129) Four Loanwords in Neo-/Late-Babylonian[1] — The case for an Aramaic derivation of 1. *he-sa-a-nu* is presented below. It has long been proposed that 4. *la-mu-ta-nu* is originally Aramaic; its structure and morphological parallels are thoroughly investigated below, thereby freeing it from isolation. 3. *kūzu* and a form resembling 2. *kandaku* are recorded later in Middle Iranian, but not in Old Iranian which is contemporary with NB/LB. All the Indo-Iranian comparanda are devoid not only of Old Iranian forerunners, but also– as far as I can see- of any cognates within the wider Indo-European linguistic framework (cf., e.g., Mayrhofer 1992: 363, s.v. *kuṇḍa*-). It seems that like many terms of realia, *kandaku* and *kūzu* are originally culture words.

　1. *he-sa-a-nu* (4x: BE 9, 94, 4; PBS 2/1, 194, 3, 14; UCP 9/3: 276, 23) with the variants *he-sa-an- nu/ni* (3+4 = 6x),[2] *he-sa-nu* (9x)[3] and *ah/eh-he-sa-nu* (2x, BE 10, 65, 16, le.e. The defective spelling *he- s*[*a-*...] in Donbaz and Stolper 1997, 52, 20 is not taken into account) is recorded in the name of an organization (*haṭru*) of dependents of the *šušānu*-class. The bow-fiefs of this organization are explicitly recorded in the Murašû archive from Nippur between 20.I.22 Art. I = 443 and 4.VII.4 Dar. II = 420 BC (see Stolper 1985: 77, 84-85). They were scattered in at least six settlements. They were administered by the foremen (sg. *šaknu*) Kāṣiru s. of Bēl-nāṣir (Kṣr s. of Blnṣr on the Aramaic docket) in the earliest occurrence (Stolper 1985: 3a, 2, le.e.: with a cylinder seal, Bregstein 1994: 613:215), by Iddin-Marduk on 25.XIIb.29 Art. I = 435 BC (Donbaz and Stolper 1997, 52, le.e., cf. 18ff.; he apparently had a representative), and by Bēl-šarra-uṣur s. of Marduk-bēlšunu from 20.VI.41 Art. I = 424 BC (at the latest) until the latest mention. Bēl-šarra-uṣur was represented in many transactions by his "brother" (presumably colleague) Aplâ. The dependents of the *šušānu*-class are described as *mārē* (DUMU^meš) *he-sa-a-nu* (etc.). This compound designation can be compared with that of the dependents of the *šušānu*-class of the foremen's estate (*bīt-šaknūtu*) in the same archive. That designation, viz. ^lú*šu-šá-né-e mārē* (DUMU^meš) *šaknūtu* (^lú*šak-nu*^meš),[4] alternates with ^lú*šu-šá-né-e šá bīt* (É) ^lú*šak-nu-tu*.[5] This alternating designation is rendered as "*šušānu*s of the estate of foremen = "*šušānu*s 'sons' (i.e. members of the class) of foremen".[6]

