State Archives of Assyria Bulletin
Volume XXX (2024) Issue 2

FIVE THOUSAND NAMES
A CENTURY OF ONOMASTIC STUDIES
ON THE NEO-ASSYRIAN PERIOD [1]

Frederick Mario Fales †

DOI: https://doi.org/10.13136/1120-4699/30/2/001
Keywords: Onomastics — Neo-Assyrian — Aramaic

Abstract

Among Mario Fales' many research interests, onomastic always occupied a special place as a means to investigate languages, cultures, and societies. He planned to organise the results of his long-standing interest, particularly his recent in-depth studies, into a comprehensive publication. This work aimed to systematically address theoretical questions related to anthroponymy, explore problems and methods of name analysis and classification, investigate the social implications of onomastic data, and the historical and anthropological perspectives of name giving within cultural and ethnic contexts. Additionally, it would look into specific situations and their meanings during the NA period.

Mario completed a large part of this ambitious project so that it was almost ready for publication and in need of only minor editorial interventions, such as a few checks and updates, whereas the last chapters he had planned were still only barely outlined. After reading the manuscript, the editorial board considered that the extensive presentation of the NA materials and the thorough definition of the methodological issues, conducted along with a critical review of decades of onomastic studies, that the author produced in the first part, was a valuable and dense study in itself, a competent reflection on this field of study which is worth being shared as such with the scholarly community. We trust that we can correctly interpret the author's desire by publishing it in the journal Mario founded more than 30 years ago. This posthumous publication, therefore, represents both an important scientific contribution and a homage to Mario's scholarly activity.

The manuscript is here published with the kind permission of Marina Bentivoglio and Ludovica Fales, who promoted the edition of this article in SAAB, and whom we heartedly thank.

The editors also thank Luigi Turri for the first preparation of the manuscript, and Giulia Francesca Grassi for checking references to the Aramaic bibliography.

To the memory of Karlheinz Deller
who opened my eyes on Assyrian texts and on the personal names therein.

To the thousands of unfortunate victims of the COVID-19 pandemic of 2020,
whose remains lie buried somewhere in haste, with only their names to linger in future memory.

A man might be deprived of his shadow, and would be in no position to replace it.
But if he were robbed of his name by a malign sorcerer, and stricken with amnesia,
he would still not have to go through life nameless.
He could invent an appellation for himself; and even if he were deprived of the faculty of speech,
or of human intelligence altogether, a name would without fail be imposed on him by others.
Pulgram 1954, 149

1. I am very grateful to Ms. Roswitha Del Fabbro (Udine - FuB Berlin) and to Mr. Luciano Esteban Monti (Buenos Aires - Udine) for their kind bibliographical support. Specific abbreviations employed in specific contexts of this essay (especially footnotes) for reasons of convenience: NA = Neo-Assyrian; NB = Neo-Babylonian; LB = Late Babylonian; PN = personal name/anthroponym; GN = geographical name/toponym; DN = divine name/theonym.

1"Five Thousand Names"

1. a General Introduction

The present essay (to which jottings and corrections have been added with irregular rhythm over the years) is aimed at a comprehensive appraisal of research on the personal names of the Assyrian empire, a topic that has long been of philological and historical interest to this writer.[2]

The proper names from the Neo-Assyrian period should, of course, be viewed first and foremost as an integral part of the onomastics of the Ancient Near East in general, and specifically as a local/temporal development of the millennial tradition of Akkadian onomastics.[3] However, it may be recalled that, although the vast majority of the names which have come down to us from this period reflect linguistic elements and cultural contents of Assyrian origin, the political developments of the period brought an inordinate number of people(s) under the sway of Assyria — and this phenomenon caused a vast crowd of non-Assyrian name bearers to trod the country roads and the city streets of the empire, leaving some not negligible marks of their presence in the Assyrian texts dealing with epistolography, administration, business and law, historiography and literature.[4] Thus, Neo-Assyrian onomastics prove to differ from all other corpora of Ancient Near Eastern names for their interestingly cosmopolitan range.[5]

This feature brings about a unique consequence in itself. The study of the proper names of this empire spread all over the Near East proves to require recourse to the corpora of onomastic forms attested in documents couched in other scripts of the time, such as the Phoenician/Aramaic/Hebrew alphabet and hieroglyphic Luwian, and in other contemporaneous or later documentary traditions such as the Old Testament and the Elephantine letters. Further, the study of Neo-Assyrian personal names allows specialists to take into account onomastic typologies tied to areas even far removed from the core of the Assyrian empire, such as Arabia and Egypt and the vast mountain sector to the north-east and east of the Twin Rivers (Urarṭu, Mannea and Media, Elam), whence came princes, military or deportees who found their way into the registers of the empire itself. In this light, therefore, investigations on the personal names in the Neo-Assyrian corpus prove to be based on the richest booty for comparative linguistic purposes of any single phase or locale in Ancient Near Eastern history.

2. Cf. Fales 1974; 1977; 1978a; 1978b; 1979; 1980; 2005.
3. For a general overview of Ancient Near Eastern onomastics, cf. the series of succinct but informative articles in Edzard *et al.* 1998, resp. dedicated to Sumerian and Akkadian (D.O. Edzard), Hittite (H.A. Hoffner, Jr), Hurrian (G. Wilhelm), Amorite and other West Semitic languages in cuneiform sources (M.P. Streck).
4. Cf. Fales 2001 for a bird's-eye view of these materials.
5. As is well known, this cosmopolitan patterning of NA-period names — which may be seen as one of the functions of an overall tolerance, if not actually an outright taste, of Assyrian rulership for the perpetuation of the cultures native to the vanquished peoples — did not find a continuation to the same extent in the (equally wide-ranging) NB empire, where onomastics show a prevailing conformity to Babylonian linguistic and religious standards (with the Murašû circle representing a welcome exception).

The present essay on Neo-Assyrian personal names is primarily directed to Assyriologists, Semitists, and students of the cultural history of the Ancient Near East, as a reference work but also with an eye to possible teaching purposes.[6] This writer's aim is to review, along historical-critical guidelines, the different methodologies that have been employed in this study area, also in relation to wider premises/conclusions reached on Ancient Near Eastern personal names in the course of the last century. However, it is the last half-century which shall be of particular concern, for two reasons. In the first place, the mid-to-late 1960s may be viewed as the "birthdate" of renewed investigations, both of philological and historical character, on the NA age: such investigations also led to specific refinements in approach concerning the onomastics of this period, as will be seen. Secondly, the same general date may be set as the beginning of a new overall consciousness regarding onomastics *per se*, which brought about a re-evaluation of personal names as bearers of many different types of information — from a linguistic, historical, and cultural-anthropological point of view — whichever the geographical or chronological context of application.[7] Since not all the potentialities of such implications prove to have been adequately exploited for NA onomastics to date, this writer will (1) attempt to pursue some of them through sectorial analyses in the course of this essay, and (2) focus on guidelines for possible future research in the field by way of conclusion.

* * *

An overview of onomastic studies on the Neo-Assyrian period is undoubtedly favoured, at this time, by the excellent state of scholarly editions in the field. Specifically, the present-day student of Neo-Assyrian names is no more forced to delve into a veritable jungle of textual references, as in the past. Her/his energy may be almost entirely devoted to the names themselves and to the relevant implications in secondary literature, thanks the full availability of the corpus of "everyday" documents of this age in updated transliterations and translations (in the series *State Archives of Assyria*, SAA), as well as by the parallel presence of a vast and detailed prosopographical repertory drawn from such documents (the three-volume *Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, PNA).

The first and foremost of these projects (begun in 1987) represents the complete renewal of the *editiones principes* of the texts of the so-called "state archives" of Assyria, published more than one century ago.[8] This result was achieved by means of international research collaborations — with specific corpora assigned to different authors — and

6. It is worth noting that onomastics are still nowadays slightly shunned in general linguistic studies on the Ancient Near East. For example, the entire sector of research on personal names was totally neglected in the otherwise interesting collective review of recent results in Semitics edited by Izre'el 2002.
7. Cf. e.g. Caprini 2001 (esp. 33–83), where the inclusion of the proper name on the part of the cultural anthropologists — starting from Lévi-Strauss — as a fully significant element within the taxonomic system elaborated by each culture is recalled. In the Italian context, it was especially the ethnolinguist Giorgio Raimondo Cardona who pointed out the importance of onomastics within ancient and traditional societies (cf. e.g. Cardona 1976, 133–155).
8. Cf. Johns 1898–1901 for the administrative and legal texts; Johns 1901 for cadastral documents; and Harper 1892–1914 for the vast epistolary corpus.

thanks to an efficient technical plan of text preparation and for subsequent editorship, founded on preliminary electronic databases and templates for final printed output. By consequence, scholars in this and adjoining fields of research, as well as an interested outer audience, have at their disposal a comprehensive and updated record in transliteration and translation of the "everyday" documents of the Neo-Assyrian period, mainly centred on the 8th and 7th centuries B.C.[9]

In its turn, the SAA editorial work gave rise to the PNA (1998–2011), a project equally based on a network of international competences and on fully computerized processes (databases, bibliographical lists) for the filing and printouts of the onomastic and prosopographical data in their documentary context.[10] The collaborators in the PNA project, responsible (with signatures) for individual lemmata — or at times entrusted with complete groups of entries — were approx. forty, from many different countries, selected on the basis of their previous interest and activity in onomastic research. Obviously, this plurality of contributions has enormously accelerated the practical realization of the work; but especially it has endowed the PNA itself with a great variety of philological and linguistic capabilities, such as are nowadays largely beyond the range of individual researchers, thus putting the many difficult etymological attributions of the names on the firmest of footings available at present.[11]

In practice, the availability of these two modern and reliable instruments of research has allowed this writer (who took part in both) to extrapolate from the complex of the approx. 5,000 known personal names of Neo-Assyrian date a representative *onomastic sampler*, which will be called upon in this essay either through single quotes or within specific charts. The sampler will include not only particularly significant cases of standard name-formations, but also a number of rare or exceptional occurrences; and it will not only regard Akkadian names, but also those of other linguistic varieties present and in use within the Assyrian empire, and notably Aramaic.[12]

9. The SAA project stems from the indefatigable scientific and editorial energies of Simo Parpola (Helsinki), with the aid of an international board of specialists.
10. This project also goes back to Parpola for its ideation, inner organization, and overall coordination, as offshoot of the SAA. It was first directed and edited by Karen Radner (1998–1999, vol. 1) and then by H. D. Baker (2000–2011, vols. 2 and 3). Well-known general studies on the theme, and specifically the scope, of prosopography are those by Stone 1971 and the response to it by Carney 1973.
11. Similarly to the SAA, the PNA is founded on the fully computerized Helsinki database of all Assyrian sources. Thus, the data for each item also comprises a brief, but very useful, description and partial quote of each documentary context in which the specific PN occurs. Indisputably, this methodology represents a fundamental scientific upgrade on the work of K.L. Tallqvist (cf. § 2, below) and on all other previous compilations of onomastic registers, where prosopographically useful data was limited to the accompanying professional names and/or chronological attributions. On the other hand, and unavoidably as such, the presence of many scholarly "hands" involved in this vast work has caused a — limited, but nonetheless visible — series of internal fluctuations, especially as regards the etymological interpretation of the PNs, such as to leave room for further reflections and future studies.
12. Since the work is satisfactorily complete, with all volumes and issues now published, and the lemmata placed in rigid alphabetical order, it will be necessary to quote the names only by the relevant page-numbers and columns (a/b) of PNA in the sampler. The names themselves will be also given in the normalized form of PNA, which represents a midrange and abstract rendering along the principles of Assyrian phonetics (this choice is explained by Parpola in PNA 1/I, xxii–xxvii), and thus sometimes

The specific function of the sampler of names will be that of background material, to illustrate the most significant stages in methodological approaches and/or factual results that have marked the progress of onomastic research on the Neo-Assyrian period during the last 40 years in this writer's opinion. This illustration, which represents the core of the present essay, will be given in a set of distinct chapters, opened by this one, as general introduction.

Getting to the heart of the topic,§ 2 will deal with the earliest general classifications on Neo-Assyrian personal names, as well as with the main theoretical positions reached on Akkadian names in general. § 3 will regard the period after 1965, describing studies of general analytical/classificatory character on the Neo-Assyrian onomastic corpus. These studies were not merely aimed at the philological/linguistic (i.e. typological or etymological) explanation of the names, but also at placing these onomastics in a historical-comparative light within the wider framework of the different languages and scripts attested in the Assyrian geographical and political horizon.

In § 4, the focus will shift to the social implications of the onomastic data from this corpus. Here, among others, we find the problems of the use of one or more variants of the same name, or even of different names, for the same individuals, and more widely the question of the initial choice or secondary attribution of names in relation to specific ideological and social instances.

§ 5 will regard an ethnolinguistic and historical-anthropological perspective on Neo-Assyrian personal names — in practice, through the analysis of the relationship between onomastics and the contemporary cultural framework. This type of examination cannot limit itself — as in the past — to mere distributional charts of cultural elements in the names along geographical or chronological guidelines, but also requires the historian to come to terms with the general problem of what the name-bearing subjects could have felt their status to be in terms of cultural identity, or ethnicity, vis-à-vis the society around him.

The review of approaches to Neo-Assyrian anthroponyms will be concluded in § 6, where some particular categories of onomastic materials of the Neo-Assyrian age will be examined,[13] in an attempt to focus on the personal names from the standpoint of the scribes of the Neo-Assyrian state administration. Finally, notes on still open problems, and a few indications for future work to be performed in this specific field of research will be illustrated in § 7.

1. b Some Preliminary Assumptions on Ancient Near Eastern Personal Names

Prior to our analysis, it may prove useful to go back once more to the well-known Shakespearean question, "What's in a name?"[14] — but in this case with specific reference to

also at variance with the phonetics of the original names. The latter are on the other hand fully retrievable within the single entries of PNA itself, and this writer has quoted them only in cases of specific interest.

13. *E.g.*, specimen names lists, astroglyphs, other crypto-writings (the numbers making up Sennacherib's name), etc.

14. W. Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, II, ii, 1–2: "What's in a name? That which we call a rose / By any other name would smell as sweet".

personal names, albeit projected on the very wide cultural and linguistic canvas of the Ancient Near East between the third millennium BC and the Christian era. The main point to be raised here regards the type and degree of expected results that the Ancient Near Eastern personal name poses as a source, whether individually considered or within a set of similar data; and in which domains of information such results may be preferentially expected. We may start from a brief and useful definition of Mesopotamian personal names *per se* and within the overall textual corpus by Jasper Eidem:

> The personal names (PNs) from Ancient Mesopotamia clearly constitute an important source material. Indeed quite a large portion of the total text-matter in the cuneiform record consists of PNs, due to the preponderance of administrative and legal archives. In contrast to modern European tradition, PNs in the Ancient Near East carried semantic content, i.e. they had a lexico-grammatical structure conveying information which could be understood in contemporary society.[15]

This element of the patent semantic content borne by onomastics in Mesopotamia, but on the whole within all Ancient Near Eastern regional contexts, represents not only — as Eidem notes — a major substantial difference with the name-giving habits of the present, but may also be said to create a major analytical rift between Near Eastern onomasticians and specialists concerned with names from other areas/times. In onomastic studies of general scope by philosophers of language or linguists, mainly with Indo-European cultural backgrounds, personal names have in the main been distinguished from common nouns not only in view of their superficial function (nouns, as appellatives, are said to "designate" or "characterize", whereas names "identify"), but also as regards their deeplying logic-linguistic aspects, i.e. in their (mainly oppositional) relation to "definite descriptions".[16] And this, despite the fact that the adjacency of nouns and names has been established since Antiquity: *onoma* and *nomen* were used for both categories, albeit with different specifications.[17]

15. Eidem 2004, 191.
16. It may be useful to recall in passing that proper names have formed a crucial cornerstone of more than a century and a half of linguistic and logical philosophy, starting from John Stuart Mill (1843) with his view of names as connotative and meaningless, and then Gottlob Frege (1892), who instead attributed both *Bedeutung* and *Sinn* to proper names (albeit leaving various open-ended problems, especially regarding the latter term), followed in part by Edmund Husserl (1900): cf. Van Langendonck 2007, 24–29. A major leap occurred with Bertrand Russell's theory of definite descriptions (*On Denoting*, 1905), in which it was held that definite descriptions were devices of quantification rather than (as it seemed) devices of genuine reference, and that they differed from indefinite descriptions like "a man" only in the affirmation of uniqueness. On "the vices and virtues of this little theory", cf. Neale 2005, 809 and 825 (on Russell's idea that ordinary proper names are disguised descriptions).
17. As recalled by Neale 2005, 825 note 62, already Basil of Caesarea (330–379 A.D.) had stated that "A name is not actually a signifier of a substance, but of the distinctive properties which characterize the individual", thus anticipating Russell's theory of disguised descriptions (cf. previous footnote). For the ancient correspondence of names with nouns, see e.g. Van Langendonck 2007, 17, who personally holds that "proper names certainly designate 'things' in the widest sense and since a thing is designated by a noun … a proper name must be a noun from the semantic point of view".

However, to investigate the logical-philosophical semantic aspect of proper names in general implies straying in part away from the more basic questions of meaning in onomatology. On the latter level, it may be observed that the Indo-European personal name (at least, in the Western horizon of the post-Hellenistic period) does not consistently preserve a linguistic form which may be perceived as identical to the appellative with which it is comparable or even identifiable; and in any case, it appears that the level/ rhythm/ complexity of language change inherent to proper names over time is different from that of the remainder of the language. For these reasons, in a nutshell, the medieval and modern Indo-European personal name is considered to be semantically endowed with "prevailing intransparency" *per* se:[18] thus, e.g., to be called *Serena* does not necessarily imply that serenity is, or was hoped/thought to be, a character trait of the name-bearer.[19]

Quite the opposite may however be said for Ancient Near Eastern naming practices, especially of Semitic affiliation.[20] The onymic meaning and content of Semitic names is decidedly, and explicitly, transparent, as long ago pointed out by Ignace J. Gelb:

> … They [= the personal names] are generally easy to understand. The reason for this comprehensibility is that they were usually couched in the language of the person or persons giving the name. The reason for their being couched in the current language of the name-givers was that the latter customarily formed names for their children in order to express a sentiment, a wish, or gratitude, revolving around their progeny or themselves … the conclusion that the ancient Near Eastern names reproduced the current language of the name-givers and

18. Pulgram 1954, 155; and see already Pulgram 1947, 201, on Indo-European compounded names (like *Hildebrand* or the like): "it must not be forgotten that a great many of these compounded names lacked meaning, and this not only because of the semantic incongruity of the component parts, but also frequently because no meaning was intended to be attached to the names: we fall easily into the error of reading into a name all sorts of more-or-less beautiful sentiments that were never contained therein nor understood as such".
19. Cf. *ibid.*, 202: "If in our times a child is christened *Lily* or *Ernest* or *Violet* or *Pearl*, surely not many persons — not even the parents themselves — bear in mind the name's dictionary-value, or wish to call attention to it". Of course there are notable exceptions to this "rule", as in e.g. Oscar Wilde's comedy *The Importance of Being Earnest* (1892), with its humorous word-play on the PN Ernest.
20. However, it must be recalled that the main semantic and semiotic characteristics of Semitic personal names may be already retrieved in Sumerian onomastics from third millennium Mesopotamia, especially of the subject-predicate (Pulgram 1947 would have said "dithematic") type. On Sumerian onomastics, the sole substantial treatment to date remains the one by Limet (1968); cf. however Di Vito 1993; Andersson 2012, for two important monographic studies comparing parallel semiotic aspects (resp. on "the designation and conception of the Personal God", and on kingship) in Sumerian and Akkadian third millennium PNs; see also Hilgert 2002. On the other hand, various Sumerian anthroponyms, especially of the most archaic periods, still present a number of etymological (and even interpretive) difficulties, for reasons of orthography, values, and sign order: see e.g. Mander 1988 (and Steinkeller 1993) on Sumerian names of scribes and musicians at Mari and Ebla; Pomponio 1991 on the names from Abū Ṣālabīḫ; Selz 1995 on presargonic Lagaš; and, in a wider perspective, Krebernik 2002. In recent years, the publication of the vast (but unprovenanced) archive from Garšana, near Umma, dating to the Ur III period, has yielded a fully new picture of the large extent to which Akkadian PNs were attested in southernmost Mesopotamia: cf. Kleinermann & Owen 2009, 378–380 (general index of names, Sumerian and Semitic), and 608–617 (the brick haulers' names, exclusively Semitic).

were consequently easily understood holds true.[21]

As will be clarified below, this interpretive result tallies by and large with the semantic results of the work of Johann Jacob Stamm on Akkadian *Namengebung* (1939), although Gelb did not acknowledge this seminal contribution in his 1962 essay.[22] At that time, in any case, Gelb himself had just published a paradigmatic demonstration of the principles enounced above, by drawing the rudiments of a grammar of the Amorite language of the late third-early second millennium BC exclusively from personal names.[23]

Moving from the initial standpoint of its intelligibility as established by Gelb, Stamm, and others, the Ancient Near Eastern anthroponym proves to be open to a multi-dimensional perspective and to a variety of approaches. If one considers that the personal name in the Ancient Near East not only (1) functioned as a specific designation of an individual, but (2) was also endowed with independent and apprehensible meaning,[24] and finally (3) bore contents patently referring to particular (but socially and/or linguistically shared) realms of religion, of *realia*, time, kinship, geography and ethnicity, physical appearance, mental status and character, professions, and even of social/ideological status,[25] it may be seen as fully representing what has been aptly described as a "multiple metaphor".[26]

As a consequence, Ancient Near Eastern personal names would theoretically deserve to be tackled along a set of concurrent research guidelines between history, linguistics, and the social sciences, similarly to what is done for personal names of some present-day societies of anthropological interest. However, in point of fact, only some of such guidelines have been hitherto actively pursued. No doubt, this is to some extent due to the limitations of the documentation itself (just to name one of such limitations, the personal names of the Ancient Near East may be accessed by modern scholars only at written level, with the additional handicap of the connected "decoding" procedures to be effected), but it is also due partly to the somewhat rigid historical-linguistic formation of many of the relevant specialists, at least as has been the case up to the present.

