J. HARMATTA

THE BISITUN INSCRIPTION AND THE INTRODUCTION
OF THE OLD PERSIAN CUNEIFORM SCRIPT

I

The end (§ 70) of column IV of the great Old Persian Bisitun inscription can undoubtedly be regarded as the most difficult and most disputed Old Persian text. The solution and explanation of this passage have been puzzling already the fourth or fifth generation of scholars and the number of papers dealing with it or touching one or the other detail problem of it has already grown to several dozens. This great interest and these efforts are not due merely to the difficulties of the passage. It is a general opinion that Dareios I in this passage of the inscription expresses his views about the introduction of the Old Persian cuneiform script or about some innovation in the field of the chancellery system. The central question of the dispute about § 70 of the Bisitun inscription is, whether this passage proves the origin and introduction of the Old Persian cuneiform script under the reign of Dareios I, or it only renders evidence of a minor innovation in the field of the chancellery practice.

The question is rendered even more complicated by the circumstance that, partly from the very beginning and partly in the course of time, it has got closely interconnected with several other important problems of the Old Persian script and inscriptions. Thus it is also a long disputed question, whether the Old Persian cuneiform script is the production of a given historic moment, eventually just in the beginning of the reign of Dareios I, or it goes back to a longer past and has a certain development. The problem of the Old Persian inscriptions of Pasargadae arose in the last few decades. Some of them contain the name of Kyros and thus, if they really originate from Kyros, then they prove that the Old Persian cuneiform script already existed at the time of Kyros. The problem of the origin of the Old Persian cuneiform script has been even more stirred up by the Ariyāramna and Aršāma inscriptions, which - - inasmuch as they can be regarded as genuine — would trace back the development of the Old Persian script far into the times preceding Kyros.

All these questions are closely connected with each other as well as with the interpretation of § 70 of the Bisitun inscription. In spite of this from the methodological point of view we are acting correctly if we examine the different problems separately one by one and do not subordinate either of the solutions

to the other, but we try to coordinate the results only at the end. Therefore separating the described problems from each other, I have prepared the following four studies: 1. «The Bisitun inscription and the introduction of the Old Persian cuneiform script», 2. «The Old Persian inscriptions of Pasargadae», 3. «The inscriptions of Ariyāramna and Aršāma» and 4. «Origin of the Old Persian Cuneiform Script». The results achieved separately will be compared in the latter study.

The interpretation of § 70 of the Bisitun inscription was rendered difficult for a long time by the circumstance that the Old Persian text has been preserved in such a fragmentary state which prevented the complete restoration of the text. Fortunately, the corresponding passage of the Elamite version has been preserved completely, so that on the basis of this we can still form a certain idea about the contents of this passage. At the interpretation of the Elamite version the main difficulty was caused by the fact that there occur several *hapax legomena* in the text and the meaning of these could only be guessed. At any rate there were no other possibilities in this phase of the investigation, than to reconstruct the content of the Old Persian passage on the basis of the fully preserved Elamite version which, however, could only be interpreted roughly, «every restoration must be a retranslation of the Elamite text» — as E. Herzfeld properly remarked.[1] The results of the efforts of this period were critically screened by W. Hinz and were summed up by conclusions based on his own investigations in 1942.[2] His work reflects well those possibilities of the interpretation of the Elamite text, which could be achieved at all at the time without the knowledge of the Old Persian version and the Elamite documents of Persepolis.

The difficulties of the interpretation of the Elamite version, of course, confined also the possibilities of restoration of the Old Persian original within narrow limits. It became clear that a further progress in the interpretation of the passage in question can only be hoped, if we shall succeed to read the original text of the Old Persian version or at least a considerable part of it, and to reconstruct it thus without the help of the Elamite version. It is a great merit of G. G. Cameron that he recognized this actual task of investigation and also solved it with tiresome work. The latex impressions and photographs prepared by him in 1948 and in 1957, and the elaborations of the same have undoubtedly opened a new epoch in the study of the Bisitun inscription.[3] Cameron succeeded to read the Old Persian text of § 70 more completely and more accurately than any of the earlier investigators. As a result of his new readings the gaps in the text have been reduced to such an extent that now one

---

[1] E. HERZFELD: Zoroaster and his World. I. Princeton 1947. 34.

[2] W. HINZ: Zur Behistun-Inschrift des Dareios. ZDMG 96 (1942) 343—349.

[3] G. G. CAMERON: The Monument of King Darius at Bisitun. Archaeology 13 (1960) 162—171, The Old Persian Text of the Bisitun Inscription. JCS 5 (1951) 47—54, The Elamite Version of the Bisitun Inscription. JCS 14 (1960) 59—68.

could attempt the complete restoration of the Old Persian version with the hope of success.

This was accomplished soon. Joining immediately to the article of Cameron, in which he published the new readings of the Old Persian version of the Bisitun inscription, R. Kent attempted among other things also the restoration of the text of § 70.[4] Soon after this, in 1952, on the basis of the new readings of Cameron, W. Hinz published his ideas about the restoration of the text of § 70.[5] In the same year R. Kent dealt again with this passage and changed his opinion in several points or discussed it in a more detailed form.[6] Finally in 1953, in the 2nd edition of his monograph, Kent — considering the results of Hinz — modified again the interpretation of the passage to some extent.[7]

The text restorations and interpretations of W. Hinz and R. Kent reflect a certain contrast as regards the whole sense of § 70. In the text restored on the basis of the new readings, Hinz sees the verification of his own earlier opinion, according to which the Old Persian cuneiform script was initiated by Dareios I. The interpretation of Kent, on the other hand, enables us to look for the innovation of Dareios I not in the initiation of a new script but rather in new methods of writing technics. Thus the dispute has been carried on also since then and in the remarks of J. Lewy,[8] H. H. Paper,[9] R. Borger—W. Hinz,[10] M. A. Dandamaev,[11] W. Brandenstein—M. Mayrhofer,[12] I. M. D'yakonov,[13] R. Ghirshman,[14] and I. M. Oranskiy[15] always new arguments were raised in protection of both standpoints.

My own investigations regarding § 70 of the Bisitun inscription date back to the beginning of the fifties, when I published the Old Persian inscription of Szamosújvár (Gherla).[16] In the course of the last decade I have described the

---

[4] R. G. KENT: Cameron's Old Persian Readings at Bisitun. JCS 5 (1951) 55—57.

[5] W. HINZ: Die Einführung der altpersischen Schrift. ZDMG 102 (1952) 28—38.

[6] R. G. KENT: Cameron's New Readings of the Old Persian at Behistan. JAOS 72 (1952) 9—20, especially 13—15.

[7] R. G. KENT: Old Persian. Grammar. Texts. Lexicon.[2] New Haven 1953. 130, 132, 219.

[8] J. LEWY: The Problems Inherent in Section 70 of the Bisitun Inscription. HUCA 25 (1954) 169 ff.

[9] H. H. PAPER: The Old Persian /L/ Phoneme. JAOS 76 (1956) 24—26.

[10] R. BORGER—W. HINZ: Eine Dareios-Inschrift aus Pasargadae. ZDMG 109 (1959) 117—127.

[11] M. A. DANDAMAEV: Проблема древнеперсидской писменности. ЭВ 15 (1963) 24—35 and Иран при первых Ахеменидах (VI. в. до н. э.). Moscow 1963. 32—60.

[12] W. BRANDENSTEIN—M. MAYRHOFER: Handbuch des Altpersischen. Wiesbaden 1964. 17, 87 foll.

[13] I. M. D'YAKONOV: История Мидии. Moscow-Leningrad 1956. 366—371 and ВДИ 89 (1964) 177 ff.

[14] R. GHIRSHMAN: A propos de l'écriture cunéiforme vieux-perse. JNES 24 (1965) 244—250.

[15] I. M. ORANSKIY: Несколько замечаний к вопросу о времени введения древнеперсидской клинописи. ВДИ 96 (1966) 107—116.

[16] J. HARMATTA: A Recently Discovered Old Persian Inscription. Acta Ant. Hung. 2 (1954) 1—16, cp. 11—13.

new interpretation of this passage also several times in my university lectures, and then in 1960 I published the new restoration and interpretation of a few details of it at the XXVth International Congress of Orientalists and I summed up my conception regarding the interpretation of the whole as follows: «The first four columns (according to the scheme of Hinz) of this passage (§ 70) deal very likely with the initiation of the Old Persian script, after this, however, already another subject is discussed, viz.: the further part of the text deals with the chancellery authentication and dispatch of the inscription as a document. How shall we imagine this whole procedure? In this part of § 70 we have to do obviously not with the great rock inscription itself but rather with the «draft» of it or the specimen text of it. We have pointed out already earlier, in connection with the Old Persian fragmentary inscription of Szamosújvár that on the basis of the Assyro-Babylonian practice we must presume a «draft» or specimen text written on clay tablets also in the case of the Old Persian inscriptions. Thus it is obvious to think that also the draft of the great inscription of Bisitun was written first on a clay tablet. The clay tablet inscribed in Old Persian cuneiform script was placed in a case-tablet and thereafter the Babylonian and Elamite versions of the inscription were written on this. The trilingual cuneiform text prepared this way was then wrapped up in parchment. This contained the Aramaic translation of the Old Persian inscription. After this the text was read to the Great King and after his approval it was sealed with his cylinder seal. Very likely only after this protocol procedure they carved the text of the inscription on the one hand in the rock walls, and on the other hand they copied it in Babylonian and Elamite languages on clay tablets, and in Aramaic language on parchment and dispatched the copies to the provinces of the Old Persian Empire.»[17] Later on I published the complete restoration and translation of the text of § 70 without a detailed argumentation in the «Ókori Keleti Történeti Chrestomathia» (Ancient Oriental Historical Chrestomathy) edited by me.[18] Now I should like to give a detailed explanation in the following.

