

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

ELAM AND BABYLONIA

C. 1400–1100 BC

Ran Zadok

INTRODUCTION¹

During the period under discussion, Elam bordered on a unified Babylonia under the Kassite dynasty, unlike when the preceding period began, under the Kidinnuids (c. 1500–1400 BC), when Elam had two different political entities as western neighbours. At that time, central and northern Babylonia were ruled by the Kassites, while southern Babylonia was controlled by the so-called First Sealand Dynasty. Southern Babylonia was united with the rest of Babylonia in c. 1475 BC at the earliest (by Ulamburiaš son of Kaštiliaš III, see Brinkman 1993–1997: 6–7, cf. Gasche 2013: 72; Figure 1). The last ruler of the First Sealand Dynasty, Ea-gāmil, fled to Elam (see [Carter and] Stolper 1984: 32 with n. 244). The region ruled by the First Sealand Dynasty was then exposed to Elamite influence, as no barrier separated Susiana (modern Khuzestan) from the Sealand and adjacent regions to its west.

Elam was ruled by two dynasties during this period; first, the Ighalkids (c. 1400–1210 BC), followed by the Šutrukids (1210–sometime after 1120 BC). No dynasty is recorded thereafter until the 2nd half of the 8th century BC. At that time, Babylonia was under the longest-ruling dynasty in its history, viz. the Kassite one, until 1155 BC when its last member was deposed by the Šutrukid Kutir-Nahhunte. Several synchronisms between Kassite kings and the two Elamite dynasties can be established. Post-Kassite Babylonia was ruled by several successive dynasties. As in the preceding periods, the main arena of peaceful and military exchanges remained the central and southern sections of the Transstigridian corridor, especially the lower Diyāla basin, and the Zagros piedmont. The porous nature of the Elamite-Babylonian frontier in Rāši (modern Deh Luran) and Yamtūhal is a *longue durée* phenomenon. In the long run, neither Elam nor Babylonia enjoyed any significant territorial gains from their wars. An international trade route connected Elam and the central Zagros region, via the Transstigridian corridor and the Euphrates River, with the Mediterranean (see Boehmer and Dämmer 1985: 73).

Dynastic marriages concluded between both Elamite dynasties and the Kassite ruling house were aimed at keeping mutual peace between both kingdoms. The Ighalkid kings Pahir-iššan, Humban-numena I and Uruaš-Napiriša married the daughters of

Kurigalzu I and Burnaburiaš II, and Šutruk-Nahhunte I was married to Meli-Šihu's daughter (see van Dijk 1986: 163–166). The paradox is that these marriages eventually generated claims to the Babylonian throne by the Šutrukids, and these claims were the ultimate cause of military encounters.

The Elamite raids into the heart of Babylonia, including Babylon, had a religious dimension as well: the Šutrukids took with them to Susa the statue of the main Babylonian god Marduk. This statue was later returned to Babylonia by Nebuchadnezzar I who had temporarily conquered Susa. However, many artefacts, some of importance, like the Hammurabi code stele, remained in Susa until their discovery by modern excavators (for a detailed list see Potts 2016: 226–227).

Kassite Babylonia enjoyed a long rule under the Kassite dynasty, interrupted only by a short interval of Assyrian occupation (c. 1225–1219 BC), after which the Kassite dynasty was restored to power for several decades. Babylonia was united and controlled virtually all the alluvium. It enjoyed an effective central government with an economy dominated by the palatial sector, like most polities in the Near East and beyond during the age of international connections. Salient features are royal donations of land to senior functionaries and other prominent figures in order to secure their allegiance to the crown, and a certain degree of control over the temples. Regarding Elam, what appears on the surface is that it kept its federative structure, but this assumption is based only on the implication of the title “king of Anšan and Susa” borne by most Ighalkid and Šutrukid rulers.² This title was borrowed from the first Sukkalmahs, Ebarat II and Šilhaha (see Vallat 1980: 6), in order to legitimize the new ruling dynasty. Interestingly enough, the Šutrukid Šilhak-Inšušinak I lists the Sukkalmahs and Ighalkids as his predecessors, thereby skipping the Kidinnuids. The latter might not constitute a dynasty.

The title *li-ga-we ri-ša-lak-ki* (OE, ME *li-ku-me ri-ša-lak-ka* with variants), that is, “great for, over the kingdom” (see Anthonioz and Malbran-Labat 2013), which was first borne by Sive-palar-huhpak, king of Anšan, in the 18th century BC, became part of the titulary of the Ighalkid and Šutrukid kings (except for Kutir-Nahhunte) from the reign of Humban-numena I. The latter was the first ruler after Sive-palar-huhpak and Tempti-Akun, who used Elamite in his inscriptions.³ *Li-ga-we* “kingdom, realm”, being sacred, was considered a numen: it is recorded as the theophorous element of the anthroponym *Ku-nik-li-ga-we* from Susa as early as the Old Babylonian period (MDP 23 234, 35).

In truth, the actual relationship between both components, viz. Anšan and Susiana, and their administrative structure in this period, are unknown. Humban-numena I's titulary has *me-er-ri-ik*, *ka-at-ri* and *hal-me-ni-ik Ha-tam-ti-ik*, which may be rendered (approximately) as “sovereign, master and ruler of the country of Elam”.⁴ These titles precede *su-un-ki-ik* (cf. *An-za-an* (cf. *Šu-šu-un-ka* “king of Anšan and Susa” (König 1965: 37). Hence, it stands to reason that *Halhamti* “Elam” is a name covering both territorial components. The same applies to Šutruk-Nahhunte I's shorter titulary where *su-un-ki-ik* ^{cf.} *An-za-an* ^{cf.} *Šu-šu-un-ka* precedes *ka-at-ri* and *hal-me-ni-ik Ha-tam-ti-ik* (König 1965: 76:22). “Elam” as a name covering both territorial components is also extant in the formula (*insušinak*) *na-ap-pi-ip Ha-tam-ti-ip* [*na-a*] *p-pi-ip* ^{cf.} *An-ša-an-pi*, *na-ap-pi-ip* ^{cf.} *Šu-še-en-pi* “The deities of Elam, the deities of Anšan (and) the deities of Susa” in an inscription of Šilhak-Inšušinak I (König 1965: 125: 54, 20, see Vallat 1980: 4). Elam is juxtaposed with Susa in the formulae [*me*] *ni-ik*

Ha-tam-tik a-ak ^{ak}Šu-še-en-ki] “the ruler of Elam and Susa” and *me-ni-ib Ha-tam-ti-ib a-ak ba-la* ^{ak}Šu-še-en-ib “the rulers of Elam and the people of Susa” contained in other inscriptions of the same ruler (König 1965: 120ff.: 54, 2, 18).

Sources for the history of this period are both Babylonian and Elamite; the former written in Akkadian (very few in Sumerian) and the latter written mostly in Middle-Elamite (ME), early Neo-Elamite (NE) and Akkadian. The Elamite sources are all contemporary, except for the important Akkadian letter of a Šutrukid king (presumably Šutruk-Nahhunte I, c. 1190–1155 BC) to a Kassite king, which exists only in a Neo-Babylonian copy (cf. Paulus 2013: 429 with n. 11). Most of the Babylonian sources stem from the period under discussion, with the exception of several later chronicles. The Babylonian and Elamite sources are both royal inscriptions and economic documents. The Middle Babylonian economic documents originate mostly from Nippur and Ur, unearthed during excavations there. The majority of the Elamite sources were also discovered during excavations; most are royal inscriptions from the capitals of Susa and Al-Utraš-Napiriša. But unlike the preceding periods, when almost all the documentation stems from Susiana,⁵ most of the economic documents from Elam datable to this period are from Anšan (late ME tablets found during excavations in Tall-i-Malyān). The number of these economic documents is much lower than the comparable and relatively rich corpus from the preceding Kidinuid period. In addition, they are written in Elamite and their content is much less variegated than that of the mostly Akkadian documentation from the century of Kidinuid rule. The sizable economic documentation from Kapnak (Haft Tepe), which is exclusively Akkadian, spills over into the reign of the early Ighalkid Attar-kitrah (see De Graef 2013: 275).

The documentation from Ighalkid and Šutrukid Elam is almost devoid of religious-literary texts. This is only partially remedied by the numerous and partly elaborate Šutrukid royal inscriptions. The Ighalkid Humban-numena I was the first ruler who composed royal inscriptions in Middle-Elamite instead of Akkadian (the only four Old-Elamite royal inscriptions were written several hundred years earlier; cf. above). The basic type of the ME royal inscriptions is the building inscription. It starts with the presentation of the king (addressing himself in the first person), and his titles, e.g., *li-ba-ak ha-ni-ik* “beloved (or ‘chosen’) servant” of the tutelary deity, followed by a statement that the sanctuary of the deity is built for the king’s life, longevity and happy reign. The inscription ends with a prayer for the preservation of the renovated edifice (e.g. König 1965: 45: 7). The more elaborate inscriptions contain a longer tutelary, more prayers and detailed lists, but they rarely include any historical narrative. Vallat (1998: 308b) observes that Akkadian documents from the Ighalkids’ time are rare compared with the Elamite ones and “most [Akkadian texts] are only curses against those who might tamper with dedicated works, as if such outrages could come only from Mesopotamia. . . .” In my opinion, the fact that the curses warning those who intend to desecrate the monuments are in Akkadian even when the inscription itself is mostly in Elamite, proves that Akkadian was still widely spoken in certain parts of Susiana during the Ighalkid period. The curses were intended, in the first place, to warn the local population in their vernacular. The practice of composing the curses in Akkadian even when the inscription itself is in Elamite is recorded in Susiana as early as Puzur-Inšušinak’s reign (c. 2100 BC, De Graef 2013: 267–268, cf. Potts 2016: 113).

