



Jan Tavernier - Leuven

Some Thoughts on Neo-Elamite Chronology*

1 Introduction

For a long time the chronology of the second half of the Neo-Elamite period (*i.e. ca. 743-550 BC*) seemed pretty much established. All scholars agreed on the main lines of Neo-Elamite history, despite various minor disagreements on specific kings.

The sources for this chronology are twofold: Mesopotamian texts (the *Babylonian Chronicle*, Neo-Assyrian letters and royal inscriptions) and Elamite texts (esp. royal

* Many thanks are due to Drs. W.F.M. Henkelman (University of Leiden), Prof. Dr. D.T. Potts (The University of Sydney) and Prof. Dr. M.W. Stolper (The University of Chicago) for their helpful comments and remarks. Obviously the responsibility for errors remains mine.



inscriptions).¹ Traditionally, the scholarly community connected some kings mentioned in the Mesopotamian sources with kings who are responsible for one or more Elamite royal inscriptions. Three such identifications were widely accepted:

- 1** The “Mesopotamian” Hallušu is the same as the “Elamite” Hallutaš-Inšušinak (Cameron 1936: 163; Hinz 1964: 122-123; König 1965: 7; Stolper 1984: 47; Steve 1987: 50 and 1992: 22).
- 2** Te’umman is Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak (Cameron 1936: 186-187; Hinz 1964: 126; König *l.c.*; Stolper 1984: 50; Steve 1992: 22; Malbran-Labat 1995: 172).

¹ The abbreviations used in this paper are cited according to the system used in *Northern Akkad Project Reports* 8, 1993: 49-77, except for PNA (= Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire). Neo-Elamite royal inscriptions are cited by their EKI-number; some of the other Neo-Elamite texts are cited as follows: a) Susa Texts: administrative and economic texts from Susa, published in MDP 9 and MDP 11: 301-307 and 309; b) Omen Text: prophecy mentioning Assyria and the children of an unnamed king, published by Scheil 1917; c) Neo-Elamite Letters: the major part of the Neo-Elamite Letters are the so-called Niniveh Letters, twenty-five letters and fragments, published by Weißbach 1902. Since then there has been a debate on their contents, date and provenience (Waters 2000: 89-92). The other part consists of two letters from Susa, published by Lambert 1977; d) Ururu Bronze Tablet: inscription found in Persepolis. Only a photograph of the tablet is published (Schmidt 1957: 64-65 and Pls. 27-28), together with Cameron’s comment on it. See also Waters 2000: 87-89. De Miroschedji (1985: 285 n.85) argues that the text should be dated to the sixth century BC.



3 Attametū is Atta-hamīti-Inšušinak (Cameron 1936: 190-1; Hinz 1964: 130; König *l.c.*; de Miroschedji 1985: 278; Steve 1992: 22).

A fourth identification (Ummanunu with Huban-Nikaš I) was proposed by König (*l.c.*), but rejected by the other scholars. The implementation of these data results in the following scheme of Neo-Elamite kings.

Huban-Nikaš I	743-717
Šutruk-Nahhunte II (EKI 71-74)	717-699
Hallutaš-Inšušinak = Hallušu (EKI 77)	699-693
Kutir-Nahhunte II	693-692
Huban-menana	692-689
Huban-haltaš I	689-681
Huban-haltaš II	681-675
Šilhak-Inšušinak II ² (EKI 78)	680-668
Urtak	675-664
Te'umman = Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak (EKI 79-85)	664-653
Huban-Nikaš II	653-652
Tammaritu	652-649
Atta-hamīti-Inšušinak = Attametū (EKI 86-89)	653-648
Indabibi	649-648
Huban-haltaš III	648-647
Tammaritu	647
Huban-haltaš III	646-645

2 Hinz (1964: 152) situates the reign of Šilhak-Inšušinak II between 680 and 668, in which case Elam had two kings in this period: Šilhak-Inšušinak II and Huban-haltaš II/Urtak.



This apparent certainty about Neo-Elamite chronology was only superficial. No scholar had made a thorough linguistic study of the Neo-Elamite texts in order to establish a relative chronology and when Vallat (1996a-b; 1998a; 1998b: 309-11; 2002) conducted such a study he reached entirely different conclusions. The main ones are (1) that the identification between Elamite kings and kings with similar names mentioned in Mesopotamian sources should be given up and (2) that most Neo-Elamite royal inscriptions (*i.e.* those from Šutur-Nahhunte, Hallutaš-Inšušinak, Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak, Šilhak-Inšušinak II and Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak) date from the period after the sack of Susa by the Assyrians (probably 646 BC³).

Waters (2000: 25-27, 48-50) leaves the question of the various identifications open. He admits that at first sight the various data speak against an identification of Hallušu and Hallutaš-Inšušinak and of Te'umman and Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak. Nevertheless, he presents four possible explanations to maintain the supposed identifications. Waters himself prefers a construction in which Šutruk-Nahhunte II and Hallutaš-Inšušinak had the same mother but two different fathers. A parallel construction is designed with regard to

3 The successive campaigns of Assurbanipal against Huban-haltaš III of Elam were treated most recently by Waters (2000: 68-80 and 117-118), who dates the first campaign to 647 and the second one (including the sack of Susa) to 646. Afterwards Huban-haltaš III managed to hold the kingship of Elam a little while, until the Assyrians captured him and took him to Nineveh, probably in 645. In this article Waters' chronology is followed. See also Frame (1992: 292-294).



Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak. Concerning the identification of Attametu and Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak Waters has a completely different opinion, since he categorically denies it (2000: 85) and presents a new alternative (**see § 4 below**).

In a review of Waters' book Vallat (2002: 374) denies the solution proposed by Waters and stresses anew his arguments against the identifications. He also presents a reconstruction of the period *ca.* 775-693. The new scheme of Neo-Elamite chronology is presented below.

Huban-tahra I	<i>ca.</i> 775
Huban-mena ⁴	<i>ca.</i> 760-743
Huban-Nikaš I	743-717
Šutruk-Nahhunte II	717-699
Hallušu	699-693
Kutir-Nahhunte II	693-692
Huban-menana	692-689
Huban-haltaš I	689-681
Huban-haltaš II	681-675
Urtak	675-664
Te'umman	664-653
Huban-Nikaš II	653-652
Tammaritu II	652-649
Indabibi	649-648
Tammaritu II	647

⁴ According to Vallat (1998b: 310) this king is named Huban-umena II, while Kutir-Nahhunte II's successor is called Huban-umena III. Yet the spellings of both names (resp. El. Hu-ban-im-me-na and Akk. Um-man-me-na-nu) do not support this assumption.



Huban-haltaš III	646-645
Šutur-Nahhunte, son of Huban-menana	} 645-585
Hallutaš-Inšušinak, son of Huban-tahra II	
Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak, son of Hutran-tepti	
Ummanunu (Susa)	} <i>ca.</i> 585- <i>ca.</i> 539
Šilhak-Inšušinak II (Susa)	
Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak (Susa)	
Šati-Hupiti and Huban-Šuturuk (Gisat)	<i>ca.</i> 585- <i>ca.</i> 539
Indada and Šutur-Nahhunte (Mālamīr)	<i>ca.</i> 585- <i>ca.</i> 539
Bahuri (Zamin)	<i>ca.</i> 585- <i>ca.</i> 539
Dabala, Ampiriš, Anni-Šilha and Unsak (Samati)	<i>ca.</i> 585- <i>ca.</i> 539
Appalaya (Zari)	<i>ca.</i> 585- <i>ca.</i> 539
Cambyses I, Cyrus II (Anšan)	<i>ca.</i> 585- <i>ca.</i> 539

In general, Vallat's chronology is credible, but not all of it is as firm as Vallat implies, and the following paragraphs reconsider parts of Vallat's argument. The first concerns the inscription EKI 71 and its dating (§ 2), the second and third concern the inscriptions of Hanne (EKI 75-76; § 3) and Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak (EKI 86-89; § 4), the fourth paragraph concerns the (approximate) date of the Susa Texts (§ 5); the final paragraph concerns the impact of forced broken writings on the Neo-Elamite chronology (§ 6).



