3.4.3. THE KING’S “SOCIO-LEGAL” RESPONSIBILITIES

Among the more-pressing social matters broached by Darius in his inscriptions is the relationship between the weak and the powerful. This, too, has clear Avestan parallels, cf. DNb 8-11:

*naimá kāma taya skauðiš
 tuna va tahayā rādiy miđa kariyaiš
 naima ava kāma taya tunuvā skauðaiš
 rādiy miđa kariyaiš

It is not my desire that a weak (man) should be wronged by a mighty (one), nor is it my desire that a mighty (man) should be wronged by a weak (one).

With this cf. Y. 47.4:

kasūścit nā aśaunē kādō an haunt

The man of a little, for how long shall he be for the benefit of the follower of Order, and the bad one who possesses much, (for how long shall he be) for the benefit of the follower of the Lie?

and DSe 37-41:

*dātam taya manā hacā avanā tarsatiy
 yathā haša kauviyā tayam skauıtum nay
 jaśtī nyā vīmardatiy

the law which is mine, that he fears, so that he who is stronger does not crush the weak nor wipe (him) out.

Cf. also Y. 57.10 (to Sraoša):

yā drīyaošca drīuuiásca amauaṭ
 nmānam haṃ tāšiti ... yā Aēšmam
 staraβata snaiðiša vīxūmaṇatam xarom
 jaiνti
 aica hē bāda kamarnēom īryumā paiti
 x’anhaieiti yathā aojā nāidīiāghem

who timbers the strong home of the poor man and woman ... who strikes Fury a bloody wound with (his) paralyzing weapon. And then, having struck, again and again he thrashes at its head, like a strong one an inferior one.

In the last pair of examples we notice two formulaic parallels involving “the mighty” and “the weak”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>ON THE SIDE OF EVIL</th>
<th>AGAINST WEAK</th>
<th>(ON THE SIDE OF GOOD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPer.</td>
<td>tunuvant-</td>
<td>miđa kariyaiš</td>
<td>skauđi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>isuuant- paraoš</td>
<td>aq haunt</td>
<td>drāguuaitē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second example the pair aojā nāidīiāghem, although used to describe Sraoša’s punitive action, still is in the context of “protection of the
weak from the mighty”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPers.</th>
<th>STRONG(ER)</th>
<th>STRIKE</th>
<th>WEAK(ER)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tauviyā</td>
<td>jan-</td>
<td>skauθim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>aοjά</td>
<td>jan-</td>
<td>nāidiuŋhom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The theme of protecting the weak and the unprotected is also found in the Near East, however, e.g., in *Code of Hammurapi* (1792-1750 B.C.E.), col. 47: “... in order to ... offer justice to the oppressed, so that the strong might not oppress the weak ...”

In this case Darius has innovated as compared both to the Avestan and Near Eastern traditions by vowing also to protect the interests of the mighty against wrong-doing by the weak!

### 3.4.4. The Goal of the Good Mazdayasni

The goal of the good Mazdayasni is set forth in several Old Persian inscriptions, e.g., XPh 46-56 (cf. above [3.2.1]):

\[
\text{tuva kā hāya aparā yadī-maniyāiy śiyāta ahanīy jīva utā marta ārtāvā ahanīy avanā dātā paridīy taya Aureamzdā niyaštāya ...}
\]

You who (come) hereafter, if you think: Let me be happy (while) alive and follower of Order (when) dead! (then) behave according to that Law which Ahuramazdā established ...

\[
\text{martiya hāya avanā dātā pariyaita taya Aureamzdā nīštāya ... hauv utā jīva śiyāta bavatiy utā marta ārtāvā bavatiy}
\]

The man who behaves according to that Law which Ahuramazdā established ... he becomes both happy (while) alive and follower of Order (when) dead.⁶⁹

From the Avesta compare *Y. 71.15-16:*

\[
\ldots \text{ ustme uruuaēse gaiiehe ...}
\]

\[
\text{yāda vaśi aśāum iḍa aŋhō aśauua}
\]

\[
\ldots \text{ at the last turn of (your) life ... as you desire, o follower of Order (= Zarathustra), (already) here you shall be a follower of Order.}
\]

---

⁶⁹ Cf. Kerdîr’s statement in his inscription at Naqš-e Rajab (19-21): *ud kē kirbakkar ān frāz ō wahişt šawéd ud kē bazakkar ān ō dušox *ahganihed ud kē kirbakkar hād ūd abar kirbag nēw rawād ūy im astwend tan husrawih ūd ābdāh rasād ū-š ūy astwend ranwān ardāyih abar rasād “And whoever does good, he goes forth to Paradise; and he who does evil, he *is thrown into hell. And whoever does good and behaves well in good deeds, renown and wealth will befall this material body of his, and blessedness will befall that material soul of his.”*
AVESTAN QUOTATIONS IN OLD PERSIAN?

