

PARNAKKA'S FEAST
Šip in Pārsa and Elam*

Wouter F.M. Henkelman
Collège de France, Paris

In memory of Peter Calmeyer

§1. Introduction; **§2.** Elamites, Iranians and Persians; **§3.** The Persepolis Fortification tablets; **§4.** The case of *lan*; **§5.** Auramazdā and the other gods who are; **§6.** *Šip*; **§6.1.** *Šip* and *anši* in translation; **§6.2.** Document status; **§6.3.** Defining the feasts; **§6.3.1.** The beneficiaries of *šip*; **§6.3.2.** Other feasts; **§6.3.3.** The beneficiaries of *šip* (*bis*); **§6.3.4.** The date of *šip*; **§6.3.5.** The location of *šip*; **§6.3.6.** *Anši*; **§6.4.** A royal feast; **§6.4.1.** The king's presence in Fārs; **§6.4.2.** Royal largesse; **§6.4.3.** Rewarding services rendered to the king; **§6.4.4.** Parnakka at Pasargadae, Peucestes at Persepolis; **§6.5.** *Šip*: an interim summary; **§7.** Feasting in Elam; **§7.1.** *Šip* and *šup*; **§7.1.1.** *Šup* at Deylam; **§7.1.2.** *Šup* at Anšan; **§7.1.3.** *Šup* at Gisat; **§7.1.4.** *Šikšibbe*; **§7.1.5.** Kilah-šupir; **§7.1.6.** The importance of Elamite *šup*; **§7.2.** Other textual evidence; **§7.3.** The feast of Aiapir; **§8.** A Persian feast.

1. *Introduction*

After the second Mithridatic war, in which he won a victory over the Roman armies led by the propraetor of Asia, L. Licinius Murena, Mithridates VI Eupator organised a grand sacrificial feast (82 BC). As Appian informs us, the feast continued a tradition that went back to the Persian kings (*Mithr.* 66 = 276-9):¹

* I am grateful to Amélie Kuhrt for useful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Abbreviations used: DN = divine name; EK1 = 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 = unpublished Persepolis Fortification tablet in the National Museum of Iran, transliterated by G.G. Cameron, and collated by R.T. Hallock, C.E. Jones and M.W. Stolper; NN = unpublished Persepolis Fortification tablet transliterated by R.T. Hallock; OPers. = Old Persian; PF = Fortification tablet published in Hallock 1969; PFa = *idem*, in Hallock 1978; PFS = Persepolis Fortification seal; PFS* = *idem*, with inscription; PFSs = *idem*, stamp seal; PN = personal name; S = Neo-Elamite tablet from Susa in Scheil 1907 and *idem* 1911; TZ = texts from Čoğā Zanbīl in Steve 1967.

¹ Translation W. Henkelman. For the precise understanding of the technicalities of the offering (two concentric heaps of wood), compare the recent Budé edition by Goukowsky (2001: 67; cf. the comments on pp. 188-90). The same (?) customary offerings to Zeus Stratios are also mentioned in App. *Mithr.* 70 = 295, with the

The news of his (= Mithridates') victory, which had been brilliant and rapid (for it had been reached at the first assault), spread quickly in all directions, and it caused many to change sides to Mithridates. The latter, having made an assault on all Murena's garrisons in Cappadocia and driven them out, offered an ancestral sacrifice (πάτριον θυσίαν) to Zeus Stratios on a high hill after having placed a lofty <pyre> of wood on its top.² (In this type of sacrifice) the kings are the first to carry wood (to the pyre). After having surrounded (the first pyre of wood) by a second, circular one that is less high, they offer milk, honey, wine, oil and all kinds of incense on the first and put out bread and meat/prepared food (σῖτόν τε καὶ ὄψον ἐς ἄριστον) for the (sacrificial) meal for those present on the second, base one (τῇ δ' ἐπιπέδῳ), as it is with the type of sacrifice practised by the Persian kings at Pasargadae. Subsequently, they set fire to the wood. Because of its size the burning (pyre) becomes clearly visible for those sailing on the sea at a distance of as much as thousand stades and it is said that it is impossible to approach it for several days, the air being ablaze. He (Mithridates) performed a sacrifice according to (this) ancestral custom.

Though Appian does not make the details clear, it seems that the traditional feast performed by Mithridates involved a sacrificial banquet for guests seated around the central fire on a hilltop. That the wood for that fire had been heaped up, at least symbolically, by the king, underlines the true meaning of the occasion: while Zeus Stratios ("Zeus-of-the-Army") is the object of veneration, it is the human victor, the Pontic king, who is, literally, the centre of attention. The feast provides him with a forum in which his role as foremost among humans can be played out in full splendour. Not only is he closest to the god, the banquet organised by him also confirms his role as greatest gift-giver.

Appian's claim that Mithridates' feast was modelled on the feasts of the Persian kings at Pasargadae (i.e. the Achaemenids) agrees with the well-known continuity of Persian cultural traditions in Hellenistic Pontus (e.g., Strabo XII.3.37) and the Iranian descent claimed by the Mithridatids (Diod. XIX.40.2; App. *Mithr.* 9).³ This remains true even if 'Zeus Stratios' refers to a local, Anatolian god and is not the Hellenized name of an Iranian deity (Auramazdā).⁴ Though

stipulation that they took place at the beginning of spring in the context of a review of Mithridates' naval forces (ἀρχομένου δ' ἡρὸς ἀπόπειραν τοῦ ναυτικοῦ ποιησάμενος ἔθυε τῷ Στρατίῳ Διὶ τὴν συνήθη θυσίαν).

² Cf. Goukowsky (2001: 67), "après avoir disposé au dessus un haut <bûcher> fait de madriers."

³ See survey in Boyce & Grenet 1991: 263-4, 281-304. Cf. Briant 1985: 176-82 on Iranian cults in Asia Minor and *idem* 2002: 134 on the purported Iranian descent of the Mithridatids.

⁴ So De Jong 1997: 135, 140, 356-7 and esp. 261-2. Cumont (1901) believed that Zeus Stratios, as he was worshipped by Mithridates, was a god of composite nature, based

certain details in the organisation and performance of the feast changed over the 250 years between the fall of the Persian Empire and the second Mithridatic war, the basic outlines of the *type* of sacrifice described by Appian seem to be ancient. This inference is supported by a number of sources, including Middle and Neo-Elamite inscriptions and rock reliefs, and various Greek sources, including a testimony from Diodorus on a feast organised by Peucestes. Each of these sources has been already been discussed at greater or lesser length, but they have not as yet received treatment as a single dossier as attempted here. The main subject of the present paper will, however, be *šip*, a feast attested in a number of Achaemenid Elamite administrative texts. Given the unwieldy nature of these texts, an extensive discussion is necessary to reach a workable definition of *šip*. The investment seems worthwhile, however, in view of possible Elamite antecedents of *šip*. As I hope to show, this type of ideologically charged royal sacrificial festival presents a telling example of Elamite-Iranian religious acculturation in the Persian heartland.

This paper includes photographs and transliterations of seven previously unpublished Achaemenid Elamite texts. The transliterations were made by the late Richard T. Hallock and are part of what is commonly known as the Hallock Nachlaß; the author has collated all texts. I am much indebted to Matthew W. Stolper, curator of the Persepolis Fortification Tablets at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, for granting access to the tablets and to Hallock's manuscripts, for providing the photographs printed in this article and for permission to publish Hallock's transliterations.

2. *Elamites, Iranians and Persians*

The last two decades of scholarship on Iranian history have witnessed an increased interest in the Neo-Elamite period (ca. 1000-539/520 BC), particularly in the relationship between the resident Elamites and the (Indo-)Iranian newcomers. Three factors are of importance in the debate.

First, it is by now generally accepted that the Neo-Elamite state did not collapse altogether in the wars with the Neo-Assyrian Empire in the 640s BC. There is ample evidence for a re-emerging kingdom that continued down to the

on local, Greek and Iranian (Auramazdā) elements, and that the feast described by Appian was of true Iranian origin. On the passage see also Taylor 1931: 249-50 (offering for dead Persian kings); Widengren 1965: 30, 180-2 (180, "iranisches Opfer"); Calmeyer 1978: 82-4 with fn. 37; *idem* 1982: 185; Boyce & Grenet 1991: 293-300 (297, "traditional Persian rite, even though it appears to have undergone ... modifications in certain details," 300, "[the god venerated by Mithridates] is by origin Ahura Mazda"); Briant 2002: 243-5.

reign of Cyrus II, perhaps even to the accession of Darius I. Many important texts, such as the Acropole archive (Scheil 1907; *idem* 1911: 101) and a number of Neo-Elamite royal inscriptions are now dated to this last century of Elamite history.⁵ Though some scholars hold that the last Neo-Elamite kingdom was rather weak as a political unit, there are in fact a number of weighty indications pointing to a certain degree of stability and prosperity (Henkelman 2006: 8-23). Most important, the Elamite state, both before and after the Assyrian wars, must have been a real Fundgrube for the emergent Persian society and culture in terms of literacy, art, craftsmanship, bureaucracy, royal ideology, military organisation, trade networks, administrative mechanisms and political structure. Persia may indeed be seen as “the heir of Elam” (not of ‘Media’), to quote Mario Liverani’s provocative comment on the matter (2003: 10; cf. Henkelman *l.c.*).

Secondly, it has become clear that Elamite sedentary culture was not confined to Susa and the Susiana proper, but also existed in a ‘dimorphic zone’ (on the concept see Rowton 1973a-b; 1976) in the transitional area between lowland Khūzestān and highland Fārs. Several larger settlements in this region (i.e. the plains of Behbahān, Rām Hormoz and Rāmšīr) continued to exist throughout the Middle and Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid periods.⁶ They were the doorsteps of urban Elamite culture for the pastoralist population of the highlands.

The population of the highlands is the third factor. Though the ceramic assemblages from surveys and excavations in Fārs cannot as yet be described in a unifying model or be linked to particular ethnic groups or cultural identities, it seems very likely that the plateau was not empty upon the arrival of the (Indo-)Iranian pastoralist tribes sometime in the period 1500-1000 BC. Rather, the dominantly Elamite population had probably turned, in the course of the second millennium, to an (agro-)pastoralist way of life in response to climatic changes, hence the disappearance and dwindling of many settlements in this region.⁷ Elamite presence on the plateau is confirmed by the Neo-Elamite additions to reliefs and inscriptions of the open-air sanctuaries of Kūrangūn, Kūl-e Farah, Šekaft-e Salmān and Naqš-e Rostam. Another indication is that of the Elamite proper names documented by the Fortification tablets (on which see §3 below); especially the use of Elamite place names for some towns in Fārs seems to point

⁵ See de Miroschedji 1978 and *idem* 1981a-c for the material culture. A revised dating of the Neo-Elamite text corpus was first proposed by Vallat 1996 and has been accepted, with some modifications, by Tavernier 2004. On Elamite-Iranian acculturation in general see also the surveys by Henkelman 2003a and *idem* 2006: 1-33 (with full bibliography).

⁶ See Carter 1994 and compare Henkelman 2006: 24-5 on the ancient town of Šullaggi in the Rāmšīr region.

⁷ Sumner 1994; Overlaet 1997; Stronach 1997: 35-7; Boucharlat 2003: 261-3; Young 2003.

to a continued Elamite presence. In short, one has to reckon with the coexistence of groups of Iranians and Elamites during 500 to 1000 years prior to the rise of the Persian Empire.

Given the above circumstances acculturation and integration should be considered axiomatic. The coexistence of Elamites and Iranians in the highlands, in combination with cultural impulses from lowland Elam and – more distant, yet tangible – from Assyria and Babylonia, may account for the Persian ethnogenesis as Pierre de Miroschedji has argued (1985: 295; *idem* 1990: 70). The rise of a new cultural identity is then seen not as linear development based primarily upon an Indo-Iranian heritage, but as the coming together and creative reception of different traditions. From this perspective, insisting on the Elamite or Iranian nature of certain strands of what really was a *Persian* cultural fabric almost inevitably becomes a rather academic exercise.

3. *The Persepolis Fortification tablets*

One of the richest sources for Achaemenid history is the Persepolis Fortification Archive.⁸ Its name derives from the northeastern Fortification section of the Persepolis terrace, where Ernst Herzfeld excavated many thousands of clay tablets in the 1933-34 season. Apart from several hundreds of Aramaic documents, a handful of unica in other languages and a large group of anepigraphic tags, the Fortification corpus contains at least 15,000 (but probably more) administrative texts written in Achaemenid Elamite. A total of 4845 texts have been transliterated (the great majority by R.T. Hallock), but 'only' 2123 of these have been published thus far.⁹ The remarks below are based on the corpus of all transliterated texts, or about a third of the excavated Elamite tablets. These texts date from the 13th through the 28th regnal year of Darius I (509-493 BC).¹⁰

The Persepolis Fortification tablets are the paperwork of a regional institution that controlled an area stretching from Behbahān (or perhaps Rām Hormoz) to Nīrīz, i.e. a larger part of modern Fārs.¹¹ The archive's purpose was to monitor the circulation of locally grown, produced and bred edible commodities

⁸ For recent surveys of the archive (with references) see Briant 2002: 422-71, 938-47 and Henkelman 2006: 39-111.

⁹ Hallock 1969; *idem* 1978; Grilot 1986; Vallat 1994. Compare also the nine texts formerly in the Erlenmeyer collection that are almost certainly from the Fortification find and that have been published recently by Jones & Stolper (2006).

¹⁰ It can tentatively be estimated that the total number of documents in the Fortification Archive for the period Dar. 13-28 originally amounted to as much as 100,000 documents (Henkelman 2006: 110-1).

¹¹ The hypothesis that the area under the archive's scope stretched all the way to Susa seems highly problematic (see Henkelman 2006: 65-70).

and livestock (grain, fruit, beer, honey, wine, sheep, goats, cattle, poultry). Individual texts typically deal with the intake, transport and storage of revenue, withdrawals for the royal domain, the allocation of rations to workers, travellers and officials, the feeding of animals kept in stables, or the provision of sacrificial foodstuffs for a variety of offerings. It is the latter category that is of particular interest for the subject of Elamite-Iranian acculturation.

4. *The case of lan*

There are about 250 texts and entries in cumulative registers ('journals') in the Fortification corpus that deal with provisions for cultic activity. Within this group *lan* is, with 81 texts, the best documented type of offering. It may be instructive to offer a brief survey of the case of *lan* before moving on to the actual subject of this paper, the royal sacrificial feast known as *šip* that was performed at Pasargadae and elsewhere.

The term *lan* simply means "offering" or "oblation" and is derived from the verbal base *la-*, "to send, to send as gift, to offer."¹² In the Fortification texts, *lan* denotes the ritual, rather than the commodity offered to the god(s). Typically, the offering was performed with flour (for sacrificial loaves) and beer or wine. Fruit and sheep/goats are also attested (*pace* Koch 1987: 270-1). One of the characteristics of *lan* is that sacrificial commodities are regularly provided for a whole year, often with a stipulation of the monthly and sometimes of the daily amounts. Three journal entries may serve as examples of the contexts in which *lan* occurs:¹³

PF 1955:1-3

360 quarts of grain, U(k)piš the *makuš* has received: 90 as *gal* ("offering") for *lan*, 90 for Mišebaka ("All Gods"), 90 for Mount Ariaramnes, 90 for the river Ahinharišda.

¹² The interpretation of *lan* as "wörtlich wohl göttliche Gegenwart, übertragen religiöser Kult, konkret Kultopfer" (EW s.v. d.*la-an*) ultimately derives from Hüsing's unsupported conjecture that *lan* in DBa 2 means "now" (Hüsing 1910: 14). Vallat (2000: 1065) claims that two verbal roots *la-* should be distinguished from one another, but the ways forms based on *la-* are used strongly suggest a single verb with a wide range of meanings. See discussion in Henkelman 2006: 113-39.

¹³ For the texts of PF 1955 and PF 1956 see Hallock 1969: 559-62 (translations mine); Hallock's transliteration of NN 2259 is published, with translation and comments, in Henkelman 2006: 319-47.

PF 1956:1-2

150 quarts of grain Umbaba the *šatin* (cultic expert) has received: 30 for *lan*, 30 for Turma, 30 for Mariraš, 30 for Earth, 30 for Mišebaka ("All Gods").

NN 2259:7-8

30 head of sheep/goats, (in accordance with) a sealed document from Parnakka, Šatrizada received (as) *daušiyam* ("sacrificial [animals]") for *lan*, to deliver/perform at the *partetaš* ("plantation") (at) Pasargadae (during) 12⁷ months.

From the above texts it appears that *lan* sometimes occurs in lists of offerings that were performed by the same officiant. This fact has been taken as a prime argument for the supposition that *lan* exclusively refers to the cult of a single, unnamed god, namely Auramazdā. The argument is that if *lan* appears side by side with offerings for named gods such as Turma and Mariraš (PF 1956:1-2), it must refer to a single god too and given the frequency of *lan* this god can only be Auramazdā (so Koch 1977: 129-30, 137-8). The line of reasoning is erroneous, however, as the lists regularly mention more than one locale as beneficiary (or rather locus) of ritual activity. A list such as the one on offerings for (at) Mount Ariaramnes and River Ahinharišda (PF 1955:1-3 above) indicates that the commodities listed were not offered in a single, combined ceremony at a single spot. The lists are, in fact, a mere bureaucratic phenomenon. Offerings are grouped in one text because the same officiant, region and jurisdiction are involved, not because a single ceremony is at stake. The principle is not without parallel in the archive: wine rations for various middle-ranking officials are often listed together, even though they have different professions and/or direct different work forces. Similar administrative practices (including those pertaining to cultic activity) are found in contemporary Mesopotamian institutional archives (Henkelman 2006: 155-8, with references).

Another claim regarding *lan* is that the term is never qualified, so it must have been well known for which god it was intended and this god can only have been *the* god, i.e. Auramazdā (Koch 1977: 138). One text does qualify *lan*, however: NN 2202:35 [2] refers to a *lan* sacrifice intended "for Humban" (^{AN}*Ihu⁷-ban⁷1-na*) or (less likely) "for the gods" (^{AN}*na-pan⁷1-na*).¹⁴ More important, the regular unqualified use of *lan* does not necessarily imply that this offering was intended for one god in particular: it just means that the word was in itself a precise enough term to be used without explanation. As such it rather seems to have denoted a particular *type* of offering rather than an offering for a particular yet unnamed god.

The above considerations illustrate two fundamental methodological principles in the study of cultic practices recorded in the Fortification tablets. One is that the archive is, and should be treated as a source in its own right. It

¹⁴ The reading "for Auramazdā" is epigraphically impossible (Henkelman 2006: 387-91).

hardly needs to be explained that reading the perspective of the ideologically charged royal inscriptions into the archive will not yield any new insights in Persian religion. That Auramazdā is omnipresent in the inscriptions does not necessarily imply that his status in the tablets must be the same. Still, it was the latter, uncorroborated supposition that inspired the explanation of *lan* as the ‘Zoroastrian state-offering’: in this view the most frequently-mentioned offering could not be anything other than an exclusive rite for Auramazdā.¹⁵ Such an argumentation also fails to pay due attention to a second axiomatic principle: namely, that the Fortification texts are straightforward utilitarian documents, part of an economic archive in which things are recorded on the basis of administrative principles and bureaucratic protocols only. This implies, for example, that there is no reason why the scribes at Persepolis would have treated a sacrifice for Auramazdā any differently from other rites. From a documentary perspective, there is no justification for referring to this particular god by means of his offering (*lan*), whereas all other gods are referred to by name. Sometimes, functionally redundant information is indeed suppressed, but the *consistent* omission of a god’s name would be unparalleled.¹⁶ Conversely, administrative principles can often elucidate seemingly inexplicable oddities such as the above-mentioned lists of offerings: these were not, as is sometimes assumed, references to collective rites, but just cumulative charts of expenses for cultic purposes. The tablets first and foremost reflect an administrative, not a cultic reality.¹⁷

¹⁵ See especially Koch 1977: 137-8, 175-8, 182. For a detailed evaluation of Koch’s arguments see Henkelman 2006: 147-76.

¹⁶ Compare the designations of officiants, which are given in only 50% of the relevant texts. Also, the names of the divine beneficiaries of offerings are not always stated (“offering for the gods”), implying that this information was already known or of no importance for the demand of accountability. Such variations are to be expected in a situation where context (explicit and implicit) and routine are of decisive importance. By contrast, there is no *administrative* explanation for the consistent use of an elliptical expression (“*lan*” instead of “*lan* for Auramazdā”); no other god is referred to by means of a specific offering.

¹⁷ *Contra*: Koch 1977: 129-30; see discussion in Henkelman 2006: 155-8. Compare also the case of the exchange texts, i.e. documents recording the allocation of grain (or, sometimes, wine) to be exchanged for sacrificial animals. Koch interpreted such texts as indicators of a taboo on animal sacrifice pronounced by the Zoroastrian state. The native Elamite population was, according to Hinz (1970: 427-30) and Koch (1987: 270; 1988: 404-5), allowed to continue their ancestral worship of the gods, but the authorities refused to allocate animals for this purpose. It is not very likely, however, that the state would uphold a taboo and at the same time tacitly sponsor the ‘pagan’ cults, albeit indirectly. But the most important objection against the above scenario is that it cannot explain why the scribes recorded the act of exchange, the number of animals acquired and the gods to whom they were sacrificed, if these cults were more

As for *lan*, there are a number of additional arguments (and counter-arguments) on its purported connection with Auramazdā, but these need not be repeated here *in extenso*. I just note in passing that it would be rather odd that of all things the 'Zoroastrian state-offering' should be referred to by an Elamite term (with an extensive background in Elamite cultic vocabulary) and this in an archive that is replete with Iranian loanwords. Along the same lines, it seems inexplicable to me that *lan* is not used in the (Elamite versions of the) royal inscriptions, not even in those passages where offerings for Auramazdā are at stake.¹⁸ Furthermore, the ten texts that do mention offerings for Auramazdā are completely different – in terms of cultic personnel, quantities, frequency and purpose – from the 81 texts mentioning *lan*. These, the above, and other considerations support the firm rejection of the idea that *lan* and Auramazdā were exclusively connected. Instead, *lan* seems to have been used as an autonomous technical term denoting a specific type of offering characterised by its regularity in frequency and quantity (Henkelman 2006: 158–61). The available evidence suggests that it functioned, in economic terms, as a basic allowance for individuals with cultic duties (not unlike the *ginû* offerings in contemporary Mesopotamia). *Lan* does not seem to have been defined in terms of a particular divine beneficiary or religious doctrine (be it Iranian or Elamite).

5. Auramazdā and the other gods who are

Connecting Auramazdā and *lan* has been a way of harmonizing the message of the royal inscriptions with the Fortification tablets. Once this connection is abandoned, the independent and precious documentary value of the Fortification archive is restored. This yields a surprising image: Auramazdā's position in the archive is remarkably modest; his name occurs in no more than ten texts. By contrast, Humban, the most important Elamite god in the Neo-Elamite period, is mentioned in 27 texts, i.e. almost three times as often.¹⁹

or less illegal and took place outside the scope of the archive. Rather, issuing grain for the acquisition of sacrificial animals served to reduce the grain surplus and preserve the institution's livestock capital whenever possible; the whole procedure should be seen in the light of contacts between the Persepolis economy and semi-autonomous pastoralists (Henkelman 2005a).

¹⁸ DSf_e 16–7 and DSz_e 15: *gal* for Auramazdā; XPh_e 33–4, 41–2 and 44: preparing a *šip* for Auramazdā. The Old Persian versions (DSf_p 18; XPh_p 40–1, 50, 53 [the corresponding passage in DSz_p is not preserved]) use the verb *yad-* "to venerate, worship" without specifying any particular type of offering or feast. On XPh see §6.3.1 below.

¹⁹ These 27 texts include NN 2202:35 [2], where ^{AN}*hu²-ban²1-na* ("for Humban") is the preferred reading (cf. §4 above).

A more reliable (but still approximate) indication of the importance of a given cult can be deduced from the amounts of commodities issued for it. Since there were fixed exchange rates for wine, beer, grain and livestock, cumulative values of the total of sacrificial commodities for each type of offering can be calculated. It may be useful to list the fifteen most popular types of offering and their cumulative value expressed in grain:²⁰

<i>type of offering</i>	<i>occurrences</i>	<i>cumulative value</i>
<i>lan</i>	81	31,019 ⁺ qts.
<i>bašur</i> ²¹	3	17,160 qts.
<i>šip</i>	9	7690 [?] qts.
<i>šumar</i>	4	6330 qts.
for Humban	27	6245 ⁺ qts.
<i>kušukum</i> ²²	21	5010 ⁺ qts.
for Mišdušiš	6	2095 qts.
for Auramazdā	10	1851 qts.
for (the) Mišebaka	12	1209 qts.
for/in (the month) Karbašiya	4	1190 qts.
for/in (the month) Sakurraziš	5	995 ⁺ qts.
<i>akriš</i>	4	860 qts.
for Napiriša	10	760 qts.
for Adad	7	705 qts.
for Išpandaramattiš	6	700 ⁺ qts.

table 1: cumulative values of sacrificial commodities

Obviously, the exact numbers presented in the table above are likely to change with the publication of more tablets. What matters is the relative weight of the various types of offerings. The above data clearly show that most resources were spent on types of offerings that were not connected to any god in particular (*lan*, *bašur*, *šip*, *šumar*) and that the difference between Auramazdā and Humban is even greater when cumulative values are taken into consideration.

²⁰ The ‘cumulative value’ (in quarts of grain) is based on the standard exchange rate used in the Persepolis economy. In this system of equivalences 10 qts. of wine equal 30 qts. of grain and one average sheep or goat normally equals 100 qts. of grain (cf. Henkelman 2005a). See Henkelman 2006: 401-3 for complete figures.

²¹ On *bašur* and *šumar* see §6.2 below.

²² The term *kušukum* refers to both a locale and a specific type of offering performed at such a locale (Henkelman 2006: 435-8).

By taking the Fortification archive as an independent source, a new insight is gained into Elamite-Iranian acculturation. It appears, for example, that the continued popularity of Humban in the Achaemenid period is not confined to the Fahliyān, the western region of Fārs, where Elamite traditions remained relatively strong. Humban's cult was not a matter restricted to provincial backwaters, but is attested in major towns along the royal road, including several places closer to Persepolis (Hatarrikaš, Barniš and, plausibly, Tikraš). Also, there is no evidence for an exclusively 'Elamite' sphere in terms of cultic personnel or gods venerated by the same officiants. Together with the fact that Humban was the most venerated named god, one can hardly avoid the conclusion that he was a very important god in the eyes of the Persepolis administrators. Indeed, the influence of his cult on Persian religion may have been underestimated thus far. The concept of *kitin* ("divine protection, god-given royal power"), which had been central to earlier Elamite theology and royal ideology and was especially connected to Humban in the Neo-Elamite period, was still known in the Achaemenid period and appears in the Elamite version of the so-called *Daivā Inscription* (XPh. 29-32). There is every reason to suspect that the conception of the royal god Auramazdā was influenced by Elamite ideas.²³

On a more general level, the study of the Fortification archive reveals that Elamite and Iranian cultic traditions were not only treated alike, but were clearly not seen as belonging to two separate 'sections.' One gains the impression that the administrators and scribes did not, and perhaps could not, make a distinction. They did, however, draw a line between native and foreign gods. Communities of foreigners, notably Babylonians, had long been known in Western Iran and enjoyed a certain recognized legal status. In Achaemenid times even more nationalities were present on the Iranian plateau and it seems that these groups were acknowledged as ethnic and cultural communities. Though evidence is slight, there are indications that private worship of Babylonian, Greek, etc. gods among these communities was permitted. Yet, such foreign gods were not sponsored by the state. In other words, gods of Iranian and Elamite descent were considered to be native and therefore entitled to state-organised worship, whereas the worship of other gods was deemed a private matter. In this context it may be noted that the label 'Elamite' is rarely used in the Fortification texts and refers exclusively to people and things from lowland Khūzestān, i.e. the satrapy of Elam. Though there were many Elamite-speaking people and Elamite cultural traditions in the highland of Fārs, these were not labelled 'Elamite.' A

²³ On Humban's cult among Elamites and Persians cf. Henkelman 2006: 282-318 and §7.3 below.

very telling case is that of the scribes writing the Elamite tablets: they were not referred to as ‘Elamites,’ but as ‘Persians.’²⁴

Based on the above and other arguments, it appears that speaking about an Iranian or Elamite god in the Persepolis pantheon is a rather futile exercise, since the inhabitants of the plateau do not seem to have made such a distinction. Rather, I would prefer to speak of gods of (Indo-)Iranian and Elamite descent in a Persian pantheon. Persian religion may then be defined as “the heterogeneous unity of religious beliefs and cultic practices that emerged from a long Elamite-Iranian coexistence and were considered as native by the inhabitants of Achaemenid Fārs and its rulers” (Henkelman 2006: 35).

6. Šip

We now turn to the actual subject of this paper, the sacrificial feast known by the Elamite word *šip*. The term occurs in nine texts and journal entries, only three of which (PF 0672; NN 2259: 1-2, 25-6) have previously been published. In addition, there is a journal entry (NN 2486:47-8) that twice mentions *anši*, which seems to be the term for a related feast, performed at a location and by an individual elsewhere associated with *šip*. All the texts, including the published ones, are presented in the appendix at the end of this paper, in the transliteration by R.T. Hallock (collated), with my translation and comments (to which I will refer as, e.g., “see ad NN 0654:3”). For the reader’s convenience, translations of the ten texts (organised by contents) are also given below, followed by sections focussing on various aspects of *šip* and *anši* (§§6.2-4). Evidence on older Elamite feasts is treated in the remaining sections of this paper (§7.1-3).

6.1. Šip and anši in translation

NN 1665

To Harrena the cattle-chief speak, Parnakka speaks as follows: “21 head of sheep/goats and 2 portions, in addition^{??}, to Mauparra the porter[?] and his associate(s), who are feeding royal mules at Tikranuš, (a total of) 212 men, to them issue! For each ten men there is one sheep/goat.” In the seventh month, 19th year this sealed document was delivered. Karkiš has written (this document); he has

²⁴ See Henkelman 2006: 266-81 for discussion. Note that the sponsoring of Adad’s cult by the Persepolis authorities does not contradict my statements about native and foreign gods. Adad had been venerated by the Elamites from the beginning of the second millennium onwards and had long ceased to be a foreign deity (see *ibid.* 237-58).

received the draft/copy from Nanitin, (at) Pasargadae. When a *šip* feast was performed.

NN 2259:1-2, 29-30

(journal entry and summary)

14 (head) in accordance with a sealed document from Parnakka were consumed at a *šip* feast, du[...]; Parnakka has performed the *šip* feast (at) Pasargadae (in) the month [...].

(...)

(Summary): Altogether 420 head of sheep/goats consumed in the 20th year; allocations from Ašbayauda, Urikama being responsible, in the 20th year.

NN 1701

[x] male cattle (grazing) on a stubble field, allocation from Iš[...]ba from the place Mubari, for Kampiya. When a *šip* feast was performed at Pasargadae, at that time (the cattle) was consumed[?], when Parnakka performed a *šip* feast. Ninth month, 20th year. Šamanda has written (this receipt), he has received the draft/copy from Puruna.

NN 1731

1 head of cattle on pasture, allocation for Šuddayauda the chief of the workers, (at) Pasargadae. Parnakka has performed a *šip* feast; at that time (the cattle) was consumed. Ninth month, 18th year. Irdamišša wrote (this receipt); he has received the draft/copy from Maraza, (at) Persepolis.

