

To be published in:  
B. Jacobs & R. Rollinger (eds.), *Der Achämenidenhof (Oriens et Occidens)*, Stuttgart (2008/2009)

“CONSUMED BEFORE THE KING”

*The Table of Darius, that of Irdabama and Irtaštuna,  
and that of his satrap, Karkiš*

Wouter F.M. Henkelman\*  
Collège de France, Paris

1. Introduction

In 1942, George G. Cameron published a Persepolis Fortification Tablet (Fort. 6764) that mentioned the name of Darius I and that proved that it was to the reign of this monarch that the Fortification archive should be dated, not to that of Artaxerxes I, as had previously been assumed. The text is remarkable because, as Cameron proudly notes, “here are quoted the actual words of Darius” (1942: 218). This, and the fact that Fort. 6764 was only the second Fortification tablet to become accessible,<sup>1</sup> render its publication a decisive step in the exploration of the archive. There is another significant aspect to the text, however, and that is the light it sheds on the complicated and often unfathomable relation between royal and public domain within the regional institution that I will henceforth refer to as the ‘Persepolis economy.’ A new edition of the often quoted text is given here, based on collations by R.T. Hallock, by C.E. Jones and M.W. Stolper, and by myself, from photographs of the tablet (figs. 1-5):<sup>2</sup>

Fort. 6764 (National Museum of Iran, Tehran)  
original box number: 1063<sup>3</sup>  
seal: PFS 0009\* (Parnakka), left edge and upper edge

obverse

\* Abbreviations used: EKI = Elamite inscriptions in König 1965; EW = Hinz & Koch 1987; Fort. = unpublished Persepolis Fortification tablet in the National Museum of Iran transliterated by G.G. Cameron and collated by R.T. Hallock, C.E. Jones and M.W. Stolper; GN = geographical name; NN = Persepolis Fortification tablet quoted from unpublished transliterations by R.T. Hallock; OD = occupational designation; PF = Fortification tablet published in Hallock 1969; PFa = *idem*, in Hallock 1978; PFS = Persepolis Fortification seal; PFS\* = *idem*, with inscription; PN = personal name; qt(s). = quart(s) (0.97 lt.). I am grateful to Pierre Briant, Mark Garrison, Amélie Kuhrt and Jan Tavernier for their useful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Thanks are also do to Shaul Shaked, for generously granting me the right to use the upcoming publication by him and J. Naveh of the late Achaemenid Aramaic documents from Bactria, a corpus that, once published, will revolutionise our thinking of Achaemenid administrative practice. For a general assessment of the significance of this corpus see Shaked 2004 and Briant [forthc. 2] §2.

<sup>1</sup> The first being Fort. 3159 in Poebel 1938: 133-4 (republished in Hallock 1969: 227 as PF 0758).

<sup>2</sup> The photographs were presumably taken by Cameron himself; they are printed here by kind permission of Matthew W. Stolper.

<sup>3</sup> The same box, perhaps not coincidentally, contained a text on honey for the royal table (Fort. 6767; cf. Henkelman 2006: 97-101).

1. <sup>DIŠ</sup>har-ri-e-na <sup>HAL</sup>gi-sa-bat-ti-
  2. iš tu<sub>4</sub>-ru-iš <sup>HAL</sup>pár-na-ak-ka<sub>4</sub>
  3. na-an KI+MIN <sup>HAL</sup>da-ri-ia-u-iš
  4. <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA <sup>HAL</sup>ú-ik-ki še-ra-iš<sup>4</sup>
  5. na-an-ri 1 ME UDU.NITÁ<sup>MEŠ</sup>
  6. <sup>AS</sup>ul-hi<sup>MEŠ</sup> <sup>HAL</sup>ú-ni-na-ma-mar
  7. <sup>SAL</sup>ir<sup>1</sup>-taš-du-na <sup>SAL</sup>du-uk-
  8. <sup>1</sup>ši-iš<sup>1</sup> hu-pír-ri id-du
  9. <sup>1</sup>ma<sup>1</sup>-ra [ ø ] a-ak am <sup>HAL</sup>
- lower edge
10. <sup>1</sup>pár-na<sup>1</sup>-ak-ka<sub>4</sub> na-an-ri sa-ap
- reverse
11. <sup>HAL</sup>da<sup>1</sup>-ri-ia-u-iš <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA <sup>HAL</sup>ú<sup>1</sup>-
  12. ik-ka<sub>4</sub> še-ra-iš-da zí-la <sup>HAL</sup>
  13. <sup>HAL</sup>ú <sup>HAL</sup>nu-ik-ka<sub>4</sub> še-ra-man-ka<sub>4</sub>
  14. am <sup>HAL</sup>nu 1 ME UDU.NITÁ<sup>MEŠ</sup> <sup>SAL</sup>ir-
  15. taš-du-na <sup>SAL</sup>du-uk-ši-iš id-
  16. du sa-ap <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA-ik-ka<sub>4</sub>-mar še-ra-ka<sub>4</sub>
  17. <sup>AN</sup>ITI<sup>MEŠ</sup> <sup>AN</sup>ha-du-kán-nu-iš-na
  18. <sup>AS</sup>be-ul 19<sup>?</sup>-um-me-na<sup>5</sup> <sup>HAL</sup>an-
  19. su-uk-ka<sub>4</sub> tal-li-iš bat-ti-ka<sub>4</sub>-maš-
  20. še <sup>HAL</sup>ma-ra-za li-iš-da

<sup>1-3</sup> Speak to Harrena the cattle-chief, Parnakka speaks as follows: <sup>3-5</sup> “king Darius ordered me, saying: <sup>5-6</sup> “100 sheep/goats from my House, <sup>7-9</sup> (to) the royal woman Irtaštuna (Artystone), to her issue it!”

<sup>9-10</sup> And now Parnakka says: <sup>10-2</sup> As Darius the king has ordered me, <sup>12-3</sup> so am I ordering you; <sup>14-6</sup> now you issue 100 sheep/goat to Irtaštuna the royal woman, <sup>16</sup> as ordered by the king!”

<sup>17</sup> First month, <sup>18-9</sup> 19<sup>th?</sup> year. <sup>19-20</sup> Anukka wrote (this document); Maraza delivered its message/instruction.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Cameron read *še-ra-iš-šá<sup>1</sup>*, but the sign read as NÍG more likely belongs to the preceding iš (partly over erasure).

<sup>5</sup> Based on the available photographs, *19-um-me-na* seems more likely than Cameron’s *16-um-me-na*, though the latter cannot definitively be excluded on epigraphic grounds. There is additional contextual evidence, however, against Cameron’s reading (cf. Hallock 1969: 52-3 fn. 48). Hallock’s collation, *19-um-me-na*, has also been accepted by Jones and Stolper (unpublished manuscript).

<sup>6</sup> Previous translations are those of Cameron (1942: 216) and Hallock (1969: 52). Cameron (*ibid.* 217) interpreted *dukšiš* (ll.7-8) as “daughter” (hence his suggestion that the hundred sheep might have constituted her dowry), but the word, a loan from Old Persian \**duxčiš*, has a wider meaning and should be translated as “princess, royal woman.” Cf. Benveniste 1966: 42-4, 48-50 (commenting on Fort. 6764) and Tavernier 2007: 420 [4.4.7.34] (with references). In l.9, *ma-ra* is the “quotational correlative” which indicates the end of direct speech. On the construction, which has roots in Middle and Neo-Elamite syntax, see Hallock 1959: 16-8; Reiner 1969: 103; Grillot & Vallat 1975: 216-7; Stolper 2004: 89. For the interpretation of the

The central question rising from the above document is what Darius actually meant when he gave instructions to take the livestock “from my House” (cf. Briant 2002: 463-4 and *idem* 2006: 348-9). In the Persepolis Fortification texts,<sup>7</sup> *ulhi*, “House, estate,” is used in very specific contexts only, namely the domain of the king and the domains of the members of the higher Persian nobility, such as Irtaštuna and Irdabama. Letters from these two royal women, pertaining to the management of their own estates, use the same formula: “issue from my House/estate” (*ulhi uninamamar ... iddu*). The parallel suggests that Darius referred to a precisely delineated entity within or connected with the Persepolis economy, not to the institution at large, as his royal property.

Though he normally spent only part of the year in Pārsa, the king is the principal actor in the Fortification archive. Among 5,572 texts and entries in journals<sup>8</sup> there are altogether 612 texts/entries (11%) that explicitly relate to the king. In some of these, the king is merely mentioned in the greeting formula, whereas others just mention him as the destination of travellers.<sup>9</sup> Still, even when omitting these cases, there remain some 524 texts (9.4%) that deal with the king’s activities, commands, assets and personnel. Darius is thus referred to more often than Parnakka, the director

colophon (ll.19-20) and the implications of such information for the data flow, cf. Henkelman 2003b: 106-7, *idem* 2006: 84-6, 90-4 and most recently Tavernier [forthc. 2] (see also Stolper [forthc.]). *Contra*: Vallat 1994: 267-71; *idem* 1997.

<sup>7</sup> For surveys of the Persepolis Fortification archive see Briant 2002: 422-71, 938-47; Hallock 1985; Henkelman 2006: 39-111.

<sup>8</sup> The total of 4,846 published and unpublished edited tablets consists for the larger part of shorter ‘memorandum’ texts, but also concludes a considerable amount of registers (‘journals’) with multiple entries taken from the memoranda. As these entries are, in fact, independent texts, the actual corpus is larger than 4,846, namely 5,572. The 2,147 published texts are those edited by Cameron (1942), Hallock (1969; *idem* 1978), Stolper (1977: 263), Grilhot (1986), Vallat (1994), Henkelman (2003b: 103-115; 2006: 319-47; [forthc.]) and Jones & Stolper (2006). Unpublished transliterations of 2,699 texts are quoted from manuscripts by Cameron and Hallock; Henkelman is currently preparing an edition of these texts.

<sup>9</sup> The standard greeting formula is *ši-ri-ni* <sup>AN</sup>*na-ap-pi a-ak* <sup>HAL</sup>*EŠŠANA hu-ut-tuk-ni*, which translates as “May your *širi* be made by the gods and the king!” *širi* continues older *šuru* and *šuri*. Different interpretations have been proposed: “fortune” *vel sim.* (Hinz 1970: 435; *idem* 1974; EW s.vv. *ši-ri*, *šu-ri*, *šu-ru*; Malbran-Labat 1995: 173) or “wish(es)” (Grilhot 1988: 62; Vallat 1998a: 99; *idem* 1998b; Henkelman 2006: 189). The latter solution, which seems preferable, gives “May your wishes be fulfilled by the gods and the king!” There are a few smaller variations: “May your wishes be fulfilled by the gods and king Darius!” (PF 1860) and “Brother (<sup>HAL</sup>*i-ki-ri*), may your wishes be fulfilled by the gods and the king!” (NN 0702). The greeting formula occurs only in letters among officials in the institution’s hierarchy and in letters from officials to their superiors, such as the general director Parnakka (cf. Hallock 1969: 53; Vallat 1998a: 99). These documents are actual letters, written on a distinct rectangular tablet, sometimes cylindrical in section. By contrast, letter-orders to officials of lower rank, like those sent by Parnakka, his lieutenant Ziššawiš or the royal woman Irtaštuna, never contain the formula. The great majority of these orders are written on tongue-shaped tablets, like the ‘memorandum’ type documents (cf. Hallock 1978: 113; Henkelman 2006: 61).

of the Persepolis economy.<sup>10</sup> This is not as self-evident as it may seem, for Parnakka was the prime administrator, responsible for the entire institution, and was, in contrast to the king, permanently based in the region.<sup>11</sup>

The number of texts referring to the king provides us only with a very rough indication of his preponderance in the archive. Single tablets sometimes refer to enormous quantities of goods consumed at the king’s table (cf. §2.2 below). Also, there are certain commodities, such as *madukka*, “honey,” that are exclusively issued for royal consumption or mentioned in connection with the king. Beyond such explicit references, many other transactions can be shown to belong to the royal sphere. Poultry is frequently mentioned in texts on animal fodder and in inventories, yet its consumption is mentioned in only seven texts, all with a distinct royal context.<sup>12</sup> This evidence suggests that *all* poultry was reserved for the court, that this notion was taken for granted by the scribes, and that the consumption of poultry was largely a matter beyond the scope of the Persepolis administration.<sup>13</sup> In a similar vein, cattle, sheep and goats are redistributed within the Persepolis economy, but only on a very limited scale and its recipients are in most cases members of the nobility and/or high-ranking officials. Moreover, there are indications that livestock was always considered to be ‘royal,’ if only in the sense that allocations of sheep/goats to labourers were considered

<sup>10</sup> Parnakka and/or one of his official seals (PFS 0009\* and PFS 0016\*) occur on 398 texts.

<sup>11</sup> Pace Koch, who assumed that Parnakka accompanied the king on his travels to and from Susa and elsewhere (1993b: 66-7, 88; *idem* 2004: 230). Koch’s thesis partly rests on the erroneous assumption that a larger part of Khūzestān fell under the scope of the administration at Persepolis (instead of that at Susa) and partly on the uncorroborated supposition that the position held by Parnakka required his continuous presence at the court (“es [ist] in der Regel so, daß der Hofmarschall sich in der Nähe des Königs aufzuhalten hatte” [1993b: 67]). Rather, Parnakka’s administrative duties as the king’s highest representative in the ‘Persepolis economy’ required his regular presence in Pārsa. They made it necessary for him to make inspection tours throughout the area under his purview, but not to accompany the king on his travels through the empire. This does not preclude occasional travels to the king at Susa (as, apparently, at the end of Dar. 21; cf. Lewis 1977: 9 fn. 33), but these do not imply a compulsory *permanent* presence at the court anymore than the travels of Babylonian officials to Susa did (see Waerzeggers, this volume). Note that the few texts on travellers coming from Susa and carrying an authorisation (*halmi*) by Parnakka do not *necessarily* imply his presence at that city: he may simply have issued a round-trip document (e.g., Persepolis → Susa → Persepolis, as may be the case in NN 0244; on the phenomenon see Tuplin 1998: 80) or an authorisation for a journey *via* Susa to, e.g., Makkan (as in PF 1409 and PFa 17 ~ PFa 29:54-5). On Parnakka’s position at Persepolis, not at the court *per se* see already Lewis 1977: 8-9 (inexplicably ignored by Koch 1993b) and Henkelman [forthc.] §6.4.1; on the geographical extent of the Persepolis economy see *idem* 2006: 65-70.

<sup>12</sup> Poultry consumed before the king: PF 0697, PF 0698, PF 2034, NN 0790 and NN 2213; → *basbas* (presumably ducks) for personnel of the royal women Irdabama: NN 0845; *basbas* sacrificed during a royal *šip* feast: NN 2225 (cf. Henkelman [forthc.] §§6.3.3, 6.4.2).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Henkelman 2006: 353-4 and *idem* [forthc.] §6.4.2. Note that, by contrast, the use of ducks for the rations of workers was not uncommon in Achaemenid Babylonia (Janković 2004: 33).

as royal gifts.<sup>14</sup> In short, a considerable part of the institution’s material reserves was ‘royal’ in one way or another.

The religious sphere was no exception to the preponderance of the king in the Persepolis economy. Large sacrificial feasts (*šip*) can be shown to be intimately connected with the crown. The king sometimes ordered commodities to be issued for certain sacrifices. Large offerings were made at the burial sites (*šumar*) of deceased royals, such as Cambyses and Hystaspes.<sup>15</sup>

Also from the perspective of human resources, the Fortification archive is of tremendous significance in evidencing the extent and importance of what could be described as the Achaemenid equivalent of the *familia Caesaris*.<sup>16</sup> One finds ample evidence on the royal guard (including lance bearers inspecting the royal road in advance of the King’s approach), the crown-prince’s guard, a royal ointment-maker, express messengers carrying messages from and to the king, carriers of (part of) the royal treasury, caretakers of royal horses, royal cooks, collectors of royal tax, muleteers responsible for the migration of the court (tents, etc.), herdsmen tending the royal flocks, large teams of servants of the royal women Irtaštuna and Irdabama, artisans (*marrip*), a commissary and specialised workforces of Irdabama, and professional private staffs of members of the royal family (secretaries, stewards, bailiffs). There is also much evidence on members of the nobility and of the Achaemenid dynasty themselves. Thus we hear of courtiers with honorary titles like chamberlain (*lipte kutira*), bow-and-arrow-case-carrier (*aptikutira*), footstool-carrier (*kadukabarra*), irrigator (*habezziš*), and cup-bearer (*battišmarnabarra*). There are direct references to the movements of, provisions for, and estates held by individuals like Kambarma (Gobryas), Mardunuya (Mardonius), Iršama (Arsames), Irtaštuna (Artystone), Irdabama, Bagiya, and “the royal women, daughters of Hystaspes” who made their way from Media to Persepolis, perhaps after their father had passed away.<sup>17</sup>

As is abundantly clear from the evidence cited above, the Fortification archive is an incredibly rich source on the management of the assets of the king, and on the economic enterprises of members of his court at large. At the same time, the evidence is problematic, not only because so many dossiers are incomplete, present a lopsided view, pertain only to shorter periods, or are just difficult to understand, but also because, on a grander scale, it poses the vexing question as to the nature of the Persepolis economy. As king, royal House and court seem to be nearly-ubiquitous, it would be tempting to consider the tablets as the administration of a palace economy in the strict sense: an institutional enterprise centred on the king, the material and

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Henkelman 2006: 350-6 on livestock allocations and on royal tagging.

<sup>15</sup> *šip*: see Henkelman [forthc.]; *šumar*: see *idem* 2003b and compare the reflections of Tuplin [forthc.]. Other royal offerings: *idem* 2006: 164.

<sup>16</sup> I use this term in loose reference to Birkman’s *patrimonium Caesaris*, as he defined the king’s private capital in his *Institutions des Seleucides* (see discussion in Briant 2006: 346-51).

<sup>17</sup> Courtiers: Henkelman 2003b: 120-2, with references. Gobryas: *idem* 2006: 252 fn. 567, Henkelman & Stolper [forthc.]. Mardonius: PFa 05 (compare Stolper 1992b). Bagiya: Henkelman 2006: 346-7. Hystaspes: *idem* 2003b: 148-9 with fn. 95. Iršama, Irtaštuna and Irdabama are discussed in §§3-4 below.

human resources of which were principally the king’s property. On the other hand there is evidence, like the text cited at the beginning of this study, that indicates that specific royal assets and royal personnel were considered distinct from the material and human resources of the general or ‘public’ Persepolis economy. On the basis of such data one could construct a model in which the royal (and princely) economy represented a clearly delineated entity of considerable size and significance, which was managed from outside the Fortification administration but which at the same time drew considerable resources from the Persepolis economy at large and therefore, and for that reason only, appears in the Fortification texts.

On closer inspection, neither of the above models applies. Considering the whole Persepolis institution and its assets as a royal or palatial economy, i.e. essentially as an example of the *Asian Production Mode* model, cannot explain the many references to royal commodities, royal personnel and transactions to and from the royal domain. At the same time, the ‘parasitic’ model according to which the royal domain was a *strictly separate and clearly defined* entity that only drew resources from the Persepolis economy, also appears to be too static and limited to explain the complex phenomena we encounter at Persepolis. One of the most poignant, yet also most baffling indicators in this respect is the manifold use of the expression EŠŠANA-na, “belonging to the king, royal.”<sup>18</sup> The qualification occurs with commodities (fruit, grain), livestock (sheep, cattle, horses, mules, camels), occupational designations (herdsmen, muleteers, *kurtaš* [labourers]), locales (storehouses) and a number of abstracta such as *baziš* (“tax”), *ukpiyataš* (a tax paid in kind), *gal* (“ration, offering”) and *huthut* (“requirements, reserves”).<sup>19</sup> Yet, while there are text categories in which EŠŠANA-na seems to be used very precisely and definitively, there are others in which the expression is used almost gratuitously, and could be omitted in similar contexts at the whim of the scribe.<sup>20</sup> In addition, there are, as indicated above, certain assets, such as honey or poultry, that are clearly reserved for the royal sphere but that are rarely labelled as ‘royal.’ Other assets, such as sheep and goats, have a more hazy character: they seem to have been

<sup>18</sup> Hallock consistently normalises EŠŠANA as Elamite *sunki* (cf. 1969: 83). This Middle and Neo-Elamite form of the word for “king” is *not* attested in syllabic spelling in the Achaemenid period, however, and there are indications that its pronunciation had changed. Compare the spellings <sup>AŠ</sup>š<sub>y</sub>-ir-EŠŠANA-ri, <sup>AŠ</sup>š<sub>y</sub>-ur-EŠŠANA-ri, <sup>AŠ</sup>š<sub>y</sub>-ur-<sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA-ri, <sup>AŠ</sup>š<sub>y</sub>-ir-su-un-kur-ri, <sup>AŠ</sup>š<sub>y</sub>-ur-su-un-kur-ri and <sup>AŠ</sup>š<sub>y</sub>-ir-su-ka<sub>4</sub>-ri for the same GN (occurrences in Vallat 1993: 264). The PN spelled variously as <sup>HAL</sup>su-un-kur-ši-ip (PF 2082, NN 0574) and <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA-ši-ip (PF 0114) seems to point in the same direction (on the name see Henkelman [forthc.]). Finally, compare <sup>AŠ</sup>su-un-ku-mu-mi (XP<sub>a</sub><sub>e</sub> 18) and <sup>AŠ</sup>su-un-mu-me (XP<sub>b</sub><sub>e</sub> 18, XP<sub>d</sub><sub>e</sub> 12) for “my kingdom,” in Xerxes’ inscriptions (cf. EW q.vv.). Given the uncertain pronunciation, I prefer to retain EŠŠANA.

<sup>19</sup> For *ukpiyataš* and *huthut* see §§2.4 and 5 below; on the meaning of *gal* see Henkelman 2006: 143-4, 222-4. See in general the discussion in Briant (2002: 464-6, 470), who also points out the intriguing case of Umizza the royal shepherd. An equally interesting case is that of the keepers of “camels of the king” (*gmln zy mlk’*), who are exempt from certain taxes and who are the subject of a letter by the Bactrian satrap Akhvamazda (A1) dating to year 6 of Artaxerxes III (see Naveh & Shaked [forthc.] and compare the remarks by Briant [forthc. 2]).

<sup>20</sup> Note, for example, that the same herd of camels is mentioned in PF 1786, PF 1787, PFa 26 and PFa 29:48, but that only PF 1787 labels it as ‘royal’ (cf. Hallock 1978: 112-3; Briant 2002: 464-5).

considered royal, but they did circulate (be it on a modest scale) in the redistribution system of the Persepolis economy at large. As such, livestock may have served economic and ideological purposes at the same time. This and other evidence suggests a certain fluidity between royal and public domain and calls for the application of a gradual model. As a working hypothesis, I propose a pyramidal model describing assets, human resources, production and transactions in an ascending hierarchy: a basis that is formed by the Persepolis economy at large, upper layers consisting of the royal domain in strictest sense, i.e. the House of the king and the estates of royal women, and intermediate layers that are ‘royal’ in a more general sense. In this model, basis and top stand out clearly, whereas the definition of transactions, status of personnel and qualification of assets in the large intermediate zone often is a function of the perspective chosen. The postulation of a ‘hazy’ zone simultaneously acknowledges the interwovenness of royal and public domain and allows for a delineation of the more explicitly royal or public responsibilities and pursuits.

The one factor that misses from our pyramidal model is time. To understand this, one has to remember that the king and the court stayed at Persepolis (or Fārs) during only a shorter part of the year – as far as can be established mostly in autumn.<sup>21</sup> This implies that the persona of the king has more than one shape in the tablets. Throughout the year his domain is managed in close cooperation with the wider Persepolis economy, royal stewards appear in the tablets, cattle is added to the royal herds, poultry is fattened, tax is taken in, foodstuffs are stored as “requirements” (*huthut*) for the king. This, as one could say, is the structural side of the monarch’s preponderance in the archive. The other side is that of the temporal physical presence of the king and his court and the impact this had on the local economy. His presence meant a considerable increase in the number of royals, nobles, guards and other personnel – the *familia Caesaris*. Again, one finds that a simple model does not work here: based on the figures that can be extrapolated from the tablets (cf. §2.4 below), one gains the impression that the commodities and animals drawn from the local economy for consumption at the royal table and the court at large would not have sufficed to feed all those extra mouths. Thus, it would seem that the court was only partly dependent of the Persepolis economy when it resided in Fārs. More significantly, there is only limited evidence on the rations of the court’s personnel. The rare texts attesting to such disbursements seem to be concern exceptions rather than regular rations. More common are texts on (large) quantities of staple foods, livestock and prepared products “consumed/poured before the king” (cf. §2 below). Information preserved by Heraclides and Polyaeus induces me to believe that much of these foodstuffs would eventually be redistributed, *via* the royal table, to family members, courtiers, and the royal guards. *This* redistribution, however, was apparently of no concern to the scribes Fortification archive and the regional administration associated with it. In other words: the court clearly travelled with its own administrative and bureaucratic apparatus,

<sup>21</sup> See Henkelman [forthc.] §6.4.1, but see also Tuplin’s analysis, who, using references to authorisations for travels to and from the king, stays undecided as to the autumnal whereabouts of the king of kings.

which was responsible, among other duties, for the institution that we know as the royal table. When resident in Fārs, the royal machinery would link up with the local administration and, to a certain extent, would draw on its resources. At the same time, however, it also drew from other resources and, more important, it continued to organise and account for the feeding of the court on its own terms and with its proper documentation.

By contrast, workers associated with the royal women Irdabama and Irtaštuna are frequently found in the archive. Such personnel was, apparently, attached to the domains of the two, resident in Fārs for longer periods, and therefore integrated in the administrative structures of the Persepolis economy in a much more structural way than, say, the king’s guards. It remains puzzling, however, why one hardly finds “royal workers,” parallel to “workers of Irdabama” and “of Irtaštuna.” Perhaps this observation implies that the royal domain, including its resident personnel, was administered more independently than the princely domains, but it may just as well mean that royal workers were not always identified as such.

Altogether, we are dealing with a perplexing accumulation of administrative systems: that of the Persepolis economy at large, the royal domain, the estates of royal women and nobles, and the resident court. All these must have produced their own records, which are lost to us except for the Fortification tablets that only cover a part of the Persepolis economy during a mere 16 years. It is only by virtue of the contacts between this and the other economic entities that we may see glimpses of the world beyond the regional institution. This limitation in scope and perspective is to be kept in mind continuously when studying the king and the royal court.

Despite the preliminary state of our understanding of the economies evidenced by the Fortification archive, it is clear that the complex as such was not an isolated phenomenon. The royal economy at Persepolis is part of the royal economy at large as we know it from other sources. Recent interpretations of Ps.Aristotle’s *Oeconomica* (II.1/1345b) show that its author was aware of the House of the King as an economic entity and that he knew that this was not merely an accumulation of assets, but an intricate *system* with its own administration, a machinery distinct yet part of a larger economic structures.<sup>22</sup>

The above considerations are necessarily vague in the absence of an encompassive study exploring the corpus of texts relating to the king, the royal domain and the court. Such a study, which necessitates detailed philological analysis, edition of unpublished material, as well as the reconstruction of complex structures and modes, would be of monograph-size and, though certainly rewarding, can therefore not be undertaken here. To make things worse, I am reluctant even to give a survey of the evidence as long as so many matters remain unresolved. Instead, this study will concentrate on a single, yet considerable dossier, that may serve as illustration of the complexities involved. On the pages that follow, I will present the Elamite evidence on

<sup>22</sup> See Briant (2002: 419-21, 469-71, 945-7; *idem* 2006) and Descat (2006: 369-71) commenting on the concept of ‘royal economy’ and in particular on the expressions ἐν τῇ ταγῆ and ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων γινομένη in Ps.Arist.

provisions for the ‘king’s table,’ as well as the tables of the royal women Irdabama and Irtaštuna, and that of the ‘satrap’ Karkiš. Wherever applicable, I will confront this evidence with that of the Greek sources.

Needless to say, my treatment requires facing a number of lexical problems, which have not been conclusively dealt with before. This pertains specifically to words relating to livestock, staple foods and special products and prepared food. Discussions on such realia are gathered in a selective lexical appendix at the end of this paper, and are referred to by means of an arrow (as in → *madukka*).

## 2. Commodities “consumed before the king”

One of the most explicit categories of texts mentioning the king is that using the phrase <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA *tibba makka*, “consumed before the king,”<sup>23</sup> or its variant <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA *tibba kitka* “poured before the king.”<sup>24</sup> There are 82 such texts and journal entries in the trans-

<sup>23</sup> There is little doubt that *makka* (*ma-ak-ka<sub>4</sub>*, *ma-ik-ka<sub>4</sub>*) derives from the verbal base *maki-*, “to eat, to consume,” and is to be explained as a contracted form of the 2<sup>nd</sup> conjugation participle (\**makik(a)* > *makka*). Vowel contraction in the second syllable is very common in Elamite. As for *ma-ka<sub>4</sub>*, this is a simplified spelling for *ma-ak-ka<sub>4</sub>*. Finite 1<sup>st</sup> conjugation forms from the verb *maki-* are very frequent in the Fortification texts. Some of these occur in contexts that are otherwise similar to those using *makka*. In NN 1874 we find <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA <sup>1</sup>ti<sup>1</sup>-ib-ba ma-kaš, “he/they consumed (it) before the king.” The seals involved (PFS 0007\* and PFS 0066a/b\*), as well as the large amount of flour (22,540 qts.) confirm that we are dealing with the same type of disbursement that is normally characterised by the phrase <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA *tibba makka*. In PF 0707, PF 0708, PF 0709, NN 0554 and NN 0857 horses are said to have *makišda*, “consumed,” grain “before the king.” Note also PFa 06 and NN 1901 where <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA *tibba makka* is followed by <sup>AŠ</sup>za-ak-za-ku ma-iš, “he/they consumed (it) at Zakzaku.” Here, the scribe (obviously not very fluent in Elamite) erroneously took *makka* to represent *maka* ([ma.k]), a 2<sup>nd</sup> conjugation participle from a supposed verbal base *\*\*ma-*, “to consume,” and derived the finite 1<sup>st</sup> form *maš* ([ma.š]) from it; alternatively, the pronunciation of *makiš* as /makš/ may have caused the occasional spelling *ma-iš*. At any rate, the rare form *maš* does not justify the overall distinction between *maki-*, “to consume” and *ma-*, “to dispense,” as made by Hallock (1969: 24, 59, 722; *idem* 1985: 608). There is evidently just one verbal base *maki-*, which means “to consume” (for this meaning see Hallock 1950: 247; EW s.vv. *ma-ak-qa*, *ma-ki-iš-da*). Note that Proto-North-Dravidian has a root *\*mōq-* for “to eat” (Starostin 2002: 157).

<sup>24</sup> Hallock’s interpretation of *kiti-*, “to pour” (1969: 25), rests on his interpretation of DB<sub>e</sub> III:76 and 88-9: <sup>DIS</sup>NUMUN<sup>MEŠ</sup>-ni a-nu ki-ti-in-ti, “mayest thou not pour out thy seed” (i.e. may you not have offspring). This solution is not unlikely, since forms of *kiti-* occur almost exclusively with liquids (beer, wine, oil) in PF texts. There are, however, cases whereby non-liquids are the object of *kiti-* or where different meaning seems implied by the context (PF 1972, PF 1974, PF 1980, PF 1986, PF 2078, NN 0146, NN 0527, NN 0704, NN 2206:32, NN 2208, NN 2266, NN 2355 and NN 2358:16-7). Perhaps *kiti-* in these texts should be considered as a continuation of Middle and Neo-Elamite *kuti/u-*, “protect, preserve.” Thus, one may either assume two homonymic verbal bases with different meanings and used in different contexts (in my view, the preferable option), or a verbal base *kiti-*, “to keep, to protect,” that somehow came to be used for expenditures of liquids. See Grillot 1973: 137 fn. 33, Vallat 1977: 49, *idem* 2005: 1238 and EW s.v. *ki-ti-in-ti* where the Bīsoṭūn passage is translated as “may you not keep your

literated corpus, dealing with disbursements of a great variety of commodities and animals at a surprising wide range of locations (§6). In addition, there are 6 texts on fodder consumed by cattle and horses “before the king,” 19 texts on commodities and livestock dispersed “before” the royal women Irdabama and Irtaštuna, and Irtaštuna’s son Iršama (§§3-4), and one text on wine dispensed “before Karkiš” (§5).

2.1. *Evidence for feasting?* – One striking feature shared by all but one text is the absence of month dates (cf. Tuplin 1998: 79 fn. 39). This contrasts sharply with the fact that the Persepolis scribes were very precise in noting monthly and, if necessary, daily expenditures for workers’ rations, sacrifices, etc. The most logical explanation would be that months are not mentioned because total amounts dispensed during one or several periods at one particular place during a given year are at stake (cf. Henkelman 2000: 499 with fnn. 5-6).<sup>25</sup>

Yet, on closer inspection the problem appears to be more complex than I previously assumed. In five cases, more than one text pertains to the disbursement of the same type of commodity at the same location during the same year. Still, month dates are absent in these texts too. It appears, however, that in each case where two tablets pertain to the same commodity issued at the same location during the same year, different suppliers, storekeepers and/or *tumara* officials are involved.<sup>26</sup> This may explain the drafting of separate documents dated to the same year.<sup>27</sup>

offspring.” Brosius 1996: 130 refers to *irdabama tibba kutka*, and translates “which was brought on behalf of Irdabama,” but the form *kutka* does actually not occur with *tibba*.

<sup>25</sup> That some texts also lack a year date is explained by the assumption that receipts would be kept at the storehouses, collected annually, presumably put in leather bags, and brought to Persepolis for accounting (cf. C.E. Jones *apud* Henkelman 2006: 83-4). There, the accountants and archivists would know from the overall contents of a leather bag, and perhaps from a docket on the string that closed the bag, the year date and the origin of the enclosed documents. Undated texts on commodities consumed “before” the king, Irtaštuna or Irdabama are: PF 0723, PF 0726, PF 0728, PF 2034, NN 0306, NN 0409, NN 0846, NN 1384 and NN 2213.

<sup>26</sup> Hadaraš, Dar.19: barley supplied by Mesakka (PF 1942:3) and by Kašunda (PF 1943:1). Harišnu, Dar.22: flour supplied by Mipanda, Bagizza being *tumara* (PF 0703) and by Da’uriša, Irtuzza being *tumara* (PF 0704). Irdunuttiš, Dar.24: flour supplied by Iršena, Zitrina being the storekeeper (NN 0174) and by Zanuš, Muška being the storekeeper (NN 0797). Maršunkurda, Dar.19: flour supplied by Irtuppiya, Turpiš being *tumara* (NN 1843) and once more by Irtuppiya, Kamišdana being *tumara* (Fort. 7864). Cf. Tuplin 1998: 79 fn. 39.

<sup>27</sup> Alternatively, one could give up the theory that texts on commodities “consumed before the king” are year totals and simply assume instead that month dates could have been assigned to the texts, yet were of no administrative importance in this type of documentation. But why? Accountability would still be vital, even if the overarching authority of the court was directly involved, since suppliers and storekeepers would have to be able to show written and sealed proof of their disbursements of commodities. Accountability works well if one assumes that the documents under discussion are year totals, as they are sealed by officials directly connected to the court and other prominent individuals (cf. below). At the end of each administrative year, a supplier would present such a sealed receipt to the accountants. If, on the other hand, documents pertained to only part of the year and did, at the same time, not have month dates, the system would be vulnerable to miscommunication or fraud:

Whatever the explanation for the absence of the month dates, however, there is no reason to take the texts as evidence that the commodities were *always* consumed on a single day, as some commentators have implied. This appears clearly from the aforementioned cases of several disbursements of the same type of commodity at the same location during the same year. At Maršunkurda 2,580 and 22,380 qts. of flour were “consumed before the king” during Dar.19 (NN 1843, Fort. 7864). This hardly implies that the second occasion was a tenfold more lavish banquet, but rather that the court stayed longer than the previous time.<sup>28</sup> Caution is therefore warranted: big numbers cannot automatically be translated into big feasts. There is certainly no *a priori* reason to assume that the 1,333 fowls mentioned in PF 2034 were consumed “bei einem riesigen Festmahl,” as Hinz would have it (1970: 438).<sup>29</sup>

Likewise, texts on commodities consumed or poured “before the royal woman Irtaštuna” again rarely mention a month date, the only exception being a provision of 314<sup>2</sup> qts. of *raziyam* (“grapes,” cf. → *abbebe razi*) in NN 1523, which is dated to XI/[x] (cf. Tuplin 1998: 78 fn. 38).<sup>30</sup> Even the two letters-orders on the provision of 1,000 qts. of wine and 100 sheep/goats to Irtaštuna, which are both dated to the first month of Dar.19 (27 March-24 April 503 BC), do not constitute adequate proof that Irtaštuna threw a lavish party, as Koch holds,<sup>31</sup> or even for the celebration of *Nō Rūz*, as Hinz assertively claimed.<sup>32</sup> The date in these documents is the date of the letter-order, not of the actual disbursement. Also, the allocation should have taken place *prior* to *Nō Rūz* if it were related to the celebration of that feast (!). If anything, the date of the letter-orders

recipients on behalf of the king could deny a second or third allocation, or a supplier could state/pretend that he had issued a certain commodity more than once but had not received proper documentation of each transaction. In other words, if accountability is the *raison d'être* of the Fortification archive (and it certainly was), disbursements of commodities “consumed before the king” logically only pertain to whole (administrative) years.

<sup>28</sup> In addition, some of the texts pertain to more than one location, like NN 0071 that mentions ten places where a total of 173 lambs were consumed. Here, we have evidence that the quantity mentioned was divided over several occasions, probably during ten days. One should at least reckon with the same or a comparable period in the case NN 2261:1-3, where 882 sheep and 85 lambs are “consumed before the king,” at Kabaš.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. *idem* 1971: 291 on PF 0728 (“diese Menge hätte ebenfalls für die gesamte Garde ausgereicht”); *idem* 1973: 40 on PF 0726. Similarly, Hallock suggests that the flour in PF 0702 could have fed 11,886 persons, but he cautiously stipulates that the amount may have been intended for more than one day (1969: 24).

<sup>30</sup> The case of PF 0710, which also has a month date, is atypical; cf. fn. 66 below.

<sup>31</sup> The texts are Fort. 6764 and PF 1795. Cf. Koch 1992: 238, “Es hat also den Anschein, daß Königin Artystone zu Beginn des Jahres 503 v.Chr. einen großen Empfang in Persepolis gegeben hat, zu dem sie etwa 2000 Gäste einlud” (cf. *idem* 1994: 136). Lewis 1987: 85 also thought of a special feast.

