

ELYNN GORRIS
Louvain*

Guess Who? Aṣamaita: a Rebel or a King?

1. *Introduction*

Early Achaemenid history is unmistakably entangled with late Elamite history: not only on an administrative level, but also in terms of territorial claims. The Achaemenids settled in what was known as the Elamite highlands; they extended their territorial boundaries from there; and gradually conquered the Elamite lowlands (Susiana). Whether this actual incorporation of the Elamite lowlands occurred during the reign of Darius I or before remains disputed, but the strong Elamite resistance against the Achaemenid rule during the early reign of Darius I indicates that Persians still had difficulties in subduing their closest neighbour at that time. A silent witness of these Elamite struggles for self-preservation is the well-known Bisitun inscription, in which the Achaemenid king Darius I elaborately described the three Elamite revolts that he had to subjugate in his first regnal years.

A certain Āçina, the son of Upad(a)ramahyā, stirred up a first rebellion in Elam (522 BCE) and took over the kingship of the Elamites (DBe, p I §16 = DBa §15; Grillot-Susini et al. 1993: 24). After Darius had commissioned a messenger to Elam, the Elamites, fearing reprisal, sent Āçina as prisoner to Darius where he was killed (Voigtlander 1978: 55-56).

A second rebellion (521 BCE) was instigated by Martiya, the son of Cincaxrajš. Martiya, who named himself falsely Ummanush, king of Elam (DBe, p §22 = DBa §21), originated from a town Kuganakā in Persia (Voigtlander 1978: 56). As soon as Darius marched to Elam, or perhaps better the formerly Elamite regions in the Fahliyan and Eastern Khuzestan, to suppress the revolt, the Elamites became afraid and murdered their own leader (DBp §23; Voigtlander 1978: 56; Grillot-Susini et al. 1993: 26; Schmitt 1991: 56).

In the third revolt (DBp v: 1-14, §71), which must have occurred somewhere in the autumn of 520 BCE, Darius sent out his commander Gaubarva (Greek:

* I would like to express my gratitude to the organizers, in particular Gian Pietro Basello, for inviting me to this International Conference *Achaemenid Studies Today* and for their efforts bringing all the papers together in this volume. Many thanks to Prof. Jan Tavernier and Prof. Lambert Isebaert for the wonderful discussions and complementary insights in Old Persian linguistics and onomastics.

Gobryas) to cast off the Elamite army under the leadership of Aṣamaita. Whereas the first two revolts were led by “Elamite” rebels with Iranian names (Tavernier 2003: 247-250; Henkelman 2003: 183-184), the protagonist of third revolt had an Elamite name. Therefore, the identity of the third rebel will be more closely examined in this article.

2. *Aṣamaita in the Bisitun Inscription (Old Persian Version)*

In the Old Persian version of the Bisitun inscription, Aṣamaita was identified as the leader of this third Elamite uprising. Unlike the other two revolts, Aṣamaita had the support of the Elamite army and the Elamites had no intentions to extradite or kill their leader. This time, it had to come to a military confrontation in order to capture the Elamite leader Aṣamaita and subdue the revolt.