　Unfortunately, the information presented above does not contain a clue for the meaning of the name of the organization. The tentative rendering of *he-sa-a-nu* (etc.) by Cardascia (1958: 59, n. 2) as "guardsmen" is unfounded. The word has no Iranian etymology (despite CAD H: 201: "probably Old Pers. lw."), but might have been borrowed from Aramaic. The LB form renders *ʼaḥsān* which is identical with the base of the infinitive of the Aramaic causative (C) stirps. SA *ḥsnh* renders BHeb. *ʼḥzh* (Gen. 23, 9) "possession". Perhaps it originates from a form *ʼḥsnt* (see Tal 2000: 287a). JAram. (Targ.) *ʼḥsn'* renders BHeb. *nḥlh* "inheritance" (see Tal 1975: 22, 99, 103, also in Onkelos; Neofiti *byt ʼḥsnw* and QA *ʼḥsnw* is with the feminine suffix –*w*, Cook 2015: 6). The word is recorded also in JBA and JPA *ʼḥsnh* "inheritance" (Kaufman and Sokoloff 1993: 34-35, to Ḥ-S-N, C "to maintain or acquire possession"). The suffix of the infinitive of the C stirps is interchangeable: it ends with the feminine suffix in Western Late Aramaic (JPA, SA, CPA and OSyr.), but with –*y* in Eastern Late Aramaic (JBA, -*yʼ* in Mandaic, cf. Bar-Asher Siegal 2016: 137-138:5.4). The infinitive of the C stirps is recorded without suffix in Old Aram. *hskr* "to deliver, hand over" from Sfire (cf. Degen 1969: 70; Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995, 2: 786, s.v. *skr*₁). Two rare substantives without an ending, namely JPA *ʼpsd* "loss" and *ʼtmh* "question (mark", see Ben-Ḥayyim 1967, 3/2: 218- 219, n. ad 65), are analogous to the infinitive of the C stirps. It seems that they are ancient survivals. It may be argued that the pristine form of the C-infinitive was without suffix, like the situation in Biblical Hebrew.[7] The LB term, which may reflect *ʼaḥsān* (> *ḥsān* is exemplified by the two occurrences of *ah-he-sa-nu* in the same document, cf. SA *ḥsnh*), would resemble these early forms. The interchange of <-*an-ni/nu*> with <-*a-nu*> in about half of the occurrences very probably renders an oxytone. This is not contradicted by the impressive number of the shorter spelling *he-sa-nu* (9x) because this defective spelling was dictated by lack of space as it mostly occurs either in captions of seals (4x) or at the end of lines (2x). My decision to transcribe –*ā*- after the 2nd radical is compatible with the MT vocalization of the C-infinitives of Biblical Aramaic in the same position with *qāmeṣ* (marked in bold), viz. *ʼḥwyt* (cstr. st.), *hktbh*, *hnsqh*, *hnzqt* (cstr. st.), *hṣlh*, *hškḥh*, *hšnyh*, *hšplh*, *hwbdh*, *hwdʼh*, and after the 1st radical in verbs with identical 2nd and 3rd radicals (*hʼlh*) and verba mediae infirmae (*hzdh* as well as *hqmwt* and *htbwt*). It stands to reason that the LB form renders an Aramaic abstract noun with the meaning "inheritance, possession". Its 1st meaning is the same as *ia-a-ri-tu-tu/ia-ri-tu-tu* "inheritance" (CAD I/J: 325-326, cf. Abraham and Sokoloff 2011: 56b:271), which is borrowed in NB. The estates employing *šušānu*s belonged to the palatial system (the only exception may be that of Itti-Šamaš-balāṭu in view of the Babylonian name of its owner). Regarding terminology, "inheritance, possession" as an estate name, can be compared with the name of the estate of the treasury (*nakkandu*) in the same archive (cf. Stolper 1985: 77, 89). The term *he-sa-a-nu* (etc.) is never preceded by *bīt*, presumably because "inheritance, possession" generally contains landed property as its core component, especially if it is part of the palatial sector (unlike *byt ʼḥsnw* above which refers to a familial landed property).

2. kandaku - *ka-an-da-ki-šú*, viz. ”his k.” (hapax), a container, is mentioned in an undatable letter (CT 22, 44, 12, see CAD K: 148a). It apparently ends with the very common Old Iranian suffix -*ka*-, attached to an –*a* stem. Unlike the sequence –*a-k* in this case, the only Iranian comparandum, viz. *k/qndwg* "storage jar" (with Middle Persian *k > g*, the –*k* is retained in the loanword *khanduk* in Armenian), ends in –*ūk* (< Old Iran. -*ūka*-). OSyr. k*ndyqwn'* (diminutive, see Ciancaglini 2008: 196-197 where all the later comparanda are discussed) shows that the suffix -*wk*- interchanges with -*yk*-, but an ascertained interchange with –*ak* cannot be demonstrated. The word is not recorded in the restricted Old Iranian corpus.