An Elamite inscription was added by Šutruk-Nahhunte I on a Babylonian boundary stone (*kuḫurru*), containing his titles, as well as a damaged laconic statement of his conquest of Babylonia (Paulus 2014: 422–423: MŠ 6). He had erased the inscriptions on Mesopotamian votive gifts (explicitly of Maništušu originally) and replaced them with his own votive inscription for his god Inšušinak (see Braun-Holzinger 1991: 220, 222, cf. Paulus 2013: 439–440 with n. 109).

THE IGHALKIDS (1400–1210 BC)

According to a passage of a historical epic embedded in the non-contemporary source of “Chronicle P”, Kurigalzu I, king of Babylonia (c. 1400, certainly before 1369 BC), defeated king Hurba-tia of Elam (Steve, Vallat and Gasche 2002–2003: 457, *pace* Gaassan 1986: 188, *Elammat* is not to be dissociated from Elam), who invaded Babylonia as far as the lower Diyāla basin (near Dūr-Šulgi in the region of Ešnunna). Kurigalzu I raided Susa and Elam as far as the border of Marhaši according to a fragmentary inscription on a statuette from Susa. This defeat coincides with the demise of the Kidinuid rule. It may in fact be the reason for the emergence of the Ighalkid dynasty, in which case the Ighalkids owe their rule to the Kassite dynasty of Babylonia (see Fuchs 2011: 241–242). No wonder, then, that this was followed by a period of intermarriage and cooperation between Kassite Babylonia and the Ighalkids. The mutual relations between both kingdoms determined the fate of their dynasties. From the depiction in “Chronicle P”, which is a non-contemporary and eclectic source, actually it is not clear whether the defater of Hurba-tia is Kurigalzu I or II (1327–1303 BC). Paulus (2013: 442–444) suggests that it may be Kurigalzu II (see already [Carter and] Stolper 1984: 35, 234) rather than Kurigalzu I, but this would place Hurba-tia within the reign of Utraš-Napiriša (c. 1340–1300 BC).

Pahir-iššan (c. 1380–1370 BC) and his brother Attar-kitrah were sons of Ighalki. The latter left an Akkadian inscription at Deh-i-Now in Susiana, where he dedicated a temple to the goddess Mazzât (see Vallat 1980: 7). Vallat (1998: 308b) regards Mazzât as an Anšanite deity. In fact, this goddess was popular in Susiana during the Old-Babylonian period.⁶ Attar-kitrah’s son, Humban-numena I (c. 1370–1340 BC), built a temple at Livan. The relationship (if any) of the Šutrukids to the Ighalkids is not known and cannot be proved (see Steve, Vallat and Gasche 2002–2003: 464, who present the case for continuity). The fact that Šilhak-Inšušinak I claims that Humban-numena I was a descendant of the early Sukkalmah Šilhaha may be of relevance here. Given the long chronological gap, the claim is in all probability merely propagandistic. It is analogous to that of the ruler of Sühu in the mid-8th century BC, who boasts that he is a distant offspring (*līḫu rīḫū*) of Tunamissah “descendant of Hammurabi” (see Cavigneaux and Ismail 1990: 328–329 *ad* 341, 411:1, 11–14). Humban-numena I’s son, Utraš-Napiriša (c. 1340–1300 BC), built a new capital, Al-Utraš-Napiriša (later Dūr-Utraš), modern Chogha Zanbil, 40 km. southeast of Susa. The reasons for the transfer of the capital from Susa are not known. At the beginning, Inšušinak was the main deity there, but later on he was the second member of the divine pair Napiriša and Inšušinak. The foundation of the temple city Al-Utraš-Napiriša was an innovative project. This marks a change in the cult (see Álvarez-Mon 2013a: 226–227), but a certain continuity is remarkable. The Akkadian terminology persisted in the latter half of the 2nd millennium BC, when the rulers of Elam started writing their

inscriptions in Middle Elamite. One encounters Akkadian loanwords for sacred edifices in Middle Elamite: *kukunnu* “ziqurrat”, *alimeli* “acropolis” (where the temple was located), (*kunbunni kidiya* “external chapel”. Is the lack of Elamite terminology for certain sacred edifices due to the Elamite tradition of outdoor sanctuaries? It should be remembered that shrines in OB Susa bore Sumero-Akkadian names and the terminology of sacred edifices was Akkadian. In addition, several temples in early Susa were sponsored and renovated by Mesopotamian conquerors (notably Sulgi) as well as by the princess Me-Kutbi from Ešnunna (see Álvarez-Mon 2013a: 221–222). The Akkadian terms persisted, like that for “priest” *pašišu* (lit. “anointed”, see Vallat 2003: 531, 541). Elamite inscriptions of Untaš-Napiriša contain not only Akkadian loanwords, but also such epithets.⁷ In addition, the Mesopotamian deities Dumuzi > Damuzi, Beler-āli, Bellili, Adad and Šala were worshipped in ME Al-Untaš-Napiriša. Steve, Vallat and Gasche (2002–2003: 464–465) cautiously suggest that the Kassite princesses who married Ighalkid kings introduced the cult of Mesopotamian deities to Al-Untaš-Napiriša. However, it should not be forgotten that most of these deities were worshipped in Susiana since the Sargonic, Ur III, OB and early MB (Kidinnid) periods. The theonyms Ikiša and Šala are still recorded as theophorous elements in anthroponyms from late ME Tall-i-Malyān.

Untaš-Napiriša led construction projects in other sites of Susiana, as well as in Huhnur (modern Tepe Bormi, see Mófidi-Nasrabadi 2005).

It seems that the diplomatic marriages contributed to peaceful relations between Elam and Babylonia at that time. Untaš-Napiriša might have raided a certain region, but its location is not clear as the relevant passage is damaged (the only name mentioned is [xxx]-li-ia-šū),⁸ it is at most an isolated episode. There is no information about activities and events in the time of Untaš-Napiriša’s son, Unpahaš-Napiriša, as well as the kings who followed him, viz. Kitin-Hurran II and Napiriša-untaš.

Elamite archers are recorded at Harbē in the upper Jazira in the time of Tukulti-Ninurta I, king of Assyria (1243–1207 BC). It can be surmised that they were brought there by this Assyrian conqueror of Babylonia as prisoners of war together with the Babylonians (“Kassites”), who are also recorded there at that time (see Jakob 2009: 17–18 and Zadok 2012: 575–576 with n. 47). In this case, it can be argued that the Elamites were the Babylonians’ allies in their war against the Assyrian king. Given the fact that the Ighalkids were related to the ruling dynasty of Babylonia, it is understandable why they continued their struggle against the Assyrian rule over Babylonia. The Ighalkids (like their Šutrukid successors, cf. below) in all probability considered themselves legitimate heirs to the Babylonian crown after Babylonia had lost its independence. The last Ighalkid, Kitin-Hurran III, fought against Illi-nādin-šumi, the Babylonian king who was Assyria’s vassal (1219 BC), from c. 1225 BC. He took Der and Nippur, and deposed Illi-nādin-šumi. Later on, Kitin-Hurran III attacked Adad-šuma-iddina (1217–1212 BC), another king of Babylonia who was Assyria’s vassal. He conquered Isin and Marad (west of Nippur). No Assyrian anti-Elamite reaction is recorded, presumably because Tukulti-Ninurta I was murdered and Assyria entered a period of instability.

The glyptic of the later Ighalkids (after Untaš-Napiriša) does not resemble that of Kassite Babylonia, in contrast to that of their predecessors which was “pseudo-Kassite” in style (see Neumann 2013: 92–93, cf. McCarthy and Hill 2009: 304–308, esp. 308). There is a restricted similarity between glyptic from mid-2nd millennium Iran (practically Elam) and Bahrain (see McCarthy and Hill 2009: 304–305).

The intimate relations between the Kassite dynasty of Babylonia and Elam under the Kidinnids, Ighalkids and Šutrukids facilitated the adoption of a basic notion of Elamite royal ideology, viz. *kitin* (> Akkad. *kidinnu*) “divine protection, god-given royal power” (see Leemans 1946; CAD K: 342–344 with further lit.).

THE ŠUTRUKIDS (C. 1210–SOMETIME AFTER 1120 BC)

Hallurtuš-Inšušinak, father of Šutruk-Nahhunte I and Šilhak-Inšušinak I, did not leave any inscriptions. His relationship to his predecessors is not recorded. It is not known whether he was king. Šutruk-Nahhunte I might have made Susa the capital again: he brought to Susa a stele of Untaš-Napiriša from Al-Untaš-Napiriša⁹ and a stele of an unknown king from Anšan (see [Carter and] Stolper 1984: 39). Inšušinak, the main deity of Susa, was the tutelary god of the Šutrukid dynasty; the sungod Nahhunte also occupied a prominent place in the dynasty’s pantheon (cf., e.g., Šilhak-Inšušinak *hu-un-te-ek ba-te-ek Nab-hu-un-te-ek* || *ha-ni-ik dIn-šiu-ša-na-ak-[ki]*, “Š., subject of Nahhunte, beloved of Inšušinak”, König 1965: 114: 48b, 2). Šilhak-Inšušinak I renovated 20 temples in Susiana (and possibly beyond it), including several sanctuaries of Inšušinak (König 1965: 110–112: 48, for a list of temples in Susa see Potts 2016: 231).

