

Line 4: A similar description appears in Ann. 13*:5, where the long list of coastal towns (lines 4-5) is close with the words "which are on [the shore] of the sea, together with (other) towns [(and) emporiums] (*a-di URU^{MES} [É ka-ri]*)".

Line 6: Tadmor restored it [*a-di lib-bi URU^{Qa}-ni-te*, i.e., biblical Kenath (Num 32:42; 1 Chr 2:23), modern Qanawat in the Hauran. I restored it [*a-di URU^{Mi-in}-ni-te*, i.e., biblical Minnith (Judg 11:33), on the western border of the Kingdom of Ammon (N. Na'aman, "Rezin of Damascus and the Land of Gilead", *ZDPV* 111 (1995), pp. 105-106). Abel-shiṭṭi is biblical Abel-shittim (Num 33:49; abbreviated as Shittim in Num 25:1; Josh 2:1; 3:1), in southwestem Gilead, east of the city of Jericho. It is clear that the Assyrians considered the land of Gilead as part of the annexed Damascene territory. It seems to me that the Gilead was included in the province of Qarnini, which is why a province named Gilead is not included in the lists of Assyrian provinces.

Episodes describing the conquest or surrender of several Palestinian kingdoms and nomadic groups, including the Kingdom of Israel (lines 15-19), follow the Damascus episode. It supports Tadmor's suggestion that lines 5-8 of Summ. 4 refer to the annexation of Damascus alone. Galil's suggestion that the passage refers to other kingdoms is evidently wrong.

As noted by Tadmor, lines 1-8 of Summ. 4 are closely related to Summ. 9. A text resembling the obverse of the latter text must have covered a slab that was lost and of which Summ. 4 forms the second part (see Tadmor, *ibid.*, p. 137 and Summ. 14). The reverse of Summ. 9 opens with the provinces of central Syria and the coast (lines 1-2) and continues with Damascus (lines 3-4). The first passage may be restored as follows:

I annexed to Assyria [the city of Hata]rikka, as far as Mount Sa[ue], the city of Kashpuna on the shore of the Lower Sea [as far as Mount Ammanana]. [I placed over them] my two eunuchs as governors.

A third text that describes the central Syrian provinces appears in Summ. 6:22-24. Following is a suggested restoration of the text:

22. [*URU^{Ha-ta-rik-ka} a-di KUR^{Sa-u-e} URU^{Ši-mir-ra} KUR^{Ar-qa-a}*

23. [*GN^{URU}Ka-aš-pu-na ša a-ḥi tam-tim e-li-ti*] a-di KUR^{Am-ma-na-na}

24. [*a-na mi-šir māt Aš-šur ú-tir-ra 2 LÚ^{šu-ut-rēši-ia} LÚ^{bēl}-pīḫati eli-šú-nu aš-ku-un*

Notes:

Although the text is badly broken, it may safely be restored on the basis of Summ. 9. The two passages appear after passage(s) that relate(s) the conquest of Bit Agusi and Unqi. They first describe the scope of the province of Hatarikka and then define the scope of the province of Šimirra. Finally they mention the appointment of governors in the two provinces.

In sum, the similarity in structure and words of Summ. 4 and 9 fully corroborates Tadmor's identification of the Damascus episodes in the two inscriptions.

Nadav NA'AMAN (20-02-01)

Dept. of Jewish History, Tel Aviv University

RAMAT AVIV 69978 (Israel)

25) More Iranian Names in Late Babylonian Sources – The following names are all Old Iranian and are attested in Late Babylonian sources from the Achaemenid period. In this article some new reconstructions or translations are being proposed.

1) Ar-ba-'^dmit-ri (FuB 14 17 no.7:3, perhaps U.E.)

This name has been explained as *Arba-miθra-, 'the young friend' or *Arva-miθra-, 'brave through Mithra.'¹ An alternative translation of *Arba-miθra- could be 'young through Mithra.'

