

## CHAPTER NINE

# Elamite

*Jan Tavernier*<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

Elamite is a language that is attested in written documents from basically two regions, both situated in the southwest of modern Iran. First of all, there is Susiana (modern Khuzestān), the region around the city of Susa. Secondly, there is the region of modern Fārs, with the ancient city of Anshan and the Achaemenid centre Persepolis. The region between these two has also yielded some texts.

One may therefore assume that Elamite was spoken in these areas. Nevertheless, the real geographical territory in which Elamite was spoken is still an issue of debate (Stolper 2004, 60–61). Two contrasting views are defended. According to the first hypothesis, Elamite was spoken in the entire highland of Iran in the late third and early second millennia BCE. In the first millennium, this territory shrank to Susiana and the neighbouring regions. Iranian languages were in use in the rest of Iran. The other hypothesis believes Elamite to be spoken only in Khuzestān, Fārs and the area between both regions.

Whatever the precise extent of the territory of Elamite as a spoken language may be, the Achaemenids still used Elamite as an administrative language in Fārs and Susiana, which should not be that surprising. More puzzling is, however, that Elamite texts were also written in present-day Kandahar, in ancient Arachosia (Fisher & Stolper 2015), which is a long way from the core Elamite territory. Perhaps this implies that Elamite as an administrative language was used in the whole of present-day Iran.

The written Elamite documents date from the twenty-third to the fourth century BCE. Nevertheless, it is well possible that the language was already used earlier than the

twenty-third century and also later than the fourth century. On the one hand, the so-called Proto-Elamite documents, dating from around 3000 BCE, may well be written in Elamite, but as the Proto-Elamite script is not yet fully deciphered, certainty on this topic cannot yet be given. On the other hand, it is very well possible that the language was still spoken in the post-Achaemenid period. Some Elamite names (e.g. Kamnaskires and Pittit) appear in post-Achaemenid documents and in the New Testament (Acts of the Apostles, c. 80–90 CE), Elamite is still conceived as an autonomous language. It is also possible but not certain that the mysterious language called Khūzī by various Arab authors (ninth to tenth centuries CE) is somehow related to Elamite.

The Elamite language is an isolate language and partly because of this status it is not yet fully known. There may be a distant link to the Dravidian languages (cf. McAlpin 1981), in a sense that possibly a Proto-Elamo-Dravidian language can be reconstructed, but unfortunately this does not help the modern scholar in the study of the Elamite language (Zadok 1995, 243). Nonetheless, Elamite may also have some connections with languages from the Zagros, sharing some features with languages such as Guti (animate delocutive suffix *-r*), Kassite (verbal suffix *-š*) and Lullubite (animate delocutive suffix *-r*). If this were true, Elamite might have originated in the Zagros mountain range. However, these languages are so poorly known that a real comparative study is difficult to conduct.

The name Elam itself is given to us by the Akkadians, through Biblical and Greek intermediation. The Elamites themselves called their land Ha(l)tamti, perhaps meaning “Land of the lord”. The name is for the first time attested in an inscription of the Old Elamite king Siwe-palar-huhpak (first half of the eighteenth century BCE).

Although it is sure that Elamite must have had several dialects, these are barely known to us. This is partially due to the scarcity of the sources and to the fact that most Elamite texts have an official (royal) character and were accordingly written in standard Elamite.

## Textual Evidence

Elamite belongs to the so-called group of Limited Text Corpus Languages, implying that only a limited number of texts has been found. Yet, the number and variety of Elamite texts is sufficient to enable us to conduct a profound grammatical study of this language, with the awareness that many uncertainties remain.

### *Proto-Elamite and Linear Elamite*

The Proto-Elamite documents are the earliest written documents from Iran (c. 3100–2900 BCE). Unfortunately, the language behind these texts is not yet known with certainty. The majority of the about 1600 Proto-Elamite documents has been discovered mainly in Susa, but sites such as Anshan and Tepe Yahya have also yielded Proto-Elamite texts (cf. Dahl 2013).

Although it is relatively sure that the few dozen Linear Elamite texts are written in Elamite, their script, used by king Puzur-Inšušinak (c. 2140 BCE), is not yet fully deciphered.

### *Old Elamite (c. 2250–1500 BCE)*

Old Elamite is unfortunately badly documented, as the textual corpus is very limited. The oldest text written in cuneiform Elamite is a treaty between the Old Akkadian king Naram-Sin and a king of Awan, a region situated to the north of Susiana.

Next to this treaty, four royal inscriptions, dating from the first half of the second millennium, are preserved. Other royal inscriptions from this period were all drafted in Akkadian or Sumerian. Furthermore, there are two third millennium documentary texts. All these documents have been discovered at Susa.

Finally, various Elamite proper names and possible incantation formulae are attested in contemporary Mesopotamian texts.

### *Middle Elamite (c. 1500–1000 BCE)*

Middle Elamite is traditionally considered as the classical level of the Elamite language. In this sense, the position of Middle Elamite may be compared to the one of Old Babylonian for the Akkadian language.

From this period the largest number of texts is preserved. One of the reasons for this higher number is the decision by the fourteenth century king Humpan-u-mena to have his inscriptions mainly recorded in Elamite, a decision that was adopted by his successors. Before that language policy switch, royal inscriptions were written in Akkadian.

About 175 royal inscriptions in several exemplars can be assigned to this period. They are commissioned by the kings Humpan-u-mena, Kitin-Hutran I, Untaš-Napiriša and his spouse Napir-asu, Šutruk-Nahhunte I, Kutir-Nahhunte II, Šilhak-Inšušinak I and Hutelutuš-Inšušinak, covering a period from about 1375 BCE to about 1100 BCE. It is in these texts that one finds the classical language.

Most inscriptions, written on various materials, come from Susa and Tchogha Zanbil, the great temple complex built by Untaš-Napiriša. Others originate from Liyan (on the Persian Gulf coast), Anshan (Tal-i Malyan) and other sites in southwest Iran.

The only administrative corpus of Middle Elamite documentary texts is an archive that was discovered at Anshan. The archive comprises about 200 small texts and can be dated to the end of the twelfth or the beginning of the eleventh century BCE, i.e. the very end of the Middle Elamite period.

As already mentioned, before the reign of Humpan-u-mena, Akkadian was the prevailing language in the textual material, both in royal and in documentary contexts. Still these Akkadian texts contain various Elamite loanwords as well as personal names, which is of course not surprising, as these texts are well embedded in an Elamite cultural environment. Unfortunately, the precise meaning of these Elamite expressions is not always fully understood.

### *Neo-Elamite (c. 1000–530 BCE)*

Despite the fact that this period is probably the most interesting one for the study of the Elamite language, it is also the least studied one. The main reason for this is simple: there are far more Middle and Achaemenid Elamite texts.