You shall convey (your) soul across the bridge of the compiler to Paradise, arriving a follower of Order.

and V. 5.61-62:

If these Mazdayasnians ... over this departed one, then neither will he be a follower of Order (while) alive, nor will he partake of the Best Being (when) dead.

The parallelisms in vocabulary and syntax in these examples is remarkable, especially the use of the thematic subjunctive of the root ah- opposed to forms of bav-:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{āṛtāvā ahanīy} & \sim \text{āṛhō așauua} \\
\text{āṛtāvā bavatiy} & \sim \text{nōīt būvaṭ așauua}.
\end{align*}
\]

The main difference between the Avestan and the Old Persian realizations of the formula is the shift of așauuaan-āṛtāvān- from “here” to “beyond.” Schematically we have as the consequence of behaving correctly:71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WILL BE(COME)</th>
<th>IN LIFE</th>
<th>HAPPY</th>
<th>DEAD</th>
<th>HAPPY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahanīy</td>
<td>jīva</td>
<td>šiyāta</td>
<td>mārta</td>
<td>artāvā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bavatiy</td>
<td>jīva</td>
<td>šiyāta</td>
<td>mārta</td>
<td>artāvā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>ațhō</td>
<td>iḍa</td>
<td>așauua</td>
<td>vahištahe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(nōīt)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ustome uruwaēse gaihehe)</td>
<td>aḥhūṣ jasō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nōīt) būvaṭ</td>
<td>juuasciț</td>
<td>așauua</td>
<td>màšasciț</td>
<td>(nōīt) baxšale vahištahe aḥhūș</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case the Rigveda has nothing comparable; as a matter of fact, “ṛtāvān essentially never modifies humans but only gods or super-human beings (like the kavis of old)” (as put by S. Jamison).

70 The genitive for the accusative appears to be due to passages such as the next one (V. 5.61-62).
71 The Rigveda does not seem to have these particular formulas, although an “echo” is found RV 1.77.1, where Agni is both immortal among mortals and followers of Order: yō mārtṛyeṣv amṛṭa ṛtāvā, hōtā yājīṣṭha ût kṛṇōti devān “Immortal (and) a follower of Order among the mortals, the best-worshiping Libator, who makes the gods (come).”
3.4.5. Staying on the Straight Path

Abiding by the Law, that is, by what has been established as true and correct behavior, also means not leaving the straight path in rebellion against the authorities, as expressed in DNa 58-60:

\[ \text{pađūm tayām rāstām mā avaḥarda mā stabhava} \]

Do not renounce the straight path, do not rebel!  

In the Avesta the "straight/straightest path" is the one that leads to Paradise, cf. Y. 68.13:

\[ \text{razištāhe paṭō aēšmca vaēšmca yō asti razištō ā aṣā ṭvahištāmca ahūm aṣāonm} \]

the search for and finding of the straightest path, which is the straightest one (leading) to Order and the Best Being of the followers of Order.

Ahura Mazda is said to dwell on these paths, cf. Gathic Y. 33.5-6:

\[ \text{yastē vispā. mazīštəm saraōsom zbaiiā aunaŋhāné apāno daragō. jiāiitōm ā xṣaθrōm vaŋhūs maŋhūo aṣā ā aražūs paṭō yaēšū Mazda Ahurō šaēti} \]

I who invoke your very greatest hearing at the end of the road, having obtained long life and the power of good thought, (and) the straight paths (leading) to Order, on which Ahura Mazda dwells.

and Y. 43.3:

\[ \text{aṭ huuō vaŋhūs vahiiō nā aibī jamiiāt yō nā aražūs sauŋhō paṭō sīšōi āhiiō aŋhūs astuutō maŋhast} \]

Thus may that man come to what is better than good, (he) who might teach us the straightest paths of strengthening of the corporeal existence and the spiritual one—

---

72 Cf. Av. auuapharz- “to leave alone, renounce.”
73 In the Rigveda “straight/straightest paths (of Order)” are common, but there is little trace of the moral metaphor of “staying on/staying from the straight path.” Still, “the path of Order” leads across duritā- “danger,” cf. RV 7.65.3: tā bhūripāsāv anṛtasya sētu, duratētu ripāve māṛtyāyā / pāya mṛtāvaruṇā pathā vām, apō nā nāvā duritā tarema “Those two are binders of un-Order with many chains and for the evil man hard to avoid. May we on your path of Order, o Mitra and Varuna, cross over dangers as over the waters on a ship!” and RV 10.133.6: pāya naḥ pathā nayāti viśvān mūri “Lead us (o Indra) across all dangers on the path of Order!”
74 The argument in Kellens-Pirart, III, 1991, p. 100 (with refs.) that the type of compound vispā.mazīsta- “greatest of all” is unusual in Iranian, is not quite correct, as the type is frequent in Khotanese (biśṭā-hvāstā-, etc.).
75 [I now prefer: “the straight paths ... to (those) among whom Ahura Mazda dwells.”]
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Mazdā