2 Shutruk-Nahhunte II and EKI 71

This paragraph focuses on EKI 71, an inscription according to which a temple for the goddess Pinigir was erected by king Šutur-Nahhunte, son of Huban-mena. As Šutruk-Nahhunte II, to whom the inscriptions EKI 72-73 are generally attributed, also calls himself the son of Huban-mena, Scheil (1901: 90-1), the first editor of these inscriptions, concluded that Šutur-Nahhunte and Šutruk-Nahhunte were one and the same person. The academic community accepted this assumption, but one problem remained as yet unanswered: if Šutruk-Nahhunte and Šutur-Nahhunte were different names, why would one king bear two names? A possible solution for this problem was offered by Hinz (1964: 116-7). The real name of the king was Šutur-Nahhunte, but because this king wanted to link himself with the great Middle-Elamite king Šutruk-Nahhunte I (*ca.* 1190-1155), he adopted the name Šutruk-Nahhunte (II).

Despite this proposal the problem persisted and became the cause of the first doubts expressed concerning the identity of Šutur-Nahhunte and Šutruk-Nahhunte. Lambert (1967: 48) emphasized that the two names have different structures (noun-DN *vs.* participle-DN), but belong to the same root. Amiet (1967: 37) believed that there are two individuals with these names, but stressed that they had to be contemporaneous, *i.e.* that they both lived at the end of the eighth century BC. According to de Miroschedji (1982: 61-62 and 1985: 278) it was Šutur-Nahhunte who reigned from 717 till



699, while Šutruk-Nahhunte II exercised power between 668 and 653 BC. An objection to this is, however, that it implies that between 668 and 653 there were two kings in Elam: Šutruk-Nahhunte II on the one and Urtak (died in 664) and Te'umman on the other hand.

According to Grillot (1984: 190 n.25) there are two different roots involved in the names: (1) *šut(u).ru-*, “to judge, decide,” a nomino-verbal compound (to which *šutruk* belongs) with *ru-*, “to break, to open” as verbal element and (2) *šutu-* (to which *šutur* belongs). Her translation of Šutruk-Nahhunte is “Nahhunte is judgement.”

Recently, Waters (2000: 114) devoted a couple of lines to the problem of the two different royal names. *Pace* Grillot, he emphasizes that the same root is involved in both names: *šutur* is also attested as substantive meaning “right, order” from the Middle-Elamite period onwards (ElW 1187) and this corresponds to the meaning given to *šutruk* by Grillot. The names Šutruk-Nahhunte and Šutur-Nahhunte may thus belong to one individual.

Vallat (1995) supports the differences between the two names and consequently argues that the dedicatory Elamite inscription of Šutur-Nahhunte (EKI 71) should not be attributed to Šutruk-Nahhunte II (who certainly is responsible for EKI 72-73), but to Šutur-Nahhunte, father of Huban-kitin and king of Susa after the Assyrian sack.⁵ In Vallat's eyes,

⁵ According to Vallat (1996a: 391 n.41) Šutur-Nahhunte became king immediately after the sack of Susa (646).



Šutruk-Nahhunte was the son of Huban-mena II (his Huban-umena II) while Šutur-Nahhunte was the son of Huban-menana (his Huban-umena III; 692-689 BC). Apart from this, two additional arguments lead Vallat to his conclusion:

- 1 The royal titlature: Šutruk-Nahhunte (EKI 72-73) uses titles that were also used during the Old- and Middle-Elamite period. Šutur-Nahhunte only calls himself “king of Anšan and Susa” and “expander of the realm,” so he must belong to a more recent period than Šutruk-Nahhunte II.
- 2 The use of the signs ŠA and ŠÁ in words such as *šak* and *rišakka*: EKI 71 uses ŠÁ while EKI 72-73 have ŠA. As the latter was replaced by ŠÁ during the reign of Šutruk-Nahhunte II there must be a chronological difference between EKI 71 on the one and EKI 72 and 73 on the other hand.

Not everyone, however, has accepted this new identification of kings and their inscriptions. Waters (2000: 114) tries to deny Vallat’s two last arguments. First of all the difference in royal titlature between EKI 71 and EKI 72-73 alone is not enough to imply a chronological distinction. Secondly “ŠA and ŠÁ might occur in different, contemporaneous inscriptions.”

It is clear that these two views cannot be reconciled. Therefore a study of various aspects concerning EKI 71 could be useful. First, let us consider the royal titlature, which proves to be an unreliable basis for a chronological conclusion. The titles occurring in EKI 71-73 are the following:



- EKI 71:1-2: su-un-ki-ik-ki ^{AS}An-z[a]-an ^{AS}Šu-šu-un-ka₄ li-ku-me ri-šá-ak-ka₄.
- EKI 72:2-4: li-ku-me [ri]-ša-ak-ka₄ ka₄-at-ru Ha-tam₅-tuk me-en-ku li-ik-ki Ha-tam₅-ti-ik li-ba-ak ha-ni-ik ^dGAL a-ak ^dIn-šu-uš-na-ak-gi-ik.
- EKI 73A:1-2: su-un-ki-ik-ki An-z[a]-an Š[u-šu-un-ka₄ li-ku-me ri-šá-ak-ka₄ ka₄-at-ru Ha-tam₅-tuk me-en-ku li-ik-ki H]a-tam₅-tuk.

The various titles used in these inscriptions are: *sunkik Anzan šusunka* (71 and 73A), *likume rišakka* (71 and 72), *katru Hatamtuk* (72 and 73A), *menku likki Hatamti/uk* (72 and 73A) and *libak hanik* ^dGAL ak ^dInšušinakgik (72). Below is a list of other kings who use these titles.

*sunkik Anzan Šušunka:*⁶

Untaš-Napiriša (ca. 1340-1300), Šutruk-Nahhunte I (ca. 1185-1155), Kutir-Nahhunte II (ca. 1155-1150), Šilhak-Inšušinak I (ca. 1150-1120), Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak (late Neo-Elamite or Achaemenid period; **see § 4 below**).

likume rišakka:

Siwepalarhuppak (18th Century), Huban-umena (ca. 1350-

⁶ This titlature is attested indirectly in the inscription of Hallutaš-Inšušinak (EKI 77): Anzan Šušun. In version *n* of this text it is written Anzan-h Šušu-h, while version *o* reads [.. Šu]šun-h (König 1965: 168n.8). The latter is probably to be restored [Anzan-h Šu]šun-h.



1340), Šutruk-Nahhunte I, Šilhak-Inšušinak I, Huteluduš-Inšušinak (ca. 1120-1110), Hallutaš-Inšušinak, Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak.

katru Hatamtuk:

Huban-umena, Šutruk-Nahhunte I, Šilhak-Inšušinak, Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak.

libak hanik DN:

Šutruk-Nahhunte I, Kutir-Nahhunte II, Šilhak-Inšušinak I, Hallutaš-Inšušinak, Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak.

As can be easily seen, EKI 71 does not differ drastically from EKI 72 and EKI 73 in its royal titlature: *sunkik Anzan Šušunka* is a common title from the Middle-Elamite period onwards and *likume rišakka* is even more widespread, from the Old-Elamite period onwards. Moreover, no single Middle-Elamite king used only one titlature, so the fact that EKI 71 has a titlature, which used another combination of older components than the one used in EKI 72-73, has no consequences for its date.

The fact that in EKI 71 only two titles are mentioned while in EKI 72-73 various titles are given does not support Vallat's argument at all. Some Middle-Elamite inscriptions also mention only one or two titles, for example EKI 30 (which only has *libak hanik DN* and *sunkik Anzan Šušunka*) and EKI 33 (only *likume rišakki*). Accordingly, the royal titlature does not offer any chronological clue for the date of EKI 71.



The use of ŠA vs. ŠÁ, too, is very insecure. It may be true that ŠA disappeared during the reign of Šutruk-Nahhunte II, but the transition from ŠA to ŠÁ was not a mere replacement, as Vallat argues. Waters is right when he assumes that ŠA and ŠÁ may occur in different but contemporaneous documents. This is proven by two facts: (1) ŠÁ already appears in the texts from Tall-e Malyān, dating from *ca.* 1000 BC (TTM 62:6 and 114: rev.2'') and also in the stela of Šutruru (EKI 74: 20, rev. 15, 19, 25, 43, 44), which is usually dated to the reign of Šutruk-Nahhunte II (König 1965: 20; ElW 1328; Vallat 1995; Waters 2000: 116); (2) the signs ŠA (ša-ra-ma⁷) and ŠÁ (hi-šá-a-[an-ra], šá-ra-ra) occur in one and the same text of Šutruk-Nahhunte II, *i.e.* EKI 73.⁸

At this stage the arguments cited by Vallat in favour of his attribution of EKI 71 to Šutur-Nahhunte (late Neo-Elamite period) turn out to be rather weak. In addition there are three more objections to Vallat's proposal.

