

L'archive

des Fortifications de Persépolis

État des questions et perspectives de recherches

Actes du colloque organisé au Collège de France par la « Chaire d'histoire et civilisation du monde achéménide et de l'empire d'Alexandre » et le « Réseau international d'études et de recherches achéménides » (GDR 2538 CNRS), 3-4 novembre 2006,

sous la direction de

Pierre Briant

Wouter F. M. Henkelman

Matthew W. Stolper

Éditions
de Boccard
2008



persika 12

De Boccard

11 rue de Médecis

75006 Paris

téléphone :

(33) 01 43 26 00 37

télécopie :

(33) 01 43 54 85 83

deboccard@deboccard.com

www.deboccard.com

Conception graphique :

Thierry Sarfis

Réalisation :

Salima Larabi, Collège de France

ISBN 978-7018-0249-7

© De Boccard 2008

From Gabae to Taoce : the geography of the central administrative province

Wouter F.M. Henkelman, Amsterdam and Paris

When it comes to putting the many toponyms we encounter in the Fortification archive on the map of southwestern Iran, uncertainty abounds. Until recently, only the following identifications could be considered certain :

Anšan	(^{AS} <i>an-za-an</i>)	=	Tall-e Malyān
Ayapir	(^{AS} <i>a-a-pír</i>)	=	Īzeh
Barša(n)	(^{AS} <i>ba-ir-ša, -ir-ša-an, -iš-ša, -iš-ša-an</i>)	=	Persepolis
Batrakataš	(^{AS} <i>bat-ra-ka₄-taš, -rak₀-ka-taš, etc.</i>)	=	Pasargadae
Tirazziš	(^{AS} <i>ti-ra-iz-zí-iš, -ra-zí-iš</i>)	=	Širāz ¹

Other toponyms may be located, if only by approximation, on the basis of these identifications. When, for example, a so-called ‘journal’ (register) deals with barley deposited at a storage facility in Pasargadae (such as NN 2286), and mentions additional places where, e.g., grain was allocated to *kurtaš* (workers), it would seem logical that these towns or villages were in the vicinity of Pasargadae. Similarly, a supplier using a certain seal may be found associated with more than one toponym, which again is likely to indicate proximity. Obviously, however, such indicators are only of relative value and some are more reliable than others. Connections range from very certain (multiple collocations of two towns in combination with shared characteristics such as suppliers and other officials, workforces, etc.) to highly uncertain (indirect links *via* seals associated with other seals, officials associated with other officials in other towns, etc.). To make things worse the five places listed above are all somewhat irregular. Anšan and Ayapir appear rarely and are therefore of little value for establishing a relative topography, not to speak of a real geographical reconstruction. Persepolis, Pasargadae and Tirazziš are, by contrast, larger and important places that drew an extraordinary amount of resources, not only from their immediate surroundings, but also from further away. Toponyms mentioned alongside, e.g., the name of Tirazziš were therefore not necessarily located in its vicinity.

Finally, there is the system of royal roads, particular the royal road connecting Susa and Persepolis, that fell partly within the scope of the Persepolis administration and could, at least in theory, provide us with a geographical frame. Especially the combination of the circumstance that a town serves as a way-station on the Susa-Persepolis road and is collocated with a so-called ‘regional seal’ may be helpful in terms of relative topography. Since

¹ Obviously ancient Tirazziš may have been located in the vicinity of modern Širāz rather than on the same spot. The list only includes places within the purview of the Persepolis administration (excluding far-away travel destinations such as Susa or Ecbatana, which were administrative centres in their own right).

the actual trajectory of the road is far from certain, however, and even the order of the way-stations mentioned in the tablets remains disputed, there is not much certainty to be gained in terms of absolute geography from this approach either. There is every reason to agree with Daniel Potts, who concludes from his survey earlier proposals and attributions (this volume) by stating that speculations on the survey of the royal road and the location of the way-stations are a “hazardous exercise”.

Potts also mentions the one hopeful development of recent years : the identification of Tappeh Bormī (Tol-e Bormī), near Rām Hormoz, as the site of ancient Huhnur. This discovery results from the fortuitous find, at Bormī, of a boulder inscription of Amar-Suen. In it, the Ur III king relates the taking of Huhnuri, and the removal of the (statue of the Elamite) god Ruhuratir, the subsequent return of that god and the rebuilding of his temple at Huhnuri, which was then re-baptised as Bīt Amar-Suen (Nasrabadi 2005). Since Achaemenid Elamite *Hunar* (^{AS}*hu-na-ir*, ^{AS}*ú-na-ir*) is a continuation of older *Huhnur*, and since Hunar is a frequently-mentioned town in the Fortification texts — a town with an important grain storage, larger groups of *kurtaš*, and officiants offering barley, sesame and beer “for the gods” (including Ruhuratir?) — the identification is a particularly fruitful one. It helps to define the western reach of the territory controlled from Persepolis and it provides approximate locations for places directly associated with Huhnur/Hunar, notably Liduma, Bessitme and Hidali ².

To this recent discovery two additional ones may now be added. One is the identification of one of two places named Tamukkan ³ with Ptolemy’s coastal Ταόκη, or more precisely *Cape Taoce* (Ταόκη ἄκρα, *Geogr.* VI.4.2) ⁴ — presumably part of the coastal district Ταοκηνή (*ibid.* VI.4.3) — and with Taḥ(u)makka in Late Babylonian sources. Though Tamukkan and Ταόκη have long been compared (Hallock 1959 : 178 ; Metzler 1977 : 1058-9), the crucial connection with Late Babylonian Taḥ(u)makka had not been recognised before ⁵. The recent publication of BM 32619 (Wunsch 2003 : 112-4), mentioning the town by the variant spelling *taḥ-ú-ka*^{ki} and stipulating that it is located in the Persian Gulf region, makes it very likely, though, that we are dealing with the same locality known as Tamukkan and Ταόκη in the Elamite and Greek sources ⁶.

² Cf. Henkelman 2007 and *idem* 2008 : 41-2, 112, 481-2, 499-501 with older bibliography. For arguments favouring the view that the territory controlled from Persepolis did *not* stretch into Khūzestān proper (i.e. not much beyond Rām Hormoz) see Henkelman 2008 : 110-7.