From the Rigveda cf. RV 10.85.23:

anŋkṣarā ṭjāvah santu pāṇthā, yēbhīh
sākhāyo yānti no vareyām

and RV 1.41.4-5:

sugāḥ pāṇthā anŋkṣarā ādityāsa ṭtāṃ yatē
| “Let the roads be without thorns (and)
| straight on which our friends go wooing.

| Easy to walk (and) without thorns (is) the
| road, o Ādityas, for him who walks
| according to Order ...
| The sacrifice that you, o lords, o Ādityas,
| lead along the straight path, that will
| come to your attention.77

Losing the straight path is characteristic of the follower of the Lie (Y. 51.13):

tā draguaṭā marādaṭī daēnā ṣrṇaọš
haihīm
yehiā uruṇā xraoḍāṭī cinuuaṭō *parətau
ākā
x’aiś šiiaotionāis hizuuascoa ašahlīā
nāsuoā paṭō

| Thereby the daēnā of the follower of the
| Lie ignores the true (formula) of the
| straight (path), he whose soul laments in
| view of the Bridge of the Compiler,78
| having lost the path of Order on
| account of his own acts and (the words) of
| (his) tongue.

| and is also equated with having bad x’arṇah (Yt. 10.105):
| The one of bad glory, having lost the
| straight (paths).

dušx’arṇā naštō razištā

The evil-doers have also left or lost the straight path or are punished by
being diverted from it, as in Yt. 10.27 (cf. Yt. 10.78 cited above, no. 5):

---

76 [See preceding note.]
77 Note the connection of both Av. daēnā- ~ Olnd. dhī- with “path.”
78 Note V. 19.30 hāu ... jaśāiti spānauwaiti “She (the daēnā-) ... comes, with (her) dogs,” and
RV 10.14.11 yau te śvānau yama rakṣitaaru, ... pathirāki “your two guardian dogs, o Yama,
... who guard the path.”
who takes away the straightest (paths) of the *rebellious land, (who) *turns the glories away, carries away the resistance-smashing ability.

In the Rigveda we have the corresponding notion of the “path of Order,” which is also “straightest” in RV 1.79.3 ṛtāsya pathibhi rájiṣṭhaiḥ, as well as the notion of the evil-doers’ not being able to go along this path (RV 9.73.6):

The blind (and) deaf have fallen behind. The evil-doers cannot traverse the road of Order

Although none of the formulas have the same or semantically equivalent verbs the “moral metaphor” is typically Avestan, and the Old Persian formula may therefore express the Avestan concept. Some doubt must remain, however, as the “straight path” is also found in Near Eastern literature, e.g., Code of Hammurapi (1792-1750 B.C.E.), col. 5: “When Marduk commanded me to direct the people along the right path ...”; col. 48: “Lord Hammurabi ... has pleased Marduk, his lord, and secured the permanent welfare of the people and led the land along the right path.”

“The idea of “straight” is further related to that of “true,” “not false,” discussed next [3.4.6].

3.4.6. THE KING AS KEEPER OF TRUTH AND PUNISHER OF FALSEHOOD

The main human keeper of truth and punisher of falsehood is, of course, the king himself.79 Thus, in DB 4.44-45, Darius pronounces an oath that what he has said in his inscription is the truth:

This is true, not false.

Truth and falsehood feature prominently in DNb 6-13:

By the greatness of Ahurmazdā I am such that I am the friend of what is straight, I am not the friend of what is false ...

What(ever) is straight, that is my wish. I am not a friend of a man who follows the Lie.

With these passages we may compare an Avestan prayer, Y. 60.5:

In this home may obedience (listening) win over disobedience (lack of listening), the correctly spoken word (win over) the false word, (and) Order (win over) the Lie!

Schematically we have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BE FRIEND OF</th>
<th>STRAIGHT (TALK)</th>
<th>BE NO FRIEND OF</th>
<th>FALSE (TALK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O Pers.</td>
<td>dauštā ah-</td>
<td>naiy dauštā ah-</td>
<td>mīdhāh drujanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>aršuxō vāxš</td>
<td>van-</td>
<td>mīdhāxōtām vācim drujim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For rāstam ~ aršuxō note that aršō (OAv. aršō) is the form taken in compounds by ārāzu- (see [3.4.5]), like ašō “great” corresponding to maz(ant)- (Schindler, 1987, pp. 345-46). Note also the that O Pers. rāstam corresponds to Av. aša-, Rīg. rtā- in connection with the straight road of Order (see [3.4.5]). The lexical correspondences are therefore nearly perfect.

