

CHAPTER NINE

ELAMITES AND IRANIANS¹



Jan Tavernier

INTRODUCTION

The Achaemenid empire and its history are intensively studied topics, as the empire itself is considered to be the first truly Iranian empire. The Iranian character of the Achaemenid empire has long been recognized and is continually being corroborated by the strong presence of Iranian names in non-Iranian texts from the Achaemenid period (cf. Tavernier 2007 and the volumes of the series *Iranisches Personennamenbuch* dedicated to the Old Iranian names).

This substantial attention to the Achaemenid empire is in sharp contrast with the relatively low degree given to the Neo-Elamite period. It is only in the last decade, thanks to new discoveries in the field, that more and more archaeologists, historians and philologists have started to conduct thorough research on this transitional period between the Middle Elamite and Achaemenid periods.

Part of this research has concentrated on the presence of Iranians in Neo-Elamite Elam, whereby it has become clear that the Iranians were already established in the whole of Elam during the Neo-Elamite period. Indeed, it is now recognized that for many years before the appearance of the Achaemenid Persian empire, there were close contacts between the Iranian and Elamite populations settled in Elam. This interaction can easily be considered as formative for the Achaemenid empire and logically reinforces the link between both periods.

In this chapter, Iranians and Elamites and their relation with each other in both the Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid periods will be studied. With regard to the Neo-Elamite period, a geographical model will be maintained (lowland versus highland), whereas for the Achaemenid period a more general model can be used.

NEO-ELAMITE PERIOD (C. 1000–550 BC)

As already mentioned, contrary to the many publications dealing with the Iranian theonyms, anthroponyms, toponyms, hydronyms, oronyms and loanwords attested in Achaemenid Elamite texts, little work has been done on the Iranian linguistic elements in Neo-Elamite documents. Only Mayrhofer (1971), Hinz (1967), Zadok

(1984) and Tavernier (2002) have published some notes on them, and a general study of the presence of Iranian proper names and loanwords in the Neo-Elamite period was published by Tavernier (2011). In the latter work, the methodology used to classify the Iranian proper names and loanwords is the same as has been used for the study of Iranian elements in non-Iranian texts from the Achaemenid period (Tavernier 2007). Following this system, the Iranica can be divided in four categories:

- (1) Directly transmitted Iranica: Names and words that are attested in their Iranian form (i.e. the Achaemenid Royal Inscriptions).
- (2) Semi-directly transmitted Iranica:
 - Names and words that are identical to Iranica from the Achaemenid Royal Inscriptions but that are attested in a documentary text.
 - Proper names and loanwords whose Iranian original is attested in the Achaemenid Royal Inscriptions but which are still slightly different. Such a difference might be a dialectal one (e.g. Old Persian Rtavardiya- vs. Median *Rtavarziya-), but contracted or monophthongized equivalents of forms, belonging to category one, are also included here (e.g. **yanē* vs older *yanaiy*).
- (3) Foreign Iranica: Non-Iranian expressions for which there is no doubt about their transmission to the Elamites by Old Iranian.
- (4) Indirectly transmitted Iranica: Reconstructed Old Iranian proper names and loanwords.

The Iranica belonging to the last three categories are always marked by an asterisk. Also note that, due to the lack of Old Iranian texts dating from the Neo-Elamite period (the oldest Old Iranian written text is the so-called Bisotun Inscription from Darius I), there are no Neo-Elamite Iranica belonging to the first and third categories.

Inevitably, there are also names and words that appear to be Iranian but have many uncertainties. These are brought together in a group called “Incerta,” which is divided into five subgroups:

- (1) Fragmentary names and words.
- (2) Hybrids: names and words belonging partly to the Iranian language and partly to a non-Iranian language.
- (3) Problematic names and words: Iranica whose analysis is problematic.
- (4) Dubia: names and words whose Iranian character is uncertain.
- (5) Pseudo-Iranica: names and words that were once believed to be Iranian but whose Iranian character is now abandoned.

In Neo-Elamite texts, the first two categories are not represented.

Most specialists believe that the Iranians arrived in Iran around 1000 BC (cf. Witzel 2009 on the Iranian migration in the 2nd millennium BC). The first attestations of Iranian-speaking people occur in the Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions (annals) of Ashurnasirpal II (883–859 BC), who confronted Iranian tribes in the Zagros Mountains while expanding the Assyrian territory towards the east. Of these tribes, the Medes and the Persians are the most frequently attested, appearing repeatedly in the Assyrian sources (cf. Radner 2013 on the relations between Assyrians and Iranians).

The oldest attestation of an Iranian element dates to 879 and occurs in an inscription from Ashurnasirpal II. There Amika (= Ir. *Am-ika-, a hypocoristic of a name with element *ama- “(military) strength”) and Araštua (Ir. *Rša-tavā “Having the strength of a hero”), two chieftains in the land of Zamua, came into conflict with the Neo-Assyrian king. Clearly, this proves Iranian presence in the 9th century in the Zagros (cf. Radner and Schmitt 1998a and 1998b).

The Medes appear from 835 onwards (^{kur}A-ma-da-a-a; RIMA 3 A.O.102.14:121), but more interesting for this study is the occurrence, from 843 onwards, of a land called Pār-su-a or Par-su-ma-āš/Par-su-ū-ma-āš, which is clearly, at least from a linguistic point of view, the predecessor of the later name Pārsa (modern Fārs = Persia), the region in southwest Iran where the Achaemenid empire would be established. That these regions were not politically unified is proven by the fact that many kings/chieftains of various areas are attested. In one passage, Shalmaneser III mentions no less than 27 kings of the land of Parsua.

