Accepted manuscript published as:

Renette, S. 2023. "The Historical Geography of Western Iran: An archaeological perspective on the location of Kimaš," in: Tavernier, J., Gorris, E. & De Graef, K. (eds.) Susa and Elam II: History, Language, Religion and Culture, Mémoires de la Délégation Française 59, Leiden: Brill, 299-339.

The Historical Geography of Western Iran: An archaeological perspective on the location of Kimaš[*]

Steve Renette[**]

Any reconstruction of the early history of Elam depends in part on the location of the many lands and cities recorded in Mesopotamian sources (fig. 1). The topic of historical geography in western Iran has spurred intense debate over the decades, but with a few notable exceptions treatises on this topic have made only cursory use of the archaeological record.[1] While it is difficult and contentious to correlate material culture with political entities and ethnic groups known from historical sources, general patterns can contribute to a reconstruction of Elamite history. This paper focuses on the land of Kimaš, known from sources of the time of Puzur-Inšušinak, Gudea of Lagaš, and the Ur III kings. While the location of this little-known ancient land might seem trivial at first, it informs us about the political aftermath of Ur-Nammu's defeat of Puzur-Inšušinak and Šulgi's military strategy to expand his young empire in competition with the rising power of Šimaški.

Previous studies have located Kimaš east of the Jebel Hamrin and north of the Diyala River, the region of Kermanshah in western Iran, and on the Iranian Plateau.[2] A. Poebel was the first to discuss Kimaš in 1930, locating it north of the Diyala River based on a misreading of an Ur III seal impression situating it near ancient Madga.[3] This identification was accepted by several scholars, most recently by D. Frayne who has argued for a location near Kifri, or near Sulaimaniyah.[4] A corrected collation and reading of the seal impression by M. Powell as "šagina

[*] I wish to thank Holly Pittman and Elizabeth Carter who read previous drafts of this article and offered insightful suggestions.

[**] University of British Columbia, Killam Postdoctoral Research Fellow in the department of Classical, Near Eastern, and Religious Studies.

[1] R. Henrickson attempted to equate Šimaški with the Godin III material culture that is restricted to the central Zagros region (1984). D.T. Potts suggested that the development of Awan is reflected in this Zagros pottery tradition (2016, 90-91). However, both proposals remain purely speculative and merely based on general correlation rather than evidence. Both Šimaški and Awan were political entities, not ethnic identities, and certainly Šimaški consisted of a multitude of lands and peoples. Perhaps more successful are the suggestions to connect Marhaši with the Jiroft civilization in Kerman as this is based on the production of a widely distributed elite product (soft stone vessels), inscriptional evidence, clear historical sources, and products explicitly designated as Marhašian in the cuneiform records (Steinkeller 1982; 2012; 2014b). Still, similar approaches, albeit much less convincing, have led to equating both Marhaši and Šimaški with the Bactria-Margiana Archaeological Complex of Central Asia (Francfort & Tremblay 2010; Potts 2008). Finally, there is consensus about the location of Awan in the central or southern Zagros region. Most recently, Michalowski made the convincing argument to situate Awan east of Susa based on an association with Adamdun, which is probably to be equated with Tepe Surkhegan (Michalowski 2008, 115; Potts 2010, 247; Stève 2001; Vallat 1993).

[2] For a comprehensive overview of the debate on the location of Kimaš, see Frayne 1999, 142-144; Potts 2010.

[3] Poebel 1930, 136. The reading and implications of this seal inscription is discussed in more detail below.

[4] Ahmed 2012, 198-199; Edzard & Farber 1974, 101; Frayne 1999, 159-161; 2008, 47.

of the land of Elam", rather than Madga, indicates a location in the Iranian highlands.[5] This has led to several suggestions. P. Steinkeller has argued in detail for a location in the central Zagros region near Kermanshah on the Great Khorasan Road that passed east-west through the mountains.[6] On the other hand, F. Vallat preferred a location further east on the Iranian Plateau near the Anarak copper mines south of Tehran based on the mention of Kimaš as a provider of copper in Gudea's inscriptions.[7] Frayne suggested the existence of two localities with the name Kimaš, one in Elam and another in the Trans-Tigridian region north of the Diyala/Sirwan River.[8] Finally, D. Potts recently sought to resolve the perceived conflict between an Elamite and a Trans-Tigridian Kimaš by proposing that this land covered a large enough region near the Diyala/Sirwan River to border Elam in its widest sense (including the central Zagros region).[9] This paper proposes yet another location of Kimaš in the Khorramabad region of southern Luristan in the central Zagros Mountains based on a combination of the textual and archaeological evidence. This identification has ramifications for the location of Šimaški,[10] the sequence and motivations of Šulgi's eastern campaigns, and the early history of Elam.

Kimaš was located within the highlands since the toponym regularly occurs with the sign NIM, conventionally read as "Elam".[11] However, the name Elam as a geographical indicator in the third millennium is problematic. Vallat's assertion that Elam during the third millennium referred only to the mountains neighboring Mesopotamia to the east has become widely accepted.[12] More recently P. Michalowski elaborated on this by defining Elam in the third millennium BCE as a geographical region, not a political entity, covering the southeastern mountains on Mesopotamia's border. The term is paralleled by Subir/Subartu as the northeastern region.[13] Still, the extent of this region remains vague and at times Elam could simply refer to "eastern highlands".[14] Beginning in the middle of the second millennium BCE, Elam became a political entity and a name for a specific language and ethnic identity. This language had third millennium

---

[5] Edzard & Röllig 1980, 593.
[6] Steinkeller 1988, 201 n. 31; 2013, 304-312.
[7] Vallat 1993.
[8] Frayne 1999, 144.
[9] Potts 2010, 253.
[10] The location of Šimaški has also been the subject of debate: Henrickson 1984b; Potts 2008; Steinkeller 1988; 2007; 2014a; Stolper 1982; Vallat 1985; 1993. The most evident location of Šimaški is based on a description of Šimaški as extending from "the border of Anšan to the Upper Sea" (Kutscher 1989, 90; Potts 2016, 132). With Anšan securely located at the site of Tal-i Malyan in Fars, the most likely location of Šimaški then stretches north of Fars to the Caspian Sea, comprising a series of lands in an arc from Yazd to the Tehran plains along the eastern Zagros Piedmont.
[11] Edzard & Farber 1974, 101.
[12] de Miroschedji 2003; Potts 2016, 7-12; Vallat 1980.
[13] Michalowski 2008, 112. P. Michalowski has discussed the region of Subartu in detail in a series of articles: Michalowski 1988; 1999; 2012. Subartu was not a political entity or ethnic identity, rather it was a general region used by Babylonian scribes in the third and early second millennium BCE to refer to the northeastern lands east of the Tigris and north of the Diyala. The term fluctuated in time, but even later it was mainly used to refer to Assyria in the north-northeast. At times Subartu was used synonymous for the main political power in that region, e.g. Simurrum, Assyria.
[14] For a discussion of the changing nature of the term Elam during the history of ancient Mesopotamia, see Potts 2016, 1-13 and 428-440. During the third millennium, Elam (written with the sign NIM) was used first to generally refer to the mountainous lands in the east, partially as a result of a lack of knowledge (and interest?) of this region's ethnic and geographical diversity. However, by the Ur III period, as a result of frequent travelers between Mesopotamia and Elam and even incorporation in the Ur III state of some of its lands, the term Elam became somewhat more precise, referring to a specific eastern region in southwest Iran with other neighbors (i.e. Marhaši, Šimaški).

roots, which for lack of a better name is usually called Elamite in modern scholarship even though NIM/Elam was not restricted to this language and people with Elamite names. Zadok's study of names of highland individuals attested in the cuneiform records clearly demonstrates that third millennium Elam was a large region that was linguistically and ethnically heterogeneous.[15] Based on these person names, the geographical extent of languages could perhaps be determined. For example, Hurrian names are much more frequent in northern territories.[16] It is therefore likely that the Elamite language itself was more restricted to the southwestern mountains east of Susa. This could at least be suggested based on the later distribution of Elamite ethnic identity and language in the mountainous zone between Susa and Anšan.[17] This region was the political heartland of the Elamite kingdoms of the second and first millennia BCE and probably also of the third millennium kingdom of Awan.

I. The land of Kimaš

Our knowledge of the land of Kimaš has already been summarized in great detail in previous studies.[18] Puzur-Inšušinak and Šulgi's inscriptions clearly associate Kimaš with Hurti and Harši as part of their military campaigns, which leaves no doubt that they were located near each other. This region must have been of great importance to both rulers and the land continued to play a prominent role in the Ur III state considering its frequent occurrence in administrative records.

The earliest attestation of Kimaš is found in a historical inscription of Puzur-Inšušinak from Susa. In this inscription, he describes his conquest over Kimaš and Hurti followed by a diplomatic visit of a king of Šimaški who came to Susa to pay tribute.[19] A contemporary inscription of Gudea of Lagaš mentions Kimaš and its mountain range Abullat as a source of copper.[20] The sudden appearance of Kimaš in the historical records continued in Šulgi's year names, which document his eastern campaigns against Harši, Hurti, and Kimaš.[21] Following his conquests, Kimaš was incorporated as a peripheral buffer state in the Ur III state and remained loyal into Ibbi-Suen's reign.[22] Messengers, ambassadors, and soldiers from Kimaš were frequently attested in Ur III administrative documents. However, after the fall of the Ur III state Kimaš vanishes from the historical records.

Ur III administrative records provide the most informative evidence regarding the location and importance of Kimaš, Hurti, and Harši. The recently published Urusagrig messenger texts indicate that these three lands lay on an overland route that connected south Mesopotamia with Šimaški, Šigriš (one of the core lands of Šimaški), Zidanum, and Zidahri via Diniktum and Der, which were located centrally on the Zagros Piedmont route from the Diyala to Susiana.[23] The city

---

[15] Potts 2016, 6.
[16] Zadok 1991, 228.
[17] Potts 2016, 11-12. Desset 2017 provides such an analysis. His conclusions support the notion of a multilingual Iranian Plateau, but with areas of language dominance. This puts the "Elamite" language securely in southwestern Iran. A separate Gutian language has been sparsely attested, but could cluster in the central Zagros region.
[18] Frayne 1999, 159-161; Potts 2010; Steinkeller 2013.
[19] Steinkeller 1988; 2013; 2014a, 289; Stolper 1982.
[20] Potts 2010; Steinkeller 2013, 308.
[21] Steinkeller 2013, 304.
[22] ibid., 305-306.
[23] Owen 2013, 152-153; Potts 2016, 306; Steinkeller 2001; 2013, 306; Steinkeller 2014a, 292. The location of Diniktum is especially informative and confirms that the messenger texts describe an eastern route. This city was located downstream on the Tigris south of Upi (= Opis) and it was integrated within the Ešnunna kingdom in which it functioned as its border with Elam (Bryce 2009, 198). At the same time, the city of Der, located at Badra midway

of Der, a major stopping point on the overland routes from Mesopotamia to Elam throughout ancient history,[24] is by far the most frequently mentioned in these texts, followed by Kimaš.[25] The land of Kimaš must have neighbored Zidanum considering that both locations are connected to Mount Abullat. This mountain range is located in or near Kimaš in Gudea's inscriptions, while it is located within Zidanum in an Ur III administrative record.[26] Based on the Urusagrig itinerary, Zidanum is very likely a neighbor of the land of Šigriš (part of Šimaški), confirming Kimaš' location on the overland route to the Iranian highlands.

Kimaš and its overland route to the Iranian Plateau were of commercial, strategic, and geopolitical importance to the Ur III rulers. The land provided access to valuable resources, especially copper from Mount Abullat. The location of Mount Abullat is unknown, but a possible clue can be derived from its name, which Steinkeller interprets as "gates" and therefore could be located at an important mountain pass.[27] Access to sources of metal and other materials available from or through the Iranian Plateau was a major concern of south Mesopotamian states and a motivation for military campaigns and diplomacy to gain control over these routes.

