

(Tavernier 2007, 571). Ama- is a minor Zoroastrian divinity (Boyce s.d.), who, however, enjoyed some popularity with the common population, given the not so low number of names containing his name (cf. Tavernier 2007, 575). This popularity may very well have been connected with the military aspect of Ama-.

Interestingly the text is dated to 29 Ululu, year 1 of the reign of Amēl-Marduk, the king of Babylon. This corresponds with 28 September 561 BC, which puts the presence of this Iranian slave well in the pre-Achaemenid area, when Babylonia was still independent. This makes *Amatavāta- one of the first attestations of an individual bearing an Iranian name in the Babylonian documentation (the oldest being one Median and two Elamites in a ration-list from 592-591, cf. Zadok 1976, 62 and 66).

In all likelihood, *Amatavāta- was ethnically an Iranian woman. Two reasons plead for this. First of all, it was not yet common for Babylonians to adopt Iranian names in the Neo-Babylonian period. In the Achaemenid period, when Babylonia was ruled by Iranian-speaking Persians, some Babylonians did this in the hope that this would enhance their chances to a career in the Achaemenid administration. Secondly, her status as a slave also induces one to believe that she was ethnically Iranian. Possibly, she had been captured by a Babylonian raid along the Iranian border and was brought to Babylon to be sold as a slave. It is this last phase of which ROMCT 2 3 is a testimony.

1) This research has been funded by the Interuniversity Attraction Poles Programme initiated by the Belgian Science Policy Office (IAP VII/14: “Greater Mesopotamia: Reconstruction of its Environment and History”).

2) This analysis has already been briefly mentioned by me in a recently published thorough research on female slave names in the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid periods (Hackl 2013, 181 n.149).

Bibliography

- Boyce, M. s.d., “Ama”, *Enc. Ir.* 1/2, 917 (<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ama-minor-zoroastrian-divinity>; consulted on 18/09/2015).
- Hackl, J. 2013, “Frau Weintraube, Frau Heuschrecke und Frau Gut – Untersuchungen zu den babylonischen Namen von Sklavinnen in neubabylonischer und persischer Zeit”, *WZKM* 103, 121-187.
- Hallock, R.T. 1969, *Persepolis Fortification Tablets* (OIP 92), Chicago.
- McEwan, G.J.P. 1982, *The Late Babylonian Tablets in the Royal Ontario Museum* (Royal Ontario Museum Cuneiform Texts 2), Toronto.
- Tallqvist, K.L. 1914, *Assyrian Personal Names* (Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae 43/1), Helsinki.
- Tavernier, J. 2007, *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period (ca. 550-330 B.C.). Lexicon of Old Iranian Proper Names and Loanwords, Attested in Non-Iranian Texts* (OLA 158), Leuven.
- Villard, P. 1998, “Ammi-iata’ or Ammi-Iata’”, *PNA* 1/I, 104.
- Zadok, R. 1976, “On the connections between Iran and Babylonia in the 6th Century B.C.”, *Iran* 14, 61-78.
- Id., 2009, *Iranische Namen in der neu- und spätbabylonischen Überlieferung* (IPNB 7/1B), Wien.

Jan TAVERNIER

Université catholique de Louvain, FIAL/INCAL/CIOL, Place Blaise Pascal 1 bte L3.03.32
B-1348 LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE, BELGIQUE

107) An Irano-Elamo-Aramaic Note¹⁾ — In various Fortification Texts from Persepolis (Fort. 00X2-101:2’ (Ir-du-maš-[da]), 4’, 1290-102+2177-101:39,45, 2287-102:4; PF 679:4, 1801:4; PFNN 1074:5, 2135:4, 2358:1)²⁾ a name *Ir-du-maš-da* occurs. This is clearly the rendering of an Iranian name and this fact was already quickly recognized.

The first to analyze this name was Émile Benveniste (1966: 84), who argued that *Ir-du-maš-da* renders the Old Iranian name *Rta-vazdā, the nominative singular of *Rta-vazdah- “possessing endurance through Arta”. This proposal was generally accepted by modern scholarship (Mayrhofer 1970, 229 n.35 and 1973, 167 no. 8.617; Hinz 1975, 217; Bogoljubov 1976, 211; Schmitt 2002, 45).

This name is well-established by its occurrences in other languages: Avestan Ašauvazdah-, Middle Persian Ašavazd, Armenian Artavazd, Greek Ἀρταβάζης, Ἀρτάβαζος, Ἀρταβάσδης, Ἀρτάζος, Ἀρταουάζης and Ἀρταουάσδης, Latin Artabazus, Artabazes, Artabasdes, Artavasdes and Artavazdes. It is also attested as Ardavasti in the medieval *Testamentum of the hypatus of Gaeta* (Docibilis I; cf. Mayrhofer 1970, 228-229).

In 2002, however, SCHMITT (2002, 45 n.17) cast doubts on this analysis in a footnote, when he rightfully referred to the Aramaic gloss on the tablet PF 1801 (rev.). There the Aramaic spelling is 'Rtm^rz^d'), a spelling clearly contradictory to an analysis *Rtavazdā, as such a name would have been written 'Rtw^rz^d in Aramaic.

