

27) **Arameo-Akkadica**¹⁾ — The words discussed below are either Akkadian borrowings in Aramaic (1-3) or LB renderings of Aramaic words (4). In addition, some Akkadian names in Aramaic transcription are dealt with (5).

1. **'klwšy** (pl.) occurs in the phrase *'klwšy dMḥwz' d'y l' 'bdy ḥlšy* “the . of Mehoza, who, if they do not work, feel faint” (Babylonian Talmud, Bābā M^ošī ā 77a, 16). The textual variants of this *hapax legomenon* are thoroughly discussed by Friedman (1993:412 and passim). The reconstructed sg. **'klwš'* is rendered as “a workman whose job requires physical strength” by Friedman (1993:421-430). He is followed by Sokoloff (2002:131b, s.v.). **'klwš'* cannot be etymologized as Aramaic and does not look Semitic at all. The explanations of several early commentators (from the late Geonic and early post-Geonic period) deserve to be mentioned: Rabbi Hananel (son of Hushiel, Qayrawan, 965-1055 CE) has “these *'klwšy* who carry a jug on a pole” (*ḥny ' dḥ'ny ḥbyṭ' bmwṭ*),²⁾ Rashi (Solomon son of Isaac, 1040-1105 CE) states “they are always used to carry loads” (*rgylm lš't mš'wt tmyd*) and Baruch (son of Samuel) the Sephardic (*hSprdy*, 2nd half of the 12th century CE) equates them (following Rabbi Hananel) with “the porters” (*hktpy*). As I gather from the very detailed and cautious discussion of Friedman (1993:428-429 with nn. 115, 118 and passim), these early commentators were part of an unceasing stream of tradition which continues Geonic learning (JBA was still the vernacular in Babylonia albeit on the verge of demise due to the spread of Arabic); the more so since – as will be shown presently from an entirely different angle – their explanations fall not far off the mark. In view of the context, it can be argued that *'klwš'* has the same denotation as NB/LB *atalluššu* “porter” (for this Akkadian occupational term see Jursa and Weszeli 1996). The difference between the original Akkadian form and its proposed JBA survival is minimal, and it is explicable in phonological terms. The *-t-* of the Akkadian source was assimilated to the following *k* in the Aramaic continuant. It may be surmised that the initial syllable (*at-*) of the original form was unstressed, whereas the final syllable was long. This is indicated both by the geminated *š* in NB/LB (final written vowels like *-u* in this case were not pronounced in NB/LB) and by the Aram. <w>. The stress was very probably on the last syllable and this might have motivated the assimilation of the *-t-*.

2. ***spr mt'***, which is compared with *'nqwlmwš* < οἰκονόμος in the Babylonian Talmud, Bābā Batrā 68b, 8 (Palestinian Talmud *'yqwmns* < *'yqwnwmws*, cf. Levy 1924, 1:70a, 115a, s.v. *'(w)nqlmws*), originates from Akkad. *šāpir māti* “governor” according to Sokoloff (2002:828b, s.v.), who renders it as “town official”. In this case, in view of the initial sibilant, it is an Assyrian form. However, the Akkadian title is recorded only in OB and was in use only in Babylonia and Mari, not in Assyria (cf. CAD Š/1:456-457a, s.v. *šāpiru*, 2a; NB has only the hapax *šāpir ša* GN). Therefore, it seems more likely that *spr mt'*, who in context is described as an official acquainted with all the town's accounts, refers to the town scribe. Scribes functioned also as accountants, and thus they covered also the range of activities of the οἰκονόμος.