The strategic importance of this region is demonstrated by the fact that Puzur-Inšušinak and Šulgi expended significant resources to control Kimaš, Hurti, and Harši. Both celebrated their conquest of these lands in historical inscriptions, while documents of Šulgi's reign record preparations for a grand victory feast and collection of booty from these lands.[28] Subsequently, they were integrated in the peripheral defensive zone of the Ur III state that functioned as a buffer against eastern powers.[29] As a result of their conquest, Puzur-Inšušinak and Šulgi gained direct access to Šimaški and therefore the overland trade routes coming through the Iranian Plateau. Following Puzur-Inšušinak's conquest, an unnamed king of Šimaški came to Susa to pay tribute, suggesting that by opening the route via Kimaš direct relations between the two were now possible. Similarly, incorporation of Kimaš in the Ur III state allowed direct interaction through messengers and ambassadors who travelled between the Šimaški and the Ur III heartland.[30]

II. Possible locations of Kimaš based on textual evidence

1. Trans-Tigridian region (Subartu)

---

between Ešnunna and Susa, was not a part of Elam and remained mostly independent between the two powers during the Old Babylonian period (Verkinderen 2004, 75-81). Between Der and Susa we can most likely situate the lands of Sabum, Urua (perhaps Musiyan in the Deh Luran: Michalowski & Wright 2010), and Pašime (recently identified at Abu Sheeja: Hussein et al. 2010), all of which were part of Elam. Therefore the border of Ešnunna with Elam must have been in the region of Der, which would locate Diniktum opposite of Der on the Tigris River, possibly somewhere just north of the present-day city of Kut, and as such formed the first stop on the overland Der-Šimaški route. Suggested locations for Diniktum are summarized in Owen 2013, 42 fn. 89.

For Zidanum and Zidahri, see most recently Steinkeller 2014a, 292 fn. 41-43. A man named DUN-gá-at is attested once as ruler of Yabulmat (one of the six core lands of Šimaški) and once as "man of Zidahri", which places this land in the Šimaškian sphere. An individual called Raši, named "man of Zidanum", provides a link between this land and Šimaški (discussed in more detail below). Finally, Steinkeller identified the land of Bulli, which also appears in the Urusagrig texts, as part of the Šimaškian sphere.

[24] Verkinderen 2004.

[25] Owen 2013, 132-152. Tallying up the placenames results in the following list: Der (290), Kimaš (62), Šimaški (30), Hurti (18), Diniktum (12), Harši (8), Zidanum (7), Šigriš (6), Zidahrum (4). Also included in the list are Susa (6) and Adamdun (2).

[26] De Graef 2008, 74-75; Lafont 1996; Potts 2016, 127; Steinkeller 2014a, 292 fn. 43.

[27] Steinkeller 2013, 310.

[28] Ibid., 295, 304-305.

[29] Michalowski 1978; Steinkeller 1987; 2013, 305-306.

[30] Potts 2016, 128.

A location for Kimaš in Subartu, between the Jebel Hamrin, the Diyala/Sirwan River, and the Lower Zab, was first proposed by Poebel in 1930. This proposal has been championed in great detail by D. Frayne who originally suggested identifying Kimaš, Hurti, and Harši with the modern towns of Quš Tepe, Taze Hurmatu, and Tuz Hurmatu respectively, all located south of Kirkuk.[31] More recently he argued for a location further northeast near Sulaimaniyah at the villages Kahr Hamza, Jaq Kharwu, and Harjana.[32] In order to resolve the frequent association of Kimaš with known Elamite cities, Frayne proposed that there were two cities called Kimaš, one in Subartu and one in Elam. Based on the sequence of campaigns of Šulgi that target northeastern lands (especially Simurrum), he identified the Subarean Kimaš as Šulgi's main target and the location of Mt. Abullat.[33]

A location of Kimaš, Hurti, and Harši in the Trans-Tigridian region of Subartu would mean that Šulgi's foreign campaigns were solely aimed at securing the northeastern border, pacifying the Subartu lands, and gaining access to the Great Khorasan Road via the Diyala/Sirwan route. Based on the recorded geographical proximity, Zidanum could then be located at the Zagros Gates past the Sar-e Pol-e Zohab reliefs and Šigriš would encompass the Kermanshah plains (which conflicts with recent studies locating it further southeast).[34] However, there are serious problems with the identification of Kimaš in northeastern Mesopotamia.

1.1 The Hunnili seal inscription used to be read as "ruler of Kimaš and general of Madga". Madga is usually located by scholars in Subartu in the region of Gasur/Nuzi, Arrapha, and Simurrum.[35] The corrected reading of "general of Elam" renders this argument void.

1.2 An Old Babylonian source from Išcali in the Diyala region appears to mention Kimaš in connection with Ekallatum, located on the Tigris River near Aššur. However, Steinkeller has recently refuted this interpretation as a misreading of the text.[36]

1.3 A group of Old Babylonian tablets from the time of Sin-iddinam of Larsa that list grain distributions include a place called Kimaš. In these administrative texts, Kimaš appears only once, together with cities securely located in the Diyala region and Subartu.[37] The reading of the tablet seems secure, which makes this reference the only reliable evidence for the existence of a Kimaš in northeastern Mesopotamia. However, it should be noted that this tablet significantly postdates the last known references to Kimaš in the Ur III period and no other mention from later periods is presently known. Also no Kimaš was mentioned in the Old Akkadian Gasur/Nuzi texts or in association with Arrapha. It then seems possible that in the centuries following the Ur III period a small town called Kimaš existed, probably unrelated to the earlier powerful land of Kimaš.

1.4 Kimaš, Hurti, and Harši are never directly associated with the lands of Simurrum, Lullubum, Karahar, or other places in the Diyala/Sirwan and Kirkuk regions. Even in Šulgi's year names, these lands are always mentioned separately.[38]

---

[31] Frayne 1999, 154-162.

[32] Frayne 2008, 46-47.

[33] ibid. He has been followed in this recently by Potts (2010) and Ahmed (2012, 198).

[34] Medvedskaya 1999, 57-58; Stolper 1982, 45-46.

[35] Ahmed 2012, 151; Frayne 1999, 157-158; and more recently Heimpel 2009 who locates Madga at the bitumen wells of Hit.

[36] Frayne 1999, 159-161. Steinkeller reinterpreted the text as "the suburb of Ekallatum" instead of "Kimaš and Ekallatum" (2013, 311 fn. 117). Either way, if Frayne's reading proves to be correct, this Kimaš can be identified with the same town as the one mentioned in the record from the reign of Sin-iddinam (cf. 1.3).

[37] Goetze 1950, 94-95: tablet UIOM 2040, line 4.

[38] Ahmed and Frayne have attempted to associate the land of Kimaš with Simurrum through the identity of Rašiši (Ahmed 2012, 237-239; Frayne 1997, 249-250). Rašiši is mentioned as "man of Kimaš" together with Hunnili (cf. 3.2). Ahmed and Frayne claim that this is the same as a man called Rabsisi mentioned together with Tabbangar as

1.5 Lands along the southern side of the Diyala/Sirwan River and on strategic points at the western end of the Great Khorasan Road are rarely or never mentioned in Ur III sources. The land and/or city of Halman has to my knowledge not yet been attested in sources before the second millennium BCE.[39] This locality is mainly known from Middle and Neo-Assyrian historical sources from which the toponym developed through the Middle Ages and to this day as Holwan and the river Alwan(d), making its location at Sar-e Pol-e Zohab virtually certain.[40] However, recently Ahmed provided a transliteration and discussion of the Haladiny Inscription on a slab of stone found at the foot of the mountain Pira Magrun, northwest of Sulaimaniyah.[41] This important and unpublished inscription belongs to the reign of Iddi(n)-Sin of Simurrum, the same ruler responsible for several other inscriptions at Sar-e Pol-e Zohab and Betwate.[42] Iddi(n)-Sin established himself as ruler of an independent kingdom of Simurrum, located on the northern side of the Diyala/Sirwan River, during the last years of the Ur III Empire under Ibbi-Suen.[43] He maintained power at least through the time of Išbi-Erra of Isin.[44] In the Haladiny Inscription, Iddi(n)-Sin describes his region-wide conquests and includes the land of Halman, which would make this the earliest attestation of the toponym. This is a few decades later than Šulgi's conquests, but it now seems virtually certain that Halman already existed during this time. That it is completely absent in the Ur III records, along with other important lands on the southern side of the Diyala/Sirwan River on or near the Great Khorasan Road such as Me-Turran, Batir, Niqqum, and Namar,[45] indicates that this region was of little interest to the Ur III kings and administration.

---

rulers of Subartu in a Middle Assyrian copy of an omen text and a Seleucid chronicle text. Tabbangar in turn has sometimes been equated with a ruler of Simurrum named Tappan-Darah known from Ur III administrative texts (Owen 2000: 820-822). However, not only are these literary sources from much later periods, the equation of Rašiši with Rabsisi is made without providing arguments and is based solely on slight similarities.

[39] Much later texts equate Halman with the alternative spelling/pronunciation Arman (Levine 1974, 24-27). A toponym Arman is attested in inscriptions of Naram-Suen who claims to have conquered the city together with Ebla (in northern Syria), which would argue against an equation with Halman in the Diyala/Sirwan region (Bryce 2009, 63) unless Naram-Suen refers to another Ebla east of the Tigris (Frayne 1992, 60-61). The toponym also occurs a few times in Ur III archival records and should be located in the eastern periphery considering it paid the gún ma-da tax (Edzard & Farber 1974, 15; Steinkeller 1987, 25). The location of this Arman was probably in the Nuzi region near the Adhaim River (Astour 2002, 66), which would place it relatively close to Halman but not identical to it and away from the Great Khorasan Road. The proximity of the two locations could perhaps explain the much later equation of the two toponyms. Regardless, if the Arman of Akkadian and Ur III texts is the same as Halman of the Haladiny Inscription, it would put it at the border of the Ur III state. Considering its strategic importance, it would still be suspiciously absent in Šulgi's campaigns in this region and rarely attested in administrative records.

[40] Ahmed 2012, 264; Frayne 1999, 147-148; Levine 1974, 24-27.

[41] Ahmed 2012, 255.

[42] ibid., 249-286. Sar-e Pol-e Zohab rock relief inscriptions: Frayne 1990, 712-713; Hrouda & Trümpelmann 1976. Betwate rock relief inscriptions: Fouadi 1978; Frayne 1990, 708; Farber 1998; Shaffer, Wasserman & Seidl 2003. Betwate stele inscription (Jerusalem inscription): Shaffer, Wasserman & Seidl 2003.

[43] Shaffer, Wasserman & Seidl 2003. A comprehensive discussion of the different suggestions for the location of Simurrum can be found in Frayne 1997 and Owen 2000 who located Simurrum midway on the Diyala/Sirwan River. More recently Frayne argued for a different location further up the Diyala/Sirwan River in the Shahrizor Plain solely based on a similarity in name with the town Shamiran west of Halabja (Frayne 2008, 46; 2011). Altaweel et al. 2012 follow Frayne, again however without providing any supporting evidence. The location of Simurrum mainly depends on its identification with the ancient city of Zabban and close association with Karahar, suggesting rather that it should be located further downstream between the Jebel Hamrin and the Qara Dagh (Ahmed 2012, 297-302; Frayne 1997, 262-265; Hallo 1978; Weidner 1951).

[44] Ahmed 2012, 243-245; Frayne 1990, 707; Shaffer, Wasserman & Seidl; Walker 1985, 224-225.

[45] Frayne 1999, 148.

