



THE ELAMITE FAMILY (THE ROYAL FAMILY, ADOPTIONS)

Enrique Quintana

Centro de Estudios del Próximo Oriente y la Antigüedad Tardía (CEPOAT)

Universidad de Murcia (España)

Centre for Near Eastern and Late Antiquity Studies (CEPOAT)

University of Murcia (Spain)

ABSTRACT

The present topic is little known. No great interest has been dedicated to it. Only when studying the inheritance right to the throne scholars have glancingly mentioned something about family relations. The ancient royal incest theory has attracted most attention. Royal marriage between brother and sister, father and daughter, mother and son, has been in vogue among scholars, though not generally accepted. This theory, being definitely challenged and contested, due to the lack of any textual base, has not been followed nor incorporated. With the scarce documental sources at hand, the Elamite family is introduced unadorned. From the texts it appears a surprisingly monogamous royal Elamite family.

INDEX

INTRODUCTION

THE ELAMITE KINSHIP DESIGNATIONS

FAMILIAL IMAGERY IN ELAMITE ART

POLITICAL MARRIAGES WITH FOREIGN PRINCESSES

FILIATION AND LEGAL INHERITANCE OF THE THRONE

LEGAL OR JURIDICAL FAMILY, ADOPTIONS

FAMILY MEMBERS, LARGE FAMILY, KINGS WITHOUT CHILDREN

ELAMITE ROYAL MONOGAMY

ELAMITE FAMILY ACTIVITIES



INTRODUCTION

Elam was a civilization that roughly extended throughout three thousand years BC, wherefore it is a usual practice to divide the Elamite History into three parts according to the time the Elamite people lived, third millennium, second millennium and first millennium. This is also applied to their culture, religion and other topics, accordingly the following exposition will ensue from such a conventional understanding.

THE ELAMITE KINSHIP DESIGNATIONS

The textual information about the Elamite family, both common and royal, is very scanty, the same is valid for the imagery of family members. The most accuracy knowledge comes from the late second millennium, with the Igehalki's dynasty and his successors, including the ancient Shutrukid dynasty.

For the understanding of the topic treated, it is important to become acquainted with the basic kinship terms we know concerning the Elamite family (Hinz and Koch 1987, sub voce). So the terms referring to one single person: *amma* (mother), *atta* (father), *shak* (son), *pak* (daughter), *rutu* (spouse, wife), *igi* (brother), *ruhushak* (nephew), *ruhupak* (niece).

There are equally some collective references to the members of the family: *puhu* (children), *puhu kushik* (biological children), *ayanip* (members of the house), *kushhuhun* (whole descendants of the house; lit.: the circle of born children).

Other terms are nuanced by adjectives of unknown political or juridical significances, however it has been customary among scholars to understand them as having a certain degree of legitimacy to the throne. This of course is not explicit in the information supplied by the texts. These special terms, of which we offer a literal translation, are: *amma hanik* (beloved mother), *atta hanik* (beloved father), *shak hanik* (beloved son), *igi hanik* (beloved brother), *igi hamit* (older² brother), *amma shutu* (genuine mother), *igi shutu* (genuine brother), *rutu shutu* (legitimate wife), *ruhu hanik* (beloved offspring).

As to the term *shutu* it appears conventionally translated as “sister” in the Elamite dictionary (Hinz and Koch 1987: sub voce). This conventional translation is deduced from the texts of king Huteludush-Inshushinak, which include the expression *takme igi shutu ubeme*, conventionally: “for the life of my brothers and sisters”. This is grammatically erroneous though and it is known from a long time ago (König 1964: 227); who shows also that it is not logical to use two possessives in reference to “the life of my nephews” (*takkime ruhušak ubeni*) and “the life of my nieces” (*takkime ruhupak ubeni*), but only a unique possessive in reference to his brothers and sisters. In fact, the term *shutu* is not a substantive, but an adjective related to *shutur* (“law, right”), what allows us the rendering as



“legal, legitimate, genuine, true, authentic”, etc. (König 1965: 219), that is “the life of my legitimate brothers”.

Furthermore, a passage in a royal inscription of king Shilhak-Inshushinak I (König 1965: 102, n° 45 § 25), after listing a series of curses against anyone who should destroy the written text, the king adds on the expression *amma shutue hish ani kutun*, conventionally “that his mother-sister may not keep the name”, a translation which stays abstruse, as it would seem that the mother of every Elamite person would be at the same time a sister. Therefore the Elamite dictionary (Hinz and Koch 1987: 51 and 1186) essays: “*seine Mutter, seine Schwester...*” (“his mother, his sister...”), what is likewise grammatically forced, for there is only one possessive in the sentence. On the opposite hand, in no other Elamite text the mother is mentioned as a sister. It sounds obviously strange that the maledictor (curser) is remembering a concrete nameless sister, forgetting other sisters or brothers, what turns out to be rather incredible. Nevertheless, in this sense it would be grammatically more correct to translate: “that his genuine mother may not keep the name”. But in fact, this turns to be erroneous too, because the subject of the phrase is the word “name”, hence it is even more grammatical “of his genuine mother may the name not be kept”, that after all is at any rate more logically understandable as malediction (curse) (Quintana 2010: 53 note 44).

