

Colloquien der
Deutschen
Orient-
Gesellschaft

Band 10

CDOG 10

10. Colloquium, Mainz 2019

Elam und seine Nachbarn

Herausgegeben von
Doris Prechel und Alexander Pruß

Harrassowitz Verlag

Marking Place Names in Ancient Elam

Jan Tavernier

(Université catholique de Louvain)

Introduction¹

When the Elamite-speaking population of Susiana adopted the Mesopotamian cuneiform writing system, they did so in all its aspects. The scribes in Elam did not only adopt syllabograms, but also Sumerograms (logograms), phonetic complements and determinatives easily found their way to Elam. However, upon arrival there they became gradually subject to a simplification². The determinatives, which will be the focal point of this paper, are a set of unpronounced semantic classifiers or semantic indicators that give more information on the category the preceding or following word belongs to, e.g. place names, plant names, names of men, names of women, divine names, etc.³

In the Mesopotamian and Elamite cuneiform writing systems there are three kinds of determinatives: prepositional determinatives, postpositional determinatives and grammatical determinatives. The first two categories are named after the position of the determinative, before (e.g. ^dUtu for the sun-god Šamaš) or after (e.g. SUM.SIKIL^{sar}, a kind of onion) the word it determines. Grammatical determinatives indicate the grammatical category to which the determined word belongs (e.g. Sumerian MEŠ for plural forms).

Despite its often slavish adoption of the Mesopotamian cuneiform writing system, the Elamite system is not an exact copy of its Mesopotamian equivalent. The best-known difference between both systems is the use of the determinative MEŠ. Whereas the Sumerian and Akkadian scribes used this morpheme as a plural marker, scribes writing in Elam used it to indicate that the preceding word was in fact a (pseudo-) logogram⁴.

1 Some abbreviations are:

PF: *Persepolis Fortification texts*, partly published in Hallock 1969 and 1978 and Arfae 2008.
PF-NN: *Persepolis Fortification texts* in draft editions by R. T. Hallock, cited from collated and corrected editions by W. F. M. Henkelman, some available via the Online Cultural and Historical Research Environment (<https://ochre.uchicago.edu/>); images of some available via InscriptiFact (<http://www.inscriptifact.com/>).

2 Tavernier 2018, 422–423.

3 Michalowski 2004, 25; Stolper 2004, 66; Jagersma 2010, 18.

4 Oppert 1879, 46; Cameron 1948, 68; Paper 1955, 6; Reiner 1969, 69; Grilhot 1987, 10; Stolper 2004, 66–67; Grilhot-Susini 2008, 9; Tavernier 2011, 318; Id. 2018, 423.

A second difference lies in the use of determinatives marking geographical names. It is on this research domain that the present contribution will focus. In other words, this paper will study the various determinatives used in Elam (Susiana and Fars) to mark toponyms (place names), gentilics (ethnic names) and oronyms (mountain names). It will not only give an overview of the various determinatives concerned, but will also evaluate any preferences that the Mesopotamian or Elamite system might have had.

Marking place names in ancient Elam

The determinative AŠ

In Elamite texts, the general determinative to mark place names is the horizontal wedge AŠ, a determinative not attested in the Mesopotamian cuneiform writing system⁵. Appearing for the first time in an inscription of the Ighalkid king Humpan-u-mena (c. 1350–1340 BCE) in the toponyms Anzan (AŠAn-za-an: EKI 4C:3) and Susa (AŠŠu-šu-un: EKI 4C:3), this determinative was quickly adopted by later Middle Elamite kings (Šutruk-Nahhunte I, Kutir-Nahhunte II, Šilhak-Inšušinak I and Hutelutuš-Inšušinak) and remained in use until the last days of Elamite as a written language (late Achaemenid period). It also occurs in documentary texts: the Middle Elamite administrative texts from Tal-i Malyan⁶, the Neo-Elamite Susa Acropole Archive⁷ and the Achaemenid administrative texts from Persepolis⁸.

AŠ could also indicate gentilic names, again from the time of Humpan-u-mena onwards: AŠLi-ia-an-ip-pá “The Liyanite (gods)” (EKI 4C:1). This use of AŠ occurs a couple of times in the Middle Elamite texts (e.g. AŠLi-ia-an-ir-ra [EKI 19:3, 31:2, 59:3], AŠLu-up-pu-ni-ir-ra “A man from Luppun” [EKI 28A:18] and AŠŠu-še-en-ra “Susian” [EKI 60:2; MDP 53 21:8]), but became popular in the Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid periods, as proven by AŠA-a-pír-ir-ra “The man from Ayapir” (EKI 75:5, 76:1, 20, 21, 76A:5; Neo-Elamite), AŠAn-tá-tá-pé-na “From the people of Antata” (MDP 9 103 rev. 7; Neo-Elamite), AŠZa-am-pè-gír-ip “Zambegirians” (MDP 9 11 rev. 2; Neo-Elamite), AŠHal-tam₅-tup “The Elamites” (XPh₆ 15–16; Achaemenid Elamite) and AŠAn-za-an-ra “The Anshanite” (PFNN 663:3–4, 793:4; Achaemenid Elamite).

5 Norris (1855, 46) noticed the combination of AŠ and place names, but thought that AŠ was an Elamite preposition meaning “at” or “in”; Mordtmann 1862, 3; Id. 1870, 2; Oppert 1879, 46; Foy 1900, 347 specifies its use: AŠ appears, according to him, before land, people, city and river names; Paper (1955, 6) believes that AŠ is sometimes interchangeable with the vertical wedge (DŠ); Reiner 1969, 69; Grillot 1987, 9; Vallat 1993, X et 21; Stolper 2004, 66; Grillot-Susini 2008, 9; Quintana Cifuentes 2010, 9; Id. 2013, 15.

6 Stolper 1984, 15.

7 Scheil 1907, 2.

8 Hallock 1969, 83.

The determinative BE

In the late Neo-Elamite period, a new determinative makes its appearance in Elamite texts: BE. It is predominantly used to mark personal names⁹, but as gentilic names can indicate groups of individuals, BE was also apt to mark gentilics, at least in documentary texts. Examples are:

12. ^{giš}PAN^{meš} ^{be}Aš-šu-ra-ap-pé "Assyrian bows": MDP 9 174 rev. 6.
13. ^{be}Ba-pi-li-[ra] "a Babylonian": MDP 9 207:4.
14. ^{be}Bar-šip^{ip}-pé "Persians": MDP 9 166:4,25.
15. ^{be}Bar-šip "Persians": MDP 9 11 rev. 1, 49:1, 51 rev. 5, 94 rev. 13, 246 rev. 7, 281:20.
In MDP 9 281:29 the determinative is omitted.
16. ^{be}Bar-šip ^{aš}Da-at-ti-ia-na-ip "Persians from the Dātāyana-clan": MDP 9 187 rev. 2.
Note the use of two different determinatives here. It looks as if BE has a more general function, whereas AŠ indicates a more specific entity.
17. ^dMÜŠ.LAM ^{be}Ha-ra-an-ra "Inšušinak the Haranian": MDP 9 147 rev. 26.
18. ^{be}Ha-tam₅-ti-ib-[be] "Elamites": MDP 9 154:27.
19. ^{be}I-da-li-ip "Hidaliens": MDP 9 163:7–8.
20. ^{be}I-da-li-ra "a Hidalian": MDP 9 37 rev. 4.

