

## Yasna 51.9

This verse is discussed in *Part Two: Molten, Glowing Metal*, and also in *Part Three: Adverse Consequences, Not Punishment*, and this analysis of its translation is offered in support of those discussions. This is one of the 3 verses that mention 'metal', each of which has also been separately analyzed. So to place ideas in context, some repetition here is inevitable, for which I ask your indulgence.

In this verse we have the term '[molten, flowing, liquid metal](#)', (just as Y32.7 speaks of '[glowing metal](#)'). Most of the translators in our group have explained their interpretation of this term, in their comments under Y32.7 (which speaks of '[glowing metal](#)'), which they do not repeat in their brief comments on this verse (Y51.9).

To avoid repeated citations, the translations and comments of our group of linguists are referenced here ~ both for this verse Y51.9, and also for Y31.3 a verse which contains parallel ideas, as we will see.<sup>1</sup> Their comments under Y32.7 (which speaks of '[glowing metal](#)') are explored in the chapter which discusses that verse.<sup>2</sup>

- a. *yqm. x šnūtəm. rānōibyā. dā. / θwā. āθrā. sux rā. mazdā.*
- b. *ayaṇhā. x šustā. aibī. / ahvāhū. dax štam. dāvōi.*
- c. *rāšayeghē. drəgvantəm. / savayō. ašavanəm. ♣ Y51.9, Geldner 1P p. 181.*

My translation.

- a. 'The satisfaction which you give, O Wisdom, for both types (of conduct), through Your bright fire,'
- b. 'through molten metal, (is) to be given for clarification among living beings,'
- c. '(is to be given) to destroy untruthfulness. (Thus) You save truthfulness.' Y51.9.

## Discussion.

This is one of several verses in which Zarathushtra gives us his ideas on how evil is defeated ~ by a soul refining process which results in a good end for all ~ for those who choose wrongfully and for those who choose truth.

Eminent linguists have translated this verse in a way that has Zarathushtra viewing people as divided into two factions or parties ([rānōibyā](#)) ~ the truthful and the untruthful (or worse, the 'believers and the unbelievers') ~ the untruthful to be damned, harmed, destroyed, and the truthful to be 'saved'.

This mind-set reflects the paradigms of other religions which did not exist in Zarathushtra's day. It is contrary to the Gathas, and is even contrary to established precepts in the later YAv. and Pahlavi texts in (at least) the following two respects:

(1) In the Gathas, Zarathushtra states that each of us has two ways of being (*mainyu-*) within us which express themselves in thought, word and action ~ the more good and the bad (Y30.3), the more beneficial and the harmful (Y45.2). Nor could Zarathushtra have been unaware that nobody (in our present reality) is all truthful or all untruthful; and,

(2) In the Gathas, everyone will eventually make it to a good end ~ an idea that is reflected in the *frašō.kərəiti-* of the YAv. texts and in the *frashegard* of the Pahlavi texts. Indeed, fire (the material

metaphor for the true (good, correct) order of existence) is described in the YAv. *Atash Nyaish*),<sup>3</sup> as the agent for bringing about the transformation of the soul, a soul refining process ~ just as in the Gathas physical fire (enlightenment) is the metaphoric agent for the soul refining process and is the agent which makes metal ore molten, glowing, to refine it into 'pure' metal ~ a metaphor for the soul refining process.

So how (you may wonder) did our linguists arrive at a translation which contradicts the 2 foregoing, well established precepts of Zarathushtra's thought? Well, I think the following factors (and possibly others) have played a part.

The first factor is that the word *rānōibyā* (dual in number, hence 'two' or 'both') has not yet been decoded. Linguists have conjectured that the stem is *rāna-*, (based on how it is inflected for case, number and gender), but they have not found a certain (or even near certain) cognate in Vedic or other ancient Indo-European language which might throw light on its meaning in GAv. where it is always used in the du. (with one possible exception (Y43.12) in which the word is in du. form in some mss and pl. in others). This consistent use of the du. suggests either a pair, or two opposites or contrasts of some kind. And linguists have speculated on what these might be. But all 'translations' by linguists of *rāna-* words in the Gathas ('thighs', 'legs', 'weighing scales', 'balance', 'factions', 'parties') are mere guesses ~ guesses which have been informed by a given translator's own mind-set; guesses which are not consonant with ~ and in fact contradict ~ Zarathushtra's thought.

Am I succumbing to the mind-set that everyone is wrong except me? I hope not. But I will leave that for you to decide, after you have seen the evidence.

The word *rānōibyā* has been discussed briefly below, and in great detail in another chapter.<sup>4</sup> Here I will simply say that in my view, the only English equivalent which fits each of its uses in the Gathas is 'type' ~ thus 'two types' (when dual), and 'many or all types' (if pl.) ~ used in Gatha verses as 'types' of conduct, choices, alternatives.

The second factor is the way *drəgvañtəm* [sg.] and *ašavanəm* [sg.] should be translated. These words are adjectives (their stems being *drəgvañt-* and *ašavan-*). And in Avestan, adjectives can also be used as nouns that express the qualities of the adjective. Therefore, these two adjectives could be used for nouns that are people ~ 'untruthful one' and 'truthful one' ~ or nouns that are concepts, literally '(what is) truthful' and '(what is) untruthful' or in more fluent English 'truthfulness' and 'untruthfulness'.<sup>5</sup> All of our linguists have chosen to translate *drəgvañtəm* [although sg.] as untruthful/deceitful (etc.) people and *ašavanəm* [although sg.] as truthful people ~ an interpretive translation that is informed by the mind-set of religious paradigms which divide people into the 'damned' and the 'saved',<sup>6</sup> thus translating line c. in a way that has Zarathushtra saying that an untruthful person will be destroyed (or harmed) and a truthful person will be saved (or benefitted).<sup>7</sup>

Yet a fundamental tenet in Zarathushtra's thought is that everyone will be 'saved' (from untruth). And Zarathushtra repeatedly speaks of destroying bad qualities, not the people who have such qualities (in mixed degrees). Indeed, we have a parallel idea expressed in Y49.3, where he says, "...truth [a quality] is to be saved for its (good) preference, that deceit [a quality] is to be destroyed for its (false) profession..." Y49.3, Insler 1975. And there are many other examples as well. A few have been footnoted.<sup>8</sup>

Not only is destroying people contrary to the Gathas and later texts, but it is illogical, in that even if an untruthful person is killed, he is not 'destroyed' because his soul survives physical death.

Moreover in the Gathas harming, destroying, are qualities that are the opposite of the true order of existence (*aša-*),<sup>9</sup> which is the existence of Wisdom. Zarathushtra's conception of the Divine is a being who is wholly good.<sup>10</sup> To say that a being who is wholly good can destroy or harm a person who is by nature fallible, is a contradiction in terms, an oxymoron ... (and other impolite things).

Even when, under the law of consequences (which is part of the true (good) order of existence) the evil we do comes back to us, this is not to harm us. It is to benefit us by enlarging our understanding, changing our preferences from mixed (bad/more good) ones to those that are wholly good ~ an all good end which brings satisfaction to everyone ~ including eventually, all of us who at one time or another have chosen wrongfully.

We see this all good end which satisfies everyone, in our verse Y51.9, in which Zarathushtra says 'The satisfaction which you give, O Wisdom, for both types (of conduct),...' Y51.9. Here, we know that *satisfaction* (a *xšnu-* word) means a 'pleased contented approval', for two reasons:

First: '*satisfaction*' in the sense of a 'pleased contented approval', fits each of the many instances in which a *xšnu-* word is used in the Gathas. Some translators have interpreted '*satisfaction*' as payment of a debt or penalty, or an atonement (detailed below). But that sense of the word does not fit any verse in which a *xšnu-* word is used in the Gathas.

Second: The words '*satisfaction*' and '*good*' are used interchangeably in 4 verses which speak of the soul refining process, indicating that the soul refining process results in a good end and satisfaction (a pleased, contented, approving state of mind) for all. These 4 verses are as follows. Notice, in each of them, it is through fire that the soul refining process is accomplished. Fire (in the Gathas and later texts) is the material metaphor for the true order of existence (of which the law of consequences and mutual, loving help are a part), and fire is also used as a metaphor for enlightenment ~ the (incremental) comprehension, embodiment, rule, of the true order of existence, generated by the soul refining process.

Of these 4 verses, here are the 2 '*good*' end verses.

In each of these verses the end for both types of conduct is '*good*'. The Av. word *vanhāu* is loc. sg. of the stem *vohu-* 'good', thus '*in-(the)-good [vanhāu]*'. I give you these 2 verses in the Insler 1975 translation (so that you do not wonder if I have molded the evidence to suit my conclusion). And I indicate in square brackets the GAv. words and my translation where it differs materially. Even if we assume (for the sake of argument) that Zarathushtra is referring to two factions (people) rather than two types of conduct, the '*good*' end applies to both ~ even in the Insler 1975 translation.

Y47.6: "Wise Lord, together with this [*spānta- mainyu-* 'beneficial way of being' ], Thou shalt give the distribution in the good [*vanhāu*] to both factions [*rānōibyā* 'for both types (of conduct)'],<sup>11</sup> through Thy fire, ...", Insler 1975.

Y31.19, "...when the distribution in the good [*vanhāu*] shall occur to both factions [*rānāyā* 'for both types (of conduct)'],<sup>12</sup> through Thy bright fire, Wise One." Insler 1975.

Here are the 2 'satisfaction' verses. The 2d one is our verse, Y51.9, which I give here in my translation (the translations of the linguists in our group are shown at the end of this chapter).

Y31.3: "That satisfaction [*x šnūtəm* acc. sg.] which Thou hast created for both factions [*rānōibyā* 'for both types (of conduct)'] together with Thy [*mainyu-* 'way of being'] and hast promised (to them) through fire and truth [*ašācā*], that commandment [*urvātəm* 'precept']<sup>13</sup> which is for Thy adherents ~ speak, Wise One, ... in order for us to know (all) that by means of which I might convert all the living." Insler 1975.

Y51.9: 'The satisfaction [*x šnūtəm* acc. sg.] which you give, O Wisdom, for both types (of conduct), through Your bright fire, through molten metal, (is) to be given for clarification among living beings, (is to be given) to destroy untruthfulness'. (Thus) You save truthfulness.' Y51.9, my translation.

