

## The Aryan and the Jew

### How the Magi look upon the three « Judaisms »

On a number of occasions Jews (*jehūd*) and Judaism (*jehūdīh*) appear in the writings of the Magi. In these texts, Judaism constitutes the very antithesis of Magianism, the doctrine of the Jews (*kēš ī jehūd*) as opposed to the good religion (*dēn māzdesn*), the evil rule (*dušx<sup>v</sup> adāyīh*) versus the good rule (*hux<sup>v</sup> adāyīh*). Both good and evil rules have been put to the test three times –the Aryan rule is presented as the legacy of Yima and the Jewish rule as that of Dahāka. The good rule comprises three steps:

1. The “Manušcihrān”, after the name of Manuš.ciθra who restored the kingdom of the Aryans (*\*aryānām xšaθra*, Pers. *ērān-šahr*) after the death of Airyaēca, his father;
2. The “Kayān”, that is, the “poet-kings”, the Kavi-dynasty founded by Kavāta;
3. The “Huāfrīdān”, that is, the Hvāfrita-dynasty announced in the Avesta and realized by the Sasanian king Ardašēr ī Pābagān.

The evil rule also comprises three lines:

1. The first Judaism (*fradum jehūdīh*), that is, after the command of Dahāka the original book of Ōraytā is written and Jerusalem is built, and following him the authority comes to Abraham, then to Moses, and then to Joshua;
2. The second Judaism (*didīgar jehūdīh*), that is, Christianity;
3. The third Judaism (*sidīgar jehūdīh*), that is, Islam.

The good (Aryan) kingship is based on the law of measure (moderation) which dilates and furthers the world of life (*Av. gaēθō.frādana*), while the evil (Jewish) rule is based on the lawlessness of excess and deficiency that shrinks and destroys the world of living beings. One creates justice and harmony and beauty in the world, and the other causes tyranny and chaos and hideousness. The rule of the Aryans is, in one word, the rule of free and noble men (*āzādx<sup>v</sup> adāyīh*); the rule of the Jews (Christians and Muslims) is the rule of ignoble men, democracy (*vēsx<sup>v</sup> adāyīh*).

The Magi bring Judaism in their field of vision to comprehend and reject it. In this vision, the Aryan religion and rule are like a twin, just as Yima and Yimī; Yima represents the model of the king who furthers the world and brings prosperity, opulence, joy and good behaviour in the world; and his twin sister Yimī represents the first example of the “religious” in the world, the religion of those who worship Ahura Mazdā. The good kingship and good religion could not be represented by one person, and however they are not separated. On the contrary, the Jewish religion and the Jewish rule both being represented by one person, come back to Dahāka –this idea is also found in the story of creation: Ahura Mazdā (heaven) creates the good creatures in a relationship with her daughter Spəntā Ārmaiti (earth), while Anra Minyu (evil spirit) miscreates the spawn through intercourse with himself (sodomy).

The Avesta and Zand give us numerous details regarding the calamities caused by the long rule of Dahāka. We have selected two passages that may highlight the difference between the rule based on Yima-model and the rule based on Dahāka-model. These passages come from a lost Pārsīg book, the Ēvēn-nāmag ‘Book of Rules and customs’, and are found in the Arabic book of Tha‘ālibī.

### The status of men

وفي كتاب الآئين انّ مراتب الناس كانت في ايام جم على الاسنان فكان [اعلاهم سنًا] اعلاهم مجلسا ثم كانت في ايام الضحّاك على الغنى والثروة ثم كانت في ملك افريدون على الغناء (العناء؟) والسابقة ثم كانت في ايام منوجهر على الاصول والقدم ثم كانت في ايام كيكاوس على العقل والحكمة ثم كانت في ايام كيخسرة على البأس والنجدة ثم كانت في ايام في ايام لهراسف على الدين والعفة ثم كانت في ملك الملوك بعده على الاحساب ثم كانت في ايام انوشروان على اجتماع هذه الخصال المذكورة الآ الغنى والثروة فانه كان لا يعتدّ بهما.<sup>1</sup>

‘In the Ēvēnnāmag [it is written that]: In the time of Yima, the status of men was according to age and the elder one was taking precedence over others; In the time of Dahāka, it was according to opulence and wealth (money); In the time of Ōraētaona, it was according to [the record of] work and service; In the time of Manuš.ciθra, it was according to origin and seniority; In the time of Kavi Usan, it was according to