This determinative continued to be used in the same way during the Achaemenid period, more specifically in the Persepolis Fortification and Treasury Tablets, e.g. ^{be}Ia-u-na(-ip) "Ionian" (cf. Vallat 1993, 110), ^{be}Šu-ig-ti-ia(-ip) "Sogdian(s)"¹⁰, ^{be}Tur-mi-ri-ia-ip "Lycians"¹¹, etc. Rarely, we find BE used instead of AŠ, thus marking a real place name:

21. PF 25:7–8: ^{be}Ma-ra-tam₅-kaš instead of ^{aš}Ma-ra-tam₅-kaš¹².
22. PFNN 673:3–4: ^{be}Nu^l-pi-iš-taš instead of ^{aš}Nu^l-pi-iš-taš¹³.
23. PT 35:5: ^{be}Ba-ir-iš-šá for ^{aš}Ba-ir-iš-šá¹⁴.
24. PT 3a:5, 9a:7: ^{be}Ba-ir-šá-iš for ^{aš}Ba-ir-šá-iš¹⁵.

Remarkably, three out of five of these attestations belong to the later Persepolis Treasury Archive (492–458 BCE). This could possibly point to a weakening of the system of using determinatives. The occurrence of ^{aš}aš.aš as determinative for ^{hal} in late Achaemenid Elamite inscriptions (e.g. ^{aš}aš.aš^{aš} Ir-tak-šá-áš-šá in A²Sa₆) could be related to this¹⁶.

9 Steve 1988; Quintana Cifuentes 2013, 15.

10 Cf. Vallat 1993, 245.

11 Cf. Vallat 1993, 286–287.

12 Vallat 1993, 171.

13 Vallat 1993, 200.

14 Vallat 1993, 208.

15 Vallat 1993, 210.

16 See also the mistake ^{aš}ha-za-kur-ra for ^{hal}ha-za-kur-ra "great" in A²Sa₆ 1.

The determinative KI

In Mesopotamian cuneiform, the determinative KI is used to indicate city and country names, e.g. KÁ.DINGIR.RA¹⁷ “Babylon”. This practice was widespread among Mesopotamians and for that reason KI became the habitual place name determinative.

As KI is predominantly Mesopotamian and as such does not seem to occur in Elamite texts, scholars in Elamite studies do not give attention to it. Reiner¹⁸, Gril­lot¹⁹ and Gril­lot-Susini²⁰ do not mention it at all. Stolper²¹ refers to it indirectly when he argues that postpositional Mesopotamian determinatives, such as MUŠEN (birds) and SAR (plants) do not occur in Elamite texts. The only author to mention KI explicitly as a determinative to mark city or land names, without, however, giving more details, is Steve²². Finally, Tavernier²³ simply names KI and MEŠ as the only two postpositional determinatives in Elamite.

The idea of KI as a determinative in Elamite seems to find support in its presence in one Elamite text, the so-called Treaty of Naram-Sin. In the said text, it occurs four times after the name of the city of Akkad: EKI 2 iii 4 (A-ga-[dè^{KI}]), iv 21 ([A-ga-dè^{KI}]), vi 20 (A-ga-dè^{KI}) and vii 2 (A-[ga]-dè^{KI}). Nevertheless, this remains the only Elamite text where KI acts as a determinative. Although it is thereby proven that Elamite scribes did use KI as a determinative, one can hardly say that KI was a real Elamite determinative. The reason for being employed in the Naram-Sin Treaty is most likely Mesopotamian influence, which may be due to the international character of the text.

The extreme rarity with which KI occurs in Elamite texts sharply contrasts with the frequent use of it in Akkadian texts from Elam. In those texts, both royal inscriptions and documentary texts, it was the determinative *par excellence* of place names. The relevant text material can be dated from the Old Akkadian period to the Old Babylonian period. Some examples are:

1. Royal inscriptions

- a. A-wa-an^{KI}: FAOS 7 Elam 7:6, 8:5 (Puzur-Inšušinak).
- b. Hu-úr-tim^{KI}: FAOS 7 Elam 2:12 (Puzur-Inšušinak).
- c. Hu-up-sa-na^{KI}: FAOS 7 Elam 2:18 (Puzur-Inšušinak).
- d. MÜŠ.EREN^{KI} (Susa): FAOS 7 Elam 4:6, 6:5, 9:3, 10:5, 11:2 (Puzur-Inšušinak); IRS 4:4' (Tan-Ruhuratur), 6-7:6, 8:3 (Idadu I), 15:4 (Temti-halki), 17:7 (Kuk-Naşur), 18:7 (Kuk-Kirwaš).
- e. Si-da-rí^{KI}: FAOS 7 Elam 3:22 (Puzur-Inšušinak).
- f. Si-maş-ki^{KI}: FAOS 7 Elam 2:106 (Puzur-Inšušinak).

17 Huehnergard & Woods 2004, 224; Jagersma 2010, 16.

18 Reiner 1969, 68-71.

19 Gril­lot 1987, 9.

20 Gril­lot-Susini 2008, 9-10.

21 Stolper 2004, 66.

22 Steve 1992, 17.

23 Tavernier 2011, 319; Id., 2018, 423.

2. Documentary texts

- a. Aš-gu-pe-en^{ki}: MDP 10 28:3, 53:3, 60:4, 64:2, 70:3, 72 rev. 2, 73:4 (Old Babylonian).
- b. A-ga-dē^{ki}: MDP 14 70 no. 8 rev. 4, 80 no. 21:2, 99 no. 55 i 2, 119 no. 86 i rev. 17 (Old Akkadian); MDP 28 13:3 (Old Babylonian).
- c. La-al-na^{ki}: MDP 55 21:13–14 (Old Babylonian).
- d. Me-ru^{ki}: MDP 28 540:8 (Old Babylonian).
- e. Pi-la-ak^{ki}: MDP 23 169:34 (Old Babylonian).
- f. Sa-da-ru-um^{ki}: MDP 55 61:21 (Old Babylonian).
- g. Susa: various spellings:
 - α) MÜŠ.EREN^{ki}: MDP 54 29 S ii 4 (Ur III); MDP 55 21:12 (Old Babylonian).
 - β) Su-sim^{ki24}: MDP 14 5 no. 1 rev. 4 = MDP 14 17 rev. 4 (Old Akkadian).
 - γ) Šu-ši-im^{ki}: MDP 28 473:8 (Old Babylonian).
 - δ) Šu-šf-im^{ki}: MDP 23 314:18 (Old Babylonian).
 - ε) Šu-ú-ši^{ki}: MDP 22 77 rev. 5 (Old Babylonian).
- h. Za-ap-za-li^{ki}: MDP 10 16:4, 25:2, 35:3 (Old Babylonian).

