

T

<i>tabusur-</i> h 'sich zusammenziehen, gerinnen'	<i>toxumak</i> h 'Weben, Gewebe'
<i>tažan-</i> h 'sich verstecken, sich verbergen'	<i>tojlanmax</i> t 'Einzugsfeier'
<i>takkele-</i> h 'dämpfen, schlagen'	<i>tokkala-</i> t 'begiessen'
<i>talavka</i> t 'Mädchen'	<i>tozak</i> h 'Staub'
<i>tartyluvcu</i> h 'der Kriechende'	<i>tubursu-</i> h 'hart werden' <i>čamur</i>
<i>tartyš-</i> t 'sich zusammenziehen, eingehen'	<i>tubursudu</i> 'Teig ist hart geworden'
<i>terelešici</i> h 'der Prozess führende, streitende'	<i>tunčux-</i> 'fressen'
<i>tijiska</i> h 'Frau des Verwandten'	<i>tušku</i> t 'Nachmittagsgottesdienst im Sommer'
	<i>tušuv</i> t 'Weihrauch'
	<i>tyn</i> t 'Geist'

U

<i>učur koreni</i> t 'eine bittere Wurzel als Heilmittel'	<i>uvullan-</i> h 'einen Sohn haben'
---	--------------------------------------

WŁADYSŁAW DULĘBA

WAS DARIUS A ZOROASTRIAN?

Arthur Christensen in his *Les Kayanides* (København 1931, p. 8) writes: „M. Benveniste dans son livre *The Persian Religion according to the chief Greek texts* (Paris 1929, p. 49) a démontré d'une façon convaincante selon mon opinion, que la religion des Achéménides, telle que nous la présentent Herodote et les inscriptions de Darius, n'est pas le zoroastrisme, mais l'ancienne religion iranienne non reformée: Differing from the religion of the magi and that of Zoroaster at the same time, it is in harmony with mazdeism only to the extent to which the latter has retained, in spite of the reform, traces of naturalistic beliefs and practices. Si l'on accepte cette thèse, l'identification du père de Darius avec le protecteur de Zoroastre devient nulle”.

The great authority of both of these scholars was probably the main reason, why this thesis remains generally approved up to our days. Let us however examine the case once more.

„The information supplied by the inscriptions — says E. Benveniste¹ — may be reduced to the following:

1. Darius boasts of having established his empire and suppressed rebellions „with the help of Ahuramazda and all the gods”.

2. He reconstructed the Ayadana, sanctuaries which the false Smerdis, the Gaumâta, had destroyed in his attempted usurpation.

3. Xerxes mentions Anahita and Mithra side by side with Ahuramazda”.

Is it really true?

Let us see, how it looks in the statistics of the Achaemenian inscriptions:²

¹ p. 35.

² conf.: Roland G. Kent, *Old Persian — Grammar, texts, lexicon*. Second edition, New Haven 1953. Pp. 116—156.

A = Ahuramazda; Aa = Ahuramazda and Arta; Ag = Ahuramazda, the greatest of gods; Ao = Ahuramazda and the other gods who are; At = Ahuramazda together with gods; N = Anahita; M = Mithra.

The inscription Name of the god mentionned (successively)

Darius I (521 — 486)

Behistan I—V	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
	A	Ao	Ao	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
	A	A								
Persepolis d—h	Ag	A	A	A	At	A	At	At	A	A
	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Naqš-e Rostam	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
	A	A	A	A	A					
Susa a—d—f,	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
i—p, s	A	A	A	A	Ag	A	A			
Hamadan	Ag	A								

Xerxes I (486 — 465)

Persopolis a—h	A	A	A	A	At	A	At	At	A	A
	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	Aa
	A	A	A	Aa	A	Aa	A			
Susa	A									
Van	A									

Artaxerxes I (465 — 425)

Persepolis	A
------------	---

Darius II (425 — 406)

Susa	At	A
------	----	---

Artaxerxes II (405 — 359)

Susa	A	N	M	A	N	M	A	A	A	N
	M									
Hamadan	A	N	M	A	N	M	M	Ag	A	A
	A									

Artaxerxes III (359 — 338)

Persepolis	A	A	M
------------	---	---	---

We can see clearly from this tablet that:

1. the phrase „and the other gods who are” (according to the translation by Roland Kent) occurs only twice in all the Behistan inscriptions of Darius, after Ahuramazda being mentioned 61 times, and it does not occur in any other Achaemenian inscription, while the name of Ahuramazda himself is mentioned 126 times in Darius’ inscriptions and 32 times in the inscriptions of the later Achaemenids, down to Darius II.