Thus, for example, it is not surprising to note that among the traditional and most productive avenues of Ancient Near Eastern onomastic research since the late 19th century, the study of anthroponyms in a philological-classificatory perspective stands out — as will be specified for Neo-Assyrian studies in §§ 2 and 3, below. This type of investigation, of a deductive-empirical character, is normally centred on the linguistic-etymological interpretation of the names (whether in a monolingual or in a multilingual horizon), on the breakdown of the grammatical characteristics attested therein (phonemics, morphology, and to a lesser degree syntax), as well as on the individuation of the broader set of cultural

21. Gelb 1962, 47.
22. In point of fact, Gelb only quotes his own studies in the sparse footnotes to his article. It may however be recalled that Stamm's work circulated in a limited fashion in the original edition, and received its main notoriety after the anastatic reprint of 1968: cf. fn. 73, below.
23. Gelb 1958; see also Gelb 1980.
24. This is only partially the case of Hittite personal names: cf. Hoffner 1968, 203; Tischler 2002.
25. This rough list is drawn from A. Hilka's exhaustive repertoire of Sanskrit onomastics, as resumed by Pulgram 1954, 156.
26. Arno 1994, 23.

features (in matters religious, but also geographical or social) which are evoked by the names. Whereas all this information may initially best be gained by accretion, i.e. through the detailed examination of every single name attested in a specific corpus and the charting of all of its significant features, it is equally clear that further results of related type may instead stem from a comprehensive or even comparative view of entire corpora. By way of example, possible presences/absences (or popularity shifts) of particular features/elements attested in names may be charted over time and space, e.g. within family onomastics or between neighbouring communities. For all these matters, as is obvious, the degree of completeness/coherence and the reliability of the studied textual evidence may represent conditioning factors.

To sum up, this entire level of investigation in the realm of Ancient Near Eastern anthroponymy, which focuses on the most visible — and thus most superficial — components of the "multiple metaphor" mentioned above, may yield a vast set of data on many different levels. Most abundant *per se* are the purely linguistic data — to the extent of allowing the construction of a full-fledged grammar of specific language varieties, as has been the case for Amorite. Also very significant is the information on the cultural arrays linked to the different onomastic corpora — insofar as it may come to corroborate and complement in detail particular notions or frameworks of intellectual history to be gained from other sources.[27] Finally, onomastics are — at least potentially — rich sources of indications in the ethno-linguistic or socio-linguistic domains, whether they are attained through statistical, geographical, or purely typological methods.

To be sure, these are by no means meagre historical results, as their presence in specifically "laconic" bodies of written information testifies most clearly. Thus, e.g., in some particularly "arid" inventories of people and commodities, personal names may represent the main source of socially-based data available; or elsewhere, where contextual information happens to be "skeletal", onomastics may provide a useful background for the overall reconstruction of the basic historical picture, e.g. regarding aspects of religious belief within specific communities or the admixture of different ethno-linguistic traditions.[28]

On the other hand, another — and quite rich and complex — series of factors which may potentially have lain behind the attribution and use of personal names remains for the moment at the level of largely untapped sources of information.

According to Robert K. Herbert (1995), there are socio-cultural issues that should be addressed in any research paper dealing with onomastics. These include: Who names a child? When is a child named? How is a name selected? Is name bestowal marked publicly or privately? Are names drawn from a stock of available names or coined freely?

27. This feature is moreover especially true of West Semitic onomastic corpora: cf. in general Pardee 1988, for an overview of the many issues involved.
28. Some of these cases are dealt with in detail by Eidem 2004.

In all probability there is no more attractive subject
in the Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions than an examination
of the personal names that many texts contain.
Pinches 1916, 858

2 Early Research

2. a Knut L. Tallqvist

An evaluation of the methods employed to analyse Assyrian onomastics may begin with the main classificatory studies written prior to the 1960s. Ever since the first editions of cuneiform texts, during the last decades of the 19th century, it became customary to accompany the copies of the tablets with indexes of anthroponyms and toponyms therein attested; but the Finnish scholar Knut L. Tallqvist (1865–1949) was the first to prepare overall collections of Mesopotamian proper names, for Babylonian texts[29] and for documents discovered in Assyria. The volume *Assyrian Personal Names* (APN),[30] written exactly a century ago, in fact, is the best evidence of Tallqvist's many pioneering intuitions, both as regards the interpretation of the names as well as for the conceptual and formal layout of the register. For these reasons, his work has enjoyed long-lasting appreciation and utilization.[31]

Let us enter into some detail concerning this work. Tallqvist's vast linguistic abilities concerning ancient languages allowed him to pick out the main varieties into which the names of the Assyrians could be subdivided, so as to provide — in the introduction (pp. xv–xxxii) — a brief but extremely useful overview of the parallels which the onomastics attested in the imperial rosters found in other textual collections of contemporary or later date, from the Bible to Old Persian, Egyptian, and Greek inscriptions. The individual components of the names were then indexed in detail in the conclusive section of the volume (pp. 250–312).[32] Moreover, within his main onomastic register (pp. 1–249), the Finnish scholar went as far as to point out precisely the multiple occurrences of same names in the Neo-Assyrian textual corpus, together with their respective professional designations.[33] Thus, while restricting his work to a single volume, he also managed to offer a preliminary but fundamental series of prosopographical indications on the ranks and

29. Tallqvist 1905.
30. Tallqvist 1914.
31. It may also be pointed out that the material assembled in Tallqvist's work amounted already to more than half of the Neo-Assyrian documents known today.
32. A minor blemish is the fact that an ordering according to the Hebrew alphabet is followed here (*ʾ*, *b*, *g*, etc.), and the non-Semitic elements have to be fitted within this ordering, while the much more convenient Latin alphabet is used in the main body of the register.
33. This perspective of extreme detail on Assyrian personal names derived from a "long-distance" cooperation with Rev. Claude H.W. Johns of Cambridge, who had prepared an unpublished analytical register of the names in Neo-Assyrian texts, and passed it over in full to his Finnish colleague (as explained in Tallqvist's Preface, p. v). Perhaps for this reason, as already surmised by reviewers of the time, the book was written in English, and not in German like other works by the same author. For work by the British scholar himself on Assyrian anthroponyms, cf. Johns 1902.

professions within the Assyrian empire. All said and done, Tallqvist compiled single-handedly what would have — some eighty years later — represented the core material of PNA; and this feat is all the more admirable, if one considers that the vaster "remake" of today constitutes the product of a widespread and complex international venture, with the full power of the electronic medium behind it.

For the sake of completeness, it may be recalled that Tallqvist's monographs on Babylonian and Assyrian personal names, while representing his most renowned and long-standing contributions, are far from exhausting the writings that this brilliant all-round Finnish Orientalist dedicated to Mesopotamian studies. After early work on Late Babylonian tablets (1890, 1891), he prepared the *editio princeps* of the British Museum tablets pertaining to the series of incantations known as *Maqlû* (1895); in later years, alongside smaller essays on Babylonian and Assyrian philology, he compiled (1932) the earliest monograph on the god Aššur and the first collection of divine epithets in Akkadian (1938).[34]

2.b Johann Jacob Stamm

Whereas Tallqvist endowed studies on ancient Mesopotamia with the first vast collections of personal names at the beginning of the 20th century, the basic structural analysis on Akkadian onomastics (especially in its most ancient phases, the Old Akkadian and Old Babylonian periods) would have had to await a further generation, with Johann J. Stamm's monograph *Die akkadische Namengebung* (1939). A former student of Benno Landsberger in Leipzig, Stamm stated at the outset that his work was a complement to previous research which tended to "die Namen als Quellen zur Erkenntnis des Lebens und Denkens auszuwerten", albeit often a bit uncritically and rigidly. [35] His specific purpose was, thus, that of reconstructing "die psychologische Situation, aus der heraus die Namen erst verständlich werden", or, in other cases, "die konkrete Situation, in der die betreffenden Namen geprägt wurden".[36]

Stamm thus set out for his investigation by considering a *Namengebung* endowed with significance at all levels, in common with the findings of Semitic studies of the time[37] — but totally in contrast, it may be noted, with the guidelines of contemporary comparative

34. Cf. Borger 1967, 524f. for a list of Tallqvist's main Assyriological contributions. Tallqvist is, by the way, also known for a translation of the Gilgamesh epic into Finnish (1945). Finally, he also prepared (again proceeding from an initial assemblage of data by C.H.W. Johns, cf. the previous footnote) a manuscript, which remained for a long time unpublished in the University Library of Helsinki, bearing a vast list of Assyrian toponyms. This manuscript would have formed the basis for the comprehensive collection of the place names of this age on the part of S. Parpola, in one of the very first experiments of computer-generated study regarding the Ancient Near East (cf. Parpola 1970, p. vi).
35. As recalled by Marten Stol (Stol 1991, 191), Stamm omitted to acknowledge the debt to his teacher due to the political climate of Nazism at the time of publication of his work.
36. Stamm 1939, 1.
37. I.e. for the parents bestowing the name at birth, for the individual who would have borne it, and for all those who would have heard it uttered. As recalled by Dennis Pardee (1988, 141), "All scholars who have studied ancient Semitic names have either stressed or assumed the meaningfulness of these names".

onomatology, which insisted on the "meaningless" character of proper names.[38] In particular, Stamm referred back to the semantic and situational principles elaborated a few years before (1928) by Martin Noth in his *Die israelitischen Personnenamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* — as end product of a long chain of historical-religious studies on Biblical names which went back to the 18th century — according to whom ancient Semitic names, and specifically the names in the Old Testament, was centered on the celebration of the child's birth.[39]

On the other hand, Stamm pointed out that the Akkadian onomastic corpus was open to a greater semantic-situational complexity than the Biblical names collected by Noth: while certainly the principle of celebrating the felicitous event of birth was common to both samplers, Akkadian names (also in relation to their Sumerian forerunners) were to be subdivided into expressions of simple and generic piety, and other cases which could be referred to a concrete situation relevant to the birth of the specific infant.[40] Within the latter category, Stamm regarded as paradigmatic the so-called "Ersatznamen", in which the newborn child is celebrated as substitute for a previously engendered brother, who had died prematurely or at childbirth. Stamm's refined study of the Akkadian names against their social and situational background did not, however, comprise a diachronical perspective. Despite the almost two millennia in which the Akkadian *Namengebung* is attested, the German scholar tended to visualize the onomastic corpus as a coherent body of materials, and proved extremely reluctant to accept the idea that specific innovative aspects, of psychological or ideological character, could have been formed in the course of time, in a certain opposition to A. Leo Oppenheim's views.[41]

The Akkadian *Namengebung* as sketched by Stamm finds its main core in the onomastic types with two elements (predicate-subject or vice versa) or with three elements (SOV

38. Cf. Caprini 2001, 17–27, for the evaluation of the *Theory of Proper Names* by A. Gardiner (1940), where the arbitrary and meaningless character of onomastics was upheld on logical and linguistic grounds.
39. Noth 1928, 132f. It may be recalled that the quite vast section of Noth's work devoted to semantic and interpretation (II. *Die israelitische Personennamen als Äusserungen der Frömmigkeit*) follows upon two equally complex sections. The first is constituted by the so-called *Prolegomena* (7–65), in which Noth examines the sources for Israelite onomastics, the grammatical structure of the names (subdivided in *Wortnamen*, *Satznamen*, *Kurznamen*), and their historical-linguistic position within Semitic languages, ending with the reconstruction of the Israelite *Namengebung* as an act performed upon the birth of the child by one or the other of the parents, also on the basis of specific Biblical references to the matter. The second of these sections (I. *Die theophoren Elemente in den israelitischen Personennamen*, 66–131) presents the study of all theophorous elements in the names, starting from the kinship terms *ʾb*, *ʾḥ*, *ʾm*, and thereupon proceeding to *ʾl* (and to the analysis of "Elohism") and *yhwh*, and ending with the mention of gods of Canaanite origin and uncertain components. While these parts of Noth's work were not taken up by Stamm, they have, on the other hand, acted as models for many later onomastic studies, especially in the Northwest Semitic milieu (cf. Pardee 1988, 119f.).
40. Stamm 1939, 2f., and further in 127–160, 161–207, in greater detail.
41. *Ibid.*, 4f. On the other hand, further on in the volume (*Namensprägung und Namenswahl*, *ibid.*, 14f.), Stamm poses — in a slightly naive fashion — the problem of the reasons behind the substantial modifications shown by Assyro-Babylonian onomastic formations in the course of time, not only from the linguistic point of view, but also as regards the contents of the names themselves.

or similar formations), which the author traced precisely back to a complex set of phraseological utterances, corresponding either (type A) to expressions of the parents at the moment of birth, or, and less frequently, (type B) to expressions which may be, in abstract, referred back to the newborn child itself. Among these utterances, Stamm distinguished clearly expressions of salutation and well-wishing, of gratitude, of supplication and lamentation, affirmations of faith, promises of grace-giving to the gods, etc.[42] Equally accurate was Stamm's analysis of verbal tenses, in which he distinguished between the use of the punctual past (preterite and perfect), of the durative present, and of the active participle, in relation to the different types of utterances.[43] A specific appendix to the category of the sentence names is represented by the so-called "allgemeine Aussagen", apodyctical utterances in which a relation of dependence between the subject (or others) and the god is affirmed (e.g. "the god X is my father"), or in which a positive quality of the invoked deity is set forth, either in relation to the birth or even in absolute (e.g. "all is in the hands of the god X"),[44] down to names bearing a definite aphorism, totally divorced from the normally presumable context of childbirth, e.g. "(the god) X loves the righteous", or "(the god) X is the bulwark of the frail", etc.

The different phraseological types singled out by Stamm have many attestations also in the Neo-Assyrian onomastic corpus, although a number of innovations characterize the latter, e.g. the use of the verbal imperative, with its direct "call" to the gods, and its variant in the third person singular represented by the precative.[45] The following examples represent both traditional and more recent forms, both as regards sentence names and apodyctical names: [1] *Aššur-maqtu-šatbi*, "O Aššur, lift up the fallen one!";[46] [2] *Ātamar-dumuq-īli*, "I have seen the grace of the god";[47] [3] *Bânītu-atkal*, "[In] Banitu I have trusted";[48] [4] *Da''inanni-Nergal*, "Strengthen me, O Nergal!";[49] [5] *Gabbu-ina-qāt-īli*, "All is in the hands of the god";[50] [6] *Inurta-āpil-kūmū'a*, "Ninurta stands up for me";[51] [7] *Issar-mētu-balliṭ*, "Ištar, revive the dead!";[52] [8] *Nabû-mukin-apli/šumi/zēri*, "Nabû is the one who establishes the heir / (the continuation of the) name / the offspring (*lit.*: the seed)";[53] [9] *Nabû-pir'u-lilbur*, "O Nabû, may the offspring become old!"[54]; [10] *Nabû-*

42. *Ibid.*, 27–36. It may be recalled that Noth (in his *II. Hauptteil* quoted above) had already distinguished the four onomastic categories of *Bekenntnisnamen*, *Vertrauensnamen*, *Danknamen*, and *Wunschnamen*.
43. *Ibid.*, 93–99.
44. Here, e.g., Stamm placed the PNs built with an interrogative sentence requiring a negative answer, of the type "Who is like (the god) x?" or "Who can exist without (the god) x?"; cf. *ibid.*, 237f.
45. To the opposite, the forms in the precative, first pers. sg. (e.g. "May I praise", in the sense of "I want to praise") are traditional: cf. *ibid.*, 31; 104.
46. PNA, 194a.
47. PNA, 231a.
48. PNA, 266a.
49. PNA, 370a.
50. PNA, 416a.
51. PNA, 547b.
52. PNA, 573a.
53. PNA, 846f.
54. PNA, 859b.

reḫtu-uṣur, "O Nabû, protect the remaining one!";[55] [11] *Paliḫka-libluṭ*, "May your worshipper live!";[56] [12] *Rēmanni-Issar*, "Have mercy on me, o Ištar!";[57] [13] *Rišat-abiša*, "Joy of her father";[58] [14] *Sīn-tabni-uṣur*, "Sin, you have created [him, now] protect [him]!";[59] [15] *(Ina)-ṣil-Bēl-allak*, "I walk in the [protective] shade of Bel".[60] Possibly also [16] *Lā-qēpu*, "(It's) incredible";[61] and [17] *Mardānu*, "Our heir"[62] belong here.

A further section of Stamm's work was devoted to the so-called "Bezeichnungen" — i.e. names built with a single structural element — such as epithets of affection, or names denoting analogies with the animal or vegetal domain, or with precious jewels and foodstuffs, or physical or social characteristics, or — finally — indications of the subject's date of birth (also in relation to festive occasions) or of his place of origin. Here, again, the examples from the Neo-Assyrian corpus are quite abundant:[63] [18] *Akbaru*, "Jerboa";[64] [19] *Batūlu*, "Young man";[65] [20] *Buṭnutu*, "Pistachio;"[66] [21] *Ḫarrānû*, "From Harran";[67] [22] *Kalbu*, "Dog/Slave"; [68] [23] *Kanūnayu*, "Born on the 10th month";[69] [24] *Namirtu*, "Brightness";[70] [25] *Qatinnu*, "Tiller".[71]

Finally, Stamm dedicated a vast chapter to the already mentioned "Ersatznamen";[72] and probably the attention given to this particularly developed aspect of Akkadian onomastics, whereby the infant is viewed "als Ersatz oder Wiederverkörperung eines (vor kurzem) verstorbenen Familiengliedes" remains his most memorable contribution, which still enjoys widespread credit. Stamm's basic idea was that, in an ancient ecological and economic horizon decidedly marked by a very high rate of infant mortality, an actual process of practical and psychological substitution should be detected behind the many Akkadian names with the subject-elements "the brother", "the sister" or "the brothers" in conjunction with specific verbal or nominal roots implying substitution and birth-giving.

55. PNA, 861a–b. This PN is in fact considered by Stamm (1939, 288) as an *Ersatzname* (see below).
56. PNA, 980b.
57. PNA, 1043b.
58. PNA, 1053b.
59. PNA, 1148-1150.
60. PNA, 1172a.
61. PNA, 652b–654a. The underlying meaning of this PN, quite well attested, is still uncertain (see already Stamm 1939, 252); perhaps it should be referred to particularly heavy and difficult conditions of childbirth.
62. PNA, 703a–b.
63. Cf. now specifically Gaspa 2008 on the topic of these "profane" names.
64. PNA, 94b.
65. PNA, 277b.
66. PNA, 357b.
67. PNA, 462a–b.
68. PNA, 598b–599a.
69. A particularly popular name: cf. PNA, 601–605, for the many individuals who bore it.
70. PNA, 923b,
71. PNA, 1010b.
72. Stamm 1939, 278–305.

