

*Elamite Names**Elynn Gorris***Introduction to the Language and Its Background**

Elamite was the main language of south-western Iran between approximately the twenty-third and fourth century BCE and developed more or less contemporaneously with neighbouring Sumerian and later with Akkadian. Elamite remains, to our current knowledge, an isolated language that is not fully understood (Tavernier 2018; Stolper 2004). Since we are dealing in this chapter with a language that has no linguistic ties with the Mesopotamian languages, one should highlight the fact that Elamite onomastic conversions into Babylonian texts are actually transcriptions of Elamite personal names into Akkadian. Even though this chapter will treat mainly Elamite names deriving from Neo-Babylonian sources, the general outlines for the conversion of Elamite names into Akkadian do not only apply to Neo-Babylonian texts, but also to Neo-Assyrian texts.

Due to the limited amount of Elamite textual sources, we are not always able to fully reconstruct the Elamite anthroponyms attested in Neo-Babylonian texts. Even if we can identify an Elamite variant, there are still numerous lacunas in our understanding of Elamite phonology and grammar. Jan Tavernier (2010, 1059–60) has given four main reasons for this lack of knowledge:

- (1) First, Elamite was written in a Sumero–Akkadian cuneiform script that was not designed for the Elamite language. This means that the script lacks characters to express specific Elamite phonemes. The Elamites either simplified the orthography of their words or used a combination of cuneiform characters to write down their language as correctly as possible.
- (2) Second, due to the isolated status of the Elamite language, comparative linguistic material for the study of Elamite is nearly absent. This restricted text corpus, including the lack of bilinguals (Elamite–Akkadian) for the early to mid-first millennium BCE, is partly the

result of limited archaeological exploration in the Iranian provinces Khuzestan and Fars.

- (3) Third, there might have existed several Elamite dialects of which we are not aware. The territory of the Elamite kingdom was a long strip divided into the lowlands of Susiana, the highlands of Fars, and some more isolated mountainous Zagros regions, such as Izeh, which bordered areas that were inhabited by other language groups (e.g., Indo-Iranians, Arameans, etc.). These other languages doubtlessly had an influence on Elamite phonology.
- (4) Fourth, there is a diachronic development in the phonological system. The transcriptions of Elamite proper names and words in non-Elamite texts, mostly Akkadian texts, can therefore be quite useful to get a better understanding of Elamite phonology.

### The Elamite Name Material in the Babylonian Sources

#### *Text Corpora*

Neo-Elamite personal names that occur in the Neo- and Late Babylonian text corpus (c. 750–100 BCE) are extremely limited and dispersed over several text genres:<sup>1</sup>

1. Literary texts: Since the Babylonian Chronicle (ABC 1) informs us on the Elamite dynastic succession from 743 to 664 BCE, this text contains a significant amount of Elamite royal names. A Babylonian scribe copied this historical document in 499 BCE.
2. Official correspondence: Bēl-ibni, a Babylonian official in service of the Neo-Assyrian king Assurbanipal as the governor of the Sealand, reported on Elamite political and military activities in the Babylonian–Elamite border region between 650 and 645 BCE (de Vaan 1995). Due to the geographical proximity and the content of the letters, the Bēl-ibni correspondence contains transcriptions of the names of several Elamite officials.
3. Private archives: During the Neo-Babylonian and early Achaemenid period, several business men trading with the Susiana region encountered individuals with Elamite names who occasionally appear in their written documents.

<sup>1</sup> The author could identify about sixty-six different Elamite names in the Neo-Babylonian text corpus. This figure excludes the various orthographies of the same name/individual.

### Typology of Elamite Names Rendered in Neo-Babylonian

Ran Zadok already stated in his *Elamite Onomasticon* (1984, 49–50) that, since the Elamite language is not yet fully known, a typology of Elamite personal names will remain preliminary as well. With our current knowledge of Elamite onomastics, the composition of Elamite names seems very similar to Babylonian names, or more generally Akkadian names.