First, the language of EKI 71 is very close to the classical language of the other inscriptions attributed to the reign of

⁷ Hinz and Koch (ElW 1134-1135) read šá-ra-ma, but the copies by Scheil (1904: pl. 11 no.2) and König (1965: pl. 11) make clear that ša-ra-ma is the right form.

⁸ EKI 73 consists of three fragments (A, B and C). The fact that ŠA and ŠÁ do not occur next to each other in one and the same fragment could lead to the conclusion that fragments A and B belong to Šutur-Nahhunte while fragment C should be attributed to Šutruk-Nahhunte II. König (1965: 20 and 148), however, confirms that the three fragments belong to the same stela.



Šutruk-Nahhunte II (EKI 72-74). This is proved by means of three linguistic and graphic evolutions which took place in the Neo-Elamite period: (1) the velar /k/ was spirantized to /h/ (especially with regard to the locutive suffix), (2) the determinatives GAM and BE only start to appear in younger texts⁹ and (3) later texts show in some verbal forms a labialization of /n/ to /m/ (Vallat 1996a: 387-388).¹⁰

EKI 71 has none of these features. Yet in the inscriptions of Hallutaš-Inšušinak (EKI 77) and Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak (EKI 86-89), who are considered by Vallat to be the successors of his Šutur-Nahhunte, all these features occur. If EKI 71 were indeed to be dated after 646, it would be very peculiar to see how Šutur-Nahhunte strictly uses the classical language while his successor on the throne, Hallutaš-Inšušinak, abruptly started to use a language that was probably much closer to the actually spoken language of that time than to classic Elamite.

Vallat (1996a: 387-388 and 390) does acknowledge the aforementioned linguistic differences between EKI 71 and EKI 77, but leaves them aside in his dating of EKI 71. This seems, however, the wrong attitude, since he uses precisely the same argument to separate EKI 77 from EKI 72-73 and to prove that Hallutaš-Inšušinak cannot be identified with Hallušu, who is mentioned in the Mesopotamian sources as king of Elam between 699 and 693.

⁹ On the development of these determinatives, see Steve 1988.

¹⁰ This aspect is probably not the result of assimilation, since it occurs before dentals, labials and liquids.



It can be added here that also another inscription naming Šutur-Nahhunte (Amiet 1967: 36-37 fig. 8c) has /k/ (spelled here by means of GI) as the locutive suffix: ú^{DIS}Šu-tur-^dUTU šá-a[k^{DIS.d}Hu-b]an-im-me-na-gi [EŠŠANA]^{AS}An-za-an^{AS}Šu-[šu-un], and thus belongs to an older linguistic level of Elamite.

Secondly, there is a palaeographic objection to Vallat's hypothesis. Two signs, SI (Steve 1992: 67-9 no.112) and UG (*ibid.* no.130) have the same shape in EKI 71 and 74, but a different one in EKI 75-76, 77, 78, 79-85, the Omen Text, the Ururu Bronze Tablet and the Susa Texts. This indicates that EKI 71 and 74 are products of the same king and accordingly EKI 71 should be dated to Šutruk-Nahhunte II. If Vallat were right, then Hallutaš-Inšušinak and his scribes would have been linguistic revolutionists, since they would have altered the writing system, the language and some signs shapes. Only in the inscriptions of Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak (EKI 86-89) do the signs discussed have the same shape as in EKI 71-74, but that may be a case of archaizing writing, certainly if Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak should be identified with the rebel Aθamaita- ([see § 4 below](#)).

The third argument focuses on the family ties between the Elamite kings. According to Vallat, Šutur-Nahhunte was the son of Huban-menana (his Huban-umena III), who was king from 692 till 689, the year of his death. Consequently Šutur-Nahhunte must have been born before 689. Vallat argues that he became king immediately after 646, at least 43 years later than the death of Huban-menana. These 43 years constitute a rather long period, during which Šutur-Nahhunte is not mentioned in the Mesopotamian sources. This is



strange, as will be pointed out below.

It is not yet fully clear whether a new dynasty arose after the death of Huban-menana or not. Neither the Assyrian sources nor the *Babylonian Chronicle* give information on any familial relationship between Huban-menana and Huban-haltaš I, his successor on the throne. This is exceptional, since normally the affiliation of all Neo-Elamite kings appearing in Mesopotamian sources is mentioned. Hinz's (1964: 125) assumption that Huban-haltaš I was a cousin of Huban-menana and thus belonged to the same family cannot be proven.

The fact that the sources are silent concerning Huban-haltaš I's descent may indicate that he began a new dynasty after the death of Huban-menana (Waters 2000: 36). If this were indeed the case, Šutur-Nahhunte would most likely have played a political role as son of the deposed king and automatically as pretender to the throne in opposition to the new dynasty. It would be strange if the Assyrians had not made use of such a situation to strengthen their position vis-à-vis the Elamite kingdom. Consequently, he should have appeared in the Neo-Assyrian inscriptions. Another possibility is that Huban-haltaš I, after seizing power, ordered the execution of Šutur-Nahhunte, but in both cases Vallat's hypothesis is not very plausible.

If Huban-haltaš I was not an usurper, one could still expect that Šutur-Nahhunte (as a member of the royal family) would have been mentioned in some Assyrian or Babylonian text before he got king in Susa after 646.



Admittedly, all these arguments are circumstantial, as are the arguments used by Vallat. Nonetheless their combination makes an attribution of EKI 71 to a king Šutur-Nahhunte, who reigned immediately after 646 BC quite unlikely. On the contrary, in all probability EKI 71-74 were recorded during the reign of Šutruk-Nahhunte II, despite the onomastical problem of two different names for one king. Perhaps Hinz's proposed solution for this problem should be reconsidered.¹¹

3 The date of the inscriptions of Hanne (EKI 75-76)

During the nineteenth century scholars started studying the Elamite reliefs in Kūl-e Farah and Šikaft-e Salmān, in the region of Ayapir (present Īzeh/Mālamīr; König 1965: 155; EIW 15; Vallat 1993: 27). The date of these reliefs is not sure yet, but according to Calmeyer (1980: 110 n.49; also De Waele 1981: 50 n.4 and 52 n.4; Stolper 1987-90: 278; Potts 1999: 253-254) the reliefs of Šikaft-e Salmān date from the twelfth century and those of Kūl-e Farah from the ninth to sixth centuries. The inscriptions accompanying the reliefs are Neo-Elamite, so the

¹¹ One could also consider a scribal error in EKI 71 (^{DIS}Šu-tur-^dUTU instead of ^{DIS}Šu-tur-uk-^dUTU), but this is unlikely. A spelling šu-tur-uk for /šutruk/ is attested in the PN [^{GAM}]Hu-ban-šu-tur-uk (Ururu Bronze Tablet: seal inscription; see Cameron *apud* Schmidt 1957: 64 and EIW 680).



inscriptions of Šikaft-e Salmān must be secondary additions.

The various texts are recorded on the command of a certain Hanne, possibly a governor of this region. The inscriptions were first published by Weißbach (1894) and later re-edited by Scheil (1901: 102-113) and Hinz (1962).

Scheil (1901: 142) dated the inscriptions to the first half of the seventh century BC, in the time of the struggle between Assyrians and Elamites. This dating was based on palaeographic reasons. Later on Hinz (1962: 105) dated the text to the reign of Šutruk-Nahhunte II (717-699) and this time the dating was the result of prosopographical considerations. In one of his texts (EKI 75: 10) Hanne explicitly shows his loyalty to a king Šutur-Nahhunte, the son of Indada. Hinz linked this Šutur-Nahhunte to the well-known king Šutruk-Nahhunte II and could thus automatically date the inscriptions of Hanne.

Nevertheless there was one problem Hinz had to deal with: while Šutur-Nahhunte was the son of Indada, Šutruk-Nahhunte II calls himself the son (*šak*) of Huban-mena. This problem was tackled by arguing that *šak* does not only mean “son,” but also “male descendant” and that it is the second meaning that should be preferred when talking about the relationship between Šutruk-Nahhunte II and Huban-mena. The real father of Šutruk-Nahhunte II was thus Indada.

