

MARTIN SCHWARTZ  
Berkeley

**An Achaemenid Position, and Gathic Composition:  
OPers. \*grasta-(pati-), OAv. grāhma-, and PIE √g<sup>h</sup>res**

A title ΓΡΑΣΤΑΠΑΤΙΣ (*grastapatis*) occurs in a 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E. Greek inscription from Mylasa in southwest Anatolia, most recently treated in DESCAT 2011,<sup>1</sup> who, restoring the text, translated it as follows: “Aux divinités bienfaisants d’Hékatomnos et d’Aba, en étant *grastapatis* de Mausole, a consacré (les brasiers?) Artimès fils de Targélios.” Nothing more is known about Artimes, son of Targelios. It is clear, as DESCAT notes, that Artimes’ title is a Greek rendition of an Old Persian noun \**grastapati-*, nominative \**grastapatisš*, in which \*-*pati-*, as in many other compounds, means “chief, master, someone in charge of something (in this instance, \**grasta-*).”<sup>2</sup>

DESCAT took \**grasta-* as referring to provision of food, seeing in \**grasta-* the equivalent of Vedic *grasta-* “something devoured” (root *gras*), which has a variety of Greek cognates which refer to devouring or eating (by animals or people). Postulating an equivalent Iranian root \**grah*, from which HUMBACH and MAYRHOFER had taken the obscure Old Avestan noun *grāhma-* as “voraciousness,” DESCAT tentatively proposed for \**grastapati-* “chef des choses dévorées, chef de ce qui est mangé.” Thereby DESCAT envisaged two possibilities for the function of the *grastapatis*.

Firstly, DESCAT called attention to the interest of the Hekatomnids in the raising of herds and the profits therefrom, which is well attested for the instance of Kondalos (Pseudo-Aristotle, *Econ.* II 2, 14a), who was responsible for nourishing the animals belonging to the satrap. This activity is related to the central role of animal husbandry in the Achaemenid system, cf. the tax mentioned in Pseudo-Aristotle (*Econ.* II 1, 4, with BRIANT 1996, pp. 453-456). In this environment *grastapati-* would refer to being in charge of the animals’ eating. A second possibility mentioned by DESCAT is that the *grastapatis*’ presidency over eating would consist of the provision of meals for the satrap. The fact is that there is no evidence whatever for an Iranian root *grah* “to eat, to devour;” words for eating and feeding are always from the root *hwar* in Iranian.

Before further considering the prepound \**grasta-*, one must note the survival of \**grastapati-* as West Middle Iranian *grast(e)bed*, attested as Pahlavi <glšpt> and Parthian <grstpty>, both in two passages of Shapur I’s trilingual inscription at Ka’be-ye Zardosht, in each instance paralleled by Greek ΤΟΥ ΕΠΙ ΑΝΝΩΝΗΣ,

<sup>1</sup> I thank Professor PIERRE BRIANT for putting this article at my disposal, and Professor RAYMOND DESCAT for a lively online discussion of the data, and both scholars for the encouragement.

<sup>2</sup> For another example of an Old Iranian compound in \*-*pati-* attested in late Achaemenid southwest Anatolia, see SCHWARTZ 2005.

the latter amounting to “the one in charge of provisions of supplies (from the provinces to the capital).”

These words were discussed by BAILEY (1956, pp. 99-100), who compared the prepound with the Iranian loanword *grast* “animal, such as horse, mule, and especially ass, for carrying loads.” From the larger contexts of Shapur’s trilingual it is clear that the two successive with the title *grast(e)bed* bore a unique imperial economic position. Given now that Arm. *grast* has as its antecedent \**grasta-*, the prepound of \**grastapati-*, the latter term should originally have meant “chief of caravan (animal)s,” which came to designate a late Achaemenid satrapal post (attested at southwest Anatolia) and later a Sasanian imperial office.<sup>3</sup>

One must reject BAILEY’s (*loc. cit.*) derivation of \**grasta-* from an alleged Indo-Iranian base \**ghar-dh* “to take up,” whence supposedly OAv. *gərazdi-* (correctly “pathway, approach, access,” to Lat. *gradior*).