On the other hand, the extension of the same principle to other members of the family posed various problems to Stamm himself,[73] and nowadays tends to be rather solved along the guidelines first set forth by Noth. In other words, those names which present as subject of the (nominal or verbal) action the father, the mother, the maternal uncle, etc., are considered as referring to figures of generally theophoric standing; their identification, depending on the cases, may be sought among actual deities (either of collective or personal nature) or, alternatively, in dead ancestors which were the object of a cultic devotion.[74] For precise examples of *Ersatznamen* in the Neo-Assyrian corpus, cf. the following: [26] *Aḫu-erība*, "He replaced the brother";[75] [27] *Aḫu-uqur*, "The brother is precious";[76] [28] *Kēnu-lāmur*, "Let me see the true one!";[77] [29] *Nabû-kēnu-šallim*, "O Nabû, keep the true one safe!";[78] [30] *Sīn-aḫḫē-erība*, "Sin replaced the brothers".[79]

* * *

Undeniably, Stamm's *Akkadische Namengebung* represents a milestone in the analysis of Assyro-Babylonian onomastics; as such, it constituted the basis for the addition of the main onomastic typologies as part and parcel of the entries within the two main Akkadian dictionaries, *CAD* and *AHw*, as well as in the phraseological examples of the more detailed grammars of Akkadian.[80] On the other hand, from a present-day standpoint, Stamm's work — in its exclusive concentration on the semantics of names as markers of contextual and psychological situations — shows a series of internal gaps and some oscillations of method, which to some extent hinder both its practical use and the overall acceptability of its results. Just by way of example, Stamm's detailed focus on the meanings of the predicative element leaves quite in the shadow, to the opposite, the variations in the subject-element, and specifically the presences, appearances, and disappearances of the many different deities of the Mesopotamian pantheon as protagonists of personal names during almost two millennia — almost as if it were virtually indifferent to place one's trust in this or that divine figure, regardless of place and time. Only in more recent studies have some of these deities been placed in their precise cultural context within the long history of ancient Mesopotamia, also on the basis of their attestations in onomastics.[81]

73. *Ibid.*, 280f., where Stamm asks himself whether the father (*abum*) acting as subject-element of nominal or verbal sentence names should in all cases be considered as deceased at the time of the name-bearer's birth.
74. Positions on this matter, however, are quite varied: see e.g. the discussion in Pardee 1988, 129–132.
75. PNA, 74f.
76. PNA, 88b.
77. PNA, 612b.
78. PNA, 840a.
79. PNA, 1113–1127, i.e. the biblical Sennacherib.
80. See, e.g., von Soden 1969, *passim*. The references to Stamm 1939 are also given in the entries to linguistically Akkadian names in PNA, but unfortunately not in an exhaustive manner, and thus also at times without noting the variant interpretations which have been brought forth on Stamm's own.
81. Such as, e.g., Franco Pomponio's monograph on the god Nabû (Pomponio 1978), or Daniel Schwemer's vast treatment of the Storm-god(s) (cf. Schwemer 2001; 2008).

Moreover, besides reconstructing the psychological or factual situations which lay behind the *Namengebung*, Stamm occasionally attempted to derive indications on specific social milieus from the meaning of specific names, e.g. by placing the onomastic types bearing the noun *bēlu*, "lord", among the so-called *Sklavennamen*.[82] Such types, however, could equally well be interpreted as formed by a theophorous element ("the Lord"). On the other hand, Stamm does not seem to draw results from the particularly frequent attestation of the subject-element *šarru*, "king", within the empires of the first millennium — an element which may nowadays, instead, be shown to refer back to specific social and political conditions.[83]

These and other limitations might explain the fact that later works of onomastic research have taken on Stamm's semantic and interpretative results mainly through perfunctory quotes, preferring instead to concentrate on the linguistic and grammatical-structural analysis of the names.[84] Nowadays, it may be safely stated that a full re-examination of the cultural implications of Akkadian name giving remains to be effected, in the light of modern ethnolinguistic and socio-anthropological criteria.[85]

2. c After Stamm

The first decades following Stamm's work show a certain slowing of pace in studies on Akkadian onomastics. Among the few exceptions, we may notice a much-quoted contribution by Dietz Otto Edzard (1962), in which light was shed on cases of intentional fluctuation (i.e. congruence or contradiction) in gender in theophorous Akkadian names — a point that Stamm had largely overlooked. Specifically, Edzard studied cases of fluctuation between the gender of the invoked deity (god/goddess) and the grammatical gender of the nominal/verbal predicate, as well as of that the bearers of the names themselves (as marked by the prefixed determinatives for "man" and "woman"). Such cases, which the author had already noted in NB-LB evidence, appear to be extant also in the earliest phases of Akkadian.[86] In an analysis of PNs from the Old Babylonian and the Old Assyrian period to the latest phases of each language (phases 1–6. with Babylonian represented by odd, Assyrian by even numbers), Edzard summons forth three morphologically separate name-types in which a distinction of gender is possible (a = nominal sentence names, also including names with the predicate in the stative; b = verbal sentence names with a prefixed verbal form; c = names in the imperative).[87] The results, given by Edzard in detailed discursive mode,[88] may be summarized in a chart as follows:

82. *Ibid.*, 307–314.
83. The typology of names built with the subject-element *šarru* will be dealt with in § 4.
84. This is the case, especially, of studies dedicated to the analysis of non-Akkadian onomastics in cuneiform sources of the second, and even of the third, millennium BC, e.g. Huffmon 1965 on the Amorite names in the Mari texts, followed by the computer-generated analysis of all Amorite personal names by Gelb (1980); see also the study on the onomastics of Ebla by Manfred Krebernik (1995).
85. Cf. § 5, below.
86. Edzard 1962, 114; but Old Akkadian names are treated as a case apart, *ibid.*, 128.
87. *Ibid.*, 113f.
88. *Ibid.*, 126f.

NAME-TYPE	PHASES	DETAILS
a	1–6	In masc. PNs with a goddess as subject, the predicative element regularly has masculine form (e.g. ^{m}Ningal-gāmil).
b	From 1 onward, with distinctions	In phase 1, frequent distinction of gender in the prefixed predicates according to the gender of the name-bearer, but independently of the gender of the deity (e.g. ^{m}Ištar-iddinam, ^{f}Aja-tarībam). For some later phases the evidence is inconclusive, but in 3 and 6 masculine and feminine names with either *iprus-* or *taprus-* forms are attested, whereas phase 5 seems to follow by and large the Old Babylonian "rules".
c	1, 3, 5	The congruence in gender of subject and predicate is respected, often also in regard to the gender of the deity.
C	2, 4, 6	Masculine imperative forms occur quite often with goddesses as subject, in male name-bearers (e.g. ^{m}Rēmanni-Ištar).

Edzard's conclusions from this precise linguistic analysis are deftly drawn, and are essentially of philological character: what occurs — in varying degrees according to the different periods — is a shift (but the author speaks of an actual *Ersatz*, substitution) from a subject-predicate congruence in gender to a congruence between the gender of the name-bearer and the predicative element. Why did this shift take place? According to Edzard, this is "leicht ersichtlich": the name was clearly to be identified as a masculine name. Consequently, gender was expressed — considering the name no more as a clause, but as a lexical unit — in the only possible place, i.e. the predicative element.[89] Nowadays, however, one may wonder if this reconstruction actually takes into account all possible factors involved from the standpoint of name-giving in ancient Mesopotamia — or, more to the point, whether Edzard's interesting assumption that "der Name war deutlich als Männername zu kennzeichnen" should not be taken up again with an eye to its possible implications for Mesopotamian society and ethnicity.[90]

* * *

Closer to the specific theme of this essay is the important collection of all onomastic material from Middle Assyrian texts by Claudio Saporetti (1970).[91] Although Saporetti stated that his corpus of Akkadian names in Middle Assyrian texts did not present particular variations on the general sampler assembled by Stamm,[92] in point of fact the impres-

89. *Ibid.*, 127.
90. This general theme has, in point of fact, been recently taken up in part, in relation to shifts in personal determinatives (feminine names sometimes bearing the masculine determinative), both for Middle Babylonian PNs (Brinkman 2007) and for the names in the Nuzi documents (Abrahami 2011). Especially the latter author posits that the occurrence of the masculine determinative might be tied to "the situation of spouses / daughters who were, under certain circumstances, given by their husbands / fathers the legal capacity normally ascribed to men" (*ibid.*, 2).
91. Saporetti 1970; cf. also Saporetti & Freydank 1974, and Saporetti 1979.
92. Saporetti 1970, II, 74f.

sion to be gained from a comparison of the two collections is quite to the opposite. In the Middle Assyrian group, a wide variety of hypocoristic typologies (i.e. forms in which the divine or theophorous subject-element is substituted by abbreviative elements, whether long vowels or diphtongs) is discernible, while Stamm had only dedicated brief remarks to them.[93] This point is certainly not negligible, insofar as the following Neo-Assyrian period is also marked by a large frequency of hypocoristic forms, which — apart from specific problems of etymological attribution — lend themselves to the wider question of a possible loss in semantic transparency on the sentence-names from which they ultimately should have derived.[94]

Moreover, Saporetti's analysis of Middle Assyrian onomastics, which concentrates on the grammatical typology of the names,[95] indicates clearly that, while the Akkadian linguistic component in his corpus is certainly predominant, it is by no means exclusive. If one glances through the list of names generically qualified as "foreign" by the Italian scholar, it is easy to pick out Hurrian formations on one hand, and West Semitic ones on the other: this feature also represents an interesting chronological anticipation of a horizon which will come to the fore in onomastic studies on Neo-Assyrian texts.[96]

3 Etymological and Interlinguistic Studies after 1965

3. a The onomastic intuitions of Karlheinz Deller

The beginning of the most recent phase of study on Neo-Assyrian onomastics may be traced back to two brief but dense contributions by Karlheinz Deller in the mid-1960s,[97] in which typically Aramaic onomastic formations were singled out in the administrative

93. In later years, Saporetti presented the project of a computer-aided re-elaboration of his onomastic collection (Saporetti & Ghiroldi 1991).
94. See, e.g., names [47], [60], [68], [106], [109], [157], etc. The problem set forth above is formulated for Biblical PNs by Pardee 1988, 141, in the following terms: "Could the divine character of a theophoric element thousands of years old be forgotten? When, for example, one named a child Reshef (1 Chron. 7:25), could one really be naming the child "Sparky" and not be aware that *ršp* had served as a theophoric element in personal names from times immemorial?".
95. Saporetti 1970, II, 77–97. It may be further noticed that Saporetti's work was innovative in character also for the presence of sections dedicated outright to the prosopography of the Middle Assyrian period: II, 52–73; 230–251; and cf. § 4, below.
96. It may be recalled that, in the time of Saporetti's enquiries on Middle Assyrian names, the basic collection of Hurrian onomastics was that of the PNs from Nuzi by Pierre M. Purves in Gelb *et al*. 1943, 183–279, although Hurrian PNs from Ugarit had also been competently classified by Gröndahl 1967, and the ones in the Mari texts had been studied in Sasson 1974. The overall outlook would soon significantly change, however, with the publication of Laroche 1980. See also Brinkman 1981 for Hurrian anthroponyms in Middle Babylonian texts.
97. Deller 1965; and see also Deller 1966. Deller's innovative graphemic and phonemic results are given in his *Lautlehre des Neuassyrischen* (unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Wien 1959), and were a half-century later taken up to a certain extent in what would become the "official" grammar of Neo-Assyrian, Hämeen-Anttila 2000; see also Luukko 2004. It is worth recalling that Deller was Saporetti's teacher at Heidelberg and inspired the latter's research project on Middle Assyrian names (cf. Saporetti 1970, I, 1), in which some of the same methodological guidelines being experimented on Neo-Assyrian onomastics (research on non-Akkadian name-types, prosopography) were carried out.

texts of the period. The presence of Aramaic anthroponyms in Neo-Assyrian texts had, of course, been clearly and efficaciously pointed out in Tallqvist's work. Deller, however, took up the problem again — while adding numerous names from recently published or even still unpublished texts — along innovative guidelines: those of graphemics, i.e. taking into specific account the written rendering (syllabic or logographic) of such names on the part of the Assyrian scribes, in the light of their expected etymologies in Aramaic.

Deller's paradigmatic study thus brought to the fore names with divine subject-elements, such as **ʿ̱ttr*, "Attar" (e.g. [31] *Attār-sūri*, "Attar is my bulwark",[98] [32] *Attār-bi'dî*, "Attar is behind me"),[99] **nsḫ*, which represents a Western Mesopotamian variant of the divine name *Nusku*, rendered in cuneiform by the writings *Našḫu* or *Našuḫ* (e.g. [33] *Al-Našuḫ-milki*, "the god N. is my king",[100] [34] *Našuḫ-dilīni*, "N., draw me up!"),[101] and finally the alleged deity **Hadad-milki*, identified by Deller as such on the basis of the possibly logographic writing U.U (or 10.10).[102] The real identity of this divine entity would, in point of fact, be clarified only many years later by Olof Pedersén as a "rebus-type" writing,[103] such as to yield the divine name **Dāda/i/u*.[104]

The solution of the "riddle" to the names bearing the element U.U (or 10.10) was found on the basis of a comparison between logographic and syllabic writings of names of same persons, and with the aid of attestations in Aramaic alphabetic script (see e.g. the case of no. [116], below). However, against Pedersén's interpretation which pointed univocally to the Akkadian noun *dādu*, "dear, beloved", **Dāda/i/u* may be understood — in the majority of cases — as a variant of the name of the Storm God, synchretistically worshiped all over Western Asia, known in the Akkadian milieu as **Hadad* and in the West Semitic horizon as **Adda/u*.[105] For relatively clear examples on this count, cf., e.g., the following names, in which a theophoric figure seems implied: [35] *Dādi-idri*, "Dadi is my help", with Aramaic predicative element;[106] or [36] *Dādi-iqbi*, "Dadi has ordered", with Akkadian predicate.[107]

98. Deller 1965, 473; PNA, 236a.
99. I.e. "Attar favours me": Deller 1965, 473; PNA, 234b.
100. Deller 1965, 474; PNA, 522b (classified without references under *Il-Našuḫ-milki*).
101. Deller 1965, 474; PNA, 935b.
102. Deller 1965, 474f.; the reading of the two identical signs on Deller's part was in fact 10.UMUN, since this rendering yielded the required correspondence with *Hadad-milki* on the basis of the equivalences in ancient Mesopotamian lexical texts.
103. I.e., a rendering in which a logogram is used, in a learned fashion, for the mere phonetic value to which it has become linked, and thus independently of its original semantic and morphological context of application. A further good example of this procedure is represented by no. [123], below.
104. Pedersén 1986.
105. Specifically, while the correspondence **Dāda/i/u* = Akkadian *dādu* might have lain behind some names with Akkadian predicative elements, on the other hand a case such as no. [114], below, makes it likely that in other names bearing U-U (especially with Aramaic predicates), a specific divine figure — and presumably the Storm God — was implied.
106. PNA I/2, 363b.
107. PNA 363f. At this point one might even wonder whether by chance the learned word-play underlying U-U had not actually overcome the interlinguistic barrier, causing the sign U/10, as used in these onomastic contexts, to be phonetically equivalent to [**d*+V] (or [***V+*d*]): in other words, leading the sign itself to take on the same wide gamut of phonetic values which may be attributed to the linear

In any case, Deller's contribution — in which he made the point that the analysis of personal names represented an important sector in the overall interpretation of written documentation in Neo-Assyrian, proceeding from the graphemic features of the latter — had the effect of stimulating a vast series of further studies, aimed at a reappraisal of Tallqvist's interpretations of West Semitic onomastics, with integrations of the data since published. The 1970s were thus marked by new editions of Neo-Assyrian texts, or re-editions of previously known documents, in which the numerous Aramaic names were set in adequate light alongside the typically Akkadian formations. Cases in point are resp. the Governor's Palace archive from Nimrud[108] and the so-called "Harran Census" texts, along with other cadastral texts from Nineveh.[109]

The following chart was made out, for the specific aims of this essay, from a vast cadastral register from the Assyrian capital:[110] it derives, in particular, from a list of the numerous possessions, of land and people, held by Nabû-šarru-uṣur, chief eunuch of Ash-urbanipal. As may be seen, it represents a good example of the widespread admixture between individuals bearing Akkadian names and those with "other" (and especially West Semitic) onomastic traditions, to be found in the "everyday" documents of this age.

THE NAMES IN SAA XII 27, 1–33

ASSYRIAN NAMES	NON-ASSYRIAN NAMES[111]
[37] *Urda-Nanaya*, "servant of Nanaya"[112]	[38] *Amurru-naṣaba*, "Amurru has placed"[113]
[39] *Šamaš-bēlu-uṣur*, "O Šamaš, protect the lord!"[114]	[40] *Iaū-idri*, "Yaw/Yahweh is my help"[115]
[41] *Nūr-Issar*, "Light of Ištar"[116]	[42] *Abi-raḫî* (femm.), "My/the father is pleased"[117]
[43] *Šamaš-killanni*, "O Šamaš, hold me!"[118]	[44] *Ḫarrâ* (fem.; uncertain Aramaic etymology)[119]
[45] *Nušku-šezibanni*, "O Nušku, save me!"[120]	[46] *Raḫīmu-Adda*, "Adda is compassionate"[121]

graphemes of ancient West Semitic alphabetic series. A shred of possible proof of this hypothesis — whereby the sequel U-U would have been secondarily perceived by peoples accustomed to contemporary alphabetic script as corresponding to [**da-ad*] or the like — might be found in the different variants of no. [137], below, in which the sign U/10 appears to be used as an (unexpected) alternative for the syllabograms *id* or *ad*.

108. Texts published in Postgate 1973; cf. Fales 1974, for the analysis of the names.
109. Fales 1973.
110. Fales 1973, n. 23 (= ADD 741), now republished as SAA XII 27.
111. Only the complete names and the ones of certain reading in the document SAA XII 27 are charted here. The non-Akkadian names of affiliation other than West Semitic are noted as such.
112. SAA XII 27, 7; PNA, 1410b–1412b.
113. SAA XII 27, 11; PNA, 109a.
114. SAA XII 27, 9; PNA, 1193b–1195a.
115. SAA XII 27, 14; PNA, 697b. The subject is said to be brother of nos. [47] and [49].
116. SAA XII 27, 9. PNA, 970a gives an interpretation as a construct-state name. However, in the light of the syllabic writing (*nu-ri-* etc.), the name could alternatively be understood as "My light is Ištar", i.e. with a pronominal suffix of the first p. sg.
117. SAA XII 27, 15 (see also *ibid.*, l. 25, for the same name, but applied to a man); PNA, 12b.
118. SAA XII 27, 10; PNA, 1204a.
119. SAA XII 27, 15 (the same name is attested in *ibid.*, 23, applied to the wife of the Assyrian *Adad-uballiṭ*); PNA, 461a.
120. SAA XII 27, 11; PNA, 974b.
121. SAA XII 27, 17; PNA, 1029a.

