



Kultur – Kontakt – Kultur

Beiträge anlässlich

der 66. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale
in Frankfurt/Main und Mainz, 25.–29. Juli 2022

Herausgegeben von Doris Prechel,
Alexander Pruß, Thomas Richter und
Dirk Wicke unter Mitarbeit von Michael Würz

dubsar 35

Zaphon

Kultur – Kontakt – Kultur

Beiträge anlässlich
der 66. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale
in Frankfurt/Main und Mainz, 25.–29. Juli 2022

Herausgegeben von
Doris Prechel, Alexander Pruß,
Thomas Richter und Dirk Wicke
unter Mitarbeit von Michael Würz

dubsar

Altorientalistische Publikationen
Publications on the Ancient Near East

Band 35

Herausgegeben von Kristin Kleber und Kai A. Metzler

Kultur – Kontakt – Kultur

Beiträge anlässlich

der 66. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale
in Frankfurt/Main und Mainz, 25.–29. Juli 2022

Herausgegeben von

Doris Prechel, Alexander Pruß,

Thomas Richter und Dirk Wicke

unter Mitarbeit von Michael Würz

Zaphon

Münster

2025

Illustration auf dem Cover: Motiv des Kongresses,
nach Entwurf von Andrea Vögeling.

Kultur – Kontakt – Kultur. Beiträge anlässlich der 66. Rencontre Assyriologique
Internationale in Frankfurt/Main und Mainz, 25.–29. Juli 2022

Herausgegeben von Doris Prechel, Alexander Pruß, Thomas Richter
und Dirk Wicke unter Mitarbeit von Michael Würz

dubsar 35

© 2025 Zaphon, Enkingweg 36, Münster (www.zaphon.de)

All rights reserved. Printed in Germany. Printed on acid-free paper.

ISBN 978-3-96327-288-2 (Buch)

ISBN 978-3-96327-289-9 (E-Book)

ISSN 2627-7174



© A. Schurzig

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Vorwort.....	XI
A Pre-Islamic Cultural Trade Center in the South-East Arabian Peninsula <i>Khuloud Alhouli & Ossama Khalil</i>	1
Enter the Crown Prince: Revisiting the Seventh Century BCE Encounter Between Assyria and Egypt <i>Talah Anderson</i>	17
La « globalisation » <i>cananéenne</i> ou une communauté technique illusoire. Analyse comparée des traditions laminaires « post-Uruk » de Mésopotamie de nord (cultures de Ninive V et de la <i>Plain Simple Ware</i> , EJZ 1–2, c. 2950–2600 BC) <i>Raphaël Angevin</i>	33
The Influence of the Assyrian Culture in the Iron Age Northern Levant <i>Adonice-A. Baaklini</i>	59
Walk About the City and See its Walls: An Allusion to the <i>Epic of Gilgamesh</i> in Psalm 48? <i>Joseph Barber</i>	83
“Great Festivals” and “Regular Festivals” in the Hittite Cult Calendar <i>Francesco G. Barsacchi & Giulia Torri</i>	97
Us Against the Others? How the Figure of the Enemy was Built up in the Middle-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions <i>Cécile Bigot</i>	117
The King of Kussara Made “the Sons of the City Nesa Mothers and Fathers”: An Example of how Clans merged in Central Anatolia during the MBA Period <i>Joost Blasweiler</i>	133
Wagen, Waffen und Varia. Lexikalische Beobachtungen zu den Texten aus Haft Tappeh, Areal I <i>Tim Brandes</i>	141
Craftsmen in the Ebla Texts: Professional Contacts during the 24 th Century BC <i>Elisabetta Cianfanelli</i>	157
Ashurbanipal’s Library of Alexandria <i>John Dayton</i>	177

From Iconography to Icon: The Image of the Hittite Great King and Hittite Soldiers in the Egyptian Reliefs and Texts of the New Kingdom <i>Marco De Pietri</i> †	191
Making Sense of Compositions: A Computational Approach to Old Babylonian Presentation Scenes <i>Albert Dietz & Anna Kurmangaliev</i>	211
The Oman Peninsula and the Gulf Trade of the Early Third Millennium BCE <i>Stephanie Döpper</i>	227
Old Babylonian Seal Prayers <i>Zsombor J. Földi</i>	241
Adoption and Adaptation of Writing Systems in Ancient Societies: The Cases of Urartian and Mycenaean <i>Lavinia Giorgi & Annarita S. Bonfanti</i>	255
The Touch in <i>Gilgamesh</i> <i>Sophus Helle</i>	279
Culture Contact in Ancient Southwest Asia: Concepts and Case Studies <i>Barbara Helwing</i>	297
Observations on the Distribution of 2MSG Stative Variants in Old Babylonian Text Genres <i>Rodrigo Hernáiz</i>	319
Šavoška and Anzili: A Comparison of Two Hittite <i>IŠTAR</i> -Goddesses <i>Timothy D. Leonard</i>	333
Šiluhlu and Assyrians <i>Werner Nahm</i>	347
The Use of ZÀ.HI.LI in the Context of Destruction and Curse: A Possible Case of Contact Between Assyrian and Hittite Literary Traditions <i>Metin Oral</i>	355
Linguistics and Lexicography in Contact: Cut, Break, and Hit Verbs in Sumerian <i>Anna Krisztina Pintér</i>	371
An Analysis of the “Dahamunzu/Zannanza Affair” According to the Cognitive Narratology, the Text World Theory and the Possible Worlds Theory <i>Claudia Posani</i>	387
Cultures in Contact – the Inhabitants of Tell el-Dab‘a/Avaris <i>Silvia Prell</i>	399

A Story of Goods and Services: Some Clues for Understanding the Relationship Between Mari and Hazor During the Old Babylonian Period <i>Leticia Rovira & Cecilia Molla</i>	435
A New Nabû: The Disruption and Renewal of the Assyrian Cuneiform Network <i>Zachary Rubin</i>	455
Cuneiform in Contact: Or, How the Hittites Learned to Pray <i>Daniel Schwemer</i>	469
Assyria and Babylonia: Clash of Civilizations or Cultural Koiné? <i>JoAnn Scurlock</i>	497
“Ahnenkult” and the AN.DAḪ.ŠUM Festival, Day 18, for the Storm-god of Lightning <i>Charles W. Steitler</i>	515
Neo-Assyrian Kings’ Perceptions of Assyrian and Non-Assyrian (Royal) Authority <i>Zozan Tarhan</i>	529
Cišpiš / Šišpiš / Teispes / Zišpiš: Old Iranian or Elamite? <i>Jan Tavernier</i>	545
Borrowing, Translation, and Syncretism of Deities in Ancient Anatolia <i>Livio Warbinek & Valerio Pisaniello</i>	565
How to Treat Verbs in a Sumerian Dictionary <i>Gábor Zólyomi</i>	579

Cišpiš / Šišpiš / Teispes / Zišpiš

Old Iranian or Elamite?

Jan Tavernier

Abstract

This study focuses on the name Teispes, attested as Čišpiš in Old Persian, Šišpiš and Zišpiš in Elamite and Τείσπης/Τίσπης in Greek. More specifically, it's aim is to determine to what language this anthroponym originally belonged. Otherwise said, is Teispes an Old Persian or Elamite name? The answer to this question is presented, as well as an etymology of the anthroponym.

1. Introduction

One of the most fascinating fields of study within the larger research area of Ancient Near Eastern Studies is onomastics. The plethora of personal names which is attested in the textual material, drafted in many languages, makes up an extremely valuable source for the study of ancient anthroponyms.

Although various scholars have since long devoted much attention to the study of personal names as they occur in Anatolia¹, Arabia², Iran³, the Levant⁴ and Mesopotamia⁵, much remains to be done with regard to Elamite onomastics (despite the efforts of Zadok 1983, 1984 and 1991). This article has the ambition to contribute modestly to this research field in having a closer look at one particular name, whose linguistic affiliation is still a matter of debate: Teispes.