Given the presently known repertory of Indo-Iranian roots, the form \**grasta-* could be, in theory, taken as a past passive participle (via \**gr̥ntʰ-ta-* > *graθ-ta-*) from the Indo-Iranian root *granth* “to tie a knot.” However, this root is manifest in Iranian only as the noun \**granθya-* > e.g. Sogdian *γranš*, Persian *giriḥ* “a knot,” and knotting generally has no notable role in the construction of pack saddles.

Etymological guidance for *grasta-* is provided by the Greek word for pack saddle, *σάγμα*,<sup>4</sup> from the root *σακ*, pres. *σάττω* (\**σακίω*) “press, constrict.” A parallel etymology would have \**grasta-* “animal upon which a saddle pack has been imposed” = past passive participle “subjected to pressure or constriction” from a root *grah* “to press, constrict” (like Av. *frašta-* from the root *fras* “to ask”).

Such a root *grah*, I shall try to show, is confirmed by Old Avestan *grāhma-*, which I take as meaning “oppression,” with cognates in words in various Indo-European languages,<sup>5</sup> for which, with OAv. *grāhma-*, I derive from a Proto-Indo-European root \**gʰres* “to press, to constrict.”

The meaning “oppression” accords with the passage which precedes the three attestations of *grāhma-* at Y32.12-14:

Y32.11...the wrongsomes ones, who through the robbery of inherited property, show themselves off as milords and miladies with their grandeurs, as they tear the righteous away from Best Mind.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> It is notable that on the eastern trade roads caravan chiefs, who were in charge of provision for the animals, occupied lucrative and prestigious positions, and the titles for this function underwent semantic expansion; cf. DIEN 1962; SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996, and SCHWARTZ, forthcoming. The situation was similar for the *rēš šayyārtā* at Palmyra; cf. DIEN 2004.

<sup>4</sup> I have derived from this word the Khwarezmian word for “pack saddle,” *sym* f. *Muqaddimat al-Adab* 47.5-6, 1242, 316.5 (= Arab. *rahl*, Pers. *pālān-i šutur* “camel’s pack saddle”), a point of cultural-historical interest. Note the also basic sense of bilateral girding for Pers. *pālān* (and Sogd. *pyrδn*) < OIr \**pari-dāna-* “placing around.”

<sup>5</sup> Cf. already SCHWARTZ 2006, p. 461, fn. 4, with dismissal of connection with Vedic *grásate* “devours” and [Henning’s] comparison with Middle Iranian forms for “wealth.”

<sup>6</sup> This context would explain the glossation of *grāhma-* as Pahlavi *pārag*, Parsi Sanskrit *lañcā*, and Persian *rišvat* “bribe.”

These evildoers are the *kauui*-s, the local warlord rulers,<sup>7</sup> characterized as domineering tyrants (Y32.12 below), who are patrons of the corrupt priestly rivals of Zarathushtra. The three passages containing *grēhma*-, with their emphasis on the misuse of power, support the translation “oppression:”

Y32.12a            *yāiš grēhmā ašāt karapā varatā xšaθrəmcaā īšanqm drujəm*  
Through such things, via \*oppression, the *karapan*-priest chooses domin(at)ion and the tyrants’ wrongness instead of Rightness.

Y32.13a            *yā xšaθrā grēhmō hīšasaṭ acištahiiā dāmānē manahō*  
b’                    *aṅhāuš marəxtārō ahiiā*  
Through such domin(at)ion, \*oppression ties<sup>8</sup> the destroyers of this existence to the House of Worst Mind...