NN 2225

20 [or more] ducks[?], alive, allocation for Iršena. When Parnakka performed a *šip* feast (at) Appištāpdan, at that time they were consumed (?), in the ninth month, 20th year. Šamanda has written (this receipt); he has received the draft/copy from Nutannuya.

PF 0672

780 qts. of flour, allocation for/from Umayā, were consumed (at) Appištāpdan, during a *šip* feast, in the eighth month, 25th year. Ziššawiš performed (the feast). Hintamukka has written (this receipt); Kamezza has delivered the instruction, at Persepolis, in the tenth month.

NN 2486:47-8

(journal entry; journal summary not preserved)

78 qts. (of fruit), (namely) 30 qts. of figs, 30 qts. of *kazla*, 30 qts. of mulberries, 8 qts. of apples[?], have been delivered (in accordance with) a sealed document from Ziššawiš. (The fruit) has been consumed (during) an *anši* feast (at) Appištāpdan,

⁴⁸ when Ziššawiš performed an *anši* feast (or: used it for an *anši* feast). Tenth month, 15th (*recte*: 16th) year.

NN 2259:25-6, 29-30

(journal entry and summary)

12 (head) Nudumatam received for (a) *pumaziš* for the gods, when Parnakka performed a/the *šip* feast, in the 8th month.

(...)

(Summary): Altogether 420 head of sheep/goats consumed in the 20th year; allocations from Ašbayauda, Urikama being responsible, in the 20th year.

NN 2402

150 qts. of wine, allocation from Kizizi, Ummanappi acquired. Therewith he has performed a *šip* feast, at Išgi, 22nd year.

NN 0654

160 qts. of grain, allocation from Manyakka, Ummanana received. Therewith he has performed a *šip* feast for Zizkurra, at Pumu, in the 24th year.

6.2. Document status

Most of the preserved Fortification texts are descriptive, not prescriptive. According to a simplified model, ‘memorandum-type’ documents (like receipts, records of deposit and exchange) were drafted and sealed at storehouses and other local administrative nuclei and brought from there to Persepolis to be controlled and summarized in ‘journals’ (cumulative registers), which, in turn, were the basis (plausibly alongside other documentation) of the account texts tabulating the credit and debit totals for a certain commodity in a certain period in a certain district. The counterpart of this sequence of descriptive documents of ascending authority must have been a sequence of prescriptive texts (and perhaps oral communications) descending from the central authorities at Persepolis down to the local officials who were ordered to certain transactions. The limited corpus of preserved documents of the latter category comprises letter-orders and a few basic delivery orders (“let PN deliver this grain”). It may be assumed that all preserved letter-orders, the great majority written by the director (Parnakka), the deputy-director (Ziššawiš) and members of the royal house, concern operations that were considered to be somehow special or irregular.²⁵

²⁵ See Henkelman 2006: 76-96 on the principles of administration (with full bibliography). The model presented here is agreed upon by the majority of specialists, the only dissenting voice being that of F. Vallat (1994; 1997), who considers the Elamite

Six out of ten texts concerning *šip* and *anši* are memorandum-type documents (PF 0672; NN 0654; NN 1701; NN 1731; NN 2225; NN 2402), three are journal entries (NN 2259:1-2, 25-6; NN 2486:47-8) and one is a letter-order (NN 1665). At first sight, this is not a very pronounced profile. Yet, two of the journal entries state that sacrificial commodities were issued in response to a *halmi* ("seal," hence "sealed document"), i.e. a letter-order, by Parnakka (NN 2259:1-2) and Ziššawiš (NN 2486:47-8).

The three letter-orders attest to the involvement of Parnakka and Ziššawiš in the organisation of the *šip* and *anši* feast. In addition, the director and deputy-director personally presided over the rituals in seven cases. Parnakka performed a *šip* feast at least five times (NN 1701; NN 1731; NN 2225; NN 2259:1-2, 25-6). His right-hand man Ziššawiš did so in one case (PF 0672), as well as presiding over an *anši* (NN 2486:47-8).

Thirdly, the director and deputy-director's offices both were engaged in the bureaucratic side of the organisational process. In this respect, interesting information can be culled from the use of seals and the colophons used. The seal of Parnakka, PFS 0009*, is applied four times (NN 1665; NN 1701; NN 1731; NN 2225), that of Ziššawiš once (PF 0672). The five tablets involved also have texts with colophons mentioning the official who transmitted the order (*relator*) and the scribe who wrote the preserved Elamite document. There are reasons to assume that the original order referred to in such colophons was written in Aramaic (cf. Stolper 1984a: 305-6 with fn. 20). To keep control over the crossover between the (deputy-)director's office and the general administration – in practical terms the translation into Elamite – the colophon was necessary. Only the offices of the director and the deputy-director seem to have had an Aramaic administrative staff, hence the exclusive occurrence of colophons in letter-orders (such as NN 1665) and memorandum-type documents issued by these offices.²⁶

Whereas letter-orders were sent to addressees at different locations, memorandum-type documents with colophons were probably issued on the spot. This can be understood from the fact that Parnakka and Ziššawiš undertook regular inspection tours throughout the territory under the purview of the Persepolis administration. A common scenario was that the (deputy-)director gave orders for his own daily rations at a certain location upon which his mobile

tablets as copies of Aramaic copies produced only for the sake of the administration at Persepolis. On this problematic theory see Henkelman *l.c.*

²⁶ It must be stressed that there are no clues that the use of Aramaic drafts or originals was a general phenomenon: 95% of the available texts seems to have been composed directly in Elamite, without an Aramaic *Vorlage* (see Henkelman 2006: 90-6). Consider, for example, the letter-orders by the director of the cattle department, Harrena, which do not include a colophon (PF 1854; NN 0614; NN 2572).

office issued a document acknowledging receipt and handed it over to the supplier responsible for that place or district. The latter would keep the document and eventually hand it in for auditing at Persepolis. Thus, the four memorandum-type texts with a colophon relating to allocations for *šip* imply that Parnakka and Ziššawiš not only partook in the sacrificial feast and its organisation (letter-orders), but also deployed their personal staff, who were present, in its administration.²⁷

text	P. or Z. performs <i>šip/anši</i>	letter-order/ <i>halmi</i> by P. or Z.	seal of P. or Z.	colophon
PF 0672	x	/	x	x
NN 0654	/	/	/	/
NN 1665	/ (?)	x	x	x
NN 1701	x	/	x	x
NN 1731	x	/	x	x
NN 2225	x	/	x	x
NN 2259:1-2	x	x	/	/
NN 2259:25-6	x	/	/	/
NN 2402	/	/	/	/
NN 2486:47-8	x	x	/	/

table 2: involvement of P(arnakka) and Z(iššawiš) and their staff
in the performance and organisation of *šip* and *anši*

The strong involvement of Parnakka and Ziššawiš in the performance and organisation of *šip* and *anši* (summarized in table 2 above) is unique in the Fortification tablets. There are no other types of sacrifice performed by the (deputy-)director, apart from an uncertain case (NN 0561) of Ziššawiš performing

²⁷ The case of PF 0672 and NN 1731 is slightly more complicated. These texts document *šip* feasts presided over by Ziššawiš at Appištāpdan and by Parnakka at Pasargadae respectively, but their colophons state that the original order was issued at Persepolis. Since the presence of Parnakka and Ziššawiš at the location of the feasts is explicitly stated, the most likely scenario is that an advance order for the celebration of *šip* was issued from Persepolis and upon its execution an Elamite memorandum-type document was issued at Appištāpdan/Pasargadae. Within the entire available corpus, there is only one more memorandum-type text that mentions a place where the transaction was concluded and a second place, in the colophon, as the location where the original order was issued (NN 0685). I assume that these texts reflect exceptional circumstances and that the Aramaic original and the subsequent Elamite document were normally drafted at the same location. In case of the two *šip* texts, one could speculate that, since the date of the feast was probably known long in advance, its organisation started before Parnakka and Ziššawiš arrived on the spot.

a *lan* ritual.²⁸ There is, however, a partial yet instructive parallel. High-ranking court-officials, and their servant taskforces, do offer sacrifices for/at the *šumar* (tomb or burial mound) of Persian kings and members of the nobility and for/at the *bašur* (cf. Akk. *paššūru*, “offering table” [CAD P 263-4 s.v. *paššūru* 2]), a locale apparently connected to the former.²⁹ Parnakka, Ziššawiš, and their personal staffs were directly involved in *šumar* and *bašur* sacrifices as appears from the frequent occurrence of colophons (*šip*) and letter-orders issued by them.³⁰ Providing sacrificial commodities for other rituals seems to have been handled by lower ranks of the administrative hierarchy.³¹ Letter-orders by Parnakka or Ziššawiš were not normally necessary in these cases.³²

It appears, even when judging from the formal properties of the relevant texts alone, that *šip* (and the related *anši*) was a high-profile event. Not only were Parnakka and Ziššawiš involved in its performance, but it was also treated

²⁸ Part of the text is illegible. After the initial statement that wine was received by a *šatin* (cultic expert) as sacrificial commodity for *lan* in the 25th year, it is revealed that Ziššawiš *huttašda*, “Z. performed it” (the expression is also used in connection with *šip*). The text has a colophon.

²⁹ On *šumar* see Henkelman 2003b, esp. 117-37 (‘chamberlains’ and their servants); see *idem* 2006: 220-2, 338-9, 439-40 on *šumar* and *bašur*.

³⁰ Letter-orders by Parnakka and Ziššawiš concerning *šumar*: NN 1700; NN 1848; NN 2174; Fort. 2512. Reference to letter-order (*halmi*) by Parnakka concerning *bašur*: 2259:19-20. Compare also PF 1854 (letter-order by the cattle chief Harrena on *bašur*).

³¹ It may be assumed that, in normal practise, sacrificial commodities were issued on the basis of standard protocols and rosters concerning individuals with cultic functions. Such documentation (of which nothing survives) must, in turn, have been based on standing orders from the court and the central authorities at Persepolis and, perhaps, a cultic calendar.

³² Cf. Henkelman 2003b: 142-3. There are three additional letter-orders by Parnakka concerning cultic activity: PF 1802 (grain for *na-ah*^{MEŠ}); PF 2067 and PF 2068 (wine and grain “for the gods”). Furthermore, in NN 2259, the ‘religious journal’ (Henkelman 2006: 319-83), ten entries refer to a *halmi* by Parnakka (sheep/goats for *šip*, for/at mountains and a river, for *lan*, for Minam, for/in the months Sakurraziš and Karbašiyaš, for/at a reservoir; for *kušukum*, for the gods). It seems that NN 2259 had a very special background (*ibid.* 350-8), which would have prompted the involvement of Parnakka. Irregular circumstances may also explain PF 2067 and PF 2068 (replacement of Parnakka’s seal) and PF 1802 (offerings for *na-ah*^{MEŠ} are not attested elsewhere). There is a handful of letter-orders concerning cultic activity by other officials, but these do not have the same implications as letters from the (deputy-)director: PF 1953:4-6 (on a *kušukum*-offering; reference to *halmi* by Karkiš, the regional director of the Persepolis area); NN 1670 (*sawur* wine for a temple; letter-order by an anonymous addressor [cf. Henkelman 2006: 441]); NN 2348:12-4, 15-6, 17-9 (offering for/in Karkašiyaš and *kušukum* offering; reference to *halmi* from Rabezza); NN 2544 (*kušukum* offering; letter-order by Mastezza [cf. *ibid.*: 435, 437]).

differently from most other types of offering in terms of organisation and administration.

6.3. *Defining the feasts*

6.3.1. *The beneficiaries of šip*

In Fortification texts on *šip*, a divine beneficiary is named only once: Zizkurra in NN 0564, probably a god of Elamite descent (cf. ad NN 0654:5-6). One should beware of putting too much weight on this text, however. As in the unique case of the *lan* offering for Humban⁷ (see §4 above), there is no reason to extrapolate the qualification “for Zizkurra” in the other texts on *šip*. That *šip* is nearly-always used without specification does not mean that we have to reckon with a single unmentioned god (i.e. Zizkurra), but rather that the feast was considered to be a type of offering *sui generis*. For the Persepolis scribes this type of offering was apparently so well defined in terms of frequency, distributional pattern, etc., that additional information on the beneficiary was administratively redundant (cf. Henkelman 2006: 154).

Unfortunately, following the traces of the personnel involved in *šip* does not lead to a clearer image of the deities venerated in the ceremony. The Umay of PF 0672 also allocates grain for a *lan* offering and “for the gods” (cf. ad PF 0672:2), but not to any named gods. The same is true for Kizizi (see ad NN 2402:3). Ummanana performs a *šip* in NN 0654 with 160 qts. of grain. In NN 0173 he sacrifices the same amount of grain and it may be assumed that *šip* was at stake here too. Unfortunately for us, the scribe of NN 0173 felt that the specification “for the gods” would suffice (cf. ad NN 0654:3-4).

There is one more text that mentions the divine beneficiary of a *šip* feast, but this text is not from the Fortification archive. In the Elamite version of the so-called *Daivā Inscription* it is mentioned no less than six times (XPh_e 30, 32, 33, 34, 41, 44). Four of these occurrences are in the following passage:³³

³³ The remaining two cases are in a passage that introduces the performing of *šip* for Auramazdā as a precondition for a blessed life and afterlife (ll.38-46). The transliteration of ll.29-34 as given here is adapted from the editions of Cameron (1959: 473) and Vallat (1977: 211). The word division *ap-pi da* in l.32 is mine (see discussion in Henkelman 2006: 294 fn. 676). *Kiten* (cf. *kitin*) is in this case to be understood as a ban invoked and upheld by god-given royal power (cf. §5 above and §7.3 below). The Old Persian expression *rtācā brazmaniya* (XPh_p 41) is simply transcribed in the Elamite version (XPh_e 34, *irdahazi pirrazmannuya*); I have adopted Schmitt’s translation of this much-discussed passage (2000: 93, 95 [with references]).

²⁹ ku-ud-da hi šà-ma ^{AŠ}da-a-ia-ma šà-ri mu^l-ur ap-pu-ka₄ da-a- ³⁰ma šī-ib-be hu-ud-da-iš-
da me-ni^l za-u-mi-in ^{AN}u-ra-maš-da- ³¹na ^{DIŠ}ú hu-be da-a-ma-da-na-um sa-ri ku-ud-da ki-
te-in uk- ³²ku ap-pi da da-a-ma šī-ib-be a-nu hu-ud-da-an-<ti> mu^l-ur ap-pu- ³³ka₄ da-a-
ma šī-ib-be hu-ut-tuk-ka₄ hu-be-ma ^{DIŠ}ú ^{AN}u-ra-maš- ³⁴da šī-ib-be hu-ud-da ir-da-ha-zí pír-
ra-iz-man-nu-ia

And among the lands there was (a place) where, formerly, they made (for) the *daivā* their *šip* (sacrificial feast). Then, by the effort of Auramazdā, I devastated that place of *daivā* worship and I placed *kiten* upon them: “(for) the *daivā* you shall not make their *šip*!” Where formerly the *daivā* their *šip* had been made, there I made (for) Auramazdā his *šip*, at the proper time and in the proper style.

In the parallel Old Persian passage of XPh, it is stated plainly that *daivā* were worshipped (XPh_p 36, *daivā ayadiya*) and that Xerxes subsequently worshipped Auramazdā (*ibid.* 40-1, *adam Auramazdām ayadai*); there is no reference to a feast. The Akkadian version, by contrast, seems closer to the Elamite and speaks of performing an *isinnu*, “religious festival.”³⁴ The inscription clearly defines such a feast as a ceremony proper to a particular god: one should worship Auramazdā according to rules of that particular god’s cult. Hence the Elamite expression DN *šibbe hudda*, “I made for DN his *šip*.”³⁵ In the inscription, Xerxes advocates the cult of Auramazdā and admonishes future readers to perform that deity’s *šip*. The *šip* feasts for the *daivā* are, naturally, a negative counter-image; one does not have to imagine that such feasts were actually performed.

In conclusion, at least one originally Elamite god, Zizkurra, and one originally (Indo-)Iranian god, Auramazdā, were among the beneficiaries of *šip* feasts. It should be stressed again that it is perfectly possible, indeed likely, that other gods profited from such sacrifices too. That the available Fortification texts do not reveal their names does not mean that they were excluded.

Incidentally, it may be noted that XPh gives us the best clue for the meaning of *šip*. Koch supposed that it meant “Verehrung,” based on the use of *yad-* in the Old Persian version.³⁶ Since the Akkadian version is syntactically closer (*performing* a religious festival), however, *šip* may be the term of a certain religious rite too. Given the contexts in which it occurs in the Fortification texts and the feasts to which it seems to be related, one could propose “sacrificial meal” or “sacrificial feast.” It is not my intention to press this matter any further since there is no etymology at hand. Henceforth I will just refer to *šip* as a ‘feast’ without implying that this is an exact translation.

³⁴ XPh_a 29, 31, etc.; see CAD I-J 195-6 s.v. *isinnu* 1; Steve 1974: 160 with fn. 29. The term *isinnu* is also used in *Haft Tepe Stone Stela* I l.29 (Reiner 1973b: 89; cf. §7.2 below).

³⁵ *Šibbe* is to be analysed as [šip.e], i.e. with possessive -e.

³⁶ Koch 1977: 45; cf. *idem* 1987: 270; *idem* 1993: 88.

6.3.2. Other feasts

A number of other feasts appear in the Fortification tablets – less grand, but still conspicuous – and comparison between these and *šip* may be instructive. The most important group of texts deals with certain feasts for Auramazdā, Humban, Mišdušiš, Pirdakamiya and, intriguingly, “the remaining gods” (Henkelman 2006: 315-7). The term used here is *bakadaušiyam* (OPers. **bagadaučiya*-), “(feast) belonging to the offering for a god.” Thus far, only grain and wine are attested as commodities issued for *bakadaušiyam*, but the amounts are sometimes considerable (1000 qts. of grain in NN 0978). Like *šip*, *bakadaušiyam* apparently could be organised for various gods. In some cases Auramazdā and Mišdušiš were jointly worshipped, as were the deities grouped as “the remaining gods” (NN 0318). Note that *bakadaušiyam* always had to be qualified; the term was therefore less precisely defined than *šip*, which could be used as a single term.³⁷

The case of *bakadaušiyam* is particularly revealing in one aspect: seven texts record that “afterwards the workers consumed (the offering)” (*meni kurtaš makiš*).³⁸ Once, we learn that 530 qts. of grain, probably used for making sacrificial loaves, fed as many as 120 workers (NN 1679). This human aspect of sacrifice is of relevance for *šip* as well (cf. §6.3.3 below).

Another type of feast is that ‘for’ (during) certain months, namely Sakurraziš (III) and Karbašiya (VI).³⁹ These feasts are occasionally also referred to as *bakadaušiyam*. Again the amounts issued are sometimes considerable. Once, 11 sheep/goats are provided ‘for’ Karbašiya (NN 2259:13-4; cf. Henkelman 2006: 331-4). That the third and the six months should have been singled out for feasting is probably not coincidental. The Sakurraziš feast may coincide with the summer solstice and Karbašiya feast with the autumnal equinox (*ibid.* 329-31, 445-6; cf. fn 58 below). In case of the *šip* feast the dates at which it was organised may be relevant too, although in a different way (cf. §6.3.4 below).

³⁷ Koch (1977: 125-7) proposes to take *bakadaušiyam* as the Old Persian equivalent of the Elamite term *šip*. The fact that *bakadaušiyam* needs to be qualified and may have been a more general term than *šip* renders this idea *a priori* unlikely, however. Besides, *bakadaušiyam* does not have such a pronounced royal profile as *šip* in terms of location, involvement of high officials, allocation of livestock and date (cf. §§6.3.3-5 below). Note also that *bakadaušiyam* is not used as equivalent of *šip* in the Old Persian version of XPh.

³⁸ PF 0336; PF 0337; NN 0366; NN 0613; NN 0679; NN 0978; NN 1679. Other *bakadaušiyam* texts are: PF 0348; PF 0349; NN 0108; NN 0318; NN 0650; NN 0791; NN 0893; NN 1941. See also Briant 2002: 246-7.

³⁹ NN 0613; NN 0679; NN 1679; PF 1947:2; NN 2259:11-2, 13-4; NN 2348:12-4, 15-6, 17-9.

6.3.3. The beneficiaries of šip (bis)

An eye-catching characteristic of *šip* is the number of animals slaughtered during its celebration. In six out of nine texts on *šip* animals are slaughtered: 47 head (and two portions) of sheep/goats, at least two head of cattle, and at least twenty ducks (?). Only *lan* (148 head of sheep/goats in 2 out of 81 texts) and *bašur* (168 head of sheep/goats in 2 out of 3 texts) are comparable. Moreover, cattle and *basbas* (ducks?) do not appear, at least not in the available sample, with any other type of sacrifice. Apart from the animals, there are allocations of 780 quarts of flour, 160 quarts of grain and 150 quarts of wine for *šip*. These quantities are again substantial, though less conspicuous than the number of animals allocated.

Generally, all sacrificial commodities issued on behalf of the Persepolis authorities must have been consumed by mortals, except, perhaps, for small quantities of wine or beer used for libation.⁴⁰ In the case of smaller sacrifices like *lan* such commodities would plausibly be taken by the officiant (and his assistants) and serve as an income.⁴¹ In such contexts, consumption is not mentioned by our texts. In case of larger sacrifices, mention is sometimes made of consumption by larger groups of workers, as in the case of *bakadaušiyam* (cf. §6.3.2 above).

As for *šip*, five texts explicate that sacrificial commodities were “consumed.”⁴² Since sacrificial commodities probably always were consumed and because the amounts are relatively high, this stipulation must be understood as “consumed by groups of people other than the officiant.” Only once the human beneficiaries are explicitly mentioned: the 212 royal muleteers in Tikranuš (NN 1665).⁴³ The names of the officials to whom commodities for *šip* are allocated provide an additional clue, however. Šuddayauda and Iršena both had the title *kurdabattiš*, “chief of workers” and were responsible for the organisation of rations for all workforces within the area of their jurisdiction, the Persepolis and the Fahliyān regions respectively (see ad NN 1731:2 and NN 2225:2). That they are mentioned in two *šip* texts implies that the commodities allocated to them were probably distributed to workforces under their command.⁴⁴ Taken together,

⁴⁰ It was not customary in Persian religion to burn parts of sacrificial animals; all edible meat was used for consumption (Hdt. I.132; Strabo XV.3.13). Cf. De Jong 1997: 118-9, 360-1 and *idem* 2002: 141, 147-8 (meat consumption in Zoroastrian sacrifices).

⁴¹ Compare also the double meaning of *gal* in sacrificial contexts: it may be translated by both “offering” and “ration” (Henkelman 2006: 222-4).

⁴² The terms used are *makka* (PF 0672; NN 1731; NN 2259:1-2; NN 2486: 47-8) and *kumbaka* (NN 1701; NN 2225). For the latter cf. ad NN 1701:7-8.

⁴³ Other texts on meat for grooms (PF 1793; NN 0254; NN 1229) do not mention *šip* but may imply the celebration of the feast (cf. ad NN 1665:6).

⁴⁴ Something similar, but on a lower level, may be true for *Kampiya* (see ad NN 1701:4) and *Umayā* (see ad PF 0672:2). Both normally appear in the role of supplier, issuing

these indications constitute a convincing argument that sacrificial commodities from a *šip* feast were afterwards consumed by labourers or officials from the lower ranks who were only involved in the sacrificial act as attendants.

We do not know much about the size of the portions of meat and other commodities issued to third groups. The muleteers of NN 1665 get 1/10 of a sheep/goat.⁴⁵ This is not a particularly high ration, though lower rations, such as 1/30, are attested as well and meat rations are generally rare.⁴⁶ Comparison with other texts suggests that the portions received by the muleteers are of the level of *šalup* (free men). This ration level is relatively low (45 qts. of grain/month), yet higher than the standard level for ordinary workers (30 qts. of grain/month). Assuming, for the moment, that commodities issued in other *šip* texts were all consumed by third parties, that they were consumed on the occasion of a single-day feast, and that the portions were comparable to those in NN 1665, we can reconstruct the following numbers:

<i>text</i>	<i>commodities</i>	<i>estimated number of consumers</i>
NN 2259:1-2	14 sheep/goats	140
NN 1701	[x] head of cattle	[x]·100? ⁴⁷
NN 1731	1 head of cattle	100?
NN 2225	20 (or more) <i>basbas</i>	160? ⁴⁸

commodities to groups and individuals. In the *šip* texts they probably are the intermediate recipients who had to pass on the sacrificial commodities to certain third parties (workforces) who are not mentioned explicitly.

⁴⁵ The same ration is found in PF 1793 (13.5 animals for 135 men) and NN 1289 (6.3 animals for 63 men) and it may be possibly restored in NN 0254 (pers.comm. M. Stolper 14/VIII/2006). These three texts all concern royal grooms and may relate to *šip* feasts (cf. ad NN 1665:6). In other texts, the 1/10 ration is only found in NN 2028 (travellers).

⁴⁶ PF 1791 gives a list of different meat rations. The lowest are 1/15 and 1/9 of a sheep/goat (cf. PF 1790 [1/9]). The 1/30 ration is attested in PF 1794; NN 0727; NN 1101; NN 1807; NN 1847; NN 2062. Other rations are attested as well, such as the ca. 1/100 portion for each of 259 boatsmen (NN 2261: 4-8). See also Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1995: 293.

⁴⁷ The estimation of 100 consumers per head of cattle is an estimation based on NN 0477 where one cow has the value of 300 qts. of wine, or ten times that of an average sheep/goat. I assume that this means that roughly ten times more edible meat could be cut from a cow carcass. The animal in NN 0477 is of prime quality, however; it is not stated what type or quality of animal was slaughtered in NN 1701 and NN 1731.

⁴⁸ In NN 0845 a certain Bagirabba receives two *basbas* for an unspecified number of workers in the service of the royal woman Irdabama (on these workers see Brosius 1996: 135-41). The same Bagirabba also regularly receives 16 qts. of wine per month wine for such a group (PF 0397; PF 0398; PF 0399; PF 0400; PF 0401; PF 0402; NN 0237;

PF 0672	780 qts. of flour	520 ⁴⁹
NN 2259:25-6	12 sheep/goats	120
NN 2402	150 qts. of wine	150 ⁵⁰
NN 0654	160 qts. of grain	107 ⁵¹

table 3: estimated number of consumers present at šip feasts

As we have seen (§6.3.2 above), during feasts known as *bakadaušiyam* loaves and wine were given to base workers (*kurtaš*), but *šip* seems to be extraordinary in terms of the amounts of sacrificial animals involved. It was the only type of sacrifice that regularly gave access to meat rations. The 212 muleteers and porters of NN 1665 certainly were not among the higher ranks of the Persepolis economy, even if groups of transporters included some *šalup* (NN 1044; cf. ad NN 1665:5). That they received meat rations at all – and not the lowest possible rations for that matter – is most probably due to the fact that they were attached to the royal domain.⁵² Generally, meat allocations to individuals and groups among the institution's lower and middle ranks are very rare and in this respect the Persepolis economy was not different from any other institution in the ancient Near East.⁵³ Large cattle slaughtered for work groups, as in *šip* texts NN

NN 0401; NN 0402; NN 0638; NN 0640; NN 1205; NN 1821). Given the consistent wine rations, Bagirabba's group must have remained constant. I assume that the group receiving the *basbas* was the same. As for the wine rations: these must be special rations; 16 qts. would be too low as a full month ration for even one person. In other texts, workers in the service of Irdabama receive special wine rations of 0.5 qt. (PF 1109; NN 0187; NN 0194; NN 1212) or 1 qt. (NN 0410). By analogy, Bagirabba's group must have consisted of 16 or 32 persons. This would mean that one *basbas* could feed 8 or 16 people. Comparison with the *šalup*-level rations of sheep meat in NN 1665 suggests a portion of 1/8 *basbas* for each individual as the most likely solution.

⁴⁹ Standard daily rations of flour are 1 qt. for adult workers and 1.5 qt. for *šalup* (cf. Koch 1983: 47). I have used the latter number in line with the height of the meat rations in NN 1665.

⁵⁰ Standard daily wine rations are 0.3, 0.5 and 1 qt. (cf. Koch 1983: 46-7); each of these is attested for *šalup*. The number of 150 consumers (based on 1 qt. per person) may therefore be on the conservative side.

⁵¹ The size of grain rations is always identical to that of flour rations.

⁵² The same is true for the other meat allocations for royal grooms: PF 1793; NN 0254; NN 1289.

⁵³ Cf. Potts 1997: 89. On livestock allocations for workers in the Fortification texts see Henkelman 2006: 350-1 with fn. 813 (perhaps add NN 2261:4-8, 12-3, 16-8, 19-21, 26-9, 30-2, 33-4). On meat rations see also Briant 1982: 155-6.

1701 and NN 1731, is otherwise not attested, apart from one very uncertain case.⁵⁴ Likewise, *basbas* (or any kind of poultry) are allocated only once apart from the *šip* sacrifice (NN 2225): in NN 0845 workers in the service of the royal woman Irdabama received two birds. The royal context is probably no coincidence.

In short, workers in the Persepolis economy sometimes profited from extra or larger rations in the contexts of feasts such as *bakadaušiyam*, but *šip* was the occasion *par excellence* that gave them access to rare meat rations. This, as will be argued below (§6.4.2), is a key to understanding the royal character of *šip*.

6.3.4. The date of *šip*

Six of the nine *šip* texts have a legible date. When converted to Julian dates this yields the following results (note that NN 1701 and NN 2259:25-6 both date to VIII/20):⁵⁵

yr.	Julian	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VI ²	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XII ²
18.	504-3	4/6	5/6	6/4	7/4	8/2	9/1	/	9/30	10/30	11/28	12/28	1/26	2/25	/
19.	503-2	3/27	4/25	5/25	6/23	7/23	8/21	9/20	10/19	11/18	12/17	1/15	2/14	3/16	/
20.	502-1	4/14	5/14	6/13	7/12	8/11	9/9	/	10/9	11/7	12/6	1/5	2/3	3/4	/
25.	497-6	4/18	5/18	6/16	7/15	8/14	9/12	/	10/12	11/11	12/10	1/9	2/8	3/9	/

table 4: dates of *šip* according to the Julian calendar

From the above table, it appears that maximum period during which *šip* could be celebrated started at October 19th and continued through December 27th. The minimum date range would be November 17th – December 6th. A fixed date for the all *šip* celebrations or for all *šip* celebrations at Pasargadae is calendrically impossible (*pace* Koch 1987: 270; 1993: 88; 2004: 233). Moreover, the fact that the feast was not confined to one date appears from Dar. 20, during which *šip* was celebrated in two different months. At the same time, there is a significant clustering in November and December.⁵⁶

Perhaps the best indication regarding the date of the feast is that in Dar. 19, when there was an intercalary second sixth month, *šip* was celebrated in the seventh month rather than the usual eighth or ninth month (cf. Koch 1993: 68 fn.

⁵⁴ NN 0572, a long, complicated and very fragmentary letter sealed by Parnakka, seems to relate the allocation of cattle to *Bapiyap*. No conclusions can be drawn, however, from such an incomplete text.

⁵⁵ Table adapted from Parker & Dubberstein 1956: 30.

⁵⁶ One could also calculate the relative weight of individual months in the maximum date range (based on the number of possible days). This yields 8% for October, 51% for November, 39% for December and 2% for January.

