

THE ELAMITE WORLD

EDITED BY JAVIER ÁLVAREZ-MON,
GIAN PIETRO BASELLO
AND YASMINA WICKS

ROUTLEDGE

THE ELAMITE WORLD

Amongst the civilizations to participate in the dynamic processes of contact and interchange that gave rise to complex societies in the ancient Near East, Elam has remained one of the most obscure, at times languishing in the background of scholarly inquiry. In recent years, however, an increasing body of academic publications have acknowledged its relevance and suggested that its legacy was more considerable and long-lasting than previously estimated.

The Elamite World assembles a group of 40 international scholars to contribute their expertise to the production of a solid, lavishly illustrated English-language treatment of Elamite civilization, covering topics such as its physical setting, historical development, languages and people, material culture, art, science, religion and society. Also treated are the legacy of Elam in the Persian empire and its presence in the modern world.

This comprehensive and ambitious survey seeks for Elam, hardly a household name, a noteworthy place in our shared cultural heritage. It will be both a valuable introductory text for a general audience and a definitive reference source for students and academics.

Javier Álvarez-Mon, a native of Spain, holds degrees in ancient Near Eastern art and archaeology from the École du Louvre (Paris) and the University of California at Berkeley, respectively. A 2003 Fullbright-Hays fellow, he is presently Associate Professor in Near Eastern Archaeology and Art at Macquarie University (Australia) and 2014–2018 Future Fellow (Australian Research Council). His primary research interests are the ancient Iranian civilizations of Elam and early Achaemenid Persia. He has two forthcoming books, *Monumental Reliefs of the Elamite Highlands* and *The Art and Culture of Elam*.

Gian Pietro Basello (PhD in the Ancient Near East 2005) is Tenured Lecturer (2018–) at "L'Orientale" University of Naples, Italy, where he has been teaching Elamite language since 2010. He has worked since 2003 on the Iranian-Italian joint Project DARIOSH (Digital Achaemenid Royal Inscription Open Schema Hypertext). His researches are also devoted to ancient calendars and systems for recording time. His website is www.elamit.net.

Yasmina Wicks completed her PhD '"Alas, Short is the Joy of Life!": Elamite Funerary Practice in the First Half of the First Millennium BCE' (2017) at the University of Sydney, Australia, where she remains a research affiliate. She has authored a monograph *Bronze 'Bathtub' Coffins in the Context of 8th-6th Century BC Babylonian, Assyrian and Elamite Funerary Practices* (2015) and several articles on the material culture of first millennium Elam.

THE ROUTLEDGE WORLDS

THE ISLAMIC WORLD
Edited by Andrew Rippin

THE WORLD OF POMPEII
Edited by Pedar W. Foss and John J. Dobbins

THE RENAISSANCE WORLD
Edited by John Jeffries Martin

THE GREEK WORLD
Edited by Anton Powell

THE ROMAN WORLD
Edited by John Wacher

THE HINDU WORLD
Edited by Sushil Mittal and Gene Thursby

THE WORLD OF THE AMERICAN WEST
Edited by Gordon Morris Bakken

THE ELIZABETHAN WORLD
Edited by Susan Doran and Norman Jones

THE OTTOMAN WORLD
Edited by Christine Woodhead

THE VICTORIAN WORLD
Edited by Marin Hewitt

THE ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN WORLD
Edited by Augustine Casiday

Forthcoming:

THE MORMON WORLD
Edited by Carl Mosser, Richard Sherlock

THE BUDDHIST WORLD
Edited by John Powers

THE ETRUSCAN WORLD
Edited by Jean MacIntosh Turfa

THE GOTHIC WORLD
Edited by Glennis Byron and Dale Townshend

THE ATLANTIC WORLD
Edited by D'Maris Coffman, Adrian Leonard, and William O'Reilly

THE POSTCOLONIAL WORLD
Edited by Jyotsna G. Singh and David D. Kim

THE SUMERIAN WORLD
Edited by Harriet Crawford

THE OCCULT WORLD
Edited by Christopher Partridge

THE WORLD OF INDIGENOUS NORTH AMERICA
Edited by Robert Warrior

THE WORLD OF THE REVOLUTIONARY AMERICAN REPUBLIC
Edited by Andrew Shankman

THE SHAKESPEAREAN WORLD
Edited by Jill L. Levenson and Robert Ormsby

THE WORLD OF COLONIAL AMERICA
Edited by Ignacio Gallup-Diaz

THE MODERNIST WORLD
Edited by Allana Lindgren and Stephen Ross

Forthcoming:

THE WORLD OF GREAT ZIMBABWE
Edited by Innocent Pikirayi

THE MEDIEVAL WORLD, SECOND EDITION
Edited by Peter Linehan, Janet L. Nelson, and Marios Costambeys

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN WORLD, SECOND EDITION
Edited by Philip F. Esler

THE SWAHILI WORLD
Edited by Stephanie Wynne-Jones and Adria LaViolette

THE ELAMITE WORLD
Edited by Javier Álvarez-Mon, Gian Pietro Basello, and Yasmina Wicks

THE ELAMITE WORLD

Edited by

Javier Álvarez-Mon,
Gian Pietro Basello, and Yasmina Wicks

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2018
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2018 selection and editorial matter, Javier Álvarez-Mon, Gian Pietro Basello and Yasmina Wicks; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Javier Álvarez-Mon, Gian Pietro Basello and Yasmina Wicks to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system,
without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-1-138-99989-3 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-315-65803-2 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

CONTENTS

List of figures ix

List of tables xvii

List of contributors xviii

Introduction 1
Javier Álvarez-Mon, Gian Pietro Basello, and Yasmina Wicks

PART I: IMAGINING ELAM: THE HISTORY OF RESEARCH AND ITS SOURCES 9

1 Ælam regio: Elam in Western scholarship from the Renaissance to the late 19th century 11
Daniel T. Potts

2 Elam and the Bible 27
Peter Dubovský

3 France and Elam 41
Nicole Chevalier

4 Between orientalism and Persomania: The presentation of the Iranian collections at the Louvre 63
Marianne Cotty

5 Elamite forgeries and the antiquities market 80
Oscar White Muscarella

PART II: THE LAND AND PEOPLES OF ELAM 97

6 Physical geography and environment of Elam 99
Cameron A. Petrie, Morteza Djamali, and Matthew D. Jones

7 Metals and mining 118
Barbara Helwing

8 The peoples of Elam 146
Ran Zadok

9 Elamites and Iranians 163
Jan Tavernier

PART III: ELAM THROUGH HISTORY 175

10 The birth of Elam in history 177
Piotr Steinkeller

11 The Old Elamite period 203
Luca Peyronel

12 Elam in the Middle Elamite period 232
Behzad Mofidi-Nasrabadi

13 The last centuries of Elam: the Neo-Elamite period 249
Elynn Gorris and Yasmina Wicks

PART IV: CLOSE ENCOUNTERS ON THE EASTERN AND WESTERN FRONTS 273

14 Great Domino games: from Elam, looking eastwards 275
Massimo Vidale

15 Elam and Babylonia *c.* 1400–1100 BC 304
Ran Zadok

16 Elam and Assyria 323
Peter Dubovský

17 Propaganda and symbolism: representations of the Elamites at the time of Ashurbanipal 340
Shahrokh Razmjou

PART V: LANGUAGE AND WRITING IN ELAM 361

18 Prehistoric administrative technologies and the ancient Near Eastern redistribution economy: the case of greater Susiana 363
Denise Schmandt-Besserat

19 The proto-Elamite writing system 383
Jacob L. Dahl

20 Linear Elamite writing 397
François Desset

21 The Elamite language 416
Jan Tavernier

22 Writing in Elam 450
Jean-Jacques Glassner

23 Elamite royal inscriptions 464
Florence Malbran-Labat

24 Elamite administration 481
Gian Pietro Basello and Grazia Giovinazzo

PART VI: THE MATERIAL CULTURE OF ELAM 505

25 Elamite architecture 507
Behzad Mofidi-Nasrabadi

26 Elamite ceramics 531
Bernadette K. McCall

27 The metal arts of Elam 550
François Bridey

28 The industry of vitreous materials in Elam 568
Noëmi Daucé

29 Origins of monumental sculpture in Elam: Two case studies 585
Holly Pittman

30 The sculptural arts of Elam 602
Javier Álvarez-Mon

31 Glyptic in the 4th–2nd millennium 624
Enrico Ascalone

32 Glyptic in the 1st millennium 649
Mark B. Garrison

33 Elamite dress and textiles 673
Trudy S. Kawami

PART VII: ELAMITE SOCIETY 695

34 Cuneiform culture and science, calendars, and metrology in Elam 697
Gian Pietro Basello and Enrico Ascalone

35 Elamite religion and ritual 729
Enrique Quintana

36 Elamite funerary practices 741
Hermann Gasche and Steven W. Cole

37 Women of Elam 763
Aurelie Daems

38 Music 781
Bo Lawergren

PART VIII: THE LEGACY OF ELAM 801

39 Elamite administrative and religious heritage in the Persian heartland 803
Wouter F.M. Henkelman

40 The Elamite artistic heritage of Persia 829
Javier Álvarez-Mon

41 Elam in Achaemenid studies 851
Adriano V. Rossi

Index 863

CHAPTER THIRTY-NINE

ELAMITE ADMINISTRATIVE AND RELIGIOUS HERITAGE IN THE PERSIAN HEARTLAND

Wouter F.M. Henkelman

MDP 10 2 and 21, two Old Babylonian texts from early Sukkalmah-period Susa, are written on half-circular or tongue-shaped tablets with flattened left edges.[1] The seal impression on the left edge is accompanied by a caption. MDP 10 2 has a string hole at each side of the left edge (no images of the other tablet's left edge are available). Although the unusual format at first sight may suggest that they were tags of some kind (so De Graef 2009), the contents show that the tablets are self-contained records in the full sense of the word. Despite several unclear aspects, it appears that they are receipts for livestock used in a series of sacrifices.

Tablets of comparable format are known from Neo-Assyrian contexts (where they are known as 'dockets' – see Radner 1997: 26–31), but the closest parallels, notably in terms of document category, are from Achaemenid Persepolis. There, tongue-shaped tablets were used for economic transactions (not legal, as in the Assyrian case) of various kinds, but mostly for receipts. One such 'memorandum,' PFa 02, records, in Elamite, the allocation of barley for the purpose of acquiring livestock, which was then sacrificed in four different rites: for Napiriša and Adad, for/at *tikrakkaš* and *kušukum*. The sacrifices listed in MDP 10 2, some 15 centuries before, includes a rite called *gūšum*, a term occurring only in Susa contexts and probably reflecting an Elamite word. Achaemenid-Elamite *kušukum* may well derive from it (through reduplication: **kušu-kušum* > **kušukušm* > *kušukum*; Koch 1977: 120–125; Hinz and Koch 1987 q.vv.; Henkelman s.d. 3 §4).

The above example illustrates the potential of tracing Elamite-Persian continuities in the sense that it shows the antiquity of institutional households organising certain sacrifices, the possible endurance of cultic terminology, and use of a particular tablet format for a particular kind of record. All this potential is marred, however, by the huge chronological gap, only slightly mitigated by the recent find of Neo-Elamite tablets in tongue-shaped and other formats (Yāsūğ, unpublished). Elamite documentary sources are generally sparse and unevenly spread throughout history; only rarely are the same document types and thematic scope found in corpora from different periods.

Yet another matter is how to appreciate the Elamite elements in Persepolis Fortification tablet PFa 02, especially since the sacrifices had been ordered, organised and performed on behalf of the Persian heartland administration at the time of Darius I.

To this may be added that the officiant had an Iranian name, Kaubara, an imprecise variant of Kambarma (OP Gaubaruva-; cf. PF 0353), better known from its Greek form, Gobryas. How to explain the Elamite deities Napiriša and Adad (worshipped in Elam since the early second millennium) and the Elamite term *kušukum* in an otherwise Persian context?

The answer to the above question depends on the interpretative model one chooses. One is, in its clearest and original form, that of an Indo-Iranian *Landnahme*: a narrative of migration and conquest by groups of Iranian-speaking or Aryan people large enough to impose their rule (see, e.g. Hinz 1976/1979 I: 42–52, 56). The migrants are thought to have carried with them an essentially mature intellectual culture. Native elements, if any, were absorbed and adapted within an existing and stable framework, hence without truly impacting the incoming cultural-ethnic identity. This identity was for a long time regarded as superior; in more recent versions of the model it is pictured more neutrally as particular and clearly distinct from any native culture (so, e.g., Kellens 2002; discussion in Henkelman 2017b: 290–303).