As you can see, *satisfaction* ~ a pleased contented approval ~ is sg. in both these verses ~ one pleased, contented approval as the end result for both types of conduct (or even for both factions). There is a marked similarity between these two verses. But if you compare them, you will see this difference ~ that in Y31.3 Zarathushtra uses 'through fire and through truth [*ašācā*]', in describing the soul refining process, whereas in our verse Y51.9, he uses through ... fire, through molten metal' ~ substituting 'molten metal' in our verse for 'truth' in Y31.3. I think these are simply two different ways of describing the soul refining process, in that ~

In Y31.3, he uses *fire* (the material metaphor for the true order of existence *aša-*) because the law of consequences and mutual loving help (which are a part of *aša-*) operate in the material existence (hence the material metaphor *fire*) ~ adding 'and through truth [*ašācā*]' representing the incremental mental/spiritual enlightenment of the true order of existence, which the process generates ~ hence 'through fire and through truth [*ašācā*]'.

In our verse Y51.9, he uses 'through ... fire, through molten metal'. Why 'molten metal'? Well, to the ancients, the metal refining process involved applying fire to ore (a mix of metal and non-metallic 'impurities'), which, as the ore was melted by fire, resulted in destroying the 'impurities' and leaving what they would have thought of as 'pure' metal because (absent the necessary technology) they had no way of ascertaining or knowing that the nature of the 'pure' metal might include other (non-metallic) elements. Thus to their minds, the process of using fire to make ore molten, to produce 'pure' metal, was a metaphor for the soul refining process of using the true order of existence (*fire*) - the earned and unearned experiences of mortal life ~ to destroy our bad preferences, leaving only the good ones ('pure' *metal*) ~ an all-good state of being, which in Zarathushtra's thought is the true order of existence (*aša-*), which explains why in he substitutes through molten metal' (in Y51.9) for 'and through truth [*ašācā*]' (in Y31.3).

\* \* \* \* \*

Let us now consider the linguistics of the words in this verse, their meanings and how they are put together (syntax).

Line a. *yqm. x šnūtəm. rānōibyā. dā. / θwā. āθrā. sux rā. mazdā.*

a. '(The) satisfaction which you give, O Wisdom, for both types (of conduct), through Your bright fire,'

*yqm* 'which'

*yqm* is the form for only acc. sg. fem., of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*.<sup>14</sup> In this context, there is no other noun for which it could stand. It therefore belongs with acc. sg. fem. *x šnūtəm* (as all our linguists agree).

*x šnūtəm* 'the satisfaction'

Taraporewala 1951 comments that *x šnūtəm* is acc. sg. fem., identifying only its root (*x šnu-*), but not its stem.

Skjaervo 2006 tentatively conjectures the stem "*x šnūt-*?" which he thinks derives from *x šnu-* without identifying the gender of "*x šnūt-*?", and he shows *x šnūtəm* (in our verse and in Y31.3) as the only declension of this stem in all surviving GAv. texts, without identifying its case, number or gender.

But acc. sg. *x šnūtəm*, has to be fem. (as Taraporewala says) because in this context (as in Y31.3) *x šnūtəm* and its relative pronoun *yqm* would have to be in the same number/gender, and we know that *yqm* is only acc. sg. fem.

Why is this important?

Because, this linguistic information establishes that here (as in Y31.3) we have only one satisfaction (sg.) given by Wisdom for both types (of conduct). Thus, the same (one) 'satisfaction' cannot mean 'penalty', 'atonement' if it is also applicable to 'good' conduct. And this is so, even for those who translate *rānōibyā* as two factions or parties (i.e. two types of people instead of two types of conduct). The only way in which the same (one) 'satisfaction' can be applicable to both types (of conduct or people) is if through the refiner's fire of our life experiences (earned, unearned and mutual loving help), our good preferences are reinforced, and our bad preferences are changed to good ones ~ thus ultimately delivering a 'good' end ~ for everyone,<sup>15</sup> which would give 'satisfaction' (a pleased contentment) to everyone. Let us now consider the opinions of the translators in our group on the meaning of *x šnūtəm*.

Taraporewala 1951 states that *x šnūtəm* "derives from (the root) *x šnu-* 'to please, to satisfy', and means lit., 'that which would satisfy'..." but he translates *x šnūtəm* in this verse as "reward". He comments that Bartholomae thinks it means 'deserved reward' without explanation. But (with respect), the meaning "reward" is not at all the same as the meaning 'to please, to satisfy'. Not only are the two concepts different in essence, but even in application, a reward may or may not be pleasing or satisfying.

Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae translate *x šnūtəm* in this verse (Y51.9) as "recompense", which is another way of saying 'reward'; and in Y31.3 they translate *x šnūtəm* as "award".

Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *x šnūtəm* as "satisfaction", in this verse (Y51.9) and in Y31.3, without comment.

Insler 1975, translates *x šnūtəm* as "satisfaction", in this verse (Y51.9) without comment, but he comments on *x šnūtəm* "satisfaction" in Y31.3, and on a *x šnu-* word (*x šnāvīšā*) under Y28.1 as follows. Under Y31.3, he states that the stem of *x šnūtəm* is *x šnūt-*, from the root *x šnu* 'satisfy', and that *x šnūtəm* means "satisfaction" in a "legalistic" sense, quoting from one of the meanings of 'satisfaction' from an English dictionary as

"The payment in full of a debt, or the fulfillment of an obligation or claim ... the pecuniary or other gift or penalty, or the act, by which a debt or obligation is discharged or an offense attoned for".

And he concludes,

"This is exactly the sense in which *x šnūt-* appears in the Gathas. In general, almost all words pertaining to the final judgment are taken from the legal vocabulary."

A problem with this conclusion is that our verse (Y51.9) and Y31.3 are the only 2 Gatha verses in which any declension of the stem *x šnūt-* appears,<sup>16</sup> and there is no specific mention of any 'final judgment' (such as we see in Pahlavi texts) in either of these two verses, nor indeed in any other Gatha verse ~ except for interpretations that have been read into the text by a given translator.<sup>17</sup>

More importantly (and with respect), his analysis of the meanings of *x šnu* words is not consistent, in that on the one hand he interprets 'satisfy' as the satisfaction of a deity in receiving correct rituals (commenting under Y28.1), and on the other, as the satisfaction of a debt, obligation, penalty, attonement for an offense (commenting under Y31.3) ~ the two being quite different concepts of 'satisfaction' ~ neither of which fits the contexts in which *x šnu* words are used throughout the Gathas (detailed in a subsequent ft. herein).

For example, in Y28.1 (using the Insler 1975 translation) Zarathushtra says "...I first entreat ...Wise One, ... for (that) through which Thou mayest satisfy [*x šnāvīšā*] the determination of (my) good thinking..." Y28.1; *x šnāvīšā* is derived from the root *x šnu*. Commenting on *x šnāvīšā*, Insler 1975 says "For the root *x šnu* itself, I find the translation 'satisfy, gratify' suffices for the whole of the Avesta; cf. particularly *x šnūt-* at 31.3." He then (under Y28.1) points to 'satisfy, gratify' in a narrow meaning associated with the worshipper satisfying a deity by offering correct sacrifices and rituals in both YAv. and Ved. texts.<sup>18</sup> However, this particular narrow use of 'satisfaction' is not found in the Gathas, and does not fit the context of Y28.1 where it is Wisdom who is being asked to satisfy Zarathushtra ~ not a deity who is satisfied with correct rituals. Nor is Wisdom being asked to satisfy a debt or obligation or penalty or attonement for sin. Wisdom is being asked to satisfy Zarathushtra's thirst for answers in a way that will please or content a reasoning mind. So we see that 'satisfy' here is used in the sense of an approving or pleased or contented state of mind.

Insler in his comment under Y31.3, asserts (inconsistently with his comment on Y28.1) that the meaning of "satisfaction" is "legalistic", in the sense of payment of a debt, or fulfillment of an obligation or claim, or an offense attoned for (quoted in full above), ~ a meaning that is not at all the same as 'satisfy' in the sense of 'gratifying, pleasing' a deity through correct rituals. A moment's reflection makes it clear that the correct performance of a ritual is not a "legalistic" debt owed by the worshipper to a deity because there is no quid pro quo. What creates this 'debt'? What does the deity first (reliably) give to the worshipper which results in the worshipper incurring the debt of correctly performing a sacrifice or ritual?

In short, neither the "legalistic" meaning of satisfying a debt, etc., nor satisfying a deity through correct rituals is any kind of a contextual fit in any of the verses in which *x šnu* words are used (many times) throughout the Gathas. Each verse in the Gathas in which a *x šnu* word is used, is footnoted here for your convenient reference, so that you may judge for yourself.<sup>19</sup>



As the footnoted evidence establishes, the only meaning of *x šnu* words that consistently fits the *micro* context of each Gatha verse in which the *x šnu* word appears, as well as the *macro* context of Zarathushtra's thought in the Gathas as a whole, is 'satisfy, satisfaction' in the sense of 'an approving, pleased, contented state of mind'. Even if it is true that in the YAv. texts and the Vedas, this general meaning was used frequently in one particular, narrow context ~ the satisfaction or pleasing of a deity with the correct performance of a ritual or sacrifice ~ that particular context is not found in any Gatha verse which neither prescribe nor describe any rituals (although Zarathushtra uses certain items of the ritual ~ milk, bread, butter ~ as metaphors..

In short, *x šnūtəm* is used in our verse (Y51.9) in the same general sense as *x šnu* words are used throughout the Gathas ~ a 'satisfaction' that means 'a pleased, approving, contented state of mind' ~ a meaning that fits the *micro* context of this verse, its near parallel Y31.3, and all other applicable Gatha verses.

Thus, *yqm x šnūtəm ...*

'(The) satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*] which [*yqm*] ...'

*dā* 'you [sg.] give'

*dā* is aorist injunctive 2p sg. of the verb stem *dā-* which in the Gathas is used in various flavors ~ 'to give, to make, to establish, to assign' (and in middle voice 'to take, receive'), Skjaervo 2006. The linguists in our group have translated *dā* as it appears in Y51.9 and Y31.3 follows:

In Y51.9 *yqm x šnūtəm ... dā*

In Y31.3 *yqm dā ... x šnūtəm*

Insler 1975: in Y51.9 "The satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*] which Thou shalt give [*dā*]..."

In Y31.3 "The satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*] which Thou hast created [*dā*]..."

