Yasna 31, Verses 6 & 7.

Composers of music often create variations on an underlying melody -- sometimes multiple variations, on multiple underlying melodies in one composition.   We see this in Indian raghas, in western classical music, in jazz, and many other forms of music.   And indeed, the Indian raghas are an ancient art form (involving improvisations and variations on one or more musical melodies or themes).

We have no way of knowing if such musical variations on one or more melodies and themes may also have been a form of music in Zarathushtra's time, which he may have expressed in the music of his Gathas.

What we do know, is that Zarathushtra uses this same technique of variations on an underlying theme, in expressing his ideas in the poems which underly his songs (the Gathas) -- expressing the same ideas in many different ways, and from many different perspectives in the poetry of his words.   And I sometimes wonder if, when he composed music for the Gathas, he assigned certain underlying melodies for certain underlying ideas, so that melodies and their variations reflected such ideas and their variations.

That would have added dimensions (and clues) to the puzzles in his poems/songs, which would have caught the attention of his audiences, and delighted them as they bent their minds to understanding such puzzles (in part as a form of entertainment in those ancient times in which electronic forms of entertainment did not exist).

In our verses -- Y31 verses 6 and 7 -- we no longer have the music to which they were sung. But we see in them, Zarathushtra's typical style of variations on certain central ideas.

In fact, Zarathushtra's own words show his intent to convey key ideas that are foundational to his new envisionment.

Yet for the longest time I simply could not puzzle out what he was telling us here.   And it did not help that translations by various eminent linguists are so very different.

As I continued to discover his thoughts in the Gathas, and started to learn Avestan (from the works of professional linguists), I began to recognize the melodies of his ideas in the Gathas that flow through these two verses.

Like so many Gatha verses, (in English translation) when we first read them, they seem ... trite, uninspiring. It is only when we understand the ideas they express that we realize how beautiful they are. An interpretive translation that is more "inspiring" or more "beautiful", is a poor substitute, because it cannot reveal the breath-taking discoveries of Zarathushtra's beautiful thought and his exquisite multi-dimensioned ways of expressing them.

Some Avestan words simply do not have an English equivalent. So I sometimes try to give you the flavor of the Avestan word by using more than one English word, with diagonal slashes between them, which (when read cold) may seem a turn off. But I think you may be pleasantly surprised when you read about these words in the *Discussion* section below. It will give you an insight into Zarathushtra's thinking that otherwise would not be available.

In addition, in Avestan (as in English), a word can sometimes have two unrelated meanings, which Zarathushtra sometimes uses to express a double entendre. For example, 'grow/blaze'.

So to understand Zarathushtra's intent, let us abandon the mind-set of: '*if it is this, it cannot be that,*' and experience the richness and beauty of his thought.

Avestan has no articles ('the', 'a', 'an'), but to keep an English translation fluent we have to insert such articles. I have not placed such articles in round parentheses (to indicate they are not in the Avestan text) unless the addition of an article changes the meaning of a phrase, so that you can decide for yourself whether the resulting meaning is consistent with Zarathushtra's thought, and therefore reflects his intent.

And in the *Discussion* section, I will give you Avestan words, sometimes in stem form, (easier to recognize), but also in the forms in which they appear in these verses so that you can connect the discussion with a given word in a verse. References to the translations and commentaries of the linguists in our group are footnoted here to avoid repeated footnotes.[1]

a. *ahmāi. aŋhaṯ. vahištəm.   / yə̄. mōi. vīdvå. vaocāṯ. haiϑīm.*
b. *mąϑrəm.[∴] yim. haurvatātō.   /   ašahyā. amərətātascā.*[2]
c. *mazdāi. [∴] avaṯ. xšaϑrəm.   /   hyaṯ. hōi. vohū. vax šaṯ. manaŋhā. ∴* Y31:6.

a. *yastā. maṇtā. pouruyō.[∴]   /   raocə̄bīš. rōiϑwən. xʸāϑrā.*
b. *hvō. x raϑwā. dąmiš. ašəm. / yā. dāyaraṯ. vahištəm. manō. ∴*
c. *tā. mazdā. mainyū. ux šyō. / yə̄. ā. nūrə̄mcīṯ. ahurā. hāmō. ∴* Y31:7 Geldner 1P p, 110.

My translation. (More literal translations are given in the *Linguistics* section, below).

a. 'The most good exists for that one ~ the knowing one ~ who tells to me the real
b. precept: That of (the) completeness of truth, and of non-deathness
c. for Wisdom: Such (is) rule, that for Him, it will grow/blaze through good thinking." Y31:6

a. 'The one who first thinks thus: *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth).*
b. That one through reason (is) the truth establisher, through which one upholds the most good thinking.
c. Through that way of being, Wisdom, You grow/(are) light, who nevertheless Lord, (are) still one and the same." Y31:7.

Discussion.

Here, I will simply give you my understanding, without going into the conflicting opinions of eminent linguists ~ which are detailed in the *Linguistics* section (below).   Their full translations of these two verses are given at the end of this chapter, so you can compare and decide for yourself, what you find persuasive.

For more than a thousand years, most Zoroastrians have lived under dominant religions, the mind-sets of which we have (unconsciously) absorbed, so that they have become a part of our own mind-sets. But these religions did not exist in Zarathushtra's time.   And in many fundamental ways, these mind-sets are very, very different from Zarathushtra's thought. So for me it is a constant struggle to keep these mind-sets (which I have absorbed) from automatically influencing my thinking. To avoid their automatic influence, I keep repeating here some of Zarathushtra's (different) mind-sets and conclusions. But it troubles me that you may find such repetitions tedious (for which I hope you will forgive me). These repetitions help us to avoid slipping into such later (inconsistent) mind-sets, which have conditioned our thinking.

To that end, let us first recall some of Zarathushtra's (unique and foundational) ideas that will help us to understand these two verses ~ so that we do not allow pre-conditioned mind-sets to influence our thinking.

First: The Divine (in his view) is:

~ a wholly good, wholly beneficial, way of being (*spəṇta- mainyu-*),[3] ~ a way of being which is

~ the true order of existence personified, which is most good (*aša- vahišta-*),[4] ~ 'truth' for short,

~ its comprehension, good thinking (*vohu- manah-*),[5]

~ its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action (*spəṇta- ārmaiti-*),[6]

~ its good rule (*vohu- x ša϶ra-*),[7]

~ its complete attainment (*haurvatāt-*), resulting in

~ a state of being not bound by mortality (*amərətāt-*);[8]

An enlightened state of being, Wisdom (*mazdā-*).
One who is Lord (*ahura-*) over ~ possesses completely ~ these qualities that make a being divine.[9]

Mortals have the first five of these divine qualities, imperfectly, incompletely, and mortals can attain them all completely.[10]   So in these qualities, we see a connection between the nature of the perfected Divine and imperfect mortals.[11]

As you can see, one of these divine qualities (the beneficial way of being) is equated with truth. And five of them are personifications of truth (its comprehension, its embodiment, its rule, its complete attainment).

In the Gathas, the path to wisdom/Wisdom is the path of these Divine qualities ~ the path of truth. And the reward for taking that path is the complete attainment of truth ~ which is wisdom/Wisdom, truth personified. So truth is both the means and the end, the path and its reward ~ truth for truth's own sake ~ ideas we see in these two verses, and throughout the Gathas in a 1,001 beautiful, kaleidoscopic ways,[12] as well as in the *Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu)* manthra.[13]

Second: If the Divine is truth personified, a key question arises: What (in Zarathushtra's view) is truth?
In English, truth usually means factual truth. In Avestan, *aša-* ~ an order of existence that is true ~ includes factual truths, as well as the truths of mind/heart/spirit ~ all that is right. Zarathushtra equates the true order of existence (*aša-*) with intrinsic goodness. In fact, this order of existence (truth) is the superlative of intrinsic goodness, *vahišta-* 'most-good', which in later texts became its standard epithet ~ *aša- vahišta-*.[14]

Third: The comprehension of truth ~ good thinking (*vohu- manah-*) ~ is acquired through reason.   In the very first verse of Yasna 28, Zarathushtra asks Wisdom for teachings that will "satisfy the reasoning of good thinking".[15] And in Yasna 29, good thinking (the reason based comprehension of truth) is the genesis of solutions for the problems that were ravaging Zarathushtra's society ~ injustice, predatory violence, cruelty, greed, might, bondage, etc.[16]

Normally in English, the meaning of 'mind/thinking/thought', is limited to intellectual functions.   But that is not so in the Gathas, in which *manah-* (mind/thinking/thought) includes the full spectrum of conscious (awake) capabilities ~ intellect, good judgment, reasoning, emotion, creativity, insight, etc. Good thinking is the incremental, and eventually the complete, comprehension of an order of existence that is true (correct), right, good, in the existences of matter and mind.[17]

Fourth: The word *vahišta-* 'most good' is the superlative degree of intrinsic 'good' (*vohu-*). Although the superlative in Avestan often is used as a crescendo of expression,[18] it also is used to show something that possesses a quality in the superlative degree.[19]   And Zarathushtra uses *vahišta-* 'most good', almost as a code word, or a word or art. This has been detailed (with evidence) in another chapter.[20] So here, I will simply summarize ~ a summary which also shows why, in later times, the religion was called the 'religion of goodness' *din-i behi*.

In the Gathas:

- *vahišta-* 'most good' is used for the Divine, who is wholly good, the superlative degree of intrinsic goodness, (who personifies the true order of existence - its comprehension, its embodiment, its rule, the beneficial way of being)

- *vahišta-* 'most good' is used for the qualities of the Divine (which comprise the true order of existence),

- *vahišta-* 'most good' is used for the teachings of the Divine, (which is the path of the true order of existence and its components),

- *vahišta-* 'most good' is used for mortal thoughts, words and actions that implement the true order of existence and its components (even though imperfectly, incompletely), and

- *vahišta-* 'most good' is used for the reward for taking that path - paradise, the 'most good existence' (a state of being which personifies completely, the true order of existence and its components).

So in Zarathushtra's thought, 'paradise' is not a place of reward. It is a wholly good state of being that we become (when we no longer are a mix of good and bad qualities).[21]

Paradise is state of being that - incrementally, and eventually completely - houses the comprehension of truth (the house of good thinking); a state of being (paradise) that is also called 'the most good thinking' ("... and how, at the end,[22] ... the best thinking [*vahišta- manah-* 'the most-good thinking'] for the truthful person." Y30:4, Insler 1975).

Paradise is a state of being that - incrementally, and eventually completely - houses bliss, happiness, like the high we feel when we hear or sing beautiful music (the house of song).

Paradise is a state of being that - incrementally, and eventually completely - personifies the qualities of the Divine, the 'most good existence' *ahu- vahišta-*, which is the existence of the Divine *aša- vahišta-*, truth personified, - (the) completeness of truth (in our verse Y31:6).

In the religious thought of certain dominant religions of today (which have conditioned our mind-sets), existence is divided into
(1) 'this life' (a material existence) and
(2) the 'after-life' (a non-material existence in which we supposedly live in places of reward or punishment - heaven, or hell, or purgatory).
That is a mind-set we have absorbed from these dominant religions which did not exist in Zarathushtra's time.

But that is not Zarathushtra's mind-set. In his mind-set (which we have largely forgotten), existence is divided into
(1) mortal existence (which enables the perfecting process through experiences) and
(2) an existence no longer bound by mortality (when the perfecting process is complete).[23]

It therefore follows (as the day the night) that Zarathushtra's notion of 'paradise' - a state of being that personifies truth completely - begins, continues incrementally, and is achieved, in *mortal* existence, at which time the perfected soul makes the transition (crosses the bridge),[24] to a state of being no longer bound by mortal existence, 'non-deathness' *amərətāt-*, because the perfecting process is complete.

This difference between the mind-set of most dominant religious paradigms, and Zarathushtra's mind-set (that paradise is a state of being that begins, and reaches the completeness of truth in *mortal* existence) is one of the single most difficult differences to keep in mind, as we navigate his thought. We keep slipping back, automatically, to the mind-set of paradise (even as a state of being) existing only in an afterlife.

Fifth: Throughout the Gathas, (and later texts), light in its various forms, is used as a metaphor (and sometimes as a simile) for truth, its comprehension good thinking, and Wisdom ~ an enlightened state of being that personifies truth and is Zarathushtra's paradise ~ the Endless Light(s) of later Avestan texts.[25]

Thus Zarathushtra's (unique) ideas regarding the *identity* of the Divine,[26] runs through these two verses, as you will see.

Let us now turn to our two verses. Zarathushtra weaves the above ideas into the fabric of these two verses, the beauty of which lie, not in a superficial reading that is 'inspiring', but in its beautiful ideas, and its poetry (see if you agree).

Here is verse 6.

Line a. 'The most good [*vahištəm*] exists for that one ~ the knowing one ~ who tells to me the real
Line b. precept: That of (the) completeness of truth, and of non-deathness
Line c. for Wisdom: Such (is) rule, that for Him, it will grow/blaze through good thinking." Y31:6.

In line a. the 'knowing one' is someone who knows Wisdom's teachings.[27] 'Knowing' (understanding) these teachings is a good beginning.   And here, the most good [*vahištəm*] that exists for this 'knowing one' includes the (incremental) paradise of a 'most good existence' which is truth (incrementally) personified ~ an existence for the 'knowing one' who understands ('who tells to me') a foundational teaching ~ the real precept (*haiϑīm mąϑrəm*), which guides and enables spiritual evolution (in *mortal* existence).

What does Zarathushtra mean by this 'real precept'? Many things.

The Avestan word for precept is *mąϑra-/mąϑrā-* (the *ą* in *mąϑra-* is pronounced nasally, as in Hindi *kaam* 'work', *aam* 'mango'; and the name Antia). And the word *mąϑra-/mąϑrā-* derives from *man-* 'to think' (*man-* is pronounced as in 'fun'). Indeed, Mills sometimes translates *mąϑra-/mąϑrā-* as 'words of reason'.[28]

There can be no doubt that in the Gathas, *mąϑra-* is used for the Word, the teachings, the precepts, of Wisdom (as understood by Zarathushtra).[29]

And the fact that *mąϑra-* derives from 'to think', indicates that to Zarathushtra, Wisdom's teachings are reason based (as our next verse Y31:7 corroborates). The precepts of Wisdom are not Divine laws, Divine mandates, Divine commands, which must be obeyed without question (the pre-conditioned mind-sets of eminent linguists to the contrary notwithstanding!).[30] In fact, in the YAv. *Hormezd Yasht* (§ 7) one of my favorite names for the Divine, is One of whom questions may be asked,[31] ~ a spirit of enquiry that is recognized in other later texts as well.[32]

Mandates, laws, commands, unquestioning obedience, are contrary to the search for truth and the freedom to choose.

In Zarathushtra's thought, we have to discover truth for ourselves, from within, by searching for it with our mind/heart/spirit. The search for truth and the freedom to choose ~ both prerequisites for spiritual growth to truth personified ~ are two of Zarathushtra's most fundamental teachings.[33] So the reason based Words of wisdom/Wisdom (*mąϑra-*) that make us think, are for guidance (what YAv. texts call 'wisdom acquired by the ear', which helps us to grow the 'wisdom within').[34]

In short, a precept (*mąϑra-*) of wisdom/Wisdom (in Zarathushtra's view) is a reason based teaching, that makes us think, that assists us in the search for truth.

Next, why does Zarathushtra choose 'real (*haiϑīm*)' to describe the precept referred to in this verse 6? Skjaervo 2006 says that the stem *haiϑya-* means "true, real (= not only seemingly true)" and he says this word derives from *ah-* 'to be' (which in the Gathas is frequently translated as 'to exist').[35]

So the real precept (*haiϑīm mąϑrəm*), is 'real' in two ways:
1. It is 'real' in quality ~ 'true' (as distinguished from false), and
2. It is 'real' in being (as distinguished from just an ideal) ~ a precept that personifies the quality 'true' ~ which echoes '(the) most good exists [*aŋhaṯ vahištəm*]' at the start of this verse.

This two-fold meaning, shows that the real precept (*haiϑīm mąϑrəm*) is a precept that personifies truth ~ an idea that is found in the qualities of the Divine; an idea that runs throughout these 2 verses, and indeed runs throughout the Gathas, and is expressed in YAv. texts as *tanu.mąϑra-* ~ the embodied Word, the incarnate Word.[36]

You well may wonder: *How* is the Word embodied, incarnate? Well, Wisdom's Word, is the path of Wisdom's own divine qualities ~ the beneficial way of being, which is the true, wholly good, order of existence (truth), its comprehension, its embodiment, its rule, its complete attainment. These personifications (although imperfect) are the path to the Divine ~ Wisdom's teachings (*mąϑra-*).   And these (perfected) Divine qualities are also the reward for taking that path ~ the path personified completely. So one who is *tanu.mąϑrā* is one who (imperfectly, incrementally, and eventually completely, in *mortal* existence) personifies the teachings of the Divine ~ embodying truth, becoming truth personified, which is ~ the paradise of the most good existence,[37] echoing the beginning of our verse.

In a related way ~ from a different perspective ~ the YAv. texts speak of *mąϑra- spəṇta-* 'the beneficial Word', which is the true wholly good order of existence (*aša- vahišta-*) and its components ~ its good comprehension, its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action, its good rule, its complete attainment ~ truth personified, the beneficial way of being (*spəṇta- mainyu-*) ~ which is the existence of the Divine ~ the 'most good existence (*ahu- vahišta-*)' which is Zarathushtra's paradise (in *mortal* existence), which personifies the 'most good true order of existence' (*aša- vahišta-*).

So, returning to our verse 6, naturally we wonder: What *is* this precept that is real/true in these two ways ~ in quality and in being? The answer is in the next phrase:
'... the real precept: That of (the) completeness of truth, and of non-deathness for Wisdom [*mazdāi*]: ...'

Now, we know that in the Gathas, a teaching (precept) of Wisdom is that completeness (*haurvatāt-*) ~ the complete attainment of truth ~ and non-deathness (*aməratāt-*) are qualities of the Divine that mortals do not presently have, but will attain.[38] So in our verse 6, '... (the) completeness of truth [*haurvatātō ašahyā*]' is a state of being that is the end of the perfecting process (truth personified) at which time mortality (the arena for the perfecting process) no longer is needed, and a non-mortal state of being ~ non-deathness (*aməratāt-*)' ~ is attained.

But isn't this is a perfecting process for mortals?   Why then does Zarathushtra speak of the precept that is real as '... That of (the) completeness of truth, and of non-deathness for Wisdom [*mazdāi*]: ...'. Why for Wisdom [*mazdāi*]?

Well, if you look at the ways in which Zarathushtra uses completeness and non-deathness, some unusual things appear.[39] He tells us that:

We earn completeness and non-deathness through our own endeavors,

6

"...Those of you who shall give [*səraoša-* 'listening'] and regard to this (Lord)[40] of mine they shall reach completeness [*haurvatāt-*] and [*amərətāt-*] ..." Y45:5, Insler 1975. In Avestan (as in English!) 'listening' means 'hearing and implementing'.[41]

Wisdom gives completeness and non-deathness to us,
"... grant Thou to me [*amərətāt-* 'non-deathness'] and completeness [*haurvatāt-*], ..." Y51:7, Insler 1975.

