

- Kozuh, M. 2014. Elamite and Akkadian Inscribed Bricks from Bard-e Karezgar (Khuzistan, Iran). In: Kozuh, M., Henkelman, W.F.M., Jones, C.E. and Woods, C. (eds.) *Extraction & Control. Studies in Honor of Matthew W. Stolper*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 68. Chicago, IL: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 131–161.
- Lafont, B. 2001. Inscriptions royales. In: Joannès, F. (ed.) *Dictionnaire de la Civilisation Mésopotamienne*. Paris: R. Laffont, 410–412.
- Lambert, M. 1970. Une inscription de Kunt-Nahhunte. *Journal Asiatique* 258: 243–246.
- . 1978. Disiecta membra Aelamica (II). *Arts Asiatiques* 34: 3–27.
- Vallat F. 1970a. Table élamite de Darius Ier. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale* 64: 97–107.
- . 1970b. Fragments de Suse. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale* 64: 171.
- . 1971. Deux nouvelles chartes de fondation, d'un palais de Darius Ier à Suse. *Syria* 68: 53–59.
- . 1972a. Deux inscriptions élamites de Darius Ier (DSf et DSz). *Studia Iranica* 1: 3–13 and Pls. I–III.
- . 1972b. Une statue de Darius Ier à Suse. *Journal Asiatique* 260: 247–251.
- . 1972c. Épigraphie achéménide. *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 2: 203–217.
- . 1974a. Les textes cunéiformes de la statue de Darius. *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 4: 161–170.
- . 1974b. L'inscription trilingue de Xerxès à la porte de Darius. *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 4: 171–180.
- . 1974c. La triple inscription cunéiforme de la statue de Darius Ier (DSa). *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale* 68: 157–166.
- . 1978. Une brique élamite de Hutehush-Inshushinak. *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 8: 97–107.
- . 1979. Les inscriptions du palais d'Arraxerxès II. *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 10: 145–154.
- . 1980. Documents épigraphiques de la Ville Royale I (1972 et 1975). *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 11: 135–139.
- . 1981a. Un fragment de brique de Tépé Boromi inscrit en élamite. *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 12: 193–196.
- . 1981b. L'inscription de la stèle d'Utash-Napirisha. *Iranica Antiqua* 16: 27–33.
- . 1983. Les briques élamites de Deylam. In: Koch, H. and Mackenzie, D.N. (eds.) *Kunst, Kultur und Geschichte der Achämenidenzeit und ihr Fortleben*, Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, Ergänzungsband 10. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 11–18.
- . 1990. Deux inscriptions royales en élamite de l'époque des Épartides (sukkalmah). *Annales Assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires*, 1990/137, 112–113.
- Yoyotte, J. 1972. Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques de Darius et l'Égypte. *Journal Asiatique* 260: 253–266.
- . 1974. Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques de la statue de Darius à Suse. *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 4: 181–183.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

ELAMITE ADMINISTRATION

Gian Pietro Basello and Grazia Giovinnazzo

In order to explain the matter treated in this chapter, the word “administration” and the adjective “Elamite” firstly require clarification. According to the *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, “administration” has at least two different meanings: 1) “the organization and running of a business or system” and 2) “the government in power” (*Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 11th edition, s.v. administration). In what follows, the term administration takes these two meanings together, that is, it is defined as the management of a state from a practical, organizational (not political) point of view. A state is the institution which leads, controls, and provides a means of self-identification to communities sharing a politically unified territory (cf. the definitions reported in Scheidel 2013). States were created as centralized administrations (Yoffee 2005: 26), and administration is a constitutive element of a state, which would otherwise be a different form of socio-political aggregation (Trigger 2003: 195–196).

An administration is needed when an institution has reached a certain degree of complexity. Surely there were, before the adoption of writing, and still there are, small-scale administrations where writing was not known or used, relying on a pyramid scheme of control and arranging commodities according to fixed patterns established in advance (e.g. associating them to agents using mnemonic devices), but only to a very limited extent. Broadly speaking, if we have written documents, we have an administration. From this point of view, administration is a synonym of bureaucracy, that is, a system where paperwork is used to track what is going on. In this way, we can connect the above-mentioned definition of administration to the starting points of historical research, the extant administrative corpora from the past. The material evidence of offices, archives, and storerooms is rarely attested and used, while metatextual or paratextual data derived from seal impressions or the formal characteristics of textual carriers (usually tablets) have been increasingly studied in the last decades.

Administration provides auxiliary services needed to run an institution (a state or a private organization). First of all, it could manage the inbound and outbound flow of resources (e.g. food and clothing) needed to sustain workers partially or completely dependent on the institution (including administration employees) or living on its

shoulders (e.g. the king and his family, the elite, and courtiers). Then administration could manage the inbound and outbound flow of goods (including raw materials and precious objects for keeping in treasury) and tools needed to equip all the workers and employees (including weapons for the army), build and maintain infrastructures (e.g. facilities, depots, fortresses, roads, canals, and dams), and display power (e.g. rituals, feasting, and banqueting). Written documents both account for human and material resources and record who is responsible for them, ensuring accountability in order to prevent robberies or frauds.

An administration requires a hierarchy of officials, a decision-making chain, means of communication, shared protocols for transferring commodities, a structured space (corresponding to an administrative topography), and a calendar. Sometimes these features surface in the written documentation, though usually in exceptional cases, because there was no need for elucidating common practices.

The administration of a political entity controlling a wide range of territories was actually built by several autonomous regional centers, in most cases originating from different pre-existing administrative traditions which were retained with some adjustments, growing as the time passed by. The expansion of an administrative center was limited technologically by the time required for a message to go to and fro between one of its remotest local units, with a speed that – at that time – could not be faster than that of its human carrier (unless a system of beacons or pigeon post was in use).

The focus of an administrative document is on accounting and accountability, that is, to keep track of quantities and commodities but also, at the same time, of officials who had responsibility over them. To pursue these aims, the scribe had to record also the involved people (often referring to them in groups by their occupation, ethnicity, and/or leader), places, and time. Besides economy, this could feed data to other research fields like onomastics and prosopography, toponymy and historical geography, chronology and history of science (for timekeeping).

Regarding the definition of “Elamite”, here it refers to documentation found in Susiana, Anshan, and – theoretically – the intermontane valleys in between, not necessarily in Elamite language only. The extant corpora matching these requirements are the product of the following administrations, serving different political entities and therefore resulting from different administrative needs and practices:

- the administration of Susa around 3000 BCE, which expressed itself using Proto-Elamite writing. It is possible that written evidence in Proto-Elamite coming from other sites around the Iranian plateau represents local instances of the same administrative system, at least in a broad way. Due to the uncertainties in the understanding of this writing and the related language, it will not be taken into account in what follows (see J. Dahl, Chapter 19 in this volume);
- the Old Akkadian administration of Susa, a branch of the Old Akkadian administrative system based in Mesopotamia, whose records were written in Old Akkadian language. The Ur III dominion surely established a branch of its administration in Susa, but the few extant documents dated or datable to this period, written in Sumerian, are scattered across several publications and still need a thorough reassessment to provide a general picture of this foreign administration (De Graef 2005: 91–99; 2013: 268–269; 2015: 292–294, §9.3.2–3).

Two fragmentary administrative texts (M-129 and M-1654) in Sumerian were found in Tall-e Malyan (Stolper 1982: 57, n. 52; cf. Reiner 1972);

- the administration of the polity (the so-called Sakkalmah kingdom) established in the first half of the 2nd millennium with Susa as the main political center, whose documents were probably written only in Babylonian until ca. 1400 BCE. About 1400 tablets in the Babylonian dialect of Susa pertain to private law (contracts, loans, adoptions, etc., probably kept in a public institution), but there were also many economic documents attesting a purely Mesopotamian organization (De Graef 2013: 272; see Peyronel, Chapter 11 in this volume); some 930 texts were discovered during the early excavations (1890s–1930s) and are published in Schell 1908: 14–80, 1930, 1932, 1933: 1–102, and 1939: 37–161, and Dossin 1927, nos. 67–235; about 500 tablets were found in the Ville Royale during Ghirshman’s excavations (1950s–1960s), 86 of which are published in De Graef 2006. Some properly administrative corpora are represented by the tablets from Haft Tappeh in Susiana, dated to the last part of the period. Little is known about the textual typologies of the unpublished Babylonian documents from Tall-e Malyan (De Graef 2013: 272); according to Matthew W. Stolper (1976: 90, §2, and 95, sub c; 1982: 57, n. 52) they are just two school texts (M-498 and M-924);
- the administration of the polities established in the first half of the 1st millennium having Anshan and Susa as administrative centers and Elamite as the administrative language. The two extant corpora are dated to the start and end of the period: the tablets from Tall-e Malyan from the beginning of the 1st millennium, that is, the end of the Middle Elamite period, and the tablets from the Acropolis of Susa from ca. 600, possibly even later, that is, very close to the Achaemenid period. It is difficult to state if they were expressions of the same political entity; the Achaemenid administration of Fars, whose documents were written in Elamite and Aramaic. The two related corpora are the Persepolis Fortification and the Persepolis Treasury tablets; isolated findings outside Persepolis add further relevant data about the system, which has to be integrated with comparisons to other Achaemenid administrations outside Fars (e.g. the Aramaic documents from Bactria published in Naveh and Shaked 2012).

Surely there were other administrative corpora pertaining to the above-mentioned administrations and also to other, still unknown, systems and polities. The list above shows great gaps both in time and space. First of all, nearly nothing is known of the Sakkalmah administrative system, even if administrative tablets are known among the legal documents in Old Babylonian; furthermore, there is proof, both from Mesopotamia and Susa, of diplomatic exchanges with Hammurabi and Zimri-Lim during the reign of Sivepalarhupak, “governor of Elam” (EKI 3:5), which must have been supported by a chancellery (Chapin 2013). Later in the 2nd millennium, it seems unlikely that a complex like Chogha Zanbil, the ancient Al Urash-Napirisha, was built without the support of a specific administrative branch that took care of the food for the workers and the materials (especially the precious ones) required for construction and furnishings.

