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§1. Introduction
The cuneiform bricks and fragments published here for the first time are preserved in the National Car Museum of Iran (NCMI) located in Tehran. Founded in 2001, the NCMI is affiliated with the Museums Cultural Institute of the Mostazafan Foundation of the Islamic Revolution. The museum is comprised of two departments: distinctively, a collection of 42 classic cars, but a small fraction of those once owned by the last Shah of Iran, and one of ancient objects, including historical doors (ca. 12th century AD) and ceramic works (ca. 18th century AD), and the texts published here. This second collection belongs to the Treasury Department of the Mostazafan Foundation Museums. We know of no other cuneiform artifacts in the NCMI. The texts lack archeological records, and the circumstances of their acquisition are not known to us. We would like to thank Mohammad Reza Javaheri, Cultural Director of the Mostazafan Foundation Museums, Turaj Hosseini, Director of the National Car Museum of Iran, Parisa Andami, Chief of the Cultural Institute of the Mostazafan Foundation Museums, and Shahram Moghaddam, Chief of the Architectural Treasury of the Mostazafan Foundation Museums, for their kind generosity and invaluable assistance during this project.1

§2. The Texts
§2.1. NCMI Text 1 (figure 1)
Artifact type: Akkadian brick
Measurements: 320 × 80 × 110mm
Provenience: Deh-e-no (?)
Date: Middle Elamite
Parallels: Steve in MDP 53, pp.11-13 (our 2a and 2b2)

§2.1.1. Transliteration and Translation

1. diši-gi-ḫa-te-et ma-an-za-at iš-si₂ iš-me-šu-ma
   (2a diši-gi-ḫa-te-et ma-an-za-at iš-si₂ iš-me-šu-ma)
   (2b2 diši-gi-ḫa-te-et ma-an-za-at iš-si₂ iš-me-šu-ma)

2. šar-ru-ut šu-ši₂-im u₃ an-za-an id-di-iš-šu-um-ma ku-ku-na ša₂
   (2a eššana-ut šu-ši₂-im u₃ an-za-an id-di-iš-šu-um-ma ku-ku-na ša₂)
   (2b2 šar-ru-ut šu-ši₂-im u₃ an-za-an id-di-iš-šu-um-ma ku-ku-na ša₂)

3. e-mi-ir-ti-im la-bi-ra u₂-uš-ši₂-iš-ma a-na ma-an-za-ti
   (2a e-pi-ir-ti la-bi-ra u₂-uš-ši₂-iš-ma a-na ma-an-za-ti)
   (2b2 e-pi-ir-lašša la-bi-ra u₂-uš-ši₂-iš-ma a-na ma-an-za-ti)

4. id-di₁-im-ma ma-an-za-at ba-la-ṭa₂-am da-ra <li₃-
   id-di-iš-šu
   (2a aš-in ṯ₃-ma-an-za-at ba-la-ṭa₂-am da-ra li-id-di-iš-šu)
   (2b2 id-di₁-im-ma ma-an-za-at ba-la-ṭa₂-am da-ra <li₃-
   (li-id-di-iš-šu)

5. šar-ru-ut ḫu₃-ud li-ib-bi li-ša-pi₂-iš-su₂
   (2a eššana-ša-ḫu₃-ud li-ib-bi li-ša-pi₂-iš-su₂)
   (2b2 šar-ru-ut ḫu-ud li-ib-bi ṯ₃-li-ša-pi₂-iš-su₂)

1. Igi-ḫatet called Manzat; she heard him and
2-3. bestowed the kingship of Susa and Anšan on him,

---

1 P. Daneshmand presented the Akkadian brick in the Cuneiform Reading Group that was held at the Griffith Institute’s Teaching Room at the University of Oxford on 4 March 2014. We must thank all participants in that session, including Stephanie Dalley, Kathrin Kelley, Marie-Christine Ludwig, Christopher Metcalf, and Klaus Wagemonner, for their invaluable suggestions. We are also grateful to Abdoulmajid Arfaee and Daniel T. Potts for their generous help. As for the Assyrian fragment, we are indebted to Grant Frame who, during his stay in Oxford, kindly cooperated with Daneshmand and noticed that this fragment is an Assurnasirpal II text. Most of all, thanks are due to Jacob Dahl for his careful reading of the manuscript, and his generous advice and helpful corrections.

