

J. HARMATTA

A RECENTLY DISCOVERED OLD PERSIAN INSCRIPTION

IN MEMORIAM E. DIEHL

I

An Old Persian inscription has become known recently; it is at present in the possession of J. Koszta. I have received the following information from its owner concerning the circumstances of its finding and its site.

«The fragmentary Old Persian inscription was brought to light in the so-called «Cock-castle» district of Gherla (Roumania) at the foot of St. Peter's Hill. The fragment was found in a vegetable garden, with soil of black earth about two spans deep covering a layer of pure clay.

The environs of the site were inhabited already in antiquity. The Roman castrum was situated practically opposite the site, towards the south-west where the Little Somes is branching off and the so-called «Grove» begins. Excavations were made here repeatedly, bringing to light a great number of objects from among the ruins. The site of the present find is situated at a distance of some 1000—1200 metres from the castrum.

As far as I remember, it was in 1937 that my uncle found the fragmentary Old Persian inscription in the above-mentioned vegetable garden. He was digging in the garden and was greatly annoyed because his spade kept striking against pebbles, broken pieces of earthenware, and tiles. On such occasions he used to poke the hard objects out of the earth, throwing them beside the fence.

One of the shards thus flung aside attracted the attention of his son who was my class-mate in the first form of the secondary school. He was particularly interested in the regular scratches on the smooth surface. The following day he took it to school and showed the fragment to the history master who, after examining it, declared the writing to be Hebrew or Armenian but did not pursue the matter further.

But the clay tablet kept rankling in my mind. I bought it from my cousin and made up my mind to solve its mystery when I grow up. But I discovered

only two years ago, in 1952, that the inscription on the tablet was in Old Persian cuneiform writing».¹

As may be gathered from the above communication, the fragment of Old Persian inscription was found in a surface layer or one slightly below the surface of the earth, saturated with various cultural remains. Unfortunately, the site has so far not been examined by experts, so that we know neither the age of the cultural layer which contained the fragmentary inscription nor the fact whether it was disturbed in later times. Gherla and its environs are very rich in archaeological sites ;² hence it is not impossible to assume that the fragment was embedded in a layer dating from Roman, or even earlier, times. On the other hand, it is possible, of course, that the layer containing the fragmentary inscription is of modern origin. This question can be decided only after an examination of the site by archaeological experts. One thing seems, in any case, to be beyond doubt : whether the inscription was found in a cultural layer dating from primitive, Roman, or modern times, it was certainly not in its original position.

II

This fragment of the inscribed clay tablet is 47 mm. in height, with a maximum width of 52 mm., and an average thickness of 5 to 6 mm. It is made of fairly well-sluiced clay which contains, however, other mineral materials as well. Among these, tiny particles of mica are at once apparent. The upper part and the left edge of the clay tablet have been broken off. It is brick-red in colour, with occasional patches of yellowish-brown. The baking is weak and uneven. As seen from the fracture, only the surface of the tablet was properly baked ; the brick-red layer is only 0,5 to 1,5 mm. in depth, while the inside of the tablet has remained grey in colour. The front part, containing the inscription, is more thoroughly burnt than the verso.

The clay tablet has preserved a fragmentary inscription of four lines. The surface of the clay chipped off in a number of places ; the damage is, however, not of such an extent as to make impossible the reading or identification of the characters. These characters are placed in strips about 7 mm. in height. They are bounded, above and below, by a thin scratch, so that between the rows of characters we see a pair of horizontal lines, running parallel, at a distance of about 1,5 mm. from each other. The upper horizontal wedge of some of the letters (*a*, *u*, *š^a*) reaches, however, into this empty strip of

¹ From J. Koszta's letter, dated January 22, 1954. I want to thank him here for his kind permission to publish the text of the inscription.

² See *M. Roska: Erdély régészeti repertórium* (An Archaeological Repertory of Transylvania), I. 1942, p. 254 & foll.

1,5 mm. On the right side and at the lower edge of the table — where the original placing of the inscription may be observed — a strip some 10—11 mm. in width has been left empty. The surface of the tablet occupied by the text of the inscription is not bounded by a special line. On the contrary — judging by the traces preserved — the parallel scratched lines running between the rows of characters extended right to the edge of the tablet (see the scratches above the last row of characters on the photograph).

With regard to the character of the writing, it is obvious, even at first glance, that in execution it is much less careful than inscriptions engraved whether in stone, or in gold or silver.³ The size and the position of the characters within the strip bounded by the pair of horizontal scratched lines shows a certain vacillation. This leads to the conclusion that the inscription on this clay tablet was made much more quickly and less carefully than inscriptions engraved on rock or on metal tablets. This circumstance might prove helpful in determining the destination of the tablet.

III

The fragmentary inscription preserved on the clay tablet may be read in the following way:⁴

- line 1.]y^a θ^a i y^a:
 line 2.]a s^a p^a h^a y^a
 line 3.]š^a y^a : h^a
 line 4.]k^u u n^a u š^a

In connection with this reading we wish to point out the following. In line 1, the final perpendicular wedge of the character θ^a has chipped off, only its upper end being somewhat still visible. The sign i which follows it is also badly damaged, but the lower end of the two perpendicular wedges is clearly legible, together with the incisions of the two small horizontal wedges above them. In line 2, at the left edge of the tablet, the trace of a perpendicular wedge may be observed close to the fracture. In the same line, the topmost horizontal small wedge of the sign p^a has chipped off, only the lower corner of its thick end being recognizable on the original. (On the photograph this

³ Cp. e. g. *E. Herzfeld*: *Altpersische Inschriften*. Berlin 1938. Tables II, III, V, VI, X—XI, XIV; *R. G. Kent*: *Old Persian. Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. New Haven 1950. T. II; *H. H. Paper*: *JAOS* 72 (1952), the Table facing p. 169.

