


ARTICLE

Tammarītu, “king of Ḫidalu,” Tammarītu, “king of Elam”

Saeideh Sharifi 

University of Tehran, Department of History, Tehran, Iran

(Received 30 August 2023; revised 23 June 2024; accepted 25 June 2024)

Abstract

The reign of Tammarītu is one of the most enigmatic parts of Neo-Elamite history because documents have attested that two individuals with that name but two different titles, “king of Ḫidalu” and “king of Elam,” played significant roles in the historical events. The lack of dates in many documents complicates establishing a secure chronology and attributing events to Tammarītu, king of Ḫidalu, or Tammarītu II/Tammarītu, king of Elam. Scholars generally agree that the documents in which Tammarītu is called “king of Elam” cannot be attributed to Tammarītu, king of Ḫidalu. However, a comparison of Ashurbanipal’s annals with other available documents does not support this viewpoint.

Keywords: Ashurbanipal; king of Elam; king of Ḫidalu; Tammarītu

In historical sources from Ashurbanipal’s reign, three individuals named Tammarītu are mentioned:

1. Tammarītu, son of Urtaku, designated as king of Ḫidalu by Ashurbanipal in 653 B.C.¹
2. Tammarītu, son of Teumman, who was killed in the battle of Tīl-Tūba in 653 B.C.
3. Tammarītu, known as king of Elam, or Tammarītu II.

This article focuses on two of these individuals: Tammarītu, king of Ḫidalu, and Tammarītu, king of Elam. Since Assyrian sources frequently referred to Tammarītu, king of Elam or Tammarītu II, most documents of this period are attributed to him.² The lack of dates in many of these documents and the absence of relevant Elamite sources for comparison have led to ambiguity in attributing extant documents to each of these kings. Accordingly, any attribution in this study will be inconclusive and based on interpretation.

Scholars agree that the title “king of Elam” was not used for Tammarītu, king of Ḫidalu. Fuchs argues that referring to “Tammarītu I” and “Tammarītu II” based solely on the term “arku” (i.e., the later/second) for Tammarītu, king of Elam, in Prism A of Ashurbanipal’s annals is incorrect:³

Such numbering leads to the erroneous assumption that both kings belonged to the same ruling line. However, this is not the case [because] the reigns of both kings

¹ The Behbahan region, Rām Hormoz Plain, and Dež-spīd in Mamasanī Plain are some places that have been suggested for the possible location of Hidalu. See Alizadeh, “Tomb,” 68; Henkelman, “Persians,” 77; Miroschedji, “Susa,” 34; Stolper, “Hidali”; Wright and Carter, “Survey,” 72; and Arfaee, “Background,” 108–9.

² Baker and Waters, “Tammarītu,” 1306.

³ Ashurbanipal, “Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period [hereafter RINAP] 5, 11,” vi 55; Fuchs, “Review,” 134–35.

may have overlapped. Ȝidalu, the dominion of Tammarītu I, is best viewed as an Elamite sub-kingdom whose ruler was subordinate to the king ruling in Madaktu.⁴

Similarly, Henkelman believes that we should not count Tammarītu son of Urtaku (675–664 B.C.) as “Tammarītu I” in the list of Elamite kings, because he reigned only as king of Ȝidalu.⁵ Gorris suggests that Tammarītu, king of Ȝidalu, was killed by the supporters of Tammarītu king of Elam, and even this king ruled over the highland region. Therefore, the documents using the title “King of Elam” belong to this Tammarītu.⁶

Although Ashurbanipal’s annals used the title “king of Elam” only for the Tammarītu, who sat on the throne of Elam after Humban-nikaš II, this alone does not prove the title was not used for Tammarītu, king of Ȝidalu; the administrative documents, especially the letters, do not support the premise based on the annals.

According to the annals, Tammarītu, king of Elam, supported the Šamaš-šuma-ukīn rebellion from the very beginning of his reign and revealed his enmity toward Assyria:

Tammarītu, who was (even) more insolent than him (Ummanigaš), sat on the throne of the land Elam. Just like him (Ummanigaš), he (Tammarītu) accepted bribes, did not inquire about the well-being of my royal majesty, went to the aid of Šamaš-šuma-ukīn, (my) unfaithful brother, and hastily sent his weapons to fight with my troops.⁷

This hostility persisted until Tammarītu’s dethronement by Indabibi.⁸ However, letters present a different picture, showing Tammarītu as an ally of Assyria. For instance, in ABL 1040, Ashurbanipal called Tammarītu “king of Elam” and “my brother.”⁹ In the opening of ABL 1022 he also called him “king of Elam” and wished him good health.¹⁰ In ABL 943, Tammarītu referred to himself as the “servant” of the king of Assyria, thanking him for his kindness.¹¹ In ABL 1400, Tammarītu called himself “king of Elam” and the “servant” of the king of Assyria, praising the Assyrian king and wishing him a long life and reign.¹² These examples show friendly relations between Tammarītu and Ashurbanipal in letters, contrasting with the enmity depicted in the annals. Examining the historical context of the events raises further doubts about the premise that Tammarītu, king of Ȝidalu, was not called king of Elam. This study compares the narration of events in the annals and other documents, such as letters and extispicy reports, to assess the accuracy of this statement. A time scale is needed to analyze the events and attribute them to each Tammarītu documented. Additionally, it is crucial to consider the toponyms “Ȝidalu” and “Elam” and whether they were distinct from the Assyrian scribes’ perspective. The documents are reviewed based on these points, and their attribution is discussed.

Time Scale

Regarding Tammarītu’s period, we can consider two points in time as the time scale: first, the termination date of the reign of Humban-nikaš II, and second, the date of the first campaign of Ashurbanipal against Humban-haltaš III. The first determines the date on which

⁴ Miroshedji has identified Madaktu with Tepe Patak, near Dawairij; “Localisation,” 213; Miroshedji, “Susa,” 34. Potts has considered Tepe Senjar a possible location for Madaktu; “Madaktu,” 23. In the annals of Ashurbanipal, Madaktu is listed among the cities located between the rivers of Ulāya and Idide; “RINAP 5, 9,” iv 33–35.

⁵ Henkelman, *Other Gods*, 12, no. 20.

⁶ Gorris, *Power*, 47.

⁷ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 3,” vii 32–36.

⁸ *Ibid.*, vii 41–54.

⁹ ABL (*Assyrian and Babylonian Letters*); Parpola, *Correspondence*, (SAA 21), 59.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 63.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 119.

¹² *Ibid.*, 120.

Tammarītu, “king of Elam,” entered the scene in Neo-Elamite history; the second establishes the date of Tammarītu’s return to power with the support of the Assyrian army.

