

ELAMITE ONOMASTICS

Ran Zadok

A. Elamite names occur both in Elamite and non-Elamite sources¹. «Elamite» here means practically the dialects written in cuneiform as the Elamite hieroglyphs are yet undeciphered. The Elamite onomasticon is documented during a period of no less than 2500 years, viz. from the middle of the 3rd millennium through the first half of the 1st century A.D., thereby being one of the oldest and most persistent and continuous onomastica of the ancient Near East. Since there are no texts in Elamite before the last third of the 2nd millennium B.C. – with the exception of the so-called Treaty of Naram-Sin (and Hita) (O[ld]-E[lamite]) and W. Farber, *Eine elamische Inschrift aus der 1. Hälfte des 2. Jahrtausends*: ZA, 64 (1975), pp. 74-86 – all the early Elamite names are recorded in Sumerian and Akkadian sources. These sources are exclusively from Susiana which formed culturally part of Mesopotamia. Early Elamite names are also mentioned in sources from Mesopotamia proper, especially Ur III (where the Elamites were the largest non-Semitic foreign group) and Old-Babylonian. The sources from Susiana where the population was mixed, viz. Elamite and Semitic, also contain many Semitic (Akkadian, Amorite) and hybrid (Semitic-Elamite) names. This mixture recurs but with a lower percentage of Semitic in the Middle Babylonian and Middle Elamite (ME) documentation. These texts contain some Kassite names as well. The onomasticon of Neo-Elamite (NE) and Royal Achaemenid Elamite (RAE) reflects the intensive Iranian penetration into Elam. I. Gershevitch (*Amber at Persepolis: Studia Classica et Orientalia Antonino Pagliaro Oblata* 2, Rome 1969, p. 168) observed that most names recorded in RAE are Iranian. NE has some Semitic and other names as well². Since there were numerous foreigners at Persepolis (most of them, however, anonymous) RAE has an especially wide spectrum of strange names. Very few Elamite names occur in Aramaic and Biblical Hebrew sources (notably Admata, Agag, Haman, Kedarlaomer, Zeresh, cf. R. Zadok, *On Five Biblical Names*: ZAW, 89 [1977], p. 268:5; id., *Notes on Esther*: ZAW, 98 [1986], p. 106:1).

¹ Abbreviations not in SEL follow HKL, as well as K. Deller–H. Klengel, *Keilschriftbibliographie* 47: OrNS, 55 (1986), pp. 1*-5*; 49: OrNS, 57 (1988), pp. 1*-3*. Additional abbreviations: BTH = R. Kutscher, *The Brockmon Tablets at the University of Haifa: Royal Inscriptions*, Haifa 1989; Hinz (W.) and Koch (H.) = *Elamisches Wörterbuch* 1, 2, Berlin 1987; MT = R.C. McNeil, *The «Messenger Texts» of the Third Ur Dynasty.*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania 1971; PMRAE = H.H. Paper, *The Phonology and Morphology of Royal Achaemenid Elamite*, Ann Arbor 1955; UCT = I.J.M. al-Ubayd, *Unpublished Cuneiform Texts of the OB Period from the Diyala Region* (unpubl. M.A. Thesis, Baghdad University, 1983; Arab.).

² E.g., OB *Ša₃-du-u₂-pi-i* (gen.) nisbe of GN *Šaduppām*; RAE *Na-pu-tur-ri-iš* < Akkad./Aram. *Nabû-dûrî* (-î is treated like an OIran. -i-stem). NE *U₂-al* is too short for a linguistic affiliation; has NA *U₂-(a-)al-li-i* (a Mannean, APN, p. 238a) a similar base? The name of the Syrian («Hiitite») NE *Ša₂-at-ku* may derive from Š-D-K «be quiet, at ease» (Aram., Mid. Heb.).

The latest Elamite onomastic survivals are contained in Greek, viz. Οκκοναψος, Υκναψος (< *Ukku-napša acc. to M. Mayrhofer *apud* Hinz and Koch, p. 1213; poss. 140 B.C.), Ανζαζη (fem., 82-81 B.C.; a Grecized «banana» name) and *Καμνασκιρης (Aram. *Kbnškyr*, LB *Qa-bi-na-aš₂-ki-ri*; 77 B.C. and later)³.

B. Research into Elamite names was started by P. Jensen (*Elamitische Personennamen*: WZKM, 6 [1892], pp. 47-70; 209-26). Subsequent work was done by F. Bork and G. Hüsing, but it was mainly a by-product of their lexical studies, generally unreliable and is almost totally antiquated (bibliography: PMRAE, pp. 112ff.). V. Scheil commented on many names in his first editions of texts from Susiana. The same was done (with much less competence) by F.W. König in *ElKi* (1965). G.G. Cameron, R.T. Hallock, M.-J. Steve, F. Vallat and M.W. Stolper made many extensive onomastic remarks in their text editions. P. Meriggi (*La scrittura proto-elamica* 1, Rome 1971; *apud* Mayrhofer, *Onomastica Persepolitana*, Vienna 1973, pp. 304-10) and W. Hinz (*ibid.*) discussed many Elamite hypocoristica and some compound anthroponyms from the 1st millennium B.C. The latter and H. Koch listed and to some extent interpreted almost all the Elamite names in their dictionary (1987; including all the names discussed below unless otherwise indicated by me). Their monumental achievement (practically an updated thesaurus and concordance) will remain a mine of information for generations to come. Both volumes should be used with caution and by applying much *ars nesciendi* due to the lack of many question-marks there. F.W. König, W. Hinz and M.W. Stolper discuss Elamite names in various RIA articles. A preliminary attempt to register and classify the Elamite anthroponyms was done by me in 1983 (*A Tentative Structural Analysis of Elamite Hypocoristica*: BNF, 18, pp. 93-120; henceforth Zadok 1983) and 1984 (*The Elamite Onomasticon* [Naples; henceforth *ElOn*; ## below refer only to this monograph]).

C. Not all the individuals who are explicitly described as Elamites bore assured Elamite names. This applies in the first place to Susians and Iamutbaleans, many of whom bore Semitic names. Moreover, the Semites seem to have been dominant in early Susiana as all the Susians mentioned in Sargonic texts bore Semitic names (cf. RGTC 1, pp. 154f.) and most names from OB Susa are Semitic. However, the Susian onomasticon became predominantly Elamite in the later periods. 1. *An-ta-lu-ma* king of Elam in the Boghazköy legendary tradition (KUB 2, 2) has no assured Elamite or other non-Semitic elements (*lumi*, #133, is doubtful); 2. *Sa-pir₆-si-mu-ut*; 3. *Hi-si-ip-ra-si-ni* and the latter's son; 4. *Lu-uh-iš-an*, the rulers of Elam in the Sargonic period (RGTC 1, pp. 44f.) bore definitely Elamite names. Other rulers of Elam in that period were 5. [x]-*in-ru-uš* and 6. *Eš₄-pum/ba₁₁* (*ibid.*); 5 is definitely non-Semitic; 6 is perhaps Akkadian according to I.J. Gelb (MAD 3, p. 74) and is compared with *Eš-be-e* from OB Susa by Hinz and Koch. 7. *Zi-na* the *ensi₂* of *Hu-zi-x-x* (prob. in Elam) then (RGTC 1, p. 75) has an atypical name like 8. (*dumu*-)*A-za-za* from Uruaz and 9. *Si₄-*

³ Cf. D. Sellwood, in E. Yarshater (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran*, 3, 1, Cambridge 1983, pp. 306-17 (Aram. *Kbnškyr*). G.J.P. McEwan, *A Parthian Campaign against Elymais in 77 B.C.: Iran*, 24 (1986), p. 94, n. 15, argues that LB *Qa-bi-na-aš₂-ki-ri* is a transcription of the Gk. form in view of <q> = Gk. κ; this is difficult as the Greek has -μ-.

