

# Leipziger Altorientalistische Studien

Herausgegeben von  
Michael P. Streck

Band 5

2017

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

# Wandering Arameans: Arameans Outside Syria

Textual and Archaeological Perspectives

Edited by  
Angelika Berlejung, Aren M. Maeir and Andreas Schüle

2017

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Cover illustration: Bronze Horse Frontlet from the Heraion of Samos, Greece,  
with an inscription of Hazael, from the Samos Archaeological Museum.  
Photograph by Aren M. Maeir.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek  
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen  
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet  
über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek  
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche  
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet  
at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our  
website <http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2017  
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.  
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission  
of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies  
particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage  
and processing in electronic systems.  
Printed on permanent/durable paper.  
Printing and binding: Hubert & Co., Göttingen  
Printed in Germany

ISSN 2193-4436  
ISBN 978-3-447-10727-3

## Contents

Figures .....	VI
Abbreviations .....	VII
Foreword .....	IX
I. Syria and Palestine	
Jonathan S. Greer – Grand Rapids, USA The Cult at Tel Dan: Aramean or Israelite?.....	3
Holger Gzella – Leiden New Light on Linguistic Diversity in Pre-Achaemenid Aramaic: Wandering Arameans or Language Spread? .....	19
Yigal Levin – Ramat-Gan “My Father was a Wandering Aramean”: Biblical Views of the Ancestral Relationship between Israel and Aram .....	39
Aren M. Maeir – Ramat-Gan Can Material Evidence of Aramean Influences and Presence in Iron Age Judah and Israel be Found? .....	53
Andreas Schüle – Leipzig Balaam from Deir Allā – A Peripheral Aramean?.....	69
Omer Sergi – Tel Aviv The Battle of Ramoth-gilead and the Rise of the Aramean Hegemony in the Southern Levant during the Second Half of the 9th Century BCE .....	81
II. Mesopotamia and Egypt	
Angelika Berlejung – Leipzig and Stellenbosch Social Climbing in the Babylonian Exile .....	101
Johannes Hackl – Leipzig Babylonian Scribal Practices in Rural Contexts: A Linguistic Survey of the Documents of Judean Exiles and West Semites in Babylonia (CUSAS 28 and BaAr 6) .....	125

Takayoshi M. Oshima – Leipzig How “Mesopotamian” was Ahiqar the Wise? A Search for Ahiqar in Cuneiform Texts .....	141
Michael P. Streck – Leipzig Late Babylonian in Aramaic Epigraphs on Cuneiform Tablets .....	169
K. Lawson Younger, Jr. – Deerfield, IL Tiglath-Pileser I and the Initial Conflicts of the Assyrians with the Arameans....	195
Günter Vittmann – Würzburg Arameans in Egypt .....	229
Index of Bible Verses .....	281
Index of Places and Proper Names .....	285
Index of subjects (selected).....	296

## Figures

Figure 1: Map of sites mentioned in “Evidence of Aramean Influence in Iron Age Judah and Israel”. .....	61
Figure 2: Pottery and objects of possible Aramean origin/influence from Tell es-Safi/Gath: a-c) pottery stands found with the fill of the Aramean siege trench; d) glazed vessel found within the fill of the Aramean siege trench; e) incised stone objects discovered on site. ....	62
Figure 3: View, looking east, of the Iron Age IIA fortifications of the lower city of Gath (2015 season of excavations). ....	63
Figure 4: The seal of Ahīqam (courtesy Cornelia Wunsch). ....	114
Figure 5: Distribution of text types. ....	127
Figure 6: Use of the unorthodox sign values. ....	128
Figure 7: Use of otherwise unattested sign values. ....	128
Figure 8: Examples for variation in word choice. ....	135
Figure 9: Analysis of orthographies and efectiva pronuncia. ....	147
Figure 10: Names and their definitions in the Uruk List. ....	149
Figure 11: Chronicles arrangement according to regnal years. ....	201
Figure 12: Geographic delimits according to A.087.3 and A.0.87.4. ....	208

Figure 13: Summary of Assyrian fort systems. ....	211
Figure 14: Map of Assyrian fort systems. ....	212
Figure 15: Military action against Karduniaš according to A.0.87.4 and the Pakute Inscription. ....	213
Figure 16: Chronology of the interactions of Tiglath-pileser I and Marduk-nādin-aḥḫē. ....	221
Figure 17: Depictions of Semites on Egypto-Aramaic stelae: (a) TAD D20.3 (details, from Lidzbarski 1898, II, pl. 28); (b) TAD D20.6 (author's drawing); (c) TAD D20.4 (from Aimé-Giron 1939, Pl. 3 No. 114). ....	236
Figure 18: Chahapi (detail from stela Berlin 2118; author's drawing). ....	237
Figure 19: Find-spots of Aramaic texts. ....	238
Figure 20: Detachment commanders. ....	239
Figure 21: House-owners at Elephantine (dark grey: Egyptians; middle grey: Iranians; light grey: the "half-Egyptian" Harwodj). ....	243
Figure 22: a) Genealogy of Yedaniah and Mibtāḥiah; (b) Mibtāḥiah's slaves. Women's names in italics; EGYPTIAN NAMES in capitals. ....	245
Figure 23: Genealogy of Yehoyishma <sup>c</sup> : Women's names in italics; EGYPTIAN- NAMES in capitals. ....	246
Figure 24: Graffito of Petechnum in the chapel of Amenophis III at Elkab (author's photograph). ....	251
Figure 25: Offering table from Saqqara (Louvre AO 4824; author's photograph). ....	257

## Abbreviations

For abbreviations see: Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (RGG), 4th edition; Theological Realenzyklopädie (TRE), abbreviations, 2nd revised and enlarged edition, compiled by Siegfried M. Schwertner; Lexicon of Assyriology and Near Eastern Archaeology ([www.rla.badw.de](http://www.rla.badw.de)).

## Foreword

The present volume contains the updated versions of the papers presented at the workshop "Wandering Arameans: Arameans Inside and Outside of Syria", held at the Faculty of Theology of the University of Leipzig in October 2014. The intention of the workshop was to explore Aramean cultures and their impact on their neighbors, including linguistic influence. The idea was to address some of the primary desiderata in current research on the Arameans and so to build a basis for a project proposal submitted to the Minerva Foundation on this and related topics, to be implemented at the University of Leipzig and Bar-Ilan University. The workshop brought together scholars from these two institutions, as well as from the University of Würzburg. In addition to the papers presented at the workshop, we invited four additional contributions to broaden the scope of our endeavor (Greer, Sergi, Gzella, and Younger).

The volume is divided into two sections:

- I. Syria and Palestine
- II. Mesopotamia and Egypt

This division reflects the areas in which one sees the presence of Arameans or of their language, Aramaic, in the first millennium BCE.

One of the outcomes of this workshop was that the "Aramean question" is a broad and complex field that touches on many issues (e.g., the presence of ethnical markers, the category of ethnicity in general, history, settlement patterns, archaeology, epigraphy, religion, and sociology) that calls for interdisciplinary work at a highly specialized level. In this perspective, it became clear that future research has to start from the following assumption: Arameans (including the Aramaic languages) in Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia, and Egypt cannot be treated as a single entity but have to be carefully distinguished. The contributions of this volume show that identifying "Arameans" and defining pertinent identity markers are difficult tasks. The interactions between the Arameans, including the Aramaic languages, and their neighbors were complex and depended on the specific cultural and historical circumstances.

As a result of the 2014 workshop we decided to limit further research to the interaction between the Aramean states in Syria and the states in Palestine from the end of the 2nd to the late 1st millennium BCE. Correspondingly, we put the focus of the projected Minerva Center on the following preliminary working question: can the rise, flourishing, and decline of Aram and Israel, as independent political entities, be attributed to their autonomous decision making or to their interdependency – or to a combination of both factors? Thus, the articles of the first part of this volume became the foundation for our current research, which will be continued within the framework

of the *Minerva Center for the Relations between Israel and Aram in Biblical Times* (RIAB; [aramisrael.org](http://aramisrael.org)).

We are grateful to the authors of the papers in this volume for their contributions from their particular fields of expertise and their inspiring comments and discussions during the workshop. In addition, we want to thank Prof. Michael P. Streck as the editor-in-chief of the “Leipziger Altorientalistische Studien” for accepting our volume into this series. We want to thank Felix Hagemeyer and Philipp Roßteuscher for collecting and editing the essays. We are particularly grateful to Vivian-Sarah Klee, who took on the laborious task of putting the pieces together and of creating the indices. We wish to express our thanks to all our helping hands. Last but not least, our thanks go to the Minerva Foundation and the *Minerva Center for the Relations between Israel and Aram in Biblical Times* that supported the publication process financially.

Leipzig/Ramat-Gan, September 2016

Angelika Berlejung

Aren M. Maer

Andreas Schüle



# Late Babylonian in Aramaic Epigraphs on Cuneiform Tablets

Michael P. Streck – Leipzig

## Aramaic Clay Epigraphs

During the first mill. BCE, the Aramaic language and script gradually spread over the entire Ancient Near East and came into contact with Assyrian and Babylonian, the two main dialects of the Akkadian language in Mesopotamia written in cuneiform. Cuneiform texts provide much information on this contact between both languages and scripts.<sup>1</sup>

One of the results of this contact are Aramaic epigraphs on cuneiform tablets. The examples from the Late Babylonian period (from 626 BCE onwards<sup>2</sup>) are the actual subject of this study. Zadok (2003, 558–570) listed 231 examples of Aramaic epigraphs from the Late Babylonian period. Following the numeration of Zadok, Oelsner (2006) corrected and supplemented that list. Since then, several new epigraphs have been published. In total, almost 300 Aramaic epigraphs on Late Babylonian tablets are known today.

The earliest epigraph dates from 728/7 BCE, the only pre-Chaldean example known. Roughly half of the epigraphs are from the Chaldean and early Achaemenid periods (593–486 BC) and half from the late Achaemenid and the beginning of the Hellenistic period. Considering that most Late Babylonian tablets are dated to the earlier half of this period, this chronological distribution probably reflects the growing importance of Aramaic in late Babylonia (Zadok 2003, 570).

The largest groups of epigraphs comes from the Nippur region. Other important groups are from Sippar and Babylon, whereas Uruk and Ur only provide rare examples. Five epigraphs were found in Neirab in northern Syria.

As to archives, the largest group of epigraphs with almost 80 examples comes from the late Achaemenid Murašû archive in the Nippur region. The huge temple archives of Ebabbar and especially Eanna are underrepresented, and Egibi, the largest private archive, only provides two examples.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Cf. the summary in Streck 2011 with references.

2 Only one epigraph of the corpus analysed here, no. 1 below, is older.

3 No. 86 and 106, cf. Oelsner 2006, 32.

Epigraphs are found on different genres of legal and administrative documents. Examples from letters are unknown. The epigraphs are of various types, from single names and keywords to longer descriptions of the document.