From the list above, another peculiarity appears, that is, the use of different languages. This is not surprising over such a wide span of time and space, but in the

Achaemenid administration of Persepolis, multilingualism is attested also in a same period and place. This, again, could be expected in a state controlling many lands and peoples. However, it is possible that multilingual administrations were also active previously in Susa, where Elamite and Akkadian seem to be equally attested, even if with a different timing.

The political frame in which the above-mentioned administrations operated was also very different: the Old Akkadian administration in Susa was dependent on and in strict relationships with the Old Akkadian state. The Achaemenid administration of Fars was also part of a broader system, even if in this case it was at the core of the state. The other administrations in Susiana and Anshan appear to be more genuinely Elamite, but we do not know how these administrations would have defined themselves from an ethnic and cultural point of view.

The inclusion of the Achaemenid administration of Persepolis here is justified not only by the use of Elamite language but also by strong similarities in palaeography and administrative formulae with the Susa Acropolis tablets, so that it is possible to consider the Persepolis administration as a legacy of the previous Elamite administrative system, with changes and developments due to the enlarged context (Basello 2011). However, these changes seem to be more in terms of quantity (i.e. in the numbers of managed resources and involved persons) than in quality (different procedures).

Private administration documents are also present in the record of Susa, for example, the archives of the Ur III scribe Igbuni (De Graef 2003) and later, of Ashishi (De Graef 2006, chapter VIII B), both from Ville Royale Chantier B. Their connections with the state-led administrations (both in actual relationships and in similarity of practices) require further investigation, bearing in mind that the public-private dichotomy, as it is conceived today, is not directly applicable to the ancient Near Eastern politics (Garfinkle 2005). Conversely, it should be recalled that the ancient Near Eastern state was steered by the king as a privately owned company at least partly dependent on his estates and revenues, even if the king alone could embody a state only symbolically: he needed an elite (including his kin) to share the power and subjects. The legislative, executive, and judicial powers were distributed between the king and the elite. The administration lies somewhat across these powers, since it is needed to manage each different branch of a state, such as the court and the army.

ADMINISTRATIVE CORPORA

Susa old Akkadian tablets

Approximately 90 Akkadian and Sumerian tablets dated or datable to the Old Akkadian period were found at different locations in the Acropolis of Susa during the excavation campaigns of 1898–1910 (Schell in Legrain 1913) and were published by Legrain (1913) in cuneiform copy and transliteration (some also in photograph). Another tablet (TS/AC 32) was found in the 1966 excavations (Steve and Gasche 1971: 80 and 198, transliteration on p. 13; cuneiform copy on Pl. 11:26, photo on Pl. 98:2; Foster 2016: 73). These tablets are similar in palaeography to the Akkadian ones found in Eshnunna and other Mesopotamian cities (Foster 1982) under the Old Akkadian dominion. Old Akkadian administrative textual typologies like household

income and receipt documents are also attested. The orthographic and linguistic evidence of these texts is taken into account in the treatment of Old Akkadian in Haselbach 2005.

The texts, economic and juridical in content (De Graef 2013: 264), are partly official records of the Old Akkadian administration in Susa (e.g. MDP 14 47 and 51) and attest to the existence of a self-sustaining Akkadian enclave which may have been called Dur-Agade (“Fort Akkad”), under the direction of an Akkadian governor (Foster 2016: 73), with a military garrison and close economic contacts with southern Babylonia and Diyala (see Steinkeller, Chapter 10 in this volume).

Thanks to personnel lists, we know that the administration managed more than a thousand individuals: the ruling elite (including the governor), courtiers and administrators (including scribes, a diviner, attendants of the palace), the skilled labor force (artisans, cooks, barbers, one seal cutter, carpenters, smiths, leather workers, fullers, reed workers, and arrow makers), and unskilled laborers (divided into the usual Mesopotamian categories of fitness for work, including women, girls, and babies) (Foster 2016: 73). As recipients of food, there were “supervisors of laborers, slaughterers, craftsmen, the officer in charge of the palace gate, a messenger and runner, a herald, soldiers, elders, and various foreigners”, while expenditures went also for offerings to deities (Foster 2016: 73).

Although relatively small in comparison to other Akkadian estates, the governor’s household was about 450 ha, labored by a workforce bearing mostly Sumerian or Akkadian names. This suggests that the enclave was self-sustainable and not dependent on land lease or levy as elsewhere (Foster 2016: 74).

Toponyms like Shuruppak, Sumur, Surgul, Uru’a, and Apishal are mentioned in the tablets, as well as places in Iran like Anshan. Travelers from Dilimun, Magan, and Meluhha are also attested, substantiating the role of Susa as a commercial hub towards the east.

Some documents are related to Sumerian merchant families holding fields at Susa (e.g. MDP 14 19, 21); a tablet lists transactions with barley, wool, and copper purchased or valued in silver (Foster 2016: 74). There are also some school exercises, signist fragments, and an incantation (MDP 14 91). Unfortunately, it is not possible to know the find-spots of these texts and therefore if, however improbable, the different typologies and groups were found together in a primary deposition of archival type. Even if the number of documents is relatively small, they attest a wide range of administrative typologies, dealing with raw materials, field production, food rations, and personnel.

The Old Elamite texts dated to the Old Akkadian period, that is, two school or incantation tablets (Lambert 1974) and the so-called Treaty of Naram-Suen (Hinz 1967), represent a very good match in palaeography, suggesting the establishment of a school in Susa where it was possible to learn Mesopotamian cuneiform writing.

Taken as a whole, the tablets dated or datable to the Old Akkadian period from Susa point to the existence of an Old Akkadian administration and school, largely employed by and dealing with Mesopotamian expatriates, in addition to some smaller-scale private administrations of foreign (Sumerian) entrepreneurs. At the same time, someone was also writing in Elamite using Old Akkadian cuneiform, therefore assuring the existence of an Elamite cultural tradition, even if – according to the extant evidence – not applied to administrative records.

Haft Tappet Babylonian tablets

During the excavations led by Negahban in the years 1965–1979, “Several thousand complete and fragmentary tablets” were found at Haft Tappet (probably the ancient site of Kapnak, less than 20 km south of Susa) (Negahban 1991: 103). About 300 tablets have been published, mainly in cuneiform copy (out of 619 texts copied by Pablo Herrero according to Herrero and Glassner 1990: 1; cf. Herrero and Glassner 1996: 51: “nous nous proposons ici de présenter . . . la suite et la fin des copies de P. Herrero”); 10 tablets (and one envelope) in cuneiform copy and transliteration (with a commentary) in Herrero 1976, the others in cuneiform copy with a usually short commentary in Herrero and Glassner 1990 (including a stela fragment [no. 1] and an inscribed spool [no. 3]), 1991 (including four tablet fragments from Abu Fandowa [nos. 160–163], a site 1 km north-west of Haft Tappet), 1993 (with an appendix of remarks and corrections to the cuneiform texts published in Negahban 1991), and 1996 (including one tablet fragment from Abu Fandowa [no. 290]); a further, stray, tablet is in Beckman 1991. The texts are broadly categorized according to their content by Glassner: construction of chariots (Herrero and Glassner 1990, nos. 5–13), metalworking (including gold, silver, and bronze objects, nos. 14–70), lists of anthroponyms (Herrero and Glassner 1991, nos. 71–80), dated or sealed tablet and envelope fragments (nos. 81–88), fragments with accounts (nos. 89–159), clothing (Herrero and Glassner 1993, nos. 164–185), livestock and animals (nos. 186–205), a juridical document (no. 206), a omen text (207), practical texts (Herrero and Glassner 1996, nos. 208–267), school and lexical texts (nos. 268–290) (four texts from Abu Fandowa are grouped together in Herrero and Glassner 1991, nos. 160–163). Seals and seal impressions (found also on bullae) are treated in Negahban 1991: 49–101 and Amiet 1999. A general treatment with remarks on chronology is in Glassner 1991.

Many of the tablets were found together in three distinct groups: the trench H XXXI in the northern part of the Terrace Complex I, the courtyard in front of the artist’s workshop of the Terrace Complex I, and in Haft Tappet B mound opposite the railroad station (Negahban 1991: 103). The onomasticon is mostly Elamite; month-names are also Elamite (Herrero 1976: 93–94). Some texts are dated internally with day, month-name, and year-name. Year-names mentioning messengers to and from Babylonia, and the defeat of Kadashman-Enlil (a name borne by two Cassite kings) testify to military conflicts and economic relationships with Cassites (Reiner 1973: 94–97, §5; Herrero 1976: 93; Glassner 1991: 119 and 125–126; Carter 1999: 118).

Thanks to the archaeologist’s eye of Negahban, we know that the tablets were usually made “from a fine, well levigated clay which might have been mixed with a small portion of natural bitumen or other additive which changed its color . . . These ingredients were kneaded to make a flexible patry . . .” (Negahban 1991: 103). Negahban remarked that rectangular and “disk-shaped” (lentic) tablets were found, corresponding to different textual typologies: letter orders, “economic texts”, school texts (on lentils), texts of exorcism, auguries, and omens. To Negahban’s list, mathematical tablets must be added (listed in Robson 2008: 330, table B.17). Even if only the first two categories pertain to administration, the tablets from Haft Tappet represent the more typologically varied corpora from Elam. Unfortunately, the find-spot of each tablet is not provided in the publications, so we do not know if administrative tablets were found together with school texts and other textual typologies. In this case,

the narrow link between administration and scribal school could be emphasized, confirming that the school trained scribes to write both administrative and literary documents, or that administration training included the literary curriculum.