The Termination Date of the Reign of Humban-nikaš II

It has been considered that the year 652 or 651 B.C. is the termination date for the reign of Humban-nikaš II.¹³ However, examination of the documents does not show the accuracy of this date. The most important evidence in this regard is ABL 1380.¹⁴ This letter provides us with a date, based on which we can calculate an approximate date for the end of Humban-nikaš II’s reign. Ashurbanipal had sent this letter to an Elamite individual named Menānu.¹⁵

This is what you sent through Ubaru, after you had killed Simburu: “I have killed Simburu, to whom you rendered a favour by imposing a treaty upon him but who sinned against the treaty, and I have released Ubaru and am herewith sending him to you. I shall go and we shall make battle with Ummanigaš, to whom you rendered a great favor but who has likewise sinned against your treaty by siding with your adversary and crossing over to your territory, and we shall fight with him and revenge you.”¹⁶

According to this letter, Ashurbanipal expected Tammarītu and Menānu to punish Humban-nikaš II’s betrayal, but they had done nothing in this regard at the time of sending this letter:¹⁷

And in the messages which I sent to you and to Tammarītu, I said thus: “These things which you did, which are good to god and man — now why have you not done what you wrote? [As so]n as you have taken your revenge with Ummanigaš, I shall [release] the rest of your messengers and send them to you.”¹⁸

Now for (all) these 19 months . . . I have not heard a word from you, [and thi]s has generated improper demands against you.¹⁹

Another part of the letter refers to a period of two years when the messengers of Ashurbanipal had been arrested in Elam: “Now, if you are well and remain in your position, why do you permit unseemly things to be done in your country? My messengers have been detained for these two years, while you have kept silent.”²⁰

According to the annals, Humban-nikaš II with the support of Assyria sat on the throne of Elam after the battle of Til-Tūba in 653 B.C.²¹ However, he betrayed Ashurbanipal by providing support for the Šamaš-šuma-ukīn rebellion.²² If we consider the fact that the Šamaš-šuma-ukīn rebellion took place in 652 B.C. and if we assume that Humban-nikaš II’s support for this rebellion was in this year, and take into account those two years in

¹³ Waters, *Survey*, 62; Henkelman, “Tammarītu,” 432; Gorris, *Power*, 47.

¹⁴ Parpola, *Correspondence*, (SAA 21), 58.

¹⁵ For Menānu, see Waters, “Menanu,” 748.

¹⁶ For Simburu, see Baker, “Šimbur,” 1266. A short time after ascending to the throne, Humban-nikaš II supported the Šamaš-šuma-ukīn rebellion and attacked the Assyrian territory; see Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 3,” vi 61–86 ; ABL 1380, obv. 3–13.

¹⁷ According to Baker and Waters, this Tammarītu may be the one to succeed Humban-nikaš II as king; Baker and Waters, “Tammarītu,” 1308.

¹⁸ ABL 1380, obv. 14–21.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, obv. 24–r. 1

²⁰ *Ibid.*, r. 4–8.

²¹ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 3,” v 97–vi 1. For the dating of this battle, see Mayr, “Lunar Eclipse,” 105–9.

²² Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 3,” vi 86–vii 5.

which Ashurbanipal's messengers were in prison in Elam, we are led to a conclusion that the ABL 1380 was written in 650 B.C. and Humban-nikaš II was still on the throne of Elam in that year.²³ Therefore, placing the beginning of the reign of Tammarītu II/Tammarītu, king of Elam, in the year 652 or 651 B.C. cannot be correct.

In an extispicy report dated the first month of the year 651 B.C. the king of Assyria was informed that Nabû-bēl-šumāti had mustered archers in Elam. In this text, it was asked whether he would fight with the Assyrian army or the supporters of Assyria.²⁴ This date (651) can be considered a *terminus ante quem* for Nabû-bēl-šumāti's first act of disloyalty toward Ashurbanipal.²⁵ Edition A of Ashurbanipal's annals referred to Humban-nikaš II's support of Nabû-bēl-šumāti.²⁶ This shows that Humban-nikaš II was the king of Elam in 651 and provided support for Nabû-bēl-šumāti. Therefore dating the reign of Tammarītu II/Tammarītu, king of Elam, to 652 must be excluded.

Furthermore, if we compare the date mentioned in ABL 1380 with the date of the battle of Mangisu in which Humban-nikaš II fought with the Assyrians, we even reach a date after 651 for the reign of Humban-nikaš II. Frame has investigated the possibility of this battle being identical to the battle of Ĥirītu that occurred between Assyrian and Babylonian forces at the beginning of the Šamaš-šuma-ukīn rebellion in the twelfth month of 652 B.C.²⁷ He believes that although there is no certainty about these two battles being identical, it is clear that the Elamites and Babylonians fought with the Assyrians at the very beginning of the Šamaš-šuma-ukīn rebellion in one or two different battles and were defeated by them.²⁸ Assuming that the Battle of Mangisu is the same as the Battle of Ĥirītu and took place in the twelfth month of 652 B.C., if we further assume that Ashurbanipal's messengers were arrested at that time, as the letter states they were held for two years, counting from this date brings us to the twelfth month of 650 B.C., which falls within the years of Humban-nikaš II's rule. Therefore, Tammarītu II, king of Elam, could not have been the king in 652 or 651 B.C.

The First Campaign of Ashurbanipal against Humban-haltaš III

Edition Kh of the Ashurbanipal annals is the first edition that gives an account of this campaign. This edition possibly was written during the first two or three months of the year 646 B.C.²⁹ Generally, this campaign is dated to the third month of 647 B.C.³⁰

“Elam” and “Ĥidalu”

The notion that the title “King of Elam” can not be applied to Tammarītu, King of Ĥidalu, may be based on the assumption that the geographical term “Elam” was not used in documents to refer to Ĥidalu, or that Ĥidalu was considered an independent territory from Elam. To evaluate this assumption, I referred to several documents to determine its accuracy. These documents provide evidence that the geographical term “Elam” may have been used to refer to “Ĥidalu.”

²³ Frame, *Babylonia*, 131. After the battle of Mangisu, Ashurbanipal sent a message to Humban-nikaš II regarding his betrayal and attack on the Assyrian territory; the Elamite king arrested the messenger and did not reply to Ashurbanipal. This is apparently referred to by Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 3,” vii 25–28.

²⁴ Starr, *Queries*, (SAA 4), 280. For Nabû-bēl-šumāti, see Baker, “Nabû-Bēl-Šumāti,” 811.

²⁵ Baker, “Nabû-Bēl-Šumāti,” 811.

²⁶ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 11,” vii 16.

²⁷ Gerardi and Potts assume that these two battles are identical; Gerardi, “Elamite Campaigns,” 176; Potts, *Archaeology*, 275. For the location of Ĥirītu, see Zadok, *Names*, 162; and Bryce, *Routledge*, 312.