/ 1 : θ-a-t-ʾi- [y : ●●●●] ʾd-aʾ-r-y-v-ʾu- [š] ʾ : x-š-aʾ- [y-θ-i-y :] / 2 i-m : t-[y : a]-
ʾd-mʾ : a-kʱ-●-ʾu- [n-v-m :] ʾdʱ-u-vʱ-i-t-i-y-a- / 3 m-c : ç- [i-t-i-y-a-m :] ʾθʾ-r-d-
m : p-[s-a-v :] ʾy-θʾ-a : x-●-š-a-y- / 4 θ-i-y : [a-b-v-m : u]-v-j : ʾnʾ-[a-m-a :] ʾd-
h-yʾ-a-u-š : h-[u]- / 5 v : h-[mʱ-i-ç-i-y-a :] a-b-v : [I m-r-t-i-y :] ʾa-θʾ-[m]-i-t : n-
a-m : [u]- / 6 v-jʱ-iʱ- [y : a-v-m : m-θ]-i-š-t-mʾ [: a-kʱ-u-n]-ʾv-t-a : ʾp-s-a-v : a-
[d]- / 7 m : k-a-[r-m : f-r-a-i-š]-●-y-mʾ [: I m-r-t-i-y :] ʾg-uʾ-b-rʱ-u-v : / 8 n-a-
m : [p-a-r-s : m-n]-a : b-●-ʾd-k : aʾ-[v-m-š-a]-ʾm : m-θʾ-i-š-t-m : a-kʱ-u- / 9 n-
v-m : [p-s-a-v : g-u]-b-rʱ-[u-v : h-d-a] ʾ : k-●-aʾ-●-r-a : a-š-i-y-v : / 10 u-v-jʱ-mʾ
[: h-m-r-n-m :] ʾaʾ-kʱ-u-n-[u-š : h-d-a :] ʾu-v-jʱ-iʱ-y-ʾiʱ-b-i-š : ʾp-sʾ- / 11 a-v :
ʾgʱ-[u-b-rʱ-u-v :] u-v-ʾjʱ-iʱ-[i-y-a : a-j :] ʾu-tʾ-a : vʱ-i-y-mʾ-r-d : / 12 u-t-a [: t-y-
m-š-a-m :] m-θʾ-iʱ- [š-t-m : a]-ʾg-r-b-a-yʾ : a-n-y : a-b-i- / 13 y : mʾ-aʾ-[m : p-s-
a]-ʾv-šʾ-[i]-m : aʾ-d-mʾ [: a-v]-ʾa-j-n-mʾ [:] ʾpʾ-s-a-v : d-hʾ-y-aʾ- / 14 u-š : ʾmʾ-
[n-a : a-b-v]

DBp v: 1-14: transliteration J. Tavernier (pers.com.)

Says Darius the king: This is what I have done in the second and the third year after I became king. A land, Elam by name, became rebellious. One man, Aṣamaita by name, an Elamite, they made him (their) leader. Then I sent an army. Gaubarva by name, a Persian, my servant, him I made their commander. Then Gaubarva advanced to Elam (and) fought the battle with the Elamites. Then Gaubarva slew the Elamites, he wiped (them) out and captured their leader. He led (him) before me. Then I killed him. Then the land became mine.

DBp v: 1-14: translation J. Tavernier (pers.com.)

The identity, ethnicity and motives of this last rebel leader in Elam have been a much debated subject among scholars studying Elamite and Achaemenid history. So what can we reveal with our current knowledge of Elamite history about the identity of this Aṣamaita?

3. Theoretical Identifications of Aṣamaita

3.1. The Onomastic Match

Matthew Waters (2000: 85; also Tavernier 2004: 22-29; Henkelman 2008: 363) is the first to suggest a hypothetical identification of the rebel Aṣamaita with the late Neo-Elamite king Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak. Indeed, based on the linguistic analysis, the Old Persian name Aṣamaita might well be a hypocoristic of the Elamite name Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak.

Firstly, the theophoric part of the personal name is omitted (Tavernier 2014: 62). This omission of theophoric element occurs abundantly in orthographic renderings of the Elamite names into Akkadian; for example, Hallutush-Inshushinak in Hallushu, or Tepti-Huban-Inshushinak in Te'umman.

Secondly, the laryngeal /h/ in late Elamite language is not pronounced anymore (Stolper 2004: 71; Tavernier 2011: 320; 2018: 425). The Old Persian and Akkadian renderings of the Elamite name Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak, respectively Aṣa-maita and Atta-metu, are therefore written without the middle consonant -h-.

Thirdly, the transmission of the vowel /i/ in the Elamite sequence *-mit-* into the Old Persian diphthong /ai/ in the sequence *mait* can be explained by the pronunciation of the name. The Elamite cuneiform sign MI could render /mi/ as well as /me/.¹ Based on the Akkadian orthography *-met-*, one can argue in this particular case that the sign MI was pronounced as /me/. The Old Persian script, however, did not have -e- graphemes. The Persian scribe therefore used a combination of the signs MA and I to form the diphthong /ai/, which he considered to be the immediate predecessor of the /e/ sound (Schmitt 2004: 724). This resulted in the orthography *-mait-* for *-met-*.

Fourthly, the last syllable of Aṣamaita/Atta-hamiti sequence is written with the cuneiform sign TA instead of the sign TI at the end, because the sign TI simply does not exist in the Old Persian script (Schmitt 2004: 720; Isebaert & Tavernier 2012: 304).