<sup>32</sup> Hinz 1970: 423 (cf. *idem* 1971: 288-89), “Zu Nourūz 503 v.Chr. befahl Darius, der Königin zweihundert Krüge (1940 Liter!) Wein auszuhändigen ... so könnte Artystone am 21. März ihre Neujahrsgäste, deren Zahl viele hunderte betragen haben muß, angemessen bewirten.” Cf., similarly, Mayrhofer 1972: 195 (“Schmauserei zum Neujahrsfest”).

suggest that the disbursements to Irtaštuna were intended for the new calendrical year, and would be used during that year within the queen’s personal domain.<sup>33</sup>

2.2. *Quantities* – Even though one should beware of hasty conclusions on royal feasting and lavish banquets, the amounts consumed and poured “before the king” (and Irtaštuna and Irdabama) are definitely considerable. Individual texts and journal entries mention figures as high 1,224 head of sheep/goats (PF 0696), 126,100 qts. of flour (PF 0701), 1,044 head of poultry (PF 2034), 5,000 qts. of *karukur* fruit (NN 0923), and 12,350 qts. of wine (PF 0728).

More indicative than individual amounts, are the totals of the commodities mentioned in our corpus of 82 texts. These are as follows:

<i>commodity</i>	<i>number of texts</i>	<i>total</i>
<b>cereals</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>&gt;305,919 qts.</b>
ŠE.BAR <sup>MEŠ</sup> (barley; cf. → <i>tarmu</i> ) <sup>34</sup>	6	41,127 qts.
flour <sup>35</sup>	15	>244,060 qts.
flour or grain <sup>36</sup>	1	[x] qts.
[x] (plausibly grain or flour) <sup>37</sup>	1	1,000 [qts.? <sup>?</sup> ]
→ <i>tarmu</i> (emmer?) <sup>38</sup>	3	1,005 qts.
→ <i>abbebe</i> ŠE.BAR <sup>MEŠ</sup> - <i>na</i> (cereal products) <sup>39</sup>	9	18,727 qts.

<sup>33</sup> This does not of course exclude the possibility that Persian royal women organised grand banquets (cf. *Esther* 1:9, on which see Mathys, this volume).

<sup>34</sup> PF 0705, PF 0706, PF 1942:3, PF 1943:1, PF 1952:1, NN 2356:4.

<sup>35</sup> PF 0699, PF 0700, PF 0701, PF 0702, PF 0703, PF 0704, NN 0117, NN 0174, NN 0324, NN 0797, NN 0919, NN 1843, NN 1874, Fort. 6352 and Fort. 7864. In three cases (PF 0699, PF 0700 and NN 0174) the flour is qualified as *mariya*, *manuya*, *battimanuya* (Old Persian \**varya-*, \**vanya-*, \**pati-vanya-*): “excellent, exceeding, eminent” (so Tavernier 2007: 406-7 [4.4.2.15, 4.4.2.23, 4.4.2.24], correcting Hinz 1973: 81). The expression is to be read as a whole, not as a grading scale (as Lewis 1987: 84-5 already saw), and can therefore not be related to the three classes of barley and wheat meal listed by Polyaeus *Strat.* IV.3.32 (*pace* Stevenson 1997: 146). At the same time, the existence of three grades of quality in flour are not only mentioned by Polyaeus, but also known from Achaemenid Bactria (cf. Naveh and Shaked [forthc.], esp. C1); two different qualities of flour are mentioned in Aršāma’s viaticum for Neḫtiḫōr (DAE 67). Actual grades are therefore the explanation for the sequence *mariya*, *manuya*, *battimanuya*, even though the expression itself was not used in a literal sense.

<sup>36</sup> PFa 29:1 is an entry in a journal dealing with either grain (barley) or flour (relevant lines broken off).

<sup>37</sup> The name of supplier in NN 0697 is only partly preserved: [...] -*āš-na*. The only possibility seems Masdayašna, a grain and flour supplier based at Persepolis and once associated (as in NN 0697) with PFS 0007\* and with provisions for the court (PF 0701). NN 0697 refers to a place named Akkuba, a locality with a *partetaš* (NN 1455) and close to Appištapan (NN 0049), which, in turn, was near Persepolis, the seat of Masdayašna. In short, the illegible commodity mentioned in NN 0697 may well have been flour or grain. Incidentally, it may be noted that Akkuba seems to have been a settlement of pre-Achaemenid date as would appear from its identification (Vallat 1998a: 100, 102-4) in a Neo-Elamite letter from Susa (Paper 1954, no. 1; different reading in Hinz 1986: 230).

<sup>38</sup> PF 0723, PF 0724 and NN 2554.

<i>miktam</i> (fruit)	2	7,500	qts.
→ <i>karukur</i> (pomegranates?) <sup>40</sup>	2	7,500	qts.
→ <i>abbebe razi</i> (food made from grapes?) <sup>41</sup>	2	300	qts.
UDU.NITÁ <sup>MEŠ</sup> (sheep/goats)	12	>2,732	
UDU.NITÁ <sup>MEŠ</sup> (unqualified) <sup>42</sup>	2	1,277	
UDU.NITÁ <sup>MEŠ</sup> <i>hasana</i> (adult sheep/goats) <sup>43</sup>	1	797	
→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs) <sup>44</sup>	4	316	
<i>kariri</i> /UDU.NITÁ <sup>MEŠ</sup> → <i>hadumiya</i> (newborn lambs) <sup>45</sup>	7	>342	
GUD <sup>MEŠ</sup> (cattle) <sup>46</sup>	6	36	
MUŠEN <sup>MEŠ</sup> (birds)	5	2,027	
→ <i>basbas</i> (ducks) <sup>47</sup>	5	106	
→ <i>ippur</i> (geese?) <sup>48</sup>	4	27	
→ <i>šudaba(h)</i> (chicken-sized fowl) <sup>49</sup>	3	300	
MUŠEN <sup>MEŠ</sup> → <i>kuktikka</i> (‘kept’ birds, poss. wild fowl) <sup>50</sup>	3	1,485	
MUŠEN <sup>MEŠ</sup> → <i>miššatannaš</i> (birds of all kinds) <sup>51</sup>	1	109	
GIŠ <sup>MEŠ</sup> GEŠTIN <sup>MEŠ</sup> (wine) <sup>52</sup>	6	>37,360	qts.
→ <i>madukka</i> (honey) <sup>53</sup>	10	>20	qts.
→ GIŠ <sup>MEŠ</sup> I <sup>MEŠ</sup> (here: ghee)	2	81	qts.
GIŠ <sup>MEŠ</sup> I <sup>MEŠ</sup> <i>ra-mi</i> (refined [sheep] ghee; → <i>rami</i> ) <sup>54</sup>	1	25	qts.
GIŠ <sup>MEŠ</sup> I <sup>MEŠ</sup> UDU.NITÁ <sup>MEŠ</sup> - <i>na</i> (sheep ghee) <sup>55</sup>	1	56	qts.
→ <i>banura</i> (cheese) <sup>56</sup>	2	11	
→ PA <sup>MEŠ</sup> (?) <sup>57</sup>	2	9	

<sup>39</sup> PF 0711, PF 0712, PF 0713, PF 0714, PF 0715, PF 0716, NN 0189, NN 0766 and PFa 06.

<sup>40</sup> NN 0923, NN 1735.

<sup>41</sup> PF 0717, PF 0718.

<sup>42</sup> PF 0696, NN 0490.

<sup>43</sup> NN 2261:1-3.

<sup>44</sup> NN 0071, NN 0846, NN 0921 and NN 2261:1-3 (text also mentions adult sheep/goats).

<sup>45</sup> PF 0695, PF 2033, NN 0067, NN 0184, NN 0921 (also mentioning lambs), NN 1525 and NN 2089.

<sup>46</sup> PF 0691, PF 0693, PF 0694, NN 0506 and Fort. 1681. Probably, these were (fattened) oxen as appears from the Aramaic gloss *twrn*, “oxen,” on PF 0693. Compare *twr kbr*, “a heavy ox” on the closely-related text PF 0692 (cf. fn. 88 below).

<sup>47</sup> PF 0697, PF 0698, PF 2034, NN 0790 and NN 2213.

<sup>48</sup> PF 0697, PF 0698, PF 2034 and NN 0790.

<sup>49</sup> PF 0697, PF 0698 and PF 2034.

<sup>50</sup> PF 0697, PF 0698 and PF 2034.

<sup>51</sup> NN 0790.

<sup>52</sup> PF 0728, PFa 30:1, PFa 31:1, NN 2041:1, NN 2195:1, NN 2493:6 and Fort. 7865 (cf. fn. 236 below).

<sup>53</sup> PF 0719, PF 0720, PF 0721, PF 0722, NN 0676, NN 1383, NN 1407, NN 1901 (cf. fn. 234 below), NN 2030 and Fort. 6767.

<sup>54</sup> PF 0726.

<sup>55</sup> NN 1384.

<sup>56</sup> PF 0725, NN 0906.

2.3. *The presence of the king* – It was Hallock’s opinion that the phrase <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA *tibba makka/kitka* suggests “the actual presence of the king ... at the place named” and that the commodities could be “for the consumption of travelling parties,” i.e. the court, when it was moving (1969: 24). At the same time, he expressed great uncertainty as to the exact circumstances and purpose of the commodities issued.<sup>58</sup> Not long before his death, Hallock apparently retracted these views, though without revealing his new arguments.<sup>59</sup>

The main issue to be solved is whether commodities that are consumed or poured “before the king,” were intended for actual banquets, in the physical presence of the king (the table of the king in strict sense) or found their way to the court at large, including guards and other personnel (the Table of the King in larger sense). Who was consuming all those meats, pastries and pomegranates, all that delicious bread, wine, wine-jelly, honey, ghee and cheese? The answer to this question hinges on the exact meaning of the postposition *tibba* in the phrase OD/PN *tibba makka/kitka*.

The first to establish the correct meaning of *tibba* (*ti-ib-ba*, *te-ib-ba*) was Walther Hinz, who, in 1942, determined that it had to mean “vor” (1942: 347-8).<sup>60</sup> He did so on the basis of XPh<sub>e</sub> 26, where the word refers a preceding paragraph,<sup>61</sup> and DB<sub>e</sub> IV.7-8, where the phrase *u tibba pepraka* must mean “was read before me.” At the same time, Hinz determined that *tibbe* (*ti-ib-be*) is a cognate form of *tibba* and means “voraus.” This form occurs several times in the Bīsoṭūn inscription in the expression *tibbe da*, “I sent forth” (e.g., DB<sub>e</sub> II.13).<sup>62</sup> These basic two meanings, “before, forth” (in time and space), have been unanimously accepted.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>57</sup> PF 0727, NN 1894.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. *idem* 1985: 608, where an even more cautious approach is chosen.

<sup>59</sup> Letter to D.M. Lewis dd. 14/XII/1979, referred to by Tuplin 1998: 78.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. *idem* 1952: 31 and EW s.vv. *te-ib-ba*, *ti<sup>2</sup>-ba*, *ti-ib-ba*, *ti-ib-be*.

<sup>61</sup> XPh<sub>e</sub> 25-6 *hi šama dayama appa tibba tallika*, “among the lands that have been written above” (not “[diese Länder, die] (in der) Inschrift geschrieben (sind),” as in Weißbach 1939: 191, 195). The Akkadian version has *maḥru* (“before, in the presence, in front of”), the Old Persian *upari* (“above”). Compare *tibba/tebba* in the Neo-Elamite inscriptions of Hanni of Aiapir (EKI 75: 8, EKI 75a: 9, EKI 76: 5; cf. Hinz 1962), apparently referring to the accompanying reliefs. *tibba* is first attested in a late Middle Elamite economic text from Malyān, TTM 90 rev.4<sup>1</sup> (Stolper 1984: 131, “sent forth, issued?”). It also occurs in some of the Neo-Elamite ‘Nineveh’ letters (see EW s.v. *ti-ib-be* and Hinz 1986: 229-30), a Neo-Elamite letter from Susa (Paper 1954 no.1: 7; cf. Hinz 1986: 230; EW s.v. *ma-ak-ki(?) -ba*; Vallat 1998a: 100, 102-4) and in a Neo-Elamite letter at Yale (MLC 1308:5 in Jones & Stolper 1986: 243-7). All these texts are notoriously hard to interpret and of little help for defining the meaning of *tibba*.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. the use of *tibbe* in Fortification contexts: *halmi parnakkak tibbe daka*, “the sealed document was sent to Parnakka” (PFa 28:5), *anka tuppi nukmar parnakkak tibbe danda*, “whenever you send a tablet from you to Parnakka” (*ibid.* 12), *umaya tibbe daš*, “he sent forth Umaya” (PF 1858) and *barša tibbe dašda*, “he sent forth (barley) to Persepolis” (NN 2110).

<sup>63</sup> Cameron 1959: 475 (“above”); Hallock 1969: 761 (“before, in behalf of”); Vallat 1977: 99 (“devant, avant, en avant”); *idem* 1998a: 101 (“devant, en avant, auparavant”); Grillot 1983: 214 and *idem* 1987: 29 (“devant”); Stolper 1984: 131 (“forth”); *idem* 2004: 84 (“before?”); Jones & Stolper 1986: 244-6 (“forth, before, out”); Grillot, Herrenschmidt & Malbran-Labat 1993: 59 (“devant”); Quintana 2001 (“ante”).

The expression PN *tibba* is based on the original locative use of *tibba*, as appears most clearly from *u tibba pepraka*, “(the text) was read/read repeatedly before me” (DB<sub>p</sub> IV.7-8).<sup>64</sup> In this case one already senses a developed use, however, since king Darius probably did not intend to focus on the fact that the composer of the inscription stood in front of him, but rather that he appeared before him, i.e. read the text at his court, in his presence. As such, *tibba* does not describe a precise spatial constellation, but a social and hierarchical (courtly) setting. Likewise, *tibba* in <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA *tibba makka/kitka* may have outgrown the primary locative meaning of the postposition and have acquired a specific, developed sense. This is *a priori* likely given the particular circumstances and administrative context, which must have been well-defined for the Persepolis scribes. For this reason, Hallock and the Elamite dictionary have adopted translations that allow for a non-literal interpretation of the phrase: “before, in behalf of” (Hallock 1969: 761) and “vor dem König (= bei Hofe)” (EW s.v. *ti-ib-ba*). Indeed, it may well be that <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA *tibba makka/kitka* points to the presence of the king, but it does not focus on the spatial constellation of the monarch sitting at a table, but rather on his presence as nucleus of the court, at which the food and drink were distributed and consumed.

More solid ground is reached by studying the precise Fortification contexts. First, in PF 0730, there is the phrase *irtaštunakka makki*, “consumed towards/near Irtaštuna,” where the suffix *-ikka*, “to, towards, at,” replaces the usual *tibba* (*irtaštuna tibba makka*). This confirms that the person in the expression PN *tibba makka* is present in direct or indirect sense. Of special importance are the texts on the feeding of the king’s horses. Five texts deal with barley which <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA *ti-ib-ba* ANŠE.KUR.RA<sup>MES</sup> *ma-ak-iš-da*, “before the king horses have consumed.”<sup>65</sup> As usual with commodities “consumed before the king,” these texts lack month dates. Moreover, the tablets are sealed with PFS 0007\*, which is exclusively applied to texts on disbursements of the type “consumed before the king” (cf. §2.5 below). There is therefore no doubt that we are dealing with the same genre of texts, with the only differences that horses are involved. Unlike, allegedly, Caligula (Cassius Dio LIX.14), Darius probably did not invite his horse to his dinner parties. The texts on horses clearly indicate that <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA *tibba makka* does not mean “consumed in front of the king” or “at the king’s table” (in strict sense), but “consumed at the king’s court.”<sup>66</sup>

<sup>64</sup> Vallat [forthc.] translates “lue et relue devant moi,” assuming an iterative meaning for the reduplicated form *pepraka*. The Old Persian version has *patiyafraθiya paišiyā mām*, “it was read aloud before me (DB<sub>p</sub> IV.91 [Schmitt 1991: 45, 74]; there is no Akkadian version).

<sup>65</sup> PF 0707, PF 0708, PF 0709, NN 0554 and NN 0857. Note that all these texts have *ma-ak-iš-da*, instead of the more common spelling *ma-ki-iš-da*; this may point to a common scribe. The total of barley listed in these five texts is 13,300 qts. A number of other texts refer to disbursements for horses “of the king” (EŠŠANA-*na*), but with different seals and not necessarily implying the presence of the court, as the *tibba ... makišda* texts do (see below).

<sup>66</sup> The case of PF 0710 is somewhat different, as Garrison (1991: 12 with fn. 76; *idem* 1996: 30-1) already saw. Here, barley is issued, which 7 GUD<sup>MES</sup> GIŠ<sup>IN</sup><sup>MES</sup> *-na* <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA *ti-ib<-ba>* *ma-ak-ka*<sub>4</sub>, “7 head of cattle on straw, (afterwards) consumed before the king, have received.” Unlike other *tibba* texts, the tablet has a month date: it pertains to a period of almost five months (V-IX/21). This underlines that we are dealing with a different situation: cattle, destined for

That the horses were indeed at the court, and not kept on stable at a different location, appears from the toponyms mentioned in the texts. In three, possibly four, out of five cases, the location and the year date mentioned match with places where commodities are “consumed before the king.”<sup>67</sup>

2.4. *The Table of the King* – Having established that texts stipulating that commodities were consumed or poured “before the king” do imply the presence of the king, but not necessarily that the commodities were used at his own dinner table, it appears that the evidence from the Fortification tablets agrees quite well with what the classical sources, notably Heraclides (*apud* Ath. IV.145e-f) and Polyaeus (*Strat.* IV.3.32), tell us about the institution known as the King’s Table (Heraclides: τὸ δεῖπνον τὸ βασιλέως καλούμενον).<sup>68</sup> Food and drinks prepared for the royal dinner not only fed the king, his family and his immediate entourage, but was also redistributed, *via* the king’s table, to courtiers, personnel and, notably, the king’s guard, who dined at a different location (Heraclides), but within the king’s vicinity or “before the king” as the Persepolis scribes would say. This is especially true for meat, which, as Heraclides reveals, is taken from the royal table to the king’s guard dining in the courtyard. Polyaeus stipulates that requisitions for the King’s Table not only included vast amounts of commodities for the members of the court, but also barley, chaff and straw for the livestock travelling with the court. This is the same as in the tablets, where rations for the court’s horses are described with the HAL-EŠŠANA *tibba* formula.

As for the ingredients of the king’s dinner, it is easy to see that, overall, the evidence from the Fortification archive is in line with the information provided by Polyaeus and Heraclides. The emphasis is on cereals, meat and wine in the Greek and Elamite evidence. There are some differences of detail, however. The most important of these is that the tablets show that barley was of much greater importance than wheat species such as emmer, whereas Polyaeus gives equal amounts at the beginning of his list (but he does give much higher amounts of barley reserved for soldiers and

consumption at the court, was kept on stable and given barley as fodder until they were slaughtered in late Fall, presumably upon the arrival of the king (cf. Garrison *ll.cc.* and Koch 1993b: 70, 88). Taking this atypical document as evidence that the *tibba* texts do *not* imply the presence of the king, as Lewis (*apud* Tuplin 1998: 78) did, seems methodologically unjustified (note that Tuplin, *l.c.* acknowledges that PF 0710 is atypical).

<sup>67</sup> Horses consuming barley “before the king” and commodities consumed “before the king” at the same location in the same year: at Bessitme in Dar.22 (PF 0708 and NN 0906; cf. NN 0911), at Umbabanuš in Dar.21 (PF 0720, NN 0857), and at Umpuranuš in Dar.22 (PF 0709, Fort. 6767). Another possible match is that of horses consuming and commodities consumed “before the king” at Dašer in year [x] (NN 0554) and Dar.21 (NN 2554). The fifth place mentioned in the horse texts is Uhakinna<sup>?</sup> (PF 0707), which does not occur elsewhere.

<sup>68</sup> Literature on the subject of the table of the king is abundant. See, among other studies, Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1980: 154-7, 169; *idem* 1989: 133-5; *idem* 1995: 292-300; *idem* 1997; Lewis 1987; Briant 1989; *idem* 2002: 286-97, 314-5, 921-2 and index s.v. royal table; Schmitt 1993; Stevenson 1997: 38-40, 143-52; Amigues 2003; Jacobs, this volume; Kistler, this volume. Amigues (2003, *passim*) adduces weighty evidence for the attribution of the Polyaeus passage to Ctesias.

animals).<sup>69</sup> Secondly, the tablets do mention dairy products (cheese, ghee) and honey, but not the many condiments listed by Polyaeus.<sup>70</sup> The reason for this may simply be that these products were not locally produced, or at least not produced within the Persepolis economy, and therefore not recorded in our tablets.

Meat was, according to the Greek and Elamite evidence, mostly from cattle, sheep (and goats), small and large fowl (including fattened geese and ducks).<sup>71</sup> The difference is that Heraclides also lists horses, asses, camels and deer, whereas Polyaeus mentions the daily consumption of 30 horses and 30 gazelles. Consumption of equids and camelids is never mentioned in the Fortification archive, though it surely must have been a common feature; indeed “we do not have to presume a Persepolis precinct for retired horses” (Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1995: 294). Presumably, the slaughter and distribution of meat from these animals was the task of an office that did not leave its records in the Fortification archive, perhaps because it was entirely within the royal domain (but cf. → <sup>GIŠ</sup>IN<sup>MEŠ</sup>). As for gazelles: products and animals acquired through hunting and fishing are never mentioned in the archive,<sup>72</sup> unless animals were caught and subsequently fed/fattened before slaughter (cf. → *kuktikka*). Similarly, products gathered in nature, such as acorns, mushrooms, truffles, and nuts are never documented, because the archive only considers culture products (including honey). This may account for the absence of some other commodities mentioned by Polyaeus: almonds, almond and terebinth oil, which are products from wild mountain trees, and salt, which is found abundantly on the shores of Iran’s salt lakes. In short, the apparent differences in terms of ingredients of the royal dinner are explicable from the disparity

<sup>69</sup> On the economy of the ratio given by Polyaeus see Amigues 2003: 28-34.

<sup>70</sup> Note that the honey mentioned by Polyaeus is not real honey, but *manna*, hence different from the honey, product of apiculture, mentioned in the tablets (cf. → *madukka*).

<sup>71</sup> On fowl for the royal table see also Hdt. VII.199 and the fragment from the *Letter of Cleomenes* (in Ath. IX.393c) that speaks of ten thousand smoked coots, five thousand thrushes and ten thousand smoked quails (φαληρίδας ταριχηράς μυρία, τυλάδας πεντακισχιλίας, χέννια ταριχηρά μύρια). On the letter see Briant 2002: 289 and Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1997: 334.

<sup>72</sup> Amigues 2003: 18 suggest that the gazelles might have been kept “en semi-liberté” in royal paradises. If so, such animals would still be considered as game, and therefore not mentioned in the archive. The absence of *Arabian* ostriches (στρουθοὶ οἱ Ἀράβιοι), mentioned by Heraclides, from the tablets may be explained on similar grounds. The Arabian ostrich (*Struthio camelus syriacus*), now extinct, was an indigenous wild gamebird of the Arabian peninsula (mentioned by Xen. *Anab.* I.5.1-3; cf. Salonen 1973: 85, 165-6) and is unlikely to have been kept at bird farms near Persepolis. It is represented, though, on some Fortification seals, as are its eggs (see now Root 2007: 197-9, with a line drawing of PFS 0535\*, a banquet scene with a seated figure holding an ostrich egg; see also Collon 1998). That fish is not mentioned in the Fortification archive, has nothing to do with its short life or unsuitability as ration commodity (pace Stevenson 1997: 145). Both fresh and dried fish is abundantly attested in contemporary Mesopotamian institutional archives (cf. Kleber 2004). 10,000 fish were consumed at Assurnasirpal’s Kalaḫ banquet (Finet 1992: 32-3, 39). Large quantities of iced and (dried) fish are mentioned in a letter to Sargon II dealing with distributions of tribute and audience gifts to the queen, the crown prince and a number of courtiers (ABL 568 in Parpola 1987: 35-6).

of perspectives: the Greek sources list all the ingredients, whereas the tablets only mention the ones that are produced locally and within the Persepolis economy.

The most critical result from the comparison of both groups of sources is that it becomes evident that the Persepolis administrators, like the Greek historiographers, thought of the king’s table as an *institution*, as a complex organisation with its own rules and hierarchy, with very specific needs and demands, and with its own administrators. The contents of tablets recording commodities consumed “before the king” as well as the specific use of seals on these tablets (cf. §2.5 below) reveal that <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA *tibba makka* does not, in the first place, refer to dinners, but to this institution.

The comparison also reveals some crucial differences. The most important and, for the moment, most baffling of these is that the amounts given by Heraclides and Polyaeus are far higher than those found in the tablets. The easiest way to show this, is by comparing the total amounts of cereals and cereal products in the years for which most documentation has survived regarding royal disbursements. These totals are: 203,317 qts. (Dar. 21), 59,587 qts. (Dar.19) and 32,050 qts. (Dar.22). Now, even if we estimate that the transliterated corpus of Fortification texts represents only 5% of the original archive (cf. Henkelman 2006: 110-111), and even if we assume that the total amounts were consumed during a relatively short stay of, say, one month in Fārs, the figures do not work. Daily amounts of cereals recalculated from the total amounts based on the above assumptions (corpus = 5%; stay = 30 days) are: 135,545 (Dar.21), 39,725 qts. (Dar.19) and 21,367 qts. (Dar.22). These figures are *purely hypothetical*, but their value is in demonstrating the great difference with the amounts given by Polyaeus, whose list of cereals (not including chaff and straw) daily consumed at the king’s table amounts to as much as 25,720 *artabe* or 771,600 qts.<sup>73</sup>

The situation is a bit different in case of other commodities. The number of cattle mentioned in the tablets is quite low compared to what Polyaeus reports. The hypothetical daily amounts of livestock, large and small fowl, and wine agree, on the other hand, much better with the figures given by Polyaeus:

<i>commodity</i>	<i>highest year total</i>	<i>hypothetical daily amount</i>	<i>Polyaeus</i>
cattle	18 (Dar.22)	12	100
sheep/goats	1,308 (Dar.19)	872	700
large fowl <sup>74</sup>	289 (no date)	193	800
small fowl	1,044 (no date)	696	600
wine <sup>75</sup>	12,350 (no date)	8,233 qts.	5,000 qts. <sup>76</sup>

<sup>73</sup> For the conversion of *artabe* to quart see Hallock 1969: 72.

<sup>74</sup> Under large fowl are counted: → *ippur*, → *basbas* and → *šudabah* (Fortification texts) and geese, doves and goslings (Polyaeus). Small fowl are any other birds mentioned (cf. → *kuktikka*; → *miššatanna*). The maximum total amounts for both kinds of fowl are taken from the same text, PF 2034.

<sup>75</sup> Maximum amount of wine attested in PF 0728 (undated). Compare the total of 10,900 qts. for Dar.21 (PFa 30:1, NN 2291:15).

It is obvious that chance preservation (and transliteration) plays into these figures. The wine total for Dar.19, for example, is based on two texts only (NN 2041:1, NN 2291:15), the large and small fowl total on just one (PF 2034). A few texts on cattle consumed during Dar.22 would suffice to bring the hypothetical daily amount much closer to Polyaeus’ figure of 100 head. Moreover, there is a considerable latitude within the parameters chosen: the overall estimation that the transliterated corpus amounts to 5% of the original archive may be a bit too conservative in the case of Dar.19. Secondly, the assumption of a 30 days stay in Fārs is entirely arbitrary.

Still, no matter how unreliable the above figures are as quantitative data, they still show a conspicuous relative trend. Whereas differences between the Fortification texts and Polyaeus regarding all other commodities may be due to chance preservation and statistical error, the huge difference in the case of cereals is much less likely to be explained in the same way. This is all the more true since the amount of Fortification texts dealing with cereals for the king’s table is relative high, which reduces the risk of statistical anomalies resulting from chance preservation.

The question rises whether the Achaemenid court, when in Fārs, was entirely fed from the resources of the institutional economy reflected in the Fortification archive. Perhaps we should regard this as *a priori* unlikely. The royal commissaries quite plausibly drew from a variety of resources. The court may have travelled with its own resources, obtained from elsewhere, especially of certain luxury products. Second, there probably was a possibility of buying additional barley from the local peasant population. Third, agro-pastoralist tribes in western Fārs may have traded their livestock surpluses directly with the representatives of court (cf. Briant 1982: 57-112; Henkelman 2005). Fourth, and most important, taxes in kind probably were imposed both on the local population as they were on the inhabitants of other regions (Babylonian cities) in order to supply for the table of the king. The crucial, yet hitherto imperfectly understood term in this context is Old Persian \**upayāta-*, which occurs in the Fortification tablets as *ukpiyataš* and in Late Babylonian archives as *upiyāta* and denotes a tax paid in kind that had to be transported to the court. I will return, albeit briefly, to this term in later sections (cf. §5 below with fn. 166 and §6), but a full treatment of *ukpiyataš* in the Fortification archive will not be attempted here. The same is true for Elamite *huthut*, plausibly a (partial) functional equivalent of *ukpiyataš*.<sup>77</sup>

The image of the table of the king provided by the tablets is thus very likely to be lopsided in terms of income and this may account in part for the differences with Polyaeus’ information. But there is another question, equally important to the solution of this problem, that is whether the perspectives of Polyaeus and the tablets, at least in case of cereal consumption, may not be incompatible because they pertain to

<sup>76</sup> Polyaeus has 500 μάριας (*marriš*) = 5,000 qts.

<sup>77</sup> The contexts in which the two terms occur are revealing as to the provisioning for the royal table, but the full exploration of this dossier has to await future study. On *huthut* see already Hallock 1969: 19, Stolper 1977: 254, EW s.vv. *hu-ut.KI.MIN* and *uk-be-ya-taš*, Koch 1990: 17-8, Briant 2002: 464, Henkelman 2003b: 108-9 and *idem* [forthc.] §6.3.5.

different contexts. This possibility is worth reviewing since the percentage of cereals reserved as fodder is very different: about 4% in the tablets against as much as 78% according to Polyaeus. In other words, fodder is the distorting factor in the comparison between the two sources. When omitting it altogether from the totals of cereals, we get an entirely different outcome: only 5,720 qts. *artabe* or 171,600 qts. in Polyaeus against 202,917 qts. in tablets dating to Dar.21, or a hypothetical daily amount of 135,278 qts.<sup>78</sup> That Polyaeus includes a much higher percentage of fodder might be explained by assuming that his list pertains to the court as it moved through the empire, i.e. when there was no time for pasturage and horses had to be fed largely with barley, chaff and straw from (local) reserves. Such reserves are actually attested in various sources (see Briant [forthc. 2] fn. 64). By contrast, when the court was in Fārs there would be, even during its tours through the region, enough opportunity to put horses on pasture.

2.5. *Seals* – The particular seal pattern associated with texts on commodities consumed “before the king” has been studied extensively by Garrison (1991; *idem* 1996).<sup>79</sup> The most striking feature is that seals associated with these transactions do not appear elsewhere and that basically only three seals are used for disbursements consumed at the court: PFS 0007\*, PFS 0066a,b,c\*, and PFS 0093\*.<sup>80</sup> These seals are described by Garrison as elite seals, made with extra-ordinary craftsmanship by virtuosi artists, and undoubtedly used by very high-ranking individuals if not members of the royal family themselves.

PFS 0007\*, with the trilingual inscription “I am Darius [...],” could be applied in the single-seal protocol.<sup>81</sup> In contrast to seals used in the counter-sealing protocol (with two or more seals on the same tablet), seals like PFS 0007\* could be used alone because they represented an office or official with overarching authority.<sup>82</sup> In the case of PFS 0007\*, this must have been the general director of the royal food supply, since receipts

<sup>78</sup> Note that both quantities are much higher than what would be expected if the royal table fed ‘only’ 15,000 individuals as Ctesias and Dinon (*apud* Ath. IV.146c) would have it. 22,500 qts. of grain would be enough to feed fifteen thousand people (assuming 1.5 qt./day rations). The amount of cereals for human consumption, as listed by Polyaeus, could suffice for as many as 114,400 people (!). See Lewis 1987: 84-5.

<sup>79</sup> This pertains only to so-called memorandum-type documents or simple receipts. Journal entries on commodities consumed “before the king” are not considered in this section, because journals are registers with abstracts drawn from the memoranda and are always sealed with special seals pertaining to the accounting offices at Persepolis. PF 0696 and PF 0728 are irregularly shaped tablets, with holes on the right side and no seals. On such tablets, which are almost never sealed, see Henkelman 2006: 61-2 (with references).

<sup>80</sup> PFS 0002 does not belong to this corpus because the only “consumed before the king” text on which it is impressed (PF 0710) is a-typical (cf. fn. 66 above). PFS 0859\* and PFS 0861 both appear only once; the case of the seals on NN 0490 is somewhat different (cf. fn. 86 below).

<sup>81</sup> On the seal see Hinz 1971: 299-300; Hallock 1977: 127-8; Garrison 1991: 13-4; *idem* 1996; Lewis 1994: 30-1; Garrison & Root 2001: 68-70 (with full bibliography).

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Hallock 1977: 127-8; Garrison 1991; Garrison & Root 2001: 11-2; Henkelman 2006: 79-80.

for all sorts of commodities consumed or poured “before the king” are sealed with this seal.<sup>83</sup> There are two exceptions: flour and livestock (sheep/goats and cattle).

Receipts of flour are sealed with PFS 0007\*, but co-sealed with PFS 0066a,b,c\*.<sup>84</sup> This suggests, as Hallock (1977: 127-8) surmised, that the holder of PFS 0066a,b,c\* was the royal miller, i.e. the official responsible for the milling of the royal grain.<sup>85</sup> Whereas all other products, apart from livestock, were requested directly from the suppliers and storehouses by the holder of seal PFS 0007\*, flour first had to be ground before it was used for the royal table. Note that a “royal mill” occurs in the Fortification archive: as Lambert (1970: 245) suggested, HAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> EŠŠANA-na in PF 0533 is probably a royal mill (“minoterie du roi”; cf. HAR for Akk. *erû*, “grinding slab”).

As for livestock: with just one exception all texts on receipts of livestock for the royal table are sealed with PFS 0093\*, always in the single-seal protocol.<sup>86</sup> The holder of this seal must have been, as Hinz aptly put it, the “Hoffleischermeister des Darius” or

<sup>83</sup> PFS 0007\* is used, in the single-seal protocol, on 44 Fortification tablets: PF 0697, PF 0698, PF 0705, PF 0706, PF 0707, PF 0708, PF 0709, PF 0711, PF 0712, PF 0713, PF 0714, PF 0715, PF 0716, PF 0717, PF 0718, PF 0719, PF 0720, PF 0721, PF 0722, PF 0724, PF 0725, PF 0726, PF 0727, PF 2034, PFa 06, NN 0189, NN 0554, NN 0676, NN 0697, NN 0766, NN 0790, NN 0857, NN 0906, NN 0923, NN 1383, NN 1384, NN 1407, NN 1735, NN 1894, NN 1901, NN 2030, NN 2213, NN 2554 and Fort. 6767. Additionally, PFS 0007\* also appears on a tablet from Susa, MDP 11 no. 308 (cf. below). In one case, a receipt of → *tarmu*, consumed “before the king” (PF 0723) is co-sealed with PFS 0861, a seal that is considered illegible by Garrison and Root (2001: 447). It may be just another impression of PFS 0007\* (as assumed by M.B. Garrison, pers.comm. 5/V/2007). If not, we are dealing with an inexplicable oddity.

<sup>84</sup> PFS 0066a,b,c\* occurs, with PFS 0007\*, on 13 tablets: PF 0699, PF 0700, PF 0701, PF 0702, PF 0703, PF 0704, NN 0117, NN 0174, NN 0324, NN 0797, NN 0919, NN 1843 and NN 1874. All these texts deal with flour; PFS 0066a,b,c\* always appears on the left edge of the tablet. Presumably it occurs on Fort. 6352 (flour; PFS 0007\*) too, but no photograph of the left edge is available.

<sup>85</sup> PFS 0066a\* was first replaced by PFS 0066b\*, and then by PFS 0066c\*. The last two are made as exact copies of the first. These and other ‘replacement seals,’ and the texts on which they occur, will be discussed in forthcoming study by Garrison and Henkelman. On PFS 0066a,b,c\* see Hallock 1977: 127-8; Garrison 1991: 10-2; *idem* 1996: 28-9; Garrison & Root 2001: 69-70.

<sup>86</sup> PFS 0093\* is used on 15 tablets: PF 0692, PF 0693, PF 0694, PF 0695, PF 2033, NN 0067, NN 0071, NN 0184, NN 0506, NN 0846, NN 0921, NN 1525, NN 2089, NN 2094 and Fort. 1681 (on PF 0692 and NN 2094 cf. fn. 88 below). Once, on PF 0691, PFS 0859\* is used instead. Garrison (1991: 14-5) describes this seal as “very large and magnificent” and suggests that it is the personal seal of the person who normally used the office seal PFS 0093\*, but had not access to the latter at the time PF 0691 was sealed. Perhaps the explanation may alternatively be sought in the fact that cattle in PF 0691 came from the *umbartašbe* (“people of Umbartaš”), a unique stipulation in the *tibba* corpus that plausibly points to a different status of the cattle (cf. NN 1703 and NN 2390 for the *umbartašbe*). Another exception is NN 0490, sealed with an unidentified stamp seal and with a cylinder seal that Hallock marked as “evidently not ‘royal’ ” (ms.). It may that the final line of the text PN *amme marriš*, “PN took (what remained) on hand” (i.e. what was left; cf. EW s.v. *am-ma*) points to a different bureaucratic context, which could explain the different seals. Note that the same phrase occurs on PF 0696, also a text on livestock consumed “before the king,” and also irregular because it has a conical shape and is unsealed (cf. fn. 79 above).

his “Barbecue-Chef” (1971: 300). As a prestigious heirloom seal, PFS 0093\* may have been in the possession of one of the members of the royal family.<sup>87</sup>

PFS 0007\* and PFS 0066a,b,c\* appear exclusively with consumed “before the king” texts, whereas PFS 0093\* typically occurs with the same type of texts, but also, twice, with another type of provision for the king/court.<sup>88</sup> In addition, PFS 0007\* is also found on the single administrative tablet from Achaemenid Susa, MDP 11 no. 308 (Sb 13078).<sup>89</sup> This suggests, very strongly, that PFS 0007\* belonged to an official who was permanently based at the court and travelled with the court from Susa to Persepolis and elsewhere. The same may be true for PFS 0066a,b,c\* and PFS 0093\*. Note that the three seals are all used at a wide range of localities where commodities were consumed “before the king.”<sup>90</sup> At the very least, their holders travelled with the king on his regular tours through Fārs (cf. §6 below), but logically they were the permanent directors of the inner-court administration. Here, then, we find some glimpses of the court’s own administrative and bureaucratic apparatus that was responsible for the supplies for the royal table (at large) and that, when in Fārs, linked up with the local administration, hence the presence of tablets sealed with PFS 0007\*, PFS 0066a,b,c\* and PFS 0093\* among the Fortification texts.

