

**On the Late-Assyrian Texts from Dūr-Katlimmu and the Significance of the NA Documentation for Ethno-linguistic Classification** – Between 43 and 55 individuals are recorded in recently published documents from Dūr-Katlimmu (602-600 BC). An intermediate number (52) is more likely in view of the recurring witnesses, viz. Gabbī (×3) ; Idī (×3) and Mannī (× 4 ; cf. J.A. Brinkman, *SAAB* 7, 1993, pp.133 with n. 3 ; 138 with n. 33). The distribution of the ethno-linguistic groups within this sample (49 = 100% as three individuals bore names of uncertain reading) is :

Akkadian : 14 (28.57%) ; Akkadian-West Semitic : 3 (6.12%) ; West Semitic (practically Aramaic) : 22 (44.89%) ; Arabian : 3 (6.12%) ; Israelite : 3 (6.12%) ; Akkadian-non Semitic (hybrid) : 1 (2.04%) ; Egyptian : 1 (2.04%) ; atypical : 2 (4.08%). This distribution does not differ much from the situation in the Jezireh during the last decades of the Assyrian empire. Most of the larger groups of this rather restricted sample have a certain degree of cohesion among their members.

The following anthroponyms and (micro-)toponyms (1-8 and 9, 10 respectively ; all forms are NA unless otherwise indicated), except for 7, 8, are West Semitic :

1. *Ah-zi-iá-a-u* (see F.M. Fales, *SAAB* 7, p. 142) is with *qatl* for */qatal/* like the predicative element of *Na-ad-bi-ia-a-ú* (*SAA* 6, 34 r. 9) and possibly that of N/LB *Šá-am-hu(?) -a-ma* (see Zadok, *Biblische Notizen* 65, 1992, p. 52).

2. *Sa-me-<sup>2</sup>-iá-a-u* (see Fales, *SAAB* 7, p. 148, cf. 143, n. 33) is with a > e before /' as in LB *Ia-de-eh-ia-a-ma* (BE 9, 25, L.E. ; 29, 3), *Ia-de-ia-a-ma* (same individual as *Ia-da-ah-ia-a-ma*, M.W. Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire : The Murašû Archive, the Murašû Firm and Persian Rule in Babylonia*, Leiden 1985, p. 170 : 2,7 and p. 216 : 92,1 respectively) ; *Ia-de-hu-ia-a-[ma]* (*PBS* 2/1, 121, 2) for *Ia-a-d[a-hu-ia-a-ma]* (*PBS* 2/1, 84, 4 ; one and the same individual, see my *The Jews in Babylonia* [Haifa 1979 ; henceforth *JBCA*], p. 20f.). Another case is LB *Ia-še-<sup>2</sup>-ia-a-ma* (Cyr. 307, 1, 8, 18, see *JBCA*, p. 21, 44).

3. *Ha-an-š/za-ru-ru* (cp. *Ha-an-š/za-ru*) hardly derives from *hnr* « swine » as understood by Fales, *SAAB* 7, p. 145f., as the latter's second syllable has *-ī-*. It may be based on *hnšr* « little finger », Syriac *hšr'* (poss. related to the GN Gk. *Anasartha*, modern *Hanāšir* in NE Syria ; the Greek transcription reflects an Aramaic form presumably with *h-* > *h-*), Arab. *hīnša/ir* (modern Syrian dialect *hūnšur*, cf. J. Blau, *Lešonenu* 57, 1993, p. 259 ad 325f.). LB *Hu-un-š/za-ra-ru* (BE 9, 75, 6) seems to be based on another variant.

4. *Kab-di-i* (J.N. Postgate, *SAAB* 7, p. 124 : 4, 26) may consist of a qatl formation of K-B-D « be weighty, honoured » (*OLA* 28, p. 48 and n. 66 on 50 with lit. ; AS 21, p. 304) and *-ī* like OB < Am. *Kab-di-um* (cf. Zadok, in M.E. Cohen, D.C. Snell and D.B. Weisberg [eds.], *The Tablet and the Scroll : Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo*, Bethesda 1993, p. 325a, s.v. *K-B-D*). For PE *Kbd'* (with *-ā*) see my *OLA* 28, p. 101. Alternatively *Gáb-ṭi-i* (cp. Gbty, *BiOr* 48, 1991, p. 34).