With regard to the Akkadian texts from Elam dated to the post-Old Babylonian periods, those from Tchogha Zanbil only mention Susa and Anshan (in the royal title), but without any determinative²⁵, something also attested in Haft Tepe.²⁶ A Sumerian inscription (MDP 28 9) of the Kassite king Kurigalzu II (1332–1308 BCE) mentions three place names: MÜŠ.EREN^{ki}, NIM.MA^{ki} and [Mar]-ḫa-ši^{ki}. A Babylonian text from the end of the 7th century (reign of Hallutuš-Inšušinak II) has ^{kur}NIM.MA^{ki27}, two others have NIM.MA^{ki28}.

The determinative KI still occurs in Babylonian texts from Achaemenid Persia: ^{kur}An-za-an^{ki} (DB_b 72), E^{ki} (DB_b 17, 39, 87, 91, 92), ^{kur}NIM.MA^{ki} (DB_b 4, 30, 31, 32, 40, 42, 91, 92; DN_a_b 11; DSe_b 14; DSf_b 32; XPh_b 15), ^{kur}Aš-šur^{ki} (DB_b 40; DN_a_b 15), Šu-šā-an^{ki} (DSe_b 34; DSf_b 16, 24, 38; DSo_b 3), TIN.TIR^{ki} (DB_b 4, 15, 19, 31, 32, 33, 36, 39, 40, 57, 72, 85, 86, 87, 89, 92, 97; DN_a_b 15; DSe_b 18; DSf_b 23), ^{kur}TIN.TIR^{ki} (XPh_b 17). Interestingly, it only appears after toponyms that were extremely well-known to the Babylonians: Assur, Babylon, Elam and Susa. The other toponyms usually use KUR. This is also valid for the Neo-Babylonian texts from Iran, which have KI only after the name of Elam. This model does, however, not apply to the Babylonian Achaemenid Royal Inscription DSaa, where KI occurs as general locative determinative²⁹.

Interesting to note is that KUR determines the land of Akkad in DSf_b 36, whereas in the same text (line 21) it occurs without any determinative.

24 Gelb & Kienast (1990, 318) prefer a reading Šu-šin^{ki}, while Vallat (1993, 268) has Šu₁₁-šim^{ki}. Here, as well as in Barton (1928, 154) and the Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative (<https://cdli.ucla.edu>) the reading Su-sim^{ki}, following the drawing in MDP 14, is adopted.

25 Steve 1967, 110–113.

26 Cf. *infra*.

27 Stolper 1986, 236:4.

28 Leichty 1983, 154:27; OIP 122 1:25.

29 Cf. Vallat 1986, 278.

As to the use of *ki*, two observations remain to be made. First, in the earlier documents, both literary and documentary, some of these toponyms also occur without determinative, e.g. Di-i-ir (Der; MDP 55 81:3 [Old Babylonian], La-al-na (MDP 55 25:15–16 [Old Babylonian]), MUŠ.EREN (IRS 13:2 [Attahušu]), NIM.MA (IRS 15:3 [Temti-halki], 17:5 [Kuk-Našur], 18:5 [Kuk-Kirwaš]; MDP 54 12:6, 20:2 [Ur III]; MDP 55 35:3 [Old Babylonian]), Si-maš-ki (IRS 15:3 [Temti-halki], 17:6 [Kuk-Našur], 18:6 [Kuk-kirwaš]), Šu-šī(-im) (IRS 14:1 [Temti-Agun], 19:1 [Inšušinak-šar-ilani], 20:1 [Tepti-ahar]), Šu-šin (MDP 54 9:4 [Ur III]) and Zi-ki-ri-im (MDP 54 22:8 [Ur III]). Especially the city of Susa often appears without its determinative³⁰.

Secondly, in the Old Babylonian Akkadian documentary texts from Elam, *ki* may, albeit rarely, be combined with URU “town”. Examples are URU^{ki} Hu-[uh-nu-ú^{ki}] (MDP 23 273:1) “the city of Huhnur”, URU^{ki} Pi-la-a-ak (MDP 23 252:3; in MDP 22 112:3, one may restore URU^{ki} Pi-la-a-a-[ak]) “the town of Pilak” and URU^{ki} Šu-šī^{ki} (MDP 24 382:11) “the city of Susa”. This is a practice widely attested in Old Babylonian texts from Mesopotamia, so it is not surprising that Akkadian scribes in Elam also made use of it. Mesopotamian examples are: URU^{ki} Áb-nun-me-du, URU^{ki} A-ḫa-nu-ta, URU^{ki} Gur-du-ra-rum, URU^{ki} Ra-ḫa-bu-um, etc.³¹

In the same context, lines 8–13 of an inscription (FAOS 7 Elam 2) on a statue of Puzur-Inšušinak (c. 2150 BCE), go as follows:

(8) i-nu-me (9) Ki-maš^{ki} (10) ù (11) ma-at^{ki} (12) Hu-úr-tim^{ki} (13) i-ge-ru-uš
 “When Kimaš and the land of Hurtum became hostile to him”.

The use of *ki* after the construct state of the noun *mātum* “land” is interesting, as it expands the use of *ki* in combination with a geographical marker, this time *mātum* “land”. Its use is accordingly nothing more than a variant of the various attestations of URU^{ki}. The inscription of Puzur-Inšušinak neatly complies with Mesopotamian scribal habits.

Alternatively, but less probably, it may be an early example of the later Elamite habit of combining the general determinative for place names (AŠ) with a noun indicating a geographical entity. In Elamite there is the use of AŠ before nouns (in the Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid periods) such as *ekallu* “palace” (^{as}e^l-kal₂-l[i]; Akkadian loanword), *iyan* “palace hall” (^{as}hi-ia-an and ^{as}i-ia-an; Neo-El. and Ach. El.³²) and *wel* “gate” (^{as}ū-el; Neo-El. and Ach. El.). Nonetheless, this practice is limited to the Neo- and Achaemenid Elamite periods and it would be surprising to see that this habit appears as an originally Elamite one before disappearing for several centuries only to see it reappear in the later Elamite texts.