3. ***sygny***. *sa-ga-ni-ia* “my officials, superiors” is recorded in a NB letter, which is datable to the 1st half of the 6th century BCE on prosopographical grounds (cf. Levavi 2018:397 ad YOS 3, 142, 26; CAD S:21b). It is the Neo-Assyrian vernacular form of Akkad. *šaknu* with intervocalic /k/ > /g/ (see Fales 1980:264). The /k/ became intervocalic due to anaptyxis (*qatl* > *qatal*, possibly motivated by a sonans /n/) in NA. NB *sa-ga-ni-ia* is the unambiguous evidence for this shift apart from the Aramaic transcriptions (*sgn*) as the NA non-logographic spellings of this title look traditional (mostly *šak-nV*, cf. CAD Š/1:186-187, where only the status constructus - in the minority of cases - is spelled *šak-an-*, assimilated *šá-ka-*).³⁾ The term referring to royal officials was borrowed in NB and lives on in JBA *sygny* “prefects, governors” (paired with *šlyty* “rulers”, cf. Sokoloff 2002:799b, where the Mandaic equivalent is compared, and Müller-Kessler 2011:242 ad 799b). The use of the NA form (borrowed via Aramaic in view of the *qatal*-formation, cf. von Soden 1977:193, i.e. only ultimately a dialect borrowing) instead of *šaknu* which is the standard and very common form in NB with a long and continuous tradition of usage, becomes understandable in view of the fact that several NB terms for royal officials (e.g. *mašemu*, see Jursa 2010:80-81) are originally Assyrian, and struck roots in Babylonia during the hundred years of Assyrian rule.⁴⁾ This seems more likely than the cautious suggestion of Abraham and Sokoloff (2011:48b:199), namely that it “may be attributed to the scribe's spoken Assyrian dialect”, the more so since the NA dialect did not significantly influence the NB one (cf. Beaulieu 2013:366). This belongs to the phenomenon of degradation of terms of the series *šaknu* = (*bēl*) *pīhati* = *ahšadrapānu* (see Stolper 1985:58), all referring both to governors of provinces and to less specific and minor royal officials. As far as *šaknu* is concerned, it referred both to provincial governors and to lower officials as early as the NA period (see Postgate 1980). Hence *šaknu* is a special case within this trio (the distribution of the other two terms is more limited in time and space). For obvious political reasons, this lesser title refers to local potentates and vassals instead of “king”. This is the case of the rulers of MB Amurru and Ugarit (Fales

1984:164-165). In the same manner, NA GAR.KUR = *šaknu* refers to the ruler of Gozan, whose title in the Aramaic parallel text is *mlk* “king” (see Greenfield and Shaffer 1983:110; Fales 1983:249; cf. CAD Š/1:183a, s.v. *šaknu* 1, 5’).

4. Two Aramaic occupational terms in LB

1’. *lú gi-ra-A+A* renders JBA *gyr’h* “arrow maker” (to *gyr’* “arrow”). Iddin-Nabû son of (A) *lú gi-ra-A+A* is recorded in Borsippa, archive of Rē’i-*alpē*, 11.II.14 Dar. I = 508 BCE (BM 26547, 8). His property and that of Nabû-lū-*tābu* son of *Ba-al-la-šū⁵* bordered on Rēmūt-Nabû’s pledged arable land stretching over two sectors of the irrigated area of Iddin-Amurru (see Zadok 2006:411:18 and cf. Waerzeggers 2010:649). This professional term ends with *-āyu* like NB/LB < Aram. *šaqqāyu* “sack maker”, which is spelled *lú šá-qq-qa-A+A* (Camb. 197, 3), *lú šá-qa-A+A* (CT 57, 237, i, 2), *lú šá-qa-A+[A]* (CT 56, 399, 7-8) and *lú šaq-qa-A+A* (CAD S:168b, cf. Bongenaar, NB Ebabbar:554a). Therefore, there is good reason for thinking that also the word for “sack” begins with /š/, the more so since all its spellings start with SAG (= *šaq*) in NB/LB (CAD S:168-169). On the other hand, genuine Akkad. (OA, OB) *saqqu* refers to a cloth. “Sack” in OB (onwards) is *udū* (made of wool) and *bašāmu* in MB (Alalah). Compare perhaps Jewish Palestinian Aramaic *sqy* (Sokoloff 1990:387b), whose meaning is not quite certain, and Middle Heb. *sq’y* “sack maker” (Bar-Asher 2015:1018-1019, 1030, 1040-1041, there is no need to assume here a derivation from a secondary root Š-Q-Y). More such terms are e.g., JBA *dyqwl’h* “basket maker/seller” to *dyqwl’* “a type of basket”, *hql’h* “field worker” (to *hql’* “field”), *sd’h* “maker of stocks” to *sd’* “stock”. (Sokoloff 2002:282-283, 334-335, 480a, 788a). NB *eš-da-A+A* is based on *ēšidu* “harvester”. Here the gentilic suffix is attached to a base which is in itself a professional term. It is analogous to JBA *sqwl’h* “polisher” and *š(’)qwl’h* “porter” (their bases have Old Syriac equivalents, viz. *s/šqwl’*, see Sokoloff 2002:829a, 1173a).6) Cf. 2’ below.