5. *KAT-nu-nu* (Postgate, *SAAB* 7, p. 121 : 1, 5). If the first sign has the value *kaṭ/qāt/gaṭ-* then it may be a qatl formation of *Q-T-N* (« be small, slender, thin, fine », with dissimilation ; cf. N/LB *Ka-ṭi-nu*, Zadok, *On West Semites in Babylonia*, Jerusalem 1978 [henceforth *WSB*], pp. 124, 261, 335, 342 and Nab. *Qṭynw*, A. Negev, *Qedem* 32, p. 57 : 1017 with parallels) and *-o, n*, cp. with *-ān*, OB GN *Qa-at-tu-na-an/nim* on the Habur (*RGTC* 3, p. 189). Is *KAT-nu-nu* alternatively a qatlūl formation of the same root ?

6. *Sa-ka-ha-a* is a qatal formation of *Š-K-H* « find » (cf. *WSB*, pp. 127, 301, 337, 343) plus hypocoristic *-ā* (differently Fales, *SAAB* 7, p. 147).

7. *dšūl-man-šangâ-ušur*, <sup>lu</sup>*šangû* - no compound name with *šangû* (cf. Postgate, *SAAB* 7, p. 113 ad 29) is hitherto recorded - the type resembles that of *Nabû-mār-šarri-ušur*, likewise the name of a functionary (Stamm, *MVAeG* 44, p. 316 ; cf. Fales, *SAAB* 7, p. 140, top).

8. *ZA-an-ga-ri-DÛ* (*-ibni*, Postgate, *SAAB* 7, p. 123 : 3, 8) has an Akkadian predicate (*-ibni*), but its theophorous element does not occur elsewhere. It reminds

one of the base of the toponym *Sangarite* (< OB *Saggaratum*? prob. on the lower Habur ; see Kh. Nashef, *RGTC* 5, p. 228 with lit.). The latter may ultimately be related (at least linguistically) to the mountain name Singar (*Saggar*, \**Sangar*). Mountain names may appear as theophorous elements, but the value *sà* for ZA occurs in NA only in literary texts.

9. *Mgd/ Ma-ag-da-la* (see W. Röllig, *SAAB* 7, p. 127 with n. 2), cf. *Magdala* of Sphorakene not far from the lower Habur (in Greek transcription, D. Feissel and J. Gascou, *CRAIBL* 1989, pp. 543, 558). It is Related to Ugar. *Mgdly/ Ma-ag-da-la-a* (M. Heltzer, *The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit*, Wiesbaden 1976, p. 12 : 108). There is no need to identify Gablīni with Rummūnīna (as suggested by Röllig, *SAAB* 7, p. 129f.) and Sahiru with Sairi (pace A.K. Grayson, *TCS* 5, p. 262). The latter (PN > GN, cf. Tallqvist, *APN*, p. 190b ; a homonym thereof may be the N/LB anthroponym *šá'-i-ri*, E. Gehlken, *Uruk : Spätbabylonische Wirtschaftstexte aus dem Eanna-Archiv*, Mainz 1990, 14 r. 5f.) is to be sought in Assyria proper or near it.

10. *Zhn* (*Byt-Z.*, Röllig, *SAAB* 7, p. 125 : 1 ; Postgate, *SAAB* 7, p. 121 : 1) may end in adjectival *-ān*. Its base can derive from *Z-H-Y* « to shine ; be happy » (JArām.), cf. Syr. *zh(y)'* « splendid, exalted, clear », JArām. *zhwh* « splendour, brightness », *zhwyy* « joyous person » (Syr. has also *Z-H-Y* « castus evasit »). Less likely to Saf. *Zhyn* (G.L. Harding, *IC*, p. 303). For non-retention of the last radical cp. *Bibl. Pdwn*, *Špwn* (*OLA* 28, p. 84).

