

THE CASE OF ELAMITE *TEP-*/*TIP-* AND AKKADIAN *ṬUPPU*

By

JAN TAVERNIER

Reprinted from
IRAN XLIV 2007

Published by
THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PERSIAN STUDIES

THE CASE OF ELAMITE *TEP-/TIP-* AND AKKADIAN *TUPPU*¹

By Jan Tavernier

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Abstract

This paper focuses on a particular Elamite lexicographical issue: the history, etymology and meaning of the etymon *tep-* and its derivatives *teppir*, *puhu teppi* and *tupppime* on the one hand, and its relation with Akkadian *tuppu* on the other hand. The study of this will be pursued through an analysis of all attestations of this etymon in combination with some historical aspects.

Keywords: Elamite, Akkadian, historical linguistics, lexicography, languages in contact.

I. INTRODUCTION

Akkadian and Elamite are two of the oldest written languages in the world and the geographical proximity of the regions where both languages were spoken (Elam is situated to the south-east of Mesopotamia) stimulated contacts between both languages. Various Elamite loanwords and proper names are attested in Akkadian texts. Conversely Akkadian loanwords and proper names occur in Elamite (hereafter El.) texts. During the Achaemenid period (c. 550–330 B.C.) a third language became involved in these contacts: Old Persian (hereafter OP). In this paper a particular example of these contacts will be studied through the etymology of the word *dipi-* (OP), *tep-* / *tip-* (El.) and *tuppu* (Akkadian).

For some time it has generally been accepted that OP *dipi-*, “inscription” is an Elamite loanword (Brandenstein and Mayrhofer 1964: 116; Hallock 1969: 764; Lecoq 1974: 67n.187; Livšic 1980: 168–69n.17; Hinz and Koch 1987: 365). Most scholars also believe that the El. source word, written *tup-pi* in Achaemenid Elamite, is a loanword from Akkadian *tuppu*, “tablet, document, letter” and Sumerian *dub* (Scheil 1925: 149; Friedrich 1949: 20n.6; Kent 1953: 191; Lewy 1954: 172; Brandenstein and Mayrhofer 1964: 116; Steve 1967: 126; Hallock 1969: 764; Lecoq 1974: 67n.187).² Hinz (1973: 26–27), however, has challenged this by referring

to the Old Elamite attestations of this etymon (e.g. *teppir*), which he suggests are derivations from a verbal root *tep-*, “to form, fashion” and have thus nothing to do with Sumerian *dub*. The Achaemenid attestations also belong to this root. Reaction to Hinz’s hypothesis has been formulated by de Blois (1994: 16n.7), who cites Middle El. *tu₄-up-pi-me*, “inscription” as corroboration of the generally accepted theory that Ach. El. *tuppi* derives from Akk. *tuppu*. The form *tippi-*, echoed in Old Persian *dipi-*, is the result of the well-known El. shift from /u/ to /i/.³

This article aims to revise the history of this Elamite lexeme. Firstly, it is imperative to introduce the spellings bearing any importance for this study (cf. Table 1). The Neo-Elamite and the Achaemenid Elamite spellings of *tuppi*, *tupptime* and *tuppir* are all written with the CVC-sign TUP. This sign was pronounced /tip/ (Jensen 1891: 172; Steve 1992: 148; cf. ^{AS}Ha-tam₅-tup vs. ^mHa-tam₅-ti-ip, ^{AS}Ti-pi-ri-na vs. ^{AS}Tup-pi-ru-na), so in all likelihood these spellings render *tippi*, *tippime* and *tipir*. This is corroborated by the absence of spellings using signs such as DU and TU, which are both attested in Neo- and Achaemenid Elamite and used to express /tup/ (e.g. *du-pe-e*, *du-pi-ni*, *tu-ba-ka₄*, etc.). Early Neo-Elamite *tuppu*, which is a transcription of Akkadian *tuppu* (as is shown by the use of PU; Steve 1992: 148), is pronounced /tuppu/.

TABLE 1. Attested forms of *tep-* and *tup-*.

Old Elamite and Old Babylonian from Susa (c. 2300–1500 B.C.)		
Date (BC)	Spelling	Attestation(s)
c. 2254–2218	dè-pi-ir	EKI 2 iv 20
c. 2000–1900	te-eb-bi-i[r]	RA 22 148:8 (=JA 259 219:8); ⁴ JCS 22 30:7
c. 1894–1595	pu-hu te-ep-pu	Delaporte 1920: 76 no. D112:2
c. 1894–1595	de-bi-ir	MDP 23 289–290:5
c. 1894–1595	pu-hu te-bi	MDP 28 437a:5, 504:2
c. 1894–1595	pu-hu te-ep-pi-i	MDP 22 101:14
c. 1894–1595	te-ep-pi-ir	MDP 23 323:5
c. 1894–1595	te-ep-pir	MDP 23 327:rev.3
c. 1894–1595	^(m) te-pir ^(ir)	MDP 22 161:7,20; MDP 23 288:14, 320:11, rev.3, 321–322:21,23,33–35,37,55
Middle Elamite and Akkadian from Haft Tepe (c. 1500–1000 B.C.)		
Date (BC)	Spelling	Attestation(s)
c. 1500–1400	te-ep-pir	IrAnt 25 31 no.46:6
c. 1400	pu-hu te-ep-pi-i	CDAFI 6 106 no.8:3
c. 1260–1235	te-pu-h	MDP 41 2–3:2
c. 1260–1235	tu ₄ -up-pi-me	EKI 16:5
c. 1185–1155	ti-pu-h	EKI 18:3
c. 1145–1120	ti-ip-pi	EKI 45 ix 9
c. 1145–1120	ti-pi-ik-ni	EKI 45 ix 10
c. 1145–1120	ti-pi-ir	EKI 54 i 9
c. 1145–1120	ti-pu-h	EKI 47:82
c. 1145–1120	tu ₄ -up-pi-me	EKI 54 iv 18,53
c. 1000	[t]e-ep-[pir]	TTM M-603:6,13
Neo-Elamite (c. 1000–530 B.C.)		
Date (BC)	Spelling	Attestation(s)
717–699	^m te-ep-pir	EKI 74:rev.27
717–699	tup-pu	RA 25 40:rev.7
c. 640	^{GAM} ti-pi-ra	RA 14 36:33
c. 640	^{GAM} tup-pi ^{MES}	RA 14 36:30; RA 24 43:7
c. 625–600	^m ti-pi-ra	EKI 76:18,23,29
c. 620–585	ti-pi-h	EKI 77:3 (var.)
c. 620–585	ti-pi-ha	EKI 77:3
c. 585–539	ti-pi-ir	BA 4 pp.182–83 no.5:32
c. 585–539	ti-pi-ka ₄	MDP 9 17:5, 21:6, 35:7
c. 585–539	tup-pi-me	MDP 9 6:rev.2; MDP 11 301:9, 302:11, 306–7:13
c. 565–550	te-ep-pir	Iran 18 77 (BM 136846:rev.16): PN the scribe.
c. 550–530	^{AS} te-ep-pir	EKI 85:5
c. 550–530	ti-pu-h	EKI 80:3, 82:2