³ ^{AS}*da-u-ka₄-an*, ^{AS}*da-u-ma-ka₄*, ^{AS}*tam₅-ka₄(-an)*, ^{AS}*tam₅-mu-ka₄(-an)* ; see Vallat 1993 : 273 (with earlier bibliography) and Tavernier 2007 : 397-8 [4.3.218].

⁴ See also *Geogr.* VIII.21.15. Coastal Ταόκη should not be confused with the homonymous town situated in inland Achaemenid Fārs. Ptolemy (VI.4.7) gives different coordinates for this second Ταόκη and lists it, among other places, with Γάβαι (Ābādeh or Esfahān region ; cf. below).

⁵ On Taḥ(u)makka in *Cyr.* 29, *Cyr.* 131 and *YOS* 3, 10 see Zadok 1976 : 72-3 and Tolini 2008 (with earlier bibliography). Tavernier 2007 : 398 [4.3.219] treats Taḥ(u)makka as a toponym distinct from Tamukkan/Ταόκη.

⁶ The spelling variation between *ta-ḥu-ma-ak-ka*^{ki} (*Cyr.* 131), *ta-ḥi-ú-ma-ak* (*YOS* 3, 10), *taḥ-ma-ak-ka*^{ki} (*Cyr.* 29) and *taḥ-ú-ka*^{ki} (BM 32619) seems to reflect a struggle to represent a /w/ or /u/ phoneme, as do the forms found in Elamite (cf. fn. 3 above). The Babylonian forms probably reflect /taḥwak(a)/, whereas the Elamite ones point to /tawka(n)/ or /tauka(n)/ (-n is a regular ending

The contexts in which Tamukkan/Ταόκη/Ταῖ(u)makka occurs confirm the identity of the toponyms⁷.

The Late Babylonian sources are all from the reign of Cyrus. One text concerns travel provisions for workers and cattle sent from Sippar to Tahmakka (*Cyr.* 131), another the transport of wooden beams and workers, by boat (cf. Ταόκη!), to the same place (*YOS* 3, 10). As Tolini (2008) rightly notes, these references should be understood as part of the corvée obligation imposed on Babylonian temples in the context of a royal building program at Tah(u)makka, in the Persian Gulf region. He also argues that Itti-Marduk-balātu's long stay at Tah(u)makka (*Cyr.* 29) probably indicates that the place hosted a royal residence; the fourth text (BM 32619) may have a similar background.

The Greek sources mentioning coastal Ταόκη, apart from the above-mentioned references in Ptolemy's *Geography*, are Arrian and Strabo⁸. The former, after having described a district easily recognisable as the Būšehr peninsula (*Ind.* 39.1-2)⁹, continues (39.3)¹⁰ :

ἐκ Μεσαμβρίας δὲ ὀρμηθέντες καὶ διεκπλώσαντες σταδίους μάλιστα ἐς διηκοσίους ἐς Ταόκην ὀρμίζονται ἐπὶ ποταμῷ Γράνιδι. καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου ἐς τὸ ἄνω Περσέων βασιλεία ἦν, ἀπέχοντα τοῦ ποταμοῦ τῶν ἐκβολέων σταδίους ἐς διηκοσίους.

From Mesambria they [Nearchus and his fleet; WH] sailed and after a voyage of about two hundred stades anchored at Taoce on the river Granis. Inland from here was a Persian royal residence, about two hundred stades from the mouth of the river.

Strabo, discussing the royal palaces of the Persians, mentions the βασιλεία of Susa, Persepolis and Pasargadae and then lists two more residences (XV.3.3) :

ἦν δὲ καὶ ἄλλα βασιλεία τὰ ἐν Γάβαις ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέρω που μέρεσι τῆς Περίδος καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ παραλίᾳ τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ταόκην λεγομένην.

for place names in Elamite). A solution might be that Iranian *Taxmaka-, which lies at the basis of the Babylonian forms (cf. Tavernier 2007 : 398 [4.3.219]), lost the /h/ phoneme when it came to be used in Achaemenid Elamite, which does not have /h/ or /h/. This presumably would have happened at an early date (Cyrus II or before), so that the historic /h/ was longer represented in spellings of the toponym at the time of the Fortification archive (Darius I). Alternatively, and perhaps more likely, the different forms reflect a development within Old Iranian; such a solution would also make Gk. Ταόκη easier to explain.

7 The identification was independently proposed by both Henkelman [forthc.] §2.3 (cf. *idem* 2008 : 116-7) and Tolini 2008.

8 In addition, there is another mention of the name in Marcianus' *Periplus maris exteri* I.24 (positioning Cape Taoce 500 stades from the mouth of the river Oroates and 700 stades from that of the river Rhogomanis. On Ταόκη and Ταοκηνή see Weißbach 1932a-b, who points out that the way Ptolemy refers to Ταόκη suggests that it was an important town.

9 See Potts [forthc.] with older literature.

10 Transl. E. Iliff Robson (Loeb).

And there were also other royal residences — the one in Gabae somewhere in the upper parts of Persis, and the one on the coast, near Taoce, as it is called.

The Greek and Babylonian sources are in agreement on all essential points : Ταόκη/Taḥ(u)makka was situated near the Persian Gulf coast, could be reached by ship, and had a royal residence. Moreover, notably Strabo's (*viz* Nearchus') information on the location of the residence may be connected to the find of the early Achaemenid palatial structures in the Daštēstān sub-province, which is centred on Borāzğān, a town located just south of the easily-navigable Rūd-e Hilleh (probably Nearchus' Granis) at a distance of about 50 km from the coast (cf. the 200 stades mentioned by Nearchus). The columned structures found just south of Borāzğān have long been identified with Ταόκη¹¹, but the surprising richness of Achaemenid architectural remains in the region in general (Sang-e Sīāh, Bardak-e Sīāh, Kākh-e Čarkhāb) should inspire caution, especially since none of the structures has been fully explored to date¹². However that may be, it is clear enough that Daštēstān/Borāzğān was highly important in the (early) Achaemenid period and witnessed not one but several royal building projects; the evidence on Ταόκη/Taḥ(u)makka, to be located in the same region, suits this picture very well¹³. Note also that, in Mediaeval times, a town named Tawwāğ or Tawwāz existed in the Daštēstān region; it may have been a continuation of antique Ταόκη/Taḥ(u)makka¹⁴.