Before exploring the name of Teispes in detail, it may be useful to briefly sketch the historical context in which Teispes lived. Teispes was the first king of a petty kingdom that emerged around 635 BCE in the region of Fars, with Anshan

¹ See Laroche 1966; Zehnder 2010; Parker 2013. Interesting websites are the “Hittite Name Finder” (<https://laman.hittites.org/>) and the “Repertoire onomastique” (<https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetonom/ONOMASTIdata.html>).

² See Ryckmans 1934; Harding 1971; Sholan 1999; Arbach 2002; Zadok 2013.

³ See, among others, Mayrhofer 1979; Remmer 2006; Tavernier 2007. Note also the excellent research project *Iranisches Personennamenbuch*, which has already produced various volumes.

⁴ See, among others, Fowler 1988. Note also the Database *Ancient Hebrew Personal Names* (<https://www.dahpn.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/>).

⁵ See, among others, Tallqvist 1902; Ranke 1905; Tallqvist 1914; Stamm 1939; Gelb, Purves & McRae 1943; Limet 1968; Saporetti 1970; Cassin & Glassner 1977; Qader 2010–2012; Nielsen 2015; Pruzsinszky 2021. For the Neo-Assyrian period, there is now the *Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (PNA). Neo- and Late Babylonian names can be found in *Prosobab* (<https://prosobab.leidenuniv.nl/about.php>).

(Tal-e Malyan) as its capital. Under the reigns of the later kings Cyrus II the Great (559–530), Cambyses (529–522) and Darius I the Great (521–486), this small state would develop into the largest empire the world had ever seen, the Persian or Achaemenid Empire.

Historical sources show different genealogies of the royal family that reigned this state/Empire, treating the person of Teispes differently (Rollinger 1998; Potts 1999, 287; Waters 2004; Potts 2016, 281; Waters 2023, 382–383):

- 1) The Cyrus Cylinder⁶: Teispes I, Cyrus I, Cambyses I, Cyrus II. As this text dates from the reign of Cyrus II, Bardiya and Darius I do not figure in it. Yet, it does mention Cyrus' son Cambyses. Date: shortly after the taking of Babylon by Cyrus in 539.
- 2) Two brick inscriptions of Cyrus II from Uruk (K.1.1) and Ur (K.1.2) are much less informative, simply mentioning Cyrus as son of Cambyses I (Schaudig 2001, 548 and 549). Date: reign of Cyrus II.
- 3) The Bisitun Inscription (DB_p I.3-6): Achaemenes, Teispes, Ariaramnes, Arsames, Hystaspes, Darius I. Date: around 518–517 BCE.
- 4) Herodotus (Hist. 7.11.2): Achaemenes, Teispes I, Cambyses I, Cyrus I, Teispes II, Ariaramnes, Arsames, Hystaspes, Darius I. Date: around 430 BCE.

Scholars now agree on the following order of early kings, attributing most authority to the oldest source, the Cyrus Cylinder: Teispes (c. 635–610 BCE), Cyrus I (C. 610–585 BCE), Cambyses I (c. 585–559 BCE), Cyrus II (559–530), Cambyses II (529–522), Bardiya (521), Darius I (521–486) (e.g. de Miroschedji 1985, 284; Briant 1996, 28; Kuhrt 1998, 653; Tavernier 2021, 27).

Historians used to call the reigning dynasty 'Achaemenids', after its (legendary) founder Achaemenes, but as it became clear that Darius was not the direct heir to the throne (he belonged to a side-branch of the royal family) and had to commit a coup d'état to become king, scholars started to make a distinction between the Teispids (who ruled from 635 to 521) and the Achaemenids (who ruled from 521 to 331), which makes Teispes the first king of the Teispid dynasty (Rollinger 2017, 193). With the ascension to the throne of Darius I in 521, the Teispid kingdom/Empire transformed itself into the Achaemenid Empire (Tavernier 2021, 27, with literature; Potts 2023, 417; Waters 2023, 376 and 387).

Culturally and linguistically the Teispid kingdom was a mix of Elamite and Iranian elements, with a sporadic presence of Babylonian (Tavernier 2021, 30–31). This is no surprise, as migration of Iranian-speaking tribes into Western Iran started around 1500 BCE (Waters 2014, 19). At that time and in the following centuries, the Elamite culture and language were dominant in southwestern Iran, so the Iranians arrived in an Elamite environment. Old Iranian (more specifically

⁶ For recent translations of the Cyrus Cylinder, see Kuhrt 2007, 70–74; Finkel 2013; Schaudig 2019.

Old Persian) and Elamite were actively used in the Teispid kingdom in the 7th and 6th centuries (Tavernier 2017, 339–340; Tavernier 2021, 30–31).

The linguistically mixed character of the Teispid kingdom is among others reflected in the four royal names of the dynasty: Teispes, Cyrus, Cambyses and Bardiya. The first of these is the focal point of this study, whose aim it is to determine the linguistic affiliation of the name of Teispes. Although various authors have already expressed their ideas on this topic, it is still useful to conduct a detailed study of the name.

Establishing the linguistic character of Teispes is not so straightforward as for the two other Teispid royal names. The names Cyrus and Cambyses clearly corroborate the mixed character of the dynasty. Cyrus (Babylonian and Elamite Kuraš, Old Persian Kuruš) is undoubtedly an Elamite name meaning “(DN) bestowed” (Andreas 1904, 93–94; Stronach 1997, 38, based on Zadok 1995, 246; Henkelman 2003, 193–195; Tavernier 2007, 528–529 no. 5.5.1.34, with literature; Tavernier 2011a, 211–212 no. 2.3.3.1.3; Waters 2011, 289–290; Tavernier 2015, 469; Potts 2016, 282; Tavernier 2018a, 149; Tavernier 2021, 31)⁷. Concerning Cambyses (Babylonian Kambuziya, Elamite Kanbuziya, Old Persian Kambūjiya), scholars generally agree on the Iranian character of this name (Charpentier 1923, 143–152; Hoffmann 1940, 146 n. 8; Tavernier 2007, 18–19 no. 1.2.22; Schmitt 2011, 209–211; Schmitt 2014, 198), which is most likely to be connected with the Old Indic gentile and toponym Kamboja-⁸.

Already in the 19th century, the identification of Greek Τείσπη/Τίσπη with the Old Persian form Cišpiš was proposed and generally accepted (Rawlinson 1849, 148; Norris 1855, 211; Oppert 1879, 288). As at that time the seal PFS 0093* was not yet known to the scholarly community (cf. *infra*), scholars quickly based their studies of the name on the Old Persian form Cišpiš. Yet, the reading Cišpiš was not always as easily accepted. Fick (Fick 1874, CXXIII and CXXVIII; also Justi 1895, 152; Bartholomae 1904, 599) suggested Caišpiš, whereas Herzfeld prefers a new reading Cahišpiš > Cēšpiš and used a Greek reconstructed rendering *Θεΐσπη as its basis (Herzfeld 1947, 91). Nonetheless, a form *Θεΐσπη is highly speculative, as Schmitt convincingly argues that Τίσπη is the correct Greek reading (Schmitt 2011, 370 no. 339). The reading Τείσπη, from which Herzfeld derived his Greek form, is secondary and may be the result of an association by the Greeks with the Greek onomastical element Τεισ(ι)-, as occur-

⁷ Some authors (Zadok 2009, 262; Schmitt 2011, 222–227; Schmitt 2014, 205) still believe in an Iranian character of this name, but the etymologies so far proposed are not convincing. Rollinger & Degen (2021, 1) do not give their preference, while Charpentier (1923, 140), Nyberg (1954, 62) and Frye (1962, 87) plead for a non-Iranian name. Bartholomae and Eilers have their doubts, but do not exclude a non-Iranian origin (Bartholomae 1904, 474; Eilers 1964, 210).

⁸ Hüsing (1908, 320–321; also Frye 1962, 87) considers Cambyses to be a non-Iranian name, but does not provide any satisfactory explanation of the name.

ring in Τείσανδρος, Τείσαρχος, Τεισίας, Τεισικράτης, Τεισίμαχος and Τείσιππος⁹, to name some of the most frequently attested ones.