Nevertheless, the largest variety in literary and documentary genres is found in the Neo-Elamite textual material. About 30 royal inscriptions are known and can be attributed to the reigns of Šutruk-Nahhunte II, Šutur-Nahhunte, Hallutuš-Inšušinak II, Šilhak-Inšušinak II, Tepti-Humpan-Inšušinak and Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak. In addition, some high-ranked officials also ordered inscriptions. Some very short inscriptions from the rulers of Samati are also known.

Next to these official inscriptions, there are some texts belonging to other genres. After the Assyrian sack of Susa in 646, Elamites started to translate Mesopotamian literature in Elamite. Two examples of such texts are known: a hemerological text (indicating favourable and unfavourable days) and an omen text, partly a translation of §71 of the Babylonian divinatory composition *Iqqur īpuš* (Tavernier 2010, 214). Both texts are dated to the second half of the seventh century BCE.

The Neo-Elamite period is the first one in which Elamite letters appear. The main corpus are the so-called Nineveh Letters, a group of about 27 diplomatic letters, found in Nineveh, in Susa and in the Arjan tomb. Other letters come from Marbacheh (Ramhormoz) and Armavir Blur (Armenia).

Finally, there are some documentary texts too. The most interesting archive of administrative texts is without doubt the so-called Susa Acropole Archive, consisting of about 299 texts. A smaller archive, the so-called Susa Apadana Archive, has a more juridical character and is composed of seven texts. Both archives probably date to the first half of the sixth century BC.

### *Achaemenid Elamite (c. 530–331 BCE)*

The Achaemenid period is the last phase of Elamite as a written language. The oldest Achaemenid Elamite text is the Elamite version of the well-known Bisitun Inscription, ordered by Darius I (522–486). From him and his successors various royal inscriptions are known. They are for the greater part trilingual (Old Persian, Akkadian and Elamite) and are engraved on rock, weights, architectural elements (e.g. window frames), vases, etc. The youngest one is the Elamite version of an inscription of king Artaxerxes III (358–337 BCE).

Most Achaemenid Elamite texts, however, belong to two large administrative archives: The Persepolis Fortification Archive (not yet completely published) and the Persepolis Treasury Archive. The first group consists of several of thousands of texts. Dating from 509–494 BCE, the Persepolis Fortification Texts deal especially with the ration system in the Persepolis region. The Persepolis Treasury Archive is composed of various texts dating to the period 492–458 BCE. It deals mainly with payments in silver. The existence of such archives in other Achaemenid administrative centres seems to be confirmed by the discovery of similar texts in Susa and Kandahar. Especially the Kandahar textual fragments are important as they stimulate the discussion on the spread and the use of the Elamite language in the Achaemenid Empire.

Achaemenid Elamite was heavily influenced by Old Persian, in so far that the Old Persian word order or other grammatical features (e.g. increased use of prepositions) are often adopted in the Elamite versions of the Achaemenid inscriptions.

## Language Contact

### Elamite and Akkadian (*cf. De Graef 2013*)

Elamite and Akkadian share a long common history. In the Susiana region, Mesopotamian presence can be seen from the earliest times (e.g. numerical systems) and Elam already appears in Sumerian texts. In addition, this region was sometimes politically dominated by Mesopotamian states (e.g. the Old Akkadian Empire and the Ur-III Empire), which also brought Mesopotamian influence into the Susiana region. Most likely, two communities lived next to each other in Susiana: Elamites and Mesopotamians. This inevitably has led to an intense contact between Akkadian (and Sumerian) and Elamite.

Already the oldest Elamite text, the Naram-Sin Treaty, demonstrates such contacts. It was probably written in Elamite because of the fact that it was a treaty with an Awanite king.

An interesting episode in the history of the Elamite–Akkadian language contact is the reign of Puzur-Inšušinak (c. 2140 BCE). Of this king, who controlled western Iran and a large part of Babylonia, various Akkadian inscriptions are preserved. Some of these were accompanied by an inscription in Linear Elamite, but the inscriptions are no translations of each other. For instance, the Elamite ones do not have curse formulae, contrary to the Akkadian ones. Remarkable too is the fact that Puzur-Inšušinak deliberately chose to use a newly designed script for his Elamite inscriptions, thereby emphasizing the double cultural character of his kingdom.

As a matter of fact, the royal inscriptions dating from the first half of the second millennium (up to the fourteenth century BCE) are practically all written in Akkadian. The documentary and literary texts of the Old and Early Middle Elamite periods are all drafted in Akkadian as well. This, however, does not automatically imply an absence of Elamite. The royal names of these periods are all Elamite. Moreover, Elamite loanwords and expressions seeped into the Akkadian texts. With regard to the non-royal anthroponyms, the situation is a bit more complicated. Whereas Akkadian names outnumbered Elamite ones in the Old Elamite documents from Susa, the inverse was the case in the Early Middle Elamite documents from Haft Tepe.

In the beginning of the Middle Elamite period, Akkadian was still an important language, as is shown by the royal inscriptions and the documentary texts in Akkadian from the capital Haft Tepe. Nevertheless, the role of Akkadian in Susiana decreased heavily from the fourteenth century (i.e. from the reign of Humpan-u-mena) onwards. The number of Elamite texts increases, whereas hardly any Akkadian text is found. This is also the case for the Neo-Elamite period.

In the Achaemenid period, Akkadian was restored as one of the languages of the royal inscriptions (together with Old Persian and Elamite).

Despite this long common history, Elamite and Akkadian have not exerted much linguistic influence on each other. The only clear aspect of influence is lexical: various Elamite loanwords have penetrated into Akkadian (e.g. *kiparu*, *teppir*), whereas several Akkadian loanwords are attested in Elamite (e.g. *gigunú*). Logically, Akkadian texts written in Susiana contain more Elamite loans than those written in Mesopotamia. Real morphological or syntactical influence is not attested.

Interesting in this context are also the Elamite formulae found in Old Babylonian Mesopotamian texts. Yet the formulae are far from comprehensible and the question arises

whether they are genuine Elamite incantation formulae or simply Elamite words put together arbitrarily by Mesopotamian scribes to create a kind of magic character.

### **Elamite and Old Iranian (*cf. Tavernier 2018a*)**

The Iranian speaking people arrived in Susiana and Fārs around 800 BCE. From then on, an intense contact between the Iranians and the Elamites developed and by the sixth Century BCE the Iranian speaking people were well established in Susiana and Fārs. This is nicely illustrated by three examples:

1. Around 630 BCE a new dynasty arose in actual Fārs, with Anshan as their capital. This dynasty, called the Teispids, was the forerunner of the well-known Achaemenid dynasty. The mixed character of this dynasty is shown by their names, both Elamite (Cyrus) and Iranian (Cambyses).
2. Another dynasty, the members of which called themselves the “Samatian kings”, also has a mixed Elamo-Iranian character, again visible in their names, which are both Iranian and Elamite. Short inscriptions on objects belonging to these kings were found in a cave in southern Luristān.
3. The documents from the Susa Acropole Archive contain various Iranian personal names and some place names and loanwords. This implies that Iranians were actively participating in the economic life of Susa in the beginning of the sixth Century BCE.