The second, alternative model entails, again in its clearest form, a denial of Persian identity as a *linear* development from its Indo-Iranian roots. Articulated in a seminal study by Pierre de Miroschedji (1985; also 1990), it proposes a Persian ethnogenesis in which merging Elamite and Indo-Iranian cultural traditions jointly produced a new identity. Incorporating ever-larger portions of the population of southwestern Iran, it eventually produced the Persian nation as it emerges in the historical record, this in analogy to the process that led to the formation of Germanic peoples in Late Antiquity (as famously proposed by Wenskus 1961). Miroschedji further argued that reduced settlement density in the centuries prior to the Achaemenids probably pointed to increased nomadism, a factor that would have facilitated the merging of various ethnic groups and their cultural traditions. While in itself valid, the second inference builds an incomplete picture in the sense that it underestimates the role of confrontations between agro-pastoralist inhabitants of the highlands with Elam's urban culture in the all-important contact zone of the Zagros piedmonts east of Khūzestān (cf. Rollinger 1999: 125f.; Henkelman 2011a: 582–584).

The ethnogenesis model does not, it should be stressed, project a homogenous cultural landscape as the outcome of acculturation (for an instructive example, see Henkelman 2011b: 4–6). While adoption of a single language and unified culture may coincide with ethnogenesis, they are not decisive prerequisites of it. What one expects rather than full-blown unity is a spectrum of cultural attitudes – yet gathered under a broad and inclusive cultural-ethnic umbrella, *viz* 'Persian'. It is this ethnonym and the traditions projected onto it that make decisive unifiers.

Although the difference is not always observed in debates on the subject, both models here outlined are hypotheses, not conclusions: their hypothetical nature is a function of the absence of conclusive evidence – historical or archaeological – confirming or falsifying either of them. Their prime value lies in the number of historical phenomena they coherently explain. The present author is convinced that the ethnogenesis model is more successful in this regard; it is this model that finds increasing support in the mounting data from the Persepolis Fortification archive. Overall, it seems to be the ascending perspective, but support for it is not spread evenly over all (sub)-disciplines implicated by the question. Notably among scholars of comparative Indo-European linguistics and Iranian religions, the notion of

large-scale cultural migration and imposition, alongside the belief in an original and definable Indo-European culture and an Aryan homeland, continues to find support.

The case of the Medes may serve as a starting point for our discussion, as it holds some prognostic value for contemporaneous developments in southern Iran. Assyrian sources first mention a 'country of the Medes' in the northwestern Zagros in 835 BCE. At that time, the Medes seem to have been neither particularly important nor very conspicuous within the medley of polities and ethnic groups that made up northwestern Iran. In the course of the next two centuries, however, Median territory – as perceived by the Assyrians – expanded, now comprising a large number of 'city lords' and areas previously not seen as Median (Radner 2003). Eventually, it became a force strong enough to launch successful raids on the Assyrian heartland. This development can only mean absorption of other groups into what was, essentially, an open and still forming identity. To be added to this are, first, the development of (local) administrative and economic networks in response to Assyrian tribute demands (perhaps inaugurated in Kassite times) and, secondly, the co-optation, hence strengthening, of local rulers. These are typical ingredients for a process known as secondary state formation (Brown 1986). It was aided by the trade network depending on the Great Khorāsān road, a crucial artery for both the Assyrians and the Medes, which undoubtedly prompted increased social stratification. Yet, as Sancisi-Weerdenburg (1988) pointed out, state formation is not an irreversible process, at least not until it reaches a certain stability independent from *ad hoc* factors and individual rulers. The collapse of the Assyrian empire took away the critical impetus that had driven the state formation; at the same time, it must have severely impacted the commercial network that had supported the process.

The lessons to be taken from the Median case for that of the Persians are legion. First, the comparison prompts the question as to the importance of trade in developments in the south. The introduction and spread of the dromedary since the late second millennium enabled trans-desert routes that previously would have been hardly viable. The Fortification archive shows, moreover, that camels were a key factor in southern Iran and were also deployed on the route from Persepolis to Hinduš and Gandhāra (Henkelman 2017b: 55–63). It may well be that this Iranian extension of the emerging camel trade network predated the rise of the Persian Empire. Indeed, it has been cogently suggested that the new southern trade routes were a decisive factor behind the mounting Assyrian aggression against southern Babylonia and Elam and, on the other hand, the emergence of the coalitions of various southern polities (Gibson 1991). The crucial difference, however, is that the fall of Nineveh did not impact the southern network in the way it impacted the northern one; on the contrary, one may plausibly project that it profited from the sudden break of Assyrian military and political pressure. The manifold contacts between Elam and Babylonia in the post-Assyrian period (Zadok 2011) should certainly be evaluated against this background. The fact that the chiefs of Samati – perhaps no more than a successful yet local agro-pastoralist tribe in late seventh or early sixth-century southern Lorestān – could amass the amounts of silver nowadays known as the Kalmākarra hoard strongly implies access to interregional trade networks in which, for example, wool and textiles could be merchandised. The incredible richness of the princely Arǧān and Ǧūbaǧī tombs, roughly from the same time, conveys a similar impression of profitable economic circumstances. References to deliveries of myrrh and frankincense in the Acropole archive, the find of Levantine *tridacna* shells at Susa, and the presence of cotton in

the Arǧān tomb all fit the hypothesis of a developing trade network (see Henkelman 2017b: 60–62, with references). It is not a far stretch to project that the cultural and social dynamic associated with this network would have become a major factor in the rise of the Persians and the emergence of their empire.

Insofar as it refers to the southern Zagros – and not to a homonymous (and partly contemporary) polity in the Kermānšāh region – the toponym Parsu(m)a(š) may with some confidence be taken to point to early or proto-Persians in southwestern Iran (Rollinger 1999, responding to Miroschedji 1985). To be sure, the geographical context given in the Assyrian sources is at times too ambivalent to allow secure distinction. Šutruk-Nahhunte II's plea to [. . .]yâ of Parsumaš to mobilize his troops makes much more sense, however, if it refers to the southern Zagros (SAA 15 129:6–9; 707 BCE; cf. Fuchs and Parpola 2001: lii n.102). A similar case can be made for Parsuaš joining the Elam-led coalition at the battle of Ḫalulê (691 BCE; Grayson and Novotny 2012: 259 s.v. Ḫalulê; cf. Waters 2000: 34f.). There, under general command of an Elamite *nāgiru*, Elam, Parsuaš, Anzan, Paširu and Ellipi (plus a series of Chaldean and Aramean districts) stood up to the Assyrians, suggesting that southwestern Iran at this point was as diverse a landscape as northwestern Iran in the ninth century (cf. Potts 2005: 22; Henkelman 2011a: 600 n.65). But around the turn of sixth century BCE, *Parsip* (Elamite pl.), in analogy to 'Medes,' seems to have emerged as the dominant ethnicon in relation to the highlands, as revealed by its use in the Acropole archive from Neo-Elamite Susa and in the Palace archive of Nebuchadnezzar II (an alternative label 'Anšanite' does not occur). Still, its typical combination, in the Acropole archive, with a toponym suggests a range of local identities rather than a fully formed and harmonized sense of being Persian (Henkelman 2011a: 603–610). It is only with Cyrus that one can begin to speak of 'Persians' *tout court*, again not unlike the Medes under Cyaxares and Astyages.

The aforementioned Acropole archive shows that the eastern Zagros piedmonts, including the royal city of Hidali, remained under control of the Susa-centred late Neo-Elamite state. It was this zone that retained an important settled population throughout the Neo-Elamite period, presumably partly because it lay beyond the scope of the Assyrian incursions into Elam and had gained vital strategic importance (Carter 1994; Carter and Wright 2003; Moghaddam and Miri 2003; 2007; Henkelman 2008: 41–43; Waters 2013: 482f.). Significantly, Hidali, Huhnur/Hunar, Kurdušum and other places in the same region were under control of the Pārsa administration at the time of Darius I. Hidali, erstwhile bulwark of the Elamite crown, appears to have remained the region's central town, yet it was now integrated into a network centred on Persepolis (Henkelman 2017b: 97–99). What this suggests, more than simple military conquest, is a progressive westward 'Persianisation' in the context of ethnogenesis (Henkelman 2011a, 609f., 613f.; cf. Basello s.d. 1). In archaeological terms, the process may, with due caution, be recognized at Tol-e Nūrābād, where a continuous stratigraphy from Neo-Elamite II to early Achaemenid is in evidence (Potts et al. 2009/1388: 38f., 72f., 77f., 181; cf. McCall 2013 on the surrounding Mamasanī district).

At the same time, the piedmont zone is likely to have played its role in a process of secondary state formation, again in analogy with the Median case, and probably coinciding with the process of ethnogenesis. Mid-seventh century references to Parsumašians appearing at Hidali and, perhaps, attacking Šallukku/Šullaggi (ABL 961, 1309, 1311+; see Waters 1999: 103f. and 2000: 59f., 74) suggest that it was in this region

that early or proto-Persians were first confronted with an urban Elamite culture. It may have been here that such elements as Elamite script, (written) language and bureaucratic protocol were adopted for the purpose of administration (cf. below). The importance of the contact zone may in fact be recognized in the very name the Persians gave to 'Elam,' as *Ūja-/Ūvja-* is arguably a cognate of Οὔξιοι (cf. Οὐζία, Οὐαζαίνη), the name of an (Elamite-speaking?) ethnos in the Zagros piedmonts region (Henkelman 2011b: 10f.).

The name as well as the title of Kuraš, King of Anšan, better known as Cyrus the Great, fit the background outlined above, as both point to a milieu in which Elamite culture was seen as prestigious.

Apart from a very early occurrence (*kùr-áš*, Ur III), at least five individuals named Cyrus occur in the sources from the seventh and sixth centuries BCE: 1. ^{m}*ku-ra-áš*, a kinglet of Parsumaš (Annals of Assurbanipal, 639 BCE); 2. [^{BE}]*ku-ráš* the Anšanite, son of Šešpeš (Elamite seal inscription, late 7th cent.); 3. ^{m}*ku-ra-áš* of Anšan, grandfather of Cyrus (*Cyrus Cylinder*; perhaps identical with 2.); 4. ^{BE}*kur-ráš*, recipient of manufactured items at Neo-Elamite Susa (Susa Acropole archive, early sixth century); 5. ^{m}*ku-ur-ra-šú*, father of Mardû (promissory note, Babylon, among mostly Elamite names, 541/40); 6. ^{m}*ku-ra-áš* of Anšan, founder of the Persian Empire (Elḫulḫul Cylinders of Nabonidus, *Nabonidus Chronicle*, *Cyrus Cylinder*, etc.; Zadok 1976: 62f.; Schaudig 2001: 709; Waters 2004: 94; Tavernier 2011: 211f.). The consistency in rendering the name's ending (*-aš*) is eye-catching; it continues among the hundreds of Babylonian legal records dating to Cyrus (^{m}*ku-ra-áš*, ^{m}*ku-raš*, ^{m}*kur-ra-áš*, etc.; never *-uš*; Tavernier 2007a: 528–530). The alternative form, *Kuruš* is restricted to Old Persian (*k^{u}-u-r^{u}-u-š*) and occurs only in Bīsotūn (*c.* 520 BCE), and the short inscriptions that Darius had made in the name of Cyrus at Pasargadae (Stronach 1990; *pace* Vallat 2011: 277–279); the Elamite and Babylonian versions of all these inscriptions again have *Kuraš*.

The layout of the evidence on the name of Cyrus does not warrant the conviction with which an Indo-Iranian etymology has been and still is defended (see, e.g. Schmitt 2009: 102f.). On the contrary, it pleads compellingly against the (often implicit) assumption that *Kuruš* must the prius and *Kuraš* only a derivative variant. If it were, one would have to provide solid arguments to accommodate not only the rendering of an original *Kuruš* as *Kuraš* – for which there are no phonological or morphological grounds in Elamite or in Akkadian – but also for the diachronic, cross-cultural and multilingual consistency of this supposed "Umdeutung des genuin iranischen Namen" (Schmitt 2009: 102f.). Such arguments have hitherto not been advanced. As Andreas (1904: 93f.) already observed, an adaptation *Kuraš* > *Kuruš* would be well explicable in Old Iranian context, where *ă*-stems do not have a final *-š*, but *u*-stems do. In short, the sources favour, *a priori*, analysis of *Kuraš* as an original Elamite name, only later adapted to *Kuruš* to match Old Persian morphology. The availability of a credible Elamite etymology based on a familiar name type ([theonym] + verbal form, abbreviated, as often in the Neo-Elamite period) reinforces this view (cf. Henkelman 2003a: 194f.; Tavernier 2011: 211–212). Additional support comes from the name of Cyrus's ancestor Teispes, the oldest attested form of which is *Šešpeš* (seal inscription of Kuraš of Anšan); this name, too, can plausibly be explained as Elamite and belonging to the same type (Henkelman 2014: 21, with correction in 2017a: 292f. n.34).