Typically, Elamite names are compound names consisting of two elements (Zadok 1984, 49–59; 1991, 231). The most common typologies of Neo-Babylonian renderings of Elamite names are:

- 1, Substantive + substantive: Imba-dara? ‘Helper of Huban(?)’ (<sup>1</sup>*im-ba-da-ra*?, YOS 7 30:11); Ištar-ḥundu ~ Neo-Elamite Šutur-Nahhunte ‘The justifier Nahhunte’ (*iš-tar-ḥu-un-du*, ABC I ii 32)
- 2, Substantive + adjective: Šutar-šarḫu ‘The proud righteous one’ (<sup>1</sup>*šu-tar-šar-ḥu*, BRM I 82:17)
- 3, Substantive + pres. active participle: Adda-ten ‘Father being favourable’ (<sup>bc</sup>*ad-da-te-na*, MDP 9 110 r. 4, MDP 9 167:4, MDP 9 172 r. 11, MDP 9 181:3; <sup>bc</sup>*ad-da-te-en*, MDP 9 73:2–3)<sup>2</sup>
- 4, Substantive + verb: Atta-luš ‘Father [. . .]’ (*at-ta-lu-uš*; -š: first conj. 3. sg.; Zadok 1984, 26 nr. 132)

Elamite names consisting of three elements are, like in Semitic onomastics, also attested but they occur more rarely. As for the Neo-Babylonian renderings, one has, for instance, the Elamite name Huban-haltaš ‘Huban received the land’ (*ḥum-ba-ḥal-da-šu*, ABC I iii 27, 33), consisting of a divine name + substantive + verb. The first element is the god Huban, the second element is the noun *hal* ‘land’, and the third element *taš* is a verbal form *ta+š* ‘he installed’ in the first conjugation 3.sg. (-š), meaning ‘Huban installed the land’. Or *taš* could be read *tuš* ‘he received’ with the system of vowel changes, and then the name translates ‘Huban received the land’. The final *-u* is an Akkadian nominative marker.

Neo-Babylonian renderings of Elamite names consisting of one element, other than hypocoristica, are to our knowledge not attested.

<sup>2</sup> These examples are taken from Neo-Elamite texts, where the determinative <sup>bc</sup> (BAD) is used as a marker of personal names. On the ‘*Personenkeil*’ used with Elamite names, see later in chapter.

*Hypocoristica*

If we look at the examples attested in the Neo-Babylonian sources, the most common renderings are hypocoristica with a reduplication of the final syllable (Zadok 1983). The Elamite origin of these names is not always certain.

Of all Elamite personal names in the Neo-Babylonian corpus, hypocoristica are by far the largest group. In fact, almost a third of the Elamite anthroponyms (33 per cent) in the Neo-Babylonian renderings belong to the hypocoristic type with a reduplication of the final syllable. In the Susa Acropole Archive, a large Elamite administrative archive of the Susa region from the late seventh century BCE, only about 15 per cent of the Elamite names are hypocoristica.<sup>3</sup> Adding the other types of hypocoristica (Zadok 1983, 107–20), Elamite hypocoristica rendered in Babylonian are at least twice as numerous as the hypocoristica in Elamite archives of the same

Table 16.1 *Elamite hypocoristica in Neo-Babylonian sources*

Neo-Babylonian renderings	References
<i>a-mur-ki-ki</i>	Zadok 1983, nr. 351, n. 351
<sup>f</sup> <i>bu-sa-sa</i>	Tallqvist 1905, 51; EIW 237
<sup>l</sup> <i>e-zi-li-li</i>	Tallqvist 1905, 62; EIW 403
<sup>l</sup> <i>ki-ru-ru</i>	Tallqvist 1905, 91; EIW 484
<sup>l</sup> <i>ha-am-nu-nu</i>	EIW 577
<sup>l</sup> <i>ha-lu-lu</i>	Tallqvist 1905, 66; EIW 611
<sup>l</sup> <i>ha-ni-ni</i>	Tallqvist 1905, 66; EIW 618
<sup>l</sup> <i>ha-nu-nu</i>	Tallqvist 1905, 66; EIW 618
<sup>l</sup> <i>in-da-bi-bi</i>	De Vaan 1995, 352–3
<sup>l</sup> <i>me-na-na</i>	Zadok 1983, nr. 76, n. 229
<i>šag-di-di</i> / <i>šak-ti-ti</i>	Tallqvist 1905, 179; EIW 1120, Zadok 1984, 38
<sup>l</sup> <i>ur-ki-ki</i> (or <i>lik-ki-ki?</i> )	Zadok 1983, nr. 147, n. 350
<sup>l</sup> <i>zu-zu-zu</i>	Zadok 1983, nr. 1150, n. 70