²⁸ Frame, *Babylonia*, 144–45.

²⁹ Novotny, “Inscriptions,” 133.

³⁰ Gerardi, *Elamite Campaigns*, 194; Waters, *Survey*, 117–18.

Ashurbanipal's Epigraphs

These epigraphs are part of a collection of epigraphs that seem to have been a draft for a series of reliefs.³¹ Part of these epigraphs related to the Tīl-Tūba battle refer to some officials of Ḫidalu who surrendered this city to the Assyrians. In these inscriptions, in one place these officials are called the officials of Ḫidalu, and in another place they are referred to as the officials of Elam:

Umbakidinu, the herald of the land Ḫidalu, is carrying the (decapitated) head Iṣtar-Nandi (Šutur-Naḫūndi), the king of the land Ḫidalu. Zinēni, his palace supervisor, is likewise depicted in the lower register. The might of (the god) Aššur, my lord, (and) fear of my royal majesty overwhelmed them (and) they cut off the heads of the nobles of the land Elam who had not submitted to me and cast (them) down before my mag-nates. They grasped the feet of my royal majesty.³²

This epigraph begins by narrating the events in Ḫidalu in 653 B.C. However, as the narration continues, the scribe uses the expression “the land Elam” instead of “the land Ḫidalu”: “[T]hey cut off the heads of the nobles of the land Elam.” According to another epigraph, “the nobles of the land Elam” may refer to Iṣtar-Nandi, king of Ḫidalu, and his companions, who were killed by Umbakidinu and his supporters.³³ The inscription states that Umbakidinu beheaded Iṣtar-Nandi and threw the head at the feet of the Assyrian magnates and then surrendered to Assyria. This replacement of “Ḫidalu” with “Elam” suggests that “Elam” could similarly replace “Ḫidalu” in Tammaritu’s titulary.

Additionally, Zinēni is known as the palace supervisor of the land of Elam in another epigraph related to the same events: “[Fear of] my lordly majesty covered [Z]inēni, the palace supervisor, (and) GIŠ-TAR-ta . . . of the land Elam, . . . they came here to do obeisance to me . . . my camp.”³⁴

Therefore, we cannot dismiss the possibility that the Assyrian scribes referred to Tammaritu, known as the king of Ḫidalu, by the title “king of Elam” instead. A similar example of a king being referred to by two different toponyms in his titulary is the use of the titles “king of Anšan” and “king of Parsu” for Cyrus the Great by the scribes of the Nabonidus Chronicle.³⁵

The Babylonian Economic Text

In a Babylonian economic document (BM 79013) written in Ḫidalu in the accession year of Tammarītu, he is referred to as “king of Elam.” This document is the testament of an individual named Bel-epuš. Leichty believes that the Tammarītu mentioned in this document is the Tammarītu, son of Urtaku, who was put on the throne of Ḫidalu by the Assyrians, and Bel-epuš was an Assyrian official sent with Tammarītu to Ḫidalu.³⁶ Similarly, Brinkman and Kennedy date this document to 653 B.C. They consider the Tammarītu mentioned here as Tammarītu, king of Ḫidalu.³⁷ However, due to the use of the title “king of Elam,” Henkelman attributes this document to the reign of Tammarītu II/Tammarītu king of Elam.³⁸ Gorris believes that BM 79013 belongs to the reign of Tammarītu II/Tammarītu,

³¹ Russell, *Writing*, 193.

³² Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 161,” i 6–11. For Umbakidinu, see Waters, “Umbakidini,” 1379. For Zinēni, see Jas, “Zinēni,” 447.

³³ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 163,” o 4’–8’.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, r. 1–5.

³⁵ Glassner, *Chronicles*, 235, 237.

³⁶ Leichty, “Bel-Epuš,” 154–55.

³⁷ Brinkman and Kennedy, “Evidence,” 61.

³⁸ Henkelman, “Tammarītu,” 433.

king of Elam, because of the title “king of Elam” used for Tammarītu; in her opinion, the Neo-Babylonian documents from the 650s make a clear distinction between Elam and Ḫidalu.³⁹ However, this distinction is not seen in the documents she has referred to; in ABL 280 and ABL 281, Ḫidalu along with other toponyms are mentioned in expressions such as “report on Elam” and “message from Elam.”⁴⁰ ABL 961 describes Ḫidalu as “this part of the country,” and, like the previous letters, does not show the distinction claimed by Gorris.⁴¹ In ABL 1311 and ABL 1309—also mentioned by Gorris—there is no clear distinction between Ḫidalu and other toponyms related to Elam.⁴² In fact, in all of these letters, Ḫidalu, like other Elamite cities mentioned, has the determinative URU.⁴³ Therefore, Gorris’s reason for attributing this document to the reign of Tammarītu II/Tammarītu king of Elam is unacceptable. In addition, in light of the date determined for this document (653 B.C.), and considering that we do not yet have a document that shows Tammarītu II/Tammarītu, king of Elam, ruled over Ḫidalu, we cannot ascribe it to the reign of Tammarītu II/Tammarītu, king of Elam.

A Review of the Documents and Their Attribution

This section discusses the documents regarding Tammarītu and their attribution to Tammarītu, king of Ḫidalu, and Tammarītu II/Tammarītu, king of Elam. First, we must mention ABL 1195, an extispicy report that has been the basis for dating the reign of Tammarītu II/Tammarītu, king of Elam. In this extispicy report, it has been said that a message on the mobilization of forces by Tammarītu, king of Elam, had been received, raising the possibility of his attack on the Assyrian territory or on Nippur. Considering the question of Tammarītu’s attack on Nippur, Frame raised the possibility that the date of this extispicy report must be put after the city was brought under Assyrian control, that is, after IX-651 B.C.⁴⁴ Considering the possibility that Humban-nikaš II was the king of Elam at that time, either the dating of ABL 1195 to 651 B.C. is incorrect, or the Tammarītu mentioned in this text is not Tammarītu II/Tammarītu, king of Elam.

Waters and Henkelman have based the date of Tammarītu’s accession to the throne of Elam on ABL 1195 and the date suggested by Frame for this text. Waters considers Tammarītu II/Tammarītu, king of Elam, to be the king in XI-651 B.C., and Henkelman believes that he was the king of Elam sometime before IX-651 B.C.⁴⁵

After ascending to the throne of Elam and supporting the Šamaš-šuma-ukīn rebellion, the first reported event of the reign of Tammarītu in the annals is his escape with his relatives and Marduk-šarru-ušur, Ashurbanipal’s eunuch, to Assyria:

(As for) Tammarītu, the king of the land Elam who had spoken insolent word(s) on account of the cutting off of the head of Teumman—which a low-ranking soldier of my army had cut off—and his brothers, his family, (and) the seed of his father’s house, together with eighty-five nobles of the land Elam who march at his side, who had flown away from the weapons of (the god) Aššur and the goddess Ištar—to praise their great divinity, they crawled naked on their bellies, together with Marduk-šarru-ušur, a eunuch of mine whom they had taken away (with them) by force, and they grasped the feet of my royal majesty.⁴⁶

³⁹ Gorris, *Power*, 47.