Military campaigns in the west

Šutruk-Nahhunte I controlled vast territories in Elam. The Šutrukids explicitly considered themselves legitimate heirs to the Babylonian crown, according to the above-mentioned letter. Therefore, Šutruk-Nahhunte I invaded Babylonia towards the end of his reign. First, he took away the lower Diyāla basin (ME *šumruk*, perhaps a reminiscence of the long extinct polity of early OB Ešnunna) from the Kassites. Thereafter, Šutruk-Nahhunte I defeated Zababa-šuma-iddina, the penultimate king of the Kassite dynasty (in 1158 BC, see [Carter and] Stolper 1984: 40; Fuchs 2011: 255). In the same year, the Assyrian king Aššur-dan I exploited the opportunity and conquered Zabban, Irīya (Irē’a) and Ugar-Sallu (Grayson, *Chronicles*: 162:117). However, the Assyrian territorial gains were ephemeral. Šutruk-Nahhunte I’s son, Šilhak-Inšušinak I, conquered Ugar-Sallu, Nuzi, Arapha, Hapate (east of Nuzi) perhaps as far as the banks of the Little Zab (see Potts 2016: 233–2238) implicitly from the Assyrians. A partial itinerary can be composed on the basis of three unpublished inscriptions of Šilhak-Inšušinak I: Mār-Irīya¹⁰ → Lubdu → Ugar-Sallu → Pīasqu (ME ^{AP}Pī-las-ka₄ pu-ul-ku, see Vallat 1993: 217, s.v. Pīazkapulku). Accordingly, the Elamite king advanced from south to north. In Fuchs’s opinion, the Diyāla basin remained under Elamite control in the time of Kurir-Nahhunte, Šutruk-Nahhunte I’s son and successor. It served as a springboard for the conquest of the rest of Babylonia by Kurir-Nahhunte’s brother and successor, Šilhak-Inšušinak I.

Šutruk-Nahhunte I’s son, Kurir-Nahhunte (1155–1150 BC), deposed and deported to Elam the last king of the Kassite dynasty, Illi-nādin-ahi (1157–1155 BC). His brother, Šilhak-Inšušinak I (1150–1120 BC), conquered 15 regions (A–O below) with at least 211 settlements, not only in eastern Babylonia but also in the hill country between Babylonia and Assyria in the northeast, where he annexed territory conquered earlier by Assyria from Babylonia. The list of these numerous settlements is

embedded in a royal inscription (König 1965: 128–130; §4: §§25, 27, 29, 32, 35, 37, 40, 43, 45, 47, 50, 52, 55, 58, 61). Each paragraph consists of a list of locales and a statement about setting a total number of *si-ild* (meaning unclear, König 1965: 127f.) translated it as “district” whereas Hinz and Koch 1987: 1072 rendered it as “statue”) and the installment of a governor in an administrative centre. Unfortunately, this statement is severely damaged in most paragraphs. Likewise, the names of most settlements (133 out of 211 = 63.03%) are either entirely broken or severely damaged, only 78 toponyms (36.97%) are fully preserved or slightly damaged. Each of the 15 paragraphs is preceded by a prayer. A detailed annotated chart with identifications is offered by Potts (2016: 235–238). The following list is based on it:

A (§25)

1. [..].] 2. [..].] 3. Bīr ([^{as}pi-it]-l...].] 4. [..].] 5. [..].] a-ti; 6. [..].]

B (§27, Uḡār-Sallu and Ebeḥ: Ú-ka -ar-si-ila-am-ni E-pe-eh)

1. [..].] e-a; 2. [..].] un-nu; 3. Ša-Šilitu (^{as}ša-ši-it-tu₄); perhaps it is based on Kass. *šil* (cf. Balkan 1954: 81 and Hölscher 1996: 209a, s.v. *šil*); 4. [..].] 5. ^{as}Ša-*Pe-el*-l...].] 6. [B]īr ([^{as}pi-it]-*Pu-li*-l...].]

C (§29)

1. [..].] -ti; 2. ^{as}[..].] 3. [..].] 4. Šenkuru (^{as}še-en-ku-ru); it is not identical with Zi-ni-ki-ri (*pace* Scheil, MDP 23 164), for *še-en* cf. perhaps Kass. PN *Šen-Sab* and for *-ku-ru* Kass. *kuri* (Balkan 1954: 66, 80); 5. ^{as}Ša-l...].] 6. [..].] 7. [Bīr-Nap]pāhē ([^{as}pi-it Na-al-pa-ni-e), Akkad; perhaps = halzi Nappāhi in the Nuzi region (Fincke 1993: 182, cf. Potts 2016: 235); 8. ^{as}Ku-ur-l...].] 9. [..].] 10. Ša-immerē (^{as}ša-i-mi-ri-e) “(the place) of the asses”, Akkad; the identification with Imēri in the Nuzi region (Fincke 1993: 117) is unlikely as the latter is in the singular form; 11. ^{as}Ita-...].] 12. [..].] 13. [..].] -ki-ite-ek-ku; 14. ^{as}[..].] 15. [..].] 16. [B]īr-l[ā]lgiri ([^{as}pi-it-n[a]-ki-ru, Akkad); 17. ^{as}Ša-l...].] 18. [..].] 19. [Bīr-P]lannu ([^{as}pi-it²-p[il]-[a]-an-tu₄), Kassite (see Balkan 1954: 76, 92); 20. ^{as}[..].] 21. [..].]

D (§32)

1. Ša-barbari (^{as}ša-ba-ar-ba-ri) “(the place) of the wolf” (or “of B”, cf. Hölscher 1996: 47a, s.v. *Barbaru*, Akkad.); 2. ^{as}Ša-al-ta-l...].] 3. ^{as}Ša-^{mx}-l...].] namkari (na-an-ka-ri), Akkad, “irrigation canal”; 4. [..].] 5. Bīr-...].] (^{as}pi-it-...].] 6. Bīr-l-...].] ([^{as}pi]-it-...].] 7–8. 2 ^{as}Ša-l...].] 9. [..].]

E (§35)

1. Sillam (^{as}i-el-la-al-m], *pace* Frayne 1992: 56, nor Tall as-Slema which is in all probability Awal); 2. [..].] 3. Bīr-[DN] ([^{as}pi-it-^d]-l...].] 4. Dumnu ([^{as}tu-un-ni), Akkad, *dumnu* “fort, fortified area”; 5. ^{as}Ar-ti-l...].] 6. Bīr(^{as}pi-it)-l...].] a] r-ti-ka₄; 7. ^{as}Ša-Pu-ut-l...].] 8. ^{as}Ša-m^l-l...].] 9. Marku (^{as}ma-ar-ku)-l...].] 10. [..].] 11. [..].] -pi-ši-l...].] 12. ^{as}Ša-Si-l...].] 13. [..].] 14. Bīr-Sim-erba (^{as}pi-it-⁹XXXX-i-ri-ba, Akkad, cf. Hölscher 1996: 187a); 15. [..].] 16. Bīr-Kadašman ([^{as}pi-it-ka₄-ta-aš-ma-an, Kass., see Balkan 1954: 92), possibly in the Trans-tigrdian region (see Brinkman 1968: 258, n. 1641).

F (§37)

1. Ašuhaš (^{as}a₂-šu-ha-š) — perhaps Ašūhiš of MB Nuzi (see Potts 2016: 234–235; south of Arrapha, see Fincke 1993: 57–58 with lit.); 2. Bīr-Lassi? (^{as}pi-it-la-as-si-it₂); 3. [^{as}Ša-l-...].] 4. [B]īr-l-Sim-šemi ([^{as}pi-it-l²-XXXX-š-emi, Akkad, cf. Hölscher 1996: 192a); 5. Bīr-elle (^{as}pi-it-e-el-li-e) “the place of princes, lords” (Akkad); 6. [..].] šla²-a-a; 7. Marka (^{as}ma-at-ka₄ = ~ (“Ma²-at-qa) of MB Nuzi (see Vallat 1993: 179–180). Heimperl (2009: 28), who identifies Marka (Ur III Madga) with Hīr (cf. Zadok 2014b), states that Madga is not recorded after the Ur III period. He does not take into account the occurrence of Marka in the Nuzi corpus and in the inscription of Šilhak-Inšuinak I MB/ME Marka may be located near modern Kiri or Tāze Ĥur-mati (on the ‘Aḡem river). The distance from Umma to the Kiri region is only slightly more than that from Umma to Hīr. Madga-bound boats (see the thorough discussion of Heimperl 2009: 33, n. 16; 35–36 and *passim*) could have reached Marka, which was situated near a river and a canal (see Fincke 1993: 176). Gudea imported from Madga not only bitumen but also limestone and gypsum, materials which are found in the hill country around Kirkuk. The Sumerians brought dates to Madga, fruits which are not commercially grown in that hill country. 8. Ša(-)Hāla (^{as}ša-ha-a-la), tentatively Šehala of MB Nuzi (see Potts 2016: 234, the forms are different); cf. the Kassite theonym *Hala* = Gula, which is recorded as a theophorous element (Balkan 1954: 106, cf. 47); 9. Appi-šimperi (^{as}ap-pi-ši-ni-pe-ti) apparently contains Akkad. *šimperi* “two-thirds”; the initial component is *appu* “spur of land (made artificially), causeway, bund” (CAD B: 189, s.v. *appu* A, 3, where the measures of these earthworks are indicated); 10. Ša-Arad-ekalli (^{as}ša-ARAD-e-gal-li, Akkad) is not identical with Ekalli near Nuzi (cautiously suggested by Potts 2016: 236); 11. Kiprat (^{as}ki-p-ra-rt) “Kipi near Nuzi (Fincke 1993: 146–147)?” (Potts 2016: 234). However, the ending (-*art*) is different.