<sup>3</sup> <sup>be</sup>*mu-me-me* (MDP 9 95:4), <sup>be</sup>*am-pi-pi* (MDP 9 137:2), <sup>f</sup>*um-pu-pu* (MDP 9 182:4), *hu-ud-da-da* (MDP 9 178:6), <sup>be</sup>*ud-da-da* (MDP 9 29:5), <sup>f</sup>*i-du-du* (MDP 9 240 r. 3), *li-pi-pa* (MDP 9 132 r. 14), <sup>be</sup>*me-na-na* (MDP 9 104:11), <sup>f</sup>*mi-ti-ti* (MDP 9 49:8), <sup>f</sup>*mu-ti-ti* (MDP 9 81:2), <sup>be</sup>*na-is-su-su* (MDP 9 4:1), <sup>f</sup>*par-ri-ri* (MDP 9 169 r. 15), <sup>l</sup>*pu-ub-ha-ha* (MDP 11 299:3), <sup>be</sup>*rap-pi-pi* (MDP 9 190:2), <sup>be</sup>*ras-ma-nu-nu* (MDP 9 259:12), <sup>be</sup>*si-ki-ki* (MDP 9 56:4), <sup>be</sup>*si-ik-ka-ka* (MDP 9 116:2), <sup>be</sup>*si-ni-ni* (MDP 9 30:7), <sup>f</sup>*sà-ma-ma* (MDP 9 282 r. 1), <sup>be</sup>*su-pi-pi* (MDP 9 7:9), <sup>be</sup>*iak-ku-ku* (MDP 9 32:8), *tan-nu-nu* (MDP 9 294:4), *te-ri-ri* (MDP 9 74 r. 1), <sup>be</sup>*tub-ha-ha* (MDP 9 146:11), <sup>be</sup>*ú-ki-ik-ki* (MDP 9 240:6), and <sup>f</sup>*za-ni-ni* (MDP 9 90:8).

period. Moreover, to our knowledge, all the Elamite names with a single compound rendering in Babylonian are in general presented as hypocoristica. An explication for this phenomenon could be that the Babylonian scribes used the hypocoristicon as a method for abbreviating Elamite compound anthroponyms.

### *Hybrid Names*

Several persons attested in the Neo-Babylonian sources have hybrid names. The typology of these names is first, Elamite deity/substantive + Akkadian verb or, second, Elamite substantive + Akkadian adjective.

An example of the first category is the name Šadi-redû (<sup>1</sup>šā-di-re-e-du), which consists of an Elamite deity, Šadi respectively Šati, and an Akkadian stative of the verb *redû* ‘Šadi is accompanying’. Ran Zadok (1984, 36, n. 199), on the contrary, classifies this name as an Elamite name and translates the cuneiform combination *ri/e-e-du* as the Elamite component *riti* ‘spouse’ based on the onomastic conversion rule in which the voiced consonant /d/ is shifting to a voiceless consonant /t/. However, the vowel sign /e/ clearly indicates that the preceding sign /ri/ has the value /re/, meaning that the word is actually the Akkadian *redû* and not the Elamite *riti*. Šadi-redû is subsequently a hybrid name. On the other hand, an Elamite personal name that looks at first glance very similar to Šadi-redû is the personal name *te-em-ti-ri-di*. In this case, *ri-di* is a Neo-Babylonian rendering of the Neo-Elamite *riti* (Neo-Babylonian *d* ~ Neo-Elamite *t*) which is a linguistic evolution of the word *rutu* (see section on ‘Vowel Changes’).

In the second category of Elamite hybrid names, Šutar-šarḫu (<sup>1</sup>šu-tar-šar-ḫu) is a combination of an Elamite noun *šutur* with an Akkadian adjective *šarḫu*. The Neo-Babylonian rendering of *šutu+r* (delocutive) has undergone a vowel modification (Neo-Babylonian *a* ~ Neo-Elamite *u*), while the adjective *šarḫu* ‘proud’ is attested with the Akkadian nominative case ending *-u*.

## **Babylonian Orthography of Elamite Names**

### *The Theophoric Element*

Since most Elamite names have a compound composition with two or three elements, one of these elements is often the name of a deity (Zadok 1991, 231). However, since the names of the Elamite gods were not similar to those of the

Table 16.2 *Neo-Elamite gods occurring in Neo-Babylonian personal names*

Neo-Elamite gods	Babylonian variants
Huban	<i>ḫum-ba</i> <i>um-man</i> <i>um-ma</i> <i>am-ba</i> <i>im-ba</i> <i>im-ma</i> Ø
Inšušinak	Ø
Nahhunte	<i>ḫu-un-du</i> Ø
Šati	<i>ša-di</i>
Tepti	<i>te-im-ti</i>

Babylonian gods, the theophoric element was not perceived as highly relevant by the Babylonian scribes. When Elamite personal names were transcribed into Babylonian, the theophoric element was either omitted or converted in Akkadian.