In 744 Tiglath-pileser III (744–726 BC) established two Assyrian provinces in Iran (Parsua and Bit-Ḥamban), meaning that for the first time in history the Assyrian Empire controlled territory in the eastern Zagros (Radner 2013: 443). Another important event is recorded by Ashurbanipal. After having sacked Susa in 646, the Assyrian king reports that two kings, Kuraš of Parsumash and Pizlume of Hudimiri, being full of fear after hearing of Ashurbanipal’s powerful and awe-inspiring deeds, sent their tribute to Ninive. Kuraš even sent his son Arukku with this tribute.

For a long, time researchers embraced the tempting thought that Kuraš of Parsumash was identical with Cyrus I of Anshan, the grandfather of Cyrus II the Great (cf. *infra*). More recently, however, this idea has been rightfully abandoned by scholars like Miroschedji (1985) and Potts (2005: 18–20, with literature), and it is now generally accepted that they were not the same person. One of the objections is that if Cyrus of Parsumash was identical with Cyrus I of Anshan, the grandfather of Cyrus II and founder of the Achaemenid empire around 550 BC, the reigns of the Anshanite kings Cyrus I and Cambyses I would have been exceptionally long (Miroschedji 1985: 283–285).

In the same way the historical geography was blurred (Miroschedji 1985: 268–278), as scholars thought that there were no less than three regions Parsua/Parsumash/Parsa: one located to the southwest of Lake Urmia (northern Zagros), one in the Central Zagros and one in the neighbourhood of Anshan. Cameron, for instance, believed that the existence of these three regions was a pivotal indication for the migration route of the Persians towards Fārs: around 815 they moved from the northern Zagros to the central Zagros, from where they finally arrived in Parsa (Anshan) during the first half of the 7th century. Again, this idea has been critically considered and consequently abandoned after it was established that the capital city of Anshan was located in Tall-e Malyan, more than 500 km away from the central Zagros.

Summarizing, it may be accepted that:

- (1) Cyrus of Parsumash reigned around 646 over an area situated somewhere in the central Zagros, whereas Cyrus I reigned in Anshan, modern Fārs.
- (2) Both Cyruses cannot be identical because of the aforementioned geographical and chronological as well as chronological objections.

These conclusions have their bearing on the present chapter. They clarify the history of the Fars region and thereby of the rise of the Achaemenid empire, where Elamites and Iranians would constitute one single people.

It is the intention of this section to discuss the Iranian presence in the region of Susa (lowland) and in the region of Anshan (highland). Further on, Iranian presence in other regions (the region between Susa and Anshan) will also be examined.

Susiana

After the sack of Susa by Ashurbanipal in 646 BC, it probably did not take long for the kingdom of Susa to re-emerge, despite Ashurbanipal's claim that his destruction of the city was thorough and definitive. Elamite royal and other inscriptions found in Susa and dated to the period between c.640 and c.550 confirm the existence of a centralized Susian kingdom. This is corroborated by two other archives found in Susa and dated to c.600–580 BC. The first one, called the Susa Acropole Archive, consists of about 300 administrative and economic documents and mentions various officials. The documents were published by Scheil (MDP 9 1–298 and MDP 11 309). About ten percent of the personal names occurring in this archive are Iranian (Hinz 1987: 128; Henkelman 2003a: 212). The second archive, consisting of seven documents, is a legal archive, usually called the Susa Apadana Archive (also published by Scheil in MDP 11 301–307).

The Susa Acropole Archive provides first-hand information on the presence of Iranians in the late Neo-Elamite period at Susa. In fact, various Iranian anthroponyms (95), toponyms (5) and loanwords (4) clearly attest to the Iranian presence in Susa and its surroundings. As there are only seven documents contained in the Susa Apadana Archive, fewer Iranian linguistic elements (personal names, place names, loanwords) are represented there.

By contrast, the Neo-Elamite royal inscriptions do not contain any Iranian personal names, implying that political power was held by ruling families of Elamite linguistic background. Nevertheless, Iranians may very well have held high administration positions within local political systems. In this sense it is a pity that the name of the highest official mentioned in the archive, Kuddakaka, can be considered either Iranian or Elamite (Tavernier 2011: 209). The fact that Iranians could have some social status in Elam is proven by their being owners of seals.

The Susa Acropole texts yield some historical information on the Iranians active at Susa and surrounding areas (cf. Tavernier 2011: 240–243). They mention three Persian population groups: *Dātāyana- (MDP 9 51, 187, 272, 281; named members of this tribe are *Patirapa-, *Teza-, *Vantuka- and *Yuvataka-), Huri (no named members) and Zambegir (with only one named member *Spakṛta-). The three groups are explicitly called “Persian”, which is also the distinguishing feature between these groups and the small groups discussed below. Scheil (1907: 17) wonders whether they were Persians already living in Susiana before Cyrus' accession to the throne or Persian tribes not living in Susiana, but still serving as tributaries to the Susian king. Unfortunately, a definite answer to this issue is difficult to give, as both are plausible ideas.

The inhabitants of the kingdom of Susa were probably organized in small population groups around one central figure. The dependents of these groups are indicated

by adding an Elamite suffix to the name of the central figure, for example, *-r* (sg.) or *-p* (pl.). In this way *Bagabāzu- (^{be}Ba-ag-ba-šu) is called “the one of the people of *Kṛpānmā” (^{be}Kur-ru-ip-pan-ma-pé-ra; cf. Hinz and Koch 1987: 532) or in MDP 9 133, one has the formula 3 ^{be}Nap-tuk-ip 2 ^{be}Ir-da-ad-da “3 (subordinates) of *Naptaka-, 2 (subordinates) of *Rdata-”. In MDP 9 133, an anonymous messenger (^{be}hu-ut-lak) of *Pāθrāna- is mentioned.