In recent years, in the framework of the Iranian-German excavations led by Mofidi-Nasrabadi at the site since 2005, new tablet discoveries were made in Areal I (ca. 200 m south-west of the previously excavated area) in a building with storerooms which has been interpreted as administrative: ca. 30 tablets from room 1 in 2005, ca. 30 tablets from room 5 and ca. 50 tablets from room 12 in 2007 (Prechel 2010: 51 and 56). A sample of four tablets is published in Prechel 2010. These texts are administrative in character; some are inventory lists related to weapons and riding equipment (see Mofidi-Nasrabadi, Chapter 12 in this volume). They are similar to the other administrative tablets found in the previous excavations, even if they seem to pertain to some other administrative department (as shown, e.g., by the tablets from Room 1 which are not sealed and do not bear dates; Prechel 2010: 51). Prechel has read a tablet mentioning an item, *watuiat* (perhaps an Elamite term formed by a reduplicated base), known also from a group of previously found tablets related to the construction of luxurious chariots, probably to be used by the king or for some ritual function (Prechel 2010: 51).

Room 1 in the administrative building in Areal I has been identified by Mofidi-Nasrabadi as the workshop of the scribes (Mofidi-Nasrabadi 2012b): a small channel in the floor could have served the purpose of discharging the water used to mould and keep tablets wet while writing; the tablets were found in an ash layer on the floor along the walls; they were probably kept on shelves of tamarisk wood, whose burned remains were also found; a stone mortar was possibly used to crush and refine clay for tablets (Mofidi-Nasrabadi 2012b: 750–752). The dating of these tablets should be nearly coeval to the destruction of the building, being the tablets in use at its moment of demise. The subsequent campaigns have also brought to light some other tablets (Mofidi-Nasrabadi 2012a and 2014). When published, these tablets, together with their detailed find-spot data and archaeological context, will permit a deeper understanding of Haft Tappet’s administration and, possibly, its relationships with the Susa administration in the first half of the 2nd millennium.

Tall-e-Malyan EDD tablets

The Middle Elamite period is especially represented at Tall-e-Malyan, the ancient city of Anshan, in the Operation EDD where a large burned building with a central courtyard (10 × 14 m) surrounded by rooms and corridors was brought to light on the highest part of the mound (Stolper 1984a: 1–3; Carter 1996). During the excavation campaigns in the years 1972–1974, on the floor and between the collapsed walls of the burned level (IVa) in the sectors A and B (plan in Stolper 1984a: 4, Figure 3), 246 inscribed fragments and tablets were found. They probably formed a compact group, since fragments from the floor and the collapse were able to be joined in at least three instances (Stolper 1984a: 5). 111 tablets and large fragments, ca. half of the 200 original tablets, are published in Stolper 1984a. Three stray tablets, similar to EDD level IV documents, are published in Stolper 2003. Most of the tablets are small and cigar-shaped (Stolper 1984a: 16).

The texts are administrative documents (except for fragments TTM 1 100–102, lacking a date formula, which perhaps are master copies of royal inscriptions; Stolper

1984a: 18) dealing with the disbursal and control of metals (copper or bronze, gold and silver) to be used to fashion objects whose names, when they can be understood in some way, point to architectural ornaments (including perhaps wall knobs) and furnishings (Stolper 1984a: 10–13). Stolper split them according to a “gross classification” in “single-issue memoranda”, “multiple and serial issues”, “dispatches”, and “summary and tabular texts”. Single and multiple issue memoranda seem to be related to an outward movement of goods and supplies within a local administration (Stolper 1984a: 13), while the dispatches seem to record movements to and from destinations outside the organization (Stolper 1984a: 16). The texts are dated internally by month name and day number.

In 1976, from the burned level but in a different sector (H) of the building, another group of tablets (34 tablets and fragments labelled as M-1461 and following numbers; Stolper 1984a: 5) was discovered, mostly in bad shape. This group differs from the first by content: it is not related to metal but to the transfer of livestock, hides, and foodstuffs (Stolper 1984a: 3). One tablet from this group (M-1471) is published in Stolper 2013 together with two more of particular interest (see below).

Some other tablets (listed in Stolper 1984a: 3–5), more or less similar in size and content to the other two groups, come from other sectors of the building. Among these is M-603 (published in Stolper 2013), a tablet from the reoccupation level (IIIa) constituted by a domestic complex built over the burned wall remains (Carter 1996: 39–42); it is similar in palaeography to the tablets from the burned level so, even if it is different in content (Stolper 1984a: 5), its find-spot was probably the result of a secondary deposition (Stolper 2013: 400). The third tablet published in Stolper 2013 is M-1157.

From a palaeographical point of view, the tablets are much closer to Neo-Elamite than Middle Elamite writings; the same is true if one considers the attested inventory of signs (Stolper 1984a: 21). In orthography, the use of *broken writings*, typical of Achaemenid Elamite, is rare (Stolper 1984a: 20).

The pottery found on the floor of level IVa is similar to that of Susa Ville Royale II level 10, which is dated to the end of the Middle Elamite period (c. 1000 BCE) (Stolper 1984a: 5–6; Carter 1996: 29). The lower limit for the dating of the tablets is represented by the burning that destroyed the building, baking the tablets. According to Stolper, the tablets were written between 1300 and 1000 BCE, most probably in the last third of this interval, just before the fire (Stolper 1984a: 9). Steve considered them as the first Neo-Elamite corpus (Neo-Elamite I A; Steve 1992: 21), due to the similarities to Neo-Elamite documents in palaeography and language. The writing of the Persepolis Achaemenid tablets seems to be a development from the Mal'yan tablets, which can be considered as the first documents showing a clear advancement towards the simplification of the signs, reducing the number of wedges and their possible arrangements.

Susa Acropolis tablets (SAT)

The Susa Acropolis tablets represent a homogeneous corpus, counting 299 published tablets found in 1900 during the French excavations led by Jacques de Morgan. According to Morgan and Scheil, the tablets were found a few metres to the south of the chapel of Shurruk-Nahunte II, beneath a structure leaning against the interior facade of the Achaemenid wall of the Acropolis (Basello in press). It is not clear if the Acropolis wall

had a military or a supporting function (probably both), or if it rested on some analogous pre-Achaemenid structure. The Acropolis tablets can be dated to the first half of the 6th century BCE (ca. 590–ca. 555), as proposed by Tavernier on historical and orthographical grounds (Tavernier 2004: 39; see also Basello 2011: 62, n. 5).

The corpus is represented by MDP 9 1–298 published by Scheil in 1907 plus MDP 11 309 (similar to MDP 9 1–298 but apparently coming from a different, unmentioned, find-spot). Hundreds of tiny fragments kept in the Louvre storerooms are still unpublished. MDP 9 88 has been considered related to the so-called Niveveh letters (Hinz 1986: 227; transliteration and translation in Hinz 1986: 231). The tablets were re-edited in Justifov 1963 with a different numbering. MDP 9 34 is treated by Stolper in Harper et al. 1992: 267–269, catalogue no. 188. MDP 9 11 has been recently collocated in Henkelman 2011a: 606–609. Tablets dealing with products received by gods are discussed in Basello 2017, §4. The seal impressions still await a full publication and have still to be connected to tablets; in the meantime, see Amiet 1973: 6–12 and Pls. I–IV, nos. 1–16, and Garrison 2002; the seal impressed on MDP 9 165 is discussed in Basello 2013: 256–257 and photos on p. 264, Figs. 3–5.

The tablets usually record the delivery of (military?) clothing, weaponry, and containers to several individuals and groups of people (identified through a shared anthroponym or toponym). While the delivering institution should be a department of the royal administration in Susa, sometimes the receivers appear to be autonomous groups, as in the cases of the *pubu Samath-p* “inhabitants of Samati” (MDP 9 94:rev.11; literally “Samatian sons”), whose kings are known from the Kalmakarra inscriptions, or three different groups of *Parsa-p* “Persians” (e.g. MDP 9 11:rev.1–2). While it remains difficult to define precisely the relationships linking these groups to the power in Susa, the obvious interpretation suggests a kind of contract or alliance where military equipment and weapons were provided to ensure allegiance if not specifically military support.

The structure of the texts is more homogeneous than the Persepolis Fortification tablets and follows roughly a common pattern, usually closed by the date formula and a toponym:

- (1) a list of quantities, products, and involved people;
- (2) PAP (*/b/uta-k* (usually transcribed *butrukt*) “total manufactured? (items)”;
- (3) *kur-ma-n PN-na* “under the responsibility of PN” (PN = personal name);
- (4) a verbal form, mainly */b/uma-k-a* “withdrawn?” or *li(-)p-k-a* “delivered?”. Few other verbs are attested in alternative;
- (5) the date formula (usually only the month name);
- (6) a toponym (usually preceded by the place classifier *ΔS*).

In most of the texts, the same official, Kurakaka, was acknowledged as the person in charge (*kur-ma-n*) for the administrative operation, assuring a certain compactness of space and time to this corpus which can be considered an archival unit.

Persepolis fortification tablets (PFT)

More than 20,000 tablets and fragments were found in the north-eastern tower of the fortification wall of the terrace of Persepolis in 1933 during the excavations led

by Ernst Herzfeld on behalf of the Oriental Institute of Chicago, where they were sent afterwards on study loan. The find-spot has been described in differing ways (see Basello in press, §1.1, for a full reassessment). Certainly tablets were found high above the floor in a “small room” on the ground floor (Herzfeld 1941: 226); according to Herzfeld this room was walled up, and indeed a one-brick thick sealing wall, still standing ca. 1 m high with respect to the floor of the adjacent corridor, could be guessed at in the few excavation photographs (e.g. Photographic Archives of the Oriental Institute P. 24771 published in Basello in press, Figure 6). Both Herzfeld (quotation in Schmidt 1957: 5, n. 11) and Krefter (1979: 23 and quotation in Henkelman 2008: 71) mentioned also tablets above the remnants of stairs, which should not be the stairway leading to the upper storey, but a few steps leading to a loophole recess in the corridor in front of the “small room”. This could account for the mention of “two little archive chambers” (i.e. the “small room” and the corridor with the steps) in one of the first lectures on the subject by Herzfeld ([Anonymous] 1934: 231, probably compiled using the text read by Herzfeld). However, the tablets on the steps probably led Herzfeld to think that they had fallen down from the upper storey where “the office of the guards” was housed, while maintaining the “small chamber” as a dead archive downstairs (Herzfeld 1941: 226). In Wouter F.M. Henkelman’s words, the tablets with “immediate bureaucratic relevance” were kept apart, while the older ones, which “retained a certain legal function (accountability)”, were deposited in the “small room” (Henkelman 2013: 530). The field number is the only extant way to attempt a reconstruction of the original arrangement of the tablets.