Humbach 1991: in Y51.9 "Which satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*] Thou apportionest [*dā*]..."

In Y31.3 "... the satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*] which Thou apportionest [*dā*] ..."

Humbach/Faiss 2010: in Y51.9 "Which satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*] you fix [*dā*] ..."

In Y31.3 "... which satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*] you fix [*dā*] ..."

Taraporewala 1951: in Y51.9 "The reward [*x šnūtəm*] which Thou bestowest [*dā*] ..."

In Y31.3 "What Thou~bestowest [*dā*]... the Bliss [*x šnūtəm*] ..."

Bartholomae: in Y51.9 "What recompense [*x šnūtəm*] thou wilt give [*dā*] ..."

In Y31.3 "What award [*x šnūtəm*] Thou givest [*dā*] ..."

Moulton's 1912 translation is the same as that of Bartholomae in both verses.

In my view, 'you [sg.] give' is the closest English equivalent for the aorist injunctive 2p sg. conjugation, as well as the flavor of meaning for *dā* in the context of this verse.

Thus *yqm x šnūtəm ... dā* 'the satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*] which [*yqm*] you give [*dā*]...'

*rānōibyā* 'for both types (of conduct)'

Linguists have conjectured that the stem of *rānōibyā* is *rāna-* (based on its inflected forms which correspond with Ved. inflections for *a-* stem masc./ntr. nouns/adjs., indicating various grammatical values). There seems to be general agreement that *rānōibyā* is dat. du. of the stem *rāna-*. But there the agreement ends.

The meaning of *rāna-* has not yet been successfully decoded. Even eminent linguists have not yet discovered a cognate in any other ancient Indo-European language nor a contextual use in YAv. texts, which conclusively establishes a parallel (or even close) meaning for GAv. *rāna-* in the Gatha verses in which it appears, where it is always du. (as in our verse Y51.9), except possibly for one verse (Y43.12) in which its form is pl. according to some mss. and du. according to others. And the opinions of linguists regarding its meaning are all entirely guess work ~ ranging from 'thigh', 'leg', 'scales (as in weighing)', 'balance', 'factions', and 'parties' ~ some of them unabashedly reading into Gatha verses interpretations that are not supported by either the words or the *micro* contexts of the verses in which *rāna-* words appear, let alone the *macro* context of the Gathas in their entirety. The opinions of linguists on *rāna-* words have been explored in great detail in another chapter.<sup>20</sup>

Just to summarize, (and with respect):

I do not find the following opinions persuasive, because they do not fit contextually:

Skjaervo 2006 'thigh, leg';

Humbach and Faiss 'balance' (associated with a weighing scale),

Insler 1975 'two factions' (which he thinks represent the 'good' and the 'bad').

Bartholomae, Moulton (1912) and Taraporewala (1951) 'two parties' which they think represent 'believers and unbelievers' ~ a view that reflects the much later mind-set of much later historical Zoroastrianism, and parenthetically (historical) Christianity and (historical) Islam.

I am not persuaded that in choosing the du. *rānōibyā* Zarathushtra intended to divide humanity into two parties or factions ~ neither 'believers' and 'unbelievers' (because to Zarathushtra the 'enemy' is untruth, not another religion),<sup>21</sup> nor even the 'good' and the 'bad' (because no person is all good or all bad, as Zarathushtra himself realizes, in that he speaks of two primeval ways of being (within each of us) which express themselves in thought, word and action ~ the 'more good' and the 'bad' and between which we must choose correctly (Y30.3).

Yet in all of the verses in which a *rāna-* word is used (with one possible exception), it is the du. declension that Zarathushtra chooses, and the contexts in which *rāna-* words are used indicate that to him the meaning includes a contrast ~ two types (of something).

In the Gathas, the contrast and conflict is between ideas ~ the true (correct) order of existence (*aša-*) and its opposite (*druj-*) ~ Zarathushtra's objective being to "deliver deceit [*druj-* 'untruth'] into the hands of truth [*aša-*]" (Y30.8, Y44.14, Insler 1975), with the choices we make in thought, word and action ~ the *macro* context. In some verses the contrast is between 2 alternatives (or choices).

Taking all these factors into consideration, I think the most accurate English equivalent (but still a guess) for is *rāna-* is 'type (of conduct, of choices, of alternative)'. Thus when du. 'both types (of conduct etc.)' and if pl. '(all or many) types (of conduct etc.)'. This English equivalent fits the *micro* context of each verse in which a *rāna-* word appears and the *macro* context of the Gathas.<sup>22</sup> And in our verse, the dat. du. *rānōibyā* requires 'for both types (of conduct)'.

Thus *yqm. x šnūtəm. rānōibyā. dā̌.*

'The satisfaction [*x šnūtəm*] which [*yqm*] you give [*dā̌*] for both types [*rānōibyā.*] (of conduct), ...'.



*θwā* 'through Your [sg.] or 'through Thy'

*θwā* is one of the forms of instr. sg. ('by/with/through \_\_\_\_') of the 2p personal pronoun *tū-* 'thou', or 'you' [sg.].<sup>23</sup> And that is exactly how all of the linguists in our group have translated *θwā* ~ 'through Thy/Your [sg.]'.

*āθrā sux rā* 'through (Your) bright fire'.

*āθrā* is instr. sg. of the masc. stem *ātar-* 'fire' (Skjaervo 2006), which is exactly how all our linguists have translated it.

*sux rā* is instr. sg. (all agree); but its meaning is more difficult to ascertain. It appears in only 2 Gatha verses Y31.19 and our verse Y51.9 ~ both of which are about the soul refining process which is linked with fire in each of these verses.<sup>24</sup>

Skjaervo 2006 shows *sux rā* as instr. sg. masc. of the adj. stem *sux ra-* derived from *saok-*: 'glowing, burning', citing a Ved. cognate *śukrá*.

Taraporewala 1951 translates instr. sg. *sux rā* as "radiant" in Y31.19, "blazing" in our verse Y51.9. He takes *sux rā* to originally mean 'bright' or 'blazing', from the Av. root *suc*, *suk* (Skt. *śuc*). He comments in passing that Jackson mentions that the Persian *surkh* means 'scarlet', whereas Skt. *śukrá* is 'white' ~ and states that it is "extremely hazardous" to base any arguments upon the names of colours found in ancient texts (explaining his view with examples).<sup>25</sup>

Bartholomae, Moulton 1912, Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010, translate *sux rā* as "red" in Y31.19 and Y51.9 without comment on that word.

Insler 1975 translates *sux rā* as "pure" in our verse (Y51.9) and as "bright" in Y31.19, without comment on that word.

My take? Well, it is true that fire when associated with molten metal, is a purifying agent. And fire as a metaphor for the true order of existence which would be deemed 'pure' in that there is nothing 'wrong' or 'false' in the true order of existence, which is wholly good, wholly beneficial.<sup>26</sup> But Insler has not mentioned any specific linguistic connection between *sux rā* and "pure" in Ved. or any other Indo-European language. I therefore am inclined to stick with the simple and obvious ~ fire is a form of light, and therefore 'bright'. The choice of this epithet for fire is corroborated by the ways in which 'fire' is used in the Gathas for enlightenment (itself a metaphor for a mind filled with light). And in this line of our verse, fire belongs to Wisdom (the Enlightened Divine) ~ 'through (Your) bright fire [*θwā āθrā sux rā*]' as well as the (incremental) enlightenment generated through the soul-refining process (in line b.) through 'molten metal'. I therefore follow Taraporewala, Skjaervo and Insler (in Y31.19) for the meaning of Av. *sux ra-* "bright", as best fitting the way it is used.

*mazdā* 'O Wisdom'

*mazdā* is voc. sg. of the stem *mazdā-*, and is Zarathushtra's most used name for the Divine in the Gathas.<sup>27</sup> In the GAv. text of line a., *mazdā* appears at the end. In English, it makes no difference if this word naming the Divine comes after 'you give', or at the end of line a.

Which gives us for line a. *yqm x šnūtəm rānōibyā dā / θwā āθrā sux rā mazdā*

a. 'the satisfaction which you give, for both types (of conduct), through Your bright fire, O Wisdom,'

Or 'The satisfaction which you give, O Wisdom, for both types (of conduct), through Your bright fire,'

\* \* \*

Line b. *ayaṇhā x šustā aibī / ahvāhū dax štam dāvōi*

b. 'through molten metal, (is) to be given for clarification among living beings'

*ayaṇhā x šustā* 'through molten metal'

*x šustā* is instr. sg. of the adj. stem *x šusta-* derived from *x šaod-* 'to flow, be liquid' (Skjaervo 2006). *ayaṇhā* is instr. sg. of the ntr. stem *ayah-* 'metal' (Skjaervo 2006), which could not have been iron, because the melting point of iron is 1,528 degrees C ~ too high for such ancient furnaces as would have existed in Zarathushtra's society ~ even giving him his latest date.<sup>28</sup> The GAv. instr. would be translated into English using one of the prepositions 'by/through/with'. The term *ayaṇhā x šustā* has been translated by our linguists as follows:

Insler 1975 as "through ... molten iron"

Humbach 1991, as "(by the ordeal) with molten metal"

Humbach/Faiss 2010 as "by the molten metal"

Taraporewala 1951 as "through-the-Fiery-Test"

Bartholomae as "by the molten metal"

Moulton 1912 "by the molten metal".

*ahvāhū* 'among living beings'

This word has been variously translated.

Skjaervo 2006 conjectures the fem. stem *ahvā-*, with the loc. pl. *ahvāhū* in our verse (Y51.9) being the only use of the word in all surviving GAv. texts. The loc. is translated into English with the prepositions as 'in/on/under/among/at /upto' and other such location related words.

In understanding *ahvāhū*, we need to know that *ah-* is the verb 'to be', 'to exist'; and a noun derived from it is *ahu-* 'existence'.

Insler 1975 conjectures that the stem is *ahvā-*, and he translates *ahvāhū* as loc. pl. "among living beings"; commenting that *ahvā-* 'living being' corresponds to *ahu-* 'existence, world', just as *gaēθā-* 'creature' corresponds to *gaya-* 'life'.

Humbach 1991 translates *ahvāhū* as loc. pl. "in (our) vital energies"; commenting that *ahvā-* means 'vital energy, fervour' ~ without any explanation as to the source(s) from which he derives this meaning.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "to the minds", (not a loc. pl. translation) without comment on this word.