3.4.7. THE BATTLE AGAINST THE LIE

The constant battle between good and evil in the world, which is the hallmark of the Iranian “dualistic” religious systems (Zoroastrianism and Manicheism), is clearly reflected in the Old Persian inscriptions. We have already seen how the king prays to the gods for protection against gasta- “evil” ([3.2.4], and cf. [3.2.5]). On a larger scale the battle is against drauga- “the Lie,” corresponding to Avestan druji-, which is portrayed as the evil genius of all persons and lands that rebel against Darius.81 Thus the king is waging a constant battle against the drauga- and those who follow the Lie, a battle is constantly fought by gods and men alike throughout the Avesta. The necessity of combating the Lie and punishing its adherents is spelled out in the following passage (DB 4.33-40):

dahyāvav imā tayā hāmiciyā abavav draugadiš * hāmiciyā akunauš taya imai kāram adurujīyaś pasāvadiš * Auramadā manā dastayā akunauš

These lands which became rebellious, the Lie made them rebellious, so that these (men) lied to the people. Then Ahuramazdā delivered them into my hands;

80 Note the enumeration in Y. 33.1 of all the key terms (see also [3.2.1]): dātā ... razištā ... draguataēcā ... ašāni ... mīdhiīā ... ārāzuā.
yaθā mām kāma avatādiś akunavam ...
tuvas kā *xšāyaθīya aparava ahay hacā
dragā daršam patipayauvā maritiya [haya] draujana ahatiya avam ufraθām
parsā yadīya avatā maniyāhāy dahavāus-
māly duruvā ahatiy

as was my wish thus I treated them ...
You who will be king in the future,
guard strongly against the Lie. The
man who is evil, him punish well if you
think as follows: May my country be
healthy.

Avestan echoes of the expression hacā dragā daršam patipayauvā are
seen in Yt. 1.14 (to Ahura Mazda):

adauuiś nqma ahmi vīθauuiś nqma ahmi
paiti.pāuiś nqma ahmi

I am called deceitless. I am called
dispeller of deceit. I am called
watchman.

and Yt. 10.19:

ahmāi naēmāi uzjasāiti Miθrō granθō
upa.tbiθō yahmāi naēmanqam
miθrō.druş naēθa mainiu paiti.pāite

Miθra angered and enraged will come up
(upon him) in (exactly) that side where the
contract-belier is not at all on (his)
guard by his mind.

More importantly, the entire complex passage of DB 4.33-40 has three
important Avestan parallels in Yasna 30.82
(1) The theme of being bewildered and deceived by the Lie is seen in Y.
30.6:

aιiā nοiθ araθ višiūtā daēuuacinā hīat iś
ā dobaomā parasmaṇoŋ upə.jasat hīat
vorṇmāθa aciśtam manō

Especially the daēuuas do not distinguish
between these two because deception
comes over them as they are deliberating,
so that they choose very bad thought.83

with which we may compare Y. 32.5:

82 See also above [3.1.9], and note Y. 58.6 pariθ pariθ viriŋg sprətai mainiawuθ
dādawaihawuθuθauθ druwō.gaeθā druawīuθauθ druwō.virā "We distribute (our) cattle
and men for the Beneficial Spirit, guarding the cattle, having healthy living beings, having
healthy cattle, having healthy men."

83 In the Avesta we find a mythological parallel in the story of Yima, in a passage that
contains one of only two occurrences of the word draoga- (Yr. 19.33): para anādruθoŋ para
ahmāt yat him aem draogyə [the best manuscript reading is F1 draogyə; J10 has draogyə]
vācim aθhaiθiθm cinmåθe paiti.barata “before, while he had not yet lied—before this one
induced him to *think deceit, untrue word(s).”
"You deceive mortal man of good livelihood and immortality with that evil thought because the evil spirit, too, (deceives) you the daēuas (therewith), (and your) act with (his) evil speech, by which the *one in command identifies the follower of the Lie."\(^{84}\)

(2) The theme of delivering the evil-doer into the hands of the good is seen in Y. 30.8:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ațcā yadā aēšam kaēnā jamaī aēnāŋham aț mazdā taibiu ā tāhtum voḥ manacho vōīvaitē aēbihō sāstē ahūrā yōī aśāī dadōn zastaiō drujiṃ}
\end{quote}

And in the same way, when the retribution comes for their offenses, then, o Mazdā, the power will be assigned to you through good thought, for (you) to announce, o Mazdā, to these who shall deliver the Lie to Order into his hands.

and in Y. 44.14:\(^{59}\)

\begin{quote}
\textit{taṭ bēkā pōrēsā araś mōī vaocā Ahūrā kaṭā aśāī drujiṃ diqim zastaiō ni hīm mārādīāi bēkhiū māthráiś sōnghahīā ēmauauītīm sinām dāuōi dragwāsū ā ēś duwaftīng Mazdā anāšē āstāscā}
\end{quote}

I ask you this: tell me truly, o Ahura!

How can I deliver the Lie into the hands of Order to rid myself of him by the formulas of your announcement (on how) to make strong the *division among the followers of the Lie (and) to lead them to torments, o Mazdā, and misery?

