This revised version simply corrects a spelling error. My apologies.

Yasna Haptanghaiti 35. 2 and 3

The Yasna Haptanghaiti is not a part of the Gathas.   Nor do we know who its author(s) may have been. The form in which it has come down to us in surviving manuscripts, is generally in Gathic Avestan, (with some additions in later forms of the Avestan language).[1] So it would be reasonable to conclude that (except for the later Avestan parts) it was composed closer in time to Zarathushtra than other Avestan texts. And indeed, some parts of the Yasna Haptanghaiti are very close to his thought. This is true of the entire first chapter of the Yasna Haptanghaiti (YHapt. 35), but also of other parts.

The opening paragraph (YHapt 35.1) is in archaic YAv. and therefore would have been added much later (some additional details are footnoted).[2]   But it also is quite beautiful and accurately reflects Zarathushtra's thought.   It reads as follows.

'The truth~possessing Lord Wisdom, (having) the judgment of truth,[3] we celebrate;
The beneficial non~mortal (ones), good~ruling, good~giving, we celebrate;
The truth~possessing existence of all (things), we celebrate
~ belonging to the existences of mind,   and physical life ~
praiseworthy (because) of good truth,   praiseworthy (because) of the good envisionment of wisdom~worship." YHapt. 35.1. There are no capital letters in Av. script, and I take last word ~ the name of the religion ~ with double entendre, meaning the worship of wisdom, and the worship of the Existence that is Wisdom personified.

These words are a beautiful introduction to the entire first chapter of the Yasna Haptanghaiti (YHapt. 35.2 through 10).   Notice also the 2d line in which we celebrate 'the beneficial non~mortal (ones), good~ruling, good~giving'.   These (in my view) are the many perfected fragments of existence which have attained the qualities that make a being divine (amesha spenta) completely (as we see in Y51.22),[4] and therefore are part of the Divine, but who 'ruling at will' over their non~deathness continue with the work of helping those of us who have not yet made it,[5] and therefore are 'good~giving', and 'good~ruling'.

If I have enough remaining time, I would like to translate all 10 chapters of YHapt. 35 (in subsequent chapters of Part Six).   But for now I give you in this chapter YHapt. 35 verses 2 and 3 which (probably) were the beginning of the original Yasna Haptanghaiti.   I also give you (in subsequent chapters) YHapt. 35.8, and a few other verses of the Yasna Haptanghaiti.   All of these verses are in Gathic Avestan.

Verse 3 contains one of my favorite descriptions of the Divine ~ 'O Lord Wisdom beautiful through truth'. I use the short hand 'truth' for the longer (but more accurate) 'true (correct, right, good) order of existence' *aša-*.

Both these verses (2 and 3) are valuable for reasons which I touch upon in the *Discussion* section (below).

Most linguists are of the opinion that the Yasna Haptanghaiti is in prose. That may be so.   I am not an expert on the meters of Avestan poetry. But I think it is a mistake to impose our modern definitions of 'poetry' on to an ancient culture.   Avestan poetry consists largely of rhythms (meters) and alliteration. Various parts of the Yasna Haptanghaiti are full of simple rhythms and alliterations (both also evident in many parts of the YAv. texts).   Rhythm and alliteration give words a musical dimension ~ which is poetry -- an expression of thoughts in the music of words.   So I call these 2 paragraphs of the Yasna Haptanghaiti (and others) 'verses'.

Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 are the only linguists in our group (so far as I am aware) who have translated the Yasna Haptanghaiti. To avoid repeated citations, I footnote here all citations to linguistic references, translations, and commentaries, that I use in this chapter.[6]

Here are these 2 opening stanzas in Gathic Avestan (transliterated), followed by my (more fluent) translation. A brief *Discussion* follows; then a word by word Linguistic Analysis with a more literal translation of each of these 2 verses, and a comparison of how Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 have translated its various words and phrases. I conclude with their full translations of each verse, for comparative purposes, and also so that you can see their translation choices in (their perceptions of the) context.

YHapt. 35.2 *humatanąm. hūxtanąm. hvarštanąm. yadacā. anyadacā. vərəzyamnanąmcā. vāvərəzananąmcā. mahī. aibī.jarətārō. naēnaēstārō. yaθənā.*[7] *vohunąm. mahi.•*

YHapt. 35.3 *taṯ. aṯ. varəmaidī.*[8] *ahurā. mazdā. aṣā.srīrā.   hyaṯ. ī. mainimadicā. vaocōimācā. varəzimācā.*[9] *yā. hātąm. šyaoθənanąm. vahištā. hyāṯ. ubōibyā. ahubyā.•* Geldner 1P pp. 128 - 129.

My (more fluent) translation.

YHapt. 35.2 'We are praisers in song, not deriders, of good thoughts,   good words, good actions ~ here and elsewhere ~ of (those that) are being produced, and of (those that) have been produced;   through effort in taking a stand, we are (part) of the good'.

YHapt. 35.3 'O Lord Wisdom, beautiful through truth, that then, we have chosen, which indeed we may think, speak, and perform, through which ~ of the actions of living beings ~ (what is) most good for both existences may exist.'

Discussion.

These 2 verses are valuable for more than one reason.

They address a universal problem of existence (at least on our planet), that causes unhappiness and suffering.   It existed in Zarathushtra's times, and in the times when the Yasna Haptanghaiti was composed. It has existed in the centuries that followed, and it exists today.   Let us consider it in our own times.

When we live in a time period during which (subject to human limitations), what is good (right, true, just, etc.) is the accepted norm for human behavior and for our social institutions ~ executive, legislative, judicial, economic ~ it is easy to take goodness for granted.   And in fact, in entertainment and print, its opposite gains a certain piquancy ~ pushing the envelope more and more until ... to our surprise, we come to a realization that violence, lies, injustice, corruption, wrongdoing are becoming an accepted norm.   We become aware (with an increasing sense of dismay) that our freedoms, opportunities, well being, happiness, relations with others, our institutions, our society, are in danger of deteriorating through the increasing absence of values that are true, right, just (as in 'fair') etc. ~ the 'good'.   When the 'good' is in danger, we begin to appreciate how valuable, how precious, it is.

And we realize with a new urgency, the need for an accepted norm which encapsulates the 'good' in the ways we think, speak and act.   This was true of Zarathushtra's time period in which violence, cruelty, murder, theft, bondage, predatory behavior, and other wrongs are mentioned in the Gathas.   And it was also true of the ancients who composed, valued, and kept alive, the opening stanzas of the Yasna Haptanghaiti.

So how do these 2 opening stanzas address this problem? Through a distillation of Zarathushtra's teachings.

First, here (in a nutshell) is the teaching that was distilled. In the Gathas, he teaches us to worship Wisdom with Its own divine qualities (amesha spenta) ~ the true (correct, wholly good) order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*), its comprehension, good thinking (*vohu- manah-*), its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action (*spənta- ārmaiti-*), its good rule (*vohu- xšaϑra-*), a wholly beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*) ~ the path to the Divine, the path of truth.

