Yasna 31.11 and 12

Y31.11 and 12 are important verses, for more reasons than one. They express ideas that are implied elsewhere in the Gathas ~ that the purpose of the material existence is to enable the choices and experiences that result in an evolution from a mixed ('good'/'bad') way of being to one that embodies, personifies, the true (correct, good) order of existence completely ~ a way of being that is personified Wisdom (*mazdā-*).[1] The acquisition of Wisdom is experience based.

In Zarathushtra's thought, the material existence is necessary to enable spiritual perfection, completeness. A neat paradox.

And verse 12 also corroborates a foundational (and beautiful) aspect of Zarathushtra's thought, which also appears elsewhere in the Gathas, and (without contradiction) in later texts ~ Avestan and Pahlavi. But we today have largely forgotten it. Yet it forms a bedrock of his envisionment, and one which is at totally odds with today's conventional wisdom regarding 'this life' and the 'afterlife'.

Here are verses 11 and 12 of Y31 in Avestan, with my translation. A discussion of their significance follows. I then give a word by word linguistic analysis, including the opinions of the linguists in our group; and at the end (to show their opinions in context, and for comparative purposes), I give the full translation of these 2 verses by each linguist in our group. To avoid repeated references to their translations, commentaries and opinions, I footnote them here.[2]

Y31.11:
hyaṯ. nə̄. mazdā. paourvīm.   gaēϑåscā. tašō. daēnåscā.
ϑwā. manaŋhā. x ratūšcā.   hyaṯ. astvantəm. dadå. uštanəm.
hyaṯ. šyaoϑanācā. sə̄nghąscā.   yaϑrā. varənə̄ng. vaså. dāyetē.[3]

Y31.12:
aϑrā. vācəm.[4] baraitī.   miϑahvacå. vā. ərəš.vacå.[5]
vīdvå. vā. əvīdvå. vā.   ahyā. zərədācā. manaŋhācā.
ānuš.hax š.   ārmaitiš.[6]   mainyū. pərəsāitē yaϑrā. maēϑā. ⁙
Geldner 1P pp. 111 - 112.

My translation.

Y31.11
ab. 'Since for us in the beginning, O Wisdom, through Thy thinking, Thou didst fashion physical lives, and envisioning-faculties, and reasoning-faculties; since Thou didst give embodied breath;
c. since (Thou didst give) actions and teachings, whereby one expresses preferences at will,'

Y31.12
ab. 'Therefore, one raises (one's) voice ~ false-speaking or true-speaking,
b. whether knowing or unknowing ~ with his heart and mind;
c. (But) over time, embodied truth deliberates with one's way of being, where (there is) opposition.

Discussion.

Let us first be aware that in verse 12, the meaning and significance of the Avestan word *zərədācā* 'with heart and' has not yet been decoded with any degree of certainty. This uncertainty does not make it impossible to understand the ideas expressed in these 2 verses, but we should be aware of it.

In verse 12, 'heart' and 'mind' are paired ~ 'with heart and mind'.

What was Zarathushtra's intent in using this phrase? In English 'heart' represents emotion, and 'mind' represents intellect.   And our culturally conditioned minds might jump to the conclusion that this was also Zarathushtra's intent.   But in the Gathas, mind/thinking/thought (*manah-*) includes intellectual functions ~ logic, reasoning, judgment (as in the capability to arrive at conclusions) etc., as well as non~intellectual functions ~ creativity, emotions, insight, etc.,   a use of *manah-* that is corroborated in later Avestan texts.

So if in Avestan, 'mind/thinking/thought' includes both intellect and emotions, what idea(s) does Zarathushtra intend to express when he uses 'heart' in verse 12?   We simply don't know.   Verse 12 is the only instance in all (surviving) GAv. texts in which 'heart' is used, and this word does not appear in Skjaervo's or Reichelt's glossary of YAv. words, so it likely does not appear in any YAv. text.   Therefore we have no other instances of its use that would help us to understand what 'heart' stood for in the Avestan culture.   All of the foregoing has been discussed (with detailed evidence) in another chapter,[7] and is touched on in the *Linguistics* section below under *zərədācā.*

Let us now look at our two verses ~ 11 and 12.

Verse 11 is not a self contained verse. the dependent 'Since ... since ... since ... [*hyaṱ*]' is repeated 3 times in verse 11, and then verse 12 starts with the concluding 'Therefore [*aϑrā*]...'. So we know that these two verses belong together.

To understand Zarathushtra's intent in these two verses, we need to recall some ideas he expresses in other verses.

In Y30.3 and Y45.2, he tell us that in the beginning, primordially, there were two ways of being ~ the more good and the bad (Y30.3), the more beneficial and the harmful (Y45.2),[8] ~ innate ways of being that are a mix of opposing qualities, that express themselves in opposing preferences.

And Zarathushtra's idea of 'creation' is that of a 'birthing' (*zątha-*), a giving from oneself, and also a fashioning, a shaping of what has been emanated, and the establishing of an order of existence that is true (correct, good), in the existences of matter and mind.[9]

Y31.11 and 12, take us a step further.

Verse 11 tells us that in the beginning, Wisdom (the beneficial aspect of two conflicting ways of being Y44.7),[10] fashioned (*tašō*) for us and gave (*dadå*) material tools ~ our physical lives, faculties to envision and reason ~ embodied breath (life embodied in material shells), actions, teachings through which we express our opposing preferences at will.

Verse 12 then says that 'one raises (one's) voice ~ with heart and mind ~ false~speaking or true~speaking, whether knowing or not knowing', which confirms the conclusion that these preferences are not limited to religious preferences (but may include them).

Which brings us to the beautiful concluding thought in verse 12 which says:

"...(But) over time, embodied truth [*ārmaiti-*] deliberates with one's way of being [*mainyu-*] where (there is) opposition." Y31.12.

There are several worthwhile ideas here. *ārmaiti-* is the concept of thoughts, words and actions that embody the true (correct, good) order of existence (*aša-*), an order that is beneficial, reasoning, friendly, generous, compassionate, loving, caring, just (as in 'being fair').[11]

And this last sentence tells us that such beneficial thoughts, words, and actions (*ārmaiti-*) will help to change lives in our material existence, from a way of being (*mainyu-*) that has opposing, conflicting, preferences to one that embodies completely, the true order of existence ~ a state of being that prefers only what is true and right ~ for its own sake.[12] How? Through a deliberative process within each fragment of existence encased in a physical shell, a process through which we ourselves change our 'bad' preferences into 'good' ones because that is the way we want to be ~ bringing about a wholly good end, the inevitability of the 'good' end (because of the freedom to choose!).

This conclusion that the true (correct, good) order of existence will eventually overcome its opposite, and will be attained by all ~ not just by human beings, but by the world, existence as a whole (YAv. *frašō.kərəiti*; Pahl. *frashgard*) ~ is one of the Zarathushtra's most fundamental ideas ~ one that we today have mostly forgotten. But it was remembered by ancient Zoroastrians (despite devastating wars and persecution) throughout the later (Avestan and Pahlavi) texts without contradiction.[13]

This idea ~ that the wholly good end will eventually be attained (completely) by all ~ is totally inconsistent with the conventional wisdom that prevails today which thinks in terms of "this life" and an "afterlife". But it is wholly consistent with Zarathushtra's idea of 'mortal' existence as the continuing matrix for the perfecting process; 'mortal' existence that will end when the perfecting process has eventually been completed, and we can make the transition (cross the metaphoric bridge) to an existence that no longer is mortal (non-deathness *amərətāt-*) because once the perfecting process has been completed, the reason for mortality no longer exists.[14]

In line c. of verse 12, the word *ārmaitiš* 'embodied truth' is not limited by the pronoun 'his/her'. It is the *ārmaiti-* of every living thing (mortal and non-mortal) ~ including the *ārmaiti-* of Wisdom Itself ~ that helps to bring about this evolution to goodness. It is the concept of mutual loving help through good, loving thoughts words and actions ~ 'embodied truth' (*ārmaiti*) ~ between the Divine, man, and all the living, that we see so often in the Gathas.

I would like to present for your consideration, an additional (and rather lovely) idea ~ expressed in multi-dimensioned ways so typical of Zarathushtra's poetry.

Who/what does the 'giving' in these two verses?

It is clearly the Divine:

In verse 11 the Divine (who fashioned *taṣ̌ō*, and gave *dadā̊*) is called by name ~ *mazdā* 'Wisdom', a state of enlightenment ~ which is a personification of the true (correct, wholly good) order of existence (*aṣ̌a-vahišta-*).

In verse 12 a quality of the Divine (amesha spenta) is mentioned ~ *ārmaitiš* 'embodied truth' ~ which is a personification (in thought, word and action) of the true (correct, wholly good) order of existence (*aṣ̌a-vahišta-*). And we know from other verses in the Gathas, that man presently (although imperfectly) has all but the last two qualities of the Divine (amesha spenta) completeness and non-deathness.

So who/what is doing the 'giving' in these two verses?

Is it the Divine as complete, non-mortal existence?

Is it the (imperfect) divine within mortals (the 'wisdom within' of the later Avestan texts)?

Both?

3

I'll give you a clue.   Check out Zarathushtra's ideas on the identity of the Divine, 'creation', and also the (allegorical) Bridge of Discerning.[15]   So beautiful.   So logical.   So mystical.

<div align="center">* * * * *</div>

Linguistic Analysis.

Here is a word by word linguistic analysis.   In the GAv. text, the first half of line b. belongs with line a., so I will consider them together.