Alternatively, but perhaps less probable for this particular name, one could suggest that the Old Persian sequence *-aita-* may also be a hypocoristic suffix² connected irregularly to the abbreviated root, in this case **attam-* < **atta(h)am*, shortened from *attaham/iti-*. The hypocoristic suffix thus can be explained as a *guna-* form, like the better known *-ita-* (see Tavernier 2007: 23, 201, 260, 267, 291, 308, 339). For such suffix variations, one can refer to for example the *-aiča-* variation of *-iča-*, the *-aina-* variation of *-ina-* or the *-auka-* variation of *-uka-*. In this way, one can also offer an appropriate explanation for the personal name *Rtaxšaita-* (Tavernier 2007: 305), which consequently would be a hypocoristic of an abbreviated form of the compound name **Rtaxšaθra-* (Old Persian

¹ I'm grateful to Prof. J. Tavernier for suggesting the sound variations in the Elamite sign MI and its transmission into Old Persian.

² I would like to thank Prof. L. Isebaert for pointing out the possibility of the *-aita-* suffix.

Rtaxšaça-, Schmitt 1979: 64-65), rather than deriving from the *Rta-xšaita-* composition.

Either way, we can safely assume that the Old Persian personal name Aṣamaita is the Old Persian rendering of the Elamite name Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak (Tavernier 2004: 24; also Henkelman 2008: 57). Accordingly, we even might assume that Aṣamaita had an Elamite identity, and that the third Elamite revolt was not a reflection of an internal power struggle as might be suggested for the first and second Elamite revolt (Tavernier 2004: 27-29; Gorris 2014: 165-166). The rebel leader of the first revolt Ācina, son of Upadarma, (DBp, e §16; DBa §15) had an Old Persian name and patronym (Henkelman 2008: 57), as well as Martiya, son of Cincaxraīšh, (DBa §21, DBp, e §22; Schmitt 1991: 56), the leader of the second rebellion. An onomastic match and a hypothetical Elamite background of Aṣamaita, however, is no conclusive evidence for a personal identification between the rebel Aṣamaita and the late Neo-Elamite king Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak.

3.2. The Time Frame: Contemporary Rulers?

A historical time frame connecting the Old Persian Bisitun text with the inscriptions of the Neo-Elamite king Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak would strengthen the prosopographical match between Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak and Aṣamaita. In other words: Did King Darius refer in the Bisitun inscription to the late Neo-Elamite king Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak as the rebel leader Aṣamaita, and was Darius accordingly refusing to recognize Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak's territorial authority? We know for sure that Aṣamaita had reached an adult age in 520 BCE, when he headed the Elamite revolt against the Persians, which means that the Neo-Elamite king Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak must have ruled Elam roughly between 540-520 BCE. Unfortunately, king Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak is a somewhat obscure figure that is known only through a single inscription on a limestone stele (EKI 86-89; Scheil 1911: 83, fig. 16), which makes it difficult to situate the reign of Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak on the timeline of Neo-Elamite history.

Originally the Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak stele was dated around 650 BCE (Cameron 1936: 190-191; also Hinz 1964: 157; Stolper 1992: 199), because scholars accepted the identification of the Elamite king with Attametū (BIWA B vii: 30-35), the Elamite commander of the Archers who was beheaded in the battle of Mangisu (652 BCE). Consequently scholars called him carefully a "local king" (Stolper 1984: 50, 235; 1992: 199). However, more recently, scholars such as François Vallat (1996: 391; 2006) and Jan Tavernier (2004: 22) have successfully demonstrated that Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak should be dated after the sack of Susa in 646 BCE, and thus belongs to the Neo-Elamite III period.

Although Matthew Waters (2000: 86) emphasized the ceremonial character of the titulary, François Vallat (1996: 391; also Waters 2000: 85; Tavernier 2004: 23) believes that the royal title *su-un-ki-i[k^{as}an-za-an^{as}šu-šu-un-ka₄li]-[ku-me ri-šá-ak-ka₄ ka₄-a]t-ri ha-tàm-ti-ik-ki^{hal}me-ni-ik-k[i ha]-tàm-ti-ik-ki* "king of Anzan