An (unknown) ancient teacher of the religion distilled this way to worship into a simple little maxim ~ 'good thoughts, good words, good actions'.

How so?

Well the true (correct) order is a wholly good form of existence (*aša- vahišta-*), and understanding it, embodying it in thought, word and action, ruling ourselves and our social units in accordance with it, and being beneficial, can be done (in our material existence) only with thoughts, words and actions that are good. It is that simple (and that profound).

Test it. Try to think of any aspect of a good form of (wakeful) existence, its comprehension, its embodiment, its rule, that is not a good thought, or a good word or a good act.

Verse 2 shows us that our good thoughts, words and actions, were not blown off by ancient priests and teachers, as 'just ethics' ~ as some (uninformed) teachers of the religion do today. On the contrary, these ancients defined the religion,

> ~ by valuing the ways in which we live in thought, word and action ('We are praisers in song, not deriders, of good thoughts, of good words, of good actions...' YHapt. 35.2);

> ~ universally ~ wherever and whenever such thoughts, words, and actions might exist (' ... ~ here and elsewhere ~ of (those that) are being produced, and of (those that) have been produced ...'), and

> ~ by expressing the need for effort, for taking a stand, so that we become part of the good ('... through effort in taking a stand, we are (part) of the good' ~ which is how Zarathushtra defines the Divine, a wholly good existence).

And in the following verse 3, the ideas expressed in verse 2 are made real. Calling personified Wisdom 'beautiful through truth' ~ a wholly good existence ~ these ancients make their choice (in verse 3) to think, speak, and act in ways that make the most good a reality in the existences of matter and mind ~
('... that then, we have chosen, which indeed we may think, speak, and perform, through which ~ of the actions of living beings ~ (what is) most good for both existences may exist.'). In the Gathas, the term 'both existences' refers to the existences of matter and mind ~ the material as well as the abstract/mental/spiritual.

These 2 verses show that their author knew of the multi~dimensioned ways in which Zarathushtra uses *vahišta-* 'most good' ~ the superlative degree of intrinsic goodness. These ways are detailed in another chapter,[10] which I will summarize here. In the Gathas,

> ~ the true (correct) order of existence is 'most good' (*aša- vahišta-*);

> ~ the Divine, (who personifies the true order of existence) is 'most good' (*vahišta-*);

> ~ the qualities of the Divine (truth and its components, later called amesha spenta) are 'most good' (*vahišta-*);

> ~ the path to the Divine ~ the path of truth and its components (amesha spenta) ~ is 'most good' (*vahišta-*);

~ our thoughts, words and actions which implement these qualities (amesha spenta) are 'most good' (*vahišta-*);

~ and the reward for taking this path (a state of being that is truth personified), is 'most good' ~ one of Zarathushtra's terms for the ultimate reward (what today is called paradise) is a most good existence (*ahu- vahišta-*).

So we see that intrinsic goodness is at the very core of Zarathushtra's teachings.   And our material experiences (the matrix for the perfecting process) consist of thoughts, words and actions ~ as the ancient teachers of the religion so clearly understood in coining the maxim 'good thoughts, good words, good actions.

Verses 2 and 3 speak of living a life of thoughts words and actions that bring about the 'most good' (*vahišta-*) ~ benefitting not only spiritual development, but also material existence ~ making our world a better, happier place (for all who exist). These verses were introduced later (in YHapt. 35.1) as the envisionment of wisdom/Wisdom-worship (*māzdayasna-*).

Now it is true that this sound byte 'good thoughts, good words, good actions' does not appear in that form in the Gathas.   But the idea itself appears in 1,001 ways.   And parenthetically, in the Gathas the Divine also has good thoughts, words and actions, ("... Lord of the word and deed stemming from good spirit [*vohu-mainyu-* 'a good way of being'],[11] ..." Y45.8, Insler 1975).   And indeed, one of the qualities of the Divine (later called amesha spenta) ~ is *spənta- ārmaiti-* which means 'beneficial thoughts, words and actions that embody the true order of existence', ("...Through its actions, [*ārmaiti-*] gives substance to the truth [*aša-*] ..." Y44.6, Insler 1975),[12] ~ an order of existence that is wholly good (*aša- vahišta-*).

Let me conclude with a final thought. In verse 2, the phrase 'we are praisers in song', shows what an important part music played in ancient Zoroastrian worship. The Gathas also are poems that originally were songs. Zarathushtra speaks of worshipping the Divine with "...songs of praise (sung) in universal glory of your kind, Wise One." Y34.2, Insler 1975. And the name he uses most often for the bliss that is paradise is the House of Song ~ a metaphor for a state of being that 'houses' the high (the bliss) we experience when we sing or hear beautiful music ~ a state of being (paradise) that he also calls the most~good existence (*ahu-vahišta-*); a state of being which personifies the true (correct, wholly good) order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*).[13]

The music of the Gathas, as songs, survived for many centuries. In a later text, the *Aerpatistan and Nirangistan,* we are told that if you hear someone singing the Gathas, whether along an aqueduct, or a river, or in the wilderness, or on the highways of commerce, you may join in.[14] Sadly, we no longer know the music to which the Gathas were sung. We no longer know any of the other ancient "...songs of praise (sung) in universal glory of your kind, Wise One." Y34.2. We no longer know the praises in song that were sung by ancient Zoroastrians at the time of the Yasna Haptanghaiti ('we are praisers in song, ...' YHapt. 35.2). Music, which so pervaded ancient worship, is absent from the forms of worship engaged in by Zoroastrians today (other than the chanting of priests).

How could this have happened?

Probably because of devastating wars in which the learned were killed, and knowledge of ancient music celebrating the Divine (among other things) was lost. Songs, by definition, have to be sung out loud. But in the centuries of persecution that followed the last of these wars (from and after 647 CE), silence became a survival technique. And music, as a celebration of worship, was inconsistent with the silence of survival.

But today, at least in diaspora, Zoroastrians live freely, without persecution. So perhaps now, as Zarathushtra's beautiful teachings inspire the love and joy they did in ancient times, we can once again express how we think and feel about his ideas, in music and songs. We can once again become 'praisers in song ... of good thoughts, of good words, of good actions ...' as were the ancients who composed the lovely verses of Yasna Haptanghaiti 35.

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

Linguistic analysis.
Let us now look at the linguistics of these 2 verses (to ensure that we understand their meanings accurately).

<center>* * *</center>

YHapt. 35.2 *humatanąm. hūx tanąm. hvarštanąm. yadacā. anyadacā. vərəzyamnanąmcā. vāvərəzananąmcā. mahī. aibī.jarətārō. naēnaēstārō. yaϑǝnā. vohunąm. mahi.•*

In this verse, the Avestan syntax is easy, and the intended meaning comes through in English, when we (more or less) follow the GAv. word order.