And we give completeness and non-deathness to the Divine (Wisdom),
"Through a [*spənta- mainyu-* 'beneficial way of being'] and the best thinking [*vahišta- manah-* 'most-good thinking'], through both action and the word befitting truth, they shall grant [*dąn*][42] completeness [*haurvatāt-*] and [*amərətāt-* 'non-deathness'] to Him [*ahmāi*]. The Wise One [*mazdā-* 'Wisdom'] in rule is Lord through [*ārmaiti-* 'embodied truth']." Y47:1, Insler 1975. The notion that we give completeness to Wisdom does not rest on the evidence of Y47:1 alone. We see it in other verses as well.[43]

What could Zarathushtra mean by this? How does the Divine complete us? Even more puzzling: How could we possibly complete the Divine, let alone give the Divine non-deathness (rescue It from mortality ~ the arena for the perfecting process)? The answer lies in abandoning our pre-conditioned mind-sets and considering Zarathushtra's thought with fresh eyes.

If multiple units of existence complete each other, then of necessity, they would have to be component parts of one whole. No other conclusion is logically possible. So (following this line of reasoning) no unit of existence is complete ~ truth personified completely ~ until every unit is complete. Therefore, until every fragment of existence is complete, the Divine (who is a part of existence) is still incomplete, and bound by mortality.[44]

Does this collective 'completeness' include other life forms as well? There is some evidence that it does, but this is discussed in other chapters.[45] In our two verses, let us limit our discussion to mortals who are human.

So in our verse 6, the real precept which is 'That of (the) completeness of truth and of non-deathness for Wisdom [*mazdāi*]', applies not only at an individual level (each perfected mortal fragment of existence), but also at a collective level (comprising all the perfected fragments of existence ~ which is Zarathushtra's notion of the Divine) and is therefore 'for Wisdom [*mazdāi*]'.[46] And it is also reflected in the twofold meaning of the 'real [*haiϑīm*] precept' ~ quality and being. To summarize:

Individual.

First: '(the) completeness of truth' is a completeness of quality that occurs at the individual level of each fragment of existence which evolves to a state of being that is no longer conflicted, no longer a mix of more-good and bad (Y30.3), more-beneficial and harmful (Y45.2), when the perfecting process is complete in the *quality* of a given fragment.[47]

Second: '(the) completeness of truth' is a completeness of being, which occurs at the collective level, in which the primeval life force (Y30:3, Y45:2) ~ temporarily fragmented to enable the perfecting process,[48] ~ becomes whole or complete again ~ a union of all perfected fragments of existence, which comprises the Divine ~ Wisdom, (Lord of the qualities that make a being divine). At which time, the reason for mortality ceases to exist (mortal existence being the arena for the perfecting process) and a non-mortal state of being occurs (non-deathness) ~ at first, incrementally as each perfected unit re-joins the other perfected units, and eventually completely when all fragments of existence as a whole become perfected ~ which in Zarathushtra's thought, is not a '*maybe*', but will occur with certainty.

In his thought, everyone eventually will make it, as part of a rational process ~ *because* of the freedom to choose. One of his neat paradoxes. We evolve spiritually to wisdom/Wisdom, to '(the) completeness of

truth and of non-deathness' ~ a spiritual completeness through earned and unearned experiences in material existence. Another one of his neat paradoxes.[49]

So the perfecting process which results in '(the) completeness of truth and of non-deathness' ~ in quality and being ~ a union of all the perfected fragments of existence ~ *enables* the existence of the Divine ~ wisdom/Wisdom. It therefore is, quite literally, 'for Wisdom [*mazdāi*]'.   Giving us so far,

Line a. 'The most good [*vahištəm*] exists for that one ~ the knowing one ~ who tells to me the real
Line b. precept: That of (the) completeness of truth and of non-deathness
Line c. for Wisdom: ..." Y31:6.

Verse 6 then concludes with a statement: 'Such (is) rule, that for Him, it will grow/blaze through good thinking' (a statement that is echoed in a more expansive way in the concluding sentence of the next verse). In our concluding sentence (in verse 6), we see 'for Him', which parallels the preceding 'for Wisdom', the repetition indicating (to me, at least) that Zarathushtra wanted to be sure we did not miss the significance of 'for Wisdom' ~ he really wants us to get it.

But of all the qualities of the Divine, why is 'rule' singled out here?

Well, good rule is first the way we govern ourselves, which in turn affects our various social units ~ the family, the community, the nation, our world, existence as a whole (including other life forms and the environment).

And Wisdom's rule is the rule of three divine qualities ~ the rule of 'truth (*aša-*)', its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action (*spənta- ārmaiti-*), which (incrementally) results in a state of enlightenment ~ ~ the most good thinking (*vahišta- manah-*).   In another verse, Y51:4, Zarathushtra summarizes the components of this Divine quality ~ good rule ~ which mortals also have (incompletely).   Teaching through rhetorical questions, he says,

"Where shall there be protection instead of injury?
Where shall mercy [*mərəždikā* 'compassion'] take place?
Where truth [*aša-*] which attains glory?
Where [*spənta- ārmaiti-* 'beneficial embodied truth']?
Where the very best thinking [*vahišta- manah-* 'the most-good thinking']?
Where, [*mazdā-* 'Wisdom'], through Thy rule?" Y51:4,[50] Insler 1975.

Parenthetically, here again, we see an echo of the state of being of a truth-possessing person ~ what we call paradise ~ *vahišta- manah-* the 'most good thinking' ("... and how, at the end, ... the best thinking [*vahišta-manah-* 'the most-good thinking'] for the truthful person [*ašavan-*]." Y30:4, Insler 1975 ~ paralleling the idea of a state of being that houses good thinking ~ the 'house of good thinking' ~ another of his terms for what we call 'paradise').

Returning to line c. of our verse 6, Zarathushtra says:
'Such (is) rule, that for Him, it will grow/blaze [*vax šaṯ*] through good thinking.'

Skjaervo shows two GAv. stems *vax š-* ~ one means 'to grow', and the other means 'to blaze'. Zarathushtra often plays with words (and phrases) that have two (or more) meanings, when he wishes to express, evoke, multi-dimensioned ideas. And in our verse 6, I think *vax šaṯ* is one such word. It means that 'rule' for wisdom/Wisdom 'will grow/blaze [*vax šaṯ*] through good thinking', because the (incremental) comprehension of truth enlightens the mind, enabling it to translate an understanding of truth, into beneficial thoughts, words and actions of truth [*spənta- ārmaiti-*], through which Wisdom's rule grows. Thus, the 'light' word blaze (in line c. of verse 6) is a metaphor for understanding truth (which enlightens),

8

which is echoed in the first and last lines of the next verse, 7. Here is the full verse 7. Withhold judgment on the triple meaning of *x^{v}āϑrā*. You may be pleasantly surprised.

a. 'The one who first thinks thus: *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment [x^{v}āϑrā] (truth).*
b. That one through reason (is) the truth establisher, through which one upholds the most good thinking.
c. Through that way of being, Wisdom, You grow/(are) light, who nevertheless Lord, (are) still one and the same." Y31:7.

The notion of paradise (a state of being) runs through these two verses in variations of an underlying melody. In verse 7 the phrase, *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth)* in line a., and the most good thinking in line b., ~ echo the strands of paradise in verse 6: ~ the most good existence in line a., the completeness of truth and of non-deathness in line b., and the blaze of good thinking (enlightenment) in line c. (the Endless Lights of later Avestan texts).

If we keep in mind that (in the Gathas and later texts) light is a symbol of truth, its comprehension, and Wisdom (who embodies truth, its comprehension ~ personifies truth), then the thought expressed in line a. (verse 7) is easy to understand, but for clarification (or perhaps as a reminder), I have added 'truth(s)' in round parentheses.

So what is Zarathushtra trying to express when he says *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth)*?

Well, first, notice the elegant framing of 'one is filled', between the two 'lights'.
Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth) ~ encompassing,

   ~ the path ~ *Through lights (truths)*, and

   ~ its incremental end ~ *good/happiness/enlightenment (truth).*

Here we see the well established teaching of Zarathushtra that truth is both the (incremental) path and its (incremental and eventually complete) end ~ enlightenment.

In the path, we see that *lights* is plural. I think this is because in our material reality, Zarathushtra's path includes the search for truth in all aspects of existence ~ factual truths, scientific truths, social truths, emotional truths, creative truths ~ all the many truths that comprise the true (correct, right) wholly good order of existence (truth).

And these words tell us that (incremental) enlightenment (truth) ~ the path and its end ~ brings 'happiness' (starting in mortal existence).

So in this line a. (of verse 7), good/happiness/enlightenment pertains not only to spiritual existence, but also to material (mortal) existence.   In the Gathas, Zarathushtra expresses the profound truth that in the long run, we cannot be happy, we cannot be successful (in our material activities), if we are out of sync with the true (correct, good) order of existence (even though untruths may bring short-term gains).[51]   His teachings are not just a 'spiritual' philosophy ~ rejecting, and divorced from, the material realities of our lives. His teachings are a way of living in the existences of matter and mind; a way of living that brings joy, well-being, and enables a spiritual evolution to the completeness of truth personified in the existences of matter and mind.[52] The growth of wisdom occurs through material experiences.

But to truly appreciate these words ~ *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth)* [x^{v}āϑrā] ~ we need to understand *x^{v}āϑrā* for which there is no one-word English equivalent (detailed in the

Linguistics section below, and summarized here). Insler consistently translates $x^v\bar{a}\vartheta ra$- words as 'happiness' throughout the Gathas. But that does not begin to convey its meaning.

Eminent linguists tell us that $x^v\bar{a}\vartheta ra$- derives from hu- + $\bar{a}\vartheta ra$.

hu- means 'good', with a related meaning 'well-being/happiness'. (So here too, we see the connection between 'goodness' and 'happiness').

$\bar{a}\vartheta r\bar{a}$ means 'through fire', (the only form of light which man could make, in those ancient days). Fire/light, ~ a symbol for truth, its comprehension, good thinking, an enlightened state of being (which is wisdom/Wisdom) ~ is the paradise of '(the) most-good thinking' (Y30:4), (the) most-good existence' ~ that mortals can attain; ideas that are corroborated in one of the most frequently used descriptions in later (YAv.) texts, which link possessing truth with light, enlightenment, goodness, joy:

> '(the) most-good existence [*vahištəm ahūm*] of the truth~possessing [*ašaonąm*] ...
> light [*raōcaŋhəm*], all~good/happiness/enlightenment [*vīspō.x^v ā ϑrəm*] ...' my translation.[53]

In short, the full, literal meaning of $x^v\bar{a}\vartheta r\bar{a}$ (hu- + $\bar{a}\vartheta r\bar{a}$) means 'good, well-being, happiness [hu-], through fire/enlightenment [$\bar{a}\vartheta r\bar{a}$] (truth) ~ a state of being that is wisdom/Wisdom, truth personified, and is the joyful paradise that mortals (incrementally) attain.' (A very long definition !).

Its length notwithstanding, this definition of $x^v\bar{a}\vartheta ra$- fits all the colors of the paradise threads that run throughout our two verses (the micro context) ~ bearing in mind that paradise begins and grows in mortal existence. It fits all of the Gatha verses in which $x^v\bar{a}\vartheta ra$- words appear.[54] And it mirrors exactly, Zarathushtra's ideas in the Gathas, as well as many later texts (the macro context).[55]

It is worth recalling that in Zarathushtra's thought, enlightenment, the personification of truth, is a wholly good state of being ~ reflecting his new envisionment of the nature of the Divine which rejected the perceptions of his culture in which deities were a mix of 'good' and 'bad' qualities (like human beings, but on a more powerful scale ~ for both 'good' and 'bad').[56] And parenthetically, 'good' is equated with Zarathushtra's idea of the true order of existence ~ an enlightened existence ~ $aša$- $vahišta$-, which is the existence of the Divine.

Returning to the above very long definition of $x^v\bar{a}\vartheta ra$-, it would be impossible to translate line a. (or any Gatha verse in which $x^v\bar{a}\vartheta ra$- words appear) with such a long definition. So I use the following abbreviated translation (here in instr. sg. form) for $x^v\bar{a}\vartheta r\bar{a}$: 'with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth)'.

This abbreviated definition is not only awkward, it is totally inadequate (as the above explanation demonstrates). But it is the best I can come up with to convey in English, the Avestan meaning of $x^v\bar{a}\vartheta r\bar{a}$. So when you read this three-word (abbreviated!) definition, please forgive the awkwardness, and think of the origins of this word, and all the beautiful multidimensioned ideas it expresses.

Let us now look at line b. (together with line a. to give context, which I show here in green font). Parenthetically, the word first in line a. is not a competitive first, it is a foundational first ~ a necessary first step in understanding.

a. 'The one who first thinks thus: *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth)* [$x^v\bar{a}\vartheta r\bar{a}$]
b. That one through reason [$x ra\vartheta w\bar{a}$] (is) the truth establisher [$d\ddot{a}mi\check{s} a\check{s}\partial m$], through which one upholds the most good thinking.'

Poetry is the music of words. Notice the subtle sound differences/similarities between *xᵛāϑrā* (line a.) and *x raϑwā* (line b.)

In essence: line a. mentions the lights (truths), which fill us with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth). And line b. tells us how we get there.

In line b., it is through reason that we become truth establishers ⁓ establishing an order of existence that includes factual truths, as well as the truths of mind/heart/spirit ⁓ all that is true, right, good.

It is through reason that we uphold the most good thinking (the complete comprehension of truth) an enlightened state of being, the truths (lights) that fill us with goodness/happiness/enlightenment (line a.) ⁓ an enlightened state of being that is paradise, which begins, grows, and becomes complete, in mortal existence (enabling a transition to an existence no longer bound by mortality).

In the phrase truth establisher [*dąmiš ašəm*], the word *dąmiš* is a grammatical form of the verb stem *dā-* which means 'to give, produce, make, establish'. So more literally:

' That one through reason [*x raϑwā*] (is) the truth giver/producer/maker/establisher [*dąmiš ašəm*] ...'

But I thought you would totally rebel (or be turned off) if you were to read (cold) yet another multi-word translation. But we need to know, and keep in mind, these meanings of *dąmiš ašəm* a 'truth giver/producer/maker/establisher,' if we want to understand Zarathushtra's intent.

Which brings us to 'The one' in line a., and 'That one' in line b. The significance of these words (and the multiple meanings of *dąmiš*) lies in the following:

In the Gathas, it is not only the perfected part of existence ⁓ the Divine (Wisdom) ⁓ that through reason is a truth giver, a truth producer, a truth maker, a truth establisher. Every unperfected part of existence is such a one as well. Each time we make, through reason, choices (in thought, word and action), that reject what is false, ignorant, wrong, harmful, each time our reasoned choices advance truth, bringing about thoughts, words, and actions that are true, beneficial, right, good,   in each such instance we give, we produce, we make, we create, we establish, the true (correct, good) order of existence (*aša-*) ⁓ even though we do so sporadically, imperfectly, incrementally. So yet again we see that in Zarathushtra's thought, the acquisition of wisdom (paradise, an enlightened state of being) is incremental and experience based ⁓ in mortal existence.

When we make choices that give, produce, create, establish truth, we uphold the most good thinking ⁓ the (incremental, and then complete) comprehension of truth ⁓ the paradise of most good thinking, the most good existence.

Which brings us to line c. (in verse 7). Let us consider it in the context of lines a. and b. which I show in green font.

a. 'The one who first thinks thus: *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth).*
b. That one through reason (is) the truth establisher, through which one upholds the most good thinking.
c.   Through that [*tā*] way of being [*mainyū*], Wisdom, You grow/(are) light [*ux šyō*], who nevertheless Lord, (are) still one and the same [*hāmō*]."

In line c. Zarathushtra tells us that through the way of being mentioned in the preceding lines (the path and its end, a way of being that, through reason, incrementally, and eventually completely, personifies truth which is wisdom/ Wisdom), the Divine, grows, becomes enlightened.

In other words, through the wisdom-way-of-being, Wisdom grows.   And here again, we see echoes of 'for Wisdom' and 'for Him' in verse 6.

In verse 6 line c.   it is rule that grows/blazes [*vax šaṯ*] ~ the Divine in quality;
In verse 7 line c.   it is wisdom/Wisdom that grows/(is) enlightened [*ux šyō*] ~ the Divine in being:
A two-fold perception that echoes the real precept as well as completeness and non-deathness (in verse 6, line b.).
Both *vax šaṯ* and *ux šyō* are simply two different grammatical forms of the stem *vax š-* which has two meanings ~ 'to grow' and 'to blaze'.

And then, Zarathushtra teases us with a paradox.   Wisdom (the Divine) grows, but nevertheless is still one and the same [*hāmō*].   The resolution of this paradox may lack credibility if I summarize it (without the underlying evidence, which is detailed in other chapters).[57]   But this resolution also reflects the other instances of double entendre ~ quality/being ~ in these two verses.   The resolution is based on what I see implied (in 1,001 ways) in the Gathas regarding the nature and identity of the Divine.

In Zarathushtra's thought, the Divine comprises a union of all fragments of existence that have become perfected. Originally, "being" started out as a mix of more good and bad qualities (Y30:3), more beneficial and harmful qualities (Y45:2); this original being temporarily fragmented and infused itself into every aspect of the material existence to enable the perfecting process ~ an evolution to '(the) completeness of truth'; which fragments re-unite (in being) when the perfecting process is complete (in quality).   Therefore, the Divine grows as more and more fragments of existence become perfected ~ truth personified, an enlightened state of being, the Endless Light(s).

Yet here too, we have the suggestion of a double entendre ~ quality/being ~ that runs through these two verses. In one sense, the Divine is still one and the same in quality ~ the perfected part of existence. This, I think, was Zarathushtra's primary intent, because here he addresses the Divine with the name 'Lord' which in the Gathas he uses in the sense of one who has attained lordship over (possesses completely) the qualities that make a being divine.[58]   And in another sense, the Divine is also still one and the same in being ~ one being comprising existence as a whole (although temporarily fragmented to enable the perfecting process).

Let us take a moment to notice (in these two verses) the many different ways in which Zarathushtra describes the (incremental, and eventually complete) state of being that is paradise ~ each of them facets of the same idea ~ the true wholly good order of existence personified (which is wisdom/Wisdom):

~ a most good existence (being), one that is the superlative degree of intrinsic goodness (quality)
   (vs. 6 line a.);

~ the real precept ~ truth (quality) personified (being)
   (vs. 6, lines a.b.); the YAv. *tanu.maϑra-* the embodied Word;

~ the completeness of truth and of non-deathness
   (vs. 6, line b.)

