


78) Iranian Notes –

1. *De-e-mi-ši* son of Tu-mu-nu, a Scythian (^{lú}*sak-ka-A+A*), acted as the first of four witnesses in Sippar on 23.VIII.10+x Darius I (sometime between 511/0 and 502/1 B.C., CT 55, 93, 9, see M.A. Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, Costa Mesa, Ca. and New York 1992, 70 :127). His name may end with the suffix *-iča-*, which is attached to OIran. **Daiva-* with the primordial meaning “god” (LB intervocalic <m> can render */v/). **Daiva-* > *δyw* is recorded in Sogdian anthroponyms such as *Δυόγγβν* < **Daiva-gauna-* “heavenly”, *Δῆωδαστ* “having god (as) creator”, as well as *Dīwdād* < *Δῆωδād* “Theódotos” (see W.B. Henning, BSOAS 28, 1965, 253f.). N. Sims-Williams, *Sogdian and other Iranian inscriptions of the upper Indus*, 2 (London 1992), 51 has *Δywn'm*, *-'kk*, *-'štyc*, *Snkδyw(?)*, to which is added **Δywy'n* (Y. Yoshida, *Studia Iranica* 13, 1984, 149). It may be surmised that **daiva-* was productive both in the Sogdian and the Old Scythian onomasticon.

2. *Ú-ma-zi-ia* in a text from the Ebabbarra archive from Sippar, 17.IX.539/8 B.C. (Nbn. 457 = AH 83-1-18, 232, 11 ; there is no reason to emend the ZI to RI as K. Tallqvist, NBN, 215a hesitantly did) is probably identical with *Ú-ma-zi-ia'* from the same archive (Til-gubbi, 19.VI.538/7 B.C. ; M. Jursa, AfOB 25, 234 : BM 74422, 17). If the reading is not *Ú-ba-zi-ia/iá* (BA and MA are indistinct in the NB/LB ductus of this period), his name may render OIran. **Hūjiya-*, cf. OPers. *u-v-j-i-y /Ūjiya-/* “Susian, Elamite”, adjective of OPers. *Ūja-* (presumably for *hŪja-*) “Susiana” (cf. F. Justi, *Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie* 2, Strasbourg 1904, 417f. ; R.G. Kent, *Old Persian*, New Haven 1953, §23.II, 177b, s.v. ; W. Brandenstein and M. Mayrhofer, *Handbuch des Altperischen*, Wiesbaden 1964, 150 ; R. Schmitt, *Epigraphisch-exegetische Noten zu Dareios' Bisütün-Inschriften*, Vienna 1990, 36f. :16 ; *idem*, *The Bisitun inscriptions of Darius the Great* [:] *Old Persian text*, London 1991, 7 ad DB v, 4). C. Bartholomae (*Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strasbourg 1904, 1846, s.v.) advocated the following normalized forms :

OIran. **Huvajiya-*, OPers. *hUvajiya-* “Susian, Elamite”, adjective of OPers. *hUvaja-* “Susiana” (cf. Bartholomae, [Bezzenberger's] *Beiträge zur Kunde der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 13, 1888, 70 ; IF 10, 1899, 189f. with

n. 1). W. Foy (KZ 35, 1899, 62 ; 37, 1904, 542f.) assumed that Armen. *Xužastan* (based on a Middle Iranian form of the above-mentioned Old Persian designation for Susiana) was borrowed not before the early 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 *uvjiyy*, (*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 *Ú-ma-zi-ia/iá* (NB/LB intervocalic <m> can render */v/). If the etymology of *Ú-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-²-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-iá* in OECT 10, 127, 12’ (collated) looks on the face of it as a form comparable with the Greek rendering Καμβουσις. 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)