Some of the above mentioned terms have a wider meaning. Thus the term *shak* means in a broader sense “male descendant from a paternal line”, so a son, nephew, grandson, etc. descending from a man (particularly the king) from paternal line is his *shak*. It has sometimes been argued that the Persian king Darius I, in his Bisotun inscription, makes use of the term *ruhushak*, instead of *shak*, with the meaning “grandson” of his grandfather, but in this only case, the Elamite term is no more than a translation from the Persian word *nap̄sa*, that does not mean “grandson”, but “any paternal or maternal descendant other than son”, that is why the scribes chose to elect the Elamite term *ruhushak*, the most appropriate word to render his Persian (Quintana 2010: 50 and note 25).

Similarly, the term *ruhupak* (niece) can refer to a female direct descendant by female or collateral line (Quintana 2010: 50 and note 26). In the same way, *ruhushak* (nephew) can be a male direct descendant by female or collateral line (Glassner 2013: 219).

The term *igi* (brother) is particularly ambiguous, as it seems to be used also for referring to a sister, that is mainly deduced from the inscriptions of the Middle Elamite king Huteludush-Inshushinak (Lambert 1972: 61-76), who, after mentioning the names of his family members, males and females, he ends up saying that they are his *igi shutu ubeme*, “my genuine brothers/sisters” (Quintana 2010: 53 note 43).

A last term *amma hashduk* (mother ...-ed) is somehow disturbing, because whenever it appears in Akkadian context it is not translated into Akkadian. Whereby it

Copyright © 2016 C.E.P.O.A.T. - Instituto del Próximo Oriente Antiguo y de la Antigüedad Tardía. Murcia. <http://www.um.es/cepoat/elamita>.



may be assumed that the Elamites themselves considered it untranslatable into other languages, similarly to another Elamite term related to building, the word *siyankuk* (templar complex surrounded by a wall), that the Elamites did not translate in Akkadian context either. So, the understanding of the term *hashduk* creates difficulties by the fact that it seems to be a proper masculine name, as shown by a seal of a certain Ibni-Adad scribe, son of Hashduk. Therefore perhaps in this case we could find in that expression a political term or just an epithet of the queen, wife of the King and mother of the heir to the throne. This is supported by the attestations of the expression, for we know the names of some of them. Thus presented in a chronological sequence:

Pilkisa, *amma hashduk* of the Great Regent or Sukkalmah Temti-agum II. She appears in an Akkadian dedicatory text for the lives of some close relatives (although not qualified as brothers, sons, sisters or daughters, with the exception of his mother) of Temti-agum II's family.

NN, *amma hashduk* of the Sukkalmah Siwe-palar-hupak. An unnamed woman, mentioned in an Elamite text of this king, who in the first part of it makes some dedications "for" the life of his nameless mother, of his nameless heir of the dynasty and of his (future?) children.

Nahhunte-utu, *amma hashduk* of the king Huteludush-Inshushinak. She was king Shilhak-Inshushinak I's wife, father in turn of Huteludush-Inshushinak. Nahhunte-utu is mentioned in another Elamite text, alluded to above, of king Huteludush-Inshushinak dedicated "for the life of his mother and his brothers and sisters".

In the Achaemenid period, there was a noticeable extension of parental terms, where non-related people were called sons or daughters and the elderly were referred to as father or mother, expressing affection and respect. If this is an Elamite or Iranian tradition is a matter to be decided.

FAMILIAL IMAGERY IN ELAMITE ART

In the third millennium, the most ancient representation of members of an Elamite family is a cylinder seal that features two women and the divinized Shimashkian king Ebarat I (Carter 2014: 42). The seal shows the king bearded and seated on a throne, wearing a dress with one shoulder bare, and holding stylized flowers in his hand. His wife with an upraised hand is squatting on a cushion in front of him. A second squatting woman is seated behind the central king figure, nearly touching him with her upraised hand. They all are dressed distinctively as Shimashkians. The position of the king between two women is similar to that found almost a millennium later on the stela of Untash-Napirisha.



The seal bears a Sumerian inscription of the Ebarat's wife-whose name is not preserved. The layout is typical of Sumerian Ur III "royal presentation scene". The seal thus presents a synthesis of Iranian iconography and Mesopotamian format, which is normal given the contacts among the Iranian lands and the Sumerian Ur III state.

As for the second millennium, the Sukkalmah period has preserved seals and vases of servants and others functionaries, in some cases brothers, sons or nephews of the king.

Some centuries later, in the Igehalkid dynasty we find the famous statue of the queen Napirasu, the wife of king Untash-Napirisha (Carter 2014: 47-48). It is manufactured in copper and weighed more than 1.750 kilos (3700 pounds). Some indications show that the statue may have been plated with gold or silver. It bears an inscription written in Elamite on her skirt that evokes the queen's status. It states "I am Napirasu, wife of Untash-Napirisha..." it follows and ends up with a series of curses, and continues in Akkadian with an offering. The rest of the Akkadian text is not preserved.

Napirasu is also shown on the sandstone stela (2'62 meters) of Untash-Napirisha. The top register of the stela shows the god handing over the ring and staff of kingship to Untash-Napirisha. The king, identified by an inscription on his arm, faces the god. In the second register, the king is pictured between two women. Napirasu, whose name is written on her forearm, stands behind the king, whose arms are bent at the elbow. Both face right, toward the second woman, who faces them. The name on the arm of the second woman -perhaps to identify with the queen mother- is damaged. The position of the king, framed by two women on the stela and in the seal of Ebarat's wife underscores the significance for the Elamites of the family ties.