The picture we find is probably seriously lopsided, however: requisition of supplies may have been only part of the responsibilities of the holders of the royal

<sup>87</sup> PFS 0093\* is the famous Kuraš the Anšanite seal and like PFS 0051, the seal used by Irdabama, a Neo-Elamite heirloom (cf. below). On the seal see Hinz 1971: 300-1; de Miroschedji 1985: 285-7; Garrison 1991: 3-7, *idem* 1996: 29-31, *idem* 2002: 76 with fnn. 42-3, 60, and esp. *idem* [forthc.]; Garrison & Root 1996/98: 6-7, figs. 2a-c; Vallat 1996: 392; Henkelman 2003a: 190 fn. 32, 193-4; Young 2003: 245; Potts 2005: 18-9. The office of the holder of the seal may be comparable to that of the *rab nikkassī*, who was responsible for disbursements of cattle and other livestock at the Neo-Babylonian court (see Jursa, this volume).

<sup>88</sup> Garrison hesitantly includes PF 0692 in the commodities “consumed before the king” category, even though the formula used is different: <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA-ik-ka za-ag-gi, “paid to the king.” The case is not unique, however: NN 2094 is a nearly-identical text (74<sup>7</sup> head of sheep/goats paid to the king), again sealed with PFS 0093\*. The texts both use the unexplained word *abbara* (written *ab-ba-ba-ra* in NN 2094 [EW s.v. *ab-ba-ra* suggests “schwer, feist” but that is in disagreement with the word order]). Whatever the precise meaning of the texts, they do not seem to be irregular descriptions of the “consumed before the king” scenario, but rather indicate a precise, yet hitherto enigmatic other procedure (cf. Garrison 1996: 29, “the text may not be a J text *in stricto sensu*”). Briant (2002: 465-6) surmises that the *zaggi*- formula is used in case of transactions between the general and the royal economic domains; since the ox mentioned in PF 0692 (with Aramaic docket: *twr kbr*, “a heavy ox”) was to become part of the king’s herds and therefore the responsibility of the court’s livestock manager. This explains the use of PFS 0093\*.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. → <sup>GIS<sub>1</sub></sup>MEŠ below for comments on this text.

<sup>90</sup> This is true for all three seals. Garrison (1996: 29) suspected, on the basis of the published tablets with impressions of PFS 0093\*, that this seal might not have travelled very far “but stayed mainly in a cattle-raising area overseeing the cattle belonging to the crown and did not travel with the king.” The inclusion of the unpublished texts renders this cautious remark unnecessary: PFS 0093\* is associated with 29 places and 7+4+4 unnamed villages. I therefore hold that, like PFS 0007\* and PFS 0066a,b,c\*, PFS 0093\* travelled with the court.

seals. As Garrison suggested, the officials “would not only receive deliveries, but also oversee the provisioning of the king’s table and ensure that the commodities were in the correct place in time for the king’s arrival” (1996: 28). Such inner-court movements and distribution of commodities remain invisible to us and must have been recorded on documents (clay tablets, wax writing boards or Aramaic scrolls with clay sealings) that were kept at the court.<sup>91</sup>

The officials responsible for the administration of the king’s table may be recognised in some Greek descriptions of the Achaemenid court. Thus, we find the “stewards of (the king’s) commissary,” mentioned by Xenophon (Cyr. VIII.1.9, τῶν εἰς τὴν δίαιταν ἐπιτηδείων ἐπιμεληταί), and a “superintendent of the table,” mentioned by Heraclides (*apud* Ath. IV.145f, ὁ τῆς τραπέζης ἐπιμελούμενος). Unfortunately, the Greek sources do not offer us any more detail on these officials’ responsibilities than the Fortification tablets do.

What we do find, however, are a limited number of special allocations upon the king’s orders, such as the 100 sheep/goats for Irtaštuna in Fort. 6764 (quoted in §1 above) or the 2,000 qts. of wine given to the same (PF 1795). The king also gave orders to give grain to a miller (NN 1528) and he had flour issued to lance-bearers (PF 1247), undoubtedly members of his own guard (cf. Henkelman 2002). Such allocations are extra-ordinary because they remain outside the system of the royal table: they are not commodities requested to be consumed “before the king” and then redistributed within the court (at large), but were directly taken from the resources of the Persepolis economy and given to a given individual or group upon the king’s orders.

### 3. *The table of Irdabama*

Irdabama, presumably the mother of Darius or one of his wives, was economically very active and held a rank of considerable importance. She was involved in the management of her estate at Šullaggi, could dispose of an entourage of *puhu*, “servants, pages,” and had *kurtaš* (workers) specifically assigned to her to perform tasks for her at Tirazziš (at or near modern Šīrāz) and other places.<sup>92</sup> Some of these teams of *kurtaš* amounted to as many as 490 individuals (cf., e.g., PF 1028). Perhaps not incidentally, the only recorded case of ducks being given to workers is associated with Irdabama (NN 0845).<sup>93</sup>

<sup>91</sup> On wax writing boards cf. Briant 1992; Henkelman 2006: 87.

<sup>92</sup> Šullaggi: PFa 27 (on the location of the town see Henkelman 2006: 358 fn. 824). Workforce: PF 1002 (Nukusantiš), PF 1028, PF 1041 (Tirazziš), PF 1098 (Tamukkan), PF 1109 (Tikraš), PF 1198 (Kurra), etc. (see also Brosius 1996: 132-44). Pages: Henkelman 2003b: 133-5.

<sup>93</sup> Irdabama, her workforce, and her estate have been extensively studied by Maria Brosius, who also convincingly demonstrated that the title *abbamuš* refers to the same woman, as does the qualification *abbakkanaš* for certain work teams (Brosius 1996: 127-44; cf. Henkelman 2000: 501). On Irdabama see also Koch 1994: 136-8; Henkelman 2006: 256. Uchitel (1989) discusses the work teams of Irdabama/*abbamuš*, but his inference that these workers were “owned” by Irdabama is unfounded (constructions like *kurtaš* PN-*na* do not necessarily imply possession). Aperghis alternatively suggested that they were not owned by Irdabama,

Irdabama could also dispose over large quantities of commodities: 2,220 qts. of “apples of Irdabama” are mentioned (NN 1849) and yields of barley that belonged to her could amount to 33,870 qts. (PF 0577).<sup>94</sup> No doubt at least some of this produce came from her own estates at Šullaggi and other places.

Irdabama had the authority to give commands to the administrative hierarchy, as appears from NN 1946, an allocation of 500 qts. of wine to Mida (*irdabama šerašda*, “Irdabama ordered (it)”). Furthermore, she sealed documents pertaining to her assets and workforces with her personal seal (PFS 0051), which carried enough weight to be used alone (single-seal protocol). Other documents relating to Irdabama are sealed with PFS 0078, a seal used by Karkiš (not the same as the Karkiš discussed in §5), PFS 0036\* and PFS 0077\*, both used by Rašda. The two officials served as royal stewards and were particularly involved with the management of Irdabama’s workforce.<sup>95</sup> The large dossier on Rašda is of particular interest: presumably the same official is responsible for fruit storage at the *partetaš* (plantation) of Nupištaš (to be used during royal visits?), the receipt of grain at (the) *iyān* (court), the rations of workers at a various *nutannuyaš* (livestock stations), the transport of commodities as *huthut* (“requirements” [for the royal table?]), and the feeding of royal horses. All these contexts may be more or less royal; a cursory reading of Rašda’s profile indicates that he was a leading royal commissioner whose tasks included the care for Irdabama’s workforce. It seems that the use of seal PFS 0036\* is largely confined to that specific part of Rašda’s activities.

Incidentally, PFS 0077\*, the second seal used by Rašda in relation to Irdabama, is a Neo-Elamite heirloom depicting an audience scene with an enthroned female. One may wonder whether Rašda purposely chose or was given this particular seal. Regardless of that question, however, the image is a powerful reminder that court protocol need not have been confined to the king and his satraps. Given the evident importance of Irdabama and the extent of her activities, an audience ceremony mirroring that of the king would certainly not be out of place.<sup>96</sup>

but by the king who assigned teams to estate-holders like Irdabama (2000: 137-8, 140). Given the uncertain status of the *kurtaš*, this conclusion is unwarranted too. Note that *abbamuš* (*ab-ba-mu-iš*) represents the transliteration that Hallock came to prefer over his initial *abbaukiš* (*ab-ba-uk-iš*; cf. 1969: 664).

<sup>94</sup> If we are to assume that all texts that name Rašda, Irdabama’s steward (cf. below), as responsible (*šaramanna*) official, there are even more texts on fruit, sesame and wine deposited for Irdabama: PF 0146, PF 0147, PF 0148, NN 0085, NN 0230, NN 0331, NN 0422, NN 0800, NN 0817, NN 0989, NN 1156, NN 1505, NN 1849, NN 1996, NN 2114, NN 2141, NN 2442, NN 2445 and NN 2506 (26,680 qts. of wine). Compare also NN 0534, a journal including several entries relating to Irdabama and in which Rašda occurs as official responsible for all transactions.

<sup>95</sup> On PFS 0051 and its use see Garrison 1991: 3-7; *idem* 1996: 30; *idem* [forthc.]. On PFS 0036\* see Garrison & Root 2001: 72 (with bibliography).

<sup>96</sup> On PFS 0077 see Garrison [forthc.], where a line drawing and photographs of its impressions are published and the seal image is discussed in the context of Neo-Elamite glyptic. See also Hinz 1971: 281, Brosius 1996: 86, *idem* 2006: 41-2, *idem* [forthc.; *non vidi*], and Lerner [forthc.; *non vidi*]. Hallock (ms.) read the seal inscription on PFS 0077\* as <sup>SAL</sup>*še-rāš DUMU hu-pan-a-ah-pi-na*, “Šeraš, daughter of Huban-ahpi” (see also Garrison, *o.c.*). EW s.v. *f.še-rāš* claims that a

Irdabama also issued letter-orders, as appears from PFa 27, addressed to the accountants at Šullaggi and demanding the disbursement of 1,500 barley from her House (*ulhi*). The letter is remarkable because it refers to a document on leather, i.e. written in Aramaic, and because it orders the administrators to review the sealed document (probably the Aramaic text) and (then) draft an account. Though not fully understood, we get the impression from PFa 27 that Irdabama’s own administrative staff was able to link up with the intricate Persepolis administration on various levels and in various languages.

Finally, commodities were *irdabama tibba makka/kitka* “consumed/poured before Irdabama.” By analogy with the *tibba* texts pertaining to the king’s court, it may be assumed that Irdabama had a court of her own, as well as a ‘table’ that served the redistribution of goods within her own economic domain. All texts relating to the table of Irdabama are sealed with her personal seal, PFS 0051. The following commodities were dispensed:<sup>97</sup>

<i>commodity</i>	<i>number of texts</i>	<i>total</i>
<b>cereals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>51,880 qts.</b>
ŠE.BAR <sup>MEŠ</sup> (barley; cf. → <i>tarmu</i> ) <sup>98</sup>	1	5,660 qts.
flour <sup>99</sup>	1	280 <sup>?</sup> qts.
grain (barley) and flour <sup>100</sup>	1	4,620 qts.
flour <i>mi-iš-[ba-]r za-na</i> <sup>1</sup> (of all kinds; → <i>miššatannaš</i> ) <sup>101</sup>	1	39,880 <sup>?</sup> qts.
→ <i>abbebe</i> ŠE.BAR <sup>MEŠ</sup> - <i>na</i> (cereal products) <sup>102</sup>	1	1,440 qts.
UDU.NITÁ <sup>MEŠ</sup> (sheep/goats) <sup>103</sup>	1	255
UDU.NITÁ <sup>MEŠ</sup> → GIŠ <sup>IN</sup> <sup>MEŠ</sup> - <i>na</i> (on straw)	1	50
→ <i>zarakka</i> (grazing)	1	165
→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs)	1	40
GIŠ <sup>GEŠTIN</sup> <sup>MEŠ</sup> (wine) <sup>104</sup>	3	3,760 qts.
(GIŠ)KAS <sup>MEŠ</sup> (beer) <sup>105</sup>	1	190 qts.

female name is unlikely given the context in which the seal is used, a position that can only be described as utter nonsense. Compare also the audience scene (rather than a worship scene) on the famous De Clercq seal in the Louvre.

<sup>97</sup> Compare the table given by Brosius 1996: 130. PFa 27, NN 1973 and NN 2055 are included in this table, but, though they are sealed with PFS 0051, they do not pertain to provisions for Irdabama’s table (PFa 27 does *not* have the phrase *irdabama tibba*, as indicated).

<sup>98</sup> PF 0740.

<sup>99</sup> NN 0855.

<sup>100</sup> PF 0738.

<sup>101</sup> NN 1773. Hallock (ms.) indicates that the amount of flour may alternatively be read as 69,880 qts. (!).

<sup>102</sup> PF 0739.

<sup>103</sup> Three categories listed in one text: NN 0641.

<sup>104</sup> PF 0735, PF 0736 and PF 0737.

<sup>105</sup> NN 1332.

The quantities of cereals, meat, wine and beer consumed and poured “before Irdabama” are considerable and add up to roughly one tenth of the amount consumed at the king’s table. This observation is quite startling considering the number of people who were fed by the table of the king. It is therefore all the more remarkable that Irdabama is completely unknown to the Greek sources. Parallel to this, it is interesting to observe that the commodities consumed “before Irtaštuna,” i.e. Artystone, Darius’ “favourite wife” (Hdt. VII.69), come in much more modest quantities (cf. §4 below).

The size of Irdabama’s table necessarily implies that her private administrative staff of commissaries, accountants and scribes must have been extensive too. The fact that, besides her own seal, her stewards used their proper office seals, should be seen in this context, as should the fact that Irdabama issued letter-orders on complicated administrative matters (PFa 27; cf. above).

Irdabama was a real traveller: commodities were consumed “before” her at Hidali, Kandama, Liduma and Persepolis, Susa, Šursunkiri<sup>2</sup> and Tandari (cf. §6 below). Only in case of Persepolis and Susa, there is evidence that the king may have been present at the same place on the same time.<sup>106</sup> This circumstance is hardly due to chance preservation: it seems more likely that Irdabama was able to travel on her own, with her own staff and her own ‘table.’ Such itineraries, from estate to estate, remind of Plutarch’s statement that Stateira was permitted by Artaxerxes II to travel in an open carriage, thus allowing the women of the region to approach and greet her, so that the queen became much beloved by the common folk (*Art.* 5.3). As Briant has argued, the queen’s behaviour mirrors that of the Persian king (Briant 1988: 256-7; *idem* 2002: 191), who toured the Persian countryside, was approached by the *autourgoi*, accepted their petitions, and received little presents. Until now, it was not clear, however, whether Persian royal woman who do so on their own or only when they travelled with the king. The evidence from the tablets leads me to suspect that the itineraries of Irdabama, and those of Irtaštuna, not always coincided with the movements of the king’s court. The advantages would have been manifold: the royal women could see to the management of (large) estates attached to the crown, were informed about local problems, and made the royal presence tangible in more areas than those covered by the king alone, showing its unrivalled richness and its power, as well as its magnificence.

That we have a text on commodities (2,360 qts. of wine) issued for Irdabama’s table at Susa (PF 0737) requires some elaboration. The text, sealed with Irdabama’s seal (PFS 0051), is an oddity because Susa normally falls outside the scope of the Persepolis administration.<sup>107</sup> Very likely, the document was drafted and sealed at Susa; from there

<sup>106</sup> Note that, when we have documentation on the king and Irdabama staying at the same location, such as Persepolis in Dar.21 (PF 0701 and NN 0641) or Susa in Dar.22 (PF 0737 and Sb 13078), disbursements for the table of the king and those for the table of Irdabama were still documented on separate receipts. Though I cannot prove it, it seems likely to me that the relevant texts pertain to the same periods of the year. This would suggest that Irdabama’s House and her own administrative staff also functioned as such when they were physically linked to the king’s court.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Henkelman 2006: 65 fn. 133; on the text see also Garrison 1996: 35 fn. 75.

it was brought to Persepolis by Irdabama’s staff and handed over to the local administration for reasons that we cannot fully grasp. The same scenario applies to documents pertaining to disbursements for Irtaštuna at Ecbatana, which also entered to Fortification archive. If there is a structural mechanism underlying such apparent intrusions, it would have to be that several regional institutions (Susa, Ecbatana, Persepolis) were in regular contact and would exchange documents on royal disbursements that had taken place outside their proper territory. Be that as it may, documents like the one drafted at Susa and sealed with PFS 0051 in any case shows that Irdabama was surrounded by a private staff that travelled with her, just as the holders of seals PFS 0007\*, PFS 0066a,b,c\* and PFS 0093\*, who were responsible for the king’s table, accompanied the migrant court.

Apart from those mentioned in the *tibba* texts, there are a number of other places associated with Irdabama, notably Šullaggi, Tirazziš and Tikraš.<sup>108</sup> Beyond the Persepolis region (and Susa), Irdabama may have had affairs in the region of Borsippa. This is, in my opinion, the conclusion to be drawn from the appearance of a certain <sup>f</sup>*ap-pa-mu-ú* (also <sup>f</sup>*pa-am-mu-ú*) in three Late Babylonian documents dating to Dar.19 (BM 29447) and Dar.20 (BM 85009; BM 28899), which were recently published by Zadok (2002; *idem* 2003). The person referred to receives meat cuts from the Borsippian Ezida temple. This, and the fact that she is twice introduced as <sup>f</sup>*ap-pa-mu-ú šá É.GAL šá LUGAL* (BM 85009:14<sup>o</sup>; BM 28899:7), suggested to Zadok that <sup>f</sup>*ap-pa-mu-ú* was the name of an Achaemenid queen, one of the wives of Darius. As he himself indicates, however, <sup>f</sup>*ap-pa-mu-ú šá É.GAL šá LUGAL* constitutes a unique variation of the usual Late Babylonian formula *MUNUS šá É.GAL* (“Lady of the Palace”). This raises the possibility that <sup>f</sup>*ap-pa-mu-ú* is a title rather than a personal name. Confirmation is found in the many attestations of the word *abbamuš* (<sup>SAL</sup>*ab-ba-mu-iš*), well established as a title of Irdabama in the Fortification archive (Brosius 1996: 127–44; cf. Henkelman 2000: 501). The observation that Irdabama/*abbamuš* is the most economically active royal woman at Persepolis as well as the circumstance that records pertaining to her and her domain date to Dar.16–25 endorse the identification of Irdabama with <sup>f</sup>*ap-pa-mu-ú šá É.GAL*. This means that this royal woman had a source of income in the Borsippa region; the meat cuts may in fact have been distributed among her local staff (as Zadok *o.c.* suggests). One might even speculate that the two documents under discussion are just the tip of the iceberg and that Irdabama’s privileges at Borsippa could be part of an economic domain that also included estates, like the ones owned about a century later by Parysatis in the Nippur and Babylon regions and beyond (see Cardacia 1991 and Stolper 2006a).<sup>109</sup>

<sup>108</sup> On Tikraš, the local *iyān* (“court”), *partetaš* (plantation) and Irdabama’s workforce see Henkelman 2006: 256–7. On Šullaggi and Tirazziš see above.

<sup>109</sup> One Fortification text mentions the title <sup>SAL</sup>*ba-nu-ka*, a loan from Old Persian \**bānūkā*, “lady, queen” (Hinz 1975: 63; Tavernier 2007: 417 [4.4.7.16]). The text is a receipt of 2,075 qts. of flour for 83 (*recte* 23) men and 7 boys/servants (*puhu*) identified as *banukanabe*, “people of the *banuka*.” I do not agree with Hinz (*l.c.* and *idem* 1970: 423) that the title can only refer to Atossa, because Irtaštuna already has the title of *dukšiš*. That title, which means “royal woman, princess,” is not specific to Irtaštuna (cf. §4 below). More important, Hinz’ explanation is an obvious and unfounded attempt to restore some status to Atossa – who

#### 4. The table of Irtaštuna

Irtaštuna (Artystone) is one of the women who sometimes has the title *dukšiš*, “royal woman, princess,” added to her name (PF 1795, Fort. 6764) and who, after the king and Irdabama, is the most frequently-mentioned member of the royal house in the Fortification archive.<sup>110</sup> She held at least three estates, at Uranduš (= Mirandu, Randu), at Kuknakkān, and at Matannan.<sup>111</sup> These estates were managed by stewards, Šalamana and, possibly, Datukka,<sup>112</sup> in cooperation with officials with the title *hirakurra* (perhaps “commissioner”).<sup>113</sup> Irtaštuna also had her own workforce at Matannan (cf. below) and Iršama, her son from Darius, owned an estate (*ulhi*) in the same place (NN 0958).<sup>114</sup>

hardly occurs at all in the archive (cf. §4 below) – and by doing so adjust the perspective of the tablets to that of Herodotus. That this is not the way forward requires no explanation. Rather, the economic activities of Irtaštuna and Irdabama would suggest that either of them could be a “lady” or “queen” (whatever the precise implications of the title *banuka*). Irdabama is perhaps the most likely option, since PF 1078 is sealed with PFS 0157, a seal otherwise collocated with the toponyms Kurdušum (PF 0036), Šursunkiri (PF 0039) and Zakzaku (PF 0039, PF 1233), all three places in the Fahliyān region. NN 0855, a receipt of flour consumed “before” Irdabama may pertain to Šursunkiri, or in any case to a place in its vicinity (cf. fn. 223 below). This, as well as her wide economic activities and the extent of her table make it feasible that Irdabama was the *banuka*. On the other hand, Irdabama also had the unique title of *abbamuš* (cf. above). It is therefore certainly not excluded that *banuka* rather refers to Irtaštuna. And it is even possible that the title refers to yet another royal woman (but not necessarily Atossa!), who has hitherto not been attested in the archive.

<sup>110</sup> On *dukšiš* (\**duxčiš*) cf. fn. 6 above. On Irtaštuna see Lewis 1985: 110; Koch 1994: 135-6; Brosius 1996: 27-8, 50, 97, 125-7; Henkelman & Kleber 2007: 167-9.

<sup>111</sup> Matannan: NN 0761 and NN 0958 (translation in Henkelman & Kleber 2007: 167); Uranduš: PF 1835, NN 1137 and NN 2523; Kuknakkān: PF 1836, PF 1837 and NN 1137. Other texts refer to the same places in relation to Irtaštuna, but do not explicitly label them as her estates.

<sup>112</sup> Šalamana is the addressee of six letter-orders from Irtaštuna (PF 1836, PF 1837, PF 1838, PF 1839, NN 0761 and NN 1137), which link him to all three of the estates and suggest that he was the general manager. As such, Šalamana also occurs as official responsible for figs deposited for Irtaštuna at Matannan (PF 0168). He seems to have the same role in a text on the deposit of apples at the plantation of a place called Murkaziš (NN 0222). Šalamana is also responsible for mothers’ rations issued at Kuknakkān, presumably to female workers in Irtaštuna’s service (NN 1707). Perhaps, he is also allocates barley rations for workers at Uranduš, who may also be members of her labour force (NN 1896; <sup>HAL</sup>sa<sup>7</sup>[-x]-<sup>f</sup>ma<sup>7</sup>-na). Finally, Šalamana allocates → *abbebe razi* (PF 0718 with PFS 0007\*) and livestock (NN 2089 with PFS 0093\*) that were “consumed before the king” at Kuknakkān in Dar.24. That Šalamana organised these royal disbursements too is explained from his role as manager of Irtaštuna’s assets at Kuknakkān. Datukka occurs in two letter-orders from Irtaštuna, PF 1835 and NN 2523 ([<sup>DIŠ</sup>]r<sup>da</sup><sup>7</sup>-a<sup>2</sup>-šá<sup>2</sup>-ak-ka<sup>2</sup>), both on wine allocations. Perhaps Datukka was Šalamana’s deputy, but he may also be identical with the wine supplier Datukka at Pit(t)annan (PF 1161, PF 1162, PF 1206, PF 1772, NN 0010, NN 0035, NN 0213, NN 0347, NN 0399, NN 0856 and Fort. 6180).

<sup>113</sup> The term *hirakurra* occurs nine times: in eight letter-orders from Irtaštuna (cf. below) and in a letter-order from her son Iršama (NN 0958). Hallock tentatively restored the word in NN 2402, in a broken and unclear context. Apart from that uncertain case, *hirakurra* is a term

Like Irdabama, Irtaštuna used her own personal seal, PFS 0038, which is found on her eight known letter-orders, as well as on nine documents on commodities “consumed before Irtaštuna.”<sup>115</sup> Five documents in the latter group state that commodities were *kitka terika*, “poured (and) ...ed,” or *makka terika*, “consumed (and) ...ed” instead of regular *kitka* or *makka*.<sup>116</sup> The meaning of *terika* has thus far not been convincingly explained, nor has the significance of its exclusive use in texts on the table of Irtaštuna.<sup>117</sup> Caution is warranted, since texts from Irtaštuna’s scribe are also unique in using the term *hirakurra* (“commissioner?”) and irregular spellings for *iddu*, “issue!” (cf. fn. 113 above). The use of *terika* could therefore reflect a different scribal context, not necessarily a different organisational or administrative procedure, or a deviant bureaucratic practice. On the other hand, it is striking that three of the texts with *terika* (PF 0733, PF 0734, PF 2035) pertain to commodities consumed at an *appišdamanna*, perhaps “crownland” or a particular type of estate granted to certain officials, but in any case an entity that seems to be (semi-)autonomous from the Persepolis economy at large and therefore appears only rarely in the Fortification texts.<sup>118</sup> Also, these three texts are the only cases of commodities consumed “before” Irtaštuna and her son Iršama. The other two *terika* texts are unusual as well: one is on wine transported to Ecbatana and poured there “before” Irtaštuna (PF 0732), the other is on → *miksu ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-na* issued for consumption by the royal woman’s table via the

specifically employed by the scribes of Irtaštuna and her son. For its etymology see Hinz 1975: 142 and Tavernier 2007: 426 [4.4.7.68] (\**īrakara-*, “commissioner”, lit. “energy-maker”); EW s.v. *hi-ra-kur-ra* (“Kommissar?” or “Überbringer?”). Officials known as *hirakurra* in Irtaštuna texts: Ankama (wine, Uranduš: NN 2523), Bababarna<sup>7</sup> (wine, Kuknakkān: NN 1137), Irtima (wine, Kuknakkān: PF 1836, PF 1837; wine: PF 1838, PF 1839), Umayā (barley, Matannan: NN 0761), Utar (wine, Uranduš: PF 1835). Iršama’s *hirakurra* at Matannan is Masdumatu (*tarmu*: NN 0958). Other idiosyncrasies of Irtaštuna’s scribe(s) are the spelling *ud-du* and *i-du* (the last only in her letters) for regular *id-du* (“issue!”).

<sup>114</sup> Matannan also had a plantation (*partetaš*; PF 0144).

<sup>115</sup> PFS 0038 is always used in the single-seal protocol. On PFS 0038 see Hinz 1971: 298; Garrison 1991: 7-10; Garrison & Root 2001: 83-5 (with bibliography); Root 2003: 28-9, *idem* [forthc.]; Seidl 2005: 157-9.

<sup>116</sup> PF 0732, PF 0733, PF 0734, PF 2035 and NN 0454.

<sup>117</sup> EW s.v. *te-ri-qa* ventures “es ist verbraucht worden,” but offers no arguments in support.

<sup>118</sup> *Appišdamanna* is a loan from Old Persian \**abistāvana*, the precursor of Middle Persian *awestān* and New Persian *ustān* (Gershevitch 1969: 166; Hinz 1975: 18; Tavernier 2007: 445 [4.4.12.1]). The problem is that these and other cognates have quite a wide range of meanings: “province,” “crown land,” “district.” The *appišdamanna* visited by Irtaštuna and her son seem to be at three different places (Uttiti, Hunar and Menri), but all three of them are “of Napumalika.” This Napumalika recurs in NN 1446 as responsible for rations of workers at Gisat (in the Fahliyān, not far from Hunar). The names of two other individuals associated with an *appišdamanna*, Irtuppiya (PF 1527, NN 2157) and Uštana (NN 2556?, Fort. 1705), frequently occur as those of officials responsible for workers’ rations. Note that an estate (*irmatam*) of Uštana (PF 2071) and several estates of Irtuppiya (PF 0330, NN 0290, NN 1711) are known. It is not clear to me whether this evidence implies that Irtuppiya, Uštana and, by association, Napumalika, were estate holders with some administrative duties, or stewards tending the crown’s estates.

people of Akkurban.<sup>119</sup> It could be argued that the root *ter-* means “loan” (*vel sim.*); hence the verbal base *teri-*, presumably derived from *ter-*, could mean “to give as loan.”<sup>120</sup> If that holds true, texts with *terika*, “loaned?”, do apply to specific circumstances: Irtaštuna at various points drew from resources outside her own domain; the receipts are then acknowledgements of a debt. In the case of the three *appišdamanna* it may be assumed that Irtaštuna and her son were travelling together, halted at the estates and drew from its resources for their table. If they indeed had remunerate the holder of the estates, this would be a crucial piece of evidence against the assumption that all land and resources were considered as royal.

The following amounts of cereals, *abbebe*, fruit, wine and beer for the table of Irtaštuna and Iršama are attested:

commodity	number of texts		total
<b>cereals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4,681</b>	<b>qts.</b>
flour <sup>121</sup>	1	290	qts.
flour and [grain <sup>?</sup> ] <sup>122</sup>	1	4,260	qts.
→ <i>miksu</i> ŠE.BAR <sup>MEŠ</sup> - <i>na</i> <sup>123</sup>	1	10	qts.
→ <i>tarmu</i> (emmer?) <sup>124</sup>	1	100	qts.
→ <i>abbebe</i> ŠE.BAR <sup>MEŠ</sup> - <i>na</i> (cereal products) <sup>125</sup>	1	21	qts.
→ <i>abbebe</i> (food; → <i>abbebe</i> ) <sup>126</sup>	1	26	qts.

<sup>119</sup> NN 0454. The beginning of text, as read by Hallock, is not entirely comprehensible: 1 BAR *mi-ik-su* ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-*na* HAL *ú-šá-ia* AS *ba-ir-šá-mar* AS *ak-kur-ba-na-be e<sup>?</sup>-iš-da* FSAL *ir<sup>1</sup>-taš-du-na ti-ib-ba ma-ak-ka<sub>4</sub>*. The sign E in *e<sup>?</sup>-iš-da* is clear, but the verbal form constitutes an inexplicable *hapax*; I therefore propose to consider E as a mistake for DU (the shape of which can be very close to E). With the reading *du<sup>1</sup>-iš-da*, I translate the text as “10 qts. of *miksu* barley, (allocation by) Ušaya from Persepolis, the people of Akkurban received; it was consumed before Irtaštuna.”

<sup>120</sup> Neo-Elamite *terma* could be a cognate of *terika*. The word occurs once, in the following passage (S 301:1-4 in Scheil 1911: 93): 10 IM KU.BABBAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> BE *um-ma-nu-nu-na* BE *ri-ši-ki-tin te-ir-ma hu-ma-iš-da*, “10 shekel of silver of Ummanunu Riši-Kitin acquired as *ter*.” The text continues with a date and a list of witnesses. The interpretations of *te-ir-ma* as “en pret” (Scheil) and “als (Leih-)Kapital(?)” (EW s.v. *te-ir-ma*) seem perfectly acceptable, especially since the verb *huma-*, in contrast to *du-* (“receive”), does not imply possession, but rather temporal use or custody. If PN *humašda terma* means “PN acquired as loan,” it would be feasible that *terika* derives from a cognate verbal base *teri-* “to give as loan,” and means “loaned.” Note that *terru*, probably an Akkadicised Elamite word in the phrase *terru šetru* (repeatedly used in *Stone Stela 1* from Middle Elamite Haft Tepe) may derive from *ter*. Reiner (1973: 94) thought of “a meaning in the range of ‘delivery,’” but Hinz’ “(Leih-)Kapital, Kapitalschuld, Hypothek” (EW s.v. *te-ir-ru še-it-ru*) seems to fit the contexts of the expression better. Compare also *te-ir-ri-e* and *tir-ma-ni-e* in the Neo-Elamite *Šutruru Stele* (EKI 74 II.5-6, I.13); cf. EW s.vv. *te-ir(?) -ri(?) -e*, *tir-ma-ni-e*.

<sup>121</sup> PF 0731.

<sup>122</sup> PF 0733; consumption before Irtaštuna and Iršama.

<sup>123</sup> NN 0454.

<sup>124</sup> PF 0730 (*irtaštunakka makki*, “consumed towards/near Irtaštuna”); cf. §2.3 above.

<sup>125</sup> PF 0734; consumption before Irtaštuna and Iršama.

<sup>126</sup> Two categories listed in one text: NN 2502.

→ <i>madamiš</i>	1	17	qts.
→ <i>mitruša</i>	1	9	qts.
<b>fruit</b>	1	314 <sup>?</sup>	qts.
→ <i>raziyam</i> (grapes?) <sup>127</sup>	1	314 <sup>?</sup>	qts.
<sup>GIŠ</sup> GEŠTIN <sup>MEŠ</sup> (wine) <sup>128</sup>	1	170	qts.
( <sup>GIŠ</sup> )KAS <sup>MEŠ</sup> (beer) <sup>129</sup>	1	543	qts.

The above numbers are certainly incomplete in the sense that Irtaštuna, like the king and Irdabama, received additional commodities from other sources and *via* other procedures. In her particular case, we have to remember, once more, that the king ordered 2,000 qts. of wine and 100 sheep or goats to be given to his wife (PF 1795, Fort. 6764). Apart from that, there are seven texts on deposits of figs and *tarmu* “for Irtaštuna,” and two on allocations of 56 qts. of perfumed oil (with cedar aroma?) and a herd of 100 oxen (or bulls).<sup>130</sup> There even seems to be an account text entirely devoted to Irtaštuna’s ducks (NN 0568). Still, as has been noted above (§3), the amounts mentioned in the *tibba* texts are much more modest in the case of Irtaštuna than in that of Irdabama. This impression is strengthened by other documents: Irtaštuna also had her own workforce, at Matannan, but it is mentioned less frequently, and appears to have been of smaller size.<sup>131</sup> She also had an entourage of *puhu* (“servants, pages”).<sup>132</sup>

Like Irdabama and the king, Irtaštuna appears to have travelled around through Fārs and elsewhere. The evidence from the *tibba* texts suggest that she stopped at Ecbatana (cf. fn. 174 below), Hunar, Matezziš, Menri, Persepolis, Uttiti. Moreover, Irtaštuna probably visited her estates at Matannan, Uranduš and Kuknakkān at regular intervals (even though direct evidence is lacking). One of her letter-orders appears to be sent from Susa (NN 2523; cf. Henkelman 2006: 65 fn. 133).

It is intriguing that we have eight letter-orders from Irtaštuna, against just one from Irdabama.<sup>133</sup> Most of these documents deal with commodities to be issued to

<sup>127</sup> NN 1523.

<sup>128</sup> PF 0732.

<sup>129</sup> PF 2035; consumption before Irtaštuna and Iršama.

<sup>130</sup> Deposits of → *tarmu*: PF 0164 (700 qts.), PF 0165 (400 qts.), PF 0166 (7,100 qts.), PF 0167 (540 qts.), NN 1685 (2,930 qts.), NN 2081 (2,100 qts.). Figs: PF 0168 (570 qts.). Oil: NN 1319 (cf. fn. 268 below). The herd of cattle is given to Bagizza “of Irtaštuna,” apparently her agent (NN 1727; cf. Henkelman, Jones & Stolper 2006: 15-6).

<sup>131</sup> NN 0279 (*kurtaš*: 132), NN 1238 (*sitmap* women: 20), PF 1236 (mothers, *pašap* women: 3), NN 1734 (*idem*: 4), NN 2497 (mothers: 12). In PF 2049, seven *kurtaš ušnurimašbe* (cf. Hallock 1978: 111) [from??] Arachosia are mentioned. Are they travelling to Irtaštuna or one of her estates?

<sup>132</sup> PF 1454 (20 *puhu*), PFa 14 (71 *puhu* of the *abbamuš* [Irdabama] and Irtaštuna). See Henkelman 2003b: 133-5.

<sup>133</sup> PF 1835, PF 1836, PF 1837, PF 1838, PF 1839, NN 0761, NN 1137 and NN 2523. Irtaštuna’s name is mentioned in all these texts (*pace* Brosius 1996: 126 fn. 15). Koch (1994: 135) inferred that, since we have these letter-orders, they must be copies. The reason why they ended up in the Fortification archive, she supposed, was that “auch eine Königin verpflichtet war, ihre Buchführung genauestens in Ordnung zu halten und beispielsweise die Kopie ihrer

officials working for Irtaštuna such as Ankama and Darizza.<sup>134</sup> One letter, the one sent from Susa (NN 2523), is remarkable for allocating 300 qts. of wine to Irtena the report<sup>2</sup> maker (*tidda huttira*), perhaps to be distributed to Irtaštuna’s workforce.<sup>135</sup> Another (NN 1137) is an answer to Maudanda’s complaint that an allocation of wine from Uranduš, previously ordered by Irtaštuna, had not come through. In the letter, Irtaštuna orders the allocation of wine from Kuknakkan instead. More tantalising glimpses of the house of Irtaštuna are found in two tablets on rations for her workers (*kurtaš*) who are said to be “accounted for at Matannan” (*matannan mušip*), i.e. probably by her own administrative staff (PF 1236, NN 0279). The fact that this is mentioned in a tablet belonging to the Fortification archive suggest a close cooperation between the agents of Irtaštuna and the administrators of the Persepolis economy. The same may be concluded from an inventory letter reporting that barley was stored at Matannan “(in accordance with) a copy-document from Irtaštuna” (*sapsap irtaštunana*; PF 1857:17-20).

As for Iršama, all five texts mentioning his name are from Dar.24, when he was 24 years of age or younger. One letter-order by Iršama relates to his estate (*ulhi*; NN 0958); another document refers to his order of barley for Uparmiya/Parmys (PF 0309). The other three texts are the ones on the commodities consumed “before” Irtaštuna and Iršama (cf. above).