Schmitt's remark was picked up by TAVERNIER (2007, 297-298 no. 4.2.1484; cf. also SCHMITT 2011, 99) who proposed to see Elamite *Ir-du-maš-da* as a rendering of Old Iranian *Rta-Mazdā, the nominative singular of *Rta-Mazdah-, a *dvandva*-compound of the two divine names *Rta- and *Mazdah-.

Nevertheless, this solution is not unproblematic either. The Elamite cuneiform sign DU is frequently attested in Elamite renderings of Old Iranian proper names and loanwords, but never is it the rendering of Ir. -/ta/- in medial position. The only exceptions to this occur when -/ta/- is followed by Ir. /w/, causing vowel colouring, as a result of which the expected El. sign DA was replaced by DU. Two examples are:

(1) El. *Da-ad-du-man-ia* for Ir. Dātavahyah- (Old Persian d-a-t-v-h-y-, in the well-known Bisitun Inscription.

(2) El. *Ir-du-mar-ti-ia* for Ir. Rtavardiya- (Old Persian A-r-t-v-r-di-i-y, also in the Bisitun Inscription).

Summarizing, it is sure that El. *Ir-du-maš-da* and Aram. 'Rtm^rz^d refer to the same name (one individual), but hitherto both the proposed etymologies are problematic.

In order to solve this problem, one has to change his strategy. It is therefore suggested here that the Aramaic spelling is an orthography influenced by the Elamite one. In other words, Aramaic -m- appears here because of the Elamite use of the cuneiform sign MAŠ.

Although strange at first sight, this feature is not isolated. In an article on the use of languages in the Persepolis Fortification and Treasury Archives, TAVERNIER (2008, 74-75) has listed four similar examples, where the Aramaic spellings are most probably influenced by the Elamite ones (for example where the Aramaic makes mistakes against the distinction of voiced and voiceless consonants, a feature unknown in Elamite). The nicest example is PF 1791 where the Aramaic has Mšbd for *Miçapāta- "Protected by Mithra", written as such under influence of the Elamite spelling *Mi-iš-šā-ba-da*, attested in the same text and thus securing the identity of both names.

If this is accepted, then the real Iranian name behind both El. *Ir-du-maš-da* and Aram. 'Rtm^rz^d must be *Rta-vazdah- and so it can be established that Benveniste after all was right in his analysis. The name *Rta-mazdah- should accordingly be removed from the Irano-Elamite onomastical corpus.

1) This research has been funded by the Interuniversity Attraction Poles Programme initiated by the Belgian Science Policy Office (IAP VII/14: "Greater Mesopotamia: Reconstruction of its Environment and History").

2) Please note the following codes for the Elamite texts:

Fort. = Persepolis Fortification tablets, mostly unpublished, cited from draft editions by M.W. Stolper, some available via the Online Cultural and Historical Research Environment (<https://ochre.uchicago.edu/>); images of some available via InscriptiFact (<http://www.inscriptifact.com/>).

PF = Persepolis Fortification texts, published in HALLOCK 1969.

PF-NN = Persepolis Fortification texts in draft editions by R. T. Hallock, cited from collated and corrected editions by W.F.M. Henkelman, some available via the Online Cultural and Historical Research Environment (<https://ochre.uchicago.edu/>); images of some available via InscriptiFact (<http://www.inscriptifact.com/>).

3) And not 'Rtm<z>[d], as previously read (source : OCHRE, PF 1801Ar, consulted on 01/09/2015).

Bibliography

BENVENISTE, É. 1966, *Titres et noms propres en iranien ancien* (Travaux de l'Institut d'études iraniennes de l'Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1), Paris.

BOGOLUBOV, M.N. 1976, "Арамейские транскрипции иранских личных имен в эламских документах из крепостной стены Персеполя", *Philologia Orientalis* 4, 210-214.

HINZ, W. 1975, *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen* (Göttinger Orientforschungen III/3), Wiesbaden.

MAYRHOFER, M. 1970, "Irano-Germanica", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 84, 224-230.

Id. 1973, *Onomastica Persepolitana: das altiranische Namengut der Persepolis-Tafelchen* (Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Klasse 286), Wien.

SCHMITT, R. 2002, *Die iranischen und Iranier-Namen in den Schriften Xenophons* (Iranica Graeca Vetustiora 2 / Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Klasse 692), Wien.

ID. 2011, *Iranische Personennamen in der griechischen Literatur vor Alexander d. Gr.* (Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Klasse 823 / Iranisches Personennamenbuch V/5A), Wien.

TAVERNIER, J. 2007, *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period (ca. 550-330 B.C.). Lexicon of Old Iranian Proper Names and Loanwords, Attested in Non-Iranian Texts* (Orientalia Analecta Lovaniensia 158), Leuven.

ID. 2008, "Multilingualism in the Fortification and Treasury Archives", P. Briant, W.F.M. Henkelman & M.W. Stolper (edd.), *L'archive des Fortifications de Persépolis. État des questions et perspectives de recherches* (Persika 12), Paris, 59-86.

