, I I have seen no basis for these guesses as to the meaning of *ašəm jasō frāx šnənē* (line a.) and I do not find them persuasive. In the Gathas there is ample evidence that Zarathushtra believes that he (and we) can arrive at the truth by searching for it. There is no evidence that he (or we) can do so either with 'foresight', or with 'prudence'.

Insler 1975 translates *frāx šnənē* as loc. sg. "in discernment" commenting that *frāx šnənē* is in effect a scribal error for **frāx šnanē*   the loc. of a (conjectured) stem *frāx šnāna-* 'discernment' citing a Vedic cognate.
He thinks the error was influenced by *frāx šnənəm* in Y43.14 and *frāx šnənā* in Y29.11.

A couple of verses later, (in Y43.14) he translates *frāx šnənəm* as an adj. "proper" ("...(grant) to me Thy proper [*frāx šnənəm*] support...").

In Y29.11, he translates *frāx šnənā* as "fit" ("...acknowledge those fit [*frāx šnənā*] for the great task..."). He comments (under Y29.11), that he takes *frāx šnənā* (supported by mss. J2, Mf1 and others), as "acc. pl. of a stem *frāx šnan-* (later *frāx šnin-*) whose meaning 'discerning' has developed the sense 'fit, proper' (through one's discernmant)."[24]

In our verse Y43.12 he translates the phrase *ašəm jasō frāx šnənē* "thou hast come to the truth in thy discernment...".

With respect, I find Insler's translation of this phrase troublesome (quite apart from his opinions on the linguistics which differs from the opinions of other linguists in any event, and which I cannot address without a better knowledge of ancient Indo-European cognates). There seems to be general agreement that in the phrase *ašəm jasō frāx šnənē* we have a statement which (according to Zarathushtra) Wisdom said to him. But if this statement (by Wisdom) says that Zarathushtra has come to the truth in his discernment, it is contrary to ideas that he repeatedly expresses in the

Gathas, ~ that a fundament of Wisdom's teaching is the on-going search for truth ~ a search which Zarathushtra makes clear is on-going for himself as well,

"...as long as I shall be able and be strong, so long shall I look in quest of truth.
Truth, shall I see thee, as I continue to acquire both good thinking and the way to the Lord?..." Y28.4 - 5, Insler 1975.

"... These things indeed and others I wish to know, Wise One." Y44.3, Insler 1975.

"... Someone like Thee, Wise One, should declare to me, his friend, ... how friendly associations with truth are to be established by us, in order that it shall come to us together with good thinking." Y44.1, Insler 1975.

"... instruct through good thinking (the course) of my direction,..." Y50.6, Insler 1975.

No place in the Gathas have I found an assertion (or even a suggestion) by Zarathushtra that he has all the answers regarding the nature of truth in all its complexity ~ that he, Zarathushtra, has already 'come to the truth in his discernment' Insler 1975.   And there is much evidence to the contrary.[25]

Taraporewala 1951 translatates *frāx šnənē* as "for-(acquiring)-Wisdom", commenting that the word derives from *x šnā-* with *frā* ~ without giving his view of their meanings, but giving a Skt. cognate. He demonstrates that there are translation differences amongst the older generation of scholars, but what I find most interesting are his comments on the opinions of Bartholomae and Andreas. Bartholomae (Tarap. says) takes *frāx šnənē* as a "dat. infinitive ... 'to be instructed'...",[26] and Andreas (Tarap. says) translates the phrase "come in order to learn about *aša-*".

I find these two opinions illuminating, consistent with the macro context of the Gathas, and entirely persuasive.
I translate *ašəm jasō frāx šnənē*,
literally as, "you have come to [*jasō*] truth [*ašəm*] to be instructed [*frāx šnənē*]",
or in more fluent English, "you have come to [*jasō*] truth [*ašəm*], for instruction [*frāx šnənē*]" in the sense that Zarathushtra wants truth to be his teacher ~ another way of expressing the on-going search for truth, and his repeated desire to comprehend it.   And this view of the word's meaning fits its other uses in Y29.11 and Y43.14.[27]
Thus,
Line a. *hyaţcā. mōi. mraoš.   ašəm. jasō. frāx šnənē.*
Line a. 'But then You said to me,   "*you have come to truth for instruction,*

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

(Wisdom still speaking).
Line b. *aţ tū mōi nōiţ   asruštā pairyaoγžā*
Line b. *you, moreover, to me, have not declared yourself to the contrary, through not listening (to truth).*

aţ   'moreover'
Skjaervo 2006 defines *aţ* as a particle which connects a statement with what precedes it (sometimes as a contrast), and suggests the following English equivalents 'then, so, thus, but'.   A particle is indeclinable (it is not inflected for case/number/gender). Beekes 1988 shows the ancestral form *āt* 'then, but, and' also as an indeclinable (p. 145). Insler 1975 in this verse (Y43.12) translates *aţ* as "moreover" which in this context is a good contextual fit.

tū   'you (sg.)'

mōi   'to me'
Insler 1975, Humbach 1991, Humbach/Faiss 2010 and Taraporewala 1951 all show *tū mōi* as two separate words. Geldner shows *tū.mōi*   as a compound. No mss. (in Geldner) shows *tū.mōi* as either a compound or as two separate words ~ all mss. showing (with variations) one word.[28] That these are scribal errors can hardly be doubted based on the meanings of these two words (about which there is no dispute). I agree with our group of linguists that these are two separate words.

tū 'you' is a 2p personal pronoun, and one of the forms (enclitic) for nom. sg., as such it has to be the subject of the verb *pairyaoγžā* in line b. Normally, the form of the verb indicates the person and number (1p, 2p, 3p, sg. or pl.), so the pronoun is not separately stated in GAv. But sometimes, when the speaker wishes to emphasize the pronoun, it is separately stated (in addition to the form of the verb), and that, I think, is the situation here ~ *tū … pairyaoγžā*

mōi 'to me' is a 1p. personal pronoun, and in GAv. it is one of the forms (enclitic) for gen. sg. ('my') and also dat. sg. ('to/for me'), (Skjaervo 2006 under *azә̄m*, M&dV 2001 p. 69). In this context I take it as dat. sg. 'to me'.
In our group, some of the translations of line b. do not give *mōi* its exact grammatical value (neither gen. sg. or dat. sg.) ~ such translations would not work if they did.   It is true that sometimes, it is not possible (consistent with fluent English) to give a GAv. word its exact grammatical value in English. However, I think GAv. words should be given their exact value if it is possible to do so (as it is here). In that way, we have a better chance of arriving at Zarathushtra's thought, rather than seeing the interpretation of the translator.

nōiţ   'not'
Skjaervo 2006 shows *nōiţ* as 'not'. It is a word of negation, a negative particle, and as such is indeclinable (Beekes 1988). It can have other meanings of negation ~ 'nor', 'neither',[29] but in this context 'not' fits well.

asruštā   'through not listening'
Skjaervo 2006 shows the fem. noun stem *asrušti-* and he shows *asruštā* in this verse (Y43.12) as the only instance of its use, stating that it is loc. sg. (in/on/at/under/ ___). And indeed, many translators take *asruštā* as loc. sg.
However, Jackson 1892 §§ 257 ~ 259, shows that in GAv. the *-ā* inflection (as in *asrušt-ā*) is also instr. sg. for *-i-* stem fem. nouns (*asrušti-* is an *-i-* stem fem. noun, although not one of Jackson's examples). So it would be linguistically defensible to take *asruštā* here as instr. sg. Skjaervo 2006 shows no instr. sg. form *asruštā* (for the stem *asrušti-*) because he thinks *asruštā* is loc. sg. in this verse Y43.12, which is the only verse in which *asruštā* appears. In the context of line b., I take *asruštā* as instr. sg.

As for its meaning, translators generally translate *sәraoša-* as 'obedience' and its opposite *asrušti-* as 'disobedience'. I have detailed in another chapter (with evidence) why I think this is an interpretive translation informed by the mind~set of other religious paradigms, and is not consistent with Zarathushtra's thought which *requires* the freedom to choose as part of his paradigm for the perfecting of existence.[30]
Skjaervo 2006 translates *sәraoša-* as 'readiness to listen' and its opposite   *asrušti-* as 'lack of readiness to listen'.
Insler 1975 translates *asruštā* as 'in disobedience' (loc. sg.).

Humbach 1991 as '(be) disobeyed'; commenting that *asruštā* is either nom. acc. pl. of *asrušta-* 'disobeyed'; or the loc. sg. of *asrušti-* 'disobedience', used adverbially in the sense of 'being disobeyed', citing Vedic examples of such adverbial use with other nouns (not cognates of *asrušti-*). Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *asruštā* as 'not without being obeyed'.
Taraporewala 1951 as "what-might-be-unheeded".
Moulton 1912 as "what I did not obey" (so also Bartholomae).

I take *səraoša-* to mean 'listening' used in the two-fold sense of 'hearing, and implementing what is heard' (as it is in English), in which event its opposite *asrušti-* would mean 'not-listening'.[31] And in line b., I translate *asruštā* as instr. sg. 'through not listening'.

pairyaoγžā '(you) have [not *nōiţ*] declared yourself to the contrary
pairyaoγžā is another word in this verse which has puzzled linguists, and they have come to different conclusions -- demonstrating once again that many puzzles still remain in de-coding this ancient language.

Humbach 1991 translates *pairyaoγžā* as 'Thou givest orders' from the root *aoj/aog* 'to speak', with the prefix *pairī* which he does not explain.
Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *pairyaoγžā* as 'you speak' without comment.
Taraporewala 1951 emends *pairyaoγžā* to **pairī-*aoγžā*,[32] translating the word as "Thou didst ... command", commenting that he follows Bartholomae who sees the verb *ug(h)-, aog-*, as meaning 'to command, to order' (citing the Skt. *ūh-*).

Insler 1975 commenting under a different verse,[33] gives a detailed and meticulous explanation, with Vedic and Gathic examples, which lead him to conclude that with certain words, *pairī* turns the meaning of the word to its opposite; giving the following examples in support of his conclusion.
1. He says that the root *man* frequently has the sense 'respect' in the Gathas, and *pairi man* (Ved. *pári man*) 'disrespect' in GAv. and in Ved.
2. He says that *aog* means 'assert' and *pairi aog* means 'contradict' (citing our verse, Y43.12), commenting that it is used in the sense of Ved. *pári vad* 'revile, contradict';
3. He infers that *pairi vrz* means 'to counteract';
4. And comments that this special use of *pairi* to indicate an opposite, helps to explain *pairi dā* as 'to exclude' in Y46.1b. (the middle voice of *dā* being 'to accept, receive').
He therefore translates *nōiţ pairyaoγžā* in our verse (Y43.12) as "thou hast never [*nōiţ*] contradicted".

To avoid confusion, it should be noted that (like so many words in Av.) *pairī-* as the first part of another word can also give it a meaning other than its opposite (English also has such words!). Such instances do not apply in the context of this verse.[34] But in light of such differences, we begin to understand how complex the de-coding of GAv. can be.

Skjaervo 2006 shows a verb stem *aog-* which he says means 'to declare oneself'. But he is uncertain regarding what the addition of *pairī* does to the meaning of *aog-*, hazarding a guess "to go about declaring(?)" (the question mark is his). However, he shows *pairyaoγžā* as Injunctive, 2p sg. (without any question mark).