The Persepolis Fortification tablets are internally dated to the regal years 13–28 (509–493 BCE) of an unnamed king who was surely Darius I, being mentioned in a few tablets (e.g. Fort. 6764 published in Cameron 1942 and Henkelman 2010). A total of 15,000 or more original documents in Elamite, of which 6,000–7,000 are still at least partially legible and meaningful (Henkelman 2013: 531; cf. Jones and Stolper 2008: 43) has been estimated. About 2,400 texts have been published to date (Henkelman 2013: 531), most of which in Hallock 1969 (2,087 tablets; PF 1–300 were sent back to the National Museum of Iran in 2004 [Henkelman 2013: 530]), 1978 (33 tablets), and Arfaee 2008a (153 tablets originally read by Cameron, 151 sent back from Chicago in 1948 and two found in later Iranian excavations at Persepolis, now in the National Museum of Iran [Tehran], plus ca. ten tablets that surfaced there; see Henkelman 2008: 76, n. 170; cf. Arfaee 2008a: v; reviewed in Schmitt 2010). Further tablets are published in Cameron 1942, Henkelman 2003, 2008: 384–415 and 455–463, 2010, 2011b-d, Henkelman et al. 2006, Henkelman and Stolper 2009, Stolper 2015, and Azzoni and Stolper 2015 (see also Henkelman 2008: 76, n. 171). A large group of 2,551 tablets circulating among scholars in a handwritten transcription by Hallock is set to be published by Henkelman (Henkelman 2008: 75–7). PFT-like Elamite tablets which were probably part of the same discovery but later scattered (Henkelman 2008: 77, and n. 174) are published in Grillot 1986, Vallat 1994, and Jones and Stolper 2006 (see the section “Isolated tablets” below).

As an archive, the tablets depict a complex administrative scenario, dealing with “the intake, storage, and notably the redistribution of locally produced food commodities” (barley, wine, beer, livestock, etc.) for individuals and groups (male and female workers, officials, members of the royal family, travellers, etc.), and also animals (Henkelman 2013: 530). Most of the tablets are single-issue memoranda,

but there are also many letter orders and journals. Several administrative typologies (labelled with letters from A to W, including further numerical indexing in some cases) were recognized by Hallock according to the managed commodities and the structure of the text (Hallock 1969: 13–69; see the comments interspersed in Azzoni and Stolper 2015: 9–12 and footnotes). Some of them deserved special attention, like the Q texts related to travel rations (e.g. Giovinnazzo 1994a and 1994b).

The memoranda are usually tongue-shaped (straight on the left and rounded on the right), with two strings emerging from the upper and lower ends of the left side; the external tract of the strings had burnt or perished leaving two small holes in the clay. The two strings were actually knotted together inside the tablet, which was then moulded around the knot. Both were evidently sections of a longer string that had either been wrapped around something, or had served as a means of suspension (see Henkelman 2008: 154–161, §2.5.5.2 for a full reassessment). Journals are written on large rectangular tablets (Jones and Stolper 2008: 29–33).

The seal impressions have been partly published in Garrison and Root 2001, besides many other publications by Mark B. Garrison (see Garrison, Chapter 32 in this volume).

The language of the Elamite tablets shows the influence of Old Persian in lexicon and syntax (besides a largely Iranian onomasticon), so strong that Ilya Gershevitch considered it as an alloglottography of Old Persian (see the reassessment in Rossi 2006: 78–82). However, while some fixed patterns of correspondences can be singled out, the large number of variations suggests a case of heavy linguistic interference, as can be expected in a bilingual socio-cultural context (Henkelman 2011a: 588–595). Not all the documents are in Elamite; besides 259 Aramaic epigraphs (usually a single or a few words, numbers, or a date) among about 6,200 Elamite tablets and fragments examined (Azzoni and Stolper 2015: 4–5), ca. 800 tablets are monolingual Aramaic, written in ink or incised (Azzoni 2008). Aramaic (which could be written even after a tablet had become completely dry and hardened; cf. Abrahami and Coulon 2009: 13 on hieratic epigraphs in ink on some Amarna letters) was evidently integrated into the bureaucratic system, while isolated tablets in Phrygian, Greek, and Old Persian remain oddities in the framework of a “general literacy”, unless they are just the “tip of the iceberg” (Stolper and Tavernier 2007; see also Tavernier 2008). The only Babylonian tablet in the Persepolis Fortification archive is a legal text (Stolper 1984b).

The first tablet to be published, Fort. 6764 (in Cameron 1942; see also Henkelman 2010), dated to March–April 503 BCE, is a letter order that presents in a very useful way the chain of command leading to a transaction in favour of one of the princesses of the royal house. Parnaka, most probably the director of the Persepolis administration, instructed Ariana to issue 100 sheep from the estate (*ulhi*) of the king to the princess Artystone. Parnaka stresses three times that this order came directly from the king. The very fact that the chain of command is stated in the text confirms its exceptional character, probably connected to the origin of the order, that is, the king in person. The tablet is dated by year and month, as is usual in the Persepolis Fortification tablets; a few are dated also by the day. A colophon closes the text, providing the names of the scribe and of the mail carrier, probably for accountability purposes.

Even if the Persepolis fortification has preserved thousands of administrative tablets, there is no doubt that other Achaemenid administrative corpora have been lost or still lie waiting underground at Persepolis, not to mention other centres of Fars

and Khuzestan. The Persepolis Fortification tablets hardly recorded any commodities other than foodstuff. It is highly probable that another group of administrative tablets dealt with metal and/or wood products. PF 335, an isolated “tools” text, is the only extant exemplar pertaining to this group (Basello 2011: 75–78, §.4.2), probably mistakenly filed with the food ration texts represented by the Persepolis Fortification archive. In structure and lexicon PF 335 is completely different from the other Fortification tablets. The commodities are unknown to us, except for *like*, a term which may point to wall knobs (Basello 2012).

The digitization of the whole corpus in the framework of the Persepolis Fortification Archive Project (<https://oi.uchicago.edu/research/projects/persepolis-fortification-archive>) directed by Stolper will pave the way for new researches based on numerical and statistical analyses, for example, calculating the volume of commodities managed and the number of workers involved over the years in order to estimate the size and developments of the Persepolis economy, an example of a system based on a newly founded royal city.

Persepolis Treasury tablets (PTT)

The Persepolis Treasury tablets were found in the north-eastern part of the so-called Treasury of Persepolis, mainly in a burned layer above the floor of the columned room 33, during the Oriental Institute excavations led by Erich F. Schmidt in the years 1936–1938 (Schmidt 1957: 4–5 and Figure 2 in between). Their distribution suggests that they were kept in the upper floor and fell down during the conflagration of the building (see also Cahill 1985: 380). The clusters of tablet pieces found on the ramp 25 and stairway 49 also point to an archival deposition on the upper floor (Schmidt 1957: 5). According to Schmidt (1957: 4), 198 tablets and large fragments, 548 smaller fragments, and a number of chips and flakes were found. 138 tablets and fragments were published by George G. Cameron in one monograph (Cameron 1948 [PT 1–84]; PT 10 is updated in Arfaee 2008b) and two articles (Cameron 1938 [PT-1937 1–5] and 1965 [PT-1963 1–20]); the rest are still unpublished. PTT were divided between the National Museum of Iran (Tehran) and the Oriental Institute Museum (Chicago). Very good photographs (obtained with the method described in Cameron 1948: viii) of the tablets in Chicago were published in the plates of Cameron 1948, but the seal impressions (placed on the left side, see below) were not visible since the focus was on the cuneiform text. A further fragment, curiously the first, isolated, tablet to be found at Persepolis but subsequently forgotten, is published in Jones and Yle 2011.

Most of the tablets are tongue-shaped and moulded around a knotted string emerging from the clay at the two ends of the left side, like PFT. The contents are generally longer and the tablets larger than the single-issue memoranda of PFT. The wedges are clearly impressed and the signs generally well-spaced.

PTT dealt with (partial) payments in silver, sometimes in lieu of food rations (in sheep, wine, beer, barley), generally to groups of specialized craftsmen (Hallock 1960: 90–91; Henkelman 2013: 534). The exchange rate of silver/foodstuff and the different amounts for different workers were also provided. The person responsible for the apportionment (*šara-ma-n-a*) seems to be the actual executor. There are two types of documents: letter orders and memoranda. Letters were addressed to the so-called

Treasurer (*kapnuški-r*) at Persepolis, requesting payments in silver; memoranda state that a payment has been made. Another typology is represented by PT 4–8 and PT 81–84 which clearly report a different administrative operation, recording huge amounts of silver given to individuals generally bearing Persian names, sometimes by command of king Darius. Only these tablets seem to be related to Persian high officials and, maybe, to soldiers (see the occurrences of *tašap* ‘army’ in PT 84).

The work period covered by the payment is given in months and regnal year. The name of the king is not provided in the date formula, but through prosopographical reasoning (Cameron 1948: 32–34) it was possible to date the tablets from the 30th regnal year of Darius I to the 7th of Artaxerxes I (not all regnal years in between are attested), that is, from 492 to 457 BCE.

