## Yasna 30.7

I have revised this chapter to correct some material typographical errors, and also to clarify ideas which before revision were less than clear (for both of which I offer my apologies).

This verse has some lovely things to tell us.  And the discussion in this chapter supports the translation of this verse in *Part Two: Molten, Glowing Metal.*  To place ideas in context, some repetition here is inevitable, for which I ask your indulgence.   Here, Zarathushtra's cryptic style of poetry generates ambiguities (some of them intended).  If we address these ambiguities in accordance with normal Avestan usage, and in ways that are consistent with his overall thought, the meanings become clear.   All implied words (which are in round parentheses) have been added in accordance with normal Avestan usage in which the verb 'to be' often is implied, and words previously mentioned are sometimes subsequently implied (discussed in more detail in the linguistic analysis below). Linguists have raised reasonable questions regarding whether a word was incorrectly transmitted (over the centuries), and I have followed the Insler 1975 emendation which fits well.   The translations of our group of linguists, together with their comments are referenced here to avoid multiple citations.[1]

If you are turned off by the 'One/one'  suspend your displeasure until you have read the dilemma and necessity for it (in the *Discussion*  section below).  It adds to the multi-dimensioned beauty of this verse.

a. *ahmāicā.  x šaϑrā.  jasaṯ.     manaŋhā.  vohū.  aṧācā.*
b. *aṯ.  kəhrpə̄m.  utayūitiš.*[2]        *dadāṯ.  ārmaitiš.  ą̄nma.*
c. *aēšą̄m.  tōi.  [\*pōi]*[3] *ā.  aŋhaṯ.     yaϑā.  ayaŋhā.  ādānāiš.  paouruyō.*[4]•• Y30.7.
Geldner 1P p. 107 (with footnoted exceptions).

My translation.

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

*Discussion.*

To understand this verse, we have to look at the whole poem, Yasna 30, of which our verse is a part. I will summarize it here.

This song is about two ways of being (*mainyu-*), I translate *mainyu-* as a 'way of being' which is the only English equivalent which fits all of the ways in which *mainyu-* is used in the Gathas.  Others have translated it as 'spirit',  'mentality', and other alternatives,  (which do not fit all of the ways in which *mainyu-* has been used in the Gathas).  The meaning of *mainyu-* has been discussed in another chapter.[5]

The very first verse of this Yasna is an introduction in which Zarathushtra says he will speak (in this Yasna) of "...those things which are to be borne in mind ~ even by one who already knows ..." ~ things

which "are to be looked upon in joy throughout your days." Y30.1 Insler 1975. So what he proposes to tell us in this song is something that will bring happiness to our lives ~ an important idea to bear in mind as we look at the other verses in this song.

In verse 2, he tells us to listen to all that is most good, reflect with a light filled mind, and make decisions, each person for himself ~ declaring ourselves for truth in the great race or contest (between these 2 ways of being within).

The next 3 verses are about various aspects of the two ways of being, ~ their conflicting natures (the more good and the bad), how we should choose between them (Y30.3), what they produce (Y30.4), and how they affect existence and our spiritual evolution (Y30.4 - 5).[6]

The verse immediately before ours (Y30.6) speaks of the deities of Zarathushtra's culture who in the Gathas are depicted as violent, cruel, predatory, full of rage, etc. That verse says that these deities were influenced by the deceptive (bad) way of being, and therefore chose the 'worst thought', rushed to rage, and as a result have afflicted mortal existence.

And then comes our verse (Y30.7) which starts with *ahmāicā* 'But to this' referring to the previously mentioned 'mortal existence' (as Insler, and Humbach/Faiss agree).

And now comes a subtle and beautiful part of our verse ~ the 3p sg. verb forms, 'But to this (mortal existence) (he, she, it) comes [*jasaṯ*]'; and '(he, she, it) shall be here [*ā aŋhaṯ*] for the protection of these (mortals) ...'. In Avestan script there are no capital letters, and the pronoun of a verb form ~ 'I' (1p sg.), 'you' (2p sg.), 'he/she/it/one' (3p sg.) usually is not separately stated, because the form of the verb itself indicates its person (1p, 2p, 3p) and number (sg. or pl.) ~ which are built into the verb form. So the two 3p sg. verb forms in our verse (Y30.7) could with linguistic accuracy represent any 3p ~ 'he', 'she', or 'it'. Which naturally raises the question: In Zarathushtra's mind, for whom, or for what, does the implied 3p sg. pronoun in these 2 verb forms stand?

Well, this Yasna is all about the two ways of being (*mainyu-*), and the immediately preceding verse (Y30.6) speaks of the influence of the bad, deceptive, way of being and the wrongful thoughts and actions it generates. So it would be reasonable to conclude that our verse ~ Y30.7 ~ speaks of the more good way of being, and what it generates, and that the 3p pronoun (implied in the 2 verb forms) refers to the more good way of being (*mainyu-*). This is corroborated by the fact that in the Gathas, beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*) is a way of being that is the true order of existence ~ its comprehension, its embodiment, its rule, which is what our verse says of the unspecified 3p ~ that it protects, and comes "with (good) rule, with good thinking, and with the true order of existence', to which embodied truth gives form, breath (life) as our verse (Y30.7) states.

Now in Avestan, *mainyu-* is a (grammatically) masc. noun. But a way of being (or spirit, or mentality) has no intrinsic gender. So in English, we normally would translate a grammatically masc. pronoun as 'it'.

To illustrate. In French, 'hat' (chapeau) is a grammatically masc. noun, and a person might say, *Mon chapeau, il est beau.* Literally, *My hat, he is beautiful.* But a hat has no intrinsic gender. So in English we would translate that phrase *My hat, it is beautiful.*

But even if we translate the 3p as 'it' here, the question arises: Whose way of being is intended here ~ man's? the Divine? Well, unlike the preceding verse, (in which the deceptive way of being was said to influence the deities of Zarathushtra's culture), the 3p in our verse does not *influence* deities.

The 3p actually brings the rule that includes within it good thinking, the true order of existence, which are given form, substance, by embodying the true order. And throughout the Gathas, the good, beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*) is used for both man's (imperfect) way of being as well as Wisdom's (perfected) way of being, although the rapture of the superlative -- *spᵊništa-* 'most beneficial' -- is used (in the Gathas) only for the way of being (*mainyu-*) that is Divine, perfected.

In the verses of this song (Y30) which come before our verse (Y30.7), the good way of being is first described in the comparative (*vahyah-* 'more good' Y30.3) -- indicating an unperfected way of being. Now it is true that in Avestan (and sometimes in English), the comparative and superlative degrees are often used to express a crescendo, rather than a difference in kind.[7] Nevertheless, we have to wonder why Zarathushtra picks the comparative degree (*vahyah-* 'more good' Y30.3) -- reflecting a small crescendo. He must have had a reason. And then, he describes the good way of being in the superlative (*spᵊništa-* 'most beneficial' (Y30.5) -- indicating a perfected way of being. So in our verse (Y30.7) which of these ways of being -- unperfected? perfected? -- is intended in the implied 3p pronoun in the 2 verb forms in our verse (Y30.7)?

Insler has opted to translate the 3p sg. pronoun as 'He' indicating by the capital 'H' that the pronoun refers to Wisdom. Other translators think the 3p sg. refers to (generic) man (detailed below). I think both these opinions are (in part) correct. I think here Zarathushtra engages in a triple entendre -- based on the *micro* context of this verse, and the *macro* context of the Yasna of which it is a part, and also the Gathas as a whole. Let us first consider the *macro* context.

In the immediately preceding verse (Y30.6) Zarathushtra says that the deities of his culture did not choose correctly; and that because they were deceived by a bad way of being they chose the worst thought and brought misery to mortal existence. And he offers Y30.7 as a contrast, so it would be reasonable to assume that the 3p sg. pronoun implicit in these 2 verb forms is his perception of the Divine -- the most beneficial way of being (the *mainyuš spᵊništō* in Y30.5), and what it brings about (which in Y30.7 is the opposite of what the deities of his culture bring about (in Y30.6).

But in the earlier verse (Y30.5), in speaking of this most beneficial way of being (*mainyuš spᵊništō*), who chose truth, Zarathushtra specifically includes mortals who do so as well "...(But) the [*mainyuš spᵊništō* '(the) most-beneficial way of being*] ... chose the truth, and (so shall those) who shall satisfy the Wise Lord continuously with true actions." Y30.5, Insler 1975. So the 3p sg. pronoun implied in the verbs in our verse (Y30.7) could reasonably stand for 3 things:

   -- a beneficial way of being (which is *spənta-/spᵊništa mainyu-*);

   -- Wisdom's completely beneficial way of being (which in Gatha verses is *spənta-/spᵊništa mainyu-*); and

   -- man's sporadic, imperfect, beneficial way of being (which in Gatha verses is *spənta- mainyu-*).