G (§40)

Administrative centre: 1. [..].] -til-la, perhaps Ihi-tilla (Fincke 1993: 125). The latter was linked to Al-ilāni = Arrapha (see Zaccagnini 1979: 164). It apparently ends with Hur. *-tilla* (cf. Gellb et al. 1943: 267, like the toponyms Iriri-tilla and Tupki-tilla (Fincke 1993: 124, 301–302). Tilla was a fortified town and one of the cultic centres of the district of Arrapha (see Fincke 1993: 293–294); 2. Arrapha (^{as}ar-ra-*ap*-ha); 3–4. Nuzi (2 ^{as}nu-ú-za) — It is probably implied here that this important town consists of two sections. In fact, Nuzi and Anzukkalli formed one administrative unit (see Fincke 1993: 199); 5. ^{as}[^d]-...].] 6. [..].] 7. Hapare (^{as}ha-an-ba-re-e); 8. ^{as}Ti-tū²-l...].] 9. [..].] 10. Ša-niše (^{as}ša-ni-še-e) should be differentiated from MB Nuzi Šimše (differently Potts 2016: 236).

H (§43)

1. [..].] 2. [..].] 3. [..].] 4. [..].] 5. [..].] 6. [..].] 7. [..].] 8. ^{as}[^d]-...].] 9. [..].] 10. [^{as}xx-ba-[x]-hi; 11. ^{as}Ša-l...].] 12. [..].] 13. Dumnātu (^{as}tu-un-na-ti), presumably “inferior quality” (NB); 14. [..].] 15. [..].] 16. [Š]ja-Hanta ([^{as}š]

a-ha-an-ra, non-Sem., cf. Gelb et al. 1943: 213b, s.v. *hanna*; 17. [Bīr-] [ʔi-] [f-...]: 18. [...]: 19. [Bīr-t-rē-ē] rabū [ʔi-ʔi-r-i-e-ra-rap-pi], i.e. “Great Bīr-rē-ē” implying the existence of a settlement Bīr-rē-ē šehru “Little Bīr-rē-ē” (cf. below, I, 12–13).

I (§45)

1. Bīr-Bahē (^{ʔi-ʔi-ti}ba-hi-e) cf. Hölscher 1996: 43–44, s.v. Bahū; 2. ^{ʔi-ʔi}Ma-Ku-ūš- [...]: 3. [...]: 4. Ša-Burna-mašum (^{ʔi-ʔi}bu-ur-na-ma-aš-hu-um, Kass., see Balkan 1954: 99; Akkadianized form of *Burna-mašū* > *Burna-mašū*, cf. Hölscher 1996: 57a); 5. ^{ʔi-ʔi}Ma-l-...]: 6. [Bīr-] [ʔi-ʔi-r-i-ʔi-ʔi-tar] is not necessarily identical with Bīr-štar in the Zagros (*Pace* König 1965: 128, n. 7 *ad loc.*); 7. Hurātu (^{ʔi-ʔi}hu-ra-tu), perhaps Akkad. (cf. Ahw: 358a); 8. Iširtu ša Adad (^{ʔi-ʔi}ši-ri-tu ša ^{ʔi-ʔi}Ma x) “sanctuary of Adad” or “decury of Adad-x” (Akkad.); 9. [...]: 10. Ša-Anpima (^{ʔi-ʔi}sa-an-pi-ma), perhaps < *Appi-ma with dissimilation of *appi*; 11. Hurāt (^{ʔi-ʔi}hu-ra-at)^dŠa-r-i-e-GUD? (cf. 7 above?); 12. [Bīr-] [dūti rabū (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-ri-ru-ti GAL), “residence of the crown prince; administrative centre”, Akkad.; originally a royal estate (the great and the little one are juxtaposed, 13 below, cf. CAD R: 328a, s.v. *ridānu* in *bīr* -, c); 13. Bīr-riddūti šehru (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-ri-tu-ti TMM); 14. [Kijim?]-Sin [^{ʔi-ʔi}ki?]-te-en-^dXXX), cf. Hölscher 1996: 122–1123, s.v. Kidim-Sin (with an the Elamite predicative element borrowed in Akkadian); 15. Bīr (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it)-It-ra-tu-?]; 16. Rēšu (^{ʔi-ʔi}e-šu) “top, summit” (Akkad.); 17. Bīr-Rigim-Adad (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-ʔi-ri-ki-im-^{ʔi-ʔi}M, cf. Hölscher 1996: 177b, s.v., Akkad.); 18–19. Bīr-Muqīya (2 ^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-mu-gi-ia), Akkad.

J (§47, Turun Ebēh)

administrative centre: Alman = Halman, Medieval (Classical Arab) *Hulwān*, modern Sarpol Zohāb, on a tributary of the Diyāla (= Turun), southeast of Jabal Ḥammīn (= Ebēh, see Nashef 1982a: 15, 115). ^{ʔi-ʔi}Ha-al-ma-an is recorded in another inscription of Šilhak-Inšūšimak I, which also lists [^{ʔi-ʔi}Uš-mar-ma-za-ah (apparently with Kass. – *Sab*) as well as ^{ʔi-ʔi}Pi-ri (= Bīr) Pu-ul-zu-šu and ^{ʔi-ʔi}Li-ip-tu (Akkad. “craft creation” or a variant of *lappu* “turnip”, König 1965: 133: 54b: 1, 4, cf. CAD L: 200–202, s.vv. *lappu* A, B, the latter was eaten together with *su-un-gi-ra*, which looks like an originally Elamite phytonym, viz. *sunke-r*; for the naming cf. Gk. *ρασυκόν* “basil, ocimum basilicum”, but this does not prove that *sungrā* is the same plant as basil).

K (§50)

1. Nahiš-bararē (^{ʔi-ʔi}na-hi-ša-ra-ri-e), the initial component is perhaps either Akkad. *nabiš*- or < Kass. *nabzi* (cf. Hölscher 1996: 146); 2. ^{ʔi-ʔi}Ba-ra-si-...]: 3. [...]: 4. Ša-Hilik (^{ʔi-ʔi}ša-hi-ik); 5. Ša-Pāluhu (^{ʔi-ʔi}ša-ba-li-hu), cf. Hölscher 1996: 166a, s.v. *Pāluhu*, Akkad.); 6. ^{ʔi-ʔi}Ma-an-l-...]: 7. [Mu]rarrāš [^{ʔi-ʔi}mu-ri-ara-taš, Kass., see Balkan 1954: 98]; 8. Dunnu (^{ʔi-ʔi}du-un-nu), Akkad. (cf. E, 4 above); 9. Bīr-Uzāli? [^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-za-li-?], perhaps Akkad. (cf. Hölscher 1996: 233a, s.v. *Uzālu*); 10. Bīr-Hānibi (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-ha-ni-pi), cf. Hölscher 1996: 80–81, s.v. *Hānibu*, Akkad.; 11. Ša-Kūbiya (^{ʔi-ʔi}ša-ku-pi-ia) contains a hypocoristic of Akkad. *kūbu(m)*, cf. *Kūbu-illassu*, -*īriš* (Hölscher 1996: 125b); 12–14.

Bīrāni (3 ^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-ra-ti) [ša...] “households” (Akkad.), apparently three conglomerates of (Kassite?) kin-based groups; 15. [^{ʔi-ʔi}x-š-i-ib-a; 16. Bīr-Naḡīya (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-ri-na-gi-ia), probably to Akkad. *naḡā*, cf. Nagutu /Nāgūtū/ (Hölscher 1996: 145b); 17. Ša-Kattar-Sah (^{ʔi-ʔi}ša-ka-at-tar-za-na, Kass., see Balkan 1954: 99); 18. [...]: 19. [Duh]ub(puna?) [^{ʔi-ʔi}dū?]-hū-bu-pu-na) has nothing to do with NA Dībna (cf. Vallat 1993: 58 with lit.); 20. Ana-hurtaš (^{ʔi-ʔi}a-na-ah-hu-taš, Elam., see Zadok 1984: 611; 14:56); 21. Bīr-Sin-šimanni (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-^dXXX-š-im-an-ni), Akkad. (cf. Hölscher 1996: 189a); 22. [Bīr-] [Silīya (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-si-li-ia), probably Hurrian (cf. Hölscher 1996: 184a, s.vv. *Sih*, *Sif-Tašūb*); 23. Ša-sahmi (^{ʔi-ʔi}ša-za-ab-mi), cf. Akkad. *sabmu* “crushed?” and as a toponymic term at Nuzi (CAD S: 66); 24. Bīr-Ša-ilt (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-ša-il-ti-l-...]), if complete, cf. Akkad. anthroponym *Ša-ilti* (Hölscher 1996: 200b); 25. [Bīr-] [Hubbani (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-hu-up-ba-ni < Elam. theonym *Humban* (cf. Zadok 1984: 11–13:48); 26. Ša-Marrāza (^{ʔi-ʔi}ša-mar-az-za).