All the texts recording silver paid in lieu of barley (about half of the published tablets) are dated to an eight-month period (December/January 467 to July/August 466) where the exchange rate of barley to silver grew from 1/30 shekel per quart of barley to 1/4 shekel. Something could have happened in this period, maybe a barley shortage which prevented the administration from paying the entire wage in kind, requiring the institution managing silver (*kapnuški*, e.g. in PT 27:5–6, usually translated “Treasury”) to provide it. These supplementary payments in silver may be considered extraordinary, while the silver payments in lieu of wine and sheep are numerically less relevant and evenly distributed in time with a constant rate, representing the usual business (Cahill 1985: 381). However, as remarked by Jones and Yle (2011: 11–12 and n. 7), this could be due to the usual fluctuation of the silver/barley rate during the winter months before the barley harvested in May and June becomes available. This kind of interpretative error, where the extant data is considered exceptional even if there is no comparative data, could be called “positivist fallacy”.

Almost all the tablets are sealed, but only with one seal per tablet (Garrison and Root 2001: 33), belonging to the official who authorized and ordered the operation, that is, the sender in the case of a letter. The seals are cylinder seals mostly carved in the so-called “court style” and therefore reflecting the social status of the officials operating in Persepolis (Garrison and Root 2001: 34).

One hundred ninety-nine sealed clay bullae and tongue-shaped anepigraphic tablets were also found in the Treasury (Schmidt 1957: 5–7 and Figure 3, called generically “labels”); the find-spots coincide partly with the tablets (room 33 and adjacent areas) but not exclusively, so they were not necessarily related to PTT even if clearly a product of the same administrative system. They are formed as lumps of clay wrapped around strings that were tied to objects, bearing four to six different seal impressions (Schmidt 1957: 6). The clay was shaped in different ways, possibly corresponding to the category of object to which they were attached. Certain shapes and seal impressions were found only in specific rooms, suggesting the existence of patterns in the distribution of stored goods (Cahill 1985: 381).

One rectangular tablet in Babylonian (PT 85 in Cameron 1948) was found together with PTT, dealing with taxation. It seems to be rather different both for its language and function.

PTT were concerned with low-level administration and did not involve taxes or gifts, but wages of workers in the Persepolis area (Cahill 1985: 381). With respect to PFT, PTT represent a more homogeneous archive. Handwriting is less differentiated, suggesting that they were all drafted in Persepolis. Some officials (e.g. Ashbazana)

attested in PFT reappear in PTT, remaining active through many years; four seals are attested both on PFT and PTT (Garrison and Root 2001: 33). The name of Hinamuka (Hpirukka in Cameron 1948) appears as that of a scribe both on PFT and PTT (e.g. PF 1182:15 and PT 1:21). Henkelman (2013: 534) stressed that PTT represent a different branch of administration, not a subsequent, new way of remunerating workers.

A complete reassessment of the Treasury material is needed, providing detailed analysis of the relationships between clay bullae and tablets, correlating find-spots, seal impressions, and shapes. Moreover, as suggested by Garrison and Root (2001: 34), the examination of the undersides of bullae may provide clues to their usage, while the analysis of clay may provide data on the locales of production.

Isolated tablets

Isolated administrative documents are represented by MDP 36 2 (one of the three Elamite tablets from the Ville des Artisans in Susa), MDP 28 468 (probably Achæmend according to Stolper 2004: 63, §1.2.4.1; see also Waters 2000: 100), BM 56302 (published in Walker 1980; “a Late Elamite administrative tablet, registered as coming from Sippar, Babylonia” according to Walker 1980: 79), and a tablet from Chogha Mish (in appearance similar to the Susa Acropolis tablets; Deloungaz and Kantor 1996: 17 and Pl. 5.K; see Henkelman 2008: 78, n. 176).

Some other Elamite administrative tablets (one published in Grillof 1986; two in Vallat 1994 [now in the Bibel+Orient Museum of Fribourg; see also Basello 2012], and nine in Jones and Stolper 2006 [formerly part of the Erlenneyer collection]) are similar to the Persepolis Fortification tablets in every respect and can therefore be considered as discovered together during the Oriental Institute excavations and later scattered. YBC 16813 (published in Jones and Stolper 1986) and the Qasr-e Abu Nasr tablet (published in Henkelman et al. 2006) are different in their seal impressions and other details like orthography, lexicon, and onomastics, suggesting that they originated in other Achæmend administrative centres. More relevant are the two fragments of PFT-like tablets from Old Kandahar in southern Afghanistan (Fisher and Stolper 2015) which seem to attest the existence of a PFT-like archive there.

ADMINISTRATIVE TEXTUAL TYPOLOGIES

Usually an administrative corpus – its survival being the result of chance – does not represent the whole administration but a branch of it within a limited span of time. One of the aims of the study of an administrative corpus is to answer the following question: why were these documents written? This question may be better framed through another, probably unanswerable, question: what was *not* written because its recording was not useful or required by the system? The answer to the first question would be only the first step towards the understanding of administration as a system. A further step would be to define the system as an ancient administrator did, that is, to recognize the different administrative departments, their hierarchical organization, the name and functions of the involved officials, the standard procedure, the administrative terminology, and the issues at stake in a diachronic perspective.

An administrative corpus could provide useful data to estimate the (minimum) size of the administration that produced it. Size could be measured by evaluating the quantities of resources by unit of time and the number of individuals working in or served by the administration. Some administrative corpora are focused on a specific category of commodities (e.g. food rations, clothing, weapons, or raw materials) while others managed different commodities together. The scope of an administrative corpus is another relevant parameter in the reconstruction of the related administration, because it provides clues about what was considered homogeneous and therefore to be treated together; what was considered different and therefore treated separately by other departments (being difficult or unuseful to manage together), and what did not pertain to the administration and therefore was not treated at all. The wider the scope, the smaller the size of the administration, at least in most cases. For example, the scope of the Susa Acropolis tablets is wider than that of the Persepolis Fortification tablets, which are focused only on food rations, but there is little doubt that the Persepolis archive was much broader in size (the extant tablets and fragments are ca. 70 times more than those from Susa), showing many more administrative typologies.

The archival context of a corpus has to be evaluated by considering, if its find-spot was a primary deposition or a secondary one (i.e. a dump); in the first case, the archive could be running or dead at the moment of its end (Garrison and Root 2001: 26–29, focused on the Persepolis Fortification tablets); if it was running, its end must have been abrupt.

An administrative corpus is broadly defined by unity of find-spot; rarely is it defined also by unity of administrative typology. The different administrative typologies are usually reconstructed by modern scholars studying the texts, generally evaluating their content and structure, and neglecting other formal characteristics of the document (size, shape, etc.). Therefore, modern classifications, while being useful tools to understand the texts, usually do not correspond to the ancient ones, which remain largely unknown. Nor is it possible to reconstruct the original arrangement of the documents on shelves, baskets, and so on for the administrative corpora from Elam, due to the lack of proper archaeological data and also because some corpora were probably not in a primary deposition context. An exception is represented by a small group of anepigraphic tablets found in a jar on the Kuh-e Rahmat fortifications at Persepolis (Garrison and Root 2001: 34; cf. Henkelman 2013: 534–535); another discovery of tablets in jars, mentioned by Meequenen, is unfortunately undocumented (De Graef 2005: 91–92).

Sometimes it is possible to distinguish economic documents (related to the management of resources) from strictly administrative documents (related to the management of officials and common people working in the administration), but this distinction does not seem to be productive since both kinds of documents have been usually found together in the extant corpora. It seems more appropriate to distinguish between corpora dealing with material or human resources, and between corpora related to transactions (inbound and outbound) or accumulation of commodities (represented by lists or inventories). The distinction between administrative and legal (contracts, loans, adoptions, testaments; e.g. the tablets from the Apadana of Susa MDP 11 301–307, the witness list published in Schell 1928: 40–42, Fort. 11786 published in Stolper 1984b) documents is clearer, at least to us.

The category of managed commodities is the key element distinguishing one administrative department from another. A further functional distinction could usually be recognized by evaluating the place of the written document into the chain of the administrative process related to a given transaction. Authorizations (usually in the form of letter orders) preceded the transaction, while memoranda followed it. Letter orders are standard administrative texts framed in a letter, that is, starting with a standard opening formula mentioning first the addressee and then the sender (Basello 2011, §2.2.1); here the focus is on communication, usually between a high official (the sender) and the official who has direct access to some resources. Memoranda can be distinguished as single-issue or multiple-issue memoranda (Azoni and Stolper 2015: 5–6, both focused on the Persepolis Fortification tablets; see Henkelman 2008: 102, fn. 228 for the use of this term). Multiple issue memoranda are characterized by unity in one or more of the following categories (which are provided only once in the whole text): place, time, commodity, involved people, or officials. It is relevant to the understanding of the administration system to single out which of these categories are usually considered unity factors. Memoranda should be written immediately (even during) or shortly after the transaction and could be distinguished from recap documents (also called “journals”), written much later on rectangular oversized tablets. Recap tablets are made by copying and putting together several memoranda, again according to some unity factor, usually much broader than multiple-issue memoranda (e.g. a period of a year). In the rare case where both the recap tablet and one or more related memoranda are extant (e.g. Pfa 29 reproducing PF 1677, PF 1080, and PF 1011), it is useful to check if some details provided in the memoranda are omitted in the recap (e.g. the recap tablet Pfa 29 which adds detail to the memoranda PF 1011).

Administrative documents are usually dated internally (Basello 2002; Basello 2011, §2.2.2, focused on the Persepolis Fortification tablets). The presence of regnal year, month, and/or day is relevant to the understanding of the scope of the archive and therefore of its function. For example, the indication of the month without year (e.g. in the Malyan EDD tablets and in the Susa Acropolis tablets), reflects an archive having a limited scope in time, unless the tablets were copied later in multiple-issue memoranda related to single years, or the tablets themselves were collected in baskets or shelves labelled by a given year. In any case, a system which records systematically the year also in single-issue memoranda (e.g. the Persepolis Fortification tablets), has to be more complex and more focused on accountability and therefore responsibility in the administration process.