2. Kermanshah

Steinkeller has provided a detailed treatment of the location of Kimaš and a valuable summary of the available evidence. He offered a series of convincing arguments to reject a location in Subartu and proposed that Kimaš encompassed the region of Kermanshah.[46] However, the crucial evidence he compiled is not conclusive and can be interpreted differently.

2.1 Steinkeller's reading of the sequence of Šulgi's conquests in his year names closely follows Hallo's reconstruction of the three Zagros wars.[47] Steinkeller argues that before Kimaš could be targeted, Šulgi needed to pacify Simurrum and Lullubum to gain access to the Great Khorasan Road, which entered the Zagros from the Diyala/Sirwan River north of the Jebel Hamrin.[48] He then continues to argue that Šulgi proceeded to open an overland route from the city of Der through the difficult landscape of the Pusht-i Kuh in western Luristan in order to reach Kimaš in Kermanshah to join the Great Khorasan Road. However, if Šulgi managed to open a route to Kermanshah and the Great Khorasan Road via the Diyala/Sirwan River and Halman at present-day Sar-e Pol-e Zohab by conquering and pacifying Simurrum, then the need for another more difficult route through the Pusht-i Kuh is unclear as is the necessity to expend military resources in this area. Keeping in mind the absence of Halman and nearby regions in the Ur III sources, which would certainly be crucial to maintain safe overland routes in this direction, it is difficult to support an understanding of Šulgi's campaigns as targeting the Great Khorasan Road.

2.2 Steinkeller's main other source of evidence for locating Kimaš in the region of Kermanshah comes from the Urusagrig messenger texts (cf. supra). While these texts allow for his proposal of a Der-Kermanshah route, such a reading is not conclusive. They describe an overland route to Kimaš and Šimaški via Der, but they do not specify in which direction this route went after Der. Therefore, this overland route could have turned north to join the Great Khorasan Road at Sar-e Pol-e Zohab, or gone straight through the Pusht-i Kuh via Islamabad-e Gharb, or turned south toward Susa. The only securely located cities that appear several times in these texts are Susa and Adamdun. If the described route were further north, their inclusion in these texts would be anomalous.

2.3 Kimaš, Hurti, and Harši were eventually included in the gún ma-da tax system and were therefore incorporated in the defensive buffer zone of the Ur III state.[49] The lands within this periphery are generally located within the Trans-Tigridian and Piedmont zone. If Kimaš is to be located at Kermanshah or even further east, the Ur III state would have controlled a vast region of intermontane valleys and difficult mountain passes. It is not until the Neo-Assyrian Empire that

[46] Steinkeller 1988; 2014a, 304-312.
[47] Hallo 1978.
[48] Steinkeller 2013, 294-295.
[49] Steinkeller 2013, 305-306. In a seminal study, Steinkeller demonstrated that this "tax of the provinces" was paid by military officers and soldiers stationed in conquered lands stretched out along the eastern border of Mesopotamia from Aššur on the Tigris to Adamdun east of Susa (Steinkeller 1987, 24-28). These lands formed a buffer zone against incursions from eastern polities as well as a base for military expeditions and control over the overland trade routes (Michalowski 1978, 46). These lands in the periphery of the Ur III state were located close enough to exert control and maintain regular communication and shipment of goods. Beyond this zone were lands with which the Ur III kings had diplomatic relations or at times military conflict (e.g. Anšan, Šimaški). Kimaš and Hurti occur only a couple of times in the Puzriš-Dagan texts that record gún ma-da deliveries in the last years of Šulgi and the first years of Amar-Suen, so its integration within the empire might not have been complete (Steinkeller 2013, 305 fn. 72). Steinkeller also observed that deliveries from Kimaš and Harši are attested before the final conquest of these lands, which could indicate that these deliveries were not necessarily a result of full integration and occupation, but rather a form of tribute as part of diplomatic relations and pacification.

these lands were conquered and incorporated in a Mesopotamian state, but even the Neo-Assyrian kings struggled to maintain their control and hegemony over these parts of the Zagros Mountains.[50]

2.4 An administrative tablet mentions prisoners-of-war from Kimaš who reached Girsu/Lagaš via Urua. According to Steinkeller, this supports his identification in the Kermanshah region since the prisoners would have been led south to Khuzestan before being shipped to Lagaš.[51] There certainly are passages southward from Kermanshah toward the Susiana plains along the eastern side of the Kabir Kuh. Shipments from the Zagros region to Girsu/Lagaš frequently passed through the Susiana region traveling by boat across the northern reaches of the Persian Gulf, which during the third millennium BCE extended much further north than today.[52] An origin of these prisoners in the Zagros region, rather than Subartu, is certain considering Urua's position at the southern end of the Ur III state. However, this still allows multiple options for Kimaš' location anywhere in the central and south Zagros region.

2.5 Steinkeller considers the discovery of an Old Babylonian archive at Chogha Gavaneh within the city of Islamabad-e Gharb to be evidence for the importance of the overland route from Der to the Kermanshah plains.[53] However, while the existence of such an overland route is not in question, it is far from certain that it was frequently used by Mesopotamian travelers throughout history. What is important is that this archive does not mention Kimaš, Hurti, or Harši, which by the Old Babylonian period no longer occurred in the records and seem to have lost their relevance despite the increasing traffic along the Great Khorasan Road.

In sum, while Steinkeller's proposal provides a better hypothesis than a location in Subartu and there is no evidence explicitly refuting his identification, alternative interpretations remain. Access to the Great Khorasan Road would undoubtedly have passed through the Subartu lands along the Diyala/Sirwan River, especially after they were fully integrated within the Ur III state. If accessing the Great Khorasan Road had been the main objective, then the final victory over the important land of Simurrum would certainly have been part of the crowning achievement. But this was not the case considering the festivities and historical inscriptions focused on Kimaš. As discussed below, archaeological evidence also does not support Steinkeller's proposal, but first we need to propose a third possibility from the evidence of the texts.

3. Khorramabad (Elam)

A location of Kimaš farther south has to my knowledge not yet been proposed in any detail. While several scholars have emphasized Kimaš' association with Elamite lands, they still preferred a location further northward on the Iranian Plateau.[54] Here I argue that Harši, Hurti, and Kimaš straddled a direct route north from Susa through the southern end of the central Zagros region reaching Šimaški and the Iranian Plateau between Hamadan and Isfahan (fig. 2).

3.1 While it is true that the Urusagrig texts do not include any mention of Sabum, Urua, or Pašime, which were likely on the route south from Der, they do mention Susa and Adamdun several times. Several texts connect Kimaš with locations in southwestern Iran. An Ur III archival tablet mentions Kimaš together with Susa, Adamdun, Urua, Sabum, and Anšan. A similar list is known from an Old Babylonian copy of an Ur III text that mentions Kimaš together with Huhnuri,

[50] Balatti 2017; Levine 1974; Medveskaya 1999.
[51] Steinkeller 2013, 308.
[52] Selz 1991; 2014.
[53] Abdi & Beckman 2007; Steinkeller 2013, 311.
[54] Edzard & Röllig 1980; Lafont 1996; Vallat 1980.

Sabum, Kašdadun, and Anšan.[55] The delivery of prisoners-of-war from Kimaš to Lagaš via Urua as mentioned above provides yet another connection. Further evidence can be found in an Ur III administrative text that lists a man from Kimaš together with a man from Gara-NE.NE. The same toponym is known from an inscription of Puzurmama, an earlier king of Lagaš, that mentions Gara-NE.NE together with Susa. A Sargonic administrative text lists a delivery by a man from Susa together with a man from Gara-NE.NE. The same toponym also occurs in an Old Babylonian copy of a Sargon inscription together with Elam, Parahsum (Marhaši), Awan, and Susa.[56]

Two indirect sources offer a tenuous relationship between Kimaš and Adamdun. An Ur III text from Girsu records miners traveling to Adamdun, while two Gudea inscriptions make it clear that Kimaš was a source of copper by providing access to the nearby Mt. Abullat. As Lafont pointed out, if these two sources are related then a route from Lagaš to Kimaš runs via Adamdun.[57] A second inference of the proximity between Adamdun and Kimaš can be found in Ur III archival tablets that record supplies for soldiers stationed at Adamdun. Michalowski noticed that these texts seem to indicate that during years 45 and 46 of Šulgi's reign, immediately before his victory over Kimaš and Hurti, there was a significant buildup of troops at this city.[58] If the two events are related then this supports the idea that Adamdun is close to Kimaš and a staging point for military campaigns in the nearby Zagros Mountains.

Finally, the Puzur-Inšušinak inscription that describes his victory over his major opponents Kimaš and Hurti also lists Huhnuri (almost certainly located at Tappeh Bormi, southeast of Susa),[59] which apparently was another major conquest in Puzur-Inšušinak's Zagros campaigns.[60] All these sources combined clearly demonstrate that Kimaš was geographically close and directly connected to the cities of southwestern Iran.

3.2 Kimaš was ethnically and geographically an Elamite land. As already mentioned, the toponym frequently occurs with the determinative NIM. In addition, Kimaš, Hurti, and Harši are listed in Ur III sources as suppliers of Elamite soldiers.[61] Unfortunately almost no personal names of individuals from Kimaš are attested, but there is a seal inscription of a ruler of Kimaš named Hunnili.[62] While not fully conclusive, this name is likely Elamite.[63] Another man of Kimaš, attested together with Hunnili in an Ur III record from Puzriš-Dagan, is named Rašiši.[64] The language of this name is uncertain, but reduplication names similar to Rašiši are known to be Elamite hypocoristica.[65] This man is likely the same as a ruler of Zidanum named Raši attested in

[55] Frayne 1999, 144 referring to Çig and Kizilyaya 1969, 179; Delaporte 1912, 84.
[56] Sallaberger & Schrakamp 2015, 123.
[57] Lafont 1996; Potts 2010, 245.
[58] Michalowski 2008, 120-121.
[59] Nasrabadi 2005.
[60] Steinkeller 2013, 294.
[61] Steinkeller 2013, 306 with references in fn. 75-77.
[62] The precise writing of this individual's name is somewhat uncertain. On his seal his name is written as hu-un-NI.NI, while in an Ur III administrative record from Puzriš-Dagan it is written as Hu-un-hi-li (for references see Edzard & Farber 1974, 100; Steinkeller 2013, 307-308). While the second reading is secure, the first writing can be read in different ways with the option of NI=ì or NI=lí. A reading of lí for the last sign seems secure considering the alternative spelling with li. A reading of the first sign results in either Hunnili or Hunili, both of which are similar enough to Hu-un-hi-li, with the addition of the sound h perhaps resulting of difficulties with rendering a foreign name. Here I follow Steinkeller's spelling Hunnili, using the sign NI's first reading considering the uncertainty.
[63] Potts 2010, 248; Vallat 1993, 140; Zadok 1984, 10-11; 1991, 229-230 and 227 where he also lists Kimaš as part of Elam.
[64] Edzard & Farber 1974, 100.
[65] Zadok 1991, 232.

several contemporary Ur III administrative records, further illustrating the close connection between Kimaš and this locality.[66] Finally, An Ur III tablet mentions a man of Harši named Hubarmirsini, which could be an Elamite name.[67] This is in stark contrast to the evidence from Der and Chogha Gavaneh, part of the central Zagros region, where no Elamite names appear.

3.3 In his seal inscription, Hunnili adopted the title "ensi of Kimaš and šagina of Elam" mirroring Puzur-Inšušinak's title of "ensi of Susa and šagina of Elam".[68] Puzur-Inšušinak's conquests extended well beyond Elam, but that a local ruler claims this title implies a close Elamite connection. The adoption of this title also attests to the sudden rise to prominence of Kimaš at the beginning of the Ur III period perhaps within the context of a power vacuum in the highlands following Ur-Namma's defeat of Puzur-Inšušinak. Šulgi also styled an inscription mirroring the phrasing of Puzur-Inšušinak reflecting his control over Elam and the territories of this last king of Awan. This title was recorded on a brick inscription that describes Šulgi's victory over Kimaš and Hurti, but it is unfortunately unprovenanced. It is possible that it could have come from Susa, but remains unclear.[69] If these lands were located in the vicinity of Khuzestan as suggested by all available sources, then recording their defeat at Susa makes sense, as does the adoption of similar titulary as Puzur-Inšušinak to an audience constituted by his former subjects.