<sup>1</sup> . Al-Tha‘ālibī, *Histoire des rois des Perses*, H. Zotenberg, Paris, 1900, 14-15.

intelligence and wisdom; in the time of Kavi Haosravah, it was according to the courage and valour; in the time of Aurvaṭ.aspa, it was according to the religion and chastity (purity); in the time of later kings, it was according to good deeds; finally, in the time of [Husrō] Anōšervān, it was according to all these qualities, except the opulence and money which he did not consider as worthy of attention.<sup>2</sup>

The quality of “wise” attributed to Kavi Usa(ḍa)n confirms the Aryan tradition of considering him as an inspired wise – a gloss of the Vīdēvdād confers on him the title of *dānāg* ‘wise’<sup>3</sup>; in the Mahābhārata also his Indian counterpart, Kavi Uśanas, is depicted as a wise who knows scriptures (*śāstram*).<sup>4</sup>

It is strange to attribute the quality of “religious” to Aurvaṭ.aspa, and not Vīštāspa, the champion of the religion of those who worship Ahura Mazdā (*daēnā māzdayasni*). It is possible that Tha‘ālibī, in order to not arousing the suspicion of Muslims, has replaced him by his peer, Aurvaṭ.aspa.

The core of the society organized by Dahāka is money. The “people” (*vēs*) are divided into classes according to their personal wealth and money, and the power in society is exercised largely through the monetary and banking system. In the time of Husrō (Anōšervān) when the military needed money, a (×Jewish) merchant offered his help in exchange for assigning the scribal position in the royal Dīvān to his son. The king refused the offer, and the above passage implicitly justifies such a state of mind.<sup>5</sup> Here a parallel is drawn between the money system of Dahāka and the practical Jewish spirit.

<sup>2</sup> . It may be rendered into Pārsīg thus:

ped ēvēnnāmag nibišt ēsted kū: gāh ud pāyag ī mardōmān andar zamānag ī jim ped dād būd, harv kē-š dād mehdar būd hē ped gyāg ī azabardar nišast hē; ud ped āvām ī x<sup>v</sup>adāyīh ī az ī dahāk ped tuvānīgīh ud x<sup>v</sup>āstag būd; ud andar x<sup>v</sup>adāyīh ī frēdōn ped arg ud pēšēnag; ud andar x<sup>v</sup>adāyīh ī manušcihr ped bun gōhr ud dagr-zamānīh; ud andar x<sup>v</sup>adāyīh ī kayus ped xrad ud dānāgīh; ud andar x<sup>v</sup>adāyīh ī kay hōsrō ped dilīrīh ud arvandīh; ud andar x<sup>v</sup>adāyīh ī luhrāsp ped dēn ud pahrēzumandīh; ud andar x<sup>v</sup>adāyīh ī abārīg x<sup>v</sup>adāyān ī pas az ōy ped hukunišnīh; ud andar x<sup>v</sup>adāyīh ī husrav anōšervān ped hāmōyēn hunarān ī azabar [guft] bē az hān ī hangadīh ud x<sup>v</sup>āstag, cē-š xīr ī gētīg vahāg nē burd.

<sup>3</sup> . Vd 20.1 varəcaṇ<sup>v</sup>hatəm : varzāvandān [dānāgān cōn kayus].

<sup>4</sup> . Mbh 1.94.33 asurāṇām ca bhārata uśanā veda yat śāstram ayam tad veda sarvaśaḥ.

<sup>5</sup> . See the Šāhnāma, M 6 (داستان کفشکر و خسرو). See also

تاریخ طبرستان، بهاء الدین محمد بن حسن بن اسفندیار کاتب، ع. اقبال، تهران، ۱۳۲۰، ۴۳-۴۵

## The Sovereign King and his subjects

وكان يقال ان رافة جم برعيته كانت كرافة الوالد بولده وكان صنيع الضحاك بالرعيّة صنيع الضرة  
بالضرة وكان افريدون لرعيته كالاخ لاجيه وكان افراسياب للرعيّة كالعده للعدو وكان بشتاسف للرعيّة  
كالمؤدّب للصبيان.<sup>6</sup>