And therein lies one of the beautiful aspects of this verse. I think Zarathushtra, with triple entendre intends the 3p sg. pronoun to stand for all three -- for the beneficial way of being, which is Wisdom's way of being and exists in man as well. Small wonder that Zarathushtra chose to encapsulate this interplay of meanings without specifically identifying the 3p sg. pronoun. This multi-dimensioned understanding of the good, beneficial, way of being is one of the things that makes our verse (Y30.7) so beautiful and so meaningful.

It is the good, beneficial, way of being ~ perfected and unperfected, the Divine and the divine in man (and all the living) ~ which brings the rule of good thinking, truth, its embodiment, to mortal existence; and that protects other units of existence (with these qualities) during the difficulties we experience as part of the soul refining process ~ the refiner's fire ~ a protection that is the mutual, loving help that we see throughout the Gathas between the Divine, man and all the living; corroborating that the adverse consequences which we experience as part of the law of consequences (that we reap what we sow) is not given for punishment.[8]   If it were, we would not be 'protected' while experiencing its difficulties.

But how does one translate this triple entendre into one English 3p pronoun?   A grammatically masc. noun (like *mainyu-*) which has no intrinsic gender, is normally translated into English as 'it'. But   (whoever said the rules of language are logical?!) in both English and Avestan, (i) masc. pronouns are used for the genderless Divine, as well as (ii) for generic man (which includes all mankind ~ all genders), and (iii) when a noun has no intrinsic gender, it is translated (in English) as 'it'.

So to translate this triple entendre into an English pronoun literally, would require 'it/He/he'.  But anyone reading this verse cold would be quite turned off by such a translation which they wouldn't understand at all.  Therefore 'it/He/he' would not convey the intended meaning ~ defeating the prime purpose of a translation.

I next flirted with the idea of choosing 'It/it' for the implied 3p pronoun, because the beneficial~ sacred way of being in the Divine and mortals has no intrinsic gender.   But I then realized that the pronoun 'it' turns the beneficial way of being into a concept ~ thereby missing the essential point, that it is the concept embodied in living beings that does all the good things described in our verse Y30.7.

I have therefore opted for the (less than adequate) generic 'One/one', which (although awkward) will at least alert the reader that the 3p sg. pronoun implicit in the 2 verb forms stands for the perfected and unperfected beneficial way of being in the Divine and mortals ~ which brings to life, the embodiment of truth, its comprehension, its rule;  a quality of being which is the first to protect, with mutual, loving help;  which is how we have each other's backs, when going through the refiners' fire.

Let us now take a look at line c.
c. One/one shall be here for the protection of these (mortals), just as (One/one shall be) the first (to protect) during the repayments through (molten) metal.'  Y30.7.

This (in my view) expresses more than just the idea of mutual, loving help between the Divine and all mortals.  It expresses the idea that such help, protection, is a necessary part of the perfecting process.[9]

And how are we helped?  How are we protected?   In other Gatha verses, the Divine helps, protects, with the true order of existence (*aša-*), its comprehension (good thinking *vohu- manah-*), its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action (*spənta- ārmaiti*), its good rule (*vohu- xšaϑra-*).[10]

And it is important to understand here what we are protected from.  Although the protection may be loving, given with solicitude,[11] we are not 'protected' by preventing us from experiencing

difficulties.  In Zarathushtra's thought, it is through all our experiences ⁓ good and bad, painful and happy, earned and unearned ⁓ that our understanding increases.[12]

The protection in line c. is the kind of help that enables the divine within us to grow, which is consistent with Zarathushtra's notion of 'salvation' ⁓ that salvation is being 'saved' from what is false, wrong ⁓ untruth ⁓ the opposite of the true (good, correct) order of existence.[13]

The protection in line c. means that we are never alone when we experience the difficulties of the refiner's fire (even though at the time we may think we are alone, with no help at hand ! ).

This statement that 'One/one shall be here for the protection of these (mortals), ...  the first (to protect)... ' is also an affirmation that the good in mortals will always be protected, and therefore cannot be extinguished.  It is consistent with Zarathushtra's solution for the defeat of evil, which is that through the law of consequences, mutual, loving help, and our ability to think/feel, the evolutionary process can only be towards complete goodness, it can never regress to the point where such divine qualities are extinguished in mortals.[14]

Which ties into the 2d half of line c. ⁓ the phrase *ayaŋhā ādānāiš* 'during (the) repayments through (molten) metal.'  Y30.7.   Why 'through (molten) metal [*ayaŋhā*]' ?   We have explored in another chapter how Zarathushtra uses 'molten, glowing, metal' in the Gathas,[15]  which I will summarize here.  In essence, he uses the metal refining process (in which ore is made molten to transform it into metal), as a metaphor for the difficult life experiences which enable the soul refining process ⁓ a process that transforms mortals from a mixed (good/bad) state of being to the pure goodness of the true wholly good (*vahišta-*), beneficial (*spənta-*), loving/generous (*hudāh-*), true order of existence (*aša-*).[16]

Some translators have read into the Gatha verses which speak of 'molten' or 'glowing', 'metal' the idea that Zarathushtra was describing a supposed ordeal of later times, in which (supposedly) molten metal was poured on to a person's chest, to see if he was telling the truth.  If the molten metal failed to burn him, he was telling the truth.  If it burned him, he was lying.

If such an ordeal did in fact exist (and was not simply a story-telling a myth), the people who invented it ⁓ and worse, believed in it ⁓  would have been incredibly stupid!   We should remember, that intelligence and independence were highly valued in ancient Iranian thought.[17]  No rational being could believe in such a 'test of truth'.  But that is my subjective opinion.  Let us stick to the facts.   A moment's reflection makes it clear that the Gatha verses which mention molten, glowing metal cannot possibly refer to this 'ordeal'.  Not only are there are no Avestan words in any Gatha verse which mention an 'ordeal' of molten metal, but the so-called ordeal of molten metal is irrelevant to the Gatha verses in which 'molten, glowing, metal' is mentioned (including line c. of our verse Y30.7), because these verses, have nothing to do with determining if someone is telling the truth. Nothing whatsoever.   And that was the only purpose of the mythical ordeal.

Some scholars are of the opinion that in our verse (Y30.7), the addition of *ayaŋhā* 'through metal' was not in the original verse composed by Zarathushtra ⁓ that it was a later gloss.   Even if it was, that would only be evidence that the ancient teachers of his thought who inserted this gloss, understood that the process of producing a refined product (metal) from chunks of rock (ore) by making it molten, fiery, in the two Gatha verses which contain the words 'molten or glowing metal', was used as a metaphor for the soul-refining process  ⁓ a transformational process.

In short, if in line c. we delete *ayaŋhā* 'through (molten/glowing) metal' as a later gloss, then Zarathushtra says that the beneficial-sacred way of being (in the Divine and mortals) will be the first to protect (mortals) when they experience the (painful) consequences of their actions ('during the repayments'). And if we do not delete it, we get 'during the repayments, through (molten/glowing) metal'. The meaning remains the same in either event, except that with the addition of *ayaŋhā* we have the added idea of using the ore-to-metal refining process as a metaphor for the soul refining process.

The conclusions we have reached so far about our verse Y30.7, also fit the macro context of the verses that follow it.

Verse 8 (which follows our verse 7) shows how the law of consequences changes minds by increasing understanding, and so changes untruth to truth, bringing about the qualities mentioned in our verse (Y30.7). Addressing Wisdom, Zarathushtra (in Y30.8) says (in essence) that 'when the repayment of their wrongdoings comes about' the 'rule of good thinking will be discovered, professed, by those, O Wisdom, who will deliver untruth into the hands of truth' my translation.

And then the beautiful verse 9, "Therefore may we be those who shall heal this world [*fəraṣə̄m kərənaon ahūm*]!¹⁸ Wise One and ye other lords, be present to me with support and with truth, so that one shall become convinced, even where his understanding shall be false." Y30.9, Insler 1975. Our verse (Y30.7) and Y30.9 show how we 'heal existence'. We 'heal existence' for ourselves and others by changing our own minds, our own preferences, from a mixed, conflicted way of being to one that is wholly in accord with the true order of existence, and through mutual, loving help, while we all go through the soul-refining process. The meaning of 'you (other) lords', in Y30.9 is rather neat, and is discussed in another chapter.¹⁹

Verse 10 then says (in essence, using the metaphor of a chariot race) that when the prosperity of untruth is destroyed, the race/contest will be won for Wisdom and truth, by those who are yoked with good thinking. Insler's translation is a bit biblical, but the meaning comes through. "For then shall descend the destruction of the prosperity of deceit [*druj-* 'untruth'], ... there shall be yoked from the good dwelling place of good thinking, the swiftest steeds, which shall race ahead unto the good fame of the Wise One, and of truth." Y30.10, Insler 1975. The phrase dwelling place of good thinking is a state of being that houses good thinking.