How can these epigraphs be used as source for Late Babylonian? To a certain degree, cuneiform orthography in general and specifically Late Babylonian cuneiform orthography<sup>4</sup> deviates from the actual pronunciation of the Akkadian words. Transcriptions of Late Babylonian into Aramaic<sup>5</sup> may provide certain informations on cuneiform orthography as well as on Akkadian phonology and morphology which can not be gained from the Akkadian texts themselves, or may at least confirm the informations from cuneiform texts. For example, Late Babylonian cuneiform *m* is shown by Aramaic (and Greek) transcriptions often to be pronounced [w]<sup>6</sup>. As limited as these informations may be, they are a welcome addition to our knowledge of Late Babylonian.

### The Corpus

The following list only contains the epigraphs which parallel parts of the Akkadian cuneiform text verbatim, because only these can be used as source for the Late Babylonian language. Such a list is necessary because neither Zadok (2003) nor Schwiderski (2004) nor Oelsner (2006), the fullest lists of Aramaic epigraphs on Late Babylonian tablets to date, systematically provide the Akkadian counterparts of the Aramaic epigraphs. The only study that systematically matches Aramaic epigraph and Akkadian cuneiform text is Blasberg (1997). Her corpus was, however, smaller than the one used here. Whereas Blasberg (1997) presented the entire Akkadian texts, I confine myself to those parts of the Akkadian texts that actually match the Aramaic epigraphs. The numeration follows Zadok (2003) and Oelsner (2006, no. 1–231). Oelsner's table II lists, with Roman numbers, epigraphs missing in Zadok 2003. New epigraphs, published after Oelsner (2006), are added below as no. 232ff.<sup>7</sup> The studies of Blasberg (1997) and Schwiderski (2004), not used by Zadok, have been compared systematically.

- 1) BRM 1, 22 (728): [š]tr nb[(w) 'dn]<sup>8</sup> = Nabû<sup>(md)AG</sup>-iddin(SUM)-na.

---

4 Streck 2001.

5 The same is true for Greek transcriptions of Late Babylonian. Cf. Streck 2014b, using the Graeco-Babyloniaca alongside Late Babylonian cuneiform texts for a comprehensive analysis of the case system.

6 Cf. pp. 182–184, below.

7 The following new publications were checked systematically: CTMMA 4, CUSAS 28, OIP 122, YOS 20–21.

8 Reading after Oelsner 2006, 29.

- 24) TuM 2/3, 19 (581): *zy ršy* = <sup>f</sup>*Ri-šá-a*.
- 27 = 108) BE 8, 14 (490 or 487):<sup>9</sup> *'dnnbw* = *Iddin*(<sup>m</sup>MU)-*Nabû*(<sup>d</sup>AG).
- 28) BE 8, 17 (571): *ks[p] š IIII zy nrgldn* = *Nergal*(<sup>md</sup>U.GUR)-*iddin*(MU).
- 29) ROMTC 2, 2 (564): *'hwšn* = *Aḫū*(<sup>m</sup>ŠEŠ)-*šú-nu*.
- 31) BE 8, 28 (562): *nrgl'dn* = *Nergal*(<sup>md</sup>U.GUR)-*iddin*(MU).
- 32) Frame (2001) (561): *s?l[m?bl(x)]xx g nrgldn nš* = <sup>m</sup>*Si-lim-Bēl*(<sup>d</sup>EN), *Nergal*(<sup>md</sup>U.GUR)-*da-ni*,<sup>10</sup> *na-ši*.
- 33) BE 8, 33 (561): *šwš'ḫdn* = *Šamaš*(<sup>md</sup>UTU)-*aḫ*(ŠEŠ)-*iddin*(MU).
- 35) Kaufmann (1975) (534):<sup>11</sup> *ltn* = *Ta-at-tan-nu*.
- 36) CIS 2/1, 62 (558): *pnbṭm* = *Pa-ni-Nabû*(<sup>d</sup>AG)-*ṭè-e-mu*.
- 37) RA 25, 63f. (between 555 and 539): *l sn 'l* = *Šin*(<sup>md</sup>XXX)-DA.<sup>12</sup>
- 39) CIS 2, 61 (555): *mrsglm?r*<sup>13</sup> = *Mār*(<sup>m</sup>DUMU)-*é-sag-gil-lu-m[ur]*.
- 40) TBÉR 59 (554): *bbwn*<sup>14</sup> = <sup>f</sup>*Ba-bu-nu*.
- 43) RA 25, 56 no. 7 (552): *šṭr nwsḫlny ks[p]* = *Nusku*(<sup>md</sup>PA.TÚG)-*kil-la-an-[ni]*.
- 45) YOS 6, 164 (550): *krn 6!*<sup>15</sup> *xxx zy*<sup>16</sup> *nrgldn* = *Nergal*(<sup>md</sup>U.GUR)-*da-a-nu*.

9 For the date of the text see Blasberg 1997, 273 n. 412 and Oelsner 2006, 32.

10 In no. 45 and in Iraq 59, 117 mo. 35: 4 we find the spelling *-da-a-nu* (same person). Other texts write *-da-nu* or *-dan-nu* (YOS 6 p. 33). The different spellings stand for the stative *-dān* “is strong”.

11 For the date see Oelsner 2006, 30.

12 The spelling *'l* seems to render a prefix conjugation, but *'* might be a mistake (Blasberg 1997, 310f.). The name structure with the predicate in the second position definitely favors a stative *\*lē'i*. Zadok 2003, 560 reads the name *Šin-le'* (assuming a metathesis?).

13 Reading after Blasberg 1997, 275, Zadok 2003, 561 and Schwiderski 2004, 79. Blasberg 1997, 276 mentions, however, that Stevenson in his edition suggests to read the second last letter *w*.

14 The epigraph is written bottom up. Zadok 2003, 561 doesn't give any transliteration.

15 Reading 6 after Zadok 2003, 561.

16 Reading *xxx zy* after Blasberg 1997, 296, who closely follows the copy in YOS 6, 164. For *xxx* we expect a word for “grain” (Akkadian *uṭṭetu*), see no. 59 for *š'rn* corresponding to *uṭṭetu*.

- 46) Knopf (1933, 56ff.) (548): *l'dy = Id-di-ia*.
- 47) CIS 2, 63 (548): *'bt = a-ba-[at?]tu4!*<sup>17</sup>
- 48) BE 8, 50 (547): *klb[y]*<sup>18</sup> = <sup>m</sup>*Kal-ba-a*.
- 49) RA 25, 56 no. 12 (546): *n[h]sy*<sup>19</sup> *br g(! text: 'b*<sup>20</sup> = <sup>m</sup>*Nu-uh-sa-a A-šú šá Nusku*(<sup>md</sup>PA.TÚG)-*g[a-b]é-e*.
- 50) YOS 19, 182 (546): *t?lm?*<sup>21</sup> = *ta-lam-mu*.
- 51) BE 8, 51 (545): *'sr*<sup>22</sup> *zy 'l nšr br nrgldn = Ah*(<sup>m</sup>ŠEŠ)-*iddin*(MU)<sup>23</sup> *A-šú šá Nergal*(<sup>md</sup>U.GUR)-*iddin*(MU).
- 52) RA 25, 56 no. 15 (544):<sup>24</sup> *nwškkln[y] š 'r[y/n]*<sup>25</sup> = *Nusku*(<sup>md</sup>PA.TÚG)-*kil-la-an-ni!*.
- 54) BE 8, 53 (542): *'nzyty = 'In-za-'ID-DA-', [...-]T-TA-a*.
- 59) BE 8, 68 (between 538 and 530): *zy šwšblt br šwš 'hdn šr 'n krn I = Šamaš*(<sup>md</sup>UTU)-*uballit*(TIN-*it*) *A-šú šá Šamaš*(<sup>md</sup>UTU)-*ah*(ŠEŠ)-*iddin*(MU).
- 64) Jursa (1995, 128f. no. 38) (535): *zy*<sup>26</sup> [*zrkn*] = [<sup>m</sup>*Zēr*(NUMUN)-*ukī*]n(DU).
- 65) TMH 2/3, 9 (534): *zy šwš[b]lt [br] š[wš]h[']?dn*<sup>27</sup> = *Šamaš*(<sup>md</sup>UTU)-*uballit*(TIN-*it*) *A-šú šá Šamaš*(<sup>md</sup>UTU)-*ah*(ŠEŠ)-*iddin*(MU).
- 66) TCL 13, 139 (533): *ksp prs I š III II 'l nbwrwn = Nabû*(<sup>md</sup>AG)-*re-man-ni*.

17 For *abattu* see Jursa 1995, 123: not limestone but a mixture of reeds and shrubs.

18 Reading after Zadok 2003, 561, and Oelsner 2006, 31.

19 Reading of *n[h]sy* after Blasberg 1997, 308.

20 Correction of *'b* to *gb* after Schwiderski 2004, 307. Blasberg 1997, 308 suggests *Ibā* or *Abā*.

21 Not read by Zadok 2003, 561.

22 Blasberg 1997, 199 has *'sr* by mistake.

23 <sup>m</sup>ŠEŠ.MU is an abbreviation for (*Šamaš*-)*ah-iddin*, see Zadok 2003, 561. A reading *Nāšir-šum* Blasberg 1997, 200, inspired by the Aramaic counterpart *nšr*, can be safely excluded by the remaining tablets of the archive.

24 For the date see Oelsner 2006, 31.

25 Reading after Zadok 2003, 561 and Schwiderski 2004, 307.

26 Reading *zy* after Jursa 1995, 129.

27 Blasberg 1997, 203 reads *š[h]dn*. Zadok 2003, 563: *š[wš][']hdn*. Schwiderski 2004, 203: *šwš [hdn?]*.

- 67) ROMTC 2, 30 (533): *l<n>bwndn* (right edge), *nbw* (upper edge)<sup>28</sup> = *Nabû*(<sup>md</sup>AG)-*na-din*.
- 69) Joannès/Lemaire (1999, 30ff. no. 3) (530): *'dny br nbwqm* = <sup>m</sup>SUM-*na-a* A-šú šá *Nabû*(<sup>md</sup>AG)-*qá!?*-[*am!?*].<sup>29</sup>
- 71) CIS 2, 64 (526): *'wlt qny ksp š 47* = *amīluttu*(LÚ-tú), <sup>f</sup>*Qú-un-na*-[*a-a*].
- 72) BE 8, 89 (between 526 and 522): *šw[š ']* = *Šamš*(<sup>md</sup>UTU)-*a*[-(*a*)].
- 77) CIS 2, 68 (519): *mrdk* = *Marduk*(<sup>md</sup>AMAR.UTU)-*re-man-ni*.
- 78) CT 55, 43 (518): *š[řr pwms]* *zy*<sup>30</sup> *kwr 5* = <sup>m</sup>*Pu-ú-ma-sa*.
- 79) RA 90, 41ff. no. 1 (516): *'wt*<sup>31</sup> *'yk<š?>[ř[...]] br z 'r'* = *Ajjak(k)u*(<sup>m</sup>É.AN.NA)<sup>32</sup>-*šulmu*(DI-*mu*) A-šú šá <sup>m</sup>*Zu-uḥ-ru-*'.
- 80) RA 90, 41ff. no. 7 (482):<sup>33</sup> *b 'l [...?] [h]nty' zy zbbšr 'šr b 'l p [...]*. The Akkadian text is missing. The name corresponds to Akkadian *Zababa-šar-ušur*.
- 81=92) Pinches, Outline 62 no. 4 (515): *š[řr zy š 5[0] 'l 'qšy* = <sup>m</sup>*Iqīš*(BA)-*šá-a*.
- 82) SpTU 5, 290 (416):<sup>34</sup> *'br mnn [III] š 10* = <sup>m</sup>*U-bar*.
- 85) Pinches, PEQ 32, 264ff. (511): *mrdkr[wn]*<sup>35</sup> = *Marduk*(<sup>md</sup>AMAR.UTU)-*re-man-ni*.
- 87) ROMTC 2, 26 (508): *'nwšt 'dn*, second epigraph<sup>36</sup> *'nw* = <sup>md</sup>*Nin-urta!*-*iddin*(MU).