21). This strongly suggests that *šip* had to be celebrated within a certain time-frame marked by certain events relating to the agricultural cycle, and that its calendrical date was of secondary importance.

There are several possible reasons why *šip* took place during late fall. One is practical: in the highlands of Fārs, where winters can be very cold, animals needed supplementary feeding whenever the pastures gave insufficient nutrition.⁵⁷ This means that the November-December period would have been a suitable moment for slaughter as this lessened the pressure on the fodder reserves. In addition, the natural reproduction cycles of the flocks may be of importance here. As Barth observed among the Bāšerī of southern Fārs, the autumn rutting season falls in October, whereas lambs from the summer season were born in November (1961: 7). This means that October-November is best suited to slaughter or sell the surplus in yearling animals (as well as infertile ewes) in order to lessen the burden of pregnant ewes and to create room in the herd. There is no proof that the situation was exactly the same in antiquity, but natural conditions do not leave much room for variation.⁵⁸ In short, the sacrificed animals killed at *šip* feasts could have been newborn animals or animals removed from the herd prior to the new lambing season.⁵⁹

Other reasons why *šip* should take place in late fall are more difficult to define. We are hardly dealing with a feast for a specific god or group of gods for whose cult the autumn season had a special relevance since we know that at least two different gods (Auramazdā and Zizkurra) could be the objects of *šip*. Also, feasts that would require a single date (even if that date shifted from year to year) seem excluded as *šip* took place during two different months in Dar. 20. For

⁵⁷ This applies both to animals kept in 'internal herds' (managed by the institution itself) and animals entrusted to herdsmen. Watson (1979: 104) observed the same practise in Hasanābād in the Kermānšāh district in 1959-60. Cold winters could have a devastating effect on the flocks if no fodder was at hand. Cf. the remarks of Wirth (1971: 263-4) on sheep-based nomadism in Syria.

⁵⁸ In southern Mesopotamia, the November-December period is clearly documented as the first lambing season (Van Driel 1993: 227-9), but no comparable data are available for ancient Iran.

⁵⁹ Unfortunately our texts tell us hardly anything about the age or sex of the animals that were slaughtered, probably because it was self-evident to the scribes. Once, a sacrifice of eight yearling sheep is mentioned (PF 0352), and this would agree with the theory that animals were removed before the new lambing season started. Elsewhere, however, we find a complaint about the absence of pregnant animals in the royal herds, and thus of lambs (or kids) that could have been used for sacrifice (NN 2544; see Henkelman 2006: 435, 437). The latter text rather points to sacrifice of newborn animals. Of course, the two possibilities are not mutually exclusive. Note that young animals were considered unsuitable for Zoroastrian sacrifices (De Jong 2002: 136).

these reasons, I do not believe that *šip* should be connected to a feast like **Miθrakāna*.⁶⁰ Likewise, it seems unlikely that *šip* was a feast to commemorate the victory of Cyrus the Great or the day of Darius' coronation (as Koch 1993: 89 proposes).

This leaves us with one last possibility: that the celebration of *šip* in November/December is in a more general way related to the presence of the king in Fārs in autumn as reported by Athenaeus (XII.513f). A distinctively royal character indeed seems to be a defining factor of the feast. Yet, caution is warranted, for it is difficult to prove the king's actual presence in the region for each of the months in which *šip* was celebrated. Another matter is whether the king always attended the sacrificial feast in person. Before we discuss these problems at greater length (see §6.4.1. below), however, we will first review the places where *šip* was celebrated.

6.3.5. *The location of šip*

Five place names are mentioned as locations where *šip* feasts were held: Tikranuš, Appištāpdan (2x), Batrakataš/Pasargadae (3x), Išgi and Pumu. The latter two places were probably situated in the Fahliyān, the westernmost district under the control of the Persepolis authorities (see ad NN 2402:3 and NN 0654:8). Neither Išgi nor Pumu seems to have been a very important or otherwise conspicuous place. Perhaps not coincidentally, the two texts that mention *šip* in Išgi and Pumu (NN 0654; NN 2402) are the only ones that do not betray the direct or indirect involvement of Parnakka or Ziššawiš.

⁶⁰ This feast is sometimes considered as an alternative for *Nō Rūz* in theories on imperial festivals taking place in Persepolis, because of Athenaeus' statement that the king was in Persepolis in Fall, at the time of **Miθrakāna*, not in Spring, at the time of *Nō Rūz* (XII.513f; for references see Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1991: 174-6, 200-1). The claim that **Miθrakāna* was celebrated under that name by the Achaemenids is based on Strabo's testimony (XI.14.9, foals sent by the Armenian satrap τοῖς Μιθρακίνοις); compare also the Mithra festival mentioned by Duris (Ath. X.434e; Lenfant 2004: 329 argues that the reference to Mithra is not from Ctesias). Note that the date of **Miθrakāna* in later periods seems to have been September/October (after the autumnal equinox), which would also plead against the identification with *šip* (November/December). If anywhere, references to **Miθrakāna* might be found in the offerings 'for' (during) the month Karbašiya (cf. §6.3.2 above). On the feast see Christensen 1944: 173-4, 301-2; Calmeyer 1980a: 55-6 (sceptical on the assumption that Persepolis was built for **Miθrakāna*); Boyce 1982: 34-6, 108-110, 248-51; Orsi 1988: 155-8; Boyce & Grenet 1991: 259-61; De Jong 1997: 371-7; Briant 2002: 251-3, 676-7, 916. For a useful survey on the *Nō Rūz* discussion see Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1991.

The situation is very different for the other three places. Tikranuš and Appištapdan had an extensive plantation (*partetaš*) with fruit trees, were visited by the king and witnessed large royal banquets (see ad NN 1701:7-8, NN 2225:5). Appištapdan in particular stands out for the elite contexts in which it occurs. Pasargadae (cf. ad NN 1665:17) hardly needs an introduction as a place of great prestige. Commissioned by the founding father Cyrus, who himself was laid to rest at the site, Pasargadae remained of great importance for later Persian kings. As Plutarch reports (Art. 3.2), the local temple of an Athena-like goddess (Anāhitā?) played an important role in the royal investiture rites.⁶¹ Further, the Achaemenid kings provided a continuous supply of sacrificial animals, grain and wine for the Magi who performed the funerary sacrifices at Cyrus' tomb.⁶² Cultic activities at Pasargadae are also amply attested in the Fortification texts, including *lan* sacrifices in the local plantation (*partetaš*).⁶³ Finally, the tablets also yield some indirect clues as to royal meals at Pasargadae.⁶⁴

That six out of eight *šip* celebrations with a known location were staged at Tikranuš, Appištapdan or Pasargadae, i.e. at places with a marked royal character, is hardly fortuitous. In combination with the strong involvement of Parnakka and Ziššawiš, the animals slaughtered for it and the autumnal date of its celebration the locations just mentioned lead us to consider *šip* as the royal feast *par excellence* (cf. §6.4.1-3 below).

6.3.6. Anši

Before we continue to explore *šip* as a royal feast, it may be useful to compare this feast to the seemingly related ritual known as *anši* and documented in a single text (NN 2486:47-8). Like *šip*, *anši* has a pronounced profile as special event. The

⁶¹ On the passage, possibly from Ctesias, see Gnoli 1974: 127-31; Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1983: 148-51; Orsi 1988: 143-9; Briant 1991: 6-9; *idem* 2002: 523-4, 998; Lenfant 2004: 145, 278-80; Henkelman 2006: 370.

⁶² Arr. *Anab.* VI.29.4, 7; Strabo XV.3.7. On the sacrifices see Briant 2002: 95-6, 895; Henkelman 2003b: 152-4; *idem* 2006: 362-5 (with references).

⁶³ Apart from the texts on *šip*, Pasargadae is the scene of cultic activities in PF 0774 (*akriš*), PF 1942:1-2 (*akriš*), NN 1941 (*bakadaušiyam*), NN 2035 (*akrim* = *akriš*) and NN 2259:7-8 (*lan* in the *partetaš*).

⁶⁴ In PF 0042, NN 2279 and Fort. 6575 wine is transported to Pasargadae as *huthut*, "materials, products, requirements," of the king. Though the expression "materials of the king" (or: royal materials) can also refer to the royal domain at large, the amount of wine in NN 2279 (11660 qts.) can hardly have been used for anything other than the royal table. Note also the 46110 qts. of wine sent as (royal?) *huthut* to Pasargadae in NN 2210 (the text is dated to VI/21; in that same month Parnakka was at Pasargadae according to NN 0709).

fruit to be issued for it was communicated by a letter-order (*halmi*) from Ziššawiš (cf. §6.2. above). The deputy-director also personally performed the ceremony; the phrase used to express this is the same as with *šip* ("PN made the *anši*," cf. ad NN 2486:47). Furthermore, the *anši* took place at Appištāpdan, a location with royal associations that also witnessed several *šip* celebrations (cf. §6.3.5 above). Finally, the fruit issued is said to have been consumed (*makka*) during the celebration, just like the commodities issued for *šip*. Based on the equivalence of grain and fruit, as attested in the archive, the 780 quarts of fruit for *anši* may have been intended for a crowd of 520 people.⁶⁵ The same amount, but flour, was used for a *šip* feast presided over by Ziššawiš, also at Appištāpdan (PF 0672).

There are, however, some differences between *anši* and *šip*. Apart from its name, *anši* is also set apart by the type of offering (fruit) and by the date. Whereas the dated *šip* feasts take place in November-December, the only known *anši* feast was celebrated in December-January (X/16). As will be demonstrated below (§6.4.1), there is slight but significant evidence that the king was in Fārs when *šip* was celebrated. The same may not be true for *anši*: there is no conclusive evidence on the king's whereabouts in Dar. 16, but in other years there are indications that the king had reached Susa by the tenth month. The situation for Dar. 16 may have been different, however (the king might have stayed in Fārs until the first part of the tenth month).

Fruit, the commodity issued for *anši*, was rarely issued for religious purposes (see ad NN 2486: 47). Occasionally it was allocated instead of grain rations (cf. fn. 65 above), but it is mostly given in special quantities as special extra rations.⁶⁶ This, and the royal contexts regularly documented in texts on fruit, suggest that this type of sacrificial commodity may have had a special status.⁶⁷ Altogether *anši* may have been a different feast, but with the

⁶⁵ Texts indicating that fruit could be used instead of grain in workers' rations are PF 0992; NN 1499; NN 1521; NN 1934. In NN 1424, a traveller receives a (daily) ration of 1.5 qt. of *kikdu* fruit. I assume that this is intended as replacement for the regular 1.5 qt. of flour issued to travelling *šalup* (free men). As explained in §6.3.3. above, the allocations for *šip* seem to be based on the ration level of *šalup* and this may be true for *anši* too.

⁶⁶ See, e.g., PF 1139 (4 qts. of figs as *zippi* for 290 workers during one month); NN 1605 (30 qts. of dates as *kamakaš* for 108 travelling Cappadocian workers). There are about 70 texts and journal entries on special fruit rations; figs are by far the most common type of fruit issued, followed by dates.

⁶⁷ Fruit appears in various royal contexts. Delivery and storage of royal fruit/fruit of the king: PF 0158; PF 0159; PF 0160; PF 2018; NN 0141; NN 0142; NN 0143; NN 0273; NN 1088; NN 1278; NN 1475; NN 1560; NN 2421; NN 2423; NN 2576. Fruit stored in the royal storehouse: PF 0133; PF 0650. Fruit transported to the king: NN 0325. Fruit consumed at the royal table: PF 0718; NN 0923; NN 1735. Fruit consumed at Irtaštuna's (Artystone's) table: NN 1523. Fruit consumed by workers of the king: Fort. 5466.

involvement of Ziššawiš, the staging at Appištapan, the number of attendants and the possible significance of the fruit it certainly qualifies as a conspicuous event comparable to *šip*.⁶⁸ Yet, the existence of just one text on *anši* should inspire caution and precludes any definitive conclusion as to the character of the feast. For this reason we shall now continue to focus our attention on *šip*.

6.4. A royal feast

Proceeding from the insights gained in the analysis of the *šip* texts in the preceding sections (§6.2-3), four specific aspects that may help define the feast will be discussed below. In these sections, the Elamite evidence will be presented in a wider context and compared with a number of Greek sources.

6.4.1. The king's presence in Fārs

One of the possible explanations for the date of the *šip* feast in November-December (cf. §6.3.4. above) is that the king was present in Fārs during that period. Heidemarie Koch believed the king always attended the feast. She reached that conclusion based on her analysis of travel texts and on the assumption that Parnakka spent most of his time at the king's side and accompanied him to Susa (1993: 66, 88; *idem* 2004: 230). By reversing the latter (erroneous) argument, she reached the conclusion that the king was present at all *šip* celebrations that Parnakka organised. The feast "stand unter der Obhut des Königs, er selbst war dabei anwesend" (Koch 1993: 66, 88; *idem* 2002: 23). It may safely be excluded, however, that Parnakka left the region of his jurisdiction for longer periods. His function did not require his regular presence at the court, as Koch seems to assume.⁶⁹ Moreover, the king's presence in Fārs during *šip*

⁶⁸ Koch (1987: 270 fn. 212) wonders whether *anši* might be the Old Persian equivalent of *šip*. Though the suggestion is interesting, there is no etymology to support it.

⁶⁹ Parnakka's extensive tasks as director of the *regional* Persepolis economy would make it impossible to follow the king even just to Susa. Parnakka did travel extensively, but only in the area of his jurisdiction. These travels may have inspired Koch to think that Parnakka accompanied the king to Susa. For Koch the area controlled from Persepolis reached all the way to Susa; she therefore situates some of the more western places visited by Parnakka in close proximity to that city. There are several convincing reasons, however, to doubt that the territory covered by the Persepolis administration stretched so far to the West. In reality, Parnakka's authority may have reached as far as Behbahān or Rām Hormoz, i.e. at the border with the satrapy of Elam. Naturally, the city of Susa (and not Persepolis) would have been

celebrations cannot always be established with certainty. This does not mean, however, that there is no connection at all.

NN 0087 is a letter-order from Ziššawiš to a *kurdabattiš*, “chief of workers” (cf. ad NN 1731:2) whose name has not been preserved. It concerns 300 qts. of flour to be issued to the female servants of the Pasargadae-people (^{SAL}*pu-hu* [^{HAL}*batl-ra-ka-taš-be-na*) upon the orders of the king. The document is dated to 12/VIII/25 and is a plausible indication of the king’s presence in Fārs in a month that a *šip* feast was organised in Appištāpdan (PF 0672). Incidentally, it is possible that the female servants are in fact temple personnel and were attached to the Pasargadae sanctuary mentioned by Plutarch (cf. §6.3.5 above and ad PF 0672:16-7). Another letter, PF 1827 (also dated 12/VIII/25), again speaks of the king’s orders, this time to issue wine to Radukkaš-people, perhaps for some religious ceremony (cf. ad PF 0672:16-7). Additional evidence may be found in NN 1665 and other texts relating to the royal muleteers/grooms (PF 1793; NN 0254; NN 1289). If my interpretation of NN 1665 is correct, these people were responsible for the migration of the royal court (cf. ad NN 1665:5); their presence may therefore point to the king’s presence in Fārs in the seventh month of Dar. 19. In other cases, the available Elamite evidence is simply inadequate to show whether the king was, or was not in Fārs at the time of a *šip* celebration.⁷⁰

Fortunately, some confirmation for the king’s presence in Fārs in autumn and the relation between this presence and the *šip* feast can be deduced from the Greek authors. Apart from Athenaeus’ statement (XII.513f) that the king spent autumn in Persepolis, we have Xenophon to inform us (Cyr. VIII.5.21; cf. VIII.5.26, 7.1) that Cyrus, when he came to Fārs, used to take with him enough sacrificial animals for all the Persians to perform an offering and organise a feast. Though the information given on this sacrificial feast is inadequate for complete certainty, it would seem that Xenophon is referring to an occasion very similar to

administratively responsible for its own hinterland (cf. Henkelman 2006: 65-70 with references).

⁷⁰ There are no texts that reveal anything certain about the king’s whereabouts during X/16 (*anši*: NN 2486:47-8) or IX/18 (*šip*: NN 1731). NN 2206:13-6 mentions travellers coming from Kermān and heading for the king; this might indicate that the king is in Fārs, but unfortunately the journal entry is undated (the journal as a whole is dated to 13/IX/19). The *šip* feasts in years 22 and 24 are not dated to a specific month. Assuming a date in the 8th or 9th month, the following evidence may be of interest. In Dar. 22, the king seems to have been in Fārs during the eighth (PF 1477; PF 1507; PF 1534) and at least part of the ninth month (NN 0570). During the ninth month, the royal road was inspected (NN 0885; cf. PF 1343; NN 0904; NN 1219 [on these texts see Henkelman 2002]), probably in anticipation of the king’s advance to Susa (his presence there, probably at the end of IX/22, is indicated by NN 2511). As for Dar. 24, NN 1528 mentions an order by Darius; the document is dated to VIII/24 and may indicate the king’s presence in Fārs at the time.

šip. Shared characteristics are 1) the presence of the king in Fārs, 2) the provision of animals as royal largesse (cf. §6.4.2 below), and 3) the sacrificial feast attended by large groups of people (cf. §6.3.3 above). Ctesias may refer to the same sacrifice as Xenophon when he relates that Darius I “returned εἰς Πέρσας, offered sacrifices and then died after an illness of 30 days” (Ctesias F13 §23 [Lenfant]). The latter event can be dated on the basis of Babylonian documents, which suggest that Darius died sometime during the second half of November 486.⁷¹ This means that Darius must have been in Fārs at least from late October onwards and that he offered the aforementioned sacrifices during this period, i.e. the same period during which *šip* seems to have been celebrated.

Altogether, there is evidence in the Elamite tablets for two *šip* celebrations during which the king may have been in Fārs and additional evidence from Athenaeus, Xenophon and Ctesias that points in the same direction. This provides a slight but significant starting point for determining the nature of *šip*.

6.4.2. Royal largesse

In his so-called *Daivā Inscription* Xerxes explicitly announces “I made for Auramazdā his *šip*” (see §6.3.1. above). Here, the king presents himself as the protagonist in the sacrificial rite. This role is mirrored in the Fortification texts where, with the same expression, Parnakka and Ziššawiš are said to “make” (perform) *šip* and *anši*. These officials, the director and deputy-director respectively, were the highest representatives of royal authority within the Persepolis institution. Their role in the *šip* and *anši* celebrations is therefore best explained as acting in the name of the king. The personal participation of the (deputy-)director in religious rites is not otherwise attested, except, perhaps, for one uncertain case (NN 0561; cf. §6.2. with fn. 28 above). The involvement of the staffs of Parnakka and Ziššawiš in the organisation and documentation of the *šip* and *anši* feasts is also an exceptional feature. Not coincidentally the only parallel is the way the funerary offerings for royal and noble Persians were ordered and coordinated (cf. §6.2. above). The specifically royal flavour of *šip* is also visible in some of the locations where it took place: Appištāpdan and Tikranuš, with their royal plantations, and Pasargadae, a place of unmatched significance for Persian kingship as it had been founded by Cyrus the Great (§6.3.5 above). Furthermore, the only text that explains the human beneficiaries of a *šip* feast, deals with the

⁷¹ On the date see Stolper 1992 and Zawadski 1992. For the implications of the passages from Ctesias and Xenophon see Briant 2002: 183-6, 910, 972-3. Compare also Calmeyer 1980b: 306-7, with fn. 50 (tentatively comparing the sacrifice at Pasargadae mentioned by Ctesias with that in App. *Mithr.* 66).

caretakers of the *royal* mules, a group of people who may have been responsible for the movements of the king's possessions (cf. §6.3.3 above). Finally, the amount and variety of animals sacrificed during *šip* celebrations is quite conspicuous (cf. §6.3.3. above). In fact, the use of sacrificial animals is quite revealing as to the nature of *šip*.

NN 2259 is a journal on allocations of sheep/goats for cultic purposes and as payment for top-level officials in an unusually wide geographic area. Elsewhere, I have argued that the common factor linking the allocations in this remarkable journal is royal patronage (Henkelman 2006: 350-8). In fact, a quick scan of the available livestock texts revealed that *all* animals in the Persepolis economy might have been 'earmarked' as royal. This is certainly true for poultry, which was reserved for the royal table. The only, and for that matter very telling exceptions are the *basbas* for a *šip* feast (NN 2225) and those for personnel of the royal woman Irdabama (NN 0845; cf. fn. 48 above). Large cattle was also reserved for royal consumption,⁷² the only exceptions being two texts on *šip* (NN 1701; NN 1731) and a complicated text on what seems to be an extraordinary allocation of cattle on the orders of Parnakka (NN 0572; cf. fn. 54 above). As for sheep and goats, there are indications that the annual revenue in animals from the institution's herds was largely or completely withdrawn and added to the royal domain before being partly redistributed within the Persepolis economy. In allocations of sheep or goats for individuals or groups a royal connection is often stated or implied and Parnakka (or Ziššawiš) is almost invariably involved in such transactions. In this context, Parnakka not only acted as director of the Persepolis institution at large, but also manager in charge of the assets of the royal domain (on this dual role see Briant 2002: 469-71).

What emerges from the Fortification tablets *vis-à-vis* the royal earmarking of animals is in agreement with the Greco-Roman sources. Polyaeus (IV.3.32) mentions a great number of animals among the daily needs for the royal table, but he does not mention meat rations among the provisions for the royal guard. Heraclides of Cyme (*apud* Ath. IV.145e-f), on the other hand, informs us that the greater part of the meat from the royal table is distributed among the soldiers in the palace courtyard.⁷³ In other words: meat is distributed to ordinary people, but only *via* the royal table. Royal tagging is also noted by Arrian, who records that the animals for the sacrifices at Cyrus' tomb were provided by the king (*Anab.*

⁷² Cattle consumed "before" the king: PF 0691; PF 0692; PF 0693; PF 0694; PF 0710; NN 0506; Fort. 1681. Cattle for queen Irtaštuna (Artystone): NN 1727. A royal context is often detectable in other cattle texts as well: PF 0281; PF 1792; PF 1942:32-3; PF 1943:37-8; NN 0290; NN 0430; NN 0525; NN 1480; NN 1904; NN 2181; NN 2280; NN 2590.

⁷³ On the passages from Polyaeus and Heraclides and their relation with the Fortification material see Lewis 1987; Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1995: 292-300; Stevenson 1997: 38-40; Briant 2002: 286-92, 314-5, 921; Amigues 2003.

VI.29.7). Most instructive is Xenophon's report on a sacrifice instituted by Cyrus (Cyr. VIII.3.33-4). After an elaborate procession and a chariot race, the latter gave cups and cattle to the winners, "so that they might sacrifice and have a banquet." According to Xenophon the type of sacrifice continued to his day, "except that the sacrificial animals are omitted when he [the king] does not offer sacrifice."⁷⁴ Elsewhere, the same author relates that the Median Cyaxares sent meat from sacrificial animals to his troops (Cyr. II.2.2).

It would seem that Xenophon's statements should not be taken to imply that the king had to be physically present and lead the sacrifice whenever animals were sacrificed. Rather, the combined evidence suggests that animals provided by the Achaemenid state were earmarked as royal and that consequently animals sacrificed during large, public feasts would be considered as gifts from the king. That the king did not have to offer sacrifice in person appears from the texts that state that Parnakka or Ziššawiš "made šip." In such ceremonies, the king could thus be represented by a high official, while his piousness and generosity were symbolised by the sacrificial animals.

6.4.3. Rewarding services rendered to the king

The Greek evidence provides another useful parallel. In the ninth book of his *Histories*, Herodotus describes a great royal banquet (βασιλῆιον δεῖπνον) annually given by the Persian king (IX.110).⁷⁵

A banquet that takes place once every year, on the king's birthday – in Persian that feast is called τυκτά, or "perfect" (τέλειον). This is the only occasion at which the king has his head anointed and distributes gifts to the Persians.

As Benveniste has convincingly argued, τυκτά renders the Old Persian *tuxta-, "donné en remboursement." The feast was therefore an occasion at which the king repaid (cf. τέλειον, "perfect, accomplished") his guests by means of the banquet and the gifts he distributed.⁷⁶ Proceeding from this analysis, Sancisi-Weerdenburg argued that τυκτά refers to the contents of the occasion, "paying

⁷⁴ On the procession, games, sacrifice and ensuing banquet described by Xenophon see Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1980: 184-216 (esp. 203-6), Kuhrt 1987: 52-3 (comparison with the Babylonian *akītu*) and Briant 2002: 184-5, 246-7 and index s.v. Xenophon, Cyr.

⁷⁵ The information is repeated by Ath. IV.146b. Compare also Hdt. I.133 (birthday celebrations among the Persians).

⁷⁶ Benveniste (1951: 38-9) takes *tuxta- to be a verbal adjective from *taug- ("to pay, compensate, reimburse"). On the form see also Schmitt 1967: 138 fn. 165; Hinz 1975: 238 ("Verpflichtungserfüllung [Gegenüber den Gästen]").

off ‘debts’ incurred at an earlier stage,” rather than the form and context of the ceremony.⁷⁷ She also suggested that, contrary to what Herodotus says, such a royal ‘acquittal’ may not necessarily have been confined to one annual feast. In fact, all royal banquets and other occasions of royal redistribution and gift-giving could have been considered as a form of *τυκτά*.⁷⁸

It is not my intention to propose what would be an over-simplistic equation: ‘*τυκτά* = *šip*.’ Rather, the two feasts seem comparable in terms of content (royal largesse as a means of acquittal of ‘debts’), form (a large communal banquet) and status (royal). The latter two elements have already been addressed in the preceding pages; the former requires some further comments.

The Fortification texts often record special, additional rations awarded to certain groups. Foremost among these are mothers receiving extra payment as a reward for giving birth (cf. Brosius 1996: 171-9; Briant 2002: 435). The Greek sources qualify such gratuities as royal gifts intended to stimulate demographic growth (Hdt. I.136; Strabo XV.3.17). The gold coins distributed by the king – and subsequently by Alexander – to Persian women whenever he entered Fārs may well be understood in the same vein (Ctesias F8d §43 [Lenfant]; cf. Plut. *Alex.* 69.1-2, *Mor.* 246a-b). Other bonuses documented by the Elamite tablets are additional amounts of regular and irregular commodities (fruit, sesame, certain types of grain, prepared food) that are often given to specialized groups, some of which had connections to the royal house, such as the *pašap* and workers associated with the royal woman Irdabama (Brosius 1996: 141-4, 165-6, 169-80). Again, the Greek sources provide some confirmation: Xenophon (*Cyr.* VIII.5.21; cf. VIII.7.1) relates that Cyrus, each time he came to Fārs, distributed “such gifts as were appropriate to his parents and his friends, and such gifts as were appropriate to the authorities (*ἀρχαίς*), the elders (*γεραιτέροις*) and all the nobles (*τοῖς ὁμοτίμοις πᾶσιν*).”⁷⁹ This passage seems to refer to a refined system of gifts that were handed out to the administrative and tribal elite of Fārs whenever the king was present in the Persian homeland. In doing so the king underlined his exalted position as greatest giver and confirmed the bonds of loyalty by which his representatives were bound to him. At the same time, the ‘appropriate’ gifts undoubtedly were a recognition of various services rendered by individuals at

⁷⁷ Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1980: 147-57; *idem* 1989: 132-3, 139; 1991: 199-200 (with an important precision on the previously assumed connection with Nō Rūz). On *τυκτά* see also Briant 2002: 308, 319, 335-6, 520-1.

⁷⁸ Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1980: 156-7 (cf. 149), “Als we uitgaan van het woord *tukta* als ‘schadeloosstelling, betaling’, is vrijwel iedere maaltijd een *tukta* geweest, een steeds terugkerende uiting van de reciprociteitsrelatie tussen heerser en onderdanen.”

⁷⁹ On the passage see also §6.4.1. above. For *ὁμότιμοι* (lit. “peers”) compare *Cyr.* VII.5.85 where they are said to spend their time at centres of power (*ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀρχαίσις*; cf. VIII.1.5). On the word, as used by Xenophon, see also Briant 2002: 326-7, 332-4.

various levels in the regional administration. The same seems to be true for the bonuses recorded in the Fortification texts, albeit in most cases on the base level of work teams. It may be noted that the passage from Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* is the same that mentions the *šip*-like sacrificial feast attended by "all the Persians" and organised by the king upon entering Fārs (cf. §6.4.1 above).

Altogether, what we have are the echoes of an intricate hierarchy of royal gifts that were bestowed on a whole range of people when the king entered Fārs. In a way, *šip* may belong to the same dossier. The evidence that we possess suggests that the celebration of this feast may have been related to the presence of the king in Fārs. Moreover, the commodities issued for *šip* were not only consumed by larger groups of attendants, but in one case these recipients are specified as *royal* muleteers, i.e. people who served the king directly. In other words, *šip* may have served in ideological terms as a locus of royal gift-giving whereby services rendered were repaid by the king and the latter's position as greatest giver was reconfirmed. Seen as such, *šip* and *τυκτά* are, in my view, indeed comparable. This should not blind us, however, to the differences between the two. First there is a marked difference in outlook. Whereas *τυκτά* is described from a perspective that focuses the king and the socio-ideological context of the feast, *šip* is (with the exception of XPh) only known from documents that are exclusively interested in its administrative and utilitarian side. More important, *τυκτά* seems to have had a predominantly secular character, while *šip* was above all a religious occasion.

6.4.4. Parnakka at Pasargadae, Peucestes at Persepolis

According to Appian's testimony (*Mithr.* 66 = 276-9), quoted at the beginning of this paper (cf. §1), Mithridates organised a sacrificial feast for Zeus Stratios in 82 BC to celebrate his victory over the Romans. In doing so he reportedly continued a tradition started by the Persian kings at Pasargadae. The pronounced role of the king in this type of sacrifice is symbolised in his being the first to carry wood to the pyre. Another important element is that bread and prepared food/meat are laid out for those attending the feast in a circle surrounding the central pyre. Elsewhere, Appian recalls another "traditional sacrifice," plausibly of the same type, performed during or after a review of the naval forces (*Mithr.* 70 = 295). Like the feast of 82 BC, the latter occasion had a military context and a leading role for the king, who performed the sacrifice. In short, the Pontic feast was an ideological platform for both the king's piety and his status as greatest giver. Certain elements, such as the royal patronage, the reference to Pasargadae and the attendance of (apparently) larger groups of people, naturally recall the

characteristics of *šip*.⁸⁰ The parallel becomes even stronger, however, when a third testimony is taken into account.

In the summer of 317 BC Eumenes of Cardia marched with his troops to Fārs, then still under the command of Peucestes, who had been appointed by Alexander and had gained the favour of the inhabitants. The arrival of the Macedonian troops under command of Eumenes at Persepolis gave Peucestes the perfect opportunity to show off his leadership qualities and make his bid for the supreme command. First, he gathered livestock for the exhausted troops during their crossing of the fertile Fahliyān region (Diod. XIX.21.2-3). Then, once the army had reached Persepolis, Peucestes gave a great banquet (*ibid.* 22.1-3):⁸¹

When they had arrived at Persepolis, the capital, Peucestes, who was general of this land, performed a magnificent sacrifice to the gods and to Alexander and Philip; and, after gathering from almost the entire Persis a multitude of sacrificial animals and of whatever else was needed for festivities and religious gatherings (εἰς εὐωχίαν καὶ πανήγυριν), he gave a feast to the army. With the company of those participating he filled four circles inclosing the others. The circuit of the outer ring was of ten stades and was filled with the mercenaries and the mass of the allies; the circuit of the second was of eight stades, and in it were the Macedonian Silver Shields and those of the Companions who had fought under Alexander; the circuit of the next was of four stades and its area was filled with reclining men – the commanders of lower rank, the friends and generals who were unassigned, and the cavalry; lastly in the inner circle with a perimeter of two stades each of the generals and hipparchs and also each of the Persians who was most highly honoured occupied his own couch. In the middle of these there were altars for the gods and for Alexander and Philip. The couches were formed of heaps of leaves covered by hangings and rugs of every kind, since the Persis furnished in plenty everything needed for luxury and enjoyment; and the circles were sufficiently separated from each other so that the banqueters should not be crowded and that all the provisions should be near at hand. While all were being duly served, the crowd applauded the generosity of Peucestes, and it was clear that he had made a great advance in popularity.