L (§52)

1. ^{ʔi-ʔi}Ša-ik-la-x?-a-i; 2. Ša-Šangbar[?] (^{ʔi-ʔi}ša-ša-an-gi-ba-ri-[?]), non-Sem.; 3. Dimti-Ili-erīš (^{ʔi-ʔi}ti-i-n-tu-i-ri-ri-š), Akkad. (cf. below, 6 and Hölscher 1996: 93b, s.v. *Li-erīš*); 4. Bīr-Mātinu (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-ri-ma-ti-mu); 5. [Bīr-] [Lā-qīpu (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-la-ki-pu), Akkad. (cf. Hölscher 1996: 131a, s.v.); 6. Dimtu (^{ʔi-ʔi}ti-in-tu), “watch-tower, fortified dwelling” Akkad.; 7. Bīr-Rigim-Adad (cf. I, 17 above); 8. [...]: 9. Bīr-Tamīya (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-a-am-te-ia); Tamīya may be based on Kass. *Tamdit* (cf. Balkan 1954: 83 and Hölscher 1996: 217a, s.v. *Tamti-Štartā*); 10–12. Harbātu (3 ^{ʔi-ʔi}ha-ar-ba-tu) “deserted, abandoned lands” (Akkad.); 13. [^{ʔi-ʔi}x]-ur-ku-up-pu-uh-ti; 14. Bīr-Šumaliya (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-^{ma}-šū-ma-li-ia), contains the Kassite theonym *Šumaliya* (see Balkan 1954: 92); 15. [...]: 16. Bīr-Task-šarri (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-a-sak-LUGAL); 17. Bīr(^{ʔi-ʔi}...)-[š]-š-i-hū(-)...]: 18. [...]: 19. Ša-Burra-hurra (^{ʔi-ʔi}ša-bu-ur-ra-hu-ur-ta), apparently hybrid, Kass., *burra* < *burru*- (see Balkan 1954: 99) and Elam. *-hurta* (Zadok 1984: 1456); 20. ^{ʔi-ʔi}Uz-zīf-...]: 21. [...]: 22. Bīr-Barbari (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-ba-ar-ba-ri), “wolf’s place” (or “B’s place”, Akkad., cf. above, D, 1); 23. [...]: 24. ^{ʔi-ʔi}URU?-ka-4-pu-lu (*kaphu* is perhaps Hurrian, cf. Richter 2016: 151).

M (§55)

Administrative centre: 1. [^{ʔi-ʔi}xx]-[i]-i-ka-at-tar; it apparently ends in Kass. *katār* (cf. Balkan 1954: 63, 98, 159; for the spelling cf. *Ka-at-tar-za-ab*, above, K, 17); 2. [Bīr-] [Lilala (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-ki-li-la-la); 3. ^{ʔi-ʔi}Za-ka-l-...]: 4. [...]: 5. [Bīr-] [e-Naggāri (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-na-an-ga-ri, Akkad.); 6. Bīr-...]: 7. [^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-...] URU? [...]: 8. [^{ʔi-ʔi}x]-š-i-l-ti, cf. perhaps Hur *šilt* (Gelb et al. 1943: 255a); 8. Damsilam (^{ʔi-ʔi}ta-an-si-la-am); 9. ^{ʔi-ʔi}l-... -ti-lu-ka-ar-l-...]: 10. [Bīr-] [Kānabereya (^{ʔi-ʔi}x-ka-an-ba-re-ia), *kan* < *abpat* (Kass. ?); 11. Bīr(^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it)-š-i-l-...]: 12. ^{ʔi-ʔi}ša-l-...]: 13. Bīr-Kunzubani (^{ʔi-ʔi}pi-it-ku-un-zu-ba-ti), Kass. ? (for *kunzi* see Richter 2016: 447 with n. 461, who quotes Jaritz 1957: 87–8 and for *bati* Balkan 1954: 98 *ad Kiam-bate*); 14. ^{ʔi-ʔi}A-ta-l-...]: 15. Puhutu (^{ʔi-ʔi}pu-hu-tu) may be a hypocoristic of a compound anthroponym with Akkad. *pūhu* “substitute”; 16. Nakapu (^{ʔi-ʔi}na-ka-pu) is probably the same place as OB ^{ʔi-ʔi}Na-ka-bu-um (Abdi and Beckman 2007: 55–56, 81: 20, 1, 10’), cf. perhaps Akkad.

naga/bpu, nakāpu A, B (CAD N/1: 105, 156-159) and NA Nakkapu (extant in the gentilic Nak-kap-A+A), which is mentioned together with Bt-Sangbuti and according to Streck (1998-2001) was perhaps located in the Zagros; 17. ^{ak}Za-al-l[a-...].] cf. perhaps Za-al-l[...], which is mentioned in the same document as Na-ka-b/pu-um (Abdi and Beckman 2007: 55-56, 81: 20, i, 16); (18. ^{ak}Ki-x-šun; 19. Bt-rāpiqi (^{ak}pi-ta-ra-ap-i-ku(-l...)) is hardly identical with *Rāpiqu* in northwestern Babylonia (cf. Brinkman 1968: 127, n. 748; Vallat 1993: 47 with lit.); *rāpiqu* is an active participle of *rapāqu* 'to hoe, break up the (uncultivated) soil, dig up (weeds)'. The verb is recorded in OB and MB (CAD R: 150) and hence it can potentially produce toponyms in 2nd millennium Babylonia, in which case a quasi-homonym of the town in northwestern Babylonia might have existed in northeastern Babylonia.

N (§58)

1. Kitan (^{ak}Ki-ta-an) is very probably identical with OB ^{um}Ki-da-an^{ki}, which is mentioned in an administrative document from Chogha Gavanah (Abdi and Beckman 2007: 55-56, 81: 20, i, 8), two lines before ^{um}Na-ka-b/pu-um (N, 16 above), cf. the UR III ruler's name *Ki-da-ni-lu-ša-ri-ti-bu-am^{ku}* (= *Šurubum*, Šaripum and perhaps *lu-ša-ri-ti-tu¹⁰*) (DÜ)^{ki}, Edard and Farber 1974: 177-178, 187, s.v. Šurubum, cf. Sigrist 2000, 1: 63, 7) near Sašrum = Šušarra, modern Šemšarra, in the piedmont of the central Zagros. *Šu-tu-ut-bi-im* is recorded in a document from OB Šemšarra (Eidem and Laessle 2001, 41, 4) and is extant in ^{ak}Ni-ti-pu-ni *Šu-tu-tu⁴-ha* (< Akkad. *Nētebu ša Šurubhi 'the pass of Š', which is mentioned in another inscription of Šilhak-Inšūinak [1: 2. ^{ak}l...].] 3. Nār-[Š]llam (^{ak}na-ar-[š-i]l-la-am); 4. ^{ak}l...].] 5. Bt[-x]haru (^{ak}pi-lt-xi-ha-tu⁴); 6. ^{ak}Na-l...].] 7. Bt-[DN]-napšira (^{ak}pi-lt-xi-na-ap-šir-a), Akkad. (cf. *Nasšku*, *Šm*- and *Šmas-napšina*, Hölscher 1996: 164b, 191, 204a); 8. [...].] 9. Bt-Ummašap (^{ak}pi-lt-um²?URU?-na-ša-ap); 10. ^{ak}l...].] 11-12. 2. ^{ak}l...].] 13. Harab/p (^{ak}ha-ra-AB); 14. ^{ak}l...].] 15. Bt-[l]qiš?-Adad (^{ak}pi-lt-[?]-kiš²-l[M], Akkad., cf. *lqiša-Adad* (Hölscher 1996: 104-105); 16. [...].] 17. Bt-[A]muri? (^{ak}pi-lt-a²-nu-ur-ti); perhaps Akkad. (for MB *Amuru*-names cf. Hölscher 1996: 30-31); 18. [...].] 19. Bt[-K]ilakl...].] (^{ak}pi-lt-ki-la-ak-l...].], perhaps Elam. *ki-lak* (cf. Zadok 1984: 20: 97b).

O (§61)

- Administrative centre: 1. ^{ak}Š[...].] 2. [...].] 3. Kulana (^{ak}ku-la-a-na); 4. [...].] 5. Bt (^{ak}pi-lt-l...].] 6. [...].] 7. Bt[-...].] (^{ak}pi-lt-l...].]).

Regarding linguistic affiliation (with various degrees of plausibility), 43 out of 78 (55.12%) toponyms are purely Akkadian, but most of the 35 remaining ones are hybrid, as they begin with Akkad. *bṭ* or *ša*. An additional toponym is probably Akkadian with a non-Semitic suffix (F, 1) due to linguistic interference. The homonymous settlements (E, 4, K, 8 and J, 17, L, 7) are Akkadian. The second largest group is Kassite, but with just 12-14 toponyms (17.94-15.38%) it lags far behind the Akkadian group. Moreover, only three toponyms (3.84%) are purely Kassite (C, 4, K, 7 and M, 1). The remainder are hybrid, as they begin with Akkad. *bṭ*- or *ša*- (B, 3, C, 19, E, 16,

E, 8, I, 4, K, 17, L, 9, 14, M, 13). One toponym is either Akkadian or Kassite (K, 1), and another one is hybrid Kassite-Elamite (with Akkad. *ša*-, L, 19). Four toponyms (5.12%) are Hurrian (G, 1, L, 24, M, 7; K, 22 is hybrid with Akkad. *bṭ*-). Three toponyms (3.84%) are Elamite, but only one (K, 20) is purely such, whereas the remaining two are hybrid (with Akkad. *bṭ*-, K, 25, N, 19). Two toponyms (2.56%) are non-Semitic, but their specific affiliation cannot be established; both are hybrid (with Akkad. *ša*-, H, 16, L, 1). Eleven toponyms (14.1%) are unexplained: one begins with Akkad. *bṭ*- (F, 2). Two or three contain the same component (silam, E, 1, M, 8 and perhaps N/3; the remaining ones are F, 7, G, 2-4, L, 16, N, 1 and O, 3).