These three examples point to a rather high degree of acculturation between both population groups. As a matter of fact, one might speak of an “ethnogénèse” (de Miroschedji 1985, 295), the emergence of a new people out of the Elamites and Iranians.

This acculturation is continued in the Achaemenid period where people with Elamite and Iranian names have the same status and venerate the same gods. Although the Iranian component held the reins of power, Elamite was used in the Persepolis administration and most likely Iranian speaking people were learning Elamite to use it in their administrative jobs.

Contrary to the near absence of influence between Elamite and Akkadian, a real influence from Old Iranian on Elamite can be seen. Indeed, in the Achaemenid period, Elamite became heavily influenced by Old Iranian. Many Old Iranian loan words (and proper names) were integrated into the Elamite lexicon and also the syntax, especially the word order, became more and more Iranian. The increased use of postpositions to express syntactical relations between words or sentence parts may also be considered a result of the intense contacts between the Elamite and the Iranian language.

Old Iranian itself was not influenced by Elamite. It seems that the Elamite language was the receiving party in its contacts with both Akkadian (to a lesser degree) and Old Iranian (to a higher degree).

## **Sketch of Elamite Grammar**

The following sketch aims at presenting a general overview of how the Elamite language functions. It is by no means a detailed description of all grammatical features of Elamite. More detailed grammatical studies (to be found in the bibliography) must

therefore be consulted to acquire a more precise view. In any case, the sketch below is based on these studies.

### *Writing System*

Elamite texts were written by means of the Mesopotamian cuneiform writing system. Two other scripts, however, were also used in the Susa and Anshan region: the so-called Proto-Elamite and Linear Elamite writing systems (cf. *supra*). Only of Linear Elamite it is sure that it rendered the Elamite language.

The scarcity of Elamite cuneiform texts dating from the third millennium makes it difficult to study the adaptation process of the cuneiform writing system by the Elamites. It is, however, possible to study the specific development of the cuneiform script in Iran. At first (Old and Middle Elamite periods) the Elamite script was a faithful copy of its Mesopotamian counterpart. This means that Mesopotamians could read an Elamite text or that Elamites could read an Akkadian text without necessarily understanding the contents.

At the end of the Middle Elamite period, some Elamite peculiar sign shapes start to appear, but it is only in the second half of the seventh century that the Elamite script has become quite distinct from the contemporary Mesopotamian one, not only with regard to the sign shapes, but also to the scribal habits (e.g. simplification and consequent loss of signs; frequent use of broken writings [CV<sub>1</sub>-V<sub>2</sub>-C] and abrupt writings [(C)VC-VC], etc.).

Interestingly, logograms are marked by the sign MEŠ, which is not used to indicate plural forms. The Elamite script also has so-called pseudo-logograms, i.e. Elamite words that are treated as a logogram (e.g. ha-al<sup>mes</sup> for El. *hal* “land”).

### *Phonology*

Various reasons make it extremely hard to study Elamite phonology, the two main ones being the fact that Elamite is an isolate language and that the cuneiform writing system was not designed to denote Elamite.

Nevertheless, various types of sources enable us to conduct research on this topic:

1. The rendering of Elamite lexemes and proper names in non-Elamite texts.
2. The rendering of non-Elamite lexemes and proper names in Elamite texts.
3. Graphical variations within Elamite.

### *Vowels*

The Elamite vowels are /a/, /e/, /i/, /o/, /u/ and perhaps /ə/. Some specific aspects of Elamite vowels are (cf. Grillett-Susini 2008, 11–12):

1. In all probability, vowels had a nasal variant (as, for instance, in Lycian, with  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{e}$ ). This is indicated by spellings such as Humpan next to Hupan or *suki* next to *sunki*.
2. /E/ and /i/ may be confused.
3. Final /e/ and /i/ can be omitted.

4. Vowel length is never expressed by the Elamite cuneiform writing system.
5. In the later periods the development /u/ > /i/ was productive. As a result, most signs of the u-series (e.g. MU, NU, etc.) could also be pronounced with *i*. Nevertheless, the vowel /u/ did not disappear from the Elamite phonological inventory. Examples of this shift are *halpu* > *halpi*-, *nu* > *ni* and *tallu*- > *talli*- (cf. Tavernier 2007, 278–285).
6. The specific use of the signs U and Ú strongly suggests the existence of /o/ or /aw/ in Elamite, denoted by the sign U.

### *Consonants (Table 9.1)*

The postulated Elamite consonants are:

**Table 9.1** Elamite consonantal inventory.

|                 | <i>Stops</i>  |              | <i>Glides</i> |              | <i>Affr.</i> | <i>Sonorants</i> |              |              |
|-----------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
|                 | <i>Fortis</i> | <i>Lenis</i> | <i>Fortis</i> | <i>Lenis</i> |              | <i>Lat.</i>      | <i>Trill</i> | <i>Nasal</i> |
| Labial          | p             | p' (b)       | f or v        |              |              |                  |              | m, m'(?)     |
| Dental          | t             | t' (d)       |               |              |              |                  |              | n, n'(?)     |
| Velar           | k             | k' (g)       |               |              |              |                  |              |              |
| Palato-alveolar |               |              | š             |              | č            |                  |              |              |
| Alveolar        |               |              | s             | s' (z)       | ts           | l                | r            |              |
| Laryngeal       |               |              | H             |              |              |                  |              |              |
| Retroflex       |               |              |               |              |              | ll               | rr           |              |

Some remarks (cf. Grilhot-Susini 2008, 11–12):

1. There was no distinction between voiced and voiceless consonants. Most likely, a distinction between *fortis* and *lenis* consonants existed. This distinction was in some cases rendered by the graphic doubling of consonants.
2. /H/ gradually disappeared, and this in all positions:
  - Initial: *hiyan* > *iyān*.
  - Medial: *lahliš* > *lališ*.
  - Final: *tunih* > *tuni*.

This evolution had some morphological consequences, such as the loss of the distinction between third singular and third plural in conjugation I (cf. *infra*).

## Morphology

### *Word Formation*

The majority of Elamite lexemes consists of one or two syllables. Attested forms are CV (e.g. *ta*- “place, put”), VC (e.g. *ak* “and”), VCV (e.g. *iki* “brother”) and CVCV (e.g. *zana* “lady”). Some roots are exclusively used for the formation of nominals, but most Elamite roots can be used to form both nominal and verbal lexemes.