3.4 In sum, all evidence for Kimaš, Hurti, and Harši argue for a location within the region of Elam in the mountains not far from cities in the Susa region. I suggest that Harši, Hurti, and Kimaš straddled the route from Susa northward to the Iranian Plateau via Khorramabad. This identification requires an explanation for an association between Kimaš and Mount Abullat. Perhaps it is no coincidence that the location of the recently discovered ancient copper and tin mines at Deh Hosein are located directly opposite of the pass from Khorramabad to Burujird.[70] The Burujird plain could then be the location of Zidanum. Šimaški likely encompassed the plains along the eastern Zagros Piedmont with Šigriš centrally located near Arak, which fits perfectly with the suggested location of Median Sikris of Neo-Assyrian times.[71]

III. Archaeological datasets and correlations from the central Zagros region

The central Zagros region has been the subject of several archaeological surveys during the 1960s and 70s as well as excavation projects. Iranian scholars in the past two decades have supplemented these old datasets with new fieldwork projects. However, most of these, both old and more recent, remain largely unpublished or inaccessible. Still, a synthetic study of archaeological data from the central Zagros region reveals interesting patterns that can inform us about local developments in relation to the wider history of southwest Iran and the formation of the first Elamite kingdoms. Especially relevant for the location of Kimaš is the unpublished dataset of the Mahi Dasht Survey Project.

---

[66] Not only is the name almost identical, both names occur in documents of the same years and mentioned as man of either Kimaš or Zidanum, which are both associated closely with Mount Abullat: Rašiši is mentioned in a document recording the payment of gún ma-da tax together with Hunnili, both men of Kimaš, in Amar-Suen year five (Steinkeller 2013, 305 fn. 73); Raši (or once Rasi) is named man of Zidanum in administrative records from years one, two, and four of Amar-Suen's reign (Steinkeller 2014a, 292, fn. 43).

[67] Ahmed 2012, 200.

[68] Steinkeller 2013, 307-308.

[69] ibid., 305.

[70] Momenzadeh, Nezafati & Pernicka 2005; Nezafati, Pernicka & Momenzadeh 2006; 2009. It should also be noted that the Deh Hosein mine is the only one so far discovered in this archaeologically underexplored region of Iran. As the authors point out, the mine is situated at one location of a long-stretching geological range, so other mines could still await discovery.

[71] Medveskaya 1999, 57-58.

1. Godin Tepe and the Godin III ceramic tradition

Any discussion of the central Zagros region needs to begin with the site of Godin Tepe.[72] Situated in the Kangavar Plain at the eastern end of the main route through the Zagros Mountains and leading directly to Hamadan and the Iranian Plateau, Godin Tepe had a long important history beginning in the Neolithic and continuing almost unbroken into the late Iron Age. Excavations at the site produced a sequence of material culture that has become the main reference for the entire central Zagros region. During the Early and Middle Bronze Age, the material culture of the site and the region became dominated by a monochrome painted tradition best referred to as the Godin III tradition after the according phase of occupation.[73] The chronology of the ceramic tradition and the occupation phases at Godin Tepe hinges on correlations with similar material from Susa and imported vessels at the site of al-Hiba, ancient Lagaš. Discovery of early sherds of this tradition at the site of Chogha Maran near Kermanshah associated with about 160 seal impressions provide additional chronological information. While R. Henrickson originally dated the earliest phase at Godin (Godin III:6) to the Early Dynastic III period, a reevaluation of the al-Hiba sherds and the glyptic evidence of Chogha Maran pushes this further back in time.[74] We can now securely date the beginning of the Godin III:6 occupation phase in the second quarter of the third millennium BCE and the origins of the monochrome painted tradition itself even earlier. The main phase of interaction between the central Zagros region and Susa and Sumer took place during the latter part of the Early Dynastic III period based on the occurrence of monochrome painted sherds in levels of that period at al-Hiba and other south Mesopotamian sites. This corresponds to the beginning of the Godin III:5 phase of the ceramic tradition. This interaction largely ceased during the Akkadian and Ur III periods from which there is almost no evidence of influence or interaction in either direction, at least not as observed in the ceramic record.

Throughout the Early Bronze Age and into the Middle Bronze Age, the central Zagros region communities maintained a cultural tradition that is clearly distinct from developments in Mesopotamia, the Trans-Tigridian Corridor, and the Iranian Plateau.[75] Distribution maps of the Godin III:6-4 ceramic tradition show that Luristan and Kermanshah were integrated into an isolated cultural ceramic tradition possibly reflecting ethnic identity or at least shared economic and cultural practices.[76] On the other hand, metalwork such as hand axes and daggers are stylistically similar to those found in Mesopotamia, while imported cylinder seals are occasionally

[72] For an extensive bibliography and general overview of the history and results from the 1960s excavations led by T. Cuyler Young of the Royal Ontario Museum, see Gopnik & Rothman 2011.

[73] Before excavations at Godin Tepe, this monochrome painted ceramic tradition was known as Giyan IV and Susa D/IV. Based on similarities of painted vessels from the Zagros intermontane valleys and those from Susa that seemed earlier, scholars assumed that it originated at Susa and that communities in the Zagros Mountains were integrated in its influence sphere. However, the excavations at Godin Tepe and subsequent surveys throughout the region have demonstrated that the direction of influence was the reverse.

[74] Haerinck 1987; 2011; Henrickson 1985; 1987a; 1987b; Pittman 2013; Renette 2016.

[75] During the first half of the third millennium, connections between the southern Trans-Tigridian Corridor (and Diyala/Sirwan region) and the Pusht-i Kuh region at the western end of Luristan (and the present-day province of Ilam) are evident. However, these ties were severed in the second half of the third millennium when Luristan became increasingly isolated.

[76] Henrickson 1984; 1986. However, very similar painted vessels have been found at Tepe Jalyan near Fasa east of the Kur River Basin (de Miroschedji 1974). Furthermore, the Kaftari tradition of the late third and second millennium also displays an influence from the Godin III tradition.

present in burials of the second half of the third millennium.[77] Undoubtedly members of the Zagros communities traveled to neighboring regions, although the dynamics of this mobility is at present unclear.[78]

2. Central Zagros surveys

Published preliminary reports of extensive, low-resolution surveys conducted in several intermontane valleys in Luristan have argued for a near abandonment of the region during the first half of the third millennium (Early Bronze Age I-II) or at least a lack of settlements indicating a shift to more mobile lifeways.[79] Almost all of our evidence for this period comes from tombs that appear isolated with no nearby settlement.[80] However, surveys during the 1960s and 70s in the region were extensive in nature and focused on spotting relatively large tell sites rather than smaller sites. Furthermore, at that time and to some degree even to this day the local material culture of the Early Bronze Age was poorly understood, which could have resulted in a failure to detect occupation of this period. This is demonstrated particularly well in the Mahi Dasht Survey Project data (see below). In other words, the perceived lack of settlements and population in the central Zagros region during the first half of the third millennium BCE reflects the present limited state of knowledge and not necessarily the ancient reality.

With the exception of Godin Tepe, the best evidence for Early Bronze Age III occupation (ca. 2500-2300 BCE) still comes from communal tombs, which during this period became richer and frequently included a set of bronze weapons.[81] This fits well with the evidence for increased interaction between the central Zagros region and south Mesopotamia during this time. For Early Bronze Age IV (ca. 2300-2000 BCE), the time of the Akkadian and Ur III states and the appearance of the kingdoms of Awan and Šimaški in the Mesopotamian records, we have additional excavated evidence from settlement sites.[82] An interesting change in burial practices occurs from EBA III to IV. While up to the Akkadian period communal tombs were the norm, a new type of tomb with individual inhumation appears during the last quarter of the third millennium BCE.[83] This could suggest a development of social differentiation and changes in ideology away from community and toward an emerging emphasis on individual positions within society.

Regional surveys detected an increase in settlements beginning in this period. Unfortunately, the distinction of the different stylistic stages of the Godin III ceramic tradition are less clear in surface material that consists mostly of small and eroded sherds. As a result it is difficult to distinguish phases of occupation in the Early and Middle Bronze Age in survey data.

---

[77] Haerinck & Overlaet 2006, 66. However, despite typological similarities of the Luristan metal artifacts with those from Mesopotamia, archaeometallurgical analysis has demonstrated that they were made with copper from different sources located in the eastern central Zagros, near Arak where the Deh Hosein mining site was recently discovered (Haerinck & Overlaet 2008, 68).

[78] Different scenarios of the appearance of Mesopotamian imports and the emergence of metal weaponry in tombs have been proposed, including pastoral nomadism with winter pastures in the Zagros Piedmont or Khuzestan, trade, and activities as mercenaries (Haerinck & Overlaet 2006, 68-70). As for the latter, it is interesting to note that Ur III sources do mention mercenaries from the eastern mountains, using the determinative NIM in its widest sense (Michalowski 2008).

[79] Goff 1971, 149; Moghaddam & Javanmardzadeh 2013, 102; Mortensen 1974, 32; 1976, 47-48; Wright 1987, 146-147. For an opposite view, see Potts 2014, 1-46.

[80] Haerinck & Overlaet 2006; 2008; 2010

[81] Haerinck 1987, 67-68; Haerinck & Overlaet 2010; Schmidt, van Loon & Curvers 1989; Vanden Berghe 1970; 1972.

[82] Baba Jan: Goff 1985; Tepe Giyan: Contenau & Ghirshman 1935; Surkh Dum-i Luri: Schmidt, van Loon & Curvers 1989 (especially Pl. 132).

[83] Haerinck 1987, 67-68; Haerinck & Overlaet 2010.

Nevertheless, the fact that Godin Tepe covered 20 ha and was joined in the Kangavar Plain by two 15 ha towns and up to 57 small sites suggests a dense population and at least some degree of social hierarchy and potentially complex political organization. This is further corroborated by evidence for large-scale irrigation works and possibly fortifications at strategic points.[84] But while there is some evidence for Mesopotamian contacts, there are almost no ceramic parallels or shared cultural practices between the two regions.[85]

A similar growth in settlements has been observed throughout Luristan, especially in the Hulailan valley.[86] Henrickson compiled the survey and excavation data from the region and observed a widespread increase in permanent settlements. He also observed that while communal tombs were an important part of the cultural tradition throughout Luristan in the Early Bronze Age, they are so far lacking east of the Kuh-i Sefid.[87] This growth of a densely settled landscape with numerous small settlements and a few larger centers mirrors widespread contemporary developments throughout southwest Asia. A good case in point is the Deh Luran Plain where the site of Musiyan (possibly ancient Urua) became a walled center reaching 15 ha and the main economic focus of the area.[88]

At the eastern end of Luristan, a remarkably different development can be observed in the Khorramabad and Burujird plains. Unfortunately this region has only been visited sporadically by archaeologists. The available data comes from low-resolution surveys conducted in the 1960s by T.C. Young, F. Hole, and C. Goff.[89] While the northwestern region between the valleys north of the Kuh-i Garin (Kangavar and Nehavand) southward to the Saimarreh River and the Kabir Kuh became fully integrated in the Godin III ceramic tradition, such monochrome painted vessels are very rare further southeast.[90] At first glance, it might seem strange that the Khorramabad, Burujird, and to some extent the Kuh-i Dasht valleys were culturally separated from the rest of Luristan. However, this pattern is paralleled both in earlier and in more recent periods. Goff conducted survey and ethnographic fieldwork in Luristan where she observed that "below Alishtar one enters the drainage area of the Ab-i-Khorramabad, which is culturally aligned with the south" and that the entire region from Khorramabad to northern Khuzestan formed a single tribal territory.[91] This cultural alignment is probably a reflection of the topography and the natural route connecting the Khuzestan plains directly with the Iranian Plateau. For the Bronze Age, the only excavated evidence for the Khorramabad valley comes from two early tomb sites: Kunji Cave and Gilviran. The Kunji Cave burials can be securely dated to the first half of the third millennium based on