That Iršama was given his own *ulhi* at Matannan, does not alter the fact that Irtaštuna was clearly the principal estate-holder at Matannan. This is highly significant in light of the fact that a palace was built at the same location during the reign of her (half-)brother, Cambyses, as appears from a Late Babylonian text (YOS 7, 187; see Henkelman & Kleber 2007). As suggested elsewhere (o.c. 167-9), Darius may, after Cambyses’ and Bardiya’s death, have granted the palace at Matannan to Irtaštuna. Not only had the potential risk of Irtaštuna’s royal lineage been neutralised by her marriage to Darius, she seems henceforth have been recognised as the head of the Teispid branch of the royal family – this would at any rate seem to be the most plausible reason why she was granted control over the estate at Matannan. That Irtaštuna, not Udusana

Anordnungen in der Verwaltung abzuliefern.” Given the fact that they are sealed, it seems unlikely, however, that Irtaštuna’s letter-orders are copies. Rather, as presumably happened with Parnakka’s letter-orders, these documents were sent, kept by the addressee as proof (cf. Henkelman 2006: 86-90), collected periodically and brought to Persepolis for accounting. That the documents are found among the Fortification tablets is indeed surprising, but can be explained by the interwovenness of the Persepolis institution at large and semi-external units like the domain of Irtaštuna.

<sup>134</sup> Ankama: PF 1835; Ankama is *hirakurra* in NN 2523. Darizza: PF 1838; Darizza is supplier for *kurtaš* in PF 0963.

<sup>135</sup> Probably the same Irtena receives *tarmu* in deposit, for Irtaštuna (PF 0166). I follow Koch’s suggestion (1983: 30-1) that the function of the *tidda huttira* is similar to that of *titikaš* (e.g., PF 1953:25-8) and that both designations are used for officers who receive special rations and give them to labourers. Since *titikaš* (from Old Persian \**didika-*; cf. Akk. *didakku*) means “supervisor” (Tavernier 2007: 419-20 [4.4.7.33], with references), *tidda huttira* may have a similar meaning. As Koch surmised (*ibid.* fn. 77), *tidda* could be cognate of *titme*, “tongue” and of *tit*, plausibly “report” (see also Hallock 1969: 763; EW s.vv. *ti-it*, *ti-ud-da*.hh.hu-ut-ti-ib-ba, *ti-ut*, *ti-ut-me*), hence my tentative “report maker” for *tidda huttira*.

(Atossa),<sup>136</sup> was indeed considered as leading in ‘Teispid affairs’ is also clear from the role played by her son, Iršama. By Dar.24 the latter was starting to take responsibility for his family, as appears from his involvement in the barley allocation for his cousin, Uparmiya. At the same time, he still sat ‘at his mother’s table,’ or at least shared the institution, which must have been a centre-point for the family, with her.<sup>137</sup>

### 5. *The Table of Karkiš*

Apart from the king, Irdabama, Irtaštuna (and Iršama), there is only one person “before” whom commodities are consumed. This person is Karkiš, who appears in one text, NN 0306, with the phrase *karkiš tibba kitka*, “poured before Karkiš.” The text, previously unpublished, is given here after the transliteration by R.T. Hallock and collations by C.E. Jones and M.W. Stolper, and by myself (figs. 6-11):<sup>138</sup>

NN 0306 (Oriental Institute, Chicago)

box number: 0256

seal: PFS 0233 left edge and reverse<sup>139</sup>

obverse

1. 5 <sup>GIŠ</sup>GEŠTIN<sup>MEŠ</sup>
2. *kur-mín* <sup>HAL</sup>ú-šá-ia-
3. *na* <sup>AŠ</sup>pár-ma-<sup>Γ</sup>da<sup>1</sup>-na-
4. *an* <sup>HAL</sup>kar-ki-iš
5. *ti-ib-ba ki-*
6. *ut-ka<sub>4</sub>*

reverse uninscribed

<sup>1</sup> 50 (qts.) of wine, <sup>2-3</sup> allocation from Ušaya, <sup>3-4</sup> (at) Parmadan, <sup>4-6</sup> was poured before Karkiš.

There are several individuals named Karkiš in the Fortification archive, so one has to proceed with caution when trying to identify the person referred to in the above text. The fact that the *tibba kitka* formula is used, however, already indicates that an

<sup>136</sup> Despite Herodotus’ portrayal of her as all-powerful, Atossa hardly occurs in the Fortification archive. Two texts document deposits of 4,000 and 1,600 qts. of *tarmu* “for Udusana” (PF 0162, PF 0163). Otherwise, Udusana/Atossa remains unmentioned. On the name see Tavernier 2007: 212 [4.2.835].

<sup>137</sup> The extant receipts of commodities consumed “before” Irtaštuna and Iršama (PF 0733, PF 0734, PF 2035) are sealed with her seal (PFS 0038), not his.

<sup>138</sup> The author is grateful to M.W. Stolper (Oriental Institute) for permission to publish the text and the photographs made thereof for the Persepolis Fortification Archive project.

<sup>139</sup> The seal was previously unidentified, since the traces of its impression are faint. Comparison with impressions of PFS 0233 on PF 0328, PF 0329 and NN 1310 confirmed that NN 0306 too has an impression of this seal. On PFS 0233 see Garrison & Root 2001: 127.

individual of high status is referred to. Starting from this observation, the complex of texts plausibly related to the same Karkiš may be unfolded in four steps:

1) One Karkiš issued sealed *viatica* to travellers on the royal road, was based at Kurmana (~ Carmana, Kermān), and was sometimes himself the destination of travellers.<sup>140</sup> These circumstances makes it likely that Karkiš was satrap in Kurmana.<sup>141</sup> In addition, we have references to vast quantities of flour, wine and livestock received by a Karkiš together with (his) *taššup*, “people/soldiers,” at various places (cf. below). In one of these texts, Karkiš is labelled *kurmanuya*, “the Kurmanian” (NN 2261:16-8), showing that he is identical with the presumed satrap in Kurmana.

2) In PF 0681 a Karkiš receives 350 qts. of barley as ration/payment from Dakka, presumably at Pirraššetaš or Paššataš (VIII/21).<sup>142</sup> This Karkiš, travelling to Puruš and carrying an *halmi* (lit. “seal, sealed document,” hence “authorisation, *viaticum*”) from the king, is introduced as <sup>AŠ</sup>*pu-ru-iš* <sup>HAL</sup>*šá-ak-šá-ba-ma*, “satrap (in) Puruš.”<sup>143</sup> Assuming that there were no two homonymic satraps, the Karkiš in Puruš is probably the same as “the Kurmanian.”<sup>144</sup> Since Kurmana may have been the name of a region and its capital or residence,<sup>145</sup> Puruš may either have been another name of the same region, or the name of a district, or that of adjacent region also under control of Karkiš.<sup>146</sup>

<sup>140</sup> There are over 40 texts that mention Karkiš in one of these capacities. See, e.g., PF 1377, PF 1384, PF 1437, PF 1466. On some the texts mentioning *viatica* by Karkiš see Giovinazzo 1995: 152-4.

<sup>141</sup> On the basis of similar characteristics other satraps have been identified, such as Bakabana at Susa. See also Hinz 1970: 430 and Koch 1993a: 16.

<sup>142</sup> Dakka is associated with both places (Pirraššetaš: PF 0454, PF 0455, PF 0570, etc.; Paššataš: PF 0913, PF 0914, NN 0164, etc.). Koch (1990: 92) and EW (s.vv. *h.pa-iš-šá-taš*, *h.pír-ra-áš-še-taš*) suggest that the two toponyms refer to one and the same place; Tavernier (2007: 379 [4.3.67]) rejects this idea as “rather improbable” (but note that /r/ can be omitted in spelling, as in the case of *pa-iš* for regular *pa-ri-iš*). Dakka is often associated with PFS 0070, which may be his office seal. This seal is once collocated with Uranduš, a place in the central region around Persepolis (NN 2092). Another connection, between Pirraššetaš and Uranduš, is found in the person of Bakatanduš (cf. Koch 1990: 91-2). The places must have been in each other’s vicinity; the allocation of barley to Karkiš must have taken place in the central region.

<sup>143</sup> On this Karkiš see also Jacobs (1994: 197-8) and Klinkott (2005: 458, 495-6 and index q.v.). Petit 1990: 205 fn. 423 claims that Karkiš cannot have been a satrap “a proprement parler” (whatever is implied by this), since Puruš is not attested elsewhere and *therefore* (!) a region of small importance. The erroneous assumption made is that ‘real’ satraps are governors and other officials with the same title are of secondary rank (cf. below).

<sup>144</sup> Koch 1993: 16 draws the same conclusion.

<sup>145</sup> In DSz<sub>e</sub> 32, Kurmana appears as region, but Carmana was also a capital city/satrapal seat mentioned by Amm.Marc. (XXIII.6.49, *inter quas ... carmana omnium mater*) and Ptol. (*Geogr.* VI.8.13, Κάρμανα μητρόπολις, VIII.22.20, Κάρμανα τὸ βασίλειον).

<sup>146</sup> Hallock (1969: 746) suggested that Puruš might be the Ποῦρα mentioned by Arrian (*Anab.* VI.24.1) in a passage on Alexander’s march through Gedrosia. In it, Alexander advances ἐς τὰ βασίλεια τῶν Γαδρωσῶν, ὁ δὲ χῶρος Ποῦρα ὀνομάζεται. One possible translation is “to the royal residence of Gedrosia; the place/locality (χῶρος) is called Pura.” Based on this interpretation it is almost universally assumed that Pura is the name of the Gedrosian capital. Yet, τὰ βασίλεια is not necessarily the same as ‘capital,’ and χῶρος may be understood differently: “[Alexander advanced] to the royal residence of Gedrosia; the district/region (χῶρος) is called Pura” (a close parallel is found in *Ind.* 25.1 on the district

A second attestation of Karkiš as satrap may be found in NN 2220, a text on flour rations (90 qts./day) received at Kurkattiš, Hunar and Liduma by <sup>HAL</sup>*kar-ki-iš šá-ka<sub>4</sub>-ra-ba-na*. I take this to mean “Karkiš the satrap.”<sup>147</sup> That “the satrap” is enough to identify Karkiš is another argument in favour of the identification of Karkiš the presumed satrap in Kurmana and Karkiš the satrap in Puruš.

3) Karkiš the satrap in Kurmana/Puruš can also be identified with Karkiš “before” whom wine is poured since an impression of his seal, PFS 0233, can plausibly be identified on NN 0306 and four of the receipts of commodities for Karkiš and (his) *taššup*.<sup>148</sup> The fact that this seal is used in the single-seal protocol is indicative of Karkiš’ overarching authority. The texts may be listed as follows:

text	seal	date	supplier	commodity	recipient	location
NN 0306	PFS 0233	Ø/Ø	Ušaya	50 qts. of wine	poured “before” K.	Parmadan
PF 0328	PFS 0233	Ø/Ø	Ukbezana	32,310 qts. of flour	K. with <i>taššup</i>	Mannandanuš
NN 1310	PFS 0233	Ø/Ø	Anpirruša	2,000 qts. of wine	K. with <i>taššup</i>	Mannandanuš
Fort. 6179	PFS 0233	Ø/Ø	Da’urisa	14,970 qts. of flour	K. with <i>taššup</i>	Mišapar
PF 0329	PFS 0233	Ø/Ø	Da’urisa	21,400 qts. of flour	K. with <i>taššup bešiyamatiya</i>	Hapidanuš <sup>?</sup>
NN 2261:16-8	PFS 0027* <sup>149</sup>	Ø/22	Kussizza	291 sheep/goats	K. the Kurmanian for <i>taššup hallinup</i>	Kabaš?

Malana in the land of Oreitai). This is also the interpretation chosen in Robson’s Loeb translation (1933), probably because *ὁ δὲ χῶρος* seems to introduce a new piece of information, not a mere addition to *ἐς τὰ βασιλεια τῶν Γαδρωσῶν*. Note that Arrian himself refers to the name Pura only once; the second time he mentions *τὰ βασιλεια* of Gedrosia without naming Pura (*Anab.* VI.27.1). The problem that Koch sees between Arrian and PF 0681, that Pura cannot be both ‘capital’ of Gedrosia and the name of the satrapy of which Kurmana was the capital (1993a: 16), may therefore be entirely illusory. Note that the existence of a modern homonymic toponym (on which see, among others, Treidler 1957) does not prove that Pura was always a town, only that the toponym at some point came to be used for a locality in Gedrosia. Arrian’s text would seem to endorse the idea that this had not happened by late Achaemenid times. The definition of ‘Pura’ may therefore have shifted over time. In early Achaemenid times it may have denoted a region under Karkiš control, synonymous to, part of, or adjacent to Kurmana. In late Achaemenid times it may have been a region or district of what was now known as ‘Gedrosia’ (itself not sharply defined!). Eventually, it may have given its name to a town that may have developed around the royal residence mentioned by Arrian. On the name Puruš (*\*pōruš > \*pauruš*, “much”) cf. Tavernier 2006: 379.

<sup>147</sup> Hallock initially read <sup>HAL</sup>*kar-ki-iš-šá ka<sub>4</sub>-ra-ba-na*, but alternatively suggested <sup>HAL</sup>*kar-ki-iš šá-ka<sub>4</sub>-ra-ba-na* (ms.). *šá-ka<sub>4</sub>-ra-ba-na* would be a hybrid ‘Median’-Old Persian form of the title, which is usually spelled as either *šá-ak-šá-ba-ma* (Old Persian *\*xšaçaṣpāwā-*; cf. Schmitt 1976: 374 and Tavernier 2007: 79 [2.4.3.3]) or *šá-at-ra-ba-ma* (Median *\*xšaθrapāwā-*; Schmitt *l.c.* 386-7 and Tavernier *l.c.* 359 [4.2.1973]). NN 2220 is undated; the seal impressions have not been identified as yet.

<sup>148</sup> Seal PFS 0233 was previously not identified on NN 0306 (cf. fn. 139 above) or on Fort. 6179. Photographs of the latter text leave little doubt that the seal impressed on the reverse (twice) and the left edge are from PFS 0233.

<sup>149</sup> This text is an entry in a journal on livestock allocation; its seal is that of an accountant at Persepolis. The year indicated, 22, may be an error for 23 (Hallock, ms).

The last text, NN 2261:16-8, stipulates that Karkiš the Kurmanian was on his way from Aššakurda (Sagartia) to Kurmana with *taššup hallinup*.<sup>150</sup> He may have received the livestock mentioned at Kabaš, a town on the road from Media to Persepolis.<sup>151</sup> The two allocations of flour from Da’urisa may also point to the so-called ‘northern cluster’ of toponyms.<sup>152</sup> As for Parmadan, this was a town on the royal road from Susa to Persepolis, in the eastern Fahliyān region.<sup>153</sup> That Karkiš the Kurmanian was moving through regions under purview of the Persepolis authorities explains why disbursements for him and his troops are registered in Fortification texts.

Another conspicuous feature of the Karkiš texts is that the *taššup* he is travelling with are once (PF 0329) qualified as *bešiyamatiya*, “from \*Bešiyamata.” \*Bez/šiyamata is the Elamite rendering of Old Persian Paišiyāvādā, the place where Gaumata/Bardiya I started his ‘uprising’ and where Vahyazdāta/Bardiya II gathered

<sup>150</sup> The word *hallinup* occurs as a qualification of *taššup* in PF 1603, PFa 31:2-4 (<sup>HAL</sup>*hal-li-nu-ib-<sup>1</sup>ba<sup>1</sup>*), NN 1154, NN 2040:4-6 (S-E) and NN 2261: 16-8, 19-21, 26-9. In all these texts, except PF 1603 and NN 1154, the *hallinup* are said to be travelling from Sagartia. The quantities of flour, wine and livestock issued to them suggest very large groups. The *taššup hallinup* of Karkiš receive as many as 291 head of sheep/goats (NN 2261:16-8); these could have fed as many as 29,100 individuals (compare the 1:100 ratio for shipmen in NN 2261:4-8). Apart from the size of their groups, the *hallinup* were clearly special since they received livestock and wine rations. This, their connection with Sagartia and their travels makes them totally different from the type of *kurtaš* qualified as *harrinup* (pace EW s.v. *hal-li-nu-ip*). It is true that one text speaks of *kurtašbe hallinup* (NN 2344:3-6), but this text speaks of seed given to the *hallinup*, again a feature not found with *harrinup*. Koch (1993a: 15) also recognises that *hallinup* are a different group and proposes to see them as special military forces, an idea that deserves further study.

<sup>151</sup> Kabaš is the town from where livestock listed in the journal NN 2261 was issued. The toponym is probably to be identified with Gabae/Esfahān; cf. fn. 195 below.

<sup>152</sup> Da’urisa occurs twice more as supplier, in PF 0704 and PF 0705, both allocations of flour consumed “before the king,” at Harišnu and Anzakurda respectively. Harišnu/a (spelled, with phonetic complement, as <sup>AŠ</sup><sup>rha</sup>*har-iš-na-an*) is collocated with Pasargadae in NN 0709. It also occurs in NN 2261:4-8, a journal entry on shipmen travelling from Persepolis to Media and receiving livestock at Harišna and Kutima; the central town from which sheep/goats listed in NN 2261 were issued was Kabaš (cf. fn. 151 above). The connections with Kabaš and Pasargadae situate Harišna in the northern cluster.

<sup>153</sup> The region is defined by the occurrence of PFS 0004, the office seal of the district administrator Iršena (with Parmadan on NN 0268). Parmadan is linked to Hunar (Tepe Bormī; see Nasrabadi 2005 and Henkelman 2007b), also in Fahliyān region (PF 0011). On Parmadan see also Hallock 1978: 110; Koch 1986: 140-1; Arfa’i 1999: 39, 45; Henkelman 2006: 306-7. The relative location of other places associated with Karkiš and (his) *taššup*, Mannandanuš, Mišapar and Hapidanuš, has not been established yet.

new troops according to Darius’ Bīsotūn inscription.<sup>154</sup> The place must, logically, have been a fortified stronghold.<sup>155</sup>

4) In the Elamite version of the Bīsotūn inscription, Paišiyāvādā is called by its (older?) Elamite name, Naširma (DB<sub>e</sub> I.28, III.13). This toponym recurs in PF 0683 where wine is allocated to a Karkiš “of Naširma.”<sup>156</sup> This individual may be the same as the satrap of Kurmana and the person for “before” whom wine is poured in NN 0306. There are four arguments that support the identification. First, Karkiš is leading troops from \*Bez/šiyamata, which links him to the Karkiš receiving wine at Naširma (= \*Bez/šiyamata). Second, the Karkiš of Naširma receives his wine from Ušaya, a supplier connected with the places Parnuttiš (e.g., PF 0048) and Parmadan (e.g., PF 1114); it is at Parmadan that wine supplied by Ušaya is poured “before” Karkiš. Third, the large quantity of 2,000 qts. of wine given to Karkiš of Naširma as rations/payment (*galma*) indicate his exalted position. A fourth argument is that Kurmana and \*Bez/šiyamata/Naširma are not only linked in the person of Karkiš, but also, as Koch has demonstrated, in that of Hinduka and Ukama.<sup>157</sup> Given the rarity of references to \*Bez/šiyamata/Naširma, this can hardly be a coincidence.<sup>158</sup>

<sup>154</sup> Cf. Gershevitch apud Hallock 1969: 678; Metzler 1977: 1057; Wiesehöfer 1978: 51-4; Henkelman 2003b: 134 fn. 54; Tavernier 2007: 74-5 [2.3.36-7]. Wiesehöfer, *l.c.*, already saw the importance of the PF texts for the understanding of the two episodes on Paišiyāvādā in Bīsotūn, rightly suggesting that the place was a) a military stronghold and b) possibly the locus of an archive of official Aramaic state documents, and therefore entirely appropriate as basis used by Gaumata/Bardiya I and Vahyazdāta/Bardiya II.

<sup>155</sup> Despite the fact that, according to edition of Porten & Yardeni (1982: 40-1), the Aramaic version does not refer to the place as a fortress (*brt*), as had been assumed in Cowley’s edition (see also Wiesehöfer 1978: 51, whose remarks remain valid).

<sup>156</sup> Koch interprets PN <sup>Aš</sup>na-āš-ir-man-nu as indication that Karkiš “aus Na-āš-ir-man stammt” (1993a: 19; cf. EW s.v. h.na-āš-ir-man-nu), but the form only implies that he is somehow associated with Naširma. Compare <sup>Aš</sup>ú-el-man-nu (< ú-el), “belonging to/residing in the palace” (DB<sub>e</sub> II.11, III.3). Possibly such (rare) forms are hybrid formations with Iranian -ya extension (\*naširman-ya). Koch concludes that Naširma/Paišiyāvādā must have been situated in the “Provinz” of Puruš and might have been the location of an estate owned by Karkiš, but this is by no means necessary. Note that Koch herself previously located Naširma near Rakkan, in the central area around Persepolis (1990: 39; on Rakkan see Henkelman 2007a).

<sup>157</sup> Koch 1993a: 17-9. Hindukka escorts 100 *puhu* (here: “servants”) from Kerman to the king (XII/22-I/23) according to PF 1377, PF 1399, NN 0809 and NN 2139 (compare also PF 1456); cf. Henkelman 2003b: 133 fn. 53. Koch plausibly suggests that he is the same as the Hi(n)dukka who is responsible for a group of 17 men *naširmannup*, “of Naširma,” at Persepolis (1946:17-8). Ukama of \*Bez/šiyamata (*beziyamatiya*) receives larger quantities of beer, wine, fruit and flour together with *taššup*, “troops” (PF 0330, PF 2027, NN 1159, NN 1254, NN 1711, NN 1816 and R558 [= Jones & Stolper 2006 no. 8]). He is undoubtedly the same as Ukama in NN 1044 (the amount of beer is the same as the amount of wine in PF 2027), who heads a group 1,060 *taššup lin huttip*, possibly “troops, transporters” (cf. Henkelman [forthc.] ad NN 1665:5). Servants of Ukama (*puhu ukamana*) are sent forth from Kurmana according to PF 1330. On Ukama see also Henkelman 2003b: 134 fn. 54.

<sup>158</sup> The texts collocating Karkiš, Hindukka and Ukama with \*Bez/šiyamata or Naširma are the only ones in the archive to mention either toponym. Note that this does not necessarily mean

If Karkiš the Kurmanian and Karkiš of Naširma are indeed identical, another sequence of texts can be added to the dossier:

text	seal(s)	date	supplier	commodity	recipient	location
NN 0306	PFS 0233	Ø/Ø	Ušaya	50 qts. of wine	poured “before” K.	Parmadan
PF 0683	PFS 0017, PFS 0146	XII/23	Ušaya	2,000 qts. of wine	K. ( <i>halmi</i> from the king)	Ø
PF 0682 <sup>159</sup>	PFS 0040, PFS 0146	XII/[23?]	Ummanana	20 qts. of beer	K. ( <i>halmi</i> from the king)	(Kurdušum?)
PF 1541	PFS 0109, PFS 0146	XII/23	Ø	10 qts. of beer	K. ( <i>halmi</i> from the king)	Ø
Fort. 3544	no seal	Ø/Ø	Ušaya	650 qts. of wine	Miturna, <i>mardam</i> of K.	to Parnuttiš

In PF 0682, PF 0683 and PF 1541, Karkiš is on a mission and travels with a *halmi* (“authorisation, viaticum”) from the king.<sup>160</sup> His destination is a place called Šurauša (PF 0682, PF 1541) and once he is described as “(of/at) Šurauša, formerly (of/at) Babylon” (PF 1541).<sup>161</sup> Unfortunately the location of Šurauša remains unknown; it may have been a locality in the region in which Karkiš was satrap or another place where he had a specific assignment.<sup>162</sup>

that \*Beziyamata/Naširma was a place in Kurmana, as Koch supposes. It could, to name just one possibility, have been a fortress were troops from Kurmana were drawn together.

<sup>159</sup> PFS 0040 is a supplier seal linked to Kurdušum (see, e.g., PF 0037, PF 0084), a town in the western Fahliyān area. Note that the text has an Elamite month name (rather than an Old Persian as PF 0683 and PF 1541 do), confirming that it was drafted in the Fahliyān region.

<sup>160</sup> The three texts, which may share the same date (PF 0682 is dated XII/[20+x]), have an impression of PFS 0146 in combination with another seal. We have therefore both another seal and another sealing protocol than found on other texts on disbursements for Karkiš (PFS 0233). This may cast doubt on the identification of Karkiš the Kurmanian (holder of PFS 0233) and the Karkiš associated with PFS 0146. There are other explanations than assuming chance homonymy, however. One is that PFS 0146 might have belonged to an official acting on behalf of Karkiš. Otherwise, it is possible that the administrative context was different and that Karkiš used another seal (perhaps his personal seal). On PFS 0146 see Garrison & Root 2001: 388-9.

<sup>161</sup> HAL<sup>1</sup> *kar-ki-iš hi-še* <sup>AŠ</sup> *šu-ra-u-šá šá-iš-šá* <<sup>AŠ</sup> *ba-pi-lu*, lit. “Karkiš by name, Šurauša, formerly Babylon.” The elaborate description is clearly intended to distinct Karkiš from other homonymic individuals. I do not think that the scribe remembered that Karkiš had had a post at Babylon. Rather, “formerly (of/at) Babylon,” is information that derives from the *viaticum* that Karkiš had with him according to the text. I suspect that it was an authorisation for a journey to Babylon (starting from Susa?) and from there back to Šurauša.

<sup>162</sup> Apart from the two occurrences cited, Šurauša (<sup>AŠ</sup> *šu-ra-u-šá*; <sup>AŠ</sup> *šu-ṛa<sup>71</sup>-ru-šá* in PF 0682) is attested only twice. In NN 0868, a company of three headed by Tišduya (otherwise unknown) heads for Šurauša, carrying an authorisation from the king (III/22). In Fort. 8863 a party of five lead by Kuršibana heads in the same direction; they two carry a royal authorisation (III/20). The toponym reflects ‘Median’ \**srauša-* (Hinz 1973: 79; Tavernier 2007: 396 [4.3.204]). The Old Persian form would be \**čauša-*, which is found in the toponym Šaušaka (<sup>AŠ</sup> *šá-u-šá-ka<sub>4</sub>*, reflecting \**čauša-ka-*) in NN 2364:14 in context that suggest that it was situated in the region of Kabaš (from where grain listed in NN 2364 was distributed), in the ‘northern cluster,’ on the road to Media (cf. fn. 195 below). Is Šaušaka the same as Šurauša? This would certainly fit the presence of Karkiš the Kurmanian in this region (cf. NN 2261:16-8, Fort. 6179, PFS 0233 and perhaps NN 2290:19-20; see above, with fnn. 151-2).

The last text listed above, Fort. 3544, mentions a “*mardam* of Karkiš,” named Miturna, who transports wine to Parnuttiš as *ukpiyataš* of/for the king. The wine supplier is Ušaya, whom we have met before at Parmadan and in relation with Karkiš of Naširma (NN 0306, PF 0683).<sup>163</sup> There is therefore little doubt that the same Karkiš is referred to once again. The appellative *mardam* (Old Persian \**varda-*), “workman,”<sup>164</sup> used for his wine transporter Miturna, occurs rarely in the archive. Whenever it is used, it seems to denote a direct relation between a high-ranking Persian and a subordinate, hence the expression PN<sub>1</sub> the *mardam* of PN<sub>2</sub>. The most conspicuous case is that of a Patischorian *mardam* “for whom Kambarma (Gobryas) is responsible.”<sup>165</sup> As Kambarma himself plausibly was the leader or a leading member of the (sub-)clan of the Patischorians (cf. Henkelman & Stolper [forthc.]), it would seem that the use of *mardam* in the archive indicates a particular legal and social status: it denotes personnel or other subordinates of high-ranking Persians who acted directly on behalf of their masters and who fell under their patron’s jurisdiction. In other words, people referred to as “*mardam* of PN” belong to the external sphere of the Persepolis institution and are indicative of semi-autonomous units, i.e. probably the Houses of noble Persians and their supporters. This may be true for the *mardam* of Karkiš too: as a satrap he would undoubtedly have had his own House.

What is most remarkable is the collocation, in Fort. 3544, of a *mardam* of Karkiš and the transport of wine as *ukpiyataš* of/for the king. The term *ukpiyataš*, like Late Babylonian *upiyāta* (from Old Persian \**upayāta*), denotes a tax in kind, presumably intended for the provisioning of the court and as such comparable to the tax known from classical and biblical sources as “the table of the king.”<sup>166</sup> Not only a *mardam* of Karkiš transports wine as *ukpiyataš* to Parnuttiš, but so does Tiššantama, *mardam* of Nariyapikna (PF 0048).<sup>167</sup> In the light of the Late Babylonian contexts of *upiyāta*, such transports by *mardam*, i.e. the personnel of semi-external parties, make sense: the

<sup>163</sup> Ušaya, the wine supplier mentioned in Fort. 3544, is regularly connected to the places Parmadan (e.g., PF 1114, NN 0306) and Parnuttiš (e.g., PF 0048, PF 0049). The places can therefore not have been far apart.

<sup>164</sup> On the word see Hinz 1973: 85-6 and Tavernier 2007: 434 [4.4.7.118].

<sup>165</sup> NN 1581, to be published in Henkelman & Stolper [forthc.]. Other texts with *mardam*: PF 0047 (*mardamardam*), PF 0048 and PF 0094. In NN 2040:4-6 a *mardabattiš*, “chief of workmen,” occurs in connection with *taššup hallinup*.

<sup>166</sup> On the etymology of the word see MacKenzie 1971: 609-10, who proposes \**upayāta-*, “bye-portion” (rejecting earlier proposals by Gershevitch and Hinz), an interpretation followed by Stolper 1977: 259 (comparing 𐎧.𐎠.𐎡.𐎢 LUGAL, “the King’s share”) and Tavernier 2007: 444-5 [4.4.10.18]. The term seems also to occur, as *’pyt’* and *’wpyty*, in the Bactrian documents (Naveh & Shaked [forthc.], A2, B5, C4). On the technical meaning of *ukpiyataš* in Fortification contexts and *upiyātu* in Late-Babylonian contexts see esp. Stolper 1977: 254-9, who proposes “a royal impost paid in commodities and/or the stores of such commodities collected for the use of the crown.” See also Hallock 1969: 19; Zadok 1984: 36; EW s.v. *uk-be-ya-taš*; Joannès 1989: 151-6; Briant 2002: 413, 440 and *idem* [forthc. 1]; Henkelman 2006: 275-7 with fn. 633; Waerzeggers, this volume; Jursa [forthc.]. “Table of the King” and “table of the satrap”: see Briant 1989: 37-9; *idem* 2002: 200-1, 402-3; Kistler, this volume.

<sup>167</sup> In addition, Da’uka, *mardamardam* (“workman with seeds, sower,” cf. Hinz 1973: 86 and Tavernier 2007: 434 [4.4.7.118]) of Nariyapikna also transports wine to Parnuttiš. Mamba[...]ra, the *mardam* of Kambarma, takes wine to Appištapdan (NN 1581).

payment of *upiyāta* tax came with the obligation to organise or pay for the transport of the commodities to the court. But why, if the transport was part of the tax obligation, did Karkiš’ *mardam* receive the wine transported as *ukpiyataš* from Ušaya, a supplier *within* the Persepolis institution? One possible answer is that the actual *ukpiyataš* was incumbent on other people, whereas Karkiš only had the obligation to organise its transport. Yet, given the rarity of texts on *mardam*, it is perhaps more likely that the wine delivered on behalf of Karkiš was issued to him *on credit* and had to be paid for at a later occasion. If so, the regular mode would have been to transport *ukpiyataš* directly from one’s estate to the royal table, an operation that would not be visible in the archive. Be that as it may, it is intriguing to see a member of the Persian elite charged with provisioning the royal table, especially since, if my analysis is right, this is still the same Karkiš who held the title of satrap. Undoubtedly the symbolism of his tribute was much more significant than the quantity he brought (650 qts.).

To summarise: the above dossier includes evidence on Karkiš who acts as a satrap in Kurmana and who referred to as “satrap” and as “satrap (in) Puruš.” Not only does he hand out *viatica* to travellers while in Kurmana, but he also appears in the Fortification tablets when he, “Karkiš the Kurmanian,” is en route with a large number of *taššup*, “troops” on the road from Media to Persepolis and at Parmadan in the Fahliyān region. Karkiš is also connected to a place, probably a military stronghold, known in Old Persian as *Paišiyāvādā* and in Elamite as *Naširma*. This supports the impression that Karkiš has extensive military duties that were not necessarily confirmed to Kurmana/Puruš. Furthermore, there is evidence for a special assignment involving a journey to Babylon and from there to Šurauša.<sup>168</sup> Finally, there is Karkiš’ role in the provisioning of the royal table and the occurrence of a *mardam*, a “workman,” undoubtedly a servant member of Karkiš’ own ‘House.’ This brings us back to the starting-point of this discussion: the wine poured “before” Karkiš (NN 0306).

It appears that our satrap not only had his own House, but also, as a satrap, had his own ‘table.’ This agrees well with existing evidence on satrapal courts that consciously imitated that of the Great King.<sup>169</sup> The satrapal table would have been an institution similar to the king’s table: an instrument for redistribution, a locus of prestige and ideology, a system that visualised hierarchy and strengthened alliances (cf. Xen. Cyr. VIII.6.11). It is therefore not surprising that the Persepolis administration adopts an idiom similar to that relating to the tables of the king, Irdabama and Irtaštuna in the case of Karkiš.

Yet, one important circumstance should not be overlooked: Karkiš was not in Kurmana when wine is poured “before” him, but at Parmadan (the only reason why the disbursement appears in the tablets). This means, in the first place, that satrapal courts could travel too – in itself hardly surprising – , but also that Karkiš was still a satrap when he was outside the region of his assignment. This is not a gratuitous observation,

<sup>168</sup> One more text may be mentioned here as evidence of another possible assignment of Karkiš. Journal entry NN 2290:19-20, documents a receipt of 11.5 qts. of barley as ration for a Karkiš who travels sometime during Dar.19 from Media to Persepolis and carries an authorisation from Mišdašba (Hystaspes). Though I think it is likely that this is our Karkiš once again, I see no formal argument to support this suspicion, apart from the high travel ration.

<sup>169</sup> Cf. Xen. Cyr. VIII.6.10-4. See Briant 1989: 37-9, *idem* 2002: 194-5, 208-10, 345-7, 502-3, 926; Petit 1990: 147-52; Kistler, this volume; Miller, this volume; Tuplin, this volume.

certainly not in a dossier that, if anything, reveals that Karkiš’ tasks were surprisingly varied. Satraps were indeed not necessarily or not only ‘governors,’ but holders of a title that meant “guardian of the kingdom” (*xšaça-pā-van-*) and that allowed them to wield executive power in the name of the King of Kings. As Briant puts it, “in itself, the term connotes first and foremost the total loyalty to the king of the person described by it. In other words, the duty of a satrap was not necessarily connected to a territory.”<sup>170</sup> This broader definition of ‘satrap’ helps to understand Karkiš’ authority to order commodities for his *taššup* and himself while being outside Kurmana: his position as satrap entitled him to tap into the empire’s resources wherever necessary in order to fulfil his assignments. Obviously, such transactions had to be accounted for, but the fact that the relevant receipts are sealed according to the single-seal protocol, in this case with Karkiš’ seal (PFS 0233), is a clear demonstration that his authority was recognised by the Persepolis administration and that suppliers, when asked to supply for Karkiš’ table and/or his troops, acted accordingly.<sup>171</sup>

#### 6. An itinerant court

The Persian kings not only travelled between their residences at Ecbatana, Persepolis, Susa and Babylon, but they also made detours from the royal road to make their appearance to the local population of Fārs, receive their gifts and heard their petitions.<sup>172</sup> The evidence from the texts on commodities “consumed before the king” even suggests that such tours may have taken place beyond the seasonal migration of the king. Such appears from the surprising variety of place names that occurs in this corpus.<sup>173</sup>

<sup>170</sup> Briant 2002: 65-7 (cf. 890). See also *idem* 2000: 268 on cases in which the title ‘satrap’ is not used for governors of regions like Egypt and compare *idem* [forthc. 2] (including discussion of the Bactrian documents). On the uses and non-uses of ‘satrap’ see also Stolper 1985: 58; *idem* 1987: 398-9; *idem* 1989: 291-2 with notes p-r (commenting, *inter alia*, on Bēšunu who may have had the title of *aḥšadrāpanu* before he came “governor of Babylon”), *idem* 2006b: 227-8, 241; Dandamaev 1992: 6.

<sup>171</sup> Compare Briant’s reflections on the famous letter (DAE 67) regarding Neḫtiḥōr’s mission by Aršāma, the satrap of Egypt, which presents a similar case (2006: 349-51; cf. *idem* 1979: 1395 fn. 89; *idem* 2002: 463). As Briant argues, Aršāma’s letter demanding travel rations for his subordinate on the road from Babylonia to Egypt is best explained from the assumption that Aršāma held, as a satrap, the authority to demand the allocation of commodities at any place in the empire; those disbursements would eventually be booked from the credit he held *ex officio*.

<sup>172</sup> Cf. Briant 1982: 81-94; *idem* 1988: 255-7; Koch 1993b: 66-7, 69-70, 75, 81-2, 87.

<sup>173</sup> Seals used on journals and accounts, which are not relevant for the subject treated, are printed between parentheses. Unidentified seal impressions are indicated by ‘x’ and ‘y,’ the absence of seals by ‘n(o) s(eal).’ Seals PFS 0066a\*, PFS 0066b\* and PFS 0066c\* have been subsumed under ‘0066\*.’

location	text(s)	date	seal(s)	“before”	commodities	amount
Agmadana <sup>174</sup> (Ecbatana)	PF 0732	25	0038	Irtaštuna	wine	170 qts.
	NN 2502	25	0038	Irtaštuna	→ <i>abbebe</i> (food): → <i>madamiš</i> → <i>mitruša</i>	17 qts. 9 qts.
Akkuban	NN 0697	21	0007*	king	[grain/flour] <sup>175</sup>	1,000 qts.
Ankatizza	PF 0711	21	0007*	king	→ <i>abbebe</i> (food) from cereals	2,970 qts.
	NN 2030	21	0007*	king	→ <i>madukka</i> (honey)	2 qts.
Anku[...] <sup>176</sup>	NN 0071	[10+]	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs)	(part of 173)
Antarrantiš	NN 0071 <sup>177</sup>	[10+]	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs)	(part of 173)
	PF 0697	21	0007*	king	birds:	
					→ <i>ippur</i> (geese)	2
					→ <i>basbas</i> (ducks)	12
				→ <i>šudabah</i> (chicken-sized fowl)	25	
				MUŠEN <sup>MEŠ</sup> → <i>kuktikka</i>	95	
Anzakurda	PF 0705	22	0007*	king	grain (barley)	1,200 qts.
Anzamannakka	PF 0693 <sup>178</sup>	19	0093*	king	cattle (ox)	1
	NN 2041:1	(19)	(x, y)	king	wine	6,820 qts.
	PF 0702	21	0007*+0066*	king	flour	17,830 qts.
Appištapan	NN 0071 <sup>179</sup>	[10+]	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs)	(part of 173)
	PF 0698	21	0007*	king	birds:	
					→ <i>ippur</i> (geese)	6
					→ <i>basbas</i> (ducks)	15
				→ <i>šudabah</i> (chicken-sized fowl)	65	
				MUŠEN <sup>MEŠ</sup> → <i>kuktikka</i>	346	
	NN 0923	24	0007*	king	→ <i>karukur</i> (pomegranates?)	5,000 qts.
Bakaradduš <sup>180</sup>	NN 0071	[10+]	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs)	(part of 173)

<sup>174</sup> PF 0732 and NN 2502 both speak of commodities transported to Agmadana (Ecbatana) and consumed there “before Irtaštuna.” Hallock originally read <sup>AS</sup>*pu-ma<sup>1</sup>-da-na* in PF 0732, but changed this, after collation, to <sup>AS</sup>*ag-ma-da-na* (*in margine*). The fact that transactions at Ecbatana are recorded on tablets found at Persepolis is paralleled by the presence of a few tablets pertaining to affairs in Susa, including a text on wine poured “before Irdabama” (PF 0737; cf. §3 above). Activities at Ecbatana were hardly organised and accounted for from Persepolis, nor were those at Susa (cf. Henkelman 2006: 65 fn. 133). The presence of the Ecbatana texts may therefore either be explained from the regular contact between various administrative centres, or from the transport of goods to Ecbatana from a location within the area under purview of Persepolis. Note that the *abbebe* consumed at Ecbatana (NN 2502) was brought there from Kuknakkān, i.e. Irtaštuna’s estate (cf. §5 above).