A new spelling of the name became known when research on the seals of the Persepolis Fortification Archive started. More specifically, the inscription on PFS 0093* proved really interesting. Hallock (1969, 715) read [^mKu?]-raš^{as} an-za-an-x-ra šak y-iš-be-iš-^lna^l, a reading modified by Hinz (1971, 300; quickly accepted by Amiet 1973, 15) in [^mK]u-raš^{as} An-za-an-ir-ra DUMU Še-iš-be-iš-na. After some smaller emendations, the at this moment generally accepted reading is [^{diš}]^lKu^l-ráš^{as} an-za-an-ir-ra DUMU še-iš-be-^liš^l-na (Garrison 1991, 4; Steve 1992, 89 and 152; Henkelman 2003, 193 n. 39; Garrison 2011, 377 n. 2).

Based on this new reading and apparently ignorant of the propositions made by Fick and Justi, Hinz introduced an Old Persian transcription Caišpiš (Hinz 1971, 300; Hinz 1973, 25; also Koch 1990, 157), which he coupled with a new etymology (cf. infra). Later studies, however, have pointed to the incorrectness of this idea (Abaev 1971, 269; Schmitt 1974, 110; Schmitt 1976, 28; Schmitt 1978, 123; Mayrhofer 1979, II/17; Werba 1979, 14; Frye 1984, 79 n. 66) and accordingly Cišpiš remains the preferred Old Persian reading.

2. The Linguistic Affiliation of the Name Teispes

2.1 Status Quaestionis

Among scholars, three theories on the linguistic affiliation of the name Teispes circulate. The first one claims an Old Iranian/Old Persian affiliation for Teispes and was for the first time propagated by George Rawlinson who connected Cišpiš with OInd. *kis*- “hair” and *pā*- “to protect, nourish” and considered -iš an attributive suffix. In his eyes, Cišpiš means “Protecting, nourishing the hair” (Rawlinson 1849, 148–149; Rawlinson 1862, 454), but this was strongly refuted by Schmitt (2011, 370, calling it “ghastly”). Fick (1874, CXXIII and CXXVII–CXXVIII) links *ciš*- with Av. *ciš*-, for which he does not give a translation, and sees in -*piš* the equivalent of Av. *pis*-/*pāēsa*- “shape, figure, form”. Apart from Justi (1895, 152), no other scholar has mentioned this etymology. Also according to Herzfeld, Teispes is an Old Persian name (Herzfeld 1935, 46).

After these earlier attempts to etymologize the name, various other propositions for an Old Iranian etymology found their way into the academic literature:

- 1) Herzfeld (1947, 91) connects his new reading Cahišpiš to the Avestan anthroponyms Čāxšni- and Sāiiuždri-, both still unexplained (Mayrhofer 1979, I/33 no. 92 and I/74 no. 277). Yet, Schmitt clearly demonstrates that Τίσης is the preferred Greek reading and not Τείσης, on which the reading Cahišpiš was based (cf. supra).
- 2) Cišpiš is an onomastical variant of Ir. **sispiš*, itself related to OInd. *sú-śiśvi*- “growing well” (Abaev 1965, 293–294; Abaev 1975, 7; Hinz 1975,

⁹ The names are collected from the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* (LGPN).

- 7; Werba 1979, 15–16 n. 15) or OInd. *śiśvi-* “growing” (Abaev 1971, 269). Stronach rejects this proposal (Stronach 1997, 38).
- 3) Cišpiš is related to Sogdian *čp`yš* “leader” (Harmatta 1971, 8). Stronach and Schmitt reject this proposal (Stronach 1997, 38; Schmitt 2011, 370).
- 4) Cišpiš has a connexion with Avestan *kaēš-* (Hinz 1971, 300). In reality, this is the Av. verbal root *ciš-*, which Narten defined as “to assign something (acc.) to someone (dat.) through religious-magical power (instr.)” (Narten 1975, 84; Mayrhofer 1977, 29–30). Schmitt rejects this proposal (Schmitt 2011, 370).
- 5) Skalmowski (2000–2005, 71–72 n. 10) considers the name to be a compound of OInd. *cit-* “thought, intelligence” and OInd. *pi-* “to swell, overflow”. Schmitt rejects this proposal (Schmitt 2011, 370).
- 6) Mayrhofer (1979, II/17) takes no position in this discussion, although he tends to prefer an Old Iranian name, because of the Iranian character of Haxāmaniš¹⁰ and Ariyāramna. Lecoq and Rollinger simply remark that the name is under debate (Lecoq 1997, 294; Rollinger 2011–2013, 508; Rollinger 2021, 819).

Only two scholars represent the second group. Already in 1907, Hoffmann-Kutschke (1907, 186) made a connexion between Cišpiš on the one hand and the Hurrian supreme divinity Tešub (Teišeba in Urartian) and the name of a Cimmerian king, Teušpâ (attested in inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian king Esarhaddon, 680–669 BCE; RINAP 4 1 iii 43, 2 ii 1, 3 ii 15, 4 i’ 2’, 30:18’, 60:1’, 77:18, 78:17, 79:17, 93:8, 97:23) on the other hand. The latter name is, however, not related to Tešup or Teispes¹¹ and should be left out of this discussion (Hüsing 1908, 319; Ivantchik 1993, 61; Lebedynsky 2004, 150; Schmitt 2009, 153–154; Jean & Schmitt 2011, 1325). Eilers adopted the Hurrian hypothesis, while, however, not referring to it (Eilers 1964, 205–206 and n. 76), but eventually the idea has not gained much response or support and stands completely isolated.

The third group of scholars prefers an Elamite affiliation for Teispes, in accordance with the Elamite character of the name Cyrus. Stronach (1997, 37–38) based himself on Teispes’ royal title “King of Anshan” to support an Elamite origin of this name, but does not propose an explanation of the name. Safaee (2021) too pleads for an Elamite name, without going further into detail. Still, two Elamite etymologies have been suggested for Teispes and both of these will be dealt with later in this study.

¹⁰ Brust (2018, 323) refutes the widely accepted name form Haxāmaniš (see Schmitt 2014, 150–151) in favour of Haxāmaniša-, but that does not fully correspond with the Elamite equivalent Ha-ak-ka4-ma-nu-iš. For this reason, the form Haxāmaniš is retained here.

¹¹ This name was already identified with Teispes by Justi (1895, 152; also Hommel 1904, 211 n. 1; Streck 1916, CCCLXXII n. 3). In any case, the scholarly community considered it to be Iranian already in Hoffmann-Kutschke’s own time (Marquart 1905, 106 n.).

Schmitt has quickly reacted to this hypothesis. He stubbornly clings to an Indo-Iranian etymology and accordingly denies an Elamite linguistic affiliation, calling Tavernier's etymology "völlig aus der Luft gegriffen" (Schmitt 2011, 371). Unfortunately, Schmitt presents no supportive arguments for any Indo-Iranian etymology. This latter aspect is noticed by Skjærvø, who accepts an Elamite etymology and in addition criticizes Schmitt for only adducing Old Indic comparative material in his defence of an Indo-Iranian etymology of the name Cišpiš (Skjærvø 2018, 574 and n. 17).

2.2 Linguistic Study

The next step in this study is of course the linguistic study of the name Teispes and its forms. To reach that goal, it may be useful to assemble all attested forms of the name studied here.

- 1) Old Persian (Schmitt 2014, 158; Brust 2018, 185)
 - a) C-i-š-p-i-š: DB_ap 8.
 - b) C-i-š-p-a-i-š: DB_p I.5–6¹².
- 2) Babylonian (Tavernier 2007, 519 no. 5.4.2.55; Zadok 2009, 299 no. 508)
 - a) Ši-iš-pi-iš: DB_b 2; VAB 3 4:21 (cf. Schaudig 2001, 553).
- 3) Elamite (Tavernier 2007, 519 no. 5.4.2.55; Garrison 2011, 377 n. 2)
 - a) Še-iš-be-iš: PF 665:7–8¹³; PFS 0093* (cf. supra).
 - b) Zi-iš-pi-iš: DB_e I 4; DB_ae 5; PF 388:3–4, 524:3.
- 4) Greek (Schmitt 2011, 369–371)
 - a) Τείσπης: Herodotus, *Hist.* 7.11.2 (manuscripts A, B, C, M, P and T).
 - b) Τίσπης: Herodotus, *Hist.* 7.11.2 (manuscripts D, R, S and V).