Verse 11,²⁰ concludes this song with Zarathushtra telling his listeners (mentioned in verse 1) that when you understand the laws of Wisdom/wisdom (which order existence in a good, beneficial way), when you learn that there is a way of good access (the path of truth) and a way of no access (the path of untruth), that there is long adversity (adverse consequences) for (all that is) untruthful, but salvation (the attainment of truth),²¹ for what is truthful then each one will exist in these principles (the path of the true order of existence). And the verse concludes with a double entendre: *uštā* a word that means 'Happiness!', and also 'Wish it so!'²²

* * * * *

Let us now look at the linguistics of Y30.7, and the opinions of our group of translators.

Line a. *ahmāicā x šaϑrā jasaṭ manaŋhā vohū aṣācā*

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

*ahmāicā*    'But to this (mortal existence)'
The suffix *-cā* is a conjunction, most often used as 'and';  but in this verse, both Insler 1975 and Humbach 1991 comment that here, *-cā* is used in an 'adversative' way.   I agree because our verse is in contrast with the immediately preceding verse (Y30.6) which says, in effect, that the local deities and their followers did not make the correct choice between the two ways of being, ~ choosing the maleficent way of being ~ with the resulting afflictions and suffering this has brought to mortal existence.  By contrast this verse (Y30.7) shows that the 'most-beneficial way of being (Y30.5) comes to mortal existence with divine qualities ~ (good) rule, good thinking, the true (correct, good) order of existence, its embodiment in thought, word and action (*ārmaiti-*).  That is why in the very first word of this verse, *-cā*  is thought to be used as an adversitive conjunction here 'but ...' (contrasting it with the immediately preceding verse.
*ahmāi*  is dat. sg. masc./ntr. of a demonstrative pronoun stem, 'this'.[23]  Demonstrative pronouns are also used as 3p pronouns.[24]   So *ahmāi* could be translated either 'to/for this, or  'to/for him'  or 'to/for it' ~ an ambiguity inherent in the language.   There is nothing in this verse to indicate what *ahmāi* stands for.  But the last two words of the preceding verse are *ahūm  marətānō*.   And both Insler 1975 (showing other Gatha parallels), and Humbach/Faiss 2010 think that in our verse, the 3p pronoun *ahmāi* is 'this' and refers to the preceding *ahūm  marətānō*.   I find Insler's parallels entirely persuasive, and I agree.   More literally, *ahūm*  means 'existence, life' (Skjaervo 2006).  And *marətānō*  can mean  'of mortal-being' (gen. sg.),   or  'mortals' (acc. pl.).[25]   So in (less literal but more fluent) English *ahūm  marətānō*  'mortal existence'. In our group of translators, dat. sg. *ahmāicā* has been translated as follows.
*Insler 1975* "But to this world...",
*Humbach 1991,* "...to it (existence)...",
*Humbach/Faiss 2010,* "...to this (existence/world)...",
*Taraporewala 1951,*  "And unto-such...",
*Moulton 1912,* and *Bartholomae,* "And to him (i.e. mankind)...".

*jasaṯ*   'One/one  comes'
Our group of translators agree that this verb form is 3p sg. injunctive (Skjaervo 2006).  We have already discussed (under the *Discussion* section above) that in Avestan the pronoun of a verb form is not usually expressed, because the form of the verb itself indicates its person and number ~ it is built into the verb form.  So the 3p could be 'he/she/it/one' ~ an ambiguity inherent in the language.

But there is disagreement in our group of linguists about for whom this implied 3p pronoun stands, in this context.  Our translators agree that the verb stem is *gam-* 'to come' (Skjaervo 2006), but they disagree about whether *jasaṯ* conveys (what we in English would simplistically call) 'present' or 'past'. I am indebted to Professor Elizabeth Tucker for the following explanation.  This verb form (and so also *dadaṯ* in line b.) are both injunctive forms, and there is an issue which comes up in most of the Gathas about whether injunctive forms indicate past time (i.e. whether they are the equivalent of augmented forms in Old Persian and Vedic, which are the normal way of expressing past time) or whether they are 'tenseless'.  English and many modern languages, do not have a tenseless category

(although Gujerati does). This accounts for the differences of opinion amongst our group of linguists in translating *jasaṯ* (and *dadaṯ* in line b.), as follows.

*Insler 1975* "He came" without comment on this verb (indicating 'past' time, and the capital H indicates that in Insler's opinion Wisdom is intended for the implied 3p sg. pronoun),
*Moulton 1912*, and *Bartholomae*, "And to him (i.e. mankind) [*ahmāicā*] came [*jasaṯ*]" ('past' time); the words in round parentheses are in Moulton's translation.
*Humbach 1991,* and *Humbach/Faiss 2010,* "one comes" without comment; the "one" (with no initial capital letter) indicates that Humbach thinks man is intended; and "one comes" is probably the closest to 'tenseless' as we can get in English).
*Taraporewala 1951,* "And unto-such [*ahmāicā*] shall-come [*jasaṯ*]" (man intended, but his translation of the verb as a future time is puzzling).

I have already discussed (under the *Discussion* section above) why in my view the implied 3p pronoun stands for the beneficial way of being in perfected (the Divine) and unperfected (mortal) being. So the closest 3p English equivalent (that I can think of) is the (awkward) generic One/one. And let us recall, mortal existence includes more than just mankind. 'Mortal' by definition means something that will die. And there can be no dispute that plants and animals also die, and therefore also are mortal.

And I think the tenseless flavor for *jasaṯ* (as best we can express it in English) is a good contextual fit, because the advent of the beneficial way of being, and its activity, in mortal existence is on-going.

Thus, *ahmāicā … jasaṯ* 'But to this (mortal existence) One/one comes...'.

*x šaϑrā … manaŋhā vohū aṣācā*
'with (good) rule, with good thinking, and with the true (correct) order of existence'
Each of these words is instr. sg. of their respective stems, all of which are ntr. ~ *x šaϑrā* 'with rule';
*manaŋhā vohū* 'with good thinking' (in GAv. the adjective frequently follows the noun it describes);
and *aṣācā* 'and with (the) true (correct, good) order of existence', (*aṣācā* is simply instr. sg. *aṣā*
with *cā* 'and' tacked on).

*Insler 1975* translates this phrase "with the rule of good thinking and of truth". As you can see, he gives of good thinking and of truth each a gen. value. In his commentaries he acknowledges that all three are instr. but makes a good argument that in this and other Gatha verses, *x šaϑrā, manaŋhā vohū* and *aṣā* are not a string of stand-alone words, but that *manaŋhā vohū* and *aṣā* modify *x šaϑrā,* in the sense, 'with the rule (in alliance, harmony) with good thinking and truth', which he translates here (Y30.7) into more fluent English as "with the rule of good thinking and of truth". There can be no doubt that in the Gathas, truth, good thinking and embodied truth, are components of Wisdom's rule (Y51.4).[26] And even in (older) English, the instr. 'with' was sometimes used to indicate something that was within something else (for example, *she is with child,* was a way of describing a woman who was pregnant). (Both Avestan and English are within the Indo-European family of languages).

*Humbach 1991,* and *Humbach/Faiss 2010* "with power, good thought, and truth," (as a string of 3 instr. nouns);

*Taraporewala 1951* "the Strength-(Divine), together with Vohu Mano and with Asha...", giving *x šaϑrā* an acc. value, instead of an instr. value.

Both Moulton and Bartholomae have a somewhat free translation which gives each word an acc. value ~ "Dominion, Good Thought, and Right".

I think giving each of these GAv. words their normal grammatical value (instr. sg.) is a better fit, and makes perfect sense. Thus,
Line a. *ahmāicā x šaϑrā jasaṯ    manaŋhā vohū ašācā*
'But to this (mortal existence) One/one comes, with (good) rule [*x šaϑrā*], with good thinking [*manaŋhā  vohū*], and with the true (correct) order of existence [*ašācā*]...'
<center>* * *</center>

Line b. *aṯ kəhrpə̄m utayūitiš   dadāt ārmaitiš ąnma*
'and enduring embodied truth gives form, breath (to them).'

The implied words in round parentheses indicate the previously mentioned divine qualities in mortal existence, and thus is in accord with well accepted Avestan usage.

*aṯ* 'and'
*aṯ* is one of those flexible Av. particles which can mean 'then, so, thus, but, moreover, furthermore, and'. Skjaervo 2006 defines *aṯ* as a particle which connects a statement with what precedes it and suggests the following meanings 'then, so, thus, but'. Beekes 1988 shows the ancestral form *āt* 'then, but, and' (p. 145).
Humbach and Faiss, translate *aṯ* here as 'then'; all others in our group, as 'and'.
I prefer 'and' in this context.