<sup>175</sup> Cf. fn. 37 above.

<sup>176</sup> <sup>AS?</sup>*an<sup>?</sup>-ku-<sup>r</sup>x-x<sup>1</sup>*. The text lists 173 lambs slaughtered at ten locations, but does not specify the exact number for each place.

<sup>177</sup> <sup>rAS</sup>*an-da<sup>?</sup>-ra-an<sup>?</sup>-ti<sup>?</sup>*. Cf. fn. 176 above.

<sup>178</sup> The GN in l.10 should be read <sup>AS</sup>*an-za-am-<sup>r</sup>na<sup>1</sup>[-ak-ka<sub>4</sub>]* (Hallock, *in margine*) instead of <sup>AS</sup>*pār-šā-am-<sup>r</sup>na<sup>1</sup>[-ak<sup>?</sup>-ka<sub>4</sub><sup>?</sup>]* (Hallock 1969: 214). The text mentions eight locations and eight head of cattle; I assume therefore that one head of cattle was slaughtered at each place. As the Aramaic gloss on PF 0693 indicates (fn. 46 above), the 8 head of cattle were oxen.

<sup>179</sup> Cf. fn. 176 above.

Baršeda <sup>181</sup>	PF 2034	s.d.	0007*	king	birds:	
					→ <i>ippur</i> (geese)	17
					→ <i>basbas</i> (ducks)	62
					→ <i>šudabah</i> (chicken-sized fowl)	210
					MUŠEN <sup>MEŠ</sup> → <i>kuktikka</i>	1,044
Bat[...] <i>mana</i> <sup>182</sup>	PF 0693	19	0093*	king	cattle (ox)	1
Bessitme	PF 0714	21	0007*	king	→ <i>abbebe</i> (food) from cereals	2,330 qts.
	NN 0906	22	0007*	king	<i>bannumar</i> (cheese; → <i>banura</i> )	5
	NN 0919	22	0007*+0066*	king	flour	2,860 qts.
	PF 0708	22	0007*	king	grain (barley) for horses	3,600 qts.
	NN 0676 <sup>183</sup>	[20+]	0007*	king	→ <i>madukka</i> (honey)	1 qt.
NN 1384 <sup>184</sup>	s.d.	0007*	king	sheep ghee (→ <sup>GIŠ<sub>1</sub>MEŠ</sup> )	56 qts.	
Dandakran	PF 0700	24	0007*+0066*	king	flour <sup>185</sup>	6,400 qts.
Dašer	NN 2554	21	0007*	king	→ <i>tarmu</i> (emmer?)	400 qts.
	NN 0554	[x]	0007*	king	grain (barley) for horses	1,700 qts.
Dumiba <sup>186</sup>	NN 0071	[10+]	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs)	(part of 173)
Hadaraš (= Hašaran)	PF 1942:3	19	(1582)	king	grain (barley)	12,440 qts.
	PF 1943:1	19	(0120)	king	grain (barley)	3,577 qts
Harišna/u <sup>187</sup>	Fort. 6352	21	0007*+0066*	king	flour	24,360 qts.
	PF 0703	22	0007*+0066*	king	flour	1,500 qts.
	PF 0704	22	0007*+0066*	king	flour	2,730 qts.
	PF 0693	19	0093*	king	cattle (ox)	1
Harrušnuzza	PF 0715	22	0007*	king	→ <i>abbebe</i> (food) from cereals	1,230 qts.
	NN 1894 <sup>188</sup>	22	0007*	king	→ PA <sup>MEŠ</sup>	5
	NN 0117 <sup>189</sup>	22	0007*+0066*	king	flour	900 <sup>?</sup> qts.
	PFa 31:1 <sup>190</sup>	(22)	(0027*)	king	wine	6,900 qts.
Hidali	PF 0738	22	0051	Irdabama	grain (barley) and flour	4,620 qts.
	NN 1332	24	0051	Irdabama	beer	190 qts.
Hunar, at the <i>appišdamanna</i> of Napumalika	PF 0734	24	0038	Irtaštuna and Iršama	→ <i>abbebe</i> (food) from cereals	21 qts.

<sup>180</sup> <sup>AŠ</sup>ba-<sup>r</sup>ka<sub>4</sub><sup>?</sup><sup>r</sup>1-ra-ut-ti-iš. The toponym is only attested in this text. Alternatively, one could read (cf. Hallock, ms.) <sup>AŠ</sup>ba-<sup>r</sup>ut<sup>r</sup>1-ra-ka<sub>4</sub>-ti-iš, which would be a unique spelling of the name of Pasargadae. Cf. fn. 176 above on NN 0071.

<sup>181</sup> <sup>AŠ</sup>ba-<sup>r</sup>ir<sup>?</sup>-šē<sup>?</sup><sup>r</sup>1-da.

<sup>182</sup> <sup>AŠ</sup>ba-at-<sup>r</sup>x<sup>r</sup>1-ma-na. Cf. fn. 178 above.

<sup>183</sup> <sup>AŠ</sup>rbe<sup>?</sup>-is<sup>?</sup>-si<sup>?</sup>-ut<sup>?</sup>-me<sup>?</sup><sup>r</sup>1. The text mentions 2 qts. of honey at Liduma and Bessitme; I presume this means that 1 qt. was disbursed at each town.

<sup>184</sup> The reading of the GN is uncertain (<sup>AŠ</sup>rbe<sup>r</sup>1-is-<sup>r</sup>si<sup>r</sup>-ut<sup>r</sup>-me<sup>r</sup>?). The same supplier, Uštana, is active at Bessitme in PF 0714, NN 0676<sup>?</sup>, NN 0906, and NN 0919.

<sup>185</sup> The flour is qualified as *mariya*, *manuya*, *battimanuya* (“excellent, exceeding, eminent”); cf. fn. 35 above.

<sup>186</sup> <sup>AŠ</sup>du-<sup>r</sup>mi<sup>?</sup>-ba<sup>?</sup><sup>r</sup>1. Cf. fn. 176 above.

<sup>187</sup> The toponym is spelled as <sup>AŠ</sup>ha-ir-iš-na (Fort. 6352), <sup>AŠ</sup>ha-ir-ši-ni (PF 0703), <sup>AŠ</sup>ha-ir-iš-nu (PF 0704) and <sup>AŠ</sup>ha-ir-<sup>r</sup>šá-na<sup>r</sup>1 (PF 0693). Cf. fn. 178 above on PF 0693.

<sup>188</sup> <sup>AŠ</sup>rhar<sup>r</sup>1-ru-<sup>r</sup>iš-nu-iz-za<sup>r</sup>1.

<sup>189</sup> The amount of flour can also be read as 600 or 2,700 qts.

<sup>190</sup> Harrušnuzza is the place from which wine mentioned in the entries of PFa 31 is dispensed (ll.33-4); the entry on the disbursement for the royal table itself does not mention a GN.

Huša <sup>191</sup> ma[...]	PF 0719	21	0007*	king	→ <i>madukka</i> (honey)	1 qt.
[.....]iknana <sup>192</sup>	NN 0067	24	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs) → <i>hadumiya</i>	10
Irdunuttiš	PF 0706	24	0007*	king	grain (barley)	1,060 qts.
	NN 0174 <sup>193</sup>	24	0007*+0066*	king	flour <sup>194</sup>	5,150 qts.
	NN 0797	24	0007*+0066*	king	flour	[x] qts.
Kabaš <sup>195</sup>	NN 2261:1-3	23	(0027*)	king	sheep/goats:	
					<i>hasana</i> (adults)	797
					→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs)	85
Kandama (-iš) <sup>196</sup>	PF 0740	24	0051	Irdabama	grain (barley)	5,660 <sup>2</sup> qts.
Karruruš <sup>197</sup>	NN 0921	22	0093*	king	sheep/goats:	
					→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs)	30
					→ <i>hadumiya</i>	60 <sup>2</sup>
Ku[...] <sup>198</sup> išla	PF 0693	19	0093*	king	cattle (ox)	1
Kuknakka	PF 0730 <sup>199</sup>	22	0038	Irtaštuna <sup>200</sup>	→ <i>tarmu</i> (emmer?)	100 qts.

<sup>191</sup> Aš<sup>r</sup>hu-šá<sup>1</sup>-ut-ma-[x] (collated).

<sup>192</sup> Aš<sup>s</sup>x-x-ik-na-<sup>r</sup>na<sup>2</sup>[-x].

<sup>193</sup> The GN Aš<sup>s</sup>ir-<sup>r</sup>du<sup>1</sup>-nu-ut-ti-iš in PF 0706 is the same place as Aš<sup>s</sup>ru-du-in-ma-ut-ti in NN 0174 and NN 0797, as had already been suspected by Hallock (ms.), EW s.vv. h.ir-du-nu-ut-ti-iš, h.ru-du-in-ma-ut-ti, Vallat 1993: 113 and Tavernier 2007: 497 [5.3.3.38]. The identity of Irdunuttiš/Rudunmatti appears from the disbursements for the royal table in Dar.24 and from the occurrence of the supplier Zanuš in PF 0706 and NN 0797. Note that in these two texts, the same storekeeper (*kantira*) occurs, whose name is once spelled as HAL<sup>mu-iš-<sup>r</sup>ka<sup>4</sup></sup> (NN 0797; this is the regular spelling) and once as HAL<sup>mi-<sup>r</sup>iš-ku<sup>1</sup></sup> (PF 0706), confirming that the sign MU could be used to represent an /i/ sound in Achaemenid Elamite as recently argued by Tavernier [forthc. 1].

<sup>194</sup> The flour is qualified as *mariya*, *manuya*, *battimanuya* (“excellent, exceeding, eminent”); cf. fn. 35 above.

<sup>195</sup> Kabaš is the central place from which livestock listed in NN 2261 is issued (II.41-2); the animals disbursed for the royal table were consumed at or near this town. Note that Kabaš is on the road to Sagartia and Media (NN 2261: 4-8, 10-1, 19-21, 41-2; cf. Koch 1993b: 90) and may possibly be identified with Gabae/Esfahān (Briant & Henkelman [forthc.]).

<sup>196</sup> <sup>r</sup>Aš<sup>1</sup>kán-da-ma may be the same place as Aš<sup>s</sup>ka<sup>4</sup>-an-da-mi-iš and Aš<sup>s</sup>kán-du-ma (cf. EW s.v. h.kán-da-ma). Hallock suggested (i.m.) to read É, with value *pid*, instead of GÁN; the place name would then be <sup>r</sup>Aš<sup>1</sup>pid-da-ma, a variant spelling of Aš<sup>s</sup>pi-ud-du-ma-an. This suggestion has is interesting because Ansaš is the supplier of barley at Kandama/Pidama in PF 0740, and is recipient of the barley yield at Pidduman in PF 0568 and PF 0569. One implication would be that Aš<sup>s</sup>ka<sup>4</sup>-an-da-mi-iš is the name of a different place; I see no formal objection to this. Much more problematic, however, is the assumed use of É in an Achaemenid Elamite text. Steve (1992: 97, 164) records one occurrence, in the unpublished text BM 108963, but there the reading IB (-*ip*) rather than É imposes itself (pers.comm. M.W. Stolper 27/II/2008).

<sup>197</sup> Aš<sup>s</sup>?<sup>r</sup>kar<sup>2</sup>-ru<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup>-ru-iš.

<sup>198</sup> Aš<sup>s</sup>ku-[(x-)]iš-la. Cf. fn. 178 above.

<sup>199</sup> This text does not have a GN, but it logically pertains to Kuknakkan. The supplier of the *tarmu* in PF 0730, Turmišduma, recurs in NN 1707, where allocates ŠE.GIG<sup>MEŠ</sup> (“wheat?,” cf. → *tarmu*) and *mitli* as mothers’ rations at Kuknakkan, a town where Irtaštuna had an estate (PF 1836, PF 1837, NN 1137 and NN 2502; cf. §5 above).

	PF 0718	24	0007*	king	→ <i>abbebe razi</i>	200 qts.
	NN 2089	24	0093*	king	sheep/goats → <sup>GIS</sup> <sub>IN</sub> <sup>MEŠ</sup> - <i>na</i> (on straw): → <i>haduya</i>	40
<b>Kurdaširi</b> [...] <sup>201</sup>	Fort. 1681	[x]	0093*	king	cattle	3
<b>Kurkatuš</b> <sup>202</sup>	PF 0712	22	0007*	king	→ <i>abbebe</i> (food) from cereals	2,240 qts.
<b>Kurra</b> <sup>203</sup>	PF 0693	19	0093*	king	cattle (ox)	1
	NN 1407	21	0007*	king	→ <i>madukka</i> (honey)	[x] qts.
	NN 1874	21	0007*+0066*	king	flour	22,540 qts.
<b>Kutima</b> <sup>204</sup>	PF 0693	19	0093*	king	cattle (ox)	1
<b>Liduma</b>	PF 0735	21	0051	Irdabama	wine	750 qts.
	NN 0676 <sup>205</sup>	[20+]	0007*	king	→ <i>madukka</i> (honey)	1 qt.
<b>Maraduka</b> <sup>206</sup>	NN 0324	[20+]	0007*+0066*	king	flour	3,270 qts.
<b>Marriš</b>	NN 0790	19	0007*	king	birds:	
					→ <i>ippur</i> (geese)	2
					→ <i>basbas</i> (ducks)	7
					MUŠEN <sup>MEŠ</sup> → <i>miššatannaš</i>	109
	NN 0846	s.d.	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs)	28
<b>Maršunkurda</b>	NN 1843	19	0007*+0066*	king	flour	2,580 <sup>?</sup> qts.
	Fort. 7864 <sup>207</sup>	19	0007*+0066*	king	flour	22,380 qts.
<b>Marzina</b>	NN 0506 <sup>208</sup>	19	0093*	king	cattle	1 <sup>?</sup>
	NN 1525 <sup>209</sup>	19	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs) → <i>haduya</i>	21
<b>Matezziš</b>	PF 0731	24	0038	Irtaštuna	flour	290 qts.
	NN 0490 <sup>210</sup>	s.d.	x, y <sup>?</sup>	king	sheep/goats	53
<b>Maudunuš</b>	NN 2213	s.d.	0007*	king	→ <i>basbas</i> (ducks)	10

<sup>200</sup> Instead of the usual formula, PF 0730 has <sup>GIS</sup>*tar-mu* <sup>SAL</sup>*ir-taš-du-na-ik-ka<sub>4</sub> ma-ak-ki*, lit. “emmer, to Irtaštuna, was consumed,” i.e. used in Artystone’s House (cf. §2.3 above).

<sup>201</sup> <sup>AS</sup>*r<sub>1</sub>kur<sup>?</sup>da-ši-ri-[x-]na*.

<sup>202</sup> Spelled <sup>AS</sup>*ku-ka<sub>4</sub>-šu-iš*. The amount of *abbebe* may alternatively be read as 3,240 qts.

<sup>203</sup> PF 0693 has <sup>AS</sup>*r<sub>1</sub>kur-r<sub>1</sub>*<sup>1</sup>; on this text cf. fn. 178 above. I propose to identify <sup>AS</sup>*ku-ri* in NN 1874 with <sup>AS</sup>*kur-ra(-na)* (written <sup>AS</sup>*ku-ra* in NN 1407). Kurra seems to be situated in the western Kāmfirūz region, not far from the Fahliyān area (cf. Henkelman 2006: 305 fn. 704). Mišparma, the flour supplier at Kuri in NN 1874, may well be the same as the grain supplier based at Zappi, in the Fahliyān (e.g., NN 1404 [V/21]). The identification Kuri = Kurra is therefore at least feasible. On the form *makaš* in NN 1874 see fn. 23 above. The text of NN 1874 has <sup>HAL</sup>*EŠŠANA r<sub>1</sub>ti<sup>1</sup>-ib-ba ma-kaš*, lit. “he/they consumed (it) before the king.”

<sup>204</sup> Cf. fn. 178 above.

<sup>205</sup> <sup>AS</sup>*r<sub>1</sub>[li<sup>?</sup>-]ud<sup>?</sup>-du<sup>?</sup>-ma<sup>?</sup>*. The text mentions 2 qts. of honey at Liduma and Bessitme; I presume this means that 1 qt. was disbursed at each town.

<sup>206</sup> <sup>AS</sup>*ma-r<sub>1</sub>ra<sup>?</sup>-du<sup>?</sup>-ka<sub>4</sub><sup>?</sup>*.

<sup>207</sup> Seals on Fort. 7864 identified from photographs (WH).

<sup>208</sup> I presume that the 4<sup>?</sup> head of cattle were consumed at the four places mentioned in the text (Ziršama, Ukbakampiya, Marzina, Pandamaš), i.e. 1<sup>?</sup> at each village.

<sup>209</sup> Given the parallel with NN 0506 (same year; cattle at Ziršama, Ukbakampiya, Marzina, Pandamaš), I assume that, after Ziršama and Ukbakampiya (ll.4-6), the GNs Marzina, Pandamaš should be restored (ll.7-8). I have tentatively divided the total number of 84 lambs equally over the four villages, but the actual division may have been different.

<sup>210</sup> The text does not mention a GN, but the livestock supplier in NN 0490, Bakawiš, recurs in PF 1572 where he allocates sheep/goats to travelling Indians at Matezziš.

	PF 0723 <sup>211</sup>	s.d.	0007*+0861	king	→ <i>tarmu</i> (emmer?)	405 qts.
Menri, at the <i>appišdamanna</i> of Napumalika	PF 2035	24	0038	Irtaštuna and Iršama	beer	543 qts.
Minhama <sup>212</sup>	PF 0716	22	0007*	king	→ <i>abbebe</i> (food) from cereals	900 <sup>?</sup> qts.
Mišaraš	NN 0189	21	0007*	king	→ <i>abbebe</i> (food) from cereals	180 qts.
Mišarakaš	PF 0727	21	0007*	king	→ PA <sup>MEŠ</sup>	4
Nupištaš	NN 1735	24	0007*	king	→ <i>karukur</i> (pomegranates?)	2,500 qts.
Pandamaš <sup>213</sup>	NN 0506	19	0093*	king	cattle	1 <sup>?</sup>
	NN 1525	19	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs) → <i>haduya</i>	21
Parmadan	NN 0306	s.d.	x, y <sup>?</sup>	Karkiš	wine	50 qts.
Persepolis (Barša)	NN 0071 <sup>214</sup>	[10+]	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs)	(part of 173)
	NN 2493:6	19	[(x)]	king	wine	[x] qts.
	PF 0701	21	0007*+0066*	king	flour	126,100 qts.
	NN 0641	21	0051	Irdabama	sheep/goats: UDU.NITÁ <sup>MEŠ</sup> on straw <sup>215</sup>	50
					→ <i>zarakka</i> (grazing)	165
					→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs)	40
	PF 0739	22	0051	Irdabama	→ <i>abbebe</i> (food) from cereals	1,440 qts.
	NN 1773	24	0051	Irdabama	flour ‘of all kinds’ <sup>216</sup>	39,880 <sup>?</sup> qts.
	NN 0454 <sup>217</sup>	24	0038*	Irtaštuna	→ <i>miksu ŠE.BAR</i> <sup>MEŠ</sup> -na	10 qts.
	PF 0722	27	0007*	king	→ <i>madukka</i> (honey)	1 qt.
Pirritukkaš	NN 2356:4	19	(n.s.)	king	grain (barley)	18,010 qts.
	NN 2291:15	21	(0120)	king	wine	5,550 qts.
	PF 0695 <sup>218</sup>	21	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs) → <i>hadumiya</i>	[x100]+34
[...]rak <sup>219</sup>	NN 0071	[10+]	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs)	(part of 173)
Rappišbena	PF 0713	22	0007*	king	→ <i>abbebe</i> (food) from cereals	2,440 qts.
	PF 0724	22	0007*	king	→ <i>tarmu</i> (emmer?)	200 qts.
	PF 0725	22	0007*	king	→ <i>banura</i> (cheese)	6
Šattenuš	NN 0766	22	0007*	king	→ <i>abbebe</i> (food) from cereals	1,230 qts.
	PF 0721 <sup>220</sup>	22	0007*	king	→ <i>madukka</i> (honey)	1 qt.
Širubba <sup>221</sup>	NN 1383	22	0007*	king	→ <i>madukka</i> (honey)	5 qts.
Šizana <sup>222</sup>	NN 0071	[10+]	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs)	(part of 173)

<sup>211</sup> Aš *ma-ṛu-du<sup>1</sup>-nu-iš* (collation Hallock, *in margine*). See fn. 83 above on seal PFS 0861.

<sup>212</sup> Aš *mín-ṛha<sup>?</sup>-ma*.

<sup>213</sup> Cf. fnn. 208-9 above.

<sup>214</sup> Cf. fn. 176 above.

<sup>215</sup> Cf. → GIŠ<sub>IN</sub><sup>MEŠ</sup>-na.

<sup>216</sup> *mišbatana*; cf. → *miššanatanaš*. The amount may alternatively be read as 69,880 qts.

<sup>217</sup> Cf. fn. 119 above on this text.

<sup>218</sup> Hallock initially read the GN in this text as Aš *pár-ṛsir<sub>8</sub>-rás-be<sup>1</sup>*, but subsequently seems to have considered the reading Aš *pár-ṛri<sup>1</sup>-tuk-kaš<sup>1</sup>* (collation *in margine*). The latter is probably correct in view of the two other texts on royal disbursements at Pirritukkaš

<sup>219</sup> [x x x]-ṛra-ak<sup>1</sup>-(x). Cf. fn. 176 above.

<sup>220</sup> Aš *ša-ṛut<sup>1</sup>-te-ṛnu<sup>1</sup>-iš*.

<sup>221</sup> Aš *ṛši-ru-ib<sup>?</sup>-ba<sup>?</sup>*.

<sup>222</sup> On NN 0017 see fn. 176 above.



	PFa 06	21	0007*	king	→ <i>abbebe</i> (food) from cereals	3,587 qts.
<b>Ziršama</b> <sup>235</sup>	NN 0506	19	0093*	king	cattle	1 <sup>?</sup>
	NN 1525	19	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs) → <i>haduya</i>	21
(4 villages)	PF 2033	20[(+)]	0093*	king	→ <i>kariri</i> (lambs) → <i>haduyaš</i>	85
(4 villages)	Fort. 7865	22	0093* <sup>236</sup>	king	cattle	10
(4 villages)	PF 0694	21	0093*	king	cattle	8
(7 villages) <sup>237</sup>	NN 0184	21	0093*	king	sheep/goats → <i>hadumiya</i>	[x100+]29
s.l. (Bessitme?) <sup>238</sup>	PF 0726	s.d.	0007*	king	refined [sheep] ghee (→ <i>rami</i> )	25 qts.
s.l. (Harrušnuzza?) <sup>239</sup>	PF 0728	s.d.	n.s.	king	wine	12,350 qts.
s.l. (Kupirkan?) <sup>240</sup>	NN 2281:8	17	(0012a+0118)	king <sup>241</sup>	cattle <i>hasana</i> (adult)	12
s.l. (Kurdušum?) <sup>242</sup>	PFa 29:1	[22]	(n.s.?)	king	[flour or barley]	[x qts.]
s.l. (Matezziš?) <sup>243</sup>	PFa 30:1	21	(0120)	king	wine	5,350 qts.
s.l. (Mubari?) <sup>244</sup>	PF 0696	19	n.s.	king	sheep/goats	1224

<sup>234</sup> The quantity of *madukka* in this text is given as “5,” without indicating the (dry) measure is QA or BAR. I assume, given the small amounts of honey in other texts, that 5 QA (5 qts.) is meant. On <sup>AS</sup>za-ak-za-ku ma-iš in this text and PFa 06 see fn. 23 above.

<sup>235</sup> Cf. fnn. 208-9 above.

<sup>236</sup> Seal identified by M.W. Stolper, who also saw that its impression makes the restoration [GUD]<sup>MEŠ</sup> (already suspected by Hallock), instead of Cameron’s [ZÍD.DA]<sup>MEŠ</sup>, very likely. Impressions of PFS 0093\* on the reverse (twice), upper edge and left edge are very clear.

<sup>237</sup> NN 0184 states that the livestock was consumed at seven villages and then adds <sup>AS</sup>šá-in-šá-<sup>r</sup>na<sup>1</sup> or <sup>AS</sup>šá-in-šá-<sup>r</sup>ma<sup>1</sup>, of/at the *šanša*. Because *šanša* denotes a certain locale, perhaps some sort of depot (cf. EW s.v. h.šá-an-šá), it seems unlikely that the royal dinner took place there; the reading <sup>AS</sup>šá-in-šá-<sup>r</sup>na<sup>1</sup>, “from the *šanša*” seems therefore preferable.

<sup>238</sup> Uštana, who supplies the ghee, is probably the same individual who supplies several commodities (cereal products, ghee, honey, cheese and flour) to the king at Bessitme (PF 0676<sup>?</sup>, PF 0714, NN 0906, NN 0919 and NN 1384<sup>?</sup>), Hušatma[...] (PF 0719), Umbabanuš (PF 0720), Liduma (PF 676) and Kurra (NN 1407). He is most frequently associated with Bessitme, however, and this is probably also the place where he allocates ghee a second time (NN 1384; cf. fn. 184 above).

<sup>239</sup> Harrušnuzza(n) is the place where wine “poured before the king” was issued according to PFa 31:1 (cf. fn. 190 above). That journal entry mentions a *halmi* (sealed document) by Ukuradduš. PF 0728 also mentions a *halmi*, and the name of the person who issued is <sup>HAL</sup>u<sup>1</sup>-kur-du-iš (Hallock, collation *in margine*), i.e. probably the same Ukuradduš. Yet, that the same person issued two sealed documents pertaining to wine for the royal table, does not necessarily mean that the wine was consumed at the same place in both cases.

<sup>240</sup> Line 3 of the account text lists cattle coming from a certain Mantašturra. The same name appears in PF 1949 as an official responsible for groups of workers receiving fruit at Kupirkan and as an official sending wine expended at the same place in PF 2002. NN 2281 may be associated with Kupirkan, though the cattle mentioned may have been consumed elsewhere.

<sup>241</sup> The text has *ma-ak<sup>1</sup>-ka<sup>4</sup>* <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA *ti-ib-ba* instead of <sup>HAL</sup>EŠŠANA *ti-ib-ba ma-ak-ka<sup>4</sup>*.

<sup>242</sup> The name of the supplier in PFa 29 has been convincingly restored as Karma (Hallock 1978: 113). This Karma is a grain supplier stationed at one of the stops on the Fahliyān stretch of the Persepolis-Susa road, presumably Kurdušum (PF 0423), but he is also associated with Baššamšura (PFa 25) and Ubarudan (NN 0171).

<sup>243</sup> Matezziš is mentioned twice in PFa 30, but in different entries (ll.2-4, 5-7). Datapparna, the wine transporter, is elsewhere, as wine supplier, associated with Matezziš (PF 0881, NN 0275, NN 0278, NN 1082, NN 1091 and NN 1846), Persepolis (NN 1093), Tenukka (PF 0880), and Tikraš (NN 0607, NN 1312). Probably the same Datapparna is responsible for an amount of wine issued and poured “before the king” at Persepolis (NN 2493:6).

s.l.	NN 1523	XI/[20+] 0038	Irtaštuna	→ <i>raziyam</i> fruit (grapes?)	314 <sup>2</sup> qts.
s.l.	NN 2195:1 <sup>245</sup>	[x] (0027*)	king	wine	5,940 <sup>2</sup> qts.

Tuplin (1998: 79 fn. 39) has tentatively suggested that the *tibba* texts could be reflections of an “annual and rotating liability to supply a commodity for the use of the king or the royal family” and do therefore not refer to the actual place of consumption. Though such a system would not seem illogical, it is not supported by the texts listed above. First, the syntax of the texts does not indicate that commodities were transported *from* the GN mentioned, only that a receipt for the court took place at that particular location. Second, the term *tibba* implies the presence of the king (or one of the royal women; cf. §2.3 above). Third, many of the places listed in the table above rarely occur elsewhere in the archive and are said to be an *umanuš* (“village, hamlet”), whereas the larger towns occur less often. Had there been a system to provide for the commodities for the royal table from various places, one would expect especially the larger towns to be mentioned in the *tibba* texts. In conclusion, the toponyms in the *tibba* texts must necessarily be taken as locations where the court halted and where a Table of the King, or that of Irdabama, Irtaštuna or Karkiš, was organised.

A regular feature of the halting places in the table above must have been a plantation (*partetaš*; cf. Gk. παράδεισος), though this is never made explicit. Among the places mentioned in texts on commodities consumed “before the king” five are known to have had such a ‘paradise.’ These places are: Akkuban, Appištapan, Kabaš, Nupištaš and Tikranuš.<sup>246</sup> Since the list of plantations and the list of places visited by the king are both necessarily incomplete, these five cases probably represent only the tip of the iceberg. There are as yet no cases of Irdabama or Irtaštuna halting at plantation, but this is probably a matter of chance preservation. Matannan, where Irtaštuna owned an estate, had a *partetaš* (PF 0144; cf. §4 above).

Many places in the table above occur in more than one year, suggesting that they had permanent facilities to host the king. Also, a quick topographical scan reveals that a number of places are certainly not located on the royal road, and some are situated north and east of Persepolis rather than in the western districts, towards Susa. Their connection with the table of the king therefore suggests royal itineraries within Fārs, independent of the seasonal migration of the court.

In this context, it may be pointed out that a growing number of structures – rather imprecisely referred to as ‘pavilions’ – has come, and is still coming to light in southern Iran. As in the case of the toponyms in the *tibba* texts, not all ‘pavilions’ were situated along the royal roads (cf. Boucharlat 2005: 274). Achaemenid stone column bases and (at some sites) other architectural remains have been found at Farneškān,

<sup>244</sup> The supplier mentioned in PF 0696, Kampiya, is elsewhere said to be based at Mubari and associated with Batrakataš (Pasargadae; NN 1701). The livestock consumed “before” the king, was not necessarily slaughtered at Mubari itself, however.

<sup>245</sup> The journal NN 2195 has various entries on travel rations for travellers on the road to Media, but the road station to which it pertains has not been identified as yet. The amount of wine could alternatively be read as 6,940 or 7,940 qts.

<sup>246</sup> *partetaš*: NN 1455 (Akkuban), PFa 33 (Appištapan, Tikranuš), PF 0157 (Tamukkan [at/near?] Kabaš), PF 0146, PF 0147, PF 0148, NN 0085, NN 0817, NN 0989, NN 1156, NN 1505, NN 2141 and NN 2445 (Nupištaš). On plantations see Henkelman 2006: 359-83 (with bibliography).

Borāzġān, Tall-e Malyān, Lāmerd, Tepe Pahnu, Tall-e Zohak, Fīrūzābād, Qalēh-ye Kalī (Ġīnġīn) and in the Tang-e Bolaghī.<sup>247</sup> Though precise archaeological data are lacking for most of these sites, and though the size and layouts of the structures may have differed from site to site, the use of stone column bases most probably points to an elite if not royal context. They may have been residential, palatial structures that were used in combination with the royal camp during the king’s visits. Besides, as permanent manifestations of royal presence and authority, they would have conveyed an ideological message. But they may well have incorporated administrative and economic functions as well. The case of Qalēh-ye Kalī is illuminating in these various respects. Recent Iranian-Australian excavations at the site have revealed a large Persepolis-style columned building and other finds that suggest a royal connection. In the words of the excavators (Potts *et al.* 2007: 298):

The extreme delicacy of the glass and the high quality of the fine stone table ware fragments (...) are consistent with usage, if only periodically, by an élite, possibly royal, clientele. Although the bulk of the ceramics recovered were not fine, and many sherds belonged to storage vessels of substantial dimensions, such material is to be expected at a site where not inconsiderable numbers of servants, local agricultural labourers and perhaps craftsmen, too, were resident, probably throughout the year. The presence of such support staff in no way contradicts the periodic arrival of élite visitors whose glass and stone plates, as well as opulent quarters, suggest that this was not a road house for the ordinary traveller. There may have been a royal storehouse, or even a distribution centre for “normal” messengers located at or near Qaleh Kali, but the building indicated by the massive bell-shaped column bases, like the meals and beverages consumed in the exquisite glass and stone vessels, reflect the élite quarters at the site, not the sort of storehouse referred to so frequently in the Persepolis fortification texts.

Needless to say, finds like those from Qalēh-ye Kalī agree well with the pattern that can be distilled from the texts on the provisions for the royal table at various sites throughout Pārsa. As appears from the archive, these sites are likely to have hosted permanent structures suited for royal visits (hence the repeated visits at the same locations), but there is also evidence on the storage and processing of commodities at some of the same places. We already encountered Rašda (cf. §3 above), the royal steward, who, among other things, was responsible for sesame, wine, apples, mulberries, → *karukur* (pomegranates?) and other kinds of fruit stored at the *partetaš* of Nupīštaš in years 22, 23, 24 and 27.<sup>248</sup> A receipt for 2,500 qts. of *karukur* in Dar.24 complements these deposits: the fruit was consumed “before the king” at Nupīštaš (NN 1735). Similarly, there are a number of relevant texts on commodities delivered and used/processed as *ukpiyataš* (\**upayāta-*), a tax paid in kind, or *huthut*, “requirements,” plausibly a partial Elamite equivalent of the Old Persian loan. Both terms are connected with the royal domain and probably relate to the provision of the royal table (cf. §§ 2.4

<sup>247</sup> See generally Boucharlat 2005: 230-6, 272-4 (with bibliography and critical reflections on the use of the term ‘pavilion’). Farmeškān (column bases, window frame, lion statue and relief fragments): Razmjou 2005. Tang-e Bolaghī: [www.ifriran.org/Recherche/Archeologie.html](http://www.ifriran.org/Recherche/Archeologie.html). Qalēh-ye Kalī: Potts *et al.* 2007. Tepe Pahnu: Petrie *et al.* [forthc.].

<sup>248</sup> Commodities deposited for storage at Nupīštaš, under responsibility of Rašda: PF 0146, PF 0147, PF 0148, NN 0085, NN 0331, NN 0800, NN 0817, NN 0989, NN 1156, NN 1505, NN 2114, NN 2141 and NN 2445. Compare NN 2506 (wine received as revenue at N., R. responsible).

and 5 above). It is therefore no surprise to find that commodities were delivered/used as *ukpiyataš* or (royal) *huthut* at places that also hosted the table of the king or that of Irdabama: Hadaran, Liduma, Rappišbena, Šumarakše, Tandari and Uzikurraš. Particularly interesting is the case of Liduma, where the same amount of wine is received as *ukpiyataš* and poured before Irdabama in Dar.21 (suggesting that *ukpiyataš* can also relate to the table of a royal woman). The evidence can be summarised as follows (‘+’ = deposit; ‘-’ = withdrawal):<sup>249</sup>

**Hadaran/-š**

PF 1943:15-6	Dar.19	+	1,000	qts.	barley	acquired for making → <i>abbebe</i> as royal <i>huthut</i>
PF 1943:17-8	Dar.19	+	1,240	qts.	barley	acquired for brewing beer as royal <i>huthut</i>
PF 1942:3	Dar.19	-	12,440	qts.	barley	consumed before the king
PF 1943:1	Dar.19	-	3,577	qts.	barley	consumed before the king

**Liduma**

PF 0389	Dar.21	+	750	qts.	wine	received and processed/used as <i>ukpiyataš</i>
PF 0735	Dar.21	-	750	qts.	wine	poured before Irdabama
PF 0392	Dar.22	+	4		KUR.SAL (??)	received and processed/used as <i>ukpiyataš</i>
PF 0393	Dar.22	+	65	qts.	ŠE.GAL <sup>MEŠ</sup>	received and processed/used as <i>ukpiyataš</i>
PF 2016	Dar.22	+	600	qts.	barley	delivered for <i>ukpiyataš</i>
NN 1351	Dar.22	+	1,000	qts.	barley	received and processed/used as <i>ukpiyataš</i>
NN 1667	Dar.22 <sup>?</sup>	+	320	qts.	<i>mitli</i> , → <i>mitruša</i> and [...] <i>mirra</i>	received and processed/used as <i>ukpiyataš</i>
NN 0676	Dar.[20+]	-	1	qt.	honey	consumed before the king (cf. fn. 183 above)

**Rappišbena**

PF 0713	Dar.22	-	2,440	qts.	→ <i>abbebe</i>	consumed before the king
PF 0724	Dar.22	-	200	qts.	→ <i>tarmu</i>	consumed before the king
PF 0725	Dar.22	-	6		→ <i>banura</i>	consumed before the king
NN 2006	Dar.23	+	2,400	qts.	<i>tarmu</i>	transported and received as <i>ukpiyataš</i>

**Šumarakše**

PF 0717	Dar.21	-	100	qts.	→ <i>abbebe razi</i>	consumed before the king
PF 0428	Dar.28	+	3,000	qts.	<i>tarmu</i>	received as <i>ukpiyataš</i> , for brewing beer

**Tandari**

PF 0736	Dar.21	-	650	qts.	wine	poured before Irdabama
PF 0124	Dar.24	+	640	qts.	→ ŠE.GIG <sup>MEŠ</sup>	delivered and received as <i>ukpiyataš</i>
PF 0394	Dar.24	+	200	qts.	<i>tarmu</i>	received and used as <i>ukpiyataš</i>
PF 0395	Dar.24	+	90	qts.	<i>tarmu</i>	received and used as <i>ukpiyataš</i>
NN 1579	Dar.24	+	750	qts.	flour	received and processed/used as <i>ukpiyataš</i>
PF 0116	Dar.26	+	1,000	qts.	→ <i>tarmu</i>	delivered as <i>ukpiyataš</i>

**Uzikurraš**

PF 0051	Dar.22	+	1,440	qts.	wine	transported and received as <i>huthut</i>
PF 0052	Dar.22	+	2,060	qts.	wine	transported and received as <i>huthut</i>
PF 0699	Dar.25	-	5,460	qts.	flour	consumed before the king

<sup>249</sup> For reasons of economy, the summary excludes the numerous texts on commodities delivered as *huthut* at Persepolis or consumed there “before” the king, Irdabama or Irtaštuna. For Persepolis and (royal) *huthut* see: PF 0002, PF 0003, PF 0004, PF 0030, PF 0031, PF 0032, PF 0053, PF 0430, PF 1797, PF 1940:7-9, PF 1943:19-20, PF 1946:81, NN 0326, NN 0925, NN 1848, NN 1935 and NN 2499. Compare also Šullaggi, where Irdabama held an estate (cf. §3 above), and where 3,600 qts. of wine were deposited as *huthut*.