Taraporewala 1951 "for-(our-Inner)-Lives; commenting that Bartholomae takes *ahvāhū* as loc. pl. of a (conjectured) stem *aṇhvā-* (*ahvā-*), which he translates as 'Soul-force'; Taraporewala says he agrees with Bartholomae, (however Taraporewala's translation is not loc.).

Bartholomae "in our souls" loc. pl.

Moulton 1912 is the same as Bartholomae's translation.

I am persuaded by Insler's analogy, and take *ahvāhū* as loc. pl. 'among living beings', which fits the *micro* context of this verse in that the soul refining process occurs in living beings.

*dax štam* 'clarification'

Needless to say, our linguists differ ~ perhaps because they see 'molten metal' in this verse as an ordeal, a test ~ giving a 'sign' ~ indicating guilt or innocence.

Skjaervo 2006 has lots of question marks, for both the stem, the declension *dax štam*, and its meaning ~ (thinking that the stem *dax š-* could mean "to \*benefit, \*mark (?) and that *dax štam* may be a participle in nom./acc. sg. ntr. "(?)" form).

Insler 1975 translates *dax štam* as "a sign".

Humbach 1991 as "clear".

Humbach/Faiss 2010 as "a sign".

Taraporewala 1951 as "an indication".

Bartholomae (and Moulton 1912) as "a sign".

Beekes 1988 shows the root *dax š* which he says means 'please, teach, reveal' (p. 206). In the context of line b., 'please' does not fit at all; 'teach' would probably fit because the soul-refining process (for which molten metal is a metaphor) does indeed teach us lessons as part of an evolutionary process. But in my view, the sense of 'reveal, make clear' is the best fit (which in noun form, *dax štam*, would be 'clarification'), because the soul refining process incrementally makes clear to us ~ in the 1,001 choices and experiences of our lives ~ what is (or is not) true, good, right ~ in all its aspects ~ physical and abstract, matter and mind/spirit.

*aibī ... dāvōi* '(is) to be given for'

*aibī*: Skjaervo 2006, Beekes 1988 and Taraporewala 1951 agree that *aibī* is cognate with Ved. *abhi*, (Beekes adding that it is related to Old Persian *abiy*).<sup>29</sup>

Skjaervo 2006 thinks that *aibī* belongs with the verb *dāvōi*. He does not give a meaning for *aibī ... dāvōi*, but says that *aibī* + dat. means 'for'.

*dāvōi*: Skjaervo 2006 shows *dāvōi* as one of the infinitive forms of the verb *dā-* (the meanings of which include 'give, make, establish, assign'). In the preceding line, the verb *dā* means 'you give'. I therefore think in line b., of all available *dā-* flavors, Zarathushtra intended 'give' as well. The infinitive form of which in English would be 'to give'. Taraporewala 1951 comments that *dāvōi* is a "dat." infinitive from *dā-*.

Our linguists have translated *aibī ... dāvōi* as follows:

Insler 1975: "is to be given as"

Humbach 1991: "make" (an imperative value, not infinitive); he suggested two alternatives for *aibī*, (i) that it could belong with *dāvōi*, and (ii) that it could belong with *ahvāhū*.

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "to attach" (an infinitive value, but I have not seen *dā-* used as 'attach'; perhaps this interpretation has been influenced by translating *dax štam* as "a sign" (of guilt or innocence) which in turn has been influenced by seeing 'molten metal' as a test to determine guilt or innocence, requiring "a sign" ~ a chain of interpretations, the accuracy of which depends on whether their perception of 'molten metal' is what Zarathushtra intended.

Bartholomae (and Moulton 1912): "give" (an imperative value, not infinitive).

Taraporewala 1951 "(this) doth-lead-to (Thy) granting"; commenting he agrees that *aibī* belongs with *dāvōi*, and says that Bartholomae takes it as an adv. But Taraporewala does not think that *aibī* is an adverb. He states that its Ved. cognate *abhi* originally meant 'face to face' (citing a Ved. example), then it came to mean 'in front of'; "and "with a further semantic change" it implies

'reaching upto', 'leading up to'," citing an example from the Rig Veda which he translates as "leading upto all felicity."

Beekes classifies *aibī* as among the "very old adverbs" ~ and states that it means 'towards'.<sup>30</sup>

As a practical matter (regarding the meaning), if *dax štam* means 'clarification', then for *aibī*, Beekes' "towards" [clarification], and Taraporewala's "leading up to" [clarification], are simply two ways of saying the same thing. And, what is more important, they both show the incremental nature of the clarification obtained through the soul refining process. Unfortunately, I have not been able to find an English equivalent, that includes this incremental flavor ('towards', 'leading up to'), that is grammatically correct, and reasonably fluent.

I translate *aibī ... dāvōi* '(is) to be given for', which is close to Insler's choice for *dāvōi* '(is) to be given as'. I think *aibī* belongs with *dāvōi* for the following additional (syntactic) reason.

In the phrase *aibī ahvāhū dax štam dāvōi*, the verb *aibī ... dāvōi* '(is) to be given for' frames or encapsulates its indirect and direct objects *ahvāhū dax štam* 'clarification among living beings', indicating that the framing and framed words form one unit of thought. True, this framing here occurs across the caesura (the poetic break in the line), but there are other instances of 'framing' in GAv. syntax which also occur across the caesura.<sup>31</sup>

Let us now look at lines a. and b. in context (with my translation choices).

- a. *yqm x šnūtəm rānōibyā dā ̥ ̥wā āθrā suxrā mazdā*  
 b. *ayaṇhā x šustā aibī ahvāhū dax štam dāvōi*

- a. 'The satisfaction which you give, O Wisdom, for both types (of conduct), through Your bright fire,'  
 b. through molten metal, (is) to be given for clarification among living beings,'

Which brings us to line c.

\* \* \*

Line c. *rāšayēhē drəgvantəm / savayō ašavanəm*

Line c. '(is to be given) to destroy untruthfulness. (Thus) You save truthfulness.'

I think the first half of line c. belongs with lines a. and b.

The 2d half of line c. summarizes what Wisdom accomplishes as a result of the preceding events and ideas described in the entire verse.

I will comment on the syntax (including the propriety of adding these implied words) at the end of the discussion on this line c.

*rāšayēhē drəgvantəm* "(is to be given) to destroy untruthfulness.'

*rāšayēhē* is the infinitive form of the verb stems "raš-, pres. denom. *rāšaya-*" Skjaervo 2006 which he translates as 'to harm'. He shows only one conjugation of this verb ~ *rāšayēhē* ~ which appears in our verse (Y51.9), and in only one other verse (Y49.3) in all surviving GAv. texts.<sup>32</sup>

In Y49.3 we have the phrase: *varənāi ... ašəm sūidyāi / tkaēšāi rāšayēhē drux š*

Literally, 'truth (is) to be saved for (its good) preference; for (its false) teaching [*tkaēšāi*] untruth [*drux š*] (is) to be destroyed [*rāšayēhē*]. ...' my translation.

The Insler 1975 translation is "...that the truth is to be saved for its (good) preference, that deceit is to be destroyed for its (false) profession. ..." Y49.3. But in our verse, Y51.9, his translation does not give *rāṣayenḥē* an infinitive value ('to be destroyed'). Our linguists translate *rāṣayenḥē* in these two verses as follows.

Insler 1975: In Y51.9, "in order to destroy". In Y49.3 "is to be destroyed".

Humbach 1991: In Y51.9, "to harm". In Y49.3 "in order to harm".

and Humbach/Faiss 2010: In Y51.9, "to harm". In Y49.3 "to harm (us)".

Taraporewala 1951: In Y51.9, "shall-have~frustration". In Y49.3 "shall be frustrated". (Neither one in the infinitive).

Bartholomae and Moulton 1912 in Y51.9 "the bringing of ruin" (not infinitive). Their translation of Y49.3 is too 'free' for me to figure out how they translate *rāṣayenḥē* there.

*drəgvantəm* is acc. sg. of the adj. *drəgvant-* (Skjaervo 2006), which in this context is used as a noun. All of our translators interpret the noun to mean people. But Beekes shows that *drəgvant-* is an adj. (although he spells it *drugvant-* believing that to have been its original GAv. form), p. 118. And in this context, it would not be consistent with Zarathushtra's thought to translate it as a noun meaning people. Insler 1975 and Taraporewala 1951 translate *drəgvantəm* as plural people, but there can be no dispute that *drəgvantəm* is sg. (the acc. pl. would be *drəgvatō* Skjaervo 2006; Jackson 1892).<sup>33</sup>

Insler 1975 *rāṣayenḥē drəgvantəm* "in order to destroy the deceitful" (pl. people)

Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010 "to harm the deceitful one" (sg. person)

Taraporewala 1951 "that the Untruthful shall-have~frustration". (pl. people)

Bartholomae and Moulton 1912 "the bringing of ruin to the Liar." (sg. person)

I have already discussed (under the *Discussion* section above) why I think *rāṣayenḥē* means 'to destroy', and why the adj. *drəgvantəm* is used here for a noun that is a concept ~ untruthfulness, or literally '(what is) untruthful' ~ rather than for a noun 'untruthful person'.

*savayō aṣavanəm* 'You save truthfulness.'

All of our linguists translate *savayō* as a verb, but their translations do not give it the same grammatical value. This may simply have been a function of translation style. But I have repeatedly found that when I stay (as closely as possible) to the actual grammatical value of a GAv. word, it allows Zarathushtra's intent to come through more clearly ~ rather than the interpretation of the translator.

Skjaervo 2006 shows *savayō* as the 2p sg. injunctive form of the verb stems *sao-*, *savaya-*. Thus 'you [sg.] save'. Beekes shows that *aṣavan-* is an adj. (although he spells it *artavan-* believing that to have been its original GAv. form), p. 120.

And there is no dispute *aṣavanəm* is acc. sg. of the adj. stem *aṣavan-* (the acc. pl. in GAv. would be *aṣāunō*, Skjaervo 2006; Jackson 1892 § 313 p. 91). Nevertheless, some of our linguists translate it here as pl. (which is incorrect). Here the adj. *aṣavanəm* is used as a noun ~ in my view representing a concept, 'truthfulness' or literally '(what is) truthful'; but in the opinions of our linguists the noun is a truthful one (sg.) or the truthful (pl.) who will be saved ~ reflecting the idea of people being divided into two groups, the damned and the saved ~ a religious paradigm that is alien to the Gathas and later texts. Our linguists have translated *savayō aṣavanəm* as follows.