The fragmentary itinerary quoted above leaves no doubt that Šilhak-Inšūinak I advanced from south (the Diyāla basin) to north (the Babylonian hill country south of the Little Zab). However, the preserved regions of the long list seem to be arranged not from south to north but from north to south (possibly not without deviations; A, which is severely damaged, is left out):

B: Ugar-Sallu and Ebeh; C: Nuzi region? (Bt-nappāh), F: Nuzi region (Maka and Ašūnaš), G: Nuzi and Arrapha (with very few Hurrian and Hurrianized toponyms; residual Hurrian toponyms are also recorded in K, L and M), J: Alman (Hulwān); K has two Elamite toponyms and L contains *dintu*-toponyms, while N has one Elamite toponym. The occurrence of at least two toponyms (M, 16 and N, 1), which are identical with settlements mentioned in the OB archive from Chogha Gavanah, strengthens the case for locating the locales of M and N in or near Nāmi (southwest of Kermanshah, cf. Potts 2016: 234 with lit.). *Dintu*-toponyms are recorded not only in Babylonia (OB, MB), but also in OB Susiana and in Rāši (during the Sargonid period). It stands to reason that the numerous toponyms in K-N refer to settlements in the Diyāla basin, the Zagros piedmont and Rāši. Hybrid names (Elamite preceded by Akkad. *bṭ*- or *ša*-) are found in Susiana as well (see Vallat 1993: cxxxv). On the whole, most of the anthroponyms contained in the toponyms of the type *bṭ*-/*ša*-PN are current in MB Babylonia (cf. the many references to the corpus of Hölscher 1996 above, *passim*). It stands to reason that they refer to relatively recent foundations or ephemeral settlements.

A campaign is recorded in a ME royal inscription, where the ruler's name is entirely broken (restored as either Šurruk-Nahhunte or Šilhak-Inšūinak). ^{ak}Hu-us-si-l...].] which is mentioned after the Tigris and before the Euphrates, is not necessarily identical with MB Huššu of Nebuchadnezzar I as suggested by König (1965: 134, n. 10 ad 55; see Potts 2016: 238, cf. below) but could be a compound toponym in view of the break. It cannot be proven that ^{ak}Ni-me-et-tu⁴ Mar-tu-uk (< Akkad. Nēmerti-Marduk, cf. NA Nē-me-ti-šarri (MAN)), somewhere between Gananati and Dēr, Grayson 1996: 190: Šamši-Adad V A.o.103.2, iii, 30'), which is mentioned after the Euphrates, is identical with Nippur. This fragmentary inscription can be compared with unpublished inscriptions of Šilhak-Inšūinak I, which record his conquests in the Diyāla basin and adjacent regions, viz. Akkad (^{ak}ka-tu⁴), Ša-B/Pahuti (^{ak}ša pā-hu-ti), Māt-Irriya (^{ak}ma-at-ir-i-ia) and further north (Vallat 1993: 5, 179, 250, s.vv. Agade, Māt-Irriya and Ša Pahuti, cf. the reconstructed itinerary above). There is no evidence for diplomatic marriages after Šurruk-Nahhunte I (see Steve, Vallat and Gasche 2002-2003: 464). It seems that the later Šurrukids reverted to endogamy because of their negative experience with their ruling Kassite relatives. Their military encounters intensified after Šurruk-Nahhunte I's attempt to persuade the Kassite

monarchs that he was the legitimate heir to the Babylonian crown. This turning point marks the end of the age of international connections in the Babylonian-Elamite arena, several decades after this age terminated in the western Fertile Crescent and the Eastern Mediterranean.

Šutruk-Nahhunte I renovated a temple of Kamul (see Kozuh 2014: 138–139), who is in all probability originally a Kassite deity, presumably the deified Mount Kamulla, which was perhaps situated south or southeast of the Radanu river near the Diyāla basin (see Nashed 1982a: 148). His cult might have been introduced to Elam by a Kassite princess. The monumental art of the period of the Šutrukid conquerors is characterized by creative genius (see Alvarez-Mon 2013b: 221–225).

A vague echo of the intensive Elamite incursions into Babylonia is recorded in a MB omen with no specific date, containing the statement “The Elamites (lit. “Elam”, NIM.MA⁶) will be in the interior, midst of my land” (Heessel 2012, 86, rev. 3, 4, cf. 13–15, rev. 21–23: “Elam will attack me”).

The coup of Marduk-kabit-ahhēšu (1150–1140 BC), the founder of the 2nd Isin dynasty, was supported by Elam, but his successor, Irti-Marduk-balātu (1139–1132 BC), ignored the Elamite rule (see Fuchs 2011: 256). Hurelunuš-Inšušinak, son of Šilhak-Inšušinak I, was defeated by Nebuchadnezzar I (1125–1104 BC) in about 1120 BC (see Fuchs 2011: 256). The latter reached Der and conquered Susa, controlling it for some time. He also controlled parts of the Zagros. The Elamite king fled, probably to Anšan (see Potts 2016: 244–245; cf. Paulus 2014: 509 with n. 17), marking the end of Elam’s involvement in Babylonian politics. Thereafter the conflicts were between Babylonia and Assyria.

A donation of plots of land in Huzsu and several other places to the deity Eriya from the city of Di-in-LUGAL in Susiana is recorded on a boundary stone.¹² The priests of this deity, viz. Šamāya and his father Šamū’a, descendants of Nūru-lišir (< Ninurta?>), had fled from Elam to Babylonia and later joined Nebuchadnezzar I on his campaign against Elam from which the Babylonian conqueror brought the statues of Marduk and Eriya to Babylon. Thereafter, Nebuchadnezzar I transferred the statue of Eriya to Huzsu. It may be a case of remuneration to important collaborators from Susiana by Nebuchadnezzar I.

Hurelunuš-Inšušinak had a brother, Šilhina-hamru-Lakamar (see Vallat 1999: 5, 14). It is not known when the rule of the Šutrukid dynasty came to an end. For three or four kings, who ruled over Anšan (if not beyond it) around 1000 BC, see Stolper (2013, especially 404). One Babylonian king, Mār-biti-ahhē-iddina (984–979 BC), who was related neither to the preceding nor to the following dynasty, was of Elamite extraction. A much later intervention occurred only in 814 BC, when the Elamites supported Babylonia against Assyria (see Brinkman 1968: 165–166, 209).

ELAMITES IN BABYLONIA

Some individuals in the rich MB documentation from Nippur are defined as Elamites or bear Elamite anthroponyms (including hybrid names, see Zadok 1987: 13–16; 1991: 230:138–142; hybrid names: 140, 142, cf. 1994: 47a). These Elamites are recorded at Nippur and its region when Elam was dominated by the Iḡhalkids. The netherworld deities Šimur and Napriša are recorded as theophorous elements in most of them (references are to Sassmannshausen 2001):

Ki-din-na-wi-ir-ša, -na-mi-ir-ša (=Napriša, 31, 20 and 55, 59, respectively; Kur 6); *Si-mu-ut-AN-da-āš* (1, 9, Bur 25); *Ši-mu-ut-GAL* (100, 4, Naz. 24; ^{kur}Ra-ši is mentioned in the same text, line 10); *Ši-mu-ut-na-pi-ir* (302, ii, 9, Naz. 10); and *Ši-mu-ut-aha-iddina* (ŠEŠ-SUM^m, 77, 4, 11, Kur 10). See Sassmannshausen 2001: 13. *Kiri-r* is the theophorous element of *Ki-ri-ru-du-uk* (with = *utuk*, cf. Zadok 1984:20:103a, 47:282). *Su-gi-ir-pu-(un)-ni*, *Su-ūg-ir-pu-ni* fulfilled an important administrative function (see van Soldt 2015: 27–28).

No Elamites are mentioned in MB documents from the Ḥamrīn basin. However, the material culture, especially the fine pottery, from Tall Yalbi in the Ḥamrīn basin shows greater affinity to Susiana as well as to Rāši, the adjacent regions of the Transjordanian corridor and the southern Zagros, than to that of the Mianni-controlled region to the north during the period under discussion (see Oselini 2016: 36–38). The glyptic from the Ḥamrīn basin betrays Elamite influence to some extent (see Bochner and Dämmer 1985: 73). Elamites are not recorded in the documentation from MB Ur, whereas in the preceding (late OB) period they are amply attested in the recently discovered texts from Tall Ḥēbar northwest of Ur¹³ (together with Tilmunites and Kassites).¹⁴ Elamite animal vessels (Tiergefäße) were found in Ur under the Kurigalzu layer (see Börker-Klähn 1970: 68ff. and Braun-Holzinger 1991: 111).

NOTES

- 1 Abbreviations are as in A. L. Oppenheim et al. (eds.), *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago-Glückstadt 1956–2010), unless otherwise indicated. Transliterated names are not capitalized if they are preceded by their transcription. Non-bibliographical abbreviations: ME = Middle Elamite; NE = Neo-Elamite; OE = Old Elamite.
- 2 The title with the inverted order, viz. “king of Susa and Anzan”, is recorded in the inscriptions of Arat-kittah (see [Carter and] Stolper 1984: 36). It can be restored in an Akkadian inscription of Untas-Napriša (cf. Paulus 2013: 439, 2), whereas the title “king of Anšan and Susa” is invariably used in his numerous Elamite inscriptions.
- 3 König 1965: 3 and 67, 70, respectively, (see [Carter and] Stolper 1984: 37; Vallat 1990 and De Graef 2013: 276). An additional OE royal inscription was published by Farber 1974–1975, but the name of the ruler is not preserved.
- 4 Cf. OE *me-ni-ik Ha-da-am-ti-ik* in the inscription of Siwe-palar-huhpak (König 1965: 34; III; see Tavernier 2016).
- 5 The undeciphered proto-Elamite material is not taken into account here.
- 6 Cf. *Ma-za-da-ti* of Pi-ša-an-ne (MDP 28 441, 20, cf. also Vallat 1993: 221). It is worth investigating whether Pišame is the ancient name of modern Deh-i-Now. There is no proof that the latter is the site of ancient Hupšun (see Potts 2016: 225).
- 7 E.g., *nu-ur ki-ir-ra-at*, i.e. *nūr kibvāti* “light of the world” (see Sieve, MDP 41 43 ad 21, 2, 5). Interestingly enough, it is the earliest occurrence of this royal epithet, which is not recorded in Mesopotamia before Esarhaddon (it resembles a divine epithet in an inscription of Šamši-Adad V, 823–811 BC, cf. CAD N/2: 348–349, s.v. nūru A, 9, 1st example and c). For a possible Akkadian loanword (*šarratim*) in an Elamite inscription of Šutruk-Nahhunte I, see Kozuh 2014: 132.
- 8 See Paulus 2013: 438–441. The theonym *Im-me-ri-ia* is not attested elsewhere; it looks Akkadian.
- 9 The site was not abandoned after it had ceased to be the capital: it recurs in a list of towns from Susiana from Ashurbanipal’s time (mid-640s BC, Parpola 1970: 115,

s.vv. Dur-Undasi and Dur-Undasima, NA, presumably referring to an upper and lower town).