⁴⁰ Vaan, *Schwertklinge*, 241, r.15, 245, obv. 4.

⁴¹ Parpola, *Correspondence*, (SAA 21), 116, obv.4.

⁴² Vaan, *Schwertklinge*, 313–15; Waterman, *Correspondence*, 411–13.

⁴³ URU is a determinative that precedes the names of cities.

⁴⁴ Frame, *Babylonia*, 134, n. 13.

⁴⁵ Waters, *Survey*, 62; Henkelman, “Tammarītu,” 432.

⁴⁶ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 3,” vii 43–54.

This text refers to Tammarītu's flight with Marduk-šarru-ušur, Ashurbanipal's eunuch to Assyria. Based on this report, it seems that the Assyrian eunuch was captured and handed over to Assyria by Tammarītu. Although Frame notes that there was probably more than one person named Marduk-šarru-ušur involved at this time, he suggests that the Marduk-šarru-ušur referred to in the annals of Ashurbanipal may be the same person apprehended by Nabû-bêl-šumāti and imprisoned in Elam.⁴⁷ However, according to the annals, those captured by Nabû-bêl-šumāti were still in Elam during Indabibi's reign:

(As for) the Assyrians whom I had sent to aid Nabû-bêl-šumāti, son of Marduk-aplaidina (II) (Merodach-baladan), with whom they used to march about protecting his land like a friend and ally (and) whom Nabû-bêl-šumāti had seized by guile during the night (and) confined in prison, Indabibi, the king of the land Elam, released them from prison.⁴⁸

Therefore, it seems unlikely that the Marduk-šarru-ušur who was with Tammarītu could be the same as the Marduk-šarru-ušur captured by Nabû-bêl-šumāti.

In addition to the annals, some letters refer to Tammarītu and Marduk-šarru-ušur. However, as Waters notes, we have no information about the nature of their relations.⁴⁹ ABL 961 refers to Tammarītu and Marduk-šarru-ušur, but this letter is dated to 653 B.C. and its content cannot be related to Tammarītu's flight.⁵⁰

In ABL 960, the author warned Ashurbanipal about the meeting between Tammarītu and Marduk-šarru-ušur by reminding him of the hostility of Šamaš-šumu-ukin:

No one remained in E[am], they have returned to Babyl[on]. They tell me the news of Marduk-šarru-ušur: "We have seen (it); [he] went for dinner to Tammarītu in our presence." [I] have sent other men, too, telling them to go and speak with him, return, and give me a sign from him.

I sent (this) report to the king, my lord, as soon as I heard it; the king, my lord, should know (it). Earlier I told the king, my lord, that Šamaš-šumu-ukin will become hostile.⁵¹

Given this warning, it is possible that the meeting was regarded as a betrayal of Marduk-šarru-ušur to Ashurbanipal. Such an assumption is strengthened by the report of the annals, which refers to returning Marduk-šarru-ušur to Assyria "by force."⁵²

Tammarītu's extradition of Marduk-šarru-ušur can be regarded as an effort to win Ashurbanipal's satisfaction and support. It seems that the annals show this satisfaction of Ashurbanipal as well:

For just one eunuch of mine, the gods Aššur, Sîn, Šamaš, Bêl (Marduk), (and) Nabû, the gods who support me, compensated me a thousand fold. I allowed Tammarītu (and) as many people as (there were) with him to stay in my palace.⁵³

ABL 1148, attributed to Tammarītu, describes some difficulties he encountered and the unavailability of the Assyrian forces to support him.⁵⁴

⁴⁷ Frame, *Babylonia*, 179.

⁴⁸ Ashurbanipal, "RINAP 5, 3," vii 65–72.

⁴⁹ Waters, *Survey*, 58.

⁵⁰ Parpola, *Correspondence*, (SAA 21), 116; Ito, "Royal Image," 33.

⁵¹ Parpola, *Correspondence*, 106, obv. 2'–15'.

⁵² Ashurbanipal, "RINAP 5, 3," vii 50–54.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, vii 57–60.

⁵⁴ Parpola, *Correspondence*, (SAA 21), xxviii, 121.

When . . . [NN] and 10 servants of the king, my lord, came to me . . . , saying, “Why don’t you appeal to the king, your lord?” I thought, “They did act harshly there.” So I came now and seized the feet of the king, my lord but no forces of the king were available.

. . . he acted harshly there; so he may accordingly act harshly here too. I’ll request no forces from him, but say (this) and go to Der.

The last lines of the letter read as follows:

Now Marduk-šarru-ušur and Kiligigu, the king’s servants whom the king sent—the king, my lord, has heard what they have done together. Now may the forces of the king, my lord, go with me, (and) may the king, bring me out.⁵⁵

Based on this part of the letter, it seems that Marduk-šarru-ušur and Kiligigu were sent by the king of Assyria to support Tammarītu, but they did not fulfill their mission properly and he had to request other forces from Assyria.

The CT 54 448 has been considered a response to the ABL 1148, and both letters have been dated to the first campaign against Humban-haltaš III.⁵⁶ In CT 54 448, the king of Assyria announced the arrival of his forces within a month. However, based on the annals, Tammarītu II/Tammarītu, king of Elam (who returned to Elam along with the Assyrian army) was enthroned in Susa and took refuge in Assyria during the same campaign for the second time.⁵⁷ Therefore it seems unlikely that this Tammarītu needed to request forces from Assyria and wait for the arrival of these forces for a month while the Assyrian army was still in Elam. Therefore, dating ABL 1148 and CT 54 448 to the first campaign against Humban-haltaš III does not seem correct. CT 54 487 refers to Tammarītu, “king of Elam,” Marduk-šarru-ušur, forty nobles, and Targibātu.⁵⁸ The toponym of Targibātu can be found in some letters of Esarhaddon’s reign. ABL 1114, ABL 1131, and ABL 576 referred to this toponym as a border area of the Sealand, which was attacked by the Elamites and attached to their territory.⁵⁹ Regarding ABL 282, it seems that Targibātu was still under the control of Elam during Ashurbanipal’s reign because this letter refers to a meeting between Nabû-bêl-šumāti and Natan (rebels against Assyria) in Targibātu.⁶⁰ According to the annals, Nabû-bêl-šumāti fled to Elam after betraying Ashurbanipal.⁶¹ Therefore, Targibātu can be considered a part of Elamite territory. There are three epigraphs related to Tammarītu’s flight to Assyria.⁶² Based on these epigraphs, Tammarītu, king of Elam, in support of Šamaš-šumu-ukin, sent his troops to fight against Ashurbanipal’s forces but due to the rebellion of his troops led by Indabibi, “his servant,” Tammarītu was defeated and fled to the Sealand through the Bitter Sea, but Tammarītu’s boat became stuck in mud and sediment; Ashurbanipal offered his support to Tammarītu. Tammarītu accepted and took refuge in Assyria.⁶³