Another woman, Nahhunte-utu wife of the Shutrukid king Shilhak-Inshushinak I, is perhaps pictured in the bricks of a wall being part of a building called *kumpum kiduya* at Susa (Carter 2014: 48), a relief reconstructed from fragmentary yellow and green glazed bricks found on the city's Acropolis; they represent probably the royal couple. The bearded male with broad shoulders and narrow waist could probably be Shilhak-Inshushinak I.

A further familial representation is a scene engraved on a chalcedony pebble (Carter 2014: 43), showing the same king Shilhak-Inshushinak I and giving a jasper stone from the country of Puralsis to his "beloved daughter" Baruli. She was the last daughter of Shilhak-Inshushinak I and Nahhunte-Utu.

With regard to the first millennium, the fragmentary stela of the Neo-Elamite king Adda-hamiti-Inshushinak at Susa (Carter 2014: 48-49) shows a poorly preserved figure with the same size as the seated king who faces him. It is probably his wife, because of the feminine brooch she wears on her shoulder. The king wears a hat with a domed crown and pointed visor -remembering those worn by the hierarch Hanni at Malamir (see below)-, broad shoulders, narrow waist, elaborately decorated garment,



long straight beard, lion-headed bracelet, and staff. The fragmentary inscription informs about the king and his realm at Susa.

Somewhat later, the reliefs of the kinglet Hanni at Shekaft-e Salman, ancient Tarrisha, in Izeh valley at Malamir, pictures the figures of Hanni, his wife Huhin and his family, together with the priest Shutruru and his family (Carter 2014: 44-46). The inscriptions are fragmentary and poorly preserved, but we can deduce that Hanni got two children, a daughter named Ammatena and a son or daughter named Zashehshi or Hah[...], according to various erudite readings.

According to Carter (Carter 2014: 45), the panels were carved on either side of a cave at the back of a gorge cut by a spring. They are part of a family sanctuary dedicated to the goddess Mashti. A panel shows five figures, three large and two small. They proceed toward the left, to the entrance of the cave. The first small figure seems to be a child. The second large is a man, presumably Hanni, who hold his hands clenched with his index finger sticking up in a gesture of prayer. Behind him is a second large man, perhaps Shutruru, wearing a short kilt, hands clasped across the waist line. A second small person follows, and at the right a large female figure brings up the rear. She wears a long dress and large headdress or wig and holds her right hand up, fist clenched with the index finger raised like Hanni. Her left hand is placed across her chest. The inscriptions below the figures mention Hanni, the ruler of Ayapir and his family, as well as the priest Shutruru and his family.

Another panel preserves a long text and a figure, also representing Hanni. In the text, after his titles, Hanni states that he will establish images of himself, of Huhin his wife and of his children at Tarrisha. To the right of the inscription stands Hanni dressed in a kilt similar to those worn by the male figures described above.

Contemporaries with the Neo-Assyrian kings are Elamites, prisoners of war, who were pictured on wall-reliefs by the Assyrian king Assurbanipal in his palace at Ninive, present Mosul. In these reliefs, Elamite men and women accompanied by their children and baggage are carried out from Elam to Assyria, as a result of the Assyrian invasion of Elam in 646 B.C. They will end up deported and settled in Samaria.

POLITICAL MARRIAGES WITH FOREIGN PRINCESSES

Foreign marriages were a customary and habitual practice of Elamites through their history. The marriages served to assure political alliances with other realms or countries. Such unions are attested from the late third millennium B.C. and sometimes the queen's name is known (Quintana 2000: 157-158). Chronologically we can cite the following sequence:

Copyright © 2016 C.E.P.O.A.T. - Instituto del Próximo Oriente Antiguo y de la Antigüedad Tardía. Murcia. <http://www.um.es/cepoat/elamita>.



The unnamed ruler (governor or king) of Anshan, the capital city of Elam married the daughter of Shulgi, the Sumerian king of the powerful Ur III Empire.

A governor of Pashime, a region in the southwest of Khuzistan, did the same.

Ebarat I of Shimashki, a region of Elam, married a supposed Sumerian princess, daughter of one of the Ur III Sumerian kings.

Another unnamed king of Anshan married Matumniatum, the daughter of Iddin-Dagan III, king of Isin, a Sumerian city.

The Elamite governor of Susa Tan-Ruhurater II married Mekubi daughter of Bilalama governor of Eshnunna.

Some five hundred years later, in the Igihalkid dynasty of the Middle Elamite period, the Berlin Letter authored (hypothetically, Quintana 2010: 55) by king Halludush-Inshushinak, is a missive which aims to demonstrate the Elamite right to rule Babylonia through his royal lineage, tracing meticulously his ancestry, listing the royal intermarriages between Elamite kings and Kassites princesses. Almost the whole Igihalkids married Babylonian king's daughters: thus king Pahirishan married the daughter of Kurigalzu II of Babylone's daughter; Humban-numena ditto; their son Untash-Napirisha married Napirasu (supposed) daughter of a certain Burnaburiash of Babylone; their son Kidin-Hudurudish married the daughter of NN of Babylone; Haludush-Inshushinak married the (supposed) daughter of Melisipak of Babylone.

Following this line, the king Shutruk-Nahhunte I, the founder of the obsolete named Shutrukid dynasty, was married to Beyak a Kassite princess of an unknown father. Among other arguments (Quintana 2010: 45-63), this union along with the information provided by the Berlin Letter clearly shows that the Igihalkids and Shutrukids were part of the same dynasty consequently both, Igehalkids and Shutrukids, belong to the same lineage, a unique dynasty founded by the opportunistic Igihalki.