Skjaervo's meaning for *aog-* 'to declare oneself' fits well the verses in which this verb stem appears in its various conjugations.[35]

In our verse Y43.12, for *aog-* I follow Skjaervo 2006, except that I am persuaded by Insler's insightful reasoning and evidence that the addition of *pairi* in this instance changes the meaning of *aog-* to its opposite. So, if *aog-* means 'to declare oneself', its opposite *pairi aog* might normally mean 'to

not declare oneself'. But in line b. we already have a 'not' (*nōiṯ*). I therefore translate *pairi aog* as 'to declare oneself to the contrary'.

Thus *tū … nōiṯ asruštā pairyaoγžā* (Injunctive, 2p sg.) would be literally 'you [*tū*] … have not [*nōiṯ*] through non-listening [*asruštā*] (to truth) declared yourself to the contrary' (supplementing the previous statement 'you have come to the truth for instruction' (line a.).

Which gives us,
Line a. *hyaṯcā mōi mraoš   ašəm jasō frāx šnənē*
Line b. *aṯ tū mōi nōiṯ   asruštā pairyaoγžā*

Line a. 'But then You said to me,   "*you have come to truth for instruction,*
Line b. *you moreover, to me, have not declared yourself to the contrary, through not listening' (to truth).*'

* * * * *

Line c. *uzirəidyāi   parā hyaṯ mōi ā.jimaṯ*
Line d. *səraošō ašī   mązā.rayā hacimnō*
Literally
c. (So it is) for me to arise, before may come
d. listening (to truth) with (the) light giving reward (of truth) following.
In more fluent English
c.d. (So it is) for me to arise, before listening (to truth) may come followed by the light-giving reward (of truth),

mōi is a 1p. personal pronoun, and in GAv. it is one of the forms (enclitic) for gen. sg. ('my') and also dat. sg. ('to/for me'), (discussed above).   In this context I take it as dat. sg. 'for me', belonging with dat. infinitive *uzirəidyāi*.

uzirəidyāi   'to arise'
Geldner's version of this word *uzərədyāi* is supported by ms. K5.

Insler 1975, and Humbach/Faiss 2010, prefer *uzirəidyāi* which is supported by mss. J3, 6; Mf2; Jp1; K4; H1; B2, L1, 3; and other mss. spell this word in other ways as well.[36] Taraporewala 1951 citing Bartholomae takes the word as a compound *uz-irəidyāi*. Based on the discussion below, I take it as shown in most mss. in accord with Insler and Humbach/Faiss ~ *uzirəidyāi*.

Skjaervo 2006 shows *uzirəidyāi* deriving from the verb *ar-*, but does not show the stem, grammatical value or meaning of *uzirəidyāi*. He shows that the verb stem *ar-* means 'to set in motion', and its middle voice means 'to move'.

Taraporewala 1951 comments that Bartholomae takes the word to be "the dat. inf[initive] from the pres[ent] redup[licated] (3rd class) base of *ar-* which he says is Avestan *īr*," giving Skt. equivalents.
And Taraporewala says that the root *uz-irəi* means 'to rise up, to advance'.
He interprets *uz-irəidyāi* here to mean "that-I-bestir-myself".
Although Tarap. says that Bartholomae takes *uzirəidyāi* as a dat. infinitive, Barth. himself translates the word (perhaps interpretively) as a 2p imperative "Speed thee" as does Moulton 1912, in the sense of 'get going'.
Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *uzirəidyāi* as 'let me arise', without comment.
Insler 1975 translates the phrase *uzirəidyāi … mōi* as "it was for me [*mōi*] to arise".

I follow Bartholomae's perception of *uzirəidyāi* as dat. infinitive 'to arise' (which is also Insler's choice).

In this context I translate *uzirəidyāi...   mōi* as '(So it is) for me to arise'.

parā hyaţ   'before'

parā is an indeclinable which can be used in more than one way, but when used with *hyaţ*, Skjaervo 2006 takes *parā hyaţ* as "before".

Insler 1975 translates *parā hyaţ* as "before";

ā.jimaţ   'may come'

Skjaervo 2006 shows *jimaţ* as 3p sg. AorSubj.[37] of the verb stem *gam-* 'to go, come', and he shows *ā ... jimaţ* as 'to come'.

Jackson 1892 shows "GAv. *jimaţ*" as an example of aorist subjunctive 3p and translates it "he may come" (§ 642, p. 180).   Both 'he' and 'it' are 3p sg., and in the context of this verse (Y43.12), the 3p is not a person, but is generally agreed to be an activity *səraošō* (which I translate as 'listening') in the next line, that 'may come'.

Insler 1975 translates *ā.jimaţ* in this verse as "was to come"; (in Y44.1 he translates *ā ... jimaţ* as "it shall come");

Humbach 1991 in this verse as "will have come";

Humbach/Faiss 2010 as "has reached";

Taraporewala 1951 as "shall arise";

Moulton 1912 as "come", following Bartholomae.

There does not seem to be an exact English equivalent (that can be used consistently) for an aorist subjunctive 3p sg., and all the foregoing express the general idea in different English words. I follow Jackson, translating *ā.jimaţ* in this verse, as "may come".

səraošō   'listening'

There is no dispute that *səraošō* is nom. sg. of the masc. stem noun *səraoša-*. And although it is in line d., *səraošō* is the subject of the verb *ā.jimaţ* in line c.   In Avestan syntax, the subject of a verb can be placed after the verb). In English syntax, however, the subject of a verb can only be placed before the verb. So in an English translation, *səraošō* in line d. would have to be placed before the verb *ā.jimaţ*.   The 'listening' here is listening to 'truth' (implied from in line a.).

Here, differences in translation lie in the meaning given to *səraoša-* ~ mentioned above (under *asruštā*), and explored in another chapter.[38]   Here I will simply say that there is no dispute that *səraoša-* 'listening' derives from the verb *srao-* 'to listen', which in the Gathas (as in English) is used in a two-fold way, in the sense of 'to hear and implement what is heard'. But our translators generally translate *səraoša-* as 'obedience', which reflects the mind~set of other religious paradigms and is contrary to Zarathushtra's thought, in which the freedom to choose is necessary for the perfecting process.[39]

Insler 1975 translates *səraošō* as "obedience";

Humbach 1991 as "Obedience";

Humbach/Faiss 2010 as "hearing/obedience";

Taraporewala 1951 leaves the word untranslated "Sraosha;"

Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae as "Obedience".

So this gives us,

c. *uzərədyāi   parā hyaṯ mōi ā.jimaṯ*
d. *səraošō ...*

In literal translation,
c. (So it is) for me to arise, before may come
d. listening (to truth) ...
In fluent English   c.d. '(So it is) for me to arise, before listening (to truth) may come...

aṣ̌ī   'by reward'

Skjaervo 2006 translates the fem. noun stem *aṣ̌i-* as "obtainment > reward, Reward" and shows *aṣ̌ī* is its instr. sg. declension ('with/by/through___'). He states that *aṣ̌i-* derives from *ar-* "obtain". (In Av. as in English the same word may have two or more completely different meanings, and *ar-* is one such word).

Insler 1975, Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010 agree that *aṣ̌i-* means 'reward', and they translate *aṣ̌ī* as instr. sg. But Humbach/Faiss 2010 show the word as 'Reward', the capital 'R' (presumably) indicating their notion that Reward here is the YAv. divine entity,[40] celebrated in the Ashi Yasht.

Taraporewala 1951 translates *aṣ̌ī* in this line as instr. sg. "by the blessing", based on his understanding of its use in YAv. texts. In the YAv. *Ashi Yasht*, Darmesteter leaves the word untranslated, but comments that Ashi (*aṣ̌i-*) is the source of all the good and riches that are connected with piety ~ which is the notion of 'obtainment' or 'reward' stated from another perspective.   Later in this verse, in line e., Taraporewala translates *aṣ̌īš* as "what-is-due".

Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae translate *aṣ̌ī* in line d. as "by ... Destiny".

I translate it as a noun that is a concept, instr. sg. 'by reward'.

mązā.rayā   'by light-giving'

Skjaervo 2006 shows *mązā.rayā* as an adj., instr. sg. fem., and here there is no dispute that it describes the instr. sg. fem. noun *aṣ̌ī*, 'reward'.   (In English translation, the instr. sg. 'with/by/through' would be stated only once, before the two words, whereas in Av. both words have the instr. sg. inflection).   The conjectured stem for *rayā* is *raē* (or *rayah-*, or *rayi-*).   Our linguists generally agree that *mązā.rayā* is an instr. sg. adj. which belongs with instr. sg. *aṣ̌ī*, 'with/by/through reward'.   And all but Taraporewala translate *mązā.rayā* as 'wealth~granting' (or 'treasure~laden'). But linguists also acknowledge a range of meanings for *raē-* words which include not only 'wealth, riches' but also various 'light' words ~ 'resplendent, radiant, brilliant, bright' etc.   The meaning of *mązā.rayā* in this verse has been explored in another chapter in which I show:

(1) That material 'wealth, riches' are not relevant to Zarathushtra's notion of the end 'reward' (which is truth itself);

(2) That throughout the Gathas and later texts, 'light' words are used for 'truth;

(3) That in our verse the *mązā.rayā* reward (in line d.) is equated with salvation (in line e.); and in other parts of the Gathas, salvation is the attainment of the true (correct) order of existence (*aṣ̌a-*) and its component parts;[41]

(4) That *mązā.rayā* is used in 2 almost identical YAv. phrases, (in a YAv. Yasna, and in the *Visperad*) in which 'reward' is implied, and 'of truth' is expressed ('...the *mązā.raya* (reward) of truth...'), whereas in our verse (Y43.12) 'reward' is expressed and 'of truth' is implied '... the *mązā.rayā* reward

(of truth), indicating that those who composed those 2 YAv. passages understood that the 'reward' that is *mązā.raya* is the reward of truth; and

(5) That in other YAv. texts, translating *raē-* words as 'light' words is paralleled not only in Pahlavi texts, but also in the writings of Greek historians.

I therefore translate *ašī   mązā.rayā* as 'the light giving reward (of truth)', because of the well established use of 'light' (in its various forms) with and for truth and the foregoing evidence and throughout Avestan texts.

But even in English 'wealth, riches, treasure' are not always used in a material sense. We speak of '*a wealth of ideas*, '*a richness of color*'. And we know that in the Gathas, Zarathushtra often engages in double entendre. So if, during GAv. times *raē-* words had both meanings 'wealth' and 'light', then Zarathushtra could have intended both the 'light' and the spiritual 'wealth' of truth.

hacimnō   (literally) 'following';   (but in fluent English) 'followed',
Insler 1975 translates *hacimnō* as "accompanied";
Humbach 1991 as "followed";
Humbach/Faiss 2010 as "in company";
Taraporewala 1951 as "accompanied";
Moulton 1912 (following Bartholomae) as "followed".

Skjaervo 2006 shows a verb stem *hak-* which he says in active voice means "to pursue, devote oneself to (?)" (the question mark is his); and in middle voice means "to follow, be in the company of, be with". And he sees *hacimnō* as the present participle middle voice, of the stem *hak-*. This would require 'following' for *hacimnō* (or at least make it linguistically defensible). But to make the English translation fluent in this context, we would say followed'.   Skjaervo 2006 is of the opinion that in our verse (Y43.12) this word is used as a nom. sg. noun.   But (with respect), I do not see it that way. I think that the present participle (*hacimnō* 'following') is used here as a verb (not a noun). It is connected with the instr. sg. 'with light giving reward' (of truth) that follows 'listening' (hearing and implementing truth ~ the path of truth).

