

text from which this passage was copied. Hinz was right in assuming this.

One could be inclined to think that the text was copied from an Old Persian version kept in the Royal Archive. It is, however, equally possible that the king dictated the text in Old Persian and that the scribe wrote it down directly in Aramaic. This process is parallel to the system of creating the Old Persian versions of the royal inscriptions:<sup>8</sup> the king dictates in Old Persian, the scribe writes it down in Elamite and retranslates it later in Old Persian. This explains also the high frequency of Elamite transcriptions of Old Persian words in the Elamite versions of the royal inscriptions.

It is sure that the source-text was drafted at the royal court. Since there were only a few persons who could read and/or write OP,<sup>9</sup> it looks probable that the influence of this language was confined to Persia proper. There is thus no reason for the presence of an Old Persian copy in Egypt.<sup>10</sup>

From the royal court the text was sent to the different provinces of the Achaemenid empire. It surely remains possible that the archive in Egypt contained an Aramaic version of the last paragraph of DNB and that the insertion of that paragraph in DB Aram. was done in Egypt. Nevertheless I believe that the text which came into the hands of the scribe in Elephantine and which was copied later on the papyrus, already contained the little section of DNB.

The date when this translation of DB, including the part from DNB, was first written, is uncertain. Perhaps the source-text was drafted somewhere between 520 and 425 BC, but only sent to Egypt around the throne accession of Darius II (the latest on 13 February 423). More likely, however, it was written shortly after this date, when Darius II had successfully occupied the throne, to celebrate the 100<sup>th</sup> birthday of the victories of Darius I.<sup>11</sup> Together with the Aramaic version probably a new Babylonian and Elamite version were recorded. These versions also included the insertion of the last paragraph of DNB).<sup>12</sup> The Aramaic text was then sent to Egypt and some other satrapies. In Egypt a scribe wrote it down on a papyrus (around 421 BC)<sup>13</sup> which was later used for the accounts on the verso.

1. N. Sims-Williams, *The Final Paragraph of the Tomb-Inscription of Darius I (DNb, 50-60) : The Old Persian Text in the light of an Aramaic Version*, BSOAS 44 (1981), pp. 1-7.
2. N. Sims-Williams, BSOAS 44 (1981), p. 2.
3. W. Hinz, *Grosskönig Darius und sein Untertan*, A Green Leaf: Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen (Acta Iranica 28), Leiden, 1988, p. 476.
4. W. Hinz, *Altiranische Funde und Forschungen*, Berlin, 1969, p. 58.
5. I. Gershevitch, TPS 1979, pp. 168-188. According to him, *šarak* is the Elamogram of OP *patiy*.
6. Two horizontal and one vertical wedge are visible on the photograph. Possibly *su*, *rap*, *tur*, ...
7. Possibly *pīr*.
8. I. Gershevitch, TPS 1979, pp. 114-155.
9. I. Gershevitch, TPS 1979, p. 116.
10. W. Hinz, A Green Leaf, 1988, p. 477 believes that DB Aram. was translated in Elephantine from the Old Persian text of DNB.
11. J. C. Greenfield and B. Porten, *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great: Aramaic Version*, (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum 1/5/1), London, 1982, p. 3; B. Porten and A. Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*, III, Jerusalem, 1993, p. 59.
12. Maybe one of the two fragments of DB Bab., found in Babylon, was a part of this version. They did not belong to it both of them, since they are not fragments of the same exemplar of DB (E. Von Voigtlander, *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great: Babylonian Version* (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum 1/2/1), London, 1978, pp. 65-66.
13. B. Porten and A. Yardeni, *Textbook*, III, 1993, p. 61.