[84] Young 1966; 1975a; 1975b. Again it should be noted that it is difficult to date these sites precisely and it is unclear how much of the large scale construction work can be assigned to the Early Bronze Age rather than the Middle Bronze Age.
[85] The western Pusht-i Kuh burials do occasionally contain a few distinct Mesopotamian ceramic and metal types, but these are virtually absent throughout the rest of Luristan.
[86] Goff 1971, 149; Mortensen 1976.
[87] Henrickson 1986.
[88] Michalowski & Wright 2010.
[89] Goff 1968; 1971; Hole 2007; Young 1966; 1975a; 1975b.
[90] Young stated that he failed to find any painted sherds of this period in Khorramabad (1966, 232). Henrickson on the other hand lists the sites of Zague and Zahed, only the latter of which had a few early Godin III sherds (1986, 12). Finally, Hole has reported that only Tepe Masur (KR-5 in his survey) had painted Godin III sherds even though several small sites in the valley could be dated to the same period based on unpainted ceramic types, perhaps more closely related to the southwestern Iranian ceramic corpus (2007, 76). For an overview of the distribution of the Godin III ceramic tradition in Luristan, see the maps in Henrickson 1984a, 918-923.
[91] Goff 1968, 108; 1971, 133-134.

ceramic parallels with Proto-Elamite assemblages,[92] while Gilviran dates slightly later to the middle of the third millennium BCE.[93] Even though both sites fit well within the wider Luristan practice of communal, stone-lined tombs (so-called *lihaq*), the grave goods show a distinctly different cultural orientation toward Khuzestan and the southern Zagros region where the Proto-Elamite period material culture was widely spread. This indicates that the route from Susa northward to Khorramabad and the Burujird plains has always been an important one. While the passes through this region might not always be the easiest, this is by far the shortest route to the central Iranian Plateau from Khuzestan and it provides the best access to the lowland plains for the inhabitants of eastern Luristan who were frequently culturally aligned with their southern neighbors rather than other mountainous communities to the north. This observation lines up well with an interpretation of the textual evidence locating Kimaš at Khorramabad considering that land's clear association with the Susiana region and Elam. A location in Kermanshah is difficult to justify considering the discrepancy between the material culture of the central Zagros region and southwestern Iran.

3. The Mahi Dasht Survey Project

The case of the Kermanshah and Mahi Dasht plains is particularly informative. Survey work done in this region has mapped large portions of the largest and agriculturally most productive plains in the central Zagros region.[94] The central Zagros was a major focus of the Neo-Assyrian kings who targeted the lands of Halman, Harhar, Ellipi, and Media. However, even the Neo-Assyrian armies found it difficult to conquer and control these regions for very long, which illustrates the peculiarities of the landscape and the ease with which the local population can block routes or harass occupiers.[95] Steinkeller's proposal to locate Kimaš in this region assumes an importance of the Great Khorasan Road in antiquity and demands some consideration on the correlation of a presence of Mesopotamian powers in the archaeological record. Especially considering that Kimaš, Hurti, and Harši were part of the Ur III defensive periphery and cuneiform records show frequent travel between Mesopotamia and these lands, we could expect Mesopotamian material culture to be present in the region. The Trans-Tigridian Corridor and the Susiana had become increasingly influenced by Mesopotamian cultural practices,[96] while the Akkadian and Ur III occupation of these regions can be seen by the implementation of

[92] Especially so-called "banded ware"; Haerinck 2011; Helwing & Neumann 2014. Emberling et al. 2002 published the material from this site, but wrongfully suggested a date contemporary with Early Dynastic II based on superficial similarities of ceramic stands with Mesopotamian examples of this period.

[93] Haerinck & Overlaet 2013. Note that this tomb does contain a single spouted vessel with parallels in the Godin III tradition, but the rest of the assemblage differs significantly from the usual grave contents in Luristan tombs of this period.

[94] Apart from a few small reports, the results from this survey project remain unpublished (Levine 1975; 1976a; 1976b. For studies making use of the Mahi Dasht survey data, see also E.F. Henrickson 1994; Levine & McDonald 1977; Levine & Young 1987). The records are currently under study by the author and a publication plan has been put in place for the coming years. The project was conducted by L. Levine of the Royal Ontario Museum in 1975 and 1978. It entailed a detailed survey of about 40% of the Kermanshah and Mahi Dasht plains and five small excavations covering the Neolithic to Iron Age. I am grateful to L. Levine, C. Reichel, and B. Pratt of the Royal Ontario Museum for granting me access to this dataset and permission to analyze it for publication. I also thank R. Henrickson for detailed discussions drawing from his long experience with the local material culture and his close involvement with the project.

[95] Balatti 2017; Levine 1974; Medveskaya 1999.

[96] For a discussion of reflections of Mesopotamian control in the archaeological record at Susa, see Carter & Stolper 1984, 146-151; Potts 2016, 99-112, 141-144.

administrative (and military?) outposts such as at Gasur and the recent discovery of an Ur III and Isin-Larsa period center at Kunara near Sulaimaniyah.[97] In contrast, survey and excavation data from the Kermanshah region shows a striking lack of Mesopotamian connections or influence.

Certainly, the Kermanshah region was densely inhabited throughout the Early Bronze Age. A map of all sites with Godin III material shows a distribution of 91 sites (out of a total of 550 sites recorded in approximately 40% total surveyed area of the Kermanshah and Mahi Dasht plains).[98] The survey sheets do not record detailed estimates of site size, but they do mention whether sites were small, medium, or large with indications of length and width. At the site of Chogha Maran, a medium-sized mound northwest of Kermanshah on the northern road toward Sanandaj and Marivan, excavations revealed the edge of a settlement of the second quarter of the third millennium BCE.[99] Again, none of the ceramics can be related to Mesopotamian assemblages. Even more striking is the fact that only very few Godin III painted sherds were present. The entire assemblage displayed a peculiar local character and revealed a yet unknown ceramic tradition consisting of red- and grey-slipped pottery. Only after excavations in 1978 ended did the team understand these levels to belong to the Early Bronze Age, mainly on the basis of association with Godin III material, a Scarlet Ware related vessel, and the presence of about 160 sealings with impressions of cylinder seals. This means that during the survey in 1975 and 1978 the team did not know this local Early Bronze Age material and therefore was unable to detect settlements of this period. A detailed reanalysis of the survey records using this new information allows a tentative identification of such sites demonstrating that the plains remained inhabited contrary to the widely accepted paradigm of near complete depopulation. At least 46 sites of the EBA I-early III (ca. 3000-2400 BCE) can be identified (fig. 3). Interestingly, occupation during this period seems to have clustered in larger settlements with fifteen large sites (generally over 4 ha), eleven medium sites (usually between 1.5-4 ha), and fourteen small sites (ca. 1 ha or less).[100] None of these early sites contain much material related to the contemporary settlement at Godin Tepe in the neighboring Kangavar region. Only a few red- and grey-slipped vessels appear in the early Godin III:6 levels, while likewise a few Godin III:6 sherds were found in the Chogha Maran excavations. This divergence of cultural traditions is striking and demonstrates that the mere existence of natural routes is insufficient to assume cultural connections or even frequent traffic between regions.

For EBA III-IV through the Middle Bronze Age (ca. 2400-1800 BCE), a total of 53 sites are recorded based predominantly on the presence of abundant Godin III sherds (fig. 4).[101] In other words, there was an increase in settlements throughout the third millennium into the second

[97] Gasur: Starr 1939 and for a stratigraphic summary see Renette 2019; Kunara: Kepinski et al. 2015; Kepinski & Tenu 2014 2016; Tenu et al. 2016.

[98] Survey in 1978 revisited the 1975 survey area and detected another 394 sites. Unfortunately part of the survey records are currently lost not allowing an analysis of periodization for the 1978 surveyed sites nor their exact location. Keeping in mind a total of 944 sites distributed across about 40% of the total area of the plains, an extrapolation results in an estimate of 2360 sites with almost 400 sites containing Godin III painted sherds. While these numbers are far from accurate, they do show that the region was densely inhabited with a high population number.

[99] Pittman 2013; Renette 2016.

[100] Five sites do not have a recorded size. Also, the size indicates the full extent of the present-day site. It is not possible from the survey records to assess the size of the settlement at any specific period.

[101] However, this amount is certainly too low considering that it is very difficult to assess continuity from the earlier Bronze Age so that some of the earlier sites could have remained in use. Only six sites show clear indications of occupation during both the Early and Middle Bronze Age. But since only the presence of Godin III painted sherds can be used as indicator of occupation, Early Bronze Age sites with this material could have remained inhabited into later centuries.

millennium BCE, but the settlement pattern shifted from a dominance of large agglomerations to a few centers (eight large sites recorded) with possibly a three-tier hierarchy of settlements dotting the surrounding landscape (twenty-two medium sites and twenty-three small sites). The recorded survey pottery does not contain any types that can be clearly linked to the Mesopotamian corpus from the third and early second millennium BCE. At Tepe Gakieh, a medium-sized site southeast of Kermanshah, the Mahi Dasht Survey team conducted a sounding into levels with Godin III:5-4 material, chronologically contemporary with the Akkadian to Isin-Larsa periods in Mesopotamia. The explored contexts in the small sounding appear to have been domestic in nature. A significant amount of pottery was retrieved, all of which is strictly local.

In conclusion, while the Kermanshah region was densely inhabited during the time of Akkadian and Ur III expansion, the archaeological record at present shows almost no evidence for intense or frequent interaction. Surely we can assume that people did travel between regions and engaged with distant communities at this time, but the region does not appear to have been integrated in any way in the Mesopotamian sphere of influence. Further fieldwork could change this interpretation, for example with the discovery of a center with a Mesopotamian enclave dominating the area. However, at this time, neither survey nor excavations support any hypothesis that the region was integrated in the Ur III state or even closely engaged with it.

4. The central Iranian Plateau

The proposed region of Šimaški, covering the vast extent from Fars to the Caspian Sea, is largely unexplored territory for archaeologists, at least for the Bronze Age. If the central Zagros region is included in the lands of Gutium and Elam covers the southern Zagros, then Šimaški can reasonably be located stretched along the eastern piedmont zone from north of Shiraz and the Yazd region along Isfahan, Arak, and Hamadan, reaching the Tehran and Qazvin plains. In the northern region, sites such as Tepe Sialk, Arisman, Tepe Sofalin, and Tepe Ozbaki were urban-sized settlements that flourished during the Late Chalcolithic and Proto-Elamite periods. However, by the second quarter of the third millennium BCE, for unknown reasons, the entire region appears to have been abandoned. While there is at present not much information available, it does appear that this zone became reoccupied and reached again urban proportions by the end of the Early Bronze Age, exactly at the time when we witness the emergence of Šimaški. Undoubtedly archaeological exploration in the large valleys and plains along the eastern flanks of the Zagros Mountains could provide much-needed clues about this formative era in Elamite history.