*utayūitiš … ārmaitiš* 'enduring embodied truth'
*ārmaitiš* is nom. sg. of the (grammatically) fem. noun *ārmaiti-* (Skjaervo 2006). In another chapter, I have explored in some detail the many conflicting opinions regarding the meaning of *ārmaiti-*. However, there can be no dispute (as Thieme ~ Insler's teacher ~ has pointed out) that *ārmaiti-* is an attribute of the Divine (an amesha spenta), and that therefore such translations as 'piety', 'devotion', et cetera, cannot be the meaning of the word.[27] Based on the ways in which Zarathushtra uses *ārmaiti-* in the Gathas, I take its meaning to be the true (correct, good) order of existence embodied in thought, word and action ~ 'embodied truth' for short (an awkward and inelegant choice, but the only accurate one I can think of).
*Insler 1975* translates *ārmaitiš* as "(our) … piety", believing that *ārmaitiš* is man's piety (in line b.) which gives substance to the previously mentioned divine qualities ~ the rule of good thinking and truth (in line a.). But each of these qualities ~ (good) rule, good thinking, truth (line a.) and embodied truth (line b.) are divine qualities which exist completely in the Divine and incompletely in man.[28] Thus (asThieme has pointed out) *ārmaitiš* cannot be 'piety', because 'piety' is not relevant to the Divine. There is nothing in this verse (other than the (interpretive) translation of *ārmaitiš* itself as "piety") which indicates that Zarathushtra intends to segregate *ārmaitiš* as belonging to man, and the other qualities as belonging to Wisdom the Lord. So I take each of them as I find them in the Gathas (and later Avestan texts!),[29] ~ without such segregation ~ as qualities of the Divine that also exist (incompletely) in man.
*Moulton 1912* and *Bartholomae* also translate *ārmaitiš* as "piety".
*Taraporewala 1951*, leaves *ārmaitiš*  untranslated in this verse.

<center>9</center>

*utayūitiš* is nom. sg. of the stem *utayūiti-* (Skjaervo 2006). But the meaning of *utayūitiš* is in dispute. *Insler* 1975 translates it as "enduring". He comments that *utayūitiš* is, as always, only an adjective ~ its nom. sg. declension indicating that it belongs with nom. sg. *ārmaiti-*. He shows Gatha parallels in which he thinks *utayūiti-* is also used as an adj., for example, *utayūitīm … təvīšīm vaŋhəuš manaŋhō* "the enduring power [*utayūitīm … təvīšīm*] of good thinking" Y48.6, and other parallels.[30] I find his view persuasive.

*Humbach 1991* translates *utayūitiš* as "stability" without comment on this word.

*Humbach/Faiss 2010* as "youthfulness" without comment on this word. Humbach and Faiss see *utayūitiš* as a noun paired with *ārmaitiš* ~ with *utayūitiš* granting "bodily form [*kəhrpə̄m*]", and *ārmaitiš* granting "breath [*ąnma*]". They do not explain how "stability" or "youthfulness" could grant "bodily form [*kəhrpə̄m*]"; or how "right-mindedness" (their translation of *ārmaitiš*) could grant "breath/life [*ąnma*]". I am puzzled to understand their intended meanings in context.

*Taraporewala 1951* translates *utayūitiš* as "continued progress", commenting that Bartholomae thinks it means 'perpetuity' or 'continued existence'.

I am uncertain how *Moulton 1912* and *Bartholomae* translate *utayūitiš* ~ their translations are too 'free'.

I am persuaded by Insler's view on *utayūitiš*. I take nom. sg. *utayūitiš* as an adj. describing nom. sg. *ārmaitiš*, thus, 'enduring embodied truth'.

Parenthetically, you may perhaps question why *ārmaitiš* should not be translated as one of the string of divine qualities in line a. giving us 'But to this (mortal existence) he comes, with (good) rule, good thinking, and the true (correct) order of existence, and enduring embodied truth (which) gives (them) substance, breath'.
Well, that would be linguistically incorrect for at least 3 reasons.

1. As we have seen (above), the three divine qualities in line a. are in the instr. case ('with____'), as such, they are the indirect objects of the verb *jasaṯ* requiring that they be translated ~ 'he comes with (good) rule (*x šaϑrā*), with good thinking (*manaŋhā vohū*), and with the true (correct) order of existence (*ašācā*)'. If *ārmaitiš* were one of this string of divine qualities, it would have to be instr. sg. as well. But it is not. *ārmaitiš* is nom. sg. so in this context, it can only be the subject of the verb *dadāt* 'gives'.

2. The conjunction *-cā* 'and' is tacked on to the 3d divine quality mentioned in line a. ~ *ašācā*. And *ārmaitiš* does not have the suffix *-cā* 'and'. The *aṯ* which appears at the start of line b. is normally used to connect two statements in various ways ('then, so, thus, but, moreover, furthermore, and'); *aṯ* is not used as a conjunction to connect a string of two or more nouns.

3. Finally, the qualities in line a. ~ (good) rule, good thinking and truth ~ are simply concepts. They have no reality, no substance, until they are embodied in thought, word and action ~ given 'body form [*kəhrpə̄m*], breath' [*ąnma*] ~ which is the meaning of *ārmaiti-* (which embodies the true (correct, wholly good) order of existence ~ which of necessity includes its comprehension (good thinking) and its rule).

*dadāt* 'gives'
As with the verb *jasaṯ* ('One/one comes') in line a., our group of translators agree that the verb stem is *dā-*, 'to give, grant', (etc.).[31] And according to Skjaervo 2006, this verb form is 3p sg.

injunctive (Skjaervo 2006). As already explained under *jasaṯ* (above), the injunctive can be given either a 'past' time flavor or a tenseless translation.

*Insler 1975* "gave" ('past' time flavor)

*Moulton 1912,* "gave" ('past' time flavor)

*Bartholomae,* "gave" ('past' time flavor)

*Humbach 1991* "grants" ('tenseless' flavor?) ~ once expressed, and a 2d time implied,

*Humbach/Faiss 2010* "grants" ~ once expressed, and a 2d time implied,

*Taraporewala 1951* "shall ... grant" (again the puzzling 'future' flavor, as with *jasaṯ*)

Based on the context, I opt for the 'tenseless' flavor, because embodying truth with each thought, word and action (*ārmaiti-*) continues ~ on an on-going basis ~ to give form, life, substance, to the true (correct, good) order of existence, its comprehension, its rule, as we see throughout the Gathas.[32]

*kəhrpə̄m ... ą̄nma* 'form, breath (life)'

*kəhrpə̄m* is acc. sg. of the fem. noun stem *kəhrp-* which means "body, form" (Skjaervo 2006); and *ą̄nma* is nom./acc. sg. (here acc.) of the ntr. noun stem *ą̄nman-* which Skjaervo 2006 says means "breath, breeze". Humbach 1991 points out that Avestan *ą̄nman-* "is likely to belong to" Latin *anima* the meanings of which include "breath, ... soul, conscience, self", and that Ved. *ātmán* means 'breath, self'. Insler 1975 commenting under another verse notes that Vedic *ātmán* means 'soul, self' and parallels GAv. *urvan-*.[33] Here, Insler 1975 translates *ą̄nma* as 'breath', but in Y45, he translates an *ą̄nman-* word as 'soul'.[34]

*Insler 1975* translates *kəhrpə̄m ... ą̄nma* as "body and breath",

*Humbach 1991* as " form (to one's body) ... breath..."

*Humbach/Faiss 2010* as "bodily form ... breath/life"

*Taraporewala 1951* translates *kəhrpə̄m* as "of-(his-) bodies" and *ą̄nma* as an adj. "gracious" describing *ārmaitiš*.[35]

I am not entirely sure how Moulton and Bartholomae translate these two words (their translation is too free).

I think that *kəhrpə̄m* "body, form" means corporeal substance. And *ą̄nma* 'breath' represents the life force (soul) that animates our corporeal shells. So this line says that when we embody the true order of existence in thought, word and action (*ārmaiti-*), we give form, life, to truth, its good comprehension, its (good) rule (mentioned in line a.) ~ we make these divine values a living reality ~ giving them 'body/form/substance and 'breath/life'.

Once again, the GAv. text itself is simple and beautiful. It needs no linguistic acrobatics.

line b. *aṯ kəhrpə̄m utayūitiš dadāt ārmaitiš ą̄nma* 'and enduring embodied truth gives form, breath (to them), ~ the implied words (to them) referring to the divine qualities in mortal existence, mentioned in the immediately preceding line a.

A word on syntax. In Avestan, when two words that belong together (such as a noun and its adj.) "frame" or encapsulate another word, that usually means that the three words form a unit of thought.[36] In line b. we have two framings ~ a small framing within a large one.

1. The small one: *utayūitiš dadāṯ ārmaitiš*. Here *ārmaitiš* and it adjective *utayūitiš* frame the verb *dadāṯ*, giving us a unit of thought which in English would be 'enduring [*utayūitiš*] embodied truth [*ārmaitiš*] gives [*dadāṯ*]...'; and

2.  The large one: *aṯ kəhrpə̄m utayūitiš dadāt ārmaitiš ą̄nma*
'and [*aṯ*] enduring embodied truth [*utayūitiš  …  ārmaitiš*] gives [*dadāt*] form [*kəhrpə̄m*], breath [*ą̄nma*] (to them).'