To the Babylonian, Greek and archaeological sources, a substantial amount of evidence is added by the Fortification texts mentioning Tamukkan. A complicating factor, however, is that the archive evidently includes references to *two* places named Tamukkan, a situation reflected in Ptolemy's *Geography*, which mentions two places called Ταόκη (cf. fn. 4 above). That PF 1790 speaks of "Tamukkan of (the district of) Ranmesa", is probably a way to avoid confusion between the two Tamukkans, but generally the administrators at Persepolis apparently did not need such explicit references to know which place was at issue¹⁵. For us, the picture is less clear. Some texts certainly refer to the inland town,

11 On the site and its suggested identification with Ταόκη see Mallowan 1972 : 6 (first to suggest that 'Borāzğān' is the site of Taoce), Sarfaraz 1971 [*non vidē*]; *idem* 1973; Hinz 1976 : 117; Stronach 1978 : 73, 80, 293-4; Boucharlat & Salles 1981 : 69-70; Hinz & Koch 1987 s.v. h.*tam, -qa*; Briant 2002 : 889; Boardman 2000 : 65-6; Boucharlat 2005 : 236.

12 Arfae 2008 : 74 mentions a relief "thought to be from the time of Xerxes, and three fragments of inscribed stone, one with a fragmentary Babylonian text" found at Bardak-e Sīāh. The find of (early) Achaemenid column bases and other structural remains at Sang-e Sīāh and Kākh-e Čarkhāb has been reported by several Iranian news agencies.

13 Cf. the useful conspectus of evidence on Achaemenid development of the Persian Gulf coast given in Briant 2002 : 758-60 (also mentioning Taoce and the ancient canal found near Borāzğān) and 1028 (bibliography), as well that by Kuhrt 2007 II : 873-8. Note that Junge (1944 : 92-3) already related the establishment of a residence at Taoce to Achaemenid efforts to develop the coastal regions and marine trade.

14 See Arfae 2008 : 74 with bibliography.

15 Note that Arfae 2008 : 27, 61, 66-7, 72-4 considers all but one occurrence of 'Tamukkan' as references to the inland town; he accepts only PF 1790 as a reference to "classical Taoce" (*sic*), i.e. as Ptolemy's coastal Ταόκη. It is actually quite hard to judge to which Tamukkan PF 1790 belongs;

as appears from the contexts of the attestations — at this Tamukkan regular transactions (deposit of grain, allocation of rations, etc.) took place¹⁶. The coastal town seems to have had a different administrative profile, at least as seen from Persepolis : this Tamukkan seems to be referred to mainly in contexts of groups travelling to and from it. That we are dealing with the coastal town in such contexts is an assumption based on the circumstance that its location at or near the Persian Gulf coast would make it a more logical destination or point of departure, being situated at the end of the road descending from Media to the Persian Gulf (cf. below). In fact, the frequency with which Tamukkan occurs as travel destination or point of departure (16 texts) makes it likely that it was a nodal point in the administrative system that organised and controlled official missions on the royal roads ; this, in turn, suggests that it was a some distance from Persepolis and probably even outside the *direct* purview of the Persepolis administration. It is uncertain whether coastal Tamukkan ever occurs as the locus of regular transactions in the Fortification archive ; we do not have, for example, receipts for rations issued to the hundreds of Egyptians, Lycians and Skudrians *at* Tamukkan, though such groups were indeed sent to that town (cf. below)¹⁷. It may be

the text is a letter order from Parnakka to Irtuppiya, on meat rations to be issued to female team leaders at various places (Hunar, Hidali, Zappi, Atek, Liduma). The colophon mentions “Tamukkan of Ranmesa” as the place where the document is delivered, but this only means that Irtuppiya (responsible for the western Fahliyān region) happened to be at one of the two Tamukkans when the letter was sent to him. Koch 1990 : 69-77 assumes only one Tamukkan (which she locates southeast of Persepolis ; both places called Ταόκη in Ptolemy’s *Geography* remain unmentioned).

- 16** See, for example, the collocation of Tamukkan and seal PFS 0032* in PF 0984 and NN 0582, NN 1810 and NN 1990. PFS 0032* is a seal used by Šuddayauda in (part of) the so-called Persepolis region (see Henkelman 2008 : 118 with bibliography). Based on the seals used and/or the officials mentioned, and the towns associated with those seals and officials, I am inclined to interpret the attestations of ‘Tamukkan’ in PF 0157, PF 0427, PF 0444, PF 0481, PF 1098, PF 1138, NN 0534, NN 1654, NN 1753, NN 1771, NN 1995 and NN 2008 as references to the inland town as well.
- 17** Irdumasda, “satrap (at) Makka”, occurs in PF 0679, receiving wine from Parnizza at Tamukkan. If he is travelling to or from Makka (Oman), it would be tempting to take this as a reference to coastal Tamukkan. Parnizza is difficult to locate. He occurs once more with Irdumasda, this time receiving wine at Karinuš (NN 2135; the location of this place is unknown), as well as with Zamašba also “satrap (at) Makka” (PF 680; no GN). Elsewhere, Parnizza the wine supplier appears collocated with the GNs Marsaškaš and Parmizzan as well as, once more, with Tamukkan (PF 1138). Of these, Parmizzan is clearly located in the Persepolis region (cf. PF 0891, PF 0892, PF 0896, etc., all with PFS 0001*, seal of the regional director) and is found directly associated with Tikraš (PF 0492, PF 0566, NN 0510, NN 2166), which was probably situated east of Persepolis (Henkelman 2008 : 318-9, 489-90). Marsaškaš is home to *kurtaš* for whom Šuddayauda, regional director of the Persepolis region is responsible (PF 1127, NN 2067, Fort. 5466). Altogether, this evidence suggests that Irdumasda the satrap had his wine at inland Tamukkan, rather than at the coast, but I admit to some uncertainty on this inference.

that there are a few texts documenting transactions at coastal Tamukkan ¹⁸, but the general impression is that the town was not fully integrated in the ‘Persepolis economy’ and fell largely outside the purview of the Persepolis administrators.