30 Cf. Vallat 1993, 268.

31 Cf. Groneberg 1980, *passim*.

32 In the Middle Elamite period, this word appears without the determinative.

The determinative KUR

The various grammatical studies of the Elamite language usually ignore this determinative. Yet, Oppert calls KUR a “monogramme «montagne»”³³ and Steve assumes it is a determinative appearing before the names of lands and mountains³⁴.

In Mesopotamian cuneiform, *kur*, the Sumerian lexeme for “land” and “mountain”, was used to mark land and mountain names. The Elamites did not adopt this determinative as a marker for countries, but instead used it to indicate mountains. The Akkadian texts from Elam hardly use the determinative KUR, preferring *ki* instead. Note, however, ^{kur}NIM.MA^{ki} in a Neo-Babylonian text from Bit-Ḫulummū³⁵ and the use of KUR in the Babylonian versions of the Achaemenid Royal Inscriptions.

The absence of KUR in Elamite texts might perhaps not be so sure³⁶, depending on the interpretation of the expression *aš kur Za-nu-na* in the late Neo-Elamite Persepolis Bronze Plaque (line 42). Hinz & Koch interpret it as ^{aš}Kur-za-nu-na “from Kurzanu”³⁷, which then constitutes a place name not attested elsewhere. Alternatively, Vallat reads the expression as ^{aš.kur}Za-nu-na “from the land of Zanu”³⁸, connecting this toponym with ^{kur}Za-na, attested in an Old Akkadian³⁹ text from Susa (MDP 14 91:8)⁴⁰. According to the first editor of the latter text, Léon Legrain, the toponym ^{kur}Za-na is preceded by the determinative URU⁴¹. Nonetheless, the reading of this line was completely modified by Geller who reads *mūš(!) gīn.za⁴².na gim* “like the appearance of lapis lazuli”. In conclusion, MDP 14 91 has no toponym at all and does not help in the analysis of the Neo-Elamite text discussed here. Accordingly, the correct toponym in that text is Kurzanu and KUR does not occur as a determinative marking toponyms in Elamite.

Of course, KUR is also the Sumerian lexeme for “mountain” and as such, it appears in Elamite texts, serving as a determinative marking mountain names, although it could also be the pure substantive determined by the marker *aš*⁴³. The Neo-Elamite inscriptions of Hanne have once ^{aš.kur}Be-e-si (EKI 76:13). In the Achaemenid period, it is the combination ^{aš}KUR^{meš}⁴⁴ that takes this function. Examples are⁴⁵:

33 Oppert 1879, 44.

34 Steve 1992, 17; also Quintana Cifuentes 2013, 15.

35 Cf. *supra*.

36 Cf. Quintana Cifuentes 2010, 9.

37 Hinz & Koch 1987, 537.

38 Vallat 1993, 308.

39 Michalowski assigns the text to both the Old Akkadian period (Michalowski 1992, 323) and the Ur III period (*Ibid.* 324).

40 Cf. Geller 1980, 24–25.

41 Legrain 1913, 125.

42 This reading, instead of *ZA.GIN*, may be an anachronistic one (Geller 1980, 25).

43 It occurs as such in e.g. in PFNN 655:17, where the text has 3 ME MUŠEN^{meš} ^{aš}KUR^{meš} “300 mountain birds”.

44 One time this combination is erroneously written ^{aš.kur.kur} (Fort. 3543:5; cf. Arfae 2008, 79).

45 Cf. Hinz & Koch 1987, 517–518.

1. aš.kur.meš Aš-ba-pír-ra-sa-na: PFNN 2290:3.
2. aš.kur.meš Bat-ti-na-šá: PFNN 2200:2, 2362:4.
3. aš.kur.meš Har-ri-ia-ra-man-na: PF 1955:2.
4. aš.kur.meš aš Ka₄-mar-zí-ia: PFNN 2265:3.
5. aš.kur.meš aš Ši-ru-man-da: PF 1960:4.

The determinative URU

Just like KUR, URU is a Mesopotamian determinative that was not adopted by the Elamite scribes. Contrary to its frequent use in Mesopotamia proper, it was not very popular with the Akkadian scribes active in Elam, as it occurs only a couple of times in the Old Babylonian Akkadian texts from Susa: ^{uru}Ma-da-at (MDP 23 181:10), ^{uru}Še-er-ma-an (MDP 28 533:22), ^{uru}Šu-ší-im (lines 2 and 4 of a seal⁴⁶, applied on MDP 23 321–322 and HT 21) and ^{uru}Šu-ší-im^{ki} (MDP 22 143:6). It is also present in some Neo-Babylonian texts drafted in Elam: ^{uru}É Hu-lum-mu⁴⁷, ^{uru}Ha-a-da-lu⁴⁸ and ^{uru}Su-mu-un-da-naš⁴⁹. Note in this context that the Babylonian text from the Persepolis Fortification Archive has URU as determinative (^{uru}Par-su in line 21), being in line with the Neo-Babylonian documentary texts from Iran. URU also appears as determinative in the Babylonian versions of the Achaemenid Royal Inscriptions (especially the Bisitun Inscription): ^{uru}Si-ku-ú-ma-at-ti-’ (DB₆ 23), ^{uru}Za-za-an-nu (DB₆ 36), ^{uru}Ku-ga-na-’ak-’ka (DB₆ 41), ^{uru}Ma-ru-’ (DB₆ 45), ^{uru}Ka-’am-pa-da-’ (DB₆ 47), ^{uru}A-ga-ma-ta-nu (DB₆ 48,60,61), ^{uru}Zu-ú-zu (DB₆ 49), ^{uru}Di-ig-’ra’ (DB₆ 51), ^{uru}Ú-ia-’a-ma-’ (DB₆ 52), ^{uru}Ku-un-du-ur (DB₆ 57), ^{uru}Ar-ba-’-il (DB₆ 63), ^{uru}Ú-mi-iš-pa-’za-tu (DB₆ 65), ^{uru}Pa-’tig-ra’-[ba]-na (DB₆ 67), ^{uru}Ta-ar-ma (DB₆ 71), ^{uru}Ra-[ha]-’ (DB₆ 74), ^{uru}Ú-ma-da-sa-’ia’ (DB₆ 78), ^{uru}Ka-’pi-šá-ka-’na-’ (DB₆ 80), ^{uru}Ar-šá-da-’ (DB₆ 83) and ^{uru}A-bi-ra-du-uš (DSf₆ 31).