It appears that ABL 1130 also refers to the flight of Tammarītu to Assyria.⁶⁴ In this letter, Bêl-ibni mentions that 50 to 60 people who fled Elam were sent with his messengers to Ur.⁶⁵ He also referred to a letter sent by “Tammarītu, king of Elam,” in which he had asked for peace with Assyria. In the annals, we can see such a request by Tammarītu from Assyria: “Tammarītu handed himself over to do obeisance to me and made an appeal to my lordly

⁵⁵ ABL 1148, obv. 1’–7’ and obv. 10’–b.e.13’; *ibid.*, r. 4–9.

⁵⁶ Parpola, *Correspondence*, (SAA 21), xxviii, 62.

⁵⁷ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 9,” iii 70–71.

⁵⁸ Vaan, *Schwertklinge*, 350–51.

⁵⁹ Reynolds, *Correspondence*, (SAA 18), 68, 86, 87.

⁶⁰ Vaan, *Schwertklinge*, 250; ABL 282, obv. 17–r. 3.

⁶¹ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 6,” ix 25’–27’.

⁶² Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 178,” obv. 22’–r. 5.

⁶³ The Bitter Sea is identical to the Persian Gulf; see Konstantopoulos, “Bitter Sea,” 188.

⁶⁴ Vaan, *Schwertklinge*, 301.

⁶⁵ For Bêl-ibni, see Baker and Brinkman, “Bêl-ibni,” 306.

majesty to be his ally.”⁶⁶ Although the sources have referred to Tammarītu’s flight, we have no exact date for this event; some references refer to an approximate date in late 650 or early 649 B.C.

First, considering ABL 1151, we know that Indabibi was the king of Elam by 649 (the reconstruction of the month refers to the third month, III?-649). Second, Edition B of the annals is the first edition that included the report of Tammarītu’s flight. The date of this edition is 649–648 B.C.⁶⁷ Third, in Edition C of the annals the presence of Tammarītu’s archers in Assyria is mentioned:

(As for) the archers [among] who[m] Tam<ma>rītu, [the king of the land Elam], had b[ragged] within the land Elam about fighting with [the troops of A]ssyria, now, inside Assyria, [tho]se arch[ers] were repeatedly coming cl[ose to] my . . .⁶⁸

An epigraph related to this inscription adds more details to the event:

I, Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria: By the command of (the god) Aššur and the goddess Mullissu, the great gods, the kings who sit upon (royal) daises bowed down to my yoke. (As for) the archers among whom Tammarītu, the king of the land Elam, had bragged about fighting with my troops, now, through the might of (the god) Aššur and the goddess [Mullissu, the go]ds who support me, tho[se] archers . . . the month Nisannu (I), with . . . approac[hed].⁶⁹

The last line of the inscription is fragmentary, but the possible connection of the mentioned month to Tammarītu’s flight or presence in Assyria cannot be overlooked. The reference to Tammarītu’s archers in Assyria is also mentioned in Edition Kh of the annals.⁷⁰ In Editions C and Kh, the report on Tammarītu’s flight precedes Inabibi’s ascension to the throne of Elam. Therefore, the reference to the presence of Tammarītu’s archers in Assyria must pertain to his first refuge there.

Letters add more details to the annals about the events of Tammarītu’s period. Some of these letters show the difficulties that Tammarītu had in the land of Rāši; Illil-bāniin ABL 863 reported on the rebellion of the land of Rāši against Tammarītu, “king of Elam.”⁷¹ According to this report, Tammarītu had retreated from Rāši and Illil-bāni assured Ashurbanipal that this information was reliable. Another letter related to this is ABL 295, in which Ashurbanipal addressed the Rāšians, reminded them of the kindnesses of Assyria toward Elam, and complained about Nabû-bēl-šumāti not being extradited.⁷² Ashurbanipal pointed out that Nabû-bēl-šumāti had better stay with Tammarītu, or he would do what his gods enabled him to do. The letter is dated to 647 B.C., and the “Tammarītu” referred to in this letter is considered Tammarītu II/Tammarītu, king of Elam.⁷³ ABL 1260 is also addressed to the people of Rāši and is very similar in content to ABL 295.⁷⁴ In this letter, Ashurbanipal criticized the sheltering of Nabû-bēl-šumāti by Elam and referred to a letter he had written to Humban-haltaš III, in which he had requested the extradition of this rebel. Based on ABL 1260, Humban-haltaš III had called for negotiations about this, and the Assyrian king had accepted this request.⁷⁵ Another part of the letter said that if Nabû-bēl-šumāti repented

⁶⁶ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 3,” vii 55–56.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, viii 93A–E.

⁶⁸ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 6,” viii 2’–5’

⁶⁹ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 176,” obv. 9–17.

⁷⁰ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 7,” viii 1–6.

⁷¹ For Illil-bāni, see Weszeli, “Illil-Bāni,” 519. Reynolds, *Correspondence*, (SAA 18), 193.

⁷² Parpola, *Correspondence*, (SAA 21), 53.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, xvii.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 55.

⁷⁵ ABL 1260, r. 3–10.

his deeds and stayed with Tammarītu, Ashurbanipal would forgive him; otherwise, the Assyrian king would do whatever his gods have enabled him to do.⁷⁶ In the last line, Ashurbanipal threatened the Rāšians and warned them.

The interesting point in ABL 1260 is that the king of Assyria described Humban-haltaš III as his negotiating party for the extradition of Nabû-bēl-šumāti while at the same mentioning Tammarītu as an ally of Assyria. In addition, according to the annals, during the first campaign, Humban-haltaš III fled to the mountains in fear of the Assyrian forces:

(As for) Ummanaldašu (Humban-haltaš III), the king of the land Elam, he heard about the entry of my troops, who had entered inside the land Elam; he abandoned the city Madaktu, a royal city of his, and (then) fled and took to the mountains.⁷⁷

This report shows that Humban-haltaš III was not in a position to negotiate the extradition of the Babylonian rebel during the first campaign. Specifically, Ashurbanipal described his negotiation with him as a negotiation “in brotherhood” in ABL 1260 (r. 10). It therefore appears that ABL 295 and ABL 1260 were written before the first campaign against Humban-haltaš III. Considering this, Tammarītu II/Tammarītu king of Elam, who was in Assyria at this time as a refugee, cannot be the Tammarītu mentioned in ABL 1260 and ABL 295, because the Tammarītu referred to in these letters was present at Elam at the same time as Humban-haltaš III was the king, and was an ally of Assyria.

