

Sassanian period (G. Bolognesi, *Le fonti dialettali degli imprestiti iranici in armeno*, Milan 1960, does not discuss this toponym). H. Hübschmann (*Persische Studien*, Strasbourg 1895, 169) stated: “Liegt *uva* oder *u* vor in ap. *uvž* = *huvaža-* oder *hūža-*?”. A. Meillet and E. Benveniste (*Grammaire du vieux perse*, Paris 1931, 153) have *uvjiy*, (*x*)*uvajiya-* ‘Susien’ (they do not elaborate). Note Ουαζαίνη (Procopius, *The Gothic war*, 4, 10, 9, cf. Ph. Huyse, *Die dreisprachige Inschrift Šābuhrs I. an der Ka’ba-i Zardušt* (ŠKZ), 2, London 1999, 2, 18f.; cf. also Old Syr. *Hūz*, Jewish Aram. *By Hwz’y*). The anthroponym Aram. *Hw(?)z(?)y/l(?)* on a seal from the fifth century B.C. (provenience unknown, N. Avigad and B. Sass, *Corpus of West Semitic seals*, Jerusalem 1997, 295:787) is too doubtful for a comparison with NB/LB *Ū-ma-zi-ia/iá* (NB/LB intervocalic <m> can render */v/). If the etymology of *Ū-ma-zi-ia/iá* is correct (he is mentioned without a filiation and any indication of his relationship to Iran is missing), then it may strengthen the case for the form **Huvajiya-*.

3. *Da-ar-ra-ku* in the LB administrative text BE 8, 102 (line 12) is presumably a mistake for *Da-ar-ra-šu*. This spelling, which is not followed by any royal title (such a title is often missing in administrative documents) refers to Darius I, as it describes the period from year 6 of Cambyses until the accession year of *Da-ar-ra-ku*. Rare spellings with *-šu* (instead of the much more common *-šú*) referring to Darius I are *Da-a-ri-’-i-šu* (*Dar.* 38: 16) and *Da-ri-ú-šu* (CT 51, 49:16; *Dar.* 311:16). Moreover, the scribe of BE 8, 102 wrote also the other royal name, viz. Cambyses, erroneously: line 10 has *Kam-bu-si-di-ia*. *Kam-bu-si-ia* in OECT 10, 127, 12’ (collated) looks on the face of it as a form comparable with the Greek rendering Καμβύσησ. However, in view of the numerous LB spellings with *-ZI-* it is more probably an audial mistake. Regarding OECT 10, 123, S. Dalley (*apud* J. Peat, JCS 41, 1989, 210) is of the opinion that the copy of the year as 9 is correct, but McEwan’s copy of the lowermost row is inaccurate. A closer look at that row reveals that it consists only of two wedges; the left wedge of the second row extends further down to the “base” of the sign:  The date is 19.VIII.8 Cyrus.

Ran ZADOK (18-11-2002)

Tel-Aviv University, Institute of Archaeology
RAMAT-AVIV 69978 (Israël)

79) Iranian presence in Neo-Elamite Susa – It is generally known that Achaemenid Elamite contains a huge number of Iranian anthroponyms, toponyms (and other proper names indicating a geographical feature) and loan words from various semantic categories. Elamites and Persians, however, did learn to know each other a few centuries before the genesis of the Achaemenid Empire. From ca. 1000 BC onwards Iranians began to settle in a part of the Elamite heartland and so contacts were established that would last for centuries.

As there are nearly no Elamite documents known from the first half of the first millennium, except for royal inscriptions, this ethnically interesting situation of two people living next to each other within the same country is a difficult research topic for the modern scholar. Fortunately the scholar is partly saved by an archive, discovered in Susa. Most likely the hundreds of texts belonging to this archive date from the period immediately preceding the Achaemenid Empire (ca. 625-539 BC). They cannot be dated with more accuracy since no kings or regnal years are mentioned.