*ku*₃ from URUxA (RGTC 1, pp. 180f.). Does 10. *x-da-ah-ru* (*ensi*₂ of Sherihum, RGTC 1, p. 151) end in Elam. *tahra* (#237a)? I cannot offer an Elamite interpretation for 11. *Hi-da-ri₂-da-x*, the *ensi*₂ of *Gu-ni-la-ha^{ki}* somewhere in the Iranian Plateau (RGTC 1, p. 64; with the same final component(s) as NA *uruKi-si-la-ha* in NW Iran, AOAT 6, p. 209 and the anthroponym *Pa-ar-la-ah* from MB Susa?). 12-21 occur in Ur III documents; 12-15 are from Adamdun (RGTC 2, p. 4; D.I. Owen, *Review of RGTC 2*: JCS, 33 [1981], p. 247; henceforth Owen 1981):

12. *Ba-ga* (homonym of *Ba-a-ga*, TEL, p. 142, s.v.; cf. *Ba-ga-ia* from OB Susa) is atypical. For 13. *La-num* cp. *lan* (#124; Semiticized?), but the name is too short for an unambiguous interpretation. 14. *U₃/U₁₈/U₁₉-ba-a* and 15. *Me-ri₂-iš* are Elamite. 16. *Da-a-zi* and 17. *Kir-ri* from Anshan (BIN 3, 477, 11, cp. *Da-zi*, TEL, 231, iii, 10) are atypical. The initial component of 18. *Ku-ku-a-lum* (MVN 7, 419, v, 7) looks Elamite (#110), but since it is followed by a Semitic theophorous element, this is open to doubt (cf. *ad* #110). The Anshanite 19. *Ar-za-na* (MVN 7, 228) had no recognizable Elamite anthroponym (it hardly ends in *-zana*, #287, as an element *ar-* is not recorded in Elamite). Moreover, it resembles Am. *Ar-za-nu-um* (AS 21, p. 566:924) if the lack of mimation is insignificant. 20. *Ku-uk-ni-a-tum* (fem., R. Borger *apud* Hinz and Koch). 21. *Tabl-gu-ri* was possibly from Anshan (MVN 7, 296, v, 3); his name may consist of Elamite terms (##118.242?).

D. Greater Elam during the Ur III period (ELAM ['NIM']) defined no less than the following 29 (+ 17 [+x] +/- 8 [h'-l', Aratta, Huzi[], Gunilaha]) regions (proceeding roughly from SE to NW; b-e, possibly f-h, and perhaps k, h' were the nuclear Elamite territory; of p-y.a'-g'.i'-l' even the relative location is not known as they are not associated with any toponym; the definition of Aratta as ELAM, in which case it would have been the easternmost region of Greater Elam, is dubious, cf. E. Sollberger, *Three Ur-Dynasty Documents*: JCS, 19 [1965], pp. 26f.):

a. Marhashi, b. Anshan, c. Pashime, d. Huhnuri, e. Adamdun, f. Susa, g. Iabrat, h. Shimashki and at least 6 dependent regions (1'. Zapshali, 2'. Sig(i)rish, 3'. Iapulmat, 4'. Alumiddatum, 5'. Garta/Karda and 6'. Shatilu, acc. to BTH, pp. 83f.122f.: Statue II [Akkad.], viii, 14f.), but their number can be elevated to 16 [+x] (*ibid.*, 24f. enumerates separately 7'. Azahar, 8'. Pulma, 9'. Nushushmar and [...]; x, 14f. has 1'.9', 10'. [x]-[x¹]-li, 4'.2', 11'. Arahir, 12'. [Lu?]-lu-bi-im, 13'. Şışirtum, 14'. Nushgamelum, 5' and 3', whereas pp. 75f.122f.: Statue I [Sum.], ii, 15ff. enumerates 14+x regions of *lu₂-SU*, viz. 1'.3', 15'. [x¹]-[x-x-a]m^{ki}, 2'.4'.5'.7'-9'.14'.13'.11'.6, and 16'. Ti-ir-mi-um^{ki}; for 17'. Zitanu cf. below), i. Sig(i)rish (sometime region of h), j. Sapum, k. Zaul, l. Harshi, m. Kimash, n. Hu'urti, o. Mah(i)li/Manhili (Owen 1981, p. 255: FLP 1980, 15), p. Itnigi («Anigi»), q. Barbarranamba (or Parparrahupa), r. Danhili (cf. H. Waetzoldt, *Review of RGTC 2*: ZA, 65 [1975], p. 272), s. Gili (MVN 9, 138, 16), t. Girkinam, u. Gisha, v. Gizili (also Sar., RGTC 1, p. 61), w. Hupum, x. Hutum, y. NE-duhu(1)ni, z. Duddul (presumably in the far NW, but perhaps SE of Shashru as the latter [poss. modern Shemshara] is not defined as ELAM), a'. Siri (=c?), b'. Sitinrupum, c'. Sium, d'. Ulum/Ullim, e'. Urri, f. Zurbati and perhaps g'. Daba, h'. Iapru is mentioned together with d. i'. Garnene, j'. Iab/pib/pum, k'. Shazibi/Shaziga (cf. RGTC 2 and Owen 1981, pp. 247ff., s.vv.; see F. Vallat, *Éléments de géographie élamite* (résumé): *Paléorient*,

11/2 [1985], pp. 50f.). I. Husan (cf. below) might have also been located somewhere in the Iranian Plateau or its piedmont. Hence Greater Elam stretched over all the western part of the Iranian Plateau and its piedmont, except for its northernmost section (notably Gutium). This vast area was ethnically heterogeneous with a discernible Hurrian element in the northern section of the piedmont. A presentation of the remaining (non-Hurrian; Semitic and Sumerian names are left out) onomastic material as far as it can be associated with the above-mentioned regions, may be of interest.

E. Shimashki extended from Fars to the Caspian Sea, a huge territory with many almost inaccessible mountainous regions and valley systems where one hardly expects ethnolinguistic unity. It seems that M.-J. Steve (*Des sceaux-cylindres de Simaški?*: RA, 83 [1989], pp. 13-25) inclines to locate Shimashki more towards the eastern section of the central Iranian Plateau. The northeastern section of the Iranian Plateau has become Indo-Iranianized towards the mid-2nd millennium B.C. according to A. Parpola (*The Coming of the Aryans to Iran and India and the Cultural and Ethnic Identity of the Dāsas*: StOr, 64 [1988], pp. 204ff.). This is a good reason to regret that the undeciphered Elamite hieroglyphs, whose geographical distribution is much wider than the cuneiform texts, cannot give us a clue as to the ethnolinguistic character of that vast area before the Indo-Iranian migrations. The names of the 59 Shimashkians (34.41.49.50.66 [cf. 36.37] written phonetically; the others – masked – directly or indirectly – as *lu₂-SU*, see P. Steinkeller, *On the Identity of the Toponym lu₂-SU(.A)*: JAOS, 108 [1988], pp. 197-202 [also on 36.37.41]; id., *More on LU₂.SU(.A)*: NABU, 1990/1, pp. 10f.:13; listed in RGTC 2, pp. 171f. and Owen 1981, p. 261 unless otherwise indicated) are – if not devoid of any parallels (30.31.42-53.55.56; some with purely formal affinities like *-uk*, *-uš*, cf. HaS, pp. 100f.), Semitic (Ahum-ilum and Puzur-Kaka) or broken (57) – Elamite (24.33-37) or somehow with Elamite connexions (29.32.38.39) or atypical (23.25.26.28.65-68 and perhaps 24.63.64). TCL 2, 5508, i, ii (cf. HaS, pp. 100-105) has 22. *Ki-ma-ni*, 23. *Si-NI-NI*, 24. *Ad-da-pu-ni* messenger of 25. *Še-eb-ba*; 26. *Ku-zu-zu* messenger of 27. *Ba-ar-ba-ra-gi*, 28. *Še-bi* messenger of 29. *Ra-ši* (of Zitanu like 30. *A-ap-mi-ra-DIN*), 31. *Ba/Ma-da-ti-na*, 32. *Pu-ul-ba/ma-at* (also FAOS 16, 807; linguistically related to the toponyms *Ia₃-pu-ul-ma-at*, *Pu-ul-ma* [3'.8']?) all followed by the designation *lu₂-SU-me*. 22.23.31.32 recur in I. Spar, *Tablets, Cones and Bricks of the Third and Second Millennia B.C.*, New York 1988, 17 where *mar-tu-me* is retained, but *lu₂-SU-me* is omitted (the text has at least one obvious mistake: 88 is defined as *lu₂-Ma-ri₂ki* instead of *Ma-hi-li₂ki* the more so since *Aq-ba-ia₃* of Mari is listed without title). They are followed by *Tan-ha-la-ah* (poss. Elam.), 92 (or his namesake; no title), 62 (or his namesake; followed by other Shulgi names), *Aq-ba-ia₃*, *Ba-ša-an-ti-ba-at*, the messenger of *Na-du-be-li₂*, *ensi₂* of Makan (poss. Akkadianized; is the name related to RAE *Nu-ti-be-ul* which is recorded over 1500 years later at cosmopolitan Persepolis ?), *Ma₂-za* (atypical, cp. Ebl. *Ma-za* ?) messenger of *I-še-b/pu* from *Da-ri-ba₂ki* (hitherto unattested), 78, and *Še-da-ku-ku*. 33. *Gu-du-me-ri-iš* (cp. 15), 34. *Ad-da-na-pi-a* (*recte -ir?*), 35. *Pi₅-ip-ra* (reduplicated verb base, to *pir* «read», cf. PMRAE, pp. 40f.: 5.2). 36. *Ha-na-gu-ni-ir* and 37. *Za-na-pi-li-ir* (MVN 12, 125). 38. *Ia₃-ap-ni-šu* is probably a homonym of *Ip-*