II

Although it is a generally accepted fact that the basic text of the Bisitun inscription was written in Old Persian language and that this way the Elamite and Babylonian versions are translations of the Old Persian text, in the investigation of § 70 it is still reasonable to start out from the Elamite translation, because the text of this has been preserved fully, and besides this its interpreta-

---

[17] J. HARMATTA: Ant. Tan. 11 (1964) 189—190, and Acta Ant. Hung. 12 (1964) 218.
[18] Ókori Keleti Történeti Chrestomathia (Ancient Oriental Historical Chrestomathy). Budapest 1964. 320.

tion can be traced back to an old past, so much so that now already only the interpretation of a few phrases can be disputed in it. The Elamite text of § 70 runs as follows:

line 1 ᵛda-ri-ia-ma-u-iš ᵛLUGÀL na-an-ri
      2 ṣa-u-mi-in ᵈu-ra-maš-da-na
      3 ᵛú ʰtup-pi-me da-a-e-ik-ki ḫu-ud-da
      4 ḫar-ri-ia-ma ap-pa šá-iš-šá in-ni šà-ri
      5 ku-ud-da ḫa-la-at-uk-ku ku-ud-da KUŠᴵᴿ-uk-ku
      6 ku-ud-da ʰḫi-iš ku-ud-da e-ip-pi ḫu-ud-da
      7 ku-ud-da tal-li-ik ku-ud-da ʰú ti-íb-ba be-íb-ra-ka₄
      8 me-ni ʰtup-pi-me am-mín-nu ᵛda-a-ia-ú-iš mar-ri-da-ḫa-ti-ma ᵛú
         tin-gi-ia
      9 ᵛtaš-šu-íb-be sa-pi-iš

1. In connection with the interpretation of the Elamite text the first problem is the meaning of the word *tup-pi-me*. In Elamite the word *tup-pi* 'clay tablet, document, inscription' is well known and the function of the formative syllable *-me* is also quite clear, viz. it is a suffix of abstract or eventually of collective.[19] Thus the meaning of the word *tup-pi-me* could be either 'writing' in the abstract sense or 'document' in the collective sense. W. Foy[20] thought for the first time of the possibility to interpret the word *tup-pi-me* in the abstract sense as 'writing'. This opinion was adopted also by W. Hinz, and in 1942 and 1952 he tried to support this with a detailed argumentation. His more important arguments were as follows: 1. The concept 'inscription' is expressed in the Bisitun inscription always with the word *tup-pi*. 2. The Old Persian word *dipi-* meaning 'inscription' is feminine, while in the Old Persian text the neutral *dipi-* corresponds to the Elamite form *tup-pi-me*. 3. In the text of the Persepolis Fortification Tablet No. 7903 the word *tup-pi-me* appears also with the meaning 'writing'.[21] The interpretation of Hinz was adopted also by J. Friedrich, who translated the Old Elamite word *tu₄-up-pi-me* also as 'writing'.[22]

First of all I. M. D'yakonov and I. M. Oranskiy endeavoured to deny the interpretation of W. Hinz. The main argument of them against the abstract interpretation 'writing' of the word *tup-pi-me* is that in § 70 Dareios obviously does not speak about the Old Persian cuneiform script in general, but about the text of the Bisitun inscription in particular, viz.: he dispatches this to the provinces.[23] And since Dareios in line 8, where he speaks about the dispatch of

[19] See F. H. WEISSBACH: Die Achämenideninschriften zweier Art. Leipzig 1890. 54; H. H. PAPER: The Phonology and Morphology of Royal Achaemenid Elamite. Ann Arbor 1955. 84 fol.
[20] W. FOY: ZDMG 52 (1898) 564.
[21] W. HINZ: ZDMG 102 (1952) 30, earlier ZDMG 96 (1942) 345 foll.
[22] J. FRIEDRICH: Orientalia 18 (1949) 20.
[23] J. M. D'YAKONOV: ВДИ 89 (1964) 177 foll.; I. M. ORANSKIY: ВДИ 96 (1966) 114 foll.

the text of the inscription — we can add to their argumentation --, uses also the word *tup-pi-me*, thus it is evident that the phrase must occur in line 3 too with the concrete meaning 'inscription, text'. If the interpretation of Hinz were correct, then the word *tup-pi-me* ought to stand at the first place and the word *tup-pi* at the second place. D'yakonov also refers to the circumstance that the word *tup-pi-me* appears in the Susa documents too with the meaning 'text, document'. In final conclusion both D'yakonov and Oranskiy are of the opinion that the clause of the Elamite version, which speaks about the inscription as something «that did not exist earlier» should not be referred to the character of the script, but it must be understood so that such a monumental inscription in Iranian language was not set by anybody before Dareios.

Against the abstract interpretation 'writing' of the word *tup-pi-me* undoubtedly convincing is the argument according to which in line 8 of the inscription this phrase refers to the Bisitun inscription, consequently it has definitely the concrete meaning 'text, inscription'. Thus, of course, the abstract meaning 'writing' of the word cannot be proved also in line 3. If, however, we give up this interpretation, then the question arises, why did the drafter of the Elamite text use here the phrase *tup-pi-me*, although the word *tup-pi* also would have been sufficient.[24] Naturally, it would be obvious to think that this usage of the Elamite text is connected in this passage with some special use of the word *dipi-* of the Old Persian original, as this was supposed also by Hinz. Since, however, the interpretation of the form of *dipi-* in the Old Persian text means a separate problem itself, therefore it is reasonable to disregard this relationship for the time being and to attempt the interpretation of the word *tup-pi-me* on the basis of the Elamite data.

As it was pointed out by D'yakonov, the word *tup-pi-me* occurs also in the Susa documents. Its occurrence in these texts is mainly therefore important from the viewpoint of the definition of its more exact meaning, because its use here seemingly coincides with that of the word *tup-pi*. The study of the following texts is most important:

No. 184 PAP ^{m}bar-ri-man-na ḫu-ma-ka tup-pi-me ḫal-mi ḫa-ra-ka$_4$ ^{m}bar-ri-man du-iš i ^{GIŠ}ka$_4$-par-ma máš-te-na GIŠ ḫu-ut-tuk-ki kap-nu-iš-ki-ip-be

No. 185 tup-⌈pi⌉ ḫi ti-ip-pan-na ^{m}bar-ri-man-ik-ki ḫi ^{GIŠ}ka$_4$-par-man-na

No. 186 tup-pi [ḫi] ^{GIŠ}ka$_4$-par-ma-na ḫi [ti-ip-pan-na] ^{m}bar-ri-man-ik-ki[25]

---

[24] The explanation of E. HERZFELD: Zoroaster and his World. I. 34 «here tip.pi.me, which makes the meaning collective ..., unmistakably so because the El. text says "as it had never existed before$_5$"», is of course not satisfactory, because the negation does not involve necessarily the collective plural and besides this at the second place of occurrence there is no negative sentence after the word *tup-pi-me*.

[25] YU. B. YUSIFOV: Эламские хозяйственные документы из Суз. ВДИ 85 (1963) 221, 237.

Let us start with the latter ones. Yu. B. Yusifov gave recently the following interpretation of these documents:

No. 185 «This document, after it has been written for Barriman, then it must be placed in the archive.»

No. 186 «This document must be placed in the archive, after it was written for Barriman.»

However, also several considerations contradict to this interpretation. First of all in the Elamite text there is no trace of succession in time expressed in the translation. This is shown well also by the fact that the order of the two sentences according to content is just the opposite to each other. Then it is not clear, why would the text stress that the document should be written for the first time for Barriman and only thereafter it should be placed in the archive, since as long as it has not been written, it could not be placed in the archive any way. Finally it is not clear either, why should the document be written for Barriman, if it will be placed in the archive at any rate.

However, all these difficulties are solved, if we observe that the quoted passages consist actually of two co-ordinate clauses, the construction of which is identical. If we compare the two passages with each other, then it becomes immediately clear from the parallel of the contrasting parts that both in No. 185 and No. 186 we must complete the word *tup-pi* before the second *ḫi* and the predicate after the *ḫi* according to contents. Thus the two documents can be interpreted as follows:

No. 185 «This document should be written for Barriman, this (document should be left) in the archive.»

No. 186 «This document (should be left) in the archive, this (document) should be written for Barriman.»

On the basis of this interpretation we can easily clarify the role of Barriman in the documents under discussion. These documents were prepared in two copies, viz.: one of the copies was given to Barriman, with whose affairs the document dealt, while the other copy was placed in the archive for preservation. Knowing this now also the third document with different text can be interpreted, viz.:

No. 184 «The whole has been taken over from Barriman. The seal has been put on the document (coll.) Barriman received it. This should be left in the archive. The prepared objects (should be handed over) to the treasurers.»

This document throws light on the administration of the Susa Treasury. Barriman furnished the articles, which have been prepared. On this two documents were issued, which were sealed. One of them was given to Barriman, and the

second was left in the archive. The objects taken over came into the hands of the treasurers. Here the wording of the document renders it doubtless that we have to do with two documents, that is to say, with two copies of the same document, because it says on the one hand that Barriman has received the document, and on the other hand it gives instruction that this — viz. the second copy of the document — should be left in the archive. In this relationship the use of the form *tup-pi-me* also becomes clear. It is doubtless that this occurs here with a collective meaning, as the denomination of the two copies of the document.

We can also give a similar interpretation of the Old Elamite form tu_4-*up-pi-me*. The fact that this does not mean 'writing' in the abstract sense, but denotes the concrete inscription itself, is proved partly by the context (*ak-ka* tu_4-*up-pi-me me-el-ka-an-ra* «who changes the inscription [coll.]»), and partly by the fact that the Accadian version of the inscription translates the word tu_4-*up-pi-me* with the phrase *tup-pa-šu* «inscription» (Acc.). The explanation of the form tu_4-*up-pi-me* is obviously also here that the inscription was prepared in two specimens, viz.: in Elamite and Accadian languages and thus it was obvious to call the two versions of the inscription in the collective sense «inscription».

Thus the Elamite word *tup-pi-me* and Old Elamite tu_4-*up-pi-me*, on the basis of the data discussed, involves a characteristic possibility of expression of the Elamite language, viz. it means such an inscription or document, which has several specimens, versions or eventually parts, but forms a unity. As a matter of fact this cannot be translated accurately into Indo-European languages, the plural which can be taken into consideration for this purpose, could denote also several different inscriptions. To a certain extent we can compare with this phenomenon the use of the plural sign $HI.A$ in Old Babylonian, which, in contrast to the plural sign $MEŠ$ denoting the plurality of the entities, means always collective plurality.[26]

Returning to the Elamite text of § 70 of the Bisitun inscription, it can hardly be doubted that in this the word *tup-pi-me* also occurs with a similar meaning. The Bisitun inscription with its long text divided into columns in its concrete appearance created also the impression of a unity forming a collective plurality, and thus for its designation in Elamite in the first place the phrase *tup-pi-me* could be taken into consideration. The question can, however, be raised with justification that in case this is so, why does the Bisitun inscription use the word *tup-pi* in all places of its occurrence apart from § 70. The reason of the differing usage can be that in all the other cases we have to do not with the concrete form of appearance of the inscription, but with the text or contents of the inscription and thus these passages could not create the impression of plurality. This is clearly shown by the context in each case, viz.:

[26] See S. SMITH: The Statue of Idri-mi. London 1949. 25.