In ABL 1022, sent from Ashurbanipal to Tammarītu, he was addressed as “king of Elam.” This letter referred to the dissolved forces and difficulties Tammarītu had in Rāši. In the last lines, Ashurbanipal reminds Tammarītu of the many favors he had done for him and asks him to be loyal to the treaty he had sworn to and return all those favors. The date of the letter is the sixteenth day of Elul (VI), but the year is uncertain. The editor has dated the letter to the year of Nabû-nādin-aḥi (r. 26) and the first campaign against Humban-haltaš III.⁷⁸ The year of Nabû-nādin-aḥi can be considered 646 B.C.⁷⁹ If we take the year of Nabû-nādin-aḥi as the year this letter was written, the Tammarītu mentioned here is unlikely to be Tammarītu II/Tammarītu king of Elam, because according to the annals Tammarītu II/Tammarītu king of Elam, who was re-enthroned during the first campaign against Humban-haltaš III (in the third month of 647), took refuge in Assyria for the second time during the same campaign.⁸⁰ Therefore he could not have been the king of Elam in 646. Additionally, if we consider the first campaign against Humban-haltaš III as the year this letter was written, we face a problem because that is the sixth month and the first campaign happened in the third month; this could mean that the first campaign had lasted at least three months, compared to the second campaign, which was a broader campaign and lasted only one month and twenty-five days.⁸¹ This seems unlikely.

Waters attributes ABL 1022 to Tammarītu II/Tammarītu king of Elam because he believes that the territory that Tammarītu king of Ḫidalu ruled over could not have reached areas like Rāši. He has put the possible date of the letter in the first campaign against Humban-haltaš III or a year later.⁸² As mentioned above, it does not appear that the first campaign went on for three months, so dating this letter to 647 (the first campaign) does not seem correct. Another possible date Waters suggests is a year after the first campaign, that is, 646 B.C. Although this date may be correct for ABL 1022, the Tammarītu mentioned in this letter cannot be Tammarītu II/Tammarītu king of Elam, because he did not present in Elam on this date. Henkelman attributes this letter to the second term of the reign of Tammarītu

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, r. 11–21.

⁷⁷ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 9,” iii 62–65.

⁷⁸ Parpola, *Correspondence* (SAA 21), xviii.

⁷⁹ Novotny, “Inscriptions,” 128.

⁸⁰ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 9,” iii 70–81.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, v 55.

⁸² Waters, *Survey*, 73–74.

II/Tammarītu king of Elam while admitting that his second tenure was too short: “His second term hardly materialized, however; the Assyrians were still in Elam when he sought their protection again.”⁸³

In CT 53908, sent from Ashurbanipal to Tammarītu, the king of Assyria expressed his satisfaction with the conquest of Bīt-Bunakki near Rāši by the Assyrian forces, and Din-Šarri near Susa by Tammarītu.⁸⁴ Considering the reference to the conquest of Bīt-Bunakki in this letter, the editors date it to the first campaign against Humban-haltaš III; this is despite the fact that the conquest of Bīt-Bunakki is also mentioned in the second campaign, and therefore it cannot be a reliable basis for this dating.⁸⁵ It is noteworthy that this letter references Parsua in the last lines (r. 6–10), in which the king of Assyria reminds Tammarītu that in the war he had in Parsua, the god supported him because Tammarītu was under the protection of Ashurbanipal.⁸⁶ The possible date of 646 B.C. suggested for this letter, as well as its reference to Parsua, makes attribution of this letter to Tammarītu II/Tammarītu king of Elam unlikely, because it does not appear that this Tammarītu was able to carry out an operation in Parsua during the short period that can be considered for his second term.⁸⁷

The reference to Parsua in this letter reminds us of ABL 1311, which referred to Tammarītu and his conflict with the Persians.⁸⁸ Based on this letter, Umḥulumā had sent his messenger to Ḫidalu and several other cities, but the people of these cities rebelled against his messenger and killed him.⁸⁹ It appears that the Persians had some raids in the Šalluki area and had some people arrested; Tammarītu sent forces against them, and the Persians came under control.⁹⁰ After the reference to the Persians, the letter discusses Tammarītu’s allies who gathered along the river Ḫudḫud. Fuchs believes that references to Ḫidalu and Parsumaš in this letter are more reminiscent of the Tammarītu who ruled Ḫidalu.⁹¹ Considering the fact that Ashurbanipal in his second campaign against Humban-haltaš III did not attack Ḫidalu, he has suggested that this territory was not regarded as an enemy of Assyria, and because there is no information about removing Tammarītu from the throne of Ḫidalu he may have remained and ruled in Ḫidalu even after Humban-haltaš III’s fall.⁹² If we consider these two letters to be related, we can say that ABL 1311 was written before CT 53 908 because CT 53 908 refers to a battle Tammarītu had in Parsua.⁹³

According to the annals, the Tammarītu who is known as Tammarītu II/Tammarītu king of Elam was enthroned by Assyrians in Susa, and his kingship did not last long, because before the Assyrian forces from the first campaign against Humban-haltaš III returned and took refuge in Assyria for the second time, he had “dangerous and rebellious thoughts” toward Assyria:⁹⁴

⁸³ Henkelman, “Tammarītu,” 433.

⁸⁴ Parpola, *Correspondence*, (SAA 21), 64; Parpola, *Toponyms*, 79; Zadok, *Names*, 99. Din-Šarri is perhaps identical to the city Dun-Šarri; see Unger, “Din-Sarri,” 228. Vallat, *Les Noms*, 57.

⁸⁵ Parpola, *Correspondence*, (SAA 21), xviii; Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 9,” iv 30; “RINAP 5, 11,” v 78.

⁸⁶ Scholars believe that there is no significant difference in the orthographic forms of Parsua, Parsuaš, and Parsumaš. Rather, the historical context determines whether a location with this name is in central Zagros or Fars. See Waters, “Earliest Persians,” 100; and Fuchs, “Parsuaš,” 341.

⁸⁷ Ito, “Royal Image,” 34.

⁸⁸ Vaan, *Schwertklinge*, 313–15.

⁸⁹ Based on ABL 281, he was responsible for distributing quotas of grain among people titled šarnuppu. For šarnuppu, see Stolper, “Sarnuppu,” 269.

⁹⁰ For locations suggested for Šalluki, see Arfae, “Background,” 144; Henkelman, *Other Gods*, 426, n. 981; Potts, “Fortification Texts,” 295; and Gorris, *Power*, 146. In ABL 281, the area between Talaḫ and Radê is considered the Šalluki area (obv. 16–17); ABL 1311, obv. 22–26.