~ the growth/blaze of understanding truth
   (vs. 6, line c.),
   which is the incremental attainment of wisdom (quality),
   a state of being that houses good thinking (being)

~ goodness, happiness, enlightenment, (lights) ~ an incremental state of enlightenment (quality/being)
   (vs. 7, lines a. and c.);

~ producing, creating, establishing ~ through reason ~ an order of existence that is true (correct), wholly good, and its comprehension, the 'most good thinking' (quality/being)
(vs. 7, line b.);
another term for what we call 'paradise' in the Gathas;

~ a way of being that is wisdom (quality), that increases the Divine/Wisdom in existence (being)
(vs. 7, line c.).

Conclusion:

In these two verses, with exquisite craftsmanship, Zarathushtra expresses simple but profound ideas in multi-dimensioned ways, cryptically, with just a few words, (don't you wish I could do the same?!?) ~ wrapping his understandings in puzzles and paradoxes.

But why? Why does he cloak his ideas in the forms of puzzles and paradoxes?

I think for many reasons, some of which I have detailed in the *Introduction* to *Part Two: Puzzles & Paradigms*, which I hope you will take a moment to read. And you may think of other reasons that I have missed.

But perhaps the most important reason has to do with human ego. To think that we can become divine, could be quite intoxicating to (imperfect) human egos, leading to arrogance, dictatorial, controlling, behavior ~ which cause so many problems that generate suffering, and also retard one of Zarathushtra's fundamental teachings (essential for the evolution of the soul) – the freedom to choose and the enlightenment that eventually comes (from within) through experiencing the consequences of our choices (as well as unearned experiences, and mutual, loving help).[59]

Perhaps Zarathushtra had in mind the example of Yima (Jamshid),[60] whose eventual pride and arrogance were a sure sign that he had not yet attained the state of pure goodness that is the completeness of truth ~ truth personified.   For in pure goodness, in the completeness of the true wholly good order of existence, there is no place for pride and arrogance. Yima's pride and arrogance were foolish. Pure goodness, truth personified, is wisdom/Wisdom (*mazdā-*).

Before going on to the *Linguistics* section, here are these two verses so that (if you wish) you can read them again ~ taking time to recognize the many themes of Zarathushtra's thought which create such beautiful melodies of ideas.

a. The most good exists for that one ~ (the) knowing one ~ who tells to me (the) real
b. precept: That of (the) completeness of truth and of non-deathness
c. for Wisdom: Such (is) rule, that for Him, it will grow/blaze through good thinking. Y31:6.

a. The one who first thinks thus: *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth).*
b. That one through reason (is) the truth establisher, through which one upholds the most good thinking.
c. Through that way of being, Wisdom, You grow/(are) light, who nevertheless Lord, (are) still one and the same. Y31:7, my translation.

* * * * *

The Linguistics of Y31, verses 6 and 7.

I have tried to ascertain Zarathushtra's intent by first translating the Avestan words as literally as possible, selecting (linguistically defensible) meanings that fit the micro context of the these verses, and the macro

context of the Gathas as a whole, including how the words in these verses are used elsewhere in the Gathas (where applicable), and how the ideas they express are corroborated in later texts.

But because eminent linguists themselves are uncertain about some of these words, my linguistic conclusions may have to be fine-tuned as knowledge of Avestan increases (as more and more people who love Zarathushtra's thought take the time and trouble to acquire cutting edge knowledge of the Avestan language ~ without which Zarathushtra's life changing ideas will once again fall into obscurity).

Let us now consider the linguistics of these two verses, starting with some preliminary information that is applicable to both verses.

Punctuation. The Avestan manuscripts have no consistent system of punctuation, such as we have in English. Usually, small and large collections of dots that look like bunches of grapes (or in manuscript L17, flowers), indicate where, in the copyists view, a thought, or a paragraph, or a chapter ends, and the next one begins. As Geldner points out, punctuation in Avestan texts is erratic, which is not surprising when we consider that with the passage of centuries knowledge of the grammar and vocabulary of Avestan was lost, and manuscripts deteriorated (with small and large holes in their pages ~ as surviving mss. show) so those who so faithfully re-copied manuscripts down through the centuries, had to decide where to put their small and large bunches of grapes (or flowers) without necessary knowledge, and therefore erratically. And Geldner himself admits that the Avestan punctuation in his monumental and amazing work (which many linguists follow) reflects Geldner's own choices. He uses three dots in a triangle ~ large ones to indicate the end of a paragraph (•.•); and tiny ones to indicate a colon, or perhaps the end of a sentence (•.•).[61]

Why is all this relevant here?

Well, linguists mostly think that in verse 6, line a. and the first word in line b. belong together. And I agree. I also think that the rest of line b. and the first word of line c. belong together (but here linguists mostly do not agree).

Therefore, in verse 6, I have inserted in square brackets, a small punctuation mark [•.•] representing an English colon, after the first word in line b. and c. respectively. And in verse 7, I have added a small punctuation mark in line a. representing an English colon. These reflect my opinion in punctuating these lines based on their (micro and macro) contexts, as shown in square brackets in red font, as follows:

Y31:6
a. *ahmāi. aŋhaṯ. vahištəm.   /   yə̄. mōi. vīdvå̊. vaocāṯ. haiϑīm.*
b. *mąϑrəm.*[•.•] *yim. haurvatātō.   /   ašahyā. amərətātascā.*
c. *mazdāi.* [•.•] *avaṯ. xšaϑrəm.   /   hyaṯ. hōi. vohū. vaxšaṯ. manaŋhā.*•.•

Y31:7
a. *yastā. maṇtā. pouruyō.*[•.•]   /   *raocə̄bīš. rōiϑwən. xᵛāϑrā.*

The gender of pronouns. In Avestan, absent specific reasons, (such as emphasis etc.) the pronouns of a verb form are not separately stated (as they are in English ~ 'I am, you are, he/she/it/one is' and their pl. forms). Such pronouns are built into the form of the verb which is not gender specific. Therefore a 3p sg. verb form could be translated with any one of the pronouns 'he/she/it/one', or even '(a) person' ~ an ambiguity inherent in the Avestan language, which can only be resolved based on the context.

In these 2 verses, for 3p sg. verb forms I use the gender neutral pronoun 'one', and 'that one' because the verb form is not restricted in meaning to any particular gender. A generic 'he' would be equally applicable.

Tenseless verbs. In these two verses, some verbs are in 3p sg. injunctive forms. Linguists disagree regarding how injunctive verb forms should be translated into English. I am deeply indebted to Professor Emeritus Elizabeth Tucker of Oxford for her cutting edge linguistic knowledge and her generosity in giving me the following explanation. She says, 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'.

The linguists in our group (including Insler) often do not translate injunctive verb forms with a tenseless flavor, as you will see (in the discussion below on some of these injunctive verbs).

I have nevertheless opted for the 'tenseless' view because in these verses, Zarathushtra expresses foundational ideas which are timeless. English does not have a tenseless verb form (although Gujerati does!), but I have done my best to give these injunctive verb forms as tenseless an English equivalent as I can.

* * *

Let us now consider a word by word analysis of the Avestan words in these two verses. Avestan syntax (the way words are put together) does not always mirror the order of words in English translation, so (to make it easier for you to see how the sense of a given phrase or line develops), I will discuss the Avestan words in the order required by a fluent English translation.

Y31:6.
Line a. *ahmāi aŋhaṯ vahištəm   yə̄ mōi vīdvā̊ vaocāṯ haiϑīm*
Line b. *mąϑrəm* [∴]

Line a. 'The most good exists for that one ˜ the knowing one ˜ who tells to me the real
Line b. precept:

vahištəm   '(the) most-good'
vahištəm. There is no dispute that *vahištəm* is nom. sg. of the stem *vahišta-*, which is the superlative degree of *vohu-* 'good'.
And there is no dispute that *vohu-* and its superlative form *vahišta-* are adjectives. In Avestan, adjectives often are used as nouns (a concept, person, or other thing that has the qualities of the adj.), and I think *vahištəm* is used as a noun here.

aŋhaṯ   'exists'
aŋhaṯ is a conjugation of the stem verb *ah-* 'to be, to exist'. In fact, in the Gathas, Insler 1975 (and others) often translate this verb as 'to exist.[62]
Skjaervo 2006 (in his Old Avestan Glossary) shows *aŋhaṯ* as a conjugation of the verb *ah-* 'to be', but does not identify its conjugation. However, in his *Introduction To Old Avestan,* he shows that for 3p sg. thematic verbs (verbs not ending in *-a*), the *-aṯ* inflection is an injunctive verb form.[63]
Beekes 1988 shows no injunctive verb forms, and thinks *aŋhaṯ* is 3p sg. subjunctive.[64]
But Skjaervo 2003, (in his *Introduction To Young Avestan*), using the verb 'to do' as an example, says that the subjunctive would be translated into English as "(that) he (should) do" (Lesson 3, p. 18). Applying this to how a subjunctive for *ah-* 'to be' would translate into English, gives us '(that) he (should) be', which simply does not fit the context of *aŋhaṯ* in our verse (Y31:6). And (just to make things more interesting) the translations of all the linguists in our group give *aŋhaṯ* a future time flavor. (Perhaps this was their way of giving the English choice a tenseless translation).

Insler 1975: "... shall be ...", without comment on *aŋhaṯ*.
Humbach 1991:   "... shall belong ...", without comment on *aŋhaṯ*.
Humbach/Faiss 2010:   "... shall be ..." without comment.
Taraporewala 1951: " ... shall accrue ..." without identifying its conjugation, but commenting on a Skt. rule that he thinks applies here.
Bartholomae "... shall ... befall ..."
Moulton 1912   "... shall ... fall ..." (used in the sense of 'shall befall').

I take this 3p sg. injunctive verb form *aŋhaṯ* as tenseless, and think the most accurate English equivalent is 'exists', which is consistent with the context of its use in our verse (*vahištəm aŋhaṯ* '(the) most-good exists'), because of the ways in which Zarathushtra uses *vahišta-* words in the Gathas ~ as a name for the Divine, the teachings of the Divine, the thoughts, words, and actions that implement these teachings, and the ultimate reward ~ the most-good existence *ahu- vahišta-* ~ one of his terms for paradise ~ which in Zarathushtra's thought, is a state of being that is attained incrementally, and eventually completely in mortal existence.

So *aŋhaṯ vahištəm* '(the) most-good exists ..."

ahmāi 'for that one'
There is no dispute that *ahmāi* is dat. sg. ('to/for ___) masc./ntr. of the demonstrative pronoun stem *a-*, which is also used as a 3p pronoun. It therefore can be translated as 'to/for that', 'to/for that one, to/for him', to/for it, or to/for one'.   Our group of linguists translate it as follows:

Insler 1975: "... for him ..." the small 'h' indicating Insler's view that this pronoun stands for a human being.
Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010:   "... to Him ..." the capital 'H' indicating their view that this pronoun stands for the Divine.
Taraporewala 1951: " ... unto him ..." (a human being).
Bartholomae "To him ..." (a human being).
Moulton 1912   "To him ..." (a human being).

In this context (including the context of the words that follow), I translate this 3p sg. dat. pronoun *ahmāi* as   'for that one' ~ a mortal being.

Giving us, *ahmāi aŋhaṯ vahištəm*
Literally, 'for that one [*ahmāi*] exists [*aŋhaṯ*]   (the) most-good [*vahištəm*] ...'
Or more fluently 'most-good exists for that one ...'

vīdvå   ' (the) knowing one'
According to Skjaervo 2006, the stem *vīdvah-* is a perfect participle (used here as a noun) of the verb *vaēd* 'to know'; and *vīdvå* is nom. sg. masc. of the stem *vīdvah-*, which Skjaervo translates as 'he who knows, knowledgeable'.
In this context, the masc. gender is grammatical and generic, because anyone of any gender can be a 'knowing one' ~ the precept in this verse applies to all mortals.   Our group of linguists translate *vīdvå* here as follows:

Insler 1975: "... the knowing man [*vīdvå*] ..." There is no Avestan word 'man' (*nar-*) here. And in his commentary Insler translates this phrase as "... the knowing one ...".
Humbach 1991 "... the Knowing One [*vīdvå*] ..." ~ the initial capital letters indicating his opinion that this term refers to the Divine.
Humbach/Faiss 2010:   "... the Knowing/Initiated One [*vīdvå*] ..." without comment. The initial capital letters indicate their opinion that this refers to the Divine. But the addition of Initiated is clearly interpretive

(no linguistic basis is given) and puzzles me. I do not understand how the Divine could be 'Initiated'. Into what? By whom?

Taraporewala 1951: " ... the Wise One [*vīdvå*] ..."

Bartholomae "... as one that knows [*vīdvå*] ..."

Moulton 1912   "... as one that knows [*vīdvå*] ..."

In this context, I translate *vīdvå* (more literally) as '(the) knowing-one'.

Thus *ahmāi aŋhaṭ vahištəm ... vīdvå*

Literally 'for that (one) [*ahmāi*] exists [*aŋhaṭ*] (the) most-good [*vahištəm*] ~ (the) knowing-one [*vīdvå*] ~ ...'

Or more fluently ' The most-good exists for that one ~ the knowing one ~ ..."

yə̄ moī ... vaocāṭ 'who to me ... tells'

yə̄ 'who', is nom. sg. masc./ntr. of the relative pronoun stem *ya-* 'who, which, that'.

moī 'to me',   is one of the 1p sg. forms for both gen. and dat. 1p sg. personal pronouns. In this context, only the dat. ('to/for me') fits the context in my view (only one of our linguists translates it as gen.).

vaocāṭ   'tells'.   Skjaervo 2006 takes *vaocāṭ* as aorist subjunctive of the stem verb *mrao-* 'to say, speak'.
Our group of linguists translate *yə̄ moī ... vaocāṭ*   as follows.

Insler 1975: "... who shall tell me ..."   (for *moī* he omits the dat. 'to' in 'to-me') probably to make his translation fluent).

Humbach 1991 "... who may pronounce for me ..."

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... who tells me ..." (a tenseless 3p sg. injunctive? They offer no comment).

Taraporewala 1951: " ... who ... shall-spread my ..." (translating *moī* as genitive 'my')

Bartholomae "... who ... speaks to me ..."   (a tenseless 3p sg. injunctive?)

Moulton 1912   "... who ... speaks to me ..." (a tenseless 3p sg. injunctive?).

I take translate this phrase, literally: *yə̄ moī ... vaocāṭ* 'who to me ... tells'

Thus: *ahmāi aŋhaṭ vahištəm   yə̄ mōi vīdvå vaocāṭ*

Literally 'For that (one) [*ahmāi*] exists [*aŋhaṭ*] (the) most good [*vahištəm*] ~ (the) knowing one [*vīdvå*] who [*yə̄*] to me [*mōi*] tells [*vaocāṭ*] ...'

Or more fluently: '(The) most good exists for that one ~ (the) knowing one ~ who tells to me ...'

haiϑīm mąϑrəm   '(the) real precept'

haiϑīm is an adj. which describes the noun *mąϑrəm*. According to Skjaervo 2006, both these words are acc. sg. masc. forms of their respective stems *haiϑya-* and *mąϑra-*.[65] Their acc. declension shows that they are the direct object of the verb *vaocāṭ* 'tells'.

haiϑīm: Skjaervo 2006 says the stem *haiϑya-* derives from the verb *ah-* [which means 'to be, to exist']. He translates *haiϑya-* as "true, real (= not only seemingly true)", giving Vedic *satyá* as cognate.   This word has been discussed in the *Discussion* section above.

mąϑrəm: Skjaervo 2006 says the stem *mąϑra-* derives from *man-* 'to think'. This word has been discussed in the *Discussion* section above, and also in another chapter.[66]

Our linguists have translated translated *haiϑīm mąϑrəm* as follows:

Insler 1975: 'the real precept', in the sense of a sacred formulation, (giving an interesting comment under another verse).[67]
Humbach 1991: 'the true formula', commenting that this formula is given by Ahura Mazda.
Humbach/Faiss 2010: 'the true/effective mantra',
Taraporewala 1951: 'Truth ~ the Holy-Word',[68]
Bartholomae: 'truthful word',
Moulton 1912: 'very word'.[69]

I translate *mąθrəm* as 'precept', giving us,

line a. and the first word of line b. as follows:
Line a. *ahmāi aŋhaṯ vahištəm   yə̄ mōi vīdvå vaocāṯ haiθīm*
Line b. *mąθrəm* [∴] ...

Line a. "The most good exists for that (one) ~ (the) knowing one ~ who tells to me (the) real
Line b. precept:

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

Let us now consider the rest of line b. and the beginning of line c. But to do so, we have to look at the context of the preceding words (which I show here in green font).

Y31:6
Line b.   ...   *yim haurvatātō aṣahyā aməratātascā*
Line c. *mazdāi* [∴]

Line a. "The most good [*vahištəm*] exists for that one ~ (the) knowing one ~ who tells to me (the) real ...
Line b. precept: That of (the) completeness of truth, and of non-deathness,
Line c. for Wisdom:

yim 'that'. There is no dispute that *yim* is acc. sg. masc. of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*. As such, this pronoun stands for the preceding *haiθīm mąθrəm* 'the real precept' (also acc. sg. masc.). These masc. genders are purely grammatical (a precept has no physical gender).

haurvatātō 'of (the) completeness'
haurvatātō is gen. sg. of the fem. noun stem *haurvāt-*, *haurvatāt-* Skjaervo 2006. All Avestan stems are conjectured, and for this word, Skjaervo (and perhaps other linguists as well) conjecture 2 possible stems. There is no dispute that *haurvatātō* is gen. sg.   But linguists are in dispute regarding the meaning of *haurvatāt-*, which I translate as completeness ~ as in the complete attainment of the true order of existence (*aṣa-*), because completeness fits all of the contexts in which this word is used in the Gathas (detailed in another chapter).[70]

aṣahyā 'of truth' is gen. sg. (in GAv.) of the ntr. noun stem *aṣa-*. No dispute here.

aməratātascā is gen. sg. of the fem. noun stem *aməratāt-*, with *-cā* 'and' tacked on. No dispute regarding its grammatical value. Thus, *aməratātascā* 'and of non-deathness'.

But most linguists translate *aməratāt-* words as 'immortality', which simply does not fit the contexts of its uses in the Gathas, as the following demonstrates. The English word 'immortality' is neither 'earned', nor given; it is inherent ~ no matter how 'bad' a person may be, his soul is thought to be immortal, wheres in the Gathas, *aməratāt-* is earned, is given by the Divine to us, and it is given by us to the Divine (detailed above).   The more literal translation 'non-deathness' is linguistically defensible (according to verbal advice

by the late Professor Insler), and fits each use of *amərətāt-* in the Gathas ~ expressing the idea of a state of being that is not bound by mortality, (when the perfecting process ~ the complete attainment of truth ~ is complete).[71]

mazdāi   'for Wisdom'.   There is no dispute that *mazdāi* is dat. sg. ('to/for ___') of the noun stem *mazdā-*.

So how do we translate this phrase *yim haurvatātō ašahyā amərətātascā mazdāi* ?

To make their translations work: all of our linguists (except Taraporewala) have ignored *yim* in their translations; some have not given one or more of the three words that follow (*haurvatātō ašahyā amərətātascā*) their true grammatical value; some have added words that are not in the Avestan text; and none of them think that *mazdāi* 'for Wisdom' belongs with line b.