10 If the above-mentioned enumeration in the Assyrian chronicle, viz. Zabban, Irriya and Uḡā-Sallu, is based on an itinerary (from south to north), then there is no proof that Irriya was very close to the Little Zab (cf. Nashet 1982a: 138). Mār-Irriya is recorded in three boundary stones. Illiḡya, the governor (*šakin māni*) of Mār-Irriya and Burtataš, is mentioned in two of them. Burtataš and the Karzi-yabku clan were linked to Halman, southeast of the Diyāla (see Nashet 1982a: 62, 75; 1985, 115). A passage with topographical information is Paulus 2014: 480 (= Lambert 2011, i, 6–12; *mt* EN.III. *ia* DUMU^m *kar-zi-ia-ab-ku i-na^m mu-zi*) KUR *ir-re-e-a A.GAR^m ar-rap-ba^m ba-dab-ha-A+A-u <šar>^m za-ba-an^m bi-riw-am-ma bu-ub-ta^m i-bu-ti^m to *mt* EN.III. *ia* DUMU^m *kar-zi-ia-ab-ku* "GAR. KUR *bu-ur-taš-ū* KUR *ir-re-e-a ig-ri-ri-na^m hu-ub-ta i-ki-me di-ke-ta-si-nu i-da-rik* " (As for) Illiḡya, descendant of Karzi-yabku – Illiḡya, descendant of Karzi-yabku, the governor of Burtataš and Mār Irriya, made war against the Habbeans, <who> had crossed over the Zaban river (= Little Zab) and engaged in plundering, (but) he (Illiḡya) took away the booty and slaughtered them in (the town of) Nuzi, in the land of Irriya, (irrigation) district of Arrapha". It is arguable that the odd syntax is due to the focus on the granter, Illiḡya, and the place where he repelled the Habbean enemy. A rendering "in (the city) of Nuzi... the ruler of Habbi crossed the Zaban river and engaged in plundering" (following the translations of Lambert 2011 and Paulus 2014) is questionable seeing that Nuzi is not situated on the Little Zab or any river, but on a wadi.*

11 König 1965: 132: 54a, 3. Hinz and Koch (1987: 1003), following König (1965: 132, n. 10 *ad loc.*) apply render "Gebirgspass von S.", but present an incorrect parsing, viz. *ni-ri* and *bu-ri*. The *ni* of *Ni-ri-pu-ri* is the same as *-ni* of *U^mka-ar-si-la-an-ni E-bech* (above, B, incorrectly parsed by Hinz and Koch 1987: 1243 who were not yet aware of the occurrences of *U^mka-ar-si-la-an* in unpublished inscriptions of Šilhak-Inšusinak I quoted by Vallat 1993: 291, s.v. Ukaršillam). Both toponyms are genitive compounds with the Elamite clitic *-ni* which is used as a genitive case marker (cf. Khačikjan 1998: 65), whose position is irregular. The regular position of *-ni* is at the end of the compound, cf. *ME-na-ap-pi-i-pi Ha-tam-ti-[il]-ni* "the gods of Elam" in an inscription of Šilhak-Inšusinak I (König 1965: 131: 54, 70) and *ga-gu-an-nu-ni^m in-sa-uš-na-ak-ni^m* "Inšusinak's ziququrrat" in an inscription of Hureluruš-Inšusinak (König 1965: 139: 61B, iii). In both toponyms *-ni* penetrated the complex and follows its 1st component as if it stands in the place of Akkad. *ša*.

12 See Paulus 2014: 160–161 *ad* 511–514: NKU I, 3; cf. Vallat 1993: 57, s.v. Din-šarri and Brinkman 1986: 200.

13 These texts, edited by Prof. Eleanor Robson (UCL), are displayed on the website of Tall Hēbar ("Tell Khaiber" = TK): <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1476498/> (cf. www.uararchaeology.org/tell-khaiber/). They are from the period of the "first dynasty of the Sealand" (for Elamites and other foreigners in unprovenanced texts from that period, see Zadok 2014a). Explicitly Elamites (≠EL.AM.MA, with Akkadian names):

A-ra-na-ah-i-lī (TK 1096.47, rev. 25), mentioned before E-re-ši-mu-ut (also TK 1114.36, rev. 16); Ga-mi-lu-se-mi (TK 1114.40, 11), and x-su-ba-nu-tum (TK 3064.135, rev. 6). Bearers of Elamite names are Me-er-ri-hal-ki (text D), TK 3080.04, 16, cf. Zadok 1984: 9.2.3; 28; 1.42b) and Ka-ra-pu-ni (TK 1096.47, rev. 33), Šil-ḡi-ši-mu-ut (TK 3064.108, rev. 3) is hybrid (Akkado-Elamite); cf. x-x-šī-mu-ut (TK 3080.86, rev. 2) and [...-x]-u-b-ter-s. of ḡi-mu-ut-[-...]. (TK 3064.063, rev. 7).

14 Tiimunnies: An-zak-GAL^m (TK 3064.051, 12), An-zak-ga-[m] (TK 1096.48, 22), father of I-din-ḡSKUR, and An-zak-[-...]. (father of I-ḡi-ŠEŠ?-SUDM, TK 1114.40, rev. 8).

Kassites: Bu-ur-ra-šū-ga-ab (TK 1096.58, flake 1, 6) and x-x-ra-sa-ab (TK 3064.076, rev. 2). The theophorous element of Bu-ur-ra-Ṭa-ba-an (TK 1096.48, 7^y) Bu-ur-ra-Ṭa-ba-an

(TK 3064.033, 13) is the deified river name Ṭaban, which is elsewhere contained only in Akkadian and Sumerian anthroponyms (see Nashet 1982b: 118–119, 121 and add Ṭaba-an-ni-a-ḡi?, MDP 22 99, rev. 5ⁱ, presumably /Ṭaban-aḡi/ from OB Susa). The river is in the Diyāla basin; Bu-ur-ra-Ṭa-ba-an perhaps refers to an individual who originated from there. The only West Semite is Šu-ri-i-tum (TK 3080.27, 14ⁱ), that is, "the Sutean lady".