Achaemenid Elamite (c. 530–330 B.C.)		
Date (BC)	Spelling	Attestation(s)
509–494	^{HAL} te-ep-pir (PN)	PFNN 1461:2–3
509–494	^{HAL} ti-pi-ip (pl.)	PF 1947:23,25,29; PFNN 1511:5–6, 2335:38,40, 2394:4, 2486:30
509–494	^{HAL} ti-pi-ra	FHE 249 (YBC 16813:12); PF 866:7, 1947:17,21; PFNN 544:3, 680:5
520, 509–494	^{AS} tup-pi	DB iii 66–67,67,70,84,85,88; PF 1940:23, 1942:39, 1943:39,41, 1944:58, 1946:76, 1948:72, 1986:31, 1994:11, 2067:14, 2068:15; PFa 1:14, 27:10, 28:5–6,11,13,14; PFNN 548:33, 746:1, 799:1, etc.
509–494	^{HAL} tup-pi-ip (pl.)	PF 1807:6–7, 1810:6, 1828:5–6; PFNN 1255:7, 1369:4–5, 2486:32,51,53, 2493:22,24, 2529:4–5
520, 509–494	^{AS} tup-pi-me	DB iv 2,8; PF 871:4, 1137:5; PFNN 1485:4–5; 1588:3–4
509–494	tup-pi-ra	PF 1561:5, 1808:5–6; PFNN 2493:46,49

The attested forms are (1) Old Elamite and Old Babylonian from Susa *puhu teppi/u* and *teppir*; (2) Middle Elamite: *puhu teppi/u*, *tep-/tip-*, *teppir/tipir* and *tuppime*; (3) Neo-Elamite *tep-/tip-*, *teppir/tipir*, *tippi* and *tippime*; (4) Achaemenid Elamite *teppir/tipir* and *tippi*. The problem immediately becomes apparent. The arguments of Hinz and de Blois, though contradictory, could both be right: Old Elamite *tep-* could be a derivation from Akk. *tuppu* and Sumerian *dub* (Hinz) and *tuppime* could be derived from a root *tep-* (de Blois). In order to come closer to a solution to these questions a thorough research of all attestations of relevant lexemes must be conducted.

II. STUDY OF THE SEPARATE LEXEMES

II.1. *Teppir/tipir*

Of the words being discussed here, the one that is attested most frequently is *teppir/tipir*, which appears throughout Elamite history. Various meanings have been proposed for this word: “scribe” (Scheil 1917: 53 and 1925: 149; Sollberger 1968: 31; Hallock 1969: 764; Zadok 1995: 244), “judge” (König 1965: 31 and 172), “superior judge” (Hinz 1967: 76n.33; AHw 1437), and “a dignitary who is superior to ordinary judges” (Scheil 1932: 183). Out of the meaning “scribe” Hinz has developed a meaning “scribe; secretary, chancellor” (Hinz 1964: 72; Lambert 1971: 219; Hinz and Koch 1987: 304, 307, 312, 334, 366; CAD T, 345–46), but Sollberger (1968: 31), pointing to the high status of scribes in Ancient Near Eastern civilisa-

tions, does not understand why a meaning “scribe” should be insufficient.

The *teppir* is regularly attested in Elamite texts dating from the first half of the second millennium B.C.⁵ Only one attestation is older: in the so-called “Treaty of Naram-Sin” (c. 2254–2218 B.C.), the oldest text written in Elamite, where there is a reference to the “treaty of the *teppir* of Akkad”. The only thing one can deduce from this is that the *teppir* was a high-ranked official.

The context of the *teppir* attested in the Old Babylonian texts from Susa does not reveal very much either: most of the occurrences of *teppir* are situated as a professional designation that appears after a personal name. There are seven *teppir* whose names are preserved. Three of them have an Elamite name: Huk, Kuk-Simut and Zuhhuti. The other four *teppir* have Akkadian names: Damqiya, Ibni-Adad, Irēmāni and Malkiya. The linguistic affiliation of the names, however, has no influence on the role of the *teppir* in the texts. Damqiya, Irēmāni and Zuhhuti are witnesses in legal texts. The field of Huk is attested in a royal grant (MDP 23 289/90:5). Malkiya appears as one of the parties in a litigation (MDP 22 161). Finally two *teppir* occur in inscriptions on objects: Ibni-Adad and Kuk-Simut. Ibni-Adad made a *kunaki*-vessel for the king (JCS 22 30:7) while Kuk-Simut received a seal from the king (RA 22 148:8). There is also one attestation of a “gate of the *teppir*” (MDP 23 327:rev.3).

Three texts provide us with a bit more information on this appellative. The first two (MDP 22 161; MDP 23 320) are records of litigations, which were adjudicated by a *teppir* and a judge (*dajānu*). The third (MDP 23

321/22), is much more informative. Two brothers claim a plot of land and appear with their complaint before an unnamed *teppir*⁶ and Ḥabil-kīnu, the judge. Apparently the case was not unimportant, because both officials organised a meeting with the *hašša* (perhaps a city governor; Hinz and Koch 1987: 581), the *kiparu* (a kind of police officer; Hinz and Koch 1987: 479) and many inhabitants of Susa. The “court” then ordered the *teppir* and Ḥabil-kīnu to collect some tablets pertaining to the case. The “court” meet again and finally the *teppir* and Ḥabil-kīnu “declared their victory (of the two brothers)” (*lê’ûssunu iškunūma*). Another *teppir*, Irēmanni, is one of the witnesses.

It is clear that the *teppir* was more than a scribe. He was an important juridical official, who might have possessed a higher rank than the ordinary judges (Scheil 1932: 183; Hinz 1973b: 278). As there are also cases treated by only judges (e.g. MDP 23 325), it becomes

apparent that the *teppir* was some kind of superior judicial official, to whom more important cases (and perhaps appeals) were entrusted (Hinz 1973b: 278). The existence of a difference between *teppir* and judges is obvious from the fact that both are sometimes mentioned in juxtaposition (MDP 23 320:rev.3, 321:21,34, 323:5).

That the *teppir* had more responsibilities than those of a simple scribe during the first half of the second millennium B.C. is also made clear by the fact that in the cuneiform texts the latter were called *dubsar*, the Sumerian word for “scribe”. Most of the 81 attested scribes (Table 2) have Akkadian names (61). Eleven have an Elamite name, three scribes bear a hybrid Akkadian—Elamite name and six others have an as yet unknown name. The *dubsar* mostly appear as the last witness (before the oath) and only in contracts and litigations.

TABLE 2. Scribes (DUB.SAR) in Old Babylonian Susa.