Insler 1975: "... concerning the truth [*ašahyā*] of His completeness and immortality ...".   His translation does not account for the relative pronoun *yim* (unless he translates this pronoun as "concerning"). He adds "His" which is not in the Avestan text.   He does not give *ašahyā* its correct grammatical value ~ genitive sg. 'of truth' (unless his choice "concerning" replaces 'of ___', in which event his translation does not account for *yim*).   He comments: "The following *mąϑra-* [line c.?] pertains to AhM and therefore the current line concerns the truth about AhM.'s completeness and immortality, not the completeness and immortality of truth, a subject never touched upon in the text."   But the idea of the completeness of truth is indeed found throughout the Gathas (in the Insler 1975 translation), with non-deathness its consequence.[72]

Humbach 1991: "... concerning the integrity [*haurvatātō*] and immortality [*amərətātascā*] of truth [*ašahyā*] ..." He does not account for *yim*, gives only "of truth" [*ašahyā*], its correct grammatical value (genitive sg.); and does not give the genitive sg. words integrity [*haurvatātō*] and immortality [*amərətātascā*] their correct grammatical value (unless his choice "concerning" is taken as a genitive preposition, replacing 'of ___').

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... implying integrity [*haurvatātō*] and immortality [*amərətātascā*] of truth [*ašahyā*] ..." They do not account for *yim*, add the word "implying" which is not in the Avestan text; and do not give integrity [*haurvatātō*] and immortality [*amərətātascā*] their correct grammatical value (genitive sg.).

Taraporewala 1951:   "... which [*yim*] (leadeth) to Perfection, and to Immortality, (the Word) of Truth ..." He translates *yim*, and in his commentary, acknowledges that the other three words are genitive sg. He translates of truth" [*ašahyā*] as genitive sg., but gives a dative sg. grammatical value to *haurvatātō* and *amərətātascā* "to Perfection, and to Immortality", expressing the opinion that there are Skt. parallels for so doing (and indeed, Skjaervo 2003 says that in Avestan, a genitive is sometimes used in a dat. flavor).[73] Taraporewala's comments about the opinions of others, shows their difficulties and uncertainties in translating this phrase. With respect, even though his dat. translation of these two genitives *haurvatātō* and *amərətātascā* is linguistically defensible, I do not think it is necessary here, because they can be translated perfectly well as genitives.

Bartholomae: "... Right's [*ašahyā*] truthful word [*haiϑīm mąϑrəm*] of Welfare [*haurvatātō*] and of Immortality [*amərətātascā*] ..." He ignores *yim*, and includes *haiϑīm mąϑrəm* as part of this phrase in order to give a genitive sg. value to the three words *haurvatātō ašahyā* and *amərətātascā*.

Moulton 1912: "... Right's [*ašahyā*] very word [*haiϑīm mąϑrəm*] of Welfare [*haurvatātō*] and Immortality [*amərətātascā*] ...". Moulton ignores *yim*, and footnotes that his translation follows that of Bartholomae, but expresses his uncertainty, stating: "...I am not quite sure that we should not keep the order, with Asha between the other two Amesha ~ "the word of Welfare, Right, and Immortality." [More literally 'the word of Welfare, [of] Right, and [of] Immortality'].

With respect, I think all of our linguists (including Taraporewala) have approached their respective translations with a pre-conceived mind-set regarding the identity and nature of the Divine based on dominant religious paradigms of our times which have (unconsciously) influenced their thinking, ~ paradigms which did not exist in Zarathushtra's time period.

If we follow the normal rules of Avestan grammar, and translate as literally as possible, without ignoring any word, or adding a word not in the Av. text, this phrase is an exact fit with Zarathushtra's thoughts (expressed and implied elsewhere in the Gathas) regarding what constitutes the Divine ~ a teaching (precept) that is both foundational, and is among the most important ways in which he rejected the perceptions of his culture regarding what is Divine ~ worthy of worship.[74]

So let us see if we can (objectively) figure out Zarathushtra's intent in crafting this phrase.

The first clue is that '(the) real precept [*haiϑīm   mąϑrəm*]' is sg., so the words that follow must belong together ~ they cannot be three seperate, independent precepts ~ that [*yim*] [1] of completeness [*haurvatātō*], [2] of truth [*ašahyā*] [3] and of non-deathness [*amərətātascā*].

The second clue is that in the Gathas, completeness and non-deathness, are qualities of the Divine that mortals are capable of attaining through a process of spiritual evolution, in which our untruthful/wrongful preferences are eliminated, and we eventually personify the true (wholly good) order of existence (*aša-*) completely (*haurvatāt-*).[75]

So completeness is the completeness of truth (*aša-*) ~ which includes its component parts ~ its comprehension (*vohu- manah-*), its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action (*spənta-ārmaiti-*), its good rule (*vohu- x šaϑra-*), which comprise the beneficial way of being (*spənta- mainyu-*).

And (the) completeness of truth and of non-deathness (*amərətāt-*) ~ the consequent non-mortal state of being ~ are necessarily one state of being, because when the perfecting process is complete, the reason for mortality (the arena for the perfecting process) no longer exists, and a non-mortal state of being is attained. That is why these two concepts are so frequently used together in the Gathas ~ non-deathness and (the) completeness of truth, are one state of being ~ neither one can exist (in a person) unless the other does so as well.

And line b. can be translated (in a linguistically defensible way) that lends itself to this new (for that time) and foundational precept as follows:

yim haurvatātō ašahyā amərətātascā ...
that [*yim*] of (the) completeness [*haurvatātō*] of truth [*ašahyā*] and of non-deathness [*amərətātascā*] ...'

Adding (the) gives this phrase its most accurate translation into English (in my view).   True, Avestan has no articles (like 'the'), but in Zarathushtra's time period, when the Gathas were sung, the phrasing of the music would have been available to indicate that (the) completeness of truth and of non-deathness formed a unit of being. We no longer know the music to which the Gathas were sung. But the sense of the foregoing translation is validated by the evidence in other Gatha verses (the macro context).[76]

Let us now look at the translation of this phrase in line b. and the first word in line c. I have added line a. in green font to provide context:
Line b.   ...   *yim haurvatātō   ašahyā amərətātascā*
Line c. *mazdāi ...*
Line a. 'The most good [*vahištəm*] exists for that one ~ (the) knowing one ~ who tells to me (the) real ...
Line b. precept: that of (the) completeness of truth and of non-deathness,
Line c. for Wisdom: ...'

* * *

Which brings us to the rest of line c.

Line c.   ...   *avat̲. x šaϑrəm.   hyat̲. hōi. vohū. vax šat̲. manaŋhā.* ⁚

Line c.   ' ...   Such (is) rule, that for Him, it will grow/blaze through good thinking.' Y31:6.

avat̲   'such (is)'

Although there is no verb 'is' in the Avestan text, the verb 'to be' (in its various grammatical forms) frequently is implied in Avestan.

According to Skjaervo 2006 *avat̲* is the nom./acc. sg. ntr. form of the demonstrative pronoun *ava-*. While it normally is translated as 'that, yonder', in this context I think the English 'such' is used here (in the sense of 'in that way'), which is Insler's choice, and I find it persuasive.

Insler 1975: "Such is ..."

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "That ..."

Taraporewala 1951: "Such (shall be) ..."

I cannot tell from their translations, how Humbach 1991, Bartholomae and Mills think *avat̲* should be translated (their translations of these two verses appear at the end of this chapter).

x šaϑrəm   'rule'

x šaϑrəm is nom./acc. sg. of the ntr. noun *x šaϑra-*, (Skjaervo 2006). Here it can only be nom. because there is no verb that would make *x šaϑrəm* acc. (both the subject and direct object of the (here implied) verb '(is)' are nom.).

In an insightful commentary, Insler expresses his opinion that in the Gathas, the same word often is used in three ways ⁓ for a faculty, its process, and its object ⁓ and he thinks *x šaϑra-* is one of these words. Thus, in his view, *x šaϑra-* words can be translated as:

⁓ 'rulership, mastery' (faculty);

⁓ 'rule, sovereignty' (process); and

⁓ 'dominion, realm', (object),[77] which helps to reconcile the different contexts in which *x šaϑra-* words are used.

Insler 1975: "... the rule ..."

Humbach 1991 "... the best power ..." but there is no word 'best' *vahišta-* in the Avestan text.

Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... that power (shall be) ..."

Taraporewala 1951: "... strength ..." without comment on this word.

Bartholomae: "... Dominion ..."

Mills 1912: "... Dominion ...".

hyat̲   'that'

There is no dispute that *hyat̲* is nom./acc. sg. masc./ntr. of the relative pronoun stem *ya-* 'that, which, who'.

Giving us: *avat̲ x šaϑrəm hyat̲* ...   'Such (is) rule, that ...'

hōi   'for Him'

hōi is the form for more than one declension of the 3p sg. personal pronoun ('he/she/it/one').[78] In the context of line c. this pronoun is dat. sg. masc. standing for the previously mentioned dat. sg. masc. *mazdāi* 'for Wisdom' (which forms a part of the preceding sentence). The masc. gender is grammatical ⁓ gender is

a function of our physical shells. The existence of the Divine is not limited to the physical ⁓ it exists in all genders (in the material existence), and has no gender (in the mental/spiritual existence).

Parenthetically, the existence of *hōi* 'for Him' in this phrase of line c., requires the conclusion (in my view) that the first word of this line c. *mazdāi* 'for Wisdom' belongs with the preceding line b. Otherwise, we would have a redundancy if line c. were to be translated as a unit ⁓ including both 'for Wisdom' and 'for Him'.

Which brings us to the next phrase:

vohū vax šaṯ manaŋhā   'it will grow/blaze through good thinking'.

vohū and *manaŋhā* are the instrumental sg. forms of their respective stems *vohu-* 'good' and *manah-* 'thinking' (*manah-* is another Avestan word which Insler 1975 thinks is used for faculty ('mind'), process ('thinking'), and object ('thought').[79] In English, the instrumental declension generally is translated 'by/with/through ___'.

Thus I take, *vohū ... manaŋhā* as 'through good thinking'.

vax šaṯ. Linguists seem to be in disagreement about this conjugation ⁓ *vax šaṯ* ⁓ of the stem verb *vax š-*, except that they agree it is 3p sg.

Skjaervo in his 2006 Old Avestan Glossary, shows two (unrelated) stems *vax š-* ⁓ one means 'to grow', and the other means 'to blaze'. He thinks *vax šaṯ* is the 3p. sg. subjunctive form of the verb stem *vax š-* 'to grow'. So too does Beekes 1981.[80]

Humbach 1991 in his commentary on this verse (Y31:6) mentions (in passing) that *vax šaṯ* is aorist. "The aor. *vax šaṯ* ...".

Here are the translations of *vax šaṯ* by the linguists in our group. Bear in mind, the 3p sg. is built into the verb form, and can be translated as 'he/she/it/one/' ⁓ so the translator's choice is necessarily interpretive.

Insler 1975: "... one shall increase ..."
Humbach 1991 "... he shall make grow ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010:   "... He shall make grow ..."
Taraporewala 1951:   "...[it] ... shall increase ..."
Bartholomae: "...[it] ... shall increase ...
Moulton 1912: "...[it] ... will prosper ...

I translate *vax šaṯ* here as 'it will grow'. However, in this context, I think Zarathushtra intended a double entendre ⁓ using the two meanings of the two stems *vax š-* 'to grow' and *vax š-* 'to blaze', in that Wisdom's rule is based on the comprehension of truth (good thinking) ⁓ an (incrementally) enlightend state of being ⁓ one that grows and blazes, which is echoed in the beginning of the next verse which speaks of (the path) 'lights' and (the end) 'enlightenment'.

Returning to the phrase *vohū vax šaṯ manaŋhā*: you well may wonder: Why do the two words ⁓ *vohū ... manaŋhā* ⁓ an adjective and its noun (which belong together), frame, or encapsulate, the verb *vax šaṯ*? Well, thanks to Professor Insler we know that in the Gathas when two words that belong together (like a noun and its adjective) frame or encapsulate another word (or words), it indicates that the framing and framed words form one unit of thought. Examples are legion.[81]

Here, the unit of thought is: 'it will grow/blaze through good thinking' ⁓ the 'it' refering to 'rule' (previously mentioned) which in the Gathas is the rule of "truth which attains glory," its "beneficial embodiment", its "most good comprehension" (Y51:4).

So if we give each word its correct grammatical value, leaving no word out, and adding no words which are not in the Av. text (except (is) which is routinely implied in Avestan usage), we get the following translation of the rest of line c. (after the word *mazdāi* 'for Wisdom).

Line c.   ...   *avaṯ x šaϑrəm hyaṯ hōi vohū vax šaṯ manaŋhā* Y31:6.
Line c.   ...   such [*avaṯ*] (is) rule [*x šaϑrəm*], that [*hyaṯ*] for Him [*hōi*], it will grow/blaze [*vax šaṯ*] through good thinking [*vohū … manaŋhā*]." Y31:6.

Let us now look at the whole verse, Y31:6, to that you can see the above discussed words in context.

Line a. *ahmāi aŋhaṯ vahištəm yə̄ mōi vīdvå vaocāṯ haiϑīm*
Line b. *mąϑrəm* [∴] *yim haurvatātō ašahyā amərətātascā*
Line c. *mazdāi* [∴]   *avaṯ x šaϑrəm hyaṯ hōi vohū vax šaṯ manaŋhā* ∴ Y31:6.

Line a. 'The most good exists for that one ~ (the) knowing one ~ who tells to me the real
Line b. precept: That of (the) completeness of truth, and of non-deathness,
Line c. for Wisdom: Such (is) rule, that for Him, it will grow/blaze through good thinking." Y31:6.

Which leads us to the next verse Y31:7.

* * * * *

a. *yastā maṇtā pouruyō* [∴]   *raocə̄bīš rōiϑwən xʰāϑrā*
b. *hvō x raϑwā dąmiš ašəm   yā dāyaraṯ vahištəm manō* ∴
c. *tā mazdā mainyū ux šyō   yə̄ ā nūrə̄mcīṯ ahurā hāmō* ∴ Geldner 1P p, 110.

a. 'The one who first thinks thus: *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth)*;
b. That one through reason (is) the truth establisher, through which one upholds the most good thinking.
d. Through that [*tā*] way of being [*mainyū*], Wisdom [*mazdā*], You grow/(are) light [*ux šyō*], who nevertheless Lord, (are) still one and the same." Y31:7.

* * *

Let us start with line a. *yastā maṇtā pouruyō* [∴]   *raocə̄bīš rōiϑwən xʰāϑrā*
Line a. 'The one who first thinks thus: *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth).*'
For clarity, I will discuss the first three words of line a. as a unit,   and then the next three as a unit.

yastā maṇtā pouruyō   'The one who first thinks thus:

Let us start with the verb.

maṇtā: 'one ... thinks'.
According to Skjaervo 2006, *maṇtā* is the 3p sg. aorist injunctive form of the stem verb *man-* 'to think' (Skjaervo 2006).
The 3p sg. pronoun (which is built into the verb form) can be translated as 'he/she/it/one'. A translator's selection depends on his/her interpretation. And all the translators in our group give this injunctive verb form *maṇtā* a past time flavor as follows.

Insler 1975: "He ... thought ..."
Humbach 1991; and Humbach/Faiss 2010:   "The Primal One ... conceived ..."
Taraporewala 1951:   "[Who] ... decreed ..."
Bartholomae: "... he ... thought ..."
Moulton 1912: "He ... thought ..."

I take this injunctive verb form as tenseless ~ because the idea expressed in line a. is timeless (and parenthetically, a tenseless translation fits each use of *maṇtā* in the Gathas, footnoted here).[82]

The verb's 3p sg. pronoun 'one' includes all genders, because it stands for everyone who thinks, that *'through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth).'*

However, this 3p sg. verb form *maṇtā* 'one thinks', appears in a context in which its two English words cannot be translated as a unit. To make the translation fluent, we have to separate them 'one ... thinks'.

yastā 'who ... thus'
yastā combines *yas* a relative pronoun 'who', with a demonstrative pronoun *tā*.
Skjaervo 2006, and Beekes 1988 show *yas* as a nom. sg. form of the relative pronoun stem *ya-* .[83]
Skjaervo 2006 shows *yastā* under the stem *ta-* without identifying its declension. But he shows *tā* as the form for 2 declensions ~ nom./acc. du. masc., as well as instr. sg. masc. ntr. In this context, the instr. sg. is the only declension that fits.

In Avestan, the stem *ta-* is a demonstrative pronoun ('that', that/one) which in Avestan is also used as a 3p personal pronoun (he/she/it/one). Skjaervo 2006 shows that most of the declensions of the stem *ta-* in Old Avestan are masc./ntr. and a few are fem. In our verse (Y31:7) however, taking *tā* (in *yastā*) as a generic 3p personal pronoun (he/it/one) would not fit the context, because the 3p personal pronoun is already built into the form of the verb *maṇtā*. So a 3p personal pronoun in *yastā* would be redundant. I therefore take *tā* (in *yastā*) to be a demonstrative pronoun.

Following Insler 1975, I take *tā* in *yastā* to be an instr. sg. demonstrative pronoun 'thus' (used in the sense of 'through that way'); giving us *yastā* 'who thus'.

In the Gathas, and all surviving Old Avestan texts, *yastā* appears only twice ~ once in our verse (Y31:7) and once in the Gatha verse, Y45:11. I have footnoted how *yastā* has been translated by the linguists in our group in these 2 verses.[84]

In our verse, this combined word *yastā* appears in a context in which we have to separate its English equivalents, in order to make the translation fluent 'who ... thus'.

paouruyō,[85]   'first'
There is no dispute that the adj. *paouruyō* means 'first'. It is nom. sg. of the adj. stem *paourvya-*.   In Avestan, (as in English) 'first' can be used in many flavors of meaning ~ first in time, first in quality, first as in original, first as in foundational, etc.   In this context, I take *paouruyō* 'first' to mean 'foundational'.

Let us now see how these three Avestan words are translated into English. I have color coded the words so that you can see how they have been broken up *yastā* 'who ... thus';   and *maṇtā* 'one ... thinks', which I take as tenseless.

Line a.   *yastā maṇtā pouruyo* '(the) one who first thinks thus: ...'

The linguists in our group have translated this phrase as follows.
Insler 1975:   "He who first thought thus: ... "
Humbach 1991:   "The Primal One who with that (intellect of His) conceived (the formula) ...".
Humbach/Faiss 2010:   "The Primal One who conceived these ...".
Taraporewala 1951:   "Who through that (Holy Word) first decreed ... ".
Bartholomae: "About which he in the beginning thus thought ...".
Moulton 1912: "He that in the beginning thus thought ...".

Which brings us to the next phrase in line a. *raocā̆bīš roiϑwən x͜ᵛāϑrā*

Our linguists are not in agreement about how these three words should be translated. So let us first look at their translations of this three word phrase.