28 Zadok 2003, 562 does not mention the endorsement on the upper edge.

29 Reading after Zadok 2003, 508 no. 1.1.2.2.13. Joannès/Lemaire 1999, 31, read -SI.[SÁ], i.e., *līšir*, and suggest that either Aram. -*qām* is a translation of Akkad. *līšir*, or that the father had two different names; however, both suggestions are difficult. They also point out in the commentary (p. 32) that the name type DN-*līšir* is not attested in Late Babylonian.

30 For *zy* see already Blasberg 1997, 278. Schwiderski 2004, 298 has [*dy*] instead of *zy*.

31 For *'wt* = Akkadian *aw/mātu* see Joannès/Lemaire 1996, 42.

32 See Zadok 2003, 562 and 574 for *ajjak(k)u* = É.AN.NA. Note that É.AN.NA is attested as logogram elsewhere, and equates in bilingual texts to *ajjak(k)u*, see AHw. 24 and CAD A/1, 224f. Differently Joannès/Lemaire 1996, 42, who think that *'ykl* is a variant for “*héykāl*” “temple”.

33 For the date see Oelsner 2003, 31 and 44.

34 For the date see Blasberg 1997, 297 and Oelsner 2003, 31 and 45.

35 Reading after Zadok 2003, 562.

36 Zadok 2003, 563 doesn't mention the second epigraph.

- 88) CIS 2, 71 (between 504 and 503):<sup>37</sup> *zy ksp' zy yhb bq?š?38 l šwkn = mŠum(MU)-ukīn(GIN)*.
- 89) VS 4, 134 (507): *šlb br 'dn'/?/y?39 = mŠe-el-le-bi A-šú šá mIddin(MU)-a*.
- 91=94) Stevenson, ABC 35 (504 or 503):<sup>40</sup> *'snyn = as-né-e*.
- 93) CIS 2, 65 (505): *'rb' zy qdm kyšwš<sup>41</sup> 't byt [ 'l[h] 6 = mKi-Šamaš(dUTU)<sup>42</sup>*.
- 95) Stevenson, ABC 39 (504): [...] *[yn k]sp['?'] zy t'štr<sup>43</sup> = Tēšī(mSŪH)-eṭir(SUR)<sup>44</sup>*.
- 102) CIS 2, 70 (503): *zy ksp' zy yhb l 'lryby<sup>45</sup> = mErīb(SU)-a*.
- 105) RA 90, 41ff. no. 5 (500): *l brk'l br ṭb' = mBa-ri-ki-'il(DINGIR<sup>mes</sup>) A-šú šá Ṭāb(mDU<sub>10</sub>.GA)-šá-lam*.
- 107) Böhl, Fs. van Oven 62ff. (493): *zy bl'dn br nḫy = Bēl(m<sup>d</sup>EN)-iddin(a)(MU)*.
- 109) BE 8, 116 (487): *spy = <sup>f</sup>Sip-pa-a-[a]*.
- 116) BE 9, 2 (between 464 and 424): *štr xxxx zy 'ply xx m mtr?bzn zy b x?yxx? [...]*  
*lšnt' š'rn krn tmrn krn = mAp-la-a*.
- 117) BE 9, 2 (455): *štr 'ḫwšn br blš[w] 'b?<n> l 'll[ḫtn] = Aḫū(mŠEŠ)-[šú-nu], Ellil(m<sup>d</sup>EN.LÍL)-ḫa-tin.<sup>46</sup>*
- 118) EE 86 (between 455 and 424): *yhwntn [š] 'rn krn 10 = m<sup>d</sup>Ia-a-ḫu-u-na-tan-nu*.

37 For the date see Oelsner 2003, 31.

38 See Zadok 2003, 578: “The Akkadian text has only the gentilic <sup>lú</sup>*Ar-ba/ma-A+A*, whereas the Aramaic indicates the name of the individual in question: ... *Bqš*”.

39 Zadok 2003, 563, and Schwiderski 2004, 29: *'dn'*. Blasberg (1997, 285) leaves the reading open.

40 For the date see Oelsner 2003, 31.

41 Reading after Schwiderski 2004, 81.

42 For the name type see CAD K 323 *kī a 1'*: hypocoristic for *Mannum-kī-Šamaš?*

43 Reading after Zadok 2003, 563 and Schwiderski 2004, 80.

44 For the name type see CAD T 377 *iēšū* 1c: hypocoristic for “DN, save me from (*ina*) confusion!”

45 Reading after Blasberg 1997, 267. Zadok (2003, 563), and Schwiderski (2004, 81) read *lyryby*.

46 Restoration of the last name with Blasberg (1997, 259) and Schwiderski (2004, 299). Zadok (2003, 564) restores the name as *'ll[šw'dn]*, a name which has no correspondance in the cuneiform text (the name in l. 4 is *Ellil(m<sup>d</sup>EN.LÍL)-šum(MU)-ibni([DŪ])*). The preposition *l* before the name, corresponding to *ana* before *Ellil-ḫātin* in l. 6, denotes the recipient of the field. The second name, which has no correspondance in the cuneiform text, seems to render Akkadian *Bēl-šum-ibni*, with *m* = [w].

- 126) IMT 44 (between 455 and 424): *br štt?n?*[?] = <sup>m</sup>Šá-*tat-na-a*’.
- 127) EE 3 (443): [?]w?]t *kšr br blnšr [l?’]llh̄tn* = <sup>m</sup>Ka-*šir*, *Bēl*(<sup>md</sup>EN)-*na-š*[*ir*], *Ellil*(<sup>md</sup>EN.LÍL)-*ḥa-tin*.
- 128) FuB 14, 7ff. no. 7 (451): *štr dntbl<sup>47</sup> rmn’ylyxbwX [...] tmrn krn x+13 šnt 14 x’xx*  
= <sup>m</sup>Dan-*na-at-Bēlet*(<sup>d</sup>GAŠAN), *Rammān*(<sup>md</sup>KUR)-*a-a-li*-<sup>48</sup>.
- 130) IMT 50 (439): [*nrgl*]’*d[n]* = *Nergal*(<sup>md</sup> U.GUR)-*iddin*(MU).
- 131) IMT 65 (438): *štr kdn br tk[t][y]<sup>49</sup> zy š[nt xx] III III[I]* = <sup>m</sup>Ki-*din*, <sup>m</sup>Tuk-*t[e?]-e*.
- 132) CIS 2, 67 (437 or 377): *štr zb[s]* = <sup>m</sup>Za-*bi-ši*.<sup>50</sup>
- 133) EE 63 (436): *štr bl[’]r w ’ḥwm[h] bny [b]rk[’]l dš? šbbšw[’]dn zy r[š]w[h]m? =*  
*Bēl*(<sup>md</sup>EN)-*ē[tir]*(S[UR]), *Aḥu*(<sup>m</sup>ŠEŠ)-*im-mé-e*, <sup>m</sup>Ba-*rik-[il]*([DINGIR]<sup>mes</sup>),  
<sup>md</sup>Za-*ba<sub>4</sub>-ba<sub>4</sub>-šum*(MU)-*iddin*(MU).<sup>51</sup>
- 134) EE 58 (436): *’ḥtr zy tmrn krn 100 = Aḥḥē*(<sup>m</sup>ŠEŠ<sup>mes</sup>)-*utūr*(GUR).<sup>52</sup>
- 136) EE 16 (431): *štr s’[t] zy ’l ’ḥyl[d Šlmbbl w’š?]rh = Aḥu*(<sup>m</sup>ŠEŠ)-*ia-l[i-da]*, <sup>m</sup>Iš-*ra-*  
*a*.<sup>53</sup>
- 138) EE 41 (429): *štr š’rn k[r]n [30] zy yhyb [s’]t mtryn lnbw’tn = [m]Mi-it-re*-*e-na-*’  
*Nabû*(<sup>md</sup>AG)-*it-tan-nu*.
- 139) BaM 21, 581f. no. 16 (429 or 369): *štr ’nw’kšr = Anu*(<sup>md</sup>60)-*ik-šur*.

47 For GAŠAN = *bl* cf. p. 193, below.

48 Blasberg 1997, 289, quoting Maraqtan (1988, 212), interprets the second name as *Rammān-’ay-yalī* “Rammān is my help” (see CAD A/1, 226 *ajalu* B “help”), but Zadok (2003, 563) as *Rammānāya-lē’i* “Rammānāya is mighty”. Since the hypocoristic ending *-āya* is strange in a sentence name, Blasberg’s interpretation is preferred here. Whether the name is Aramaic or Akkadian, cannot be decided.

49 The [y] is partly preserved, see the copy in IMT p. 53.

50 Reading after Zadok 2003, 565 and Schwiderski 2004, 80.

51 The reading *bny* (Zadok 2003, 565) is confirmed by the copy EE p. 202. M. W. Stolper, EE p. 260, Blasberg (1997, 208) and Schwiderski (2004, 305b) read *bry*; the plural of “son” is formed on the basis *bn* in Aramaic (see, e.g., Segert 1986, 208). Instead of *’ḥwm[h]*, Stolper, Blasberg and Schwiderski restore *’ḥwm[y]*.