No.	Name	Linguistic Affiliation	Texts
1	[]ak	El.	MDP 28 406:rev.7
2	Aba-Nanna	Akk.	MDP 24 339:10
3	Abu-waqar	Akk.	MDP 22 90:16
4	Abuya	Akk.	MDP 23 215:rev.8
5	Adad-rīm-ili	Akk.	MDP 28 413:rev.9
6	Adad-šarri	Akk.	MDP 23 217:34
7	Addaru	Akk.	MDP 23 185:11
8	Addaruru	Akk. – El.	MDP 23 188:12, 256:15, 258:14
9	Ahiyu	Akk. – El.	MDP 22 7:rev.12
10	Aḥūšina	Akk.	MDP 24 394:16
11	Ahintuli	El.	MDP 23 170:34
12	Apaš	El.	MDP 22 35:16
13	Apil-Amurru	Akk.	MDP 24 335:rev.8, 336:rev.8, 337:rev.4
14	Arad-Kūbi	Akk.	MDP 23 174:25
15	Bēlšunu	Akk.	MDP 23 218:19; MDP 24 387:11
16	Būr-Adad	Akk.	MDP 23 221:13
17	[Dami]q-ili	Akk.	MDP 22 31:15
18	Damqiya	Akk.	MDP 23 220:rev.3, 224:34, 227:36, 229:19, 230:14, 243:13, 245:16, 249:15, 250:14, 251:15, 253:18, 254:15, 257:15, 260:16, 261:17, 262:13, 263:16, 264:15, 265:14, 266:16, 267:14, 268:15, 277:19, 278:15, 279:14, 325:25 (°-<ia>)
19	[Ea]-šar-apli	Akk.	MDP 23 199:18
20	Elmesi ⁷	Akk. or El.	MDP 23 240:33

21	Emitti	Akk.(?)	MDP 22 21:rev.11
22	Erra-šēmi	Akk.	MDP 22 135:rev.9
23	Etebišu	Akk.	MDP 22 88:17, 93:16, 105:18, 107:16, 109:16, 126:18
24	Etel-pi-Šara	Akk.	MDP 22 111:rev.3
25	Ewittu ⁸	Akk.(?)	MDP 22 161:28
26	Ḫablum	Akk.	MDP 23 181:31
27	Hunzaza	El.	MDP 22 76:23
28	Ḫutiliya ⁹	El. – Akk.	MDP 22 18:rev.9
29	Ibbi-ili	Akk.	MDP 22 37:19
30	Iddin-Adad	Akk.	MDP 22 46:36
31	Ik[ihal]ki	El.	MDP 23 270:18
32	Ili-išmeanni	Akk.	MDP 23 191:12
33	Ili-unneni	Akk.	MDP 23 166:36
34	Ilu-šulmu-iqīš	Akk.	MDP 22 121:15
35	[I]nnita	Akk.(?)	MDP 22 85:18
36	Inšušinak-abi	Akk.	MDP 22 89:16
37	Inšušinak-abi-enši	Akk.	MDP 22 27:8, 91:16
38	Inšušinak-kīnam-īde	Akk.	MDP 23 272:19
39	Inšušinak-muballiṭ	Akk.	MDP 23 204:rev.7, 205:23
40	Ipipi	El.	MDP 24 331:24, 334:27
41	Īri[š]	Akk.	MDP 22 66:29
42	Īrib-Sîn	Akk.	MDP 24 345:16
43	Isir	El.	MDP 23 213:rev.9
44	Iššap-Šamaš	Akk.	MDP 22 73:29
45	Išmeanni	Akk.	MDP 22 101:25
46	Išmekarāb-šēmi	Akk.	MDP 23 212:rev.5
47	Kabta-nāšir	Akk.	MDP 22 97:18; MDP 23 285:rev.13
48	Kidinu	Akk.	MDP 22 128:18
49	Kīnu-lizziz	Akk.	MDP 22 84:rev.10
50	Mannu-kī-Inšušinak	Akk.	MDP 22 96:17
51	Mār-ešrē	Akk.	MDP 22 10:31, 14:rev.32, 21:rev.12, 44:41, 45:38, 50:43, 51:47, 53:37
52	Muhaddûm	Akk.	MDP 23 181:32
53	Nidnat	Akk.	MDP 23 173:rev.15
54	Nūr-Adad	Akk.	MDP 22 117:rev.2
55	Nūr-Inšušinak	Akk.	MDP 24 369:17
56	Nūriya	Akk.	MDP 23 324:rev.14; MDP 24 341:44
57	Nūr-Kūbi	Akk.	MDP 22 94:17, 98:15
58	Padum-gāmil	Akk.	MDP 22 16:42
59	Pirayu	El.	MDP 22 92:14
60	Qištiya	Akk.	MDP 22 33:18
61	Qulpû	Akk.(?)	MDP 22 108:19
62	Rabi-Inšušinak	Akk.	MDP 23 255:16

63	Rēš-eqli-ili	Akk.	MDP 23 259:17
64	Rēšiya	Akk.	MDP 22 7:33, 15:33; MDP 24 353:39
65	Simmanni-Adad	Akk.	MDP 22 150:3
66	Sîn-apaš	Akk. – El.	MDP 22 124:12
67	Sîn-gāmil	Akk.	MDP 22 127:15
68	Sîn-ibnišu	Akk.	MDP 23 209:rev.16
69	[Sîn-i]kišuni	Akk.	MDP 23 169:53
70	Sinnî ¹⁰	El.	MDP 22 9:rev.4
71	Sîn-riḫa	Akk.	MDP 22 56:23
72	Šapri	Akk.	MDP 23 274:15
73	Šilli-Adad	Akk.	MDP 22 100:14
74	Šummama	El.	MDP 22 52:25, 71:27, 74:24, 162:35
75	Šumum-libši	Akk.	MDP 22 8:28; MDP 24 379:34
76	Šunati	Akk.	MDP 23 247:16
77	Tukultiya	Akk.	MDP 23 167:29
78	Turram-ili	Akk.	MDP 23 183:rev.3
79	Uš9i-ana-nūrišu	Akk.	MDP 22 95:18
80	Waqriya	Akk.	MDP 22 19:rev.1
81	Ye	El.	MDP 22 29:12, 72:35, 75:23, 81:15, 132:21

The Middle Elamite period attestations of *teppir* add little to this. In a fifteenth century ration list (IrAnt 25 31 no.46:6) one of the beneficiaries is te-ep-pír, but it is not certain whether here the appellative is meant or rather a personal name (Herrero and Glassner 1990: 31). Šilhak-Inšušinak (c. 1145–1120 B.C.) uses the word as an epitheton of the god Tirumithir (EKI 54 I 9) and in the Middle Elamite texts of Tall-i Malyan (TTM M-603:3,16) a man named Assizah appears as *teppir*.

The next attestation, from the early Neo-Elamite period (EKI 74:rev.27), is doubtful. ^mTe-ep-pír-mi is considered a personal name by König (1965: 154), while Hinz and Koch (1987: 334) believe that it was an appellative. The text itself mentions “15 estates of Teppirmi/the *teppir*”.

By the late Neo-Elamite period (c. 646–530 B.C.) the meaning and function of the *teppir* had developed. The Omen Text (c. 640 B.C.; RA 14 36:33) has a colophon in which a *teppir* is mentioned. It is probable that the *teppir* was the author of the text (Scheil 1917: 53). The inscriptions of Hanne (EKI 75–76) have three occurrences: in the first (EKI 76:18) a *teppir* either recites a prayer (König 1965: 164) or must pray to a goddess (Hinz and Koch 1987: 334). The second and third (EKI 76:23 and 29) connect the *teppir* with the act

of reading inscriptions. A Neo-Elamite letter (BA 4 182–83 no.5) mentions Ilasuhir the *teppir*, who is also called *muktirra*, “the one of the lord”. The attestation in an inscription of Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak (EKI 85:5) unfortunately is unclear. Nevertheless the attestations mentioned above indicate a meaning “scribe” for *teppir*. He also might have had some religious importance.