To summarize, looking at lines c. and d. in their entirety,
c.   *uzərədyāi.   parā. hyaṯ. mōi. ā.jimaṯ.*
d.   *səraošō. ašī.   mązā.rayā. hacimnō.*
Literally (which I rather like)
c. (So it is) for me to arise, before may come
d. listening (to truth) with (the) light giving reward (of truth) following.
But in more fluent English
cd. (So it is) for me to arise, before listening (to truth) may come, followed by the light giving reward (of truth).
<center>* * *</center>

e. *yā vī ašīš   rānōibyō savōi   vīdāyāṯ*
e. (For it is truth) through which He will distribute, in salvation, the rewards (of truth), for (all) types (of conduct).

Let us start with the verb

vī   …   vīdāyāṯ   'He will distribute'

Skjaervo 2006 shows *dāyāt̰* as subjunctive 3p sg. of the stem verb *dā-*, one of the meanings of which (in active voice) is 'to give'; and he says that the addition of *vī* (showing *vī ... vīdāyāt̰*) changes the meaning to 'to distribute'.

The subjunctive 3p sg. would give us 'he/she/it will distribute' or 'one will distribute' ~ in Av. the 3p pronoun being implicit in the 3p verb form. In English translation, the identity of the 3p pronoun ('he/she/it') would depend on the context which would indicate who/what is doing the distributing. Therefore, (because of ambiguities in this verse), the choice of the pronoun here is necessarily interpretive.

I think the 3p here in line e. refers to Wisdom, referred to in line a. (but there in the 2p 'You'). I therefore translate the verb as 'He will distribute'.

In our verse Y43.12, it is readily apparent that there are two *vī* ~ the verb appearing as *vī ... vīdāyāt̰*. In another verse, Y34.12b., the verb appears as *vīdāyāt̰* without an additional *vī* before it.

Insler 1975, Humbach 1991, Taraporewala 1951 (and others) think that the 2d *vī* (attached to *dāyāt̰*) is redundant, and indicate their opinion by enclosing the 2d *vī* in parentheses (*vī ... (vī)dāyāt̰*). Taraporewala mentions Mills' opinion that the 2d *vī* (attached to *dāyāt̰*) spoils the meter.

Geldner shows *vī ... vīdāyāt̰* with no mss. differences for *vīdāyāt̰*. Skjaervo 2006 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 do not enclose the 2d *vī* (attached to *dāyāt̰*) in parentheses.

I have not sufficiently mastered the nuances of the repeated *vī* to usefully comment on these differences. But as a practical matter, there is no difference in the translation of Humbach 1991 (who shows *(vī)dāyāt̰*) and Humbach/Faiss 2010 who have *vīdāyāt̰*. So perhaps we might be forgiven for ignoring this difference of opinions (I mention it only in the interests of completeness).

Parenthetically, I speculate that the two *vī* may have been a stylistic or idiomatic way of indicating repeated or continuous action (thus 'He will continue to distribute'),[42] This speculation would fit Zarathushtra's thought in that under the law of consequences, attaining the true order of existence is a process that is incremental, continuous, on-going. But I have no evidence on which to base this speculation so I do not adopt such a translation of *vī ... vīdāyāt̰*.

aṣ̌īš   'rewards'
Skjaervo 2006 shows *aṣ̌īš* as acc. pl. of the fem. stem *aši-* (discussed above under line d.) It therefore means 'rewards'. And our group of translators generally give *aṣ̌īš* an acc. value, as the direct object of the 3p verb *vī ... vīdāyāt̰* 'will distribute'.
Insler 1975 translates the phrase *vī aṣ̌īš ... vīdāyāt̰* as "one should distribute the rewards...";
Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate the phrase as "who ... will distribute the rewards..." (the "who" presumably refers to their opinion that Reward is an entity in the preceding line d. who distributes the 'rewards' in line e.).
Taraporewala 1951 (probably referring to "Sraosha") translates it as "he apportions what is due...";
Moulton 1912 (probably referring to "Obedience") translates it as "who shall render ... the destinies...", and Bartholomae as "destiny" (sg.).

I take *vī aṣ̌īš ... vīdāyāt̰* as literally as possible, 'He will distribute the rewards' (referring to Wisdom).

It is worth noting that Skjaervo 2006 does not show *aṣ̌īš* as the form for acc. *dual* fem. ~ such as would support an interpretation that these rewards are a good reward (heaven) and a bad reward (damnation, and punishment in 'hell'). Nor does Jackson 1892 show an *-īš* inflection (such as *aṣ̌īš*) for acc. *dual* fem. (or indeed in any gender) for *-i-* stem words (§§ 251 - 260, pp. 74 - 77).

Which brings us to the puzzling *yā* ~ the first word in line e.

yā   'through which' (instr. sg. ntr.)
There is no dispute that the stem *ya-* is a relative pronoun, and therefore can refer to a person, place, or thing ~ 'who, which, that' etc. ~ depending on the noun to which it relates and the phrase in which it appears.
And Jackson 1892 (§§ 399, 400, pp. 113 - 115) shows that *yā* is the form for the following declensions,
1: instr. sg., masc./ntr., ('through/by/with ___')
2: nom. du. masc./ntr.,
3: nom./acc./voc./ pl., ntr. and
4: nom. sg. fem.

A lot of options!   To decide which of these declensions fits the use of *yā* in line e., we first have to decide: To what noun does it refer? Here are lines d. and e. for convenient reference,

d. *sᵊraošō aṣ̌ī   mązā.rayā hacimnō*
e. *yā vī aṣ̌īš   rānōibyō savōi vīdāyāṯ*

At first thought one might conclude that (option 4) nom. sg. fem. *yā* in line e., refers to the preceding fem. *aṣ̌ī*, the 'light-giving reward' in line d.   But that would not work in this context as you can see,   because it would give us

d. '... followed by the light giving reward [*aṣ̌ī mązā.rayā*]
e. which [*yā* referring to the preceding 'reward'] He will distribute the rewards [*aṣ̌iš*]...'.   Not a viable option.

Nor can *yā* describe the following *aṣ̌īš* 'rewards', because *aṣ̌īš* is pl. fem. and the only fem. declension for *yā* is sg., so sg. fem. *yā* cannot stand for pl. fem. *aṣ̌īš*).

Nor in the context of line e., could any available declension of *yā* stand for *rānōibyō* (or *rānōibyā*) or *savōi* in line e., without adding a lot of implied words that are not in the GAv. text.

So (as often happens in the poetic syntax of the Gathas), in the absence of any other alternative, we have to imply a previously expressed noun, to which the relative pronoun *yā* was intended to refer.

The nouns in the preceding lines (a. through d.) are truth, listening, and non-listening.   I think the implied noun which makes this line (and the verse as a whole) most consistent with the framework of Zarathushtra's thought, is the ntr. noun 'truth' expressed in line a., and implied in lines d., and e., thus taking *yā* in line e. as instr. sg. ntr., giving us:
'(For it is truth nom. sg. ntr.) through-which [*yā* instr. sg. ntr.].

In the context of the entire verse, this solution is also consistent with a poetic technique of Zarathushtra, in which he starts and ends a verse (and sometimes a chapter) with the same concept or idea (here 'truth').   But specific to lines d. and e., this would giving us,

d.   ' ... followed by the light giving reward (of truth),
e. (For it is truth) through which [*yā*] He will distribute, in salvation, (the) rewards (of truth) ...'

A somewhat parallel thought is expressed in Y46.17 in which Wisdom's judgment (as in His 'discernment') is made through truth, Insler 1975 "... the glories of Him who offers solicitude (to us), the Wise Lord who, together with His clever advisor, truth, has judged [*vīcinaoṯ* 'has discerned']⁴³ the just [*dāϑᵊm*] and the unjust [*adāϑᵊmcā*]." Y46.17.   The words *dāϑᵊm* / *adāϑᵊmcā* are adjectives (Skjaervo 2006), which in Av. can also be used for a person or concept that has the

qualities of the adjective. Insler 1975 translates these adjs. as persons. But with equal accuracy they could be translated as concepts. Thus, '...The Lord Wisdom who with (His) clever advisor truth has discerned [*vīcinaoţ*] (what is) just and (what is) unjust.' Y46.17 my translation. Parenthetically, even in the Insler 1975 translation, did you notice the attitude of the Lord Wisdom, who makes these judgments, or discernments?   It is one who "offers solicitude" ~ not damnation and punishment.

rānōibyō   'for (all) types (of conduct)'
rānōibyō is another word in this verse which has not yet been decoded. Our linguists disagree regarding its meaning (and even its intended number ~ pl. or du.), and all translations are simply guesses. Pure speculation (though well-intentioned).

Based on its inflected forms, its stem is (conjectured to be) *rāna-*.   But although its derivation (in meaning) may still be shrouded in the mists of antiquity, *rāna-* words have been used in 4 other Gatha verses, and I think we can arrive at a reasonably good understanding of its intended meaning based on the contexts in which it is used. And here, I will give you more detail than I did in the summary under the *Discussion* section above (so please forgive any repetition).

Skjaervo 2006 believes that *rānōibyō* is dat. pl. of the masc. or ntr. noun stem *rāna-* (an -*a*- stem noun), which he says means "thigh, leg". With respect, I do not see how thighs or legs in the plural (or in the du.) could fit the context of line e.   But (as in English), we often find GAv. words that have two completely different meanings,[44] (although Skjaervo does not show any other meanings for *rāna-*).

Humbach/Faiss 2010 comment that *rāna-* appears in the Gathas in the following possible declensions in the following verses (reflecting Geldner's choices from the mss.),
The form *rānōibyō* (appearing in our verse Y43.12) is the form for dat. pl. and abl. pl.,
The form *rānōibyā* (appearing in Y31.3, Y47.6, Y51.9) is instr./dat./abl. du.
The *rąnayå* (appearing in Y31.19) is gen. du.[45]
These conclusions are corroborated in Jackson 1892 who shows the same inflections for *a*- stem words as Humbach/Faiss 2010 have detailed for *rāna-* (above) although Jackson's main example is not *rāna-*.[46]

So according to Geldner's choices (from the mss. available to him) of the 5 Gatha verses in which *rāna-* appears, its declension is dual in 4, and plural in 1 (our verse Y43.12).

Taraporewala 1951 however, points out that 8 mss.[47] show the word our verse (in Y43.12) in du. form (*rānōibyā* instead of *rānōibyō*), a declension which he prefers.   He thinks the word means 'faction' or 'party'. In Y43.12 he construes his preferred *rānōibyā* as dat. du. "to-the-two-parties".

Humbach/Faiss 2010 have a comment on *rāna-*.[48] They offer no cognates or etymology for *rāna-*, expressing the opinion that "no acceptable solution of the actual meaning of the word in the Gathic context could be offered before Humbach 1991" who surmised that the original meaning 'legs' probably evolved in usage to "the two legs of the scales of the balance."   They note that in other Gatha verses the word is in du. form, (thus two legs), whereas in Y43.12 (our verse), the word is in pl. form, which (they say) "draws attention to the possible distributive use of the dual ('arbitrary number of pairs of scales/balances')."[49]   They think *rānōibyō* is dat. or abl. pl. but nevertheless translate *rānōibyō* (in our verse Y43.12) as "with the balance" (a translation which is neither dat. pl., nor abl. pl., but instr. sg.), interpreting the meaning in light of the Pahlavi glosses "...'it makes manifest the saved/redeemed and the condemned/damned' ..." (quoted more fully and referenced above). A conclusion which they think "is certainly right.". On what basis, they do not say.

