

## Corpus Statistics and Concordance List for Linear Elamite – Supplement to the OCLEI (Online Corpus of Linear Elamite Inscriptions)

Stephan Balmer & Michael Mäder, GEAS, Version May 2020

### The traditional (additive) corpus

Architectures for modern online script corpora, such as CDLI for cuneiform texts, ET for Etruscan, TIR for Raetic or LexLep for Lepontic, construct, on the first level, alphabetically ordered sub-groups, and, on the second level, fill up these sub-groups according to the chronology of their archaeological appearance, i.e. "first found – first entered". A two-level organization of this sort enables the maintenance of logically coherent sub-corpora even if the chronology of the individual entries is subject to the inevitable *Fundzufall*. No such procedure had been put into place when Walther Hinz (1969) collected the, at the time, fewer than twenty Linear Elamite inscriptions. Instead, Hinz simply labelled them alphabetically with the letters A to R. Subsequent finds were labelled S, T, etc., continuing with A', B' etc., when the range of Latin letters had been exhausted. The most complete additive text list can be found in Desset (2018: 111).

### The multi-level (sub-divided) corpus

In order to avoid the troubles related to additively compiled corpora described above, the authors of OCLEI (followed by Mäder et al. 2018: Tab.1) added provenance indicators in front of the original siglum in order to visualize natural sub-corpora, as well as to facilitate the splitting of the corpus by electronic means. Building on this two-level corpus organization, a third level can now be introduced, given the greater quantity of texts known today. Based on archaeological context, the Linear Elamite text corpus is divided into three sub-groups baptized "Western Elamite / Susian / Lowlands", "Central Elamite / Highlands", and "Eastern Elamite / Elamo-Bactrian / Elamo-Jiroftian". The three sub-corpora are highly coherent in themselves, but differ from each other in terms of the provenance, date, style, material and content of the texts, i.e. repeated sequences (phrases, words). The main features of the three sub-corpora are listed in Tab. 1:

	Western (Lowlands)	Elamite	Central Elamite (Highlands)	Eastern Elamite (Bactria / Konar Sandal)	Overall
Date	2150 BCE		1950–1900 BCE (?)	2200–1900 BCE	2150–1900 (?) BCE
Provenance sigla (Archaeological reports)	Susa (18)		Pers (1)	Sha / Jir / Gonur (6)	25
Provenance sigla (Art collections)	---		Mah / Phoe / Schø / Time (24)	Liga / Chris (2)	26
Text and fragment sigla (number)	A–N; P; R; T; U		Q; W–Z; A'; F'; H'–O'	S; V; B'–E'; G'; P'	
Number of texts (counting each fragment)	18		24	8	51
Number of texts (fragments collated) (of which dextroverse texts)	18 2 (SusaB; SusaP)		14 2 (MahYb; MahN')	8 3 (JirB'T; JirC'T; ChrisG')	41 (7)
Readable signs	553 (32%)		1133 (65.5%)	45 (2.5%)	1731 (100%)
Average text length	31		45	6	28
Longest text (readable signs)	SusaH (66)		MahZ (160)	JirD' (11)	
Material	Stone / Clay		“Gunagi” Silver Vessels	Clay / Steatite / Gold	
Persons mentioned	Puzur-Inshushinak, Shinpi-Ishhuk		Ebarat (?), Shilhaha (?)	Title of an unnamed high official (?)	
Gods mentioned	Inshushinak		Napirisha	---	
Places mentioned	Susa		---	Shimashki (?)	
Purpose	Royal Inscriptions		Royal Inscriptions	Signatures / Labels / Seals	

Tab. 1: Statistical properties of the three geographical/chronological sub-corpora

The multi-level corpus listing every single inscription (albeit with fragments subsumed) was first presented in Mäder et al. 2018: 51. It preserves basic corpus information from traditional additive text lists (Desset 2018: 111), such as "first publication" and "material", but overturns the *Fundzufall*-based alphabetical order which is maintained only within the provenance groups ("Herkunft").