More literally. 'Of good thoughts, of good words, of good actions [*humatanąm hūx tanąm hvarštanąm*] ~ here and elsewhere, [*yadacā anyadacā*] ~
of (those that) are being produced, and have been produced, [*vərəzyamnanąmcā vāvərəzananąmcā*]
we are praisers in song, not deriders [*mahī aibī.jarətārō naēnaēstārō*];
through effort in taking a stand, we are (part) of the good [*yaϑǝnā vohunąm mahi*]'.

<center>* * *</center>

humatanąm   'of good thoughts'
hūx tanąm   'of good words'
hvarštanąm   'of good actions'
The prefixes   *hu/hū* mean 'good'. Examples abound ~ *hudāh-* 'good~giving';   *hujyāiti-* 'good living'; *hušəiti-* 'good dwelling';   *hux šaϑra-* 'good rule', etc.
Skjaervo 2006 tells us that each of these 3 words ~ *humatanąm, hūx tanąm, hvarštanąm* ~ are gen. pl. of their respective stems which are adjectives, and which he translates as follows, giving the verbs from which they derive:
humata- 'well~thought' (derived from the verb *man-* 'to think');
hūx ta- 'well~spoken' (derived from the verb *vac-* 'to speak');
hvarəšta- 'well~performed' (derived from the verb *varz-* 'to produce'). In this word, *hu-* has been contracted, eliminating the *u*. Reichelt 1911 thinks the applicable verb stem is *varəz-* 'to work, do, perform, effect, ... beget'. The meanings of this verb given by Skjaervo and Reichelt are simply related flavors of an underlying sense, and in this context, for *hvarəšta-*,   Skjaervo has chosen the flavor 'well~performed'.   And I agree, because the word *hvarəšta-* pertains only to actions (which are performed). Later in this verse, Skjaervo's meaning 'to produce' for forms of the verb *varz-* is a better contextual fit.

So if we translate these 3 words in YHapt. 35.2 as adjectives, we would have:
humatanąm   'of well~thought (thoughts)'
hūx tanąm   'of well~spoken (words)'
hvarštanąm   'of well~performed (actions)';
And that is exactly how Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 have translated them.

But in Avestan, adjectives are frequently used as nouns, and doing so here would be not only linguistically accurate, but it enables us to give the prefix *hu/hū* its normal meaning ~ 'good', and results in a more fluent

<center>5</center>

translation, without the need for adding implied nouns.   And for *hvarəšta-* I prefer the more modern 'good actions' instead of the more archaic 'good deeds' (although there is no difference in meaning).

Thus, *humatanąm hūxtanąm hvarštanąm* 'of good thoughts, of good words, of good actions ...'

yadacā anyadacā   'here and elsewhere'
The *-cā* at the end of both these words simply means 'and'.   But in English, we say the 'and' only once.
yadacā. The meaning of *yadacā* standing alone, would be difficult to decode. The meanings of words that may seem to be related, do are not applicable. I footnote them here for your convenience.[15]
So let us consider the word with which *yadacā* is paired.
The fact that the two words *yadacā anyadacā* both have the suffix *-cā* 'and' means that (in GAv.) they form a unit. So let's puzzle out meaning of *yadacā* based on its relationship with *anyadacā*, (the meaning of which is generally agreed to).
anyadacā means means 'elsewhere', a GAv. adverb *anyada* with *-cā* 'and' tacked on (Skjaervo 2006, Beekes 1988 p. 144).
The prefix *a-/an-* turn a word into a negative or its opposite. The fact that *anyadacā* includes the prefix *an-* plus the word *yadacā* means that *anyadacā* is either a negative of, or in contrast or opposition to, *yadacā*.
All our linguists agree that *anyadacā* means 'not-here' (or more fluently 'elsewhere'). Its opposite (*yadacā*) would therefore have to be 'here', giving us *yadacā anyadacā* 'here and not-here' or (more fluently) 'here and elsewhere' which is how Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 have translated these 2 words. Humbach 1991 mentions a YAv. phrase *iδaṯca ainiδaṯca* in Yy57.33 which he says means 'here and not here'.   And the translation 'here and elsewhere' also fits the larger phrase in which *yadacā anyadacā* appears,

Thus, *humatanąm hūxtanąm hvarštanąm yadacā anyadacā ...*
'Of good thoughts, of good words, of good actions ~ here and elsewhere ~ ...

vərəzyamnanąmcā   vāvərəzananąmcā 'of (those that) are being produced, and of (those that) have been produced'
Once again, the *-cā* at the end of each of these two words simply indicates that they form a unit, joined by the conjunction 'and'.
vərəzyamnanąmcā. As a pronunciation aid, try breaking down the word into the following syllables *vərəz-yamna-nąmcā* (a bit of a tongue twister ~ but once you can say it, the alliteration is beautiful).
Meaning: *vərəzyamnanąmcā* is a form of a verb stem which (as mentioned above) Skjaervo 2006 thinks is *varz-* 'to produce'; and Reichelt 1911 thinks is *varəz-* 'to work, do, perform, effect, ... beget'.   These are related flavors of meaning. I have selected Skjaervo's flavor 'to produce' because here the word applies ~ not just to actions *hvarəšta-* which Skjaervo thinks derives from the verb *varz-*) but to the full spectrum of conscious (awake) activity ~ thoughts, words and actions ~ which are produced (whereas 'to perform' pertains only to actions).
Grammatical value: Skjaervo 2006 thinks that *vərəzyamnanąmcā* is the present participle (middle voice) gen. pl. of the verb stem *varz-* 'to produce'. In English, a present participle is (usually) formed by adding 'ing' to the verb (for example, 'danc*ing*', 'sing*ing*') and a present participle can be used as a noun (*the dancing was lively*). In GAv. the present participle of *varz-* 'to produce' (in middle voice) would be 'being produced'; and in GAv. (as in English) a present participle can be used as a noun as well. Skjaervo says

that as a noun, its grammatical form (declension) is gen. pl. For *vərəzyamnanąmcā* the gen. pl. would give us 'of (those that) are being produced and'.

vāvərəzananąmcā. As a pronunciation aid, try breaking down this word into the following syllables, *vā-vərəzana-nąmcā* (another tongue twister! but again, beautiful alliteration).

vāvərəzananąmcā is a perfect participle (middle voice) gen. pl. of the verb stem *varz-* 'to produce'. (Skjaervo 2006). So for *vərəzyamnanąmcā* that would give us 'and of (those that) have been produced'.