⁸⁰ They are less reminiscent of *bakadaušiyam*, the type of feast to which Koch (1977: 126) compares the rite performed by Mithridates (cf. §6.3.2 with fn. 37 above).

⁸¹ Translation R.M. Geer (Loeb). The same event is described by Plutarch (*Eum.* 14.5), but in much less detail. According to Plutarch, Peucestes gave a magnificent feast for the troops and provided every man with one animal for sacrifice. This résumé is a bit confusing, for it seems to suggest a series of individual offerings by Macedonian soldiers. In reality, the remark on the amount of sacrificial animals is intended to underline the splendour of the feast *during which* they were slaughtered (as Diodorus indicates).

It is certainly intriguing that Peucestes, in his anxiety to gain supreme command chose such a particular type of feast as a platform for his pretensions. Obviously, the altars for Alexander and Philip at the centre were a physical expression of Peucestes' closeness to the Macedonian kings and served to support his grand aspirations. But there is more to this than ad hoc propaganda. Peucestes was Alexander's leading representative in the Persian heartland, and as such he fulfilled in many ways the same role as Parnakka had done under Darius I. Just as Parnakka seems to have presided over *šip* feasts at Pasargadae in the name of the Persian king, Peucestes performed a sacrifice for the gods and organised a banquet during which the Macedonian kings were literally the centre of attention. The parallelism may not be fortuitous: we know that Alexander's satrap in Persia was eager to adopt local customs, to present himself as a Persian governor and to learn the Persian language.⁸² The feast he organised may well have been inspired by his knowledge of Persian culture. In fact, the similarities with *šip* do not stop at Peucestes' role as the king's representative. The location, near the partly-burnt palaces of Persepolis, must have been chosen deliberately and effectively placed the occasion in the context of the Persian monarchy, just as the staging of *šip* at Pasargadae (and Appištāpdan and Tikranuš) had done earlier. Like Parnakka, Peucestes used his position as head of the regional administration to gather animals for the sacrifice. Earlier, he was personally involved in the acquisition of livestock for the army while on march through the Fahliyān.⁸³ In other words, livestock was not just a necessary ingredient of the festivities, but it carried the notion of a special gift, comparable to what I have called the 'royal earmarking' of animals in the *šip* feast (cf. §6.4.2 above). Finally, the feast at Persepolis was a locus for establishing alliances and fostering bonds of loyalty. Diodorus leaves no doubt that Peucestes understood this aspect of the feast very well (Diod. XIX.23.1; cf. Briant 2002: 247). Not only did he win the soldiers' favour by the gift of livestock, but he also took care to grant honourable seats (close to the centre) to high-ranking Persians. Among the latter may have been local leaders with whom Peucestes worked in his capacity as satrap of Persia. One of these may have been Tiridates, who had been reinstated as

⁸² Arr. Anab. VI.30.3, VII.6.3; Diod. XIX.14.5, 48.5. See Calmeyer 1982: 185; Briant 1982: 41-2 with fn. 8; *idem* 2002: 871; Wiesehöfer 1991: 129-31; *idem* 1994: 45-9, 53-5; Boyce & Grenet 1991: 9

⁸³ Diod. XIX.21.2-3. On Peucestes' use of the existing administrative network in organising the feast at Persepolis see also Wiesehöfer 1994: 53-4. Note that the acquisition of animals from the local inhabitants is reminiscent of a practice documented by the Fortification texts. Surpluses of grain and sometimes wine were exchanged (at fixed rates) for animals from third parties, presumably semi-autonomous tribes. This practice was concentrated in the Fahliyān. See on this Henkelman 2005a and fn. 17 above.

treasurer of Persepolis by Alexander (Curt. V.6.11).⁸⁴ The gift of a first rank seat to such individuals probably served as a recognition for the services they had rendered, a characteristic again paralleled by *šip* (cf. §6.4.3 above).

The hierarchy expressed and confirmed by means of the four concentric circles at Peucestes' feast is, as Briant has argued, rooted in the Achaemenid tradition.⁸⁵ Similar table arrangements are recorded by Xenophon (Cyr. VIII.4.1) and these seem to have been copied by Alexander when he organised a sacrificial banquet with three ranks (in circles?) at Opis (Arr. *Anab.* VII.11.8). The feast organised by Mithridates, claimed to have been a continuation of a feast once celebrated at Pasargadae, may in fact have had the same set-up: the combination of a circle surrounding the central pyre and the apparent participation of large segments of the army again suggest some sort of pronounced hierarchy.⁸⁶ This raises the question whether similar hierarchical aspects may have been expressed in *šip*, which was also celebrated at Pasargadae.

As I have argued before, the area at Pasargadae that would seem most fit for the *šip* feast organised there by Parnakka is the so-called 'sacred precinct,' in the northeastern part of the site (cf. Henkelman 2006: 324-6). Of the constructions found here, a mud-brick terrace, a low wall enclosing a large open space and two large stone plinths, only the latter seem to date to the (early) Achaemenid period.⁸⁷ Since one of the plinths has a staircase and the other probably never had, a plausible theory as to their use is that the first served as a platform for an officiant and the other one as support for a portable fire-altar.⁸⁸ The ritual

⁸⁴ Cf. Wiesehöfer 1994: 45-6 on the role of the local elite during the governorship of Peucestes.

⁸⁵ Briant 1982: 80 fn. 4; *idem* 2002: 310-2; cf. Calmeyer 1982: 185-6. On the circles see also Boyce & Grenet 1991: 20 with fn. 91. Wiesehöfer 1991: 130-1 and 1994: 72-3, 78 fn. 126 tentatively connects the passage from Diodorus to the votive inscriptions and altar (?) bases found in the 'Fratarakā temple' near Persepolis (Zeus Megistos, Athena Basileia, Apollo, Artemis, Helios).

⁸⁶ Cf. Calmeyer (1982: 185-6), who compared the feasts organised by Mithridates and Peucestes and related them to Achaemenid iconography.

⁸⁷ Boucharlat & Benech (2002: 30-3) conducted a geo-magnetic survey which showed that the low walls of undressed stones, which seemingly connect the plinths and the mud-brick platform in a large, asymmetric layout, "n'existent pas en profondeur; il est peu probable alors qu'ils soient contemporains des plinthes en pierre ni même de la série de terrasses. La conséquence directe de ce constat est la disparition de tout lien certain entre les deux plinthes et les terrasses." Based on this evidence and the plausible later date of the mud-brick terrace, it is preferable to consider the two stone plinths as a separate monument in its own right; its inclusion in a larger complex must be seen as a secondary development.

⁸⁸ On the interpretation of the plinths see: Stronach 1978: 138-145, pls. 103-7; Trümpelmann 1977 (speculating on a cult for Anāhitā and Mithra); Yamamoto 1979

performed on the plinths would thus not be dissimilar to the scene depicted on the façades of the royal tombs at Naqš-e Rostam and Persepolis. There, the king stands on a stepped platform and makes a solemn gesture towards a fire altar on a second stepped platform. Fragments of two or three stone fire-altars have indeed been discovered in and near Pasargadae.⁸⁹

The most important characteristic of the stone plinths is their monumental size. They are undoubtedly intended to make the officiant and the religious rite visible to a larger audience. Whatever the precise layout of the 'sacred precinct' in the early Achaemenid period may have been, it seems reasonably certain that the plinths stood at the centre of a large open space. The centrality and monumentality of the plinths, the ideological importance of the site, and the parallel with the tomb reliefs very much suggests that the ceremony performed here was a royal ritual. Based on this assumption, two tentative connections may be considered. One is with the Peucestes' Persepolitan feast and with Mithridates' purportedly Pasargadaean feast. The large open space and the central plinths would be perfectly suited for larger groups of attendants seated in one or several circles. The hierarchical aspects would furthermore find eloquent expression in the exalted position of the officiant, be it the king or his representative. The other parallel is with the *šip* feast, an occasion that involved hundreds of people, was profoundly royal in character, was presided over by the king (XPh) or by his immediate representatives, and was, among other places, celebrated at Pasargadae. As we have seen the *šip* feast functioned as an ideological stage that gave expression to the king's piusness and his position as greatest gift-giver; it was an occasion to reward loyalty and confirm hierarchy. The sacred precinct at Pasargadae may well have been the physical setting of the feast. One can easily imagine Parnakka, or perhaps the king himself, dominating the audience from the first platform, calling piously for divine blessing and at the same time demonstrating his largesse by distributing the sacrificial meat as a true royal reward to the faithful subjects seated at various distances from the centre and lucky enough to be included in this communal celebration.

6.5. *Šip: an interim summary*

In the preceding pages, I have attempted to identify the parameters that defined the feast known as *šip* in the royal inscriptions (XPh) and in nine Fortification texts. Apart from the Achaemenid-Elamite evidence, Greek sources and the

[*non vidi*]; Boyce 1982: 53-4 ("made to enable the Great King to perform religious rites in the open with fitting solemnity"), 89; Boucharlat 1984: 126-7; Stronach 1985: 606-8, pl. 36a; Houtkamp 1991: 36-7; Garrison 1999: 614-5.

⁸⁹ Stronach 1978: 141; Houtkamp 1991: 37; Garrison 1999: 614-5, pl. 3.

material record (stone plinths at Pasargadae) have been adduced in order to sketch a profile of the feast. Naturally, this method involves certain risks, primarily caused by the difference in perspective between the Greek historians and the scribes at Persepolis. I have therefore tried to avoid simplified equations and firm conclusions. Instead, I have tried to reach more specific descriptions of a number of elements that seem characteristic of the *šip* feast.

The Persepolis scribes used *šip* as an autonomous term that did not normally require qualification (§6.3.1). As such it is similar to *lan* (§4). The only divine beneficiary of *šip* attested in the tablets is Zizkurra, a god of Elamite descent. In the Elamite version of the so-called *Daivā Inscription* (XPh), a *šip* for Auramazdā is mentioned. There is no reason to believe that other gods were excluded from the feast, however. The parallel with the feast known as *bakadaušiyam* supports this assumption (§6.3.2).

Allocations for *šip* include flour, wine, sheep/goats, poultry and cattle. The cumulative value of these allocations is among the highest for religious purposes recorded in the Fortification archive (§5). In fact, the *šip* texts explicitly state that the large amounts were consumed, presumably by substantial groups of people; in one case the human beneficiaries are identified as royal muleteers (§6.3.3). The occurrence of a *kurdabattiš*, “chief of workers,” in several texts confirms that groups of labourers, possibly consisting of up to 520 individuals, may have attended the feast. Apart from its social and ideological functions, *šip* also had an economic side to it (cf. §4 on *lan*), namely the distribution of meat rations to labourers.

Dated texts on *šip* indicate that the feast was celebrated in November/December, that there was no fixed date and that *šip* could be celebrated more than once during the same season. Practical reasons for such an autumnal feast involving a high amount of animal sacrifices may have been that (internal) herds had to be reduced in view of the scarcity of fodder during the winter season, that October was the autumnal rutting season and that November was the first lambing season (§6.3.4). The official reason, on the other hand, may have been that the king was in Fārs during the Fall season, as is suggested by Greek and Elamite sources. His presence at the time of at least some *šip* celebrations may be assumed (§6.4.1).

The royal connection is not only expressed by the date of *šip*. It is also visible in the strong involvement of Parnakka and Ziššawiš in its performance and organisation, an involvement only paralleled in the *šumar* and *bašur* offerings, which are also directly connected to the crown (§6.2). Since Xerxes himself claims to have performed *šip* (XPh), it seems reasonable to suggest that Parnakka and Ziššawiš acted as the king’s representatives when they presided over the feast (§6.4.2). In addition, *šip* is mostly celebrated at places with a pronounced royal character: Appištapan, Tikranuš (large plantations; royal banquets) and Pasargadae (plantation; palaces of Cyrus; coronation ceremony). Finally, an analysis of Fortification texts on poultry, cattle and sheep/goats

suggest that animals issued for sacrificial purposes always had a specific royal 'earmark' that would be understood by the people consuming these gifts from the king. Such royal food tagging is confirmed by the Greek sources (§6.4.2).

As Herodotus reports, the Persian king organised a feast called *τυκτά*, which seems to have served as a forum for the acquittal of 'debts,' i.e. the rewarding of services rendered to the king (§6.4.3). Though perhaps not the same feast, *šip* may have had similar characteristics; the participation of royal muleteers, possibly responsible for the movements of the court, in a *šip* ceremony would suggest so. The feast could therefore be seen as an element in a refined system of royal gift giving in Fārs as attested in Elamite and Greek sources. The common factor in all these royal gifts is that they underlined the king's position as the greatest giver.

Two other sources concern sacrificial feasts attended by larger groups of people who were seated in hierarchical order around a central (fire) altar (§6.4.4). Mithridates is reported to have organised such a feast for his troops in 82 BC, thereby following a tradition set by the Persian kings at Pasargadae. The other feast is the one given by Peucestes at Persepolis in 317 BC. Both occasions were clearly stages that enabled the protagonist to show his largesse, publicly reward services rendered, and re-confirm status and bonds of loyalty. The feast at Persepolis is of special interest, because Peucestes seems to have used his position as head of the regional administration to organise the necessary sacrificial animals and to have stressed his role as Alexander's representative in Fārs, just as Parnakka had personally taken care of the organisation and represented the king when presiding over the *šip* feast. As for the hierarchical aspect: if the suggestion that the *šip* feasts at Pasargadae may have taken place at the so-called 'sacred precinct' is valid, it would seem that the people attending the sacrifice were seated around the two central stone plinths. The elevated position of the person standing on the first plinth alone is enough to suggest that here too the confirmation of social hierarchy was a key factor.

7. Feasting in Elam

Though there is no doubt that *šip* was an extraordinary and high-profile ritual, one does not have to be a historian of ancient religion to know that it hardly qualifies as a unique feast. Large sacrificial banquets are known to virtually all traditional societies and visualisation of hierarchy, the centrality of the ruler and the re-confirmation of social bonds are normal elements in such ceremonies. Thus, among the Mbanderu of Namibia the division of meat from cows slaughtered at the burial of a kraal leader directly reflects the society's complex hierarchy and simultaneously underlines the prestige of the deceased. As Theo Sundermeier writes in a thought-provoking study of the subject,

(...) the sacrifice serves life. The society reconstitutes itself. After the death of the master of the kraal everybody is given a new place in the hierarchical order and this place is confirmed by the distribution of the meat. The distribution of the meat publicly respects the value and the position of each family member and of the neighbours and strengthens the bonds within the community (...). Nothing will strengthen a community more than a common meal.⁹⁰

The sharing of a sacrificial banquet is also one of the most important aspects of *šip*. This appears not only from the Fortification tablets, but especially from older Elamite sources, such as the rock reliefs of the Kūl-e Farah sanctuary (see §7.3 below). Confronting such historic evidence with traditions from other, non-related cultures can be revealing both in terms of shared characteristics and unique features. Also, in some cases individual elements may be elucidated by a comparative approach. This applies, for example, to the role of Parnakka as representative of the king when compared to Roman cultic practice. Some sacrificial feasts held within the Severan army, such as the *suovetaurilia* at the occasion of the ritual purification of the legion, were truly imperial in character and required, at least in theory, the presence of the Emperor himself. In practice, a regional governor or other *legatus* could substitute for the Emperor, while preserving the imperial character.⁹¹

In the remaining sections of this study, no extensive comparison with feasts in other cultures – a precondition for reaching reliable results – will be attempted. Instead, I will focus on possible historical predecessors of the *šip* feast.

Sacrificial meals are known within the Zoroastrian tradition, but the evidence is limited and, for the most part, of post-Achaemenid date. Sacrificial banquets with a special royal character existed, but the available sources almost exclusively pertain to later periods.⁹² Better documentation exists regarding royal feasts in Mesopotamia, including the banquet on the tenth day of the Babylonian New Year's celebrations (*akītu*) that was held outside the city under

⁹⁰ Sundermeier 2002: 9. The author rightly stresses the important dietary aspect of sacrificial meals: “in archaic societies meat is not an everyday food, but a feast!” (*ibid.* 6), a remark that equally applies to *šip*. I am grateful to Regine Reincke for drawing my attention to Sundermeier's important study.

⁹¹ See Herz 2002, especially pp. 95-8 on the role of the *legatus*. As Herz argues, the shared sacrificial meals also helped to create a common identity among soldiers from different parts of the Empire.

⁹² See the survey on Zoroastrian “ritual community meals” by Hultgård (2004, esp. 374, 380-3, 386). A question not treated by the author is whether the specifically *royal* sacrificial meals in later periods are a continuation of older Zoroastrian rites or an Achaemenid inheritance.

the king's supervision.⁹³ The Neo-Babylonian ceremony known as *šalām bīti* appears to be a good comparandum for *šip* in terms of institutional context. The feast, attested for the great temples of Uruk and Sippar, may have been performed on a monthly basis, could be organised for a number of different gods, and involved large amounts of flour, beer, sesame, cattle, sheep, and prepared foods such as sweet cakes. After the offering was made, these sacrificial commodities were given, according to a fixed distributive formula, to craftsmen and other temple personnel (in the widest sense).⁹⁴ The *šalām bīti* ceremony does not seem to have had a particularly royal character, however.

Undoubtedly the most prolific Fundgrube when it comes to contextualising *šip* is Elam. That the feast continued Elamite traditions seems *a priori* a good possibility for two reasons. First, the word is Elamite and occurs in older Elamite texts. Secondly, Elam is, in recent publications, increasingly emerging as the political and cultural entity that was the predecessor *par excellence* of Persia and Persian culture. If Elam had a feast similar to *šip*, the Persians of the highland would not only have known it, but they might very well have appreciated, borrowed and adapted it to their emergent culture. In this context it must be stressed that, unlike the (Indo-)Iranian background of the Persians, the Middle and the Neo-Elamite state provided all the conditions necessary for a feast like *šip*: a centralised government, a clear royal ideology expressed by means of various media including public religion, a certain degree of prosperity, an intricate social hierarchy, a complex bureaucracy, and state-run institutions with considerable numbers of personnel and dependent labourers (Henkelman 2006: 8-23; cf. §2 above). This is not to say that (Indo-)Iranian, or for that matter Mesopotamian, traditions may not have played a role in shaping the Achaemenid feast. Whatever the extent of the Elamite contribution, Persian culture had to be receptive to it and such receptivity always implies a certain transformation and adaptation. This is not only true for *šip*, but also for *lan* and even for a god with such a rich Elamite history as Humban. In short, though we will now proceed to discuss the Elamite background of *šip*, we should not lose track of the *Persian* character of the feast as it was celebrated during the reign of Darius and Xerxes.

⁹³ Compare also the sacrifices and banquets for the inhabitants of Babylon and Borsippa organised by Shalmaneser III in the course of his campaign of 851 BC (Michel 1967: 32-3).

⁹⁴ MacGinnis 1991/92: 75-7, 79-80; *idem* 1995: 155-6; Bongenaar 1997: 116, 120-2, 264-6; Linssen 2004: 59-61 (translating the name of the feast as "the good functioning [or completion] of the temple"); Kleber 2005: 308-9, 317-8. Compare also the complex hierarchy evidenced by the distribution formula for meat from various regular offerings in Uruk's Eanna temple in the Neo-Babylonian period (McEwan 1983).

7.1. Šip and šup

Apart from its use as noun in the Fortification archive (*šip*) and in XPh (*šibbe*), *šip* also occurs as an element in a number of Achaemenid Elamite names. Some of these names continue older forms with *šup* (compare, e.g., Achaemenid Elamite Sunki-šip/Sunkur-šip and Neo-Elamite Sunki-šup).⁹⁵ Change of the root vowel from earlier /u/ to /i/ is a well-attested phenomenon in Achaemenid Elamite (cf. Vallat 1983: 12 fn. 4; Grillot 1987: 10-1). This makes it also likely that the noun *šup*, attested twice in Middle and once in Neo-Elamite, is an older form of *šip*.

7.1.1. Šup at Deylam

The oldest attestation of *šup* is in a votive inscription by Untaš-Napiriša (ca. 1340-1300 BC) known from six bricks found in secondary context at Deylam (Khūzestān). In it, Untaš-Napiriša introduces himself and mentions the construction of a temple dedicated to Inšušinak, Mašti and Tepti. Next follows a statement on the sacrifices for these gods (ll.3-5):

³ šu-up a-pi-me ⁴ a-ak li-ki-ir a-pi-te pi-ip-ši-it-te hu-ut-tah šu-ut-ku-me ⁵ ša-at-ki-me
I renewed their *šup* and their *likir*, night and day

The publisher of the Deylam bricks, François Vallat, gave “sacrifice” for *šup* (comparing it to Achaemenid *šip*) and tentatively proposed “offrande” or “libation” for *likir*.⁹⁶ Since the expression *šutkume šatkime* can be used with the same general sense as “day and night” in English, the offerings instituted by Untaš-Napiriša may have been, but were not necessarily a daily affair (cf.

⁹⁵ Achaemenid Elamite: Šipipi (Zadok 1983: 105 [121]); Sunki-šip (Zadok 1984: 40 [223]; EW s.v. hh.LUGĀL.šī-ip); Sunkur-šip (Zadok *l.c.*; EW s.v. hh.su-un-kur-ši-ip). Neo-Elamite: Sunki-šup (Amiet 1973: 30; not Middle Elamite as EW s.v. v.LUGĀL.šū-ip [pers.comm. M.B. Garrison]); Šupipi (Zadok 1983: 105 [126]; EW s.v. šu-pi-pi); Šupipi-lari (EW s.v. hw.šū-pi-pi.la-ri). Old Elamite period: Pilili-šube (EW s.v. pi-li-li.šū-be); Šububu (Zadok 1983: 105 [126]; EW s.v. šu-bu-bu); Šupi (Zadok 1983: 119; EW s.v. šu-ú-pi); Šuppu (Zadok *l.c.*; EW s.v. šup-pu); Šuppuri, “my *šup*” (Zadok 1983: 111 with fn. 491; EW s.v. v.šū-up-pu-ri); Šupšuppi (Zadok 1983: 94; EW s.v. šup-šup-pi); Šupšupiyaš (Zadok 1983: 94; EW s.v. šup-šū-pi-aš). Achaemenid Elamite Šupšuppiya (Zadok *l.c.*; EW s.v. hh.šup-šup-pi-ya) seems to be a fossilized form continuing older Šupšuppi and Šupšupiyaš. Zadok also considers Achaemenid Elamite Šepzilla as a form based on *šip* (1984: 40 [223]). If correct, Achaemenid Elamite Mitlišep (EW s.v. hh.mi-ut-li-še-ip) and Old Elamite period Šep-Sin (EW s.v. še-ip.d.sîn) belong here too (but see EW s.v. še-ip-pi-ri). Compare also the Neo-Elamite GN Šepšilak (EW s.v. h.še-ip-ši-lak-en-ni; Vallat 1993: 257).

⁹⁶ Vallat 1983: 11-2; cf. *idem* 2002/03: 541 and EW s.v. li-ki-ir.

Henkelman 2006: 234). At any rate *šup* is used here as a specific term, denoting a type of sacrifice different from *likir*. As for the gods associated with *šup*: Inšušinak was very much a royal or dynastic god and this could, in theory, explain the connection with *šup*. Tepti and Mašti are among the leading gods mentioned in the inscriptions of Hanni of Aiapir (Īzeh); there, they are the only gods referred to as “my god” (cf. §7.1.3 below).⁹⁷

7.1.2. Šup at Anšan

A second text (perhaps) mentioning *šup* dates to the very end of the Middle Elamite period or the earliest phase of the Neo-Elamite period.⁹⁸ This clay tablet, M-603, was found at Tall-e Malyān, ancient Anšan, in a level postdating that of the administrative texts from the so-called EDD building (Stolper 1984b: 15).⁹⁹ It concerns disbursements (ZI.GA) of certain items for Šimut or the “Gods of Elam.”¹⁰⁰ The disbursements, under the responsibility of a chancellor (*teppir*), are: 115 for/during (?) four consecutive months (IX, X, X², XI) and 26 for (?) two individuals identified as king (*sugir*) as well as a third person or purpose.¹⁰¹ The 26 items of the second series are identified as *hillahila*, a word of unknown meaning.¹⁰² The last lines are fragmentary, which is very unfortunate because

⁹⁷ EKI 76: 8, 30; EKI 76F:5-6, compare also “my Tepti” in EKI 75:1.

⁹⁸ Matthew Stolper kindly gave me access to his unpublished photographs, hand copy and transliteration of the text.

⁹⁹ Stolper (1984b: 9) assumes 1100-1000 BC as the most probable date for the composition of the published texts from the so-called EDD building. This means that M-603 would date to 1000 or slightly later. Steve (1992: 21) dates all the tablets, apparently including M-602, to 1000-900 BC and assigns them to ‘Neo-Elamite IA.’

¹⁰⁰ The text (l.1) has DINGIR.NIM^{MEŠ}, interpreted by EW (s.v. *te-ip-pir*) as Šimut. Arguments for this proposal are that Šimut was worshipped at Malyān (Lambert 1972; Reiner 1973a) and that he is sometimes referred to as the “Elamite god” (EKI 53 III.2-3; EKI 65:10-1). It is not excluded that DINGIR should be considered as a plural in the present case, however (cf. Malyān text M-788 in Stolper 1984b: 27, 122-5).

¹⁰¹ The identification of the months as IX-XI rests on the assumption that they had the same place in the calendar as they later had at Persepolis (Stolper 1984b: 15; cf. Hallock 1969: 426 on G/Kammama). It cannot be excluded, however, that the Persepolitan months had shifted and no longer had the same place they had in the late Anšanite calendar. EW (s.vv. *gam-ma-ma*, *še-ru-um*) identifies the M-603 sequence as months V-VII, Basello (2002: 20, 36) as months VIII-X (cf. also Stolper *l.c.*).

¹⁰² Instead of Stolper’s *hi-il-la-hi-la* x [...], Hinz and Koch propose *hi-du-me šu-hi* [la²] [...] (EW s.v. *hi-du-me*). The photographs and hand copy of the tablet make it very clear, however, that this alternative reading is implausible. Furthermore, *hidume*, according to the dictionary a collective term for “sheep,” is not attested elsewhere in Elamite.

they contain the signs *šu-up* and may therefore relate to a *šup* feast.¹⁰³ Altogether, the tablet, with its reference to god(s), allocations (of sacrificial commodities?) connected to certain months and kings, and (possibly) *šup*, presents a tantalizing yet nebulous and therefore hazardous piece of evidence.

7.1.3. *Šup* at Gisat

This leaves us with the last pre-Achaemenid reference to *šup*, in the so-called *Persepolis Bronze Plaque* (PBP), an unpublished Neo-Elamite text found in the Persepolis Treasury.¹⁰⁴ The document is nowadays dated to ca. 585-539 BC, i.e. merely 35 to 80 years before the first Fortification texts.¹⁰⁵ The place to which the text pertains is probably Gisat in the Fahliyān, or rather a small polity centred on that town. Regardless of the question whether Gisat still belonged politically to Elam in this period, it seems clear enough from the text that it lay in a area where Elamite cultural traditions were very much alive.¹⁰⁶ This appears from the names of the gods invoked in the tablet, specific terms and titles, and a reference to

Note that this does not rule out the possibility that sacrificial animals are at stake in M-603. Other relevant EW entries on this text are: *ak-sir*.KI.MIN; *gam-ma-ma*; *hi-du-me*; *ir-mu*; *s[i-b]a-ri*; *ša-pír*; *še-ru-um*; *šu-hi*; *šu-up*; *šu-ut-ru-uk.nah-hu-[un-te]* (Stolper [ms.] considers this reading to be implausible); *te-ip-pír*; *ur-ma-ak-ku*.

¹⁰³ The signs are preceded by what seems to be AN. It is therefore possible to read ^{AN}*šu-up* (cf. Achaemenid Elamite ^{AN}*ši-ip*). The problem is, however, that the generalised use of ^{AN} for all things sacred seems to have been a late development, largely confined to Achaemenid Elamite (cf. Henkelman 2006: 162, fn. 343, 398-9).

¹⁰⁴ There are unpublished transliterations and tentative interpretations of the text, including those by W. Hinz and by M.-J. Steve and E. Reiner. A photograph, with some textual notes by G.G. Cameron, was published by Schmidt (1957: 64-5, pls. 27-8). All proper names and vocabulary are included in EW, the toponyms are also in Vallat 1993. On the PBP see also Hinz 1967: 73; *idem* 1970: 428; Koch 1980: 111 fn. 29 (“königliche Stiftung”); Duchêne 1986: 66; de Miroschedji 1990: 79; Vallat 2002: 141; *idem* 2002/03: 535; Waters 2000: 87-9; Steve, Vallat & Gasche 2002/03: 483-4 (“charte royale qui redistribue des biens fonciers”); Henkelman 2003c: 257-8; *idem* 2006: 106 fnn. 228, 172, 206, 235 fn. 524, 249-50, 333.

¹⁰⁵ Vallat 1996: 391, 393; Tavernier 2004: 36-7, 39; *idem* [forthc.] 23-4.

¹⁰⁶ On the reverse of the *Persepolis Bronze Plaque* a seal ‘impression’ is engraved with an inscription mentioning “King Huban-šuturuk son of Šati-hupiti.” This ruler is not mentioned in the legible parts of text; he may have been the paramount ruler (presumably of Elam) granting the privileges recorded in the document. He may also have been a local ruler, however, or even an ancestor of the Gisat rulers whose seal was still used to authenticate deeds. Contacts between Gisat and the Neo-Elamite state may be hinted at in EKI 86:2, where inhabitants of the town are mentioned, unfortunately in a broken context.