Insler 1975: "and to save the truthful." (acc. pl. people ~ there is no "and" in the GAv. text).

Humbach 1991: "Thou dost benefit the truthful one."; (acc. sg. a person)

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "you benefit/save the truthful one."; (acc. sg. a person)

Taraporewala 1951: "(and) the Truthful shall~have~blessings."; (acc. pl. people)

Bartholomae and Moulton 1912: " the bringing ... of blessing to the Righteous." (dat. pl. people)

I have already explained (in the *Discussion* section above) why I think the adj. *aṣavanəm* is here used as a noun that means a concept ~ literally '(what is) truthful'; but more fluently 'truthfulness'.

Which brings us to the syntax of line c.

All of our translators see line c. as one syntactic unit. But if we give each word in this line its true grammatical value, it cannot accurately be one unit of thought and still be consonant with Zarathushtra's thought. Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 do indeed give each word its true grammatical value. Humbach 1991 inserts a period at the end of line b. and shows line c. as a separate sentence. Humbach/Faiss 2010 insert a colon at the end of line b., but nevertheless see line c. as one unit of thought.

Humbach 1991: "To harm the deceitful one, Thou dost benefit the truthful one." Y51.9.

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "to harm the deceitful one you benefit/save the truthful one." Y51.9.

But, with respect, this does not accord with Zarathushtra's teachings. No place does he say that Wisdom benefits a truthful person in order to harm a deceitful person. In other words, harming a deceitful person is not what motivates Wisdom to benefit or save a truthful one anywhere in the Gathas, and indeed such a thought is contrary to what Zarathushtra does repeatedly say, in 1,001 different ways ~ that a commitment to advance truth should be for its own sake ~ truth for the truth,<sup>34</sup> and that ultimately (through the law of consequences and mutual loving help) everyone will make it ~ both those who choose what is false and those who choose truth.<sup>35</sup>

In my view, the only way to give each word in line c. its true grammatical value, and also arrive at a translation that is consistent with Zarathushtra's thought, is to take the first half of line c. as belonging with lines a. and b. Then the 2d half of line c. states the desired result which Wisdom accomplishes through everything in the foregoing lines. Thus

a. *yqm. x šnūtəm. rānōibyā. dā.* / *θwā. āθrā. sux rā. mazdā.*

b. *ayaṇhā. x šustā. aibī.* / *ahvāhū. dax štəm. dāvōi.*

c. *rāšayenjhē. drəgvantəm.* / *savayō. aṣavanəm. ♀*

a. 'The satisfaction which you give, O Wisdom, for both types (of conduct), through Your bright fire,'

b. 'through molten metal, (is) to be given for clarification among living beings'

c. '(is to be given) to destroy untruthfulness. (Thus) You save truthfulness.' Y51.9.

True, I have added implied words in round parentheses (in line c.) in order to make this syntax work.

The first implied phrase in line c., is previously expressed in line b., and is thus consistent with normal Avestan usage in which words previously stated often are subsequently implied.

The second implied phrase is a connecting phrase. It is not unusual in translating GAv. phrases, to insert an implied connecting English phrase in order to make the English translation fluent. Insler



himself has added the implied English words 'in order' at the start of line c. (although he has not placed them in round parentheses). And if you study the translations of other verses by linguists in our group, you will see similar connecting phrases which are implied to make the English translation fluent (although most often not placed in round parentheses). So in my view the second half of line c. summarizes what Wisdom accomplishes as a result of the process described in the entire verse.

You may well question: if this had been Zarathushtra's intent, why did he not place a small punctuation symbol ∴ (the equivalent of our 'period'), after the end of the first half of line c.? Well, the Gathas were composed to be sung. And its sentence endings would have been handled by the music. The punctuation we have today originated with the scribes who copied and recopied the texts down through the centuries, after they had been committed to writing. I think punctuation in the mss. is important, and should not be ignored. But it is not controlling. It is just one factor that has to be taken into consideration when determining syntax.<sup>36</sup> And in many, many Gatha verses, at least some (if not all) of the linguists in our group have placed periods (or as the English say, 'full stops') within a verse, where there is no corresponding small bunch of grapes (∴) in the GAv. text to denote the end of a sentence.

\* \* \* \* \*

Here again is my translation, and the translations of the linguists in our group, so that you can compare and evaluate them in context.

- a. *yqm. x šnūtəm. rānōibyā. dā. / θwā. āθrā. sux rā. mazdā.*  
 b. *ayaṇhā. x šustā. aibī. / ahvāhū. dax štəm. dāvōi.*  
 c. *rāšayenḥē. drəgvantəm. / savayō. ašavanəm. ∴*

My translation:

- a. 'The satisfaction which you give, Wisdom, for both types (of conduct), through Your bright fire,'  
 b. 'through molten metal, (is) to be given for clarification among living beings';  
 c. '(is to be given) to destroy untruthfulness'. (Thus) You save truthfulness.' 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 and to save the truthful." Y51.9

Humbach 1991:

- a. "Which satisfaction Thou apportionest by means of Thy red fire, according to balance, O Wise One,  
 b. "(by the ordeal) with molten metal, make that clear in (our) vital energies.  
 c. "To harm the deceitful one, Thou dost benefit the truthful one." Y51.9.

Humbach/Faiss 2010:

"Which satisfaction you fix with the balance by your red fire, O Wise One, (and) by the molten metal ~ to attach a sign (of that) to the minds: to harm the deceitful one you benefit/save the truthful one." Y51.9.

Taraporewala 1951:

- a. "The reward which Thou bestowest on~both~parties through Thy blazing Fire, O Mazda,  
 b. "through~the~Fiery Test (this) doth~lead~to (Thy) granting an indication for~(our~Inner)~Lives;

c. "that the Untruthful shall~have~frustration, (and) the Truthful shall~have~blessings." Y51.9

Moulton 1912 whose translation is identical with that of Bartholomae:

"What recompense thou wilt give to the two parties by they red Fire, by the molten Metal, give us a sign of it in our souls ~ even the bringing of ruin to the Liar, of blessing to the Righteous." Y51.9.

\* \* \* \* \*

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to Skjaervo 2006 are to his on-line *Old Avestan Glossary*.

For Y51.9:

Insler 1975 ~ his translation is at p. 105; his (very few) comments on this verse are at p. 315.

Humbach 1991 ~ his translation is in Vol. 1, p. 188; his comments on this verse in Vol. 2, pp. 226 - 227

Humbach/Faiss 2010 ~ their translation is at pp. 154 - 155; their brief comment at p. 191

Taraporewala 1951 ~ his translation is at p. 271; his comments are on pp. 272 - 273; and he includes Bartholomae's English translation at p. 273

Moulton 1912. His translation and fts. are at p. 385. His translation is identical to Bartholomae's English translation as shown in Taraporewala 1951.

For Y31.3:

Insler 1975 ~ his translation is at p. 37; his comments on this verse are at p. 315.

Humbach 1991 ~ his translation is in Vol. 1, pp. 126 - 127; his comments on this verse in Vol. 2, pp. 60 - 61.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 ~ their translation is at p. 84; their brief comment at p. 172.

Taraporewala 1951 ~ his translation is at p. 178; his comments are at pp. 179 - 182; and he includes Bartholomae's English translation at p. 182.

Moulton 1912. His translation and ft. are at p. 352. His translation is identical to Bartholomae's English translation as shown in Taraporewala 1951.

<sup>2</sup> See *Part Six: Yasna 32.7*.

<sup>3</sup> See *Part Two: Light, Glory, Fire*, which includes quotations from the YAv. *Atash Nyaish* which show fire as beneficent, a full source of healing, of knowledge, of wisdom, of the understanding that continues to grow, which is not acquired by learning (i.e. the wisdom within). 'Healing' existence means to heal it from untruth. See the explanation of *frašō.kərāiti-* in *Part Three: Heaven In Other Avestan Texts*.

<sup>4</sup> See *Part Six: Yasna 43.12*.

<sup>5</sup> See *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant*.

<sup>6</sup> All of the linguists in our group have this mind~set (except that Taraporewala who sees damnation in 'hell' in the Gathas, but does not think that hell is eternal). This mind~set is discussed ~ and its flaws are exposed ~ in some detail in *Part Six: Yasna 43.12*. And Insler 1975, in his introductory comments on Yasna 51, (p. 310) referring to verse 6, says "so that he my save those who shall follow in the true ways of their lord and damn those who reject his means of salvation (6)." ~ the "(6)" indicating Y51.6 ~ a mind~set which informs his interpretation of our verse Y51.9 as well. But there is no mention of 'damnation', or 'hell' in an afterlife in Y51.6 ~ just a few ambiguities inherent in the Avestan language which have been interpreted (not just by Insler) to refer to such ideas ~ ideas that are absent from the Gathas. For a discussion of Y51.6 (and other verses) see *Part Three: Apema, One of Many Ends*.

<sup>7</sup> True, in Y47.5, Zarathushtra speaks of truthful and untruthful persons, "... Thou hast promised for the truthful person [*aṣāunē*] what indeed are the very best things [*vahištā*]. (But) the deceitful man [*drəgvā*] shall

have his share apart from Thy approval,..." Y47.5, Insler 1975. But here Zarathushtra does not divide humanity into 2 factions. He speaks of a person who is truthful, and a person who is untruthfully ~ as we all are at one time or another. It is a person's choices that make him at any given moment a 'truthful' or 'deceitful' person. It is his choices that generates applicable consequences.

<sup>8</sup> Here are a few examples in which it is a bad quality that is defeated, not a person who might have such a quality (in whatever mixed degree).

"... If, ... one shall defeat deceit [*drūj-*] by truth [*aša-*],..."Y48.1, Insler 1975.

"... to those, Lord, who shall deliver deceit [*drūj-*] into the hands of truth [*aša-*]." Y30.8, Insler 1975;

"... How might I deliver deceit [*drūj-*] into the hands of truth [*aša-*],..." Y44.14, Insler 1975.

See *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant* for a more detailed discussion of this idea.

<sup>9</sup> See *Part One: Truth, Asha*.

<sup>10</sup> See *Part One: The Nature of the Divine*.