All but one attested Elamite forms come from Achaemenid Elamite texts. The only earlier one dates to the Neo-Elamite period (more precisely to the reign of Cyrus I, c. 610–585 BCE) and is attested on PFS 0093*, the so-called seal of Cyrus (see Garrison 2011), a heirloom seal still used in the Achaemenid period as one of the Persepolis Fortification Seals, but easily datable to the Neo-Elamite period by its inscription. This of course implies that Šešpeš is the earliest form of this name.

With all spellings established, one can now have a close look at the various transpositions of phonemes between the Old Persian name on the one hand and

¹² This is a rendering of Cišpaiš, the genitive singular of Cišpiš. Here it is fully written (c-i-š-p-a-i-š), with a redundant -a- (a writing c-i-š-p-i-š can also render Cišpaiš in Old Persian). Two possible reasons for the use of this spelling are the wish to distinguish both cases in their spelling or the wish to write -a- to fill up the space available on the rock (see most recently Brust 2018, 185). In my view, the first idea is more likely.

¹³ Hallock (1969, 207) reads ^{hal}Hi-iš-be-iš, but a reading ^{hal}Še-iš-be-iš is more likely (Stolper, apud Tavernier 2008, 78 n. 36). Cišpiš was the scribe of the text. In PF 388 and 524, Cišpis is connected with a place called Zila-Umpa (see Koch 1990, 160–162).

the non-Iranian names on the other hand. Thereby special attention will be given to the rendering of the Old Persian palato-affricate /c/, since this sound does not exist in all target languages. The other transpositions are expected: OP /š/ = Bab. and El. *š* and OP /p/ = Bab. *p* and El. *b/p*. As most of the attestations are dated to the Achaemenid period, it may be wise to first investigate the transpositions between these name forms.

The Achaemenid Elamite name form is *Zi-iš-pi-iš*, which nicely reflects OP Cišpiš. Other certain examples of the transposition OP /c/- = El. *z-* are *-cā-* / *-zī-* (Tavernier 2007, 36 no. 1.4.6.1), *Cagmana- / *Za-ak-ma-na* (Tavernier 2007, 152 no. 4.2.379), *ciça-* / *zī-iš-šá* (Tavernier 2007, 33 no. 1.4.1.3), Ciçantaxma- / *Zi-iš-šá-an/in-tak-ma* (Tavernier 2007, 14–15 no. 1.2.11), Cincaxriš / *Zi-in-za-ak-ri-iš* (Tavernier 2007, 15 no. 1.2.12), etc. (see Tavernier 2007, 152–159 nos. 4.2.379–435, 376 nos. 4.3.37–38, 412 no. 4.4.5.6, 418 nos. 4.4.7.21–22, 450 no. 4.4.15.1, 455 no. 4.4.18.2). A second, less frequent way to denote initial /c/ is a cuneiform sign with *s*, e.g. *Caitakā / *Sa'-a-tuk-ka*¹⁴ (Tavernier 2007, 153 no. 4.2.381), *Cōbaka- / *Su-ba-ak-ka* (Tavernier 2007, 159 no. 4.2.435) and *Cōkica- / *Su-ki-iz-za* (Tavernier 2007, 154 no. 4.2.395). It should, however be noted that these three examples are reconstructed Old Iranian proper names (belonging to category 4 in Tavernier 2007). In addition, the two latter examples are perfectly explainable: because of the absence of the cuneiform sign ZU in the Achaemenid Elamite syllabary (Steve 1992, 45), the sign SU has taken over the functions of ZU (Hinz, apud Mayrhofer 1973, 278 no. 10.13). As a consequence of this, only SU can express the Old Iranian sequences /cō/ and /cu/. The remaining example (*Caitakā-) is, due to the difficult and highly uncertain reading of the name, doubtful. Needless to say, this observation highly weakens the existence of this transposition.

It is interesting to see that the Elamite *Nebenüberlieferung* also has three examples of initial /c/ being rendered by a sign with *t*: *Ciça- / *Ti-iš-šá* (Tavernier 2007, 154 no. 4.2.397), *Ciçuka- / *Ti'-šu'-uk'-ka* (Tavernier 2007, 156–157 no. 4.2.413; reading uncertain) and *Ciθrakiš / *Ti-ut-ra-gi-iš* (Tavernier 2007, 158 no. 4.2.425). Extremely rarely, Iranian /c/ appears as *š* in Elamite (cf. *infra*).

The Neo-Elamite material is rather scarce. Most Iranian proper names and loanwords occur in the Susa Acropole Archive, dated to the first half of the 6th century. Next to the attestation of Cišpiš in the seal mentioned above, there are only three names containing /c/: *Bāmkaca-, *Gauciraka-¹⁵ and Nāfēca-. These three names all use a sign with *z* (ZA, ZĪ) to render Ir. /c/ (Tavernier 2011a, 225)¹⁶.

¹⁴ Reading based on the edition in the Persepolis Fortification Archive Project on Ochre (<https://voices.uchicago.edu/ochre/>).

¹⁵ The analysis of this name as *Gau-cira-ka- is not certain yet (see Tavernier 2011a, 207 no. 2.2.2.2).

¹⁶ *Si-ir-un-da* (MDP 9 156:9) is rather a rendering of *Çīravanta- “beautiful” than of *Cīrvanta- (as Tavernier 2011a, 198 no. 2.2.1.15 believes).

In conclusion, the main rendering of Old Iranian initial /c/ in Elamite is *z* (Mayrhofer 1973, 101 no. 5.2.113). The Achaemenid Elamite spellings are expected renderings of the Old Persian form *Cišpiš*.

The Babylonian equivalent of *Cišpiš* is *Ši-iš-pi-iš*. Here discussion is barely needed. In all Akkadian (i.e. Neo-Assyrian, Neo- and Late Babylonian) *Nebenüberlieferungen* an Iranian initial (as well as medial¹⁷) /c/ is rendered by signs with *š*, which basically denotes the non-palatalized equivalent of /c/:

1) Neo-Assyrian:

- a) **Ciθrafarnah*- = *Ši-di-ir-par-na* (Schmitt 2009, 145–146 no. 130).
- b) **Ciθrakāna*- = *Ši-ti-ir-ka-a-nu* (Schmitt 2009, 140–141 no. 124).
- c) **Ciθrāsūra*- = *Ši-dir-áš¹-šu-ra-a* (Schmitt 2009, 144–145 no. 123).

2) Neo- and Late Babylonian:

- a) **Cašinaka*- = *Še'-ši-na-ka* (in the text HSM 1909.6.601:14, see Zadok 2009, 298 no. 503).
- b) **Cašēna*- = *Šá-še-in-nu* (Tavernier 2007, 154 no. 4.2.393).
- c) **Cēta*- = *Še-ta-*' (Tavernier 2007, 152–153 no. 4.2.380).
- d) **Cincaxriš* = *Ši-in-šá-aḥ-ri-iš* (Tavernier 2007, 15 no. 1.2.12).
- e) **Ciθrabrzana*- = *Ši-it-ra-ba-ar-za-nu* (HSM 1909.6.601:15, see Zadok 2009, 299 no. 510).
- f) **Ciθrantaxma*- = *Ši-it-ra-an-taḥ-ma* and *Ši-tir-an-taḥ-mu* (Tavernier 2007, 48 no. 2.2.14).
- g) **Ciθrēna*- = *Ši-it-re-en-na-*' (Tavernier 2007, 159 no. 4.2.433).