The texts cited here are a glimpse of the large-scale mechanism of provisioning for the royal table during the movements of the court. As stated before, this mechanism largely eludes us due to incomplete preservation of dossiers within the Fortification archive and the complete absence of the documentation produced by the court itself. Still, the above combinations of texts provide enough clues to reconstruct a sequence of steps starting with royal orders, advance planning of royal itineraries and lists of required commodities (documentation not extant), the effectuation of these in the transport of commodities to future halting places, the local processing and storage, and the accounting for the deposits (*ukpiyataš* and *huthut* texts), the withdrawal of the deposits for use at the royal table and the accounting for these withdrawals (*tibba* texts), finally, the distribution at the court of the king, or that of the royal women and the basis of lists kept by court officials and, presumably, a final round of accounting (documentation not extant).

Especially the evidence cited above on local processing, brewing beer, milling grain (implicit) and producing *abbebe*, “food,” from barley, is interesting in the light of the Qalēh-ye Kalī finds, which included millstones and large storage vessels (Potts *et al.* 2007: 297-8).

A last, conspicuous aspect of dated texts on commodities consumed “before” the king, Irdabama and Irtaštuna is their chronological distribution: all but four are dated to Dar.19, 21, 22 or 24.<sup>250</sup> In the Fortification archive, there is an overall clustering of more than 70% of dated memorandum-type texts in Dar.21-24. Relatively few texts from Dar.19 survive; the *tibba* texts from this year are thus a remarkable exception. By contrast, there is only one *tibba* text from Dar.23, whereas, overall, this year has the highest number of dated memorandum texts. Does this mean that tablets on commodities consumed “before” the king were kept longer or were stored separately? Does the striking virtual absence of texts from Dar.23 imply that the king did not tour in that year?

## 7. Evaluation

This study has focused on part of the rich dossier on the king and the court that still lies partly buried in the Persepolis Fortification Archive. I have generally concentrated on the disbursement side: commodities consumed at the Table of the King and similar institutions headed by Irdabama, Irtaštuna and Karkiš. The income side, particularly the texts on *huthut* and *ukpiyataš*, awaits further study. This means that the above discussions are necessarily incomplete and preliminary. Among the main conclusions reached the following may be listed here:

- The royal domain (*ulhi*) was a separate economic entity, yet closely related and overlapping with the Persepolis economy at large in a way best described by a gradual, pyramidal model
- the crown travelled with its own administrative and bureaucratic apparatus that linked up with the Persepolis administration when in Fārs

<sup>250</sup> The above texts on deposits of *ukpiyataš* or (royal) *huthut* add only four or five exceptions.

- the court drew upon the resources of the Persepolis economy at large, but it also had other sources of income, including the *ukpiyataš/upiyāta* tax
- the crown’s internal hierarchy included officials responsible for the provisioning of the royal table who travelled with the court; they are visible in the Fortification archive through the impressions of their seals on receipts (*tibba* texts)
- redistribution of commodities within the court society was a matter of the court administration and therefore largely invisible in the Fortification archive; it may have been the responsibility of the same officials that sealed the *tibba* texts
- the *tibba* texts do not necessarily imply feasting, but they do imply the presence of the king (or Irdabama, Irtaštuna or Karkiš)
- the *tibba* texts agree with the testimonies of Heraclides and Polyaeus on the Table of the King as the central locus of redistribution
- the Elamite and Greek sources both (implicitly) understand the Table of the King as an complex organisation with its own rules, hierarchy and bureaucracy
- difference in detail as to the commodities consumed at the Table of the King are largely explicable from differences in perspective: whereas Polyaeus describes *all* ingredients for a royal banquet, the tablets concentrate exclusively on locally produced foodstuffs
- Polyaeus’ list seems to refer to the court during its seasonal movements; during its stay in Fārs more time was available to put horses on pasture, lessening the need for supplementary fodder, hence the lower amounts of grain for horses in the *tibba* texts
- the royal women Irdabama and Irtaštuna had their own ‘table’ and like the king’s theirs was an institution of its own right and was recognised as such by the Persepolis administration
- the structure and complexity of the economic realms, *ulhi*, of Irdabama and Irtaštuna are modelled after that of the king. Like the House of the King, theirs was distinct yet intricately interwoven with the Persepolis economy at large
- beyond Fārs, Irdabama seems to have had economic interests in the Borsippa region
- Irtaštuna seems to have been considered as prime representative of the Teispid branch of the royal family; her young son, Iršama still ‘sat at her table,’ but was also starting to take responsibility for family members such as Uparmiya (Parmys)
- the case of Karkiš not only confirms that satraps had their own ‘table,’ but it particularly illuminates the status of satraps; the title principally refers to an authority directly bestowed by the king on a representative who could yield that authority whenever and wherever his duties or his status required it: one did not need to be in a ‘satrapy’ to act as a satrap
- the reference to a *mardam* of Karkiš is an indication that the latter had his own House (*ulhi*), recognised as a separate economic entity by the Persepolis authorities
- the *tibba* texts provide evidence for royal itineraries through Fārs distinct from the court’s seasonal movements
- Irdabama and Irtaštuna presumably embarked upon itineraries of their own, separate from the king, to visit their domains and to be seen by the *autourgoi*
- plantations (paradises) must have been common halting places for the royal court
- the archaeological evidence on so-called ‘pavilions,’ notably that of Qalēh-ye Kalī matches the profile of royal halting places as can be deduced from the *tibba* texts

I briefly return to “the actual words of Darius” cited at the beginning of this study (Fort. 6764): his order to transfer of 100 sheep from his *ulhi* to that of Irtaštuna. This text became known as an isolated and exceptional piece of evidence, before Hallock had started to publish the Fortification tablets. Indeed, Fort. 6764 does shed a light of its own on the Achaemenid court, but its full significance can only be understood against the background of the archive. This observation may seem gratuitous, but it gains relevance in the light of the dazzling complexity and size of the royal economy, its intricate relation with the Persepolis institution and its existence among the economic domains of royal women, satraps and other nobles.

Whereas the dossier treated in this study has shed some light on the economic persona of Irtaštuna and king Darius, one character mentioned in Fort. 6764 stands out as even more mysterious than before: Parnakka. As Pierre Briant has convincingly argued, Parnakka headed the Persepolis economy at large, but also the royal domain, or at least that part of it that was in Fārs (2002: 469-71). This would explain how Darius could order Parnakka to transfer livestock from the royal *ulhi* to Irtaštuna and how Parnakka could subsequently order Harrena, an official *within* the Persepolis economy, to issue the animals (on the king’s account) to the royal woman. It also explains how Parnakka, in other texts, could order livestock to be issued for sacrifices at the *šip* feast that he himself presided over as direct representative of the king (Henkelman [forthc.]). The solution is especially attractive in that it underlines the haziness of the border between royal and ‘public’ domain. But it also makes us wonder more and more who this man named Parnakka really was. Was he actually Darius’ uncle, as some (e.g., Hallock 1985: 591) have concluded from the patronym on his seal, *ršm* (Arsames)? Was he a satrap in the sense that he was bestowed with direct royal authority, like Karkiš? Does the fact that he issued *viatica* to travellers make him the king’s satrap plenipotentiary in Fārs? Did he tour Fārs precisely *because* he was the king’s representative? Where the large daily amounts of wine, livestock and grain given to Parnakka redistributed within his own House? Where they a recognition of his status? And, if the answer to all these questions is affirmative, why is there not a single *tibba* text on Parnakka...?

Wouter F.M. Henkelman  
Collège de France  
11, place Marcelin-Berthelot  
75231 Paris

*Appendix: select Achaemenid Elamite nutritional and agricultural terms*

*abbebe* – The word usually spelled as *ab-be-KI+MIN* was probably pronounced /apepe/;<sup>251</sup> and is a general term for “food, prepared food.”<sup>252</sup> It is used as summarising term for grain (barley), sesame, *tarmu* (emmer?), beer and *šanakaš* in NN 0521 and for various kinds of fruit in NN 0002. Cereal products (loaves, porridges, grain-based stews, etc.) are denoted by the more precise term *ab-be-KI+MIN ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-na*, but this does not always have to be used when it is clear from the context that grain or flour is involved.<sup>253</sup> Thus, in PF 0421 grain is used for making *abbebe*, and in PF 1940:7-9 (and elsewhere) grain is issued to a *abbebe huttira* (producer of food from cereals; cf. Henkelman 1997: 344). Note, however, that once *abbebe ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-na* summarises a list including non-cereal products such as honey (PF 0298 on which cf. → *mitruša*).

*abbebe razi* – The element *ra-zí* in *abbebe razi* may be an imprecise variant spelling of *ra-zí-ia-um*, “grape.”<sup>254</sup> The combination with → *abbebe*, probably denotes a kind of food prepared from grapes. The scepticism of the EW (s.v. *ra-zí*, “An eine ‘Traubenspeise’ ist schwerlich zu denken”) seems unjustified and is a bit mysterious given that EW s.v. *ab-be.KI.MIN*, gives “Nahrungsmittel, Speise(n).”

Polyaenus (*Strat.* IV.3.32) lists, among the commodities prepared for the king’s table, 5 *marriš* (50 qts.) of γλεύκους ἐξ οἴνου πέντε μάριας, i.e. grape jelly, wine syrup, or some similar product (cf. Amigues 2003: 8, 49, “concentré de vin doux, moût tiré du vin” and Schmitt 1993: 248, “must from grapes”).

*banura* (*bannumar*) – Korbel (*apud* Hinz 1973: 82) suggested, on the basis of *ba-nu-ra* (PF 0725), a loan from Old Persian *\*panīra-*, “Käse.”<sup>255</sup> Note that *ba-nu-ra* was probably pronounced /panir(a)/ (cf. Tavernier [forthc. 1]), which supports Korbel’s proposal. On the other hand, the spelling *ban-nu-mar* (NN 0906) does not agree with *\*panīra-*, though the context strongly suggests that we are dealing with the same commodity. Perhaps one should assume an older form, *\*panīvara-*, which contracted to *\*panīra-* (pers.comm. J. Tavernier 11/4/2007). That no (weight) measure, but only a number is mentioned agrees with the Neo-Babylonian *Aršam* contracts, which state that a contractant herdsman should give one cheese (*gubnatu*) per fertile ewe, but do not stipulate its size or weight. The same is true for a list of provisions from late Achaemenid Bactria, where no weight or volume measure is given in the entry on cheese (*gbn*).<sup>256</sup>

<sup>251</sup> Cf. the spellings *ab-be-be* and *ha-be-be*.

<sup>252</sup> Cf. EW s.v. *ab-be.KI.MIN*, “Nahrungsmittel, Speise(n).”

<sup>253</sup> One of these cases is probably PF 1768, where *abbebe* is given to horses and probably denotes some cereal product, perhaps a special porridge (not necessarily bread, as Gabrielli 2006: 43 assumes).

<sup>254</sup> Old Persian *\*razya-*; Hinz 1975: 204; EW s.vv. *ra-zí-ya-ra*, *ra-zí-ya-um*; Tavernier 2007: 460 [4.4.20.13]; cf. Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1997: 336.

<sup>255</sup> Accepted by Hinz *l.c.*, EW s.v. *ba-nu-ra* and Tavernier 2007: 457 [4.4.19.9].

<sup>256</sup> Bactria: Naveh and Shaked [forthc.], C1. Babylonia: Van Driel 1993: 222, 241; CAD G 118 s.v. *gubnatu*. Kozuh discusses AnOr 8 67 (dating to Camb.28), on she-goats and ewes producing

In PF 0727 and NN 1894 the commodity PA<sup>MEŠ</sup> is “consumed before the king.” Hallock considered *pa-áš* a possible alternative reading (1969: 221 note a), but MEŠ seems likelier than ÁŠ in both cases. The absence of a (weight) measure, the low numbers involved and the fact that PA<sup>MEŠ</sup> is consumed at the royal table induces me to consider PA<sup>MEŠ</sup> as an abbreviation of *banura*. The editors of the EW (s.v. *pa.lg*) may have been thinking in the same direction since they propose “Käse,” yet without giving their arguments. Abbreviations are not uncommon in Elamite. Compare RI for *ribut*, “quarter shekel” (Akk. *rebūtu*) in late Middle Elamite (Stolper 1984: 22, 107), Middle and Neo-Elamite Elamite HA for *hat*, “terror” (Akk. *ḥattu*; cf. Henkelman 2006: 263: 600), Neo-Elamite MU<sup>MEŠ</sup> for *murun* “earth” (cf. EW s.v. *mu.lg*), Achaemenid Elamite *na-ah*<sup>MEŠ</sup> for Nahhunte (PF 1802; cf. Koch 1977: 59-60) and, plausibly, <sup>GIŠ</sup>RU<sup>MEŠ</sup> for *rumiziš/miriziš*, “rice(?)” (Old Persian \**vrīziš*; Fort. 7253).

Another, less likely, possibility is to take PA<sup>MEŠ</sup> as an abbreviation of *baša*, which occurs in reduplicated form (*ba-šá-KI+MIN*) in a list of cereal products (PF 0298). This word is itself of unknown meaning. Unlike PA<sup>MEŠ</sup>, it occurs with an indication of (dry) measure.

Hallock’s translation of PA<sup>MEŠ</sup> as “axes(?)” probably based on Akk. *pāšum*, is unlikely, since the commodity or objects are said to be *makka*. Though *makka* does not have always have to be taken literally (“consumed”), it surely belongs to the sphere of nutrition, not to that of use or delivery of durable goods (cf. fn. 23 above).

In both texts concerned PA<sup>MEŠ</sup> is issued by Mipanda. This officer also allocates flour (PF 0703, NN 0117), cereal products (PF 0715, PF 0716, NN 0189, NN 0766) and honey (PF 0721, NN 1383).

*basbas* – *basbas* is a loan from Akkadian *paspasu*, “duck” (CAD P 222-4 s.v. *paspasu*), but it is debated whether the word refers to the same bird in Iranian context, as Hallock assumed (1969: 48, 675). The word occurs already in late Middle Elamite (Stolper 1984: 107), which is one of the reasons that “Pfaufen” (EW s.vv. *ba-as-ba-as*<sup>MEŠ</sup>, *ba-is.KI.MIN*) seems highly unlikely. Note that ducks are also known from a Neo-Elamite omen text from Susa, but this text uses a logogram (UZ<sup>MEŠ</sup>; Scheil 1917: 34, 52-3). Other, more pertinent objections against the peafowl thesis is that its meat is rather untasty (yet *basbas* were consumed and used for sacrifices) and that some texts speak of Egyptian *basbas*,<sup>257</sup> whereas peafowl are native to India and Sri Lanka.<sup>258</sup> That the amounts of

milk for the court, “perhaps to be consumed as such or made into cheese or yoghurt” (2006: 268). According to Aelian (*VH* I.31), cheese was among the simple gifts given to the Persian kings by the peasant population of Fārs. It was also among the products from India tasted by Ctesias at the Achaemenid court (Phot. *Bibl.* LXXII.49b = Ctesias F45 §48 Lenfant). A cup of sour milk (ποτήριον ὄξυγάλακτος) was drunk by the Persian king during the coronation ritual (Plut. *Art.* 3.2). On the dairy products listed by Polyaeus (*Strat.* IV.3.32) see Amigues 2003: 40-2.

<sup>257</sup> NN 0028, NN 0891, NN 0940, NN 0966, NN 1164, NN 2375 and Fort. 6831. One text (PF 1724) qualifies *basbas* as <sup>1</sup>ra<sup>2</sup>-lu<sup>2</sup>, the meaning of which is unknown. The EW, in one of its more amusing entries (s.v. *ra-lu*), proposes “Dressierte(?) Pfaufen.”

grain fodder for *basbas* sometimes equal that of → *ippur* (perhaps geese) does not favour peafowl either (*pace EW l.c.*); equal rations for ducks and geese are known from Mesopotamia (Janković 2004: 46). The conclusive argument is that of the attested ration scales for *basbas*. A few texts have an amount of 1 qt./day: PF 1727,<sup>259</sup> PF 1943:21-30, PF 1945:1-3 and NN 0655. This highest ration scale for *basbas* would still be quite low for a peacock (cf. Tuplin 1996: 108 fn. 93) or a turkey (as Hinz 1970: 438 proposed [*sic!*]), but it has an exact parallel in the ration scales for ducks that are subjected to quick fattening or even force-feeding (*gavage*) in Neo-Babylonian texts (Janković 2004: 41-7). The other, more regularly attested ration scales for *basbas* are 0.17 or 0.33 qt. of grain per day, the former the amount for young animals (*titpi*, "chicks, ducklings").<sup>260</sup> The rations of 0.17/0.33 qt./day probably pertain to ducklings and ducks that were also fattened for slaughter, but over a longer period including much pasture time (Germ. *Weidenmast*). Animals kept for breeding at Sippar received lower yet comparable rations of 0.2-0.25 lt./day (cf. Janković, *l.c.*).<sup>261</sup> The small difference may be explained from divergent local practice, perhaps influenced by the fact that all poultry at Persepolis was for royal consumption.

Finally, the fact that account texts on *basbas* list more male than female animals is only seemingly an argument for the interpretation "peafowl" for *basbas*. First, the peacock is indeed more beautiful than the dull peahen, but peafowl tend to be monogamous so that slaughtering female chicks would be disadvantageous for breeding purposes. Secondly, the fact that males outnumber females in account texts on *basbas*, agrees well with the likelihood that ducks were, like sheep and goats, managed in a consignment or share-breeding system, as they were in Mesopotamia.<sup>262</sup> In this system, flocks predominantly consisting of female animals (*e.g.*, in a 1:5 male/female ratio) were consigned to individual duckherds who were obliged to deliver a three-fold yield in ducklings (based on the number of females) and were themselves entitled to extra increase of the flock. In contrast to this external sphere, the accounts in the archive are inventories of internal herds, i.e. the animals delivered to the administration by the contractant duckherds and subsequently fattened for slaughter. Logically, these groups have, overall, more drakes and male ducklings rather than

<sup>258</sup> The Egyptian ducks could be of the species known as the Northern Pintail, *Anas acuta*; cf. Janković 2004: 5-6.

<sup>259</sup> The daily ration of 7 qts. in total for ʾ70ʾ1 *basbas* is unlikely low; the number of birds is therefore probably to be corrected to ʾ7ʾ1 (almost nothing of the sign remains).

<sup>260</sup> NN 0891, NN 0940 and NN 0966.

<sup>261</sup> Note that Gershevitch explained *datkamaš*, a qualification for *basbas* on the 0.33 qt. (PF 1728, PF 1729, PF 1730 and PF 1731) or the 1 qt. ration (NN 0099) as "puffed up" (1969: 169), but the word, though certainly Iranian, is of uncertain etymology (Hinz 1975: 87; Tavernier 2007: 505 [5.3.4.16]).

<sup>262</sup> Janković 2004: 49-50, 68-82; compare also Tarasewicz 2003.

ducks and female ducklings.<sup>263</sup> There is, then, a strong case for Hallock’s proposal to translate *basbas* as “duck.”<sup>264</sup>

*hadu(mi)ya* – The word *hadumiya* is an *-iya* derivation of *haduš*, evidently a loan from Old Persian \**ādu-*, “seed” (EW s.v. *ha-du-iš*); cf. Avestan *ādu-*, “grain.” In Fortification contexts *haduš* and *hadumiya* are used in the secondary meaning “revenue, yield” or “increase.” *haduš* (and its variants) occurs in texts on the intake of grain, fruit, and wine, whereas the derivative *hadumiya* is used for livestock. Hallock, though generally translating “provision,” also thought of an Old Persian loan and suggested that, when used as qualification of young animals, *haduše* (“its *haduš*”) should be interpreted as “yield” (1969: 22, 686). More precisely, we are dealing with new-season lambs, less than one year old and possibly still unweaned.<sup>265</sup>

As for *haduš*, I cannot concur with Giovinazzo’s proposal to differentiate between *haduš* in expressions like (wine) *haduš ha duka* (“it was received as revenue”) and *haduš* (and *hadumiya*) used in relation to animals (1989: 22-4). There are several objections to be raised against this thesis, which I have listed elsewhere (cf. Henkelman 2006: 339 fn. 780). One is the observation that *haduš* sometimes occurs with a determinative, which renders its analysis as locative adverb + finite verb (\*\**ha duš*, “on a reču ici”) impossible. Furthermore, the interpretation of the ‘second’ *haduš* as “petits ou jeunes animaux” (*ibid.*; cf. Tavernier 2007: 521 [5.4.4.6]) basically rests on the unfounded assumption that *haduš* is used as synonym of *tila* (“calf”) in PF 2086:12-4. In fact, the word is used as a summarising category (“yield”) qualifying male and female *tila* in a list of cattle.

$\text{GIŠ}_1\text{MEŠ}$  – In most cases,  $\text{GIŠ}_1\text{MEŠ}$  in the Fortification texts denotes oil pressed from sesame.<sup>266</sup> Like Akk. *šamnu* (i, i.GIŠ, i+GIŠ), it could also, however, refer to other oily substances (*pace*

<sup>263</sup> The ratio male/female is 10:1 in NN 0521, 5:1 in PF 2014 and NN 0568, 3:1 in NN 0755, NN 0757 and NN 2296. Just slightly more males than females: NN 1030, NN 2295, NN 2375.

<sup>264</sup> By contrast, *hatika* can hardly be a duck. The word has been explained as a loan from Old Persian \**ātika*, “duck?” (Emmerick *apud* Gershevitch 1969: 170; Hinz 1975: 48; Tavernier 2007: 413 [4.4.6.1]). *hatika* are mentioned twice and get rations as low as 0.1-0.2 qt./day (PF 1940:11-22; PF 1943:21-30). They occur alongside *basbas* in PF 1943:21-30 (the *basbas* get five times more fodder).

<sup>265</sup> It is not known at what age lambs were normally weaned in Pārsa; if not weaned by the herdsman, lambs will be weaned by the ewe after five months (Heimpel 1993: 121-3; Steinkeller 1995: 54-5 [I owe these references to Bojana Janković]). See also Finet 1992: 32 on spring lambs eaten at the Kalah banquet and Fales & Postgate 1992 nos. 149, 151, 154.

<sup>266</sup> PF 0431 (*pace* Vallat 1994: 272), PF 0986, NN 0232 and NN 0647; cf. EW s.vv. *ap-pi*,  $\text{GIŠ}_1\text{.i.lg}$ , and *mi-ul*. Sesame has not, thus far, been attested in disbursements for the royal table, but it is found among the commodities stored for use within the royal domain (PF 0543). It is also mentioned in connection with “cattle of the king” (PF 1991, PF 1992, PF 2082, NN 1016, NN 1017 and NN 1904). At first sight, this would seem to point at feeding sesame to the animals, a practise which would be aimed at improving the meat’s flavour. Similarly poultry (probably always ‘royal’; cf. §1 above) was fed with various (special) cereals, flour (for dough paste?; cf. Janković 2004: 19) and sesame: PF 1748, PF 1754, PF 1755, PF 1756, NN 0033, NN 0335, NN 0337,

Lewis 1987: 86), namely other vegetable oils and (animal) fat or dairy products like cream or ghee.<sup>267</sup> Perfumed oil, perhaps prepared with (cedar) wood, for Irtaštuna is mentioned in NN 1319, and terebinth, acanthus and almond oil (ἔλαιον) were among the requirements for the royal table.<sup>268</sup> Sheep/goats and  $GI\dot{S}_1ME\dot{S}$  are withdrawn from thirteen stockyards in the account text PF 2084 (similarly NN 2192), suggesting that, in this case, we are dealing with a dairy product.

A corpus of three texts refers to  $GI\dot{S}_1ME\dot{S}$  dispensed for the royal table. One is Sb 13078 = MDP 11 308, the unique Fortification-like economic text excavated at Susa. It speaks of 64 *mar-ri-iš*  $GI\dot{S}_1ME\dot{S}$  *ra-mi* UDU.NITÁ<sup>MEŠ</sup>-*na*, “640 (liquid) qts. of refined sheep ghee,” which were consumed (*makka*) “before the king” at five villages near Susa.<sup>269</sup> Note that Susa text uses *makka*, “consumed,” not *kitka*, “poured” (as with wine and beer), but that it also gives the quantity in the liquid measure, *marriš*. This implies a semi-liquid substance kept in jars, apparently the criterion for the use of *marriš*.<sup>270</sup> Furthermore, the circumstance that the  $GI\dot{S}_1ME\dot{S}$  of Sb 13078 is *rami*, “refined,”<sup>271</sup> and the observation that it is consumed in the warm climate of the Susiana, suggest that ghee (clarified butter, Germ. Butterschmalz) is meant. Ghee, Akk. *ḫimētu*, was part of the herdsman’s annual pensum in the Aršam contracts; 1 lt. per 100 sheep was the required amount (cf. Van

NN 0574, NN 0829, NN 0969, NN 1292 and NN 1664. Yet, as EW s.v. GUD.lg points out, in some contexts there are arguments favouring a second meaning for GUD: “possession” (“Hab und Gut, Besitz”). If that applies to GUD<sup>MEŠ</sup> EŠŠANA-*na* in the sesame texts, it means that the product (probably as sesame oil) was added to assets of the king’s house. In PF 0297, 435 qts. of barley are exchanged for 145 qts. of *appi šE.GIŠ.Ī<sup>MEŠ</sup>*, which, considering the amounts, must be sesame oil (cf. Stol [forthc.]). On sesame in Polyaeus’ list (*Strat.* IV.3.32) see Amigues 2003: 50-1.

<sup>267</sup> Cf. CAD Š/1 329 *šamnu* m-n: ĩ+GIŠ MUŠEN.MEŠ, ĩ+GIŠ UDU.NITÁ, etc.

<sup>268</sup> NN 1319:1-4 reads (in Hallock’s transliteration): 56 qts.  $GI\dot{S}_1ME\dot{S}$  *ik-na-tur-ráš ma-i-ki* <sup>SAL</sup>*ir-taš-du-na-ik-ka*<sub>4</sub>. In this text, *iknaturráš* probably is a loan from Old Persian \**gnādra-*, “aromatic, odoriferous” (cf. Gershevitch [letter dd. Oct. 1971] *apud* Hallock [ms.]; EW s.v. *ik-na-tur-ráš*, Tavernier 2007: 405 [4.4.2.8]). More problematic, however, is the following *ma-i-ki*, which seems inexplicable. A different word separation may be proposed:  $GI\dot{S}_1ME\dot{S}$  *ik-na-tur-ráš-ma i-ki*, “(56 qts. of) oil, as aromatic (product) (made of) *iki*.” If this interpretation is correct, *iki* is probably to be taken as the Achaemenid Elamite continuation of Neo-Elamite *hu-uk* and *huhkat*, “wood” (on which see Frank 1928/29: 39; EW s.vv. *hu-h-qa-at*, *hu-uk* and *ḫu-uk*). One may think of ‘cedar oil,’ i.e. sesame oil perfumed with cedar aroma (cf. Jursa 2004; see also CAD Š/1 328-9 s.v. *šamnu* l). For terebinth, acanthus and almond oil, cf. Polyaeus *Strat.* IV.3.32 (see Amigues 2003: 51-3). Amyntas (*apud* Ath. II.67a) mentions terebinth, mastic and Persian nut oil, Ctesias (*ibid.*) thistle oil.

<sup>269</sup> On the tablet cf. Scheil 1911: 89, 101; Hallock 1969: 25; Garrison 1991: 5; *idem* 1996 [with transliteration and translation by Jones]; Stolper 1992a; Garrison & Root 2001: 35, 68-70; Briant [forthc. 1]. Jones *apud* Garrison 1996: 20 translates “fine<sup>?</sup> animal fat.”

<sup>270</sup> For this reason, we are probably not dealing with more liquid dairy products like dugh or yoghurt (*dwg* is mentioned in the Late Achaemenid Aramaic administrative documents from Bactria; cf. Shaked 2004: 41 and Naveh & Shaked [forthc.], C1). Moreover, fermented is not the same as ‘refined,’ the qualification given to  $GI\dot{S}_1ME\dot{S}$  (cf. 201 below).

<sup>271</sup> Old Persian \**ramya-*, “fine, refined, delicate.” Cf. Hinz 1973: 40; Schmitt 1974: 104; Tavernier 2007: 406 [4.4.2.17].

Driel 1993: 222, 242). The product can be preserved over extended periods, even in hot climates. It also occurs among the requirements for the banquet organised by Assurnasirpal II at Kalah.<sup>272</sup> Note that Polyaeus (*Strat.* IV.3.32) mentions, among the requirements for the royal table, “50 qts. of oil from milk” (ἐλαίου ἀπὸ γάλακτος πέντε μάριας), which may mean butter (so LSJ s.v. ἔλαιον; Amigues 2003: 41-2), but which, in Persian context, is probably ghee (cf. fn. 272 above).

The two other texts on  $GI\dot{S}_I^{ME\dot{S}}$  from sheep are PF 0726 and NN 1384. Though the former does not stipulate that the ‘oil’ mentioned is from sheep, this is very likely from the parallel with NN 1384 (same supplier) and from the fact that commodity is *makka*, “consumed” (not *kitka*, “poured”).<sup>273</sup>

Note that all three texts on  $GI\dot{S}_I^{ME\dot{S}}$  are sealed with PFS 0007\*, used on all receipts of requirements for the royal table, except sheep/goats and cattle. This confirms this  $GI\dot{S}_I^{ME\dot{S}}$  is not animal fat or any other semi-liquid substance from slaughtered animals. If that had been the case, one would have expected PFS 0093\*, the seal used by the royal butcher (cf. §2.5 above). Note that another dairy product, → *banura*, “cheese,” also occurs with seal PFS 0007\*.

$GI\dot{S}_{IN}^{ME\dot{S}}$  – This logogram occurs exclusively in texts on fodder for livestock (including poultry) and is introduced to indicate that the animals receiving barley (or another cereal) receive nutrition from another source as well. This may affect the height of the fodder ration in positive or negative sense, or not at all. Hallock therefore only hesitantly proposed “in pasture, on pasturage” (1969: 48). The EW (s.v.  $GI\dot{S}_{IN}.lg$ ), in turn, explained the logogram as an abbreviation of *IN.NU* (*tibnu*), “straw,” which is not unlikely since the abbreviated form is attested from the Old Babylonian period onwards, especially in Elam (cf. CAD T 380 s.v. *tibnu*). The dictionary subsequently concludes that animals said to be  $GI\dot{S}_{IN}^{ME\dot{S}}-na$ , must be “auf Strohweide” (stubble field), but this is not necessarily true, even though the practice as such is well known.  $GI\dot{S}_{IN}^{ME\dot{S}}-na$  animals occur in fodder texts pertaining to periods of up to six months (PF 1705, PF 1710, NN 0711, NN 1915 and NN 2537); it is hard to imagine that there would be harvested fields available during such extensive periods. I therefore prefer to see  $GI\dot{S}_{IN}^{ME\dot{S}}-na$  as an expression for animals that are “on straw.” More precisely, animals that were “on straw” may sometimes actually have been put on stubble fields, but the definition of  $GI\dot{S}_{IN}^{ME\dot{S}}-na$  is not grazing on a stubble field, but being on a diet that had straw as main component. For the administrators it was important to know this, because it affected the quantity of fodder necessary for the animals. Note that large quantities of straw (and chaff) for animals were distributed daily by the king according to Polyaeus (*Strat.* IV.3.32). These animals too, were apparently not put on stubble field, but were fed in the stable or the king’s camp.

<sup>272</sup> For Babylonian uses see CAD H 198-99 s.v. *himētu*, Stol 1993: 101-3 (who stresses that real butter was unknown in the ancient Near East) and Englund 1995: 38-40. Kalah: Finet 1992: 35.

<sup>273</sup> Note also the intriguing remark by Aelian about Indian rams from whose tails fat was extracted by means of incisions (*NA* IV.32). See also Steinkeller 1995: 51 on Ur III “fat-tailed” sheep.

At the same time, I concur with EW, that the simultaneous occurrence of animals that are on straw and animals that are → *zarakkaš*, “grazing” (NN 0641), excludes Hallock’s interpretation of  $GI\dot{S}_{IN}ME\dot{S}-na$  as “on pasture.” An additional argument to this effect is that an opposition similar to  $GI\dot{S}_{IN}ME\dot{S}-na/zarakkaš$  is found in Aramaic administrative documents from Achaemenid Bactria. There, the same term, *zarakkaš* (rendered *šrk* in Aramaic), is used alongside *syt*, explained by the editors as a loanword (from Old Persian \**čāyita-*, “protected”?) for “sheltered, kept in an enclosure” (Naveh & Shaked [forthc.], commentary on C1).

It should be noted that the barley (and other cereals) given to livestock in the Fortification tablets normally does not represent a full ration (cf. Gabrielli 2006: 52-62). Especially in the case of horses, it is clear that other sources of nutrition must have been used, i.e. green feed in the case of grazing animals, and straw in case of animals kept on stable. Each condition (and the transition from one phase to another) required a balanced diet; it is this reality that underlies the use of the terms  $GI\dot{S}_{IN}ME\dot{S}-na$  or *zarakkaš*.

It may be that the  $GI\dot{S}_{IN}ME\dot{S}-na$  diet at least in some cases it pertained to animals that were being fattened for slaughter. This is particularly evident in the case of → *basbas* (ducks) and → *ippur* (geese): the 1 qt./day ration for animals subjected to intensive fattening is several times associated with  $GI\dot{S}_{IN}ME\dot{S}-na$  poultry (PF 1734 and NN 0655). Similarly, Gabrielli (2006: 50-2) notes that horses  $GI\dot{S}_{IN}ME\dot{S}-na$  sometimes receive exceptionally high rations; he concludes that these animals may have been fattened for consumption.<sup>274</sup> In other words “on straw” at least in some cases identifies animals with a diet aimed at fattening.

*ippur* – As Hallock (1969: 48) remarks, Mesopotamian institutional archives refer to only three kinds of poultry: geese, ducks and doves (cf. Janković 2004: 3 on Neo-Babylonian Sippar and Uruk). His suggestion that the three most frequent terms for poultry species in the Fortification archive, *ippur*, *basbas* and *šudabah*, may be identified with geese, ducks, and doves respectively is therefore perfectly legitimate, especially since *ippur*, *basbas* and *šudabah* are usually mentioned in that order (i.e. of descending weight). The suggestion has not yet, however, been tested against the evidence on fodder rations. It appears that this evidence, in the case of *ippur*, corroborates Hallock’s suggestion (followed by Hinz 1970: 438 and EW s.v. *ip-pu-ur*) and is in line with Babylonian documentation on geese (*kurkû*). Note that geese also occur, again in the context of an Achaemenid institutional economy, in the Aramaic documents from Bactria (Naveh & Shaked [forthc.], esp. C1 and, from year 7 of Alexander, C4).

Like *basbas*, *ippur* normally receive rations of 0.17 or 0.33 qt. of grain per day; Middle Babylonian rations for geese of 0.2 and 0.4 lt. are attested (Janković 2004: 46).<sup>275</sup>

<sup>274</sup> But elsewhere in the same publication (pp.58-61), the high rations of 15 qts./day are interpreted as evidence for exceptionally big horses. It is not clear to me how precisely Gabrielli combines these two notions.

<sup>275</sup> The ration scales for *ippur* exclude “ostrich” (as Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1995: 294-5 proposed).

Apart from the standard ration of 0.33 qt., rations of 0.20-0.25 qt. are attested.<sup>276</sup> Higher rations, of 0.5 lt. are known in Mesopotamia; these were animals that were fattened together with ducks that received 0.2 and 0.6 lt./day (CT 55, 660 in *ibid.* 42-3). The situation in Fārs is again not too different: exceptional rations for intensive fattening for *ippur* were the same as for *basbas*, 1 qt./day.<sup>277</sup> Note, moreover, that these animals are sometimes said to be “on straw” (PF 1734, NN 0655), pointing to a specific method of fattening (cf. → G<sup>Š</sup>IN<sup>MEŠ</sup>). In such a situation, geese would probably be able to gather more additional nutrition than ducks (Janković 2004: 18). Furthermore, *ippur* consistently occur in lower numbers than *basbas*, which again agrees with the Mesopotamian evidence on geese and ducks (Janković, *ll.cc.*). Finally, and this is the most weighty argument, contrary to *basbas*, *ippur* do not appear in annual inventories; such inventories point to the existence of an external consignment system in the case of livestock and ducks. As Janković has demonstrated for the Ebabbar at Neo-Babylonian Sippar, ducks were tended in external flocks, but doves and geese were a matter for the temple’s internal organisation.<sup>278</sup>

Fattened geese and goslings were standard requirements for the royal table according to Polyaeus (*Strat.* IV.3.32) and Heraclides (*apud* Ath. IV.145e), and even half a goose constituted a royal gift according to Xenophon (*Anab.* I.9.25).<sup>279</sup>

*kariri* – *kariri* does not mean “kids” as Hallock (1969: 16, 710) proposed. The meaning “lambs” is established on the basis of the Aramaic gloss *’mrn* on PF 0695 (EW s.v. *qa-ri-ri*; Henkelman, Jones & Stolper 2006: 8).

*karukur* – EW s.v. G<sup>Š</sup>.*qa-ru-kur* tentatively suggests “Granatäpfel” (followed by Uchitel 1997: 142). The pomegranate is native to Iran, was already known by proto-Elamite culture, and may have been exported from Iran to Mesopotamia (Börker-Klähn 1957/71; Bobek 1968: 284, 287). There are some indications that *karukur* was considered a royal fruit: large amounts are consumed before the king (NN 0923 and NN 1735), it is given to a group of ca. 500 royal workers (Fort. 5466; cf. NN 1705 and NN 1958), it is sometimes ‘royal’ (PF 2018 and NN 0141; but other fruit may be ‘royal’ too) and it is

<sup>276</sup> PF 1735, PF 1741 and PF 1940:11-22.

<sup>277</sup> PF 1734, PF 1943:21-30 and NN 0655.