⁹¹ For identification of the rivers Ḫudḫud and Idide with modern Dez, see Zadok; *Names*, 372; Potts, “Elamite Ulā,” 36, n. 6; Waters, *Survey*, 74; and Cole and Gasche, “Environmental Evidence,” 26–27. Fuchs rejects the identification of Ḫudḫud with Dez and accepts only Idide to be identical with Dez; “Review,” 134; ABL 1311, obv. 27–31.

⁹² Fuchs, “Review,” 133–34.

⁹³ CT 53 908, r. 6–10.

⁹⁴ Ashurbanipal, “RINAP 5, 9,” iii70–71.

He forgot the kindness that I had done for him, in having sent aid to him, and constantly sought out evil (ways) to conquer my troops. (The god) Aššur and the goddess Ištar, who marched at my side (and) allowed me to stand over my foes, saw the dangerous (and) rebellious thought(s) of Tammarītu and called him to account: They removed him from his royal throne and (then) they made him return (and) bow down at my feet for a second time.⁹⁵

References to toponyms like Ḫīdalu, Ḫudḫud, and Taiqu in ABL 1311 can be seen in several other letters, which may put these letters in the same sequence of events.⁹⁶

ABL 280 refers to a revolt against Humban-haltaš III led by a person named Humban-nikaš, son of Amedirra. Based on this letter, people from the river Ḫudḫud to the city of Ḫīdalu supported this revolt, and the opposing forces had lined up on both sides of the river. The reference to the assembled forces of rebels at the river Ḫudḫud is reminiscent of ABL 1311, which refers to the army of Tammarītu and his allies gathered by this river. ABL 1311 also refers to a conflict that happened near Taiqu (r. 35–38). This toponym is also mentioned in ABL 462, in which it is reported that Humban-haltaš III had fled to the mountains and went to Taiqu; ABL 460 also mentioned the presence of Humban-haltaš III in Taiqu.⁹⁷ According to ABL 281, Humban-haltaš III, after returning to Madaktu (possibly after the first campaign) and gathering his supporters, went to Talaḫ, where some of his opponents withdrew and were thinking about finding refuge in Ḫuḫan or Ḫīdalu.⁹⁸ The fact that Ḫīdalu was considered a refuge by Humban-haltaš III's opponents and the fact that the sources do not refer to Humban-haltaš III taking refuge in Ḫīdalu suggest that this region was controlled by his opponents. Furthermore, the absence of any mention of an Assyrian assault on Ḫīdalu in historical accounts implies that Ḫīdalu may have been an ally of Assyria.

Conclusion

The review of the documents in this study shows that the consensus of the scholars about not using the title “King of Elam” for Tammarītu, King of Ḫīdalu, cannot be accepted with certainty. This research shows that the title “King of Elam” was probably used for Tammarītu, King of Ḫīdalu as well, because according to the dates we have for the reign of Humban-nikaš II and the first campaign of Ashurbanipal against Humban-haltaš III, some of the documents in which Tammarītu is called “king of Elam” cannot be attributed to Tammarītu II/Tammarītu, king of Elam. The analysis of the events based on these dates belie this attribution. In addition, this study shows that almost no document can be attributed to the second term of the reign of Tammarītu II/Tammarītu, King of Elam, because his second tenure was too short, according to the annals.

Author Biographical Note:

Saeideh Sharifi holds a Ph.D. from University of Tehran. Their research focuses on the Neo-Elamite period, and this article is an extract from their Ph.D. dissertation.

BibliographyAbbreviations

ABL Assyrian and Babylonian Letters

SAA State Archives of Assyria

SAAS State Archives of Assyria Studies

obv. Obverse

r. reverse

⁹⁵ Ibid., iii72–79.

⁹⁶ Taiqu's location is unknown.

⁹⁷ Vaan, *Schwertklinge*, 260, 263–64. Waters dates ABL 460 to either 648 or 647 B.C.; *Survey*, 68.

⁹⁸ Zadok believes that Ḫuḫan is another form of Ḫunnir; “Notes,” 136, n. 20. Arfaee considers Tol-espīd to be a possible location of Ḫunnir; “Background,” 117–18.

References

- Alizadeh, Abbas. "A Tomb of Neo Elamite Period at Arjan near Behbahan." *Archaeologische Mitteilungen Aus Iran* 18 (1985): 49–73.
- Arfaee, Abdolmajid. "The Geographical Background of the Persepolis Tablets." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2008.
- Ashurbanipal. "Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 5, 3." Open Richly Annotated Cuneiform Corpus (ORACC) 2015, <http://oracc.org/rinap/Q003702>.
- Ashurbanipal. "Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 5, 6." Open Richly Annotated Cuneiform Corpus (ORACC) 2015, <http://oracc.org/rinap/Q003705>.
- Ashurbanipal. "Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 5, 7." Open Richly Annotated Cuneiform Corpus (ORACC) 2015, <http://oracc.org/rinap/Q003706>.
- Ashurbanipal. "Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 5, 9." Open Richly Annotated Cuneiform Corpus (ORACC) 2015, <http://oracc.org/rinap/Q003708>.
- Ashurbanipal. "Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 5, 11." Open Richly Annotated Cuneiform Corpus (ORACC) 2015, <http://oracc.org/rinap/Q003710>.
- Ashurbanipal. "Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 5, 161." Open Richly Annotated Cuneiform Corpus (ORACC) 2015, <http://oracc.org/rinap/Q007569>.
- Ashurbanipal. "Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 5, 163." Open Richly Annotated Cuneiform Corpus (ORACC) 2015, <http://oracc.org/rinap/Q007571>.
- Ashurbanipal. "Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 5, 176." Open Richly Annotated Cuneiform Corpus (ORACC) 2015, <http://oracc.org/rinap/Q007584>.
- Ashurbanipal. "Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 5, 178." Open Richly Annotated Cuneiform Corpus (ORACC) 2015, <http://oracc.org/rinap/Q007586>.
- Baker, H. D. "Nabû-Bêl-Šumāti." In *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, vol. 2 (II), 810–14. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2001.
- Baker, H. D. "Šimbur." In *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, vol. 3 (II), 1266. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2011.
- Baker, H. D., and J. A. Brinkman. "Bêl-Ibni." In *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, vol. 1 (II): 305–11. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1999.
- Baker, H. D., and M. W. Waters. "Tammariṭu." In *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, vol. 3 (II): 1306–8. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2011.
- Brinkman, J. A., and D. A. Kennedy. "Documentary Evidence for the Economic Base of Early Neo-Babylonian Society: A Survey of Dated Babylonian Economic Texts, 721–626 B.C." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 35, no. 1/2 (1983): 1–90.
- Bryce, Trevor. *The Routledge Handbook of the Peoples and Places of Ancient Western Asia*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Cole, S.W., and Hermann Gasche. "Documentary and Other Archaeological and Environmental Evidence Bearing on the Identification and Location of the Rivers of Lower Khuzestan and the Position of the Head of the Persian Gulf ca 1200 BC–200 AD." *Akkadica* 128 (2007): 1–72.
- Frame, Grant. *Babylonia 689–627 B.C. A Political History*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1992.
- Fuchs, A. "Parsuaš." In *Reallexikon Der Assyriologie Und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, vol. 10, 340–41. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003.
- Fuchs, A. "Review of M. Waters, 2000." *ZA* 93 (2003): 128–37.
- Gerardi, Pamela De Hart. "Assurbanipal's Elamite Campaigns: A Literary and Political Study." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1987.
- Glassner, Jean-Jacques. *Mesopotamian Chronicles*. Edited by Benjamin R. Foster. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- Gorris, Elynn. *Power and Politics in the Neo-Elamite Kingdom*. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2020.
- Henkelman, W. F. M. *The Other Gods Who Are: Studies in Elamite-Iranian Acculturation Based on the Persepolis Fortification Texts*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2008.
- Henkelman, W. F. M. "Persians, Medes and Elamites. Acculturation in the Neo-Elamite Period." In *Continuity of Empire (?): Assyria, Media, Persia*, edited by Giovanni B. Lanfranchi, Michael Roaf, and Robert Rollinger. Padova: Sargon, 2003.
- Henkelman, W. F. M. "Tammariṭu." In *Reallexikon Der Assyriologie Und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, vol. 13, 432–33. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.
- Ito, Sanae. "Royal Image and Political Thinking in the Letters of Assurbanipal." University of Helsinki, 2015.
- Jas, R. "Zineni." In *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, vol. 3 (II), 1446–47. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2011.
- Konstantopoulos, Gina. "The Bitter Sea and the Waters of Death: The Sea as a Conceptual Border in Mesopotamia." *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 35, no. 2 (2020): 171–90.
- Leichty, Erle. "Bel-Epuš and Tammariṭu." *Anatolian Studies* 33 (1983): 153–55.