ni-šu in early OB Susa (MDP 28, 416, 26). 39. *Ia₃-ap-ra-at* is homonymous with the toponym in Rashi (45.47.48.52.53.68 were his messengers). 40. *Ba-ab-du-ša* (-tu-š, #252a ?), 41. *Gu-ri-na-me* (= *Kir-na-me* [CTNMC 7, 7]⁴), 42. *Ba-ar-ba-ra-gi*, 43. *Ba-ar-ka-na-zu* (is the identity with the initial syllable of the preceding name significant?), 44. *Ba-du/tu-uk-ra-at*, 45. *Da-pu-du-uk*, 46. *Da-šu-uk*, 47. *Du-li-a* (*Da-la*), 48. *Ga-da-ad-du* (D.I. Owen–R. Veenker in *Ebla* 1975-, p. 267, 17), 49. *Gi/Zi-ri* (?) -*im-gi-na-ak*, 50. *La-mu-ša*, 51. *Nim-zi-na* (PN ?), 52. *Pu-šu-du/ud*, *Pu₆* (?KAXGU-*tenû*)-*šu-ud*, 53. *Zu-pu-uš*. 54. *U₂-ga-ab-bi-ir* (Jones–Snyder 4, 2; hardly ends with a form related to Hurr. *ewr-* due to <bb>; also what precedes does not support such a derivation; -*bir* is extant in early names from the Iranian Plateau). 55. *Šu-nu-un-du*, 56. *Šu-l¹-uk* brother of 57. [...] -*at*, 58. *Ia₃-a-da-az* (CTNMC 7, 7), 59. *I₃-u₃-ša-na-aka₂* (full form of 60 ?), 60. *I₃-u₃-ša* and 61. *Ia₃-ap-ti(-um*, father of 44) have *y-* which is rare, but not totally absent in Elamite (partly rendered by *I-* there). 60.61 or their namesakes are also defined as Amorites (where *y-* is very common). The latter looks like a gentilic of Bibl. *Yepet*. 62. *Hu-un-dšul-gi* or his namesake is also defined as both *Iu₂-SU* and *mar-tu*. 63. *Me-ša/ši-nu-nu*, 64. *Za-ba-zi-zi*, 65. *Ba-da-du*, 66. *Pu-zu-zu* (MDP 28, 346, 7), 67. *Lu-lu*, 68. *Su₂-ur-su₂-ra*; and 69. *Ku-uš-dan* (at least partly Sem.) son of 70. *Ba-ak-ti* (MVN 11, 140, 11). Of the Zapshalians' names, 71. *In-da-su* can be Elamite (##67.236c), but 72. *Ši₂/Zi-ri₂-in-gu* seems to be without ascertained parallels (*šir-* and *inki*, ##68.224 are doubtful). Other Shimashkians with preserved non-Semitic names (regions in brackets; BTH, pp. 85f.122f., x, 19; xi, 1.13.18f.) are 73. *Ba-ri-hi-za* (11'), 74. *Ti-ru-bi-u₂* (14'), 75. *Ti-ti* (Nushushmar, preceding Nushgamelum; both apparently with the same initial component), 76. *Ne-ni/i₃-ip₂-zu* (13') and 77. *Sa-am-ri* (10'). None of these anthroponyms is definitely Elamite. For 73 compare perhaps ##45.175 (both doubtful elements). 74 apparently begins with Tir(V) (#250). 75 is atypical. 78. *S/Šar-ga-pi* of Zahara (RGTC 1, p. 193, Sar.) is definitely non-Semitic. *Zahara* is probably identical with the Shimashkian region *A-za-ha-ar* (cp. Ur III *Ašīmanum* = *Šīmanum*, RGTC 2, pp. 165f.). *DUN-ga₂-at ensi₂* of Iapulmat, is homonymous with the somewhat coeval ruler of Zidahri (*DUN-ga₂-a-at*). The latter region is not explicitly Elamite, but is mentioned together with Shimashki (RGTC 2, p. 244). Gelb (MAD 3, p. 314) does not rule out a possibility that *DUN-ga₂-(a)-at* is Semitic. The same may apply to *Ši-ba-ra-aq* from Zi-da-<ah>-ri.

F. Most of the 46 Marhashites' names may not be strictly Elamite (see R. Zadok, *Hurrians as well as Individuals Bearing Hurrian and Strange Names in Sumerian Sources*: Tel Aviv, 18, [1991]; *lipan* is possibly extant in *In-zu-li-pa₂-ni* [OB Susa] and -*ukpi* in RAE *Ša-an-du-uk-pi*). 79. *Ša-al-hu-ni* of Sapum does not seem to be Elamite; the same applies to the names from Harshi, 80. *Ši-il-ni-gi* and 81. *Pu-ni-i₃-li₂* from Sig(i)riš (the latter is Akkadianized) and Zitanu (29 resembles 82. *Ra-ši-ši* of Kimash). 83. *Ze₂-ze₂* from Itnigi is atypical (does the toponym end with the same final component as 80 ?). 84. *Hu-un-hi-li* from Kimash (mentioned together with 85. *Ad-da-ga-di-nu* in G. Boson, TCS 140; *U₂-du* of Kimash is atypical), 86. *Hu-un-ur₅-ti*

4 One may infer that *kuri*, which is contained mostly in female names (#118) is just a variant of *kiri* «goddess» (#103).