2’. *lūma-gal-la-a* “parchment maker” (not in CAD) presumably goes back to *magall-āy*. This purely Aramaic term from Seleucid Uruk is the equivalent of the hybrid (Arameo-Iranian) *magallatu-karānu* (pl., sg. **magallatu-kara-*) from the Achaemenid period according to Corò 2018:39. The gentilic suffix *-āy* is attached to the base (the word itself ends with fem. *-t*), like *gyn’h* (Mand. *gyn’y’*) “vegetable gardener” (to *gyn’t* “vegetable garden”) and *hww’h* “tavern keeper” (to *hww’t*, Sokoloff 2002:281-282, 473a), cf. 1’ above. It can be surmised that after the fall of the Achaemenid empire the (partially) Iranian term was not in use.

5. Akkadian names on dockets (etc.) compared with such names in purely Aramaic texts. The transcriptions of Akkadian names on Aramaic dockets are thoroughly analyzed by Streck 2017. This note is basically complementary and offers more comparanda. *’dnbnw* does not render *Iddina-Nabû* (pace Zadok 2003a:564:108), but rather *Iddin-Nabû* in view of ([i]dⁿ-*din*-^d+AG (son of Nabû-šuma-ušur descendant of ¹⁹Šarrahu, scribe, Babylon, Bēliya archive, 8.V.8 Dar. I = 514 BCE, BM 96266, 18f.). The sequence < *nn* > reflects a pausa between the two name elements Iddin and Nabû (see Streck 2017:188). An analogous case is Aram. *šnn’d* = NA *Sin-na’id* from Assur (cf. Kaufman 1974:103-104, n. 364). In general, Akkadian (Babylonian) anthroponyms in Official Aramaic texts (from Babylonia and Egypt) match the spellings of the Aramaic epigraphs. Here is a selection:

šwš’blt (< *šamaš-uballit*); *’rdknn* (*Ardi-Kinūni*, cf. CAD K:395b, s.v. *kinūnu*, 2d, all the examples are pre-1st millennium BCE, but the Aramaic transcription proves that this anthroponym was still current in the middle of the 1st millennium BCE); *Lbšnsk^o* (*Lā-abāši-Nuska*); *šwš’htn* (< *šamaš-aha-ittannu*) son of *šmšy* (*šamašāyu*); *’tyblm^r* (*Itti-Bēl-limmir*, written plene in view of *-y-*); and *’lbi* (*Ilu-Bēl*, Dupont- Sommer 1945-46 with interpretation of the whole list from Larsa).

’nwštbls’qb (< *Ninūrta-balāssu-iqbi*); *’nwštly* (< *Ninūrta-ilīya* or < *Ninūrta-lē’i*); *Lbš* (*Lā-abāši*); *Bly* (*Bal(ā)līya*); *Ndn’nwšt* (< *Nādīn-Ninūrta*); *’nwštwsr* (*Ninūrta-ušur*, plene in view of *-wsr-*; the same component is generally spelled *-’sr*, cf. *Mrdkšr’šr*, *Nrglšr’šr* below); *’ll’tn* (*Illil-ittannu*). *šw’dn* (< *šuma-iddina*) is with *VmV* > *VwV*, but *Blšmdn* (*Bēl-šuma-iddina*) in the same ostrakon retains intervocalic *m* (see Montgomery 1908:206-207, where all the other names of this list from Nippur are explained). For *Ninūrta* > NA (*I)nūrta and NB/LB Inūšta* see S. Parpola, PNA 1:xxv.- *’ndblt* (on a docket from the Murašū archive, Achaemenid Nippur) renders the well-attested anthroponym *Andi* (< *Amti*)-*Bēlti* “Bēltu’s maid”; differently Streck 2017:190 ad 145: *Andu* (< *Antu*)-*bēlet* (*Antu* is hitherto not attested in names from this archive). The following examples are from Achaemenid Egypt (Porten [Pearce and Zadok] 2016:8-11):

