



Università degli Studi di Udine

Corso di dottorato in

Scienze dell'antichità

(XXVIII)

TESI DI DOTTORATO

Titolo

**A SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO THE HURRIAN PANTHEON:
THE ONOMASTIC EVIDENCE**

Relatore

Prof. FREDERICK MARIO FALES /

Prof. DANIELLE MORANDI BONACOSSÌ

Dottorando

LUCIANO ESTEBAN MONTI

Anno Accademico 2016/17

COPYRIGHT © 2017 by Luciano Esteban Monti
All rights reserved.

**A Nely,
Pura y Roque,
Emilia y Enrique, y
Valentina
*In Memoriam.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
ONOMASTICS	6
§1. General Introduction.....	6
§1.2 Historiography of Proper Names	7
§1.3 Proper Nouns, Proper Names, Personal Names and Lexical items	13
§2 Onomastics	22
§2.1 Onomastics and Social Sciences (Anthropology and History).....	27
§2.2 Socio-Cultural Aspects of Onomastics.....	33
§2.3 Ethnicity or Socio-cultural complex	37
§2.3.1 The problems around ‘Ethnicity’	39
§2.4 Personal Names and Socio-cultural complexes	46
§2.5 Social implications of Personal Names.....	49
§3 Personal Names, Religion and Pantheon	51
§3.1 Antiquity and Personal Names	55
§3.2 Hurrian Personal Names and Deities	61
§4 Methodological Approach	64
§4.1 Linguistic Analysis	67
§4.2 Historical Use	70
§4.3 Methodological Issues	72
A STATE OF THE ART OF HURRIAN PERSONAL NAMES	77
§1.1 The appearance of Hurrians in History	77
§1.2 The study of the Hurrian Language	80
§1.3 Hurrian Language	87
§1.4 Characteristics of the Language.....	91
§1.5 Hurrian Sources	93
§1.6 Hurrian Dialects.....	96
§1.7 Hurrian Onomastics	99
§1.7.1 Research on Hurrian Personal Names	101
§1.7.2 Geographical and Spatial distribution of Hurrian Personal Names	104
§1.7.3 Characteristics of Hurrian Personal Names.....	106
§1.8 <i>Bezeichnungsnamen</i>	120
§1.9 Theophoric Elements	121

§1.9.1 Theonyms	122
§2. Towards the Origins of Hurrian <i>Satznamen</i>	126
§2.1 Syntactic Change	128
§2.1.2 Hurrian as a Case of Ancient Near Eastern Personal Names.....	130
HURRIAN PERSONAL NAMES IN THE THIRD MILLENNIUM	137
§ 1. Pre-Sargonic Period (ED IIIb ca. 2475-2324 BC).....	137
§ 1.1 Nabada (Tell Beydar)	138
§ 1.2 Ebla (Tell Mardih).....	139
§ 1.3 Mari (Tell Hariri).....	141
§2. Sargonic Period (ca. 2334-2193 BC).....	143
§ 2.1 Ḥafājah.....	143
§ 2.2 Ġirsu	144
§ 2.3 Unknown provenance	144
§ 2.4 Nippur.....	146
§ 2.5 Tall al-Sulaima	146
§ 2.6 Ešnunna	146
§ 2.7 Gasur.....	147
§ 2.8 Ḥabur region	148
§ 2.8.1 Nagar	148
§ 2.8.2 Urkeš	149
§ 3. UR III Administration (2102-1995 BC)	153
§ 3.1. Theophoric Elements in Personal Names.....	155
§ 4. Religious Connotations.....	159
§ 5. Onomastic Elements	161
Notes on the List of Hurrian Personal Names	168
List of Hurrian Personal Names (and Hurrian-related names) from the Third Millennium	170

HURRIAN PERSONAL NAMES IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE SECOND MILLENNIUM	195
Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Mari (Tell Hariri).....	197
§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Mari texts.....	199
§ Expressive Names.....	201
§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names.....	204
§ Primary and Secondary Deities	204

§ Minor Deities	209
§ Common Theophoric Elements	211
List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts From Mari	213
Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Terqa (Tall 'Ašāra)	322
List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Terqa	323
Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Tuttul (Tell Bi'a)	327
§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Tuttul Texts	327
§ Kinship.....	327
§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names.....	328
§ Primary and Secondary Deities	328
§ Minor Deities	328
§ Divinised Entities	328
§ Common Theophoric Elements	328
List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Tuttul	331
Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Šubat-Enlil (Tell Leilan).....	337
§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Tell-Leilan Texts	338
§ Kinship.....	338
§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names.....	339
§ Primary and Secondary Deities	339
§ Minor Deities	339
§ Divinised Entities	340
§ Common Theophoric Elements	340
List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Šubat-Enlil	341
Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Ašnakkum (Chagar Bazar)	355
§ Nature of Hurrian PNs in the Ašnakkum texts	355
§ Kinship.....	356
§ Expressive Names.....	356
§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names	357
§ Primary and Secondary Deities	357
§ Minor Deities	359
§ Divinised Entities	359
§ Common Theophoric Elements	359

List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Ašnakkum	361
Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Karana (Tell al-Rimah).....	379
§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Rimah Texts	379
§ Kinship.....	380
§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names	380
§ Primary and Secondary Deities	380
§ Minor Deities	380
§ Divinised Entities	380
§ Common Theophoric Elements	381
List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Karana	383
Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Šušarrā (Tell Šemšārā).....	399
§ Nature of Hurrian PNs in the Šušarrā Texts	400
§ Kinship.....	400
§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names	400
§ Primary and Secondary Deities	401
§ Minor Deities	401
§ Divinised Entities	401
§ Common Theophoric Elements	401
List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Šušarrā.....	403
Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Tigunāni.....	417
§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Tigunāni Texts.....	417
§ Kinship.....	418
§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names	418
§ Primary and Secondary Deities	419
§ Minor Deities	419
§ Divinised Entities	420
§ Common Theophoric Elements	420
List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Tigunāni	423
Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Ebla (Tell Mardih)	442
§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Ebla Texts.....	442
List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Ebla	443
Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Kaneš (Kültepe).....	445

§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Kültepe Texts	446
§ Kinship.....	446
§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names	446
§ Primary and Secondary Deities	447
§ Minor Deities	447
§ Divinised Entities	448
§ Common Theophoric Elements	448
List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Kaneš.....	449
Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Alalah VII.....	461
§ Nature of Hurrian PNs in the Alalah Texts.....	462
§ Kinship.....	462
§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names	463
§ Primary and Secondary Deities	463
§ Minor Deities	465
§ Divinised Entities	465
§ Common Theophoric Elements	465
List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Alalah VII	467
CONCLUDING REMARKS	489
ANNEXES	497
Hurrian Theophoric Elements in the Second Millennium Personal Names	507
Number of Individuals Bearing Hurrian Theophorous in the Second Millennium.....	509
List of Hurrian Main Deities Theophorous	515
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	533
BIBLIOGRAPHY	549

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a privilege, honour and duty to acknowledge my gratitude to those who, for one reason or another, helped me in this journey.

First, I would like to thank Prof. Bernardo Gandulla (UBA) for introducing me to the history of the Ancient Near East and teaching me History. His dialectical way of thinking and humanity have been two lessons that I would never forget. In parallel, I would also like to express my gratitude to Prof. Saad Chedid (UBA) for opening my mind and showing me that the best way to move forward is to “remove my floor as many times as I have to”. For this, and many other reasons, I owe them a piece of my academic past, present and future.

I would also like to thank Prof. Manuel Molina Martos for opening the doors of the CSIC (Consejo Superior en Investigaciones Científicas) and its magnificent library in Madrid, and Prof. Ignacio Márquez Rowe for his inputs and suggestions on the Hurrians in the context of the Ancient Near East. Another professor and scholar without whose help this dissertation would never have been written is Stefano De Martino (Torino). My most solemn and sincere gratitude to him.

Also, I have to express my thanks to Armando Bramanti (La Sapienza) for discussing different parts of this work and giving me his Sumerian perspective, as well as the Egyptologist Andrea Trevisani (Udine), who was always by my side to help me in any matter, whether academic or everyday life. To you and your family, all my thanks. Furthermore, I have to express my gratitude to my co-director Prof. Daniele Morandi Bonacossi for listening to my ideas and providing some interesting inputs, and particularly (without him knowing) for teaching me one of the most important lessons in the international academic world. For all this, thank you.

Last but foremost, I am fortunate, indeed, to have been taken under Prof. Mario Fales supervision. He rapidly adopted me as his student and taught me everything he knew - and even what he did not know. His guidance, assistance, corrections and suggestions made this work possible. Without him, this boat would have never berthed. For the opportunity he gave me, his wisdom, generosity, friendship and constant support, *grazie infinite!*

Outside the academic world, I would like to thank my family. My parents, Silvia and Roberto, for giving the opportunity to exist and for supporting me financially, morally

and ethically on this journey, and whose effort and education made the person I am. To my sister, Agustina, that, without knowing much of my life, was always intrigued for what I did. Antonio and María José for their constant and silent support. To my (life) big brother Marzio Sabbadini, who took care of me, and showed me that *terra santa* is in Friuli. Finally, I want to thanks María José for her constant support, companionship, happiness and love. With her, life has been a joy to me.

Needless to say that any mistake or blunder found in this work is entirely the responsibility of the author.

S/C de Tenerife, 25th of May, 2017

INTRODUCTION

On his well-known essay regarding the different aspects of the history of Ancient Mesopotamia, L. Oppenheim was convinced that “a systematic presentation of Mesopotamian religion cannot and should not be written”.¹ He held this interpretation under two orders: the nature of the evidence, which, for instance, was extremely varied regarding the religious practices of the higher classes of the society but not for the lowers or general population; and the problem of comprehension across the barriers of conceptual conditioning.² Indeed, these premises could also be applied to the entire Ancient Near East (Mesopotamia, Syria-Palestine and Anatolia) because the picture regarding the variety of documents and the religious manifestations was primarily that of the higher classes; and because if modern scholars are not able to overcome the conceptual barriers for ancient Mesopotamia, neither are they to overcome those from the entire Near East. However, these strong and influential conceptions have not prevented scholars from studying and writing particular and general works on Ancient Near Eastern religions, which has long been one of the main topics of research. In this line, and being aware of Oppenheim’s premises, the aim of the following investigation is to bring some new light on the structure of the Hurrian pantheon and pick up the torch that the Russian scholar I. Diakonoff threw more than thirty years ago concerning the religion of the Hurrians.³

However, and given the particularities of the Hurrian civilisation, a systematic study of the structure of its pantheon is not an easy task to undertake. In the first place,

¹ Oppenheim 1977: 172.

² Ibid.

³ Diakonoff 1981: 88-89.

because no Hurrian city⁴ has yielded a consistent Hurrian archive with significant religious material.⁵ The textual information regarding Hurrian religion (beyond the one presented in the theophoric personal names) has come from different locations and contexts where Hurrians were not the main socio-cultural group but rather a constituent member of the society (e.g. Ḫattuša, Ugarit, Emar). Secondly, because Hurrians were spread throughout the entire Near East and for a considerable amount of time (Hurrian onomastics show that the first traces can be found in the Early Dynastic period IIIb and the last during the Neo-Assyrian period). Thus, and as a natural consequence, a study of this magnitude presents several problems and complexities that should be taken into consideration.

Therefore, we have limited our scope of the study to the analysis of the Hurrian personal names from the third and the first part of the second millennium. This decision was taken upon the criterion regarding the real limitations that the available sources present, and mostly because of the connection, long perceived, between Hurrian anthroponyms and the theophorous element that constituted them. However, in the course of this investigation, we have realised two important things: 1) that one single person could not handle the Hurrian onomastic corpus from the entire ANE, and even less in one single work, and 2), most importantly, the phases that the Hurrian pantheon went through, at least until the moment that we have information about it.⁶ Thus, our aim is to analyse the Hurrian personal names from the mentioned period and to discern the internal changes that the pantheon experienced between the third and first half of the second millennium, which ended up reflected in the onomastic material.

4 By Hurrian city we intend an urban area with preponderance of Hurrian population, such as the ancient kingdom of Urkeš.

5 The most important information regarding Hurrian religion (myths, ritual, incantations, parables) comes from Anatolia (mainly Ḫattuša and Šapinuwa).

6 We believe that the Hurrian pantheon can be organized in the three different phases: pre-Amorite, Amorite and post-Amorite. These coincide, roughly, with the third millennium, the first half of the second millennium and the appearance, development and fall of Mitanni.

The analysis of Hurrian personal names from a philological and historical perspective can provide us with a wider scope of the structure of the pantheon; the most common (or unusual) deities throughout time and space; the characteristics (epithets and appellatives) and the possible changes that suffered along with its development. As J. Eidem pointed out:

“The personal names from Ancient Mesopotamia clearly constitute an important source material. Indeed quite a large portion of the total text-matter in the cuneiform record consists of personal names, due to the preponderance of administrative and legal archives. In contrast to modern European tradition personal names in the ANE carried semantic content, i.e. they had a lexico-grammatical structure conveying information which could be understood in contemporary society.”⁷

The social and cultural processes that have meant great creations for any civilisation have always been very long processes. However, to create an everlasting continuum of the process, or to ignore the beginning or the conclusion, could lead to historical distortions and factual misconstrues. Thus, the choice for the third and first half of the second millennium as our time frame has to do with the internal and external processes that the Hurrian society underwent and therefore reflected in the structure of their gods. A socio-cultural complex such as the Hurrian, which endured for more than one millennium, and coexisted with numerous and different civilisations, experienced important changes in every aspect of its structures. Consequently, we have decided to focus on those changes that seem relevant and encompass a particular process: the transitional variations that took place between the ‘first’ and ‘second’ phase of the

⁷ Eidem 2004: 191.

pantheon.⁸

Our intention to analyse a certain quantity of deities, their importance, characteristics, symbolism, location within a hierarchical structure and any other particularity, is an undoubted task of higher complex conceptual abstraction. Especially when the documentation at hand is fragmentary and we have to turn to the analysis of thousands of personal names in search for traces. In this sense, it is necessary to consider the conjectural differences and the socio-cultural processes that participated in the formation of the Hurrian pantheon, since this was not a rigid structure that remained fossilised and immutable for centuries. Therefore, we believe that, notwithstanding the slowness or rapidity of the process, our working hypothesis should focus on the changes that the pantheon suffered, particularly during the transition between the third and second millennium, and the reflection that these changes, at least the most evident, had on the Hurrian personal names.

The present work has been structured in three different parts. The first one concerns the theoretical framework and the methodological approach towards the analysis of personal names as the object for the study of a religious manifestation (i.e. the pantheon). The second part deals with the analysis of the Hurrian onomastic material from the third millennium and first part of the second. And the third part consists of the conclusions that the analysis of the onomastics has left.

⁸ The remaining changes that occurred between the second and third phases should be part of another study, which evidently would be complementary to the one introduced here.

ONOMASTICS

In the beginning, we were homo loquens.

§1. General Introduction

The word for ‘name’ is probably one of the most antique words; almost every ancient civilisation had it. It has a genealogy which goes back to the beginnings of the language family. In the Indo-European branch, for instance, we can trace it in Old English as *nama* or *noma*, in Old Frisian as *nama* and *noma*, Old Saxon *namo*, Old High German as *namo*, Old Norse *nafn* and *namm*, Gothic *namo*, a presuppose Germanic **namōn*, Latin *nōmen* and Greek *ónoma* (ὄνομα). In addition there are cognate records in Sanskrit, Avestic, Tokharian (A and B), Old Slavonic, Old Prussian, Armenian, Albanian, Hittite, Luwian, Palaic, Old Irish and Early Welsh, pointing to an Indo-European *en(o)m̥n-*, and *nōm̥n* as the common root and source for its variations.¹ Therefore, it is not strange that the compilers of etymological dictionaries have treated this lexical family item with some sort of “veneration”, terming it an ‘ancient and widespread word’ or ‘one of the most archaic and honourable words still alive among us’.² But, what is the importance to make this word part of the so-called ‘paleontological lexicon’? Does it have a modern interest due to merely fashion trends, or scholars have been dealing with issues related to this word since the beginning of Classical Thought? In any case, the linguistic, philosophical and historical importance of the word ‘name’, and its varied uses, has always been closely associated with the relationship between people and the term that designates the same individual in every possible world, i.e. the personal name.

¹ Nicolaisen 1995: 384.

² Nicolaisen 1995: 384.

From a scientific and theoretical point of view, personal names (PNs), as a branch of proper names, began to be analysed during the last century. At the turn of the nineteenth century, theoretical linguists, particularly those that have been called onomasticians, approached the study of PNs by going beyond its mere etymological meaning; they started to understand the significant value that proper names had as a constituent part of the linguistic analysis.

Proper names are one of those areas of study which have been analysed from a wide range of perspectives by scholars from different disciplines. They have formed a significant topic of study not only in ancient, modern and contemporary philosophy but also in traditional philology, modern linguistics, logic, philosophy of language, social psychology, sociology and social anthropology. To some extent these disciplines, which often turned into complementary fields, focused their attention on the different questions about proper names: what kind of lexical item they are, what they refer to, how they are used and by whom, how they are chosen and by whom, etc.³ However, the interest and the study of proper and personal names did not begin at the turn of the 19th century; in fact, it can be traced back to ancient times.

§1.2 Historiography of Proper Names

We are not completely acquainted if the people from the Ancient Near East (ANE) established any linguistic categories while referring to PNs because the sources do not tend to go beyond proper names. The mere fact of carrying a semantic marker to disambiguate the interpretation of the word, i.e. a determinative, was already a sign of socio-linguistic consideration. But what we do know is that PNs were part of a major group of proper names (e.g. names of deities, people/populations, countries/territories,

³ Allerton 1987: 61-62.

cities, stones, birds, plants and herbs, stars and constellations) who were semantically particular and the correct understanding could not be left to the free interpretation of the reader. The idea of applying a semantic indicator to a particular group of lexical items was not just restricted to proper names. Wooden elements, leather items or pottery, together with some grammatical elements (e.g. to mark the plural), could also be marked with a determinative sing, meaning that ancient scribes probably had some idea of what proper names could be but were not yet grammatically developed. Thus, the values of PNs were located somewhere between the outside world of grammar and the linguistic sphere, covering a vast range of social-cultural significances.

In ancient Greece, philosophers were attracted by the symbolic, linguistic and theoretical value that proper names had in their societies.⁴ The first semantic approaches on proper names came from Aristotle (384-322 BC) whom managed to distinguish particular from general names and realised that in proper names the meaning of their appellative⁵ parts was weakened.⁶ One of Aristotle's Peripatetic pupil, Klearchos of Soli (ca. IV-III BC), continued with the line of the study of proper names and established the well-known category: θεόφορα or ἄθεα.⁷ The conception of dividing names for its theophoric character was one of the main and most important semantic steps in the process of understanding this particular linguistic element.

With the intensification of grammatical studies, the high point of Hellenistic research delivered new conceptualizations. The first definition of proper names emerged as part of the spelling and morphological problems collected in the work *Tekhne Grammatike* (Τεχνή γραμματική) by Dionysius Thrax (170-90 BC). In this work, proper names are described for the first time: “ *A proper name* is a sign of individual substance, such as

⁴ Summerell 1995: 368-370; Klearchos fr. 86 (Wehrli) ap. Athen., 448d-e.

⁵ In ancient times, the appellative included the act of calling something by its name.

⁶ Blanár 2009: 92.

⁷ Fraser 2000: 149-150.

Homer or Socrates. *General names* are signs of general substance, e.g. man, horse.”⁸ Dionysius understood proper names as words tied down to a particular entity (e.g. Socrates and Homer), and we, by using the very same term ‘proper name’, are committed to perpetuating the entity named and avoid its vanishing.⁹ Thus, from a semantic and linguistically formal point of view, Hellenistic Greeks considered ‘proper names’ as nouns;¹⁰ this is the reason why this term in Greek, ὄνομα κύριον, rendered *nomen proprium* in Latin, meaning a ‘genuine’ name, or a name more genuinely such than other names.

On the other hand, this concept was contrasted with the προσηγορία or ‘appellation’ (ὄνομα προσηγορικόν, *nomen appellativum*), a term used to describe what we call ‘general names’ or ‘common nouns’ such as man, horse, tree.¹¹ The Stoics apparently kept the term ‘names’ (ὀνόματα) for proper names, calling appellation to common nouns (προσηγορίαι). Later Greeks, and therefore also Roman grammarians, extended ὀνόματα (*nomina*) to refer to all nouns, and distinguished proper nouns as real names (ὀνόματα κύρια, *nomina propria*) from appellative names (ὀνόματα προσηγορικά, *nomina appellativa*).¹²

Moving to medieval times, philosophers, particularly those linked with the grammarian philosophical school known as *Modistae* (e.g. William of Conches, Thomas of Erfurt or William of Occam), carried on with the study of proper names. These were considered as individual substances without any specific conventional meaning and with pure referential signs or, by contrast, as the character of *propria* from specific characteristics of people. In any case, the complex perception of proper names continued to be absent as they were understood as isolated concepts and not elements of

⁸ Blánár 2009: 93.

⁹ Gardiner 1954: 8.

¹⁰ Langendonck 2007: 17.

¹¹ Gardiner 1954: 4.

¹² Allerton 1987: 69.

a more intricate system, a linguistic system.¹³

It is only at the turn of the nineteenth century that more complex and systemic analysis began to appear concerning proper names and, more generally, onomastics. However, these new approaches to the reference and semantics of proper names were developed not by trained linguists or onomasticians but by language philosophers who were convinced that solving the problem of proper names was solving the problem of meaning and reference, and vice-versa.¹⁴ They agreed that proper names function to denote particulars, i.e. individuals, entities or members of classes, but these features have been analysed from different standpoints.

On the hand, John Stuart Mill set the grounds for considering proper names as signs without meaning; they have no attributes that could define the object named and therefore they only have a denotational¹⁵ but not a connotational sense.¹⁶ In Mill's words:

“Proper names are not connotative: they denote the individuals who are called by them; but they do not indicate or imply any attributes as belonging to those individuals. When we name a child by the name Paul, or a dog by the name Caesar, these names are simply marks used to enable those individuals to be made subjects of discourse.”¹⁷

¹³ Blanár 2009: 93.

¹⁴ Van Langendock 2007: 22.

¹⁵ By denotation we understand, in Lyons words, “the relationship that holds between lexemes and persons, things, places, properties, processes and activities external to the language-system.” (Lyon 1977: 207)

¹⁶ Blanár 2009: 94. Mill distinguished common nouns as those that can connote and denote from proper names that can only denote but do not connote.

¹⁷ Mill 1882: 40. To exemplify this statement, Mill gave the famous example:

“A man may have been named John, because that was the name of his father; a town may have been named Dartmouth, because it is situated at the mouth of the Dart. But it is no part of the signification of the word John, that the father of the person so called bore the same name; nor even of the word Dartmouth, to be situated at the mouth of the Dart. If sand should choke up the mouth of the river, or an earthquake change its course, and remove it to a distance from the town, the name of the town would not necessarily be changed. That

In a way, for Mill, proper names were just linguistic elements strapped to a certain object and were independent of any subsequent attribute of the object.

With the onset of the twentieth century, several linguists and philosophers such as A. Gardiner,¹⁸ J. Katz¹⁹ and S. Kripke²⁰ began to follow Mill's idea. They argued that proper names represented something but without any particular respect; they simply stand for their bearers, and whether they signify some attributes of the bearer is strictly secondary.²¹ In this line, Kripke's thesis stated that proper names maintained their meaningless character; for a proper name to function, it suffices that it has been assigned to a referent and passed on to other users.²²

On the other hand, numerous scholars such as G. Frege,²³ B. Russell,²⁴ J. Searle²⁵ or A. Seppänen²⁶ questioned this 'anti-semantic' view and highlighted the problems that arise when proper names are taken to avoid descriptive content. This perspective argues that proper names do indeed signify and have special senses. Thus, they denote

fact, therefore, can form no part of the signification of the word; for otherwise, when the fact confessedly ceased to be true, no one would any longer think of applying the name. *Proper names are attached to the objects themselves, and are not dependent on the continuance of any attribute of the object [emphasis added].*" (Mill 1882: 41)

¹⁸ Gardiner 1954, with abjections and *addenda*.

¹⁹ Katz 1972.

²⁰ Kripke 1980.

²¹ Bean 1980: 306.

²² Van Langendock 2007: 33.

"Kripke's conclusion was that a name is not an abbreviated description at all, but a *rigid designator*—a term that designates the same individual in every possible world. A name, in other words, refers to an individual in every conceivable circumstance in which we can sensibly talk about that individual at all... The reference of a name is fixed when the person's parents, in effect, point to the little person whom they intend to bear the name, or at whatever later moment a name for the person sticks. It then continues to point to that person throughout his life and beyond, thanks to a chain of transmission in which a person who knows the name uses it in the presence of another person who intends to use it in the same way ("I am going to tell you about a great philosopher. His name was Aristotle . . ."). Names are, in a sense, closer to indexicals...When we know a name, we are implicitly pointing to someone, regardless of what we, or anyone else, know about that person." (Pinker 2007: 286-287).

²³ Frege 1892.

²⁴ Russell 1918.

²⁵ Searle 1969: part. chap. 7.

²⁶ Seppänen 1974.

individuals by functioning as shorthand for, or equivalent to, definite descriptions of their bearers. In a way, they are logically connected ‘in a loose sort of way’ with the characteristics of the referent.²⁷

The first and most influential character of this philosophical tradition was G. Frege (1892) who attributed not only reference (*Bedeutung*) but also sense (*Sinn*) to proper names.²⁸ He presupposed the existence of a difference between these two because it is hard to see the ‘sense’ as an object with lexical meaning. He posits the ‘sense’ as something in between the proper name’s reference (the object itself) and the subjective representations we may have of the object, because, eventually, its closeness to a lexical meaning is almost indiscernible from associative meaning.²⁹

It is interesting to mention that philosophers such as L. Wittgenstein or B. Russell³⁰ shifted from Mill’s to Frege’s ideas as a logical and dialectic consequence.³¹ The idea of combining denotative and connotative senses to proper names was in line with the principles of Hegelian philosophy: subject and object are part of a whole that includes them and makes them what they are. Subjectivity and materiality are not substances that exist autonomously, sufficient in themselves to be what they are and whose essence is independent of each other. Therefore, there is not a relationship of exteriority between subject and object: the subject can know the object, in our case the proper name, because he is the one who creates it and therefore connotes it.

Despite these two opposing standpoints, several philosophers and linguists have been claiming a ‘view from the middle’. These have proposed that in the content of proper

²⁷ Bean 1980: 306.

²⁸ Van Langendock 2007: 33.

²⁹ Van Langendock 2007: 27-28.

³⁰ Wittgenstein 1922: 3.203, 1953: part. 40, 41, 79; Russell 1903: part. 476.

³¹ For instance, the first Wittgenstein believed that the name means the object; the object is the meaning. In a way he stated that proper names merely denote. But he changed his point of view and asserted that it is linguistically impossible to call the thing itself the meaning of the name. On the opposite, the meaning of a proper name is constituted not by the referent but by the description one can provide of the thing named (Van Langendock 2007: 30).

nouns, the existence of some elements of expressions and characteristics of meaning can be assumed because “without the elements of category and meaning, a name would not be suitable to designate anything real”.³²

However, already in the first half of the twentieth century several theories, tributaries of diverse philosophical thoughts, began to emerge in the linguistic field. Such linguists as O. Jespersen (1963) or J. Kurylowicz (1956)³³ believed that proper names were a kind of “word class with a maximum of content but a minimum of referents, i.e. the intention of a noun was considered inversely proportionate to its extension”.³⁴ They believe that proper names convey something about the object “and the more as we get to know the object (the) better.”³⁵ To a certain extent, common nouns and proper names denote in the same way and that the sole difference lies in whether connotation is present or absent.

Thus, the philosophical approaches regarding the semantic definition of individual names towards proper names ended up relegating to a second plane the linguistic characteristics. The approaches towards solving the problems of proper nouns do not necessarily mean the solution of the linguistic status of proper names. In a way, these major debates about semantic content and pragmatics of names have only marginally concerned themselves with the issue of their grammatical status; they present almost no dissension from the pervasive view that names are a kind of noun: a ‘proper noun’.³⁶

§1.3 Proper Nouns, Proper Names, Personal Names and Lexical Items

There is a shared line, a common question to all the disciplines that study proper names:

³² Walther 1973.

³³ He later abandoned this thesis in favour of a categorical meaning thesis.

³⁴ Van Langendock 2007: 39.

³⁵ Jespersen 1963: 66.

³⁶ Anderson 2004: 435-436.

what is a proper name? In linguistic terms, as mentioned above, they are a very particular type of noun, but: what kind of word is a proper noun? What is their grammatical status? Are they the same type of grammatical object as common nouns? Many of these questions have been, and continued to be, raised by linguists and philosophers of language when dealing with proper names. Traditionally, in grammatical studies, names have been considered to be a subclass of the noun; they were presented as proper nouns and common nouns, two lexical categories subdividing that of the noun (see above).³⁷ However, it is important to acknowledge the differences between proper and common nouns. A proper name is a noun that belongs and has been connected to an object through an act of bestowal (e.g. the Carian ruler Mausolus), but a common name is when a noun stands for its object through the signification of attributes and the referent has properly been denoted by the term³⁸ (e.g. mausoleum).³⁹

Proper names can be originated from verbs, adverbs or adjectives, but from a basic linguistic point, they are grammatically characterised as nouns. They possess the ability to act as mere PNs (e.g. *John* went to the club) or just simple nouns (e.g. *John* is the most common name). Furthermore, they are so flexible that they can even be used as adjectives when the PN, or even the original noun, expresses its own semantic features (think of the name of Amerigo Vespucci, from which derives the name of the American continent and the demonym/adjective American; or those who follow the ideology of Aristotle, Aristotelian; Christ, Christians; Marx, Marxists, etc.)

Despite this, it is not completely clear whether proper names are to be regarded solely as nouns, i.e. a word, or as a noun phrase, i.e. a syntagm. This can be seen when

³⁷ Anderson 2004: 456. The word *name* is virtually synonymous with the word noun; indeed, in some languages, the same term can be used for both, e.g., French *nom* (Bright 2003: 670).

³⁸ Bean 1980: 308.

³⁹ The burial place of the king Mausolus survived into the twelfth century and was considered one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World (it had an altitude of ca. 45 metres in height). Since then, the word 'mausoleum' has come to be used for any large, above-ground tomb.

we mention the name of a city in a clause, and we do not need to use any article: *Mosul* is the home of ancient Nineveh. However, when we refer to a geographical entity we do need to use an article: *The Tigris* flows through Mosul.⁴⁰ In both examples, the noun of the phrase is clearly viewed, but it is the second case that needs to be accompanied by an article, that in fact does not modify the noun but renders necessary.⁴¹ Thus, proper names, as opposed to common nouns, contain no asserted lexical meaning since they are essentially referring items. As proper names are nouns, in principle they possess the lexical, morphological and syntactic apparatus of the noun,⁴² but they go beyond this linguistic characterisation; they reveal an intricate contradiction of being ‘flexible’ and ‘rigid’ elements that make them unique and different from any other type of noun.

It has been argued that in many languages proper names have a distinctive syntax from other syntactic categories, and that, specifically, they are no more nouns that are pronouns or determiners. Moreover, this is why one of the morphological differences between proper and common names lies in their potential for structural variety.⁴³ However, what marks out names as distinctive and as specifically not a kind of noun?⁴⁴ Why do proper names show a different pattern of development from other lexical terms? Does this development pattern occur in every language/dialect or does it vary according to the historical time and the geographical space? It is clear that lexical terms and proper names have different functions in language as well as in the society they coexist; this is also why there is a clear distinction between the function of a name (or word) and its mere existence as a dictionary lemma. Proper names possess a dual status in language: the name as an element of the lexicon of a language and at the same time

⁴⁰ This phenomenon occurs in many Indo-European languages such as English, Spanish (‘El Tigris’), Italian (‘Il Tigri’), French (‘Le Tigre’) or Portuguese (‘O Tigre’).

⁴¹ Contrast this with many of the PNs from the ANE that are classified as *Satznamen*. See below.

⁴² Van Langendock 2007: 308.

⁴³ Allerton 1987: 67.

⁴⁴ Anderson 2004: 436.

an element of an onymic set.⁴⁵ The comprehension of this particular status together with the appraisal of proper names in a language is pivotal. To name an individual of the same kind (i.e. a human to another human) is a singular case of nomination because it develops the most detailed classification of real phenomena by language means, which is prompted by socio-cultural necessities of communication.⁴⁶

For instance, “a proper name is a noun that denotes a unique entity at the level of established linguistic convention to make it psychosocially salient within a given basic level category (pragmatic)”.⁴⁷ However, the meaning of the name does not necessarily determine its semantic denotation. “An important formal reflex of this pragmatic-semantic characterization of names is their ability to appear in such close appositional constructions.”⁴⁸ Moreover, on the other hand, the rest of the lexical items are those that have a denotative content (lexical meaning) and designate things, actions, qualities or attributes. In general, its meaning can be explained without necessarily refer to the grammar, as exemplified by the following cases: ‘house’ (name/noun), ‘jump’ (verb), ‘clearly’ (adverbs), ‘beautiful’ (adjective) or ‘from’ (preposition).

Now, inside the group of proper nouns we have the category of proper names which holds the most important subclass, corresponding to ‘personal names’.⁴⁹ These have been considered “not as ordinary words but as a particular type of lexical item with the distinction of having definite and unique reference qualities and functions, and therefore classified as parts of the proper nouns”.⁵⁰ Though, as we have seen above, this classical/standard definition is far from reflecting the whole nature of PNs. For instance,

⁴⁵ In the philosophy of language an onymic is the individual of a given class that is named as an individually existing object.

⁴⁶ Blánar 2009: 99-100.

⁴⁷ Van Langendock 2007: 87.

⁴⁸ Van Langendock 2007: 116.

⁴⁹ In linguistics, PNs belong to the sphere of ‘proper names’ and not to the ‘proper nouns’ or ‘proper words’.

⁵⁰ Möller 1995: 324.

while the characteristic feature of proper names is that they refer to a specific object, PNs go further and always refer to individuals as being specific: the object in its entirety as distinct from all other objects. Therefore a PN is a definition in itself and what it does is limited to the socio-linguistic field, i.e. a specific person with a specific name. They constitute the unmarked subcategory of proper names since they refer to humans (and not only).⁵¹

Beyond its etymological and semantic value, not all PNs are identical. A fictitious or made-up name which at first hand would not correspond to any known word (e.g. **Larumta*), is not the same as a name derived from a noun (e.g. light) or an adjective (e.g. luminous). Nor is the same those portmanteau names that combine two words (e.g. Budapest)⁵² from those who are phrase-names (Alexander).⁵³ The ultimate goal is to fulfil the function of nominating someone, but from the beginning, their grammatical value and class type differ substantially. It is not the same to have a PN formed from an adjective or a noun or those formed by noun/adjective and a verb, or vice versa. The grammatical and syntactical construction of each PN could provide significant information about the culture from where it comes (e.g. 'Ndrangheta),⁵⁴ but it is first necessary to unravel its linguistic values.

PNs have been used to recognise individuals uniquely in our universe of discourse and therefore have a clearly referential function. They have also been used as shorthand

⁵¹ Langendock 2007: 188. Proper names can also refer to animals, especially those who developed close ties with humans.

⁵² Budapest is the combination of the city names Buda and Pest, which were united into a single city in 1873.

⁵³ The name 'Alexander' derives from the Greek Ἀλέξανδρος (Aléxandros), which can be translated as "Defender of the people", "Defending men" or "Protector of men". It is formed by the verb ἀλέξειν (*aléxein*), "to ward off, to avert, to defend" and the genitive noun ἀνὴρ (*anēr*), "man" (ἀνδρός, Andros).

⁵⁴ The name associated to the Calabrian criminal organisation 'Ndrangheta probably derives from Classical Greek, a language that had an important influence in the Calabrian dialects. *Andragathía* (ἀνδραγαθία) has been translated as "virtue, courage," both adjectives pertaining to Men of honours. *Andragathos* (ἀνδράγαθος) is a compound name derived from the Greek words for 'man' (ἀνὴρ, *anēr*, gen. *andros*) and 'good, brave' (ἀγαθός, *agathos*), meaning a 'courageous man'.

for whatever characteristics a particular individual may at one time have been associated with, i.e. a connotative function.⁵⁵ However, how are the referential and connotative uses of PNs related when PNs have meanings?

As we have seen, it is hard to establish a precise definitions of what proper names are and to which structure class they belong. Formally they are nouns, but this is simply the ‘last station’ of the grammatical journey. Moreover, despite the viability of raising the question regarding the necessity, or even the possibility, of establishing a definition of them, it is preferable to characterise them by the following features:⁵⁶

- 1) Depending on the language, they lack certain grammatical features of common nouns, such as contrastive number, potential for restrictive adjectives and relative clauses.
- 2) Semantically are partly or wholly opaque.
- 3) They each refer to an individual entity, not a class of entities, and therefore any meaning they have is of an idiosyncratic nature and not integrated into the lexical and grammatical system of the language.
- 4) They are often singled out for special orthographic attention (nowadays capital letters, in ancient times semantic markers such as determinatives).
- 5) Proper names are not necessarily known to all speakers of a language; some are even limited to small groups of speakers. They do not usually appear in dictionaries. So do all proper names form a part of a particular language?
- 6) If no proper names, or at least only some, belong to the common stock of the language, what is the status of the rest? Who or what do they belong to, and who has the right to choose them?

This group of features synthesise some of the key points that characterise proper

⁵⁵ Marmaridou 1989: 355.

⁵⁶ Adopted from Allerton 1987: 81-ff.

names. Trying to define them with an extremely long sentence, in the best encyclopaedic style, does not imply a better characterization of the concept we are addressing; it simply pigeonholed into a few lines, more or less extensive, and turns it into a dead knowledge. In this case, and due to the summary history recounted (see above), we partially agree with Nietzsche's definition regarding the definition of terms⁵⁷, and for now, we prefer to stay at the level of characterization and less on the definition.

Proper names can also work without lexical meaning. This has been shown by their endurance in time. They are capable of surviving the death of the words that initially went into their making and also the demise of the language that coined them.⁵⁸ However, as long as PNs develop throughout time and space, they tend to lose their "purity" and hence its grammatical correctness. The first step before they start losing its grammatical sense is when a lexical term turns into an onomastic element. From that point onwards it is just a matter of time for the element to lose its purity and become a 'self-sufficient' component. In this sense, proper names tend to be more independently from a language (consider, for example, foreign names in a language), but on the other hand speakers of the language may alter those in a specially privileged position, unlike ordinary words.⁵⁹

On the contrary, common words of a language are usually accessible in different ways as proper names are, but at the same time these are more or less persistent in their shape across languages in a way that common lexicons are not. Thus, by general rule, proper nouns are difficult (and sometimes impossible) to translate; they tend to be phonetically and grammatically adapted to those languages that decide to adopt them.

⁵⁷ "Alle Begriffe, in denen sich ein ganzer Prozeß semiotisch zusammenfaßt, entziehn sich der Definition; definierbar ist nur das, was keine Geschichte hat." (Nietzsche GM, II, § 13).

⁵⁸ Nicolaisen 1995: 384.

⁵⁹ Allerton 1987: 86.

This phenomenon is even clearer with PNs or toponyms. For instance, the Hebrew name Immanuel (לאֱמוּנָה), and all its variants, has not been translated as “El-is-with-us”, nor the Greek name George (Γεώργιος > *Geōrgios*, and its variants in different languages) as “peasant or farmer”, or Andrew (Ἀνδρέας/ ἄνδρός > *Andreas*) as “man”. The vast majority of the foreign PNs that a language incorporates into its onomasticon are not translated but merely phonologically and grammatically adapted, another characteristic which makes them an atypical lexical item.

It has been said that the literal meaning and the real transcendence of a PN are correlated but not necessarily identical.⁶⁰ In fact, names with the same literal meaning may have been conferred on various people for different reasons. These names will thus have different real meanings, although their literal meaning is one and the same for all. By literal meaning is intended the significance of word or words making up the name; this meaning is given by the literal translation of the name (e.g. Irene, εἰρήνη, which means ‘peace’ in Greek). Moreover, by real meaning of a PN is intended the actual meaning that the name has for its bearer and for those who bestowed it because it reveals the particular motivations that drive that real meaning and that were originated from the specific psychological and social environment of the individual.⁶¹ The true sense of a PN is, of course, more difficult, and depending on the culture or period also impossible, to detect than the literal meaning. The former cannot be automatically deduced from the latter. However, despite this characteristic of one literal meaning versus one or many real meanings, the possibility of the opposite occurrence can also happen.

The problem between the real and the literary meaning can certainly be seen in the Chinese and Japanese toponyms because it is not always impossible to find in the outer

⁶⁰ Dalfovo 1982: 118.

⁶¹ Dalfovo 1982: 116.

layer the etymologies of the characters with which they are written. Take, for instance, the toponym of the city of ‘Taiwan’ which is written with the Chinese characters for ‘platform’ and ‘bay’. Initially it would not be strange to find a place name formed with these two nouns, but in fact, the name has nothing to do with the Chinese culture; is a folk-etymology that belongs to an aboriginal tribe from the Austronesia region, later adopted by the Sino culture.⁶² A similar case of probable folk-etymology is that of the name of the most famous city of ancient Mesopotamia: Babylon. The prominence of this place has been owed to its famous Amorite King Hammurabi, who ruled the city during the first part of the XVIII century (1792-1750 BC). In the cuneiform inscriptions, the city was written KÁ.DINGIR^{ki} usually with a final -MA (particularly from Ur III onwards),⁶³ rendering *Bāb-ilim* in Akkadian, which can be translated as ‘Gate of the God’.⁶⁴ However, I. Gelb, followed by other scholars,⁶⁵ suggested that the standard reading of the word ‘Babylon’ was achieved through a folk-etymology and was neither Sumerian nor Semitic in origin.⁶⁶ It belonged to the so-called Mesopotamian substratum (Protoeuphratian?), that later passed to Akkadian and from there to Sumerian.

In this sense, the distinction between proper names as a semantic-pragmatic concept and proper names as a grammatical category has to be considered. The linguistic contradiction between proper nouns and the rest of the lexical items is not easy to resolve. Recently, the linguist Van Langendonck made a basic distinction between proprial lemmas and proper names.⁶⁷ Proprial lemmas are lexical items such as *Mario*, *Daniel*, *Rome* or *Teide*, that are usually used as proper names. On the other hand, the

⁶² Bright: 2003: 673.

⁶³ The Ur III material also presents several readings KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{ki}, which are followed by rulers (ENSI) with Akkadian PNs. Apart from this, it also appears the writing KÁ.DINGIR.MA^{ki}, a clear proof that the name of the city was a logogram to be read Semitic as *Bab-ilim-ma* (Kienast 1979: 248).

⁶⁴ Lambert 2011: 71.

⁶⁵ Kienast 1979; Lambert 2011.

⁶⁶ Gelb 1955: 1-4.

⁶⁷ Langendock 2007: 7.

term proper name is also used to refer to a semantic-pragmatic concept. In any case, words must have to mean and must connote to function; names must have content and must denote.⁶⁸ Thus, “whether a word is a proper name or not depends on the way in which it is used in an utterance”.⁶⁹ This difference between proper names as a semantic-pragmatic concept and proprial lemmas as a lexical class is particularly useful in those languages (e.g. the Gabonese Bantu language Orungu, and some other Myene dialects such as Adjumba, Nkomi, Mpongwe, Galwa or Enenga) that lack or possess few proprial lemmas, i.e. languages which take appellatives, verb forms and entire phrases as anthroponyms and toponyms.⁷⁰

In a way, PNs present a variety of complex features that not only challenge linguists, and with them the linguistic sphere, but many other research fields. Therefore, and from the comments made above, it is clear that proper names, and specially PNs, do not enter in the category of “regular” grammatical items because they exclude several of the developmental properties that other elements of the lexicon share. Thus, names are language elements that partially ‘respect’ the “linguistic structure” and “they simply do not participate in the procession universal that orchestrates the “linguistic” items of language”.⁷¹

§2 Onomastics

We could probably go back in time to ancient Greece, Pharaoh’s Egypt or even the Mesopotamian city-states, to trace the origin of many disciplines (astronomy, medicine, history, geography), though it would not be right for the case of onomastics. It is relatively true that the roots of the scholarly treatment of names can be placed back to

⁶⁸ Nicolaisen 1995: 388.

⁶⁹ van de Velde 2012: 1.

⁷⁰ van de Velde 2012: 2.

⁷¹ Markey 1982: 141.

ancient Greece where different ‘books’, particularly those concerning with toponyms, enjoyed a high degree of popularity.⁷² However, the treatment they received was far from being considered either systemic or methodical; they were closer to “an arranged lexico-toponymic list”, i.e. an analytic work, rather than the result of a thorough study. Likewise, the interest on specific names, whether personal or geographical, was also found in mythological, cosmological, cosmogonical, religious, literary and another type of texts. They were used, primarily, because of their etymological value as the common thread of several narratives that continue to these days (e.g. the genealogies from ancient Mesopotamia such as the Sumerian King List⁷³ or the ones mentioned in the book of Genesis from the Old Testament).⁷⁴

In modern times, onomastics, a specific branch of linguistics, began as a consequence of the establishment of philology by Friedrich A. Wolf in 1795 with his classical work *Prolegomena ad Homerum*. In the modern sense of the word, philology has been conceived as the thorough investigation, criticism and the accurate and manifold explanation of ancient written documents and works of literature.⁷⁵ However, onomastics is not merely the quest for the etymological meaning of names, as Isidore of Seville (ca. 556-636 BC) had elevated, for the first time, into a category of thought to explain and justify the Christian salvation history.⁷⁶ It is a discipline that intends to embrace all the possible angles that names can reach. Therefore, onomastics is understood as the study of names which are usually carried out as part of several larger fields, including linguistics, history, ethnography, philology, geography, philosophy, and literary scholarship.

We understand onomastics as a systematic and organised auxiliary discipline that

⁷² Stewart 1958: 2-ff.

⁷³ Jacobsen 1939.

⁷⁴ For the Genesis genealogies see Speiser 1964: *passim*.

⁷⁵ Hadju 2002: 11.

⁷⁶ Amsler 1979: 106.

focuses on proper names (specially anthroponyms and toponyms) with a particular methodology and process of research. However, we do not agree with those that postulate onomastics as an independent discipline of linguistics, hence a discipline in itself.⁷⁷ It is impossible to conceive any research on onomastics detached from the linguistic characters that PNs or toponyms have. Moreover, the inter-disciplinary nature of this discipline has become a common rule among many of the studies concerning names.⁷⁸ Thus, a field of study that constantly needs to intertwine with many other disciplines cannot be considered as an autonomous discipline,⁷⁹ and this, by no means diminishes the importance that onomastics has.

From a linguistic point of view, the study of PNs usually starts and develops with the study of a new language. The decipherment of ancient scripts has usually been boosted by the help of well-known individuals (usually rulers) whose names were translated into different scripts from different languages. For instance, according to some Egyptologists,⁸⁰ the study of names marked the beginning of scientific Egyptology. While deciphering the hieroglyphs from the Rosetta stone, J-F. Champollion used as decoding keys the Macedonian royal names of Ptolemaios and Cleopatra, and the

⁷⁷ Blánar 2009: 90.

⁷⁸ Algeo and Algeo 2010.

⁷⁹ To illustrate this statement we could mention the case of place names used by the native inhabitants of the territory of California. T. Waterman published in 1920 a list of more than 900 place names that only comprised to the territory of the Yurok tribes and their language in northwestern California. However, one of the greatest scholars of the history of California, Erwin Gudde, published in 1949, a study on the geographical names of California. In the preface of the work, he stated “The original inhabitants had very few geographical names, and practically all of these were descriptive... Mountains themselves were of no practical importance to the Indians and probably had no names”. The difference in perception between the two authors was not due to formalities or linguistic aspects but to the cultural-historical issues of such people. Native Americans did not see places as alien to humans but quite the opposite. The human was conceived as part of nature, not his master, and many of the elements of this were simply described and not considered as separate isolated entities (e.g. any high mountain could be described as ‘Big Mountain’, or the same for a large river, path, etc.). The ethnocentric, conscious or not, standpoint that linguists and onomasticians had tended to conceive all natives ‘terms’ as toponyms, without first asking the real value of each expression. It is because of this that onomastic studies cannot be completely disassociated from other disciplines; from it could fall into conceptual errors, as in the case of Native Americans.

⁸⁰ Quaegebeur and Vandorpe 1995: 841.

Pharaohs Tutmosis and Ramesses, all from the Greek version of the inscription.⁸¹ A similar situation occurred to the philologists G. Grotefend and H. Rawlinson who used the names of the ancient kings from Persia (i.e. Darius and Xerxes) as main guides to decipher the Old Persian cuneiform, which eventually led to the decipherment of the Behistun Inscription and the cuneiform writing system.⁸²

Onomastics is usually subdivided into two major groups: PNs or anthroponyms and place/geographical names or toponyms. To a lesser degree, it also applies to the so-called ethnic or national groups (ethnonyms) and languages (glottonyms). However, and due to the amount as well as the importance they have in any society, onomastics has been mainly associated with the study of PNs. Most of the work has been seen as etymological and merely philological (though it is true that sometimes proper names are more complicated than any other type of nouns).

The study of onomastics comprises a basic methodology which consists of deductive and empirical characters: linguistic description, analysis and classification. These are applied in the proper methodological procedures employed in the descriptive, diachronic-comparative, typological and special aspects, which usually consists of the analysis of the formal construction of names, classification of onyms, textual and etymological analysis, statistical and stratigraphical analyses, determination of onymic areas, onomastic cartography and generalities.⁸³

Still, the issue of proper names can be approached from different angles. The most common are the linguistic point of view, where linguists and onomasticians (and language philosophers) tend to analyse the essential nature of proper names. They regularly avoid any socio-cultural manifestation and try to stay in a more abstract and formal level; its scope is none other than the language itself. Once they have outlined

⁸¹ Loprieno 1995: 26-27.

⁸² Lion and Michel 2012: 18.

⁸³ Blanaar 2009: 91.

the basics, they try to apply to specific cases, i.e. proper names of given cultures, to validate what has been stated at the theoretical level. However, both onomasticians and linguists should be aware of the fact that proper names are a particular lexical item which deserves linguistic attention in the first place, but only in the first place. Consequently, as already stated, onomastics should not and cannot be conceived as an autonomous discipline from linguistics.⁸⁴ In fact, it is a fundamental part that should be incorporated into linguistics in its widest sense, comprising all its pragmatic components,⁸⁵ including the elaboration of theories to unify morphology, semantic and syntactic accounts.

Inside the linguistic view, we also have the etymological analysis that has been closely connected with onomastics. Proper names, like the rest of the words, have a history, usually a very telling history. It would be senseless to ignore the primary reason/s for coining them as well as to ignore the variations and derivations from the original meaning, especially when the original meaning might be mundane. By looking into the etymological root, the analysis turns into legitimate grounds. G. Sartori pointed out that going back to the etymon reassures the grounds for a proper analysis a proper analysis that should not see the etymological meaning as an end but as a starting point.⁸⁶

Now, despite onomastics being an important part of linguistics, linguists tended to overlook the study of names. While it is true that there have been many studies related to proper names (see above), the fact remains that onomastics has not had a major role in linguistics. It is only in the recent past decades⁸⁷ that some comprehensive studies began to be undertaken in a more professional and academic way.⁸⁸ However, and

⁸⁴ While some authors advocate for its autonomy (Algeo and Algeo 2000), the very fact is that Onomastics remain an interdisciplinary discipline inseparable from linguistics.

⁸⁵ Langendock 2007: 3.

⁸⁶ Sartori 1987: 21.

⁸⁷ Notwithstanding the great efforts made, particularly, by the Journals *Names* and *Onoma*.

⁸⁸ Ashley 2001: 223. See, e.g., the *International Handbook of Onomastics* (IHZO); Van Langendonck

paradoxically, Assyriological studies have placed onomastics as a main area of research since its birth in the nineteenth century. The role of personal and geographical names was a key element not only to elucidate grammatical features but also to perceive and, sometimes, comprehend a wide variety of historical events.

It is well known that linguistics has focused the studies of ancient languages, mainly, on those from the Indo-European family, and, paradigmatically, have undervalued or overlooked a significant part of the languages of the ANE. This can be perceived in the small number of linguistic studies (not to be confused systemic studies of a language with studies of its grammar) that the Near Eastern languages have received.⁸⁹ Many of the examples, case studies, generalisations or theories that are commonly put forward almost entirely ignored the ANE. However, due to the clear predominance that philology has over the other disciplines related to the ANE (i.e. archaeology and history), the study of onomastics remains of crucial value.

§2.1 Onomastics and Social Sciences (Anthropology and History)

The American linguist Williams Labov pointed out that languages can only function in social contexts and therefore linguistics is nothing more than sociolinguistics. Following this line, many anthropological linguists argue that language and culture are closely intertwined in complex ways that turn them inseparable. Thus, the interaction between language and society can go either way; it is a dialectical phenomenon where the linguistic system may influence on social clusters and vice-versa. However, this influence is not equally proportionate. In every dialectical relationship exist an element that determines, in this case, the social cluster, and another that conditions, the linguistic

2007; or the voluminous conference proceedings from the International Congress of Onomastic Sciences.

⁸⁹ With some exceptions such as Hittite because is the oldest written attestation of an Indo-European language, or the Hebrew from the Old Testament, for obvious reasons.

system. So, in this sense, we believe that it is the social cluster that determines the linguistic system, and the linguistic system that conditions the social cluster.

When referring to onomastics, the impact of social clustering on the naming system is even more significant. This determination seems to be a sensitive barometer for the measurement of social development. Sociolinguistic variables constitute every linguistic system, and therefore socio-historical analysis becomes essential in order not to pass over certain linguistics or socio-onomastic realities without missing the essential facts. This is primarily why onomastics tends to prove the sensitivity of PNs to registering social change (as we will try to demonstrate for the Hurrian case).

Thus, Proper names possess a specificity that makes them well suited for the investigation of social transformations since these changes have a direct and rapid impact on the structuring of especially the name-giving of persons in a community. However, the study of PNs not always awakes the interest of historians or anthropologists because it is considered as a work of philologists and linguists who essentially analyse the etymological or structural values. The use of PNs as part of a historical analysis –in our case the Hurrian pantheon- can offer several advantages, always depending on the scope of the research. The versatility of onomastics, as a particular branch of the linguistic field, has turned it into an analytic tool capable of combining and enhancing different types of historical analysis.

While it is true that a language can be studied as an independent phenomenon on its configuration and internal structure, it is also true that historical analyses have paid attention to the relationship that had with the different aspects of the social life and the culture of the societies that expressed them. In these types of studies, it often takes precedence the diachronic aspects as evidence of the changes suffered by the language, understood as an object of social creation. The history of language is dedicated to

studying the development of the system in its external relations by the cultural, social, religious or political influences.

Furthermore, the socio-onomastic value of PNs also lies in the fact that the onomasticon is constantly renewed: new names originate with new individuals, and new individuals originate new names. From all word classes, PNs possess the greatest possibilities to take on pragmatic and sociolinguistic information. Since proper names, and especially PNs, are so flexible and adaptable, it is to be expected that they can reflect socio-cultural structures in a fairly faithful and direct way. They appear to be a barometer of sociological changes in a rapid and flexible way, unlike the rest of the language elements. Thus, PNs have often been the favourite and the privileged subject of the historical onomastic research. Valuable information for linguistic prehistory can be recovered from them because they are socially anchored linguistic signs and as such part and parcel of the linguistic inventory of society.

Onomastics, as stated before, is a particular branch of linguistics, but not exclusively. Though it is true that linguists and philologists study and analyse all the grammatical and structural features of proper names, including their semantic value, the historical inferences and connotations belonged to a different area, i.e. Social Sciences. Quite often, the concept of 'history' used in linguistics is the one attached to 'historical linguist' (i.e. the scholar who studies languages from a diachronic perspective), but it is important to distinguish that linguists or philologists that are often preceded by this adjective are not proper historians. The study of phonological, morphological and syntactical changes throughout time and space is more of a diachronic linguistic exercise than a proper historical analysis. Therefore, we should be more cautious while using the word 'history'.

Together with onomastics, a crucial field, which necessarily needs to intertwine with

history, is Reference Sociolinguistic. This field determines the place of PNs in language system and society by relating linguistic or onomastic forms to the cultural properties of their referents, i.e. the objects in reality they refer to. In this sense, John Stuart Mill's theory on the lack of connotation of PNs (see above) is partially valid in some historical moments and certain areas. The further back in time we move, PNs tend to hold more related characters of the people that used them. They work as a mirror of the cultural conservatism of ancient societies.

Names, in antiquity as well as in modern times, established the individuality of the entity named. They were (and continue to be) strongly connected with languages and cultures, to such an extent of reflecting the linguistic influences outside a given group. Moreover, and whether the grammatical structure of anthroponyms might have been a consequence of the proper language and hence more conservative, the very act of naming, that is the when, how and where an individual (child or not) received a named, was open to socio-cultural variations, caused by internal developments or external influences.

Societies do not consciously realise that during the act of bestowing a name, whether a newborn or an individual that is being re-named, they are giving birth to a new "socio-cultural life". Anthropologists argue that humans have two births: a biological and a socio-cultural. The first one is the mere physical act that any species does to perpetuate their parties, while the latter starts with the act of naming someone. However, above all, the act of bestowing a name is an act of socialisation. It does not matter what type of ritual or ceremony is performed to establish the act of bestowal, which of course can be analysed later. However, names are a significant clue to what a society values and that is why anthropologists recognise naming as one of the chief methods for imposing order on perception. Therefore, anthropology should focus its anthroponomic studies on

identifying different aspects: the various rules of naming attributions, the relationship between social classes or other objective differentiation, style, similarities within a particular group of individuals, sex, membership to a family nucleus, either extended (clan) or large (tribe), kinship systems, or any other characteristic that establishes dissimilarities when choosing a PN.

However, instead of analysing the anthroponomic structure of the system as a whole, an important part of the work has been devoted to studying piecemeal phenomena that led to different individuals to give this or that name to their descendants. The broader overviews have been conditioned by very specific ethnographic studies that have served only to establish different layers or types of names by completely ignoring a more structural and systemic analysis.⁹⁰

In the last decades of the past century, and despite the postmodern influence (see above), anthropologist began to look for more structural guidelines regarding the study of PNs. The criticism of Benveniste's idea according to which the name is simply a conventional brand of social identification to designate unique individuals,⁹¹ served as a starting point to rework part of the approaches that anthropology had applied to the study of proper and personal names. If individual denominations had only the function of identifying, then there would be no need to examine the systems name of each society. It is from here that anthropology took up the ideas about the functionality of PNs; their meanings as social classification codes (existence and social position holders); capacity as a translator and bearer of the dominant trends in society; the value of its symbolic and identity function; indicator of what is 'allowed' and what is 'forbidden' (taboo); and exponents of the propitiatory and tutelary functions.

One of the most significant contributions that anthropologists provided to the study

⁹⁰ Bromberger 1982: 103-ff.

⁹¹ Benveniste 1976: 200.

of PNs has been the characterisation as a particular classificatory device: a symbolic element. As such, it is logical to bestow a PN through another symbolic action, i.e. a specific ritual, whether religious, secular, dramatic or anodyne. For Levi-Strauss, symbolic actions are part of the essence of any given society, thus naming an individual is understood as classifying it, a precondition of possession which transforms that person in a member of the community by conferring socialness.

Onomastics and the study of PNs has always been associated with the linguistic field. In fact, they belong together. Consequently, in studies of ancient civilisations, particularly ANE, it has been linked to the philological sphere, despite the great importance that its scientific valued has to the history. For instance, in the past decades of the twentieth century, the so-called ethnic picture of ancient Mesopotamia during the first half of the third millennium started to be challenged (i.e. the dichotomy/antagonism between Sumerian and Akkadians, and their chronological appearance in history).⁹² The basis for the different interpretations (e.g. when did Sumerians and Akkadians appear, how did they interrelate, which areas did they control, who created what and how it conferred) started with the thorough analysis of onomastics, and to lesser extent theonyms. Thus, the study of the early contacts between these two populations, mainly but not exclusively, ineludible needed to deal with PNs, particularly because in this period the cuneiform documents revealed much more ‘pristine’ information regarding onomastics than any other cultural differentiator.

In general terms, language scholars tend to see the outer and structural face of PNs; however, by also studying the culture that reproduced them, we can infer at first glances different characteristics, such as linguistic, historical or anthropological ones. The family language (including dialects), the socio-cultural group, the historical time, the

⁹² See Rubio 2013 for an updated discussion.

geographical area, the worshipped deities, the social class or the gender, are simply the most visible aspect that PNs can express. Therefore, onomastics is one of the many ‘keys’ to understand any social dimension of a given society.

§2.2 Socio-Cultural Aspects of Onomastics

One of the main criteria for determining socio-cultural parameters is the language that a given group has. This point of reference is often used by historians, anthropologists and linguists to outline the most important marker of ethnicity. However, it is well recognized that language, culture and human biology need not coincide and frequently do not.⁹³ There are examples where distinct cultures encompass speakers of different languages, where a distinct language involves diverse cultures, and where human biology does not correspond in a straightforward fashion to either cultural identity or linguistic identity. Therefore, language is often a sign of identity, a symbol of belonging, but it is not the only such marker. Thus, this raises important questions such as to what extent do groups with a common cultural tradition and language tend to coincide? Alternatively, to what degree does the connection tend to last, if a link exists?

Variances in language, or even dialects, do not necessarily mean substantial differences in cultural recognition because it can be constructed on numerous things besides language: e.g. kinship, heritage or genealogy, common cultural tradition, religion, different types of ideology (i.e. political, social), territory, national origin, values and social class. However, despite this, an outstanding amount of the interaction between culture and linguistic information is assumed by a more or less clearly identifiable link represented by language. It is true that cultural development (or

⁹³ To a certain extent, this problem resembles the much-debated issue that archaeologists have been dealing between ‘pots’ and ‘people’. On this see the compendium by Skibo and Feinman 1999. It also resembles the archaeological issue regarding ‘food’ and ‘people’, particularly debated in the ANE concerning the ancient Canaanites, Hebrews and Israelites. On this see Finkelstein and Silberman 2002: 119; Finkelstein 2012: 55

change) and linguistic variation belong to different domains. This means that a lack of correlation between language and non-linguistic culture can develop relatively easily, especially because it is much easier for a group to modify its material culture in a relatively short period while linguistic structures changes much more slowly (and not necessarily the adoption of a new language).⁹⁴

The acknowledgement of this problem, as important as it may be, does not imply the complete rejection of the connection between language and people. The idea held by some scholars who claim that if linguistic identity and ethnic identity do not coincide through history then nothing can be said about people or language, is short-sighted.

We have many sorts of information from ‘language history’ that tell us about the past: place names, information on contacts from borrowings, cultural inventory from reconstructed proto-languages, and evidence of language spread or migration. This remains historical data regardless of whether there was continuity in the linguistic socio-cultural identity. We cannot always know from material culture whether the language remained constant, whether new genes filtered into the population, whether a trait of material culture spread across culture and language boundaries or spread with the expansion of its bearers into territory formerly associated with other cultural and linguistic groups. The whole point of research in history is to take as much evidence from as many lines as possible to try to answer as many problems as we encounter. Therefore, we believe that the starting point to the Hurrian problem should focus on philological aspects, but only as an outset and not as an end in itself. Onomastics has been one of the most resourceful disciplines in the search for clusters of socio-cultural complexes. The proper study of onomastics usually leads to identifying the possible source of population substrates. This implies the conviction that the PN of an individual

⁹⁴ Campbell 1999: 372.

is a direct reflection of their language and that language is the emblematic element of their socio-cultural position. This is why, for instance, it has been proposed, among other aspects, the existence of a linguistically Semitic population in the third millennium southern Mesopotamia before the advent of Sargon of Akkad, due to the onomastics presence in the documents from different cities of Sumerian predominance.⁹⁵

However, as many authors have discussed, is neither obvious nor necessary, for example, that people who take Hurrian names necessarily belong to a Hurrian socio-cultural complex,⁹⁶ or the same for those with Semites,⁹⁷ Sumerians⁹⁸ or Hittites names. This does not mean that the fact of carrying a Semitic or Hurrian is indifferent; the language of a name certainly means ‘something’, but that ‘something’ may be the result of cultural aspects and not a consequence of their “genetic filiation”.⁹⁹ This is shown in different parts of the ANE where local people adopted names that were not part of their linguistic background but maybe from the place where they resided; or because they had local, regional or macro-regional prestigious character due to religious, political or any other prominent aspect.¹⁰⁰

Now, despite the mentioned caveats regarding language and people, when we decide to reconstruct ancient populations profiles, i.e. particular socio-cultural groups, we base our starting point, mainly, on the primary language or mother tongue used by these

⁹⁵ Today, few scholars continue to pose a socio-cultural history of ancient Mesopotamia in successive terms (Sumerians, Akkadians, neo-Sumerians, Babylonians, Assyrians, etc.). It is known that the Semites (or proto-Akkadians) coexisted with Sumerians long before the advent of Sargon, and one of the main elements to assume this existence is the presence of Semitic PNs. See, e.g., Gelb 1960; Roberts 1972; Heimpel 1974, who already argued about this in the 60’s and 70’s; or Rubio 2013 for an updated version.

⁹⁶ Sasson 1979: 3; Van de Mieroop 1996: 336, Von Dassow 2008: 68-69.

⁹⁷ To counteract this idea, it has been argued that 90% of people designed as “Haneans” bore Amorite PNs (Streck 2013: 321-322).

⁹⁸ Rubio 2013: 8.

⁹⁹ Liverani 1978: 150.

¹⁰⁰ A clear example of this situation can be seen in the Assyrian deportations of the first millennium and the PNs *Mischsprachen*.

groups in the written documents tradition. This is followed, mostly, because the link in ancient times between language and culture was much closer than we could expect from modern or contemporary societies (except for those that continue to have a high degree of isolation). Moreover, because the available sources express, objectively, much more characteristics concerning the language than people customs, religions, traditions, ways of life, or idiosyncrasy for that matters.¹⁰¹ However, this does not imply to ignore and discard the other aspects related to the characteristics of a group. It simply involves, according to our conception, to place in the order of priority or possibilities those elements that give us more tools when analysing the different aspects that certain populations had expressed. From this, i.e. language, we can continue to identify the different characterizations and cultural identifications and describe them as a whole.

The language itself, understood as the consequence of the social nature of a given population, provides a cumulous of information that transcends the mere linguistic sphere (i.e. morphology, syntax, semantics) and can be extrapolated to many other fields. For instance, there are many cases in which primary sources are either absent or partially represented,¹⁰² and we must rely on secondary aspects to understand the socio-cultural picture. Among these secondary aspects are proper names, mainly personal and geographical, which we find mentioned in the primary sources.¹⁰³

Now, many criticisms and objections could be raised to this more linear interpretation between language and socio-cultural complex; and many might even be valid. However, in the Hurrian case: how it could be argued a complete absence or little relationship between the PNs and the socio-cultural aspect of the people? Overall, and

¹⁰¹ Gelb 1962: 46.

¹⁰² This could be the case of the Hurrian sources regarding their religion, particularly during the third millennium.

¹⁰³ Gelb 1962: 47.

perhaps with some exceptions,¹⁰⁴ those places where the population mainly used Hurrian PNs resulted from a living Hurrian cultural environment. Therefore, the nexus between culture and language, hence PNs, was unyielding among the macro-regional group called Hurrian.

§2.3 Ethnicity or Socio-Cultural Complex

The modern interpretation of the term ‘ethnicity’ has been understood as the definitional set of attributes by which membership in a particular group is ultimately determined¹⁰⁵ while imposing a “self-established boundary separating the group from other groupings of the same order”.¹⁰⁶ However, the set of criterion/criteria markers to establish any interpretation has been changing throughout time.

According to scholars who have been tackling this issue,¹⁰⁷ particularly anthropologists, the “classical” main attributes that faced the subject have been: genetics, language and religion. The genetic aspects had to do with the physical features, i.e. a cosmetic reinterpretation of ‘race’, which encompasses genetics (mainly skin colour and body size) to social (e.g. circumcision, ablation, body painting and piercing) and stylistic (e.g. dress, haircut) differences.¹⁰⁸ The linguistic features have also been another important ethnic marker, usually employed by those who strongly rejected the biological marker. Lastly, the ideological sphere of religion has also served as a controversial and problematic indicator towards achieving a differentiated characterization of a specific group.

These main attributes (physical, linguistic and religious) have been strongly criticised

¹⁰⁴ On the case for Ugarit see the discussion between Sanmartín 1999-2000 and Vita 2009.

¹⁰⁵ Hall 1997: 20.

¹⁰⁶ Fales 2013: 48. For differentiated boundaries and self-identification between cultural groups see the pioneering work by Barth 1969.

¹⁰⁷ Fought 2006: 4-ff.

¹⁰⁸ Hall 1997: 21.

(particularly the genetic aspect)¹⁰⁹ because none could stand as an objective set of criteria for defining an ‘ethnic group’. This is why scholars had to fall back on the idea of the ethnic category as a *polythetic* set of shared cultural forms, i.e. a set of cultural attributes where the appearance of any single attribute is neither necessary nor sufficient on its own to define the set.¹¹⁰ In this sense, the anthropologist Anthony Smith has postulated six dimensions that could be used to identify ethnicity and, partially, counteract this issue:

- 1) A collective name;
- 2) a common myth of descent;
- 3) a shared history;
- 4) a distinctive shared culture;
- 5) an association with a specific territory;
- 6) and a sense of communal solidarity.¹¹¹

However, not all of these features need to be exclusive to the ethnic group, though, according to Smith, an enquiry into these six dimensions will reveal the extent to which we are dealing with an *ethnie* or an ethnic category or simply some regional variations of an *ethnie*.¹¹²

Already in 1978, Brian Du Toit surveyed the series of meanings assigned to the term “ethnic” and its application as “ethnic group”, and summarised them in five general definitions:

“In the **first** sense, the term was equated with race. This is present in its early use by Huxley and Haddon [1939] as well as in point six of the statement by United Nations experts on race [E. Beaglehole *et al.* 1950]. The term is **also**

¹⁰⁹ Zelinsky 2001: 8.

¹¹⁰ Hall 1997: 23.

¹¹¹ Smith 1986: 22-30.

¹¹² Smith 1986: 30.

used to refer to specific major races, as was done in point seven of the United Nations statement. The **third** reference is to a sociocultural group such as the French, either in France or in another country. But **some writers have** narrowed this down and set as prerequisite that ethnic really refers to a subgroup living among others in a foreign country. The **fifth** meaning uses ethnic group when a group of people contrast themselves or are contrasted by others, on the basis primarily of sharing certain cultural criteria such as language, beliefs and values, religion, or history. Such an ethnic group may have geographical contiguity and may include “racial characteristics”, though neither of these is required.”¹¹³

Therefore, and however we want to put it, the problems and solutions regarding the term ‘ethnicity’, since its first uses as a social concept, are nothing more than ‘superficial’ emendations of a much deeper issue. And before relating Hurrians, their language, their PNs and the problems regarding its cultural membership, it is necessary, at least succinct, to understand why we do not consider useful the concept of ethnicity to facing any aspect of Ancient Near Eastern societies, and particularly the human.

§2.3.1 The problems around ‘Ethnicity’

Currently, the so-called Social Sciences or Humanities (i.e. history, philosophy, anthropology, and archaeology) are going through a serious epistemological crisis, whose beginnings can be dated back to the early 1980’s. The crisis has caused a series of deliberated rejections of the use of theoretical and conceptual frameworks to the detriment of mere opinions and absent scientific basis, followed by scepticism and distrust toward major ideologies, theories, objective reality and absolute truth. The movement that has been leading this trend, i.e. Postmodernism, has had enough ability to empty the theoretical arsenal and to, significantly, contribute the proliferation of

¹¹³ Du Toit 1978: 4.

particularisms.¹¹⁴ It is within this broad movement where we have to place the contemporary usage of the term ‘ethnicity’ and many of the studies around this problem.¹¹⁵

At present, anthropologists, sociologists, archaeologists and, to a lesser extent, historians have dedicated themselves to mostly describe the social processes that have been framing with the concept of ‘ethnicity’. Their contemporary views have implied that ethnic groups are more of an idea built by modern scholars than a real thing.¹¹⁶ They “agree that ethnicity is a *socially constructed category*, not based on any objectively measurable criteria,”¹¹⁷ spawning some ‘free-will’ for those scholars who deal with issues of ethnicity. For instance, if the definition of ethnicity is too succinct it cannot embrace the entire reality that is intended to do, remaining an ambiguous concept; but if the definition becomes too long, it turns too specific and limits the scope of research.¹¹⁸ In such characterizations, the notion of ethnicity becomes a difficult task that can only be unravelled by each scholar. However, this does not imply anything new; every scholar builds the object of study and the realities around it. Here, the difference relies on those who are consciously aware of their construction and uses a specific theoretical framework, and those who disingenuously reject every theoretical preconception and pose a more ‘neutral’ perspective.¹¹⁹ Thus, such elastic and vague

¹¹⁴ Postmodernism thought has been articulated over the basis of high-flown or made up terms that simply hide or disguise the theoretical, epistemological and methodological vacuum of the research that is being conducted. See the paradigmatic work by Sokal and Bricmont 1997.

¹¹⁵ It is important to distinguish the ideological current and intellectual reasons that led scholars to give major relevance to the study of ethnicity. There is no doubt that the collapse of the Soviet Union brought to light new or latent ethnic conflicts in many Eastern and Asian societies, and the global economic crisis (including all types of wars) has produced new patterns of migration and modified the flow of peoples between the more and less developed nations (Fenton and Harriet 2002: 1). But the interpretation and the projection of the so-called problem of ethnicity to other fields relies on different grounds.

¹¹⁶ Lucy 2005: 86.

¹¹⁷ Fought 2006: 4.

¹¹⁸ Limet 2005: 370.

¹¹⁹ The rejection is usually based on the idea that the oldest viewpoints and theoretical concepts are no

term is a ‘breeding ground’ for interpretations of any kind and can hardly be useful to something else than to confuse or disguise further facts or processes beyond their full understanding. Hence, the underlying postmodernism in anthropological studies did nothing but dismantle the structural theoretical frameworks and compartmentalise, in many pieces as they could, all the objects of study, processes and a varies set of problems. And within this area of studies, the concept of “ethnicity” (together with gender, agency, alterity/otherness) is a clear example, which forces us to reject the use of this term, not just because its meaning remains vaguely defined and conceptually distinct, but over the bases of two greater criteria: a philosophically moral consideration and a theoretically methodology appreciation.

Ethnicity has been used to simply express a “politically correct” term that has been subtly masking the concept of race,¹²⁰ understood in biological and social terms, either from social Darwinism as well as the phenotypic expression of the whole population which it is intended to apply. And while it is true that many researchers assume features of “intellectual arrogance” in arguing that this relationship no longer exist,¹²¹ the full masked use of this concept as an implicit synonym for race is no less true –at least in the social connotation of the term. It is still palpable the ongoing use to highlight features of superiority, either inside a group to reinforce its cohesion or to differentiate themselves from others, by claiming an alleged biological or theological supremacy, scientifically non-existent. And whether scholars reject the term as a ‘tricky’ synonym for race, the fact is that ethnicity holds a hidden but real pejorative association to the socio-cultural group that is being applied. It is always the ‘civilised eye’ (Eurocentric or Americanocentric) who studies the ‘cultural alterity’, whether minorities or not, by classifying it as ethnic. Almost no studies concerning ‘White Americans’ use the term

longer valid, not as a matter of theoretical supersedement but as a matter of age.

¹²⁰ For a historical account of the relationship between ethnicity and race see Fought 2006: 4-8.

¹²¹ See van Driel 2005: 1.

ethnicity while virtually every study related to any aspect of the ‘African Americans’ or ‘Native Americans’ cultures does. A similar situation occurs with the vast majority of the anthropological and sociological studies that European scholars have been conducted on every culture, ancient or modern, outside Europe. The term ethnicity (from Greek ἔθνος, ‘group, crowd, swarm’) already had a derogatory meaning in ancient Greece. Aristotle used it to refer to ‘foreign people’,¹²² Hellenistic Greeks used it to refer to ‘heathen’, while the Latin version of the Greek New Testament translated this word as ‘the pagans’ (τὰ ἔθνη).¹²³ Therefore, and notwithstanding the ‘best moral intentions’ in those scholars who use this term, ethnicity keeps carrying a relatively important amount of philosophically and morally reprehensible content which prevents its use.

However, Social Sciences are not simply built over morally accepted or rejected concepts; it is necessary to transcend the subjective interpretations by displaying the material limitations. And, although it would be irrational to deny the existence of the ‘word’ ethnicity, we do reject the use of the concept of ethnicity because it is simply the eternal attempt to reify (objectify) a thing that cannot exist in a changing universe, a dialectical universe. No one can be ethnically identical to another, not even to himself, because it would imply the complete inability to reproduce itself as an individual and, collectively, as a society. Hence people have no ethnicity; what they have, or better said, what they are is a socio-cultural process. They represent clusters of social realities that express the cultural aspects of any given society.

This is not a mere change in terminology but of conceptualization. The ethnicities of people are commonly conceived “as if they were natural, real, eternal, stable, static

¹²² Despite some precise cases, ‘foreign people/’ had an implicit diminishable connotation for Greeks.

¹²³ Beekes 2010: 377.

units. They seem to be always already in existence.”¹²⁴ Hence, ethnicity involves objectification, stillness, immutability; pure absence of movement and development to “define a particular group on the basis of certain immutable characteristics”. Therefore, in terms of social studies, to analyse the ethnicity of a group is to deny its historicity, ergo to challenge its existence. On the contrary, a socio-cultural complex implies the opposite: movement, dialectic, change, process, i.e. the ability to express a historical phenomenon and changing reality.¹²⁵ In this terms, how could we study the ethnicity of a population like the Hurrian, which existed for over 1500 years across the entire Near East and cohabited with many different cultures (Sumerian, Akkadians, Amorites, Syrians, Ugaritics, Hattian, Hittites, and the list continues)? Is it even feasible to address the issue of Hurrian ethnicity?¹²⁶ By doing so, we would be rejecting the socio-cultural development of a millennial population that has contributed in a varieties of ways to the historical legacy of the cuneiform culture.

The problems regarding the ethnicity in the ANE,¹²⁷ as well as in the ancient world,¹²⁸ have been a frequent topic of research in recent years. However, the significant problem

¹²⁴ Sollors 1989: xiii-xiv.

¹²⁵ Our view could be interpreted as in line with the definition that S. Jones proposed for ethnicity: “all those social and psychological phenomena associated with a culturally constructed group... The concept of ethnicity focuses on the ways in which social and cultural processes intersect with one another in the identification of, and interaction between, ethnic groups.” (Jones 1997: xiii). Nonetheless, this definition hides, again, the **immobility** characteristics that scholars apply to the concept of ethnicity.

¹²⁶ See the compelling argument against a possible Hurrian ethnicity by Von Dassow 2008: 72.

¹²⁷ It is true that in the last three decades, scholars from the ANE have been dealing with this problem, particularly related to Biblical Studies (e.g. Ben-Rafael and Sharot 1991; Brett 2002; Killebrew 2005; Miller 2008. For the ANE see van, e.g., van Driel 2005; Kamp and Yoffee 1980; Emberling 1995; Emberling and Yoffee 1999; Bahrani, 2006; Rubio 2013). Thought much of the work has been theoretically based, at least partially, on studies from modern or contemporaries societies (see, e.g. the articles published in the RAI 48, particularly van Driel 2005 and Roaf 2005; or Fales 2013, 2015; 2017).

¹²⁸ See, e.g., Hall 1997 for ancient Greece; Edwards and McCollough 2007 for a varied compendium regarding the ancient world; Luraghi 2008 for ancient Greek Messenia; Derks and Roymans 2009 for the Greek and Roman world.

is that scholars who have theorised about ethnicity (and concepts such as gender, agency, class or alterity) do not usually deal with the cuneiform societies but with modern or contemporaries –think of the vast majority of anthropologists or sociologists. Hence, the theoretical frameworks developed to justify their research do not usually fit with ancient societies, particularly those from the ANE, nor the critics to different ‘ethnicity’ theories. Thus, the relationship of socio-cultural complex (instead of ethnicity) and language, and their significance for understanding the historical processes in the ANE need not be underestimated or marginalised. To diminish the use of language as a socio-cultural marker is to perceive a partial reality of the Eastern societies (e.g. the Hurrians from third millennium Mesopotamia), while its overuse can also depict a distorted scenario (e.g. Neo-Assyrian Empire).¹²⁹ The idea of the socio-cultural complex has to be understood as a continuum and not a fixed concept. It varies according to time, space and specific cultures, and language cannot be excluded beforehand.¹³⁰

From earliest times, people have been aware of language and cultural traditions as markers of differentiation: the ‘other’ was built on the differences exposed from the standpoint viewer.¹³¹ It goes that some may have used language in conscious ways, but already in antiquity people were aware of socio-cultural distinctions such as nomads

¹²⁹ The Neo-Assyrian Empire is probably one of the best examples to be extremely cautious while using language as a socio-cultural marker. This empire was not only the largest political unit ever existed in ANE but also the largest ‘melting pot’ or ‘potpourri’ of population coming from anywhere. On this see the extensive and updated sequence of analysis by Fales 2013, 2015, in press.

¹³⁰ Still today, language plays an important differentiator element of particular groups. Without further, think about the nationalist problems that Europe is facing, especially the case of Spain with some parts of the Basques and Catalans societies, which justify a primordial existence based, mostly, on language. In recent years, Catalans have sought to assert a different uniqueness without distinctive features that the mere fact of speaking a different language to that of Castile, i.e. the Catalan language. The remaining differences are simply part of the nationalist propaganda. The Basque case is much more complicated and comprises deeper socio-historical roots, which are not the scope of this work. A similar situation happens with Flemish in Belgium. Alternatively, think of the Kurds in Turkey, Syria, Iraq and Iran or Quebecers in Canada, just to mention some current examples. Language has been and continues to be a very clear marker of differentiation.

¹³¹ Barth 1969.

and sedentaries, local and foreign tribes, and, especially, language communities. There has always been a twofold logic in the dialectic of alterity, a we (I) / they (you), an outer ‘them’ that contrasts with an inner ‘we’. In itself the “cultural *we*” becomes a negative definition which is only the enunciation of what the other cultures (them) are not.¹³² However, this binary logic, which appears as a dialectical contradiction, overcomes the opposition in a mutual interplay of social integration. Therefore the role of the ‘other’ in the construction of identity is not confined as opposition and contrast, although this may be one of its primary functions.¹³³

The marking of a collective identity has frequently been linked to an ethnonym, usually followed by the language of its members (often the second being the consequence of the first, and in fewer cases vice-versa). Examples of language as a socio-cultural marker can be found in ancient, medieval, modern and contemporary societies. For instance, ancient Athens had two main socio-cultural markers: citizenship and language. The concept of “barbarian” (βάρβαρος, “an onomatopoeic reduplicated formation, which originally referred to the language of the foreigner”),¹³⁴ a designation that equated the inferiority of others with their inability to speak comprehensible Greek, was applied to all non-Greek speaking peoples, including Egyptians, Persians, Medes or Phoenicians, and served to emphasise their otherness. Furthermore, the word barbarian was also used by Athenians to deride other Greek tribes and states. The prestige of Greek culture was thus tied to mastery of the Greek language.¹³⁵

There are no objective criteria while dealing with cultures but rather tendencies. Although it is true that language cannot always be a socio-cultural hallmark *per se*, it is not less certain that it cannot be completely discarded as an objective definition of

¹³² Severi 2010.

¹³³ García 2006.

¹³⁴ Beekes 2010: 201.

¹³⁵ Haarmann 2014: 17.

socio-cultural identity and therefore considered as a criterion rather than an *indicium*.¹³⁶ Thus, we believe that language, in any of its expressions, is a key instrument to *begin* the analysis of socio-cultural complexes in the ANE. From language, we can move forward to other spheres (myths, territories, common cultural aspects or material culture among others) to hone the particular or general aspects of the different groups or sub-groups that we intend to study. However, it is important to be extremely cautious and to avoid assuming that language is equal to socio-cultural complex.

In this sense, Hurrians present a relatively typical case because in those cities where they had a strong presence, either primary or secondary regarding primacy, their linguistic inferences were reflected in the texts they produced. The most emblematic cases took place in the cities of Nuzi and Alalah where Akkadian was the administrative language. But in Nuzi, and to a lesser extent Alalah, the influence of Hurrianisms had a strong imprint, generating documents with evident particularities.¹³⁷ This meant that many of the scribes did not have the Akkadian language as their vernacular or mother tongue but simply as a means of written communication, which often generated confusion when writing a text in a language other than their own.¹³⁸ Therefore, these scenarios, unlike others, give us the pattern that every aspect of a language does not always coincide with a specific socio-cultural complex.

§2.4 Personal Names and Socio-Cultural Complexes

PNs in the ANE, and particularly Hurrians, did have a close relationship with people. As an expression of language and, partially, culture, they had an extremely important

¹³⁶ Hall 1997: 22.

¹³⁷ On the Hurro-Akkadian from Nuzi see Wilhelm 1970. On that from Nuzi see Dietrich and Mayer 1997; Márquez-Rowe 1998. Also Giacumakis 1970.

¹³⁸ Most of the Nuzi scribes were Hurrian-speakers, with Hurrian PNs in a Hurrian background. On these see Negri 2005.

value. This connection was so close that, for instance, in the case of the Amorite language it has been partially reconstructed from information obtained in their PNs.¹³⁹ In this sense, Gelb has raised the question regarding the usefulness of PNs, both for the Amorite or others cultures, as elements to rebuild different structures of their societies.¹⁴⁰

Despite some specific cases,¹⁴¹ Ancient Near Eastern PNs are not complicated to understand or associate with a linguistic family or a particular language or dialect. The reason for this is that they were usually bestowed in the language of the person or persons giving the name. The reason for being inherent to the current language of the name-givers was that the names were not just merely ‘designators’ or ‘individualizers’ of a particular person; they usually expressed a sentiment, a wish, a request or gratitude, revolving around their progeny or themselves.¹⁴² Since parents (or in the Hurrian case, most likely, also the siblings) bestowed names, many of the characteristics (e.g. deities, expressions, wishes) were not necessarily of the bearer but their parents. However, PNs could also be linked to the personality of the bearer. The relationship between both, the individual and the PN, could turn so strong creating a new entity, a named entity,¹⁴³ able to transcend its mere linguistic status and became a socio-cultural marker. But the phenomenon of creating and bestowing names with comprehensible meanings for those involved in the process was not only restricted to the ANE; in fact, various societies reproduced the same mechanism.