Andreas deserves credit for his lucid comments on the name of Cyrus, but that should not exonerate him for the all too familiar sin he appended to these, that of taking linguistic phenomena as a direct reflection of a historical reality ("*Kyros ist*

also kein Perser gewesen" [emphasis original]; Andreas 1904: 93). Lehmann immediately protested against this facile identification of name and ethnicity (be it on the grounds that "er unmöglich glauben könne, dass Kyros kein Arier gewesen sei"; Andreas 1904: 98), suggesting, instead, that the Elamite name might have resulted from intermarriage. It is interesting to see that exactly the same discussion re-emerged in recent decades: as the Elamite interpretation of the name and title of Cyrus gained traction in the 1990s and 2000s, some took these elements as markers of a distinctly Elamite (or Anšanite) cultural identity, hence opposed to the explicitly Aryan-Persian identity proclaimed by Darius and his successors.

The suggested opposition may well be illusory. Cyrus, for one, gave at least three of his children Iranian names (Bardiya/Bṛdiya-, Artystone/*Ṛtastūnā- and Atossa/*Hutauθa-). At the very least, his family onomastics show a mixed picture, not unlike that of the Neo-Elamite chiefs of Samati in the Kalmākarra inscriptions (Henkelman 2003a: 22–24; Tavernier 2011 index s.v. Kal.). If anything, the Elamite name Kuraš, certainly if seen as a dynastic name, betrays its mixed Elamite-Iranian cultural context. Perhaps it additionally reflects an appropriation of a prestigious tradition, but this is uncertain. The title of Cyrus invites similar reflections, be it that it presents a stronger case for wilful adoption.

One way to understand "King of Anšan" in the *Cyrus Cylinder* and other Babylonian sources is to take it at face value. After all, at the time of the battle of Ḫalulê (691; cf. above), southwestern Iran as seen by the Assyrians was still a mosaic of polities, including Parsuaš *and* Anšan. Potts initially took this as a lead argument in positing that Cyrus had actually been king of Anšan, a polity that, as opposed to Parsuaš and others, was "culturally *Elamite*, not Persian" (emphasis original) and whose inhabitants had an Anšanite identity (Potts 2005: 16f.; cf. 2011: 41; modified in 2016: 304f.). Zournatzi, in a recent reaction, alternatively suggested that the title "king of (the city of) Anšan," whatever its precise background, was merely intended to cater to a Babylonian audience. As a royal style it was in fact "alien to his own practice," not unlike Darius's adoption of Egyptian titles in the hieroglyphic inscription on his Susa statue (Zournatzi s.d.; see also Stronach 2013).

The Anšanite titulature of the Teispid line is not limited to Babylonian contexts: it occurs in the inscription on the seal of "Kuraš of Anzan, son of Šešpeš" (for the reading ^{AŠ}*an-za-an-ir*^{i}*-ra* see Henkelman 2008: 55f. n.135; Elamite seal inscriptions often include peculiar sign shapes). Garrison's broad contextualisation of the seal image, now known from about 20 impressions in the Fortification archive, has established beyond doubt that it belongs to the second half of the seventh century, that it has important connections with late Neo-Assyrian art, but itself belongs to an Iranian context. He also argued for a highland rather than a Susiana milieu for this particular glyptic style, perhaps even "a nascent 'court style' associated with the Teispid royal house" (Garrison 2011, citation p. 400f.). At any rate, Elamite elements are evident: apart from the Neo-Elamite seal inscription, the motif of the broken bow has clear Elamite associations (so Waters 2011: 290f.).

The short seal inscription mentioning "Kuraš of Anzan, son of Šešpeš," although it does not mention the word 'king,' strongly implies rulership of Anzan/Anšan. Whereas Cyrus, in 539 BCE, may well have been aware that the title "king of (the city of) Anšan" would reverberate with a Mesopotamian audience, the claim of rulership of Anšan in itself was a datum within the Teispid line long before his conquest

of Babylon. From this perspective, it is understandable that Potts presents the seal of Kuraš of Anzan as significant evidence (Potts 2005: 12f.), whereas Zournatzi credits it with little authority (Zournatzi s.d.).

Contextual analysis of the impressions of the seal of Kuraš of Anzan in the Persepolis Fortification archive (siglum: PFS 0093*) shows that it was used by a chief agent of the crown in sealing receipts for animals procured from the Persepolis economy for the royal table. The seal, therefore, belonged to a narrowly defined court context. Not coincidentally, the closest parallel, PFS 0007*, used by the official procuring all other food commodities for the court, is a so-called royal name seal stating the name of Darius (Garrison 1996; 2014: 70f.; Henkelman 2010; 2011a: 581). Both seals were deployed, in the most literal sense, 'in the name of the king,' be it in that of the reigning monarch, or in that of a perceived distant predecessor with whom he sought to associate himself. Being exposed to administrative contexts wherever the court halted, the heirloom seal that had originally belonged to Kuraš of Anzan became an emblematic argument underscoring Darius's dynastic claims, not unlike the posthumous 'Cyrus' inscriptions in Pasargadae. The historic significance of the seal is therefore not in doubt. In fact, its central, narrative and legitimizing role need not have commenced with Darius: for the Teispids, too, the heirloom may have suggested a concrete connection to a distant past, to a founding hero, Šešpeš, of whom little was known. Some would even suspect that the suspiciously clean and straightforward genealogy Cyrus presents in the *Cyrus Cylinder* (son of Cambyses I, grandson of Cyrus I, descendant of Teispes) was inspired by the very seal of Kuraš of Anzan, son of Šešpeš (so Henkelman 2011a: 602f. n.71).

With the seal of Kuraš of Anzan, a third, specifically Elamo-Iranian, reading of the title 'king of Anšan' comes into sight. Although not attested for every Neo-Elamite king, it is clear that the old title 'King of Anšan and Susa' still resonated in Elamite context in the seventh century and possibly, if the re-dating of Atta-hamiti-Insušnak is correct, all the way down to c. 520 BCE (Tavernier 2004: 22–29; 2006; Henkelman 2008: 6–8, 13f., 362f.). Cultural and chronological proximity forbids disconnecting the early Persian claim of rulership of Anšan/Anzan from the Middle and Neo-Elamite title 'King of Anšan and Susa.' There is little doubt that the adoption of a royal style referring to Anšan/Anzan would, in the late Neo-Elamite age, have been understood to stand in rivalry with the Elamite kings whose rule had effectively become confined to Susa, Khuzestān and the Zagros piedmonts. Simultaneously, it would have expressed a pretended link to the prestigious line of those same Neo-Elamite kings, whose names, styles and copying of Middle Elamite inscriptions in turn betray a strong historical orientation. It should be noted, in this context, that Anšan cannot have been a major, central town at the time. Whereas the archaeological evidence is inconclusive (only part of Tal-e Malyān has been excavated), the scarcity of references in both the Acropole and Fortification archives should not be ignored. Since 'Persian' seems to have become the dominant ethnicon in this period (whereas there is no evidence for 'Anšanite'), the reference to 'Anšan/Anzan' in the Teispid titulature can hardly be read as a mere geographical marker. Instead, it was a conscious strategic, ideological choice, a 'deliberate archaism' (so Henkelman 2003a: 193f.; cf. 2008: 55–57; Waters 2004: 94; Potts 2011).

Cyrus and his contemporaries arguably considered themselves Persian, but they lived in a time when Elam and Elamite culture were still important referents and in

which a royal style referring to Anšan/Anzan would have reverberated widely. With the emergence of empire and the inclusion and consolidation of vast Iranian-speaking territories, the focus, naturally, shifted. Darius's choice to emphasize that he was 'Persian' and 'Aryan' (i.e. Iranian-speaking) does not constitute a radical break from this perspective but the maturing of an ethnic identity (Henkelman 2011a: 610–614).

Just how complicated the construction of a Persian identity was is illustrated by two other, be it ephemeral, rulers of southwestern Iran. One, Āçina son of Upadarma, rose in Elam or part thereof at the time of Darius's accession, claimed kingship over Elam, was labelled an Elamite in the Elamite and Babylonian versions of Bīsotūn, but had an Iranian name and patronymic (DB_e I.56–60, 63–65; DB_b 29–33; cf. DB_p I.72–77, 81–83). The other, Martiya, son of Cincaxriš (both names presumably Iranian), resided in Kuganakā in Pārsa, yet rebelled in Elam and took an Elamite royal name, Ummanuš (i.e. a theophoric name containing 'Humban' – DB_e II.4–8; DB_p II.8–13; DB_b 41f.). These cases show that the process of acculturation, or indeed of Persian ethnogenesis, was an active and wide-reaching phenomenon even around 520 BCE, stretching into territory that was then still seen as 'Elamite' (Henkelman 2003a: 183f.; Potts 2016: 315f.; for the names see Tavernier 2003: 247–250; 2007a: 12 [1.2.1], 15 [1.2.12], 20 [1.2.24, .28]).

The original residence of the rebel Martiya, Kuganakā (Kukkannakan, Kugunakka), evokes another element of possible Elamite-Iranian continuity. The place was not, as one might suspect, located somewhere in the transitional zone between Fārs and Khūzestān: well-attested in the Fortification archive as 'Kuknakkan,' it appears to belong to the district of Tirazziš (ancient Šīrāz). Like Matannan, which must have been relatively near, it was the site of an estate (*ulhi*, lit. "house") of queen Irtašduna (*Ṛtastūnā-, Artystone), daughter of Cyrus. Matannan had been developed as a palatial site under Cambyses and this may have been the reason why Darius (re-)granted it to his Teispid wife (Henkelman and Kleber 2007; Henkelman 2010: 698–703). Kuganakā/Kuknakkan seems to have had a similar fate: the seat of a powerful and presumably noble Persian with political aspirations in 'Elam' (i.e. the eastern part thereof?) at the time of Darius's accession, it was subsequently granted to Irtašduna (Henkelman 2017b: 196–198).

As evidence from Bactria, Arachosia, Egypt, Babylonia and the Persian heartland demonstrates, the phenomenon of the landed-estates held by the imperial élites and the higher ranks of the bureaucracy (thus remunerated for their service) was common all over the Achaemenid Empire. Estates were not only essential economic assets (for the holder) and an effective means to develop the provinces (for the state) but also emblems of social prestige and, as Stolper puts it, 'determinants of political behavior' (Stolper 1985: 52; cf. Briant 2002: 444–446, 460–463, 943, 945; Henkelman 2017b: 165–167). Also, especially the larger estates and domains (in the sense of collective assets of an individual or family), constituted their own household economies, as references to dependent workers, accountants and storage facilities make clear. For all these aspects, the question as to the origin and antiquity of the phenomenon is a vital one, as it potentially relates to the formation of Persian élites and, with that, to the evolution of early-Persian society.

In the Fortification archive, the most frequently used term for estate is *irmadim* (or *irmatam*, when reading GIM with an Elamite value *tam*$_{\circ}$), reflecting Old Iranian **ṛmā-tam* (Tavernier 2007a: 447 [4.4.12.10]; Henkelman s.d. 1). This term is once found in

the Acropole archive from Susa. In MDP 9 109, various items are distributed to three individuals: Huban-danna; Ubukra, wife of Huban-rašma; and Huban-rašma himself (Scheil 1907: 98f.; Tavernier 2011: 207). The name of the last recipient is followed (l.13) by *ir-mad-dím*, which either indicates the place of delivery or identifies Huban-rašma as holder of an estate. Hinz concluded from this single reference that the Iranian term must refer to a Persian concept adopted by the Elamites; that all Persians and people with Iranian names receiving items in the Acropole archive were estate-holders; that they were under obligation of military service to the Elamite crown; that they were the avant-garde of much larger waves of Iranians, who would eventually take control of Elam on their path to their glorious, predestined future (Hinz 1987, esp. 130–134; cf. 1973: 60–63). These inferences are entirely unsubstantiated and of little consequence in the debate, except for the observation that the term *irmadim* occurs in a Neo-Elamite archive that indeed contains Old Iranian onomastic material (Tavernier 2011). This appears to suggest that the phenomenon of estates – somehow bound to the central authority of Susa and therefore explicitly mentioned – existed around 600 BCE. Its social setting, it may be assumed, was the accultured Elamite-Iranian world of that time, hence the occasional appearance of an Iranian term.