[47] *Urdî*, hypocoristic from *urdu*, "servant, slave"[122]
[48] *Se'-sūri*, "Se' is my bulwark"[123]
[49] *Urdu-Issar*, "Servant of Ištar"[124]
[50] *Adda-ḫutni*, "Adda is my strength"[125]
[51] *Issar-rēmanni*,"O Ištar, have pity on me!"[126]
[52] *Bannâ* (fem.; uncertain etimology [Aramaic?])[127]
[53] *Mullissu-dūrī*, "Mullissu is my protective wall"[128]
[55] *Ṣūṣu* (masc.; uncertain etimology)[129]
[56] *Libūšu*, "May they [= the ill-wishers] come to shame!"[130]
[60] *Nūrî*, hypocoristic from Aramaic *nūr* or from Akkadian *nūru*[131]

122. SAA XII 27, 14; PNA, 1393b. The subject is said to be brother of nos. [40] and [49].
123. SAA XII 27, 14; PNA, 1106b.
124. SAA XII 27, 14; PNA, 1404a–1407b. The subject is said to be brother of nos. [40] and [47].
125. SAA XII 27, 18; PNA, 46a. Cf. no. [139], below.
126. SAA XII 27, 15; PNA, 576b. The graphemic rendering of this name is unusual: 15–AMA–*man-ni*, with the use of the logogram AMA = *rēmu* (instead of the more frequently used syllabic signs *rem* /*rém*), and of the phonetic complement –*man-ni* (instead of the usual -*an-ni*). Not surprisingly, Tallqvist (1914, 107b) had understood it as 15-AMA-MAN-*ni*, "Ištar is the mother of our king"; but this interpretation is neither justified from the point of view of writing or that of meaning. Much more intriguing was a further interpretation, long ago suggested by word of mouth to this writer by K. Deller, as an interrogative sentence name, "Whose mother is Ištar?". However, in this case the required answer would not necessarily have been in the rhetorical negative (i.e. "of nobody"), and thus the meaning would have clashed with the basic "rule" of this class of names (especially if bearing *mannu*) in Akkadian.
127. SAA XII 27, 18; PNA, 267b.
128. SAA XII 27, 15; PNA, 765b. In fact, however, on the tablet there would seem to be space in the gap immediately following for a further element; in this case, the integration could lead to a formation such as [54] *Mullissu-dūru-uṣrī*, "O Mullissu, protect the city wall!", for which see PNA, 766a. In this case, we would have here an onomastic formation of a "civic" typology, pertaining to Stamm's so-called *Beamtennamen* (1939, 316), of which more shall be said in § 4.
129. SAA XII 27, 19; PNA, 1178b.
130. SAA XII 27, 16; PNA, 661b. The etymology of this abbreviated name, given in PNA as a precative of the verb *bâšu* (by S. Parpola *apud* the entry by Angelika Berlejung), seems absolutely acceptable, due to the excellent sense it yields in similar names which bear also the subject-element, e.g. [57] *Dabībī-libūšu*, "May my opponents come to shame!". See, however, PNA, 358b, where this name is in fact read *Dabībī-lipušū* and interpreted as "May they make my plea [come true]!", with a more traditional reference to the verb *epēšu*, "do, make", but with an overall interpretation which differs yet from the one offered by Stamm 1939, 195, "Mögen meine Feinde tun". Further fluctuations between the two verbs may be noted in [58] *Lidbubū-libāšū*, PNA, 662a, which is understood as "Let them speak, let them come to shame!", i.e. from *bâšu,* in comparison with the next entry, quite similar in orthography, *Lidbubū-lip/būšu*, which is not taken as a mere variant of [58], but is translated "Let them speak, let them do [whatever they will]!", i.e. again drawing the final verb from *epēšu* (both entries are by A. Berlejung). Fluctuating solutions come to the fore also for [59] *Ḫādê-lip/bušū*, PNA 2/I, 438a, which is interpreted following Stamm as "May the ill-wishers do [whatever they will]!" (although the alternative suggestion by W. von Soden, to derive the verbal form from **puāšu*, "to be frustrated", is also recalled), against the adjacent entry, again with quite similar orthographic rendering (*ibid.*, 438f.), *Ḫadi-libbušu*, which is (albeit problematically) explained as "His heart is happy", from *ḫadû+ libbu+* pronominal suffix (both entries are by Claus Ambos). As may be seen, therefore, despite the fact that the *akkadische Namengebung* is normally viewed as totally solved, there are still various obscure areas of interpretation, which appear to require in-depth grammatical and/or contextual research — possibly even beyond the results achieved in PNA.
131. SAA XII 27, 20 (husband of no. [62]); PNA, 969a.

[61] *Bāzītu*, (fem.)"woman from Bāzu"[132]
[62] *Ḫanzabâ* (fem.; uncertain etymology)[133]
[63] *Mannu-kī-Adad*, "Who is like Adad?"[134]
[64] *Awirâ*, "Blind"[135]
[65] *Bēl-ukīn*, "Bel has established"[136]
[66] *Asâ* (fem.; uncertain etymology [Aramaic?])[137]
[67] *Ilu-eppaš*, "God makes"[138]
[68] *Nanî* (masc.; uncertain etymology)[139]
[70] *Sukkītu*, "the woman of the shrine"[140]
[71] *Adda-idri*, "Adda is my help"[141]
[72] *Adad-uballiṭ*, "Adad has revived"[142]
[73] *Mati'î*, hypocoristic from *mt'*, "to save"[143]
[74] *Īn-ili*, "Eye of God"[144]
[75] *Am-rāpi*', "The paternal uncle is (my) healer"[145]
[76] *Aḫu-lē'ī*, "The brother is almighty"[146]
[77] *Iatamâ*, "Orphan"[147]
[78] *Qitti-ilāni*, "My end are the gods"[148]
[79] *Šamgayāni*, "Šam has exalted me"[149]
[80] *Urda-Banītu*, "Servant of Banitu"[150]
[81] *Pišatti*, (unknown etymology)[151]
[82] *Banītu-aiāli* (fem.), "Banitu is my help"[152]
[83] *Ḫiṭubarra* (fem.; unknown etymology)[153]
[84] *Damqaya* (fem.), hypocoristic of *damqu*, "good"[154]
[85] *Gūgî*, "Spider" (? Aramaic)[155]
[86] *Ra'imtî*, (fem.) "My beloved"[156]
[87] *Bi'â* (fem.), "The desired one"[157]

132. SAA XII 27, 16: PNA, 229a–b. The region of Bāzu was inhabited by Arab populations, and was the object of Esarhaddon's campaigns (680–668 a.C.); on the other hand, as in many other similar cases, the gentilic suffix (the so-called *nisbe*) of the name is decidedly Akkadian. Cf. however Stamm 1939, 254, followed by CAD B, 185, s.v. *bazītu* for references to NB cases, and an interpretation as an animal name.
133. SAA XII 27, 20 (wife of no. [60]); PNA, 458b, no etymology given. It may be asked, in any case, whether the West Semitic root *ʿzb*, "to abandon", may be implied here, with a quaint graphemic rendering *<ḫan> for the initial consonant *ʿayin*. See also chart II, below.
134. SAA XII 27, 16; PNA, 681–683.
135. SAA XII 27, 20 (husband of no. [66]); PNA, 238a.
136. SAA XII 27, 17; PNA, 334f.
137. SAA XII 27, 20 (wife of no. [64]); PNA, 135b.
138. SAA XII 27, 18; PNA, 527b.
139. SAA XII 27, 21 (the same name in l. 23, *ibid.*); cf. PNA, 925b, where a possible Anatolian etymology is discussed. On the other hand, *Nanî* might represent a *Lallname*, or alternatively be connected to the West Semitic root *ḥnn*, "to be merciful", perhaps as further abbreviation of the hypocoristic [69] *Ḫananî*, "Merciful" (PNA, 450a–b).
140. SAA XII 27, 19; PNA, 1156b.
141. SAA XII 27, 21; PNA, 46b–47a.
142. SAA XII 27, 23 (husband of the woman *Ḫarrâ*, on whom cf. no. [44]); PNA, 41a–b.
143. SAA XII 27, 22; PNA, 745a.
144. SAA XII 27, 24; PNA, 544a.
145. SAA XII 27, 22; PNA, 106a, s.v. *Ammi-rāpi'*. This is a typical *Ersatzname*, in which the paternal uncle (deceased) is indicated as being behind the (perhaps difficult) birth of the infant.
146. SAA XII 27, 24; PNA, 82a–b.
147. SAA XII 27, 23; PNA, 495b.
148. SAA XII 27, 25; PNA, 1016b.
149. SAA XII 27, 25; cf. Tallqvist 1914, 239 a. To my knowledge, the writing of this name (*Ú/šam-ga-a-a-ni*) causes still some uncertainties regarding the subject-element.
150. SAA XII 27, 26.
151. SAA XII 27, 26; PNA 3/I, 997b.
152. SAA XII 27, 27; PNA 1/II, 266a.
153. SAA XII 27, 26; PNA 2/I, 474b.
154. SAA XII 27, PNA 1/II, 374b.
155. SAA XII 27, 27; PNA 1/II, 427b.
156. SAA XII 27, 28; PNA 3/I, 1030b.
157. SAA XII 27, 28; PNA 1/II, 342a.

[88] *Qurdī-Nergal*, "Heroism of Nergal"[158]

[89] *Adadi-ṭalli* (femm.), "Adad is my protective shadow"[159]

2. b Beyond Deller: Assyro-aramaica

Wide-ranging applications of the Deller "method" brought about, in the 1970s, a number of studies dedicated to the systematic comparison between the West Semitic names occurring in Neo-Assyrian administrative documents and the onomastic attestations in contemporary Aramaic epigraphs in alphabetic script, at times with the aid of other West Semitic materials (e.g. the names in Phoenician and Hebrew epigraphs, Biblical names, etc.). Thus. e.g., Stephen A. Kaufman clarified the problematical *incipit* to one of the Neirab funerary inscriptions of the sixth century BC, *š'gbr*, previously considered to bear a relative pronoun *š* in first position, as corresponding instead to the name *Si'gabbar, with a rendering of the DN *Sîn typical of NW Syro-Mesopotamia.[160] Other PNs in Aramaic alphabetic script of the eighth–sixth centuries BC were brought to light in the detailed study of Aramaic epigraphy undertaken by Francesco Vattioni, thus acting as an important premise for the full republication of Aramaic epigraphs on clay tablets of NA date, and the comprehensive catalogue of PNs on Aramaic alphabetic texts, of more than a decade later.[161] As for West Semitic names in NB texts, a monograph by Michael D. Coogan provided the full study of PNs in the plentiful documents of the Murašû firm, largely innovating on Tallqvist's results in a clear and satisfactory way.[162]

In sum, a bird's-eye view of these studies shows that the overall, albeit not always explicitly formulated, objective of the newly discovered or critically re-examined onomastic comparisons was (1) to fix the rules of graphemic correspondence between cuneiform and alphabetic renderings in the case of immediately identifiable PNs, and (2) to verify the overall onomastic inventory of the West Semitic linguistic-cultural horizon in alphabetic script, in order to trace further, and not immediately evident, attestations of this inventory in the NA/NB corpus. This double scope was posed outright and met concretely in various parts of the 1975 monograph on Aramaic inscriptions and onomastics by Edward Lipiński.[163]

In this book — the first of a three-volume series, which would reach to 2010[164] — the Belgian scholar chose to make personal names one of the main focuses of his research on the most ancient remnants of the Aramaic language, alongside the detailed re-examination of various groups of Old Aramaic inscriptions. Thus, Lipiński posited the notion that "names are an important source for our knowledge of ancient Aramaic and of the societies in which the Aramaic language was used, as well as of the religious ideas of the Aramaeans

158. SAA XII 27, 29; PNA 3/I, 1024b. For this onomastic type, cf. already Stamm 1939, 322.
159. SAA XII 27, 28; PNA 1/I, 51a.
160. Kaufman 1970. For the divine name Si', Se', cf. fn.215, below.
161. Vattioni 1970; for later studies which took off from Vattioni's research, cf. Fales 1986; Maraqten 1988.
162. Coogan 1976.
163. Lipiński 1975.
164. Lipiński 1994, 2010.

and of the Aramaic speaking peoples".[165] And, in conclusion, the author expressed the expectation that the future would bring about a comprehensive historical grammar of Aramaic and an Aramaic etymological dictionary, in which also personal names — in the different graphemic renderings by which they have come down to us — could find room.[166]

Among the many interesting cases which formed the object of his treatise, Lipiński studied names bearing the predicative element *-šumkī*, " [DN] (is) my support", from the Aramaic root *smk* (e.g [90] *Attār-šumkī*,[167] [91] *Bēl-šumkī*,[168] [92] *Se'-šumkī*)[169] and *-sakā*, "(DN) has looked at /has looked out for [the newborn]", from the Aramaic root *śky* (e.g. [101] *Adda-sakā*,[170] [102] *Se'-sakā*,[171] [103] *Sakā-il*,[172] and [104] *Iltakâ*).[173] Forms such as the latter, showing a complex orthographical rendering (<V*lt*>) in cuneiform for the West Semitic lateral sibilant /ś/, gave rise to a further series of studies of comparative phonology and graphemics on the part of various authors, proceeding from the important indications already provided by Tallqvist,[174] in order to tackle the broader problem of the

165. *Ibid.*, 13.
166. *Ibid.*, 210.
167. Lipiński 1975, 58f.; cf. now PNA, 236a–b. The name was borne by a king of the Aramaic state of Arpad, who had political relations with Assyria during the mid-8th century: his name is given in Aramaic epigraphs of the time as '*trsmk*.
168. Lipiński 1975, 65, where this unusual pairing of a Babylonian god with an Aramaic predicative element was noted, with the suggestion that the logogram EN (= Akkadian *bēlu*, "lord/the god Bel") could have here represented Aramaic *māre'*, "lord". However, as argued in Fales 1977, there are no cases of loan-translations in these renderings of Aramaic personal names in Neo-Assyrian texts, but merely — and eventually — those of an encoding of Aramaic elements by means of the cuneiform logo-syllabic system on the basis of broad phonetic resemblances ("improper encoding"): thus, at most, one might see in the name in question the possibility of a rendering EN=*bēlu* for West Semitic **b'l*, "lord/ the god Baal". That the factual pronunciation of the latter divine name was not so remote from that of Akkadian *bēlu* may be demonstrated considering the "lord/Baal of the chariot" of Sam'al, which appears as ^{d}*bé-'e-li–ra-kab-bi ša* URU.*sa-ma-al-la* in SAA XVI 63, r.11. Moreover, a partial parallel to this use of EN in connection with West Semitic predicative elements may be found in names built with the synchretistic divine name EN–KASKAL = *Bēl-Ḫarrān*, "lord of Harran" — an epithet of the Moon-god Sīn with reference to his main sanctuary. Although mainly Akkadian predicative elements are attested in connection with this god (such as [93] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-abu/aḫu/bēlu/šarru-uṣur,* "Lord of Harran, protect the father/brother/lord/king!", PNA I/2, 300–303; [94] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-dūri*, "The Lord of Harran is my protective wall", *ibid.*, 302 a; [95] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-issē'a*, "the Lord of Harran is with me", *ibid.*, 302b; [96] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-killanni*, "Lord of Harran, hold me!", *ibid.*, 303 a; [97] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-kuṣuranni*, "Lord of Harran, put me together!", *ibid.*; [98] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-ṣabtanni*, "Lord of Harran, take me!"; [99] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-šaddū'a,* "The Lord of Harran is my mountain", *ibid.*; etc.), there is also an Aramaic case, [100] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-idrī,* "the Lord of Harran is my help" (PNA I/2, 302b), which tallies with the designation of the Moon-god as *b'l Ḥrn* in a contemporary Aramaic inscription from a private collection (cf. Lemaire 2001, no. 1, l. 10).
169. Lipiński, *loc.cit.*; PNA, 1106b.
170. Lipiński 1975, 71; see now PNA, 50 a–b.
171. Lipiński 1975, *ibid.*; see now PNA, 1106a.
172. Lipiński 1975, *ibid.*; see now PNA, 1065b.
173. Lipiński 1975, *ibid.*, see now PNA, 525a, albeit with an erroneous interpretation as a verbal sentence name formed by **'l* and **śky* ("the god has looked out"). In point of fact, this is a hypocoristic formation, built only with a verbal perfect in the third pers. sg., on the basis of the rendering <V*lt*> for /ś/, as discussed in Fales 1978b.
174. Tallqvist 1914, xviii–xix.

correspondence of sibilants in alphabetic and cuneiform script.

Thus, Simo Parpola (1974) conclusively established — through a paradigmatic example — how the phonetic values of Neo-Assyrian graphemes with <š> had consistently shifted to /s/, and viceversa: e.g., the name of the god **Aššur* should have been pronounced as /*Assur*/, while the name of the Moon-god **Sîn* was presumably pronounced /Ši:n/. This phenomenon should account for the "crossed" references between the two in transcriptions of Assyrian names in Aramaic or Biblical Hebrew: e.g. in the royal name [105] *Tukultī-apil-Ešarra*, "My trust/support is the heir of Ešarra",[175] rendered *tgltplysr* in Aramaic epigraphy and *Tiglath-pileser* in the OT.[176]

In the same general vein, Lipiński (1978) instituted a full-fledged comparison between the renderings of /š/, /s/, and /ś/ in Aramaic epigraphy and in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian documents, seeking the phonetic characteristics of the sibilants in Aramaic and Late Akkadian.[177] Finally, this writer (1978) brought to light the use of transcriptions in cuneiform with <*V*lt> to indicate the phonemes /š/ and /ś/, both in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian.[178] Examples of this rendering are the Neo-Assyrian names [106] *Iltama'*, a hypocoristicon from the root **šm'*, "to hear"[179], and [107] *Iltadaia*, perhaps to be understood as **Šaday*, "man of the open country/steppe".[180]

* * *

A further aspect, relevant to graphemic variants in the names of single individuals as indication of the mechanisms behind the overall written rendering of personal names, both "native" and "foreign", on the part of the Assyrian scribes, was tackled in an extended review article by this writer (1977).[181] Comparisons were made of the different variants that the same name underwent, both in Neo-Assyrian "everyday" documents and in official inscriptions, and — more rarely — between the two.[182] The result was a chart of 110 case-studies of anthroponyms, in which graphemic variants (in the following patterns: $sign_1$::$sign_2$, sign::sign sequence, or $sequence_1$::$sequence_2$) were visualized in varying po-

175. PNA, 1328b–1331a.
176. Parpola 1974, 4; see also Millard 1976. The opposite case is, e.g., represented by the divine name *mlš*, attested in the Aramaic Sefire treaties after Aššur (Stele I A, l. 8), which corresponds to the NA consort of Aššur **Mullissu* (^{d}NIN.LÍL), as shown by Parpola 1974 and Dalley 1979: cf. the names [53] and [54], above. For the traditions concerning the goddess, cf. Krebernik 1998–2001; for later periods (Mylitta and Molis), cf. most recently Huber 2009,142.
177. Lipinski 1978, 205ff.; cf. Fales 1986, 63 n. 103, for objections to this reconstruction.
178. Fales 1978b.
179. PNA, 525a.
180. PNA, 524b. As noted *ibid.*, the tentative etymology goes back to Fales 1991, 105 n. 37. For a fuller picture of the correspondences, cf. Chart 3, below.
181. Fales 1977, review article of Lipiński 1975.
182. Obviously, these often-repeated PNs were attached to individuals of a certain overall prominence: more often than not foreign rulers, encountered and subdued by the Assyrians, or high-level officials of the Palace and administration (and especially the year-eponyms, attested most frequently in legal documents for dating purposes: cf. Millard 1994 for their names and sequence).

sitions within the names. Thus, e.g., variations in the final vowels of the individual morphological elements were observed (as in the case of the Aramean king [108] *Ammi-Baʿal*, "Baʿal is my paternal uncle", attested as *Am-me/ma/mi—ba/pa-ʿa-li*,[183] and in that of the eponym [109] *Saʾīlu*, a hypocoristic formation from the West Semitic root **šʾl*, "to ask", which shows the renderings *Sa-i/ʾi-lu/li / Sa-il / Si-i/ʾi-lu/li*.[184] More vastly, variations in the perception of the internal structure of names were noticed e.g. in the Canaanite name of a merchant from the city of Assur, [110] *Menaḫēme*, "Comforter", rendered either as *Mi-(i)-nu-uḫ-ḫi-me* or as *Me-na-ḫi-me*.[185]

Further, this writer pointed out that, in order to understand the process of written registration of the names, particularly interesting were those cases in which logograms, desumed from a standard scribal repertory of the age for the writing of anthroponyms in Neo-Assyrian cuneiform,[186] were employed merely on the basis of assonance to reproduce linguistically non-Assyrian contents — with yields that, at first sight, may even seem obscure to the modern researcher. Cases in point of this process, which led from phonically perceived linguistic substances to their written reproduction by employing the solutions available to the scribes (which this writer has called "improper encoding"), are the names of two year-eponyms. The first is [111] *Mār-larīm*, "May the lord be exalted", an Aramaic PN composed of the noun *māre'* and the precative of the verb *rw/ym*: to render this name in the texts, purely syllabic solutions were envisaged (*Mar–la-rim(-me) / Mar–la-ar-me / Ma-ri–la-rim*) alongside the mixed renderings DUMU–*la-rim/la-ár-me*, in which the logogram DUMU (= Akkadian *māru*, "son") was obviously chosen on the basis of assonance with the Aramaic noun, and for ease of use.[187] The second case is that of [112] *Bur-Sagalê*, "son of Sagalê",[188] i.e. either with reference to a specific goddess or (more likely) to a divine "Queen" in Aramaic (cf. Hebrew *šegal*, "queen, royal wife", which in its turn derives from an originally NA designation).[189] In this case, alongside a straightforward syllabic rendering *Bur–*^{d}*sa-gal-e*, one finds the variant SUḪUŠ–*sa-gal-e*, with the use of the logogram SUḪUŠ, which *per se c*orresponds to Akkadian *ubru* (construct state *ubur-*), "client": again, with an encoding of the name which was based on a generic assonance of linguistic content, and on the need for brevity in written execution.[190]

183. Fales 1977, 49: 19; cf. PNA, 103 a–b. For the interchange between <b> and <p>, see Chart. 3, below.
184. Fales 1977, 49: 15; see the full range of cases in PNA, 1063f., relevant to various different, but homonymous, individuals.
185. Fales 1977, 51: 71; cf. PNA, 748 a–b.
186. Cf. § 6, below, for this repertory.
187. Fales 1977, 49: 24, and *passim*; cf. PNA, 740b.
188. Fales 1977, 49: 6: translation given following PNA, 355a.
189. The element **Sagalê*, known from Hebrew *šegal*, and to be further connected to a goddess *šgl* in the Palmyrene context, seems to derive in its turn from NA *issi ekalli*, "palace woman, queen", as has been demonstrated by Parpola 1988 (against the previously accepted etymology, from *ša ekalli*).
190. For the equivalence of SUḪUŠ with *ubru* in NA, cf. Postgate 1973, 67f. At present, this equivalence is further confirmed by the rendering of *ubru* as *ʾbr* in Aramaic alphabetic epigraphs, in connection with cuneiform versions bearing SUḪUŠ: see e.g. *ʾbrḥrn* = **[113]** *Ubur-Ḫarrān*, "client of (Sîn of) Harran" (written: SUḪUŠ–URU.KASKAL) in Radner 2002, no. 39 (and see also *ibid.*, nos. 38 and 40).