The Achaemenid Elamite attestations of *teppir* corroborate the meaning “scribe” (Haddock 1969: 764). Almost all attestations describe the *teppir* as “Babylonian” and/or “(writing) on parchment”. This clearly indicates a meaning “scribe” for *teppir*, which is then the Elamite equivalent of Bab. *sepīru*. In YBC 16813 Harkipi (an Egyptian name), the *teppir*/scribe of the Egyptians, is mentioned. Interestingly two Babylonian *teppir*/scribes have an Iranian name (*Bagēna- [PF 1561] and *Hiθagrzi- [PF 1808]) and most of the Babylonian *teppir*/scribes are assigned by *Farnaka-. Only scribes using scripts other than cuneiform are called *teppir*, a circumstance which raises the question whether this could be a remnant of the old meaning of the word, in which case it could point to a higher status of these scribes vs. the scribes writing in cuneiform.

The Persepolis Fortification Texts are a large corpus of administrative texts dealing with food rations, and a look at the rations specifically given to the *teppir* has the potential to reveal some information on their status within the Persepolis administration. In the first through third months of year 21 (501/00 B.C.) a *teppir* received a monthly ration of 3 BAR (= c. 30 quarts) of flour (PF 1947).¹¹ At the end of year 23 (499/98 B.C.) this amount was still 3 BAR (PF 1810) and the same amount of grain and flour was given in the tenth and eleventh months of year 25 (496/95 B.C.; PF 1828). The one exception to this is PF 866, where a *teppir* received 4 BAR in the fifth month of year 28 (494/493 B.C.).

The amount of wine did not change from the eighth month of year 20 (502/01 B.C.) to the twelfth month of year 24 (497/96 B.C.), as is documented by various texts (PF 1807, 1808; PFNN 1040, 1255, 1369, 1511, 1752, 1775). When travelling a *teppir* received more wine: daily 0,5 QA, which equals 1 *marriš* in twenty days (PFNN 2493).

Four texts are particularly interesting if one wants to compare the rations of *teppir* with the rations of other officials: PF 864–66 and PFNN 1524. Table 3 (words marked with a star are Old Iranian reconstructions; the others are Elamite) gathers the information of these texts.

Although there is only one *teppir* mentioned in these examples, compared to the amounts of rations received by the other officials, the amount of rations issued to the *teppir* suggest he is situated in the upper echelons. The fact that only a small number of officials received more rations than the *teppir*, seemingly confirms the importance of his position.

In all likelihood the *teppir* had subordinates. This is indicated by some entries in three so-called journals (category V). The entries containing this information all refer to K2-texts (“rations for persons qualified in some way”). The examples are:¹⁵

- (1) PF 1947:8–9: 132 (BAR of flour) [] the delivery man(?)¹⁶ of the treasury received as rations. (For) 4 months, the second through the fifth, (in) the 21st year, 1 man (received) 9 BAR, 8 “boys” received 3.
- (2) PF 1947:10–12: 12 (BAR of flour) [] rina the delivery man of the treasury received as rations. (For) 3 months, the tenth and eleventh and twelfth, (in) the 20th year, (and for) 1 month, the first, in the 21st year, total 4 months, (in) the 20th year and the 21st year. 1 man monthly received 3 BAR.
- (3) PF 1947:13–14: 30 (BAR of flour) [] da the delivery man of the treasury received as rations. (For) one month, the third, (in) the 21st year. 1 man received 9 BAR; 7 servants 3; total 8 workers.
- (4) PF 1947:15–16: 66 (BAR of flour) [] da the delivery man of the treasury received as rations. (For) 2 months, the fourth and the fifth, 21st year. 1 man (receives) 9 (BAR); 8 servants 3; total 9 workers.
- (5) PF 1947:17–18: 50 (BAR of flour) [] adda the *teppir* at the treasury received as rations. (For) 2 months, the second and third, 21st year. 1 man received 9 BAR; 8 servants 2; total 9 workers.
- (6) PF 1947:21–22: 48(?) (BAR of flour) [] baturra the *teppir* (writing) on parchment at *Abištāfta-, together with his companion Puraya(?), of him ... (For) 2 months, the third and fourth, (in) the 21st

TABLE 3. Comparison of rations for officials in PF 864–66 and PFNN 1524.

	PF 864	PF 865	PF 866	PFNN 1524
<i>araššar</i>	—	5 BAR	5 BAR	5 BAR
* <i>bārēkara</i> -, “artisan” ¹²	—	4 BAR	4 BAR	4 BAR
<i>etira</i>	—	4 BAR	4 BAR	4 BAR
<i>teppir</i>	—	—	4 BAR	—
<i>kapnuškir</i> , “treasurer”	3,5 BAR	3,5 BAR	3,5 BAR	—
* <i>āčarna</i> -handler ¹³	3 BAR	3 BAR	3 BAR	3 BAR
<i>mulata</i>	3 BAR	3 BAR	3 BAR	3 BAR
* <i>ramikara</i> -, “artisan” ¹⁴	—	3 BAR	3 BAR	3 BAR

year. 2(?) men (receive) 9(?) BAR; 3(?) servants 2(?); total 5 workers.

- (7) PF 1947:31–32: 52 (BAR of flour), delivered (in accordance with) a sealed document of *Čiçavahuš, *Čiθrina- the delivery man at the treasury received as rations. (For) 3 months, the tenth and eleventh and twelfth, (in) the 20th year, and 1 month, the first, (in) the 21st year, (for) a total (of) 4 months, (in) the 20th (and) 21st year. 1 man (receives) 9 BAR, 2 servants 2.
- (8) PFNN 2335:40–41: 18 (BAR of barley), delivered (in accordance with) a sealed document of *Ršēna-, Nukudda en *Nitita- the *teppir* []. Seventh month. Year 17. Each received 4,5 (BAR). 3 (BAR) boys.¹⁷
- (9) PFNN 2356:5–8: 120 (BAR of barley), delivered (in accordance with) a sealed document of *Čiçavahuš, *Dr(u)vaspāda- together with his colleagues, the fortress commanders in Persepolis, received as rations. (For) 4 months, the ninth through the twelfth, 19th year. 1 man (received) 6 (BAR), 2 men (received) 4,5 (BAR), 5 men (received) 3 (BAR). Total 8 workers.
- (10) PFNN 2356:12–15: [44] (BAR of barley), delivered (in accordance with) a sealed document of *Čiçavahuš, Šarbaladda,¹⁸ the treasurer in Persepolis, received as rations. (For) 4 months, the ninth through the twelfth, 19th year. 1 man (received) 9 (BAR), 1 servant (received) 2 (BAR).

