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

Michael Mäder, GEAS, Mai 2020

The traditional (additive) corpus

Architectures of modern online script corpora such as CDLI for cuneiform texts, ET for Etruscan, TIR for Raetic or LexLep for Lepontic, build, on a first level, alphabetically ordered sub-groups, and, on a second level, fill up these sub-groups acording to the chronology of their archaeological appearance, i.e. "first found – first entered". Such a two-levelled organization allows to keep up logically coherent sub-corpora even if the chronology of the single entries underlies the inevitable *Fundzufall*. No such procedure had been chosen when Walther Hinz (1969) collected the then less than twenty Linear Elamite inscriptions. Instead, Hinz simply coined them alphabetically with letters from A to R. Future finds have been subsequently coined S, T, etc., continuing with A', B' etc. when the range of the Latin alphabet ran out. The most complete additive text list can be found in Desset (2018: 111).

The multi-levelled (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 ahead of the original siglum in order to visualize natural sub-corpora and to facilitate the splitting of the corpus by electronical means. Starting from this two-levelled corpus organization, even a third level can be introduced with the larger amount of texts known today. Based on archaeological context, the Linear Elamite text corpus is divided into three sub-groups coined "Western Elamite / Susian / Lowland", "Central Elamite / Highland", and " Eastern Elamite / Elamo-Bactrian". The three sub-corpora are highly coherent in itself, but different from each other in terms of 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 Elamite (Lowlands)	**Central Elamite (Highlands)**	**Eastern Elamite (Bactria / Konar Sandal)**	**Total**
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
Texts' and fragments' 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 Number of texts collating fragments (thereof dextroverse texts)	18 18 2 (^{Susa}B; ^{Susa}P)	24 14 2 (^{Mah}Yb; ^{Mah}N')	8 8 3 (^{Jir}B'r; ^{Jir}C'r; ^{Chris}G')	51 41 7
Readable signs	553 (32%)	1133 (65,5%)	45 (2,5%)	1731 (100%)
Average text lenght	31	45	6	28
Longest text (readable signs)	^{Susa}H (66)	^{Mah}Z (160)	^{Jir}D' (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-levelled corpus listing every single inscription (but fragments subsumed) was first presented in Mäder et al. 2018: 51. It maintains basic corpus information from traditional additive text lists (Desset 2018: 111) such as "first publication" and "material", but disrupts the *Fundzufall*-based alphabetical order which is maintained only within the provenance groups ("Herkunft").

Sub-Corpus	Herkunft	Material	Erste Publikation	Inschrift	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 (^{Phoe}A′) und unpubl. (^{Phoe}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	Hakemi 1997:67, Fig. 45
	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

Concordance List: OCLEI – Mäder et al. 2018 – Desset 2018

In 2018, two articles appeared, each publishing a bunch of new Linear Elamite inscriptions presented mainly by the Mahboubian Collection. Both Desset (2018) and Mäder et al. (2018) had access to only a part of the newly found artefacts, and the choice taken by each of them happened to overlap in some instances. Unfortunately, no mutual agreement was made between the authors. (Mäder et al. for their part were in constant exchange with the compilers of OCLEI – Online

Corpus of Linear Elamite Inscriptions, which naturally will be the routing reference in future.) Not surprisingly, this resulted in a partial overlap of the sigla chosen. The present concordance list helps out with this deplorable lack of communication.

Count incl. fragments	Count excl. frragments	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}Yb **	^{Mah}Yb	Y	8
26	25	^{Phoe}Z	^{Phoe}Z	Z	160
27	26	^{Phoe}A′	^{Phoe}A′	A′	135
28	27	^{Jir}B′ ***	^{Jir}B′	B′	6
29	28	^{Jir}C′ ***	^{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}H′b	^{Mah}H′b	H′	6
36	34	^{Mah}I′a	^{Mah}I′a	---	4
37	fragment	^{Mah}I′b	^{Mah}I′b	I′	26
38	fragment	^{Mah}I′c	^{Mah}I′c	I′	27

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

* 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 intermediate stage between Proto-Elamite and Linear Elamite. Another option, regarding the fact that each of the 8 lines displays 6 signs (Dahl 2009:29), is to consider it a school text for an unnamed learner of Proto-Elamite. Or, as Dahl (ibid.) suggests, a dream-text born from fantasy.

** ^{Mah}Yb is separated from the main text ^{Mah}Y and, unlike the latter, written in dextroverse direction.

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

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

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.