There may be other evidence, though it is admittedly circumstantial. Irdabama, queen and perhaps mother of Darius, had an estate (*ulhi*) at Šullaggi, a town in eastern Khūzestān. This economically very active and powerful woman sealed letter orders and other documents in the Fortification archive with her privy seal, an heirloom belonging to the same group as the seal of Kuraš of Anzan (PFS 0051; cf. below). Yet another such heirloom seal was used by her agent, Rašda. It is this last seal, PFS 0077*, that shows an audience scene with a seated female; its Neo-Elamite inscription reads "Šeraš, daughter of Huban-ahpi." Henkelman suggested that this last Huban-ahpi is the same as the 'Huban-ahpi of Šulluggi' in the Acropole archive. If so, a hypothesis can be made that Huban-ahpi not only fathered Šeraš, but also was an ancestor of Irdabama and that for this very reason Irdabama held an estate at Šullaggi, that is, in analogy to the estate Matannan held by Irtašduna as leading member of the Teispid line and successor to Cambyses and Bardiya (Henkelman 2011a: 613). In such a scenario, one could picture Irdabama and her family as prestigious (part of the old Elamite élite), rich (having an estate or lands at Šullaggi), and taking part in the Elamite-Iranian acculturation (Irdabama is an Iranian name), hence an attractive party for a Persian like Hystaspes (if Irdabama was indeed Darius's mother). Though this reading of the evidence remains speculative, it signals the potential relevance of landed estates in the transition from Neo-Elamite to early-Persian society.

The seal of Kuraš of Anzan is, as Garrison has shown, exceptional, but not unique (Garrison 2011). It belongs to a small group of seals, all known from impressions in the Fortification archive, which otherwise includes the seals of Irdabama and her agent (PFS 0051, PFS 0077*) and a seal showing a seated deity (PFS 1308*, cf. below). As pointed out earlier, the critical locus of this glyptic was probably in the Neo-Elamite or early-Persian (Garrison: Anzanite) highlands. While reflecting wide cultural associations, the seals were local products made in and for an Iranian milieu.

Beyond their art-historical significance, the four heirloom seals also have important historical implications. Their very existence points to a need for authentication and expression of jurisdiction in written context. This context presumably was an adapted form of Neo-Elamite cuneiform writing (as the seal inscriptions also imply). That

there are at least four such seals, apparently all handed down in royal or élite contexts, implies a social stratum, rather than one exceptional individual, that had adopted the use of these instruments. If one, with Garrison, associates the glyptic tradition under discussion with the early Teispids and their milieu, it follows that this early-Persian acculturated society of the late seventh century engaged in (Elamite) writing and presumably played a pivotal role in emerging bureaucratic and administrative structures.

The view presented here matches well with the fact that the Acropole archive, which is only one or two generations younger, evidences an intricate administrative network including the Zagros piedmonts and co-opting various groups of *Parsip*, "Persians" and individuals with Iranian names. Given the overall dynamic of secondary state formation and the impact of the sedentary zone of eastern Khūzestān, it is entirely unsurprising that administrative structures would develop in the regions directly adjacent. The Acropole archive yields glimpses of this process as it happened. The seals of Kuraš of Anzan and his contemporaries are concrete testimonies to the same effect but carry more weight given their continued use, as heirloom objects, in the mature administrative contexts from the reign of Darius.

Incidentally, one of the seals regularly impressed on tablets in the Acropole archive has an inscription that can tentatively be read as "Andada son of king/chief Taššek" (see Garrison, Chapter 32 this volume; not retrograde, despite Vallat 1995). Taššek seems to be an Iranian name (*Dāθayak-; Tavernier 2011: 198). The fact that nothing else is known about this person shows the level of our ignorance but also the potential scope of Elamite-Iranian acculturation, notably in administrative and bureaucratic contexts.

In a 1978 paper, Stolper showed that the appellative ^{lú}*šá-ár-nu-up-pu*, occurring in a single Neo-Assyrian letter (ABL 281), reflected Elamite **šarnup*, which he explained as 'intended recipients of rations apportioned' and which he connected to the verbal base *šara-*, 'to apportion,' one of the key terms of the Fortification and Treasury archives (Stolper 1978, despite De Vaan 1998: 72–73). The letter in question speaks of workers who depend on rations (*ina libbi balṭū*, 'they live on it') that are issued by a centralized redistributive household economy that managed a large territory. The connection with the 'Persepolis economy' of the reigns of Darius I, Xerxes and Artaxerxes I is therefore not only etymological but apparently also generic in nature. In Persepolis, too, large numbers of dependent workers, *kurtaš*, formed the backbone of a regional institutional system; their dependence is similarly expressed by the frequent addition *gal makip*, 'consuming rations' (Henkelman 2008: 18f.).

A fleeting reference in the preserved Constantinian *Excerpta* of Nicolaus of Damascus states that, among the Medes, any pauper may subject himself to a rich man for nourishment, be fed and clothed, and henceforth be regarded as equal in status to the latter's slave (F66 §2, presumably in turn based on Ctesias, F8d §2 Lenfant). This information, given in the context of the Cyrus legend, may refer to a phenomenon documented in developed form in primary sources from the Achaemenid period. The most evolved version is that of the aforementioned dependent labourers, *kurtaš*, of the household economy of Persepolis, who received about two-thirds of their nutritional needs from the state (Henkelman s.d. 4 §2.5). In this setting, the term signifies state-dependency. The underlying Old Iranian word, *gṛda-*, 'domestic servant' points, however, to an origin in actual household contexts (cf. Av. *gərəda-*, 'house, dwelling,' Skt. *gṛhá-*, 'house, property,' Eng. *yard*, Germ. *Garten*, etc.; see Tavernier 2007a: 423f. [4.4.7.54]). Egyptian (Aramaic) and Babylonian sources from the Achaemenid period

take an intermediate position as they use *grd'/gardu* in connection with estates, hence in semi-public contexts (Stolper 1985: 56–59; Briant 2002: 455–460, 944f.; Tuplin 2013: 43, 75–77, 101f.). The same seems true for the Elamite version of the Bīsotūn inscription, where Darius claims to have restored to the free and able-bodied men (*taššup*) their livestock and *kurtaš* (as well as the 'house/estate-subjects'; DB_e I.49; DB_p I.65 has *māniya-*, 'house personnel,' DB_b 26 ^{lú}ḫUN.GÁ^{meš}, 'hirelings, hired labourers'). It would not be surprising if an Elamite redistributive economic model involving larger forces of dependent labourers impacted early Persian society, more precisely the status and deployment of *gṛda-* workers. This idea would gain strength if, as suggested, estates played a role in the transition from Elamite to early-Persian society.

The most important elements in the dossier on administrative heritage have hitherto only been mentioned in passing: writing and language. That Elamite was important in Achaemenid context is easy to establish. The Fortification and Treasury archives from Persepolis bear witness to it, as do isolated texts from Achaemenid Susa and Qandahār (Arachosia). Elamite originally was the only language of Darius's Bīsotūn monument; the Old Persian and Akkadian versions were added at a later stage. For the early Persians, as also appears from the inscriptions on the seals of Kuraš of Anzan and his contemporaries, writing first and foremost meant writing in Elamite (cf. Stolper 2005: 20).

Writing in Elamite, in the days of Darius I, furthermore meant writing in a script that continued developments peculiar to Elamite cuneiform and occurring from about 650 or 600 onwards. These characteristics include a progressively reduced sign inventory and the adoption of particular writing rules (disharmonious spelling, conventions to render Iranian diphthongs). Late Elamite script is, moreover, visually distinct from Mesopotamian cuneiform of the same period, a difference that was recognized in antiquity. At Bīsotūn, for one, the Elamite and Babylonian versions consistently use signs that are distinct in shape and morphology and thus give very different aethetic impressions (cf. Stolper 2005: 20; s.d.).

The observation that an indigenous school of cuneiform writing existed and continued from Neo-Elamite into Achaemenid times has further implications. The ascending view on the genesis of the Old Persian script holds that the distinct tradition of Elamite cuneiform provided the main inspiration, presumably among scribes themselves versed in Elamite writing (D'Erme 1990; Rossi 2005; Basello s.d. 2). Just how crucial the impulse from Elamite writing was appears from the Old Persian word for 'inscription, tablet,' *dipi*, a loan from Elamite *tuppi* (pronounced /tipi/; Tavernier 2007b [it ultimately derives from Sumerian]).

Who wrote in Achaemenid Elamite, and why? In the *Landnahme* model mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the conquering Persians are assumed to have deployed Elamites as their clerks, not bothering to engage in writing themselves. An extreme version of this hypothesis held that written Elamite cuneiform was actually no more than a code for spoken Old Iranian (alloglottography: Gershevitch 1979; cf. Hinz 1971: 271, 308f.). More recently, and in line with of model of Elamite-Iranian acculturation, Achaemenid Elamite has been characterized as a morphosyntactically restructured form of the language resulting from second language acquisition by native speakers of Old Iranian (Henkelman 2011a: 586–595, 614–622; Yakubovich 2008: 207). This view agrees with the observation that when, occasionally, the ethnicity of the Persepolis scribes needed to be made explicit (to distinguish them from

Aramaic scribes), they were called 'Persians,' not 'Elamites' (Henkelman 2008: 348–350; 2011a: 587f.; Henkelman and Stolper 2009: 275–278).

Achaemenid Elamite, perhaps more properly described as 'Irano-Elamite,' not only contains numerous Iranian loanwords but betrays imposition of grammatical features from Old Iranian. An example is the ablatival use of the Elamite separative suffix *ikkimar*, a grammatical calque on *hacā*, 'away from, by,' with the same dual function. Other signs of language interference are the use of the relative pronoun as article and the completion of the sets of the demonstrative pronouns with 'here' and 'there' deixis in conformity with the Iranian paradigms. All such changes increased isomorphism between the two languages and thus facilitated code switching. More generally, reduction of morphosyntactical complexity made access to the contact-induced form of the Elamite language much easier, notably in those areas of the grammar that were very distinct from Old Iranian (and other Indo-European languages). The best example in this regard is the radical generalisation of a single suffix (*-na*) for all attributive constructions, replacing the more complex system of gender suffixes expressing person, number and gender.

The late, morphosyntactically restructured form of Elamite is unlikely to have emerged among native speakers of the language: the changes that occur are too radical for such a scenario and rather point to the agency of iranophones. At the same time, as always, the language interference was not a one-sided process. Adaptation of Iranian loanwords to inherited Elamite morphology also occurs, and this phenomenon is typical for the agentivity of native speakers. Adaptation to native morphology was concentrated in the western Fahliyān region. In this same area, presumed to have had a stronger presence of native or near-native speakers of Elamite, there is a clear preference for Elamite technical words and month names instead of Old Iranian equivalents. The scribes that belong to this profile form a minority of 10–15%, however: the main body of the administrative personnel must have been iranophones. They used Elamite in a situation of asymmetrical bilingualism, expressing themselves reasonably well in Elamite in administrative matters but probably less so in other settings.

Common sense suggests an intimate connection between the introduction of Elamite writing on the one hand and administrative structures and bureaucratic protocol on the other: introduction of script as an abstract skill, without its practical basis, seems unlikely. If more complex forms of administration, involving the use of seals and script, indeed started to emerge among the early Persians in the seventh century BCE or even before, the adoption of the Elamite language as a language of writing may well have occurred at the same time. This does not mean, however, that the Persian use of Elamite was necessarily limited to bureaucracy. It may well have been used in the increasing contacts between iranophone highlanders and the Elamites of the contact zone of the Zagros piedmonts. Indeed, the *Parsip* approaching representatives of the Neo-Elamite state at Susa, Hidali and elsewhere would hardly have made themselves understandable by speaking Iranian.

A long-term scenario, whereby Elamite was in use among Persians for more than a century before the reign of Darius, would account for the relative stability and coherence of the contact-induced variety of the language as documented in the Persepolis archives. Yet a later date and more restricted setting for the genesis of Achaemenid Elamite is certainly not excluded. In that case, adoption of Elamite would have been a means to meet with the rising complexity of Persian society under Cyrus or his immediate predecessors

and would have enabled the administrative structures necessary for, as an example, the great building projects at Pasargadae and Taoce. In both scenarios, one expects a continuity of administrative jargon and details of bureaucratic protocol from the Neo-Elamite to the Achaemenid period. Here, however, we reach the limits of the evidence at hand.