The various elements of this construction are:

- (1) A certain amount of commodity: barley, flour or wine are mentioned as being received or delivered.
- (2) This happened in accordance with a sealed document of a high official: this is either *Čiçavahuš, *Farnaka- or *Ršēna-.
- (3) The receiver of the ration was always an official. Delivery men, fortress commanders, *teppir* and a treasurer are mentioned.
- (4) The date, consisting of the months and the regnal year, is listed.
- (5) The people to whom the rations were finally given is also listed: starting with one or more “men” (*ruh^{MEŠ}*). It is conspicuous that the number of officials is the same as the number of “men” receiving the rations.¹⁹ This implies that the men mentioned first are actually the officials receiving the rations and that they had to divide the rations between the other persons mentioned. This

suggests that these other people were the subordinates of these officials. The *puhu* mentioned among the people receiving rations might very well be *puhu teppi*.

There is obviously a semantic change with regard to the lexeme *teppir*. In the first half of the second millennium B.C. the *teppir* is an important judicial official. By the Achaemenid period the appellative merely indicates a scribe, and more precisely scribes writing in non-cuneiform writing systems. Thus, in the later periods the lexeme no longer indicates a high-ranked official (despite the high social status of the *teppir*), but always a scribe, and there is no trace in the Fortification Tablets of a *teppir* having judicial power, although this cannot be expected due to the nature of the Fortification Texts.

II.2. *Puhu teppu/i*

The next expression discussed here is *puhu teppu/i*, which is only attested in the Old Babylonian texts and seals from Susa and in an Akkadian letter order from Haft Tepe (early to mid fourteenth century B.C.). The literal meaning of the expression is “child teppi, boy teppi”. In all likelihood this expression means apprentice *teppir* (Hinz 1964: 72; Lambert 1971: 219n.8; Herrero 1976: 114; Hinz and Koch 1987: 230; CAD P, 502). The meaning “prince” (Scheil 1930: 115) is undoubtedly wrong. That a *puhu teppi* could possess a seal is proven by the Old Babylonian seal of Kuk-Ninšupur, who calls himself the servant of Hutran (Delaporte 1920: 76 no. D112).

An interesting text is MDP 28 437a, where Turukuzu is reprimanded for treating the apprentices with disrespect. The other attestations do not reveal much about the status of the *puhu teppi*: Atkalšu is a witness (MDP 22 101:14) and Nūr-Sîn is mentioned in a ration list (MDP 28 504:2). In an Akkadian letter order from Haft Tepe (CDAFI 6 106 no.8:3) the group of *puhu teppi/u* may be mentioned, rather than an individual *puhu teppi*.

II.3. *Tipu- and tipi-*

Some Middle and Neo-Elamite verb forms should also be included in this discussion: *tepuh*, *tipih(a)*, *tipika*, *tipikna* and *tipuh*. *Tipika* is the past participle of a verbal

base *tipu/i-*, *tipikni* is the past participle followed by *-ni*, the others are first person singular forms.

Tepuh, *tipuh* and *tipih(a)* occur in various texts. Their object is usually *erentum*, “baked brick”,²⁰ but in one case *upat*, “brick” is the object (MDP 41 2–3:2) and in another it is *hal*, “land, earth”, hence “clay” (EKI 47:82).

Steve (1967: 15 and 126) derives this verb from Akk. *tuppu* and, as Lambert did earlier (1962: 92), prefers a meaning “to engrave, inscribe”. Scheil (1901: 44; also Bork 1933: 163; König 1965: 71–72 and 222; Grilhot 1970: 220; Hallock 1973: 148; Hinz and Koch 1987: 598 and 1162) prefers a meaning “to fashion, form, shape”. Lambert (1965: 36) thinks of “to enclose; to deposit”. According to Malbran-Labat (1995: 80 and 184) the various forms belong to one verb *tipu/i-*, with two meanings: (1) “to fashion bricks of a special type, perhaps those that had to be inscribed”, and (2) “to engrave, inscribe”. In her view *tipu-* must refer to a specific action, since the general word for making bricks is *kuši-*. Malbran-Labat adds that during the Neo-Elamite period the meaning of *tipu-* was generalised to “to make bricks”, because in the Neo-Elamite texts it may replace *kuši-*. This is, however, not true. *Tipuh* occurs twice in inscriptions of Tepti-Suban-Inšušinak (EKI 80:3, 82:2), while *tipih(a)* is attested in a text of Hallutaš-Inšušinak (EKI 77:3). The first two times it is followed by *ak ... kuših*, “and I have built”, the last time by *ak ... šilhah*, “I made stronger, I restored”. In the Middle Elamite texts it is connected with *halihma*, “I shaped” (EKI 18:3) and *kuših*, “I built” (MDP 41 2–3:2). Accordingly there is no reason to assume that *tipu/i-* could replace *kuši-* in the Neo-Elamite period.

Tipikni is attested once in an inscription of Šilhak-Inšušinak (EKI 45 ix 10: *halli tippi aha tipikni*), which has been translated differently by the various scholars and needs to be looked at more closely. The phrase is situated at the end of a curse: *ha-al-li ti-ip-pi a-ha ti-pi-ik-ni a-ak ku-ú-ut a-ha-an ku-ul-la-áš-ni*, rendering *halli tippi aha tipikni ak kut ahan kullašni*. The second part of this phrase (*ak kut ahan kullašni*) is relatively clear: “And may he pray in vain to them (i.e. to the gods)”. The first part probably consists of a verb (*tipikni*) and its object (*tippi*), with the role of *halli* being unclear for the moment. Bork (1929: 5; also König 1965: 101n.8 and 102) connects *halli* with Achaemenid Elamite *hal-lu-ir* and *hal-lu-ma-ir*, “one who causes damage” and translates “to his damage may his inscription be written down here”. This is,

however, an unlikely translation, since the Elamite text contains no possessive pronouns. In the Middle Elamite royal inscriptions the possessive pronoun of the third person was always indicated by the sign E.²¹ There are only two exceptions to this: *hi-i-še*, “his name” (MDP 41 32:6) and *ul-be-te*, “his sowing” (EKI 45 ix 2), but both spellings have a sign, which is otherwise exclusively used to indicate a /Ce/-sequence. If “his inscription” was really meant the Elamite text would have had *ti-ip-pe-e*. A translation “to his damage may the inscription be written” remains possible, but not probable.

Two other translations are presented by Steve (1967: 16; “May that what has been engraved remain there engraved”) and Hinz and Koch (1987: 334; “The art-inscription may remain here written down”). The first word of the phrase, *halli*, may be connected with various lexemes (apart from the already mentioned connection with *hal-lu-ir*). It occurs once more, in an inscription of Untaš-Napiriša (MDP 41 32:5–6; *ha-al-li ap-pa [ku]-ši-ha lu-pu-ru-uh*).²² Steve (1967: 119) identifies *halli* with *hal*, occurring in MDP 41 31:5 in a similar construction (*ha-al [a]p-pa ku-[š]i-ha lu-up-pu-ru-uh-ni*), which he translates as “land, district, city”. Hinz and Koch (1987: 575), however, believe in a relation to *hali-*, “to build, construct”, resulting in a meaning “work (of art)”. Although at first sight plausible, this proposal is formally untenable, since the verbal base is never written with a geminated *l*. This points to a phonetic distinction between *hali-* and *halli-*.