and Susa, enlarger of the realm, heir to the throne of Elam, landlord of Elam” (EKI 86: 1-2) reflected an actual political power in the Anshan region and used this royal title as a tool for establishing a late Neo-Elamite chronological framework. Based on the territorial claim in the Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak titulary, François Vallat (1996: 391) suggested that the Elamites re-established their rule over the highlands after the sack of Susa (646 BCE). François Vallat (1996: 391) further hypothesises that since the Elamite kings Ummanunu (MDP 9 165), Shilhak-Inshushinak II (EKI 78) and Tepti-Huban-Inshushinak (EKI 79-85) did not refer to themselves as “king of Anshan and Susa,” Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak must have preceded them. Therefore, he argues that the kings of Elam, bearing this royal title, must have reigned before 585 BCE, when the Elamites would have lost the highland capital to the emerging Teispid dynasty. Taken all his arguments into consideration, François Vallat finally assigned the reign of Atta-Hamiti-Inshushinak to the last part of the 7th and the beginning of the 6th century BCE (646-585 BCE). In any case, with this dating king Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak cannot be identified with the rebel leader Aṣamaita.

Jan Tavernier (2004: 24), on the other hand, refuted François Vallat’s dating for Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak based on graphic and linguistic features.

Firstly, although the inscription contains typical late Neo-Elamite broken spellings, several harmonic writings, such as the /Cup/-sequence (e.g. ap-pu-up; EKI 98: 11), are still used. Once the syllabic writing of Inshushinak (EKI 87) is attested with a broken spelling of the /Cuš/-sequence in the theophoric element of Atta-hamiti-in-su-iš-na-ak (EKI 87: 1-3). However, in the other attestations, Inshushinak has the logographic writing ^dMUŠ.LAM (EKI 86: 1, 4, 5, 7; EKI 87: left caption; EKI 89: 10). Secondly, although Jan Tavernier correctly remarks that the locutive suffix -ka₄ at the end of the genitive construction (EKI 86: 1 *te-ip-ti-ik-ka₄šu-šu-un-ka₄*; EKI 87: 4-5 left caption *te-ip-ti-ka₄*) is replaced by the suffix -h- in the horizontal inscript (EKI 87: 5 *hu-ut-ra-an-te-ip-ha*; EKI 89: 10 *su-un-ki-ih-ki*), he has to admit that it does not occur systematically (Gomis 2014: 151). Finally, Jan Tavernier recognized also 5 cuneiform signs (RU, SI, TUL, UG, UZ) with an archaic shape, which means that these signs are similar to early Neo-Elamite inscription of Shutruk-Nahhunte II.

Jan Tavernier (2004: 24-26) eventually concluded that the archaizing impression of several graphic and linguistic elements on the Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak stele³ and the royal titulary “king of Anshan and Susa,” which is referring to the great Middle Elamite and early Neo-Elamite kings, merely serve to emphasize the political aspirations of king Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak. Unlike Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak’s predecessors Shilhak-Inshushinak II and Tepti-Huban-Inshushinak II, Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak had the ambition to march to Persia in order to restore the Elamite kingdom in all its glory. Consequently, Jan Tavernier favours a late

³ A similar tradition is found on the Neo-Babylonian royal inscriptions of Nabopolassar, Nabuchadnezzar and Nabonidus (Schaudig 2001: 86-87).

dating into the Achaemenid period and dated the reign of Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak around 530-520 BCE. In this context, Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak could be identified with the Elamite rebel Aθamaita from the Bisitun inscription.

However, François Vallat (2006: 59-61) refuted Jan Tavernier's (2004: 24-30) proposal of associating Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak with Aθamaita. He based himself on an unpublished text in which Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak claims to battle against the army of Shutur-Nahhunte, son of Huban-immēna, near Ayapir (modern Izeh). In this text, François Vallat finds confirmation for his own hypothesis, but fails to give a transcription, a photograph, a hand-copy or even a reference to the inscribed lines. Accordingly, Jan Tavernier (2010: 1063; also Henkelman 2008: 636) did not consider this inscription as a valuable argument, adding that it is by no means certain that the Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak cited by Vallat is the same person as in the Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak stele.

With these analyses, i.e. François Vallat dating the reign of Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak between 646-585 BCE and Jan Tavernier between 530-520 BCE, scholars have reached an impasse. Therefore, one has to look for additional arguments in order to define the reign of Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak with more accuracy.