Four texts refer to smaller groups of *šalup* (“free men”, *vel sim.*) and their servants travelling to Tamukkan ¹⁹. Such groups are quite regular on any stretch of the royal road system documented by the Fortification tables. More conspicuous are groups of *kurtaš* (workers), sometimes described as painters or stone masons (or quarrymen), heading for or returning from Tamukkan ²⁰ :

<i>Text</i>	<i>Seals and date</i>	<i>Supplier/way-station</i>	<i>Origin</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Travel party and guide/leader</i>
PFa 18	PFS x; III/23	/	Miturna (in Media)	Tamukkan	150 female Skudrian ²¹ <i>kurtaš</i> , 3 guides, 9 servants; Ubateya
PF 1363	No seal; III/23	Kasakka; (location unknown)	Miturna (in Media)	Tamukkan	150 Skudrian <i>kurtaš</i> , 3 guides, 9 servants; Ubateya
PF 2055	PFS 1620, PFS 1621, III/23	/	Miturna (in Media)	Tamukkan	150 Skudrian <i>kurtaš</i> ; Ubateya
PF 1557	PFS 0017, PFS 1442; 0/21	Ušaya; (Fahliyān region, probably Parmadan)	Bakabana (at Susa)	Tamukkan	547 Egyptian <i>kurtaš</i> ; Bakabaduš
NN 0480	No seal; IV/23	Ušaya; (Fahliyān region, probably Parmadan)	King (at Susa or further west)	Tamukkan	690 Egyptian men, stone masons ²² ; Kamšabana

18 PFa 30 : 11-3 and 14-6 refer to *kurtaš* sent to Tamukkan, to Ušbaka. This Ušbaka also occurs in PF 1992, where he is the official responsible for the intake of sesame at Tamukkan. It is unclear whether the same individual is referred to in NN 1321, on *kurtaš*-painters being “[sent] to Ušbaka, the *kurzap nuškira*, “he who takes care of *kurtaš*”. Egyptian painters are sent to Tamukkan in NN 1177, so in that sense NN 1321 would fit nicely. However, the workers of NN 1321 receive rations for two months from Mazamanna, who was based at Kaupirriš, north-west of Persepolis (e.g., PF 0743). Compare PF 1829, PF 1963, PF 1993 and NN 2394 (all with Ušbaka); on Ušbaka see also Koch 1990 : 69-71.

19 PF 1452 (1 *šalur*, 5 *pubu*; King → Tamukkan), NN 0424 (2 men, presumably *šalup*; King → T.), NN 0879 (4 š.; Bakabana [Susa] → T.), NN 1398 (24 š.; Bakabana/Susa → T.).

20 Perhaps NN 0271, with 560 *taššubbe zaridap*, “people/troops from Zarida” travelling from Susa to ^{AS}*da-ma-I ak*²¹-[x] belongs here as well, though the spelling would be unique.

21 On ‘Skudrians’ see Henkelman & Stolper [forthc.].

22 ^{AS}HAR^{MES} *maz0-zī-ip* are literally “stone cutters”, hence “stone masons” or “quarrymen”. That the first meaning of *mazzi-* is “to cut” appears from both inscriptional (e.g., DBc II.55 [cutting off body parts]) and archival contexts (PF 1246 [cutting wood], NN 1999 [*idem*]). “To remove, to withdraw” is a derivative meaning, specific to certain administrative contexts. I do therefore not concur with Hallock (1978 : 115, probably following a suggestion by A. M. Arfaee; cf. Arfaee 2008 :

NN 1177	PFS 0095, PFS x; III/23	Umayā	Tamukkan ²³	Persepolis	29 Egyptian men, painters ²⁴ ; Zinuyapir the Egyptian
PFa 30 : 14-6	PFS 0120; VI/21	Puktezza [?] ; (Matezziš near Persepolis?) ²⁵	Rakkan (Persepolis region)	Tamukkan, to Ušbaka	980 Lycian <i>kurtaš</i> ; Šiyatiparna
PF 1368	PFS 0095, PFS 1293; VI/22	Medumannuš (= Mazamanna?); estate of Iršena	?	Tamukkan	304 Tamukkan- <i>kurtaš</i> of Minmira; Šiyatiparna
Fort. 9408	?; IX/23	Miššumanda	Matezziš (near Persepolis)	Tamukkan	161 Lycian <i>kurtaš</i> ; (no guide mentioned)
NN 0111	No seal; VIII/20	Mau[...]; (location unknown)	Parnakka (at Persepolis)	Tamukkan	8 <i>kurtaš</i> , stone masons; Nukurkatiriš, stone mason at Persepolis
NN 1858	No seal; ø/24	/	Parnakka at Persepolis	Tamukkan	74 men, Bactrians ²⁶ ; Zipu[...].da
PFa 30 : 11-3	PFS 0120; IX/21	Puktezza [?] ; (Matezziš near Persepolis?)	Rakkan (Persepolis region)	Tamukkan, to Ušbaka	980 Cappadocian <i>kurtaš</i> ; Yadaušiya

As appears from the above evidence, as many as 2,000 *kurtaš* may have been active at the building site(s) of Tamukkan at the same time. Not only skilled labourers, but human resources from all over the Empire were gathered at the Persian Gulf coast, underlining the scale of the efforts and, obviously, the Achaemenids' great interest in developing the coastal region. Moreover, the efforts were not a novelty of Darius' reign, but had already started under Cyrus, as appears from the Babylonian sources (cf. above).

73-4), who believes that ^{AS}HAR^{MES} *maz₀-zi-ip* are "stone removers", nor that such a designation should be understood as "miners". I am even less convinced that the 'stone removers' heading for Tamukkan (NN 0111, NN 0480) could help locate that town at Čāhak, situated north of Niriz and known for its iron mine in early Islamic times. Compare Hinz & Koch 1987 : 279 s.v. *h.tam₅-qa*. See also Sumner 1986 : 23 on the location of inland Tamukkan. NN 0480 may be compared with NN 1922, a text on 106 Egyptian stone masons travelling from Susa to an unknown location (Tamukkan?) and receiving rations somewhere in the Fahliyān region (VIII/23).

23 Zinuyapir, the leader of the 29 Egyptians in NN 1177 carried a travel authorisation (*balmi*) from Parnakka, the director of the Persepolis economy at Persepolis. That he had such a document, while coming from Tamukkan, probably means that the Egyptians had come to Tamukkan from Persepolis, where they were given the travel document, which also specified the rations to be issued during their return trip.

24 For *karsup*, "painters" cf. *karsuka* and *karsuša* in DSf_e 37, 47 and DSz_e 39, 51-2 (see also Hinz & Koch 1987 s.v. *kar-su-qa*).