Y31.11
Line a.   *hyaṯ. nə̄. mazdā. paourvīm.   gaēϑā̊scā. tašō. daēnā̊scā.*
b. (1st half)   *ϑwā. manaŋhā. xratūšcā.   ...*
            'Since for us in the beginning, O Wisdom, through Thy thinking, Thou didst fashion physical
            lives, and envisioning-faculties, and reasoning-faculties,

GAv. Syntax: 'Since [*hyaṯ*] for us [*nə̄*] in the beginning [*paourvīm*], O Wisdom [*mazdā*], Thou didst fashion [*tašō*] physical lives [*gaēϑā̊scā*] and envisioning-faculties [*daēnā̊scā*] and through Thy thinking [*ϑwā. manaŋhā*] reasoning-faculties [*xratūšcā*] ...

At first thought, we might conclude that the phrase through Thy thinking [*ϑwā. manaŋhā*] applies only to the word that follows, *xratūšcā* 'reasoning-faculties'. But that is not so.

Here the words *gaēϑā̊scā daēnā̊scā* and *xratūšcā* are all joined with the suffixes *-cā* 'and', so we know that these three words belong together.   And Insler has pointed out that in GAv. syntax when words that belong together 'frame' or 'encapsulate' one or more other words, all such words (the framed and framing words) form one unit of thought.[16]   Here the term Thou didst fashion [*tašō*] and the term through Thy thinking [*ϑwā. manaŋhā*] are framed or encapsulated by the things that are fashioned by Wisdom,

<div align="center">*... gaēϑā̊scā tašō daēnā̊scā ϑwā manaŋhā xratūšcā ...*</div>

So, (following Insler on GAv. syntax) all these words form one unit of thought ~ expressing the idea that it is through Wisdom's thinking that He fashioned physical lives [*gaēϑā̊scā*] and envisioning-faculties [*daēnā̊scā*] and reasoning-faculties [*xratūšcā*].

hyaṯ   'since'
hyaṯ   is one of those flexible GAv. words which has more than one grammatical function[17] and many potential meanings, so we have to decide the meaning of *hyaṯ* based on the context of the verse in which it is used.   Here *hyaṯ* appears 3 times in lines a. b. and c., "Since ... since ... since ..." and the next verse starts with *aϑrā* "Therefore".   In this context, I find the choice of 'since' for *hyaṯ* persuasive.
Insler: "...Since [*hyaṯ*]..."
Humbach 1991: "...Since [*hyaṯ*]..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "...Since [*hyaṯ*]..."
Tarap. "...Since [*hyaṯ*]..."
Barth.: "...When [*hyaṯ*]..."
Moulton 1912: "...When [*hyaṯ*]...".

nə̄   'for us'
nə̄ is a personal pronoun 1p dat. pl. ('to/for us'). This same word *nə̄*, is also one of the personal pronouns 1p gen. pl. ('our', 'of us'), but in the context of this verse, our translators all think that the best fit is 1p dat. pl. 'to/for us'. And I agree.

Insler 1975: "...for us [*nə̄*]..."
Humbach 1991: "...for us [*nə̄*]..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "...to us [*nə̄*]..."
Taraporewala 1951: "...for us [*nə̄*]..."
Bartholomae and *Moulton* 1912:   No English equivalent for *nə̄* appears in their translations.

mazdā 'O Wisdom'
There is general agreement that in GAv. *mazdā* is the vocative form of the stem *mazdā-* (an older generation of linguists show the stem as *mazdāh-* Jackson 1892 § 356, p. 102).

paourvīm   'in the beginning',
Skjaervo 2006 shows *paourvya*[18] as an adj. meaning 'first, original', with *paourvīm* as its acc. sg. form. In Avestan (as in English) 'first', can mean first in time, first in quality, et cetera.[19]   In this context, each of our translators, translate *paourvīm* as first in time. I agree.
In this verse, Y31.11, Insler, Barth. Tarap. and Moulton have translated *paourvīm* as 'in-the-beginning', 'at-the-beginning'.
Humbach 1991 as "the primal (stage of our existence),"
Humbach/Faiss 2010 as "fundamental".

In this context, I think *paourvīm* means 'first' as in the beginning.
Thus, *hyaṯ nə̄ mazdā paourvīm* 'Since for us, in the beginning, O Wisdom, ...'

ϑwā manaŋhā 'through Thy thinking'
ϑwā is the instr. sg. ('by/through/with _____') form of the 2p personal pronoun stem *tū-* (Skjaervo 2006; Jackson 1892 § 390, p. 112). In this context, I think 'through thy' is the best (instr. sg. 2p) fit for *ϑwā*.
manaŋhā is the instr. sg. form of the ntr. noun stem *manah-*.
These two words belong together, so in Av. both words have to be in the same case, number, (etc.) but in English the (instr.) 'through/by/with' is used only once, thus 'through Thy thinking'.

As Insler 1975 has pointed out (p. 118), in the GAv., *manah-* is used in 3 ways.
(1) As faculty ('mind'),
(2) As process ('thinking'), and
(3) As object ('thought').

In this context, *manaŋhā* is used as part of the process of fashioning something, so I translate instr. sg. *manaŋhā* as process ~ thus, *ϑwā manaŋhā* 'through Thy thinking'.

tašō 'Thou didst fashion'
According to Skjaervo 2006, *tašō* is 2p sg. (aor. injunctive) of the verb stem *taš-* 'to fashion'. In GAv. the verb form indicates whether it is 1p, 2p, or 3p, sg. or pl. So the pronoun 'thou' (or sg. 'you') is part of the verb form.
Insler 1975: "... Thou... didst fashion ..."
Humbach 1991: "... Thou... didst fashion ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... you fashion ..."
Taraporewala 1951: "...Thou-didst-create...", but he comments that the original meaning of *taš-* is 'to hew, to cut' (citing Barth. Wb. 644 -45) indicating perhaps what a craftsman does when s/he sculpts or 'fashions' something from stone or wood.

Barth. "... Thou... didst create ..." ~
Moulton 1912: "... thou... didst create ...".

In our culture 'to create' when used with the Divine carries the implication of making something separate from Oneself, out of something else, or out of nothing. To translate *taš-* words as 'to create' is therefore an inaccurate interpretation. The more literal 'to fashion' (for *taš-*) more accurately expresses this aspect of Zarathushtra's notion of 'creation'.[20]

gaēϑåscā 'physical lives and'
gaēϑåscā is acc. pl. of the fem. stem gaE{A- (Skjaervo 2006); the *-cā* at the end means 'and' ~ indicating that this *-cā* word belongs with the other two *-cā* words (*daēnåscā* and *x ratūšcā*) each of which is also acc. pl.
Our group of translators do not agree about the meaning of *gaēϑåscā*.
Skjaervo 2006 thinks *gaya-* means 'life, living" deriving from *gaē-/ jyā-* 'to live'. But he thinks *gaēϑā-* (also deriving from *gaē-/ jyā-* 'to live') means 'livestock, herd'. So too do Humbach and Faiss.
Humbach 1991: "...the herds..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "...the herds..."
Insler: "... creatures...". Commenting under a different verse (Y31.1) Insler says that *gaēϑā-* simply means 'living creature' and corresponds to *gaya-* 'life', in the same way as *ahvā-* 'being' (Y51.9) corresponds to *ahu-* 'existence, world'. p. 181.
Taraporewala 1951: "...Bodies...". He too says that the form is acc. pl., and comments (under Y31.1[21] and also here) that in Avestan *gaēϑå* means 'life' or 'world' in the physical sense, and is sometimes specifically defined as *astvaītī* 'corporeal (lit. 'possessing bones')." (p. 174). Commenting under our verse Y31.11, he states that Bartholomae translates the word as 'individual' and says that it means originally 'mundane existence'.
Bartholomae: "...the Individual..."
Moulton 1912: "...beings...".

In my view, *gaēϑåscā* means 'physical lives'. We see a parallel term used in line b. 'embodied breath' (*astvantəm ... uštanəm* discussed below).
The phrase 'physical lives and envisioning-faculties, and reasoning-faculties', here simply expresses the idea that Wisdom has fashioned abstract qualities (envisioning, reasoning) as a part of life encased in physical shells ~ the material and abstract tools needed to enable the experiences necessary for the perfecting process. Considering the opinions of the linguists in our group, I therefore think the closest English equivalent for *gaēϑåscā* in this context is 'physical lives and'.

daēnåscā 'envisioning-faculties and'
daēnåscā is acc. pl. of the fem. stem *daēnā-* (Skjaervo 2006); the *-cā* at the end means 'and'.
Our translators do not agree about the meaning of *daēnåscā*.
Insler 1975: "... and conceptions ..."
Humbach 1991: "...and religious views ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... and the views ..."
Tarap. 1951: "... and Souls"
Barth.: "... and the Individuality ..."
Moulton 1912: "... and intelligences ..."

These differences and the ways in which Zarathushtra uses *daēnā-* words in the Gathas have been discussed in depth in another chapter,[22] but the following summary may be useful.

daēnā- is derived from *dī* 'view, consider'.

Insler has perceptively demonstrated with many examples (but *daēnā-* is not one of them), that a GAv. word can be used in three ways ~ for a faculty, for its process, and for its object (p. 118; *manah-* is a word used in these 3 ways ~ described above under *manaŋhā*).

And I think *daēnā-* is a GAv. word that is used in these three ways as well.

As object it means 'envisionment', 'conception' ~ what is envisioned or conceived by the mind.

As process it means the act of envisioning.

As faculty, it means 'the ability to perceive, the ability to envision' (Skjaervo calls *daēnā-* a 'visionary faculty') and I think this is how *daēnå* is used here in Y31.11~ as faculty.

For *daēnåscā* (pl.), I think 'and envisioning~faculties' more literally and accurately reflects Zarathushtra's intent based on the context of our verse Y31.11.

x ratūščā   'and reasoning~faculties',

x ratūščā is acc. pl. of the masc. stem *x ratu-* (Skjaervo 2006); the *-cā* at the end means 'and'.

There is wide disagreement about the meaning of *x ratūščā.*

Insler 1975: "... and intentions ..."

Humbach 1991: "...as well as the intellects ..."

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... and the intellects ..."

