

Shilhak-Inshushinak II

ELYNN GORRIS

Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium

Shilhak-Inshushinak II is the name of a Neo-Elamite ruler, not to be confused with the Middle Elamite Shutrukid king Shilhak-Inshushinak I (ca. 1150–1120 BCE). He is only known from an ornament, found at the Susa Acropolis, with a brief, partly broken, dedicatory text: “*He, king Shilhak-Inshushinak, son of Ummanunu, has given it to the temple of DIL.BAT, lady of Susa, [...]*” (EKI 78).

CHRONOLOGY

The lack of a well-defined archaeological context and the limited number of internal linguistic hints in the inscription make it difficult to position the Shilhak-Inshushinak inscription within the relative chronology of the Neo-Elamite period. As the cuneiform script does not contain distinctive late Neo-Elamite signs, some orthographic arguments have to narrow down the date of the inscription. The replacement of the syllabic value *su-un-ki* by the logogram EŠŠANA (Vallat 1996: 387) as well as the Elamite broken spelling of the /Cuš/ sequence (Tavernier 2004: 32–4) are elements in favor of assigning the inscription to the late Neo-Elamite period (post-646 BCE). However, some traditional elements, such as the classical genitive denotation and the use of the personal determinative ^{dis}, are still present. Within the late Neo-Elamite relative chronology Shilhak-Inshushinak can thus be situated toward the end of the seventh century BCE and the beginning of the sixth century BCE (Vallat 1996: 389, 393; Tavernier 2004: 36–7; Gorris 2020: 73).

GENEALOGY

The inscription defines Shilhak-Inshushinak as son of Ummanunu, but Ummanunu's identity is debated. Earlier scholars, such as Cameron (1936: 167) and König (1965: 169, n.15) identified Ummanunu with the Elamite king Huban-menanu (692–689 BCE) and consequently dated this inscription to the early seventh century BCE. Others (Waters 2006: 65–9) suggested that Shilhak-Inshushinak could have been the son of Te-uman (Tepti-Huban-Inshushinak I) of the Neo-Assyrian sources, based on the patronymic affiliation of Tepti-Huban-Inshushinak to a certain Shilhak-Inshushinak on Neo-Elamite brick inscriptions (EKI 79–85). These inscribed bricks, however, do not belong to the reign of Tepti-Huban-Inshushinak I (664–653 BCE), but to the late Neo-Elamite ruler Tepti-Huban-Inshushinak II (ca. 550–530 BCE; Vallat 1996: 391–4; Tavernier 2004: 39; Gorris 2020: 85–7), which excludes a hypothetical family connection.

Vallat (1996: 389, 393) suggested removing Shilhak-Inshushinak from the chronological sequence of the early seventh century BCE in order to link him to king Ummanunu, one of the rulers mentioned in the Susa Acropolis texts (MDP 9 165). If Shilhak-Inshushinak was king of Elam at the end of the seventh century BCE, Ummanunu could be the father of Shilhak-Inshushinak, who himself then could have had a son and successor Tepti-Huban-Inshushinak II. The inscribed brick fragments of Tepti-Huban-Inshushinak II, however, display solely late Neo-Elamite orthographic and paleographic features (mid-sixth century BCE), which make a direct succession equally debatable. Moreover, there is no direct proof that Ummanunu was the paramount king of Elam during the era of the