Elamite roots may produce derived words by adding a thematic vowel (e.g. *mur* “place”; *muru* “ground; soil”), by full reduplication (e.g. *but-* “work”; *buthut* “provisions”), by reduplication of the last syllable (e.g. the PN Haltete, derived from Halte; frequently used to form anthroponyms) or by adding suffixes (cf. *infra*).

The Elamite language possesses many compounds, which may be divided into four categories:

1. Two nouns: *kik-murun* “world, universe” (“heaven – earth”), *hal-menir* “land-regent” (“land - authority holder”), *kap-niskir* “treasurer” (“treasure – guardian”).
2. Noun and participle: *but-halik* “sculpture” (“work-perfected”).
3. Two participles: *buttak-halik* “handiwork, accomplishment” (“done-perfected”).
4. Infinitive and noun: *paha-buttip* “protective (gods)” (“protect – doers”).

### *Nouns and Adjectives*

Like other languages, Elamite possesses substantives, adjectives, pronouns and nominal forms of the verb (infinitive, participle, etc.).

### *Gender and Number*

Elamite does not have the distinction masculine – feminine – neuter. The Elamite nominal inflection rather uses a distinction animate – inanimate. Examples of both genders are:

1. Animate: *elt(i)* “eye”, *nap* “god”, *pat* “foot”, *sunki* “king”, etc.
2. Inanimate: *hal* “land”, *his* “name”, *kap* “treasure”, *ulhi* “house”, etc.

In concordance with many other languages, Elamite has a singular and a plural. Dual forms are not attested.

### *Declension*

Nouns belonging to the animate class can belong to three personal classes in the singular, which correspond with the three persons of the verbal conjugation. The plural is only attested with delocutive animate nouns. Note that kinship nouns (e.g. *atta* “father”) do not take classifying suffixes. See Tables 9.2 and 9.3.

The classifying suffixes are:

**Table 9.2** Elamite nominal classifying suffixes.

| <i>Person</i>  | <i>Animate</i>  | <i>Animate</i> | <i>Inanimate</i>     |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|
|                | <i>Singular</i> | <i>Plural</i>  | <i>Singular</i>      |
| 1 (locutive)   | -k              |                |                      |
| 2 (allocutive) | -t              |                |                      |
| 3 (delocutive) | -r              | -p             | Ø<br>-me<br>-n<br>-t |

Examples:

**Table 9.3** Examples of use of classifying suffixes.

|                | <i>Animate</i>            | <i>Animate</i>              | <i>Inanimate</i>                                                        |
|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Person</i>  | <i>Singular</i>           | <i>Plural</i>               | <i>Singular</i>                                                         |
| 1 (locutive)   | sunki-k “(I, the) king”   |                             |                                                                         |
| 2 (allocutive) | sunki-t “(you, the) king” |                             |                                                                         |
| 3 (delocutive) | sunki-r “(he, the) king”  | sunki-p “(they, the) kings” | ulhi “house”<br>sunki-me “kingship”<br>siya-n “temple”<br>hala-t “clay” |

Delocutive suffixes are also used to produce agent nouns (only in the animate gender), ex. *Hutti-r* “maker” (from *but-* “to make”, with epenthetic *i*). In the inanimate gender the suffix *-me* is used to form abstract nouns, e.g. *husame* “forest” (from *husa* “wood”) and *sunkime* “kingship” (from *sunki* “king”). Roots may also produce nouns using more than just one suffix. For example, both Achaemenid Elamite nouns *muši-n* and *muši-me* mean “account” and are derived from the verb *muši-* “calculate, register”.

Elamite has no real case system. The only case suffixes are genitive *-na* and locative *-ma* and both are mainly attested in Neo- or Achaemenid Elamite.

## Adjectives

Elamite adjectives are not a separate morphological category and have the same structure as substantives. They also use the same classifiers, e.g. *riša-k* “(I, the) great”, *riša-r* “(he, the) great”. Passive verbal participles in *-k* may also have an adjectival function: *halpi-k-a* “dead”, *hani-k* “loved”, *haštu-1k* “venerated”, *katu-k-a* “alive”, *mišnu-k-a* “bad”. These adjectives may in their turn be transformed into substantives by adding the delocutive suffix: *butla-k-r-i* “someone who is sent, envoy”, *ippa-k-r-a* “strong one”, *ištu-k-r-a* “weak person, weakling”, *katu-k-r-a* “living person”.

## Pronouns

### Personal Pronouns

The personal pronouns are the only Elamite nominals using a case system. The pronouns of the first and second person have a nominative/dative form without inflectional suffixes and an accusative form characterised by a suffix *-n*.

In the following tables, a distinction is made between “ancient” Elamite (i.e. Old and Middle and Early Neo-Elamite) and “recent” Elamite (Late Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid Elamite).

**Table 9.4** Elamite independent pronouns of the 1st and 2nd person.

| Pers. | Singular  |        |         |        | Plural    |        |         |        |
|-------|-----------|--------|---------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------|
|       | Nom./Dat. |        | Acc.    |        | Nom./Dat. |        | Acc.    |        |
|       | Ancient   | Recent | Ancient | Recent | Ancient   | Recent | Ancient | Recent |
|       | 1         | u      | u       | u-n    | u(-n)     | nika   | nuku    | nuku-n |
| 2     | ni        | nu     |         | nu-n   | num       | numi   | numu-n  | numi-n |

The resumptive pronoun *ir*, as well as the demonstrative pronouns (cf. *infra*), can also be used as personal pronoun of the 3rd person:

**Table 9.5** Elamite resumptive pronoun used as 3rd person independent pronoun.

|           | Singular  |       | Plural    |                           |
|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------|---------------------------|
|           | Nom./Dat. | Acc.  | Nom./Dat. | Acc.                      |
| Animate   | i-r       | i-r   | ap(pi)    | appi-n, appa-n (Ach. El.) |
| Inanimate | i(-n)     | i(-n) |           |                           |

### Resumptive Pronouns

A resumptive pronoun, appearing always right before the verb, is a noun which refers to a nominal element mentioned earlier in a sentence, e.g. *“Im ak Šala lansitippa apun murtah”* “Adad and Šala, as golden (statues) I placed them”.

The forms *ir* (animate) and *i(n)* (inanimate) are frequently used as resumptive pronouns indicating the direct object of conjugated verbs. In addition, the element *aha* “here” (Old, Middle and Neo-Elamite), *ah* (Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid Elamite), *ha* (Achaemenid Elamite) may also be used as resumptive pronoun.

### Demonstrative Pronouns

Proximal demonstrative pronouns (“this”) occur in texts dated to all periods. Distal demonstratives (“that”) only start to appear in the Achaemenid period.