Tarap. 1951: "... and (Mental) powers ..."

Barth.: "... and powers of understanding ..."

Moulton 1912: "... and intelligences ..."

These differences and the ways in which Zarathushtra uses *x ratu-* words in the Gathas have been discussed in depth in another chapter,[23] but the following (partial) summary may be useful.

Taraporewala comments that in the Rig Veda *kratu* is used in the sense of 'understanding, intelligence, spiritual power', and that its traditional Avestan sense has been preserved in the Pahlavi *x irad* and Persian *khirad*, both of which mean 'intelligence' or 'wisdom'.

Insler 1975 in his Addenda (pp. 327 - 330) acknowledges the opinion of Schmidt that *x ratu-* means 'reason, intellect', but states that in his opinion *x ratu-* should be translated as 'will, determination, intention'. He does not give a linguistic basis for this view. And, with respect, based on all of the ways in which Zarathushtra uses *x ratu-* in the Gathas, I do not find his view persuasive. However, I do find persuasive his view that *x ratu-* is used in three ways ~ for faculty, process, and object (p. 118).

Based on all of the ways in which *x ratu-* is used in the Gathas, and the evolution of its meaning in YAv. texts, 'intellect' or 'intelligence' is too narrow to be an accurate English equivalent for GAv. *x ratu-*.   The flavor 'reason' (an aspect of 'intellect, intelligence, and one of Schmidt's choices) fits all the ways in which *x ratu-* is used in the Gathas and and also how its meaning evolved in YAv. texts. I therefore conclude that 'reason is the closest English equivalent for *x ratu-* in the Gathas.

As faculty *x ratu-* would be the ability to reason;

As process, *x ratu-* would be the process of reasoning; and

As object, *x ratu-* would be 'reasonings/reasons' ~ the products of reasoning.

In the context of our verse, (as with *daēnåscā*), the acc. pl. *x ratūščā* would (literally) mean 'faculties that produce reasonings'. I therefore translate acc. pl. *x ratūščā*   as 'and reasoning~faculties'.

* * *

Y31.11
Line b. (2d half)   ...   *hyaṯ astvantəm dadå uštanəm*
                          ...   since Thou didst give embodied breath;

GAv. syntax.   Here again, we see the framing technique, indicating one unit of thought. In the phrase *astvantəm dadå uštanəm,* the verb *dadå* 'Thou didst give' is framed by the 2 words describing what is given ~ *astvantəm* (an adj. which literally means 'possessing bones') and the noun it describes *uštanəm* ('breath/life'). The phrase *astvantəm ... uštanəm* is an Avestan idiom or figure of speech which means life (breath) embodied in a physical shell, or 'embodied breath' (explained below). Thus the 3 words *astvantəm dadå uštanəm* form one unit of thought 'Thou didst give embodied breath/life'.

hyaṯ 'since',
explained above.

dadå 'Thou didst give'
dadå is 2p sg. (injunctive) of the verb stem *dā-* (Skjaervo 2006), which has many related meanings ~ 'give', 'make', 'produce', 'assign', 'establish', etc.[24] And our translators disagree on which meaning Zarathushtra intended for *dadå* in this verse. Although I have given an initial capital letter to the pronoun 'Thou, you can see that in Avestan, the 2p pronoun is not separately stated ~ it is included in the verb form. And in Avestan there are no capital letters in any event ~ all of which enables Zarathushtra's multi~dimensional use of this verb (mentioned under the *Discussion* section above).   Here are the ways in which *dadå* has been translated by our linguists.

Insler 1975: "...Thou didst create [*dadå*]..." Y31.11; (but in other verses, he has translated *dadå* as "...Thou didst grant [*dadå*]..." Y31.9b, and "...shalt Thou grant [*dadå*]..." Y44.15e).
Humbach 1991: "...Thou didst assign ..." Y31.11
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... you grant ..." Y31.11
Taraporewala 1951: "... Thou didst place ..." Y31.11; (but in other verses, he has translated *dadå* as "... Thou hast granted..." Y31.9b identifying its root as *dā*-;   and "...wouldst Thou grant [*dadå*]..." Y44.15e.[25]
Barth.: " ... Thou didst make ... " Y31.11; but in Y31.9b, "... thou didst give [*dadå*]..."; and in Y44.15e "...thou wilt give [*dadå*]..."[26]
Moulton 1912: " ... Thou didst make ... " Y31.11; but in Y31.9b, "... thou didst give [*dadå*]..."; and in Y44.15e "...thou wilt give [*dadå*]..."[27] (identical with Barth.);

The many meanings of *dā-* have been explored in another chapter.[28] But the following summary may be useful.

The stem *dā-* is used for many (related) meanings ~ 'to give, to produce, to make, to create, to assign, to establish'. Zarathushtra's notion of 'creation' is not a process of 'creating' something separate out of nothing. It is one of 'birthing' *ząϑa-* (i.e. emanating from oneself) ~ a creative process that is one of producing/giving/establishing [*dā-*], and fashioning [*taš-*].[29] In the context of Y31.11, 'assign' or 'establish' do not fit for *dadå*.

In my view, 'thou didst give' for *dadå*, is the most accurate English equivalent for what Zarathushtra has in mind, based on the context of this verse, and also based on on Zarathushtra's notion of the creative process.

astvantəm … uštanəm   'embodied breath'

Skjaervo 2006 says that the form of each of these words is acc. sg., of their respective stems; he states that *astvant-* is an adj. which means 'consisting of bones, with bones' and the masc. noun stem *uštāna-* means 'life, breath'.

In both Vedic and Avestan, the suffix *-vant* (as in *astvant-)* indicates 'possessing'.[30] The ntr. noun *ast-* means 'bone' (Skjaervo 2006).

Thus *astvant-* literally means 'possessing bone'.   But many linguist agree that this is a GAv. idiom which means 'possessing a physical body', 'corporeal'. Thus the phrase *astvantəm   …   uštanəm* literally means 'breath/life possessing bones (a body)' ~ breath/life encased in a physical shell, as distinguished from pure breath (life) [*uštāna-*] the intangible, non-corporeal life force of a being with no body.

The phrase *astvantəm   …   uštanəm* has been translated by the linguists in our group as follows:

Insler 1975: "...body and breath..." Y31.11. However, there is no *-cā* 'and' here.   In another Gatha verse (Y43.16), Insler translates another grammatical form (*astvaṯ* nom./acc. sg. ntr.) of the stem *astvant-* 'possessing bones' as expressing the idea of 'embodiment', which I find persuasive.   In he translates *astvaṯ aṣ̌əm hyāṯ uštānā aojōnghvaṯ* as "May truth [*aṣ̌əm*] be embodied [*astvaṯ*] and strong [*aojōnghvaṯ*] with breath [*uštānā* instr. sg.]..." Y43.16c. [31]

Humbach 1991: "...corporeal life..." Y31.11; he comments that the phrase *astvaṇt uštāna-* 'corporeal life' comes from *ast-* 'bone/body and *uštāna-* 'vitality/life';[32] in his translation of verse 11 *astvantəm* "corporeal" is an adj. that qualifies *uštanəm* "life" which is consistent with the fact that in these two Gathic Avestan words there are no connectives *-cā* 'and';

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "...osseous vitality..." Y31.11. They have opted for a literal translation, instead of recognizing these words as an Avestan idiom; but here also *astvantəm* "osseous" (i.e. 'bony') is an adjective which describes *uštanəm* "vitality".[33]

Taraporewala: "...Life within-flesh-encaged..." Y31.11; he comments that *astvantəm* literally means 'possessing bones' which Jackson and Barth. have rendered 'clothed with a body'; on *uštana-* or *uštāna-* he says that it means 'life' or 'life force' citing Jackson's opinion that it is "the vital power, the physical life inherent in the body and lost at death". Taraporewala notes that Bartholomae is uncertain about its etymology, but Taraporewala himself suggests that it stems from *vas-*, *uš-*, 'to burn, to be hot, and implies the life force connected with the heat and energy of the living body;[34]

Bartholomae "...life clothed with the body..."Y31.11;[35]
Moulton 1912 "...life clothed with body..." Y31.11;[36]

In the absence of *-cā* 'and', the word *astvantəm* can only be an adjective describing the noun *uštanəm*. Technically 'breath' in English is also corporeal, but in the Gathas (and also some Pahlavi texts) 'breath' is used in the sense of the intangible life force that animates the corporeal body.

While a literal translation of *astvantəm   …   uštanəm* is ' bone possessing' (adj.) breath (noun), it would puzzle most readers of English, and would not at all convey Zarathushtra's thought.

Although (in my view) 'embodied life' more clearly express the idea of *astvantəm   …   uštanəm* in English, I prefer to stay with a more literal 'breath' which gives the flavor of the original idiom for the idea of life embodied in a physical shell.

I therefore translate this this GAv. idiom *astvantəm   …   uštanəm* as 'embodied breath'.

* * *

9

Y31.11
Line c. *hyaṯ. šyaoϑanācā. sānghạscā.   yaϑrā. varənəng. vaså. dāyetē.*
      since (Thou didst give) actions and teachings,   whereby one expresses preferences at will,'

GAv. syntax.   Here, the phrase *hyaṯ šyaoϑanācā sānghạscā* literally 'since actions and teachings' requires a verb, and in GAv. syntax a verb previously expressed, often is subsequently implied. So in line c. I have added the implied verb *dadå* 'Thou didst give' (previously expressed). All the linguists in our group have also added an implied verb here ~ but not all have chosen a verb previously expressed.

hyaṯ 'since (Thou didst give)'
hyaṯ has been explained above. Here are the implied verbs selected by our linguists.
Insler 1975: "...since (Thou didst create) ..." Y31.11
Humbach 1991: "...when (Thou didst establish) ..." Y31.11
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... since (you determine the ritual) ..." Y31.11; no ritual is mentioned in either of these two verses ~ not even in the Humbach/Faiss 2010 translation. This implied (added) phrase illustrates how a personal interpretation can color a translation.
Taraporewala 1951: "... since ... (Thou didst bestow) ..." Y31.11
Barth.: " ... when (Thou madest) ... " Y31.11
Moulton 1912: " ... when (Thou madest) ... " Y31.11.