Here, with the exception of the first word *aṯ*, the entire line is framed by the two acc. objects of the verb *dadāt ~ kəhrpə̄m* and *ą̄nma*, ~ which encapsulate the unit of thought (with the verb *dadāt* in the center).  So this entire line is one unit of thought.

Beautiful architecture.  Circles in circles.  Imagine the fun Zarathushtra must have had, engaging in these syntactic designs as part of the metrical structure (rhythms) of his poetry.  And imagine the fun those who studied the Gathas (being fluent in its language) must have had in discovering them.

<center>* * *</center>

Line c. *aēšą̄m tōi [\*pōi] ā aŋhaṯ    yaϑā ayaŋhā ādānāiš paouruyō.*
'One/one) shall be here for the protection of these (mortals), just as (One/one) shall be) the first (to so protect us) during the repayments through (molten) metal.'

A word (or two ... ? ) about the implied words that I have added in this line.

(1) The implied words (mortals)  indicates that the pronoun 'of these'  stands for mortal existence and the divine qualities within it, mentioned in the immediately preceding lines a. and b.

(2) In the 2d half of line c. inserting the implied verb phrase  '(One/one shall be)', is in accord with normal Avestan usage.  The verb 'to be' (and its various conjugations) often is implied in Avestan.

(3) In the 1st half of line c.  'protection' is expressed.  And in the 2d half of this line, it is implied '(to so protect us)'.  In Avestan, when a word is expressed in one part of a verse (here  *\*pōi* 'for protection') it often is implied in a phrase that follows.  So literally,  'One/one shall be here for protection of these (mortals), just as (One/one shall be) the first (for protection) during the repayments through (molten) metal.'

(4) The implied adj. '(molten)'  is necessary for an understanding of how Zarathushtra uses 'metal' in the Gathas, and is explained in the general discussion of this verse (above), and also in the discussion on *ayaŋhā* 'through (molten) metal' (below).

A word on the syntax of line c. which affects translation options.

The 2d half of this line c. (after the caesura) starts with *yaϑā* which means 'just as', so the meaning of the 2d half of the line would have to explain (or supplement) the first half.[37]  I think it is important to bear that in mind in selecting translation options for this line.  However, not all translators agree and instead translate the whole of line c. as one sentence (not as two complementary halves).  But whether (because of the position of *yaϑā*) we think each half of the line is a unit of meaning, or whether we translate the whole line as one unit, this line presents translation difficulties.  These will be apparent as we consider each word.  The syntax (how our translators put these words together) in line c. will be considered at the end.  So bear with me as we go through the word by word analysis of this line.

*ā aŋhaṯ.*   'One/one shall be here'.
*ā*    Skjaervo 2006 says that *ā*  is an adv. meaning "here (and now), currently, at present".

<center>12</center>

*aŋhaṯ.*   Skjaervo 2006 shows that *aŋhaṯ* is a conjugation of the verb *ah-* 'to be', and that it appears in numerous Gatha verses, but he leaves this conjugation unidentified (indicating his uncertainty?). And he shows that the addition of *ā* to various conjugations of the verb *ah-* 'to be' means "to be present (?)" ~ the question mark is his, indicating his uncertainty about this as well.  In all of the Gatha verses in which *aŋhaṯ* appears, Insler 1975 has translated it as 3p sg. 'He shall be'.   And in our verse, most of our translators take *aŋhaṯ* as 3p sg. as well, but in other respects, it is difficult for me to discern how some of them translate this word.

*Insler* 1975 translates *ā  aŋhaṯ* "He shall be here", (without comment on these 2 words).

*Taraporewala* 1951 translates *ā  aŋhaṯ* as "indeed ... shall-he-belong" .   He comments that *ā* is a particle used for emphasis in Vedic,  and that when the verb *ah-* 'to be', is used with a gen. [here *aēšąm*] the verb means 'to belong to', thus "indeed ... shall-he-belong".

*Humbach* 1991, "(existence) will be" (3p sg.) without comment. His translation adds an implied (existence) as the 3p sg. ('it');   but Humbach 1991 does not account for *ā*.

*Humbach/Faiss* 2010 "this (existence) will be"  (3p sg.) without comment.  Their translation does not account for *ā*.

It is difficult for me to discern for certain how Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae translate *ā  aŋhaṯ* because their translations (which are almost identical) are too 'free'.

I translate *ā  aŋhaṯ* with a  3p sg. pronoun that has no gender. 'One/one shall be here'  ~ the 'One/one' referring to the Divine and generic mortals.


*aēšąm.*   'of these (mortals)'

Skjaervo 2006 shows *aēšąm* as gen. pl. masc./ntr. of the demonstrative pronoun stem *a-*, which Jackson 1892 says means 'this' (§ 422, p. 120).  The gen. pl. gives us the following (most frequently used) translation options 'of these, or 'their' (and others not here relevant).[38]   There is no noun in line c., for which this pronoun *aēšąm* 'of these'  could stand.   Therefore, 'of these' can only stand for the nouns in the preceding lines a. and b. ~ divine qualities in mortal existence (i.e.  'body', 'breath').  Since all mortals are a mix of divine qualities and their opposites (in varying degrees) I think 'of these'  refers to protecting all mortals and the qualities of the divine within them.


*tōi* 'to/for you'   or   *\*pōi* 'for the protection'.

The asterisk before *\*pōi* indicates an emendation.  Geldner shows no (surviving) manuscript variations for *tōi* ~ indicating that if this is an error of memory in chanting (or a scribal error), it occurred in an early period of transmission.[39]

Why should *tōi* be emended to *\*pōi*?  Well, there is no dispute that *tōi* is a 2p sg. pronoun, and this form (*tōi*) is used for both gen. sg. ('of you' /  'your' etc.) and dat. sg. ('to you / for you').   In this first half of line c, there are only 4 words,  *aēšąm  tōi  [\*pōi]  ā  aŋhaṯ.*  And *aŋhaṯ*  is the only verb in the whole line.   Insler 1975 has pointed out that since Ahura Mazda must be the subject of  *aŋhaṯ*, (3p sg. ~ 'he shall'), the reading *tōi*  ('to/for you') cannot be correct.  He surmises that the original word was *\*pōi* 'for the protection' based on a parallel usage in Y44.15b *ahyā  ašā  pōi*  which he translates as "for the protection [*pōi*] of the world allied with truth",  where *pōi* also appears with a dependent gen. (the gen. sg. *ahyā* 'of this (existence)'  in Y44.15b, just as in our verse Y30.7 *aēšąm* 'of these' is a dependent gen. (but pl.).  Insler thinks that in our verse, (Y30.7 line c.) the word originally was *pōi* and that its change to *tōi* has taken place under the influence of Y34.1c   *aēšąm*

*tōi  ahurā*, appearing "in identical metrical position" (he discusses the principle involved, with other examples, in his introduction, pp. 11 et seq.).

For an additional use of *pōi* in the Gathas (other than in Y30.7 and Y44.15), see "...Who shall smash the obstacle (of deceit) in order to protect [*pōi*], in accord with Thy teaching, those pure ones who exist in my house?..." Y44.16 Insler 1975, ~ which (in my view) expresses a somewhat parallel thought to our verse Y30.7 line c.[40]    This phrase appears in the Kemna Mazda prayer as part of a larger quotation from Y44.16 (*kə̄  vərəϑrə̄m.jā       ϑwā  pōi  sə̄nghā  yōi  həntī       ciϑrā  mōi  dąm*).

I find Insler's explanation and emendation persuasive.  It is the only way (I can think of) in which line c. can be translated both in keeping with the individual words, without adding words not in the GAv. text (that are not in accord with established Av. usage), and with *yaϑā* in its position at the start of the 2d half of the line (the first word after the caesura).
In our verse (Y30.7), the emendation of *tōi* to *\*pōi* gives us the following translation by Insler of the first half of line c.
*Insler* 1975  "He shall be here [*ā  aŋhaṯ*] for the protection [*\*pōi*] of these [*aēšąm*] (faithful),...".  As you can see, Insler interprets 'of these'  to mean those who are faithful to Ahura Mazda.  But Zarathushtra teaches that the Divine and its qualities (good rule, truth, good thinking, and embodied truth, mentioned in lines a. and b.) exist in all mortals (*ahmāicā* in line a.) ~ in whatever varying degrees.[41] There is no preceding reference to those who pledge allegience to Ahura Mazda, such as would warrant a conclusion that the pronoun *aēšąm*  'of these' stands for His followers.  In the Gathas, Wisdom's teachings are the path of truth ~ a path for all mortals, ('truth' is universal, it cannot possibly belong exclusively for the followers of any one deity ~ a tribal mind-set).[42]  The concept of limiting 'salvation' or 'protection' or 'help' to only those who give allegiance to a particular deity (the 'faithful') is not found in the Gathas.[43]
The conclusion that 'of these' stands for the divine values in all mortals, mentioned in lines a. and b. of this verse is consistent with the 2d half of line c. starting with *yaϑā* 'just as' which supplements or explains the first half when so translated (as discussed below).  Our remaining translators translate the whole of line c. as one unit (discussed below), so their views will be given at the end of this discussion on line c.