Thus, *humatanąm hūxtanąm hvarštanąm yadacā anyadacā vərəzyamnanąmcā vāvərəzananąmcā ...* 'Of good thoughts, of good words, of good actions ~ here and elsewhere ~ of (those that) are being produced, and of (those that) have been produced, ...'

mahī 'we are'
mahī is the indicative (present) 1p pl. of the verb stem *ah-* (Skjaervo 2006); which means 'to be, to exist'. So here *mahī* means 'we are', which is how Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate the word.

aibī.jarətārō. 'praisers in song'
Skjaervo 2006 shows *aibī.jarətārō* as nom. pl. of the agent noun *aibī.jarətar-* which he thinks means 'praisers in song' (giving a Ved. cognate).
An 'agent noun' is simply a noun that performs the action of a verb (for example dancer, teacher, driver, actor, are agent nouns of the verbs 'to dance, teach, drive, act,' etc.).
I cannot think of an English equivalent which conveys the meaning of someone who both 'praises' and does so 'in song'.
Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *aibī.jarətārō* as 'eulogists'. True, eulogists are those who praise, but there is no requirement that the praise of an eulogist be 'in song'.
Both 'chanters' and 'hymnists' include the notion of 'song' but not necessarily of 'praise' ~ chants and hymns can be about many things other than praise.
So I have opted to convey the Avestan thought more accurately by staying with Skjaervo's more literal 'praisers in song'.

naēnaēstārō 'not deriders'
Skjaervo 2006 shows the agent noun *naēstar-* which he says means 'blamer', and he says that of all surviving GAv. texts, the form *naēnaēstārō* is found only once ~ in our verse (YHapt. 35.2). He does not show its declension. But Jackson shows that the *-ō* inflection (for stems ending in consonants) is nom./voc. pl.[16] Here, the nom. pl. fits because this noun the object of *mahī* 'we are' (both subjects and objects of the verb 'to be' are nom.).
Reichelt 1911 does not show in his glossary, either the prefix *naē-* or the word *naēstar-* (that I could find). But he shows various words beginning with *naē-*, all of which are words of negation.
The word *naēnaēstārō* follows *aibī.jarətārō* 'praisers in song'. And the prefix *naē-* before *naēnaēstārō* indicates that it is being used here as a negative in contrast to 'praisers in song'. I therefore surmize that a flavor of meaning for *naēstar-* may have been 'non-praiser', for which a regular English equivalent would be 'derider' ~ because 'to deride' is the opposite of 'to praise'.
So if we add the negative *naē-* to *naēstar-* we get the stem *naēnaēstar-* which in its nom. pl. form would give us *mahī naēnaēstārō* literally 'we are not non-praisers' but more fluently, 'we are ... not deriders' because a derider is the opposite (or negative) of a praiser.
Humbach 1991 translates *naēnaēstārō* as 'not abusers', (without giving a Ved. cognate or any linguistic explanation). But he thinks *naēnaēstārō* belongs with the words that follow it; whereas I think

naēnaēstārō belongs with the words that precede it, because these preceding words have repeated contrasts (or opposites). And I think *naēnaēstārō* stands in contrast or in opposition to the immediately preceding 'praisers in song'.

As for its meaning, while (Humbach's) 'abuse' can be the opposite of praise, it can also be many other things. In the same way (with respect) I do not think Skjaervo's 'blamer' fits ~ a 'blamer' is not the opposite (or negative) of a 'praiser'.

But 'to deride' is the opposite of 'to praise'. I therefore think that for nom. pl. *naēnaēstārō* the flavor of meaning 'not deriders' is more accurate in this context, than 'not blamers' (Skjaervo), or 'not abusers' (Humbach).

Thus, *humatanąm hūxtanąm hvarštanąm yadacā anyadacā vərəzyamnanąmcā   vāvərəzananąmcā mahī aibī.jarətārō naēnaēstārō ...*

More literally: 'Of good thoughts, of good words, of good actions ~ here and elsewhere ~ of (those that) are being produced, and have been produced, we are the praisers in song, not the deriders; ...'

I think the last three words in this verse *yaϑənā vohunąm mahi* belong together and form a separate phrase, which we will consider next.

yaϑənā 'through effort in taking a stand'
yaϑənā is difficult, and any translation of it ~ even by eminent linguists ~ is at best an educated guess.
Skjaervo 2006 shows *yaϑənā* as instr. sg. ('through/by/with ___') of a conjectured ntr. noun stem *yaϑəna-* which he thinks may mean "effort (?)" (the question mark is his). He thinks it derives from the verb *yat-* which he translates as "to take up (one's) position (in the sacrifice, in the competition, etc.)."
Humbach 1991 has a different opinion. He thinks (following Narten) that *yaϑə-na* was derived from *hyaṯ-nā*, (referencing his Vol. 1 § 10.7.2 in which he discusses Sasanian errors that affected the transmission of Avestan words, although I do not quite see his reasoning in this instance).
He therefore thinks *yaϑənā* means 'as'. And in 1991 and 2010 (with Faiss), he translates *naēnaēstārō yaϑənā vohunąm mahi* as one phrase: "as [*yaϑənā*] we are [*mahi*] non~abusers [*naēnaēstārō*] of the good (things) [*vohunąm*]."
With respect, I am not persuaded by Humbach's views on *yaϑənā*. It is true that in many GAv. instances *yaϑā* means 'just as' (or 'as'), but Humbach's explanation does not account for the *-nā*, or what it means when added to *yaϑə*. The suffix *na-* generally indicates 'possession' or 'belonging to',[17] which does not fit either the micro context of *yaϑə* nor the macro context of the verse.

I therefore opt to follow Skjaervo 2006, because it fits the context of this verse (and the verse that follows). In this verse the reciters first praise a good way of thinking, speaking and acting, and then make a commitment to expend the effort to take a stand for it ~ a step beyond just words of praise ~ stating that by so doing, we become part of the collective plurality of goodness *vohunąm* (pl.). And the following verse makes these ideas real by choosing the most good. So I opt for Skjaervo's (tentative) understanding of *yaϑənā* 'effort (?)' but I add to this noun, the flavor of the verb from which Skjaervo thinks it is derived ~ *yat-* "to take up (one's) position" (in a variety of different circumstances ~ rituals, competition, etc.), here it would be to take a stand to become a part of all that is good.

I therefore translate instr. sg. *yaϑənā* as 'through effort in taking a stand...'

vohunąm mahi 'we are (part) of the good'.

Under the adj. stem *vahu-*, Skjaervo's 2006 glossary shows *vohunąm* with our verse (YHapt. 35.2) as the only instance of its use in surviving GAv. texts. He does not identify its declension there, but in his GAv. Lessons, he shows the *-unąm* inflection as gen. pl. ntr. for *u-* stem words and gives *vohunąm* as an example.[18] I therefore take *vohunąm* in our verse to be gen. pl. ntr. of the adj. stem *vohu-* (or *vahu-* as Skjaervo has it), used here as a noun.

But English does not have a plural equivalent for the adj. 'good' when used as a noun.

The pl. noun 'goods' denotes material things that we possess, buy and sell. And 'good (things)' does not convey the plurality of a collective goodness as a way of being (in thought, word and action) in existence which I think the context requires.

So (for want of a better alternative), I translate *vohunąm* (as a noun), '(part) of the good' ~ reflecting the collective 'good' in existence, brought about by the three 'good' prefixes in thought, word and action *humatanąm hūx tanąm hvarštanąm* (which also are gen. pl.).