šyaoϑanācā   'actions and'
šyaoϑanācā is acc. pl. of the ntr. stem *šyaoϑana-* (Skjaervo 2006); the suffix *-cā* means 'and'. All the linguists in our group have translated this word as "actions and" except that:
Humbach/Faiss 2010 think that ritual actions are implied; and
Taraporewala 1951 translates the word as "... Powers to act and ...".

In my view 'actions and' is the most accurate (and most literal) English equivalent for *šyaoϑanācā*.

sānghạscā 'and teachings'
The form is acc. pl. of the masc. noun stem *sāngha-* (Skjaervo 2006), with the suffix *-cā* 'and'. In the phrase *šyaoϑanācā sānghạscā* the suffix *-cā* 'and' is tacked on to both words. But in fluent English 'and' is used only once.

Insler: "...and words..." Y31.11. He comments (on *sānghāmahī* in another verse Y31.1) that the root *sanh-* is used in the Gathas in three senses (1) 'declare, announce' (2) 'teach' and (3) 'decree' (p. 180).
He does not explain his choice of 'words' for *sānghạscā* in the context of our verse Y31.11. He may have chosen it because 'words' would include all three flavors of meaning; or he may have chosen it because 'actions' (*šyaoϑanācā*) and 'words' often are used together. Examples are footnoted.[37]

Humbach (1991): "...and proclamations...";
Humbach/Faiss (2010): "...and pronouncements...".

Taraporewala 1951 "...and also Words-to-guide..." (which is another way of saying 'teachings'); he comments that Jackson translates the word as 'words', Mills as 'injunctions'.

Barth.: "... and teachings...";
Moulton: "...and teachings...".

Of the three meanings Insler gives for the root *sanh-* (1) 'declare, announce', (2) 'teach', and (3) 'decree', I do not think (1) or (3) fit the context of our verse 11. Divine 'decrees' are antithetical to Zarathushtra's

thought, in which a fundamental teaching is the freedom to choose. Nor do I think 'declarations, or announcements, or proclamations' fit the context of this verse.   I think 'teachings' for *sәnghąscā* is the most accurate contextual fit, because it is linked with the previously mentioned *daēnåscā … x̌ratūšcā* 'envisioning-faculties and reasoning-faculties' both of which produce (good) 'teachings', just as 'embodied breath' produces 'actions'.

yaϑrā   'whereby"
yaϑrā is another of those flexible adverbs, an indeclinable (its ending does not change to reflect different cases, genders, or numbers). According to to Beekes 1988 it is an adverb which can mean 'where, whither, in order to' (p. 146). According Skjaervo 2006 it means 'where'.   In our verse,
Insler 1975: "... whereby ..."
Humbach 1991: "... in which ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... at which ..."
Taraporewala 1951: "... whereby ..."
Barth.   "... whereby ..."
Moulton 1912: "... whereby ..."

vaså 'at will',
According to Skjaervo 2006 *vaså* is nom. acc. pl. of the ntr. adverb stem *vasah-* (deriving from *vas-* 'wish'), and means 'at will'.   Therefore, in this verse Y31.11, the verb *dāyetē* 'one expresses' is modified by this adverb which shows how one expresses ~ giving us *vaså … dāyetē* 'one expresses at will'.   But the translations of our linguists disagree ~ perhaps because they give an interpretive translation, or perhaps because they give *vaså* a different grammatical value (other than an adverb).

Insler 1975: "...a person with volition..." Y31.11; commenting that he follows Barth. who construes *vaså* as nom. sg. of the adj. *vasah-*,[38] (which here is used as a noun in the sense of a person who has free will.

However, in other verses, Insler 1975 sees a related adverb, without comment,
"... one who has mastery over (verb) his tongue at will [*vasō* adverb] ..." Y31.19,
"... those who rule over [verb] life at will [*vasō* adverb] ..." Y32.15.
"... May the Wise Lord who rules [verb] at will [*vasə̄* adverb] ..." Y43.1;
"... When I could rule [verb] at will [*vasə̄* adverb] over my reward ... Y50.9.

Humbach 1991: "...the wisher..." (noun); he comments that *vaså* is either nom. sg. (which is how he translates the word in his 1991 translation) or could be acc. pl. (which is how he and Faiss translate the word in 2010).
Humbach/Faiss 2010: " ... his wishes..." (noun).

Taraporewala 1951: "...one-wills..." (verb?); he demonstrates the uncertainty regarding the grammatical value of this word, commenting that "Orig." it is acc. pl. of the ntr. noun *vasah-* will, wish; but that Mills and Jackson take it as nom. sg. (noun), and that "the word is used almost as an adv. in its function. (But he translates the word as a 3p verb).

Bartholomae: "...at one's free-will..."
Moulton 1912: "...at one's free-will...".

In Avestan the rules forming adverbs are not clearly defined.   In this context, I find Skjaervo 2006 persuasive.   I take *vaså* as an adverb 'at will' modifying the verb *dāyetē* 'one expresses ~ giving us 'one expresses [*dāyetē*] at will [*vaså*] ...'.

varənāng 'preferences'
Skjaervo 2006 says that *varənāng* is acc. pl. of the masc. stem *varəna-/varana-* which means 'choice'.
Insler 1975: "...preferences..."; commenting under Y30.2, he says that *āvarəna-* means 'choice' and is different from *varəna-* which he says consistently means 'preference', citing our verse Y31.11 and also Y45.1, Y48.4 and Y49.3. There is a (subtle) difference between 'choice' and 'preference'.
Humbach 1991: "... preferences..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "...wishes..."
Taraporewala 1951: "... whatever faith...";
Barth.: "... convictions ...", Tarap. comments that Barth. adds 'especially in matters of religion';
Moulton: "... choice ...".

In my view 'preferences' is the closest English equivalent for *varənāng* in this context.
varəna- may include religious preferences, but the way *varəna-* words are used in this and other contexts, its meaning is not limited to religious preferences or religious choices. especially if, as Tarap. believes, it originally comes from *var-* 'to choose'. The word also appears (in various inflected forms) in Y45.1, Y45.2, Y48.4, and Y49.3. In each of these verses, the preferences in question relate not to religious preferences but to preferences that are 'good' and 'evil/bad' (Y48.4, Y45.1); 'more beneficial' and 'harmful' (Y45.2); truth and deceit (Y49.3). This accords with Zarathushtra's teachings in the Gathas, which consistently advocate choices between these opposing preferences. In the context of our verse, Y31.11, the 'preferences' (*varənāng*) all relate to the preceeding tools which are used to express these preferences ~ physical lives, and the abilities to envision and reason, embodied breath, actions and teachings (or 'words' Insler 1975), none of which are limited to religion. I therefore think that in Zarathushtra's mind, the 'preferences' which are expressed through these tools include all the many preferences which embodied lives have (which may include religious preferences).

dāyetē 'one expresses'
dāyetē is an Avestan verb which has not yet been decoded.
Skjaervo 2006 does not show a stem for *dāyetē* or **dayetē*, (so far as I could tell).
Insler 1975 "... a person ... expresses...", a 3p verb (pres. indicative). He comments that *dāyetē* is difficult, but may represent an original **dayetē,* in which case he would derive it from *dī* 'view, consider' which could also mean 'express' [as in express what is seen, or express what is considered]. He bases his conclusion on another [Avestan] root *caš,* which like Vedic *khyā*, means both 'see' and 'relate' [as in relate what is seen], quoting an example.
Humbach 1991: "...makes use of...". Due to my lack of knowledgeable, I haven't the foggiest understanding of Professor Humbach's linguistic comment on *dāyetē*.
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "...one takes..." without comment;
Taraporewala 1951: "... one-may-hold ...";
Barth.: "... one may exercise ...";
Moulton: "... one-may-exercise ...".

I find Insler's view persuasive, and I think the 3p sg. verb form 'one expresses' is the most accurate English equivalent for *dāyetē*.

In GAv. (as in German and occasionally in English), the verb often appears at the end of a phrase, thus
yaϑrā varənāng vaså dāyetē
literally 'whereby [*yaϑrā*] preferences [*varənāng*] at will [*vaså*] one expresses [*dāyetē*].'

Or in more fluent English, 'whereby one expresses preferences at will,'.

* * * * *

Y31.12
a. *aϑrā   vācim   baraitī   miϑahvacå   vā   ərəš.vacå*
b. *vīdvå vā əvīdvå vā   ahyā zərədācā manaŋhācā*[39]
a. 'Therefore, one raises (one's) voice ~ false~speaking or true~speaking,
b. whether knowing or unknowing ~ with his heart and mind;

aϑrā   'Therefore'
Insler 1975: "... Therefore ..."
Humbach 1991: "... whether ..." (?)
Humbach/Faiss 2010: It is not clear to me how they translate this word.
Taraporewala 1951: "... Therefore ..."
Barth. "... Then ..."
Moulton 1912: "... Then ..."

baraitī   'one raises'
baraitī is 3p sg. indicative (present) of the verb stem *bar-* 'to lift up, to carry' (Skjaervo 2006). As previously stated, the verb form itself indicates whether it is 1p, 2p, 3p, sg. or pl. ~ There is no separate GAv. word '(a) person', or 'one' or 'he', or 'she', or 'it' ~ the 3p being implicit in the verb form (which is not gender specific), it could mean any of the foregoing. So we have to choose based on the context. Here it makes no difference, because in Avestan (as in English) the masc. can be used generically. The linguists in our group agree about the meaning of this verb, and that it is 3p sg..
Insler 1975: "... one raises ..."
Humbach 1991: "... a man ... raises ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... one ... raises ..."
Taraporewala 1951: "... (each) lifts up ..."
Barth. "... lifts up ... the false speaker ..."
Moulton 1912: the same as Bartholomae.

vācəm   '(one's) 'voice'
Skjaervo 2006 says that *vācəm* is acc. sg. of the masc. noun stem *vak-/vac-* "voice, word", and our linguists agree. The pronoun indicating 3p is implied, and if 'his' is selected, it is used generically (applying to all genders).
Insler 1975: "... his voice ..."
Humbach 1991: "... (his) voice ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... his voice ..."
Taraporewala 1951: "... (his) voice ..."
Barth. "... his voice ..."
Moulton 1912: "... his voice ..."

miϑahvacå   'false~speaking'
This word (perhaps originally a compound word which became one word), has 2 components. The origins of this word are further discussed below under *maēϑā*. Skjaervo 2006 says that *miϑah-* is a ntr. noun stem

which means 'falseness'; and *vacah-* is a ntr. noun stem which means 'word, speech'; but he thinks that the combined *miϑahvacah-* is an adjective which means "whose words are ever-changing, i.e. false"; and in our verse (Y31.12) its declension *miϑahvacå* is nom. sg. masc.

