26) An Iranian Ghost-name: *Šušika-, ‘beetle’ — One of the many Iranian names, only known by their attestations in the so-called Nebenüberlieferung, is *Šušika-, a name first analyzed by Gershevitch and connected by him to New Persian sūsk, ‘beetle.’¹ It is the intention here to prove that the name *Šušika-, that has no Middle or New Iranian attestations, is a ghost-name, i.e. a name that never existed and that therefore should be removed from the list of Iranian names.

In order to do this, one has first to assemble all possible spellings that have been connected with this name. There are five such spellings, all Elamite: Du-si-ka₄, Du-tuk-ka₄, Du-ut-tuk-ka₄, Šu-si-ka₄, and Tu-tuk-ka₄. The next step is to find an alternative solution for each of these five writings, which are without any doubt rendering Iranian names. For the occurrences of each spelling we refer to W. Hinz- H. Koch, Elamisches Wörterbuch, AMI Ergänzungsband 17 (Berlin, 1987) (= EW).

1) Du-si-ka₄ (EW 377)
This spelling was connected with *Šušika- by Gershevitch and this connection was accepted by Hinz. However, Mayrhofer has suggested a new explanation: *Tauqikā-, the female equivalent of *Tausika-, an -ika-hypocoristic of *Taus-, Skt. tośā-, ‘granting abundantly.’²

2) Du-tuk-ka₄ (EW 379) and Du-ut-tuk-ka₄ (EW 388)
Both these writings were assigned to *Šušika by Hinz, but Mayrhofer has shown that the Iranian name behind these Elamite spellings is actually *Dūta-ka-, a -ka-hypocoristic of *Dūta-, ‘messenger’ (Av. dūta-).³

3) Tu-tuk-ka₄ (EW 379)
Gershevitch argues that Elamite Tu-tuk-ka₄ is a rendering of *Dūta-vahu-ka-, but this was rejected by Hinz, who proposed to read *Šušika-.⁴ This is based on the fact that the Elamite sign -tu- normally renders Iranian /qu/. There is, however, (at least) one exception to this rule: in PF 1647:6-7 the month name *Drnabāziṣ is written tu-ur-na-ba-zī-iṣ, which proves that -tu-, albeit rarely, can
render the Ir. consonant /d/. Accordingly, this name can be a representation of the same name as Du-(ut)-tuk-ka₄ and thus can be read *Dūta-ka-, as Mayrhofer already has seen.⁵ An even better solution is to reconstruct a name *Tauqika-, the male equivalent of *Taušikā- (no. 1). This reconstruction can be perfectly rendered by the spelling Tu-tuk-ka₄.

4) Šu-si-ka₄ (EW 1183)
There is complete concordance among the scholars on the analysis of this name:⁶ it is a clear representation of the Iranian name *Quqika-. The only dissident opinion comes from Delaunay,⁷ who considers this spelling as a rendering of the Kassite name Šuzigaš.⁸ His proposal, however, is not accepted by the El.Wb. 1183, that again stresses the fact that Šu-si-ka₄ is certainly Iranian, in particular that it is the Elamite version of *Šušika-

While it is agreed that we must be looking for an Iranian name, it is not clear that this name is *Šušika-. A more plausible name behind this spelling could be *Çaucika-, an -ika-hypocoristic of *Çau-ca-, which itself is a -ca-derivation of a short name, originating from a compound with *Çau-, ‘capable of,’ the Old Persian equivalent of Av. srao-.

As all the spellings that were connected with *Quqika- have been ‘disconnected’ from that name, there is no more reason to believe that such a name really existed and that it had a place in the collection of Iranian names.

Notes
1. I. Gershevitch, “Iranian Nouns and Names in Elamite Garb,” *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1969, p. 197. This analysis has been accepted subsequently by Hinz and Mayrhofer, see W. Hinz, *Neue Wege im Altpersischen*, Göttinger Orientforschungen.
4. W. Hinz (Altiranisches, p.241) accepted the proposal of Mayrhofer.
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