In the contemporary world, particularly western societies, people have lost contact

¹³⁹ Gelb 1958a, 1980.

¹⁴⁰ Gelb 1962: 47.

¹⁴¹ See, e.g., the list of PNs in MacGinnis 2012.

¹⁴² Gelb 1962: 47.

¹⁴³ PNs not only served as socio-cultural marker but also as life takers or givers. Whenever *ma-an-un-me-e a-wa-te-e ša tup-pí an-na-am ú-sà-ḫa-ru* ^dNIN.URTA MU-šu lu-ú-ḫa-li-iq: “As to anyone who changes the words of this tablet, may ^dNIN.URTA make his name and his offspring disappear (Westenholz 2000: 156). PNs were closely connected with individuals; the idea of removing someone’s name was the idea of eliminating him.

with the etymological origins of their languages (e.g. Spanish or French names derived from Latin). Hence, names are selected from a wide variety of multilingual examples available to everyone but whose linguistic abilities are not skilfully enough to understand the real meaning. This scenario was not the main case for the people of the ANE (e.g. Israelites)¹⁴⁴ because most of them tended to speak, or at least have some knowledge (e.g. Sumerian), of the language of the PN.

Moreover, in the ANE, PNs tended to change in consonance with linguistic and socio-cultural transformations. These changes could mean variations in the population structure, i.e. the arrival of foreign people to the group, but also internal changes, whose origins could have been of different nature. However, in contrast to this situation, geographical names from the ANE tended to be much more rigid. Natural features such as rivers and mountains are much harder to understand (its etymological meaning), if not impossible, while human-made, such as cities, towns, and any other type of settlement, represented a lesser degree. One of the main reasons for this phenomena lies in the fact that toponyms were not formed anew every time a group arrived at a particular region or gained control of it, but they were inherited from previous times, sometimes so distant that turns into virtually impossible the identification of the language.¹⁴⁵ This can also work as a socio-cultural marker because the information based on the study of toponyms can prove or be of great usefulness while trying to reconstruct pre or proto-historical periods.

As the pace of changes in names fluctuated and was not lineal, it is important to recognise whether the fluctuations in onomastics occur as a result of external influences, as a result of changes within the group itself, or as a consequence of the conjunction of both phenomena. So the question regarding the socio-cultural changes, language and

¹⁴⁴ Pike 1990: 3.

¹⁴⁵ Gelb 1962: 44. See, for e.g., the Hurrian name of the Tigris River (Aranzah).

PNs is valid as long as we present a full picture of the process and not just simply philological allegations.

The old expression *lingua fecit gentem* is part of the social construction that societies make when referring to different populations. Despite the many objections raised concerning the connection between language and people, scholars keep on putting forward that populations disappear when its languages perish.¹⁴⁶

§2.5 Social Implications of Personal Names

PNs have been representing an important “repository of language data” by the inferences those data confer about etymology, settlement history, social structure and status, cultural attitudes, religion and symbolic intertextual values.¹⁴⁷ However, what was the social nature of the language for the inhabitants of the ANE? Is it possibly to study the relationship between social structure and the different languages and dialects? As Saussure pointed out, language is a social fact, a kind of social contract; it exists not in an individual, but in a community.¹⁴⁸ Therefore, PNs are an integral part of this social agreement insofar they can classify a person according to sex, culture origin, family status, social class, working environment, religion and, in those societies which bestow different PNs to children at the various stages of their life, by age.¹⁴⁹

However, PNs do not just signify the attributes of what they name. Their reference must be held in some other place -although some agreement about the attributes is required for the acceptable use of them. Thus, the connection between denotation and a

¹⁴⁶ Scholars are fond of saying that Sumerians vanished at the end of the third millennium because its language was no longer in use, especially not in everyday life. The same happened with Hurrians who disappeared from the ANE at the end of the second millennium (despite some PNs from the first millennium) or the Hittites for that matter.

¹⁴⁷ Markey 1982: 141-142.

¹⁴⁸ Saussure 1995: 31.

¹⁴⁹ Morpurgo Davis 2000: 20.

PN, and what it stands for or what it means, is established by the social act of bestowal because it rests on the intrinsic connection between language and social life.¹⁵⁰ This is one of the reasons why PNs have an indexical function, i.e. they signify by using a socially established connection. At a certain moment they are conferred or bestowed upon their bearers in any religious ritual, or a less ritualised act, and the name comes to belong to its bearer. From this moment onwards, the PN functions as an index of its bearer, whether or not there is any spatiotemporal relation between the uttered name and its bearer. Hence, the use of a PN works because it is presumed that it was rightfully bestowed and linked to a person, and distinguishes the indexical relationship of PN and its bearer from the fundamentally symbolic relationship between common names and their objects.¹⁵¹ In this sense, PNs are mostly bestowed on individuals that are visible and therefore deserve an *ad hoc* name, because a person that happens not to have a name will be considered not to exist or become an outcast.¹⁵² Thus, the relationship between the bearer and his name is usually reciprocal; so reciprocal that when a person changes its name, it is usually because the consequence of a major shift in his life.

For instance, the cuneiform texts or the Old Testament mentions relatively few occasions in which a person decides to change his or her name. These cases are typically found in contexts reflecting unusual circumstances in which the change took place by something or someone other than the person's will.¹⁵³ Thus, PNs tend to act as a guiding influence on the bearer who is expected to correspond that name, although sometimes the name itself acquires status, privilege and popularity and consequently, transcends the bearer who has transform the name into a symbol. The social connection between the PN and the bearer is significant because it often carries the character

¹⁵⁰ Bean 1980: 307.

¹⁵¹ Bean 1980: 307-308.

¹⁵² Langendock 2007: 4.

¹⁵³ Eissfeldt 1968.

underlying the selection of such name.¹⁵⁴ Take, for instance, the use of the name ‘Sargon’ by different Assyrian kings, particularly Sargon II, and the connection it had with the prestigious King of Akkad who bore that name,¹⁵⁵ or for that matter the name from the Ur III king Šulgi.

Many Ancient Near eastern PNs also tended to reflect and perpetuate a particular or general situation that existed at the time of the birth of its bearer.¹⁵⁶ However, a name may also be the reminiscence of a situation preceding the birth of the infant and experienced by the parents who want to perpetuate this particular experience in the name of their newly born child.¹⁵⁷ In a way, a person’s name in the ANE was synonymous with the existence and nature of an individual.

§3 Personal Names, Religion and Pantheon

There is no breakthrough in claiming that language is the real and practical awareness of the immediate reality of thought which exists in every human being. Thus, language works as a channel that reflects a broad range of aspects of the human life. However, the connection between the linguistic sphere and the human’s expressions is directly proportional to the importance or symbolic value of the former. Biological or basic needs of any social group could rapidly be manifested in the language together with different cultural, material and ideological expressions. The degree or characteristics of these phenomena would depend on each society but the tendency to reflect, sooner or later, religious aspects is a common feature. Religious institutions are frequently the first social structure outside the family (nuclear or extended) that intends to influence

¹⁵⁴ Abd-el-Jawad 1986: 81.

¹⁵⁵ Fuch 2009.

¹⁵⁶ For example, the Amorites name *Admat-ilī*, ‘How long, Oh my god?’, *Mati-Ilu*, ‘When, Oh God?’ *Ammīni-Annu*, ‘Why, Oh Annu?’ *Maši-El*, ‘It is enough, Oh El’ were cries against the god in order to know how much longer the pain of illness would last in the new-born.

¹⁵⁷ Dalfovo 1982: 117.

language use.¹⁵⁸

There is certainly a close relationship between language and religion which is, mainly, manifested in the impact and mutual influences that each area contributes to the other. There are languages, like Arabic, which owe their “standardisation” to a particular religion, Islam. Others which owe their permanence in time, as Hebrew (despite some possible reserves), to a main religious text, the Tanakh, that preserved a language which otherwise would have been tough to endure to this day.¹⁵⁹

The connection between language and religion is not unidirectional; it can go either way. There are religious communities that are closely bequeathed to a language (Islam to Arabic),¹⁶⁰ and languages that are closely tied to religion (Hebrew to Judaism, or Sumerian to Mesopotamian religion). This is not restricted to specific beliefs or territories. For instance, a significant part of the oldest linguistic documents that we possess from the “native” population of Mesoamerica (e.g. Popol Vuh) are due to the proselytising work accomplished by different missionaries who learnt local languages to evangelise the indigenous population.¹⁶¹ Likewise, the most significant knowledge of Sanskrit reveals that in its origin was a literary language of the priestly class of India,¹⁶² or Avestan, the language of Avesta, the sacred text of the Zoroastrian religion.¹⁶³ Thus, examples of religion and language, or vice versa, are not restricted to any particular period or geographical place; it is a transversal line, probably inherent to social nature,

¹⁵⁸ Spolsky 2011: 14.

¹⁵⁹ At the very beginning of the first millennium AD, Palestine was a multilingual territory. The Jewish population there had Aramaic as vernacular language and Greek (and to a lesser extent Latin) for relations with the government. The Hebrew language was only used in their religious life. While Greek and Aramaic were also used in different cultic contexts, Hebrew was almost absent outside the religious sphere (Spolsky 2011: 18).

¹⁶⁰ The connection between Islam and Arabic (and not the other way around) is so tight that the translation of the Qur’an has always been a controversial and intricate issue in Islamic law. Muslims worship this book as the miraculous and inimitable work of Mohammed, and argue that the text should be written and read in no other than Mohammed’s original language.

¹⁶¹ Rivera Dorado 2012: 10.

¹⁶² Aklujkar 1996.

¹⁶³ Martínez and De Vaan 2013: 1.

which transcends different societies throughout the world.

The relationship between language and religion necessarily involves the writing of scripts (at least in those literate societies). While it is true that writing in the ANE or Egypt was born as a result of a specific material necessity,¹⁶⁴ this record-keeping mechanism subtly adapted, among others, to the religious field and played a major role in the reproduction of this particular ideology. For instance, the writing system of ancient Egypt was considered as a ‘sacred script’ invented by the deity Thoth (*Djehuti*), the Ibis-headed god of wisdom and scholarship, considered as the scribe of the gods.¹⁶⁵ Thus, Greek observers coined the terms *ta hieroglyphika grammata* (τὰ ἱερογλυφικὰ γράμματα), literally ‘the sacred carved letters’, and *grammata hieratika* (γράμματα ἱερατικά), literally ‘priestly writing’, to describe the mysterious glyphs that the Egyptian priests used in their writing systems.

There are many ancient unique documents which we owe their existence to the intention of the elite to reproduce, perpetuate and transcend their religious practices. Mentioning them would simply redound the clear and obvious connection that existed, and continue to exist, among religion and language (and by extension script).

In the case of the ANE, religious texts, together with administrative and epistolary, constitute a vast corpus among the hundreds of thousands of cuneiform tablets. At the *edubba*, an important part of the teaching and training of ancient scribes consisted of copying out and even composing religious texts. Despite the significant amount of

¹⁶⁴ The birth was the consequence of an economic-administrative record-need, and not as a result of an abstract necessity, i.e. religion or magic (despite the argument raised by Cervellò 2005 for the hieroglyphic writing from the early Egyptian dynasties). A similar situation probably occurred in China (Bolz 2000-2001: 3-ff) and Mesoamerica (Justeson 1986), despite the poorly or non-attested early stages.

¹⁶⁵ Wilkinson 2003: 215-217. The Egyptians also had the goddess Seshat (lit. ‘Female scribe’), already known from the 2nd Dynasty, related to the writing activities. She was the deity of every type of notation and record keeping (e.g. accounting and census), apart from being the patroness of temple libraries and other collections of texts (‘she who is foremost in the house of books’). It seems that Thot was related mostly to the religious sphere while Seshat to the mundane-administrative.

‘profane’ works such as sign-lists, lexical texts, literary compositions or letters,¹⁶⁶ a relatively substantial number of the school texts were religious (god-lists, hymns, mythological compositions), which inevitably led to an influence on most of the literary languages of the ANE.¹⁶⁷

The connection between religion, language and scripture was also manifested through cuneiform inscriptions. Whenever a temple was erected, particular objects were earthed beneath the structure as ‘foundational or building’ deposits. Thus, pegs became the most prevalent kind of foundation deposit during the Early Dynastic II Period and began to be accompanied with inscriptions from the Early Dynastic III down through Ur III.¹⁶⁸ These inscriptions, which were engraved in clay tablets, bricks, stones or metal objects, had two main purposes: some were supposed to avert evil influences or bad luck from the constructed building by invoking the protection of the gods, i.e. they had an apotropaic purpose; while some others had a more dedicatory or commemorative meaning than ‘magical’.¹⁶⁹ Of course, some inscriptions met this dual purpose (commemoration and apotropaic) as it is shown by the famous inscription from Tiš-atal, king of Urkeš, where he commemorates the construction of a Temple dedicated to Kumarbi¹⁷⁰ and invokes the protection of the gods to avert any possible destruction of it.¹⁷¹ Hence, the religious value was not only expressed through the construction of a temple, which was the main feature, but it was also transmitted through the inscription, which in the end made the whole and every element of it a religious procedure above all.

¹⁶⁶ Sjöberg 1974.

¹⁶⁷ Watson 2001: 6.

¹⁶⁸ Ellis 1968: 46.

¹⁶⁹ Averbeck 2010: 9.

¹⁷⁰ See Tiš-atal Inscription. Buccellati and Buccellati 2009.

¹⁷¹ Ellis 1968: 57-58; Muscarella 1988; Wilhelm 1998b.

§3.1 Antiquity and Personal Names

Among the various components that constitute a language, onomastics, as we have seen, is of great importance. Such importance has served as a vehicle to reflect a variety of things, among which religion has deftly used it as a channel to “propagate” its ideology. Thus, anthroponyms have been serving as major exponents to reproduce those values that societies consider dominant.

PNs have been systematically studied as a source of information about religious beliefs since the nineteenth century -although the Greeks already distinguished those with or without divine names (see above §1.2). For instance, the ancient Semitic names were, paradigmatically, a source of inspiration: they did not just simply appeared extensively in cuneiform, aramaic or canaanite inscriptions, or later in the Old Testament, but many of them often comprised name-phrases describing its bearers as ‘subordinates of the deities’¹⁷² or short sentences reciting a particular situation.¹⁷³ The semiotic value of PNs with a theonym inside was not exclusively of the Semites but also a common characteristic of many cultures of the ANE, as well as the Egyptians¹⁷⁴ and Greeks.¹⁷⁵ They usually represented one of the largest groups of PNs,¹⁷⁶ and the higher or lower incidence or the completely absence of deities names in the anthroponyms was a patent indicator of a specific idiosyncrasy expressed by particular groups. As a parallel way, this attitude contributed to shaping and modelling the cosmology of the people since it resembled how important and imprinted where the deities in the daily life, not only from the ruling elite but also from the rest of the classes that constituted the society.

¹⁷² Fowler 1988: 29-ff.

¹⁷³ Tigay 1987: 159.

¹⁷⁴ Lüddeckens 1985; Quaegebeur and Vandorpe 1995: *passim*.

¹⁷⁵ See the general studies concerning different aspects of Greek Onomastics in Matthews and Hornblower 2000.

¹⁷⁶ Fraser 2000: 149.

In antiquity, many PNs were formed with words for natural objects and phenomena such as fire, rain, thunder, water, subterranean waters, sky, rivers or mountains. Many were probably religious in origin or later semantically modified to the tune of the religious changes. They were also formed with kinship elements, attributes, political achievements or heroic deeds that were usually confused or attributed to a deity's will. But the most obvious religious anthroponyms were the theophorous ones, which derived from deities of all types (macro-regional, regional, local, family and personal). The opposite situation could also occur (i.e. an anthroponym derived in a theonym). But to know what came first (apart from the obvious cases of deified prominent figures, such as kings, e.g. Šulgi) is virtually impossible, particularly when the etymology of the theonym is not clear or when the origin, e.g. if it derives from toponyms or belongs to a so-called substratum, is unknown.¹⁷⁷

In the case of the third millennium ancient Mesopotamia, Sumerian anthroponyms consisted of religious (the basic element is a deity's name) and profane names. The most common deities that appeared in the PNs tended to be the reflection of the local city-states gods: Nanna (Ur), Šara (Umma), Ba'u (Lagaš); and also from the greatest deities of the Sumerian pantheon: Enlil, Utu, Inanna, Nergal.¹⁷⁸ An analogous situation occurred during the Old Akkadian period where the selection of a deity to be part of the PN was not simply serendipitous, but it was also probably conditioned above all by the local pantheon.¹⁷⁹

During the second millennium, the PNs from the Old Babylonian period (OB) continued to bear theonyms, which also reflected, partially, the religious reality of the

¹⁷⁷ Take for example the PNs that carry the theonym of Dagan, a deity that has been associated to the so-called substratum because none of its possible etymological meanings nor his origin has been clearly granted (see Feliu 2000; Oliva Mompeán 2008: 160-ff.).

¹⁷⁸ Limet 1995a: 853. See also Edzard 1998.

¹⁷⁹ Di Vito 1993: 15, 272.

time. For instance, at the city of Sippar, 70% of all theophorics contained the names of gods who belonged to the official pantheon of Sippar (deities who had either a complex temple organisation or small shrines). The chief deity of the city, Šamaš, occupied the largest number of theophorous (20%), followed by Sîn (15%). After these, though in a much smaller percentage, were the remaining deities: Adad (5,5%), Ištar (5%), Ea and Enlil (4%), Marduk (3,5%), and Nanna, Aja, Nabium and Amurru (2%).¹⁸⁰

An important group of Mesopotamian PNs, both Sumerian and Akkadian, also reflected the relationship with personal/family deities. In the OB period, the generalisation about the identity of the god occurring in PNs was not always regular, and the descendants might have not always received a name with the family theophorous or vice-versa. The act of bestowing names varied from city to city, but the religious tradition of granting theonyms continued.¹⁸¹

If we move to the pharaoh's realm, theophorous are already found in the first dynasties from the Old Kingdom (ca. 2700), and from this moment onwards all the important deities will appear in the Egyptian onomasticon. The PNs tended to shift according to the level, popularity and importance of the worshipped gods, particularly reflecting the "popular" religion. For instance, it is known that the god Amun was the most popular deity during the New Kingdom (except for some religious distortions); this is reflected in the frequency of appearance attested in the PNs.¹⁸²

The Hebrew Bible, as mentioned before, is another well-known example of the relationship between religion, gods and PNs. A significant amount of the bestowed names reproduces a common noun or a phrase in Hebrew (apart from the foreign

¹⁸⁰ Harris 1972: 102.

¹⁸¹ It is interesting to highlight that deities names and divine epithets are usually found without case ending in most of the functions in which theophorous elements in PNs occur. In Akkadian, for instance, the names of Šamaš, Adad or Il are usually found in an endless form, as if his/her status could transcend any mundane rule, in this case a grammar rule (Streck 2013: 311).

¹⁸² Quaegebeur and Vandorpe 1995: 844.

names) which usually refer to Semitic deities such as El, Yahweh or, in fewer cases, Ba'al.¹⁸³

The societies in which religion has been placed at the centre of daily life tended to be more conservative and to reproduce, with minor changes, cultural idiosyncrasies bequeathed of yesteryear. As seen before, this is often palpable in ancient civilisations. However, the connection that existed between religion and onomastics is not an exclusive property of them; this bond has been observed in many other societies from different historical periods and various religious backgrounds. For example, the phenomenon of naming newborns with Christian names had a significant impact during the Christianization process that occurred in Egypt during the Early Byzantine period in the post-Diocletian and Constantine centuries. Throughout the sixth and seventh centuries AD, the propensity of the Egyptian Christians (or Christianized) to particularly give names from biblical characters, saints or Christian qualities was notorious. The contrast with the “pagan” names bestowed during the second and third centuries AD was a clear consequence of the “adoption/imposition” of a new religion on a pre-existing religious society.¹⁸⁴

A similar situation occurred with the population of Medieval Iran. During the conversion to Islam, a common practice for the early Muslims of different Iranian families was to give their children names of the Arabic onomasticon, a tradition that continued after successive generations. This change was very obvious since the conversion to Islam occurred during the life of the last member of the family who bore a Persian rather than Arabic name.¹⁸⁵ And unlike other religions, who brandished a lesser

¹⁸³ Pike 1990. For a complete dictionary of the Biblical PNs see Odealain and Segueineau 1991. The discovery of the Samaria ostraca date to the first half of the eight-century has confirmed the use of Ba'al as a theophorous, which was probably more common than the Bible presents it (Tigay 1987: 161).

¹⁸⁴ Bagnall 1982: 107.

¹⁸⁵ Bulliet 1979:16-25

degree of fundamentalism or were not directly associated with a particular language (especially Christianity),¹⁸⁶ Islam was much more demanding, even to this day, as regards the granting of PNs to their *Ummah*.

In the case of ANE, people named its inhabitants with hundreds of different PNs, most of which probably had definite (real) meaning at the time they were given. However, this specific meaning was not static; in many cases varied and with time also vanished, leaving just an empty and meaningless ‘skeleton’. Thus, the use of PNs as evidence of religious belief presupposes that their meaning was understood and intended to last much longer than other types of names. However, this is sometimes questioned by scholars, especially because in the modern Western world PNs are frequently not understood; they were originated in a different language (or dialect) and culture of those who use them.¹⁸⁷

In any case, people in antiquity, as well as in conservative societies, whether ancient, modern or contemporaries, took much more seriously the connotations of the names they gave their children.¹⁸⁸ Thus, in most of the cases, the use of PNs as evidence for religion is proof for the religion of the parents at the times of the children’s birth and not necessarily of the individual holding the name. Except for major changes (e.g. the Christianisation of Egypt, Islamisation of Iran or, in a much lower scale, Akehnaton’s

¹⁸⁶ Christianity adopted many anthroponyms that were considered pagan and which originally did not refer to that religion. The name of the saint Onuphrius, for instance, existed since the Pharaoh’s time and continued during the Greek and Coptic periods. It corresponded to an epithet from the god Osiris (Egyptian *wmn-nfr* > ‘He who is continually good’). Cfr. with the rest of the Egyptian names formed with ‘*nfr*’, such as the well-known Mayor of Thebes Sennefer (*sn-nfr*) ‘The god brother’, or the Chief of the artisans at Deir el-Medina Neferhotep (*nfr-htp*) ‘Good in peace’.

¹⁸⁷ Tigay 1987: 161. To exemplify this, we can take the extended cases of Hebrew or Hindi names, where people bearing these are neither religious nor belong to those cultural groups and, furthermore, have no idea what their PNs means (as probably happens with the parents that selected the name).

¹⁸⁸ Conservative societies tended to reproduce in their own language and in many of its aspects the real, practical and existent consciousness of the immediate reality of social thought. An example of this reality is the commonly dissymmetry percentage of theonyms between female and male, which alludes to their roles in society, and particular the roles in religion. Despite the presence of priestess which had significant roles in the cultic practices (e.g. Ba’al’s high priestess at the city of Emar), religion, throughout history, and with some exceptions, has always been dominated by males.

reform), ancient populations, mostly, did not tend to adopt entirely different religious belief from that of their predecessors. So if the name represented the ideology of the parents, it would most probably characterise that of their offspring (despite some exceptions).¹⁸⁹ Therefore, the symbolic meaning of the name was probably shared by both: the name-giver and the name-receiver. This phenomenon has been termed as “double indexicality” which characterises “the association with the bearer on the one side and the deity on the other and subsequent beliefs about the relationship between deity and bearer derive from the one being named for the other.”¹⁹⁰ But bearing a theophoric name did not necessarily influence the religious behaviour of the individual, particularly during the adulthood. Despite the cultural conservatism of the ANE societies, it is important to distinguish the difference between sharing common symbolic values through religion and that of actually practising or worshipping a specific deity.

Therefore, theophoric names may have different implications depending on the scope of the analysis, but they usually serve to shed some light on those aspects of the religious practices which may be hidden or remain unclear, and that of the evidence they provide for the spread and popularity of particular cults and deities.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁹ Both Egypt and Mesopotamia have shown examples where the offspring adopted different deities from their predecessors and eventually changed their names. The most famous case from Egypt is that of the Pharaoh Amenophis IV, better known as Akhenaton, which led a religious reformation by introducing the worship of Aten (together with the foundation of a new capital, Akhetaten) to the detriment of existing beliefs.

¹⁹⁰ Bean 1978: 97.

¹⁹¹ The relationship between religion and PNs has not been restricted to ancient or medieval societies, or simply the population from the ANE and eastern Mediterranean. In modern and contemporary cultures, we still find numerous examples of this connection coming from distinct places with completely different cultures. For instance, John Mbiti, in his study of the African religion (Mbiti 1991: chap. 3), dedicates a section of his work to gather all the sources for the African religion. However, as sacred writings are almost absent, Mbiti looks for other types of sources and collects information from rituals, festivals, shrines, symbols, music, dance, proverbs, and specially anthroponyms. He claims that PNs were an important source for the Africans and a key reservoir for studying their religion (Mbiti 1991: 28). However, paradoxically, the relationship between religion and PNs among Africans was not restricted to their vernacular beliefs. During the 20th century

§3.2 Hurrian Personal Names and Deities

The methodological approach for studying a religious pantheon using the PNs of a given society could not be applied to every culture or every period. Due to specific characteristics and particularities (some of which have been mentioned), ancient cultures developed a close relationship between onomastics and the religious phenomenon. This occurrence can be widely seen in the entire ANE, being more patently in some macro-linguistic cultures, e.g. Semites or Indo-Europeans, but also in reduced ones, e.g. Sumerians and Hurrians.

As it has been stated in the introduction of this work, the unusual (and not for this reason less efficient) method of studying the Hurrian pantheon through onomastics could be interpreted as a consequence of the methodological weakness of the topic, particularly due to the scarcity or disparity of the Hurrian written sources that could delineate the structures of their deities. However, and despite this alleged setback, we

(thought it started in the previous century), the Uganda population underwent a process of Christianisation and, to a lesser extent, Islamisation. These processes were concomitant with the significant decrease of PNs that referred to traditional religion, which was also the consequence of the impact that Christianity and Islam had over the society. Among the various groups that suffered this process in Uganda were the Lugbara. Nowadays, this population is constituted, roughly, by 78% of Christians, 18% of Muslims and the remaining of pagans. This process of conversion had an impact on PNs referring to traditional beliefs. Both religions, in fact, demanded a complete rejection of traditional faith, practices and cults, among which, PNs, had a paramount role; so important that the conversion to the new religion was marked by a substantive personal development that revolved around PNs. In fact, a common expression to signify “becoming a Christian” was *ru'da*, literally meaning in the Lugbara language: ‘to give the name’ (Dalfovo 1982: 131).

Another example of religion, deities and PNs is the one expressed by Hinduists. The vast majority of Hindi PNs derived from Hindu religion, particularly Hindu deities, prominent figures, philosophers, sacred rituals and centres of pilgrimage. There is hardly a deity of the pantheon, male or female, missing in the onomasticon. Its presence is often believed to work as a spell upon the utterer which not only protects him from the evil spirit but also brings good luck, happiness and prosperity. Thus, by naming their children with any theophorous, the parents and elders of the family hope to gain easy *punya*, i.e. the divine reward of a righteous deed (Mehrotra 1982: 43).

If we take the case of modern (and contemporary) Europe and its surroundings, we still find the existing relationship between PNs and gods; or the extended variations which use saints or biblical names. For instance, Catholics choose their names preferably from the Calendar of Saints: the day that an individual was born received as its first name (or as a middle one) the name of the saint of that day. Protestants, instead, prefer to take names from the Bible, particularly the Old Testament, as they do not worship the figure of saints, while Muslims pick Arabic names from the Quran and Islamic history.

must emphasise on the contrary: a holistic approach of the Hurrian pantheon *must* include an analysis of the onomastics due to its complementary character to the *rest* of the religious sources, whether material or textual. Moreover, we emphasise the word ‘rest’ because Hurrian PNs can contribute, even in a more objective way than the remaining sources, to outline the structure of the pantheon, their characteristics and their deities, or at least a large part of its features. In this manner, names, as an expression of language and culture, are the manifestation of a real collective conscious and not just a random phenomenon. Onomastics open the scope and the possibilities of our investigation by a number of things and most importantly, it transcends the limited point of view of an elite which was in charge, through their scribes, to reproduce a particular view and religious ideology. However, this more ‘democratic’ approach generates an appeal to the historian of religion because they can face a relatively straightforward form of evidence; much more objective than a tendentious literary text created by an author(s) to fulfil a particular argument.¹⁹²

However, the relationship between ideology and onomastics, and how the first one imprints its view in the second one, is not exclusively associated with religion, despite being the ‘mother’ of all the ideologies in ancient societies. PNs have also been interpreted as ideological markers for other dimensions. For instance, a very well-known paradigmatic case were the Hittite kings, its courtiers and some members of the elite society that during the New Kingdom (XIII century BC) decided to adopt, add or change their birth or previous names into Hurrian ones.¹⁹³ This has been considered as “a sure signal of the diffusion of Hurrian culture and traditions and of the receptivity of them among the elite of the Hittite society”,¹⁹⁴ and could also be considered as a sign of ‘prestige and cultural appreciation’ which was expressed under the Hurrian figure.

¹⁹² Tigay 1987: 160.

¹⁹³ Beal 2002: 69.

¹⁹⁴ De Martino 2011: 18.

However, this peculiar phenomenon did not end with the mere act of “(re-)baptising” with random Hurrian names. In fact, the vast majority of these were Hurrian theophoric *Satznamen*, i.e. one of the two components of the names is almost always the name of a divinity and the second is usually a verbal form, and to a lesser extent a noun or an adjective.¹⁹⁵ Thus, we may ask if the Hittites decided to adopt these names just because of their Hurrian origin, because of the presence of a specific theonym or because of the occurrence of both elements. What was more important? The Hurrian background or the religious connotations of the names? Or, could they have been considered as an indivisible unit, i.e. Hurrian culture equals religious/cultic manifestation? In any case, these particular PNs were the result of deeper transformations that were not simply restricted to the religious sphere and which also expressed the political reality of the Kingdom of Hatti, particularly its relationship with Kizzuwatna.¹⁹⁶

The close connection inside the Hurrian world between religion, gods and PNs was evident. The very first names identified and associated by different scholars with this group (see below) were mainly theophorous, and, mostly, belonged to population from the second millennium. However, the oldest Hurrian names did not appear in the cuneiform tablets from Mesopotamia and Syria as theophorous or religious. In fact, the oldest examples suggest very few or no connection with gods and religious aspects; they expressed a more political and kinship character.

Linguists and language philosophers have long debated whether proper names have connotative or denotative capabilities or both. On one side, they first assert that proper names have essentially a reference but not a sense, i.e. proper names denote but do not connote. On the other hand, they state that they have a sense essentially and only contingently a reference, meaning that they refer only to the condition that one and only

¹⁹⁵ De Martino 2011: 19.

¹⁹⁶ Beal 2002.

one object satisfies their sense. However, the common omission made by philosophers of language and linguists is that connotation and denotation are not simply inherent to the name and the bearer but especially to the historical-cultural context that surrounds them. Without knowing this, the analysis of the PN turns incomplete. Therefore, we consider that the Hurrian PNs from the third and second millennium have connotative and denotative capacities, and it is the historical context that helps us to elucidate the relationship of the both; a relationship that in the case of anthroponyms and deities is essential. Pretending to analyse the PNs out of their social expression would only contribute to creating more inconsistencies, either in the strictly linguistic field or in the historical anthropological. Thus, it is crucial to follow the development of religion, language, PNs and the way they interact to fully understand the dimension of such phenomenon in a holistic manner.

§4 Methodological Approach

The approach towards onomastics -to use a close example from our discipline- is similar to the one that archaeologists do when dealing with ceramics. They first carry out a ‘technical’ analysis of the artefact: shape, decoration and painting design and techniques, manufacturing method, cooking process, design, pattern, petrography, etc. Once this phase has been performed, the study moves forward to the interpretation level where the socio-economic significance, the place where it was retrieved, its social value (i.e. funerary complex, house, temple, palace, granary, storage, etc.) and many other elements are considered and appraised. Finally, the overall picture is formed while combining both approaches; otherwise, the study will be limited to a partial view of the matter in question.

In the case of onomastics, the ‘technical’ approach is comprised of the philological analysis. Recognising the linguistic affiliation and consequently the language, the

grammar, syntax, morphology, semantic, etymology and any other linguistic aspects is part of the general process. But in a study of this kind, it is not sufficient to approach the question of PNs only from a linguistic point of view. It is necessary to go beyond and enter the ‘social’ world, the ‘historical scenario’, to understand why the names were born (i.e. bestowed and bearing), reproduced (i.e. adopted by others), and evolved (i.e. adapted to different groups). However, the dominating approach towards ancient languages, particularly those from the ANE, has long been philological rather than the historical or linguistic.¹⁹⁷ Thus, “the influence of modern linguistics upon the study of the ancient near eastern texts, if there can indeed be one, is something that has still to be felt in the future”.¹⁹⁸ There are several definitions for the word ‘philology’, but when apply to the ANE, it is usually conceived as:

“the field that attempts to retrieve systematic information about a language from written records... to obtain historical information from documents to learn about the culture and history of the people behind the text, and, to interpret older written attestations with the goal of obtaining information about the history of the language (or languages) in which the documents are written.”¹⁹⁹

Today, the most common sense of philology in historical linguistics is concerned with the linguistic information acquired from written material, with how this information can be obtained and what can be done after processing. And while

¹⁹⁷ Despite some works. For Sumerian see Civil 1973; Diakonoff 1975; Gragg 1973. For Akkadian see Rainer 1966; Buccellati 1996.

¹⁹⁸ Barr 1968: 22.

It is striking that linguists, in general, have overlooked the study and analysis of the languages of ANE. Except for Hittite language, due to its Indo-European origin, and Hebrew, for its religious implications, the remaining known languages of ANE (Sumerian, Akkadian, Hurrian, Ugaritic, Aramaic, Phoenician, etc.) have been poorly approached from a linguistic perspective. It is suggestive that the most ‘renown’ linguists have focused their studies on ancient languages, mainly, on those pertaining to the Indo-European family (particularly Greek, Latin and Sanskrit) to the detriment of those belonging to other linguistic families.

¹⁹⁹ Campbell and Mixco 2007: 152.

linguistics considers the texts just as ‘linguistic facts’, i.e. as language phenomena, philology is interested in the documents as written history and culture of people. In this sense, philology works as an auxiliary science of history and literary history; it provides all the information that cannot be deduced exclusively from the linguistic aspect of the texts and that are essential for the exact interpretation of it.²⁰⁰ In a way, linguists have as their goal the system of language, whereas philologists have as their goal a better understanding of the meaning of the text being studied, while the language is just the primary means to those ends.²⁰¹

Now, onomastics, as a very important field of linguistics, has always been of great interest for ANE philologists. It functions, at first glance, as a ‘socio-cultural marker’ and a ‘grammatical element’, although the range of possibilities is so wide that detailed analysis of proper names has been the subject of numerous studies.²⁰² And unlike many other modern or ancient languages, grammatical descriptions of the languages of ANE such as Akkadian, Sumerian, Hurrian, Ugaritic, Aramaic, Hittite, often include sections or entire chapters dedicated to onomastics (to the case of reconstructing a ‘partial’ grammar of the Amorite language over the evidence shown in their PNs).²⁰³

Therefore, our methodological approach moves in the direction from the general and abstract, i.e. philology/linguistic, to the particular and concrete, i.e. socio-historical and religious significance. From the concerns of particular philosophy, we turn to general linguistic and from there to an issue of a more specialised nature that lies on the boundary between grammar (particularly syntax), semantics and historical value. In

²⁰⁰ Coseriu 1986: 13-14.

²⁰¹ Holmstedt 2006: 6.

²⁰² Just to exemplified, see the voices “Name, Namengebung (Onomastik)” in the *RIA* 9 for Sumerian, Akkadian, Hittite, Hurrian, Amorite and West-Semitic PNs. See also the number 8 (1991) of the journal *SEL*, completely dedicated to Onomastics, or the compendium of Semitic and Ancient Near eastern onomastics edited by Streck and Weninger 2002. For the Akkadian world see also Di Vito 1993. For the Old Babylonian period see Streck and Weninger 2002; For the Amorites see Rasmussen 1980; Streck 2000. For the Hittite world see, e.g. Goetze 1953; Laroche 1966; De Martino 2011.

²⁰³ Gelb 1958, 1980.

doing so, we analyse the religious information provided by the Hurrian PNs and confront it with the characteristics of its society to establish the specificity and changes of the pantheon.

§4.1 Linguistic Analysis

A thorough investigation of PNs should start from the visible part, i.e. the linguistic point of view that characterises the semantic-pragmatic factors followed by the morphosyntactic analysis. It is important to bear in mind the distinction between the pragmatic and the syntagmatic axis of language because the classification of the PNs pattern can result, from a formal and a semantic viewpoint, into a more precise linguistic characterization.

By semantic-pragmatic factors, we recognise the basic linguistic information that at first glance can be appreciated from the PN. In the case of the ANE, it is usually the language family: Semitic, Sumerian, Hurro-Urartian, Elamite, Anatolian (Indo-European or Hattian), Hamito-Semitic. Or the sub-groups: Akkadian, Amorites, Aramaic, Hittite, Luwian or Egyptian.

The analysis of the morphosyntactic structure of a PN is essential for the linguistic and philological field. It is, perhaps, the first point to consider in any investigation that presents a particular group of anthroponyms. It is a prerequisite that not only serves to support further studies from different fields (e.g. historical, anthropological, and sociological) but also provides the conditions to move on solid grounds.

When we confront a PN, i.e. that the basic lexical element (adjective, noun, verb and grammatical variants) has passed to a linguistic category with a higher semantic connotation, it is necessary to start the process of analysis from the very beginning. As the PN could be formed by one or more lexical elements, the morphological question

must be addressed from the outset. This will let us understand the construction of the internal features, and recognise those parts that make up the derivation and inflexion phenomena, i.e. the morphemes that are affixed to the lexical elements. It will also allow comprehending the present basis in the formation of proper names for the derivation cases and the adaptation of existing words for the inflexion case, which does not perform a process of lexical innovation but a process of grammatical adaptation.²⁰⁴ Thus, the morphology of proper names involves the analysis of their constructions, and the discernment of the lexical items resulted in PNs (that occurs in most cases) or vice versa.

After the morphological stage, it is necessary to continue with the syntactic aspects, i.e. how words combine to form a sentence (sentence-names, in the case of PNs). There is a need to individuate the type of words that make up the name. If they are nouns or adjectives, and the position they occupy (subject or object) in the sentence. Or if it is a verb, and what role takes (e.g. nominal phrase). Once identified, it is important to determine the syntactic position they are occupying since not all languages reproduce the “standard” or “correct” syntax in the various objects that form it (especially for those who have a ‘standard or official’ grammar).²⁰⁵ For instance, it is well known, whether in modern or ancient languages, the existence of a “written” and a “spoken” register, i.e. the syntactic and lexical differences that often appear between the written and the oral language. In some cases (e.g. Italian or Spanish), the disparity between both registers is extremely evident, bridging a significant gap between both. This does not necessarily indicate that the spoken language is grammatically incorrect, but the interlocutors use different strategies, including wiles, shortcuts, and, often, mistakes to orally express an idea.

²⁰⁴ Widdowson 1996: 47.

²⁰⁵ For different reasons, PNs have the tendency to vary the ‘standard’ or ‘common’ syntax of the language that creates them.

Once established the structural linguistic aspects, it is necessary to continue with the semantic features, i.e. the meaning encoded in the PN as purely lexical value. But semantics cannot completely be disassociated from syntax because the meaning of a PN may easily vary. It is not the same, for example, to translate the name of the Assyrian king Sennacherib (*Sîn-ahhē-erība*) as “(The god) Sîn has replaced the brothers” than “The brothers have replaced (the god) Sîn”. In this case, the syntax could completely change the semantic value of the PN, and even leading to consider different historical and religious implications.

However, semantics should not be confused with the concept of etymology, which corresponds to the practice of studying the origin and history of specific words, i.e. unfolding the original and literal meaning of the lexical item. Thus, solving the features of PNs, whenever possible, does not necessarily solve the problem of meaning and reference. This is why it cannot be completely disassociated from the social context because to fully understand the meaning we need to acquire, or at least possess, as much input as we can of the historical background of the PNs. Thus, semantics (followed by etymology) has become one of the main bridges between the linguistic field and the social sciences.

Moreover, a linguist analysis of this type should combine the diachronic and synchronic aspects. There is nothing new about the complementary ties between both viewpoints (in a sense, diachrony is merely synchrony view from a *longue durée*). But the analysis resulted from the synchrony-diachrony intertwined is essential for descriptive and explanatory level. It provides, at the same time, the pattern and the differences of the PNs spread throughout a given territory and the same throughout a given span of time. Therefore, the variations in syntax, morphology and semantic of the PNs are a crucial element, both for linguistics phenomena and historical significance.

However, in a study of this kind, the absence of linguistic or historical perspective, just to mention the most important and comprehensive disciplines, could lead to an even more partial interpretation of the processes that are trying to be analysed (i.e. the Hurrian pantheon). The task of combining as much as potential prospects as we can to explore all or most of the facets that a historical phenomenon presents, is an exercise that does not usually appear in studies of the ANE.²⁰⁶ This, to a large extent, is due to the lack of maturity that the Assyriological discipline has, as a result of the philological primacy and oversizing (primarily the need to publish texts, by the mere fact of publishing), the undervaluation of historical analysis and the ensuing historiographical discussion.²⁰⁷ That is why our perspective will try to combine -or at least attempt- the linguistic/philological features and the historical (and archaeological when needed) aspects to pursue a more *complex* analysis. More *complex* not in the sense of difficulty (or in scholarly haughtiness) but in the ability to combine all those elements that were part in the process of structuring and developing the Hurrian pantheon.

§4.2 Historical Use

Behind the graphic expression of PNs, there are a significant number of ‘readings’ that go beyond the merely visual. Phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics (-etymology) remain at a linguistic level, but the socio-cultural values and subjective expressions immediately transcend to different ones. These particular expressions tend to be confined to specific societies and cultures which condition the metalinguistic values of the PNs. Consequently, the second part of the methodological approach consists of the analysis that transcends the linguistic field, i.e. the study of the interaction between the different social areas that have imprinted their characteristics

²⁰⁶ Liverani 2014: 14.

²⁰⁷ Vidal 2015: 25-26.

through various mechanisms and the PNs.

The specific linguistic phenomenon of PNs is conditioned by the individual and collective acts determined by a specific society; that is, they do not usually escape the standard rules of the community that creates them. Therefore, the use of PNs into a historical analysis can offer several utilities, but always depending on the scope of the research. The versatility of onomastics has made this particular approach to become a (sub-)discipline inside the linguistic discipline, but open and useful to many other fields.

The historical-linguistic analysis of the vocabulary used by a particular language, commonly expressed in PNs, can reflect the nature of the society that uses it. For example, the common Indo-European vocabulary has made different scholars to think in a patriarchal society based on a large family or clan, characterised by an eminently aristocratic organisation.²⁰⁸ Therefore, a synchronic and diachronic study of PNs can be of great value for any historian if it is capable of studying and understanding the philological sphere; it can provide the entry tools to more forward the linguistic scope and see the background that surrounded the names. As to paraphrase what F. Saussure pointed out at for the study of languages and any of its parts; *Hurrian onomastics must be approached from different but complementary viewpoints.*

But any diachronic study has to be complemented with a synchronic perspective. By performing a diachronic and synchronic analysis of the PNs, we can see the socio-linguistic development of them. It would be wrong to believe that by the mere fact of being a traditional society, language, and all its derivations, would not suffer any change. The synchronic position looks at the differences that languages have at a given moment and different levels. It is the pattern to establish all the differences between a particular moment in time and other/s. Here, the linguistic structure is more

²⁰⁸ Coseriu 1986: 72.

representative because it provides the possibility to recreate an abstraction of how the language and PNs work. Therefore, these “snapshots” in time allow seeing and contrasting the possible internal grammatical changes of the PNs, understood as the description of all its linguistic aspects (syntactic, morphology and semantic), if we compare two synchronous moments, i.e. a diachronic analysis. In the end, diachronic is nothing more than synchronicity seen from a *longue durée* perspective.

In our case, the Hurrian language and its PNs have had a particular structure that endured over time. Thus, it is crucial to analyse them from a diachronic point of view as the linguistic changes suffered over time can serve not only to understand the language as an object of study *per se* but as a reflection of the internal processes and external influences that Hurrians suffered throughout history. The synchronic analysis provides the ‘pattern’; the diachronic study unfolds the changes.

§4.3 Methodological Issues

Religion in ancient societies cannot be unquestionably distinguished from the rest of the public and private life. It would be a provocative -and false- statement to argue that social life in ancient times was the religion life, but to a certain extent, religion, and all the beliefs emanated from it, had a strong influence in the social and individual spheres. The sacred and the things that could be considered profane were so intermingled that constituted almost one single reality; a single reality which could be hardly dismantled when trying to discern, in the case of the PNs, the religious from the secular.²⁰⁹ In the onomastic field, this problem arises when some PNs may be held to have a clear and direct reference to religion (e.g. theophorous) while others, instead, are associated with religion but indirectly or less clearly (epithets, appellatives, or simple nouns or adjectives). This is probably the case with some of the Hurrian kinship PNs, particularly

²⁰⁹ Rubio 2011: 92.

those from the second millennium, because the indirect association with religion (kinship relationships as homologues to deity relationships) poses another dilemma as to whether they are to be considered religious or not.²¹⁰ The key issue, in the case if it were there, is to discern, if possible, when (and why) Hurrian kinship PNs changed their ‘profane’ semantic value to a religious one, a task that could be linked to the introduction of theonyms into the PNs. However, this allegedly religious conversion could not have taken place, and we are simply linking every lexical item to the religious sphere. Related to these matters, we have to consider the difficulty regarding the actual sense of the PNs, because the literal and real meaning of anthroponyms do not always go hand in hand.

As it has been mentioned, the most enduring factor in name giving is probably religion, especially deities (as well as their epithets and appellatives), and sacred entities (buildings, statues, objects, individuals or geographical places). But to establish any socio-linguistic relationship between PNs and a particular pantheon, it is mandatory to analyse and display at a diachronic level the entire Onomasticon, at least from a given period.²¹¹ This method is the most rigorous way to find the discrepancies between different periods and different types of PNs, which show particular changes in the socio-cultural and religious conditions. Therefore, it is important for this study to consider the conceptualizations wielded by F. Braudel regarding the historical times to analyse the significant amount of processes throughout the different historical periods that Hurrians spanned.

Among Fernand Braudel’s historical times,²¹² the concept of *Longue Dureé* still

²¹⁰ On favour of the religious connotation see Wilhelm 1998b; 124-125; Giorgieri 2000b: 283-284. Richter 2001.

²¹¹ In the case of this work comprises the third and first half of the second millennium.

²¹² F. Braudel examined three types of rhythms of historical time, showing much reluctance to the “short time” (the factual history, *histoire événementielle*), but admitting the great contributions of the history based on the “cycles and conjuncture” (*cyclique et conjoncturelle*).

holds a high degree of validity. This is clearly seen, though not necessarily, in the historical processes that occurred in ancient societies, particularly those from the ANE. The further back in time we go, the more necessary becomes to encompass our historical processes in a *longue durée* optic, or better-said *extra longue durée*. Consequently, framing the study of the Hurrian PNs as a reflection of their religious pantheon in an *extra longue durée* perspective is the appropriate historical framework to comprehend its structure and substantial developments.

This work concentrates on PNs that seem to have clear and direct reference to traditional religion, taking religion to consist of a set of beliefs and rites in which the human effort at establishing a relation with the beyond finds fulfilment. In those cases where no direct or reliable information on the real meaning of names could be obtained, we limited the inquiry to their literal meaning which, in fact, was sufficient for the purpose of illustrating the relation of PNs to religion.

The PNs that will be discussed below do not necessarily infer that the bearer belonged to the Hurrian population group. But despite the discussion regarding language, PNs and socio-cultural complex (see above), the vast majority of these individuals can be considered to pertain to the macro group understood as Hurrian, especially those from the third millennium and the first part of the second, the period that comprises this study.

The methodological guidelines and problems presented here do not intend to be definitions. While beginning an investigation, it is more important to construct theoretical problems, not solutions. Therefore, it is crucial

“above all to get the feel of the actual subject matter—the object under investigation; it is essential to separate it from the reality surrounding it and to make a preliminary delimitation of it. At the outset of an

investigation, it is not so much the intellectual faculty for making formulas and definitions that lead the way, but rather it is the eyes and hands attempting to get the feel of the actual presence of the subject matter”.²¹³

²¹³ Voloshinov 1986: 45.

A STATE OF THE ART OF HURRIAN PERSONAL NAMES

§1.1 The Appearance of Hurrians in History

The appearance of the Hurrians in the History of the ANE is almost contemporary with the birth of Assyriology. Its mention, as well as the Subar(t)ians, in the inscriptions discovered at Kouyunjik, ancient Nineveh, was a clear testimony of the first attestations. In a book published in 1881, the German Assyriologist Friedrich Delitzsch envisioned in the Assyrian inscriptions the frequent occurrence of a population or a place, (*mât*) *Šú-ba-ri-i*, *mât Šú-ba-ri-ê*, *mât Šú-bar-tê*, which was located in the middle of Syria. The accuracy of the reading as the geographical site was relatively vague but Hurrians –back then called Subarians- were starting to be present in the Assyriological studies.

In 1887/8 the discovery of the Egyptian royal archive located at el-‘Amārna¹ revealed hundreds of cuneiform letters that were sent between the Pharaohs (Amenhotep III and Akhenaton) and many rulers from the entire ANE.² Among the extensive epistolary documentation, one excited the attention of the scholars particularly. The letter EA-24³ had been sent by a king named Tušratta, from the kingdom of Mittani, to Pharaoh Amenhotep III and was written in an unknown language. Shortly after this discovery, several scholars, independently, tried to decipher the language contained in the letter and decided to call it “Mitanni”,⁴ since the king that sent it belonged to that realm. Thus, a new branch in the study of the ANE was born, which during the last decades has been coined as Hurritology or Hurrian Studies.⁵

¹ Knudtzon 1915: 1-15; Campbell 1964: 32-34.

² For an updated study of the letters see Rainey 2014.

³ For a philological and epigraphic study of the EA-24 letter see Dietrich and Mayer 2010. For the latest version see Wilhelm 2014a.

⁴ Jensen 1890, 1891; Sayce 1890 and Brünnow 1890.

⁵ Salvini 2000a: 8.

After the discovery of the Mitanni letter, the task was then to understand the words and phrases of the only well-known text written in Hurrian that came from the archives of Akhenaton's capital. Several scholars tried to study this new language in depth,⁶ though probably F. Bork was the first one to present an approach -hardly to call it a grammar- regarding the "Mitanni language".⁷ Soon afterwards, hundreds of cuneiform tablets were retrieved from different sites throughout the Near East, particularly Mesopotamia, revealing many PNs of the Mittanian type.⁸ Thus, contemporaneously, the first attempts to study Hurrian PNs began as a consequence of the results that scholars had started to attain regarding the Tušratta letter.

F. Bork, who back then called the Hurrian language *Mitannipsrache* (Mitannian Language), was the first one to start analysing the *Mitanni-namen* (Mitannian names) from Nippur.⁹ Later, he was followed by A. Ungnad who discussed several *Subarian* PNs from different archives;¹⁰ F. Hommel who analysed the *Mitanninamen* in the Draham tablets;¹¹ A. Clay who studied PNs from the Cassite period, including a chapter on the *Hittite-Mittanian* elements;¹² K. Tallqvist who included the Mittani names that appeared in the sources of what he called the Assyrian Kingdom (ca. 2200-606);¹³ and several other scholar who came across with Hurrian anthroponyms.¹⁴

After this starting point, two major breakthroughs heightened the historical and linguistic study of Hurrians. The first one emanated as a direct consequence of the discovery (1906) and later decipherment (1915) of the cuneiforms archive from Ḫattuša (Boğazköy), the ancient capital of the Hittite Kingdom, and the second came some years

⁶ Brünnow 1890; Jensen 1890; Sayce 1890; Messerschmidt 1899.

⁷ Bork 1909: 30-ff.

⁸ Gelb 1944: 3.

⁹ Bork 1906.

¹⁰ Ungnad 1909.

¹¹ Hommel 1913.

¹² Clay 1912: part. 28-35.

¹³ APN: *passim*.

¹⁴ Thureau-Dangin 1912; Landsberger 1924: 228-ff; Speiser 1930: 148-ff; Ungnad 1936: 139.

later with the unearthing of the north-east Mesopotamian site of Nuzi (1925) and its records. Right from the beginning, both archives brought to light hundreds of Hurrian elements, mainly PNs, which contributed to clarifying different questions as well as a better knowledge of the culture.

For instance, the Boğazköy material helped to indicate, almost from the very beginning, that the word ‘Mitanni’, whether in its socio-cultural, linguistic or political connotation, was limited in time and space, and therefore erratic in some designations (linguistic and socio-cultural).¹⁵ For instance, the Hittite texts referred to the Hurrians and its population not as “Mittanians” but as ^{URU}*Hurri* (Ḫurri land/country) and ^{URU}*hurlili* (inhabitant of the land of Ḫurri).¹⁶ They adapted the very same word that Hurrians used to name their own ‘country/territory’: *hurroḡe* (var. *hurvoḡe*).¹⁷ The second major contribution from these texts was the acquisition of a vast number of new Hurrian definitions and lexical terms that were obscure at the time.¹⁸

In the same vein, the texts from Nuzi contributed to improving the knowledge, both in quantity and quality, of the PNs in an unusual way, and put the Hurrians to the fore of the Assyriological discipline.¹⁹ During the years after World War II, various sites (e.g. Ugarit, Mari, Alalah, Qatna, Nagar, Chagar Bazar) kept bringing to light different amounts of Hurrian texts and PNs, while at the same time indicating that the Hurrians enjoyed a significant status in the “cuneiform” cultural horizon.

Despite the sufficient data in history and historiography, Hurrian studies have not hitherto been compounded into a full-fledged branch of ANE studies such as happen to Sumerology and Hittitology. In this sense, we can establish two distinct stages. The first one was occupied by Assyriologists and Sumerologists, and covered the beginning of

¹⁵ Speiser 1940-1941: 3.

¹⁶ Wilhelm 2004a: 95.

¹⁷ Richter 2012: 171.

¹⁸ Wilhelm 1989: 3.

¹⁹ See the Series *SCCNH* dedicated, mainly, to the study of Nuzi and the Hurrians.

Hurritology until the 1980s. These studies were approached from a “Mesopotamo-centric” perspective, i.e. Mesopotamia was considered the departing point to explore the Hurrians. In this phase, Hittitologists played a secondary role, although providing significant additional information (whether historical or philological) that contributed to clarifying different aspects of the complex Hurrian world. However, in the mid-80’s (ca. 1983-1985), the Assyriological primacy started to fade due to the discovery of the bilingual (Hurrian-Hittite) literary composition from Boğazköy known as the “Song of Release”.²⁰ The philological consequences of this text completely altered the understanding of the Hurrian language, making the primacy of these studies to come under the influence of Hittitology, which remains till these days.

§1.2 The study of the Hurrian Language

The study of the Hurrian language was born with the discovery of the Tušratta letter (EA-24) at the end of the nineteenth century, and continued its development, hand in hand, with the findings of new cuneiform sources (syllabic and alphabetic).

During the early part of the twentieth century, scholars made significant efforts on trying to analyse and understand the grammatical, syntactic and morphological structure of the Hurrian language that, in comparison with others, lacked any known linguistic affiliation (except for Urartian) nor bilingual documents from which additional information could be extracted.²¹ The pioneering efforts of several scholars²² led E.

²⁰ For the first edited edition see Neu 1996a. For updated analysis see Wilhelm 2001, 2013; de Martino 2000b, 2012; Von Dassow 2014; Bachvarova 2014a, 2014b.

²¹ The scholars working on the EA-24 soon realised that the remaining letters of King Tušratta, which were written in Akkadian, used the same phrases and dealt with the same topics as the Hurrian letter, providing ‘quasi-bilingual’ documents (Wilhelm 1989: 3; Wegner 2007: 28).

²² Jensen 1890, 1891, 1899; Brünnow 1890; Sayce 1890; Messerschmidt 1899; Ungnad 1909; Götze 1936; Bork 1909, 1939; Friedrich 1939. (For a full bibliographical list on the Hurrian linguistic studies prior to Speiser see Wegner 2007: 149-150).

Speiser, in 1941, to publish the first²³ ‘grammar’ of the Hurrian language,²⁴ which was structured, largely, on the 494 lines of the Tušratta letter and some Hurrian fragments from Boğazköy, Mari and Ugarit.²⁵ Indeed, the documentary base was considerably lower than, for example, the available for the study of Akkadian, Sumerian, Hittite or Ugaritic, in addition to the absence of consistent bilingual texts (with the exception of the Sumerian-Hurrian vocabulary list from Ras Šamra)²⁶ or well-known affiliated languages. Nonetheless, Speiser’s enormous efforts laid the groundwork for the subsequent systematic studies on Hurrian language.

From a linguistic point of view, the study of Hurrian continued with the major work (1943) carried out by I. Gelb, P. Purves and A. MacRae on the PNs that were retrieved from the Nuzi tablets.²⁷ As it happened with Speiser’s grammar, this piece of work set the grounds for the future studies on Hurrian PNs, despite some later emendations of the list.²⁸

After World War II, European expeditions returned to the ANE and resumed the ongoing excavations that had been set on hold for major reasons. This was the case of the French expedition at Ras Šamra, ancient Ugarit, which was already known to be a major site with Hurrian material. In 1955, E. Laroche published, for the first time, a bilingual Akkadian-Hurrian document from Ugarit, which provided new information about the language, as well as several others texts, which unfortunately were only written in Hurrian and did not have a bilingual counterpart.²⁹ These contributions were

²³ Despite some previous attempts, especially Götze (1936), Bork (1939) and Friedrich (1939), Speiser’s work is the first comprehensive and substantial grammar of the Hurrian language, though far from being considered a ‘standard version’.

²⁴ Speiser 1940-1941.

²⁵ Speiser 1940-1941: 4.

²⁶ Thureau-Dangin 1931.

²⁷ See NPN.

²⁸ See AAN I. There is still a significant amount of Hurrian PNs from Nuzi, some of which have been published in the series *SCCHN*, while some remaining unpublished.

²⁹ Nougayrol and Laroche 1955; Laroche 1955.

complemented by new grammatical and lexical works that Laroche had established from some Hurrian texts from Mari³⁰ and Boğazköy.³¹

Regarding structural analysis, the next action was taken by F.W. Bush who, in 1964, presented a descriptive grammar of the Hurrian language as part of his dissertation.³² Again, the study was based on the Tušratta letter and complemented with new findings from Boğazköy, Mari, Ugarit, Urkeš and Nuzi.³³ Most probably, it was the best and last useful Hurrian grammar before the discovery of the Hurro-Hittite Bilingual.

As it has been mentioned before, the linguistic relationship between Hurrian and Urartian had been recognized during the first decades of the twentieth century,³⁴ but it was I. Diakonoff who established in 1971 the first comprehensive and comparative grammar concerning both languages.³⁵ Despite the linguistic aims, his analysis had the purpose of finding and establishing a common genealogical tree between these ancient languages and the Caucasian linguistic family (the theoretical reconstruction of a possible “proto-Hurrian” language);³⁶ something that was later discarded.³⁷ The grammatical connection between these languages has been established, particularly, between the Old Hurrian dialect and the Urartian from the late ninth to the seventh century BC, which is supposed to have branched from Hurrian (or vice versa?) not much later than the beginning of the second millennium.³⁸ From a morphological point of view, Urartian shares the basic structural characteristic of having a fix root, followed by a thematic vowel and, optionally, derivational suffixes. Both languages have two

³⁰ Laroche 1957.

³¹ Laroche 1960a. Apart from the Anatolian texts, the author kept the Mittani Letter as the main guidance for the study, plus the Hurrian vocabulary gained from the bilinguals found at Ugarit.

³² Bush 1964.

³³ Bush 1964: 2-10.

³⁴ For a short summary of the studies and the known connections between Hurrian and Urartian up to 1940 see Friedrich 1939: chap. 9.

³⁵ Diakonoff 1971. His study was later updated by Khačikyan 1985.

³⁶ Diakonoff 1971: 157-171.

³⁷ Wegner 2007: 35-36; Patri 2009.

³⁸ Wilhelm 2004b: 119.

numbers, singular and plural, but no grammatical genders.³⁹ The syntax of the Urartian usually takes the agent of the ergative clause in the initial position,⁴⁰ followed by the patient and the verb (S-O-V), but the word order absolutive-ergative-verb can also appear (O-S-V).⁴¹ The Urartian lexicon is still less known than the Hurrian, and the nature of the texts (mainly military campaigns and building commemorative activities of the kings) does not help to contrast the Hurrian ones. Nonetheless, circa twenty per cent of the verbal roots are also known in Hurrian⁴² apart from several lexical items, mainly nouns.⁴³

At the beginning of the '80, E. Laroche gathered a significant amount of Hurrian lexemes⁴⁴ and published the first glossary of this language, with a succinct introductory grammar.⁴⁵ The vocabulary was far from being completed but it was the first attempt that condensed in a single work all of the Hurrian words (including part of the anthroponyms and toponyms) known up to that moment.

The 1980's marked a turning point in the knowledge that scholars had of this language. The discovery of multiple Hurro-Hittite bilingual tablets and fragments in the upper city of Boğazköy transformed the understanding of the language, providing new insights into Hurrian. It also helped scholars in the deciphering work of other texts from Boğazköy that had previously proven to be difficult to translate.⁴⁶ The numerous contributions of the so-called “Bilingual from Boğazköy/Song of Release”, which are

³⁹ Wilhelm 2004b: 124.

⁴⁰ Urartian, as Hurrian, is an ergative and agglutinative language. Ergativity has been classified as a recessive feature, that is, a feature which is almost always lost by at least some daughter languages in a family and is not readily borrowed in contact situations. Therefore, ergativity can be an important component of the grammatical signature of a language family (Nichols 2003: 285).

⁴¹ Wilhelm 2004b: 133.

⁴² Wilhelm 2004b: 135-136.

⁴³ See Salvini 1979, 1991, 1992; Wilhelm 1988; Catsanicos 1996; Kassian 2009. For a thorough study on Hurrian and Urartian lexicon see Kassian 2011.

⁴⁴ The translation of several Hurrian words has presented, since the beginning of the studies, a major problem for the development of the discipline.

⁴⁵ Laroche 1980.

⁴⁶ Salvini 1988a; Haas 1989; Wegner 1990, 1994; Giorgieri 1998.

still enhancing our knowledge,⁴⁷ have rendered Speiser's, Bush's, Dikonoff's and Laroche's grammars less useful, and many of their parts obsolete.⁴⁸ This transformation of the Hurrian studies was accompanied by the beginning of the regular publication of the *Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler* (ChS) volumes, which gather, according to genre, the Hurrian texts from Boğazköy and the rest of the ANE.⁴⁹

As a consequence of these new changes, the knowledge of the Hurrian language experienced remarkable changes that had to be conveyed in new grammatical works. Simultaneously, the year 2000 saw the publication of two grammars, which included the new linguistic contributions gained from the thorough studies of the "Bilingual".

On the hand, as part of a major opera concerning the Hurrian civilisation,⁵⁰ M. Giorgieri published a short but consistent sketch of the Hurrian language, which has a more technical and descriptive approach.⁵¹ The aim of this work is basically to introduce, in an updated synthesis, the new findings and results that have been appearing since the 1980's, while avoiding, unless necessary, the previous bibliography.⁵²

On the other hand, I. Wegner's grammar also gathers the new information but with a broader and didactic perspective. She dedicated a full work not only to provide a comprehensive scholarly grammar (*eine wissenschaftliche Grammatik*) but also a thorough textbook or teaching grammar (*Lehrbuch*), the first one to be published of the Hurrian language.⁵³

In the subsequent years, two short schematic grammars, or rather descriptions, of the

⁴⁷ See, e.g. the latest work from de Martino 2000b, 2012; Wilhelm 2009 (*passim*), 2013; Von Dassow 2014; Bachvarova 2014a, 2014b.

⁴⁸ Campbell 2015: 6.

⁴⁹ See in the bibliography the works pertaining to the series.

⁵⁰ See PDP 55.

⁵¹ Giorgieri 2000.

⁵² Giorgieri 2000: 172, fn. 2.

⁵³ Márquez-Rowe 2008: 2.

Hurrian language appeared in linguistic compendiums concerning the ancient world.⁵⁴ In 2007, N. Nozadze published a second detailed vocabulary (Hurrian-Russian-English) of the Hurrian language, albeit most of the information and the bibliographical references were prior to 1980.⁵⁵ In fact, it was an analogue of Laroche's glossary published almost thirty years later.⁵⁶

The last significant work related to the Hurrian vocabulary was authored by T. Richter who published in 2012 the most complete and updated bibliographical glossary of the Hurrian language, which has turned into an essential tool for the research of the language. Due to the current state of the language, in general, and its lexicon, in particular, it is unfeasible to build a proper dictionary of Hurrian, but Richter's work is the closest tool that the vocabulary of the language has.

From a linguistic (and grammatical) point of view, the analysis of the Hurrian language has not received much of attention, despite the several studies concerning the ergativity character of the language.⁵⁷ The first 'linguistic approach', or at least grammatical-linguistic, because the author has included a short sketch of Hurrian grammar,⁵⁸ was done by Campbell on a PhD. Dissertation (2007) that later was published (2015), which focused on the formal and functional analysis of the Hurrian modal system.⁵⁹ The morphemes involved in the different moods (i.e. imperative, jussive, optative, purposive or desiderative) have been ignored and disregarded from a systematic point of view and this, together with a linguistic approach to the language, is what makes this opera a valuable source for the study of the Hurrian language.

Finally, the last contribution regarding the study of the Hurrian language, though

⁵⁴ Wilhelm 2004a; Hazenbos 2006.

⁵⁵ Nozadze 2007.

⁵⁶ Kassian 2011: 522.

⁵⁷ On Hurrian ergativity see, e.g. Haas-Wilhelm 1969; Giorgieri 2000a: 175; Wilhelm 2004a: 110; Wegner 2007: 39-41; Campbell 2008b, 2015: 13-14.

⁵⁸ Campbell 2015: chap. 2.

⁵⁹ Campbell 2015: vii. For a definition and understanding of what mood and modalities are see chap. 3.

from its PNs perspective, has been done by T. Richter (2016). It is the most complete analysis regarding the Hurrian onomastic from the middle Euphrates and north Mesopotamia region during the Old Babylonian period.

Now, Hurratology, if we can speak of a “-logy”, continues to be -and probably will remain like this- a sub-field of studies of a major group of philological-historical-archaeological discipline/s that has been fluctuating between Assyriology and Hittitology. From a historiographical point of view, it is clear that till mid-80’s Assyriologists were concerned on dealing with Hurrians as a complementary part of their works. Scholars such as A. Ungnad, E. Speiser, I. Gelb, A. Goetze, M. Astour or I. Diakonoff, just to mention the most relevant till that time, were primarily Assyriologists who focused their studies on ancient Mesopotamia and Syria, which also deal with the problems engendered by the Hurrian civilisation. From the Hittite side, however, we cannot exclude the efforts of H. Güterbock, C. Burney, and, particularly, E. Laroche, who also focused their works on Hurrians, though from an Anatolian (-Indo-European) perspective. From the mid-80s onwards, the main interest in Hurrian studies underwent some changes, particularly in two spheres.

The first one comprised the shift from a Mesopotamian point of view, that still exist but with less strength,⁶⁰ from which scholars understood the Hurrian phenomenon, to a Hittite-Anatolian perspective. Scholars such as V. Haas, E. Neu, A. Archi, or, more recently, S. De Martino, M. Giorgieri and M. Trémouille, have been dealing with Hurrian studies but their position stands, more or less, from a Hittite viewpoint.⁶¹ As a

⁶⁰ The Assyriologist Giorgio Buccellati continues to deal with Hurrian studies as a consequence of his work at Tell Mozan, the ancient city of Urkeš.

⁶¹ This is not completely the case for Archi. Although he comes from an Anatolian world, his work concerning the Hurrians has shifted into a more balanced view, particularly considering Syria and the Levant as complementary scenarios to the Hurrian civilization. We can also set in this “middle view”, understanding the term in the geographical sense (being Syria and Levant half way between Anatolia

logical viewpoint, they conceive the Hurrians as long as they are part of the Hittites and its world (something similar with the Assyriologists and Mesopotamia). Furthermore, in the last twenty years, a group of philologist (e.g. Wegner, Giorgieri, Richter, Campbell) have been pushing forward, despite the several grey zones, the knowledge and comprehension of the Hurrian language and grammar.

However, apart from these two “sides” -understood in a very schematic view- we must mention the scholars M. Salvini and G. Wilhelm. They respectively began their studies in Anatolia and Mesopotamia, but soon after developed a particular interest in the Hurrian world which made them Hurritologists in the full sense of the word. They have been combining Mesopotamian, Anatolian, Syrian and ANE studies, from philological, historical and archaeological perspectives, together with the study of the Hurrian and Urartian civilisations as part of this entire scenario. Their studies have been, and continue to be, breakthroughs in the linguistic-grammar-epigraphic areas⁶² and historical ones.⁶³

§1.3 Hurrian Language

As mentioned before, the Hurrian language began to appear in the ANE sources at an early stage of research, but the agreement on the name of the language was not definitive until Speiser’s work.⁶⁴ This lack of understanding was because Hurrian population did not leave, in any of their sources, the proper name for its language.

For instance, we know that Hittite rituals and spells texts from Boğazköy continued

and Mesopotamian) and historiographical one, the works of M. Dietrich and, particularly, W. Mayer, who studied the Hurrians from an Ugaritic perspective. These Ugaritologists/Assyriologists have analysed different problems of the Hurrian phenomenon in the Ugaritic society, focusing mainly on the religion sphere as well as the grammatical aspects of the language; but they also widen their scope to the rest of Syria (e.g. Alalah) and the Hurrian presence in several other parts of the ANE.

⁶² E.g. Wilhelm 1992; Salvini 2008.

⁶³ E.g. Wilhelm 1989; Salvini 2000a/b.

⁶⁴ Speiser 1940-1941.

with the existing logic in Anatolia and mention the language of the Hurrian population as ^{URU}*hurlili*,⁶⁵ i.e. “in the (language) of the Hurrian country”. This adjective construction (*hur-la-ili*)⁶⁶ derives from the place name ^{URU}*Hurri* (Hurri country) attested in the Hittite sources⁶⁷ and referred, though inaccurately, to northern Mesopotamia and Syria, particularly the area, which during the second millennium, was inhabited and controlled by Hurrian population. Moreover, the Tušratta letter reveals that the Hurrians from the second millennium used the adjective *hurroge* (var. *hurvoḡe*)⁶⁸ to name their country/territory. While it is true that a document from Nuzi, which contains a list of scribes, mentions *dub.sar Hurrum*,⁶⁹ is no less true that the documents written in their vernacular language lack of any mention of it. Even the very same meaning of the term *Hurri* (Hurrian *huradi*, Akkadian *hurādu*: soldier, troops, sentinel), which is probably of Hurrian origin, still presents ambiguities.⁷⁰

The appearance of the name of the language, which clearly derives from the demonym root of *Hurri*, is quite late (ca. XVI century onwards), but the Hurrian presence in the ANE, at least from a historical point of view, is attested in the onomastics and place names from the pre-Sargonic period (ca. 2470-2316).⁷¹ During the third millennium, Sumerians and, by extension, Akkadians used a pre-existing geographical term, *Subartu* (which meant ‘the land of the north’), to refer linguistically and socio-culturally to the Hurrians.⁷² However, before proceeding with the name of the

⁶⁵ Note, for example, the adverbial suffix construction ‘-ili’ that Hittites used while naming a particular language. This suffix was generally used in languages based or related to geographical entities (*hurla* was the word that the Hittites used to name the “inhabitant of the land of Hurri”). See Hoffner-Melchert 2008: 292; Wilhelm 2004a: 95. Cfr. ^{URU}*pabilili*, “in the language of the city/country of Babylon”.

⁶⁶ *hurla* > ‘Inhabitant of the land of Hurri’.

⁶⁷ RGTC 6: 120; RGTC 6/2: 42.

⁶⁸ BGH 171.

⁶⁹ Lacheman 1939: 94.

⁷⁰ Wilhelm 1989: 1; BGH: 169-170.

⁷¹ Gelb 1944: 52-ff; Steinkeller 1998; Salvini 200b; Richter 2004: 273-ff.

⁷² For a bibliographical summary of the Subartu problem see Michel 2011-2012: 225.

language of the Hurrians in the third and part of the second millennium, it is necessary to understand the problems that still encloses the term Subartu.

Throughout its historical development, which is attested from the archaic period of Uruk to the neo-Babylonian, the term Subartu designated a vast region that comprised its inhabitants and their languages, though not always in a precise way and even less static.⁷³ The recurring allusions in the cuneiform texts, both from the third and second millennium, and to a lesser extent the first, have generated a cumulous of uncertainties regarding the real meaning of the concept.

During the 1950s, it was suggested as a result of several works⁷⁴ and the onomastics collected from Old Babylonian texts⁷⁵ that the emerging pattern of PNs considered “Subareans” did not seem to support the isolation of any distinctive socio-cultural element that could be classified as “Subarean”. The names were Hurrians, Elamites and probably Lullubeans, while the unknown seemed to be Semitic, and the remaining hypocoristic forms. Thus, it was argued that the Hurrians represented another socio-cultural element of the “Subarea” compound.⁷⁶ In the following decades, Michalowski (1986) presented a study analysing the concept of Subartu from the ideological vision of the user. The author coined the term “mental maps” to express the geographical mental interpretation that Sumerians and Akkadians had of the known world. In this way, by tracking the term Subartu in the pre-Sargonic, Sargonic, Ur III and Old Babylonian documents, concluded that the meaning of concept in terms of geographic terms fluctuated from period to period, turning almost impossible to specify a trans-historical location of the territory. This concept served to delimit internal and external relations, although at certain times, as in the Old Babylonian period, several entities were

⁷³ Michel 2011-2012: 225.

⁷⁴ Particularly Ungnad 1936; Gelb 1944 and Speiser 1948.

⁷⁵ Finkelstein 1955.

⁷⁶ Finkelstein 1955: 6.

described accurately and without using the broad meaning of Subartu. In sum, the author sought to establish that the utilization of this geographical term as ideological expression must vary from the vision that existed in each historical moment, and it could probably be verified if there were documents from the urban centres of the Syrian belt expressing how they viewed the southern civilisations which were at their periphery, i.e. southern Mesopotamia.⁷⁷

Over the next decade, Steinkeller (1998) took up the problem of Subartu in a work on the historical and cultural background of the ancient city of Urkeš and the Hurrians, and established a distinction when referring to the controversial term. He stated that already in the third millennium Subartu had two senses: one narrow and one broad. The first one, which according to the author was the original, referred to the area stretching from north of the Diyala and east of the Tigris reaching the Zagros Mountains. The territory was the same one that later occupied the Assyrian homeland, so it is possible to establish a connection between the term Subartu the designation of Assyria during the third millennium. As for the broad sense, the term referred to the whole of northern Mesopotamia, from the Zagros Mountains in the east to the Amanus ranges in the west.⁷⁸ Thus the author tried to combine two problematic aspects: socio-cultural-geographical-political and imprecise use of the term. Shortly afterwards, Michalowski (2000) resume the theme around Subartu but establishing a differentiation from Steinkeller. He accepted the existence of two senses for the term Subartu but disregarded the connection between the narrow aspect and the territory from Assyria. He believed that the concept referred to a toponym that, depending on the time, varied and that therefore is hard to establish an accurate definite.⁷⁹

Thus, we can see that the discussion on the meaning of the term Subartu was

⁷⁷ Michalowski 1986a: 145.

⁷⁸ Steinkeller 1998: 76-77.

⁷⁹ Michalowski 2000.

restricted, mainly, to the geographical and political aspects, and less strictly to the socio-cultural ones. It is more likely that the ancient near eastern idiosyncrasies tended to prevail the “geographic” and “physical” characters above further things, while defining and nominating the “others”.

§1.4 Characteristics of the Language

The Hurrian language belongs to the group of ‘isolated’ ANE languages whose linguistic “families” are still unknown (e.g. Sumerian, Elamite or Hattian). The only cognate language is Urartian, which is attested in cuneiform inscriptions from the late ninth to the middle seventh century BC. Both languages were thought to be established as part of a “Caucasian Group”, speculating a possible link with the Lezgian or Nakh groups.⁸⁰ In fact, Russian scholars attempted to reconstruct a “Proto-East Caucasian” language due to the close affinity between Hurrian and Urartian and the reconstructed language.⁸¹ These two would also be part of a macrolinguistic family called ‘Alarodian,’⁸² forming two branches: the Hurro-Urartian/Proto-East Caucasian and Northeast Caucasian.⁸³ However, this hypothesis has neither been accepted nor completely rejected, and still, three decades later, requires further elaborations and proofs.⁸⁴

Regarding typology, Hurrian belongs to the group of languages that are defined as agglutinative. This group shares, at least, the basic characteristics of having a fixed root (unchanging root) and grammatical elements (morphemes) that are attached or

⁸⁰ Diakonoff 1971: 161.

⁸¹ Diakonoff – Starostin 1986: 96.

⁸² The name that Herodotus gave to the Urartu Kingdom. Hdt. iii, 94; vii 79.

⁸³ Diakonoff – Starostin 1986: 97.

⁸⁴ Farber 1988; Smeets 1989; Giorgieri 2000: 176. For recent criticism see Patri 2009.

agglutinated as affixes to the root.⁸⁵

<i>en = dan: ruler</i>	<i>ever=ni>Everni: King</i>
root + profession suffix	root + individualizing suffix

In the Hurrian case, each morpheme affixed to the construction has only one grammatical meaning and respects a fixed position as well as a stable vocalism. Likewise, morphemes are not semantically blended with other grammatical elements, creating a syllabic independence of the suffixes. A significant difference from the rest of the agglutinative languages, including those from the ANE (i.e. Sumerian, Elamite and Hattian), is that Hurrian morphemes are always suffixed to the main root, leaving no possibility of any prefix.

Regarding syntax, Hurrian (as well as Urartian) has been classified for the first time as an ergative language by the Russian school of linguistics.⁸⁶ Most of the languages of the ANE,⁸⁷ particularly Indo-Europeans and Semitics, are defined as “accusative languages”. They distinguish one case, ‘nominative’, to be used with the subject of a transitive or intransitive verb from another case, ‘accusative’, used for the direct object of transitive verbs. In ergative languages, on the contrary, the subject (known as agent or actor)⁸⁸ of intransitive verbs and the direct object of transitive verbs are treated identically for grammatical purposes, while the subject of transitive verbs is treated differently. Therefore, Hurrian distinguishes one ‘ergative’ case, suffixed to the verbal voice of the transitive-ergative agent, from an ‘absolute’ case, used for the direct object of the transitive-ergative verbal voice and from the agent of the intransitive verbal voice

⁸⁵ Wegner 2007: 38.

⁸⁶ This major linguistic contribution was done by Diakonoff (1967) in an article, written in Russian, where he also analysed Urartian, Elamite and Sumerian. In 1971 he picked up the results of the investigation, focusing particularly on Hurrian and Urartian. Previous grammatical studies had ignored (e.g. Friedrich 1939; Speiser 1940-1941) or overlooked (Bush 1964) the ergative structure.

⁸⁷ With the exceptions of Sumerian, Elamite and Hattian, also ergative languages.

⁸⁸ Wegner 2007: 40.

and transitive non-ergative.⁸⁹

Regarding scripture, Hurrians adopted the syllabic cuneiform writing system that Sumerians and Akkadians utilised to write their languages. This writing system was, apparently, adapted to the scriptural needs of the Hurrians, similarly to the alphabetic cuneiform from Ugaritic, which according to some authors was the only significantly successful adaptation of the script.⁹⁰

§1.5 Hurrian Sources

Cuneiform documents in the Hurrian language or mixed languages were spread throughout the entire ANE during the third and second millennium BC. Presumably, the oldest text comes from the regular excavations at Tell Mozan, the ancient city of Urkeš, and has an administrative content.⁹¹ The tablet has been dated to the Old Akkadian period, most probably to the kingdom of Naram-Sîn, on the basis of palaeography, stylus shape, physical characteristics and stratigraphical context.⁹² However, the most significant Hurrian text from this millennium, at least from a historical point of view, is the well-known foundation tablet that belonged to the King Tiš-atal from Urkeš.⁹³ This is by far the most complex text (from the third millennium) from which Hurritology has been extracting linguistic, historical and religious information.

During the beginning of the second millennium, the oldest Hurrian documents came from the city of Mari on the Euphrates (ca. XVIII century BC) where a small set of six tablets, found in the palace archives, revealed some sort of magic and incantation

⁸⁹ Giorgieri 2000: 175.

⁹⁰ Vita 1999: 457.

⁹¹ Maiocchi 2011.

⁹² Maiocchi 2011: 192.

⁹³ Parrot-Nougayrol 1948; Wilhelm 1998a; Salvini 2000b: 38-44.

literature, and a letter mentioning the sovereign Zimri-Lîm.⁹⁴ A group of tablets (ca. 11),⁹⁵ similar to the latter, were found in southern Babylonia,⁹⁶ most probably coming from Larsa,⁹⁷ indicating some regional status or prestige towards Hurrian incantation and invocation texts. From the first part of this millennium, we also have a fragmentary document originated in the ancient city of Tigunāni.⁹⁸

The archaeological level VII from the town of Alalakh revealed several Hurrian words and grammatical elements (apart from the significant amount of PNs) that were mixed with the Akkadian dialect used to write the texts. Level IV of the site, dated to the second part of the millennium (ca. XV century), showed a similar situation but with a greater quantity and new Hurrian and Hurrian-Akkadian words (technical terms for political, economic, administrative and religious classes, as well as regarding daily life).⁹⁹

The vast majority of Hurrian texts come from the Late Bronze Age (ca. 1500-1180) and were spread around the ANE (Egypt, Anatolia, Levant, Syria and Mesopotamia). Particularly significant, both for quantity and contents, are the documents that have been retrieved from the lands occupied and controlled by the Hittites in Anatolia. The capital of the Hittite empire, Hattuša (Boğazköy), revealed extensive linguistic material written in Hurrian or Hittite-Hurrian bilingual versions. These texts are classified in omens (astrological and birth omens), historical, mythological and literature, conjuration and purification rituals, offering lists, festival, allegories and parables.¹⁰⁰ Also from the

⁹⁴ Thureau-Dangin 1939; Laroche 1957; Salvini 1988b; Wegner 2004. In 1999, a duplicate text from one of the tablets found at Mari (Incantation text against the ‘*gergiššum* illness’) was discovered at Tuttul (Tell Bi’a) and dated to the Old Babylonian period (Krebernik 2002: 157-159).

⁹⁵ Van Dijk 1982; Cunningham 1997: 131-159; Prechel – Richter 2001: 335.

⁹⁶ Wegner 2007: 25.

⁹⁷ Prechel – Richter 2001: 336

⁹⁸ Salvini 1996: 123-126.

⁹⁹ See the extensive study from Von Dassow 2008. Also Márquez-Rowe 1998; Dietrich and Mayer 1997 and Draffkorn 1959: 152-ff. (although out of date and with some reserve).

¹⁰⁰ These texts are published in the series *Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler I (ChS I)*.

Hittite sphere, hundreds of cuneiform tablets and fragments (ca. 650) were found at the royal residences in the ancient city of Šapinuwa (Ortaköy), which were classified, mainly, as religious and ritual texts (especially the *Itkalzi* ritual).¹⁰¹

The Syrian region continued to provide many Hurrian and mixed Akkadian-Hurrian written documents. The ancient city of Qatna has yielded a set of letters, dating back to the time of the Hittite King Šuppiluliuma I (ca. 1344-1322), which were written in a Hurrian-Akkadian mixed form (*Mischsprache*),¹⁰² as well as a number of lists of precious objects dedicated to the local deity, *Bēlet ekalli*, that contain several Hurrian technical terms.¹⁰³

On the Syrian coast, the city of Ugarit (Ras Šamra) has contributed enormously to the corpus of the Hurrian written documents with numerous exemplars, both in syllabic cuneiform and alphabetic, which embrace different genres: religion, rituals, omens, vocabulary, lexical list and epistolary. Some of these tablets have been discovered in bilingual, trilingual and even quadrilingual versions, combining Hurrian, Akkadian, Ugaritic and Sumerian.¹⁰⁴

The historically Hurrian region around the Ḫabur area is supposed to have been the core of the Mittani Empire during the period of its hegemony.¹⁰⁵ Nonetheless, we only have a fragment of a Hurrian written letter, which mentions the kings Artašumara and Tušratta,¹⁰⁶ and comes from the city of Nagar (Tell Brak, in the upper Ḫabur).¹⁰⁷

The most important testimonial of the Hurrian language, paradoxically, was not

¹⁰¹ Süel 2013. Some Hurrian fragmentary texts were also found at the site of Kayalıpınar (ancient Šamuha), which corresponded to a historical or epistolary text (apparently dealing with a military campaign of king Tuthaliya II/III) and the mythological version of the Song of silver (Wilhelm 2006; Rieken 2009).

¹⁰² Richter 2005a; Richter and Lange 2012.

¹⁰³ Bottéro 1949; Fales 2004; Richter 2005b.

¹⁰⁴ Dietrich – Mayer 1999. For a detailed explanation of the texts see the author's section on Hurrians in Ugarit.

¹⁰⁵ On Mittani see the compendium by Cancik-Kirschbaum, Brisch and Eidem 2014.

¹⁰⁶ On the chronology of the Mittani kings see de Martino 2004, 2014.

¹⁰⁷ Wilhelm 1991.

found in their local territory but Egypt. The so-called Mittani Letter retrieved from Akhenaton's capital, el-Amarna, has been the most relevant text discovered concerning Hurrian language.¹⁰⁸ It probably originated in the Mittani chancery (Waššukanni?) and reproduced the dialectal variety that the language had on the court.