In his *syllabaire elamite*, Steve⁵⁰ mentions it as an Elamite determinative placed before the names of cities and further on⁵¹, he gives one, admittedly doubtful, example of its use as a determinative in an Elamite text: in EKI 54 iii 54 (Šilhak-Inšušinak I) the city of Kaplu appears as aš uru Ka₄-ap-lu. König provides the sign URU with a question mark⁵², but on the photograph in MDP 11 (Pl. 9) the sign URU is visible enough.

Nevertheless, it is not a determinative here. On the contrary, it is clear that AŠ is the determinative used here, as can be expected, and that URU is a part of the city name itself⁵³. A well-known example of a toponym constructed with *ālu* “town” is Āl-Untaš-Napiriša (Tchogha Zanbil)⁵⁴. In addition, names beginning with BĀD (= *dār*;

46 Edited by Glassner 1991, 122.

47 Stolper 1986, 236:19.

48 Leichty 1983 153–154:25.

49 OIP 122 1:23.

50 1992, 17; also Quintana Cifuentes 2010, 9 and 2013, 15.

51 Steve 1992, 144.

52 König 1965, 129.

53 Cf. Vallat 1993, 300.

54 Cf. Vallat 1993, 8.

cf. Vallat 1993, 59–61) are generally written ^{as}BAD-DN/PN, e.g. ^{as}BAD-Na-ah-ú-te (EKI 15:4–5) and ^{as}BAD-Un-taš (EKI 20:9). As a result of all this, URU should be deleted from Steve's list of Elamite determinatives.

The determinative DIŠ

This determinative appears as marker for toponyms in only one text, an inscription drafted on the command of the *sukkalmah* Siruktuh (c. 1800 BCE). This inscription, situated on a stela with an image of a male divinity/king, possibly accompanied by a second person⁵⁵, is nothing more than a short introduction, partially lost, with among others the royal name, title and affiliation. This introduction is followed by a rather long list of conquered settlements. The phrase model is ^{dis}GN du-uh "I have conquered GN". The place names do not match Mesopotamian toponyms, so in all likelihood they were situated to the east of Susiana⁵⁶. This may also explain why the inscription was drafted in Elamite, as the intended readership may have been Elamite speaking.

In general, vertical wedges function as markers for male personal names. This usage is widespread in all areas where cuneiform was used: Mesopotamia, Anatolia, the Levant and Elam. Accordingly, the use of this determinative for toponyms is, to say the least, remarkable⁵⁷. Possibly, it is a variant of the horizontal wedge (AŠ) that would later be the general Elamite marker of toponyms. Alternatively, it could have something to do with the eastern character of the text. Both hypotheses remain, however, highly speculative and difficult to prove.

Much later, during the Achaemenid period, this determinative reappears, this time to mark people, e.g. in the Bisitun Inscription (e.g. ^{dis}Áš-šá-kar-ti-ia-ip-pé "The Asagartians"; ^{dis}Ha-tam₅-tar-ra "An Elamite"), DNa (e.g. ^{dis}Áš-šu-ra "An Assyrian"; ^{dis}Šá-ak-ka₄ ^{dis}u-mu-mar-ka₄-ip "The haumavarga-Scyths") and in the subscripts accompanying the throne bearers in Naqš-i Rostam (e.g. ^{dis}Máš-zf-ia-ra "The Macian" [DNe 30]) and Persepolis (e.g. ^{dis}Pu-ud-da-a-ia "The Libyan" [A³Pb 27]). Here the gentilic character of the expressions ("Elamite individual" rather than "Elam"; "Persian individual" rather than "Persia") justifies its use. Once, in the Bisitun Inscription (DB_e ii 7), DIŠ appears erroneously before the land name itself (^{dis}Hal-tam₅-ti), but this may be due to the occurrence of "the Elamites" (^{dis}Hal-tam₅-ti-ip) in the same line.

The determinative HAL

In modern literature, HAL appears for the first time in the grammar of Jules Oppert, where it is described as "Comme monogramme «ville puis le pays d'Élam»"⁵⁸. The use of the determinative HAL to mark place names is not that surprising, given that Elamite HAL means "land". Some modern scholars mention it and one can suppose

55 Farber 1974, 74–76.

56 Farber 1974, 85–86.

57 Farber 1974, 82 and n.12.

58 Oppert 1879, 44.

that land names are marked by HAL⁵⁹, which then becomes the Elamite equivalent for Mesopotamian KUR, used as a marker for countries in Mesopotamian cuneiform.

In various cases, the sign HAL serves as a marker of names of regions or countries. Examples are⁶⁰:

1. ^{hal}Áš-šu-ra-[na] in ^{be}LUGAL ^{hal}Áš-šu-ra-[na] “The king of Assyria” (Nin 13:4; cf. Gorris 2020, 95).
2. ^{aš,hal}Ha-ra-na: attested in the Late Neo-Elamite period (Nin 13:3-4).
3. ^{hal}Hatamti “Elam”: the use of this specific combination is limited to the Middle Elamite (Šutrukid) period and to the late Neo-Elamite period⁶¹. Mostly the spelling is ^{hal}Ha-tam₅-ti, whereby clearly the land is intended (EKI 86:8, 89:10 [Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak]; Nin 5:3). In the Nineveh Letters (c. 600 BCE), the name appears once as follows: ^{aš,hal}Ha-tam₅-ti (Nin 15:17). Remarkably, the letter Nin 24:5 has ^{hal,hal}Ha-tam₅-[ti]⁶². In all likelihood, the scribe was a bit confused. In any case, this writing does not prove that *hal* was a part of the name of Elam, as Hinz & Koch assume⁶³.
4. ^{hal}Hupšan/Hupšen (modern Deh-e Now): attested in the Middle Elamite period (MDP 53 10 A:5, B:5–6⁶⁴; EKI 45 iv 10; EKI 54 iv 34⁶⁵). The same toponym occurs five times without any determinative: EKI 70C iv 13 (Old Elamite: Temti-Agun), EKI 17:45–46⁶⁶ (Middle Elamite: Šutruk-Nahhunte I), EKI 54 i 95 (Middle Elamite: Šilhak-Inšušinak I), EKI 73A:9 and 74 rev. 45–46 (Neo-Elamite: Šutruk-Nahhunte II).
5. ^{hal}Karintaš, the region around modern Kverend⁶⁷: mentioned with the determinative HAL in an inscription of Šutruk-Nahhunte I (^{hal}Ka₄-ri-in-taš: EKI 23:6,7–8) and in an inscription of Šilhak-Inšušinak (^{hal}Ka₄-ri-[in-taš]: EKI 52:23). EKI 51 iv 8,10 has the toponym without any determinative, whereas a text of Šutruk-Nahhunte II (EKI 72:11) has the determinative AŠ (^{aš}Kar-<in>-taš).
6. ^{hal}Ráš-še-[]: attested in the late Neo-Elamite period (MDP 9 76:1).
7. ^{hal}Zamin: ^{hal}Za-min ^{hal}Ha-tam-ti-na “Zamin of Elam” (Nin 5:2,27⁶⁸) and ^{hal}Za-am-mín (Nin 15:15).