The attested central figures with Iranian names and their subordinates (if their name is known) are:

- (1) *Aina-
- (2) ^{be}Ka₄-gi-ás-ba
- (3) *Kamna-
- (4) *Kṛpānmā (subordinates: *Bagbāzu-, *Bagrapa-, *Vananta-)
- (5) *Manuša-
- (6) *Naptaka-
- (7) *Pāθrāna- (subordinates: ^{be}Ad-da-te-en, an unnamed messenger)
- (8) *Rōpāθa- (subordinate: ^{be}Lu-da-da)
- (9) *Rdata-
- (10) *Θrābuka- (subordinate: *Bāmkaca-)
- (11) *Θrāya-
- (12) *Vaigana- (subordinate: ^{be}Ha-mi-ti-ra)

Not only individuals bearing Iranian names could be such central figures. People with Elamite names, too, could have this role. Examples of such individuals are:

- (1) ^{be}A-a-zip-pi
- (2) ^{be}Ak-ki-ra-ra (subordinate: *Bāma-)
- (3) ^{be}Ap-pa-la-a-a (subordinate: *Xsaparapa-)
- (4) ^{be}Hu-ban-ki-tin
- (5) ^{be}Hu-ban-hal-tas
- (6) ^{be}La-li-in-tas
- (7) ^{be}Su-un-ki-ba-ki-iš
- (8) ^{be}Um-be-nu-iš

One might be inclined to think that these small groups are also ethnic categories and that we are dealing here with Iranian or Elamite tribes. This is, however, not very likely. The main argument against this idea is the fact that some of the central figures are also mentioned in the Acropole texts as individuals (i.e. tribes or ethnic groups would more likely be named after eponyms, not after still living individuals). If they were merely eponyms, their appearance in the texts is relatively unusual. There may rather be a hierarchic system at work, according to which the central figure is head of a clan or a business unit.

The socio-economic role of the people bearing Iranian names is not different from that of the people bearing Elamite names. They all receive various garments and other objects such as bows, shafts, spears and so on. They appear as witnesses (*Arina-, *Gitika-) or as one of the parties in legal texts of the Apadana Archive (^mKu-na-ra-mi-ka₄). Some of the men bearing Iranian names certainly had, however, high

socio-economic positions, as may be deduced from the existence of the central figures described above and from their ownership of seals.

The individuals with Iranian names apparently had no political power in the kingdom of Susa. Nevertheless, they could hold important administrative roles. *Arina- had the title *rab ekalli*, a chief palace official; if ^{be}Ku-ud-da-ka⁴-ka⁴ is an Iranian name, then another high official (*arash hutlak*) could have been an Iranian. *Hiθika- also may have been quite important, since a statue of a god was assigned to him. People bearing Iranian names could also be subordinates of people with non-Iranian names. Overall, it is conspicuous that, despite the rather low number of Iranian personal names (10%), there are more central figures with an Iranian name than central figures with a non-Iranian name.

Despite the close contacts between Elamites and Iranians, the individuals with Iranian names attested in the Acropole texts are often mentioned together; a few texts have (almost) only Iranian names and it is rare for a text to have only one Iranian name.

Nonetheless, one should not overestimate the Iranian segregation in Elam. On the contrary, the close contacts are proven by the fact that, as Table 9.1 shows, the people bearing Iranian names often occur together with those bearing Elamite names. Moreover, if Pír-na is the Elamite rendering of an Old Iranian name *Farnah-, as Zadok (1984: 388) claims, then a person bearing an Iranian name would have had two

Table 9.1 Elamite and Iranian names in MDP texts

<i>Text</i>	<i>Iranian names</i>	<i>Elamite and other names</i>
MDP 9 11	*Bagrapa-, *Dayāta-, *Hvāθris	Kuddakaka (if Elamite)
MDP 9 49	*Kṛpānmā	Mutiti
MDP 9 51	*Nāfēca-, *Patirapa-, *Tēza-, *Xvarθis, *Yuvātaka-	Kuddakaka (if Elamite)
MDP 9 63	*Arina-, *Kṛmi-, *Manuša-	–
MDP 9 71	*Arina-, *Sakidēva-	Aplaya- (Semitic)
MDP 9 94	*Ama-, *Māda-	Akšin-kilik, Anni-šilha, Attakitin, Sunki-bakuš, Unzi-[], etc.
MDP 9 101	*Franjana-, Kagiasba, *Vananta-	Atta-Barru
MDP 9 110	*Hadāspa-, *Pāθrāna-, *Vṛzvanta-	Attaten, Humpanta, Napupu
MDP 9 132	*Aspavika-, *Uvaxstra-, *Xsaparapa-	Halluš, Humpan-ampa, Kitin-Humpan, Upuhu
MDP 9 133	*Bagbāzu-, *Katāna-, *Pāθrāna-, *Franjana-, *Ṛdata-	–
MDP 9 134	*Pāyu-, *Sugda-	Kutup, Lalu-in-taš, Napkilapal
MDP 9 135	*(H)uvataxsa-, *Miθra-	Anni, Kikkit, Kutur, Kutur-ter, Lalu-in-taš

<i>Text</i>	<i>Iranian names</i>	<i>Elamite and other names</i>
MDP 9 145	*Arina-, *Vēškāma-, *Vīdamanā	Itpun, Ittiti, Mardu-nukaš
MDP 9 147	*Manuša-, *Rōpāθka-, *Zāta-	Hutradadda, Simimi
MDP 9 148	*Bāmakaca-, *Kṛpānmā, *Pāθrāna-	Ittiš, Lillu
MDP 9 157	*Gōmāya-, *Gōšaya-, *Kṛpānmā	Unsak
MDP 9 160	*Bāma-, *Vēškāma-	Akkirara, Hamitira
MDP 9 187	Baksienda, *Bagbādu-, Mitilaksar, *Vantuka-, *Vṛzvanta-	Halluš
MDP 9 199	*Kāra-, *Maθiya-, *Pāyuna-	—
MDP 9 229	*Br̥ga-, *Gōmāya-, *Gōšaya-	Hulili
MDP 9 259	*(H)ubṛga-, *Mazdara-	18 Elamite names
MDP 9 289	*Maθāna-, *Rōpāθka-	Kursu, Lalu-sunkik

sons with Elamite names (Simimi and Upuhu). Hinz and Koch (1987: 211) believed it was an Elamite name, but without presenting an Elamite etymology. In fact, there is a convincing Iranian etymology, and an Elamite one is very difficult to find, so it may, despite Tavernier's (2011: 209) doubts, very well be an Iranian name. This only enhances the intensity of Elamo-Iranian contacts and integration at that time.