2. While mentioning these „other gods” Darius writes:

„Saith Darius the king: This which I did, in one and the same year by the favour of Ahuramazda I did; Ahuramazda bore me aid, and the other gods who are.

Saith Darius the king: For this reason Ahuramazda bore me aid and the other gods who are, because I was not hostile, I was not a Lie follower, I was not a doer of wrong — neither I nor my family. Neither to the weak nor to the powerfull did I do wrong. The man who cooperated with my house, him I rewarded well; whoso did injury, him I punished well”³.

So Darius seems to have mentioned the other gods only for the reason that he was not hostile, not a doer of wrong. It is obvious that these „other gods” were not his gods. Let us not forget that Behistan rock stood above the main road from the Egypt, Palestine and Babilon to the East. These countries had their really powerfull gods. As a great statesman Darius preferred to show his respect to them.

Almost the same we can say about another similar expression:

³ R. Kent, *op. cit.*, p. 132, par. 62—63.

„together with the gods” which was used only in the palace inscriptions — 4 times by Darius and 3 times by Xerxes.

3. The phrases „Ahuramazda and Artā” and „Ahuramazda, the greatest of gods” do not deny the monotheism of their authors at all.

4. Darius — in his more „private” inscription, on his tomb at Naqš-e Rostam — does not mention any god except Ahuramazda.

Darius boasts that he has reconstructed the sanctuaries destroyed by Gaumata.

„The fact that Darius had restored temples — says E. Benveniste⁴ — must be looked upon simply as a measure of religious policy intended to court the favour of the people, and a mark of the tolerance which the Achaemenid dynasty showed to all cults living on their empire. Would then a faithful Zoroastrian king, fired with the intolerant spirit which the *Gathas* breathe, have paid such regard to foreign creeds?”

In Behistan inscription we read about this⁵:

„Saith Darius the king: The kingdom had been taken away from our family, that I put in its place; I restored to the people the pastures and the herds, the household slaves and the houses which Gaumata the Magian took away from them. I reestablished the people on its foundation, both Persia and Media and other provinces. As before, so I brought back what have been taken away. By the favour of Ahuramazda this I did: I strove until I reestablished our royal house on its foundation as (it was) before. So I strove by the favour of Ahuramazda, so that Gaumata the Magian did not remove our royal house”.

It means, in my opinion, that Darius simply has restored the peace and the social order — by any means.

Xerxes, as we see in the statistics of the Achaemenian inscriptions, did not mention neither Anahita nor Mithra. They were not mentioned in the inscriptions until the time of Artaxerxes II, whose rule was about 120 years later than this of

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 48.

⁵ R. Kent, p. 120.

Darius I. Then we can really say about the reconstruction of „other gods”. But Xerxes, on the contrary, writes in his Persopolis inscription:⁶

„Saith Xerxes the king: When that I became king, there is among these countries which I inscribed above (one which) was in commotion. Afterwards Ahuramazda bore me aid; by the favor of Ahuramazda I smote that country and put it down in its place.

And among these countries there was (a place) where previously false gods were worshipped. Afterwards, by the favour of Ahuramazda, I destroyed that sanctuary of the demons, and made proclamation, the demons shall not be worshipped!” Where previously the demons were worshipped, there I worshipped Ahuramazda and Artā reverent(ly)”.

So Xerxes was already not even tolerant for „the false gods”.

⁶ R. Kent, p. 151, XPu, par. 4a—4b.