⁴ In the transcription I am following Kent's method (*Old Persian*, p. 11. foll.). I think it necessary, however, to give, in addition to the normalized transcription used by Kent, also the close transcription which gives a more adequate picture of the text; cp. *Kent*: *JAOS* 72 (1952), p. 10, note 2.

detail cannot be made out.) Yet we have to do here with the character p^a , not with i : this is clearly shown by the fact that the remaining two small upper horizontal wedges are not placed in a straight line — the one on the right is placed somewhat higher than the first. With regard to line 4, we wish to point out that at the left edge of the tablet there are two point like dents in front of the character k^u ; the dent on the right is merely due to chipping off in the material of the tablet. On the other hand, the dent on the left, immediately beside the fracture, looks as if it were the remnant of the upper thick end of a perpendicular wedge; above it, one also seems to discover the tapering end of a horizontal wedge (this may be observed on the photograph, too).

Going over to the interpretation of the text of the inscription, the first line may be read as]*yadiya*; it is an obvious suggestion to complement this form to [*xšā*]yadiya. Similarly, the interpretation of the fourth line also seems indubitable. This may be read as]*kunauš* and supplemented to [*a*]kunauš. Thus, the first line of the inscription contained the word »king«, the last line the word »made«. From this fact two conclusions may be drawn. The first is that the inscription probably referred to some work (building) erected at the command of some Old Persian king. Hence these two words to some extent determine the contents of the inscription while giving some indication of its form and text. The other conclusion that may be drawn from the two words is that the word [*xšā*]yadiya must have been preceded and followed by the titles of the king.

On the basis of the results obtained so far let us examine the second and third lines of the inscription. The second line may be read as]*āspahy*; it is obvious, even at first glance, that this form represents the singular possessive of a name ending in *-aspa*. The context makes it clear that we have to do here with a name in a king's titles; hence it cannot be doubted that the word represents the name of some member of the Achaemenid dynasty. There was only one person in the Achaemenid dynasty who bore a name ending in *-aspa*, viz. *Vištāspa*. Hence it is practically certain that the form]*āspahy* must be supplemented to [*Višt*]āspahy[ā].

The recognition of the name *Vištāspa* makes it possible to reconstruct the text of the whole inscription. We must bear in mind that the name *Vištāspa* figures in the king's titles only in inscriptions dating from the time of Darius: it does not appear in inscriptions from the time of Xerxes. This makes it certain that our fragment must be taken as referring to Darius. Hence the possessive form [*Višt*]āspahy[ā] can be supplemented only with the word *puça*: [*Višt*]āspahy[ā] *puça* 'Vištāspa's son'. The other reconstruction which is intrinsically possible, viz. [*Višt*]āspahy[ā] *napā* = 'Vištāspa's grandson', need not be considered, since this could occur only in an inscription by Xerxes; but *Vištāspa* is never referred to in Xerxes's titles. Reconstructed in the way

indicated, the third line of the inscription will read as follows :

$$[a : p^a u \zeta^a : + \dots +] \xi^a y^a : h^a$$

Judging from the context, the remaining part of line 3 may be supplemented to the form $[H^a x^a a m^a n^a i] \xi^a y^a$, since in Darius's inscriptions this invariably follows the expression *Vištāspahyā puça*. A striking feature of the word $[H^a x^a a m^a n^a i] \xi^a y^a = Haxāmanišiya$ is its orthography, instead of the form $H^a x^a a m^a n^a i \xi^a i y^a$ which is the usual one in Darius's inscriptions. In one instance, however, we come across this form in a Susa inscription by Darius (DSa, lines 2—3).⁵ Hence the orthography $-\xi^a y^a$ cannot cast any doubt on the reconstruction proposed above. Obviously, all that happened in both instances was that the scribe forgot the sign *i* after the character ξ^a .

On the basis of the suggested reconstruction, the total number of characters in line 3, including the word-dividers, must have been 16. Approximately the same number of characters must, therefore, be suggested for the rest of the lines. Of these, the reconstruction of line 4 seems the easiest. The 3. person verb *a)kunauš* after the title probably points to a new sentence, presumably introduced by the relative pronoun *hya*. Actually, at the end of line 3 we find the character h^a ; hence we may confidently suppose that line 4 began with the character y^a . Accordingly, the structure of the closing sentence of the inscription may have been as follows: *hya ... akunauš* = 'who ... made (built)'. Between the two words, there is still room for nine or ten characters in line 4. It is obvious that in this part of the inscription the object made, or the building erected, by Darius must have been named. In the absence of any material evidence, this gap cannot be filled with any final certainty; but we feel justified in suggesting, by way of conjecture, the words *imam tacaram* 'this palace'. In this case, line 4 would consist of 17 characters, roughly corresponding in length to line 3.