59 Bleichsteiner 1928, 186; Hallock 1969, 83; Steve 1967, 24; Id. 1992, 17; Quintana Cifuentes 2010, 9; Gorris 2020, 99.

60 The reading ^{hal}Te-er-tak-ra by Vallat (1993, 277) is erroneous, if one looks at Scheil’s copies of the tablets where it occurs. The determinative is BE in MDP 9 38 rev. 9 and 121 rev. 2. It is clearly AŠ in MDP 9 53:10. In MDP 9 60:5 it is not preserved. In all likelihood, this expression is a gentilic name “The Tertakian” (Scheil 1907, 52 and 108; Hinz & Koch 1987, 315), hence the use of both determinatives AŠ and BE.

61 Examples in Vallat 1993, 91.

62 Cf. Weissbach 1902, 199.

63 Hinz & Koch 1987, 597. On the name Haltamti, see, most recently, Mäder forthc., 8 n. 62.

64 Here the determinative is restored: [^{hal}Hu]-up-ša-an.

65 Here the determinative is restored: [^{hal}]Hu-up-ša-an.

66 Here the toponym is partially restored: Hu-up-[še-en].

67 Cf. Potts 2017.

68 Cf. Gorris 2020, 93.

In the Neo-Elamite period, the determinative may be spelled syllabically *ha-al*^{mes} (considered by the ancient scribes as a logogram), as shown by the following examples.

1. *ha-al*^{mes} Ba-la-hu-te-ep-pè (EKI 79:6, 80:2; Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak)⁶⁹.
2. *ha-al*^{mes} Ku-ur-pu-ut-tu₄ (EKI 74 i 19; Šutruru).
3. *ha-al*^{mes} La-al-la-ri-ip-pè (EKI 79:7, 80:2–3; Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak)⁷⁰.

As can be expected, HAL does not serve as determinative in Akkadian texts, that prefer KUR instead. The Middle Elamite place name Hališrati (HT 29:5) cannot be emended to *hal*Išrati, because the name Huhnur (HT 29:6) is also spelled without any determinative⁷¹. In fact, other toponyms in the Middle Elamite Akkadian texts from Haft Tepe also appear without any determinative, e.g. Šu-šf (HT 1:12', 2:3)⁷².

Finally, there is also the disputed case of Haptiš. This possible toponym occurs in various Middle Elamite texts, following the determinative HAL, spelled *hal* or *ha-al*. Interestingly, the spelling *ha-al* is older than the spelling *hal*, although *ha-al* also occurs in Neo-Elamite texts⁷³. *Ha-al* appears in texts from Untaš-Napiriša (EKI 13B:6; MDP 41 44:3) and Šutruk-Nahhunte I (EKI 28A:21,33), whereas Silhak-Inšušinak I preferred *hal* (EKI 55:11,13). Nevertheless, doubts exist on the real character of this lexeme. According to Vallat⁷⁴, it is a real toponym, but alternative hypotheses also exist: a verb meaning 'to conquer'⁷⁵, an adjective meaning 'complete, entire'⁷⁶, or a substantive meaning 'procession'⁷⁷.

In the Achaemenid Bisitun inscription, *hal* is the standard translation of Old Persian *vr̥dana-* 'settlement'. The Akkadian equivalent is the determinative URU. Yet, here *hal* is not a determinative, as Steve assumes⁷⁸, but a pseudo-logogram:

1. *aš*^{HAL}^{mes} *aš*Bat-ti-ik-ráb-ba-na 'a region called Battikrabbana' (DB₆ ii 75); OP *vr̥danam* (DB_p iii 5); Akkadian URU (DB₆ 67).
2. *aš*^{HAL}^{mes} *aš*Ku-un-tar-ru-iš 'a region called Kuntarruš' (DB₆ ii 50); OP *vr̥danam* 'settlement' (DB_p ii 66); Akkadian URU (DB₆ 57). Kunduruš also occurs in the Persepolis Fortification Texts, but only preceded by *aš*.

69 Cf. Hüsing 1916, 25.

70 Cf. Hüsing 1916, 25.

71 Cf. Herrero & Glassner 1993, 98.

72 Cf. also Vallat 1993, 268.

73 Cf. *supra*.

74 Vallat 1993, 79.

75 Hinz 1962, 37.

76 Lambert 1965, 29.

77 König 1965, 186; Hinz & Koch 1987, 574.

78 Steve (1992, 143) is also wrong in arguing that *hal* is a determinative in the expression *hal* *a*^{mes} 'watered land' (frequently attested in the Persepolis Fortification Archive, cf. Hinz & Koch 1987, 594).

3. ^{aš}HAL^{mes} ^{aš}Ma-ru-iš “a region called Maruš” (DB_e ii 16); OP *vrđanam* (DB_p ii 22); Akkadian URU (DB_b 45).
4. ^{aš}HAL^{mes} ^{aš}Mi-iš-ba-u-za-ti-iš “a region called Višpauzāti” (DB_e ii 70); OP *vrđanam* (DB_p ii 95–96); Akkadian URU (DB_b 65).
5. ^{aš}HAL^{mes} Rák-ka₄-an “a region called Raxā” (DB_e iii 8); OP *vrđanam* (DB_p iii 34); Akkadian URU (DB_b 74).
6. ^{aš}hal^[mes aš] Tā-ra-ú-ma “a region called Tarava” (DB_e iii 1); OP *vrđanam* (DB_p iii 22); Akkadian URU (DB_b 71).
7. ^{aš}HAL^{mes} Za-iz-za-an “a region called Zazzan” (DB_e i 73); OP *vrđanam* (DB_p i 92); Akkadian URU (DB_b 36).