DB IV 41—42 hya : aparam : imām : dipim : patiparsāh^{n}y
«you who will later read this text of inscription»

DB IV 48   hya : aparam : imām : dipim : patiparsātiy
«he who will later read this text of inscription»

DB IV 47   ahyāyā : dipiyā : naiy : nipištam
«in this text of inscription is not written»

DB IV 70   hya : aparam : imām : dipim : vaināh^{a}y
«you who will later see this text of inscription»

DB IV 72—73 yadiy : imām : dipim : vaināh^{a}y

DB IV 77   yadiy : imām : dipim ... vaināh^{a}y.
«if you will see this text of inscription»

In all these passages the verbal forms *patiparsāh^{a}y, patiparsātiy, nipištam, vaināh^{a}y* render it doubtless that the inscription is specified as a text. In a similar context appears the word *dipi-* also in the Van inscription of Xerxes, viz.:

XV 23—25 adam : niyaštāyam : imām : dipim : nipaištanaiy
«I ordered this text of inscription to be written on it»

The word *dipi-* occurs similarly with the predicate *nipištām akunauš* 'caused to be inscribed' in XV 22—23. In contrast to this in DB IV 89 beside the word *dipi-* stands the predicate *akunavam* 'I caused to be made' and in DB IV 91—92 the predicate *frāstāyam* 'I sent', which clearly refer to the concrete form of appearance of the inscription. Thus it seems likely that in the Elamite version the use of the forms *tup-pi* and *tup-pi-me* reflects the use of the Old Persian word *dipi-* with different meanings. Of course, it is striking that the Elamite translation expressed also morphologically the semantic fineness of the Old Persian original not perceptible from the morphological point of view. This phenomenon would be much more comprehensible if the Old Persian original in § 70, differently from the other passages, would use the plural of the word *dipi-* and this would have been rendered by the Elamite translator with a fine interpretation with the form *tup-pi-me* having the collective suffix.

2. The interpretation of the word *da-a-e-ik-ki* is also disputed. As the word *da-a-e* corresponds to the Old Persian word *aniyā* in several passages of the Bisitun inscription (for example Elamite version I 36) and thus its meaning is 'other' and the element *-ik-ki* could be identified as a locative suffix, earlier investigation attributed to this phrase the meaning 'elsewhere' or 'in another way'.[27] W. Hinz adopted first the second analysis,[28] but later on he changed his view and, regarding the element *-ik-ki* as an adjectival suffix, ascribed to the word *da-a-e-ik-ki* the meaning 'andersartig'.[29] In this he was governed by two

[27] Cp. F. H. WEISSBACH: Die Achämenideninschriften zweier Art. 50, 94, 104, and Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden. Leipzig 1911. 71.
[28] W. HINZ: ZDMG 96 (1942) 346.
[29] W. HINZ: ZDMG 102 (1952) 29.

considerations. One of them was that the form *da-a-ki*, obviously equivalent with *da-a-e-ik-ki*, occurs in adjectival function (for example XPh 35 *da-a-ki-da šà-ri* = Old Persian *aniyašcᵃ* : *āha* «there was also other»), and the other is that in DSj 2 in the Elamite version the form *da-a-ki-lu-ra-ka₄* and not *da-a-ki* or *da-a-e-ik-ki* correspond to the Old Persian phrase *aniyaθā* 'otherwise'. Again another interpretation of the phrase *da-a-e-ik-ki* was given by I. M. D'yakonov who, relying upon the fact that in the Old Persian version *patišam* corresponds to it, which was translated by R. Kent with the meaning 'besides',[30] presumed its meaning to be 'besides this'.[31]

In connection with these different opinions first of all the following facts must be taken into consideration. 1. Neither the form *da-a-e-ik-ki*, nor the form *da-a-ki* occur with the meaning 'elsewhere'. 2. Only the form *da-a-e* and the plural forms *da-a-ip, da-a-ib-be* are used in adjectival function, as attribute (DB I 27, 31, 36, 51; III 78, 79) and out of 6 cases in 5 cases they are linked to the noun with the relative pronoun *ap-pa*. 3. The form *da-a-ki* is used only independently, in a substantival function. 4. On the basis of the Persepolis Treasury Tablets and the Persepolis Fortification Tablets G. G. Cameron and R. T. Hallock interpreted the meaning of the word *lu-ra-ka₄* (variants: *lu-ri-ka₄*, *lu-ri-ik-ka₄, lu-ᵣrak(?)-ka₄*) at a high probability as 'single'.[32] As a result of this in DSj 2 we must regard not the phrase *da-a-ki-lu-ra-ka₄* but only the word *da-a-ki* as the equivalent of the Old Persian *aniyaθā* 'otherwise'. Thus the meaning 'otherwise' of the form *da-a-ki* can be regarded as sure. 5. The forms *da-a-e-ik-ki* and *da-a-ki* can very likely be regarded only as orthographical variants, as this possibility was considered also by W. Hinz. In fact in the form *da-a-e* we cannot attribute to the *e* the function of a possessive pronoun 3rd person, because — in contrast to the word *ḫi-še* 'his name' — the context does not render any basis for this. The spelling *-a-a-e* occurs also in the word *a-ia-a-e*, which is the Elamite transliteration of the Old Persian form *ahyāyā*. Taking this into consideration, the written form *da-a-e* can be interpreted as **taya*. However, the plural of the word *da-a-e* is *da-a-ip, da-a-ib-be*, that is **tayp*, and since in the phrases *ᵈna-ap ap-pa da-a-ib-be* «the other gods» and *ᵛda-a-ia-u-iš ap-pa da-a-e* «the other provinces» there is no difference between the functions of the forms *da-a-e* and *da-a-ib-be* (apart from the circumstance that the former is singular and the latter plural), it is obvious that we must not attribute a special importance to the *-e*. Thus the meaning 'otherwise' must be regarded as sure also for the form *da-a-e-ik-ki *tayaki*. 6. The meaning 'besides' of the Old Persian word *patišam*, derived by Kent on an etymological basis, cannot be accepted, as we shall see later on. Thus the meaning 'besides this'

[30] R. G. KENT: Old Persian. 132.
[31] I. M. D'YAKONOV: ВДИ 89 (1964) 177.
[32] Cf. G. G. CAMERON: JNES 24 (1965) 181—182.

of the form *da-a-e-ik-ki,* which cannot be confirmed on the basis of the available data, will be discarded automatically.

On the basis of the above argumentation in § 70 we can count only with two meanings of the word *da-a-e-ik-ki,* viz.: 1. 'other (thing)' (noun) and 2. 'otherwise' (adverb). The choice between the two alternatives is easy. It is evident that in the context $^v\acute{u}$ ^htup-pi-me da-a-e-ik-ki $\dot{h}u$-ud-da the substantival interpretation 'other (thing)' would have no meaning («I caused to prepare the inscription, other thing» ? ?). Thus of the presumable meanings of the word *da-a-e-ik-ki* only the adverbial meaning fits into the context, and so besides the meaning 'otherwise' all other interpretations must be regarded as unlikely.[33]

3. The differences of opinion in respect of the subordinate clause *ap-pa šá-iš-šá in-ni šà-ri* are similarly significant. Here not the meaning of the clause itself is disputed, in this respect a uniform opinion has been evolved for a considerably long time. It is disputed, however, whether the clause should be related to the phrase preceding it or to the one following it. F. H. Weissbach and W. Hinz correlating the clause with the phrase *ḫar-ri-ia-ma* preceding the clause, translated it as follows: «auf arisch, was vormals nicht war»[34] or «auf arisch, was es vordem nicht gab».[35] On the other hand G. G. Cameron gave the following interpretation of this passage: «in other ways I fashioned inscriptions *in Aryan* (ways) which formerly did not exist: both on baked bricks and upon leather (parchments).»[36] A similar interpretation was given also by I. M. D'yakonov, viz.: «я текст, кроме того, сделал по-арийски, какого прежде не имелось, и на тадлетках, и на коже».[37] The translation of J. M. Stève essentially agrees with these, but regarding the word *da-a-eik-ki* he accepts the interpretation of Hinz, viz.: «J'ai fait une inscription différente, ce qui auparavant n'avait pas été fait: en aryan et sur l'argile et sur la peaux . . .»[38] Both trends have several representatives and naturally the two contrasting interpretations derive entirely different historical conclusions from § 70. It is interesting, however, that the syntactic position of the subordinate clause was not examined by anybody thoroughly, but it was almost self-evidently referred either to the preceding or to the subsequent phrase.

It can be decided only by the examination of the relative pronoun and conjunction *ap-pa,* which of the two possible interpretations is correct. Since in such cases the usage can be also individual to a certain extent, it is reasonable

---

[33] We are not dealing here with the question of the element *-ik-ki* (adjectival formative syllable, suffix of adverb of place, or postposition ?), as it is not of decisive importance from the viewpoint of interpretation, see on this recently R. T. HALLOCK: JNES 17 (1958) 261 foll.

[34] F. H. WEISSBACH: Die Keilschriften der Achämeniden. 71; W. HINZ: ZDMG 96 (1942) 348.

[35] W. HINZ: ZDMG 102 (1952) 33.

[36] G. G. CAMERON: Persepolis Treasury Tablets. Chicago 1948. 29.

[37] I. M. D'YAKONOV: ВДИ 89 (1964) 178.