Insler 1975: "... false-speaking ..."
Humbach 1991: "... of crooked words ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... of false speech ..."
Taraporewala 1951: "... false speaker ..."
Barth. "... the false speaker ..."
Moulton 1912: "... the false speaker ..."

vā   'or'
vā is a word that has more than one meaning.[40]   But here, it is used as a conjunction (indeclinable) 'or', as all our linguists agree.

ərəš.vacå   'true-speaking'
This compound word has two components. Literally *ərəš* is an adverb (deriving from *ərəzu-*) which means 'straight (not crooked)' (Skjaervo 2006). And Skjaervo thinks the stem *ərəš.vacah-* is an adjective which means 'whose words are straight'. Our linguists agree about its meaning, but not its grammatical value (adj. or noun) - not a substantive difference here.

Insler 1975: "... true-speaking ..."
Humbach 1991: "... one of plain words ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... one of straight speech ..."
Taraporewala 1951: "... true-speaker ..."
Barth. "... the true speaker ..."
Moulton 1912: "... the true speaker ..."

In English, 'straight' (perhaps originally) had a physical meaning 'straight line', 'straight road', etc. - the opposite of something that is physically 'crooked' - a 'crooked line', evolving to something that is physically not correct - a broken leg that healed 'crooked', which may in turn have acquired an abstract, non-physical meaning (a 'crooked' heart).   All of which may also have applied to the physical 'straight' becoming the abstract 'straight (not crooked)'.   But in the GAv. word *ərəš* we do not have an evolution from the physical to the abstract; *ərəš* originally had an abstract meaning, deriving from a root *ar-* 'to fit' (as in an order that is correct, that fits) generating *aša-* (Ved. *rta-*),[41] - the true (correct) order of existence. So *ərəš* is used in the sense of 'true, correct' - the opposite of false.   And in this verse the 2 words *miϑahvacå* and *ərəš.vacå* are opposites - 'false-speaking' and 'true-speaking'. So (following Skjaervo 2006) I take these 2 opposites as adjectives describing 2 opposite types of speech.

Thus, a. *aϑrā   vācim   baraitī   miϑahvacå   vā   ərəš.vacå*
      a. 'Therefore, one raises (one's) voice - false-speaking or true-speaking,

vā ... vā   'whether ... or ...'
vā alone means 'or'; but *vā ... vā* means 'whether ... or'; 'either ... or' as in 'whether [this] or [that]'; or 'either ... or ...' (Beekes p. 149). In this context 'either ... or' does not fit, but 'whether ... or' does.

vīdvå vā əvīdvå vā   'whether knowing or unknowing'
According to Skjaervo 2006, *vīdvah-* is the perfect participle of the verb *vaēd-* 'to know', and *vīdvå* is its nom. sg. declension. Technically, a perfect participle indicates a completed action.   It is formed by putting

'having' in front of the past participle of the verb in question. Thus if Skjaervo 2006 is correct in stating that the stem *vīdvah-* is the perfect participle of *vaēd-* 'to know', we would have to translate *vīdvå vā əvīdvå vā* as 'whether having known or not having known'. The prefix 'ə' in the word *əvīdvå* simply turns *vīdvå* into a negative 'not having known'.

But none of our linguists translate *vīdvå* and *əvīdvå* as perfect participles.
Insler 1975: "... be he knowing or un-knowing ... "
Humbach 1991: "... (whether) a knowing one or an ignorant one ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... a knowing one or an ignorant one ..."
Taraporewala 1951: "... whether enlightened or unenlightened ..."
Barth. "... he that knows, or he that knows not ..."
Moulton 1912: "... he that knows, or he that knows not ..."

I think that Insler's translation captures Zarathushtra's intended double meaning for *vīdvå vā əvīdvå vā* indicating both
(1) whether the preceding true and false speaking was intentional ('knowing') or unintentional ('unknowing'), and also
(2) as two sets of opposites ~ true or false speaking, and having knowledge ('knowing') or ignorance ('unknowing').

ahyā zərədācā manaŋhācā   'with his heart and mind'

ahyā is gen. sg. masc. of the demonstrative pronoun stem *a-* 'this, that'. But in Avestan, this demonstrative pronoun stem (among others) is also used for 3p pronouns (he, she, it, etc.).[42] So literally gen. sg. *ahyā* could mean 'his' (which fits the context) or 'of his' or 'of this/that' (which do not). Here, gen. sg. *ahyā* means 'his' refers to the person's heart and mind (other such instances of *ahyā* meaning 'his' are footnoted).[43] Needless to say, the gender is generic (as in English).

zərədācā manaŋhācā   'with heart and mind'; both words are instr. sg. of the (conjectured) ntr. stems *zərəd-* 'heart' and *manah-* 'mind' respectively (Skjaervo 2006) ~ all Avestan stems are conjectured. In GAv., the instr. 'with' (and the suffix *cā* 'and') are a part of each of these word forms, but in fluent English these words ('with' and 'and') often are stated only once.

zərədācā. This verse is the only time a *zərəd-* word is used in all surviving Avestan texts. In their Glossaries, Skjaervo 2006 and Reichelt 1911 both show *zərəd-* only in GAv. (not in YAv.). And Skjaervo 2006 shows that this verse (Y31.12) is the only instance in all surviving GAv. texts in which a *zərəd-* word is used. So we cannot decode its meaning by comparing the contexts of its use in other GAv. texts. Humbach 1991 (and others) translate *zərəd-* as 'heart' based on two Vedic passages.[44]

manaŋhācā. As Insler 1975 has pointed out, in GAv., *manah-* is used for 'mind' (faculty), 'thinking' (process), and 'thought' (object). In this context it is the faculty 'mind' through which a person expresses himself 'raises (his) voice'. The linguists in our group translate this phrase *ahyā zərədācā manaŋhācā* as follows,

Insler 1975: "... in accordance with his heart and mind ..."
Humbach 1991: "... with his heart and thought ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... with his heart and thought ..."
Taraporewala 1951: "... with-the-heart and also with-the-head of each [*ahyā*] ..."
Barth. "... according to his own heart and mind ..."

Moulton 1912: "... according to his own heart and thought ..."

But what meaning, what ideas, does Zarathushtra intend to convey, when he used this phrase 'with his heart and mind'? In English, 'heart' denotes emotions; and 'mind' denotes intellectual functions. But in Avestan, *manah-* 'mind/thinking/thought', includes the full spectrum of (abstract) conscious capabilities ~ intellectual, as well as emotional, creative, insightful, etc. (detailed in another chapter).[45]   So in Zarathushtra's culture, in the phrase 'heart and mind', the word 'heart' would have to denote something other than emotions.   What that may have been, we do not know.   Zarathushtra's meaning in using *zərədācā   manaŋhācā* has not yet been decoded.

<div align="center">* * *</div>

Y31.12
Line c. *ānuš.hax š   ārmaitiš   mainyū   pərəsāitē yaϑrā   maēϑā.*
        (But) over time embodied truth deliberates with one's way of being, where (there is) opposition.

ānuš.hax š   'over time'
ānuš.hax š   is a word about which our linguists disagree regarding both its grammatical classification (adj.? adverb? verb? something else?), as well as the flavor of its underlying meaning.
Skjaervo 2006 thinks that *ānuš.hax š*   is nom. sg. fem. of the adjective stem *anuš.hak-* which he says means 'following along'. If he is correct, then *ānuš.hax š* describes *ārmaitiš* and expresses the idea that embodied truth [*ārmaitiš*] follows along, or pursues, one who still is a conflicted mix of 'good' and 'evil' preferences.

Insler 1975: translates *ānuš.hax š*   as "... in due course ...". He comments that Ved. *ānuṣák* 'in turn' is cognate, and that *ānuš.hax š* is an adverb for the verb *pərəsāitē* which he translates as 'shall come to terms'. Thus he translates *ānuš.hax š ārmaitiš … pərəsāitē* "(But) in due course [*ārmaitiš*] shall come to terms ..."

Humbach 1991: translates *ānuš.hax š* (perhaps interpretively) as a verb form "... persuing (this matter) ..."; but he comments that Ved. *ānuṣák* is cognate, and means 'in continuous order, uninterrupted, one after another' (all of which seem adverbial ~ not verbs).

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... following up (this question)..." (a verb?) without comment.

Taraporewala 1951: "... standing by ...". He comments that *ānuṣák* in the Vedas means 'in continuous order', 'one after the other', and therefore Bartholomae translates *ānuš.hax š* as "...passing from one to another" [which translation in my view, and with respect, makes no sense in this context].   But Taraporewala himself thinks that Skt. *anu- √ sac-* which he says means 'to stand by (in order to help)' is a better fit.