Further typologies of administrative documents are represented by written labels (e.g. MDP 9 2 and 293) and bullae (also called “sealed anepigraphic tablets”), some of which share the tongue shape of the Persepolis memoranda. This practice is known also in Mesopotamia: for example, in the Nuzi archives or in the Middle Assyrian tablets from Ashur (Garrison and Root 2001: 30, n. 88; Stein 1993: 34, n. 113). The Neo-Assyrian administrative documents related to textiles show string traces, too: see especially SAA 7 93 (dated to 658 BCE) that, beside the characteristic holes at the left corners, has the same shape as the Persepolis tablets; Mario Falas and Nicholas Postgate remark that the text unusually runs along the longitudinal axis of the tablet (Falas and Postgate 1992: 108, n. 93; photo on Pl. V; see also p. XXVI, “Textiles”), which is the only direction known in the Persepolis memoranda. From Haft Tappeh,

we have sealed clay envelopes which were moulded around knobs probably used to seal doors (Fertili and Fiandra 1979: 310–311 and Figs. 4–6).

Usually the language of an administrative corpus is technical and formulaic (see Basello 2011, focused on the Persepolis Fortification tablets). The actual character of a transaction or of the role of an official may be disguised in formulaic expressions, which can rarely be understood through etymological means. Therefore, exceptions are most relevant to understand the system, since they reveal the point at which the formulaic language is no longer adequate to express what has to be communicated (see Basello 2011, §2.4, focused on the Persepolis Fortification tablets). As an example, one can mention the exceptional addition in tablets PF 2067 and PF 2068 (dated to the same day, 6th June 500 BCE), where the introduction of a new seal of Parnaka is detailed. This leads us to consider the inherent presence of anomalies and mistakes, possibly due also to frauds. Administrative systems are far from being perfect machines. So scholars have to take into account also their limits and deficiencies. Rarely we have letters dealing with anomalies of the system mixed with personal issues (see Joannès 2009 from a Mesopotamian point of view).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

All the corpora examined above seems to pertain to a relatively local scope, for example, they are not concerned with the administration of far provinces. Conversely, the Old Akkadian tablets from Susa are related to a colonial presence maintaining strong relationships with Mesopotamia. Unfortunately, except for some unpublished tablets related to the international correspondence of Sivepalahupak, we have nothing to tell us about the branches of administration pertaining to relationships with other polities. The army seems to be represented both in Haft Tappeh and Susa, while cultic provisions are known from Persepolis (see Henkelman, Chapter 39 in this volume) and temple institutions are probably mentioned in the Susa Acropolis tablets.

The language switch from Akkadian to Elamite around 1400 BCE may be a ghost phenomenon, that is, the result of a positivist fallacy. It is possible that other corpora in Elamite had existed before and in Akkadian afterwards.

Even if administrative language is formulaic and metaphorical, in the case of corpora in the Elamite language, it has to be paired with the study of language. This will lead to a better understanding of the Elamite language (including morphology, syntax, and lexicon).

It is therefore hoped that in the future:

- the publication of the Malyan, Susa, and Persepolis tablets will be completed at least in the digital domain;
- photos (not to speak of RTI and 3D images) of most of the tablets will be available at least in the digital domain;
- an integrated study of the texts, their physical carriers (size, shape, etc.), and seal impressions will be performed;
- quantitative and statistical studies will be carried out, especially on the Persepolis Fortification tablets which are the most numerous corpus and are generally dated by year;

- clay analysis of the tablets, to be compared with samples taken in the main coeval sites around Susa, Persepolis, and so on will be carried out. This is particularly relevant for the Persepolis Fortification tablets, many of which were probably fashioned and drafted outside Persepolis in local administrative centers in the intermontane plains between Susa and Persepolis, especially the Marvdasht, Mamasani, and Pasargadae plains;
- palaeographical analysis of the tablets, aiming at the singling out of the hands of the scribes, will be carried out;
- comparisons (including sealing practices, text carrier size and shapes, etc.) with Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, and also Achaemenid practices in Babylonian documents from Mesopotamia will be exploited.

From what has been discussed above, it is clear that a monolithic “Elamite administration” or an “Elamite administrative system” or “practice” never existed. Notwithstanding this, the relative scarcity of extant sources has prompted here a collective treatment, hoping that in the future the interconnections between the corpora (and therefore between the administrations) will be better outlined.

ABBREVIATIONS

- MDP 9 Administrative tablets from the Acropolis of Susa published in Scheil 1907 and also in Justifov 1963 (according to another numbering; correspondences in Justifov 1963: 261).
- MDP 11 Elamite inscriptions and tablets published in Scheil 1911.
- MDP 28 Tablets published in Scheil 1939.
- MDP 36 Elamite tablets published in Paper 1954.
- PF Persepolis Fortification tablets published in Hallock 1969.
- PFa Persepolis Fortification tablets published in Hallock 1978.
- PT Persepolis Treasury tablets published in Cameron 1948.
- AAA 7 Neo-Assyrian administrative tablets published in Fales and Postgate 1992.
- TTM 1 Elamite tablets (mainly administrative) from Tall-e Malyan published in Stolper 1984a.

REFERENCES

- Abrahami, Ph. and Coulon, L. 2009. De l'usage et de l'archivage des tablettes cunéiformes d'Amarna. In: Panaracci, L. (ed.) *La lettre d'archive. Communication administrative et personnelle dans l'Antiquité proche-orientale et égyptienne. Actes du colloque de l'université de Lyon 2 9-10 juillet 2004*, Bibliothèque générale 32 = TOI/OI Orient – Occident, Suppl. 9 (2008). Lyon: Institut Français d'archéologie orientale, Le Caire, 1-26.
- Álvarez-Mon, J. and Garrison, M.B. (eds.) 2011. *Elam and Persia*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Amiet, P. 1973. La glyptique de la fin de l'Élam. *Arts Asiatiques* 28: 3-32 and Pls. I-111.
- . 1999. Le sceaux de Kabnak (Haft Tappeh). In: Alizadeh, A., Majidzadeh, Y. and Malek Shahrnizadi, S. (eds.) *The Iranian World. Essays on Iranian Art and Archaeology Presented to Ezat O. Negahban*. Tehran: Iran World, 101-113.
- [Anonymous] 1934. Notes of the Quarter. Recent Discoveries at Persepolis. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 226-232.

- Artée, A. 2008a. *Persepolis Fortification Tablets. Fort. and Teh. Texts* (according to the English title-page), Ancient Iranian Studies Series 5. Tehran: The Centre for the Great Islamic Encyclopedia (in English and Persian).
- . [Arté, A.M.] 2008b. PT 10a, Collated and Completed. ARTA 2008.001 (Mars 2008), 8 pp., www.achemenet.com/document/2008.001-Artai.pdf.
- Azzoni, A. 2008. The Bowman MS and the Aramaic Tablets. In: Briant et al. 2008: 253-274.
- Azzoni, A. and Stolper, M.W. 2015. From the Persepolis Fortification Archive Project, 5. The Aramaic Epigraph *ns(y)h* on Elamite Persepolis Fortification Documents. ARTA 2015.004 (juillet 2015), 88 pp., www.achemenet.com/document/ARTA.2015.004-Azzoni-Stolper.pdf.
- Basello, G.P. 2002. Elam and Babylonia: The Evidence of the Calendars. In: Panaino, A. and Pettinato, G. (eds.) *Ideologies as Intercultural Phenomena*, Melammu Symposia 3. Milano: Università di Bologna – Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 13-36.
- . 2006. Old Persian in Elamite: The Spellings of Month-Names. In: Panaino, A.C.D. and Pras, A. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 5th Conference of the Societas Iranologica Europaea held in Ravenna, 6-11 October 2003*, 1, *Ancient & Middle Iranian Studies*. Milano: Mimesis, 19-38 and Pls. I-IV.
- . 2011. Elamite as Administrative Language: From Susa to Persepolis. In: Álvarez-Mon and Garrison 2011: 61-88.
- . 2012. Eine Wirtschaftsurkunde aus der Festung von Persepolis, 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. In: Steyrmans, H.U. and Straubli, T. (eds.) *Von den Schriften zur (Heiligen) Schrift. Keilschrift, Hieroglyphen, Alpbabete und Tora*. Freiburg: BIBEL+ORIENT Museum Freiburg (CH) – Katholisches Bibelwerk Stuttgart, 74-76.
- . 2013. From Susa to Persepolis: The Pseudo-Sealing of the Persepolis Bronze Plaque. In: De Graef and Tavernier 2013: 249-264.
- . 2017. Of Gods and Men in the Persepolis Bronze Plaque. In: Henkelman, W.F.M. and Redard, C. (eds.) *Persian Religion in the Achaemenid Period/La religion perse à l'époque achéménide*, Classica et Orientalia 16. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 347-383.
- . in press. Administrative Topography in Comparison: Overlapping Jurisdiction between the Susa Acropole Tablets and the Persepolis Fortification Tablets. In: Tavernier, J., Abraham, K., Boschloo, V. and Gorris, E. (eds.) *Topography and Toponymy in the Ancient Near East: Perspectives and Prospects*, Publications de l'Institut orientaliste de Louvain 71. Louvain.
- Beckman, G. 1991. A Sray Tablet from Haft Tépé. *Iranica Antiqua* 26: 81-83.
- Briant, P., Henkelman, W.F.M. and Stolper, M.W. (eds.) 2008. *L'archine des Fortifications de Persepolis. État des questions et perspectives de recherches. Actes du colloque organisé au Collège de France par la "Chaire d'histoire et civilisation du monde achéménide et de l'empire d'Alexandre" et le "Réseau international d'études et de recherches achéménides"* (GDR 2538 CNRS), 3-4 novembre 2006, Persika 12. Paris: Éditions de Boccard.
- Cahill, N. 1985. The Treasury at Persepolis: Gift-Giving at the City of the Persians. *American Journal of Archaeology* 89/3: 373-389.
- Cameron, G.G. 1942. Darius' Daughter and the Persepolis Inscriptions. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 1: 214-218.
- . 1948. *Persepolis Treasury Tablets*, Oriental Institute Publications 65. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- . 1958. Persepolis Treasury Tablets Old and New. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 17: 161-176.
- . 1965. New Tablets from the Persepolis Treasury. With Contributions by I. Gershevitch. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 24: 167-192.
- Carré, E. 1996. *Excavations at Anshan (Tale Malyan): The Middle Elamite Period*, University Museum Monograph 82 = Malyan Excavation Reports 2. Philadelphia: The University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania.