REFERENCES

- Abdi, K. and Beckman, G. 2007. An Early Second-Millennium Cuneiform Archive from Chogha Gavanah, Western Iran. *JCS* 59: 39–91.
- Alvarez-Mon, J. 2013a. Khuzestan in the Bronze Age. In: Potts, D.T. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Iran*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 217–232.
- . 2013b. Brads of Glory. Elamite Sculptural Reliefs from the Highlands: Kul-e Farah IV, in De Graef, K. and Tavernier, J. (eds.) *Susa and Elam. Archaeological, Philological, Historical and Geographical Perspectives: Proceedings of the International Congress Held at Ghent University, December 14–17, 2009*. MDP 58. Leiden: Brill, 207–248.
- Anthony, S. and Malbran-Labat, F. 2013. Approche historique et philologique du titre royal likamewe rišakki. In: De Graef, K. and Tavernier, J. (eds.) *Susa and Elam. Archaeological, Philological and Geographical Perspectives: Proceedings of the International Congress Held at Ghent University, December 14–17, 2009*. MDP 58. Leiden: Brill, 417–428.
- Balkan, K. 1954. *Kassitenstudien. I: Die Sprache der Kassiten*. AOS 37. New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society.
- Boehmer, R.M. and Dämmer, H.-W. 1985. *Tell Imthlye, Tell Zubeidi, Tell Abbas*. Baghader Forschungen 7. Mainz: von Zabern.
- Börker-Klähm, J. 1970. *Untersuchungen zur altheimischen Archäologie*. Dissertation. Berlin: Freie Universität.
- Braun-Holzinger, E.A. 1991. *Mesopotamische Wehgeben der frühdynamischen bis Altbabylonischen Zeit*. HSAO 3. Heidelberg: Heidelberg: Orientverlag.
- Brinkman, J.A. 1968. *A History of Post-Kassite Babylonia*. AnOr 43. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- . 1986. The Elamite-Babylonian Frontier in the Neo-Elamite Period, 750–625 B.C. In: De Meyer, L., Gasche, H. and Vallat, F. (eds.) *Fragmента Historiae Elamicae. Mélanges offerts à M.-J. Stele*. Paris: Recherches sur les civilisations, 199–207.
- . 1993–1997. Meerland (Sealand). *RIA* 8: 6–10.
- Carter, E. and Stolper, M.W. 1984. *Elam: Surveys of Political History and Archaeology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cavigneaux, A. and Jsmail, B. Kh. 1990. Die Starthalter von Suhu und Mari im 8. Jh. *VChR. BAM* 21: 321–456.
- De Graef, K. 2013. The Use of Akkadian in Iran. In: Potts, D.T. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Iran*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 263–282.
- van Dijk, J. 1986. Die dynastischen Heiraten zwischen Kassiten und Elamern: eine verhängnisvolle Politik. *OrNS* 55: 159–170.
- Edard, D.O. – Farber, G. 1974. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der Zeit der 3. Dynastie von Ur*. Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 2. Wiesbaden.
- Eidem, J. and Laessle, J. 2001. *The Shemshara Archives I: The Letters*. The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Historisk-fil. Skrifter 23. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Farber, W. 1974–1975. Eine elamische Inschrift aus der 1. Hälfte des 2. Jahrtausends. *ZA* 64: 74–86.
- Fincke, J. 1993. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der Nuzi-Texte*. Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 10. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- Frayne, D.R. 1992. *The Early Dynastic List of Geographical Names*. AOS 74. New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society.
- Fuchs, A. 2011. Das Ostirrigisgebiet von Agum II. bis zu Darius I (ca. 1500 bis 500 v.Chr.). In: Miglus, P. and Mühl, S. (eds.) *Betwien the Cultures: The Central Tigris Region from the 3rd to the 1st Millennium B.C.* HSAO 14. Heidelberg: Heidelberg Orientverlag, 229–320.
- Gasché, H. 2013. Transfers culturels de la Babylonie vers Suse au milieu du 2^e millénaire av. n. ère. In: De Graef, K. and Tavernier, J. (eds.) *Susa and Elam. Archaeological, Philological, Historical and Geographical Perspectives: Proceedings of the International Congress Held at Ghent University, December 14–17, 2009*. MDP 58. Leiden: Brill, 71–82.
- Gassan, M. 1986. Une inscription casite d'Iran. In: De Meyer, L., Gasché, H. and Vallat, F. (eds.) *Fragments Historiae Elamitiae. Mélanges offerts à M.-J. Stele*. Paris: Recherche sur les civilisations, 187–189.
- Gelb, I.J., MacRae, A.A. and Purves, P.M. 1943. *Nazi Personal Names*. OIP 57. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Grayson, A.K. 1996. *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium B.C., II (858–745 B.C.)*. RIMA 3. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Heessel, N.P. 2012. *Divinatorische Texte 2: Opferschau-Omina*. WVDOG 139. Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Orientalgesellschaft in Assur 9. Keilschrifttexte aus Assur literarischen Inhalts 5. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Heimpel, W. 2009. The Location of Madga. *JCS* 61: 25–61.
- Hinz, W. and Koch, H. 1987. *Elamisches Wörterbuch 1–2*. AMI Ergänzungsheft 17. Berlin: Reimer.
- Hölscher, M. 1996. *Die Personennamen der Kassitenzeitlichen Texte aus Nippur*. Ingula 1. Münster: Rhema.
- Jakob, S. 2009. *Die mittellassyrischen Texte aus Tell Chuera in Nordost-Syrien*. Vorderasiatische Forschungen der Max Freiherr von Oppenheim-Stiftung 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Jaritz, K. 1957. Die kassitischen Sprachreste. *Anthropos* 52: 850–898.
- Khačikjan, M. 1998. *The Elamite Language*. Documenta Asiana 4. Rome: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche. Istituto per gli Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici.
- Köng, F.W. 1965. *Die elamischen Königschriften*. AO Beh. 16. Graz: Weidner.
- Kozuh, M. 2014. Elamite and Akkadian Inscribed Bricks from Bard-e Karegar (Khuzistan, Iran). In: Kozuh, M., Henkelman, W.F.M., Jones, C.E. and Woods, Ch. (eds.) *Extraction & Control: Studies in Honor of Matthew W. Stolper*. SAOC 68. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 131–62.
- Lambert, W.G. 2011. Another Boundary Stone of Merodachbaladan I. *A/O* 52: 15–21.
- Lemans, W.F. 1946. Kidinnu, un symbole de droit divin babylonien. In: David, M., van Groningen, B.A. and Meijers, B.M. (eds.) *Symbolae ad ius et historiam antiquitatis pertinentes Julio Christiano van Oven dedicatae*. Leiden: Brill, 36–61.
- McCarthy, A.R. and Hill, J. 2009. Emblems of Ethnicity: Hurrians, Elamites and the Mitranian “Common Style” Glyphics. In: Willhelm, G. (ed.) *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi in Honor of David I. Owen on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday October 28, 2005*. SCNCN 18. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 299–322.
- Mofidi-Nasrabadi, B. 2005. Eine Steinschrift des Amar-Suena aus Tappe Borimi (Iran). *ZA* 95: 161–171.
- Nashif, Kh. 1982a. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der mittelbabylonischen und mittelassyrischen Zeit*. Repertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 5. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- _____. 1982b. Der Taban-Fluss. *BAM* 13: 117–141.
- Neumann, G. 2013. Elams Kulturkontakte mit seinen Nachbarn im Spiegel der Glyptik des 2. Jahrtausends v.Chr. In: De Graef, K. and Tavernier, J. (eds.) *Susa and Elam. Archaeological, Philological, Historical and Geographical Perspectives: Proceedings of the International Congress Held at Ghent University, December 14–17, 2009*. MDP 58. Leiden: Brill, 83–128.
- Oselmi, V. 2016. Traces of Elamite and Mittani Culture in the Hamrin Basin: the Case of Fine Pottery in the Kasse Contexts of Tell Velkhi, in Fofera, E. et al. (eds.) *Cultural and Material Contacts in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the International Workshop 1–2 December 2014*. Torino. Sesto Fiorentino, 36–45.
- Papola, S. 1970. *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms*. AOAT 6. Kevelaar.
- Paulus, S. 2013. Beziehungen zweier Grossmächte – Elam und Babylonien in der 2. Hälfte des 2. Jahrtausend v.Chr. Ein Beitrag zur internen Chronologie. In: De Graef, K. and Tavernier, J. (eds.) *Susa and Elam. Archaeological, Philological, Historical and Geographical Perspectives: Proceedings of the International Congress Held at Ghent University, December 14–17, 2009*. MDP 58. Leiden: Brill, 429–449.
- _____. 2014. *Die babylonischen Kudurnu-Inschriften von der kassitischen bis zur frühneubabylonischen Zeit: untersucht unter besonderer Berücksichtigung gesellschafts- und rechtshistorischer Fragestellungen*. AOAT 51. Münster: Ugarit Verlag.
- Portz, D.T. 2016. *The Archaeology of Elam: Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State*. Cambridge World Archaeology. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richer, Th. 2016. *Vorbereiten zu einem hurritischen Namenbuch*. 1. Personennamen altabylonischer Überlieferung vom Mittleren Euphrat und aus dem nördlichen Mesopotamien. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sassmannshausen, L. 2001. *Beiträge zur Verwaltung und Gesellschaft Babyloniens in der Kassitenzeit*. Baghdader Forschungen 21. Mainz: von Zabern.
- Sigrist, M. 2000. *Texts from the Yale Babylonian collections 1 (1–1176), 2 (1177–2223)*. Sumerian archival texts 2, 3 (respectively). Bethesda: CDL press.
- van Soldt, W.H. 2015. *Middle Babylonian Texts in the Cornell University Collections*. CUSAS 30. Bethesda: CDL.
- Stevé, M.-J., Vallat, F. and Gasché, H. 2002–2003. Suse. F. Suse dans l'histoire. *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, fasc. 74. Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 403–530.
- Stolper, M.W. 2013. *Sigurs of Ansan*. In: De Graef, K. and Tavernier, J. (eds.) *Susa and Elam. Archaeological, Philological, Historical and Geographical Perspectives: Proceedings of the International Congress Held at Ghent University, December 14–17, 2009*. MDP 58. Leiden: Brill, 399–415.
- Streck 1998–2001. *Nakkab*. *R/Ä* 9: 91.
- Tavernier, J. 2016. *Syro-Asianica Scripta Minora X. III. The Meaning of Elamite men*. *Le Muséon* 129: 10–16.
- Vallat, F. 1980. *Suse et l'Elam*. Recherche sur les grandes civilisations. Études elamites, Mémoire n° 1. Paris: Éditions ADPF.
- _____. 1990. Deux inscriptions royales en élamite de l'époque des Épartides (sukkalnah). *NABU* 1990/137.
- _____. 1993. *Les noms géographiques des sources suso-élamites*. Repertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 11. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- _____. 1998. Elam I. The History of Elam. *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 8, 302–313.
- _____. 1999. Succession royale en Elam au II^{ème} Millénaire. In: Gasché, H., Tarnet, M., Janssen, C. and Degraeve, A. (eds.) *Cinquante-deux réflexions sur le Proche-Orient Ancien offertes en hommage à Léon De Meyer*. MHEO 2. Leuven: Peeters, 1–14.
- _____. 2003. Suse, G.I. La religion suso-élamite. *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, fasc. 74. Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 529–533 (and the abbreviations and bibliography on 619–652).
- Zaccagnini, C. 1979. *The Rural Landscape of Arraphe*. Quaderni di geografia storica 1. Rome: Università di Roma, Istituto di studi del vicino Oriente.
- Zadok, R. 1984. *The Elamite Onomasticon*. Supplement 40 to AION 44/3. Naples: Istituto Orientale.
- _____. 1987. Peoples from the Iranian Plateau in Babylonia During the Second Millennium B.C. *Iran* 25: 1–26.