52 Zadok (2003, 565) renders the Akkadian name “*Aḥu-utūr*”, probably because he assumes a sandhi phenomenon *Aḥutūr*.

53 Zadok (2003, 565) has at the end of the epigraph *ḥ* instead of *h* by mistake.

- 140) EE 94 (428): *štr plyh* = <sup>m</sup>*Pi-il-ia-a-ma*.
- 143) BE 9, 64 (427): *štr šyt'* = <sup>m</sup>*Ši-ia-*'.
- 144) BaM 21, 580f. no. 15 (427 or 367): *štr [ 'n]wbls?* = *Anu*(<sup>md</sup>60)-*uballis*(TIN)-*su*.<sup>54</sup>
- 145) BE 9, 66a (426): *štr s 't 'rq' zy 'ryby br 'ndblt pry' mn 'llšw '[dn]* = *Erīb*(<sup>msu</sup>)-*a*, *Ellil*(<sup>md</sup>EN.LÍL)-*šum*(MU)-*iddin*(MU).<sup>55</sup>
- 146) BE 9, 68 (426): *štr 'wr[ 'tr]* = *Amurru*(<sup>md</sup>KUR.GAL)-*ētir*(SUR).
- 147) EE 79 (426): [*š*]*tr 'll 'tr* = [*Ellil*(<sup>md</sup>EN.LÍL)-*ētir*].
- 148) BE 9, 71 (425): *štr s 't 'rq' zy nbw 'tn 'ly mgn br n[...]* = *Nabû*(<sup>md</sup>AG)-*it-tan-nu*.
- 150) EE 37 (424): *štr 'hwšn zy pry' [s] 't 'rq'* = *Aḫū*(<sup>m</sup>ŠEŠ)-*šú-nu*.<sup>56</sup>
- 151) EE 99 (425): *rym' [... š]tr r[m]škn zy ks?t* = *Rēm*(<sup>m</sup>ARḪUŠ)-*šukun*(GAR).<sup>57</sup>
- 153) BE 9, 87 (424): *štr ḥnwn* = <sup>m</sup>*Ha-nun*.
- 154) IMT 103 (424): *štr [nbw] 'šzb [mn 'rdnwš[t] 3 nš*<sup>58</sup> = *Nabû*(<sup>md</sup>AG)-*ú-še-zib*.
- 155) EE 112 (424): [*š*]*tr 'wr 'd[n]* = *Amurru*(<sup>md</sup>KUR.GAL)-*iddin*(MU).
- 156) BE 9, 108 (424): *štr nydbl br lbny zy š 'rm krn x 16 ...* (followed by date) = *Na'id*(<sup>m</sup>I)-*Bēl*(<sup>d</sup>EN), <sup>m</sup>*La-ba-ni-[ia]*<sup>59</sup>.
- 157) PBS 2/1, 170 (ca. 419 or 418):<sup>60</sup> *blšw 'dn* = *Bēl*(<sup>md</sup>EN)-*šum*(MU)-*iddin*(MU).
- 158) PBS 2/1, 157 (between 424 and 415): *štr blw?t 'w šwš* = *Šamš*(<sup>md</sup>UTU)-*a-a*.

54 Zadok 2003, 565 follows M. W. Stolper, BaM 21 p. 581 and transcribes the Akkadian name *Anu-bullissu*.

55 Reading after Blasberg 1997, 179. Zadok 2003, 565 reads 'ryb and 'ndblty. Schwiderski 2004, 300 reads 'rby and 'ndblty.

56 For the date cf. Oelsner 2003, 32 and 53.

57 Blasberg 1997, 262 (cf. also Schwiderski 2004, 300) reads at the end *ks?/d?t*.

58 Cf. Jursa 1999. Zadok 2003, 56 has several mistakes: *šzb* instead of 'šzb, *m'n* instead of *mn*, and *nš* instead of *nš'*.

59 Zadok 2003, 156 reads *La-ba-ni-*'. The copy shows, with Blasberg 1997, 230, *-[ia]*.

60 For the date see Blasberg 1997, 263 and Oelsner 2003, 32 and 53.



- 161) BE 10, 46 (423): [b]yt 'rz<sup>61</sup> = <sup>uru</sup>Bīt(É)-<sup>m</sup>Ar-za-'.  
 162) BE 10, 29 (423): [štr]<sup>62</sup> 'nwšt 'dn 'št[ym]<sup>63</sup> = *Ninurta*(<sup>md</sup>MAŠ)-*iddin*(MU).  
 164) BE 10, 52 (423): k' zy q<d>m škwḥ br zyrn<sup>64</sup> = <sup>m</sup>Šá-ku-ú-ḥu, <sup>m</sup>Ḥi-[-...].  
 165) TuM 2/3, 99 (423): štr bl 'ḥtn = *Bēl*(<sup>md</sup>EN)-*aḥ*(ŠEŠ)-*it-tan-n*[u].  
 166) BE 10, 55 (423): 'dgšyrzbd = <sup>md</sup>Ad-gi-ši-ri-za-bad-du/-zab-du.<sup>65</sup>  
 168) PBS 2/1, 154 (between 423 and 415): štr bl 'bšr w 'rdnrg[l] =  
 [...]-*Nergal*(<sup>d</sup>U.GUR).  
 170) PBS 2/1, 49 (422): štr ttn = <sup>m</sup>Tat-tan-nu.  
 171) BE 10, 59 (422): štr lbš = <sup>m</sup>La-ba-ši.  
 172) BE 10, 60 (422): štr bl 'dn [...] štydr mšḥ krn 6 = *Bēl*(<sup>md</sup>EN)-*iddin*(MU).  
 173) JCS 40, 146ff. (422): štr 'llḥtn b[r] šw<š>[ 't?][r] zy š[ 'rn kr]n 3 =  
*Ellil*(<sup>md</sup>EN.LÍL)-*ḥa-tin*, *Šamaš*(<sup>md</sup>UTU)-*ētir*(SUR).  
 175) TuM 2/3, 146 (421): [š]tr by<s>dh = <sup>m</sup>Ba/Bi-is-de-e.  
 176) BE 10, 68 (421): štr rhym 'l zy tmrn krn [40] = <sup>m</sup>Ra-ḥi-[im- ...]<sup>66</sup>.  
 177) PBS 2/1, 69 (421): štr ḥnṭ[ṭ][ ' ] kr 1 qdm 'dy = <sup>m</sup>Id-di-ia.

61 According to the copy, *b* is only partially preserved. Schwiderski 2004, 301 reads [...] [g]t 'rz'.

62 According to the copy, *štr* is only partially preserved.

63 Zadoks reading is based on the interpretation as the Old Persian title *uštajammu* (cf. CAD U 325f.), which is, however, not mentioned in the Akkadian text. Blasberg 1997, 212 reads the last word [ 'štmḥ ], Schwiderski 2004, 301 'štm/yḥ/m'. According to the copy, the third last sign might be *d*.

64 The reading follows Blasberg 1997, 232f. Zadok 2003, 567 reads the name of the father as *hyrn* = *Ḥe-ra-nu*. However, neither his reading of the Aramaic nor of the Akkadian text is confirmed by the copy. Schwiderski 2004, 301 reads *hyrq*. *br* is completely preserved in the copy (pace Schwiderski ib.).

65 On this name see Zadok 1977, 48.

66 Pace Zadok 2003, 567, the Akkadian name is broken.

- 180) BE 10, 87 (420): *štr 'nwšt[ 'b]l̄t br mšzb tmrn krn 15<sup>67</sup> = Ninurta<sup>(md)MAŠ</sup>-uballiṭ([TIN]-[iṭ]?)*.
- 182) EE 114 (420): *štr bšy zy!<sup>68</sup> xxxx = <sup>m</sup>Bi-ša-a*.
- 183) IMT 95 (420): *štr 'dy = <sup>m</sup>Id-di-ia*.
- 184) BE 10, 99 (419): *štr 'rqt ngrý 'zy [y]hb h̄ydwrý br h̄bš[y]r lrybt br bl'ryb bs 'h = <sup>m</sup>[H̄i]-'du-ri-', <sup>m</sup>H̄ab-šir, [<sup>m</sup>Ri-bat, Bēl<sup>(md)EN</sup>-erīb(SU)*.
- 185) BE 10, 104 (419): *štr bl'tr br gwzy = Bēl<sup>(md)EN</sup>-ēṭir(SUR), <sup>m</sup>Gu-zi-ia*.
- 186) BE 10, 105 (419): [*šf*]r 'wrphr = Amurru<sup>(md)KUR.GAL</sup>-ú-pah-ḫir.
- 187) PBS 2/1, 118 (418): *štr bl'tr = Bēl<sup>(md)EN</sup>-ēṭir(SUR)*.
- 188) BE 10, 106 (418): *štr zbdnn 'zy qn' = <sup>m</sup>Za-bid-<sup>d</sup>Na-na-a*.
- 189) PBS 2/1, 215 (418): *bl'tršwš = Bēl<sup>(m)EN</sup>-eṭēr(SUR)-Šamaš<sup>(d)UTU</sup>*<sup>69</sup>.
- 190) Iraq 4, 16ff. (18): *štr nbwkšr [br kd]p!<sup>70</sup> zy t[m]rn [krn] 4 [l bl ']tn ... (followed by date) = Nabū<sup>(md)AG</sup>-kāšir(KÁD), Bēl<sup>(md)EN</sup>-it-tan-ni*.
- 191) PBS 2/1, 129 (418): *štr [ 'nw]št 'bl̄t = Ninurta<sup>(md)MAŠ</sup>-uballiṭ(TIN)*.
- 192) BE 10, 115 (418): *štr bl'bšr br bl '[tr] [šmtk]ny' [h]lk' [zy] šnt 6<sup>71</sup> = Bēl<sup>(md)EN</sup>-ab(AD)-ušur(ÚRU), Bēl<sup>(md)EN</sup>-ēṭir(SUR), <sup>lú</sup>Šu-mu-ut-ku-na-a-a<sup>72</sup>*.
- 194) BE 10, 119 (417): *štr [škyn [ 'l] br n[...]<sup>73</sup> = <sup>m</sup>Ši-kin-il(DINGIR<sup>meš</sup>), Nabū<sup>(md)AG</sup>-za-bad-du*.

67 Zadok 2003, 567, has 5 instead of 15 by mistake.

68 Reading *zy!* follows Blasberg (1997, 264), although the copy shows *r*. Zadok 2003, 568 and Schwiderski 2004, 306 follow the edition of Stolper (1985, 228 no. 114) and read *zr*.

69 The name means “Šamaš is the lord of saving”. Differently Blasberg 1997, 248, and Zadok 2003, 568: *Bēl-ēṭir-Šamaš*, which is, however, difficult.

70 Reading *kdp!?* after Blasberg 1997, 314. Zadok 2003, 568 and Schwiderski 2004, 296 read *kdm*.

71 Text damage according to the copy. *bl'bšr* Blasberg 1997, 191 and Schwiderski 2004, 303 is confirmed by the copy. Zadok 2003, 568 has *bl'b'šr*.

72 For *šumutkunāya* see CAD Š/3, 265 *šumatkanu* “a title”, and ib. 265 discussion section “perhaps a gentilic from a WSEm. tribal name”.