Two other expressions possibly related to *halli* are *hallime* (spelled *hal-la-me*, *hal-li-me* and *hal-li-um-me*) and *hallina* (spelled *hal-li-na*). The first one is only attested in Neo-Elamite, where it indicates an unknown object, and Achaemenid Elamite, where it is used as the name of the fourth Elamite month. It could be a *me*-derivation of *hal(li)*, “land”. The second word, *hallina*, has caused disagreement among scholars. Bork (1929: 5) translated this as “to perdition”, Friedrich (1949: 27) translates “long”, König (1965: 101) equates it with *halma*, “in the land” and Hinz and Koch (1987: 575) have “to his damage”.

In all likelihood *halli* means “land, city”. This is enhanced by Achaemenid Elamite *hallinip*, “farmers, peasant labourers”. The phrase now goes “The land-*tippi* may be *tippi*-ed”.

The above has shown that it is by no means sure that *tip-* is connected here with the semantic field of “to write”. In other words, it is not necessary to postulate here an act of engraving/writing.

Tipika is attested three times in the Neo-Elamite Susa Acropole Texts. Scheil (1907: 23) translated it as “entrusted”, while Bork (1910: 573; also Jusifov 1963: 253 and Hinz and Koch 1987: 334) preferred “written down, noted down”.

The structure of the three texts in which this word occurs is similar. One of them (MDP 9 17) is edited below.

Text:

(1) 2 ku-uk-tu₄ li-[man-na] (2) 4 tuk-li a-h máš-
zi-ka₄ (3) NÍG.KA₉^{MES} uk-ku-ma (4) 2 ku-uk-tu₄ da-
mi (5) ti-pi-ka₄ (6) 4 tuk-li mu-h-šá-ma-na (7) PAP
hu-ut-tuk-ki kur-mín (8) ^{BE}Ku-ud-da-ka₄-ka₄-na
(9) hu-ma-ka₄ ITU ŠU UD ^{AS}Šu-šu-un.

Translation:

2 *kuktu*-garments of linen, 4 *tukli*-garments have
been taken away (or: cut) here. In accordance
with the account two aforementioned *kuktu*-
garments are written down. The four *tukli*-
garments must (yet) be accounted. All products,
supplied by Kuttakaka, are acquired. A day in the
month Du ūzu. At Susa.

Here *tipika* probably means “written down, noted; registered”, in contrast to *muhšamana*, which is said of the products yet to be accounted for. It is also interesting to see that both NÍG.KA₉^{MES} and *tipika* occur only three times in Elamite, precisely in these three texts. The meaning of *tipika* fits the meaning of *teppir* in the Neo- and Achaemenid Elamite periods, as discussed above.

II.4. *Tippi, tippime and tuppime*

Tippime and *tuppime* are clearly abstract equivalents of *tippi* and **tuppi*. A Middle Elamite inscription of Napirasu (EKI 16) contains the earliest attestation of one of these lexemes: tu₄-up-pi-me, reflecting /tuppime/. The same form occurs also in an inscription of Šilhak-Inšušinak and is derived from Akkadian *tuppu*, “tablet; document, letter” (König 1965: 222). Also derived from the Akkadian form is Neo-Elamite tup-pu (Hinz and Koch 1987: 345; Steve 1992: 148).

The meaning of these words should be well-known thanks to their occurrence in the Bisitūn Inscription of Darius I. *Tippi* occurs as equivalent of Old Persian *dipi*-,

“inscription”, while *tippime* is the equivalent of *dipičiçam*, “form of writing” (reading by Schmitt 1990: 56–60). *Tippi* clearly means “inscription” (Foy 1898: 564; Friedrich 1949: 20n.6; Hallock 1969: 764). The meaning of *tippime*, however, has aroused a discussion among scholars.

Foy (1898: 564) believed that the El. word means “script, writing system” and used it to prove that Darius had invented the Old Persian cuneiform writing system: in the famous paragraph 70 of his Bisitūn Inscription Darius claims that he has made a new *tippime* in Aryan. From now on the term *tippime* became part of an argument in the discussion on the origin of the Old Persian writing system. Jensen (1901: 237–38) and Weissbach (1911: 71; also Scheil 1911: 55, Hallock 1950: 244 and König 1965: 69 and 223) rejected Foy’s proposal and instead ascribed the meaning “inscription” to *tippime*. Hinz (1942: 345–46 and 1952: 30) and Friedrich (1949: 20), however, defended Foy’s proposal, which again triggered reactions from Cameron (1948: 53) and Lewy (1954: 172–73), who preferred the meaning “text”.

Remarkably, a really thorough investigation of this lexeme and its contexts was not carried out before 1974, when Lecoq (1974: 67–73) devoted several pages to the issue. First of all he analysed the word itself and came to the conclusion that it belonged to the category of words where the suffix *-me* does not modify the meaning very much (e.g. *mušin*—*mušimme*, “account”, *nan*—*nanme*, “day”, *zak*—*zakme*, “payment”). Accordingly *tippime* should mean something like “text” or “inscribed text”. Another objection to the meaning “script, writing system” is the Akkadian curse formula found on a statue of Untaš-Napiriša. This formula can be compared with the Elamite curse formula on a statue of Napir-asu, the wife of Untaš-Napiriša. Both curses contain a sentence against the one who damages (El. *melkanra*) or obliterates (Akk. *ipiššitu*) the inscription/text (El. *tuppime*; Akk. *tuppašu*). Thirdly Lecoq had a closer look at the contexts of *tippime*. In the seven Neo-Elamite legal texts from Susa the word is used in connection with *talli*-, “to write”: *tippime PN talliš(t)a*, “PN wrote the *tippime*”. Again the meaning “writing system” is impossible.

All this makes clear that *tippime* cannot mean “script, writing system”. In all probability such a word would be **tallime* in Elamite. It can be safely concluded that *tippime* means “text; what is written in the *tippi*” (Herrenschmidt 1989: 194; Mayrhofer 1989: 175n.5).

III. THE HISTORY OF *TEP-*, *TIP-* AND *TUP-*

It is difficult to accept a Sumero-Akkadian origin for the Old Elamite period attestations of these words. The Akkadian scribes in Susa would most likely have used a spelling with *TU* (tu-pi-ir), if the word was really derived from Akkadian *tuppu*. In my opinion *puhu teppi* and *teppir* are genuine Elamite expressions, derived from the verb *tep-*, “to fashion”. Moreover it has been pointed out that *teppir* has nothing to do with the act of writing and that a translation “scribe” must be ruled out with regard to the Old Elamite period examples.

The discussion on the Middle Elamite period is more complicated, since there are more variant spellings. The Middle Elamite spellings with *TE* and *TI* are most likely derived from El. *tep-* and in the Middle Elamite period too this root has no relation to “to write”. Middle Elamite *tuppime* cannot be connected to *tep-/tip-*, because in that case Old Elamite *tep-/tip-* would have become *tup-* and thereafter again *tep-/tip-*. This would be a very peculiar phonetic evolution. The oldest of the three attestations of *tuppime* occurs in an inscription of Napirasu, the wife of king Untaš-Napiriša (c. 1260–1235 B.C.) and is thereby the oldest use in an Elamite text of a word belonging to the semantic field “to write”. The oldest attestations (EKI 42) of the Elamite stem *talli/u-*, “to write” date from the reign of Šutruk-Nahhunte I (c. 1185–1155 B.C.), which does not, however, indicate that the word did not exist earlier. It is thus plausible to believe that the person who recorded the inscriptions of Napir-asu decided to make use of an Akkadian loanword followed by the Elamite suffix *-me*. If *tep-/tip-* were an Akkadian loanword meaning “to write”, it is strange that the writer of the text did not use a derivation of that stem, e.g. **teppime*. What one sees here is the introduction of an Akkadian loanword into the Elamite lexicon, with no relation whatsoever to *tep-/tip-*.