De Waele (1972: 30-31) refuted this proposal. According to him the inscriptions of Hanne are Neo-Elamite, but a more precise date cannot be given.

Vallat (1996a: 387-389) also expressed objections against Hinz’s proposal, when presenting his views on Neo-Elamite chronology. These objections have a linguistic character. In



the inscriptions of Hanne some graphic and linguistic features, which are only attested in texts dated after 699 and which make a connection with Šutruk-Nahhunte II simply impossible, appear: the (partial) replacement of su-un-ki and šá-ak by EŠŠANA and DUMU respectively, the spirantization of /k/ to /h/ in the locutive suffix and the labialization of /n/ to /m/ in some verbal forms. Vallat dates EKI 75-76 to the same period as the Susa Texts, *i.e.* the first half of the sixth century BC (see § 5 below).

There is an additional argument pleading for a later date for the inscriptions of Hanne. Some phonetic sequences are spelled broken: /Car/ (Ca-ir; e.g. ri-šá-ir, su-ul-ra-ir-ra, etc.), /Cil/ (Ci-ul; e.g. mi-ul-ka₄-ma-an-ra, ši-ul-ha-ak, etc.), /Cim/ (Ci-um; e.g. te-um-be-en-ra) and /Cuš/ (Cu-iš; e.g. du-iš-ni, ku-iš, etc.). This practice contrasts sharply with the inscriptions of Šutruk-Nahhunte II, where these sequences are all written harmonically,¹² and accordingly it indicates the improbability of a connection between EKI 75-76 and the reign of Šutruk-Nahhunte II, although one should be cautious about this, since the inscriptions from both persons come from different places.

Vallat's proposal undoubtedly has more credibility than Hinz's, yet it need not be completely correct. In my view Vallat has set his date too late. Two things point to such an opinion. First, there is the absence of the determinative BE,

¹² More on the role of broken writings in establishing a relative Neo-Elamite chronology can be found in § 6, below.



which occurs frequently in the Susa Texts, the Neo-Elamite Letters and the Ururu Bronze Tablet. Secondly, despite the general use of broken writings in Hanne's inscriptions, the development of the broken writings is not yet completed: /Cid/-sequences are still written harmonically (e.g. mi-it, pi-it-tan-ra, etc.) while they are not in the Susa Texts, in the Neo-Elamite Letters and in the Ururu Bronze Tablet. Accordingly, the inscriptions of Hanne have to be a bit older than these texts and this assumption leads to a proposed date of the last quarter of the seventh century BC for Hanne's inscriptions.

The next logical step is to find out whether more information can be retrieved on king Šutur-Nahhunte, Hanne's superior. In 1965, Kahane (1965: 38, no. 90 and pl. IIIg) published an inscribed seal, which reads ^{DIŠ.d}Hu-ban-kitin DUMU EŠŠANA ^{DIŠ}Šu-tur-^dUTU-na, "Huban-kitin, son of king Šutur-Nahhunte" (see also Amiet 1973: 29).¹³ De

13 According to Lambert (1967: 51) Šutur-Nahhunte ruled in Susa somewhere between 612 and 590, before the Babylonians started to control Susa. With this assertion Lambert automatically takes side in the discussion whether Susa and Susiana have been occupied by Babylonia during the Neo-Babylonian period. This was suggested by Scheil (1904: xxiii and 1927: 47-48) and accepted by many scholars (König 1931: 23; Cameron 1936: 219; Weidner 1939: 929; Hinz 1964: 132; Dandamayev 1972: 258; Zadok 1976: 61; Dandamayev & Lukonin 1989: 59). Yet, the arguments in favour of such an occupation are not very strong, as has been pointed out by Thompson (1925: 215-216), Wiseman (1956: 36), Amiet (1973: 5) and de Miroschedji (1982: 62). Nowadays such an occupation is generally refuted. Zawadzki (1988: 143) offers an alternative theory: Susa was never controlled by



Miroschedji (1982: 61) dates this seal to the first half of the sixth century, while Steve (1992: 22) situates it in the period 653-605.

According to Vallat Huban-kitin, the son of Šutur-Nahhunte¹⁴ is most likely the same individual as the Huban-kitin, son of king x, who is attested in the Susa Texts. This is, however, not very certain and will be discussed later (see § 5 below).

If one brings all these data together the following scheme becomes apparent: the king Šutur-Nahhunte, son of Indada, who appears as the lord of Hanne in the last quarter of the seventh century, has to be identified with Šutur-Nahhunte, father of Huban-kitin, who is mentioned on his son's seal. Geographically speaking, it is plausible that the region of Īzeh/Mālamīr was dependent on Susa and not on Anšan (where the Persians exercised power from about 635 BC onwards; see de Miroschedji 1985: 284 and 298).

The rise of a new Elamite kingdom¹⁵ is situated

Babylonia, but by Media, from approximately 584 onwards. This idea, however, has not gained much acceptance (see Briant 1996: 33 and 907; Potts 1999: 294-295 and 311; Waters 2000: 103 n.9; Henkelman 2003a: 210-211).

¹⁴ Vallat assumes that this Šutur-Nahhunte is also the king on whose command the inscription EKI 71 was recorded (see § 2 above).

¹⁵ The rise of such a kingdom also finds support in a chronicle passage (ABC no.5: rev. 19-20) where a confrontation between Nebuchadnezar and possibly a king of Elam is mentioned (cf. Amiet 1973: 24 n.1; Grayson 1975: 20; Waters 2000: 102). Unfortunately, the text is heavily damaged and the reading of Elam is not com-



between *ca.* 640 and 625 (de Miroschedji 1982: 62 and 1985: 298; Vallat 1984: 7). In the latter year, Nabopolassar, king of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, returned some divine statues to Susa,¹⁶ which the Assyrians had taken to Uruk after the sack of Susa, so there had to be an administration which was capable of receiving these statues (Amiet 1973: 24; de Miroschedji 1982: 62; Potts 1999: 290). In all likelihood Šutur-Nahhunte, son of Indada and father of Huban-kitin, was at that time king in Susa.

The data discussed above lead to the conclusion that the inscriptions of Hanne should be dated in the last quarter of the seventh century BC.

Since the two previous paragraphs dealt with the problem of Šutruk-Nahhunte II and the various Šutur-Nahhunte's mentioned in Neo-Elamite sources, it is useful to present both Vallat's views and my views in a synoptic table. The main difference between both reconstructions is that Vallat distinguishes three individuals bearing the name Šutruk-Nahhunte or Šutur-Nahhunte (being Šutruk-Nahhunte II and two Šutur-Nahhunte's), while I only have two (being Šutruk/Šutur-Nahhunte II and Šutur-Nahhunte, son of Indada).

pletely clear ([š]àr E[lamt]i^{ki}), so one may not use this passage to assume a strong Elamite kingdom capable of threatening Babylonia (Zawadzki 1988: 140).

16 ABC no.2: 15-17: "The accession year of Nabopolassar: In the month Adar Nabopolassar returned to Susa the gods of Susa whom the Assyrians had carried off and settled in Uruk."



<i>King</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Vallat: texts</i>	<i>Tavernier: texts</i>
Šutruk-Nahhunte II, son of Huban-mena	717-699	EKI 72-74	EKI 71-74; Amiet 1967: 36-7 fig. 8c
Šutur-Nahhunte, son of Huban-mena	<i>ca.</i> 645-620	EKI 71; Amiet 1967: 36-7 fig. 8c; Seal of Huban-kitin; MDP 9 5	/
Šutur-Nahhunte, son of Indada	<i>ca.</i> 645-620	/	EKI 75-76; Seal of Huban-kitin
Šutur-Nahhunte, son of Indada	<i>ca.</i> 585-539	EKI 75-76	/

4 The date of the inscriptions of Atta-hamiti-Inshushinak (EKI 86-89)

The Elamite inscriptions EKI 86-89 were written on the command of Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak, son of Hutran-tepti (Pézard 1924: 1-4; König 1965: 23; Steve 1992: 22; Waters 2000: 85 n.22), who calls himself “king of Anšan and Susa.” Scheil (1911: 78) situated this king chronologically a little before Ummanunu and Šilhak-Inšušinak II, but presented no date. Later on this person has been identified with Attametu, who appears in the annals of Assurbanipal. Yet, Attametu never appears with the title “king” in the Mesopotamian sources, which never mention his patronymic neither (see PNA 324). For this reason Stolper (1984: 50) prudently calls him “a local sovereign at Susa.”