The city of Nuzi (Yorgan Tepe), located in the Transtigridian region, has also provided a significant amount of Hurrian vocabulary mixed in the Akkadian written documents,¹⁰⁹ replicating the similar cases from Qatna and Alalah.

The latest Hurrian documents, known up to date, are probably those that have been retrieved from the ancient city of Emar (Tell Meskéné), where several divinatory texts, a lexical list AN =*anum*, and a fragment of the Sumerian wisdom literature known as “The Instructions of Šuruppak”, were displayed in a bilingual Akkadian-Hurrian edition.¹¹⁰

§1.6 Hurrian Dialects

When dealing with languages and dialects, it is problematic to draw the division line between both; when do we consider that certain language has dialects? And if so, up to which point these dialects represent variations of the “main” language and not a different one? Ideally, the distinction between language and dialect is based on the notion of ‘mutual intelligibility’: dialects of the same language should be mutually intelligible, while different languages should not.¹¹¹

To avoid this classic dilemma between language and dialect, it would be better, at least partially, to work with the concepts of ‘abstract linguistic system’ and ‘specific

¹⁰⁸ Dietrich – Mayer 2010; Wilhelm 2014a.

¹⁰⁹ For a thorough analysis of the Akkadian-Hurrian *Mischsprache* from Nuzi see Wilhelm 1970. See also Márquez-Rowe 1998; Giacumakis 1970.

¹¹⁰ See the recently publication by Salvini 2015.

¹¹¹ Hock 1991: 381.

linguistic varieties'. In this way, we limit, to some extent, certain adjectives that often derive from the use of such concepts (i.e. language and dialect).

In the ANE, for instance, we tend to talk about Akkadian as an abstract linguistic system, and Assyrian or Babylonian, and its diachronic variations, as specific linguistic varieties. However, these considerations are more complicated while trying to analyse the Hurrian language. Despite its written and oral use for more than one thousand years (ca. 2450-1100), it is difficult (due to the state of the sources) to consider one particular branch of Hurrian as the 'abstract linguistic system' and the others the 'varieties'. Khačikyan, amending some of the divisions made by Diakonoff,¹¹² divided the language into six different branches:¹¹³

1. The dialect of the Tiš-atal inscriptions, known as "Old Hurrian";
2. The "Babylonian" dialect in the old Babylonian oaths/rituals from Larsa and Mari;
3. The dialect of the Sumerian-Hurrian *ḪAR-ra* list from Ugarit;
4. The dialect of the remaining texts from Ugarit;
5. The Boğazköy dialect and;
6. The Mittani dialect.

Wegner adopted this list (with minor differences) and added one more Hurrian dialect, pertaining to "Middle-Syrian", which includes the texts from Qatna and Niya.¹¹⁴

However, the problems concerning the dialectical varieties are far from being solved.¹¹⁵ Thus, at present, it would be more cautious, following Giorgieri's proposal, to refer to two main linguistic phases, primarily distinguished by the verbal system:¹¹⁶ the 'Old-Hurrian' (OH) and 'Mittani Hurrian' (MH).¹¹⁷

¹¹² Diakonoff 1981.

¹¹³ Khačikyan 1985.

¹¹⁴ Wegner 2007: 33.

¹¹⁵ Khačikyan 1978, 1985; Diakonoff 1981; Girbal-Wegner 1987: 147-ff; Giorgieri 2000a: 179-180; Wegner 2007: 33-34.

¹¹⁶ Wilhelm 1992; Campbell 2008a.

¹¹⁷ Giorgieri 2000a: 179.

The diachronic differences between these two phases are relatively distinct from one another but not enough to suggest the existence of a different language, as it happens with Urartian. It is more likely to be a diachronic evolution of the verbal forms found in the OH, particularly seen in the differences between the transitive verbs.¹¹⁸

Old Hurrian: Indicative transitive ergative forms.

Root + complements	Tense	Transitive Class Marker	Ergative per. suffixes
xxx	∅	-o-	3. Sg.: -m

Mittani Hurrian: Indicative transitive ergative forms.

Root + complements	Tense	Transitive Class Marker	Ergative per. suffixes
xxx	Present: ∅ Future: -ed- Peterite: -ož-	-i-	3. Sg.: -a

Another important difference of the verbal structure falls on the grammatical system. It seems that the OH form of the transitive verb (i.e. =o=m) may indicate an aspect value (i.e. the extension of a verb over time) while the MH functions according to a tense system (i.e. the location in time of the verb/action employed).¹¹⁹

The OH variety refers, mainly, to the Tiš-atal inscription (see *above*) and the Hurrian documents retrieved from Mari, Larsa and Tuttul. The “Bilingual from Boğazköy”, the Parables¹²⁰ and especially the PNs (particularly the *Satznamen*), show close links with the ‘old phase’ of the language.¹²¹ The remaining Hurrian texts from Anatolia contain

¹¹⁸ Campbell 2015: 17.

¹¹⁹ Campbell 2015: 17-18.

¹²⁰ Wegner 2007: 34.

¹²¹ The closest similarities with Urartian come from ‘Old-Hurrian’.

mixture forms between the ‘Old’ and the ‘later/Mittani’ variety,¹²² while the ‘Mittani phase’ comprises, evidently, the Tušratta Letter, and some of the varieties from north-eastern Syria.

Old Hurrian	Mixed Hurrian?	Mittani Hurrian
Tiš-atal Inscription	Ugarit	Tušratta Letter
Texts from Mari, Larsa and Tuttul	Different Texts from Boğazköy	Tell Brak
Bilingual from Boğazköy	Qatna ?	
Parables	Emar?	
Personal Names (<i>Satznamen</i>)		

§1.7 Hurrian Onomastics

The linguistic material concerning the Hurrians does not occur solely in the form of cuneiform texts, but also in the aspect of PNs and to a lesser extent, toponyms.¹²³ In this sense, it is evident to highlight the importance of anthroponyms in any study of the ANE. Aside from bequeathing a great variety of useful documentation to analyse the different aspects of their societies, the cultures from the ANE also reproduced throughout onomastics an alternative source to give acquaintance many of the characteristics of their societies: family language and varieties, socio-cultural group, historical time, geographical area, social class, gender, age, style/vogue, worshipped deities, etc.

For Assyriologists, and to a lesser extent Hittitologists, Hurrian civilisation, paradoxically, has always been preconceived and associated with the ‘idea’ of

¹²² Giorgieri 2000a: 179.

¹²³ Salvini 2000a: 16.

onomastics. The identification of a Hurrian population, as happens with many other cultures, has been connected, primarily, to anthroponyms and toponyms, and secondary with the texts. This is evidently truistic because the archives that yielded Hurrian written documents, in general terms, also provided PNs but not vice-versa. Thus, this was not an arbitrary or subjective decision but the direct consequence of the abysmal ratio between the people who bore Hurrian PNs (in Sumer, Babylonia, Assyria, or the regions controlled by Amorites, Ugaritics or Hittites) and the quantity of cuneiform documents written in Hurrian or Hurrian *Mischsprache*. Moreover, the characteristics of Hurrian onomastics (see below) provide a mass of information extremely valuable for many types of studies, and in our case turning crucial for the analysis of the pantheon.

Thus, the study of PNs offers a complementary approach that turns out to be particularly useful when analysing the Hurrian pantheon during the third and second millennium. This is due to two reasons:

a) The quantity and quality of Hurrian texts from where the information to outline the structure of the pantheon can be obtained -despite the growth that has taken such corpus in recent times and;

b) The particularities of the onomastics. The philological and historical analysis of PNs provides a more comprehensive scope of the structure of the pantheon, envisioning the most common deities through time and space, some of their features (epithets and appellatives), and the possible changes occurred in their development. It is evident that this particular methodology can only be applied to those civilisations, whether ancient or modern, that had a close relationship between the action of naming a person and the action of worshiping gods. Therefore, these aspects of the Hurrians PNs should be considered primarily as a constituent part of the ANE onomastics, but at the same time as the local and temporal development of an ancient tradition they reproduced

throughout its history.

§1.7.1 Research on Hurrian Persona Names

The history of the study of the Hurrian PNs can be traced back to its foundations with the publication of the Nuzi PNs in 1943 by Gelb, Purves and McRae.¹²⁴ This opera, still useful today, was not exclusively dedicated to the Hurrian names but to the entire onomasticon (i.e. Hurrian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Amorites, Sumerian, Kassites, Indo-European and unknown groups) retrieved from the cuneiform documents from the capital of the Arrapha Kingdom.¹²⁵ Nevertheless, the work settled the bases, due to the vast quantity of Hurrian PNs (ca. more than 50 percent), for the subsequent studies on the subject.

The following year, Gelb published, as an appendix to his work on the Subareans and Hurrians,¹²⁶ a lesser list of anthroponyms that were all related to the different cities from the third millennium. The linguistic and philological analysis of the names was brief and partially inaccurate due to the nature of the knowledge of the Hurrian language at that time. The same characteristic had the article published by Finkelstein in 1955 regarding some Hurrian names but from the Old Babylonian sources.

The first study exclusively related to the Hurrians and its anthroponyms in the Syrian region was made by A. Draffkorn in a doctoral dissertation from 1959.¹²⁷ The work, partially following the known scheme from NPN, attempted to trace and analyse all the Hurrian PNs presented in the documents from the city of Alalakh, both from the Old (Level VII Tell Atchana) and Middle Babylonian (level IV) periods. The work presents

¹²⁴ The previous works concerning Hurrian PNs were scarce, secondary and rather inaccurate.

¹²⁵ NPN 5.

¹²⁶ Gelb 1944: 109-115.

¹²⁷ Draffkorn 1959.

many inaccuracies and is outdated,¹²⁸ but it remains of great importance for the Hurrian presence in Alalah.

The following study that focused, though not exclusively, on the Hurrian PNs was written by F. Gröndahl (1967). The work, up to that moment, gathered all the existing onomastics, until that moment, from the cuneiform texts of the Syrian city of Ugarit (Semitic, Hurrians, Anatolian, Indo-Aryans, Egyptians and unknown origin), both in syllabic and alphabetic. As it happens with the previous case, the detailed study of the Hurrian PNs turned out to be scarce and limited only to the translation of some elements, and to relate those unfamiliar elements with other Hurrian names from various files (especially Nuzi).¹²⁹ Contemporaneously, D. Kinlaw presented a dissertation analysing the PNs presented in the Akkadian texts from Ugarit, paying substantial interest to those of Hurrian origin. The methodology used for the work did not greatly differ from that used by his colleagues, but he placed a greater focus on the analysis and the correspondence with other examples of the different elements composing the Hurrian onomastic universe.

The methodology of individualizing Hurrian PNs in different cuneiform files continued with the studies for the cities of Mari (1974) and Karana (1979) by J. Sasson; Dilbat (1977) by D. Charpin; and E. Cassin (1977), who, along with J. Glassner, updated the list names from Nuzi.

During the mid-1980s the onomastic studies regarding Hurrian PNs continued, (though not always exclusively): M. Astour for the Transtigris area; Freydank H. and M. Salvini for texts from Kār-Tukultī-Ninurta; C. Saporetti also for Middle Assyria; or J.

¹²⁸ This work should be use with major reserves. For a succinct critical review see Von Dassow 2007: 73, fn. 178.

¹²⁹ Regarding Gröndahl's work see the reviews from Nougayrol 1968; Richter 1969; Schult 1969; Berger 1970 and Hiller 1970.

Brinkman for Middle Babylonia.¹³⁰ Although with some reticence and gradualism, they also began to incorporate more grammatical aspects on analysis of the names.¹³¹ While in the past existed some attempts to analyse names in this manner,¹³² the works limited themselves, mostly, to identify and translate, if possible, the various elements that formed the names.

However, the qualitative changes regarding the structural aspects of Hurrian onomastics emerged in the 1990s. G. Wilhelm published in 1992 the work that laid the modern foundation on which much of the current knowledge has been developed. He focused the study on the Hurrian verbal system, which its oldest dialectal phase was clearly reproduced in the PNs. Hence, the combination of both analysis proved essential to understanding the grammatical function of a significant part (a vast majority of *Satznamen*) of the Hurrian anthroponyms.

Since then, the study of Hurrian onomastics happened to occupy essentially two areas: one that continued with the identification and differentiation from the rest of the anthroponyms extracted from the various cuneiform archives, and another one, that usually served as complementary, that tried to analyse the different names from a grammatical and sociolinguistic approach. Thus, we have the studies from Wilhelm (1998b) and Giorgieri (2000b) that focus strictly on the structural aspects of Hurrian onomastics, i.e. geographical and temporal distribution, types of names, constituent elements, verb forms (mood and tense), characteristics, attempts of translations, among other issues. In turn, new studies on the history and origins of the Hurrians were also carried out, which led, inexorably, to the onomastics trace (not just anthroponyms but

¹³⁰ Astour 1987; Freydank and Salvini 1984; Saporetti 1981; Brinkman 1981.

¹³¹ Khačikyan 1987; Salvini 1991.

¹³² See, e.g., Gelb 1940-1941: 8; Draffkorn 1959: 120; Bush 1964: 9; Kammenhuber 1977: 139; Laroche 1980: 20-22.

also place names).¹³³

Towards the end of last century and the beginning of this one, studies on Hurrian onomastics strengthened the ties between philological, grammatical and sociolinguistic aspects. The various works from T. Richter (1998, 2001, 2004a, 2006), M. Giorgieri (1999b) G. Wilhelm (2008) and S. de Martino (2011) not only identified Hurrian names within larger files (e.g. Boğazköy, el-Amarna or Kaniš), but combined the grammatical structure as well as sociolinguistics, giving a broader picture of the Hurrian culture and language.

The knowledge achieved throughout the entire history of Hurrian onomastics (and language) began to be assembled by T. Richter in several works (*Vorarbeiten zu einem hurritischen Namenbuch*) of which has only recently been published the first part.¹³⁴ This includes a meticulous analysis of the Hurrian PNs from the Old Babylonian period obtained from the archives of the cities of Ašnakkum (Chagar Bazar), Mari (Tell Hariri), Tell al-Rimaḥ, Šušarrā (Tell Šemšara), Šeḫna/Šubat-Enlil (Tell Leilan), Tigunāni, Tuttul (Tell Bi'a), Ebla (Tell Mardih), Qal'at al-Hādī, Terqa (Tell 'Ašāra) and Ṭābatum (Tell Taban).

§1.7.2 Geographical and Spatial Distribution of Hurrian Personal Names¹³⁵

The geography in which Hurrian onomastic spread had clearly two avenues: a north-south and an east-west axis. The oldest historical information we can find on Hurrians corresponds to their PNs and dates back to Pre-Sargonic Period (EDIIIb, ca. 2470-

¹³³ See, e.g., Salvini 1998, 2000b; Steinkeller 1998. A thorough research, though incomplete, of the Hurrian PNs from III millennium Mesopotamia, particularly Ur III, was developed by Zadok 1993.

¹³⁴ Richter 2016 (=VHN).

¹³⁵ This is just an introductory outline. For a complete detailed analysis and bibliography of the Hurrian PNs in the III and II millennium see the following chapters.

2316).¹³⁶ They timidly began to appear, for certain, in the archives of the ancient cities of Nabada (Tell Beydar)¹³⁷ and Ebla (Tell Mardih),¹³⁸ but the number and place distribution increased in the subsequent Sargonic and Gutian Periods (ca. 2316-2103) by a significant amount.¹³⁹ This number saw its peak during the Ur III Administration covering vast Mesopotamian territories as well as parts of Syria.¹⁴⁰

During the first half of the second millennium, the existence of Hurrian population, at least from an onomastic point of view, spread far and wide across the entire ANE. The attestation in the areas that later would be under the orbit of the Mitanni kingdom seems predominant (e.g. Alalaḫ VII, Ašnakkum, Tell al-Rimaḫ, Tigunāni, Mari, Terqa, Šeḫna/Subat-Enlil). However, it is also conspicuous the presence that existed in central and southern Mesopotamia (Dilbat, Larsa), in the north-eastern Tigris region (Šušarrā, Azuḫinum), and to a lesser extent in eastern Anatolia (Kaneš).

In the second half of the millennium, the onomastic distribution spread even more widely than before, covering extensive areas and having the expansion of Mitanni as the main motor. The particular increase in Anatolia (Ḫattuša, Šapinuwa, Kayalıpınar) and Syria (Alalaḫ IV, Emar, Qatna, Ugarit), the significant level manifested in Mesopotamia (Babylonia, Nippur, Kār Tukulti-Ninurta, Dūr Katlimmu, Aššur) and the thousands of PNs coming from the city of Nuzi, shows a clear and significant presence of this socio-cultural group, or at least names of Hurrian origin.

The transition to the first millennium completely changed this scenario. Hurrian PNs began to gradually disappear from the extensive areas where it had been attested and

¹³⁶ The chronology adopted in this work corresponds to the updated work by Sallaberger and Schrakamp 2015.

¹³⁷ Richter 2004: 275-277.

¹³⁸ The undisputable PNs that appeared in the Ebla archives belonged to individuals from Nagar (Tell Brak). See Richter 2004: 278.

¹³⁹ There are examples coming from southern/central Mesopotamia (e.g. Tutub, Girsu or Nippur) as well as northern (e.g. Gasur, Urkeš, Nagar or Azuḫinum).

¹⁴⁰ For a general overview see Zadok 1993.

managed only to survive in subtle and residual quantities in some Assyrian historical inscriptions, which mostly mention governors and sovereigns.¹⁴¹

§1.7.3 Characteristics of Hurrian Personal Names¹⁴²

Hurrian PNs were not foreign to the surrounding ANE societies. To a certain extent, they reproduced the structure and meaning pattern that existed in many of these cultures, particularly following the Semitic and Sumerian configuration.¹⁴³ From a grammatical point of view, Hurrian PNs are divided into two groups: ‘Sentence names’ (*Satznamen*) and ‘descriptive names’ (*Bezeichnungsnamen*).

The *Satznamen*, which constitutes a considerable amount of the anthroponyms, are names that represent a complete sentence. They are in the main definable as a finite verbal form in the indicative mood, which occupies the first position, with a theophoric element, which functions as the subject (agent) of the verb (e.g. *Unap-Teššup* > ‘Teššup came’). We also encounter names that are built in the imperative mood (*Eḫli-Teššup* > ‘Teššup, save him!’) or in the optative/desiderative (*Aniš-Ḫurpi* > ‘May Ḫurbi be (the) joy!’). There also are nominal phrases regularly formed by a theophoric element that functions as the subject, which can be placed at the beginning or the end, and a name or an adjective that takes the function of the nominal predicate (e.g. *Kušuh-atal* > ‘Kušuh (is) strong’).¹⁴⁴

Among the verbal *Satznamen* the most common attested type is the one formed by the 3rd person (sg.) of a finite verbal form, which has a preterit sense and precedes a

¹⁴¹ Gelb 1944: 81-83.

¹⁴² The topic of PNs has been an important theme of the Hurrian linguistic/grammatical studies. The most relevant contributions are: Speiser 1940-1941: 7-8; Friedrich 1943: 7-ff, 1969: *passim*; NPN: spec. 183-179; Draffkorn 1959; Bush 1964: 9; Diakonoff 1971: 60-ff; Salvini 1991; Wilhelm 1992, 1996a, 1996b, 1998; 2004: *passim*; Giorgieri 2000b; Richter 2004, 2012, 2016: 559-ff.; Wegner 2007: 130-*passim*; De Martino 2011; Fournet 2013: 121-ff.

¹⁴³ For a general overview of the Akkadian and Sumerian onomastics see Edzard 1998a, 1998b.

¹⁴⁴ Giorgieri 2000b: 283

theophoric element.¹⁴⁵ The morphemes used in the syntax of these names are those that correspond to the ‘Old-Hurrian’ linguistic variation of the verbal system.¹⁴⁶ This syntax will endure, with minor variations,¹⁴⁷ until the latest attestations of Hurrian PNs.¹⁴⁸

Between these types of *Satznamen* there are three different verbal forms, followed by the person morpheme indicator.

§1.7.3.a The first group corresponds to the ‘*intransitive*’ verbal form (intransitive movement verbs), which is configured with the thematic vowel ‘=a=’ and the 3rd person marker ‘=b=’.¹⁴⁹ The most common and attested examples are:

Akap-ewri [ag=a=b-*evri*]: ‘The lord came up’¹⁵⁰

Akap-šenni/elli [ag=a=b-*šen(a)=ni / el(a)=ni*]: ‘The brother/sister came up’¹⁵¹

Nahḫap-atal [nahḫ=a=b-*adal*] ‘The lord sat down’¹⁵²

Šintap-šarri [šind=a=b-*šarri*]: ‘The godking gave a third (child)’¹⁵³

Unap-atal [un=a=b-*adal*]: ‘The strong came’¹⁵⁴

Unap-Teššup [un=a=b-*Teššob*]: ‘Teššup came’¹⁵⁵

Alternatively, less attested and with assimilations or elisions:

Aka-menni [ag=a=Ø-men(a)=ni]: ‘The sibling came up’¹⁵⁶

¹⁴⁵ Wilhelm 1998b: 122.

¹⁴⁶ This characteristic was definitely asserted by Wilhelm 1992.

¹⁴⁷ In late Hurrian the marker of the 3rd person, ‘-b’, can be absent due to an assimilation process (Wilhelm 1998b: 123). See, for instance, the antipassive *Satznamen* from the Anatolia/Ugaritic area (XV century onwards): *Aki*-^dU-up (ag=i=(t<b)-Teššob) Teššup gave (him); *Pente-šina* (fend=i=(b)-šena ‘the brother made (him) perfect’); *Ari-Šarruma* (ar=i=(b)-Šarruma) ‘Šarruma gave (him)’; *Tiḫi-Teššup* (teḡ=i=(b)-Teššob) ‘Teššup raised (him)’. However, these names can also be interpreted as forms in the imperative mood (see VHN 596-ff.)

¹⁴⁸ See Gelb 1944: 82-83.

¹⁴⁹ Wilhelm 1992: 661-ff, 1998: 122-123; Giorgieri 2000b: 285; VHN 579-ff.

¹⁵⁰ From now on, all the names given as examples will have a footnote corresponding to at least one of the archives where it can be found. This name can be retrieved at Mari.

¹⁵¹ Mari, Karana or Ašnakkum.

¹⁵² Ur.

¹⁵³ Mari.

¹⁵⁴ Mari, Ašnakkum.

¹⁵⁵ Nuzi.

Aka-tišan [ag=a=Ø-tiža=n(na)]: ‘The heart came up’¹⁵⁷

Nahḥam-atal [nahḥ=a=m(<b!)-adal]: ‘The strong sat down’¹⁵⁸

Ullam-šen [ull=a=m(<b!)- šen]: ‘The brother destroyed’¹⁵⁹

Apart from ‘full’ *Satznamen* there also are hypocoristics. These tend to shorten the subject of the verb and mutate or elide the person or the thematic vowel marker:

ʿUna-ki [un=a=Ø-ki(yaze)]: ‘The sea came’¹⁶⁰

Unap-še [un=a=b-še(na)] ‘The brother came’¹⁶¹

Unaya [un=a-ya] ‘He/She came’¹⁶²

The group of ‘intransitive’ PNs can also present cases with negative verbs.¹⁶³

√=o=kk=vowel/=enclitic

Kutukkatil (ku-duq/du-uq-qa-til) [kod=o=kk=o>a=dil(la)] ‘We did not fall’¹⁶⁴

ʿHelukka (ḥe-lu-uk-ka) [ḥel=o=kk=o>a=Ø] ‘He/She said nothing’¹⁶⁵

Takilukku ta-ki-lu-ku) [tag=il=o=kk=o] ‘...’¹⁶⁶

√=o=g

Kutuk-atal [kud=o=g-adal] ‘The strong did not fall’¹⁶⁷

Natunuk [nad=o/un=o=g] ‘...’¹⁶⁸

¹⁵⁶ Mari.

¹⁵⁷ Mari.

¹⁵⁸ Puzriš-Dagan.

¹⁵⁹ Umma, Ur.

¹⁶⁰ Mari.

¹⁶¹ Mari, Ašnakkum, Ur and elsewhere.

¹⁶² Mari.

¹⁶³ VHN 589-ff.

¹⁶⁴ Mari, Šusārrā, Nuzi.

¹⁶⁵ Mari.

¹⁶⁶ Kaniš.

¹⁶⁷ Tigunāni.

Ḫapaluk [ḫab=al=o=g] ‘...’¹⁶⁹

§1.7.3.b The second group corresponds to the ‘*transitive non-ergative*’ (also known as *antipassive*)¹⁷⁰ verbal form, which is configured with the thematic vowel ‘=i=’ and the 3rd person marker ‘=b’.¹⁷¹ These *Satznamen* have a transitive but non-ergative meaning, i.e. the object of the action is not explicit but implicit, and identified with the subject of the phrase.¹⁷²

To this group pertains a large quantity of the PNs:

Akit-Teššup [ag=i=t(<b!)-Teššob] ‘Teššup brought (him)/took (him) up’

Arip-enni [ar=i=b-en=ni] ‘The god gave (him)’¹⁷³

Eḫlip-atal [eḫl=i=b-adal] ‘The strong saved (him)’¹⁷⁴

ḪPaip-elli [pa=i=b-el(a)=ni] ‘The sister created (him)’¹⁷⁵

Ḫaip-šarri [ḫa=i=b-šarri] ‘The king took (him)’¹⁷⁶

Ḫašim-Nawar [ḫaž=i=m(<b!)-Nawar] ‘(The god from) Nawar listened (him)’¹⁷⁷

Ḫašip-Teššup [ḫaž=i=b-Teššob] ‘Teššup listened (him)’¹⁷⁸

Ḫutip-Ugur [ḫud=i=b-Ugur] ‘(The god) Ugur glorified (him)’¹⁷⁹

Kirip- ulme [kir=i=b-olme] ‘The (female) servant liberated (him)’¹⁸⁰

¹⁶⁸ Mari.

¹⁶⁹ Mari.

¹⁷⁰ For the antipassive verbal form see Giorgieri 2000a: 250-ff; Wegner 2007: 120-ff.

¹⁷¹ Wilhelm 1992: 661-ff, 1998: 123; Giorgieri 2000b: 285. VHN 574-ff.

¹⁷² The vast majority of the PNs from the first half of the second millennium belong to his type. The name Evri-Karim [evri-kar=i=m(b!)] (Garelli 1963: 156) or Eniš-arim [eni=ž-ar=i=m(b!)] (Donbaz 1988: 7) from Kaneš could be an exception from the ‘transitive non-ergative’ group. If the normalization is correct, and the second element should be considered as a verb, ‘to conquer, defeat’ (BGH 190), then the verb has been set at the end of the *Satzname* (VHN 431; 579 fn. 931).

¹⁷³ Nuzi.

¹⁷⁴ Mari, Ašnakkum.

¹⁷⁵ Nuzi.

¹⁷⁶ Nuzi.

¹⁷⁷ Tigunāni.

¹⁷⁸ Mari, Šusārrā, Šubat-Enlil.

¹⁷⁹ Nuzi.

¹⁸⁰ Ašnakkum.

Hypocoristics:¹⁸¹

Akiya [*ag=i(=b)-ya*] ‘He/She brought (him)/took (him) up’¹⁸²

Arit-Te [*ar=i=t(<b)-Teššob*] ‘Teššup gave (him)’¹⁸³

The PNs in the ‘transitive’ form also present cases with negative verbs.¹⁸⁴

√*=i=kk=vowel/=enclitic*

Ammarikki (*am-ma-ri-ik-ki/am-ma-ri-ik-e*) [*amm=ar=i=kk=i*] ‘...’¹⁸⁵

Arikke (*a-ri-ig-ge*) [*ar=i=kk=i*] ‘He/She did not give (him)’¹⁸⁶

Tatikkanna (*ta-ti-ig-ga-an-na*) [*tad=i=kk=i>a=nna*] ‘He/She did not love (him)’¹⁸⁷

√*=i=g*

Kanik-ewri [*kan=i=k-evri*] ‘The lord did not... (him)’¹⁸⁸

√*=i=kk*

Ehlikku [*egl=i=kk=o/u*] ‘He/She did not save (him)’¹⁸⁹

Paikku (*pa/pá-(i-)ik-ku*) [*pa=i=kk=o/u*] ‘He/She did not build (him)’¹⁹⁰

§1.7.3.c Another type of PNs in the indicative mood corresponds to the ‘**transitive-ergative**’ verbal form, which is configured with the thematic vowel ‘=o=’ (typical of the Old-Hurrian verbal system, but becomes absent on the Mitanni letter variety) that

¹⁸¹ For this particular hypocoristic form see VHN 578-579.

¹⁸² Mari, Šusārrā, Ašnakkum.

¹⁸³ Tigunāni.

¹⁸⁴ VHN 587-ff.

¹⁸⁵ Alalaḫ.

¹⁸⁶ NPN 26; AAN I 27.

¹⁸⁷ Kaneš.

¹⁸⁸ Tigunāni.

¹⁸⁹ Alalaḫ.

¹⁹⁰ Nuzi.

forms a *Satzname* where the direct object of the action is explicit, followed by the bipolar 3rd person ending ‘=*m*’,¹⁹¹ which indicates the subject and object of the indicative verb.¹⁹²

To this group also pertains a significant quantity of PNs:

Anum-Ĥirpi [*an=o=m-ĥirbi*] ‘Ĥirbi made him happy’¹⁹³

Arum-Teššup [*ar=o=m-Teššob*] ‘Teššup gave him’¹⁹⁴

^fĤašum-alla(i) [*ĥaž=o=m-alla(i)*] ‘The lady listened her’¹⁹⁵

Kelum-atal [*kel=o=m-adal*] ‘The strong made him healthy/happy’¹⁹⁶

Mušum-atal [*muž=o=m-adal*] ‘The strong brought him the right shape /
made him right’¹⁹⁷

Putum-kiriš [*fud=o=m-kiriž*] ‘Kiriš begot him’¹⁹⁸

^fŠarum-elli [*šar=o=m-el(a)=ni*] ‘The sister wished her’¹⁹⁹

Teĥum-atal [*teġ=o=m-adal*] ‘The strong raised him’²⁰⁰

Some of the ‘transitive-ergative’ *Satznamen* suffered mutations ($m + n > n - n$; $m + š > p - š$) or elisions ($-m$; $-o$, $-m$),²⁰¹ particularly after the XV century:²⁰²

Ar-šarri [*ar(=o=m)-šarri*] ‘The king gave him’²⁰³

^fĤašup-eni [*ĥaž=o=b(>m!)-eni*] ‘The god listened her’²⁰⁴

¹⁹¹ Giorgieri 2000a: 229-230, 286-287; Wegner 2007: 128-131. VHN 569-ff.

¹⁹² Wilhelm 1992: 666, 1998: 123; Giorgieri 2000b: 286.

¹⁹³ Mari.

¹⁹⁴ Mari, Tigunāni.

¹⁹⁵ Nuzi.

¹⁹⁶ Mari.

¹⁹⁷ Mari. “Der ‚Starke‘ brachte ihn in die richtige Form” (Wilhelm 1998b: 123).

¹⁹⁸ Šerši.

¹⁹⁹ Nuzi.

²⁰⁰ Mari.

²⁰¹ On this subject see Wilhelm 1992: 668; Giorgieri 2000b: 287-288.

²⁰² Except for some Old-Babylonian cases from Mari (Šatu-šarri/LUGAL>šad=o=(m)-šarri ‘the king replaced him’) and from Tigunani (Šatu-šarri> šad=o=(m)-šarri).

²⁰³ Nuzi.

²⁰⁴ Nuzi.

Kel-Teššup [*kel(=o=m)-Teššob*] ‘Teššup made him healthy/happy’²⁰⁵

^fKelu-Ḫeba(t) [*kel=o=(m)-Ḫeba(t)*] ‘Ḫebat made her healthy/happy’²⁰⁶

^fKelu-manna[*kel=o=Ø-manna*] ‘Manna made her healthy/happy’²⁰⁷

^fMušup-Šayu [*muž=o= b(<m)-Šayu*] ‘Šayu brought her the right shape’²⁰⁸

^fPutu-Ḫeba(t) [*pud=o=(m)- Ḫeba(t)*] ‘Ḫebat created her’²⁰⁹

Šar-Tilla [*šar(=o=m)-Tilla*] ‘Tilla wished him’²¹⁰

Hypocoristics:²¹¹

Akkuya [*akk=o(=m)-ya*²¹²] ‘He/She brought him / took him up’²¹³

Mušuya [*muž=o(=m)-ya*] ‘He/She made him righteous’²¹⁴

Ar-Teya [*ar(=o=m)-Teššob*] ‘Teššup gave him’²¹⁵

Kel-Teya [*kel(=o=m)-Teššob*] ‘Teššup made him healthy/happy’²¹⁶

Muš-Teya [*muž(=o=m)-Teššob*] ‘Teššup brought her the right shape’²¹⁷

§1.7.3.d.1 Among the ‘transitive-ergative’ PNs, we encounter a significant alteration of the syntax since a group of *Satznamen* set the subject of the name in the first position and the verb in the last, matching the standard syntax in the Hurrian written documents.²¹⁸ So far, this type of names, attested in both millennia, are not extended throughout the onomastics, and they are restricted to certain verbs.

²⁰⁵ Nuzi.

²⁰⁶ El-Amarna.

²⁰⁷ Mari.

²⁰⁸ Nuzi.

²⁰⁹ Ḫattuša.

²¹⁰ Nuzi.

²¹¹ VHN 573.

²¹² Cf. with the name Akkul-enni (Wilhelm 1998b:125).

²¹³ Mari, Ašnakkum, Šubat-Enlil.

²¹⁴ Nuzi.

²¹⁵ Nuzi.

²¹⁶ Nuzi.

²¹⁷ Nuzi.

²¹⁸ Giorgieri 2000b: 287, fn 36; VHN 574.

^fAlla-tatum [*alla-tad=o=m*] ‘The lady loved her’²¹⁹

^fAllaiš-arum [*allai=ž-ar=o=m*] ‘The lady gave her’²²⁰

Allaš-arum [*alla=ž-ar=o=m*] ‘The lady gave him’²²¹

Elaš-arum [*ela=ž-ar=o=m*] ‘The sister gave him’²²²

Eniš-akum [*eni=ž-ag=o=m*] ‘The god brought him/took him up’²²³

Eniš-arum [*eni=ž-ar=o=m*] ‘The god gave him’²²⁴

Mališ-akum [*mali=ž-ag=o=m*] ‘Mali brought him/took him up’²²⁵

Nawar-arum [*navar-ar=o=m*] ‘Nawar gave him’²²⁶

Numiš-akum [*no/umi=ž-ag=o=m*] ‘Numiš brought him/took him up’²²⁷

Tupki-ašum [*to/upki-až=o=m*] ‘Tupki ...’²²⁸

§1.7.3.d Apart from the indicative, Hurrian *Satznamen* can also be constructed in several other moods, so far identified: imperative and optative/desiderative.

§1.7.3.e.1 The names built in the imperative do not necessarily have the same sense that this mood has in English or modern languages. In fact, sometimes it represents a sense that is halfway between an order and a wish. The transitive imperative mood can carry the thematic vowel ‘=o’ and ‘=i’,²²⁹ although the ‘=o’ has recently been challenged from the indicative paradigm of the written texts.²³⁰

Names with the form: $\sqrt{\text{=o}}$.

²¹⁹ Mari.

²²⁰ Mari.

²²¹ Ur, Umma, Puzriš-Dagan and Ğaršana.

²²² Nuzi.

²²³ Puzriš-Dagan, Mari, Tigonāni.

²²⁴ Kaneš.

²²⁵ Mari.

²²⁶ Mari.

²²⁷ Mari.

²²⁸ Tuttub.

²²⁹ VHN 593.

²³⁰ Campbell 2015: 40.

Alpu-atal [*alb=o-adal*] ‘...’²³¹

Anunni [*an=o=nni*] ‘Gladden him/her!’²³²

^fMatunni [*mad=o=nni*] ‘Make her wise!’²³³

^fMuzu-elli [*muž=o-el(a)=ni*] ‘Sister, make (him) right!’²³⁴

^fTalmu-ašiḫe [*talm=o=ažiḫe*] ‘Ašiḫe, make (her) big!’²³⁵

^fTalmu-Ḫeba [*talm=o-Ḫeba*] ‘Ḫebat, make (her) big!’²³⁶

^fUru-Ḫeba [*ur=o-Ḫeba*] ‘Ḫebat, make/let (her) exist!’²³⁷

Ḫalut [*ḫal=o=t(ta)*] ‘Carry me away!’²³⁸

Ipšun-tuk [*ipš=o=n(na)-to/k*] ‘Tuk, make (him) comfortable?!’²³⁹

Kikku [*kikk=o*] ‘Let three (the third children) be present!’²⁴⁰

Kipu-šenni [*kip=o-šen(a)=ni*] ‘...’²⁴¹

Kirru [*kirr=o*] ‘Let (the children) be free!’²⁴²

Kuzzu [*ko/uzz=o*] ‘Hold (him) back!’²⁴³

§1.7.3.e.2 In the singular transitive imperative mood the names are marked with the vowel ‘=i’, which is the same thematic vowel for the indicative paradigm.²⁴⁴ Among this group, a very common name is the one formed with the verb ‘to save’, *eḡl-*, followed by a theonym.²⁴⁵

²³¹ Mari.

²³² Mari.

²³³ Mari

²³⁴ Mari.

²³⁵ Mari.

²³⁶ Mari.

²³⁷ Mari.

²³⁸ Tigunāni.

²³⁹ Tigunāni.

²⁴⁰ Šušarrā.

²⁴¹ Mari.

²⁴² Mari, Šubat-Enlil.

²⁴³ Šušarrā, Šubat-Enlil.

²⁴⁴ For the imperative mood see Campbell 2015: chap. 4; VHN 596-ff.

²⁴⁵ Wilhelm 1996b: 339-342, 1998: 123; Giorgieri 2000b: 288. This type of Hurrian PNs appears with certain regularity in the L.VII-IV texts from Alalakh. See Draffkorn 1959: 27-ff.

Eḫli-Addu [eḡl=i-Addu] ‘Addu, save him!’²⁴⁶

Eḫli-Šarruma [eḡl=i-Šarruma] ‘Šarruma, save him!’²⁴⁷

Eḫli-Išhara [eḡl=i-Išhara] ‘Išhara, save him!’²⁴⁸

Eḫli-Teššup [eḡl=i-Teššob] ‘Teššup, save him!’²⁴⁹

And with syncope and anaptyxis:

Eḫel-Teya [eḡel(eḡl=i)-Teya] ‘Teššup, save him!’²⁵⁰

We also encounter names with many different verbs and subjects:

Aminna [amm=i=anna] ‘Bring him here!’²⁵¹

ʿAmmen-ki [amm=i=n(na)-ki] ‘Sea, bring her here!’²⁵²

Awi-kiriš [av=i-kiriš] ‘Kiriš, save him!’²⁵³

Awi-Ukur [av=i-Ugur] ‘Ukur, save him!’²⁵⁴

Haši [haš=i] ‘Listen!’²⁵⁵

Panti [fand=i] ‘Make him good!’²⁵⁶

Panti-Išhara [fand=i-Išhara] ‘Išhara, make him good!’²⁵⁷

§1.7.3.e.3 The imperative intransitive names are marked with the thematic vowel

‘=a’.²⁵⁸

²⁴⁶ This is hybrid *Satzname* from Alalah.

²⁴⁷ Ḫattuša.

²⁴⁸ Alalah.

²⁴⁹ Mari, Tigunāni.

²⁵⁰ Nuzi

²⁵¹ Mari.

²⁵² Mari.

²⁵³ Mari, Ašnakkum.

²⁵⁴ Mari.

²⁵⁵ Tigunāni.

²⁵⁶ Mari.

²⁵⁷ Mari, Alalah.

²⁵⁸ VHN 601.

Ana-kepal [an=a-kebal(i)] ‘Kepali, make (her) happy!’²⁵⁹

^fTaka-tati [tag=a-tadi] ‘...’²⁶⁰

^fUnam-me [un=a=m(ma)-me] ‘Sibling, come here!’²⁶¹

Uštam-šenni [ušt=a=m(ma)-šen(a)=ni] ‘Go outside, brother!’²⁶²

§1.7.3.f The *Satznamen* formed in the optative/desiderative mood²⁶³ still remains problematic, particularly due to the current knowledge of this modal form and the verb construction.²⁶⁴ Thus, it can be recognised the morpheme ‘=l’, characteristic of the intensifier value of this mood, affixed to the thematic vowel (=a=, =i=, =o=).²⁶⁵

Urḫal-enni [urḡ=a=l-en(i)=ni] ‘May the god be (your) certainty!’²⁶⁶

^fTazal-elli [taž=a=l-el(a)=ni] ‘May the sister...’²⁶⁷

Tuppal-eni [tupp=a=l-eni] ‘May the god be (your) existence (?)!’

Mazil-enna [maz=i=l-en=na] ‘May the gods help (him)’²⁶⁸

Ḫutil-enni [ḫud=i=l-en(i)=ni] ‘May the God listen to (him)’²⁶⁹

Takil-šenni [tag=i=l-šen(a)=ni] ‘May the brother make (him) god!’²⁷⁰

Akkul-enni [akk=o=l-en(i)=ni] ‘May the god bring (him) up!’²⁷¹

Zawul-natki [zav=o=l-natki] ‘...’²⁷²

²⁵⁹ Mari, Šušārrā.

²⁶⁰ Mari.

²⁶¹ Ašnakkum.

²⁶² Mari.

²⁶³ Hurrian distinguishes the optative from the desiderative mood. In both case the speaker wishes or desires a certain action or state to be achieved, but the optative mood indicates counter-factuality or remote possibility, in contrast with the desiderative which functions as a means for expressing desire, needs or wants (Campbell 2015: 105).

²⁶⁴ See Giorgieri 2000b: 237-238; Wegner 2007: 109-ff. For a more detailed analysis see Campbell 2015: chap. 6 and 9.

²⁶⁵ Wilhelm 1998b: 124; Giorgieri 2000b: 289; VHN 605-ff.

²⁶⁶ Nuzi.

²⁶⁷ Ašnakkum.

²⁶⁸ Nuzi.

²⁶⁹ Nuzi.

²⁷⁰ Nippur (Cassite period)

²⁷¹ Nuzi, Nippur.

§1.7.3.f.1. Another form is constructed with the morpheme ‘=ž’, which is often found in the optative/desiderative mood,²⁷³ but with the thematical vowels ‘=i=’ and ‘=o=’.²⁷⁴

Aniš-Ḫurpi [*an=i=ž-Ḫurbi*] ‘May Ḫurbi be (the) joy!’²⁷⁵

Ḫaiš-Teššup [*ḫa=i=ž-Teššob*] ‘May Teššup take (him)’²⁷⁶

^fTeḫiš-menni [*teḡ=i=ž-men=ni*] ‘May the sibling raise (her)’²⁷⁷

^fAruš-Ḫeba [*ar=o=ž-Ḫeba*] ‘May Ḫebat give (her)’²⁷⁸

Tuḫuš-mati [*to/uḡ=o=ž-madi*] ‘...’²⁷⁹

Unuš-kiaše [*un=o=ž-kiaše*] ‘May the Sea bring him!’²⁸⁰

§1.7.3.g Within the *Satznamen*, another important group is constituted by the verbless clauses. Here the predicate, often in the second position, is an adjective, sometimes formed with the essive case marker (=a),²⁸¹ or with, most likely, the enclitic pronoun of the 3rd person sg. (=n) between the predicate and the subject.

Teššup-ewri [*Teššob-ewri*] ‘Teššup is the lord’²⁸²

Kušuḫ-atal [*kužoḡ-adal*] ‘Kušuḫ is strong’²⁸³

Kušuḫ-ewri [*kužoḡ-ewri*] ‘Kušuḫ is lord’²⁸⁴

Allai-talma [*allai-talm(i)=a*] ‘The lady is big’²⁸⁵

²⁷² Mari.

²⁷³ Giorgieri (2000b: 289) adds the possibility that ‘-ži’ could be an adjectival morpheme affixed to the derivational vowel. On the optative and desiderative moods see respectively Campbell 2015: chap. 6 and 9.

²⁷⁴ An unusual example is the PN Talpuš-atili [*talb=o=ž-adili*] which could be interpreted as ‘May the strong make (him) big’ or ‘The strong is big’, where ‘*tal(a)b-o=ž(i)*’ could be representing an aggrandizing adjective from *tal(a)mi* (Giorgieri 2000b: 289).

²⁷⁵ Kaneš.

²⁷⁶ Nuzi.

²⁷⁷ Mari.

²⁷⁸ Emar.

²⁷⁹ Kaneš.

²⁸⁰ Ašnakkum.

²⁸¹ Wilhelm 1998b: 124; Giorgieri 2000a: 254-255; VHN 601-ff.

²⁸² Šubat-Enlil, Karana.

²⁸³ Mari, Tigunāni, Alalah.

²⁸⁴ Mari, Tigunāni.

Enna-muša [*en=na-muž=a*] ‘The gods are fair’²⁸⁶

Erwe-talma [*ervi-talm(i)=a*] ‘The Lord is big’²⁸⁷

Erwen-atal [*ervi=n(na)-adal*] ‘The Lord is strong’²⁸⁸

Memem-Naye [*meme=n(na)-Naye*] ‘Memem is naye’²⁸⁹

Tirmen-šeni [*tirme=n(na)-šen(a)=ni*] ‘Tirmen(?) is the brother’²⁹⁰

§1.7.4.h The *Satznamen* classified as nominal phrases (or verbless clauses) could also be formed by placing the predicate in the first position. This characteristic is more common in the Hittite area.²⁹¹

Šarri-Teššup [*šarri-Teššob*] ‘The godking is Teššup’²⁹² [inverted translation]

Erwe-šarri [*ervi-šarri*] ‘The lord is the godking’²⁹³

Talmi-šarruma [*tal(a)mi-šarruma*] ‘(the god) Šarruma is big’²⁹⁴

§1.7.4.1 The last group of PNs that falls into the *Satznamen* category is the hybrid one (Hurrian-Sumerian, Hurrian-Akkadian, Hurrian-Ugaritic and Hurrian-Luwian, or vice-versa). These names are usually formed with a theophoric element, predominantly Hurrian, and a foreign lexical item.²⁹⁵

Hurrian-Sumerian:

ʿGeme-Ša(w)uš(k)a [*ʿGéme-^dša-u₁₈-ša*] ‘The (female) servant of Šawuška’²⁹⁶

Lú-Ša(w)uš(k)a [*Lú-^dša-u₁₈-ša*] ‘The man of Šawuška’²⁹⁷

²⁸⁵ Nuzi.

²⁸⁶ Nuzi.

²⁸⁷ Nuzi.

²⁸⁸ Nuzi.

²⁸⁹ Ašnakkum.

²⁹⁰ Šubat-Enlil.

²⁹¹ Wilhelm 1998b: 124; De Martino 2011.

²⁹² Šušārrā.

²⁹³ Kaneš.

²⁹⁴ Ḫattuša.

²⁹⁵ Wilhelm 1998b: 121; Giorgieri 2000b: 291; De Martino 2011: 38-39.

²⁹⁶ Lagaš.

Hurrian-Semitic (Akkadian, West-Semitic):

Ea-Talmi [*Ea-talm(i)=a*] ‘Ea is great’²⁹⁸

Eḫli-Addu [*eḫl=i-Addu*] ‘May Addu save him!’²⁹⁹

Gimil-Teššup [*gimil-Teššob*] ‘The favour of Teššup’³⁰⁰

Ili-Šarruma [*ilu(m)-šarruma*] ‘Šarruma is my god’³⁰¹

Hurrian-Luwian:

Šawuška-muwa [*Ša(w)uška-muwa*] ‘The strong of Šawuška’³⁰²

Šawuška-piya [*Ša(w)uška-piya*] ‘The gift of Šawuška’³⁰³

One of the issues that the hybrid PNs brings to light is the question regarding the correct reading of the sumerograms/logograms. Are they supposed to be read and transliterated in Akkadian (e.g. *i-ni-^dIM>Ini-Addu*) or in Ugaritic (e.g. ^m*a-dal-ŠEŠ>Atal-‘aḫû*)³⁰⁴ when a phonetic complement does not follow them? What was the original meaning and how are we supposed to read it?

As it will be shown later, it is hard to establish a single rule for the entire group of Hurrian hybrids PNs because each archive has its peculiarities. Therefore, each case has to be considered separately, and the readings and translations have to agree with the general but also the particular context (i.e. the socio-cultural background, the vernacular language of the scribes, the geographical area, etc.).

²⁹⁷ Ur.

²⁹⁸ In these cases the foreign elements are the theophorous.

²⁹⁹ Alalakh.

³⁰⁰ Nuzi.

³⁰¹ Hattuša.

³⁰² Hattuša.

³⁰³ Hattuša.

³⁰⁴ RS 16.132: 4.

§1.8 Bezeichnungsnamen

The second major group of the Hurrian PNs falls into the category of ‘descriptive names’ (*Bezeichnungsnamen*).³⁰⁵ These names usually represent a characteristic of the bearer, and they do not carry a specific pattern. They consist of generic terms related to:

Man and woman

Ašti: woman

Tah(h)e/Ta’e: man

Kinship

Atta: father

Ela: sister

Mena: sibling

Nera: Mother

Šala: daughter

Šena: brother

Professions

Takuḫuli [*tag=o=ġ(e)=(o)=li*]: ‘The person in charge of the light’

Tapšahe [*taps=āġ=i*]: ‘Cupbearer’

Social/legal status

Pirati [*fir=adi*]: free-man, noble

Purame: slave

Ewuri: heir

Animals

³⁰⁵ Wilhelm 1998b: 125-126; Giorgieri 2000b: 291-292.

Ḫupita: bull-calf

Šešwe: goat

Petari: cattle

Ḫawirni: Lamb

Demonym

Ḫattuḫe [*hatt(i)=o=ge*]: (The) Hittite

Nuzaḫe [*nuz(i/u)=a=ge*]: (The) Nuzian

Geography

Aranziḫ: (The) Tigris (River)

Objects

Kumdi: Tower

Kešḫe: Throne

Abstract entities

Šarišše: Desire

Šeḫurni: Life

Body parts

Šu=ni: Hand

Tišna: Heart

Ziza: Chest

§1.9 Theophoric Elements

A large group of the Hurrian PNs are formed with different types of theophoric elements. By theophoric elements we intend the theonyms of the Pan-Hurrian deities,

secondary deities, minor/local deities and non-Hurrian deities; divinised entities, and common or “generic” theophoric elements (appellatives and epithets), which could have alluded to different deities.

§1.9.1 Theonyms

Regarding their grammatical status, especially with the most ancient attestations, they are closer to the ‘descriptive names’ and particularly to the sub-group of geographical/cities. Many of the theonyms seemed to have an appellative or epithet origin rather than a proper noun.

§1.9.1.2 Pan-Hurrian Deities

Within the group of the ‘Pan-Hurrian’ deities, we encompass Teššup,³⁰⁶ Kušuḫ³⁰⁷ and Šimiga.³⁰⁸ This triad appears in almost every cuneiform archive holding Hurrian PNs during the second millennium (at least one of them and with minor exceptions). They do not appertain to any particular region or city (apart from their shrines), and they are considered to be native gods of the Hurrian pantheon.

§1.9.1.3 Secondary Deities

The secondary deities correspond to the group of Hurrian or Hurrianised gods that had a significant development throughout the pantheon, mythological tales, incantations, rituals and any other religious manifestation, but do not frequently appeared in every archive holding Hurrian PNs. Moreover, its presence, at least in the onomastics, fluctuated unevenly, making them to appear many times in one archive, while being

³⁰⁶ On Teššup see Laroche 1948; Wilhelm 1989: *passim*, esp. 49-55, 1994; Popko 1995: *passim*; Schwemer 2001: chap vi, 2008; Green 2003: *passim*; Taracha 2009: *passim*;

³⁰⁷ On Kušuḫ see Otten 1980-1983; Wilhelm 1989: 53; Trémouille 2000: 124; Taracha 2009: 110-ff.

³⁰⁸ On Šimiga see Laroche 1968: 447-544, 1976: 94-99; Wilhelm 1989: 53, 2008: 183; Popko 1995: 89, 100, 102; Trémouille 2000: 124; Taracha 2009: 108-ff.; Giorgieri 2009-2011.

completed absent from many others. To this group, it also appertains those deities that belonged to the so-called “substratum” and were adopted and incorporated to the pantheon by the Hurrians: Allani,³⁰⁹ Aštabi(l), Ғebat,³¹⁰ Iṣḥara,³¹¹ Šalaš,³¹² IŠTAR/Šawuška,³¹³ Ukur,³¹⁴ Kubaba,³¹⁵ Kumarbi,³¹⁶ Šerriš,³¹⁷ and Tilla.³¹⁸

§1.9.1.4 Minor/local deities³¹⁹

This group is constituted by a large number of deities that appear unevenly and randomly in the Hurrian PNs, and that also played minor roles or were completely absent in the religious texts so far retrieved in the Hurrian or Hittite language: Abari,³²⁰ Ala;³²¹ Ara;³²² Ғurmiš (place);³²³ Ғurpi (?), Kalli (mountain); Kelti (?);³²⁴ Kepali (?) Kešiyar (mountain); Kulpi (?);³²⁵ Meme; Kulmiš (place); Naye (Na); Pairi; Pišaiš (mountain);³²⁶ Šantalluk;³²⁷ Šayu,³²⁸ Šuriḫe,³²⁹ Šuwala;³³⁰ Taḫupe (place?);³³¹

³⁰⁹ On Allani see Wilhelm 1989: 55, 63, 65; Archi 1998: 39; Trémouille 2000: 126, 139, 154; De Martino 2000b: *passim*; Von Dassow 2014: 128-129. On Allatum see Taracha 2009: 86-ff.

³¹⁰ On Ғebat see, especially, the work by Trémouille 1997, 2000: *passim*; Archi 1998: 42.

³¹¹ On Iṣḥara see Archi 1992, 1998, 2002.

³¹² Archi 1995.

³¹³ See Wegner 1981, 1995; Trémouille 2009.

³¹⁴ Wiggermann 1999a, 1999b; Trémouille 2000: 132; Krebernik 2014; VHN 549.

³¹⁵ Laroche 1960b; Bittel 1980-1983; Edzard 1980-1983; Hawkins 1980-1983, 1981; Popko 1995: *passim*; Richter 2001: 564 fn.8; Taracha 2009: *passim*.

³¹⁶ Güterbock 1980-1983; Wilhelm 1989: 50, 52, 53, 59-62, 1996; Haas 1994: 309; Popko 1995: 97, 99-100, 123-127, *passim*; Hoffner 1998: 52, §6; Trémouille 2000: *passim*; Taracha 2009: *passim*; Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 2009: 62-ff.

³¹⁷ Wilhelm 1989: 50. Haas 1994: 333; Popko 1995: 97, 112; Richter 2001: 566, fn.17; Taracha 2009: *passim*.

³¹⁸ Wilhelm 1989: 50-51, 2014b; Popko 1995: 97; Taracha 2009: 67 fn.357, 120.

³¹⁹ The “(…)” indicates the relationship that existed between the name of the deity and a possibly entity or source from where they might have been originally.

³²⁰ BHG 35; VHN 376.

³²¹ Haas 1994: 452; van Gessel 1998: 9-ff.

³²² VHN 378. However, this could also be interpreted as an abbreviation for the word Aranzih.

³²³ VHN 423-424.

³²⁴ This name might also have an divinatory sense. See de Martino (1992: 143-153) for the list of technical terms related to Hurrian divinatory practices.

³²⁵ Giorgieri 1999b: 70-ff; VHN 445.

³²⁶ Popko 1995: 127; Taracha 2009: 95, 118; Trémouille 2000: 126; VHN 485-486.

³²⁷ Laroche 1980: 214; van Gessel 1998: 373; Wegner 2004: 232; VHN 498-499.

³²⁸ VHN 495.

³²⁹ VHN 521-522.

Takidu,³³² Tašmiš,³³³ Taya,³³⁴ Tulla.³³⁵

§1.9.1.5 Non-Hurrian Deities

Several Hurrian PNs have been built over hybrid bases, especially Semitic (Amorite or Akkadian) and Indoeuropean (Hittite and Luwian). From these cases, the most common theophorous has been “Addu”, which expresses similar characteristics with Teššup, i.e. they are both storm-gods and chiefs of their respective pantheons. In this sense, those places where the Amorite population was strongly rooted and cohabited with the Hurrians might have generated this type of ‘theophoric syncretism’.³³⁶

§1.9.1.6 Divinised Entities

Hurrians were able to turn divine many different entities, i.e. objects, mountains, rivers, cities, places or pre-existing things, by given them religious connotations. It is not clear how or why they turned them into this sort of elements but they had an important imprint in a vast amount of PNs, providing a distinctive character among the onomasticon.³³⁷ The most common entities that appear on the names are: Anšal (place),³³⁸ Aranziḫ (river),³³⁹ Arrapḫa (place),³⁴⁰ Ašīḫum (place),³⁴¹ Ḫabur (river),³⁴²

³³⁰ Schwemer 2001: 409; Taracha 2009: 95, 119; VHN 216.

³³¹ VHN 525.

³³² Laroche 1980: 250; Haas 1994: 388, 447; Popko 1995: 115; van Gessel 2001: 218; Taracha 2009: 95, 119; VHN 526-527.

³³³ Wilhelm 1989: 59, 61; Popko 1995: 97, 115, 117, 125, 165; Taracha: 2009 *passim*; Trémouille 2011-2012; VHN 532-533.

³³⁴ VHN 525.

³³⁵ This deity only appears in the Boğazköy material. See Laroche 1980: 277 (under the voice Tulli); Van Gessel 1998: 527; VHN 542-543.

³³⁶ The most common cases are those from Alalah. See Draffkorn 1959: 65.

³³⁷ Wilhelm 1998b; Giorgieri 2000b: 283-284.

³³⁸ According to Zadok, this town should be located in the periphery of Urartu (Zadok 2000: 11)

³³⁹ The Hurrian name for the Tigris River. See BHG 44.

³⁴⁰ The city of Arrapḫa was well related to the storm-god (Giorgieri 2000b: 283-284).

³⁴¹ VHN 383.

³⁴² RGTC 3: 284.

Ĥašur (river);³⁴³ Igar (place);³⁴⁴ Kakka (place?); Kaniš (place); Kumme (place);³⁴⁵ Nawar (place);³⁴⁶ Ninua (place);³⁴⁷ Purandi (river);³⁴⁸ Šuri (place).³⁴⁹

§1.9.1.7 Common or “Generic” Theophoric Elements

Within the group of common theophoric elements, we find different divine appellatives that are not exclusively associated to any particular deity: Alla=i (lady); Ardi (city); Atal (strong); Eni (god); Ewri (lord); Kešhe (throne); Kiaze (sea); Mušni (righteous); Šarri (godking); Talmi (big); Ulme (female slave/servant). Thus, the connection between both could be assumed on the basis of the characteristics of the gods. However, these adjectives are associated with different gods, which turns impossible to establish a direct link between them. Of course, we cannot discard that in ancient times the connection could have been tighter but since the beginning of the second millennium, at least, the exclusiveness was already gone.

§1.9.1.8 Non-Theophoric Elements

Among the constituent topics of Hurrian onomastic, the second most common element is the one related to kinship: šena (brother); eli (sister); mena (sibling); šali (daughter); and atta, (father).

A first appraisal would be that of associating this group of elements as part of the theophoric ones.³⁵⁰ However, in general terms, the deities of the population of the ANE were not characterised by having a ‘low divine level’,³⁵¹ but quite the opposite. That is

³⁴³ VHN 411 and fn. 310.

³⁴⁴ RGCT 12/2: 140.

³⁴⁵ The city of Kumme, yet to be located, is supposed to be Teššup’s main dwelling. See Wilhelm 1994

³⁴⁶ Salvini 2000a: 291; VHN 465-466.

³⁴⁷ The appearance of the city of Nineveh is understandable since it was connected with Ištar/Šawuška.

³⁴⁸ Euphrates River.

³⁴⁹ VHN 521-522.

³⁵⁰ Wilhelm 1998b; 124-125; Giorgieri 2000b: 283-284. Richter 2001.

³⁵¹ By ‘low divine level’ we understand the characteristic of the interaction between deities and humans.

why kinship, reproduced among gods (e.g. according to mythology, Teššup and Šawuška were siblings),³⁵² was not frequently between humans and their deities. Therefore, the kinship elements used by the Hurrians, which are attested already in the oldest PNs, did not necessarily have a primordial divine connotation. The significant incidence of kinship terms used, allegedly as divine epithets, reflects a common pattern with Semitic onomastic, which has also projected onto the divine domain the legal and emotional ties of family life.³⁵³ Thus, the use of kinship elements should not be automatically associated with theophoric elements but to the socio-economic characteristic that Hurrian society had. Therefore, it cannot be excluded that the semantic values of these items were probably reconsidered, together with the adjective ‘strong’ (*adal*) or the figure of the deified king (*šarri*), as a result of the changes within the Hurrian religious structure. However, it is more mundane to think that the kinship elements were a reflection of the family structure (nuclear, extended/household and tribal) than the pantheon one.

§2. Towards the Origins of Hurrian *Satznamen*

It has long been argued, on the basis of apparent grammatical peculiarities and idiosyncrasies, that the language of PNs, at least in the ANE, cannot be treated as identical to the living one or even to the language of texts. The evidence preserved in PNs, likewise in loanwords, is often viewed as a survival of an older stage of the language, which can help to document earlier phases of a language before later changes took place. This happens, to some degree, with the Hurrian case, where the morphemes

The higher the interaction with humans, the lower the level of divinization, and the lower interaction with humans, the higher the level of divinization.

³⁵² Bernabé 2009.

³⁵³ Buccellati 1995: 858.

used to build the *Satznamen* are, mostly,³⁵⁴ the ones that characterise the so-called “Old Hurrian” verbal-system (see above). Thus, PNs may show a higher level of formal continuity than other elements of the lexicon (cf. Hurrian onomastics in the Mittani period and the written dialect), though with the Hurrian case is only partially accurate.

On the *Reallexikon* entry related to Hurrian “Name, Namengebung”, Wilhelm states that:

“Es ist unklar, ob die hurr. Satznamen von den semit. beeinflusst sind. Die Tatsache, daß in hurr. Satznamen das Prädikat entgegen der normalen Syntax die Anfangsposition einnimmt, könnte dafür sprechen. Allerdings gehören Satznamen zu den ältesten andauernde Sprachbundsituation in der Mitte des III. Jts. angenommen werden müßte, für die bisher keine Belege beizubringen sind.”³⁵⁵

A decade later, he placed a similar argument claiming that:

“Hurrian anthroponomy points at a long ‘*Sprachbund*’ situation between Hurrian and ancient Semitic languages, because Hurrian shares a certain type of sentence-names with Akkadian, Amorite and Canaanite. The important point is that the Hurrian sentence-names place the finite verbal form in the initial position as is the case with Semitic sentence-names, though the normal position of verbal forms in all Hurrian texts including the oldest ones is the final position (at least if not topicalized).”³⁵⁶

However, to move forward with the Hurrian *Satznamen* origin and Wilhelm’s hypothesis, it is important to mention certain aspects concerning the various changes in language.

³⁵⁴ There are some Hurrian names which correspond to the Mittani verb paradigm but their presence in the onomasticon is relatively limited. See VHN 584-587

³⁵⁵ Wilhelm 1998b: 122.

³⁵⁶ Wilhelm 2008: 181.

§2.1 Syntactic Change

Syntax has always been closer to the ‘upper’ ends of the grammar, i.e. to the semantic pole of language, than morphology or, especially, phonology.³⁵⁷ Thus, when a given society changes the syntactic structure in any of its linguistic fields (e.g. spoken language, common written phrases, or PNs), it does not do it as a mere unconscious or fortuitous act. This is frequently accompanied by deeper circumstances that usually transcend the simple linguistic level, which sometimes has been interpreted as the failure³⁵⁸ in the transmission across time of linguistic features.³⁵⁹

Language change is inevitable; sooner or later it will take place. In linguistic terms, syntactic change shows many similarities with semantic change, with the main difference that syntax is eminently systematic and it follows a highly rule-governed order. Despite this, syntactic change is the area of historical linguistics which has been least thoroughly researched. The few generalisations concerning diachronic syntax do not always apply to many cases of study. Nonetheless, syntactic change appears to start in a relatively limited domain and then expands to others.³⁶⁰ It begins as a gradual process and in one specific area (e.g. PNs) and then expands to others (e.g. spoken and written language). The absence of generally recognised approach towards the treatment of syntactic change has been a major setback among linguistic studies; something that cannot be argued for phonetic change. However, three mechanisms which could induce syntactic change have been raised: grammatical reanalysis, extension and borrowing.³⁶¹

The **grammatical reanalysis** modifies the main structure of a syntactic construction but does not alter the external appearance. The main structure includes constituency, hierarchical structure, grammatical categories, grammatical relations and cohesion,

³⁵⁷ Hock 1991: 310.

³⁵⁸ This allegedly failure could have been on purpose or unconscious.

³⁵⁹ Kroch 2011: 699.

³⁶⁰ Hock 1991: 378.

³⁶¹ On the study of syntactic change see Campbell 1999: chap. 9.

while the outer appearance includes morphological marking and word order.³⁶² We have to bear in mind that reanalysis depends on the possibility of more than one analysis of a given construction. For instance, the gradual loss of morphological case distinctions due to phonological weakening at the ends of words is thought to lead to the rigidity of word order to compensate the syntactic ambiguity generated by the loss of the case.³⁶³ This process can be seen with Latin and the Romance languages which became syntactically more rigid as a consequence of the case morphology lost.

The mechanism of syntactic change defined as **extension** results in modifications in the surface manifestation but does not bring a direct alteration of the underlying structure.³⁶⁴ However, when a language faces synchronic variations, sooner or later will have a diachronic change. This can be observed, for instance, in the use of the reflexive verbs in Old Spanish formed with the 3rd person pronoun ‘*se*’ and the latter use of this pronoun in the passive voice.³⁶⁵

The last mechanism is described as the act of **borrowing** and consists of the process of acquiring a new syntactic structure by the mere fact of copying or emulating it from another language. This mechanism, generally associated with the lexical level, is much more frequent and significant than some scholars have thought in the past, but it is important to avoid the other extreme of assuming that everything not otherwise readily explained in a language’s grammar is due to borrowing. Because of this, it is crucial to recognise the proper role of syntactic borrowing in syntactic change.³⁶⁶ Examples of this type are abundant both ancient and modern languages.

From these three types of syntactic change, we believe that Hurrian PNs suffered the borrowing-type from the Semitic group, a process that began during the third

³⁶² Campbell 1999: 227.

³⁶³ Kroch 2001: 701.

³⁶⁴ Campbell 1999: 227-228.

³⁶⁵ See the examples given by Campbell 1999: 229-230.

³⁶⁶ Campbell 1999: 230.

millennium settlement in northern Mesopotamia and was enriched with the arrival of the Amorites by the end of the millennium. However, to understand this process, it is necessary to transcend the linguistic analysis and focus on the historical one.

§2.1.2 Hurrian as a Case of Ancient Near East Personal Names

Languages and dialects do not exist in a vacuum; there always is, at least, some contact with other languages or dialects, and it is only the degree of that contact which may differ from language to language or dialect to dialect.³⁶⁷ Language loans are a very common result of linguistic contact. Other languages often influence the syntax, morphology and the various lexicographical components of a language. The incorporation of individual or large sets of words is usually a common phenomenon between two or more different cultures with different dialects or languages, which are generally nativized by the culture that adopts them.

Among this phenomenon, one of the greatest difficulties with foreign-language loans is that the linguistic structures of different languages may diverge considerably, necessitating in most cases at least some adjustment of the loan word to the native structure of the borrowing language. But linguistic contact is not necessarily restricted to the borrowing of lexical items and the relatively minor structural implications of such lexical borrowings. It may also have sometimes far-reaching effects also on the general linguistic structure.

What leads a group to adopt particular words, phrases, ideas or different elements alien to them? Prestige, need, utility, unconsciousness, violence? If the language from which they incorporate loans belongs to a “superstratum”, then the borrowings tend to come from the most high-status sections of the lexicon and their connotations likewise

³⁶⁷ Hock 1991: 380.

tend to be prestigious. If the donor language appertains to the “substratum”, the linguistic loans tend to be more limited to ‘need/necessity’ borrowings and to have derogatory connotations.³⁶⁸ The relative prestige of a given language does not affect the question of whether it will replace the other language or be replaced by it, but it is often the sociolinguistic notion of prestige which determines the sphere of vocabulary most likely to be affected by borrowing.³⁶⁹

The different languages from the ANE are well known to have loans and influences from many others, being lexical borrowings the common characteristics -though not exclusively. It is known, for example, that in the classical Sumerian syntax the verb is usually placed at the end of the sentence (S-O-V).³⁷⁰ This feature, apparently, could have been assimilated by the Akkadian language as a result of the adoption of the cuneiform writing system directly from the Sumerians.³⁷¹ However, Akkadian onomastics continued to maintain, though not exclusively, the syntactic structure characteristic of the Semitic languages, unable to completely detach the linguistic conservatism present in the anthroponyms.³⁷² This process could be understood as the expression of a socio-linguistic greater consistency because in ancient and traditional societies, the language of PNs (i.e. its grammatical and lexical features) cannot be treated as identical to the living language or even the language of texts. Often, they are seen as survivals of a primordial stage of the language. This is what happens with Akkadian PNs, particularly the *Satznamen*, which often alternate their syntactic structure. Sometimes the verbal predicate is at the beginning of the sentence and the subject at the end (e.g. *Iddin-Ištar*> ‘Ištar has given’ or (Amorite) *Yasmah-Addu*> ‘Addu has listened’); but in others the order is inverted (e.g. *Sîn-iddinam*> ‘Sin has given’).

³⁶⁸ Hock 1991: 441.

³⁶⁹ Hock 1991: 412.

³⁷⁰ Despite some literary texts (see Edzard 2003: 36).

³⁷¹ Caplice 2002: 27.

³⁷² On Akkadian onomastic see Roberts 1972; Di Vito 1993; Limet 1995b; Edzard 1998.

This oscillation could be explained, among other possible causes, by the variation that the Akkadian language suffered while adopting the cuneiform writing system directly from the Sumerian, where the verb was placed at the end of the phrase. Thus, the contradiction between a previous syntactical stage and a new one (although unfortunately, it is unknown whether the spoken language also suffered such variation) was reflected in the Akkadian anthroponyms, as well as the Assyrian and Babylonian dialects and their temporal differentiations. The Old-Babylonian (e.g. *Šūnuḫ-Šamaš*, *Šamaš-iddina*) and Old-Assyrian names (e.g. *Aššur-amārum*, *Iddin-Aššur*) reproduced these oscillations without being aware, at least so apparent, of the syntactic incongruity that existed between the written texts and some of the *Satznamen*. This is how PNs appeared to show a higher level of formal continuity than other lexical elements.

Now, apparently Hurrian language and its onomastics have similar characteristics; the morphemes used to build the anthroponyms are those corresponding to the ‘Old-Hurrian’ verbal system, but the syntax of the *Satznamen* does not match to any possible standard dialectal variety.³⁷³

The syntax of the Hurrian language³⁷⁴ puts the agent of the ergative construction in the first (e.g. Mittani letter) or second position (Bilingual from Boğazköy) and the verb in the last position.³⁷⁵ This characteristic, as seen before, is not reproduced in the PNs, but is reversed: Hurrian *Satznamen*, in its vast majority, are formed by a finite verbal form, which regularly occupies the starting position, and a theophoric element in the second, which functions as the agent (subject) of this verbal form. However, as it happens with Akkadian (and probably Amorite) but in a much lower percentage, there is a group of Hurrian PNs that reflects the written syntax of the texts (§1.7.3.d.1) by

³⁷³ There is a group of Hurrian PNs where the verb is inverted and is set in the final position (See §1.7.3.d.1).

³⁷⁴ Salvini 1971; Diakonoff 1978; Wilhelm 1992, 2004b; Wegner 2007: 119-ff.

³⁷⁵ In some rare cases the verb can appear at the beginning of the sentence to give more emphasis. (Wegner 2007:119)

setting the verb in the final position. This could be indicating that in an earlier stage, Hurrians could have reproduced their proper syntax and later decided to alter it. Therefore, the obvious question that follows this phenomenon is: how or why did they form the anthroponyms keeping the morphemic aspects and part of the lexical items, but reversing or altering its own syntax, at least the written one?

The few studies that linguistically have developed this issue were not entirely satisfactory to provide an encompassing explanation of the problem, at least outside the grammatical sphere.³⁷⁶ However, as Wilhelm has stated,³⁷⁷ the origin and settlement process of the Hurrians in northern Mesopotamia and the Fertile Crescent could give us some clues. The early connection between Hurrians and Akkadians, Amorites and Canaanites, could have generated a syntactically borrowing process limited to PNs. Ultimately, the only thing that the Hurrians did was to adapt³⁷⁸ and place its morphology and lexical terms in a borrowed structure.

But this hypothesis presents a possible drawback. If Hurrians *Satznamen* are attested since the Sargonic period³⁷⁹ and already have the verb-agent form (e.g. *Unap-šeni*), probably replicated from the Semites: why they did not also copy the use of theonyms in the PNs?³⁸⁰ It is hard to believe that they only copied the structure but not the content, when in general, from a sociolinguistic point of view, it is more common and simpler to modify semantics than syntax.³⁸¹

However, this issue could be lessened due to the importance and the religious symbolism that the use of theophorous had. They required social, political and cultural

³⁷⁶ Wilhelm 1998b; Giorgieri 2000b, Richter 2016: 652-ff.

³⁷⁷ Wilhelm 1999: 8, 2008: 181.

³⁷⁸ It is important to distinguish the difference between **adapt** from **adopt** in linguistic borrowings.

³⁷⁹ See the Hurrian PNs list for the III millennium.

³⁸⁰ The use of theonyms in Hurrian PNs appeared at the end of the third millennium (see the following chapter).

³⁸¹ Lexical loans are a very common result of linguistic contact, and the incorporation of individual or large sets of words is usually a common phenomenon between two or more different cultures with different dialects or languages.

conditions much more complex than those necessary to modify the syntax of anthroponyms. In this sense, it would be reasonable to assume that a process of this magnitude would take much longer and would be neither vertical nor systemic. A certain institution, e.g. temple or palace, could impose a specific type of PN to an entire society (including those on the fringes and outside the cities) and control the whole process. In the end, the decision to bestow a name on a new individual rested with the parents/family.

With the ancient Hebrews, the meaning of a PN was more important than its form.³⁸² Could this have been the same for the Hurrians, where the name and its meaning were more important than its syntactic or morphologic form?

Thus, from a historical and linguistic point of view, it is very complicated to prove that Hurrian *Satznamen* were copied and adopted from the Semites. But this should not preclude us to search and establish possible hypothesis that could be later proven by the appearance of new sources, nor to completely close the question on the origin of the, if it ever existed, syntactic change.³⁸³

As it has already been mentioned, PNs are presented in a way that the rest of the ordinary lexical items are not; but at the same time they are more or less constant in form across languages in a way that ordinary lexical items are not. This particular characteristic of the PN, as a partially independent element of the language and therefore more reluctant to changes, contrast with the will of changing of the speakers of the language.³⁸⁴ If this were the case, could we think that Hurrian names are halfway between a foreign and their own language, and that being linguistically independent of the language adapted and structured as best they could (despite having “altered” the Hurrian syntax). In any case, PNs are usually loaded with semantic content which

³⁸² Smith 1954: 102.

³⁸³ See Richter 2016: 652-653 for a critical view of this.

³⁸⁴ Allerton 1987: 86.

makes them transcend the simply linguistic aspects of establishing as descriptors and socio-cultural players of the different social conditions created by the different cultures.

HURRIAN PERSONAL NAMES IN THE THIRD MILLENNIUM

“A tiger bequeaths its hide; a man, his name”.

Korean proverb

§ 1. Pre-Sargonic Period¹ (ED IIIb ca. 2475-2324 BC)²

The main thing to trace back the Hurrians into the early history of the Ancient Near East is to isolate its “linguistic element” because the perception that we have comes, primarily, from a linguistic nature.³ PNs present our most important testimonial since only very few linguistic relics of Hurrian have been discovered up to know. From a historical point of view,⁴ the clearest testimonies of the Hurrian population are indicated by the presence of their onomastics (anthroponyms and toponyms) during the Old Akkadian period (ca. 2324-2142 BC).⁵ However, several traces of possible Hurrian linguistic elements were found in the archives of the ancient cities of Nabada (Tell Beydar), Ebla (Tell Mardih) and Mari (Tell Hariri), which would move back its earliest attestations, at least from an onomastic point of view, into the Early Dynastic IIIb (ca. 2450 BC). So in this sense, we have decided to follow the notion that has been proposed for the study of different populations,⁶ and to understand the term Hurrian in a cultural,

¹ The Hurrian PNs mentioned for the second half of the third millennium are listed inside the major group of periods (i.e. Pre-Sargonic/EDIIIb, Sargonic, Gutian and Ur III) and not in an absolute chronological order, unless mentioned, due to the problematic nature of the documents and the way to date them.

² The chronology used in this work has been adapted from the conclusions of the recent work edited by Sallaberger and Schrakamp 2015: esp. 302.

³ Salvini 2000: 26.

⁴ We emphasise the term historical because the discussion concerning the origin of the Hurrians as well as their material culture is still open to debate. See Gurney 1989a, 1989b, 1997; Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 2002; Kelly-Buccellati 2005, in print.

⁵ Gelb 1944: 54

⁶ See Vanstiphout (2009:16) for the Sumerian case.

linguistic and socio-historical perspective.

The complexity that represents this population throughout its history, mainly during the third and second millennium BC, has been conditioning the way scholars have dealt with them and hence limiting the scope of the study. Nonetheless, recent studies concerning Hurrian onomastics⁷ have provided a wider outlook, offering new ideas and perspectives which contributed to enrich the knowledge up-to-date.

The purpose of this section is to chronologically track as much as possible the Hurrian PNs that the cuneiform sources yielded for the third millennium.⁸ This task is motivated by the need to understand the socio-linguistic processes that condition the act of bestowing names, and to perceive when, where and why –if possible- the Hurrians began to incorporate names of deities in their PNs. We believe that this fact was neither accidental nor random. It was the consequence of internal changes that followed the Hurrian society and were intertwined with external influences (most probably Amorites, but not exclusively) that were the result of the close and continuous relationship established with the various cultures of Syria and Mesopotamia (mainly Sumerians and Semites, understood as a macro linguistic-cultural group).

§1.1 Nabada (Tell Beydar)

The most ancient archives (ca. 2450 BC) so far discovered in northern Mesopotamia, particularly in the Ḫabur region, were found at the site of Tell Beydar (Nabada).⁹ According to the editors of the corpus, from the cuneiform tablets recovered, “Unequivocal examples of Sumerian names are missing, as are **Hurrian ones**”.¹⁰

⁷ De Martino 2011; De Martino and Giorgieri 2008; Richter 2004, 2006, 2007, 2012; 2016; Von Soldt 2003; Wilhelm 2007, 2008.

⁸ Due to the nature of this enterprise, we are aware of the possibility of missing several Hurrian anthroponyms, either because we were not able to recognise them or because we simply overlook them.

⁹ Concerning the ancient name of Tell Beydar as Nabada see Sallaberger 1998

¹⁰ Sallaberger 1996a: 32. See also Talon 1996: 75; Van Lerberghe 1996: 126.

However, this assumption was partially true. A re-analysis of the onomastics retrieved from the texts have shown some clear examples of Hurrian names, together with another that could also be interpreted as Hurrian:

1) *sa-tar-gu-ni* / *ša-tar-gu-ni*¹¹ and;

2) *šu-gu-zi*.¹²

The first name philological analysis proposed is coherent with the Hurrian language which could be indicating the presence of this cultural group in the Ḫabur already by the EDIIIb.¹³

§ 1.2 Ebla (Tell Mardih)¹⁴

It has been long thought that the extensive archives from Ebla could yield significant amounts of Hurrian material. However, the enormous corpus of information that belonged to the 24th century BC, particularly relevant to the last three rulers of the kingdom, *Yigriš-Ḫalab*, *Yirkab-damum*, and *Yitgar-damum*,¹⁵ has left almost nothing or relatively small and problematic clues that could be related to the Hurrian linguistic trail. The PNs retrieved from the documents discovered at the Royal Palace¹⁶ have shown very few and isolated elements that could be interpreted as Hurrian, albeit on a fragile basis.

¹¹ Richter 2004: 276. *ša-tar-gu-ni* > šad=ar=kun=i/e. See also BGH 362. For the attestations of the name in the Tell Beydar texts see Sallaberger and Talon 1996: 127,137,144. The first part of the name, ‘šadar’, matches the Urkes king PN ‘Šadar-mat’ of the Samarra Tablet (see below).

¹² Richter 2004: 276. *šu-gu-zi* > šug(i)=uzzi (“The fitting/righteous one”); see also Richter 2010 and BGH 406-407. For the attestation of the name in the Tell Beydar texts see Sallaberger and Talon 1996: 129. For a more sceptical view on the interpretation of these PNs, see Sallaberger 2007: 434, fn.94.

¹³ Oliva (2008:158-160) has suggested that one of the names of the calendar from Nabada could also have a possible Hurrian connection because the penultimate month of the calendar contains the syllabic version of a deity that could be interpreted as the Hurrian sun-god: ITI.SAR ⁴Ša-ma-gan (for the Nabada calendar see Sallaberger 1996: 85).

¹⁴ Some of the PNs retrieved from the Ebla archives might be closer to the end or the very beginning of the Akkadian period.

¹⁵ Bonechi 2001: 248.

¹⁶ On the PNs from Ebla see PET and ARES III.

The element ‘*ag-*’ and its variants found in the onomastics (i.e. *a-ga*, *a-ag*, *ag-ga*,¹⁷ *a-ga-iš*; *ag-ga-LUM*)¹⁸ could be understood as the verb ‘*ag-*’ (‘to lead, to bring up, to lead away, to take, to raise up, lift up), very common in the Hurrian PNs (e.g. Akap-šen).¹⁹ It could also be considered the element ‘*akk-*’, as in the Hurrian expression ‘the one (of two), the other’, but quite unlikely to be a PN.²⁰ In any case, a plausible Hurrian interpretation is more feasible than considering them as Semitics.²¹

The texts from Ebla also yielded two other PNs, which probably hold some Hurrian elements, that belonged to individuals that were originally from the city of Nagar, with whom Ebla seemed to have a tight political and economic relationship:²²

- 1) *Puk(k)e* (bù-gú-e)²³ and;
- 2) *Ultum-ḥuḥu*²⁴ (ul-TUM-ḤU-ḤU);²⁵
- 3) *Zuzu*.²⁶

The second name may be compared with a sovereign (ENSI) of Urbilum (Arbil)²⁷ that ruled during the Gutian period (Niriš-ḥuḥa),²⁸ and some of the second-millennium PNs that appeared at Mari, Ašnakkum, Tigunāni,²⁹ or later in Nuzi.³⁰

¹⁷ See below the name ‘*a-ga-ga*’ from Ešnunna.

¹⁸ Catagnoti 1998: 41, 42 and 44 respectively.

¹⁹ BGH 4.

²⁰ BGH 8.

²¹ Catagnoti 1998: 42.

²² On the relationship between Ebla and Nagar, see Biga 2014.

²³ Catagnoti (1998: 46; 2010: 463-464) has proposed a possible Hurrian origin for the PN but without any philological explanation. See also BGH 323. cf. *bù-gu-u₄* and *bù-gú* (ARES III: 294).

²⁴ *Ultum-ḥuḥu* was the son of the EN of Nagar who married the Eblaite princess *Tagriš-Damu*. On this, see Biga 1998.

²⁵ Richter 2004: 278.

²⁶ Catagnoti 1998: 60. VHN 361-362.

²⁷ On the history of the city of Arbelum/Erbil see MacGinnis 2014.

²⁸ An Old-Babylonian tablet from Nippur, containing copies of three statues with inscriptions of the Gutian king Emdu-pizir, mentions a certain sovereign from the city of Arbela that had a Hurrian name: *ḥu-ri-iš-ḥu-ḥa* ÉN[SI] *Ur-bi-[lum^{ki}]*. RIME 2:227 xi 9-11 (Cf. NPN 107).

²⁹ See VHN 420.

³⁰ NPN 208, 246 and 217, 271.

Also from Ebla we have a group of seemingly hybrid names that apparently shared the theonym of the Hurrian sun-god Šimiga(n):³¹

- 1) *Puzur*-^dŠamagan;³²
- 2) *Kūn*-^dŠamagan;³³
- 3) *Inū*-^dŠamaganu;³⁴
- 4) *Ib/Ur*-^dŠamagan;³⁵
- 5) *I/Ni-lam*-^dŠamagan;³⁶
- 6) *Iti*-^dŠamagan;³⁷
- 7) *Iirmi*-^dŠamagan;³⁸
- 8) ^dŠamagan-be³⁹ and;
- 9) ^dŠamagan.⁴⁰

§ 1.3 Mari (Tell Hariri)

Following the Šamagan group of PNs, the archives of the Pre-Sargonic Mari have yielded three sources (two statues and one vessel) that mention a king (LUGAL) that ruled the city under the name *Ikū*-^dŠamagan.⁴¹ From the same period, though apparently slightly earlier, a limestone statue also attested another king (LUGAL) named *Ikū(n)*-Šamaš (*i-ku*-^dUTU), which led some scholars to argue that both sovereigns were, in fact,

³¹ See below the discussion of these names together with those from Mari (§ 1.3 Mari).

³² ARET VIII: 531 §42 xiv 23: *puzur*₄-^dša-ma-gan

³³ ARET VIII: 526 §9 ix 6: *kūn*-^dša-ma-gan *du-ub*^{ki}.

³⁴ PET: 0205: *i-nu*-^dša-ma-ga-nu.

³⁵ ARET VIII: 541 §42 xix 18: [*ib/ur*-^dša]-ma-gan *ur-ša-um*^{ki} (ARES II: 246). The first sign of this PN has been partially reconstructed so it is not clear if the correct sign is *ur* or *ib*.

³⁶ ARET II: 13 x 3: *i/ni-lam*-^dša-ma-gan EN *i-bu*₁₆-*bu*^{ki}.

³⁷ PET 211: *i-ti*-^dša-ma-gan

³⁸ PET 224: *ir-mi*-^dša-ma-gan. He seems to be the Prince (DUMU.NITA EN *ir-i-tum*^{KI}) of the city of Iritu(m).