73 Text damage according to the copy.

- 196) BE 10, 120 (417): *nbwrp* = Nabû<sup>(mdAG)</sup>-*ra-pa-[']*.
- 197) BE 10, 121 (417): *štr mrdk* = <sup>m</sup>*Mar-duk-a*.
- 199) BE 10, 125 (417): <sup>?</sup>*w?l<sup>74</sup> byb* <sup>?</sup>*šnt* [7] = <sup>m</sup>*Bi-ba-a*.
- 200) BE 10, 126 (417): *štr bl* <sup>?</sup>*šrš sgn bnšy* [zy] *ksp š* [3]0 *zy* <sup>?</sup>*rq bnšy*<sup>75</sup> = Bēl<sup>(mdEN)</sup>-*ú-šur-šú*, <sup>lu</sup>*Ba-na-nēš*(UR.MAH)-*a-a*.
- 201) *štr ksp mn*[y][n ...] *qdm bl* <sup>?</sup>*tr br nbw*[<sup>?</sup>*tn*] xx *ywm* 1 *lbt šnt* 7 = Bēl<sup>(mdEN)</sup>-*e-ti[r]*//Bēl<sup>(mdEN)</sup>-*ētir*(SUR)-*ru*, Nabû<sup>(mdAG)</sup>-*it-tan-nu*.
- 202) FuB 14, 28f. no. 21 (417): *pp*<sup>76</sup> *z*[y]<sup>77</sup> *šnt* 7 x = <sup>m</sup>*Pa-ap-x*.
- 203) FuB 14, 11ff. no. 1 (415): *štr m*<sup>?</sup>*xšr*<sup>?</sup>*x*<sup>?</sup><sup>78</sup> <sup>?</sup>*ry* ... *zy* <sup>?</sup>*l nbwb*<sup>?</sup>*l*<sup>?</sup>*s*<sup>?</sup> *qb* = Nabû<sup>(mdAG)</sup>-*balās*(TIN)-*su-iqbi*(E).
- 204) TCL 13, 208 (414): *zy qdm* <sup>?</sup>*rd* [?] *xxn*<sup>79</sup> = *Arad*(<sup>m</sup>IR)-<sup>d</sup>*xx*.
- 206) BE 10, 131 (413): *štr* <sup>?</sup>*hwšn br bl* <sup>?</sup>*tr* = *Ahū*(<sup>m</sup>ŠEŠ)-*šú-nu*, Bēl([<sup>md</sup>]EN)-*ētir*(SUR).
- 207) PBS 2/1, 145 (413): *štr dhlth br hzh* <sup>?</sup>*l* = <sup>m</sup>*Da-ḥi-il-ta-* <sup>?</sup>*ḥa-za-* <sup>?</sup>*il*(DINGIR<sup>meš</sup>). *dhlth* (Blasberg 1997, 252 and Schwiderski 2004, 304) is confirmed by the copy. Zadok 2003, 569 has *dhl* <sup>?</sup>*t*.
- 208) BE 10, 132 (411): *štr hnny*<sup>?</sup> *br tby* = <sup>m</sup>*Ha-an-na-ni-* <sup>?</sup>*Ṭābī*(<sup>m</sup>DÜG)-*ia*.
- 209) FuB 14, 13f. (410): *xxxx nbwkšrš* <sup>?</sup>*l* x [...] = [*Na*]bū(<sup>md</sup>A)G)-*ku-šur-šú*.
- 212) BE 8, 121 (404): *štr* <sup>?</sup>*hyly*<sup>80</sup> *br by*[*b*] = <sup>m</sup>*A-ḥu-ia-a-le-e*<sup>81</sup>, <sup>m</sup>*Bi-ba-a*.
- 214) UET 4, 34 (401): *štr blt* = <sup>m</sup>*Ba-la-tu*.

74 Blasberg 1997, 228 reads the first word *bxt*, Schwiderski 2004, 303 [*blyt*].

75 Text damages according to the copy.

76 For *pp* see also Blasberg 1997, 288 and Schwiderski 2004, 71.

77 Reading *z*[*y*] according to the copy and Schwiderski 2004, 71.

78 Read differently by Schwiderski 2004, 68.

79 Reading follows Blasberg 1997, 299. Schwiderski 2004, 296 reads *zy qr* <sup>?</sup>*rdnbw**dn*.

80 Blasberg 1997, 282 and Schwiderski 2004, 298 read <sup>?</sup>*hylw*, Zadok 2003, 569 <sup>?</sup>*hy*[*y*].

81 Cf. no. 128 for <sup>?</sup>*ayyalu* “help”: the name probably means “the brother (*aḥu*) is my help (<sup>?</sup>*ayyalī*)”, with *ia-a* as spelling for <sup>?</sup>*ayya*.

228) CT 49, 6 (308?):<sup>82</sup> *zy mnsb 'p[r]y zy sngl* = É.SAG.ÍL.

XI)<sup>83</sup> PBS 2/1, 73 (421): [*š*][*f*][*r*] 'nwšt [*bšr*] = *Ninurta*(<sup>md</sup>MAŠ)-*ab*(AD)-*ušur*(ŠEŠ).

XXXIII) Studies Larsen p. 533f. (Bellino 1) (404): *štr q!št? bly?rš* [*š*][*lm*?][*r*]*y b?* x = [*Bēl*](<sup>md</sup>EN)-[*e*]-*ri-iš*, <sup>m</sup>Šá-*lam-ma-re-e*.

XXXIV) Festschrift Huot p. 251f. no. 2 (309): [*š*]*tr bqt*<sup>84</sup> *šwš'* = *bīt*(É) *qātī*(ŠU<sup>II</sup>), *Šamaš*(<sup>md</sup>UTU)-*ittannu*(MU-*nu*).

New epigraphs published after Zadok (2003) and Oelsner (2006):

232) Abraham (2012) (602): *l mrdkndn 'h br mlk* = *Marduk*(<sup>md</sup>AMAR.UTU)-*na-din-ah*(ŠEŠ).

233) CUSAS 28, 10 (550): *šlmyh* = <sup>m</sup>Šá-*lam-mi-ía-a-ma*.

234) CUSAS 28, 40 (517): *štr xy'?* = *Iš-šu-ú-a*.<sup>85</sup>

235) CUSAS 28, 41 (517): '*bd*[*y?* ...] = <sup>m</sup>*Ab-du-ía-ḫu-ú*.

236) CUSAS 28, 42 (509): *n*[*ny/ 'l*]*tr*[*h*] x<sup>86</sup> = <sup>fd</sup>*Na-na-a-ul-ta-ra-ah*.

237) CUSAS 28, 102 (538): *bl' dn* = *Bēl*(<sup>md</sup>EN)-*iddin*(MU).

238) CUSAS 28, 71 and 71B (529): *štr k* = <sup>m</sup>*Ki-na-a*.

239) CUSAS 28, 53 (477): *byt 'lḫsn*[*y*] *tmrn krn 6* = *Bīt*(<sup>md</sup>É)-*il-ḫi-is-ni-*'.

82 For the date (Alexander III or IV?) see Oelsner 2003, 33.

83 Cf. Blasberg 1997, 218f.

84 Cf. p. 192, below.

85 Pearce/Wunsch, CUSAS 28 p. 162f. read *štr nb'*, with *nb'* as an abbreviation of the name of the debtor's father, which would be unusual. *Iš-šu-ú-a* (if not to be read *Mil-ku-ú-a*) they derive from *YŠ'*.

86 Pearce/Wunsch, CUSAS 28 p. 166 read *n?n?lt*[...].

## Aramaic Epigraphs and Late Babylonian Cuneiform Orthography and Grammar

### Cuneiform Orthography

1. Late Babylonian cuneiform frequently writes vowels not present in the actual pronunciation, e.g., *ni-bu-luṭ* TCL 9, 131: 28 for *niblūṭ*.<sup>87</sup> This is also confirmed by the following epigraph:

*Pa-ni-Nabû*(<sup>d</sup>AG)-*ṭè-e-mu* “Before Nabû is counsel” = *pnbṭm* no. 36.

If the vowel *i* in the sign *ni* would be spoken, we would expect an Aramaic spelling \**pnnbṭm*.

2. Cuneiform *a-a* is rendered *y* for /yy/<sup>88</sup>:

*Rammān*(<sup>md</sup>KUR)-*a-a-li-*' = *rmn 'yly* for *Rammān-'ayyalī* “Rammān is my help” no. 128.<sup>89</sup>

Cf. <sup>m</sup>*A-ḥu-ia-a-le-e* = *'hyly?* no. 212 for *'Aḥu-yayyalē* < \**'Aḥu-'ayyalē* “The brother is my help”.

3. A final aleph sign in cuneiform may stand for Aramaic /'/:

*Nabû*(<sup>md</sup>AG)-*ra-pa-[']* = *nbwrp'* (no. 196) for *Nabû-rapa'* “Nabû has healed”.

On the other hand, the aleph sign is also used to render Aramaic vowels. The Aramaic status determinatus in /-ā/:

<sup>uru</sup>*Bīt(É)-<sup>m</sup>Ar-za-*' = */b hyt 'rz'* for *Bīt-'arzā* “House of the cedar” no. 161.

<sup>m</sup>*Ši-ṭa-*' = *šyt'*, for *Šītā(?)*<sup>90</sup> no. 143.

[<sup>m</sup>*Mi-it-re*]-*e-na-*' = *mtryn* no. 138 for *Mitrēnā(?)*.

<sup>m</sup>*Da-ḥi-il-ta-*' = *dḥlth* no. 207 for *Daḥiltā(?)*.<sup>91</sup>

Note that the Aramaic spellings render the status determinatus by ', *h* or *l*.

The possessive suffix /-ī/, corresponding to *y* in Aramaic:

87 Streck 2001, 78–80.

88 For the hypocoristic ending *-a-a* see p. 188, below, and for the nisba *-a-a* pp. 188–189, below.

89 Cf. Mayer 2003, 293 for *a-a* standing for /*ajjV*/.

90 The root is not clear: ŠWT “to go about, swim, gaze” (Sokoloff 1990, 540) or ŠTY “foolish, insane” (ib. 545)?

91 Zadok 1977 derives the name from *daḥīl* „(god-)fearing“.

*Rammān*(<sup>md</sup>KUR)-*a-a-li-*' = *rmn'yly* for *Rammān-ʾayyalī* "Rammān is my help" no. 128 (either Aramaic or Akkadian).

<sup>m</sup>[*Hi*]-'*du-ri-*' = *ḥydwry* no. 184.

*Bīt*(<sup>md</sup>É)-*il-ḥi-is-ni-*' = *byt'lhšn[y]* no. 239 "Bīt-'il is my strength".

That the aleph sign renders final vowels is also known from Late Babylonian texts: *i-šak-nu-*' YOS 3, 45: 39 for *iššaknū* "they were put".<sup>92</sup>

A difficult case is no. 54: *ʾIn-za-ʾ-ID-DA-*' (var. [...-I]T-TA-a) = 'nzyty. *Ka-*' is rendered twice as *y*, which leads to a reading *ʾInZā/ayidd/ttāy(a)*. However the name defies any analysis.

4. Cuneiform *ḥ* stands for Aramaic *h*, *ḥ* and ' , a situation similar to Old Babylonian renderings of Amorite names<sup>93</sup>.

*h*:

<sup>md</sup>*Ia-a-ḥu-u-na-tan-nu* = *yhwntn* for *Yahū-natan(u)* no. 118 "Yahū has given".<sup>94</sup>

*ḥ*:

<sup>m</sup>*Ḥa-nun* = *ḥnwn* for *Ḥanūn* no. 153.

<sup>m</sup>*Šá-ku-ú-ḥu* = *škwḥ* for *Šakūḥu* no. 164.

<sup>m</sup>*Ra-ḥi-[im-]* = *rhym'l* for *Raḥīm-'il* no. 176.

<sup>m</sup>[*Hi*]-'*du-ri-*' and <sup>m</sup>*Ḥab-šir* = *ḥydwry* and *ḥbš[y]* no. 184.

*Bīt*(<sup>md</sup>É)-*il-ḥi-is-ni-*' "Bīt-'il is my strength" = *byt'lhšn[y]* no. 239.

' :

<sup>m</sup>*Zu-uḥ-ru-*' = *z'r'* no. 79.

### Phonology

1. Original Akkadian intervocalic /*m*/ occurs as *w* in Aramaic:<sup>95</sup>

<sup>92</sup> Streck 2001, 87.