However, Humbach/Faiss 2010 also express the view that the opinions of Gatha translators who translate *rāna-* as 'the two religious parties (fighting against each other)' can hardly be correct even though the view derived "from PhlT. *pahikār-dārān* 'fighters' (Phl. *pahikār* 'struggle/battle/dispute')," because (they contend) "*rāna-* in all its occurrences stands in an auspicious context."[50]   However, (with respect), if in the Gathas, *rāna-* always occurs in an auspicious context, I fail to see how this "auspicious context" would support either the translation 'balance', or the opinions of the Pahlavi translator(s) and commentator(s) that *rānōibyō* stands for the reward of salvation (which is indeed auspicious) and the punishment of damnation (which certainly is not).

Insler 1975 in his GAv. text has chosen dat. pl. *rānōibyō* in this verse (Y43.12), but translates the word as "to both factions" ~ giving it a dat. du. value (Skjaervo and Humbach take *rānōibyō* as pl. and Jackson 1892 does not show the *-byō* inflection as dat. du. for *a-* stem words).
Insler translates lines c.d. and e. as follows,
c.d. it was for me to arise before obedience was to come to me accompanied by a wealth-granting reward,
e. (for it is obedience) according to which one should distribute the rewards to both factions [*rānōibyō*] at the time of (our) salvation [*savōi*]." Y43.12, Insler 1975.

His footnoted interpretation that line e. means that means the final judgment will bring salvation to the truthful and damnation to the deceitful is not supported by either the words of line e. or the micro context of the verse itself, as already discussed in the *Discussion* section above (so I won't repeat it here).

In short (!?) , in attempting to arrive at a meaning for *rāna-* in the Gathas (and *rānōibyō* or *rānōibya* in our verse Y43.12), it is clear that even the most eminent linguists have not yet discovered a cognate in any other ancient Indo-European language, nor a contextual use in YAv. texts, which establishes a parallel (or even close) meaning for GAv. *rāna-* in the context of the 5 Gatha verses in which it appears.

With respect, I am not persuaded that 'thigh(s)', or 'leg(s)', or 'balance(s), comes even close to fitting the micro contexts of all five verses in which *rāna-* words appear, or the macro context of Zarathushtra's thought. Nor am I persuaded that the choice of Taraporewala 1951 ('parties') and Insler 1975, ('factions') is the meaning, (for the reasons set forth in the *Discussion* section above.

In light of this disagreement among linguists, can we make a reasonable attempt at finding a meaning for *rāna-* words?   I think we can. I think that the context in which *rāna-* words are used, inform their meaning. And to that end, I offer the following line of reasoning.

In the Gathas, the 'enemy' to be overcome is not an opposing tribe, or family, or clan. The enemy is what is false, wrong ~ the ideas and conduct that are in opposition to the true (correct, good) order of existence ~ Zarathushtra's objective being to "deliver deceit into the hands of truth" (Y30.8, Y44.14, Insler 1975). We even see traces of this idea (that the 'enemy' is what is not in accord with truth) in later texts.[51]

I therefore think that *rāna-* means 'type'; when du. 'two types'; and when pl. 'many or all types'. And depending on the context of the verse in which the word is used, it could mean two or more 'types' of conduct, or two 'types' of choices. In our verse Y43.12 the dat. du. 'for two types (of conduct)' fits well, in that the verse speaks of listening (to truth) and non-listening ~ both being types of conduct ~ justifying the dat. dual *rānōibyā* (in 8 mss.). However, the dat. plural *rānōibyō* 'for (all) types (of conduct)' (in even more mss.), also fits in that both listening and not listening generate multiple types of conduct (pl.) which generate the 'rewards' in line e.

And this understanding of *rāna-* as 'type' fits well the 4 other instances of its use in the Gathas, which are all dual (thus 'two types'), as the footnoted discussion showing each such verse demonstrates.[52]   And this understanding also fits Zarathushtra's use of adjectives to describe two opposing concepts ~ '(what is) untruthful' and '(what is) truthful' ~ rather than two factions of people ~ '(those who are) deceitful', and '(those who are) truthful'.[53]

Insler's and Taraporewala's choices for *rāna-* are also (in a sense) 'type' ~ except that they see the word as 2 or more types of people (Insler 'factions'; Taraporewala 'parties') whereas I see it as two or more types of conduct or choices. There is nothing intrinsic in the word *rāna-* which requires 'people' instead of 'conduct' or 'choices'.

I therefore translate *rānōibyō* as dat. pl. 'for (all) types (of conduct)'.

savōi   'in salvation'
Skjaervo 2006 shows *savōi* as loc. sg. ('in/at/on/under___') of the ntr. stems *sava- / savah-* both of which he translates as "(vitalizing) strength", deriving from the verb *sao-*, *savaya-* which he translates "to revitalize" and from which we get the masc. noun *saošyant-* (which I presume he would translate as 'one who vitalizes').   I do not know how he arrived at this meaning (he cites the same Vedic cognate ~ *śávas* ~ for both stems).

Insler (1975) consistently translates the noun stem *sava-* as "salvation" in all the Gatha verses in which *sava-* words appear, but does not comment on its meaning.
Here in line e. he also takes *savōi* as loc. sg. "at the time of (our) salvation".
He translates the verb as "to save", and *saošyant-* as "savior".
But he sees *savah-* as a different stem with a different meaning, translating *savah-* as 'mighty', (commenting under Y43.3, p. 232).

Humbach 1991 translates *savōi* in line e. as loc. sg. "at the benefaction".   He translates *sava-* words in all the other Gatha verses in which they appear as 'benefit(s)'. He offers no comment on how he arrived at the meaning(s) 'benefit', 'benefaction'.

Humbach/Faiss (2010), have partly come around to Insler's way of thinking. They translate the verb as "to benefit/save", its related noun as "welfare/salvation", and *saošyant-* as "benefactor/savior". But here in line e. they translate *savōi* as loc. sg. with a different meaning "in the favorable (case)". They offer no comment on how they arrive at these various meanings or why in line e. their translation is different from the way they translate all other instances of *sava-* words in the Gathas.

Taraporewala 1951 following Bartholomae translates *savōi* as acc. du. ntr. "both-reward-and-punishment". He says that when the word is used in dual, it means (both) 'happiness and misery'. But he gives no evidence to support this conclusion. It is true that in Vedic, *one* word in dual form is sometimes used to denote a usual pair, or a pair of opposites,[54] and perhaps Taraporewala was influenced by this Vedic usage. But he cites no instance in any Avestan (or Vedic) texts of any dual word ~ let alone *sava- / savah-*~ being used in the meaning of both 'reward and punishment,' which is not at all surprising, because in the Gathas, various phrases for the 'good' reward and the 'bad' reward are not places of reward and punishment.[55] They are incremental states of being in this life, culminating in the eventual attainment of the true order of existence completely (*haurvatāt-*) by all the living, at which time the reason for mortality ceases and a state of non-deathness occurs (*amərətāt-*).[56]

The absence in Avestan texts of the dual paradigm of redemption/damnation, or reward/punishment, or heaven/hell in the afterlife, (such as we see in some Pahlavi/Pazand texts

and most dominant religions of today) has been detailed (with evidence) in other chapters.[57] Here I will simply say that this dual paradigm does not appear in any well known YAv. text (that was written in Av. times) ~ not in the *Yasnas*, not in the *Visperad*, not in the *Sirozahs* (1 and 2), not in the *Yashts*, not in the *Nyaishs*, not in the *Afringans*, not in the *Gahs*.

Shouldn't this tell us something?

We see the beginnings of the idea of adverse consequences in an afterlife ~ for disobeying the rules of the religious establishment ~ in the *Vendidad*, a text written in grammatically flawed YAv., (indicating that it was written after Avestan times, when the religious establishment was no longer fluent in the Avestan language),[58] but even in the *Vendidad*, no torture or punishment is mentioned ~ just a dark, unpleasant *existence* with demons (and in one instance as a demon).   It is not till we come to a YAv. Fragment (# 22), that we see the dual paradigm of a *place* of reward and a *place* of punishment in the afterlife. This Fragment shows some confusion of ideas (and may have reflected different traditions recorded after Avestan times), but even here, the punishment is limited to 'suffering' for the first 3 nights after death, and then cold, darkness, stink, and bad food.[59]   No tortures or other punishments are described.

The mind~set of the Avestan people (as reflected in the Gathas and YAv. texts) was one that was focused on the pleasures and pains of this life, not so much the afterlife which (comparatively speaking) is not much mentioned in Avestan texts ~ except occasionally for 'heaven', and of course the future *fraš̄ō.kərəiti-* ~ a good end for all.

In short, the dual paradigms of heaven/hell, salvation/damnation, reward/punishment in the after-life did not exist in YAv. times (as their absence in the YAv. texts demonstrates).   It was not until many, many centuries later (perhaps 1,000 years of more) that these paradigms arose in texts composed after the Arab invasion of Iran, and infiltrated the Pahlavi/Pazand mind~set, reflecting (perhaps) the desire of the Pahlavi religious establishment to control human behavior by adding fear of punishment in the afterlife (because they no longer had any powers of enforcement in this life); and perhaps also reflecting the influence of the mind~set of other dominant religions in that period ~ religions which did not exist during the time period of the Avestan texts.

In light of these facts is it reasonable ~ or even credible ~ to interpret *savōi* 'in salvation' (or "blessing" or "benefit") to include within it its meaning both salvation and damnation, or both reward and punishment? If we are going to interpret or make reasoned guesses, is it reasonable to ignore the evidence of so large a body of surviving Avestan texts and the Avestan mind~set?   I leave it to you to decide.

The (identical) translations of Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae are a bit free, and I am not sure which English equivalent they ascribe to *savōi*, "the destinies of the two-fold award."

I translate *savōi* as loc. sg. 'in salvation', because I do not think 'benefit' is adequate. In most verses in which a *sava-* word is used in the Gathas, it is equated with the *ultimate* good end, and in the remaining verses, it is consistent with the ultimate end. I have footnoted these verses for your convenient reference.[60]

I have explored in other chapters,[61] the evidence from the Gathas which establishes Zarathushtra's idea that the ultimate good end 'salvation' is being saved, not from damnation and hell, but from untruth. In the Gathas, the ultimate good end ~ 'salvation' ~ *is* the true (correct, wholly good) order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*), its good comprehension (*vohu- manah-*), its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action (*spənta- ārmaiti-*), its good rule (*vohu- x šaϑra-*), its complete attainment (*haurvatāt-*) ~ which comprise the wholly beneficial~sacred way of being

22

(*spənta- mainyu-*). A way of being that is Divine. A way of being that is Zarathushtra's idea of paradise.[62]

The loc. sg. *savōi* 'in salvation' defines the previously stated 'rewards'. Thus, the 'rewards' 'in salvation' are truth and its components ~ hence the pl. 'rewards' in line e.