³⁹ ARES II:17: ^dša-ma-gan-be

⁴⁰ ARET VIII: 533 §61 xx 18; AfO 35: 168: ^dša-ma-gan

⁴¹ The king seemed to have ruled after the king (LUGAL) *Ikūn-Mari*. RIME 1:317-319: *i-ku(n)*-^dša-ma-gan.

the same one (*Ikū(n)-Šamaš^dUTU=Ikū(n)-Šamagan*), using the logographic or phonetic form indistinctively.⁴² If this were the case, we could be certain that already in this period Šamagan was considered to be the Hurrian sun-god who formed the theophorous and not, according to some authors,⁴³ the Sumerian Equid deity Šagan/Šakan in charge of protecting the wild animals of the steppe. However, the chances of having this scenario are relatively scant despite considering that the Hurrian sun-god was part of the oldest Hurrian pantheon, attested outside the onomastics in its logographic-phonetic form (^dUTU-*ga-an*>*Šimigan*).⁴⁴

The problem concerning the identification of the deity mentioned in the theonyms of Ebla and Mari can be analogous. On the one hand, the general agreement among Eblaite scholars is to consider that this deity, that appears in the PNs and DNs as *Šamagan* (Šakan/Sumuqan), is, in fact, the equid/quadrupeds god that belonged to the Sumerian cultural substratum;⁴⁵ something which would absolutely discard any connection with the Hurrian Sun-god Šimiga. To support this, it has been stated that “quatre autres types onomastiques sont connus, la plupart appartenant à des étrangers (un homme de Dub/Ṭub et un lú-kar du même royaume, qui pourrait bien être un éblaïte; un homme d'Uršum et un autre d'Ibbūb), une circonstance qui témoigne dans une certaine mesure du caractère international du culte de Šamagan”.⁴⁶ However, it is not less certain, though later in time, that during the Ur III period some Hurrian PNs (e.g. *Tašal-ipri* and *[E(?) -r]i-iš-ti-ši-tal*) came from the city of Uršu(m),⁴⁷ indicating the presence of this ethnic group which could have been settled there for a long time. On the other hand, it has been argued that “Naturalmente, la maggior parte dei nomi propri di Mari, in totale

⁴² IRSA 87-88; FAOS 7: 9-11; FAOS 8: 40.

⁴³ Lambert 1981; Xella and Pomponio 1997: 324-326.

⁴⁴ See *Tiš-atal* inscription (Wilhelm 1998: 19)

⁴⁵ Lambert 1981, 1986; Pomponio 1984; PET 1998: 107; Pomponio and Xella 1997: 324-326.

⁴⁶ Pomponio and Xella 1997: 326.

⁴⁷ Zadok 1993: 227.

alcune centinaia, sono semitici...”⁴⁸ and no Hurrian PNs has been found in the Pre-Sargonic period. It is also known that the god Šamaš had a very important role in the pantheon of the OB Mari,⁴⁹ something that could be extrapolated to the Pre-Sargonic phase, with a king bearing the name *Ikūn-Šamaš* (*i-ku-^dUTU*). Now, if we consider what has been argued regarding the same identity between the latter sovereign and the King *Ikū(n)-Šamagan* (*i-ku-^dša-ma-gan*), we could be facing the confirmation, through the equivalence of both deities, that we are dealing with the Hurrian Sun-god, and not the Sumerian Equid one; something that could also affect the Ebla data.⁵⁰ However, in overall, as the available information creates a complex and so far eclectic and unsettled scenario, we decided to mention this problem, which needs to be addressed; nonetheless, due to the scanty evidence, we cannot state for granted and link *Šamagan* neither to the Hurrian Sun-god nor the Sumerian Equid/Quadrupeds.⁵¹

§2. Sargonic Period (ca. 2334-2193 BC)

The Hurrian Onomasticon from the Sargonic period comprises several examples of linguistic bases and a heterogeneous geographical distribution. During this time, we can certainly perceive the growth and expansion of the Hurrian names throughout many cities in the Syro-Mesopotamian region.

§ 2.1 Ḫafājeh

A tablet from the town of Ḫafājeh (ancient Tutub) has revealed the name *Tupki-ašum*⁵²,

⁴⁸ Catagnoli 2012: 461.

⁴⁹ Lambert 1985.

⁵⁰ In this sense it has been suggested (Oliva 2008:160) that the PN *Tagi-^dUTU* (ARET VIII: 533 §14 vii 30) could be considered as Hurrian ‘*Taki-Šamagan*’ (His light is the sun/*Šamagan*), or better interpreted as *tag=i-Šamagan* (‘Šamagan, illuminate him!’), a predicative element attested in the Hurrian Onomasticon.

⁵¹ On this issue see also Richter 2004: 285-286.

⁵² MAD 1: 233 IV 11; Gelb 1944: 54, fn.44. This name appertains to the group of the ‘transitive-ergative’ Hurrian *Satznamen* where the verb ‘*aš-*’ is set at the end [to/upki-až=o=m].

where the first element,⁵³ well known in the onomastics of the II millennium,⁵⁴ also appears in a late Sargonic royal seal from Urkeš (see below) and in Ur III documents (see Annex with third Millennium PNs). Also from this town comes the name *Zuzu*, which could be interpreted as Hurrian.⁵⁵

§ 2.2 Ĝirsu

From the ancient city of Ĝirsu we have the names of *Ahu-šena*, *Šitap-atal* and *Šename* bestowed to individuals within a gang of workers identified with the Subartu region⁵⁶ (northern Mesopotamia).⁵⁷

§ 2.3 Unknown provenance

The oldest Hurrian PN referring to a sovereign,⁵⁸ who happened to rule over the city of *Azuḫinnum*,⁵⁹ is *Taḫiš-atili*,⁶⁰ and it is mentioned in a limestone fragment inscription of unknown provenance which refers to year name from Naram-Sîn's period (ca. 2254-2218 BC).⁶¹ In another year name, probably contiguous to the previous one, a place

⁵³ On the name see Laroche 1980: 272; Salvini 1996b; VHN 544-555.

⁵⁴ For instance in the archives of Mari, Šušarrā, Chagar Bazar, Tell al-Rimah, Nuzi, Ugarit or Boğazköy.

⁵⁵ MAD 1 S. 228-f. VHN 361-362.

⁵⁶ On Subartu and Hurrians see “A State of the Art...” (§1.3 Hurrian Language).

⁵⁷ STTI 142: 2, 4, 7.

⁵⁸ It is uncertain whether he was a king, a city governor, or had any other type of political status, but most certainly, he had a ruling character.

⁵⁹ Michalowski 1986. The site has not been found, but it has been suggested to be in the vicinity (maybe northern area) of Nuzi, close to the Lower Zab. The same topographic name appeared in the documents from the OB Mari (ARM XXVI/2: 431, 433, 435) and Tell al-Rimah (RGTC 3: 27), but it seems that refers to another city, allegedly located in the north of Sinjar but on the west side of the Tigris (Charpin 1990: 94). Therefore, there might have existed two cities; one in the east (close to Nuzi) and one in the west (Ḥabur region), which might be the one mentioned by Naram-Sîn. These would be more logical due to the available information referring to a sort of “Hurrian Country” in northern Djezireh (Salvini 2000a: 31).

⁶⁰ Foster 1982: 23; Lambert 1983: 95; Salvini 2000: 27. Although the verb etymology it is not yet clear, the name contains the thematic vowel =i= and the morpheme =ž that is used in the optative-desiderative mood rendering: *tag=i=ž-adil=ni* ‘May the strong ...!’

⁶¹ RIME 2: 86: *in* 1 M[U] ^d*na-ra-[am-^dE]N.ZU REC 169 SUBIR.KI in a-zu-ḫi-nim.KI i-ša-ru tá-ḫi-ša-ti-li ik-mi-ù* “The ye[ar] Narā[m-S]în was victorious over Subartum at Azuḫinnum and captured Taḫiš-atili.”

name of Hurrian origin is mentioned.⁶² *The year Narām-Sîn was victorious over Simurrum⁶³ at Kirašenive⁶⁴ and captured Baba, governor of Simurrum, (and) Dubul, governor of Arame.*⁶⁵ These events, particularly the ones that occurred at Simurrum, are repeated in an Old Babylonian text, most probably a late third-millennium copy,⁶⁶ and refer to the general insurrection that took place against Narām-Sîn,⁶⁷ in which the Hurrian name *Puttim-atal* is mentioned as the king of the city Simurrum.⁶⁸

⁶² For the Hurrian toponyms in the III millennium see Hallo 1978; Michalowski 1986b; Astour 1987; Steinkeller 1998; Salvini 2000b; Giorgieri 2000b: 292-ff. Richter 2004.

⁶³ The geographical term Simurrum (as well as Subartu) has vague definitions regarding historical geography, as it may have from a philological point of view. In the Mesopotamian mental map, the north was known as Subartu, particular North of Diyala and East of the Tigris, but this geographical space tended to enlarge or decrease depending on the historical periods, so basically referred to what later became the Assyrian region. For more discussion on the term Simurrum see Frayne 1997, 2007; and for Subartu see Gelb 1994; Finkelstein 1955; Michalowski 1986a, 2000; Steinkeller 1998: 76-ff.; Wilhelm 1989: 7; and, more recently, Michel 2011-2012.

⁶⁴ For the analysis of the place-name see GLH 143; Salvini 2000: 33.

⁶⁵ RIME 2: 87: “in 1 MU ^dna-ra-am-^dE[N.ZU] REC 448bis *ši-mu-ur₄-ri-[im.KI] in ki-ra-še-ni-we iš₁₁-a-ru ù ba-ba ÉNSI ši-mu-ur₄-ri-im.KI dub-ul ÉNSI a-ra-me.KI ik-mi-ù.*”

⁶⁶ Another copy, though much later than the Old Babylonian period, comes from a Hittite-Hurrian cultic text referring to some events that happened during the Sargonic era and mentions the Hurrian name of a king: *Kiklip-atalli* from *Tukriš* (^mKi-ik-li-pa-ta-al-li-in URU Du-uk-ri-iš-hi: KUB 27, 38 iv 13: Güterbock 1938: 83. For the geographical location of the city, probably near Iran’s Caspian, see Steinkeller 1982: 248.

As already pointed out by Gelb (1941: 56), to what extent later copies of texts can be reliable on the onomastic sphere by maintaining the proper transmission of names; whether anthroponyms, toponyms or theonyms, is open to debate. Nevertheless, and due to the characteristics of the Hurrian onomastics for the III millennium, we cannot completely discard later copies.

⁶⁷ On this particular historical event, see Tinney 1995; Liverani 1993, esp. 59-61; Westenholz 1992, 1997, esp. 227-ff.

⁶⁸ Grayson and Sollberger 1976: 112. G, 1. 29: ¹Pu-ut-ti-ma-tá-al LUGAL ši-mu-ur-ri-im. The second element of the name, *-atal* (strong), is very well known for the onomastic of the III millennium; the first element, *Puttim-*[*putt=i=m(b!)-*], is less attested despite some names of the Ur III period (see Ur III names list in *Annex III Millennium PNs*), and might be the verb *f/pud-*: ‘to generate, create, beget, procreate’ (BGH 332-333; VHN 492). Both elements are recurrent, specially the second one, during the II millennium. Among the kings (LUGAL) of the insurrection text appear two other names that might be interpreted as Hurrians. Gelb (1944: 55, fn.53) suggested, and in fact was right, that the name mentioned in the line 33, ¹Hu-up-šum-ki-pi LUGAL mar-ḥa-ši^{ki}, could be Hurrian [*ḥo/ubš=o=m-kibi*] (VHN 438). The king name mentioned in the line 34, ¹Du-uḥ-su-su LUGAL mar-da-ma-an^{ki}, could also be interpreted as Hurrian (despite the Subarian proposal by Ungnad 1936: 144) over the basis of the first element of its name *tuḥ-* (see NPN 268; GLH 269-270; BGH 465-466; VHN 541). The second element, *susu-*, is difficult to interpret as Hurrian, and probably could be closer to Subarian, though is known from Gasur (NPN 279). In this sense, the city of Mardaman, located in the area around the Upper Tigris region of Northern Mesopotamia (Edzard 1989; Kessler 1980: 63-ff.), was probably populated by Hurrians and the so-called Subarians as it is attested during the Ur III period by at least two persons bearing Hurrian names: *Ne-ri-iš-a-tal* and *Na-ak-tá-ma-tal lú mar-da-*

§ 2.4 Nippur

From the Sargonic period also comes a very particular white marble tablet,⁶⁹ found at Nippur (Nuffar), listing the offering of some clothing textile (TÚG)⁷⁰ from a lady named *Tupin* to a man called *Šehrin-ibri*, both bearing Hurrian names.⁷¹ Also from this city and the same period,⁷² two Hurrian names belonging to a workers account list are mentioned:⁷³ *Ari-nin*⁷⁴ and *Unap-šena*, the latter one being well attested throughout the third millennium (see below).⁷⁵

§ 2.5 Tall al-Sulaima

This period has also yielded two other Hurrian PNs, retrieved from Tall al-Sulaima (probably ancient Awal), that were found in a set of tablets, specifically letters,⁷⁶ concerning the involvement of two participants in the *Kalûm* (some sort of cantor or lamentation priest) and the *nārum* (musician) cultic performance. These two individuals are respectively named: *Tulpip-še*⁷⁷ and *Wirri*.⁷⁸

§ 2.6 Ešnunna

The city of Ešnunna (Tell Asmar) has also revealed some Hurrian PNs which belonged

ma-an^{ki}; and one bearing a possible Subarian: *gu-zu-zu lú-mar-da-ma-an*^{ki} (RGCT 2: 118).

⁶⁹ Edzard and Kammenhuber 1972-1975: 509: “Diese auch wegen ihres Materials merkwürdige Urkunde läßt sich am ehesten als ein Prunk-Begleitschreiben einer Geschenksendung”.

⁷⁰ Gelb 1956: 382.

⁷¹ Gelb 1959. For a brief discussion of the historical context of the tablet see Salvini 2000: 34.

⁷² It is difficult to state an approximate date of the documents strictly on epigraphic bases, having to leave aside the archaeological aspect due to its lack of reliability.

⁷³ Westenholz 1975: 36, N° 47 V 3, 4.

⁷⁴ The cuneiform sign can have several values, *ri*, *re*, *dal/tal* or *tal* (Borger 1986: 88) that can create a problem while reading a Hurrian PN. This has been the case with several scholars, starting with Thureau-Dangin in 1912, and repeated by Meek, Gelb, Speiser, among others, with, e.g., the name *Atal-šen* (until not so long ago read *a-ri-si-en*) that appears in the so-called Samarra Tablet (see below).

⁷⁵ Also from the Sargonic period, yet of unknown origin, we have: [†]Ú¹-?-na-ap-[šè-na?]. MAD 4 167: 17.

⁷⁶ Al-Rawi 1992: 184. IM 85455:1, 9 and IM 85456: 5.

⁷⁷ For this type of PNs see below, particularly the cases of *Tupkiš* and *Unap-še*.

⁷⁸ For the onomastic analysis see Al-Rawi 1992: 181, fn.13; Wilhelm 1996b: 337.

to individuals from a monthly barley ration: *Akakka*,⁷⁹ *Alla*⁸⁰ and *Zuzu*.⁸¹

§ 2.7 Gasur

The ancient city of Gasur buried below Yorgan Tepe (the site that Nuzi occupied during the second millennium) was believed to have almost no traces of Hurrian anthroponyms in the third millennium.⁸² On the contrary, a comprehensive onomastic survey of the archives revealed some PNs that can be explained as Hurrians:

- 1) *Apšam*;
- 2) *Ari/Atal-ḫuḫa*;⁸³
- 3) *Ewri-kira*;
- 4) *Ḫiwiriš*;
- 5) *Ḫuḫir*;
- 6) *Ḫuzira*;
- 7) *Kip-turu*;
- 8) *Naniya*;
- 9) *Tiru-šaki*;
- 10) *Tiru-šaki*;
- 11) *Zazum*;

⁷⁹ MAD 1, 163 II 39.

⁸⁰ MAD 1, 163 VII 9.

⁸¹ MAD 1 S. 228.

⁸² Meek 1931-1932: 7. “Very few, if any, Hurrian names appear, and in this respect the tablets differ very decidedly from those discovered in the upper strata of the mound, which belong to the Hurrian city of Nuzi”; HSS X: XI “An examination of the names shows that the great majority are Semitic; a number are Sumerian, and relatively few are foreign (i.e., non-Semitic and non-Sumerian), but none of these is definitely Hurrian, Elamite, or Gutian. A name like *E-wi-rí-ki-ra* (185 II 3) at first sight might be regarded as Hurrian because of the first element *e-wi-rí*, but the second element, *ki-ra*, is not Hurrian, in so far as we know; it is not certain to what language it does belong.” (Gelb 1944: 53). “The great majority of the Gasur names certainly cannot be called Hurrian in any sense of the word, but there are a few names whose elements may conceivably be Hurrian.” See also Wilhelm 1989: 8.

⁸³ Although the second element (*-ḫuḫa*) of the PN is still unknown, it is more likely to read *Ari-ḫuḫa* (ar=i=b-Ḫuḫa: Ḫuḫa, gave (him)) than *Adal-ḫuḫa* in light of the different Hurrian anthroponyms bearing this element (e.g. Šubiš-ḫuḫa, Niriš-ḫuḫa, Niš-ḫuḫa).

12) *Zuzu*.

Moreover, some others which may contain elements that could also be analysed from a Hurrian linguistic perspective:

1) *Tituri*;

2) *Tuturi*;

3) *Zuzu*.

As Gelb pointed out, the existence of some PNs could have been a marker of the beginning of the Hurrian infiltration in the Kirkuk region.⁸⁴

§ 2.8 Ḫabur Region

From the same time frame but geographically in the plains of the Ḫabur triangle, particularly in the area that later became part of what has been called the “Hurrian urban ledge”,⁸⁵ we have several sources attesting Hurrian PNs. At present and due to the nature of the sources it is difficult to state which seals/inscriptions are earliest, but we do know that the span of time goes between the end of the Akkadian period (ca. 2193 BC) and not much further than the beginning of the Ur III Dynasty (ca. 2112 BC).

§ 2.8.1 Nagar

At Tell Brak (ancient Nagar), who already revealed some Hurrian onomastic through the Ebla archives (see § 1.2), was found a seal with the inscription “*Talpuš-adili*⁸⁶, *the sun of the country of Nagar, son of [x]*”,⁸⁷ dated as late Akkadian or early post-Akkadian (Gutian period).⁸⁸ Unfortunately, the seal is fragmentary, and we cannot know the name of the father of the individual, but it would not be strange if the latter bore a Hurrian name, pointing to some ruling lineage in the city. This was the case, although

⁸⁴ Gelb 1944: 53.

⁸⁵ Buccellati 1999; Kelly-Buccellati 2004a; Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 2007: 150.

⁸⁶ Giorgieri 2000b: 289. *Talb=ō=š-adil=ni*: ‘May the Strong make (him) big’.

⁸⁷ Matthews and Eidem 1993: 202. “*tal-pu-za-ti-li* ^dutu *ma-ti na-^fgàr* ^{ki1} dumu [x-x] – [x]”.

⁸⁸ Ibid 203.

more ancient, with another prince of Nagar who bore a Hurrian name and married a princess of Ebla (see above); and later with the king Atal-šen who claimed to rule over Urkeš and Nagar (see below).⁸⁹

Another interesting name coming from Nagar is *Ḫapiram*,⁹⁰ which can be translated as “He is like a Ḫabiri/u”.⁹¹ This is probably one of the most ancient attestations of a name related to the Ḫabirus⁹² and linked to the Hurrians.

§ 2.8.2 Urkeš

Around fifty kilometres north of Tell Brak, close to the Turkey border, the regular excavations from Tell Mozan (ancient Urkeš)⁹³ have provided few but valuable epigraphic sources. During several campaigns, dozens of glyptic material holding inscriptions were retrieved,⁹⁴ and they consisted, mainly, of names and royal epithets.⁹⁵ It is also the first Hurrian site that yielded, so far, the oldest name of a Hurrian king and part of his courtiers:

- 1) *Tupkiš* king of Urkeš;
- 2) *Uqnītum*,⁹⁶ the consort queen;
- 3) *Zamena*,⁹⁷ the queen’s nurse (hand made), attested with its butcher.

§ 2.8.2.a

⁸⁹ Illingworth 1988: 89, 91. Also from Sargonic Nagar comes a possible Hurrian name *Ḫapa-ša* (ḫa-ab-a-za), particularly for the first element (Cf. NPN 213); and *Uškae* (uz-ga-e) (Catagnoti 2010: 464).

⁹⁰ Gadd 1940: 42.

⁹¹ Wilhelm 2008: 184.

⁹² Bottéro 1955: 1.

⁹³ Due to the Civil War that broke out in Syria in 2011 the project, as the majority of the archaeological excavations in Syria, has been put on hold.

⁹⁴ Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 1996: 65, fn.5.

⁹⁵ Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 1995-1996, 1996.

⁹⁶ This name is probably Akkadian which would reveal its cultural origin.

⁹⁷ It has been suggested that the name *Zam-mena* and *Unap-šena*, tend to demonstrate an early pattern of Hurrian onomastics in *-a* (*Zam-menni* and *Unap-šenni*). Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 1996b: 198. Wegner 2000: 16. On the contrary, Catagnoti (1998: 59) points out that “is certainly Semitic and belongs to a well-attested series of PNs and GNs that documents a root **zmn*”.

The name *Tupkiš* has been proposed as an abbreviation of *Tupki=šenni*,⁹⁸ a PN known from an individual of the city of Kumaraši, attested during the Ur III period (see Ur III names list in *Annex III Millennium PNs*), as well as in Nuzi.⁹⁹ A similar case happens with the name *Unap-še* being the abbreviation of *Unap-šen*.¹⁰⁰ However, it is more likely to interpret it as *to/upk=i=ž*, despite remaining uncertain the etymology for the element *to/upk*-.¹⁰¹ It has been suggested a semantically connection with the root *tulp*- ('to cause, to prosper'),¹⁰² though it could also be interpreted, more likely, with the verb *tupp*- ('to be, to exist'),¹⁰³ being *tupk*- the non-assimilation or oldest form of the verb, also well diffuse in Alalah with the ending *-i*.¹⁰⁴

The seals from *Tupkiš*¹⁰⁵ not only confirmed that the site was the ancient city of Urkeš, but also provided a clearer context to the *Tiš-atal* and *Atal-šen* inscriptions. However, they also underscored the fact that the Hurrian sovereigns may have been controlling not only independent cities but also some sort of "Hurrian country" because the kings bore the epithet *endan*,¹⁰⁶ translated from Hurrian as 'ruler/king'.¹⁰⁷

Apart from the glyptic material,¹⁰⁸ the sixth season at Tell Mozan also yielded the first set of cuneiform tablets coming from regular excavations at the site. The partially

⁹⁸ Salvini 1996: 84-86; Wegner 2000: 16.

⁹⁹ VHL 387; NPN 269.

¹⁰⁰ Milano 1991: 25; Salvini 1996: 84; Wilhelm 1996b: 335.

¹⁰¹ BGH 474; VHN 544-545.

¹⁰² Salvini 1996: 86; BGH 467.

¹⁰³ BGH 471-472.

¹⁰⁴ Giorgieri 2000b: 291.

¹⁰⁵ Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 1996: 92.

¹⁰⁶ This title can be interpreted as a loanword from Sumerian 'EN' (ruler) with the Hurrian suffix for professions *-dan(ni)*: 'The one who rules'. For a previous etymology of the name, see Wilhelm 1989: 11, and later 1998: 122. For a recent interpretation see Fournet 2012 and BHG 89-90 for a summary.

¹⁰⁷ The scribe who wrote the seal could have simply used the Sumerian term referring to king, LUGAL, or ruler, EN, as a sort of governor, but instead he wrote the Hurrian word, *endan*, probably to establish and make clear some sort of political entity among the Hurrian "country".

¹⁰⁸ For the general report on the epigraphic finds, see Milano 1991.

preserved administrative inscriptions were written in the old Akkadian dialect and dated to the Sargonic period.¹⁰⁹ They mentioned some interesting Hurrian PNs:

- 1) *ʔAwa-turi*;¹¹⁰
- 2) *Šeni-zasam* (compound Hurro-Akkadian? name);¹¹¹
- 3) *Šupae* (probably Hurrian);¹¹²
- 4) *Unap-šeni*¹¹³;
- 5) *Zira* (probably Hurrian);¹¹⁴
- 6) *Ewrim-atal*;¹¹⁵
- 7) *Puššam*.¹¹⁶

Another administrative tablet from Urkeš mentions some workers with Hurrian names:¹¹⁷

- 1) *Kapawe*;
- 2) *Kuzzawa(?)*;
- 3) *Pituram*;
- 4) *Ziza[...]*

Two Hurrian tablets that belonged to the post-Akkadian period (Gutian and Ur III

¹⁰⁹ Milano *op. cit.* 21-22. According to the palaeographic analysis of the signs, the tablets should not be older than the Akkadian kingdom of *Šar-kali-šarrī* (ca. 2217-2193 BC).

¹¹⁰ Milano *op. cit.* M2 2 V:11. The normalization could render: *av=i-turi* 'Man, save (him)!'. Both parts of the name are well attested in Nuzi (NPN 208a, 269b; AAN 38, 151 fn.), Mari, Tigonāni, Ašnakkum, (for these see the correspondent annexes) but not together.

¹¹¹ Milano *op. cit.*, M2 1 IV:5. The first element of the name 'šeni-' is clearly the word for 'brother' (*šen(a)=ni*), but the second part '-zasam', according the Milano (1991:24), might be Akkadian, but with no etymological interpretation.

¹¹² Milano *op. cit.*, M2 2 IV:13. *Šo/up=a=i(?)* or *Šo/upa=(w)e* '(That) From Šupa'.

¹¹³ Milano *op. cit.*, 25. Name already known from other sources: Giorgieri 2000: 284, fn.29. *un=a=b-šen(a)=ni* (Cf. *Unap-Teššup*). A broken name, *Unap-[...]*, also appears in another Tell Mozan seal (Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 2002: 25)

¹¹⁴ Milano, L. *op. cit.* 26; Cfr. BGH 393.

¹¹⁵ Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 2002: 20.

¹¹⁶ Volk 2004: 88-ff.

¹¹⁷ Maiocchi 2011: 197-198.

respectively), and probably originated in the city of Urkeš —despite not being retrieved from the regular excavations at Tell Mozan—,¹¹⁸ became the most important epigraphic sources for the Hurrians of the third millennium. Despite some preliminary attempts,¹¹⁹ it is difficult to state precisely the date of the documents based solely on the mentioned king because an absolute chronology has not yet been established in parallel with those from Akkad or Ur III.

The first of these tablets is the so-called “Samarra Tablet”¹²⁰ or “Atal-šen inscription”.¹²¹ It was written in old Akkadian, and the last consensus dates it during the Ur III period (ca. 2112-2004 BC)¹²². This document contains three Hurrian names, two of which belonging to kings:

- 1) *Atal-šen*;
- 2) *Šatar-mat*¹²³ and;
- 3) *Šaum-šen*.¹²⁴

The second, and so far the oldest tablet written in the Hurrian language, is the “Tiš-atal inscription”.¹²⁵ The modern name of the inscription refers to king mentioned in it, *Tiš-atal*, who also carries a specific epithet for a sovereign, so far not found outside the Hurrian world: *endan*. The very same name also appears on two other occasions during the end of the third millennium:¹²⁶

¹¹⁸ On the origin of the tablets see Parrot and Nougayrol 1948; Muscarella 1988; Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 2007: 63-ff.

¹¹⁹ Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 2005: 59.

¹²⁰ Thureau-Dangin 1912. The name “Samarra” was given by Thureau-Dangin who first published the document in 1912 and used the name of the Iraqi city where the tablet was acquired.

¹²¹ Wilhelm 1988.

¹²² For differences on dating the inscription, see Wilhelm 1988: 46, particularly notes 13-22.

¹²³ On this name, see Richter 2004: 276.

¹²⁴ Salvini 2000: 36, fns.54-55.

¹²⁵ Parrot and Nougayrol 1948; Wilhelm 1998. The dating of document has been fluctuating between the early Sargonic period until Ur III, but remains unclear the approximately date in which it was composed.

¹²⁶ Whiting 1976

- 1) *Tiš-atal, man of Nineveh*,¹²⁷ was written on an administrative text from Ešnunna (Tell Asmar) dated to the third year of Šu-Sîn (2034 BC)¹²⁸ and;
- 2) *Tiš-atal, king of Karaḥar*, which was engraved in an Ur III (or Isin-Larsa) seal.¹²⁹

The state of our knowledge and the dating issues do not allow us to asserting whether the names, or some of them, referred to the same person or different individuals.¹³⁰ It is possible that the one referring to a man of Nineveh had nothing to do with the king of Urkeš because a sovereign would hardly downgrade a king's title from *endan* to LÚ. In any case, these attestations expose that Hurrians were already spread throughout northern Mesopotamia, not only residing in cities but in several cases ruling them and conforming large political entities.

§ 3. UR III Administration (2102-1995 BC)

By the end of the third millennium, the Hurrian scenario displayed in onomastics and relevant to individuals, deities and political institutions, seems to coalesce into a wider and clearer complex, possibly visible as such to the Mesopotamians. From the abundant documents of the Ur III Administration, Hurrian PNs would seem to have enjoyed a similar condition to the Sumerians or Akkadians: they were understood not completely as foreign names but mainly as part of the cultural diversity of the Sumerian administration.¹³¹ The historical relevance of this process might be inferring that

¹²⁷ Ibid, 173: l. 1-2: *ti-iš-a-tal lú Ni-nu-a*^{ki}

¹²⁸ According to the middle chronology re-established by Sallaberger and Schrakamp (2015: 302) Šu-Sîn governed between the years 2027 and 2019 BC.

¹²⁹ Whiting *op. cit.* 174: *Di-ša-a-tal LUGAL Kár(a)-ḥar*^{ki}. For the same period, Gelb (1944: 57) has proposed the reading *An-ki-sa-a-tal* (instead of ^d*Ki-sa-a-ri*) for the name of a king also from *Karaḥar*. Moreover, although the first element of name, *an-ki-(sa)*, is so far uncertain, the second one, '*atal*', is clearly Hurrian. Therefore, having two Hurrian kings in the same city (an evidence of Hurrian lineage?) would give us another hint on the local political situation as well as the regional one.

¹³⁰ On this, see Whiting *op. cit.* 177-ff.

¹³¹ Gelb 1944: 58.

Hurrians were somehow integrated into the Ur III society and were not perceived as complete “strangers” or foreigners, as could be interpreted by the religious involvement they had in the Sumerian court.¹³² A plausible process of relatively peaceful infiltration, which could have had many motifs, later becoming into an assimilation/integration development, could likely have been the case with some of the Hurrian population in Babylonia. An indication of this could lie in the fact that they started to name their children with Akkadian linguistic elements and not just in their own language tradition¹³³ (e.g. *Puzur-Eštar* and *Šū-Adad* sons of *Pušum-šen*).¹³⁴ However, it has also been suggested¹³⁵ that due to the military campaigns carried out in Northern Mesopotamia and the Subartu region (i.e. in Ғarši, Ғuḥnuri, Ғurti, Karaḥar, Kimaš, Lullubum, Šašrum, Simurru, Urbilum, Zabšali) by the rulers of Ur III, particularly Šulgi, but also Amar-Sîn, Šū-Sîn and Ibbi-Sîn, Hurrian population might have been captured as slaves and deported to the core of the realm (e.g. to Nippur, Puzriš-Dagan, Girsu or Ur). This idea seems completely plausible in the light of the current research and could explain the growing presence of Hurrians in southern Mesopotamia during the last century of the third millennium. In this sense, the cuneiform sources do not reveal any significant Hurrian attack in the central areas controlled by the Ur administration.

From an onomastic point of view, the most glaring difference between the preceding periods and Ur III is clearly visible in the number of anthroponyms.¹³⁶ I. Gelb started to

¹³² On the Hurrian religious influence in the Sumerian court see Sharlach 2002.

¹³³ Gelb *op. cit.* 60. We cannot be certain if this phenomenon was already taking place in the previous periods due to the lack of sources. In any case, the last century of the third millennium was a good example of this kind of practice.

¹³⁴ Zadok 1993: 229. *Puzur-Eštar*, *Šū-Adad*, *Pu-šúm-še-en*.

¹³⁵ Wilhelm 1989: 10; Owen 1992: 110; Richter 2004: 295-296.

¹³⁶ At present, we cannot state whether the increase of Hurrian PNs in the corpus was the consequence of the exponential growth of the Ur III bureaucracy or the proliferation of this population in the entire Mesopotamia. In any case, it would be more reasonable to think of a combination of both.

gather and study in a systematic way the Hurrian PNs from the Ur III period,¹³⁷ which were later revised and enhanced by H. Limet,¹³⁸ W.W. Hallo,¹³⁹ M. Astour,¹⁴⁰ and R. Zadok.¹⁴¹ The philological and historical analysis of such an extensive prosopographic corpus¹⁴² sheds some extremely useful light related on the everyday life, gender, origin, social status, professions, and others aspects concerning the Hurrians. Furthermore, in our case, the religious sphere expressed in the theophoric elements and the predicative associated with them are the key elements to detect the reflection of the Hurrian pantheon in the third millennium, at least from an onomastic point of view. The major difference between the Pre-Sargonic/Sargonic and Ur III period is the appearance of undisputable theophorous (whether Hurrian or Sumero-Semitic) in Hurrian onomastic. However, a general overview of the corpus can show a broader picture of the ongoing process that the Hurrians experienced.

§ 3.1. Theophoric Elements in Personal Names

As we have mentioned in the introduction of this section, our goal is to understand the process by which the Hurrians changed the way and content of naming. To achieve this, we have traced in time and space all the pre-theophoric PNs and analysed their social milieu. By doing so, we believe to have set the context to paragon and demonstrate the process between two different socio-linguistic stadiums, which are markedly manifested as we enter the period of Ur III. From this moment onwards, the quantitative (more than two-thirds of Hurrian onomastics of the third millennium belongs to this period) and

¹³⁷ Gelb 1944: 109-115.

¹³⁸ Limet 1972.

¹³⁹ Hallo 1978.

¹⁴⁰ Astour 1987.

¹⁴¹ Zadok 1993.

¹⁴² The Hurrian PNs from this period referred to individuals that belonged to the following cities: Agaz, Arraphum, Ġirsu, Ĥibilat, Hu`urti, Kakmi, Karaĥar, Kumaraši, Kumi, Lagaš, Mardaman, Marhaši, Nagar, Nippur, Pil, Puzriš-Dagan, Šašrum, Šerši, Šetirša, Simanum, Simurru, Talmuš, Umma, Ur, Urbilum, Urkeš, Uršu, Karaĥar, Nineveh and from several unknown cities located in the Subartu region, i.e. northern Mesopotamia.

qualitative (introduction of theophorous) increase of Hurrian PNs turns evident and deserves a thorough study. For this reason, we set the emphasis on those PNs that incorporated deities or any other theophoric element and those who are related in some way to them (kinship or any other sort of relationship).

The first theophorous name (TN) belongs to a man (LÚ) from the city of Kumaraši, located in the north Transtigradian region. This man bore a hybrid (Sumerian-Hurrian) PN referring to the divinised Ur III king: ^d*Šulgi-atal*.¹⁴³

In line with this, an individual from the city of Arraphum, probably not far from Kumaraši, bore the TN *Puzur-dŠulgi* (*puzur₄-dŠul-gi*),¹⁴⁴ but his father, who was some sort of supervisor, held the Hurrian name *Hašip-atal*.¹⁴⁵ On the basis of this genealogy, it has been suggested that this individual, bearing a hybrid name, wanted to express loyalty to the imperial dynasty ruling in Ur.¹⁴⁶

The following TN came from the southern Mesopotamia city of Ur, and although it is not proper Hurrian but Sumerian, ^d*Nanna-ludu*, the father of the bearer held the Hurrian name *Unap-...*.¹⁴⁷ As we have seen with the previous case, during the Ur III period Hurrians started to name their offspring with Sumerian, Akkadian or hybrid names as a natural consequence of the multiculturalism that the Mesopotamian region was experiencing.¹⁴⁸

The subsequent examples come from the Mesopotamian city of Puzriš-Dagan where four names, over an important amount of Hurrian anthroponyms (ca. 80 PNs), comprised theophoric elements:

¹⁴³ RGTC 2: 70. ^d*Šul-gi-a-tal*.

¹⁴⁴ Zadok 1993: 225.

¹⁴⁵ *Ha-ši-ba-tal* > *haž=i=b-adal*, ‘The strong listened (him)’.

¹⁴⁶ Astour 1987: 40.

¹⁴⁷ Zadok 1993: 230. ^d*Nanna-lú-du*₁₀; *Ú-na-ap-...*.

¹⁴⁸ It is also possible, although so far unattested, that the individuals could have changed their birth-names into new ones as an expression of the cultural and political situations.

1) ^d*Nanna-ma(an)ba*;¹⁴⁹

2) *Puzur-Eštar*;

3) *Šū-Adad*¹⁵⁰ and;

4) *Teššup-šelaḥ*.¹⁵¹

The first TN reproduces the same situation that occurs with the previous individual from the city of Ur, including the name of his father: *Unap-šen*.

The following two theophorous are clearly Akkadian but also share the same characteristic of the previous one, i.e. that the father bears a Hurrian name: *Pušum-šen*.¹⁵²

The fourth theophorous, *Teššup-šelaḥ*,¹⁵³ who according to the text was married to a woman named *Addu*,¹⁵⁴ is clearly Hurrian for its first element, and so far the oldest attestation, at least in syllabic, that we have from this deity. For the second element, *šelaḥ*, there is still no explanation from a Hurrian perspective,¹⁵⁵ though this element forms the same name in four different individuals from Lagaš and Puzriš-Dagan: *Šim-šelaḥ*.¹⁵⁶

The last group of Hurrian-related theophorous, who happened to share the same theonym, comes from the city of Lagaš:

¹⁴⁹ Zadok 1993: 229. ^d*Nanna-ma-(an-)ba*.

¹⁵⁰ Zadok 1993: 229. *puzur-Eštar*; *Šu-Adad*.

¹⁵¹ Schneider 1932: 44, 9; Meyer 1937-1939; Zadok 1993: 229. *Te-šup-še-la-aḥ*.

¹⁵² Zadok 1993: 229: *pu-šúm-še-en*. This individual also had another son with (mix?) Hurrian name *Atalal*.

¹⁵³ This name was already recognised as the oldest attestation of Teššup by Meyer (1937-1939). See also Schwemer 2001: 445, fn.3699.

¹⁵⁴ Schneider *op. cit.* 44: 12. The text is dated ca. 2031 BC, in the middle chronology.

¹⁵⁵ It could also be considered as part of a hybrid PN (Hurrian-Akkadian) as explained through the Akkadian verb *šalaḥ* 'To pull up, uproot', though less likely. See VHN 506.

¹⁵⁶ Zadok 1993: 228. *Šim-še-la-aḥ*. See also BGH 375; NPN 254. It has been proposed (Wilhelm 1985: 494) that the first element of this name, 'Šim-' could be the abbreviation of the Hurrian sun-god Šimiga. If this were the case, then we could have a pattern of theophoric names followed by the unknown element 'šelaḥ'.

- 1) Ur-^dŠa(w)uška;¹⁵⁷
- 2) Géme-^dŠa(w)uška¹⁵⁸ and;
- 3) Lú-^dŠa(w)uška.¹⁵⁹

As it happens with the Hurrian Storm-god, these names are also the oldest attestations, together with the theonyms ^dŠa-u₁₈(ÙLU)-ša, ^dŠa-ù-ša and ^dŠa-u₁₈-ša,¹⁶⁰ in syllabic transcription, concerning the name of the Hurrian goddess Šawuška. The fact of only having Teššup and Šawuška (considered siblings in the pantheon of the second millennium)¹⁶¹ forming the firsts and only theophorous in Hurrian names is a clear trace of the changes that Hurrians were experiencing; changes that for some reason, happened in southern Mesopotamian and at the end of the third millennium.

It is interesting to contrast this process with the development that many other Mesopotamian PNs had during the third Millennium. From a study conducted with Akkadian and Sumerian names of 137 theonyms, 7% (9) were attested in the Fara period (ca. 2570-2470 BC), 21% (29) in the Pre-Sargonic Period (ca. 2470-2292 BC), 53% (73) in the Sargonic (ca. 2316-2134 BC) and 63% (86) in the Ur III period (ca. 2102-1995BC).¹⁶² The evident process of proliferation of theonyms in PNs reached its peak by the end of the millennium, the very same moment that Hurrians started to incorporate into their onomasticon the concept of a theophorous; a connection that must be taken into account.

¹⁵⁷ This PN (SAT 1 435, o.5) appears in another administrative texts, from the same period and place (Ur-^dŠa-u₁₈-ša. SAT 1 376, 3). Although we cannot be sure if it belonged to the same individual, the scarcity of Hurrian theophorous may suggests that it was the same person.

¹⁵⁸ SAT 1 435, o.ii 26 - r.i 16: Géme-^dŠa-u₁₈-ša.

¹⁵⁹ Lú-^dŠa-u₁₈-ša. MVN 6 240 O.12.

¹⁶⁰ Wilcke 1988: 21-ff. See also Wegner 1995; Sharlack 2002: 105-106.

¹⁶¹ Popko 1995: 96, 99.

¹⁶² Di Vito 1993: 299.

§ 4. Religious Connotations

Onomastics seem to indicate that the Hurrian population settled in the Syro-Mesopotamian region dates, at least, from the Pre-Sargonic period, and its number increased over time. During the nearly four hundred years that passed between the Pre-Sargonic and Ur III, the feature of adding a divine name into a PN was not common but on the contrary, it was almost overlooked by Hurrians. From a very extensive list of PNs,¹⁶³ only four different individuals (maximum five if we consider that the name Ur-^dŠa(w)uška belonged to two different individuals) bore theophorous that referred to Hurrian deities:

- 1) *Teššōb-šelaḥ*;
- 2) *Lú-^dŠa(w)uška*;
- 3) *Ur-^dŠa(w)uška* and;
- 4) *Geme-^dŠa(w)uška*.

Five more, which were the sons of persons with Hurrian names, bore Mesopotamian (Semitic and Sumerian) TN:

- 5) *Puzur-^dŠulgi*;
- 6) *Puzur-Eštar*;
- 7) *Šū-Adad*;
- 8) *^dNanna-ludu* and;
- 9) *^dNanna-ma(an)ba*.

Also, one individual bore a hybrid Sumerian-Hurrian name with the divinised king of Ur:

¹⁶³ The list of the third millennium Hurrian PNs has to be considered preliminary due to the following reasons: The state of knowledge of the Hurrian language and particularly the onomastics (especially the *Bezeichnungen*) of the third millennium; the analysis was built up to the present date of the publication, hence the likelihood of coming to light new information is always at stake; and last, but not least, the high possibility of having missed Hurrian PN from this period.

10)^d*Šulgi-atal*

In overall, only four persons (five at the most) bore two Hurrian theophorous and appeared at the very end of the millennium; a subtle quantity if we compare with the Mesopotamian situation (Sumerian and Semites) during the Fara period, and almost insignificant with Ur III.¹⁶⁴

Despite this low percentage (both in quantity and in diversity), and taking into consideration the onomastic situation during the second millennium, it would not be inappropriate to raise the questions: What were the reason/s for adding theonyms into the Hurrian anthroponyms? Was this a natural outcome of the internal religious evolution (as it seems with the Mesopotamian development throughout the entire third millennium) or was the consequence of an “outside” influence or emulation process that Hurrians took from Sumerians and Semites?

It is hard to state for granted which was/were the cause/causes. However, as we have seen, the Mesopotamians, who already adopted this religious-cultural mechanism of incorporating deity names as part of their PNs,¹⁶⁵ could have been emulated by the Hurrians as a consequence of the close interaction that both cultures had in the course of the millennium. Another element could have been related to the religious shifts that occurred inside the Hurrian world; changes that could only be hypothesised due to the lack of written sources, but that might have been easily complementary to the previously mentioned.

¹⁶⁴ There are two other PNs that might contain theophorous elements. The first one corresponds to an individual from Umma named *Allani*, which could be interpreted as the theonym of the goddess ‘Allani’, though unlike given the fact that it is not accompanied by any other element or predicate. The second name belongs to a hitherto unattested king of Karahar, ^d*Keleš-atal* (^dke-le-eš-a-tal) which holds the determinative for god (^d). However, a deity with that name has not yet been attested in Hurrian sources, which turns the name into a particular hapax. Furthermore, if we consider the name as ‘regular’ *Satznamen* it could be translated as ‘May the strong make (him) healthy / happy’ (kel=i=ž-adal), leaving the determinative aside.

¹⁶⁵ Roberts 1972: 12-ff.; Di Vito 1993.

The evidence for the first reason, the “outside” influence, could be supported, to a certain extent, by the fact that eight of the ten quoted theophorous¹⁶⁶ came from southern Mesopotamia (Puzriš-Dagan, Ur and Lagaš), an environment where Hurrians were not the main socio-cultural group and were probably influenced by the locals.¹⁶⁷ This clear link between the two phenomena and the influence that Mesopotamians had over the Hurrians should be complemented with the appearance and gradual settlement of Amorites in the entire Syro-Mesopotamian region; something that probably contributed or enhanced this seemingly incipient process that the Hurrian society was experiencing.

The appearance of Teššup and Šawuška does not seem to be, at first glance, a natural emanation of the Hurrian culture. These deities, as discussed below, existed within the Hurrians but not with the position that they will have during the second millennium, especially the case of the storm-god.¹⁶⁸ The interrelationship with the Mesopotamians, followed by changes within the Hurrians, were the factors that prompted a process of gradual transformation into the Hurrian religion, which was reflected in different areas (onomastics being a central one).

§ 5. Onomastic Elements

Despite the scarcity of Hurrian theophorous during the third millennium, there is a relatively important amount of epithets and appellatives, adjectives and nouns that can

¹⁶⁶ The remaining names did not come from the core of the Ur III administration but from the city of Kumaraši and Arraphum, located in the North Transtigridian region (Astour 1987: 25, 39) and in fact were not properly theophorous but PNs with deification of the Ur III sovereign, ^d*Šulgi-atal*, *Puzur-Šulgi*, a king who self-imposed a divine character and nonetheless did not go down in history as a god.

¹⁶⁷ Lambert (1978) has proposed that the structure of the Hurrian pantheon was very much influenced by the Mesopotamians. If that were the case, at least partially, it would not be unreasonable to think that onomastics suffered a similar process.

¹⁶⁸ Popko 1995: 96.

be interpreted as theophoric elements. In the subsequent millennium, their status will become clearer, and some will be linked, not always exclusively, to particular deities.

At first glance, we identify the most common epithet/adjective from the third millennium, ‘*atal*’ (strong),¹⁶⁹ which is found primarily in the second part of the name forming the subject of the *Saztnamen* (e.g. *Puttim-atal*, *Unap-atal*, *Hašip-atal*); although in some few cases appear in the first part (e.g. *Atal-šen*, *Atal-ḫuḫa*). Concerning the appellatives/nouns, there is also no surprise on finding the noun ‘*šena*’ (brother) as the first element (*Šena-ame*, *Šeni-zasam*) or, more common, in the second part of the PNs (e.g. *Taḫi-šena*, *Atal-šena*, *Akap-šena*, *Ḫurpi-še(na)*, *Ullam-šena*). More seldom the noun for Lord ‘*ewri*’ (*Ewri-kira*, *Ewri*); the noun for god ‘*eni*’ (*Enni-tagu*, *Eniš-akum*); the noun for lady ‘*Alla=i*’ (*Allaš-arum*); the noun for man ‘*turi*’ (*Kip-turi*, *ʔAwa-turi*); and the nouns for slave ‘*Puram*’ and bull-calf (or understood also as young boy?) *Ḫupitam*’.

At this phase of the Hurrian onomastic (second half of the third millennium), these appellatives and epithets could not necessarily be associated with one particular deity but maybe to different “personal gods”. T. Jacobsen defined the concept -although he was thinking in Mesopotamia, i.e. Sumero-Akkadian world- where personal deities represented not a deity with a human or divine personality but a divine figure with whom

“the individual had direct and personal relations mainly... the power who took a personal interest in him and his fortunes, whom he worshipped in a daily private cult, to whom he brought his immediate personal problems and whom he occasionally badgered if

¹⁶⁹ This element will become very frequent in the Hurrian onomastic of the OB period (see below). Salvini 2000: 51.

he did not think he was properly taken care of.”¹⁷⁰

The common Akkadian appellatives, particularly from the Old Akkadian period, such as *bēlī* (my lord) or *abī* (my father) found in the Mesopotamian onomastic as well as in the texts have also been recognised as designations of personal gods;¹⁷¹ an idea that could also be extrapolated to the Hurrian case.

In this sense, it is also important to bear in mind that the epithets are very common in the onomastics horizon and they could easily refer to a certain deity by expressing a distinct character or a giving adjective. However, again, the problem that arouses with this is to identify the deity behind the epithet, sometimes feasible, at times conjecturable and at times unknown. At a certain point, theonyms entered the onomastic sphere with their personal names (e.g. ^dMarduk>Marduk-apla-iddina; ^dAdad/^dIŠKUR> ^dŠamšī-Adad; ^dNabû> Nabû-apla-ušur/Nabopolassar). Throughout internal evolutions as well as social, especially cultic and religious ones, the deity name derives into an epithet. Of course, there is no general law to understand how epithets appear, evolve and vanish. A common aspect seen in different cultures starts with compound names that mention a noun with a certain characteristic, usually qualifying the name, which in time gets separated and starts to act autonomously (it is undeniable that certain epithets become “generic” because their use is more of a customary-repetition than a conscious election). However, the problem with the Hurrians is that the theonyms appeared at the very end of the third millennium while the appellatives and the epithet started much earlier and continued until the end.

Another interesting feature to take into consideration is the social distribution of the name-bearers during this millennium, despite the fact of having limited information to establish any particular pattern.

¹⁷⁰ Jacobsen 1970: 37-38.

¹⁷¹ Di vito 1993: 3-4.

The first picture we can get comes from those names that corresponded to Hurrian sovereigns and rulers:

- 1) *Ankiš-**atal*** LUGAL Karaḥar;
- 2) *Taḥiš-**atili*** king of Azuḥinum;
- 3) *Ḥašip-**atal***, supervisor (UGULA) in the city of Arraphum, that named his son *Puzur-^dŠulgi*, probably in line with the Ur III ideology;
- 4) *Puttim-**atal*** LUGAL Simurru;
- 5) *Ḥupšum-*kipi** LUGAL Marḥaši;
- 6) *Niriš-ḥuḥa* ENSI Urbilum;
- 7) *Ultum-ḥuḥu*, DUMU.NITA EN *Na-ga-ar^{ki}*;
- 8) *Tiš-**atal*** LUGAL Karaḥar;
- 9) *Tuḥ-susu* LUGAL Mardaman.

The city of Urkeš, so far, is the only Hurrian Kingdom from which we can establish a relative chronology of their kings:¹⁷²

- 1) *Tupkiš endan*/LUGAL Urkeš;
- 2) *Tiš-**atal** endan* Urkeš;
- 3) *Šatar-mat* LUGAL (probably from Urkeš);
- 4) *Išar-Kīnum endan* Urkeš;
- 5) ***Atal**-šen* LUGAL Urkeš and Nawar and;
- 6) ***Ann-atal*** LÚ Urkeš.

From this list, we can infer that none of the rulers, whether from a particular kingdom or city/region, seemed to bear a theophorous name (with the possible exception of the divinised Šulgi), and that the most common epithet/adjective was ‘*atal*’ (highlighted in bold). This last characteristic seems logical from a reigning perspective

¹⁷² Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 2005: 59.

where the power represented by the strength had to be an essential feature of the ruler.¹⁷³ Apart from this, we cannot exclude the theophoric value that this epithet might have had in the Hurrian culture of the third millennium as well as the distinct meaning that each individual could have given to the adjective, despite not being able to establish a connection with any particular deity. Last, we must underline the appearance, so far, of the first king from Urkeš with an Akkadian name: *Išar-Kīnum* ('the just one prospers').¹⁷⁴ There is no information concerning this sovereign, but bearing an Akkadian name followed by the Hurrian title *endan* is a demonstration of the close political and cultural ties that existed between both cultures.

The rest of the Hurrian PNs that appeared in the sources related to any profession/status corresponded to:

- 1) *Tupki-ašum* and
- 2) *Aḫu-šena*, individuals within a gang of workers identified with Subartu.
- 3) *Atal-šen* and
- 4) *Unap-šen*, likely deportees from Simanum.
- 5) *Taḫiš-atal*, an envoy sent to Nippur.
- 6) *Tuliya*, messenger from Labrat.
- 7) *Tulpip-še* and
- 8) *Firri*, two musicians/cantors at the Awal court.
- 9) *Zamena*, royal nurse of Queen Uqnītum at Urkeš.
- 10) *Ewri-adal*, a courtier at Urkeš.
- 11) *Unap-....*, servant of King Tupkiš.
- 12) *Teḫeš-atal*, scribe at Simurru.
- 13) *Šaum-šen*, scribe/builder from Urkeš.

¹⁷³ It could be established a parallelism with Sumerian or Babylonian king names that were formed with the adjective 'GAL/*rabi*' (e.g. Hammurabi). Trémouille 2000: 131-132.

¹⁷⁴ Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 2005: 39.

- 14) *ʔAwa-turi*,
- 15) *Atal/ri-nin*,
- 16) *Unap-šena*,
- 17) *Kaba* and
- 18) *Kuz(z)a*, land-workers from Urkeš.
- 19) *Ziza*[...],
- 20) *Pituram* and
- 21) $\lceil a^{ʔ} \lceil [d]a-rugu-ḥuni$, supervisors from Urkeš.

From this list, we cannot determine any pattern between professions and PNs because the sample is too small to establish any conclusion, despite noticing the recurrence of ‘atal’ and ‘šen’, the two most common elements in the Hurrian Onomasticon. Furthermore, we have two individuals coming from Ur¹⁷⁵ and Puzriš-Dagan¹⁷⁶ bearing the PN ‘Puram’. This name, the Hurrian word for ‘slave’, could already be describing the social and economic status of the parents and, consequently, the bearer. However, it could also have a different connotation because it is quite common to find TN formed with the word ‘slave’ followed up by a particular deity or intended to be related as ‘servants’ of a particular, though implicit, god.

It has been argued that the total semiotic value of Eblaite and Amorite PNs, at least for those of the third millennium, remains particularly uncertain, especially due to the contextual setting and the lack of information about their ideology.¹⁷⁷ This situation could also be analogous to the Hurrian case. It is true, however, that we can extrapolate some of the Mesopotamian cases regarding the royal ideology or the concept of divine, or try to infer some information straight from the Hurrian elements (e.g. *Teššup-šelah*,

¹⁷⁵ Zadok 1993: 230

¹⁷⁶ Zadok 1993: 229

¹⁷⁷ Buccellati 1995: 858.

Lú-Šauša). Some others are still quite problematic, remaining obscure, as happens with e.g. *Talpuš-atili*, and all the PNs that include ‘*atal*’ as possible theophoric elements. In each case: Whom is ‘*atal*’ or ‘*ewri*’ referring to? Are they always functioning as epithets or appellatives for any particular deity, or they are just “mundane” allusions?

The third millennium PNs show that Hurrians were not yet fully “acculturated” neither by the Mesopotamians (Sumerians and Akkadians) nor by the “newly” arrived Amorites. They were experiencing a process that started to show its changes by the end of the millennium, and it became fully pictured, at least from a historical-documentary point of view, during the early periods of the second millennium. Moreover, despite the scarcity of Hurrian written sources, PNs result in a fundamental element to provide us with a more complex picture of the early development of its religion, particularly the attitude towards their deities, whether they were “official” or “personal/private” ones. As we have stated in the introduction of this work, the religion in ancient societies tended to impregnate a wide variety of fields, and as long as we identify them, we can recreate a better picture of the complex reality.

Notes on the List of Hurrian Personal Names

- For practical reasons, the bibliography cited in the compilation of the Hurrian names has been that, in the cases that allowed, which gathers together the majority of them. The specific citation of texts, tablets or documents is given only in the cases where there is no other option.

- The spaces in blank means:

- 1) That the transliteration was not provided by the author of the texts.
- 2) That the Hurrian normalisation is not clear.
- 3) That the Hurrian meaning preclude us from translating the name.

- The PNs from the third millennium have been placed separately, related to every individual.

- The PNs from the second millennium have been ordered according to the name, with the gender differentiation. The same name may belong to more than one person.

- For practical reasons, we have decided to use the order of the Latin alphabet to organise the names. However, according to the rules of transcription, the consonants are to be adjusted as follows:

T/D; K/G; P/B; 𐎧; W/B; Z; Š.

Voiceless: T, K, P, 𐎧, F, S, Š

Voiced: D, G, B, Ġ, V, Z, Ž.

Abbreviations

[G]: Gender

[?]: Doubtful names

[**H**]: Hurrian

[**S**]: Semitic

[**Su**]: Sumerian

[**A**]: Amorite

[**X²**]: Number of attestations

List of Hurrian Personal Names (and Hurrian-related Names)

from the Third Millennium

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Aḥu-šena			a-hu-šè-na	aḡ=o=-šena		STTI 142:2	Ĝirsu	Sargonic
Ak		?	a-ag	ag		TM.75.G.2502; ARET IV:8	Nagar	Pre-Sargonic
Aka		?	a-ga	ag=a		ARET I:15	Nagar	Pre-Sargonic
Akaiš		?	a-ga-iš	aga=i=ž		PNEBM:42	Nagar	Pre-Sargonic
Akakka			a-ga-ga	ag=a=k(k)=a		MAD 1, 163 II 39	Ešnunna	Sargonic
Akap-šen			a-kap-še-en	ag=a=b-šen	The brother came up	Zadok 1993:227	Lagaš	Ur III
Akap-šen			a-kap-še-in	ag=a=b-šen	The brother came up	Hirose 372:2	Umma	Ur III
Akap-ta[ḫe]			a-ga-ap-tá-[ḫe?]	ag=a=b-ta[ḡe]	The man came up	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Akiya			a-ki-ia	ag=i=ya	He/She brought (him) up	Sigrist 1991: 231, 2	Ĝirsu	Ur III
Akiya			a-ki-ia	ag=i=ya	He/She brought (him) up	AUCT 2, 337 Vs. 4; 367 Vs. 4	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Akiya			a-ki-a/ia	ag=i=ya	He/She brought (him) up	MVN 21, 365 Vs. 12	Umma	Ur III
Akka		?	ag-ga	akk=a	Lift up, take to, come up ?	ARET I:16; IV:7, 14, 24; VIII 523	Nagar	Pre-Sargonic
Akka-LUM		?	ag-ga-LUM	akk=a-LUM ?		Archi 1984: 250	Nagar	Pre-Sargonic
Akua			a-gu/ku-a	ag=o=ya	He/She brought (him) up	UDT 91 V s. VIII 16; YOS 4, 254 Vs. I 4	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Akua			a-gu/ku-a	ag=o=ya	He/She brought (him) up	AnOr 7, 295 Vs.	Umma	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Alla			al-la	alla	Lady	MAD 1, 163 VII 9	Ešnunna	Sargonic
Allani			al(?) -la-ni	alla=ni	Lady	Nisaba 16, 93 Vs. 14	Umma	Ur III
Allaš-arum			al-la-ša-ru-um	alla=ž-ar=o=m	The Lady gave him	Kleinerman and Owen 2009: 410	Ĝaršana	Ur III
Allaš-arum			al-la-ša-ru-um	alla=ž-ar=o=m	The Lady gave him	AUCT I, 525 Vs. 2	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Allaš-arum			al-la-ša-ru-um	alla=ž-ar=o=m	The Lady gave him	AnOr 1, 292 Rs. II 28, 35	Umma	Ur III
Allaš-arum			al-la-ša-ru-um	alla=ž-ar=o=m	The Lady gave him	UET 3, 1195 Vs. 4	Ur	Ur III
Ankiš-atal			an-ki-sa-a-tal	ang=i=ž-adal		Gelb 1944:57	Karaḫar	Ur III
Ann-atal			an-na-tal	ann-adal		Zadok 1993:227	Urkeš	Ur III
Apar-tuk			a-ba-ar-du-uk	ab=ar-to/uk		Syracuse 480 Rs. 17	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Apilā		?	a-bi-la-a			Zadok 1993:230	Ur	Ur III
Apšam			ap-ša-am	apš(e)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a snake	HSS X 190 II	Gasur	Sargonic
Ar(i)p-atal			ar-pá-tal	ar=(i)=b-adal	The strong gave (him)	Zadok 1993:226	Simanum	Ur III
Ari-meme			a-ri-me-me	ar=i-meme	<i>Meme</i> , give (him)!	Zadok 1993:230	Unknown	Ur III
Ari-nin			a-ri-nin	ar=i-nin	<i>Nin</i> , give (him)!	Westenholz 1975: 36, N° 47 V 3	Nippur	Sargonic
Ari-tupuk			a-ri-du-bu-uk(!)	ar=i-to/ubuk	Tupuk?, give (him)!	SET 297 Rs. I 14	Ĝirsu	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Ari-tupuk			a-ri-du-pu-uk	ar=i-to/ubuk	Tupki?, give (him)!	Zadok 1993:225	Šašrum	Ur III
Ari/Atal-ḫuḫa			a-ri/tal-ḫu-ḫa	ar=i-ḫo/uḡ=a / adal-ḫo/uḡ=a	Father, give (him)! / The strong is the father	HSS X 153 VIII 4	Gasur	Sargonic
Arip-atal			a-ri-ip-a-tal	ar=i=b-adal	The strong gave (him)	SET 297: 69	Ĝirsu	Ur III
Arip-atal			ar-ba-tal / a-ar-ba-tal / a-ri-ip-a-tal	ar=i=b-adal	The strong gave (him)	AUCT 3, 294: 9, 11; BCT 1, 95: 6	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Arip-ḫuppi			a-ri-ip-ḫu-up-pí	ar=i=b-ḫuppi	ḫuppi gave (him)	Zadok 1993:226	Talmuš	Ur III
Ašip-atal			a-ši-ba-tal	až=i=b-adal		NISABA 8, 383 Vs. 6	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ata(l?)-šen			a-tá-še-en ₆	ada(l)-šen	The strong is the brother	Zadok 1993:230	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ata(l?)-šen			a-tá-še-en ₆	ada(l)-šen	The strong is the brother	Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Atal-šen			a-tal-še-[en]	Adal-šen	The strong is the brother	Zadok 1993:230	Nippur	Ur III
Atal-šen			a-tal-še-en	adal-šen(a)	The brother is strong	Wilhelm 1988:47 l.3	Urkeš	Ur III
Atalal			a-tal-al	adal-al		Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Attu	f		ad-du	addu	Woman	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Attu	f		ad-du	addu	Woman	UET 3, 1034 Rs. I 14; 1415 Vs. 7	Ur	Ur III
Attuki	f		a-tu-ki	attukki	Young woman	PDT 2, 1120:2	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Awar-tuk			a-ba-ar-du-uk	av=ar-to/uk	Tuk rescued (him) repeatedly	MVN 15, 66 Vs. II 1	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Awari-turuk			a-ba-ri-du-ru-uk	av=ar=i-Turuk		MDP 14, 73: 5	Susa	Ur III
Elakku			e-la-ak-ku	elakk(i)=(a)=u	He is instead of the young sister	JCS 34, S. 247 Nr. 2: 11	Umma	Ur III
Ellala			il-la-la	ell(a)=a=la	He is like a sister	MDP 54, 12: 4, 21: 2	Susa	Ur III
Elum-alan			e-lum-a-la-an	el=o=m-alan?		BIN 3, 627	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Elum-Mašura			e-lum-ma-šu-ra	el=o=m-mažor(i)=a		ITT 5, 6772 Vs. 4	Ĝirsu	Ur III
Eniš-akum			e-ni-iš-a-gu-um	eni=ž-ag=o=m	The god brought him / took him up	AUCT 3, 47 Vs. 2	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Eniš-akum			e-ni-iš-a-gu-um	eni=ž-ag=o=m	The god brought him / took him up	Orientalia 47-49, 38 Vs. 8	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Eniš-ħa(lu?)um			e-ni-i[š-ħa(?)-lu(?)]-um	en=i=ž-ħal=o=m	The god transferred / transmitted him	Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Enni-taku			en-ni-tá-gú	enn=i-tago/u		Zadok 1993:227	Urkeš	Ur III
Ennip-šen			en-ni-ip-še-en	enn=i=b-šen		Zadok 1993:230	Unknown	Ur III
Enniya			en-ni-ia	enn=i=ya		Meyer 1937-1939:369	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Eriš-atal(?)			[e(?)-r]i-iš-ti-AR(-or-ti-ši-tal)	er=i=ž-(adal?)		Zadok 1993:227	Uršu	Ur III
Ewri			e-wa-ri	evri	Lord	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ewri-Kira			e-wa-rí-ki-ra	evri-kir(i)=a		HSS X 185 II 3	Gasur	Sargonic

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Ewrim-atal			IB-rí-im-a-tal	evri=m-adal	The Lord is strong	Buccellati & Kelly-Buccellati 2002:20	Urkeš	Sargonic
Ewrip-atal			eb-rí-ba-tal	evri=b(m!)-adal	The lord is strong?	Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Geme-Šauša	f	Su/H	Géme- ^d Ša-u ₁₈ -ša	Geme-ša(v)=o=š=ka	Servant of Šawuška	SAT 1 435 o.ii 26 & r.i 16	Lagaš	Ur III
Ḫamannen		?	ḫa-ma-an-ne-en ₆	ḫamann(i)=n(a)	ḫamanni-child?	Zadok 1993:230	Unknown	Ur III
Ḫap-šen			ḫa-ap-še-en ₆	ḫa=a=b-šen		Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ḫapa-ša		?	ḫa-ab-a-za	ḫa=a=b-ša(še?)		Illingworth 1988:89	Nagar	Sargonic
Ḫapaluke			ḫa-ba-lu-ge	ḫab=al=o=g=(n)e		NRVN 1, 88 Vs. 3	Nippur	Ur III
Ḫapaluke			ḫa-ba-lu-gé	ḫab=al=o=g=(n)e		Sigrist 2004: 436 Rs. 4; Sigrist 1990: 2, 403 Vs. 5; SAT III 1989 V s. 5	Umma	Ur III
Ḫapiram			ḫa-bi-ra-am	ḫabir(u)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a Ḫabiru	Gadd 1940: 42	Nagar	Sargonic
Ḫarap-atal			ḫa-ar-ba-tal	ḫar=a=b-adal		PDT [1] 166:4	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ḫariš-ḫuntaḫ		?	ḫa-ri-iš-ḫu-un-taḫ	ḫar=i=ž-ḫuntaḫ		Zadok 1993:223	Marhaši	Ur III
Ḫašip-[a]tal			ḫa-si-ip-a!-tál	ḫaž=i=b-adal	The strong listened (him)	Zadok 1993:230	Unknown	Ur III
Ḫašip-atal			ḫa-ši-ip-a-tal / ḫa-ši-pá-tá-al / ḫa-ši-pá-tal	ḫaž=i=b-adal	The strong listened (him)	Zadok 1993:225; Sigrist 1979:166	Arraphum	Ur III
Ḫašip-atal			ḫa-ši-pá-tal / ḫa-ši-ip-a-tal	ḫaž=i=b-adal	The strong listened (him)	Zadok 1993:222	Marhaši	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Ĥašip-atal			ĥa-ši-pá-tal	ĥaž=i=b-adal	The strong listened (him)	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ĥašip-atal			ĥa-ši-pá-tal	ĥaž=i=b-adal	The strong listened (him)	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ĥašip-atal			ĥa-ši-pá-tal	ĥaž=i=b-adal	The strong listened (him)	Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Ĥašip-atal			ĥa-ši-pá-tal	ĥaž=i=b-adal	The strong listened (him)	Zadok 1993:230	Unknown	Ur III
Ĥawurna-nike			ĥa-úr-na-ni-ge ₄	ĥavorn(i)-nige	The sky is <i>Nike</i>	Zadok 1993:222	Marhaši	Ur III
Ĥiliš			ĥi-li-iš (?)	ĥil(i)=i=ž?	May (he/she) speak!	Astour 1987:31	Talmuš	Ur III
Ĥiš-atal			ĥi-ša-tal	ĥi=(i)=ž-adal?	May the strong speak!	Astour 1987:27	Kakmi	Ur III
Ĥiš-atal			ĥi-ša-tal	ĥi=(i)=ž-adal?	May the strong speak!	TAD 67: 3	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ĥiwiriš(?)			ĥi-WA-rí-iš	ĥiv=ir(?)=i=ž		HSS 10, 69: 3; 142: 6; 146: 5; 153 VII 4; 155 II 10; 158 III 2; 187 IV 15	Gasur	Sargonic
Ĥuĥ-atal			ĥu-ĥa-tal	ĥo/uġ(i/a)=a-adal		SAT III 2074 Vs. 1, Rs. 3	Umma	Ur III
Ĥuĥa			ĥu-ĥa	ĥo/uġ(i/a)=a		SET 213 Rs. 11	Ĝirsu	Ur III
Ĥuĥa			ĥu-ĥa	ĥo/uġ(i/a)=a		MVN 2, 97 Vs. 7	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ĥuĥir			ĥu-ĥi-ir	ĥo/uġ(i/a)=ir		Zadok 1994:39- ff.	Gasur	Sargonic
Ĥuĥu			ĥu-ĥu	ĥo/uġ(i/a)=o		MVN 17, 59 Vs. I 20	Ĝirsu	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Ĥuĥuni			ĥu-ĥu-ni	ĥo/uġo/u=ni		Zadok 1994:39-ff.	Ġirsu	Ur III
Ĥuĥuni			ĥu-ĥu-ni	ĥo/uġo/u=ni		Zadok 1994:39-ff.	Umma	Ur III
Ĥun-tuĥli		?	Ĥu-un-tu-úĥ-li			Zadok 1993:230	Ur	Ur III
Ĥunli		?	Ĥu-un-li	ĥun=li		Zadok 1993:223	Marhaši	Ur III
Ĥupitam			ĥu-bi/bí-dam	ĥo/ubid(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a bull-calf	MVN 5, 150 Vs. 8	Ġirsu	Ur III
Ĥupitam			ĥu-pis-tám	ĥo/ubid(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a bull-calf	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ĥupitam			ĥu-bí-dam	ĥo/ubid(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a bull-calf	MVN 3, 338 Rs. 5; MVN 15, 142 Vs. 23	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ĥupitam			ĥu-bí-dam	ĥo/ubid(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a bull-calf	Nisaba 16, 178 Rs. 9	Umma	Ur III
Ĥupitam			ĥu-pis-tám	ĥo/ubid(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a bull-calf	Zadok 1993:230	Unknown	Ur III
Ĥupšum-kipi			ĥu-up-šum-ki-bi	ĥo/ubž=o=m-kibi		Zadok 1993:222	Marhaši	Ur III
Ĥupšum-kipi			ĥu-up-šum-ki-pi	ĥo/ubž=o=m-kibi		Grayson & Sollberger 1970: G 33	Marhaši	Sargonic (OB)
Ĥurip-še(n)			ĥu-rí-íp-ši	ĥo/ur=i=b-še		Zadok 1993:233	Unknown	Sargonic
Ĥurpi-še(n)			ĥur-pí-šè	ĥo/urb=i-še		Zadok 1993:227	Lagaš	Ur III
Ĥuzira			ĥu-zi-ra	ĥužir(i)=a		HSS 10, 65: 20; 123: 19; 212: 8	Gasur	Sargonic
Ĥuziri			ĥu-zi-ri	ĥužiri=(a)		SACT 1, 169 Rs. 2	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
l/Ni-lam- ^d Šamagan		Su	ì/ni-lam- ^d ša-ma-gan			ARET II: 13 x 3	Inibu/Ibubu	Pre-Sargonic
lb-ḫuḫa			lp-ḫu-ḫa	ib-ḫo/uḫa(?)		Zadok 1993:226	Simanum	Ur III
lb/Ur- ^d Šamagan		Su	i[b/ur- ^d ša]-ma-gan			ARET VIII: 541 §42 xix 18.	Uršu	Pre-Sargonic
lpani		?	l-ba-ni			Zadok 1993:230	Unknown	Ur III
lkū(n)-Šamagan		S	i-ku- ^d ša-ma-gan		Šamagan is firm	RIME 1:317-319	Mari	Pre-Sargonic
lniš-tuḫ[x]ḫum			i-ni-iš-tuḫ-[x]-ḫu-um	in=iž-to/uḫḫo/um		Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
lnu- ^d Šamagan		S	i-nu- ^d ša-ma-ga-nu		Šamagan is the eye/watcher	PET:205	Ebla	Pre-Sargonic
lpšin		?	Íp-ši-in	ib-šen		Zadok 1993:228	Lagaš	Ur III
lrmī- ^d Šamagan		S	ir-mi- ^d ša-ma-gan			PET:224	Iritum	Pre-Sargonic
lšab-atal			ì-ša-pá-tal	iž=a=b-adal		Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
lšar-kīnum		S	i-šar-GI	lšar-kīnum	The just one prospers	Buccellati & Kelly-Buccellati 2005:39	Urkeš	Sargonic
lḫa/ip-atal			á(it!)-ḫa/ḫi-ba-tal	itḡ=a/i=b-adal		CDLJ 2012: 001 §4.38.1 Rs. 2'	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
lḫab-atal			it-ḫa/ḫi-pá-tal	itḡ=a=b-adal		Zadok 1993:225	ḫipilat	Ur III
lti- ^d Šamagan		S	i-ti- ^d ša-ma-gan			PET:211	Unknown	Pre-Sargonic
ltin-atal			i-ti-na-tal	ed=i=n(na)-adal		MVN 19, 13 Rs. 3	Ĝirsu	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Kapawe		?	ga-ba-wa	kab=a=ve		Maiocchi 2011:197	Urkeš	Sargonic (Naram-Sin)
Keleš-atal			°ke-le-eš-a-tal	Keleš-adal / kel=i=ž-adal	Keleš is strong / May the strong make (him) healthy / happy	Földi 2013 §5.4.	Karaḥar	Ur III
Kikiya			gi ₄ -gi ₄ -a	kik=i=ya	He/She left the third	UDT 91: 178	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Kiklip-atal			ki-ik-li-pa-ta-al(-li-in)	kig ₁ =i=b-adal		Zadok 1993:225	Tukriš	Ur III
Kina-muša			ki-na-mu-ša	Kina-muž(i)=a	Kina is righteous	AUCT 3, 484 Vs. 6	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Kina-muša			ki-na-mu-ša	kina-muž(i)=a	Kina is righteous	Zadok 1999/2000a: 208	Agaz	Ur III
Kip-atal			ki-pá-a-[tal]			Zadok 1993:226	Urbilum	Ur III
Kip-turi			ki-ip-tu-ri	ke=i=b-turi	The man put (him)	AUCT II, 317:61	Umma	Ur III
Kip-turu			ki-ip-tu-ru	ke=i=b-tur(i)	The man put (him)	HSS X 129:II; 153 IV 31; 199:5	Gasur	Sargonic
Kipil-taku			ki-bi-la-ta-gú	kibil(i)-tag=u	The hunter is god(?)	Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Kirip-atal			kir-pá-tal	kir=i=b-adal	The strong liberated (him)	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Kirip-ulme			ki-rí-ip/pu-ul-me	kir=i=b-ulme	The servant liberated (him)	Zadok 1993:224	Simurru	Ur III
Kirri			kir-ri	kirr=i	Let (him) free!	BIN 3, 477: 11	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Kubaba(w)e			Ku-ba-ba-e	Kubaba=(v)=e	That from Kubaba	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Kūn- ^d Šamagan		S	kūn- ^d ša-ma-gan		Be true Šamagan	ARET VIII:526 §9 ix 6	Tuba	Pre-Sargonic
Kunda			ku-un-da-a	ko/und=a		Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Kuš-eli			ku-uš-é-li	ko/už-eli		Zadok 1993:224	Marhaši	Ur III
Kutuk-šeni			kú-du-uk-še-in	kud=o=g- šen(a)=(n)i	The strong did not fall	Sigrist - Figulla and Walker 1996: 247	Ĝirsu	Ur III
Kuwari			ku-wa-ri	Kuvari		Ahmed 2012: 370, fn. 204.	Tell Mizyad	Ur III
Kuzuzzu			gu-zu-zu			UDT 92: 22	Mardaman	Ur III
Kuzzawa			gu-za-wa	koz(z)=a=va		Maiocchi 2011:198	Urkeš	Sargonic (Naram-Sin)
Lu-Šauša	Su/H		Lú- ^d ša-u ₁₈ -ša	Lu-ša(v)=o=š=ka	The man of Šauška	MVN 6 240 v.12; 307	Lagaš	Ur III
Maliya			ma-li-a	mal=i=ya		Buccellati 1966: 111	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Matuni			ma-du-ni	mad=o=n(n)i	Give (him) wisdom!	MVN 13, 423 Rs. 6	Urbilum	Ur III
Mišhi-nišhi		?	mi-iš-ḫi-ni-iš-hi			Zadok 1993:223	Marhaši	Ur III
Mišu-apir		?	mi-šu-a-bi-ir	mišu-apir		Zadok 1993:222	Marhaši	Ur III
Naḥap-atal			na-ḫa-ba-tal	naḡ=a=b-adal	The strong sat down	Princeton 86: 4, 8	Kumme	Ur III
Naḥḫam-atal			na-aḫ-ḫa-ma-tal	naḫḫ=a=m(b!)-adal	The strong sat down	MVN 15, 142 Rs. 1	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Naḥap-atal			na-ḫa-pá-tal	naḡ=a=b-adal	The strong sat down	Zadok 1993:226	Kumi	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Nahap-atal			na-ḥa-pá-tal	naḡ=a=b-adal	The strong sat down	Zadok 1993:230	Unknown	Ur III
Nahap-ewri			na-ḥa-ap-ip-rí	naḡ=a=b-evri	The lord sat down	Zadok 1993:230	Ur	Ur III
Naktam-atal			na-ak-tá-ma-tal	nakt(i)=a=m-adal	The strong is like annihilation	Zadok 1993:226	Mardaman	Ur III
Naluk			na-lu-uk	nal=o=k(k)		Astour 1987:27	Kakmi	Ur III
Naluk			na-lu ₅ -úg	nal=o=k(k)		PDT 2, 807 II 3	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
^d Nanna-lú-du ₁₀		Su	^d Nanna-lú-du ₁₀			Zadok 1993:230	Ur	Ur III
^d Nanna-ma(an)ba		Su	^d Nanna-ma-(an-)ba			Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Nanau			na-na-ù	nan=av		Owen 1981: 264	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Nanip-atal			na-ni-pá-tal	nan=i=b-adal	The strong struck down	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Nanip-atal			na-ni-pá-tal	nan=i=b-adal	The strong struck down	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Nanip-atal			na-ni-ba-tal	nan=i=b-adal	The strong struck down	Astour 1987:39	Urbilum	Ur III
Nanip-ul(me)			na-ni-pu-ul	nan=i=b-ol(me)?	The servant struck down	Zadok 1993:233	Unknown	Sargonic
Nanip-ur(olme?)			na-ni-pú-ur	nan=i=b-ol!(me)	The servant (?) struck down	Zadok 1993:233	Unknown	Sargonic
Naniya			na-ni-a	nan=i=ya	He/She struck down	HSS X 82:7; 98:2; 185 v3	Gasur	Sargonic
Napḥi		?	la-ap-ḥi	na=b-ḥi?		Zadok 1993:222	Marhaši	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Nawar-šen			na-wa-ar-še-en	navar-šen	Nawar is the brother	Gelb 1943:113	Nawar	Ur III
Nawar-šen			na-wa-ar-še-en	navar-šen	Nawar is the brother	de Genouillac: 1911 83 Vs. 8	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Neriš-atal			ne-ri-iš-a-tal	nir=i=ž-adal	May the strong be healthy!	Zadok 1993:226	Mardaman	Ur III
Neriš-atal			ne-ri-iš-a-tal	nir=i=ž-adal	May the strong be healthy!	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ninu-šeni			ni-nu-še-ni	Ninu(a)?-šen(a)=n(i)		Nisaba 11, 33 I 19	Umma	Ur III
Niriš-ḫuḫa			ni-ri-iš-ḫu-ḫa	nir=i=ž-ḫo/uğ(o/u)=a	May <i>ḫuḫa</i> ? be healthy!	RIME 2:227 xi 9-11	Nippur	Gutean (OB)
Niriš-ḫuḫa			ni-ri-iš-ḫu-ḫa	nir=i=ž-ḫo/uğ(o/u)=a	May <i>ḫuḫa</i> ? be healthy!	Zadok 1993:226	Urbilum	Ur III
Nupan			nu-ba-an			PDT 2, 959 III 25	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Nupan			nu-ba-an			TCL 5, 6039 II 29	Umma	Ur III
Pakir		?	ba-gir ₁₂	fagir?		Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Paḫan-šen			pá-ḫa-an-še-en ₆	faḡa=n(a)-šen		Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Paḫar-šen			pá-ḫa-ar-še-en	faḡar-šen	The brother is good	MVN 10, 130 Vs. 2	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Papan-šen			pá-pá-an-še-en ₆	paba=n(na)-šen	The mountain is a brother	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Papan-šen			pá-pá-an-še-en/en ₆	paba=n(na)-šen	The mountain is a brother	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Pari-apir		?	ba-ri-a-bi-ir	par=i=(?)-apir		Zadok 1993:222	Marhaši	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Pituram(a)		?	BI-tu-ra-am	pi? tur(i)=a=m(e/a)		Maiocchi 2011:198	Urkeš	Sargonic (Naram-Sin)
Puku(w)e		?	bù-gú-e	puku=ve			Nagar	Pre-Sargonic
Punza			pu-un-za-a			MVN 3, 338 Rs. 14	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Puram			pu-ra-am	Puram(e)	Slave	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Puram			pur-ra-am	Puram(e)	Slave	Zadok 1993:230	Ur	Ur III
Purašje		?	pu-ra-aš-je			Zadok 1993:223	Marhaši	Ur III
Pušam			pù-ša-am	po/už=a=m(a)		Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Puššam			pu-ša-am	po/už=a=m(a)		Zadok 1993:226	Simanum	Ur III
Puššam			pu-uš-ša ₁₀ -am	po/ušš=a=m(a)		Volk 2004: 88, 91, 93.	Urkeš	Sargonic
Pušum-šen			pu-šúm-še-en	po/už=o=m-šen		Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Pušum-šen			pu-šúm-še-en	po/už=o=m-šen		CST 263 VI 9	Umma	Ur III
Puttim-adal			pu-ut-ti-ma-tá-al	futt=i=m(b!)-adal	The strong begot (him)	Grayson & Sollberger 1970: G 29	Simurram	Sargonic (OB)
Putuk-manum	f		pu ₄ -du-uk-ma-núm	fud=o=g-mano/um	<i>Manum</i> (?) did not beget him	Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Putuk-šen			pu ₄ -(?)-du-uk-še-en	fud=o=g-šen	The brother did not beget him	Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Putuk-šen			pu ₄ -du-uk-še-en	fud=o=g-šen	The brother did not beget him	Zadok 1993:230	Unknown	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Putum-kiriš			pu-du-um-ki-ri-iš	fud=o=m-kiriž	Kiriš begot him	Zadok 1993:226	Šerši	Ur III
Puzur- ^d Šamagan		Su	púzur- ^d ša-ma-gan		Under the protection of Šamagan	ARET VIII:531 §42 xiv 23	Ebla	Pre-Sargonic
Puzur- ^d Šulgi		Su	Puzur ₄ - ^d Šul-gi	Puzur-šulgi	Under the protection of Šulgi	Astour 1987:40	Arraphum	Ur III
Puzur-Eštar,		Su	Puzur-Eštar,	Puzur-eštar	Under the protection of Eštar	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Šakar		?	ša-ga-ar	šag=ar?		Zadok 1993:233	Unknown	Sargonic
Šakup-ali	f	?	ša-ku-ba-li	šag=o=b(m!)-ali?		Zadok 1993:235	Unknown	Sargonic
^d Šamagan		?	^d ša-ma-gan			ARET VIII: 533 §61 xx 18; AfO 35:168	Unknown	Pre-Sargonic
^d Šamagan-be		?	^d ša-ma-gan-be	šamagan=ve?		ARES II:17	Tuba	Pre-Sargonic
^d Sard-amu		?	^d Sa/Sà/Za-ar-da/tá/ta-mu			Zadok 1993:224	Karaḥar	Ur III
Šatar-Kuni			sa ² -tar-gu-ni	šad=a=r-kuni	Kuni replaced (him)	Subartu 2, 1996 Nr. 2 II 3	Nabada	Pre-Sargonic
Šatar-Kuni			ša-tar-gu-ni	šad=a=r-kuni	Kuni replaced (him)	Subartu 2, 1996 Nr. 23 V 7	Nabada	Pre-Sargonic
Šatar-mat			Šá- ^r dar-ma-at ¹	šad=a=r-mad=(i?)	The wise? replaced (him)	Wilhelm 1988:47 I.9	Urkeš	Ur III
Šatazi			ša-da-zi	šad=a-ši?		Astour 1987:39	Urbilum	Ur III
Šaum-šen			Šá-um-še- ^r en ¹	šav=o=m-šen	The brother made him outstandingly good	Wilhelm 1988:47 I.21	Urkeš	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Šeḥlam			še-eḥ-la-am	šeḡl=a=m?	He/She entered	Zadok 1993:230	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Šeḥrin-ewri			šè-eḥ-ri-in-ip-rí	šeḡr=i=n-evri	May the Lord be (make him) generous!	Gelb 1959, Rev. 14	Nippur	Sargonic
Šelḥa		?	še-il _x -ḥa	šelḡ=a?		Zadok 1993:223	Marhaši	Ur III
Šen			še-en ₆		Brother	SNATBM 512 Vs. 4	Umma	Ur III
Šenam			še-en-nam	šen(a)=n(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a brother	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Šename			šè-na-me	šen(a)=n(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a brother	STTI 142:7	Ĝirsu	Sargonic
Šeni-zasam			šè-ni-za-sa-am	šen(a)=ni-zasam?		Milano 1991 M2 1 IV:5	Urkeš	Sargonic
Šeškala		?	šeš-kal-la			Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Šetap-adal			še-et-ba-tal	šed=a=b-adal	The strong made (him) fat?	Babyloniaca 8 pl. VII Nr. 30 Rs. 1	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Šim-šalaḥ		?	Sí-im-sà-la-aḥ			Zadok 1993:230	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Šim-šelaḥ		?	šim-še-la-aḥ			Zadok 1993:228	Lagaš	Ur III
Šim-šilaḥ		?	ši-im-ši-<la>-aḥ			Zadok 1993:227	Lagaš	Ur III
Šim-šilaḥ		?	sí-im-sí-la-aḥ			Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Šitap-atal			šid=a=b-adal	šid(?)=a=b-adal		STTI 142:4	Ĝirsu	Sargonic
Šū-Adad		S	šū-Adad			Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Šuirra		?	šu-ir-ra	Šuirra		Zadok 1993:230	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Šukuzi			šu-gu-zi	šo/ug(i)=uzzi	The right one	Subartu 2, 1996 Nr. 5 III 1	Nabada	Pre-Sargonic
Šulgi-atal	Su/H		Šul-gi-a-tal	šulgi-adal	Šulgi is strong	Zadok 1993:225	Kumaraši	Ur III
Šunikip			šu-ni-ki-ip	šo/un=i-kip(i)		Zadok 1993:226	Pil (pi-il ^{ki})	Ur III
Šupae		?	šu-pa-è	šo/ub=a=i		Milano 1991 M2 2 IV:13	Urkeš	Sargonic
Šupiš-ḫuḫa			šu-bí-iš-ḫu-ḫa	šo/ub=i=ž- ḫo/uğ(o/u)=a		Zadok 1993:225; Astour 1987:27	Kakmi	Ur III
Tagi- ^d UTU		?	tá-gi- ^d UTU	tagi- ^d UTU / tag=i-Šamagan?		ARET VIII: 533 \$14 vii 30	Unknown	Pre-Sargonic
Tagu		?	tá-gu	tag(i)=u?	Good	Zadok 1993:223	Marhaši	Ur III
Taḫa-šen			tá-ḫa-še-en	tag(e)=a-šen	The man is the brother	Zadok 1993:230	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Taḫa-šen			tá-ḫa-še-en	tag(e)=a-šen	The man is the brother	Zadok 1993:230	Ur	Ur III
Taḫeš-atal			tá-ḫe-iš-a-tal	tag=i=ž-adal		Zadok 1993:230	Ur	Ur III
Taḫḫi-šen			taḫ-ḫi-še-en	taḫḫe-šen	The brother is the man	Zadok 1993:228	Lagaš	Ur III
Taḫi-šen			tá-ḫi-še-en ₆	tage-šen	The brother is the man	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Taḫi-tani			tá-ḫi-ṭà-ni	tage-dan=i		Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Taḫip-atal			tá-ḫi-ip-pi-ta-al	tag=i=b-adal		Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Taḥiš-atal			tá-aḥ-ša-tal	tag=i=ž-adal		Zadok 1993:230	Ur	Ur III
Taḥiš-atal			tá-ḥi-iš-a-tal / taḥ-ša-tal / taḥ-ša-a-tal / tá-ḥi-ša-tal / tá-ḥi-iš-ša-tal	tag=i=ž-adal		Zadok 1993:228,229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Taḥiš-atal			tá-aḥ-ša-tal/tá-ḥi-iš-ša-tal/tá-ḥi-iš-a-tal	tag=i=ž-adal		Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Taḥiš-atili			da-ḥi-ša-ti-li	tag=i=ž-adal=(n)i		RIME 2:86; AIA 8 IV:1	Azuḥinum	Sargonic
Taḥiš-šen			tá-hi-iš-še-en	tag=i=ž-šen		Zadok 1993:225	Šetirša	Ur III
Taḥum-adal			tá-ḥu-ma-tal	tag=o=m-adal		Zadok 1993:230	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Takua			da-ku-a	tag=o=ya	He/She made (him) god	TCL 2, 5481 Rs. 5	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Talpuš-atili			tal-pu-za-ti-li	talb=o=ž-adal=(n)i	May the strong make (him) big!	Matthews and Eidem 1993	Nagar	Sargonic
Tapšaḥi	f		tap-ša-ḥi	tapš=aḡ=i	Cupbearer	Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Tašal-ewri			tá-šal-ip-ri	taž=a=l-evri		Zadok 1993:227	Uršu	Ur III
Taše			tá-še			Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Tašim-še			ta-ši-im-še	taž=i=m(b!)-še		TCL 2, 5484: 11	Umma	Ur III
Teḥeš-atal			te-ḥe-eš-a-tal	teḡ=i=ž-adal	May the strong raise (him)	Sollberger 1980:63	Simurrum	Ur III
Teššup-šelaḥ			te-šup-še-la-aḥ	Teššob-šelaḡ	Teššup...(?)	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Tiki-nari			ti-ki-na-ri	tig=i-nari		TRU 157: 8	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Tikin-adal			ti-ki-na-tal	teg(i)=n-adal	The beautiful is the strong	Zadok 1993:230	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Tiru-šaki			ti-ru-ša-ki	tir=o-šagi		HSS X 129:13, 156:7, 197:10	Gasur	Sargonic
Tiš-adal			ti-iš-a-tal	ti=i=ž-adal	May the strong speak!	Whiting 1976	Nineveh	Ur III (Šu-Sîn - 2034 BC)
Tiš-adal			ti-iš-a-tal	ti=i=ž-adal	May the strong speak!	Wilhelm 1998:119	Urkeš	Ur III
Tiš-atal			ti(!)-sa-a-tal	ti=i=ž-adal	May the strong speak!	Whiting 1976	Karaḥar	Ur III - Isin Larsa
Tiš-šenki		?	ti-is-s[i]-en-ki	ti=i=ž-šenki	May <i>Šenki</i> (?) speak!	Zadok 1993:223	Marhaši	Ur III
Tišan-taḫe			ti-ša-an-tá-ḫe	tiža=n(na)-taḫe	The heart is the man	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Tituri		?	ti-tu-rí	ti-turi		HSS X 129:9; 157 II 13	Gasur	Sargonic
Tugaš		?	tu-ga-aš			Zadok 1993:223	Marhaši	Ur III
Tuḫ-susu		?	du-uḫ-su-su			Grayson & Sollberger 1970: G 34	Mardaman	Sargonic (OB)
Tuḫ-susu		?	du-uḫ-su-su			Zadok 1993:226	Mardaman	Ur III
Tukam-ašti		?	tu-ga-ma-aš-ti	Tukam?-ašti	... woman	Zadok 1993:223	Marhaši	Ur III
Tukra		?	du-uk-ra			Astour 1987:27	Kakmi	Ur III
Tukši		?	du-uk-ši			Zadok 1993:223	Marhaši	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Tukši		?	tu-uk-ši			Zadok 1993:223	Marhaši	Ur III
Tulip-mama			tu-li-ip-ma-ma	to/ul=i=b-mama		BIN 5, 300 Vs. 1	Umma	Ur III
Tuliya			du-li-a	to/ul=i-ya		Delaporte 1911:191 12,4	Nippur	Ur III
Tulpip-še			túl-pí-ip-še	to/ulb=i=p-še	The brother thrived (him)	Al-Rawi 1992:184; IM 85455:1	Awal	Sargonic
Tupin	f		tu-pi-in	tup(p)i=n(a)		Gelb 1959, Rev. 13	Nippur	Sargonic (OB)
Tupki-ašum			dup-ki-a-šum	to/upki-až=o=m		MAD 1, 233 IV 11	Tutub	Sargonic
Tupki-šen			tup-ki-še-ni	to/upki-šen(a)=ni		Zadok 1993:225	Kumaraši	Ur III
Tupkiš			tup-ki-iš	to/upki=i-ž?		Buccellati & Kelly-Buccellati 1995-1996; 1996	Urkeš	Sargonic
Tuturi		?	tu-tu-rí			HSS X 188 IV 7	Gasur	Sargonic
Ullam-šen			ul-lam-še-en	o/ull=a=m(b!)-šen	The brother destroyed (him)	Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Ulli-Peluk			ul-li-pè-lu-uk	o/ull=i-pelo/uk(ki)		AUCT 1, 291:14; MVN 13, 515:1 Orient 16, S. 43 Nr. 13: 2 UDT 91 VI 27'	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ulli-Peluk			ul-lí-pè-lu-uk	o/ull=i-pelo/uk(ki)		RA 19, S. 193 Nr. 10: 5	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ulli-Peluk			ul-lí-pè-li-ik	o/ull=i-pelo/uk(ki)		Hilgert 1998: 294 I 19	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ulli-Peluk			u-li-pè-lu-uk	o/ull=i-pelo/uk(ki)		Fs. Levine S. 115-119 IV 35	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Ulli-Peluk			ul-li-be-lí-uk	o/ull=i-pelo/uk(ki)		Fs. Levine S. 115-119 VIII 19	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ulli-Peluk			ul-li-pè-lu-úk	o/ull=i-pelo/uk(ki)		CST 507: 10	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Ultum-ḫuḫu			ul-tum-ḫu-ḫu	o/uld=o=m-ḫo/uḡo/u?		TM.75.G.1250 Obv, l 4	Nagar	Pre-Sargonic
Ulum-šen			ù-lum-še-in	o/ull=o=m-šen	The brother destroyed him	Zadok 1993:230	Unknown	Ur III
Unap-[...]			ú-na-ap-[...]	un=a=b-[...]		Zadok 1993:230	Ur	Ur III
Unap-[....]			ú-na-ap-[...]	un=a=b-[...]		Buccellati & Kelly-Buccellati 2002:25	Urkeš	Sargonic
Unap-atal			ú-na-pá-tal	un=a=b-adal	The strong came	Zadok 1993:228	Lagaš	Ur III
Unap-atal			ú-na-pá-tal	un=a=b-adal	The strong came	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Unap-atal			ú-na-pá-tal	un=a=b-adal	The strong came	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Unap-atal			ú-na-pá-tal	un=a=b-adal	The strong came	Zadok 1993:230	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Unap-atal			ú-na-ap-a-tal	un=a=b-adal	The strong came	Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Unap-kal			ú-na-ab-kal	un=a=b-kal(i)	Kali? came	TCL 5, 6039 Rs. III 6	Umma	Ur III
Unap-še			ú-na-ap-še	un=a=b-še	The brother came	Zadok 1993:227	Lagaš	Ur III
Unap-še			ú-na-ap-šè	un=a=b-še	The brother came	Zadok 1993:228	Lagaš	Ur III
Unap-šen			ú-na-ap-še-en ₆	un=a=b-šen	The brother came	Zadok 1993:230	Nippur	Ur III