The expression \textit{ḥāstāyōr dḥā-} "place in the hands; hold in the hands" is found several times in the Rigveda (see Kellens-Pirart, III, 1991, p. 51) but always in a concrete sense, and more often than not the things held are good.

The expression "to deliver a vanquished enemy into the hands of the king" is found in the Ancient Near East, however. I have noticed, e.g., from the reign of Narām-Sīn (2254-2218 B.C.E.) "When the god Dāgān ... delivered into his hands (\textit{qātissu iddinu-ma}) Rīd-Adad, king of Armanum." Thus, while the Old Persian again uses a Near Eastern formula for an Avestan theme, in this case the formula is also original in Iranian.

\(^{84}\) Ahura Mazdā is speaking.

\(^{59}\) Note that this strophe is followed by one concerning warfare (Y. 44.15) \textit{yezī ahiū aśā poi maṭ xasaihī hiiat hīm spādā anacahā jamaētē auwāīs urauāīs yā tū Mazdā dīdorēzō kurtī aitā kahnāi vananaṃm dađā "If you together with Order rule over this (state) in order to protect (it) when two armies come together because of mutual dislike, by those ordinances which you, o Mazdā, wish to keep firmly, to which side of the two and to whom do you give victory?"
(3) The theme of punishing sinners to keep the land healthy has a pendant in Y. 30.8-9:

Old Persian:

marṭiya haya draujana ahatiṣ avam
ufraṣṭam parsā yadīv avalā manīyāhāy
dahayāuṣ-maïy duruvā ahatiṣ

The man who is evil, him punish well
if you think as follows: May my country
be healthy.

Avestan:

aṭcā yadā aešam kaēnā javāiṣt
aṇaṇaye ṣa mazdā taibīō xšaθwem vohū
manasθā vōvidātē aēbīō sostē ...
aṭcā tōi vaēm xiāmā yōi ṣi rēaθm
καρμαν ωήμ

When punishment for the sins of these
(evil-doers) comes, then, o Mazdā, the
power will be assigned to you through
Good Thought, for (you) to command
those (= us) ... and so we shall be those
who make the existence Precious.

The connection between the Avestan and the Old Persian passages may become clearer if we look at the Pahlavi translation of the beginning of Y. 30.8: ēdōn-iz ū pad ḥan daḥiṣn [pad tan *ū pasēn] ō awēsans kēnīgān [wināhkaṙān] rasēd kēn [kē-šān pādīfrāh kunēnd] “Thus too at that creation
[i.e., the Final Body] upon those vindictive ones [i.e., the sinners] will come vengeance [i.e., they will punish them].” With this compare DNb 19-21
naimā kāma taya marṭiya vināθyaiṣ naiṣpaṭimā ava kāma yadīy vināθyaiṣ
naiṣ frāhydration marṭiya “It is not my desire that a man should work damage,
nor is it my desire that he should not be punished if he should work damage.”

In view of the perfect parallel

wināhkaṙān ... pādīfrāh kunēnd “they will punish the sinners”
yadīy vināθyaiṣ ... frāhydration marṭiya “if a man should work damage
[=sin] he should ... be punished”

it is quite possible that the “Old Persian version” of the Gāthic passage
actually used formulas very close to the one in DNb 19-21, which were
replaced by the more pregnant ones in DB 4.33-40 (marṭiya- vināθyaiṣ- ~
draujana-).

In summary: We have in this complex example two passages, one Old
Persian and one Avestan, containing the development of four identical or closely
related ideas or themes:

1. The deceiving of men/daivas causing them to become followers of the
Lie;
2. Ahura Mazdā delivers (causes to be delivered) the followers of the Lie
into the hands of Order/the king;
3. (this serves as an example:) the punishment of the followers of the Lie
is a prerequisite for
4. making the land healthy/the existence (here) Precious (fraša).

Schematically we have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECEPTION</th>
<th>MADE</th>
<th>THE REBELS</th>
<th>FOLLOWERS OF THE LIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPers. draoğa-</td>
<td>kar-</td>
<td>hamićiya-</td>
<td>durujiya-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. dəbaoman</td>
<td>upājasa-...hiat</td>
<td>daēuāa</td>
<td>var- acištam manō</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AHURA MAZDĀ</th>
<th>DELIVER</th>
<th>(FOLLOWERS OF) THE LIE</th>
<th>INTO HANDS OF</th>
<th>(FOLLOWER OF) ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPers. Auramazdā-</td>
<td>kar-</td>
<td>-diš (= hamićiya-)</td>
<td>dastayā</td>
<td>manā (= king)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. (Mazdā-)</td>
<td>dā-</td>
<td>druji</td>
<td>zastaiiō</td>
<td>aṣa-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THEREFORE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUNISHMENT COMES</th>
<th>THE SINNER (AND)</th>
<th>YOUR LAND</th>
<th>WILL BE PERFECT/WE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPers. ufraštam pasrā</td>
<td>martiya haya draujana</td>
<td>dahayāuš-maiy</td>
<td>duruvā ahati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. kaēnā jamaiti</td>
<td>aēšam ... aēnaghqm</td>
<td>īm ... ahūm</td>
<td>vaēm ... kərməon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have in addition one identical formula (no. 2) and one (no. 1) with strong underlying thematic parallelism. Neither formula seems to have a close Rigvedic parallel and at least one of them represents a typically Iranian-Mazdayasian concept, namely the influence of the Lie/Deceit upon the minds of men/daivas, which causes them to make the wrong choices.