Y32.14a            *ahiiā \*grēhmā<sup>9</sup> ā.hōiθōi nī kāuuaiiascīt xratūš nī.dadaṭ*  
Through the \*oppression of this [existence], the *kauui*-s indeed put their intelligence into ensnarement...

It shall now be argued that *grēhma*- \* “oppression” retains an association with the idea of constriction posited above for *grah* as root of \**grasta*-, and further that *grēhma*- itself is specifically associated with the constriction of animals seen in the form \**grasta*-. We may proceed from the fact that at Y32.13a’ and Y32.14a’ *hīšasaṭ* and *hōiθōi* respectively immediately follow derivatives of the root *hāy* “to tie (up)” (which is in the same semantic field as constrict, constrain) and occur immediately after *grēhma*- “oppression,” the agency responsible for the tying of the oppressors themselves. These derivatives of  $\sqrt{hāy}$  are among a series in the second half of Y32, with culmination at Y32.16c *aēnaḥhē drəguuatō... aṅhaiiā* “may I tie up (*aṅhaiiā* < /ā hāyāyā/) the wrongsomenes for their harmfulness ...”

In Y32 the focus on tying<sup>10</sup> proceeds from Y46 recalled backwards; specifically Y46.19-Y46.6 contributes a lexical and thematic basis for Y32.7-Y32.16,<sup>11</sup> as shall be charted below. In this compositional recasting, Y46.7 *haēθahiiā* “of ensnare-

<sup>7</sup> SCHWARTZ 2013. To the Sogdian evidence should be added S. *kwy*, *kw’y*, *kw’y* discussed in SIMS-WILLIAMS 1992, pp. 54 and 75. Note the spelling *kw’y* in the personal name *wkwy’y* and Man. S. *sm’wtry kw’y* “sea giant,” which shows that the Sogd. word is /kawāy/, from the OIr. strong-stem acc. \**kawāyam*. The OAv forms *kāuuaiiascīt* and *kāuuaiiascā* must have defectively placed *ā*.

<sup>8</sup> For the meaning and etymology of *hīšasaṭ*, see SCHWARTZ 2006, p. 461, fn. 5 and the cross-textual composition evidence in ID. 2010, p. 219 and Chart 1 on 221, and most recently ID. 2013, p. 72.

<sup>9</sup> Mss. *grēhmō* by influence of Y32.13a’ *grēhmō*.

<sup>10</sup> For the relevant punitive and other ties, see SCHWARTZ 2006, pp. 460-466.

<sup>11</sup> For the principle, see ID. 2002, pp. 3-8, and the charts, with discussion thereupon, in ID. 2003, 2009, and 2010. The relationship between Y46.19 remembered backwards and Y32.7 seq. was first treated, in elaborate detail, in ID. 1991, pp. 143 and 161.

ment” has as positional correspondent Y32.16 *aṅhāiīā* “may I tie up” from the same  $\sqrt{hāy}$ . At Y46.6, the wrongdoer is said to be doomed to enter the traplines of Wrongness: *drūjō huuō dāmaṅ haēṅahiiā gāt*. The next stanza, Y46.7, asks Mazdā’s protection from the evildoer who would lay hold of Zarathushtra to harm him. The idea is then elaborated in the stanza which follows, Y46.8: “May the threat of him who plots harm against me ... not reach me ..., but may it come with matching enmity against his person, and keep him from good life...” Here the themes of tying down and restraining go with statements of punitive reciprocity.

This ideology of punitive reciprocity lies behind Y32.13 and 14, where *grāhma-* +  $\sqrt{hāy}$  may consequently be said to indicate that the latent constriction ( $\sqrt{grah}$ ), which we have noted from *\*grasta-* as root notion of *grāhma-* “oppression,” ties up the agents of oppression.

The following chart shows the aforementioned formal relationships between Y46.19-16 and Y32.7-16, including those mentioned above. The charting of the correspondences of formally related words also provides a collocative framework for recognizing words which are related purely semantically, within which items there is further evidence for the etymological connection between *grasta-* and *grāhma-*.