Jan TAVERNIER (18-10-1999)

Research Assistant of the Fund for Scientific Research  
Flanders Katholieke Universiteit Leuven  
Faculteit Letteren, Blijde Inkomststraat 21  
B-3000 LEUVEN (Belgique)  
Jan.Tavernier@arts.kuleuven.ac.be

**87) The Iranian name Šá-ta-b/ma-ak-su** – In a document drafted in 487 in D/Ṭamar, a certain Šá-ta-b/ma-ak-su appears together with his colleague Numagazu as the *rab bīṭī* of a person whose name is unfortunately not preserved (VAS 3, 159: 3). The name Šatab/maksu is undoubtedly Iranian. Zadok recognized the first element as the Babylonian equivalent of Iranian *šyāti*- ‘prosperity’, but he gave no explanation for the second element of this name, *b/ma-ak-su*. Neither did Dandamaev.<sup>1</sup> My proposition is that the second part of this name is Iranian *\*-baxša-* (Av. *baxš-* ‘to give, *schenken*, *zuteilen*’) or *\*-vaxša-* (Av. ‘to grow, to make grow’).

This proposition implies that an Iranian /š/ can be rendered by a Babylonian *su*-sign. At first sight this looks improbable, as mostly the Iranian /š/ is rendered by a /š/ in Babylonian (cf. the royal names *Dārayava<sup>h</sup> auš*, *Xšayarša-* and *Artaxšaça-*, always spelled with a š in Babylonian: <sup>m</sup>*Da-ri-ia-a-muš*, <sup>m</sup>*Aḫ-ši-ar-šú* and <sup>m</sup>*Ar-tak-šat-su*)<sup>2</sup>. There are, however, some indications in favour of such a phonological feature.

Firstly, this feature is attested in the other direction: Iranian /s/ is rendered by Babylonian /š/, e.g. Iranian \*Aspa-janta 'horse-rutting' appears in a Babylonian text as <sup>m</sup>Áš-pa-za-an-da.<sup>3</sup>

A second indication is that sometimes *s* and *š* interchange within one word. The city \*abistāna is normally written *a-ba-as-ta-nu* (BE 9, 86a: 3; PBS 2/1, 7: 4, 8: 2 and 4, 20: 1, 120: 6, 193: 5, 207: 6), but in one document it appears as *ab-ba-eš-ta-nu* (PBS 2/1, 87: 6). The PN \*Rta-raučah 'having the light of Arta' is spelled <sup>m</sup>Ar-ta-ru-us (S.+ 409: 8, in Hebraica 8, p. 134) and <sup>m</sup>Ar-ta-ru-šú (Camb.384: 11 and 19).

In addition to these indications, there may also be a real example of this phonological feature: the name of Artaxerxes III, <sup>m</sup>Ū-MA-SU. The last sign can be perfectly read as -*su* or -*kuš*-, hence the problems of this example. Schmitt believes that the underlying Iranian name is \*Vauka- (a hypocoristic of Dārayava(h)uš) and therefore reads <sup>m</sup>Umakuš. Stolper argues that a reading *su* is preferable «by standards of Late Babylonian orthography» and that the Iranian basis for this form is \*Va(h)uš, from which a name \*Vauka- would be derived.<sup>4</sup>

A problem with the connection <sup>m</sup>Umakuš and \*Vauka- is that the latter would never be rendered in Babylonian using a *š* at the end. As the nominative is the leading case in the transposition from proper names from one language to another,<sup>5</sup> the *š* of <sup>m</sup>Umakuš probably renders the ending of the OP nominative singular of Iranian *i/-* and *u/-* stems. All Iranian names that appear in Babylonian with an ending *š* are representations of such *i/-* or *u/-* stems: <sup>m</sup>Aḫ-ra-tu-uš = \*(A)-xratu-š, <sup>m</sup>A-tar-ba-nu-uš = \*Atr-banu-š, <sup>m</sup>Pa-ar-mar-ti-iš = Fravartiš, <sup>m</sup>Pa-ar-nu-uš, <sup>m</sup>Par-ri-nu-uš, <sup>m</sup>Par-ri-ni-iš, <sup>m</sup>Par-ri-nu-ú = \*Parnu-š, <sup>m</sup>Par-ri-na-'-ni-iš = \*Frīmāni-š or \*Farnāni-š, <sup>m</sup>Ti-ri-a-iaš-muš = \*Tirya-va(h)uš. As \*Vauka- is an *o/a*-stem, its nominative would certainly not be \*Vauka-š<sup>6</sup> and would consequently not appear in Babylonian using a *š*. The name is thus to be read <sup>m</sup>Ū-ma-su and renders Iranian \*Va(h)uš<sup>7</sup> (cf. Elamite *ma-hu-iš* in PF 2006: 14). Possibly the beginning /u/ of *Umasu* is a representation of the Iranian word *hu*.<sup>8</sup>