**Table 9.6** Elamite demonstrative pronouns.

|           |         | Singular |            | Plural   |         |
|-----------|---------|----------|------------|----------|---------|
|           |         | Proximal | Distal     | Proximal | Distal  |
| Animate   | Ancient | i        |            | ap       |         |
|           | Recent  | (h)i     | hupe-r(r)i | ap(pi)   | hupe-pi |
| Inanimate | Ancient | i        |            |          |         |

### *Possessive Pronouns*

Elamite possessive pronouns are traditionally divided in two groups: enclitic possessive pronouns and non-enclitic possessive pronouns.

The non-enclitic possessive pronouns (type 1) are actually nothing more than personal pronouns that are positioned after the possessed item and that correspond with it through nominal classifiers.

**Table 9.7** Elamite possessive pronouns.

| <i>Person and gender</i> | <i>Singular</i> |               | <i>Plural</i>  |                   |
|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|
|                          | <i>Ancient</i>  | <i>Recent</i> | <i>Ancient</i> | <i>Recent</i>     |
| 1 animate                | u-r(i)          | u-r(i)        | nika-pi        |                   |
| 1 inanimate              | u-me(-ni)       | unina/i, unan | nika-me        | nuka-me           |
| 2 animate                | ni-ri           |               |                |                   |
| 2 inanimate              | nu-me           |               |                |                   |
| 3 animate                | i/e-r(i)        |               |                |                   |
| 3 inanimate              | i-me            |               | api-me, api-te | appini, hupirrini |

The enclitic possessive pronouns (type 2) have a different character, as they are not declined and accordingly, they do not exhibit the distinction between animate and inanimate nouns. The most frequently attested one is undoubtedly *-e* “his, her, its” (attested already in Old Elamite).

In Achaemenid Elamite, *-še* “his, her, its” is the Elamite rendering of the Old Iranian enclitic possessive pronoun *-šai* > *-šē* “his, her, its”.

**Table 9.8** Elamite enclitic possessive pronouns.

| <i>Person</i> | <i>Singular</i> |               | <i>Plural</i>  |               |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
|               | <i>Ancient</i>  | <i>Recent</i> | <i>Ancient</i> | <i>Recent</i> |
| 1             |                 | -ta           | -nika          |               |
| 2             |                 | -ni           |                |               |
| 3             | -e              | -e, -še       | -ap(p)e        | -ap(p)e       |

The Elamite language also has a way to express the reflexive possessive pronoun by combining the noun *tuh* “property” with an enclitic possessive pronoun. Examples are *hiš tuh-e* “his own name” (Middle Elamite) and *Kambuziya halpi tuhema halpik* “Cambyses died his own death”.

### *Relative and Interrogative Pronouns*

The Elamite relative pronouns are *akka* “who” and *appa* “that, which”. A plural form *akkap* “who” is attested in the Late Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid periods.

Under Old Persian influence, the Achaemenid Elamite relative pronouns can also be used as indicators of appositional relations in two ways:

1. Between substantive and attribute: PN *akka magus* = Old Persian PN *haya 15 im a* “PN the magian”, lit. “PN, who is a magian”.
2. Between a noun and its complement: *taššup appa unina* “my troops”, lit. “the troops that are mine”.

The invariable pronoun *mur* means “where”: *kat 15im mur balmarraš hi kušik* “On this terrace, where this fortress has been built”. It can also appear in indirect questions, e.g.: *mur humabšita inme turnah* “I do not know where they have brought it”.

Elamite has two attested interrogative pronouns: *akka* “who?” and *appa hamak* “of what sort?”.

### *Indefinite Pronouns*

The indefinite pronouns are *akkar* “someone” and *aški* (only attested in Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid Elamite) “something”. In combination with the negating particle they obviously assume a meaning “nobody” and “nothing”.

### *Adjectival Pronouns*

The adjectival pronouns are *unra* “each” and *marrita* “all, entire”.

### *Negation*

The Elamite negation particle is *in*. In Old, Middle and Neo-Elamite (and exceptionally also in Achaemenid Elamite) it may be accompanied by nominal classifiers, resulting in forms like *inki* (1st sg.), *inri* (3rd sg.), *inni* (inanimate) or *inme* (inanimate). Examples are *inki tun* “I will not be receiving” and *inki in tununkumar* “I will not give it”. These classifiers make the negation particle correspond with the subject.

From the Middle Elamite period onwards the particle *inni* gradually absorbs all other forms and by the Achaemenid period it also replaces the animate forms to become the generally but not exclusively used negating element.

### *Particles*

#### *Vocative*

In Middle and Neo-Elamite, the particle *e* indicates the vocative: *e Inšušinak* “O Inšušinak”. However, this particle disappeared, although not completely, in the Achaemenid period.

### *Numerals*

Elamite numerals are not well-known, because they are nearly always written by numbers (as is also the case in the other languages using cuneiform script). The only fully written

numeral is *ki* “one”, which is used with both animates (*rub ki-r* “one man”) and inanimates (*pel ki-ma* “within one year”).

In Achaemenid Elamite, the ordinal numerals are generally followed by *-ummema*, *-ummena* or *-ummemana*. In all probability, one is dealing here with constructions of the nominal suffix *-me* in combination with *-ma* and *-na*. Fractions are denoted by the suffixes *-irmaki* and *-kurmaki*.

### Postpositions

The Elamite language makes regular use of postpositions to indicate spatial and temporal relations between different elements of a phrase. In the older periods the postpositions are not very numerous and are rather indicators of spatial relations (referring to place or direction):

1. *ma* “in” (locative postposition): *talluh ak siyan Inšušinakni-ma tah* “I inscribed (them) and I placed (them) in the temple of Inšušinak”.
2. *sima* “before, in front of”: *hunipin sima* “In front of the *hunipin*”.
3. *sira* “before, in front of”: *Inšušinak ir sira ani uzzun* “Inšušinak, before him may he not walk around”.
4. *tur* “for”: *takki ume tur bih* “I prayed for my life”.