<sup>11</sup> *rānōibiyā* is instr./dat./abl. du. according to Humbach/Faiss 2010 § 37.2, p. 71. In this instance, I think the context requires a dat. translation.

<sup>12</sup> I think *rqnayā* here (in Y31.19) means 'for both types (of conduct)'. True, *rqnayā* is gen. du. (which would make it literally 'of both types (of conduct)'), but I think this is one of those instances in which the Av. gen. is translated into an English dat. (See Skjaervo 2003, Lessons 12 and 13). The Insler 1975 translation of the gen. *rqnayā* here also has a dat. flavor ('to/for \_\_\_\_') except that he translates *rqnayā* as two factions ("to both factions [*rqnayā*]" Insler 1975) instead of 'for two types (of conduct)'.

<sup>13</sup> In this verse Y31.3, Insler 1975 translates *urvātām* (stem *urvāta-*) as 'commandment'; but in his comment under Y44.15 Insler he translates *urvātāiš* (dat. pl. of *urvāta-*) as "precepts" instead of "commandments", commenting that the phrase *avāiš urvātāiš* ('with those precepts') is parallel to the phrase *θwahyā mqθrāiš sānghahyā* 'the precepts of Thy teaching' in the preceding verse Y44.14, and the phrase *θwā pōi sānghā* 'to protect in accord with Thy teaching' in the verse that follows (Y44.16), pp. 249 - 250.

<sup>14</sup> Skjaervo 2006, *Old Avestan*, Lesson 3, p. 26; Jackson 1892, § 399, p. 114.

<sup>15</sup> See *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution*.

<sup>16</sup> For the conjectured stem *xšnūt-* Skjaervo 2006 shows the following (he is the only linguist in our group who translates this word as 'rejection' but indicates uncertainty). He shows:

"*xšnūt-* ? : \*rejection. -- OI *hnu-*

*xšnūtām* Y31.3, Y51.9 "

These are the two verses discussed in this chapter, except that I have followed Geldner's Av. script in transliterating it ~ *xšnūtām*].

Skjaervo 2006 shows the following additional noun form *xšnūm* which he thinks derives from *xšnu*, but Insler, Humbach and Humbach/Faiss disagree, and think this noun is a form of the stem *xšnā-* 'knowledge', etc.

Skjaervo 2006 noun: "*xšnū-* ? : favor, approval.

*xšnūm* Y48.12, Y53.2." (no declension shown by Skjaervo).

Skjaervo 2006 also shows verb forms and an adj. deriving from the root *xšnu*:

Verb: "x šnao- , pres. x šnaoša-, aor. x šnāu- / x šnu-; active voice: to favor; middle voice 'to seek the favor of'.

x šnaošan Ind 3p pl. Y30.5

x šnaošāi Su 1p sg. Mid. Y46.1

x šnaošāmnō Pr.Pt. Mid. nom. sg. masc. Y46.18

x šnāuš aor inj 3p sg. Y46.1, Y46.13, Y51.12

x šnāvīšā aor. op. 2p sg. Mid. Y28.1."

Adjective: "cix šnuša- < x šnao- : 'wishes to please'.

cix šnušō nom. sg. masc. Y32.8, Y43.15, Y45.9

cix šnušā instr. sg. masc. ntr. (?) Y49.1." (The question mark is Skjaervo's).

The Gatha verses in which these words are found, and how they have been translated, are detailed in another footnote in this chapter.

<sup>17</sup> The fact that there is no mention of 'final judgment' in the Gathas and that all such interpretations are personal to a given translator, is detailed in *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise & Hell*; and *Part Three: Apema, One of Many Ends*.

<sup>18</sup> Insler 1975 supports his conclusion that x šnu words mean 'satisfy, gratify, appease', by explaining that the root x šnu is cognate with Vedic *ni hnu* 'satisfy, appease, gratify', and *āpa hnu* 'displease', that in Ved. texts *ni hnu* "is employed uniformly in passages which describe the appeasement of a god (or the sacrifice itself), who would be angered by a certain incorrect ritual action" (giving an example) and states that "This corresponds exactly to the usual Av. usage of x šnu in sacrificial contexts, [giving 3 YAv. examples] where x šnūta- 'gratified' is opposed frequently to *ṭbišta-* 'angered'." And he concludes that "Zarathushtra employs x šnu in a broader sense ... but this extended usage also appears in Ved. *āpa hnu* 'displease', [giving a Rig Ved. example]. " (Insler 1975 pp. 118 - 119).

The problem with these conclusions is that they are not supported by any of the many uses of x šnu in the Gathas (detailed in a ft. herein).

<sup>19</sup> Words derived from the root x šnu appear in many Gatha verses ~ as verbs, nouns and adjs., ~ in various grammatical forms. Because linguists have expressed various (sometimes conflicting) views regarding the meanings of x šnu words, we need to look at how each such word is used in the Gathas, in order to ascertain what of meaning(s) Zarathushtra had in mind, based on the context in which he uses them. Therefore, I will focus on the meanings of the words. I will not analyze their grammatical values (except to the extent relevant to meaning).

Skjaervo 2006 shows the following verbs, nouns and an adjective which our group of linguists all agree are derived from the root x šnu which they variously translate as 'satisfy, gratify, please, approve, reward'. I have omitted x šnūm in Y48.12 and Y53.2, because our translators differ regarding whether that word is a declension of x šnā- 'knowledge', (etc.) or is derived from the root x šnu 'satisfy'. All remaining Gatha verses using x šnu words are given here ~ 14 in all ~ a large number enabling its decoding with greater certainty based on its contextual uses.

1. Verses using verbs: x šnao- , pres. x šnaoša-, aor. x šnāu-/x šnu-; < x šnu; active voice: 'to favor'; middle voice: 'to seek the favor of' (all from Skjaervo 2006)

Y30.5 x šnaošan Ind 3p pl. (Skjaervo 2006).

In this verse, the x šnu word x šnaošan clearly means to 'satisfy' as in *pleasing* Wisdom by choosing truth, and true actions; here 'satisfy' [x šnaošan] does not mean satisfying a debt or penalty, or atonement for an

offense as all of the translations in our group seem to agree. Nor is there any hint of the satisfaction of ritual obligations.

Insler 1975: "... But the very virtuous spirit [*spāništa- mainyu-*], who is clothed in the hardest stones, chose the truth, and (so shall those) who shall satisfy [*x šnaošan*] the Wise Lord continuously with true actions." Y30.5, p. 33.

Humbach 1991 "...as also (do those) who devotedly satisfy [*x šnaošan*] the Ahura with true actions..." Y30.5, Vol. 1, p. 125.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "...as (do those) who devotedly satisfy [*x šnaošan*] the Wise Lord with real/realizing actions." Y30.5, p. 82.

Taraporewala 1951 "...and whoso would-please [*x šnaošan*] Ahura through deeds of-Truth ..." p. 144.

Bartholomae "...so also they that are fain to please [*x šnaošan*] Ahura Mazda by dutiful actions." Y30.5, (in Tarap. 1951 p. 147).

Moulton 1912 "likewise they that are fain to please [*x šnaošan*] Ahura Mazdah by dutiful actions." p. 350.

Y46.1 *x šnauš* aor inj 3p sg.; *x šnaošāi* Subj 1p sg. middle voice (Skjaervo 2006).

Here again the *x šnu* words *x šnauš* and *x šnaošāi* mean to 'satisfy' as in 'to please'. Zarathushtra is not pleased with his community and its rulers, and wonders how then he can please Wisdom ~ presumably by successfully teaching such hostile, unreceptive people Wisdom's teachings. Here 'satisfy' does not mean satisfying a debt, or, or atonement for an offense, or ritual satisfaction, as all of the translations in our group make clear.

Insler 1975: "To what land to flee? Where shall I go to flee? The community with which I have associated has not satisfied [*x šnauš*] me, nor those who are the deceitful rulers of the land. How, then, shall I satisfy [*x šnaošāi*] Thee, Wise Lord?" Y46.1, p. 81.

Humbach 1991 "...The community which I wish to join does not satisfy [*x šnauš*] me nor (do) the deceitful tyrants of the land How shall I satisfy [*x šnaošāi*] Thee, O Wise Ahura?" Y46.1, Vol. 1, p. 167.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "...neither does the community that I wish to join satisfy [*x šnauš*] me nor do so the deceitful tyrants of the land. How shall I satisfy [*x šnaošāi*] you, O Wise Lord?" Y46.1, p. 132.

Taraporewala 1951 "... (there is) no satisfaction [*x šnauš*] for-me, which (may come) through (my) Co-Workers, nor-yet (from these) Rulers of the land, who (are) followers-of-Untruth; how (then) shall-I-satisfy [*x šnaošāi*] Thee, O Mazda Ahura?" Y46.1, p. 571.

Bartholomae "...nor are the people pleased [*x šnauš*] with me, nor the Liar rulers of the land. How am I to please [*x šnaošāi*] thee, Mazdah Ahura?" Y46.1; (in Tarap. 1951 p. 574).

Moulton 1912 (same as Bartholomae's translation) p. 372.

Y46.13, *x šnauš* aor inj 3p sg. (Skjaervo 2006).

Here again, the *x šnu* word *x šnauš* means 'satisfy' in the context of pleasing Zarathushtra by offering him solicitude, generosity, help, as all of our translators agree; in this context 'satisfy' [*x šnauš*] does not mean satisfying a debt, or penalty, or atonement for an offense, or the satisfaction of ritual obligations.

Insler 1975: "Who among men did gratify [*x šnauš*] Zarathushtra Spitama with solicitude ..." Y46.13, p. 85.

Humbach 1991 "(That man) among mortals who has satisfied [*x šnauš*] Spitama Zarathushtra with bounteousness ..." Vol. 1, p. 171;

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "That man among the mortals who satisfies [*x šnauš*] Spitama Zarathushtra by (his) order/care..." Y46.13, p. 137;

Taraporewala 1951 "Whoso (helping) Zarathushtra to fulfill (His task), (whoso) among-men shall-satisfy [*x šnauš*] (Him)..." Y46.13, p. 618;

Bartholomae "Whoso among mortals has pleased [*x šnauš*] Spitama Zarathushtra by his willingness..." Y46.13, (in Tarap. 1951 p. 619).

Moulton 1912 (same as Bartholomae's translation) p. 375.

Y51.12 *x šnauš* aor inj 3p sg. (Skjaervo 2006).