The first millennium does not provide information about the royal marriages practice, but we will see that Achemenid Persians will continue this practice to create alliances between different groups and even nations.

FILIATION AND LEGAL INHERITANCE OF THE THRONE

One of the most interesting features in the Elamite studies is the way the throne was transmitted inside the Elamite royal family. The sources provide sufficient information to decide that the throne was a transmission from father to son in every epoch (van Soldt 1990: 586), with the exception of the Kings usurpers, whose legitimacy was always a god or goddess. The Sukkalmah and Shutrukid dynasties in the second millenium B.C. have been most studied.

Copyright © 2016 C.E.P.O.A.T. - Instituto del Próximo Oriente Antiguo y de la Antigüedad Tardía. Murcia. <http://www.um.es/cepoat/elamita>.



The Sukkalmah dynasty has created much confusion, due to the multiple royal titles of the regent rulers. In this dynasty, according to the testimony of royal servant seals written in Sumerian language, the filiation is always presented from father to son (*Kukalla dumu Kuksharum*; *Ibni-Adad dumu Hashduk*), *dumu* is the Sumerian word for “son”. The same is valid for the royal family according to the royal inscriptions, either in Sumerian (*Kuknasur I dumu Silhaha*) and Elamite (*Kuk-Kirwas shak Lankuku*, cited by Shilhak-Inshushinak I). In some occasions the word for “son” is nuanced by a Sumerian term (*ki-ag*) meaning “beloved” (“*Kuksanit dumu ki-ag Temti-agum*”). In other cases is the word for “brother” (Sumerian *shesh*) (*Palaishan shesh ki-ag Temti-agum*).

A problematic expression comes into view as well in the texts. Both the Sumerian *dumu nin* (“son of the sister”, id est nephew) and the Akkadian *mar ahatishu* (same translation) are used to express royal filiation of a certain sovereign (*Attahusu dumu nin Silhaha*; *Temti-agum dumu nin Silhaha*; *Palaishan dumu nin Silhaha*; *Kuknasur dumu nin Silhaha*; etc.). This foreign term is translated as *ruhushak* in the Elamite texts of Shilhak-Inshushinak I, written some centuries later. This king assigns such a filiation for the first time to a king of the ancient Shimashki dynasty (*Itaddu ruhushak Hutrantemti*, König 1965: n° 48), but being an exception, for all the Shimashkian kings claim a direct filiation (“son of...”), it turns out to be unusable, even more so as the so called Itaddu remains an unidentified ruler, since we know four kings with the same or similar name, but with different filiation (*Idadu-Inshushinak dumu Biebi*; *Idadu I dumu Kindadu*; *Idattu II dumu Tan-Ruhurater II*) (Quintana 1994: 79).

This bizarre “son of the sister of” has been interpreted as meaning that the king got married with his sister, what is by no means obtained from the texts.

In fact, some texts are markedly revealing and transparent, as they differentiate both the biological and the political parentage. In this respect, the seal of Kuknasur II reads “Kuknasur son of the sister of Temti-agum, beloved son of Naririda” (*Kuknasur dumu nin Temti-agum dumu ki-ag Naririda*). In the same way, Kuk-Kirwas is referred to as “son of the sister of Silhaha” in contemporary documents, while in contrast Shilhak-Inshushinak I called him “son of Lankuku”.

That being so, the Elamite term *ruhušak* appears to be used for expressing a kingly legitimacy whenever a sovereign claims either, a parental relationship from other sovereign (nephew), or a far relationship in time (descendant), though in both cases from a collateral line.

On the other hand, following Steinkeller and contrary to the previous believing among scholars, Glassner has shown that “sukkalmah” was a title of an inferior rank than “king” (Glassner 2013: 322), consequently the king of Susa and Anshan was the supreme sovereign in the country Elam, followed by the sukkalmah and sukkals. This opportune suggestion is mainly based on an analysis of the cylinder of the Susian ruler Attahusu, which we translate “Eparti the king of Anshan and Susa, Silhaha is the first sukkalmah of



the country Anshan and Susa, Attahusu sukkal and *ibbir* of Susa, son of the sister of Silhaha, the temple of Nanna has built”. This translation differs slightly from that of other authors in the rendering of the Sumerian title *sukkalmah adda*, as we consider that the word *adda* (father) makes part and accompanies the word *sukkalmah* forming the compound *sukkalmah-adda*, “sukkalmah father” or better freely “first sukkalmah”, what fits perfectly with the fact that there were other great regents or sukkalmahs between Silhaha and Attahusu, such as Kuknasur I son of Silhaha, Temti-agum son of Silhaha’s sister, etc.

In the Shutrukid epoch the Elamite *ruhushak* is used precisely as in the Sukkalmah period, on the grounds that the texts show the royal power being transmitted from father to son, but whenever this son has no descendants, then it is his old brother who ascends to the throne, who at the same time transfers the right to his own son and so forth. The absence of male progeny hand over the right to a collateral member –the son of a sister– who become king, or lacking this, to a paternal uncle (brother of his father). In other words, the royal line follows the male progeny, that is why a *ruhushak* (collateral descendant) gets access to the throne only when a direct son (*shak*) is no more present, that is to say, when the male direct line gets cut off, then the line proceed to the collateral one; in this case the male (brother) is preferred to the female (sister), which is not completely excluded (sister’s son) (Quintana 2010: 57).

One last observation: In Elam no queen is attested, neither a governor woman, nor a feminine regent. According to the extant written texts and solely on textual basis, the woman does not play any role in transmitting the right to the royal throne.