Jan TAVERNIER

108) On seven Ebla fragments (MEE 3 27, 41, 42, 60; MEE 15 77, 79) —

— [1] TM.75.G.4553 = MEE 3 27, published in PETTINATO 1981:92 as part of the "Fish List", is rather a fragment of a Sumerian lexical list of the éš-bar-kin₅ kind.

I read: I:1-4, NE-sumaš(LAK-226) / GAM.GAM-zugud(LAK-352) / sumaš(LAK-226)^{ku6} / [...] ^{ku6} [...]; II:1-3, túg¹(KU)-gùⁿ / [g]íd¹^{u6} / [...] ¹^{u6} / [...]. However, it seems to me that this fragment belongs to the reverse of the tablet. I am not sure it includes the upper edge, as implied by its editor.

— [2] TM.75.G.5807 = MEE 3 41, published in PETTINATO 1981:122 among the "altre liste di uccelli" (but see ARCHI 1992:8, n. 11), is rather a fragment of a Sumerian lexical list of the éš-bar-kin₅ kind.

I read: I':2'-3', [...] / gú-[...] / gú-ba[ra] / ħi-¹túm¹ / [...]; II':1'-5', su-din^{mušen} / numma_x(GÁ.NU₁₁)^{mušen} / buru₅^{mušen} / ir₇^{mušen} / kad₄^{mušen} / [...]. However, it seems to me that this fragment belongs to the reverse of the tablet.

— [3] TM.75.G.11256 = MEE 15 79, published in PICCHIONI 1997:145 among the "frammenti e scaglie non localizzabili" (ibid., p. XVI), is rather a fragment belonging to the acrographic section šu of a Sumerian lexical list of the éš-bar-kin₅ kind, the first column of the obverse.

Its first part runs parallel to TM.75.G.4505 = MEE 15 16 obv. IV':4'-9'. I read: [...] / [š]u-tur / [š]u(-...)-lá² (cf. MEE 15 16 obv. IV':5': šu-[-...]; hardly šu-lá, attested in ED Lú E 116) / [š]u-...-¹x¹ (cf. MEE 15 16 obv. IV':6': šu-t[a]² šu-ti) / [š]u-nir / [š]u-ku₅¹ (PICCHIONI 1997:145 reads [...]BE; cf. MEE 15 16 obv. IV':8': šu-ku₅) / [š]u-si / [š]u-dub / [š]u-bal]-aka / [š]u-ba₄-ti / [š]u-sal / [...] ¹x¹ / [...] ¹x¹ / [...].

— [4] TM.75.G.11294 = MEE 4 111, published in PETTINATO 1982:112 as "Estratto di Vocabolario aj", is rather a fragment of a Sumerian lexical list of the éš-bar-kin₅ kind.

Its text runs parallel to TM.75.G.5629 = MEE 15 22 obv. IV:3-10 (as for the first two terms see Picchioni 1997:167 n. 231). I read: [...] / [e-sag-keš]da / [e-d]ur-¹sag¹-¹ab¹(KAK) / ¹e¹ / ¹a¹ / [igi-íl]a / [a]-ĤI / [š]u-¹munu₄¹ / [š]u-p]aĥ / [...]. However, it seems to me that this fragment belongs to the reverse of the tablet.

— [5] TM.75.G.20123 = MEE 15 77, published in PICCHIONI 1997:144 among the "frammenti e scaglie non localizzabili" (ibid., p. XVI), is rather a fragment belonging to the acrographic section ninda of a Sumerian lexical list of the éš-bar-kin₅ kind.

Its text runs parallel to TM.75.G.2414 = MEE 15 29 obv. I:17-19. I read: [...] / [níg-ni]gin / [ninda]-sikil / [ninda]-sal-sal.

— [6] TM.75.G.20326 = MEE 3 60, published in PETTINATO 1981:246 among the lexical lists (but see ibid., p. 243), is rather a fragment of an administrative text.

The personal name in II:1 is certainly to be read *Zi-ĭb-da-mu*: as *Sag-da-mu*, *Ip-te-da-mu* and *Īl-zi-da-mu*, *Zi-ĭb-da-mu* was one of the Ebla princes, dumu-nita en (see ARCHI et al. 1988:222-232). In I:2 [...] *-x-nu-ba* is a rather unlikely reading; it is instead to be read [...] *-x-nu*^{ki}?

— [7] TM.75.G.20595 = MEE 3 42, was published in PETTINATO 1981:123 among the "altre liste di uccelli".

In my opinion is a fragment belonging to the so-called source C of the Ebla bilingual lexical list, with the four Sumerian bird-names, lacking their Semitic equivalents, which are attested in VE 913-916 (for these entries see the synopsis in PETTINATO 1982:302).

Note that neither photographs nor handcopies of these seven fragments have been published.

Bibliography

ARCHI 1992 "Transmission of the Mesopotamian Lexical and Literary Texts", in P. Fronzaroli ed., *Literature and Literary Language at Ebla*, QuSem 18, Firenze, pp. 1-39.

ID. et alii 1988 "Studies in Eblaite Prosopography", in A. Archi ed., *Eblaite Personal Names and Semitic Name-Giving*, ARES I, Roma, pp. 205-306.