Although there are translation differences amongst our group of linguists, on one thing they are agreed ~ there can be no doubt that the *x šnu* word *x šnauš* means 'satisfy' in the context of failing to please Zarathushtra, and in this context does not mean satisfying a debt, or penalty, or atonement for an offense, or the satisfaction of ritual obligations.

Insler 1975: "In no such way did the roguish Kavi satisfy [*x šnauš*] this Zarathushtra Spitama at Earth~Bridge, since he rejected (him who) arrived at that spot, although his two draft animals were trembling from wandering and from the cold." Y51.12; p. 105;

At the start of this verse, the words "In no such way" refers to the immediately preceding verse in Zarathushtra says "Wise One, which man has been an ally to Zarathushtra Spitama? Which one has taken counsel with truth? With whom is [*spənta- ārmaiti-*] allied? Which man of good thinking has shown himself to be lofty (enough) for the (great) task?" Y51.11, Insler 1975 p. 105.

Humbach 1991 "In such a way, the Kaviyan ... did not satisfy [*x šnauš*] him, Spitama Zarathushtra, when he (as) messenger stopped there in wintertime..." Y51.12, Vol. 1, p. 189;

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "It was not in such a way (that) the Kavyan ...treated [*x šnauš* ?] him, Zarathushtra Spitama, in wintertime at the bridge, when (that/his) lackey stopped (him) there..." Y51.12, p. 155; This English translation does not contain any words such as 'satisfy, please, gratify', so I am not sure which English equivalent they have chosen for *x šnauš*. But the context of the translation makes it clear that this verse has nothing to do with satisfying a debt, or penalty, or atonement for an offense, or ritual satisfaction.

Taraporewala 1951 "Not satisfactory [*x šnauš*] to-me, therefore, (is) the dupe of~the~Kavi in~(his)~passage through~the~World, to Zarathushtra Spitama..." Y51.12, p. 794.

Bartholomae "The Kavi's wanton did not please [*x šnauš*] Zarathushtra Spitama at the Winter Gate, in that he stayed him from taking refuge with him ... " Y51.12, (in Tarap. 1951 p. 798).

Moulton 1912 (same as Bartholomae's translation), p. 386.

Y28.1 *x šnavīšā* aor. op. 2p sg. middle voice (Skjaervo 2006).

Here the *x šnu* word *x šnavīšā* is used in the context of Zarathushtra asking Wisdom to satisfy the reasoning part of good thinking and the collective soul of the beneficial-sacred in mortal existence (the allegorical cow). Although there are translation differences, there is no doubt that *x šnavīšā* 'satisfy' in this context does not mean satisfying a debt, or penalty, or atonement for an offense, or the satisfaction of ritual obligations.

Insler 1975: "... I first entreat all (of you), Wise One, ... for (that) through which Thou mayest satisfy [*x šnavīšā*] the determination [*x ratūm* 'reasoning'] of my good thinking and the soul of the cow." Y28.1, p. 25.

Humbach 1991 "... I first entreat ... O Wise One, ... (for the spirit) with which Thou mayest satisfy [*x šnavīšā*] the intellect [*x ratūm*] of good thought and the soul of the cow." Y28.1 Vol. 1, p. 117.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "... I first request ... actions of the spirit beneficent through truth, by whom you may satisfy [*x šnavīšā*] the intellect [*x ratūm*] of good thought and the soul of the cow." Y28.1 p. 74.

Taraporewala 1951 "... through deeds inspired-by-Asha (I pray) for all (knowledge) (and) for Wisdom of Vohu Mano (do I pray); this I-shall-bring-solace [*x šnavīšā*] to the Soul of Mother~Earth as-well." p. 89.

Bartholomae "... I will pray for the works of the holy spirit, O thou the Right, whereby I may please [*x šnavīšā*] the will [*x ratūm*] of Good Thought and the Ox~Soul." Y28.1, (in Tarap. 1951 p. 93).

Moulton 1912 (same as Bartholomae's translation), p. 322.

2. A verse in which the verb's present participle is used as a noun.

Y46.18 *x šnaošəmnō* present participle middle voice (Skjaervo 2006).

Here again, *satisfying* [*x šnaošəmnō*] is used in the sense of pleasing Wisdom with truth, by frustrating evil designs. The context does not support the meanings satisfying a debt, or penalty, or atonement for an offense, or the satisfaction of ritual obligations.



Insler 1975: "... But evils to the person who would deliver us to evil! ~ thus satisfying [x šnaošəmnō] your wish with truth, Wise One..." Y46.18, p. 87; (here Zarathushtra is engaging in a play on words, in that frustrating "with truth" the 'evil' designs of a person, would be regarded as 'evil' by the frustrated evil person, because this 'evil' is accomplished by truth (which is intrinsically 'good'), see *Part Two: The Puzzle of Bad for the Bad*).

Humbach 1991 "...harm to him who would aim at us to harm us, O Wise One, (thereby) satisfying [x šnaošəmnō] Your Will by truth..." Y46.18, Vol. 1, p. 173.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "... (but) harm to that one who should intend to harm us, O Wise One, satisfying [x šnaošəmnō] your will by truth..." Y46.18, p. 139.

Taraporewala 1951 "... opposition to him who places-himself in-opposition to us; fulfilling [x šnaošəmnō] Your Wish, O Mazda, through Asha..." Y46.18, p. 632.

Bartholomae "...but enmities to him that shall set himself to devise enmity to us, O Mazdah and the Right, desiring to satisfy [x šnaošəmnō] your will..." Y46.18, (in Tarap. 1951 p. 633).

Moulton 1912 (same as Bartholomae's translation), p. 376.

3. Verses using nouns derived from the root *x šnu*: Skjaervo is uncertain of the noun stem, "*x šnūt*- ? favor, approval".

*x šnūtəm* Y31.3; *x šnūtəm* Y51.9 (our verse, which has been detailed in the main part of this chapter).

Y31.3 *x šnūtəm* acc. sg.

Regardless of the differences in translation, the context requires several conclusions regarding the nature of the "satisfaction" that is *x šnūtəm*, each of which fits Zarathushtra's notion of how evil is defeated ~ not by punishment, but by changing minds through life experiences ~ earned, unearned, and mutual, loving help (see *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution*). These conclusions are as follows:

(i) The "satisfaction" is created by Wisdom. It therefore cannot mean the satisfaction created by a worshipper through the correct performance of rituals, or the satisfaction of a debt, or penalty, or atonement for an offense.

(ii) *x šnūtəm* is sg. ~ one satisfaction ~ the same (one) satisfaction for both types of conduct. It therefore cannot be a penalty, or atonement, because it applies not only to bad conduct but also to good conduct. In We know that *x šnūtəm* is sg., because (in addition to its inflection) in Y31.4 ~ as in our verse (Y51.9) ~ the relative pronoun *yqm* (which is sg.) stands for *x šnūtəm* which therefore has to be sg.).

(iii) The "satisfaction" has been created through Wisdom's way of being (*mainyu*-), it therefore can only be a 'beneficial' satisfaction because throughout the Gathas ~ without exception ~ Wisdom's way of being (*mainyu*-) is described as beneficial (*spənta*-), most beneficial (*spəništa*-), most good (*vahišta*-), the true, wholly good order of existence (*aša*- *vahišta*-) which is the antithesis of harming, injuring, torturing, and other 'evil' qualities.

(iv) The 'satisfaction' is promised through 'fire and truth'. Fire is a symbol of the Divine in all Zoroastrian texts. Fire is never used as an instrument of punishment or torture in any Zoroastrian text. In the Gathas and other Avestan texts, 'fire' is used for enlightenment ~ as a material symbol for the true order of existence (*aša*- ~ which is the existence of the Divine) and its component qualities (the amesha spenta). So in this verse, the 'satisfaction' is promised through the medium of truth ~ expressed in the experiences of life, material ('fire') and abstract or spiritual ('truth'). It is the end result of these experiences ~ changing bad preferences to good ones ~ that brings 'satisfaction' ~ a conclusion that is validated by the fact that in other Gatha verses this end result (which is 'satisfaction') is also described as 'the good' (detailed in *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution*).

Insler 1975: "That satisfaction [x šnūtəm] which Thou hast created for both factions together with Thy spirit [mainyu-] and hast promised (to them) through fire and truth, that commandment 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.

Humbach 1991: "(Tell us about) the satisfaction [*x šnūtām*] which Thou apportionest by means of (Thy) spirit and (Thy) fire, and (which) Thou accordst through truth according to balance, (and about) what (is) Thy rule for the responsible ones, tell us about that, so that we may know (it) ... so that therewith I might receive all the living." Y31.3.

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "(Tell us) which satisfaction [*x šnūtām*] you fix by (your) spirit and (your) fire and which as (your) commandment in favor of the conscientious, tell us that to let us know (it) ... so as to let me test thereby all the living." Y31.3.

Taraporewala 1951: "What Thou~bestowest through~(Thy)~spiritual Fire and the Bliss [*x šnūtām*] (attainable) through Asha Thou~hast-promised to both parties, (and) what the Law (is) for~(those)~rich-in~discernment, that unto~us, O Mazda, declare for~(our)~enlightenment, ... so~that I~may~ever~convert all the living (into the Right Path)." Y31.3.

Bartholomae: "What award Thou givest through the (holy) Spirit and through the Fire and hast taught through Asha, to both parties, and what the decision is for the wise, this do Thou tell us, Mazdah, that we may know, ... that I may convert all living men." Y31.3.

Moulton 1912: "What award thou givest by they Spirit and thy Fire, and hast taught by Right, to the two parties, and what decision unto the wise ~ this do thou tell us, Mazdah, that we may know, ... that I may convert all living men." Y31.3.

4. Verses using an adjective *cix šnuša-* 'wishes to please' < *x šnao-*, < *x šnu* (Skjaervo 2006).

Translations of some of these verse vary a bit (because the applicable parts have not been decoded 100%), but there is no disagreement about one thing: the adj. *cix šnušō* 'wanting to please, satisfy' is used in the sense of wanting to do something in order to please certain people, or please Wisdom. The contexts of these verses do not lend themselves to the meaning 'wanting to satisfy a debt, or penalty' or 'wanting to atone', or 'wanting to satisfy a ritual obligation.

Y32.8 *cix šnušō* nom. sg. masc. (Skjaervo 2006).