(D.C. Snell, *The Ur III Tablets in the Emory University Museum*: ASJ, 9 [1987], p. 270: 78,18) and 87. *Hu-ba-mer-si-ni* from Hu'urti (cp. *Mer-si*, Schneider: Or 23, p. 163:2291 ?), 88. *Še-da-ku-ku* from Mah(i)li (cf. above and #110 ?), as well as 89. *Hu(-ul)-li/li₂-par* (Elam. (h)un + -lipar «servant» ? Hurr. acc. to A. Goetze, *Hullibar of Duddul* : JNES, 12 [1953], p. 123), 90. *Hu-un-ti-pa₂* and 91. *Še-il-ha* from Duddul seem to have Elamite onomastic parallels. The same applies to 92. *Hu-un-ki-ib-ri* (at least partly Sem.?) from Ulli, 93. *In-da-da-bi* from Iab/pib/pum, 94. *Hu-un-da-ah-še-er* from Husan (cf. MAD 3, p. 129 and an unpubl. Yale text) and perhaps to 95. *Še-il-ha(?) -ha(?)* from Shazibi/Shaziga. 96. *Bi₂-li* from Iapru is atypical, but his master's name, *Zu-zu-wa-dar*, is Semitic. The names from Iabrat which was in Rashi, the most southwestern region of Greater Elam are Semitic (*La-ba-an-am-si₂*, FAOS 16, index, s.v.; for Laban cp. M. Astour, *Semites and Hurrians in Northern Transtigris*, in D.I. Owen-M.A. Morrison [eds], *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians* 2, Winona Lake 1987, p. 49 and *La-ba-na-ab-du₄-ga*, *La-ba-an-sum-e*, PDT 408 r. 4; 507 r. 3.7). Many individuals without obvious geographical context, who were defined as ELAM, bore Sumerian and Semitic names. 97-120 (UR III), 121-137 (OB) and 138-142 (MB) belonged to the same category, but had Elamite (including hybrid [125.140.142]) and atypical names (110-120.137):

97. *Da-an-gu-ni*, 98. *Da-hu-un-ba-an*, 99. *Gu₄-ka-ri*, 100. *Ha-ar-ša-ti-ip*, 101. *Hal-ti* (R. Zadok, *Some Elamite Names in Mesopotamian Sources*: NABU, 1990/1, p. 29:39; henceforth Zadok 1990), 102. *Hu-un-da-pi*, 103. *In-zu* (Ch.-F. Jean, *L'Elam sous la dynastie d'Ur : les indemnités allouées aux «Chargés de mission» des rois d'Ur*: RA, 19 [1922], p. 33; henceforth Jean 1922), 104. *Pu-ra-an-ha-al-bi-it*, 105. *Še-il-ha-ak-li₂/ni-pa₂-aš*, 106. *Še-er-ra-še-er*, 107. *Še-er-ti*, 108. *Za-mi-du-uk*; 109. *Šim-še-la-ah* is linguistically Hurr., but resembles 121 (Elam.; a case of contamination?), 110. *Šu-šup* (ITT 6787), 111. *Ad-da*, 112. *Ga-ti*, 113. *Ki-ip-ti*, 114. *Ma-aš₂*, 115. *Pa₂-hu*, 116. *Pi-li* (TEL 47), 117. *Pi-pi* (ITT 952), 118. *Ra(?) -lu-ut* (MVN 3, 243 r. 2), 119. *Še-er-ti*, 120. *Šu-ti* (MT, p. 247), 121. *Šim-še-il-ha* (AS 22, p. 29, n. 90), 122. *La-ma(?) -ah* (B. Lafont, *Documents administratifs sumériens*, Paris 1985, 354), 123. *Ku-ku-ma-an-zu*, 125. *Ku-uk-(ku-)š₂-ia-ri* (hyb.; with Sem. DN Šiyarum, APNM, p. 273), 126. *In-ne-ri*, 127. *Ka-ia-a-ia*, *Ku-ia-(a-)ia* (J.-M. Durand, *Fragments rejoins pour une histoire élamite*, in L. de Meyer et al. [eds], *Fragmenta Historiae Elamicae. Mélanges offerts à M.-J. Steve*, Paris 1986, pp. 124f.; henceforth Durand 1986), 127. «*Simti-halluriš*» (cf. Zadok 1990), 128. *At-ta-še₂-e*, 129. *Ku-uk-ša-al-ba-ak*, 130. *Si-im-ti-li-ge-eš*, 131. *Ši-ip-ša-lu(-uš)*, 132. *In-da-aš-šu*, 133. *Ar-ra-ak*, 134. *Ha-PI-ru*, 135. *Ni-su-uh*, 136. *Ši-mu-u₂*, 137. *Pi-li-i*, 138. *Hu-(um-)ba-an*, 139. *HAR-gu-up-še-e*, 140. *Ku-kul-me* (Elam.-Hurr.), 141. *Ši-mut-ak-šir₂* and 142. *Šimut-nāšir* (refs. in R. Zadok, *Peoples from the Iranian Plateau in Babylonia During the Second Millennium B.C.: Iran*, 25 [1987], pp. 1-26; henceforth Zadok 1987). If we add the names of Elamite rulers and dignitaries mentioned in Ur III, OB, MB, NB, MA, NA and other sources we shall get altogether approximately 200 anthroponyms. The number of names borne by individuals who were not described as Elamites, but are explicable in Elamite terms is much higher.

G. Except for few modifications and new examples I have very little to add to my preliminary exposé of the typology of Elamite names in ElOn, pp. 49-59:

Most Elamite compound anthroponyms are theophorous. They can contain one, two or three theophorous elements (typologically one may compare the situation in Hittite [Laroche, *Noms des Hittites*, p. 282], Egyptian and Indian). Theophorous elements are the better-known segment of the lexicon. Like in Sumerian and Akkadian, an Elamite theophorous element is not only a theonym, but also a numen (like a temple, a part thereof, or a cultic item), a kinship term, a royal name or a toponym. The last category may be exemplified by *Pulma*, a Shimashkian region which is the theophorous element of the hybrid (Elam.-Akkad.) names OB *dPu-ul-ma-um(?) -mi-la-ab-bi* and *IR₃-dpu-ul-ma* (from Susa; see Scheil, MDP 23, pp. 97.211b ad 237, 15). *Pu-ul-ma* (HSS 10, 185, iv, 15; Sar. Gasur) and *Pu₃-ul-ma* (MVN 6, 90, 5.r. 9; Ur III; among Susians) are divine names used as personal names. OB *Zi-bi-ir-an-ša-an* (Durand 1986, pp. 120f. ad ARMT 25, 1.4) seems to contain Anshan (GN) as a theophorous element, but the assumed predicate is isolated. RAE *Za-pan(-mu-ma-na)* resembles another toponym which is extant in the NA PN *i⁷Za-ban-SUM^{na}* (CEC 24, 14; homonym of Aram. *Zbn'dn*, KAI 233, 14), but *-mu-ma-na* is unexplained. Very few theophorous elements are compounds, e.g. *Kilah-šupir* and Akkad. *Išme-karab* (##80+.97a; semantically they may have something in common if Hinz and Koch's interpretation of the former «vielleicht ich tröste den Betenden» proves to be correct). It seems that in very few cases the theophorous element is plural (of majesty?), viz. *šatip* of *Ha-ar-ša-ti-ip* (F/100) and perhaps *kirip* «goddesses» of OB *Zi-ga-ki-ri-ip* (Hurr. *kirip* appears only in initial position) and *temptip* «lords» (of *Si-im-ti-ip-še-er?*). It is not known whether the difference in word-order is semantically significant. Most anthroponyms have two components; only a few consist of three. The common patterns of compound names consisting of two elements are (more examples in ElOn): 1. Substantive + substantive: OB *Ki-ri-ša-ru-ha* (Zadok 1987, p. 1), *Te-em-ti-na-pi-ir*, *-na-ru-ut*. – 2. Substantive + adjective: OB *Li-li-ri-ša* «Lili is great» (cf. Stolper, RIA 7, p. 21). – 3. Adjective + substantive: poss. OB *Pi-li-ir-dša₃-zi* «Shazi is firm, stable» (or sim.). – 4. Substantive + passive participle: OB *Ši₂-mu-ut-š₂-il-ha-ak*, [*I*]n-zu-li-ik, *Te-em-ti-hu(-uh)-pa-ak* and NE *Hu-pan-šu-tur-uk*. – 5. Substantive + personal pronoun 3rd pers. pl. dat.(??): NE *Ši₂-ir-ap-pi*. – 6. Substantive + verb ending in -š (marking the 3rd pers. sg.): OB [*T*]e-em-ti-bi-iš «Tempt has created»; *Si-in(?) -zu-lu-uš*, prob. «Sin has called, prayed loudly»; ME *dSin(XXX)-ni-taš*, RAE *Na-ap/ip-taš*, *Šu-ša-an-da-ša* «Sin/God/Susa has established/supported»; RAE *Kur-ha-ni-iš* «Kur has loved», *Na-pu-mi-Ir^l-iš*, *-mar-ri-iš* (CVC signs are indifferent to vowel quality from NE onwards) «God has fixed, maintained» (differently Hinz and Koch), *U₂-zi₂-li-iš(?)*, poss. «Uzi (DN) has granted»; OB *In-zu-pa-ha-aš* «Inzu has protected(?)». OB *In-zu-li-ba/pa₂-ša₃* and *Hu-um-li-ba/pa₂-ša* may perhaps mean «Inzu/Hun (with dissimilation of liquids/nasals) has served»; the latter may alternatively mean «He has served me» (with <hu-un> for Elam. *un*, cf. below). An Akkadian interpretation of the predicative element is semantically difficult (cf. Zadok 1987, p. 2), but it should be stressed that the Elamite one is also not satisfactory on theological grounds; cp. *Še-il-ha-ak-li₂-pa₂-aš?* – 7. Verb + substantive: perhaps Ur III *Ha-ap-ru-še-er* (UDT 91, 329), but the final component is not an assured one and the marker may be either -h or