“*puhu ziyanup*, temple servants” or “temple personnel” (rev.15; cf. Henkelman 2006: 206). One passage in particular (rev.10-7) seems to deal with cultic activity and may be a list of prescribed offerings, including animal sacrifices. As the Fortification tablets indicate, Gisat remained a site of religious activity during the reign of Darius, suggesting a certain religious continuity. In fact, the principal character of the Neo-Elamite document, a certain Ururu, may have been an ancestor (grandfather?) of the Ururu mentioned as officiant in Gisat in the Fortification tablets. One could even argue that the find spot of the bronze tablet is not coincidental: it may have been kept in the Treasury as a retroact document, i.e. as a deed on certain grants or privileges that still had relevance for the cults and rights of the Gisat sanctuary. Given all these considerations, the reference to *šup* (rev.11) in the *PBP* is of eminent interest for the case of *šip*. The preceding line lists one sheep/goat and another commodity, both presumably intended for sacrifice. Then it is stated:

rev.11 ITI *ra-hal* UD-*ma* ^{AN}*šu-ip sir-ma* ^{AN}*ša-šum* ^{AN}*na-pír*- rev.12 *ú-ri* *du-iš-ni*¹⁰⁷

On a day in the seventh month, may *Šašum*, my god(dess), receive a *šup* as offering/recompensation!¹⁰⁷

Šašum is the only deity mentioned in the inscription with the epithet “my god(dess)” (cf. §7.1.1 above on *Tepti* and *Mašti*). She is also the most frequently mentioned god in the *PBP* (rev.13[?], 24, 28). Once there is an elaborate titulature: “*Šašum-Elhalaë* of Gisat, my god,” perhaps suggesting that this deity in particular

¹⁰⁷ Alternatively, though syntactically less likely, one may read *du-iš-da*[?] (DN ... has received). My translation of *sirma* as “as offering” is based upon Stolper’s analysis of the verbal base *sira-*, for which he proposes the semantic range, “to hang up, weigh, verify, display, present, offer” (1984b: 12-14). The alternative, “as recompensation [for divine blessing],” is based upon Acropole and Fortification evidence. Neo-Elamite *sirma* occurs in contexts that suggest “as payment” (S 13, S 80, S 126, S 234; see *EW* s.vv. *sir-ma*; compare also *sir-na*). Similarly, Achaemenid Elamite *zir* and *zirna* (*ŠUD* is transcribed as *zir_x* in texts from this period) occurs in contexts parallel to those of *gal* (“share, ration, payment, offering”) and could well mean “weight, payment, wage” (PF 1583, NN 0421, NN 1612, NN 2409; *EW* s.vv. *sir*, *sir-ma*). The *EW* translates the phrase in *PBP* as “an einem Tag im Monat Rahal hat einen Gottesdienst als Entgelt [zum Dank?] die *Šašum*, meine Gottheit, empfangen” (s.v. *d.šu-ip*). On *sir(a)*- see also Grillot 1983: 216 with fn. 62 (*zirna*, *zirna*, “équivalent à, correspondant à, par”); *idem* 1984: 189 fn. 19 (*sirah*, “j’ai dressé”); *EW* s.v. *si-ra*, *si-ra-h* (“ich hängte auf”), *sir-me*, *sir-ri-me* (“Gewicht”); Grillot-Susini, Herrenschmidt & Malbran-Labat 1993: 29, 50 (*appin sir* in DB_e II.58, “je ... les pendis”); Malbran-Labat 1995: 122-3 (*sirah*, “j’ai fixé”).

was at home at Gisat.¹⁰⁸ Šašum, perhaps female (Hinz 1967: 74; Steve 1967: 89), is already mentioned, as Šiašum, in the Old Elamite *Narām-Sîn Treaty* (EKI 2 I.19, II.22, IX.8); as Šiašum she had a temple at Čoğā Zانبīl in the Middle Elamite period (EKI 8A = TZ 49:3:4).

7.1.4. Šikšibbe

Apart from older Elamite attestations of šup, there are two other words that may be relevant here. First, there is šikšibbe, in an inscription by Tepti-Huban-Insušnak (EKI 85:10), possibly a contemporary of Cyrus the Great. The word occurs in a list of 31 occupational designations of individuals and groups receiving sacrificial animals; all these people are collectively referred to as lap, “officiants, oblaters.” The list may include some court officials with cultic duties, but it is safe to say that the šikšibbe (a plural) represent a group with some cultic expertise. This is confirmed by the attestation of the same word in a Neo-Elamite economic text from Susa (S 117; poss. also S 274), where it is preceded by the determinative ^{AN} (indicating sacredness). Elsewhere, I have suggested that the šikšibbe contains -šip (analysis: [šik.šip.p]); it may denote a class of sacrificial specialists.¹⁰⁹ Interestingly, all the livestock and cattle mentioned in the inscription seems to have been intended for a communal rite in a husa (“grove”), arguably the Elamite predecessor of the Persian paradises, such as the plantations where šip seems to have taken place (Henkelman 2006: 373-82).

7.1.5. Kilah-šupir

As Vallat and the *Elamisches Wörterbuch* suggest, the element -šupir, which occurs in the divine name Kilah-šupir, may be a derivative of šup.¹¹⁰ Kilah-šupir is attested in school texts from Sukkalmah-period Susa and in Middle Elamite royal

¹⁰⁸ ^{AN}šá-šum el-ha-la-e-ra ^{AŠ}gi-sa-at-ir-ra ^{AN}na-pír-ú-ri (rev.24-5, cf. rev.28). See Hinz 1971: 669; Vallat 2002/03: 534-5.

¹⁰⁹ See EW s.vv. d.še-ik-sip-pi; h.ši-ik-ši-ib-be (“Künstler”); Vallat 2002/03: 539-40; Henkelman 2006: 376-80 with fn. 879. Note that all the occupational designations in EKI 85 are preceded by ^{AŠ}, normally reserved for toponyms and other locales. In the case of šekšippi in S 117, the sign ZIB has, in my view, to be read as šip (^{AN}še-ik-šip-pi), not as sip as EW s.v. (despite the observations by Vallat 1987 on *parsip*). That šikšibbe has šip, not šup, may be explained by the late date of EKI 85 and the Acropole texts; at that time the development from /u/ to /i/ may already have been under way.

¹¹⁰ Vallat 1983: 12; EW s.v. šu-bi-ir.

inscriptions from Čoğā Zanbīl and, possibly, Tul-e Spīd in the Fahliyān.¹¹¹ -šupir in his name can be explained as nomen agentis [šup(i).r] and as such is comparable to the plural form šibbe in šikšibbe ([šip.p]). This would give “performer of a feast,” “officiant,” “worshipper” or the like, depending on how one translates šip/šup (cf. §6.3.1. above). Though the meaning of ‘Kilah-šupir’ as a whole is hard to grasp, a divine name containing šup would not be very surprising.¹¹²

Neo-Elamite Humban-šupir is another (personal) name with -šupir.¹¹³ It is most likely the same as the one found in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian documents as Umman-šipir/-par.¹¹⁴ Apparently šup- was already pronounced as /šip-/ in this period. Compare Sukkalmah-period Šuppuri, which is continued in Achaemenid Elamite as Šipirra/Šiparra.¹¹⁵

Incidentally, the development from šupir to šipir/par opens the possibility that the name of the ninth Elamite month in the Persepolitan calendar, Šibar(i) (Hallock 1969: 74-5; *EW* s.v. *ši-ba-ir*) is a derivative of šip as well. This seems especially attractive since šip is celebrated twice in the ninth month and, as far as we can see, always in autumn. It could therefore be suggested that, in the highland calendar, Šibar(i) originally was the name during which a sacrificial feast was celebrated, that the name subsequently lost part of its significance and that šip was no longer confined to the month named after it in the Achaemenid

¹¹¹ Sukkalmah-period: Dossin 1927, nos. 237:4, 245:4 (cf. the letters mentioned by Steve 1967: 91-2). Middle Elamite: brick inscriptions by Untaš-Napiriša for the temple of Kilah-šupir (EKI 9Vb = TZ 51). The name is restored in l.1 of EKI 41A, a brick inscription found by Herzfeld at Tul-e Spīd, where König suggests [^{AN}ki-la-ah]-šū¹-pi-ir. The sign read as šu appears as QA in Herzfeld's drawing (König 1965, pl. 7), but is taken as a copy error by König (*ibid.* 94 fn. 2). This is admittedly a bit adventurous, but König is certainly right in stressing that the first line requires a divine name and that Kilah-šupir fits the available space and last two signs.

¹¹² Steve relates the first element to *k/gil*-, “être maître, gouverner” (1967: 92); cf. Zadok (1984: 20 [97-a], 41 [231]). The latter takes the name to be that of a deified ruler, Kuk-kilah-šupir (Dossin 1927 no. 105:3). *EW* (s.vv. *d.ki-la-h.šū-pi-ir*, *d.ki-la-h.šū-bi-ir*) explains the DN as “ich tröstete den Betenden (den zum Gottesdienst - šup - Gekommenen).”

¹¹³ S 119; S 135; S 169; S 294. *EW* s.v. *hw.hu-ban.šū-pír* proposes “Humban-Anbeter(?)” “He who performs a feast for Humban” seems preferable to me.

¹¹⁴ Zadok 1984: 12 [48], 223a; *EW* s.v. *v.um-man.ši-bar*, *v.um-man.ši-bir*; Stolper 1998.

¹¹⁵ Šuppuri: Scheil 1932 no. 306:9 (cf. Zadok 1983: 111, who also cites the Old Babylonian spelling Šipurri). Šipirra/Šiparra: PF 0550; PF 1682; PF 1683; NN 2044 (cf. Zadok *l.c.*). The Achaemenid Elamite form was explained from Old Persian **spara*- by Gershevitch (1969: 195) and Mayrhofer (1973: 233), but this may be rejected on the basis of Šuppuri and the fact that **spara*- names are always spelled *iš-ba*- in Achaemenid Elamite. *EW* s.v. *hh.ši-bar-ra* suggests **čībara*- (cf. Hinz 1975: 76), but this is again unlikely given the existence of Šuppuri. Zadok also counts Šepiri (Sukkalmah period) as a *šip(ir)* name (*contra*: *EW* s.v. *še-ip-pi-ri*).

period. That caution is warranted, however, is clearly demonstrated by the case of the seventh (Old Persian) month, Bāgayādi-, “belonging [to the feast of] worshipping the gods.” The Fortification tablets yield no clue whatsoever of religious activity specifically related to this month.¹¹⁶ Another complication is that the etymological connection between Šibar(i) and šip is not entirely unproblematic.¹¹⁷ Without evidence on the month’s historical significance, the relation with šip therefore remains an attractive yet uncorroborated possibility.

7.1.6. *The importance of Elamite šup*

Unfortunately, none of the texts, nouns and names in §§7.1.1-5 is very well understood at present and this means that pre-Achaemenid šup remains somewhat nebulous. On the positive side, we do have some actual results: 1) šup was a specific type of offering that could be performed by the king in the Middle Elamite period (Deylam), 2) it still seems to have had a connection with kings at the dawn of the Neo-Elamite period (M-603), 3) there seems to be a connection with certain months (M-603, PBP), 4) it was used to denote the offering for Šašum, presumably the prime deity of Neo-Elamite Gisat. Also of interest is the connection with the royal god Inšušinak (Deylam) and with Šašum, “my god” (PBP). This may be compared with Xerxes performing šip for Auramazdā, again a typical royal god (cf. §6.3.1 above). In addition, šup/šip remained a productive element for forming names from the Old Elamite through the Achaemenid period; the base may also be recognised in the Neo-Elamite occupational designation šikšibbe (denoting a certain class of officiants), the Old and Middle Elamite divine name Kilah-šupir, and, perhaps, the Achaemenid Elamite month name Šibar(i). The most important observation, however, is simply that there was such a thing as šup in Elamite culture and that this feast still existed in Gisat,

¹¹⁶ See Schmitt 2003: 29-32 on the month name and Henkelman 2006: 330 on its occurrence in the Fortification tablets (cf. §6.3.2. above on feasts during other months). Compare also the cautious remarks by Schmitt 1991: 112-4.

¹¹⁷ The month name also appears, in the form Sibari (^{A5}ITI ʾsi-ba¹-ri), in the unpublished late Middle Elamite document from Malyān, M-603, that also mentions the word šup (cf. §7.1.2 above and EW s.vv. s[i-b]a-ri, še-ru-um). At first, this may seem to be a welcome confirmation of the existence of the month name in the pre-Achaemenid highland calendar and its relation with šip/šup. The form of the name, with sip- rather than the expected šup-, is at least puzzling, however, and it may imply that the supposed connection between šip and Šibar has to be given up altogether. Note also that it is not entirely certain that Anšanite Sibari was the ninth month (cf. fn. 101 above).

right on the doorstep of the emergent Persian Empire in geographical, chronological and cultural respects.¹¹⁸

7.2. Other textual evidence

Apart from texts mentioning *šup* and related words, there are some other indications for feasting in Elam. The evidence is elusive, however, and does not offer enough details for a productive comparison with the Achaemenid *šip* feast. I therefore mention the following two texts only in passing.

Animal sacrifices known as *gūšum* and *hatapi* were frequently performed in Sukkalmah-period Susa (reign of Atta-hušu). The relevant texts, from an institutional archive, record such offerings for various gods and at the occasion of the new moon.¹¹⁹ The available documentation does not reveal who the human recipients of the sacrificial meat were.

The Akkadian tomb inscription known as *Stone Stela I*, from early Middle Elamite Haft Tepe, contains a detailed prescriptive list of monthly and annual sacrifices of beer, flour and sheep, apparently from a land grant founded by king Tepti-ahar for this purpose. The annual sacrifices include the *isinnu*, “festival,” of the month Abu (V), as well as offerings connected to the month Tašrītu (VI) and the god Kirmašir (Kirwasir).¹²⁰ Given the use of the word *isinnu* and the 14 sheep slaughtered at the occasion of the Abu festival, one may assume that the meat was redistributed to more people than just the six tomb guards and the few other individuals mentioned in the text.¹²¹

The aforementioned inscription of Tepti-Huban-Insušnak (EKI 85; cf. §7.1.4. above), a king from the last part of the Neo-Elamite period, mentions a total of 31 head of cattle and 186 head of sheep/goats apparently issued to various individuals and groups with cultic professions and duties. Though the text is badly broken and at times very difficult to understand, it seems that the

¹¹⁸ I have not included a fourth pre-Achaemenid attestation of *šip/šup* in a late Neo-Elamite text known as Nin.18 (83-1-18, 801 [British Museum, from Rassam's excavations at Nineveh]). As EW s.v. *ši-ip* indicates, the passage in which *šip* occurs (if complete) is badly broken and does not allow interpretation. For the text see Weißbach 1902: 195; cf. Reade 1992.

¹¹⁹ Scheil 1908 nos. 6, 12 (new moon) and *passim*; CAD G 144 s.v. *gūšu*, H 149 s.v. *ḥatāpu*; Hinz 1964: 50; AHW 300 s.v. *gūšum*, 336 s.v. *ḥatāpu(m)*; EW s.vv. *gu-šum*, *gu-ú-šum*; Vallat 2002/03: 531, 540.

¹²⁰ Note that two Middle Elamite kings, including Tepti-ahar, styled themselves, “servant of Kirmašir and Inšušinak.” The cult of Kirmašir may therefore have had a special dynastic flavour.

¹²¹ Text with translation and commentary: Reiner 1973b; cf. Henkelman 2006: 233-4 (with references). On Tašrītu see also Herrero & Glassner (1991: 80 fn. 5).

animals listed in it were collectively slaughtered during a ceremony in a *husa*, “grove” (Henkelman 2006: 377-80). It is not stated by whom the enormous amount of sacrificial meat was consumed; it may have been the entire population of Susa. The mere existence of the inscription describing this exceptional royal largesse is ample testimony to its ideological background.¹²²

7.3. *The feast of Aiapir*

Of the four Elamite open-air sanctuaries that were founded in the Middle Elamite period and that were enlarged and still functioning in the Neo-Elamite period, Kūl-e Farah is the most extensive and the one with the most elaborate iconography.¹²³ The sanctuary is situated in a gorge in the northeastern part of the valley of Īzeh (Mālamīr). Most conspicuous are its six reliefs (KF I-VI) depicting various cultic acts and stages in a grand sacrificial feast carved on the rock faces of the gorge and on three boulders. All are near the entrance. One of the reliefs has a large Neo-Elamite inscription (EKI 75) and ten short captions (EKI 75A-K). The subjects of the reliefs may be summarised as follows:

KF I (northern face)	ruler with two court officials, one carrying (the ruler's?) bow, quiver and sword; musicians with harps and drum (?); officiants with a humped bovid and sacrificed rams at an altar; inscription and captions identifying the figures
KF II (boulder)	ruler in praying attitude; attendants and officiants sacrificing a humped bovid and six other animals
KF III (boulder)	ruler lifted on a platform (depicted twice); a host of participants in several registers on both sides marching in procession towards the sacrifice; harp players; sacrificial

¹²² That the Neo-Elamite kings were very rich in cattle (and sheep), and could therefore afford a sacrifice of the kind described in EKI 85, appears from ABL 520 (1500 head belonging to the king of Elam and the chieftain of the Pillutu tribe). On this text see Malbran-Labat 1975: 24-5 and De Vaan 1995: 265-9.

¹²³ Studies on the Kūl-e Farah monuments include: Jéquier 1901: 133-9; Hüsing 1908: 48-53; Vanden Berghe 1963: 25-33, 39; *idem* 1983: 103, 112-3, 152; Hinz 1966; Amiet 1966: 549-58; De Waele 1972; *idem* 1973; *idem* 1979; *idem* 1981; *idem* 1989; Calmeyer 1973: 140-2, 149-52; *idem* 1980c: 104-5, 110-1; *idem* 1988; Börker-Klahn 1982: 72-5; Carter in Carter & Stolper 1984: 170-2; Seidl 1997; Potts 1999: 253-4, 302-3; Majidzadeh 2001 (photographs); Malbran-Labat 2004: 45-7; Henkelman 2005b: 144-51. Possible evidence for a Middle Elamite temple in the Īzeh valley: Walker 1981: 136-7.

	animals (18 smaller animals, 3 humped bovids). ¹²⁴
KF IV (southern face)	banquet with seated ruler before table accompanied by attendants and court dignitaries (one carrying bow, quiver and sword); six harp players and their conductor; numerous participants in registers (on panels left, below and right of the central relief) oriented towards the king and lifting their right hands to their mouths (paying homage to the king or eating?); six officiants (?) on the extreme left near the fire altar or fire bowls (cf. below)
KF V (southern face)	ruler in praying attitude followed by his retinue; thymiatèrion; officiant slaughtering humped bovid; six more sacrificed animals
KF VI (boulder)	ruler in praying attitude, lifted on a platform and followed by a short procession of his retinue (one dignitary carrying a quiver); another surface prepared but not used for an additional relief

Less known are the double fire altar (or fire bowls) carved in a boulder near KF IV, a sacrificial platform surrounded by a 'sacred circle' of boulders (including KF II-III) in the centre of the gorge, and a (natural) basin with a water conduit at its end. The circle of boulders has been described in the following terms by Éric de Waele:¹²⁵

...une 'aire sacrée' plus ou moins circulaire, à quelques mètres d'un torrent saisonnier, qui est délimitée par les bas-reliefs Kul-e Farah II et III et par une série de rochers isolés portant sur leur face intérieure des surfaces clivées. Un grand rocher plat, sorte de podium naturel, se trouve au centre. Il a également été clivé sur son côté intérieur. On peut supposer qu'il servait aux évolutions du culte et aux sacrifices sanglants.

There is no agreement among scholars on the date of Kūl-e Farah. Some have dated all reliefs to various stages of the Neo-Elamite period, while in more recent studies most are dated to the Middle Elamite period. Agreement exists only on KF I, which is generally dated to the seventh century, partly on the basis of the

¹²⁴ De Waele's theory (1972: 4) that the figure raised on a platform on KF III (twice) and KF VI is a statue of a deity, not a human ruler, was convincingly rejected by Calmeyer (1973: 151-2; *contra*: De Waele 1979).

¹²⁵ De Waele 1972: 5 (see also *ibid.* fig. 7) and *idem* 1973: 36, *idem* 1989: 35; cf. Carter in Carter & Stolper 1984: 171; Seidl 1997: 201. Fire altar: De Waele 1973: 41-3; *idem* 1989: 32-3, 35. Water basin and water conduit: *idem* 1973: 41; *idem* 1981, fig. 3 (E-F); *idem* 1989: 35.

inscriptions carved on it.¹²⁶ This is not the place to review all the arguments raised on this matter; suffice is to say that there is no obvious thematic break in the sequence of the reliefs and that the sanctuary was still functioning towards the end of the Elamite period, at the time that a local ruler Hanni commissioned the inscriptions. This was, however, not during but rather towards the end of the seventh century, or even later, around the middle of the sixth century.¹²⁷

In the large inscription carved on KF 1 (EKI 75), Hanni son of Tahhi, invokes a series of gods, including Tirutur, *bahir sunkipri*, “protector of kings” (l.1; cf. Henkelman 2002: 7, 13), apparently the deity to whom the sanctuary was dedicated (ll.7-8; cf. EKI 75A).¹²⁸ Next, Hanni introduces himself as the *kutur* (“leader, chief”) of Aiapir who has set up his image (i.e. KF I with the inscriptions) in compliance with the will of Tirutur. In l.10, king Šutur-Nahhunte, son of Indada, is referred to in a context that suggests that he is Hanni’s overlord. The central part of the inscription does not, as is sometimes thought, refer to the sacrifice on the relief, but relates to victories of Hanni over other polities and, in the wake of these, the building of a temple for Narsina and the dedication of prisoners or booty to the gods of Aiapir (ll.11-7). The inscription is concluded by a curse formula aimed at anyone who might damage the relief and the inscriptions.

On KF I all the figures are identified by captions. One of these, “Šuturu, the Master of the Palace” (EKI 75B), carries a bow, quiver and sword, presumably for Hanni. Also represented are “Tepti-Huban, who delivers the sacrificial victim” (EKI 75G) and “Kutur the *šatin*” (cultic expert; EKI 75K).¹²⁹

¹²⁶ Vanden Berghe 1963: 27 (KF I-II: second half of the seventh century; KF II-V: slightly later, after the reign of Hanni); *idem* 1983: 103 (KF I-VI: 8th/7th cent.); De Waele 1981 (KF I-VI: all Neo-Elamite, 9th-6th cent.); Carter in Carter & Stolper 1984: 172, *idem* 1999: 289 (KF IV: 2nd half 2nd mill.; KF I: Neo-Elamite); Seidl 1986: 12-3, *idem* 1997: 202 (KF II-IV, VI: end 2nd mill.; KF I: 7th cent.); Calmeyer 1988 (KF IV: end 2nd mill.; KF I: 7th cent.).

¹²⁷ Text of EKI 75 and EKI 75A-K: Scheil 1901: 102-113, pls. 23-6; Hinz 1962; König 1965: 155-60. See also De Waele 1976; Stolper 1988; Waters 2000: 82-5. Date: 585-539 (Vallat 1996: 387-9, 393; cf. Steve, Vallat & Gasche 2002/03: 484) or end 7th century (Tavernier 2004: 16-22). Éric de Waele deserves credit for stressing, as early as 1973, the likelihood of a Neo-Elamite revival after the Assyrian raids of the 640s and raising the possibility that some of the Kūl-e Farah reliefs date to this last period of Elamite history (1973: 45 n. 25).

¹²⁸ The following summary of EKI 75 and EKI 76 largely follows the interpretation given in Stolper 1988: 277-8.

¹²⁹ The title *ragipal* n EKI 75B was explained by Hinz (1950: 287 fn. 13) as a blurred form of Akk. *rab ekalli*, “Master of the Palace.” This solution seems convincing to me (cf. Henkelman 2003b: 127-8). On *muhhutu ullira*, “who delivers the sacrificial victim” in EKI 75G) see Grillot & Vallat 1984: 26; EW s.v. *mu-h-hu-du.ul-li-ra*. EW (s.v. *ni-si-ik-ki-ir*) reads EKI 75C as ú ^{DIŠ}šu-ut-ru-ru *ni-si-ik-ki-ir* ^{DIŠ}ha-an-ni and translates “ich bin Šuturu,

Actual sacrifices are described in a hardly penetrable passage in EKI 76, the main inscription in the nearby sanctuary of Šekaft-e Salmān. The text regulates the division of parts of the sacrificed animals to various dignitaries such as “the woman Ammaziraš of Aiapir” (l.21), the “Master of the Palace” (l.22), the scribe who offers prayers and reads the inscription (ll.18, 23), *šin-šatinbe* (a certain class of cultic experts; l.24) and *zammip*, “labourers” (l.25).¹³⁰ A similar, if not the same regulation undoubtedly pertained to the sacrifices performed at Kūl-e Farah.

As Louis vanden Berghe notes, “l’art de Mālamīr annonce déjà celui des achéménides” (1963: 39). The many parallels between the Kūl-e Farah iconography and that of Achaemenid monumental art include the absence of images of deities, representation of figures in superimposed registers (in combination with an audience scene), costume of the ruler, platform with the ruler carried by Atlas-figures, *proskynesis* gesture, prayer attitude, use of fire altars, and the retinue of dignitaries including the ruler’s weapon bearer.¹³¹

Apart from these iconographic continuities, there are other parallels between the Īzeh inscriptions and Achaemenid sources. A subject that merits a study of its own is the structure of the Aiapiran court in comparison with that of the Achaemenids. Hanni’s Master of the Palace, i.e. probably his chief administrator, also had the ceremonial duty of carrying the king’s weapons. As such this *ragipal* Šutruru is a predecessor of Ašbazana (Aspathines), who was weapon bearer, “Chamberlain,” and chief administrator at Darius’ court.¹³²

Another parallel is found on the level of theology. Boyce already argued that the position of Humban as the leading god in the Neo-Elamite pantheon may well have had a bearing on the exaltation of Auramazdā to the position of greatest of the Ahuras (1982: 27-8). More tangible is the influence of the notion that Humban was the king-maker *par excellence*. Hanni makes it very clear that Humban is not only “the greatest of the gods” (EKI 75:4-5); he is also the god

der Leibwächter des Hanne” (apparently taking *nisikkir* as an older form of Achaemenid-Elamite *nuškira*).

¹³⁰ On *zammip* see EW s.v. *v.za-am-mi-ip* and *hh.za-mi-ip* (with references) and Stolper 2004: 72. On *šin-šatinbe* see Meriggi 1971: 205 (“incantori dei serpenti”).

¹³¹ Hüsing 1908: 51-3, 56 (registers, audience scene); Vanden Berghe 1963: 33, 39 (registers, audience scene, processions, costume); Amiet 1966: 550 (absence of deities; registers); De Waele 1973: 41-4 (fire altars); Calmeyer 1973: 141-2, 150-1, *idem* 1975: 233-4 with n.13; *idem* 1980c: 110-1; *idem* 1983: 170, *idem* 1988: 283-5; *idem* 1996: 231 (platforms; weapon bearers; hand-over-wrist gesture; prayer attitude; registers; *proskynesis* gesture; absence of deities; sacrificial practice); Root 1979: 154 fn. 68, 157-8, 246 (registers; platforms; cf. 272-6 on the hand-over-wrist gesture at Šekaft-e Salmān); Henkelman 2003a: 188-9, 192-3 with fn. 37 (hair-cut; royal robe).

¹³² See Henkelman 2003b: 127-8. Parnakka may have had not only the same position, but also the same court titles as his successor Ašbazana.

“under whose *kitin* a king (stands)” (EKI 75:4-5, 6-7, 20-1). This *kitin* is a complicated abstraction that defines various aspects of divine authority and power as it emanates from the divine to the human world. *Kitin* is that which makes a king (“god-given royal power”), but it also becomes an instrument in his hands (“divinely enforced rule, protection”). Thus, Hanni is able to place *kitin* of the gods upon the relief, to protect it from destruction and desecration (EKI 75:24). Achaemenid royal ideology works with a very similar conception of the relation between god and ruler. In that context it is highly significant, and certainly not just the result of a free ‘translation,’ that the Elamite version of the *Daivā Inscription* uses the word *kiten* (*kitin*) in a crucial passage (XPh_e 29-32): “By the effort of Auramazdā, I devastated that place of *daivā*-worship and I placed *kiten* upon them: ‘(for) the *daivā* you shall not make their *šip*!’”¹³³

The Kūl-e Farah sanctuary, as a dazzling complex of iconographic themes, religious concepts, social stratigraphy, and ideological strategies, deserves the full attention of students of Achaemenid culture. It is against that background that the significance of the feast of Aiapir as the foremost parallel for Persian *šip* should be seen.

As in the case of *šip*, the feast of Aiapir may well have been celebrated annually, during the autumn season. This suspicion rests on the assumption that the region of eastern Khūzestān and western Fārs is most suitable for agropastoralism and on the observation that tribes adapted to that way of life made up, until recently, most of the population in these parts. Within the grand system of migration routes and seasonal pastures in what is commonly known as the Bakhtiārī Mountains, the Īzeh valley functions as *garmsīr* land and is used as winter residence by the Čār Lang. The pastoralists descent to the area in September/October from their summer pastures in the eastern mountains (in the direction of Esfahān) and stay until April/May.¹³⁴ Because the autumn rutting season falls in October and lambs from the summer season are born in November (cf. Barth 1961: 7), autumn is the best time to reduce the herds by slaughtering or selling the surplus of yearling animals as well as infertile ewes. This has the additional advantage of lowering the need for fodder during the winter season.¹³⁵ In the days of Hanni and his predecessors conditions are likely to have been similar, even though there may have been a more important sedentary segment resident in the valley. It may therefore be expected that the feast of Kūl-e Farah

¹³³ On *kitin* in Elamite texts and in XPh see Henkelman 2006: 291-8 and §6.3.1 above.

¹³⁴ Jéquier 1901: 133; Vanden Berghe 1963: 25; De Waele 1973: 33; Zagarell 1982: 105; Digard 1989: 553-5.

¹³⁵ Barley is grown in the region of the tribe’s summer pasture, harvested and carried as fodder to the winter pasture. The supply is therefore limited and should be stored as long as possible in view of the possibility of an exceptionally cold winter (cf. Digard 1989: 553-5).

took place in autumn.¹³⁶ If this assumption is correct the date and the economic rationale of the communal sacrifice at Aiapir is comparable to that of *šip* (cf. §6.3.4 above). In addition, it does not require much imagination to picture 'Aiapir' as a dimorphic chiefdom (Rowton) centred on the Īzeh valley, where the tribal seat and chief's residence may have been situated.¹³⁷ This would mean that the date of the feast celebrated at Kūl-e Farah was also connected to the reuniting of migrant pastoralist groups and permanent inhabitants of the valley under the aegis of the Aiapiran leader. The significance of the Achaemenid king's presence in Fārs at the time of the *šip* celebrations (cf. §6.4.1-2 above) seems to be a reverse parallel (ruler rejoining the local population).

More in general the central role of the ruler is a communal element of *šip* and the feast of Aiapir. The fact that the ruler of Aiapir is depicted on all six reliefs in Kūl-e Farah, and that sacrifices are always performed right in front of him already indicates his role as the celebration's protagonist. Compare Xerxes, who prides himself on having performed *šip* in the *Daivā Inscription* (§6.3.1). In other cases the king's highest representative performed the feast (§6.2). The royal character of the feast is furthermore expressed by the location and the 'royal earmarking' of the sacrificial animals (§§6.3.5, 6.4.1-2).

The centrality of the king also found visual expression during the sacrificial feast. At Aiapir, we find the ruler enthroned and surrounded by a multitude of banquet guests who have all turned their faces to him and pay him homage with their gestures (KF I). Also, he is leading the procession towards the sanctuary (KF III, VI). To accentuate his position even more, the ruler is raised on a platform and carried to the place where the sacrifice takes place. This is, of course, reminiscent of the platform on which the Achaemenid king stands on the tomb façades at Naqš-e Rostam and Persepolis (cf. fn. 131 above), but it also reminds one of the 'sacred precinct' at Pasargadae. As we have seen, one of the two monumental plinths at that site may have functioned as a podium for the king or his representative, the other perhaps for a fire-altar during a religious gathering identical or similar to *šip* (cf. §6.4.4 above). Fire altars (and thymiateria, cf. the tomb reliefs) were used at Aiapir as well.