#### *Omission of the Theophoric Element*

Most Neo-Elamite royal names are known through Mesopotamian or Akkadian sources in which their regnal name is modified to a Babylonian or Assyrian dialect. A typical phenomenon is the omission of the theophoric element. As a matter of fact, the deity Inšušinak as second element of the Elamite name is never written in Babylonian sources (e.g., Ḫallušu-<Inšušinak> (reigned 699–693 BCE) ‘Inšušinak made the country rich’, ABC 1 iii 7). The deities Huban and Nahhunte are mostly attested in a variety of writings; Huban is often written as first particle and Nahhunte as last particle of a compound name. However, these deities could occasionally be absent as well (e.g., <Huban>-menanu (692–688 BCE) ‘Huban is authority’, ABC 1 iii 26; Kutur-<Nahhunte> (693–692 BCE) ‘The lord Nahhunte’, RINAP 3/1 22 v 14–16; Grayson 1963, 90 l. 19).

The Elamite royal name Urtak, written *ur-ta-gu* (675–664 BCE; ABC 1 iv 13) in Babylonian, is a special case. The name Urtak/Urtaḡu only occurs in Akkadian sources and has no corresponding Neo-Elamite attestation yet. Urtak consists of two parts, *ur.ta+k*, in the Babylonian sources: *ur* is a sandhi writing of *u+ir* (personal pronoun 1.sg. ‘I, me’) and *ta+k* is a verbal form (passive participle ‘is placed, installed’), meaning ‘I, who

is installed (by x)'. Based on the typology of Elamite names, one can assume that Urtak was followed by a noun, most likely a theophoric element. Within the group of theophoric elements, Nahhunte or Inšušinak are the most plausible candidates, because these divine names are generally positioned as the last element in a compound construction and are almost always omitted in Babylonian renderings. However, since no Elamite inscription is known that mentions this king, the reconstruction of Urtak's full name remains hypothetical.

#### *Conversion of the Theophoric Element*

If one takes into consideration that the Elamite pronunciation may have sounded foreign to Babylonian and Assyrian ears, one must accept that Elamite names may have been written similarly to, but not necessarily identically with, a Neo-Assyrian or Neo-Babylonian anthroponym. An example of such a Babylonian confusion is the conversion of the Elamite royal name Šutur-Nahhunte/Šutruk-Nahhunte 'The justifier, Nahhunte' into Ištar-ḫundu (717–699 BCE; ABC 1 ii 32). At first glance, one would expect that the Babylonians changed an Elamite theophoric element into the equivalent deity of the Babylonian pantheon – that is, from *šutur* to *Ištar*. However, *šutur* is not an Elamite god, but a noun (-r delocutive), meaning 'the justifier, the righteous'. The Babylonian scribe probably used the Babylonian deity *Ištar* for the rendering of *šutur* because of the Semitic principle: as the three consonants *š-t-r* of *šutur* and *Ištar* are identical, *šutur* sounded like *Ištar* for the Babylonians.

The conversion of the other theophoric particles, namely Huban, Tepti, Nahhunte, and Šati, can be clustered in a number of Elamite–Babylonian onomastic conversion rules.

#### *Sumerograms*

Although rarely attested, Elamite names can be transferred in Neo-Babylonian renderings by the use of Sumerograms. One example is the Elamite royal name Kutur-Nahhunte. As we have seen, the Babylonians omitted the theophoric element Nahhunte. Kutur, the Elamite word for 'lord', is rendered as *kuduru* in Neo-Babylonian according to the onomastic conversion rules explained in 'Elamite–Babylonian Onomastic Conversion Rules' (*t* ~ *d*; Akk. case ending *-u*). This conversion subsequently sounded like the Babylonian word *kudurru* 'son' (CAD K 497), a meaning quite different from the Elamite 'lord'. Subsequently, for Akkadian *kudurru* the Sumerogram

NÍG.DU was used by the Babylonians to express the Elamite royal name Kutur-Nahhunte (693–692 BCE; ABC 1 iii 14').

### *The 'Personenkeil'*

In Neo-Babylonian texts, male anthroponyms are indicated with the determinative DIŠ (the '*Personenkeil*'; see Chapters 1 and 2), while male names in Neo-Elamite texts are preceded by the determinative <sup>be</sup> (BAD). Due to this discrepancy in traditions, the personal determinative before an Elamite name is often missing in a Babylonian text, while in that same text the Akkadian names are accompanied by a determinative (e.g., in ABC 1). The addition of a personal determinative to Elamite names probably depended on the onomastic knowledge of the scribe writing or copying the tablet. If the scribe or copyist did not recognise the foreign word as an Elamite personal name, then he was incapable of adding the correct determinatives as well. Perhaps this is the reason why the Akkadian determinative DIŠ for Elamite anthroponyms is correctly applied in the Bēl-ibni archive and is lacking in the Babylonian Chronicle.