-š. Hinz and Koch render the initial component as «verehren» or sim., without supplying evidence. However, their interpretation as a verbal form is to be preferred on that of Scheil (DN) in view of the relatively frequent occurrence of *ir* in front of *hap(i)ruh* (cf. 9 below). – Three-element names are of the following patterns:

8. Substantive + substantive + verb: perhaps OB *Te-em-mu-ra-ap-ta-aš* «Lord *Rap* (cp. *Te-em-ti-ra-ap-ta-aš*, *-ra-bi*) has established/supported». – 9. Substantive + personal pronoun + verb: RAE *Hu-pan-un-be-iš*, *-taš* «*Hupan* has created me» and «H. has established/supported me» resp. OB *Ši₂-mu-ut-ir-ha-pi-ru-uh*, *Te-em-ti-ir-ha-ap-ru-uh* «*Šimut/Tempt* ihn verehrte ich» (Hinz and Koch, cf. 7 above). If *-ur₂* of OB *In-zu-ur₂-ha-ap-ru-[uh]* is the outcome of *-ir-* under the influence of the preceding *-u*, then the name would be of the same pattern. NE *La-li-in-taš* and Ur III *Kur-in-tah* (Jean 1922, p. 34) seem to belong here as well. – 10. Personal pronoun + verb + substantive: ME *Un-taš*-DINGIR.GAL is rendered in MB as *Hu-un-da-ša*-DINGIR.GAL (J. van Dijk, *Die dynastischen Heiraten zwischen Kassiten und Elamern: eine verhängnisvolle Politik* : OrNS, 55 [1986], p. 161, 12; henceforth van Dijk 1986). This proves that MB <*hu-un*> can render Elam. *un*. If this was the older form of the Elamite pronoun then it may be reflected at least in several *hun*-names which are amply recorded in earlier Mesopotamian sources (#49, cp. *Hu-un-da-ah-še-er*). Cf. 11 below. – 11. Personal pronoun + substantive + verb: Does Ur III *Hu-un-ha-al-bi-it* denote «*Hal* you have created me»? Cf. 10. – 12. Personal pronoun + passive participle + substantive: MB *U₂-tuk^d-in-šu-uš* (hybrid DN). – 13. ME *Na-ku-ha-ah-pu* «*Nak* ist mich erhörend» (Hinz and Koch). – 14. Genitive compounds: a fairly clear example is probably OB *Li-ba-ar-ma-za-at* «servant of *Manzat*». This and the *kuk*-names (alternatively nominal sentences) are «attachment» names like in Sumerio-Akkadian. NE *Ad-da-mi-ut* (Hinz and Koch: «Vaters Los»).

H. Most Elamite hypocoristica (abbrev. hyp.; in the broadest sense, i.e. any non-compound name, see Zadok 1983) are of the reduplicated type. The «banana» names are the commonest pattern, e.g., OB *A-mu-mu*, *Ap-pi-i-pi*, *A-ši-ši*, *E-la-la*, *Ga-zi-zi*, *In-ti-ti*, *La-te-te*, *Li-nu-nu*, *Ni-šu-šu*, *Pi-ir-ri-ri*, *Pu-ur-ri-ri*, *Sa-ap-pu-pu*, *Si-il-la-la*, *Si-ri-ri*, *S/šup-ri-r[i]*, *Ši-li-li*, *Šu-ti-ti*, *Ta-pu-pu*, *Za-al-pu-pu*, *Zi-li-li*, *Zi-nu-nu*, *Zu-ba-ba*, RAE *Iš-mi-mi*, *Še-er-mi-mi*; OB *I-ku-ku-a* is suffixed. There is always a vocalic accord between the two final syllables. This may apply to suffixed hypocoristica as it is difficult to dissociate RAE *Su-un-ka-na* from *sunki* (Zadok 1983, pp. 114f.). The negligible exceptions to this rule were caused by the artificial Akkadian case endings (Zadok 1983, pp. 97ff.: OB *A-tu-ur₂-ta*, *A-tu-ti*, *A-ku-ki*, *Ba-da-du*). *Tuh-* of NE *Tuh-ha-ha* is a CVC sign which is indifferent to vowel quality. *Hu-um-ba/pa-be/bi*, *Hu-(up-)pa-be* are from MB Nuzi and therefore not necessarily Elamite. NE *Si-mi-ma* possibly does not belong here and NA *Si-ma-me* is West Semitic. Therefore I do not regard the objection of Hinz and Koch to associate e.g. *In-za-za* and *In-zi-zi* with *In-zu-zu* as justified for (1) the last vowel of the assumed stem is adjusted to that of the final syllable of the hypocoristicon (c. 30 such examples are listed by me with ample question marks which should not be suppressed); (2) Hinz and Koch associate *Li-ba-ba* with *Li-pi-pa*, derive *La-nu-nu* from *lani*, agree that *mu-ri(-ip)* is related to *murun*, and trace the origin of NE *Na-ah-in-ti-ti* and RAE *Šá-ti-ti* to ME *Na-ha-an-ti-e* and OB

Sa-tu-tu respectively. The «banana» names (and other reduplicated patterns) are not exclusively or typically Elamite. They are amply recorded all over the ancient Near East and were borne *inter alia*, by dignitaries from Mukish in the northwest to the Diyala region in the southeast. Hinz and Koch did not take these facts into account when they decided to register such names from any ancient sources, including many which have nothing to do with the Elamites and their land. OB *Pu-pu* is of a very common and atypical pattern. The typically Elamite reduplicated verbal base is represented by one name only, viz. Ur III *Pi₅-ip-ra*. (E/35). Ur III *Me-ri₂-i_š* (C/15. E/35), *Ha-ap-ru-ša* (A. Goetze, *Šakkanakkus of the Ur III Empire*: JCS, 17 [1963], p. 22:39) and MB *U₂-da-ši* (Zadok 1987, pp. 14f.) can be regarded as «isolated predicates» of verbal sentence names (with the marker of the 3rd pers. sg. [G/6] and perhaps OB *Ru-pu-uš*, hardly to Akkad. *rupšu* «breadth», for *rupu* cp. Ur III *Ha-ap-ru-pu* [M. Sigrist, AUCT 1, 415, 23] and *Li-na-aš₂*). The same applies to Ur III *Ha-ap-ru* (YOS 4, 289, 8) which may render *Hapru-h* and OB *Hu-ut-ra* (MDP 18, 162 r. 3; «I did»). OB *Ku-du-pu-ut*, NE *Pi-ši-ut* and RAE *Ag-gi-ut* may also be «isolated predicates» if they end in the marker *-t* (acc. to Hinz and Koch; *-t* whose function is still to be clarified is apparently extant in RAE *Sa-an-ku-ut*, *Su-ut-pi-ut*). RAE *Un-sa-ak* (< title)⁵ and apparently OB *Sa-sa-ak*, OB *Zi-te-ep* as well as RAE *Su-ku-ra* end in *-k*, *-p* and *-r* respectively. RAE *Šu-ba-r[a]* is homonymous with a divine name according to Hinz and Koch (DN used as PN, cp., e.g., *ad* #48). Does OB *Ra-bi-ia-u₂-ni* end in a compound suffix based on *rap-*?