Naturally, alongside these cases, there are examples of a more transparent form of encoding, i.e. in which it is easier to perceive the reasons for such partial semantic "Assyrianizations" on the part of the imperial scribes. Thus, e.g., the name of an Arab chieftain, [114] *Bīr-Dāda*, "son of Dada", shows, alongside the syllabic renderings *Bir–da(-ad)-da*, also an "encoded" version, *Bir–*^{d}IM, with the use of one of the best-known logographic renderings for the Storm-god Adad: this rendering may be justified on the basis of the (at least partial) overlap of the divine figures Dād and Adad in the NA context.[191] On the other hand, it may be noted that this phenomenon is by no means limited to Semitic onomastics: e.g. in the renderings of the names of various successive kings of Urarṭu bearing the Hurrian dynastic name [115] *Sardūri*, we find — alongside syllabic transcriptions (*Sa-ar-du/da-ur-ri*) — various cases of encoding with the use of the numeric logogram 15 for the goddess *Ištar (which in NA was pronounced as *Issār, and even *Sār, with a variant by aphaeresis),[192] and at times also with the logogram BÀD (= Akkadian *dūru*), i.e. with an overall rendering *Issar-dūri*, which in NA corresponds to the nominal sentence PN "Issar is my protective wall".[193]

2. c Ran Zadok's classification of West Semitic PNs

Other contributions in the same decade came to refine this or that aspect of our understanding of Aramaic PNs through comparisons of alphabetic renderings with cuneiform transcriptions.[194] However, it was only with the 1977 monograph *On West Semites in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods: an Onomastic Study*, by the Israeli scholar Ran Zadok,[195] that research of West Semitic onomastics in cuneiform reached a first major standpoint. Zadok's book, although published as "grey literature" (i.e. with appearance little better than a typescript, and in an out-of-the way venue), is a precious consultation tool, insofar as it holds a full and basically coherent classification of West Semitic onomastics in the cuneiform texts of the Neo-Babylonian and Persian periods, with an ample set of references to the Neo-Assyrian period as well.

Zadok starts out from the assumption that the overall NB-LB corpus held a certain amount of names which were recognizable as Aramaic — not only on the basis of linguistic criteria which tell them apart from the remainder of Northwest Semitic (phonology, lexicon, morphological elements), but also on the basis of various so-called "topical criteria", of theological, genealogical, historical, geographical and social character (pp. 21f.). In practice, therefore, Zadok tries to identify the "Arameans", as well as other Northwest-Semitic-speaking population elements attested in Mesopotamia between the

191. See nos. [35] and [36], discussed above.
192. Cf. S. Parpola in PNA I/1, xxv. This abbreviated rendering explains clearly the correspondence of *Ištar with Aramaic alphabetic *šr* in some texts on clay tablets of this period: see e.g. the name *šrdrq'l* (see Chart 3, below), and even more cogently the legal clause mentioning *'šr nnwh* (* Ištar of Nineveh), in Lemaire 2001, no. 2, ll. 6–7.
193. PNA, 568–570.
194. See e.g. Millard 1976; Lipiński 1976; Fales 1979.
195. Zadok 1977b.

eighth and the fourth centuries BC, through a connection between personal names, etymologically examined, and some contextual data, whether internal to the PNs themselves (e.g. the names of the deities acting as subject-element) or external (ethnic or social designations of the individuals, connected toponyms of tribal names, distribution of the PNs by geographical criteria). This comprehensive operation (see pp. 175–191 for the conclusions) is thereupon repeated, albeit more briefly, for the linguistically Arabic names (pp. 202–239).

Summing up, in Zadok's vast and detailed monograph — which represented his seminal debut in a major scholarly oeuvre on onomastics, continuously enriched with books and articles until the present — attention to the studied anthroponyms is first and foremost given along well-tested (and obviously cherished) linguistic and etymological guidelines. However, a historical outlook on the bearers of the names themselves is also provided, especially with the use of statistics and historical geography; and some parts of the work moreover comprise attempts at a historical-ethnographic approach to the names, albeit without the support of adequate critical tools. Thus, *On West Semites in Babylonia* represents a work mingling and blending various analytical levels, moreover with the aim of illuminating two distinct chronological/geographical horizons (the NB-LB one in the first place, but also, collaterally, the previous NA phase), and finally with application to two different onomastic corpora (the Aramaic and Canaanite names on one hand, the Arabic names on the other). No wonder, therefore, that — although it gives rise to a vast number of original results and suggestions — the book is indeed arduous to consult and in no way user-friendly.[196]

The most significant part of the book remains the first and longest one, relevant to the Northwest Semitic anthroponyms in Mesopotamia (pp. 1–191).[197] The examination of Aramaic and Canaanite names is effected initially following the system first devised by Noth, i.e. by classifying the names (1) by subject-elements of divine/theophorous type, and then (2) by morphological characteristics (nominal and verbal typologies). Thus, first of all an overview is given of subject-elements represented by deities of the Aramaic pantheon, of other epithets and symbolic terms, of Mesopotamian deities, and of some toponyms — obviously, to the extent that they are coupled with Northwest Semitic predicative elements (pp. 28–78). A classification of the same names by structural components follows: Zadok starts out with verbal-sentence names, and specifically names in the perfect tense (which form the overwhelming majority of Northwest Semitic PNs of the 1st millennium BC), subdivided by conjugations and then by declinations, and then goes

196. The great difficulty in the use of Zadok's book also derives from the "binary" system of numbering employed by the author to mark chapters, sections, and subsections (of the type 1, 11, 111, 1111, 11111, etc.), which the reader is forced to follow in his search for the frequent internal cross-references. The latter may, in not a few cases, also concern the countless footnotes — quite uncomfortably lumped together toward, but not at, the end of the book (pp. 265–333). Quite frequently, therefore, the reader will need to refer to the very exhaustive conclusive indexes (pp. 346–420) to retrieve the specific page-number in which a name is quoted — unless it were by chance hidden in the numerous pages of *Addenda and Corrigenda* (pp. 421–437)!

197. In a further section of the book, Zadok classifies the (much more limited) PNs which may be classified as Arabic.

on to the few names with verbs in the imperfect and the imperative (pp. 79–86). Names with nominal sentences (either interrogatives, or construct-state names), and finally the rare types with three elements, follow (pp. 96–110).

At this point, the vast section (pp. 11–172) dedicated to "One-Word Names" opens. This may be considered the most important and innovative area of Zadok's work. In the face of a veritable mass of one-word West Semitic onomastic formations in NA and NB cuneiform, the author chose to classify them again from a amorphological point of view, i.e. subdividing along the classic parameter of Semitics of nominal types, and indicating only in general the semantic references tied to each type.[198] In this, Zadok deviates from Noth's model — more specifically tied to the semantics of the names and thus to onomastic types of more transparent meaning — and rather follows the model already tested by Herbert B. Huffmon for Amorite names in the cuneiform texts from Mari (18th century BC).[199]

Working by growing complexity, Zadok begins with trilitteral names, from the mono- and bisyllabical bases (*qVtl*, *qVtVl*) to those bases extended by different affixes — through doubling of the second or third radical or the addition of various prefixes (*'a-*, *ya-*, *ma-*, *nV-*, *ta-*)– and then goes on to themes with a number of radicals different from three (from one to five). The same standard inspires the following analysis of hypocoristica, i.e. those names which present suffixes in substitution of lost subject or predicative elements: Zadok proceeds here from purely vocalic suffixes (of quite frequent attestation) to the consonantal ones, and thereupon to composite formations (*V+C*), ending with actual clusters of suffixes. A final section is dedicated to the not particularly frequent feminine names.

* * *

Summing up, a major asset of the classification presented in *On West Semites in Babylonia* lies in the much greater "inclusiveness" of Zadok's onomastic collection than in the previous assemblages of West Semitic PNs in first millennium cuneiform sources. On one hand, Zadok arrives at a systematization of the many diverse intuitions on sentence names which had been already formulated by Tallqvist, as by-product of his list of West Semitic PNs in NA and NB/LB texts: and he applied them not only on a largely enriched corpus, but also with the addition of previous results of research, especially those from Deller onward on the graphemics of the names. On the other hand and with a greater degree of innovation, Zadok came to flank this central onomastic nucleus of clear West Semitic origin and transparent meaning with a further (and quite vast) group of names with various types of abbreviations — which, as such, could have been of a greater or lesser significance to the bearers and their contemporaries, according to each case — on the basis of the etymologies of the constituent roots and of the many formal typologies

198. As is well known, beginning with the seminal work of Jacob Barth (Barth 1894), various types of Semitic nominal formations are tied to specific semantic areas, although the latter may — on the other hand — show a wide range of variation, according to the specific linguistic variety, to the basic meaning of the root, and/or to technical-lexical accretions which occurred through time.

199. Cf. Huffmon 1965, 130–140 (*Hypocoristica*), 141–152 (*One-word names*).

presented by their hypocoristic "appendages".

In this sense, the West Semitic (and especially Aramaic) horizon traced by Zadok for Mesopotamia in NA and NB/LB times also came to be "populated" by a myriad or short names or nicknames, conceived — or perhaps restructured by the imperial scribes in an *ad hoc* fashion[200] — for a rapid and functional identification of the name-bearer, and nowadays recoverable in their sole etymological base, provided by the root. This horizon proves moreover, at a closer view, to be fully coherent with the picture provided by the administrative sources for the vast supra-national empires centred on first millennium BC Mesopotamia — and especially the Assyrian empire — in which the aim of a homogenizing admixture of many different ethnicities and traditions of the subjected populations would seem to have been pursued.

A further result of Zadok's analysis, albeit presented in the book only in a preliminary and partial form, was the focus on those morphological elements of continuity or innovation characterizing West Semitic anthroponymy of the first millennium BC on that of the previous millennium, in which "Amorite" populations prove to be amply attested. Also this feature, it may be noted, represents a development and a deepening of hints already provided by Noth; however, Zadok projects it on a vast documentary base in cuneiform script, similarly to what had been done by Huffmon for the Mari texts. Just to give a couple of examples, Zadok sheds light on two paradigmatic cases — albeit mutually oppositional ones — which concern (1) the presence of generally adjectival suffixes in *-ān* (+ vowel), which show a clear continuity with Amorite formations known since the Ur III period,[201] and, to the opposite, (2) names with a verbal clause built with the imperfect (or prefix-conjugation), which are the norm in West Semitic PNs of the second millennium, but are instead quite rare in the more recent period, having been substituted in an almost systematic way by verbal forms of the perfect (or suffix-conjugation).[202]

Nowadays, the worth of this attempt at correlating Amorite anthroponimy with later Canaanite/Aramaic names may be gauged on the basis of a textual corpus of more recent discovery, that of the cuneiform archive from Meskeneh/Emar in Syria, to be dated to the 13th century BC.[203] These newer materials have, in point of fact, shed light on some diachronically intermediate phases, which allow to evaluate in detail between the typologies of West Semitic onomastics of the Middle Bronze - Late Bronze ages and those of the Iron Age.[204]

200. In this sense, considering the ample body of administrative rosters of servile personnel and/or deportees which have come down to us from the Mesopotamian empires of the age under discussion, thoughts inevitably run to the case of the names of European immigrants to the United States between the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, and in particular to the many diverse ways in which those names were pitilessly cut, altered or anglicized by the immigration authorities at Ellis Island in New York City (e.g. *Cuzzle* from *Casupola*, *Emil Smith* from *Milan Shimitz*: cf. e.g. Petersen 2001).
201. See e.g. names [135], [140], [143], below.
202. Cf. already Noth 1928, 41ff., for Biblical Hebrew. See e.g. names [146–147], below.
203. Pruzszinsky 2003.
204. As noted by Zadok himself in a later contribution (Zadok 1993, 317), "… one cannot avoid the impression that the onomastics of Late Bronze Emar, although still of the Amorite type, approaches very slightly the onomastics of the Aramaic type from early first millennium Mesopotamia".

* * *

A work more analytical than synthetical in its mechanisms, rather explorative than resumptive in its results: the first monograph by Ran Zadok is still at present of great importance for the myriad of philological and linguistic data which fill its classificatory grid, for the multiplicity of its etymological suggestions, often innovative and largely acceptable, and for the vast presence of comparisons, ranging from PNs in Sumerian texts of the third millennium BC to those in Greek and Syriac of the first millennium A.D. From another point of view, however, the work shows the serious limitation of failing to fulfil one of its initial assumptions: that of isolating the Aramaic onomastic component against the remainder of the West Semitic PNs attested in the cuneiform sources from Mesopotamia of the first millennium BC. At the end of the day, Aramaic names do not seem to be endowed with a sufficient gamut of distinctive linguistic traits, to allow them to be set consistently in opposition to Canaanite (Hebrew, Phoenician, Ammonite, Moabite) names, with the ensuing attribution to one or the other group. This result was already evident in the contemporaneous names in alphabetic script, but it proves to be confirmed, and even increased, viewing the names as passed through the "filter" of cuneiform renderings by Assyrian and Babylonian/Persian scribes — a filter which, as seen above, even tended toward some homogeneity of West Semitic and Akkadian names, wherever possible.[205]

In a nutshell, it is impossible to decide, on the basis of purely the available data, if the already mentioned merchant from Assur, *Menaḫēme*,[206] was — following the logic of Zadok's initial assumption — of Aramaic or Phoenician/Hebrew linguistic-cultural affiliation. Or, to take a further example: it is legitimate to surmise that a real estate owner from Ma'allanate, in present-day northern Syria,[207] by name [116] *Dādi-nūrī*, "Dadi is my light", was an Aramean. However, it may be noted that many versions of his name by the scribes of the Assyrian administration, more often encoded with the use of logograms (10.10–*nu-ri*, *da-di*–ZALÁG, 10.10–ZALÁG) than through a purely syllabic rendering (*da-di-nu-ri*), tended — on the basis of the similarity of the lexeme **nūr* in Aramaic and Akkadian — to obfuscate the possible "alterity" of this individual's ethnicity.[208]

At the end, therefore, the attribution of *Dādi-nūrī* to the group of Arameans, or better Arameophones, within the Assyrian empire essentially results from the specific geographical context in which this individual is to be found (North-western Mesopotamia, an area of ancient Aramean settlement), and from the presence of his name also in Aramaic documents from the same archive (where he appears as *ddnr*, *ddnwry*).[209] More in general,

205. It is interesting to note that, to the contrary, the group of Arab names as isolated by Zadok in their attestations in Mesopotamia show a series of decidedly distinctive traits, as the same author was to further clarify in a later essay on the subject (Zadok 1981).
206. See name n. [110], above.
207. The texts from this site have, after a wait of some 30 years, been finally published by E. Lipiński (Lipiński 2010). On the numerous merits and defects of the edition, cf. the extensive review by this writer (Fales 2013).
208. PNA, 364b.
209. *Ibid*. Cf. most recently the indexes in Lipiński 2010, 275, 279.

the question of the specific linguistic-cultural affiliation of many individual West Semitic names may be essentially answered, or at least find the most precious hints for its solution, through subsidiary contextual information whenever available, rather than by purely linguistic means. In other words, it may be necessary to take into account the presence of particular deities within the names, or the ethnonyms possibly attested for the individuals or their groups of belonging, or even other (similarly non-linguistic) markers, so as to trace a picture of the single ethnic and linguistic communities present in the two major imperial formations of first millennium BC Mesopotamia. But the search for such possible interpretative "keys" would have the inevitable consequence of a radical shift of methods in the investigation on the names themselves, leading far from linguistics *tout court*, and toward ethnolinguistics, or toward various applications of historical research on names (with prosopography to the fore), and finally toward studies on ethnicity. This shift was destined to take place, for Zadok himself and for other authors, in the decades following the publication of *On West Semites in Babylonia.*

* * *

Among the many different data which may be extrapolated from Zadok's work, a special position may be assigned to the comprehensive phonology of West Semitic names in relation to their outcomes in cuneiform script of the periods considered. The following chart will thus deal with an updated synopsis on this aspect, in which the Neo-Assyrian "orthographic" correspondences with the least transparent and most mutable Northwest Semitic phonemes (mainly to be found in the area of the so-called "gutturals") are provided, with some examples for each case[210] (NSP = Northwest Semitic Phoneme; NAC = Rendering in Neo-Assyrian Cuneiform; EX. = Examples)

NSP: /'/ (etymological)
NAC: <Ø> in initial, internal and final position; also <'> in internal and final position[211]
EX.: [117] *Abi-ḫazâ*, "the father has seen;"[212] [118] *Ammi-lēti*, "the paternal uncle is my strength" (renderings: *A-mi–le-'e-ti/Am–le-e-te*);[213] [119] *Ammi-rāpi'*, "the paternal uncle is a healer" (renderings: *Am-mu–ra-pi, Am–ra-pi-i'*);[214] see also nos. [126], [127], etc.

210. This chart is based on the more abbreviated one in Zadok 1977b, 263f., with the addition of some examples quoted by the author in his discussion of single cases (*ibid.*, 243ff.), and of further data or renderings attested in PNA.
211. It may be recalled that the Akkadian syllabary presents only one sign (Labat no. 397, with its partial doublet of later periods Labat no. 398) to indicate the presence of an *aleph* ('), with the entire gamut of connected vocalic values, whether before or after it (i.e. <'V> or <V'>), depending on the case.
212. PNA, 10a.
213. PNA, 105a.
214. PNA, 106a.

NSP: /'/ from the fall of final /n/ [215]
NAC: <Ø>, more often <'>
EX.: [120] *Ammi-ladin*, "may the paternal uncle dispense justice!" (renderings: *Am-mu(-u)–la(-ad)-di-in/din*, *Am-mu–la-di*);[216] [121] *Se'-dilīni*, "Se', lift me up!" (renderings: *Se-e'–di-li-i-ni*, *Se-e–dil-li-ni*);[217] see also nos. [122], [131], etc.

NSP: /b/ and /p/
NAC: <b> / <p> and <p> / <b>
EX.: [122] *Se'-barakka*, "Se' has blessed" (renderings: *Se-e'–ba-rak-ki/pa-rak-ka*);[218] [123] *Būru-rāpa'*, "Buru has healed"[219] (= epigraphic Aramaic *prp'*).[220]

NSP: /*ḏ/ (rendered as ד and more rarely as ת in Aramaic, as ת in Canaanite)
NAC: <d>, <z>
EX.: [124] *Kubāba-idrī* (rendering: *Kù*-KÁ–*id-ri*), "Kubaba is my help";[221] [125] *Attar-dimrī*, "Attar is my protection";[222] [126] *Azrī-Iāu*, "Yahweh is my help" (renderings: *Az-ri/A-za-ri/A-zar*$_4$*–Ia-u/Ia-a-ú/Ia-ú/A-ú*);[223] see also no. [153], below.