In view of the different contexts (political vs. religious text) and style (simple prose vs. highly artistic poetry) I find these parallels remarkable.

3.4.8. THE KING’S “ESTHETIC” FUNCTION

By the king’s “esthetic function” I mean his efforts to produce “Precious (fraša) work.” This function corresponds to Ahura Mazdā’s cosmological and eschatological function of “making the existence Precious.” Cf. DNb 1-5:

baga vazarka Auramazdā haya adadā
imam frašam taya vainataiy

The great god (is) Ahuramazdā, who
made this Precious (work) that is seen.
and DSf 55-57:

\( \text{Thātiy} Dārayavauś XŚ Čišāyā paruv frašam framātām paruv frašam *kartam \)  
(Thus) says Darius the king: ‘In Susa much Precious (work) had been ordered, much Precious (work) has been made.’

Xerxes uses naiba- instead of fraša- (and vasiy instead of paruv, see [2.2.3]; XPg 3-5):

\( \text{vasiy taya naibam akunauš utā} \)  
(There was) much good that Darius the king, my father did and ordered.

Both adjectives have Avestan parallels (Yt. 19.10):

\( \text{yaθa dānum daθaθ Ahurō Mazdā pouruca vohuca ... pouruca frašaca} \)  
when Ahura Mazdā made the creatures both plentiful and good ... both plentiful and Precious.

From Old Avestan cf. Y. 34.15:

\( \text{mazdā aŋ mōi vahistā srauścā Šūaoθaŋacā vaocā tā tu vohū manadhī ašacā išudm stūtō xšmákā xšabrā ahurā forašām vasnā haidīsīm dā ahūm} \)  
Thus, o Mazdā, say that my hymns and actions are the best! Make you, o Ahura, by good thought and Order, through this your power, o Ahura, the invigorant of the praises as exchange price,\(^{86}\) (this) world precious (and) true.

---

\(^{86}\) I have translated vasnā as “exchange price” in the sense of “price of goods offered in exchange,” cf. Latin vēnum (dare), etc. (Humbach’s latest translation [1994] has “value”). Traditionally (Bartholomaeae, Air. Wb.; Kellens-Pirart, etc.) the word is derived from Vvas “to wish” and equated with OPer. vašnā, which, however, probably means “greatness” (see above [3.3.3]). In the Rigveda vasnā- means “price (of goods offered in exchange)” (4.24.9: bhūyasā vasnām acarat kāniyah “He has offered a lesser price for something worth more”); vasnaya- “demand ransom” (6.47.21: āhan dāsā vṛṣabhō vasnayeñāh “The bull smashed the two Dašās who were demanding ransom”); and vasnaya- “offered in exchange(?)” (10.34.3 āśvasyeva járato vásnyasya, nāhām vindāmi kitavāasya bhōgam “I find no value in the gambler, like an old horse offered in exchange.” In the Gāthās, vasnā is used with foraša- only when those who make foraša- are the gods (Y. 34.15, 46.19, 50.11), not when they are the human (Y. 30.9). J. Katz also points out that the last example occurs within a Gāthā (in the middle of the Ahūnauaiti Gāthā), while each of the other three is in the concluding strophe of its Gāthā (Ahūnauaiti, Uṣṭaūaiti, and Spāntā mainiit; the formula is not found in the Vohušaθrā and the Vahiṣṭoṭisti); see also Kellens-Pirart, III, 1991, p. 113 (whose “chaque Gāthā” should be “the first three Gāthās”). I translated Avestan foraša- as “Precious” because of the phonetic echo; today I prefer “juicy,” that is, “filled with life-giving juices.”
Schematically we have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RULER OF THE WORLD</th>
<th>MAKE</th>
<th>THE WORLD</th>
<th>PRECIOUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPers. Aūrmazdā</td>
<td>dā-</td>
<td>iman taya vainataiy</td>
<td>frašam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. Ahūro Mazda</td>
<td>dā-</td>
<td>ahūm</td>
<td>frašām</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RULER OF THE WORLD/LAND</th>
<th>MAKE</th>
<th>MUCH</th>
<th>PRECIOUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPers. Dārayavauš Xš</td>
<td>kar-</td>
<td>paruv</td>
<td>frašam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. Ahūro Mazda</td>
<td>dā-</td>
<td>vasiy</td>
<td>naibam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pouru</td>
<td>frašm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pouru</td>
<td>vohu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the strongest pieces of evidence, in my opinion, for Darius’s and his successors’ intentional use of scriptural terminology is seen here. Aside from the complete formulaic identity, we should also note that this action of the king is not the kind of universal duty seen in many of the examples above (as pointed out by S. Jamison).