Insler 1975: "Even Yama, the son of Vivahvant, was tried for these sins, he who wanted to satisfy [*cix šnušō*] our men (by) swearing: 'The cow is goddess'. If I too am guilty of these sins, Wise One, lies in Thy judgment." Y32.8, p. 47.

Humbach 1991 "Even Yima, the son of Vivahvan, became notorious for (one instance of) such crimes, the ox, who tried to satisfy [*cix šnušō*] the mortals, our (people), in swearing by God..." Y32.8, Vol. 1, p. 133.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "Even Yima, the son of Vivahvan, is notorious for (one) of such outrages, (even he) who tried to satisfy [*cix šnušō*] (us) humans (and) our (animals with the injunction: 'Meat (is just) a part of a (complete) meal' ..." Y32.8, p. 92.

Taraporewala 1951 "... even Yima, has~been~noted; who desiring-to~make~happy [*cix šnušō*] us mortals ..." Y32.8, p. 274.

Bartholomae "... Yima ... Vivanghan's son, who desiring to satisfy [*cix šnušō*] men gave our people flesh of the ox to eat. ..." Y32.8, (in Tarap. 1951 p. 277).

Moulton 1912 "...Yima ... Vivahvant's son, who desiring to satisfy [*cix šnušō*] men gave our people flesh of the ox to eat..." Y32.8, p. 356.

Y43.15, *cix šnušō* nom. sg. masc. (Skjaervo 2006).

Insler 1975: "... A man should not wish to satisfy [*cix šnušō*] the many deceitful people..." Y43.15, p. 65.

Humbach 1991 "...A man should not try to satisfy [*cix šnušō*] the many deceitful..." Y43.15, Vol. 1, p. 156.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "...The/a man should not try to satisfy [*cix šnušō*] the many deceitful..." Y43.15, p. 119.

Taraporewala 1951 "... never let the Leader seek-to-placate [*cix šnušō*] the-followers-of-Untruth..." Y43.15, p. 453.

Bartholomae "...Let not men seek again and again to please [*cix šnušō*] the Liars ..." Y43.15, (in Tarap. 1951 p. 455).

Moulton 1912 (same as Bartholomae's translation), p. 366.

Y45.9, *cix šnušō* nom. sg. masc. (Skjaervo 2006).

Insler 1975: "I shall try to gratify [*cix šnušō*] Him for us with good thinking..." Y45.9, p. 77

Humbach 1991 "(I am) trying to satisfy [*cix šnušō*] Him with our good thought..." Vol. 1, p. 166.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "Him I try to satisfy [*cix šnušō*] by our good thought..." p. 131.

Taraporewala 1951 "Him shall-I-~~seek-to-propitiate~~ [*cix šnušō*] together-with Vohu Mano for us..." Y45.9, but he comments that he thinks *cix šnušō* means "seeking to make gracious". pp. 561 ~562. (Which in my view is another way of saying "seeking to make Him pleased").

Bartholomae "Him thou shouldst seek to propitiate [*cix šnušō*]..." Y45.9, (in Tarap. 1951 p. 563).

Moulton 1912 (same as Bartholomae's translation), p. 371.

Y49.1, *cix šnušā* "instr. sg. masc. ntr. (?)" Skjaervo 2006.

Insler 1975: "Yes, throughout my lifetime I have been condemned as the greatest defiler, I who try to satisfy [*cix šnušā*] the poorly protected (creatures) with truth, Wise One..." Y49.1, p. 95.

Humbach 1991 "... (Come to me), O Wise One, (to me) who try to satisfy [*cix šnušā*] the ill-herded (cows) with truth..." Y49.1, Vol. 1, p. 179.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 "... (Come to me) who try to satisfy [*cix šnušā*] the badly herded (cows) through truth, O Wise One..." Y49.1, p. 145.

Taraporewala 1951 "... (me) who wishes-to-win-(him)-over [*cix šnušā*] through-Asha from-(his)-evil-ways..." Y49.1, p. 693.

Bartholomae "...I who desire to give satisfaction [*cix šnušā*] to those who are neglected..." Y49.1, (in Tarap. 1951 p. 696).

Moulton 1912 (same as Bartholomae's translation), p. 380.

<sup>20</sup> See the discussion under *rānōibyō* in Part Six: Yasna 43.12.

<sup>21</sup> See Part One: Differences In The Spirit of Friendship.

<sup>22</sup> A detailed discussion on the opinions of our group of linguists on the meaning of *rāna-* words, their declensions, and each Gatha verse in which a *rāna-* word appears, is given in Part Six: Yasna 43.12.

<sup>23</sup> Jackson 1892 § 390 - 391, p. 112; *θwā* is one of the forms for both instr. sg., and acc. sg. of the 2p personal pronoun, But in this context, the acc. sg. does not fit. Skjaervo 2006 shows no instr. sg. form of the 2p personal pronoun ~ neither in his Old Avestan Glossary, nor in his Old Avestan Lesson 2, p. 14.

<sup>24</sup> Here is Y31.19. The soul refining process, in which fire (truth) brings enlightenment, is alluded to in the last part of the verse. Referring to himself in the 3d person, Zarathushtra states, "This knowing world-healer has listened, he who has respected the truth, Lord, ... when the distribution in the good shall occur to both factions [*rqnayā* 'for both types (of conduct)] through Thy bright fire, Wise One." Y31.19, Insler 1975.

<sup>25</sup> Taraporewala supports his argument that colors named in ancient texts are an unreliable basis for translation, by citing the fact that Av. *auruša* "which is usually thought to mean 'white'," is an epithet of the star Tishtrya (believed to be Sirius) in the Tir Yasht (Yt. 8.2) "where it means 'red'."; noting that "at present the colour of the star Sirius is quite clearly white, but in the Illiad it is definitely mentioned as 'red', and Ptolemy has put it down amongst the *red* stars." (p. 219, italics for emphasis is in T's original). Little do I

know about Sirius being red in the past, or about why *auruša* means 'red' in the Tir Yasht but 'white' in other Avestan texts. I simply give Taraporewala's opinion because it helps to explain some of the translation choices of the linguists in our group.

<sup>26</sup> See *Part One: Truth, Asha*.

<sup>27</sup> See *Part Three: Evolution of the Name(s) Ahura Mazda*.

<sup>28</sup> As detailed in *Part Two: Molten, Glowing, Metal*.

<sup>29</sup> Beekes 1988, p. 144, however Beekes spells the word *abi* believing that to have been its original GAv. form.

<sup>30</sup> Beekes 1988, pp. 144, 148. Beekes classifies *abi* (written *aibī* in the mss.) amongst the "prepositions /preverbs" that function as adverbs.

<sup>31</sup> I am indebted to Insler (in his 1975 essay on the *Ahuna Vairya*) for knowledge of this syntactic practice of 'framing' or 'encapsulation' to give one unit of thought in Gatha verses. It is discussed in the following chapters,

In *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo) An Analysis* (discussed in great detail, with many examples); *Yasna 28.5* (discussed in some detail);

In *Part Six: Yasna 28.1* (discussed briefly); *Yasna 32.7* (discussed briefly ~ including examples of 'framing' that occurs across the caesura, as in our verse Y51.9); *Yasna 44.16* (discussed briefly); and *Yasna 32.9* (discussed briefly).

<sup>32</sup> Although *rāšayēhē* is the only conjugation of the stem verb *raš-* / *rāšaya-* that appears in surviving GAv. texts, we do have in one verse (Y30.11) the related noun *rašō* nom./acc. sg. of the noun stem *rašah-*, which our linguists have translated as follows in the phrase *darəgēm ... rašō*:

Insler 1975: "long destruction" pp. 34 - 35.

Humbach 1991: "long-lasting harm" Vol. 1, p. 125.

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "long-lasting/endless harm" p. 83.

Taraporewala 1951: "age-long punishment" p. 168.

Moulton 1912: "long punishment" p. 351; (Moulton's translation is the same as that of Bartholomae.

At first thought, one might be tempted to conclude that the meaning of the noun *rašō* in Y30.11 would have to be 'harm' because how could 'destruction' be 'long'? But we know from other evidence in the Gathas (and also in YAv. texts) that the soul refining process ~ whereby our wrongful preferences are eliminated or destroyed ~ is a long, long one. So "long destruction" as Insler 1975 has it, is consistently the most accurate (in my view). Here is the full verse so that you can see *darəgēm ... rašō* in context. "Men [*mašyāñhō* 'mortals'], when ye learn those commandments [*urvātā*] which the Wise One has posed, when ye learn (there is) both a way of easy access and one with no access, as well as long destruction for the deceitful [*drəgvō.dəbyō* 'for (all that is) deceitful'] but salvation for the truthful [*ašavabyō* 'for (what is) truthful'], then each one (of you) shall abide by (all) these commandments. Wish it so." Y30.11, Insler 1975. Parenthetically, *mašyāñhō* means 'mortals'; and *urvātā* which he translates as "commandments" in this verse, he translates as "precepts" (of Wisdom's teachings) in his commentary on Y44.14 pp. 249 - 250; *drəgvō.dəbyō* is abl./dat. pl. of the adj. *drəgvant-* here used as a noun, which could be people, concepts, or activities. Insler has chosen to translate the word as people. In my view, the option that is most consonant with Zarathushtra's teachings is the destruction of (pl.) all untruthful things (in thought, word and action), so I would indicate the plural by translating the word in context as 'long destruction for (all that is) untruthful'. Similarly *ašavabyō* is abl./dat. pl. of the adj. *ašavan-* which here is used as a noun, and which I would translate as all things that are truthful (in thought, word and action), thus 'salvation for (all that is) truthful'. See *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant*.

---

<sup>33</sup> Jackson 1892 also shows that *dr̥agvatō* is acc. pl.; and for *vant-* stems he shows the *-əm* inflection is acc. sg. § 291, pp. 85 - 86.

<sup>34</sup> See *Part Two: A Question of Reward & The Path*.

<sup>35</sup> See *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution*.

<sup>36</sup> Geldner states "Punctuation is a weak point in the manuscripts. They have various signs of punctuation, indeed, but they have no system of punctuation. I had to devise a system for myself, based on the signs that are found", and he then describes his system in which colons, semi-colons and periods, and the end of a paragraph are all denoted by the symbol ∴ ~ but in different sizes. Geldner p. lii. I have not done a study of the mss. to determine how any punctuation signs are placed in line c. of our verse Y51.9. I simply have followed Geldner.