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Unap-šen			ú-na-ap-še-en/en ₆	un=a=b-šen	The brother came	Zadok 1993:229	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Unap-šen			ú-n[a]-ap-[š]e-en ₆	un=a=b-šen	The brother came	Zadok 1993:230	Unknown	Ur III
Unap-šena			ú-na-ap-še-na	un=a=b-šena	The brother came	Westenholz 1975: 36, N ^o 47 V 4	Nippur	Sargonic
Unap-šena			[ú]-?-na-ap-[šè-na?]	un=a=b-šena	The brother came	MAD 4 167:17	Unknown	Sargonic
Unap-šeni			ú-[n]a-ap-šè-ni	un=a=b-šen(a)=ni	The brother came	Milano 1991 M2 1 I:3	Urkeš	Sargonic
Unap-tan	f		ú-na-ap-tan	un=a=b-tan	The maker? came	Zadok 1993:228	Umma	Ur III
Ur-Šauša			Ur- ^d ša-u ₁₈ -ša	Ur-ša(v)=o=š=ka		SAT 1 376 o.3	Lagaš	Ur III
Ur-Šauša			Ur- ^d ša-u ₁₈ -ša	Ur-ša(v)=o=š=ka		SAT 1 435 o.5	Lagaš	Ur III
Urib-at		?	ù-rí-ba-at	ur=i=b-at(?)		Zadok 1993:233	Unknown	Sargonic
Uškae			uz-ga-e	uška=(v)?e		Illingworth 1988:89	Nagar	Sargonic
Ušši			uš-ši	ušš=i	Go!	Foster 1982a: 353	Umma	Sargonic
Uššin			uš-ši-in			Nisaba 1, 243: 6; OrSP 18, 24 II 13	Umma	Ur III
Wirri			wi-ri / wi-ir-ri	firr=i	free/Liberty?	Al-Rawi 1992:184; IM 85455:9; 85456:5	Awal	Sargonic
Zamena	f	?	za-me-na			Buccellati & Kelly-Buccellati 1996b: 198	Urkeš	Sargonic

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
Zazi			za-zi			PDT 2, 922: 11, Rs. 18, 23	Puzriš-Dagan	Ur III
Zazum			za-zum / za-zu-um	zaž=o=m	He/She fed him	HSS 10, 35: 2; 108: 5; 145 III 6; 153 I 11, II 11; 154 V 11; 155 I 7; 157 I 7; 161: 22; 175 II 13	Gasur	Sargonic
Zike			zi-gi	zig=i		HSS 10, 187: 11	Gasur	Sargonic
Zikumi		?	zi-gu-um-e	zig=o=m-e?		Gelb 1944:105	Subir	Ur III
Zilia			zi-li-ia	zil=i=ya		Zadok 1993:224	Huʾurti	Ur III
Zilip-ewri			[z]i-li-ip-ri	zil=i=b-evri		FAOS 8, 32.	Simurram	Sargonic
Zira		?	zi-ra			Milano 1991 M2 2 V:8	Urkeš	Sargonic
Ziza[...]		?	zé?'za-[x]			Maiocchi 2011:197	Urkeš	Sargonic (Naram-Sin)
Zuzu		?	zu-zu-ù	zo/uzz=o		Catagnoti 1998:60	Ebla	Pre-Sargonic
Zuzu		?	zu-zu	zo/uzz=o		MAD 1 S. 228	Ešnunna	Sargonic
Zuzu		?	zu-zu-ù	zo/uzz=o		Catagnoti 1998:60	Gasur	Sargonic
Zuzu		?	zu-zu	zo/uzz=o		Zadok 1983: 96	Susa	Sargonic
Zuzu		?	zu-zu	zo/uzz=o		MAD 1 S. 228f.	Tutub	Sargonic
Zuzu		?	zu-zu	zo/uzz=o		Foster 1982a: 354	Umma	Sargonic

NAME	G	?	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE	DATE
ʔAwa-turi			ʔÀ-WA-tu-rí	av=i-turi	Man, save (him)!	Milano 1991 M2 2 V:11	Urkeš	Sargonic
			ʔaʔ¹-[d]a-ru-gu⁴-ḥu-ni			Maiocchi 2011:198	Urkeš	Sargonic (Naram-Sin)

HURRIAN PERSONAL NAMES IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE SECOND MILLENNIUM

The disposition of the archives has not been set on precise historical parameters because many sites have yielded documents from different periods (all within a certain range of time, i.e. Old Babylonian period). For this reason, we have arranged the distribution of the names according to regions or zones of influences from one central state.¹

The archives from Tuttul (Tell Bi'a) and Terqa (Tell 'Ašāra) have been set in connection with those from Mari (Tell Hariri) because of the geographical position and the political influence that this state had over them during the OB period.

The archives from Ašnakkum (Chagar Bazar), Karana (Tell Rimaḥ) and Šušārrā (Tell Šemšāra) have been arranged according to that of Šubat-Enlil (Tell Leilan).

The archives from Tigunāni, Ebla, Kaneš and Alalaḥ VII have been set independently.

¹ Liverani 2013: 224.

Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Mari

The Hurrian presence in the city of Mari (Tell Hariri) has not been attested solely through the PNs but also from the cuneiform tablets, written in Hurrian, unearthed at the room 108 of the palace of the city.¹ This set of tablets² represents, so far, the oldest testimony of the Hurrian language (in addition to the PNs) during the second millennium. The character of these texts could be classified as religious (five incantations and one hymn), except for one letter, which highlights the cultural value that the Hurrian population represented among the ANE populations.³ At the same time, it emphasises the connection that the Hurrians developed between religion and writing, in particular, because the majority of the documents that we possess in that language appertain to the cultic and religious sphere (magic and incantations).

However, the Hurrian presence at Mari is not only distinguished by its texts but especially by the vast amount of PNs.⁴ It is known that during the last centuries of the third millennium, the presence of Hurrian population, as well as kingdoms under their control, was significant throughout northern Mesopotamia.⁵ This situation, notwithstanding the Amorite phenomenon, continued during the second millennium. The archives from the royal palace of Mari have made particular reference to the existence of Hurrian towns and kingdoms throughout the territory of Syria (from the Middle and North Euphrates area) and Mesopotamia, as well as in the regions east of the Tigris and the Zagros (e.g. Purundum, Ḫaššum, Zarwar, Ašihum, Ḫaburātum,

¹ Gelb 1944: 62-63.

² Thureau-Dangin 1939; Laroche 1957; Salvini 1988b; Catsanicos 1989; Wegner 2004.

³ Kupper 1978: 117.

⁴ The vast majority of the Hurrian names appertain to the period of Yaḥdun-Lim and Zimri-Lim. A smaller quantity comes from the Assyrian interregnum and Sumu-Yaman.

⁵ Steinkeller 1998; Salvini 2000b.

Azuḫihum).⁶ In this way, the socio-cultural range of the kingdom of Mari, together with the areas that were under its political and economic control⁷ or had some kind of relationship, provides us with a vast number of individuals bearing Hurrian names that apparently lived under the supervision of the Amorite kingdom or were involved in different affairs with it. Therefore, the existence of such vast quantity of anthroponomys should not come as a surprise but rather as a portrait of the socio-cultural background.

A considerable amount of the individuals with Hurrian names did not enjoy economic or social prerogatives. They were often prisoners of war and seldom found in positions of responsibility.⁸ In their vast majority, they belonged to the lower social classes of the society⁹, and they fulfilled several labour functions: weavers belonging to the palace, slaves with different occupations, rural workers, rural slaves, fractionators, shepherds, water-drawers, brewers and wine-makers, millers and cooks among others.¹⁰ However, they were also associated, albeit to a lesser extent, with tasks that demanded certain social status: musicians (especially females), housekeepers, supervisors of large groups of workers, weaver supervisors, troop commander, diviners, officials from the palace or diplomats.¹¹ At the same time, Mari's archives have also revealed a no lesser number of Hurrian individuals who did not live under the control of the kingdom and who possessed a high social role: kings and governors (e.g. King of Ursum, Mardaman, Ka'at, Ḥaburātum, Azuḫinumor Eluḫut),¹² messengers sent from various cities (e.g. Ursum, Tupham, Ḥaššum),¹³ officers and diplomats.

⁶ Wilhelm 1989: 13.

⁷ Heimpel 2003: 7-ff.

⁸ Dalley 1980: 8.

⁹ Kupper 1978: 119-120.

¹⁰ Sasson 1974: 356.

¹¹ Sasson 1974: 356.

¹² Kupper 1978: 125-127.

¹³ Sasson 1974: 359, 369, 372.

Now, the entire onomasticon from the Mari archives¹⁴ reveals that the Hurrian component occupied the third position behind the West-Semitic/Amorite and Akkadian.¹⁵ This does not imply that all who happened to have Hurrian names belonged to such socio-cultural group, as it does not mean for those who had Amorites or Akkadians.¹⁶ However, it does show that the Hurrian element in the eighteenth-century Mari was considerably significant and that the interaction of the various cultural complexes (basically Amorites and Hurrians) was closer, probably much closer than what the texts have been revealing.¹⁷

§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Mari Texts

The Hurrian PNs from the Mari texts present significant changes compared to the onomastics of the third millennium. Regarding quantity, they overwhelmingly exceed those from the previous millennium,¹⁸ while regarding quality they represent substantial changes, particularly with respects to the theophoric elements. Furthermore, the close correlation that exists between the form and content with those of the Semitic sphere, particularly Amorite, is particularly appealing.¹⁹

¹⁴ According to Rasmussen (1981: 17), the Mari texts provided almost 6000 PNs, from which 9% correspond to Hurrians. However, these quantities should be increased because since 1981 numerous documents have been discovered and with that the number of anthroponyms. Additionally, recent studies (VHN) have identified more Hurrian PNs, previously omitted.

¹⁵ Kupper 1978: 119; Rasmussen 1981: 15.

¹⁶ Huffmon 1965: 17. For instance, the Akkadian PN Mašam, “twin”, belonged to a DUB.SAR.MAR.TU (ARM I.60.6), while the Amorite name [Y]a-si-im-^dIM belonged to a Gutian (ARM V.2.11’). However, for this period of the ANE, we still emphasise the existing and close relationship between a PN and the socio-cultural background of the individual, at least in its vast majority.

¹⁷ Kupper 1957: 231-232.

¹⁸ The Hurrian PNs from the Mari archives multiplies, at least, by 8 (ca. 2400 names from different individuals) those attested from the third millennium.

¹⁹ A detailed study contrasting the Semitic and Hurrian PNs from Mari could provide very interesting results. At a simple view, we find various names that seem to have the very same meaning (same verb and equal noun). For instance, compared the Semitic names with the verb ‘Išme+theophorous’ (e.g. Išme-Dagan, ‘Dagan has listened’) and the Hurrian ‘Ḫazip+ theophorous’, (Ḫazip-Teššup, ‘Teššup

§ Kinship

As regards to kinship, Hurrians anthroponyms, in general, express a wide variety of relationships with a high level of connotation among the PNs, a characteristic that is also frequent in the Semitic names from Mari.²⁰ The Hurrian word brother, ‘*šen-*’ is the most constant element of the third millennium (and most likely from the entire Hurrian onomasticon) as well as in the names from Mari.²¹ In addition to it, we find names that mention the figure of the sister, ‘*ela*’,²² the sibling, ‘*mena*’,²³ the father, ‘*atta*’,²⁴ probably the mother, ‘*nera*’,²⁵ as well as the feeling of kinship and closeness to the group they belong by bestowing names regarding brotherhood, sisterhood²⁶ and paternal relationship.²⁷ Another interest group of kinship names indicates the ‘history’ of the family regarding its descendants. These mention the number (e.g. the first,²⁸ the second,²⁹ the third³⁰) of the child and whether if it was masculine or feminine. Therefore, the names reflect the importance that kinship relationships had for the Hurrian society, something that could have also reproduced, at least in an early stage, the deities that configured the pantheon. It also shows that such elements could be reproducing certain ‘clan’ or ‘tribal’ character extended to the whole Hurrian society.

listened (him)’).

²⁰ Rasmussen 1981: *passim*.

²¹ E.g. Akap-šeni; Atal-šenni; Inib-šena; Kirip-šenni; Šatu-šenni; Šenāya; Taḥakka-šenni; Turip-šeni; Unap-še; Uštap-še.

²² E.g. ^fAkap-eli; ^fEla; ^fElalla; ^fElan-kiyaze; ^fElan-šaki; Elani; Kelib-elai; ^fMuzu-elli; ^fNawar-elli; ^fUnap-elli; ^fUrap-elli.

²³ E.g. Aka-menni; ^fItim-menni; ^fMenna; ^fMennatum; ^fMenninna; ^fNaḥar-me; Nawar-me; ^fTatum-menni; ^fTeḥiš-menni; ^fUtu-me. The word ‘*mēna*’ has also been translated as “Twin sister” (PDP 55: 400), however the English word ‘sibling’ renders more accurate (BGH 251).

²⁴ E.g. Arip-ḥuḥ(u) (?); Atta; Attakkuzzi; Katiš-ḥuḥ(u); Šḥlip-ḥuḥ(u); Šḥrum-ḥuḥ(u); Šiḥrum-ḥuḥ(u). (For ‘*ḥuḥ*’ as a word for father see BGH 161).

²⁵ Akap-ner(a).

²⁶ E.g. ^fElanza (sisterhood); Ḥanazzu (childhood?); ^fMennazze (siblinghood?); Šinurḫe (twin).

²⁷ ^fAttazze.

²⁸ Šukšeya.

²⁹ ^fNawar-šinza; Šenip-šarri; Šenze; ^fŠinenna; ^fŠinen-šalli; ^fŠinen-tari; ^fŠiniš-ewri; ^fŠiniš-tara.

³⁰ Šintap-šarri.

§ Expressive Names

A very interest group of Hurrian names is constituted by those who express wishes, desires, greetings, thanksgivings, request (commands), complaints, associative phrases, kinship information, endearment, or expresses a command or permission. This group is not usually clearly perceived in the names from the third millennium. However, paradoxically, it is also highly expanded among the Semitic names from Mari³¹ (see here, again, the connection between Hurrian and Semitic names). Within this, the parental figure, or other members of the family (e.g. siblings, uncles), becomes central. During childbirth, they were probably the ones who performed some kind of expression that later could have been part of the name of the new individual.

Among the group of wish and desire,³² we find several names where the parents or siblings invoke someone, most probably a deity or a divinised entity,³³ to save/rescue ('av-') the new-born.³⁴ The Hurrian-related documents, so far, make no mention of childbirth,³⁵ so we cannot be sure why the parents chose expressions of this kind. However, it is possible to infer that the origin of these expressions, later transformed in names, was due to the high rate of mortality among newborns in the ANE (as well as their mothers), particularly during childbirth or during the first months/year of life. Thus, a desire/wish of this kind is naturally understandable in any person and culture which seeks to perpetuate.

A set of PNs connected to the previous one, although with more precise intentions, is

³¹ See Huffmon 1965; Rasmussen 1981.

³² These groups of names are usually built in the optative (express the wish and desire of the speaker) and desiderative (it expresses the desire of the speaker) moods. See Campbel 2015: chaps. 6 and 9; VHN 603-ff.

³³ E.g. Naje, Muši, Tulla.

³⁴ E.g. Aweš-tari; Awiš-arra; Awiš-tehupe; Awiš-Tulla; Awiš-una; Awiš-uri; ^fAwiš-muši; ^fAwiš-Na.

³⁵ Despite the Song of Kumarbi which narrates the birth of Teššup and the remaining myths which narrate the birth or creation of different creatures.

the one that belongs to request or commands.³⁶ These are usually expressed in an imperative way so as to imprint a major character on the petition that is being issued. However, the directives express in the names (e.g. ‘deliver the second!’, ‘destroy something!’, ‘feed someone!’, ‘enlarge someone!’, ‘Save someone!’, ‘bring someone!’) are mostly a manifestation of fear or apprehension towards a situation that is being faced by the newborn than an imposition to any deity or divinised entity.

Another interest group is the one appertaining to the names that express greetings and thanksgivings. These were probably spoken at the time of birth by one of the parents³⁷ or siblings³⁸ and were bestowed according to the family status (members, sex, age, personal history, etc.).

On the contrary, there are also some names that express complaints or some regrets.³⁹ In the ANE, particularly in the Akkadian world, these types of PNs were borne by both sexes.⁴⁰ Thus, the reason to complain was not that the newborn was female but most probably, as happens with many other names, because of a particular sickness or affliction on the child or the mother. Consequently, names holding expressions such as ‘did not substitute (him)’, ‘destroyed (him)’, ‘did not speak’ or ‘does not exist’ are probably the utterance of frightened parents/siblings due to an unexpected situation.

Apart of these groups, we also have the characteristic Hurrian *Satznamen* (i.e. verb + subject [+ implicit/explicit object])⁴¹ that mostly convey a preterit expression of

³⁶ Awinni; ^fHalunna; Nain-muzni; Panti-Išhara; Puḥen; Šatu-šenni; Šeren-atal; ^fŠinen-šalli; ^fŠinen-tari; ^fTalme-ki; ^fTalmu-Ḥeba; ^fTawenna; Tawen-Šimeki; Ullu-ewri; ^fUru-Ḥeba; ^fUtul-me.

³⁷ ^fAkuya; ^fAna-kepali; Ariya; Eḥlip-Kaziyar; Eḥlip-Kuzuḥ; Eḥlum-rū’ī; Eniš-akum; Ḥazip-Kakka; Ḥazip-Kuzuḥ; Ḥazip-Na; Ḥazip-Nawar; Ḥazip-Šayu; Ḥaziya; Kelum-[...]; ^fKelum-kiyaze; Muzum; Muzum-Eni; Šazum-eni; Širiya; Takiya; Takuya; Tunniya; ^fUrap-elli.

³⁸ E.g. Kirip-šenni; ^fŠe[n-n]irze; Taḥakka-šenni; Uštap-še.

³⁹ Mannukka; Šatuk-atal; Šitip-šarri; Tašpir; Tašpuš-ulme; Turukkan; ^fUllum-ki; Ullum-tišti.

⁴⁰ Stamm 1939: 161-162.

⁴¹ We also have some names that correspond to the ‘inverted’ *Satznamen* group (i.e. subject+verb [+ explicit object]): Alla-tatum; Allaš-arum; Allaiš-arum.

endearment.⁴² These names were also probably thought during the moment of birth and were part of a distinct connection that the father, mother, or siblings, had with a particular entity, whether divinised or not. Among the most commons we find the verbs ‘provide (*tun-/tunn-*), liberate (*kir-*), save (*av-*), bring up/come up (*ag-*), give/deliver (*ar-*), provide health (*kel-*), hear (*haž-*), enter (*šēgl-*), ‘substitute’ (*šad-*), which in some way connects them with those from the greeting/thanksgiving group.

A further set of names is constituted by ‘associative phrases’ which subordinate the newborn with an entity (natural, metaphysics, divinised, human-built) or establish a link, whose background is not always easy to elucidate but probably refers to the progenitors. Those names that include divinised entities such as the sea,⁴³ mountain,⁴⁴ or those who refer to topographical places (Šuri, Canals, Punzi, Pazi, Keliya, Zalpuḥa),⁴⁵ might indeed reflect the origin, profession or destiny that the parents have for their offspring (apart from a clear religious connotation).

Moreover, Hurrians developed a type of name that intended to equate the newborn with an existing or known thing. These names use the preposition ‘like’ to establish the association between the child and, for instance, a bull-calf,⁴⁶ a friend,⁴⁷ or a *ḥabiru*.⁴⁸

The examples illustrated above demonstrate that the act of bestowing a name was not always preconceived nor predetermined. Those in charge of providing a name, usually the parents or the siblings, were sometimes subject to external interferences such as the

⁴² E.g. Akap-ewri; Akap-kišḥe; ^fAkap-kiyaze; Arip-mušni; Eḥlip-atal; Eḥlip-šarri; Ḥazip-šarri; Kelib-elai; ^fKelum-allai; Kirip-atal; Muzum-atal; Muzum-elli; Naḥḥap-atal; ^fŠatum-amumi; Šatum-atal; ^fŠatum-kiyaze; Šeḥlip-šarri; ^fTatum-menni; ^fTunip-mušni; Tunip-šarri; Turip-šeni; Turup-atal; Uštāp-atal.

⁴³ Elan-kiyaze; Uran-ki; Allae-Kiyazi; Kiyāše.

⁴⁴ Papaḥum; Papam; Papan; Papanna; Papanni; Papuzzi; Papāya.

⁴⁵ Alli-šuriḥu; Pelluwe; Punzue; Pazue; Keliyae, Pilluzzi; Zalpuḥe.

⁴⁶ Ḥupitam.

⁴⁷ Ezallam

⁴⁸ Ḥapiram.

moment of childbirth (during the labour and delivery), the health of the newborn (or the mother), the chances of surviving, the gratitude and attitude towards a divine or divinised figure, their past experiences and their social status. Thus, many aspects seem to have taken place before, during and after an individual was born, and many of these ended up reflecting the newborn's name.

§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names

At first glance, the Hurrian onomastic retrieved from the Mari texts is substantially different from the one of the third millennium, especially when it comes to the theophorics. The recurring appearance of previously unattested theophorous, particularly those that appertain to the highest structure of the pantheon, which have a macro-regional presence, is a salient fact. If our hypothesis concerning the changes inside of the pantheon is plausible, particularly during the transition between the third and second millennium, the reflection of these modifications, at least the most notorious, are clearly seen in the PNs.

§ Primary and Secondary Deities

As we recall, during the previous millennium Hurrian names only reflected the deities Teššup and Šawuška, and appeared only at the very end of the era. Thus, in the Mari texts, we also encounter the Hurrian storm-god forming several *Satznamen*,⁴⁹ but Šawuška is apparently absent.⁵⁰ Connected with the character of the figure of Teššup,

⁴⁹ [... r]it-Te; [...] -Teššup; [...] -Teš]šup; Arip-Teššup (5); Arum-Teššup; Atti-^dIM (Atti-Teššup); Eḫlip-Teššup; Ḫazip-Teššup (7); Kipam-Teššup; Kirip-Teššup; Nawar-Teššup; Pikum-Teššup; Šukrum-Teššup.

⁵⁰ The names Pazi-*IŠTAR*, ^f*IŠTAR*-šaki (3), Ḫazip-*IŠTAR* (2) and [...]ip-^d*IŠTAR* could be exceptions if read as Pazi-Šawuška (the first element, faž=i, could be interpreted as the verb 'bring/enter'), Šawuška-šaki and Ḫazip-Šawuška (ḫaž=i=b-šawoška 'Šawuška heard (him)'). However, at Alalah (both L. VII and IV) the sign *IŠTAR* (IŠ₈-TÁR), in the majority of the cases, also refers to Išḫara (VHN 405; Archi 2002: 32, fn. 60) Additionally, the Hurrian texts from Mari mention the deity Šawuška in an incantation performance (Thureau-Dangin 1939: 4, Text 1: 17), meaning that the goddess was present, or at least, taken into consideration in the religious sphere.

we also have two interest names: *Ewri-Addu* and *Matim-Addu*. In form, these are Hurrian-Semitic hybrids names. However, due to the connection between both deities (being storm-gods and chiefs of their respective pantheons), it would not be strange to be facing early attempts of equation. In fact, during the time of Zimri-Lim the main cult at Mari was that of the Storm-god *Addu* (^dIM), particularly that from Aleppo⁵¹. Thus, an attempt to combine both deities and their cults could have existed among the Hurrian population. Furthermore, names of this type but mentioning *Teššup* (i.e. *Matip-Teššup* and *Ewri-Teššup*) are found elsewhere in the Hurrian world.⁵²

Together with the head of the pantheon, the remaining Pan-Hurrian deities are also present: the moon-god *Kušuh*⁵³ and the sun-god *Šimika*,⁵⁴ both absents in the onomastics of the third millennium.

A second ‘layer’ of deities attested in the PNs appertains to the group of Hurrian gods whose cult importance fluctuated according to the area: *Ḫebat*,⁵⁵ *Šalaš*⁵⁶ and *Allani*.⁵⁷ These names are the oldest onomastic attestation that we possess, at least from a Hurrian background. However, they present some issues that should be addressed.

In the case of *Ḫebat*, as it has been demonstrated,⁵⁸ she was not originally a Hurrian deity but the goddess from *Ḫalab*,⁵⁹ associated to the so-called substratum.⁶⁰ The deity is completely absent in the Hurrian sources from the third millennium. Thus, if we base

⁵¹ Trémouille 1997: 50.

⁵² The name *Mati-Teššup* is well attested in Nuzi (NPN 97, ANN I 92; Deller 1981: 482) as well as *Ewri-Teššup* (ANN 47).

⁵³ *Arip-ku[šuh]*; *Arim-Kušuh*; *Eḫlip-Kušuh*; *Ḫazip-Kušuh* (3); *Kušuh-...*; *Kušuh-[...]*; *Kušuh-atal* (6); *Kušuh-ewri*; *Kušuh-šarri*.

⁵⁴ *Arip-Šimika*; *Ḫazip-Šimika*; *Ḫazip-Šimike*; *Inib-Šimika* (2) (*i-ni-ib-^dUD*); *Nawar-Šemike*; *Šime(ki)-takup* (?); *Tawen-Šimeki*.

⁵⁵ ^f*Allai-Ḫebat*; ^f*Talmu-Ḫebat*; ^f*Uru-Ḫebat*; *Uḫiriš-Ḫebat*; ^f*Men-Ḫepat*.

⁵⁶ ^{fd}*Šalaš-tappi*; ^{fd}*Šalaš-turiya*. The first of these names is semitic (‘*Šalaš* is my friend’), as well as the name ^f*Ipqu-^dšala(š)* (2) (‘Grace of *Šalaš*). However, the second is more likely to be analysed as Hurrian (*Šalaš-to/ur=i=ya*; ‘*Šalaš* brought (him) away?’)

⁵⁷ ^f*Išmen-Allani*; ^f*Allanni*.

⁵⁸ Trémouille 1997.

⁵⁹ *Archi* 1994: 249-252.

⁶⁰ *Archi* 1998a: 42.

and extrapolate our knowledge from the onomastic sphere, we find the oldest attestation linked to the Hurrian world in the Mari texts.⁶¹ This does not necessarily mean that the Hurrians incorporated this deity into their religious system at Mari. However, Ғebat was already associated, most probably his consort, with the Storm-god of Ғalab, *Addu*,⁶² whose connection with Teššup is evident (see above). Thus, the assimilation/integration of Ғebat (a deity whose characters and features could not be akin to any other original Hurrian deity) could be understood as part of the re-shaping of the Hurrian pantheon, which the onomastics from Mari reassembles.

The goddess Šalaš experiences a similar situation to that of Ғebat. She is also attested in the Ebla texts from the third millennium (at least four times in the form *Šalaša/Šāša*)⁶³ but as a minor deity (she is completely absent from the official cult list of sheep offerings)⁶⁴ related to the god *Wada'anu*. However, she acquired a relatively prominent position in the pantheon as well as in the cults, despite not being Hurrian in origin.⁶⁵ The PNs bearing this theonym at Mari are relatively scarce (at least three different), and only one can be interpreted as Hurrian.

The last deity of this group is indeed of Hurrian origin and corresponds to the well-known goddess of the underworld (later associated with the Mesopotamian Ereškigal) identified as 'Allani'. Her name derives from the word 'lady, mistress, queen' (*alla=(n)i*),⁶⁶ and, as it happens with the case of Šawuška, is an epithet.⁶⁷ Her presence beyond the Hurrian world was already attested during the Ur III period where she was worshipped at the court under the name *Allatum* (its Akkadian form), and probably had

⁶¹ Despite the reserves that Trémouille (1997: 50-51) has raised regarding the presence of this deity in Mari. See Rasmussen (1981:62) for the Semitic PNs from Mari bearing Ғebat.

⁶² Archi 1998: 42.

⁶³ Archi 1995: 2. A text from Ebla keeps record of Šalaš being venerated at the city of Tuttul (TM.75.G.1771).

⁶⁴ Archi 1995: 1.

⁶⁵ For a brief account of Šalaš history see Archi 1995; Schwemer 2008a, 2008b.

⁶⁶ BGH 12; VHN 369.

⁶⁷ VHN 370.

a temple or shrine of its own at Ur.⁶⁸ In Mari, the occurrence of this deity was not simply restricted to the very few cases in the onomastics (two), but it also appears in the Hurrian incantation texts against snakebite.⁶⁹ Thus, it is not strange but on the contrary foreseeable to find her theophorous among the many other goddesses that Hurrians worshipped.

Another particular group of theophorous correspond to the goddess Išhara,⁷⁰ frequently connected with the Hurrian world, especially since the *Song of Release*. However, this deity was originally the main goddess from the city of Ebla (belonging to the so-called substratum)⁷¹ and had entered Mari's onomastics already during Ur III period,⁷² though not through the Hurrian hand.⁷³ Therefore, the vast majority of the theophorous that carry this deity are mostly Semitic,⁷⁴ with the exceptions of *Panti-Išhara* and *Tupki-Išhara*, which are clearly Hurrian. From this, it would not be premature to consider that Hurrians added Išhara into their pantheon, roughly, during the same time they did it with Šalaš and Ḫebat, the three being ancient goddesses attested in the Ebla pantheon from the third millennium.

A very interest and peculiar group of PNs concerns the god Ukur,⁷⁵ frequently associated with the underworld. The logogram ^dU.GUR has usually been attributed to the god Nergal.⁷⁶ In origin, Ukur was Nergal's vizier, who after the Old Babylonian

⁶⁸ Sharlach 2002: 99.

⁶⁹ Thureau-Dangin 1939: 4, Text 1: 16.

⁷⁰ ^{fd}Išhara-asīya; ^{fd}Išhara-damqa; ^{fd}Išhara-dannat; ^{fd}Išhara-dumqī; ^{fd}Išhara-gumlī; ^{fd}Išhara-^dLamassī; ^{fd}Išhara-malaki; ^{fd}Išhara-naḫme; ^{fd}Išhara-napši; ^{fd}Išhara-nīri; ^{fd}Išhara-samrati; ^{fd}Išhara-^dšamši; ^{fd}Išhara-šarrat; ^{fd}Išhara-šeme'at; ^{fd}Išhara-šulume; ^{fd}Išhara-tašbam; ^{fd}Išhara-taskup; ^{fd}Išhara-ummī; ^{fd}Ummi-Išhara; ^{fd}Ḫabdu-^dIšhara; ^{fd}Idin-^dIšhara; ^{fd}Nūr-^dIšhara; ^{fd}Ummī-^dIšhara. ^{fd}Panti-^dIšhara; ^{fd}Tupki-^dIšhara.

⁷¹ Archi 2002: 27, 31.

⁷² Owen 1992: 129.

⁷³ In fact, Išhara's cult had already spread from Ebla to Babylonia during the Akkadian period as it is revealed by the Sargonic theophorous ^dÁš-ḫa-ra or the Old Akkadian love incantation dedicated to Ištar as well as to Išhara (Archi 2002: 29).

⁷⁴ For Semitic analysis of Išhara theophorous see Rasmussen 1982: 80-81, 108, 144.

⁷⁵ [...] ^dUkur; Arip-Ukur (6); Awi-Ukur; Ḫazip-Ukur; Panti-Ukur; Tizeḫe-Ukur; Ukur-atal (4).

⁷⁶ Krebernik 2014.

period came to be replaced by Ḫendursanga/Išum. From then onwards, the logogram ^dU.GUR became the spelling for Nergal,⁷⁷ while the word ‘*uqur*’ (Akkadian *namšāru*) remained associated to Nergal’s dagger/sword.⁷⁸ However, how did the name/theophorous Ukur end up in the Hurrian onomastic?⁷⁹

According to some authors, the element ‘*atal*’ (strong) found in many Hurrian sovereigns is an epithet that indicates or refers to the god Nergal.⁸⁰ Thus, the presence of *Ukur*, the name of Nergal’s dagger/sword which later became personified as his vizier, is a natural consequence of the connection between Nergal and Hurrian kings. However, this hypothesis has been based on an incorrect interpretation of the Tiš-atal inscription where the logogram for the Sumerian god Nergal (^dKIŠ.GAL) is mentioned, which in fact refers to Kumarbi.⁸¹ Therefore, if we consider that for some reason Hurrians equated, though without assimilation, Kumarbi with Nergal, including all its attributes, the PNs bearing the element ‘*ukur*’ could in fact be related, through the use of an epithet, to Kumarbi. It is important to highlight that Hurrians were very keen on the use of epithets while referring to deities (e.g. Šawuška,⁸² Allani,⁸³ Kumarbi⁸⁴) so the use of *Ukur* as another epithet for Kumarbi could be considered.⁸⁵

In connection with the previous statement, the onomastic from Mari reveals one of the few examples of the entire Hurrian onomasticon corresponding to Kumarbi’s

⁷⁷ Wiggermann 1999a: 216.

⁷⁸ Wiggermann 1999b: 224.

⁷⁹ The theophorous Ukur is not only restricted to the Hurrian onomastic from Mari but it also appears in numerous names from Nuzi (NPN 29,42, 58, 66,76, 82, 88, 103, 148, 162, 171, 179) and in Šemšārā (Šemšārā 1: 169 and Šemšārā 2: 99).

⁸⁰ Trémouille 2000: 132.

⁸¹ Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 2009: 62-ff. For skeptical view of this reading see Wilhelm 2015: 418.

⁸² ‘The Great One’. See Wegner 1995.

⁸³ ‘The Lady’.

⁸⁴ ‘(That) from (the city of) Kummar’.

⁸⁵ For a different interpretation see Richter 2001: 568-569.

theophorous.⁸⁶ This deity, which ruled the pantheon during the third millennium and starred many of the most important Hurrian myths, could not be completely ignored from the PNs. However, the names from Mari⁸⁷ could have probably been reminiscences of the past, which did not take long to disappear from the onomastics.

Another secondary deities that appear are Šeriš⁸⁸ and Tašmiš(u),⁸⁹ both related to the realm of the storm-god. The first is one of the bulls (together with Hurwiš or Tilla) that draw the four-wheeled chariot ridden by Teššup,⁹⁰ while the latter corresponds to Teššup's vizier and brother, an active character together with the storm-god in many of the mythological narratives.⁹¹

Lastly, the Mari texts reveal two PNs which refer to Kubaba, from which one could be Hurrian.⁹² This goddess was also incorporated by the Hurrians to its pantheon,⁹³ despite supposedly being originally from the city Karkemiš.⁹⁴

§ Minor Deities

Besides the more 'relevant' deities from the Hurrian pantheon, at least as far as literature (particularly myths, rituals, incantations) concerns, the PNs from Mari reveal an important amount of what it seems to be 'minor' (local/regional) deities. By 'minor' we do not intend to diminish their importance but to set a parameter inside the official pantheon as to the place that each god occupied. These deities are poorly known from the texts, which could be a reflection of their role in society, particularly within the

⁸⁶ Arip-Kumarwe (2); Kumarwe-atal; Kumarwe-ewri.

⁸⁷ At Šubat-Enlil there is another individual bearing the name Arip-Kumarwe (see the *Tell Leilan PNs Annex*).

⁸⁸ Kirip-Šerriš (3).

⁸⁹ Tašmiš; f[...]-Tašmiš.

⁹⁰ Wilhelm 1989: 50. Richter 2001: 566, fn.17.

⁹¹ Taracha 2009: 84.

⁹² 'fKupapuzzi' could be interpreted as Hurrian (Kubaba is reasonable/appropriate), but 'Ḫaya-Kubaba' is less likely to be.

⁹³ Popko 1995: 98.

⁹⁴ Laroche 1960b; Hawkins 1981, 1980-1983.

social groups that worshipped them. However, they represent a very significant group among the onomastics from Mari.

The most attested theophorous corresponds to the deity Naye and its hypocoristic ‘Na’.⁹⁵ The information regarding this deity is almost inexistent despite being a very common theonym among the Hurrian onomastics of the first half the second millennium.⁹⁶ At Mari, the individuals bearing this theophorous are mostly woman who belonged to the lower classes (mostly weavers and one musician). The second most attested theophorous appertains to Kepali,⁹⁷ although it is difficult to assure if we are dealing with a deity or a simple noun.⁹⁸ The remaining theophorous belong to several (possible) deities: Ala,⁹⁹ Hurmiš,¹⁰⁰ Hurpi,¹⁰¹ Kaziyar,¹⁰² Kelti,¹⁰³ Kulmiš,¹⁰⁴ Pišaiš,¹⁰⁵ Šantalluk,¹⁰⁶ Šayu,¹⁰⁷ Šuriḫe,¹⁰⁸ Taya,¹⁰⁹ Teḫupe,¹¹⁰ Tulla,¹¹¹ Yazī.¹¹²

§ Divinised Entities

The presence of divinised entities is particularly significant in the Hurrian names from

⁹⁵ f[...]-Naye; f[...]Naye; [...u]p-Naye; fAlla-Naye; fAttap-Na (2); fAttap-Naye; fAwiš-Na (5); fAzza-Naye; fElip-Naye; fElul-Na (2); fḪazip-Na; Innu-Naye; fKuniš-Na(?); fKunuš-Na; Ilip-Naye; fMaška-Naye; fNaktum-Naye; fNanip-Naye; fNeniš-Naye; fNupin-Naye; fŠatam-Naye; fŠatum-Na; fŠatum-Naye (3); fŠeḫra-Naye; fŠelwi(?)-Na (2); fŠerum-Naye (5); fŠerwi(?)-Na; fŠiḫlum-Naye; fTaḫiz-Na; fTalmēš-Na; fTieš-Naye; fTulup-Na; fTulup-Naye; fTuza-Na (2); fTuza-Naye; fUnuš-Na; fUnuš-Naye (3); fZazza-Naye; Zazza-Naye.

⁹⁶ VHN 461-462. It also appears in the onomastics from Šubat-Enlil, Ašnakkum and Tell al-Rimah (see the corresponding PNs annexes). See also its presence in Nuzi (NPN 18, AAN 22).

⁹⁷ [A]naš(?)-kepal; Ama-kepal; Ana-kepal; Anaš-kepal; Aniš-kepal (4); fApa-kepal; Iniš-Kepal(i).

⁹⁸ VHN 439.

⁹⁹ fAštu-Ala; fḪawin-Ala.

¹⁰⁰ Arip-Ḫurmiš (2), Ḫurmiš-atal, . This deity seems to come from the city of Ḫurmiš. See VHN 423-424.

¹⁰¹ Aniš-Ḫurpi.

¹⁰² Eḫlip-Kaziyar.

¹⁰³ Tazap-Kelti (5).

¹⁰⁴ Arip-Kulmiš (2). This deity seems to come from the city of Kulmiš. See VHN 444-445.

¹⁰⁵ Arip-Pišaiš (3). This deity is connected with a mountain. See Trémouille 2000: 126.

¹⁰⁶ Šantalluk.

¹⁰⁷ Ḫazip-Šayu; Tunip-Šayu (2).

¹⁰⁸ Alli-šuriḫu.

¹⁰⁹ Ulluš-Taya.

¹¹⁰ Awiš-Teḫupe (2).

¹¹¹ Awiš-Tulla.

¹¹² Awi-Yazi.

Mari (almost ten percent of the individuals mentioned in the texts bore one). The most common element is the name related to the ‘Sea’ (kiyaze) and its hypocoristic (Ki),¹¹³ followed by the divinised figure of the the mountain,¹¹⁴ the city of Nawar¹¹⁵ and the Tigris River.¹¹⁶ The remaining names bear the elements for the ‘Sky’ (ḥawur),¹¹⁷ the city of ‘Kumme’,¹¹⁸ and, probably, the town of ‘Ašihē’,¹¹⁹ and Ikar.¹²⁰

§ Common Theophoric Elements

The last group of names is the most common throughout the entire Hurrian onomastic (including the third and second millennium). These names bear the common theophorous elements ‘Atal-’ (strong),¹²¹ ‘Šarri-’ (godking),¹²² ‘Ewri-’ (lord),¹²³

¹¹³ [...]en-kiyaze; [...]un-kiya[ze]; [...y]ap(?)-ki; [...]...an-kiyaše; †Ašmun-kiyaze; †Akap-kiyaze (5); Allae-Kiyazi; †Elan-kiyaze; †Amman-kiyazi (5); †Ammen-ki; †Azum-ki; †Elum-kiyaze; †Enam-ki (3); †Kašme-ki; †Kelum-kiyaze (4); †Kisen(?)-ki; Kiyāše; †Mati-ki; †Meme-kiyaze; †Memen-ki; †Memen-kiyazi (3); †Muḥrum-kiyaze; †Pazu-ki; Pirḥen-kiyaze (3); †Pulum-kiyaze (3); †Šattam-ki (4); †Šattam-kiyazi (2); †Šattum-ki; †Šattum-kiyaze; †Šawlum-ki (2); Šawlum-kiyaze; †Šerwi(?)-ki; †Šušan-ki (3); Taki-ki; Talme-ki; †Talmiš-ki; †Talmuš-kiyaze (2); †Taprum-kiyaze; Tati-ki; Tazi-ki; †Tešen-ki; †Tišan-ki; †Tita-ki; †Tiz-kiyaze; †Ullum-ki; †Una-ki; Unap-kiyaze; †Unuš-ki; †Unuš-kiyaze (12); †Ura-ki; †Uran-ki

¹¹⁴ Papan; Papan (5); Papanna; †Papanni (2); Papanni; Papan-šarri; Papan-taḥe (3); Papāya.

¹¹⁵ [...]mi-Nawar; [...]šep(?)-Nawar; Arip-Nawar (6); Elap-Nawar; Ḥazip-Nawar (6); (Ḥ)abdu-Nawar (2); Mut-Nawar; Nawar-[-...]; Nawar-a[-...]; †Nawar-amume; Nawar-arum; †Nawar-atal; †Nawar-elli (2); Nawar-ewri; Nawar-k[iyaze(?)]; †Nawar-Kanazzi (5); Nawar-kiazi; Nawar-me; †Nawar-nišḥe; Nawar-šarri (2); †Nawar-šinza; Nawar(-)zu; Šukrum-Nawar; Tiša-Nawar; Ummī-Nawar; Zilip-Nawar; Zillip-Nawar.

¹¹⁶ Aranzaḥ; Aranzaḥ-atal (2); Aranzi; Aranziḥ-atal (5); Aranziḥ-ewri (2); Elap-Araz(z)uḥ; Ḥazip-Aranziḥ (6); Kirip-Aranziḥ.

¹¹⁷ Eḥlip-ḥawur.

¹¹⁸ Kummen-atal.

¹¹⁹ Talmu-ašihē. On this see VHN 383.

¹²⁰ Memen-Igar.

¹²¹ [...]šu-atal; [...]š[en(?)]-atal; [Eḥ]lip-atal; A...-atal; A[...]-atal; Alpu-atal; Arim-atal; Arraph(a)-atal; Arum-atal; Atal-ewri (3); Atal-šarri (3); Atal-šenni (2); Atal-paḥar; Atal-širi; Atalal; Atalli; Eḥlip-atal; Elap-atal; Ewri-atal (2); Ḥalum-atal; Ḥazip-atal (3); Ḥellip-atal; Ḥurmiš-atal; [Eḥ]lip-atal; Kelum-atal; Ki...-atal; Kinum-atal; Kirip-atal; Kulpi-atal; Masum-atal (2); Memen-atal; Muzan-atal; Muzum-atal; Naḥḥap-atal; Nupar-atal; Patum-atal; Pirḥen-atal (2); Pirkun-atal; Šarri-atal; †Šattam-(a)tal; Šatuk-atal; Šatum-atal (2); Šazum-atal; Šehlip-atal; Šehren-atal; Šeren-atal; †Šilum-atal; Šum-atal; Šum-atal; Taḥašḥ(e)-atal; Taripen-atal; Tawen-atal; Teḥ-atal; Teḥum-atal; Telum-atal; Tišwen-atal (3); Tuḥn-atal; Tulup-atal; Turip-atal (2); Turup-atal; Unap-atal (2); Uštup-atal.

¹²² Akap-šarri; Akip-šarri; Altip-šarri; Anni-šar; Arip-šarri; Arum-šar[ri]; Atal-šarri (3); Eḥlip-šarri (3); Ewri-šarri (2); Ḥazip-šarri (4); Inib-šarri; Kelip-šarri; Kinip-šarri; Kirip-šarri (2); Mime-šarri; Nanip-šarri (3); Nikir-šarri (2); Nupar-šarri (3); Paip-šarri (2); Papan-šarri; Partip-šarri; Pirtup-šarri; Pulum-šarri; Šatum-šarri; Šazum-šarri; Šehlip-šarri; Šenip-šarri; Šewen-šarri; Šewum-šarri; Šimiš(?)-šarri;

‘Mušni-’ (Righteous),¹²⁴ ‘Alla(=i)’ (Lady),¹²⁵ ‘Eni-’ (generic god figure),¹²⁶ ‘Ulme-’ (female servant),¹²⁷ ‘Tišni-’ (Heart),¹²⁸ as well as the less common ‘Arde-’ (divinised city)¹²⁹ and ‘Kešhe-’ (divinised throne).¹³⁰

The Hurrian PNs retrieved from the Mari texts have revealed a very good example (so far the best) of the onomastic scenario that this socio-cultural group had during this part of the millennium. We encounter different anthroponomys in both form and content, revealing a much wider outlook of the possibilities that Hurrians had at the time of bestowing names. However, much of the complexity and difficultness that presents such setting is still under work not only because of the knowledge of the language but also from the internal practices of this socio-cultural group, which are still poorly known. In any case, the study of onomastics have revealed different aspects, previously unnoticed, which could contribute to enhance our current understanding of this group.

Šintap-šarri (2); Šitip-šarri; Tunip-šarri; Tunum-šarri; Unap-šarri (3); Ušan-šarri; Zilip-šarri.

¹²³ [...]-ewri (3); Akap-ewri (2); Atal-ewri (3); Ewr[i(-...)]; Ewri (3); Ewri-Addu; Ewri-atal (2); Ewri-kipa (7); Ewri-muza (5); Ewri-šarri (2); Ewri-talma (3); Ewri(-)[...]; Ĥitar-ewri; Kirip-ewri; Kiza...-ewri; Kukku(?) -ewri; Nanip-ewri; Nupar-ewri (5); Pawena(?) -ewri; ^fŠima-ewri; Šimiš-ewri (2); ^fŠiniš-ewri (2); Ullu-ewri.

¹²⁴ ^f[A-ri]-ip-mušni; ^fArip-alla (3); Arip-mušni; Arip-mušni/muzu; ^fAwiš-muši (2); Ewri-muza (5); Ĥazip-muš[ni](?); Nain-muzni; Tunip-mušni.

¹²⁵ ^f[...-a]llai; ^fAllae-mata; ^fAllai(-)zu (2); ^fAllai-aznu; ^fAllai-nanla; ^fAllaiš-arum (2); ^fAllaš-arum (3); ^fAllaš-arum (2); ^fAlla-tatum; Allawe (3); Allazar; ^fAllazari (2); ^fAlli-kanza; ^fAlli-kipra; ^fAlli-turaḥ (2); ^fAlli-turaḥe (2); ^fAlli-wati; ^fKelum-allai; ^fKitum-allai.

¹²⁶ Azzun-enni; Eniš-akum (4); Šazum-eni; Tamakum-eni (2); Tekauš-en; Ukkun-enni (2).

¹²⁷ [...]rip-ulme; Ĥazip-ulme; Iniš-ulme; Kirip-ulme; Nanip-ulme; Tašpuš-ulme; Tiš-ulme; Ulme-xx; Ulmi-[...].

¹²⁸ [...-t]ižni(?); Aka-tišan; Ullum-tišni.

¹²⁹ Šattum-arte.

¹³⁰ Akap-kišhe.

List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts From Mari

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
... aš-tupki				x-aš-tu-up-ki			VHN 346
...ap-atal				x-x-ap-a-da-al			VHN 343
...ewri(?)				x-ew(?) -ri			VHN 344
[... r]it-Te				[...-r]i-it-te	[...r]=i=b>t-Te		VHN 346
[...]...[n]e-kanazzi				[x]-x-[n]e-ka-na-zi			VHN 344
[...]...al-tari				[...]x-al-ta-ar-e			VHN 346
[...]...ap-atal				[x-x]-x-ap-a-tal			VHN 343
[...]...ap-elli				[...]x-ap-e-li			VHN 343
[...]...-atal				[...]x-a-tal			VHN 343
[...]...-elli				[...]x-e-li			VHN 343
[...]...-kanazzi				[...]x-ka-na-zi			VHN 344
[...]...-Naye	f?			[...]x-na-ie			VHN 345
[...]...-paḥal				[...]x-ḥa-ba-al			VHN 345
[...]...-peluk(!)				[...]x-be-lu(!)-uk			VHN 345
[...]...-taḥḥe				[...]x-ta-aḥ-ḥe			VHN 345

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
[...]an-taḥe				[...]-an-ta-ḥe			VHN 345
[...]ap-še				[...]-ap-še			VHN 345
[...]atal				[...]-a-tal			VHN 343
[...]en-kiyaze				[...]-en-ki-ia-ze			VHN 344
[...]ewri			3	[...]-ew-ri / [...]-ib-ri			VHN 343
[...]iš-menni				[...]-iš-me-ni	[...]=i=ž-men(a)=ni		VHN 345
[...]menna				[...]-me-en-na			VHN 344
[...]menni	f			[...]-me-ni	[...]-men(a)=ni		VHN 344
[...]men-pattae				[...]-me-en-pa-da-e	[...]-patt(i)=ae		VHN 345
[...]mi-Nawar				[...]-mi-na-wa-ar			VHN 345
[...]Naye	f?			[...]-na-ie			VHN 345
[...]rip-ulme				?			VHN 347
[...]šep(?) -Nawar				[...]-še(?) -ep-na-wa-ar			VHN 345
[...]šu-atal				[...]-šu-a-tal			VHN 343
[...]Tašmiš	f			[...]-ta-aš-mi-iš			VHN 346

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
[...]-Teššup				[...]-te-eš-šu-up			VHN 346
[...]-tukki				[...]-tu-uk-ki			VHN 346
[...]-tupki				[...]-tu-up-ki			VHN 346
[...]-turaḥḥe	f			[...]-tu-ra-ḥe			VHN 346
[...]- ^d Ukur				[...]- ^d u-gur			VHN 347
[...]-um(-)mini				[...]-x-um-mi-ni			VHN 347
[...]-um-tišni				[...]-ú-um-ti-iš-ni			VHN 346
[...]-un-kiya[ze]				[...]-un(?) -ki-ia-[...]			VHN 344
[...]-us-tuk				[...]-úš-tu-uk			VHN 346
[...]-zuzari				[...]-zu-za-ri			VHN 347
[...]-a)l)lai	f?			[...]-a)l-la-i			VHN 343
[...]-a)p-taḥe				[...]-a)p-ta-ḥe			VHN 345
[...]-k)anazzi				[...]-k)a-na-zi			VHN 344
[...]-š)en(?) -atal				[...]-š)e(?) -en-a-tal			VHN 343
[...]-t)išni(?)				[...]-iš-ni			VHN 346

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
[...-Teš]šup				[...-te(?)]-š]u-up			VHN 346
[...u]p-Naye				[...-u]p-na-ie			VHN 345
[...y]ap(?) -ki	f?			[...-i]a(?) -ap-gi			VHN 344
[...]-...an-kiyaše	f			[...]-x-an-ki-ia-še			VHN 344
[...]-ħašme	f			[...]-ħa-aš-me			VHN 344
[...]ip- ^d lštar				[...] - ^d ip- IŠ ₈ -TÁR			VHN 343
[A]naš(?) -kepal				[...]-na-aš-ke-ba-al	[a]n(?)=a=ž-kebal(i)		VHN 344
[Wa]reš-tipunni	f			[...]-re-eš-di-pu-ni	far(?)=i=ž-tibonni		VHN 346
(<i>ħ</i>) <i>abdu-Nawar</i>		H/S	2	ħa-ab-du-na-w[a-ar] / ab-du-na-wa-ar	<i>ħabdu-Navar</i>	Servant of Nawar	ARM XVI/1:95
[A]ttezuya	f?			[a]t-te-zu-ia			VHN 91
[A]ttuya				[a]t-tu-ia	att=o=ya		VHN 92
[A-ri]-ip-mušni	f			[a-ri]-ip-mu-uš-ni	ar=i=b=mužni	The righteous gave (him)	Sasson 1974:373
[Eħl]ip-atal				[eħ-l]i-ip-a-dal	eğl=i=b-adal	The strong saved (him)	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:89
[Š]ere[n-...]				[š]e-re-e[n-...]	šer=i=n(na)-[...]		VHN 276
[T]apuš-anni	f			[t]a-pu-úš-an-ni	tab=o=ž-anni		VHN 298

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
[T]awen[...]	f			[t]a-we-en-[...]	tav=i=n[(na)-...]	Pour it!	VHN 297
A[...]-atal				a-x-x-a-tal	a[...]-adal		VHN 93
A[...]-atal				a-[...]-a-tal	a[...]-adal		VHN 93
A[...]-tuk				a[...]-to/uk			VHN 93
Aḥar-[...]	f			a-ḥa-ar-[...]	aḡ=ar-[...]		VHN 39
Aḥar-me				aḥ-ar-me	aḡ=ar-me		VHN 39
Aḥar-me	f			aḥ-ar-me	aḡ=ar-me		VHN 39
Aḥar-menni	f			a-ḥa-ar-me-en-ni	aḡ=ar-men(a)=ni		VHN 39
Aḥ-šena	f			aḥ-še-na	aḡ-šena		VHN 39
Ak[ap-p]anazzi	f			a-g[a-ap-p]a-na-zi	ag=a=b-panazzi	Panazzi came up	VHN 40
Akakka				a-ga-ag-ga	ag=a=kk=a		ARM XVI/1:52
Akakka	f			a-ga-ka	ag=a=kk=a		VHN 40
Aka-menni				a-ga-me-ni	ag=a=∅-men(a)=ni	The sibling came up	VHN 40
Akap-[...]				a-ga-ap-[...]	ag=a=b-[...]		VHN 44
Akap-a[...]				a-ga-ap-a-[...]	ag=a=b-a[...]		VHN 40

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Akapān				a-ga-ba-an	ag=a=b=ān	He/She came up	VHN 40
Akapaya			2	a-ga-ba-ia	ag=a=b=aya	He/She came up	VHN 40
Akap-eli	f		7	a-ga-ap-e-li	ag=a=b-el(a)=ni	The sister came up	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:52
Akap-ewri			2	a-ga-ap-ew-ri	ag=a=b-evri	The lord came up	VHN 41
Akap- <i>ʾiḡīr</i>		H/S		a-ga-ap-i-di-ir	ag=a=b- <i>ʾiḡīr</i>	The saviour came up	VHN 41
Akap-kišḡe				a-ga-ap-ki-iš-ḡe	ag=a=b-kešḡe	The throne came up	VHN 42
Akap-kiyaze	f		5	a-ga-ap-ki-ia-ze	ag=a=b-kiyaže	The sea came up	VHN 41
Akap-ner/nir				a-ga-ap-NI-IR	ag=a=b-ner(a)/nir(i)	The mother/good came up	VHN 42
Akap-šarri				a-ga-ap-šar-ri	ag=a=b-šarri	The godking came up	VHN 42
Akap-še			3	a-ga-ap-še	ag=a=b-še	The brother came up	VHN 42
Akap-šeni				a-ga-ap-še-ni	ag=a=b-šen(a)=ni	The brother came up	VHN 42
Akap-taḡe			2	a-ga-ap-ta-ḡe	ag=a=b-taḡe	The man came up	Kupper 1978:125; ARM XVI/1:52
Aka-tišan				a-ga-ti-ša-an	ag=a=∅-tiša=n(na)	The heart came up	VHN44
Akaya			4	a-ga-ia	ag=a=ya	He/She came up	VHN 39
Akaya	f			a-ka-ia	ag=a=ya	He/She came up	ARM XVI/1:56

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Akipān				a-ki-pa-an	ag=i=b=ān		VHN 46
Akip-šarri				a-ki-ip-LUGAL	ag=i=b-šarri	The godking brought (him) up	VHN 46
Akira	f		3	a-ki-ra	agir(i)=a		Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:56
Akiya			8	a-ki-ia	ag=i=ya	He/She brought up	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:57
Akiyān			2	a-ki-ia-an	ag=i=ya=ān		Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:57
Akiyānum				a-ki-ia-nu-um	ag=i=ya-ānum		ARM XVI/1:57
Akka			2	ak-ka	akk=a		ARM XVI/1:57
Akkakka	f			ak-ka-ak-ka	akk=a=kk=a		VHN 40
Akki(?)				ak(?)-ki	akk=i	Bring (him) up!	VHN 46
Akku	f			ak-ku	akk=o	Bring (him) up!	VHN 47
Akkukki			2	ak-ku-uk-ki	akk=o=kk=i		VHN 48
Akkunti	f			ak-ku-un-[(x-)]di			VHN 48
Akkuwe	f			ak-ku-WA	akki=ve	The (girl) of the one	VHN 48
Akkuya	f			ak-ku-ia	akk=o=ya	He/She brought (her) up	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:57

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Akkuzzi	f			ak-ku-zi	akkuzzi	To the righteous one / The one	VHN 48
Akukki				a-ku-ki	ag=o=kk=i		VHN 47
Akukum				a-ku-kum	ag=og=o=m	He/She ascended	VHN 48
Akuya	f		2	a-ku-ia	ag=o=ya	He/She brought (her) up	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:57
Akuya	f		2	a-ku-ia	ag=o=ya	He/She brought (her) up	ARM XVI/1:57
Akuyatum	f			a-ku-ia-tum	ag=o=y(a)=atum		VHN 47
Alla	f		2	al-la		The lady	VHN 49
Allae				al-la-e	allae	The lady	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:58
Allae-Kiyazi	f			al-la-e-ki-ia-zi	allae-kiyaže	The lady is the sea	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:58
Allae-mata	f			al-la-e-ma-da	allae-mad(i)=a	The lady is wise	VHN 49
Allai(-)zu	f		2	al-la-i-zu			VHN 50
Allai-aznu	f			al-la-i-az-nu	allai-aznu?		Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:58
Allai-Ḫebat	f			al-la-i-ḫé-bat	allai-Ḫebat	The lady is Ḫebat	VHN 49
Allai-nanla	f			al-la-i-na-an-lá	allai/e-nanl(i)=a	The lady is victorious	VHN 49
Allaiš-arum	f		3	al-la-ia-ša-rum	allai=ž-ar=o=m	The lady gave her	ARM XVI/1:58

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Alla-kanzu	f			al-la-ka-an-zu	alla-kanz(i)=u		VHN 50
Allalla	f			al-la-al-la	alla=a=lla	You are like a lady?	VHN 50
Alla-Naye	f			al-la-na-a-ie	alla-Naye	The lady is Naye	VHN 50
Allanni	f			al-la-an-ni		Allanni	VHN 50
Allanzar	f			al-la-an-za-ar		Young lady	VHN 51
Allanzar	f			al-la-an-za-ri		Young lady	VHN 52
Allaš-arum	f		2	al-la-aš-a-rum	alla=ž-ar=o=m	The lady gave her	VHN 52
Allaš-arum			3	al-la-aš-a-rum	alla=ž-ar=o=m	The lady gave him	VHN 51
Alla-tatum	f			al-la-ta-dum	alla-tad=o=m	The lady loved her	VHN 52
Allawe			3	al-la-e	alia=(v)e	That from the lady	VHN 51
Allazar	f			al-la-za-ar		Young lady	VHN 51
Allazari	f		2	al-la-za-ri		Young lady	VHN 51
Alli-kanza	f			al-li-ka-an-za	alli-kanz(i)=a	The lady is ...	VHN 52
Alli-kipra	f			al-li-ki-ip-ra	alii-kibir(i)=a	The lady is a hunter?	VHN 52
Alli-šuriḥu	f			al-li-šu-ri-ḥu	alli-šo/urig(e)=u	The lady is from Šuriḥe	VHN 52

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Alli-turaḥ	f		2	al-li-tu-ra-a[ḥ]	alli-turaḥḥ(e)	The lady is manly	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:58; ARM XIV 106:8
Alli-turaḥḥe	f		2	al-li-tu-ra-ḥe	alli-turaḥḥe	The lady is manly	VHN 53
Alli-wati	f			al-li-wa-di	alli-fandi	The lady is good	VHN 52
Al-muni				al-mu-ni	al-mo/uni		VHN 53
Al-nuki				al-nu-gi	al-no/ugi		VHN 53
Alpu-atal				al-pu-a-tal	alb=o-adal		VHN 53
Alpuš-...]				al-pu-úš-...]	alb=o=z-...]		VHN 54
Altem-urašše	f			al-te-mu-ra-ši	ald=i=m(b!)-urašše		VHN 54
Altikkan				al-ti-ga-an	ald=i=kk=i>a=n(na)		VHN 54
Altimikka				al-ti-mi-ga	ald=im=i=kk=i>a		VHN 54
Altip-...]				al-ti-ip-...]	ald=i=b-...]		VHN 54
Altip-šarri				al-ti-ip-šar-ri	ald=i=b-šarri		VHN 54
Alukki				a-lu-uk-ki	al=o=kk=i		VHN 54
Alukku				a-lu-ku	al=o=kk=o		VHN 55
Am(m)urti	f			a-mu-ur-di			VHN 57

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ama-kepali	f			a-ma-ke-ba-li	am=a=∅-kebali	<i>Kepali</i> arrived	VHN 55
Amaruk			2	a-ma-ru-uk	am(m)=ar=o=g		VHN 56
Amman-amumen	f			am-ma-an-a-mu-me-en	amm=a=n(a)- amumi=n(a)	The news? arrived	VHN 55
Amman-kiyazi	f		2	am-ma-an-ki-ya-zi	amm=a=n(na)-kiyaže	The sea arrived	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:59
Ammanna				am-ma-an-na	amm=a=nna	He/She arrived	VHN 55
Ammanni	f		2	am-ma-an-ni	amm=a=nni	He/She arrived	VHN 55
Amman-taḥe			2	am-ma-an-ta-ḥi	amm=a=n(na)-taḥe	The man arrived	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:59
Amma-tan		?	2	a-ma-ta-an			Sasson 1974:357
Ammen-ammume	f			am-me-en-am-mu-me	amm=i=(na)- ammon/umi	News, arrive!	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:60
Ammen-ki	f			a-me-en-gi	amm=i=n(a)-ki	Sea, bring (her) here!	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:60
Amminna	f		2	am-mi-in-na	amm=i=nna	Bring (her) here!	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:60
Amumi	f		4	a-mu-mi		News?	VHN 57
Anaiš			6	a-na-i-iš	an=ai=ž	May (them) be happy?	VHN 57
Anaiš-ḥumu				a-na-i-iš-ḥu-mu	an=ai=ž-ḥo/um(i)=u	May <i>ḥumu</i> be (the) Joy!	VHN 57
Ana-kepali	f			a-na-ki-ba-li	an=a=∅-kebali	Kepali, make (her) happy!	Kupper 1978:125; ARM XVI/1:61

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Anaš-kepal				[a]-na-aš-ki-ba-al	an=a(i)=ž-kebal(i)	May <i>Kepali</i> be (the) Joy!	Kupper 1978:125; ARM XVI/1:61
Ani[š(?)]-tali				a-ni-[...]-ta-li	an=i[=ž]-tali	May the three (third) be (the) Joy!	VHN 59
Aniš-ħurpi				a-ni-iš-ħu-ur-pí	an=i=ž-ħo/urvi	May <i>ħurpi</i> be the Joy!	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:62; Kupper 1978:123
Aniš-kepal			4	a-ni-iš-ki-ba-al	an=i=ž-kebal(i)	May <i>Kepali</i> be the Joy!	Sasson 1974:358; ARM XVI/1:62
Annakka				an-na-ka	annakk(i)=a		VHN 57
Anni-kapi	f			a[n-n]i-ka-bi	ann=i-kab=i		Sasson 1974:358
Anniš-...]				an-ni-iš-...]	ann=i=ž-...]	May ... be the joy!	VHN 59
Anni-šar				an-ni-i-š[ar?]	ann=i-šarr(i)		Sasson 1974:358
Annuħ(ħ)e				an-nu-ħe			VHN 60
Anunni				a-nu-un-ni	an=o=nni	Gladden (him)!	VHN 60
Anzunza				an-zu-un-za	anzo/unz(e)=a		VHN 59
Apa-kepali	f			a-ba-ke-ba-li	ab=a=∅-kebali		VHN 60
Apari				a-ba-ri			VHN 60
Apikuħle				a-bi-ku-uħ-le			VHN 61
Apukkan				a-pu-uk-ka-an	ab=o=kk=o>a=n(na)		VHN 64

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Aranzaḥ				a-ra-za-[aḥ?]		The Tigris	Sasson 1974:358; ARM XVI/1:66
Aranzaḥ-atal			2	a-ra-az-za-ḥi-x [...]a?- [dal?]	aranžaḡ-adal	The Tigris is strong	Sasson 1974:358; ARM XVI/1:66
Aranzi				a-ra-an-zi		The Tigris	VHN 64
Aranziḥ-atal			5	a-ra-an-zi-iḥ-a-tal	Aranziḡ-adal	The Tigris is strong	VHN 64
Aranziḥ-ewri			2	a-ra-an-zi-iḥ-ew-ri	Aranziḡ-ewri	The Tigris is the lord	VHN 65
Ari(?) -tupki				a-ri-tu-ip-ki	ar=i=(b)-to/ubki	Tupki gave (him)	Sasson 1974:358; ARM XVI/1:66
Ari[p(?)-...]			2	a-ri(?) -i[p(?)-...]	ar=i=[b-...]		VHN 70
Ari-AB? [-x-a]n				a-ri-AB?[-x-a]n			Sasson 1974:358; ARM XVI/1:66
Arim-atal				a-ri-im-a-da-al	ar=i=m(b!)-adal	The strong gave (him)	Sasson 1974:358; ARM XVI/1:66
Arim- <i>idūka</i>		H/S		a-ri-im-i-du-ka	ar=i=m(b!)- <i>id=ū=ka</i>	(He) gave your arm	VHN 66
Arim-Kušuḥ				a-ri-im-30	ar=i=m(b!)-Kužo/uḡ	Kuzuḥ gave (him)	VHN 66
Arip-...]				a-ri-ip-...]	ar=i=b-...]		VHN 70
Arip-alla	f		3	a-ri-ip-al-la	ar=i=b-alla	The lady gave (her)	VHN 66
Aripān				a-ri-ip-a-an	ar=i=b-ān	He/She gave (him)	VHN 67
Arip- ^d x				a-ri-ip- ^d x	ar=i=b-...		Sasson 1974:358; ARM XVI/1:66

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Arip-ḥuḥ(u)				a-ri-ip-ḥu-uḥ	ar=i=b-ḥo/uḡ(i)	The father? gave (him)	VHN 67
Arip-Ḥurmiš			2	a-ri-ip-ḥu-ur-mi-iš	ar=i=b-ḥo/urmiš	Ḥurmiš gave (him)	Sasson 1974:358; ARM XVI/1:66
Arip-ku[šuh]				a-ri-ip-ku- [...]	ar=i=b-ko/u[žog]	ku[šuh] gave (him)	VHN 67
Arip-Kulmiš			2	a-ri-ip-kul-mi-iš	ar=i=b-Ko/ulmiš	Kulmiš gave (him)	VHN 67
Arip-Kumarwe			2	a-ri-ip-ku-mar-we	ar=i=b-Kumarve	Kumarwe gave (him)	VHN 67
Arip-mušni			2	a-[r]i-ip-mu-úš-ni	ar=i=b=mužni	The righteous gave (him)	Kupper 1978:125; ARM XVI/1:66
Arip-mušni/muzu				a-ri-ip-mu-uš-ni / a-ri-ip-mu-zu	ar=i=b-mužni/mužu	The righteous gave (him)	VHN 68
Arip-Nawar			6	a-ri-ip-na-wa-ar	ar=i=b-Navar	Nawar gave (him)	VHN 68
Arip-nupar			3	a-ri-ip-nu-bar	ar=i=b-no/ubar	Nupar gave (him)	VHN 68
Arip-Pišaiš			3	a-ri-ip-bi-za-i-iš	ar=i=b-Pižaiž	Pišaiš gave (him)	VHN 67
Arip-šarri			2	a-ri-ip-šar-ri	ar=i=b-šarri	The godking gave (him)	VHN 68
Arip-Šimika				a-ri-ip-ši-mi-ga	ar=i=b-Šimiga	Šimika gave (him)	VHN 69
Arip-Teššub			5	a-ri-ip-ti-šu-ub	ar=i=b-Teššob	Teššub gave (him)	ARM XVI/1:66
Arip-tupki				<a>-ri-i[p-t]u[p]-ki	ar=i=[b-t]o/ubki	Tupki gave (him)	ARM XVI/1:66
Arip-turi				a-ri-ip-tu-ri	ar=i=b-turi	The man gave (him)	Sasson 1974:358; ARM XVI/1:66

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Arip-Ukur			6	a-ri-ip- ^d U.GUR/ ^d U-kùr	ar=i=b-O/Ugo/ur	Ukur have (him)	Sasson 1974:358; ARM XVI/1:66
Ariš-kan				a-ri-iš7-ka-an	ar=i=ž-kan(i)	May Kan give (him)!	VHN 71
Ariš-nupar				a-ri-is-nu-bar	ar=i=ž-no/ubar	May Nupar give (him)!	VHN 71
Ariya			2	a-ri-ia	ar=i=ya	He/She gave (him)	VHN 65
Arizzan			2	a-ri-iz-za-an	ariss(e)=a=n(na)		VHN 70
Arraph(a)-atal				ar-ra-ap-ḥa-a-tal	Arraph(a/e)-adal	(That from) Arrapha is strong	VHN 65
Arti-kanti				ar-di-ga-an-di /ar-da-ka-an-da	ard=i-kandi		VHN 72
Arti-maluš			3	ar-di-ma-lu-uš	arde-mal=o=ž		VHN 72
Artiya			3	ar-di-ia	ard=i=ya		VHN 72
Aruḥḥe				a-ru-uḥ-ḥe			VHN 73
Arum-...]				a-ru-um-...]	ar=o=m-...]		VHN 74
Arum-atal				a-rum-a-tal	ar=o=m-adal	The strong gave him	VHN 73
Arum-šar[ri]				a-rum-sa[r-ri]	ar=o=m-šarri(?)	The godking gave him	VHN 74
Arum-Teššup				a-rum-te-eš-šu-up	ar=o=m-Teššob	Teššup gave him	VHN 74
Aruriya				a-ru-ri-ia	ar=o/ur=i=ya	He/She gave (him)	VHN 75

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ašakka				a-ša-ak-ka			Sasson 1974:358
Ašmenna	f		3	aš-me-en-na	ažm=i=nna		VHN 77
Ašmu[n(-)...]	f			aš-mu-u[n-...]	ažm=o=n[(na)(-)...]		VHN 78
Ašmum-šaki	f		4	aš-mu-un-ša-ki	ažm=o=n(na)-šagi		Sasson 1974:358; ARM XVI/1:68
Ašmu-niri	f			aš-mu-ni-ri	ažm=o-niri		VHN 77
Ašmun-kiyaze	f			aš-mu-un-ki-ia-ze	ažm=o=n(na)-kiyaže		VHN 77
Ašt[u(-...)]	f			aš-t[u(-...)]		Wom[an...]	VHN 80
Aštakka	f			as-ta-ak-ka	astakk(i)=a	She is like a young woman	VHN 78
Aštakkuzi	f			aš-ta-ku-zi		A proper young woman	Sasson 1974:358; ARM XVI/1:68
Aštar-taki	f	H/S		aš-ta-ar-ta-ki	'attar-ta/egi	Aštar is good	VHN 78
Ašte			4	aš-te		Woman	VHN 78
Ašten	f		4	aš-te-[en]	ašte=n(a)	She is a lady	Kupper 1978:125
Aštu	f		4	aš-tu	aštu	Woman	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:69
Aštu(-)[...]	f			aš-tu(-)[...]			VHN 80
Aštu-Ala				aš-tu-a-la	ašto/u-Ala	Ala is a lady	VHN 79

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Aštu-atana	f		8	aš-tu-a-ta!-na	ašto/u-adana		Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:69
Aštue	f		3	aš-tu-e	ašte=ve or ašto/u=(v)e	The (girl) of the woman	VHN 80
Astuḥḥe	f			as-tu-ḥe		Femininely	VHN 80
Aštun	f		2	aš-tu-un	ašto/u=n(na)	It (girl) is a woman	VHN 80
Aštuzar	f			aš-tu-za-ar		Woman/Wife	VHN 80
Ašuzzi				a-šu-zi	ašuzzi		Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:69
Atai				a-da-i	ad=ai		VHN 84
Atalal				a-da-la-al	adal	The strong	ARM XVI/1:49
Atal-ewri			3	adal-evri	adal-evri	The strong is the lord	VHN 86
Atalli				a-ta-al-li	adal=ni	The strong	VHN 86
Atal-paḥar				a-tal-pa-ga-ar	adal-faḡar	The strong is good	VHN 86
Atal-šarri			3	a-tal-šar-ri	adal-šarri	The strong is the godking	VHN 86
Atal-šenni			2	A-dal-še-en-ni / a-dal- še-ni / a-dal-še-nu / a- dal-ši-ni	adal-šen(a)=ni	The strong is the brother	Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:49
Atal-širi				a-tal-ši-ri	adal-širi	The strong is the throne	VHN 87
Atan			4	a-da-an	ad=a=n(na)		VHN 88

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Atašše	f			a-da-še		suburb?	VHN 89
Ataya	f		2	a-da-ia	ad=a=ya		VHN 85
Atiya			2	a-di-ia	ad=i=ya	He/She made (him) big?	VHN 90
Atta			4	at-ta		Father	VHN 84
Attaḥan				ad-da-ḥa-an	att=a-ḥan(i)		Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:49
Attakkuzzi				at-ta-ku-zi		Young father	VHN 85
Attap-Na	f		2	at-tap-na	att=a=b-Na		VHN 89
Attap-Naye	f			at-ta-ap-na-a-ie	att=a=b-Naye		VHN 89
Attaya			2	at-ta-a-ia	att=a=ya		VHN 85
Attazza	f		3	at-ta-za	attašš(e)=a	Like paternity	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:70
Attazze	f		4	at-ta-az-ze		Paternity?	VHN 90
Attazze				at-ta-az-ze		Paternity?	VHN 90
Atti	f		6	at-ti	atti	Woman	ARM XVI/1:70
Atti-Teššup		?		at-ti- ^d IM	att(a)=i-Teššob	Teššup, make (him) strong!	ARM XVI/1:70
Attiya			3	at-ti-ia	att=i=ya	He/She made (him) strong	VHN 91

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Attizzi	f			at-ti-zi			VHN 91
Attu	f		2	at-tu		Woman	VHN 91
Attuāya	f			at-tu-a-ia	atto/u=āya		Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:70
Attue	f		5	at-tu-e	att(e)=ve	The girl of the woman	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:70; VHN 92
Attukki	f		1 4	at-tu-ki	attukki	Girl	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:70; VHN 92
Attuzar	f		6	at-tu-za-ar	attuzar(i)	Woman?	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:70
Attuzari	f			at-tu-za-ri		Woman?	VHN 93
Awar-tuk			2	a-wa-ar-du-uk	av=ar-to/uk	Tuk saved (him) repeatedly	VHN 60
Aweš-tari				a-we-eš-ta-ri	av=i=ž-tari	May the fire? save (him)!	VHN 62
Awi-kiriš				a-wi-ki-ri-iš	av=i-kiriž	Kirše, save (him)!	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:70
Awin				a-wi-in	av=i=n(na)	Save (him)!	VHN 61
Awinni				a-wi-ni	av=i=nni	Save (him)!	VHN 61
Awiš-arra				?	av=i=ž-arr(i)=a	May Arri? Save (him)!	VHN 62
Awiš-muši	f		2	a-wi-iš-mu-ūš-e	av=i=ž-muži	May the righteous save (him)!	VHN 62
Awiš-Na	f		5	a-wi-is-na	av=i=ž-Na	May Naye save (him)!	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:71