25 See Hallock 1978 : 115 on PFa 30 and Matezziš.

26 For *ba-ak-ši-ia-āš* = *Bāxçiš, "Bactrian" see Tavernier 2007 : 69 [2.3.7].

Arrian, in the passage preceding the one quoted above, describes the Bušēhr peninsula as having many fruit trees and gardens, a clear sign of a vast irrigation effort. This, as Whitcomb has argued (1987), was made possible by the so-called Angali Canal that ran from the Hilleh just above Borāzġān to the western end of the peninsula and that must have been either an Elamite inheritance or an Achaemenid construction. In either case this canal, newly constructed or kept operational, adds to the picture of Achaemenid efforts to develop the area.

The second recent identification concerns the town of Kabaš²⁷. The crucial document in this context is NN 2261, a journal centred on ^{AS}ka₄-ba-iš, the central town from which sheep/goats were issued in a district that also included Harišna and Kutima. Among the entries in the journal are seven travel texts :

<i>Journal entry</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Origin</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Travel party and guide/leader</i>
ll.4-8	ø/23	Harišna, Kutima	Parnakka at Persepolis	Media	259 men, boatmen ²⁸ ; Kursanuya and Appirša
ll.10-1	ø/(23?)	(Kabaš)	Persepolis	Media	Rimadadda the fast messenger
ll.16-8	ø/22	(Kabaš)	Sagartia	Kermān	<i>hallinu</i> -troops; Karkiš the Kermani ²⁹
ll.19-21	VII/(22)	(Kabaš)	Sagartia	Persepolis	<i>hallinu</i> -troops; Da'urisa
ll.26-9	ø/(22)	(Kabaš)	Sagartia ³⁰	Kermān	<i>hallinu</i> -troops; Umesana the <i>padarakka</i> ³¹ (and) Ušpirša
ll.30-2	ø/(22)	(Kabaš)	Bakabaduš (in Arachosia) ³²	Persepolis	Skudrian women ³³ ; Bagina
ll.33-4	ø/(22)	(Kabaš)	Bakabaduš (in Arachosia)	Persepolis	Ionian/Greek men ³⁴ ; Bakanbama

27 Not to be confused with Kab(b)ašna; see Vallat 1993 : 121 and Henkelman 2008 : 347.

28 For ^{GIS}MÁ^{MEŠ}-ip₁, “boatmen”, compare ^{AS}GIŠ.MÁ^{MEŠ}, “boat” in DB_e I.68 and the ^{GIS}MÁ^{MEŠ} *gillira*, “boat commander, captain” in PT 008 (cf. Henkelman 2008 : 266).

29 On *taššup hallinup* and the role of Karkiš the Kermani (*kurmanuya*), satrap in Puruš/Kermān see Henkelman [forthc.] §5.

30 This travel party holds an authorisation from the King, but that does not *necessarily* mean that the court was at Sagartia when the document was issued. Note, however, that livestock was issued for the royal table at Kabaš according to the same journal (ll.1-3; cf. Henkelman [forthc.]).

31 On ^{HAL}pa-ud-da-rak₀-ka₄ see Tavernier 2007 : 508-9 [5.3.4.42], with bibliography.

32 Bakabaduš, who issued the travel authorisation for the Skudrians, was stationed in Kandahār/Arachosia, as appears from PF 1351 (Arachosia), PF 1358 (Kandahār), NN 1898 (Arachosia). One text associates him with Barikana (PF 1495), apparently a city and/or region in Arachosia. Cf. Henkelman & Stolper [forthc.] §2.1, with bibliography.

33 The text has ^{SAL}uk-ku, lit. “female heads/persons”.

34 ^{HAL}uk-ku ^{HAL}ia-u-na-ip, lit. “Ionian/Greek male heads/persons”.

From these seven entries it appears that Kabaš and its satellites were at a crossroads of routes linking Media and Persepolis (ll.4-8, 10-1), Sagartia and Kermān (ll.16-8, 26-9), Sagartia and Persepolis (ll.19-21) and Arachosia and Persepolis (ll.30-2, 33-4). This makes Kabaš a place located north or NNE of Persepolis, at an intersection of a north-south route (Media-Persepolis and further south), and an eastern route to Kermān and Arachosia. NN 2261 (ll.1-3) also stipulates that Kabaš at least once hosted the ‘table of the King.’

Kabaš occurs in other Fortification texts as well, though not very frequently³⁵. One text (PF 0157) mentions a *partetaš* (OPers. **paridaida-*, cf. Gk. παράδεισος), “plantation.” Such plantations often have a royal connection, which would underline the link between Kabaš and the crown (cf. Henkelman 2008 : 427-34, 439-40). Otherwise, the Kabaš texts yield clues confirming the likelihood of a northern location : Kabaš is linked, directly and indirectly, to a group of towns that seems to have been situated north of the Susa-Persepolis road, perhaps in the region north of Pasargadae and beyond. Some of these places, such as Mišaraš (NN 2290 : 19-20, 21-2) and Harrušnuzzan (PFa 31 : 13-6), are also stops on the route to Media (cf. below).

The northern location, the royal connection and the association with the routes to Media and Arachosia make the identification of Kabaš relatively easy. In the passage quoted above, Strabo (XV.3.3) mentions royal residences at Ταόκη and at Γάβαι (βασίλεια τὰ ἐν Γάβαις), “somewhere in the upper parts of Persis”. This strongly suggest that our toponym Kabaš is the same as Greek Γάβαι³⁶. Note also that Γάβαι is listed with *inland* Ταόκη in Ptolemy’s *Geography* (VI.4.7) and that Kabaš and inland Tamukkan are collocated in PF 0157³⁷.

Kabaš and Γάβαι both render Old Persian *Gaba-³⁸, which occurs in Parthian as G’b and in Middle Persian as Gay. The toponym may have been first used for a region (cf. below), from which it came to be used for the royal residence situated in it. In early Islamic sources, it occurs, as Ġay, as the name of the Esfahān region and that of a town located about 5 km east of the present centre of Esfahān and now part of that city³⁹.