According to the Old Testament, Israelites were deported from Samaria and its province to the Habur (glossed as *nhr Gwzn*, 2R 17, 6 and 18, 11 ; 1Ch. 5, 26 is secondary and corrupted). Samaritans are indeed recorded in the Jezireh (perhaps on the lower Habur) in Sargon's time (*SAA* 1, 220) including Gozan ; cf. *OLA* 28, pp. 28 32, n. 22 ; 304 : 721423 : 12-14 and poss. 7 ; B. Becking, *The Fall of Samaria* (Leiden 1992), pp. 64ff. : 4.3 (but there is no evidence that *SAA* 6, 34 originates from Gozan). However, it cannot be demonstrated that the Israelites from early NB Dūr-Katlimmu were descendants of the early wave of deportees : the discernible non-indigenous people at Dūr-Katlimmu around 600 BC were Elamites and at least one descendant of Egyptians. They presumably belonged to recent (late-Sargonid) arrivals of deportees (cf. Postgate, *SAAB* 7, p. 110 ; for

the diffusion of Elamites and Egyptians in Assyria proper and the Jezireh cf. Zadok, *Iran* 32, 1994, p. 47 and E. Lipinski in J. Aviram et al. [eds.], *Biblical Archaeology Today*. Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, April 1984, Jerusalem 1985, p. 346). But it should be remembered that the latest evidence for Israelites at Gozan is from the beginning of the last quarter of the 7th century BC, i.e. just two decades before the pertinent documentation from Dür-Katlimmu.

There is no direct evidence for Israelites in Babylonia before 597 BC, but there may be some indirect one (cf. my *JBCA*, p. 34f.). *fṭābat-dīš-šar* (Sippar, 531/0 BC), who bore an Assyrian name, was the daughter of *Ia-še-'-ia-a-ma* (*JBCA*, p. 44). Were they descendants of Israelites/Judeans who moved from Assyria or the Jezireh to northern Babylonia?

The NA Documentation has relatively more information on ethno-linguistic groups than the abundant Neo/Late-Babylonian corpus. The latter does not adequately represent all the important ethno-linguistic groups in Babylonia in view of the following preliminary statistical results :

Babylon - Egibi archive : out of 3517 individuals only 60 (1.705%) bore foreign (predominantly West Semitic) names or had blood relatives with such names. The situation in other documentation centres was basically the same (figures of the general number of individuals are followed by percentage of foreigners) :

Borsippa – Ea-ilūta-bāni archive (1192 ; 1.6%) ; Borsippa – other documents (2011 ; 1.292%) ; Dilbat (340 ; 1.764%) ; Ur (2305 ; 1.41%) ; Nippur- private archives (excluding Murašû ; no more than 2%).

It follows that the huge prosopographic sample of the private archives represents almost exclusively the owners and their circle who were basically Babylonian urbanites. The temple archives (esp. Ebabbarra and somewhat less Ekur and Eanna) record a slightly higher percentage of people with non-Akkadian names and explicit foreigners :

Sippar (over 4000 individuals) : c. 3-4% bore foreign (mostly West Semitic) names or had blood relatives with such names (predominantly the archive of the Ebabbarra temple).

Uruk (c. 6000 individuals ; predominantly the archive of the Eanna temple) : between 1.5-2% bore West Semitic names or had blood relatives with such names.

The most notable exception is the Murašû archive from Nippur : out of c. 3200 individuals 972 (30.4%) bore West Semitic names or had blood relatives with such names. This is probably because most of the transactions recorded in this archive took place in the countryside. Thus this private archive represents the population as a whole, much like an official archive. Official archives (as distinct from private or temple ones) are almost non-existent in the enormous N/LB documentation in sharp contrast to the much more restricted NA pertinent corpus. The only notable exception is the small but extremely important dossier from the Southern Fortress (Südburg) of Babylon (E.F. Weidner, *Mél. Dussaud*, pp. 923ff.).

Ran Zadok (24-01-95)

Institute of Archaeology Tel-Aviv University

Ramat-Aviv 69978, Israel