Insler 1975: "... *They are to be joined* [*rōiϑwən*] *with happiness* [*x͜ᵛāϑrā*] *throughout their days* [*raocā̆bīš*]',..." and in his comment "...*Let them be joined* [*rōiϑwən*] *with happiness* [*x͜ᵛāϑrā*] *throughout their days* [*raocā̆bīš*], ...". Insler places in italics, phrases that he thinks are either precepts or what someone says (or thinks). Here these words reflect the thinking of Wisdom, in Insler's view.

Humbach 1991: "... Let the comforts [*x͜ᵛāϑrā*] (displayed) intersperse [*rōiϑwən*] with lights [*raocā̆bīš*] ...".
Humbach/Faiss 2010: "... comforts [*x͜ᵛāϑrā*] flooded [*rōiϑwən*] with lights [*raocā̆bīš*] ...".

Taraporewala 1951:   "... (that His) Light [*x͜ᵛāϑrā*] shall-stream-forth [*rōiϑwən*] through-heavenly Lights [*raocā̆bīš*] ... "

Bartholomae: "... 'let the blessed realms [*x͜ᵛāϑrā* ?] be filled [*rōiϑwən*] with Light [*raocā̆bīš* ?]', ..."
Moulton 1912: "... 'let the blessed realms [*x͜ᵛāϑrā* ?] be filled [*rōiϑwən*] with Light [*raocā̆bīš* ?]' ...".

At first thought, it may seem that the differences are too great for us to ascertain, with accuracy, what Zarathushtra may have intended.   But I think you may be pleasantly surprised.   So let us look at each of the words in this phrase *raocā̆bīš rōiϑwən x͜ᵛāϑrā*.

raocā̆bīš   'through lights'

Skjaervo 2006 thinks *raocā̆bīš* is instr. pl. of the ntr. stem *raocah-* 'light', which would give us (for *raocā̆bīš*) 'with/by/through lights'.
Humbach/Faiss 2010, Taraporewala and Moulton agree.
Humbach 1991 in his translation gives *raocā̆bīš* an instr. sg. translation "with light", but in his commentary he states that *raocā̆bīš* is instr. pl. "with lights".
Bartholomae's translation (as it appears in Tarap. 1951), and Moulton 1912, have 'with Light' (sg.).

But Insler 1975 disagrees.   He comments that *raocā̆bīš* is an "instr. of temporal extent" ~ hence "throughout",[86] (giving other examples from the Gathas), but he does not explain his choice of "their days"; nor could I find any similar stem or root in any glossary available to me, which would support Insler's translation of *raocā̆bīš* as "throughout their days". That doesn't mean there isn't one. I just could not find one.

rōiϑwən   'one is filled'

In the entire corpus of (surviving) Old Avestan (Gatha Avestan) texts, the word *rōiϑwən* is used only once ~ in our verse (Y31:7).   Nor do any other grammatical forms of its (conjectured) stem appear in any Old Avestan text.   So its use in other instances is not available in helping to decode the meaning of this word in this verse.

Grammatic value:

The 'infinitive' form of a verb is translated into English as: 'to fill', ' to join', ' to mix', ' to sing', ' to dance', etc.

Reichelt's 1911 glossary shows that in Gatha Avestan *rōiϑwən* is infinitive (of the stem verb *raēϑwa-*) and means "to fill"; or when used with an instr. 'to fill with'.
By contrast, Reichelt separately shows that in Young Avestan the verb stem *raēϑwa-* has *rōiϑwən* as its infinitive form which, when used with an instr. means 'to mix with'.

He does not explain how (for the same word) he arrived at "to fill" in GAv., and "to mix" in YAv.

I think part of the problem may be that the Old Avestan and Young Avestan texts span a period of several centuries, and over time, the meanings of words in any language tend to change, or acquire different flavors. We see this very clearly in the meaning of *daēnā-* and *x ratu-*.[87] So a meaning (or flavor) of a word that is valid in later YAv. texts may not be exactly the same as the meaning (or flavor) of the word in GAv. texts.

Skjaervo 2006 shows the Old Avestan verb stem *raēϑ- rōiϑwa-* 'to blend with', under which he shows *rōiϑwən* as a noun form nom./acc. sg. ntr.

Our linguists have translated *rōiϑwən* as follows: And as you can see from their translations, it is difficult to give *rōiϑwən* its correct grammatical value in fluent English.

Insler 1975: *rōiϑwən*: "... They are to be joined ... ",   and in his commentary he has "... Let them be joined ... ", commenting that "*rōiϑwən* is a jussive infinitive." (A jussive infinitive is a command or wish, often translated with 'may' or 'let'). He gives *rōiϑwən* a 3p pl. translation.

Humbach 1991: *rōiϑwən*: "... Let [the comforts] intersperse ..." taking *rōiϑwən* as a 3p pl. verb; commenting that "*rōiϑwən* ... is usually understsood as an inf. [infinitive] of a very peculiar formation:".
Humbach/Faiss 2010: *rōiϑwən*: "... [comforts] flooded ..." ~ a 3p pl. verb.

Taraporewala 1951: *rōiϑwən*: "... [Light] shall stream forth ... " ~ a 3p sg. verb ~ stating that he derives *rōiϑwən* from √ *ri-, raē-* 'to flow'.

Bartholomae: *rōiϑwən*: "Let [the blessed realms] be filled ..." ~ a 3p pl. verb.
Moulton 1912: *rōiϑwən*: " Let [the blessed realms] be filled ..." ~ a 3p pl. verb.

Following Skjaervo 2006, I translate *rōiϑwən* as nom. sg. of the infinitive verb form; with an implied 3p sg. declension '(one is):
Literally '(one is) to be filled', implying (to me) an incremental process of being filled (consistent with the macro context of the Gathas) ~ rather than a one-shot future event (which would require 'one will be filled', and is not consistent with the macro context).
More fluently 'one is filled', ~ an on-going process.

Thus *raocābīš rōiϑwən*
More literally, 'through lights (truths), (one is) to be filled ...'
Or more fluently, 'through lights (truth), one is filled ...'

xᵛāϑrā   'with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth)'.
There is no dispute that *xᵛāϑrā* is a noun, and is the form for more than one grammatical declension,[88] but linguists do not agree about which declension is applicable in this verse (Y31:7), and they disagree about the meaning of the word as well.   So can we (reliably) arrive at its meaning in this verse?   I think we can. Let's take a look.

Skjaervo 2006 thinks that in all Gatha verses in which *xᵛāϑrā* appears, it is nom./acc. pl. of the ntr. stem *xᵛāϑra-*. But there is no dispute that for ntr. *a-* stem nouns (like *xᵛāϑra-*) the *-ā* inflection in GAv. is also instr. sg. ('by/with/through ___').[89]

And Skjaervo 2006 is of the opinion that the stem *xᵛāϑra-* means "good breathing space, comfort". In his opinion, there are two derivations for *xᵛāϑra-*, which he shows as "< *hu* + °*āϑra-*[90] < *an-*" (The footnote number is not in Skjaervo's quotation. I have added it).   And he (separately) shows that the GAv. stem *an-* means 'to breathe'.[91]

Reichelt 1911 also shows that the ntr. noun stem *xᵛāϑra-* derives from "*hu-* + *āϑra-*. He does not mention a derivation from *an-* 'to breathe'. And the meaning he gives for *xᵛāϑra-* covers all bases but ignores *āϑra-* ~ "breathing ... comfort, happiness, paradise".

In our verse:

Insler 1975 translates *xᵛāϑrā* as "*with happiness*" (instr. sg.).

Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *xᵛāϑrā* as "comforts", (nom. pl.).

Taraporewala translates *xᵛāϑrā* as "(that His) Light" ~ giving *xᵛāϑrā* a nom. sg. value. But there is no dispute that in GAv. the nom. sg. inflection of ntr. *a-* stem words is *-əm*,[92] not *-ā*.
However, Taraporewala gives us valuable comments (in our verse, and also under Gatha verse Y28:2) stating that Bartholomae translates *xᵛāϑra-* as 'felicity' (i.e. happiness) deriving it from Aryan *sū-āϑra* and *hu-āϑra*, which Taraporewala says gives a clue to its original meaning (which he sees as 'glory', 'divine light', implying 'abode of light or heaven').[93]

I am not sure how Bartholomae and Moulton translate *xᵛāϑrā* in our verse 7 ~ possibly "the blessed realms" (nom. pl), meaning 'paradise'.

My take? Well, I think 'comfort' for *xᵛāϑra-* falls far, far, short of its meaning (at least as used in the Gathas).

Many linguists have translated *xᵛāϑra-* as 'light' words (Bartholomae, Taraporewala, and others),[94] and also as "happiness" (Insler 1975 consistently throughout the Gathas; and Bartholomae), and "paradise" (Reichelt 1911, Bartholomae, and Taraporewala).

I think the key to reconciling these translations, and also ascertaining Zarathushtra's intent in using *xᵛāϑra-* words in this verse and throughout the Gathas, is its derivation from *hu-* + *āϑra-* ~ an opinion expressed by eminent linguists ~ Bartholomae, Skjaervo, Taraporewala and Reichelt.

The prefix *hu-* means 'good',[95] and also 'well',[96] as in 'well-being, happiness'; and *āϑrā* is instr. sg. of the (conjectured) stem *ātar-* 'fire' (Skjaervo 2006). Thus *xᵛāϑrā* < *hu-āϑrā* literally means 'good/well-being/happiness through fire'. And if Skjaervo is correct in thinking that that *xᵛāϑra-* derives not only from from *hu-āϑrā* but also from *an-* 'to breathe', then here again (as in the 'real precept'), we see the notion of a quality that is personified ~ a foundational idea of Zarathushtra's (which we see in his envisionment of the qualities that make a being divine ~ the beneficial way of being (*spəṇta- mainyu-*), which is the true wholly good order of existence (*aša-*), its good comprehension (*vohu- manah-*), its beneficial embodiment in thought, word and action (*spəṇta- ārmaiti-*), its good rule (*vohu- xšaϑra-*), its complete attainment (*haurvatāt-*), which results in a being not bound by mortality (*amərətāt-*) ~ qualities which the Divine personifies.

In short (returning to verses 6 and 7), throughout the Gathas and YAv. texts, light/fire is a metaphor (and symbol) for 'truth' (*aša-* the true order of existence) ~ a wholly good, joyful, enlightened existence, which the Divine personifies, and which is the paradise that mortals can attain ~ and that state of being is called *xᵛāϑra-*.

Bearing in mind that 'light' is a symbol of 'truth' throughout the Gathas (and later texts), this gives us,
raocəbīš rōiϑwən xᵛāϑrā
'through lights (truths) one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth).

Thus,
Line a. *yastā maṇtā pouruyō raocəbīš rōiϑwən xᵛāϑrā*

The one who first thinks thus: *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth).'*

* * *

Let us now look at line b. To place it in context, I have added the English translation of line a. in green font (notice the subtly different poetic alliteration between *xᵛāϑrā* in line a., and *x raϑwā* in line b.).

Y31:7

Line b.   *hvō x raϑwā dąmiš ašəm   yā dāyaraṭ vahištəm manō*

Line a. '(The) one who first thinks thus: *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth).'*

Line b. That one [*hvō*] through reason [*x raϑwā*] (is) the truth establisher [*dąmiš ašəm*], through which [*yā*] one upholds [*dāyaraṭ*] the most good thinking [*vahištəm manō*].

hvō   'that one'

Skjaervo 2006 states that *hvō* means 'that one', and is nom. sg. masc. of the demonstrative pronoun stem *ha-*.[97]   Demonstrative pronouns in Avestan are also used for 3p pronouns. And *hvō* appears numerous times in the Gathas, where eminent linguists have translated it as a 3p personal pronoun 'he'. In this context, I think the demonstrative/personal pronoun 'that one', is the best fit (referring to 'the one' in line a.).

x raϑwā   'through reason'

There is no dispute that *x raϑwā* is instr. sg. ('with/by/through ___') of the masc. noun stem *x ratu-*, but there is disagreement about its meaning (discussed in detail in *Part Three: Xratu-*). In our verse:

Insler 1975 translates *x raϑwā* as "intention" ~ "... in accordance with this very intention ..." (instr. sg.). In his Addenda he acknowledges that Schmidt thinks *x ratu-* means "reason, intellect", but Insler states that he himself prefers "will, determination, intention". He gives no linguistic basis for his preference, other than to say that the Gathas "bear the undeniable mark of the prophet's unswerving determination and insistence in revealing and realizing his message founded on this higher understanding." (Addenda p. 327). But the Gathas bear the 'undeniable mark' of many aspects of Zarathushtra's teachings, so (with respect) I do not find persuasive Insler's rationale for the meaning of *x ratu-*.

Humbach 1991 translates *x raϑwā* as "...with (that) intellect ..." (instr. sg.) with no linguistic comment on *x raϑwā*.

Humbach/Faiss 2010 as "... by his intellect ..." (instr. sg.), with no linguistic comment on *x raϑwā*.

Taraporewala 1951 as "...in-His-Wisdom ..." with no linguistic comment on *x raϑwā*. With respect, 'in' is one of the ways in which the loc. case is translated into English; 'in' is not used for an instr. declension.

Bartholomae as "... by his wisdom ..." (instr. sg.)

Moulton 1912 as ""... by his wisdom ..." (instr. sg.).

I follow H. P. Schmidt in translating *x ratu-* words as 'reason', (detailed in another chapter),[98] and I translate *x raϑwā* as 'through reason' (instr. sg.).

Thus, *hvō x raϑwā*   ' That one through reason ...'

dąmiš ašəm   '(is the) truth establisher'

(is the). In this context, I imply the verb '(is)' ~ frequently implied in Avestan. And the article '(the) is needed to make the translation fluent.

ašəm. There is no dispute that in GAv. *ašəm* is nom./acc. sg. of the ntr. noun stem *aša-*.

dąmiš. Linguists disagree regarding the derivation, meaning and grammatical value of *dąmiš.*

Derivation.

In Avestan, nouns and verbs are derived from roots; and sometimes nouns are derived from verb stems.

There are two (unrelated) verb stems *dā-* (Skjaervo 2006).
dā- 'to tie', (which in my view is not used here to give a double entendre), and
dā- 'to give, produce, make, establish', generating such nouns as 'giver, producer, maker, establisher, etc.[99]
Linguists often translate *dā-* words as 'to create' and its related noun as 'creator'. But 'to create' and 'creator' carry a lot of baggage from the mind-set of three of today's dominant religions (which did not exist in Zarathushtra's day), so I prefer to use the less baggaged 'to make' and 'maker', ~ especially in light of Zarathushtra's very different ideas on 'creation' (discussed in another chapter).[100]
Which brings us to the word *dąmiš*. Linguists are in disagreement regarding which verb stem has generated *dąmiš*. And they also disagree about whether *dąmiš* itself is a noun or a verb.

In Avestan, all stems are conjectured ~ based on the ways in which they are inflected, and Vedic cognates.

dąmiš as a verb:

Skjaervo 2006 does not show *dąmiš* as any conjugation of either of the foregoing *dā-* verb stems.

Insler 1975 translates *dąmiš* as a 3p sg. verb form, and *ašəm* as its direct object (acc. sg.), "He created [*dąmiš*] truth [*ašəm*] ...", without comment on these words.
Bartholomae also translates *dąmiš* as a 3p sg. verb form "... he it is that ... created Right [*dąmiš ašəm*] ..."
Moulton's 1912 translation of *dąmiš* is the same as that of Bartholomae.

dąmiš as a noun:

Jackson 1892 shows that for *i-* stem nouns (giving many examples ~ the main one being *ga^iri-* 'mountain') the *-iš* inflection is nom. sg. (and also acc. pl. which is not applicable in this context).[101]

Skjaervo 2006 translates *dąmiš* as nom. sg. of a noun stem *dāmi-* "*web-holder" which he thinks derives from *dā-* "to tie".[102]

Humbach 1991 translates *dąmiš* as "creator" ~ a nom. sg. noun. He does not connect *ašəm* with *dąmiš*, taking *ašəm* as the direct object (acc. sg.) of an implied verb, translating *dąmiš ašəm* "(as) creator [*dąmiš*] He (conceived) truth [*ašəm*]...") ~ adding a verb which is not in the Av. text ~ an interpretive translation. But one of the things I like about Humbach is that he has the integrity to admit that he has changed his mind, as he did here in 2010.
Humbach/Faiss 2010 translate *dąmiš* as "the establisher", commenting that *dąmiš* is nom. sg. of a (conjectured) noun stem *dąmi-* 'builder/establisher'. They translate lines a. and b. together "The Primal One ... (is) ... the establisher of truth [*dąmiš ašəm*]..."). Their translation gives *ašəm* a genitive sg. value ~ 'of truth', but in Old Avestan, the gen. sg. of *aša-* is *ašahyā* not *ašəm*.[103] They acknowledge, however, that *dąmiš* could be a 3p sg. injunctive verb form of a conjectured verbal root *dam*, build/establish.[104]

Taraporewala 1951 translates *dąmiš* as "Creator" ~ a nom. sg. noun but to make his translation work, he also gives *ašəm* a genitive sg. value "He-Himself ... (is) the Creator of-Eternal-Law [*dąmiš ašəm*] ..." But there is no dispute among linguists that (in GAv.) *ašəm* is nom./acc. sg. of the ntr. noun stem *aša-*, and that the genitive sg. of *aša-* is *ašahyā*.

As a practical matter, if we look at the first half of line b. alone, translating *dąmiš* as a verb, gives us (roughly) the same meaning ~ 'That one through reason establishes truth ...'. I agree that reasonable minds may differ regarding which alternative Zarathushtra intended in the context of the entire line.

I translate *dąmiš ašəm* as two nouns ~ 'truth establisher' (both nom. sg.),[105] because I think it is a better contextual fit for line b. as a whole.

If *dąmiš* is translated as a verb, then in the 2d half of this line, the sg. pronoun *yā* 'through which' means that it is through 'truth' that one upholds its comprehension, the most good thinking. Thus: 'That one through reason establishes truth, through which [establishing truth] one upholds the most good thinking'. This alternative misses the emphasis on reason.   The religious authorities of Zarathushtra's culture controlled people through fear ~ fear of the terrible punishments (described so graphically in the Yasht to Mithra) that the gods would inflict if people did not do what the gods wanted them to do (as conveyed by their priests, naturally).

Where fear is present, reason is paralyzed, as Zarathushtra himself recognises in another verse (Y28:5).[106] And reason (even imperfectly exercised) is an essential component in understanding truth, and indeed in the search for truth, and the freedom to choose (without which spiritual evolution would not be possible).[107] In this line b., I think Zarathushtra expresses the two fold idea (which I think is a better fit), that:

   ~ it is through reason that we become truth establishers;

   ~ it is through reason that we uphold the comprehension of truth ~ the most good thinking.

Thus: 'That one through reason (is the) truth-establisher, through which [i.e. through reason] one upholds the most good thinking'.