LEGAL OR JURIDICAL FAMILY, ADOPTIONS

It is generally admitted that the Elamite common family could have a legal composition too, at least in the city of Susa, in the Sukkalmah period, in the early second millennium B.C. This legal family refers to adoptions as brother or son. The information is provided by the juridical archive of Susa (Scheil 1930 and 1932), a town conquered by the Shimashkian kings some time before and governed by the Elamite sukkalmahs. Only few tablets of this archive written in Akkadian language bear this topic, some of them so much fragmentary that are useless. There are no documents to assume whether this adoptional practice should be made extensible to the royal Elamite family, or to whole Elam. In the present state of knowledge, it was an exclusively Susian practice.

One text (Scheil 1930: n° 1) refers to an adoption in filiation with a simultaneous donation of the fortune from the adopting to the adopted, who become in this way the heir with respect to the things donated.



A second text (Scheil 1930: n° 3) describes that a certain Ilshubani adopts in brotherhood his aunt Atuta, his father's sister, although Ilshubani has no rights to the Atuta's possessions. Conversely he donates his properties to Atuta, like the previous example, because this fraternal adoption of the aunt obliges the nephew to donate his fortune to the inheriting aunt explicitly by a legal covenant. Thus the aunt becomes a universal heir of her nephew's fortune.

Another important and commented document (Scheil 1932: n° 321) informs us of a lawsuit concerning the property of an estate with house and garden. It narrates in detail the juridical case of an adoption in brotherhood contested in trial, which allows us to identify the origin of the rule invoked by the tribunal.

Here is the case: A certain Ahuhutum possessed this estate and his son Beli inherited it. Two sons of a certain Damqiya (Lulu and Anihshushim) were claiming that the fortune Beli would have inherited through his dead father from his adoptive uncle should be handed over to them. But Beli replies that Damqiya son of Anihshushim (the grand-father of the other Anihshushim, Damqiya's son) has adopted his father as his brother, according to the rule that adoption as a brother creates a brother-relationship, and adoption as a son creates a son -relationship, and thus the land of Ahuhutum belongs to him.

He had inherited that estate from his own father Anihshushim, who had obtained it through a division with his brother Amurnuhshu. Although Beli received judgement in his favour it was because his adoptive uncle Damqiya had once made over the fortune to his adopted brother by a deed of gift. According to the customary law of inheritance Beli would have gone away empty-handed, only Damqiya's own children, the two plaintiffs would have inherited.

The origin of this norm was laid down by god Inshushinak –the city-god of Susa and goddess Ishmekarab, the death-goddess. These divinities also laid down the effects of the adoption: the son of the deceased adopted as a brother inherited the goods and estates that the adopting possessed in the moment of the adoption. A tablet (Scheil 1932: n° 286) confirms that the patrimonial effects of the adoption in brotherhood were limited to the things handed over by the adopting to the adopted. In short, the adoption was a right of inheritance on the property donated to the adopted person, but in case of an adopting person dead childless, the adopted inherited all his fortune. In this way, the adoption was used between related people (brother and sister, uncle and nephew, etc.) or strangers to switch the line of succession. However, the brother's right of inheritance was no longer sufficient by itself even in the case of the testator being childless. The fortune had to be made over to the adopted brother as a gift while the testator was still alive. The case against Beli shows that in the matter of the inheritance, things had been transacted in accordance with the legal path which the gods had established regarding brotherhood.



This fraternal system, giving a brother preference to inherit before a son, had the basic principle that brothers held their fortunes in common. Their fortune belonged to them jointly, what the one obtained by his labours whether in money or not, was the property of the other. Whichever of the two is first to die charges his adoptive brother with the burial. If one of them should say to the other you are not my brother, then the punishment was to pay money and suffer body amputations (ten minas of gold and gets his hand and tongue cut off).

This right of the brother in the fraternal system is only attested in the Sukkalmah period. After this time, it had been displaced by a patriarchal system with reversion of inheritance to the children alone. It is this way how it is explained the case of the above mentioned Damqiya. The Achaemenid times show that patriarchal system was still prevalent and husbands and brothers had far more rights and privileges than their wives or sisters.

In summary, in Elamite Susa women owned properties, which they could sell or lease. After the death of her husband, the widowed wife inherited from the deceased even if she did not have children.

FAMILY MEMBERS, LARGE FAMILY, KINGS WITHOUT CHILDREN

The sources for our knowledge about the Elamite family composition are scanty. In the Old Elamite period, that of Shimashkians and Sukkalmahs, due to the dedicatory objects, list of kings, chronicles or annals and literary texts, mainly from Mesopotamian origin, we are acquainted with king's brothers, sons and nephews. The wife (or wives) is a topic will be dealt with in the following chapter.

The Middle Elamite period allows us to get some slightly better information (Malbran-Labat 1995: 59-120; König 1965: 36-141), according to which the Elamite family was not particularly large, with one exception. In the Igehalkid and Shutrukid dynasties, the names and number of some family subjects are known. Thus Igehalki the founder of his own dynasty had two sons, Pahirishan and Attarkitah, who both were kings. Pahirishan' sons Kitin-Hutran and Unpashash-Napirisha were also kings, but no children are extant in documents.