2) Pa-at-ni-e-šá (TCL 13 186:17)

Zadok concluded that the Iranian name behind this Babylonian writing begins with *Pati-.² It might, however, be better to divide this name in *Paθnī-, 'woman, wife,' and -aiša-, 'looking for.' For *Paθnī-, see Old Indian pátnī- (SED 582) and Av. *paθnī- in dðmanō.paθnī-, nmānō.paθnī-, 'lady of the house' (AiW 1093), hapathnī-, 'concubine' (AiW 1765). As for -aiša-, we refer to Av. aēš-, 'to look for' (AiW 28-31). Accordingly the Iranian name is *Paθnīaiša-, 'looking for a wife.'

3) Pe-e-mar-di-' (Dar. 427:20)

This is Iranian *Payavrđi-, 'protecting the happiness.' Pāya- is a present stem from Av. pā-, 'to protect' (AiW 885-886) while *vrđi- means 'happiness,' cf. Av. vōrōdi- (AiW 720).

4) Ra-za-am-ár-ma (Camb. 384:2) and Ra-za-am-ú-mar-ga-' (Camb. 384:3)

These names have often been thought to contain the element *razma-, 'battle' (cf. Av. rasman-, AiW 1513-1514).³ Two authors do not agree with this: Hinz believes that the first component of these names is *razam (acc.sg.), 'vine,' while Schmitt rejects the fact that -za-am-V would represent Ir. *razma-.⁴ The problem with Hinz's conclusion is that his research does not result in meaningful names (see below). Schmitt does not give an alternative reconstruction.

Yet there is no problem in assuming a lecture *razma- for these two names. The vocal (V) that Schmitt uses in his argument to deny this reconstruction is of no importance since the rendering of Iranian vocals in Babylonian is not always very accurate. The question that should be asked is whether Bab. C₁V-VC₂- (za-am) can represent Ir. C₁C₂ (/zm/) or not, and it can. This is shown, for example, by the names *Rauxšna-dāta- and *Rauxšna-pāta-, both of whom's first component is normally written Ru-šu-un. This means that Bab. -šu-un- renders Ir. /-xšn-/ and thus that Bab. -za-am- can render /-zm-/. Consequently, the first component of the two names here under discussion is *razma-. An additional argument is that both names appear in one and the same text, so the writing ra-za-am- for /razma-/ might merely be a graphic variant, connected with the particular scribe of Camb. 384.

Let us turn now to the second component of each name. First Ra-za-am-ár-ma will be discussed. Hinz reconstructs *Razambarva-, 'cherishing vines' for this name, but that is impossible, since -ár-ma- does not represent /barva-/. Several other possibilities have been given,⁵ but the most likely one is *Razmarva- 'brave in battle' (Av. aurva-, 'brave,' AiW 200).⁶ As for Ra-za-am-ú-mar-ga-, it can be easily stated that this name is problematic. The second part is written in the same way as the Babylonian versions of OP hauma-varga-, whose second component is not yet clearly analyzed. Yet, in combination with razma-, 'battle,' it is better to reconstruct the prefix hu-, 'good, well,' instead of the word hauma-. The proposal by Gershevitch to read *Razma-hu-arga- would leave the -m- in Ra-za-am-ú-mar-ga-⁷ unexplained.⁸ As for now the precise meaning of Ra-za-am-ú-mar-ga-⁹ remains unknown.

5) Ru-ud-da-a-tú (PBS 2/1 206:12) / Ú-ru-ud-da-at (PBS 2/1 173:18, L.E.)

Dandamayev argues that both names belong to the same person whose Iranian name was *Raudāta-, a derivation from the root raod-, 'to grow' (AiW 1492-1493), while Zadok derives Ú-ru-ud-da-at from *Ahuradāta-, 'created by Ahura'.⁹ Zadok is correct. Firstly, the spelling Ú-ru-ud-da-at does not support an Iranian name starting with an /r/. Secondly, the persons bearing this name cannot be the same, since they have different patronymics. Ruddatu is the son of a certain Ú-mar-[...], while Uruddat is the son of Ú-ḫe-e-bar-ra-².

6) Šā-tat-na-³ (IMT 44:2)

This name is rendering Old Iranian *Šātātāna-. Its first component is without doubt Ir. šāta-, 'prosperous,' which is then followed by two suffixes: the hypocoristic suffix -āta- and the patronymic suffix -āna-.