There are few exceptions: *Uvādaicaya*- appears as *Ú-ma-da-sa-ia* (Tavernier 2007, 31 no. 1.3.41), *(H)*uvarcanah*- is written *Ú-ma-ar-za-nu* and *Ú-mar-za-na-*' (Tavernier 2007, 214–215 no. 4.2.856), **Rtapātacā*- is rendered by *A-ra-ti-pa-ta-as-su* (Tavernier 2007, 300 no. 4.2.1495) and **Rtaraucah*- appears as *Ar-ta-ru-us* (Tavernier 2007, 300 no. 4.2.1497; next to *Ar-ta-ru-šú*). Note that all these exceptions concern medial /c/, never initial /c/.

It is also clear that the Greek forms are simple renderings of the Old Persian version *Cišpiš* and that the initial τ does not have an impact on etymological studies of the name. Indeed, initial Old Persian /c/ regularly appears as τ (Schmitt 1967, 127). Another example is the Old Iranian name **Ciθrantaxma*-, the 'Median' equivalent of the inscriptionally attested *Ciçantaxma*- and rendered in Greek by Τριτανταίχμης (< Τίτραντάχμης by popular etymology; Schmitt 2011, 374–

¹⁷ Two Neo-Assyrian examples are **Upaca*-, rendered by *Ú-pa-áš* (Schmitt 2009, 170–171 no. 158) and **Zārica*-, rendered by *Za-ri-šú* (Schmitt 2009, 189–190 no. 177). Neo-Babylonian has a possible name **Hanci*-, rendered by *An-ši-ia* (Zadok 2009, 79 no. 17). Late Babylonian examples are legion: *Ākaufaciya*- = *A-ku-pi-i-iš* (Tavernier 2007, 24 no. 1.3.2); *Aspacanah*- = *Aš-pa-ši-ni* (Tavernier 2007, 14 no. 1.2.7); *-cā*- = *-šá*- (Tavernier 2007, 36 no. 1.4.6.1); *tacara*- = *da-šá-ri* and *ta-áš-šá-ri* (Tavernier 2007, 36 no. 1.4.4.8).

376 no. 343). Other examples are *Ciṣafarnah- / Τις(σ)αφέρνης (Schmitt 2011, 371–373 no. 340)¹⁸, *Ciṭrafarnah- / Τετραφέρνης (Huyse 1990, 62 no. 132) and *Ciṭrāvahišta- / Τιθράυστης (Schmitt 2011, 365–367 no. 336). Initial /c/ is also rendered by σ in the name *Ciṣamaka- (Gk. Σισιάκης; Schmitt 2011, 329 no. 298). Middle -/c/- appears in Greek as σ(σ), as in *Bagaciṭra- (Gk. Μεγάσιδρος; Schmitt 2011, 256 no. 213), *Barica- (Gk. Βαρίσσης; Schmitt 2006, 235; Schmitt 2011, 160 no. 119) and *Parmica- (Gk. Παρμίσσης; Schmitt 2006, 266; Schmitt 2011, 292 no. 259).

The transpositions cited above can help in defining the linguistic affiliation of Cišpiš. If we assume that the name is Iranian, then an Elamite š would be used to render an initial Old Iranian /c/. Yet, it is precisely this transposition that is barely attested. To my knowledge, only two examples exist:

- 1) *Cartuka-: *Cartu-ka-, -ka-hypocoristic of a name with *Cartu- “race course” (cf. Av. *carətu-*). This name is spelled Šá-ir-tuk-ka₄ in Fort. 0197-103:12'. The same name, however, appears two times with the expected sign ZA: Za-ir-du-ka₄ (PFNN 1694:2-3¹⁹) and Za-ir-du-uk-ka₄ (Fort. 1932-101:12').
- 2) *Ciṣava-, a two-stem hypocoristic of *Ciṣavahuš “Of good lineage” (Tavernier 2007, 155 no. 4.2.404). In one text the spelling 'Šu¹-iš-šá-ma occurs (PF 1515:8–9), next to the five other spellings with ZÍ as initial sign, attested in various Elamite administrative texts from Persepolis. Note that here the scribe may have used the sign ŠU instead of ZU, which was not in use anymore at the time the text was drafted.

As conclusion, the usual transposition system used in Elamite to render Iranian names contradicts Teispes being an Iranian name. Initial /c/ is practically never rendered by a š-sign and the one remaining possible example left has equivalents with an expected z-sign.

On the other hand, what if the name were Elamite? Then Old Persian /c/ would be the denotation of Elamite signs with š and z. In Elamite, the spelling variation š/t/z is in all likelihood a rendering of a palato-alveolar affricate /č/ (Tavernier 2010, 1076), so a variation š/z²⁰ also may denote the same phoneme. Expectedly, such a phoneme would appear in Old Persian as /c/, also a palato-alveolar affricate (Schmitt 2004, 723; Isebaert & Tavernier 2012, 306). Here the Elamite transposition system to render Old Iranian names functions well.

¹⁸ This name also appears as Σισαφέρνης and Σ(ε)ισαφέρνης (Schmitt 2011, 373; LGPN V.C, 391 and 392).

¹⁹ The spelling Za-ir-du-ka₄-na for *Cartukāna-, as mentioned in Tavernier (2007, 154 no. 4.2.391), is not correct. Rather does it represent Zarduka followed by the genitive suffix -na.

²⁰ Despite Tavernier (2010, 1073), a variation š/z does exist in Elamite.

Based on these observations, one can easily conclude that the original name must have been El. /Češpeš/ or /Čišpiš/, written Šešpeš/Šišpiš/Zišpiš, which was rendered in Old Persian by Čišpiš.

Based on the observations above, the following table of the equivalents of the Iranian affricate phoneme /c/ in non-Iranian languages can be drawn up:

Iranian	Akkadian			Elamite		Greek
	Neo-Ass.	Neo-Bab.	Late Bab.	Neo-El.	Ach. El.	
/c/-					s (rare)	σ
	š	š	š	š	š(?)	
				z	t (rare)	τ
					z	
-/c/-			s			σ(σ)
	š	š	š			
			z	z	z	

Table 1: Rendering of Old Iranian /c/ in Akkadian, Elamite and Greek.

Even if the Elamo-Iranian transposition system corroborates an Elamite origin of the name Teispes, its Elamite character would even be more acceptable if a plausible Elamite etymology is found. Hitherto, two such etymologies have been proposed. The first hypothesis (Tavernier 2007, 519 no. 5.4.2.55; Tavernier 2021, 31) divides Šišpiš into *šiš-* and *piš-*. The first element might be connected with *šišna/i-* “beautiful”, a lexeme occurring as *šišna-* in non-compounds, but as *šiš-* in compound words or names, e.g. Middle Elamite Šiš-atar (*Ši-šá-ta-ar*; Zadok 1984, 41) and Achaemenid Elamite Amma-šiš (*Am-ma-ši-iš* “beautiful mother”²¹). The second element belongs to the verbal stem *piš-* “to renew, restore” (Grillot & Vallat 1978, 83), which is attested in El. anthroponyms, e.g. Piš-lume (Zadok 1984, 35). Following this idea, a name Šišpiš can mean “Restoring the beautiful”.

The second etymology was proposed by Henkelman (2014, 21; 2017, 292–293 n. 34), who believes the name to derive from the Elamite root *šep(e)-/šip(i)-* “to devote, to vow”, attested in Old Elamite Šepiri (*Še-ep-pi-ri* in MDP 23 190:11) and Šep-Sin (*Še-ep-^dEN.ZU* in MDP 43 1793) and in Achaemenid Elamite Mitli-šep (*Mi-ut-li-še-ep* in PFNN 2496:1–2), Šepi (*Še-pi* in PFNN 225:5 and *Še-íp-hi* in PF 1512:2), Šep-šilla (*Še-ep-šil-l[a]* in PF 232:11) and Šipipi (*Ši-pi-pi* in PF 371:4)²². In addition, there is Neo-Elamite Šepšilakenni “The one from Šep-šilak” (*Še-ip-ši-lak-en-ni* in EKI 86:9). Henkelman also refers to the sacrificial

²¹ Hinz & Koch (1987, 54) read *Am-ma-ši-iš-na*, but in both occurrences of the name *-na* is a genitive suffix.