The Shutrukids yield more names. Shutruk-Nahhunte I had three sons, Kutir-Nahhunte II, childless, Simut-nikatash, childless, and Shilhak-Inshushinak I, who produced six girls and six boys, two of them were kings. All of these are mentioned by their name. After this last king, it is only known that Huteludush-Inshushinak, his son, had nephews and nieces, but no children. His brother Silhina-hamru-Lakamar was king and from him on his son, grandson etc.



In the Neo-Elamite epoch, the kinglet Hanni alluded to previously can be observed in art with his wife and two children. Slightly later, thanks to the annals of Neo-Assyrian kings, we find out a large Neo-Elamite family (Waters 2006a), wherein it is known that king Ummanigas I had two nephews, who both were kings; king Hallushu had two sons, kings as well. Somewhat later, an unknown king generated four brothers who were kings (Waters 2006b): Ummanaldas I, Ummanaldas II (he had three sons), Urtaku (three sons and two grandsons) and Teuman (three sons). An ample group of family members, from which we know even the names of all masculine children, but ignore the subsequent events.

Finally, on the stone walls of the Assurbanipal's palace at Ninive, there can be seen adult Elamite prisoners sometimes accompanied by a single child.

This examples and the information provided by the texts allow us to summarize that in the various Elamite dynasties there was not a large family, all the more since some dying kings were childless. Only the Middle Elamite king Shilhak-Inshushinak I and some Neo-Elamite kings were part of an apparent large family. Nevertheless it is legitimate for everyone to imagine heirs and other descendants not mentioned in texts.

ELAMITE ROYAL MONOGAMY

Polygamy, concubinage and even incest are Occidental ideas about the Oriental people, but into the Elamite world such ideas are neither attested nor are supported by the texts. As we have previously mentioned and will see next, only one wife –and not precisely the alleged sister- is attested in every case.

In the third millennium we know the “beloved” wife of the Elamite and Shimashkian king Ebarat I through her own seal. She was one of the royal princesses of Ur who married a foreign Elamite king, from the evidence shown by diplomatic contacts between these kings and those of Ur.

It is of concern to highlight that the Sumerian kings gave significance to the fact that their daughters got married to Elamite nobles, governors or kings, what is demonstrated by the year names commemorating the most important events of their reign (Quintana 2000: 157-158). It happened this way with Shulgi's daughters. The Sumerian king married them to both the king of Anshan and a governor of Pashime, a region in the southwest of Elam. Another year name of the Sumerian king Iddin-Dagan III of the city of Isin, celebrates the marriage of his daughter Matumniatum to the king of Anshan.

A famous woman, daughter of Bilalama, governor of Eshnuna, and “beloved” wife of Tan-Ruhurater II, the ruler of Susa, dedicated a text for the life of his husband, in building a temple in Susa for her goddess Ishtar. This is something extraordinary in Ancient Near Eastern history.

Copyright © 2016 C.E.P.O.A.T. - Instituto del Próximo Oriente Antiguo y de la Antigüedad Tardía. Murcia. <http://www.um.es/cepoat/elamita>.



The seals and texts whose owner is a woman, a wife of an important governor or king, and the celebrations of royal unions with not native kings do not speak in favour of a concubinage or Harem, but of a single spouse. It is true that this does not contradict the existence of a Harem, while not supporting it.

The Sukkalmah epoch does not procure anything useful in this respect. On the contrary, the subsequent dark period provides subtle information, found on a presage amongst the texts of Haft-Tepe. This presage refers that if a certain event should happen, the wife of the concerned person would die. This notice is of concern for the topic we are dealing with.

The next evidence emerges somewhat later, in the late second millennium. Here, the Ighalkid dynasty reports more available data. The Berlin Letter listing the royal intermarriages between Elamite kings and Kassite princesses equates one single wife with one single king: so king Pahirishan married the daughter of Kurigalzu II; Humban-numena idem; Untash-Napirisha married Napirasu daughter of Burnaburiash; Kidin-Hudurudish married the daughter of an unknown ruler; Haludush-Inshushinak married the daughter of Melisipak.

It is noticeable that king Humban-numena mentions two women named Rishapla and Mishimru, unfortunately it is not recorded in the text neither a title nor an epithet or even parentage attributed to them. They both are perhaps daughters or wife and daughter, but in no event mother, as she is referred to separately though unhappily as well as nameless.

The wife of King Untash-Napirisha is the author of an inscription on a magnificent statue, as already mentioned above. In the text, she is entitled “wife” (*rutu*), and not “principal wife”, or “first wife”, or something similar. This is also of concern for the topic we are dealing with.

The Shutrukid dynasty has customarily been the source for the incest theory. For years scholars have claimed that the queen Nahhunte-utu got married to her father Shutruk-Nahhunte I, to her brothers Kutir-Nahhunte II and Shilhak-Inshushinak I and to her son Huteludush-Ishushinak, becoming an extraordinary and exceptional historical case of incest. However, as we have made reference to above, this system has been completely challenged and contested (Quintana 2010: 45-63), because the texts only evidence, when alluded to, one wife for each king. Thus Beyak is the attested name of Shutruk-Nahhunte I's wife and Nahhunte-utu is the attested Shilhak-Inshushinak I's single wife and Huteludush-Inshushinak's mother.

The first millennium follows the same pattern whenever evidence is found. We have already noticed Huhin the wife of Hanni, prince of Ayapir. This man only mentions



one wife. She is represented in reliefs not accompanied by other women or secondary wives.

Somewhat later in the rare Bronze plaque of Persepolis, which bears an inscription of a certain Ururu or Oruru, it is stated that a woman designated as Ammaten is the wife of Bahuri, a Neo-Elamite hierarch. We have here perhaps the same person as Ammatena, the Hanni's daughter.