[38] J. M. STÈVE with R. GHIRSHMAN: JNES 24 (1965) 249.

to confine the investigation to the text of the Bisitun inscription. In the Bisitun inscription the following cases of the usage of the word *ap-pa* can be distinguished:

A/ 1. Conjunction = Old Persian *tya* 'that' I 25, 40 to introduce an object subordinate clause

   2. Conjunction = Old Persian *tya* '(so)that' III 62 to introduce a consecutive clause

   3. Conjunction = Old Persian *yaθā* 'as if' I 54 to link a comparative clause

   4. Conjunction = Old Persian yaθā 'as' I 47, 51/52; III 68 always in the idiomatic expression *sa-ap ap-pa*, to link adverbial clauses

   5. Conjunction = Old Persian *(pasāva) yaθā* 'after that' I 22 in the idiomatic expression, *ma-ni sa-ap ap-pa*, to link adverbia clauses of time

B/ 1. Pronoun = 'which' (singular and plural) it has no equivalent in Old Persian I 18, 27, 31, 36, 51

                    Old Persian *hya* I 62, 67; II 18, 19, 23, 27, 31, 35, 39, 42, 46, 62, 64, 70, 81, 83; III 3, 11, 15, 26, 29

                    Old Persian *tya* I 63

                    Old Persian *tyam* I 77; II 18, 31, 35, 43, 47, 52, 64, 72, 76, 83; III 11, 15, 25, 29

                    Old Persian *tyām* III 94

                    Old Persian *tyai-, tyaiy* I 44; II 57; III 17, 18, 79

                    In all these cases the relative pronoun *ap-pa* introduces attributive nominal clause or attributive construction, type: III 29 ᵛ*taš-šu-ip ap-pa* ᵛ*ú-ni-na* «the army, which is mine» or II 23 ᵛ*taš-šu-ip ap-pa* ᵛ*be-ti-ip* «the army (Acc.), which is revolting». It refers in all cases to the phrase preceding it.

   2. Pronoun = Old Persian *tya* I 47; III 71, 74

                    Old Persian *tyā-* I 50

                    Old Persian *tyaiy* III 78

                    In these cases the relative pronoun *ap-pa* introduces attributive clauses with verbal predicate, type: III 74 *ap-pa* ᵛ*u ḫu-ud-da* «what I did». It refers in all cases to the phrase preceding it.

   3. Pronoun = Old Persian *(imā) . . . tyā* or *(imām) . . . tyám* I 9—10, 15 21; III 47, 61, 66, 67, 77, 84

In these cases the relative pronoun *ap-pa* links attributive clauses with verbal predicate, which in the main clause are always preceded by the demonstrative pronoun *ḫi* 'this'. From the viewpoint of the contents the subordinate clause always refers to this, type: *ḫi ap-pa* ^{v}*ú ḫu-ud-da* «this, what I have done» (III 47) or ^{v}*nu ak-ka$_4$ me-iš-ši-in* ^{h}*tup-pi ḫi ṣi-ia-in-ti ap-pa* ^{v}*ú tal-li-ra* «thou, who later wilt see this inscribed text, which I caused to be written» (III 84—85).

4. Pronoun   = Old Persian *tya . . . (ava)* I 16; III 67, 87, 89 and I 52 (here in Old Persian the demonstrative pronoun *ava* is missing). In these examples the relative pronoun *ap-pa* introduces attributive clauses with verbal predicate, which refer always to the phrase or sentence following them. In the latter, however, always the demonstrative pronoun *ḫu-uḫ-be*, *ḫu-be* refers to the word *ap-pa*, type: I 16 *ap-pa* ^{v}*ú ap ti-ri-ia* ^{d}*ši-ut-ma-na* ^{d}*na-a-ma-na-ma ḫu-uḫ-be ḫu-ud-da-iš* «what I told them day and night, they did it». The demonstrative pronoun *ḫu-be* is such an essential accessory of this construction that — as it is shown by I 52 — it is put out even if the Old Persian text does not use the demonstrative pronoun *ava*.

5. Pronoun   = it has no equivalent in Old Persian, I 68—69 *me-ni* ^{v}*ú* ^{v}*taš-šu-ip maš-ka-um-ma sik-ka$_4$-ka$_4$ ap-pa ANŠU.-A.AB.BA^{lg}-ma ap-pi-in be-ip-la ap-pa-pa ANŠU.-KUR.RA^{lg}-ir be-ip-li-ib-ba*. The correct interpretation of this passage involves several difficulties even after the new readings of G. G. Cameron.[39] First of all it is not clear, why does Cameron give the form *ap-pa* instead of the first part of the pair of pronouns *ap-pa-pa . . . ap-pa-pa* read earlier and since he quotes the text only up to the second pronoun *ap-pa-pa*, we do not know, whether he read the form *ap-pa* also instead of this or the first form *ap-pa* also came about only as a result of a mistake. Besides this the whole passage is full of constructions with hiatuses, which can obviously be regarded as the results of the effort to avoid repetitions.

[39] G. G. CAMERON: JCS 14 (1960) 64.

Considering this we can interpret this passage as follows:
«Then I caused the army to be put on leather
(botles), (the army), which (was mounted) on
camels, I put (on camels), the (army) which (was)
mounted on horses, I put (those on horses)». As we can
see, the structure of the sentence unites in itself types 1
and 4, inasmuch as the attributive phrase or nominal
clause beginning with the pronoun *ap-pa* refers to the
word *^{v}taš-šu-ip*, but at the same time in the following
main clause the personal pronoun 3rd person *ap-pi-in*
refers back to the pronoun *ap-pa*. If, however, in this
passoge we still have to count with the reading *ap-pa-pa . . .
ap-pa-pa* and we must separate it from the relative pro-
noun *ap-pa*, giving to it the interpretation 'certain
people, one part . . . others, other part', then the evidence
of the structure of the sentence will, of course, become
indifferent from the viewpoint of our investigation.[40]

Summing up the results of the investigation regarding the use of the rela-
tive pronoun or conjunction *ap-pa*, we can state that the subordinate clause
ap-pa šá-iš-šá in-ni šà-ri occurring in § 70 represents undoubtedly type B/2,
and thus it can only refer to the phrase preceding it. So the possibility, accord-
ing to which the assertion of the subordinate clause should refer to the sub-
sequent phrase, can be excluded with an entire surety. This result agrees also
with the evidence of the Old Persian original. In this after the phrase *ariyā : āha*
= Elamite *har-ri-ia-ma*, clearly enough a new sentence starts, because in the
initial *ga-ra-[* following after *utā : pavastāyā : utā : carmā*, we must by
all means see a predicate. The Elamite translator, however, did not translate
the Old Persian verbal form of special meaning, but he linked the Elamite
passage corresponding to the quoted Old Persian phrase to the subsequent
predicate *hu-ud-da*. The structure *ku-ud-da . . . ku-ud-da . . ., ku-ud-da . . .
ku-ud-da . . . hu-ud-da* came about this way.

We must also remark that the relative pronoun *ap-pa* does not occur
anywhere in the Bisitun inscription with the meaning 'such as, as', so that we
cannot attribute to it such a meaning in the sentence *ap-pa šá-iš-šá in-ni
šà-ri* either.

4. In connection with the word *šà-ri* I. M. D'yakonov expressed the
opinion that this is not a verbal form, but an adjective with the meaning

---

[40] In the investigation I disregarded the passages I 33 *^{v}LUGAL^{lg}-me [hu-be ap]*
-pa . . . = Old Persian *aita . . . tya* and II 60 *[^{v}ap-pi] . . . ap-pa*, because the restoration
of these is not quite reassuring.

'being, existing'.[41] This opinion was based very likely on the observation
that the form *šà-ri* can be fitted with difficulty in the system of the Elamite
verbal forms. The decision of the question is difficult. In itself, on the basis of a
formal analysis the verbal character of the word *šà-ri* cannot be denied, because
the forms of the substantive verb in most of the languages are outside the
general system of verbal forms. It is doubtless that the form *šà-ri* in the Bisitun
inscription always corresponds to the inflected forms of the Old Persian sub-
stantive verb,[42] and it is difficult to presume an adjective with the meaning
'being, existing', which, however, would not be the derivative of the verb 'to
be'. On the other hand, the form *šà-ri* does not seem to be a participle, because
in DB II 69 its form *šà-ri-ir* occurs, and this can be interpreted as a participle,
although in the Old Persian version its equivalent is *āha* 'was' also here, viz.:
ᵛmi-iš-da-aš-ba ʳ*ú* ʳ*ad-da-da* ʰ*par-tu-maš* *šà-ri-ir* *ḫu-pir-ri* . . . «Vištāspa, my
father being in Parθava him . . .». From the morphological point of view a good
parallel is rendered to this by the form *ut-tar-ra* 'doing, acting'.[43] The character
as a verbal form of the word *šà-ri* would be supported by the form *šà-ri-ka* (!)
reconstructed by Cameron in DB III 78.[44] In the inscription, however, we can
read *šà-ri-na* and even if this is very likely the mistake of the engraver of the
inscription, from the epigraphic point of view it is more obvious to correct it
into the form *šà-ri-ba* (!), because in the signs *na* and *ba* the number of horizon-
tal and vertical wedges is exactly identical, and in the case of reading *ba* the cler-
ical error would only be that the engraver incised the central horizontal
wedge somewhat to the left from the other two wedges, instead of having
arranged it a little to the right. In this case the form *šà-ri-ba* (!) could be the
plural 3rd person «connective» form of an intransitive verb *šà-ri-*.[45] Thus — al-
though in the Elamite inscription of Mālamīr also the meaning 'being, existing'
of the word *šà-ri* would fit into the context[46] — for the time being it is more
likely to regard the form *šà-ri* as a verb.

5. I. M. D'yakonov attempted to give a new interpretation of the phrases
ti-ib-ba, *am-min-nu* and *mar-ri-da*. In his translation the word *ti-ib-ba*
appears with the interpretation 'действительно(?)', *am-min-nu* with the
interpretation 'повсюду (?)', and *mar-ri-da* with the interpretation 'я взял'.[47]
But these phrases occur also elsewhere in the Elamite inscriptions of the
Achaimenian period and we also know their exact Old Persian equivalents. The

---

[41] I. M. D'YAKONOV: ВДИ 89 (1964) 177.
[42] See G. G. CAMERON: JCS 14 (1960) 63.
[43] G. G. CAMERON: *loc cit.*
[44] G. G. CAMERON: *loc. cit.*
[45] On the concept of the «connective» verbal forms see R. T. HALLOCK: JNES 18
(1959) 5.
[46] See the publication and interpretation of the inscription in W. HINZ: Die ela-
mische Inschriften des Hanne. A Locust's Leg. Studies in Honour of S. H. Taqizadeh.
London 1962. 105 ff.
[47] I. M. D'YAKONOV: ВДИ 89 (1964) 178.