The Akkadian loanword is once more attested in Neo-Elamite (*tup-pu*), in a text from Susa, dating from the reign of Šutruk-Nahhunte II (717–699 B.C.). It does not occur again in later texts. The root *tep-/tip-* occurs regularly in Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid Elamite texts, but by then it has absorbed the semantic field of Akkadian *tuppu*, “(inscribed) tablet; inscription” and now means both “to fashion” and “to write”.

To summarise, in the Old and Middle Elamite periods the root *tep-/tip-* had nothing to do with the act of

writing. In the Middle Elamite period a new form entered the Elamite lexicon: *tuppi(me)*, “text”, which was an Akkadian loanword. This loanword should not be confused with the Neo- and Achaemenid Elamite homograph *tuppime* (pronounced /tippime/) and is only attested in this and the Neo-Elamite period, but the phonetic similarity with Elamite *tep-/tip-* triggered the merger of the two forms. By the Neo-Elamite period *tep-/tip-* had two meanings: (1) “to form, shape” and (2) “to write”, hence the general meaning of “scribe” for *teppir* in the Achaemenid texts, but also the architectural way it was used in e.g. the inscriptions of Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak (c. 550–530 B.C.). As a result of this merger the now superfluous Akkadian form disappeared.

Notes

- ¹ Abbreviations are cited according to the system used in *Iran*. It should be emphasised that the PFNN citations are drawn from copies of Hallock’s working transliterations and not from the original documents.
- ² Some scholars (Meillet-Benveniste 1931: 163; Kent 1953: 191) seem to believe that the Old Persian word is a direct loan from Sumerian.
- ³ Cf. Tavernier (in press) for a detailed study of this shift.
- ⁴ In his republication of the seal Lambert does not mention Scheil’s earlier publication. This has led Hinz and Koch (1987: 307 and 312) to accept the existence of two seals.
- ⁵ Mention should be made of Sollberger’s (1968: 31) reading <te>-eb-bi-ir in the Attahušu inscription (c. 1900 B.C.; cf. Scheil 1929: 1–2 and 1939: 7). Hinz and Koch (1987: 739) prefer ib-bi-ir, which they derive from a root *ip-*, “to be strong”, but which is a *hapax*. Their translation is “ruler”.
- ⁶ Scheil reads the word before *teppir* in MDP 23 321/2:38 as a personal name Atar, but it is better to read a-ša’-ar (De Meyer 1962: 93–94). The fact that the name of the *teppir* is not mentioned corroborates his high status.
- ⁷ According to Hinz and Koch (1987: 395) this is an Elamite name. Nevertheless it could also be related to Akk. Elmešum, cf. Aḫūšina, spelled A-hu-si-na.
- ⁸ Hinz and Koch (1987: 397) read E-pi-it-ti and consider it an Elamite name. Yet a reading E-wi-it-ti is also possible in which case the name could be identified with Emitti. On the other hand both names could be different: Emitti can be connected with Akk. *imittu*, “divine support”, a frequent element in personal names, while Epitti might be related to Akk. *epitu*, “baked product, pastry”.

- ⁹ Hutil is probably an Elamite word, to which an Akkadian hypocoristic suffix is attached. The name is certainly related to Huddulu and Huddilatu, both occurring in Old Babylonian texts from Susa.
- ¹⁰ Hinz and Koch (1987: 398) read Eš-ni-i, but the existence of an Elamite name Si-ni-ni makes a reading Sin-ni-i more probable.
- ¹¹ Interestingly PF 1947:17–18 and 21–22, where the name of the *teppir* is mentioned, indicate that the *teppir* received 4,5 BAR of flour from at least the second through the fourth month of year 21. This could point to a hierarchy within the *teppir*.
- ¹² Cf. Tavernier (2007: 417 [4.4.7.18]).
- ¹³ *Āčarna- is an Iranian word meaning “furniture, equipment” (Tavernier 2007: 437 [4.4.8.1]).
- ¹⁴ *Ramikara- (< *ramiya-kara-) is an Iranian word meaning “worker who has to do delicate, refined work” (Tavernier 2007: 430 [4.4.7.94]).
- ¹⁵ The translations are based on Hallock’s translations.
- ¹⁶ El. [ul-li-r]a(?). In my opinion this reconstruction is correct for two reasons: (1) the parallel with other entries in this text and (2) the amount of ration he receives (9 BAR), which is also the ration for an *ullira* in PF 786.
- ¹⁷ The Elamite phrase is read by Hallock pu-hu-u[n-ra]. Yet that sounds a bit strange, since in that case one single *puhu* would receive 9 BAR in one month (there is no space to reconstruct a second month). In addition the traces on the tablet cast doubt on Hallock’s restoration. It is much more plausible that 3 *puhu*’s received 3 BAR, as is also indicated in the following lines 42–43.
- ¹⁸ This person is attested four times in the Fortification Archive. In year 17 (if that date may be inferred from the data in PFNN 544) he was a *teppir* at the treasury, while by year 19 he had become treasurer (PFNN 2356 and 2493) himself. He kept that position at least until the first month of year 21 (PF 1947). This means that a restoration of his name in PF 1947:17 is not probable, since he would at the same time be a *teppir* and a treasurer.
- ¹⁹ Accordingly one may assume that PF 1947: 23–24 and 25–26 deal with 5 *teppir*, while PF 1947: 29–30 deals with 3 *teppir*.
- ²⁰ Equivalent of Akk. *agurru* (Scheil 1900: 120) and attested in Akkadian as *erimtu*. It is originally an Elamite word (it only occurs in Old Babylonian Susa; Pézard 1914: 70n.2), despite claims that it is Akkadian (CAD E, 294).
- ²¹ Examples: ap-he-e, “his titulature” (EKI 48b:63); ba-re-e, “his seed” (EKI 45 viii 3); du-he-e, “his own” (EKI 45 vi 6); e-re-en-tum-e, “its bricks” (EKI 38:9, 38b:12, 42:2); ha-al-li-la-ar-e, “his possession of land” (EKI 45 viii

17–18); hi-i-še-e, hi-iš-e and hi-ši-e, “his name” (EKI 39:5, 51 iv 6; MDP 41 31:5); hi-it-e, “his army” (EKI 45 viii 18); sa-h-ti-e, “his plaster(?)” (EKI 28A:3, 47:94); ša-le-e, “his picket, his pole” (EKI 45 vii 3); šu-tú-e, “his sister” (EKI 45 ix 7).