The texts from this Neo-Elamite archive also contain various Iranian personal names and place names and thus function as a source for the study of the ethnic situation of those days. Most of the Iranian names have already been studied and analysed. Yet I would like to offer a few more, which have hitherto escaped the attention of modern scholars.

1. Anthroponyms

1.1. hw.Ak-ki-da-da (El. Wb. 38)

Most likely Akkidada is a representation of Ir. **Haxidāta-*, “given as a friend”. **Haxi-* is the weak stem of Old Persian *haxā-*, “friend, companion” (Zadok 1976: 66-67), while **dāta-* is the past participle of Old Persian *dā-*, “to give” (OPG 188).

1.2. hw.Pír-ka₄ (El. Wb. 213)

Hinz – Koch (El. Wb. 213) propose an Iranian name **Pṛga-*, which does indeed not contradict the Elamite spelling, but which unfortunately is no plausible name either. Alternatively a name **Bṛga-* makes sense, since it can be derived from Av. *barəg-*, “to welcome”. See 1.5 below.

1.3. hw.Si-ir-un-da (El. Wb. 1078)

An Iranian name **Čir(a)-vanta-*, “having courage” is hidden behind this Elamite spelling. The Old Iranian lexeme **čira-* can be reconstructed on the basis of Av. *čiriia-* and NP *čira-*.

1.4. v.Ū-pi-iz-za (El. Wb. 1241)

This name is described as being Elamite (El. Wb. 1241), but this is simply not acceptable. The Old Iranian hypocoristic suffix *-(a)iča-* is nearly always written *-iz-za*. The sequence *-iz-za* points almost certainly

to an Old Iranian name. In this particular case the name behind v.Ú-pi-iz-za could be *Hup-(a)iča- or *Huf-(a)iča-, but these proposals do not yield plausible meanings. Another possibility is *Hu-bīza-, “having good seed” from *hu-, a frequently used prefix, and *bīza-, the Old Iranian equivalent of Skt. bija-.

1.5. hw.Ú(?)-pír(?)-ka₄(?) (El. Wb. 1241)

This name renders Iranian *Hu-brga-, “who welcomes well”. See 1.2 above.

2. Toponyms

2.1. hw.Ka₄-am-na-ib-be (El. Wb. 406)

-Ib-be is the plural suffix, indicating that the inhabitants of a place Ka₄-am-na are meant. Ka₄-am-na renders Old Ir. *Kamna-, “small, little”, cf. Av. and Old Persian kamna-.

2.2. Mat-taš-šá-an (El. Wb. 901)

According to Hinz – Koch (El. Wb. 901) Mattaššan is a Neo-Elamite toponym. It looks, however, more plausible to consider it an Iranian name. Ma-taš-šá (-an is a suffix attached to toponyms and is not a part of the root) is a perfect rendering of *Maθasa-, “big horse”. This anthroponym is composed of *maθa- and asa-. The former is the Old Persian form of Av. masa-, “big”, while the latter is the Old Persian form of Av. aspa-, “horse” (OPG 173).

References

El. Wb. = W. Hinz – H. Koch, *Elamisches Wörterbuch* (Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran. Ergänzungsband 17), Berlin, 1987.

OPG = R.G. Kent, *Old Persian : Grammar, Texts, Lexicon* (American Oriental Series 33), OPG New Haven 1953².

Zadok 1976 = R. Zadok, “On Some Iranian Names in Late Babylonian Documents”, *Israel Oriental Studies* 6 (1976), 65-70.

Jan TAVERNIER (20-11-2002)

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Faculteit Letteren, Blijde Inkomststraat 21

B-3000 LEUVEN (Belgique)

Jan.Tavernier@arts.kuleuven.ac.be

80) Notes sur “Les tribus amurrites de Mari” – Le bel ouvrage de M. Krebernik, *Tall Bi’a/Tuttul-II, Die Altorientalischen Schriftfunde*, WVD OG 100, nous a enrichis, entre autres, en informations sur “Les tribus amurrites de Mari”.