For the sake of completeness, it should be noted that the region of Susiana was not just populated by Iranians or Elamites. In the Acropole Archive two kings of a people called Zari are mentioned: Aplaya- is called “king of the Zarians” (MDP 9 71:2; [su]nki ^{as}Za-ri-pé-ra), as well as ^{be}Mar-tuk (MDP 9 80:3; sunki ^{as}Za-ri-pé-[r]a). Both names (Aplaya- and Marduk) are Akkadian, which supports Henkelman's (2003b: 257) thesis that the Zarians might have been an “Aramaic or Chaldaean tribe on the south-western fringe of Khuzestan”.² It may be that the border region of Susiana and Mesopotamia was inhabited by Aramaean and Chaldaean tribes. Babylonians also occur in an administrative text, recorded in Akkadian and containing only Babylonian names, dated to the 15th year of Hallutaš-Inšušinak II, king of Elam (probably the end of the 7th century BC). The text, concerning an adoption of a girl, clearly emanates from a Babylonian community in the town of Sumundunaš in the Susiana region. Another text (PTS 2713; Stolper 1986: 236) again only has Babylonian names and was drafted in the first year of the same king Hallutaš-Inšušinak II in the town of Bīt-Ḫulummū. Of a third text dated to this king (VS 4 1; cf. San Nicolò and Ungnad 1935: 199 no.165), the exact date and place where it was drafted are lost. The existence of an “assembly of the Babylonians” in the town of Hidalu is demonstrated by a text (Leichty 1983: 154) dated to the accession year of Tammartu, the king installed in Hidalu by Ashurbanipal around 653 BC.

Anshan

The date of the arrival of the Iranian immigrants in the region of Anshan (modern Fārs) is difficult to determine. The texts are silent on the population movements,

and the archaeology is not very helpful either. In fact, there are no signs of sedentary occupation in Anshan between the late Middle Elamite and Achaemenid periods (Potts 1999: 262). An explanation for this is that the people living in Anshan were probably semi-nomadic and therefore more difficult to trace in the archaeological records (Miroschedji 1985: 289–292).³ Nevertheless, a date around 1000 BC seems to be quite plausible (Miroschedji 1985: 292).

Since about 1500 BC the number of settlements in the Anshan region had started to decline, while at the same time new types of ceramics appeared. These two developments imply a greater role played by nomadism but should not be linked to the immigration of Iranian-speaking tribes (Miroschedji 1985: 290). It remains true, however, that the Iranians could have benefited from this nomadisation by settling themselves in the area.⁴

In the 10th century BC this depopulation was at its maximum, as demonstrated by the fact that only at two sites (and in small numbers) Iron Age II sherds were found in the Anshan region. Moreover, for the 7th century there is no archaeological evidence in the area, except for the reliefs of Kurangun and Naqsh-e Rostam, again confirming a high level of pastoralist nomadism (Miroschedji 1985: 292).

If the date of the Iranian arrival in Fārs around 1000 BC is correct, contacts between Elamites and Iranians existed since this date, although not much is known of them.

These contacts are also illustrated by the fact that troops from Anshan as well as troops from Parsuaš fought together in the battle of Ḫalule in 691 BC against the Neo-Assyrian king Sennacherib (Waters 2011: 286). It was in this period that the process of “ethnogenèse des Perses” (Miroschedji 1985: 295) was ongoing, which would culminate in the Elamo-Persian culture of the Achaemenid Empire.

The political status of Anshan and its surroundings in the 7th century is not clear, despite Miroschedji’s hypothesis (1985: 304) that Anshan still belonged to the kingdom of Susa (in his eyes, this control lasted until 646). The authority of the Susian kingdom over Anshan must have been very lax (Miroschedji 1985: 291). In the context of a weaker Susian kingdom (certainly after the Assyrian attack of 646), a new Anshanite kingdom was established around 635 BC (Miroschedji 1985: 284 and 304). Its first king was called Teispes (hence the name “Teispid kingdom”), who was a direct forebear of Cyrus II, the founder of the Teispid/Achaemenid empire. One can find this genealogy on the famous Cyrus cylinder, a royal inscription in which Cyrus II justifies his conquering of Babylonia.

Teispes would be succeeded by Cyrus I, of whom the seal is still preserved (cf. the most recent collation by Waters [2011: 290] which, however, does not yield a plausible result) and who reigned c.610–585 BC. His successors were Cambyses I (c.585–559 BC) and the well-known Cyrus II (c.559–530 BC), who would establish the Teispid/Achaemenid empire. These kings (or, at least, Cyrus II) most likely bore the royal title “King of Anshan”, as is clear from inter alia the Cyrus Cylinder (Miroschedji 1985: 296–298). Actually, the title “King of Parsa”, was only in use from the reign of Darius I (521–486 BC) onwards. Note also that from then on the name Anshan is attested only once again, in the Bisitun inscription (Waters 2011: 287).

It is not within the scope of this chapter to discuss the beginnings of the kingdom of Anshan and its relation with its successor, the Achaemenid Empire. Many scholars have already dedicated time and energy to this debate (cf. recently Quintana 2011, Vallat 2011 and Waters 2011, to name but a few).