Putting it together, here again is line e. in its entirety,

e. *yā vī ašīš   rānōibyō savōi vīdāyāṯ*

e. (For it is truth) through which He will distribute, in salvation, the rewards (of truth), for (all) types (of conduct).

A multi-dimentioned thought which is more simply echoed (in one dimension) in the last line of the GAv. *A Airyema Ishyo* (Y54.1), which says, "I ask for the desired reward of truth, which Wisdom the Lord awards." My translation.[63]

* * * * *

I now give you, each in its entirety, the translations of Y43.12 by the linguists in our group, so that you can see their opinions and interpretations in context, and compare them ~ with each other and with the foregoing linguistic analysis. Where possible, I have inserted the line designations so you can more easily compare these different translations with the GAv. text. And I have placed in *italics* the words purportedly said by Wisdom (in a given translator's opinion).

a. *hyaṯcā. mōi. mraoš.   ašəm. jasō. frāx šnənē.*
b. *aṯ. *tū *mōi. nōiṯ.   asruštā. pairyaoγžā.*
c. **uzirəidyāi.   parā. hyaṯ. mōi. ā.jimaṯ.*
d. *səraošō. ašī.   mązā.rayā. hacimnō.*
e. *yā. vī. ašīš.   rānōibyō. savōi. vīdāyāṯ* ∴ Y43.12.

My translation.
a. 'But then You said to me, "*you have come to truth for instruction,*
b. *you moreover, to Me, have not declared yourself to the contrary, through not listening (to truth).*'
c.d. (So it is) for me to arise, before listening (to truth) may come, followed by the light giving reward (of truth),
e. (For it is truth) through which He will distribute, in salvation, the rewards (of truth) for (all) types (of conduct).' Y43.12.

Insler 1975
a. "However, that Thou didst say to me: '*Thou hast come to the truth in thy discernment;*
b. *moreover, thou hast never contradicted Me in disobedience*',
c.d. it was for me to arise before obedience was to come to me accompanied by a wealth-granting reward,
e. (for it is obedience) according to which one should distribute the rewards to both factions at the time of (our) salvation."[ft. 11]. Y43.12.
Footnote 11, "That is, the final judgment shall bring salvation to the truthful but damnation to the deceitful. Z therefore looks upon the final judgment as the time of salvation." p. 65.

Humbach 1991
a. "And when Thou tellest me: '*With foresight thou reachest truth*',
b. then Thou givest me orders (which will) not be disobeyed.
cd. Let me arise before (Recompense for) Obedience will have come to me, followed by wealth-granting Reward,
e. who at the benefaction will distribute the rewards according to (the respective) balances." Y43.12.

Humbach/Faiss 2010

a. "And when you say to me: *'in prudence you reach truth,'*

b. then you speak to me not without being obeyed (by me).

cd. Let me arise (already) before hearing/obedience has reached me,

in company with wealth-granting Reward,

e. who, in the favorable (case) will distribute the rewards with the balance." Y43.12.

Taraporewala

a. "And when Thou-didst-order me: *'Follow Asha for-(acquiring)-Wisdom,'*

b. then Thou didst not command me (to do) what-might-be-unheeded;

cd. that-I-bestir-myself until when within-me shall-arise, Sraosha accompanied by the blessing of-Divine-Light,

e. whilst He-apportions what-is-due both-reward-and-punishment to-the-two-parties." Y43.12.

Moulton 1912 (his translation is identical to that of Bartholomae's English translation in Tarap. 1951)

a. "And when thou saidst to me, *'To Right shalt thou go for teaching,'*

b. then thou didst not command what I did not obey:

c.d.e. *'Speed thee* [ft. 2], *ere my Obedience* [ft. 3] *come, followed by treasure-laden Destiny, who shall render to men severally the destinies of the twofold award'."* Y43.12.

Moulton's ft. 2 following the words "*Speed thee*" says, "2. To the work of propaganda. Bartholomae observes, ' The renovation of mankind must be accomplished speedily, for the beginning of the Second Life is conceived as near at hand.: cf. Matt. 3^2 , 4^{17} ' See p. 159." These references are to chapters and sections of the Gospel of Matthew in the New Testament of the Bible. On p. 159 Moulton expresses the same opinion. He does not give the Avestan evidence (if any) on which his interpretation is based.

Moulton's ft. 3 following the word "*Obedience*" says, "3. *Sraosha* later associated with the Amshaspands. He is an angel of Judgement: see p. 169." But on p. 169 Moulton simply quotes from (his translation of) this verse (Y43.12) to support his position that Sraosha "comes as angel of judgment ~ as in the Later Avesta". He does not give a reference to any later Avestan text in support of his statement. The meaning and treatment of Sraosha in YAv. texts is covered (with evidence) in another chapter.[64]

* * * * * * *

---

[1] The Ahuna Vairya, is not a part of any Gatha, but it is in pure GAv., is believed to have been composed by Zarathushtra himself. In this manthra words are first expressed and then implied, detailed in *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya, (Yatha Ahu Vairyo) An Analysis.*

[2] References to Skjaervo 2006 are to his on-line *Old Avestan Glossary.*

Insler 1975 ~ his translation and footnotes are at p. 65; his comments at pp. 237 - 238.

Humbach 1991 ~ his translation is in Vol. 1, p. 161; his comments in Vol. 2, p. 158.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 ~ their translation is at p. 126; their comment at p. 184..

Taraporewala 1951 ~ his translation is at p. 441; his comments at pp. 442 - 445; and he includes Bartholomae's English translation at p. 445.

Moulton 1912. His translation and footnoted comments are at p. 366. His translation is identical to Bartholomae's English translation.

[3] Geldner 1P, the verse appears at p. 145; the fts. to it are on pp. 144 - 145. The asterisks I have inserted before a word in the (transliterated) GAv. text, shows where other translators (sometimes based on mss. differences) differ from Geldner's choice.

[4] Almost every chapter in this book supports these conclusions, but a lot of evidence is collected:
In *Part One: The Search for Truth;   The Freedom to Choose;*   and *A Question of Salvation;*
In *Part Two: A Question of Reward & the Path* (which shows that truth and each of its component parts are both the path and the reward); *Asha & The Checkmate Solution; The Houses of Paradise & Hell;* and *The Puzzle of the Amesha Spenta;* and
In *Part Three: The Absence of Damnation & Hell in Other Avestan Texts;* and *Heaven & Hell In Pazand & Pahlavi Texts.*

[5] Detailed in *Part Three: Seraosha.*

[6] See *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise & Hell,* and *Part Three: The Absence of Damnation & Hell in Other Avestan Texts.*

[7] Detailed in *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise & Hell.*

[8] For the Gathas, detailed in *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution; Molten, Glowing Metal;* and *The Houses Of Paradise & Hell.*

[9] In YAv. texts, detailed in *Part Three: The Absence of Damnation & Hell In Other Avestan Texts;* and *Heaven in Other Avestan Texts.*

[10] Zaehner 1961 p. 308. While I do not agree with all of Zaehner's conclusions, this is one with which I agree 100%. See also *Part Three: Heaven & Hell In Pazand & Pahlavi Texts.*

[11] Detailed in *Part One: A Question of Salvation.*

[12] See *Part Two: The Puzzle Of The Singular & The Plural;*   in *Part Three: The Yenghe Haatam, An Analysis;* and *The Puzzle of the Sincere Ones & Others.*

[13] An alternate would be to imply the verb '(speaks)' instead of '(exists'). Giving us,
b. 'the true order of existence through good thinking, words [*ux δā*] through which embodied truth [*ārmaitiš*] (speaks),'. The footnote that follows discusses why an implied verb is (linguistically) necessary here. The verb 'to be' (in its various forms) frequently is implied in GAv. But because 'words' appears in this clause, implying the verb '(speaks)' may possibly be linguistically defensible, in which event *ārmaiti-* here would be an allegory.

[14] Insler 1975 translates this verse a bit differently.

"All ye (immortals) of the same temperament, let that salvation of yours be granted to us: truth allied with good thinking!   (We shall offer) words allied with [*ārmaitiš*], while worshipping with reverence of the Wise One who offers support (to us)." Y51.20, Insler 1975. The words in red font are not in the GAv. text.

It is readily apparent that the definition of 'salvation' would be materially affected by where the first sentence ends.

In Insler 1975, the first sentence ends with the words "... let that salvation of yours be granted to us: truth allied with good thinking!"   And he starts the next sentence with three words which he has inserted in parentheses, indicating that they do not appear in the Gathic text, but have been inserted by him to make his translation work, "...(We shall offer) words allied with [*ārmaitiš*]..." Y51.20. I have placed 'allied with' in red font because *ārmaitiš* is not the form for instr. ('with/by/through ___').

Other translators do not think that the first sentence ends with 'truth with good thinking'. The Avestan punctuation, as shown in Geldner places the punctuation mark at the end of the verse.

If we consider the entire verse as one sentence, then 'that salvation' in line a. is described in lines b. and c. as 'the true (correct) order of existence, through good thinking, words through which embodied truth [*ārmaitiš*]

(exists or speaks), the worship of Wisdom with reverence, ...' Y51.20, (my translation). And in the Gathas, we worship the Divine with the qualities that make a being divine. So lines b. and c. define salvation as these qualities.

The key lies in giving each word its true grammatical value. *ārmaitiš* is nom. sg. and is not the form for any other case/number. Because of the relative pronoun *yāiš* 'through with', and because *ārmaitiš* is nom., a translation of the words *uxδā yāiš ārmaitiš* 'words through which embodied truth', a verb is needed following *ārmaitiš*. In Gathic Avestan, the most frequently implied verb is *ah-* 'to be', (sometimes used in the sense of 'to exist'). Other verbs are less frequently implied ~ usually when they have been previously expressed. There is no previously expressed verb of which *ārmaitiš* (nom.) could be the subject. And many translators have indeed included an implied verb following *ārmaitiš*. I imply the verb '(exists)'. This verse has been discussed in detail (with other translations given for comparative purposes) in *Part Six: Yasna 51.20*.

[15] See *Part Two: Asha & the Checkmate Solution*.

[16] See *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise & Hell*.

[17] See *Part Two: A Question of Reward & the Path*.

[18] See in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu*, and *Good & Evil*.

[19] In Avestan, adjectives (such as 'bad') can be used as nouns ~ 'bad-conduct' or 'bad-one'. This is an ambiguity inherent in the Avestan language. And Zarathushtra, does indeed sometimes describe certain groups of people as 'bad', who personify or exemplify conduct that he complains about or condemns ~ conduct that harms, or victimizes others. But in his thought, it is conduct that is 'good' or 'bad', and when announcing a principle of his teaching, ambiguities in the Avestan language should be resolved in accord with the macro context of his teachings. This problem, with examples from the Gathas, is detailed in *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant*.

[20] Zarathushtra sometimes speaks of persons who are truthful or deceitful, as reaping the consequences of their actions, but that is different from speaking of 'factions' who are good (and will be saved), and 'factions' who are bad (and will be damned, punished, or both). Here are a few examples. In each of these verses, Zarathushtra uses the words *ašavan-* 'truthful' and *drəgvant-* 'deceitful' (which actually is the opposite in meaning of *ašavan-* 'truthful' and therefore means 'not in accord with the true (correct) order of existence' (as discussed in *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise & Hell*). But here I will use the Insler 1975 translation of *drəgvant-* as 'deceitful'.