De Miroschedji assigns to Attametu/Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak a reign between 653-648. This is, however, very problematic, since in that case the reigns of three other kings (Huban-nikaš II [653-652], Tammaritu [652-649] and Indabibi [649-648]), attested in the Mesopotamian sources, should be shifted (Vallat 1996a: 385 n.4).

As pointed out by Vallat (1996a; see also Waters 2000: 85), this and other identifications between kings mentioned in Elamite and Mesopotamian sources cannot be accepted anymore. Vallat (1996a: 391) situates the reign of Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak in the last quarter of the seventh century and the first quarter of the sixth century BC. He reaches this conclusion by assuming that (1) Šutur-Nahhunte reigned immediately after 646, (2) that Hallutaš-Inšušinak (EKI 77) and Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak have to be situated after Šutur-Nahhunte because the language of their inscriptions is more recent than the language of Šutur-Nahhunte's inscription (EKI 71; see, however, § 2 above) and (3) that they precede Ummanunu (Susa Texts), Šilhak-Inšušinak II (EKI 78) and Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak (EKI 79-85) because the latter do not call themselves "king of Anšan and Susa" anymore.

This is by no means certain, however. It is true that the identifications between kings in Elamite and Mesopotamian sources should be discarded, but that does not mean automatically that Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak reigned in the last quarter of the seventh and the beginning of the sixth century, as postulated by Vallat. In fact, there is an interesting alternative, proposed by Waters (2000: 85), according to which Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak is identical with Aθamaita, the man



who rebelled against Darius I in 520 and who was subsequently defeated by Gobryas (DB V.1-14). Onomastically, this hypothesis is acceptable, since the Old-Persian version of this inscription has Aθamaita-, which is, just like Bab. Attametu, an abbreviation of the Elamite name Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak (Hinz 1972: 250; Mayrhofer 1979: II/16; Zadok 1984: 7 and 9; Stolper *apud* Harper, Aruz & Tallon 1992: 199; PNA 234). There are thus two possible datings for Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak: (1) Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak really governed Elam around 600 or (2) Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak is indeed the rebel mentioned in Darius' Bisitun Inscription and may perhaps be considered the last king of Susa.

For the discussion to progress, a study of the inscriptions of Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak is necessary. EKI 86-89 contain no chronological information, so a relative date must be suggested on the basis of graphic and linguistic features. Three of these features indicate that the inscriptions were doubtlessly recorded after the reign of Šutruk-Nahhunte II (717-699). The first one is the spelling Ad-da-ha-mi-ti-^dIn-su-iš-na-ak (EKI 87:1-3), with a broken writing of a /Cuš/-sequence (°-su-iš-°) in the theophorous element. The second one is the use of -h- instead of -k- as the locutive suffix (e.g. Hutran-teptiha, EKI 87). The last feature is the logographic writing of the name of Inšušinak in EKI 86, 87 and 89: ^dMÜŠ.LAM. The oldest attestation of this logogram can be found in EKI 73C, from the time of Šutruk-Nahhunte II, since whose reign it is used more frequently. The syllabic writing, however, is attested throughout Elamite history.



Other features, on the other hand, could indicate that the inscription cannot be Achaemenid: the spelling ap-pu-up (with a harmonic writing of a /Cup/-sequence, the only one in an inscription which is dated after Šutruk-Nahhunte II), the use of -k- as the locutive suffix (e.g. Hutranteptikka, EKI 86 and 87), a syllabic writing of Inšušinak in EKI 87 and the palaeography, for the shapes of five signs (RU, SI, TUL, UG and UZ) resemble rather the signs from the time of Šutruk-Nahhunte II than those of later inscriptions. It is, however, possible and even probable that these features are merely archaizing in order to give more strength to the great aspirations of Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak. If so, they could plead for a date in the Achaemenid period.

An especially archaizing element is the titulature “king of Anšan and Susa, expander of the realm, master of Elam, sovereign of Elam,” which reminds one immediately of the titulatures of the great Middle-Elamite kings, and which clearly illustrates the political aspirations of Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak. There is a sharp contrast with the titulatures of his predecessors Šilhak-Inšušinak and Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak, the first of whom merely calls himself “king” and the second of whom does not even assume a royal title. This leads to the idea that the latter accepted the role of semi-autonomous Elamite ruler under Achaemenid authority, while Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak started a rebellion against Darius I, an unwise decision. The titulature used by Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak can be considered an argument in favour of an identification between him and Aθamaita- and consequently in favour of an Achaemenid date for Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak.



There is also a prosopographical element which deserves attention, namely the predecessor of Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak and his role in the inscriptions of the latter. Although it is fairly certain that one inscription (EKI 86) mentions him, one cannot tell his name with absolute certainty, since his name depends on the analysis of the form H/hal-ka₄-taš, occurring three times in direct connection with the word “king.” The text also mentions Huntran-tepti, Atta-hamiti’s father, but never explicitly as “king.” Concerning H/halkataš the scholarly opinions are not unanimous. Either Halkataš is a proper name, belonging to the predecessor of Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak (König 1965: 173 n.5; Potts 1999: 297) or halkataš is nothing more than an epithet for Hutran-tepti, so only one other royal name occurs next to Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak himself in the inscription (Pézard 1924: 9 and 12; EIW 29 and 607). If the first hypothesis is right then Hutran-tepti, Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak’s father, was never king. If the second hypothesis is correct, then Hutran-tepti reigned before Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak.

It is even possible that Hutran-tepti/Halkataš never ruled in Susa (Vallat 1998b: 310), but that he was only used by Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak to legitimate his own royal authority, when he wanted to convince the Elamites to join the insurrection against Darius I. This, however, seems a little bit far-fetched. Unfortunately the mentioning of Hutran-tepti/Halkataš does not help the scholar in dating the inscriptions of Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak.

The combination of Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak’s grand ambitions (titulature) and the archaizing elements in his



inscriptions (linguistics) make a later date more attractive than that of Vallat's hypothesis.

The proposal advocated here implies the possibility that Susa and Elam were not under complete Achaemenid control before the reign of Darius I (see Vallat 1984: 7 and Carter 1998: 323). Despite the fact that no Achaemenid material remains predating Darius' reign have been excavated in Susa, most scholars believe that Cyrus took Susiana around 540-539 (Hinz 1970: 1026; Amiet 1973: 24; Zadok 1976: 61-62; de Miroschedji 1982: 61-63 and 1985: 305 and n.161; Stolper 1984: 53). Nothing, however, is known about the actual character of this annexation. Perhaps Cyrus concluded a treaty with the Elamite king (Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak or Hutran-tepti/Halkataš), as a result of which the latter could retain his throne, on the condition of loyalty to the Achaemenids (Vallat 1996a: 391). When Darius I saw himself confronted with a series of rebellions in the first year of his reign Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak may have seen an opportunity to regain the former independence of Elam. Yet he failed in his attempt, as a consequence of which Darius conquered Susa and put an end to the Neo-Elamite kingdom.

Finally, another point should be taken into consideration, in case of a dating of Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak in the Achaemenid period: his relation to the other rebel leaders, appearing in Darius' inscription (see Henkelman 2003a: 183-184). The Bisitun Inscription mentions no less than three uprisings against Darius in Elam. The first one was led in the fall of 522 by Āçina, son of Upadarma. Both persons have an Iranian name (Tavernier 2003: 247-250), so Āçina was most



likely a Persian, also because of the typically Old-Persian /ç/ in his name. The rebellion was apparently not that widespread, so Darius could easily subdue it (see DB I.72-81; Dandamayev 1982: 430 and 1984: 114). A certain Martiya, also a Persian, started the second Elamite uprising. He called himself Ummaniš,¹⁷ in order to give himself some dynastic background (Briant 1996: 132), but again the rebellion was easily suppressed: when the Elamites heard that Darius was close to their land, they captured Martiya and handed him over to Darius, who had him executed (DB II.8-13). The heaviest uprising was the one led by Aθamaita/Attametū, since it is the only one that needed a battle to be suppressed and since it was included in the additional fifth column of the Bisitun inscription. Most likely it was also the only one with real nationalistic feelings because the two previous ones were led by Persians (despite the fact that Martiya named himself Ummaniš).