270 J. HARMATTA

Old Persian equivalents of the word *ti-ib-ba* are *fra-* and *upariy*, and its meaning is 'before, ahead, earlier'.[48] The word *am-min-nu* occurs in DB I 34 in the phrase *ᵛLUGAL-me am-min-nu* = Old Persian *aita : xsaçam*, thus its meaning is 'this, (the) same'.[49] The form *mar-ri-da* is in DB I 62 the translation of the Old Persian *haruva* and in DNa 39—40 the translation of the Old Persian form *visam*, its meaning is 'all, every'.[50] In the phrase *ᵛda-a-ia-ú-iš mar-ri-da-ḫa-ti-ma* from the syntactic point of view the form *mar-ri-da* could not be interpreted as a verb even otherwise.

6. The interpretation of the last word of § 70 meant a difficult problem from the very beginning. After earlier guessings, W. Hinz ascribed to the word *sa-pi-iš* the meaning 'sie erlernten'.[51] I. M. D'yakonov recently proposed the translation ' постиг (?)'.[52] Since the verb *sa-pi-* occurs in the Bisitun inscription only here, and the context does not render any foothold for the determination of its meaning, its interpretation is possible only with the help of the Old Persian original and its other occurrences. The Old Persian original is already known to us as a result of the efforts made by G. G. Cameron in 1951, but the opinions considerably differ also regarding the interpretation of this word. Thus in practice we can rely only upon those data of the Persepolis Fortification Tablets, which were published by R. T. Hallock.[53] These two data are as follows: Persepolis Fortification Tablet No. 7903, 3—5 *pu-ḫu bar-šib-be tup-pi-me sa-pi-man-ba*. The interpretation of the text according to Hallock is as follows: «Persian youths (who) are copying (?) inscription(s)», while Hinz proposed the translation «Persische Knaben, die die Schrift lernen». Hallock, besides the interpretation 'to copy', thinks possible also the interpretations 'to translate, to read'. The second passage is as follows:

Persepolis Fortification Tablet No. 2934, 4—10 *ḫal-mi ba-ka₄-gi-ia-na-ma saap-KI.MIN ḫu-be-ma ap-pa man-ṣa-na-na-ši ku-iṣ.*

According to Hallock's interpretation:

«According to the sealed document of Bakagiya, according to that copy (?) which Manṣananaṣi carried.»

If we examine these two contexts of the verb *sa-pi*, we can state that these do not render possible either the definition of the exact local meaning of the form *sa-pi-iš* occurring in § 70. First of all we have to point out that the context does not prove either of the recommended meanings 'learn, copy, translate, read' of the verb *sa-pi-*. The presumed meaning 'copy' of the word *sa-ap-KI.-MIN* from the quoted passage cannot be proved either. As regards document

[48] See W. HINZ: ZDMG 96 (1942) 347, and ZDMG 102 (1952) 31; G. G. CAMERON: Persepolis Treasury Tablets. 126, Die Welt des Orients 2 (1959) 475; R. T. HALLOCK: JNES 24 (1965) 272.
[49] W. HINZ: ZDMG 102 (1952) 31 foll.
[50] See already F. H. WEISSBACH: Die Achämenideninschriften zweier Art. 107.
[51] W. HEINZ: ZDMG 96 (1942) 348, ZDMG 102 (1952) 32.
[52] I. M. D'YAKONOV: ВДИ 89 (1964) 178.
[53] R. T. HALLOCK: JNES 9 (1950) 244.

No. 7903 of the Persepolis Fortification Tablets, this can at any rate be paral-
lelled with the Persepolis Treasury Tablet No. 9, which partly on the basis of
the suggestions of E. Benveniste and R. T. Hallock[54] can be restored as
follows:

line   4   . . . hhkur-taš ap-[pa hhat-ti-ip]
        5   a-ak hhmu-ṣir-ri-ⁱiaⁱ-[ip GIŠGIŠˡᵍ]
        6   hhše-iš-ki-ip hhⁱakⁱ-[ka₄-be hšu-šá-]
        7   an-mar hba-ir-šá-ⁱišⁱ[ši-nu-ip]
        8   hHAR hhhu-ut-ti-[ip hhak-ka₄-be]
        9   hi-ia-an hnu-pi-ⁱišⁱ[da-ma sa-pi-]
       10   man-ba . . .
                    «. . . workers, who are Syrians
             and Egyptians, wood-
             workers, who came
             from Susa to Persepolis
             stone-workers,
             who are working
             inscription in the palace . . .»

Cameron recommended here in line 9 originally the restoration [ḫu-ud-da-],[55]
but on the basis of Persepolis Fortification Tablet No. 7903 it is obvious to
think about the restoration [sa-pi]-man-ba also here. Whichever of the restora-
tions we accept, it seems to be likely that in both cases we have to do with
the workers employed in the preparation of the inscription. Thus the gen-
eral meaning of the verb sa-pi- is very likely 'works, acts on something, makes
something'.[56] In the Bisitun inscription, however, the meaning 'they worked,
they acted' of the verbal form sa-pi-iš would be so meaningless that we must
by all means think about some more specialized local meaning. This, however,
can be defined at the most with the help of the Old Persian version. On the
basis of the Elamite data we could suppose at the most that the verb sa-
pi- occurs at this place with some intellectual stress with the meaning 'to
work diligently, to work actively, to act well'.

On the basis of all these the Elamite version of § 70 can be translated as
follows:

line 1   «King Dārayavauš declares:
     2   by Auramazda's will

---

[54] E. BENVENISTE: JA 246 (1958) 59; R. T. HALLOCK: JNES 19 (1960) 97.
[55] G. G. CAMERON: Persepolis Treasury Tablets. 95.
[56] Since the relationship of the word sa-ap-KI.MIN (= *sapsap?) with the verb
sa-pi- is not at all clear and its meaning cannot be defined precisely either, it is reason-
able to disregard it in this connection.

line 3 I made the inscription (coll.) otherwise,

    4 in Āryan (language), which earlier did not exist.

    5 Both on clay tablet and on parchment,

    6 both my name and my origin I caused to be written on it.

    7 Both it was written and read before me.

    8 Thereafter I sent this inscription to all provinces.

    9 The army acted well (performed its duty well).»

Considering this interpretation of the Elamite version, from the view-point of the content § 70 can be divided into four units, viz.:

1. The novelty of the inscription; it was prepared in Āryan language (lines 2—4).

2. The protocol-like procedure of the authentication of the inscription (lines 5—7).

3. The dispatch of the inscription.

4. The effect of the inscription.

According to the evidence of this passage Dareios I really stated in the Bisitun inscription that he had this inscription prepared in Old Persian language, what had been unknown earlier. Of course, the Elamite version in itself does not decide the question whether it was really Dareios I who introduced the use of the Old Persian cuneiform script. Theoretically it is possible that the Elamite translation, to a certain extent, misunderstood the Old Persian or laid emphasis on another motive. Thus it is essential to control the results received on the basis of the interpretation of the Elamite version by the restoration of the Old Persian original.

III

Every attempt, which wants to restore the Old Persian text of § 70 of the Bisitun inscription, must start out from the new readings of G. G. Cameron. Later, on the basis of the suggestions of W. Hinz, the readings published in 1951 were revised and corrected by Cameron in several points.[57] This corrected text is as follows:

line 88   . . . θa-a-ta-i-ya : da-a-ra-ya-va-u-ša : xa-ša-a-ya-[θa-i]ya : va-ša-na-a : a-u-

    89 ra-[ma]-za-da-a-ha : i-ma : di-i-pa-i-⌜ma?⌝-i- [+ — + — + — + :] a-da-ma : a-ku-u-na-va-ma : pa-ta-i-ša-ma : a-ra-i-ya-a : a-ha : u-ta-a : ⌜pa⌝-va-sa-ta-

---

[57] G. G. CAMERON: JCS 5 (1951) 52; W. HINZ: ZDMG 102 (1952) 36—37; R. G KENT: JAOS (1952) 15.

line 90 a-y[a-a :] u-ta-a : ca-ra-ma-a : ga-ra-[+ — + — + — + — + — +]:
        [+ — +]-i-ša-ma-i-[+]-ya : [+ — + — + — +]-fa?-ma : a-ku-u-na-va-
        ma : ⌐pa-ta⌐-i-ša-[ma : +]-va-a-da-a-

     91 [+ — + — + — + — + — + — +] : u-ta-a : ⌐na-i-ya⌐-pa-i-[+]-⌐i⌐-
        [+ — +]-ma/ta-a⌐ : pa-ta⌐-i-ya-fa-⌐ra-ša-i⌐-ya : pa-i-[ša?⌐-i-ya-a : ma-
        a-[ma] : pa-sa-a-[va] : i-ma : di-

     92 i-pa-i-[+ : a]-da-ma : ⌐fa⌐-[+ — +]-sa/va-ta-a-ya-ma : ⌐vi-i⌐-[sa]-⌐pa⌐-
        da-a : a-ta-ra : da-ha-ya-a-[va] o : ka-a-ra : ha-ma-a-[ta]-xa-⌐ša]-ta-a

1. The difficulties in the Old Persian version start in line 89 with the
phrase *i-ma : di-i-pa-i-ma?-i-[*. Actually the nominative singular of the word
dipī- 'inscription' ought to stand here, but the form of the demonstrative
pronoun does not comply with this requirement. The word *dipī-* is feminine in
all other passages where it occurs and thus the form of the demonstrative pro-
noun ought to be here *iyam*. R. G. Kent really presumes this form here and
believes that the sign *ya* has been left out or we are having here a contracted
form *īm* of the pronoun *iyam*.[58] The difficulty of this conception is that later on
in lines 91 and 92 the phrase *i-ma : di-i-pa-i[* occurs again and this ought to be
here accusative singular. The form of the demonstrative pronoun, however,
even now does not correspond to the expectations, because instead of *imām* the
form *ima* can be read. Thus Kent was obliged to presume also here that either
the signs *a-ma* have been left out or the form *īm* derives from the basic root *ī-*
of the demonstrative pronoun, the latter assumption, however, is not held likely
by himself either.