As remarked at the start of this chapter, Elamite administrative corpora from different periods are rarely comparable in terms of genre, bureaucratic level and administrative perspective. The detailed comparison, undertaken by Basello, between the Neo-Elamite Susa Acropole archive (manufactured items) and the Persepolis archives (livestock, food commodities, silver payments in lieu of rations in kind) yielded few parallels. Not a single formulaic expression is carried over from the Neo-Elamite to the Achaemenid corpus, and the general level of convergence is limited. The most significant evidence is probably the shared use of the key term *kurman* (identifying the officer 'handling' the items/commodities in the recorded transaction), which may continue a tradition going back to Middle Elamite times. That the evidence from divergent terminologies should not be taken as an absolute verdict is shown by a few minor categories as well as by exceptional texts spilled over from other branches of administration into the Fortification archive. The format of tablets regarding exchange of surplus (*sut*) is strikingly similar to that of a particular range of tablets in the Acropole archive. A single text on manufactured items (PF 0335) is, by a number of standards, much closer to the Acropole corpus than the average Fortification text (Basello 2011; cf. 2012a).

Elamite script and language, it should be underlined, were not *Fremdkörper* in their new setting: they had become Persian things that Persians used. Not only did Persians adopt Elamite as their way to communicate in writing, especially in the context of administration, and not only did they unconsciously impose features of their mother-tongue onto it, but they also rendered it more Persian in the particular use of inherited features. The increased deployment of phonetic complements (*matres lectionis*), for one, would have especially aided iranophones. More important from a cultural perspective is the extended use of determinatives, particularly the one for divinity (^{AN}). In Achaemenid Elamite it is applied not only to divine names, but also to temples, rites, priests, days, months and so on, hence reflecting a world-view informed by (Indo-)Iranian tradition. Such adaptations point to a community of iranophone scribes who felt themselves at home in the language of writing. Some even mastered the language well enough to be inventive; the prime example is the production of abbreviations, a kind of new 'logograms,' from Old Iranian loanwords (such as *pa*^{MEŠ} for *banura* = **panīra-*, 'cheese').

Potts rightly pointed out that the technical skills, garment styles or such heirloom forms as the 'Elamite dagger' by themselves need not spell a very profound Elamo-Iranian acculturation. In a minimalist approach, as he surmises, one would consider all these as 'epiphenomena . . . which fail to convince one of any meaningful Elamite contribution to the idea of Iran or Iranian identity' (Potts 2005: 11–13). Potts' answer was to point out the significance of Cyrus's name and title, as discussed above. Today, after a decade of intensified research on Elamites and Persians, one can be more confident and count writing and religion among the areas of significant contribution. The first, as argued here, came in a context of emergent administrative structures among the early Persians and was internalized as part of Persian culture.

Recent work has shown that institutional networks of the Persepolis type existed at Achaemenid Susa and Ecbatana, and that Elamite (alongside Aramaic) was used at these centres. A similar argument can be made for a range of other places, including

Taoce, Gabae and Kṛmāna (Kermān), suggesting that most of the western Iran plateau was covered by such networks (Henkelman 2017b: 109–149). All this could still, with some effort, be explained as an organic growth of an inherited Elamite model which the Persians adopted and expanded. The Elamite Arachosian tablets and other evidence from Achaemenid Arachosia, however, forcefully point to another explanation: that of Persians conceiving the inherited institutional economy as a *system* that they could advantageously use as a template for setting up complex administrative and bureaucratic structures in areas where these were absent or underdeveloped (Fisher and Stolper 2015; Henkelman 2017b: 150–174). Elamite writing, bureaucratic protocol and administrative tradition, then, were not epiphenomena in a brave new Persian world but essential tools for building and organizing it. For sure, the Achaemenids were quick to acquire a whole range of other means and mechanisms to further and sustain their empire, but the Elamite contribution, adopted and adapted in a truly Persian society, provided the original impetus.

The historical panorama stretching from the seal of Kuraš of Anzan to the use of Elamite at Achaemenid Qandāhar leaves no doubt as to the internalisation of bureaucratic and administrative traditions by the Persians. The evidence on Elamite elements in Persian religion allows for a similar vision: not one of 'tolerated' yet essentially foreign cults but of inherited traditions that were meaningfully adopted and adapted.

PFS 1308*, mentioned earlier in this chapter as one of the four Neo-Elamite/early-Persian heirloom seals known from the Persepolis Fortification archive, depicts a female deity seated on a throne, holding a mace and wearing a crenelated and horned polos headdress. Whereas a number of elements have Assyro-Babylonian antecedents, details of the composition and style point to a local background. The Neo-Elamite seal inscription points in the same direction (Garrison 2011: 387–390). The seal is attested only once; it probably belonged to a high-placed traveller by the name of Bakabadada (PF 1385). Some other individuals with Iranian names used seals with seal inscriptions stating the names of individuals with Elamite names; these seals are younger than the four heirloom seals discussed here but nevertheless of interest. A notable example is the seal inscribed with the (Elamite) name of 'Huban-ahpi, son of Šati-Huban,' used by Iršena (*Ṛšēna-), the important director of the Fahliyān region (PFS 0004*). Of this last seal, Walther Hinz, in a letter to Richard Hallock, wrote that he found it incredible that the administrator Iršena had inherited his seal from an Elamite (Henkelman 2008: 119 with n.263). This is, however, exactly the point: Elamite elements are not only absorbed but they find new meaning and context in the Persian period. The same is arguably true for the goddess on Bakabadada's seal and, for that matter, for all deities and rites of Elamite background attested in the Fortification archive.

The latest survey of named deities in the Fortification archive, on the basis of an enlarged edited corpus, confirms a trend observed earlier: that gods with an Elamite background are well presented in the cultic landscape of ancient Pārsa. Table 39.1 lists all deities mentioned more than once in the available sample of the archive (*c.* 6400 Elamite texts and fragments as of January 2017). It indicates the cultural background, the number of attestations and – important in an economic context – the aggregate volume of the deities' sacrifices expressed in barley value (see Henkelman s.d. 2 for full data; reconstructed Iranian theonyms after Tavernier 2007a).

Humban stands unrivalled in terms of attestations and aggregate volume ($6455^{+}/6585^{+}$ l.). The latter is more than three times higher than that of Auramazdā

Table 39.1 List of deities mentioned more than once in the Fortification archive.

	Elamite	*Iranian*		*attestations*	*aggregate volume: minimum*	*maximum*
1.	Humban			32	6455+ l.	6585+ l.
2.		Mišdušiš	*Miždušī-	7	2095+ l.	2095+ l.
3.		Uramasda	Auramazdā	13	2171+ l.	2331+ l.
4.	Napiriša			26	1880+ l.	1920+ l.
5.	Adad			12	1715+ l.	1775+ l.
6.		Išpanda-ramattiš	*Spandārmatiš/ - aramatiš	9	900+ l.	900+ l.
7.		Mariraš	*(H)uvarīra-?	8	450+ l.	450+ l.
8.		Šetrabattiš	*Šēθrapatiš	5	330 l.	330 l.
9.		Pirdaka-miya		3	210 l.	210 l.
10.		Narišanka	*Bṛakām(i)ya-	3	270 l.	270 l.
11.	'Earth' (?)		*Narēsanga-	5	270 l.	270 l.

(2171+/2331+ l.) and almost as much as that of all gods with an (Indo-)Iranian background taken together (6486+/6646+ l.). This, with the prominence of Napiriša and Adad, and with the additional presence of Earth (if the logogram KI refers to an Elamite deity: Henkelman 2008: 324–331; s.d. 3 §2.6), Nabbazabba, Šimut, Zizkurra, and Nah (Nahhunte?), shows that the significance of the Elamite element in the divine world of the Persian heartland is unambiguous. What cause controversy are the cultural inferences drawn from this circumstance.

One approach, in agreement with the *Landnahme* model, takes the evidence from the Fortification archive as essentially coherent with the assumption of an inherited and mature Iranian religion, more particularly of a form of Zoroastrianism (or Mazdaism, etc.). Elamite elements are seen as either tolerated yet extraneous to the ancestral religion (Hinz 1970: 427–430; 1976/1979 II: 192–202; Koch 1977; 1987; 2011: 108–137; Boyce 1982: 132–149), or as adapted to an existing structure without significantly impacting that same structure (Kellens 2012; Kreyenbroek 2012). A major problem confronting this view, especially in its more extreme form (tolerated Elamite paganism), is the relatively low rank of Auramazdā. His non-exclusive position appears to contrast sharply with the evidence from Achaemenid royal inscriptions; it certainly diverges from traditional views on Achaemenid Persian religion.

A past remedy has been to identify the so-called *lan*-sacrifice as the exclusive rite for Auramazdā. Since *lan*, at the time, was only known to occur without explicit reference to a particular deity, and since it is frequently attested, its proposed association with Auramazdā seemed an admissible and convenient means to restore the latter's status as foremost god and bring the Fortification archive on a par with the royal inscriptions. Contextual evidence had already severely undermined this

view (Razmjou 2004; Henkelman 2005: 140–143; 2008: 214–253), when a decisive counter-argument came to light in the form of several attestations of '*lan* for Napiriša' (Henkelman 2017a: 283–287, 324). These do not imply that all *lan* sacrifices were made for this originally Elamite god, but it excludes analysis of the word *lan* as a scribal shorthand for 'Auramazdā-sacrifice.' With that conclusion, the image of an administration that spent more of its means on Humban than on Auramazdā returns with full force. How, then, is this situation to be understood?

The case of *lan* and Napiriša is particularly important for the question of Elamite elements in Achaemenid religion. *lan*, an inherited Elamite term for 'offering,' was part of a web of cognate forms that was important in Middle and Neo-Elamite cultic terminology and remained productive in Achaemenid Elamite (Vallat 2000; Henkelman 2008: 192–203, 241f., 254–280). A recent addition to this file is the short late Neo-Elamite inscription on one of the gold 'rings' from the Ǧūbağī tomb, which reads *la-ar-na*, 'for/belonging to the sacrificiant.' In Persepolis, one finds, among others, the verbal base *la-* 'to offer' (especially in connection with Humban), the appellative *lan-lirira*, 'oblator' (a qualification of *makuš*) and the compound *lankul*, 'offering-prayer' (cf. *kulla-*; Henkelman s.d. 5). This rich context forbids disconnecting *lan* from its Elamite past and reading it as merely an old word for a new reality (an Indo-Iranian cult). Instead, it shows continuity of a technical sacrificial vocabulary used alongside Iranian loanwords for specific cultic phenomena.

The most consequential case of *lan* for Napiriša (Fort. 1316–101:14') is connected to Anzamannakka, a place in the so-called 'northern cluster' along the road to Media. Henkelman has argued that Napiriša's cult in this area may have been relatively new: it was brought there by Persians in the context of their extending administrative network and institutional economy, of which cultic activity was an essential component (Henkelman 2017a: 277–281, 287). Napiriša, in other words, had become a Persian god, an inference also borne out by the circumstance that he was recipient of an *akriš* (Fort. 1785–103), a rare but seemingly important celebration, the name of which is Iranian (Henkelman s.d. 3 §5).

The adoption of Napiriša's cult into, and adaptation to, its new the Persian context should be placed in a longue durée perspective. The overall strength of the cult in Achaemenid Pārsa may well be based on Napiriša's long-time connection with the highland parts of Elam (Henkelman s.d. 2 §2.4). Most scholars agree that the central male deity at Kūrāngūn and Naqš-e Rustam is Napiriša (or Napiriša-Inšušinak), dispensing, as the Elamite Ea/Enki, the fertilising streams of water emerging from the deep (Vallat 2002/03: 533f., 543f.; Potts 2004: 152–154; undecided: Seidl 1986: 20f.). The fact that both open-air sanctuaries were enlarged with additional sculpture, hence still in active use in the Neo-Elamite period, is relevant here, as it allows for a direct link between the veneration of Napiriša in the highlands in the time before and that after Cyrus.

Incidentally, there is a Fortification seal (PFS 1312s) which shows (the statue) of a male deity flanked by composite creatures. One of these is a goat-fish, associated with Ea/Enki in Mesopotamia. The same creature is well attested in Elamite art, where it may be an emblem of Napiriša (Garrison 2017: 201; cf. Amiet 1994: 64f.).