Barth.   "... Passing from one to another ..."
Moulton 1912: "... Passing from one to another ..."

I really like Taraporewala's explanation. But although it accords with the context, he has not given enough Vedic details to persuade me that GAv. *ānuš.hax š* is not cognate with Ved. *ānuṣák*, but instead, is related to Ved. *anu- √ sac-* (which he does not explain in any event).

ānuš.hax š is a word that appears only once (in this verse Y31.12) in all surviving GAv. texts. Nor does Skjaervo show it in his 2003 YAv. glossary, so it likely does not occur in any surviving YAv. text. We therefore cannot arrive at Zarathushtra's intended meaning, by comparing other instances of how he uses this compound word.

Based on the context, I think *ānuš.hax š* is cognate with Ved. *ānuṣák*, and is used in our verse in the sense of a continuous stream (of experiences) one after the other. There is no one~word (or even one~phrase) English equivalent that is both a literal translation, and also accurately conveys its meaning in this context. I think 'over time', is the closest English equivalent that expresses its literal meaning.

ārmaitiš   'embodied truth'
ārmaitiš is nom. sg. of the fem. stem *ārmaiti-* (Skjaervo 2006), but there is wide disagreement about the meaning of *ārmaiti-*, which has been translated variously as 'right~mindedness'; 'divine wisdom'; 'piety or respect'; 'faith and devotion';   satisfying intention; 'fittingness, submission and humility'; and 'serenity, stability and tranquility'.   Even the finest linguists seem to have forgotten a point raised by Thieme ~ that *ārmaiti-* is an attribute of the Divine, so most of these educated guesses regarding its meaning cannot be correct.   These opinions and the meaning of *ārmaiti-* (based on the ways in which the word is used in the Gathas) have been detailed in another chapter.[46] For the reasons set forth in that chapter I think *ārmaiti-* means 'the true (correct, good) order of existence (*aṣa-*) embodied in thought, word and action' or 'embodied truth' for short. Here I will summarize a few examples of the ways in which *ārmaiti-* is used in the Gathas, which support my conclusion.

Insler 1975 translation (except for Y34.10, and words in square brackets).

"But to this world He came with the rule of good thinking and of truth, and ... enduring [*ārmaiti-*] gave body [*kəhrpām*] and breath (to it)..." Y30.7,

"...Through its actions, [*ārmaiti-*] gives substance to the truth..." Y44.6,

'By his action stemming from good thinking, a good-reasoning (person) has expressed his understanding and his [*spənta- ārmaiti-*]...' Y34.10, my translation (I follow Schmidt in translating *hux ratu-* as 'good reasoning' whereas Insler translates it as 'a person of good determination').

"[*spənta-* 'beneficial'] is the man of [*ārmaiti-*]. He is so by reason of his understanding, his words, his actions, his conception [*daēnā-* 'envisionment']..." Y51.21.

The linguists in our group have translated *ārmaitiš* in our verse, Y31.12, as follows,

Insler 1975: "... piety ..."
Humbach 1991: " ... right~mindedness ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... Right~mindedness ..."
Taraporewala 1951: "... Armaiti ..."
Bartholomae   "... Armaiti ..." (as shown in Tarap. 1951)
Moulton 1912: "... Piety ...".

Thus, *ānuš.hax š ārmaitiš* '(But) over time, embodied truth ...'

mainyū 'with (one's) way of being'
There is general agreement that *mainyū* is instr. sg. of the ntr. stem *mainyu-*, but here too, linguists vary widely regarding its meaning. It has been variously translated as 'spirit', 'spirit or inspiration', 'intention or spirit', 'thought', 'mentality or way of thinking', and 'mind'.   These translations simply do not fit the ways in which *mainyu-* is used in the Gathas.   These opinions and the meaning of *mainyu-* have been discussed in detail in another chapter, in which I show that the only meaning that fits *all* the ways in which *mainyu-* is used in the Gathas, is the totality of a way of being ~ thought, word and action.[47] Indeed, in Y30.3, the two opposing ways of being [*mainyu-*] are specifically described as "... in thought and in word, in action,

they are two..." Y30.3. Therefore *mainyu-* cannot mean 'spirit', or 'mentality', etc. When *mainyu-* is used for the Divine, it means the totality of the Divine's way of being (which is not limited to our physical reality). When *mainyu-* is used for us, it means the totality of our (present) way of being ~ the life force and the physical shell which it inhabits.   This meaning of *mainyu-* is consistent with our two verses (Y31.11, and 12) because *mainyū* as 'way of being' in Y31.12 parallels *astvantəm … uštanəm* 'embodied breath' in Y31.11. Here are the ways in which the linguists in our group have translated (instr. sg.) *mainyū.*

Insler 1975: "... with one's spirit ..."
Humbach 1991: "... with the spirit ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... with the spirit ..."
Taraporewala 1951: "... through~(his)~spirit ..." (the instr. sg. in English is expressed with the prepositions 'with, by, through')
Barth.   "... with the spirit ..."
Moulton 1912: "... with the spirit ...".

pərəsāitē 'deliberates'
Except for Moulton, I think the differences in how the linguists in our group translate *pərəsāitē* are different flavors of the same underlying meaning.[48]

Skjaervo 2006 thinks that *pərəsaitē*,[49] is 3p sg. indicative (present), middle voice, of the verb stem *pars-* which he says means (in middle voice) 'to consult'. In this conjugation, the meaning of *pərəsaitē* would give us '[he, she, it] consults'.

Insler 1975: "... shall come to terms ...". He does not comment on *pərəsāitē*. But it is instructive to see how he has translated this *pars-* verb (in middle voice) ~ in other verses. For example, Insler translates *pərəsaitē* as "... is deliberated ..." Y31.13a (the very next verse), based on mss. K5 and H1; *pərəsmanāng* "... they were deliberating ..." Y30.6b.
Returning to our verse Y31.12, our other linguists translate *pərəsaitē* as follows,

Humbach 1991: "... takes counsel ..." Y31.12
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... shall hold counsel ..." Y31.12

Taraporewala 1951: "... doth discuss ..." commenting that the verb means 'to confer with'. Y31.12
Barth.   "... confers ...". Y31.12
Moulton 1912: "... pleads ...". Y31.12.

In this context, I think *ānuš.hax š ārmaitiš … pərəsāitē* is used for a continuing deliberative process (within each of us based on our many material experiences ~ each following the other), that brings about incremental change from a conflicted, mixed (good/bad) state of being to one which 'embodies the true (correct, good) order of existence' (which is *ārmaiti-*), which once again echoes Zarathushtra's thought regarding that the means and the end are the same ~ it is *ārmaiti-* (personified truth) that incrementally, through a deliberative process (within), brings about *ārmaiti-* (personified truth).[50] Therefore (following Insler's choice in other verses) I use the flavor of meaning 'deliberates' for *pərəsāitē* (3p sg. indicative, middle voice).

Thus *ānuš.hax š ārmaitiš mainyū pərəsāitē*
'(But) over time, embodied truth deliberates with (one's) way of being, ...'

yaϑrā   'where'

Insler 1975: "... where ..."
Humbach 1991: "... where ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... where ..."
Taraporewala 1951: "... wherever ..."
Barth. "... in whom ..."
Moulton 1912: "... in which ..."

maēϑā   '(there is) opposition'.
'(there is)'; in Avestan, various forms of the verb 'to be' often are implied, and this is one such instance.
maēϑā has generated differences in meaning resulting from either an evolution in meaning, or a different flavor of meaning.   Here I will start with Insler's view, because he gives us a comment that helps to explain the differing translations of the linguists in our group.

Insler 1975: "... there has been opposition."; citing our verse Y31.12, he omments (under a different verse Y30.9) as follows. "The root *miϑ* originally meant 'to be on opposing sides', but early acquired the sense 'to be false', clearly stated in *miϑahvacah-* 'of false words' Y31.12 ..." (p. 173). Here, when Insler says "originally", I do not know whether he means a chronological evolution of meaning, or whether he uses "originally" to indicate an underlying meaning which early on was used for 'bad' opposition ~ what is false.

Skjaervo 2006 conjectures a verb stem *maē-* 'to alternate', which he thinks generated the adjective stem *maēϑa-* "ever changing".

Humbach 1991: "... (right~mindedness is) present." In his comment he provides 2 possible alternative translations "...in case (matters are) undecided" and "... doubtful ..."; but he gives no linguistic explanation for his choices.
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... (is) a partner."; with no comment.

Taraporewala 1915: "... (there is) doubt ..." with no linguistic explanation.
Bartholomae: "... there is wavering."
Moulton 1912: "... there is wavering."

I find Insler's comments on *maēϑā* persuasive.   In our verse (Y31.12), Zarathushtra contrasts opposites ~ 'false~speaking [*miϑahvacǻ*] or true~speaking',   'knowing or unknowing' (in lines a. and b.).   And here in line c. he expresses the same idea of opposites, in which embodied truth [*ārmaiti-*] deliberates (within the person) where there has been opposition to it (within the person) ~ the implication being that embodied truth will (experience by experience, over a long period of time) incrementally through a person's own deliberations, changing his preferences, from 'bad' preferences to those that embody the true (correct) order of existence (which is *ārmaiti-*).

As a practical matter, the opposite of embodiment of truth [*ārmaiti-*] is in fact embodied untruth (all that is false, wrong, ignorant, and all the other qualities that are the opposite of the true order of existence).[51]

'Opposition' *maēϑā* is not only the "original" linguistic meaning (as Insler comments), it includes all the qualities that are the opposite of embodied truth (of which 'falseness' is just one). I therefore think the "original" meaning is applicable here, and I translate *maēϑā* as 'opposition'. Thus,

 Line c. *ānuš.hax š   ārmaitiš   mainyū   pərəsāitē yaϑrā   maēϑā.*
        (But) over time, embodied truth deliberates with one's way of being, where (there is) opposition.