The classical sources also mention a region or district named Gab(i)ene, which was part of Media according to Ptolemy (VI.2.13 [Γάβηνη]) and adjacent to Paraetacene

35 NN 0757 and NN 2280 are livestock accounts that mention cattle at Kabaš (as well as other animals at other places). NN 2364 is a large grain account centred on Kabaš and mentioning a number of other towns. PF 0157 concerns a deposit of 49,330 quarts of *tarmu* (presumably emmer; cf. Henkelman [forthc.]) at (inland) Tamukkan (and) at the plantation (of) Kabaš. NN 0778 is a receipt for livestock issued to Parnakka “from Kabaš” (but the reading of the GN is uncertain). NN 2265 : 10-2 is a receipt of wine issued to a lance bearer acting as *pirrasaka*, “investigator” (**fraθaka-*; see Tavernier 2007 : 421 [4.4.7.43]) at Kabaš and holding an authorisation from the King.

36 As Pierre Briant first suggested to me in a discussion about the Kabaš material.

37 Polyb. XXXI.3.9 mentions Τάβαι in Persis, the place where Antiochus IV died. Andreas’ emendation of the toponym to Γάβαι is defended by Henning (1957) and by Schmitt (2000), who also argues in favour of reading ‘Tabae’ in Curt. V.13.2 as ‘Gabae’.

38 Old Iranian names are regularly supplemented with a final -š, when rendered in Achaemenid Elamite. The consistently CV-CV spelling in (^{A5})*ka₄-ba-iš* agrees with the voiced intervocalic consonant in *Gaba-. I thank Jan Tavernier for his comments on the etymology of Kabaš.

39 See conspectus in Schmitt 2000; see also Hansman 2006 : 635-6 and De Planhol 2006 : 618.

according to Diodorus (XIX.34.7; see also XIX.26.2)⁴⁰. Since Paraetacene can be located immediately north of Pasargadae⁴¹, Gabiene might be found in the region around or just north of Ābādeh, and this would certainly fit with what we know about Kabaš (and Γάβαι). Note that the region directly north of Ābādeh would agree with Henning's (1951) understanding of the name *Gaba- as "valley." At the same time, this location makes the idea that Kabaš/Γάβαι was located as far north as Esfahān less likely⁴². In addition, one may wonder whether Esfahān was not too far away to be, if only partially, within the scope of the Persepolis administration. Perhaps, then, *Gaba was the name of a region and the prime royal residence located in it; it was located on the route to Media, at some distance north of Pasargadae, but close enough to Persepolis to be within the purview of the Fortification archive and to be considered as a place "in Persis" by Strabo. The name of the (expanded or shifted) region may, in turn, have survived as that of a new capital, close to the city now known as Esfahān.

With Hunar located at Bormī (near Rām Hormoz), Tamukkan in the Borāzġān region and Kabaš probably in the Ābādeh region or a little further north, the contours of the territory under purview of the Persepolis administration are emerging more clearly than before. What is missing from the picture is the southeastern side where, according to the tablets, the town of Narezzaš seems to have been the most far-away outpost of some importance. As I have argued elsewhere, the identification of the town as Nīrīz or Neirīz, first proposed by Cameron⁴³, seems etymologically possible, and finds some support in the water system of Fārs : the Kūr and Pulvār both empty in Lake Tašk, which is connected to Lake Bakhtigān, on the eastern shore of which Nīrīz is situated⁴⁴. Note also the royal character of Narezzaš, arguably the site of the tomb of Cambyses (Henkelman 2003, esp. 111-3, 145-7, 154, 159). That the area was settled in Achaemenid times appears from the important site of Tall-e Zohak near Fasā (about 60 km WSW of Nīrīz) as well a modest Achaemenid settlement in the plain of Dārāb (50 km SSW of Nīrīz)⁴⁵.

From the above observations, I conjecture that the administrators at Persepolis controlled an economic institution active in an oval-shaped territory maximally defined

40 Strabo XVI.1.18 mentions three routes leading to Elymais, one from Persis, one from Media and the Zagros *via* Massabatice, and one from Susis, *via* Gabiane. The information is hard to reconcile with all the other evidence in the Graeco-Roman sources on Gabae and Gabiane; it may result from some confusion of data, for it would seem that Gabiane was indeed on a route to Elymais, but not the one coming from Susis, but rather one of the routes descending from Media (see also Potts 1999 : 371, 380). Compare Ptol. *Geogr.* VI.4.3, where the Γάβαῖοι are said to live "above the Ouxians" (ὑπὲρ τοῦς Οὐζαῖους). Plut. *Eum.* calls the inhabitants of the region Γαβηνοί.

41 Bosworth 1980 : 334, following Strabo XV.3.6.

42 Compare the reservations expressed by Schmitt 2000 on the conventional Γάβαι-Esfahān identification.

43 Cameron 1948 : 166 — but note that the argument based on the iron mines at Narezzaš is untenable (Henkelman 2008 : 116). See also Arfae 2008 : 39. On the etymology of Narezzaš see Tavernier 2007 : 257-8 [4.2.1170] (suggesting *Nary-aica- > *Narēca-; with bibliography).

44 Cf. Henkelman 2008 : 116.

45 Tall-e Zohak : see Hansman 1975; Pohanka 1983; de Miroschedji 1990 52, 64; Boucharlat 2005 : 233-4, with bibliography. Dārāb plain/Dārābgird : Miroschedji 1990 : 52; Boucharlat *L.c.*

by modern Rām Hormoz (or a little bit further to the northwest), Ābādeh (or a bit further north), Nīrīz, and Borāzġān (or rather a point on the road from Šīrāz to Borāzġān). The NW/SE axis, running from Rām Hormoz, *via* Persepolis, to Nīrīz, roughly coincides with the royal road from Susa to Persepolis and further east. The NE/SW axis roughly coincides with the road that ran from Media, *via* Γάβαί, to the Persian Gulf (on this route see Briant 2002 : 358, 737). Note in this context that three of the known travel parties heading to Tamukkan came from Miturna in Media. Note also that the shipmen travelling from Persepolis to Kabaš may have come from Tamukkan (cf. above).

The above hypothesis makes me rethink the way Strabo describes the residences of the Persian kings (XV.3.3) : Susa, Persepolis and Pasargadae, and then, bracketed together, Γάβαί in the highlands and Ταόκη at the coast. Indeed, the palatial structures in the Daštēstān/Borāzġān region are suggestive of a function as royal residence(s) and NN 2261 : 1-3 similarly suggests that a table of the king was organised at Kabaš/*Gaba- (cf. above). Yet providing a suitable accommodation for the travelling court is certainly not the entire story. The two βασιλεια were both centres of a region or district (Ταοκινηή, Γάβηνη) and clearly major points on the important north-south route. They seem to have been on or close to the border of the territory under control of the administration based at Persepolis. As such, they surely must have been of pivotal importance in the economic and, most likely, military structure of Achaemenid Fārs ⁴⁶.