Thus, *yaϑənā vohunąm mahi*
Literally 'through effort in taking a stand [*yaϑənā*], (part) of the good [*vohunąm*] we are [*mahi*].

To recapitulate, here again is the full verse in GAv., with my more literal translation.

humatanąm. hūx tanąm. hvarštanąm. yadacā. anyadacā. vərəzyamnanąmcā. vāvərəzananąmcā. mahī. aibī.jarətārō. naēnaēstārō. yaϑənā. vohunąm. mahi.•:• YHapt. 35.2.

A more literal translation:
'Of good thoughts, of good words, of good actions ~ here and elsewhere ~ of (those that) are being produced, and have been produced, we are praisers in song, not deriders; through effort in taking a stand, we are (part) of the good.' YHapt. 35.2.

I like the Avestan flavor of the more literal English translation. But the more fluent one (given at the beginning of this chapter) make the meaning of the verse more readily apparent, to someone reading the verse cold.

* * * * *

YHapt. 35.3 *taṯ. aṯ. varəmaidī. ahurā. mazdā. aṣ̌ā.srīrā. hyaṯ. ī. mainimadicā. vaocōimācā. varəzimācā. yā. hātąm. šyaoϑənanąm. vahištā. h̃yāṯ. ubōibyā. ahubyā.•:•*

The syntax of this verse is a bit more challenging, in part because we need to account for all the pronouns, and the nouns for which they stand; and in part because sometimes a given word is the form for more than one grammatical value; and we have to figuring out which fits the context ~ a bit like working on a jigsaw puzzle.

It helps to understand the very first word ~ the pronoun *taṯ* which means 'that, he, it', and what it refers to. This verse speaks of what brings about the most good (*vahištā*). And I think the pronoun *taṯ* means 'that' and refers to choosing that which brings about the most good (*taṯ. aṯ. varəmaidī.* 'that then, we have chosen...'), and I think this pronoun is later implied in the last phrase.

All the implied words that I have added (in round parentheses) are consistent with the GAv. rule, according to which a word that is expressed, often is subsequently implied.

And I have opted for translation options that (more or less) reflect the word order of the GAv. phrases in this verse.

With respect, the translations of Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 do not account for all the GAv. words in this verse.   Perhaps they did not do so, to make their translations more fluent which is certainly a valid way to translate.

My approach is that to ascertain the meaning of the intended verse as accurately as possible, we first need to account for each word ~ even though the resulting literal translation may be awkward. Once we understand the composer's intent (through a more literal translation) we can express it with greater accuracy in a more fluent translation.

So first, here is a more literal translation, (with applicable GAv. words in square brackets following their English equivalents), so that you can see how I have accounted for each GAv. word, and you can see how the English word order compares with that of the GAv. original.   I then give a more fluent translation, in which the sense of the verse is more readily apparent.

taṯ. aṯ. varəmaidī. ahurā. mazdā. aṣ̌ā.srīrā.   hyaṯ. ī. mainimadicā.   vaocōimācā.   varəzimācā. yā. hātąm. šyaoϑənanąm. vahištā. ħyāṯ. ubōibyā. ahubyā.•ː YHapt. 35.3.

More literally:
That then, we have chosen [*taṯ aṯ varəmaidī*]
O Lord Wisdom beautiful through truth [*ahurā mazdā aṣ̌ā.srīrā*]
which indeed we may think, and we may speak, and we may perform [*hyaṯ ī mainimadicā vaocōimācā varəzimācā*]
through which ~ of the actions of living beings ~ [*yā hātąm šyaoϑənanąm*]
(that) may exist [*ħyāṯ*]
(which is) most good for both existences [*vahištā … ubōibyā ahubyā*]. YHapt. 35.3.

More fluently. 'O Lord Wisdom, beautiful through truth, that then, we have chosen, which indeed we may think, speak, and perform, through which ~ of the actions of living beings ~ (what is) most good for both existences may exist.' YHapt. 35.3.

Let us now consider the meanings and grammatical value of the words themselves.

taṯ aṯ   'that, then',
taṯ Skjaervo 2006 says that *taṯ* is nom./acc. sg. ntr. of the demonstrative/3p pronoun *ta-* 'he, that' (if as he says, it is also ntr. we would need to add 'it' to the potential meanings of *taṯ*).   Here I take *taṯ* to be an acc. ntr. demonstrative pronoun, the object of the verb *varəmaidī*   'that ... we have chosen'.
aṯ Skjaervo 2006 shows a GAv. particle *aṯ* which he says means 'then, so, thus, but'.   Here I take *aṯ* as 'then', which makes what is said in this verse 3, the consequence of the ideas in the preceding verse 2.
So far as I am aware, the translation of Humbach 1991 does not account for *aṯ*. And the translation of Humbach/Faiss 2010 does not account for either *taṯ* or *aṯ*.

varəmaidī   'we have chosen'
Skjaervo 2006 shows a verb stem *var-* and its AorInj. 1p pl. conjugation *varəmaidī*. He shows the meaning of *var-* as 'to choose (to be)' ~ a choice that affects the quality of our beings. So AorInj. 1p pl. *varəmaidī* gives us the translation 'we have chosen' in the sense of a choice that affects what we want to be.   The pronoun 'we' (1p pl.) is part of the verb form, and therefore is not separately stated (unlike English).
Humbach in 1991 preferred Geldner's choice *vairimaidī* (supported by one ms. J2), and stated that *vairimaidī* is "a correct 1st [person] pl. opt., and is not attested elsewhere" commenting with disfavor on Narten's preference *varəmaidī*.

But by 2010 Humbach/Faiss preferred *varəmaidī* which they interpretively translated as "We make up our minds" (there are no words 'our minds' in the GAv. text, but it is a way of saying 'we choose').

The optative conjugation is used to express a hope or wish. So *vairimaidī* (1p pl. opt. ~ the preference of ms. J2 and Geldner) gives us the translation 'may we choose', or 'we may choose', or 'we wish to choose', or 'we would choose'.

The aorist injunctive conjugation is used to express a more decisive tense/mood.   So *varəmaidī* (AorInj. 1p pl. the preference of mss. Jp1, Mf2, C1, Skjaervo 2006, and other linguists), gives us the translation 'we have chosen'.   This form *varəmaidī* also appears in the Gatha verse in Y32.2c where Insler 1975 translates it "we have chosen".

I think the mss. which show *varəmaidī* are more accurate, because in this context the more decisive 'we have chosen' is a better fit, in that the preceding verse 2 is about ideas, ~ singing the praises of a good way of thinking, speaking and acting, and the need for effort, for taking a stand ~ which flows into this verse 3, which is about making those ideas real (*varəmaidī* 'we have chosen').