It still remains to reconstruct the first two lines. Here we may derive considerable help partly from the titles in other Darius inscriptions, partly from the number of characters in lines 3 and 4. Judging from our findings so far, the inscription must have consisted only of the titles and the closing sentence, and must have thus been very brief: hence it is unlikely that it contained the fullest list of titles of Darius. From the viewpoint of reconstruction, this certainly rules out such strings of expressions as e. g. *xšāyadīya : dahyū-nām : vispazanānām* or *xšāyadīya : ahyāyā : būmīyā : vazrakāyā : dūraiya piy*. On the other hand, the number of characters in the lines of the inscription excludes also the shortest formula, viz. *Dārayavauš : XŠ : vazraka*, found on one of the Persepolis inscriptions of Darius, since in that case line 2 would

⁵ See *Kent: Old Persian*, pp. 13 and 141.

contain only 13 characters. It is clear from the above that the titles in our inscription must have been between the shortest and the most detailed formulae ; this leads one, in turn, to the conclusion that, originally, the inscription must have consisted of more than four lines.

If in the light of the above considerations we attempt the reconstruction of line 2, we must point out, first of all, that there is no room for the form *xšāyaθiyānām* in front of the word [*Višt*]āspahy, since in that case the line would contain 20 characters. We have already seen that the word *vazraka*, too, must be ruled out: hence line 2 can be supplemented only with the form *dahyūnām*. This would give 16 characters to line 2, a number which fits admirably the 16 characters of line 3 and the 17 characters of line 4.

The reconstruction of line 1 is much more uncertain since here we must take into account the preceding lines, nothing of which has come down to us. To fill up the room before the expression *xšāyaθiya dahyūnām*, the following formulae must be taken into consideration: *xšāyaθiya vazraka*, *xšāyaθiya xšāyaθiyānām*, and *xšāyaθiya Pārsaiy*. Of these, the expression *xšāyaθiya Pārsaiy* appears only in the earliest Bīsūtūn inscriptions of Darius (DB and DBa); it does not reappear in the later inscriptions. Hence it seems improbable that our inscription should have contained this formula. This leaves us with the two former expressions. If we complement line 1 with *yaθiyānām* or *θiyānām*, the line would consist of 17 or 16 characters. Were we then to place the words *vazraka : xšāyaθiya : xšā* into the line preceding line 1, this would, again, yield 16 characters. The line before that would contain the word *xšāyaθiya*, leaving still room for 8 characters. The Old Persian form of the name Darius, together with the word-divider, is represented, precisely by 8 signs, so that this line contained in all probability the name *Dārayavauš* before the word *xšāyaθiya*. The form *adam : Dārayavauš* would also suit the context, but it must be ruled out here, since in that case the line would contain 20 characters. The most probable reconstruction is the one suggested above.

IV

On the basis of the above it seems likely that the fragment of Old Persian inscription found at Gherla originally consisted of six lines, with the following text :

Orig.	At Present	Close Transcription	Number of Characters
line 1		[<i>Da a r^a y^a v^a u š^a : x^a š^a a y^a θ^a i y^a :</i>]	16
line 2		[<i>v^a z^a r^a k^a : x^a š^a a y^a θ^a i y^a : x^a š^a a</i>]	16
line 3	line 1	[<i>y^a θ^a i y^a a n^a a m^a : x^a š^a a</i>] <i>y^a θ^a i y^a :</i>	17
line 4	line 2	[<i>d^a h^a y^a u n^a a m^a : Vi š^a t^a</i>] <i>a s^a p^a h^a y^a</i>	16
line 5	line 3	[<i>a : p^a u š^a : H^a x^a a m^a n^a i</i>] <i>š^a y^a : h^a</i>	16
line 6	line 4	[<i>y^a : i m^a m^a : t^a c^a r^a m^a : a</i>] <i>k^u u n^a u š^a</i>	17

Orig.	At Present	Normalized Transcription
line 1		[<i>Dārayavauš : xšāyaθiya :</i>]
line 2		[<i>vazraka : xšāyaθiya : xšā</i>]
line 3	line 1	[<i>yaθiyānām : xšā</i>] <i>yaθiya :</i>
line 4	line 2	[<i>dahyūnām : Višt</i>] <i>āspahy</i>
line 5	line 3	[<i>ā : puça : Haxāmani</i>] <i>š^aya : h</i>
line 6	line 4	[<i>ya : imam : tacaram : a</i>] <i>kunauš</i>

Translation :

«Darius the great king, the king of kings, the king of countries, son of Hystaspes, the Achaemenian (is the one) who had this palace built».

With regard to this restoration of the text we must point out that the introduction of the word *tacaram* in the last line is supported, from the material point of view, only by the fact that the verb *akunauš* demands the name of some kind of building as its object. From the viewpoint of language, however, we can think only of the word *tacara* among the Old Persian words which would fit the context: the substitution of any other word would crowd a great many more characters into the last line. We also wish to point out that the suggested reconstructions are in keeping with the traces of the characters observable beside the fracture at the left edge of the inscription. The remnant of the perpendicular edge at the beginning of line 2 probably points to the final, perpendicular wedge of the character *t^a*, while the remnant of the perpendicular wedge seen at the beginning of line 4 may obviously be regarded, together with the end of the horizontal wedge above it, as the remaining part of the character *a*.

Judging by the measurements of the extant part of the inscription, the original height of the clay tablet must have been about 7,5 cm., its original breadth about 15 cm.