3. ku-ú-zu in the deed BM 84129(, 8', not –SU as erroneously read by Roth 1989: 25, collated on 18.2.2020) renders *kwz* (JPA, JBA, Mand. *kwz'*) "pitcher". The deed is a typical late Achaemenid –early Hellenistic thick tablet with a ring seal, presumably from the Babylonian Isthmus. Ciancaglini (2008: 191) is of the opinion that the word was borrowed from Iranian. There are no ascertained Old Iranian cognates and it should be remembered that none of the comparative Iranian cognates predates the Middle Iranian stage. This word, like k*ndwg* (2 above), was well-integrated in later Aramaic where JBA has also forms with Aramaic suffixes, viz. k*wzt'* and *kwzynt'*, presumably diminutives (analogous to the case of OSyr. kndyqwn', above, 2).

4. la-mu-ta-nu (*lawûtānu*) "slave, retainer" is based on a form deriving from L-W/Y-Y "to join, accompany, escort, attend" (Aram., Heb., cf. Minaic *lw'*)[8] as its <V*m*V> can render /*w*/ in NB/LB (CAD L: 77-78, cf. Fales 1980: 263). There is a certain overlapping between the status and function of the *la-mu-ta-nu*-s and that of the *qallu*-slaves: The same person is defined as *lawûtānu* and *qallu* at the same time.[9] In one case it is stated: [lú]*la-mu-ta-nu* ÌR^meš-*ka*, i.e. "the *lawûtānu*s, your servants" (TCL 9, 118 = Levavi 2018, 50, 6, probably time of Nbk. II). Pairs of slaves as well as groups consisting of three and four slaves are described as [lú]*la-mu-ta-nu*: pair (OECT 10, 357, 4'); groups (Wunsch, Urkunden, 38, Larsa, 17.X.6 Nbn. = 549 BC); [lú]*la-mu-ta-*[*nu*] (Babylon, 18.VI.3 Nerigl. = 557 BC, Wunsch, Egibi, 15) refers to two individuals. *La-mu-ta-nu* is both singular and plural, presumably because its –*ān*, being homophonous with the suffix of the Akkkadian masculine plural as it was probably pronounced in NB/LB (-*ān* < -*āni*), was perceived as a plural form by the Babylonian scribes where the context required it. Due to this perception, the hapax *la-mu-tu₄* with the same denotation as *la-mu-ta-nu* can be regarded as a back formation.

Since *la-mu-ta-nu* or any closely resembling form does not exist in any Aramaic dialect, Abraham and Sokoloff (2011: 39a:117) are sceptic whether V*m*V here = /*w*/, but this can be supported by the numerous spellings with a single *m* (at least 30x, plus the hapax *la-mu-tu₄*, cf. just above; there is only one exception, viz. *lam-mu-ta-nu*[10]) and *la-ú-ta-*[*ni-šú*] (Nbn. 1098, 5), provided the restoration is correct. They admit that the derivation is theoretically possible. Streck (2010: 651 with n. 35) presents forms deriving from L-W/Y-Y in support of an Aramaic derivation. The compound suffix –(*a*)*t-ān* forms adjectives in Aramaic (see Nöldeke 1875 [1964]: 57, 139; Duval 1881 [1969]: 236-237:251; Brockelmann 1908 [1961]: 392-393:215; Macuch 1965: 196; 143, b) and Middle Hebrew (cf. Segal 1936: 83:133). It was pointed out that in most cases these adjectives are not based on abstract nouns or on substantives ending in –*t*, but on adjectives of the *qtwl*-formation (see Nöldeke 1904: 78-79:129c). There are ample cases of adjectives of the *qatūl-t-ān* pattern, viz. OSyr. *'ywqtn'* "sorrowful, melancholic", *dḥwltn'* "fearful", *ḥywstn'* "compassionate", *nkwltn'* "cunning, crafty", *rgwštn'* "sensitive", *rgwztn'* "angry, very irascible" (cf. JPA *rwgzn* "quarrelsome"), *rywgtn'* "lustful, voluptuous, avaricious" (from R-G-G "to desire greatly" conflated with the verba mediae infirmae class), *ṣnw'tn'* "sly", *šgwštn'* "turbulent", *špwrtn'* "low, cringing flatterer, sycophant", *śkltn'*/*skwltn'* "intelligent" (JPA *swkltn*, cf. *śkl'* "mind"); and *yṣwptn'* "diligent, careful". Hence the NB/LB form can originate from **lawūy-t-ān* and normalized as **lawûtān* with contraction of -*y*- (to *qatūl*). It is well-established that -*ān* is an adjectivising suffix, but it can be argued that also –(*a*)*t* has the same function in few cases. In addition, <*la-mu-ta-nu*> cannot be based on nominal forms of L-W/Y-Y, such as CPA *lwyt'*, JPA *lwyyt'* and Mand. *lwita*/*lwayta* "party, company, accompaniment" (Sokoloff 2017: 304a), which are of different formations.