I. The patterns of many of the assured names can be established (cf. G.H). However, most of the name-components which are included in my ElOn are not assured, but with various degrees of plausibility; many are very doubtful and of uncertain segmentation. Only a small percentage can be regarded as assured. Most of the assured Elamite name-components are theophorous elements (followed below by additional examples not in ElOn):

6: With an aphaeresis (after *-V-* or a liquid) poss. the final component of Ur III *Da-an-*, *La-al-gu-ni* (MVN 15, SI 303283, 8), *Zu-zu-gu-ni* (MAD 3, p. 241) and OB *Ša₃-ti-gu-ni*; 7: Ur III *Am-ma-za-za* (Zadok 1990, if not Sum.); 17; 18: OB *Ad-da-ša-ra*, *-uk-ki*?, *U₂-za-lu-ka-at-ta*, Ur III *Gu-uk-at-<ta>*?, *Ša₃-ša-ad-da* (M. Sigrist, *Textes économiques néo-sumériens de l'Université de Syracuse*, Paris 1983, 9, 3; 365, 20; cf. #110 and *-ša₆-ša₆*, *ad* #49?); 18b; 21: OB *Hal-šar-ra-aš*, *^dIŠKUR(Adda/Adad[a]) -ha-al-da-[aš* ?]; does the latter's theophorous elem. render #18(a) with popular etymology? 22a (not fem. acc. to Hinz); 23: Ur III *Ha-al-ka* (MVN 6, 377, 1.15)? 29: OB *Ri-im-ha-ni-iš*; *Ha-niš* is to be read *Ha-ia₃* with Th. Jacobsen, *The Reign of Ibbi-Suen*: JCS, 7 (1953), p. 38, n. 17; 34; 48: Ur III *Hu-ba-nu-du* (Zadok 1990) ? *Hu-up-<pa>-ni-ki-te-er-ra* (Ch.-F. Jean, SA 7, 3); MB *Hu-um-ba-ri-tu₄* (Zadok 1987, p. 15) and *^dHu-um-ba-an-im-me-ni* (van Dijk 1986, p. 161, 11); RAE *At-hu-pan*, NA *Amman-ap-pu*, *-i-pi-te*, *Ha-im-bi-ia* (see A. Livingstone, *Court Poetry and Literary Mis-*

⁵ Is OB (Susa) *Si₂-ba/ma-a-gir₂*, which is compared by Hinz and Koch with NE *si-pa-ak-ir-ra* «der glänzende(?)», the forerunner of Bab. *simmagir* (cf. Hinz *apud* W. von Soden, *Der neubabylonischer Funktionär simmagir und der Feuertod des Šamaš-šum-ukin*: ZA, 62 [1973], pp. 89f.)?

cellanea, Helsinki 1988, 30, 8f.), are problematic because of NA *um*- of *Um-man-al-da-si* etc.; hyp. UR III *Hu-ba-na* (Zadok 1990), NE *Um-ba* and perhaps NA *Ha-im-bi-ia*; 56; 58: MB *Ki-di-nu-[hu-d]u (?) -r[u-d]š* (van Dijk 1986, p. 161,14); 60: RAE *I-gi-te-na*, ?OB *Ul-li-gi* (Zadok 1987, p. 2); 60a: OB *La-ba^di-gi₄-gi₄*; 61: OB *Ku-uk-i-gi-iš-ta*, *Ku-ri-šu(?) -i-ge-eš-ta*, *Tan^di-ge-eš-da*, *-i-gi-iš-ta*, *Tan-ni^di-gi-iš-ta*; 72: hyp. Ur III *In-zu*; 77: OB *Pi-li-ir-iš-ša-an*, and perhaps *Iš-ša-ri* (< *Iš-ša-an-ri* ?); MB *Pi-hi-ra-nu^dU* (van Dijk 1986, p. 161; see F. Vallat, *^dU = élamite usan/iššan*: NABU, 1987/3, p. 48:89); 97a: Is early MB *Ki-la-hi* (UCT) related? 103: OB *Tan-ki-ri-ri-ša*; 104; 108: ME *Ki-ten^{en}-na-ku*; 110: UR III *Ku-ku-da-iš* (UET 3, 1048), OB *Ku-uk-i* (<<*i*>>?) *-na-ru-ut*, *Gu-uk-ra-š₂-ir* (GN < PN?), *Ku-uk^dIlabrat* (NIN.ŠUBUR), *-^dkal-la*, *-ri-ih-tu-uh*; and perhaps *Ia-an-ku-uk*. For *Te-ep-ku-uk* cp. perhaps Ur III GN *Ti-im-ku-ku* (RGTC 2, pp. 193f.). I have doubts about *Ku-ku-a-lum* (prob. with Akkad. *ālum*) because there is a homonymous component in Old Akkadian in view of *Ku-ku-DINGIR* (see Sollberger, TCS 1, p. 99:54) and *^dKu-ku* (cf. MAD 3, p. 4); 119a; 128: Do OB *Li-li-ri-ri*, *Su-pi-li₂-li₂* and NB *E-zi-li-li* belong here? 141.145; 153: Ur III *Tan-na-hu-ti* (Zadok 1990); 157: MB *Nap-ga-an-za* (Zadok 1987, p. 3; cp. Ur III *Ga-an-za*, UDT 91, 186), NE *-ag-gi-tal-li*, RAE *-šil-la*, *Na-be-du-un*, ?OB *Na-pi-il-hu-uš*; 157b: UR III *E-zu-* (MT 178, 25), *Še-er-na-pi₂-ir* (Zadok 1990); *Tar-na-pi-ir* (Delaporte, *Cat. Bibl. Nat.* 68), ME *^fA-mi-ni-na-pir₂* hyp. Ur III *Na-pi₅-ir* (MVN 6, 500); 157d: OB *Tan^dna-pi-ri-ša*; 159.160.164; 182: ME *Pi-ni-gir-ak-šir_g* 198: ?OB *^dRi-ša-ut-ta*, ?*Na-aš₂-ba-ri-iš*; 200: hyp. Ur III *Ru-hu* (CT 32, 15 r. 3)? 209: NE *Sunki-šimut-(ir-)ra*; 209a: RAE *Su-un-kur-ši-ip*; 215: NE *Ša₂-tin-te-en-na*; 220: hyp. Ur III *Še-il-ha*; 220b: hyp. MB *Ši-il-ha-gi* (UCT); 222: OB *Ši₂-mu-ut-ri-ri*, *-ri-tuh* (<*-ri-ih-tuh*, cf. *Ku-uk- ad* #110?), *Tan-š₂-mu-ut*, ME *^dŠi-mut-i-hi-ša-ah*; 234; 246: Ur III *Si-im-ti-ip-še-er* (MVN 15, 9), OB *Si-im-ti-ru-du-uk* (Zadok 1987, p. 10), *Te-em-ti-a-ni-ir*, *-be(?) -ti-ir*, *Ti-im-ti-bi-ir-ra*, *Te-em-uk-ra* (poss. = *Si/Su-im-mu-uk-ri*, W. von Soden, *Review of CAD S*: OLZ, 82 [1987], col. 459f.; with popular etymology of Am. *sum/sim* [**šVm*] «name»?); hyp. OB *Še-em-da-a* and ME *EN-pi-pi* (see Stolper, *Malyan*, p. 73 ad 43, 4)? 256; 287: Sar. *Ba-ak-za-na* (MVN 6, 381), Ur III *Za-na-hu-š[a₃]-ri-it* (both fem.), ?OB *Za-ni-dah*, hyp. Ur III *Za-na* (Zadok 1987, pp. 1f.; fem.).