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Awiš-teḥupe			2	a-wi-iš ₇ -<te->ḥu-be	av=i=ž-tego/ube	May Teḥupe save (him)!	VHN 63
Awiš-tulla				a-wi-iš-tu-ul-la	av=i=ž-Tulla	May Tulla save (him)!	ARM XVI/1:71
Awiš-una			2	a-wi-is-ú-na	av=i=ž-o/un(i)=a	May Uni save (him)!	VHN 63
Awiš-uri			2	a-wi-is-ú-ri	av=i=ž-uri	May the foot save (him)!	VHN 63
Awi-Ukur				a-[w]i-u-gur	av=i-Ugur	Ukur, save (him)!	VHN 63
Awi-yazi				a-wi-ia-zi	av=i-yazi?	Yazi?, save (him)!	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:71
Awizzu				a-wi-iz-zu	avišš(e)=u	Salvation	VHN 63
Ayazi				a-ia-zi			Sasson 1974:357; ARM XVI/1:71
Aziya	f		4	a-zi-ia	až(?)=i=ya		VHN 76
Azizan				a-zi-za-an	až(?)=i=ž-an		Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:71
Az-mena	f		2	az-me-na	až(?)=mena		VHN 76
Azum-ki	f			a-zu-um-gi	až(?)=o=m-ki		VHN 83
Azuzikki				a-zu-zi-ik-ki	až(?)=oz=i=kk=i		VHN 84
Azza-Naye	f			az-za-na-a-ie	azz(e)/azz(o/u)=a-Naye	Naye is like a woman	VHN 75
Azze	f		2	az-ze		Woman	VHN 75

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Azzu	f		13	az-zu	azzu	Woman	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:71; VHN 80
Azzu-ana	f			az-zu-a-na	azzo/u-an(i)=a	The woman is (like the) joy	VHN 81
Azzuatum	f			az-zu-a-tum	azzo/u= <i>atum</i>	Young woman	VHN 81
Azzuāya	f		3	az-zu-a-ia	azzo/u= <i>āya</i>		VHN 81
Azzuāya				az-zu-a-ia	azzo/u= <i>āya</i>		VHN 81
Azzue	f		11	az-zu-e	azzo/u=ve	That from the woman	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:72; VHN 81
Azzueli	f			az-zu-e-li	azzo/u=eli		Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:72
Azzukka	f			az-zu-ga	azzo/ukk(i)=a	A young woman	VHN 82
Azzukkanni	f		4	az-zu-ka-[an-ni]		She is like a young woman?	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:72
Azzukki	f			az-zu-uk-ki		Woman	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:72
Azzun-enni				az-zu-un-e-en-ni	azzo/u=n(na)-en(i)=ni	The deity is a woman	VHN 83
Azzunnan				a-zu-na-an	azzo/unn(i)=a=n(a)		Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:71
Azzunni	f		2	az-zu-un-ni			Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:72
Azzu-rānu		H/S		az-zu-ra-nu	azzo/u= <i>rānu</i>		VHN 84
Azzuzari	f			az-zu-lZ-za-ri		Woman?	VHN 84

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Eḫli[...]			2	eḫ-li-[...]			VHN 97
Eḫlip-ar[...]				eg-li-ip-ar-[...]	eḡl=i=b-ar		VHN 94
Eḫlip-atal				eḫ-li-ip-a-tal	eḡl=i=b-adal	The strong saved (him)	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:89
Eḫlip-ḫawar				eḫ-li-ip-ḫa-wa-ar	eḡl=i=b-ḫavar(i)	ḫawar saved (him)	VHN 94
Eḫlip-ḫawur				eḫ-li-ip-ḫa-wu-ur	eḡl=i=b-ḫavor	The sky saved (him)	VHN 94
Eḫlip-Kaziyar				eḫ-li-ip-ka-zi-ia-ar	eḡl=i=b-Kažiyar	Kaziyar saved (him)	VHN 95
Eḫlip-Kušuḫ			2	eḫ-li-ip-ku-zu-uḫ	eḡl=i=b-Kužo/uḡ	Kuzuḫ saved (him)	VHN 95
Eḫlip-šarri			3	eḫ-li-ip-šar-ri	eḡl=i=b-šarri	The godking saved (him)	Sasson 1974:359; ARM XVI/1:89
Eḫlip-Teššup				eḫ-li-ip-te ₄ -šu-up	eḡl=i=b-Teššob	Teššup saved (him)	VHN 96
Eḫliya			4	eḫ-li-ia	eḡl=i=ya	He/She saved (him)	ARM XVI/1:88
Eḫliyan			5	eḫ-li-ia-an	eḡl=i=ya= <i>ān</i>		ARM XVI/1:89; VHN 94
Eḫlum- <i>rūṯ</i>		H/S	1	eḫ-lu-um-ru- ^ḫ i	eḡl=o=m- <i>rū=ṯ</i>	My friend saved him	VHN 97
Ełanza	f		6	e-la-an-za	elanž(e)=a	According to the sisterhood?	VHN 100
Ela	f			e-la		Sister	VHN 98
Ełakka	f			e-la-ka	elakk(i)=a		VHN 99

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Elalla	f			e-la-al-la	el(a)=a=lla	She is like a sister	VHN 99
Elan(-)[...]				e-la-an(-)[...]	ela=n(na)(?)-[...]		VHN 101
Elan(-)[...]	f			e-la-an(-)[...]	ela=n(na)(?)-[...]		VHN 101
Elani				e-la-ni	ela=a=n(a)=i	The sister	Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:89
Elan-kiyaze	f			e-la-an-ki-ia-ze	ela=n(na)-kiyaže	The sister is the sea	Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:89
Elanna	f		2	e-la-an-na	ela=a=nna	(She) is instead of the sister / She is like the sister	VHN 100
Elan-šaki	f		4	e-la-an-ša-ki	ela=n(na)-šagi	The sister is <i>šaki</i>	Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:89
Elap(-)ja				e-la-pa			VHN 101
Elap-Araz(z)uḫ				e-la-pa-ra-zu(!)(LU)-uḫ	el=a=b-araz(z)o/uḫ(e)		Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:89
Elap-atal	f			e-la-pa-tal	el=a=b-adal		Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:89
Elapi		?		e-la-pi			Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:89
Elap-nawar				e-la-ap-na-wa-ar	el=a=b-Navar		VHN 101
Elen				e-le-ens(PA.TE)	el=i=n(na)		VHN 102
Elenna				e-le-en-na	el=i=nna		VHN 102
Elen-turazze	f			e-le-en-tu-ra-ze	el=i=n(na)-turazze		VHN 102

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Elenza	f			e-le-en-za			Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:89
Eliliš			5	e-li-li-iš	e/il=e/il=i=ž		Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:90; VHN 101
Eliliš(-)a				e-li-li-ša			Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:90
Elip-Naye	f			e-li-ip-na-ie	el=i=b-Naye		VHN 102
Elizza				E-li-za	elizz(i)=a		Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:90
Elli				el-li	ell=i		VHN 101
Elul-Na	f		2	e-lu-ul-na	el=o=l-Na		VHN 103
Elum-kiyaze	f			e-lum-<x>-ki-ia-ze	el=o=m-kiyaže		VHN 103
Elum-šeḫiri	f			e-lu-um-še-ḫi-ir-e	el=o=m-šegiri		Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:90
Eluziran				e-lu-zi-ra-an	eložir(i)=a=n(na)		VHN 103
Enam-ki	f		3	e-nam-gi	en(i)=a=m(e/a)	The deity is like the sea	VHN 104
Eniš-akum			4	e-ni-iš-a-gu-um	eni=ž-ag=o=m	The deity brought him up	Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:90; VHN 104
Eniš-kiša				e-ni-iš-ki-sa	en=i=ž-kiž(i)=a		VHN 105
Eniš-taḫe				e-ni-iš-ta-ḫe	en=i=ž-taḡe		VHN 105
Eniya			2	e-ni-ia	en=i=ya		Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:90; VHN 104

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Erame	f		2	e-ra-me			VHN 112
Eramuk				e-ra-mu-uk	er=am=o=g	He/she did not make a gift	VHN 112
Ešm[en-k]anazzi				eš-m[e-en-k]a-na-zi	ešm=i=[n(na)-k]anazzi		VHN 116
Eten(-)[...]	f			e-de-en-[-...]	ed=i=n(na)-[-...]		VHN 118
Eten-elli	f		3	e-de-en-e-li	ed=i=n(na)-el(a)=ni		VHN 118
Eteya				e-te-ia	ed=i=ya		VHN 117
Etim-me	f			e-di-im-me	ed=i=b>m-me		VHN 117
Etip-ḥuḥ				e-di-ip-ḥu-uḥ	ed=i=b-ḥo/uḥ		VHN 118
Etip-kirišu				e-ti-ip-ki-ri-šu	ed=i=b-kiriž=u		VHN 118
Ewe-[-...]	f			e-we-[-x]	ev=i[-...]		Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:91
Ewenni			6	e-wi-en-ni	ev=i=nni		Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:91; VHN 107
Ewennikki	f			e-wi-e-ni-ik-ki	ev=enn=i=kki=i		Sasson 1974:360
Ewenzari				e-we-en-za-ri			VHN 107
Ewernakki				e-we-er-na-ki		Young lord	VHN 107
Ewr[i(-...)]				ew-r[i(-...)]			VHN 111

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ewri			3	e-ew-ri		The Lord	VHN 108
Ewri(-)[...]				ew-ri(-)[...]			VHN 111
Ewri-Addu				ew-ri-ad-du	evri-Addu	The lord is Addu	VHN 109
Ewri-atal			2	ew-ri-a-tal	evri-adal	The lord is strong	VHN 108
Ewri-kipa			7	ew-ri-ki-ba	evri-kib(i)=a		Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:213
Ewri-muza			5	ew-ri-mu-za	evri-muž(i)=a	The lord is righteous	Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:213
Ewri-šarri			2	ew-ri-šar-ri	evri-šarri	The lord is godking	VHN 110
Ewri-talma			3	ew-ri-ta-al-ma	evri-talm(i)=a	The lord is big	Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:213
Eyan-elli	f			e-ia-an-e-li	ey=a=n(na)-el(a)=ni		VHN 97
Ezallam				e-za-al-la-am	*ḥežal(i)=n(i)=a=m(e) /m(a)	He is like a friend	VHN 114
Ḥabdu-Išhara		S	3	ḥa-ab-du-iš-ḥa-ra		Servant of Išhara	ARM XVI/1:94
Ḥalaš-tuk				ḥa-la-aš-tu-uk	ḥal=a=ž-to/uk		VHN 119
Ḥaliya		?	3	ḥa-li-ia	ḥal=i=ya		ARM XVI/1:97
Ḥalulāya	f			ḥa-lu-la-a-ia	ḥalo/ul(i)=āya	Young grape?	VHN 119
Ḥalum-atal				ḥa-lu-ma-tal	ḥal=o=m-adal		VHN 119

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ḫalunna	f			ḫa-lu-un-na	ḫal=o=nna	Carry (her) away!	VHN 120
Ḫalutil				ḫa-lu-di-il	ḫal=o=dil(la)	Carry us away!	VHN 120
Ḫamanna	f		3	ḫa-ma-an-na	ḫamann(i)=a	Like <i>Ḫammani</i>	VHN 120
Ḫamanna				ḫa-ma-an-na	ḫamann(i)=a	Like <i>Ḫammani</i>	VHN 120
Ḫamanni				ḫa-ma-an-ni		<i>Ḫammani</i>	VHN 121
Ḫame-za	f	?		ḫa-me-za			Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:98
ḫanazzu				ḫa-na-zu	ḫanazz(e)=u	Childhood?	VHN 121
Ḫaniya			5	ḫa-ni-ia	ḫan=i=ya	She gave birth	ARM XVI/1:102; VHN 121
Ḫapaluk				ḫa-ba-lu-uk	ḫab=al=o=g		Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:93
Ḫapanna	f		3	ḫa-ba-an-na	ḫab=a=nna		VHN 122
Ḫapar-tuk				ḫa-ba-ar-du-uk	ḫab=ar-to/uk		VHN 122
Ḫapiram				ḫa-bi-ra-am	ḫabir(u)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a ḫabiru	VHN 123
Ḫapiya		?	2	ḫa-bi-ya	ḫab=i=ya		Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:96
Ḫapšari				ḫa-ap-ša-ri	ḫapš=ar=i	Pass on (him)!	VHN 124
Ḫapu-ri	f			ḫa-bu-ur-ri			Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:96

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ḫapzuran				ḫa-ap-zu-ra-an	ḫapzor(i)=a=n(na)	Like saliva	VHN 124
Ḫapzuraš				ḫa-ap-zu-ra-aš	ḫapzor(i)=aš	Salivas	VHN 124
Ḫapzuri			2	ḫa-ap-zu-ri		Saliva	VHN 124
Ḫarim- [...]				ḫa-ri-im- [...]	ḫar=i=m(b!)- [...]		VHN 125
Ḫaripān			3	ḫa-ri-ba-an	ḫar=i=b-ān		Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:102
Ḫariya			2	ḫa-ri-ia	ḫar=i=ya		Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:103
Ḫariya(-)zu				ḫa-ri-ya-zu	ḫar=i=yazu		Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:103
Ḫaruḫul			2	ḫa-ru-ḫu-ul			VHN 126
Ḫawin-Ala	f			ḫa-wi-na-la	ḫav=i=n(na)-Ala		VHN 122
Ḫawirni				ḫa-wi-ir-ni	ḫawirni	Lamb	ARM XVI/1:105
Ḫawiš-alla	f			ḫa-wi-iš-al-la	ḫav=i=š-alla		VHN 124
Ḫawlizza				ḫa(!)(A)-aw-li-iz-za	ḫavlizz(i)=a		VHN 124
Ḫawlizzan				ḫa-aw-li-za-an	ḫavlizz(i)=a=n(na)		VHN 124
Ḫaya-Kubaba		?		ḫa-ià-ku-ba-ba			ARM XVI/1:106
Ḫazip-... kizu(?)				ḫa-zi-ip-x-gi(?) - zu(?)	ḫaž=i=b-...		VHN 133

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ḫazip-a?	f			ḫa-zi-ba	ḫaž=i=b-...	Listened	Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:107
Ḫazipan				ḫa-zi-pa-an	ḫaž=i=b-an	He/She listened (him)	Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:107
Ḫazip-Aranziḫ			6	ḫa-zi-ip-a-ra-an-zi-iḫ	ḫaž=i=b-aranžig	The Tigris listened (him)	Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:107
Ḫazip-atal			3	ḫa-zi-ip-a-dal	ḫaž=i=b-adal	The strong listened (him)	Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:107
Ḫazip-IŠTAR			2	ḫa-zi-ip-IŠ ₈ -TÁR	ḫaž=i=b-IŠTAR	Ištar (Išḫara/Šawuška) listened (him)	VHN 129
Ḫazip-Kakka				ḫa-zi-ip-ka-ak-ka	ḫaž=i=b-kakk(i)=a	Kakka listened (him)	Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:107
Ḫazip-Kušuḫ			3	ḫa-zi-ip-ku-zu-uḫ	ḫaž=i=b-Kužog	Kuzuḫ listened (him)	Sasson 1974:361
Ḫazip-muš[ni](?)				ḫa-zi-ip-mu-úš-[ni]	ḫaž=i=b-muž[ni](?)	The righteous listened (him)	VHN 130
Ḫazip-Na				ḫa-zi-ip-na	ḫaz=i=b-Na	Naya listened (him)	VHN 130
Ḫazip-nan				ḫa-zi-ip-na-an	ḫaz=i=b-nan(i)	The <i>nani</i> -weapon listened (him)	VHN 130
Ḫazip-Nawar			6	ḫa-zi-ip-na-wa-ar	ḫaž=i=b-Navar	Nawar listened (him/it)	Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:107; VHN 130
Ḫazip-pa[...](?)				ḫa-zi-ip-pa(?)-[...]	ḫaz=i=b-pa[...]		VHN 128
Ḫazip-šaki	f			ḫa-zi-ip-ša-ki	ḫaž=i=b-šagi	Šaki listened (him)	Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:107
Ḫazip-šarri			4	ḫa-zi-ip-šàr-ri	ḫaž=i=b-šarri	The godking listened (him)	Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:107; VHN 131

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ḥazip-šaya	f			ḥa-zi-ip-ša-ya	ḥaž=i=b-šaya	Šaya listened (him)	Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:107
Ḥazip-šayu				ḥa-zi-ip-ša-iu	ḥaž=i=b-šayu	šayu listened (him)	VHN 130
Ḥazip-šimika				ḥa-zi-ip-ši-mi-ga	ḥaž=i=b-šimiga	šimika listened (him)	VHN 131
Ḥazip-šimike				ḥa-zi-ip-ši-mi-ge	ḥaž=i=b-šimige	šimika listened (him)	VHN 131
Ḥazip-šuwitimze(?)				ḥa-zi-ip-su-WA-di-im-ze	ḥaž=i=b-šo/uvidimže(?)	šuwitimze(?) listened (him)	VHN 131
Ḥazip-tawan				ḥa-zi-ip-ta-wa-an	ḥaž=i=b-tawan	Tawan? Listened (him)	VHN 131
Ḥazip-Teššup			7	ḥa-zi-ip-te-iš-šu-ub	ḥaž=i=b-teššob	Teššup listened (him)	Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:107
Ḥazip-Ukur				ḥa-zi-ip- ^d u-gur	ḥaž=i=b-O/Ugo/ur	Ukur listened (him)	VHN 133
Ḥazip-ulme				ḥa-zi-ip-ul-me	ḥaž=i=b-olme	The servant listened (him)	Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:107
Ḥaziya			4	ḥa-zi-ia	ḥaž=i=ya	He/She listened (him)	VHN 126
Ḥaziya	f			ḥa-zi-ia	ḥaž=i=ya	He/She listened (him)	VHN 127
Ḥaziyān				ḥa-zi-ia-an	ḥaž=i=ya=ān		VHN 127
Ḥazriya		?	2	ḥa-az-ri-ia			ARM XVI/1:108
Ḥazukan		?		ḥa-zu-ga-an	ḥaž=o/ug=an		Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:108
Ḥazulak(?)				Ḥa-zu-la-[a]k(?)	ḥaž=o/ul=a=g		VHN 134

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Heḥḥe	f			ḥe-eḥ-ḥe	ḥeḥḥ=i		VHN 134
Ḥellip-atal				ḥe-el-li-pa-tal	ḥell=i=b-adal	The strong said	VHN 134
Ḥelukka	f			ḥe-lu-uk-ka	ḥel=o=kk=o>a=∅	He/She said nothing	VHN 135
Ḥelze				ḥe-el-ze			VHN 135
Ḥemzi	f			ḥe-em-zi	ḥemz=i	Gird!	VHN 135
Ḥenziya				ḥe-en-zi-ia	ḥenz=i=ya		VHN 135
Ḥerizza				ḥe-ri-iz-za	ḥerizz(i)=a	According to the <i>ḥerizzi</i> -stone?	VHN 136
Ḥerzi				ḥe-er-zi	ḥerž=i		VHN 136
Ḥerziḥe				ḥe-er-zi-ḥe		properly <i>ḥerzi</i> ?	VHN 136
Ḥerzin				ḥe-er-zi-in	ḥerz=i=n(na)		VHN 137
Ḥerziya				ḥe-er-zi-ya	ḥerž=i=ya		VHN 136
Ḥerzuk				ḥi-ir-zu-uk	ḥerž=o=g		Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:109
Ḥerzuk				ḥe-er-zu-uk	ḥerž=o=g		VHN 137
Ḥešalap				ḥe-ša-la-ap	ḥezal(i)=a=p(pa)	Like a friend	VHN 137
Ḥezali	f			ḥe-za-li		(girl)Friend	VHN 137

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Hikulla	f		3	hi-gu-la	he/ig=o=lla		VHN 134
Hilme				hi-il-me			VHN 134
Hilmi	f		3	he-el-mi	hilm(e)=u		VHN 134
Hinzukkatta	f			hi-in-zu-ga-ta	hinz=o=kk=o>tta		VHN 135
Hinzurum				hi-in-zu-ru-um	hinzor(i)=um	Apple tree	VHN 135
Hiššam	f			hi-iš-ša-am	hišš(i)=a=m(e/a)	(she) is a descendant?	VHN 138
Hitar-ewri				hi-da-ar-ew-ri	hid=ar-evri		VHN 139
Hitluk				hi-it-lu-uk	hidl=o=g		VHN 139
Hiwiriš(?)				hi-WA-ri-iš	hiv=ir(?)=i=ž		VHN 136
Hizulak				hi-zu-la-ak	hiž(?)=o/ul=a=g		ARM XVI/1:109
Hizza				hi-iz-za	hizz=a		VHN 137
Hizzi			6	hi-iz-zi	hizz=i		VHN 138
Hizziya				hi-iz-zi-ia	hizz=i=ya		VHN 138
Hizzu				hi-iz-zu	hizz=o		VHN 138
Huiššam				hu-i-iš-ša-am	huiss(e)=a=m(e/a)	He is Like a call?	VHN 139

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Huiššam	f		2	ḥu-i-iš-ša-am	ḥuiss(e)=a=m(e/a)	She is Like a call?	VHN 139
Huizze				ḥu-iz-ze		The call	VHN 139
Huizze	f			ḥu-iz-zi		The call	Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:109
Hulap-ah̄ī				ḥu-la-pa-ḫi	ḫ/lul=a=b-ah̄=ī		VHN 140
Huli			3	ḥu-li	ḫo/ul=i		VHN 140
Hulli	f			ḥu-ul-li	ḫo/ull=i		VHN 140
Hulliya				ḥu-ul-li-ia	ḫo/ull=i=ya		VHN 140
Humpiri	f			ḥu-um-bi-ri			VHN 141
Hunzanze	f		6	ḥu-un-za-zi			ARM XVI/1:110; VHN 141
Hunzullatum	f			ḥu-un-zu-la-tum	ḫo/unz=o=ll(a)=atum		VHN 141
Hupazzan				ḥu-pa-az-za	ḫo/ubazzi=a=n(a)		Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:109
Hupitam			2	ḥu-bi-dam	ḫo/ubid(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a bull-calf	VHN 142
Hurmiš-atal				ḥu-ur-mi-iš-a-tal	ḫo/urmiž=adal	<i>Hurmiš</i> is strong	VHN 143
Hurpiš-elli	f			ḥu-ur-bi-iš-e-li	ḫo/urb=i=ž-el(a)=ni		VHN 143
Hurpiya				ḥu-ur-bi-ia	ḫo/urb=i=ya		VHN 143

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Hurpiya	f			ḥu-ur-bi-ia	ḥo/urb=i=ya		VHN 143
Hutan	f			ḥu-ta-an	ḥo/ud(i)=a=n(na)	He is according to the prayer	VHN 144
Huziri				ḥu-zi-ri	ḥuzir(i)=a		VHN 143
Huzukuk(?)				ḥu-zu-ku-uk(?)	ḥuz=o/ug=o=g		VHN 144
Huzulli				ḥu-zu-li	ḥuž=o=lli		VHN 144
Huzuluk				ḥu-zu-lu-uk	ḥuž=o/ul=o=g		VHN 144
Idin- ^d Išḫara		S	4	i-din- ^d iš-ḫa-ra			ARM XVI/1:115
Iluza				i-lu-za	ilo/uzz(i)=a		VHN 103
Ikel-tuk				i-ge-el-du-uk	ig=e/il-to/uk		VHN 98
Ikkazzi				ik-ka-az-zi			VHN 97
Ikulum				i-ku-lum	ig=o/ul=o=m		VHN 98
Ikuza				i-ku-za	igo/uzz(i)=a		Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:117
Illu-te		?		il-lu-di	ill=u-Te		Sasson 1974:361; ARM XVI/1:124
Ima-ku	f			i-ma-gu			Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:125
Inib-šarri	f			i-ni-ib-šar-ri / i-ni-ib-LUGAL	in=i=b-šarri		ARM XVI/1:126

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Inib-šena	f		3	i-ni-ib-ši-na / i-ni-ib-šu-nu	in=i=b-šena		ARM XVI/1:126
Inib-šimika			2	i-ni-ib- ^d UD	in=i=b-šimiga		ARM XVI/1:126
Iniš-kepal				i-ni-iš-ke-ba-al	in=i=ž-kebal(i)		VHN 105
Iniš-ulme			4	i-ni-iš-ul-me	in=i=ž-olme		VHN 105
Iniya	f			i-ni-ia	in=i=ya	He/She gave (him)	Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:90
Inna-ḫan				in-na-ḫa-an	inn=a-ḫan(u)		Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:126
Innu-Naye				in-nu-na-a-ie	inn=o-Naye		VHN 106
Intaya				in-da-ia	ind=a=ya		VHN 106
Inulum				i-nu-lum	in=o/ul=o=m		VHN 106
Inziya				in-zi-ia	inz=i=ya		VHN 106
Ipki-tukka				ip-ki-tu-ka	ipk=i-to/ukk(i)=a		VHN 108
Ipqu-šala(š)	f	S/H	2	ip-qú- ^d ša-la / ip-qú-ša-la		Grace of šalaš	ARM XVI/1:127
Irhil				ir-ḫi-il	irḡ=i=l		VHN 113
Iriya				i-ri-ia	ir=i=ya		VHN 112
Irpíš				ir-bi-iš	irb=i=ž		VHN 114

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Irrip-šenni				ir-ri-ip-še-ni	irr=i=b-šen(a)=ni		VHN 113
Irriri				ir-ri-ri			VHN 113
Irruk				ir-ru-uk	irr=o=g		VHN 114
Irruše				ir-ru-úš-še			VHN 114
Irtizzi				ir-di-iz-zi			VHN 114
Išḫa	f	?	3	iš-ḫa			ARM XVI/1:129
Išḫara-asīya	f	S		^d iš-ḫa-ra-a-si-ia			ARM XVI/1:129
Išḫara-damqa	f	S		^d iš-ḫa-ra-dam-qa			ARM XVI/1:129
Išḫara-dannat	f	S		^d iš-ḫa-ra-dan-na-at			ARM XVI/1:129
Išḫara-dumqi	f	S		^d iš-ḫa-ra-{da]-du-um-qí			ARM XVI/1:129
Išḫara-gumli	f	S		^d iš-ḫa-ra-gu-um-li			ARM XVI/1:129
Išḫara-Lamassi	f	S		^d iš-ḫa-ra- ^d KAL			ARM XVI/1:129
Išḫara-malaki	f	S		^d iš-ḫa-ra-m[a-l]a-ki			ARM XVI/1:129
Išḫara-naḫme	f	S		^d iš-ḫa-ra-na-aḫ-me			ARM XVI/1:129
Išḫara-napši	f	S		^d iš-ḫa-ra-na-ap-si			ARM XVI/1:129

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Išhara-nīri	f	S		^d iš-ḥa-ra-ni-ri			ARM XVI/1:129
Išhara-samrati	f	S		^d iš-ḥa-ra-sà-am-ra-ti			ARM XVI/1:129
Išhara-šamši	f	S		^d iš-ḥa-ra- ^d UD			ARM XVI/1:129
Išhara-šarrat	f	S		^d iš-ḥa-ra-šar-ra-at			ARM XVI/1:129
Išhara-šeme'at	f	S		^d iš-ḥa-ra-še-me-at			ARM XVI/1:129
Išhara-šulume	f	S		^d iš-ḥa-ra-šu-lum?-me			ARM XVI/1:129
Išhara-tašbam	f	S		^d iš-ḥa-ra-ta-aš-ba-am			ARM XVI/1:129
Išhara-taskup	f	S	2	^d iš-ḥa-ra-ta-às-ku-up			ARM XVI/1:129
Išhara-ummi	f	S	5	^d iš-ḥa-ra-um-mi			ARM XVI/1:129
Iškar-elli				is-ka-ar-e-li / iš-kur-e-li	iška/or(i)-el(a)=ni		VHN 115
Išmen-aḥar	f			iš-me-en-a-ḥa-ar	išm=i=n(na)-aḡar		VHN 116
Išmen-allani	f		2	iš-me-en-al-la-ni	išm=i=n(na)-Allanni		ARM XVI/1:131
Išmen-amumi	f			iš-me-a-mu-mi	išm=i=n(na)-amo/umi		VHN 116
IŠTAR-šaki	f		3	IŠ ₈ -TÁR-ša-ki	IŠTAR-šagi		VHN 116
Itim-menni	f			i-di-im-me-ni	id=i=b>m-men(a)=ni	The siblings struck	Sasson 1974:360; ARM XVI/1:114

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
lwi(?) -tuni				i-WA-tu-ni	ivi(?) -to/uni		VHN 108
lwinne				i-wi-in-ne	iv=i=nni		VHN 107
lwiš-šen				i-wi-iš-še-e[nə]	iv=i=ž-šen		VHN 108
lwri				i-wi-ri	evri	Lord	Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:133
lwušše	f			i-wu-úš-e			VHN 112
lzamu	f			i-za-mu			Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:133
lziza	f			i-zi-za			Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:133
lzum-talma				i-zu-um-ta-al-ma	iz=o=m-talm(i)=a	The big mourned him	VHN 117
lzunna				i-zu-un-na	iž=o=nna	Mourn him!	VHN 117
lzzan			3	i-sa-an / i-za-an / iz-za-an	iz(z)=a=n(na)		Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:127, 133
lzzanni			2	iz-za-ni	iz(z)=a=ni		Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:133
lzzāya	f			iz-za-a-ya	izz=a=ya		Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:133
lzzin				iz-zi-in	izz=i=n(na)		VHN 115
lzzunni				iz-zu-un-ni	izz=o=nni		Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:134
Kabiya			4	ka-bi-ya	kab=i=ya		Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:135

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kaita	f			ga-i-da			Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:92
Kakka	f		4	ka-ak-ka	kakk=a		ARM XVI/1:135
Kakkanna	f			ka-ak-ka-an-na	kakk=a=nna		VHN 145
Kakkarukkum				ka-ak-ka-ru-kum	kakk=ar=o=kk(=o)=u m		VHN 145
Kakki				ka-ak-ki	kakk=i		VHN 145
Kališ-nur				ka-li-iš-nu-úr	kal=i=ž-no/ur(i)		VHN 146
Kaliya				ka-li-ia	kal=i=ya		Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:134
Kammiya				ka-am-mi-ia	kamm=i=ya		VHN 146
Kanapān			2	ka-na-pa-an	kan=a=b=ān		ARM XVI/1:136
Kanapānu				ka-na-pa-nu	kan=a=b=ānu		VHN 146
Kanazzi	f			ka-na-az-e			VHN 147
Kanazzi				ka-na-az-zi			VHN 147
Kanikkan				ka-ni-ka-an	kan=i=kk=i>a=n(na)		ARM XVI/1:136
Kanipān				ga-ni-ba-an	kan=i=b-an		Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:92
Kanni			2	ka-an-ni / ga-an-ni	kan=ni		Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:92, 136

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kannukka				ka-an-nu-uk-ka	kann=o=kk=o>a		Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:136
Kanti				ga-an-di			VHN 149
Kanzan	f			ka-an-za-an	kanz(i)=a=n(na)		VHN 147
Kanzaya				ka-an-za-ia	kanz=a=ya		VHN 147
Kanzaya	f			ka-an-za-ia	kanz=a=ya		VHN 147
Kanzi	f		3	ka-an-zi	kanz=i		VHN 148
Kanzu	f		9	ka-an-zu	kanz=o		Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:136
Kanzunta[x]	f			ka-an-zu-un-t[a ² -]			Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:136
Kanzulle	f		2	ka-an-zu-ul-e	kanz=o=lle		VHN 148
Kanzu-petunni	f		6	ka-an-zu-be-tu-ni	kanz=o-pedonni		VHN 148
Kapanna-api	f			ka-ba-an-na-a-bi	kab=a=nna-abi		VHN 149
Kapiata	f			ka-bi-A-da	kab=i-ada?		Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:134
Kapiata				ka-bi-a-ta	kab=i-ada?		Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:134
Kapinna				ka-bi-na	kab=i=nna		VHN 150
Kapinni				ka-bi-in-ni	kab=i=nni		VHN 150

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kapinnu				ka-bi-in-nu	kab=i=nno/u		VHN 150
Kapip-urša	f			ka-bi-bu-ur-ša	kab=i=b-o/urž(i)=a		Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:134
Kapita	f		3	ka-bi-da	kabid(i)=a		Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:134
Kapitam				ka-bi-dam	kabid(i)=a=m(e/a)		VHN 151
Kapitaya	f			ka-bi-da-ya	kabid(i)=a=ya		Sasson 1974:362; ARM XVI/1:134
Kap-še				ka-ap-še	kab-še		VHN 151
Karakka				ka-ra-ak-ka	kar=a=kk=a		VHN 152
Karitan				ka-ri-ta-an	kar=i=dan?		Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:136
Kariya			2	ka-ri-ia	kar=i=ya		Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:92, 136
Karšan				ka-ar-ša-an	karž(i)=a=n(na)		VHN 152
Kašakka			2	ka-ša-ak-ka	kaž=a=kk=a		VHN 152
Kaširazzi				ka-ši-ra-az-zi			VHN 153
Kašme-ki	f			ka-aš-me-gi	kažm=i-ki		VHN 154
Katamze				ka-dam-ze			VHN 154
Katirḫe			3	ka-ti-ir-ḫe	kadirḫe	To the one who said, properly	VHN 154

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Katiš-ḥuḥ(u)				ka-di-iš-ḥu-uḥ	kad=i=ž-ḥo/uḡo/u	May the father? say!	VHN 155
Katiya				ka-ti-ia	kad=i=ya	He/She said	VHN 154
Katune	f			ka-du-ne	kad=u=ne		Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:135
Kawlam			3	ka-wi-lam	kavl(i)=a=m(e/a)		ARM XVI/1:137
Kazame	f			ka-za-am-e			VHN 153
Kazaya				ka-za-ia	kaž(?)=a=ya		VHN 152
Kaziram				ka-zi-ra-am	kažir(i)=a=m(e/a)		VHN 153
Kaziya				ka-zi-ia	kaž(?)=i=ya		VHN 153
Keam-šenni				ke-a-am-še-en-ni	ke(?)=a=m(b!)-šen(a)=ni		VHN 155
Keki	f			ke-e-ki	kig=i	Let the third (number three) be here!	VHN 156
Kelib-elai				Ke-li-be-la-i	kel=i=b-elai	The sister made (him) healthy/happy	Kupper 1978:125; ARM XVI/1:138
Kelip-šarri				ki-li-ip-šar-ri	kil=i=b-šarri	The godking made (him) healthy/happy	Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:138
Keliya			3	ke-li-ya	kel=i=ya	He/She was satisfied	Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:138
Keliyae				ke-li-ia-e	Keliya=(v)e	That from Keliya	VHN 157
Kelti	f			ke-él-di		Health	VHN 158

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Keltuzzi	f		2	ke-el-du-zi		Healthy	VHN 159
Kelum-...[...]				ke-lum-x-[...]	kel=o=m-x[...]		VHN 160
Kelum-[...]				ke-lu-um-[...]	kel=o=m-[...]		VHN 161
Kelum-allai	f			ki-lum-al-la-i	kel=o=m-allai	The lady made her healthy/happy	Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:138
Kelu- <i>manna</i>	f			ke-lu-ma-na	kel=o=∅- <i>manna</i>	Manna made her healthy/happy	VHN 160
Kelu- <i>mannu</i>				ke-lu-ma-nu	kel=o=∅- <i>mannu</i>	Mannu made him healthy/happy	VHN 160
Kelum-atal				ke-lum-a-tal	kel=o=m-adal	The strong made him healthy/happy	VHN 160
Kelum-kiyaze	f		4	ke-lum-ki-ia-ze	kel=o=m-kiyaže	The sea made her healthy/happy	VHN 160
Kelze			6	ke-el-ze		Health?	VHN 158
Kelzu				ke-el-zu	kelž(e)=u	Health?	VHN 158
Kerazze	f			ke-ra-ze			VHN 163
Kerizze				ke-ri-iz-ze		Lenght	VHN 166
Kerizzu				ke-ri-iz-zu	kerišš(e)=u	Lenght	VHN 166
Kewar				ke-wa-ar			VHN 162
Ki...-atal				ki-x-a-tal	ki...-adal		VHN 170

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kiki				ki-ki	kig=i	Let the third (number three) be here!	VHN 155
Kikkinnu				ki-ik-ki-nu	kikkinn(i)=u	Tripod	VHN 156
Kimma	f		?	ki-im-m[a?]			Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:138
Kinip-šarri				ki-ni-ip-šar-ri	kin=i=b-šarri		VHN 161
Kiniya	f			ki-ni-ia	kin=i=ya		VHN 161
Kinnikku				ki-in-ni-ik-ku	kinn=i=kk=o		VHN 161
Kinum-atal				ki-nu-um-a-da-al	ken=o=m-adal		Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:137
Kinzi			2	ki-in-zi	kinz=i		VHN 161
Kinziya			2	ki-in-zi-ia	kinz=i=ya		Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:138
Kipam-šenni				ki-ip-a-am-še-ni	kib=a=m(b!)- šen(a)=ni		VHN 162
Kipam-Teššup				ki-ba-am-te-šu-up	kib=a=m(b!)-Teššob		VHN 162
Kipir[um]				ki-bi-ir-[um]	kibir(i)=um	Hunter?	ARM XVI/1:137
Kipiri				ki-bi-ri		Hunter?	Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:137
Kipram			2	ki-ip-ra-am	kibir(i)=a=m(e/a)		VHN 163
Kipsunna	f		4	ki-ip-su-un-na	kips=o=nna		VHN 163

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kipu-šenni				ki-pu-še-ni	kip=o-šen(a)=ni		Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:138
Kipzunna	f			ki-ib-zu-un-na	kips=o=nna		ARM XVI/1:137
Kirari				ki-ra-ri			VHN 163
Kiripān		?		ki-ir-ba-an	kir-i-b-ān		Kupper 1978:128; ARM XVI/1:138
Kirip-Aranziḫ				ki-ri-ip-a-ra-an-zi-iḫ	kir=i=b-Aražiḡ	The Tigris liberated (him)	VHN 164
Kirip-atal				Ki-ri-ip-a-tal	kir=i=b-adal	The strong liberated (him)	Kupper 1978:125; ARM XVI/1:139
Kirip-ewri				ki-ri-ip-ew-ri	kir=i=b-evri	The lord liberated (him)	VHN 165
Kirip-šarri			2	ki-ri-ip-šar-ri	kir=i=b-šarri	The godking liberated (him)	VHN 165
Kirip-šenni			2	ki-ri-ip-še-ni	kir=i=b-šen(a)=ni	The brother liberated (him)	VHN 165
Kirip-šerriš			3	ki-ri-ip-še-ri-iš	kir=i=b-Šerriž	Šerriž liberated (him)	Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:139
Kirip-Teššup				ki-ri-ip-te-šu-up	kir=i=b-Teššob	Teššup liberated (him)	VHN 165
Kirip-ulme			2	ki-ri-ip-ul-me	kir=i=b-olme	The servant liberated (him)	VHN 165
Kirri				ki-ir-ri	kirr=i	Let (him) free!	VHN 163
Kirru			2	ki-ir-ru	kirr=o	Let (him) free!	VHN 166
Kisen(?) -ki	f			ki(?) -še(?) -en-gi	kiž=i=n(na)-ki		VHN 168

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kiš-kanazzi	f		2	ki-iš-ka-na-zi	kiž-kanazzi		VHN 168
Kitum-allai	f			ki-tum-al-la-i	kid=o=m-allai		VHN 170
Kitumze	f			ki-du-um-ze	kidumze		VHN 170
Kiyaše	f			ki-ia-še	Kiyaže	Sea	VHN 155
Kiyazi	f			ki-[x-]Pl-zi			Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:137
Kiza				ki-za	kiz=a		VHN 166
Kiza...-ewri				ki-za-x-ew-ri	...-evri		VHN 167
Kiziya				ki-zi-ia	kiz=i=ya		VHN 167
Kizum				ki-zu-um	kiz=o=m		VHN 169
Kizuri			6	ki-zu-ri			VHN 169
Kizuzzum			2	ki-zu-zum	kizo/uzz(i)=um		VHN 169
Kizzazzum				?	kizzazz(i)=um		VHN 166
Kizzi				ki-iz-zi	kizz=i		VHN 167
Kizzikkan				ki-iz-zi-ga-an	kizz=i=kk=i>a=n(na)		VHN 167
Kizziya			2	ki-iz-zi-ia	kizz=i=ya		Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:138

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kizzu			2	ki-iz-zu	kizz=o		VHN 168
Kizzu(-)[...]				ki-iz-zu(-)[...]			VHN 170
Kizzu-men				ki-iz-zu-mi-en	kizz=o-men		VHN 169
Kizzunni				ki-iz-zu-un-ni	kizz=o=nni		VHN 169
Kizzuri				ki-iz-zu-ri			VHN 169
Kizzutta					kizz=o=tta		VHN 170
Kizzuzzi				ki-iz-zu-zi			VHN 169
Kubabuzzi	f			Ku-ba-bu-zi		Kubaba is reasonable	Kupper 1978:125; ARM XVI/1:139
Kukiya	f			ku-ki-ia	ko/ug=i=ya		VHN 170
Kukki	f			ku-uk-ki	ko/ukk=i		VHN 170
Kukku	f		2	ku-uk-ku	ko/ukk=o		VHN 170
Kukku(?)ewri				ku-uk-ku(?)ew-ri	ko/ukk=o-evri		VHN 171
Kukkurēn				ku-uk-ku-re-en	ko/ukkori=ān		VHN 171
Kukkuriān	f			ku-uk-ku-ri-a-an	ko/ukkori=ān		VHN 171
Kullulli				ku-ul-lu-li	ko/ull=o=lli		VHN 172

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kullumzar				ku-ul-lum-za-ar			VHN 173
Kulpi				Ku-ul-pi			Kupper 1978:125; ARM XVI/1:140
Kulpi-atal				Ku-ul-pi-a-tal	ko/ulbi-adal		Kupper 1978:125; ARM XVI/1:140
Kumarwe-atal				?	Ko/umarve-adal	Kumarwe is strong	VHN 173
Kumarwe-ewri				?	Ko/umarve-evri	Kumarwe is the lord	VHN 173
Kummen-atal				Ku-um-me-en-a-tal	ko/ummen=n(a)-adal	<i>Kumme</i> is strong	Kupper 1978:125; ARM XVI/1:140
Kun[tu]ri(?)							VHN 177
Kuniš-Na(?)	f			ku-ni-iš-na-a	ko/un=i=ž-Na(?)		VHN 174
Kunki	f			ku-un-gi			VHN 174
Kunni				ku-un-ni	ko/unni=i		VHN 174
Kunnunna				ku-un-nu-na	ko/unni=o=nna		VHN 177
Kunnuzzi	f			ku-un-nu-zi			VHN 177
Kun-šen				ku-un-še-en	ko/un-šen		VHN 175
Kunti	f		5	Ku-un-di	ko/und=i		Kupper 1978:125; ARM XVI/1:140
Kuntiya	f			ku-un-ti-ia	ko/und=i=ya		VHN 176

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kuntulla	f			ku-un-du-la	ko/und=o=lla		VHN 176
Kuntullatum	f		2	ku-un-du-la-tum	ko/und=o=ll(a)=atum		VHN 176
Kuntulli	f			ku-un-du-li	ko/und=o=lli		VHN 177
Kuntunna	f		2	ku-un-du-na	ko/und=o=nna		VHN 177
Kunturi	f		5	ku-un-du-ri	kunduri		VHN 177
Kunukki	f			ku-nu-uk-ki	ko/un=o=kk=i		VHN 177
Kunum			2	ku-nu-um	ko/un=o=m		VHN 177
Kunuš-Na	f			ku-nu-úš-na	ko/un=o=ž-Na		VHN 177
Kunzatte	f		2	ku-un-za-at-te	ko/unz=a=tte		VHN 174
Kunzi	f		3	ku-un-zi	ko/unz=i	Bend!	VHN 174
Kunzi-šalli	f			ku-un-zi-sa-al-li	ko/unz=i(=n(na))- šal(a)=ni	Sister, bend!	VHN 175
Kunziya	f		4	Ku-un-zi-ia	ko/unz=i=ya	He/She, bent (him)!	Kupper 1978:125; ARM XVI/1:141
Kunzunna	f			ku-un-zu-un-na	ko/unz=o=nna	Bend!	VHN 175
Kupam				ku ² -pa ² -am-[x ²]			Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:141
Kupan				ku-ba-an			Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:139

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kuppiya			2	ku-ub-bi-ya	ko/upp=i=ya		Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:139
Kušaya	f			ku-ša-ia	ko/už=a=ya		VHN 180
Kušiya				ku-ši-ia	ko/už=i=ya		VHN 183
Kuš-kipa(!)				ku-uš-ki(!)-ba	ko/už-kib(i)=a		VHN 183
Kušuḥ-[...]				ku-zu-u[ḥ-...]	Kužo/uğ-...		VHN 185
Kušuḥ-...				ku-zu-uḥ-AN-x-x	Kužo/uğ-...		VHN 185
Kušuḥ-atal			6	ku-zu-uḥ-a-dal	kužo/uğ-adal	Kuzuḥ is strong	Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:142; VHN 184
Kušuḥ-ewri				ku-zu-uḥ-ew-ri	Kužo/uğ-ewri	Kuzuḥ is the lord	VHN 184
Kušuḥ-šarri				ku-zu-uḥ-šar-ri	Kužo/uğ-šarri	Kuzuḥ is the godking	VHN 185
Kutate	f			ku-da-di			Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:140
Kutate	f			ku-da-di			Sasson 1974:363; ARM XVI/1:140
Kutaya				ku-ta-a-ia	kud=a=ya	He/She fell	VHN 186
Kute	f		3	ku-te	kud=i	Let (her) fall!	VHN 186
Kuti	f		3	ku-ti	kud=i	Let (her) fall!	VHN 186
Kutin	f			ku-ti-in	kod=i=n(na)	Let (her) fall!	VHN 187

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kutinna	f			ku-di-na	kod=i=nna	Let (her) fall!	VHN 187
Kutiya	f		4	ku-di-ia	kud=i=ya	He/She dropped (him)	ARM XVI/1:140
Kutiya				ku-di-ia	kud=i=ya	He/She dropped (him)	ARM XVI/1:140
Kutte				gu-ut-te	kutt=i	Let (her) fall!	VHN 186
Kutti			3	ku-ud-di	kutt=i	Let (her) fall!	Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:140
Kutuk				ku-du-uk	kud=o=g	He did not fall	VHN 187
Kutukkatil			2	ku-du-uk-ka-di-il	kud=o=kk=o>a=dil(la)	We did not fall	VHN 188
Kutulli	f			ku-du-li	kud=o=lli		VHN 188
Kutunze	f			ku-du-un-ze			VHN 188
Kuwakki	f			ku-wa-ak-ki	ko/uv=a=kk=i		VHN 178
Kuwari	f		9	Ku-wa-ri	Kuvari		Kupper 1978:128; VHN 179
Kuwari				ku-wa-ri	Kuvari		VHN 178
Kuwariya				ku-wa-ri-ya	ko/uvari=ya		Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:141
Kuzan				gu-za-an			Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:93
Kuzar				ku-za-ar	koz(?)=ar=i	Keep (him) back!	VHN 181

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kuzari	f			ku-za-ri	koz(?)=ar=i	Keep (her) back!	VHN 181
Kuzari			11	ku-za-ri	koz(?)=ar=i	Keep (him) back!	VHN 181
Kuzarina				ku-za-ri-na	koz(?)=ar=i=na		Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:142
Kuzarum				ku-za-rum	koz(?)=ar=o=m	He/She Kept back	VHN 182
Kuzaya				ku-za-ia	koz(?)=a=ya		VHN 180
Kuzazzi	f			ku-za-az-zi			Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:141
Kuzi	f			ku-zi	koz(?)=i	Hold ((her)/(him)) back!	VHN 182
Kuzi			2	gu-zi	koz(?)=i	Hold ((her)/(him)) back!	Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:93
Kuziya			2	ku-zi-ia	koz(?)=i=ya	He/She Kept back (him)	VHN 183
Kuzizari				ku-zi-za-ri			VHN 183
Kuz-kuzi	f			ku-uz-ku-zi			VHN 183
Kuzuzari				ku-zu-za-ri			VHN 185
Kuzzari			5	ku-uz-za-ri / ku-za-ri	koz(?)=ar=i	Keep back!	Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:142
Kuzzari			5	ku-uz-za-ri	koz(?)=ar=i	Keep back!	VHN 181
Kuzzari	f			ku-za-ri	koz(?)=ar=i		Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:142

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kuzzi				ku-uz-zi	kozz(?)=i	Keep back!	VHN 182
Kuzzuya				gu-uz ₄ (AZ)-zu-ia	kozz(?)=o=ya	Keep back!	VHN 185
Makiya	f		7	ma-ki-ia	mag/meg=i=ya	He/She gave(?) (him)	VHN 189
Makunta	f			ma-ku-un-da	magond(i)=a		VHN 189
Mališ-akum			2	ma-li-iš-a-gu-um	mali=ž-ag=o=m	Mali brought (him) up	VHN 189
Maliya				Ma-li-ia	mal=i=ya		Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:148
Maliya				ma-li-ia	mal=i=ya		VHN 189
Manniya		?		Ma-an-ni-ia	mann=i=ya		ARM XVI/1:149
Mannukka			2	ma-an-nu-uk-ka	mann=o=kk=o>a=∅	He/She does not exist	VHN 189
Maratilla				ma-ra-di-la	mar=a=dilla		VHN 190
Maruḥ(h)e	f			ma-ru-[ḥ]e		Like Mari	VHN 190
Maruš-taḥe	f			ma-ru-uš-ta-a-ḥe	mar=o=ž-taḥe		VHN 190
Maška-Naye	f			ma-áš-ka-na-ie	mašk=a=∅-Naye		VHN 191
Masum(-)a	f			ma-sú-ma			VHN 190
Masum-atal			2	Ma-su-um-a-t[al!]	mas=o=m-adal		Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:151

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Masum-ši[...]				ma-sum-ši-[...]	mas=o=m-ši[...]		VHN 190
Masuya				ma-su-ia	mas=o=ya		VHN 190
Matazza	f			ma-ta-az-za	madazz(e)=a	Like wisdom	VHN 191
Mati-ki	f			Ma-ti-gi	mad=i-ki		Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:152
Matim-Addu				ma-di-im-ma-tum	mad=i=m(b!)-Addu	Addu showed the wisdom	VHN 192
Matiya				ma-di-ia	mad=i=ya	He/She made (him) wise	ARM XVI/1:147
Matun[...]				ma-du-un-[...]	mad=o=n(-)[...]	Give (him) wisdom!	VHN 193
Matunna	f			ma-du-na	mad=o=nna	Give (him) wisdom!	VHN 192
Matunni	f			ma-du-un-ni	mad=o=nni	Give (him) wisdom!	VHN 193
Mazalla	f		2	ma-za-al-la	maz=all=a		VHN 191
Mazalla				ma-za-la	maz=all=a		VHN 191
Mazallaya	f			ma-za-la-a-ia	maz=all=a=(a)ya		VHN 191
Mazallum	f			ma-za-al-la	maz=all=o=m		VHN 191
Mazura	f			ma-zu-ra	mazor(i)=a		VHN 191
Mazurāya	f			ma-zu-ra-a-ia	mazor(i)=āya		VHN 191

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Meḡhaniya		?	2	me-ḡa-ni-ia			ARM XVI/1:152
Meme(n(-)...)]				me-me-e[n-...]	meme=[n(na)(-)...]		VHN 195
Meme-kiyaze	f			me-me-ki-ia-ze	meme-kiyaže	Meme is the sea	VHN 193
Memem(-)]				me-me-en(-)]	meme=n(na)(-)]		VHN 195
Memem-atal				me-me-en-a-tal	meme=n(na)-adal	Meme is strong	VHN 193
Memem-lgar				me-mi-ni-ga-ar	meme=n(a)-lgar		ARM XVI/1:152
Memem-kanazzi	f			me-me-en-ka-na-zi	meme=n(a)-Kanazzi		Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:152
Memem-ki	f			me-me-en-gi	meme=n(a)-ki	Meme is the sea	Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:152
Memem-kiyazi	f		3	me-me-en-ki-ia-zi	meme=n(a)-kiyaže	Meme is the sea	Kupper 1978:128
Memem-šaki	f		2	me-me-en-ša-ki	meme=n(a)-šagi		Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:153
Memma	f		2	me-em-ma			VHN 193
Memma(-)]				me-em-ma(-)]			VHN 193
Memšari				me-em-ša-ri			VHN 195
Menanna	f		9	me-na-an-na	mena=nna		Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:153
Men-ḡeba(t)				Me-en-ḡe-ba	men(a)-ḡeba(t)	ḡebat is the sibling?	Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:153

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Menna				me-en-na		Sibling	Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:153
Menna	f			me-en-na		Sibling	Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:153
Menna	f			me-en-na-a		Sibling	Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:153
Menna-pu[...]	f			me-en-na-pu- [...]	menna-... [...]		VHN 196
Mennatum	f		3	me-en-na-tum	menn(a/i)=atum	Young sibling	VHN 197
Mennazze	f		7	me-en-na-ze		Siblinghood?	VHN 196
Menninna			2	me-ni-en-na	men(a)=ni=nna	It is the sibling	VHN 197
Menninna	f			me-ni-en-[na?]	men(a)=ni=nna	It is the sibling	Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:153
Mime-šarri				mi-me-ša-ar-ri	mime-šarri	<i>Mime</i> is the godking	Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:155
Minna-minna	f			mi-in-na-mi-in-na			VHN 195
Minnu	f			mi-in-nu	minn(a/i)=u		VHN 198
Minnunnatum	f			mi-in-nu-na-tum	minnonn(i)=atum		VHN 198
Mišaya				mi-ša-ia	miž=a=ya		VHN 198
Muḥrum-kiyaze	f			mu-uḥ-rum-ki-ia-ze	mo/uḡr=o=m-kiyaže		VHN 198
Muḥulla	f			mu-ḥu-ul-la	mo/uḡ=o=lla		VHN 198

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Mulukkan				mu-lu-ga-an	mo/ul=o=kk=o>a=n(n a)		VHN 198
Munuzzi	f			mu-nu-zi			ARM XVI/1:156
Muruḥ(ḥ)e				mu-ru-ḥe		To <i>Muri</i>	VHN 198
Mušun(-)[...]				mu-šu-un(-)[...]	muž=o=n[(na)(?)...]		VHN 200
Mušunan				mu-šu-na-an	mužun(i)=a=n(na)		VHN 200
Mut-Nawar				mu-ut-na-wa-ar	mut-Navar	Man/Warrior of Nawar	ARM XVI/1:157
Muzan-atal				mu-za-an-a-dal	muž=a=n(a)-adal	The strong is righteous	Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:159
Muza-ni				mu-za-ni	muž=a=n(a)=(n)i		Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:159
Muziya			2	mu-zi-ia	muž=i=ya	He/She, make (him) righteous!	ARM XVI/1:159
Muzu-elli				mu-zu-e-li	muž=o-el(a)=ni	Sister, make (him) right!	Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:159
Muzu-elli	f			mu-zu-e-li	muž=o-el(a)=ni	Sister, make (him) right!	ARM XVI/1:159
Muzum				mu-zu-um	muž=o=m	He/She made (him) right	Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:159
Muzum-atal				mu-zu-um-a-tal	muž=o=m-adal	The strong made (him) right	VHN 199
Muzum-elli				mu-zu-um-e-li	muž=o=m-el(a)=ni	The sister made (him) right	VHN 200
Muzum-eni				mu-zu-um-e-ni	muž=o=m-eni(a)	The deity made (him) right	Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:159

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Muzum-Gunu				mu-zu-um-gu-nu	muž=o=m-Gunu/e	<i>Gunu?</i> made (him) right	VHN 200
Na[...]ar-ki	f			na-[... -a]r-ki	Navar(?) -ki	Nawar is the sea	VHN 210
Naḥar(-)[...]				na-ḥa-ar-[...]	naḡ=ar-[...]		VHN 201
Naḥar-me	f			na-ḥa-ar-me	naḡ=ar-me	The sibling took place repeatedly	VHN 201
Naḥḥap-atal				na-aḥ-ap-a-tal	naḥḥ=a=b-adal	The strong took place	VHN 201
Nain-muzni				na-in-mu-lZ-ni	na(i)=i=n(na)-mužni	Righteous, feed (him)!	VHN 200
Nakat-miš				na-ga-at-mi-iš	naḡ=ad-miž(i)		VHN 202
Nakazni	f			na-ka-az-ni			VHN 201
Nakiya	f		2	na-gi-ia	naḡ=i=ya		ARM XVI/1:160
Naktam-amumi			2	[...] -ak-ta-am-a-mu-mi	nakt/natk(i)=a=m(e/a)	Childbirth is like annihilation	VHN 202
Naktum-Naya				Na-ak-tum-na-ia	nakt=o=m-Naya	Naye destroyed him	Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:160
Naktum-Naye	f			na-ak-tum-na-ie	nakt=o=m-Naye	Naye destroyed him	VHN 202
Nallame	f			na-al-la-me			VHN 202
Nalukkatil	f			na-lu-ka-di-il	nal=o=kk=o>a=dil(la)		VHN 202
Nanakka	f			na-na-ak-ka	nan=a=kk=a		Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:161

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Nanatan		?		na-na-ta-an	nan=a=dan(i)		Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:161
Naniku				na-ni-gu	nan=i=ku?		Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:161
Nanip-ewri			2	na-ni-ip-ew-ri	nan=i=b-evri	The lord struck down	VHN 204
Nanip-naya	f			na-ni-ip-na-ia	nan=i=b-Naya	Naye struck down	Sasson 1974:364; ARM XVI/1:161
Nanip-Naye	f			na-ni-ip-na-ie	nan=i=b-Naye	Naye struck down	VHN 204
Nanip-šarri			3	Na-ni-ip!-[š]ar-ri	nan=i=b-šarri	The godking struck down	Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:161
Nanip-šawuri				na-ni-ip-ša-Pl-ri / na-ni-ip-ša-ú-ri	nan=i=b-šavori	Šawuri struck down	Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:161
Nanip-ulme				na-ni-ip-ul-me	nan=i=b-olme	The servant struck down	VHN 204
Naniya	f			na-ni-ya	nan=i=ya	He/She struck down	Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:161
Naniya				na-ni-ia	nan=i=ya	He/She struck down	VHN 203
Naniyatum	f			na-ni-ia-tum	nan=i=y(a)=atum		VHN 203
Nan-miki				na-an-mi-gi	nan-migi	Miki struck down	VHN 205
Nan-miki	f			na-an-mi-gi	nan-migi	Miki struck down	VHN 205
Nanni(-)zu				na-an-ni-zu			VHN 205
^d Nanni-šarra		?		^d na-an-ni-šar-ra			ARM XVI/1:161

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Nanniya	f			na-an-ni-[ya [?]]	nann=i=ya	He/She struck down	Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:161
Nanniya				na-an-ni-ia	nann=i=ya	He/She struck down	VHN 203
Naraya	f		2	na-ra-a-ia	nar=a=ya	She is the fifth	VHN 209
Naraya				na-ra-a-ia	nar=a=ya	He is the fifth	VHN 209
Natunuk				na-tu-nu-uk	nad=o/un=o=g		VHN 210
Nawakku			3	na-wa-ak-ku	nav=a=kk=o		VHN 205
Nawar(-)zu				na-wa-ar-zu			VHN 208
Nawar-[...]				na-wa-r[i [?]]	Navar-	Nawar	ARM XVI/1:163
Nawar-a[...]				^d na-wa-ar-a-[...]	Navar-a[...]	Nawar	VHN 206
Nawar-amume	f			na-wa-ar-a-mu-me	Navar-amo/umi	Nawar is the arrival	VHN 205
Nawar-arum				na-wa-ar-a-rum	Navar-ar=o=m	Nawar gave him	VHN 206
Nawar-atal			2	na-PI-ar-a-da[-a]l	Navar-adal	Nawar is strong	Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:163
Nawar-elli	f		2	Na-wa-ar-e-li	Navar-el(a)=ni	Nawar is the sister	Kupper 1978:126
Nawar-ewri				na-wa-ar-ew-ri	Navar-evri	Nawar is the lord	VHN 206
Nawarikki(?)				na-WA-ri-ki	nav=ar=i=kk=i		VHN 206

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Nawarītum	f			na-wa-ri-tim			ARM XVI/1:163
Nawar-k[iyaze(?)]				na-wa-ar-k[i-ia-ze]	Navar-kiyaže(?)	Nawar is the sea	VHN 207
Nawar-Kanazzi	f		5	na-wa-ar-ka-na-zi	Navar-kanazzi		Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:163; VHN 206
Nawar-kiazi				Na-wa-ar-k[i-ia?-zi?]	Navar-kiyaže	Nawar is the sea	Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:163
Nawar-me				na-wa-ar-me	Navar-me	Nawar is the sibling	VHN 207
Nawar-nišḫe	f			na-wa-ar-ni-iš-ḫe	Navar-nišḫe		VHN 207
Nawarša-lūmur				na-wa-ar-ša-lu-mu-ur			ARM XVI/1:163
Nawar-šarri			2	na-wa-ar-šar-ri	Navar-šarri	Nawar is the godking	VHN 207
Nawar-Šemike	f			na-wa-ar-še-mi-ge	Navar-Šemige	Nawar is Šemike / is the sun	VHN 208
Nawar-šinza	f			Na-wa-ar-ši-in-za	Navar-šinza	Nawar (gave) the second	Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:163
Nawar-Teššup				Na-wa-ar- ^d IM	Navar-Teššob	Nawar is Teššup	Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:163
Nawarze			2	na-wa-ar-ze			Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:163
Nazzukku				na-az-zu-gu	nazz=o=kk=o		VHN 210
Neniš-naya	f			ne-ni-iš-na-a-ya	nen=i=ž-Naya		Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:163
Nikili				ni-ki-li	nig=i=le		VHN 210

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Nikirānu				ni-gi-ra-nu	nigir(i)(?)=ānu		VHN 210
Nikir-šarri			2	ni-gi-ir-šar-ri	nigir(i)-šarri		Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:164
Niluk				ni-lu-uk	nil=o=g		VHN 211
Nineš-elli	f			ni-ne-eš ₁₇ (MEŠ)-e-li	nin=i=ž-el(a)=ni		VHN 211
Nineš-tari	f		8	ni-ne-iš-ta-ar-e	nin=i=ž-tari		VHN 211
Nineya	f			ni-ne-ia	nin=i=ya		VHN 211
Nipr(i)-aḫu			2	ni-ip-ra-ḫu	nibir(i)(?)=aḫu		VHN 212
Nipram			2	ni-ip-ra-am	nibir(i)(?)=a=m(e/a)		VHN 212
Nipriya				ni-ip-ri-ia	nibiri(?)=ya		VHN 212
Niriš- [...]				ni-ri-iš- [...]	nir=i=ž- [...]		VHN 213
Nišḫe	f			ni-iš-ḫe			VHN 213
Nukizzan				nu-gi-za-an	no/ugizz(i)=a=n(a)		Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:165
Numenna				Nu-me-en-na	no/um=i=nna		Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:165
Numenna	f			nu-me-en-na	no/um=i=nna		ARM XVI/1:164
Numiš(?)=akum				nu(?)=me-iš-a-gu-um	no/umi=ž-ag=o=m	Numi brought (him) up	VHN 213

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Nuparakka				nu-bar-ak-ka	no/ub=ar=a=kk=a		VHN 214
Nupar-atal				nu-bar-a-tal	no/ubar-adal		VHN 214
Nupar-ela	f			nu-bar-e-la	no/upar-ela		Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:165
Nupar-ewri			5	nu-bar-ew-ri	no/upar-evri		Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:165; VHN 214
Nupari/Nupuri				nu-ba-ri / nu-pu-ri			VHN 214
Nuparikka				nu-ba-ri-ka	no/ub=ar=i=kk=i>a=∅		VHN 214
Nuparikki				nu-bar-ik-ki	no/ub=ar/o/ur=i=kk=i		VHN 214
Nupar-šarri			3	nu-bar-šar-ri	no/upar-šarri		Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:165; VHN 215
Nupatiya	f			nu-pa-ti-ya	no/ub=a=tta=ya		Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:166
Nupatta	f			nu-ba-ta	no/ub=a=tta		Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:165
Nupaya			2	nu-ba-ia	no/ub=a=ya		VHN 214
Nupin-Naye	f			nu-bi-en-na-a-ie	no/ub=i=n(na)-Naye		VHN 215
Nupputa				nu-bu-ta	no/ub=o=tta		Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:165
Nupur- [...]				nu-pur- [...]	no/ub=o/ur- [...]		VHN 217
Nupur-[na]lame	f				no/ubor-nalame		VHN 216

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Nupuri				nu-bu-ri	no/ub=o/ur=i		Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:165
Nupurikku				Nu-pu-ri-ik-ku	no/ub=o/ur=i=kk=i>a		Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:165
Nupurna-inni	f			nu-pur-na-in-ni	no/ubor(i)=n(i)=a-inni		VHN 216
Nuputta/Nupatta	f		2	nu-pu-ut-ta / nu-ba-at-ta	no/ub=o=tta / no/ub=a=tta		VHN 217
Nūr- ^d l̥ḥara		S		nu-úr- ^d iṣ-ḥa-ra		l̥ḥara is the light	ARM XVI/1:166
Nusawari			3	Nu-sa-wa-ri			Sasson 1974:365; Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:166
Nutal				nu-da-al	no/ud=a=l		VHN 218
Nutaya				nu-da-a-ia	no/ud=a=ya		VHN 218
Nuwazze	f			nu-wa-az-ze			VHN 215
Nuzukka				nu-su-ug-ga	no/uz=o=kk=o>a		Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:166
Nuzzan			5	nu-uz-za-an	no/uzz(i)=a=n(na)		VHN 218
Nuzzukkulla				nu-uz-zu-gu-ul-la	no/uzz=o=kk=o=lla/li		ARM XVI/1:166
Nuzzukkulla				Nu-uz-zu-gu-li	no/uzz=o=kk=o=lla/li		Kupper 1978:126; ARM XVI/1:166
Paḥar-mi	f	?		pa-ḥa-ar-mi	faḡar-mi	The sibling is good	Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:167
Paḥrizze				pa-aḥ-ri-ze		Goodness	VHN 220

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Paila			11	pa-i-la	pail(i)=a	According to the building	VHN 218
Paila	f			pa-i-la	pail(i)=a	According to the building	Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:167
Pailu				pa-i-lu	pail(i)=u	The built	VHN 219
Paip(-)a(?)				pa-i-ba(?)			Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:167
Paip-šarri			2	pa-i-ip-šar-ri	pa=i=b-šarri	The godking created (him)	Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:167
Pairi			2	pa-i-ri			Kupper 1978:127
Paizzan				pa-i-iz-za-an	paizz(i)=a=n(na)		VHN 220
Pakazzi				ba-ka-zi			VHN 221
Pakila				ba-ki-la			Sasson 1974:366
Pakiri				pa-gi-ri			VHN 221
Pakkari				pa-ka-ri			VHN 221
Pakkukki			2	pa-ak-ku-uk-ki	pakk=o=kk=i		VHN 221
Pakuzzi				ba-ku-zi			Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:74
Pala-kinzi				pa-la-ki-in-zi	pal=a=∅-kinzi		VHN 221
Palalla	f			ba ² -la-al-la			Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:74

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Palami				ba-la-mi			Sasson 1974:366
Palan				pa-la-an			Sasson 1974:366
Palan				pa-la-an			Sasson 1974:366
Paliya			3	ba-li-ia	pal=i=ya	He/She knew (him)	ARM XVI/1:75
Panašhe				pa-na-áš-he			VHN 222
Panti				pa-an-di	fand=i	Make (him) good!	Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:167
Panti- <i>Išhara</i>				pa-an-di- ^o iš-ha-ra	fand=i- <i>Išhara</i>	Išhara, make (him) good!	VHN 223
Panti-Ukur				pa-an-di- ^d u-gur	fand=i-O/Ugo/ur	Ukur, make (him) good!	VHN 224
Pantiya			4	pa-an-di-ya	fand=i=ya	He/She made (him) good	Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:167; VHN 223.
Pantunna				pa-an-du-un-na	fand=o=nna	Make (him) good!	VHN 224
Pantunnam				pa-an-du-na-am	fandonn(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is the favourite	VHN 224
Panzaya				pa-an-za-ia	panz=a=ya		VHN 222
Papaḥum				pa-ba-ḥu-um	pabağ(e)=um	Mountain dweller	VHN 224
Papam				pa-pa-am	paba=a=m(e/a)	He is like a mountain	VHN 224
Papan			5	pa-ba-an	paba=n(a)	He/She is a mountain	ARM XVI/1:167

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Papanna				pa-ba-an-na	paba=nna	He/She is a mountain	VHN 225
Papanni	f		2	pa-ba-an-ni	paba=nni	He/She is a mountain	VHN 225
Papanni				pa-ba-an-ni	paba=nni	He/She is a mountain	VHN 225
Papan-šarri				pa-ba-an-šar-ri	paba=n(a)-šarri	The mountain is godking	Sasson 1974:365; ARM XVI/1:167
Papan-taḫe			3	pa-ba-an-ta-ḫe	paba=n(na)-taḫe	The mountain is a man	VHN 225
Papāya				pa-ba-ia	pab(a)=āya	Young mountain	VHN 224
Papunze	f			ba-pu-un-ze			VHN 226
Papuzzi	f			pa-pu-zi		A mountain adequately	Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:167
Partip-šarri				p[a-a]r-di-ip-šar-ri	pard=i=b-šarri		VHN 226
Paruri	f		3	pa-ru-ri			Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:167
Paruri				pa-ru-ri			VHN 227
Pašaya	f		3	ba-ša-ia	faž(?)=a=ya		VHN 227
Paš-tari	f			pa-aš-ta-ar-e	faž(?)=tari	The fire entered	VHN 228
Patalla				pa-ta-al-l[a]	pad=all=a		Sasson 1974:366
Patallan				pa-da-la-an	pad=all=a=n(a)		Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:167

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Pata-nite	f			pa-da-ni-te	pad=a=ni=te		Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:167
Patatte	f			pa-da-at-te	pad=a=tte		VHN 229
Patinta	f			pa-di-it-ta	padind(i)=a		VHN 229
Patiya				pa-ti-ia	pad=i=ya		VHN 229
Pattae	f			ba-ad-da-e	patt(i)=ae		VHN 228
Patul	f			pa-du-ul	pad=o=l		VHN 230
Patum-atal				pa-du-um-a-tal	pad=o=m-adal		VHN 230
Pawena(?)ewri				pa-WA-na-ew-ri			VHN 226
Pazi			2	pa-zi	faž(?)=i	Bring (him) here!	VHN 227
Pazi- Išḫara/Šawuška		?		ba-zi-IŠDAR			ARM XVI/1:76
Pazue					paž(i)(?)=ve	That from Pazi	VHN 228
Pazu-ki	f			pa-zu-gi	faž(?)=o-ki	Sea, bring (her) here!	VHN 228
Pazuya	f			pa-zu-ia	faž(?)=o=ya	He/She brought (her) in	VHN 228
Pazza				pa-az-za	pazz=a		VHN 227
Pelluwe				pé-el-lu-WA	PELLI=ve	That from the canals	VHN 230

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Pent(i)- <i>Ammu</i>			2	bi-en-dam-mu	*fend(i)=i-' <i>ammu</i>	Paternal-Uncle, make (him) good	VHN 231
Pentakki				bi-en-da-ak-ki	fend=a=kk=i		VHN 230
Penziya				pí-in-zi-ya			Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:168
Petari				bi-da-ri		Cattle	VHN 234
Pikinna	f		2	bi-ki-in-na	pig=i=nna		VHN 230
Pikum-Teššup				bi-gu-um-te-eš-šu-up	pig=o=m-Teššob		VHN 230
Pilliya				bi-il-li-ia	PELLI=ya		VHN 230
Pilluzzi	f			bi-il-lu-lZ-zi		A canal adequately	VHN 230
Pirati			4	bi-ra-di		Foreign guest	VHN 232
Pirḫe[...]	f			bi-ir-[ḫ]e-[...]			VHN 233
Pirḫen(-)zu	f			bi-ir-ḫe-en-zu			VHN 232
Pirḫen-atal			2	Pí-ir-ḫe-en-a-tal	pirḡ=i=n(a)-adal		Kupper 1978:128
Pirḫen-kiyaze			3	bi-ir-ḫe-en-ki-ia-ze	pirḡ=i=n(na)-kiyaže		VHN 232
Pirḫen-šaki	f			pí-ir-ḫi-en-ša-ki	pirḡ=i=n(a)-šagi		Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:168
Pirḫun-na	f			pí-ir-ḫu-un-na	pirḡ=u=na=(na)		Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:168

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Pirki[...]	f			bi-ir-ki- [...]			VHN 233
Pirkinna	f			bi-ir-ki-na	pirg=i=nna		Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:168
Pirkinnu				bi-ir-ki-in-nu	pirg=i=nno/u		Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:168
Pirkištum	f			bi-ir-ki-iš-tum	pirgišt(i)=um		VHN 233
Pirkun-atal				bi-ir-ku-na-da-al	pirg=o=n(na)-adal		VHN 233
Pirpaya				bi-ir-ba-ya	pirb=a=ya		Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:81
Pirpaya				bi-ir-ba-ia	pirb=a=ya		VHN 233
Pirtup-šarri				Pí-ir-du-up-šar-ri	pird=o=b(m!)-šarri		Kupper 1978:128
Piruyan				bi-ru-ya-an			Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:168
Pišruḫle	f			bi-iš-ru-uḫ-li			Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:168
Pitḫunna	f			pí-it-ḫu-un-na	pitḫ=o=nna		Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:168
Pitirri	f			bi-di-ir-ri			VHN 234
Pittakku	f			bi-it-ta-ku	pitt=a=kk=o		VHN 234
Pizrunna	f			pi-iz-ru-na	pižr=o=nna		Sasson 1974:366; ARM XVI/1:168
Puḫen				pu ² -ḫi-[e]n ²	po/uḡ=i=n(na)	Replace!	Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:168

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Puḥi[n(?)]					po/uḡ=i=n(na)	Replace!	VHN 235
Puḥiya			2	pu-ḥi-ia	po/uḡ=i=ya	Replace!	VHN 235
Puḥtani	f			pu-uḥ-ta-ni	po/uḡ=(i)-dani		Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:168
Puḥu[...]				pu-ḥu-[...]	puḡ=o-[...]		VHN 236
Pukanta				pu-qa-an-da	fugand(i)=a		VHN 236
Pukantam			2	pu-qa-an-dam	fugandi=a=m(e/a)		VHN 236
Pukiya				pu-ki-ia	fug=i=ya	He/She has made long	VHN 236
Pulaya				pu-la-ia	po/ul=a=ya		VHN 236
Pulaya	f			pu-la-ia	po/ul=a=ya		VHN 237
Puliya	f		4	pu-li-ia	po/ul=i/o/a=ya		VHN 237
Pulukkan				pu-lu-ga-an	po/ul=o=kk=o>a=n(na)		VHN 237
Pulum-[...]	f			pu-lu-um-[...]	po/ul=o=m-[...]		VHN 237
Pulum-kiyaze	f		3	pu-lu-um-ki-ia-ze	po/ul=o=m-kiyaže		VHN 237
Pulum-šarri				pu-lu-um-šar-ri	po/ul=o=m-šarri		VHN 237
Puniya				bu-ni-ia	pun=i=ya		ARM XVI/1:81

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Punni	f			pu-un-ni	po/unn=i		VHN 238
Punniya	f		2	pu-un-ni-ia	po/unn=i=ya		VHN 238
Punukki(?)	f			pu-nu-ki(?)	po/un=o=kk=i		VHN 239
Pununni				pu-nu-un-ni	po/un=o=nni		VHN 239
Punzatte	f			pu-un-za-te	po/unz=a=tte		VHN 238
Punzi	f		5	pu-un-zi	po/unz=i		ARM XVI/1:169
Punzu	f			pu-un-zu	po/unz=o		VHN 238
Punzue	f			pu-un-zu-e	po/unz(i)=ve	That from Punzi	VHN 238
Punzuri	f			pu-un-zu-ri			ARM XVI/1:169
Puraman		?		bu-ra-ma-an	puram(e)=a=n(a)	He/She is a slave	Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:169
Puramze				bu-ra-am-zi		Slavery	Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:169
Purana	f			bu-ra-na	furan(i)=a	According to the sign	ARM XVI/1:82
Purran			2	bu-ur-ra-an	furran(i)		Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:83
Pušaya				pu-ša-ia	po/už=a=ya		VHN 240
Putal-puri				pu-da-al-pu-ri	fud=a=l-furi		VHN 242

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Putaman		?		pu-da-ma-an			Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:168
Putan		?		bu-da-an			Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:81
Putiya			2	pu-di-ia	fud=i=ya	He/She begat	VHN 242
Puttuzzi	f			pu-ut-tu-uz-zi		A birth appropriate	VHN 242
Putum		?		pu-du-um		A birth adequately	ARM XVI/1:168
Puzi			7	pu-zi	po/uz=i		VHN 240
Puzi	f		17	pu-zi	po/uz=i		ARM XVI/1:169; VHN 241
puziya	f		2	pu-zi-ia	po/uz=i=ya		VHN 241
Puziya			3	pu-zi-ia	po/uz=i=ya		VHN 241
Puzni	f			pu-uz-ni			VHN 242
Puzunna	f			pu-zu-na	po/uz=o=nnā		VHN 242
Puzunni				pu-zu-un-ni	po/uz=o=nni		VHN 242
Puzunze				pu-zu-un-ze			VHN 242
Puzzi				pu-uz-zi	po/uzz=i		VHN 241
Šaḫeš-menni	f			ša-ḫi-iš-me-en-ni (See Teḫiš-menni)	šaḡ=i=ž=adal		Sasson 1974:367

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šaišam				ša-i-ša-am	šaiž(i)=a=m(e/a)		VHN 243
Šakiya				ša-ki-ia	šagi=ya		VHN 243
Šakiya	f			ša-ki-ia	šagi=ya		VHN 243
Šakiyan				ša-gi-ya-an	šagi=ya= <i>ān</i>		Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:190
Šalanzari	f			ša-la-an-za-ri		Daughter?	VHN 244
Šalaš-tappi	f	S		^d ša-la-aš-tap-pi	Šalaš-tappi	Šalaš is my friend	ARM XVI/1:190
Šalaš-turiya	f			^d ša-la-aš-tu-ri-ya	Šalaš-to/ur=i=ya	Šalaš brought (him) away?	ARM XXII 10 IV 4
Šalmuzzi	f			ša-al-mu-zi		The ashes adequately	VHN 244
Šamaḥiš				ša-ma-ḥi-iš	šam=aḡ=i=ž		Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:191
Šamaḥul			4	ša-ma-ḥu-ul			Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:191
Šamba-ri	f	?		ša-an-ba-ri			Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:194
Šan-mata			3	ša-an-ma-da	šan-mad(i)=a		VHN 245
Šanta[...]				ša-an-da-[...]			VHN 246
Šantalluk				ša-an-da-al-lu-uk	Šandalluk		VHN 246
Šantari				ša-an-da-ri			VHN 246

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šarnitham			2	ša-ar-ni-it-ḥa-am	šarnith(e)=a=m(e/a)		VHN 251
Šarnitḥe				šar-ni-it-ḥe			VHN 251
Šarraḥḥe				šar-ra-aḥ-ḥe		Belonging to the king	VHN 248
Šarrakki				šar-ra-ak-ki		Young king	VHN 250
Šarrap-tuk				šar-ra-ap-tu-uk	šarr=a=b-to/uk		VHN 250
Šarrāya / Šarriya			7	šar-ra-ia	šarr=a=ya		ARM XVI/1:194; VHN 248
Šarri-atal					šarri-adal	The godking is strong	VHN 250
Šarrun				šar-ru-un	šarr=o=n(na)		VHN 251
Šaruzzi	f			ša-ru-zi		The desire	VHN 251
Šaškaru	f	?		ša-aš-ka-ru			Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:195
Šatam-Naya				ša-dam [?] -na-ya	šad=a=m(b!)-Naya	Naya replaced (him)	Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:194
Šatam-Naye	f			ša-dam-na-ie	šad=a=m(b!)-Naye	Naya replaced (her)	VHN 255
Šat-arra	f			ša-at-a-ar-ra	šad-arr(i)=a	Arri replaced (her)	VHN 255
Šatiya				ša-di-ia	šad=i=ya	He/She replaced (him)	VHN 255
Šatkam				ša-at-ka-am	šatk(i)=a=m(e/a)		VHN 256

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
šatpa	f	?		ša-at-ba			Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:195
šattam-(a)tal	f			ša-at-tam-tal	šatt=a=m(b!)-(a)dal		VHN 255
šattam-ki	f		4	ša-tam-gi / šà-at-ta-am-gi	šatt=a=m(b!)-ki		VHN 254
šattam-kiyazi	f		2	ša-at-tam-ki-ya-zi	šatt=a=m(b!)-kiyaže		Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:195; Kupper 1978:127
šattiya				ša-at-ti-ia	šatt=i=ya	He/She seized (him)	VHN 255
šattum-arte					šatt=o=m-arde	The city seized (him)	VHN 256
šattum-ki	f			ša-at-tum-gi	šatt=o=m-ki	The sea seized (him)	VHN 257
šattum-kiyaze	f			ša-at-tum-ki-ya-zi	šatt=o=m(b!)-kiyaže	The sea seized (him)	Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:195; Kupper 1978:127
šattum-šišni				ša-at-tum-ši-iš-ni	šatt=o=m-šišni	Šišni seized (him)	VHN 260
šattup(-)a	f			ša-at-tu-ba			VHN 260
šattu-ri[xx]	f			ša-at-tu-ri[-xx]	šatt=o...		Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:195
šatu[m-...]				ša-du-u[m-...]	šad=o=[m-...]		VHN 260
šatuk-atal				ša-du-uk-a-tal	šad=o=g-adal	The strong did not substitute (him)	VHN 256
šatum-[...]				ša-du-um-[...]	šad=o=m-[...]		VHN 260
šatum-amumi	f			ša-du-um-a-mu-mi	šad=o=m-amo/umi	The just-arrived substituted him	VHN 256

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šatum-atal			2	Ša-du-um-a-tal	šad=o=m-adal	The strong substituted him	Kupper 1978:128
Šatum-ki	f			ša-tum-gi	šad=o=m-ki	The sea substituted her	VHN 257
Šatum-kiyazi	f			ša-tum-ki-ia-zi	šad=o=m-kiyaže	The sea substituted her	Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:195; Kupper 1978:127
Šatum-Labbū'a		S/H	2	ša-du-La-ba / ša-du-um-La-ba / ša-du-un-La-ba / ša-du-um-La-bu-a	šad=o=m-labbū'a	Labbū'a substituted him	ARM XVI/1:189; VHN 258
Šatum-Labi		H/S		ša-du-um-La-bi	šad=o=m-labi	Labi substituted him	ARM XVI/1:190
Šatum-Na	f			ša-du-um-na	šad=o=m-Na	Naya substituted her	VHN 259
Šatum-Naya	f			ša-du-um-na-a-ia	šad=o=m-Naya	Naya substituted her	Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:194
Šatum-Naye	f		3	ša-du-um-na-ie	šad=o=m-Naye	Naya substituted her	VHN 260
Šatum-šarri				ša-du-LUGAL / ša-du-un-šar-ri / ša-du-šar-ri / ša-du-ša-ar-ri / ša-du-ša-ar-ri	šad=o=m-šarri	The godking substituted him	Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:190; Kupper 1978:127
Šatu-naye	f			ša-du-na-ya	šad=o-Naye	Naya, substitute (her)!	Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:190
Šatu-šenni				ša-du-še-en-ni	šad=o-šen(a)=ni	Brother, substitute (him)!	VHN 261
Šawanni-kizi	f			ša-wa-an-ni-ki-[z]i	šavanni-kizi		VHN 246
Šawla	f			ša-aw-la	šavl(i)=a		VHN 246
Šawlatum	f			ša-aw-la-tum			VHN 246

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
šawliš				ša-aw-li-iš	šavl=i=ž		ARM XVI/1:195
šawlum-ki	f		2	ša-aw-lu-um-gi	šavl=o=m-ki		VHN 247
šawlum-kiriš				ša-aw-lum-ki-ri-iš	šavl=o=m-kiriž		VHN 247
šawlum-kiyaze				ša-aw-lum-ki-ya-zi	šavl=o=m-kiyaže		Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:194
šawlum-nakte				ša-aw-lum-na-ak-te	šavl=o=m-nakte		VHN 247
šawlun[...]	f			ša-aw-lu-un(-)[...]	šavl=o=n[(na)(-)...		VHN 247
šawum				ša-wu-ú-um	šav=o=m		VHN 248
šawum-nirze	f			ša-wu-ú-um-ni-ir-ze	šav=o=m-nirže	The good made him excellent	VHN 248
šawu-muru				ša-wu-mu-ru	šav=o-mur(i)=u	Muri, make him excellent!	VHN 248
šazue				ša-zu-e	šaž(i)=ve		Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:195
šazum-atal				ša-zu-um-a-tal	šaž=o=m-adal	The strong fed him	VHN 254
šazum-eni				ša-zu-um-e-ni	šaž=o=m-eni	The deity fed him	VHN 254
šazum-šarri				ša-zu-um-ša-ar-ri	šaž=o=m-šarri	The godking fed him	Sasson 1974:367; ARM XVI/1:195
še[n-n]irze(?)	f			še-en-ni-ir-ze	šen-nirže	The brother is good	VHN 271
šeḥḥiya	f			še-eḥ-ḥi-ia	šeḥḥ=i=ya		Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:195

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šeḥlip-atal				še-eḥ-li-ip-a-tal	šeḡl=i=b-adal	The strong entered	VHN 262
Šeḥlip-ḥuḥ(u)				še-eḥ-li-ip-ḥu-uḥ	šeḡl=i=b-ḥo/uḡ	The father? Entered	VHN 262
Šeḥlip-šarri				še-eḥ-li-ip-šar-ri	šeḡl=i=b-šarri	The godking entered	Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:196
Šeḥliya			4	še-eḥ-li-ia	šeḡl=i=ya	He/She entered	VHN 261
Šeḥlum-naya	f			ši-iḥ-lum-na-ya	šeḡl=o=m-Naya	Naya entered	Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:197
Šeḥra-Naye	f			še-eḥ-ra-na-ie	šeḡr=a=∅-Naye	Naye was generous	VHN 262
Šeḥren-atal				še-eḥ-re-en-a-tal	šeḡr=i=n(na)-adal	Strong, be generous!	VHN 263
Šeḥru(?)				še-eḥ-ru(?)	šeḡr=o	Generous	VHN 263
Šeḥrum-ḥuḥ(u)				še-eḥ-rum-ḥu-uḥ	šeḡr=o=m-ḥo/uḡ	The father? made him generous	VHN 263
Šeḥrum-nirze	f		2	še-eḥ-ru-um-ni-ir-zi	šeḡr=o=m-nirže	The good made him generous	Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:196
Šeḥšiya				še-eḥ-ši-ya	šeḥš=i=ya		Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:196
Šelai				še-la-i	šel=ai		VHN 265
Šelwi(?)-Na	f		2	še-él-WA-na	šelv=i-Na		VHN 266
Šelwi-kin[tiri](?)				še-el-WA-gi-in- [...]	šelv=i-kin[diri](?)		VHN 266
Šelwuzzi	f			še-el-wu-uz-zi		Selwi properly	VHN 267