<sup>278</sup> Janković 2004: 92-5. Note that the situation in Babylonia and, apparently, Iran, differed from that of Achaemenid Egypt. From a small collection of Demotic documents dating to 488-485 BC, we know that the grey geese in the possession of the Domain of Amon in the district of Hou were leased out in small flocks to gooseherds. An expected annual increase of three geese for a flock of twenty is attested once. On the dossier see Vleeming 1991, esp. 7-11, 19-69. Geese in administrative documents from Achaemenid Bactria: Shaked 2004: 41.

<sup>279</sup> Geese are depicted on a Lorestān brooch (Börker-Klähn 1957/71: 622), on the famous Arjān bowl (Alvarez-Mon 2004: 219), on Daskyleion seal DS 110 (Kaptan 2002 vol. I: 161; vol. II: 123, pls. 318-9) and on Fortification seals PFS 31 and, possibly, PFS 1374 (Garrison & Root 2001: 104, 257).

stored under supervision of Rašda, the royal steward (PF 0147, NN 1505; cf. §3 above).<sup>280</sup> Note also the *karukur* keepers (<sup>GIŠ</sup>ka<sub>4</sub>-ru-kur <sup>HAL</sup>nu-iš-ki-ip) mentioned twice (PF 0869, NN 2441); no ‘keepers’ of other kinds of fruit are known.

In addition to the Elamite evidence, we know that the pomegranate was indeed special for the Achaemenids: pomegranates are held by many of the nobles on the Persepolis reliefs, a pomegranate serves as the finial of the king’s parasol and gold and silver pomegranates famously adorned the spears of the 10,000 strong royal guard (Hdt. VII.41). A large pomegranate was a suitable gift to the king of kings (Ael. *VH* I.33; Plut. *Art.* IV.4) and one *artabe* of a potion or posset in which (the skins of) sour pomegranates had cooked (κυκεῶνος ἐκ σιδίων ὀξέων ἀρτάβης; cf. LSJ s.vv. κυκεών, σίδιον) was served at the royal table.<sup>281</sup> Altogether, there is a case to be made for both *karukur* and the pomegranate as a particularly royal fruit. This renders the proposed identification likely, though not proven.

*kudagina* – The EW s.v. *ku-da-gi-na* compares Middle Persian *gōzēnag* and New Persian *gowzīne*, a kind of “Walnuß-süßspeise” (cf. *gowz*, “walnut”), and reconstructs Old Persian \**gauḍakaina* (cf. Tavernier 2007: 456 [4.4.19.3], \**gōdakēna*-). The supposed k/n change from \**gauḍakaina* to *gōzēnag* is not explained in this etymology, however. New Persian *gowzāgand* seems a more likely cognate. The word means “getrockneter, einzuckerter [sic] Pfirsich” according to Junker & Alavi (1947: 639).<sup>282</sup> Compare Old Persian \**gōdica*-, which occurs also as a loan in the Fortification tablets, in the form <sup>GIŠ</sup>ku-ti-iz-za-an (PF 0644, NN 2141). This word has been related to New Persian *gowḡe*, “plum, damson” (Junker & Alavi 1947: 638).<sup>283</sup> I therefore tentatively propose to interpret *kudagina* as “candied dried peaches/plums/damsons.” 2<sup>7</sup> qts. of this delicious product were given to ‘Ionians’ (*yunuyap* = *yaunap*) travelling to the king, in accordance with a sealed document from Irdapirna/Artaphernes (NN 2108). No doubt this was an elite gift marking the status of the travellers and the favour they enjoyed.<sup>284</sup>

*kuktikka* – Three times birds qualified as *kuktikka* (*ku-uk-tik<sub>0</sub>-ka<sub>4</sub>*, *ku-ik-da-ka<sub>4</sub>*) are served to the king (PF 0697, PF 0698 and PF 2034). In one of these cases (PF 2034), no less than 1,044 *kuktikka* birds are consumed, against much lower numbers of *basbas*, *ippur* and *šudabah*. This evidence, however elusive, suggest some kind of smaller fowl.

<sup>280</sup> There is probably no reference in NN 0422, however, to *karukur* for the royal woman Irdabama, as EW s.v. *GIŠ.kar-ru-kur* claims. Hallock rejected the possibility of this reading in his manuscript; the collation by Jones and Stolper confirms his doubt.

<sup>281</sup> Polyaeus *Strat.* IV.3.32; cf. Amigues 2003: 45-7. Pomegranates are listed among the requirements for Assurnaširpal’s Kalah banquet (Finet 1992: 34) and occur several times in accounts of food commodities from the royal palace (Fales & Postgate 1992 nos. 130, 136, 141, 172).

<sup>282</sup> Steingass 1892 [1970]: 1102 has “a dried apricot stuffed with walnut-kernels.”

<sup>283</sup> Cf. EW (s.v. *GIŠ.ku-ti-iz-za-an*) and Tavernier (2007: 459 [4.4.20.7]). *kudagina* is spelled variously as *ku-da-gi-na*, *ku-ud-da-gi-na*, *ku-ti-kán-na* and *ku-ti-ki-na*.

<sup>284</sup> Other occurrences of *kudagina*: PF 0136, PF 0298, PF 1153 and NN 0312.

Hallock suspected that *kuktikka* was not the name of a particular fowl, but “a reduplicated form of *kuti-*, ‘to carry’ and meaning ‘carried’ ” (1969: 49). In fact, *kuktikka* is probably not derived directly from *kuti-*, since the reduplicated base *kukti/a-* exists as such in Achaemenid Elamite and means “keep, protect, observe,” though it can also be used as equivalent of the simple base *kuti-*, “to carry, to support.”<sup>285</sup> The EW (s.vv. *ku-ik-da-qa*, *ku-uk-tuk-qa*) translates “gehegt” (kept), which is formally right, but may not cover the defining characteristic of these birds. Obviously, ducks and geese were also ‘kept,’ but the *kuktikkas* may have been different because they had to be *guarded*, i.e. in an enclosure or cage. I suspect that these birds were not raised in bird farms, like the *basbas* and *ippur*, but were caught by fowlers, perhaps fed for a shorter period and afterwards consumed “before the king.” This suspicion rests mainly on the occurrences of MUŠEN<sup>MEŠ</sup> KUR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-*na*, “literally “bird(s) of the mountain,”<sup>286</sup> in contexts similar to the *kuktikka* birds. These mountain birds are listed after *ippur*, *basbas* and *šudabah*, get rations of only 0.1 qt./day, and occur in large numbers.<sup>287</sup> They may have been wild fowl, such as francolins, partridges, pheasants or sandgrouses.<sup>288</sup>

<sup>285</sup> Vallat 1977: 49-50 (“protéger”); EW s.vv. *ku-uk-da-ak*, *ku-uk-da-in-da*, *ku-uk-tan-ti*, *ku-uk-taš*, *ku-uk-ti*; Grillot, Herrenschmidt & Malbran-Labat 1993: 41, 58 and *passim* (“observer, protéger”); Henkelman 2003b: 117.

<sup>286</sup> This interpretation is based on the observation that KUR is mostly used, both in the royal inscriptions and in the Fortification tablets for “mountain.” Compare the term *grdtk* in one of the Aramaic documents from Achaemenid Bactria, hesitantly interpreted by the editors as an Old Persian compound, \**gari-datika-*, for “wild animals of the mountain” (Naveh & Shaked [forthc.], C6). Yet, as in other cuneiform languages, the logogram KUR could also be used for “land,” though this usage is rare: EW s.v. h.KUR.lg lists only two examples (PT 15 and PT 22). I cannot exclude that MUŠEN<sup>MEŠ</sup> AŠ<sup>MEŠ</sup>KUR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-*na* should be explained from this rare second meaning. In that case it means “birds of the land,” i.e. birds from a foreign land, migrant birds. In Babylonian bird terminology, KUR is used to denote such migrant birds as in KUR.GI.MUŠEN or KUR.GI.MUŠEN for *kurkû*, “goose” (CAD K 561-2 s.v. *kurkû*). The term MUŠEN.KUR.RA (*išsur šadî*), “mountain bird,” is used to describe exotic, strange birds, and therefore different from our MUŠEN<sup>MEŠ</sup> AŠ<sup>MEŠ</sup>KUR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-*na*. See Salonen 1973: 17-8. 200.

<sup>287</sup> NN 0188 (50 mountain birds of all kinds; 0.1 qt./day); NN 0655 (2 *ippur*, 10 *basbas*, 50 *šudabah* and 300 mountain birds; 0.1. qt./day for the latter); NN 1544 (2 *ippur*, 10 *basbas*, 52 *šudabah* and 157 mountain birds; ration cannot be calculated); NN 1674 (4 *ippur*, 14 *basbas*, 90 *šudabah* and 400 mountain birds; ration cannot be calculated).

<sup>288</sup> By contrast, it seems not very likely that the mountain birds were, or included doves since the ration of 0.1 qt. of grain per day (ca. 60 gr.) would still be rather high compared to rations for dove attested in Babylonian sources (cf. → *šudabah*). Compare Ath. IX.393c (coots, thrushes, quails) on smaller fowl for the royal table (cf. fn. 71 above). Resident species of wild fowl in southern Iran include, according to Porter et al. (1996: 56-65, 102-3), the chukar (*Alectoris chukar*), the see-see partridge (*Ammoperdix griseogularis*), the black francolin (*Francolinus francolinus*), the grey francolin (*F. pondicerianus*), the water rail (*Rallus aquaticus*), the spotted crane (*Porzana porzana*), the moorhen (*Gallinula chloropus*), the coot (*Fulica atra*), Lichtenstein’s sandgrouse (*Pterocles lichtensteini*), the crowned sandgrouse (*P. coronatus*), the black-bellied sandgrouse (*P. orientalis*), the spotted sandgrouse (*P. senegallus*) and the pin-tailed sandgrouse (*P. alchata*). The houbara bustard (*Chlamydotis undulata*) is a winter visitor to coastal Iran. The common pheasant (*Phasianus colchidus*) is known to have spread as far as Colchis by the Parthian period (Plin. *Nat.Hist.* X.67), appears in Sassanian recipes (Āmūzgar

In PF 1943:21-30, ten species of fowl receive grain during a total period of seven months. These birds are collectively referred to as <sup>AŠ</sup>MUŠEN<sup>ΓMEŠ1</sup> *ki<sup>2</sup>-ut<sup>2</sup>-tik<sup>2</sup>-ka<sup>4</sup>?*<sup>289</sup>, probably a variant of *kuktikka* (-*kt*- > -*tt*-; cf. Hallock 1969: 714). The fowl include *basbas*, *ippur* and *šudabah*, but also *šarazida*, *iriri*, *hatika*, *daprakkaš*, *kakataš*, *šaušuka* and *šarnuzza* – species that do not occur in other texts or only very rarely. Of these, *šaušuka* may be a grey partridge (*Perdix perdix*) or, plausibly, another species of the *phasianidae* family.<sup>289</sup> *daprakkaš* is a derivate of \**dabra*-, “black,” and could denote a black francolin (*Francolinus francolinus*).<sup>290</sup> While nowadays such birds may breed in captivity, which is the definition of domestication in the strict sense, it is unlikely that this was the case in antiquity.<sup>291</sup> I therefore venture an interpretation of PF 1943:21-30 as a list of wild fowl (including wild ducks and geese), kept in captivity and therefore collectively referred to as *kittikka* = *kuktikka*, “kept [in captivity], guarded.”<sup>292</sup>

1993: 249) and art (Overlaet, De Jonghe & Daemen 1996: 202-8). Though it is nowadays confined to the Caspian regions, it may have been resident in southern Iran in antiquity, when deforestation was not as advanced as it is today. The quail (*Coturnix coturnix*) occurs in northwestern and western Iran.

<sup>289</sup> Cf. Gershevitch 1969: 182-3 (followed by Hinz 1975: 223; Tavernier 2007: 414 [4.4.6.7]) comparing New Persian *sūsak*, also *tīhū*, “grey partridge” (cf. Junker & Alavi 1947: 202, 438 “graues Rebhuhn”). Compare the captivating Old Iranian name, attested in Akkadian, \**tīhūpardaisa*- / *tīhūpardēsa*-, “having an estate for partridges” (Tavernier 2007: 325 [4.2.1701]). Note, however, that according to Porter *et al.* (1996: 60) the grey partridge occurs only in the northwestern regions of Iran. Similar species, that live in the southern areas, are the chukar (*Alectoris chukar*), the see-see partridge (*Ammoperdix griseogularis*) and the grey francolin (*Francolinus pondicerianus*); see Porten *et al.* 1996: 56-9. Grey partridges occur among the animals consumed during ceremonial banquets at the Neo-Assyrian court (Fales & Postgate 1992 nos. 148, 149). Note that <sup>AŠ</sup>šá-u-šu-ka<sup>4</sup><sup>MEŠ</sup> is written with the suffix MEŠ (for determinatives, loanwords, historical spellings, etc.) as are all ten bird names in the journal entry, even though some, like *basbas* and *ippur* are very common terms.

<sup>290</sup> On the etymology (\**dabra-ka*-) see Hinz 1975: 78; Tavernier 2007: 413-4 [4.4.6.3]. *daprakkaš* and *šaušuka* receive rations of 0.1 qt./day of grain or ca. 60 gr., the same as that for the smallest (or young) → *šudabah* and probably enough for a black francolin, a species common in southern Iran (Porter *et al.* 1996: 58-9). Research on the grey partridge (*Perdix perdix*) shows an average consumption of 22 gr. of wheat grains at average temperatures of ca. 15°C (G.R. Potts 1986: 146-7). The Black francolin is a bigger bird and needs more grain. In addition, it was fed during the hot summer months (and needed more energy for cooling its body temperature), and was probably fattened for consumption. These factors indicate that 60 gr. of barley is certainly possible for a black francolin. Francolins (DAR = Akk. *ittidū*; CAD I/J 304 q.v.) are already attested in early Sakkalmah-period Susa (MDP 55 23:5 in De Graef 2006: 107-8). Partridges, francolins and other gamebirds in Sassanian recipes: Āmūzgār 1993: 249.

<sup>291</sup> Cf. Janković’ remarks on “Domestizierung vs. Tierhaltung” (2004: 4-5). The term *kuktikka*, if interpreted correctly, refers to the latter practice.

<sup>292</sup> Compare also the cage birds, *iššūr kīli*, attested in Neo-Babylonian Sippar (Janković 2004: 97). For wild geese and ducks in Iran see Porter *et al.* 1996: 24-33.

*madamiš* – The word *ma-da-mi-iš* occurs only in NN 2502, where it is listed with → *mitruša*. The commodities are summarised as → *abbebe*, “food, food products.” The (same?) word occurs also as personal name.<sup>293</sup>

*madukka* – There is little doubt that *madukka* means “honey” (Old Persian \**maduka*-; Hinz 1973: 82-3; Tavernier 2007: 236 [4.2.1017], 456 [4.4.19.7]), not salt (Hallock 1969: 25) or even coffee (*idem*, *apud* Lewis 1987: 86). This honey is probably the product of apiculture rather than wild honey since the Fortification texts do not mention commodities acquired through fishing, hunting or gathering (except from hunted fowl, which appears only because it was kept in captivity and received fodder while being fattened). For the same reason, *madukka* can hardly be equalled to the “100 square blocks, of 10 minas each, of rain honey (τοῦ ὕοντος μέλιτος ἑκατὸν παλάθαι τετράγωνοι ἀνὰ δέκα μνᾶς ἔλκουσαι) mentioned by Polyaeus *Strat.* IV.3.32 as standard requirement for the royal table. Rain honey (*manna*) was collected from certain trees, as reported by the classical sources.<sup>294</sup> As appears from PF 0298, quantities of *madukka* are to be read as dry measure, which, in turn, suggest, that we are dealing with chunks of comb honey or perhaps with crystallised (set) honey.

*miksu* – The *mi-ik-su* šE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-*na* in NN 0454 is, as the term indicates, a product made from barley (or grain). EW s.v. *mi-ik-su* proposes “Malz(?)” (malt), but offers no arguments for this.

*miššatanna(š)* – is a loan from Old Persian \**visadana*-, “of all kinds.” This is one of three forms of the same word: the others, ‘Median’ \**vispazana*-, and ‘Median’-Old Persian \**vispadana*- also occur in Elamite as *mišbazana/mišbašana* and *mišbatanna/mišbadanaš* (Schmitt 1978: 106; Tavernier 2007: 78 [2.4.2.1-3]). Whereas the royal inscriptions use the word for “of all nations,” the Fortification texts apply the term for fowl and, twice, flour and grain.<sup>295</sup> Compare ὀρνίθια παντοδαπὰ μικρὰ, “small birds of all kinds” in Polyaeus, *Strat.* IV.3.32.<sup>296</sup>

<sup>293</sup> Hinz 1975: 137-8; Tavernier 2007: 212 [4.2.838], (reconstructing \*(h)uvadāmiš, “own creation).”

<sup>294</sup> On rain honey see, e.g., Ael. NA V.42, XV.7 and Diod. XVII.75.6 with the comments by Goukowsky 2002: 227. On Polyaeus see also Amigues 2003: 56-7. On bee honey see Lewis 1987: 86; Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1997: 341-2; Potts 1997: 150; Henkelman 2006: 355 fn. 822; Root 2007: 207-10.

<sup>295</sup> Fowl: PF 1747, PF 1748, PF 1749, NN 0188, NN 0574, NN 0790, NN 1544, NN 1664 and NN 1674. Flour/grain: PF 1223 and NN 1773. Royal inscriptions: DNa<sub>e</sub> 8, DPa<sub>e</sub> 3-4, DSe<sub>e</sub> 7-8 and DSz<sub>e</sub> 4. Compare also PT 79, where *mišbazana* describes *marrīp*, “artisans, craftsmen.” In NN 0726:33, in a passage on *berna* horses, Hallock reads *mi-šá-tan*<sup>71</sup>-...; if the reading is correct, it means that horses could also be “of all kinds” (cf. EW s.v. *mi-šá-tan-na-iš*). On *berna* horses see Gabrielli 2006: 48.

<sup>296</sup> Compare also the great variety of birds eaten at Assurnāṣirpal’s Kalah banquet (Finet 1992: 32-3, 39).

Whereas NN 0790 has “birds of all kinds,” PF 0697, PF 0698 and PF 2034 have MUŠEN<sup>MEŠ</sup> → *kuktikka*, “birds kept (in captivity),” in contexts that are otherwise very similar. This suggests that *miššatannaš* and *kuktikka*, though certainly not semantic synonyms, could sometimes be used as equivalents. Given the likelihood that we are dealing with wild birds caught and put in cages or enclosures, it is no surprise that birds “of all kinds” and “birds kept (in captivity)” could be the same. Note in this context that PF 1943:21-30 lists no less than ten species of *kuktikka* birds (cf. → *kuktikka*). The difference is only in perspective: *kuktikka* focuses on the origin and special status of the wild animals, whereas *miššatannaš* reflects the eye of the inventory-maker whose interests is to report the number of available poultry for the royal table. Note that *miššatannaš* and related forms may also be used, in wider sense, for fowl in general, including *ippur*, *basbas*, and *šudabah* (NN 1544, NN 1674).

*mitruša* – The word *mi-it-ru-šá* occurs twice in a long list (PF 0298), “evidently a bakery inventory” (Hallock 1969: 17-8) of items summarized as *ab-be-KI+MIN ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-na* (→ *abbebe*). Hallock took *mitruša* as “a kind of bread” (*ibid.* 733), but this explanation is based on a definition of *ab-be-KI+MIN ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-na* as “barley loaves,” which may be too narrow. Moreover, the list also contains → *madukka*, honey and → *kudagina*, a sweet product, perhaps candied dried peaches, plums or damsons. This seems to imply that, in this particular case, the commodities listed are ingredients used for the preparation of pastries, bread, or other cereal products, but were not necessarily all cereal-based. This suspicion is confirmed by NN 1359, where *mitruša* occurs parallel to *ab-be-KI+MIN ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-na*, and by NN 2502, where *madamiš* and *mitruša* are summarised as <sup>1</sup>*ab<sup>1</sup>-be-KI+MIN*, “food,” rather than *ab-be-KI+MIN ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-na*.<sup>297</sup> For this reason, the suggestion that *mitruša* might be “Röstmehl” (EW s.v. *mi-ut-ru-šá*), is unlikely. Whatever it was, *mitruša* must have been a rare product; it occurs only five times: twice in inventories and thrice in a special (elite) context.<sup>298</sup> An etymology is not at hand.

PA<sup>MEŠ</sup> – See *banura* above

*rami* – See <sup>GIŠ</sup>MEŠ above

*raziyam* – Probably “grapes.” See *abbebe razi* above.

ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> – See *tarmu* below

ŠE.GIG<sup>MEŠ</sup> – See *tarmu* below

<sup>297</sup> Here, *mitruša* is spelled *ut-ru-šá*, which Hallock (ms.) recognised as a variant of *mi-ut-ru-šá* (cf. EW s.v. *ut-ru-šá*).

<sup>298</sup> Occurrences: PF 0298 (inventory), PF 1153 (special extra rations, including *kudagina*, for *harrinup* women), NN 1359 (special rations for Aspathines [on this official see Henkelman 2003b: 123-6]), NN 1667 (*mitruša* and 2 other commodities used as *ukpiyataš* [tax in kind]), NN 2502 (→ *madamiš* and *mitruša* for Irtaštuna).

*šudabah* – Like → *ippur*, *šudabah* were not, apparently, managed in a consignment system, but kept by the institution’s internal organisation. This agrees with what we know about dove keeping in Neo-Babylonian Sippar (Janković 2004: 92-5) and therefore seems to support Hallock’s interpretation “dove” (1969: 48-9). Moreover, the three main species of fowl at Persepolis were *ippur* (geese), *basbas* (ducks), and *šudabah* – usually mentioned in that order – whereas the three principal fowl species found in Mesopotamian institutions and, more specifically, in Neo-Babylonian Uruk and Sippar, were geese, ducks and doves.

Yet, the proposed identification, though attractive at first sight, finds no support in the attested rations scales for *šudabah*: 0.1 (PF 1746), 0.2 (PF 1745, PF 1943:21-31, NN 0655) and 0.25 qt. (NN 0098) per day, i.e. ca. 60, 120 and 150 gr. of grain. I assume that the unique ration of 0.1 qt. (60 gr.) is intended for younger animals, meaning that a standard adult ration amounted to 0.2-0.25 qt. (120-150 gr.). This is much more than the fodder rations attested for doves in Mesopotamia: 0,047-0.050 and 0.067 lt., or ca. 30 and 40 gr. (Janković 2004: 47 fn. 156 [Kassite, Middle Babylonian]). In modern dove breeding, 30 gr. of fodder is an average daily ration, though amounts up to 70 gr. are given to bigger species or to doves kept for consumption. The amounts given in Persepolis are impossibly high for doves, especially considering the likelihood that these birds would have been kept in dovecotes and thus would have been able to find supplementary nutrition (Janković 2004: 10).<sup>299</sup>

The fact that smaller rations for younger *šudabah* are attested (PF 1746), suggest that a domesticated bird species (rather than a wild animal held in captivity) is referred to. This bird could be a chicken, since the attested rations for *šudabah*, 120-150 gr., do roughly match that what is expected for chicken. In early-twentieth century poultry farming, a laying hen of 2 kg would be given 70-80 gr. of grain and about 50 gr. of mixed fodder (also including a large portion of grain) a day.<sup>300</sup> Especially if a chicken would be fed exclusively on grain and some green fodder, 120-150 gr. would be a suitable amount of grain.

<sup>299</sup> Doves are also unlike to be among the “mountain birds” that occur in some texts (cf. fnn. 286-7 above). As a matter of fact, there is hardly a logical candidate for ‘dove’ among the species of fowl mentioned in the Fortification texts. The only species that could be considered is that known as MUŠEN<sup>MEŠ</sup> (<sup>AŠ</sup>)*zī-iš-na(-iš)*. According to PF 1745, 60 *zīšna* birds each received 0.67 qt. of grain per day, which agrees with Babylonian rations for doves. The same birds occur in PF 1743 and PF 1744, but in small numbers (30 and 24) that do not endorse the interpretation “dove.” Note, moreover, that *zī<sup>2</sup>-iš-na* occurs as a qualification of *basbas* in NN 1867 and may therefore not denote a species. PF 1723, which is otherwise very similar to NN 1867, adopts *batinna*, “of the district” to qualify *basbas*. Note that the invisibility of doves in the Fortification archive is at variance with the turtle-doves consumed, according to Polyaeus, at the royal table (*Strat.* IV.3.32), and with Athenaeus’ statement that the Persians had white doves on board of their ships when they stranded at Mount Athos in 492 BC (*Ath.* IX.394e). The colour of Athenaeus’ doves indicates that they were domesticated, since fowl tend to lose their original colour when bred in captivity. Note also, however, Herodotus’ remark (I.138) on Persian aversion for white doves.

<sup>300</sup> Ter Haar 1911: 69-78, esp. 76.

Though much remains unclear about the domestication of the original red jungle fowl (*Gallus gallus*) in eastern Asia and the subsequent westward spread of the domesticated variety (*G. gallus domesticus*), certain iconographic evidence for the knowledge and popularity of chicken and cocks (Lorestān, Caspian region, Elam) dates already from the end of the second millennium (Calmeyer 1972/75). By Achaemenid times, chicken may long have been at home in Iran, plausibly as domesticated animals. Chicken (*trngln*) occur in a list of provisions from late Achaemenid Bactria (C1 in Naveh & Shaked [forthc.]; cf. Shaked 2004: 41). As Heraclides stipulates, cocks (ἀλεκτρούνες) were eaten at the king’s table (*apud* Ath. IV.145e). The familiarity of chicken in Achaemenid context gave it the Greek by-name “the Persian bird” (Tuplin 1992, with references).

Yet, attractive as the identification of *šudabah* as chicken may seem, a complication arises from PF 1943:21-30, where ten species of fowl, including *ippur*, *basbas* and *šudabah*, but also, possibly, partridge and francolin species, are referred to as “kept” animals, i.e. wild birds (cf. → *kuktikka*). If our interpretation of this text is correct, it would imply that *šudabah* could be wild as well as a domesticated fowl. Two inferences could be drawn from this. First, one could assume that the wild red jungle fowl was once native to Iran, as it still is to India and Pakistan. The other option would be to give up the identification of *šudabah* as “chicken,” and assume instead that the word denotes another species in the *Galliformes* order (or even beyond that) that consumed, when held in captivity, about 120-150 gr. of grain per day.

Altogether, the available evidence on *šudabah* does not allow for a definitive identification, though ‘chicken’ seems at least possible.

*tarmu* – The word spelled variously as <sup>GIŠ</sup>*tar-mu*, <sup>GIŠ</sup>*tar-mi*, <sup>GIŠ</sup>*tar-mu*<sup>MEŠ</sup>, *tar-mu*<sup>MEŠ</sup>, and *tar-mu*, is most likely to denote a (species of) wheat, as Hallock (1969: 20, 760) already inferred. EW (s.v. <sup>GIŠ</sup>*tar-mu*) holds it cannot be wheat, because it is “offenbar ein Gemisch von Gerste und Getreide.” This conclusion is based upon texts like PF 0040, where quantities of *hazatiš* and *kurrusam* are counted up as *tarmu*. Earlier, Hinz had proposed “Weizen” (wheat) and “Gerste” (barley) for *hazatiš* and *kurrusam* (cf. below). This theory is surely to be rejected, however. First, as Hallock already noted (1969: 20), *tarmu* is stored as seed in PF 0462 and thus cannot be a mix.<sup>301</sup> Secondly, *hadatiš* and *kurrusam* are often used in apposition to *tarmu*, as in <sup>GIŠ</sup>*tar-mu ha-da-ti-iš* (PF 0154) or <sup>GIŠ</sup>*tar-mu kur-ru-sa-um*<sup>1</sup> (PF 0155). They must therefore represent two sub-types of the same kind of grain, *tarmu*, rather than constituents of “Mischgetreide.”<sup>302</sup>

From the tablets we know that *tarmu* is a type of grain that was considered of equal value as *šE.BAR*<sup>MEŠ</sup> (PF 0276), of which seed could be stored (PF 0462), which existed

<sup>301</sup> In this text, *tarmu* is received instead of (*ukku*, lit. “upon”) barley (*šE.BAR*<sup>MEŠ</sup>) and stored as seed (*NUMUN*<sup>MEŠ</sup> *nutika*). EW s.v. *uk-ku* translates “Mischgetreide ist anstelle von Gerste deponiert worden,” tacitly omitting “as seed” (*sic!*). Compare also NN 2191 and NN 2204, in which quantities of *tarmu* are listed as *haduš*, “harvest, revenue,” of a given year (cf. → *hadumiya*).

<sup>302</sup> Note that in Fort. 6765 *tarmu hadatiš* is listed with <sup>GIŠ</sup>*u-ma-ma* (EW s.v. proposes “Mehl”).

in two varieties, *hadatiš* and *kurrusam*, and which was used for making beer.<sup>303</sup> Beer was, in fact, nearly always made from *tarmu*; both *hadatiš* and *kurrusam* were suitable for this.

The use of *tarmu* for making beer, would seem to suggest that *tarmu* is barley. Yet, it seems quite likely that ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>, when used as a technical term (not for “grain” in general), represents barley.<sup>304</sup> Arguments for this assumption are that ŠE.BAR is sometimes used as logogram for “barley” in Akkadian (AHw 1446 s.v. *uṭṭatu*; Powell 1984: 49-51) and that ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> is by far the most common commodity in the Persepolis economy, which agrees with the fact that barley was the prime staple food in the ancient Near East during the first millennium (Potts 1997: 57-60). In addition, in PF 1223 *hiyamiyaš* and ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> are apparently used as equivalents; the former is a loan from Old Persian *yavya-* (\**yava-ya-*), which, given its Sanskrit cognate *yávya-*, must mean “(cereal) of the barley kind, barley.”<sup>305</sup> It may therefore safely be assumed that ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> represents barley.<sup>306</sup>

ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> occurs in two varieties: ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> HAL.A<sup>MEŠ</sup>, “irrigated barley” (lit. “barley [from] water-land”) and ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> AŠ<sup>sa-a-in</sup>, which, logically, represents rainfed barley.<sup>307</sup> That the distinction is indicated in a number of tablets is explained from the

<sup>303</sup> *tarmu* used for making beer (*k.* = *kurrusam*; *h.* = *hadatiš*): PF 0040 (*h.+k.*), PF 0227, PF 0228, PF 0424 (*k.*), PF 0425 (*k.*), PF 0426, PF 0427, PF 0428, PF 0429, PF 1996, NN 0126 (“including *h.*”), NN 0234, NN 0896, NN 0909, NN 0914<sup>2</sup>, NN 0926 (*h.*), NN 1026, NN 1145 (*h.+k.*), NN 1261 (*h.+k.*), NN 1401, NN 1450, NN 1591, NN 1785, NN 1960 (*h.+k.*), NN 2021, NN 2260, NN 2469 and NN 2513. On the two cases of ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> used for brewing (PF 1943:17-18, NN 1830), see fn. 306 below. In contrast to Mesopotamian practice in the first millennium (on which see Stol 1994, esp. 161), beer in Iran was generally made of grain, not of dates. There is a term, *luluki*, that could refer to date beer and date wine in the Persepolis texts, but it is used infrequently. Another term, *sawur*, may be a loan form Old Persian *θavar-* (Tavernier 2007: 457 [4.4.19.12], with bibliography) and, one used as a qualification of wine, means “vinegar” (pace Lewis 1987: 86); vinegar also occurs in the Bactrian documents (Naveh & Shaked [forthc.]). Stol 1994: 181 refers to YOS 7 129:4-6, where 200 vats of sweet beer are delivered for the palace of Cambyses at Amānu/Abānu (cf. Dandamayev 1984: 117).

<sup>304</sup> cf. Hallock 1969: 20, 756; *idem* 1985: 60; Lewis 1987: 84. Surprisingly, EW s.v. ŠE.BAR agrees to “Gerste,” but ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> and *tarmu* cannot both be barley (cf. below).

<sup>305</sup> Gershevitch *apud* Hallock 1969: 697; Tavernier 2007: 458 [4.4.19.18]. On barley in Polyaeus’ list of requirements for the royal table (*Strat.* IV.3.32) see Amigues 2003: 21-3.

<sup>306</sup> In the Bactrian documentation a *ywbr*’, i.e. Old Persian \**yavabara-*, “grain carrier, grain supplier” occurs (C4; cf. the function of *tumara* in Fortification contexts), responsible for distributing š̄r, “barley” - the latter crop occurs frequent in this corpus (Naveh & Shaked [forthc.]). Note that there are only two cases of ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> being used for brewing (PF 1943:17-18, NN 1830), and one of these concerns beer “for the gods” (NN 1830; cf. Henkelman 2006: 450, 453). This may be an another argument supporting “barley” for ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>. In first-millennium Mesopotamia, date beer was the predominant alcoholic drink for human consumption, but established tradition demanded that the gods would be served barley beer (Stol 1994: 161; Bongenaar 1997: 206-7). This same may have been true for Achaemenid Fārs, where we find one of two references to beer made from ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> in cultic context. The other reference to barley beer is also special in that it pertains to royal *huthut*, “requirements.”

<sup>307</sup> Cf. Hallock 1969: 749; EW s.v. *h.sa-a-in*. The word is also spelled AŠ<sup>sa-a-en</sup> and AŠ<sup>sa-a-na</sup>; it was probably pronounced /sayan/.

sharp contrast in yields from irrigated and non-irrigated fields (the average yield for irrigated fields is about three times as high; cf. Bazin 1989: 802).

*tarmu*, which is the second most frequent type of grain in the Fortification texts, must necessarily be a different kind of grain, as it is sometimes explicitly mentioned as a replacement for ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>/barley.<sup>308</sup> It is also likely to be different from ŠE.GIG<sup>MEŠ</sup>, the third most common cereal crop, even though two terms are never listed together. ŠE.GIG<sup>MEŠ</sup> is different from ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>, was much less common than ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> and *tarmu*, could be used as seed (and therefore cannot be a cereal *product*), could be ground to fine flour, was sometimes given as (special) rations to workers, and was used as (special) fodder for livestock.<sup>309</sup> There is no evidence, however, that beer was made from ŠE.GIG<sup>MEŠ</sup>. In Mesopotamia, GIG, ŠE.GIG and GIG.BA denote “some type of free threshing wheat,” i.e. bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) or durum (*T. durum*), the least common of the three major cereal crops (barley, emmer, and ‘wheat’).<sup>310</sup>

As for making beer: apart from barley, various species of wheat, oat or rye can be used for brewing. In Mesopotamia, wheat, and more specifically emmer (*T. dicoccum*), is the most commonly used among these.<sup>311</sup>

The constellation and properties of the three most common cereal crops at Persepolis suggest to me that ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> is (two- or six-row) barley, that *tarmu* is a general term for at least two varieties of emmer, and that ŠE.GIG<sup>MEŠ</sup> is bread or durum wheat.

The identification of *tarmu* as emmer would agree well with the frequent appearance of *tarmu* and its equivalence with ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>/barley. Emmer is suited for human and animal consumption, and the same is true for *tarmu*, as replacement for

<sup>308</sup> PF 0113, PF 0276, PF 0277, NN 0603 and NN 2010. ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> and *tarmu* are furthermore listed together in PF 1923, NN 0593, NN 2283 and NN 2389.

<sup>309</sup> ŠE.GIG<sup>MEŠ</sup> listed together with ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>: PF 0238, PF 1800, NN 0203 and NN 2536. Stored as seed: NN 0997, NN 1607. Used for making flour: PF 0835, PF 0836 and PF 0838 (compare also NN 2057). Used for feeding birds: PF 1754, PF 1755, PF 1756, NN 0033, NN 0335, NN 0337, NN 0829 and NN 0969. Given as fodder to a royal horse: NN 1508.

<sup>310</sup> cf. CAD K 340-1 s.v. *kibtu*; Renfrew 1984; Powell 1984: 56. Compare also Miller 1982: 175-80, who tentatively identified barley, wheat, emmer and einkorn among the archaeobotanical remains found at Tall-e Malyān. On wheat in Polyaeus *Strat.* IV.3.32 cf. Amigues 2003: 23.

<sup>311</sup> Röllig 1970: 29,38; Powell 1984: 52; Stol 1994: 161. As an alternative, one could think of any of the millet species (such as broomcorn millet, *panicum miliaceam*, and foxtail millet, *setaria italica*), especially since it is well attested in the administrative documents from Bactria (Naveh & Shaked [forthc.], esp. C4) and reportedly was once widely grown in Iran (Bazin 1987). Millet can also be used for brewing (as it is in many regions of present-day Africa). It seems, however, to have been of limited importance in the ancient Near East (Renfrew 1984: 38; Van Zeist 1984: 15). Moreover, it was considered a lower class of grain: in Bactria it was, apparently, given to servants only and elsewhere it is especially known as fodder, hence unlikely to have been of same value as barley (as *tarmu* was). Finally, Mesopotamian sources regularly mention *duḥnu*, among other uses, as feed for fowl (CAD D 171 q.v.; Powell 1984: 64; cf. Amigues 1995: 62), but *tarmu* only once occurs as such in Fortification contexts (NN 1292). I therefore think that *emmer* is a likelier option, despite the occurrence of millet in the Bactrian documents.

ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup>.<sup>312</sup> That *tarmu* existed in two types, *hadatiš* and *kurrusam* (which both could be used for brewing) is also explicable from the assumption that it is emmer: Mesopotamian texts distinct between a number of varieties of processed emmer on the basis of the grain’s colour (which may vary from white to dark). Different beers are made from these different varieties (Powell 1984: 51-6) and this may be true for *hadatiš* and *kurrusam* too.<sup>313</sup> It may be observed that *hadatiš* occurs less frequently and, when listed together with *kurrusam*, mostly in (much) smaller quantities; it may therefore be a more rare variety than *kurrusam*.<sup>314</sup>

*zarakka(š)* – Sheep/goats, cattle, camels and birds that on pasture are referred to as *zarakka(š)*, a loan from Old Persian \**caraka-* (“grazing”).<sup>315</sup> The word also occurs in Aramaic, as *šrk*, in late Achaemenid administrative documents from Bactria (Shaked 2004: 41; Naveh & Shaked [forthc.], esp. C1). There, as in Persepolis, it used to indicate animals that were not on stable. For the administration it was important to know whether animals were on pasture or not, since this had consequences for any supplementary nutrition they might be given (cf. → <sup>GIŠ</sup>IN<sup>MEŠ</sup> above).

<sup>312</sup> Cf., e.g., PF 0984, PF 1054 (workers), NN 1292 and NN 2388 (*basbas*; cf. the occasional use of emmer for fodder in Mesopotamia: Janković 2004: 41). The workers of PF 1034 and PF 1035 receive half of their rations in ŠE.BAR<sup>MEŠ</sup> and half in *tarmu* (other half rations in *tarmu*: PF 0990, PF 1069, PF 1072, NN 0409 and NN 0450).