²² See Hinz & Koch 1987, 943, 1149 and 1170 as well as Henkelman 2011, 122 n. 88.

feast called *šip*²³. This idea is really credible, but Henkelman's reconstruction of a development **šepšepeš > *šepšpeš > šešpeš* is not necessary, as *šešpeš* is the Conj. I 3rd sg. form of the internally reduplicated verb *šešpe-*, meaning "He has devoted (to DN)". Elamite has various verbs with a partial reduplication, whereby the first consonant of the verb is reduplicated just before the second one, e.g. *hutta-* ~ *huhta-* "to do", *kazza-* ~ *kakza-* "to forge", *peti-* ~ *pepti-* "to become hostile, revolt", etc. (Paper 1955, 40–41; Reiner 1969, 79; Stolper 2004, 78; Tavernier 2011b, 329; Tavernier 2018b, 436).

In fact, a supplementary objection to a development **šepšepeš > *šepšpeš > šešpeš* is that this development requires an assimilation of *p* to *š*: /pš/ > /š/. Such an assimilation is not known for the Elamite language. Moreover, assimilation is a feature not all too frequent in Elamite.

If this etymology is true, both names Kuraš and Šešpeš belong to the same type of Elamite names: a hypocoristic consisting of a theophoric and a verbal element (e.g. *Humpan-haltaš*) whereby the divine part of the name has been omitted. Such names are often attested in Elamite (Gorris 2020a, 10). By the time of Cyrus II (Cyrus Cylinder), an Old Persian notation Cišpiš was already in use. This notation, on its turn, became the basis for the Babylonian (Šišpiš), Achaemenid Elamite (Zišpiš) and Greek (Τείσπις and Τίσπις) renderings. Nevertheless, it remains interesting to see that one PF tablet still uses the older spelling with initial *š*.

Accordingly, two of the three royal names of the Teispid dynasty are Elamite, whereas the third one is Iranian. This mixed character should not surprise, as the region where the Teispid kings reigned was a cultural mix of Elamite and Iranian elements (cf. *supra*). Moreover, the same is attested for the Samatian kings, who ruled in a region north of Susa in the first half of the 6th century BCE. Here three names are Iranian (**Gītiya-*, **Hamfrīš* and **Tapala-*), whereas the four other royal names are Elamite (*Ahtir*, *Anni-šilhak*, *Unsak* and *Unzi-kilik*; see Henkelman 2003, 222–224; Tavernier 2011a, 195 and 205; Gorris 2020b, 102–107).

3. Conclusion

This study has focused on the royal name Teispes, founder of the Teispid dynasty in and around Anshan. It has been demonstrated that Teispes, next to Cyrus, is an Elamite name and not an Iranian one as formerly believed. Additional arguments have been presented to confirm the Elamite character of this name, already proposed by Stronach and others. The main one is based on the various transpositions which clearly show that Elamite Šešpeš must be the original name, corresponding with the fact that it is also the oldest attested name. In fact, it occurs on a Neo-Elamite seal of his son Cyrus I.

²³ See Henkelman 2011 on this feast. Note that in Elamite *e* and *i* are interchangeable: a sign *ZÍ* also has a value /ze/ (most recently, Tavernier 2018b, 424; see also Hinz 1975, 70).

The name of Teispes means “He has devoted (to DN)” and its original Elamite form most likely is Češpeš/Čišpiš, /e/and /i/ being interchangeable in Elamite. In accepting that the name is a Conjugation I 3rd singular of the verb *šešpe-/ šišpi-*, a partially reduplicated variant of *šep-/šip-* “to devote”, this study adopts an etymology proposed by Henkelman and rejects the one proposed by Tavernier.

This interesting situation of a bilingual and bicultural dynasty is nicely paralleled by the example of Samati, a region north of Susa, where the ruling dynasty counted three kings with an Iranian name and four with an Elamite name.

Both dynasties, Teispids and the dynasty ruling in Samati, are interesting cases of Elamo-Iranian interculturality in Susiana and Fars at the end of the Neo-Elamite period. This obviously increases the interest of southwestern Iran for the formation of the later Achaemenid Empire, successor to the Teispid one.

Bibliography

Abaev, V.I.

1965 К этимологии древнеперсидских имен Kuruš, Ka^mbujiya, Čišpiš. *Etimologija*, 286–295.

1971 Iz Iranskoi Onomastiki, in: Gafurov, B.G. (ed.), *Istoriya Iranskogo Gosudarstva i Kultury* (Moskva), 262–276.

1975 Contribution à l'Histoire des Mots, in: *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à E. Benveniste*. Société de Linguistique de Paris. Collection linguistique 70 (Leuven), 1–11.

Amiet, P.

1973 La glyptique de la fin de l'Élam. *Arts Asiatiques* 28, 3–43.

Andreas, F.C.

1904 Über einige Fragen der ältesten persischen Geschichte, in: *Verhandlungen des 13. internationalen Orientalistenkongresses, Hamburg, September 1902* (Leiden), 93–99.

Arbach, M.

2002 *Les noms propres du Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum. Pars IV, Inscriptiones himyariticas et sabaeas continens*. Inventaire des inscriptions sudarabiques 7 (Paris / Rome).

Bartholomae, Ch.

1904 *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (Strassburg).

Briant, P.

1996 *Histoire de l'empire perse de Cyrus à Alexandre*. Achaemenid History 10 (Paris).

Brust, M.

2018 *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre des Altpersischen. Mit einem etymologischen Glossar*. IBS 161 (Innsbruck).

- Cassin, E. & J.-J. Glassner
 1977 *Anthroponymie et Anthropologie de Nuzi 1. Les Anthroponymes* (Mallibu).
- Charpentier, J.
 1923 Der Name Kambyses (Kaⁿbūjiya). *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 2, 140–152.
- Eilers, W.
 1964 Kyros. Eine namenkundliche Studie. *BNF* 15, 180–236.
- Fick, A.
 1874 *Die griechischen Personennamen nach ihrer Bildung erklärt, mit den Namenssystemen verwandter Sprachen verglichen und systematisch geordnet* (Göttingen).
- Finkel, I.J.
 2013 The Cyrus Cylinder: the Babylonian perspective, in: Finkel, I.J. (ed.), *The king of Persia's proclamation from ancient Babylon: the Cyrus Cylinder* (London), 4–34.
- Fowler, J.D.
 1988 *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew. A Comparative Study*. JSOT. Suppl. Series 49 (Sheffield).
- Frye, R.N.
 1962 *The Heritage of Persia*. History of Civilisation 6 (London).
 1984 *The History of Ancient Iran*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 3/7 (Berlin).
- Garrison, M.B.
 1991 Seals and the élite at Persepolis. Some observations on early Achaemenid Persian art. *Ars Orientalis* 21, 1–29.
 2011 The Seal of “Kuraš the Anzanite, son of Šešpeš” (Teispes), PFS 93*: Susa – Anšan – Persepolis, in: Álvarez-Mon, J. & M.B. Garrison (eds.), *Elam and Persia* (Winona Lake), 375–405.
- Gelb, I.J., Purves, P.M. & McRae, A.A.
 1943 *Nuzi Personal Names*. OIP 57 (Chicago).
- Gorris, E.
 2020a When God is forgotten ... The orthography of the theophoric element Hu(m)ban in Elamite and Mesopotamian Onomastics. *Les études classiques* 88, 163–180.
 2020b *Power and Politics in the Neo-Elamite Kingdom*. AcIr 60 (Leuven).
- Grillot, F. & F. Vallat
 1978 Le verbe élamite “pi(š)ši”. *CDAFI* 8, 81–84.
- Hallock, R.T.
 1969 *Persepolis Fortification Tablets*. OIP 92 (Chicago).

Harding, G.L.

- 1971 *An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions*. Near and Middle East Series 8 (Toronto).