Y46.19 & Y32.7	<i>tu(uām)</i> (...) <i>mazdā vaēdištō</i> “Thou, Mazdā, most knowing”
Y46.18 & Y32.8	<i>vīciṅa-</i> “decision;” $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$ “to satisfy reciprocally”
Y46.17 & Y32.9	<i>sēṅgh-</i> “to declare;” $\sqrt{sr(a)u}$ “to hear”
Y46.16 & Y32.9	<i>išti-</i> + <i>vaṅhāuš manaṅhō</i> “the power of Good Mind”
Y46.15 & Y32.10	<i>dāṅṅ</i> “lawful” + $\sqrt{dā}$ “put, establish”
Y46.14 & Y32.11	<i>maz-</i> “great”
Y46.13 & Y32.12	$\sqrt{sr(a)u}$ “to hear” + <i>marəta-</i> “mortals”
Y46.12 & Y32.12	<i>aēibiiō</i> ... <i>mazdā</i> “to them Mazda speaks”
Y46.11 & Y32.13	<i>xšaṅrā(iš)</i> “via dominations;” <i>ahu-</i> + $\sqrt{mark/č}$ “destroy existence;” <i>dāmāna-</i> “house;” <i>karapan-</i> “priest (pej.)”
Y46.10 & Y32.13	<i>ahiiā</i> “of this [existence]”
Y46.9 & Y32.14	<i>gau-</i> “cow”; <i>mrāu-/mrāu-</i> “say”
Y46.8 & Y32.15	<i>jiiātəuš/jiiātəiš</i> “of life”
Y46.8 & Y32.16	<i>āṅ(r)iš</i> “threat”
Y46.7 & Y32.16	<i>aēnaṅhē</i> “for harming”
Y46.6 & Y32.16	$\sqrt{hāy}$ “to tie;” <i>drəḡuuant-</i> “wrongsome;” <i>vahišta-</i> “best”

Now, in both corresponding stanzas with the most lexical correlations, Y46.11 and Y32.13, it is said that the *karapan-s*, “the destroyers of existence, via the domination(s),” are doomed to the “House” of Hell; in both the instrumental of *xšaṅra-* “domination” is immediately followed at Y46.11 by *yūjən* “they yoke/subjugate [mankind]” and at Y32.13 by *grāhmā\** “oppression.” Not only does subjugation here semantically parallel \*oppression, but the literal reference of *yūjən* to yoking would parallel the imposition of pressure, or constriction, posited above, toward the meaning of  $\sqrt{grah}$  in *\*grasta-* “having a pack saddle” – and in *grāhma-*.

Furthermore,  $\sqrt{yuj}$  “yoke,” in its basic reference to encumbering animals, has a parallel at Y32.15, which immediately continues the thought of the three pre-

ceding stanzas, which attest *grāhma-*: “Through these things the *karapan*-dom and *kauui*-dom are lost, together with those whom they put into *harness* (*aibī ... daiñtī*); those latter, with the former two groups, will not be brought into the House of Best Mind by Those Who rule over life as They wish.” Here, again collocated with the theme of retributive impedance we have seen with *grāhma-*, *aibī ... daiñtī* “they harness” parallels *yūjān* “they yoke,” both expressing the imposition of constriction, which, again, with animals as object, characterizes *grasta-*, the meaning of whose root, *grah*, as “to put under pressure, constrict, constrain,” is corroborated by the contextual and compositional details attending *grāhma-* < OIr. *\*grah-ma-*.