V

If this proposed reconstruction of the fragmentary Old Persian inscription of Gherla is correct, it may be regarded as the exact counterpart of the brief Persepolis inscriptions of Darius, engraved in several places of Darius' palace, on door-posts of the inner room, above the figures of the king and his attendants.⁶ The text of these inscriptions (DPa) agrees completely with the Gherla inscription as restored by us (according to Kent's system, it could be designated with DG). Besides the agreement of texts, there are also similarities in form. The Persepolis inscriptions, too, consist of six lines,

⁶ See *F. H. Weissbach*: Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden. Leipzig 1911. XVI; *Kent*: Old Persian. 108. foll.

with precisely the same division of the text within the lines as had to be assumed in the case of the Gherla inscription. These agreements of content and form are, however, counterbalanced by certain differences between the two types of inscriptions. One of the differences is that the Persepolis inscriptions in question are trilingual, while the text of the Gherla inscription is only in Old Persian. The possibility that the broken-off upper part of the tablet contained the Akkadian and Elamite versions must be ruled out, since in trilingual inscriptions it is always the Old Persian text that is placed on top. It seems indubitable, therefore, that the Gherla inscription was kept in one language even in its original form. The two inscriptions differ in their material, too: the one from Persepolis is engraved in stone, while the Gherla inscription is incised on a clay tablet. Finally, the two inscriptions show an interesting divergence in the orthography of the word *Haxāmanišiya*. On the copies of the Persepolis inscription we find the regular form $H^a x^a a m^a n^a i š^a i y^a$, while in the case of the Gherla inscription the scribe has left out the *i* after the character $š^a$. These agreements and differences suggest, by themselves, the problem of the precise relation of the inscriptions discussed here.

With regard to its material, the Gherla inscription does not stand isolated among Old Persian inscriptions. We know of a number of Old Persian inscriptions incised on clay tablets. Several Susa inscriptions of Darius (types D_{Sa}, D_{Sb}, D_{Se}, and D_{Sf}, all of them extant in more than one copy) belong to this class. Nevertheless, it is a striking fact that the number of Old Persian inscriptions incised on clay tablets, compared with those engraved in stone, is practically negligible. There are also cases of inscriptions on clay tablets reappearing engraved in stone, as e. g. in type D_{Sf}. This fact allows us to draw certain conclusions with regard to the destination of Old Persian clay tablet inscriptions and their relation to inscriptions engraved in stone or metal tablets. Old Persian inscriptions were usually made in a number of copies. Of the Persepolis inscriptions of Darius, D_{Pa} has come down to us in «several» copies, D_{Pc} in 18, D_{Ph} in 4; there are 2 copies of the Hamadan inscription (D_H), while of the Susa inscriptions D_{Sa} is extant in 2, D_{Sb} in 2, D_{Sc} in 2, D_{Sd} in 2, D_{Se} in «several», D_{Sf} in «several» copies, etc. The same refers also to the inscriptions of Xerxes and several other Persian rulers. We must also bear in mind that the extant specimens obviously represent only an insignificant proportion of the copies originally made. Such a mass engraving of inscriptions in stone is, however, hardly imaginable without a suitable model text. In all probability, Old Persian inscriptions were made according to the following process.⁷ The royal scribes prepared the «draft» of the text of the

⁷ As seen from their comments on the errors found in the inscriptions, Kent and Paper probably imagine the making of Old Persian inscriptions in the way described by us below. See *Kent*: Old Persian. 140; *Paper*: JAOS 72 (1952) p. 170, note 6.

inscription, in accordance with the instructions received. The draft was probably revised by a corrector,⁸ and then sent to the engraver who incised the model text into stone or metal. The engravers may have been illiterate in most cases.⁹ Hence, only the clay tablet could have served for preparing the «draft»-text of the inscription. Thus it is highly probable that the engraving of Old Persian inscriptions into stone or metal was made on the basis of model texts written on clay tablets.

This procedure had been well-known in the territory covered by Assyrian-Babylonian written records. The texts describing the various scenes represented by the reliefs in the royal palaces were first incised by the Assyrians on clay tablets; the stone-cutters were working on the basis of these model texts. Thus e. g. a number of clay tablet inscriptions, serving as model texts, have come down to us from the reign of Assurbanipal; one of them can be definitely proved to have been used as model text in preparing an inscription engraved in stone which has also come down to us.¹⁰

This Assyrian-Babylonian practice may have been taken over by the Persian scribes in preparing inscriptions engraved in stone or metal. Hence it is very probable that the Old Persian inscriptions preserved on clay tablets must be regarded as model texts to be engraved in stone or metal. This is obviously the case with inscription DSf which has come down to us in two copies, one of them written on a clay tablet, the other engraved in stone. Judging from their character, inscriptions DSa and DSb must have been similar model texts. Naturally, there is a possibility in some cases that the clay tablet inscriptions are copies, made for a certain purpose, from inscriptions engraved in stone.¹¹ But in the case of brief inscriptions referring to buildings, reliefs, etc., such a possibility is highly improbable.

For this reason, it is a suggestion close at hand that the fragmentary inscription of Gherla is the remnant of a clay tablet inscription serving as a model text. This view is supported by the fact that inscription DPa which agrees with it completely in wording, is a typical inscription for buildings, and has come down to us, engraved in stone, in several copies from the palace of Darius at Persepolis. Another circumstance supporting this view is the feature noted above, viz. that the Old Persian inscription on our tablet is much less carefully executed than those engraved in stone or metal. Compared with the latter from this viewpoint, it really strikes one as a «draft».