As Jan Tavernier already demonstrated, the orthography, grammar and palaeography of the Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak stele is full of contradictions. In the morphology, there is:

- 1) a systematic absence of the personal determinative ^{dis}, which is typical late Neo-Elamite feature;
- 2) an inconsequent mix of the determinative ^{hal} or pseudo-logogram *ha-al*^{MEŠ}. This syllabic writing is still an archaic form of the logogram ^{hal} (Steve 1992: fn. 2) that is used in the early Achaemenid inscriptions and the late Neo-Elamite correspondence;
- 3) the replacement of the cuneiform sign *ša* (in the word *ša-ak*) in a late Neo-Elamite variation *šá* by the author of the stele.

Then there is also a variety of harmonic and broken spellings with various spellings for the divine name *Inshushinak*. The syllabic spelling is attested throughout history, the logogram in Neo-Elamite texts, and the broken spelling in late Neo-Elamite inscriptions. Also *sunki* "king" has various spellings: the syllabic spellings *su-gir*, *su-un-ki-ik* are archaic forms; the logogram EŠŠANA is standard Neo-Elamite.

As for the grammar in the text: the locutive suffix *-ka₄* is occasionally replaced by the late Neo-Elamite suffix *-h* and the classical suffix *-ra* is used, instead of the late Neo-Elamite genitive marker *-na*.

Moreover, Jan Tavernier (2004: 25) recognized in his palaeographic study five weak cuneiform signs (RU, SI, TUL, UG, UZ) with an archaic Neo-Elamite shape, but he could have listed some additional features (Gorris 2020: 83). For instance, the cuneiform signs NA and IN can be added to Tavernier's list of early Neo-Elamite signs. The palaeography of KA₄ and AL are attested in various shapes

in Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak stele; some early Neo-Elamite, while others late Neo-Elamite. MÜŠ, LAM and KU on the other hand represent a typical late Neo-Elamite script.

In my judgment (Gorris 2020: 82-83), the analysis of the palaeography of the Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak stele gives a similar result as that of the orthography: an almost equal balance between archaic and late Elamite elements. The overall impression I got while studying the Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak stele was that the palaeography most resembled the Shikaf-e Salman inscription of Hanne (EKI 76). This rock inscription dates according to Jan Tavernier (2004: 16-22) to the late 7th century BCE, while François Vallat (1996: 387-389) gives it a post-585 BCE dating. However, taking into account that the Shikaf-e Salman text was a provincial inscription, and probably resembles more the actual writing/language of that era ~~rather~~ than any royal inscription, the Shikaf-e Salman text must predate the Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak stele.

Both Jan Tavernier and François Vallat were so focused on the linguistic elements and the royal title that they missed some important historical markers. While formulating the stele, the Elamite scribe must have had examples to introduce the archaic elements. These examples were to be found on the Middle Elamite and early Neo-Elamite royal statues and inscriptions of his predecessors on the Susa Acropole. However, these were all confiscated by the Assyrians during the Sack of Susa (BIWA F v: 34-9) and only returned by the Babylonian king Nabopolassar in 626 BCE (ABC 2; CM 21: 15-17).

The year of Nabopolassar's accession, in the month of Adar, Nabopolassar returned to Susa the gods of Susa that Assyria had deported and assigned to a residence in Uruk. (ABC 2; CM 21: 15-17)

Since the title “king of Anshan and Susa” is so similar to the royal inscriptions of Shutruk-Nahhunte II, he must have known these inscriptions and therefore the reign of Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak must postdate the return of the statues (626 BCE). This event provides us consequently with an important *terminus post quem* for the reign of Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak, which reduces the timeframe of François Vallat considerably.

4. Historical Context of the Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak Stele: Topography

The topographical references in the Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak stele, indicating the territorial claims of the Neo-Elamite king, may provide us with important historical markers for a *terminus ante quem*. In his stele (EKI 86: 12, 15), Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak refers to his infantry or military camp (*ka₄-rās*^{MES} = Akk. *karāšu* “military camp;” König 1965: 100, fn. 4) in connection to two cities Šamaršusu and Pessitme that refused to recognize Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak's royal house

(EKI 86: 11 ^{as}*pe-is-si-it-me ha-al-li-pe im-me a-hi-in da-ah-ši*; cf. Elamite Nineveh letters with regard to “royal house,” see Gorris 2018: 315). Apart from these toponyms, also people of Gisat (EKI 86: 2), Shepshilak (EKI 86: 9) and Huhnur (EKI 88: 4) play a prominent role in the stele.