I leave it to you to decide (through reason!) which you think Zarathushtra intended.

yā   'through which'
yā   in this context is instr. sg. masc./ntr. of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*,[108] ~ the masc./ntr. gender is purely grammatical.

dāyaraṯ 'one upholds
dāyaraṯ is the 3p sg. injunctive form of the stem verb *dar-* (Skjaervo 2006). As for its meaning:
Skjaervo 2006 thinks the stem verb means 'to hold, uphold, sustain'.
Reichelt 1911 gives *dar-* many flavors of meaning, including 'to sustain, support'.[109]
Our linguists have translated *dāyaraṯ* as follows ~ some translating this injunctive verb form with a past time flavor; and others perhaps tenseless?

Insler 1975 as " ...He has (also) upheld ..." a past time flavor, without comment on this word.
Humbach 1991 as " ... one upholds ..." tenseless? No comment on this word.
Humbach/Faiss 2010 as " ... one holds ... tenseless? No comment on this word.
Taraporewala 1951 as " ... he-continually-upholds ..." He identifies its "orig. root" as √*dar-* and says that its Skt. cognate is also used in the sense of "constantly or continuously upholding", (tenseless?).
Bartholomae and Moulton 1912:   I cannot identify from their translations, the English equivalent each of them gives for *dāyaraṯ*.

I take this 3p sg. injunctive verb form *dāyaraṯ* as tenseless.
Thus, *yā dāyaraṯ* 'through which [*yā*] one upholds [*dāyaraṯ*] ..."

vahištəm manō '(the) most-good thinking'.
manō   is nom./acc. sg. of the ntr. noun stem *manah-* , which Insler says is used in the Gathas in 3 ways ~ as 'mind' (faculty), 'thinking' (process), and 'thought' (object).[110] But here and throughout the Gathas,

Zarathushtra's focus is primarily on the dynamic process of increasing understanding, so I agree with Insler in translating *manah-* words as process ~ 'thinking' ~ unless the context requires 'mind' or 'thought'.[111] *vahištəm* in GAv. is nom./acc. of the adj. stem *vahišta-*.[112]   Here the adj. and its noun *vahištəm manō* are acc. sg. because they are the direct objects of the verb *dāyaraṱ* 'one upholds'.
And there is no dispute that *vahišta-* is the superlative degree of *vohu-* 'good'.

Thus, *yā dāyaraṱ vahištəm manō*   'through which one upholds the most good thinking'.

Giving us (with line a. in English in green font, to provide context):

Line b. *hvō x raϑwā dąmiš ašəm   yā dāyaraṱ vahištəm manō*
Line a. '(The) one who first thinks thus: *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth).*'
Line b. That one through reason (is) the truth establisher, through which one upholds the most good thinking.

<center>* * *</center>

Line c.   *tā mazdā mainyū ux šyō   yə̄ ā nūrə̄mcīṱ ahurā hāmō* •⦙
Line c.   Through that way of being, Wisdom, You grow/(are) light [*ux šyō*], who nevertheless Lord, (are) still one and the same."

Let us consider the first three words as a unit.

tā mazdā mainyū   'through that way of being Wisdom',

tā 'through that' is the grammatical form for more than one declension of the demonstrative pronoun stem *ta-*.[113] But in this context *tā* can only be instr. sg. ('with/by/through ___').

mainyū: The ntr. noun stem *mainyu-* has been translated as 'spirit', 'spirit or inspiration', 'intention or spirit', 'thought', 'mentality or way of thinking', and 'mind'.   But the only translation that fits each use of *mainyu-* in the Gathas is the totality of a 'way of being'. And indeed, Insler changed his mind from translating *mainyu-* as 'spirit' in 1975, to translating it as 'nature' years later. The evidence has been detailed in another chapter.[114]
mainyū is the grammatical form for more than one declension of the ntr. stem noun *mainyu-*.[115] But in this context, *mainyū* can only be instr. sg. and belongs with the instr. sg. *tā*.   In English, when two instr. words belong together, the (instr.) preposition ('with/by/through ___') is used only once ~ to include both words.

Thus, *tā ... mainyū*   'through that [*tā*] way of being [*mainyū*]'.

mazdā is voc. sg. of the stem *mazdā-* (Skjaervo 2006). The voc. is a way of calling or naming someone. Thus it is translated as 'O Wisdom';   or 'Wisdom'.

But here, the pronoun and its noun *tā ... mainyū* (which belong together), encapsulate or frame the noun *mazdā.* When this occurs, the framed and framing words form one unit of thought (discussed and footnoted under *vohū vax šaṱ manaŋhā* above, in Y31:6 line c.).

Here we know that Zarathushtra's primary intent is addressing the Divine, Wisdom, because *mazdā* is voc. sg.   But (in a secondary way) we also have the suggestion of a double entendre (quality/being), because the quality of the way mentioned in the foregoing lines of these two verses ('that way of being') is the quality of personifying truth (including its comprehension) ~ which is 'wisdom' (quality/being).   So in effect, through the wisdom-way-of-being (truth personified), Wisdom grows, is enlightened.

Giving us, *tā mazdā mainyū*   'through that way of being Wisdom,'

<center>31</center>

ux šyō   'You grow/(are) light'

ux šyō is the 2p sg. injunctive conjugation of the stem verb *vax š-* which has two unrelated meanings ~ 'to grow' and also 'to blaze' (Skjaervo 2006).

Insler 1975:   "...Thou art to grow ..." no linguistic comment on this word.
Humbach 1991:   "... Thou growest ..." (tenseless?) no linguistic comment on this word.
Humbach/Faiss 2010:   "... you are growing ..." (tenseless?) no linguistic comment on this word.
Taraporewala 1951: "... do-Thou-brighten ..." his comment demonstrates the uncertainty in the opinions of earlier generations of Avestan scholars.
Bartholomae: "... dost Thou exalt ..." (tenseless?)
Moulton 1912:   "... thou dost prosper ..." (tenseless?)

As an injunctive verb form, I take 2p sg. *ux šyō* as tenseless. And here also, I think Zarathushtra uses this *vax š-* word with double entendre that Wisdom grows and is light. In my view, here 'blaze' is inadequate. And I cannot think of a one-word English equivalent (despite checking for synonyms in all thesauruses available to me). So I have used 'You grow/(are) light [*ux šyō*]' ~ echoing the idea in line a.   The result is awkward.   But the meaning behind the awkward English equivalent is quite lovely.

Thus, *tā mazdā mainyū ux šyō*
Through that [*tā*] way of being [*mainyū*] Wisdom [*mazdā*], You grow/(are) light [*ux šyō*].

yə̄ 'who'
yə̄ is nom. sg. masc./ntr. of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*, and stands for the preceding 'Wisdom'.

ā nūrə̄mcīṯ ahurā   'nevertheless, Lord, (are) still'

ahurā: There is no dispute that *ahurā* is voc. sg. of the masc. noun stem *ahura-* 'lord'. The vocative declension is used for calling someone. So 'O Lord' or 'Lord'.

ā nūrə̄mcīṯ: According to Skjaervo 2006, both *ā* and *nūrə̄mcīṯ* are adverbs.
The suffix *-cīṯ* (*nūrə̄mcīṯ*) is used frequently as a particle of emphasis (Beekes 1981 p. 145). But in addition, Skjaervo 2006 states: "The particle *-cīṯ* can be attached to all types of nouns and pronouns to express various nuances,[116] including "even, -self [as in 'itself', 'himself'], just, exactly".[117]

Skjaervo 2006 says *ā* means "here (and now), currently, at present." But he comments: "The exact meaning and function of the particle (adverb, preverb, pre-/postpos.) *ā* is very elusive. Basically, it seems to focus the action on 'here/there and now/then'."[118]
Reichelt 1911 agrees that *ā* is an adv. and gives it the following flavors of meaning 'hither, hitherto; thereto, moreover'.
ā is found numerous times in the Gathas, where (as Skjaervo says), its meaning is "elusive" and translations by eminent linguists are nowhere near as simple as the glossary meanings given by Skjaervo and Reichelt.

Skjaervo 2006 says that the adverb *nūrə̄m* means "now".
Reichelt 1911 says that the adverb *nū* means "now, even now," and *nūrə̄m* means "now, just now".
And in the entire surviving corpus of Old Avestan texts (which includes the Gathas), our verse Y31:7 is the only place in which the adverb *nūrə̄m* is found. So comparing its use in other Gatha verses is not an available option, to determine Zarathushtra's intent in using it.

Now, if the phrase *ā nūrə̄mcīṯ* is adverbial, it has to describe a verb. But there is no verb in the phrase *yə̄ ā nūrə̄mcīṯ ahurā hāmō* so we have to imply a verb, as all the linguists in our group have done (although

they have not implied the same verb, and some of them have not placed the implied verb in round parentheses ~ indicating it is not in the Avestan text).

The linguists in our group translate *ā nūrəmcīṯ* and its implied verb as follows.

Insler 1975, "... up to now indeed [*ā nūrəmcīṯ*]" with the implied verb "Thou ... hast been ...". He comments "*ā nūrəmcīṯ* 'up to now indeed'. Same use of *ā* with an acc. [noun] in 46.8d *tanvəm ā* 'up to his body (person)'."   But (with respect) that is only one of many instances of *ā* being used in the Gathas.
Humbach 1991, " ... to this very day [*ā nūrəmcīṯ*]" with the implied verb "(Thou ... hast remained ...)". No linguistic comment on these words.
Humbach/Faiss 2010, " ... even now [*ā nūrəmcīṯ*]" with the implied verb "(are)". No comment on these words.
Taraporewala 1951 as " ... even uptil now [*ā nūrəmcīṯ*]" with the implied verb "(has remained)". He translates the emphatic particle *-cīṯ* as "even", and places [*ā*] in square brackets, agreeing with Andreas that it is "metrically unnecessary" ~ although Taraporewala's 'uptil' is close to Insler's translation of *ā*.   Taraporewala comments that *nūrəmcīṯ* is a derivative adverb, showing its cognates as: Skt. *nu-, nū-* ; later Skt. *nūnum* ; Greek *nu-*; and Ossetic as *nur*; "now". (The Greek and Ossetic are relevant because Avestan is in the Indo-European family of languages).
Bartholomae and Moulton 1912: I cannot tell from their translations, how they translate *ā nūrəmcīṯ*.

I think Reichelt's 'moreover' for *ā* is close, and in this context, I translate *ā nūrəmcīṯ* (including its emphasis of the idea 'now') as 'nevertheless ... still. And I imply the verb '(are).

Thus, *yə̄ ā nurəmcīṯ ahurā*   'who nevertheless, Lord, (are) still ...'

hāmō   'one and the same'
hāmō   according to Skjaervo 2006, is nom. sg. of the adj. stem *hāma-* which he says means "one and the same", showing that our verse (Y31:7) is the only instance of its use in all surviving Old Avestan texts.   He also shows the adj. stem *hama-* which he says means "same" (appearing in Y32:16 where Insler 1975 translates *haməm* as 'equal to']. Skjaervo 2006 does not give the linguistic basis for these two different stems (*hāma-* and *hama-*), but I think the difference between their meanings is substantive (in the context of our line c.).

Reichelt 1911 shows that the adj. stem *hāma-* means "equal, like, the same"; and for *hama-* (which he thinks is YAv.) shows no difference in meaning.

The linguists in our group translate *hāmō* as follows.

Insler 1975 as "... the same ..."
Humbach 1991 as "... the same ..."
Humbach/Faiss 2010 as " ... the same ..."
Taraporewala 1951 as " ... the same ..."
Bartholomae: " ... is ever the same."
Moulton 1912: " ... is ever the same."

In this context, I find persuasive Skjaervo's translation of *hāmō* (a *hāma-* word) as "one and the same". It fits best with the the micro/macro contexts (explained in the *Discussion* section above).

Thus, *yə̄ ā nūrəmcīṯ ahurā hāmō*   'who nevertheless Lord, (are) still one and the same.'

Giving us:
Line c. *tā mazdā mainyū ux šyō   yə̄ ā nūrəmcīṯ ahurā hāmō* ⁝

Line c. 'Through this [*tā*] way of being [*mainyū*], Wisdom [*mazdā*], You grow/(are) light [*ux šyō*],   who [*yə*] nevertheless Lord, (are) still [*ā nūrə̄mcīṯ ahurā*] one and the same [*hāmō*].'

* * * * *

Let us now look at the full translation of this verse by each of the linguists in our group.   As you can see, they insert into their translations many implied words (sometimes, but not always, shown in round parentheses) to make their respective translations work. Some of these implied words follow normal Avestan usage for implied words.   Others (with respect) do not.   Having seen the word by word linguistic analysis, you can decide for yourself, to what extent these translations reflect Zarathushtra's thought, or the pre-conditioned mind-set of each translator.

Y31:6.
a. *ahmāi. aŋhaṯ. vahištəm.   /   yə̄. mōi. vīdvå. vaocāṯ. haiϑīm.*
b. *mąϑrəm.[∴] yim. haurvatātō.   /   ašahyā. aməratātascā.*
c. *mazdāi. [∴] avaṯ. x šaϑrəm.   /   hyaṯ. hōi. vohū. vax šaṯ. manaŋhā. ∴*

Y31:7
a. *yastā. maṇtā. pouruyō.[∴]   /   raocə̄bīš. rōiϑwən. xʷāϑrā.*
b. *hvō. x raϑwā. dąmiš. ašəm. / yā. dāyaraṯ. vahištəm. manō. ∴*
c. *tā. mazdā. mainyū. ux šyō. / yə̄. ā. nūrə̄mcīṯ. ahurā. hāmō. ∴* Geldner 1P p, 110.

My translation (the more fluent version):

Y31:6
Line a. "The most good exists for that one ⁓ the knowing one ⁓ who tells to me the real
Line b. precept: that of (the) completeness of truth, and of non-deathness,
Line c. for Wisdom: Such (is) rule, that for Him, it will grow/blaze through good thinking."

Y31:7
a. 'The one who first thinks thus: *Through lights (truths), one is filled with good/happiness/enlightenment (truth).*
b. That one through reason (is) the truth establisher, through which one upholds the most good thinking.
c. Through that way of being, Wisdom, You grow/(are) light, who nevertheless Lord, (are) still one and the same."

Insler 1975:
Y31:6
"(to the adherents). The best shall be for him, the knowing man, who shall tell me the real precept concerning the truth of His completeness and immortality: '*Such is the rule for the Wise One that one shall increase it for Him through good thinking*'."

Y31:7
"He who first thought thus, '*They are to be joined with happiness throughout their days*',
He created truth in accordance with this very intention, by reason of which He has (also) upheld the very best thinking.
     (to the Wise Lord). Through this spirit, Wise One, Thou art to grow, Thou who up to now indeed, hast been the same, Lord."

Humbach 1991:

Y31:6.

a. "The best (part) shall belong to Him, the Knowing One, who may pronounce for me the true

b. formula concerning the integrity and imortality of truth;

c.   to the Wise One (shall belong) that best power which He shall make grow with His good thought."

Y31:7.

a. "The Primal One who with that (intellect of His) conceived (the formula): 'Let the comforts (displayed) intersperse with light',

b. (as) creator He (conceived) truth with (that) intellect. (By means of the spirit) with which one upholds best thought,

c. by means of that spirit Thou growest, O Wise One, (Thou) who (hast remained) the same to this very day, O Ahura."

Humbach/Faiss 2010:

Y31:6.

a. "The best (power) shall be to Him, the Knowing/Initiated One,

b. who tells me the true/effective mantra implying integrity and immortality of truth,

c. that power (shall be) to the Wise One which He shall make grow through good thought."

Y31:7.

a. "The Primal One, who conceived these comforts flooded with lights,

b. (is) by his intellect, the establisher of truth. (Through that spirit) by which one holds on to the best thought,

c. through that spirit you are growing, O Wise One, who (are) the same even now, O Lord."

Taraporewala 1951:

Y31:6.

a. "The Best shall-accrue unto him, who, the Wise-One, shall-spread my Truth ~

b.   the Holy-Word which (leadeth) to Perfection, and to Immortality, (the Word) of Truth; ~

c.   such (shall be) the Strength of Mazda, that through Vohu Mano shall-increase within-him."

Y31:7

a. "Who through-that (Holy Word) first decreed, (that His) Light shall-stream-forth through-heavenly Lights,

b. He-Himself in-His-Wisdom (is) the Creator of-Eternal-Law, through-which He-continually-upholds the Best Mano;

c. that (Light), O Mazda, do-Thou-brighten (within us) through-(Thy)-Spirit, which, O Ahura, (has remained) the same even [uptil] now."

Bartholomae:

Y31:6

"To him shall the best befall, who as one that knows speaks to me Right's truthful word of Welfare and of Immortality; even the Dominion of Mazdah which Good Thought shall increase for him."

Y31:7.
"About which he in the beginning thus thought, 'let the blessed realms be filled with Light', he it is that by his wisdom created Right, (Those realms) that the Best Thought shall possess those dost Thou exalt, O Mazdah, through the Spirit, which O Ahura, is ever the same."

Moulton 1912:
Y31:6
"To him shall the best fall who as the one that knows speaks to me Right's very word of Welfare and Immortality, even that Dominion of Mazda which Good Thought will prosper for him."

Y31:7
"He that in the beginning thus thought, 'Let the blessed realms be filled with lights,' he it is that by his wisdom created Right. Those realms that the Best Thought shall possess thou dost prosper, Mazdah, by thy spirit, which O Ahura, is ever the same."

* * * * * * *

---

[1] Insler 1975: pp. 37 - 39; 183 - 184.
Humbach 1991: Vol. 1. pp. 127 - 128; Vol. 2 pp. 63 - 65.
Humbach/Faiss 2010: pp. 85 - 86; 172.
Taraporewala, 1951: pp. 190 - 197
Bartholomae's translation in English is given in Taraporewala 1951, pp. 192, and 197.
Moulton 1912: p. 352.

[2] Geldner places a very small punctuation mark ~ ∴ ~ at the end of this line b., (in Y31:6), but acknowledges in his Introduction (*Prolegomena* p. lii) that because the manuscripts have no consistent system of punctuation and vary so greatly in punctuation, he has opted to insert punctuation marks based on his own opinion. I (respectfully) disagree with his opinion here, which is why I have omitted his small punctuation mark at the end of line b. (in Y31:6). In my opinion, just as the sense of line a. ends with the first word of line b., so also the sense of line b. ends with the first word of line c.

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

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

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

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

[7] Detailed in *Part One: Good Rule, Vohu Xshathra, & Power.*

[8] Detailed in *Part One: Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat.*

[9] Detailed in *Part One:*
The Nature Of The Divine; (which includes quotations regarding how Zarathushtra uses 'Lord' which throws light on his intended meaning for this word); and
The Identity Of the Divine.

[10] Detailed in *Part One: Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat.*

[11] Detailed in *Part One: The Identity Of The Divine.*

---

[12] Detailed in *Part Two: A Question Of Reward & The Path.*

[13] Detailed in *Part One: The Manthra Of Truth, Ashem Vohu;* and in *Part Two: The Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu), An Analysis.*

[14] Detailed in *Part One: Truth, Asha;*
And in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of The Most Good, Vahishta.*

[15] Detailed in *Part Six: Yasna 28:1.*

[16] Detailed in *Part Two: The Solution Of Yasna 29.*

[17] Detailed in *Part One:*
Good Thinking, Vohu Manah; and
The Search For Truth.

