§1. Introduction

§1.1. After a new edition of the first column of the Elamite version of the Behistun inscription was published in 2017 (Amiri 2017), I examined the second column and carried out a similar study for the purpose of producing a precise copy as well as collating previous editions with its cuneiform text. With the experiences I have gained, I hope to publish the remaining sections of the Elamite version, particularly the third column, in which erosion damaged many of its passages.

§1.2. The newer Elamite version (hereafter the Elamite version) is a copy of the older one, which is situated to the right of the sculptured reliefs of the monument of Behistun. The Elamite version was engraved in three large columns directly beneath the Babylonian version. Moreover, a number of small Elamite inscriptions are placed on the empty parts of the relief panel of the monument or on its lower margins. This contribution offers an edition of the second column of the Elamite version. The remaining sections will be published in subsequent articles.

§2. The state of the second column

§2.1. Unlike the first and third columns of the Elamite version, which include severely eroded portions, the cuneiform signs in the second column are mostly legible. However, water damage to the upper section of the column partially eroded some of its signs. In addition, further water damage to the right section of the first column and its seepage into the left section of the second column has eroded the signs at the beginning of its lines (see figures 1, 2 and 4). On the other hand, damage from a solution of water and calcareous compounds to the top of the third column and its seepage into the right section of the second column has left tufa deposits on some signs at the end of several lines (see figures 1 and 5). Except for these affected portions, the majority of the passages in the second column are sufficiently intact that they seem to have the same quality as at the time of engraving. As Cameron, who closely examined the inscription in 1948 and 1957, mentioned:

“This column [= the second column] has suffered less damage than any other portion of the Bisitun [= Behistun] inscription.” (Cameron 1960, 65)

§3. General notes on the engraving

§3.1. According to my measurements of the inscription, the dimensions of the second column...
are 341.3 cm in height and 209 cm in width. It was engraved on the smoothed face of the rock and there is a space of 3 cm between its borders and that of the two other columns.

§3.2. Several reasons might be suggested to show that the second column was engraved in conjunction with the other two. Accordingly, there are reasons to be suggested that the engraver(s) who incised the cuneiform signs in the second column were different from those who worked on the two others. However, this topic requires an extended discussion which does not fit into this article.

§3.3. Detailed examination of the second column substantiates that the wedges at the beginning of its lines particularly in left lower section of the column were more shallowly cut than the wedges in middle and right sections (see figure 6). In addition, such manner of engraving is observable at the end of right section of the first column. Probably, this is due to more rock hardness in the area wherein they were cut.

§4. The text
§4.1. The second column of the Elamite version contains a royal text with a detailed account of Darius the Great’s battles and his suppression of a number of revolts happened after his expedition to Babylon and killing Nidintu-Bēl the Babylonian rebel. Like other columns of the Behistun inscription, the text in the second column is divided into segments each one beginning: “and Darius the king says,“. They are preceded by a blank space. This column contains 14 segments, hereafter designated “paragraphs” (abbr. par. or §) and 85 lines. In this article, the text of the second column (= paragraphs 20-33) is presented in some detail.

§4.2. Transliteration and translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Par.</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>(1)diș da-ri-ia-ma-u-iš ašeššana na-an-ri ku-is diș u2 ašba-pi-li ša3-nu-ți ut ap-pi diș da-a-ia-țu2 (2)iiš u2 ir be-ip-ti-ip diș bar-șip, (E) aș ak diș na-tam-tup ak diș ma-da-be ak diș aș2-șu-ra a-ak diș ma’mu-(3)iz-za-ri-ia-ip a-ak diș par2 tu-ma-ip a-ak diș mar-ku-iš-be a-ak diș sa-ud-da- ku-iš a-ak diș aș2 ak’-(4)kat-ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Darius the king says: While I was in Babylon these nations rebelled against me: The Persians and the Elamites and the Medes and the Assyrians and the Egyptians and the Parthians and the Margians and Sattagydia and the Scythians.

---

3 King and Thompson’s measurement of the second column in 1904 are: 11 feet and 2 inches in height (=340.36 cm) and 6 feet and 10.25 inches in width (=208.9 cm) (King and Thompson 1907, xxiv).