## **Elamite–Babylonian Onomastic Conversion Rules**

When looking for Elamite personal names in the Mesopotamian textual records, three features of Neo-Elamite phonology and orthography that may influence the Akkadian rendering of Elamite words should be kept in mind: the reduction of consonants, consonant shifts, and vowel alterations.

### *Reduction of Consonants*

When Elamite personal names occur in Babylonian texts (or more widely in Akkadian texts) several consonants tend to be omitted. In the Neo-Babylonian renderings of the theophoric element 'Hu(m)ban' (Gorris 2020b, 164–77), for instance, the consonants /h/, /n/, and /m/ are altered.

#### *The Consonant /h/*

In the theophoric element the initial consonant /h/ is predominantly omitted. In this case, the Babylonian spellings adopt an evolution known from Elamite. During the Neo-Elamite period /h/ gradually disappeared in Elamite words, a development that continued in Achaemenid Elamite



(Stolper 2004, 71; Tavernier 2018, 425). Although the god Huban continued to be written with an /h/ in Neo-Elamite spellings, the /h/ was probably not pronounced anymore. Therefore, the Mesopotamian spelling reflects the common pronunciation of Huban in the first millennium BCE.

In the Babylonian Chronicle (ABC 1), one can find the only Neo-Babylonian attestation of the theophoric element 'Huban' written with an initial /h/ in the royal name Huban-haltaš<sup>4</sup> 'Huban received the land' (*ḫum-ba-ḫal-da-šu*). The Babylonian Chronicle is, however, not consistent in the use of the initial /h/ since the royal name Huban-nikaš<sup>5</sup> 'Huban has blessed' is attested in the more common Neo-Babylonian orthography *um-ma-ni-gaš*. Based on the Babylonian attestations (e.g., <sup>1</sup>*um-man-ši-bar*, <sup>1</sup>*um-ma-ḫal-da-šu*, <sup>1</sup>*um-man-al-da-šu*, and <sup>1</sup>*im-ba-da-ra*<sup>6</sup>) the rendering *um-ma(n)* for the theophoric element is indeed most frequently used.

#### *The Consonant /m/*

The Neo-Babylonian attestations of Huban and Tepti are consistently written with a medial /m/ (*ḫum-ba*, *um-ma(n)*, *ilam-ba*, *im-ma*, and *te-im-ti*), whereas the Neo-Elamite renderings *hu-ban* and *te-ip-ti* omit the middle /m/.<sup>6</sup> The /m/ in the Babylonian attestations is an indication of the Elamite nasalised vowels (Tavernier 2018, 424). In the Huban element, the reduplication of the /m/ is the result of the assimilation of /m/ with the consonant /b/ or /p/, which is also the case for the Babylonian attestation of the Elamite god Tepti (*te-im-ti*).

#### *The Consonant /n/*

In Neo-Elamite orthography, the final consonant *-n* is not consistently written. Françoise Grillot-Susini and Claude Roche (1987, 11; also Grillot-Susini 1994, 15; Khačikjan 1998, 10; Stolper 2004, 73) argue that the neutralisation of some final vowels and the elision of some medial vowels suggests that the stress was not final, but probably initial. This would suggest that the

<sup>4</sup> Three kings are known by the name Huban-haltaš during the Neo-Elamite period: (1) Huban-haltaš I (688–681 BCE), the founder of the second Neo-Elamite dynasty (i.e., the Hubanids); (2) his successor Huban-haltaš II (681–675 BCE); (3) Huban-haltaš III (648–647 BCE; 647–645 BCE), one of the Elamite Rebel Kings, who came into power twice during a period of Assyrian-induced political turmoil marking the downfall of the Hubanid dynasty (Gorris 2020a, 55–60). For more information on the division of the Neo-Elamite kings into dynasties and their genealogy, see Gorris (2020a, 37–8).

<sup>5</sup> The name Huban-nikaš is attributed to two Neo-Elamite kings. Huban-nikaš I (743–717 BCE) is the first known king of the first Neo-Elamite dynasty (Gorris 2020a, 20–22), while nearly a century later the Assyrian ruler Assurbanipal installed Huban-nikaš II (653–652/1 BCE) as Elamite king over the Susa territory (Gorris 2020a, 45–6).

<sup>6</sup> The only royal Elamite inscriptions (IRS 22; IRS 24–30) attested with a *hu-um-ban* orthography are those of the Middle Elamite king Untaš-Napiriša (1345–1305 BCE); see Gorris (2020b).

stress was put on the initial syllable of the word and that the pronunciation of the final consonant /n/ was rather weak, which resulted in the omission of the final /n/ in Neo-Babylonian renderings. This omission of the final /n/ is frequently attested in Neo-Babylonian renderings of Elamite toponyms (Gorris 2018, 324–5), but the same conversion rule counts for Elamite anthroponyms (e.g., Huban ~ *um-ma*; *im-ba*).