Not only the position of the ruler, but that of every participant found

¹³⁶ Note that the obvious importance of water for the Kūl-e Farah sanctuary (seasonal torrent, basin, water conduit) does not necessarily point to a spring date for the feast since there is also a period of autumn rains.

¹³⁷ On the Īzeh valley as tribal centre in the early Islamic period and in the nineteenth century see Rowton 1973b: 208; Krawulsky 1978: 363; de Miroschedji 1990: 88-9. There are several settlement mounds in the valley, which have produced evidence of occupation in the Middle Elamite period. Later occupation has not been attested in surveys thus far, but this may be due to the problem of recognizing Neo-Elamite pottery (Carter in Carter & Stolper 1984: 168, 187). Cf. Malbran-Labat (2004: 45-7), who stresses the importance of Kūl-e Farah as a league shrine for pastoralist tribes.

explicit expression at the sacrificial feast. Visible hierarchy was a key element. As De Waele notes, the Kūl-e Farah reliefs are a panorama of an intricate social pyramid in which status is expressed by size, arrangement, closeness to the king, representation in frontal view or in profile, garments, hair-cut, and beard (1972: 2-3; 1989: 34). A hierarchical aspect may also have been made visible in the celebration of *šip* and related feasts such as the one organised by Peucestes whereby the participants were seated in concentric circles around two central altars (§6.4.4). The *šip* feasts at Pasargadae may have had a circular build-up (around the two stone plinths) and the same is true for the feast of Aiapir, where the sacrifices seem to have taken place on a central flattened rock surrounded by a 'sacred circle' of boulders. At the feast organised by Peucestes, the most highly honoured Persians, probably including local leaders and members of the regional administration, were seated close to the centre. Judging from the Kūl-e Farah reliefs, court officials, like Šutruru the Master of the Palace, were closest to the ruler in this case too. Interestingly, the position and ceremonial duties of Šutruru are comparable to those of Parnakka (Henkelman 2003b: 127-8), who himself was directly involved in the celebration of *šip* as well (§6.2).

As for religious attitudes, there are again some parallels between the Elamite and the Persian feast. Like the grand sacrifice at Aiapir, *šip* took place in the open air, at plantations and, presumably, at the sacred precinct at Pasargadae. Elamites and Persians shared sensitivity for the numinous quality of such special places. The Elamite sanctuaries on hill tops (Kūrangūn) or near water streams and wells (Kūl-e Farah, Šekaft-e Salmān and Naqš-e Rostam) are significant as possible forerunners of Persian religious ceremonies on mountain tops and at rivers as attested by the Fortification texts and reported by the Greek authors (Hdt. I.131; Strabo XV.3.13-4). Apparently no images of the deities were used at these occasions judging from the apparent absence of gods on the Kūl-e Farah reliefs (cf. fn. 124) and the information given by Herodotus and Strabo on Persian practices (*ll.cc.*).¹³⁸ Fire altars did provide for a certain contact with the divine, however: such altars were certainly used at Aiapir and during Persian ceremonies, possibly including the *šip* feasts at Pasargadae (§6.4.4 above).

Like *šip*, the feast at Aiapir may have been a forum at which the king could pay off 'debts' by awarding seats of honour to his servants in the local government. That Hanni chose to mention his principal ministers by name in the inscriptions on KF I and that these officials are positioned close to the ruler similarly implies recognition for services rendered. As for the base level of ordinary Aiapirans and workers in the Persepolis economy the banquets meant access to rare meat rations for larger groups (§6.3.3): a true feast!

¹³⁸ This is not to say that the information given by Herodotus and Strabo agrees in all aspects with what the tablets say; they are certainly not describing a cultic practice similar to *šip*.

The unity of the ruler and his god would of course have been stressed to the maximum during sacrificial feasts such as *šip* and the one celebrated at Aiapir. It is certainly no coincidence that most of the gods associated with *šip* or earlier *šup* are closely connected to the ruler or the dynasty, including Inšušinak, Šašum and Auramazdā (§7.1.6). No doubt Hanni will have adopted a similar attitude *vis-à-vis* Tirutur. Yet, in the end neither the king, nor the god is the principle participant in the sacrificial feast. It is the community that convenes and reconstitutes itself which is really celebrated. Group identity, social hierarchy and bonds of loyalty are reconfirmed in the sacrifice and the ensuing banquet. This is of special importance in a situation whereby ruler and subjects are separated from each other during large parts of the year. Sedentary and pastoralist Aiapirans, the latter returning from their summer abode, were reunited amidst the reliefs of Kūl-e Farah, those sublime expressions of their common identity. Likewise, *šip* was a re-union: it seems to have been an occasion at which the king's presence in Fārs was made tangible by the gift of extraordinary rations, by the special location of the feast at royal plantations and at the site of ancient Pasargadae, and by his personal attendance (XPh) or that of his highest representative. Traditional hymns played an important role in Persian religious experience (references in Briant 2002: 245, 330), as did music, and probably song in Kūl-e Farah. Such a musical setting may have served to connect the present to the past and to lift the momentary experience of the feast to a timeless level. At Aiapir, this connection with the past is made tangible in such a way that visiting the site is still a haunting experience. Not only the king and priests, but all members of the community found themselves mirrored on the surrounding reliefs when they entered the gorge for the annual feast. The very ceremony they were about to perform engraved in stone visualised their bond with a communal past and a communal future by putting the whole gathering *sub specie aeternitatis*.

It is here, at Aiapir, that we get as close to Elamite religion as one possibly can, and it is here that we find the most eloquent expression of a feast that, only a few generations after Hanni, was celebrated in Pārsa.

7.4. A Persian feast

It could be surmised that the many similarities and parallels between the reliefs at Kūl-e Farah and Persian culture are testimonies to an increasing (Indo-)Iranian cultural presence. That would mean that the many similarities and parallels with Persian culture are misleading in the sense that they do not really point to Elamite 'influences.' Yet, the antiquity of some of the reliefs forbids such a conclusion (cf. De Waele 1973: 43-4). Moreover, even the language of the Neo-Elamite Kūl-e Farah inscriptions and the names of the gods venerated do not betray a distinct Iranian background. It seems preferable, then, to consider the

sanctuary as a clear expression of Elamite culture that was still alive at a time that Persian culture was emerging and absorbed traditions from adjacent cultures, particularly those of Elam. The rooting of the *šip* feast in the Elamite past is furthermore underlined by the evidence on *šup* and related words in pre-Achaemenid Iran.

This does not mean, however, that *šip* remained an Elamite or ‘foreign’ element in an Achaemenid cultural context. Peter Calmeyer has, in his article series *Zur Genese altiranischer Motive*, repeatedly stressed the exceptional ability to unite traditions from various backgrounds as an essential characteristic of Achaemenid art (e.g., 1973: 146–7). The same may be concluded for Persian culture at large, which emerged as the product of the coming together and the creative reception of (Indo-)Iranian, Elamite and Mesopotamian traditions (cf. §2 above). In this context the ancient feast inherited from the Elamites immediately found a new meaning and was adapted to its grander imperial and institutional context as is apparent from its staging at Pasargadae and in the royal paradeisoi and from the administrative efforts applied to organise the feast. Interestingly, a more local variant of *šip* also continued to exist: the feasts celebrated at Pumu and Išgi, both presumably in the Fahliyān region, seem to have been of a more modest type. Neither of these was presided over by Parnakka and the one at Pumu was performed for the otherwise unattested god Zizkurra who may have been of local importance only (see ad NN 0654 and NN 2402). As such the feasts of Pumu and Išgi may have been more similar to the *šip* feast for Šašum in the small Neo-Elamite entity centred on Gisat (cf. §7.1.3 above). The situation is illustrative of the religious landscape of Achaemenid Pārsa: a unity in terms of cultural identity (only Persian gods are sponsored by the Persepolis administration), but at the same time an intricate patchwork of traditions with an Elamite, (Indo-)Iranian or mixed Elamite-Iranian background.

Perhaps the best proof of the transformation of *šip* is the fact that Xerxes mentions the word precisely at the point where he insists on the purity of his convictions and his loyalty to Auramazdā (XPh). In the same passage *kiten*, another crucial concept of Elamite religious thinking, is used. As was stressed before (§§6.3.1, 7.3), this cannot be just the work of a liberal-minded Elamite scribe: one really has to dispose of the antiquated *idée fixe* that the Old Persian texts are the only authoritative versions of the inscriptions. As I concluded elsewhere, the mention of *kiten* in one of the versions of XPh simply means that *kiten* is part of the deal (2006: 297). Likewise, we cannot afford to ignore the occurrence of *šip* (or, for that matter, Old Persian *rtācā brazmaniya* and *daivā*) in the Elamite version. It is true that one should beware of reading the ideological message of the inscriptions into the Fortification tablets (cf. §4), but the reverse can sometimes be very useful. These mundane economic texts are indeed a gold-mine in which the Elamite background of Persian culture may be slowly, yet steadily uncovered.

Appendix

Texts with *šip* or *anši*¹³⁹

NN 1665

Box: 1003

Seal: PFS 0009* upper edge, left edge, right edge

Transliteration

¹ [DİŠ]har-ri-e-na ^{AS}ka₄-a-sa-bat-ti-¹iš¹ ²tu₄-ru-iš ^{HAL}pár-na-ak-ka₄ ¹na-lan ³KI+MIN 21
UDU.NITÁ^{MEŠ} a-ak ²mi-lut ¹be-l ⁴ut-ka₄-⁷um⁷ ^{HAL}ma-u-pír-¹ra hi-še ⁵li-¹in hu⁷-ut⁷-
ti⁷-ra a-ak ^{HAL}ak-lka₄- ⁶ia-še ¹ak-ka₄-be pa-ru¹ [^{MEŠ} ^{HAL}]EŠŠANA-na ⁷sa-ti-lman-ba ^{AS}ti⁷-
ik⁷-¹ra-[nu-] ⁸iš¹ ²ME 12 ^{HAL}LÚ^{MEŠ} hu-lpi-l ⁹be ap ¹id-l¹du 10-na-ip-l¹na¹ ^{lower edge} ¹⁰a-ak
10-[na-]ip-l¹na ^{HAL}LÚ^{MEŠ} rev. ¹¹1 UDU.NITÁ^{MEŠ} ni-lma-lak ^{AN} ¹²ITI^{MEŠ} ^{AN}ba-gi-lia-ti-iš-na¹
¹³AS¹be-ul 19-um-me-man-na ^{AS}hal-lmi ¹⁴hi ¹li-ma-lka₄ ^{HAL}kar-ki-l¹iš tal- ¹⁵li-iš-da¹ du-
um-me¹ ^{HAL}na-ni- ¹⁶ti-en-ik-ka₄-¹mar¹ du-iš-da ¹⁷AS¹bat-ra-ka₄-taš ¹an-ka₄ ^{AN}ši- ¹⁸[ip]
hu-ud-da-ka₄-¹na¹

Translation

¹⁻³ To Harrena the cattle-chief speak, Parnakka speaks as follows: ³⁻⁶ “21 head of sheep/goats and 2 portions, in addition^{??}, to Mauparra the porter⁷ and his associate(s), ⁶⁻⁸ who are feeding royal mules at Tikranuš, ⁸⁻⁹ (a total of) 212 men, to them issue! ⁹⁻¹¹ For each ten men there is one sheep/goat.” ¹¹⁻¹⁴ In the seventh month, 19th year this sealed document was delivered. ¹⁴⁻¹⁶ Karkiš has written (this document); he has received the draft/copy from Nanitin, ¹⁷⁻¹⁸ (at) Pasargadae. When a *šip* feast was performed.

Notes

- 1 On Harrena and his position of *kasabattiš* (OPers. **gaiθapatiš*, “cattle-chief”): Hinz 1970: 288-90; Briant 1982: 341-2; Koch 1990: 95-8; Henkelman 2003b: 111 (ad l.1-2), 145. On the box numbers of the tablets with Parnakka’s letter-orders to Harrena and other officials see Henkelman 2006: 99.
- 2 Parnakka was director of the institution that may be labelled the ‘Persepolis economy.’ His seal, PFS 0009*, is impressed upon the left and upper edge of the tablet (on the seal see Garrison & Root 2001: 404-6, with full bibliography). On his involvement in the organisation and performance of *šip* feasts see §6.2 above.

¹³⁹ Abstracts of all the *šip* and *anši* texts are published in Henkelman 2006: 442-3. Note that Hallock’s simplified transliteration style (‘ka₄’ not ‘ka’) is not adopted here. For the sake of clarity determinatives are not abbreviated (‘^{AN}’, not ‘^d’).

- 3-4 EW (1987 s.v. *be-ut-qa-um*) may be right in assuming that *betkam* is a nominalised and “iranisierte Form” of *betka*. The latter appears in very similar documents (NN PF 1793; NN 0254?; NN 1289; compare also *betki* in NN 1847 and NN 2217), but the immediate contexts are different. Hallock interprets *betka* as “it has been changed” (1969: 678), EW as “verzögert, nachträglich” (1987 s.v. *be-ut-qa*). Assuming that *betka* is related to the reduplicated form *bep̄tika*, sometimes used for intercalary months (Henkelman 2006: 219-20 fn. 484), one may also think of “added, additional” for *betka* and “addition” for *betkam*. It should be stressed, however, that “addition(al)” does not seem to fit all the contexts in which *betka* and *bep̄tika* occur; my interpretation should therefore be considered as tentative at best.
- 4 There were probably several individuals by the name of Mauparra active in the Persepolis economy. The one mentioned in the above text may have been the same individual as the Mauparra receiving grain for horses at Uzikurraš (PF 1665). Uzikurraš (also Uzikraš) was situated in the eastern Kām̄fīrūz region, north-west of Persepolis (Arfa’i 1999: 40). The distance between Tikranuš (probably near Pasargadae; cf. below) and Uzikurraš does not pose a serious problem since we are dealing with caretakers of equids and since Mauparra is a *lin huttira* (cf. ad 1.5 below). The latter reason makes it also possible to identify our Mauparra with one mentioned in NN 1497, where he receives wine for 101 men travelling on the royal road, probably coming from Susa. NN 1497 can be associated, via seal PFS 0137, with Umpuranuš (PF 0621; PF 1115) and its satellite Uratukkaš (PF 0348), both tentatively situated in the eastern Fahliyān (Arfa’i 1999: 36; Henkelman 2006: 305-6). It would seem that Mauparra was escorting mules or horses to Fārs.¹⁴⁰

Note that the spelling of Mauparra’s name in the present text is unique (l^{HAL}ma-u-p̄r-l^{ri?}-ra for regular l^{HAL}ma-u-p̄r-ra). I have taken the additional RI as a phonetic complement indicating that the preceding P̄R should be read as *p̄r*, not as *tam*_s. On the use of phonetic complements in Elamite see Vallat 1989 and Tavernier 2002: 227-8.

5. ^{AS}li-lin hu²-ut²-ti²-ra¹: Hallock’s reading seems reasonably plausible (I have omitted his question mark after IN). It is not clear what a “lin-maker” did. The term recurs, in plural form, in four other texts, two of which are dated to the first month (PF 1542; NN 0740; NN 1044). EW (1987 s.v. *hh.li-in.hu-ut-ti-ip*) proposes “Kanalgräber,” but this suggestion is solely based on the name of the first month Hadukannaš, “[month] of the digging of canals” (Schmitt 2003: 39-43), in PF 1665 and NN 1044. As there is no indication that the month name has any bearing on the activity of the *lin-huttira* and as the other three

¹⁴⁰ Perhaps PF 1597, in which Tiridada receives flour at Hidali for workers whom Mauparra and his associates “conscripted” or “took prisoner” (*rabbāšda*), belongs to the same dossier.

texts in which the latter occur (NN 0740; NN 1665; Fort. 7250) are not even dated to the first month, the explanation “Kanalgräber” should be given up (cf. Henkelman 2006: 127 fn. 271). Instead, one may follow Hallock's suggestion that *lin* is a derivative of the base *li-* (1969: 721), which means “to send, bring, deliver.” Yet, the form seems a nominal, not a verbal formation as Hallock thought. Nominal forms based on *li-* include Middle Elamite *lamlir*, “oblation-giver,” and *lamlie*, “its offering-gift” (Henkelman 2006: 188-94). In our case, *lin* perhaps does not mean “gift,” but rather “delivery.” A *lin-huttira* would then be a “delivery maker,” i.e. a (trans)porter. This solution would surely fit the context of NN 1665: Mauparra is feeding the royal mules and may therefore have been responsible for the organisation of the periodical migration of the king's court. In other texts, *lin-hutti* designates groups of over thousand individuals travelling the royal road. Via the officials escorting them, Ukama and Kurdama, other groups can plausibly be added to the *lin-hutti* dossier. It appears that “delivery makers” could be *libap* (“servants”) or *šalup* (gentlemen, free men) and were sometimes designated as *taššup*.¹⁴¹ The latter term can mean “people” and “troops/soldiers,” but also “personnel,” as in the expression *taššup mišakašbe*, “palace personnel.”¹⁴² Taken together, the evidence allows for the hypothesis that the *lin-hutti* constituted a body of personnel comprising both courtiers (*šalup*) and actual servants (*libap*) who organised and carried out the transport of royal possessions and as such had supervision over the royal mules (on which see below ad l.6). They may be compared to the *gangabae*, porters of the royal possessions, mentioned by Curtius (III.13.7-11, *gangabas Persae vocant humeris onera portantes*; see Briant 2002: 256, 918).

6. The remaining traces allow for the reading $\text{ṽpa-ru}[\text{MEŠ}]$ (PA is likely, RU is plausible). The word is not a logogram, despite the use of the determinative MEŠ , but a loan from Akkadian *parû*, “mule” (it should therefore not be

¹⁴¹ In PF 1542, NN 0740 and Fort. 7250 Kurdama receives beer, wine and flour for *lin-hutti* (1500 in PF 1542). In Fort. 7250 the *lin-hutti* are also identified as *taššup*. The same Kurdama escorts *taššup* in PF 1602 (*taššup appa Kurdama kuzza*) and receives flour for no less than 2700 *taššup* who are qualified as *libaba šalup*, “servants [and] free men” and who were travelling to the king. A fifth and final text on *lin-hutti* concerns Ukama (NN 1044) who is escorting 1060 *taššup lin-hutti* additionally qualified as *šalup*. Ukama occurs in seven texts with large groups of *taššup* (PF 0330; PF 2027; NN 1159; NN 1254; NN 1711; NN 1816; R558) and once with ten *puhu*, “servants” (PF 1330); on this individual see Henkelman 2003b: 133-4 with fn. 54 (alternatively suggesting that Ukama's *taššup* may have been military forces) and Jones & Stolper 2006: 19-20 (R558).

¹⁴² The *taššup mišakašbe* (on the etymology see Gershevitch 1969: 175-7; Hinz 1975: 268) of Hystaspes, mentioned in PF 1596, recur in PFa 20 where they are introduced as a company of 200 *šalup* and 1194 *puhu*. Cf. EW s.v. *v.taš-šu-íp*; Henkelman 2003b: 149 fnn. 94-5.

transcribed as PA.RU^{MEŠ}). That the mules are “royal” (I^{HAL}IEŠŠANA-na, lit. “of the king”) means that they belonged to the royal domain, not to the Persepolis economy at large (Briant 2002: 463-71; Henkelman 2006: 351-6). Equids that belonged to the king’s house are mentioned in a number of texts.¹⁴³ Three of these are very similar to NN 1665 in that they are letter-orders from Parnakka to Harrena concerning similar allocations of meat for grooms of royal animals (PF 1793; NN 0254; NN 1289).¹⁴⁴ These texts do not mention a *šip* feast, but this difference may be optical only. This is particularly true for NN 1289, dated to the same month and year as NN 1665, dealing with meat rations for muleteers at Tikranuš and mentioning Pasargadae as the place where the original order was issued. Given these parameters, it seems likely that the allocations recorded in NN 1289 were made in the context of a *šip* feast too. The same may be true for PF 1793, which again deals with royal grooms, receiving meat rations at the same date (VII/19), yet at a different location (Karakušān). Similarly, NN 0254 is again dated to VII/19, and deals with meat rations for caretakers of “large cattle” (*kiti*), which may include mules, at Harrakran.

The use of mules as pack animals in the royal train is known from the classical sources (Hdt. I.188; Curt. III.3.24). That royal mules are mentioned in NN 1665 therefore supports the interpretation of *lin-huttira* as “porter” (cf. ad l.5 above). On Persian mules and asses see also Potts [forthc.].

- 7-8 The restoration of the GN ^{AS}I^{ti}²-ik²-lra-[nu-]I^{iš}l: is based on NN 1289 (also concerning meat portions for the grooms of the royal mules at Tikranuš; cf. ad l.6 above). The place name is mentioned in four more texts, but none of the contexts in which it occurs is conclusive as to its position. That Persepolis (NN 2515) and Pasargadae (NN 1289; NN 1665) are mentioned as places where orders were issued regarding transactions in Tikranuš does not necessarily

¹⁴³ Horses: PG 1668; PF 1669; PF 1765; PF 1784; NN 0177; NN 0185 (horses *miššiyadadda*); NN 0477; NN 0907; NN 1054; NN 1508; NN 1656. Horses and mules: PF 1793. Mules: NN 1289; NN 1665. Camels: PF 1787. *Kiti*, “large cattle” (may include equids, cf. *EW* s.v. *h.ki-ti*): NN 0254. Compare also the horses and mules “of Ariaramnes” (PFa 24; PFa 29: 10-1; NN 1823) and the mules (written ANŠE¹.RU^{MEŠ}) brought to the royal palace (*da-za-ra-na-m* ^{HAL}IEŠŠANA-na; NN 1950).

¹⁴⁴ PF 1793: 13 sheep and 5 portions for 135 feeding ANŠE.KUR.RA^{MEŠ} *a-ak pa-ru*^{MEŠ} ^{HAL}IEŠŠANA-na *a-ak* ^{HAL}mi-sa-pu-šā-iš-be-na, “horses and mules of the king and of (the) princes” (OPers. **viθapuça-*; see Hinz 1975: 268). NN 0254: sheep/goats (number destroyed) for caretakers of royal *kiti* (cf. fn. 143 above). NN 1289: 6 animals and 3 portions for 63 men feeding the royal mules at Tikranuš; their foreman is designated as ^{AS}uk-ba-[a²-]I^{iš}²l-šā (OPers. *upāsa-*, groom; cf. Gershevitch 1969: 183).

imply that the towns were in the same district.¹⁴⁵ The available texts do disclose other aspects of the place, however (see Henkelman 2006: 372). It appears that Tikranuš was a village (*humanuš*) with a sizeable plantation of fruit trees (PFa 33:20-5), a place where the king enjoyed a nice lamb kebab (NN 0071), where a specialized craftsmen working with gold received elite wages (NN 2515) and where the grooms of the royal mules received their meat rations (NNN 1289; NN 1665). In short, Tikranuš had a decidedly royal profile. This observation is of obvious relevance for the interpretation of the *šip* feast.

- 13-6 For the interpretation of the colophon reflected in the above translation cf. 2003b, *idem* 2006: 84-6, 90-4; Stolper [forthc.] (*contra*: Vallat 1994: 267-71; *idem* 1997). Karkiš and Nanitin are both regularly-mentioned members of the (deputy-)director's staff; on the Akkadian name of Nanitin and its implications see Delaunay 1976: 45 and Stolper 1984a: 305 with fn. 20.
- 17 Batrakataš: on the identification with Greek Πασ(σ)αργάδαι and the (problematical) etymology of the name see Hinz 1975: 190; Bailey *apud* Hansman 1975: 311-2; Gignoux 1976: 306-7; Tavernier 2002: 641-2 (8.3.153). For occurrences in the Fortification texts see Vallat 1993: 38-9. See also Koch 1990: 30-1 and index s.v. *Ba-iš-ra-qa-da*. On Pasargadae as the site of religious activity see Henkelman 2006: 324-6, 359-72 and §6.3.5 below.

Though the place name Pasargadae in NN 1665 is immediately followed by the statement “when a *šip* feast was performed,” there does not seem to be a direct connection. Comparison with NN 1289 (cf. above ad 1.6) shows that Pasargadae was the place where the original order was issued, whereas Tikranuš was the location where the *šip* feast took place. Another parallel is provided by the three texts on *šip* and *anši* celebrations at Appištapdan: one explicitly states that the *šip* feast took place at Appištapdan, whereas the order was issued at Persepolis (PF 0672). The other two texts (NN 2225; NN 2486:47-8) mention only Appištapdan.

- 17-8 ^{AN}[*an-ka*₄][*ši-[ip]*] *hu-ud-da-ka*₄-*na*! restoration based on NN 1701 (see below). The particle *-na* in *huddakana* seems to have developed from the precative particle *-ni* and was used in modal subordinate clauses. In the present text, it is used in what seems to be a past-oriented temporal subordinate clause introduced by the conjunction *anka*. The construction with *anka* ... *-na* is not applied consistently in Achaemenid Elamite: the *-na* particle is regularly omitted in contexts that are otherwise similar to those that have *-na*; there is no apparent difference in meaning. Thus, NN 2225 (below) has *anka parnakka šip ... huttašdana* (“when Parnakka performed a *šip* feast”) whereas NN

¹⁴⁵ Similarly, the two remaining texts on Tikranuš (PFa 33 and NN 0071) both mention a series of place names, but may well pertain to a wider area and are therefore not helpful in locating the town.

2259:25-6 has *anka parnakka šip huttašda* (*idem*). Apparently some scribes felt that the temporal aspect of subordinate clauses with *anka* did not require a sense of modality; such inconsistent scribal attitudes are quite common in the Fortification corpus. This is not to say that all past-oriented constructions with the *-na* particle lack a sense of modality; indeed *anka nuda šerašda*, “as he has ordered you to” (PF 1860), has a clear causal tone. In most cases, however, the context suggests a temporal rather than a causal or motivative aspect. This is particularly clear in PF 1620 and Fort. 3562 (cf. Stolper 1977: 263-4 and compare Fort. 3568) and in DSz₆ 11-2. In the case of *anka ... (-na)* constructions pertaining to the performance of a *šip* feast I have also assumed a temporal aspect (NN 1665; NN 1701; NN 2225). It may be, however, that the expression was felt to be somewhat motivative or explicative in that it provides the reason for and the context in which the recorded transaction took place: meat rations are issued *at the occasion of* the religious feast. For more details on the *anka* constructions in Achaemenid Elamite see Henkelman 2006: 340-6.

In her analysis of NN 1665 and NN 2259, Koch (1987: 270-1) assumed that the *šip* feast provided only an indirect context: the meat portions for the muleteers at Tikranuš would have been issued only as festive rations unrelated to the offering *per se*. For Koch, the meat could not have been sacrificial meat as she (erroneously) assumed that animal sacrifices were anathema to the Persian administration.¹⁴⁶ From the nine texts on *šip* it is very clear, however, that the meat, grain and wine provided by the administration were intended *for*, not *at* the occasion of the feast (cf. Henkelman 2006: 347-9). Compare also NN 0173 and NN 0654 (see ad NN 0654:3-4), which are almost identical except that the first text speaks of grain “for the gods,” whereas the second records grain “for a *šip*” (for DN).

NN 2259:1-2, 29-30

(journal entry and summary)

text first published, with translation and notes, in Henkelman 2006: 319-47.

Box 1461

Seal: unidentified seal reverse

Transliteration

¹ 14 *hal-mi* ^{HAL}*pár-na-ak-ka₄-na-ma* ^{AN}*šī-īp¹-ma ma-ak-īka₄ du⁷l- [...]* ² ^{HAL}*KI+MIN* ^{AN}*ši-īp*
hu-ī ut¹-taš-da ^{AŠ}*bat-ra-ka₄-ī taš* ^{AN}*ī ITI* ^{MEŠ}*ī [...]*

¹⁴⁶ Note that NN 1665 does not contain the phrase “als Parnakka *šip* machte,” as Koch claims (1987: 271), but rather the impersonal “as *šip* was made.” For a recent study on Zoroastrian animal sacrifices see De Jong 2002.

(...)

²⁹ PAP 4 ME 20 UDU.NITÁ^{MEŠ} *ma-ak-ka₄ be-¹ul¹ 20-um-¹me¹-ma kur-mín^{HAL} áš-ba-¹ia-¹ ³⁰u-da-na^{HAL} u-ri-¹ka₄¹-ma¹ šá-ra¹-man-na be-ul 20-um-¹me-ma¹*

Translation

¹⁻² 14 (head) in accordance with a sealed document from Parnakka were consumed at a *šip* feast, *du*[...]; Parnakka has performed the *šip* feast (at) Pasargadae (in) the month [...].

(...)

²⁹⁻³⁰ (Summary): Altogether 420 head of sheep/goats consumed in the 20th year; allocations from Ašbayauda, Urikama being responsible, in the 20th year.

Notes

- 1 The commodity issued is not stated in each entry in journals. In this case sheep or goats (mentioned in l.29) are at stake.
*du*¹-[...]: possibly otiose.

NN 1701

Box 1048

Seal: PFS 0009* upper edge, right edge, left edge

Transliteration

¹ [X GUD⁷]^{MEŠ} GURUŠ^{MEŠ}-na^{GIŠ} ² [IN⁷ MEŠ⁷]-[na⁷ kur-mín^{HAL} iš- ³ [...]-ba-na^{AS} mu-¹ba-¹ri-¹mar¹ ⁴ [HAL¹ kam-¹pi-ia-na an-¹ka₄¹ ⁵ [AS¹ bat-ra-ka₄-taš^{AN} si- ⁶ ip hu-ud-da-ka₄-¹na¹ ⁷ hu-pi-me-ir kúm¹-ba-^{lower edge} ⁸ ka₄ an-ka₄ [HAL¹ pá-r-na-] ⁹ [ak-¹ka₄ AN¹ [ši-ip hu-] rev. ¹⁰ ud-¹da-iš-da¹ [(-na)] ¹¹ AN¹ ITI¹ MEŠ¹ AN¹ mar-¹ka₄-šá-¹ ¹² na-iš-na^{AS} be-ul 20- ¹³ um-me-na^{HAL} šá-¹man-¹da¹ tal- ¹⁴ li-iš-¹da¹ du-¹um-me¹ ¹⁵ HAL¹ pu-¹ru⁷-na⁷-lik-ki- ¹⁶ mar du-¹iš-¹da¹

Translation

¹⁻⁴ [x] male cattle (grazing) on a stubble field, allocation from iš[...]¹ba from the place Mubari, for Kampiya. ⁴⁻⁶ When a *šip* feast was performed at Pasargadae, ⁷⁻⁸ at that time (the cattle) was consumed⁷, ⁸⁻¹⁰ when Parnakka performed a *šip* feast. ¹¹⁻¹³ Ninth month, 20th year. ¹³⁻¹⁶ Šamanda has written (this receipt), he has received the draft/copy from Puruna.

Notes

- 3 The place name Mubari is mentioned in the present text only.
- 4 Kampiya logically must be the recipient of the cattle, hence the translation “for Kampiya” instead of “from Kampiya” for *Kampiyana*. Kampiya is not,

however, the ultimate recipient: the cattle are put at his disposal (*kurmin*), to be used for a *šip* feast (compare the role of Šuddayauda in NN 1731 below).¹⁴⁷ In his role of allocator of animals, Kampiya recurs in PF 0663 (sheep/goats for Parnakka), PF 0678 (*idem* for Ziššawiš), PF 0696 (animals consumed “before the king” [within the royal domain]) and NN 1865 (receipt of sheep/goats by four individuals, including Kampiya). It cannot be excluded that the scribe named Kampiya of PF 0659 and NN 1717 (allocation of sheep/goats for Parnakka by Harbezza) is the same. Other texts mentioning Kampiya (also: Kaupiya) may pertain to a different individual (PF 0650; PF 0843; PF 1323; PF 1943:37-38; PFa 32; NN 0544; NN 0548; NN 1367; NN 2280; NN 2372:26; NN 2452; NN 2492:1-2).