If we take a look to the approximate locations of these cities, we may find a convincing element in the Aṭamaita/Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak discussion. Šepšilak (Vallat 1993: 256, EIW 1149) and Šamaršusu (Vallat 1993: 253, EIW 1129) are exclusively mentioned in the Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak stele, so we can only assume that they must have been located in the same region as the cities Pessitme, Gisat and Huhnur, which all appear to be prominent cities in the Persepolis Fortification Archive.

Since the toponym Gisat is associated with Hidalu (PF 35, PF 1851) in the Persepolis Fortification texts, Wouter Henkelman (2008: 44) convincingly locates Gisat in the Fahliyan region. Huhnur (*hu-uh-pír* = *hu-uh-nur*, Steve 1988: fn. 393, cf. Susa Acropole texts, Vallat 1993: 101-102), a district also known as the “Gate to the highlands” (Duchene 1986: 67-68), is located in the Assyrian sources (Borger 1996: 240-241, Cohen F5) at the border with Hidalu. Similar to Hidalu, the Persepolis Fortification texts coming from Huhnur were impressed with a specific seal (PFS 0004) that was used for the Fahliyan administration (Hallock 1977: 129, 131-133; Garrison & Root 2001: 535; Henkelman 2008: 44, fn. 112; Potts 2008: 293). Accordingly, Huhnur was located northwest of Hidalu on the road from Persepolis to Susa.

If the Elamite toponym Pessitme could be identified with the city the Bashimu from the Annals of Assurbanipal (Borger 1996: 240-241, Cohen F5), then Pessitme is the district that the Assyrian army entered before arriving at the Huhnur district, which would indicate that the toponym was located northwest of Huhnur in a transition zone between the Elamite lowland and highlands. Hinz (1971: 661; also Hallock 1978: 109; Arfa’i 1999: 44; Henkelman 2008: 121, 502, fn. 1164) identified ancient Bessitme with modern Basht between Fahliyan and Behbahan. When leaving the Mamasani plain via the Pol-e Pirim pass, one passes by the town of Basht on the road to Behbahan (Roustaei et al. 2009: 23) and therefore the modern town Basht seems to me a plausible candidate for ancient Pessitme.

In the Aṭamaita/Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak discussion, however, the exact location of these toponyms is less relevant than the fact that these cities all had highland locations in southeastern Khuzestan and Fars. If the Elamite king Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak would have ruled or had political influence over an extensive territory reaching until the border of Hidalu in Fars, then the reign of Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak must have predated the emergence of the Teispid dynasty in the Elamite highlands (c. 559 BCE) (Gorris & Wicks 2018: 256 for a revision of the late Neo-Elamite chronology). Consequently, dating the reign of Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak to the late 6th century BCE, as Jan Tavernier suggested, seems also unlikely.

Since Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak returned to Susa and erected a stele on which he commemorated his achievements, we can be sure that Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak had regained the loyalty of the highland landlords/sheikhs in the Mamasani cities.

In other words: The Persians did not have full control over the Mamasani region at that time, nor did they capture Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak. Therefore, Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak cannot be identified with Aṣamaita, the rebel leader from the Bisitun inscription.

5. Conclusions

I will end this paper by concluding that an onomastic match is not necessarily a prosopographical match. Even though Aṣamaita probably had an Elamite identity, he must have been at least half a century younger than Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak, the great king of Anshan and Susa, who probably ruled in the second quarter of the 6th century BCE (c. 580-559 BCE) and was perhaps the last Neo-Elamite king to rule a more extended Elamite territory. Aṣamaita, the Elamite rebel leader, on the other hand, could have adopted this name to stir the Elamite collective memory in order to gain support from the Elamite nobility and population. While Darius was distracted with rebellions in the east, Aṣamaita was able to raise an Elamite army and prepare for an offensive against the Persians. Since this uprising of Aṣamaita was widely supported by the Elamites, I suggest to call Aṣamaita “Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak II,” as a tribute for his efforts to preserve the self-governance of Elam. And in this context, Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak II may have been briefly the last king of Elam after all.