2 For the sake of clarity and comparison, a score apparatus for the three tablets is given here.
and be (=Igi-hatet) renewed the old \textit{kukunnû} of baked brick and gave it to Manzat.

4. May she (=Manzat) give him a long life!

5. May she (=Manzat) provide him a joyful kingship!

§2.1.2. Commentary

§2.1.2.1. Philological Remarks

1. Steve read \textit{iš-tar} instead of \textit{iš-si} and took Manzat-Ištar to be a syncretized Elamite-Babylonian god. Although Manzat is parallel to Ištar, no other document confirms such a reading. Moreover, in all three bricks, the second sign is a clear ZI, not GI, meaning that a reading \textit{tar} (deriving from GI(4) = târu) is without foundation. But the reading \textit{iš-si}, from the verb \textit{šasû}, 'to call,' fits the context, and corresponds to \textit{šamû}, 'to hear,' following it. The lack of (at least orthographic) assimilation of \textit{s} to \textit{ss} is frequent and is found in other texts, for instance, in the Old Babylonian Epic of Zu cited by \textit{CAD} \textit{Š/II}, p. 153: \textit{iš-si-a-am}. Attestation of \textit{ss} instead of \textit{ss} in the present brick inscription is confirmed by \textit{li-še-pi-iš-su} at the end of line 5. The occurrence of Manzat without \textit{iš-si} in lines 3 and 4 strengthens this suggestion.

2. \textit{kukunnû} / gigunû, denoting a sacred building generally devoted to Inšušinak, is a well attested term; cf. \textit{CAD} \textit{G}, pp. 67ff. and also Malbran-Labat 1995: 187. The end of the line is broken, so the last sign is not clear. One may expect a "mimation" for \textit{kukunnû}; however, it looks more like \textit{ša}.

3. \textit{e-mi-ir-ti-im} is a hapax legomenon in this text. The two texts published by Steve give \textit{epirtu}, a common form for 'baked brick.' For the \textit{b/p} and \textit{b/m} assimilation, see \textit{GAG} §27. The finite verb \textit{a₂-uš-si₂-iš-ma} is attested in \textit{MDP} 23, 282 10.

4. The sign DI in \textit{id-di-im-ma} is doubtful; however, as far as the photo shows, the verb \textit{nadânû} is probably attested in (2b2): \textit{id-di-in} (Steve 1987: pl. 1). As regards brick (2a), the verb is more obscure. One may read the first sign as \textit{AŠ: aš-in: iddin}. This hypothesis can be questioned in three ways: first of all, one may argue that the sign is not a well written \textit{AŠ} (more likely BI). Secondly, it is well known that the sign \textit{AŠ} for \textit{nadânû} is normally used in writing proper names, and finally, since the whole text is written syllabically, the use of a single logogram is not expected. Steve tried to read these words as \textit{uš₂-le-er} and \textit{uš₂-iš₂-ir}, taken from \textit{uššuru}, but his reading matches neither the photos nor the meaning. Until a new collation of the tablets 2a and 2b is done, it is not possible to be sure of this verb.