Sub-Corpus	Herkunft	Material	Erste Publikation	Inscription	Detailed Photographs
Western Elamite (Lowlands)	Susa	Stein	Ausgrabungen in Susa, publ. MDP 6, 10, 14, 26.	A–R T–U	Hinz 1969:29-41 André/Salvini 1989:Pl. IV-V
Central Elamite (Highlands)	Pers	Silbervase	Kunsthandel, publ. Hinz 1969.	Q	Hinz 1969:20, Taf. 6
	Mah	Silbervasen	Kunsthandel, Mahboubian Gallery, publ. Mahboubian 2004.	X Y Yb Z H'a H'b I'a–c J' K'a–d L'a–d N' O'	MCEI, Fig. 41-44 MCEI, Fig. 1-11 Mahboubian 2004:53 MCEI, Fig. 12-40 MCEI, Fig. 50-51 MCEI, Fig. 49 MCEI, Fig. 45 MCEI, Fig. 47 MCEI, Fig. 48 MCEI, Fig. 46 Desset 2018:117, Fig. 12 Desset 2018:117, Fig. 13
	Schø	Silbervase	Kunsthandel, Schøyen Collection, publ. Vallat 2011.	F'	Vallat 2011:Pl. LXXV
	Phoe	Silberkessel	Kunsthandel, Phoenix Ancient Art Collection, publ. PAA 2007 ( <sup>Phoe</sup> A) und unpubl. ( <sup>Phoe</sup> W).	W A'	Mäder et al. 2018:101, Abb. 8-14 Mäder et al. 2018:100, Abb. 1-7
	Time	Silbervase	Kunsthandel, Timeline Auctions, publ. Desset 2018.	M'	Desset 2018, 118, Fig. 14
	Eastern Elamite (Bactria and Konar Sandal)	Sha	Tonkrug	Ausgrabungen in Shahdad, publ. Hinz 1971.	S
Liga		Speckstein	Kunsthandel, Ligabue Coll., publ. Winkelmann 1999.	V	Winkelmann 1999:24 Fig. 1
Jir		Tontafeln	Unklare Umstände, publ. Lawler 2007 und Madjidzadeh 2011.	B'r C'r D' E'	Madjidzadeh 2011:225 Fig. 4b Madjidzadeh 2011:227 Fig. 6b Madjidzadeh 2011:223 Fig. 3a Madjidzadeh 2011:229 Fig. 8a
Chris		Goldsiegel	Kunsthandel, Christie's Auctions, publ. Mäder 2020	G'	Mäder 2020:Abb. 1
Gonur		Tonscherbe	Oberflächenfund, Gonur Nord, publ. Kločkov 1995	P'	Kločkov 1995:55, рис. 1

Tab. 2: Archaeological properties of the eleven current provenance groups

In 2018, two articles appeared, each publishing a number of new Linear Elamite inscriptions presented mainly by the Mahboubian Collection. Both Desset (2018) and Mäder et al. (2018) had access to only a portion of the newly found artefacts, and their choices happened to overlap in some instances. Unfortunately, no mutual agreement was reached between the authors. (Mäder et al., for their part, were in constant communication with the compilers of the OCLEI – Online Corpus of Linear Elamite Inscriptions, which will naturally be the standard reference in the future.) Not surprisingly, this resulted in partial overlap among the sigla chosen. The present concordance list will help to remedy this deplorable lack of communication.