The permanence in certain cults suggested in the case of Napiriša does not stand on its own. Humban's leading position among the gods mentioned in the Fortification archive, for one, clearly continues his surging popularity in the eighth, seventh and

sixth centuries BCE. His role as the Enlil of the Elamite pantheon (suggested by the commentaries to *Šurpu*) is not only reflected in the many Neo-Elamite royal names with the element 'Humban' (the last one being the aforementioned rebel Ummanuš) or in Hanni of Ayapir's reference to Humban, 'under whose *kitin* a king (stands),' but also in the ideologically charged *bakadaušiyam* celebrations organized in his honour under Darius I. Not co-incidentally, Auramazdā, too, figures prominently in the same context. Although it would be reductive to postulate a one-to-one connection, there is every reason to suspect that the role Humban assumed in the later Neo-Elamite period, that of a typical royal god, informed the profile of Auramazdā as visible in the royal inscriptions (Henkelman 2008: 353–384; 2017a: 306–319; s.d. 2 §2.1; cf. Gaspa 2017).

Some have pointed out the absence of prominent Elamite gods such as Inšušinak from the Fortification archive, and even inferred from it that his followers had turned their back on him, disappointed that he had forsaken them against the Babylonians and the Persians (so Koch 1995: 1963). It is not difficult to counter this *e silentio* argument: Inšušinak's traditional ties were with Susa and the Susiana, hence with a region from which hardly any Achaemenid administrative sources are preserved (Henkelman 2017a: 281f. with n.16). The few snippets that we have, however, do include reference to the continued cult of Nanāya at Achaemenid Susa (Joannès 1990: 173–175). Late Neo-Elamite royal inscriptions indicate continued worship, at that time, of Inšušinak, Humban, Pinigir, and Napiriša (EKI 77–80, 82–84), as does the Acropole archive for Inšušinak, Šimut, Hutran, Šazi and Zizi-pahha, some of whom had several local cult centres (Vallat 2002/03: 534–536; Basello 2017: 363–367; Henkelman s.d. 6). Given the marked role of gods of Elamite descent in Achaemenid Fārs, it would be unwise to assume a dramatic rupture in the parallel case of Khūzestān, only because textual evidence is scant. More plausible is a scenario of continuity of at least some of the major cults, besides the attested one of Nanāya. One wonders, in this context, whose temple it was which was plundered at Susa during the absence of Alexander (Arrian *Anabasis* VI.27.5; see also Álvarez-Mon 2011: 346–349 on Nabû and Marduk).

The various elements evoked with regard to the Elamite heritage in the Persian heartland religion provide the basis from which other elements may be explained. This is particularly true for aspects of Persian cultic space, cultic practice and cultic personnel, as documented in the Fortification archive and elsewhere. An important example is the duality of temple and open-air worship, which existed in Elamite and Persian culture alike.

The richness of Elamite temple culture is evident from the many inscriptions dedicated to the building and rebuilding of sanctuaries (*siyan*) throughout Elam (Potts 2010), but also from the apocalyptic tale of Susa's doom told by Assurbanipal (Prisms A VI:27–69 ~ F V:19–48; Borger 1996: 53–55, 241). In it, not only the capture of divine paraphernalia and temple property are mentioned, but also that of temple administrators (*sangē*) and cultic personnel (*buhlalē* > **puhu-lar*; Vallat 2001; Henkelman 2008: 272–274). The *Persepolis Bronze Plaque* adds to these categories that of the *puhu ziyanup*, 'temple servants,' perhaps a class of oblates (Henkelman 2008: 273f., 315). The Neo-Elamite *Šutruru Stela* (EKI 74), centring on the priest Šutruru, seems to document a complicated land grant (so Reiner 1969: 61f.; Koch 1980: 108–113; Waters 2000: 18f.). In short, economic activities of Elamite temples are alluded to in the sources; seen within the wider ancient Near Eastern context, this is, of course, anything but surprising.

The Fortification archive includes a few isolated references to temples (*ziyan*); each of these suggests an economic entity of some importance. An amount of 9405 l. wine was ordered for the temple at Hakurtiš, to give the most telling example. Perhaps the rareness of such references should be explained as a function of the relative autonomy of the sanctuaries (Henkelman 2008: 469–473, 547f.; 2017a: 287–290; s.d. 3 §3.1). If indeed they were institutional households of their own, the phenomenon may well have been informed by Elamite tradition.

Elamite and Indo-Iranian traditions shared a susceptibility to bodies of water and elevated places as numinous loci where mortal man might approach the divine. Kūrāngūn and the water-rich gorges of Kūl-e Farah and Šekaft-e Salmān are captivating examples of the Elamite tradition, but they are also of direct relevance here as they are all situated in what would become the Persian heartland (Álvarez-Mon 2013; Canepa 2013; Henkelman and Khaksar 2014; cf. Rapin 2017 on raised platforms of Achaemenid Central Asia). Since water was a key element in a number of Achaemenid monuments (Bīsotūn, Naqš-e Rustam, Ganǧnāmeh, Qadamgāh), it is tempting to postulate a connection with the Elamite past. Indeed, the Fortification archive is rich in references to river and mountain sacrifices, one of which is an offering for Humban at the river Betir ('Hostile, Adversary'). Contextual data for assigning the rites to a particular god or cultural tradition are lacking for all other cases, however. At any rate, the question of their cultural affiliation is probably moot since, in all likelihood, Elamite and Indo-Iranian traditions both contributed to the Persian rites (Henkelman 2008: 224, 377–380, 392f., 536–541; s.d. 3 §3.2).

A dossier that has emerged only in recent years is that of the funerary cult of Persian kings. Again, some of its elements point to the Elamite past.

Food offerings for the deceased are well attested in Elam, as they are in the ancient Near East in general (Carter 2011; Wicks 2015: 76–79, 93–97). Assurbanipal, in the above-quoted passage, prided himself on having deprived the royal shades of food offerings and water. The best-known individual cult, involving a statue/stela image of the king, is that of Tepti-ahar in the early Middle Elamite period (Reiner 1973, esp. 95f.). A fragmentary Neo-Elamite inscription, perhaps from Atta-hamiti-Insušnak, mentions sacrifices to be performed 'for my statue/stela' (EKI 89:5, *zalmu*; see Henkelman 2008: 362f.). Also relevant are clay heads, perhaps intended as portraits of the deceased, found in Elamite graves; the series continues into the Neo-Elamite period (Álvarez-Mon 2005; Carter 2011: 49). One wonders if these representations somehow connect to the statues of Elamite kings made from silver, gold, bronze and alabaster, 35 in total, that Assurbanipal seized. Mentioned in the context of the destruction of Elamite sanctuaries, they may have been votive images or the object of a dynastic cult (or both). The same is probably true for the images of deceased and living family members placed by Šilhak-Inšušinak I in the *suhter* (Grillot 1983).

Regular offerings for the statue/stela (*ṣalmu*) of Darius I were performed at Sippar during the reign of Xerxes (Waerzeggers 2014; cf. Rollinger 2011: 44–46). Though, presumably, continuing Mesopotamian rather than Elamite precedent, the case is important in the wider context of Persian funerary customs. To start with, an image of the deceased, and perhaps also those of the ancestors, indeed seems to have played a role in funerary rites. Classical sources repeatedly refer to such an image, lain on the royal catafalque (Hdt. VI.58.3, Ael. *VH* XII.64 [Alexander], Curt. III.3.16, perhaps Diod. XVII.115.1; Briant 2002: 522f., 959). Secondly, there is a series of texts in the

Fortification archive on the food offerings for Cambyses, his queen Upanduš/Phaidyme and Hystaspes (Henkelman 2003b; s.d. 3 §7; Henkelman and Miri s.d.). The cultic space for such evolvements consisted of the actual funerary monument (*šumar*) and a sanctuary (*siyan*) with a *bašur*, 'sacrificial table' (all mentioned together in NN 2174 [collated]). That the last term, a loan from Akkadian (*paššūru*), is potentially significant as such loanwords, rare in Achaemenid Elamite, usually go back to Middle or Neo-Elamite intermediate forms (cf. AE *zip* < ME-NE *sip* < Akk. *sippu*).

As for cultic personnel: the most common designation for priest or officiant in the Fortification archive is *šatin*, continuing a term already attested in the early second millennium (Tavernier 2007c: 283f.; Henkelman 2008: 254f. n.559, 298 n.677). The majority of individuals bearing it did not have Elamite names, however, nor were they exclusively assigned to the cult of Elamite gods. Indeed, almost all of the priests tending to Auramazdā were *šatin*, not *makuš* (*maguš*). This trend is a general one: although specialisation in certain cults sometimes occurs, cultic personnel regularly tended to the rites of deities of both Elamite and Indo-Iranian background. Priests with Iranian names and designations could sacrifice to deities of Elamite descent and *vice versa*. The terms *makuš* and *šatin* were not equivalents – *šatin* was a more precise term for sacrificial priest, *makuš* had to be qualified – but their difference cannot be construed in terms of ethnic or cultural profiles. This observation carries some weight, as the cultural traditions from which the terms *šatin* and *makuš/maguš* stem were indeed distinct (Henkelman s.d. 3 §2)

It is important to remember that the sacrifices recorded in the Persepolis Fortification archive pertain to cults that were wilfully organised by the state as part of the activities of an institutional household. These cults were for all those gods whom the Persians regarded to have a sway over their homeland: commodities allocated for their sacrifices were not philanthropic subsidies for indigenous cults. Along the same lines, places where deities of Elamite descent were worshipped, were not backward 'enclaves.' In fact, closer inspection of such 'isolated' places shows that some of them actually had a royal profile and were well connected to the rest of the institutional territory (examples: Henkelman 2008: 316–323; 2017a: 276f.).

That only an integrated approach can make sense of the religious phenomena documented by the Fortification archive is clearly shown by the following case. Since agriculture and animal husbandry were the prime supports of Persian heartland society, and since the archive pertains to an institutional context, it is not surprising that much of the documented cultic activity is related to fertility, rain, protection of the crops and stored revenue. Sometimes a series of sacrifices occurs, to be performed by the same priest in the same district (but not necessarily at the same time): the deities and rites that occur in such lists may include Adad, Napiriša, Sakurraziš, *kušukum*, *hapidanuš* and *tikrakkaš*. The last term perhaps refers to a conical granary (**tigraka-*, 'pointed'), while *hapidanuš*, another Iranian loan, literally means 'water place, reservoir' (**āpidāniš*; Tavernier 2007a: 398 [4.3.220], 437 [4.4.8.3]). Sakurraziš is the elamograph of Θāigraciš, the name of the third month in the Persian agricultural calendar. In this context, Napiriša probably occurs as god of the deep waters, while Adad, who had been at home in Elam since the Sukkalmah period, presumably is invoked in his role as fertility and rain god (Lipiński 2005; cf. Henkelman 2008: 305–323, 519f.; s.d. 2 §2.5; see also Álvarez-Mon and Basello 2014). This shows, in a nutshell, the practical reality of religious life: Iranian and Elamite elements occur side

by side in an agricultural setting, the basis of human existence (Henkelman 2008: 396–400, 541f.; s.d. 3 §4).

What is true for the everyday level of agricultural life, and the worries that come with it, also applies to prestigious, royal contexts. The grand sacrificial feast known as *šip* was performed at Pasargadae and other places with a clear royal profile. It was organised and presided over by the general director of the Persepolis economy or his deputy, *viz* by the king's highest representatives in the heartland. As in the case of the *bakadaušiyam* celebrations, larger crowds must have benefitted from the generous allocations in wine, grain and livestock. Displaying generosity on behalf of the king was, in fact, a prime concern at such a fore: it served an ideological purpose, but also had a practical side in motivating the workers with a little extra food. Unquestionably, then, the *šip* feast reflects both the way the Achaemenid monarchy wanted to see itself and the economic reality of the Persian heartland, with its expanded and multi-ethnic *kurtaš* workforce, in the age of empire.