Both these words *ašavan-* 'truthful' and *drəgvant-* 'deceitful' are adjectives (Beekes 1988 pp. 118, 120) which in Av. can be used for a noun,

  ~ either for a person who has the qualities of the adjectives, (thus literally '(a person who is) truthful' and '(a person who is) deceitful');

  ~ or for something which reflects the qualities of the adjective (thus literally '(what is) truthful' and '(what is) deceitful'.

Here are some examples.

"...the worst existence [*aŋhuš acištō*] shall be for the deceitful [*drəgvantəm*] but the best thinking [*vahištəm manō*] for the truthful person [*ašāunē*]." Y30.4, Insler 1975. This verse says in effect, that when a person is deceitful, his existence will become the worst existence (notice no punishment or damnation ~ the 'worst' existence is one which is not in accord with the true (correct) order of existence). And when a person is truthful, his thinking will become most-good (which is the comprehension of truth see *Part One: Good Thinking, Vohu Manah*); see also *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise and Hell*.

"... That the soul of the truthful person [*ašaonō*] be powerful in immortality [*amərətāitī*], that woes beset the deceitful men [*drəgvatō*] in an enduring fashion ..." Y45.7, Insler 1975. In the Gathas, Zarathushtra associates 'power' with the attributes of the Divine (see *Part One: Good Rule, Vohu Xshathra, & Power*), one of which is

amərətāt- 'non-deathness'. So regarding the truthful person [*ašavan-*], the acquisition of the true (correct) order of existence is an incremental thing. And when a person's existence becomes the true (correct) order of existence (completely), he becomes powerful (as Zarathushtra uses power), and the reason for mortality ceases ~ he attains a state of non-deathness (*amərətāt-*). And a person who is 'deceitful' experiences 'woes'. Conduct that is not in accord with the true (correct) order of existence (*drəgvant-*) causes harm to others, and under the law of consequences what you do comes back to you, so the harm done by a person who is deceitful comes back to harm him ('woes'). This is not for punishment, but to enable the process of changing minds, changing preferences, from a mix, to those that are all good (see *Part Two: Asha & the Checkmate Solution*).

"... Thou hast promised for the truthful person [*ašāunē*] what indeed are the very best things [*vahištā*]. (But) the deceitful man [*drəgvā̊*] shall have his share apart from Thy approval,..." Y47.5, Insler 1975; The same reasoning (above) applies. Notice, here again, when a person is deceitful, he loses the approval of Wisdom. No mention of 'punishment'.

"... which of the payments shall be taken as claims from the truthful [*ašāunō*] and which from the deceitful [*drəgvō.dəbyō*],..." Y31.14, Insler 1975. The 'payments' are a reference to the law of consequences.

"... (there is) both a way of easy access and one with no access, ... long destruction [*darəgām ... rašō*] for the deceitful [*drəgvō.dəbyō* pl. 'for (all that is) untruthful'] but salvation [*savacā*] for the truthful [*ašavabyō*],..." Y30.11, Insler 1975; Skjaervo's *Old Avestan Glossary* shows the stems *darəga-* as 'long' and *rašah-* as 'harm'. To translate the adjectives *drəgvō.dəbyō* and *ašavabyō* as nouns that are people is not consistent with Zarathushtra's teachings. To translate them as nouns that are qualities is so consistent. See *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant.* But even if we stick to the Insler 1975 translation, here again, we have a re-statement of the law of consequences ~ that when a person is 'deceitful' he reaps harm for himself (in a long process of learning), and a person who is 'truthful' reaps 'salvation' which is the attainment of the true (correct) order of existence *aša-*, (see *Part One: A Question of Salvation*).

"... those rewards Thou shalt give, through the heat of Thy truth-strong fire [*āϑrō aš̌ā.aojaŋhō*], to the deceitful [*drəgvāitē*] and to the truthful [*ašāunaēcā*],..." Y43.4. Notice, the "truth-strong fire" here is the agent for delivering "rewards" to both those who are truthful, and those who are false. Therefore the "truth-strong fire" cannot be the fiery torment of 'hell'. It is the fire of enlightenment, which eventually comes to everyone ~ those who choose truth and those who do not (through the law of consequence and mutual, loving help, which are part of the true (correct) order of existence). 'Fire/light are material metaphors for the true (correct) order of existence (*aša-*) in both the Gathas and the later texts ~ an order of existence that is wholly good, wholly beneficial (see *Part Two: Asha & the Checkmate Solution*).

It is true that translators have translated certain words in Gatha verses as 'punishment', 'retribution', or words of like import. But in my view, based on various basic themes of thought in the Gathas, these GAv. words mean 'adverse consequences', without the added flavor of desiring to inflict harm or revenge which such words as 'punishment' or 'retribution' entail. See *Part Three: Adverse Consequences, Not Punishment.*

[21] We see the idea that the 'enemy' is the opposite of the true (correct) order of existence scattered throughout the YAv. texts. For example,

Even after the syncretization, when pre-Zarathushtrian deities were worshipped in YAv. texts, in Yy19 (addressed to Haoma) the 'enemy' is hatred and the lie,

"This fourth blessing I beseech of thee, O Haoma, ... that I may stand forth on this earth with desires gained, and powerful, receiving satisfaction, overwhelming the assaults of hate, and conquering the lie.

This fifth blessing, ... I beseech of thee, ... that I may stand victorious on earth, conquering in battles, overwhelming the assaults of hate, and conquering the lie." Yy19.20, Mills translation, SBE 31, p. 237.

The YAv. names of 'demons' are actually vices (i.e. conduct not in accord with the true (correct, good) order of existence), see *Part One: Does the Devil Exist?* The 'demons' of course are the proverbial 'enemies' in YAv. and Pahlavi texts.

The *Haft Ameshaspand (Haptan) Yasht* (Yt. 2) also demonstrates that the 'enemy' is what is not in accord with the true order of existence (*aša-*); *druj-* means what is false, 'untruth' ~ the opposite of *aša-* 'truth'.

"...Who is he in whose house, O Spitama Zarathushtra! every Druj is destroyed, every Drug perishes ...?

It is he who takes the seven Amesha-Spentas, the all-ruling, the all-beneficent, as a shield against his enemies." Yt. 2, §§ 11 - 13, Darmesteter translation, SBE 23, pp. 38 - 39.

The "Amesha-Spentas" are attributes of the Divine ~ the true (correct) order of existence and its component parts ~ which are a shield against the enemy to be destroyed ~ *druj-* the opposite of truth.

And there are many other examples as well.

[22] Beekes 1988 shows *hyaṯ* as a form of *yat* (not to be confused with *yāt*) classifying it as an indeclinable conjunction, meaning 'when, because, (so) that', p. 145.
Skjaervo 2006 shows *hyaṯ* as a conjunction meaning "that, because, as, etc."

[23] Skjaervo 2006 also shows *hyaṯ* as a relative pronoun.

In Jackson 1892 § 403 *hyaṯ* is a relative pronoun nom./acc. sg. ntr. of stem *ya-* (with variations *yaṯ, yiaṯ,* e.g. Y28.9, Y30.6 and other verses.

[24] Insler 1975 p. 157.

[25] *Part One: The Seaerch for Truth* details the evidence that in Zarathushtra's thought, the search for truth is a necessary and on-going part of spiritual evolution, and that he does not have all the answers. And *Part One: Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat,* details the evidence that in Zarathushtra's thought, human beings have not attained truth completely, but are capable of doing so.

[26] Taraporewala does not disclose Bartholomae's conjectured stem.

[27] In Y43.14b. we have the words *tavā rafənō frāx šnənəm*. There is no dispute that *tavā* means 'Thy' and *rafənō* means 'support'. Insler 1975 translates *frāx šnənəm* as an adj. "proper". Here is the sentence in which it appears "Yes, Wise One, (grant) to me Thy proper [*frāx šnənəm*] support, which an able man, possessing such, should give to his friend and which has been obtained through Thy rule that is in accord with truth. ..." Insler 1975. If Bartholomae and Andreas are correct in their perception of the stem word, "instructive support [*rafənō frāx šnənəm*]" would be a good fit in Y43.14b.

In Y29.11, Insler translates *frāx šnənā* adverbially ("...acknowledge those fit [*frāx šnənā*] for the great task..."). If Bartholomae and Andreas are correct in their perception of the stem word, "instructed" would be a good fit.

[28] Geldner ft. 3) p. 144, shows 2 mss. have *tūmōi* as one word, and S1 combines all three *aṯtūmōi* as one word. He gives no other mss. references, which seems strange.

[29] *nōiṯ* can also mean 'neither' and 'nor'. For example, when used as *nōiṯ ... nōiṯ ...* or when used as *naēda ... nōiṯ ...* (Y45.2) it means 'neither ... nor ...', Jackson § 739 p. 205.

[30] Detailed in *Part Three: Seraosha*.

[31] Detailed in *Part Three: Seraosha*.

[32] Taraporewala comments that in emending to **pairī-*aoγžā*, he follows "the reading of [manuscript] S1" but "at the same time dividing the *upasarga* and the verb" because it suites the meter better to have a hiatus here rather than the usual *sandhi* which gives the reading *pairyaoγžā*, as others do.

[33] Insler 1975, pp. 189 - 190, commenting under Y31.19.

[34] Under the verb *gam-*, Skjaervo 2006 shows that the addition of *pairī* to *gam-* gives the meaning "to come into the presence of" and in middle voice, "to circumambulate in reverence".

Insler 1975 takes a related but different view. Commenting under Y28.2 he states that *pairī gam* in the Gathas has the same meaning as *pári car* has in Ved. where it means 'to wait on, attend, serve', p. 119.

In Y28.2 he translates *yə̄ vā … pairī.jasāi* as "I who shall serve you..." [referring to the Divine and Its attributes with the plural *vā* 'you'].

In each of the first two lines of Y43.7, 9, 11, 13, and 15, we have a repetition of the same sentence which contains the words *mā … vohū pairī.jasaṯ manaŋhā* which he translates as "he attended [*pairī.jasaṯ*] me with good thinking".

In Y50.8, he translates *pairī.jasāi* as "I shall serve";

He notes that in GAv. and YAv. texts, *pairī gam* often occurs in association with *yaz-* 'worship', giving the following GAv. examples, (with his translation).

Gatha verse Y51.22 which says [referring to the Divine and His attributes] *tą yazāi … pairicā jasāi vantā* "I shall worship [*yazāi*] them and serve [*pairicā jasāi*] them with love [*vantā*]."

YHapt. 36.4 *vohū ϑwā manaŋhā vohū ϑwā ašā vaŋhuyå ϑwā cistōiš šyaoϑanāišcā vacə̄bīšcā pairijasāmaidē* "We shall serve [*pairijasāmaidē*] Thee with good thinking, Thee with good truth, Thee with actions and words stemming from good understanding." Insler 1975 p. 119.