<sup>93</sup> Streck 2000, 240–253.

<sup>94</sup> See Weippert 1976–1980, 248 for further references for *Ia(-a)-ḥu*. In no. 175, <sup>m</sup>*Ba/Bi-is-de-e* corresponds to *by<s>dh*. The name is explained by Zadok 1977, 364 as "Son of 'isdē" or "(I swear) by 'isdē", which would mean that *h* is a mater lectionis for /ē/. However, the analysis remains doubtful.

<sup>95</sup> *Mār*(<sup>md</sup>DUMU)-*é-sag-gil-lu-m[ur]* = *mrsglm?r* no. 39 with intervocalic /*m*/ rendered *m* in Aramaic remains uncertain.

*Šamaš*<sup>(md)UTU</sup>-*aḥ*(ŠEŠ)-*iddin*(MU) “Šamaš has given a brother” = *šwš’ḥdn* no. 33.<sup>96</sup>

*Nabû*<sup>(md)AG</sup>-*re-man-ni* “Nabû, show mercy on me!” = *nbwrwn* no. 66.

*Amurru*<sup>(md)KUR.GAL</sup>-*ú-paḥ-ḥir* “Amurru has gathered” = *wrpḥr* no. 186.<sup>97</sup>

That intervocalic /m/ was pronounced [w] in Late Babylonian is sometimes visible also in cuneiform, e.g. *šu-ma-a-ti* VS 5, 6: 25 for *šuwāti* < \**šu’āti* “him” with glide [w], or *ḥaš-ši-ur* Nrgl. 45: 1 for *ḥašiwur* < \**ḥašimur* “cumin”. Further confirmation is provided by the Graeco-Babyloniaca, e.g., ωει ZA 87, 81 no. 15: 3 for *ūmī* “days”, or [λ]εουν! ZA 87, 76f. no. 11f.: 2f. for *lemun* “evil”.

Akkadian *šum* “name, offspring” occurs as *šw*, which may stand for [šuw] or for a contracted form [šuw] > [šū]:

*Šum*<sup>(m)MU</sup>-*ukīn*(GIN) “He has established the name” = *šwkn* no. 88.

<sup>md</sup>*Za-ba<sub>4</sub>-ba<sub>4</sub>-šum*(MU)-*iddin*(MU) “Zababa has given a name” = *šbbšw[’]dn* no. 133.

*Ellil*<sup>(md)EN.LÍL</sup>-*šum*(MU)-*iddin*(MU) “Ellil has given a name” = *’llšw[’]dn* no. 145.

*Bēl*<sup>(md)EN</sup>-*šum*(MU)-*iddin*(MU) “Bēl has given a name” = *blšw’dn* no. 157.

However, spellings in cuneiform like *šu-ú* CT 22, 129: 5 etc.<sup>98</sup> favor a realization [šū].

Word initial /m/, however, is rendered *m* also in Aramaic:

*Mār*<sup>(m)DUMU</sup>-*é-sag-gil-lu-m[ur]* “Let me see the son of Esagil” = *mrsglm?r* no. 39.

*Marduk*<sup>(md)AMAR.UTU</sup>-*re-man-ni* „Marduk, show mercy on me!“ = *mrđk* no. 77.<sup>99</sup>

Syllable closing /m/ is once rendered *m*, if we assume that the case vowel is only written but not spoken:

*Pa-ni-Nabû*<sup>(d)AG</sup>-*ṭè-e-mu* “Before Nabû is counsel” = *pnbṭm* no. 36 for *Pan-Nabû-ṭēm*.

96 Further references for Šamaš cf. p. 191, below.

97 Further references for Amurru see p. 189–190, below.

98 CAD Š/3, 284 *šumu* heading.

99 Further references for Marduk see p. 190, below.

On the other hand, the spelling *Slwʾll* in no. 125 (OIC 22, 152) without preserved cuneiform counterpart perhaps shows syllable closing /m/ rendered *w*, if the name indeed stands for Akkadian *Silim-ʾEllil*.<sup>100</sup>

/m/ in foreign names occurs as *m* both in cuneiform and in Aramaic:

<sup>m</sup>*Pu-ú-ma-sa* = [pwms] no. 78, name of a Median.

<sup>lu</sup>*Šu-mu-ut-ku-na-a-a* = [šmtk]nyʾ no. 192, a title perhaps derived from a West Semitic tribal name.

2. Original Akkadian /w/, which after the Old Babylonian period occurs in cuneiform as written *m*, is rendered *w* in Aramaic. This proves that it was still spoken [w]:

*amīluttu*(LÚ-tú) “slave” = ʾwlt no. 71.

ʾwt in no. 79 stands for Akkadian ʾawāt “matter”.

Cf. in the Graeco-Babyloniaca [na]-ma-ri = νααρ “to shine” ZA 73, 115: 7.

3. Akkadian /s/ normally occurs as *s* in Aramaic:

<sup>m</sup>*Si-lim-Bēl*(<sup>d</sup>EN) “Be friendly, Bēl!” = sʾl[mʾbl no. 32.

*Sin*(<sup>md</sup>XXX)-DA = lsnʾl no. 37.

*Mār*(<sup>m</sup>DUMU)-é-sag-gil-lu-m[ur] “Let me see the son of Esagil” = mrsglmʾr no. 39.

<sup>m</sup>*Nu-uh-sa-a* = n[h]sy no. 49.

Only in the god name conventionally read *Nuska* /s/ appears as š, see 189, below.

4. Akkadian /š/ is almost always rendered š in Aramaic:

*Ahū*(<sup>m</sup>ŠEŠ)-šú-nu “Their brother” = ʾhwšn no. 29, 150 and 206.

*na-ši* “he takes” = nšʾ no. 32.

*Rēm*(<sup>m</sup>ARḪUŠ)-šukun(GAR) “Put mercy!” = r[m]škn no. 151.

<sup>m</sup>*La-ba-ši* “Let me not come to shame” = lbš no. 171.

<sup>m</sup>*Ši-kin-il*(DINGIR<sup>mes</sup>) “Creature of god” = [škyn][ʾ]l no. 194.

*Bēl*(<sup>md</sup>EN)-ú-šur-šú “Bēl, guard him!” = blʾsrš no. 200.

[Na]bû([<sup>md</sup>A]G)-ku-šur-šú “Nabû, strengthen him!” = nbwkšrš no. 209.

<sup>100</sup> Zadok 2003, 564.



[Bēl]<sup>(mdEN)</sup>-[e]-ri-iš “I have wished from Bēl” = *bly?rš* no. XXXIII.

*mšzb* in no. 180 (without Akkadian counterpart) stands for Akkadian *Mušēzib*.

Cuneiform and Aramaic š also correspond in names of non-Akkadian origin:

<sup>m</sup>Šá-tat-na-a’ = štt?n?’ no. 126.

<sup>m</sup>Ši-ṭa-’ = šyt’ no. 143.

<sup>md</sup>Ad-gi-ši-ri-za-bad-du/-zab-du “Adgi has bestowed my flesh” = *’dgšyrzbd* no. 166.

<sup>lu</sup>Šu-mu-ut-ku-na-a-a = [šmtk]ny’ no. 192.

<sup>m</sup>Šá-lam-mi-ía-a-ma = šlmyh no. 233.

Only once cuneiform š corresponds to Aramaic s in a name of non-Akkadian origin:

<sup>m</sup>Za-bi-ši = zb[s] no. 132.

5. /št/ becomes /rt/:

<sup>md</sup>Nin-urta!-iddin(a)(MU) “Ninurta has given” = *’nwšt’dn* no. 87.<sup>101</sup>

This phenomenon is also known from Neo- and Late Babylonian cuneiform texts:

*áš-ta-kas* ABL 1387 r. 13 < \**artakas* “I bound”, *Aš-taḥ-šá-as-su* JCS 40, 149: 7 “Artaxerxes”, *a-mar<sup>as</sup>-tu<sub>4</sub>* BM 24, 46: 5, 6, 10 “dividing wall”.

6. Aleph between vowels is replaced by a glide /y/:

*nydbl* = *Nayid*<sup>(m)</sup>-*Bēl*<sup>(dEN)</sup> < \**na’id* “Praised is Bēl” no. 156.

But this replacement is not obligatory, as the epigraph *nb[w]n’d* for *Nabû-na’id* “Praised is Nabû” on a Late Babylonian brick<sup>102</sup> demonstrates.

7. A widespread misconception in Akkadian studies claims that Akkadian syllables may start with a vowel since an initial aleph is not written. This claim contradicts Semitic syllable rules, which require that every syllable starts with a consonant.<sup>103</sup> Aramaic clay epigraphs showing initial aleph where cuneiform only has a vowel provide ample evidence that this is also true for Akkadian. In the following only examples with syllabically spelled cuneiform are listed, leaving out the many examples where the cuneiform counterpart is logographically written:

101 Further examples for the name of Ninurta cf. p. 191, below.

102 Oelsner 2007, 296 G.

103 Streck 2014a, 30 § 86.

*Id-di-ia* = *l'dy* no. 46, cf. no. 177 and 183.

<sup>m</sup>*U-bar* “Guest” = *'br* no. 82.

*as-né-e* “Dates” = *'snyn* no. 91=94.

<sup>m</sup>*Ap-la-a* = *'ply* no. 116.

*Nabû*(<sup>md</sup>AG)-*it-tan-nu* “Nabû has given” = *nbw'tn* no. 148.

*Bēl*(<sup>md</sup>EN)-*it-tan-ni* “Bēl has given” = [*bl'*]*tn* no. 190.

*Bēl*(<sup>md</sup>EN)-*e-ti[r]* “Bēl is saving” = *bl'tr* no. 201.

<sup>m</sup>*A-ḫu-ia-a-le-e* “The brother is my help” = *'hyly?* no. 212.

Vowel in cuneiform and aleph in Aramaic also correspond in non-Akkadian names:

<sup>uru</sup>*Bīt*(É)-<sup>m</sup>*Ar-za-*’ “House of the cedar” = [*b*]*yt'rz'* no. 161.

<sup>md</sup>*Ad-gi-ši-ri-za-bad-du/-zab-du* “Adgi has given my flesh” = *'dgšyrzbd* no. 166.

*Bīt*(<sup>md</sup>É)-*il-ḫi-is-ni-*’ “Bīt-’il is my strength” = *byt'lhsn[y]* no. 239.

Due to sandhi phenomena, we sometimes find forms without initial aleph in the middle of a name:

*Nergal*(<sup>md</sup>U.GUR)-*iddin*(MU) “Nergal has given” = *nrgldn* no. 28 for *Nergaliddin*.<sup>104</sup>

*Šamaš*(<sup>md</sup>UTU)-*uballiṭ*(TIN-*iṭ*) “Šamaš has kept alive” = *šwšblṭ* no. 59 for *Šawašuballiṭ*.<sup>105</sup>

<sup>m</sup>*Šum*(MU)-*ukīn*(GIN) “He has established the name” = *šwkn* no. 88 for *Šūkīn* < *Šū-ukīn* < *Šuw-ukīn*.<sup>106</sup>

*Bēl*(<sup>md</sup>EN)-*aḫ*(ŠEŠ)-*it-tan-n[u]* “Bēl has given a brother” = *bl'ḫtn* no. 164 for *Bēl'aḫittannu*.