Yet *šip*, both as a term and as a religious phenomenon, also connects to an Elamite past. The first indication for this is the single occurrence of a *šip* at the place Pumu. Apparently a more modest, local version, it was performed for the god Zizkurra, whose compound name contains a reduplication of *Zit*, 'Luck, Well-being' (*Zizit > *Zizt > Ziz), a theonym already attested in the *Narām-Sîn Treaty*. Secondly, the precursor to Achaemenid-Elamite *šip*, Middle and Neo-Elamite *šup*, is attested as a term for (royal) sacrifice in an inscription by Untaš-Napiriša, the Neo-Elamite *Persepolis Bronze Plaque* and other texts; it also occurs in various compounds and proper names. Finally, although we do not know its name, the sacrificial feast performed at Kūl-e Farah was arguably similar to Achaemenid *šip*, as appears from the large audience, the host of sacrificial animals, the communal banquet and other elements. If not a *šip* feast, it remains relevant as a phenomenon that may have informed the Achaemenid celebration (Henkelman 2011c; 2017a: 303–306; s.d. 3 §8; Basello 2012b: 153–156).

Although transformed in the Persian context and adapted to the needs of Achaemenid society, *šip* clearly has to be studied with due attention to the Elamite past. That past manifests itself with great force in the Elamite version of Xerxes' *Daivā* inscription. Clearly written by an iranophone with limited command of Elamite, it nevertheless describes the veneration of Auramazdā as 'performing his *šip*.' In the same text, moreover, Xerxes bans the cult of the *daivā* by laying his '*kiten* upon them, lest the *šip* of the *daivā* be performed!' This magical use of *kiten* (*kitin*), divine power in the hands of the monarch, strikes one as a direct echo of Elamite usage: Hanni, for one, laid *kitin* of the gods upon his relief as a ban protecting it from violation (Henkelman 2008: 364–371; 2017a: 318f. n.75; compare Garrison s.d. §4.3.5. and Rollinger 2011: 20–22).

The central message of the *Daivā* inscription may be Iranian, but it nevertheless includes an important Elamite sacrificial term and a crucial Elamite religious concept, both connected with Elamite royal ideology. These are present not because the scribe wanted to appeal to the tastes of an Elamite audience but because they were internalized in Persian society.

NOTE

1 All abbreviations as per Henkelman 2008.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Álvarez-Mon, J. 2005. Elamite Funerary Clay Heads. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 68: 114–122.

———. 2011. The golden griffin from Arjan. In: Álvarez-Mon and Garrison (eds.): 299–373.

———. 2013. Aesthetics of the natural environment in the arts of the ancient Near East: the Elamite rock-cut sanctuary of Kurangun. In: Brown, B.A. and Feldman, M.H. (eds.) *Critical approaches to ancient Near Eastern art*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 741–771.

Álvarez-Mon, J. and Basello, G.P. 2014. Like a Thunderstorm: Storm-Gods 'Sibitti' Warriors from Highland Elam. *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli* 74: 17–46.

Álvarez-Mon, J. and Garrison, M.B. (eds.) 2011. *Elam and Persia*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Amiet, P. 1994. Quelques sceaux élamites. In: Gasche, H. et al. (eds.) *Cinquante-deux réflexions sur le Proche-Orient ancient offertes en hommage à Léon De Meyer*. Mesopotamian History and Environment – Occasional Publications 2. Gent: Peeters, 59–66.

Andreas, F.C. 1904. Über einige Fragen der ältesten persischen Geschichte. In: *Verhandlungen des 13. internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses*, Leiden: Brill, 93–99.

Basello, G.P. 2011. Elamite as administrative language: from Susa to Persepolis. In: Álvarez-Mon and Garrison (eds.): 61–88.

———. 2012a. Doorknobs, nails or pegs? The function(s) of the Elamite and Achaemenid inscribed knobs. In: Basello, G.P. and Rossi, A.V. (eds.) *Dariosh Studies*, vol. 2: *Persepolis and its settlements: territorial system and ideology in the Achaemenid state*, Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale," 1–66, Pls. 1–20.

———. 2012b. L'uomo e il divino nell'antico Elam. In: Basello, G.P., Ognibene, P. and Panaino, A. (eds.) *Il mistero che rivelato ci divide e sofferto ci unisce: studi pettazzoniani in onore di Mario Gandini*, San Giovanni in Persiceto: Biblioteca Comunale "Giulio Cesare Croce," 143–220.

———. 2017. Of gods and men in the Persepolis Bronze Plaque. In: Henkelman and Redard (eds.): 347–383.

———. s.d. 1. Administrative topography in comparison: overlapping jurisdictions between the Susa Acropole Tablets and the Persepolis Fortification Tablets. In: Tavernier, J. et al. (eds.) *Topography and Toponymy in the Ancient Near East: Perspectives and Prospects*. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 71. Leuven: Peeters.

———. s.d. 2. The sign GAM in Elamite and the Old Persian word-divider. In: Schmitt, R. et al. (eds.) *Achaimenidica* 1. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Borger, R. 1996. *Beiträge zum Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals: die Prismenklassen A, B, C = K, D, E, F, G, H, J und T sowie andere Inschriften*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Boyce, M. 1982. *A history of Zoroastrianism*, vol. 2: *Under the Achaemenians*. Handbuch der Orientalistik 1.8.1.2.2A/2. Leiden: Brill.

Briant, P. 2002. *From Cyrus to Alexander: a history of the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Brown, S.C. 1986. Media and Secondary State Formation in the Neo-Assyrian Zagros: An Anthropological Approach to an Assyriological Problem. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 38: 107–119.

Canepa, M.P. 2013. The transformation of sacred space, topography, and royal ritual in Persia and the ancient Iranian world. In: Ragavan, D. (ed.) *Heaven on Earth: temples, ritual, and cosmic symbolism in the ancient world*. Oriental Institute Seminars 9. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 319–372.

Carter, E. 1994. Bridging the gap between the Elamites and the Persians in southeastern Khuzistan. In: Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H.W.A.M., Kuhrt, A. and Root, M.C. (eds.) *Continuity and Change*. Achaemenid History 8. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten: 65–95.

———. 2011. Landscapes of death in Susiana during the last half of the 2nd millennium B.C. In: Kozuh et al. (eds.): 45–58.

Carter, E. and Wright, H. 2003. Archaeological survey on the western Ram Hormuz Plain, 1969. In: Miller, N.F. and Abdi, K. (eds.) *Yeki bud, yeki nabud: Essays on the archaeology of Iran in honor of William M. Sumner*. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, 60–82.

De Graef, K. 2009. Count Your Sheep! Doings and Dealings of Kûya, Trader in Small Stock During the Early Sukkalmaḫat. *Revue d'Assyriologie* 103: 5–18.

de Miroschedji, P. 1985. La fin du royaume d'Anšan et de Suse et la naissance de l'Empire perse. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 75: 265–306.

———. 1990. La fin de l'Élam: essai d'analyse et d'interprétation. *Iranica Antiqua* 25: 47–95.

De Vaan, J.M.C.T. 1998. Idiom im Neubabylonischen (I): Erläuterungen zum Vokabular des Generals Bēl-ibni. In: Dietrich, M. and Loretz, O. (eds.) dubsar anta-men, *Studien zur Altorientalistik: Festschrift für Willem H.Ph. Römer*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 253. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 71–80.

D'Erme, G.D. 1990. Elamico e antico-persiano; affinità stilistiche tra i due sistemi scritori. In: Gnoli, G. and Panaino, A.C.D. (eds.) *Proceedings of the First European Conference of Iranian Studies*, vol. 1. Serie Orientale Roma 67.1. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 69–83.

Fisher, M.T. and Stolper, M.W. 2015. Achaemenid Elamite administrative tablets, 3: fragments from Old Kandahar, Afghanistan. *ARTA* 2015.001.

Fuchs, A. and Parpola, S. 2001. *The Correspondence of Sargon II*, vol. 3: *Letters from Babylonia and the Eastern Provinces*. State Archives of Assyria 15. Helsinki: Helsinki University.

Garrison, M.B. 1996. A Persepolis Fortification Seal on the Tablet MDP 11 308 (Louvre Sb 13078). *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 55: 15–35.

———. 2002 [2006]. The 'Late Neo-Elamite' Glyptic Style: A Perspective from Fars. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 16: 65–102.

———. 2011. The seal of "Kuraš the Anzanite, son of Šešpeš" (Teispes), PFS 93*: Susa – Anšan – Persepolis. In: Álvarez-Mon and Garrison (eds.): 375–405.

———. 2014. The royal-name seals of Darius I. In: Kozuh et al. (eds.): 67–104.

———. 2017. Beyond Auramazdā and the winged symbol: imagery of the Divine and Numinous at Persepolis. In: Henkelman and Redard (eds.): 185–246.

———. s.d. Visual representation of deities and demons in Achaemenid Iran: old problems, new directions. In: Uehlinger, C. and Graf, F. (eds.) *Iconography of ancient Near Eastern religions*, vol. 1: *pre-Hellenistic periods, introductory essays*, Leiden.

Gaspa, S. 2017. State theology and royal ideology of the Neo-Assyrian Empire as a structuring model for the Achaemenid imperial religion. In: Henkelman and Redard (eds.): 125–184.

Gershevitch, I. 1979. The Alloglottography of Old Persian. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1979: 114–190.

Gibson, M. 1991. Duplicate Systems of Trade: A Key Element in Mesopotamian history. In: Haellquist, K.R. (ed.) *Asian Trade Routes*. Studies on Asian Topics 13. London: Curzon, 27–37, 254–256, 281.

Grayson, A.K. and Novotny, J. 2012. *The Royal Inscriptions of Sennacherib, King of Assyria (704–681 BC)*, Part 1. Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 3.1. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Grillot, F. 1983. Le 'suhter' royal de Suse. *Iranica Antiqua* 18: 1–23.

Henkelman, W.F.M. 2003a. Persians, Medes and Elamites: Acculturation in the Neo-Elamite period. In: Lanfranchi, Roaf and Rollinger (eds.): 181–231.

———. 2003b. An Elamite memorial: the *šumar* of Cambyses and Hystaspes. In: Henkelman, W.F.M. and Kuhrt, A. (eds.) *A Persian perspective: essays in memory of Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg*. Achaemenid History 13. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 101–172.

———. 2005. Animal sacrifice and 'external' exchange in the Persepolis Fortification Tablets. In: Baker, H.D. and Jursa, M. (eds.) *Approaching the Babylonian economy*. Studies in the

Economic History of First Millennium Babylonia 2 = Alter Orient und Altes Testament 330. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 137–165.

———. 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 Irdabama and Irtaštuna, and that of his satrap, Karkiš. In: Jacobs, B. and Rollinger, R. (eds.) *Der Achämenidenhof*. Classica et Orientalia 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 667–775.

———. 2011a. Cyrus the Persian and Darius the Elamite: a case of mistaken identity. In: Rollinger, R., Truschnegg, B. and Bichler, R. (eds.) *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich; Herodotus and the Persian Empire*. 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. Parnakka's Feast: *šip* in Pārsa and Elam. In: Álvarez-Mon and Garrison (eds.): 89–166.

———. 2014. Teispès et les Perses. *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section des sciences historiques et philologiques* 145: 19–21.

———. 2017a. Humban and Auramazdā: royal gods in a Persian landscape. 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, 273–346.

———. 2017b. Imperial Signature and Imperial Paradigm: Achaemenid administrative structure and system across and beyond the Iranian plateau. In: Jacobs, B., Henkelman, W.F.M. and Stolper, M.W. (eds.) *Die Verwaltung im Achämenidenreich – Imperiale Muster und Strukturen/Administration in the Achaemenid Empire – Tracing the Imperial Signature*. Classica et Orientalia 17. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 45–256.

———. s.d. 1. Local Administration: Persia. In: Jacobs and Rollinger (eds.).

———. s.d. 2. The heartland pantheon. In: Jacobs and Rollinger (eds.).

———. s.d. 3. Practice of worship in the Achaemenid heartland. In: Jacobs and Rollinger (eds.).

———. s.d. 4. Bactrians in Persepolis – Persians in Bactria. In: Lhuillier, J. and Boroffka, N. (eds.) *A millennium of history: the Iron Age in southern Central Asia (2nd and 1st millennia BC)*. Archäologie in Iran und Turan.

———. s.d. 5. Of nanny goats and fated horses: reflections on Elamite *muhtu* and *kulla-*. In: Henkelman, W.F.M. (ed.) Studies in Achaemenid Culture and Society on the Basis of the Persepolis Fortification Archive.

———. s.d. 6. The other gods still are: an update from Persepolis. In: Henkelman, W.F.M., *Studies in Achaemenid Culture and Society on the Basis of the Persepolis Fortification Archive*.

Henkelman, W.F.M. and Khaksar, S. 2014. Elam's dormant sound: landscape, music, and the Divine in ancient Iran. In: Eneix, L.C. (ed.) *Archaeoacoustics: the Archaeology of Sound*. Myakka City: OTS Foundation, 211–231.