[35] Skjaervo 2006 shows the following conjugations of the verb *aog-* appearing in the following Gatha verses, which I show in context.
aojōi in Y32.7a. Indicative. 1p sg., which would give us 'I declare myself' my translation.
Or in Humbach/Faiss 2010 "I explicitly declare myself ..."

aojī Inj. 1p sg. in Y43.08;
In the immediately preceding verse (Y43.7), Zarathushtra is asked to declare who he is, to whom he belongs (i.e. to Wisdom), and how he would explain these revelations to mortals. And in Y43.8, Zarathushtra declares himself,
aṯ hōi aoji 'Then to him I declared myself,...' my translation.
Or in Insler 1975, "Then I said [*aoji*] to him first: (I am) Zarathushtra. If I were able, I would be a true enemy to the deceitful one, but a strong support to the Truthful One...

aogədā Inj. 3p sg. in Y32.10a.;
hvō … yə̄ … aogədā '...he who declares...' my translation.
Or in Humbach/Faiss 2010 "That man ... who professes...".

aojāi Sub. 1p sg. in Y50.11a.;
aṯ vā staotā āōjaī mazdā 'Yes, I shall declare myself your praiser, Wisdom...' my translation.
Or in Insler 1975 "Yes, I shall swear to be your praiser, Wise One...".

[36] Geldner 1P p. 144, ft. 6 of Y43.12.

[37] The aorist and the subjunctive are not verb systems that have exact English equivalents that are not used for other conjugations.

For the aorist, Jackson 1892 says "In regard to meaning, the aorist in Avesta commonly denotes a simple past action, usually but not always momentary. It may often, as in Skt. be rendered by our 'have'. (§ 624, p. 176).
But for the subjunctive in the aorist system, in the 3p sg. Jackson (§ 642, p. 180) gives "GAv. *jimaṯ*" as an example, translating it 'he may come'. Both 'he' and 'it' are 3p, and in the context of this verse (Y43.12), it is not a person, but conduct *səraošō* 'listening' from the next line that 'may come'.

[38] In *Part Three: Seraosha*.

[39] Detailed in *Part One: Differences in the Spirit of Friendship*, and *Part Three: Sraosha*.

[40] In Zarathushtra's Indo-Iranian culture, it was thought that various material things, and also important concepts (like 'reward') have spiritual essences which in the Yashts are objects of worship or celebration. This idea is discussed in *Part One: The Identity of the Divine.*

[41] See *Part One: A Question of Salvation.*

[42] Discussed in *Part Six: Yasna 32.9.*

[43] *vīcinaoṭ.* Skjaervo 2006 shows the verb stem *caē-* 'to pick, sort out', which with the suffix *vī-* means 'to distinguish, discriminate (between/among)' and he shows *vīcinaoṭ* as its 3p sg. injunctive form. Thus, "... the Wise Lord who, together with His clever advisor, truth, [*vīcinaoṭ* 'discerns'][43] the just [*dāϑəm*] and the unjust [*adāϑəmcā*]." Y46.17. The word *cinvatō* also derives from the stem *caē*, discussed in *Part Three: Chinvat, The Bridge of Discerning.*

[44] Some examples of GAv. words which have two completely different meanings are footnoted in *Part Six: Yasna 28.5.*

[45] Humbach/Faiss 2010 § 37.4, p. 71.

[46] Jackson 1892 §§ 236 - 242, pp. 69 - 71 agrees with the declensions shown by Humbach/Faiss 2010. Using a different *-a-* stem word as his example, he shows the,
-ibyā inflection as masc. instr. /dat. /abl. du. (giving also a GAv. example *rānōibyā* 'with both allies', and the
-ibyō inflection as masc. dat./abl. pl. He shows no such ntr. inflection.
Therefore, if Jackson is correct, *rānōibyō* can be only a grammatically pl. noun.

[47] Geldner 1P p. 145 ft. 15) of Y43.12, shows 17 mss. in support of his preferred reading *rānōibyō* (the pl.); 1 ms. which has *rənōibyō*; and 8 mss. which have *rānōibyā* (the du.) which Taraporewala prefers. But bear in mind, this is not a numbers game. In selecting which declension was originally intended by Zarathushtra, the number of mss. which support a given declension is just one factor to be considered.

[48] Humbach/Faiss 2010 § 37.2, p. 71. Their entire discussion on *rāna-* is under § 37 and all its sub-parts, pp. 70 - 72. They see the declensions of *rāna-* as follows,
rānōibyō = dat./abl. plural (in Y43.12);
rānōibyā = instr./dat./abl. dual (in Y31.3, Y47.6, and Y51.9); and
rānayå = gen. dual (in Y31.19);

[49] Humbach/Faiss 2010 § 37.4, p. 71. They do not identify a source or reference for the words in parentheses and single quotation marks, so these words probably indicate their understanding of why the pl. *rānōibyō* is used in Y43.12.

[50] Humbach/Faiss 2010 § 37.1, p. 70.
[51] We see the idea that the 'enemy' is the opposite of the true (correct) order of existence scattered throughout the YAv. texts. For example,

Even after the syncretization, when pre-Zarathushtrian deities were worshipped in YAv. texts, in Yy19 (addressed to Haoma) the 'enemy' is hatred and the lie,

"This fourth blessing I beseech of thee, O Haoma, ... that I may stand forth on this earth with desires gained, and powerful, receiving satisfaction, overwhelming the assaults of hate, and conquering the lie.

This fifth blessing, ... I beseech of thee, ... that I may stand victorious on earth, conquering in battles, overwhelming the assaults of hate, and conquering the lie." Yy19.20, Mills translation, SBE 31, p. 237.

The YAv. names of 'demons' are actually vices (i.e. conduct not in accord with the true (correct) order of existence), see *Part One: Does the Devil Exist?* The 'demons' of course are the proverbial 'enemies' in YAv. and Pahlavi texts.

The *Haft Ameshaspand (Haptan) Yasht* (Yt. 2) also demonstrates that the 'enemy' is what is not in accord with the true (correct) order of existence (*aša-*); *druj-* means what is false, 'untruth' ~ the opposite of *aša-* 'truth'.

"...Who is he in whose house, O Spitama Zarathushtra! every Druj is destroyed, every Drug perishes ...?

It is he who takes the seven Amesha-Spentas, the all-ruling, the all-beneficent, as a shield against his enemies." Yt. 2, §§ 11 - 13, Darmesteter translation, SBE 23, pp. 38 - 39.

The "Amesha-Spentas" are attributes of the Divine ~ the true (correct) order of existence and its component parts ~ which are a shield against the enemy to be destroyed ~ *druj-* the opposite of truth.

And there are many other examples as well.

[52] Here are the other 4 Gatha verses in which *rāna-* words are used ~ all in the dual. Just so you can be assured that I have not molded the evidence to fit my translation preferences, I use here the Insler 1975 translation ~ showing my preferred translation options in square brackets and black font.

Y51.9 *rānōibyā* dat. du. (the dat. is translated into English with either one of the following two prepositions 'to' or 'for').

Insler 1975: "The satisfaction which Thou shalt give to both factions [*rānōibyā* dat. du. 'for both types (of conduct)'] through Thy pure fire and the molten iron, Wise One, is to be given as a sign among living beings, in order to destroy the deceitful [*drəgvantəm* sg. '(what is) deceitful'] and to save the truthful [*ašavanəm* sg. '(what is) truthful']." Y51.9, Insler 1975. The phrase " through Thy pure fire and the molten iron" refers to the soul refining process which results in the enlightenment of truth.

As you can see, translating *rānōibyā* as 'for both types (of conduct)' fits the context of this verse well (and it also fits the macro context of Zarathushtra's thought). Parenthetically, *drəgvantəm* (sg.), and *ašavanəm* (sg.) are adjs. which can be used as nouns. Most translators of this verse think they are nouns that are people. I think they are nouns that are 2 types of qualities ~ truthfulness and untruthfulness (see *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant*). It is our bad qualities that are eliminated and our good qualities that are saved in the soul refining process. I translate this verse as follows. 'The satisfaction which you give, O Wisdom, for both types (of conduct), through Thy bright fire, through molten metal, (is) to be given for clarification among living beings, (is to be given for) untruthfulness to be destroyed'. (In this way) You save truthfulness.' Y51.9. See *Part Three: Yasna 51.9* for a detailed discussion of this verse with other translations given for comparative purposes.

Y47.6. *rānōibyā* dat. du.

In the immediately preceding verse (Y47.5) Zarathushtra speaks of persons (pl.) who (in literal translation) 'possess truth *ašavan-*' and a person (sg.) who (in literal translation) 'possesses untruth/deceit *drəgvant-* "... Thou hast promised for the truthful person [*ašāunē* pl. 'for the ones who possess truth'] what indeed are the very best things [*vahištā*]. (But) the deceitful man [*drəgvå* 'the one possessing untruth'] shall have his share apart from Thy approval,..." Y47.5, Insler 1975. Notice, here Zarathushtra does not speak of damnation, or punishment or hell for those who possess untruth. Nor does he divide humanity into 2 factions. He speaks of persons who possess truth, and a person who possesses untruth ~ both of which we all are, many times. In the Gathas, it is a person's choices, his actions, that make him at any given moment 'truthful' or 'deceitful', generating consequences.
And then in the next verse (which has *rānōibyā* in it) Y47.6 Zarathushtra says,
"Wise Lord, together with this virtuous spirit [*tā spənta- mainyu-* 'this beneficial way of being'] Thou shalt give the distribution in the good to both factions [*rānōibyā* dat. du. 'for both types (of conduct)'] through Thy fire, by reason of the solidarity of [*ārmaiti-*] and truth. For it shall convert the many who are seeking." Y47.6, Insler 1975.
Here again, translating *rānōibyā* as 'two types (of conduct)' fits well. Notice, the consequences are administered by the Lord Wisdom, with His beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*). And even in the Insler 1975 translation, the end distributed for both is "in the good [*vaŋhāu* loc. sg. of *vohu-*]". So the 'end' is a good end for both types of conduct (and even for all types of people) ~ not damnation or punishment. His phrase "the distribution in the good ... through Thy fire" ~ indicates the enlightening, soul-refining

31

process which, experience by experience, results in everyone eventually making it to the true (correct) order of existence ~ which is most good (*aša- vahišta-*) ~ hence "the distribution in the good".

Y31.3 *rānōibyā* dat. du.

The immediately preceding verse (Y31.2) speaks of 'two alternatives' which are the true order of existence and its opposite ~ indicating two choices in how we think, speak and act (conduct) "... then let me lead all of you in which way the Wise Lord knows (to exist) that judgment between the two alternatives by which we are going to live in accordance with truth." Y31.2 Insler 1975.

And the next verse, Y31.3 Zarathushtra says, "That satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*] which Thou hast created for both factions [*rānōibyā* 'for both types (of alternatives)'] together with Thy spirit and hast promised (to them) through fire and truth, that commandment [*urvātəm* 'precept'] which is for Thy adherents ~ speak, Wise One, with the tongue of Thine own mouth, in order for us to know (all) that, by means of which I might convert all the living" Y31.3, Insler 1975. (Insler translates *urvātəm* as "commandment" here, but as "precept" in his comment under Y44.15 pp. 249 ~ 250).

Here, translating dat. du. *rānōibyā* as 'for both types (of alternatives)' refers to the two alternatives in the immediately preceding verse, ~ especially in light of the last phrase here in which Zarathushtra speaks of wanting to "convert all the living". If Zarathushtra had been speaking of two types of factions, one faction would already be all good, and there would be no need to include it in "both factions" in his wish to "convert all the living".