The exact correspondence of the Gherla inscription with the text of DPa, as well as the identical distribution of the number of characters within

⁸ The hand of a corrector is detected in certain cases by *Kent*: Old Persian. 21.

⁹ This view is definitely held by *Paper* (loc. cit.).

¹⁰ See *M. Streck*: Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergang Ninivehs. Leipzig 1916. Vol. I, p. LVII, note 2; Vol. II, p. 320, note 3.

¹¹ Similar cases are referred to in a Bisutun inscription of Darius: col. IV. §. 70. See *Kent*: JAOS 72 (1952) 13 foll.

the lines in the case of both inscriptions may easily suggest the idea that the Gherla inscription may have served as model text for the inscriptions in the Persepolis palace. This obvious conclusion is, however, ruled out by the circumstance that the word *Haxāmanišiya* shows a different orthography in the Gherla inscription from those in Persepolis; since the Persepolis inscriptions represent the correct orthography of the word, it is clear that the Gherla inscription could not have served as their model. It seems probable, therefore, that our fragmentary inscription was the model text of an inscription or inscriptions engraved on some other building erected at the command of Darius.

VI

The most difficult question connected with the recently discovered Old Persian fragmentary inscription — a question that cannot be satisfactorily answered at the moment — is, no doubt, the problem of the way it got to Gherla. It seems entirely improbable that the inscription should have been originally erected by Darius in Transylvania. All the circumstances connected with the discovery indicate that the fragmentary inscription was found at a secondary site. With regard to the way it got into the soil at Gherla there seem to be two possibilities.

If the cultural layer containing the fragmentary inscription derived from modern times, then the only possible explanation is that the inscription got from Persia to Transylvania some time during the modern age, perhaps through Armenian mediation. In that case the original site of our inscription must obviously be sought somewhere in the territory of the former Persian empire, i. e. in Asia Minor. The question becomes much more complicated if the cultural layer containing the fragment goes back to Roman, or even earlier, Dacian, times. In that case there is much less likelihood of its having got to Transylvania from Persia. This supposition would be particularly improbable should the cultural layer prove to go beyond Roman times. If this were, in fact, the case, then the inscription must probably be regarded as a monument of Persian rule in Thrace. We know from Herodotus' account that in the course of his Scythian campaign, Darius erected several inscriptions in Thrace (Herodotus IV 87, 91). It seems very likely that Persian rule in Thrace, in general, has left behind it architectural and epigraphic remains.¹² In the above

¹² For recent accounts of Darius' Scythian campaign and the Persian rule in Thrace see *V. V. Struve: Дарий I и скифы Причерноморья. Serta Kazaroviana. Serdicæ MCML. Vol. I. 115 foll.*; *R. Ghirshman: L'Iran des origines à l'Islam. Paris 1951. 128 foll.*; *V. V. Struve: Академику Борису Дмитриевичу Грекову по дню семдесятилетия сборник статей. Moscow 1952. 37 foll.* — The possibility of Old Persian inscriptions coming to light in the Balkan peninsula had already been envisaged by *Weissbach*.

quoted passage Herodotus relates how Persian inscriptions were carried off in all directions by the local population after the fall of Persian rule : he saw one of them with his own eyes in Byzantium. It is possible that the fragmentary inscription of Gherla was the model text of such a Persian inscription erected in the North Balkans, and was carried off to Transylvania after the collapse of Persian rule in Thrace.

Should this latter possibility be verified, the fragmentary inscription of Gherla would prove a most interesting historical document. In any case, this question can be settled, with some amount of probability, only after an archaeological investigation of the site where the inscription was found.¹³

VII

As we have seen, the Gherla inscription goes back undoubtedly to Darius I ; hence, another inscription has been added to those deriving from this monarch. Among the inscriptions of Old Persian rulers those connected with Darius I have always been represented in greatest number. If we supplement Kent's list¹⁴ with the Hamadan inscription of Darius II, recently published by Paper, but leaving out of account the inscriptions of Ariaramnes, Arsames, and Cyrus (these cannot be dated with certainty), we get the following numerical distribution of Old Persian inscriptions among the various rulers :

Darius I	— 56 inscriptions (including those on weights and seals)
Xerxes I	— 20 inscriptions (including those on seals and vases)
Artaxerxes I	— 4 inscriptions (including those on vases)
Darius II	— 3 inscriptions
Artaxerxes II	— 7 or 8 inscriptions
Artaxerxes III	— 1 or 2 inscriptions

However, this list does not give an entirely correct picture of the historical distribution of Old Persian written records, since it only takes into

¹³ I have been subsequently informed by J. Koszta that the site was not inhabited in modern times ; building on this site began only after the first World War. When digging the foundations of the neighbouring houses, there, too, broken pieces of earthenware and other cultural remains came to light. All this seems to indicate that the site used to be occupied by an old settlement, perhaps going back to antiquity. This circumstance makes it improbable that the Old Persian fragmentary inscription was taken in modern times by the Armenians to Gherla, lending colour to the alternative possibility, viz. that it got there in antiquity.