4 The wedges seem to be more delicate in the second column than in the other two. They were engraved more elaborately, particularly than the first column. In the second column, the average height of the lines is almost 4 cm while in the others it is almost 3.6 cm. At the end of the last lines in the first and the second columns, the first signs of each paragraph are written (see figures 3 & 7) followed by a long blank space up to the vertical border. The paragraph continues at the top of the next column. The existence of this blank space could be a reason for the assumption that the engraver was interrupted in writing the text at these points.

5 In this article, the following abbreviations are employed: AE: Achaemenid Elamite; Bab.: Babylonian; CAD: Chicago Assyrian Dictionary; ElW: Elamisches Wörterbuch; KT: King & Thompson; OP: Old Persian; CII: Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum; PFT: Persepolis Fortification Tablets and VAB: Vorderasiatische Bibliothek.

6 In the transliteration, line numbers are specified in parentheses.

7 The first term of paragraph 20 (a-ak “and”) appears at the end of the first column (Amiri 2017, 7) and this paragraph continues with the phrase diș da-ri-ia-ma-u-iš ašeššana na-an-ri “Darius the king says,” at the top of the second column.

8 Instead of aš, diș is to be expected as a determinative for eššana.

9 A tufa deposit has covered u2 at the end of the pertinent line (see figure 5). However, its faint trace is clearly recognizable.
And Darius the king says: One man, Martiya by name, Zinzakriš, his son, (a) town, Kukkan-nakan by name, in Persia, dwelt. He rose up in Elam and the people thus to them (he) said: I (am) Ummannuš, king of the Elamites, and at that time I was near Elam. Afterwards, the Elamites feared me; (they) seized that Martiya who called himself their chief, and killed him.

And Darius the king says: One man, Phraortes by name, he rose up in Media, thus to the people said: I am Šattarrida of the family of Cyaxares. Then the Mede troops who were in the palace rebelled against me (and) went (over) to him. (He) became king in Media. The Persian and the Median troops with me, were few. Then I sent forth the troops to Media. Hydarnes by name, a Persian, my servant, I made their chief, thus I said to them: Go forth! The Median troops who do not call themselves mine, kill them! Then Hydarnes together with the troops went off to the Media. When he went to Media, in the town, Maruš by name, in Media, there (he) did battle. (He) who was chief among the Medes wasn’t present at that time. Ahuramazda sent me aid. (By) the intercession of Ahuramazda, my troops slaughtered many of the rebellious troops. 27 days of the month Hanamakaš had passed, thus (they) did battle. Then my troops did not accomplish anything. (In a) district, Kampāntaš, in Media, there they awaited me until I came to Media.
And Darius the king says: Daturšiš by name, an Armenian, my servant, I sent him to the Armenia, thus I said to him: Go forth! The troops who (are) rebels (and) do not call themselves mine, kill them! Then Daturšiš went off. When (he) went to Armenia, the rebels assembled (and) came against Daturšiš: let us do battle! Then Daturšiš battled them in a village, Suzza by name, in Armenia, there. Ahuramazda sent me aid. (By) the intercession of Ahuramazda, my troops slaughtered many of the rebellious troops. 8 days of the month Turnar had passed, thus (they) did battle. And again (for) the 2nd (time) the rebels assembled (and) came against Daturšiš: let us do battle! Then at a fortress, Tigra by name, in Armenia, (they) did battle there. Ahuramazda sent me aid. (By) the intercession of Ahuramazda, my troops slaughtered many of the rebellious troops. 18 days of the month Turnar had passed, thus (they) did battle. And again (for) the 3rd (time) the rebels assembled (and) came against Daturšiš: let us do battle! In the fortress, Wiyama by name, in Armenia, (they) did battle there. Ahuramazda sent me aid. (By) the intercession of Ahuramazda, my troops slaughtered many of the rebellious troops. 9 days of the month Sakurriš had passed, thus (they) did battle, and then Daturšiš did not accomplished anything. (He) awaited me until I came to Media.