§2.1.2.2. General Remarks

§2.1.2.2.1. This inscription belongs to an Elamite king whose name was not recognized in previously published materials. Two texts similar to the brick were published by M.-J. Steve in \textit{MDP} 53, pp. 11-13. All three texts speak of rebuilding the temple of the goddess Manzat by the king. According to Steve, as a part of a 1978 survey conducted by M. S. Ganjavi at Deh-e-no in the Iranian province of Khuzestan, François Vallat had recognized two duplicate bricks (our 2a and 2b2) that he in turn permitted Steve to publish. Brick 2a at the very beginning of the line 1, where the name of the king is written, is broken, and just two signs \textit{i-gi} are legible. Brick 2b2 is better preserved in this section, and the signs \textit{i-gi-Ìa-te-} can be easily read. The sign after \textit{ha} is clearly a TE sign, misread by Steve as LI. The sign after TE is partly damaged; however, it is not a KI sign, but ID. Despite all this, Steve reconstructed the name of the king as \textit{i-gi-Ìa-li-ki}, concluding that the bricks belonged to \textit{Igi-halki}, whose name was already attested in the genealogy of \textit{∑ilÌak-Inšušinak} as the father of \textit{PaÌir-ishišan} and \textit{Attar-kittaÌ}. Since no available documents display any trace of \textit{Igi-halki}'s kingship at Susa and Anšan, Steve was confident that "we now know that he reigned," a hasty conclusion on the basis of his reading of the two aforementioned bricks. By this inference, the bricks were dated to ca.1400 BC when the \textit{Igi-halkid} house gained power.
§2.1.2.2.2. Our NCMI brick, however, clearly demonstrates that the name of the king is written as i-gi-ba-te-et (Igi-hatet) with an ID-sign at the end of the name preceded by the sign TE. Thus Igi-hatet is the correct name of the king, and since he is not cited in the genealogy of Šīlḥaq-Inšišīnak or in the other documents related to Igi-haltē's sons, he should be dated to a different dynasty. Among legal documents published in MDP 4, there are two names of significance in this regard: Amma-hatet and Atta-hatet are written syllabically as am-ma-ba-te-et and at-ta-ba-te-et, respectively, parallel to i-gi-ba-te-et. Other occurrences of Atta-hatet can be found such Haf-Tappe texts as HT 82: 4.7 These names are translated by Hinz as “Be (your) mother’s favorite!” and “Be (your) father’s favorite!”, respectively.8 Since igi in Elamite means “brother”, a name Igi-hatet, “Be (your) brother’s favorite!”, fits this pattern.9 An additional point in favor of this argument is the script of the three bricks. Paleographically, the signs in these bricks are not properly identical to those of well known Akkadian texts found within Elam. Consequently, we should refer back to Scheil’s 1932 statement: “Nowhere is it stated that Igi Halki reigned, but he could very well have founded a dynasty.”

§2.1.2.2.3. In cases like Tepti-halki and Igi-halki, the element halki is written as halki. Nonetheless, the attribution of these bricks to Igi-halki made its way into a variety of secondary publications that have dealt with the history of ancient Elam. Consequently, we should refer back to Scheil’s 1932 statement: “Nowhere is it stated that Igi Halki reigned, but he could very well have founded a dynasty.”

§2.1.2.2.4. How then is this new king to be dated? MDP 22, 160, provides notable documentation in our discussion. Palaeographically, this tablet is quite similar to our text 1. The name of Susa is written with both ši₂ and with mimiation: (35-26) i-na šu-ši₂-im i-na ki-de-en dšušin in-ta-ga-ru, ‘In Susa, they came to an agreement in the kingdom of Inšišīnak.’ According to the text, the participants in the agreement swore an oath by the life of Kuk-nāṣur, the sukkal of Elam, and also by the life of Kuduzuluš, the king of Susa, referring to the rulers of the sukkalmah dynasty: (25-27) mu ku-uk-na-šu-ur₂ sukkal nim-ma-tim u₃ ku-du-zu-lu-u₃ lugal šu-ši₂-im it-mu-u₃.13 However, the attestation of the “kingship of Susa and Anšan” characteristic of Middle Elamite, instead of the “king/kingship

The genealogy of Šīlḥaq-Inšišīnak is published in EKI 48 & 2 and MDP 11, 96 = EKI 48b & 3. The lack of the name of the Igi-hatet in the genealogy cannot be problematic as some other names like Atta-halki are not mentioned in this document, despite the fact that they are well known Elamite kings through their individual bricks; cf. Malbran-Labat 1995: 30-33. A broken text first published by Hüsing (1916: 86) speaks of rebuilding the temple of Manzat (see also EKI 42). The further research in Deh-e-no revealed some other fragments which showed that Ṣatrukh-Naḥḫunte was the king who rebuilt the temple of Manzat; cf. Or 37, 299-303. Since he refers to the previous kings whose names were written on the bricks of the temple, one may expect that he had seen Igi-hatet’s brick and was aware of him, while there is no evidence which proves his son, Šīlḥaq-Inšišīnak dealt with Manzat’s sanctuary that it may explain why he did not mention the name of Igi-hatet in his genealogy. It is possible that there is no genealogical kinship between the Iğibalkis, the Šatrukid, and Igi-hatet.

MDP 4, pp. 169, 183.

Herrero & Glassner 1993: 104; see also HT 339: 5 at page 122: [..]-ba-te-et.

ZA 58, 70.