The final support for the meaning of the latter root comes from broader Indo-European considerations, for which we may compare the Iranian exclusively with a series of Baltic forms, which, with the Iranian, point to a PIE verb root *\*g<sup>h</sup>res*. OAv. *grāhma-*, with *-mV-* formant, compares with Lithuanian *grėsmė*, *grasmė* “threat, compulsion.”<sup>12</sup> Allied Baltic forms are Lith. *gresiù*, *grėsti* “to threaten (Latvian *grasāt*, *grasīt* ‘id.’), to make loathsome;” *grasùs* “disgusting;” *grasà* “threat, restriction;” *gristù*, *grīsti* “be bored.”

Sharing meanings found for Lith. *gresiù* and *grasùs*, Armenian *garšim* “I loathe, am disgusted” (whence Arm. noun *garš* “loathing”) is easily seen as a cognate, < PIE passive *\*g<sup>h</sup>rsye/o* “be \*oppressed.” With the Baltic and Armenian should belong Tocharian B *krās-* “to torment, vex” and related B and A forms (for solution of vocalic problems of derivation from *\*g<sup>h</sup>res*, an account of the history of this etymology, and mention of semantically less likely suggestions for cognates of *krās-*, see ADAMS 2013, p. 231. Accordingly, the PIE root *\*g<sup>h</sup>res*, giving Plr. *\*grah* “to put under pressure, press down, constrict,” explains OAv. *grāhma-*, “oppression” and its association with “tying down, harnessing,” etc., and thus also accounts for *\*grasta-* “< (animal) upon which a pack saddle has been imposed,” the latter paralleled by the derivation of the Greek word for “pack saddle” from “press, constrict,” as we have seen. One may readily compare, for the historical semantics, OIr. *\*ubjya-* (Av. *ubjiia-* “be pressed down,” noun. *\*ubjyā* > Sogd. /üžbā/, /wižbā/ “fright, worry, anxiety,” Khwar. ’wzβ’hyd “bored, was tedious to” (SCHWARTZ 1970, p. 299).

In conclusion, a late Achaemenid Old Persian title *\*grastapati-*, reflected in a Greek inscription of Mylasa, has as a later correspondent Middle Persian and Parthian *grast(e)bed*, whose Greek equivalent indicates the transportation of provincial supplies. From all these data one may trace the development of *\*grastapati-* as an important economic office originating from “chief of caravan animals,” whose prepound *\*grasta-* (> Armenian *grast*), referring to the imposition of pack saddles, is cognate with OAv. *grāhma-*, which, on the basis of Gathic contextual and compositional criteria, must mean “oppression, subjugation, constrict-

<sup>12</sup> POKORNY 1959, p. 445, under *\*ghers-*, *\*ghres-* “Widerwille, Abscheu, Ekel” gives Av. *grāhma-* as “Sünder, Frevler” but, although mentioning the other relevant Baltic forms, omits mention of Lithuanian *grėsmė*, *grasmė*. PIE *\*g<sup>h</sup>res-* is not represented by RIX ET AL. 1998.

tion,” from a Proto-Iranian root *grah-* < Proto-Indo-European *\*g<sup>hr</sup>es* (also attested in Baltic, Armenian, and Tocharian) “to press down, constrict, oppress.”

#### ADDENDUM

A novel explanation of OAv. *grēhma-* (or, theoretically, *\*grēhman-*) has recently been offered by HUMBACH (2010, pp. 50-51), who, comparing the Vedic root *gras* “to devour, to graze,” Greek γράστις “fodder, forage” and Latin *grāmen* “leaf of grass” < *\*grasmen*, takes the OAv. word as parallel to English slang *grass*, Arabic *ḥašīš* (“grass”) for “cannabis,” and suggests that the OAv. refers to some unspecified drug plant “and those gang of those who are addicted to it.” Given that no such word for “grass” is attested in (Indo-)Iranian, and the close analysis of Y32.12-14 does not support such an interpretation but points to a very different meaning and (an inner-Iranian) etymology.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup> A variant version of this article is scheduled to appear in the online journal *ARTA*.