I translate the first half of line c. as follows (exemplifying the good, beneficial way of being in the Divine and mortals),    *aēšąm  \*pōi  ā  aŋhaṯ* 'One/one shall be here for the protection of these (mortals), ...'.

*yaϑā*    'just as'
Beekes 1988 shows that *yaϑā* (an indeclinable) is an adverbial conjunction meaning 'in which manner', 'just like' (p. 146);  Jackson 1988 shows *yaϑā* as an adverb of manner and degree meaning 'as' (§ 730, p. 202).[44]   It sometimes is paired with  *aϑā*  'so also' (as in the Ahuna Vairya *yaϑā  …  aϑā*  'just as ... so also').   Here *yaϑā*  starts the 2d half of line c.  and I follow Insler 1975 in translating it in that position as 'just as'.
*Humbach 1991*, and *Humbach/Faiss 2010* (who translate the whole of line c. as one unit) think that *yaϑā* belongs at the beginning of line c. and that its position as the first word after the ceasura is simply a function of GAv. syntax.  Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae, who also translate the whole of line c. as one unit, are of the same opinion.  In fact, these translations would not work if *yaϑā* were not moved to the beginning of the line.

*paouruyō*      '(One/one shall be) the first (to so protect)'
*paouruyō* is nom. sg. masc. of the stem *paourvya-* 'first' (Skjaervo 2006, although he spells it *paurvya-* ~ the difference in spelling makes no difference to its meaning). It is an adjective (Skjaervo 2006) which in Av. can be used as a noun.
*Insler 1975* "He shall be the first" (referring to Wisdom the Lord).
*Humbach 1991,* "[he] will be Thy prime one" (referring to man).
*Humbach/Faiss 2010* "(existence/world) will be your first/foremost one" (referring to the quality of existence).
*Taraporewala 1951* translates *paouruyō* as "successful", but comments that it means "first" as in "successful".
*Moulton 1912* and *Bartholomae* do not give *paouruyō* its true meaning. Their translation is interpretive, and I am unable to assign any one word in it to *paouruyō*.

I translate *yaϑā ... paouruyō* 'just as (One/one shall be) the first-one (to so protect mortals) ...'


*ādānāiš* 'during (the) repayments'
There seems to be no dispute that *ādānāiš* is instr. pl. but its meaning, and the way in which the instr. should be translated, are in dispute.

*Its meaning.*
Setting aside its declension (instr. pl.) for a moment,
*Insler 1975* thinks the pl. *ādānāiš* means "requitals" (which means 'repayments'),
*Moulton 1912* and *Bartholomae* think it means "retributions" (i.e. 'repayments that are punishments'). which, according to Taraporewala follows the Pahlavi view.
*Taraporewala 1951* comments that that he is "inclined" to derive *ādānāiš* "from √*dā-* with *ā* (Skt. *ā* √*dhā-*) to put upon, to apply" and therefore translates it as 'test' or 'ordeal' (which however is sg. not pl.]. But he comments that regardless of the later Pahlavi "symbology" of the 'ordeal of (molten) metal', in the Gathas this ordeal "means definitely our life in this world".
*Humbach 1991* thinks that *ādānāiš* means "fettering", but could also mean "apportionment" (giving potential Ved. cognates for each meaning).
*Humbach/Faiss 2010* opt for "allotment" (which however is sg. ~ not pl.).

*Its declension.*
Skjaervo 2006 shows *ādānāiš* as instr. pl. of the stem *ādāna-* citing this verse (Y30.7) as the only instance of its use in extant GAv. texts. *ādāna-* is an *a-* stem noun, and Jackson 1892 also shows that the *-āiš* inflection is instr. pl. for *a-* stem nouns and adjectives (§ 236, p. 70).
*Humbach 1991* "through their (the Daevas') being fettered..." (taking it as a verb form?)
*Humbach/Faiss 2010* "through their allotment" (which is instr. sg.),
*Moulton 1912,* and *Bartholomae* "by thy retributions" (instr. pl. ~ with the biblical idea of punishment),
*Taraporewala 1951* "in the ordeal" (which is loc. sg., not instr. pl.),
Most often, the instr. declension is translated as 'by/with/through___'. But in Av. the instr. is used in other ways as well.
*Insler 1975* translates *ādānāiš* as 'during (the time of) requitals', (a type of instr. pl.) He comments (p. 170) that in this context, *ādānāiš* "is an instr. of temporal extent" (i.e. pertaining to time) showing the following other instances of instr. words being so used in the Gathas,

15

Y29.9c  *yavā* 'during my lifetime',
Y31.7a *raocə̄bīš* 'throughout the days',
Y31.22b. *x šaϑrā* [instr. sg.] 'during his rule';  and Y46.11a *x šaϑrāiš* [instr. pl.]  'during their rule, regimes'
Y44.3b  *zą̊ϑā*  'during the birth, creation',
Y51.15c *savāiš*  [instr. pl.] 'during the times of salvation',
He notes that the syntax of other verses shows an "instr. of spatial extent" giving the following examples,
Y34.14c  *vərəzə̄nā* 'throughout the community',
Y48.11b  *x šaϑrā*  'throughout the dominion',
Y50.5c *x šmā*  'across the earth' (= yAv. *zəmā*,  Ved. *jmá*).'
And he comments that Vedic has identical ways of using the instr., giving examples.

It is this kind of meticulous, evidence-oriented, research and analysis (by Insler) that has been so valuable in decoding Avestan.  I find Insler's opinion that *ādānāiš* is an instr. of temporal extent (pertaining to time, duration)   persuasive in this context, and I translate *ādānāiš*   'during (the) repayments'.


*ayaŋhā*  'through (molten) metal'
*ayaŋhā*  is instr. sg.  ('through/by/with ___') of the ntr. stem noun *ayah-* 'metal'  (Skjaervo 2006). Although it has been translated sometimes as 'iron', *ayah-*  could not have been 'iron' (consistent with metallurgical principles) for the reasons discussed in another chapter.[45]
*Insler 1975* translates *ayaŋhā* as "with the (molten) iron" and more literally in his commentary (in context with *ādānāiš*) as "during the (time of the) requitals with the iron".  He agrees with those linguists who thinks  *ayaŋhā* may have been added later into the text of this verse.  He footnotes *ayaŋhā* "Omit" (ft. 8, p. 34), and comments that Kuiper (1964) may well have been correct in taking *ayaŋhā* as "a later gloss added to this passage".
*Humbach 1991*  "...in iron..."  (a loc. sg. translation),
*Humbach/Faiss 2010* (interpretively)  "...by the (ordeal with glowing) metal ..."  (instr. sg.)
*Taraporewala 1951* "... through-(molten)-metal...", (instr. sg.)
*Moulton 1912* and *Bartholomae* "...through (molten) metal..." (instr. sg.).

The word *ayaŋhā* 'through (molten) metal'  may (or may not) have been a later addition.  But it makes no difference to the meaning of this line, as explained in the *Discussion* section above.

I will now give you, for comparative purposes, translations of line c. in its entirety so that you can see the foregoing translation choices in the context of each translation. As you can see the translators have not always place the additional words they have added (which are not in the GAv. text) in round parentheses.
Line c.  *aēšą̇m tōi* [*pōi*] *ā aŋhaṯ    yaϑā ayaŋhā ādānāiš paouruyō*
My literal translation,
'One/one shall be here for the protection [*pōi*] of these (mortals),  just as (One/one shall be) the first (for protection) during the repayments through (molten) metal'.
Insler 1975
"He shall be here for the protection of these (faithful), just as He shall be the first (to do so) during the requitals with the (molten) iron."

Humbach 1991
"so that through their (the Daevas') being fettered in iron, (existence) will be Thy prime one."
Humbach/Faiss 2010
"so that through their allotment by the (ordeal with glowing) metal, this (existence/world) will be your first/foremost one."
Moulton 1912 and Bartholomae (somewhat 'free')
"so that by thy retributions through the (molten) metal he may gain the prize over those others."

* * * * *

Let us now look at the Av. text of the entire verse Y30:7 and compare the entire translation of each translator in our group,

a. *ahmāicā. x šaϑrā. jasaṯ.    manaŋhā. vohū. aṣācā.*
b. *āt. kəhrpə̄m. utayūitiš.    dadāt. ārmaitiš. ą̄ma.*
c. *aē̆šą̄m. tōi [\*pōi] ā. aŋhaṯ.    yaϑā. ayaŋhā. ādānāiš. paouruyō.•:*

My translation.
(referring to mortal existence mentioned in the preceding verses)
a. 'But to this (mortal existence) One/one comes, with (good) rule, with good thinking, and with the true (correct, good) order of existence'
b. 'and enduring embodied truth gives form, breath (to them)'.
c. 'One/one shall be here for the protection of these (mortals), just as (One/one shall be) the first (to so protect) during the repayments with (molten) metal.' Y30:7.