In the more recent periods, the postpositions become more and more frequently used. This is probably a reaction to the gradual weakening of the Elamite nominal and syntactical system. This weakening process took place under Old Persian influence. The Neo- and Achaemenid Elamite postpositions are:

1. *em* “from”: only used with the verb *tu-* “take” and a pronoun (sg. *i* or pl. *ap*), e.g. *meni Kammatta akka makuš Kanbuziya emi tuš* “Then Gaumāta the magian took away from Cambyses”.
2. *batma* “in, at, for”: locative, both temporal and spatial. Example: *2 palum hatma* “at two storehouses”.
3. *(ik)ki* “to”: direction. Example: *anka tuppi ni ikmar Parnaka ikki tippe tanta* “When you send a tablet from you to Parnaka”.
4. *ikk(i)mar*: “away from” (only with animates). Example: *anka tuppi ni ikmar Parnaka ikki tippe tanta* “When you send a tablet from you to Parnaka”.
5. *intukkime* “because of”. Example: *hupe intukkime mušimmi inni hutttakka* “Because of this the accounting was not done”.
6. *itaka* “with”. Example: *meni Mimana taššup itaka meri ir taka sak* “Then Mimana, with the troops, in pursuit of him, advanced”.
7. *lakka* “beyond”. Example: *Yauna ... akkap kam lakka marrišta* “The Ionians who have seized the area beyond the sea”.
8. *ma* “in; for; in front of; by means of” (spatial and temporal). Example: *(grain) kantima taka* “(grain) has been deposited in the storehouse”.
9. *mar* “from” (only with inanimates). Example: *Harassumar* “from (the place) Harassu”.
10. *-na* “of”, extremely frequent genitive indication. Example: *zaumin Uramašta-na* “By the effort of Ahuramazda”, *eššana Hatamtip-na* “The king of the Elamites”.
11. *sima* “before, in front of” (spatial). Example: *zalmi umini ... Mašti ...sima kitenuh* “I have protected magically my statuary before Mašti”.

12. *ša-ma* (Hallock 1969, 753) or *ša-ma* (Hinz & Koch 1987, 1128) “within, among”. Example: *kuš GUD hupe šama* “among those cowhides”.
13. *tippa* “before, in front of”. Example: *3 GUD IN Umpartašpena sunki tippa makka* “3 cattle in pasture(?), of the people from Umpartaš were consumed before the king (i.e. at his court)”.
14. *tupaka* “to, in the direction of, towards; concerning”. Example: *akkari aški Kam-ma-ad-da makuš tupaka inni lilmaš* “No one attained anything concerning Gaumāta the magian”.
15. *ukku* “on”. Example: *kutta halat ukku kutta kuš ukku* “Both on clay and on parchment”.

A real preposition is *kuš* “until” (attested from the Middle Elamite period onwards).

## Verbal Morphology

### Verbal Roots

Elamite verbal roots may be divided into three groups:

1. Simple roots: *li-* “give, deliver”, *ta-* “put, place”, *tunu-* “give, donate”, etc.
2. Reduplicated roots, whereby the reduplication may express some kind of plurality. There are two types:
  - a. Full reduplication ( $C_1V_1 > C_1V_1C_1V_1$ ): *li- ~ lili-* “give, deliver”, *ta- ~ tatta-* “put, place”.
  - b. Partial reduplication:
    - Repetition of the first syllable ( $C_1V_1C_2V_2 > C_1V_1C_1V_1C_2V_2$ ): *kata/u- ~ kakkata-* “to live”, *sikka- ~ sissikka-* “to set up”, *tallu/i- ~ tatallu/i-* “to write” (from older *\*taltallu-*).
    - Repetition of the first consonant before the second one ( $C_1V_1C_2V_2 > C_1V_1C_1C_2V_2$ ). This is the most frequent type of reduplication: *hapu- ~ hahpu-* “to hear, listen”, *butta- ~ buhta-* “to do”, *kazza- ~ kakza-* “to forge”, *kuši- ~ kukši-* “to build, construct”, *pera- ~ pepra-* “to read”, *peti- ~ pepti-* “to become hostile, revolt”.
3. Compound roots: *mur* “place” + *ta-* “to put” > *murta-* “to place, set up”. In most cases, the verb *ma-* “to put” is one of the elements: *el* “eye” + *ma-* > *elma-* “consider, think”, *ki/ur* “hand” + *ma-* > *kurma-* “to allocate”, *tu(h)* “self” + *ma-* > *tuma-* “to take, receive”.

Many lexemes have both nominal and verbal forms: *irša* “big, great” – “become great, increase”, *me* “behind – follow”, *tu(h)* “property – take”, etc.

## Conjugations

Elamite verbs have three conjugations. Whereas the first one is a purely verbal conjugation, both the second and third can be labelled “nominal”.

The first conjugation is only attested with transitive verbs and expresses a completed action. It consists of the verbal base and personal endings. In the following table asterisked forms are not attested as such. See Tables 9.9 to 9.16.

**Table 9.9** Elamite verbal conjugation.

| <i>Person</i> | <i>Middle Elamite</i> |               | <i>Achaemenid Elamite</i> |               |
|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|
|               | <i>Singular</i>       | <i>Plural</i> | <i>Singular</i>           | <i>Plural</i> |
| 1             | -h                    | -hu           | -Ø                        | -ut           |
| 2             | -t                    | -ht           | *-t                       | *-t           |
| 3             | -š                    | -hš           | -š                        | -š            |

Examples:

**Table 9.10** Verbal conjugation: examples.

| <i>Person</i> | <i>Middle Elamite</i> |               | <i>Achaemenid Elamite</i> |               |
|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|
|               | <i>Singular</i>       | <i>Plural</i> | <i>Singular</i>           | <i>Plural</i> |
| 1             | kulla-h               | kulla-hu      | marri-Ø                   | hutta-ut      |
| 2             | hap-t                 | hutta-ht      | *-t                       | *-t           |
| 3             | hutta-š               | hutta-hš      | hutta-š                   | hutta-š       |

The two other conjugations are participial conjugations, since they are both based on the verbal participles. The main characteristic of the second conjugation is the presence of *k* just after the verbal root. The forms have an intransitive, passive, completed and adjectival value. The endings of this conjugation are the nominal classifiers.

**Table 9.11** Elamite k-conjugation.

| <i>Person</i> | <i>Middle Elamite</i> |               | <i>Achaemenid Elamite</i> |               |
|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|
|               | <i>Singular</i>       | <i>Plural</i> | <i>Singular</i>           | <i>Plural</i> |
| 1             | *-k-k                 |               | -k-it                     |               |
| 2             | *-k-t                 |               | -k-t                      |               |
| 3             | -k                    | -k-p          | -k-Ø                      | -Ø-p          |

Examples:

**Table 9.12** Elamite k-conjugation: examples.

| <i>Person</i> | <i>Middle Elamite</i> |               | <i>Achaemenid CElamite</i> |               |
|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------------|---------------|
|               | <i>Singular</i>       | <i>Plural</i> | <i>Singular</i>            | <i>Plural</i> |
| 1             |                       |               | šinnu-k-it                 |               |
| 2             |                       |               | katu-k-t                   |               |
| 3             | hutta-k               | hutta-k-p     | hutta-k-Ø                  | šinnu-Ø-p     |

Note that in the third singular (Achaemenid Elamite) the expected suffix *r* is not written. When it is attached to the passive participle it denotes a noun: *halpik* “dead”, *halpikra* “dead person”.

In Achaemenid Elamite, the first person suffix is always written and may also be attached to nouns in order to express the verb “to be”, e.g. *inni titukra-k-it* “I am not a liar”.