7) Tu-ú-tu₄ (PT 85: obv.3)

According to Dandamayev the etymology of this name is not known.¹⁰ Bab. Tu-ú-tu₄ could, however, be a representation of an Iranian name *Tavāta-, a hypocoristic of *Tav-, 'to be strong,' see Av. and OP tav- (AiW 638-639).

8) Ú-pár-at-ta (Dar. 458:13)

Most likely we are dealing here with the Babylonian version of Iranian *hu-frata-, 'good and fine.' That a sign with the value /par/ (e.g. -par-, -pár-) can render Iranian /fra/ is shown by the fact that the LB name Par-ta-am-mu (Dar. 379:3) is a representation of Ir. *Fratama-.

9) Ú-ra-a-na-³ (TuM 2/3 189:19, U.E.)

This name has been explained as Iranian *Vārāna-, an -āna-patronymicon of Av. vāra-, 'will' (AiW 1411)¹¹ or as Iranian *Hu-rāna-, 'having beautiful thighs,' Av. ¹rāna- (AiW 1523).¹² A better reconstruction might be *Hu-rāna-, 'he who is a good fighter' to Av. ²rāna-, 'fighter' (AiW 1523). According to Zadok, the spelling U-la-na-³ (PBS 2/1 128:16) represents the same name with an l/r interchange.¹³

10) Uš-ta-pa-nu (IMT 53:7)

The Iranian name behind the Babylonian spelling is *Uštāpāna-, analyzed by Donbaz and Stolper as composed of *Ušta- and *pāna-.¹⁴ The second part of this name is clearly to be connected with *pā- 'to protect.' The first part is considered by Donbaz and Stolper as being the passive perfect participle of the verb vas-, 'to wish, to desire' (AiW 1381-1382). In their view the name has to be interpreted as 'protecting what is desired.' Yet, if one connects the first part of this name with the Av. substantive ušta-, 'happiness, well-being' (AiW 417-418), the result would be the more appropriate name 'protecting happiness.'

Notes

1. W. Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen*. Göttinger Orientforschungen. III. Reihe: Iranica. Band 3 (Wiesbaden, 1975), p. 35.
2. R. Zadok, "Iranians and Individuals bearing Iranian names in Achaemenian Babylonia," *IOS 7* (1977): 99; M.A. Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*. Columbia Lectures in Iranian Studies 6 (Costa Mesa, 1992), p. 113.
3. Gershevitch, apud R. Zadok, "On the Connections between Iran and Babylonia in the sixth Century B.C.," *Iran* 14 (1976): 78; R. Zadok, loc. cit., p. 78.
4. W. Hinz, *Altiranisches*, pp. 203-204; R. Schmitt, review of M.A. Dandamayev, *Iranians*, *Kratylos* 39 (1994): 86.
5. R. Zadok, review of W. Hinz, *Altiranisches*, *BiOr* 33 (1976): 215.
6. *Razma-arma-, 'the arm of the battle' (Av. arma-, 'arm,' AiW 197; Gershevitch, apud Zadok, "Connections," p. 78) or *Razma-arma-, 'firm, tranquil in battle' (Av. armōi-, 'firm, tranquil,' AiW 197; R. Zadok, "Connections," p. 78).

7. Zadok, loc.cit.
8. I. Gershevitch, apud Zadok, "Connections," p. 78.
9. R. Zadok, "Iranians," p. 104 ; M.A. Dandamayev, *Iranians*, p. 117.
10. M.A. Dandamayev, *Iranians*, p.130.
11. R. Zadok, "Iranian Names in Late Babylonian Documents," *IJ* 17 (1975) : 247.
12. I. Gershevitch, apud R. Zadok, loc. cit.
13. R. Zadok, review of M.A. Dandamayev, *Iranians*, BSOAS 58 (1995) : 159.
14. V. Donbaz and M.W. Stolper, "Gleanings from Muršû Texts in the Collections of the Istanbul Archaeological Museums," *N.A.B.U.* 1993/102 ; Id., *Istanbul Murašû Texts*, PIHANS 79 (Istanbul, 1997), p. 4.