In the same way that almost a millennium later the first Sasanian kings, Ardašer and Sāpūr, combined their claims to the throne with intensive religious propaganda that emphasized crucial aspects of Mazdayasnaism, so did Darius combine his claim to political legitimacy with a claim to the real faith, as revealed to him by Ahuramazdā. Indeed, judging by the inscriptions, he saw himself as fulfilling the ideal function of the worshiper of Ahuramazdā of making the world, or at least part of it, fraša “Precious,” just as it had been originally made. This “esthetic” function of the king matches Ahuramazdā’s creative, but also eschatological function (see below [3.4.8]).

In the Avesta, ahūm frašām kar- “make existence Precious” is an aspect of the ritual that has a double meaning: making existence here and now “Precious” through sacrifice both recreates the original state of the world and anticipates its end, when it will again be “Precious. “Precious” here implies that the “world” returns to the state it was in when it was first made by Ahura Mazda (= Order, the creation of Ahura Mazda’s Beneficial Spirit). In practice it means that day and sun return and dispel darkness (= chaos, the creation of the Evil Spirit of the Lie). That the sacrificers themselves are important participants in this process of remaking and rejuvenation is clear from Y. 30.9 (discussed above [3.4.7]):

\[
\text{ataū tøi vaēm šiāma yøi im frašēm} \\
\text{karṇaon ahūm} \\
\text{And may we be the ones who shall make} \\
\text{this existence precious!}
\]

We therefore have a threefold scheme: God, king, sacrificer, as pointed out to

The Achaemenid kings obviously understood it differently.
me by R. Shayegan. The king unites in his person, as it were, both the others; as God’s agent on earth and as the prime sacrificer (cf. the recurrent formula Ahuramazdām ayadaiy “I sacrificed to/worshipped Ahuramazdā”).

Whether the Iranian religion at this time had already developed its eschatological ideas to the stage in which they appear in the Sasanian period and whether Darius saw himself as a “savior” (Av. saōšiianṭ-) in this eschatological scheme are interesting questions, but difficult to answer. Darius could certainly have found justification for seeing himself in such a role in Y. 48.12:

\[\text{at tōi aghan saōšiianṭō daxiunām yōi xśnūm voḥū managāhā hacāntē sīiaotānāiś aṣā thāhīiā mazdā sāŋghahīiā tōi zī dātā hamaēstārō aēšom.mahiiā} \]

Those shall be the Benefit-Providers of the lands who through Good Thought pursue the pleasing (of you), o Mazdā, through Order with actions (according to the dictates) of your Word. For they have been made (as) opponents of the Fury.

Of the features assigned to the saōšiianṭs expressed here, the first: that Darius pleased Ahuramazdā, is clear from the fact that the God chose him to be king (DSf 15-18):

*Ahuramazdām *avāṭā kāmā āha
haruvahāyāyā [BUyā] *martiyam mām
*avārnavatā *mām XŚyam *akunauś
*ahāyāyā BUyā

Thus Ahuramazdā willed it: He chose me, the (only) man of the whole [earth]. He made [me] king of this earth.

Darius clearly regarded his commands as reflecting those of Ahuramazdā. Whether this is reflected in his choice of the verb thārha- “proclaim” = Avestan sāŋgh-śqh- cannot be definitely proved, but we may note that “say” is otherwise gauba-.

Since whoever cares for the poor also smites Fury (see [3.4.3]), Darius matches this last feature, as well, and is therefore a saōšiianṭ in the sense of Y. 48.12.

The passage in DB 1.19-20 also belongs in this context. Already in the Young Avesta Āēšma is the opponent of Šraoša “obedience” = “listening to the word of God,” which is expressed—mutatis mutandis—by Darius as follows (DB 1.19-20):

\[\text{manā baṇḍaka āha ... tayaśām hacāma aṭahaya śapavā raucapativā ava akunavyayantā} \]

They were my bondsmen ... That which was said to them by me by night or by day, that they would do.
3.5. AVESTAN-OLD PERSIAN WORDS IN ELAMITE?

In the Elamite version of the royal Achaemenid inscriptions we occasionally find Old Persian words quoted rather than translated. The reason for this is not clear. Here I would like to mention the possibility that these Old Persian words are quoted because they were regarded as quotations from Avestan in Old Persian. Thus the formula ġrtacā barznāyi (discussed in [3.4.1]) would not merely reflect an Avestan formula, it could actually be one.

As no study or even compilation has been made of the Old Persian words in Elamite inscriptions, it is difficult to evaluate this hypothesis. The following examples were found with the help of Hinz, 1973, pp. 52-70, 119-60.