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

Humbach 1991
"(But) if one comes to it (existence) with power, good thought, and truth,
then stability grants form (to one's body), right-mindedness (grants) breath,
so that through their (the Daevas') being fettered in iron, (existence) will be Thy prime one." Y30:7.

Humbach/Faiss 2010
"(But when) one comes to this (existence/world) with power, good thought, and truth, then youthfulness grants bodily form, (and) right-mindedness (grants) breath/life,
so that through their allotment by the (ordeal with glowing) metal, this (existence/world) will be your first/foremost one." Y30:7.

Taraporewala 1951,
"And unto-such shall-come the Strength-(Divine), together with Vohu Mano and with Asha;
and continued-progress of-(his-) bodies shall gracious Armaiti grant;
to Them, indeed to Thee, shall-he-belong, as-if (he had been) successful in the ordeal through-(molten)-metal. Y30:7.

Moulton 1912,
"And to him (i.e. mankind) came Dominion, Good Thought, and Right; and Piety gave continued life of their bodies and indestructibility, so that by thy retributions through the (molten) metal he may gain the prize over those others." Y30:7. [Both parentheses are Molten's].

Bartholomae
"And to him (i.e. mankind) came Dominion, and Good Mind, and Right and Piety gave continued life to their bodies and indestructibility, so that by thy retribution through (molten) metal he may gain the prize over the others." Y30:7. [Both parentheses are Bartholomae's].

* * * * * * *

---

[1] The translation and comments of our group of linguists are referenced here to avoid multiple citations.
*Insler 1975*, translation and applicable footnotes at pp. 34 - 35;   his commentaries at pp. 168 - 171; and in his Addenda under Y30, pp. 330 - 332.
*Humbach 1991*, translation in Vol. 1, p. 124;  his commentary in Vol. 2,  pp. 52 - 53.
*Humbach/Faiss 2010*, translation at p. 82; their commentary on p. 171.
*Taraporewala 1951*, his translation and commentaries on pp. 151 - 155.
*Moulton 1912*, his translation and applicable footnotes at p. 350.
*Bartholomae*, his translation as it appears in Taraporewala 1951 at p. 155.

[2] Of the mss. variations for this word, Geldner has selected *utayūitīš* (with the last *ī* long), whereas Insler 1975 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 have selected *utayūitiš* (with the last *i* short).  I follow the latter, because the *-iš* inflection is nom. sg. (Skjaervo in his 2006 Glossary also has selected *utayūitiš* nom. sg. for this verse Y30.7).  The nom. sg. declension *utayūitiš* fits the context of this verse.  Jackson 1892 shows the *-īš* inflection for fem. *-i-* stem words is acc. pl. (§ 257, p. 76, although he does not use *utayūiti-* as his example).  The acc. pl. does not fit the context of this verse.

[3] Emendation by Insler 1975, which I find persuasive.

[4] There are many mss. variations in spelling this word.  Geldner has selected *pōuruyō* whereas Insler 1975 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 have selected *paouruyō*, and (just to keep things simple !) Skjaervo 2006 has chosen *pauruyō*.   These differences have to do with principles of linguistics but do not change the meaning of the stem word or its declension (which is nom. sg.).   I have followed Insler and Humbach/Faiss.

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

[6] Some of these preceding verses have been discussed in detail in *Part Six: Yasna 30.2;*  and *Yasna 30.3 and 4.*

[7] To illustrate, in the *Hormezd (Ormazd) Yasht,* the names of the Divine are most often expressed in the positive and superlative degrees, side by side in the same line, indicating a crescendo, rather than a difference in kind.  Here are a couple of examples (Ahura Mazda purportedly speaking),

> ... *baēšazya nąma ahmi    baēšazyōtəma nąma ahmi*
> '...healing by name am I, most-healing by name am I';

> ... *ašava nąma ahmi    ašavastəma nąma ahmi*
> '... truthful by name am I, most-truthful by name am I';

> ... *xᵛarənaŋha nąma ahmi    xᵛarənaŋuhastəma nąma ahmi...*
> '... glorious by name am I, most-glorious by name am I...'. Yt. 1.12.

My translation.  Avestan words are from Geldner 2P p. 62.

In the Gathas, (as in the *Hormezd Yasht*) the names of the Divine are a way of revealing Its personality (as Thieme so insightfully has stated, see *Part One: The Nature Of The Divine*).

[8] For more evidence that the law of consequences is not given for punishment, see
In *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution*;
In *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant*; and *Adverse Consequences, Not Punishment.*

[9] A conclusion that is corroborated in a Pahlavi text (quoted in *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution*), which states that there are 3 things necessary for the renovation -- an understanding that the Divine is all good;   the law of consequences (that the good and evil we do comes back to us);   and mutual, loving help.

[10] The idea that Wisdom protects with truth and its comprehension good thinking,  is explored in more detail in *Part One: Worship & Prayer.*   But here are a few examples.

"What help by truth [*aša-*] hast Thou for Zarathushtra who calls?  What help by good thinking [*vohu-manah-*] hast Thou for me, ... ? " Y49.12, Insler 1975.  Rhetorical questions which contain their own answers.

"Wise One, where are those sincere ones who, through their possession of good thinking [*vohu-  manah-*] make even immoral decrees and painful legacies disappear?  I know of none other than you. Therefore protect us in accord with truth [*aša-*]." Y34.7, Insler 1975.

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

[11] That Wisdom's protection is offered with solicitude, loving care, is shown in the following verses,

"... And do Thou give, Wise Ruler, that promise [*mąϑrā* 'Word'] through which we may hear of your solicitude (for us)." Y28.7, Insler 1975.  Wisdom's Word (the path of truth) protects against the enemy -- untruth.

"Because those who are alive, and those who have been, and those who shall be, shall seek after the salvation that comes from Him, the One who offers solicitude..." Y45.7, Insler 1975.  In Zarathushtra's thought, salvation  is being saved from untruth (detailed in *Part One: A Question of Salvation*).

"... the glories of Him who offers solicitude (to us), the Wise Lord..." Y46.17, Insler 1975.

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

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

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

[15] See *Part Two: Molten, Glowing Metal.*

[16] The nature of *aša-*  -- the true (correct, wholly good) order of existence -- is detailed in *Part One: Truth, Asha.*

[17] That intelligence was highly valued in ancient Iranian thought is evident in the YAv. texts.  For example, in the *Aban Yasht*, a number of legendary figures (purportedly) ask the spiritual essence of the waters -- Anahita -- for various wishes, one of which is a request for assistance in answering riddles,

"To her did Yoista, one of the Fryanas, offer up a sacrifice with a hundred male horses, a thousand oxen, and ten thousand lambs... He begged of her a boon, saying: 'Grant me this, ...that I may overcome the evil-doing Akhtya, ... that I may answer the ninety-nine hard riddles that he asks me maliciously...'...'" *Aban Yasht,* §§ 82 - 82; Darmesteter translation, SBE 23, pp. 72 - 73.

It is also evidenced in the riddles, and word-games of the Shah Nameh.

That independent thought was so valued is detailed, with references and quotations in a ft. in *Part One: The Freedom To Choose.*

[18] *fəraṣ̌ə̄m kərənaon ahūm* in Y30.8 is the notion of making existence healed by forwarding (or bringing about) the true order of existence (*aṣ̌a-*) and Insler thinks that this Gatha phrase is the genesis of the term *fraṣ̌ō.kərəiti-* in later YAv. texts. The meaning of *fraṣ̌ō.kərəiti-* and its genesis from the Gathas, is discussed in more detail in *Part Three: Heaven in Other Avestan Texts.*

[19] See *Part Two: The Lords & the Equations of Y31.4.*

[20] This verse (Y30.11) is discussed in a ft. in *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant.*

[21] Zarathushtra's notion of 'salvation' is the attainment of the qualities that make a being divine ~ truth, its comprehension, its embodiment, its rule ~ attained completely, resulting in an existence not bound by mortality, detailed in *Part One: A Question of Salvation;* and in *Part Six: Yasna 51:20.*

[22] Here is the full verse.

'When mortals learn these principles which Wisdom gives [*dadāt̰*] ~ a way of good access and one of no access; as well as long destruction for (all that is) deceitful, but salvation for (all that is) truthful, then each one shall exist with these (principles). Happiness!/Wish it so [*uštā*].' Y30.11, my translation. This verse is also discussed (with the Insler 1975 translation also given) in the following chapters in *Part Three: Ashavan & Dregvant; Chinvat, The Bridge of Discerning;* and *Adverse Consequences, Not Punishment* (with much indebtedness to Insler for his opinion on certain difficult words). As for *uštā,* this is a word that has more than one meaning and grammatical value, including the following:

*uštā* is the imperative form of the verb 'to wish, to desire' ~ thus 'wish (it)! desire (it)!' And
*ušta* (in YAv., with the short *a*) is an interjection 'Happiness!' As such, its Gathic Avestan form would be *uštā* (with the long *ā*).
The meanings and grammatical values of *uštā* are discussed in *Part Three: The Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu), An Analysis.*

[23] Skjaervo 2006 and Jackson 1892 both agree that *ahmāi* is dat. sg. masc./ntr., of a demonstrative pronoun stem which means 'this' but they disagree as to what its stem might be (Skjaervo 2006 *Old Avestan* Lesson 2, p. 16; Jackson 1892 § 422(c), p. 120). Unlike Sanskrit, no ancient grammars on Avestan have survived. So all Avestan stems are conjectured (based on a comparison of how cognate words are inflected for case, number, gender in Vedic ~ which is largely how Avestan has been decoded ~ although even now, Avestan has been only approx. 80% + decoded).