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šenāya			2	še-na-a-ia	šena=āya	Young brother	VHN 268
Šenip-šarri				še ² -ni-ip-šar ¹ -ri	šen=i=b-šarri	The godking made the second	Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:196
Šenirse				še-ni-ir-še			VHN 271
Šennam			7	še-en-nam	sen(a)=n(i)=a=m(e/a)	Like one of the brothers	VHN 268
Šenniya				še-ni-ia	šen(a)=ni=ya	Young brother	VHN 269
Šentip	f			še-en-di-ip	šind=i=b	He/She had a seventh	VHN 272
Šenze				še-en-ze		Second	VHN 272
Šerat-umar	f			še-ra-at-ú-ma-ar	šer=ad-o/umar(i)		VHN 275
Šeren-atal				še-re-en-a-tal	šer=i=n(na)-adal	Strong, make (him) pleasant!	VHN 275
Šerum-Naye	f		5	še-ru-um-na-a-ie	šer=o=m-Naye	Naya made her pleasant	VHN 276
Šerwi(?)-[...]				še-er-WA-[...]	šerv=i-[...]		VHN 276
Šerwi(?)-ki	f			še-er-WA-gi	šerv=i-ki		VHN 276
Šerwi(?)-Na	f			še-er-WA-na	šerv=i-Na		VHN 276
Šerzam				še-er-za-am	šerž(e)=a=m(e/a)		Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:196
Šerze				še-er-ze		Throne	VHN 276

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šeššallum				še-ša-al-lum	šešš=all=o=m		VHN 277
Šetiya				še-di-ia	šed=i=ya		ARM XVI/1:195
Šewanni			2	še-wa-an-ni	šev=a=nni		Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:196
Šewen- <i>idrī</i>		H/S		še-we-en-iz-ri	šev=i=n(na)- <i>idrī</i>		VHN 273
Šewenna	f			še-we-en-na	šev=i=nna		VHN 273
Šewen-šaki				še-we-en-ša-ki	šev=i=n(na)-šagi		VHN 273
Šewen-šarri				še-we-en-šar-ri	šev=i=n(na)-šarri		VHN 273
Šewlu(?)-šaki	f			še-WA-lu-ša-ki			VHN 273
Šewrum-pirati	f			še-ew-rum-bi-ra-te / še-ew-rum-bi-ra-tu / še-ew-rum-bi-ri-ti / še-ew-rum-bi-ri-te / še-ew-rum-pa-ra-ti / še-ew-rum-pa-ra-at / še-er-wu-bi-ri-te / še-ru-um-pa-ra-te / še-ri-it-ú-tum	ševr=o=m-firadi		Kupper 1978:127; ARM XVI/1:196
Šewum-paḫal				še-wu-um-ba-ḫa-al	šev=o=m-faḡal		VHN 274
Šewum-šarri				še-wu-um-ša-ar-ri	šev=o=m-šarri		Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:196
<i>Siban-taḫe</i>		S/H		si-ba-an-ta-ḫe	<i>dī'bān-taḫe</i>		VHN 243
Šiḫlum-Naye	f			ši-iḫ-lum-na-ie	šegl=o=m-Naye	Naye entered	VHN 262

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šiḥrum-ḥuḥ(u)				ši-iḥ-rum-ḥu-uḥ	šigr=o-ḥo/uḡ	The father? made (him) generous	VHN 263
Silluzzi	f			si-lu-zi			VHN 243
Šilum-...]				ši-lu-um-...]	šil=o=m-...]		VHN 267
Šilum-atal	f			ši-lum-ma-tal	šil=o=m-adal		VHN 267
Šima-ewri	f			ši-ma-ew-ri	šim=a=∅-evri		VHN 267
Šime(ki)?-takup				ši-me-ta-gu-up	šimi-tag=o=b(m!)	Šime(ki)? brought (him) the light	Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:197
Šimiš(?)-šarri				ši-im-iš(?)-šar-ri	šim=i=ž-šarri		VHN 267
Šimiš-ewri			2	ši-mi-iš-ew-ri	šim=i=ž-evri		VHN 267
Šim-kinna	f		3	ši-im-gi-na/Ši-im-ge-en-na			Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:197
Šim-kintiri	f			ši-im-gi-in-di-ri	šim-kindiri		VHN 268
Šimšari(?)				ši-im-ša(?) -ri			VHN 268
Šina-miš				ši-na-mi-iš	šin=a=∅-miž(i)		VHN 269
Šinanna	f			ši-na-an-na	šin=a=nna	It is two	VHN 269
Šinazze	f			ši-na-az-ze		Dual	VHN 269
Šinenna	f		3	ši-in-e-en-na	šin=i=nna	Second	VHN 270

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šinen-šalli	f		8	ši-ni-in-ša-li	šin=i=n(a)-šal(a)=(n)i	Daughter, do/bring the second!	Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:198
Šinen-tari	f			ši-ni-en-ta-ri	šin=i=n(na)-tari	Fire, do/bring the second!	VHN 271
Šiniš-ewri	f		2	ši-ni-iš-ew-ri	šin=i=ž-evri	May the lord give a second!	Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:198
Šiniš-tara	f			ši-ni-iš-ta-ar-a	šin=i=ž-tar(i)=a	May the fire do/bring the second!	Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:198
Šintap-šarri			2	ši-in-tap-šar-ri	šind=a=b-šarri	The godking gave a third	VHN 272
Šinuka	f			ši-nu-k[a]			Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:198
Šinurḫe				še-nu-ur-ḫi		Twin	Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:196
Širiya				ši-ri-ia	šir=i=ya	He/She made (him) pleasant	VHN 275
Šitip-šarri				ši-di-ip-šar-ri	šid=i=b-šarri	The godking cursed (him)	VHN 279
Šituri	f		8	ši-du-ri	šiduri	Girl	ARM XVI/1:197; VHN 279
Šukrum-al[...]				šu-uk-ru-um-al[...]	šo/ugr=o=m-al[...]		VHN 280
Šukrum-Nawar				šu-uk-ru-um-na-wa-ar	šo/ugr=o=m-Navar		Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:199
Šukrum-Teššob				šu-uk-rum-te-šu-ub / šu-uk-rum-ti-šu-ub	šo/ugr=o=m-Teššob		Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:199
Šukšeya				šu-uk-ši-ya	šukše=ya	Firstborn	Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:199
Šum-atal				šu-ú-ma-da-al	šo/u=o=m-adal		VHN 282

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šum-atal				šu-ú-ma-da-al	šo/u=u=m-adal		ARM XVI/1:199
Šunzunna	f		6	šu-un-zu-un-na	šo/unž=o=nna		VHN 283
Šunzunni	f			šu-un-zu-ni	šo/unž=o=nni		VHN 283
Šupram				šu-up-ra-am			Kupper 1978:127; ARM XVI/1:198
Šure				šu-ur-e	šo/ur=i		Sasson 1974:368; ARM XVI/1:200
Šuršiya				šu?-ur-ši-ia	šo/urš=i=ya		Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:200
Šurunna	f		4	šu-ru-un-na	šo/ur=o=nna		VHN 284
Šurunni	f		2	šu-ru-ni	šo/ur=o=nni		VHN 284
Šušān-ki	f		3	šu-ša-gi / šu-ša-an-gi	šo/už=a=n(a)-ki		VHN 285
Šuše-kin[tiri](?)				šu-še-gi-in(-)[(...)]	šo/už=i-kin[diri](?)		VHN 286
Šušenna	f			šu-še-na	šo/už=i=nna		VHN 286
Šušinna				šu-ši-in-na	šo/už=i=nna		VHN 286
Šuzi	f			šu-zi	šo/už=i		ARM XVI/1:200
Šuzinni(?)	f			šu(?)-zi-ni	šo/už=i=nni		VHN 286
Tae			2	ta-e		Man	VHN 287

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Taen				ta-e-en	tæ=n(na)	He/She is a man	VHN 287
Taḥa	f			ta-ḥa	taḡ(e)=a	He/She is a man	VHN 287
Taḥakka-šenni				ta-ḥa-ga-še-ni	taḡakk(i)=a-šen(a)=ni	The brother is like a young man	VHN 288
Taḥašḥ(e)-atal				ta-ḥa-aš-ḥa-tal	taḡašḥ(e)-adal	The strong is manliness	VHN 288
Taḥe			9	ta-ḥe		Man	VHN 288
Taḥḥe				ta-aḥ-ḥe		Man	VHN 288
Taḥiya				da-ḥi-ia	taḥ(e)=i=ya		Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:86
Taḥiz-Na	f			ta-ḥi-iz-na	taḡ=i=ž-Na		VHN 289
Taḥuk				da-ḥu-uk	taḡ=o=g		Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:86
Taḥuš				ta-ḥu-úš	taḡ=o=ž		VHN 289
Taḥuzzan				ta-ḥu-za-an	taḡo/uzz(i)=a=n(a)		Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:201
Ta'ira	f	?		da-i-ra			Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:86
Tai-zi	f			t[a] ² -i ² -zi			Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:201
Taka-tati	f			ta-ga-ta-di	tag=a-tadi	Dear, be good!	VHN 290
Takazze	f			da-ga-ze		Beauty	VHN 290

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Taki			5	ta-gi		Good	VHN 290
Taki-ki				ta-ki-gi	tag=i-ki	Sea, make (him) good!	Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:201
Takiš-natê	f			ta-gi-iš-na-ti-e	tag=i=ž-nade?	May <i>Nate</i> make (her) good!	Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:201
Takitu	f		3	ta-gi-tu / ta-gi-tum		Good	ARM XVI/1:201
Takiya			3	ta-ki-ya	tag=i=ya	He/She made (him) good	VHN 291
Takka				ta-ak-ka	takk=a=∅	He/She is good	VHN 290
Takkakki				ta-ak-ka-ki		Young beauty	VHN 290
Takki			3	ta-ak-ki		Good!	VHN 291
Takkiya				da-ak-ki-ia	takk=i=ya	He/She made (him) good!	VHN 292
Takūna	f		2	ta-ku-na			Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:201
Takuya				ta-ku-ia	tag=o=ya	He/She made (him) good	VHN 292
Takuzza				ta-gu-uz-za	tago/uzz(i)=a		Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:201
Talm[i...]				ta-al-m[i-...]			VHN 294
Talme-ki	f			ta-al-me-gi	talm=i-ki	Sea, make (her) big!	VHN 293
Talmen-ša[...]				ta-al-me-en-ša- [...]	talm=i=n(na)-ša[...]		VHN 293

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Talmeš-[...]na	f			ta-al-me-eš-[x-n]a	talm=i=ž-[...]n(i)(?)=a		VHN 294
Talmeš-Na	f			ta-al-me-eš-na	talm=i=ž-Na	May Naye make (her) big!	VHN 293
Talmišhe				ta-al-mi-iš-ḥe			VHN 293
Talmiš-ki	f			ta-al-mi-iš-ki	talm=i=ž-ki	May the sea make (her) big!	VHN 293
Talmu-ašiḥe	f			ta-al-mu-a-ši-ḥi	talm=o=ažiḡe	Ašiḥe, make (her) big!	Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:201
Talmu-Ḥeba(t)	f			ta-al-mu-ḥe-ba	talm=o-Ḥeba	Ḥebāt, make (her) big!	VHN 294
Talmu-ša[...]				ta-al-mu-ša- [...]	talm=o-ša[...]		VHN 294
Talmuš-kiyaze	f		2	ta-al-mu-úš-ki-ia-ze	talm=o=ž-kiyaže	May the sea make (her) big	VHN 294
Talukki	f			ta-lu-ki	tal=o=kk=i		VHN 295
Tamakum-eni			2	ta-ma-k[u]-me-ni	tam=ag=o=m-eni		VHN 295
Tamar-elli	f			ta-mar-e-li	tam=ar-el(a)=ni		VHN 296
Tamar-taḥe				ta-mar-ta-ḥi	tam=ar=taḡe		Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:201
Tamaru				ta-ma-ru	tam=ar=u		Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:202
Tamarze				ta-mar-ze / ta-ma-ar-šu / ta-ma-ar-ze	tamarze		Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:202
Tami				ta-mi			Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:202

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tamma	f			tam-ma			Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:202
Tammunze	f			ta-am-mu-un-ze			VHN 297
Tampuštil				ta-am-pu-úš-til	tamb=o/ušt=i=l(la)		VHN 296
Tanuta	f			ta-nu-da			Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:202
Tapru				tap-ru-ú	tabr=o		VHN 297
Taprum-kiyaze	f			tap-rum-ki-ia-ze	tabr=o=m-kiyaže		VHN 297
Tapuya	f			ta-pu-ia	tab=o=ya		VHN 298
Tapuzzi				ta-pu-zi			VHN 298
Taraḥ-tuk				ta-ra-aḥ-tu-uk	tar=aḡ-to/uk		VHN 298
Taraya				ta-ra-a-ia	tar=a=ya		VHN 298
Tarinze				ta-ri-in-ze			VHN 299
Taripen-atal				ta-ri-bé-en-a-tal			VHN 299
Tariya				ta-ri-ia	tar=i=ya		VHN 298
Tarmariš				ta-ar-ma-ri-iš	tarm=ar=i=š	May (he) drink repeatedly!	Sasson 1974:369; ARM XVI/1:202
Taškari	f			ta-aš-ka-ri			VHN 300

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tašmiš			2	ta-aš-mi-iš	tažm=i=ž	May he/she deport (him)	VHN 301
Tašpaya				ta-aš-ba-a-ia	tašp=a=ya		VHN 301
Tašpir				ta-aš-bi-ir		The (enemy) destroyed (him)	VHN 301
Tašpuš-ulme				ta-aš-pu-úš-ul-me	tašp=o=ž-olmi	May the weapon destroy (him)!	VHN 301
Tatap-elli			3	Ta-da-ap-e-li	tad=a=b-el(a)=(n)i		Kupper 1978:127; ARM XVI/1:201
Tatara	f	?		ta-da-ra			Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:201
Tati-ki	f			ta-ti-gi	tad=i-ki	See, love (her)!	VHN 302
Tatta	f		3	ta-at-ta	tatt=a		VHN 301
Tattum-a[...]	f				tatt=o=m-a[...]		VHN 302
Tattupate	f			ta-at-tu-ba-de			VHN 303
Tatum-menni	f			ta-du-um-me-ni	tad=o=m-men(a)=ni	The sibling loved her	VHN 303
Tatupate				ta-tu-ba(!)(MA)-de			VHN 303
Tawen-atal				ta-we-en-a-tal	tav=i=n(na)-adal	Strong, pour (him)!	VHN 297
Tawenna	f			ta-we-en-na	tav=i=nna	Pour it!	Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:203
Tawen-Šimeki				ta-we-en-ši-me-ge	tav=i=n(na)-Šimege	Šimeki, pour (him)!	VHN 297

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tazalla	f			ta-za-al-la	taž=all=a		VHN 299
Tazap-[k]el(?)	f			ta-za-ap-[...]-el	taž=a=b-kel(i)		VHN 300
Tazap-kelti	f		5	ta-ša-ap-ki-il-di	taž=a=b-keldi		Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:203
Tazi-ki				ta-zi-gi	taž=i-ki		VHN 300
Teḥ-atal				te-eḥ-a-tal	teḡ=adal	The strong raised	VHN 303
Teḥeš-tukki				te-ḥe-eš-tu-uk -ki	teḡ=i=ž-to/ukki	May Tukki raise (him)!	VHN 304
Teḥiš-a[...]				te-ḥi-iš-a-[...]	teḡ=i=ž-a[...]		VHN 303
Teḥiš-e[...]				te-ḥi-iš-e-[...]	teḡ=i=ž-e[...]		VHN 303
Teḥiš-me[...]	f			te-ḥi-iš-me-[...]	teḡ=i=ž-me[...]		VHN 304
Teḥiš-me[...]				te-ḥi-iš-me-[...]	teḡ=i=ž-me[...]		VHN 304
Teḥiš-menni	f			Te-ḥi-iš-me-en-ni	teḡ=i=ž-men(a)=ni	May the sibling raise (her)	Kupper 1978:127; ARM XVI/1:203
Teḥiš-tupki				te-ḥi-iš-tu-up-ki	teḡ=i=ž-to/ubki	May Tupki raise (him)	VHN 304
Teḥum-atal				te-ḥu-um-a-tal	teḡ=o=m-adal	The strong raised him	VHN 304
Tekauš-en				te-ga-uš-e-in	teg=av=š-en(i)	We make the deity beautiful	VHN 305
Telum-atal				te-lum-a-tal	tel=o=m-adal	The strong increased him	VHN 305

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Terru			2	te-er-ru	tterr=o		ARM XVI/1:204
Tešen-ki	f			te-še-en-gi	tižni-ki	The heart is the sea	VHN 309
Tieš-Naye	f			ti-e-eš-na-ie	ti=e=ž-Naye	May <i>Naye</i> speak!	VHN 310
Tilit(-)ma	f			ti-li-it-ma			VHN 305
Tiluš				ti-lu-úš	til=o=ž		VHN 305
Tirwi-i[...]				ti-ir-wi-i[...]			VHN 307
Tišam / Tišnam				ti-iš-na-am / ti-ša-am	tiža/tižn(i)=a=m(e/a)	Like a heart	Kupper 1978:127; ARM XVI/1:204
Tiša-Nawar				ti-iš-a-na-wa-ar	tiža-Navar	The heart is Nawar	VHN 308
Tišan-ki	f			ti-ša-an-gi	tiža=n(a)-ki	The heart is the sea	Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:204
Tiš-na[...]	f			ti-iš ₇ (AB)-na-[...]-x	ti=i=ž-na[...]		VHN 310
Tišnam	f			ti-i-iš-na-am	tižn(i)=a=m(e/a)	Like a heart	VHN 310
Tiš-naru	f			ti-iš ₇ (AB)-na-ru	ti=i=ž-nar(i)=u	May <i>Nari</i> speak!	VHN 310
Tišnu	f			ti-iš-nu	tižn(i)=u	Heart	VHN 310
Tiš-nuri	f		2	ti-iš-nu-ur-e	ti=i=ž-no/uri	May <i>Nuri</i> speak!	VHN 310
Tiš-ulme			3	ti-iš-ul-me	ti=i=ž-olme	May the servant speak!	VHN 311

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tiswena				ti-is-we-na	tišfe=n(a)-...		Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:204
Tišwen-atal			3	ti-iš-we-en-a-tal	tišfe=n(na)-adal		VHN 311
Tita-ki	f			ti-ta-gi	tid=a=∅-ki		VHN 312
Titikkan			2	ti-di-qa-an	tid=i=kk=i>a=n(a)		Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:204
Tiwiran				ti-wi-ra-an	tivir(i)=a=n(na)		VHN 306
Tizam-taḥe				ti-za-am-ta-ḥe	tiž(a)=a=m(e/a)-taḡe	The man is like the heart	VHN 308
Tizan-taḥe				ti-za-an-ta-ḥe	tiža=n(na)-taḡe	The heart is the man	VHN 308
Tizeḥam			5	ti-ze-ḥa-am	tižeḡ(e)=a=m(e/a)	He/She is a leader	VHN 308
Tizeḥe-[U]kur				ti-ze-ḥe-[...-k]ūr	tižeḡe-Ugur	The leader is Ukur	VHN 309
Tiz-kiyaze	f			ti-iz-ki-ia-ze	tiž(?)=kiyaže		VHN 310
Tizna	f		3	ti-iz-na	tižn(i)=a	Like the heart	VHN 310
Tizna				ti-iz-na	tižn(i)=a	Like the heart	VHN 310
Tuḥaya				tu-ḥa-a-ia	to/uḡ=a=ya		VHN 312
Tuḥn-atal				tu-uḥ-na-da-al	to/uḡn-adal		VHN 312
Tukiya				tu-gi-ia	to/uḡ=i=ya		VHN 313

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tukki(-)[...]				tu-uk-ki(-)[...]	to/ukki(-)[...]		VHN 313
Tukkiya			3	tu-uk-ki-ia	to/ukki=ya		VHN 313
Tukkizzan				tu-uk-ki-iz-za-an	to/ukkizz(i)=a=n(na)		VHN 313
Tuliš				tu-li-iš	to/ul=i=ž		Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:205
Tulpiya			2	tu-ul-bi-ia	to/ulbi=ya		VHN 314
Tulpura	f			tu-ul-pu-ur-ra	to/ulbor(r)(i)=a		VHN 314
Tultuk				tu-ul-du-uk	to/uld=o=g		VHN 315
Tulup-atal				tu-lu-up-a-tal	to/ulbi-adal		VHN 315
Tulup-Na	f			tu-lu-up-na	to/ulbi-Na		VHN 315
Tulup-Naye	f			tu-lu-up-na-ie	to/ulbi-Naye		VHN 315
Tunip-mušni	f			tu-ni-ip-mu-uš-ni	to/un=i=b-mušni	The righteous provided (her)	VHN 315
Tunip-šarri				tu-ni-ip-šar-ri	to/un=i=b-šarri	The godking provided (him)	VHN 316
Tunip-šayu	f		2	tu-ni-ip-ša-a-iu	to/un=i=b-šayu	Šayu provided (her)	VHN 316
Tuniya				du-ni-ia	to/un=i=ya	He/she provided (him)	VHN 315
Tunniya				du-un-ni-ia	to/un=i=ya	He/she provided (him)	VHN 315

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tunti	f			tu-un-di	to/und=i		Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:205
Tuntuk				tu-un-du-uk	to/und=o=g		VHN 316
Tunum-šarri				tu-nu-um-šar-ri	to/un=o=m-šarri	The godking provided (him)	VHN 316
Tupi-marra	f		2	tu-bi-mar-ra	to/ub=i-marr(i)=a		VHN 317
Tupi-marra			4	tu-bi-mar-ra	to/ub=i-marr(i)=a		VHN 317
Tupiya				tu-bi-ia	to/ub=i=ya		VHN 317
Tupki			4	tu-up-ki			Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:205
Tupki-...				tu-up-ki-x-x	to/upki-...		VHN 318
Tupki-...]				tu-up-ki-...]	to/upki-...]		VHN 318
Tupki- <i>lšhara</i>	f		2	tu-up-ki-iš-ḥa-ra	to/upki- <i>lšhara</i>		VHN 318
Tupkizzan				tu-up-ki-iz-za-an	to/upkizz(i)=a=n(na)		VHN 317
Turam				tu-ra-am	tur(i)=a=m(e/a)	He/She is a man	VHN 318
Turazze				tu-ra-ze			VHN 318
Turip-atal			2	tu-ri-ip-a-tal	to/ur=i=b-adal	The strong brought (him) away	VHN 319
Turip-šeni				tu-ri-ip-še-ni	to/ur=i=p-šen(a)	The brother brought (him) away	Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:205

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Turiya			2	tu-ri-ia	to/ur=i=ya	He/she brought (him) away	VHN 318
Turizza				tu-ri-iz-za	turizz(i)=a		VHN 319
Tur-kanazzi	f		3	tu-ur-ka-na-zi	to/ur-kanazzi	<i>Kanazzi</i> brought away	VHN 319
Turukkan				tu-ru-uk-ka-an	to/ur=o=kk=o>a=n(n a)	He/She did not run away	VHN 320
Turum				tu-ru-um	to/ur=o=m	He/she brought him away	VHN 320
Turum-natki			2	tu-ru-um-na-ad-ki / tu-rum-na-ad-ki	to/ur=o=m-natki	The destruction brought him away	VHN 320
Turup-atal				tu-ru-up-a-tal	to/ur=o=b(m!)-adal	The strong brought him away	VHN 320
Turzan			4	tu-ur-za-an	to/urž(i)=a=n(a)		ARM XVI/1:206
Tušaya	f			tu-ša-ia	to/už=a=ya		VHN 321
Tutanap-Šuri				tu-ta-na-ap-šu-ri	to/ud=an=a=b-Šo/uri		VHN 322
Tuten				[t]u-de-en	to/ud=i=n(a)		ARM XVI/1:205
Tutinni				tu-di-in-ni	to/ud=i=nni		VHN 322
Tuttu				tu-ut-tu	to/utt=o		VHN 322
Tutuk	f			tu-du-uk	to/ud=o=g		VHN 323
Tutunni				tu-du-un-ni	to/ud=o=nni		VHN 323

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tuza	f			tu-za-a	to/už=a=		Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:206
Tuza-Na	f		2	tu-za-na	to/už(?)=a=∅-Na		VHN 321
Tuza-Naye	f		2	tu-za-na-a-ie	to/už(?)=a=∅-Naye		VHN 321
Tuzaya	f			tu-za-ia	to/už=a=ya		Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:206
Uḫanai	f		2	ú-ḫa-na-i	o/uḡ=an=ai		VHN 323
Uḫaz[zu](?)				ú-ḫa-az-[...]	o/uḡazz(e)=u		VHN 323
Uḫazzu				ú-ḫa-az-zu	o/uḡazz(e)=u		VHN 323
Uḫi	f			ú-ḫi	o/uḡi	Let (him) cry!	VHN 323
Uḫizzan	f			ú-ḫi-za-an	o/uḡizz(i)=a=n(na)		VHN 323
Ukiya	f			ú-gi-ia	o/uḡ=i=ya		VHN 324
Ukkannu				uk-ka-nu	o/ukk=a=nno/u		VHN 323
Ukkun-enni			2	uk-ku-un-e-en-ni	o/ukk=o=n(na)- en(i)=ni		VHN 324
Ukkuranti	f			uk-ku-ra-an-di			VHN 324
Ukun				ú-gu-un	o/uḡ=o=n(na)		VHN 324
Ukur-atal			4	^d u-gur-a-da-al / ^d u-gur- a-tal / ú-gur-a-tal	ugur-adal	Ukur is strong	ARM XVI/1:208

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ukuzzi				ú-gu-lZ-zi			VHN 325
Ullaya			2	ul-la-ia	o/ull=a=ya		VHN 325
Ulle	f			ul-le-en	o/ull=i=n(na)	Destroy it!	VHN 325
Ulli	f			ul-li	o/ull=i	Destroy!	VHN 325
Ulliya				ul-li-ia	o/ull=i=ya	He/She destroyed (him)	VHN 325
Ullu-ewri				ul-lu-ew-ru	o/ull=o-evr*=(i)=u	Destroy, oh lord!	Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:208
Ullukki				ul-lu-gi	o/ull=o=kk=i		Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:208
Ullum-[...]				ul-lu-um-[...]	o/ull=o=m-[...]		VHN 327
Ullum-ki	f			ul-lu-um-gi	o/ull=o=m-ki	The sea destroyed (her)	VHN 326
Ullum-tišni				ul-lum-ti-iš-ni	o/ull=o=m-tišni	The heart destroyed (him)	Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:208
Ullum-tišti				ul-lum-ti-iš-ti	o/ull=o=m-tišti	Tišti destroyed (him)	VHN 327
Ullun				ul-lu-un	o/ull=o=n(na)	Destroy (him)!	VHN 327
Ulluni				ul-lu-ni	o/ull=o=nni	Destroy (him)!	Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:208
Ullunna				ul-lu-un-n[a]	o/ull=o=nnna	Destroy (him)!	VHN 327
Ullunni				ul-lu-ni	o/ull=o=nni	Destroy (him)!	VHN 327

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ulluran				ul-lu-ra-an	o/ullor(i)=a=n(na)		VHN 328
Ulluri			20	Ul-lu-ri			VHN 328
Ulluš-Taya				ul-lu-úš-ta-ia	o/ull=o=ž-Taya	May Taya destroy (him)!	VHN 329
Ullutti				ul-lu-ut-ti	o/ull=o=tti	Destroy me!	VHN 329
Ulme-na[...]				ul-me-na- [...]	olme-na[...]		VHN 326
Ulme-xx				ul-me-x[x]	olme...		Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:208
Ulmī- [...]				ul-mi- [...]	olm=i- [...]		VHN 326
Umar-e(?)				ú-mar-e	o/um=ar-el(a)=ni		VHN 329
Umar-talame	f		4	ú-mar-ta-la-am-e	o/um=ar-talame		VHN 329
Umer-elli	f			ú-me-er-e-li	o/um=ir-el(a)=ni		VHN 329
Ummī-Išhara	f	S		um-mi- ^d iš-ḥa-ra		My mother is Išhara	ARM XVI/1:208
Ummī-Nawar		S/H		um-mi-na-wa-ar		My mother is Nawar	ARM XVI/1:209
Una-ki	f			ú-na-gi	un=a=∅-ki	The sea came	VHN 330
Unakka	f			ú-na-ak-ka	un=a=kk=a		Sasson 1974:370; ARM XVI/1:209
Unam-ṣulūlī	f	H/S		ú-nam-ṣú-lu-lí	un=a=m(ma)-ṣulūlī	Come here, my protection!	VHN 330

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Unap(-)[...]				ú-na-ap(-)[...]	un=a=b(-)[...]		VHN 332
Unap(-)[...]	f			ú-na-ap(-)[...]	un=a=b(-)[...]		VHN 332
Unap-atal			2	ú-na-ap-a-tal	un=a=b-adal	The strong came	VHN 331
Unap-elli	f			ú-na-ap-e-li	un=a=b-el(a)=ni	The sister came	VHN 331
Unap-kaḥḥi(?)				ú-na-ap-ga(?)-aḥ-ḥi	un=a=b-kaḥḥi	<i>Kaḥḥi</i> came	VHN 331
Unap-kiyaze				ú-na-ap-ki-ia-ze	un=a=b-kiyaže	The sea came	VHN 331
Unap-paši	f			ú-na-ap-pa-aš-e	un=a=b-paži	The mouth came	VHN 330
Unap-šarri			3	ú-na-ap-šar-ri	un=a=b-šarri	The godking came	VHN 331
Unap-še			6	ú-na-ap-še	un=a=b-še	The brother came	VHN 331
Unap-taḥḥe				ú-na-ap-ta-aḥ-ḥe	un=a=b-taḥḥe	The man came	VHN 332
Unap-taki				ú-na-ap-ta-gi	un=a=b-tagi	The light came	Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:209
Una-ti[x]				ú-na-ti?[-x]	un=a=∅-ti...		Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:209
Unaya				ú-na-ia	un=a=ya	He/She came	Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:209
Uninna	f			ú-ni-na	un=i=nna	Bring it!	Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:209
Untanki	f	?		un-da-an-ki			Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:209

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Untanti	f			un-da-an-di			VHN 333
Untu	f			un-du	o/und=o		VHN 333
Untulli	f		3	un-du-li	o/und=o=lli/Ila		VHN 334
Unturi	f			un-du-ri			VHN 334
Unuš-ki	f			ú-nu-úš-ki	un=o=ž-ki	May the sea bring (her)!	VHN 334
Unuš-kiyaze	f		12	ú-nu-uš-ki-ya-zi	un=o=ž-kiyaže	May the sea bring (her)!	Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:209
Unuš-Na	f			ú-nu-úš-na	un=o=ž-Na	May Naye bring (her)!	VHN 335
Unuš-Naye	f		3	ú-nu-uz-na-ia	un=o=ž-Naye	May Naye bring (her)!	Kupper 1978:127; ARM XVI/1:209
Unušni	f			ú-nu-úš-ni			VHN 335
Unziya	f			un-zi-ia	o/unz=i=ya		VHN 333
Upḥaiš				up-ḥa-i-iš	o/upḥ=ai=š		VHN 336
Upšan(?)-nirze				up-ša(?)-an-ni-ir-ze	o/upš=a=n(na)-nirže		VHN 336
Upšanu				up-ša-nu	o/upš=an=o		VHN 336
Ura-ki	f			ú-ra-gi	ur=a-ki	The sea is present	Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:210
Urakka	f			ú-ra-ak-ka	urakk(i)=a	Like a foot	VHN 337

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Uran-ki	f			ú-ra-an-gi	ur=a=n(na)-ki	The sea is present	VHN 337
Urap-elli	f			ur=a=b-el(a)=ni		A sister existed	VHN 337
Uraya				ú-ra-ia	ur=a=ya	He/She existed	VHN 336
Urmiš				ur-mi-iš	o/urm=i=ž		VHN 337
Urran				ur-ra-an			Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:210
Uru-Ḫeba(t)	f			ú-ru-ḫe-ba	ur=o-Ḫeba	Ḫebat, make/let (her) exist!	VHN 337
Ururiš				ú-ru-ri-iš	ur=o/ur=i=ž		VHN 338
Uše	f		5	Ú-še	ušš=e		Kupper 1978:127; ARM XVI/1:210
Uškizzan				úš-gi-za-an			Sasson 1974:371
Ušš(u)-ultu				úš [?] -šu-ul-tu			Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:210
Ušše	f		7	ú-úš-še	ušš=e	Go!	VHN 338
Ušše				ú-uš-še	ušš=e	Go!	Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:210
Uštam				úš-ta-am	ušt=a=m(ma)	Go outside!	VHN 339
Uštam-šenni				uš-tam-še-en-ni	ušt=a=m(ma)- šen(a)=ni	Go outside, brother!	VHN 339
Uštanni			2	uš-ta-an-ni		Great Warrior?	Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:211

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Uštan-šarri				uš-ta!-an-šar-ri	ušta=n(a)=šarri	The godking is a heroe	Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:211
Uštantu	f			uš-ta-an-du	uštand(i)=u		VHN 339
Uštanzar				uš-ta-an-za-ar	uštanzari	heroe	VHN 339
Uštap			2	uš-ta-ap	ušt=a=b	He/She went out	VHN 340
Uštap(?)(-)[...]				uš-tap(?)(-)[...]	ušt=a=b(-)[...]		VHN 341
Uštap-atal				uš-tap-a-dal	ušt=a=b-adal	The strong went out	Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:211
Uštap-kiriš			2	uš-tap-ki-ri-iš	ušt=a=b-kiriš	<i>Kiriš</i> went out	Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:211
Uštap-nišē	f			uš-tap-ni-iš-ē	ust=a=b-nišē	<i>Nišē</i> went out	VHN 340
Uštap-še				uš-tap-še	ušt=a=b-še	The brother went out	VHN 340
Uštaya			2	uš-ta-ya	ušt=a=ya	He/She went out	Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:211
Utena	f			ú-di-na	utt=i=n(a)=(na)		Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:208
Uḫiriš-ḫebat				ut-ḫi-ri-iš-ḫe-bat	udḫir?=i=ž-ḫebat		ARM XVI/1:211
Uttazzi(?)	f			ut-ta(?) -zi			VHN 342
Utul-me	f			ú-du-ul-me	o/ud=o=l-me	Protect the siblings!	VHN 342
Uwaya	f		3	ú-wa-ia	o/uv=a=ya		VHN 336

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Uwuḥule	f			ú-wu-ḥu-ul-e / ú-wu-ḥu-le		(Female) butcher?	Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:211
Uzana	f			ú ² -sa-na			Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:210
Uzana	f			ú-za-na			Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:211
Uzi		?		ú-zi			Sasson 1974:371
Uzulli			2	ú-zu-li	o/uz=o=lli		Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:211
Uzulli	f			ú-zu-li	o/uz=o=lli		VHN 341
Uzunnan			2	ú-za-na-an	o/uzonn(i)=a=n(a)		Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:211
Uzuri				ú-zu-ri			VHN 341
Uzuzar			3	ú-zu-za-ar			VHN 341
Uzziya				uz-zi-ia	uzz=i=ya		Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:211
Uzzu	f			uz-zu			Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:211
Uzulli	f			uz-zu-ul-li	o/uz=o=lli		Sasson 1974:371; ARM XVI/1:211
Waznau				wa-az-na-ú	fažn(?)=av		VHN 228
Zaḥazza	f			za-ḥa-az-za	zaḡazz(i)=a		ARM XVI/1:238
Zakaya	f			za-ka-a-ia	zag=a=ya		VHN 243

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Zakuya	f			za-ku-ia	zag=o=ya		VHN 243
Zalpuḡe			2	Za-al-pu-ḡi		Zalpuḡian	Kupper 1978:127; ARM XVI/1:239
Zamal-tuk				za-ma-al-du-uk	zam=al-to/uk		VHN 245
Zanzar				za-an-za-ar	zaḡ=ar=i	Feed (him) repeatedly!	VHN 246
Zatan				za-ta-an			Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:240
Zawul-natki				za-wu-ul-na-at-ki	zav=o=l-natki		VHN 248
Zazaraya	f			za-za-ra-ia	zaḡ=ar=(i)=aya	Feed (him) repeatedly!	VHN 251
Zazipiya				za-zi-bi-ia	zaḡ=i=b=iya	He/She fed (him)	VHN 253
Zaziya			8	za-zi-ya	zaḡ=i=ya	He/She fed (him)	Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:240; VHN 252
Zazum			3	za-zu-um	zaḡ=o=m	He/She fed him	VHN 253
Zazza-Naye				za-za-na-a-ie	zazz(i)=a-Naye	Naye is the feeder	VHN 251
Zazza-Naye	f			za-za-na-ie	zazz(i)=a-Naye	Naye is the feeder?	Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:240
Zazzari				za-az-za-ri	zazz=ar=i	Feed (him) repeatedly!	VHN 251
Zerri			2	ze-er-ri		Donkey	VHN 275
Zika-n		?		zi-qa-an			Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:243

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Zike			5	z[i]-gi	zig=i		Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:240
Zikil-tanum				zi-gi-il-da-un-um			Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:240
Zilapān			3	zi-la-ba-an	zil=a=b=ān		VHN 265
Zilipān				Zi-li-ba-an	zil=i=b=ān		ARM XVI/1:241; Kupper 1978:127
Zilip-Nawar			2	zi-li-ip-na-wa-ar	zil=i=b-Navar		VHN 266
Zilip-šarri				zi-li-ip-šar-ri	zil=i=b-šarri		VHN 266
Zillip-Nawar			2	zi-il-li-ip-na-wa-ar	zill=i=b-Navar		VHN 266
Zinaki				zi-na-gi			Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:243
Zipiya		?		zi-pi-ia			ARM XVI/1:240
Zipiyān		?		zi-pi-ia-an			ARM XVI/1:240
Zirpi-[xxx]				z[i ² -i]r ² -bi ² -[]			Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:244
Zirpi-kuni				zi-ir-bi-gu-ni			Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:244
Zirri				zi-ir-ri			Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:244
Zituya				zi-tu-ya			Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:244
Ziwanni	f		4	zi-wa-an-ni	ziv=a=nni/nna		VHN 273

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ziweni	f			zi-wi-ni			Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:244
Ziwuḥḥe(?)				zi-WA-Aḥ-ḥe			VHN 274
Zizap(-)a				zi-za-ba			VHN 277
Zizapān				zi-za-ba-an	<i>ziz=a=b=ān</i>		Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:244
Zizi	f		2	zi-zi	<i>ziz=i</i>	Chest	VHN 277
Zizi				zi-zi	<i>ziz=i</i>	Chest	VHN 277
Zizu	f			zi-zu	<i>ziz=o</i>		ARM XVI/1:244
Zizzānum				zi-iz-za-nu-um	<i>zizz(i)=ānum</i>		VHN 277
Zū-lšḥara		?		zu- ^d iš-ḥa-ra			ARM XVI/1:244
Zukan				zu-ga-an	<i>zo/ug(i)=a=n(na)</i>	He/She is a young	VHN 280
Zukašši(?)				zu-ga-aš(?)-šī(?)			VHN 280
Zuki-zuki				zu-gi-zu-ki			VHN 280
Zukuzḥe				zu-ku-uz-ḥe			VHN 282
Zuku-zu[ku](?)				zu-gu-zu- [...]	<i>zo/ug(i)=u-zo/ug(i)=u</i>		VHN 282
Zuliya				zu-li-ia	<i>zul=i=ya</i>	He/She tied	VHN 282

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Zulki				zu-ul-gi		Umbilical cord?	VHN 282
Zullum				zu-ul-lum	zull=o=m		VHN 282
Zunan				zu-na-an			Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:245
Zunna	f			zu-un-na			Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:245
Zunzum				zu-un-zu-um	zo/uz=0=m		Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:245
Zuwene	f			zu-Pl-ne			Sasson 1974:372; ARM XVI/1:245
Zuzamma			2	zu-za-am-ma	zo/uz=a=mma		VHN 284
Zuzan			3	zu-za-[an]	zo/uz(i)=a=n(a)		Sasson 1974:373; ARM XVI/1:245
Zuzan				zu-za-an	zo/uz(i)=a=n(a)		Sasson 1974:373; ARM XVI/1:245
Zuzan				zu-za-an	zo/uz(i)=a=n(a)		Sasson 1974:373; ARM XVI/1:245
Zuzan				zu-za-an	zo/uz(i)=a=n(a)		Sasson 1974:373; ARM XVI/1:245
Zuzanḥe							VHN 285
Zuzar				zu-za-ar			VHN 285
Zuzen				zu-ze-en	zo/uz=i=n(na)		VHN 286
Zuziya			2	zu-zi-ia	zo/uz=i=ya		VHN 285

NAME	G	?	X	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Zuzu				zu-ú-zu	zo/uz(i)=a=n(a)		Sasson 1974:373; ARM XVI/1:245
Zuzu				zu-zu	zo/uz(z)=o		Sasson 1974:373; ARM XVI/1:245
Zuzu				zu-zu	zo/uz(z)=o		Sasson 1974:373; ARM XVI/1:245
Zuzuwe				zu-zu-WA	zo/uz(i)=ve		VHN 287
Zuzzari	f			zu-za-ri			VHN 285
Zuzzu			2	zu-uz-zu	zo/uzz=o		VHN 286
Zuzzunna				zu-uz-zu-na	zo/uzzonn(i)=a	Like a <i>Zuzzunni</i> -animal	VHN 286
Zuzzunni				zu-zu-ni		Zuzzunni-animal	VHN 287

Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Terqa (Tall 'Ašāra)

The Hurrian PNs retrieved from the Terqa documents (administrative, letters, real estate transactions, ration lists and legal contracts)¹ constitute a small sample of onomastic material. The vast majority (13) belonged to the Old Babylonian period, particularly to the last phase of Zimri-Lim's kingdom,² while a smaller amount appertained to the period I (Puzurum archive) of the Kingdom of Ḫana, contemporary to the end of the first Babylonian dynasty.³

Within the small corpus, we do not have any theophoric name nor any other related element. There are some few kinship elements ('Ari-šeni', 'Atta') and random Hurrian names. Due to the location of the town (on the banks of the Euphrates, about 25 km south of the confluence of the Euphrates and Ḫabur rivers and half-way from Mari) and its political situation one would expect to find more PNs related to Hurrians. However, this is not the case, as well as the absence of any theophorous element.

¹ For the archives see BibMes 16; BibMes 29; Rouault 1992.

² Rouault 2011: 7. During Old Babylonian period, Terqa apparently had a subordinate relationship with the kingdom of Mari until the period of Šamšī-Adad I and Zimri-Lim (1815-1760).

³ Rouault 1984: viii.

List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Terqa

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Akiya				a-ki-ia	ag=i=ya	He/She brought (him) up	BibMes 16:62
Akiyān				a-ki-ia-an	ag=i=ya=ān		BibMes 16:63
Akka				ak-ka	akk=a		BibMes 29:75
Akukki				a-ku-ki	ag=o=kk=i		BibMes 16:62
Alli-talmi				a-li-ta-li-mi	alli-talm(i)=a	The lady is big	BibMes 16:65
Ari-šeni				[a]-rī-se-ni	ar=i-šen	Brother, give (him)!	BibMes 16:62
Atta				ad-da-a	Adda	father	BibMes 29:75
Attiyān			2	ad-di-ia-an	att=i=ya=ān		BibMes 29:75
Ḥuziya				ḥu-zi-ya	ḥuž=i=ya		BibMes 29:76
Kammukku				ka-am-mu-ku	kamm=o=kk=o		BibMes 29:77
Kikkinnu				ki-ik-ki-nu / ki-ki-nu	kikkinn(i)=u	Tripod	BibMes 29:78
Kizzazum				ki-iz-za-<zu>-um			BibMes 29:78
Kuwari				?			Rouault 1992:252
Kuzu-...				ku-zu-[x]			BibMes 29:78
Pattani		?		ʿbʿa?-at-ta-ni	patt=a=ni		BibMes 16:62

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tati[...]		?		da?-d[i?-x]			BibMes 29:76
Tatiyān				da-di-ia-a-an	tad=i=ya=ān		BibMes 29:75
Tatta				da-da	tatt=a=∅		BibMes 29:75
Tatta				da-da-a / da-da-e	tatt=a=∅		BibMes 29:75

Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Tuttul (Tell Bi'a)

The Hurrian onomastic present in the material from the city of Tuttul appertains to an archive contemporary to the early phases of the Lîm dynasty and the Assyrian interregnum in Mari during the Old Babylonian period.¹ The connection between Tuttul and the Hurrians is not only through onomastics, but the city has been linked to the fate of Kumarbi.² In the Hurrian myths from Boğazköy, Tuttul becomes one of Kumarbi's settings.³ However, the selection of this scenery is not random; it is probably the consequence of the association that existed between this deity and the Syrian Dagan,⁴ whose main dwelling and worshipped centre was at Tuttul.⁵ At the same time, Tuttul brought to light a Hurrian incantation text against the '*gergišsum*-illness'⁶ which was a duplicate from the one retrieved from Mari.⁷

§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Tuttul texts

The Hurrian PNs recovered from the Tuttul documents belonged to approximately 79 different individuals. The vast majority belongs to male individuals (approx. 67 men and 12 females) who are categorised as labourers for the palace or field-workers, together with some minor overseers and officials.⁸

§ Kinship

The kinship elements in the PNs do not particularly seem to be extended in the

¹ Pappi 2014: 233.

² Krebernik 2002: 11.

³ Song of the god LAMMA. "Ea [went] to Apzuwa, but Kumarbi went away to Tuttul" (Hoffner 1998: 47, §7, 19-30).

⁴ Archi 1995.

⁵ Feliu 2003: 118.

⁶ Krebernik 2002: 157-159.

⁷ Thureau-Dangin 1939: 15-16.

⁸ There is also one soldier bearing the Hurrian name 'Arušan'.

onomasticon. We just encounter names related to the figure of the brother⁹ and the sister.¹⁰

§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names

The Hurrian PNs from Tuttul reveal a low level of theophoric elements, especially if compared to the number of names.

§ Primary and Secondary Deities

We only encounter two theophorous appertaining to this group of deities. The first name corresponds to the ‘Pan-Hurrian’ sun-god Šimike (Nenip-[Šimi]ke), while the second mentions the goddess ‘Allani’ (Arip-Allani), an unusual theonym among the Hurrian PNs from the first half of the second millennium.¹¹

§ Minor Deities

The only possible minor deity attested in the names is Kelti (^fTazap-kelti). However, it is not completely clear that this element appertains to the name of a particular deity since it has been analysed in different ways.¹²

§ Divinised Entities

Among the group of divinised entities we only have the names mentioning the River Tigris¹³ and the city of Nawar.¹⁴

§ Common Theophoric Elements

The names holding common theophoric elements correspond to those of ‘talmi’,¹⁵

⁹ Unap-še(n); Šenniya; Šenniyān.

¹⁰ Elan; Elanna.

¹¹ Cf. ^fIšmen-Allani and ^fAllanni from Mari.

¹² Giorgieri 2000a: 200; VHN 436, fn. 412.

¹³ Ḫazip-Aranziḫ (6).

¹⁴ Nawar-tupki; Nawar-atal.

¹⁵ ^fMuš-talma.

‘allai’,¹⁶ ‘ewri’,¹⁷ ‘atal’,¹⁸ ‘tišne’,¹⁹ and ‘šarri’,²⁰ common in the Hurrian onomasticon from this period.

In sum, the Hurrian theophoric elements from Tuttul do not present many similarities to those contemporaries from other cities (e.g. Mari, Šubat-Enlil, Chagar Bazar). One would expect a higher incidence of deities into the PNs given the religious and sacred character of the city of Tuttul, and the importance it had for Dagan, and by extension to Kumarbi. However, the absence of several Pan-Hurrian deities, as well as secondary and minor gods, resembles the characteristics of the third millennium Hurrian anthroponyms, which most probably reproduced a previous stage of the pantheon.

¹⁶ fAllaiš-[...]

¹⁷ Šitip-ewri; Ewri-kipa.

¹⁸ Atal-šunuḫ; Itip-atal; Nupar-atal; Tirḫi-atal.

¹⁹ Ḫulum-tizni

²⁰ Tir-šarri.

List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Tuttul

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Allaiš-[...]	f			al-la-iš-[...]	allai=ž-[...]	The lady [...]	Krebernik 2001:211
Alzaraya				al-za-ra-ia	alž(?)=ar=aya		Krebernik 2001:211
Apukkan			2	a-pu-uk-ka-an / a-pu-ka-an	ab=o=kk=o>a=n(na)		Krebernik 2001:208
Arip-Allani	f			a-ri-ip-al-la-ni	ar=i=b-Allani	Allani gave (her)	Krebernik 2001:210
Arip-ziluk(?)				a-ri-ip-zi(?) -lu(?) -uk(?)	ar=i=b-zilok(ki)	Ziluk gave (her)	Krebernik 2001:210
Arušan				a-ru-sa-an	ar=ož=a=n(na)	He/She gave (him)	Krebernik 2001:210
Aštu				aš-tu		Woman	Krebernik 2001:212
Aštu	f			aš-tu		Woman	Krebernik 2001:212
Atal-šunuḥ				a-tal-šu-nu-uḥ	adal-šonoḡ(e)	The strong is the proper hand	Krebernik 2001:208
Atan				a-da-an	ad=a=n(na)		Krebernik 2001:208
Atiya				a-di-ia	ad=i=ya	He/She did (him) strong?	Krebernik 2001:209
Elan				e-la-an	ela=a=n(na)	He is instead of the sister	Krebernik 2001:213/214
Elanna				e-la-an-na	ela=a=nna	He is instead of the sister	Krebernik 2001:213/214
Eruzzi				e-ru-zi		The <i>eri</i> -cultivator?	Krebernik 2001:214
Ewri-kipa				ew(wa)-ri-ki-ba	evri-kib(i)=a		Krebernik 2001:229

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ezalam				e-za-la-am	*ħežal(i)=a=m(e/a)	Like a friend	Krebernik 2001:214
Ĥawir-alla				ħa-wi-ir-al-la	ħav=ir-alla		Krebernik 2001:215
Ĥazip-Aranziħ			6	ħa-zi-ip-a-ra-an-zi-iħ	ħaž=i=b-aranžig	The Tigris listened	Krebernik 2001:215
Ĥaziya				ħa-zi-ia	ħaž=i=ya	He/She listened	Krebernik 2001:215
Ĥilliya				ħi-il-li-ia	ħill=i=ya	He/She said	Krebernik 2001:215
Ĥulum-tizni				ħu-lum-ti-iz-ni	ħo/ul=o=m-tižni		Krebernik 2001:215
Ĥupitam				ħu-bi-dam	ħo/ubid(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a bull-calf	Krebernik 2001:215
Iriya				i-ri-ia	ir=i=ya	He/She gave (him)	Krebernik 2001:217
Itip-atal				i-di-ip-a-tal	id=i=b-adal	The strong struck?	Krebernik 2001:216
Kammuzzi	f			ka-am-mu-zi / ka-mu-zi		The <i>kami</i> -animal properly	Krebernik 2001:221
Kawlam				ka-aw-la-am	kavl(i)=a=m(e/a)		Krebernik 2001:221
Kelze				ke-él-ze		Health?	Krebernik 2001:221
Kikiya			2	ki-ki-ia	kig=i=ya	He/She left the third	Krebernik 2001:221
Kikki			2	ki-ik-ki	kikk=i	Let the third (number three) be here!	Krebernik 2001:221
Kizziħe				ki-iz-zi-ħe		<i>Kizziħe</i> -jewelry?	Krebernik 2001:221

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Muš-talma	f			mu-uš-ta-al-ma	muž-talm(i)=a	The big made (her) right	Krebernik 2001:223
Nawar-atal				na-wa-ar-a-tal	Navar-adal	Nawar is strong	Krebernik 2001:224
Nawar-tupki				na-wa-ar-tu-up-ki	Navar-to/ubki		Krebernik 2001:224
Nenip-[Šimi]ke(?)				ne-ni-ip-[...]-ge	nen=i=b-Šimige (?)		Krebernik 2001:224
Nirazzi(?)		?		ni-ra-zi			Krebernik 2001:224
Nupar-atal				nu-bar-a-tal	no/ubari-adal		Krebernik 2001:224
Nupar-šu[...]				nu-bar-šu-[...]	no/ubar-šo/u[...e]		Krebernik 2001:224
Papāya				pa-ba-ia	pab(a)=āya	Young mountain?	Krebernik 2001:224
Pataya				pa-ta-ia / pa-ta-a-ia	pad=a=ya		Krebernik 2001:224
Pulukkan				pu-lu-ga-an	po/ul=o=kk=o>a=n(na)		Krebernik 2001:136, 5; 167, 3
Pušan				pu-ša-an	po/už(i)=a=n(na)		Krebernik 2001:279, 22
Šarriya				šar-ri-ia	šarr=i=ya		Krebernik 2001:229
Šawlatum	f			ša-aw-la-tum			Krebernik 2001:227
Šenniya				še-ni-ia	šen(a)=ni=ya	Young brother	Krebernik 2001:229
Šenniyan				še-ni-ia-an	šen(a)=ni=ya=ān	Young brother	Krebernik 2001:229

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šewi-nirze	f	?		še-wi-ni-ir-ze	šev=i-nirže		Krebernik 2001:229
Šitip-ewri				ši-di-ip-ew-ri	šid=i=b-evri	The lord cursed (him)	Krebernik 2001:227
Taḥḥen				ta-aḥ-ḥe-en	taḥḥe=n(na)	He is a man	Krebernik 2001:227
Taḥil				ta-ḥi-il	taḡ=i=l		Krebernik 2001:227
Talmuž-elli	f			ta-al-mu-uš-e-l[i]	talm=o=ž-el(a)=ni	May the sister make (her) big!	Krebernik 2001:227
Tapšaḥe	f			ta-ap-ša-ḥe		Cupbearer	Krebernik 2001:227
Tatta	f			ta-at-ta	tatt=a=∅		Krebernik 2001:227
Tazap-kelti	f			ta-za-ap-ke-el-di	taž=a=b-keldi		Krebernik 2001:228
Tir-šarri				ti-ir-šar-ri	tir-šarri		Krebernik 2001:228
Tirḥi-atal				ti-ir-ḥi-a-tal	tirḡ=i-adal		Krebernik 2001:228
Tiwarri				ti-wa-ar-ri	tiwarni	Saying?	Krebernik 2001:228
Tizeḥam				ti-ze-ḥa-am	tižeg(e)=a=m(e/a)	He is a leader	Krebernik 2001:228
Tukiya				tu-gi-ia	to/ug=i=ya		Krebernik 2001:228
Tupkiya				tu-up-ki-ia	to/upki=ya		Krebernik 2001:228

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Unap-ni[r]ze(?)				ú-[n]a-ap-ni-[...]ze	un=a=b-nirže	The good came	Krebernik 2001:228
Unap-še				ú-na-ap-še	un=a=b-še	The brother came	Krebernik 2001:228
Uriya				ú-ri-ia	ur=i=ya	He/She wanted (him)	Krebernik 2001:228
Utturi				ut-tu-ri			Krebernik 2001:228
Zalulle	f			za-lu-ul-e	zal=o=lle		Krebernik 2001:229
Zaziya				za-zi-ia	zaž=i=ya	He/She fed (him)	Krebernik 2001:229
Zizen				zi-ze-en	ziz=i=n(na)		Krebernik 2001:230
Ziziya				zi-zi-ia	ziz=i=ya		Krebernik 2001:230

Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Šubat-Enlil (Tell Leilan)

The site of Tell Leilan, located in the Ḥabur plains of northeast Syria, has been identified with the ancient city of Šeḫna/Šubat-Enlil.¹ The latter was the name of the capital of the ancient ‘Kingdom of Upper-Mesopotamia’ ruled by a sovereign that belonged to a family of Amorite tribal chiefs, Šamšī-Adad I (1833-1776),² and managed to control large parts of Assyria and the upper Ḥabur region.³ This king was able to conquer the Ḥabur basin and chose, instead of Assyria, the site of Tell Leilan, probably deserted by the end of the 19th century, to establish his new residence, and re-baptized it as Šubat-Enlil.⁴ However, when Šamšī-Adad died the kingdom rapidly disintegrated, and the political stability of the city became unsustainable. Several figures, including the King of Apum, Turum-Nakti (who happened to bear a Hurrian name), tried to keep or conquer the city for themselves.⁵

The Hurrian PNs were retrieved from documents, which consisted, mostly, of letters and administrative texts.⁶ These belonged to different periods, mainly the archives of the three last Old Babylonian kings of Šubat-Enlil: Mutu-Abiḫ, Till-Abnû and Yakûn-Ašar (ca. 1755-1728).⁷ Given the nature of the texts, the vast majority of the PNs appertain to individuals who belonged to the lower classes of the society. However, it is difficult to discern (unless revealed by the document) if the people who bore Hurrian names were part of the native population of the city or if they came from the nearby region as war prisoners. In any case, it is not unlikely to have Hurrian people living in

¹ Eidem 2008: 269.

² The date has been adopted from Eidem 2011: 2.

³ Liverani 2013: 224.

⁴ Eidem 2008: 271.

⁵ Eidem 2011: 2-3.

⁶ Apart from some few political treaties and a copy of the Sumerian King List.

⁷ Eidem 2011-2012b: 228. The documents from Tell Leilan have been published by Vincente 1989; Ismail 1991; Van de Mieroop 1994; Eidem 2011.

Tell Leilan given that the site was located in one of the regions historically populated by Hurrians.

§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Tell-Leilan Texts

The Hurrian material retrieved from the Tell-Leilan documents reveals a relatively good example of the onomastic scenario that this population had during the first half of the second millennium. However, there is still a considerable amount of names that escape the present knowledge of the Hurrian language, especially regarding normalisation and translation.

§ Kinship

The PNs related to kinship are not particularly significant if we compare to other sites from the same period (e.g. Mari). However, they are in line with those archives from its vicinity, such as Chagar Bazar or Karana (see below). The figure of the ‘brother’,⁸ ‘sister’,⁹ ‘twin’,¹⁰ or ‘daughter’¹¹ appear in some of the names. We also find in two different individuals the hybrid name (Hurrian-Amorite) ‘Pent(i)- *Ammu*’¹² mentioning the figure of the paternal-uncle, which is also attested in Mari,¹³ Ebla¹⁴ and Tigonāni.¹⁵ However, it seems unusual that Hurrians would need to use a foreign word to a build kinship name.¹⁶ Therefore, it would not be strange to be facing a kinship element with a theophoric value.¹⁷

⁸ Šatu-šen[a](?); Šatu-šenni; Tirmen-šeni; Umpi-šenni; Akap-še[...]; Ap-šena.

⁹ ^fAšmar-elli.

¹⁰ Šinurḫe.

¹¹ ^fŠalan(zari).

¹² One name belongs to a high-ranking official and the other one to King Hammu-rabi’s servant from Yamḫad.

¹³ Pent(i)- *Ammu* (2).

¹⁴ Pent(i)- *Ammu*; Talmi- *Ammī*.

¹⁵ Tari- *Ammu*.

¹⁶ The element *Ammu* (patern-uncle) is Amorite and is commonly used in Amorite PNs. See Huffmon 1965: 196-98.

¹⁷ See the analysis of this type of name in the Hurrian PNs from the Alalah texts.

§ Theophoric elements in Personal Names

The theophoric elements are well displayed and varied throughout the onomastics. The relatively large presence of the main deities, as well as some minors, represents an interesting reflection of the Hurrian pantheon.

§ Primary and Secondary Deities

The Pan-Hurrian triad is well represented with names bearing the storm-god Teššup,¹⁸ the sun-god Šimika¹⁹ and the moon-god Kušuḫ.²⁰ We also encounter two hybrid names bearing the Semitic storm-god *Addu*, of which one is certainly Hurrian (*Takir-Addu*) and the other most likely (*Inna-Addu*).

Šubat-Enlil is the only site that, together with Mari,²¹ has brought to light another theophorous related to Kumarbi: *Arip-kumarwe*.

From the secondary deities, we only have a name bearing the theophorous for Teššup's bull Šerriš.²²

§ Minor Deities

Within the group of minor deities, we encounter the theophorous for Naye,²³ found in several other archives (Mari, Ašnakkum, Tell al-Rimah) and usually associated with female individuals, as well as Tulla,²⁴ Pišapḫe,²⁵ and Meme.²⁶

¹⁸ Hazip-Teššup (5) (one of these names belonged to the king of Razama); Teššup-ewri; Šukrum-Teššup.

¹⁹ Hazip-Šimika (4); Hazip-Šimike.

²⁰ Hazip-Kušuḫ (2); Kuzuḫ-[...] (2); Kuzuḫ-ewri.

²¹ Arip-Kumarwe; Kumarwe-atal; Kumarwe-ewri.

²² Kirip-Šerriš.

²³ †Attap-Naye; †Ilip-Na; †Šehlum-Na.

²⁴ Awiš-Tulla.

²⁵ Hazip-Pišapḫe.

²⁶ Memen-atal.

§ Divinised Entities

This group of names consist only on the figure of Nawar.²⁷ One would expect to find different divinised entities, particularly those related to natural things (rivers, mountains, places), given the location of Tell Leilan (i.e. situated in the Ḥabur basin, the core region of the Hurrians in Syria). However, we only encounter the city of Nawar, not just because of its vicinity to Šubat-Enlil (50 km away to the south-west), but because it is one of the most common divinised elements in the Hurrian anthroponyms.

§ Common Theophoric Elements

Finally, the group with common theophoric elements consists of several names bearing the noun ‘atal’,²⁸ and few with the word for ‘lord’,²⁹ ‘godking’,³⁰ and ‘(female) servant’.³¹

²⁷ Šaum-Namar (2); Kummen-atal; Nawar-...; Nawaranu; Šap-Namar.

²⁸ Kapizz(i)-atal (2); [...] -atal; Ḥawurni-atal; Kipu-atal; Masum-atal; Nupur-atal; Šan(i)p-atal; Šattum-atal; Tišwen-atal; Atal-tawar; Kummen-atal; Memen-atal.

²⁹ Ewri; Keleš-ewri; Partip-ewri; Tunip-ewri; Kuzuḥ-ewri; Teššup-ewri.

³⁰ Attai-šarri.

³¹ Uštāp-ulme

**List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Šubat-Enlil (Tell
Leilan)**

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
[...]taḥi				x-ta-ḥi	[...]-taḥe		Vincente 1991:532
[...]-atal				[x-x]-a-tal	[...]-adal		Vincente 1991:532
[Ku]zuzzi(?)				[ku]-zu(?) -uz-zi			Vincente 1991:520
Aḥar-[...]	f			a-ḥa-ar-[...]	aḡ=ar-[...]		Vincente 1991:506
Aḥi-[...]				a-ḥi-[...]	aḡ=i[...]		Vincente 1991:506
Akap-[...]	f			a-ga-ap-[...]	ag=a=b-[...]		Vincente 1991:505
Akap-[...]				a-ga-ap-[...]	ag=a=b-[...]		Vincente 1991:505
Akap-še[...]				a-ga-ap-še-x	ag=a=b-še[...]	The brother came up	Vincente 1991:505
Akap-taḥe			2	a-ga-ap-ta-ḥe	ag=a=b-taḡe	The man came up	Vincente 1991:505
Akap-tišeḥe				a-ga-ap-ti(DIM)-še-ḥe	ag=a=b-tiḡeḡe	The leader came up	Vincente 1991:506
Akap-tunu				a-ga-ap-tu-nu	ag=a=b-to/un(i)=u	The footstool came up	Vincente 1991:506
Aki-				a-ki-[...]	aki[...]		Vincente 1991:507
Akiya				a-ki-ia	ag=i=ya	He/She came up	Ismail 1991:169
Akkuya	f			ak-ku-ia	akk=o=ya	He/She came up	Ismail 1991:171
Akuki				a-ku-ki	ag=o=kk=i		Ismail 1991:171

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Al-mena				al-me-na	al-mena		VHN 53
Alip-mur				a-li-ip-mu-ur	al=i=b-mo/ur(i)		Vincente 1991:508
Anaiš				a-na-i-iš	an=ai=ž	May them be happy?	Ismail 1991:171
Ap-šena				ap-še-na	ap-šena		Vincente 1991:503
Arip-alla			2	a-ri-ip-al-la	ar=i=b-alla	The woman gave (him)	VHN 66
Arip-kumarwe				a-ri-ip-ku-mar-we	ar=i=b-Kumarve	Kumarbi gave (him)	Vincente 1991:532
Ašmar-elli	f			aš-ma-ar-e-li	ažm=ar-el(a)=ni		Vincente 1991:505
Atal-tawar				a-tal-ta-wa-ar	adal-tavar		VHN 88
Attai-šarri				at-ta-i-šar-ri	attai-šarri	The father is the godking	Vincente 1991:508
Attap-Naje	f			at-ta-ap-na-a-ie	att=a=b-Naye		VHN 89
Attara				at-ta-ra	attar(i)=a		Vincente 1991:508
Aweš-munulu	f			a-we-eš-mu-nu-lu	av=i=ž-mo/unol(e)=u	May <i>Munuli</i> save (her)!	Vincente 1991:508
Awi- [...]				a-wi- [...]	av=i[...]		Vincente 1991:508
Awiš-Tulla				a-wi-iš-tu-ul-la	av=i=ž-Tulla	May Tulla save (him)!	VHN 63
Azzu(-)ati	f			az-zu-a-di			Vincente 1991:508

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Elluš-šira				e-el-lu-uš-ši-ra	ell=o=ž-šir(i)=a		Vincente 1991:511
Ewri				e-ew-ri	evri	Lord	Eidem 2011: 110, 3; 171, 3.
Ĥalaš-tuk				ĥa-la-aš-tu-uk	ĥal=a=ž-to/uk		VHN 119
Ĥapal- [...]				ĥa-pa-al-x-x-x			Vincente 1991:512
Ĥaṭhiški				ĥa-at-ĥi-iš-ki			Vincente 1991:512
Ĥawurni-atal				ĥa-wu-ur-ni-a-tal	ĥavor(ni)-adal	The sky is strong	Vincente 1991:512 / Ismail 1991:171
Ĥazi- [...]				ĥa-zi- [...]	ĥaž=i- [...]		Vincente 1991:512
Ĥazi-kakku				ĥa-zi-kà-ak-ku	ĥaž=i-kakk(i)=u	Kakku, listen!	Ismail 1991:171
Ĥazip-Kušuḥ			2	ĥa-zi-ip- [...]-zu-uḥ / ĥa-zi-ip-ku-zu-uḥ	ĥaž=i=b-Kužoḡ	Kušuḥ listened	Vincente 1991:513 / Ismail 1991:171
Ĥazip-Pižapḥe				ĥa-zi-ip-pí-x-ap-ḥe	ĥaž=i=b-Pižapḥe	Pižapḥe listened	Vincente 1991:513
Ĥazip-Šimika			4	ĥa-zi-ip-ši-mi-ga	ĥaž=i=b-Šimiga	Šimika listened	Vincente 1991:512, 513 / Ismail 1991:171
Ĥazip-Šimike				ĥa-zi-ip-ši-mi-ge	ĥaž=i=b-Šimige	Šimike listened	PIHANS 117, 16:5
Hazip-Teššup			5	Ĥa-zi-ip-te-eš-šu-ub	ĥaž=i=b-Teššob	Teššup listened	Vincente 1991:513 / VHN 132
Ĥimtiya		?		ĥi-im-di-ia	ĥimd=i=ya		Vincente 1991:513
Ĥizzi				ĥi-iz-zi	ĥizz=i		Vincente 1991:513

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Hizzuḥe				ḥi-iz-zu(?)·x-ḥe			Vincente 1991:513
Hupitam				ḥu-bi-dam	ḥo/ubid(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a bull-calf	PIHANS 117, 51: 5
Ilip-na	f			i-li-ip-na	il=i=b-Na		Vincente 1991:516
Inna-Addu		H/S?		in-na-ad-du	inn=a-Addu		Vincente 1991:511
Innaya				in-na-a-ia	inn=a=ya		Vincente 1991:517
Inni- [...]				in-ni- [...]	inn=i- [...]		Vincente 1991:517
Irya-antu		?		i-ri-a-an-du			Vincente 1991:517
Irim-mun[u]				i-ri-im-mu-n[u]	ir=i=m(b!)-mo/un(i)=u	Munu gave/bestowed (him)	Ismail 1991:172
Iškiya				iš-ki-ia	išk=i=ya		OrNs 63 S. 334, L91-731 Vs. 6; L91-750 Vs. 5
Itimaya	f			i-di-ma-a-ia	id=i=m(b!)=aya		Vincente 1991:516
Izzinni				iz-zi-in-ni	izz=i=nni		PIHANS 117, 132: 16
Izzunni				iz-zu-un-ni	izz=o=nni		PIHANS 117, 13: 12
Kapiya			2	ka-bi-ia	kab=i=ya		Vincente 1991:518 / Ismail 1991:172
Kapizz(i)-atal			2	ka-bi-iz-za-tal	kabizz(i)-adal	Kapizzi-jewelry is strong	PIHANS 117, 157: 4, 17

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kapizza				ka-bi-iz-za	kabizz(i)=a	Like the <i>kapizzi</i> -jewel	Ismail 1991:172
Kariya				ga-ri-ia	kar=i=ya		Vincente 1991:511
Karzam				ka-ar-za-am	karž(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is born with a (special) lip	Vincente 1991:518
Kawiya		?		ka-wi-ia	kav=i=ya		Vincente 1991:518
Kazikuk				ka-zi-ku-uk	kaž(?)=ig=o=g		Ismail 1991:172
Keleš-ewri				ke-le-eš-ew-ri	kel=i=ž-evri	May the Lord please (him)!	OrNS 63, 317
Kellukkāya				ke-el-lu-ga-a-ia	kell=o=kk=a=(a)ya		PIHANS 117, 13: 7
Kelukki				ke-lu-uk-ki	kel=o=kk=i	He/She did not satisfy	Vincente 1991:519
Kelzaḥḥe				ke-el-za-aḥ-ḥi		Belong to the health?	Vincente 1991:518
Kilimani		?		ki-li-ma-ni			Vincente 1991:518
Kinnu				ki-in-nu	kinn=o		Vincente 1991:519
Kinziya				ki-in-zi-ia	kinz=i=ya		Vincente 1991:519
Kipram				ki-ip-ra-am	kibir(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a hunter?	PIHANS 117, 132: 16
Kipu-atal				ki-pu-a-tal	kib=o-adal		Ismail 1991:172
Kirip-Šerriš				ki-ri-ip-še-ri-iš	kir=i=b-Šerriž	Šerriš liberated (him)	VHN 165

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kiriya			2	ki-ri-ia / gi-ri-ia	kir=i=ya	He/She liberated (him)	PIHANS 117, 7: 5, 17; 147: 9; 148 Rs. 13'; 157: 10
Kizuriya				ki-ʿzu ¹ ?-ri-ia	kizori=ya		Ismail 1991:172
Kizzi-kawari				ki-iz-zi-ka-wa-ri	kizz=i-kavari		Ismail 1991:172
Kizziya			2	ki-iz-zi-ia	kizz=i=ya		Vincente 1991:519 / Ismail 1991:172
Kizzu				ki-iz-zu	kizz=o		Vincente 1991:519
Kukki				ku-uk-ki	ko/ukk=i		Vincente 1991:519
Kuliu				ku-li-ú	ko/ul=i=o		VHN 172
Kummen-atal				[ku]-um-me-na-[tal]	ko/umme=n(na)-adal	Kumme is strong	Vincente 1991:519
Kuntulla	f			ku-un-du-la	ko/und=o=lla		Vincente 1991:520
Kunu-šaranu		?		ku-nu-ša-ra-[nu]			Vincente 1991:520
Kuparze				ku-pa-ar-ze			Vincente 1991:520
Kuti-...]				ku-di-...]			Vincente 1991:519
Kuzuḥ-...]			2	ku-zu-uḥ-...]	Kužo/uḡ-...]		Vincente 1991:520 / Ismail 1991:172
Kuzuḥ-ewri				ku-zu-uḥ-ew-ri	Kužo/uḡ-ewri	Kušuḥ is the lord	Vincente 1991:520
Kuzuzzu				ku-zu-uz-zu	kozo/uzz(i)(?)=u		VHN 186

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kuzzu				ku-uz-zu	ko/uzz(?)=o	Hold back!	Vincente 1991:520
Kuzzu[...]				ku-uz-zu-[...]	ko/uzz(?)=o[...]		Vincente 1991:520
Kuzzuri			2	ku-uz-zu-ri			Vincente 1991:520
Liḫeš-tukki				li-ḫe-eš-tu-uk-ki	liḫ=i=ž-to/ukki		Vincente 1991:521
Maliya				ma-li-ia	mal=i=ya		Ismail 1991:172
Maškiya				ma-aš-ki-ia	mašk=i=ya		Ismail 1991:172
Masum-atal				ma-su-um-a-tal	mas=o=m-adal		Vincente 1991:521
Memem-atal				me-me-en-a-tal	meme=n(na)-adal	Meme is strong	VHN 193
Menna				me-en-[n]a		Sibling	Ismail 1991:173
Muziya			2	mu-zi-ia	muž=i=ya	He/She made (him) right	Ismail 1991:173
Naḫum(?) -muri				[n]a(?) -ḫu-um-mu-ri	naḫ=o=m-mo/uri	Muri sat him down	Vincente 1991:522
Naiukku				na-i-uk-ku	nai=o=kk=o		Ismail 1991:173
Naniya	f			na-ni-ia	nan=i=ya	He/She defeated (the enemy)	VHN 203
Nawar-[...]				na-wa-ar-[...]	Navar-[...]		Ismail 1991:173
Nawaranu				na-wa-ra-nu	Navar-ānu		Vincente 1991:523

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Nupur-atal				nu-pur-a-tal	no/ubo/ur-adal		Vincente 1991:523
Nuzānu				nu-za-nu	nuz(i)=ānu		Vincente 1991:523
Partip-ewri				pa-ar-di-ip(!)-ew-ri	pard=i=b-evri		Vincente 1991:523
Pent(i)-'ammu			2	bi-en-dam-mu	fend(i)=i-'ammu	Paternal-uncle, make (him) good!	Vincente 1991:509
Pithaya	f			bi-it-ḥa-a-ia	pith=a=ya		Vincente 1991:524
Pukuḥle				bu-ku-uḥ-l[e]			Vincente 1991:509
Puniya	f			bu-n[?i]a?	po/unn=i=ya		Vincente 1991:510
Punninni	f			pu-un-ne-in-ni	po/unn=i=nni		Vincente 1991:510
Puzakki	f			pu-za-ak-ki	po/uz=a=kk=i		Vincente 1991:510
Puzzaya				pu-uz-za-ia / pu-za-ia	po/uzz=a=ya		VHN 240
Sakniya		?		sa-ak-[ni]-ia			Vincente 1991:524
Šalanzari	f			ša-la-an-x- [...]		daughter?	Vincente 1991:526
Salluḥḥe				sa-al-lu-uḥ-ḥe		To the booty properly?	Vincente 1991:524
Šan(i)p-atal	f			ša-a-an-ba-tal	šan=i=b-adal		Ismail 1991:174
Šap-Namar				ša-ap-na-mar	ša=a=b-Namar		Ismail 1991:174

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šattiya				ša-at-ti-ia	šatt=i=ya	He/She seized (him)	Ismail 1991:174
Šattum-atal				ša-at-tu-um-a-tal	šatt=o=m-adal	The strong seized him	VHN 257
Šatu-šen[a](?)				ša-du-še-n[a(?)]	šad=o-šena	Brother, substitute (him)!	VHN 261
Šatu-šenni				ša-du-še-en-ni	šad=o-šen(a)=ni	Brother, substitute (him)!	Vincente 1991:526
Šatuzzi				ša-du-zi			Vincente 1991:526
Šaum-Namar			2	ša-ú-um-na-mar	ša=o=m-Namar	Nawar made (him) perfect	Vincente 1991:526
Šaum-uri				ša-ú-um-ú-ri	ša=o=m-Uri	Uri (foot?) made (him) perfect	Vincente 1991:526
Šeḫli-				še-eḫ-li- [...]	seḫl=i- [...]		Vincente 1991:527
Šeḫlum-Na	f			še-eḫ-lu-um-na	seḫl=o=m-Na	Naye entered	Vincente 1991:527
Šinurḫe				še-nu-ur-ḫi		Twin	VHN 272
Siweḫhanu		?		sí-we?-eḫ-ḫa-nu			Vincente 1991:525
Šukrum-Teššup				šu-uk-rum-te-šu-up	šo/ugr=o=m-Teššob		VHN 281
Šupir-nanu				šu-bi-ir-na-nu	šo/ubir(i)-nan(i)=u		Ismail 1991:174
Taḫe			2	ta-ḫe / ta-ḫi-e		Man	Vincente 1991:527 / Ismail 1991:174
Taḫuzzu				ta-ḫu-zu?			Vincente 1991:527

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Taki				ta-ke-e / [t]a-gi	take	Good	Vincente 1991:435, 176:6 / Ismail 1991:174
Takir-Addu				ta-ki-ra-du	tag=ir- <i>Addu</i>	Addu made (him) good	Ismail 1991:174
Takki				ta-ak-ki	takki	Good	Vincente 1991:528
Takli		?		ta-ak-li			Vincente 1991:528
Takli-pur				ta-ak-li-bur	tagl=i-pur		Vincente 1991:528
Takli-še?				ta-ak-[li]-[x]-ši?	tagl=i-še?		Vincente 1991:528
Tarinnam				ta-ri-nam	tarinn(i)=a=m(e/a)		VHN 299
Tariruki		?		[da]-ri-ru-ki			Vincente 1991:510
Tariš-matum	f			ta-ri-iš-ma-tim	tar=i=ž- <i>matum</i>		Ismail 1991:174
Tariya				ta-ri-ia	tar=i=ya		Vincente 1991:528
Tarmuši				tar-mu-ši	tarm=o/už=i	Drink!	VHN 299
Tašupaya				ta-šu-ba-a-ia	taž=o=b(m!)- <i>āya</i>		Vincente 1991:527
Tatukkan				da-du-uk-ka-an	tad=o=kk=o>a=n(na)		VHN 302
Tatum-tešhe				ta-du-um-te-eš-ḥe	tad=o=m-tešhe	The guard loved him	VHN 303
Teššena			2	te-eš-še-na	tess=i=nna	Make (him) solemn!	Vincente 1991:528 / Ismail 1991:174

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Teššup-ewri				te-eš-šu-ub-ew-ri	Tessob-evri	Teššup is the lord	Vincente 1991:528
Tirmen-šeni				ti-ir-me-en-še-ni	tirme=n(na)-šen(a)=ni		Vincente 1991:528
Tirukkānu				ti-ru-uk-ka-nu	tir=o=kk=(o)=ānu		PIHANS 117, 137:10
Tišwen-atal				ti-iš-we-en-a-tal	tišfe=n(na)-adal		Ismail 1991:174
Tiwen-turuk				ti-wi-en-tu-ru-u[k]	tive=n(na)-turuk(i)?		Vincente 1991:528
Tulip-arawši(?)				tu-li-pa-ra-WA-ši	to/ul=i=b-aravši		VHN 313
Tulpiya				[tu]-ul-pi-ia	to/ulbi=ya		Vincente 1991:528
Tunip-ewri				tu-ni-ip-[ew]-[ri]	to/un=i=b-evri(?)	The Lord endowed (him)	Vincente 1991:529
Tunti	f			tu-un-di	to/und=i		Vincente 1991:528
Tur-kanazi	f			tu-ur-ka-na-zi	to/ur-kanazzi	<i>Kanazzi</i> took away	Vincente 1991:530
Turum-natki				tu-rum-na-at-ki	to/ur=o=m-natki/nakte	The annihilation brought him away	VHN 320
Ukku			2	uk-ku	o/ukk=o		Vincente 1991:530 /Ismail 1991:174
Ullu				ul-lu	o/ull=o	Destroy!	Vincente 1991:530
Ullup(-)a				ul-lu-ba			Ismail 1991:175
Umpi-šenni				um-bi-še-ni-e	o/umb=i-šen(a)=ni		VHN 329

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ušše	f			ú-uš-še	ušš=e	Go!	Vincente 1991:529
Uštāp-tupki			2	uš-tap-tu-up-ki	ušt=a=b-to/ubki	Tupki went out	Vincente 1991:530
Uštāp-ulme				uš-tap-ul-me	ušt=a=b-olme	The slave went out	Ismail 1991:175
Uttuzzi	f			ut-tu-uz-zi			Vincente 1991:530
Wanzar				wa-an-za-ar			Vincente 1991:530
Watram		?		wa-at-ra-[am]			Ismail 1991:175
Wiriri-šati				wi-ri-ri-ʿšaʿ-ti			Ismail 1991:175
Zazari				za-za-ri	zaž=ar=i	Feed (him) repeatedly	VHN 251
Zaziya				za-z[i-ia]	zaž=i=ya	He/She fed (him)	Ismail 1991:175
Zerrakka				ze-er-ra-ga	zerrakk(i)=a	He is like a donkey	Vincente 1991:531
Zerri				ze-er-ri		Donkey	Vincente 1991:531
Zike				zi-gi-e			Ismail 1991:175
Ziki			2	zi-gi	zig=i		Vincente 1991:530, 531
Zikku-				zi-[ik]-ku-[x-x]			Vincente 1991:531
Ziwuḥḥānu				zi-WA-Aḥ-ḥa-nu	zivoḥḥ(e)=ānu		VHN 274

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Zizaya				zi-za-a-ia	ziz=a=ya		VHN 277

Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Ašnakkum (Chagar Bazar)

The site of Chagar Bazar, ancient Ašnakkum,¹ located in the central Upper Ḫabur plains, has been providing, during its several campaigns, hundreds of cuneiform tablets.² The documentation retrieved from the site consists, mostly, on administrative texts³ dating to the time when Šamšī-Addu established his kingdom in Upper Mesopotamia (1792-1775 BC).⁴ The documents, belonging to the palace, not only show the relationship between the city and the capital of the kingdom, Šubat-Enlil (Tell Leilan), but also the social distribution of the site due to the extensive lists regarding grain and beer distribution.⁵ The city was ruled, at least during the time of the texts, by Sîn-iqīšam⁶ which was a high-ranking governor under Šamšī-Addu's power.

The Hurrian population at Ašnakkum seems to have been, mostly, workers. The foremen in charge of the grain and beer distribution, the most important economic places of the city, had Semitic (mostly Amorite and Akkadian) names as well as those in charge of the palace administration and textiles.⁷ In the case of the textile workers, many bore Hurrian names, mostly women, which might have been war prisoners⁸ or simply native or seasonal workers since Ašnakkum was located in the Hurrian heartland nearness.

§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Ašnakkum Texts

The quantity of Hurrian PNs in the texts from Ašnakkum is not contemptible at all.

¹ On the ancient name of Chagar Bazar see Lacambre and Millet Albà 2008.

² For briefings on the campaigns and the tablets unearthed see Talon 1997: 3-4; Lacambre 2010: 97.

³ For the documents see Loretz 1969; Talon 1998; Chagar Bazar III.

⁴ Lacambre 2010: 98.

⁵ Talon 1997.

⁶ Lacambre 2010: 100-ff.

⁷ Lacambre 2010: 105-108.

⁸ Zadok 1999/2000b: 356.

According to some scholars, Hurrians represented the second major group besides the Semitic one (i.e. Amorite and Akkadian).⁹ This same scenario is repeated in different parts of the region,¹⁰ turning the Hurrian population into a common actor during the first half of the second millennium.

The social nature of the individuals bearing Hurrian names seems to be, in its vast majority, that of workers.

§ Kinship

As it happens in the case of Mari, kinship relationships are well attested in the PNs. Names holding the words for brother,¹¹ sister,¹² sibling¹³ or father,¹⁴ expressing some sort of joy or gratitude, appear along the examples.

§ Expressive Names

The Hurrian onomastic from Chagar Bazar also reproduces names were the parents invoke someone, most probably a deity or a divinised entity, to save/rescue ('av-') the new-born¹⁵ or to help them to raise them,¹⁶ in the form of wish or desire. There are also names, mostly in the imperative, that express requests or commands regarding the nature or any characteristic of the childbirth or the infant. For instance, the directives express in the names: 'Sibling, come here!'¹⁷, 'Bring it!'¹⁸, 'Come!'¹⁹, 'Let (him)

⁹ Zadok claimed that, at least till the date of his publication, from the 513 names attested in the Chagar Bazar texts, 30% were Hurrians (1999-2000b: 358). See also VHN 18.

¹⁰ See the case for the Hurrians in Mari (despite the distance), which also have a high degree of accord on PNs.

¹¹ Šennam; Unap-še(n); Atal-*aḥu* (hybrid Hurrian-Akkadian); Šenāya.

¹² Akap-elli; Kirip-elli; Atauž-elli; Eten-elli; Nupur-elli; Tazal-elli.

¹³ Allai-menni; Teḥum-menni.

¹⁴ Attai-nirze.

¹⁵ Awen-kapi; Aweš-tal[ma]; Awiš-muzi.

¹⁶ Talme-IŠTAR (Šawuška/Išḥara); Talpuš-atal.

¹⁷ Unamme

¹⁸ Uninna

¹⁹ Unappa.

free!’²⁰ or ‘Strong, make him solemn!’.²¹ Among the group that express greetings and thanksgiving, we find names such as ‘one daughter!’.²² In the groups of kinship information, we encounter names such as ‘Seventh’,²³ ‘He is like one of the brothers’²⁴ or ‘The (girl) of the woman’.²⁵

§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names

Chagar Bazar could probably be used as a good example of the relationship between names and socio-economic condition because the vast majority of the population bearing Hurrian names were simply labourers (weavers, field-workers, brewers, herdsman, common workers at the palace or the beer/grain bureau, gatekeepers, cooks, millers and even slaves). Thus, the question regarding the connection between theophorous in individuals of a particular social class could be raised here.

§ Primary and Secondary Deities

Among the group of primary deities, the PNs from Chagar Bazar clearly reveal the theophorous for the sun-god Šimika²⁶ and moon-god Kušuḫ.²⁷ We also encounter Iṣḫara,²⁸ although one of the names is hybrid (Semitic-Hurrian)²⁹ and the other one is broken,³⁰ so we cannot do a complete analysis. The remaining theophorous present some problems regarding its correct reading and interpretation.