Henkelman, W.F.M. and Kleber, K. 2007. Babylonian workers in the Persian heartland: palace building at Matannan during the reign of Cambyses. In: Tuplin, C. (ed.) *Persian Responses: Political and Cultural Interaction With(in) the Achaemenid Empire*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 163–176.

Henkelman, W.F.M. and Miri, N. s.d. Ancient Neirīz: reflections on an Achaemenid and Sasanian city.

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*. Persika 14. Paris: De Boccard, 271–329.

Hinz, W. 1970. Die elamischen Buchungstäfelchen der Darius-Zeit. *Orientalia* 39: 421–440.

———. 1971. Achämenidische Hofverwaltung. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 61: 260–311.

———. 1973. *Neue Wege im Altpersischen*. Göttinger Orientforschungen 3.1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
———. 1976/1979. *Darius und die Perser: eine Kulturgeschichte der Achämeniden*., 2 vols. Baden-Baden: Holle.
———. 1987. Elams Übergang ins Perserreich. In: Gignoux, P. (ed.) *Transition periods in Iranian history*. Studia Iranica Cahier 5. Paris: Association pour l'Avancement des Études Iraniennes, 125–134.
Hinz, W. and Koch, H. 1987. *Elamisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols., Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran Erg.Bd. 17. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
Jacobs, B. and Rollinger, R. (eds.). s.d. *A companion to the Achaemenid Persian empire*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.
Joannès, F. 1990. Textes babyloniens de Suse d'époque achéménide. In: Vallat, F. (ed.) *Contribution à l'histoire de l'Iran: mélanges offerts à Jean Perrot*. Paris: Recherche sur les Civilisations, 173–180.
Kellens, J. 2002. L'idéologie religieuse des inscriptions achéménides. *Journal Asiatique* 290.2: 417–464.
———. 2012. Les Achéménides et l'Avesta. In: Cantera, A. (ed.) *Séptimo centenario de los estudios Orientales en Salamanca*. Estudios Filológicos 337. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 551–558.
Koch, H. 1977. *Die religiösen Verhältnisse der Dareioszeit: Untersuchungen an Hand der elamischen Persepolistäfelchen*. Göttinger Orientforschungen 3.4. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
———. 1980. Steuern in der achämenidischen Persis? *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 70: 105–137.
———. 1987. Götter und ihre Verehrung im achämenidischen Persien. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 77: 239–278.
———. 1995. Theology and worship in Elam and Achaemenid Iran. In: Sasson, J. (ed.) *Civilizations of the ancient Near East*, vol. 3. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959–1969.
———. 2011. Iran. In: Haas, V. and Koch, H., *Religionen des Alten Orients*, vol. 1: *Hethiter und Iran*. Grundrisse zum Alten Testament 1.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 17–144.
Kozuh, M.B., Henkelman, W.F.M., Jones, C.E. and Woods, C. (eds.) 2011. *Extraction and control: studies in honor of Matthew W. Stolper*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 68. Chicago: Oriental Institute.
Kreyenbroek, P.G. 2012. On the Construction of Zoroastrianism in Western Iran. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 22: 47–56.
Lanfranchi, R.B., Roaf, M. and Rollinger, R. (eds.) 2003. *Continuity of Empire (?): Assyria, Media, Persia*. History of the Ancient Near East – Monographs 5. Padova: S.A.R.G.O.N.
Lipiński, E. 2005. s.v. Adad. In: L. Jones (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Religion* (second edition), vol. 1. Detroit etc.: Thompson Gale, 27–29.
McCall, B. 2013. Re-assessing Elamite highland boundaries: new evidence for the Middle and Neo-Elamite periods in the Mamasani valleys, south-western Iran. In: De Graef, K. and Tavernier, J. (eds.) *Susa and Elam: archaeological, philological, historical and geographical perspectives*. Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse 58. Leiden: Brill, 191–205.
Moghaddam, A. and Miri, N. 2003. Archaeological Research in the Mianab Plain of lowland Susiana, South-Western Iran. *Iran* 41: 99–137.
———. 2007. Archaeological Surveys in the "Eastern Corridor," South-Western Iran. *Iran* 45: 23–55.
Potts, D.T. 2004. The numinous and the immanent: some thoughts on Kurangun and the Rudkhaneh-e Fahliyan. In: Von Folsach, K., Thrane, H. and Thuesen, I. (eds.) *From Handaxe to Khan: Essays Presented to Peder Mortensen on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Aarhus: Aarhus University, 143–156.
———. 2005. Cyrus the Great and the Kingdom of Anshan. In: Sarkhosh Curtis, V. and Stewart, S. (eds.) *Birth of the Persian Empire*, vol. 1, London: I.B. Tauris, 7–28.

———. 2010. Elamite Temple Building. In: Boda, M.J. and Novotny, J. (eds.) *From the Foundations to the Crenellations: Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 366. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 49–70, 479–509.
———. 2011. A note on the limits of Anšan. In Álvarez-Mon and Garrison (eds.): 35–43.
———. 2016. *The archaeology of Elam: formation and transformation of an Ancient Iranian state*. Cambridge: CUP [second, revised edition].
Potts, D.T. et al. (eds.) 2009/1388. *The Mamasani Archaeological Project, stage one: a report on the first two seasons of the ICAR – University of Sydney expedition to the Mamasani District, Fars Province, Iran*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
Radner, K. 1997. *Die neuassyrischen Privatrechtsurkunden als Quelle für Mensch und Umwelt*. State Archives of Assyria Studies 6. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.
———. 2003. An Assyrian view of the Medes. In: Lanfranchi, Roaf and Rollinger (eds.): 37–64.
Rapin, C. 2017. Sanctuaires sogdiens et cultes avestiques de l'époque de Gava à l'époque hellénistique (Koktepe et Sangir-tepe). In: Henkelman and Redard (eds.): 417–460.
Razmjou, S. 2004. The *lan* Ceremony and Other Ritual Ceremonies in the Achaemenid Period: The Persepolis Fortification Tablets. *Iran* 42: 103–117.
Reiner, E. 1969. The Elamite Language. In: Friedrich, J. *et al*., *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen*. Handbuch der Orientalistik 1.2.1–2.2. Leiden: Brill, 54–118.
———. 1973. Inscription from a Royal Elamite Tomb. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 24: 87–102.
Rollinger, R. 1999. Zur Lokalisation von Parsu(m)a(š) in der Fārs und zu einigen Fragen der frühen persischen Geschichte. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 89: 115–139.
———. 2011. Herrscherkult und Königsvergöttlichung bei Teispiden und Achaimeniden: Realität oder Fiktion? In: Günther, L.-M. and Plischke, S. (eds.) *Studien zum vorhellenistischen und hellenistischen Herrscherkult*. Oikumene 9. Berlin: Antike, 11–54.
Rossi, A.V. 2005. La scrittura antico-persiana e la scrittura elamico-achemenide. In: Bernardini, M. and Tornesello, N.L. (eds.) *Scritti in onore di Giovanni M. D'Erme*, vol. 2. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale," 927–942.
Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. 1988. Was there ever a Median Empire? In: Kuhrt, A. and Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. (eds.) *Method and Theory*. Achaemenid History 3. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 197–212.
Schaudig, H. 2001. *Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros' des Großen, samt den in ihrem Umfeld entstandenen Tendenzschriften*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 256. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
Scheil, V. o.p. 1907. *Textes élamites-anzanites, troisième série*. Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse 9. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
Schmitt, R. 2009. *Iranische Personennamen in der neuassyrischen Nebenüberlieferung*. Iranisches Personennamenbuch 7.1a = Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften phil.-hist. Klasse 792. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
Seidl, U. 1986. *Die elamischen Felsreliefs von Kūrāngūn und Naqš-e Rustam*. Iranische Denkmäler 2.H.12. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
Stolper, M.W. 1978. šarnuppu. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 68: 261–269.
———. 1985. *Entrepreneurs and Empire: the Murašû archive, the Murašû firm, and Persian rule in Babylonia*. Publications de l'Institut Historique et Archéologique Néerlandais de Stamboul 54. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
———. 2005. Achaemenid languages and inscriptions. In: Curtis, J. and Tallis, N. (eds.) *Forgotten Empire: the world of Ancient Persia*, London: British Museum, 18–24.
———. s.d. Mesopotamianisms in the Achaemenid Elamite adaptation of cuneiform. *Signs of Writing: the Cultural, Social and Linguistic Contexts of the World's First Writing Systems*, III.
Stronach, D. 1990. On the genesis of the Old Persian cuneiform script. In: F. Vallat (ed.) *Contribution à l'histoire de l'Iran: Mélanges offerts à Jean Perrot*. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 195–203.

———. 2013. Cyrus and the Kingship of Anshan: Further Perspectives. *Iran* 51: 55–69.
Tavernier, J. 2003. Drei altiranische Notizen. In: Van Tongerloo, A. (ed.) *Iranica Selecta: Studies in honour of professor Wojciech Skalmowski on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*. Silk Road Studies 8. Turnhout: Brepols, 247–256.
———. 2004. Some thoughts on Neo-Elamite chronology. *ARTA* 2004.003.
———. 2006. Elam: Neo-Elamite period (*ca.* 1000–530 B.C.). In: Eder, W. and Renger, J. (eds.) *Chronologies of the ancient world: names, dates and dynasties*. Brill's New Pauly, Suppl. 1. Leiden: Brill, 22–4.
———. 2007a. *Iranica in the Achaemenid period (*ca. *550–330 B.C.): Lexicon of Old Iranian proper names and loanwords attested in non-Iranian texts*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 158. Leuven: Peeters.
———. 2007b. The Case of Elamite *tep-/tip-* and Akkadian *ṭuppu*. *Iran* 45: 57–69.
———. 2007c. On Some Elamite Signs and Sounds. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 157: 265–292.
———. 2011. Iranians in Neo-Elamite texts. In: Álvarez-Mon and Garrison (eds.): 191–261.
Tuplin, C. 2013. *The Arshama Letters from the Bodleian Library*, vol. 3: *Commentary* [arshama. bodleian.ox.ac.uk/publications/; accessed 11/01/2017].
Vallat, F. 1995. Une inscription élamite écrite de droite à gauche! *NABU* 1995/45.
———. 2000. Le 'clergé' élamite. In: Graziani, S. (ed.) *Studi sul Vicino Oriente antico dedicati alla memoria di Luigi Cagni*, vol. 2. Istituto Universitario Orientale, Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor 61. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1065–1074.
———. 2001. Les *puhlalê* d'Assurbanipal. *NABU* 2001/65.
———. 2002/03. s.v. Suse: G.1. La religion suso-élamite. *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* fasc. 74: 529–553.
———. 2011. Darius, l'héritier légitime, et les premiers Achéménides. In: Álvarez-Mon and Garrison (eds.): 263–284.
Waerzeggers, C. 2014. A statue of Darius in the temple of Sippar. In: Kozuh et al. (eds.): 323–329.
Waters, M.W. 1999. The Earliest Persians in Southwestern Iran: The Textual Evidence. *Iranian Studies* 32/1: 99–107.
———. 2000. *A survey of Neo-Elamite history*. State Archives of Assyria Studies 12. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.
———. 2004. Cyrus and the Achaemenids. *Iran* 42: 91–102.
———. 2011. Parsumaš, Anšan, and Cyrus. In: Álvarez-Mon and Garrison (eds.): 285–296.
———. 2013. Elam, Assyria, and Babylonia in the early first millennium BC. In: D.T. Potts (ed.) *The Oxford handbook of Ancient Iran*. Oxford: OUP, 478–492.
Wenskus, S.R. 1961. *Stammesbildung und Verfassung: das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen gentes*. Köln: Böhlau.
Wicks, Y. 2015. *Bronze 'bathtub' coffins in the context of 8th-6th century BC Babylonian, Assyrian and Elamite funerary practices*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
Yakubovich, I. 2008. review Sanders, S.L. (ed.) *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures* (Chicago 2006). *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 36: 202–211.
Zadok, R. 1976. On the Connections Between Iran and Babylonia in the Sixth Century B.C. *Iran* 14: 61–78.
———. 2011. The Babylonia – Elam Connections in the Chaldaean and Achaemenid Periods. *Tel Aviv* 38: 120–143, 241–271.
Zournatzi, A. s.d. Early cross-cultural political encounters along the paths of the Silk Road: Cyrus the Great as a "King of the City of Anshan." In: Akbarzadeh, D. (ed.) Proceedings of the First International Conference "Iran and the Silk Road." Tehran.