### *The Consonant /t/*

Due to a weakening of /t/ in Neo-Elamite, the middle or final /t/ may occasionally disappear in Neo-Babylonian onomastic renderings (Tavernier 2014, 62); for example, 𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠 ~ 𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠-𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠 and 𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠 ~ 𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠-𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠 (ABC I iii 7; PTS 2713; VS 4 I; I N 297).<sup>7</sup>

## *Consonant Shifts*

### *Voiced vs. Voiceless*

According to Tavernier (2018, 425), there is no difference in Elamite between voiceless and voiced consonants. In general, Babylonian renderings of Elamite personal names are written with the voiced consonant, while the Elamite version uses the voiceless consonant. Hence, Neo-Elamite /k/ is rendered /g/ in Neo-Babylonian (e.g., *ur-ta-ak* ~ *ur-ta-gu*; *šak-ti-ti* ~ *šag-di-di*) and Neo-Elamite /t/ is rendered /d/ (e.g., *ḫu-ban-te-na* ~ *im-ba-de-en-na*; *ḫu-un-du* ~ *nah-hu-un-te*).

### *Sibilants*

The Elamite language has more sibilants than Akkadian (Tavernier 2010, 1067–70) which is the reason why Elamite words converted into Akkadian reveal a variety of orthographies. It is commonly known that the sibilants /s/ and /š/ switched places in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian dialects (GAG § 30d; Hämeen-Anttila 2000, 9–10) and thus the writers of these dialects opted to express the Elamite sibilants differently. Whereas the Neo-Assyrian variations often use an /s/ sound for rendering an

<sup>7</sup> The royal name 𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠-𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠 is attributed to two Neo-Elamite kings. The Babylonian Chronicle (ABC I iii 7) refers to 𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠-𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠 I (699–693 BCE), who belonged to the first Neo-Elamite dynasty (Gorris 2020a, 33–5). 𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠-𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠 II (c. 598/93–583/78 BCE) was one of the late Neo-Elamite kings, whose reign is attested in Elamite as well as Neo-Babylonian documents (Gorris 2020a, 73–80). For the most plausible orthography of 𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠-𐎶𐎠𐎺𐎠, see Tavernier (2014).

Elamite /š/, the Neo-Babylonian renderings are much closer to the original and also use /š/ (e.g., Neo-Elamite <sup>be</sup>*hal-lu-iš* = Neo-Assyrian <sup>1</sup>*hal-lu-sulī* = Neo-Babylonian <sup>1</sup>*hal-lu-šūli*). The geographical proximity of the Neo-Babylonian kingdom may have been the reason for a more accurate vocal transition.

### *Babylonian Consonant Modification*

Although rarely attested, Babylonian renderings of Elamite names undergo even further changes when they are submitted to the Neo-Babylonian assimilation rules. One example is the royal name Urtak. Elamite Urtak, with the onomastic conversion rules, become *ur-ta-gu* in Babylonian, but in the latter dialect the -rt- consonant combination is modified into -št-. Therefore, a common Neo-Babylonian rendering of Urtak is <sup>1</sup>*uš-ta-gu* (Zadok 1984, 42).

### *Vowel Changes*

Vowel changes regularly occur in Babylonian renderings of Elamite names. The Akkadian nominative case ending *-u* replaces in general the last vowel of the Neo-Elamite name or it is added to a Neo-Elamite name ending on a consonant. Since the vowel in Elamite anthroponyms written with /CvC/ signs is uncertain, the Babylonian renderings of Elamite names may exhibit various orthographies; for example, Neo-Elamite <sup>be</sup>*hu-ban-šu-pír* ~ Neo-Babylonian <sup>1</sup>*um-man-ši-pár* or <sup>1</sup>*um-man-ši-pír* ‘Huban, the worshipper’. It is much harder to find a system behind the vowel changes at the beginning and in the middle of the personal name with /Cv/ or /vC/ signs. Sometimes the Neo-Babylonian rendering undergoes a vowel change, sometimes it reflects the conventional Elamite vowel. Therefore, the overview of the vowel changes presented in Table 16.3 is a non-exhaustive list, which may be extended after further research on the topic.