J. Probable elements: 2: ?NE *^fZa-nah-pi*; *huhun* «fortress» or sim. (all Ur III): hyp. Ur III *Hu-hu-ni* (AnOr 7, 306, 10). Are *Hu-hu-me* (MVN 6, 500; among Elamites; + abstract *-me* ?) and *Hu-hu-um-ti* (PDT 558, 2) related? 130: NE *Li-ib-ba-li-kaš* (*-likiš*, #127 as *-kaš* is a CVC-sign?); 181.193; 196: hyp. OB *Ra-ti-ti*; 196b. 227. 231.233; 236a: Ur III *I-ri-dah* (Zadok 1990) ?OB *Hal-bi-ri-in-da-ah* (Zadok 1987, p. 2; segmentation?); 270; 291: ?OB *Ka-pa-zi-la* (*ibid.*); 300: Ur III *Hu-un-zu-lu* (Zadok 1990).

K. Possible elements: 5b: hyp. RAE *^fAk^l-ši-ra*; 8.20.25-28; 30: Ur III *Ha-ap-hi-iš* (MVN 6, 100, v, 2; segmentation?), 30b.30c.32; 35 (*hati-t*, is it significant that it occurs only after *amma* and *atta* «mother» and «father»?); 36.38.39; 41: hyp. OB *I-pi-ri* ? 42: OB *Hi-iš-pa-ti*; 42a.47.51.53.54; 57 (several names doubtful); the segmentation of 64.65 is dubious; 66.67.69.74-76; iše: OB *I-še-hu-ut-ra*; 81.84; 85: <*izia* in view of OB *I-zi-a-pu-ni* ? *I-za-ra-sa-at*; 87.89.91.93; 97: It is doubtful whether NA *Ki-li-gu-gu*

(homonym of NB GN *Kal-gu-gu*, YOS 17, 54, 12) belongs here; 102.105.107; 112-114 (a phonetic var. of *kul/n?*); 115b: Ur III *Da-a-gu-ni-ir* (MVN 7, 377 r. 6; cf. #236; like *Da-hu-un-ba-an*); cf. Steinkeller 1988, p. 202, n. 39; 117: *Kur/Kur₃-da-šu* can be read *Qur₂/Qur₃-da-šu* and compared with OB *Qu₂-ru-su₂* (< *qurud-šu*), *Qur₂-du-ša*, *Qu₂-ru-ud-sa₃* (CAD Q, p. 318a), but <*da*> instead of the expected <*du*> casts doubt on an Akkadian derivation; 118: OB *Gu-ri-in-zu*, -*š₂-mu*-[*u₇*]; hyp. Ur III *Gu-ri* (MVN 6, 500; atypical, but listed among Elamites); 121-123: ?OB *La-la-ru-u₂*; 126.117.131; 132: ?OB *Ta-ak-lu-uš* (Zadok 1987, p. 2; <Akk. *taklu-šu* «his confidant [intimate, friend]» seems attractive, but is not recorded); 135.136a.136d; 139: OB *Ši-ir-ma-pu*-[*uk*] (Zadok 1990); 143; 144: ?UR III *E-ze₂-me-na* (YOS 4, 289, 7), -*ni* (UET 3, 1452); 147; 148b: hyp. RAE *Me-te-na-na*; 151.154.155.158.165.167.168.169c.171-174.178; 179 (partly hyp.); 186.189.191.192; 194 (poss. originally non-Elam.); *rušpir* (DN; segmentation? *ru*-<*ruh*?); OB *Tan-d₂ru-š₂-pi₂-ir*; 203; 205: OB *Ši-in-du-uh* (Zadok 1987, p. 2); 210-212; 213: RAE *Na-kam-ša₂-ap*, hyp. *Ša₂-ap-pa*, 213a: hyp. NE *Sa-pir₂*; 216-218.221.223.224 (the following examples are very doubtful!): Pre-Sar. *Pu-da-ši-ir* (cf. H. Limet, ABAW, NF 75 [1972], p. 131), Ur III *Ra-bi-še-er* (MVN 3, 283, 6), *Še-er-ra-še-er*, RAE *Ši-ru-uk-pir₂* (-*uk-pi-r*? cf. F and *Š₂-ru-uk-tu-uh?*); 228.230.235.237a; 238: Ur III *Ur-da-ka* (Schneider: Or 23, p. 76:1210) may be homonymous with RAE *Ur-da-ak*; 238a: ?NE *Ras₂-da-ap-ti-ki-na-tak-ra*; 241 (partly Akkadian-ized); Ur III *Tan-ha-la-ah* (E) and *Tan*-(<*ha*>)-*la-ah* (Jones-Snyder 290, 10, but cf. ad C/11 for -lah), *Tan-nu-ri* (Sigrist, AUCT 3, 259, 13), hyp. *Da-an* (MVN 6, 500; atypical but listed among Elamites); 243 (partly not necessarily Elam.); 244 (not a DN acc. to Hinz and Koch); 247a.247b.249; 250: ?MB *Te-ri-ma-an-ni* (Zadok 1987, p. 2); 252-254; 257 (poss. DN; Elam.); 258 (poss. compound DN); 259 (DN); 260-262, 262a: hyp. OB *U₂-ku-ra*; 266: OB *U₂-li-nu-nu*; 268.273; 274 (prob. DN, mostly in fem. names, perhaps a goddess): NE *U₂-pu-li-man*, -*mu-la*; cp. perhaps the 1st component of 275 (*upur*-, a goddess' name); 277.279; 280 (segmentation?); 281; 283 (*U₂-š₂-na-wi-ir* alternatively Akkad.); 286 (recte *zami*); 289.290.292.293.296-298.

L. Doubtful elements: 1: *A-ha-lu-lu* poss. Semitic; 3-5a; 9: Cp. NA GN *Am-pi-ha*-(<*a*>)-*pi₂* (AOAT 6, p. 16; mentioned together with Der, definitely non-Sem.)? 11: *An-na-hi-li* is Sumerian (Limet, *Anthroponymie*, p. 379) and the segmentation of the GN is dubious; 12.14-16; 18a: ?OB *A-ta-ta-wi-ir* (OIP 72, 729, 2); 22b; 30e: -*ha-ap-taš* is to be read *ha-ap-ur* in view of *Hu-un-ha-ap-pur* (Jones-Snyder 51, 18); 31.33; 40 (Elam.); 43; 49: Ur III *Hu-un-gu-ur₂-bi* (MAD 3, p. 130), -*kap-ku* (Jones-Snyder 243, i, 26), -*nu-du-uk* (Zadok 1990); *Hu-un-nu-ri* (B. Lewis-E.R. Jewell, *Sumerian Economic Texts from the Robert Hull Fleming Museum of the University of Vermont*: ASJ, 4 [1982], p. 58:18, 2) may be a homonym of OB *Hu-un-nu-ra*; *Hu-un-ša₆* (BIN 3, 351, 1), -*ša₆-ša₆* (Schneider: Or, 47-49, 500, 28); *Hu-nu-ha-ra* (Sigrist, AUCT 3, 259, 41), OB *Hu-na-pir-tu₄* (Zadok 1987, p. 1), hyp.: Ur III *Hu-un* (MVN 6, 500; among Elamites); Ur III *Hu-un-ši/ze₂-ri* can be Akkad. (MAD 3, p. 130); 50: OB *Hu-un-di-la-ma*, *Hu-un-da-hu-li-ik*, *Te-da-hu-un-ti*; 59 (poss. incomplete); 71 (recte *inta*? Is OB *In-da-lu-lu-um* Akkadianized?); 74; 82: Is OB *I-da-du-gu-la* originally Elamite? 88; 92; *kula*: RAE *Man-ku-la*; cf. ad #82? *li*-. OB *Hu-du-li-iš* (Zadok 1987, p. 2) if not a var. of *hu-ut-li-iš* (a functionary at OB Susa); 136c/140; 137: OB *Man-si-mu-ut*; 149: NE *Mu-*