*Amurru*(<sup>md</sup>KUR.GAL)-*ú-paḫ-ḫir* “Amurru has gathered” = *'wrpḫr* no. 186 for *'Awurruḫḫir*.

104 Cf. for *iddin(a)* also no. 33, 51 and 59.

105 Cf. for *uballiṭ* also no. 65 and 144.

106 Cf. for *ukīn* also no. 64.

*Bēl*(<sup>md</sup>EN)-*ab*(AD)-*uṣur*(<sup>URU</sup>) “Bēl, guard the father!” = *bl’bšr* no. 192 for *Bēl’abuṣur*.<sup>107</sup>

[*Bēl*](<sup>md</sup>EN)-[*e*]-*ri-iš* “I have wished from Bēl” = *bly?rš* no. XXXIII for *Bēlēriš*.

*’rdnwš[t]* no. 154, without Akkadian counterpart, stands for *’Aradinušta* “Slave of Ninurta”.

In one cases, aleph is missing between two different vowels, apparently because of vowel contraction:

*Aḥḥē*(<sup>m</sup>ŠEŠ<sup>mes</sup>)-*utīr*(GUR) “He has brought back the brothers” = *’ḥtr* no. 134 for *’Aḥḥūtīr*.

### Morphology

1. The vowel of the accusative suffix 1. sg. *-ni* appears as *y* in Aramaic, which means that it was not dropped but preserved:

*Nusku*(<sup>md</sup>PA.TÚG)-*kil-la-an-[ni]* “Nusku, hold me!” = *nwšklny* no. 43.

In no. 66, however, *y* is missing. It remains unclear whether this is a defective spelling or reflects the loss of */-i/*:

*Nabû*(<sup>md</sup>AG)-*re-man-ni* “Nabû, show mercy on me!” = *nbwrwn*.

Late Babylonian cuneiform texts rarely provide evidence for the loss of final */-i/*: *i-du-uk-kin* YOS 3, 141: 7 for *idukkan* < *\*idukkanni* “he beats me”.

2. In general, short case vowels are lost in the course of the Late Babylonian period.<sup>108</sup> The god-name *Anu*, however, is frozen and the ending */-u/* appears as *w* in Aramaic:

*Anu*(<sup>md</sup>60)-*ik-šur* “Anu has strengthened” = *’nw’kšr* no. 139.

*Anu*(<sup>md</sup>60)-*uballis*(TIN)-*su* “Anu has kept him alive” = [’*n*]wbls? no. 144.

Nowhere else case vowels are rendered by Aramaic matres lectionis, e.g.:

*a-ba-[a?]*tu! “reeds and shrubs” = *’bt* no. 47.

*amīluttu*(LÚ-tú) “slave” = *’wlt* no. 71.

<sup>m</sup>Še-*el-le-bi* “Fox” = *šlb* no. 89.

107 Cf. *bl’bšr* (without Akkadian counterpart) no. 168.

108 Streck 2014b.

*Marduk*(<sup>md</sup>AMAR.UTU)-*na-din-aḥ*(ŠEŠ) “Marduk is the giver of a brother” = *lmrkdndn* ’*ḥ* no. 232.

3. The status constructus of *aḥu* ends in a vowel (cf. GAG § 65h):

*Aḥū*(<sup>m</sup>ŠEŠ)-*šú-nu* “Their brother” = *’ḥwšn* no. 29 and 150.

4. The ending /-ī/ of the dual is preserved:

*bīt*(É) *qātī*(ŠU<sup>II</sup>) “storehouse” = *bqt*’ no. XXXIV.

5. The following case perhaps reflects the preservation of the ventive ending /-a/:<sup>109</sup>

*Iddina*(<sup>m</sup>MU)-*Nabū*(<sup>d</sup>AG) “Nabū has given” = *’dnnbw* no. 27 = 108.

I /-a/ s lost, a possible spelling would be \*’*dnbw* with only one *n* as in *pnbtm* = *Pa-ni-Nabū*(<sup>d</sup>AG)-*ṭē-e-mu* no. 36. The evidence is, however, uncertain since double *nn* may also reflect a pausa between the two name elements *’Iddin* and *Nabū*.

6. In most cases, the hypocoristic ending spelled (C)*a-a*, *Ca-a-a* or *-a* in Akkadian is rendered *y* in Aramaic, which proves that it was normally pronounced /-āya/ and not /-ā/:<sup>110</sup>

<sup>f</sup>*Ri-šá-a* = *ršy* for *Rīšāya* no. 24.

<sup>m</sup>*Kal-ba-a* “Dog” = *klb[y]* for *Kalbāya* no. 48.

<sup>m</sup>*Nu-uḥ-sa-a* = *n[h]sy* for *Nuḥsāya* no. 49.

<sup>f</sup>*Qú-un-na-[a-a]* = *qny* for *Qunnāya* no. 71.

<sup>m</sup>*Erīb*(SU)-*a* = *’ryby* for *’Erībāya* no. 102 and 145, and similarly in no. 69, 81=92, 89(?), 109, 116 and 182.

In some cases, however, the hypocoristic ending is rendered *’*, *h* or *ḥ* in Aramaic, which points to a (secondary) contraction of the triphthong /\*-āya/ > /-ā/:<sup>111</sup> Since

109 Zadok 2003, 578.

110 This at least in part answers the question raised by Beaulieu 2000, 26: „The question as to whether the additional <a> denotes an ending /aya/ or /ayu/, a final diphthong /ay/, or a contracted diphthong /â/ remains open“. Mayer (2003) amply documents the use of *a-a* for the hypocoristic ending /-āja/, but also sometimes for /-īya/.

111 For the theonym *Naná* cf. p.190, below.

Aramaic has a hypocoristic ending /-ā/ spelled <sup>112</sup>, this contraction might be influenced by Aramaic or might even be present only in the Aramaic rendering of the Akkadian names. See for <sup>113</sup>:

$\check{S}am\check{s}(^{md}UTU)-a[(-a)] = \check{s}w[\check{s}']$  for  $\check{S}aw\check{s}\check{a}$  no. 72.

$^{m}Mar-duk-a = mrdk'$  for  $Marduk\check{a}$ <sup>114</sup> no. 197.

$^{m}Bi-ba-a = byb'$  for  $B\check{b}\check{b}\check{a}$  (?)<sup>115</sup> no. 199.

In no. XXXIV,  $\check{s}w\check{s}' / \check{S}aw\check{s}\check{a}'$  is a hypocoristicon of  $\check{S}ama\check{s}(^{md}UTU)-ittannu(MU-nu)$  in the Akkadian text, and similarly in no. 105  $\check{t}b' / \check{T}\check{a}b\check{a}'$  of  $^{m}\check{T}\check{a}b(DU_{10}.GA)-\check{s}\check{a}-lam$ .

*h* and *0*:

$^{m}\check{I}\check{s}-ra-a = '\check{s}?'rh / '\check{I}\check{s}r\check{a}'$  no. 136.

$\check{S}am\check{s}(^{md}UTU)-a-a = \check{s}w\check{s}$  no. 158.

7. The nisba spelled  $(Ca)-a-a$  in Akkadian<sup>116</sup> occurs as  $-y-'$  in Aramaic, which apparently renders the status determinatus<sup>117</sup>:

$^{l\check{u}}\check{S}u-mu-ut-ku-na-a-a = [\check{s}mtk]ny'$  for  $\check{S}umutkun\check{a}y\check{a}$  no. 192.

$^{l\check{u}}Ba-na-n\check{e}\check{s}(UR.MAH)-a-a = bn\check{s}y'$  for  $Bann\check{e}\check{s}\check{a}y\check{a}$  “Carians”<sup>118</sup> (collective singular) no. 200.

### Individual Words and Signs

1. Divine names and temple name

*Amurru*: Always rendered  $'wr$ , showing that original Akkadian *m* was pronounced [w] (cf. 3.2.1, above):

$Amurru(^{md}KUR.GAL)-\check{e}\check{t}ir(SUR)$  “Amurru is saving” =  $'wr[ 'tr]$  no. 146.

112 Segert 1986, 163.

113 Another example on a Late Babylonian brick is possibly  $zbn'$  (Oelsner 2007, 295f. C), which probably stands for  $Zab\check{b}\check{b}\check{a}y\check{a}$ .

114 An atypical hypocoristicon, because normally the theophoric element is deleted and not the predicative element. See Stamm 1939, 117 for the name  $Marduk(u)$ .

115 See AHW 125 and CAD B 233 for  $bib\check{u}$ , occurring only in names with the alleged meaning “child, baby”. Or from Akkadian  $bibbu$  „wild sheep“, which would explain the spellings  $^{m}Bi-ib-bu-ii(-a)$  BRM 1, 84: 18, Nbk. 350: 6?

116 Thus spelled similarly to the hypocoristic ending, cf. p. 188, above. Cf. Mayer 2003, 294 for  $-a-a$  rendering the nisba.

117 See Segert 1986, 156 for the nisba/ $-\check{a}y\check{a}$ /in Aramaic.

118 Zadok, RGTC 8, 64f. see v.  $Bann\check{e}\check{s}u$ .

*Amurru*(<sup>md</sup>KUR.GAL)-*iddin*(MU) “Amurru has given” = *wr’d[n]* no. 155.

*Amurru*(<sup>md</sup>KUR.GAL)-*ú-paḥ-ḥir* “Amurru has gathered” = *wrphr* no. 186.

*Antu*: Rendered *’nd*, showing assimilation /nt/ > /nd/ :

*’ndblt* no. 145, without Akkadian counterpart, for *’Andu-bēlet* “Andu is mistress”.

*Anu*: Rendered *’nw*, cf. 187–188, above.

*Enlil*(EN.LÍL): Always rendered *’ll*, showing assimilation /nl/ > /ll/ also known from Akkadian:

*Ellil*(<sup>md</sup>EN.LÍL)-*ḥa-tin* “Enlil is protecting” = *’llḥtn* no. 173, cf. no. 117 and 127.

*Ellil*(<sup>md</sup>EN.LÍL)-*šum*(MU)-*iddin*(MU) “Enlil has given a name” = *’llšw [dn]* no. 145.

[*Ellil*(<sup>md</sup>EN.LÍL)-*ēṭir*] “Enlil is saving” = *’ll’tr* no. 147.

(*E*)*sangil*(É.SAG.ÍL): Cuneiform É “house” is not rendered in the epigraphs, pointing to a pronunciation *Sangil*:

É.SAG.ÍL = *sngl* no. 228.

*Mār*(<sup>m</sup>DUMU)-*é-sag-gil-lu-m[ur]* “Let me see the son of Esagil” = *mrsglm?r* no. 39.

Whereas in the first epigraph the old Sumerian pronunciation /sang/ for SAG is still present, the second shows a pronunciation /sag/.

*Marduk*: Always *mrđk*:

*Marduk*(<sup>md</sup>AMAR.UTU)-*re-man-ni* “Marduk, show mercy on me!” = *mrđk* no. 77.