- 7-8 Hallock’s question mark after *kúm* (NE) in *kúm-ba-ka₄* in the present text and in NN 2225 (below) seems a bit over-cautious. The middle section of the sign has three, not four horizontals. This comparable form is, however, already attested in later Neo-Elamite (see Steve 1992: 81) and the sign is written in same manner elsewhere in the Fortification texts, in contexts where the reading *kúm* (NE) cannot be doubted (e.g., ^(A5)*ku-šu-kúm* in PF 0278; NN 2259:16; NN 2482). But whereas the reading *kúm¹-ba-ka₄* is relatively unproblematic, the meaning of the word is uncertain. *Kumbaka* occurs only here and in NN 2225. As the contexts in which it occurs are very similar to those of *makka*, “consumed” in other texts on *šip* (e.g., NN 1731; see below), the meaning of *kumbaka* could approximately be the same (cf. *EW* s.v. *kum-ba-qa*; Henkelman 2006: 442-3). Alternatively, *kumbaka* could be compared to *kappaka*. The latter verbal form is normally used for travellers and means “summoned.” In a few cases, however, it is used for livestock and may be translated as “ordered” (PF 1987:32 [cf. *EW* s.v. *kap-pa-qa*]; cf. *kappaša*, “he ordered [livestock]” in NN 2544).
- 9-11 Restorations based on NN 2225.
- 11-3 Note that the date (VIII/20) is the same as that of NN 2259:25-6, another text recording allocations for a *šip* feast (see below).
- 15 The personal name ^{HAL}*pu-Iru²-na²* occurs only in this text; the signs are badly damaged, but Hallock’s reading seems at least possible.

NN 1731

Box 1056

Seal: PFS 0009* right edge, left edge

¹⁴⁷ Compare Jones & Stolper [forthc.] on the uses of *kurmin* and *kurma-* in Achaemenid Elamite.

Transliteration

¹ 1 GUD^{MEŠ} za²-ra¹-kaš kur- ² mīn^{HAL} šu-ud-da-ia-u-¹ ³ da^{HAL} kur-da-bat-ti-iš-¹ ⁴ na^{AŠ} bat-ra-ka⁴-taš¹ ^{HAL} ⁵ pár-na-ak-ka⁴ ^{AN} ši-ip ⁶ hu-lut-taš-da ha-me- ⁷ [ir] ma-ak-ka⁴ ^{AN} ITI^{MEŠ} lower edge ⁸ ha-ši-ia-ti-na¹ ^{rev.} ⁹ AŠ be-ul 18-um-me- ¹⁰ man-na^{HAL} ir-ltam⁵-mi-iš-šá ¹¹ tal-li-iš du-um-me¹ ¹² HAL ma-ra-za-ik-ki-mar ¹³ du-iš-da^{AŠ} ba-ir-¹ ¹⁴ šá-an

Translation

¹⁻⁴ 1 head of cattle on pasture, allocation for Šuddayauda the chief of the workers, (at) Pasargadae. ⁵⁻⁶ Parnakka has performed a šip feast; ⁶⁻⁷ at that time (the cattle) was consumed. ⁷⁻¹⁰ Ninth month, 18th year. ¹⁰⁻¹⁴ Irdamišša wrote (this receipt); he has received the draft/copy from Maraza, (at) Persepolis.

Notes

- 1 Instead of Hallock's za²-ra¹-kaš, my reading za²-ra¹-kaš seems preferable (cf. Henkelman 2006: 442). Whereas *zayakaš* is not attested elsewhere as qualification of cattle and does not have an etymology in Elamite or Old Persian, *zarakaš* (OPers. *caraka-, "grazing, on pasture") is used frequently in Achaemenid Elamite.
- 2 Šuddayauda the *kurdabattiš* (OPers. *gr̥dapatīš*, "chief of workers") was the regional director of the central administrative area comprising Persepolis, Pasargadae and Tirazziš (Šīrāz).¹⁴⁸ As Šuddayauda's main responsibility was the organising (the rosters and) the provisions for the workforces active in the area of his jurisdiction, I have translated *kurmin šuddayaudana* as "allocation for Š." rather than "allocation from Š." One should probably imagine that the cattle was removed from another herd, perhaps the royal domain, and 'ear-marked' by Parnakka for consumption within Šuddayauda's jurisdiction. In concrete terms, the animal slaughtered at the occasion of the šip feast at Pasargadae was reserved for workers or other individuals under the command of the chief of workers Šuddayauda.
- 7-10 Interestingly, in another text dated to the ninth month of Dar. 18 (PF 1792), Parnakka orders 30 head of cattle to be issued to Šuddayauda the *kurdabattiš*. Was this cattle also intended for the celebration of the šip feast?

¹⁴⁸ On Šuddayauda and the function of *kurdabattiš* see Hinz 1971: 283-4; Hallock 1985: 594-6; Koch 1981: 235-42; *idem* 1990: 237-45; Aperghis 1999: 183-5; Briant 2002: 426-8; Henkelman 2006: 70-1, 76-7.

NN 2225

Box 1432

Seal: PFS 0009* upper edge, right edge and left edge

Transliteration

¹ ʾ20⁷1 *ba-is-KI+MIN* *ka₄-da-* ² *ka₄ kur-mín* ^{HAL} *ir-še-ʾna-l* ³ *na ʾan-ka₄l* ^{HAL} *pár-na-* ⁴ *ak-ka₄*
^{AN} *ši-ip* ^{AŠ} ⁵ *ap-pi-iš-tap¹-da-* ⁶ *an hu-ut-taš-ʾda-l* ⁷ *na ha-me-ʾir¹ kúm¹* ^{lower edge} ⁸ *ba-ka₄*
^{AN} ^{IT} ^{IMEŠ} ^{AN} *ha-še-l* ^{rev.} ⁹ *ia-ti-iš-na* ¹⁰ ^{AŠ} *be-ul* *20-um-ʾme-man-l* ¹¹ *na* ^{HAL} *šá-man-da ʾtal-li-l*
¹² *iš-da du-um-me* ¹³ ^{HAL} *nu-lti-nu-ia-ik-* ¹⁴ *ki-mar du-iš-da*

Translation

¹⁻³ 20 [or more] ducks⁷, alive, allocation for Iršena. ³⁻⁷ When Parnakka performed a šip feast (at) Appištapdan, ⁷⁻⁸ at that time they were consumed (?), ⁸⁻¹¹ in the ninth month, 20th year. ¹¹⁻¹⁴ Šamanda has written (this receipt); he has received the draft/copy from Nutannuya.

Notes

1 Hallock read the number as ʾ20⁷1, but confessed to some uncertainty as the verticals in ‘20’ slant to the left and are not unlike the number 20 in l.10. Also, the space to the left of the sign in l.1 is broken off, so my “ʾ20⁷1 (or more)” seems justified. Possible alternatives for 20 would be 30, 80 or 90.

1 *Basba* (*ba-is-KI+MIN*) is most probably the Elamite rendering of Akkadian *paspasu*, “duck” (CAD P 222-4 s.v. *paspasu*), but it is uncertain whether exactly the same bird was referred to in Iranian context. See discussion in Stolper 1984b: 107; EW s.v. *ba-is.KI.MIN*; Tuplin 1996: 108 fn. 93.

NN 2225 is the only text known to date in which an allocation of poultry for religious purposes is recorded. In general, fowls stand somewhat apart from the Persepolis economy in that they seem to be reserved for the royal table. Workers and even high-ranking officials never receive poultry as rations (cf. Henkelman 2006: 353-4).

2 Like Šuddayauda in the Persepolis region (cf. ad NN 1731:2), Iršena was regional director of the Fahliyān, the westernmost area under the purview of the Fortification archive.¹⁴⁹ He too had the designation *kurdabattiš*, “chief of workers” (e.g., PF 1368) and this makes it likely that *kurmin iršenana* in our present text should be translated as “allocation for Iršena” (not: “from Iršena”). Being responsible for the provisions needed by work teams in his region, Iršena had at his disposal stocks of grain, which were kept by the suppliers in the region of his jurisdiction and issued upon his command. In this particular case, however, Parnakka (whose seal is impressed in the

¹⁴⁹ On Iršena see Hinz 1971: 281-3; Hallock 1977: 131; *idem* 1985: 596-7; Koch 1990: 240-1; Aperghis 1999: 186; Briant 2002: 426-8.

tablet) provided Iršena directly with poultry at the occasion of the *šip* celebration. The implication seems to be that Iršena had to distribute the meat from the *basbas* among workers or other individuals under his supervision. One aspect of the transaction remains a bit mysterious, however: Appištāpdan is in the Persepolis area (see ad l.5 below), i.e. far from the Fahliyān, the area of Iršena's jurisdiction. Such extra-territorial activities are not uncommon for Iršena (see, e.g., PF 0054 [Matezziš]; PF 1946 [Rakkan]; PF 0585 [Tikraš]), but as yet not fully explained. Other texts in which Iršena is connected to Appištāpdan are: PF 0698 (poultry for the king's table, allocation from I.); PF 1947:21-2, NN 0682 and NN 0988 (rations for workers under I's supervision).

- 4 The signs of ^{AN}fšī-īp¹ are clearly visible on the tablet.
- 5 Attested connections between Appištāpdan and Rakkan (PF 1947:21-2, 93), and Kamenuš (PF 1941:10, 20) locate the former in the Persepolis region (cf. Hallock 1978: 116; Koch 1990: 78-9, 276). Appištāpdan, like Tikranuš (see NN 1665, ad ll.7-8 above), had a marked royal profile. Various kinds of poultry, lambs and a staggering amount of *karukur* fruit (5,000 qts.) were consumed at the royal table in Appištāpdan (PF 0698; NN 0071; NN 0923).¹⁵⁰ The place, which is described as a small village (*humanuš*) may have comprised little more than an extensive plantation (PFa 33: 39-48), in which the festivities and ceremonies may have taken place. For further royal and/or elite contexts in which the place appears see Henkelman 2006: 371 fn. 859. Cultic activities at Appištāpdan are also recorded in PF 0672 and NN 2486:47-8 (see below); in those cases the deputy-director, Ziššawiš presided over a *šip* and *anši* respectively. Note that the actual presence of Ziššawiš (and, by analogy, that of Parnakka) at Appištāpdan is also implied in a text regarding his wages (NN 0049). For attestations of the place name see Vallat 1993: 78 (add PF 0672).
- 7-8 See comment on *kumbaka* in ll.7-8 of NN 1701.

PF 0672

text first published, with translation, in Hallock 1969: 209; German translation in Koch 2005: 233.

Box 1188

Seal: PFS 0011* left edge

Transliteration

upper edge 1 78 BAR ZÍD.DA^{MEŠ} kur-mín 2 DÍŠ¹ ú-ma-ia-na obv. 3 AŠ¹ ap-pi-iš-tap-da-na 4 ANŠ¹ šī-īp-ma
ma-ak-ka⁴ AN¹ ITI^{MEŠ} AN¹ mar-ka⁴-šá-na-iš- 7 na-ma AŠ¹ be-ul 8 25-na-ma 9 HAL¹ zī-iš-šá-ú-iš lower edge

¹⁵⁰ For the royal table being set up in a paradise see Tuplin 1996: 107-8; Briant 2002: 202.

¹⁰ *hu-ut-taš* ¹¹ HAL *hi-tam₅-luk-ka₄* ^{rev. 12} *tal-li-liš-da* ¹³ *bat-ti-ka₄-maš* ¹⁴ HAL *ka₄-me-iz-za li-* ¹⁵
iš-da ^{AŠ} *ba-ir-ša-* ¹⁶ *iš* ^{AN} *ITI* ^{MEŠ} ¹⁷ *ha-na-ma-ak-kaš-* ¹⁸ *na-ma*

Translation

¹⁻² 780 qts. of flour, allocation for/from Umayā, ³⁻⁵ were consumed (at) Appištapdan, during a *šip* feast, ⁵⁻⁸ in the eighth month, 25th year. ⁹⁻¹⁰ Ziššawiš performed (the feast). ¹¹⁻⁸ Hintamukka has written (this receipt); Kamezza has delivered the instruction, at Persepolis, in the tenth month.

Notes

- 2 There is a number of individuals named Umayā in the Fortification archive (cf. Koch 1990: index s.v. Ú-ma-ya). Notwithstanding the connection of the Umayā in PF 0672 with Appištapdan in the Persepolis area (cf. ad NN 2225:5), this individual may have been the same as the grain supplier in the Kāmfirūz region, northwest of Persepolis. In a few cases the latter Umayā allocates grain that is subsequently transported from his region to Persepolis (PF 1594; NN 1796) and this makes a connection to Appištapdan possible as well. The Umayā in the Kāmfirūz region occurs in about fifty texts, mostly dealing with rations for workers, travellers and animals. Two texts are of special interest: in PF 0755 and NN 0722 Umayā allocates *tarmu* (a kind of grain) and grain for a *lan* offering and “for the gods” respectively. It seems likely that Umayā had a similar role in the transaction documented by PF 0672: he allocated grain for a *šip* celebration. No recipient is mentioned in PF 0672, however, and that the tablet is sealed with the seal of the deputy-director, Ziššawiš (see ad l.9 below), suggesting that he initiated the transaction. This would seem to support an analysis of *kurmin umayana*, as “allocation for Umayā,” (cf. Hallock’s “entrusted to Umayā”), in analogy to the cases of Kampiya (NN 1701), Šuddayauda (NN 1731) and Iršena (NN 2225) in other *šip* texts. Deciding between these two options is difficult and perhaps unnecessary since both aspects of the allocation (to and from Umayā) may be implied in the text. My “allocation for/from Umayā” should be understood in this light: flour was put at Umayā’s disposal at the command of Ziššawiš subsequently distributed by the former to people attending the *šip* celebration at Appištapdan. Note, finally, that the determinative used in the personal name ^{DIŠ} *ú-ma-ia* (^{DIŠ} instead of common ^{HAL}) in PF 0672 may be an indication of senior rank (see Giovinazzo 1989: 212-5).
- 3 Hallock later corrected his initial reading ^{HAL} *ap-pi-iš-man-da-na* (as printed in Hallock 1969: 209) to ^{AŠ} *ap-pi-iš-tap-da-na* (cf. ^{AŠ} *ha-pi-iš-da-ap-da* in PF 0698). On the place see ad NN 2225:5 above.
- 9 Ziššawiš was the deputy-director of the Persepolis administration and lieutenant of Parnakka. His seal, PFS 0011*, is imprinted upon the tablet’s left edge. On the man and his seal see Hinz 1971: 302; Hallock 1985: 589-90; Lewis 1985: 114-5; Koch 1990: 227-33; Garrison 2000: 141-3 (PFS 0011*). Koch (1993:

82; *idem* 2005: 233) explained the performance of the *šip* feast by Ziššawiš instead of Parnakka as a sign of the latter's death or retirement. Yet, PF 1828 suggest that Parnakka was still in function in the eleventh month of Dar. 25 (he was replaced, by Ašbazana (Aspathines), but the latter's activity is not attested before IV/28).

- 16-7 Among the texts that, like PF 0672, are dated to the eight month of Dar. 25, two are of particular interest in the present context. PF 1827 is a letter-order (dd. 12/VIII/25) from Ziššawiš to the wine-supplier Bakawiš, dealing with a delivery of 240 qts. of wine to people at Radukkaš (*radukkašbe*): "let the use it 'upon' an *aktittaš* (*aktittaš ukku huddašni*), the king has ordered (it)." The context (letter-order, amount of wine, date and the connections between Bakawiš and Pasargadae) certainly renders the tentative explanation of the *hapax* ^{AS}*ak-ti-ut-taš* as term for a feast or ceremonial structure (EW s.v. *h.ak-ti-ut-taš*) an attractive one. In the absence of more concrete indications, no firm ground can be reached, however. The second text, NN 0087, is also a letter-order by Ziššawiš (also dd. 12/VIII/25), this time concerning flour that, upon the orders of the king, is to be issued to female servants of the Pasargadae-people (^{SAL}*pu-hu* ^{HAL}*bat¹-ra-ka₄-taš-be-na*). Separate groups of servants are rarely mentioned in the archive, let alone groups of female servants (the only other case is NN 2202:15 [18]). The 300 servants of Parnakka are mentioned in several texts and may have constituted the director's professional entourage (on these and other elite servant task groups see Henkelman 2003b: 133-7). The servants of the people of Pasargadae may have been such a professional task group as well. One is tempted to connect them to the temple of the Athena-like goddess (Anāhitā?) at Pasargadae, as described by Plutarch (Art. 3.2). Female cultic personnel in Anāhitā sanctuaries are attested for the Achaemenid period (Plut. Art. 27.4); women performing religious tasks are also known from the Elamite past and from one Fortification text (NN 2259:19-20; Henkelman 2006: 335-7). The designation *puhu* in NN 0087 would certainly be fitting for such cultic personnel (*ibid.* 205-7). In short, Darius' order of flour for "female servants of the Pasargadae-people" may relate to the locale sanctuary and to a particular cultic activity, perhaps another *šip* feast. Unfortunately, for lack of conclusive evidence renders this interpretation has to remain speculative.

NN 2486:47-8

(journal entry; journal summary not preserved)

Box 2023

Seal: unidentified seal left edge

Transliteration

⁴⁷ 7 (+) 8 QA 3 ^{GIŠ}pi-ut 3 ^{GIŠ}kaz-la 1 ^{GIŠ}du-ud-da 8 QA ^{GIŠ}ha-su-ur hal-mi ^{HAL}zī-iš-šá-u-ú-iš-na
li-ka₄ ^{AN}an-ši-ma ⁴⁸ma-ak-ka₄ ^{AŠ}ap-pi-iš-tap-da-an«-an» an-ka₄ ^{HAL}zī-iš-šá-u-ú-iš ^{AN}an-ši-
ma hu-ut-taš-da ^{AN}ITI^{MEŠ} ^{AN}ha-na-ma-kaš be-ul 15-na

Translation

⁴⁷ 78 qts. (of fruit), (namely) 30 qts. of figs, 30 qts. of *kazla*, 30 qts. of mulberries, 8 qts. of apples[?], have been delivered (in accordance with) a sealed document from Ziššawiš. ⁴⁷⁻⁸ (The fruit) has been consumed (during) an *anši* feast (at) Appištapdan, ⁴⁸ when Ziššawiš performed an *anši* feast (or: used it for an *anši* feast). Tenth month, 15th (*recte*: 16th) year.

Notes

- ⁴⁷ The meaning of *pit* (“figs”) and *dudda* (“mulberries”) is assured by Aramaic glosses (PF 2024 [*pit*], PF 0215 and PF 0216 [*dudda*]). Since *hasur* occurs several times as ration for workers, the interpretation “apple” (cf. Akk. *ḥašḥūru*, “apple” [CAD H 140 s.v. *ḥašḥūru* 2; Hallock 1969: 693]) seems more convincing than “almond” (EW s.v. *GIŠ.ha-su-ur*). The fruit species known as *kazla* also figures among commodities issued as rations; no convincing interpretation has been suggested to date (the EW s.v. *GIŠ.kas-la* thinks of “Aprikosen”).

Fruit is only rarely used for cultic purposes. Apart from the present text, there are five more attestations: PF 0768 (dates for *lan*); PF 0769 (figs for *lan*); NN 2486: 25, 26, 45-6 (dates and *hasur* for *lan*).

- ⁴⁷ Hallock compared, in his manuscript, the expression *anšima makka* to *šipma makka*, “consumed during a *šip* feast,” in PF 0672 (see above). This seems to imply that he understood the word as [anši.m.a], i.e. having the ‘locative’ suffix *-ma* (cf. EW s.v. d.an-ši). Yet, the subsequent expression PN *anšima huttašda*, parallels PN *šip huttašda*, “PN performed a *šip* feast” (e.g., NN 2225). In theory, this could lead to the conclusion that the word is *anšima*, not *anši*. As nouns on *-ma* are not to be expected in Elamite, however, the most probable solution is to take the word as *anši* after all. The second phrase could then be translated as “PN prepared it as *anši*,” but I would prefer to take *-ma* in the second ^{AN}*an-ši-ma* as otiose and translate “when PN performed an *anši* feast” (cf. PF 0672).

At any rate, it seems unlikely that *both* occurrences of ^{AN}*an-ši-ma* in NN 2486:47-8 are mere scribal errors for ^{AN}*ši-ip-ma* (^{AN}«^{AN}»*ši-<ip>-ma*).

- ⁴⁸ The fruit journal NN 2486 concerns several consecutive years (at least Dar. 14-16). The different years are treated in separate sections, each of which has a fixed order. In accordance with general practice, allocations for religious purposes are listed first. NN 2486-45-6 (fruit for *lan*) is the first entry for Dar. 16. The next entry, the present text, is dated to Dar. 15, but this is, as Hallock already noted, evidently a mistake for Dar. 16.

NN 2259:25-6, 29-30

(journal entry and summary)

text first published, with translation and notes, in Henkelman 2006: 319-47

Box 1461

Seal: unidentified seal reverse

Transliteration

²⁵ 12 ^{HAL}nu-du-^{ma}l-tam₅ ^{du}l-šá ^{pu}l-ma-^{zi}l-iš-^{na}? ^{AN}na^l-ap^l-^{pi}-na^l ²⁶ an-ka₄ ^{HAL}pár-na-ak-^{ka}₄ ^{AN}ši-ip hu-ut-^{ta}š-da ^{AN}mar-^{ka}₄-šá-na^l[(^{-iš})]

(...)

²⁹ PAP 4 ME 20 UDU.NITÁ^{MEŠ} ma-ak-ka₄ be-^{ul}l 20-um-^{me}l-ma kur-mín ^{HAL}áš-ba-^{ia}-l ³⁰ u-da-na ^{HAL}u-ri-^{ka}₄-l-ma ^{šá}-ra^l-man-na be-ul 20-um-^{me}-ma^l

Translation

²⁵⁻⁶ 12 (head) Nudumatam received for (a) *pumaziš* for the gods, when Parnakka performed a/the *šip* feast, in the 8th month.

(...)

²⁹⁻³⁰ (Summary): Altogether 420 head of sheep/goats consumed in the 20th year; allocations from Ašbayauda, Urikama being responsible, in the 20th year.

Notes

25-6 All Hallock's restorations seem reliable, including the reading ^{pu}l-ma-^{zi}l-iš-^{na}l. The word is not otherwise known, nor is Nudumatam (cf. Henkelman 2006: 340).

NN 2402

Box 1501

Seals: unidentified seal reverse; possibly seal PFS 0624 left edge

Transliteration

¹ 15 mar-ri-iš ² ^{GIŠ}GEŠTIN^{MEŠ} kur-^lmín^l ³ ^{HAL}ki^l-zī-zī-na ⁴ ^{HAL}um[?]-^{ma}-na-ap-pi ⁵ um-^{ma}-šá^l ^{AN}ši- ⁶ ip ha hu-^{ut}-l ⁷ taš-da ^{AS}iš[?]-l lower edge ⁸ ^{gi}-^{ma} ^{AS}be-^{ul}l rev. ⁹ 22-^{um}-me-na^l

Translation

¹⁻⁵ 150 qts. of wine, allocation from Kizizi, Ummanappi acquired. ⁵⁻⁷ Therewith he has performed a *šip* feast, ⁷⁻⁸ at Išgi, ⁸⁻⁹ 22nd year.

Notes

3 The sign KI in ^{HAL}ki^l-zī-zī-na misses one vertical. The same Kizizi occurs in PF 0371 (with seal PFS 0624), where he allocates wine to a certain Šipipi at

Partukki who delivered it “for the gods.” In two other tablets, PF 1590 and NN 1172, a Kizizi is involved in allocating grain rations. This individual may be located (via the occurrence of Zazzap and seal PFS 0044s) in the Fahliyān region; unfortunately there is no clue that could link him to the Kizizi of NN 2402 (cf. Koch 1990: 187 fn. 773).

- 4 Hallock’s reading ^{HAL}um²-lma-na-ap-pi is at least possible. The form is known as an Elamite name (*Hubanahpi; cf. EW s.v. hh.um(?)-ma-na-ap-pi and v.um-man-ab-ba), but does not occur elsewhere in the available Fortification corpus.
- 6 I have taken *ha* in *ha huttašda* as a general resumptive pronoun (here: “therewith”), in line with Hallock’s (1969: 9, 685) and Stolper’s views on this (1984b: 25-6; 2004: 76-7); cf. Henkelman 2006: 338 ad l.20.
- 7-8 The reading ^{AS}iš⁷-gi-lma seems reliable. Išgi is attested in this text only. The name is suffixed by the regular locative element -ma; I fail to see any support for “die Innenstadt von Išge” (EW s.v. h.iš(?)-gi-ma).

NN 0654

Box 543

Seal: PFS 0154 left edge

Transliteration

¹ 16 ŠE.BAR^{MES} ² kur-lmín¹ ^{HAL}man-ia-lak-l ³ ka-na ^{HAL}um- ⁴ ma-na-na du¹-šá ⁵ AN¹ zī-liz-kur-ra-^{lower edge} ⁶ na lšī-lip^{rev.} ⁷ ha hu-lud-l-da-iš-da ⁸ AS⁸ pu-lmu-lma be-ul 24- ⁹ um-me-na¹

Translation

¹⁻⁴ 160 qts. of grain, allocation from Manyakka, Ummanana received. ⁵⁻⁷ Therewith he has performed a šip feast for Zizkurra, ⁸ at Pumu, ⁸⁻⁹ in the 24th year.

Notes

- 2-3 There are probably two or more individuals named Manyakka active in the Persepolis economy. The one mentioned in the present text was a grain supplier who shared a seal (PFS 0154) with his colleague Napzilla. Together they were responsible for grain supplies for the places Pumu and Kazma (cf. Koch 1990: 55 fn. 258, 170 with fn. 708). Besides NN 0564, four texts record grain allocations by Napzilla and Manyakka “for the gods” (PF 0363; PF 0364; NN 0173; NN 0927). On some of these texts see Henkelman 2005a: 154-5, 160 with fn. 50.

Note that NN 0654 bears the impression of only one seal, PFS 0154. If used with regular memorandum-type texts, the single-seal protocol indicates that the holder of the seal has senior authority (and therefore counter-sealing is not required). Thus, memorandum-type texts issued by the offices

of Parnakka and Ziššawiš (such as the *šip* texts PF 0672; NN 1701; NN 1731; NN 2225) have just one seal. That PFS 0154 is the only seal applied to NN 0654 is remarkable, because this seal seems to be a normal supplier-seal, which in most cases is applied in the counter-sealing protocol, i.e. with two sealings, one by the supplier and one by the recipient. The only exception apart from NN 0654 is PF 0018, but the latter is a text on the transport of commodities; such texts often have only one seal; besides, both individuals mentioned in PF 0018, Manyakka and Napzilla, are using PFS 0154. Is the single seal protocol used on NN 0654 a matter of coincidence, or does it mean an adaptation to the prestige sealing protocol used on other *šip* texts?¹⁵¹

- 3-4 The Ummanana who performs the *šip* feast at Pumu (in the present text) and the Ummana who sacrifices grain “to the gods” at Pumu (NN 0173) are probably one and the same. It is very probable that the grain “for the gods” was also sacrificed at the occasion of a *šip* feast, since the amount (160 qts.) is the same). By contrast, Hupannunu the *šatin* who sacrifices grain and sesame “to the gods,” presumably at Hunar (PF 0366; NN 2235 [cf., e.g., PF 0479 for Hunar]), may be a different person than Ummana(na). There is also an Ummanana (also Hupannana) who was a brewer and beer supplier based at Kurdušum. He may have been the same as our Ummanana (cf. Koch 1987: 272), but direct evidence is lacking.
- 4 There is one horizontal short in the sign DU in *du^l-šá*.
- 5-6 The god Zizkurra is thus far only attested in this text. As Koch (1987: 268) notes, the name sounds Elamite. Perhaps the second part is a form of the root *kurra*- “to allocate.” If so, the first part of the name, *ziz*, might be interpreted as a reduplicated form of *zit*, the Elamite word for “luck” or “well-being.”¹⁵² An Elamite god named Zit (^{AN}*zít-it*) appears in the opening paragraph of the Old Elamite *Narām-Sîn Treaty* from the 23rd century BC (EKI 2 I.6; Hinz 1967: 91, 93). Given the fact that he or she is mentioned as the fifth deity, Zit must have been of some importance. The element *zit* also occurs in names from the Old

¹⁵¹ The only exception is NN 2402, which follows, with two seals, the standard counter-sealing protocol. NN 2259 is a journal; such texts often have one seal, but for different reasons (they are sealed by a controller). I am grateful to Mark Garrisons for his suggestion on PFS 0154.

¹⁵² One could think of a development **zizitkurra* > **ziztkurra* > *zizkurra*. Syncopation of the vowel in the second syllable of reduplicated forms is common in Elamite (cf. **bebeti*- > *bepi*-, “to rebel,” **gigila*- > *gikla*-, “to command, order,” and **hahapu*- > *hahpu*-, “to hear”). The Akkadian equivalent of *zitme* [zit.m] is *šalāmu*, “health, well-being, welfare” (CAD Š/1 206-8 s.v. *šalāmu* A; Steve 1967: 10). On *zit*, *zitme* and *sitme* see also Hinz 1950: 290 (*siti* = “heil, gesund”); Lambert 1965: 34 (“santé”); Vallat 1983: 11 (“bonheur”); EW s.vv. *si-it-me*, *zi-it-me*, *zi-ti-in* (“Gesundheit, Wohlergehen”); Malbran-Labat 1995: 204 (“prospérité”); Koch 2005: 284 fn. 9 (Zit = “Heil,” *zitme* = “Gesundheit, Wohlergehen”).

Babylonian and Neo-Elamite periods (Zadok 1984: 48; Vallat 2000: 1068). Furthermore, the divine name Zit has been recognised by François Vallat in two Mesopotamian magical spells, where it occurs in the forms Šiti and Sit (Vallat 2000: 1068; cf. 2002/03: 530, 538).¹⁵³ The Achaemenid Elamite Zizkurra, whose name probably means something like “bestow(er) of well-being,” may be a continuation of the old god Zit.

- 6 Enough traces of the sign IGI (ši) in ʾši-lip are preserved to be reasonable certain of Hallock’s reading. That the determinative indicating divinity (AN) is omitted is because it has already been prefixed to Zizkurra (cf. Henkelman 2006: 162 fn. 341, 442).
- 8 The place Pumu occurs in seven texts (PF 0016; PF 0363; PF 0488; NN 0173; NN 0654; NN 0873; NN 1169). Apart from the present text, two other documents deal with cultic activity at Pumu: PF 0363 (Akšimašra sacrifices “to the gods” at a *kušukum* [cf. PF 0364]) and NN 0173 (Ummana [= Ummanana] sacrifices “to the gods”). The connection between Manyakka and Iššante and seal PFS 0047 (PF 0419) indicates that Pumu may be situated in the region of Liduma, Tandari and Kurdušum (see, e.g., PF 0392; PF 0394; PF 0037), the connection with Šimut-dap (Fort. 5901) points to the place Šurkudur (PF 0576; PF 0577; NN 1952). In short, Pumu is to be located in the Fahliyān region.