Bln renders *Bēl-bani*; less likely *Bēl-ibni* in view of the retention of *-’-* in *šrmdn’h* (*šarru-nādin-ahi*), *Mrdkšr’šr* (*Marduk-šarra-ušur*) and *Nbwzr’dn* (*Nabû-zēra-iddina*, also OT like *Nrglšr’šr* = *Nergal-šarra-ušur*). *šbwdnq* (Porten [Pearce and Zadok] 2016:3, 9-10); *-w-* is a plene spelling like in *’nwštwsr* above) renders *šābu-damqu*, which is recorded only in NA (K. Akerman, PNA 3:1162-1163 “the troops are fine”, or rather “the troops are expert, skillful”, cf. CAD D:71a, s.v. *damqu*, 4 ad OIP 2, 70, 31). *Nbwdnq* “Nabû is good” (Porten [Pearce and Zadok] 2016:4, 9) ends with the same component. For *mq* > *nq*, which is more common in NA than in NB/LB see von Soden, GAG3 :40:31f, and cf. CAD D:69-70, 73b, s.v. *damqu*, 1, a, b (already OB), 8; 180-181, s.v. *dumqu* (already in MB Alalakh *du-un-qi-iš*, cf. CAD D:180a). *Bntsr(l)* (*Bānītu-Issār-āli*) and *šndn* (< *Sin-iddina*, Porten [Pearce and Zadok] 2016::5, 11) are typically Assyrian.

Notes

1. Abbreviations of as in CAD unless otherwise indicated. CPA = Christian Palestinian Aramaic; JBA = Jewish Babylonian Aramaic; OSyr. = Old Syriac; Sam. = Samaritan.
2. He is quoted by Rabbi Nathan son of Jeziel of Rome (1035-1103 CE) in his *Aruch completum sive lexicon vocabula et res, quae in libris Targumicis, Talmudicis et Midraschicis continentur* (ed. A. Kohut, Vienna 1878, reprinted New York 1955):236b with n. 9.
3. ADD 88, rev. 1 (see Postgate 1980:67 and cf. CAD Š/1:184b).
4. Aram. *sgn* is also recorded at Persepolis (cf. Kaufman 1974:97-98), where the Aramaic scribes originated from Babylonian in view of their designation there.
5. Apparently a *qattāl*-formation of B-L-Š “to search, inquire” in OSyr., Sam. Aram., CPA, i.e. “searcher, seeker”, cf. Sam. Aram. *blwš*, JBA *blwš* “searcher, seeker” (Tal 2000:101-102); MHeb. *hblšyn* “the searching ones” (Levy 1924, 1:237b ad Mishna Kelim 15, 4, not listed in Bar-Asher 2015:1015-1060).
6. With dropping of short unstressed *-i-*. A variant of the gentilic suffix (with *ā > ē*) is *-wy-* which is extant in *mrwy* “wool dealer” (to *mr* “wool”), *mbrwy* “ferryboat operator” (to *mbr* < *m br* “ferry”), *nptwy* “dealer in *npt*”, and *qštwy* “archer” (Sokoloff 2002:639-640, 760b, 871a, 1051b).

