3) A note on ᴵᵈḪu-ʾ-a-pa-a-tu₄ (HSM 8414) – The unpublished Babylonian text HSM 8414 (drafted on 7 Oct 386 or 8 Oct 340) is a receipt for payments made by a bailiff of ᴵᵈḪu-ʾ-a-pa-a-tu₄, the *ustarbar-official*[1]. His name is undoubtedly Iranian and Zadok recognises in the Babylonian spelling a name *Huua-pati-, 'sovereign', referring to OInd. *svapati-,* 'sovereign' and Av. *xᵛāpaiθiia-,* 'sovereignty'[2].

Yet the determinative indicating a divine name causes some problems, since a god *Huuapati- is not known from the Iranian pantheon. Zadok counters this problem by assuming that it is an epithet turned into a divine name, which on its turn became a personal name. To support this hypothesis he refers to the trilingual (Aramaic, Greek and Lycian) stela of Xanthos, in which the goddess Lētō and her two children, Artemis and Apollo, are mentioned :

Greek version (34) :   Λητοῦς καὶ ἐγγόνων, 'Lētō and her children'.
Lycian version (38-39) :   sey-Ēni setideime, 'the Mother ... and her children'
Aramaic version (24-25) : ʾLʾtw ʾRtmwš Ḥštrpty, 'Lētō, Artemis and Ḥštrpty'.

A comparison between the three versions quickly learns that Ḥštrpty is the equivalent of Apollo[3]. Since Ḥštrpty is not a transcription of the name of Apollo, but an Iranian form (*Xšaθrapati-) meaning 'lord of power', it must be an epithet of Apollo. According to Zadok the epithet for Apollo has been turned into a divine name.

Nevertheless this parallel cannot be used as an argument in favour of Zadok's explanation of the presence of the determinative indicating a divine name in ᴵᵈḪu-ʾ-a-pa-a-tu₄. Two aspects make this clear : First of all Zadok's second step (divine name > personal name) has not been made in the Xanthos Stela or elsewhere, since *Xšaθrapati- is never attested as personal name. Secondly, if the Babylonian scribe of

---

[1] M.W. Stolper, *Late Achaemenid, Early Macedonian, and Early Seleucid Records of Deposit and Related Texts* (AION. Suppl. 77), Napoli, 1993, p.10.

[2] R. Zadok, « Foreigners and Foreign Linguistic Material in Mesopotamia and Egypt ». K. Van Lerberghe – A. Schoors (edd.), *Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East. Festschrift E. Lipinski* (OLA 65), Leuven, 1995, p. 442 ; Id., « Some Iranian Anthroponyms and Toponyms ». *N.A.B.U.* 1997/7, no. 5.

[3] M. Mayrhofer, « Die iranischen Elemente im Iranischen Text». *Fouilles de Xanthos VI : La stèle trilingue du Lētôon,* Paris, 1979, pp. 184-185.

the text wrote this specific determinative (d) he must have understood the name or part of it as a divine element [4]. In all probability he did not know (1) that he was dealing with an epithet turned into a divine name, which was later turned into a personal name, and (2) that for that reason he had to use this determinative. Accordingly the presence of the determinative cannot be reconciled with an epithet > divine name > personal name. Zadok's theory therefore cannot be accepted.

Moreover, only a minority of the names beginning with *baga- ('god'), the must frequent divine element attested in Old Iranian onomastics, have spellings with the determinative : (1) IdBa-ga-ʾ-da-a-ta-ʾ (BE 10 9 : 1, 9, 13, 17), (2) IdBa-gaʾ-da-a-tú (BE 10 111 : 12, L.E.; PBS 2/1 84 : R.E., 97 : 3), (3) IdBa-ga-ʾ-da-taʾ (PBS 2/1 84 : 13), (4) IdBa-ga-ʾ-ud-da-tú (JCS 53 110 : 6, 8), (5) IdBa-ga-da-du (Strassmaier 8e Congrès 31 : 15), (6) IdBa-ga-ʾ-pa-a-ta (PBS 2/1 4 : 17), (7) idBa-ga-pa-da (AfO 19 78 Amherst 253 : 20), (8) IdBa-ga-ru-uš (Dar. 82 : 5), (9) idBa-ga-ʾ-sa-ru-[ú] (VS 6 302 : 6), (10) IdBa-ga-ʾ-a-mi-[ri] (CT 22 244 : 14)[5]. There are 17 attestations in 11 texts, which is in sharp contrast with the 151 attestations in 90 texts of names not spelled with the determinative. This enhances the hypothesis that scribes only used these determinatives when they were sure that the name consisted at least partially of divine elements. The same pattern can be seen regarding the names beginning with *Miθra- and *Tīr(ya)-, other Iranian gods. Only two of the 21 Babylonian different *Miθra-names are spelled with a determinative : IdMi-tir-ri-a-da-da-ʾ (PBS 2/1 159 : 5, 9) and IdMitit-ra-da-a-ta (TuM 2/3 147 : 24). Of the 24 Babylonian spellings of *Tīr(ya)-names only one is spelled with the determinative (IdTir-ra-a-ka-am : PBS 2/1 159 : 5, 9) and remarkably enough it occurs in the same text as IdMi-tir-ri-a-da-da-ʾ [6]. One can thus safely assume that IdḪu-ʾ-a-pa-a-tu$_4$ contains something that the scribe considered as a divine element and that this element cannot be Ḫu-ʾ-a-.

An alternative reading of IdḪu-ʾ-a-pa-a-tu$_4$ is IAn-ḫu-ʾ-a-pa-a-tu$_4$, which, however, does not render an acceptable Iranian name. It is therefore my proposal to suggest another reading for the sign Ḫu, more precisely bag[7]. The result is IdBag-ʾ-a-pa-a-tu$_4$, admittedly a strange spelling, but at least a plausible one. The Iranian name now unveiled is the common

---

[4] M.W. Stolper, pers. comm.

[5] It is remarkable that five of the ten spellings (nos. 1-5) reflect the popular name *Bagadāta- and two of them (nos. 6-7) render the also popular name *Bagapāta-. The other three spellings render *Bagarauča, *Bagasravā and *Bagavīra-.

[6] Unfortunately the scribe's name is lost : [ ]-šum-iqišašá A šá mA-qar-a. Perhaps it may be restored [Ninurta]-šum-iqiša, son of Aqara, who appears as a scribe in EEMA 42 : 14.

[7] See also the spelling Bag-da-du for *Bagdāta- (R. Zadok, « Some Iranian Anthroponyms and Toponyms ». *N.A.B.U.* 1997/7, no. 4).

*Bagapāta-, 'protected by God'[8]. An element *Baga-, the Old Iranian word denoting 'god', was easily understood by the scribe as a divine element, which led him to the inclusion of a determinative. The name ^Id^dHu-ʾ-a-pa-a-tu$_4$ should thus be given up and replaced by ^Id^Bag-ʾ-a-pa-a-tu$_4$.

Jan TAVERNIER (05-09-2003)
K.U. Leuven, Blijde Inkomststraat 21, B-3000 (Belgique)

---

[8] See W. Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen* (GOF 111/3), Wiesbaden, 1975, p. 58 and M.A. Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia* (Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies 6), Costa Mesa, 1992, p. 59.