10 In terms of phonology, the inclusion of “mimation” in words such as šu-ši₂-im, e-mi-ir-ti-im and ba-la-ta₂-am, refers to an era earlier than the 14th century BC. The bricks published by Steve seemingly lack mimiation, so that this amalgam is suggestive of a very late Old Elamite or an early Middle Elamite dating.11 Furthermore, there is no attestation of writing halki as ha-li-ki in other documents.

11 A comparison between the three bricks makes it certain that three different scribes were involved in their writing, since there is a clear distinction in their literary style and dialect. Mofidi-Nasrabadi has recently (2013: 89-133) published some other fragments excavated from Deh-e-no. A number of them are clearly similar to Igi-hatet inscriptions, but they are either completely or partly broken on their left sides where the name is attested. Only in one brick (D.N.12-1228-8), the signs i-gi-ba-te- [...] are legible. However, Mofidi-Nasrabadi (2013: 95), following Steve’s transliteration, in all cases reconstructed the name as “Igi-halki.” As the photos show, mimiation is apparently preserved in ba-la-ṭa₂-am (Mofidi-Nasrabadi 2013: D.N.12-1278-20).

12 Scheil 1932: 135.

For an analysis of the Old Babylonian features of these texts, see Salonen 1962.

---

5 The name of the king is written as Igi-hatet in the genealogy cannot be problematic as some other names like Atta-halki are not mentioned in this document, despite the fact that they are well known Elamite kings through their individual bricks; cf. Malbran-Labat 1995: 30-33. A broken text first published by Hüsing (1916: 86) speaks of rebuilding the temple of Manzat (see also EKI 42). The further research in Deh-e-no revealed some other fragments which showed that Ṣatrukh-Naḥḫunte was the king who rebuilt the temple of Manzat; cf. Or 37, 299-303. Since he refers to the previous kings whose names were written on the bricks of the temple, one may expect that he had seen Igi-hatet’s brick and was aware of him, while there is no evidence which proves his son, Šīlḥaq-Inšišīnak dealt with Manzat’s sanctuary that it may explain why he did not mention the name of Igi-hatet in his genealogy. It is possible that there is no genealogical kinship between the Iğibalkis, the Šatrukid, and Igi-hatet.

6 MDP 4, pp. 169, 183.

Herrero & Glassner 1993: 104; see also HT 339: 5 at page 122: [..]-ba-te-et.

8 ZA 58, 70.

of Susa,” probably puts the date of our brick to an overlapping phase between the end of the sukkalma period and the beginning of the Middle-Elamite I period in the 15th century BC.14

§2.2. NCMI Text 2 (figure 2)
Artifac type: Elamite brick
Measurements: 355 × 95 × 170mm
Provenience: Chogha Zanbil
Date: Middle-Elamite

§2.2.1. Transliteration and Translation
1. u₂ di-un-taš-GAL ša-ak di-di-hu-ba-nu-me-na-ki su-an-ki-ik an-za-an
2. šu-su-un-ka ta-ak-me u₂-me tu₄-ur hi₄-ih si-it-me u₂-me šu-ul-lu-me-ka
3. az-ki-it tu₄-ur sah-ri hu-su-ia in-ki₂ hi-en-ka₂ in-t₁₄ <ik₃> a-k₁₂
4. si-ia-an u₂-pa-at hu-us-si-ip-me ku-ku-un-nu-um ub-ku-mi₄ a ku-si-ih
5. in-su-us-na-ak si-ia-an ku-uk-ra in du-ni-ib u₂ zag-ra-tu₄-me
6. ki-ik-te-eb hu-ut-tak hu-li-ik u₂-me in-su-us-na₄ ak ul-li-na te-la-ak-ni

1. I, Untaš-napiriša, son of Humbanumena, king of Anian
2-3. and Susa. Wishing that my life (will) constantly prosper and that the extinction of lineage may not be granted to me (at the time of) judgment (?), it is for this reason that
4. I have built a temple with baked brick, a kukunnû with glazed bricks.
5-6. I gave it to Inšušinak of siyan-kuk. I raised a ziggurat. May my work be dedicated to Inšušinak.