It should be pointed out that *lawûtānu* refers to both sexes: a female slave and her one-year daughter are defined as *lawûtānu* (see Zadok 2019: 206 ad B.I.3 = IAC 225, 8-9). The form *la-ta-*(*a*)-*nu*, which invariably refers to females (8x), is thought to be related. CAD (L: 77-78) list both forms together without assigning a sub-section for *lâtānu* which is considered a mere variant, apparently an allegro form. This variation reminds one of the homonymous pair BHeb. *lwytn* (LXX Λευιαθαν, i.e. *qitl+-at-ān*, cf. Mand. *lywy't'n*, Nöldeke 1875 [1964]: 57): Ug. *ltn* (a mythical monster, del Olmo Lete et al. 2015, 2: 502), but this does not imply a continuity given the very long chronological gap as well as the different meaning. The shorter forms are thought to originate from the longer ones, viz. *lâtān < *lawâtān < *lawayatān* (see Tropper 2012: 272:51.46, e.). It can be envisaged that *lātānu* originated from *lawûtānu* with omission of –*wû*-, with the result that the -*a*- of the 1st syllable has undergone a compensatory lengthening. Emerton (1982) suggested for ltn a vocalization **lītānu* (< **līyitānu < *liwyatānu* in view of LXX -ε-. Both he and Tropper do not mention the NB/LB appellatives.

Lawûtānu-people belonging to the temple are recorded from the late Sargonid (c. 652-649 BC (ABL 960 = Parpola 2018, 106, rev. 1, cf. 92 ad loc. and 148b) until the early Achaemenid period (cf. the letters BIN 1, 15, 5; CT 22, 213, 14; TCL 9, 118 = Levavi 2018, 50, 6; YOS 6, 246 and YOS 3, 160, 14; 193, 26). They also belonged to private individuals and to officials.

Notes

1. Abbreviations (mostly of editions of cuneiform texts) are as in A.L. Oppenheim et al. (eds.), *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago and Glückstadt 1956-2010), unless otherwise indicated. The months (in Roman figures) are the Babylonian ones. Abbreviated rulers' names: Art. = Artaxerxes; Dar. = Darius; Nbk. = Nebuchadnezzar; Nbn. = Nabonidus; Nerigl. = Neriglissar. Non-bibliographical abbreviations: Aram. = Aramaic; BHeb. = Biblical Hebrew; CPA = Christian Palesinian Aramaic; cstr. st. = construct state; Iran. = Iranian; JAram. = Jewish Aramaic; JBA = Jewish Babylonian Aramaic; JPA = Jewish Palestinian Aramaic; Mand. = Mandaic; OSyr. = Old Syriac; QA = Qumran Aramaic; s. = son; SA = Samaritan Aramaic; Sem. = Semitic.