According to Jan Tavernier (2007, 278–9), signs of the type /Cu/ can be pronounced as /Ci/. In late Elamite sources not only the sound but also the orthography of the vowel /u/ is evolving into /i/ (Tavernier 2007, 278–9; 2018, 424). This also has an impact on the Neo-Babylonian renderings of Elamite names such as *te-em-ti-ri-di*. The element *riti* ‘wife’ is attested in a Neo-Elamite source (Ururu bronze plaque), but traditionally the word is written *rutu* in Elamite.

Table 16.3 *Neo-Babylonian renderings of Neo-Elamite vowels*

Neo-Elamite vowel	Neo-Babylonian rendering	Example
a	a	<i>ḫu-ban-nu-kaš ~ um-man-ni-gaš</i>
a	i	<i>ḫal-taš ~ il-da-šú</i>
u	u	<i>ḫu-ban ~ um-ba, um-ma</i>
u	i	<i>ḫu-ban ~ im-ba</i> <i>šu-pir ~ ši-pir</i> <i>nu-kaš ~ ni-gaš</i>
u	a	<i>ḫu-ban ~ am-ba</i> (in <sup>1</sup> <i>am-ba-zi-ni-za</i> , <i>Amba-ziniza</i> , mng. uncertain)

### Socio-Onomastics

This brings us to the ethno-sociological context of Elamite names that were written in the Neo-Babylonian texts. Who were the Elamites mentioned in those Neo-Babylonian texts? To which social class did they belong, and what were their professions? Only a few clusters of Neo-Babylonian documents, such as the Babylonian chronicles or the Bēl-ibni archive, contain multiple Elamite personal names and can give us some insight in the ethno-sociological context.

Since the Babylonian chronicles record specifically the regnal years and succession of the Babylonian kings and their royal neighbours, only names of Elamite kings from the reign of Huban-nikaš I (743–717 BCE) to the accession of Urtak (675–664 BCE) are described. The chronicles target a specific group within the Elamite upper class of the population, namely the king as the highest political authority within the Neo-Elamite kingdom.

Since the governor Bēl-ibni was positioned in southern Babylonia to monitor Elamite political activities at the Elamite–Babylonian border (de Vaan 1995), his archive mentions several Elamite kings: Indabibi (mng. unknown), Huban-nikaš II ‘Huban has blessed’, Tammaritu (mng. unknown), and Huban-ḫaltaš III; additionally, various Elamite royal officials concerned with foreign policies are noted, including the palace herald Ummanšibar ‘Huban, the worshipper’, the chief of the *šarnuppu*-officials Umḫuluma? ‘Huban is connecting(?)’, Huban-nikaš, son of Amedirra (a West Semitic name), and the borderland sheikhs Undadu (hypocorism of (Huban)-untaš ‘(Huban) installed me(?)’) of

the zilliru-people and Atmanu (possibly from Atta-menu ‘Father is authority’) of B/Manānu.<sup>8</sup> So, based on the official governmental character of the Bēl-ibni archive, it seems that the individuals with Elamite names occurring in these Babylonian texts were either highly ranked Elamite officials or specialised professionals, and Babylonian–Elamite borderland sheikhs with a mixed identity (Elamite–Aramean–Babylonian).

Interestingly, three seemingly unrelated Neo-Babylonian documents (an adoption contract and two loans of silver) give a rather exceptional insight in Babylonian–Elamite social relations. This adoption contract of a girl (OIP 122 1), drafted in Sumuntunaš (Western Elam) and found in Nippur, was dated to the 15th regnal year of Ḫallutuš-Inšušinak II. A loan of silver (VS 4 1), drafted in Elam and presumably found in Babylon, is linked to the archive of Iqīša, son of Bēl-nāšir, of which all contracts are dated to the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II (605–562 BCE). Another loan of silver (PTS 2713) was drafted during the first regnal year of Ḫallutuš-Inšušinak II at Bīt-Hullumu (i.e., in the vicinity of the Sumuntunaš). What is special about these Neo-Babylonian documents is that the date formula referred to an Elamite place of writing and used the reign of the Elamite king Ḫallutuš-Inšušinak II (c. 598/93–583/78 BCE) as the year reference. Hence, these contracts must have been drawn up by a Babylonian community living (in the case of the adoption contract) or trading extensively in the western border region of the Neo-Elamite kingdom.<sup>9</sup>

As for the ethno-sociological profile of Elamite names in the Neo-Babylonian texts, we can thus roughly distinguish two groups. One group of Elamite kings and high officials active in Elamite–Babylonian bilateral relations was mentioned in official Neo-Babylonian state documentation. Another group are Elamites (including the hybrid and hypocoristic names) occasionally mentioned in dispersed Neo-Babylonian private archives, generally in connection with Babylonian trading activities or communities in the western Elamite Susiana region.