The determinative GAM

According to Hinz & Koch⁷⁹, the name of the land of Elam is preceded by the determinative GAM in the following example: ^{gam}hal-ha-tam₅-ti (Omen Rev. 28)⁸⁰. This determinative is normally used for the indication of male personal names and it would be rather strange to see it used as a determinative for place names. In the Omen text, GAM is accordingly not a determinative for place names, but it serves as a word and line divider, although not used consistently⁸¹. In Mesopotamia, this function is quite usual⁸². In some cases, it marks male personal names and group designations⁸³.

In addition, as the name for Elam is Hatamti⁸⁴, HAL is the real determinative in this fragment.

Conclusion

This study has concentrated on the various determinatives, of which the inhabitants of ancient Elam made use to mark their toponyms and gentilics. Not less than seven determinatives could serve as a marker of toponyms and/or gentilics, GAM being excluded from the list. Of course, this is also the result of the co-existence of Elamite- and Akkadian-speaking and -writing communities writing living in Elam.

It may also be useful to draw some conclusions from a chronological point of view. The oldest Elamite text, the Naram-Sin Treaty, is the only Elamite text using the typically Mesopotamian determinative K1, possibly under Mesopotamian influence. The other Old Elamite text concerned here is a royal inscription, whose creator, Siruktuh, uses D1š, which again is a not expected determinative in an Elamite text.

⁷⁹ Hinz & Koch 1987, 597.

⁸⁰ Cf. Scheil 1917, 34.

⁸¹ Labat 1988, 24–25; Steve 1988; Quintana Cifuentes 2010, 9; Id. 2013, 16; Basello forthc., 23–26.

⁸² Borger 1981, No. 362 and 378; Id. 2004, 372 no. 576; Labat 1988, 24–25; Steve 1988.

⁸³ Basello forthc., 21–23.

⁸⁴ Cf. supra.

Determinative	Language	Period	Category	Type of toponym
No determinative	Akkadian	Ur III	Documentary	Toponyms
		OB	Documentary, literary	Toponyms
		MB	Documentary, literary	Toponyms
		LB	Literary	Toponyms
	Elamite	OE	Literary	Toponyms
		ME	Literary	Toponyms
		NE	Documentary, literary	Toponyms
AŠ	Elamite	ME	Documentary, literary	Toponyms, gentilics
		NE	Documentary, literary	Toponyms, gentilics
		AE	Documentary, literary	Toponyms, gentilics
BE	Elamite	NE	Documentary	Gentilics
		AE	Documentary	Toponyms (rare), gentilics
KI	Akkadian	OA	Documentary, literary	Toponyms
		Ur III	Documentary	Toponyms
		OB	Documentary, literary	Toponyms
		MB	Literary	Toponyms
		NB	Documentary	Toponyms
		LB	Literary	Toponyms
	Elamite	OE	Literary	Toponyms
KUR	Akkadian	NB	Documentary, literary	Toponyms
		LB	Literary	Toponyms
		LB	Literary	Oronyms
	Elamite	NE	Documentary	Oronyms
		AE	Documentary	Oronyms
URU	Akkadian	OB	Documentary	Toponyms
		NB	Documentary	Toponyms
		LB	Documentary, literary	Toponyms
DIŠ	Elamite	OE	Literary	Toponyms
		AE	Literary	Gentilics
HAL	Elamite	ME	Literary	Toponyms
		NE	Documentary, literary	Toponyms

Both determinatives do not occur anymore in later Elamite texts. In fact, the Middle Elamite period witnesses the birth of two completely new determinatives: AŠ and HAL. The former one quickly became the usual Elamite determinative marking place names and gentilics both in royal inscriptions and documentary texts. The latter one is only attested when determining Hatamti, the name of Elam, and Hupšan/Hupšen.

Texts dated to the Neo-Elamite period predominantly use AŠ, but BE and, less frequently, HAL, also occur (in the Nineveh letters, with only one exception). Oronyms were marked by KUR.

Of these four Neo-Elamite determinatives, only two (AŠ and BE) remain in use during the Achaemenid period, both in literary and documentary texts. BE, however, only appears with gentilics. This may very well point to a tendency towards simplification in the use of determinatives during the Achaemenid period.

As a result of this, a rupture can be seen between the Old Elamite period on the one hand and the younger periods on the other hand.

Expectedly, the Akkadian texts from Elam show more Mesopotamian habits. There, the texts dated from the Old Akkadian to the Old Babylonian periods, predominantly make use of the habitual Mesopotamian place marker KI. The other typically Mesopotamian determinative URU appears in some Old Babylonian documentary texts. Next to that, URU is also present in three Neo-Babylonian texts from Iran, in the Achaemenid Babylonian text from the Persepolis Fortification and in the Babylonian versions of the Achaemenid royal inscriptions (esp. in the Bisitun Inscription).

KI would remain the most popular determinative marking place names during the later periods: Middle Babylonian (texts from Tchogha Zanbil and Haft Tepe), Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Babylonian, although this determinative is only reserved for the in the eyes of the Mesopotamians very familiar toponyms. The Babylonian versions of the Achaemenid Royal Inscriptions prefer the determinatives KUR for toponyms and DIŠ for gentilics.

This article has made clear that each cultural tradition in Elam, i.e. the Mesopotamian one and the Elamite one, had its own distinct habits in marking geographical names. The Mesopotamian scribes, writing in Akkadian, expectedly adopted the existing Mesopotamian habits of using KI, KUR and URU as place name markers. Yet, the Elamite scribes, drafting their documents in the Elamite language, developed a new set of determinatives, which changed over time: from Old Elamite DIŠ over Middle Elamite AŠ and HAL to Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid Elamite AŠ, BE, DIŠ and HAL. The only exceptions to this distinct use of geographical determinatives by Mesopotamians and Elamites are KI, attested once in the Naram-Sin Treaty, and KUR, which the Elamites used in late Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid times to mark mountain names.

Bibliography

Arfaee, A.

2008 *Persepolis Fortification Tablets (Fort. and Teh. Texts)*. Ancient Iranian Studies Series 5. Teheran.

Barton, G. A.

1928 *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad*. Library of Ancient Semitic Inscriptions 1. New Haven.

Basello, G. P.

forthc. The Sign Gam in Elamite and the Old Persian Word-Divider, in: R. Schmitt, A. V. Rossi, G. P. Basello, E. Filippone, A. Panaino & V. Sadovski (eds.), *Achaimenidika* 1. SÖAW 851. Wien.