215. This phenomenon is documented e.g. for the name of the Moon-god *Sîn* ([**Šîn*]), which, in its conjunction with Aramaic predicative elements, finds the rendering *š', šy* (i.e. [**Ši/ Še /Še'*]) in contemporaneous alphabetic texts from North-western Mesopotamia: see Lipiński 1994, 171–192, and cf. already fn. 164 above. For a reduced rendering as *š-*, see e.g. *šlpqd*, "May Šê order!", Hug 1993, 24 (for Aramaic **pqd*, cf. DNWSI, 932).
216. PNA, 104f.; see already Fales 1977, 51: 97.
217. PNA, 1099b.
218. PNA, 1098a. It is a form of perfect *qal*, third p. sing., from **brk*. For the paragogic vowel added by the Assyrian scribes in an accented VC syllable, i.e. following their own phonetic rules, see Parpola in PNA I/1, xxiv. Notice also the third variant, which shows an interesting example of "improper encoding" by means of the logogram BARAG (= Akkadian *parakku*, "[cultic] podium, dais").
219. Cf. Radner 2002, no. 66; the relevant individual, from Dur-katlimmu, was the son of one *Būru-aḫu-iddina*. On the presence of a deity named Būr in the Aramaic pantheon, but also in connection with Akkadian-type PNs, see already Zadok 1977, 62. At present, the attestation of a great number of names bearing Būr-, with both Aramaic and Akkadian predicative elements, in the recently published texts from Dur-katlimmu, has allowed to suggest that this deity was endowed with a local temple on the Middle Euphrates (Radner 2002, 16). A further question is whether the character of this divine figure was actually that of a divine "Stierkalb" (as believed *ibid.*, and cf. PNA, 355ff.), on the strength of the constant rendering of its name in cuneiform with the logogram AMAR (= Akkadian *būru*, "calf"), or if, instead, this rendering could not have been a further case of "improper encoding" (see § 3, above), also in the light of its alphabetic version with <p>.
220. Radner 2002, no. 66b.
221. PNA, 631a; for the "rebus-type" writing of the name of the goddess, with the use of KÁ for the phonetic value *[*bab*V], deriving from the traditional equivalence KÁ=*bābu*, "door, gate", see Zadok 1977b, 273. Kubaba, known from Old Assyrian texts onward, corresponds to the Kybele of the Greek epigraph material; overall, this goddess shows a synchretistic cult, extending from southern Anatolia to North-eastern Syria (cf. Hawkins 1981). That its main centre was Karkemiš is abundantly clear from early first millennium hieroglyphic Luwian texts, and is confirmed by the loyalty oath of Esarhaddon of 672 BC (SAA 2 6); it is now further corroborated by the 7th century NA documents discovered at Tell Shiukh Fawqani, some 8 km downriver from Karkemiš itself, where it appears with the particular writing KU$_6$ both in legal formulae (^{d}KU$_6$ *āšibat Gar<ga>meš*) and as a component of PNs, at times built with Aramaic predicative elements (cf. Radner in Fales & Radner 2005, 625ff., and esp. 628).
222. PNA, 235a, with a noun from the root **ḏmr* (cf. Zadok 1977b, 98 and *passim*).
223. PNA, 240 a. The name is that of a king of Judah or of the Syrian state of Hatarikka, in any case of

NSP: /h/
NAC: <Ø> or <ḫ>, initial and internal
EX.: [127] *Awsēa'* (rendering: *A-ú-se-'a*) and [128] *Ūsēa'* (rendering: *Ú-se-'a*), "salvation";[224] [129] *Nagaha-Dādi*, "Dadi has shone";[225] [130] *Samsi-iâbi* (rendering: *-ia-a-bi*), "Samsi has given";[226] [131] *Iaū-ḫazi* (rendering: *Ia-ú–ḫa-zi*), "Yahweh took possession of" (= Biblical Hebrew *yhw'ḥz*).[227]

NSP: /ḥ/
NAC: <ḫ>
EX.: [132] *Ḫana-Se'*, "Se' has been merciful";[228] [133] *Ḫazugu*, "the strong one";[229] [134] *Ḫamaṭuṭu* (= Aramaic alphabetic *ḥmṭṭ*), "lizard(?)";[230] [135] *Iaḫūṭu* (cf. Aramaic alphabetic *yḥwṭ*).[231]

NSP: /'/
NAC: initial <Ø>/<ḫ>,[232] internal and final <Ø>/<'>, with reflexes on vowel colouring and possibly on length
EX.: [136] *Abdānu*, diminutive (?) from **'bd*, "slave";[233] [137] *Idrī-aḫā'ū*, "My help is the brother" (renderings: *Id-ri/Ad-ra/A-da-ra/A-tar/*10-*ra–ḫa-ú/a-ḫa-ú/a-ḫa-a-ú*);[234] [138] *Ḫabdidu*, "servant of Addu/Idu";[235] [139] *Se'-ḫutni*, "Se' is my strength" (cf. Aramaic alphabetic *š'šny*);[236] [140] *Baḫiānu*, "the desired one" (cf. Aramaic alphabetic *b'yn*);[237]

similar form to Biblical *'zryhw* (Azaryah). The second variant presents the phenomenon of anaptyxis, quite frequently to be found not only in the graphemics of PNs (non-Assyrian or Assyrian), but also in common nouns and verbs of Neo-Assyrian: see Zadok 1977b, with previous bibliography.

224. PNA, 238b for this rendering of the name of the last king of Israel (*Hwš'*). For the second variant, PNA, 1421b. See already Zadok 1977b, 255, who pointed out — on the basis of the parallel versions *Ú-se-'a* / *Hwš'* on an Assyro-Aramaic tablet (= Fales 1986, n. 5) — that the use of the initial sign <*ú*> in West Semitic PNs of the NA period could have represented an explicit notation of the diphtong /aw/, and not of its reduction.
225. PNA, 921b: from the root *ngh*, "to shine" (cf. Zadok 1977, 88).
226. PNA, 1085b: from the root *yhb*, "to give" (cf. Zadok 1977, 83).
227. PNA, 497a: both cuneiform and alphabetic renderings refer to a well-known king of Judah (cf. Zadok 1977, 244). For the predicative element (where /ḥ/ is realized as <ḫ>) see the following case in the chart.
228. PNA, 450b.
229. PNA, 470a; the comparison here is with the Aramaic alphabetic name *ḥzg* (Fales 1986, nos. 53, 57; see also Maraqten 1988, 163).
230. PNA, 446b, for different and non-conclusive etymological suggestions. The cuneiform attestation refers to the same individual as the Aramaic alphabetic one (Fales 1986, 135–140).
231. PNA, 487f. (with uncertain etymology); see on the other hand Maraqten 1988, 171, who suggests it may be a hypocoristicon from **ḥwṭ*, with prefix-conjugation, "he protects". Cf. *ibid.* for the Aramaic epigraphic attestation.
232. For further cases of a cuneiform rendering <ḫ> corresponding to an alphabetic realization as ʾ, see the next row in the chart.
233. PNA, 4b.
234. PNA, 506 a-b. This writer's interpretation of the name (see the references *ibid.*) is =**'dry+'ḥ'+hw*, with postposition of the independent pronoun of the third person m. sg., so as to underscore the subject. For anaptyxis in the second variant, cf. fn. 223, above.
235. PNA, 436b, where the unusual "NA phonetic spelling of the DN Adda" is noted.
236. PNA, 1100b; and see already Fales 1996, 93f.; the root is **'ṯn*. Cf. also no. [50], above.
237. PNA, 252 a–b.

[141] *Mati'-il*, "saved by the god/El" (= Aramaic alphabetic *mt''l*);[238] and see nos. [73], [126] and [127], above.

NSP: /*ḏ/ (rendered ק and later ע in Aramaic, צ in Canaanite, ض in Arabic)[239]
NAC: <q>/<ḫ>, also <ṣ>
EX.: [142] *Adda-raqî*, "Adda is pleased" (cf. Aramaic alphabetic *hdrqy*);[240] [143] *Raqiānu/Raḫiānu*, "pleased" (= Biblical Hebrew *rṣyn*);[241] [144] *Raṣī'*, "pleased";[242] see also no. [42], above.

NSP: /*ġ/ (or /ɣ/) (rendered ע in Canaanite and Aramaic, and possibly also ק)
NAC: <ḫ>
EX.: [145] *Ḫīri-aḫḫē*, "awakened by the brothers", or sim. (= Aramaic alphabetic *qyrḥ*);[243] [146] *Il-iaḫīri*, "The god/El will awaken".[244]

NSP: /ś/ (usually rendered שׁ, also ס[245])
NAC: <s>, rarely <*V*lt>
EX.: [147] *Iasime'-il*, "God/El will establish"[246]; [148] *Sagib-Il*, "God/El is exalted"[247]; for other renderings with <s>, see nos. [101], [102], [103], above; for renderings with <*V*lt>, see nos. [104], [106], [107], above.

238. PNA, 745 a–b.
239. The phoneme indicated here with the conventional Arabic rendering /*ḏ/ corresponds to the traditionally posited voiced interdental emphatic of Proto-Semitic (i.e. emphatic ḏ), or — according to a different view (e.g. already Moscati 1964, 28, 34; and especially Steiner 1977, 1991) — to a lateral fricative, presumably emphatic (i.e. emphatic ŝ); the latter hypothesis has gained much consensus in recent decades (e.g. Lipiński 1997, 129–132; Kogan in Weninger 2011, 71f.). For a bird's-eye view of the renderings of this phoneme as ק and/or as ע in the different textual corpora of Aramaic between the 10th and the 3rd century BC, see Folmer 1995, 63–70; Muraoka & Porten 1998, 8f. It may be of some interest to note that in NA itself a shift between <q> and <ḫ> (or even <Ø>) may be observed, in those cases in which an etymological /ʿ/ may be reconstructed; e.g. **qudīni* is an alternative to *udīni*, "up to now; hitherto" (Hämeen-Anttila 2000, 17).
240. PNA, 50a; cf. Avigad & Sass 1997, 281:751, for the seal with the alphabetic PN.
241. PNA, 1028a. Both the cuneiform and the alphabetic versions reflect the name of a king of Damascus, known as *Reṣīn* from the Masoretic text; see discussion in Lipiński 2000, 404. In PNA, s.v. *Raḫiānu,* the etymological section (by Andreas Fuchs and Herrmann Hunger) does not take account of this well-known correspondence, which leads back to the root **rḍy*, and the name is instead attributed to **rʿy*, "to be friendly, to desire".
242. PNA, 1034a (again from **rḍy*).
243. PNA, 474a; cf. Fales 1980, for a detailed study of the correspondences between these names, all deriving from *ġwr, "to awake, to wake". Considering the faringalisation of <q> for Neo-Assyrian, we cannot exclude that this example may be "melt" with the previous one: both the /*ḏ/ and the /*ġ/ of the Aramaic could have already developed in /ʿ/, giving place to the common graphemic renderings <q>/<ḫ> (and possibly also <Ø>) in cuneiform.
244. PNA 2/I, 517a. Note this form of imperfect tense, always from *ġwr.
245. Cf. Fales 1996, 107; and cf. no. [177], below.
246. PNA 2/I, 494a, a form of imperfect tense from *śym; alternatively, the name might derive from *šmʿ, "hear, listen" (imperfect tense). Also the name *'trśmn* attested in a seal of the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale, erroneously explained as a divine name ("ʿAtarshamin": Bordreuil 1986, 75f.), might be connected to the verb *śym (with the suffix pronoun of first p. sg.).
247. PNA 3/I, 1061 a–b.

NSP: /s/
NAC: <š>
EX.: [149] *Aplad(ad)-šitrī*, "Aplad(ad) is my refuge"[248]; [150] *Aštrâ*, "Captive" (cf. epigraphic Aramaic *'sr'*);[249] [151] *Ḫašānu*, "strong, powerful".[250] Cf. also nos. [90], [91], [92], above.

NSP: /š/
NAC: <s>, also <*V*lt>
EX.: [152] *Ammi-sūrī*, "my paternal uncle is my bulwark"[251]; [153] *Salmānu-idrī*, "Salmanu is my help" (= epigraphic Aramaic *šlmn'zry*);[252] [155] *Adda-same'*, "Adad listened" (=epigraphic Aramaic *'dšm'*).[253]

NSP: /*t̲/ (rendered ת, also שׂ or ס in Aramaic, שׂ in Canaanite)
NAC: <t>
EX.: [156] *Adda-it'ī*, "Adda is my liberation" (=epigraphic Aramaic *hdys'y*; and cf. *hdyš'y*);[254] cf. no. [139], above.

CHART 3

RENDERINGS IN NEO-ASSYRIAN CUNEIFORM AND IN ALPHABETIC

[166] *Akkadāyu*, "Man from Akkad".[255] Alphabetic Rendering: *'kdy*.[256]
A gentilic, with the typical suffix (*nisbe*) *–y*, well attested in alphabetic rendering, from the traditional toponym "Akkad", used for marking a Southern Mesopotamian origin, parallel/alternative to *Kaldāyu*, "Chaldaean".

[167] *Aššur-šallim-aḫḫē*, "Assur, keep my brothers safe (*recte*: keep my brother safe)!".[257] Alphabetic Rendering: (=) '*srslmB* / *srslmB*.[258]
The alphabetic rendering shows an apheresis of the initial *aleph*, which appears in other names formed with *Assur,[259] and its apocope in internal position. In final position, the Neo-Assyrian abbreviation of the final vowels might be registered, also in the plural;[260] however, the variant renderings of the final element in cuneiform (-PAP.MEŠ / -*a*-*ḫi*) signal the use of the sign MEŠ "as a rebus" for the first person singular suffix adjective *–ī*.[261]

248. PNA 1/I, 115 a. For the Aramaic name *sitr, cf. DNWSI, 805.
249. PNA 1/I, 142f.
250. PNA 2/I, 464 a, suggesting an etymology from North-western Semitic *bsn.
251. PNA 1/I, 1096b; for Aramaic *šūr, "bulwark", cf. Zadok 1977b, 99 and *passim.*
252. PNA 3/I, 1078b. This god has been recently identified as one of the main objects of cult in the region of the Khabur river, subject to syncretism (Radner 1998); cf. e.g. the name [154] *Salmānu-ašarēd*, "Salmanu is the main (god)", adopted by several Assyrian kings.
253. PNA 1/I, 50b.
254. PNA 1/I, 47b. It is the name of the king of Tell Fekheriye/Sikāni.
255. PNA 1/I, 95a.
256. Fales 1986, no. 47:3; Maraqten 1988, 231.
257. PNA 1/I, 216f. With the second proposal the problem of the identity of the ideal "giver" of the name (Stamm 1939, 43, 145) would be solved: he would be the elder brother.
258. Maraqten 1988, 233; cf. Fales 1986, nos. 46:2, 47:2, 48:2; Hug 1993, 21ff.
259. Cf. no. [167], and also *e.g., srḥdn mlk'*, "king Aššur-aḫḫē-iddina [= Esarhaddon]" in Lemaire 2001, 26, 16–17.
260. Hämeen-Anttila 2000, 78.
261. Cf. Parpola in PNA 1/I, xxiii–xxiv.

[168] *Aplad(ad)-erība*, "Aplad(ad) has replaced".[262] Alphabetic Rendering: *'pldryb / 'pl(d)rb*; *pldrb*.[263]
The alphabetic writings suggest a common phonetic rendering [aplad];[264] also note the rare case of *mater lectionis –y* for the long vowel of the verb *riābu.*

[169] *Arba'il-šarrat*, "(Issar of) Arba'il is queen".[265] Alphabetic Rendering: *'rblsr*.[266]
The toponym is rendered in defective form compared to no. [178].

[170] *Nergal*(?)*-šarru-uṣur*, "Nergal, protect the king!".[267] Alphabetic Rendering: (=)*'ṯhrsrṣr*.[268]
The identity of the two names, attested in a recently edited tablet from Dur-katlimmu, is certain, and also the reading of the divine name, alphab. *'ṯhr*, and cuneiform MAŠ.MAŠ, corresponding (as U.GUR) to Nergal. However, this equation, albeit not yet understood,[269] is justified through *'ṯhr* = *Išḫara, an Anatolian-Mesopotamian goddess connected with the Netherworld, like in general Nergal.[270] This opens the possibility of other "alternative" renderings, hidden under the logograms used for the Assyrian names.[271] The rendering of the two other elements of the name is *standard*.[272]

[172] *Mullissu-ibni*, "Mullissu has created".[273] Alphabetic Rendering: *mlš'bny*.[274]
The goddess *Mullissu* (<**Mulliltu*), the god Assur's paredra, usually rendered in cuneiform with NIN.LÍL, is attested as *mlš* in the Aramaic Sefire stele:[275] cf. no. [54], above. In the second element, note the final *–y*, which has a parallel in *Bqby*.[276]

[174] *Mannu-kī-Inurta*, "Who is like (the god) Inurta?".[277] Alphabetic Rendering: *Mng'nrt*.[278]
For the exchange *k*::*g*, cf. above; and *ibid.* for the insertion of the *aleph* at the border between morphemes in presence of a long vowel. For other renderings of manes formed of an interrogative sentence, cf. e.g. *mng'sr*, "Who is like Assur?", *mng'rbl*, "who is like (Issar of) Arba'il?", and *mngsr*, "Who is like the

262. PNA 1/I, 113b.
263. The first two names could be reciprocal variants; cf. Fales 1986, nos. 50, 2; 51, 3; but cf. Hug 1993, 24 (Ass U 6), for the reading of the second name. The third name is edited in Lemaire 2001, 26: 12.
264. Cf. Lipiński 1976 for a long-range study about this god.
265. PNA 1/I, 127b, but with an erroneous reconstruction of the corresponding Aramaic name (cf. Fales 1986, tab. IX, fig. 27).
266. Fales 1986, no. 27; Maraqten 1988, 233.
267. PNA 2/II, 954–956; and cf. specifically 955b:36, for the case from Dur-katlimmu studied here (the Aramaic equivalent, however, is not given).
268. Röllig, *apud* Radner 2002, 88f.
269. Cf. Röllig *apud* Radner 2002, 89, who suggests an unlikely connection with Ammonite **'ṯhr*, "hiding place".
270. As for phonology, we must suppose that the local pronunciation of the goddess' name contained an interdental element /*t̲/, rendered ת in Aramaic (cf. §4, Table 2, above).
271. Cf., *e.g.*, against this rendering, the name *nrglslm* in a seal from Jerusalem (Avigad & Sass 1997, 307:822), out of context, but probably of Assyrian period considering the *Lautverschiebung* of the sybilants. It corresponds indeed to [171] *Nergal-ušallim*, "Nergal has protected", PNA 2/II, 958b.
272. Cf. *blsrṣr* (variant: *blsr'ṣr*) in Fales 1986, nos. 46, right edge. 1; 47, verso, 3; 48, verso, 2; *nbsrṣr* (= *Nabû-šarru-uṣur*) in *ibid.*, no. 3:7, and *šlmnsrṣr* in Röllig 1997, 368:1 (= Lemaire 2001, 84:1). Again, *blsrṣr* appears in Radner 2002, no. 109:c., and cf. no. [168].
273. PNA 2/II, 766b.
274. Fales 1996, 106.
275. Cf. Parpola in PNA 1/I, xxv, with literature.
276. Fales 1986, no. 13 verso 4. The name corresponds to [173] *Aḫu-iqbi*, "The brother has decreed" (or: "He has decreed/promised a brother", with PNA 1/I, 77f.).
277. PNA 2/I, 691b.
278. Avigad & Sass 1997, 301:805.

king?".[279] This case demonstrates the pronounce /*Inūrta*/ of the name of the Sumerian-Akkadian god *Ninurta in neo-Assyrian times.[280]

[175] *Nabû-šumu-iddina*, "Nabû gave the name"[281]. Alphabetic Rendering: *nbwsmdn.*[282]
Cf. above. In the alphabetic renderings, *nbw* is attested almost similarly as *nb* in initial position (however, the predicates can be Aramaic, not only Assyirian), but seems to prevail in final position.

[176] *Nusku-šarru-uṣur*, "Nusku, protect the king!".[283] Alphabetic Rendering: (=) *nšsrṣr***.**[284]
Other certain alphabetic renderings of Assyrian names bearing the god Nusku are, *e.g.*, *nškly* and *nškn'd***,**[285] always with an epigraphic <š> pointing to an Assyrian pronunciation /*Nusku*/[286]. In this instance, considering the identity of the person in the two renderings, the Aramaic scribe possibly simply omitted to mark the <*k*>.

[177] *Šamaš-aḫu-uṣur*, "Šamaš, protect the brother!"**.**[287] Alphabetic Rendering: (=) *ssḥṣr***.**[288]
The alphabetic rendering *ss* of the sun god's name seems characteristic of contemporaneous Northern Mesopotamia: as of today it is only attested at Tell Fekheriye (alphabetic *ssnwry* = cuneif. *Šamaš-nūrī*),[289] at Tell Shioukh Fawqani (*ssly*),[290] at Ma'allanate (*ssbṣr*),[291] with an Assyrian predicate, like this name from Dur-katlimmu. It seems a peculiar rendering of Aramaic **Śamš*, as discussed elsewhere;[292] here, the cuneiform rendering, pointing to the Assyrian god *Šamaš* (with logograms), can be explained, like no. [170], as a "translation", albeit in the light of a clear syncretism between the relevant divine persons.