<sup>8</sup> The latter occurs in the correspondence of Bēl-ibni, governor of the Sealand, and Assurbanipal with the Elders of Elam (Gorris 2020a, 180), aka the southern Mesopotamian–Elamite border zone. Whereas Joop M. C. T. De Vaan (1995) reads Banānu, Ran Zadok (1985) reads Manānu; thus with almost identical signs, either BA or MA.

<sup>9</sup> For a detailed study of these documents (including further references) and their relation to the history of Elam, see Gorris (2020a, 73–7).

### Further Reading

For Elamite, there is only one sign list, the *Syllabaire Elamite* by Marie-Joseph Stève (1992), and one dictionary, the *Elamisches Wörterbuch* (EIW) by Walther Hinz and Heidemarie Koch (1987). In the EIW lexicon, the word entries are catalogued by the occurrence in the texts rather than by their root, and translations are often very tentative. The most recent grammars, with references to preceding grammatical, morphological, and phonological studies, are by the hand of Jan Tavernier (2018) and Matthew W. Stolper (2004). Ran Zadok (1983; 1984; 1991) has especially contributed to our knowledge of Elamite onomastics.

### References

- Gorris, E. 2018. 'Crossing the Elamite borderlands: a study of interregional contacts between Elam and the "kingdom" of Hara(n)' in J. Tavernier, E. Gorris, K. Abraham, and V. Boschloos (eds.), *Topography and Toponymy in the Ancient Near East. Perspectives and Prospects*, Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 71. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 313–44.
- Gorris, E. 2020a. *Power and Politics in the Neo-Elamite Kingdom*, Acta Iranica 60. Leuven: Peeters.
- Gorris, E. 2020b. 'When God is forgotten . . . The orthography of the theophoric element Hu(m)ban in Elamite and Mesopotamian onomastics', *Les Études classiques* 88, 163–80.
- Grayson. 1963. 'The Walters Art Gallery Sennacherib inscription', *Archiv für Orientforschung* 20, 83–96.
- Hinz, W. and H. Koch 1987. *Elamisches Wörterbuch*, Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, Ergänzungsband 17. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Khačikjan, M. 1998. *The Elamite Language*, Documenta Asiana 4. Rome: Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche/Istituto per gli studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici.
- Grillot-Susini, F. 1994. 'Une nouvelle approche de la morphologie élamite: racines, bases et familles de mots', *Journal asiatique* 1, 1–18.
- Grillot-Susini, F. and C. Roche 1987. *Éléments de grammaire Élamite*. Paris: Geuthner.
- Hämeen-Anttila, J. 2000. *A Sketch of Neo-Assyrian Grammar*, State Archives of Assyria Studies 13. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.
- Stève, M.-J. 1992. *Syllabaire Elamite: Histoire et paléographie*, Civilisations du Proche Orient, Série 2, Philologie I. Neuchâtel/Paris: Recherches et Publications.
- Stolper, M. W. 2004. 'Elamite' in R. D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 60–94.
- Tallqvist, K. L. 1905. *Neubabylonisches Namenbuch zu den Geschäftsurkunden aus der Zeit des Shamash-shum-ukin bis Xerxes*, Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae 32/2. Helsinki: Societas Litteraria Fennica.

- Tavernier, J. 2007. 'On some Elamite signs and sounds', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 157, 265–91.
- Tavernier, J. 2010. 'On the sounds rendered by the s-, š-, and š/z- series in Elamite' in L. Kogan (ed.), *Proceedings of the 53e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Vol. 1: Language in the Ancient Near East*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, pp. 1059–78.
- Tavernier, J. 2014. 'What's in a name: Hallušu, Hallutaš, or Hallutuš', *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 108/1, 61–6.
- Tavernier, J. 2018. 'The Elamite language' in J. Álvarez-Mon, G. P. Basello, and Y. Wicks (eds.), *The Elamite World*. London: Routledge, pp. 416–49.
- de Vaan, J. M. C. T. 1995. 'Ich bin eine Schwertklinge des Königs'. *Die Sprache des Bēl-ibni*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 242. Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker/ Neukirchener Verlag.
- Zadok, R. 1983. 'A tentative structural analysis of Elamite hypocoristica', *Beiträge zur Namensforschung NF* 18, 93–120.
- Zadok, R. 1984. *The Elamite Onomasticon*, Supplemento n. 40 agli Annali vol. 44.3. Naples: Istituto Universitario orientale.
- Zadok, R. 1985. *Geographical Names According to New- and Late-Babylonian Texts*, Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 8. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
- Zadok, R. 1991. 'Elamite Onomastics', *Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici* 8, 225–37.