ABBREVIATIONS

- ABC = Grayson, A.K. (1975) *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*. Texts from Cuneiform Sources, 5. Locust Valley.
- BIWA = Borger, R. (1996) *Beiträge zum Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals. Die Prismenklassen A, B, C = K, D, E, F, G, H, J und T sowie andere Inschriften*. Wiesbaden.
- CM = Glassner, J.J. (2004²) *Mesopotamian Chronicles*. Writings from the Ancient World, 19. Atlanta.
- DBa = Bisitun Inscription. Akkadian version.
- DBp = Bisitun Inscription. Old Persian version.
- DBe = Bisitun Inscription. Elamite version.
- EKI = König, F.W. (1965) *Die elamischen Königsinschriften*. AfO Beihefte, 16. Graz.
- ElW = Hinz, W. & H. Koch (1987) *Elamisches Wörterbuch*. Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, Ergänzungsband 17, 2 vols. Berlin.
- MDP 9 = Scheil, V. (1907) *Textes élamites-anzanites, troisième série*. Paris.
- PF = Persepolis Fortification Texts.
- PFS = Garrison, M.B. & M.C. Root (2001) *Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets I. Images of Heroic Encounter*. Oriental Institute Publications, 117. Chicago.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- Arfa'i, A. (1999) La grande route Persépolis-Suse. Une lecture des tablettes provenant des Fortifications de Persépolis. *Topoi*, 9, pp. 33-45.
- Borger, R. (1996) *Beiträge zum Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals. Die Prismenklassen A, B, C = K, D, E, F, G, H, J und T sowie andere Inschriften*. Wiesbaden.
- Cameron, G.G. (1936) *The History of Early Iran*. Chicago.
- Duchene, J. (1986) La localization de Huhnur. In L. De Meyer, H. Gasche & F. Vallat, eds., *Fragmenta Historiae Elamicae: Mélanges offerts à M.-J. Steve*, pp. 65-74. Paris.
- Garrison, M.B. & M.C. Root (2001) *Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets I. Images of Heroic Encounter*. Oriental Institute Publications, 117. Chicago.
- Grayson, A.K. (1975) *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*. Texts from Cuneiform Sources, 5. Locust Valley.
- Glassner, J.J. (2004²) *Mesopotamian Chronicles*. Writings from the Ancient World, 19. Atlanta.
- Gorris, E. (2018) Crossing the Elamite Borderlands: A Study of Interregional Contacts between Elam and the "Kingdom" of Hara(n). In J. Tavernier et al., eds., *Topography and Toponymy in the Ancient Near East. Perspectives and Prospects*. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, 71, pp. 313-344. Leuven.
- Gorris, E. (2020) *Power and Politics in the Neo-Elamite Kingdom*. Acta Iranica 60. Louvain.
- Gorris, E. & Y. Wicks (2018) The Last Centuries of Elam: the Neo-Elamite Period. In J. Álvarez-Mon, G.P. Basello & Y. Wicks, eds., *The Elamite World*, pp. 249-272. London-New York.
- Grillot-Susini F., C. Herrenschildt & F. Malbran-Labat (1993) La version élamite de la trilingue de Bisitun: une nouvelle lecture. *Journal Asiatique*, 281, pp. 19-59.
- Hallock, R.T. (1977) The Use of Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets. In Mc. Gibson & R.D. Biggs, eds., *Seals and Sealings in the Ancient Near East*. Bibliotheca Mesopotamica, 6, pp. 127-133. Malibu.