In DB Elam, ha-tar-ri-man-nu is repeatedly used together with da-mi hu-pa-ip-pi to render fratamā anušīyā “foremost followers.” The Elamite word can be read variously as (h)āt(a)r/νmani, and Hinz chooses *haṭra-mani. If this is the correct interpretation we may compare such Avestan passages as Y. 30.9:

hiāt haṭrā manā buuaṭ yaṭrā cistiš aḥaṭ maṇā
the thoughts are in one and the
same place (= constant) where (our)
understanding is changing (?).

and Y. 28.4:

yā uruudānam mūn gaire vohū dadē haṭrā
managhā
I who keep (my) soul in mind for the song
of praise with (my) good thought in one
and the same place.

If the word in Elamite actually has a final -i, then it is probably a vrddhi-formation of the common Old Persian type and should be read as *haṭramani- “he whose thought is in one and the same place; constant; loyal” < *haṭra-manah. The doubling of the terms in the Elamite version may reflect the use of a solemn, Avestan, word plus the literal translation of the Old Persian itself.

Corresponding to dahayuṣmaiy duruvā ahatiy in DB 4.39-40, the Elamite has da-a-ya-u-iš-mi tar-ma āš-du, with the imperative *astu instead of the subjunctive. With this we may compare the use of the imperative in Avestan as seen in Y. 53.8: rāmāmcā āiš dadātū šueitibiō vižibiō irtātū iš duuafsō huuō dərzə maŋthiiaš mažištō mošcā astū “And may it (= Right-mindedness) in spite of them (= the followers of the Lie) give peace to the settlements! May the greatest torment pull them by the chain of death and let

87 Thus Kellens-Pirart.
it be at once!"; and in the common formula Sraošō (iō) astū (and vars.) “Let Sraoša/listening be present!”

In A²Sa, mā yātum mā kayadā vilx x /jitu[v] “May no magician or sorcerer destroy this which I made!” is rendered by Elamite an-nu (anni “may not”) hi-ya-du an-nu ki-ya-da me-ulqa-in (?). Here again the two words yātum and kayadā may have been regarded as literary, Avestan, words and were therefore kept untranslated (cf. [3.2.3]). The important term frašam “Precious” (discussed in [3.4.8]) is quoted in the Elamite as pír-ra-ša-um, conceivably as an Avestan term.

4. CONCLUSION

With regard to the three possible sources of tradition reflected in the Old Persian inscriptions we can now conclude.

1. The authors of the Old Persian were strongly influenced by Near Eastern models, although they often had at their disposal Iranian and Indo-Iranian literary forms to cast these themes in. Near Eastern themes and even forms are present in instances where the Iranian or Indo-Iranian origin of the theme at first sight seemed clear. These coincidences—which will no doubt become still more numerous when the material is more closely investigated—are clearly attributable to the universality of the themes involved and similarities between the structures of the languages which entailed similar wordings.88

2. The Indo-Iranian heritage is very strong in many parallels between Old Persian and Avestan, but in most cases it cannot be determined whether it is to be accounted for by the individual heritages of the two languages or influence of Avestan on Old Persian.

3. There remain a few instances of parallels for which both Indo-Iranian heritage and Near Eastern influence seem excluded. If we assume these parallels are due to common Iranian heritage we must also conclude that the themes and forms in question 1. belong to the pre-Avestan period and 2. were transmitted for over a millennium with utmost faithfulness, which is possible. Keeping in mind, however, that the Avestan calendar, which reflects the religious concepts of the Avesta, was present in the Achaemenid empire from the 5th century—but had not been inherited by the Old Persians, who continued to use their own calendar—by far the simpler scenario would be to assume that the parallels in the last group are due to direct influence of the Avesta itself.

In one sense this investigation has to end as it started: with a query; however, I hope I have added to the cumulative evidence for the presence of

---

88 Among the many desiderata in Old Persian studies is a complete edition—with synoptic glossaries—of the Akkadian Achaemenid inscriptions and a comparison of their vocabulary and formulary with those of Assyrian and Babylonian royal inscriptions.
the Avesta in Persia from the earliest Achaemenids onward.

One subsidiary point that emerges from this survey is that the king (or his "speech-writer") portrays himself in his inscriptions within the framework of the ancient literature, both the Near Eastern—oral and written—and the old Iranian oral literature. The patterns of imitation discussed by Bickerman and [3.1.6] above also show that, even when the kings portrayed actual events, they would have recourse to the themes and forms of this traditional literature. The tradition served them well, because it allowed them to cover their more questionable acts with a familiar—and therefore credible—veil of popular story-telling.

The use of traditional literary themes and forms, including those used in the Old Persian inscriptions (see Skjærvø, 1985) was to remain a feature of royal inscriptions in Iran at least until the Sasanian period, when King Narseh (ca. 290) borrowed themes and formulas from the epic tradition for his big inscription at Paikuli, as I show elsewhere.63
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