13 ḫu-ut-la; all signs are clearly discernible on the rock.
14 mi-da and mi-te (in par. 24) are variant writings of a Conj. II imperative form of mite- and mean “go forth!” (Hallow 1969, 732).
15 ša₂-ir-ra-ib-ba and ša₂-ir-ra-ap-ba are variant writings of ēārrāpā “they assembled” (Hallow 1969, 755).
16 u₂-ba and ḫu-ba are variant writings of uba (Hallow 1969, 698). ḫu-ud-ti-nu-un ḫu-ba: Hallow translated this phrase as “let us make (battle)”. He interpreted ḫu-ba (or uba) evidently as a cohortative particle in the phrase (ibid).
17 Expected here is diš as a determinative for ma-da-be (King and Thompson 1907, 119).
And Darius the king says: Maumiša by name, a Persian, my servant, him I sent forth to Armenia, thus (I) said him: Go forth! The troops who are rebels (and) don’t call themselves mine, kill them! Then Maumiša went (off). When (he) went (off) to Armenia, the rebels assembled (and) came against Maumiša: let us do battle! Then, in Izzila by name in Assyria, (they) did battle there. Ahuramazda sent me aid. (By) the intercession of Ahuramazda, my troops slaughtered many of the rebellious troops. 15 days of the month Hanamakaš had passed, thus (they) did battle. And again (for) the 2nd (time) the rebels assembled (and) came against Maumiša: let us do battle! Then in the district, Hautiyaruš by name, (they) did battle there. Ahuramazda sent me aid. (By) the intercession of Ahuramazda, my troops slaughtered many of the rebellious troops. The month Turmar, at its end thus (they) did battle. Then Maumiša waited in Armenia until I came to Media.

---

18 ni has an extra vertical wedge and is written as ir (King and Thompson 1907, 121).

19 na is expected here, as a genitive postposition preceded by the month name ḫu-ir-ma-ir (Hallock 1969, 98 & 735).
And Darius the king says: Then I came forth from Babylon and went to Media. When I went to Media, the town, Kuntarruš by name, in Media, that Phraortes, who said: I am king of the Medes, came to do battle there. Then (we) did battle. Ahuramazda sent me aid. (By) the intercession of Ahuramazda, I slaughtered many of troops of Phraortes. 25 days of the month Hadukannaš had passed, thus (we) did battle. Then that Phraortes together with few horsemen fled and went to Rakkan. Then I sent the troops after him. From there (he) was seized and brought (back) to me. I cut off his nose and tongue and ears and I put out one eye, (and) at my gate (he) was bound and seized. All people saw him and then at Ecbatana I impaled him and the men who were his foremost followers, at a fortress in Ecbatana I cut off their heads (and) I displayed(?) all of them together.
According to Hallock’s terminology, it seems that $\text{hi}$-da-iš is a variant writing of the term $\text{idaš}$: I. 7i(i) “to him” + II. daš (conjugation I form of daš: “to set, place”) cf. idaka (Hallock 1969, 680, 696 & 701).

$\text{ni}$ written as $\text{ir}$ and has an extra vertical wedge (King and Thompson 1907, 125).

24 $\text{ik}$ lacks one vertical wedge (King and Thompson 1907, 125).

25 $\text{ik}$ lacks one vertical wedge (King and Thompson 1907, 126).
And Darius the king says: Then I sent the Persian troops from Rakkan to Hystaspes. When those troops went to Hystaspes, then Hystaspes together with troops went (off) to a town, Patti-grabban by name, in Parthia, (where he) made battle. Ahuramazda sent me aid. (By) the intercession of Ahuramazda, Hystaspes slaughtered many of the rebellious troops. I day of the month Karmabataš had passed, thus (he) made battle.

And Darius the king says: Then the nation became mine. This is what I accomplished in Parthia.

And Darius the king says: Then the nation became mine. This is what I accomplished in Bactria.

And...
This is based on personal communication with Abdolmajid Arfaee who believes that the scribes and the engravers were different. He says that unlike the first column, the text of the second column has a clear relationship supposing that the scribe/engraver erred following previous repetition of some phrases, terms and even signs with similar forms (such as ba and šu) might be a cause of these errors.

2. Some scribal errors are found in the text of the second column. As indicated in the transilation, in some cases, the signs are written with an extra wedge or with a missing wedge. According to the Behistun inscription, it seems that, firstly, the scribes wrote the cuneiform texts (probably on clay) and arranged them in correspondence to their designated columns; then, the engravers cut them into the stone. Although it is difficult to determine a reason for such errors, they might have occurred due to the engravers’ inadequate knowledge of cuneiform or to absent-mindedness. In addition, frequent repetition of some phrases, terms and even signs with similar forms (such as ba and šu) might be a cause of these errors.