- . 1999. Kabnak (Haft Tappéh) and Al Unraash-Napurisha (Chogha Zanbil): Elamite cities of the Late Bronze Age. In: Alizadeh, A., Majidzadeh, Y. and Malek Shahrizadi, S. (eds.) *The Iranian World. Essays on Iranian Art and Archaeology Presented to Ezat O. Negahban*. Tehran: Iran University Press, 114–130.
- Charpin, D. 2013. "Ainsi parle l'empereur". À propos de la correspondance des *sukkal-mah*. In: De Graef and Tavernier 2013: 341–353.
- De Graef, K. 2005. *Les archives d'Iqbitum. Les documents Ur-III du chantier B à Suse*. Mémoires de la Délégation Archéologique en Iran 54. Gand: Universitè de Gand.
- . 2006. *De la dynastie Simaki au Sukkalmaḫar. Les documents fm PE IIB – début PE III du chantier B à Suse*. Mémoires de la Délégation Archéologique en Iran 55. Gand: Université de Gand.
- . 2013. The Use of Akkadian in Iran. In: Potts, D.T. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Iran*, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 263–282.
- . 2015. Susa in the Late 3rd Millennium: From a Mesopotamian Colony to an Independent State (MC 2110–1980). In: Sallaberger, W. and Schrakamp, I. (eds.) *History & Philology*, Associated Regional Chronologies for the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean (ARCANÉ) 3. Turnhout: Brepols, 289–296.
- De Graef, K. and Tavernier, J. (eds.) 2013. *Susa and Elam. Archaeological, Philological, Historical and Geographical Perspectives. Proceedings of the International Congress Held at Ghent University, December 14–17, 2009*, Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse 58. Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- Delougaz, P. and Kantor, H.J. 1996. *Chogha Mish Volume I. The First Five Seasons of Excavations 1961–1972*, edited by A. Alizadeh, Oriental Institute Publications 101. Chicago, IL: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Dossin, G. 1927. *Autres textes sumériens et accadiens*, Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Perse 18. Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- Fales, F.M. and Postgate, J.N. 1992. *Imperial Administrative Records, part I. Palace and Temple Administration*, State Archives of Assyria 7. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Ferrioli, P. and Fiandra, E. 1979. The Administrative Functions of Clay Sealings in Protohistoric Iran. In: Gnoli, G. and Rossi, A.V. (eds.) *Iranica*, Series Minor 10. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 307–312 and Pls. XVI–XXI.
- Fisher, M.T. and Stolpe, M.W. 2015. Achaemenid Elamite Administrative Tablets, 3. Fragments from Old Kandahar, Afghanistan. ARTA 2015.001 (Janvier 2015), 27 pp., www.achemenet.com/document/ARTA_2015.001-Fisher-Stolpe.pdf.
- Foster, B.R. 1982. Archives and Record-Keeping in Sargonic Mesopotamia. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 72: 1–27.
- . 2016. *The Age of Agade. Inventing empire in ancient Mesopotamia*. London – New York: Routledge.
- Garfinkle, S.J. 2005. Public Versus Private in the Ancient Near East. In: Snell, D.C. (ed.) *A Companion to the Ancient Near East*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden, MA – Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 406–418.
- Garrison, M.B. 2002. The "Late Neo-Elamite" Glyptic Style: A Perspective from Fars. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, n.s. 16: 65–102.
- Garrison, M.B. and Root, M.C. 2001. *Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets*, Volume I: *Images of Heroic Encounter*, Oriental Institute Publications 117, with seal inscription readings by Charles E. Jones. Chicago, IL: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Giovannazzo, G. 1994a. Les documents de voyage dans les textes de Persépolis. *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale* 54: 18–31.
- . 1994b. Les voyages de Darius dans les régions orientales de l'empire. *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale* 54: 32–45.
- . 1995. 'I puhu' nei testi di Persepoli. Nuove interpretazioni. *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale* 55: 141–157.
- . 2012. Gli artigiani della pietra a Persepoli. In: Basello, G.P. and Rossi, A.V. (eds.) *DAROSH Studies II. Persepolis and Its Settlements: Territorial System and Ideology in the Achaemenid State*, Series Minor 78. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale", 121–138.
- Glassner, J.J. 1991. Les textes de Haft Tépé, la Susiane et l'Élam au zème millénaire, with the collaboration of F. Grillot. In: *Mésopotamie et Élam. Actes de la XXXVIème Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*. Gand, 10–14 juillet 1989, Mesopotamian History and Environment, Occasional Publications 1. University of Ghent, 109–126.
- Grillot, F. 1986. Une tablette achéménide inédite. *Archéologische Mitteilungen aus Iran*, n.F. 19: 149–150.
- Hallack, R.T. 1960. A New Look at the Persepolis Treasury Tablets. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 19/2: 90–100.
- . 1969. *Persepolis Fortification Tablets*, Oriental Institute Publications 92. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- . 1978. Selected Fortification Texts. *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 8: 109–136.
- Harper, P.O., Anu, J. and Tallon, F. (eds.) 1992. *The Royal City of Susa. Ancient Near Eastern Treasures in the Louvre*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art (also in a French edition revised by A. Caubert. *La cité royale de Suse. Trésors du Proche-Orient Ancien au Louvre*, Paris: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1994).
- Hasselbach, R. 2005. *Sargonic Akkadian. A Historical and Comparative Study of the Syllabic Texts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Henkelman, W. 2003. An Elamite Memorial: The Šumar of Cambyses and Hyrshapes. In: Henkelman, W. and Kuhrt, A. (eds.) *A Persian Perspective. Essays in Memory of Helen Sancisi-Weerdenburg*. Achaemenid History 13. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 101–172.
- . 2008. *The Other Gods who are. Studies in Elamite-Iranian Acculturation based on the Persepolis Fortification Texts*, Achaemenid History 14. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- . 2010. "Consumed before the King". The Table of Darius, that of Irababana and Irastuna, and that of his Satrap, Karkis. In: Jacobs, B. and Rollinger, R. (eds.) *Der Achämenidenhof. The Achaemenid Court. Akten des 2. Internationalen Kolloquiums zum Thema "Vordariens im Spannungsfeld klassischer und altorientalischer Überlieferungen"*. Innsbruck, 24. – 28. November 2008, Classica et Orientalia 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 577–634.
- . 2011b. Of Tapyroi and Tablets, States and Tribes: The Historical Geography of Pastoralism in the Achaemenid Heartland in Greek and Elamite Sources. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 54/2: 1–16.
- . 2011c. Xerxes, Atossa, and the Persepolis Fortification Archive. In: Eidem, J. and van Zoest, C. (eds.) *Annual Report 2010*. Leiden – Istanbul, 26–33.
- . 2011d. Parnak's Feast: *šip* in Pārsa and Élam. In: Alvarez-Mon and Garrison 2011: 89–166.
- . 2012. The Achaemenid Heartland: An Archaeological-Historical Perspective. In: Potts, D.T. (ed.) *A Companion to the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East*, Blackwell