5. Overland routes through the Zagros Mountains

Finally, a short discussion of the overland routes between Mesopotamia and the Iranian Plateau is in order. The study of interregional interaction and exchange in the ancient Near East tends to focus on long-distance distribution of artifacts and diffusion of cultural elements often with the assumption that these naturally flow along the most efficient geographical routes.[102] In the past, the identification of such routes depended on accounts of western travelers, regional surveys, and ethnographic studies of mobile populations. More recently, Geographical Information Systems (GIS) have provided a powerful tool through least-cost-path analysis to accurately map the most efficient naturally occurring routes through topographical landscapes. However, such approaches do not always succeed in taking into account historical, cultural, and economic factors that could disrupt natural movements across the landscape or inform deliberate choices for

[102] A recent thorough overview of such evidence for the Early Bronze Age can be found in Quenet 2008 and Wilkinson 2014.

alternatives. Unless we have access to detailed historical accounts of specific routes with a thorough understanding of historical geography, it is of course extremely difficult to obtain direct evidence for the use or neglect of a route.

This paper does not allow a detailed treatment of this subject, but it is useful to reiterate a few points that are directly relevant to the debate surrounding the location of lands such as Kimaš. Impressive historical sources and monuments, such as the inscriptions of Annubanini and Iddi(n)-Sin at Sar-e Pol-e Zohab, Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions retelling their military campaigns, the Bisitun rock-relief of Darius, Taq-i Bustan in Kermanshah, and the long tradition of the Silk Road demonstrate the importance of the so-called Great Khorasan Road that connected Mesopotamia with the Iranian Highlands via the Diyala/Sirwan River and the Kermanshah plains to Hamadan at least since the second millennium BCE. Considering that the northwest-southeast running folds of the Zagros Mountains impede east-west travel and there are only a few passages that allow such movement, especially with a commercial or military caravan, scholars frequently assume the primacy of the Great Khorasan Road. This assumption guides interpretations of textual sources and strategic motivations of ancient rulers. For example, the arguments for the location of Kimaš in either the Trans-Tigridian zone or Kermanshah rely on an unquestioned assumption that access to this overland route via the Diyala/Sirwan River was an important objective of Mesopotamian campaigns in the eastern highlands. However, there is very little evidence from the Early Bronze Age to support this. Even though the Kermanshah and Kangavar plains are naturally connected by this major passage through the Zagros Mountains via Bisitun, they have distinct cultural traditions during several periods. During the later Early and Middle Bronze Age the central Zagros region was culturally relatively homogeneous, but apparently quite isolated from neighboring traditions in Mesopotamia or the Iranian highlands. Because there is a lack of comparative material, it is difficult to correlate the Godin Tepe sequence with Mesopotamian chronology.

In contrast, Susa and the Khuzestan plains occupied a pivotal position in the interregional interaction sphere encompassing both Mesopotamia and the Iranian highlands. By the Akkadian and Ur III periods, Susa had become central to the foreign ambitions of Mesopotamian and Elamite rulers to control the overland routes.[103] This position is clearly reflected in the material culture of Susa and the Elamite world, in both western and eastern directions. Elamite material culture from the Early and Middle Bronze Age is closely related to Mesopotamian traditions. Clearly, access to the Iranian highlands via Susa and Elam was considered crucial and had to be maintained through diplomacy or if necessary warfare. Considering geographical proximity to southern Babylonia and higher efficiency of water transport, it should not be surprising that southern Mesopotamian polities preferred to focus on Susa and the Persian Gulf to obtain precious resources that could be funneled southward from the Iranian Plateau and Central Asia. This geographical focus for foreign trade is reflected in historical sources of the Early Bronze Age.[104] It is telling that before the second millennium BCE, places that are securely located in the western end of the Zagros region where the Great Khorasan Road enters Mesopotamia are conspicuously rare or absent in historical sources.[105] Especially the land and/or town of Halman does not occur until the very beginning of the second millennium. We could expect that this crucial area, which can be securely located near Sar-e Pol-e Zohab, would be part of Šulgi's campaigns or occur in administrative records dealing with travel in that direction. Likewise, other lands such as Batir, Niqum, and Namar are also

[103] T. Potts 1994.

[104] Amiet 1986; Laursen & Steinkeller 2017; T. Potts 1994; Selz 1991; 2014.

[105] Frayne 1999, 148: "Strangely enough, apart from Karahar, we find no references in Ur III archival texts to cities that […] lay along the Hulwan River, namely: Me-Turran, Batir, Niqum, Namar, Madar, and Padan".

lacking in Ur III sources, but are known to exist at this time.[106] The absence in those records suggests that these areas, all of which are situated along the Diyala/Sirwan River and the route into the Zagros Mountains, is another indication that this overland route was actually not of great importance throughout the Early Bronze Age.

IV. Conclusions and implications

1. The location of Šimaški with Zidanum, Zidahri, and Šigriš

With Kimaš located in the Khorramabad region, neighboring lands can also be placed on the map. We know that Zidanum was an immediate neighbor where Mount Abullat was located. The road from Khorramabad leads through a pass to the Burujird plain, a likely location for Zidanum. The Deh Hosein mine nearby confirms that this region was a source of copper and tin. The Šimaškian lands of Šigriš and Zidahri are the furthest destinations of the land route evidenced in the Urusagrig messenger texts. These can be located in the region defined by Hamadan, Arak, and Isfahan. This reading of the texts fits very well with the most likely location of the vast region of Šimaški stretched across the plains east of the Zagros Mountains.

2. Šulgi's eastern campaigns

Locating Kimaš on the Khorramabad route allows a reinterpretation of Šulgi's eastern campaigns (fig. 5). It appears that the defeat of Puzur-Inšušinak by Ur-Namma and the latter's conquests securely incorporated Susa and its surrounding region within the Ur III state.[107] His successor Šulgi's first objective was to secure the Piedmont route by incorporating Der in the Ur III state. This opened up land routes south to Susa and north to Subartu, while at the same time providing a military outpost as protection from potential raids from the central Zagros highlands.[108] He then directed his attention northward with a first Subartu war in the years 24-25, first against Karahar (perhaps located in the Mandali region) between Der and the Diyala/Sirwan River and then against Simurrum on the northern side of the Diyala/Sirwan River between the Jebel Hamrin in the southwest and the Qara Dagh in the northeast. Having temporarily secured the northeast, he then attempted for the first time to gain direct access to the Iranian Plateau from Susa by targeting Harši in year 27 in the first Elam war. Possibly he failed to defeat and conquer Hurti and Kimaš during this campaign resulting in their omission from the year name. Following this failure to access the Khorramabad route, he attempted to open diplomatic relations with Anšan establishing a marriage pact in year 30. His endeavors in Elam were brought to a halt by an uprising of Karahar and Simurrum between year 31-33 resulting in the second Subartu war. Possibly encouraged by the absence of Šulgi's armies, the relations between Anšan and the Ur III state deteriorated forcing Šulgi to conduct a second Elam war in year 34 in the hopes of forcing Anšan to open up the overland trade routes from the Iranian Plateau. In the following ten years, Šulgi lost control over Subartu, which became an ever-increasing threat to the point that he decided to construct a northeastern defensive wall protecting Babylonia from incursions. The third Subartu war required Šulgi to spend many years in the region battling not only Simurrum, but also the more distant lands of Šašrum (in the Rania Plain), Urbilum (Erbil), and Lullubum (in the Bazyan, Tanjaro, and

[106] For example, Namar occurs already in Old Akkadian sources, but is absent in Ur III records (Levine 1974, 22).
[107] De Graef 2015, 289; Marchesi 2013; Steinkeller 2013, 298.
[108] That such raids were a concern is attested by a letter from either the Akkadian or Ur III period that mentioned a small army of Gutians attacking the road between Der and Susa (Haerinck & Overlaet 2010, 148-149). The Urusagrig texts also mention "bandits", either in the vicinity of Urusagrig, but perhaps also on the overland route followed by the messengers (Owen 2013, 123-125).

Shahrizor plains).[109] In year 45 he finally managed complete victory over these forces, which is reflected in a year name listing the main adversaries and using the alternative phrasing "he smashed the heads". With Subartu finally subdued and integrated into the Ur III state, he could then reallocate troops toward Elam with a preparatory buildup in the southern frontier at Adamdun. From Adamdun, he then launched the third Elam war during which he finally gained direct access to the Iranian Plateau and Šimaški via the Khorramabad route, thereby bypassing Anšan. By establishing direct relations between the Ur III state and Šimaški, Šulgi inadvertently could have contributed to its growing political power.

3. Historical development of early Elam

Both the archaeological record and the textual evidence of the Akkadian and Ur III periods indicate that the central Zagros region of intermontane valleys from the Diyala/Sirwan River to the Khorramabad drainage system was isolated from the political developments in southwest Iran and Mesopotamia. Awan, located east of Susa, encompassed the heartland of Elam from the Susiana to Anšan. At this time, Šimaški might still have been a more modest entity, geographically much more restricted. Following the fall of the Akkadian Empire and the ensuing power vacuum, local rulers could emerge throughout southwest Iran. Eventually, Puzur-Inšušinak managed to obtain hegemony and established his seat of power at Susa, which required pacifying the land routes through the surrounding mountain regions and securing access to the Iranian Plateau. The lands of Harši, Hurti, and Kimaš straddled the shortest route northward from Susa. Puzur-Inšušinak's victory and control over this route was a memorable achievement by reaching the emerging kingdom of Šimaški and direct access to the overland trade routes reaching as far as Central Asia. The Šimaškian king's visit to Susa was testimony to this accomplishment and forged new diplomatic relations.

Locating Kimaš at Khorramabad also has ramifications for the extent of Puzur-Inšušinak's kingdom. Even though he campaigned in and conquered the Zagros Piedmont and Diyala/Sirwan region, currently we do not have any reference to Gutians or the land of Gutium in his inscriptions despite that these conquests very likely put him in direct conflict with them. The archaeological evidence of relative isolation of Luristan and Kermanshah and the lack of evidence of control over the Great Khorasan Road, suggests that this region was never conquered by the Ur III state or Puzur-Inšušinak. It is reasonable to assume that this was the location of the land of Gutium from where different Gutian groups conducted raids and infiltrated the eastern alluvium, especially around Adab and Umma.[110]

Ur-Namma's defeat of Puzur-Inšušinak and conquest of Susa and the Khuzestan plains created a new power vacuum in the surrounding mountain lands. In this context, Hunnili, ruler of Kimaš, could have adopted the title "ruler of Kimaš and šagina of Elam" in an attempt to obtain the status of the former kings of Awan. However, Šulgi's conquests put an end to his ambitions. Again the opening of a direct route from Susa was a major strategic and commercial accomplishment, bypassing Anšan, and resulting in direct diplomatic relations with the ruler of Šimaški who sent ambassadors to Babylonia and became a political and commercial ally of the Ur III state. This in turn increased Šimaški's importance and wealth at the expense of Anšan. The Elamite ruler Ebarat secured relative stability in the highlands between Susa and Anšan in a

[109] It is tempting to see the ever further reaching northern extent of Šulgi's campaigns in Subartu as mission-creep with more and more cities and polities resisting Babylonian incursions and control.
[110] Sallaberger & Schrakamp 2015, 113-130; Steinkeller 2015.

symbiotic relationship with the Ur III state.[111] Following the disintegration of the Ur III state under Ibbi-Suen, Kindattu, successor of Ebarat, established the independent Old Elamite kingdom encompassing the Susiana, the Elamite highlands including Anšan, and the Iranian Plateau.[112] Kimaš occupied a prominent position within the Ur III administration, which it would lose when absorbed in a large Elamite state. Its rulers remained loyal to Ibbi-Suen to maintain their privileged status, but for a third and final time a more powerful king took control of the overland route between Susa and the Iranian Plateau. This time however, the political integration of the lands of Šimaški, Anšan, and Susa rendered Kimaš and the strategic route through its territory into merely one of many regions within a powerful empire.

Bibliography

Abdi, K. & G. Beckman, 2007, "An Early Second-Millennium Cuneiform Archive from Chogha Gavaneh, Western Iran", *JCS* 59, 39-91.