The place of Attametū in the historical context of the three insurrections is not clear. Two possibilities come to mind. The first one postulates that Elam had no own king at the time the first rebellion broke out. The death of Cambyses may have caused trouble in Elam and as a result the land may have fallen into a state of anarchy in which context the three

¹⁷ Possibly a denotation of Huban-nikaš (D'jakonov 1956: 276 and 456; Dandamayev 1984: 119 n.6), but alternatively a rendering of Ummanunu (Waters 2000: 95 n.93). An Ummanunu, king of Susa, is mentioned in the administrative texts from this town (MDP 9 165: 4-5).



uprisings could easily take place. The last Neo-Elamite king of Susa was in that case Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak or Hutran-tepti/Halkataš.

The second possibility is the counterpart of the first reconstruction. Given the existence of an Elamite kingdom during the reign of Cyrus and Cambyses it can be postulated that Susa still had a king when the first rebellion broke out. This king was Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak, who had succeeded some years before to Hutran-tepti. Two arguments may point to such a solution: (1) the fact that Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak had the time to erect a stela, which would have been extremely difficult while in the middle of a rebellion against the Achaemenids and (2) the Iranian names of the two other rebellion leaders, Āçina and Martiya. The first two rebellions may have been instigated not by Elamites alone, but by Elamites and Persians living in Eastern Khūzestān or in Fārs, while Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak was ruling in Susiana.

The choice between these two historical reconstructions is not simple, and a definite answer is not presented in this paper, which rather aims at giving a clear overview in the various possibilities where and when this person should be situated. The evidence for an identification of Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak and the rebel leader Aθamaita, however, is more plausible, but whether he was a short-lived rebel or the last Susian king is not clear.



5 The chronological information in the Susa Texts

These texts, found on the Acropolis (MDP 9 and 11 309) and under the Apadana (MDP 11 301-307) of Susa, are usually dated in the first half of the sixth century BC, *i.e.* between 600 and the beginning of the Achaemenid period (Reiner 1960: 224; Hinz 1981: 176; Steve, *apud* Vallat 1984: 11 n.24 and 1992: 22; Vallat 1984: 11 n.24). The most precise date (600-575) has been suggested by Vallat (1998b: 311) and is based on the seals on the tablets.

Unfortunately the texts themselves are very uninformative regarding the chronology. They are dated only to unspecified days in given months and no more than four times a king is mentioned. Two times the attestation is not helpful for this discussion: Appalaya, king of “the ones of Zari” in MDP 9 158 on the one hand and a king of Egypt on the other hand. This pharaoh could be Psammetichus II (595-589), Apries (589-570) or Amasis (570-526).

The two other “royal” references yield a bit more information. In MDP 9 5: 9-10 Huban-kitin, son of king x, appears: ^{BE}Hu-ban.ki-tin DUMU EŠŠANA []. While Scheil, the editor, thought that EŠŠANA was the first part of a personal name (Sunki-xxx), Yusifov (1963: 202 and 231) has shown that EŠŠANA functions as a title, not as a part of an anthroponym.



This is nowadays generally accepted (Vallat 1995 and Waters 2000: 95 n.91).¹⁸ Vallat (1995) restores ^{DIS}Šu-tur-^dUTU and sees another reference to his king Šutur-Nahhunte, who reigned after the sack of Susa (see § 2 above).

Despite the superficial plausibility of this assumption it has two weaknesses: (1) the name Huban-kitin is extremely popular in this time period and occurs frequently in the texts from Susa. For this reason one cannot safely assume that all occurrences of Huban-kitin refer to one and the same individual, being the son of king Šutur-Nahhunte. It is equally possible that another king, perhaps Ummanunu, is meant here. (2) The copy of the text by Scheil has some faint traces of the sign following EŠŠANA and these traces do not seem to reflect a sign ŠU. Absolute certainty on this topic can also be reached by finding new material, but as long as that does not appear, Vallat's restoration is not obligatory.

The fourth and last reference to a king in the Susa Texts is found in MDP 9 165, where a king Ummanunu is attested. Vallat (1996a: 389 and 393) identifies this king as the father of Šilhak-Inšušinak, a plausible reasoning. For now it is certain that at least a part of the Susa Texts was composed during the reign of Ummanunu.

It is not precisely known over what time period these tablets are spread, due to the lack of a coherent dating system in the texts. This is stressed by Amiet (1973: 25) and Steve (1986: 14-15). Nevertheless Stolper (*apud* Harper, Aruz &

¹⁸ De Miroschedji (1982: 61 n.46) disagrees with it and reads Sunki-[].



Tallon 1992: 268) uses a prosopographical argument to argue that the time span of the texts is not longer than a lifetime, and probably less. His argument is the preponderance of Kuddakaka, a high official, in the texts. One might take 25 years as a plausible time span for the texts. Consequently, it is possible that the Susa Texts were written during the reign of more than one king, e.g. Ummanunu and Šilhak-Inšušinak or Ummanunu's father and Ummanunu.

All this, however, does not help the scholar much further in his search for a more precise date. It looks as if Vallat's date (600-575) has to be shifted a little bit later. With a certain degree of plausibility it can be supposed that the approximate date for the Susa Texts is *ca.* 590/580-565/555.

6 **Forced broken writings and Neo-Elamite chronology**

Broken writings, *i.e.* writings of the type CV_1-V_2C (e.g. ba-iš), are a particular aspect of Elamite cuneiform. Their evolution and function are discussed in Justeson & Stephens (1994). Two types of broken writings can be discerned: forced ones and optional ones. The first type encompasses these spellings to which there is no possible graphic parallel but a CVC-sign. Their existence is a direct result of the evolution that occurred in Elamite cuneiform from the seventh century BC onwards. One of the aspects of this evolution is the loss of some VC-signs (AL, AR, IL, IM, UB/P, US/Z, UŠ) which made some sign



combinations impossible, e.g. ME du-uš, pa-ar or šu-up. The two possible ways to write these words in later periods were the use of a CVC-sign (e.g. BAR) or (if the latter did not exist in the Elamite syllabary) the use of a broken writing (e.g. du-iš, ba-ir and šu-ip). Analogy with the first group is the reason why the second type of broken writing came into existence. It involves the spellings to which there is a parallel harmonic writing, e.g. NE na-ba-iš could also be written na-ba-áš since the sign ÁŠ was still in use.

It is generally accepted that broken writings are particularly popular during the Neo- and Achaemenid-Elamite periods. They are extremely rare in the Old- and Middle-Elamite periods and in the first part of the Neo-Elamite period. Only in texts dated after the sack of Susa by the Assyrians (646) they start to become more and more regular. In the Achaemenid-Elamite texts they are very frequently attested.

Since broken writings are rare before the Neo-Elamite period and frequent after, a study of the development of forced broken writings may provide a check on proposed chronologies for NE texts and rulers. It is the intention of this paragraph to study this information and to apply it to the chronological framework of the Neo-Elamite period.

In the following table the development of forced broken writings in the Neo-Elamite period is presented. Not all Neo-Elamite texts are included, since some of them are not



relevant for this study, e.g. the so-called “hemerology,”¹⁹ a dedication to Inšušinak,²⁰ MDP 36 3 and FHE 244. The headings are the VC-signs that disappeared from the Elamite syllabary. An entry 8/4 means that there are eight forced broken writings in four different words. The abbreviation ‘fr.’ means ‘frequent;’ ‘Ururu’ refers to the Ururu Bronze Tablet.

<i>traditional</i>	AL	AR	AS/ AZ	ID/ IT	IL	IM	UB/ US	US	UŠ
<i>chronology</i>									

EKI 71-74	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
MDP 11 299	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
RA 25 40 no.3	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
EKI 75-76	o	8/4	o	o	9/5	2/1	o	o	6/2
EKI 77	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	1
EKI 78	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	1
EKI 79-85	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	1
Omen Text	o	3/1	1	o	2/2	o	o	o	o
MDP 11 300	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
EKI 86-89	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	1
Ururu	o	o	o	6/4	o	3/2	2/2	o	6/4
Susa Texts	2/2	16/10	28/5	33/12	7/5	17/8	29/11	3/1	21/7
Neo-El. Letters	o	o	1	4/3	2/2	1	o	1	11/4
MDP 36 1	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	1/1
Achaem. Texts	fr.	fr.	fr.	fr.	fr.	fr.	fr.	fr.	fr.