The third conjugation is also nominal, but here the conjugational consonant is *n*. This conjugation has an incomplete value and is used with transitive as well as intransitive verbs.

**Table 9.13** Elamite *n*-conjugation.

| Person | Middle Elamite |        | Achaemenid Elamite |        |
|--------|----------------|--------|--------------------|--------|
|        | Singular       | Plural | Singular           | Plural |
| 1      | -n-k           | n-un-k | -n-k               | n-un   |
| 2      | -n-t           |        | -n-t               |        |
| 3      | -n-r           | -n-p   | -n-r               | -n-p   |

Examples:

**Table 9.14** Elamite *n*-conjugation: examples.

| Person | Middle Elamite |             | Achaemenid Elamite |            |
|--------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|------------|
|        | Singular       | Plural      | Singular           | Plural     |
| 1      | hutta-n-k      | туру-n-un-k | na-n-k             | hutti-n-un |
| 2      | hutta-n-t      |             | na-n-t             |            |
| 3      | hutta-n-r      | tahha-n-p   | na-n-r             | na-n-p     |

Each of these three conjugations has a parallel one, the so-called *m*-conjugation (usually labelled Im, IIm and IIIm). These conjugations are formed by inserting *-ma-* directly after the root (*butti-ma-* “to do”). *Ma-* is probably an auxiliary verb, but the precise function and meaning of these conjugations are not clear.

**Table 9.15** Elamite *m*-conjugation.

| Conjugation | Person | Middle Elamite |         | Achaemenid Elamite |          |
|-------------|--------|----------------|---------|--------------------|----------|
|             |        | Singular       | Plural  | Singular           | Plural   |
| Im          | 1      | -ma-h          |         | -ma                |          |
|             | 3      |                | -ma-h-š | -ma-š              | -ma-š    |
| IIm         | 3      | -ma-k          |         | -ma-k              |          |
| IIIm        | 1      |                |         | -ma-n-k            | -ma-n-un |
|             | 2      |                |         | -ma-n-t            |          |
|             | 3      | -ma-n-r        |         | -ma-n-r            | -ma-n-p  |

Examples:

**Table 9.16** Elamite m-conjugation: examples.

| Conjugation | Person | Middle Elamite |             | Achaemenid Elamite |              |
|-------------|--------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|
|             |        | Singular       | Plural      | Singular           | Plural       |
| Im          | 1      | sahti-ma-h     |             | tu-ma              |              |
|             | 3      |                | tiri-ma-h-š | tu-ma-š            | tu-ma-š      |
| IIm         | 3      | mišir-ma-k     |             | tu-ma-k            |              |
| IIIIm       | 1      |                |             | šera-ma-n-k        | tiri-ma-n-un |
|             | 2      |                |             | mazzi-ma-n-t       |              |
|             | 3      | pepšir-ma-n-r  |             | tu-ma-n-r          | tu-ma-n-p    |

From the Late Neo-Elamite period onwards, more and more Iranian influence becomes visible in the Elamite language. This has led to some kind of systematisation in the use of the verbal conjugations in Achaemenid Elamite. The Old Persian future forms (subjunctive) were always rendered by Elamite forms of the third conjugation, whereas Old Persian presents appear in Elamite as forms of the IIIIm-conjugation.

### *Nomino-Verbal Forms*

Elamite has two participles, which may also have an adjectival function. The first one is composed of the root and the suffix *-k* and represents a passive form (e.g. *butta-k* “made”). It is mostly translated by a passive participle. The second one is composed of the root and the suffix *-n*. It indicates an active and incomplete action (e.g. *buttan* “making”). The link of both participles with the conjugations II and III is clear.

Elamite infinitives do not have their own forms and are expressed by:

1. The verbal root without any suffixes, e.g. *GN-mar GN<sub>2</sub> laki* “to cross from GN to GN<sub>2</sub>”.
2. A form of conjugation III, e.g. *meni ušera TUP<sup>meš</sup> talli-ma-n-a* “Then I ordered an inscription to be written”.

Finally, the Elamite language also possesses a verbal noun with the same form as the active participle: *li-n* “gift” (from *li-* “to give”), *murta-n* “installation” (from *murta-* “to install”), *piti-n* “transfer, assignment” (from *piti-* “to transfer, to reassign”).

### *Verbal Modes*

#### *Imperative*

The Middle Elamite imperative uses the conj. I form of the 2nd sg., e.g. *hap-t* “listen!”, *ten-t* “be merciful!”. In Neo- and Achaemenid Elamite, however, forms of the 3rd sg. (conj. I) are used: *mite-š* ... *halpi-š* “go forth and slay!”, *butta-š* “do!”. There is no distinction between singular and plural.

### *Prohibitive*

This mode is indicated by conjugation III forms preceded by the particle *anu/i*: *anu izzun* “May he not walk around”, *hupe anu buttant* “Do not do this!”.

### *Optative/Precative*

The optative is formed by adding the suffix *-ni* or *-na* (= *-ni+a*) to conjugation I and II forms: *buttabš-ni* “May they do”, *katakt-ni* “May you live”, *taš-ni* “May he put, place”, *telak-ni* “May it be dedicated”.

### *Anteriority*

Verbal forms accompanied by *-ti*, *-ta* (= *-ti + -a*) are omnipresent in Elamite. Nonetheless, the suffixes are mostly attested with a 3rd singular form of conjugation I, as in *buttašta* “he has done” or *kušišta* “he has built”. In Middle Elamite, this mode often occurs in subordinate clauses. In Achaemenid Elamite, however, they are also attested in main clauses.

In all likelihood, these forms express a completed action in the past (anteriority) and are accordingly translated by means of a perfect or pluperfect, as in *akka kušišta imme turnah* “I do not know who has constructed it” or *u siyan nappanna butta appa Kammatta akka makuš sarišta* “I (re-)constructed the temples of the gods that Gaumāta the magician had destroyed”.

### *The Suffix -a*

In general, this suffix is the last morpheme of a cluster, but again exceptions are attested, e.g. *kuši-š-t-a-p* “women who have given birth”. It can have two functions:

1. As an indication of subordination. In this sense, it was originally the indication of nominal predicates of a subordinate clause. In Achaemenid Elamite, it is usually attested after subordinated verbal forms. When, however, the clause was accompanied by a relative pronoun or a conjunction, it could be omitted.
2. The suffix may also have a coordinating function: *maurriša appin halpiš* “He captured and slew them”.

In both cases it connects phrases or parts of phrases and helps thus to bring some structure into the text.

## **Syntax**

### *Syntactic Relations*

Many languages express their syntactic relations by means of a case system. Elamite was not one of them, albeit it is not void of any case element either (cf. supra).