## REFERENCES

- D.Q. ADAMS: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged*. Amsterdam 2013.
- H.W. BAILEY: "Armeno-Indo-iranica." In: *TPS* (1956), pp. 88-126.
- C. BARTHOLOMAE: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg 1904.
- P. BRIANT: *De Cyrus à Alexandre*. Paris 1966.
- R. DESCAT: "Autour de la tombe d'Hékatomnos. Nouvelle lecture d'une inscription de Mylasa." In: *Zeitschrift der Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 178 (2011), pp. 195-246.
- A.E. DIEN: "The *Sapao* Problem Revisited." In: *JAOS*, 82.3 (1962), pp. 335-346.  
— "Palmyra as a Caravan City."  
<[www.silkroadfoundation.org/newsletter/2004/vol2num1/Palmyra.htm](http://www.silkroadfoundation.org/newsletter/2004/vol2num1/Palmyra.htm)> 2004.
- H. HUMBACH, K. FAISS: *Zarathushtra and His Antagonists*. Wiesbaden 2010.
- J. POKORNY: *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern and München 1959.
- H. RIX, M. KÜMMEL, T. ZEHNDER, R. LIPP, B. SCHIRMER: *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden 1998.
- RONG XINJIANG: "New Light on the Sogdian Colonies along the Silk Road."  
<[http://edoc.bbaw.de/volltexte/2009/pdf/V\\_01\\_Rong.pdf](http://edoc.bbaw.de/volltexte/2009/pdf/V_01_Rong.pdf)> 2009.
- M. SCHWARTZ: "On the Khwarezmian Version of the Muqaddimat al-Adab as edited by Johannes Benzing." In: *ZDMG* 120 (1970) [1971], pp. 288-304.  
— "Sound, Sense, and 'Seeing' in Zoroaster: the Outer Limits of Orality." In: *K.R. Cama Oriental Institute Proceedings (5<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> January 1989)*. Bombay 1991, pp. 127-163.  
— "How Zarathushtra Generated the Gathic Corpus: Inner-textual and Intertextual Composition." In: *BAI* 16 (2002) [2006], pp. 1-8.  
— "Women in the Old Avesta: Social Position and Textual Composition." In: *BAI* 17 (2003) [2007], pp. 53-64.  
— "Apollo and Khshathrapati, the Median Nergal, at Xanthos." In: *BAI*, 19 (2005) [2009], pp. 45-50.  
— "The Gathas and Other Old Avestan Poetry." In: *La langue poétique indo-européenne. Actes du colloque de travail de la Société des Études indo-européenne, Paris 22-24 octobre 2003*, ed. G.-J. PINAULT, D. PETIT, Leuven-Paris 2006, pp. 459-498.  
— "Pouruchista's Gathic Wedding and the Teleological Composition of the Gathas." In: *Exegisti Monumenta: Festschrift in honour of Nicholas Sims-Williams*, ed. W. SUNDERMANN, A. HINTZE, F. DE BLOIS. Wiesbaden 2010, pp. 429-448.  
— "Lexical Cruces of Yasna 29 and the Cross-textual Composition of the Gathas." In: *Ancient and Middle Iranian Studies: Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> European Conference of Iranian Studies*, ed. M. MACUCH, D. WEBER, D. DURKIN-MEISTERERNST. Wiesbaden 2010.  
— "Avestan *kauui*-s and the Vocabulary of Indo-Iranian Institutions." In: *Gifts to a Magus, Indo-Iranian Studies Honoring Firoze Kotwal*, ed. J. CHOKSY, J. DUBEANSKY. New York 2013, pp. 63-76.  
— Forthcoming, *BAI* 23.
- N. SIMS-WILLIAMS: *Sogdian and Other Inscriptions of the Upper Indus*. London 1992.  
— "The Sogdian Merchants in India and China." In: *Cina e Iran da Alessandro Magno alla dinastia Tang*, ed. A. CADONNA, L. LANCIOTTI. Firenze 1996, pp. 45-47.