§2.2.2. Commentary
§2.2.2.1. Philological Remarks
1. The translation of ta-ak-me u₂-me tu₄-ur hi₄-ih si-it-me u₂-me šu-ul-lu-me-ka: tak-me u.me tur-hih sit.me u.me sit.me u.me: continuity of my prosperity. Grillot in her grammar analyzed tur-hih and sit.me u.me as “continuity of power (=reign)” and “my-happiness of” respectively (Grillot 1987: 53) and translated sullume-g/k+a as “which is prolonged” (Grillot 1987: 52). On the basis of this analysis, Grillot’s translation is as follows: “So that (=this [being] the reason of) my life, may my happy reign be extended” (Grillot 1987: 53-54). Malbran-Labat gave a slightly different interpretation of this passage and translated “desirous that my life (is) one of continuous prosperity” (Malbran-Labat 1995: 71). For a discussion of this formula, see Akkadica 27, 8-9; JA 271: 207-218; and Malbran-Labat 1995: 72.

1. The interpretation of az-ki-it tu₄-ur sah-ri hu-su-ia in-ki₂ hi-en-ka₂ in-t₁₄: azki-t tur sahri huin-ya in-g/ki han-g/k+a is quite problematic. Grillot in 1982 translated azkit as “a separation” (Akkadica 27, 10). One year later in JA 271: 216, she offered a different view and analyzed it in form of “as (“part”, “thing”, “element”) + ki “a” + t (nominal suffix)”. Malbran-Labat translated it as “extinction” (Malbran-Labat 1995: 72). Grillot in Akkadica 27, 14, proposed that the element sahri is probably identical to sahrui sebyu in Akkadian. As a result, tur sahri has been translated as ‘lineage’ (literally “continuity of child”). Hinz & Koch (1987: 705) interpreted ñuwiya as “retributive.” Their interpretation is based on the function of Inšušinak as the judge of the dead. Malbran-Labat (1995: 72) has pointed out that ñuwiya can serve in both favorable and unfavorable contexts: “the contexts in which ñuwiya appears make the qualifier occasionally disastrous, occasionally favorable.” For more discussion of this formula, see Akkadica 27, 10, 11; JA 271, 216; and Malbran-Labat 1995: 72.

§2.2.2.2. General Remarks
The brick belongs to Untaš-napiriša, the Middle-Elamite king whose famous building work is the ziggurat of Chogha Zanbil located about 40 km southeast of Susa.15

The text is identical to MDP 41, 1, EKI 12, and Malbran-

---

14 Potts 1999: 191

15 Potts 1999: 222
Labat 1995: 71-72 no. 28. The surface of the brick is badly abraded, but the signs are on the whole legible. For the system of transcription in commentaries we follow the method proposed in Grillot 1987.

§2.3. NCMI Text 3 (figure 3)
Artifact type: Elamite brick
Measurements: 220 × 90 × 170mm
Provenience: Chogha Zanbil
Date: Middle-Elamite

§2.3.1. Transliteration and Translation
1. [...]
2. [...]
3. [...]
4. [...]
5. [...]

§2.3.2. Commentary
The brick duplicates text 2 with some minor orthographical differences; more than 10 cm is broken off of the left side of the artifact.

§2.4. NCMI Text 4 (figure 4)
Artifact type: Assyrian relief
Measurements: 200 × 120 × 40mm

§2.4.1. Transliteration and Translation
beginning broken
1'. [...] iri kal-ḫu [mat-ra-a ...]
2'. [...] kur za-mu-a ana [pat] [gim-ri ša₂ ...]
3'. [...] e₂-gal [gī-] eren-na [...]
4'. [...] u₂-ša₂ am kur-meš-e u a-ab-[ba]₂-[meš ...]
5'. [...] ina ka₂-meš-[ša₂]-u₂-re-ti ku₁-babbar-meš u₂-[meš ...]

rest broken
1'. [...] the ancient city of Calah ...
2'. [...] the entire land of Zamua ...
3'. [...] a palace of cedar ...
4'. [...] beasts of mountains and seas ...
5'. [...] in its doorways. I put silver, gold ...

§2.4.2. Commentary
A piece of a stone relief belonging to the reign of Assurnasirpal II (figure 4). The inscription duplicates RIMA 2.0.101.2 lines 52-61 and RIMA 2.0.101.23 (the Standard Inscription) lines 14b-21. Both texts concern the building of Calah and its palace.
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