Count incl. fragments	Count excl. fragments	OCLEI	Mäder et al. 2018	Desset 2018	Number of readable signs
1	1	Susa A	Susa A	A	50
2	2	Susa B	Susa B	B	35
3	3	Susa C	Susa C	C	37
4	4	Susa D	Susa D	D	56
5	5	Susa E	Susa E	E	29
6	6	Susa F	Susa F	F	48
7	7	Susa G	Susa G	G	44
8	8	Susa H	Susa H	H	66
9	9	Susa I	Susa I	I	37
10	10	Susa J	Susa J	J	18
11	11	Susa K	Susa K	K	39
12	12	Susa L	Susa L	L	11
13	13	Susa M	Susa M	M	20
14	14	Susa N	Susa N	N	22
15	15	Susa P *	Susa P	P	7
16	16	Susa Q	Susa Q	Q	48
17	17	Susa R	Susa R	R	11
18	18	Shah S	Shah S	S	6
19	19	Susa T	Susa T	T	3
20	20	Susa U	Susa U	U	20
21	21	Liga V	Liga V	V	3
22	22	Susa W	Susa W	W	126
23	23	Mah X	Mah X	X	56
24	24	Mah Y	Mah Y	Y	126
25	fragment	Mah Y <sub>b</sub> **	Mah Y <sub>b</sub>	Y	8
26	25	Phoe Z	Phoe Z	Z	160
27	26	Phoe A'	Phoe A'	A'	135
28	27	Jir B <sub>T</sub> ***	Jir B'	B'	6
29	28	Jir C <sub>T</sub> ***	Jir C'	C'	8
30	29	Jir D'	Jir D'	D'	11
31	30	Jir E'	Jir E'	E'	5
32	31	Schø F'	Schø F'	F'	65
33	32	Chris G'	Chris G'	G'	4
34	33	Mah H'a	Mah H'a	H'	48

35	fragment	Mah <sup>H</sup> 'b	Mah <sup>H</sup> 'b	H'	6
36	34	Mah <sup>I</sup> 'a	Mah <sup>I</sup> 'a	---	4
37	fragment	Mah <sup>I</sup> 'b	Mah <sup>I</sup> 'b	I'	26
38	fragment	Mah <sup>I</sup> 'c	Mah <sup>I</sup> 'c	I'	27
39	35	Mah <sup>J</sup> '	Mah <sup>J</sup> '	---	16
40	36	Mah <sup>K</sup> 'a	Mah <sup>K</sup> 'a	---	5
41	fragment	Mah <sup>K</sup> 'b	Mah <sup>K</sup> 'b	---	18
42	fragment	Mah <sup>K</sup> 'c	Mah <sup>K</sup> 'c	---	9
43	fragment	Mah <sup>K</sup> 'd	Mah <sup>K</sup> 'd	---	5
44	37	Mah <sup>L</sup> 'a	Mah <sup>L</sup> 'a	---	4
45	fragment	Mah <sup>L</sup> 'b	Mah <sup>L</sup> 'b	---	2
46	fragment	Mah <sup>L</sup> 'c ****	Mah <sup>L</sup> 'c	part of I'	6
47	fragment	Mah <sup>L</sup> 'd	Mah <sup>L</sup> 'd	---	7
48	38	Time <sup>M</sup> '	---	L'	27
49	39	Mah <sup>N</sup> '	---	J'	70
50	40	Mah <sup>O</sup> '	---	K'	129
51	41	Gonur <sup>P</sup> '	---	---	2
					<b>1731</b>

\* For the omission of inscription O (Hinz 1969: Taf. 16), see Desset 2012: 93, Fn. 2. Together with a non-numeral tablet dating to the Old Elamite period (Amiet 1986:260. Fig. 48), this inscription seems to represent some sort of intermediate stage between Proto-Elamite and Linear Elamite. Another option, given the fact that each of the 8 lines displays 6 signs (Dahl 2009:29), is to consider it as a school text for an unnamed learner of Proto-Elamite – or, as Dahl (ibid.) suggests, a dream-text born of fantasy.

\*\* Mah<sup>Y</sup>b is separated from the main text Mah<sup>Y</sup> and, unlike the latter, written in dextroverse.

\*\*\* Two of the Jiroft Tablets, B' and C', have "geometric writing" (Desset 2014) on the obverse and a Linear Elamite phrase or signature on the reverse (r).