W. Hinz attempted to solve these difficulties by the supposition that the
word *dipī-* occurs here in neuter with the abstract meaning 'writing'.[59] The
difficulties of this ingenious assumption has already been pointed out above.[60]
This explanation is denied also by the circumstance that in Old Persian
neither neutral *-i* stems are known nor the use of the neuter is attested in
an abstract sense parallel with a feminine of concrete meaning. These semantic
and lexicological difficulties render the assumption of a neutral word *dipī-*
unlikely.[61]

If we do not want to presume grave engraver's errors in the inscription
and want to bring the word *dipī-* into harmony with the occurring form of
the demonstrative pronoun, then the only possibility will be to restore
in line 89 the form *di-i-pa-i-ma-i-[* to *di-i-pa-i-ma-i-[ya]* and in lines 91—
92 the form *di-i-pa-i-[* to *di-i-pa-i-ya*, to interpret these as *dipīmaiy* and

---

[58] R. G. KENT: JCS 5 (1951) 56, JAOS 72 (1952) 14, 15.
[59] W. HINZ: ZDMG 102 (1952) 34.
[60] See also I. M. D'YAKONOV: B 89 (1964) 177—178; I. M. ORANSKIY: ВДИ 96
(1966) 112 ff.
[61] Therefore the supposition of HINZ was in general not accepted, except by W.
BRANDENSTEIN—M. MAYRHOFER: Handbuch des Altpersischen. 116.

dipiya, respectively, and to regard them as nominative plural and accusative plural. In Old Persian, on the basis of the Old Indian and Old Iranian data, we can presume **dipiya* as nominative plural of the word *dipi-* and **dipiya* or eventually **dipiš* as its accusative plural. The presumed form of the nominative plural is supported by the similarly plural feminine nominative form *aθangainiya* (DSf 45), while the accusative plural form has not yet been discovered in the Old Persian inscriptions. In the form *dipīmaiy*, which stands instead of the form **dipiyamaiy* to be expected, we have to do with the frequently occurring written form *-ī-* of *-iya* standing inside the word.[62] In the second passage the form *dipiya* exactly corresponds to the expected accusative plural, since however instead of *di-i-pa-i-[ya]* we can think eventually also of the restoration *di-i-pa-i-[ša]*, we cannot exclude the possibility of this accusative form either. The writing *i-ma* can be interpreted in both cases as *imā* with the repeatedly occurring defective writing of the final *-ā*.[63]

The interpretation of the phrases *ima : dipīmaiy* and *ima : dipiya* as nominative plural and accusative plural, respectively, renders at once comprehensible the use of the word *tup-pi-me* in the Elamite version instead of *tup-pi* used for the rendering of the singular forms of *dipi-*.

The gap following after the word *dipīmaiy*, in conformity with this interpretation, can be restored to *di-i-pa-i-ma-i-[ya : ta-ya-a :]* and the predicate *a-ha* can be interpreted as the 3rd person plural form *āha^n*.

2. The next problem is the interpretation of the word *pa-ta-i-ša-ma = patišam*. On basis of Greek and Latin analogies, R. G. Kent ascribed to the word the meaning 'in addition, besides'.[64] Essentially this interpretation is followed also by the translation 'überdies' of W. Hinz. The explanation of Kent has been generally accepted,[66] only M. A. Dandamaev differed from it to a certain extent, inasmuch as, using Kent's Greek and Latin semantic parallels, he tried to ascribe to the word the meaning 'to it, still, also'.[67]

Although this way an almost uniform opinion was formed regarding the interpretation of the word *patišam*, its meaning presumed by Kent still cannot be accepted. In fact from the methodological point of view it is obviously incorrect to define the meaning of an Old Persian word on the basis of Greek and Latin parallels, when the equivalent of the word is known to us also from another Old Iranian language. Curiously enough the circumstance has escaped the attention of the investigators of the past one and a half decades that the exact equivalent of *patišam* occurs also in the Avesta and with the help of this the meaning of the Old Persian word can be identified without any doubt. It is

---

[62] See R. G. KENT: Old Persian 13 foll.
[63] See R. G. KENT: Old Persian. 22.
[64] R. G. KENT: JCS 5 (1951) 55 foll., JAOS 72 (1952) 13, Old Persian. 195.
[65] W. HINZ: ZDMG 102 (1952) 37.
[66] See W. BRANDENSTEIN—M. MAYRHOFER: Handbuch des Altpersischen. 139.
[67] M. A. DANDAMAEV: Иран при первых Ахеменидах. 56.

even more strange that the circumstance also escaped the attention of the investigators dealing with § 70 that E. Herzfeld already in 1947 referred to the Avestan equivalent of the Old Persian word *patišam* and also to the fact that the Old Persian phrase is obviously the equivalent of the Elamite word *da-a-e-ik-ki*, although at that time the reading of the text rendered by Cameron was not yet available.[68]

In Avestan the word *paitiša-* corresponding to Old Persian *patišam* has the following meanings: as an adverb 1. 'in der Richtung nach — hin, nach -- zu', 2. 'nach vorn hin, vorn'; as an adjective 1. 'contrarius, widrig', 2. 'abweichend, ungleichartig'. As in the text after the word *patišam* the phrase *āriyā* 'in Aryan' follows as a closer definition, it is obvious that only the meaning 'abweichend, ungleichartig' fits into the context. Thus it cannot be doubted that the meaning of the word *patišam* is 'in a different way, otherwise' and that the Elamite phrase *da-a-e-ik-ki* represents the exact translation of this.

3. The next problem is rendered by the word *pa-va-sa-ta-a-ya-a* = *pavastāyā*. Before the new reading of Cameron this word was read as *a-va-sa-ta-+-ya*, which rendered its correct identification impossible for a long time. However, Herzfeld already at that time, without knowing the new reading, looked in it for the antecedent of the word *pōst* 'skin' and emended it to the form *pa-va-sa-ta*.[69] His assumption was justified by the new reading of Cameron, but the full knowledge of the Old Persian text unexpectedly resulted in a new difficulty, viz.: it turned out that the word *pavastā-* regarded as having the meaning 'skin, parchment' was rendered by the Elamite translation by the phrase *ha-la-at* 'clay tablet'. R. G. Kent interpreted the word *pavastā*, on the basis of Cameron's recommendation, first as 'papyrus'.[70] E. Benveniste, on the other hand, exactly on the basis of the Elamite word, attributed to the Old Persian phrase the meaning 'clay envelope of tablet'.[71] This was accepted later on also by Kent who interpreted the word as the compound of the prefix *pa* and the derivative of the verb *vah-*'to dress' with the meaning 'clay envelope of tablet'.[72] W. Hinz endeavoured to solve the contradiction between the meaning 'skin, parchment' of the Middle Persian development of the Old Persian word *pavastā* and the Elamite word *ha-la-at* 'clay tablet' by the supposition that in line 90 instead of the word *ga-ra-[* following after the word *carmā* it can be read *u-ta-[.* Thus in the gap he restored *ut[ā : (h)i-štā]* with the meaning 'und auf Lehmziegeln'.[73]

---

[68] E. HERZFELD: Zoroaster and his World. 34. This too shows that Herzfeld's book does not belong among the mostly read products of Iranian studies. W. B. HENNING'S remarks (Zoroaster. Politician or Witch-Doctor. London 1951. 4. foll.) have seemingly done their share.

[69] E. HERZFELD: Zoroaster and his World. 34, note 5.

[70] R. G. KENT: JCS 5 (1951) 56.

[71] E. BENVENISTE: Études sur le vieux-perse. BSLP 47 (1951) 43—46.

[72] R. G. KENT: JAOS 72 (1952) 14; Old Persian.² 219.

[73] W. HINZ: ZDMG 102 (1952) 34 foll.

The difficulty of this restoration is that the reading *ga-ra-*[seems to be sure and thus it cannot be corrected to *u-ta-*[, besides in this case the concepts «clay tablet» and «parchment» appearing in Elamite, «parchment», «skin» and «clay tablet» would correspond in Old Persian, and at the same time it is not at all clear what is the difference between «parchment» and «skin» as materials used for writing. A further difficulty is that the predicate is missing from the sentence, although [*pat*]*išamaiy* in the beginning of line 6 against the conjunctions *utā . . . utā* «both . . . and» of line 5, clearly points to a new sentence, thus line 5 cannot be linked to the predicate *akunavam* standing in the following line. On account of these conspicuous difficulties the explanation of Hinz was only partly accepted.[74] However, the explanation of Kent regarding the word *pavastā-* is not quite reassuring either, because the existence of variant *pa* of the particle *apa* cannot be regarded as completely insured even in the Avesta,[75] and it can be presumed even less in Old Persian. Therefore H. W. Bailey compared the Old Persian word *pavastā-*, the Old Indian *pavasta-* 'Decke, Hülle', Middle Persian *pōst*, Sangleči *pāsk* 'covering, skin', Munji *pūsto* 'tree bark' with the Saka words *pvīsta-* 'covered', *pvīš'-* to cover', *pvīysaka-* 'a covering thing, wrap', *pvecā-* 'something put on to a garment', and traced back the whole group of words to a root **pav-/*pu-* 'to cover'. According to him, from this root — the further relation of which he thinks to point out in Hittite, in the words *puwatti-* 'colour', *puwaliya-* 'piece of clothing', *putalliya-* 'put on clothes' — could be derived the word *pavastā-*, with the formative syllable *-sta-* occurring in the Middle Persian words *tapast* 'carpet' etc.[76]

This explanation would solve the problem of the word *pavastā-* very ingeniously, but this has also certain difficulties. As regards, in the first place, the Hittite data, of these the more exact meaning of the verb *putalliya-* is very likely '(Kleid) aufknüpfen (?), hochschürzen (?)', *i.e.* just the opposite of what we could expect in the case of relationship with the root **pav-*.[77] The meaning of the word *puwatti-* is uncertain, because the context of its occurrences is unknown. The presumed meaning 'Farbe, farbige Marke (als Eigentumszeichen)?' does not point at all to a relationship with the root **pav-*.[78] Finally the meaning of the word *puwaliya-* is not 'article of clothing' in general, but 'a certain article of clothing', viz. probably 'belt'.[79] Consequently, the Hittite data do not render any basis for the assumption of a root **pav-/*pu-* meaning 'to cover'.

---

[74] See for example W. BRANDENSTEIN —M. MAYRHOFER: Handbuch des Altpersischen. 140.