And once again, the 'end' for both types of alternatives is 'satisfaction' ~ a beneficial end ~ the eventual attainment through the soul~refining process of the true (correct, good) order of existence. It has been argued that 'satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*]' here is used in a legalistic sense as in payments due. But if that were so, the form of the word would have to be either du. or pl. because under the 'reward/punishment' line of reasoning, the payment would be different for truthful conduct and for its opposite. But here, 'satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*]' is acc. sg. Specifically,

Insler 1975 p. 182, identifies the noun stem as *x šnūt-*, deriving from the root *x šnu* 'satisfy'; in his translation, the word 'satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*]' has an acc. value (the object of 'Thou hast created'). And Jackson 1892 shows the *-əm* inflection as acc. sg. for nouns that end in consonants (*x šnūt-* being one such noun). For such stems, he shows no *-əm* inflections for acc. du. or pl. (§§ 279 ~ 283, pp. 82 ~ 83).

In passing, one might wonder, if fire is a metaphor for truth, why does Zarathushtra use both fire and truth in this verse "That satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*] which Thou ... hast promised ... through fire and truth, ..." Y31.3. Perhaps it is because fire (a material metaphor) represents the refining process of the true order of existence (*aša-*) in mortal (material) existence, and truth represents the attendant (incremental) enlightenment.

Y31.19 *rąnayå* gen. du.

"This knowing world-healer has listened, he who has respected the truth, Lord, being one who has mastery over his tongue at will for the true speaking of the (proper) words when the distribution in the good shall occur to both factions [*rąnayå* gen. du.] through Thy bright fire, Wise One." Y31.19, Insler 1975.

Here Insler's translation gives *rąnayå* a dative, (rather than a genitive) flavor. However, this may be one of those instances in which the GAv. gen. has a dat. flavor in English, as Skjaervo 2003 mentions in his *Young Avestan, Lesson* 12, p. 116. And translating *rąnayå* as 'for both types of conduct' (truthfulness and its opposite) fits well. I translate this verse as follows.

a. *gūštā yə̄ mantā ašəm   ahūm.biš vīdvå ahurā*
b. *ərəžux δāi vacaŋhąm   x šayamnō hizvō vasō*
c. *ϑwā āϑrā sux rā mazdā   vaŋhāu vīdātā rąnayå*

a. '(This) knowing world-healer who has listened, Lord, has thought truth,
b. ruling over (his) tongue at will for the true~speaking of words.
c. Through Thy bright fire, Wisdom, the distribution of the good (shall occur), for both types (of conduct) [*rąnayå*].' Y31.19, my translation.

In this verse, Zarathushtra speaks of himself in the 3d person. And although he does not use *srao-* 'to listen' but a synonym *gūštā* (AorInj. 3p sg. of the verb stem *gaoš-* 'to hear with the ear' in middle voice), here (as in our verse Y43.12), we have 'listening' to truth, and its implied opposite (non-listening). And here again, the reward is goodness ~ 'the distribution in the good' ~ and is the same for both types of conduct (listening and its opposite) because through the illumination ('bright fire') brought about by the true (correct, good) order of existence (which includes the law of consequences and mutual, loving help), minds are changed, so that the ultimate end is the same for both types of conduct ~ goodness, which is another way of saying the true order of existence ~ an existence that is superlative of intrinsic goodness (*aša- vahišta-*).

[53] Detailed in *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant,* and in *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise & Hell.*

[54] Macdonell's *A Vedic Grammar for Students* states that sometimes one word in du. form (either a masc. or fem. dual) is used to express a male and female of the same class. He states that this type of dual has "its widest application in naming pairs of deities" but gives other examples as follows;

The word 'father' in du. form, *pitárā* means 'father and mother';

The word 'mother' in dual form *mātárā* means "mother and father".

He gives two other examples ~ 'dawn' in dual form means "dawn and night"; 'heaven' in dual form means "heaven and earth", § 193, (2) a., p. 287. Notice, the dual for 'heaven' does not mean 'heaven and hell'. Macdonell gives no instance of a dual 'reward' being used for 'reward and punishment' in an afterlife (or the other way around), nor does he show 'salvation' being used for 'salvation and damnation' in an afterlife (or the other way around).

Similarly, in co-ordinative (dvandva) compounds, Macdonell shows *dyāvā-prthivī* 'heaven and earth'. § 186 A 1, p. 269. He shows no dvandva *heaven and hell.*

Was the paradigm of 'heaven/hell', damnation/salvation, reward/punishment in an afterlife, relevant to Ved. thought? To ancient pre-existing Indo-European thought?

It certainly is not relevant to GAv. and YAv. thought (see *Part Three: The Absence of Damnation & Hell in Other Avestan Texts*).

[55] In the Gathas, various phrases for the 'good' reward and the 'bad' reward, are incremental states of being. The Gathas do not mention a *place* of punishment and tortures in the afterlife ~ what we today call 'hell' (see *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise and Hell*). So also, in all major (surviving) YAv. texts that were composed in YAv. times, there is no mention of a *place* of punishment and tortures in an afterlife such as today is thought of as 'hell' (see *Part Three: The Absence of Hell & Damnation in Other Avestan Texts*).

[56] As detailed in *Part Two: A Question of Reward & the Path, Asha & the Checkmate Solution,* and *The Houses of Paradise & Hell.*

[57] See in *Part Three: The Absence of Damnation & Hell in Other Avestan Texts; Heaven in Other Avestan Texts;* and *Heaven & Hell In Pazand & Pahlavi Texts.*

[58] See *Part Five: The Vendidad, An Overview.*

[59] Detailed in *Part Three: The Absence of Damnation & Hell in Other Avestan Texts.*

[60] Here are all the remaining Gatha verses (in addition to our verse Y43.12) in which *sava-* nouns and *sao-/savaya-* verbs appear. As you can see, in most of them these words are equated with the ultimate good end, and in the others are consistent with the ultimate good end. The grammatical values (e.g. sg. pl. etc.) where shown are from Skjaervo 2006.

Equated with the ultimate good end.

Noun: Y45.7, Insler 1975. "Because those who are alive, and those who have been, and those who shall be, shall seek after the salvation [*savā*] that comes from Him, the One who offers solicitude, That the soul of the

truthful person be powerful in immortality, that woes beset the deceitful men in an enduring fashion ~ these things, too, did the Wise Lord create by reason of His rule." Insler 1975.

Noun: Y48.1, Insler 1975. "(to the Wise Lord). If, during the times after this (present) one which is under the workings of evil, one shall defeat deceit by truth, that hateful deceit which has been taught by gods and men for the sake of immortality, then one shall increase Thy glory, Lord, **during those times of salvation** [*savāiš*]." Insler 1975.

Noun: Y51.15, Insler 1975. "What prize Zarathushtra previously promised to his adherents ~ into that House of Song did the Wise Lord come as the first one. This prize has been promised to you **during the times of salvation** [*savāiš*] by reason of your good thinking and truth." Insler 1975.

Noun: Y51.20, Insler 1975. "All ye (immortals) of the same temperament, let that **salvation** [*savō*] of yours be granted to us: truth allied with good thinking! (We shall offer) words allied with [aramaiti], while worshiping with reverence of the Wise One who offers support (to us)." Insler 1975.

Noun: Y45.11, Insler 1975. "(to the Wise Lord). The person who, in this very way, has opposed the guilty gods and mortals who, in their turn, have kept on opposing this one ~ that is, people other than the man who has been pious to him ~ such a person, by reason of his virtuous conception, is an ally, a brother, or a father (of Thee), Wise Lord, the Master of the house **Who shall save** [*saošyaṇtō*] (us)." Insler 1975.

Noun: Y48.12, Insler 1975. "Yes, those men shall be the **saviors** [*saošyaṇtō*] of the lands, namely, those who shall follow their knowledge of Thy teaching with actions in harmony with good thinking and with truth, Wise One. These indeed have been fated to be the expellers of fury." Insler 1975

Noun: Y30.11, Insler 1975. " ... when ye learn (there is) both a way of easy access and one with no access, as well as long destruction for the deceitful [*drəgvō.dəbyō* dat. pl. 'for (all that is) untruthful'] **but salvation** [*savacā*] for the truthful [*ašavabyō* dat. pl. 'for (all that is) truthful'], then each one (of you) shall abide by (all) these commandments. Wish it so." Insler 1975. The basis for my translation preferences in this verse has been discussed in a ft. above.

Verb: Y51.9, Insler 1975. "The satisfaction which Thou shalt give to both factions through Thy pure fire and the molten iron, Wise One, is to be given as a sign among living beings, in order to destroy the deceitful [*rāšayeŋhē drəgvantəm* acc. sg. 'untruthfulness'] and to **save** the truthful [*savayo ašavanəm* acc. sg. '(Thus) **You save** [*savayo*] truthfulness'']." Here translating *drəgvantəm* sg. and *ašavanəm* sg. as nouns that are people instead of nouns qualities is not consistent with Zarathushtra's thought. I translate these sg. adjs. as nouns that are sg. qualities. Detailed in *Part Six: Yasna 51.9.*

Verb: Y44.2, Insler 1975. "This I ask Thee. Tell me truly, Lord. Is the beginning of the best existence in such a way that the loving man who shall seek after these things is **to be saved** [*sūidyāi*]? For such a person, virtuous through truth, watching over the heritage for all, is a world-healer and Thy ally in spirit, Wise One."

Verb: Y49.03, Insler 1975. "However, it has been fated for this world, Wise One, that the truth is **to be saved** [*sūidyāi*] for its (good) preference, that deceit is to be destroyed for its (false) profession. By reason of this, I am eager for the alliance of good thinking in order to ban all the deceitful persons from our company."

Consistent with the ultimate good end.

Noun: Y34.3, Insler 1975. "Therefore, let us reverently give an offering to Thee, Lord, and to truth, all of us creatures under Thy rule whom one has nourished with good thinking. Indeed let **salvation** [*savō*] be granted to the beneficent man by all those among your kind, Wise One!"

Noun: Y44.12, Insler 1975. "... The deceitful person [*drəgvā* 'one possessing untruth'] who, in order to fight against Thy (means of) **salvation** [*savā*], shall act with evil, is it that such a person ~ not this one ~ is considered evil?

Noun: Y34.13, Insler 1975. "To that, Lord, which Thou hast told me to be the road of good thinking, to the conceptions **of those who shall save** [*saošyaṇtəm*], along which Thy extoller shall proceed in alliance with

truth indeed to the prize which has been promised to the beneficent, and of which Thou are the (only) source of giving, Wise One."

Noun: Y53.2, Insler 1975. "Moreover, let Kavi Vishtaspa, the son of Zarathushtra Spitama, and Frashaoshtra continually accompany their knowledge ~ and their prayers as well ~ with words and actions in harmony with such (good) thinking, for the glory of Him, the Wise One, in order to serve the straight paths and that conception which the Lord granted His **savior** [*saošyaṇtō* nom. pl. '(these) saviors']."

Noun: Y46.3, Insler 1975. "... The intentions of **those who shall save** [*saošyaṇtəm*] are in accord with Thy mature teachings! To which person shall one come with good thinking to (give) help? To me?   I choose (only) Thy teachings, Lord."

[61] Detailed in *Part One: A Question of Salvation,* and in *Part Six: Yasna 51.20*.

[62] See *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being;* and *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise & Hell.*

[63] Detailed in *Part Six: A Airyema Ishyo, Y54.1.*

[64] Detailed in *Part Three: Seraosha.*