Ahmed, K.M. 2012. *The Beginnings of Ancient Kurdistan (c. 2500-1500 BC). A Historical and Cultural Synthesis*, unpublished PhD. dissertation, Leiden.

Altaweel, M., A. Marsh, S. Mühl, O. Nieuwenhuyse, K. Radner, K. Rasheed & S.A. Saber, 2012, "New Investigations in the Environment, History, and Archaeology of the Iraq Hilly Flanks: Shahrizor Survey Project 2009-2011", *Iraq* 74, 1-35.

Amiet, P., 1986, *L'âge des échanges inter-iraniens 3500-1700 avant J.-C.* (Notes et documents des musées de France 11), Paris.

Astour, M.C., 2002, "A Reconstruction of the History of Ebla (Part 2)", C.H. Gordon & G.A. Rendsburg (eds.), *Eblaitica 4: Essays on the Ebla Archives and Eblaite Language*, Winona Lake, 57-195.

Balatti, S., 2017, *Mountain Peoples in the Ancient Near East. The Case of the Zagros in the First Millennium BCE* (Classica et Orientalia 18), Wiesbaden.

Bryce, T., 2009, *The Routledge Handbook of the Peoples and Places of Ancient Western Asia. From the Early Bronze Age to the Fall of the Persian Empire*, London and New York.

Carter, E. & M.W. Stolper, 1984, *Elam. Surveys of Political History and Archaeology* (University of California Publications: Near Eastern Studies 25), Los Angeles.

Çig, M. & H. Kizilyay, 1969, *Sumer Edebî Tablet ve Parçalari*, Ankara.

Contenau, G. & R. Ghirshman, 1935, *Fouilles de Tepe Giyan, près de Nehavend, 1931-32*, Paris.

De Graef, K., 2008, "Annus Simaškensis. L'usage des noms d'année pendant la période simaškéenne (ca. 1930-1880 av. notre ère) à Suse", *Iranica Antiqua* 43, 67-87.

De Graef, K., 2015, "Susa in the Late 3rd Millennium: From a Mesopotamian Colony to an Independent State (MC 2110-1980)", W. Sallaberger & I. Schrakamp (eds.), *ARCANE Vol. III: History & Philology*, Turnhout, 289-296.

Delaporte, L., 1912, *Textes de l'époque d'Ur* (Inventaire des Tablettes de Tello IV), Paris.

Desset, F., 2017, "Here ends the history of Elam: Toponomy, linguistics and cultural identity in Susa and south-western Iran, ca. 2400-1800 BC", *Studia Mesopotamica* 4: 1-32.

de Miroschedji, P., 1974, "Tépé Jalyan, une nécropole du IIIe millénaire av. J.-C. au Fars oriental (Iran)", *Arts Asiatiques* 30, 19-64.

[111] Steinkeller 2014a, 287.

[112] Potts 2016: 134-137; Steinkeller 2007; 2014a; Stolper 1982.

de Miroschedji, P., 2003, "Susa and the Highlands. Major Trends in the History of Elamite Civilization", N. Miller & K. Abdi (eds.), *Yeki Bud, Yeki Nabud. Essays on the Archaeology of Iran in Honor of William M. Sumner*, Los Angeles, 16-38.
Edzard, D.O. & G. Farber, 1974, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der Zeit der 3. Dynastie von Ur* (Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 2), Wiesbaden.
Edzard, D.O. & W. Röllig, 1980, "Kimaš", *RlA* 5, 593.
Emberling, G., G. Robb, J.D. Speth & H.T. Wright, 2002, "Kunji Cave: Early Bronze Age Burials in Luristan", *Iranica Antiqua* 37, 47-104.
Farber, W., 1998, "Did Kulunnum 'carry a campaign' against Anzabazuna of Simurrum?", *NABU* 1998/129.
Fouadi, A.H.A., 1978, "Inscriptions and reliefs from Bitwata", *Sumer* 34, 122-129.
Francfort, H.-P. & X. Tremblay, 2010, "Marhaši et la Civilisation de l'Oxus", *Iranica Antiqua* 45, 51-224.
Frayne, D., 1990. *Old Babylonian Period (2003-1595 BC)* (RIME 4), Toronto.
Frayne, D., 1992, *The Early Dynastic List of Geographical Names*, New Haven.
Frayne, D., 1997, "On the Location of Simurrum", G.D. Young, M.W. Chavalas & R.E. Averbeck (eds.), *Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons. Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour on His 80th Birthday*, Bethesda, 243-269.
Frayne, D., 1999, "The Zagros Campaigns of Šulgi and Amar-Suena", D.I. Owen & G. Wilhelm (eds.), *Nuzi at Seventy-Five* (Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians 10), Bethesda, 141-201.
Frayne, D., 2008, "The Zagros Campaigns of the Ur III Kings", *The Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 3, 33-56.
Frayne, D., 2011, "Simurrum", *RlA* 12/7-8, 508-511.
Goetze, A., 1950. "Sin-iddinam of Larsa. New Tablets from his Reign", *JCS* 4, 83-118.
Goff, C.L., 1968, "Luristan in the First Half of the First Millennium B.C.: A Preliminary Report on the First Season's Excavations at Baba Jan, and Associated Surveys in the Eastern Pish-i-Kuh", *Iran* 6, 105-134.
Goff, C.L., 1971, "Luristan before the Iron Age", *Iran* 9, 131-152.
Goff, C.L., 1975, "Excavations at Baba Jan: The Bronze Age Occupation", *Iran* 14, 19-40.
Gopnik, H. & M.S. Rothman, 2011, *On the High Road: The History of Godin Tepe, Iran*, Cost Mesa.
Haerinck, E., 1987, "The chronology of Luristan, Pusht-i Kuh in the late fourth and first half of the third millennium B.C.", J.-L. Huot (ed.), *Préhistoire de la Mésopotamie*, Paris, 55-72.
Haerinck, E., 2011, "Painted pottery of the first half the Early Bronze Age (late 4th – first centuries of the 3rd millennium BC) in Luristan, W-Iran", *Iranica Antiqua* 46, 55-106.
Haerinck, E. & B. Overlaet, 2006, *Bani Surmah. An Early Bronze Age graveyard in Pusht-i Kuh, Luristan* (Luristan Excavation Documents VI, Acta Iranica 43), Leuven.
Haerinck, E. & B. Overlaet, 2008, *The Kalleh Nisar Bronze Age graveyard in Pusht-i Kuh, Luristan* (Luristan Excavation Documents VII, Acta Iranica 46), Leuven.
Haerinck, E. & B. Overlaet, 2010, *Early Bronze Age Graveyards to the West of the Kabir Kuh (Pusht-i Kuh, Luristan)* (Luristan Excavation Documents VIII, Acta Iranica 50), Leuven.
Haerinck, E. & B. Overlaet, 2013, "An Early Bronze Age tomb near Khorramabad (W-Iran). Herzfeld's Gilviran revisited", *Iranica Antiqua* 48, 39-76.
Hallo, W.W., 1978, "Simurrum and the Hurrian Frontier", *RHA* 36, 71-83.
Heimpel, W., 2009, "The Location of Madga", *JCS* 61, 25-61.

Helwing, B. & G. Neumann, 2014, "Local Painted Ceramics in Western Iran", M. Lebeau (ed.), *ARCANE Interregional Vol. I: Ceramics*, Turnhout, 41-81.
Henrickson, E.F., 1994, "The Outer Limits: Settlement and Economic Strategies in the Central Zagros Highlands During the Uruk Era", G. Stein & M.S. Rothman (eds.), *Chiefdoms and Early States in the Near East. The Organizational Dynamics of Complexity* (Monographs in World Archaeology 18), Madison, 85-102.
Henrickson, R.C., 1984a, *Godin Tepe, Godin III, and Central Western Iran: c. 2600-1500 B.C.*, unpublished Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto.
Henrickson, R.C., 1984b, "Šimaški and central western Iran: The archaeological evidence", *ZA* 74, 98-122.
Henrickson, R.C., 1985, "The Chronology of Central Western Iran 2600-1400 B.C.", *AJA* 89/4, 569-581.
Henrickson, R.C., 1986, "A Regional Perspective on Godin III Cultural Development in Central Western Iran", *Iran* 24, 1-55.
Henrickson, R.C., 1987a, "Godin III and the Chronology of Central Western Iran circa 2600-1400 B.C.", F. Hole (ed.), *The Archaeology of Western Iran. Settlement and Society from Prehistory to the Islamic Conquest*, Washington, 205-227.
Henrickson, R.C., 1987b, "The Godin III Chronology for Central Western Iran 2600-1400 B.C.", *Iranica Antiqua* 27, 33-116.
Hole, F., 2007, "Cycles of Settlement in the Khorramabad Valley in Luristan, Iran", E.C. Stone, (ed.), *Settlement and Society. Essays Dedicated to Robert McCormick Adams*, Los Angeles and Chicago, 63-82.
Hrouda, B. & L. Trümpelmann, 1976, *Iranische Felsreliefs C. Sarpol-i Zohab* (Iranische Denkmäler 7), Berlin.
Hussein, A.M., H. Ali Hamza, A.K. Thaher, S.J. Kadhum, M. Hashem, H.M. Taha, M.R. Altaweel, B. Studevent-Hickman, 2010, "Tell Abu Sheeja/Ancient Pasime. Report on the First Season of Excavations, 2007", *Akkadica* 131, 47-103.
Kepinski, C. & A. Tenu, 2014, "Kunara, ville majeure de la haute vallée du Tanjaro", *Revue d'archéologie de l'Orient ancien* Hors-Série 1, 4-19.
Kepinski, C. & A. Tenu, 2016, "Two seasons of excavations at Kunara (Upper Tanjaro): An Early and Middle Bronze Age city", K. Kopanias & J. MacGinnis (eds.), *The Archaeology of the Kurdistan Region of Iraq and Adjacent Regions*, Oxford, 139-146.
Kepinski, C., A. Tenu, C. Benech, P. Clancier, B. Hollemaert, N. Ouraghi, C. Verdellet, 2015, "Kunara, petite ville des piedmonts du Zagros à l'âge du Bronze: rapport préliminaire sur la première campagne de fouille, 2012 (Kurdistan irakien)", *Akkadica* 136/1, 51-88.
Kutscher, R., 1989, *The Brockmon tablets at the University of Haifa: The royal inscriptions*, Haifa.
Lafont, B., 1996, "L'extraction du minerai de cuivre en Iran à la fin du IIIe millénaire", Ö, Tunca & D. Deheselle (eds.), *Tablettes et images aux pays de Sumer et d'Akkad. Mélanges offerts à Monsieur H. Limet*, Liège, 87-94.
Laursen, S. & Steinkeller, P., 2017, *Babylonia, the Gulf Region, and the Indus: Archaeological and Textual Evidence for Contact in the Third and Early Second Millennia B.C.* (Mesopotamian Civilizations 21), Winona Lake.
Levine, L.D., 1974, *Geographical Studies in the Neo-Assyrian Zagros*, Toronto and London.
Levine, L.D., 1975, "Archaeological Investigations in the Mahidasht, Western Iran, 1975", *Paléorient* 2/2, 487-490.