More interesting is to have a look at the ethnic character of the ruling dynasty of this Anshanite kingdom. From the ethnic point of view, a highly interesting development can now be seen in Fars, where Elamite and Iranians (Persians) had already lived together for centuries. It is difficult to assess the principal ethnicity of the kingdom itself. Was it an Elamite kingdom, or an Iranian one? The truth lies most likely somewhere in the middle and the idea of an “ethnogénèse des Perses”, as Miroschedji (1985: 295) calls it, is, admittedly, quite attractive. It postulates a gradual melting together of the Iranians and the Elamites, creating a new people, traditionally called Persians. It is out of this amalgamation process that the Achaemenid culture would be born.

With regard to the material culture, one rather sees an Elamite culture. For instance, seals are in a Neo-Elamite style. The first seal in Achaemenid style dates from the reign of Darius I. Nevertheless, the material and artistic culture of Susa and Anshan was not different in the 7th and 6th centuries and must be called Neo-Elamite rather than Iranian (Miroschedji 1985: 300–301).

The textual sources, too, may give us some information on the character of the Teispid culture. First of all, the royal names Teispes (Old Persian *Cišpiš*, Elamite *Sešpeš* or *Zišpiš* [Achaemenid]) and Cyrus (Old Persian *Kuruš*, Elamite *Kuraš*) can most likely not be attributed to the Iranian language family. Rather (certainly concerning the name of Cyrus) they are Elamite, which enhances the idea that the Teispid kingdom was not purely Iranian. Note also that the first version of the Bisitun inscription was the Elamite one and that it was only later that the Old Persian was added (Miroschedji 1985: 301; Huyse 1999).

Further evidence for an ethnically mixed kingdom is found in the Persepolis Fortification and Treasure Archives, the texts of which are drafted in Elamite, proving that the administration set up by Cyrus II in the Anshanite region was originally an Elamite one (Miroschedji 1985: 301–302). The officials probably mastered the two languages (Elamite and Old Persian), as the Elamite texts are flooded by Iranian anthroponyms, toponyms and loanwords (cf. Tavernier 2007), showing a large Iranian presence in the Kur River basin by the reign of Darius I. Moreover, the Elamite texts are also syntactically influenced by Old Persian, for example, concerning word order.

Elsewhere in Elam

Susa and Anshan were not the only regions with a mixed population. It can easily be expected that the regions in between and around them also saw the arrival of Iranian-speaking people. Unfortunately, the textual record of these regions is not very abundant.

In light of this situation, one can only welcome the appearance of various objects found in the so-called Kalmākarra Cave in Lorestān. These objects are usually called the “Kalmākarra Hoard” (Henkelman 2003a: 214–227) and date from the first half of the 6th century BC. Some of the objects bear a label/ownership inscription, which is of interest for this study.

The small inscriptions give us more information on the state of Samati, inhabitants of which are also mentioned in the Susa Acropole Archive. In MDP 9 94, 12 Samatians receive *kuktu*-garments. Two of the 12 individuals (*Ama- and *Māda-) bear

Iranian names, whereas the ten others have Elamite names.⁵ This pattern is confirmed in the inscriptions from the Kalmākarra Cave, where, of the 24 personal names, three are Iranian: *Gītiya-, *Hamfrīš and *Tapala- (cf. Vallat 2000, Henkelman 2003a: 222, Tavernier 2011: 199 no. 2.2.24, 199 no. 2.2.1.28, and 205 no. 2.2.1.67). These individuals even occupy high ranks in the Samatian society: *Hamfrīš is king of Samati, whereas *Tapala- is his father and *Gītiya- is named as father of Unsak, another Samatian king. Interesting for the acculturation between Elamites and Iranians is that the brother of *Hamfrīš has an Elamite name (Anni-šilhak) and that two of *Hamfrīš's sons also have Elamite names (Ahtir⁶ and Unzi-kilik). This means that the acculturation was also active in the ruling dynasty, with its mixed onomasticon (Henkelman 2003a: 224).

Other non-Iranian names occurring in these texts are Aksimarti, Abu-līti,⁷ Aspe, Attasapir, Huban, Hunzak, Indapipi, Ipunukaš, Lalintaš, Pirri, Sapparak, Simima, Turhakra and Umbadudu.

The personal names that occur in both the Kalmākarra inscriptions and the Neo-Elamite texts from Susa are *Hamfrīš, Annišilha(k), Lalintas, Pirri, Umbadudu, Unsak and Untaš. In all probability, Unzi-[] should be restored to ^{be}Un-zí-[ki-li-ik] (Vallat 1996), because the element *unzi* only occurs in this name. Vallat (1996; also Henkelman 2003a: 222 fn. 149) strongly believes in prosopographical identifications of these names, but this is not so easily accepted.

The strongest case is Anni-šilhak, the brother of *Hamfrīš and king of Samati, called “Samatian” in an Acropole text. If one individual is involved here, this would mean that the kingdoms of Susa and Samati had well-established contacts. This would be corroborated if *Hamfrīš the king of Samati is the same as *Hamfrīš who is mentioned in the Acropole texts. The latter is the father of ^{be}Hu-ban-rās-ma.

The style of the objects belonging to the “Kalmakarra Hoard” has many parallels in Achaemenid art. This, combined with the onomastic evidence, may point to a high degree of acculturation between Elamites and Iranians in Samati (Boucharlat 1998: 149–150; Henkelman 2003a: 222).

Finally, one must also mention the few Iranian elements in the Neo-Elamite letter corpus, consisting of the so-called Nineveh letters plus two letters found in Susa but belonging to the same archive (MDP 9 88 and MDP 36 79; cf. Tavernier 2004: 39). A group of Persians is mentioned in BA 4 177 no. 2:13. The Iranian name *(H)ubīza- (spelled Ū-pi-iz-za) occurs in another letter (Tavernier 2011: 200 no. 2.2.1.3). One of the four Iranian loanwords attested in Neo-Elamite texts (the other occurring in the Susa Acropole Archive), being Old Persian *xšaça- (spelled šā-ah-šā), is also attested in a Nineveh letter (Tavernier 2011: 195 no. 2.1.3.2). This again proves the established Iranian presence in Elam around 600 BC.