[75] See CHR. BARTHOLOMAE: Altiranisches Wörterbuch. Strassburg 1904. 816.

[76] H. W. BAILEY: The Preface to the Siddhasāra Śāstra. A Locust's Leg. Studies in Honour of S. H. Takizadeh. London 1962. 35 foll.

[77] See J. FRIEDRICH: Hethitisches Wörterbuch. 2. Ergänzungsheft. Heidelberg 1961. 21.

[78] Cp. J. FRIEDRICH: Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg 1952. 174.

[79] A. GÖTZE: Corolla Linguistica. Festschrift Ferdinand Sommer. Wiesbaden 1955. 59; J. FRIEDRICH: Hethitisches Wörterbuch. 1. Ergänzungsheft. Heidelberg 1957. 17.

Thus the enumerated Indo-Iranian data are isolated. But even of these not all are in relationship with each other. The Saka words phonologically can be traced back to the forms *pati-vaid-, *pati-vaiǰ- and *pati-vaič-. The eventually presumable other Iranian equivalents of the word pavastā- could all be also adoptions from Old Persian, so that in conclusion only the Old Persian and Old Indian words can be invariably regarded as fully acceptable data. The isolation of these words in the Old Iranian and Old Indian vocabularies renders the assumption of a separate root *pav-/pu- for their derivation rather unlikely. Thus we can think more of the possibility that these words are still compounds or internally formed elements of the Old Iranian and Old Indian vocabularies, developed in another way. The Old Iranian word could be divided into the elements pa- and vasta- and in its first part we could see the shortened form of the root pāy- (cp. Avestan pa-vant-, Old Indian -pa-), and in its second part the passive perfect participle of the verb vah- 'to dress'. The meaning of the compound could be 'protecting the dressed' or 'the protecting (cloth) put on' → 'protecting wrapper', 'protecting cloth', according to the presumed type of compound. Another possible interpretation could be to presume the word pavastā- to be such a derivation from the word pavant- 'protecting' as the Avestan word ašavasta- from the word ašavant-. Its meaning in this case could be 'protecting wrapper'. We may choose either of these solutions, the Old Indian form will still remain rather problematic at all events, in the first case because pavastā- does not seem to be a common Iranian word, and in the second case also because in Old Indian we could expect another phonemic form. It is possible that we still must regard the Old Indian word only as an old adoption from Old or Proto-Iranian, similar to the word atharvan-.

At any rate we can have no doubt about the relationship of the Old Persian and Old Indian words and thus it seems to be sure that the original meaning of the word pavastā- was not 'skin', but the more general 'protecting wrapper'. We can still raise the question, what is the explanation for the feminine gender of the Old Persian word. We could think that in accordance with the explanation given above the word was originally an adjective and thus it could stand beside the word dipī- 'clay tablet' also as an attribute. The word pavastā- 'clay envelop tablet' became independent later on from the phrase *pavastā dipi 'clay envelop tablet', while in a general meaning 'protecting wrapper' → 'skin' the form *pavasta- agreeing with Old Indian could be used.

4. The verbal form following after utā : pavastāyā : utā : carmā was restored by R. G. Kent as gra[θitā] and on the basis of the Old Indian verb grath-/granth- 'to bind, to bind together, to compile, to write (a literary work)' he presumed its meaning to be 'written, composed'.[80] The form restored by

---

[80] R. G. KENT: JCS 5 (1951) 56, JAOS 72 (1952) 14.

I

278   J. HARMATTA

Kent was already earlier corrected by me implicitly to gra[stā]⁸¹ and indepen-
dently from me, M. Mayrhofer proved the untenability of the form gra[θitā] in
a broader relationship also in detail.⁸² However, not only the form restored
by Kent was incorrect, but also the meaning attributed to it. In fact the mean-
ing 'to write, to compile' is only a specialized meaning of the Old Indian verb,
for the assumption of which in Old Persian we have no basis. Therefore, return-
ing to the basic meaning of the root grath-, I presumed the meaning 'bind, bind
together, wrap' also in Old Persian.⁸³ Thus the interpretation of the whole
passage will be as follows: «It was bound both in clay tablet and parchment.»
Thus this sentence clearly refers to the operation, in the course of which the
ready clay tablets were put, on the one hand, into clay envelope tablets and
they wrote on these the Babylonian or Elamite translation of the Old
Persian text, other specimens were, on the other hand, wrapped in the parch-
ment rolls containing the Aramaic translation. In accordance with the nomina-
tive plural ima : dipīmaiy after the word gra[stā we must, of course, restore
the plural form āhaⁿ also here.

Since the existence of the root *graθ- in Iranian is not quite doubtless,⁸⁴
restoring the passage we must take into consideration also other pos-
sibilities. We can think first of all still of two verbs. One of these is the root
grat-, the meaning of which is 'twist, spin', but it has also the specialized mean-
ing 'roll up, wrap'.⁸⁵ We can presume the passive perfect participle gr̥sta- of
this, the written form of which, however, would be in Old Persian the same as
that of the form grasta-. The other verb to be taken into consideration is graš-
'bind, link, connect', which in recent time is linked to the root graθ-,⁸⁶ but which
according to the evidence of its imperfect — as this has been pointed out by
me⁸⁷ — must undoubtedly be separated from it. The passive perfect participle of
this root is *gr̥šta-, which in the Old Persian script would be *gra[šta-. If we
restore any of these forms in the discussed passage of the inscription, the result-
ing meaning will be the same at any rate.

5. After the predicate gra[šta : āha] a new sentence starts, which in all
probability is introduced by the phrase [pat]išamaiy and is closed down by the
word akunavam. After this again very likely the word ⌈pat⌉iša[m must be re-
stored and at the end of the sentence starting with this and on the basis of
the parallel structure shown with the preceding sentence, cf.

⁸¹ Cp. J HARMATTA: Acta Ant. Hung. 12 (1964) 217.
⁸² M. MAYRHOFER: Orientalia 33 (1964) 72 ff.
⁸³ J. HARMATTA: Acta Ant. Hung. 12 (1964) 217.
⁸⁴ See on this question. G. MORGENSTIERNE: An Etymological Vocabulary of
Pashto. Oslo 1927. 27 foll.
⁸⁵ The data see G. MORGENSTIERNE: loc. cit.
⁸⁶ Thus for example M. MAYRHOFER: Orientalia 33 (1964) 75.
⁸⁷ J. HARMATTA: The Oldest Brāhmī Inscription in Inner Asia. Acta Orient. Hung.
19 (1966).

Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 14, 1966

> [pat]išamaiy : [. . .] fam : akunavam
> ⌜pat]iša[m : .]vādā[. . . . . . .]

we must presume obviously also the predicate *akunavam*.[88] Thus the question is raised at once, how the word *patišam* can be interpreted in this context. The meaning 'otherwise', of course, cannot be taken into consideration here and thus we can think only of the interpretation 'nach — zu' or 'nach vorn hin, vorn'. Thus the first sentence, restored with regard to its contents on the basis of the Elamite version, will have the following interpretation: «to it I had my name put on it» or «in front I had my name put on it». Since the inscription really starts with the name and titles of Dareios, the latter interpretation seems to be more likely.[89]

6. To the fragment [+ — + — + — +]-*fa?-ma* to be read between the words *patišamaiy* and *akunavam* in the Elamite translation the word *ḫi-iš* 'name' corresponds. R. G. Kent, finding no such word in Old Persian, which would end in *-fam* and would have the meaning 'name', instead of *fa?* suggested the reading *ra* and restored the whole word in the form *patikaram*.[90] Thus, however, he got into sharp contradiction with the evidence of the Elamite translation which can by no means be approved from the methodological point of view. Obviously W. Hinz was lead also by this consideration, when, finding no suitable word from the viewpoints of meaning and form, he left the passage unrestored.[91] Considering that of the Old Iranian words ending in *-fa-* the word *nāfa-* 'family, clan, kinship' as regards its meaning fits fairly well into the context, in 1960 I raised the possibility of the restoration [*uvānā*]-*fam*.[92] Independently from me, later on M. Mayrhofer thought about the same restoration.[93] At the same time, however, I counted also with the restoration [*nāmanā*]*fam* as an alternative possibility. The latter form could be understood as *dvandva* type compound in the meaning 'name and clan'. Thus the sentence would have the following interpretation: «in front I had my clan put on it» or «in front I had my name and my clan put on it». From the viewpoint of the meaning, however, even these restorations do not correspond exactly to the Elamite word *ḫi-iš* 'name' and at the same time to a certain extent they even pass over to the circle of meanings of the Elamite phrase *e-ip-pi* 'descent'. Further examining the possibilities of restoration of the word [+ — + — + — + — +]-*fa-ma*, my attention was drawn to the Avestan verb *saēf-* 'über — hin (acc.) streichen'. To this the form **θaif-* would correspond in Old Persian and the noun derived from it is **θaifa-* 'touching, smoothing, drawing, striking'.

---

[88] Thus correctly W. HINZ: ZDMG 102 (1952) 35, 37.
[89] See J. HARMATTA: Acta Ant. Hung. 12 (1964) 217.
[90] R. G. KENT: JCS 5 (1951) 55—56, JAOS 72 (1952) 15.
[91] W. HINZ: ZDMG 102 (1952) 35, 37.
[92] J. HARMATTA: Acta Ant. Hung. 12 (1964) 217.
[93] M. MAYRHOFER: Orientalia 33 (1964) 82 ff.

This word combined with the word *nāman-* 'name' would give the restoration [*na-a-ma-θa-i*]-*fa-ma* and its meaning would be approximately the same as that of the German word *Namenszug*, by which W. Hinz translated the Elamite word *ḫi-iš*. Among the various possibilities at any rate this would correspond best to the Elamite translation from the viewpoint of the meaning.