*Marduk*(<sup>md</sup>AMAR.UTU)-*re-man-ni* = *mrđkr[wn]* no. 85.

*Marduk*(<sup>md</sup>AMAR.UTU)-*na-din-aḥ*(ŠEŠ) “Marduk is giver of a brother” = *mrđ-kndn’ḥ* no. 232.

*Nabû*: Normally rendered *nbw*, e.g.:

*Iddina*(<sup>m</sup>MU)-*Nabû*(<sup>d</sup>AG) “Nabû has given” = *’dnnbw* no. 27 = 108.

*Nabû*(<sup>md</sup>AG)-*re-man-ni* “Nabû, show mercy on me!” = *nbwrwn* no. 66.

*Nabû*(<sup>md</sup>AG)-*qá!?-[am!?!]* = *nbwqm* no. 69.

Further examples no. 138, 148, 190, 196, 201, 203, 209.

Only in no. 36 we find a spelling without *w* (mistake?):

*Pa-ni-Nabû*(<sup>d</sup>AG)-*ṭè-e-mu* “Before Nabû is counsel” = *pnbṭm*.

*Nanā*: *Na-na-a* is rendered *nn’* in no. 188<sup>119</sup>, pointing to a secondary pronunciation *Nanā* (cf. p. 190, above).<sup>120</sup>

119 The epigraph no. 236 is too broken to give a reliable reading of the goddess’ name.

120 Elsewhere, the name of the goddess is spelled *nny* for *Nanāya*, cf. Stol 1998–2001, 146.

*Nergal*: Always rendered *nrgl*:

*Nergal*<sup>(mdU.GUR)</sup>-*da-ni* “Nergal is strong” = *nrgldn* no. 32, and similarly no. 45, 51, 130, 168.

*Ninurta*: Rendered as *'nwšt* for *'Inušta*, with *\*/rt/ > /št/* (cf. p. 186, above). Initial *\*/n/* dissimilates to */ʾ/*, a phenomenon also attested with the god name *Inšušinak* < *\*Nin-šušinak* “lord of Susa”.<sup>121</sup>

*Ninurta*<sup>(mdMAŠ)</sup>-*iddin*(MU) “Ninurta has given” = *'nwšt'dn* no. 162. Cf. no. 87, 180, 191, XI.

For sandhi *'rdnwšt* no. 154 cf. p. 185, above.

*Nuska*: */s/* is rendered in Aramaic epigraphs from Nerab as *š* (cf. p. 183, above), also attested in Assyria and in Elephantine, whereas Aramaic texts from Babylonia give his name as *nsk*.<sup>122</sup>

*Nusk(a)*<sup>(mdPA.TÚG)</sup>-*kil-la-an-[ni]* = *nwšklny* no. 43 and 52.

Note that only one *k* is written in both instances, which may mean that the god's name ended in */k/*.<sup>123</sup>

*Sîn*: Rendered *sn*:

*Sîn*<sup>(mdXXX)</sup>-*DA* = *sn'l* no. 37.

*Šamaš*: Rendered always as *šwš*, with *\*/m/ > /w/* (cf. 180, above):

*Bēl*<sup>(mEN)</sup>-*eṭēr(i)*(SUR)-*Šamaš*<sup>(dUTU)</sup> “Šamaš is the lord of saving” = *bl'ṭršwš* no. 189. Cf. also no. 33, 59, 65, 72, 93, 158, 173 and XXXIV.

*YHWH*: *ia-a-ma* [*Yaw*] corresponds to *yh*:

<sup>m</sup>*Pi-il-ia-a-ma* “Yaw is wonder” = *plyh* no. 140.

<sup>m</sup>*Šá-lam-mi-ia-a-ma* “Yaw is well-being(?)” = *šlmyh* no. 232.

Weippert (1976–1980, 249) assumes that *ia/ía-a-ma* is a conventional spelling of Yahwe with different pronunciations.<sup>124</sup>

*Zababa*: Rendered once as *zbb* and once as *šbb*:

*zbbšr'šr* “Zababa, guard the king!”, without Akkadian counterpart, no. 80.

121 Hinz 1976, 117.

122 Streck 1998–2001b, 630 § 2.

123 Was there a form corresponding to Aramaic Našuḫ, a variant of Nuska in the region of Ḥarrān (Streck 1998–2001a)?

124 Pearce/Wunsch, CUSAS 28 p. 82 don't give any explanation for the correspondance *ia-a-ma* : *yh*.

<sup>md</sup>*Za-ba<sub>4</sub>-ba<sub>4</sub>-šum(MU)-iddin(MU)* “Zababa has given a name” = *šbbšw[ ]dn* no. 133.

The reading of cuneiform ZA as *Za* is conventional and based on a “Sumerian” analysis of the name. The name has, however, no certain etymology, and in Akkadian contexts, the sign could well be read *Ša*.

## 2. *bītu*

*bītu* “house” appears as *b* in no. XXXIV, either an abbreviation (assimilation?) or a mistake:

*bī(É) qātī(ŠU<sup>II</sup>)* “storehouse” = *bqt*’.

## 3. Logograms

DA: Appears as *’l* instead of expected *\*l’*, see no. 37, above.

É.AN.NA: Is rendered *’yk* = *ajjak(k)u*, see no. 79, above.

DINGIR<sup>meš</sup>: Rendered as *’l*, understood as singular *’il* in spite of the plural determinative MEŠ:<sup>125</sup>

<sup>m</sup>*Ba-ri-ki-’il*(DINGIR<sup>meš</sup>) “Blessed by god” = *brk’l* no. 105.

<sup>m</sup>*Ši-kin-’il*(DINGIR<sup>meš</sup>) “Creature of god” = [*škyn*][*’l*] no. 194.

*Ha-za-’il*(DINGIR<sup>meš</sup>) = *hzh’l* no. 207.

KI: In the name <sup>m</sup>KI-Šamaš(<sup>d</sup>UTU) = *kyšwš* not a logogram for *itti* (*Itti-Šamaš* “With Šamaš”) but a syllabogram *ki* for *Kī*, s. no. 93, above.

GAŠAN: Rendered *bl* in no. 128, most probably a mistake:

<sup>m</sup>*Dan-na-at-<sup>d</sup>Bēlet*(GAŠAN) “Strong is the lady” = *dntbl*.

## Bibliography

- Abraham, K. 2012: A Bilingual and Biliteral Artifact from the Time of Nebuchadnezzar II in the Moussaieff Private Collection, in: M. Lubetski/E. Lubetski (eds.), *New Inscriptions and Seals Relating to the Biblical World*, Atlanta, 111–128.

125 Quite frequently attested in Achaemenid Babylonia, cf. Zadok 1977, 31–33 with previous literature.



- Beaulieu, P.-A. 2000: *Legal and Administrative Texts from the Reign of Nabonidus (YOS 19)*, New Haven.
- Blasberg, M. 1997: *Keilschrift in aramäischer Umwelt*, Diss. Köln.
- Frame, G. 2001: A Neo-Babylonian Tablet with an Aramaic Docket and the Surety Phrase *pīl šēp(i) ... našū*, in: M. Daviau et al. (eds.), *The World of the Aramaeans III: Studies in Language and Literature in Honour of Paul-Eugène Dion (JSOT SS 326)*, Sheffield, 100–133.
- Hinz, W. 1976–1980: Inšušinak, RIA 5, 117–119.
- Joannès, F./Lemaire, A. 1996: Contrats babyloniens d'époque achéménide, RA 90 (1996), 41–60.
- . 1999: Trois tablettes cunéiformes à onomastique ouest-sémitique, Transeuphratène 17, 17–34.
- Jursa, M. 1995: *Die Landwirtschaft in Sippar in neubabylonischer Zeit (AfO Bh. 25)*, Wien.
- . 1999: Die aramäische Beischrift auf Ni. 2670, NABU 1999/105.
- Kaufman, S. A. 1975: Appendix C: Alphabetic Texts, in: M. Gibson (ed.), *Excavations at Nippur, Eleventh Season (Oriental Institute Communications 22)*, Chicago, 151f.
- Knopf, C. S. 1933: Items of Interest from Miscellaneous Neo-Babylonian Documents, *Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Sciences* 32/2, 41–76.
- Maraqten, M. 1988: *Die semitischen Personennamen in den alt- und reichsaramäischen Inschriften aus Vorderasien*, Hildesheim/Zürich/New York.
- Mayer, W. R. 2003: Besonderheiten in der Verwendung des Graphems A.A. im Akadischen, Or. 72, 293–306.
- Oelsner, J. 2006: Aramäische Beischriften auf neu- und spätbabylonischen Tontafeln, WO 36, 27–71.
- . 2007: Aramäische Beischriften auf neubabylonischen Ziegeln, ZDMG 157, 293–298.
- Schwiderski, D. 2004: *Die alt- und reichsaramäischen Inschriften, Band 2: Texte und Bibliographie*, Berlin/New York.
- Segert, S. 1986: *Altaramäische Grammatik*, Leipzig.
- Sokoloff, M. 2002: *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period Ramat Gan/Baltimore, 2nd Ed*, Tübingen.
- Stamm, J. J. 1939: *Die akkadische Namengebung (MVAeG 44)*, Leipzig.
- Stol, M. 1998–2001: Nanaja, RIA 9, 146–151.
- Stolper, M. 1985: *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, Leiden.
- Streck, M. P. 1998–2001a: Našūḫ, RIA 9, 187.
- . 1998–2001b: Nusku, RIA 9, 629–633.
- . 2000: Das amurritische Onomastikon der altbabylonischen Zeit (AOAT 271/1), Münster.
- . 2001: Keilschrift und Alphabet, in: D. Borchers/F. Kammerzell/S. Weninger (eds.), *Hieroglyphen, Alphabete, Schriftreformen: Studien zu Multiliteralismus, Schriftwechsel und Orthographieneuregelungen (Lingua Aegyptia-Studia Monographica 3)*, 77–97.
- . 2011: Akkadian and Aramaic Language Contact, in: S. Weninger et al. (eds.), *The Semitic Languages: An International Handbook*, Berlin/Boston.

- 2014a: *Altbabylonisches Lehrbuch*, 2nd Ed., (*Porta Linguarum Orientalium Neue Serie 23*), Wiesbaden.
- 2014b: Die Kasusflexion im Status rectus des Neu- und Spätbabylonischen, in: M. Krebernik/H. Neumann (eds.), *Babylonien und seine Nachbarn in neu- und spätbabylonischer Zeit*, Wissenschaftliches Kolloquium aus Anlass des 75. Geburtstags von Joachim Oelsner, Jena, 2. und 3. März 2007 (*AOAT 369*), 247–288.
- Weippert, M. 1976–1980: Jahwe, *RIA 5*, 246–253.
- Weszeli, M./Baker, H. 1997: Ešeleien II, *WZKM 87*, 231–247.
- Zadok, R. 1977: *On West Semites in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods: An Onomastic Study*, Jerusalem.
- 2003: The Representation of Foreigners in Neo- and Late-Babylonian Legal Documents (Eighth through Second Centuries B.C.E.), in: O. Lipschits/J. Blenkinsopp (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, Winona Lake, Indiana, 471–589.