¹⁴ Old Persian. 107 & foll.

account inscriptions with different texts, or inscriptions with identical texts but found in different sites. It has, however, been pointed out above that a considerable part of Old Persian inscriptions was made in several copies. This fact may not be very important from the viewpoint of language or linguistics — but it becomes so when we attempt to estimate the extent, scope, and the territory covered by Old Persian written records. Hence, if we wish to form a correct picture of the history of Old Persian written records, we must take into consideration all available copies of the various inscriptions. On this basis, we get the following figures :

Darius I	—	95 inscriptions (approximate figure)
Xerxes I	—	36 inscriptions
Artaxerxes I	—	9 inscriptions
Darius II	—	4 inscriptions
Artaxerxes II	—	9 or 10 inscriptions
Artaxerxes III	—	4 or 5 inscriptions

As we see, the number of the Darius inscriptions becomes even more overwhelming, compared with those left behind by other Old Persian rulers. The proportion shifts even more in Darius I's favour if we take the length of the inscriptions also into account. The Gherla inscription accentuates this fact even more ; in this connection we wish to raise two questions.

No doubt, archaeological research may bring to light new specimens of Old Persian inscriptions, causing a certain modification in the numerical distribution of inscriptions among the various rulers ; yet the investigation of Old Persian inscriptions has had a fairly long past, so that the picture described above cannot be due to mere chance. If this is so, the following two questions naturally suggest themselves. How can one account for the fact that Old Persian records show their highest degree of development under Darius I, diminishing sharply under Xerxes I, and becoming practically insignificant from the reign of Artaxerxes I? The clarification of the causes leading to such a development would, no doubt, throw very interesting light on the history, not only of Persian written records, but of the administration of the Persian empire, and, consequently, on the history of Persian society.

The other question suggested by the historical distribution of Old Persian inscriptions may be put in the following way. How can one account for the fact that the highest degree of development of Old Persian written records — leaving out of account the inscriptions of Ariaramnes, Arsames, and Cyrus, probably dating from later times — was reached suddenly, without any preliminaries under Darius I? This question is by no means identical with the problem of the date when Old Persian cuneiform writing came into being. The latter question has recently been copiously discussed in the literature

on the subject ;¹⁵ undoubtedly, it is to some extent connected with the problem raised above. But independent of the answers which will be given to the questions concerning the origin and development of Old Persian cuneiform writing, the sudden flourishing of Old Persian written records under Darius I certainly needs elucidation. The solution of this problem is, obviously, at least as important for the history of the internal organization of the Persian empire as is the history, let us say, of the later development of Old Persian written records.

VIII

The last question we wish to raise in connection with the Gherla inscription is whether the inscription is not a fake. The question must be asked, chiefly because the question of its original site has not been clarified. Naturally, the possibility of its having been forged in modern times would be excluded, should the cultural layer containing the inscription prove to date from Roman or Dacian times and to be undisturbed. Since, however, the archaeological examination of the site may show the fragmentary inscription to have lain in a cultural layer dating from modern times, we must briefly discuss the possibility of forgery.

So far, 7 Old Persian inscriptions have been shown to be fakes.¹⁶ The fragmentary inscription of Gherla has, no doubt, certain traits which remind one of these forged inscriptions. It is a clay tablet inscription, and the fakes known so far were incised in baked clay tablets or bricks. Our inscription is unilingual : it gives only the Old Persian text, like the forgeries known so far. A final point of agreement is that 4 of the forgeries reproduce, like the Gherla inscription, the text of DPa. All these facts may, no doubt, be adduced if one wished to argue that the Gherla inscription was a fake.

We must point out, however, that these arguments supporting the possibility of forgery are by no means convincing. A number of the authentic Old Persian inscriptions were incised in clay tablets ; some of them contain, moreover, only the Old Persian text (DSb). The only circumstance that makes one reflect is that 4 of the known forgeries reproduce the same text. This agreement may, however, be due to chance. It would seem natural, on the one hand, that the forger should select the brief, easily copied text of DPa for repro-

¹⁵ See e. g. *F. H. Weissbach*: Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden. LIV, foll.; *A. Meillet—E. Benveniste*: Grammaire du vieux-perse. Paris 1931. I foll.; *W. Hinz*: ZDMG 96 (1942) 343 foll.; *G. G. Cameron*: Persepolis Treasury Tablets. Chicago 1948. 29; *Kent*: Old Persian. 12; *V. V. Struve*: Реформа письменности при дария I. »Вестник древней истории« 1951. 4. 186 foll. — For a recent interpretation of the part of the Bisutūn inscription (col. IV, §. 70) which has a decisive bearing on this question see *Kent*: JAOS 72 (1952) 13 foll. and *Hinz*: ZDMG 102 (1952) 28 & foll.

¹⁶ *Kent*: Old Persian. 115.

duction; there is, on the other hand, the possibility that this inscription existed also in copies incised in clay tablets.

Again, the Gherla fragmentary inscription has certain other features which definitely testify to its originality. Such are, first of all, the technical characteristics of the clay tablet. The chippings observable on it, the character and colouring of the fracture point unmistakably to its old age. Another point of difference is that while the known fakes are badly written, contain errors or even lack sense, the manner of writing on the Gherla clay tablet — though less finely executed than inscriptions engraved in stone or metal — is, in any case, unobjectionable and gives a correct text. Our fragmentary inscription has another interesting peculiarity. In Old Persian inscriptions, the usual procedure of scribes or engravers was to separate the various rows of characters by single lines.¹⁷ As against this, we find a double line between the rows of characters in the Gherla inscription, a procedure which scribes seem to have followed very rarely. In the material accessible to me I have observed it only in one instance, in an inscription of Artaxerxes I.¹⁸ All these facts militate against the assumption of forgery.