Another striking observation that emerges from these notes is that the modern town of Kāmfirūz is almost exactly at the intersection of the Ābādeh-Borāzġān and the Rām Hormoz-Nīrīz axes. This, I think, is not a coincidence : Kāmfirūz could, as Hallock and Arfaee have proposed, be the same toponym as Kaupirriš/Kaupirriyaš (Old Iranian *Gaufriš/*Gaufrya-), which occurs very often in the Fortification tablets ⁴⁷ It was the centre of an administrative subdivision defined by the use of seals PFS 0003 and PFS 0030, known as the Kāmfirūz region. The region included a few stops on the royal road from Susa to Persepolis and further east (India), including Uzikurraš, as well as important towns such as Kaupirriš and Kurra (presumably Κόρρα in Ptol. *Geogr.* VI.4.6). Yet, compared to the other two administrative regions — known as the Fahliyān and Persepolis regions — the Kāmfirūz region was clearly quite small. I have often wondered what special reason lay behind the existence of this odd administrative unit. The answer to that question is, it would seem, that the Kāmfirūz region is defined as the crossroads of the Susa-Persepolis-India and the Ecbatana-Gabae-Taoce routes. As such it had a special status, which explains why it is smaller than the Persepolis region to the southeast (stretching to Narezzaš/Nīrīz) and the Fahliyān region to the northwest (stretching to the Rām Hormoz plain).

The matter of the regional seals evokes an additional comment on the geographical system underlying the ‘Persepolis economy’ and the study of its relative and absolute topography. As stated above, the Kāmfirūz region is recognisable by the use of regional seals PFS 0003 and PFS 0030. Such seals always occur alone (without counter sealing) and are collocated with a variety of places within the same administrative sub-region. They do not, however, occur with texts on travel provisions : the royal road system clearly was a

⁴⁶ See also the remarks by Hansman 2006 : 635-6 on Γάβαί.

⁴⁷ See Hallock 1977 : 129, 131; Arfa'i [Arfaee] 1999 : 35-6 with fnn. 3, 40; Arfaee 2008 : 78-80. See also Sumner 1986 : 20. On the etymology of Kaupirriš see Tavernier 2007 : 380 [4.3.73], with bibliography.

different jurisdiction (cf. Henkelman 2008 : 118, 132-3). Now, because certain towns appear as stops on the Susa-Persepolis road, but also appear in texts (e.g., on rations for workers) with impressions of a regional seal, we have a rough idea of the relative location of a number of towns in one of the three regions defined by regional seals. By studying seal use, officials, collocation of place names, etc., we can add other places to this relative topography. This approach works reasonably well for most places mentioned in the Fortification tablets, though the results are necessarily only approximations (cf. above).

There is a group of places, however, that does not answer to the above pattern and is surprisingly difficult to locate even on the relative map. Hallock, partly working from the first results of Arfae's research, assumed that all these places were located in a fourth region, the "northern area", which he described as "less clearly defined" (1978 : 109; cf. *idem* 1985 : 598). Arfae himself eventually did not venture to include the "northern area" in his dissertation on the geography of the Fortification archive (2008), probably because the image rising from the relevant texts is so diffuse. The main problem is that the "northern area" is not defined by a regional seal. Some towns in the problematic group are stops on the road to Media, but others have links to both the Fahliyān and the Persepolis regions, including links to Tirazziš (Šīrāz) in the southwestern section of the latter region.

A probable solution comes from our new understanding of the road system and the location of coastal Tamukkan at the end of the north-south route : the road descending from Media indeed passed towns like Kabaš/*Gaba-, but it continued, *via* the special Kāmfirūz region, towards the Persian Gulf. Some towns in the problematic groups are associated with the northern stretch of this road and the area around it, but others are associated with the area south(east) of the Fahliyān region and (south)west of Šīrāz and the Persepolis region. For reasons that we can, as yet, not fully grasp these two areas are not associated with a regional seal, but they are at least partially defined by the north and south stretches of the Media-Tamukkan road. Thus, it would be better not to speak of one "northern region" (if only to avoid confusion with the three clearly-defined administrative regions), but rather of a 'northern cluster' and a 'sub-Fahliyān cluster'⁴⁸.

Needless to say, many questions remain open at this point. Some of them will perhaps be answered by the results of the excavations in the Mamasanī region and in the Tang-e Bolāgi, as well as by future surveys and excavations in the Būšehr/Borāzgan area. Meanwhile, we are getting a clearer view of the territory under purview of the Persepolis administration : not only can we identify some of the major towns and residences, but we can especially better understand the *system* that underlies the structuring of the territory. As such the above observations add, once again, to the impression that the institutional economy centred on Persepolis was the result of careful, long-term and large-scale planning and a witness to the energy and resources invested by the Teispids and the Achaemenids in the development of the empire's heartland.

⁴⁸ See also Henkelman 2008 : 119, 483-6, 493-6, 504. Hallock (1985 : 598) pointed out the importance of PF 2084, in which a town named Kuntarruš occurs among a variety of other places. Comparing Kuntarruš to ^{AŠ}*ku-un-tar-ru-š* (DB_e II.50) "in Media", Hallock assumed that all these places should be in the northern region. Kuntarruš, however, is clearly one of the towns of the sub-Fahliyān cluster and it must therefore be different from the place mentioned in the Bisotūn inscription (cf. Henkelman 2008 : 484-6).