[18] Examples from the YAv. *Hormezd Yasht* are given in a ft. in *Part One: The Manthra Of Truth, Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu);* and in the main part of the chapter in *Part Three: The Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu), An Analysis.*

[19] Skjaervo 2006 *Introduction To Old Avestan,* Lesson 8, p. 94.

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

[21] Detailed in:
Part One: Zarathushtra's Paradise In This World & The Next;
Part Two: The Houses Of Paradise & Hell;
Part Three:
Heaven In Other Avestan Texts, and
The Absence of Damnation & Hell in Avestan Texts.

[22] The 'end' includes incremental ends and eventually the complete good End, see *Part Three: Apema, One Of Many Ends.* In Avestan script there are no capital letters. Yet the choice (of a given translator) to insert initial caps. makes a big difference in meaning.

[23] That mortals are capable of attaining *amərətāt-* 'non-deathness' ~ a Divine quality ~ a state of being no longer bound by mortality, is detailed with references in *Part One: Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat;* and in *Part Three: Chinvat, The Bridge Of Discerning.*

[24] Detailed in *Part Three: Chinvat, The Bridge Of Discerning.*

[25] Detailed in
Part One: The Fire In All Things; and in
Part Two: Light, Glory, Fire.

[26] Detailed in *Part One: The Identity Of The Divine.*

[27] In the Gathas, Zarathushtra uses the term 'knowing one' for both the Divine (Wisdom) as well as for a mortal who understands Wisdom's teachings. For example:
In Y29:6 the 'knowing one' is the Divine;
In Y31:12, one who knows refers to a mortal; and

In Y31:17, the 'knowing one' is used to refer to the Divine in one instance, and to a mortal in another instance, in the same verse ("(Tell) which of the two? Does the truthful man or the deceitful one turn to what is more important? Let the Knowing one [ft. 12 "Intended is Ahura Mazda himself"] speak to the knowing, ..." Y31:17 Insler 1975).

[28] Detailed in *Part One: Manthra, An Introduction.*

[29] For example, addressing the Divine, Zarathushtra speaks of,
" ... Thy precepts [*tōi maϑrå*] ..." Y43:14, Insler 1975.
" ... in accord with the precepts of Thy teaching [*ϑwahyā maϑrāiš sānghahyā*] ..." Y44:14, Insler 1975.

And in some YAv. texts *maϑra-* words are used in the same way ~ as the Word of Wisdom. For example, the term *maϑra- spənta-* 'the beneficial Word' of Wisdom often appears in YAv. texts ~ one of which, referring to the Ahuna Vairya *maϑra-* (the Yatha Ahu Vairyo) says,

> "...It is the word of Mazda. ... It is the Mathra-spenta word [the beneficial Word], the unsubdued, the undeceived, the victorious, the opponent of malice, the healing and victorious word of Mazda..." Younger Avestan Fragment 9, Mills' translation, SBE Vol. 31, p. 393.

Notice the identity of the "opponent" ~ even in this YAv. text ~ it is "malice", a wrongful quality, not different tribes, races, or religions.

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

[31] SBE 23, p. 24.

[32] We see this same spirit of enquiry in a Pahlavi text, in a story which tells of Zarathushtra being taken by *vohuman* (good thinking) to the 'seat of the inquirers', and invited to ask questions of the Divine, (detailed in *Home Page: Buried Treasure In Ancient Stories*).   This noble idea (although still remembered even in Pahlavi times) was turned into a propaganda machine, in certain later Avestan texts (not limited to the *Vendidad*), in which Zarathushtra (purportedly) asked questions of Ahura Mazda, whose (purported) replies laid out rules (often outlandish and the very opposite of Zarathushtra's teachings) which the religious establishment wanted to enforce, using the popularity of Zarathushtra and the (purported) authority of the Divine to their own views.

[33] Detailed in *Part One: The Freedom To Choose;* and *The Search For Truth;*
And in *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution.*

[34] Detailed in *Part One: Meditation & Contemplation.*

[35] Detailed (in the Insler 1975 translation) in a ft. in *Part One: The Manthra Of Truth, Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu).*

[36] The YAv. word *tanu.maϑra-* is referenced and discussed in *Part Three: Evolution Of The Name(s) Ahura, Mazda.*

[37] Detailed in the following chapters in *Part Two:*
A Question of Reward and the Path;
The Puzzle of the Most-Good, Vahisha;
The Houses Of Paradise & Hell.
And in *Part Three: Heaven In Other Avestan Texts.*

[38] Detailed in the following chapters in *Part Two:*
Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat; and
Asha & The Checkmate Solution.

[39] Detailed in *Part One: Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat.*

[40] The word 'Lord' does not appear in the Gathic text of Y45.5. Insler has inserted "(Lord)", in parentheses, as an interpretive aid, to indicate that in his opinion "to this [*ahmāi*]" stands for the Lord. The full verse reads as follows (in Insler's 1975 translation) "Now I shall speak of what the [*spəṇtō.təmō* 'Most-Beneficial-One'] told me, that word, which is to be heard as the best [*vahišta-* 'most good'] for men: Those of you who shall give obedience [*səraošəm* 'listening'] and regard to this [*ahmāi*] (Lord) of mine, they shall reach completeness and immortality. The Wise One is Lord through such actions stemming from good spirit [*vohu- mainyu-* 'a good way of being']." Y45.5.   It could be argued that, 'to this [*ahmāi*] of mine' refers to the preceding 'word which is ... most~good', so in essence, this verse would be saying that those who listen to, and implement, Zarathushtra's teaching ('to this [*ahmāi*] of mine') which he believes to be the Word of Wisdom, the Most Beneficial One, they shall reach completeness and non-deathness. Parenthetically, Humbach 1991 and Humbach/Faiss 2010 also take *ahmāi* as referring to the previously mentioned "word ... which is best"). But actually, it makes no difference, because listening to Zarathushtra's teachings ('to this [*ahmāi*] (Word) of mine') is listening to (hearing and implementing) the path of Wisdom's divine qualities, which '*spəṇtō.təmō* (the) Most-Beneficial-One told me...' and therefore is the same as listening 'to this [*ahmāi*] (Lord) of mine...'.

[41] See *Part Three: Seraosha,* for a detailed discussion of the meaning of this word ~ based on the (conflicting) opinions of eminent linguists, as well as the ways in which the word is used in the Gathas.

[42] Skjaervo 2006 identifies *dąn* as 3p pl. aorist subjunctive of the stem *dā-* 'to give, produce, make, establish'. Here is the full verse in my translation, as well as in Insler's 1975 translation.

My translation: 'Through a beneficial way of being [*spəntā mainyū*] and the most good thinking [*vahištācā manaŋhā*], through action [*šyaoϑanācā*] and the word [*vacaŋhācā*] in accord with truth [*hacā ašāṯ*], they shall give/produce/make/establish [*dąn*] completeness and non-deathness to/for Him [*ahmāi*].   Wisdom [*mazdå*] through rule [*x̌šaϑrā*] (is) Lord through embodied truth [*ārmaitī*]." Y47:1.

Insler 1975: "Through a virtuous spirit [*spəntā mainyū*] and the best thinking [*vahištācā manaŋhā*], through both action [*šyaoϑanācā*] and the word [*vacaŋhācā*] befitting truth [*hacā ašāṯ*], they shall grant [*dąn*] completeness and immortality to Him [*ahmāi*]. The Wise One in rule is Lord through piety [*ārmaitī*]." Y47:1. Years later, Insler changed his mind regarding the meaning of *ārmaiti-* from 'piety' to 'respect', but offered no linguistic explanation for his new choice.

[43] Detailed in *Part One* in:
Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat; and
The Identity Of The Divine.
And in *Part Two* in:
The Puzzle Of The Singular & The Plural;
The Puzzle Of Creation;
A Question Of Immanence; and
Did Wisdom Choose Too?

[44] Detailed in *Part One:*
The Identity Of The Divine; and
Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat;
And in *Part Two: Did Wisdom Choose Too?*

[45] See in *Part One:*
The Identity Of The Divine.

And in *Part Two:*
A Question of Immanence,

[46] Detailed in *Part One:*
Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat, and
The Identity of the Divine.

[47] Detailed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way Of Being;* and
In *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution.*

[48] See in *Part Two: Asha and the Checkmate Solution* and *The Puzzle of Creation*, and in *Part Six: Yasna 31.11 and 12.*

[49] Evidence from the Gathas which supports the conclusion of the certain good end, is detailed in *Part Two: Asha &*
The Checkmate Solution; and touched on in *Part One: A Friendly Universe.* So fundamental was this principle, that we
see it in both YAv. and Pahlavi texts.   As Zaehner 1961 puts it:
   "Zoroastrianism differs from most other religions in that it sees reality as a spiritual disharmony..."
resulting from the conflict between good and evil. But referring to Pahl. *frashkart* he asserts that the final, certain
good End, (YAv. *frašō.kərəiti-*)
   "is regarded as being the inevitable consummation of a rational process initiated by God, and it is never supposed
   for one moment that there is any doubt that it will come to pass." p. 308.

[50] Detailed in *Part One: Good Rule, Vohu Xshathra, & Power.*

[51] Discussed in *Part One: Joy, Happiness, Prosperity;* and also touched on in the piece *In A Nutshell & Some FAQs* on the
home page of this website.

[52] Zarathushtra says,
"I who shall serve ... you, Wise Lord, with good thinking, to me are to be granted the attainments of both existences -
- yes, of matter as well as of mind ~ those attainments befitting truth through which one might set Thy supporters in
happiness." Y28:2, Insler 1975. The string of dots before "you", indicates that I have deleted the words 'all of' because
they are not in the GAv. text. Insler probably inserted the words 'all of' to indicate that the 'you' is pl.
In the Gathas, Zarathushtra frequently alternates between the sg. and the pl. in refering to the Divine. Discussed in
Part Two: The Puzzle Of The Singular & The Plural.

[53] One of the most popular descriptions of paradise in YAv. texts is,

   ... *vahištəm ahūm ašaonąm yazamaide raōcaŋhəm vīspō.xᵛāϑrəm* ...
   '(the) most-good existence [*vahištəm ahūm*] of the truth-possessing [*ašaonąm*] we celebrate,
   light [*raōcaŋhəm*], all-good/happiness/enlightenment [*vīspō.xᵛāϑrəm*] ...' my translation.
And in YAv. texts, (what we call) paradise ~ the ultimate enlightened end ~ is also called 'Endless Light(s)'.
References are detailed in a ft. in *Part Three: Heaven In Other Avestan Texts.*
That 'we celebrate' is one of the meanings of GAv. *yazamaidē*, (YAv. *yazamaide*) is detailed and referenced in a
footnote in *Part Two: The Puzzle of Worship*, a conclusion with which Humbach/Faiss agreed ~ in 2010 they translated
yaz- words in three ways ~ as 'worship', 'sacrifice' and 'celebrate'.

[54] Here are all the Gatha verses in which *xᵛāϑra-* words appears (in various declensions), given here in the Insler 1975
translation. As you can see, the "happiness [*xᵛāϑra-*]" in each such verse is linked in some way with truth and its
comprehension ~ the happiness of enlightenment ~ (which corroborates Zarathushtra's choice of the 'most-good
existence', the 'house of good thinking' and the 'house of song' for 3 of his terms for what today is commonly called

paradise ~ 3 names which integrate the notion of happiness and the enlightenment of personifying truth as qualities of the most-good state of being that is his envisionment of paradise.

Y28:2 "I who shall serve ... you, Wise Lord, with good thinking, to me are to be granted ... the attainments befitting truth through which one might set Thy supporters in happiness [$x^v\bar{a}\vartheta r\bar{e}$ 'in good/happiness/enlightenment']."

Y50:5 "Lord, let wisdom come in the company of truth across the earth! Yes, ... reveal Thyself with visible help, mighty through Thy hand, through which he might set us in happiness [$x^v\bar{a}\vartheta r\bar{e}$ 'in good/happiness/enlightenment']."
In the Gathas, Wisdom helps with truth and good thinking (detailed in *Part One: Worship & Prayer*).

Our verse Y31:7 in the Insler 1975 translation. "He who first thought thus, '*They are to be joined with happiness* [$x^v\bar{a}\vartheta r\bar{a}$ 'with good/happiness/enlightenment'] *throughout their days*', He created truth in accordance with this very intention, by reason of which He has (also) upheld the very best thinking ..."

Y33:9 [The two companions in this verse, refer to completeness and non-deathness in the preceding verse].
"Yes, for Thee, Wise One, let a person support with good thinking the very spirit of these two companions who increase truth through that happiness [$x^v\bar{a}\vartheta r\bar{a}$ 'through (that) good/happiness/enlightenment'] consisting of change. The association of these two [the two companions, completeness and non-deathness] has already arisen, under whom (all) souls are in harmony."

43:2 "Moreover, (I wish) for this person the best [*vahištəm* 'most good'] of all things, that by which a man might place a person of good purpose in happiness [$x^v\bar{a}\vartheta r\bar{o}iy\bar{a}$ 'in good/happiness/enlightenment']: to be understanding all his days, with the joy of long life, understanding through Thy [*spāništā   mainyū* 'most beneficial way of being'], Wise One, by reason of which Thou didst create the wondrous powers of good thinking allied with truth."
Parenthetically, I think the "with (the) joy of long life" is a flip~side way of saying the 'with (the) joy of non~deathness' (*amərətāt-*)' ~ so in essence, with the joy of a state of being no longer bound by mortality, when the perfecting process is complete, truth personified ~ which is Zarathushtra's idea of paradise, a joyful existence (discussed in *Part Six: Yasna 30: 3 and 4*, under 'life and non-life'.

Y53.6 "... happiness [$x^v\bar{a}\vartheta r\partial m$ ' good/happiness/enlightenment'] has been lost to the deceitful who violate truth."
Y53.6.

[55] Detailed in *Part Two:*
The Houses Of Paradise & Hell;
Light, Glory, Fire.
And in *Part Three: Heaven In Other Avestan Texts.*

[56] Detailed in *Part One: The Nature Of The Divine.*

[57] Detailed in *Part One* in:
Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat;
The Nature Of The Divine; and
The Identity Of The Divine.
And in *Part Two* in:
A Question Of Reward & The Path;
Asha & The Checkmate Solution;
Light, Glory, Fire;
A Question Of Immanence;
The Puzzle Of Creation;
Did Wisdom Choose Too?
And in other chapters in *Parts One, Two* and *Three.*

[58] Detailed in *Part One: The Nature Of The Divine.*

[59] Detailed in *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution*; and in *Part One: A Friendly Universe*.

[60] We know that the legendary figure Yima (Jamshid) existed before Zarathushtra's time because Zarathushtra mentions Yima in a Gatha verse (Y32:8), and also because Avestan "Yima son of Vivanghvat", was Vedic "Yama son of Vivasvat" in Indic texts. So Yima/Yama was an ancient Indo-Iranian legendary figure, when the Iranian and Indic people were one tribe -- before they split into 2 tribes, the Indic and the Iranian (detailed in *Part Four: Ancient Origins & Homelands*). Now, the Avestan legend of Yima recorded in one or more YAv. texts mentions Ahura Mazda, which has caused some people to think that the worship of Ahura Mazda predated Zarathushtra. But this is not so. We know that the Avestan story of Yima was 'Zoroastrianized' (to include Ahura Mazda) because there is no mention of Ahura Mazda in the Vedic accounts of Yama. In the Gathas Zarathushtra rejected the deities of his culture. He says nothing about 'reforming' them. And As Thieme (Insler's teacher) has pointed out, there was no Vedic deity called Mazda. In the Vedas, there is only the Vedic fem. noun *medhas* 'wisdom' (referenced and discussed in *Part One: The Nature Of The Divine*).

[61] Geldner, p. lii).

[62] In the Gathas, the verb stem *ah-* 'to be' often is translated as 'to exist' (in its many grammatical forms). Many examples from the Insler 1975 translation are quoted in a footnote in *Part Three: Asha Vahishta (Ashem Vohu), An Analysis.*

[63] Skjaervo 2006 *Introduction To Old Avestan*, Lesson 4, pg. 43.

[64] In his GAv. Index, under *ah-* ('to be'), Beekes shows "*aŋhaṯ /ahat/*" -- indicating that (based on linguistic principles) he believes the original of this grammatical verb form was *ahat*; and on p. 82, § 48, Beekes identifies *ahat* as a 3p subjunctive verb form.

[65] Skjaervo 2006 shows 2 forms for the acc. sg. masc. declension of the adj. stem *haiϑya-* --
(1) *haiϑīm* (in our verse Y31:6) and
(2) *haiϑyām* (which appears in another Gatha verse, Y34:15).

[66] Mills translates manthra as 'words of reason' in the following YAv. texts. The words in round parentheses are Mills' own words indicating his translations of the terms. He translates *yaz-* (and other ritual words) as 'sacrifice' whereas I think 'celebrate' (or a worship that is a celebration) is a more accurate translation.

In the Visperad

> "...praise of the Māthra Spenta (the bounteous word of reason)..." *Visparad* 9.7, SBE 31, p. 355; Mills translates *spənta-* words as 'bounteous' rather than 'beneficial', (as discussed in *Part One: The Beneficial-Sacred Way of Being, Spenta Mainyu*).

> "...and we sacrifice ... to every Māthra (as to a sacred word of reason)..." *Visparad* 13.1, SBE 31, p. 355;

> So also *Visperad* 21.1 SBE 31, p. 362.

In the YAv. Yasna

> "And we worship the Māthra-spenta (the bounteous word-of-reason), the Zarathushtrian law against the Daevas, and its long descent." Yy17.13, SBE 31, p. 259.

Some scholars have concluded that the reference in this Yy17.13, (and other YAv. Yasnas) to "the Zarathushtrian law against the Daevas" refers to the *Vendidad* (*Vi-dev-dat* which means 'the law that sets aside, or resists, the daevas'), because of its title But this conclusion is not accurate for two reasons.

From a linguistic point of view, the *Vendidad* was composed much later than Yy17.13 (quoted above) and other YAv. texts which speak of the 'Zarathushtrian law against the Daevas'. We know this to be a fact, because the Vendidad contains serious grammatical errors indicating that the Vendidad was composed long after Avestan times, when the composer(s) of the Vendidad were not fluent in the Avestan language (Zaehner, The *Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism*, (1961, Phoenix Press reprint 2003) p. 162). Humbach/Faiss 2010 on p. 31 also mention the "notoriously doubtful" Avestan grammar of the *Videvdat* (*Vendidad*).

Hintze thinks the Vendidad was written in the post-Achaemenian period (Hintze (1994), *Zamyad Yasht*, p. 9). And indeed, Darmesteter in his Introduction expresses the opinion that parts of the Vendidad were written as late as Sasanian times (SBE 4, pp. xxxvii - xli).