ABBREVIATIONS

BA	Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.
MDP 9	Administrative tablets from the Acropole of Susa published in Scheil 1907.
MDP 11	Elamite inscriptions and tablets in Scheil 1911.
MDP 36	Elamite tablets in Paper 1954.
PTS	Persepolis Treasury Seal.

- RIMA 3 Grayson, A.K. 1997. *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858–745 BC)*, The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 3. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- VS Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin.

NOTES

- 1 This research has been funded by the Interuniversity Attraction Poles Programme initiated by the Belgian Science Policy Office (IAP VII/14: “Greater Mesopotamia: Reconstruction of its Environment and History”).
- 2 On the precise character of the relation between Aplaya and Marduk, see Gorris 2014, §6.3.
- 3 This is in contrast with the northern and central Zagros, where the arrival of Iranian-speaking tribes is archaeologically attested (Miroschedji 1985: 289, who dates this arrival to 1500 BC).
- 4 According to Miroschedji (1985: 291), the late Middle Elamite temple and palace of Anshan (Tall-e Malyan) were nothing more than an “ilôt de civilisation susienne dans une ville en voie de désurbanisation et dans une région en voie de dépopulation”.
- 5 Anni-šilhak, Sunki-bakiš, Akšin-kilik, Atta-kitin, Arra-[], Kašla, Atta-[], Unzi-[] and Itnak. One name is lost.
- 6 Cf. Tavernier 2011: 242 fn. 58.
- 7 Cf. Tavernier 2011: 242 and fn. 59.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boucharlat, R. 1998. L’Iran au 1er millénaire avant J.-C. Recherches iraniennes récentes. *Isimu* 1 = In: Córdoba Zoilo, J.M. (ed.) *Actas del I Symposium Internacional. Una década de estudios sobre el Oriente antiguo (1986–1996)*. Madrid: Universidad Autónoma, 143–158.
- Gorris, E. 2014. *Power and Politics in the Neo-Elamite Kingdom*, 2 vols. PhD Diss., Université catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Henkelman, W. 2003a. Persians, Medes and Elamites. Acculturation in the Neo-Elamite Period. In: Lanfranchi, G.B., Roaf, M. and Rollinger, R. (eds.) *Continuity of Empire (?)*. Assyria, Media, Persia, History of the Ancient Near East. Monographs 5. Padova: S.a.r.g.o.n., 181–231 and Pls. 9–15.
- . 2003b. Defining Neo-Elamite History. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 60/3–4, cols. 251–263.
- Hinz, W. 1967. Zu den Zeughaustäfelchen aus Susa. In: *Festschrift für Wilhelm Eilers. Ein Dokument der internationalen Forschung zum 27. September 1966*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 85–98.
- . 1987. Elams Übergang ins Perserreich. In: *Transition Periods in Iranian History. Actes du symposium de Fribourg-en-Brisgau (22–24 mai 1985)*, Studia Iranica, Cahier 5. Leuven: Peeters, 125–134.
- Hinz, W. and Koch, H. 1987. *Elamisches Wörterbuch*, Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, Ergänzungsband 17. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Huyse, Ph. 1999. Some Further Thoughts on the Bisitun Monument and the Genesis of the Old Persian Cuneiform Script. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* N.S. 13, 45–66.
- Leichty, E. 1983. Bel-epuš and Tammarišu. *Anatolian Studies* 33: 153–155.
- Mayrhofer, M. 1971. *Aus der Namenwelt Alt-Irans. Die zentrale Rolle der Namenforschung in der Linguistik des Alt-Iranischen*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft Vorträge 3. Innsbruck (reprinted in Mayrhofer, M. 1979. *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 127–141).
- Miroschedji, P. de 1985. La fin du royaume d’Anšan et de Suse et la naissance de l’Empire perse. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 75: 265–306.

- Paper, H.H. 1954. Note préliminaire sur la date des trois tablettes élamites de Suse. In: Ghirshman, R. (ed.) *Village perse-achéménide*, Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique en Iran 36. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 79–82 and Pl. XXIV.
- Potts, D.T. 1999. *The Archaeology of Elam: Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State* (Cambridge World Archaeology). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2005. Cyrus the Great and the Kingdom of Anshan. In: Curtis, V.S. and Stewart, S. (eds.) *Birth of the Persian Empire*, The Idea of Iran 1. London – New York: I.B. Tauris, 7–28.
- Quintana, E. 2011. Elamitas Frente a Persas: el Reino Independiente de Anšan. In: Álvarez-Mon, J. and Garrison, M.B. (eds.) *Elam and Persia*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 167–190.
- Radner, K. 2013. Assyria and the Medes. In: D.T. Potts (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Iran*. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 442–456.
- Radner, K. and Schmitt, R. 1998a. Ameka. In: Radner, K. (ed.) *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire* 1/I. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 100.
- . 1998b. Araštua. In: Radner, K. (ed.) *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire* 1/I. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 124.
- San Nicolò, M. and Ungnad, A. 1935. *Neubabylonische Rechts- und Verwaltungsurkunden 1: Rechts- und Wirtschaftsurkunden der Berliner Museen aus vorhellenistischer Zeit*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
- Scheil, V. 1907. *Textes élamites-anzanites. Troisième série*, Délégation en Perse, Mémoires 9. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- . 1911. *Textes élamites-anzanites. Quatrième série*, Délégation en Perse, Mémoires 11. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Stolper, M.W. 1986. A Neo-Babylonian Text from the Reign of Hallušu. In: De Meyer, L., Gasche, H. and Vallat, F. (eds.) *Fragmentae Historiae Elamicae. Mélanges offerts à M.J. Steve*. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 235–241.
- Tavernier, J. 2002. Iranian Presence in Neo-Elamite Susa. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2002/79.
- . 2004. Some Thoughts on Neo-Elamite Chronology. *ARTA* 2004.003, 44 pp.
- . 2007. *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period* (ca. 550–330 B.C.). *Lexicon of Old Iranian Proper Names and Loanwords, Attested in Non-Iranian Texts*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 158. Leuven – Paris – Dudley, MA: Peeters.
- . 2011. Iranians in Neo-Elamite Texts. In: Álvarez-Mon, J. and Garrison, M.B. (eds.) *Elam and Persia*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 191–262.
- Vallat, F. 1996. Le royaume élamite de SAMATI. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 1996/31: 21–22.
- . 2000. Une inscription élamite sur un rhyton en argent à tête de bélier. *Akkadica* 116: 29–33.
- . 2011. Darius, l'héritier légitime, et les premiers Achéménides. In: Álvarez-Mon, J. and Garrison, M.B. (eds.) *Elam and Persia*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 263–284.
- Waters, M. 2011. Parsumaš, Anšan and Cyrus. In: Álvarez-Mon, J. and Garrison, M.B. (eds.) *Elam and Persia*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 285–296.
- Witzel, M. 2009. Iranian Migration. In: Potts, D.T. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Iran*. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 423–441.
- Zadok, R. 1984. On Some Non-Semitic Names in the Ancient Near East. *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* N.F. 19, 385–389.