uk-tu₄-na-ah-pi; 150c: NE GN *Qat-mur-ti* ? 161; 169: ?NE *Ba-hu-ri*; 171a; 175: OB *Ba-ar-šu-šu*, ME *Pa-ar*-[^du₂-]i, hyp. UR III *Ba-ar* (MVN 6, 500; atypical, but listed among Elamites); 176 (segmentation?); 183; *Pirti* (DN): ?Ur III *Na-ah-pi₂-ir-ti* (Zadok 1987, pp. 1f.); 190 (segmentation? but NE has *Pu-taš*); 229 (cf. J.-M. Steve, *Survey of Excavations in Iran 1967-8: Suse: Iran*, 7 [1969], p. 183: Susian deity «Shugu»); 232: Ur III *Šu-ša-a-bi*, *-ha-ni*, *-i₃-li₂* (Reisner, TUT, p. 50b with refs), *-ha-li* (Pinches, *Amherst*, 61, 3), *-ha-zi* (G. Frame–D.R. Frayne–G. McEwan, *Cuneiform Texts in the Collections of McGill University, Montreal*: ARRIM, 7 [1989], p. 30: 19, 9^o); Susa as a theophorous element is already recorded in an Early Dynastic lexical list from Fara (see M. Green, *Urum and Uqair*: ASJ, 8 [1986], p. 77; same element in all cases?). Of doubtful segmentation: *ati*(-)*h* (19), *hal*(-)*pi*(-)*t* (24), *hit*(-)*ki* (44), *hupši* (52: ?MB HAR-*gu-up-še-e*, NE *Gir-hup-pi-iš*, Zadok 1987, p. 4; is OB *Up-ši₂* a hyp. thereof?), 62 (hyp.?), *iku*(-)*r* (63), 68.70, *inta*(-)*p* (71), 79 (Elam.?), 90.99.111.115.129, *li*(-)*tar* (131), 136b.143.146, *miti*(-)*k* (148a), *nahi*(-)*n* (152), 156.177.195, 197 (partly Akkad. *ri₂bu*?), 202.208, *šita*(-)*k* (226), 240, *ta*(-)*p* (242), 245.248, *u*(-)*kuk* (263), 264.269, *ur*(-)*kira* (276), *u*(-)*tuk* (282), 285.294. The segmentation of all the names listed under the following hypothetical elements is dubious:

37.45.46.55.73.83.86.94.95.98.106.133.134.142.163.170.180.184.185.204.206.211. 255.262.267; 276: segmentation of *Urtaku*), 284.288.295. 183 is the base of a hypocoristicon. Some of the names listed in 251, 299 (same element in all cases?), possibly 301 and perhaps 179a are not compound ones, but reduplicated hypocoristica. The following names occurring in Elamite or in sources from Elam may end in reduplicated theophorous elements (*Mama*, *Nunu*, *Šušu*, *Tutu*) or belong to a special pattern of reduplicated names: NE [A]z-*zi₂-ma-ma*, *Ša-du-nu-nu*, OB *Zi-i-šu-šu*, *Šu-gi-nu-nu*, *U₂-zi-tu-tu*. It is not certain whether 13.41.78-80.138.162.166.214.225 are genuine Elamite.

This list can easily be augmented from material registered in Hinz and Koch.

M. Hybrid names are thoroughly discussed in ElOn (pp. 55-59; #207 is Mesopotamian *Zugallitu*!) and Zadok 1987, pp. 1f. 1. Elamite-Akkadian (from OB Susa, except for 4): 1. *Ri-ib-in-zu*, 2. *-si/ši-mu-ut* (*ri₂bum* «substitute»); 3. *Nu-ur₂-in-zu* (*nūrum* «light»); early OB 4. *Šu-^dgu-nu-ra* (BIN 10, 171, 6) «he of *Kunir*? (cf. ad #115b). 5. ŠU (prob. *Gimil*)-*ha-ni-iš* is doubtful. Does 6. *U₂-li-ri-mu* end in *ri₂mu(m)* «wild bull»? 7. *Ki/Qi₂-ri-ib/p-i-gi-iš-da* hardly contains Akkad. *qerbum* «proximity» as the latter is never found in initial position (cf. MVAeG 44, pp. 318f.). Hurr. *kirip* + DN (OIP 57, p. 228) is attractive, but Hurrian names are not recorded in OB Susa; to Elam. *kirip* «goddesses»? Contrary to the preceding names whose theophorous element is Elamite, that of 8. *Zu-up-ša₃-ha-an* is Mesopotamian, but the predicate is not clear. A three-element name is 9. *Te-ep-ti-a-mur-di-nu* «*Tempt* see (my) right!» (nom. instead of acc.; unique pattern, but the idea is not strange to Akkadian onomastics). – 2. Elamite-Amorite may be *Gu-ri-me-ra-ah* and *Me-ra-ah-i-da-du* (OB Susa). – 3. Elamite-Kassite: NE *Ki-tin*-^dAMAR.UTU-*gal-zu* (does the Sumerogram render here *kuri*?). – 4. Elamite-Iranian. According to Hinz and Koch NE *Ku-ud-da-qa-qa* and *U₂-nu-qa-qa* cannot be based on Iranian forms as c. 685 B.C. is too early for an Iranian presence in Susa. However, The Persians were allies of the Elamites in

the same period (Sennacherib's time). In addition, E. Reiner (in A. Kammenhuber [ed.], *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen*, Leiden 1969, p. 63) dates the NE texts from Susa to \pm 600 B.C. Moreover, one is inclined to infer from P. de Miroschedji's article (*La fin du royaume d'Anšan et de Suse et la naissance de l'Empire perse*: ZA, 75 [1986], pp. 266f.) that the NE documentation from Susa did not cease before the middle of the 6th century B.C. Hinz and Koch allow for the possibility that the initial component of NE *Mar-du-nu-kaš* is Iranian. According to Koch, several individuals having Elamite names of the «banana» type were physically identical with bearers of Old Persian names ending in *-ča*: RAE *Mi-te-te* was apparently the same person as *Mi-te-ez-za* (presumably defective for *Mi-in-te-ez-za* rather than rendering OP **Vidaiča-*), and *Mi-in-te-ez-za* (< OP **Vindaiča-*) and *Zi₂-ni-ni* the same person as *Zi₂-ni-iz-za*. The latter is according to her an Old Persian «Koseform» of an Elamite name, like RAE *Sa-ak-ti-iz-za* <OP **Θaxtaiča-*. According to Hinz and Koch NB *Ku-ur-ra-š₂* is not homonymous with Cyrus, but is NE *kur-raš₂* «er verfügte». However, it is not impossible that the Old Persian name *Kuru-š* was identified by popular etymology with the resembling genuine Elamite one (the Elamitized form was borrowed in N/LB). The Elamite name may be extant c. 1500 years earlier in Ur III *Kur₃-aš₂* (Forde, *Neb.* 72,3).