1. Pp. 86-87, pls. 21, 56, no. KTT 128 : il s’agit d’un “Fragment der Hülle einer Zensusliste” datant probablement de l’année de l’éponyme Adad-bāni, 1779/1778 avant notre ère, quand a eu lieu un recensement effectué par l’administration de Mari du 30.VI jusqu’au 6.VII. Krebernik traduit les deux lignes *tēbibtī bītātīm/šā Ha-a-na^{ki}* comme suit : “Zensus der Haushalte von Hana”. Le pseudo-idéogramme Ha-a-na (= *Hanûm*) est nouveau à ma connaissance. Il se trouve aussi comme second élément dans des noms propres de l’époque des Šakkanakkû : Bu-na-Ha-a-na, p. 38, no. 5.4 et Ma-ku-Ha-a-na p. 39, no. 12.1 à comparer avec le nom Mu-ut-Ha-na qu’on trouve à Mari (ARM XIV.47.31 ; XXIV.233.I.30 ; A.4305.14 ; M.7001.3’ ; M.8874.11 [FS Garelli, pp. 38, 43] ; M.6202.II (LAPO 17, p. 371g). A Mari j’ai noté, à part Ha-na, la forme Ha-na-a (A.486+M.5319.51 (FM I, p. 140) ; A.1086.5 (BENJ, p. 989d) ; A.4319.11’ (NABU 1991/112). Quant au terme *bītātum*, il se réfère au sous-clan tribal, attesté aussi dans la Bible : *bayit*, voir Jos 7 :14. Chez les bédouins c’est la plus petite unité sociale et économique, la famille patriarcale, le ‘ā’ilah, qui habite une maison ou une tente et est dirigée par le père. A Mari on trouve dans ARM XXIII.87.1-36 des noms de sous-clans de Nihad, un clan des Hanûm (= “Bédouins” d’après D. Charpin et J.-M. Durand), dont une partie contient comme premier élément le terme Bīt. Dans une lettre du temps de Zimri-Lim, ARM VI.28.6-10 (= LAPO 17, pp. 195-196, no. 573), il est question de recenser (ou : d’établir l’approvisionnement ; *paqādum*) les Hanûm (“Bédouins” d’après J.-M. Durand) section (*pirsum*) par section et clan (*gā’um*) par clan. Or, le nouveau document de Tuttul, du temps de Samsi-Addu, atteste un recensement par les plus petites unités tribales, les sous-clans, les “maisons”.

2. P. 70, pl. 16, KTT no. 92 : il s’agit d’un “Verköstigung von Boten, ‘welche Tafeln brachten’” datant de l’éponyme Awiliya, 1780/1779 avant notre ère, qui enregistre deux groupes de messagers, l’un originaire de Hen (^{lu}*He-na-ju^{ki}*) “Hēnāer” et l’autre de Zalpah (^{lu}*Za-al-pa-ha-ju^{ki}*) “Zalpahāer”. Yahdun-Lim mena une série de campagnes dans “la région d’amont” ; il conquiert Tuttul, Abattum, Imar, Zalpah et Pahudara. Comme Zalpah est à localiser sur le Balīh, on peut, peut-être, conclure que Hen aussi, doit être localisé sur le Balīh. Cette localisation s’accorde avec la mention de Hen dans A.1146:24 (FM I, p. 115 [= LAPO 16, pp. 146-148]) et A.987:28 (FM I, p. 122, n. 11 ; FM II, p. 326, no. 33), voir P. Marelli, FM I, p. 123.

3. P. 50, no. KTT 41 :3 : [n] UDU TUR Si-im-a-li-u-um : il ne s’agit pas de “[n] junge(s) Schaf(e) : der Sim’ālter (oder PN)”, mais de moutons appartenant aux Bini-Sim’āl, cfr. ARM IX.15.7.