Jan TAVERNIER (08-02/01)
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Faculteit Letteren, Blijde Inkomststraat 21
B-3000 LEUVEN (Belgique)
Jan.Tavernier@arts.kuleuven.ac.be

26) An Iranian Ghost-name : *Θuθika-, 'beetle' — One of the many Iranian names, only known by their attestations in the so-called Nebenüberlieferung, is *Θuθika-, a name first analyzed by Gershevitch and connected by him to New Persian sūsk, 'beetle'.¹ It is the intention here to prove that the name *Θuθika-, that has no Middle or New Iranian attestations, is a ghost-name, i.e. a name that never existed and that therefore should be removed from the list of Iranian names.

In order to do this, one has first to assemble all possible spellings that have been connected with this name. There are five such spellings, all Elamite : Du-si-ka₄, Du-tuk-ka₄, Du-ut-tuk-ka₄, Šu-si-ka₄, and Tu-tuk-ka₄. The next step is to find an alternative solution for each of these five writings, which are without any doubt rendering Iranian names. For the occurrences of each spelling we refer to W. Hinz- H. Koch, *Elamisches Wörterbuch*, AMI Ergänzungsband 17 (Berlin, 1987) (= EW).

1) Du-si-ka₄ (EW 377)

This spelling was connected with *Θuθika- by Gershevitch and this connection was accepted by Hinz. However, Mayrhofer has suggested a new explanation : *Tauθikā-, the female equivalent of *Tauθika-, an -ika-hypocoristic of *Tauθ-, Skt. tośá-, 'granting abundantly'.²

2) Du-tuk-ka₄ (EW 379) and Du-ut-tuk-ka₄ (EW 388)

Both these writings were assigned to *Θuθika by Hinz, but Mayrhofer has shown that the Iranian name behind these Elamite spellings is actually *Dūta-ka-, a -ka-hypocoristic of *Dūta-, 'messenger' (Av. dūta-).³

3) Tu-tuk-ka₄ (EW 379)

Gershevitch argues that Elamite Tu-tuk-ka₄ is a rendering of *Dūta-vahu-ka-, but this was rejected by Hinz, who proposed to read *Θuθika-.⁴ This is based on the fact that the Elamite sign -tu- normally renders Iranian /θu/. There is, however, (at least) one exception to this rule : in PF 1647 :6-7 the month name *Dṛnabāžiš is written tu-ur-na-ba-zí-iš, which proves that -tu-, albeit rarely, can render the Ir. consonant /d/. Accordingly, this name can be a representation of the same name as Du-(ut)-tuk-ka₄ and thus can be read *Dūta-ka-, as Mayrhofer already has seen.⁵ An even better solution is to reconstruct a name *Tauθika-, the male equivalent of *Tauθikā- (no. 1). This reconstruction can be perfectly rendered by the spelling Tu-tuk-ka₄.

4) Šu-si-ka₄ (EW 1183)

There is complete concordance among the scholars on the analysis of this name :⁶ it is a clear representation of the Iranian name *Θuθika-. The only dissident opinion comes from Delaunay,⁷ who considers this spelling as a rendering of the Kassite name Šuzigaš.⁸ His proposal, however, is not accepted by the EI.Wb. 1183, that again stresses the fact that Šu-si-ka₄ is certainly Iranian, in particular that it is the Elamite version of *Θuθika-

While it is agreed that we must be looking for an Iranian name, it is not clear that this name is *Θuθika-. A more plausible name behind this spelling could be *Çaučika-, an -ika-hypocoristic of *Çau-ča-, which itself is a -ča-derivation of a short name, originating from a compound with *Çau-, 'capable of,' the Old Persian equivalent of Av. srao-.

As all the spellings that were connected with *Θuθika- have been 'disconnected' from that name, there is no more reason to believe that such a name really existed and that it had a place in the collection of Iranian names.

Notes

1. I. Gershevitch, "Iranian Nouns and Names in Elamite Garb," *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1969, p. 197. This analysis has been accepted subsequently by Hinz and Mayrhofer, see W. Hinz, *Neue Wege im Altpersischen*, Göttinger Orientforschungen. 3. Reihe : Iranica 1 (Wiesbaden, 1973), p. 89 and M. Mayrhofer, *Onomastica Persepolitana : das altiranische*