- Companions to the Ancient World. Malden, MA – Oxford – Chichester: Blackwell, 932–962 and shared bibliography.
- . 2013. Administrative Realities: The Persepolis Archives and the Archaeology of the Achaemenid Heartland. In: Potts, D.T. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Iran*. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 528–546.
- Henkelman, W.F.M., Jones, C.E. and Stolper, M.W. 2006. Achaemenid Elamite Administrative Tablets, 2: The Qasr-i Abu Nasr Tablet. ARTA 2006.003 (Décembre 2006), 20 pp., www.achemenet.com/ressources/enligne/arta/pdf/2006.003-Stolper-Jones-Henkelman.pdf
- Henkelman, W.F.M. and Stolper, M.W. 2009. Ethnic identity and ethnic labelling at Persepolis: the case of the Skudrians. In: Briant, P. and Chauveau, M. (eds.) *Organisation des pouvoirs et contacts culturels dans les pays de l'empire achéménide. Actes du colloque organisé au Collège de France par la "Chaire d'histoire et civilisation du monde achéménide et de l'empire d'Alexandre" et le "Réseau international d'études et de recherches achéménides"* (CDR 2538 CNRS), 9–10 novembre 2007, Persika 14. Paris: Éditions de Boccard, 271–329.
- Herrero, P. 1976. Tablettes administratives de Haft-Tépé. *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 6: 93–116.
- Herrero, P. and Glassner, J.-J. 1990. Haft-Tépé: choix de textes I. *Iranica Antiqua* 25: 1–45 (tablets nos. 1–70).
- . 1991. Haft-Tépé: choix de textes II. *Iranica Antiqua* 26: 39–80 (tablets nos. 71–163).
- . 1993. Haft-Tépé: choix de textes III. *Iranica Antiqua* 28: 97–135 (tablets nos. 164–207).
- . 1996. Haft-Tépé: choix de textes IV. *Iranica Antiqua* 31: 51–82 (tablets nos. 208–290).
- Herzfeld, E.E. 1941. *Iran in the Ancient East. Archaeological Studies Presented in the Lowell Lectures at Boston*. London – New York.
- Hiinz, W. 1967. Elams Vertrag mit Nārām-Sin von Akkade. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 24: 66–95.
- . 1986. Zu den elamischen Briefen aus Nimive. In: De Meyer, L., Gasche, H. and Vallat, F. (eds.) *Fragmenta Historiae Elamicae. Mélanges offerts à M. J. Steve*. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 227–234.
- Jannès, F. 2009. La lettre d'archive. Essai de synthèse. In: Panatucci, L. (ed.) *La lettre d'archive. Communication administrative et personnelle dans l'Antiquité proche-orientale et égyptienne. Actes du colloque de l'université de Lyon 2 9–10 juillet 2004*, Bibliothèque générale 32 = TOI/OI Orient – Occident, Suppl. 9 (2008). Lyon: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, Le Caire, 193–198.
- Jones, C.E. and Yie, S. 2011. From the Persepolis Fortification Archive Project, 3. The First Administrative Document Discovered at Persepolis: PT 1971–1971. ARTA 2011.003 (Jun 2011), 14 pp., www.achemenet.com/document/2011.003-Jones&Yie.pdf
- Jones, C.E. and Stolper, M.W. 1986. Two Late Elamite Tablets at Yale. In: De Meyer, L., Gasche, H. and Vallat, F. (eds.) *Fragmenta Historiae Elamicae. Mélanges offerts à M. J. Steve*. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 243–254.
- . 2006. Fortification Texts Sold at the Auction of the Erlenneyer Collection. ARTA 2006.001 (Jun 2006), 22 pp., www.achemenet.com/ressources/enligne/arta/pdf/2006.001-Jones-Stolper.pdf
- . 2008. How Many Persepolis Fortification Tablets Are There? In: Briant et al. 2008: 27–30.
- Justifoy, Ju.-B. 1963. Elamskie chozjastivennye dokumenty iz Suz (i.e. "Elamite economic documents from Susa"). *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 84/2: 189–222 and 85/3: 199–261 (in Russian).
- Kretzer, F. 1979. Mit Ernst Herzfeld in Pasargadae und Persepolis 1928 und 1931–1934. *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran*, n.F. 12: 13–23 and Pls. 1–7.
- Lambert, M. 1974. Deux textes élamites du III^e millénaire. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale* 68: 3–14.
- Legrain, L. 1913. Tablettes de comptabilité, etc. de l'époque de la dynastie d'Agadé, with an introduction by V. Scheil, Tablettes de l'époque de la dynastie d'Agadé. In: Scheil, V., *Textes*
- élamites-sémitiques. Cinqième Série*, Mémoires de la Mission archéologique en Susiane 14. Paris: Ernest Leroux, éditeur, 61–131.
- Mofidi-Nasrabi, B. 2010. *Vorbericht der archäologischen Ausgrabungen der Kampagnen 2005–2007 in Haft Tappeh (Iran)*, with contribution by D. Prechel and R. Vahdizadeh. Münster: Agenda.
- . 2012a. *Vorbericht der archäologischen Ausgrabungen der Kampagnen 2008–2010 in Haft Tappeh (Iran)*. *Elamica* 2: 55–115, Pls. 1–41, and Plan 1.
- . 2012b. Arbeitszimmer eines Schreibers aus der mittelmelamischen Zeit. In: Wilhelm, G. (ed.) *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Würzburg 20–25 July 2008*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 747–756.
- . 2014. *Vorbericht der archäologischen Ausgrabungen der Kampagnen 2012–2013 in Haft Tappeh (Iran)*. *Elamica* 4: 67–167.
- Naveh, J. and Shaked, Sh. 2012. *Aramaic Documents from Ancient Bactria*. London: Khalili Family Trust.
- Negahban, E.O. 1991. *Excavations at Haft Teppe, Iran*. University Museum Monograph 70. Philadelphia: The University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania.
- Paper, H.H. 1954. Note préliminaire sur la date des trois tablettes élamites de Suse. In: Ghirshman, R., *Village perse-achéménide*, Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique en Iran 36. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 79–82 and Pl. XXIV.
- Prechel, D. 2010. Die Tontafel aus Haft Tappeh 2005–2007. In: Mofidi-Nasrabi 2010: 51–57.
- Reiner, E. 1972. Tall-i-Malyān – Inscribed material. *Iran* 10: 177.
- . 1973. Inscription from a Royal Elamite Tomb. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 24: 87–102.
- Robson, E. 2008. *Mathematics in Ancient Iraq. A Social History*. Princeton, NJ – Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Rossi, A.V. 2006. Ilya Gershevitch, Old Persian and Western Iranian Dialectology. In: Panaino, A. (ed.) *The Scholarly Contribution of Ilya Gershevitch to the Development of Iranian Studies. International Seminar 11th April 2003 Ravenna*, with the contribution of S. Ciracassa. Milano: Mimesis, 69–84.
- Scheidt, W. 2013. Studying the State. In: Bang, P.F. and Scheidel, W. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of the State in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean*. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 5–58.
- Scheil, V. 1907. *Textes élamites-anzanites. Troisième série*, Délégation en Perse, Mémoires 9. Paris: Ernest Leroux, éditeur.
- . 1908. *Textes élamites-sémitiques. Quatrième série*, Délégation en Perse, Mémoires 10, with the collaboration of J.-E. Gautier. Paris: Ernest Leroux, éditeur.
- . 1911. *Textes élamites-anzanites. Quatrième série*, Délégation en Perse, Mémoires 11. Paris: Ernest Leroux, éditeur.
- . 1928. Sparsim. *Revue d'Assyriologie* 25: 37–49.
- . 1930. *Actes juridiques susiens*, Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Perse 22. Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- . 1932. *Actes juridiques susiens (Suite: n° 166 à n° 327)*, Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Perse 23. Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- . 1933. *Actes juridiques susiens (Suite: n° 328 à n° 395)*. *Inscriptions des Achéménides (Supplément de suite)*, Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Perse 24. Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- . 1939. *Mélanges épigraphiques*, Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Perse 28. Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- Schmidt, E.F. 1957. *Persepolis II. Contents of the Treasury and Other Discoveries*, Oriental Institute Publications 69. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

- Schmitt, R. 2010. Zu den Persepolis Fortification Tablets im Iran. *Bastan Museum* (review of *Artae* 2008a). *Orientalia*, n.s. 79/3: 390–400.
- Stein, D. 1993. *Das Archiv des Šilva-Taššip*, 8. *The Seal Impressions*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- Steve, M.-J. 1992. *Syllabaire élamite. Histoire et paléographie*, Civilisations du Proche-Orient, Serie II. Philologie 1. Neuchâtel – Paris: Recherches et Publications.
- Steve, M.-J. and Gasche, H. 1971. *Licropole de Susse. Nouvelles feuilles (rapport préliminaire)*, Mémoires de la délégation archéologique en Iran 46, with the collaboration of A. Caisson. Leiden: E.J. Brill – Paris: P. Geuthner.
- Stolper, M.W. 1976. Preliminary Report on Texts from Tall-e-Malyān 1971–1974. In: Bagherzadeh, F. (ed.) *Proceedings of the IVth Annual Symposium on Archaeological Research in Iran, 3rd – 8th November 1975*. Tehran: Iranian Centre for Archaeological Research, 89–100 and 108–109, photos 1–3.
- . 1982. On the Dynasty of Šinaški and the Early Sukkalmals. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 72: 42–67.
- . 1984a. *Texts from Tall-i-Malyan I. Elamite Administrative Texts (1972–1974)*. Occasional Publications of the Babylonian Fund 6. Philadelphia, PA: Babylonian Fund of the University Museum.
- . 1984b. The Neo-Babylonian Text from the Persepolis Fortification. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 43: 299–310.
- . 2003. Three Stray Elamite Tablets from Malyan. In: Miller, N.E. and Abdi, K. (eds.) *Yeki bud, yeki nabud. Essays on the archaeology of Iran in honor of William M. Sumner*, Monograph 48. Los Angeles: The Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, University of California, 201–206.
- . 2004. Elamite. In: Woodard, R.D. (ed.) *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the world's ancient languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 60–94, reprinted also in Woodard, R.D. (ed.) *The ancient languages of Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Aksum*, 47–82 (2008).
- . 2013. *Sigets of Anšan*. In: De Graef and Tavernier 2013: 399–415.
- . 2015. From the Persepolis Fortification Archive Project, 4. 'His Own Death' in Bisotun and Persepolis. *ARTA* 2015.002 (Mars 2015), 28 pp., www.achemenet.com/document/ARTA_2015.002-Stolper.pdf.
- Stolper, M.W. and Tavernier, J. 2007. From the Persepolis Fortification Archive Project, 1: An Old Persian Administrative Tablet from the Persepolis Fortification. *ARTA* 2007.001 (Jun 2007), 28 pp., www.achemenet.com/pdf/arta/2007.001-Stolper-Tavernier.pdf.
- Sumner, W.M. 2003. *Early Urban Life in the Land of Anshan: Excavations at Tall-e Malyan in the Highlands of Iran*, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology Reports 3. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology.
- Tavernier, J. 2004. Some Thoughts on Neo-Elamite Chronology. *ARTA* 2004.003 (Mars 2004), 44 pp., www.achemenet.com/ressources/enligne/arta/pdf/2004.003-Tavernier.pdf.
- . 2008. Multilingualism in the Fortification and Treasury archives. In: Briant et al. 2008: 59–86.
- Trigger, B.G. 2003. *Understanding Early Civilizations. A Comparative Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vallat, F. 1994. Deux tablettes élamites de Fribourg. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 53: 263–274.
- Walker, C.B.F. 1980. Elamite Inscriptions in the British Museum. *Iran* 18: 75–81.
- Waters, M.W. 2000. *A Survey of Neo-Elamite History*, State Archives of Assyria Studies 12. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.
- Yoffee, N. 2005. *Myths of the Archaic State. Evolution of the Earliest Cities, States, and Civilizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

PART VI
THE MATERIAL CULTURE
OF ELAM