If we weigh carefully the arguments which would prove the Gherla inscription to be a fake and those which testify to its originality, the arguments in favour of its being original seem to be more weighty. This problem, however, can be solved definitely only after the archaeological examination of the site.

Я. ГАРМАТТА

ДРЕВНЕПЕРСИДСКАЯ НАДПИСЬ

(Резюме)

Только недавно стало известно об открытии древнеперсидской надписи, найденной в г. Герла (Румыния), у подножья холма св. Петра. Местонахождение, к сожалению, не было подвергнуто еще подробному обследованию и поэтому нам неизвестны ни возраст, ни состояние культурного слоя, в котором сохранился этот памятник.

Фрагмент глиняной таблицы, содержащей надпись, имеет высоту 47 мм., наибольшая ширина его составляет 52 мм., а толщина 5-6 мм. Она изготовлена из хорошо отмученной глины, в которой все же остались различные минеральные примеси. Верхний и левый края ее отломаны. Она кирпичного цвета, местами с желто-коричневыми пятнами. Обжиг ее слабават и неравномерен.

На таблице сохранился фрагмент 4-строчной надписи. Поверхность глины во многих местах повреждена, но эти повреждения не столь существенны, чтобы разбор и идентификация письменных знаков были невозможны. Эти знаки расположены полосами 7 мм. высоты. Полосы ограничены сверху и снизу врезанными линиями и таким образом между линиями двух соседних строк образуется промежутки, приблизительно 1,5 мм. шириной.

¹⁷ See *Herzfeld*: *Altpersische Inschriften*. Tables I, II, III, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X—XI, XII—XIII, XIV, XV; *Kent*: *Old Persian*. Table II; *Paper*: *JAOS* 72 (1952), Table facing p. 169.

¹⁸ *Herzfeld*: *Altpersische Inschriften*. Table XVI.

А что касается характера письма, сразу видно, что выполнение знаков менее тщательно, нежели у надписей, высеченных на камне или выгравированных в благородном металле.

Фрагмент, сохранившийся на табличке, содержит следующее :

1. строчка] <i>y^a θ^a i y^a :</i>
2. »] <i>a s^a p^a h^a y^a</i>
3. »] <i>š^a y^a : h^a</i>
4. »] <i>k^u u n^a u š^a</i>

Первая строчка должна читаться как *]yaθiya* или же с соответствующим дополнением как *[xšā]yaθiya*. Не подлежит сомнению и чтение 4. строчки : она читается *]kunauš*, а с дополнением *[a]kunauš*. Во второй строчке стоит *]āspahy*. В этой форме скрывается родительный падеж единственного числа имени, оканчивающегося на *-aspa*. Так как из контекста ясно, это имя представляет собой часть титулатуры царя, оно не может быть ничем иным, как именем одного из членов династии Ахеменидов. Но в названной династии только один из членов владел именем, оканчивающимся на *-aspa*, а именно *Vištāspa*. Таким образом, форма *]āspahy* должна быть дополнена до *[Vištā]špahy[ā]*.

Распознавание имени *Vištāspa* разрешает нам реконструкцию текста всей надписи. *Vištāspa* фигурирует только в титульных формулах Дария, а в надписях Ксеркса никогда не встречается. Из этого можно заключить, что наш фрагмент принадлежит к группе дарийских надписей. Таким образом, родительный падеж имени *[Vištā]špahy[ā]* может быть дополнен только словом *puca* 'сын'. Итак третья строчка надписи должна читаться как *[a : p^a u ca :]š^a y^a : h^a* и может быть дополнена как *[H^a x^a a m^a n^a i]š^a y^a*, ибо в перечислении титулов Дария всегда так продолжается выражение *Vištāspahyā puca*.

Имея в виду вышепредложенное дополнение, третья строчка состояла, по всей вероятности, из 16 письменных знаков. Подобную же длину можно предположить и у других строк. Самым легким оказывается сейчас дополнение третьей строчки. Сказуемое третьего лица *a]kunauš*, стоящее после титулов, указывает, повидимому, на новое предложение, которое было введено вероятно относительным местоимением *hya*. На конце третьей строчки действительно находим знак *h^a*, за которым в четвертой строчке следовал *y^a*. Следовательно последнее предложение надписи имело следующую форму : *hya akunauš* 'который сделал (построил)'. Между этими словами имеется место еще для 9 или 10 письменных знаков. Этот пробел нелегко поддается заполнению, но пока можно удовольствоваться дополнением в роде *imat tacaram* 'этот дворец'.

При дополнении первых двух строк ценную заслугу оказывают титульные формулы, фигурирующие на надписях Дария с одной стороны, и число третьей и четвертой строк данной надписи с другой. В связи с дополнением второй строки надо указать на то, что перед именем *[Vištā]špahy* нет достаточного места для *xšāyadīyānām*, поэтому эта строка может быть дополнена только формой *dahyūnām*.