- Bleichsteiner, R.
1928 Beiträge zur Kenntnis der elamischen Sprache, *Anthropos* 23, 167–198.
- Borger, R.
1981 *Assyrisch-babylonische Zeichenliste*. AOAT 33. Neukirchen-Vluyn.
2004 *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon*. AOAT 305. Münster.
- Cameron, G. G.
1948 *Persepolis Treasury Tablets*. OIP 65. Chicago.
- Farber, W.
1974 Eine elamische Inschrift aus der 1. Hälfte des 2. Jahrtausends, *ZA* 64, 74–86.
- Foy, W.
1900 Altpersisches und Neu-elamisches, *ZDMG* 54, 341–377.
- Gelb, I. J. & Kienast, B.
1990 *Die altakkadischen Königsinschriften des dritten Jahrtausends v. Chr.* FAOS 7. Stuttgart.
- Geller, M. J.
1980 A Middle Assyrian Tablet of *utukkū lemnūtu*, Tablet 12, *Iraq* 42, 23–51.
- Glassner, J.-J.
1991 Les textes de Haft Tepe, la Susiane et l'Élam au 2^{ème} millénaire, in: *Mésopotamie et Élam. Actes de la XXXVI^{ème} Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Gand, 10-14 juillet 1989*. Mesopotamian History and Environment. Occasional Publications 1. Gent. 109–126.
- Gorris, E.
2020 *Power and Politics in the Neo-Elamite Kingdom*, *Acta Iranica* 60, Leuven.
- Grillot, F.
1987 *Éléments de grammaire élamite*. Paris.
- Grillot-Susini, F.
2008 *L'élamite. Éléments de grammaire*. Geuthner manuels. Paris.
- Groneberg, B.
1980 *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der altbabylonischen Zeit*. RGTC 3. Wiesbaden.
- Hallock, R. T.
1969 *Persepolis Fortification Tablets*. OIP 92. Chicago.
1978 Selected Fortification Texts, *CDAFI* 8, 109–136.
- Herrero, P. & Glassner, J.-J.
1993 Haft-Tépé: choix de textes IV, *IrAnt* 28, 97–135.

Hinz, W.

1962 Elamisch hu-sa, *Orientalia* 31, 34–44.

Hinz, W. & Koch, H.

1987 *Elamisches Wörterbuch*. AMI. Erg. 17. Berlin.

Huehnergard, J. & Woods, C.

2004 Akkadian and Eblaite, in: R. D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Cambridge. 218–287.

Hüsing, G.

1916 *Die einheimischen Quellen zur Geschichte Elams. Teil I: Altelamische Texte in Umschrift mit Bemerkungen, einer Einleitung und einem Anhang*. Leipzig.

Jagersma, A. H.

2010 *A Descriptive Grammar of Sumerian*. Leiden.

König, F. W.

1965 *Die elamischen Königsinschriften*. AfO Beihefte 16. Wien.

Labat, R.

1988 *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne. Signes, Syllabaire, Ideogrammes*. Paris.

Lambert, M.

1965 Les inscriptions élamites de Tchogha-Zanbil, *IrAnt* 5, 18–38.

Legrain, L.

1913 Tablettes de comptabilité, etc. de l'époque de la dynastie d'Agadé, in: V. Scheil (ed.), *Textes élamites-sémitiques. Cinquième série*. MDP 14. Paris. 62–131.

Leichty, E.

1983 Bel-e-puṣ and Tammaritu, *Anatolian Studies* 33, 153–155.

Mäder, M.

forthc. Tradition und Nationalgefühl in der elamischen Konföderation, in: J. Tavernier, E. Gorris & K. De Graef (eds.), *Susa & Elam II: History, Language, Religion and Culture* (MDP). Leiden – Boston.

Michalowski, P.

1992 The Early Mesopotamian Incantation Tradition, in: P. Fronzaroli (ed.), *Literature and Literary Language at Ebla*. Quaderni di Semitistica 18. Firenze. 305–326.

2004 Sumerian, in: R. D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Cambridge. 19–59.

Mordtmann, A. D.

1862 Erklärung der Keilinschriften zweiter Gattung, *ZDMG* 16, 1–126.

1870 Über die Keilinschriften zweiter Gattung, *ZDMG* 24, 1–84.

- Norris, E.
1855 Memoir on the Scythic Version of the Behistun Inscription, *JRAS* 15, 1–213.
- Oppert, J.
1879 *Le peuple et la langue des Mèdes*. Paris.
- Paper, H. H.
1955 *The Phonology and Morphology of Royal Achaemenid Elamite*. Ann Arbor.
- Potts, D. T.
2017 Elamite Karintaš and Avestan Kvirinta: Notes on the Early History of Kerend, *Iranian Studies* 50, 345–367.
- Quintana Cifuentes, E.
2010 *La lengua elamita (Irán pre-persa)*. Murcia.
2013 *Gramática de la Lengua elamita*. Madrid.
- Reiner, E.
1969 *The Elamite Language, Altkleinasiatische Sprachen*. Handbuch der Orientalistik 1/2/1-2/2. Leiden. 54–118.
- Scheil, V.
1907 *Textes élamites-anzanites. Troisième série*. MDP 9. Paris.
1917 Déchiffrement d'un document anzanite relatif aux présages, *RA* 14, 29–59.
- Stève, M.-J.
1967 *Tchoga Zanbil (Dur-Untash) volume III. Textes élamites et accadiens de Tchoga Zanbil*. MDP 41. Paris.
1988 Le déterminatif masculin BE en néo-élamite et élamite-achéménide, *NABU* 1988, 35.
1992 *Syllabaire Elamite: histoire and paléographie*. Civilisations du Proche Orient. Série 2. Philologie 1. Neuchâtel.
- Stolper, M. W.
1984 *Texts from Tall-i Malyan I. Elamite administrative texts (1972-1974)*. Occasional Publications of the Babylonian Fund 6. Philadelphia.
1986 A Neo-Babylonian Text from the Reign of Hallušu, in: L. De Meyer, H. Gasche & F. Vallat (eds.), *Fragmenta Historiae Elamicae. Mélanges offerts à M.-J. Stève*. Paris. 235–241.
2004 Elamite, in: R. D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Cambridge. 60–94.
- Tavernier, J.
2011 Elamite: analyse grammaticale et lecture de textes, *Res Antiquae* 8, 315–350.
2018 The Elamite Language, in: J. Álvarez-Mon, G. P. Basello & Y. Wicks (eds.), *The Elamite World*. The Routledge Worlds. London / New York. 416–449.

Vallat, F.

1986 Table accadienne de Darius Ier (DSaa), in: L. De Meyer, H. Gasche & F. Vallat (eds.), *Fragmenta Historiae Elamicae. Mélanges offerts à M.-J. Steve*. Paris. 277–287.

1993 *Les noms géographiques des sources suso-élamites*. RGTC 11. Wiesbaden.

Weissbach, F. H.

1902 Susische Thontäfelchen, *BA* 4, 168–201.