2. *he-sa-an-nu* (BE 10, 14, 4; 49, 4; PBS 2/1, 30, 2); *he-sa-an-ni* (BE 10, 61, 5; Donbaz and Stolper 1997, 83, 10; PBS 2/1, 162, 13).

3. BE 10, 61, 17; PBS 2/1, 54, u.e.; 63, 14, 18 (end of line), u.e. (caption); 66, lo.e. 1 (caption); 87, 13, 17 (end of line); 194, le.e. (caption).

4. $^{lú}\ulcorner ha\urcorner$-*aṭ-ri šá* $^{lú}šu$-[*šá-né*]-$\ulcorner e\urcorner$ DUMU^{meš} $^{lú}šak$-$nu^{meš}$; $^{9lú}\ulcorner ha\urcorner$-*aṭ-ri šá* $^{lú}šu$-[*šá-né*]-*e* DUMU^{meš} $^{lú}šak$-$nu^{meš}$ (BE 10, 112, 3, 9); $^{lú}šak$-*nu* (no PN) *šá* $^{lú}šu$-*šá-né-e*^{6}, ^{12}DUMU^{meš} $^{lú}šak$-$nu^{meš}$ (BE 10, 112, 5f., 11f.); $^{lú}šak$-*nu šá* $^{lú}šu$-*šá*-$nu^{meš}$ ^{12}DUMU$<^{meš}>$ *šá* $^{lú}šu$-*šá-nu-tu* (BE 10, 64, 11f.).

5. $^{lú}\ulcorner ha\urcorner$-*aṭ-ri šá* $^{lú}šu$-*šá-né-e šá* É $^{lú}šak$-*nu-tu*; $^{lú}šak$-*nu šá* ^{lú}[*šu-šá*$\urcorner$-*né-e šá* É $^{lú}šak$-*nu-tu* (PBS 2/1, 117, 5, le.e); ^{lú}ha-*aṭ-ri* $^3šá$ $^{lú}šu$-*šá*-$nu^{meš}$ *šá* É $^{lú}šak$-*nu-tú* (PBS 2/1, 181, 2f.); ^{lú}ha-*aṭ-ri šá* $^{lú}šu$-*šá-né-e* $^5šá$ É $^{lú}šak$-*nu-*[*tú*]; $^{lú}šak$-*nu* $^6\ulcorner šá\urcorner$ É $^{lú}šak$-*nu-tú* (PBS 2/1, 226, 5f.).

6. See Stolper 1985: 77:41, but cf. *šušānu* DUMU^{meš} ENGAR^{meš} lit. "*šušānu*s 'sons' of *ikkaru*s" (cf. Stolper 1985: 77:46: "*šušānu*s 'sons' of field hands"), which need not be a complementary apposition. It is not contradicted by the rendering "field hands" since *ikkaru* covers a wide spectrum and does not display a linear degradation, but can be a genitive compound, expressing dependency, viz. "*šušānu*s dependents of the *ikkaru*s", "the farmers' *šušānu*s" as rendered by CAD I/J: 54b, s.v. *ikkaru* in *mār ikkari*, c; *mār ikkari* is of the same type as JBA *br ḥmr*. They are the semantic equivalents of "ploughman" and "donkey driver" respectively (cf. JBA *br 'mwd'y = 'mwd'h* "driver", Sokoloff 2002: 139a, 234b).