Levine, L.D., 1976a, “The Mahidasth Project”, *Iran* 14, 160-161.
Levine, L.D., 1976b, “Survey in the Province of Kermanshah, 1975: Mahidasht in the Prehistoric and Early Historic Periods”, F. Bagherzadeh (ed.), *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Archaeological Research in Iran 4*, Tehran, 284-297.
Levine, L.D. & M.M.A. McDonald, 1977, “The Neolithic and Chalcolithic Periods in the Mahidasht”, *Iran* 15, 39-50.
Levine, L.D. & T.C. Young, 1987, “A summary of the ceramic assemblages of the central Western Zagros from the middle Neolithic to the late third millennium B.C.”, J.-L. Huot (ed.), *Préhistoire de la Mésopotamie*, Paris, 15-53.
Marchesi, G., 2013, “Ur-Nammâ(k)’s Conquest of Susa”, K. De Graef & J. Tavernier (eds.), *Susa and Elam. Archaeological, Philological, Historical and Geographical Perspectives* (Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse 58), Leiden, 285-291.
Medveskaya, I.N., 1999, “Media and Its Neighbors I: The Localization of Ellipi”, *Iranica Antiqua* 34, 53-70.
Michalowski, P., 1978, “Foreign Tribute to Sumer during the Ur III Period”, *ZA* 68, 34-49.
Michalowski, P., 1986, “Mental Maps and Ideology: Reflections on Subartu”, H. Weiss (ed.) *The Origins of Cities in Dry-Farming Syria and Mesopotamia in the Third Millennium B. C.* Four Quarters, 129-156.
Michalowski, P., 1999, “Sumer Dreams of Subir: Politics and the Geographical Imagination", K. van Lerberghe & G. Voet (eds.), *At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro-Mesopotamian Realm*. Leuven, 305-316.
Michalowski, P., 2008, “Observations on ‘Elamites’ and ‘Elam’ in Ur III Times”, P. Michalowski (ed.), *On the Third Dynasty of Ur: Studies in Honor of Marcel Sigrist* (Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplemental Series 1), Boston, 109-124.
Michalowski, P., 2012, “Subartu”, R.S. Bagnall, K. Brodersen, C.B. Champion, A. Erskine & S.R. Huebner (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, Oxford, 6431-6432.
Michalowski, P. & Wright, H.T., 2010, “The Mid-Late Third Millennium B.C. on the Deh Luran Plain”, H.T. Wright & J.A. Neely (eds.), *Elamite and Achaemenid Settlement on the Deh Luran Plain. Towns and Villages of the Early Empires in Southwestern Iran* (Memoirs of the Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan 47), Ann Arbor, 106-109.
Momenzadeh, H., N. Nezafati & E. Pernicka, 2005, “First indication of tin at the ancient mining site near Deh Hosein”, H. Kars & E. Burke (ed.), *Proceedings of the 33rd International Symposium on Archaeometry, 22-26 April 2002, Amsterdam*, Amsterdam, 116-117.
Moghaddam, A. & A. Javanmardzadeh, 2013, “The Chalcolithic in the Central Zagros”, D.T. Potts (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Ancient Iran*, Oxford, 105-119.
Mortensen, P., 1974, “A survey of prehistoric settlements in northern Luristan”, *Acta Archaeologica* 45, 1-47.
Mortensen, P., 1976, “Chalcolithic Settlements in the Holailan Valley”, F. Bagherzadeh (ed.), *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Archaeological Research in Iran 4*, Tehran, 42-62.
Nasrabadi, B.M., 2005. “Ein Steininschrift des Amar-Suena aus Tappeh Bormi (Iran)”, *ZA* 95, 161-171.
Nezafati, N., E. Pernicka & M. Momenzadeh, 2006, “Ancient tin: Old question and a new answer”, *Antiquity* 80/308.

Nezafati, N., E. Pernicka & M. Momenzadeh, 2009, "Introduction of the Deh Hosein Ancient Tin-Copper Mine, Western Iran: Evidence from Geology, Archaeology, Geochemistry and Lead Isotope Data", *Tüba-Ar* 12, 223-236.
Owen, D.I., 2000, "The Royal Gift Seal of Silluš-Dagan, Governor or Simurrum", S. Graziani (ed.), *Studi sul Vicino Oriente antico dedicati alla memoria di Luigi Cagni* (Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor LXI), Naples, 829-859.
Owen, D.I., 2013, *Cuneiform Texts Primarily from Iri-Sagrîg/Al-Sarraki and the History of the Ur III Period* (NISABA 15), Bethesda.
Pittman, H., 2013, "Chogah Maran in the Central Zagros: The Glyptic Art of the Early Bronze Age", P. Bielinski, M. Gawlikowski, R. Kolinski, D. Lawecka, A. Soltysiak & Z. Wygnanska (eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th International Congress of the Ancient Near East*, Wiesbaden, 48-63.
Poebel, A. 1930, "Sumerische Untersuchungen IV", *ZA* 39, 129-164.
Potts, D.T., 2008, "Puzur-Inšušinak and the Oxus Civilization (BMAC): Reflections on Šimaški and the geo-political landscape of Iran and Central Asia in the Ur III period", *ZA* 98, 165-194.
Potts, D.T., 2010, "Adamšah, Kimaš and the miners of Lagaš", H.D. Baker, E. Robson & G. Zólyomi (eds.), *Your Praise is Sweet. A Memorial Volume for Jeremy Black from Students, Colleagues and Friends*, London, 245-254.
Potts, D.T., 2014, *Nomadism in Iran. From Antiquity to the Modern Era*, Oxford.
Potts, D.T., 2016, *The Archaeology of Elam. Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State. Second Edition*, Cambridge.
Potts, T., 1994, *Mesopotamia and the East. An Archaeological and Historical Study of Foreign Relations ca. 3400-2000 BC* (Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph 37), Oxford.
Quenet, P., 2008, *Les échanges du nord de la Mésopotamie avec ses voisins proche-orientaux au IIIe millenaire (ca 3100-2300 av. J.-C.)* (Subartu XXII), Turnhout.
Renette, S., 2016, "Painted Pottery from Al-Hiba: Godin Tepe III Chronology and Interactions between Ancient Lagash and Elam", *Iran* 53, 49-63.
Renette, S., 2019, "Stratigraphy", E. Rova (ed.) *ARCANE: Tigridian Region*, Turnhout, 19-40.
Sallaberger, W. & I. Schrakamp, 2015, *ARCANE III: History & Philology*, Turnhout.
Schmidt, E.F., M.N, van Loon & H.H. Curvers, H.H., 1989, *The Holmes Expeditions to Luristan* (Oriental Institute Publications 108), Chicago.
Selz, G.J., 1991, "'Elam' und 'Sumer' – Skizze einer Nachbarschaft nach inschriftlichen Quellen der vorsargonischen Zeit", L. De Meyer & H. Gasche (eds.), *Mésopotamie et Elam* (Mesopotamian History and Environment Occasional Publications 1), Ghent, 27-43.
Selz, G.J., 2014, "Feeding the travellers: On Early Dynastic travel, travel networks and travel provisions in the frame of third millennium Mesopotamia", L. Milano (ed.), *Paleonutrition and Food Practices in the Ancient Near East: Towards a Multidisciplinary Approach* (History of the Ancient Near East Monographs 14), Padua, 261-279.
Shaffer, A., N. Wasserman & U. Seidl, 2003, "Iddi(n)-Sîn, King of Simurrum. A new rock-relief inscription and a reverential seal", *ZA* 93, 1-52.
Starr, R.F.S., 1939, *Nuzi*, Cambridge.
Steinkeller, P., 1982, "The Question of Marhaši: A Contribution to the Historical Geography of Iran in the Third Millennium B.C.", *ZA* 72, 237-265.

Steinkeller, P., 1987, "The Administrative and Economic Organization of the Ur III State: The Core and the Periphery", McG. Gibson & R.D. Biggs (eds.), *The Organization of Power: Aspects of Bureaucracy in the Ancient Near East* (SAOC 46), Chicago, 15-34.
Steinkeller, P., 1988b, "On the Identity of the Toponym LÚ.SU(.A)", *JAOS* 108, 197-202.
Steinkeller, P., 2001, "New Light on the Hydrology and Topography of Southern Babylonia in the Third Millennium", *ZA* 91, 22-84.
Steinkeller, P., 2007, "New light on Šimaški and its rulers", *ZA* 97, 215-232.
Steinkeller, P., 2012, "New Light on Marhaši and Its Contacts with Makkan and Babylonia", J. Giraud & G. Gernez (eds.), *Aux marges de l'archéologie: Hommage à Serge Cleuziou* (Travaux de la Maison René-Ginouvès 16), Paris, 261-274.
Steinkeller, P., 2013, "Puzur-Inšušinak at Susa: A pivotal episode of early Elamite history reconsidered", K. De Graef & J. Tavernier (eds.), *Susa and Elam. Archaeological, Philological, Historical and Geographical Perspectives* (Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse 58), Leiden, 293-318.
Steinkeller, P., 2014a, "On the dynasty of Šimaški: Twenty years (or so) after", M. Kozuh, W.F.M. Henkelman, C.E. Jones & C. Woods (eds.), *Extraction and Control: Studies in honor of Matthew W. Stolper* (SAOC 69), Chicago, 287-296.
Steinkeller, P., 2014b, "Marhaši and Beyond: The Jiroft Civilization in a Historical Perspective", C.C. Lamberg-Karlovsky & B. Genito (eds.), *'My Life is like the Summer Rose'. Maurizio Tosi e 'Archeologia come modo di vivere* (BAR International Series 2690), Oxford, 691-708.
Steinkeller, P., 2015, "The Gutian Period in Chronological Perspective", W. Sallaberger & I. Schrakamp (eds.), *ARCANE III: History & Philology*, Turnhout, 281-288.
Stève, M.-J., 2001, "La tablette sumérienne de Šuštar (T. MK 203)", *Akkadica* 121, 5-21.
Stolper, M.W., 1982, "On the Dynasty of Šimaški and Its Rulers", *ZA* 72, 42-67.
Tenu, A., M. Altaweel, P. Clancier, F. Marchand, N. Ouraghi, B. Perello, C. Verdellet, 2016, "Kunara, une ville du IIIe millénaire dans les piémonts du Zagros. Rapport préliminaire sur la troisieme campagne de fouilles", *Akkadica* 137/2, 109-182.
Vallat, F., 1980, *Suse et l'Elam*, Paris.
Vallat, F., 1985, "Éléments de géographie élamite", *Paléorient* 11/2, 49-54.
Vallat, F., 1993, *Les noms géographiques des sources suso-élamites* (RGTC 11), Wiesbaden.
Vanden Berghe, L., 1970, "Prospections archéologiques dans la région de Badr", *Archeologia* 36, 10-21.
Vanden Berghe, L., 1972, "Recherches archéologiques dans le Luristan. Cinquième champagne: 1969. Prospections dans le Pusht-i Kuh Central (rapport préliminaire)", *Iranica Antiqua* 9, 1-48.
Verkinderen, P., 2004, *Dêr. Grenzen, goden, geschiedenis [Dêr. Borders, Gods, and History]*, unpublished MA thesis, Ghent.
Walker, M.F., 1985, *The Tigris Frontier from Sargon to Hammurabi: A Philological and Historical Synthesis*, Ann Arbor.
Weidner, E.F., 1951, "Simurrum und Zaban", *AfO* 15, 75-80.
Wilkinson, T.C., 2014, *Tying the Threads of Eurasia. Trans-regional routes and material flows in Transcaucasia, eastern Anatolia and western Central Asia, c. 3000-1500 BC*, Leiden.
Wright, H.T., 1987, "The Susiana Hinterlands during the Era of Primary State Formation", F. Hole (ed.), *The Archaeology of Western Iran. Settlement and Society from Prehistory to the Islamic Conquest*, Washington D.C., 141-156.

Young, T.C., 1966, “Survey in western Iran, 1961”, *JNES* 25/4, 228-239.
Young, T.C., 1975a, “An Archaeological Survey of the Kangavar Valley”, F. Bagherzadeh (ed.), *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Archaeological Research in Iran 3*, Tehran, 23-30.
Young, T.C., 1975b, “Kangavar Valley Survey”, *Iran* 13, 191-193.
Zadok, R., 1984, *The Elamite Onomasticon* (AION Suppl. 40), Naples.
Zadok, R., 1991, “Elamite Onomastics”, *Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico* 8, 225-237.