Harmatta, J.

- 1971 The Rise of the Old Persian Empire. Cyrus the Great. *AAH* 19, 3–15.

Henkelman, W.F.M.

- 2003 Persians, Medes and Elamites: acculturation in the Neo-Elamite period, in: Lanfranchi, G.B., M. Roaf & R. Rollinger (eds.), *Continuity of Empire(?)*. *Assyria, Media, Persia*. History of the Ancient Near East. Monographs 5 (Padova), 181–231 and 407–448.
- 2011 Parnakka's Feast: *šip* in Pārsa and Elam, in: Álvarez-Mon, J. & M.B. Garrison (eds.), *Elam and Persia* (Winona Lake), 89–166.
- 2014 Teispes et les Perses. *Annuaire de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes. Section des sciences historiques et philologiques* 145, 19–21.
- 2017 Humban & Auramazdā: royal gods in a Persian landscape, in: Henkelman, W.F.M. & C. Redard (eds.), *Persian Religion in the Achaemenid Period / La religion perse à l'époque achéménide*. *Classica et Orientalia* 16 (Wiesbaden), 273–346.

Herzfeld, E.

- 1935 *Archaeological History of Iran*. The Schweich Lectures on Biblical Archaeology 1934 (London).
- 1947 *Zoroaster and His World* (Princeton).

Hinz, W.

- 1971 Achämenidische Hofverwaltung. *ZA* 61, 260–311.
- 1973 *Neue Wege im Altpersischen*. GOF III/1 (Wiesbaden).
- 1975 *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen*. GOF III/3 (Wiesbaden).

Hinz, W. & H. Koch

- 1987 *Elamisches Wörterbuch*. AMI. Ergänzungsband 17 (Berlin).

Hoffmann, K.

- 1940 Vedische Namen. *Wörter und Sachen* 21, 139–161.

Hoffmann-Kutschke, A.

- 1907 Iranisches bei den Griechen. *Philologus* 66, 173–191.

Hommel, F.

- 1904 *Grundriss der Geographie und Geschichte des Alten Orients*. Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 3/1 (München).

Hüsing, G.

- 1908 Die Namen der Könige von Anšan. *OLZ* 11, 318–322.

Huyse, Ph.

- 1990 *Iranische Namen in den griechischen Dokumenten Ägyptens*. Iranisches Personennamenbuch V/6a. (Wien).

- Isebaert, L. & J. Tavernier
 2012 Le vieux-perse, *RAnt* 9, 299–346.
- Ivantchik, A.I.
 1993 *Les Cimmériens au Proche-Orient*. OBO 127 (Göttingen).
- Jean C. & R. Schmitt
 2011 Tešpâ. *PNA* 3/2, 1325–1326.
- Justi, F.
 1895 *Iranisches Namenbuch* (Marburg).
- Koch, H.
 1990 *Verwaltung und Wirtschaft im persischen Kernland zur Zeit der Achämeniden*. Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients. Reihe B : Geisteswissenschaften 89 (Wiesbaden).
- Kuhrt, A.
 1998 *The Ancient Near East c. 3000–330 BC* (London / New York).
 2007 *The Persian Empire. A corpus of sources from the Achaemenid period* (London / New York).
- Lebedynsky, I.
 2004 *Les Cimmériens. Les premiers nomades des steppes européennes IX^e–VII^e siècles av. J.-C.* (Paris).
- Laroche, E.
 1966 *Les noms des Hittites* (Paris).
- Lecoq, P.
 1997 *Les inscriptions de la Perse achéménide. Traduit du vieux-perse, de l'élamite, du babylonien et de l'araméen* (Paris).
- Limet, H.
 1968 *L'anthroponymie sumérienne dans les documents de la 3^e dynastie d'Ur*. Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 180 (Paris).
- Marquart, J.
 1905 *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran II*. Philologus. Suppl. 10/1 (Leipzig).
- Mayrhofer, M.
 1973 *Onomastica Persepolitana: das altiranische Namengut der Persepolis-Tafelchen*. SÖAW 286 (Wien).
 1977 *Zum Namengut des Avesta*. SÖAW 308 (Wien).
 1979 *Die altiranischen Namen*. Iranisches Personennamenbuch 1 (Wien).
- de Miroschedji, P.
 1985 La fin du royaume d'Anšan et de Suse et la naissance de l'Empire perse. *ZA* 75, 265–306.
- Narten, J.
 1975 Avestisch ciš, *Monumentum H.S. Nyberg, vol. 2*. AcIr 5 (Téhéran / Liège), 81–92.

Nielsen, J.P.

2015 *Personal names in early Neo-Babylonian legal and administrative tablets, 747–626 B.C.E.* Nisaba 29 (Winona Lake).

Norris, E.

1855 Memoir on the Scythic Version of the Behistun Inscription. *JRAS* 15, 1–213.

Nyberg, H.S.

1954 Das Reich der Achämeniden, in: Varjavec, F. (ed.) 1954, *Historia Mundi: Ein Handbuch der Weltgeschichte in zehn Bänden. Vol. 3: Der Aufstieg Europas* (Bern), 56–115.

Oppert, J.

1879 *Le peuple et la langue des Mèdes* (Paris).

Parker, R. (ed.)

2013 *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia*. Proceedings of the British Academy 191 (Oxford).

Paper, H.H.

1955 *The Phonology and Morphology of Royal Achaemenid Elamite* (Ann Arbor).

Potts, D.T.

1999 *The Archaeology of Elam. Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State*. Cambridge World Archaeology (Cambridge).

2016 *The Archaeology of Elam. Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State*. Cambridge World Archaeology, 2nd ed. (Cambridge).

2023 The Persian Empire under the Achaemenid Dynasty, from Darius I to Darius III, in: Radner, K., N. Moeller & D.T. Potts (eds.), *The Oxford History of the Ancient Near East. Vol. 5: The Age of Persia* (Oxford), 417–520.

Pruzsinszky, R.

2021 A History of Akkadian Onomastics, in: Vita, J.-P. (ed.), *History of the Akkadian Language*. HdO 1/152. (Leiden / Boston), 477–510.

Qader, A.M.

2010–2012 *Personennamen der Keilschrifttexte aus Tall al-Fahḥar* (preprint; available on https://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/Nuzi/nuzimat/Fakhar_www_preprint.pdf).

Ranke, H.

1905 *Early Babylonian Personal Names from the Published Tablets of the So-Called Hammurabi Dynasty (B.C. 2000)*. The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania. Series D. Researches and Treatises 3 (Philadelphia).

Rawlinson, H.C.

1849 The Persian Cuneiform Inscription at Behistun, Decyphered and Translated. With a Memoir (Continued). *JRAS* 11, 1–192.

- Rawlinson, G.
1862 *History of Herodotus*, Vol. 3 (London).
- Reiner, E.
1969 The Elamite Language, in: *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen*. HdO 1/2/1–2/2 (Leiden / Köln), 54–118.
- Remmer, U.
2006 *Frauennamen im Rigveda und im Avesta. Studien zur Onomastik des ältesten Indischen und Iranischen*. SÖAW 745 / Iranische Onomastik 3 (Wien).
- Rollinger, R.
1998 Der Stammbaum des achaimenidischen Königshauses oder die Frage der Legitimität der Herrschaft des Dareios. *AMIT* 30, 155–209.
2011–2013 Teispes. *RIA* 13, 508–509.
2017 Monarchische Herrschaft am Beispiel des teispidisch-achaimenidischen Großreichs, in: Rebenich, S. (ed.), *Monarchische Herrschaft im Altertum*. Schriften des Historischen Kollegs 94 (Berlin), 189–215.
2021 Empire, Borders, and Ideology, in: Jacobs, B. & R. Rollinger (eds.), *A Companion to the Achaemenid Persian Empire*, vol. 1 (Hoboken), 815–830.
- Rollinger, R. & Degen J.
2021 Cyrus II, in: Potts, D.T., E. Harkness, J. Neelis & R. McIntosh (eds.) 2021, *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History. Asia and Africa*, Online edition, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119399919.eahaa00363>.
- Ryckmans, G.
1934 *Les noms propres sud-sémitiques. Tome I. Répertoire analytique*. Bibliothèque du Muséon 2 (Louvain).
- Safae, Y.
2021 Teispes, in: Potts, D.T., E. Harkness, J. Neelis & R. McIntosh (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History: Asia and Africa*, Online edition, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119399919.eahaa00023>.
- Saporetti, C.
1970 *Onomastica medio-assira*. Studia Pohl 6 (Rome).
- Schaudig, H.
2001 *Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros' des Großen samt den in ihrem Umfeld entstandenen Tendenzschriften. Textausgabe und Grammatik*. AOAT 256 (Münster).
2019 The text of the Cyrus Cylinder, in: Shayegan, R. (ed.), *Cyrus the Great: life and lore* (Cambridge), 16–25.
- Schmitt, R.
1967 Medisches und persisches Sprachgut bei Herodot. *ZDMG* 117, 119–145.
1974 Review: Walther Hinz 1973. *GGA* 226, 94–113.