<sup>313</sup> Unfortunately, the Old-Iranian etymologies of the two terms do not contribute anything certain as to their taxonomy. *hadatiš* and its variant *hazatiš* have been interpreted as loanwords from Old Persian \**ādātiš* and ‘Median’ \**āzātiš*, related to Avestan *āzāta-*, “noble.” The interpretation of *hadatiš/hazatiš* as “wheat” is based solely on Hinz’ intuitive understanding of its Fortification contexts (Hinz 1970: 436; *idem* 1975: 23; EW s.vv. *ha-da-ti-iš*, *ha-za-ti*; cf. Tavernier 2007: 458-9 [4.4.20.1, 4.4.20.3]). *kurrusam*, is probably a loan from Old Persian \**xvarθa-*, for which one may compare Avestan *x<sup>v</sup>arəθa-*, “food.” The interpretation of \**xvarθa-* as “barley” is again based only on Fortification contexts (Hinz 1973: 82; *idem* 1975: 141; EW s.v. *GIŠ.kur-ru-sa-um*; Tavernier 2007: 458 [4.4.19.17]). As I have argued above, *hadatiš* and *kurrusam* are varieties of the same type or species of grain, *tarmu*, and cannot therefore represent barley and wheat.

<sup>314</sup> In NN 0126 it is stated that 6,300<sup>7</sup> qts. *tarmu* includes 1,000 qts. of *hadatiš*, which suggests that *kurrusam* was considered the regular variety of *tarmu*. Overall, the ratio between *hadatiš* and *kurrusam* is roughly 1:4.

<sup>315</sup> Hinz 1975: 71; EW s.v. *za-rák-kaš*.

### Bibliography

- ALVAREZ-MON, J. 2004, *Imago Mundi: Cosmological and Ideological Aspects of the Arjan Bowl*, *IrAnt* 39: 203-37.
- AMIGUES, S. 1995, *Végétation et cultures du Proche-Orient dans l'Anabase*, in: P. Briant (ed.), *Dans les pas des Dix-Mille. Peuples et pays du Proche-Orient vus par un Grec* (Pallas 43), Toulouse: 61-78.
- 2003, *Pour la table du Grand Roi*, *Journal des Savants* 2003: 3-59.
- ĀMŪZGĀR, Z. 1993, s.v. *Cooking, II*: in *Pahlavi Literature*, *EnIr* VI: 249-50.
- APERGHIS, G.G. 2000, *War captives and economic exploitation: Evidence from the Persepolis Fortification Tablets*, in: J. Andreau, P. Briant & R. Descat (eds.), *La guerre dans les économies antiques* (Entretiens d'Archéologie et d'Histoire Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges 5), Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges: 127-144.
- ARFA'Ī, A. 1999, *La grande route Persépolis-Suse. Une lecture des tablettes provenant des Fortifications de Persépolis*, *Topoi* 9.1: 33-45.
- BAZIN, M. 1987, s.v. *Arzan*, *EnIr* II: 689.
- 1989, s.v. *Barley, I*: in *Iran*, *EnIr* III: 802-3.
- BENVENISTE, É. 1966, *Titres et mots propres en iranien ancien* (Travaux de l'institut d'études iraniennes de l'Université de Paris 1), Paris.
- BOBEK, H. 1969, *Vegetation*, in: W.B. Fisher (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 1: *The Land of Iran*, Cambridge: 280-93.
- BONGENAAR, A.C.V.M. 1997, *The Neo-Babylonian Ebabbar Temple at Sippar: its Administration and its Prosopography* (PIHANS 80), Istanbul.
- BÖRKER-KLÄHN, J. 1957-71, s.v. *Granatapfel A*. *Archäologisch*, *RLA* III: 616-30.
- BOUCHARLAT, R. 2005, *Iran*, in: P. Briant & R. Boucharlat (eds.), *L'archéologie de l'empire achéménide: nouvelles recherches* (Persika 6), Paris: 221-92.
- BRIANT, P. 1979, *Des Achéménides aux rois hellénistiques: continuités et ruptures*, *Annali della Scuola Normale di Pisa* 9: 1375-1414.
- 1982, *État et pasteurs au Moyen-Orient ancien*, Paris – Cambridge.
- 1988, *Le nomadisme du Grand Roi*, *IrAnt* 23: 253-73.
- 1989, *Table du roi, tribut et redistribution chez les Achéménides*, in: P. Briant & Cl. Herrenschildt (eds.), *Le tribut dans l'Empire perse. Actes de la Table ronde de Paris (12-13 Décembre 1986)* (Travaux de l'Institut d'Études Iraniennes de l'Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle 13), Paris: 35-44.
- 1992, *Les tablettes de bois du Grand Roi et les lettres d'Atossa*, *DATA* 1: 2 (note 1).
- 2000, *Numismatique, frappes monétaires et histoire en Asie Mineure achéménide (quelques remarques de conclusion)*, in: O. Casabonne (ed.), *Mécanismes et innovations monétaires dans l'Anatolie achéménide. Numismatique et histoire. Actes de la Table Ronde Internationale d'Istanbul, 22-23 mai 1997*, Paris: 265-74.
- 2002, *From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire*, Winona Lake [english translation of *Histoire de l'empire perse, de Cyrus à Alexandre*, Paris 1996/Leiden 1996].
- 2006, *L'économie royale entre privé et public*, in: R. Descat (ed.), *Approches de l'économie hellénistique* (Entretiens d'Archéologie et d'Histoire Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges 7), Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges: 343-58.
- [forthcoming 1], *Suse et l'Élam dans l'empire achéménide*, in: J. Perrot (ed.), *Le palais de Suse*.

- [forthcoming 2], The Empire of Darius in Perspective, in: L. Tritle & W. Heckel (eds.), *Alexander the Great: a Concise Guide*.
- BRIANT, P. & HENKELMAN, W.F.M. [forthcoming], From Taoce to Gabae: two geographical notes on the Fortification Tablets.
- BROSIUS, M. 1996, *Women in Ancient Persia 559-331 BC*, Oxford.
- 2006, *The Persians. An Introduction*. London.
- [forthcoming], Female audiences in Achaemenid Persia, in: J. Curtis & St J. Simpson (eds.), *The World of Achaemenid Persia*.
- CALMEYER, P. 1972/75, s.v. Huhn, *RLA* 4: 487-8.
- CAMERON, G.G. 1942, Darius' Daughter and the Persepolis Inscriptions, *JNES* 1: 214-8.
- 1959, The “Daiva” Inscription of Xerxes: in Elamite, *WO* 2: 470-6, pls. 13-6.
- CARDASCIA, G. 1991, La Ceinture de Parysatis: une Morgengabe chez les Achéménides?, in: D. Charpin & F. Joannès (eds.), *Marchands, diplomates et empereurs. Études sur la civilisation mésopotamienne offertes à P. Garelli*, Paris: 363-69 [reprinted in: *Hommage à Guillaume Cardascia* 1995: 137-46].
- COLLON, D. 1998, First catch your ostrich, *IrAnt* 33: 25-42.
- DANDAMAYEV, M.A. 1984, Royal Paradeisoi in Babylonia, in: *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin Emerito Oblata* (Acta Iranica 23), Leiden: 113-7.
- 1992, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia* (Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies 6), Costa Mesa – New York.
- DE GRAEF, K. 2006, *Ville Royale de Suse*, vol. 9: *De la Dynastie de Simaški au Sukkalmahat. Les documents fin PE IIB – début PE III du chantier B à Suse* (MDP 55), Gent.
- DE MIROSCHEDJI, P. 1985, La fin du royaume d’Anšan et de Suse et la naissance de l’Empire perse, *ZA* 75: 265-306.
- DESCAT, R. 2006, Aspects d’une transition: l’économie du monde égéen (350-300), in: P. Briant & F. Joannès (eds.), *La transition entre l’empire achéménide et les royaumes hellénistiques* (Persika 9), Paris: 353-73.
- ENGLUND, R.K. 1995, Late Uruk Period Cattle and Dairy Products: Evidence from Proto-Cuneiform Sources, in: *Domestic Animals of Mesopotamia*, part 2 (BSA 8), Cambridge: 33-48.
- FALES, F.M. & POSTGATE, J.N. 1992, *Imperial Administrative Records*, vol. 1: *Palace and Temple Administration* (SAA 7), Helsinki.
- FINET, A. 1992, Le banquet de Kalah offert par le roi d’Assyrie Ašurnasirpal II (883-859), in: R. Gyselen (ed.), *Banquets d’Orient* (Res Orientales 4), Bures-sur-Yvette: 31-44.
- FRANK, C. 1928/29, Fremdsprachliche Glossen in assyrischen Listen und Vokabularen, in: *Altorientalische Studien Bruno Meissner zum sechzigsten Geburtstag am 25. April 1928 gewidmet von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern* (MAOG 4), Leipzig: 36-45.
- GABRIELLI, M. 2006, *Le cheval dans l’empire achéménide - Horse in the Achaemenid Empire* (Studia ad Orientem Antiquum Pertinentia 1), Istanbul.
- GARRISON, M.B. 1991, Seals and the Elite at Persepolis: Some Observations on Early Achaemenid Persian Art, *Ars Orientalis* 21: 1-29.
- 1996, A Persepolis Fortification Seal on the Tablet MDP 11 308 (Louvre Sb 13078), *JNES* 55: 15-35.
- 2002 [2006], The “Late Neo-Elamite” Glyptic Style: A Perspective from Fars, *BAI* 16: 65-102.

- [forthcoming], The Seal of “Kuraš the Anšanite, Son of Šešpeš” (Teispes), PFS 93\*: Susa – Anšan – Persepolis, in: J. Alvarez-Mon & M.G. Garrison (eds.), *Elam and Persia*.
- GARRISON, M.B. & ROOT, M.C. 1996/98, *Persepolis Seal Studies. An Introduction with Provisional Concordances of Seal Numbers and Associated Documents on Fortification Tablets 1-2087* (Achaemenid History IX), Leiden [corrected edition; see [www.achemenet.com](http://www.achemenet.com) for updates].
- 2001, *Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets*, vol. I: *Images of Heroic Encounter*, 2 parts (OIP 117), Chicago.
- GERSHEVITCH, I. 1969, Iranian Nouns and Names in Elamite Garb, *TPS* 1969: 165-200.
- GIOVINAZZO, G. 1989, L’expression “*ha duš ha duka*” dans les textes de Persépolis, *Akkadica* 63: 12-26.
- 1995, I ‘*puhu*’ nei testi di Persepoli. Nuove interpretazioni, *AION* 55: 141-157.
- GOUKOWSKY, P. 2002, *Diodore de Sicile, Bibliothèque Historique*, vol. XII, Paris.
- GRILLOT, F. 1973, La postposition génitive *-na* en élamite, *CDAFI* 3: 115-169.
- 1983, Le mécanisme des groupes nominaux en élamite, *JA* 271: 207-18.
- 1986, Une tablette achéménide inédite, *AMI* 19: 149-50.
- 1987, *Éléments de grammaire élamite* (ERC synth. 29), Paris.
- 1988, À propos d’un cas de «*lévirat*» élamite, *JA* 276: 61-70.
- GRILLOT-SUSINI, F., HERRENSCHMIDT, C. & MALBRAN-LABAT, F. 1993, La version élamite de la trilingue de Behistun: une nouvelle lecture, *JA* 281: 19-59.
- GRILLOT, F. & VALLAT, F. 1975, Le semi-auxiliaire *ma-* en élamite, *JA* 263: 211-217.
- HALLOCK, R.T. 1950, New Light from Persepolis = review G.G. Cameron, *Persepolis Treasury Tablets* (Chicago 1948), *JNES* 9: 237-52.
- 1959, The finite verb in Achaemenid Elamite, *JNES* 18: 1-19.
- 1969, *Persepolis Fortification Tablets* (OIP 92), Chicago.
- 1977, The Use of Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets, in: Mc.Gibson & R.D. Biggs (eds.), *Seals and Sealings in the Ancient Near East* (Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 6), Malibu: 127-133.
- 1978, Selected Fortification Texts, *CDAFI* 8: 109-136.
- 1985, The Evidence of the Persepolis Tablets, in: I. Gershevitch (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 2: *The Median and Achaemenian Periods*, Cambridge: 588-609 [first published in 1971 as an advance offprint].
- HEIMPEL, W. 1993, Zu den Bezeichnungen von Schafen und Ziegen in den Drehem- und Ummatexten, in: *Domestic Animals of Mesopotamia*, part 1 (BSA 7), Cambridge: 113-60.
- HENKELMAN, W.F.M. 1997, Footnote at Foodnotes (on Elamite *ku-ra-qa-ráš* and *šá-mi-da.kur-ra*), in: M.-F. Boussac (ed.), *Recherches récentes sur l’Empire achéménide* (Topoi 7, Suppl. 1), Lyon: 343-5.
- 2000, review of M. Brosius, *Women in Ancient Persia (559-331 BC)*, Oxford 1996, *Mnemosyne* 53.4: 497-504.
- 2002, Exit der Posaunenbläser: on Lance-guards and Lance-bearers in the Persepolis Fortification Archive, *ARTA* 2002.007.
- 2003a, Persians, Medes and Elamites. Acculturation in the Neo-Elamite period, in: G. Lanfranchi, et al. (eds.), *Continuity of Empire (?): Assyria, Media, Persia* (History of the Ancient Near East / Monographs 5), Padova: 181-231, pls. 9-15.
- 2003b, An Elamite memorial: the Šumar of Cambyses and Hystaspes, in: W. Henkelman & A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History XIII: A Persian Perspective. Essays in Memory of Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg*, Leiden: 101-172.

- 2005, Animal sacrifice and ‘external’ exchange in the Persepolis Fortification Tablets, dans: H.D. Baker & M. Jursa (eds.), *Approaching the Babylonian Economy: Proceedings of the start Project Symposium Held in Vienna, 1-3 July 2004* (Studies in the Economic History of First Millennium Babylonia 2): 137-65.
- 2006, *The Other Gods Who Are. Studies in Elamite-Iranian Acculturation Based on the Persepolis Fortification Texts* (diss. Leiden University), Leiden [revised edition forthcoming as Achaemenid History XIV].
- 2007a, s.v. Rakkan, *RLA* 11, Berlin – New York: 232-3.
- 2007b, s.v. Ruhurater, *RLA* 11, Berlin – New York: 449.
- [forthcoming], Parnakka’s Feast: *Šip* in Pārsa and Elam, in: J. Alvarez-Mon (ed.), *Elam and Persia* [pre-publication at [www.achemenet.com/ressources/souspresse/annonces/WH15-02-07\\_ParnakkasFeast.pdf](http://www.achemenet.com/ressources/souspresse/annonces/WH15-02-07_ParnakkasFeast.pdf)].
- HENKELMAN, W.F.M., JONES, C.E. & STOLPER, M.W. 2006, Achaemenid Elamite Administrative Tablets, 2: The Qasr-i Abu Nasr Tablet, *ARTA* 2006.003 [[www.achemenet.com/ressources/enligne/arta/pdf/2006.003-Stolper-Jones-Henkelman.pdf](http://www.achemenet.com/ressources/enligne/arta/pdf/2006.003-Stolper-Jones-Henkelman.pdf)].
- HENKELMAN, W.F.M. & KLEBER, K. 2007, Babylonian Workers in the Persian Heartland: Palace Building at Matannan during the Reign of Cambyses, in: C. Tuplin (ed.), *Persian responses. Political and Cultural Interaction with(in) the Achaemenid Empire*, Swansea: 163-76.
- HENKELMAN, W.F.M. & STOLPER, M.W. [forthcoming], Ethnic Identity and Ethnic Labelling at Persepolis: The Case of the Skudrians, in: P. Briant & M. Chauveau (eds.), *Organisation des pouvoirs et contacts culturels dans les pays de l’empire achéménide* (Persika), Paris.
- HINZ, W. 1942, Zur Behistun-Inschrift des Dareios, *ZDMG* 96: 326-349.
- 1952, Die Einführung der altpersischen Schrift. Zum Absatz 70 der Behistun-Inschrift, *ZDMG* 102: 28-38.
- 1962, Die Elamischen Inschriften des Hanne, in: W.B. Hennig & E. Yarshater (eds.), *A Locust’s Leg. Studies in Honour of S.H. Taqizadeh*, London: 105-16.
- 1970, Die elamischen Buchungstäfelchen der Darius-Zeit, *Orientalia* 39: 421-40.
- 1971, Achämenidische Hofverwaltung, *ZA* 61: 260-311.
- 1973, *Neue Wege im Altpersischen* (Göttinger Orientforschungen 3.1), Wiesbaden.
- 1974, Glückwunsch aus Persepolis, in: Ph. Gignoux & A. Tafazzoli (eds.), *Mémorial Jean de Menasce*, Louvain: 125-129.
- 1975, *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen* (Göttinger Orientforschungen 3.3), Wiesbaden.
- 1986, Zu den elamischen Briefen aus Ninive, in: L. de Meyer, H. Gasche & F. Vallat (eds.), *Fragmenta Historiae Elamicae. Mélanges offerts à M.J. Steve*, Paris: 227-34.
- HINZ, W. & KOCH, H. 1987, *Elamisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols. (AMI Erg.Bd. 17), Berlin.
- JACOBS, B. 1994, *Die Satrapenverwaltung im Perserreich zur Zeit Darius’ III* (Beih. TAVO B87), Wiesbaden.
- JANKOVIĆ, B. 2004, *Vogelzucht und Vogelfang in Sippar im 1. Jahrtausend v.Chr.* (Veröffentlichungen zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte Babyloniens im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. Bd. 1 = AOAT 315), Münster.
- JOANNÈS, F. 1989, *Archives de Borsippa. La Famille Ea-ilûta-bâni. Étude d’un lot d’archives familiales en Babylonie du VIIIe au Ve siècle av. J.-C.* (Hautes Études Orientales 25), Genève.
- JONES, C.E. & STOLPER, M.W. 1986, Two Late Elamite Tablets at Yale, in: L. de Meyer, H. Gasche & F. Vallat (eds.), *Fragmenta Historiae Elamicae, Mélanges offerts à M.J. Steve*, Paris: 243-54.

- 2006, Fortification Texts Sold at the Auction of the Erlenmeyer Collection, ARTA 2006.001 [www.achemenet.com/ressources/enligne/arta/pdf/2006.001.Jones-Stolper.pdf].
- JUNKER, H.F.J. & ALAWI, B. 1947, *Persisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig.
- JURSA, M. 2004, s.v. Parfüm(rezepte), A. In *Mesopotamien*, RLA 10: 335-6.
- [forthcoming], On taxation in Achaemenid Babylonia, in: P. Briant & M. Chauveau (eds.), *Organisation des pouvoirs et contacts culturels dans les pays de l'empire achéménide* (Persika), Paris.
- KAPTAN, D. 2002, *The Daskyleion Bullae. Seal Images from the Western Achaemenid Empire*, 2 vols. (Achaemenid History XII/1-2), Leiden.
- KLEBER, K. 2004, Die Fischerei in der spätbabylonischen Zeit, WZKM 94: 133-165.
- KLINKOTT, H. 2005, *Der Satrap. Ein achaimenidischer Amtsträger und seine Handlungsspielräume* (Oikumene 1), Frankfurt a.M.
- KOCH, H. 1977, *Die religiösen Verhältnisse der Dareioszeit, Untersuchungen an Hand der elamischen Persepolistäfelchen* (Göttinger Orientforschungen 3.4), Wiesbaden.
- 1983, Zu den Lohnverhältnissen der Dareioszeit in Persien, in: H. Koch & D.N. Mackenzie (eds.), *Kunst, Kultur und Geschichte der Achämenidenzeit und ihr Fortleben* (AMI Erg.Bd. 10), Berlin: 19-50.
- 1990, *Verwaltung und Wirtschaft im persischen Kernland zur Zeit der Achämeniden* (TAVO Beih. B89), Wiesbaden.
- 1992, *Es kündigt Dareios der König... Vom Leben im persischen Großreich*, Mainz.
- 1993a, Zu den Satrapien im Achämenidenreich, in: H. Koch, *Achämeniden-Studien*, Wiesbaden: 5-48.
- 1993b, Königliche Hofhaltung und die Anlagen in Persepolis, in: H. Koch, *Achämeniden-Studien*, Wiesbaden: 61-91.
- 1994, Zu den Frauen im Achämenidenreich, in: P. Vavroušek (ed.), *Iranian and Indo-European Studies. Memorial Volume of Otokar Klíma*, Praha: 125-141.
- 2004, Texte aus Iran, in: B. Janowski & G. Wilhelm (eds.), *Texte zum Rechts- und Wirtschaftsleben* (TUAT ns. 1), Gütersloh: 221-48.
- KÖNIG, F.W. 1965, *Die elamischen Königsinschriften* (AfO Beiheft 16), Graz.
- KOZUH, M.G. 2006, *The Sacrificial Economy: on the Management of Sacrificial Sheep and Goats at the Neo-Babylonian/Achaemenid Eanna Temple of Uruk (c. 625-520 BC)*, diss. University of Chicago, Chicago.
- LAMBERT, M. 1970 [1971], Une inscription de Kutir-Nahunte, JA 1970: 243-6.
- LERNER, J.A. [forthcoming], An Achaemenid Cylinder Seal of a Woman Enthroned, in: J. Curtis & S. J. Simpson (eds.), *The World of Achaemenid Persia*.
- LEWIS, D.M. 1977, *Sparta and Persia*, Leiden.
- 1985, Persians in Herodotus, in: *The Greek Historians, Literature and History. Papers Presented to A.E. Raubitschek*, Saratoga: 101-117.
- 1987 The King's Dinner (Polyaenus IV 3,32), in: H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg & A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History II: The Greek Sources*, Leiden: 79-87.
- 1994, The Persepolis Tablets: speech, seal and script, in: A.K. Bowman & G. Woolf (eds.), *Literacy and power in the ancient world*, Cambridge: 17-32.
- MACKENZIE, D.N. 1971, review of R.T. Hallock, *Persepolis Fortification Tablets* (Chicago 1969), JAOS 34: 608-10.

- MALBRAN-LABAT, F. 1995, *Les inscriptions royales de Suse. Briques de l'époque paléo-élamite à l'Empire néo-élamite*, Paris.
- MAYRHOFER, M. 1972, Alltagsleben und Verwaltung in Persepolis: linguistisch-onomastische Aufgaben aus neuerschlossenen Profantexten, *AÖAW* 109: 192-202.
- METZLER, D. 1977, Ptolemaios' Geographie und die Topographie der Persepolis Fortification Tablets, in: W. Voigt (ed.), *XIX. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 28. September bis 4. Oktober 1975 in Freiburg in Breisgau: Vorträge* (ZDMG Suppl. 3.2), Wiesbaden: 1057-1060.
- MILLER, N.F. 1982, *Economy and Environment of Malyan, A Third Millennium B.C. Urban Center in Southern Iran* (diss. Michigan), vol. 1, Ann Arbor.
- NASRABADI, B.M. 2005, Eine Steininschrift des Amar-Suena aus Tappe Bormi (Iran), *ZA* 95: 161-71.
- NAVEH, J. & SHAKED, Sh. [forthcoming], *Aramaic Documents from Ancient Bactria (Fourth Century B.C.E.)* (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum 1.5.2), London.
- OVERLAET, B., DE JONGHE, D. & DAEMEN, S. 1993, Pfister's Sassanian Cocks Tapestry Reconsidered. A Rediscovery at the Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, *IrAnt* 31: 179-211.
- PAPER, H.H. 1954, Note préliminaire sur la date des trois tablettes élamites de Susa, in: H. Ghirshman, *Village Perse-Achémenide* (MDP 36), Paris: 79-82.
- PARPOLA, S. 1987, *The Correspondence of Sargon II*, vol. 1: *Letters from Assyria and the West* (SAA 1), Helsinki.
- PETRIE, C., ASGARI-CHAVERDI, A., MCCALL, B. & SEYEDIN, M. [forthcoming], Archaeological Evidence for Achaemenid Settlement Patterns Within the Mamasani Valleys, Western Fars (Iran), in: J. Curtis & St J. Simpson (eds.), *The World of Achaemenid Persia*.
- PETIT, Th. 1990, *Satrapes et satrapies dans l'empire achéménide de Cyrus le Grand à Xerxès Ier* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 254), Paris.
- POEBEL, A. 1938, The Names and the Order of the Old Persian and Elamite Months during the Achaemenian Period, *AJSL* 55: 130-41.
- PORTEN, B. & YARDENI, A. 1982, *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great. Aramaic Version* (CII I.5.1), London.
- PORTER, R.F., CHRISTENSEN, S. & SCHMIERMACKER-HANSEN, P. 1996, *Birds of the Middle East*, London.
- POTTS, D.T. 1997, *Mesopotamian Civilization. The Material Foundations*, London.
- 2005, Cyrus the Great and the Kingdom of Anshan, in: V.S. Curtis & S. Stewart (eds.), *The Idea of Iran*, vol. 1: *Birth of the Persian Empire*, London: 7-28.
- POTTS, D.T., ASGARI CHAVERDI, A., PETRIE, C.A., DUSTING, A., FARHADI, F., MCRAE, I.K., SHIKHI, S., WONG, E.H., LASHKARI, A. & JAVANMARD ZADEH, A. 2007, The Mamasani Archaeological Project, Stage Two: Excavations at Qaleh Kali (Tappeh Servan/Jinjun [MS 46]), *Iran* 45: 287-300.
- POTTS, G.R. 1986, *The Partridge. Pesticides, Prediation and Conservation*, London.
- POWELL, M.A. 1984, Sumerian Cereal Crops, in: N. Postgate & M.A. Powell (eds.), *Bulletin of Sumerian Agriculture* 1, Cambridge: 48-72.
- QUINTANA, E. 2001, A vueltas con el apartado 70 de Behistún. Versión elamita, *NABU* 2001/13.
- RAZMJOU, S. 2005, Notes on a Forgotten Achaemenid Site at Farmeshgan, Iran, in: P. Briant & R. Boucharlat (eds.), *L'archéologie de l'empire achéménide: nouvelles recherches* (Persika 6), Paris: 293-312.
- REINER, E. 1969, The Elamite Language, in: *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen* (HdO 1.2.1-2.2), Leiden: 54-118.
- 1973, Inscription from a Royal Elamite Tomb, *AfO* 24: 87-102.

- RENFREW, J. 1984, Cereals Cultivated in Ancient Iraq, in: N. Postgate & M.A. Powell (eds.), *Bulletin of Sumerian Agriculture*, vol. 1, Cambridge: 32-44.
- RÖLLIG, W. 1970, *Das Bier im Alten Mesopotamien*, Berlin.
- ROOT, M.C. 2003, The Lioness of Elam: Politics and Dynastic Fecundity at Persepolis, in: W. Henkelman & A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History XIII: A Persian Perspective. Essays in Memory of Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg*, Leiden: 9-32.
- 2007, Reading Persepolis in Greek: Gifts of the Yauna, in: Chr. Tuplin (ed.), *Persian responses. Political and Cultural Interaction with(in) the Achaemenid Empire*, Swansea: 177-224.
- [forthcoming], The Legible Image: How did Seals and Sealing Matter in Persepolis?, in: P. Briant, W.F.M. Henkelman & M.W. Stolper (eds.), *Les archives des Fortifications de Persépolis dans le contexte de l'Empire achéménide et de ses prédécesseurs* (Persika 11), Paris.
- SALONEN, A. 1973, *Vögel und Vögelfang im alten Mesopotamien* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 180), Helsinki.
- SANCISI-WEERDENBURG, H.W.A.M. 1980, *Yaunā en Persai. Grieken en Perzen in een ander perspectief*, diss. Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, Groningen.
- 1989, Gifts in the Persian Empire, in: P. Briant & Cl. Herrenschildt (eds.), *Le tribut dans l'Empire perse. Actes de la Table ronde de Paris (12-13 Décembre 1986)* (Travaux de l'Institut d'Études Iraniennes de l'Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle 13), Paris: 129-146.
- 1995, Persian Food: Stereotypes and Political Identity, in: J. Wilkins, D. Harvey & M. Dobson (eds.), *Food in Antiquity*, Exeter: 286-302.
- 1997, Crumbs from the Royal Table. Foodnotes on Briant (pp. 297-306), in: M.-F. Boussac (ed.), *Recherches récentes sur l'Empire achéménide* (Topoi 7, Suppl. 1), Lyon: 333-42, 345.
- SCHEIL, V. 1911, *Textes élamites-anzanites, quatrième série* (MDP 11), Paris.
- 1917, Déchiffrement d'un document anzanite relatif aux présages, *RA* 14: 29-59.
- SCHMITT, R. 1974, *Neue Wege zum Altpersischen*, review W. Hinz, *Neue Wege im Altpersischen* (1973), *GGA* 226: 95-113.
- 1976, Der Titel “Satrap,” in: A. M. Davies & W. Meid (eds.), *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics offered to Leonard R. Palmer on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday June 5, 1976* (IBS 16), Innsbruck: 373-90.
- 1978, De verbis atque litteris titulorum Susianorum restituendis, *Orientalia* 47: 105-8.
- 1987, s.v. Artystone, *EnIr* II: 665.
- 1991, *The Bisitun Inscriptions of Darius the Great. Old Persian Text* (CII 1.1.1), London.
- 1993, s.v. Cooking, I: In Ancient Iran, *EnIr* VI: 246-8.
- SEIDL, U. 2005, review M.B. Garrison & M.C. Root, *Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets*, vol. I: *Images of Heroic Encounter* (Chicago 2001): *ZA* 95: 155-9.
- SHAKED, Sh. 2004, *Le satrape de Bactriane et son gouverneur. Documents araméens du IV s. avant notre ère provenant de Bactriane* (Persika 4), Paris.
- STAROSTIN, G. 2002, On the Genetic Affiliation of the Elamite Language, *Mother Tongue* 7: 147-70 [cf. [starling.rinet.ru/Texts/elam.pdf](http://starling.rinet.ru/Texts/elam.pdf)].
- STEINGASS, F. 1892 [reprint 1970], *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*, Beirut.
- STEINKELLER, P. 1995, Sheep and Goat Terminology in Ur III Sources from Drehem, in: *Domestic Animals from Mesopotamia*, part 2 (BSA 8), Cambridge: 49-70.
- STEVE, M.-J. 1992, *Syllabaire élamite. Histoire et paléographie* (Civilisations du Proche-Orient II.1), Neuchâtel - Paris.

- STEVENSON, R.B. 1997, *Persica. Greek Writing about Persia in the Fourth Century BC* (Scottish Classical Studies 5), Edinburgh.
- STOL, M. 1993, Milk, Butter, and Cheese, in: *Domestic Animals of Mesopotamia*, part 1 (BSA 7), Cambridge: 99-113.
- 1994, Beer in Neo-Babylonian Times, in: L. Milano (ed.), *Drinking in Ancient Societies. History and Culture of Drinks in the Ancient Near East. Papers of a Symposium held in Rome, May 17-19 1990* (HANE Studies 6), Padova: 155-83.
- [forthcoming], s.v. sesam, *RLA*.
- STOLPER, M.W. 1977, Three Iranian Loanwords in Late Babylonian Texts, in: L.D. Levine & T.C. Young (eds.), *Mountains and Lowlands: Essays in the Archaeology of Greater Mesopotamia* (Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 7), Malibu: 251-66.
- 1984, *Texts from Tall-i Malyan, I: Elamite Administrative Texts (1972-1974)* (Occasional Publications of the Babylonian Fund 6), Philadelphia.
- 1985, *Entrepreneurs and Empire. The Murašû Archive, the Murašû Firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia* (PIHANS 54), Leiden – Istanbul.
- 1987, Bēlšunu the Satrap, in: F. Rochberg-Halton (ed.), *Language, Literature, and History: Philological and Historical Studies Presented to Erica Reiner* (AOS 67), New Haven.
- 1989, The Governor of Babylon and Across-the-River in 486 B.C., *JNES* 48: 283-305.
- 1992a, Elamite Administrative Tablet with Impression of a Royal Name Seal, in: P. Harper, J. Aruz, F. Tallon (eds.), *The Royal City of Susa: Ancient Near Eastern Treasures in the Louvre*, New York: 273.
- 1992b, The Estate of Mardonius, *Aula Orientalis* 10: 211-221.
- 2004, Elamite, in: R.D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, Cambridge: 60-94.
- 2006a, Parysatis in Babylon, in: A.K. Guinan et al. (eds.), *If a Man Builds a Joyful House. Assyriological Studies in Honor of Erle Verdun Leichty* (CM 31), Leiden – Boston: 463-72.
- 2006b, Iranica in post-Achaemenid Babylonian Texts, in: P. Briant & F. Joannès (eds.), *La transition entre l'empire achéménide et les royaumes hellénistiques* (Persika 9), Paris: 223-60.
- [forthcoming], How Many Persepolis Fortification Tablets Are There?, in: P. Briant, W.F.M. Henkelman & M.W. Stolper (eds.), *Les archives des Fortifications de Persépolis dans le contexte de l'Empire achéménide et de ses prédécesseurs, Actes du colloque organisé au Collège de France et au Centre de l'Université de Chicago à Paris, 3-4 Novembre 2006* (Persika 12), Paris.
- TARASEWICZ, R. 2003, YOS 6 141: the account of bird keepers from Eanna Temple at Uruk, *NABU* 2003/15.
- TAVERNIER, J. 2006, Iranian Toponyms in the Elamite Fortification Archive, *BNF* 41: 371-97.
- 2007, *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period (ca. 550-330 B.C.). Lexicon of Old Iranian Proper Names and Loanwords, Attested in Non-Iranian Texts* (OLA 158), Leuven – Paris – Dudley.
- [forthcoming 1], On some Elamite signs and sounds, *ZDMG*.
- [forthcoming 2], Multilingualism in the Fortification and Treasury Archives, in: P. Briant, W.F.M. Henkelman, M.W. Stolper (eds.), *Les archives des Fortifications de Persépolis dans le contexte de l'Empire achéménide et de ses prédécesseurs. Actes du colloque organisé au Collège de France et au Centre de l'Université de Chicago à Paris, 3-4 Novembre 2006* (Persika 12), Paris.
- TER HAAR, A.A., *Hoenders, kalkoenen, eenden, ganzen. Het fokken, voeden, verplegen en mesten beschreven voor fokkers van nutgevolgelte*, Maastricht.

- TREIDLER, H. 1957, s.v. Pura, *RE* 23.2, Stuttgart: 1995-99.
- TUPLIN, Chr. 1992, The “Persian” Bird: an Ornithonymic Conundrum, *AMI* 25: 125-29.
- 1996, The Parks and Gardens of the Achaemenid Empire, in: Chr. Tuplin, *Achaemenid Studies* (Historia Einzelschriften 99), Stuttgart: 80-131, 178-82.
- 1998, The seasonal migration of Achaemenid kings, in: M. Brosius & A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History XI: Studies in Persian History. Essays in Memory of David M. Lewis*, Leiden: 63-114.
- [forthcoming], Taxation and Death. Certainties in the Persepolis Fortification Archive?, in: P. Briant, W.F.M. Henkelman, M.W. Stolper (eds.), *Les archives des Fortifications de Persépolis dans le contexte de l'Empire achéménide et de ses prédécesseurs. Actes du colloque organisé au Collège de France et au Centre de l'Université de Chicago à Paris, 3-4 Novembre 2006* (Persika 12), Paris.
- UCHITEL, A. 1989, Organization of Manpower in Achaemenid Persia According to the Fortification Archive, *ASJ* 11: 225-38.
- 1997, Persian Paradise: Agricultural Texts in the Fortification Archive, *IrAnt* 32: 137-44.
- VALLAT, F. 1977, *Dictionnaire des inscriptions royales en élamite achéménide*, s.l. [unpublished].
- 1993, *Les noms géographiques des sources suso-élamites* (RGTC 11 = Beih. TAVO B 7/11), Wiesbaden.
- 1994, Deux tablettes élamites de l'Université de Fribourg, *JNES* 53: 263-74.
- 1996, Nouvelle analyse des inscriptions néo-élamites, in: H. Gasche & B. Hrouda (eds.), *Collectanea Orientalia. Histoire, arts de l'espace et industrie de la terre. Études offertes en hommage à Agnès Spycket*, Neuchâtel – Paris: 385-95.
- 1997, L'utilisation des sceaux-cylindres dans l'archivage des lettres de Persépolis, in: R. Gyselen (ed.), *Sceaux d'Orient et leur emploi* (Res Orientales 10), Bures-sur-Yvette: 171-4.
- 1998a, Le royaume élamite de Zamin et les “lettres de Niniveh,” in: R. Boucharlat, J.E. Curtis & E. Haerinck (eds.), *Neo-Assyrian, Median, Achaemenian and other studies in honor of David Stronach* (= *IrAnt* 33), Gent: 95-106.
- 1998b, Formules de vœux en élamite, *NABU* 1998/126.
- 2005, L'inscription néo-élamite de Manaka[...]untaš et l'emploi des déterminatifs à basse époque, in: M. Bernardini & N.L. Tornesello (eds.), *Scritti in onore di Giovanni M. d'Erme* (Università degli Studi di Napoli “L'Orientale,” Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor 68), Napoli: 1237-42.
- [forthcoming], Darius, l'héritier légitime et les premiers achéménides, in: J. Alvarez-Mon (ed.), *Elam and Persia*.
- VAN DRIEL, G. 1993, Neo-Babylonian Sheep and Goats, *Bulletin of Sumerian Agriculture* 7: 219-258.
- VAN ZEIST, W. 1984, List of Names of Wild and Cultivated Cereals, *Bulletin on Sumerian Agriculture*, vol. 1, Cambridge: 8-15.
- VLEEMING, S.P., 1991, *The Gooseherds of Hou (Pap. Hou). A Dossier Relating to Various Agricultural Affairs from Provincial Egypt of the Early Fifth Century B.C.* (Studia Demotica 3), Leuven.
- WEISSBACH, F.H. 1939, Die Elamische Übersetzung der *Daiwa*-Inscription, in: J. Friedrich, J. G. Lautner & J. Miles (eds.), *Symbolae ad iura orientis antiqui pertinentes Paulo Koschaker dedicatae* (Studia et documenta ad iura orientis antiqui pertinentia 2), Leiden: 189-98.
- WIESEHÖFER, J. 1978, *Der Aufstand Gaumātas und die Anfänge Dareios' I.*, Bonn.

- YOUNG, T.C. 2003, Parsua, Parsa, and Potsherds, in: N.F. Miller & K. Abdi (eds.), *Yeki bud, yeki nabud. Essays on the Archaeology of Iran in Honor of William M. Sumner* (Cotsen Institute of Archaeology – Monograph 48), Los Angeles: 242-8.
- ZADOK, R. 1984, Assyro-Babylonian Lexical and Onomastic Notes, *BiOr* 41: 33-46.
- 2002, An Achaemenid queen, *NABU* 2002/65.
- 2003, Updating the Apammu Dossier, *NABU* 2003/33.