7. It seems that the insertion of –*t* was motivated by its function as a substantive, the more so since it interchanges with –*w* (constr. state –*wt*), a suffix of abstract nouns: e.g., BAram. *ḥṣlh/ḥṣlw* and *hwdʿh/hwdʿw* (cf. *hqmwt* and *htbwt*, for the alternation see Muraoka 1997: 207-208) and JPA *'ḥsn'/'ḥsnw*. It is noteworthy that –*n* was inserted to the Old Sabaic C-infinitive *hqtl* in the later stage of this Ancient South Arabian dialect and that verbal nouns of C-verbs, viz. *'/hqtlt,* end in –*t* (cf. Stein 2013: 60-61:4.2.2.7 ad *'/hfʿlt* and 85:7.2.1 ad *hfʿl/hfʿln*). This typological analogy may corroborate the special relationship between early Aramaic and Sabaic which is advocated by Kottsieper and Stein 2014.

8. See Albright 1919: 184 who is followed by von Soden, AHw.: 534a, s.v. *lam/wūtānu*. More documentation is presented by Bongenaar, NB Ebabbar: 301, 311, 334-336, 341, 343, 365 ad CT 55, 850, 2; 866, 4-5; 57, 491, 2-5 and BM 63962, 4.

9. Cf. Bongenaar, NB Ebabbar: 315, 317-318, 339. For a thorough discussion with most of the pre-1984 material see Dandamayev 1984: 94-96. Additional references have the same spelling (e.g. *la-mu-ta-nu*, OECT 10, 53, 4, 11; cf. Zadok 2018: 125-126:CUA 5b). PN$_1$ and PN$_2$ ^{lú}la-*mu-ta-nu* of 9 PN$_3$, Zazannu, 13 Dar. I = 509/8 BC, Zawadzki 2000: 736-737:5, 8f.).

10. BIN 1, 33, 36 and Nbk. 207, 2 respectively. The former refers to several dependents; I suspect that the scribe regarded –*ūt* in this case as the plural form of a masculine adjective.

Bibliography

ABRAHAM, K. and SOKOLOFF, M. 2011. Aramaic Loanwords in Akkadian – A Reassessment of the Proposals. *AfO* 51: 22-76.

ALBRIGHT, W.F. 1919. Notes on Assyrian Lexicography and Etymology. *RA* 16: 173-194.

BAR-ASHER SIEGAL, E.A. 2016. *Introduction to the Grammar of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*. LOS III: Aramaic, 3. 2nd Revised and Extended Ed. Münster.

BEN-ḤAYYIM, Z. 1967. *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans*, 3/2. Jerusalem (in Hebrew).

BREGSTEIN, L. 1994. *Seal Use in Fifth Century B.C. Nippur, Iraq: A Study of Seal Selection and Sealing Practices in the Murašû Archive*, doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1993. Ann Arbor.

BROCKELMANN, C. 1908. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen 1: Laut- und Formenlehre*. Berlin (repr. Hildesheim 1961).

CARDASCIA, G. 1958. Le fief dans la Babylonie achéménide, in Les liens de vassalité et les immunités. *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin* 1. 2nd ed. Brussels: 57-88.

CIANCAGLINI, C.A. 2008. *Iranian Loanwords in Syriac*. Beiträge zur Iranistik 28. Wiesbaden.

COOK, E.M. 2015. *Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic*. Winona Lake.

DANDAMAYEV, M.A. 1984. *Slavery in Babylonia from Nabopolassar to Alexander the Great (626-331 BC)*. DeKalb.

DEGEN, R. 1969. *Altaramäische Grammatik*. AKM 38/3. Wiesbaden.

DONBAZ, V. and STOLPER, M.W. 1997. *Istanbul Murašû Texts*. PIHANS 79. Leiden.

DUVAL, R. 1881. *Traité de grammaire syriaque*. Paris (repr. Amsterdam 1969).

EMERTON, J.E. 1982. *Leviathan and Ltn: the Vocalization of the Ugaritic Word for the Dragon*. VT 32: 329-331.

FALES, F.M. 1980. Accadico e aramaico: livelli dell'interferenza linguistica. *Vicino Oriente* 3: 243-267.

HOFTIJZER, J. and JONGELING, K. 1995. *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*, 1-2. HdO I/21. Leiden.