19 Published by Scheil (1925: 157-158).

20 Published by Scheil (1927: 43).



<i>new</i>	AL	AR	AS/	ID/	IL	IM	UB/	US	UŠ
<i>chronology</i>			AZ	IT			US		

EKI 71-74	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
MDP 11 299-300	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
RA 25 40 no.3	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
EKI 77	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	1
Omen Text	o	3/1	1	o	2/2	o	o	o	o
EKI 75-76	o	8/4	o	o	9/5	2/1	o	o	6/2
Susa Texts	2/2	16/10	28/5	33/12	7/5	17/8	29/11	3/1	21/7
Neo-El. Letters	o	o	1	4/3	2	1	o	1	11/4
MDP 36 1	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	1/1
Ururu	o	o	o	6/4	o	3/2	2/2	o	6/4
EKI 78	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	1
EKI 79-85	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	1
Achaem. Texts	fr.	fr.	fr.	fr.	fr.	fr.	fr.	fr.	fr.

The forced broken writings indeed yield some chronological information, especially with regard to the relative chronology of the texts. They tend to favour the new chronology advocated in this article, which is for the larger part based on Vallat's chronological framework of the Neo-Elamite period. The main argument for this assumption are the inscriptions of Hanne (EKI 75-76) which would contain the only forced broken writings dated in the reign of Šutruk-Nahhunte II (717-699), while in Vallat's scheme all forced broken writings occur in texts dating from the period after the sack of Susa. Hanne's texts certainly do not belong to Šutruk's reign.

In the Omen Text /Cas/-sequences are spelled broken, while /Cim/- and /Cus/-sequences are still spelled harmonically. Consequently, this text must be older than the Susa



Texts, the Neo-Elamite Letters, the inscriptions of Hanne and the Ururu Bronze Tablet, where the latter sequences are spelled broken. The Ururu Bronze Tablet ([see note 1](#)) is probably a bit younger than the inscriptions of Hanne (EKI 75-76), since /Cid/-sequences appear harmonically in the latter, but are written with a broken spelling in the Ururu Bronze Tablet. This yields the following chronological order of these texts: (1) Omen Text,²¹ (2) EKI 75-76 (Hanne) and (3) Susa Texts, Neo-Elamite Letters and the Ururu Bronze Tablet. The broken writings do not allow any chronological distinction among the last three (series of) texts.

7 Conclusion

Taking the above discussion into consideration, Vallat's scheme for the Neo-Elamite kings after 646 needs changes. Consequently, I propose the following scheme of Neo-Elamite kings of Susa after the Assyrian sack. An asterisk indicates that it is not sure whether this person reigned at Susa.

Huban-haltaš III (-645) Šutur-Nahhunte, son of Indada Huban-kitin*, son of Šutur-Nahhunte Huban-tahra* Hallutaš-Inšušinak, son of Huban-tahra

²¹ Perhaps this text is written not long after the events of 646.



Ummanunu
 Šilhak-Inšušinak II, son of Ummanunu
 Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak, son of Šilhak-Inšušinak II
 Hutran-tepti/Halkataš
 Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak

In sixth-century texts some other kings are attested in Elam or its surroundings: Bahuri of Zamin, the kings of Samati, etc. Vallat (1996a: *passim*; also Waters 2000: 100-101) argues that the existence of these kings indicated a fragmentation of the Elamite kingdom into several smaller states, one of which was the kingdom of Susa. Henkelman (2003b: 257) does not accept this. Zari could have been the name of a “Chaldean or an Aramaic tribe on the southwestern fringe of Khūzestān” (Appalaya is probably a Semitic name) while Samati (in southern Lorestān) may be an area that was not under direct Elamite control. Huban-šuturuk, the king mentioned in the Ururu Bronze Tablet, may have ruled in the region around Gisat, on the eastern border of Khūzestān. This region was not necessarily part of Elam, but may have been subject to “a proliferation of Elamite culture outside this state.”

Only Bahuri and the kings of Anšan remain objections to a completely unified Elam. The Achaemenids had their base in Anšan from around 635 BC and probably stayed out of Susanite control.

The role and position of Bahuri, who was certainly an Elamite king (Vallat 1998a), the “founder of a royal house” is still unclear. The suggestion by Reade (2000) that he should be identified with Pa’e who rebelled against Huban-haltaš III in the aftermath of the Assyrian campaigns against Susa is not



very likely. Bahuri himself occurs in a letter found in Susa (MDP 36 1) and in another text from Susa (MDP 9 88) and is therefore closely connected with the administrative tablets from Susa (Waters 2000: 96), which cannot be dated to the middle of the seventh century BC.

There is, however, also an alternative explanation for at least some of these kings. Vallat seems to believe that all Neo-Elamite kings are attested through their inscriptions. Yet this has still to be proven. Possibly, some kings are simply not attested in this way, because, for example, they reigned during a short period or because they simply did not order inscriptions to be made. Bahuri or Huban-Šuturuk could be such kings, but that is mentioned here with much cautiousness, since there is little known about the territorial extent of the Susian kingdom and the internal relations between king and high officials within the kingdom.²² Henkelman is right when he argues that “all the arguments used in favour of a fragmented Neo-elamite state are open to different interpretations and need critical re-examination.”

Finally an overview of the chronology of Neo-Elamite texts is offered in a synoptic table. It should be noted that the proposed dates are only relative and possibly subject to revision:

²² It is certain that the economic activities displayed in the Susa Archives concern much of Khūzestān.



<i>Texts and related king(s)</i>	<i>Approximate Date</i>
EKI 71-74: Šutruk-Nahhunte II	
MDP 11 299	} 717-699
MDP 11 300	
Hallušu	699-693
Kutir-Nahhunte II	693-692
Huban-menana	692-689
Huban-haltaš I	689-681
Huban-haltaš II	681-675
Urtak	675-664
Te'umman	664-653
Huban-nikaš II	653-652
Tammaritu	652-649
Indabibi	649-648
Huban-haltaš III	648-647
Tammaritu	647
Huban-haltaš III	646-645
Omen Text	ca. 640
EKI 75-76: Indada and Šutur-Nahhunte	ca. 625- ca. 600
EKI 77: Hallutaš-Inšušinak (Susa)	ca. 620- ca. 585
Susa Archives: Ummanunu (Susa)	ca. 590- ca. 555
Niniveh Letters: Bahuri (Zamin)	ca. 590- ca. 555
EKI 78: Šilhak-Inšušinak II (Susa)	ca. 565- ca. 550
EKI 79-85: Tepti-Huban-Inšušinak (Susa)	ca. 550- ca. 530
EKI 86-89: Atta-hamiti-Inšušinak (Susa)	ca. 530-520
Ururu Bronze Tablet: Šati-Hupiti and Huban-Šuturuk (Gisat)	ca. 585- ca. 539
Inscriptions of Kalmākarra: Dabala, Ampiriš, Anni-Šilha and Unsak (Samati)	ca. 585- ca. 539

Jan TAVERNIER (Postdoctoraal Onderzoeker F.W.O.-Vlaanderen)

jan.tavernier@arts.kuleuven.ac.be



Bibliography

- AMIET, P. 1967, "Éléments émaillés du décor architectural néo-élamite," *Syria* 44: 27-46.
- 1973, "Glyptique élamite, à propos de documents nouveaux," *ArAs* 26: 3-45.
- BRIANT, P. 1996, *Histoire de l'empire perse de Cyrus à Alexandre* (Achaemenid History 10), Leiden.
- CALMEYER, P. 1980, "Zur altiranische Motive, VII. Achsnägel in Form von Betenden," *AMI* 13: 99-111.
- CAMERON, G.G. 1936, *History of Early Iran*, Chicago.
- CARTER, E. 1998, "Elam, II. The Archaeology of Elam," *EncIr* 8: 313-325.
- DANDAMAYEV, M.A. 1972, "Connections between Elam and Babylonia in the Achaemenid Period," in: *Memorial Volume of the Vth International Congress of Iranian Art and Archaeology*, vol. 1, Teheran: 258-264.
- 1982, "Āçina," *EncIr* 1: 429-430.
- 1984, *A Political History of the Achaemenid Empire*, Leiden (transl. W.J. Vogelsang).
- DANDAMAYEV, M.A. & Lukonin, V.G. 1989, *The Culture and Social Institutions of Ancient Iran*, Cambridge.
- DE WAELE, E. 1972, "Šutruk-Nahunte II et les reliefs rupestres dits néo-élamites d'Iseh/Malamir," *Revue des archéologues et historiens d'art de Louvain* 5: 17-32.
- 1981, "Travaux archéologiques à Shekaf-e Salma et Kul-e Farah près d'Izeh (Malamir)," *IrAnt* 16: 45-62.
- D'JAKONOV, I.M. 1956, *История Мидии от древнейших времен до конца IV в. до н.э.*, Moscow – Leningrad.
- FRAME, G. 1992, *Babylonia 689-627 B.C.: a Political History* (PIHANS 69), Istanbul.
- GRAYSON, A.K. 1975, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (TCS 5), Locust Valley.
- GRILLOT, Fr. 1984, "Trinôme de la royauté en Élam," *StIr* 13: 185-191.