Bibliography

- ABRAHAM, K. and SOKOLOFF, M. 2011. Aramaic Loanwords in Akkadian – A Reassessment of the Proposals. *AfO* 51: 22-76.
- BAR-ASHER, M. 2015. *A Morphology of Mishnaic Hebrew: Introductions and Noun Morphology*, 1/2. Jerusalem (in Hebrew).
- BEAULIEU, P.-A. 2013. Aspects of Aramaic and Babylonian Linguistic Interaction in First Millennium BC Iraq. *Journal of Language Contact* 6: 358-378.
- CORÒ, P. 2018. *Seleucid Tablets from Uruk in the British Museum. Text Editions and Commentary*. Antichistica 16. Studi orientali 6. Venice.
- DUPONT-SOMMER, A. 1945-46. Un ostracon araméen inédit de Larsa. *RA* 40: 143-147.
- FALES, F.M. 1980. Accadico e aramaico: livelli dell'interferenza linguistica. *VO* 3: 243-267.
1983. Le double bilinguisme de la statue de Tell Fekherye. *Syria* 60: 233-250.
1984. An Akkadian Letter from Ugarit between Šaknus. *OrAnt.* 23: 163-166.
- FRIEDMAN, Sh. Y. 1993. *Tyqwny 'rkym lmylwn htlmwdy (g) - 'wklws'- 'wklwz'- 'blrw'-blwz'- 'klwšy- 'blwšy*, in Bar-Asher, M. and Rosenthal, D. (eds.), *Mehqerei Talmud: Talmudic Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Professor Eliezer Shimshon Rosenthal*, 2. Jerusalem: 411-430.
- GREENFIELD, J.C. and SHAFFER, A. 1983. Notes on the Akkadian-Aramaic Bilingual Statue from Tell Fekherye. *Iraq* 45: 109-116.
- JURSA, M. 2010. Der neubabylonische Hof, in Jacobs, B. and Rollinger, R. (eds.), *Der Achämenidenhof/The Achaemenid Court. Akten des 2. Internationalen Kolloquiums zum Thema "Vorderasien im Spannungsfeld klassischer und altorientalischer Überlieferungen. Landgut Castelen bei Basel, 23.- 25. Mai 2007*. Classica et Orientalia, 2. Wiesbaden: 67-106.
- JURSA, M. and WESZELI, M. 1996. *Atkalluššu, der “Träger”. *NABU* 1996/26.
- KAUFMAN, S.A. 1974. *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*. AS 19. Chicago.
- LEVAVI, Y. 2018. *Administrative Epistolography in the Formative Phase of the Neo-Babylonian Empire*. Spätbabylonische Briefe 2. Dubsar 3. Münster.
- LEVY, J. 1924. *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim* 1-4. Berlin and Vienna.
- MONTGOMERY, J.A. 1908. An Aramaic Ostrakon from Nippur and the Greek Obolos. *JAOS* 29: 204-209.
- MÜLLER-KESSLER, Ch. 2011. Beiträge zum Babylonisch-Talmudisch-Aramäischen Wörterbuch. *OrNS* 80: 214-251.
- PNA 1 = RADNER, K. 1998-1999. *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire* 1. Helsinki.
- PNA 3 = BAKER, H.D. 2002-2011. *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire* 3. Helsinki.
- PORTEN, B., PEARCE, L. and ZADOK, R. 2016. Akkadian Names in Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt. *BASOR* 375: 1-12.
- POSTGATE, J.N. 1980. The Place of the Šaknu in Assyrian Government. *AnSt* 30: 67-76.
- VON SODEN, W. 1977. Aramäische Wörter in neuassyrischen und neu- und spätbabylonischen Texte. Ein Vorbericht III. *OrNS* 46: 183-197.
- SOKOLOFF, M. 1990. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*. Dictionaries of Talmud, Targum and Midrash 2. Ramat-Gan.
2002. *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Period*. Dictionaries of Talmud, Targum and Midrash 3. Ramat-Gan.
- STOLPER, M.W. 1985. *Entrepreneurs and Empire: The Murašû Archive, the Murašû Firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia*. PIHANS 54. Leiden.
- STRECK, M.P. 2017. Late Babylonian in Aramaic Epigraphs on Cuneiform Tablets, in Berlejung, A., Maeir, A.M. and Schüle, A. (eds.), *Wandering Arameans: Arameans outside Syria. Textual and Archaeological Perspectives*. LAOS 5. Wiesbaden: 169-194.
- TAL, A. 2000. *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic* 1-2. Handbook of Oriental Studies 1/50. Leiden, Boston and Köln.
- WAERZEGGERS, C. 2010. *The Ezida Temple of Borsippa: Priesthood, Cult, Archives*. Achaemenid History 15. Leiden.
- ZADOK, R. 2006. The Geography of the Borsippa Region, in Amit, Y. et al. (eds.), *Essays on Ancient Israel in Its Near Eastern Context: A Tribute to Nadav Na'aman*. Winona Lake: 389-453.

Ran ZADOK <radokr@tauex.tau.ac.il>
Tel Aviv University, Institute of Archaeology (ISRAEL)