In light of all this evidence, the phrase "the Māthra-spenta (the beneficial word of reason), the Zarathushtrian law against the Daevas" in Yy17.3 quoted above (a YAv. *Yasna* which *was* composed during Avestan times) obviously could not have meant a text not yet in existence (the *Vendidad* composed after Avestan times) and could only have been a reference to the Gathas themselves ~ corroborated by the fact that the Gathas themselves speak explicitly and repeatedly against the cruel gods of Zarathushtra's society which in the Gathas he calls daevas. Thus Zarathushtra's teachings are ~ quite literally ~ 'against the daevas'. Moreover, the teachings of the Gathas are very, very different from most of the teachings in the *Vendidad*. See *Part Five: The Vendidad and its Lessons for Today*.

[67] Either *maϑra-* (masc.) or *maϑrā-* (fem.) words in their inflected case/number forms appears in the Gatha verses Y31:6, Y31:18, Y43:14, Y44:14, Y44:17, and Y45:3 where Insler 1975 translates the word as 'precept(s)'.

The word also appears in Y28:5, where Insler 1975 translates it as 'prayer'.   And it appears in Y29:7, where Insler 1975 translates it as 'promise' but he comments (under verse Y29:7) that it means 'precept' and discusses its various shades of meaning one of which he thinks is the 'command', as well as the 'teachings, insructions' of Wisdom (pp. 153 - 154). With respect, I do not agree with 'command' ~ one of Insler's flavors of meaning ~ because in Zarathushtra's thought the freedom to choose is a fundament, ("...Him who left to our will (to choose between) the [*spāncā* 'beneficial'] and the [*aspāncā* 'non-beneficial'] ..." Y45.9, Insler 1975; and is essential to the process of spiritual evolution, detailed in *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution*). And 'commands' are opposed to, and incompatible with, the freedom to choose.

But translating *maϑrəm* in Y29:7 as 'promise' while interpretive, is easy to understand when we consider that Wisdom's 'promise [*maϑrəm*]' of nurture in Y29 is His teachings (precepts, *maϑra-*).

[68] Taraporewala 1951 comments that the meaning of *maϑra-* corresponds with the Biblical "*Word* ~ divine law, scripture, promise command", and thinks that the mention of *maϑra-* in this verse (Y31:6) refers to the Ahuna Vairya. He states that in later Avestan, like in Later Sanskrit, the word "acquired the meaning of a mere 'spell'."
But (with respect) Zarathushtra taught a new envisionment of the Divine, the path to the Divine and the reward for taking that path. So when he composed the Gathas, there was no Zoroastrian "scripture" ~ other than the Gathas. And I have already explained my views on "promise" and "command" in Gatha verses, discussing Insler's views (in a ft. above).

I have not researched every instance of *maϑra-* in YAv. texts, so I do not know whether (as Taraporewala and Moulton state) in later Avestan the word was used to mean a "mere spell".   I do know that the YAv. texts are diverse ~ not monolithic.   Some of them contain, complement, and corroborate, lovely strands of Zarathushtra's thought. Others are very, very far from, and quite the opposite of, his thought. Indeed, I find certain YAv. texts to be ~ spiritual wastelands ~ difficult to keep reading.

[69] Moulton 1912 expresses an opinion similar to that of Taraporewala. He footnotes his view of *maϑra-* (in our Y31:6) as follows "*Manϑra*, teaching, doctrine: the word later fell to a mere 'spell'."

[70] Detailed in *Part One: Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat*.

[71] Detailed in *Part One: Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat.*

[72] Detailed in *Part One: Completeness & Non-Deathness.*

[73] Skjaervo 2003, *Introduction To Young Avestan,* Lesson 12, p. 110, numbered paragraph 5.

[74] Detailed in 2 chapters in *Part One: ~ The Nature Of The Divine,* and *The Identity Of The Divine.*

[75] Detailed in the following chapters:
In *Part One:*
The Beneficial-Sacred Way Of Being, Spenta Mainyu)
Truth, Asha,)
Good Thinking, Vohu Manah,) 5 Divine qualities that mortals currently have, imperfectly;
Embodied Truth, Aramaiti,)
Good Rule, Vohu Xshathra, & Power)
Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat ~ 2 Divine qualities that mortals do not currently have, but are capable of attaining completely, at which time they no longer will be bound by mortality because the perfecting process is complete.
And In *Part Two:*
A Question Of Reward, & The Path,
Asha & The Checkmate Solution

[76] Detailed in *Part One: Completeness & Non-Deathness, Haurvatat, Ameretat.*

[77] Other examples that Insler 1975 gives of GAv. words used in those three ways are as follows (p. 118).
manah- 'mind' (faculty); 'thinking' (process); and 'thought' (object).
cašman- 'eye' (faculty); 'in the light of their eyes, vision' (process, as in the process of seeing); and 'vision' (object, as in what is seen).
šyaoϑana- 'action' (process, as in taking action), and 'an act' (object). The faculty would be 'actor', but perhaps Insler did not think that this usage of the stem word occurs in the Gathas. Insler does not mention the 'faculty' version of *šyaoϑana-*.

[78] *hōi* is the form for the following declensions of the personal pronoun stem *hi-*: (a) gen. sg. masc./ntr./fem.; and (b) dat. sg. masc./ntr./fem. (Skjaervo 2006). But in some verses, Insler and/or Taraporewala give *hōi* an acc. sg. masc. translation.

[79] Detailed in a preceding ft.

[80] Beekes 1988 shows *vax šaṯ* as "3s sub." which means 3d person, sg., subjunctive, p. 81.

[81] This technique of 'framing' or 'encapsulation' in the syntax of the Gathas, to give one unit of thought, is discussed in (at least) 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 ~ Insler's examples, and also additional ones).
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 in this verse of 3 lines).

[82] In addition to our verse (Y31:7), *maṇtā* appears in 3 additional Gatha verses Y31:19; Y33:6; and Y51:16, in each a tenseless translation of this 3p sg. injunctive verb form, fits the context. The following translations are by Insler 1975 except for the words in black font, in square brackets, which show my tenseless translation.

Referring to himself, Zarathushtra says, "This knowing world-healer [*ahūm.biš*] has listened, he who has respected the truth [*yə̄ maṇtā ašəm* 'he who thinks truth ...'] ..." Y31:19 Insler 1975. Here Insler has (interpretively) translated *maṇtā* as 'he ... has respected'. But in the Gathas, truth (in thought, word and action) is how we heal existence. So to be an existence-healer [*ahūm.biš*], one has to think truth, speak truth, and do truth. Therefore the tenseless 'he ... thinks truth' fits both the micro context of this verse as well as the macro context of the Gathas.

"The priest who is just in harmony with truth is the offspring from the best spirit [*mainyə̄uš ... vahištāṱ* 'from (the) most-good way of being'], ... he has respected [*maṇtā* 'he thinks'] to bring to realization his pastoral duties ..." Y33:6 Insler 1975. Here also Insler has translated *maṇtā* as 'he has respected'. But the stem verb is *man-* 'to think'. And in my view, the tenseless, 'he thinks, to bring to realization his pastoral duties' is a perfect fit, because (good) thinking is the genesis of the words and actions that are pastoral and brought to realization ~ nurturing, helping, the mutual loving help which is a fundament of Zarathushtra's thought.

"Through his rulership (following) along the paths of good thinking, Kavi Vishtaspa reached this understanding of our task, which he respected in harmony with truth [*yąm cistīm ašā maṇtā* ~ literally: 'which understanding through truth he thinks'] ..." Y51:16 Insler 1975. Because of the syntax of these words and the preceding words (which do not follow English word order), it is a bit difficult to express in English, Zarathushtra's full intent in the phrase *yąm cistīm ašā maṇtā*, without translating the entire verse, but in essence the words which precede *maṇtā* express the idea that King Vishtaspa's understanding of our task is enabled by thinking through truth. In other words, the comprehension of truth ~ 'through truth he thinks' ~ generates the understanding that is required to perform our task, which in the Gathas is forwarding existence to truth, and making it happen ~ the *frašō.kərəiti-* of the later Av. texts. For the meaning of *frašō.kərəiti-* and its Gatha origins, see *Part Three: Heaven In Other Avestan Texts*.

[83] Skjaervo *Introduction To Old Avestan*, Lesson 1; p. 4. Beekes 1988 p. 140, shows *yas* as nom. sg. masc. (here a generic masc.) of the relative pronoun stem *ya-*.

[84] Insler 1975:
yastā "who ... thus ..." Y31:7; and
yastā "... who in this way ..." Y45:11, p. 261.   More literally (instr. sg.) '... who through this (way) ..."

Humbach 1991:
yastā "... who with that ..." Y31:7; and
yastā "... who (inspired) by Him ... " Y45:11 (Vol. 1, p. 167; commenting in Vol. 2 p. 173).

Humbach/Faiss 2010:
yastā "... who ... these comforts ..." Y31:7; and
yastā "... who (inspired) by Him ... " Y45:11 p. 132.

Taraporewala 1951:
yastā "Who through that ..." Y31:7, and
yastā "Whoso, therefore ..." Y45:11, p. 567 (perhaps as in 'whoso ... through that' way).

Bartholomae:
yastā "About which ... thus ..." Y31:7; and
yastā "Whoso, therefore ..." Y45:11 (an interpretive translation), shown in Tarap. 1951 p. 570.

Moulton 1912:
yastā "... that ... thus ..." Y31:7; and
yastā "Whoso, therefore ..." Y45:11, p. 372.

[85] The manuscripts and also eminent linguists are in disagreement regarding how this word should be written ~ Geldner (citing 3 mss., Jp1, Mf2, and J11) and others prefer *pouruyō;* Insler 1975 and others prefer *paouruyō*, which is supported by other mss. ~ Pt4, Mf1, Pd, J61, H1, P6, and L20.2, (as Geldner shows in his ft. 2 for this verse), p. 110). As a practical matter, the different spellings make no difference to the meaning of the word.

[86] Insler's comment under Y31:7 refers us to his discussion of instrumentals of temporal extent and spatial extent under his commentary on the instrumental *adanāiš* in Y30:7, pp. 170 - 171. My translation abbreviation to indicate the instrumental case ('by/with/through ___') of necessity is only the general rule, to explain to a reader who is not a linguist, how the instrumental case usually is translated into English. But there are variations. And this is true of some other cases as well.

[87] Detailed in the following 2 chapters in *Part Three:*
Daena, and *Xratu.*

[88] Jackson 1891 shows that for masc./ntr. *a-* stem nouns, the *-ā* inflection in Gatha Avestan is instr. sg., ('with/by/through ___') and also vocative sg. ('Oh ____').   And for only ntr. *a-* stems, the *-ā* inflection in Gatha Avestan is also nom./acc./voc. pl. Jackson 1891, §§ 236, 237, 238, pp. 69 - 70.
In the context of our verse (Y31:7), the vocative clearly does not fit.   So (because *xᵛāϑra-* is a ntr. noun, Skjaervo 2006), in our verse, *xᵛāϑrā* could be instr. sg. or nom/acc. pl. Therefore, Skjaervo's opinion that *xᵛāϑrā* in our verse is nom./acc. pl. is simply that ~ his opinion.

[89] Jackson 1891, §§ 236, 237, 238, pp. 69 - 70.

[90] I do not know what Skjaervo 2006 means by the superscript symbol °. He does not have a Table of Abbreviations.

[91] Skjaervo, 2003, *Introduction to Young Avestan*, Lesson 2, p. 11.

[92] There is no dispute that in ntr. *a-* stem nouns the nom./acc. sg. inflection is *-əm*.
As in:
Skjaervo 2006: ntr. stem *aša-*: its nom./acc. sg. declension is *ašəm*;
Skjaervo 2006: ntr. stem *x šaϑra-*: its nom./acc. sg. declension is *x šaϑrəm*;
So for the ntr. stem *xᵛāϑra-*: its nom./acc. sg. declension would be *xᵛāϑrəm*.

[93] Tarap. 1951 commenting under Y28:5 p. 97 [*sū-āϑra*]; and under our verse Y31:7 on p. 195 [*hu-āϑra*].

[94] An earlier generation of Avestan scholars have translated *xᵛāϑrå* words as 'light' words'.   For example:
In Yy17.14, we have *paouru.xᵛāϑrå* (Geldner 1P p. 71); Mills "abundant glory" SBE 31, p. 259.
In Yy16.7, we have *vīspō.xᵛāϑrəm* (Geldner 1P p. 68) Mills "all glorious" SBE 31, p. 257.

[95] For example, the prefix *hu-* in *hucisti-* 'good understanding; *hujyāiti* 'good life'; *hušyaoϑana-* 'good actions', and many other such words.

[96] Jackson 1892, § 748, p. 209.

[97] Skjaervo 2006 *Introduction To Old Avestan,* Lesson 2, p. 15.

[98] Detailed in *Part Three: Xratu.*

[99] The meanings of *dā-* 'to give, produce, make, establish' are discussed in detail in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of Creation.*

[100] Detailed in *Part Two: The Puzzle Of Creation.*

[101] Jackson 1992, **§§** 251 - 253, pp. 74 - 75.

[102] The following additional information gives you some idea of:
(i) the fact that eminent linguists disagree with Skjaervo's view of the meaning of *dąmiš* (in our verse, Y37:1);
(ii) how difficult and uncertain is the process of decoding Avestan; and also
(iii) the truth of Insler's verbal advice to me (a few years ago) that Avestan has been perhaps 80% decoded.

To understand Skjaervo's view, we need to be aware that he shows two related nouns:
dāman- "net, web" a ntr. noun stem, (which he says appears in Y46:6, and Y48:7 as nom./acc. pl. *dāmąn*); and
dāmi- " *web-holder" a masc. noun stem, (of which he thinks *dąmiš* in our verse, Y37:1 is the nom./acc. pl. form).
He thinks both these nouns derive from a 2d meaning of *dā-* "to tie", (unrelated to *dā-* 'to give, produce, make, establish').
In support of his position, Skjaervo 2006 gives an Old Indic (Ved.) cognate *dāman-*. (In Ved. transliteration, the *ā* has a line above it, which my fonts cannot reproduce). But linguists disagree. For example:

Insler 1975 translates *dāmąn* in Y46:6 as 'bonds', ("...such a person shall go to the bonds [*dāmąn*] of deceit's captivity..."). In his commentary (p. 267), he thinks the same Vedic word (that Skjaervo mentions) is cognate, but translates it as 'bonds'. In Y48:7 he translates *dāmąm* (which he emends to **dāmąn*) as 'bonds' as well ("...Yes, his bonds [**dāmąn*] are in Thy house, Lord.").

Humbach 1991 (Vol. 2, p. 180) thinks *dāmąn* in Y46:6 could mean either 'abodes' or 'creatures' ~ stating the same problem occurs in Y48:7. He comments that in YAv. *dāmąn* always means "creatures, creation" (giving no examples), but that Vedic *dhāman-* means 'abode' (giving one example). He does not mention the Ved. *dāman-* which both Skjaervo and Insler mention.

[103] For *dąmiš aš̌əm* Humbach/Faiss 2010 acknowledge that *aš̌əm* is acc. sg., but state that *dąmiš* 'builder/establisher' "... dominates the acc. *aš̌əm* in verbal government, ...". Yet they themselves take *dąmiš* to be nom. sg. not genitive sg. So I do not see how a nom. sg. *dąmiš* can turn *aš̌əm* into a genitive "of truth" by "dominating" it (their translation in context "The Primal One ... (is) ... the establisher of truth [*dąmiš aš̌əm*]...").

[104] Humbach/Faiss 2010 giving an alternative (in their comment): "... yet it is possible as well that *dąmiš* is the 3p sg. "inj. *s*-aor." of the underlying verbal root *dam* 'build/establish'." p. 172.

[105] If *dąmiš* is a noun, the words *dąmiš aš̌əm* 'truth establisher' are the direct objects of the implied verb (is). 'That one (*hvō*) ... (is the) truth establisher ...'. So you may be puzzled about why I think they are nom. (which usually is the subject of the verb. Well, as a general rule, the direct object of a verb is in the acc. case. But when the verb is any form of the stem verb 'to be' (such as 'is'), both the subject and the direct object of the verb are in the nom. case. This rule was not made to annoy us. It has a logical basis. Think of the verb 'to be' (in this instance 'is') as an equal sign. 'he [subject] ... is [verb] the truth establisher [direct object] ...". The subject is always in the nom. case. And when 'to be' (in its various grammatical forms) is the verb, the direct object is equated with the subject, and therefore is in the nom. case as well.

[106] Detailed in *Part Six: Yasna 28:5.*

[107] Detailed in *Part One:*
The Search For Truth, and
The Freedom To Choose.

And in *Part Two: Asha & The Checkmate Solution*.

[108] *yā* is the relative pronoun form for more than one declension:
    ~ nom. sg. fem.
    ~ instr. sg. masc./ntr.
    ~ nom. du. masc.
In this instance, however, the only good contextual fit in instr. sg. masc./ntr.

[109] As part of the process of decoding Avestan, all verb stems are conjectured (based on the ways in which they are inflected, when compared with Ved. cognates).
Skjaervo 2006 shows only one verb stem *dar-* .
Reichelt shows 2 verb stems *dar-* , one of which (*dar-* 'to split') is not relevant in this context.
For his other verb stem *dar-* he gives many meanings (some of which may pertain to its middle voice): "to hold, hold fast; to keep back; to maintain; to keep in mind; ... to keep, sustain, support; to guide to (loc.); to receive."
I have omitted the definitions he gives when *dar-* is used with other words (or pre-fixes or suffixes).

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

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

[112] Skjaervo 2006 does not identify the declension of *vahištəm*.
But Jackson 1892, shows the *əm* inflection to be nom./acc. sg. of ntr. *-a* stem nouns/adjs. in GAv. §§ 236, 237, 238, 361, pp. 69 - 70, 103.

[113] *tā* is the form for 3 declensions of the demonstrative/ 3p pronoun stem *ta-* 'he, that' (Skjaervo 2006):
~ instr. sg.,
~ nom./acc. du. masc. and
~ nom./acc. pl. ntr.
Linguists (Jackson, Skjaervo) announce the general rule that demonstrative pronouns can be used also for 3d person pronouns. But there are many demonstrative pronoun stems, and I have not researched whether all of them, or only some of them, can be used also for 3d person pronouns.

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

[115] *mainyū* is the declension for both instr. sg. and also nom./acc. du. (Skjaervo 2006).

[116] Skjaervo 2006 *Introduction to Old Avestan,* Lesson 3, p. 29.

[117] Skjaervo 2006 *Introduction to Old Avestan,* Lesson 7, p. 82.

[118] Skjaervo 2006, *Introduction To Old Avestan,* Lesson 2, p. 19. This sentence is one of his incidental notations ("Note:")
~ explaining *ā ahmi* in one of his (unrelated) examples of "Uses of the Locative".
He translates *ā ahmi* as "I am here. ..." ~ translating *ā* as 'here'.
But it could equally be translated as "I now am"; or "I still am" ~ depending on the context of its use.