If one reads *Umasu* for Iranian \*vahuš 'the good one', there is an unequivocal attestation of a Babylonian /s/ for an Iranian /š/. Yet the name is still not clear, as it cannot be determined whether it should be read <sup>m</sup>Šá-ta-ba-ak-su or <sup>m</sup>Šá-ta-ma-ak-su. The underlying Iranian form of the first possibility would be \*Šyātabaxša-, meaning 'he who gives prosperity'. This is a plausible name, since both elements of it are also found in other Iranian names.<sup>9</sup> As plausible, however, as \*Šyātabaxša- is the name \*Syātavaxša- (Bab. <sup>m</sup>Šá-ta-ma-ak-su, with Bab. /m/ for Ir. /v/) 'he, who makes prosperity grow'. The second element -*vaxš*- also serves as second element in other Iranian names.<sup>10</sup>

A second possibility for explaining this name is a scribal error. Since the LB forms of the signs *su* and *šu* are nearly identical, it is possible that the scribe wrote erroneously *su* for *šu*.

1. R. Zadok, *Iranians and Individuals bearing Iranian names in Achaemenian Babylonia*, in IOS 7 (1977), p. 95 n.39; M.A. Dandamaev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia* (Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies 6), Costa Mesa, 1992, p.121.

2. These names prove that Iranian /x/ can be represented in Babylonian by a /k/.

3. BE 10, 66: 4. Cf. R. Zadok, review of W. Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen*, 1975, in BiOr 33 (1976), p. 213.

4. R. Schmitt, *Achaemenid Throne Names*, in AION 42 (1982), p. 88 n.13: «The last sign of that name -SU- in Late babylonian texts has the values of both *kuš* and *su*, the first of which may be preferred here since the reading in that case seems to be nearer to the primary Iranian form». M.W. Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire: the Murašû Archive, the Murašû Firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia* (PIHANS 54), Istanbul, 1985, p. 115 n.21.

5. R. Schmitt, *The name of Darius*, in Iranica Varia: Papers in Honor of Professor Ehsan Yarshater (Acta Iranica 30), Leiden, 1990, pp. 194-195.

6. These stems have no endings in -š (R.G. Kent, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexikon* (American Oriental Series 33), New Haven, 1953<sup>2</sup>, p. 58).

7. The end-u of <sup>m</sup>Ū-ma-su is not a problem for a connection with \*Va(h)uš. Cf. OP *maguš* (DB OP I 36, 44, 46, 64, 66, 70, IV 8; DBb 2), Bab. *ma-gu-šú* (DB Bab. 15, 18 (two times), 25, 26, 28, 90; DBb 2).

8. Cf. R. Zadok (with I. Gershevitch), in IOS 6 (1976), p. 70.

9. For names constructed with one of these two elements, see W. Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, 1975, pp. 62, 230-231, etc.

10. W. Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, pp. 49 and 169; M. Mayrhofer, *Die Altiranischen Namen* (Iranisches Personennamenbuch 1), Wien, 1979, p. I/41.

Jan TAVERNIER (18-10-1999)

## 88) Updates to Šuruppak's Instructions, Proverbs of Ancient Sumer, and Ancient Rulers –

### A) Šuruppak's Instructions: Corrections and additional lines to the text reconstruction

The most recent edition of the text is available electronically on the Website The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature (etcsl) from Oxford, address: <http://www-etcsl.orient.ox.ac.uk:/> under 5.6.1: The instructions of Shuruppak: composite text, translation, bibliography. The electronic version with a rather successful translation was prepared mainly by Gábor Zólyomi taking previous works by others into account. His line counting follows a revised manuscript, the basic core of which I prepared in Philadelphia in 1989, and