¹⁵³ Texts: amulet in Lambert 1976: 62 Face A l.6 = Van Dijk 1982: 102 (Šiti laḥ, “I offer to Zit”) and S 7/1600 in Cavigneaux & Al-Rawi 1994: 73 (Sit laḥ, “I offer to Zit”). See also Henkelman 2006: 210-1.

Bibliography

- AMIET, P. 1966, *Élam*, Auvers-sur-Oise.
- 1973, La glyptique de la fin de l'Élam, *Arts Asiatiques* 28: 3-32.
- AMIGUES, S. 2003, Pour la table du Grand Roi, *Journal des Savants* 2003: 3-59.
- APERGHIS, G.G. 1999, Storehouses and Systems at Persepolis: Evidence from the Persepolis Fortification Tablets, *JESHO* 42.2: 152-93.
- ARFA'I, A. 1999, La grande route Persépolis-Suse. Une lecture des tablettes provenant des Fortifications de Persépolis, *Topoi* 9.1: 33-45.
- BARTH, F. 1961, *Nomads of South Persia. The Basseri Tribe of the Khamseh Confederacy*, Oslo.
- BASELLO, G.P. 2002, Elam and Babylonia: the Evidence of the Calendars, in: A. Panaino & G. Pettinato (eds.), *Ideologies as Intercultural Phenomena. Proceedings of the Third Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project Held in Chicago, USA, October 27-31, 2000* (Melammu Symposia 3), Milano: 13-36.
- BENVENISTE, É. 1951, Études sur le vieux-perse, *BSLP* 47: 21-51.
- BONGENAAR, A.C.V.M. 1997, *The Neo-Babylonian Eabbar Temple at Sippar: its Administration and its Prosopography* (PIHANS 80), Istanbul.
- BÖRKER-KLÄHN, J. 1982, *Alt Vorderasiatische Bildstelen und vergleichbare Felsreliefs* (BaF 4), Mainz a.Rh.
- BOUCHARLAT, R. 1984, Monuments religieux de la Perse achéménide. État des questions, in: G. Roux (ed.), *Temples et sanctuaires* (Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient 7), Lyon: 119-35.
- 2003, The Persepolis Area in the Achaemenid Period, Some Reconsiderations, 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: 260-5.
- BOUCHARLAT, R. & BENECH, Ch. 2002, Organisation et aménagement de l'espace à Pasargades. Reconnaissances archéologiques de surface 1999 et 2002, *ARTA* 2002.001 [see www.achemenet.com].
- BOYCE, M. 1982, *A History of Zoroastrianism*, vol. II: *Under the Achaemenids* (HdO 1.8.1.2.2a/2), Leiden – Köln.
- BOYCE, M. & GRENET, F. 1991, *A History of Zoroastrianism*, vol. III: *Zoroastrianism under Macedonian and Roman Rule* (HdO 1.8.1.2.2a/3), Leiden – New York – København – Köln.
- BRIANT, P. 1982, *Rois, tributs et paysans. Études sur les formations tributaires du Moyen-Orient ancien*, Paris.
- 1985, Les Iraniens d'Asie Mineure après la chute de l'Empire achéménide, *DHA* 11: 167-95.
- 1991, Le roi est mort: vive le roi! Remarques sur les rites et rituels de succession chez les Achéménides, in: J. Kellens (ed.), *La religion iranienne à l'époque achéménide. Actes du Colloque de Liège, 11 décembre 1987* (IrAnt Suppl. 5), Gent: 1-11.
- 2002, *From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire*, Winona Lake 2002 [French edition: *Histoire de l'empire perse, de Cyrus à Alexandre*, Paris 1996].

- BROSIUS, M. 1996, *Women in ancient Persia (559-331 BC)*, Oxford.
- CALMEYER, P. 1973, Zur Genese altiranischer Motive, *AMI* 6: 135-52, pls. 30-40.
- 1975, The Subject of the Achaemenid Tomb Reliefs, in: F. Bagherzadeh (ed.), *Proceedings of the IIIrd Annual Symposium on Archaeological Research in Iran*, Tehran: 233-42.
- 1978, Das Grabrelief von Ravansar, *AMI* 11: 73-85, pls. 15.1-22.
- 1980a, Textual Sources for the Interpretation of Achaemenian Palace Decorations, *Iran* 18: 55-63.
- 1980b, review of D. Stronach, *Pasargadae*, Oxford 1978, *ZA* 70: 297-307.
- 1980c, Zur Genese altiranischer Motive, VII. Achsnagel in Form von Betenden, *AMI* 13: 99-111, pls. 21-8.
- 1982, Zur Genese altiranischer Motive, VIII. Die “Statistische Landkarte des Perserreiches” – I, *AMI* 15: 105-87, pls. 16-24.
- 1983, review of M. Root, *The King and Kingship* (Acta Iranica 9), Leiden 1979, *OLZ* 78.2: 169-73.
- 1988, s.v. Mālamīr, A. Lage und Forschungsgeschichte; C: Archäologisch, *RLA* VII: 275-6, 281-7.
- 1996, Achaimenidische Möbel und ¹⁵kussû ša šarrute, in: G. Herrmann (ed.), *The Furniture of Western Asia, Ancient and Traditional. Papers of the Conference held at the Institute of Archaeology, University College London, June 28 to 30, 1993*, Mainz: 223-31, pls. 71-7.
- CAMERON, G.G. 1959, The “Daiva” Inscription of Xerxes: in Elamite, *WO* 2: 470-6, pls. 13-6.
- CARTER, E. 1994, Bridging the Gap between the Elamites and the Persians in Southeastern Khuzistan, in: H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, A. Kuhrt & M.C. Root (eds.), *Achaemenid History VIII: Continuity and Change*, Leiden: 65-95.
- 1999, Neuelamische Kunstperiode (Neo-Elamite Period = NE), *RLA* IX, Berlin – New York: 283-290.
- CARTER, E. & STOLPER, M.W. 1984, *Elam, Surveys of Political History and Archaeology*, Berkeley – London.
- CAVIGNEAUX, A. & AL-RAWI, F.N.H. 1994, Charmes de Sippar et de Nippur, in: H. Gasche, M. Tanret, C. Jansen & A. Degraeve (eds.), *Cinquante-deux réflexions sur le Proche-Orient ancien offertes en hommage à Léon De Meyer* (MHEO 2), Leuven: 73-89.
- CHRISTENSEN, A. 1944, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, Copenhagen [second, revised edition].
- CUMONT, F. 1901, Le Zeus Stratios de Mithridate, *RHR* 43: 47-57.
- DE JONG, A.F. 1997, *Traditions of the magi: Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature*, Leiden.
- 2002, Animal Sacrifice in Ancient Zoroastrianism: a Ritual and its Interpretations, in: A.I. Baumgarten (ed.), *Sacrifice in Religious Experience* (Studies in the History of Religions 93), Leiden – Boston – Köln: 127-48.
- DELAUNAY, J.A. 1976, Remarques sur quelques noms de personne des archives élamites de Persépolis, *StIr* 5.1: 9-31.
- DE MIROSCHEDE, P. 1978, Stratigraphie de la période néo-élamite à Suse (c. 1100 - c. 540), *Paléorient* 4: 213-28.
- 1981a, Fouilles du chantier Ville Royale II à Suse (1975-1977), *CDAFI* 12: 9-136.
- 1981b, Observations dans les couches néo-élamites au nord-ouest du tell de Ville Royale à Suse, *CDAFI* 12: 143-67.
- 1981c, Prospections archéologiques au Khuzistan en 1977, *CDAFI* 12: 169-92.

- 1985, La fin du royaume d'Anšan et de Suse et la naissance de l'Empire perse, *ZA* 75: 265-306.
- 1990, La fin de l'Élam: essai d'analyse et d'interprétation, *IrAnt* 25: 47-95.
- DE VAAN, J.M.C.T. 1995, "Ich bin eine Schwertklinge des Königs." *Die Sprache des Bēl-ibni* (AOAT 242), Kevelaer – Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- DE WAELE, É. 1972, Quelques aspects de la religion d'Élam à travers l'art rupestre d'époque néo-élamite d'Izeh/Malamir, in: *Proceedings of the 1st Annual Symposium on Archaeological Research in Iran*, Tehran.
- 1973, Une page d'art iranien: les reliefs rupestres d'Izeh Malamir, *Archéologia* 60: 31-45.
- 1976, Remarques sur les inscriptions élamites de Šekāf-e Salmān et Kūl-e Farah près Izeh, I: leur corrélation avec les bas-reliefs, *Le Muséon* 89: 441-50.
- 1979, Les processions avec statues divines sur les reliefs rupestres élamites Kul-e Farah III et Kul-e Farah VI (Izeh), in: *Akten des VII. Internationalen Kongresses für Iranische Kunst und Archäologie, München, 7.-10. September 1976* (AMI Erg.Bd. 6), Berlin: 93-100.
- 1981, Travaux archéologiques à Šekāf-e Salmān et Kūl-e Farah près d'Izeh (Mālamir), *IrAnt* 16: 45-61.
- 1989, Musicians and musical instruments on the rock reliefs in the Elamite sanctuary of Kul-e Farah (Izeh), *Iran* 27: 29-44.
- DIGARD, J.-P. 1989, Baktiārī Tribe, I: Ethnography, *EnIr* III: 553-9.
- DOSSIN, G. 1927, *Autres textes sumériens et accadiens* (MDP 18), Paris.
- DUCHÊNE, J. 1986, La localisation de Huhnur, in: L. de Meyer, H. Gasche & F. Vallat (eds.), *Fragmenta Historiae Elamicae. Mélanges offerts à M.-J. Steve*, Paris: 65-74.
- GARRISON, M.B. 1998, The Seals of Ašbazana (Aspathines), in: M. Brosius & A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Achaemenid History XI: Studies in Persian History. Essays in Memory of David M. Lewis*, Leiden: 115-131.
- 1999, s.v. Fire altars, in: *Enclr* IX: 613-9.
- 2000, Achaemenid iconography as evidenced by glyptic art: subject matter, social function, audience and diffusion, in: Chr. Ühlinger (ed.), *Images as media. sources for the cultural history of the Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean (1st millennium BCE)* (OBO 175), Fribourg – Göttingen: 115-63.
- GARRISON, M.B. & ROOT, M.C. 2001, *Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets*, vol. I: *Images of Heroic Encounter*, 2 vols. (OIP 117), Chicago.
- GERCHEVITCH, I. 1969 [1970], Iranian Nouns and Names in Elamite Garb, *TPS* 1969: 165-200.
- GIGNOUX, P. 1976, review of *Monumentum H.S. Nyberg* (AI 4-7), Leiden 1975, *StIr* 5.2: 303-10.
- GIOVINAZZO, G. 1989 [1991], « NP hiše » dans les textes achéménides, *AION* 49: 209-17.
- GNOLI, Gh. 1974, Politique religieuse et conception de la royauté sous les Achéménides, in: J. Duchesne-Guillemin et al. (eds.), *Commémoration Cyrus. Actes du congrès de Shiraz en 1971 et autres études rédigées à l'occasion du 2500^e anniversaire de la fondation de l'Empire perse*, vol. II (AI 2), Leiden: 117-90.
- GOUKOWSKY, P. 2001, *Appien, Histoire Romaine*, vol. 7: *Livre XII, La guerre de Mithridate*, Paris.
- GRILLOT, F. 1983, Le mécanisme des groupes nominaux en élamite, *JA* 271: 207-218.
- 1984, Trinôme de la royauté en Élam, *StIr* 13: 185-91.
- 1986, Une tablette achéménide inédite, *AMI* 19: 149-50.

- 1987, *Éléments de grammaire élamite* (Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, synthèse 29), Paris.
- GRILLOT, F. & VALLAT, F. 1984, Dédicace de Šilhak-Inšušinak à Kiririša, *IrAnt* 19: 21-9.
- GRILLOT-SUSINI, F., HERRENSCHMIDT, C. & MALBRAN-LABAT, F. 1993, La version élamite de la trilingue de Behistun: une nouvelle lecture, *JA* 281: 19-59.
- HALLOCK, R.T. 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: *CHI* II: 588-609 [first published in 1971 as an advance offprint with a preface by I. Gershevitch].
- HANSMAN, J. 1975, An Achaemenian Stronghold, in: *Monumentum H.S. Nyberg*, vol. III (AI 6), Leiden: 289-312.
- HENKELMAN, W.F.M. 2002, Exit der Posaunenbläser: On lance-guards and lance-bearers in the Persepolis Fortification archive, *ARTA* 2002.007 [www.achemenet.com].
- 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 series 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.
- 2003c, Defining 'Neo-Elamite History,' review-article of M. Waters, *A Survey of Neo-Elamite History*, Helsinki 2000, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 60.3-4: 251-63.
- 2005a, Animal sacrifice and 'external' exchange in the Persepolis Fortification Tablets, in: 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 = AOAT 330), Münster: 137-65.
- 2005b, De goden van Iran: (breuk)lijnen in een religieus landschap, ca. 4000-330 v.Chr., *Phoenix* 51: 130-72 [in Dutch].
- 2006, *The Other Gods Who Are. Studies in Elamite-Iranian Acculturation Based on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets*, diss. Leiden University, Leiden [to be published as *Achaemenid History XIV*].
- HERRERO, P. & GLASSNER, J.J. 1991, Haft-Tépé: choix de textes II, *IrAnt* 26: 39-80.
- HERZ, P. 2002, Sacrifice and Sacrificial Ceremonies of the Roman Imperial Army, in: A.I. Baumgarten (ed.), *Sacrifice in Religious Experience* (Studies in the History of Religions 93), Leiden – Boston – Köln: 81-100.
- HINZ, W. 1950, Elamisches, *ArOr* 18.1-2: 282-306.
- 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.
- 1966, Nachlese elamischer Denkmäler, *IrAnt* 6: 43-7.
- 1964, *Das Reich Elam*, Stuttgart.
- 1967, Elams Vertrag mit Narām-Sîn von Akkade, *ZA* 58: 66-96.
- 1970, Die elamischen Buchungstäfelchen der Darius-Zeit, *Orientalia* 39: 421-40.

- 1971, Persia c. 2400–1800 B.C., in I.E.S. Edwards, C.J. Gadd & N.G.L. Hammond (eds.), *Early History of the Middle East* (CAH 1.2), Cambridge: 644–80.
- 1975, *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen* (GOF 3.3), Wiesbaden.
- HINZ, W. & KOCH, H. 1987, *Elamisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols. (AMI Erg.Bd. 17), Berlin.
- HOUTKAMP, J. 1991, Some Remarks on Fire Altars of the Achaemenid Period, in: J. Kellens (ed.), *La religion iranienne à l'époque achéménide. Actes du Colloque de Liège, 11 décembre 1987* (IrAnt Suppl. 5), Gent: 23–48.
- HULTGÅRD, A. 2004, Ritual Community Meals in Ancient Iranian Religion, in: M. Stausberg (ed.), *Zoroastrian Rituals in Context* (Numen Book Series 102), Leiden – Köln: 367–88.
- HÜSING, G. 1908, *Der Zagros und seine Völker. Eine archäologische Skizze* (Der Alte Orient 9.3/4), Leipzig.
- 1910, Die elamische Sprachforschung, *Memnon* 4: 5–40.
- JÉQUIER, G., Appendice: description du site de Malamir, V. Scheil, *Textes élamites-anzanites, première série* (MDP 3), Paris 1901: 133–43, pls. 27–33.
- JONES, C.E. & STOLPER, M.W. 2006, Fortification Texts Sold at the Auction of the Erlenmeyer Collection, ARTA 2006.001 [see www.achemenet.com].
- [forthcoming], Achaemenid Elamite Administrative Tablets, 2: The Qašr-i Abu Našr Tablet, ARTA.
- KLEBER, K. 2005, Von Bierproduzenten und Gefängnisaufsehern: dezentrale Güterverteilung und Buchhaltung in Eanna, in: 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 = AOAT 330), Münster: 290–321.
- KOCH, H. 1977, *Die religiösen Verhältnisse der Dareioszeit, Untersuchungen an Hand der elamischen Persepolistäfelchen* (GOF 3.4), Wiesbaden [= diss. Göttingen 1976].
- 1980, Steuern in der achämenidischen Persis?, *ZA* 70: 105–137.
- 1981, 'Hofschatzwarte' und 'Schatzhäuser' in der Persis, *ZA* 71: 232–47.
- 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.
- 1987, Götter und ihre Verehrung im achämenidischen Persien, *ZA* 77: 239–78.
- 1988, Zur Religion der Achämeniden, *ZAW* 100: 393–405.
- 1990, *Verwaltung und Wirtschaft im persischen Kernland zur Zeit der Achämeniden* (TAVO Beih. B-89), Wiesbaden.
- 1993, Königliche Hofhaltung und die Anlagen in Persepolis, in: H. Koch, *Achämeniden-Studien*, Wiesbaden: 61–91.
- 2002, Iranische Religion im achaimendischen Zeitalter, in: R.G. Kratz (ed.), *Religion und Religionskontakte im Zeitalter der Achämeniden*, Gütersloh: 11–26.
- 2004, IV. Texte aus Iran, in: M. Lichtenstein (ed.), *Texte zum Rechts- und Wirtschaftsleben* (TUAT ns. 1), Gütersloh: 221–48.
- 2005, V. Texte aus Iran, in: M. Lichtenstein (ed.), *Staatsverträge, Herrscherinschriften und andere Dokumente zur politischen Geschichte* (TUAT ns. 2), Gütersloh: 283–306.
- KÖNIG, F.W. 1965, *Die elamischen Königsinschriften* (AfO Beiheft 16), Graz.

- KRAWULSKY, D. 1978, *Īrān - Das Reich der Īlhāne, eine topographisch-historische Studie* (TAVO Beih. B17), Wiesbaden.
- KUHRT, A. 1987, Usurpation, conquest and ceremonial: from Babylon to Persia, in: D. Cannadine & S. Price (eds.), *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, Cambridge: 20-55.
- LAMBERT, M. 1965, Les inscriptions élamites de Tchogha-Zanbil, *IrAnt* 5: 18-38.
– 1972, Hutélutush-Insushnak et le pays d'Anzan, *RA* 66: 61-76.
- LAMBERT, W.G. 1976, An Old Babylonian Letter and Two Amulets, *Iraq* 38: 57-64.
- LENFANT, D. 2004, *Ctésias de Cnide. La Perse, l'Inde, autres fragments*, Paris.
- LEWIS, D.M. 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.
- LINSSSEN, M.J.H. 2004, *The Cults of Uruk and Babylon. The Temple Ritual Texts as Evidence for Hellenistic Cult Practices* (CM 25), Leiden – Boston.
- LIVERANI, M. 2003, The Rise and Fall of Media, in: G. Lanfranchi, et al. (eds.), *Continuity of Empire (?): Assyria, Media, Persia* (History of the Ancient Near East / Monographs series 5), Padova: 1-12.
- MACGINNIS, J. 1991/92, Neo-Babylonian Prebend Texts from the British Museum, *AfO* 38-9: 74-100.
– 1995, *Letter Orders from Sippar and the Administration of the Ebabbara in the Late-Babylonian Period*, Poznań.
- MAJIDZADEH, Y. 2001, Rock Reliefs, in A.Sh. Shahbazi (ed.), *The Splendour of Iran*, vol. 1: *Ancient Times*, London: 144-9.
- MALBRAN-LABAT, F. 1975, Nabû-bêl-šumâte, prince du Pays-de-la-mer, *JA* 263: 7-37.
– 1995, *Les inscriptions royales de Suse. Briques de l'époque paléo-élamite à l'Empire néo-élamite*, Paris.
– 2004, La fête en Élam dans le culte royal et les cérémonies populaires: in: M. Mazoyer, J. Pérez Rey, Fl. Malbran-Labat & R. Lebrun (eds.), *La fête. La rencontre des dieux et des hommes* (Collection Kubaba, Série Actes 4), Paris: 39-48.
- MAYRHOFER, M. 1973, *Onomastica Persepolitana. Das altiranische Namengut der Persepolis-Täfelchen* (SbÖAW 286), Wien.
- MCEWAN, G.J.P. 1983, Distribution of Meat in Eanna, *Iraq* 45: 187-98.
- MERIGGI, P. 1971, *La Scrittura Proto-Elamica*, Parte I^a: *La scrittura e il contenuto dei testi*, Roma.
- MICHEL, E. 1967, Die Assur-Texte Salmanassars III. (858-824), 11. Fortsetzung, *WO* 4: 29-37.
- ORSI, D.P. 1988, La rappresentazione del sovrano nella *Vita di Artaserse* plutarchea, *Ancient Society* 19: 135-160.
- OVERLAET, B. 1997, A Report on the 1952 and 1954/55 Soundings at Tall-i Taimuran (Fars), Iran. A File-Excavation at the Royal Museums of Art and History, Brussels, *IrAnt* 32: 1-51.
- PARKER, R.A. & DUBBERSTEIN, W.H. 1956, *Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C. – A.D. 75* (Brown University Studies 19), Providence.
- POTTS, D.T. 1997, *Mesopotamian Civilization. The Material Foundations*, London.
– 1999, *The Archaeology of Elam. Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State*, Cambridge.

- [forthcoming], Irano-Elamica 1. An ass for Ares.
- READE, J.E. 1992, The Elamite tablets from Nineveh, *NABU* 1992.119.
- REINER, E. 1973a, The Location of Anšan, *RA* 67: 57-62.
- 1973b, Inscription from a Royal Elamite Tomb, *AfO* 24: 87-102, pls. 11-2.
- ROOT, M.C. 1979, *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art. Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of Empire* (Acta Iranica 19), Leiden.
- ROWTON, M.B. 1973a, Autonomy and Nomadism in Western Asia, *Orientalia* 42: 247-58.
- 1973b, Urban Autonomy in a Nomadic Environment, *JNES* 32: 201-15.
- 1976, Dimorphic Structure and Topology, *Oriens Antiquus* 15: 17-31.
- SANCISI-WEERDENBURG, H.W.A.M. 1980, *Yaunā en Persai. Grieken en Perzen in een ander perspectief*, diss. Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, Groningen.
- 1983, The Zendan and the Ka'bah, in: H. Koch & D.N. Mackenzie (eds.), *Kunst, Kultur und Geschichte der Achämenidenzeit und ihr Fortleben* (AMI Erg.Bd. 10), Berlin: 145-151.
- 1989, Gifts in the Persian Empire, in: P. Briant & Cl. Herrenschildt (eds.), *Le tribut dans l'Empire perse. Actes de 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.
- 1991, Nowruz in Persepolis, in: H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg & J.W. Drijvers (eds.), *Achaemenid History VII: Through Travellers' Eyes. European Travellers on the Iranian Monuments*, Leiden: 173-201.
- 1995, Persian food: stereotypes and political identity, in: J. Wilkins, D. Harvey, & M. Dobson (eds.), *Food in Antiquity*, Exeter: 286-302.
- SCHÉIL, V. 1901, *Textes élamites-anzanites, première série* (MDP 3), Paris.
- 1907, *Textes élamites-anzanites, troisième série* (MDP 9), Paris.
- 1911, *Textes élamites-anzanites, quatrième série* (MDP 11), Paris.
- 1932, *Actes juridiques susiens. Suite: n° 166 à n° 327* (MDP 23), Paris.
- SCHMIDT, E.F. 1957, *Persepolis*, vol. II: *Contents of the Treasury and Other Discoveries* (OIP 69), Chicago.
- SCHMITT, R. 1967, Medisches und persisches Sprachgut bei Herodot, *ZDMG* 117: 119-145.
- 1991, Name und Religion: Anthroponomastisches zur Frage der religiösen Verhältnisse des Achämenidenreiches, in: J. Kellens (ed.), *La religion iranienne à l'époque achéménide. Actes du Colloque de Liège, 11 décembre 1987* (IrAnt Suppl. 5), Gent: 111-28.
- 2000, *The Old Persian Inscriptions of Naqsh-e Rostam and Persepolis* (CII 1.1.2), London.
- 2003, *Meno-logium Bagistano-Persepolitanum. Studien zu den altpersischen Monatsnamen und ihren elamischen Wiedergaben* (SbÖAW 705), Wien.
- SEIDL, U. 1986, *Die Elamischen Felsreliefs von Kūrāngūn und Naqš-e Rostam* (Iranische Denkmäler XII, Iranische Felsreliefs IIh), Berlin.
- 1997, s.v. Izeh, in E.M. Meyers (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Archaeology in the Near East*, vol. III: 199-203.
- STEVE, M.-J. 1967, *Tchoga Zanbil (Dur-Untash) III: Textes élamites et accadiens de Tchoga Zanbil* (MDP 41), Paris.
- 1974, Inscriptions des Achéménides à Suse (suite), *StIr* 3.2: 135-169, pls. 17-22.
- 1992, *Syllabaire élamite. Histoire et paléographie* (Civilisations du Proche-Orient II.1), Neuchâtel - Paris.
- STEVE, M.-J., VALLAT, F., GASCHÉ, H. 2002/03, s.v. Suse: A-F, *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* fasc. 73-74, Paris: 359-529.

- STEVENSON, R.B. 1997, *Persica. Greek writing about Persia in the Fourth Century BC* (Scottish Classical Studies 5), Edinburgh.
- 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.
- 1984a, The Neo-Babylonian Text from Persepolis Fortification, *JNES* 43: 299-309.
- 1984b, *Texts from Tall-i Malyan*, vol. I: *Elamite Administrative Texts (1972-1974)* (Occasional Publications of the Babylonian Fund 6), Philadelphia.
- 1988, Mālamīr, B. Philologisch, *RLA* VII: 276-81.
- 1992, Babylonian Evidence for the End of the Reign of Darius I: a Correction, *JNES* 51: 61-2.
- 1998, Ummanšipir the Elamite, *NABU* 1998.112.
- 2004, Elamite, in: R.D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, Cambridge: 60-94.
- [forthcoming], How Many Fortification Tablets Are There?
- STRONACH, D. 1978, *Pasargadae. A report on the excavations conducted by the British Institute of Persian Studies from 1961 to 1963*, Oxford.
- 1985, Pasargadae, in: *CHI* II: 838-55.
- 1997, Anshan and Persia: Early Achaemenid History, Art and Architecture on the Iranian Plateau, in: J. Curtis (ed.), *Mesopotamia and Iran in the Persian Period: Conquest and Imperialism 539-331 BC*, London: 35-53.
- SUMNER, W.M. 1994, Archaeological Measures of Cultural Continuity and the Arrival of the Persians in Fars, in: H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, A. Kuhrt & M.C. Root (eds.), *Achaemenid History VIII: Continuity and Change*, Leiden: 97-105.
- SUNDERMEIER, T. 2002, Sacrifice in African Traditional Religions, in: A.I. Baumgarten (ed.), *Sacrifice in Religious Experience* (Studies in the History of Religions 93), Leiden – Boston – Köln: 3-12.
- TAVERNIER, J. 2002, *Iranica in de Achaemenidische periode (ca. 550-330 v.Chr.). Taalkundige studie van Oud-Iraanse eigennamen en leenwoorden, die geattesteerd zijn in niet-Iraanse teksten*, diss. Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Leuven.
- 2004, Some Thoughts on Neo-Elamite Chronology, *ARTA* 2004.003 [see www.achemenet.com].
- [forthcoming], Elam: Neo-Elamite Period (ca. 1000–530 B.C.), in: W. Eder & J. Renger (eds.), *Chronologies of the Ancient World* (Brill's New Pauly, Suppl. 1), Leiden – Boston: 22-4 [not previously published in the original German version].
- TAYLOR, L.R. 1931, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Philological Monographs 1), Middletown.
- TRÜMPELMANN, L. 1977, Das Heiligtum von Pasargadae, *StIr* 6: 7-16.
- TUPLIN, Chr. 1996, The Parks and Gardens of the Achaemenid Empire, in: Chr. Tuplin, *Achaemenid Studies* (Historia Einzelschriften 99), Stuttgart: 80-131, 178-82.
- VALLAT, F. 1977, *Corpus des inscriptions royales en élamite achéménide*, s.l. [unpublished diss.].
- 1983, Les briques élamites de Deylam, in: H. Koch & D.N. Mackenzie (eds.), *Kunst, Kultur und Geschichte der Achämenidenzeit und ihr Fortleben* (AMI Erg.Bd. 10), Berlin: 11-8.

- 1987, Perse, Persépolis dans les textes achéménides rédigés en élamite, *NABU* 1987.113.
- 1989, Les compléments phonétiques ou graphiques en élamite achéménide, *AION* 49.3: 219-222.
- 1993, *Les noms géographiques des sources suso-élamites* (RGTC 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.
- 2000, Le 'clergé' élamite, in: S. Graziani (ed.), *Studi sul Vicino Oriente Antico, dedicati alla memoria di Luigi Cagni*, Napoli: 1065-74.
- 2002, La Dame faite prisonnière à Babylone, *Akkadica* 123: 137-44.
- 2002/03, s.v. Suse: G.1. La religion suso-élamite, in: *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* fasc. 74, Paris: 529-553.
- VANDEN BERGHE, L. 1963, Les reliefs élamites de Mālamīr, *IrAnt* 3: 22-39.
- 1983, *Reliefs rupestres de l'Iran ancien (vers 2000 av. J.C. - 7^e après J.C.)*, Bruxelles.
- VAN DIJK, J. 1982, Fremdsprachige Beschwörungstexte in der südmesopotamischen literarischen Überlieferung, in: H.-J. Nissen & J. Renger (eds.), *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn* (CCRAI 25.1), Berlin: 97-110.
- VAN DRIEL, G. 1993, Neo-Babylonian Sheep and Goats, *Bulletin of Sumerian Agriculture* 7: 219-258.
- WALKER, C.B.F. 1981, *Cuneiform Brick Inscriptions in the British Museum, the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, the City of Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery, the City of Bristol Museum and Art Gallery*, London.
- WATERS, M.W. 2000, *A Survey of Neo-Elamite History* (SAAS 12), Helsinki.
- WATSON, P.J. 1979, *Archaeological Ethnography in Western Iran* (Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology 75), Tucson.
- WEISSBACH, F.H. 1902, Susische Tontäfelchen, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* 4: 168-201.
- WIDENGREN, G. 1965, *Die Religionen Irans* (Religionen der Menschheit 14), Stuttgart.
- WIESEHÖFER, J. 1991, Beobachtungen zu den religiösen Verhältnissen in der Persis in frühhellenistischer Zeit, in: J. Kellens (ed.), *La religion iranienne à l'époque achéménide. Actes du Colloque de Liège, 11 décembre 1987* (IrAnt Suppl. 5), Gent: 129-35.
- 1994, *Die 'dunklen Jahrhunderte' der Persis* (Zetemata 90), München.
- WIRTH, E. 1971, *Syrien. Eine geographische Landeskunde* (Wissenschaftliche Länderkunden 4/5), Darmstadt.
- YAMAMOTO, Y. 1979, The Zoroastrian Cult of Fire in Archaeology and Literature, *Orient* 15: 19-53.
- 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. 1983, A Tentative Structural Analysis of Elamite Hypocoristica, *BNF* 18: 93-120.
- 1984, *The Elamite Onomastikon* (Suppl. 40 AION 44.3), Napoli.

- ZAGARELL, A. 1982, *The Prehistory of the Northeast Baḥtiyārī Mountains, Iran. The Rise of a Highland Way of Life* (TAVO Beih. B42), Wiesbaden.
- ZAWADSKI, S. 1992, The date of the death of Darius I and the recognition of Xerxes in Babylonia, *NABU* 1992.49.