7. The restoration of the word [+]-*va-a-da-a-*[+ — + : *a-ku-u-na-va-ma*] following after the second *patišam* is also a problem. R. G. Kent originally gave here the restoration [*a*]*vādā*[*tā*] 'it was sent down',[94] however, he gave this up soon in favour of the restoration [*u*]*vādā*[*m*] proposed by W. Hinz.[95] Hinz saw in this word the Old Persian equivalent of the Old Indian word *svadhā-* 'residence, home' and he thought that the Elamite word *e-ip-pi* 'pedigree, descent' can be the translation of this.[96] This interpretation brings the Old Persian text undoubtedly much nearer to the Elamite translation than the restoration of Kent, but the difficulty is also here that the meaning of the presumed Old Persian word **uvādā-* is not 'pedigree, descent' but 'home' and this from the viewpoint of the subject does not correspond to the initial formulae of the Bisitun inscription which contain partly the name of Dareios and his titles (= *ḫi-iš*) and in fact also his pedigree (= *e-ip-pi*). Since concluding on the basis of the Old Indian word *jāta-* 'birth, descent, clan', in Old Iranian the word meaning 'descent' was **zāta-*,[97] and as the Old Persian form of this the word **dāta-* can be presumed, thus the word meaning 'own descent, pedigree' would be in Old Persian **uvādāta-*. This can be inserted in the discussed passage, viz. [*u*]-*va-a-da-a-*[*ta-ma*] without any difficulty and thus the meaning of the Old Persian text corresponds exactly to the Elamite translation, viz.: «in front I had my pedigree put on it.»[98]

8. In line 91 the interpretation of the word *paišiyā* is not reassuring. R. G. Kent held this word first the derivative of the verb *pais-* and translated it with the meaning 'writings'.[59] Later on, however, he accepted the interpretation of W. Hinz,[100] according to which the meaning of this word is 'before' and the word itself derives with epenthesis from the form **pašyā < *patyā*.[101] Both suggestions have, however, hardly surmountable difficulties. To the word *paišiya-* we cannot ascribe the meaning 'writing', because this concept in Old Persian is expressed by the word *nipištam*, and without the verbal prefix *ni-* the meaning of the verb *pais-* is not 'to write' but 'to cut, to decorate' and thus the meaning of its nominal derivative cannot be 'writing' either. On the other

---

[94] R. G. KENT: JCS 5 (1951) 56.
[95] R. G. KENT: JAOS 72 (1952) 14—15, Old Persian². 130, 177.
[96] W. HINZ: ZDMG 102 (1952) 35—36.
[97] It is possible that this occurs in the name *ztwhy *Zāta-vahya-* preserved in Aramaic transcription, see W. EILERS: AfO 17 (1956) 332.
[98] See J. HARMATTA: Acta Ant. Hung. 12 (1964) 217.
[99] R. G. KENT: JCS 5 (1951) 56.
[100] R. G. KENT: JAOS 72 (1952) 15.
[101] W. HINZ: ZDMG 102 (1952) 37.

hand, a serious obstacle of the interpretation 'before' of *paišiyā* is the circumstance that in Old Persian we cannot count at all with epenthesis. Earlier it seemed that at least in one word, viz. the adjective *yaumaini-*, the occurrence of the epenthesis can be traced in Old Persian. Since, however, K. Hoffman identified the element *maini-* convincingly with the Avestan word *maēni-* 'Vergeltung, Strafe',[102] it has become doubtless that the presence of epenthesis cannot be presumed in Old Persian. Thus we must look for another explanation. The word *paišiyā* can be interpreted without any difficulty as the instrumental singular (ablative, locative, genitive) form of a noun *paišī-*. This is the exact equivalent of the Old Indian word *peśi-* 'piece of meat', the original meaning of which was, however, obviously 'slice', and its special meaning developed only later, very likely in the compound *māṃsapeśī-*. Thus in Old Iranian we can presume the meaning 'slice, piece' of the word **paišī-*. In the passage of the Bisitun inscription under discussion the meaning of this word can be 'passage, section, Abschnitt', so that the whole sentence can be translated as follows: «and was read paragraph by paragraph to me». If this interpretation is correct, then the phrase *paišiyā* refers obviously to the parts of the Bisitun inscription divided by the phrase *θātiy : Dārayavauš : xšāyaθiya.*

9. The last problem is represented by the last word of § 70, viz.: *hamātaxšatā*. The explanation of this moves on a broad scale of the interpretations and it shows several variations between the meanings «they learned (the writing)» and «they copied (the inscription)».[103] In the dispute going on about the explanation of the phrase the most striking circumstance is that the verb *hamtaxš-* is well known in Old Persian and occurs several times also in the Bisitun inscription. The circumstance that up to now no reassuring interpretation could be given to the phrase *hamātaxšatā* is very likely due to the fact that we have to do here not only with a linguistic problem, but important historical questions or questions of paleographic character are also involved in connection with the interpretation of the phrase.

From the methodological point of view the only correct way of interpretation of the phrase *hamātaxšatā* is still to start out from the meaning of the verb to be ascertained on the basis of its other occurrences. From the viewpoint of the interpretation of the phrase *hamātaxšatā* in the first place three passages of the inscriptions of Dareios are of decisive importance. These are as follows:

DB IV 65—66   martiya : hya : hamataxšatā : manā : v^{i}θiyā : avam : ubar-
              tam : abaram
              «the man, who collaborated with my house, I reward him well»

[102] K. HOFFMANN: Altpers. *afuvāyā.* Corolla Linguistica. Festschrift Ferdinand Sommer. Wiesbaden 1955. 84 ff.
[103] See R. G. KENT JCS 5 (1951) 56, JAOS 72 (1952) 13; W. HINZ: ZDMG 102 (1952) 37 foll.

3

DNb   16—17 martiya : hya : hataxšataiy : anudim : hakarta° hyā : avaθā-
               dim : paribāramiy
               «that man, who collaborates, in accordance with his collabora-
               tion, so I provide for him»
DB IV 82—83 adakaiy : imaiy : martiyā : hamataxšatā : anušiyā : manā
               «then these men collaborated as my followers».

From the comparison of the three passages it becomes clear that Dareios inter-
prets «collaboration» always as a support rendered to his «house», as «collabora-
tion with his house». Thus there cannot be any doubt regarding the fact that
from the viewpoint of the contents we must add the phrase *manā : viθiyā* in
thought also to the sentence *kāra : hamātaxšatā*, just as this has to be implied
also to the phrase *hya : hataxšataiy.* Thus the end of § 70 must be interpreted
as follows: «the army collaborated (with my house)».

      It is not difficult to realize the immense political meaning of this state-
ment. After the killing of Gaumāta, Dareios had to gain the regime at the cost
of heavy fights and he could have himself recognized as ruler in the whole
empire only after initial difficulties. In this he undoubtedly assigned a great
importance to the text of the Bisitun inscription, which was sent by him even
to the most distant garrison of the Old Persian Empire according to the evi-
dence of the Aramaic version of Elephantine. When Dareios with the help of
his followers killed Gautāma, certain provinces of the empire revolted against
him and did not recognize his rule. But very likely there were also many such
territories, the «army» of which *(kāra)* adopted an expectant attitude. The
purpose of the Bisitun inscription was to convince these, it justified the con-
duct of Dareios and placed him before the «army» as a ruler supported by
Auramazdā, impersonating and carrying out the will of Auramazdā. The last
sentence of § 70 does not want to say more or less than that after the dispatch
of and acquaintance with the text of the inscription, the «army», the garri-
sons, the whole empire recognized Dareios as a ruler and collaborated with the
Royal House.

      On the basis of the aboves the Old Persian text of § 70 can be restored
as follows:

line 88 ... θātiy : Dārayavauš : xšāya[θi]ya : vašnā : Au-
      89 ra[ma]zdāha : ima : dipī⌐ma⌐i[y : tyā :] adam : akunavam : patišam :
         āriyā : āha : utā : ⌐pa⌐vast-
      90 āy[ā :] utā : carmā : gar[štā : āha] : [pat]išamai[o]y : [nāmaθai]fam :
         akunavam : ⌐pat⌐iša[m : u]vādā-
      91 [tam : akunavam] : utā : ⌐niya⌐pi[š]i[ya : u]tā ⌐: pat⌐iyaf⌐raši⌐ya : pai-
         [š⌐iyā : mā[m] : pasāva : ima : di-
      92 pi[ya : a]dam : f[rā]stāyam : ⌐vi⌐[s]⌐pa⌐dā : atar : dahyā[va]° : kāra :
         hamā[ta]x⌐ ša]tā

line 88 «. . . Declares king Dārayavauš: by Au-

line 89 ramazdā's will these inscriptions, which I caused to be made, were otherwise, in Āryan language. Both in clay envelope

line 90 tablets and in parchment they were wrapped. In front I had my name put on it, in front my pedi-

line 91 gree I caused to be put on it. It was both written and read section by section to me. Then I dispatched these in-

line 92 scriptions everywhere in the provinces. The army collaborated (with my house)».

As it becomes clear from this translation, the Old Persian original shows the same division of the contents as the Elamite version, but certain details are much clearer and more accurate than in the latter. The Elamite translator in the part dealing with the protocol-wise authenticity of the inscription did not understand several phrases or could not translate them and therefore he left them out.

As a whole from the Old Persian original, in agreement with the Elamite version, it becomes clear that Dareios or the Old Persian chancellery preparing the draft of the inscription regarded it as differing from the earlier practice, that the inscription was prepared in Āryan language. This points to the circumstance that in the Bisitun inscription they saw the first application of the Old Persian cuneiform script. Whether this opinion of theirs, which was clearly expressed in the text of the inscription, corresponded to reality or not, is of course a question, the solution of which exceeds the framework of this paper.[104]

[104] Additional notes. — 1. According to the kind information of Professor G G. CAMERON (on the 3rd September 1966, Tehran) the second *pa* in the passage DB I 68—69 (quoted on p. 267 above) was in reality the beginning of *ANŠU.KUR.RA*[ıš]. Consequently, the correct text of the passage runs as follows: *ap-pa ANŠU.A.AB.-BA*[ıš]-*ma ap-pi-in be-ip-la ap-pa ANŠU.KUR.RA*[ıš]-*ir be-ip-li-ib-ba.* — 2. Professor W. HINZ kindly communicated to me (on the 4th September 1966, Tehran) that in line 91 of the Old Persian Bisitun inscription he does not restore ⌈*niya*⌉*pi*[*š*]*iya* any more as adopted above on the basis of his article in ZDMG 102 (1952) 36 foll. (cf. also W. BRANDENSTEIN — M. MAYRHOFER: Handbuch des Altpersischen. 135), but referring to the inscription DMa where the passive form [*niyap*]*iθi*[*ya*] occurs, he considers, as correct form ⌈*niya*⌉*pi*[*θi*]*ya* also in DB IV 91.