THE ELAMITE WORLD



Edited by

Javier Álvarez-Mon,
Gian Pietro Basello, and Yasmina Wicks

THE ELAMITE WORLD



Amongst the civilizations to participate in the dynamic processes of contact and interchange that gave rise to complex societies in the ancient Near East, Elam has remained one of the most obscure, at times languishing in the background of scholarly inquiry. In recent years, however, an increasing body of academic publications have acknowledged its relevance and suggested that its legacy was more considerable and long-lasting than previously estimated.

The Elamite World assembles a group of 40 international scholars to contribute their expertise to the production of a solid, lavishly illustrated English-language treatment of Elamite civilization, covering topics such as its physical setting, historical development, languages and people, material culture, art, science, religion and society. Also treated are the legacy of Elam in the Persian empire and its presence in the modern world.

This comprehensive and ambitious survey seeks for Elam, hardly a household name, a noteworthy place in our shared cultural heritage. It will be both a valuable introductory text for a general audience and a definitive reference source for students and academics.

Javier Álvarez-Mon, a native of Spain, holds degrees in ancient Near Eastern art and archaeology from the École du Louvre (Paris) and the University of California at Berkeley, respectively. A 2003 Fullbright-Hays fellow, he is presently Associate Professor in Near Eastern Archaeology and Art at Macquarie University (Australia) and 2014–2018 Future Fellow (Australian Research Council). His primary research interests are the ancient Iranian civilizations of Elam and early Achaemenid Persia. He has two forthcoming books, *Monumental Reliefs of the Elamite Highlands* and *The Art and Culture of Elam*.

Gian Pietro Basello (PhD in the Ancient Near East 2005) is Tenured Lecturer (2018–) at “L’Orientale” University of Naples, Italy, where he has been teaching Elamite language since 2010. He has worked since 2003 on the Iranian-Italian joint Project DARIOSH (Digital Achaemenid Royal Inscription Open Schema Hypertext). His researches are also devoted to ancient calendars and systems for recording time. His website is www.elamit.net.

Yasmina Wicks completed her PhD “‘Alas, Short is the Joy of Life!’: Elamite Funerary Practice in the First Half of the First Millennium BCE” (2017) at the University of Sydney, Australia, where she remains a research affiliate. She has authored a monograph *Bronze ‘Bathtub’ Coffins in the Context of 8th–6th Century BC Babylonian, Assyrian and Elamite Funerary Practices* (2015) and several articles on the material culture of first millennium Elam.

First published 2018
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2018 selection and editorial matter, Javier Álvarez-Mon, Gian Pietro Basello and Yasmina Wicks; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Javier Álvarez-Mon, Gian Pietro Basello and Yasmina Wicks to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-1-138-99989-3 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-315-65803-2 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

CONTENTS



<i>List of figures</i>	ix
<i>List of tables</i>	xvii
<i>List of contributors</i>	xviii

Introduction	I
<i>Javier Álvarez-Mon, Gian Pietro Basello, and Yasmina Wicks</i>	

PART I: IMAGINING ELAM: THE HISTORY OF RESEARCH AND ITS SOURCES 9

1	Ælam regio: Elam in Western scholarship from the Renaissance to the late 19th century	II
	<i>Daniel T. Potts</i>	
2	Elam and the Bible	27
	<i>Peter Dubovský</i>	
3	France and Elam	41
	<i>Nicole Chevalier</i>	
4	Between orientalism and Persomania: The presentation of the Iranian collections at the Louvre	63
	<i>Marianne Cotty</i>	
5	Elamite forgeries and the antiquities market	80
	<i>Oscar White Muscarella</i>	

PART II: THE LAND AND PEOPLES OF ELAM 97

- 6 Physical geography and environment of Elam 99
Cameron A. Petrie, Morteza Djamali, and Matthew D. Jones
- 7 Metals and mining 118
Barbara Helwing
- 8 The peoples of Elam 146
Ran Zadok
- 9 Elamites and Iranians 163
Jan Tavernier

PART III: ELAM THROUGH HISTORY 175

- 10 The birth of Elam in history 177
Piotr Steinkeller
- 11 The Old Elamite period 203
Luca Peyronel
- 12 Elam in the Middle Elamite period 232
Behzad Mofidi-Nasrabadi
- 13 The last centuries of Elam: the Neo-Elamite period 249
Elynn Gorris and Yasmina Wicks