- Mayr, R. J. "The Lunar Eclipse of July 13, 653 B.C." In *Historical Prism Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal: Editions E, B 1-5, D and K.*, vol. 1, 105–9. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.
- Miroschedji, P. De. "La Localisation De Madaktu Et L'organisation Politique De L'elam A L'epoque Neo-Elamite." In *Fragmenta Historiae Elamicae: Mélanges Offerts À M.J. Steve*, edited by L. De Meyer, H. Gasche, and F. Vallat, 209–25. Paris: Editions Recherche Sur Les Civilisations, 1986.
- Miroschedji, P. De. "Susa and the Highlands: Major Trends in the History of Elamite Civilization." In *Yeki Bud, Yeki Nabud Essays on the Archaeology of Iran in Honor of William M. Sumner*, edited by Naomi F. Miller and Kamyar Abdi, 17–38. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology at UCLA, 2003.
- Novotny, Jamie R. "Classifying Assurbanipal's Inscriptions: Prisms C, Kh (= CND), and G." In *University of Chicago: Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization*, vol. 62, 127–35. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2008.
- Parpola, Simo. *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms*. Herstellung: Butzon and Bercker, 1970.
- Parpola, Simo, ed. *The Correspondence of Assurbanipal*. Part 1, *Letters from Assyria, Central Babylonia, and Vassal States*. SAA 21. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2018.
- Piepkorn, A. C. *Historical Prism Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal: Editions E, B 1-5, D and K*. Vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.
- Potts, D. T. *The Archaeology of Elam: Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Potts, D. T. "Elamite Ulā, Akkadian Ulaya, and Greek Choaspes: A Solution to the Eulaios Problem." *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 13 (1999): 27–44.
- Potts, D. T. "Madaktu and Badace." *Isimu* 2 (2001): 13–28.
- Potts, D. T. "The Persepolis Fortification Texts and the Royal Road: Another Look at the Fahliyan Area." In *L'archive Des Fortifications de Persépolis: État Des Questions et Perspectives de Recherches*, edited by W. F. M. Henkelman, P. Briant, and M. Stolper, 275–301. Persika 12. Paris: Éditions de Boccard, 2008.
- Reynolds, Frances, ed. *Babylonian Correspondence to Esarhaddon and Letters to Assurbanipal and Sin-Šarru-iškun from Northern and Central Babylonia*. SAA 18. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 2003.
- Russell, John Malcolm. *The Writing on the Wall: Studies in the Architectural Context of Late Assyrian Palace Inscriptions*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Starr, Ivan, ed. *Queries to the Sun God: Divination and Politics in Sargonid Assyria*. SAA 4. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1990.
- Stolper, M. W. "Hidali." In *Encyclopædia Iranica*, 2003. <https://iranicaonline.org/articles/hidali>.
- Stolper, M. W. "Sarnuppu." *Zeitschrift Für Assyriologie Und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 68 (1978): 261–69.
- Unger, Eckhard. "Din-Sarri." In *Reallexikon Der Assyriologie Und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, vol. 2, 228. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1938.
- Vaan, J. M. C. T. de. "Ich bin eine Schwertklinge des Königs": Die Sprache des Bēl-ibni. Kevelaer, Germany: Butzon and Bercker, 1995.
- Vallat, François. *Les Noms Géographiques Des Sources Suso-Élamites*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1993.
- Waterman, Leroy. *Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1930.
- Waters, M. W. "The Earliest Persians in Southwestern Iran: The Textual Evidence." *Iranian Studies* 32, no. 1 (1999): 99–107.
- Waters, M. W. "Menanu." In *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, vol. 2 (II), 748. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2001.
- Waters, M. W. *A Survey of Neo-Elamite History*. SAAS 12. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 2000.
- Waters, M. W. "Umbakidini." In *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, vol. 3 (II), 1379. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2011.
- Weszeli, M. "Illil-Bāni." In *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, vol. 2 (I), 519. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2000.
- Wright, Henry T., and Elizabeth Carter. "Archaeological Survey on the Western Ramhormoz Plain." In *Yeki Bud, Yeki Nabud: Essays on the Archaeology of Iran in Honor of William M. Sumner*, edited by Naomi F. Miller and Kamyar Abdi, 61–82. Cotsen Institute Monograph Series 48. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology at UCLA, 2003.
- Zadok, Ran. *Geographical Names According to New- and Late-Babylonian Texts*. Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes (RGTC) 8. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert, 1985.
- Zadok, Ran. "Iranian and Babylonian Notes." *Archiv Für Orientforschung* 28 (1981): 135–39.