In Achaemenid time, it is said that polygamy and concubines existed; marriage with close relatives even brothers and sisters was practiced. But in fact, there are not substantiated evidences for that. When notices are found, only one wife is mentioned, as in the case of a daughter of king Darius I, who is referred to as 'the wife of Mardonius, daughter of the king'. Even only one wife of Darius I, Artistone, and of Darius II, Parisatys, are mentioned frequently in Neo-Babylonian documents. It is certainly documented that Cambyses and Bardiya are described as descendants of "the same father and the same mother". An ambiguous statement which could imply that there were other children from a different mother, maybe or maybe not. In any case, Persia and Elam were different entities.

While it is true that polygamy cannot be rejected at all, the common scholarly divulged incest is not explicit in any source; yet it does not appear neither indirectly nor circumstantially. Elamite incest is no more than a baseless scholar construct, which has been taken for granted without justification.

ELAMITE FAMILY ACTIVITIES

Nothing or little is known about this topic. In the juridical tablets of Susa in the Old-Babylonian period, studied elsewhere in this work, is noteworthy the case of a man who leaves his whole fortune to his wife, due to the fact that she has cared for him; moreover the sons will be allowed to inherit on condition that they will remain with the mother and care for her. These tablets bear also the information that women owned and administered properties, estates, etc.

Outside these tablets and period, the scanty references we can cite about familial activities inside the Elamite family are reduced to the following:

In the Kidinuid dynasty -Middle Elamite period-, some texts of the Haft-Tepe site (nº 1) mention bracelets as royal gifts for the daughter of noble persons, and in presages (nº 207) the disgrace of the heir, his wife or one of his sons.

The family members occupy a space in the memory of the kings of the Igihalkid dynasty. Humban-numena remembers his mother thankful to her for his kingship. His son

Copyright © 2016 C.E.P.O.A.T. - Instituto del Próximo Oriente Antiguo y de la Antigüedad Tardía. Murcia. <http://www.um.es/cepoat/elamita>.



Untash-Napirisha erects temples to the gods and goddesses asking for the blessing of his whole family in return.

In the Shutrukid dynasty, it has been mentioned the gift that the king Shilhak-Inshushinak I has given to his daughter Baruli. It is in this dynasty where it is found most information about the love and consideration the members of the family have for each other. The so-called texts of *takkime* (“for the life of...”), written down by the King Shilhak-Inshushinak I and his son Huteludush-Inshushinak are an impressive testimony of this motif. In such texts, all the family members are cited by his complete name, the father, the wife, the mother, the brothers, the sisters, the children, the nephews, the nieces. The king is asking the divinities for the life of all of them, making their figures and sculptures in miniature and introducing them in the temples for the familial protection.

Some centuries later, as mentioned, the prince Hanni and his family (wife and children) is represented in rock-reliefs carrying out some religious ceremonies.

The Neo-Assyrian texts of the king Assurbanipal show the royal Elamite family and the nobles of Elam in the act of fleeing altogether from Elam to Assyria, escaping the dead-threats of other family members, notably the king’s brother (Quintana 2000: 114-115 n° 316, 317 and 318, 130 n° 363). The assassination of the royal heir or even the regnant king were customary in Neo-Elamite period, an epoch contemporary to Neo-Assyrian kings.

We finally can cite the Achaemenid times, in which some unsure Elamite features could have survived with regard to Elamite family. Thus, based on Fortification and Treasury tablets from Persepolis (509-438 BC), the texts indicate distinctions of status between various members of the royal household. The royal women used titles determined by their relationship with the king. Thus the King’s mother was at the highest rank. The next was the queen (the wife and mother of the crown prince) followed by the kings’ daughters and sisters. Funerary customs commemorating the death of royal women also reflect the official recognition of the king’s mother and wife.

The Achaemenid family had employed women for the care of some minors. Thus a certain woman named Artim, the nanny for a royal daughter, received a rent for a property she owns; another female employee in the royal court, called Madamis, was to pay tax for the property of an estate.

The royal women (king’s mother, wife and daughters) owned large properties and were involved in managing their assets. They travelled widely visiting their estates and administered their wealth individually; participated in economic activities and other economic units. Quite the opposite, neither the Fortification texts nor the Greek evidence suggest that Achaemenid royal women played any part in religious ceremonies.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carter, E. 2014. Royal Women in Elamite Art. In Kozuh M., Henkelman W.F.M., Jones Ch.E., and Woods Chr. (eds.) *Extraction & Control: Studies in Honor of Matthew W. Stolper. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization* (SAOC). The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 68: 41-61.

Cuq, E. 1932. Le Droit élamite d'après les actes juridiques de Suse. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale*, 29: 149-182.

De Miroschedji, P. 1986. La localisation de Madaktu et l'organisation politique de l'Elam à l'époque néo-élamite. In De Meyer, L. Gasche, H., Vallat, F. (eds.). *Fragmenta Historiae Aelamicae, Mélanges offerts à M.J. Steve*. Paris: Editions Recherches sur les civilisations, 209-226.

Dijk van, J.J. 1986. Die dynastischen Heiraten zwischen Kassiten und Elamern: eine verhängnisvolle Politik. *Orientalia* 55: 159-170.

Grillot, F. 1988. A propos d'un cas de "lévirat" élamite. *Journal Asiatique* 276: 61-70.