* * * * *

19

For comparative purposes (and to place their translation choices in context), here are these 2 verses in the various translations of our group of linguists. Translators have not always placed English words that are not in the GAv. text in round parentheses. The syntax also makes for translation differences. You may wish to evaluate these translation choices in light of what is linguistically defensible, and the macro/micro contexts of the Gathas (which give us Zarathushtra's intent).

Y31.11:
hyaṯ. nə. mazdā. paourvīm.   gaēϑåscā. tašō. daēnåscā.
ϑwā. manaŋhā. x ratūšcā.   hyaṯ. astvantəm. dadå. uštanəm.
hyaṯ. šyaoϑanācā. sənghąscā.   yaϑrā. varənəng. vaså. dāyetē.

Y31.12:
aϑrā. vācəm. baraitī.   miϑahvacå. vā. ərəš.vacå.
vīdvå. vā. əvīdvå. vā.   ahyā. zərədācā. manaŋhācā.
ānuš.hax š. ārmaitiš.   mainyū. pərəsāitē yaϑrā. maēϑā. ⁙

My translation.
Y31.11
ab. 'Since for us in the beginning, O Wisdom, through Thy thinking, Thou didst fashion physical lives, and envisioning~faculties, and reasoning~faculties; since Thou didst give embodied breath;
c. since (Thou didst give) actions and teachings, whereby one expresses preferences at will,'

Y31.12
a. 'Therefore, one raises (one's) voice ~ false-speaking or true-speaking,
b. whether knowing or unknowing ~ with his heart and mind;
c. (But) over time, embodied truth deliberates with one's way of being, where (there is) opposition.

<div align="center">* * *</div>

Insler 1975.
Y31.11:
"Since Thou, Wise One, at the beginning, didst fashion for us by Thy thinking, creatures and conceptions and intentions, since Thou didst create body and breath, since (Thou didst create) both actions and words, (all these things) whereby a person with volition expresses his preferences,"

Y31.12:
"Therefore one raises his voice in accord with both his heart and his mind, be he false-speaking or true-speaking, be he knowing or un-knowing. (But) in due course [ArmaITI~] shall come to terms with one's spirit [maINYU~] where there has been opposition." Y31.12.

<div align="center">* * *</div>

Humbach 1951
Y31.11:
ab."Since Thou, O Wise One, didst fashion for us the primal (stage of our existence), the herds and the religious views, with Thy thought, as well as the intellects, when Thou didst assign corporeal life,
c. when (Thou didst establish) the actions and proclamations, in which the wisher makes use of (his) preferences: ~

Y31.12:
"whether it (be) a man of crooked words or one of plain words, (who) raises there (his) voice, (whether) a knowing one or an ignorant one, with his heart and thought,

pursuing (this matter), right-mindedness takes counsel with the spirit where (right-mindedness is) present."

* * *

Humbach/Faiss 2010
Y31.11:
"Since you fashion what (is) fundamental to us, O Wise One, the herds and the views,
through your thought, and the intellects, since you grant osseous vitality,
since (you determine the ritual) actions and pronouncements at which one takes his choices (and forms) his wishes --

Y31.12:
"(Whether it is a man) of false speech or one of straight speech who raises there his voice,
a knowing/initiated one or an ignorant, with his heart and thought,
following up (this question) Right-mindedness shall hold counsel with the spirit where she (is) a partner."

* * *

Taraporewala 1951
Y31.11:
"Since for-us, O Mazda, from the-beginning Thou-didst-create Bodies and also Souls, and (Mental) powers through-Thine-own Thought;
since Thou-didst-place Life within-flesh-encaged, since Powers-to-act and also Words-to-guide (Thou didst bestow)
whereby one-may-hold whatever-Faith one-wills;"

Y31.12:
"Therefore (each) lifts-up (his) voice, whether false-speaker or true-speaker, whether enlightened or unenlightened; (still) with-the-heart and also with-the-head of-each through-(his)-spirit Armaiti, standing-by, doth-discuss wherever (there is) doubt."

* * *

Moulton 1912
Y31.11:
"When thou, Mazdah, in the beginning, didst create beings and (men's) Selves by thy Thought, and intelligences -- when thou didst make life clothed with body, when (thou madest) actions and teachings, whereby one may exercise chice at one's free will;"

Y31.12:
"Then lifts up his voice the false speaker or the true speaker, he that knows or he that knows not, each according to his own heart and thought.   Passing one to another, Piety pleads with the spirit in which there is wavering."

* * *

Bartholomae
Y31.11:
"When Thou, O Mazdah, in the beginning didst create the Individual and the Individuality, through Thy Spirit, and powers of understanding -- when Thou didst make life clothed with the body, when (Thou madest) actions and teachings, whereby one may exercise one's convictions at one's free-will;"

21

Y31.12:

"The lifts up his voice the false speaker or the true speaker, he that knows or he that knows not, (each) according to his own heart and mind. Passing one to another Armaiti confers with the spirit in whom there is wavering."

<div align="center">* * * * * * *</div>

---

[1] See in *Part One: The Beneficial Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu,   Completeness, Non-Deathness, Haurvatat/Ameretat, The Nature of the Divine,* and *The Identity of the Divine;* and
In *Part Two: Asha and the Checkmate Solution;   The Puzzle of the Best, Vahishta; A Question of Reward & The Path; The Puzzle of Creation;* and *Did Wisdom Choose Too?*

[2] References to Skjaervo 2006 are to his on-line *Old Avestan Glossary.*
Insler 1975 ~ his translation and fts. for both verses are at pp. 38 - 39; his comments at pp. 185 - 186.
Humbach 1991 ~ his translation is in Vol. 1, p. 129; his comments in Vol. 2, pp. 67 - 68.
Humbach/Faiss 2010 ~ their translation of both verses appears at p. 86; their comments at p. 172.
Taraporewala 1951 ~ his translation and comments for both verses appear at pp. 210 - 217.
Moulton 1912. His translation of both verses is at p. 353.
Bartholomae's English translation is shown in Taraporewala 1951 as follows: Y31.11 at p. 214; Y31.12 at p. 217.

[3] Geldner has a tiny punctuation mark $\because$ after the last word of this verse (Y31.11), which I have omitted because the next verse (Y31.12) starts with "Therefore" so it is a continuation of Y31.11.   I do not know which mss. have (or do not have) any punctuation marks here, because in his introduction (*Prolegomena*) to this work Geldner states that punctuation varies widely in the mss. and that he had to devise a system for himself, in which he thinks the tiniest punctuation mark $\because$ represets a colon (in English punctuation). p. lii.

[4] Geldner has *vācəm* based on a number of mss., whereas Insler 1975 has *vācim* which Geldner's ft. shows is also supported by a number of mss.   Humbach and Taraporewala prefer *vācəm*.

[5] Geldner shows *ərəšvacå* as one word, Insler, Humbach and Humbach/Faiss show it as a compound word.

[6] Geldner has *ārmaitīš* here, which whereas all the linguists in our group (who have the GAv. form transliterated) show the word as *ārmaitiš*. Skjaervo 2006 shows no declension *ārmaitīš* (as Geldner has it), so I have followed our linguists and take this word as nom. sg. *ārmaitiš*.

[7] Detailed in *Part One: Good Thinking, Vohu Manah.*

[8] See *Part One: The Beneficial Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu.*

[9] See *Part Two: The Puzzle of Creation,* which also discusses our 2 verses ~ Y31.11 and 12 ~ under the sub-title *The purpose of 'creation'.*

[10] At first glance, you may think that the two ways of being are the two uncreated entities of the later texts ~ one all good and the other all evil.   That this is not Zarathushtra's teaching is detailed (with evidence) in other chapters. For example, in *Part One: The Beneficial Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu;* and *Part Two: The Puzzle of Creation.*

[11] See *Part One: Truth, Asha.*

[12] See *Part Two: Asha and the Checkmate Solution.*

[13] Discussed in *Part Three: Heaven In Other Avestan Texts;*   and *Heaven & Hell In Pazand & Pahlavi Texts.*

[14] See *Part One: Reincarnation.* In *Part Two: A Question of Reward & The Path;   Asha & The Checkmate Solution; The Houses of Paradise & Hell;* and *The Puzzle of Creation.* In *Part Three: The Absence of Damnation & Hell in Other Avestan Texts;* and *Chinvat, The Bridge of Deciding.*

[15] Detailed:

In *Part One: The Identity Of The Divine*;

In *Part Two: The Puzzle of Creation*; and *A Question Of Immanence*; and *Did Wisdom Choose Too?* and

In *Part Three: Chinvat, The Bridge of Discerning* ~ (not neglecting the last part).

[16] Discussed in the following chapters (to give you some idea of the frequency with which this type of framing syntax is used in the Gathas:

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

In *Part Six: Yasna 28.5* (discussed in some detail); *Yasna 30.7* (which has a double framing ~ one within another); *Yasna 32.7* and *Yasna 51.9* (in which the framing extends over the ceasura); *Yasna 28.1* (discussed briefly); *Yasna 32.9* (discussed briefly); and *Yasna 44.16* (discussed briefly).

[17] *hyat* an indeclinable ~ used for both a conjunction and an adverb. An indeclinable is simply an Avestan word whose ending does not change for case, gender, number.

Skjaervo 2006 shows GAv. *hyat* as a conjunction, 'that,   because,   as'.

Beekes 1988 shows GAv. *hyat /yat* as an indeclinable adverb 'since, in so far' (p. 145 ~ 146).

hyat is also a grammatical form (declension) of the relative pronoun stem *ya-* 'who, which, that'. Skjaervo 2006, Jackson 1892 **§** 403. But in this context, a relative pronoun does not fit.

[18] The transliterated spellings of *paourvya-* vary.