Lacking a case system, Elamite had to find other ways to express its syntactical relations. In fact, it used a system of classifying suffixes and relational particles. Therefore, word-order is very important. The usual word order is:

subject(+modifier) – indirect object(+modifier) – direct object(+modifier)  
– resumptive pronoun(s) – verb.

Example: *u siyan kuših Inšušinak ak Simut ap in tunih* “I constructed the temple. The gods Inšušinak and Simut, to them I gave it”.

In the later periods, word order became freer, partly because of the emergence and frequent use of postpositions to indicate the precise relations between words. This emergence was in any case partially due to influence from the Indo-European Iranian languages, in particular Old Persian, with which the Elamites came into intense contact in the Neo-Elamite period.

Elamite uses *classifying suffixes* to indicate the precise relationship between a noun and its complement(s). As already mentioned, they can be found anywhere, not only after substantives or pronouns, but also after the negation particle or locative adverbs (e.g. *aha*).

If A is determined by B, the structure of the group is A-suffix B-suffix, e.g. *sunki-k Anšan-i-k* “I, the king of Anshan”, *PN sunki-r Hatamti-r* “PN, the king of Elam”.

*Relational particles* (e.g. *pat* “foot”, *šara* “under”, *ukku* “head; on”), in combination with classifiers, are used to indicate spatial relationships between nouns or pronouns: *pat-r* “he who is under”, *šara-r* “he who is below”, *ukku-p* “those who are above”.

An example is *petir uri ni patr ur tatni* “My enemy, may you place (him) below me”, literally “my enemy (*peti-r u-ri*), you (*ni*) below (*pat-r*) me (*u-r*) may you place (*ta-t-ni*)”. Here the classifier *-r* connects *pat* and *u*.

## *Coordination*

Coordination in Elamite is expressed both asyndetically and syndetically by means of the conjunction *ak*. In Achaemenid Elamite (royal inscriptions), this lexeme is also used to introduce a paragraph. *Kutta* is also used in the later periods.

## *Subordination*

Originally, subordinate phrases were inserted in the text without any subordinating conjunction. They only took a particle *-a* to indicate the subordination. An example is *U Šutruk-Nahhunte Inšušinak napir uri ur tahhanra Akkat halpuh* “When my god Inšušinak, commanded it to me, Šutruk-Nahhunte, I destroyed Akkad”, lit. “I, Šutruk-Nahhunte (*U Šutruk-Nahhunte*), my god Inšušinak (*Inšušinak napi-r u-ri*) me (*u-r*) commanding (*tahha-n-r-a*), I destroyed (*halpu-h*) Akkad (*Akkat*)”.

Next to this type of construction, subordinate phrases may also be expressed by subordinating conjunctions. This happened more frequently in the Late Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid periods. Such conjunctions are *anka* “when”, *appa anka* “after”, *kuš* “until”, *meni sap anka* “after”, *sap* “while, when”, *sap appa* “when” and *sap innu* “as long as”. Usually the subordinate phrase is situated before the verb of the main clause.

## *Direct Discourse*

In Elamite, direct discourse is indicated by *-man-k* (1st sg.), *-ma-r* (3rd sg.) or *-ma-p* (3rd pl.), all positioned at the end of the direct discourse, e.g. *ir unsaha ma-ra tirinra* ““I paid him”, he says”.

A specific kind of documents was always considered direct discourse, not only in the Elamite culture, but basically in all Ancient Near Eastern cultures: the letters. This is made clear by the introductory formulas (ex. *PN turuš PN<sub>2</sub> nan turuš* “Say to PN, PN<sub>2</sub> has said, saying”).

## 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”).

## REFERENCES

- Dahl, J.L. (2013). “Early Writing in Iran.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Iran* (ed. D.T. Potts), 233–262. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Graef, K. (2013). “The Use of Akkadian in Iran.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Iran* (ed. D.T. Potts), 263–282. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- de Miroschedji, P. 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.
- D’jakonov, I.M. 1967. “Эламский язык.” In *Jazyki Drevnej Perednej Azii*, edited by I.M. D’jakonov, 85–112. Moskva: Nauka.
- Fisher, M.T. and Stolper, M.W. 2015. “Achaemenid Administrative Tablets, 3. Fragments from Old Kandahar, Afghanistan.” *Achaemenid Research on Texts and Archaeology* 2015.001 (on line, [www.achemenet.com](http://www.achemenet.com)).
- Grillot-Susini, F. 2008. *L’élamite: Éléments de grammaire* (Geuthner Manuels). Paris: Geuthner.
- Hallock, R.T. 1969. *Persepolis Fortification Tablets* (Oriental Institute Publications 92). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hinz, W. and Koch, H. 1987. *Elamisches Wörterbuch* (Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran. Ergänzungsband 17). Berlin: Reimer.
- Khačikyan, M. 1998. *The Elamite Language* (Documenta Asiana 4). Roma: Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche. Istituto per gli studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici.
- Krebernik, M. 2005. “Elamisch.” In *Sprachen des Alten Orients*, edited by Michael P. Streck, 159–182. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Labat, R. 1951. “Structure de la langue Elamite (état présent de la question).” *Conférences de l’Institut de Linguistique de Paris*, 9: 23–42.
- McAlpin, D. 1981. *Proto-Elamo-Dravidian: The Evidence and its Implications* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 71/3). Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

- Paper, H.H. 1955. *The Phonology and Morphology of Royal Achaemenid Elamite*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Quintana Cifuentes, E. 2010. *La lengua elamita (Irán pre-persa)*. Madrid: Gram Ediciones.
- Quintana Cifuentes, E. 2013. *Gramática de la Lengua elamita*. Madrid: Visión Libros.
- Reiner, E. 1969. "The Elamite Language." In *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen* (Handbuch der Orientalistik 1/2/1-2/2), 54–118. Leiden: Brill.
- Stolper, M.W. 2004. "Elamite." In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, edited by Roger D. Woodard, 60–94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tavernier, J. 2007. "On Some Elamite Signs and Sounds." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 157: 265–291.
- Tavernier, J. 2010. "Migrations des savoirs entre l'Élam et la Mésopotamie." *Res Antiquae*, 7: 199–222.
- Tavernier, J. 2011. "Elamite: analyse grammaticale et lecture de textes." *Res Antiquae*, 8: 315–350.
- Tavernier, J. 2018a. "Elamites and Iranians." In *The Elamite World* (Routledge World Series), edited by Javier Álvarez-Mon, Gian Pietro Basello and Yasmina Wicks, 163–174. London: Routledge.
- Tavernier, J. 2018b. "The Elamite Language." In *The Elamite World* (Routledge World Series), edited by Javier Álvarez-Mon, Gian Pietro Basello and Yasmina Wicks, 416–449. London: Routledge.
- Zadok, R. 1995. "On the Current State of Elamite Lexicography." *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul vicino oriente antico*, 12: 241–252.