Дополнение первой строки значительно труднее, так как здесь надо учесть и предыдущие строки, от которых ничего не осталось. Место, находящееся перед выражением *xšāyadīyā dahyūnām*, может быть занято формулами *xšāyadīyā vazraka*, *xšāyadīyā xšāyadīyānām* или *xšāyadīyā Pārsaiy*. Если *yadīyānām* или же *θiyānām* поставим в первую строку памятника, то получим 17 или 16 письменных знаков. В этом случае к предыдущей строке надо отнести слог *xšā-*, равно как и слова *vazraka* : *xšāyadīyā*, насчитывающие ровно 16 знаков. В строку, предыдущую восстановленной, просится теперь слово *xšāyadīyā*, причем остается еще место для 8 письменных знаков. Древнеперсидская форма имени Дария, совместно с дивизом, требует как раз 8 знаков, вследствие чего дополнение вряд ли может быть иным, как *Dārayavauš*.

Принимая сказанное во внимание, можно установить, что фрагмент надписи, найденной в г. Герла, первоначально состоял вероятно из 6 строк и имел следующее содержание :

строки подлинника фрагмента	транслитерация	число письменных знаков
1. —	<i>[Du a r^a y^a va u š^a : x^a š^a a y^a θ^a i y^a]</i>	16
2. —	<i>[va za r^a k^a : x^a š^a a y^a θ^a i y^a : θ^a x^a š^a a]</i>	16
3. 1	<i>[ya θ^a i y^a a n^a a m^a : x^a š^a a]y^a θ^a i y^a</i>	17
4. 2	<i>[da h^a y^a u n^a a m^a : Vi š^a ta]a s^a p^a h^a y^a</i>	16
5. 3	<i>[a : p^a u ca : H^a x^a a m^a n^a i]š^a y^a : h^a</i>	16
6. 4	<i>[y^a : i m^a m^a : ta ca r^a m^a : a]k^u u n^a u š^a</i>	17

Транскрипция

1.	—	[<i>Dārayavauš : xšāyaθiya :</i>]
2.	—	[<i>vazraka : xšāyaθiya : xšā</i>]
3.	1.	[<i>yaθiyānām : xšā</i>] <i>yaθiya :</i>
4.	2.	[<i>dahyūnām : Višt</i>] <i>āspahy</i>
5.	3.	[<i>ā : puça : Haxāmani</i>] <i>šaya : h</i>
6.	4.	[<i>ya : imam : tacaram : a</i>] <i>kunauš</i>

Перевод :

»Великий царь, царь царей, царь стран, Дарий, сын Гистаспа из рода Ахеменидов был (тот), который построил этот дворец«.

Если восстановление текста фрагмента в вышеприведенной форме правильно — то надпись имеет точные аналогии в кратких надписях Дария в Персеполе, высеченных на дверных створках внутренних помещений царского дворца над фигурами, изображающими царя и членов его свиты. Текст этих надписей (DPa) в полной мере соответствует восстановленному тексту фрагмента из г. Герла.

Надпись, поступившая из г. Герла, не представляет собой исключения среди древнеперсидских надписей в отношении материала, на который она нанесена. Нам известны и другие древнеперсидские надписи, нанесенные на глиняные таблицы, но их число ничтожно по сравнению с надписями, высеченными на камне. Часто бывает, что текст надписи, выполненной на глиняной таблице, появляется и в гравировке по камню. Из этого можно вывести некоторые заключения для назначения глиняных таблиц и для их отношения к надписям на камне.

Древнеперсидские надписи выполнялись, как правило, во многих экземплярах. Но массовая высека надписей на камне вряд ли мыслима без соответствующего образца текста. Поэтому вполне допустимо, что черновой набросок текста происходил на глиняных таблицах, как это практиковалось в области ассирийско-вавилонской письменности. Персидские писцы по всей вероятности пользовались этим же методом при выполнении надписей на камне или металле.

На основании вышесказанного можно предполагать, что фрагмент надписи из г. Герла служил тоже образцом текста. Это подкрепляется и тем, что точно соответствующая ему надпись DPa является типичной построочной надписью, высеченной на камне, текст которой сохранился на дворце Дария в Персеполе в нескольких экземплярах.

Совпадение текста фрагмента с текстом DPa наводит на мысль о том, что пожалуй именно фрагмент из г. Герла служил образцом при выполнении надписей персепольского дворца. Но это вряд ли допустимо, потому что письменная форма *Haxāmanišaya* на фрагменте из г. Герла не согласуется с надписями Персеполя и так как последние содержат правильную форму, наш фрагмент не мог служить образцом для них. Он исполнил эту функцию, повидимому, при выполнении надписи или надписей какой-нибудь другой постройки Дария.

Но как же попала глиняная таблица с древнеперсидской надписью в г. Герла? Это является самым трудным и пока еще неразрешимым вопросом, возникшим в связи с фрагментом. Если культурный слой, в котором он был открыт, не был древним, то он в течение нового века поступил из Персии в Трансильванию: может быть его завезли армяне. Но если бы культурный слой, в котором его нашли, был более древним, происходящим из времен римлян или даже дакийцев, то это значительно усложняет дело. В этом случае допустимо предположение, что фрагмент представляет собой памятник персидского господства в Фракии. Из сообщений Геродота (IV 87, 91) знаем, что Дарий во время своего скифского похода сделал много надписей в Фракии. Не подлежит сомнению, что персидский режим оставил после себя и памятники зодчества в этой стране. По прекращении персидского режима местное население — по словам Геродота — растаскивало эти памятники и надписи, как это случилось и в Византии. Допустимо, что фрагмент из г. Герла представляет собой образец текста персидской надписи, оставшейся в северной части Балканского полуострова, который попал в Трансильванию по прекращении персидской власти в Фракии.