[178] *(U)pāqa-ana-Arba'il*, "I am obedient to (Issar from) Arba'il"[293]. Alphabetic Rendering: (=) *pqn'rb'l***.**[294]
The alphabetic rendering fully corresponds to the cuneiform in the same contract: *Pa-qa–a-na–Arba-ìl***.**[295] Thus, it is a variant proper of Neo-Assyrian for the form *ūpāqa* (*puqqu***,** pres. first p. s.), as is demonstrated by the name of an eponym who is mentioned in both ways**.**[296] Further, note the rendering *'rb'l*, which reflects — with its second *aleph* — a popular Neo-Assyrian concept of the toponym *Arbīl, Arba'il (classic

279. For the first two names, cf. Fales 1986, resp. nos. 46, 2; 47, 4, L.E. 1; and no. 28:1; Maraqten 1988, 240. For the third, cf. Lemaire 2001, 134:5, and cf. PNA 2/II, 697f.; he is the *Mannu-kī-šarri* eponym for year 665 BC. Cf. also [*mng*]*šl*[*mn*] in Radner 2002, no. 45:b, which corresponds to *Mannu-kī-Salmānu* ("Who is like Salmanu?") in the cuneiform section of the text.
280. Cf. Parpola in PNA 1/I, xxv.
281. PNA 2/II, 884–888.
282. Fales 1986, no. 19, l sup.; Maraqten 1988, 242.
283. Radner 2002, no. 60.
284. *Ibid.*
285. For *nškly*, cf. Fales 1986, no. 13 verso 4; Maraqten 1988, 243 (equivalent to *Nusku-lē'i*, "Nusku is omnipotent", PNA 2/II, 974 a). For *nškn'd*, cf. Avigad & Sass 1997, 309:826 (equivalent to **Nusku-na'id*, "Nusku is praised, exalted", not attested in cuneiform).
286. It is obscure why — diverging from Tallqvist 1914, 178a–b — in PNA 2/II, 972–975 an Assyrian normalized writing *Nušku* has been adopted.
287. Tallqvist 1914, 209 a–b.
288. Radner 2002, n. 53:b.
289. Cf. Abou Assaf, Bordreuil & Millard 1982, 80–82.
290. Fales 1996, 91:21**.**
291. O. 3714:4; cf. Fales 2000, 113.
292. Fales 1996**,** 107; the rendering <*s*> of the second sibilant should depend on assimilation.
293. Tallqvist 1914, 242a; Stamm 1939, 84, 195.
294. Fales 1986, 209; Maraqten 1988, 245.
295. Cf. SAA XIV, no. 47, for the context of the two renderings.
296. Cf. *e.g.*, SAA XIV, 353b.

Arbela, mod. *Erbil*) as formed of the numeral "4" /*arba*/ and of /*il*(*u*)/, "god", which is reflected in the cuneiform rendering through the signs <4–DINGIR>.

[179] *Aššur-gārû'a-nēre*, "Assur, kill my foe!".[297] Alphabetic Rendering: (=) *srgrnr*.[298]
A (typically Assyrian: Stamm 1939, 179) name bearing a request of help against an enemy, who, however, might be not exclusively human. Compared to the meager alphabetic rendering, the syllabic cuneiform renderings of the name of this eponym generally show the preservation of the *–û* at the end of the word and of the suffix pronomen **'a*(*-gar)-ru-u-a / -gar-u-a*) and only rarely its removal (*gar-u*).

[180] *Issar-dūr-qalli*, "Issar is the protecting wall of the weakling".[299] Alphabetic Rendering: *šrdrq'l*.[300]
For the Mesopotaman goddess *Ištar, rendered in Neo-Assyrian *Issar*, and, like in this case, also *Sar*, cf. § 3, above.[301] As for the last element, note that the alphabetic version reflects, through the *mater lectionis '*, a rendering **qāli*, according to the Neo-Assyrian rule which has a possible alternation between penultimate long vowel and gemination of the following consonants (and vice-versa).[302]

* * *

From this point on the article is highly incomplete and fragmentary.
We publish only the intelligible parts.

4 Social Implications of the Neo-Assyrian Onomastic Data

From the information that Sir Winston Churchill was Prime Minister,
a number of consequences follow, such as that he was the leader
of the majority party in Parliament. But from the fact that yonder dog is Fido,
no other truth about him follows at all.
(Kirwan 1968, 509)

Names and systems of naming "can exist only in social communication"; thus "one of the basic tasks of onomastics is research into the social function of proper names".[303]

Naming procedures at birth: some hypotheses.
Were there class distinctions in onomastics?
Cf. the Old English "Domesday Book"

At the outset we must recognize that the Domesday Book material is bound to give a rather incomplete and one-sided picture of late OE nomenclature. The vast majority of the tenants whose names are recorded in Domesday Book belong to the higher classes of

297. PNA 1/I, 185-186.
298. Fales 1986, n. 58:4; Hug 1993, 25.
299. PNA 2/I, 570 a.
300. Fales 1986, 206-207.
301. A clear instance of epigraphic rendering *'šr* for *Issar* out of onomastics is now attested in an Aramaic calco loanword of an Assyrian juridical formula, *'l brky 'šr nnwh yśm*, "he will place (*n* minas of gold) on the knees of *Issar* of Nineveh": Lemaire 2001, 26f.
302. Hämeen-Anttila 2000, 30.
303. Blanár 2009, 92.

the community, to what might be termed the landed gentry of the period. The names employed by them were mostly dithematic and of stereotyped, conventional character …

(…) The humbler people, the villains, cottars, bordars, serfs, and, with few exceptions, the soke-men, who represented the majority of the population, are never mentioned by name.

(…) Apart from incidental information [from other sources] we know next to nothing about the habits of name-formation prevalent among the lower classes on the eve of the Conquest ... (from Pulgram 1947, 194f.)

(…) One of the first problems I encountered in doing fieldwork with the Kaguru was determining a person's name. My problem in part stemmed from an ethnocentric and naive assumption that a person would have one and only one proper name. Although Kaguru do not have the intense aversion to disclosing a name to another as is found in some societies, every Kaguru has several names which he uses on different occasions. Besides his or her social names (mentioned above), there are baptismal names if the person is a Christian, an Arabic-Swahili type name if a Muslim, and a number of personal names, the number depending in large part on the difficulties the person encountered at birth, during infancy, or at initiation (Beidelman 1974, 285).

5 Neo-Assyrian names in an ethnolinguistic and historical-anthropological perspective

"It has often been remarked in West Semitic studies that the deities known from ritual, narrative, or other documentary sources to be considered the deities most proper for worship and veneration are not those that occur most frequently in proper names" (Pardee 1988, 119).

How is the NA situation in this regard?

(…)

6 Beyond Naming at Birth: Particular Categories of NA Onomastic Materials

Mälkä-t' ïfu bäsïm yïdäggïfu
An ugly face is compensated by a good name.
(Amharic proverb, after Leyew 2003, 182)

Now we may begin to wonder how we can ever invent new proper names and form new definite descriptions, or indeed devise any at all if, as I say, their correct use requires that they already be understood as performing their function within an established tradition of usage. This problem is not difficult. There are recognised procedures for assigning proper names: champagne bottles at launchings, baptisms, birth certificates, etc. In these cases there is some kind of accepted ceremony which is generally recognised as correctly assigning a name (or, rather, there is no question of correctness to arise). .... New proper names and definite descriptions can be introduced when there is the possibility of relating them to a particular already encompassed by the knowledge of speaker and hearer.
(Candlish 1968, 158)

(…)

7. Conclusions
(…)

INDEX OF THE QUOTED NAMES

In order of quotation

[1] *Aššur-maqtu-šatbi*
[2] *Ātamar-dumuq-īli*
[3] *Bânītu-atkal*
[4] *Da''inanni-Nergal*
[5] *Gabbu-ina-qāt-īli*
[6] *Inurta-āpil-kūmū'a*
[7] *Issar-mētu-balliṭ*
[8] *Nabû-mukin-apli/šumi/ zēri*
[9] *Nabû-pir'u-lilbur*
[10] *Nabû-reḫtu-uṣur*
[11] *Paliḫka-libluṭ*
[12] *Rēmanni-Issar*
[13] *Rišat-abiša*
[14] *Sīn-tabni-uṣur*
[15] *(Ina)-ṣil-Bēl-allak*
[16] *Lā-qēpu*
[17] *Mardānu*
[18] *Akbaru*
[19] *Batūlu*
[20] *Buṭnutu*
[19] *Ezibtu*
[21] *Ḫarrānû*
[22] *Kalbu*
[23] *Kanūnayu*
[24] *Namirtu*
[25] *Qatinnu*
[26] *Aḫu-erība*
[27] *Ahu-uqur*
[28] *Kēnu-lāmur*
[29] *Nabû-kēnu-šallim*
[30] *Sīn-aḫḫē-erība*
[31] *Attār-sūri*
[32] *Attār-bi'dî*
[33] *Al-Našuḫ-milki*
[34] *Našuḫ-dilīni*
[35] *Dādi-idri*
[36] *Dādi-iqbi*
[37] *Urda-Nanaya*
[38] *Amurru-naṣaba*
[39] *Šamaš-bēlu-uṣur*
[40] *Iaū-idri*
[41] *Nūr-Issar*
[42] *Abi-raḫî*
[43] *Šamaš-killanni*
[44] *Ḫarrâ*
[45] *Nušku-šeribanni*
[46] *Raḫīmu-Adda*
[47] *Urdî*
[48] *Se'-sūri*
[49] *Urad-Issar*
[50] *Adda-ḫutni*
[51] *Issar-rēmanni*
[52] *Bannâ*
[53] *Mullissu-dūrī*
[54] *Mullissu-dūru-uṣrī*
[55] *Ṣūṣu*
[56] *Libūšu*
[57] *Dabībī-libūšu*
[58] *Lidbubū-libāšū*
[59] *Ḫādê-lip/bušū*
[60] *Nūrî*
[61] *Bāzītu*
[62] *Ḫanzabâ*
[63] *Mannu-kī-Adad*
[64] *Awirâ*
[65] *Bēl-ukīn*
[66] *Asâ*
[67] *Ilu-eppaš*
[68] *Nanî*
[69] *Ḫananî*
[70] *Sukkītu*
[71] *Adda-idri*
[72] *Adad-uballiṭ*
[73] *Mati'î*
[74] *Īn-ili*
[75] *Am-rāpi'*
[76] *Aḫu-lē'ī*
[77] *Iatamâ*
[78] *Qitti-ilāni*
[79] *Šam-gayāni*
[80] *Urda-Banītu*
]81] *Pišatti*
[82] *Banītu-aiāli*
[83] *Ḫiṭubarra*
[84] *Damqaya*
[85] *Gūgî*
[86] *Ra'imtî*
[87] *Bi'â*
[88] *Qurdī-Nergal*
[89] *Adadi-ṭalli*
[90] *Attār-šumkī*
[91] *Bēl-šumkī*
[92] *Se'-šumkī*
[93] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-abu/aḫu/bēlu/ šarru-uṣur*
[94] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-dūri*
[95] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-issē'a*
[96] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-killanni*
[97] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-kuṣuranni*
[98] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-ṣabtanni*
[99] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-šaddū'a*
[100] *Bēl-Ḫarrān-idrī*
[101] *Adda-sakā*
[102] *Se'-sakā*
[103] *Sakā-il*
[104] *Iltakâ*
[105] *Tukulti-apil-Ešarra*
[106] *Iltama'*
[107] *Iltadaia*
[108] *Ammi-Ba'al*
[109] *Sa'īlu*
[110] *Menaḫēme*
[111] *Mār-larīm*
[112] *Bur-Sagalê*
[113] *Ubur-Ḫarrān*
[114] *Bīr-Dāda*
[115] *Sardūri*
[116] *Dādi-nūrī*
[117] *Abi-ḫazâ*
[118] *Ammi-lēti*
[119] *Ammi-rāpi'*
[120] *Ammi-ladin*
[121] *Se'-dilīni*
[122] *Se'-barakka*
[123] *Būru-rāpa'*
[124] *Kubāba-idrī*
[125] *Attar-dimrī*
[126] *Azrī-Iāu*
[127] *Awsēa'*
[128] *Ūsēa'*
[129] *Nagaha-Dādi*
[130] *Samsi-iâbi*
[131] *Iaū-ḫazi*
[132] *Ḫana-Se'*
[133] *Ḫazugu*

[134] *Ḫamaṭuṭu*
[135] *Iaḫūṭu*
[136] *Abdānu*
[137] *Idrī-aḫā'ū*
[138] *Ḫabdidu*
[139] *Se'-ḫutni*
[140] *Baḫiānu*
[141] *Mati'-il*
[142] *Adda-raqî*
[143] *Raqiānu/Raḫiānu*
[144] *Raṣī'*
[145] *Ḫīri-aḫḫē*
[146] *Il-iaḫīri*
[147] *Iasime'-il*
[148] *Sagib-Il*
[149] *Aplad(ad)-šitrī*
[150] *Aššrâ*
[151] *Ḫašānu*
[152] *Ammi-sūrī*
[153] *Salmānu-idrī*
[154] *Salmānu-ašarēd*
[155] *Adda-same'*
[156] *Adda-it'ī*
[157] *Ḫanda-buri*
[158] *Ḫanda-larīm*
[159] *Kubaba-aḫu-iddina*
[160] *Kubaba-uarri*
[161] *Aramiš-šar-ilāni*
[162] *Arwas-ma'ādī*
[163] *Ḫiba-azammi*
[164] *Sanda-pî*
[165] *Aḫḫēšāya*
[166] *Akkadāyu*
[167] *Aššur-šallim-aḫḫē*
[168] *Aplad(ad)-erība*
[169] *Arba'il-šarrat*
[170] *Nergal-šarru-uṣur*
[171] *Nergal-ušallim*
[172] *Mullissu-ibni*
[173] *Aḫu-iqbi*
[174] *Mannu-kī-Inurta*
[175] *Nabû-šumu-iddina*
[176] *Nusku-šarru-uṣur*
[177] *Šamaš-aḫu-uṣur*
[178] *Upāqa-ana-Arba'il*
[179] *Aššur-gārû'a-nēre*
[180] *Issar-dūr-qalli*

In alphabetical order

Abdānu [136]
Abi-ḫazâ [117]
Abi-raḫî [42]
Adadi-ṭalli [89]
Adad-uballiṭ [72]
Adda-ḫutni [50]
Adda-idri [71]
Adda-it'ī [156]
Adda-raqî [142]
Adda-sakā [101]
Adda-same' [155]
Aḫḫēšāya [165]
Aḫu-erība [26]
Aḫu-iqbi [173]
Aḫu-lē'ī [76]
Aḫu-uqur [27]
Akbaru [16]
Akkadāyu [166]
Al-Našuḫ-milki [33]
Ammi-Ba'al [108]
Ammi-ladin [120]
Ammi-lēti [118]
Ammi-rāpi' [119]
Ammi-sūrī [152]
Am-rāpi' [75]
Amurru-naṣaba [38]
Aplad(ad)-erība [168]
Aplad(ad)-šitrī [149]
Aramiš-šar-ilāni [161]
Arba'il-šarrat [169]
Arwas-ma'ādī [162]
Asâ [66]
Aššrâ [150]
Aššur-gārû'a-nēre [179]
Aššur-maqtu-šatbi [1]
Aššur-šallim-aḫḫē [167]
Ātamar-dumuq-īli [2]
Attār-bi'dî [32]
Attar-dimrī [125]
Attār-sūri [31]
Attār-šumkī [90]
Awirâ [64]
Awsēa' [127]
Azrī-Iāu [126]
Baḫiānu [140]
Banītu-aiāli [82]
Bânītu-atkal [3]
Bannâ [52]
Batūlu [17]
Bāzītu [61]
Bēl-Ḫarrān-abu/aḫu/ bēlu/ šarru-uṣur [93]
Bēl-Ḫarrān-dūri [94]
Bēl-Ḫarrān-idrī [100]
Bēl-Ḫarrān-issē'a [95]
Bēl-Ḫarrān-killanni [96]
Bēl-Ḫarrān-kuṣuranni [97]
Bēl-Ḫarrān-ṣabtanni [98]
Bēl-Ḫarrān-ṣaddū'a [99]
Bēl-šumkī [91]
Bēl-ukīn [65]
Bi'â [87]
Bīr-Dāda [114]
Buṭnutu [18]
Bur-Sagalê [112]
Būru-rāpa' [123]
Dabībī-libūšu [57]
Dādi-idri [35]
Dādi-iqbi [36]
Dādi-nūrī [116]
Da''inanni-Nergal [4]
Damqaya [84]
Ezibtu [19]
Gabbu-ina-qāt-īli [5]
Gūgî [85]
Ḫabdidu [138]
Ḫādê-lip/bušū [59]
Ḫamaṭuṭu [134]
Ḫananî [69]
Ḫana-Se' [132]
Ḫanda-buri [157]
Ḫanda-larīm [158]
Ḫanzabâ [62]
Ḫarrâ [44]
Ḫarrānû [20]
Ḫašānu [151]
Ḫazugu [133]
Ḫiba-azammi [163]
Ḫīri-aḫḫē [145]
Ḫiṭubarra [83]
Īn-ili [74]
(Ina)-ṣil-Bēl-allak [15]
Inurta-āpil-kūmū'a [6]
Issar-dūr-qalli [180]
Issar-mētu-balliṭ [7]
Issar-rēmanni [51]
Kalbu [21]
Kēnu-lāmur [28]
Kubaba-aḫu-iddina [159]

Kubāba-idrī [124]
Kubaba-uarri [160]
Lā-qēpu [22]
Libūšu [56]
Lidbubū-libāšū [58]
Mannu-kī-Adad [63]
Mannu-kī-Inurta [174]
Mardānu [23]
Mār-larīm [111]
Mati'î [73]
Mati'-il [141]
Menaḫēme [110]
Mullissu-dūrī [53]
Mullissu-dūru-uṣrī [54]
Mullissu-ibni [172]
Našuḫ-dilīni [34]
Nabû-kēnu-šallim [29]
Nabû-mukin-apli/šumi/zēri [8]
Nabû-pir'u-lilbur [9]
Nabû-reḫtu-uṣur [10]
Nabû-šumu-iddina [175]
Nagaḫa-Dādi [129]
Namirtu [24]
Nanî [68]
Nergal-šarru-uṣur [170]
Nergal-ušallim [171]
Nušku-šeribanni [45]
Nūrî [60]
Nūr-Issar [41]
Nusku-šarru-uṣur [176]
Paliḫka-libluṭ [11]
Pišatti [81]
Qatinnu [25]
Qitti-ilāni [78]
Qurdī-Nergal [88]
Raḫīmu-Adda [46]
Ra'imtî [86]
Raqiānu/Raḫiānu [143]
Raṣī' [144]
Rēmanni-Issar [12]
Rišat-abiša [13]
Sa'īlu [109]
Sagib-Il [148]
Sakā-il [103]
Salmānu-ašarēd [154]
Salmānu-idrī [153]
Samsi-iâbi [130]
Sanda-pî [164]
Sardūri [115]
Se'-barakka [122]
Se'-dilīni [121]
Se'-ḫutni [139]
Se'-sakā [102]
Se'-sūri [48]
Se'-šumkī [92]
Sīn-tabni-uṣur [14]
Sukkītu [70]
Ṣūṣu [55]
Šam-gayāni [79]
Šamaš-aḫu-uṣur [177]
Šamaš-bēlu-uṣur [39]
Šamaš-killanni [43]
Urda-Banītu [80]
Urda-Nanaya [37]
Urdî [47]
Ūsēa' [128]

LITERATURE

Abou Assaf A., Bordreuil P., Millard A. 1982, *La statue de Tell Fekherye*, Paris.

Abrahami P. 2011, "Masculine and Feminine Personal Determinatives before Women's Names at Nuzi: Gender Indicator of Social or Economic Independence?", *Cuneiform Digital Library Bulletin* 2011, 1, pp. 1–3 (http://cdli.ucla.edu/pubs/cdlb/2011/cdlb2011_001.html (accessed 22/I/2014).

Andersson J. 2012, *Kingship in the Early Mesopotamian Onomasticon 2800–2200 BCE*, Uppsala.

Archi A. (ed.) 1988, *Eblaite Personal Names and Semitic Name-Giving*, Roma.

Arno A. 1994, "Personal Names as Narrative in Fiji: Politics of the Lauan Onomasticon", *Ethnology* 33, pp. 21–34.

Avigad N., Sass B. 1997, *Corpus of North-West Semitic Stamp Seals*, Jerusalem.

Barth J. 1894, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, Leipzig.

Beidelman T.O. 1974, "Kaguru Names and Naming", *Journal of Anthropological Research* 30, pp. 281–293.

Benz F. L. 1972, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions*, Rome.