[24] Beekes 1988, p. 137.

[25] There is some difference of opinion amongst linguists regarding the declension of *marətānō.* Skjaervo 2006 shows it as nominative. pl. But here Insler 1975 shows it as the direct object of the verb "afflicted", in which event, it can only be accusative, not nom. Skjaervo 2006 conjectures that the stem is *marətan-*, which is an *-an* stem. Jackson 1892 shows that for *-an* stems the *-nō* or *-anō* inflection is gen. sg. (giving us 'of mortal being'), and acc. pl. (giving us 'mortal beings') § 300, pp. 88 - 89. So in Y30.6, a more literal translation

of the words *ahūm marətānō* would be either 'existence [acc. sg.], mortals [acc. pl.]'; or 'existence of mortal-being' ~ or in more fluent English, 'mortal existence'.

²⁶ "Where shall there be protection instead of injury? Where shall mercy [*mərəždikā* 'compassion'] take place? Where truth [*aša-*] which attains glory? Where [*spənta- ārmaiti-*]? Where the very best thinking [*manah-vahišta-*]? Where, Wise One, through Thy rule?" Y51.4, Insler 1975. See *Part One: Good Rule, Vohu Xshathra*.

²⁷ Detailed in *Part One: Embodied Truth, Aramaiti*.

²⁸ The meaning of each of these divine qualities is explained (with evidence) in the early chapters of *Part One*.

²⁹ That *ārmaiti-* is a quality of the Divine (an amesha spenta) is shown quite clearly in various YAv. texts, examples of which have been quoted in a footnote in *Part Two: The Puzzle of the Amesha Spenta.*

³⁰ Insler 1975 also cites the dual *utayūitī təvīšī* in Y34.11c, Y45.10c, Y51.7c, "as 'the two enduring powers, forces'," ~ describing the dual *haurvatāt- amərətāt-* (completeness and non-deathness) "which they always represent." p. 169. The English word force is used, not in the sense of coercion, but in the sense of *may the force be with you* (of 'Star Wars' fame).
Here are these examples in the Insler 1975 translation.

"Yes, both completeness and immortality [*haurvåscā … amərətatåscā*] are for Thy sustenance. Together with the rule of good thinking allied with truth, [*ārmaitiš*] has increased these two enduring powers [*utayūitī təvīšī*] ..." Y34.11;

"I shall try to glorify Him ... with prayers of [*ārmatōiš*] ... Whatever one has promised to Him with truth and with good thinking is to be completeness and immortality [*haurvātā amərətātā*] for Him under His rule, is to be these two enduring powers [*təvīšī utayūitī*] for Him in His house." Y45.10;

"... grant Thou to me immortality and completeness [*amərətātā haurvātā*] those two enduring forces [*təvīšī utayūitī*] which are to be praised with good thinking." Y51.7.

³¹ The meaning 'to give, grant' are the only meanings of the verb stem *dā-* that fit the context of this verse (Y30.7). Its many other (somewhat related) meanings, are detailed in *Part Two: The Puzzle of Creation.*

³² See *Part One: Embodied Truth, Aramaiti.*

³³ Insler 1975 commenting under Y28.4, p. 123.

³⁴ "...Him, the Lord who is famed to be Wise in His soul [*ənmānī*]..." Y45.10, Insler 1975; *ənmānī* is loc. sg. of the stem *ənman-*. Thus literally 'in-soul'.

³⁵ Taraporewala comments that he construes *kəhrpə̄m* as genitive pl. but does not give any grammatical basis for his conclusion, other than to say that he thinks two acc. sg. words (*kəhrpə̄m* and *ənma*) "would be a very unusual construction." On *kəhrpə̄m*, he thinks the meaning "should be nearer to that in the Veda", noting that a Ved. *kṛpá* means 'splendour' or 'radiance' or 'beauty' ~ suggesting that *kəhrpə̄m* is not just physical form, but is used in a spiritual sense ~ deriding the "purely materialistic" interpretations of "western scholars". In so doing, I think he misses a key element of Zarathushtra's thought ~ that of infusing each material thought, word and action with the spiritual values that are the amesha spenta. One of Zarathushtra's beautiful paradoxes (discussed in *Part One: The Paradox of the Material & the Spiritual*).

³⁶ This technique of 'framing' or 'encapsulation' in the Gathas' syntax, to give one unit of thought, is discussed in the following chapters:

In *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo) An Analysis* (discussed in great detail, with Insler's insight referenced, and 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);  *Yasna 44.16* (discussed briefly);   and the *A Airyema Ishyo (Y54:1)* (multiple framings ~ 5 framings in a verse of 3 lines).

[37] Sometimes *yaϑā* is paired with *aϑā* ~ as in the Ahuna Vairya
*yaϑā ahū vairyō aϑā ratuš ašāṯcīṯ hacā*
In such situations, *yaϑā ... aϑā*  means 'just as ...  so also'. See *Part Three: The Ahuna Vairya (Yatha Ahu Vairyo), An Analysis*. But in our verse, Y30.7c. *yaϑā*   'just as  appears alone at the start of the 2d half of line c.  I therefore think it explains or supplements the phrase that appears immediately before it.

[38] Skjaervo 2006 *Old Avestan* Lesson 2, and Skjaervo 2003 *Young Avestan* Lessons 11 and 12, give detailed explanations of the various uses of the genitive in Avestan (the rules for YAv. on this point being applicable to GAv. as well).  One of them is the use of a gen. with the verb 'to be' generating the translation of 'having' (or as Taraporewala says, of 'belonging').  But none of these many uses of the gen. seems applicable here.

[39] Geldner 1P p. 107.  He shows no mss. variations in the mss. available to him.

[40] Here are the phrases in our verse Y30.7c,  and in Y44.16,  which I think are instructive parallels regarding what is to be protected.

Our verse (Y30.7) 'One/one shall be here for the protection [*pōi] of these (mortals), ...'  my translation (referring to the preceding divine qualities in mortals).

Y44.16  "...in order to protect [pōi], in accord with Thy teaching those pure ones [ciϑrā 'bright-ones'] who exist in my house?..." Insler 1975.  Here, what is to be protected are qualities of the divine in Zarathushtra's (mortal) existence.  The words "in my house" refer to Zarathushtra's state of being. In the Gathas, 'house' is frequently used as a metaphor for a state of being that houses the comprehension of truth (detailed in *Part Two: The Houses of Paradise & Hell*).   And although in Y44.16 Insler has translated *ciϑrā* as "pure ones", according to Skjaervo 2006 (and Insler himself in other verses) the word *ciϑrā* is an adj. which means 'bright'.  In Y44.16 this adj. is used as a noun, and so could mean 'bright ones' as in qualities, or 'bright ones' as in people.   Here I think the 'bright ones that exist in my house'  means qualities ~ the illumination of truth and its component parts (divine qualities) which Zarathushtra houses in his being  ~ Zarathushtra standing for all mortals here, because these are qualities that all mortals have (although in varying degrees and not completely).  So what is to be protected in Y44.16 is divine qualities in mortal existence. (See *Part Six: Yasna 44.16,* for a detailed discussion of this verse with my translation and others for comparative purposes).

And that is exactly what is to be protected in Y30.7c ~ the qualities of the Divine (all that is most-good) in mortal existence.

[41] See in *Part One* the first few chapters on each quality of the Divine (amesha spenta) which show that the beneficial way of being, truth, good thinking, embodied truth, good rule presently exist in man (incompletely), and that man is capable of attaining them completely.  And see also *Part One:  The Identity of the Divine,* and *Part Two: A Question of Immanence.*

[42] Detailed in *Part One: A Teaching for All Mankind.*

[43] The concept of limiting 'salvation' or 'protection' or 'help' to only those who give allegiance to a particular deity is not found in the Gathas (see in *Part One: A Question of Salvation,* and *Differences in the Spirit of Friendship*), although we see some instances of this (tribal) mind~set in later texts in connection with pre-

Zarathushtrian Indo-Iranian deities ~ who were tribal deities ~ whose worship was syncretized with the Zoroastrian religion some centuries after Zarathushtra (see *Part Four: The Syncretization*).

[44] Skjaervo 2006 shows *yaϑā* having a number of grammatical values "interr./rel.    adv./conj."  but he translates it with one English word 'how'.  I do not think 'how' fits in the context of line c.

[45] See *Part Two: Molten, Glowing Metal.*