**PART IV: CLOSE ENCOUNTERS ON
THE EASTERN AND WESTERN FRONTS 273**

- 14 Great Domino games: from Elam, looking eastwards 275
Massimo Vidale
- 15 Elam and Babylonia c. 1400–1100 BC 304
Ran Zadok
- 16 Elam and Assyria 323
Peter Dubovsky
- 17 Propaganda and symbolism: representations of the Elamites at
the time of Ashurbanipal 340
Shahrokh Razmjou

PART V: LANGUAGE AND WRITING IN ELAM 361

- 18 Prehistoric administrative technologies and the ancient Near Eastern
redistribution economy: the case of greater Susiana 363
Denise Schmandt-Besserat
- 19 The proto-Elamite writing system 383
Jacob L. Dahl
- 20 Linear Elamite writing 397
François Desset
- 21 The Elamite language 416
Jan Tavernier
- 22 Writing in Elam 450
Jean-Jacques Glassner
- 23 Elamite royal inscriptions 464
Florence Malbran-Labat
- 24 Elamite administration 481
Gian Pietro Basello and Grazia Giovinzio

PART VI: THE MATERIAL CULTURE OF ELAM 505

- 25 Elamite architecture 507
Behzad Mofidi-Nasrabadi
- 26 Elamite ceramics 531
Bernadette K. McCall
- 27 The metal arts of Elam 550
François Bridey
- 28 The industry of vitreous materials in Elam 568
Noëmi Daucé
- 29 Origins of monumental sculpture in Elam: Two case studies 585
Holly Pittman
- 30 The sculptural arts of Elam 602
Javier Álvarez-Mon

31	Glyptic in the 4th–2nd millennium <i>Enrico Ascalone</i>	624
32	Glyptic in the 1st millennium <i>Mark B. Garrison</i>	649
33	Elamite dress and textiles <i>Trudy S. Kawami</i>	673

PART VII: ELAMITE SOCIETY 695

34	Cuneiform culture and science, calendars, and metrology in Elam <i>Gian Pietro Basello and Enrico Ascalone</i>	697
35	Elamite religion and ritual <i>Enrique Quintana</i>	729
36	Elamite funerary practices <i>Hermann Gasche and Steven W. Cole</i>	741
37	Women of Elam <i>Aurelie Daems</i>	763
38	Music <i>Bo Lawergren</i>	781

PART VIII: THE LEGACY OF ELAM 801

39	Elamite administrative and religious heritage in the Persian heartland <i>Wouter F.M. Henkelman</i>	803
40	The Elamite artistic heritage of Persia <i>Javier Álvarez-Mon</i>	829
41	Elam in Achaemenid studies <i>Adriano V. Rossi</i>	851
	<i>Index</i>	863



THE ELAMITE WORLD

EDITED BY JAVIER ÁLVAREZ-MON,
GIAN PIETRO BASELLO
AND YASMINA WICKS

"This much-needed book provides a comprehensive and up-to-date survey of scholarship on one of the more enigmatic cultures of the ancient world, which dominated western Iran from the late fourth millennium BC to the mid-first: Elam. It is a necessary research tool for anyone with an interest in the history, philology, and archaeology of the ancient Near East and beyond." – Marc Van De Mieroop, *Columbia University, USA*

Amongst the civilizations to participate in the dynamic processes of contact and interchange that gave rise to complex societies in the ancient Near East, Elam has remained one of the most obscure, at times languishing in the background of scholarly inquiry. In recent years, however, an increasing body of academic publications have acknowledged its relevance and suggested that its legacy was more considerable and long-lasting than previously estimated.

The Elamite World assembles a group of 40 international scholars to contribute their expertise to the production of a solid, lavishly illustrated, English language treatment of Elamite civilization. It covers topics such as its physical setting, historical development, languages and people, material culture, art, science, religion and society, as well as the legacy of Elam in the Persian empire and its presence in the modern world.

This comprehensive and ambitious survey seeks for Elam, hardly a household name, a noteworthy place in our shared cultural heritage. It will be both a valuable introductory text for a general audience and a definitive reference source for students and academics.

Javier Álvarez-Mon, a native of Spain, holds degrees in ancient Near Eastern art and archaeology from the École du Louvre (Paris) and the University of California at Berkeley, respectively. A 2003 Fulbright-Hays Fellow, he is presently Associate Professor in Near Eastern Archaeology and Art at Macquarie University (Australia) and 2014–2018 Future Fellow (Australian Research Council). His primary research interests are the ancient Iranian civilizations of Elam and early Achaemenid Persia. He has two forthcoming books, *Monumental Reliefs of the Elamite Highlands* and *The Art and Culture of Elam*.

Gian Pietro Basello (PhD in the Ancient Near East 2005) is Tenured Lecturer (2018–) at "L'Orientale" University of Naples, Italy, where he has been teaching Elamite language since 2010. He has worked since 2003 on the Iranian–Italian joint Project DARIOSH (Digital Achaemenid Royal Inscription Open Schema Hypertext). His researches are also devoted to ancient calendars and systems for recording time. His website is www.elamit.net.

Yasmina Wicks completed her PhD "Alas, Short is the Joy of Life!: Elamite Funerary Practice in the First Half of the First Millennium BCE" at the University of Sydney, Australia, where she remains a research affiliate. She has authored a monograph *Bronze 'Bathtub' Coffins in the Context of 8th–6th Century BC Babylonian, Assyrian and Elamite Funerary Practices* (2015) and several articles on the material culture of first millennium Elam.

ARCHAEOLOGY



 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
www.routledge.com

Routledge titles are available as eBook editions in a range of digital formats

Cover image: Gold statuette dated to the 12th century BC representing an Elamite king as offering bearer (7.5cm high with base). Found in 1904 on the Acropole mound at Susa, now displayed in the Louvre Museum (Sb 2758).

an informa business

ISBN 978-1-138-99989-3



9 781138 999893