Blanár V. 2009, "Proper Names in the Light of Theoretical Onomastics", *Namenkundliche Informationen* 95–96, pp. 89–157 (http://www.namenkundliche-informationen.de/pdf/95_96/articles/NI%2095_96_2009_Blanar.pdf (accessed 4/I/2014))

Bordreuil P. 1986, *Catalogue des sceaux ouest-sémitiques inscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale, du Musée du Louvre et du Musée biblique de Bible et de Terre Sainte*, Paris.

—— 1996–97, "Aramaic Documents from Til Barsib", *Abr-Nahrain* 34, pp. 100–107.

Borger R. 1967, *Handbuch der Keilinschriftliteratur*, Berlin.

Brinkman J. A. 1981, "Hurrians in Babylonia in the Late Second Millennium B.C.", in M. A. Morrison, D. I. Owen (eds.), *Studies on the Civilisation and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians. In Honor of Ernest R. Lacheman on His 75th Birthday*, Winona Lake, IN, pp. 27–35.

Brinkman J. A. 2007, "Masculine or Feminine? The Case of Conflicting Gender Determinatives for Middle Babylonian Personal Names", in M. T. Roth, W. Farber, M. Stolper (eds.), *From the Workshop of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary: Studies Presented to R. D. Biggs* (*Assyriological Studies* 27), Chicago, pp. 1–10.

Caprini R. 2001, *Nomi propri* (*Collana del Dipartimento di Scienze della comunicazione linguistica e culturali*), Alessandria.

Cardona G. R. 1976, *Introduzione all'etnolinguistica*, Bologna.

Carney T. F. 1973, "Prosopography: Payoffs and Pitfalls", *Phoenix* 27, pp. 156–179.

Coogan M. D. 1976, *West Semitic Personal Names in the Murašû Documents* (*Harvard Semitic Monographs* 7), Missoula.

Cowley A. 1923, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford.

Dalley S. 1996–97, "Neo-Assyrian Tablets from Til Barsib", *Abr-Nahrain* 34, pp. 66–99.

Deller K. 1965, " Neuassyrisches aus Sultantepe", *Orientalia Nova Series* 34, pp. 457–477.

—— 1966, "The Neo-Assyrian Epigraphical Remains of Nimrud", *Orientalia Nova Series* 35, pp. 179–194.

Di Vito R. A. 1993, *Studies in Third Millennium Sumerian and Akkadian Personal Names: The Designation and Conception of the Personal God*, Rome.

DNWSI = J. Hoftijzer, K. Jongeling, *Dictionary of North-West Semitic Inscriptions*, I–II, Leiden, 1995.

Donbaz V., Parpola S. 2001, *Neo-Assyrian Legal Texts in Istanbul* (*Studien zu den Assur-Texten* 2), Saarbrücken.

Ebeling E. 1939, *Die Eigennamen dei mittelassyrischen Rechts- und Geschäftsurkunden* (*Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft* 13/I), Leipzig.

Edzard D. O. 1962, "^{m}Ningal-gāmil, ^{f}Ištar-damqat. Die Genuskongruenz in akkadischen theophoren Personennamen", *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* N.F. 21, pp. 113–130.

Edzard D. O., Hoffner H. A. Jr., Streck M. P., Wilhelm G. 1998, "Namen, Namengebung", *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 9/1–2, Berlin – New York, pp. 94–134.

Eichler E. *et al.* (eds.) 1995–96, *Namenforschung / Name Studies / Les noms propres*, I–III, Berlin - New York.

Eidem J. 2004, "In the Names of Aššur!", in J. G. Dercksen (ed.), *Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen* (*Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul* 100), Leiden, pp. 191–203.

Fales F. M. 1973, *Censimenti e catasti di epoca neo-assira*, Roma.

—— 1974, "West Semitic Names from the Governor's Palace", *Annali di Ca' Foscari* 13/3, pp. 179–188.

—— 1977, "On Aramaic Onomastics in the Neo-Assyrian Period", *Oriens Antiquus* 16, pp. 41–68.

—— 1978a, "L'onomastica aramaica in età neo-assira: raffronti tra il corpus alfabetico e il materiale cuneiforme", in *Atti del I Convegno Italiano sul Vicino Oriente Antico, Roma 22–24 aprile 1976* (*Orientis Antiqui Collectio* 13), Roma, pp. 199–229.

—— 1978b, "A Cuneiform Correspondence to Alphabetic ש in West Semitic Names of the I Millennium B.C.", *Orientalia Nova Series* 47, pp. 91–98.

—— 1979, "A List of Assyrian and West Semitic Women's Names", *Iraq* 41, pp. 55–73.

—— 1980, "L'enigmatico QYRḤ", *Annali di Ca' Foscari* 19/3, pp. 7–14.

—— 1983, "Le double bilinguisme de la statue de Tell Fekheriye", *Syria* 40, pp. 233–250.

—— 1986, *Aramaic Epigraphs on Clay Tablets of the Neo-Assyrian Period* (*Studi Semitici* 2), Roma.

—— 1991, "West Semitic Names in the Assyrian Empire: Diffusion and Social Relevance", *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico* 8, pp. 99–117.

—— 1993, "West Semitic Names in the Šēḫ Ḥamad Texts", *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 7, pp. 139–150.

—— 1995, "Assyro-aramaica: the Assyrian Lion-Weights", in K. van Lerberghe, A. Schoors (eds.), *Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East*. *Festschrift E. Lipiński* (*Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 65), Leuven, pp. 33–55.

—— 1996, "An Aramaic Tablet from Tell Shioukh Fawqani, Syria", *Semitica* 46, pp. 81–121 (Introduction by L. Bachelot, Appendix by E. Attardo).

—— 1997, "People and Professions in Neo-Assyrian Assur", in H. Waetzoldt, H. Hauptmann (eds.), *Assyrien im Wandel der Zeiten* [= XXXIX *Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, 6–10/VI/1992*], Heidelberg, pp. 33–40.

—— 2000, "The Use and Function of Aramaic Tablets", in G. Bunnens (ed.), *Essays on Syria in the Iron Age*, Louvain - Paris - Sterling (Va.), pp. 89–124.

—— 2001, *L'impero assiro: storia e amministrazione (IX–VII sec. a.C.*), Roma - Bari.

—— 2003, "Assiri e aramei a Tell Shioukh Fawqani e dintorni", in F. M. Fales, D. Morandi Bonacossi (eds.), *Mesopotamia e Arabia: Scavi archeologici e studi territoriali delle Università trivenete (1994–1998)*, Venezia.

—— 2013, Review of Lipiński 2010, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 70, pp. 204–210.

Fales F. M., Radner K. 2005, "Tablets in Neo-Assyrian Cuneiform Script", in L. Bachelot, F. M. Fales (eds.), *Tell Shiukh Fawqani 1994–1998*, Vol. II (*History of the Ancient Near East / Monographs* VI 2), Padova, pp. 623–649.

Fales F. M., Radner K., Attardo E., Pappi C. (eds.) 2005, "The Assyrian and Aramaic Texts from Tell Shiukh Fawqani", in L. Bachelot, F. M. Fales (eds.), *Tell Shiukh Fawqani 1994–1998*, II, Padova, pp. 595–694.

Folmer M. L. 1995, *The Aramaic Language in the Achaemenid Period*, Leiden.

Gaspa S. 2008, "Remarks on Some Profane Names in the Neo-Assyrian Anthroponomy", *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* XVII, pp. 119–188.

Gelb I. J. 1958, "La lingua degli Amoriti", *Rendiconti Lincei. Scienze Morali Storiche e Filologiche* 8/13, pp. 143–164.

—— 1962, "Ethnic Reconstruction and Onomastic Evidence", *Names* 10, pp. 45–52.

—— 1980, *Computer-aided Analysis of Amorite*, Chicago.

Gelb I. J., Purves P. M., Mac Rae A. (eds.) 1943, *Nuzi Personal Names*, Chicago.

Gröndahl F. 1967, *Die Personnenamen der Texte aus Ugarit*, Rome.

Hämeen-Anttila J. 2000, *A Sketch of Neo-Assyrian Grammar* (*State Archives of Assyria Studies* 13), Helsinki.

Harper R. F. 1892–1914, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters*, I–XIV, London - Chicago.

Hawkins J. D. 1981, "Kubaba", *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 6/3–4, Berlin - New York, pp. 257–261.

Herbert R. K. 1995, "The Sociolinguistic of Personal Names: Two South African Case Studies", *South African Journal of African Languages* 15 (1), pp. 1–8.

Hilgert M. 2002, "Herrrscherideal und Namengebung. Zum akkadischen Wortschatz kyriophoren Eigennamen in in der Ur III-Zeit', in N. Nebes (ed.), *Neue Beiträge zur Semitistik*, Wiesbaden, pp. 39–76.

Hinz W. 1975, *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen*, Wiesbaden.

Hoffner H. 1968, "Birth and Name-giving in Hittite Texts", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 27, pp. 198–203.

Huber I. 2009, „Ktesias und Babylonien: über eine nicht existierende Größe in den Persika", in J. Wiesehöfer *et al.* (eds.), *Die Welt des Ktesias / Ctesias' World*, Stuttgart, pp. 130–161 (http://www.achemenet.com/document/HUBER_Ktesias_und_Babylonien_10-02-09.pdf (accessed 6/I/2014).

Huffmon H. B. 1965, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts*, Baltimore - London.

Hug V. 1993, *Altaramäische Grammatik der Texte des 7. und 6. Jh.s v. Chr*., Heidelberg.

Izre'el Sh. (ed.) 2002, *Semitic Linguistics: The State of the Art at the Turn of the 21st Century* (*Israel Oriental Studies* XX), Winona Lake.

Johns C. H. W. 1898–1901, *Assyrian Deeds and Documents*, I–IV, Cambridge.
—— 1901, *An Assyrian Doomsday Book*, Leipzig.
—— 1902, "Some Secondary Formations among Assyrian Proper Names", *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 18, pp. 149–166; 246–253.
Kaufman S. A. 1970, "Si'gabbar, Priest of Sahr in Neirab", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90, pp. 270–271.
—— 1974, *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*, Chicago.
Kleinermann A., Owen D. I. 2009, *Analytical Concordance to the Garšana Archives*, Bethesda.
Klengel-Brandt E., Radner K. 1997, "Die Stadtbeamten von Assur und ihre Siegel", in Parpola & Whiting 1997, pp. 137–159.
Knudsen E. E. 1982, "An Analysis of Amorite: A Review Article", *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 34, pp. 1–18.
Krebernik M. 1988, *Die Personennamen der Ebla-Texte*, Berlin.
—— 1998–2001, "Ninlil", *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 9, Berlin - New York, pp. 452–461.
—— 2002, "Zur Struktur und Geschichte des älteren sumerischen Onomastikons", in M. P. Streck, S. Weninger (eds.), *Altorientalische und semitische Onomastik*, Münster, pp. 1–74.
Kühne H. *et al.* 1993,"Vier spätbabylonische Tontafeln aus Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad", *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* VII, pp. 75–150.
Layton S. C. 1990, *Archaic Features of Canaanite Personal Names in the Hebrew Bible*, Atlanta.
Laroche E. 1980, *Glossaire de la langue hourrite*, Paris.
Lemaire A. 2001, *Nouvelles tablettes araméennes*, Genève.
Leyew Z. 2003, "Amharic Personal Nomenclature: A Grammar and Sociolinguistic Insight", *Journal of African Cultural Studies* 16, pp. 181–211.
Lidzbarski M. 1921, *Altaramäische Urkunden aus Assur*, Leipzig.
Limet H. 1968, *L'anthroponymie sumérienne dans les documents de la 3^{me} dynastie d'Ur*, Paris.
Lipiński E. 1975, *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics, I*, Leuven.
—— 1976, "Apladad", *Orientalia Nova Series* 45, pp. 53–74.
—— 1978, "La correspondance des sibilantes dans les textes araméens et les textes cunéiformes néo-assyriens", in P. Fronzaroli (ed.), *Atti del secondo congresso internazionale di linguistica camito-semitica*, Firenze, pp. 201–210.
——1993-94, "Aramaic Clay Tablets from the Gozan-Harran Area", *Jaarbericht van het Voor-aziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux* 33, pp. 144–150.
—— 1994, *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics, II*, Leuven.
—— 1997, *Semitic Languages. Outline of a Comparative Grammar*, Leuven.
—— 2000, *The Aramaeans. Their Ancient History, Culture, Religion*, Leuven.
—— 2010, *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics, III: Malanâ*, Leuven.
Luukko M. 2004, *Grammatical Variation in Neo-Assyrian* (*State Archives of Assyria Studies* 16), Helsinki.
Mander P. 1988, "Sumerian Personal Names in Ebla", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 108, pp. 481–483.
Maraqten M. 1988, *Die semitischen Personnenamen in den alt- und reichsaramäischen Inschrif-ten aus Vorderasien*, Hildesheim.
Millard A. R. 1976, "Assyrian Royal Names in Biblical Hebrew", *Journal for Semitic Studies* 21, pp. 1–14.
—— 1994, *The Eponyms of the Assyrian Empire 910–612 B.C.* (*State Archives of Assyria Studies* 2), Helsinki.
Moscati S. *et al.* 1964, *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, Wiesbaden.
Muraoka T. & Porten B. 1998, *A Grammar of Egyptian Aramaic*, Leiden.

Muffs Y. 2003, *Studies in the Aramaic Legal Papyri from Elephantine*, Prolegomenon by B. Levine, Leiden.
Neale S. 2005, "A Century Later", *Mind* 114, pp. 809–871.
Noth M. 1928, *Die israelitischen Personnenamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung*, Stuttgart (reprint: Hildesheim 1966).
Onasch H.-U. 1994, *Die assyrischen Eroberungen Ägyptens*, Wiesbaden.
Osing J. 1978, "Zu einigen ägyptischen Namen in keilschriftlicher Umschreibung", *Göttinger Miszellen* 27, pp. 37–41.
Pardee D. 1988, "An Evaluation of the Proper Names from Ebla from a West Semitic Perspective: Pantheon Distribution according to Genre", in Archi (ed.) 1988, pp. 119–151.
Parpola S. 1970, *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms*, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
—— 1974, "The Alleged Middle/Neo-Assyrian Verb *naṣṣ and the Assyrian Sound Change š>s", *Assur* I/1, pp. 1–10.
—— 1988, "The Neo-Assyrian Word for 'Queen' ", *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* II, pp. 73–76.
Pedersén O. 1986, "The Reading of the Neo-Assyrian Logogram U.U", *Orientalia Suecana* 33–35, pp. 313–315.
Petersen W. 2001, "Surnames in US Population Records", *Population and Development Review* 27, pp. 315–322.
Pinches T. G. 1916, Review of K. L. Tallqvist, *Assyrian Personal Names*, *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, Oct. 1916, pp. 858–860.
Pomponio F. 1978, *Nabû*, Roma.
—— 1991, "I nomi personali dei testi amministrativi di Abū Ṣālabīḫ", *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico* 8, pp. 141–147.
Postgate J. N. 1973, *The Governor's Palace Archive*, London.
Pruzsinszky R. 2003, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Emar*, Bethesda.
Pulgram E. 1947, "Indo-European Personal Names", *Language* 23, pp. 189–206.
—— 1954, " Theory of Names", *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 5, pp. 149–196.
Radner K. 1997, *Die neuassyrischen Privatrechtsurkunden als Quelle für Mensch und Umwelt*, Helsinki.
—— 1998, "Der Gott Salmānu ('Šulmānu') und seine Beziehung zur Stadt Dūr-katlimmu", *Die Welt des Orients* 29, pp. 33–51.
—— 2002, *Die neuassyrischen Texte aus Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad*, Berlin.
Röllig W. 1997, "Aramaica Haburiensia II. Zwei datierte aramäische Urkunden aus Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad", *Altorientalische Forschungen* 24, pp. 366–374.
Rosenthal F. 1936, *Die Sprache der palmyrenischen Inschriften*, Leipzig.
Saporetti C. 1970, *Onomastica medio-assira*, I–II, Roma.
—— 1979, *Gli eponimi medio-assiri*, Malibu.
Saporetti C., Freydank H. 1974, *Nuove attestazioni dell'onomastica medio-assira*, Roma.
Saporetti C., Ghiroldi A. 1991, "Per una rielaborazione dell'onomastica medio-assira", *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico* 8, pp. 181–190.
Sasson J. M. 1974, "Hurrians and Hurrian Names in the Mari Texts", *Ugarit-Forschungen* 6, pp. 353–400.
Schmitt R. 1975, "Einige iranische Namen auf Inschriften oder Papyri", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 17, pp. 15–24.
—— 1987–90, "Mamit(i)aršu", *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 7, Berlin - New York, p. 329.
Schwemer D. 2001, *Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyrien im Zeitalter der Keilschriftlkulturen. Materialien und Studien nach den schriftllichen Quellen*, Wiesbaden.
—— 2008, "The Storm-Gods of the Ancient Near East: Summary, Synthesis, Recent Studies, Part I", *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 7/2, pp. 121–168; "Part II", *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 8/I, pp. 1–44.

Selz G. 1995, *Untersuchungen zur Götterwelt des altsumerischen Stadtstaates von Lagaš*, Philadelphia.

Stamm J. J. 1939, *Die akkadische Namengebung*, Leipzig.

Stark J. K. 1971, *Personal Names in Palmyrene Inscriptions*, Oxford.

Starke F. 1990, *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Namens*, Wiesbaden.

Steiner R. C. 1977, *The Case for Fricative-Laterals in Proto-Semitic*, New Haven.

—— 1991, "Addenda to the Case for Fricative-Laterals in Proto-Semitic", in A. Kaye (ed.), *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau*, Wiesbaden, pp. 1499–1513.

Steinkeller P. 1993, "Observations on the Sumerian Personal Names in Ebla Sources and on the Onomasticon of Mari and Kish", in M. E. Cohen, D. C. Snell, D. B. Weisberg (eds.), *The Tablet and the Scroll. Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo*, Bethesda, pp. 236–244.

Stol M. 1991, "Old Babylonian Personal Names", *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico* 8, pp. 191–212.

Stone L. 1971, "Prosopography", *Daedalus* 100, pp. 46–79.

Tallqvist K. L. 1905, *Neubabylonisches Namenbuch zu den Geschäftsurkunden aus der Zeit des Šamaššumukîn bis Xerxes*, Helsingfors.

—— 1914, *Assyrian Personal Names*, Helsingfors.

Tischler J. 2002, "Zur Morphologie und Semantik der hethitischen Personen- und Götternamen", in M. P. Streck, S. Weninger (eds.), *Altorientalische und semitische Onomastik*, Münster, pp. 75–84.

Trémouille M. C. 1997, *^{d}Hebat. Une divinité syro-anatolienne*, Firenze.

Van Langedonck W. 2007, *Theory and Typology of Proper Names*, The Hague.

Vattioni F. 1970, "Epigrafia aramaica", *Augustinianum* 10, pp. 495–532.

von Soden W. 1969, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (*Analecta Orientalia* 33/47), Roma.

Weninger S., Khan G., Streck M. P., Watson J. C. E. (eds.) 2011, *The Semitic Languages*, Berlin - Boston.

Zadok R. 1976, "Geographical and Onomastic Notes", *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of the Columbia University* 8, pp. 113–126.

—— 1977a, "Historical and Onomastic Notes", *Die Welt des Orients* 9, pp. 35–56.

—— 1977b, *On West Semites in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods: an Onomastic Study*, Jerusalem.

—— 1978, "Phoenicians, Philistines, and Moabites in Mesopotamia", *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 230, pp. 57–65.

—— 1979a, "On Some Foreign Population Groups in First-Millennium Babylonia", *Tel Aviv* 6, pp. 164–181.

—— 1979b, "On Some Non-Semitic Names in Cuneiform Sources", *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 14, pp. 294–301.

—— 1981, "Arabians in Mesopotamia during the Late-Assyrian, Chaldean, Achaemenian and Hellenistic Periods Chiefly According to Cuneiform Sources", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 131, pp. 42–84.

—— 1983, "A Tentative Structural Analysis of Elamite Hypocoristica", *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 18, pp. 93–120.

—— 1984, *The Elamite Onomasticon*, Napoli.

—— 1986, "Die nichthebräischen Namen der Israeliten vor dem hellenistichen Zeitalter", *Ugarit-Forschungen* 17, pp. 387–398.

—— 1991a, "Elamite Onomastics", *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico* 8, pp. 225–237.

—— 1991b, "On the Onomasticon of the Old Aramaic Sources", *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 48, pp. 26–40.

—— 1993, "On the Amorite Material from Mesopotamia", in M. E. Cohen, D. C. Snell, D. B. Weisberg (eds.), *The Tablet and the Scroll. Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo*, Bethesda, pp. 315–333.