- Hallock, R.T. (1978) Selected Fortification Texts. *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran*, 8, pp. 109-136.
- Henkelman, W.F.M. (2003) Defining Neo-Elamite History. Review of Waters, 2000. *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 60, pp. 252-263.
- Henkelman, W.F.M. (2008) *The Other Gods Who Are: Studies in Elamite-Iranian Acculturation Based on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets*. Achaemenid History, 14. Leiden.
- Hinz, W. (1964) *Das Reich Elam*. Urban-Bücher, 82. Stuttgart.
- Hinz, W. (1971) Achämenische Hofverwaltung. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie*, 61, pp. 260-311.
- Hinz, W. & H. Koch (1987) *Elamisches Wörterbuch*. Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, Ergänzungsband, 17, 2 vols. Berlin.
- Isebaert, L. & J. Tavernier (2012) Le vieux perse. *Res Antiquae*, 9, pp. 299-346.
- König, F.W. (1965) *Die elamischen Königsinschriften*. Archiv für Orientforschung, Beihefte, 16. Graz.
- Potts, D.T. (2008) The Persepolis Fortification Texts and the Royal Road: Another Look at the Fahliyan Area. In P. Briant, W.F.M. Henkelman & M.W. Stolper, eds., *L'archive des fortifications de Persépolis. État des questions et de perspectives de recherches*. Persika, 12, pp. 275-301. Paris.
- Roustaei, K., A. Alamdari & C.A. Petrie (2009) Chapter 2: Landscape and Environment in Mamasani. In D.T. Potts, ed., *The Mamasani Archaeological Project, Stage One. A Report on the First Two Seasons of the ICAR – University of Sydney Expedition to the Mamasani District, Fars Province, Iran*, pp. 17-30. Oxford.
- Schaudig, H. (2001) *Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros' des Großen samt den in ihrem Umfeld entstandenen Tendenzschriften. Textausgabe und Grammatik*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 256. Münster.
- Scheil, V. (1907) *Textes élamites-anzanites, troisième série*. Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse, 9. Paris.
- Scheil, V. (1911) *Textes élamites-sémitiques, quatrième série*. Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse, 11. Paris.
- Schmitt, R. (1979) Artaxerxes, Ardašir und Verwandte. *Incontri Linguistici*, 5, pp. 61-72.
- Schmitt, R. (1991) *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great. Old Persian Text*. Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, I. London.
- Schmitt, R. (2004) Old Persian. In R.D. Woodard, ed., *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, pp. 717-741. Cambridge.
- Steve, M.-J. (1988) Le déterminative masculine BE en néo-élamite et en élamite achéménide. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*, 35, pp. 23-24.
- Steve, M.-J. (1992) *Syllabaire élamite: Histoire et paléographie*. Civilisations du Proche-Orient, série 2: Philologie. Neuchâtel-Paris.
- Stolper, M.W. (1984) *Texts from Tall-i Malyan I. Elamite Administrative Texts (1972-1974)*. Philadelphia.
- Stolper, M.W. (1992) Stele of Adda-hamiti-Inshushinak: the Inscription. In P.O. Harper, J. Aruz & F. Tallon, eds., *The Royal City of Susa. Ancient Near Eastern Treasures in the Louvre*, p. 199. New York.
- Stolper, M.W. (2004) Elamite. In R.D. Woodard, ed., *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, pp. 60-94. Cambridge.
- Tavernier, J. (2003) Review of Waters, 2000. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 62, pp. 202-204.
- Tavernier, J. (2004) Some Thoughts on Neo-Elamite Chronology. *Achaemenid Research on Texts and Archaeology*, 2004.003, pp. 1-44.

- Tavernier, J. (2007) *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period (ca. 550-330 B.C.)*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 158. Leuven.
- Tavernier, J. (2011) Élamite. Analyse grammaticale et lecture de textes. *Res Antiquae*, 8, pp. 315-350.
- Tavernier, J. (2014) What's in a Name: Hallushu, Hallutash or Hallutush? *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale*, 108, pp. 61-66.
- Tavernier, J. (2018) The Elamite Language. In: J. Álvarez-Mon, G.P. Basello & Y. Wicks, eds., *The Elamite World*, The Routledge World Series, pp. 416-449. London-New York.
- Vallat, F. (1993) *Les noms géographiques des sources suso-élamites*. Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes, 11. Wiesbaden.
- Vallat, F. (1996) Nouvelle analyse des inscriptions néo-élamites. In H. Gasche & B. Hrouda, eds., *Collectanea Orientalia. Histoire, arts de l'espace et industrie de la terre. Etudes offertes en hommage à Agnès Spycket*. Civilisations du Proche-Orient, 1. Archéologie et environnement, 3, pp. 385-396. Neuchâtel-Paris.
- Vallat, F. (2006) Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak, Šutur-Nahhunte et la chronologie néo-élamite. *Akkadica*, 127, pp. 59-62.
- Voigtlander, E. von (1978) *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great. Babylonian version*. Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, II. London.
- Waters, M.W. (2000) *A Survey of Neo-Elamite History*. State Archives of Assyria Studies, 12. Helsinki.

SUMMARY

Due to the limited amount of historical data, a chronological list of the late Neo-Elamite kings is difficult to establish. The variety of textual sources (Mesopotamian, Elamite and Persian) and often their conflicting story lines, makes the identification of late Neo-Elamite royalty and their political achievements—certainly in the light of the emerging Persian Empire—a challenging experience for every scholar working on the topic. In this article, the author will examine once more the identification of the late Neo-Elamite king Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak with the Elamite rebel leader Aḡamaita, who is named as the Achaemenid king Darius' adversary in the Bisitun inscription, by taking into account onomastic, linguistic, chronological and historical arguments.