- 1976 The Medo-Persian Names of Herodotus in the Light of the New Evidence from Persepolis. *AAH* 24, 25–35.
- 1978 Fragen der Anthroponomastik der achaimenidischen Vielvölkerstaates. *ZDMG* 128, 116–124.
- 2004 Old Persian, in: Woodard, R.D. (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* (Cambridge), 717–741.
- 2006 *Iranische Anthroponyme in den erhaltenen Resten von Ktesias' Werk*. SÖAW 736 (Wien).
- 2009 *Iranische Personennamen in der neuassyrischen Nebenüberlieferung*. Iranisches Personennamenbuch VII/1A (Wien).
- 2011 *Iranische Personennamen in der griechischen Literatur vor Alexander d. Gr.* Iranisches Personennamenbuch V/5A (Wien).
- 2014 *Wörterbuch der altpersischen Königsinschriften* (Wiesbaden).
- Sholan, A.
1999 *Frauennamen in den altsüdarabischen Inschriften*. Texte und Studien zur Orientalistik 11 (Hildesheim).
- Skalmowski, W.
2000–2005 Note on the Name of Cyrus. *OLP* 31, 69–72.
- Skjærvø, P.O.
2018 Review: Henkelman, W.F.M. & C. Redard (eds.), *Persian Religion in the Achaemenid Period. La religion perse à l'époque achéménide*. *Classica et Orientalia* 16 (Wiesbaden 2017). *BiOr* 75, 569–575.
- Stamm, J.J.
1939 *Die akkadische Namengebung*. *MVAeG* 44 (Leipzig).
- Steve, M.-J.
1992 *Syllabaire Elamite: histoire and paléographie*. Civilisations du Proche Orient. Série 2. Philologie 1 (Neuchâtel).
- Stolper, M.W.
2004 Elamite, in: Woodard, R.D. (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* (Cambridge), 60–94.
- Streck, M.
1916 *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Niniveh's. I. Teil: Einleitung*. VAB 7/1 (Leipzig).
- Stronach, D.
1997 Anshan and Persia: Early Achaemenid History, Art and Architecture on the Iranian Plateau, in: Curtis, J. (ed.), *Mesopotamia and Iran in the Persian Period. Conquest and Imperialism 539–331 BC* (London), 35–53.
- Tallqvist, K.L.
1902 *Neubabylonisches Namenbuch zu den Geschäftsurkunden aus der Zeit des Šamašsumukîn bis Xerxes*. Acta Societatis scientiarum Fennicae 32 (Helsingfors).

- 1914 *Assyrian Personal Names*. Acta Societatis scientiarum Fennicae 43/1 (Helsingfors).
- 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 (Leuven).
- 2008 Multilingualism in the Fortification and Treasury Archives, in: Briant, P., W.F.M. Henkelman & M.W. Stolper (eds.), *L'archive des Fortifications de Persépolis. État des questions et perspectives de recherches*. Persika 12 (Paris), 59–86.
- 2010 On the sounds rendered by the *s*-, *š*- and *š/z*-series in Elamite, in: Kogan, L., N. Koslova, S. Loesov & S. Tishchenko (eds.), *Proceedings of the 53^e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Volume 1: Language in the Ancient Near East*. Babel und Bibel 4/1 (Winona Lake), 1059–1078.
- 2011a Iranians in Neo-Elamite Texts, in: Álvarez-Mon, J. & M.B. Garrison (eds.), *Elam and Persia* (Winona Lake), 191–261.
- 2011b Élamite: analyse grammaticale et lecture de textes. *RAnt* 8, 315–350.
- 2015 Review: R. Schmitt 2011. *AfO* 53, 468–469.
- 2017 The Use of Languages on the Various Levels of Administration in the Achaemenid Empire, in: Jacobs, B., W.F.M. Henkelman & M.W. Stolper (ed.), *Die Verwaltung im Achämenidenreich. Imperiale Muster und Strukturen / Administration in the Achaemenid Empire. Tracing the Imperial Signature. Akten des 6. Internationalen Kolloquiums zum Thema "Vorderasien im Spannungsfeld klassischer und altorientalischer Überlieferungen" aus Anlass der 80-Jahr-Feier der Entdeckung des Festungsarchivs von Persepolis, Landgut Castelen bei Basel, 14.–17. Mai 2013*. Classica et Orientalia 17 (Wiesbaden), 337–412.
- 2018a The Functions of Abrupt Spellings in the Elamite Writing System. *Elamica* 8, 137–151.
- 2018b The Elamite Language, in: Álvarez-Mon, J., G.P. Basello & Y. Wicks (eds.), *The Elamite World*. The Routledge Worlds (London / New York), 416–449.
- 2021 The Linguistic Landscape in South-western Iran from the Neo-Elamite to the (Early) Islamic Period, in: Balatti, S., H. Klinkott & J. Wiesehöfer (eds.), *Paleopersepolis. Environment, Landscape and Society in Ancient Fars. Proceedings of the International Colloquium held in Kiel 4th–6th July 2018*. Oriens et Occidens 33 (Stuttgart), 23–47.
- Waters, M.W.
- 2004 Cyrus and the Achaemenids. *Iran* 42, 91–102.
- 2011 "Parsumaš, Anšan, and Cyrus", in: Álvarez-Mon, J. & M.B. Garrison (eds.), *Elam and Persia* (Winona Lake), 285–296.

- 2014 *Ancient Persia. A Concise History of the Achaemenid Empire, 550–330 BCE* (Cambridge).
- 2023 The Persian Empire under the Teispid Dynasty: Emergence and Conquest, in: Radner, K., N. Moeller & D.T. Potts (eds.), *The Oxford History of the Ancient Near East. Vol. 5. The Age of Persia* (Oxford), 376–416.
- Werba, Ch.
- 1979 Zu einigen offenen Fragen der Achaemenidischen Onomastik. *AÖAW* 116, 13–25.
- Zadok, R.
- 1983 A Tentative Structural Analysis of Elamite Hypocoristica. *BNF N.F.* 18, 93–120.
- 1984 *The Elamite Onomasticon*. AIONS 40 (Napoli).
- 1991 Elamite Onomastics. *SEL* 8, 225–237.
- 1995 On the Current State of Elamite Lexicography. *SEL* 12, 241–252.
- 2009 *Iranische Personennamen in der neu- und spätbabylonischen Nebenüberlieferung*. Iranisches Personennamenbuch VII/1B (Wien).
- 2013 The Onomastics of the Chaldean, Aramean, and Arabian Tribes in Babylonia during the First Millennium, in: Berlejung, A. & M.P. Streck (eds.), *Arameans, Chaldeans and Arabs in Babylonia and Palestine in the First Millennium B.C.* Leipziger Altorientalistische Studien 3 (Wiesbaden), 261–336.
- Zehnder, Th.
- 2010 *Die hethitischen Frauennamen. Katalog und Interpretation*. DBH 29 (Wiesbaden).