Bibliography

- Arfaee, A. M. 2008, *The Geographical Background of the Persepolis Tablets*, diss. Chicago (UMI 3300414), Ann Arbor.
- Arfa'i [Arfaee], A. M. 1999, "La grande route Persépolis-Suse. Une lecture des tablettes provenant des Fortifications de Persépolis", *Topoi* 9/1 : 33-45.
- Boardman, J. 2000, *Persia and the West. An Archaeological Investigation of the Genesis of Achaemenid Art*, London.
- Bosworth, A. B. 1980, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, vol. 1, Oxford.
- Boucharlat, R. 2005, "Iran", in : P. Briant & R. Boucharlat (edd.), *L'archéologie de l'empire achéménide : nouvelles recherches* (Persika 6), Paris : 221-92.
- Boucharlat, R. & Salles, J.-F. 1981, "The History and Archaeology of the Gulf from the fifth century B.C. to the seventh century A.D. : a review of the evidence", *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies* 11 : 65-94.
- Briant, P. 2002, *From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire*, Winona Lake.
- Cameron, G. G. 1948, *Persepolis Treasury Tablets* (OIP 65), Chicago.
- De Miroschedji, P. 1990, "La fin de l'Élam : essai d'analyse et d'interprétation", *IrAnt* 25 : 47-95.
- De Planhol, X. 2006, s.v. "Isfahan II, Historical Geography : An Overview since Ancient Times", *EnclIr* XIII : 617-22.
- Hallock, R. T. 1959, "The Elamite Texts from Persepolis", in : H. Franke (ed.), *Akten des vierundzwanzigsten internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses, München 28. August bis 4. September 1957*, Wiesbaden : 177-9.
- Hallock, R. T. 1977, "The Use of Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets", in : McG. Gibson & R. D. Biggs (edd.), *Seals and Sealing in the Ancient Near East* (BiMes 6), Malibu : 127-133.
- Hallock, R. T. 1978, "Selected Fortification Texts", *CDAFI* 8 : 109-136.
- Hansman, J. 1975, "An Achaemenian Stronghold", in : *Monumentum H.S. Nyberg*, vol. 3 (Acta Iranica 16), Leiden : 289-312.
- Hansman, J. 2006, "Isfahan IV, Pre-Islamic Period", *EnclIr* XIII : 635-8.
- Henkelman, W. F. M. 2003, "An Elamite memorial : the *šumar* of Cambyses and Hystaspes", in : W. F. M. Henkelman & A. Kuhrt (edd.), *A Persian Perspective. Essays in Memory of Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg* (AchHist XIII), Leiden : 101-172.
- Henkelman, W. F. M. 2007, s.v. "Ruhurater", in : *RLA* 11, Berlin/New York : 449.
- Henkelman, W. F. M. 2008, *The Other Gods Who Are. Studies in Elamite-Iranian Acculturation based on the Persepolis Fortification Texts* (AchHist XIV), Leiden.
- Henkelman, W. F. M. [forthc.], "'Consumed before the King'. Requisitions for the King and the Court in the Persepolis Fortification Archive", in : B. Jacobs & R. Rollinger (edd.), *Der Achämenidenhof* (Oriens et Occidens), Stuttgart.
- Henkelman, W. F. M. & Stolper, M. W. [forthc.], "Ethnicity and Ethnic Labelling at Persepolis : the Case of the Skudrians", in : P. Briant & M. Chauveau (edd.), *Organisation des pouvoirs et contacts culturels dans les pays de l'empire achéménide* (Persika), Paris.
- Henning, W. B. 1957, "Gabae", *Asia Major* 1951 : 144 [reprinted in *Acta Iranica* 15 : 357].

- Hinz, W. 1976, *Dareios und die Perser. Eine Kulturgeschichte der Achämeniden*, vol. 1, Baden-Baden.
- Hinz, W. & Koch, H. 1987, *Elamisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols. (AMI Erg. 17), Berlin.
- Junge, P.J. 1944, *Dareios I. König der Perser*, Leipzig.
- Koch, H. 1990, *Verwaltung und Wirtschaft im persischen Kernland zur Zeit der Achämeniden* (TAVO Beih. B89), Wiesbaden.
- Kuhrt, A. 2007, *The Persian Empire. A Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period*, 2 vols., London/New York.
- Mallowan, M. 1972, "Cyrus the Great", *Iran* 10 : 1-17.
- Metzler, D. 1977, "Ptolemaios' Geographie und die Topographie der Persepolis Fortification Tablets", in : W. Voigt (ed.), *XIX. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 28. September bis 4. Oktober 1975 in Freiburg in Breisgau : Vorträge* (ZDMG Suppl. 3/2), Wiesbaden : 1057-60.
- Nasrabadi, B. M. 2005, Eine Steininschrift des Amar-Suena aus Tappeh Bormi (Iran), *ZA* 95 : 161-71.
- Pohanka, R. 1983, "Zu einigen Architekturstücken von Tell-e Zohak bei Fasa, Südiran", *AÖAW* 120/7 : 255-65.
- Potts, D. T. 1999, *The Archaeology of Elam. Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State*, Cambridge.
- Potts, D. T. [forthc.], "Sailing to Pasargadae", in : K. Abdi (ed.), Memorial Volume for Sh. Shabazi.
- Sarfaraz, A. A. 1971, "Un pavillon de l'époque de Cyrus le Grand à Borazdjan", *Bastanshenasi va honar-e Iran* 7-8 : 19-32.
- Sarfaraz, A. A. 1973, "Borazjān", *Iran* 11 : 188-9.
- Schmitt, R. 2000, s.v. "Gabrae", *EncIr* X : 235.
- Stronach, D. 1978, *Pasargadae. A report on the excavations conducted by the British Institute of Persian Studies from 1961 to 1963*, Oxford.
- Sumner, W. M. 1986, "Achaemenid Settlement in the Persepolis Plain", *AJA* 90 : 3-31.
- Tavernier, J. 2007, *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period (ca. 550-330 B.C.). Lexicon of Old Iranian Proper Names and Loanwords, Attested in Non-Iranian Texts* (OLA 158), Leuven/Paris/Dudley.
- Tolini, G. 2008, "Les travailleurs babyloniens et le palais de Taokè", *ARTA* 2008.002 [<http://www.achemenet.com/document/2008.002-Tolini.pdf>].
- Vallat, F. 1993, *Les noms géographiques des sources suso-élamites* (RGTC 11), Wiesbaden.
- Weißbach, F. H. 1932a, s.v. "Ταόκη", *RE* II/4 : 2247-8.
- Weißbach, F. H. 1932b, s.v. "Ταοκηνή", *RE* II/4 : 2248.
- Whitcomb, D. S. 1987, "Bushire and the Angali Canal", *Mesopotamia* 22 : 311-36.
- Zadok, R. 1976, "On the Connections between Iran and Babylonia in the sixth century B.C.", *Iran* 14 : 61-78.