- HARPER, P.O., ARUZ, J. & TALLON, Fr. (eds.). 1992, *The Royal City of Susa: Ancient Near Eastern Treasures in the Louvre*, New York.
- HENKELMAN, W. 2003a, "Persians, Medes and Elamites: acculturation in the Neo-Elamite period," in: G.B. Lanfranchi, M. Roaf & R. Rollinger (eds.), *Continuity of Empire (?), Assyria, Media, Persia* (History of the Ancient Near East, Monographs 5), Padova: 181-231, 407-448.
- 2003b, "Defining 'Neo-Elamite history'," *BiOr* 60: 251-263.
- HINZ, W. 1962, "Die elamischen Inschriften des Hanne," in: W.B. Henning & E. Yarshater (eds.), *A locust's leg: Studies in honour of S.H. Taqizadeh*, London: 105-116.
- 1964, *Das Reich Elam* (Urban-Bücher 82), Stuttgart.
- 1970, "Persis," *PRECA Suppl.* 12: 1022-1038.
- 1972, "Die Zusätze zur Darius-Inschrift von Behistan," *AMI* 5: 243-251.
- 1981, "Aus der Werkstatt des elamischen Wörterbuches," in: A. Noth & H.R. Römer (eds.), *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des vorderen Orients: Festschrift für Bertold Spuler zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Leiden: 171-180.
- JUSTESON, J.S. & STEPHENS, L.D. 1994, "Variation and change in symbol systems: case studies in Elamite cuneiform," in: C. Renfrew & E.B.W. Zubrow (eds.), *The Ancient Mind: Elements of cognitive archaeology* (New Directions in Archaeology), Cambridge : 167-175.
- KAHANE, P. 1965, *Le musée d'Israël, Catalogue no.6: Archéologie*, Jerusalem.
- KÖNIG, F.W. 1931, *Geschichte Elams* (Der Alte Orient: gemeinverständliche Darstellungen 29/4), Leipzig.
- 1965, *Die elamischen Königsinschriften* (AfO Beihefte 16), Graz.
- LAMBERT, M. 1967, "Appendice: Šutruk-Nahunte et Šutur-Nahunte," *Syria* 44: 47-51.
- 1977, "Deux textes élamites de la fin du septième siècle," *JA* 265: 221-225.
- MALBRAN-LABAT, Fl. 1995, *Les inscriptions royales de Suse: Briques de l'époque paléo-élamite à l'empire néo-élamite*, Paris.



- MAYRHOFER, M. 1979, *Die altiranischen Namen* (IPNB 1). Vienna.
- DE MIROSCHEJJI, P. 1982, "Notes sur la glyptique de la fin de l'Élam," *RA* 76: 51-63.
- 1985, "La fin du royaume d'Anšan et de Suse et la naissance de l'Empire perse," *ZA* 75: 265-306.
- PÉZARD, M. 1924, "Réconstruction d'une stèle de Adda-hamiti-In-sušnak," *Babyloniaca* 8: 1-26.
- POTTS, D.T. 1999, *The Archaeology of Elam: Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State* (Cambridge World Archaeology), Cambridge.
- READE, J. 2000, "Elam after the Assyrian sack of Susa in 647 BC," *NABU* 2000.4: 89 (note 80).
- REINER, E. 1960, "Calques sur le Vieux-Perse en élamite achéménide," *BSP* 55: 222-227.
- SCHEIL, V. 1901, *Textes élamites-anzanites* (MDP 3), Paris.
- 1904, *Textes élamites-anzanites* (MDP 5), Paris.
- 1911, *Textes élamites-anzanites* (MDP 11), Paris.
- 1917, "Déchiffrement d'un document anzanite relatif aux présages," *RA* 14: 29-53.
- 1925, "Passim," *RA* 22: 141-162.
- 1927, "Carptim," *RA* 24: 31-48.
- SCHMIDT, E.F. 1957, *Persepolis II: Contents of the Treasury and Other Discoveries* (OIP 69), Chicago.
- STEVE, M.-J. 1986, "La fin de l'Élam: à propos d'une empreinte de sceau-cylindre," *StIr* 15: 7-21.
- 1987, *Nouveaux mélanges épigraphiques: inscriptions royales de Suse et de la Susiane* (MDP 53), Paris.
- 1988, "Le déterminatif masculin BE en néo-élamite et en élamite achéménide," *NABU* 1988.2: 23-4 (note 35).



- 1992, *Syllabaire élamite, histoire et paléographie* (Civilisations du Proche-Orient. Série 2. Philologie 1), Neuchâtel – Paris.
- STOLPER, M. W. 1984, “Political History,” in: E. Carter, E. & M.W. Stolper, *Elam: Surveys of Political History and Archaeology* (University of California Publications. Near Eastern Studies 25), Berkeley: 3-100.
- 1987-1990, “Mālamīr, B. Philologisch,” *RLA* 7: 276-281.
- TAVERNIER, J. 2003, “Drei altiranische Notizen,” in: A. Van Tongerloo (ed.), *Iranica Selecta: Studies in honour of Professor Wojciech Skalmowski on the occasion of his seventieth birthday* (Silk Road Studies 8), Turnhout: 247-256.
- THOMPSON, R.C. 1925, “The New Babylonian Empire,” *CAH* 3: 206-225.
- VALLAT, F. 1984, “Kidin-hutran et l’époque néo-élamite,” *Akkadica* 37: 1-17.
- 1993, *Les noms géographiques des sources suso-élamites* (RGTC 11), Wiesbaden.
- 1995, “Šutruk-Nahhunte, Šutur-Nahhunte et l’imbroglio néo-élamite,” *NABU* 1995.2: 37-8 (note 44).
- 1996a, “Nouvelle analyse des inscriptions néo-élamites,” in: H. Gasche & B. Hrouda (eds.), *Collectanea Orientalia. Histoire, Arts de l’espace et industrie de la terre: Études offertes en hommage à Agnès Spycket* (Civilisations du Proche-Orient, série 1: Archéologie et environnement 1), Neuchâtel: 385-395.
- 1996b, “Le royaume élamite de SAMATI,” *NABU* 1996.1: 21-2 (note 31).
- 1998a, “Le royaume élamite de Zamin et les “lettres de Ninive,” *IrAnt* 33: 95-106.
- 1998b, “Elam, I. The History of Elam,” *EncIr* 8: 301-312.
- 2002, Review of Waters 2000, *OLZ* 97: 372-376.
- WATERS, M.W. 2000, *A Survey of Neo-Elamite History* (SAAS 12), Helsinki.
- WEIDNER, E.F. 1939, “Jojachin, König von Juda, in babylonischen Keilschrifttexten,” in: *Mélanges syriens offerts à Monsieur René Dussaud par ses amis et ses élèves* (Haut-commissariat de la République française en Syrie et au Liban. Service des Antiquités. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 30). Paris: 923-935.



- WEISSBACH, F.H. 1894, *Neue Beiträge zur Kunde der susischen Inschriften* (ASGW Phil.-hist. Klasse 14/7), Leipzig.
- 1902. “Susische Thontäfelchen,” *BA* 4. 168-202.
- WISEMAN, D.J. 1956, *Chronicles of Chaldean Kings (626-556 B.C.) in the British Museum*. London.
- YUSIFOV, Y.B. 1963, “Зламские хозяйственные документы из Суз: транскрипция, перевод и комментарий,” *VDI* 85: 200-261.
- ZADOK, R. 1976, “On the Connections between Iran and Babylonia in the sixth Century,” *Iran* 14: 61-78.
- 1984, *The Elamite Onomasticon* (Istituto Universitario Orientale Napoli. Supplementi 40), Napoli.
- ZAWADZKI, S. 1988, *The Fall of Assyria and Median – Babylonian Relations in the Light of the Nabopolassar Chronicle* (Uniwersytet im Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, Serie Historia 149), Poznan.