Glassner J.J. 1994. Ruhušak-mar ahatim: la transmission du pouvoir en Elam. *Journal Asiatique* 282: 219-236.

_____ 1998. Question de succession en Elam: mise au point. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* n° 2 (juin) 45.

_____ 2013. Les premiers sukkalmah et les derniers rois de Simaski. In De Graef, C., Tavernier, J. (eds.), *Susa and Elam, Archaeological, Philological, Historical and Geographical Perspectives, Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse* 58. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 319-328.

Goldberg, J. 2004. The Berlin Letter, Middle Elamite Chronology and Šutruk-Nahhunte I's Genealogy. *Iranica Antiqua* 39: 33-42.

Grillot, F., Glassner, J.J. 1991. Problèmes de succession et cumuls de pouvoirs: une querelle de famille chez les premiers sukkalmah? *Iranica Antiqua* 26: 85-99.

Hinz, W. 1964. Legal life in old Elam. In *Persia c.1800-1550 B.C. Cambridge Ancient History* II/vii, Cambridge University Press, 282-283.

Hinz, W., Koch, H. 1987. *Elamisches Wörterbuch*. Teil I (A-H), Teil II (I-Z). Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Copyright © 2016 C.E.P.O.A.T. - Instituto del Próximo Oriente Antiguo y de la Antigüedad Tardía. Murcia. <http://www.um.es/cepoat/elamita>.



König, F.W. 1926. Mutterrecht und Thronfolge im alten Elam. *Festschrift der National Bibliothek in Wien*, Wien: Österreichische Staatsdruckerei, 529-552.

_____ 1964. Geschwisterehe in Elam, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, Band 3, Berlin-Leipzig-New York: W. de Gruyter, 224-231.

_____ 1965. *Die elamischen Königsinschriften*. *Archive für Orientforschung*, Beiheft 16, Graz: E. Weidner. (Reprint, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1977).

Lambert, M. 1972. Hutelutush-Inshushinak et le pays d'Anzan. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Oriental* 66: 61-76.

Malbran-Labat, F. 1995. *Les Inscriptions royales de Suse*, Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux.

Quintana, E. 1994. Los gobernantes elamitas. *Aula Orientalis* XII, 73-94.

_____ 1996. Humban-numena I un usurpateur à la royauté en Elam? *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* n° 4 (Décembre) 106.

_____ 2000. *Textos y fuentes para el estudio de Elam*. *Estudios Orientales* IV, Centro de Estudios del Próximo Oriente y La antigüedad Tardía. Universidad de Murcia.

_____ 2004. ¿Shutruknaunte II o Shuturnaunte I contemporáneo de Sargón II de Asiria? *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* n° 1 (Mars) 16.

_____ 2010. Filiación y acceso al trono en Elam (2ª mitad II milenio a.C.). *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Oriental* 104: 45-63.

_____ 2011. Elamitas frente a Persas: El reino independiente de Anshan. In Alvarez Mon, J.A., Garrison, M.B. (eds.), *Elam and Persia Monograph*. Chicago: Eisenbrauns, 167-185. English Summary 186-190.

Scheil, V. 1930. *Actes juridiques susiens (I)*, *Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse* XXII, Paris: E. Leroux. [Nrs. 1 to 165].

_____ 1932. *Actes juridiques susiens (II)*, *Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse* XXIII, Paris: E. Leroux. [Nrs. 166 to 327].

Steve, M.J., Vallat, F. 1989. La dynastie des Igihalkides: nouvelles interpretations. In De Meyer, L. Haering, E. (eds.), *Archeologia Iranica et Orientalis, Miscellanea in honorem Louis van den Berghe*, vol. I, Gent: Peeters, 223-238.

Vallat, F. 1985. Hutelutush-Inshushinak et la famille royale élamite. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Oriental*, 79/1: 43-50.

Copyright © 2016 C.E.P.O.A.T. - Instituto del Próximo Oriente Antiguo y de la Antigüedad Tardía. Murcia. <http://www.um.es/cepoat/elamita>.



_____ 1994. Succession royale en Elam au II^{ème} millénaire. In De Meyer, L., Gasche, H., Tanret, M., Jansen, C., Degraeve, A. (eds.). *Cinquante deux réflexions sur le proche-orient ancien, Mélanges offerts à Léon de Meyer, Mesopotamian History and Environment*. Occasional Publications 2. Leuven-Paris: Peeters, 1-14.

_____ 1997. Nouveaux problèmes de succession en Elam. *Iranica Antiqua* 32: 53-70.

_____ 1999. L'hommage de l'Elamite Untash-Napirisha au Cassite Burnaburiash. *Akkadica* 114-115: 109-117.

_____ 2006. La chronologie méso-élamite et la lettre de Berlin, *Akkadica* 127 fasc. 2, 123-136.

van Soldt, W.H. 1990. Matrilinearität A. In Elam. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, Band 7. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 586-588.

Waters, M. 2006 a. A Neo-Elamite Royal Family. *Iranica Antiqua* 41: 59-69.

_____ 2006 b. Four Brothers and a Throne. In Guinan, A. Ellis, M.J., Ferrara A.J., Freedman, S.M., Rutz, M.T., Sassmannshausen, L., Tinney, S., Waters, M.V. (eds.). *If a Man Built a Joyful House, Assyriological Studies in Honor of E.V. Leichty*. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 499-502.

Yusifov, Y.B. 1974. The problem of the order of succession in Elam again. *Acta Antiquae Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* XXII, 321-331.