‘It is also said that: The kindness of Yima for his subjects was like that of a father for his child; Dahāka treated his subjects like a wife her rival; Oraētaona was for his subjects like a brother for his siblings; Fraṅrasyan was for his subjects like an enemy against his enemies; and Vīštāspa was for his subjects like a master towards his young students.’<sup>7</sup>

Amongst the different relations between a sovereign king and a person under his authority, first, the relation between the father and the child is the ethical representation of sovereignty par excellence. This relation reflects the golden age of the Aryans, that is, the reign of Yima for the Perso-Aryans and the rule of Rāma (*rāma-rājya*) for the Indo-Aryans. This same relation is, according to the Mahābhārata, a prerequisite for the happiness of creatures in the world. Bērōnī states: “Once in the time of Pērōz (5<sup>th</sup> century), the grandfather of Anōšervān the rain was kept back, and people in Ērānšahr suffered from barrenness. Therefore Pērōz remitted them the taxes of these years, opened the doors of his storehouses, borrowed money from the properties of the fire-temples, and gave all to the inhabitants of Ērānšahr, taking care of his subjects as a parent does for his children; and the consequence was that during those years nobody died of hunger.”<sup>8</sup>

On the other hand, the unjust and inconvenient behaviour of Dahāka (and Fraṅrasyan) disturbs the sound relation in the society, and the subjects suffer disaster. The Aryans hopelessly

---

<sup>6</sup> . Al-Tha’ālibī, *Histoire des rois des Perses*, H. Zotenberg, Paris, 1900, 15.

<sup>7</sup> . It may be rendered into Pārsīg thus:

jim mihrbānīh abar bannag ī x<sup>v</sup>ēš ōn būd cōn hān ī pidar abar fraزند ; ud kunišn ī az ī dahāk ō bannag ī x<sup>v</sup>ēš rōn cōn hān ī habōg būd ō habōg rōn ; frēdōn bannag rāy cōn brād būd brādar rāy ; frāsyāb bannag rāy cōn dušmen būd pedīrag dušmen ; vīštāsp bannag rāy cōn frahangbed būd rēdakān rāy.

<sup>8</sup> . *The Chronology of Ancient Nations*, E. Sachau, London, 1879, 215.

الآثار الباقية عن القرون الخالية، ابوريحان البيروني، پ. اذكائي، تهران، ۱۳۸۰، ۷۲.

Homa Nategh has compared this period of dearth with the years of famine in Persia during which (the 1870s), because of the attitude of the Muslim clergy and the Muslim sultān (Nāšir ad-dīn Šāh) nearly half of the population perished.

observed the ruin of their countries and the massacre of a whole people by the onslaught of the Tāzīg , that is, the Arab-Muslims belonging to the third Judaism. Āḍar Kēvān (16<sup>th</sup> century) gives the Persian version of the above passage, and he adds: “The conduct of Husrō (Anōšervān) towards his subjects was like that of a partner towards a partner; the other (Persian) kings till Yazdegird, the last Persian king, followed the same conduct. But after the fall of the Persian kingdom, the behaviour of most of our (Muslim) governors is like that of victors towards the defeated, or rather that of oppressors against the oppressed.”<sup>9</sup>

Raham Asha

---

<sup>9</sup> . شارستان چارچمن (Mulla Feroze Library, Mumbai, R VIII 50, fol. 140 / R VIII 51, fol. 159 a).

حضرت ذوالعلوم می فرمود (می فرماید): سلوکِ ملوکِ عجم در داستان با رعایا تا سلطنتِ فریدون چون سر کردنِ پدر بود با پسر، و زندگانیِ فریدون با ایشان چون برادر با برادر، و این قاعده تا حکومتِ گشتاسپ بود؛ پس سیرتِ گشتاسپ با رعیت چون استاد بود با شاگرد، و این طریقه تا زمانِ نوشیروان باقی و مرعی بود. پس خصوصیتِ او با رعایا چون اتباع بود با اتباع، و این قاعده تا سلطنتِ یزدگرد که آخرِ ملوکِ عجم است رعایت کردند. بعد از آن کردارِ اکثرِ حکامِ مَاصدق (د. ماصدیق) چون معیشتِ غالب با مغلوب است بل ظالم با مظلوم.