Thus, *taṯ aṯ varəmaidī …*   'that then, we have chosen ...'

ahurā mazdā   'O Lord Wisdom'
Both these words are in the voc. sg. case of their respective noun stems *ahura-* and *mazdā-*. The voc. case is used to call out (e.g. O truth!   O Wisdom! etc.)

aṧā.srīrā   'beautiful through truth'
aṧā.srīrā is a compound word.[19]   There is general agreement that *aṧā* is instr./voc. sg. of the ntr. noun stem *aṧa-*. Here I take *aṧā* to be instr. sg., thus 'through truth'.[20]   And both Skjaervo 2006 and Reichelt 1911 think that the adj. stem *srīra-* means 'beautiful'.   Skjaervo 2006 takes the declension *srīrā* to be instr. sg. But *srīra-* is an *a-* stem word, and Jackson 1892 shows that in GAv. the *ā-* inflection (when sg.) is the form for both instr. sg. and voc. sg.   I could be wrong, but here I think the voc. applies because voc. *srīrā* 'beautiful' describes the voc. 'O Lord Wisdom'.   Thus, *aṧā.srīrā* 'beautiful through truth'.
Humbach 1991 translates *aṧā.srīrā* as 'beautiful through truth'.
But Humbach/Faiss 2010 give an interpretive translation 'majestic through truth' (without explanation) indicating their perception of the Divine (rather than Zarathushtra's).

hyaṯ ī 'which indeed'
hyaṯ is has 2 different grammatical values and meanings.   Skjaervo 2006, and Reichelt 1911, both show that *hyaṯ* is the form for:
1. a rel. pronoun nom./acc. sg. ntr. (and possibly masc.) 'who/whom, that, which' of the stem *ya-*, and
2. a conjunction 'that, because, as'.
In this context, I take *hyaṯ* as a relative pronoun 'which'.
ī is the form for more than one meaning (and grammatical value).[21]
In this context, I take *ī* to mean 'indeed' (an emphatic particle ~ one of the grammatical values given by Skjaervo 2006 and Reichelt 1911).
So far as I am aware, the translation of Humbach 1991 does not account for *ī*; and the translation of Humbach/Faiss 2010 does not account for either *hyaṯ* or *ī*.

Thus, *taṯ aṯ varəmaidī ahurā mazdā aṧā.srīrā   hyaṯ ī …*
'That then, we have chosen, O Lord, beautiful through truth! which indeed ...'

mainimadicā 'we may think and'

Skjaervo 2006 takes *mainimadicā* as AorOpt 1p pl. of verb stem *man-* 'to think', with *-cā* 'and' tacked on. Neither Humbach 1991, nor Humbach /Faiss 2010 offer any linguistic comment on this verb form. However, the translation of Humbach 1991 has an optative flavor ('... we might conceive ...'). The translation of Humbach/Faiss 2010 does not ('... to think of ...').

vaocōimācā 'and we may speak'

Skjaervo 2006 shows *vaocōimācā* as AorOpt 1p pl. of the conjectured verb stem *mrao-* (perf. *vaok-*) 'to say, speak'.
Reichelt 1911 conjectures the verb stem *vak-* 'to speak, say, tell, utter, announce, proclaim'.
Neither Humbach 1991, nor Humbach /Faiss 2010 offer any linguistic comment on this verb form. However, the translation of Humbach 1991 has an optative flavor ('... we might ... pronounce ...'). The translation of Humbach/Faiss 2010 does not ('... and to speak of ...').

varəzimācā 'and we may perform'

Grammatical value: Skjaervo 2006 says *varəzimācā* is Aor.Opt. 1p pl. of a verb stem which he conjectures to be *varz-* 'to produce' (a slightly different flavor than that of Reichelt).
Reichelt 1911 conjectures the verb stem as *varəz-* 'to work, do, perform, effect, ... beget';
Neither Humbach 1991, nor Humbach /Faiss 2010 offer any linguistic comment on this verb form. However, the translation of Humbach 1991 has an optative flavor ('... we might ... perform ...'). The translation of Humbach/Faiss 2010 does not ('... and to perform ...').

Thus, *taṯ aṯ varəmaidī ahurā mazdā aṣ̌ā.srīrā   hyaṯ ī mainimadicā   vaocōimācā   varəzimācā*
'That then, we have chosen, O Lord, beautiful through truth! which indeed we may think, and we may speak, and we may perform, ...'

yā 'through which'

yā is the form for more than one declension of the rel. pronoun stem *ya-* 'who, that, which'.[22]   There is no dispute that one of these is instr. sg. masc./ntr., which I think fits this context.

šyaoϑ∂nanąm hātąm '- of the actions of living beings -'

šyaoϑ∂nanąm is gen. pl. of the ntr. stem *šyaoϑana-* 'act, action' Skjaervo 2006.
hātąm is the perfect participle of the verb *ah-* 'to be' (Skjaervo 2006). Participles can be used as nouns, in which event Skjaervo says that *hātąm* is gen. pl. masc./ntr. which gives us 'of beings', which is how Insler 1975 translates the word in the Gathas.   This word is discussed in more detail, with references, in the chapter which analyzes the Yenghe Hataam.[23]
Humbach/Faiss 2010 do not translate this phrase as a unit. Their translation does not give *šyaoϑ∂nanąm* a gen. value ("... to perform the actions ...") and for *hātąm* they prefer "... of the existing ..." which is linguistically accurate.

ħyāṯ '(that) may exist'

The accented *ħ* (which is shown by Insler 1975) is shown in a different font by Skjaervo and more recent linguists - as an *x* with an acute accent over it, which I actually prefer, but I do not have that (more recent) font. And in *ħyāṯ*, notice the long *ā* which makes this word different from the rel. pronoun/conjunction *hyaṯ* (discussed above).

So far as I am aware, the translation of Humbach 1991 does not seem to account for *hātąm* or *ħyāt̰* (sg.) based on the normal grammatical values and meanings of these two words.   Humbach/Faiss 2010 do not account for *ħyāt̰* in their translation.

Skjaervo 2006 shows *ħyāt̰* as opt. 3p sg. of the verb stem *ah-* (Skjaervo 2006), which means 'to be, to exist'.[24] In Avestan verbs, the 1p, or 2p, or 3p (sg. or pl.) pronoun normally is not separately stated (with exceptions not here applicable) because it is implied in the verb form.   Here, I think the 3p sg. pronoun (of the verb form *ħyāt̰* 'may exist') is the demonstrative pronoun 'that' (acc. sg.) which is specifically stated (as the object of the verb "that then we have chosen') at the beginning of this verse, except that here it is implied (in the verb form as its subject '(that) may exist') so I have placed it in round parentheses.   When reading the translation, if you emphasize '(that)', the meaning becomes more apparent (as a demonstrative pronoun which is the subject of the verb, rather than as a relative pronoun).