\*\*\*\* Desset (2018:117, Fig. 11.2) has demonstrated that OCLEI's fragment Mah<sup>L</sup>'c is, in fact, the leftward joint of his I'1 (left) = OCLEI's Mah<sup>I</sup>'c.

## References:

**Amiet, P. (1986):** *L'âge des échanges Inter-Iraniens, 3500 - 1700 avant J.-C.* Notes et documents des Musées de France 11, Paris.

**André, B. & Salvini, M. (1989):** Réflexions sur Puzur-Inšušinak, *IrAnt* 24, 53-72.

**CDLI:** Cuneiform Digital Library of the UCLA, <https://cdli.ucla.edu/>

**ET:** Gerhard Meiser (2014): *Etruskische Texte*. Auf Grundlage der Erstausgabe von Helmut Rix neu bearb. von Gerhard Meiser in Zusammenarbeit mit Valentina Belfiore und Sindy Kluge. Hamburg.

**Hinz, W. (1969):** Eine neugefundene altelamische Silbervase, in: *Altiranische Funde und Forschungen* 1, 11-44.

**Dahl, J. (2009):** Early Writing in Iran: A Reappraisal. *Iran* 47, 23-31.

**Desset, F. (2012):** *Premières écritures iraniennes – Les systèmes proto-élamite et élamite linéaire*. Napoli.

**Desset, F. (2014):** A New Writing System Discovered in 3rd Millennium BCE Iran: The Konar Sandal 'Geometric' Tablets. *IrAnt* 49, 83-109.

**Desset, F. (2018):** Nine Linear Elamite Texts Inscribed on Silver 'Gunagi' Vessels (X, Y, Z, F', H', I', J', K' and L'): New Data on Linear Elamite Writing and the History of the Sukkalmah Dynasty. *Iran* 56/2, 105-143.

**Hakemi, A. (1997):** *Archaeological Excavations of a Bronze Age Center in Iran*, Roma.

**Kločkov, I.S. (1995):** Znaki na čerepke s Gonura: K voprosu o margianskoj pis'mennosti. *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 2 (213), 54-60.

**LexLep:** Lexicon Leponticum, <https://www.univie.ac.at/lexlep/wiki/>

**Mäder, M.; Balmer, S.; Plachtzik, S., and Rawyler, N. (2018):** Sequenzanalysen zur elamischen Strichschrift, in: B. Mofidi-Nasrabadi, D. Prechel, A. Pruß (Hrsg.): *Elam and its Neighbors. Recent Research and New Perspectives. Proceedings of the international congress held at Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, September 21-23, 2016* (Elamica 8), 49-104.

**Mäder, M. (2020):** Ein weiteres baktrisches Siegel mit elamischer Strichschrift und die Suche nach Šimaški. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 54, 1-14.

**Madjidzadeh, Y. (2011):** Jiroft Tablets and the Origin of the Linear Elamite Writing System, in: Osada/Witzel (eds.), *Cultural Relations Between the Indus and the Iranian Plateau During the Third Millennium*. Harvard.

**Mahboubian, H. (2004):** *Elam – Art and Civilization of Ancient Iran*, 3000-2000 BC. Salisbury.

**MCEI:** Mahboubian Collection of Elamite Inscriptions. <https://mahboubiancollection.com/collections/elemite-inscription-3?view=nano>

**OCLEI:** Online Corpus of Linear Elamite Inscriptions, [www.elamicon.org](http://www.elamicon.org)

**TIR:** Thesaurus Inscriptionum Raeticarum, <https://www.univie.ac.at/raetica/wiki/>

**Vallat, F. (2011):** Textes historiques élamites et achéménides, in: A. George et al. (eds.), *Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions and Related Texts in the Schøyen Collection*, Bethesda, 187-188.

**Winkelmann, S. (1999):** Ein Stempelsiegel mit alt-elamischer Strichschrift, *AMI* 31, 23-32.