3. As this contribution follows the edition of the first column in the Elamite version of the Behistun inscription, here I add a comment about the reading of ap-pa-pa ANŠE in par. 17 of the first column (see Amiri 2017, 3, 6, 18). Based on the most recent photographs, it can be seen that in Behistun, two other derivatives of dau- (daḫup and daunman) also appear in the third column (Hallock 1969, 681) where Darius names the six Persians men who helped him slaughter Gaumâta the Magus. Compared to OP and Bab. correspondence, we infer that semantically, dau- could also carry the meaning “to ally”, “to be with someone (as auxiliary force)” or similar. With this interpretation and using Hallock’s terminology, the writing of da-u₂ (=dau “I helped”) as a Conj. I of dau- in par. 22 is probable. Therefore, it is possible to translate the sentence in par. 22 as: “The Persian and the Median troops with me (or who were helpful) were few.”

2. Some scribal errors are found in the text of the second column. As indicated in the transliteration, in some cases, the signs are written with an extra wedge or with a missing wedge. According to the Behistun inscription, it seems that, firstly, the scribes wrote the cuneiform texts (probably on clay) and arranged them in correspondence to their designated columns; then, the engravers cut them into the stone. Although it is difficult to determine a reason for such errors, they might have occurred due to the engravers’ inadequate knowledge of cuneiform or to absent-mindedness. In addition, frequent repetition of some phrases, terms and even signs with similar forms (such as ba and šu) might be a cause of these errors.

3. As this contribution follows the edition of the first column in the Elamite version of the Behistun inscription, here I add a comment about the reading of ap-pa-pa ANŠE in par. 17 of the first column (see Amiri 2017, 3, 6, 18). Based on the most recent photographs, it can be seen that in Behistun, two other derivatives of dau- (daḫup and daunman) also appear in the third column (Hallock 1969, 681) where Darius names the six Persians men who helped him slaughter Gaumâta the Magus. Compared to OP and Bab. correspondence, we infer that semantically, dau- could also carry the meaning “to ally”, “to be with someone (as auxiliary force)” or similar. With this interpretation and using Hallock’s terminology, the writing of da-u₂ (=dau “I helped”) as a Conj. I of dau- in par. 22 is probable. Therefore, it is possible to translate the sentence in par. 22 as: “The Persian and the Median troops with me (or who were helpful) were few.”

2. Some scribal errors are found in the text of the second column. As indicated in the transliteration, in some cases, the signs are written with an extra wedge or with a missing wedge. According to the Behistun inscription, it seems that, firstly, the scribes wrote the cuneiform texts (probably on clay) and arranged them in correspondence to their designated columns; then, the engravers cut them into the stone. Although it is difficult to determine a reason for such errors, they might have occurred due to the engravers’ inadequate knowledge of cuneiform or to absent-mindedness. In addition, frequent repetition of some phrases, terms and even signs with similar forms (such as ba and šu) might be a cause of these errors.

3. As this contribution follows the edition of the first column in the Elamite version of the Behistun inscription, here I add a comment about the reading of ap-pa-pa ANŠE in par. 17 of the first column (see Amiri 2017, 3, 6, 18). Based on the most recent photographs, it can be seen that in Behistun, two other derivatives of dau- (daḫup and daunman) also appear in the third column (Hallock 1969, 681) where Darius names the six Persians men who helped him slaughter Gaumâta the Magus. Compared to OP and Bab. correspondence, we infer that semantically, dau- could also carry the meaning “to ally”, “to be with someone (as auxiliary force)” or similar. With this interpretation and using Hallock’s terminology, the writing of da-u₂ (=dau “I helped”) as a Conj. I of dau- in par. 22 is probable. Therefore, it is possible to translate the sentence in par. 22 as: “The Persian and the Median troops with me (or who were helpful) were few.”

2. Some scribal errors are found in the text of the second column. As indicated in the transliteration, in some cases, the signs are written with an extra wedge or with a missing wedge. According to the Behistun inscription, it seems that, firstly, the scribes wrote the cuneiform texts (probably on clay) and arranged them in correspondence to their designated columns; then, the engravers cut them into the stone. Although it is difficult to determine a reason for such errors, they might have occurred due to the engravers’ inadequate knowledge of cuneiform or to absent-mindedness. In addition, frequent repetition of some phrases, terms and even signs with similar forms (such as ba and šu) might be a cause of these errors.