Thus *yā šyaoϑənanąm hātąm … ħyāt̰* 'through which ~ of the actions of living beings ~ (that) may exist..."

vahištā … ubōibyā ahubyā   '(which is) most good for both existences.'
First, the verb 'is' often is implied in GAv. and I have implied it here ~ '(which is)'.
I will need to explain the rest of these words out of order, so that you can see how their grammatical values fit, which makes a difference in the meaning of the phrase.
Let us start with *ubōibyā ahubyā*.
ubōibyā Skjaervo 2006 shows *ubōibyā* as the form for instr., /abl. / dat. du. masc. of the pronoun stem *uba-* 'both'. In this context, only the dat. ('to/for ___) du. masc. fits because *ubōibyā* belongs with *ahubyā* and therefore has to be in the same case, number and gender as *ahubyā*.
Skjaervo 2006 shows *ahubyā* as the form for instr.,/ abl. / dat. du. of the masc. noun stem *ahu-* which means "life, existence". In this context, once again, only the dat. du. fits this masc. noun.   Thus literally *ahubyā* alone would mean 'for (dat.) the two (du.) existences'. But here, the dat. du. pronoun *ubōibyā* 'for both' already has the dat. 'for' and the du. number 'both', so in English translation, the case and number are not repeated in translating *ahubyā*.
Thus, *ubōibyā ahubyā*   'for both existences'.
vahištā 'most good' is a form of the adj. stem *vahišta-* and means the superlative degree of intrinsic goodness.
In GAv. *vahištā* (with a long final *-ā* inflection) is used for more than one declension,[25] of the *a-* stem adj. *vahišta-*.   One of these declensions is nom. du. masc. which fits here for the following reasons.
Here, *vahištā* belongs with '(which is)' ~ a form of the implied verb 'to be', which requires a nom. So here *vahištā* would have to be nom.   As for number and gender, it describes the two dual masc. words *ubōibyā ahubyā*.
I therefore think *vahištā* here is nom. du. masc.

Thus, *yā hātąm šyaoϑənanąm vahištā ħyāt̰ ubōibyā ahubyā*.
'through which [*yā*] ~ of the actions of living beings [*hātąm šyaoϑənanąm*] ~ (that) may exist [*ħyāt̰*] (which is) most good for both existences [*vahištā ubōibyā ahubyā*].'

* * * * *

Let us now take a look at the full translations of both these 2 verses for comparative purposes. For my translations, I have already given you the more literal translations, so here I give more fluent versions.

*humatanąm. hūxtanąm. hvarštanąm. yadacā. anyadacā. vərəzyamnanąmcā.   vāvərəzananąmcā.
mahī. aibī.jarətārō. naēnaēstārō. yaϑənā. vohunąm. mahi.•͙•* YHapt. 35.2

*taṯ. aṯ. varəmaidī. ahurā. mazdā. aṣ̌ā.srīrā.   hyaṯ. ī. mainimadicā. vaocōimācā. varəzimācā.
yā. hātąm. šyaoϑənanąm. vahištā. hyāṯ. ubōibyā. ahubyā.•͙•* YHapt. 35.3

My (more fluent) translations.
'We are the praisers in song, not the deriders, of good thoughts, of good words, of good actions ~ here and elsewhere ~ of (those that) are being produced, and of (those that) have been produced;   through effort in taking a stand, we are (part) of the good'. YHapt. 35.2.

'O Lord Wisdom, beautiful through truth, that then, we have chosen, which indeed we may think, speak, and perform, through which ~ of the actions of living beings ~ (what is) most good for both existences may exist.' YHapt. 35.3.

Humbach 1991
"We are the eulogists of the well~thought (thoughts), of the well~spoken (words), and of the well~performed (actions) ~ both (those that are now) performed and (those) that have been performed here and elsewhere ~ as we are non~abusers [praisers] of the good (things)." YHapt. 35.2.

"We would decide in favor of that, O Wise Ahura beautiful through truth, that we might conceive, pronounce, and perform them, (namely) the actions that might be the best (among the actions) of those who exist, for both existences." YHapt. 35.3.

Humbach/Faiss 2010
"We are the eulogists of the well~thought (thoughts), of the well~spoken (words), and of the well~performed (actions) that are being performed and that have been performed here and elsewhere as we are non~revilers/eulogists of the good (things)." YHapt. 35.2.

"We make up our minds, O Wise Lord, majestic through truth, to think of, and to speak of, and to perform the actions that would be the best of the existing for both existences." YHapt. 35.3.

* * * * * * *

---

[1] Detailed in *Part Five: Later Avestan Texts.*

[2] Humbach 1991 comments that YHapt. 35.1 is in Archaic YAv. (Vol. 1, p. 7). This is a form of Avestan that is closer to Younger Avestan, but sometimes still retains certain GAv. forms (although not consistently ~ possibly through scribal errors).
Here is the Archaic YAv. paragraph YHapt. 35.1, with which the Yasna Haptanghaiti is introduced.
*ahurəm. mazdąm. ašavanəm. ašahe. ratūm. yazamaide.•͙•
aməšā. spəntā. huxšaϑrā. huδåŋhō. yazamaide.•͙•
vīspąm. ašaonō. stīm. yazamaide.•͙•
mainyəvīmcā. gaēϑyąmcā. bərəjā. vaŋhōuš. ašahe. bərəjā. daēnayå. vaŋhuyå māzdayasnōiš.•͙•* YHapt. 35.1,
Geldner 1P p. 128.

My translation.
'The truth~possessing Lord Wisdom, (who has) the judgment of truth, we celebrate;
The beneficial non~mortal (ones), good~ruling, good~giving, we celebrate;
The truth~possessing existence of all (things), we celebrate ~

(Those) belonging to the existences of mind, and physical life, praiseworthy (because) of good truth, praiseworthy (because) of the good envisionment of wisdom~worship." YHapt. 35.1.

In Avestan, *yaz-* words mean worship/celebrate; detailed in a ft. in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of Worship.*

It is worth noting that YHapt. 35.3 (discussed in this chapter) speaks of what is '... most good ... for both existences', and the above (later) introduction (YHapt. 35.1) speaks of the existences of mind and physical lives. I infer therefore that the author of this later introduction (YHapt. 35.1) understood 'for both existences' in YHapt. 35.3 to be the existences of mind and matter ~ which is precisely what Zarathushtra speaks of in the Gathas (although using different Av. words "... the attainments of both existences ~ yes, of matter as well as of mind [*astvatascā hyaţcā manaŋhō*] ~ those attainments befitting truth [*aṣ̌āţ hacā*] through which one might set Thy supporters in happiness." Y28.2, Insler 1975).