- ²² The meaning of *lupuruh(ni)* is unfortunately unclear. Possible meanings are “to give access to” (Grillot 1984: 190n.25) a compound of *lupu-*

Bibliography

- Blois, F. de. 1994. “Elamite Survivals in Western Iranian. A preliminary survey”, *Studia Iranica Mesopotamica Anatolica* 1: 13–19.
- Bork, F. 1910. “Nochmals das Alter der altpersischen Keilschrift”, *ZDMG* 64: 569–80.
- 1929. “Elamisches Sprachgut in keilschriftlichen Vokabularen”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 36: 1–12.
- 1933. “Zur Religion der alten Elamer”, *Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionsgeschichte* 48: 161–76.
- Brandenstein, W. and Mayrhofer, M. 1964. *Handbuch des Altpersischen*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Cameron, G.G. 1948. *Persepolis Treasury Tablets* (OIP 65). University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Delaporte, L. 1920. *Catalogue des cylindres, cachets et pierres gravées de style oriental* (Catalogue des cylindres, cachets et pierres gravées du Musée du Louvre). Hachette, Paris.
- De Meyer, L. 1962. *L'accadien des contrats de Suse* (IA Suppl. 1). Brill, Leiden.
- Foy, W. 1898. “Beiträge zur Erklärung der susischen Achaemenideninschriften”, *ZDMG* 52: 564–605.
- Friedrich, J. 1949. “Altpersisches und Elamisches”, *Orientalia* NS 18: 1–29.
- Grillot, F. 1970. “À propos de la notion de subordination dans la syntaxe élamite”, *JA* 258: 213–36.
- 1984. “Trinôme de la royauté en Élam”, *St Ir* 13: 185–91.
- Hallock, R.T. 1950. “New Light from Persepolis”, *JNES* 9: 237–52.
- 1969. *Persepolis Fortification Tablets* (OIP 92). University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 1973. “On the Middle Elamite Verb”, *JNES* 32: 148–51.
- Herrenschmidt, C. 1989. “Le paragraphe 70 de l’inscription de Bisotun”, in *Études irano-aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard* (St Ir. Cahier 7). Paris, Association pour l’avancement des études iraniennes: 193–208.
- Herrero, P. 1976. “Tablettes administratives de Haft Tépé”, *CDAFI* 6: 93–116.

- and Glassner, J.J. 1990. "Haft-Tépé: Choix de texts I", *IrAnt* 25: 1–45.
- Hinz, W. 1942. "Zur Behistun-Inschrift des Dareios", *ZDMG* 96: 326–49.
- 1952. "Die Einführung der altpersischen Schrift. Zum Absatz 70 der Behistun-Inschrift", *ZDMG* 102: 28–38.
- 1964. *Das Reich Elam* (Urban Bücher 82). Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.
- 1967. "Elams Vertrag mit Narām-Sin von Akkade", *ZA* 58: 66–96.
- 1973. *Neue Wege im Altpersischen* (Göttinger Orientalforschungen. III. Reihe: Iranica 1). Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- 1973b. "Persia c. 1800–1550 B.C." In *CAH* 2/1, 3rd ed. Cambridge, University Press: 256–88.
- and Koch, H. 1987. *Elamisches Wörterbuch* (AMI. Erg. 17). Reimer, Berlin.
- Jensen, P. 1891. review of F.H. Weissbach, *Die Achämenideninschriften zweiter Art* (AB 9), Leipzig, 1890, *ZA* 6: 167–82.
- 1901. "Alt- und Neu-elamitisches", *ZDMG* 55: 223–40.
- Jusifov, Ju.B. 1963. "Эламские хозяйственные документы из Суз", *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 2 (84): 200–61.
- Kent, R.G. 1953. *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexikon* (American Oriental Series 33), 2nd ed. American Oriental Society, New Haven.
- König, F.W. 1965. *Die elamischen Königsinschriften* (AfO. Beih. 16). Weidner, Graz.
- Lambert, M. 1962. "Épigraphie élamite (III)", *RA* 56: 91–94.
- 1965. "Les inscriptions élamites de Tchogha Zanbil", *IA* 5: 18–38.
- 1971. "Investiture de fonctionnaires en Élam", *JA* 259: 217–21.
- Lecoq, P. 1974. "Le problème de l'écriture vieux-perse", in *Commémoration Cyrus: actes du Congrès de Shiraz 1971 et autres études rédigées à l'occasion du 2500e anniversaire de la fondation de l'Empire Perse: hommage universel*, vol. 3 (Afr 3). Tehran, Bibliothèque Pahlavi: 25–107.
- Lewy, J. 1954. "The problems inherent in section 70 of the Bisutun Inscription", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 25: 169–208.
- Livšić, V.A. 1980. "New Parthian Documents from South Turkmenistan", *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 25: 157–85.
- Malbran-Labat, F. 1995. *Les inscriptions royales de Suse: briques de l'époque paléo-élamite à l'empire néo-élamite*. Réunion des musées nationaux, Paris.
- Mayrhofer, M. 1989. "Über die Verschriftung des Altpersischen", *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 102: 174–86.
- Meillet, A. and Benveniste, E. 1931. *Grammaire du vieux-perse*, 2nd ed. Champion, Paris.
- Pézard, M. 1914. *Mission à Bender-Bouchir: documents archéologiques et épigraphiques* (MDP 15). Leroux, Paris.
- Scheil, V. 1900. *Textes élamites—sémitiques* (MDP 2). Leroux, Paris.
- 1901. *Textes élamites—anzanites* (MDP 3). Leroux, Paris.
- 1907. *Textes élamites—anzanites* (MDP 9). Leroux, Paris.
- 1911. *Textes élamites—anzanites* (MDP 11). Leroux, Paris.
- 1917. "Déchiffrement d'un document anzanite relatif aux présages", *RA* 14: 29–53.
- 1925. "Passim", *RA* 22: 141–62.
- 1929. "Documents et arguments", *RA* 26: 1–19.
- 1930. *Actes juridiques susiens* (MDP 22). Leroux, Paris.
- 1932. *Actes juridiques susiens* (MDP 23). Leroux, Paris.
- 1939. *Mélanges épigraphiques* (MDP 28). Leroux, Paris.
- Schmitt, R. 1990. *Epigraphisch-exegetische Noten zu Dareios' Bisutūn-Inschriften* (SÖAW 561), Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien.
- Sollberger, E. 1968. "A Tankard for Atta-hušu", *JCS* 22: 30–33.
- Steve, M.-J. 1967. *Tchoga Zanbil III: textes élamites et accadiens de Tchoga Zanbil* (MDP 41), Geuthner, Paris.
- 1992. *Syllabaire élamite: histoire et paléographie* (Civilisations du Proche Orient, Série 2: Philologie 1), Recherches et publications, Neuchâtel.
- Tavernier, J. 2007. *Iranica in the Achaemenid period (ca. 550–330 B.C.). Lexicon of Old Iranian Proper Names and Loanwords, Attested in Non-Iranian Texts* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 158), Peeters, Leuven.
- in press, "On Elamite signs and sounds", *ZDMG*.
- Weissbach, F.H. 1911. *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden* (Vorderasiatische Bibliothek 3), Hinrichs, Leipzig.
- Zadok, R. 1995. "On the Current State of Elamite Lexicography", *Studi epigrafici et Linguistici* 12: 241–52.