



DRUJ-

DRUJ-, Avestan feminine noun defining the concept opposed to that of *aša-*. Controversies about the meaning of the latter word have naturally had implications for the understanding of *druj-*. The corresponding verbal root in Indic (*druh:* *drúhyati*) seems to have the basic meaning “to blacken” (Mayrhofer, *Dictionary* II, pp. 79 ff.), perhaps preserved in Avestan in *Yašt* 5.90 and 8.5. In view of the opposition of the two words, if the meaning of *aša-* is “truth,” then that of *druj-* must be “lie,” but, if the meaning of the former is “order, justice,” then *druj-* must mean “error, deceit.” Christian Bartholomae prudently gave both meanings: “falsehood, deceit” (*AirWb.*, cols. 778-82). Considering that the meaning “falsehood” corresponds to a certain kind of derivation (see the discussion of *draoga-/drauga-*, below) and that the meaning “deceit” results from a specific contextual usage (cf. the verb *druj:druža-*, below), the opposition was probably between “real order” and “illusory, deceptive order,” the first being linked to the lights of the day, the second to the shadows of the night (Kellens, 1991, pp. 46 ff.).

The opposition of the Iranian Mazdean conceptions of *Aša* and *Druj* reflected the revision and systematization of an old schema of Indo-Iranian ideology, but the opposition was not simply that between *ṛtá* (order, truth) and *ánṛta* (chaos, lie), as in the Vedic religion, a detail that also argues for an interpretation different from “truth versus lie.” Rather, it underlay all aspects of the religion, including cosmogony (see [COSMOGONY AND COSMOLOGY i](#)), ritual, and [eschatology i](#), and thus appears to have been the foundation of Mazdean dualism.



Druj- is attested eighteen times in the Old Avesta and is often found explicitly and systematically opposed to *aša-*, as in *aša varatā karapā . . . drujəm* “the Karapan preferred Druj to Aša” (32.12). The debasement of both the word and the principle that it defined is reflected metrically, for the word occurs as an excess of syllables at the end of the second hemistich of *ahunavaitī* meter, probably reflecting a bungled recitation (Kellens and Pirart, p. 89). In one way or another the principle of *druj* motivates the action of the *daēuuas* (32.3; see *DAIVA). The defeat of Druj is hoped for or sought (31.4, 48.1), and victory over her will either make her the prisoner of Aša (30.8, 44.14) or detach her from the side of the enemy (44.13). In the metaphor of the cosmic dwelling place that illustrates Old Avestan cosmogony the dwelling place erected by Aša, as the agent of *Ahura Mazdā*, is opposed to that erected by Druj (46.6, 51.10; Kellens, 1989). Just as Aša is the point of reference for the *ratu* “archetypal planes” and the *mąθra* “formulas” of Ahura Mazdā, Druj is the reference point for the fabricated words of the bad divinities (31.1, 53.6). In the eschatological sphere the refuge for the souls of the dead depends upon their merits: either the “residence” (*dam-*) of Ahura Mazdā or that of Druj (46.11, 49.11, 51.11: *drūjō dāmānē*). It should be noted that *druj-*, like all words expressing negative concepts, is not attested in the *Yasna Haptanhāiti*. The negative present participle *adrujiiaṇt-* “who does not deceive” is attested once in the *Gāthās* (31.15).

Many mentions of *druj* in the Younger Avesta are direct calques of passages in the Old Avesta; for example, *vainiṭ aša drujəm* (Y. 60.5) and analogous passages are based on *yezī . . . aša drujəm vāṇghaitī* “as he will conquer the Druj through the agency of Aša” (41.1). *Yašt* 13.12-13, in which the Younger Avestan cosmogony is explicitly described as the arena for the dual confrontation between Aša and Druj and between the two *mainiūs*, deserves special mention: “If the mighty *fravašis* of the just had not given me aid . . . to the Drug would have been the power, to the Drug the rule, to the Drug corporeal life; of the two spirits the Drug would have sat down between earth and heaven” (Boyce, *Zoroastrianism* I, p. 269). In references to female demons in the *Vīdēvdaddruj-* was sometimes substituted for *pairikā-* or for the feminine *daēuua-* (Boyce, *Zoroastrianism* I, p. 279 n. 11). It is possible that a similar usage appeared in Vedic (Spiegel, pp. 215 ff.). *Druj-*, apparently in the nominative form, is the first term in the compounds **druxš.vī.druj-* “who abjures deception of the deception” (Vd. 19.16) and *druxš.manah-* “who has deception for thought” (Yt. 1.18) and in the accusative in *drujim.vana-* “who conquers deception” (Y. 9.19-20), all of which are hapax legomena (Kellens,



1974, p. 39).

The personal forms of the verb *druj:druža-*

(< *drúj(h)ia-*), frequently with the prefix *aiβi*; compounds in which *druj-* is the second term (e.g., *adruj-* “who does not deceive,” *tanu.druj-* “who has deception in his body,” *miθrō.druj-* “who betrays the contract,” **druxš.vi.druj-* “who abjures the deception of the deception”); and derivations with a passive adjectival sense (*anādruxta-*, *anaiβidruxta-*) or the noun of action (*anaiβidruxti-*) are used almost exclusively in connection with deception practiced on the occasion of a contract (*miθra-*), when there is a question of its not being respected or of having a fraudulent clause introduced into it (Kellens, 1974, pp. 40 ff.).

The full-fledged Younger Avestan derivation in *-a-*, *draoga* (OPers. *drauga-*) has the obvious meaning “lie,” which the noun of agent *draojina-* “liar” (OPers. *draujana-*) also expresses. In Old Persian *drauga-* and the personal forms of the verb *druj:duṛujiya-* connote more specifically the lie about dynastic legitimacy. It is in this sense that *drauga-* represents the first sin in the triad of calamities mentioned in inscription DPd 19-20, the other two being the enemy army (*hainā-*) and famine (*dušiyāra-*; see Dumézil, pp. 617 ff.; Boyce, *Zoroastrianism* II, pp. 120, 123). The passive adjective *duruxta-* is used as an antonym for *hašiya-* “truth” (DB 4.6-8).

In Avestan *druj-* also has a secondary derivation, the adjective *drəguuant-* (Younger Av. *druuant-*) “partisan of deception, deceiver,” of which the superlative *draojišta-* and perhaps also the comparative *draoj(ii)ah-* are attested (Kellens, 1977, pp. 69 ff.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(For cited works not found in this bibliography and for abbreviations found here, see “Short References.”)

G. Dumézil, *Mythe et épopée*, Paris, I, 1968.



J. Kellens, *Les noms-racines de l'Avesta*, Wiesbaden, 1974.

Idem, "Remarques sur le Farvardin Yašt," *AAASH* 25, 1977, pp. 69-73.

Idem, "Huttes cosmiques en Iran," *MSS* 50, 1989, pp. 65-78.

Idem, *Zoroastre et l'Avesta ancien*, Paris, 1991.

Idem and E. Pirart, *Les textes vieil-avestiques I*, Wiesbaden, 1988.

F. Spiegel, *Die arische Periode und ihre Zustände*, Leipzig, 1887.