[3] This phrase in YAv. is *ahurəm mazdąm aṣ̌avanəm aṣ̌ahe ratūm yazamaide*. The word *ratūm* is the accusative form of the stem *ratu-*, and therefore is the subject of a verb. But there is no verb in this phrase, therefore one has to be implied (which often happens in GAv. syntax). In this context, the implied verb forms '(who has)' or '(having)' are the closest fit. And 'one who has the judgment of truth' is another way of saying wisdom/Wisdom.
The words in red font are used in YAv. texts to describe many, many things other than Wisdom ~ animate and inanimate ~ which makes their translation a bit of a puzzle. If you are interested, this phrase, its translation and its uses, are discussed in *Part Three: Ratu.*

[4] Detailed in *Part Six: Yasna 51.22.*

[5] Detailed towards the end of the chapter in *Part Three: Chinvat, The Bridge Of Discerning.*

[6] Geldner 1P pp. 128 - 129.
Humbach 1991 Vol. 1 p. 143; Vol. 2 pp. 116 ~ 117.
Humbach/Faiss 2010, translation at pp. 104 ~ 105; commentary at p. 177 ~ they offer no linguistic explanations or commentary; they simply express their preferences for certain word forms, following Narten rather than Geldner.
Skjaervo's 2006 on line Old Avestan Glossary, http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~iranian/OldAvestan/index.html
Reichelt's 1911 Avestan Glossary.

[7] Geldner shows a number of mss. variations for this word, choosing *yaϑanā* which is supported by 2 mss (K5 and J3).
Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 prefer *yaϑənā* which is supported by 4 mss. (S1; K11; R1; and J2 as corrected by its scribe).
I do not think the difference affects the meaning of the word. I think it may pertain to the correct linguistic change in a word form, depending on how it is inflected.

[8] Geldner shows a number of mss. variations for this word, choosing *vairīmaidī* which is supported by one ms. J2.
Humbach in 1991 agreed with Geldner's choice, explaining that *vairīmaidī* is "a correct 1st [person] pl. opt., not attested elsewhere."
However, by 2010 Humbach/Faiss preferred *varəmaidī*, without identifying the conjugation or giving any explanation. Geldner's ft. for this word shows that *varəmaidī* is the form of the word supported by 3 mss. ~ Jp1; Mf2; C1.
In the context of YHapt. 35.3, I think the conjugation ~ *varəmaidī* ~ is a better fit for the reasons explained in the linguistic discussion of this word.

[9] Here again, Geldner shows a number of mss. variations for this word, choosing *vərəzimācā* which is supported by 3 mss. (Lb2, L13 and S2).
Humbach 1991, and Humbach/Faiss 2010 prefer *varəzimācā* without comment or explanation. Geldner's ft. for this word shows that *varəzimācā* is the form of the word supported by 12 mss. (J2, 6, 7; Pt4; Mf2; Jp1; K4; H1; B2; L1, 2, 3).

Skjaervo 2006 also prefers the form *varəzimācā*.
I do not think the difference affects the meaning of the word. I think it may pertain to the correct linguistic change in a word form, based on its inflection.

[10] Detailed in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of The Most Good, Vahishta.*

[11] The word *mainyu-* has variously been translated as 'spirit, mentality, thought' etc. but for many reasons, the only English equivalent that fits all of the ways in which *mainyu-* is used in the Gathas, is a 'way of being', detailed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way Of Being, Spenta Mainyu.*

[12] Various translations of *ārmaiti-* ~ such as 'devotion', 'piety', etc. ~ cannot have been the meanings Zarathushtra intended, because *ārmaiti-* is one of the amesha spenta (which in the Gathas are qualities of the Divine). And (as Insler's teacher Thieme has pointed out) such meanings as 'devotion', 'piety', etc. have no relevance to the Divine. The meaning of *ārmaiti-* as 'thoughts, words and actions which embody the true (correct) order of existence' is the only English equivalent that fits all of the ways in which *ārmaiti-* is used in the Gathas, detailed in *Part One: Embodied Truth, Aramaiti.*

[13] Detailed in *Part Two: The Houses Of Paradise & Hell;* and in *Part Three: Heaven In Other Avestan Texts.*

[14] *Aerpatastan and Nirangastan*, Chapter VIII, pp. 83 - 84 translated by S. J. Bulsara, and printed by the Parsee Panchayat in 1915.

[15] Beekes 1988 shows that *yadā* 'when' can be used in GAv. as an adv. or a conjunction (p. 146).
Skjaervo 2006 shows *yadā* 'when' as a GAv. conjunction. He does not cite this verse (YHapt. 35.2) as an instance of its use.
Reichelt 1911 shows *yadā* as a GAv. adv. which he says can mean 'when', 'at the time when', and 'if'.
As you can see, none of these meanings fits *yadacā* of which *anyadacā* could be a negation.

[16] Jackson 1892 § 279, p. 82.

[17] Detailed in the discussion of the word *ahuna* in the title Ahuna Vairya, towards the end of the chapter in *Part One: The Manthra Of Choices, Ahuna Vairya.*

[18] Skjaervo 2006 *Old Avestan*, Lesson 2, p. 14.

[19] Compound words are discussed in a bit more detail in *Part Three: Evolution of the Name(s), Ahura, Mazda.*

[20] The form *ašā* is also voc. sg. 'O truth', which would give us for *ahurā mazdā āšā.srīrā* the alternative translation 'O Lord Wisdom! O beautiful truth!'. Since 'wisdom/Wisdom' personifies 'truth', this could be taken as 2 ways to call the Divine.

[21] Reichelt 1911 shows that *ī* is used for a "strengthening particle" and also as one of the forms of a demonstrative/3d person pronoun, acc. masc./ntr. giving the following forms "... *īm, īṯ; īš, ī* 'him, her, it';
M & DeV do not have a declension *ī* under personal or dem. pronouns (pp. 69 - 71).
Skjaervo 2006 does not show *ī* alone, but under *īṯ* he has
(1) pers. pron > *ī,* but does not give a declension;
(2) emphatic particle 'even, indeed'.
In his 2006 *Old Avestan* Lesson 2, he shows *ī* as a 3p person pronoun, acc. pl. ntr. (pp. 15 - 16), which would give us 'it'. But he does not show *ī* as any demonstrative pronoun (Lessons 2 and 3).

[22] Skjaervo 2006 does not give the declensions of the relative pronoun ya- in his Glossary. But in his 2006 *Old Avestan* Lesson 3, he shows that *yā* is the form for the following declensions of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*, pp. 26 - 27:
~ nom. sg. fem.

~ instr. sg. masc./ntr.;
~ nom./acc. du. masc.;
~ nom. pl. ntr.

[23] In *Part Three: The Yenghe Hataam, An Analysis & Ancient Commentaries.*

[24] Insler often translates forms of the verb *ah-* 'to be' as 'to exist'. There is a ft. in *Part Three: Asha Vahishta, An Analysis*, which gives many examples from the Gathas, in which he has done so.

[25] *vahišta-*   'most good' is an *a-* stem adj. (used here as a noun).
Jackson 1892 (§§ 236 - 238, pp. 70 - 71) shows that in GAv., for *a-* stem adjs./nouns, the *-ā* inflection is used for the following declensions:

    instr. sg. masc./ntr. ('through/by/with (the) most good')
    voc. sg. masc.   ('O most good')
    nom/acc/voc du. masc.
    nom./voc. pl. masc.
    nom./acc./voc. pl. ntr..