3. As this contribution follows the edition of the first column in the Elamite version of the Behistun inscription, here I add a comment about the reading of ap-pa-pa ANŠE in par. 17 of the first column (see Amiri 2017, 3, 6, 18). Based on the most recent photographs, it can be seen that in Behistun, two other derivatives of dau- (daḫup and daunman) also appear in the third column (Hallock 1969, 681) where Darius names the six Persians men who helped him slaughter Gaumâta the Magus. Compared to OP and Bab. correspondence, we infer that semantically, dau- could also carry the meaning “to ally”, “to be with someone (as auxiliary force)” or similar. With this interpretation and using Hallock’s terminology, the writing of da-u₂ (=dau “I helped”) as a Conj. I of dau- in par. 22 is probable. Therefore, it is possible to translate the sentence in par. 22 as: “The Persian and the Median troops with me (or who were helpful) were few.”

2. Some scribal errors are found in the text of the second column. As indicated in the transliteration, in some cases, the signs are written with an extra wedge or with a missing wedge. According to the Behistun inscription, it seems that, firstly, the scribes wrote the cuneiform texts (probably on clay) and arranged them in correspondence to their designated columns; then, the engravers cut them into the stone. Although it is difficult to determine a reason for such errors, they might have occurred due to the engravers’ inadequate knowledge of cuneiform or to absent-mindedness. In addition, frequent repetition of some phrases, terms and even signs with similar forms (such as ba and šu) might be a cause of these errors.

3. As this contribution follows the edition of the first column in the Elamite version of the Behistun inscription, here I add a comment about the reading of ap-pa-pa ANŠE in par. 17 of the first column (see Amiri 2017, 3, 6, 18). Based on the most recent photographs, it can be seen that in Behistun, two other derivatives of dau- (daḫup and daunman) also appear in the third column (Hallock 1969, 681) where Darius names the six Persians men who helped him slaughter Gaumâta the Magus. Compared to OP and Bab. correspondence, we infer that semantically, dau- could also carry the meaning “to ally”, “to be with someone (as auxiliary force)” or similar. With this interpretation and using Hallock’s terminology, the writing of da-u₂ (=dau “I helped”) as a Conj. I of dau- in par. 22 is probable. Therefore, it is possible to translate the sentence in par. 22 as: “The Persian and the Median troops with me (or who were helpful) were few.”

2. Some scribal errors are found in the text of the second column. As indicated in the transliteration, in some cases, the signs are written with an extra wedge or with a missing wedge. According to the Behistun inscription, it seems that, firstly, the scribes wrote the cuneiform texts (probably on clay) and arranged them in correspondence to their designated columns; then, the engravers cut them into the stone. Although it is difficult to determine a reason for such errors, they might have occurred due to the engravers’ inadequate knowledge of cuneiform or to absent-mindedness. In addition, frequent repetition of some phrases, terms and even signs with similar forms (such as ba and šu) might be a cause of these errors.
be confirmed that in the Elamite version, the Sumerogram ANŠE, “ass(es),” is composed of the signs pa+šab₇ (Hallock 1969, 83 & 86). Therefore, the reading ap-pa ANŠE is correct and my reading is to be corrected to what is written in some earlier editions (e.g. Grillot-Susini, Herrenschmidt, and Malbran-Labat 1993, 25; Vallat 1977, 93).

Figure 1: The upper section of the second column of the Elamite version of the Behistun inscription, §§20-24, lines 1-38.

Figure 2: The middle section of the second column of the Elamite version of the Behistun inscription, §§23-26, lines 36-59.
Figure 3: The lower section of the second column of the Elamite version of the Behistun inscription, §§25-33, lines 57-85.

Figure 4: An image of the current state of the upper left side of the second column from line 3 to 14.
Figure 5: An image of the current state of the upper right side of the second column from line 3 to 12.

Figure 6: An image of the current state of the lower left side of the second column from line 70 to 85.
Figure 7: An image of the current state of the lower right side of the second column from line 70 to 85.

Figure 8: An image of the partial left side of the second column. Note the form of the first sign of line 13 (see §3.3.1).
Figure 9: Another image of the partial left side of the second column. The form of the first sign of line 13 is more discernible and probably is $u_2$ (see §4.3.1).
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