Insler shows it as *paourvya-* in his comment on *paourvīm* in Y**31.8a** (Insler p. 184);

Tarap. shows it as *paoirya-* or *pouruya-* in his comment on *paourvīm* in Y28.1, and identifies it with the RV *pūrvyam* (Tarap. p. 91).

Geldner shows that the mss. themselves vary, see for example Geldner *Avesta,* under Y28.1b, p. 98, note 1 (4); and under Y30.3a, p. 106, note 3 (1).

To avoid confusion, and because I primarily use the Insler translation I consistently show it as *paourvya-* in its various grammatical forms (as his text does).

[19] See *Part Three: Paourvya,* for an analysis of the meanings of this word as used in the Gathas ~ first in time, first in quality, et cetera.

[20] Detailed in *Part Two: The Puzzle of Creation.*

[21] Tarap. (1951) p. 174.

[22] See *Part Three: Daena,* for an in depth discussion of the meaning of this word.

[23] See *Part Three: Xratu,* for an in depth discussion of the meaning of this word.

[24] The many flavors of meaning of the verb *dā-* are discussed in detail in *Part Two: The Puzzle of Creation,* and affect our understanding of Zarathushtra's notion of 'creation' ~ quite different from what is ascribed to him (viewed through the spectacles of most of today's dominant religions).

[25] Taraporewala 1951 pp. 202, 204; and 509.

[26] Tarap. 1951 pp.   512.

[27] Moulton EZ 1912, pp. 353, 369.

[28] Detailed in *Part Two: The Puzzle of Creation.*

[29] See *Part Two: The Puzzle of Creation.*

---

[30] Macdonell in *A Vedic Grammar for Students*, **§** 86, p. 63, says that adjective stems formed with the suffix *-maṇt- -vaṇt-* both mean *possessing*. Jackson expresses the same opinion for similar Avestan adjectives. Speaking of stems that end in consonants, Jackson says, "This subdivision of consonant stems includes: ... (ii) possessive adjective stems in *maṇt*, *vaṇt*. ..." Jackson 1892, **§** 289, p. 84.

[31] Insler 1975 does not explain the linguistics of either *astvaṇt-* or *uštāna-*, but his translation in the following verses is instructive.
in Y34.14 he translates forms of these words as follows, "For that prize, desirable for the body [*astvaitē* dat. sg.] and breath [*uštānāi* dat. sg.]..." Y34.14. There is no 'and' here, so more literally 'desirable for the embodied breath (life)'. In Y33.14a he translates *uštanəm* as 'breath', "For Zarathushtra does give the breath [*uštanəm* acc. sg.] of even his own person as a gift..." Y33.14a; and he sees parallels with synonyms expressed in Y30.7 *kəhrpə̄m ... qnmā* which he also translates "...body and breath..."; (but there is no 'and'; *kəhrp-* means 'form, body' and *qnman-* means 'breath' Skjaervo 2006). In each of these verses, 'breath' is used in the sense of 'life'.

[32] Humbach 1991 (consistently) translates *astvaṯ* (corporeal) and *uštānā* (with vitality) in Y43.16c; and *uštanəm* (vitality) in Y33.14a (Vol. 1, pp. 156, 139). In Y30.7, he translates *kəhrpə̄m ... qnmā* as 'form ... breath' (Vol. 1, p. 124); commenting on *qnmā* he suggests that the word likely belongs to Latin *animus* 'mood' and *anima* 'breath, respiration wind, soul, conscience, self' (comparing Ved. *ātmán* 'breath, self').

[33] They (consistently) translate *astvaṯ* ('osseous/material') and *uštānā* (through vitality) in Y43.16c; and *uštanəm* (vitality) in Y33.14a (pp. 120, 99).

[34] In Y43.16c Taraporewala 1951 translates *astvaṯ* as 'incarnate' (commenting that it means 'possessing bones' or 'corporeal', and *uštānā* as '(full of Thy) Life' (Tarap. p. 456, 457-458. In Y33.14a he translates *uštāna-* as 'Life' (p. 348).

[35] In Y43.16c Barth. translates *astvaṯ* as 'embodied' and *uštānā* as 'full of life' (Tarap. p. 458). In Y33.14a he translates *uštanəm* as 'life' (Tarap. p. 350).

[36] In Y43.16c and Y33.14a, Moulton's translations of *astvaṯ ... uštānā* and *uštanəm* are identical to the translations of Barth. (Moulton EZ 1912, pp. 367, 360).

[37] "Wise One, therefore tell me the best words and actions [*šyaoϑanācā ... vaocā*] ..." Y34.15;
"...Thou didst determine actions [*šyaoϑanā*] as well as words [*ux δā*] to have their prizes..." Y43.5;
"...through words [*ux δāiš*] and acts [*šyaoϑanā*] stemming from [*ārmaiti-*]..." Y44.10;
"...the words [*ux δā*] and actions [*šyaoϑanācā*] stemming from His good conception [*daēnayå vaŋhuyā*]." Y53.1.
But in Y51.14 he again translates another form of *sə̄ngha-* (linked with *šyaoϑana-*) as 'by ... words',
"...Theirs is a pleasure from (bringing) injury ... by their actions and their words [*šyaoϑanāišcā sə̄nghāišacā*]..." Y51.14.

[38] Beekes identifies *vasah-* as an adj. 'wishing' (Beekes p. 116);
Insler translates the various grammatical forms of *vasah-* as 'wish' and also as 'will',
Y34.12a *vasā* 'wish' (following mss Jp1, J2)
Y43.1b *vasā* 'at will'
Y50.9c *vasā* 'at will'
Y31.19b *vasō* 'at will'
Y32.15b *vasō* 'at will'.

[39] Geldner has a tiny punctuation mark ·: after this word which I have omitted because an English colon here does not fit the context of the verse. The transliterated Avestan form of this verse shown by Insler, Humbach, Humbach/Faiss, and Taraporewala show no punctuation marks.

[40] Other meanings of *vā* in Avestan are as follows,

24

vā   'we two' personal pronoun 1st person nom. du. (M&dV p. 69, Insler); and

vā   'indeed' Beekes 1988 says that *vā* is (among other things) an emphatic particle (p. 149).

[41] See Insler's explanation, quoted in *An Introduction to the Gatha of Zarathushtra,* Issue # 2, p. 12, which may be viewed at Shahriar Shahriari's website www.zarathushtra.com.

[42] Skjaervo 2006 shows *ahyā* as gen. sg. masc. of the personal /demonstrative pronoun stem *a-* (but this just pertains to 3p personal pronouns (he, she it etc.), it does not apply to 1p and 2p personal pronouns (I, you, etc.). Beekes states that "For the third person, demonstrative pronouns are used." p. 137. While there are other specific forms for 3p personal pronouns, certain demonstrative pronoun stems are used also for 3p pronouns. Jackson 1892 **§§** 394, 395, p. 113.

[43] Here are a few examples from the Gathas, of gen. sg. *ahyā* used for his with a noun in a different declension (as in our verse Y31.11) ~ all in the Insler 1975 translation except for words in square brackets (which are mine).

ahyā x ratū frō.mā sāstū vahištā Y45.6e.
"May He instruct me in His [*ahyā* gen. sg.] best intentions [*x ratū* instr. sg. 'through His most good reasoning]."

ahyā šyāōϑanāiš   akāt̰ ā šyąs manaŋhō Y47.5d
"... since he lives by his [*ahyā* gen. sg.] actions [*šyāōϑanāiš* instr. pl.] stemming from evil thinking."

ahyā zaošǝ̄ng uštiš varǝnāng ... Y48.4c
his [*ahyā* gen. sg.] pleasures [*zaošǝ̄ng* acc. pl.], ... desires [*uštiš* sic? for *uštīš* acc. pl.], ... preferences [*varǝnāng* acc. pl.], ...".

[44] Humbach 1991 and Taraporewala both point out a phrase in the Rig Veda which they think is cognate *hrdā mánasā* which they translate as 'with heart and thought' (Humbach), and which Taraporewala says is "an exact paralell" with *zǝrǝdācā manaŋhācā* in our verse.   But neither of them give the context in which the Vedic phrase is used.   Humbach 1991 mentions another Vedic parallel which he describes as "strange" in which *hrdā ... mánasā* is used in the following context "they see the bird with (their) heart and thought", indicating that the phrase did not make sense to him. I am not sufficiently knowledgeable in Vedic to say whether 'heart' (representing loving emotions) fits all uses of *hrdā* in Vedic texts.

[45] Detailed in *Part One: Good Thinking, Vohu Manah.*

[46] Detailed in *Part One: Embodied Truth, Aramaiti.*

[47] Detailed in *Part One: The Beneficial Way Of Being, Spenta Mainyu.*

[48] Examples of different flavors of the same underlying meaning in the use of 2 Avestan words, (and the importance of understanding which flavor of meaning Zarathushtra intends, based on the macro/micro contexts of the Gathas and the Song and verse in which the word appears), are detailed in *Part Three: Is Wisdom A God of Wrath, Enmity?*

[49] In our verse, Y31.12, Geldner, Insler, Humbach and Humbach/Faiss show the word with a long *ā, pǝrǝsāitē*, but Skjaervo 2006 in his glossary shows the word only with a short *a pǝrǝsaitē*.   I do not know the reasons for, or significance of, these differences. In the very next verse Y31.13a. *pǝrǝsaitē* with short *a* is shown by Insler, but in Geldner with a long *ā, pǝrǝsāitē* (with mss. variations), whereas Skjaervo 2006, Humbach, and Humbach/Faiss prefer a different conjugation *pǝrǝsāētē* (3p du. indicative according to Skjaervo 2006).   This gives some indication of how challenging it is to accurately ascertain what Zarathushtra's intent may have been ~ based on the form of a word (which may affect its grammatical value, and therefore its meaning in a given context).

[50] Detailed in *Part Two: A Question of Reward & The Path.*

[51] Detailed in *Part One: Truth, Asha.*