KAUFMAN, S.A. and SOKOLOFF, M. 1993. *A Key-Word-in-Context Concordance to Targum Neofiti*. Baltimore and London.

KOTTSIEPER, I. and STEIN, P. 2014. Sabaic and Aramaic — a common origin? *PSAS* 44: 81-87.

LEVAVI, Y. 2018. *Administrative Epistolography in the Formative Phase of the Neo-Babylonian Empire*. Spätbabylonische Briefe 2. Dubsar 3. Münster.

MACUCH, R. 1965. *Handbuch of Classical and Modern Mandaic*. Berlin.

MAYRHOFER, M. 1992. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, 1. Heidelberg. N.A.B.U. 2020 n° 4 (décembre) – 273 –

MURAOKA, T. 1997. Notes on the Aramaic of the Achiqar Proverbs, in Wardini, E. (ed.), Built on Solid Rock: *Studies in Honour of Professor Ebbe Egede Knudsen on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday April 11th 1997*. The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, Oslo. Ser. B, 98. Oslo: 206- 215.

NÖLDEKE, Th. 1875. *Mandäische Grammatik*. Halle (repr. Darmstadt 1964).

— 1904. *Compendious Syriac Grammar*. London.

DEL OLMO LETE, SANMARTÍN, J. and WATSON, G.E. 2015. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*, 1, 2. HdO I/112. 3rd ed. Leiden and Boston.

PARPOLA, S. 2018 (with an Introduction by S. Ito). *The Correspondence of Assurbanipal, Part I: Letters from Assyria, Central Babylonia, and Vassal States*. SAA 21. Helsinki.

ROTH, M.T. 1989. *Babylonian Marriage Agreements, 7th-3rd Centuries B.C.* AOAT 222. Neukirchen-Vluyn.

SEGAL, M.Z. 1936. *Dqdwq Lšwn hMšnh*. Tel Aviv.

SOKOLOFF, M. 2002. *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods*. Dictionaries of Talmud, Midrash and Targum 3 and Publications of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project. Ramat Gan.

— 2017. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*. Dictionaries of Talmud, Midrash and Targum 1 and Publications of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project. 3rd Revised and Expanded Edition. Ramat Gan.

STEIN, P. 2013. *Lehrbuch der sabäischen Sprache*. 1 Teil: Grammatik. SILO 4, 1. Wiesbaden.

STOLPER, M.W. 1985. *Entrepreneurs and Empire: The Murašû Archive, the Murašû Firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia*. PIHANS 54. Istanbul.

STRECK, M.P. 2010. Innovations in the Neo-Babylonian Lexicon, in Kogan, L. and Koslova, N.V. (eds.), *Languages in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 53e RAI (Moscow and St. Petersburg 2007)*. Babel und Bibel 4. Orientalia et Classica 30. Moscow: 647-660.

TAL, A. 1975. *The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets and Its Position within the Aramaic Dialects*. Tel Aviv (in Hebrew).

— 2000. *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic* 1-2. HdO 50/1. Leiden.

TROPPER, J. 2012. *Ugaritische Grammatik*. AOAT 273. 2nd ed. Münster.

ZADOK, R. 2018. *People from Countries West and North of Babylonia during the Reign of Nebuchadnezzar*. HeBAI 7: 112-129.

— 2019. Documentation from the Babylonian Countryside or about It during the Long 6th Century BCE, in Avioz, M., Minka, O. and Shemesh, Y. (eds.), *Ben Porat Yoseph: Studies in the Bible and Its World. Essays in Honor of Joseph Fleishman*. AOAT 458. Münster: 183-213.

ZAWADZKI, S. 2000. Zazannu and Šušan in the Babylonian Texts from the Archive of the Ṣāhit ginê Family, in Dittmann, R. *et al*. (eds.), *Variatio Delectat. Iran und der Westen. Gedenkschrift für Peter Calmayer*. AOAT 272. Münster: 723-744.

Ran ZADOK