The first one is ‘^fTalme-*IŠTAR*’ (ta-al-me-IŠ₈-TÁR), which presents the common issue concerning the proper reading for the *IŠTAR* logogram: Ištar, Iṣḫara or Šawuška.

²⁰ Kirri.

²¹ Teššen-atal.

²² Šalli.

²³ Šintazze.

²⁴ Šennam.

²⁵ Aštue.

²⁶ ^fNawar-Šimik(a); Ḫazip-Šimika; ^fTarim-Šimika.

²⁷ Ḫazip-Kuzuḫ; Kuzuḫ-atal (3).

²⁸ Ḫazip-^dIṣḫara.

²⁹ *Ibni*-^diṣḫara.

³⁰ [...] -Iṣḫara.

The second name corresponds to ‘Purit-Kubaba’ (pu-ri-id-ku-ba-ba), one of the few cases we encounter a theophorous bearing the name of Kubaba. Here the problem relies on whether to consider this a Hurrian name, and if so if it represents the name of the goddess. At Mari we also have two names (Kupapuzzi and Ḫaya-Kubaba) bearing the theophorous, which could indicate that this is not an isolated case.

The third group of names might correspond to the goddess Šalaš: ^fŠalaš-niki (Ša-la-aš-ni-gi) and ^fŠalaš-turaya (ša-la-aš-tu-ra-ia). Here, it is not clear if the names are referring to the deity itself or have to be interpreted as ‘šal=a=ž-nigi/turaya?’.³¹ However, the root ‘šal-’ is not very frequent in the Hurrian onomasticon³² which could lean for interpreting as the name of the goddess.

The last theophorous is also problematic (as the case for IŠTAR) because is formed with a sumerogram: Kabi-^dIM. The readings of this name could be interpreted as Kābī-Addu (Semitic), Kabi-*Addu* (Hybrid Sem-Hurr) or Kabi-Teššub (Hurrian). The Semitic interpretation could be translated as ‘Addu is my rock’, though the element ‘kābī’, particularly in Amorite *Satznamen*, is usually set after the noun (i.e. Addu-kābī). The hybrid interpretation could be valid since the Amorite theophorous for the storm-god has been used in different Hurrian names,³³ while the Hurrian reading is slightly less feasible since there are no attestations of the name Kabi-Teššub. Thus, a possible absence of the theophorous of the head of the Hurrian pantheon is a fact that should be taken into consideration since Chagar Bazar could be the only site, with a significant amount of Hurrian PNs, in overlooking, at least from an onomastic point of view, the god Teššup.

Therefore, the theophorous from Chagar Bazar reveal the presence of the following primary deities from the Hurrian pantheon: Kušuḫ and Šimika (and maybe Teššup); and

³¹ VHN 496.

³² NPN 123; AAN I 117.

³³ For instance at Mari (Ewri-*Addu*, Matum-*Addu*), Šubat-Enlil (Takir-*Addu*) or Šušarra (Artim-*Addu*).

the following secondary: Išhara, Ištar/Šawuška and probably Šalaš and Kubaba.

§ Minor Deities

Within the group of minor deities, Chagar Bazar reveals the presence of Naye,³⁴ Šuriḫe³⁵ and Šayu³⁶ found elsewhere (e.g. Mari, Tikunani, Šubat-Enlil). We should emphasise, again, that many of these, which we consider as minor/local deities, in fact, could be something else.

§ Divinised Entities

In the case of the divinised entities, we find ‘kiaze’,³⁷ ‘eše’³⁸ (earth), Aranziḫ,³⁹ Nawar,⁴⁰ mountain⁴¹ or throne,⁴² elements which are commonly found in the onomastics.

§ Common Theophoric Elements

Finally, we also encounter the common theophoric elements such as ‘strong’,⁴³ ‘detyking’,⁴⁴ ‘lord’,⁴⁵ ‘righteous’,⁴⁶ ‘lady’,⁴⁷ ‘servant’⁴⁸ and ‘throne’,⁴⁹ which are usually present in the Hurrian onomastic.

³⁴ fKanzuš-Naye; fMemen-Naye; fNakaš-na; fŠatum-Na; fŠunzu-Naye; fUniš-Na; f[...]naya.

³⁵ fIšmen-Šuriḫ(e).

³⁶ fKelum-Šayu.

³⁷ fAttap-kiyaze; fMemen-Kiyazi (3); fPulum-kiyazi; Unuš-kiyaze.

³⁸ fAmman-eše (2); fAntar-eše.

³⁹ Aranziḫ-atal.

⁴⁰ fNawar-kanazzi; fNawar-Nišḫe (3); Nawar-tupki (2); fAtal-Naware; fḤazip-Nawar.

⁴¹ Paḥri-pabni.

⁴² fŠazum-kešḫi.

⁴³ Kuzuḫ-atal; Talpuš-atal; Atal-šerah; Teššen-atal; Unap-atal; Arum-atal; Atal-*abkān*; Atal-Našše; Atal-Našše; Atal-Naware; Atal-šaki; Atal-*aḫu*; Muzum-atal; Eḫlip-atal; Aranziḫ-atal; Kumpaz-atal; Nupur-atal; Partip-atal; fŠa-atal.

⁴⁴ [...]šarri; fḫi...šarri; Inip-šarri; fŠazum-šarri.

⁴⁵ fḤazip-ewri, Ewri-zu.

⁴⁶ fAwiš-muzi (2).

⁴⁷ fAllai-menni; fKelum-allai.

⁴⁸ Kirip-ulme.

⁴⁹ fŠatum-kešḫe; fŠazum-kešḫi.

Therefore, the Hurrian onomastic material from Ašnakkum reveals some differences from that of the same period and close vicinity (e.g. Mari, Šubat-Enlil, Tell al-Rimah). First, it is probably missing the presence of the storm-god Teššup. Second, it also lacks the presence of Ḫebat, Kumarbi or Allani from the onomasticon. Third, the occurrence of Šawuška is also doubtful. And last, the amount of main deities as part of the theophorous element is relatively small (maximum 15 names from ca. 230), if compared with other sites. Thus, we could be tempted to claim, at least in this phase of the Hurrian religion, a relationship between the election of a name and the belonging to a social class. However, the overall facts inside the Hurrian onomasticon do not suggest a direct connection of this type, at least not during this period.

List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Ašnakkum

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
[...]-išhara				[...i]š-ḥa-ra	[...]-Išhara		Loretz 1969:25
[...]-kiya		?		[...]-ki-ya			Loretz 1969:25; Talon 1997:139
[...]-naya				[x]-[x]-na-ia	[...]-Naye		Loretz 1969:25; Talon 1997:139
[...]-šarri				[...]-ša-ri	[...]-šarri		Loretz 1969:25; Talon 1997:139
[...]-tupki				[...]-tu-up-ki	[...]-tupki		Loretz 1969:26; Talon 1997:139
[...]-tupki				X-X-tu-ub!-ki	[...]-tupki		Talon 1997:139
[...]-a-tal				[...]-a-tal	[...]-adal		Loretz 1969:25; Talon 1997:139
[...]-ap-tupki				[...]-ap-tu-up-ki	[...]-a=b-tupki		Loretz 1969:25; Talon 1997:139
Adatta		?		a-da-at-ta			Loretz 1969:19; Talon 1997:122
Akakka			2	a-ga-ka/a-ga-ak-ka	ag=a=kk=a		Talon 1997:122
Akap-elli	f			a-ga-ap-e-li	ag=a=b-el(a)=ni	The sister came up	Chagar Bazar III:359
Akkan		?		ak-ka-an	akk=a=an		Loretz 1969:19; Talon 1997:123
Akkuya				ak-ku-ia	akk=o=ya	He/She brought (him) up	Loretz 1969:19; Talon 1997:123
Allai-menni	f			al-la-i-me-ni	allai-men(a)=ni	The lady is the sibling	Talon 1997:123
Amman-eše	f		2	am-ma-an-e-še	amm=a=n(na)-eže	The earth arrived	Talon 1997:123

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Antar-eše	f			an-da-ar-e-še	and=ar-eže		Talon 1997:123
Apšam			2	ap-ša=am	apš(e)=a=m(e/a)		Talon 1997:122
Aranziḡ-atal				a-ra-an-zi-iḡ-a-dal	Aranziḡ-adal	The Tigris is strong	Talon 1997:123
Ariš-kan				a-ri-iš7-ka-an	ar=i=ž-kan(i)	May Kani give (him)!	VHN 71
Arriwe				Ar-ri-we	arri=ve(?)		Loretz 1969:19; Talon 1997:123
Arum-atal				a-rum-a-dal	ar=o=m-adal	The strong gave him	Talon 1997:123
Ašlakka				áš-la-ak-ka	ažl=a=kk=a		Talon 1997:123
Aštu-atana	f		3	aš-tu-a-ta-na	ašto/u-adana		Talon 1997:123
Aštue	f			aš-tu-e	ašte=ve or ašto/u=(v)e	The (girl) of the woman	Talon 1997:123
Aštuzar	f			aš-tu-za-ar		Woman?	Talon 1997:123
Atal-				a-dal-...]	adal-		Talon 1997:122
Atal-abkân				a-dal-ab-ka-an	adal-	The strong is Abkan?	Talon 1997:122
Atal-aḡu				a-dal-a-ḡu	adal-aḡu	The strong is the brother	Talon 1997:122
Atal-Našše	f			a-dal-la-aš-še	adal-našše	The Strong is Našše	Talon 1997:122
Atal-Naware	f			a-tal-la-wa-ar-e (a-dal-la-ya/wa/à-ar-e)	adal-Navar=(n)i	The strong is Nawar	Loretz 1969:19; Talon 1997:122

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Atal-šaki	f			a-dal-ša-ki	adal-šagi	The strong is Šaki	Talon 1997:122
Atal-šeraḥ	f			a-dal-še-ra-aḥ	adal-šeraḡ(e)		Talon 1997:122
Atauž-elli	f			a-ta-uš-e-li	ad=av=ž-el(a)=ni		Talon 1997:123
Attai-nirze	f			at-ta-i-ni-ir-ze	attai-nirže	The father is the good	Talon 1997:123
Attap-kiyaze	f			At-tap-ki-ia-zi	att=a=b-kiyaže	Sea?	Loretz 1969:19; Talon 1997:123
Atte	f		2	at-te	atte	Woman	Talon 1997:123
Atte-nan	f			at-te-na-an	atte-nan(i)	The woman is a <i>nani</i> - weapon?	Talon 1997:124
Attu	f			at-tu		Woman	Talon 1997:124
Attue	f			at-tu-e	att(e)=ve / atto/u=(v)e	The girl of the woman	Talon 1997:124
Attukki	f			at-tu-uk-ki		Young woman	Talon 1997:124
Awal-...di		?		A-wa-al-[x]-di			Loretz 1969:19; Talon 1997:124
Awen-kapi	f			a-we-en-ga-bi	av=i=n(na)-kabi	Kapi, save her!	Talon 1997:124
Aweš-tal[ma?]	f			a-we-eš-tal-[ma?]	av=i=ž-tal[ma?]	May the big save (her)!	Talon 1997:124
Awiš-muzi	f		2	a-wi-iš-mu-úš-e / a-we- eš-mu-zi	av=i=ž-muži	May the righteous save (her)!	Talon 1997:124
Azul-...]	f			a-zu-ul-...]			Talon 1997:124

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Azzu			2	az-zu		Woman	Loretz 1969:19; Talon 1997:124
Azzukka	f			az-zu-ka	azzo/ukk(i)=a	Like a young woman	Talon 1997:124
Eḫlip-atal				eḫ-li-ip-a-dal	eḡl=i=b-adal	The strong saved (him)	Chagar Bazar III:362
Elešša	f			e-le-eš-ša	elišš(e)=a		Talon 1997:126
Ellu				el-lu	ell=o		Talon 1997:126
Ellunna	f			e-el-lu-un-na / e-lu-un-na	ell=o=nna		Talon 1997:126
Eriḫri...		?		e-ri-iḫ-ri-...			Talon 1997:127
Eten-elli	f			e-de-en-e-li	ed=i=n(na)-el(a)=ni		Talon 1997:126
Ewenni				e-we-en-ni	ev=i=nni		Talon 1997:126
Ewri(-)zu			2	ew-ri-zu			Talon 1997:137
Ḫaḫḫiḫe		?		Ḫa-aḫ-ḫi-tum	ḫaḫḫ=i=tum(?)		Loretz 1969:20; Talon 1997:127
Ḫaḫḫu		?		ḫa-aḫ-ḫu	ḫaḫḫ=u		Talon 1997:127
Ḫaliya				ḫa-li-ia	ḫal=i=ya		Talon 1997:127
Ḫalukkan				ḫa-lu-uk-ka-an	ḫal=o=kk=o>a=n(na)		Talon 1997:127

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Hammiya		?		ha-mi-ia	ham=i=ya		Loretz 1969:21; Talon 1997:127
Haniya				ha-ni-ia	han=i=ya	She gave birth	Talon 1997:127
Hawinu		?		ha-wi-nu			Talon 1997:127
Hazip- [...]				ha-zi-ip- [...]	haž=i=b-....		Talon 1997:127
Hazip- ^d lšhara				Ha-zi-ib- ^d iš-ha-ra	haž=i=b-lšhara	lšhara listened	Talon 1997:127
Hazip-ewri				ha-zi-ip-ew!(wa)-ri!(tal)	haž=i=b-evri	The lord listened	Talon 1997:127
Hazip-Kuzuḥ				Ha-zi-ib-ku-zu-uḥ	haž=i=b-Kužoḡ	Kuṣuḥ listened	Loretz 1969:21; Talon 1997:127
Hazip-Nawar				Ha-zi-ib-na-wa-ar	haž=i=b-Nawar	Nawar listened	Talon 1997:127
Hazip-Šimika				Ha-zi-ib-ši-mi-ga	haž=i=b-Šimiga	Šimika listened	Loretz 1969:21; Talon 1997:127
Hazirum		?		ha-zi-rum			Talon 1997:127
Hazzu				ha-az-zu			Talon 1997:127
Hi...-šarri				hi- [...]-ša-ri	hi[...]-šarri	godking	Talon 1997:127
Hiwilatḥe				hi-wi-la-at-ḥe		Hiwilatian	Talon 1997:127
Hizili				hi-zi-li	hiž(?)=i=le		Talon 1997:127
Hizla				hi-iz-la			Talon 1997:127

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Hizza				hi-za	hizz=a		Talon 1997:127
Huhan(um)			2	hu-ħa-an / hu-ħa-nim	ho/uğ(i/a)=ān(um)		Talon 1997:128
Huiššam				hu-i-iš-ša-am	huiss(e)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a call?	Talon 1997:128
Hulliya				hu-ul-li-ia	ho/ull=i=ya		Talon 1997:128
Hulmunzu				Hu-ul-mu-un-zu	ho/ulmonž(e)=u		Talon 1997:128
Hulpa		?		hu-ul-pa			Talon 1997:128
Hunzanze	f			hu-un-za-ze			Talon 1997:128
Hupitam				hu-bi-dam	ho/ubid(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a bull-calf	Talon 1997:127
Hutiya				hu-di-ia	ho/ud=i=ya	He/She blessed (him)	Talon 1997:128
Ibni- ^d išħara		H/S?		ib [?] -ni- ^d iš-ħa-ra	ibni-lšħara	Išħara has created	Talon 1997:128
Ikkizzan	f			ik-ki-za-an	ikkizz(i)=a=n(na)		Talon 1997:128
Ilanzu				i-la-an-zu	ilanž(e)=u		Talon 1997:128
Inip-šarri				i-ni-ib-šar-ri	in=i-b-šarri		Talon 1997:129
Iniya				i-ni-ia	in=i=ya		Talon 1997:129
Išmen-Šuriħ	f			iš-me-en-šu-ri-iħ	išm=i=n(na)- Šo/uriğ(e)		Talon 1997:129

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Išmen-Šuwala	f			iš-me-en-šu(!)-wa-la	išm=i=n(na)-Šo/uwala		VHN 116
Iwatil	f			i-wa-di-il	iv(i)=a=dil(la)		Talon 1997:129
Kabi-Addu/Teššob		S or H/S?		Ka-bi- ^d IM	kab=i-Addu/Teššob		Loretz 1969:22; Talon 1997:129
Kaliya	f			ka-li-ia	kal=i=ya		Talon 1997:129
Kanuniḫi		?		ka-nu-ni-ḫi			Talon 1997:130
Kanzan	f			ka-an-za-an	kanz(i)=a=n(na)		Talon 1997:130
Kanzuš-Naya	f			ka-an-zu-úš!-na-ia	kanz=o=ž-Naye		Talon 1997:130
Kazizzan				ka-zi-iz-za-an	kazizz(i)=a=n(na)		Talon 1997:130
Kelum-allai	f			ki-lum-al-la-i	kel=o=m-allai	The lady made her healthy/happy	Talon 1997:130
Kelum-Šayu	f			ki-lum-ša-iu	kel=o=m-Šayu	Šayu made her healthy/happy	Talon 1997:130
Kewazzu(?)	f			ke-WA-zu	kevazz(i)=u		Talon 1997:130
Kinam-Turi	f			ki-nam-du-ri	kin=a=m(b!)-turi		Talon 1997:130
Kiniš-matum		?		ki-ni-iš-ma-tum	kin=i=ž-mātum		Talon 1997:130
Kirip-elli	f		2	ki-ri-ip-e-li	kir=i=b-el(a)=ni	The sister liberated (her)	Loretz 1969:22; Talon 1997:130
Kirip-ulme				ki-ri-ip-ul-me	kir=i=b-olme	The servant liberated (him)	Talon 1997:130

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kirri				ki-ir-ri	kirr=i	Let (him) free!	Talon 1997:130
Kirru				ki-ir-ú	kirr=u	Let (him) free!	Talon 1997:130
Kizi-kanazzi	f			ki-zi-ka-na-zi (ki-nam?-ka-na-zi)	kiz=i-kanazzi		Talon 1997:130
Kizzuri			2	Ki-iz-zu-ri			Loretz 1969:22; Talon 1997:130
Ku...-naze				ku-X-na-zi			Talon 1997:130
Kullali				ku-ul-la-li	ko/ull=a=ni(?)		Talon 1997:130
Kulliya				ku-ul-li-ia	ko/ull=i=ya		Loretz 1969:22; Talon 1997:130
Kumpaz-atal	f			Ku-um-ba-za-tal	ko/umb=a=ž-adal	The strong?	Loretz 1969:22; Talon 1997:130
Kunki	f			ku-un-gi			Talon 1997:130
Kunti	f			Ku-un-di	ko/und=i		Talon 1997:130
Kururze	f			ku-ru-ur-zi			Talon 1997:130
Kute	f			ku-te	kud=i		Talon 1997:130
Kuwari	f			Ku-wa-ri	Kuvari		Loretz 1969:22; Talon 1997:130
Kuzuḥ-atal			3	Ku-zu-uḥ-a-tal	Kužo/uḡ-adal	Kuṣuḥ is trong	Loretz 1969:22; Talon 1997:130
Kuzzari				ku-uz-za-ri	kozz(?)=ar=i	Keep (her) back!	Talon 1997:130

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kuzzutta				ku-uz-zu-ta	kozz(?)=o=tta	Hold me back?	Talon 1997:130
Memem-Kiyazi	f		3	me-me-en-ki-ya-zi	meme=n(na)-kiyaže	<i>Meme</i> is the sea	Talon 1997:131; Chagar Bazar III:367
Memem-Naye	f			me-me-en-na-ie	meme=n(na)-Naye	<i>Meme</i> is Naye	Loretz 1969:22; Talon 1997:131
Menna-pu...	f			me-en-na-bu-X	menna-...[...]		Talon 1997:131
Muzum-atal				Mu-zu-um-a-tal	muž=o=m-adal	The strong made him right	Loretz 1969:22; Talon 1997:132
Nakaš-na				na-ga-aš-na	nag=a=ž-Na		Talon 1997:132
Nalluzza				na-al-lu-za	nallo/uzz(i)=a	Like a deer?	Talon 1997:132
Nani-zu				na-ni-zu			Loretz 1969:23; Talon 1997:132
Nawar-kanazzi	f			na-wa-ar-ka-na-zi	Navar-kanazzi		Loretz 1969:23; Talon 1997:132
Nawar-Nišhe	f		3	na-wa-ar-ni-iš-ḥi	Navar-nišhe		Loretz 1969:23; Talon 1997:132
Nawar-Šimik	f			na-wa-ar-ši-mi-ig	Navar-Šimig	Nawar is Šimika / the sun	Talon 1997:132
Nawar-tupki			2	na-wa-ar-tu-up-ki	Navar-to/ubki	Nawar?	Loretz 1969:23; Talon 1997:132
Nawukku				na-wu-uk-ku	nav=o=kk=o	He/She did not graze?	Talon 1997:132
Nirizzi	f			ni-ri-zi			Talon 1997:132
Nupur-atal			3	nu-bur-a-tal	no/ubo/ur-adal	Nupur is the strong	Loretz 1969:23; Talon 1997:132

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Nupur-elli	f			nu-bur-e-li	no/ubor-el(a)=ni	Nupur is the sister	Loretz 1969:23; Talon 1997:132
Paḥri-pabni	f			pa-aḥ-ri-pa-ab-ni	faḡri-pabni	The mountain is good	Talon 1997:133
Paḥri-šeḥirni	f			pa-aḥ-ri-še-ḥi-ir-ni	faḡri-seḡirni	The providence/generous is good	Loretz 1969:23; Talon 1997:133
Paḥri-uzuwi(?)	f			pa-aḥ-ri-ú-zu-wa	faḡri-o/uzo/uvi(?)	<i>Uzuwi?</i> Is good	Talon 1997:134
Pakuraya		?		ba-ku-ra-ia			Talon 1997:124
Paninaya		?		ba-ni-na-ia			Talon 1997:124
Papaḥe	f			pa-ba-ḥi		Mountain dweller	Talon 1997:133
Partip-atal				Pa-ar-di-ip-a-tal	pard=i=b-adal		Loretz 1969:23; Talon 1997:133
Paruli				Pa-ru-li	par=o=lli		Loretz 1969:23; Talon 1997:133
Parzilu		?		Pa-ar-zi-lu			Loretz 1969:23; Talon 1997:133
Piziya				bi-zi-ia	piz=i=ya		Talon 1997:125
Pukiya				pu-gi-ia	fug=i=ya		Talon 1997:125
Pulum	f			pu-lu-um	po/ul=o=m		Talon 1997:125
Pulum-kiyazi	f			pu-lu-um-ki-ia-zi	po/ul=o=m-kiyaže		Loretz 1969:20; Talon 1997:125
Purame				bu-ra-me		Slave	Talon 1997:123

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Purit-Kubaba				pu-ri-id-ku-ba-ba	pur=i=t(b!)-kubaba		Talon 1997:133
Puzi	f			pu-zi	po/uz=i		Talon 1997:125
Ša-atal				ša-a-dal			Talon 1997:134
Šalaš-niki	f			Ša-la-aš-ni-gi	šal=a=ž-nigi or Šalaš-nigi		Loretz 1969:23; Talon 1997:134
Šalaš-turaya	f			ša-la-aš-tu-ra-ia	šal=a=ž-turaya or Šalaš-turaya		Talon 1997:134
Šalli	f			ša-al-li	šal(a)=ni	One daughter!	Talon 1997:134
Šan-mata				Ša-an-ma-da	šan-mad(i)=a		Loretz 1969:23; Talon 1997:135
Šarriya				šar-ri-ia / šar-ra-ia	šarr=i=ya		Talon 1997:135
Šattiš				ša-at-ti-iš	šatt=i=ž		Talon 1997:135
Šattiya				ša-at-ti-ia	šatt=i=ya	He/She replaced (him)	Talon 1997:135
Šatum-kešhe				ša-du-um-ke-eš-ḥe	šad=o=m-kešhe	The throne substituted him	Loretz 1969:23; Talon 1997:134
Šatum-Na[ye]	f			ša-du-um-na-[ie]	šad=o=m-Naye	Naye substituted her	Talon 1997:134
Šazum-kešhi	f			Ša-zu-um-ke-eš-ḥi	šaž=o=m-kešhe	The throne fed her	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:135
Šazum-šarri				Ša-zu-um-šar-ri	šaž=o=m-šarri	The godking fed him	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:135
Še...am-kanazi	f			še-[x]-am [?] -ka-na-zi	še[...]-kanazzi		Talon 1997:135

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šeḥlip-kanazi	f			Še-eḥ-li-ip-ka-na-zi	šeḡl=i=b-kanazzi	<i>Kanazzi</i> entered	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:135
Šeḥrum-makuš	f			še-eḥ-rum-ma-gu-úš	šeḡr=o=m-magoš(še)	<i>Makuš</i> made her generous	Talon 1997:135
Šeltap-še				Še-el-tap-še	šeld=a=b-še		Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:135
Šeltuya		f		še-el-du-ia	šeld=o=ya		Talon 1997:135
Šelwina	f			Še-el-wi-na	šelv=i-Na		Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:135
Šenāya			2	še-na-a-ia	šena=āya	Young? Brother	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:135
Šennam				še-en-nam / še-na-a-am	šen(a)=n(i)=a	Like one of the brothers	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:135
Šewi-iniri	f			Še-wi-i-ni-ri	šev=i-niri		Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:135
Šimgina		?		ši-im-gi-na			Talon 1997:135
Šinamme	f			ši-na-am-me			Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:135
Šinen[...]	f			ši-ni-en- [...]	šin=i=n(na)- [...]		Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:135
Šintazze	f			ši-in-da-zi		Seventh	Talon 1997:135
Šinuwa	f			ši-nu-a			Talon 1997:135
Šiturakki	f			ši-du-ra-ki		Young girl	Talon 1997:135
Šituri	f		3	ši-tu-ri		Girl	Talon 1997:135

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šunzu-Naye	f			šu-un-zu-na-ie	šo/unž=o-Naye		Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:135
Šunzuri	f			šu-un-zu-ri			Talon 1997:135
Taḥe				ta-ḥi		Man	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:136
Taḥḥuni				ta-aḥ-ḥu-ni / ta-aḥ-ḥu-un-ni			Talon 1997:136
Taḥumman		?		ta-ḥu-um-ma-an	taḡo/umm=a=n(na) or taḡ=o=m-man(i)?		Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:136
Takki				ta-ak!-ki		Good	Talon 1997:135
Talme- <i>IŠTAR</i>	f			ta-al-me-IŠ ₈ -TÁR	talm=i- <i>IŠTAR</i>	May Šawuška/Išḥara/Ištar make her big!	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:136
Talmikku	f			ta-al-mi-ik-ku	talm=i=kk=o	He/she did not make (her) big	Talon 1997:136
Talp-arra	f			ta-al-ba-ar-ra	talb-arr(i)=a		Talon 1997:136
Talpuš-atal				ta-al-pu-úš-a-tal	talb=o=ž-adal	May the strong make (him) big!	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:136
Tamme				tam-me	tamm=e((na)=ni)		Talon 1997:136
Tammena				tam-me-na	tamm(e)=ena(ni)		Talon 1997:136
Tap...an-nišḥe	f			ta-ab-X-an-ni-iš-ḥi			Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:136
Tarim-Šimiga	f			ta-ri-im-ši-mi-ga	tar=i=m(b!)-Šimiga		Talon 1997:136
Tašap-tu[...]				ta-ša-ap-tu- [...]	taž=a=b-to/u[...]		Talon 1997:136

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tatap-Uzuwi	f			ta-da-ap-ú-zu-WA	tad=a=b-o/uzo/uvi(?)		Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:136
Tatiya				da-di-ia	tad=i=ya		Chagar Bazar III:361
Tawenna	f			ta-we-en-na	tav=i=nna	Pour it!	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:136
Tazal-elli	f			ta-za-al-e-li	taž=a=l-el(a)=ni		Talon 1997:136
Teḥum-menni	f			te-ḥu-um-me-ni	teḡ=o=m-men(a)=ni	The sibling raised (her)	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:136
Terikkan				te-ri-ka-an	ter=i=kk=i>a=n(na)		Talon 1997:136
Teriš-turtenu		?		te-ri-iš-tu-úr-di-nu	ter=i=ž-to/urden(i)=u		Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:136
Teššen-atal				te-eš-še-en-a-dal	tešš=i=n(na)-adal	Strong, make him solemn!	Talon 1997:136
Tukkiya				tu-uk-ki-ia	to/ukki=ya		Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:136
Tukkizzan				tu-uk-ki-iz-za-an	to/ukkizz(i)=a=n(na)		Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:136
Tupki-(a)tana				tu-ub-ki-ta-na	to/upki-tana		Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:136
Tutap-irri	f			tu-ta-bi-ir-ri	to/ud=a=b-irri		Talon 1997:136
Tuziya				tu-zi-ia	to/už(?)=i=ya		Talon 1997:136
Ulluri				ul-lu-ri			Talon 1997:137
Unam-me	f			ú-na-am-me	un=a=m(ma)-me	Sibling, come here!	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:137

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Unap-atal				Ú-na-ap-a-tal	un=a=b-adal	The strong came	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:137
Unap-še(n)				ú-na-ap-še	un=a=b-še	The brother came	Talon 1997:137
Unappa			2	Ú-na-ap-pa	un=a=ppa	Come!	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:137
Uninna	f			ú-ni-na	un=i=nna	Bring it!	Talon 1997:137
Uniš-Na	f			Ú-ni-eš-na	un=i=ž-Na	May Naye bring (her)!	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:137
Unni				un-ni		Now!	Talon 1997:137
Untulla	f			un-du-ul-la	o/und=o=lla		Chagar Bazar III:374
Unuš-kiyaze				ú-un-úš-ki-ia-zi	un=o=ž-kiyaže	May the sea bring (him)!	Talon 1997:137
Unuš-šalli	f			Ú-nu-úš-ša-li	un=o=ž-šal(a)=ni	May the lady bring (her)!	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:137
Unuš-umar	f			Ú-nu-úš-ú-mar	un=o=ž-o/umar(i)	May <i>Umar</i> bring (her)!	Loretz 1969:24; Talon 1997:137
Unzina	f			un-zi-na	o/unz=i-Na		Talon 1997:137
Unziya				un-zi-ia	o/unz=i=ya		Talon 1997:137
Ušše				ú-úš-še	ušš=e	Go!	Talon 1997:137
Utte				ut-te	utt=i		Talon 1997:137
Utten	f			ut-te-en	utt=i=n(na)		Talon 1997:137

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Uzi				ú-zi	o/uz=i		Talon 1997:137
Uzuri				ú-zu-ri			Talon 1997:137
Zaziya			2	za-zi-ia	zaž=i=ya		Loretz 1969:25; Talon 1997:138; Chagar Bazar III:377
Zikuya				zi-gu-ia	zig=o=ya	He/She fed (him)	Loretz 1969:25; Talon 1997:138
Ziwuḥḥa(?)				zi-WA-Aḥ-ḥa	zivoḥḥ(e)(?)=a		Talon 1997:138
Zuki				zu-ki	zugi	Young	Loretz 1969:25; Talon 1997:139

Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Karana (Tell al-Rimah)

The Hurrian presence at the Kingdom of Karana is line with other sites in its vicinity (e.g. Ašnakkum) and mid-range distance (e.g. Mari, Šubat-Enlil) during the Old Babylonian period. As opposed to Mari, where a large number of Hurrians were supposed to be war prisoners working for the palace, and to a lesser extent occupying important positions, at Karana, it seems that Hurrians were part of the indigenous population and belonged to different social classes.¹ At Mari, the main socio-cultural group, at least from an onomastic point of view, was formed by Amorites, followed by Hurrians and Akkadians. At Karana, however, Hurrians were still holding the second place (or at the most were competing with Amorites), but the analysis of the PNs show that Akkadians occupied the first position.²

The Hurrian onomastics recovered from the Tell al-Rimah documents³ appertain to three different periods: a) contemporary to the early Šamšī-Adad reign; b) Ḫatnu-rapi (usurper who took the throne when Zimri-Lim expelled the Assyrians from Mari); and c) Iltana/Ḫaqba-Ḫammu (period in which Karana was a vassal state from Hammurabi of Babylon).⁴ From these periods, it is the first who has more than three thirds (approx. 70%) of Hurrian names, followed by that from Iltana/Ḫaqba-Ḫammu.

§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Rimah Texts

In general terms, the Hurrian onomastics from the Karana archives present certain complexity because the nature of many names is still unclear. This setback, at least at this stage of knowledge, only allow us to analyse the theophoric elements in some of the anthroponyms.

¹ Dalley 1984: 8.

² OBTR 38; Sasson 1979: 3; Dalley 1984: 8.

³ For the Old Babylonians documents from Tell al-Rimah see OBTR.

⁴ Dalley 1984: xviii.

§ Kinship

Regarding kinship, we have a limited set of only nine PNs mentioning the figure of the ‘brother’,⁵ ‘sister’,⁶ ‘father’⁷ and, possibly, ‘sibling’.⁸

§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names

The names carrying any theophoric element constitute less than a 25 percent of the entire onomasticon.

§ Primary and Secondary Deities

Among the Pan-Hurrian group of deities we only encounter Teššup⁹ and Šimiga,¹⁰ in three different individuals each, while from the secondary deities we only have Ukur, and it is attested in the name: Ukur-atal (^dU.GUR-a-tal).

§ Minor Deities

The group of minor deities is constituted mostly by the deity ‘Naye’¹¹ and ‘Yazu’.¹² Unfortunately, the translation of these names (except for Awi-yazu, ‘Yazu, save (him)!’) remains obscure.

§ Divinised Entities

The names bearing divinised entities are also not particularly assorted. They only mention the Tigris River,¹³ the sea,¹⁴ the city of Nawar¹⁵ and the divinised figure of the city.¹⁶

⁵ Akap-šenni; ^fInip-šina; Irip-še(n); Unap-še(n); Kakki-še(n).

⁶ ^fUnap-elli.

⁷ Atta.

⁸ ^fMenin-Kaššil; ^fMenin-Kaššil.

⁹ Arip-Teššup; Teššup-ewri (2).

¹⁰ Ḫazip-Šimiga (2); Inip-Šimiga (Inip-^dUTU).

¹¹ ^fInip-Naye; ^fAlum-Naye; Alum-Naye; ^fAttap-Naye; Mennu-Naya; Zuzzun-Naya.

¹² Awi-yazu.

¹³ Ḫazip-Aranzi(h).

¹⁴ Irri-ki(aze); ^fPuzum-ki(aze).

¹⁵ Nawar-atal.

¹⁶ Šattum-arte.

§ Common Theophoric Elements

This group, as one would expect, is the most extensive and varied from the all the names bearing theophorics. The elements for ‘strong’,¹⁷ ‘righteous’,¹⁸ ‘lord’,¹⁹ ‘godking’²⁰ and ‘lady’²¹ are attested throughout the names, as it commonly happens in the Hurrian onomastic.

The general impression that can be obtained from this archive is the “obscurity” that some Hurrian PNs still presents, especially those who are only attested in these documents, and the low quantity of theophoric elements used to build the names (less than 25%). It is difficult to say if these features are tied to the fact that Hurrians were probably part of the ‘indigenous’ population of the site. In any case, the presence of the Teššup and Šimiga reveals two of three main members of the Pan-Hurrian pantheon.

¹⁷ Alpu-atal; Arum-atal; Inip-atal; It̄hen-atal; Muzun-atal; Nann-atal; Šaḫeš-atal; Šatuk-atal.

¹⁸ Arum-mušni.

¹⁹ Ewri; Ewrakkānum; Talpuš-ewri.

²⁰ Nupur-šarri.

²¹ Allaš-arum; ^fAlpuš-allai.

List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Karana

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
[...]-Kiriš				[...]-ki-ri-iš	[...]-kiriž		Sasson 1979:12
[...]jizzia				[X]-iz-zi-ia			OBTR:264
A[y]a...-taḥe				a-[i]a-x-ta-ḥe	[...]-taḡe		VHN 39
Akap-šenni				a-gap-še-ni	ag=a=b-šen(a)=ni	The brother came up	Sasson 1979:4
Akap-Tupki				a-ka-ap(!)(TA)-tu-up-ki	ag=a=b-to/ubki	Tupki came up	Sasson 1979:4
Akuluk				a-ku-lu-uk	ag=o/ul=o=g	He/She did not came up	Sasson 1979:4
Allaš-arum				al-la-aš-a-rum	alla=ž-ar=o=m	The lady gave her	Sasson 1979:4
Alpu-atal				al-pu-a-dal	alb=o-adal		Sasson 1979:4
Alpuš-allai	f			al-pu-úš-al-la-i	alb=o=ž-allai		Sasson 1979:4
Alpuya				al-pu-ya	alb=o=ya		Sasson 1979:5
Alum-mannu		H/S		a-lu-um-ma-nu	al=o=m-mannu		OBTR:257
Alum-Naye	f			a-lu-na-ia / a-lu-um-na- ¹ ia ¹	al=o=m-Naye		Sasson 1979:5
Alum-Naye				a-lu-um-na- ¹ ya ¹	al=o=m-Naye		Sasson 1979:5
Amman-taḥe				a-ma-an-ta-ḥe	amm=a=n(na)-taḡe	The man arrived	Sasson 1979:5
Amteya		?		am-te-ia	amt=i=ya		OBTR:257

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Aniš-kepal				a-ni-iš-ki-ba-al	an=i=ž-kebal(i)	May <i>Kepali</i> be (the) Joy!	Sasson 1979:5
Aran- [...]				a-ra-an- [...]			Sasson 1979:5
Ari- [...]				a-ri- [...]	ar=i[...]		Sasson 1979:5
Arip-Teššup				a-ri-ip-te-eš-šu-ub	ar=i=b-Teššob	Teššup gave (him)	Sasson 1979:5
Ariš-u[...]		?		a-ri-šu- [...]	ar=i=ž-u[...]		OBTR:257
Ariya				a-ri-ya	ar=i=ya	He/She gave (him)	Sasson 1979:5
Arum-atal				a-ru-um-a-dal	ar=o=m-adal	The strong gave him	Sasson 1979:5
Arum-mušni				a-rum-mu-úš-ni	ar=o=m-mušni	The righteous gave him	Sasson 1979:5
Atta				a-at-ta		Father	Sasson 1979:5
Attap-Naye	f			at-ta-ap?-na-a-ie	att=a=b-Naye		Sasson 1979:5
Attara				a-at-ta-ra	attar(i)=a		Sasson 1979:5
Attaya				a-at-ta-(ra)ia!	att=a=ya		Sasson 1979:5
Awi-kiriš				a-wi-ki-ri-iš	av=i-kiriž	<i>Kirše</i> , save (him)!	VHN 60
Awi-yazu				a-wi-ya-zu	av=i=yazu	Yazu, save (him)!	Sasson 1979:5
Awi-ziri				a-wi-zi-ri	av=i=ziri	Ziri, save (him)!	Sasson 1979:5

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Azip-nan				a-zi-ip-na-an	až(?)=i=b-nan(i)		Sasson 1979:5
Azen	f			az-ze-en	azze=n(na)	She is a woman	Sasson 1979:5
Azzu	f		3	az-zu / a-az-zu-ú		Woman	Sasson 1979:5
Azzue	f		2	az-zu-e	azz(e)/azzo/u=ve	That of the woman	Sasson 1979:5
Azzuena	f		3	az-zu-e-na	azz(e)/azzo/u=ve=na	That of a woman?	Sasson 1979:6
Azzupiya				az-zu-bi-ia	azzo/u-Piya		OBTR:258
Eḫli-a[...]				eḫ-li-a- [...]	eḫl=i-a[...]	a[...] saved (him)	Sasson 1979:6
Eḫliya				eḫ-li-ya	eḫl=i=ya	He/She saved (him)	Sasson 1979:6
Eken-natḫe	f		2	e-ge-en-na-ad-ḫi	eg=i=n(na)-natḫe		OBTR:258
Ella- [...]				e-el-la- [...]	ell=a[...]		Sasson 1979:6
Ellali				el-la-li	ell=a-li		Sasson 1979:6
Elli				el-li	ell=i		Sasson 1979:6
Enzunni				en-zu-un-ni	enz=o=nni		OBTR:258
Erati				e-ra-ti	erati	Bird	Sasson 1979:6
Ewrakkānum				e-wa-ra-ka-nu-um	evrakk(i)=ānum	Young lord	OBTR:258

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ewri				e-ew-ri	evri	Lord	OBTR:258
Ḫaluli				ḫa-lu-li	ḫaluli	Wine/grape	Sasson 1979:6
Ḫammata				ḫa-am-ma-ta			Sasson 1979:6
Ḫapiya		?		ḫa-bi-ya	ḫab=i=ya		Sasson 1979:6
Ḫašakka(?)				ḫa-ša(?) -ak-ka	ḫaž=a=kk=a		VHN 126
Ḫašiya			3	ḫa-ši-ya / ḫa-zi-ya	ḫaž=i=ya	He/She listened (him)	Sasson 1979:6
Ḫazip-Aranzi				ḫa-zi-ip-a-ṽra-an-zi ¹	ḫaž=i=b-Aranžig	The Tigris listened	Sasson 1979:6
Ḫazip-mu[...]				ḫa-zi-ip-mu-[...]	ḫaž=i=b-mo[...]		Sasson 1979:6
Ḫazip-Šimika			2	ḫa-zi-ip-ši-mi-ga	ḫaž=i=b-Šimiga	Šimika listened	Sasson 1979:6
Ḫerššitta				ḫi-ir-ši-it-ta	ḫerž=i=tta		Sasson 1979:6
Ḫerziya			3	ḫe-er-zi-ya	ḫerž=i=ya		Sasson 1979:6
Ḫezallu				ḫe-za-al-lu	ḫežal(i)=n(i)=u	Friend	VHN 138
Ḫiza...lu		?		ḫi-za-X-lu			OBTR:259
Ḫuena				ḫu-e-ṽna ¹	ḫu=i=n(n)a	Call him!	Sasson 1979:6

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Hulli				ħu-ul-li-[ia]	ħo/ull=i=ya		OBTR:259
Huziri			2	ħu-zi-ri	ħuzir(i)=a		OBTR:259
Huzukuk				ħu-zu-ku-uk	ħuž=o/ug=o=g		OBTR:259
Inip-atal				i-ni(!)-ba-tal(!)	in=i=b-atal		OBTR:260
Inip-Naye	f			i-ni-ip-na-ie	in=i=b-Naye		OBTR:260
Inip-Šimiga				i-ni-ib- ^d UTU	in=i=b-Šimiga		OBTR:260
Inip-Šina	f			i-ni-ib-ši-na	in=i=b-šena		OBTR:260
Irip-še				i-ri-ip-si	ir=i=b-še(na)		Sasson 1979:7
Irri-ki				ir-ri-gi	irr=i-ki	Kiaze	Sasson 1979:7
Itħen-atal				it-ħe-en-a-dal	itħ=i=n(na)-adal		Sasson 1979:7
Itħiya				it-ħi-ya	itħ=i=ya		Sasson 1979:7
Izzazzi				iz-za-az-zi			Sasson 1979:7
Kakki-še				ka-ak-ki-še	kakk=i-še(na)		Sasson 1979:7
Kaksu		?		ka-ak-su			Sasson 1979:7
Kališ-taħum				ka-li-iš-ta-ħu-um	kal=i-ž-tağ(e)=um or kaliž-tağ=o=m		OBTR:260

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kanak-urši				ka-na-ku-ur-ši	kan=a=g-o/urši		Sasson 1979:7
Kanaya		?		ka-na-a-ya			Sasson 1979:7
Kani-...]				ka-ni-...]			Sasson 1979:7
Kaniazzu		?		ka-ni-az-zu	kaniazz(i)(?)=u		Sasson 1979:7
Kaniya			2	ka-ni-ya	kan=i=ya		Sasson 1979:7
Kannaya				ka-an-na-a-ya	kann=a=ya		Sasson 1979:7
Kanzanni				ka-an-za-ni	kanz=a=nni		Sasson 1979:7
Kanzazni				ka-an-za-az-ni			Sasson 1979:7
Kap(i)-tupki				ga-ap-tu-up-ki	kap=(i)-tupki		Sasson 1979:7
Kapanna				ka-ba-[an-na]	kab=a=nna		OBTR:260
Kapannu				ka-ba-an-nu	kab=a=nno/u		Sasson 1979:7
Kapinni				ka-bi-in-ni	kab=i=nni		Sasson 1979:7
Kapiya				ka-bi-i-ya	kap=i=ya		Sasson 1979:7
Katirḫe				ka-ti-ir-ḫi	kadirḫe	To the one who said, properly	Sasson 1979:7
Kenkiya				ki-en-gi/zi-ya	keng=i=ya		Sasson 1979:7

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kenzukkatte				ki-en-zu-ga-te	kenz=o=kk=o>a=tte		Sasson 1979:7
Kinniya				ki-in-ni-ya	kinn=i=ya		Sasson 1979:7
Kinziya			2	ki-in-zi-ya	kinz=i=ya		Sasson 1979:8
Kirišu				ki-ri-šu			OBTR:260
Kizzi			2	ki-iz-zi	kizz=i		Sasson 1979:8
Kizzipa				ki-iz-zi-ba			Sasson 1979:8
Kizzipu				ki-iz-zi-bu			Sasson 1979:8
Kuitanu				ku-i-ta-nu			Sasson 1979:8
Kullu				ku-ul-lu	ko/ull=o		Sasson 1979:8
Kulzipaya	f			ku-ul-zi-pa-ia	ko/ulž(?)=i=b=aya		Sasson 1979:8
Kuntanu				ku-un-ta-nu			Sasson 1979:8
Kunuzzaḥ(ḥ)e				ku-nu-za-ḥe			Sasson 1979:8
Kupata			2	ku-ba-ta			Sasson 1979:8
Kutati				ku-da-di			Sasson 1979:8
Kutiya				ku-ti-ya	kud=i=ya	He/She dropped	Sasson 1979:8

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kutukka				ku-tu-uk-ᵀka¹	kud=o=kk=o>a=∅	He did not fall	Sasson 1979:8
Kutuluzzi	f			ku-du-lu-zi			OBTR:261
Kuzizzu				ku-zi-zu	kozizz(i)(?)=u		Sasson 1979:8
Menin-Kaššil				ᵀme¹-ni-in-ka-aš-ši-il	men(a)=ni-kaššil?	The sibling is Kaššil?	Sasson 1979:8
Menin-Kaššil	f			me-ni-e-en-ka-aš-ši-il	men(a)=ni-kaššil?	The sibling is Kaššil?	Sasson 1979:8
Menna	f		2	me-en-na		Sibling	Sasson 1979:8
Mennu-Naya				me-en-nu-la-ya	minno(a/e)=u-Naya		Sasson 1979:8
Muzun-atal				mu-zu-un-a-dal	mužo/un(i)-adal	The righteous is strong	Sasson 1979:8
Nalukkatil	f			na-lu-ka-di-il	nal=o=kk=o>a=dil(la)		Sasson 1979:8
Nann-atal				na-an-na-dal	nann-adal		Sasson 1979:9
Nawanu				na-wa-nu			Sasson 1979:9
Nawar-atal				na-wa-ar-a-dal	Navar-adal	Nawar is strong	Sasson 1979:9
Nazzakulla				na-az-za-gu-ul-la	nazz=a=kk=o/u=lla		OBTR:261
Nuniya				nu-ni-ia (be-lí-X-ia)	no/un=i=ya		OBTR:258
Nunnakka				nu-un-na-ak-ka	no/unn=a=kk=a		Sasson 1979:9

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Nupur-šarri			2	nu-pur-šar-ri	no/ubor-šarri		Sasson 1979:9
Nuza(-)ma				nu-za-ma			Sasson 1979:9
Nuzānu				nu-za-nu	nuz(i)=ānu		VHN 218
Pakiya				pa-gi-ya	pag=i=ya		Sasson 1979:9
Palatanu				ba-la-ta-nu	pal=a=∅-Tanu		Sasson 1979:9
Pantiya			2	wa-an-ti-ya	fand=i=ya	He/She made (him) good	Sasson 1979:11
Papazzu				ba-ba-az-zu	pabazz(i)=u		Sasson 1979:9
Pappizu		?		pa-ap-pí-su / pa-pí-su			Sasson 1979:9
Paššitḫe				pa-aš-ši-it-ḫe		Messenger	VHN 228
Pazziku				ᵀba ¹ -az-ᵀzi ¹ -ku			Sasson 1979:9
Pezanu				be-za-nu			Sasson 1979:9
Puzum-ki	f			pu-zu-um-gi	po/uz=o=m-ki		Sasson 1979:9
Puzzi				bu-uz-zi	po/uzz=i		OBTR:258
Šaḫeš-atal				ša-ḫi-eš-a-ᵀdal ¹	šaḡ=i=ž-adal		Sasson 1979:9
Šalanzar	f		2	ša-la-an-za-ar		Daughter?	Sasson 1979:9

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šamaḥuli				ša-ma-ḥu-li			Sasson 1979:9
Šarriya			2	šar-ra-ia	šarr=i=ya		OBTR:262
Šattum-arte				ša-at-tum-ar-[de]	šatt=o=m-arde	The city seized him	Sasson 1979:9
Šatuk-atal				ša-du-uk-a-dal	šad=o=g-adal	The strong did return him	Sasson 1979:9
Šawlum-natki				ša-aw-lum-na-ad-ki	šavl=o=m-natki		Sasson 1979:10
Šeḥlum-tari	f			še-eḥ-lum-ta-ri	šeḡl=o=m-tari	The fire entered?	Sasson 1979:10
Šekešše	f			še-ge-eš-še			Sasson 1979:10
Šennip-anu				še-in-ni-ba-nu	šen(a)=ni- <i>panu</i> or šenn=i=b- <i>ānu</i>		Sasson 1979:10
Šešwi				še-eš-WA		Kid	Sasson 1979:10
Šikkuzzi				ši-ik-ku-uz-zi / ši-ik-ku-zi			Sasson 1979:10
Šilallu	f			ši-la-al-lu	šil=all=o		Sasson 1979:10
Šukupi		?		šu-ku-bi			Sasson 1979:10
Šunzu[nna(?)]				šu-un-zu-[...]	šo/unž=o=nna		OBTR:262
Šure				šu-re-e	šo/ur=i		Sasson 1979:10
Taḥe				ta-ḥi		Man	Sasson 1979:10

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Taḥpi-ya				ta-aḥ-pí-ia	tag=(i)=p-ya		OBTR:262
Taki-...				ta-ki-[XX]	tag=i=...		Sasson 1979:10
Takiya				ta-ki-ya	tag=i=ya	He/She did (him) good	Sasson 1979:10
Talluḥul				ta-al-lu-ʿḥu-ul ¹	talluḥle		Sasson 1979:10
Talpuš-ewri				ta-al-pu-úš!-ew-ri	talb=o=ž-ewri	May the lord make (him) great!	Sasson 1979:10
Tampuštil				ta-am-bu-úš-til	tamb=o/ušt=i=l(la)		Sasson 1979:10
Tapšaḥe	f			ta-ap-ša-ḥi		Cupbearer	OBTR:262
Tarim...				ta-ri-im-[...]			OBTR:262
Tašmuya				ta-aš-mu-ia	tažm=o=ya	He/She deported him	OBTR:262
Tašub-nawu		?		ta-šu-ub-na-wu			OBTR:262
Tasulaya	f	?		ta-su-la-ia			Sasson 1979:10
Tatakka				ta-da-ak-ka	tadakk(i)=a	Like a young love	Sasson 1979:10
Tatenna	f			ta-de-en-na	tad=i=nna	Love (her)!	Sasson 1979:10
Terikka				te-ri-ik-ka	tir=i=kk=i>a=∅		Sasson 1979:11
Teššup-ewri			2	te-eš-šu-ub-PI-ri/ʿte ¹ -šu-ub-PI-ri	Teššob-ewri	Teššup is the lord	Sasson 1979:11

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tetti[...]				te-et-ti- [...]			OBTR:263
Tiku				ti-gu			OBTR:263
Tizeḥam				ti-zi-ḥa-am	tišeg(e)=a=m(e/a)	He is a leader	Sasson 1979:11
Tukki(-)[...]				tu-uk-ki- [...]	to/ukki(-)[...]		Sasson 1979:11
Tulpiya				tu-ul-pí-ya	to/ulbi=ya		Sasson 1979:11
Tupki- [...]				tu-up-ki- [...]	to/ulbki- [...]		Sasson 1979:11
Tupkiya				tu-up-ki-ya	to/ulbki=ya		Sasson 1979:11
Tuttaya				tu-ut-ta-ya	to/utt=a=ya		Sasson 1979:11
Uki	f			ú-ge	o/ug=i		Sasson 1979:11
Ukkannu				uk-ka-nu	o/ukk=a=nno/u		OBTR:262
Ukkaya				uk-ka-[ya?]	ukk=a=ya		Sasson 1979:11
Ukkunnu				ú-ku-un-nu	o/ukk=o=nno/u		Sasson 1979:11
Ukur-atal				^d U.GUR-a-tal	Ugur-adal	Ukur is strong	OBTR:263
Unap-elli	f			ú-na-ap-e-li	un=a=b-el(a)=ni	The sister came	Sasson 1979:11
Unap-še				ú-na-ap-še	un=a=b-še	The brother came	Sasson 1979:11

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Urani				ú-ra-ni	ur=a=∅-Ni		Sasson 1979:11
Ušše				ú-úš-še (ú-nu-še)	ušš=e	Go!	Sasson 1979:11
Utena	f			ú-te-na	ut=i=n(na)		Sasson 1979:11
Utuhu		?		ú-du-ḫu			Sasson 1979:11
Uzuzari				ú-zu-za-ri			Sasson 1979:11
Waḫra[...]				wa-aḫ-ra-[X]			Sasson 1979:11
Warae	f	?		wa-ra-e	fara=e		Sasson 1979:11
Wurḫaš(š)i				wu-úr-ḫa-ši			Sasson 1979:12
Zanapan				za- ¹ na ¹ -ba- ¹ an ¹ ?			Sasson 1979:12
Zazaraya	f			za-za-ra-a-ia	zaz=ar=(i)=aya	Feed (him) repeatedly!	VHN 251
Zaziya				za-zi-ia	zaž=i=ya	He/She fed (him)	OBTR:263
Zazza-wiš				za-az-za-wi-iš	zazz(i)=a-viš(?)	Wiš? Is like the feed	Sasson 1979:12
Ziki				zi-gi	zig=i		Sasson 1979:12
Zikiya				zi-gi-ya	zig=i=ya		Sasson 1979:12
Zikuya				zi-ku-ya	zig=o=ya		Sasson 1979:12

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Zilipān				zi-li-ba-an	zil=i=b=ān		Sasson 1979:12
Zinni-kanu				zi-in-ni-ga-nu	zinn=i-kanu		OBTR:263
Zippaya				zi-ib-ba-a-ia	zipp=a=ya		OBTR:263
Zirari	f			zi-ra-ri			Sasson 1979:12
Ziritta				zi-ri-it-ta			Sasson 1979:12
Ziru				zi-ru			Sasson 1979:12
Zizu				zi-zu-ú	ziz=o		Sasson 1979:12
Zuya				zu-ú-ya			Sasson 1979:12
Zuziya				zu-zi-ya	zo/uz=i=ya		Sasson 1979:12
Zuzu[...]				zu-zu- [...]			Sasson 1979:12
Zuzzi				zu-uz-zi	zo/uzz=i		Sasson 1979:12
Zuzzi- [...]				zu-uz-zi- [...]			OBTR:264
Zuzzi-ewri				zu-uz-zi-P[l-ri]	zo/uzz=i-evri		Sasson 1979:12
Zuzzun-naya				zu-uz-zu-un-na-ya			Sasson 1979:12
Zuzzunna				zu-uz-zu-un-na-a	zo/uzzonn(i)=a	Like a <i>zuzzunu</i> -animal	OBTR:264

Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Šušarrā (Tell Šemšārā)

The texts from the ancient city of Šušarrā (Tell Šemšārā)¹ are comparatively much less than those retrieved from other contemporary archives such as Tell Leilan or Mari. However, they bring some light on the history of the Zagros as well as on the Upper Mesopotamian Kingdom founded by Šamšī-Adad I.² The archives appertain to the phase (ca. 1780 BC)³ when the city was governed by Kuwari, who, primarily, functioned as viceroy for the Turukkean kingdom of Itaballum, located in the Zagros and ruled by Pišenden, and later when he became Šamšī-Adad's vassal.⁴ The texts comprise mostly letters, sent from Šamšī-Adad, his son Išme-Dagān, several other officers and local figures, and administrative documents (agriculture, food rations, etc.).⁵

The onomastic material retrieved from the texts reveals a mixed population of indigenous groups, particularly Hurrians and Lullubeans. Given the prestige they represented, Semitic names (Akkadians and Amorites) were mostly bear by local individuals apart from those that belonged to foreigners (particularly Amorites).⁶ However, the socio-cultural picture of Šušarrā should not be taken for granted from the onomastic material. The picture seems to be much more complex. The city was surrounded by hierarchically organised kingdoms: Turukkeans through the larger valleys (i.e. Itaballum, Kusanarhum, Šudamelum and Zutlum), Guteans on the south and Elamites on the west of the Zagros. Thus, a Hurrian-Lullubean picture was most probably to be the result, since it has been postulated that the native population was Lullubean, whom later became subjugated by different Hurrian-speaking groups which turned into the

¹ The site of Tell Šemšārā, located on the west bank of the Lower Zab, close to nowadays Raniya, in the Transtigridian region, was the capital of the land Utûm ('Land of the gatekeeper').

² Eidem and Læssøe 2001: 8.

³ Eidem 2011-2012: 361.

⁴ Eidem and Læssøe 2001: 14.

⁵ Eidem 2011-2012: 360-361.

⁶ Eidem 1992: 47-48.

ruling class.⁷ In fact, Kuwari was not a citizen of Šušarrā, as some letters reveal.⁸ His wife (Šip-šarri), son (Tenduri), house and livestock were in a place called Zukula/Zigulā, meaning that he was carrying out a governing function that was probably assigned to him.

In any case, our interest in the onomastic material does not intend to tackle the so-called ethnic situation of the site nor the region but the possible connection between the theophoric elements and the Hurrian pantheon.

§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Šušarrā Texts

Regarding the general content, the Hurrian PNs from the Šušarrā texts (ca. 200 PNs) occupy the first group among Akkadians, Amorites, Lullubeans, Guteans and those from unknown origin.⁹ This is not a strange fact given the political, geographical and historical period of the site.

§ Kinship

As it happens in most of the archives with considerable amounts of Hurrian PNs, kinship relationships are well reproduced in the onomastic material. Names holding the words for brother,¹⁰ sister,¹¹ sibling¹² or father,¹³ which express joy or gratitude, appear along the examples.

§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names

The first characteristic that can easily be observed from the Hurrian onomastic in these texts is the presence of relatively few theophorous names (max.10, min. 8), particularly those belonging to the ‘Pan-Hurrian’ pantheon.

⁷ Eidem 1992: 52.

⁸ SH 822 (no. 35) and SH 811 (no. 59).

⁹ Many of the names have been associated with the kingdom of Itabalhum.

¹⁰ Akap-še; Izzip-šenni; Nuḥ-še; Puḥu-še; Puḥu-šeni; Šeḥran-šeni; Šeni; Šinen-šalli; Tirwen-šenni (2); Tur-še; Turu-še; Wantip-šenni.

¹¹ Elakka; Elakku.

¹² Mennatte; Menne; Menni.

¹³ Awiš-*abī*.

§ Primary and Secondary Deities

There is one individual bearing the theophorous for the Hurrian moon-god, ‘Kušuḫ-ewri’, and two others bearing the names ‘Ukur-atal’ and ‘Tar-Ukur’.

The remaining theophorous are related to the storm-god. The first one is a hybrid Hurrian-Semitic name, ‘^fArtim-Addu’, while the others hold Teššup. However, from this group we are certain for the following names: ‘Ḫazip-Teššup (4)’ and ‘Teššup-ewri’. The remaining could be interpreted as Teššup, although it presents some problems. The name ‘Šarri-^dTeššup’ is written under the logograms LUGAL-^dIM which most likely, given the nature of the socio-cultural context (i.e. Hurrian majority), renders a Hurrian name and not the Semitic reading ‘Šarrum-Addu’, which in fact is less probable.

In overall, from almost 200 Hurrian PNs, we can only individuate the theonyms for Teššup (6) and Kušuḫ (1), which belonged to seven different individuals, together with that of Ukur and Addu.

The low quantity of theophorous is not the only point to highlight. It is interesting to note that, in a socio-cultural contexts of this nature, the deity Ukur, also attested in the Mari and Tell al-Rimaḫ names, appears twice.

§ Minor Deities

Among the group of minor deities, we only find the presence of Kepal(i) in the name ‘Anakepal’.

§ Divinised Entities

This group is also very succinct. It only appears the names for the River Ḫabur, ‘Ḫābūr-atal’, and the ‘sea’ (^fKašmen-ki; Tuiz-kiyaše).

§ Common Theophoric Elements

Regarding quantity, this group is probably one of the most extended. However, we only have

names with the figure of the ‘godking’,¹⁴ ‘lord’¹⁵ and ‘strong’.¹⁶

¹⁴ Nanip-šarri; Šepu(m)-šarri (2); Talpuš-šarri; Tupki-šarri; Unap-šarri; Uštan-šarri; Uštap-šarri; Zilip-šarri; [...]šarri.

¹⁵ Ewri-atal; Ewri-kepa; Zileš-ewri; Nupur-ewri; [...]jib-ewri.

¹⁶ Ḫamar-atal; Katam-(a)tal; Muzum-atal; Pulla-atal; Šarrip-atal; Ullup-atal.

List of Hurrian Personal Names in the texts from Šušarrā

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
[...]-mi-ya				ṛx x ¹ -mi-ia			Šemšara 2:100
[...]-šarri		?		[...]-LUGAL			Šemšara 2:100
[...]akriya				[x]-ak-ri-ia			Šemšara 2:100
[...]anti				[...-a]n-ṛdi ¹			Šemšara 2:100
[...]ib-ewri				[...]-ib-ew-ri	[...]=i=b-evri		Šemšara 2:100
[...]kuli				[...-k]u-li			Šemšara 2:100
[...n]ip-širi				[...-n]i-ip-ši-ri			Šemšara 2:100
Aizza		?		a-i-iz-za			Šemšara 2:90
Akam-tim?		?		a-ga-am-t[im]	ag=a=m(b!)-tim		Šemšara 2:90
Akap-še				a-ga-ap-še	ag=a=b-še	The brother came up	Šemšara 2:90
Akap-taḫi				a-kap-ta-ḫi	ag=a=b-taḫe	The man came up	Šemšara 2:90
Akap-tukki				a-kap-tu-uk-ki	ag=a=b-to/ukki	Tukki came up	Šemšara 2:91
Akaš-turum				a-ga-aš-tu-rum	ag=a=ž-tur(i)=u/um	May the man come up!	Šemšara 2:90
Akiya				a-gi-ya	ag=i=ya	He/She brought (him) up	Šemšara 2:90
Alanza-tae				a-la-an-za-da-e	alanz(e)=a-tae		Šemšara 2:91

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Altipānu				al-ti-pa-nu	ald=i=b=ānu		Šemšara 2:91
Ammina				am-mi-na	amm=i=nna	Bring (him) here!	Šemšara 2:91
Ana-kepal				a-na-ke-ba-al	an=a-kebal(i)		Šemšara 2:91
Apizza			2	a-bi-za	abizz(i)=a	Rescue(?)	Šemšara 2:90
Appu-panti				ap-pu-ba-an-di	app=o-fandi		Šemšara 2:91
Arazan		?		a-ra-za-an			Šemšara 2:91
Ari-...				ʾa-ri-x-xʾ / a-ri-[...]			Šemšara 2:91
Arruk				ar-ru-uk	arr=o=g		Šemšara 1:167
Artim-Addu	f			ar-di-im-ma-tu	ard=i=m(b!)-Addu		Šemšara 2:91
Ašna-teki				aš-na-[t]e-ki	ažn=a=∅-tegi		Šemšara 2:91
Atiya			2	a-di-ia	ad=i=ya	He/She made (him) big(?)	Šemšara 1:167; Šemšara 2:90
Atta(-)ma(?)				at-ta-ma(?)			Šemšara 2:91
Attaru				at-ta-ru	attar(i)=u		Šemšara 2:91
Attiya				ad-di-ia	att=i=ya	He/She made (him) strong(?)	Šemšara 2:90
Awiš-abī		H/S		a-ʾwiʾ-iš-a-ʾbiʾ	av=i=ž-abi/ī	May the <i>father</i> save (him)!	Šemšara 2:91

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ayata		?		a-ia-ta			Šemšara 1:167
Aziya				a-zi-ia	až(?)=i=ya		Šemšara 2:91
Elakka				e-la-ak-ka	elakk(i)=a	He is instead of a young sister(?)	Šemšara 2:93
Elakku				[e-la]-ku	elakk(i)=(a)=u	He is instead of a young sister(?)	Šemšara 2:93
Ewri-atal				ew-ri-a-tal	evri-adal	The lord is strong	Šemšara 2:93
Ewri-kepa				ew/wa-ri-ki-ba	evri-keb(i)=a	The lord is kipa	Šemšara 2:99
Ḫābūr-atal				ḫa-bu-ur-a-tal	Ḫābūr-adal	Ḫabur is strong	Šemšara 1:167
Ḫamar-atal				ḫa-ma-ar-a-ʿtal ¹	ḫam=ar-adal		Šemšara 2:93
Ḫaniya				ḫa-ni-ia	ḫan=i=ya	He/She gave birth	Šemšara 2:93
Ḫašip-a[...]				ḫa-ši-ba- [...]	ḫaz=i=b-a...		Šemšara 2:93
Ḫašip-ma...				ḫa-ši-ip-ma- [...]	ḫaz=i=b-ma ...		Šemšara 2:93
Ḫazip-Teššup			4	ḫa-ši-ip-te-šu-up	ḫaz=i=b-Tessob	Teššup listened	Šemšara 1:167; Šemšara 2:93
Ḫaziya				ḫa-ši-ia	ḫaž=i=ya	He/She listened (him)	Šemšara 2:93
Ḫillura				ḫi-il-lu-ra	ḫillor(i)=a		Šemšara 2:93
Ḫizzutta			3	ḫi-zu-ut-[t]a / ḫi-zu-ta / ḫi-iz-zu-ut-ta	ḫizz=o=тта		Šemšara 2:93; Šemšara 1:167

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ĥulukkatił				ĥu-lu-uk-ka-di-il	ĥo/ul=o=kk=o>a=dil(la)		Šemšara 1:167
Ĥutinna				ĥu-ti-na	ĥo/ud=i=nna		Šemšara 2:93
Ikiliš-tae				i-gi-li-iš-ta-e	ig=e/il=i=ž-tae		Šemšara 1:167
Ikiya				i-gi- ^r ia ¹	ig=i=ya		Šemšara 2:93
Ilanzu				i-la-an-zu	ilanz(e)=u		Šemšara 2:93
Imtiya				im-di-ia	imd=i=ya		Šemšara 1:167
Intušše				in-du-úš-še / en-du-uš-še / en-da-aš-še / in-du-úš-še / in-du-uš-še / in-da-aš-šu / in-du-uš-še / en-du-úš-še	e/indass(e)=u		Šemšara 1:167
Išiya				i-ši- ^r ia ¹	iž=i=ya		Šemšara 2:93
Iziya				i-zi-ia	iz=i=ya	He/She mourned (him)	Šemšara 2:94
Izzini				iz-zi-ni	izz=i=nni	He/She mourned (him)	Šemšara 1:167
Izzip-šenni				iz-[z]i-ip-še-en-ni	izz=i=b-šen(a)=ni		Šemšara 2:94
Kakme				ka-ak-me	kagme		Šemšara 2:94
Kannani		?		ka-an-na-ni			Šemšara 2:94
Kapi-tuni				[k]a-bi-tu-ni	kab=i-to/uni		Šemšara 2:94

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kapiya				ka-bi-ia	kab=i=ya		Šemšara 2:94
Kapulu				ka-ap-ú-lu	kab=o/ul=o		Šemšara 2:94
Kašmen-ki	f			ka-aš-me-en-ki	kažm=i=n(na)-ki		Šemšara 2:94
Katam-(a)tal				ka-ta-am-tal	kad=a=m(b!)-(a)dal		Šemšara 2:94
Kelḥuru				ke-el-ḥu-ru	kelgor(i)=u		Šemšara 2:94
Kelli				ke-el-li	kell=i	Leave (him) unhurt!	Šemšara 2:94
Kellukki				[k]e-el-lu-ug-gi	kell=o=kk=i	He/She was not healthy	Šemšara 2:94
Keltuḥul				ke-el-tu-ḥu-ul	Kelduḥle	Bowmaker	Šemšara 2:94
Kelturim				ke-el-tu-ri-im	keldori=m(ma)		Šemšara 2:94
Kikirza				ki-gi-ir-za	kigirž(e)=a		Šemšara 1:167
Kikku				[k]i-ig-gu	kikk=o	Let the three be present!	Šemšara 2:94
Kinnu				ki-in-nu / ki-in-nu-ú	kinn=o		Šemšara 2:94
Kirkiri				ki-ir-ki-ri	kirgiri		Šemšara 1:167
Kiziya				ki-zi-ia	kiz=i=ya		Šemšara 2:94
Kizzi-ma			3	ki-iz-zi-ma / ki-iz-zu-ma / ki-si-ma / ki-zi-[ma] / ki- zi-ma / ki-zi-ma-an			Šemšara 1:167; Šemšara 2:94

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kizzuri				ki-iz-zu-ri	Kizzuri		Šemšara 2:94
Kularum			2	ᵀku-la ¹ -ru-um	ko/ul=ar=o=m		Šemšara 1:167; Šemšara 2:95
Kullu				ku-ul-lu	ko/ull=o		VHN 172
Kumuratte				ku-mu-ur-a-at-t[e]	ko/um=o/ur=a=tte		Šemšara 2:95
Kun-šaki				ku-un-ša-ki	ko/un-šagi		VHN 174
Kun-šeya				ku-un-še-ia	ko/un-šeya		Šemšara 2:95
Kunzu				ku-un-zu	ko/unz=o	Bend!	Šemšara 2:95
Kupi				ku-bi	ko/ub=i		Šemšara 2:95
Kupiya				ku-bi-ia	ko/ub=i=ya		Šemšara 1:167; Šemšara 2:95
Kušiya				ku-ši-ya	ko/už=i=ya		Šemšara 1:168
Kutukkati				ku-du-ka-di-ᵀil ¹	kud=o=kk=o>a=dil(la)	We did not fall	Šemšara 1:167
Kuwari				ku-wa-ri	kuvari		Šemšara 1:168; Šemšara 2:95
Kuzuḥ-ewri				ku-zu-uḥ-ew-ri	Kužo/uḡ-evri	Kušuḥ is the lord	Šemšara 2:95
Kuzzu				ku-uz-zu	ko/uzz(?)=o	Hold back!	Šemšara 2:95
Likri				li-ik-ri		Bolt	Šemšara 2:95

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Mennatte				me-en-na-te	menna=tte	I am the/a sibling	Šemšara 2:95
Menne				me-en-ne	men(a)=ni	Sibling	Šemšara 2:95
Menni				me-en-ni	men(a)=ni	Sibling	Šemšara 2:95
Muškwawi		?		mu-uš-ka-wi			Šemšara 1:168
Muzum-atal				mu-zu-um-a-tal / mu-šum-a-tal	muž=o=m-adal	The strong made him right	Šemšara 2:96
Naikku		?		na-ig-gu	na(i)=i=kk=o	He/she did not feed (him)	Šemšara 2:96
Nakar-tuk				na-ga-ar-du-uk	nag=ar-to/uk		Šemšara 2:96
Nakatu		?		na-ga-du			Šemšara 2:96
Nanip-šarri				na-ni-ip-šar- ¹ ri ¹	nan=i=b-sarri	The godking struck down	Šemšara 2:96
Napili		?		na-bi-li			Šemšara 1:168
Naššumar		?		na-aš-šu-ma-ar			Šemšara 1:168
Nawaya				¹ na-wa-a-ia ¹	nav=a=ya	He/she grazed (?)	Šemšara 2:96
Nazzaku				na- ¹ az ¹ -za-gu	nazz=a=kk=o/u		Šemšara 2:96
Niper				ni-be-er	Nibiri		Šemšara 2:96
Nipram				ni-ip-ra-am	nibir(i)(?)=a=m(e/a)		Šemšara 1:168

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Nuḥ-še				nu-uḥ-še	no/uḡ-še		Šemšara 2:96
Nuḥniš				nu-uḥ-ni-iš	no/uḡn=i=ž		Šemšara 2:96
Nupur-ewri				nu-pu-ur-ew-ri	no/ubor-evri		Šemšara 2:96
Nuzaku				nu-za-ku	no/uz=a=kk=o		Šemšara 2:96
Pantuzzi				pa-an-du-zi		The right side appropriate	Šemšara 2:96
Papan				ba-ba-an	paba=n(na)	He is a mountain	Šemšara 2:91
Papan-tiki				ba-ba-an-di-ki			Šemšara 2:91
Perti-kentae		?		be-er-di-ge-en-da-e			Šemšara 1:167
Pikiya				bi-ki-ia	pig=i=ya		Šemšara 2:92
Pirati				pi-ra-te	p/wiradi	Foreign guest	VHN 232
Piraya				bi-ra-a-ia	fir(?)=a=ya		Šemšara 2:93
Pišenden		?		pi-še-en-de-en / pi-še-en-te			Šemšara 1:168
Pittun				bi-it-tu-un	pitt=o=n(na)	Help him!	Šemšara 2:93
Puḥmu-šarlaš		?		pu-uḥ-mu-šar-la-aš			Šemšara 2:97
Puḥu-še				pu-ḥu-še	puḡ=o-še	Replace the brother!	Šemšara 2:97

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Puḥu-šeni				pu-ḥu-še-ni	puḡ=o-šen(a)=ni	Replace the brother!	Šemšara 2:97
Pukiri				bu-gi-ri		(He) made long	Šemšara 2:93
Pulla-atal				bu-ul-la-at-ri/tal	pull=a-adal?		Šemšara 1:167
Pušeḫe				pu-še-ep-ḫe		Related to Puši	Šemšara 2:97
Šarnita			2	šar-ni-da	šarnid(i)=a		Šemšara 1:168; Šemšara 2:97
Šarri-Teššup				LUGAL- ^d IM	šarri-Teššob	The godking is Teššup	Šemšara 1:168
Šarrip-atal				ʾšar-ri-ip ¹ -a-tal	šarr=i=b-adal		Šemšara 2:97
Šarriya				šar-ri-ia	šarr=i=ya	He/She seized (him)	Šemšara 2:97
Šattiš				ša-at-ti-iš!	šatt=i=ž	May he/she seize him!	Šemšara 2:97
Šattuya				ša-at-tu?-ia	satt=o=ya	He/She seized (him)	Šemšara 1:168
Šau				ša-ú	ša=o		Šemšara 2:97
Šeḫran-šeni				še-eḫ-ra-an-še-ni	šeḡr=a=n(na)- šen(a)=ni	The brother is generous	Šemšara 2:97
Šeni- [...]				še-ni- [...]			Šemšara 2:97
Šep-šarri		?		ši-ip-š[ar-r]i / ši-ip-šar-ri			Šemšara 1:168
Šepu(m)-šarri			2	[š]i-pu-[LUGAL] / ši-pu- LUG[AL]	šep=o=(m)-šarri		Šemšara 2:98

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šinen-šalli				ši-ni-en-ša-li	šin=i=n(na)-šal(a)=ni	Daughter, do/bring the second!	Šemšara 2:97
Šunak-rānu				su-na-ak-ra-nu	šo/un=a=g-rānu		Šemšara 1:168; Šemšara 2:98
Šunšiya				šu-un-ši-ia	šo/unž=i=ya		Šemšara 1:168
Šupiya				šu-pi- ¹ ia ¹	šo/ub=i=ya		Šemšara 2:98
Šurti		?		šu-úr-ti			Šemšara 1:168
Šušinna				¹ šu ¹ -še-en-na	šo/už=i=nna		Šemšara 2:98
Taka-...				ta-ka- ¹ x ¹ [...]			Šemšara 2:98
Taken				ta-ge-en	tag=i=n(na)	Make (him) good!	Šemšara 2:98
Taki				ta-ki		Good	Šemšara 1:168
Talpuš-šarri				ta-al-pu-uš-šar-ri	talb=o=ž-šarri	May the strong make (him) big!	Šemšara 1:168; Šemšara 2:98
Tar-Ukur				ta-ru-gu-ur	tar-0/Ugo/ur		Šemšara 1:169
Tarinam				ta-ri-nam	tarinn(i)=a=m(e/a)		Šemšara 2:98
Tarip-...				ta- ¹ ri-ip ¹ -[...]	tar=i=b-[...]		Šemšara 2:98
Taru-...				ta-ru-[x x] ¹ x ¹			Šemšara 2:98
Taši				ta-ši-[...]			Šemšara 2:98

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Teḫiš-šuka		?		te-ḫe-eš- ^ṽ šu?-ka? ¹	teḡ=i=ž-šo/ug(i)=a	May Šuka? Raise (him)	Šemšara 2:98
Tenturi			2	te-en-du-ri / ti-du-ri	Tenduri		Šemšara 1:169; Šemšara 2:98
Teššup-ewri				te-eš-šu- ^ṽ up ¹ -ew-ri	Teššob-ewri	Teššup is the lord	Šemšara 2:98
Tetiya				te-di-ia	ted=i=ya		Šemšara 2:98
Tiriya				ti-ri-ia	tir=i=ya		Šemšara 2:98
Tirwen-šenni			2	ti-ir-we-en-še-ni / ti-ir- we-en-še-en-ni	tirve=n(na)-sen(a)=ni		Šemšara 1:169 ; Šemšara 2:98
Tu[...]tupki				du-x-tu-up-ki	[...]-to/upki		Shemshara 1, 8:39
Tuiz-kiyaše				tu-iz-ki-a-še	to/u=i=ž-kiyaže		Šemšara 2:99
Tukukti		?		tu-ku-uk-ti			Šemšara 1:169
Tulip				du-li-ip	to/ul=i=b		VHN 313
Tulpi				tu-ul-pí	to/ulbi		Šemšara 2:99
Tupki-šarri				du-up-<-ki?>-LUGAL	to/upki-šarri		Šemšara 2:93
Tur-še				tu- ^ṽ ur-še ¹	to/ur-še	The brother brought away	Šemšara 2:99
Turu-še				t[u]-ru-še	to/ur=o-še		Šemšara 2:99
Turukti		?		tu-ru-uk-ti	to/ur=o=k=di		Šemšara 1:169

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tutikānu				tu-ti-ka-nu	to/udig(i)=ānu		Šemšara 2:99
Tutiya				tu-di-ia	to/ud=i=ya		Šemšara 2:99
Ukizzan				ú-ki-za-an	o/ugizz(i)=a=n(na)		Šemšara 2:99
Ukur-atal				ú-gur-a-tal	Ugur-adal	Ukur is strong	Šemšara 2:99
Ullam-tašni				ul-la-am-taš-ni	o/ull=a=m(b!)-tašni		Šemšara 1:169
Ullup-atal				ul-lu-up-a-tal	o/ull=o=b(m!)-adal	The strong destroyed him	Šemšara 2:99
Ullutta				ul-lu-ut-ta	o/ull=o=tta	Destroy me!	Šemšara 2:99
Ulmur-Taḫe				ul-mu-ur-ṽda-ḫe ¹	olm=o/ur-taḫe		Šemšara 2:99
Unap-...]				ú-na-a[p-...]	un=a=b-...]		Šemšara 2:99
Unap-šarri				ú-n[a-a]p-šar-ri	un=a=b-šarri	The godking came	Šemšara 2:99
Uru-tatni				ú-ru-ta-ad-ni	ur=o-tatni	Tatni, make/let (her) exist!	Šemšara 2:99
Uštan-šarri				uš-ta-an-šar-ri	ušta=n(na)-šarri	The heroe is the godking	Šemšara 2:99
Uštap-šarri				u[š?-ta]p?-šar-[ri?]	ust=a=b-šarri	The godking went out	Šemšara 1:169
Uštap-tukki				úš-tap-tu-u[k-ki]	ušt=a=b-to/ukki	Tukki went out	Šemšara 2:99
Uštap-tupki			2	uš-tap-tu-up-ki	ušt=a=b-to/ubki	Tupki went out	Šemšara 1:169; Šemšara 2:99

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Uštun				uš-tu-un	ušt=o=n(na)	Bring him out!	Šemšara 1:169
Ušunni				ú-šu-ni			Šemšara 1:169
Wanni				wa-an-ni / pa-an-ni	fann(i)=a		Šemšara 1:169
Wantip-šenni				wa-an-di-ib-še-en-ni	fand=i=b-šen(a)=ni	The brother made (him) good	Šemšara 2:99
Zapari				ʽza-pa ¹ -[ri]			Šemšara 2:100
Zaziya			2	za-zi-ia	zaž=i=ya	He/She fed (him)	Šemšara 1:169; Šemšara 2:100
Zileš-ewri				zi-li-eš-ew-ri	zil=i=ž-evri		Šemšara 2:100
Zilip-šarri				zi-li-ip-šar-ri	zil=i=b-šarri		Šemšara 2:100
Zilippu				zi-lí-ip-pu	zil=i=b-Nu(?)		Šemšara 1:169
Ziliya				zi-lí-ia	zil=i=ya		Šemšara 1:169; Šemšara 2:100
Ziluša				zi-lu-ša	zil=ož=a		Šemšara 2:100
Zuzzu				zu-zu / ʽzu-uz-zu ¹	zo/uzz=o		Šemšara 2:100

Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Tigonāni

The kingdom of Tigonāni seemed to have had a major political role during the time of Ḫattušili I, as it is revealed by the letter that he sent to the King Tunip-Teššup.¹ However, it also became notorious to modern scholars by a unique cuneiform prism which has inscribed the names of 438 *ḫabirus* workers that belonged to the king,² together with some minor texts.³ The origin and findspot of the few documents appertaining to the city are unknown⁴ because the location of the Hurrian kingdom of Tigonāni is still not clear. However, it is believed to be located in the north of Šubat-Enlil, beyond the Ṭūr ‘Abdīn Mountains, on the left margin of the upper Tigris.⁵ The Hurrian onomastic retrieved from the texts appertained to the period when Tunip-Teššup ruled the kingdom (contemporary to Ḫattušili I)⁶, which dates back to the last third of the XVIIth century.⁷

§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Tigonāni Texts

The Hurrian PNs from Tigonāni have a clear nature:⁸ except those from the tablets,⁹ the vast majority of the anthroponyms that appear in the prism appertain to *ḫabiru* workers (except for the overseers,¹⁰ the scribe¹¹ and the king¹²). The percentage of Hurrian names among the total

¹ Salvini 1995, 1996: 107-114; de Martino 2002; Durand 2006.

² Salvini 1996: 7.

³ Salvini 1996: chap. 3-4; Wilhelm and Akdoğan 2010.

⁴ The documents belonged to a private collections and were retrieved from clandestine diggings.

⁵ Charpin 2014: 30.

⁶ The only other king known from Tigonāni is named Nakat-miš and belonged to the period of Zimri-Lim from Mari (Charpin 2000: 63).

⁷ Salvini 1996: 8.

⁸ The Hurrian PNs have been obtained from: Salvini 1999 and; Wilhelm and Akdoğan 2010.

⁹ Wilhelm-Akdoğan 2010 (Aranziḫ-ewri; Arum-ḫute; Arum-Nawar; Ḫašip-šarri; Kilum-šarri; Kun-šekki; Ninu; Nupur-šarri; Nupuzza; Pattikki(?); Pikunna; Šatum-ke[war](?); Teššup-ewri); Salvini 1996: 107, 1 (Tuniya), 123, 5 (Kuzzi-wena) and 126, 20 (Teššup-...).

¹⁰ Zumalaḫ, Yaḫul and Azrapi.

¹¹ Aššur-Iddin.

¹² Tunip-Teššup.

(prism and tablets) is close to the 50 percent.¹³ Thus, the *Habiru* phenomenon seemed to have been a common practice among Hurrians because much of this population would have come from neighbouring cities and regions with Hurrian backgrounds.¹⁴ In this sense, the anthroponyms from Tigonāni could be understood as a good -though random- ‘sample’ of the PNs. These names were most probably in vogue throughout the “Hurrian country” because the *habiru* workers mentioned in the prism were not originally from Tigonāni but most likely refugees or fugitives from different cities.¹⁵

§ Kinship

Regarding kinship, the first aspect that differs from the rest of the documents with Hurrian PNs is the complete absence of female individuals (this absence is for the entire PNs that appear in the documents). The onomasticon appertains to male individuals, and this is clearly shown in the onomastics because there is no allusion to any female figure, particularly names related to ‘sister’ (*ela*). The kinship elements are mostly restricted to the common figure of the brother (*šen*)¹⁶ and father (*atta*),¹⁷ which clearly denotes the gender reflection of the individuals.

§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names

An important characteristic of this group of PNs is the high rate of theophoric names that appear throughout the corpus.

¹³ So far, the individuals that appear in the documents from Tigonāni arise to 465 (442 from the prism, 4 from the letters and 19 from the rations of grain). From these, 211 belong to Hurrians, i.e. 48 % per cent of the total. See Zadok (1999-2000: 352) for previous numbers.

¹⁴ Hurrians were probably identified with the *habiru* phenomenon since the third millennium. During the Sargonic period, an individual from the city of Nagar bore the Hurrian name ‘Ḫapiram’ (He is like a *habiru*) (Gadd 1940: 42).

¹⁵ On the *Habiru* problem see the classic work by Bottéro 1955, 1988 and, particularly Rowton 1965, for the geographical description of the distribution of the *Habirus*. The Hurrian name Ḫapira (‘Like a *Ḫabiru* or He is a *Ḫabiru*’), mentioned in the prism, could be considered as an act of ‘re-bestowing’ someone’s PN or the name given to the new-born of a *Ḫabiru*.

¹⁶ Nawaru-še; Akap-*aḫī* (hybrid Hurrian-Semitic); Unap-še; Akap-še; Arip-šenniš; Puḫi-šen.

¹⁷ Atta; Attan; Attannu; Attanu; Šeren-ḫuḫ(?). Besides the name for ‘father’, there is also a hybrid Hurrian-Amorrite name Tari- *Ammu* which mentions the figure of the ‘paternal-uncle’.

§ Primary and Secondary Deities

Among the group of the ‘Pan-Hurrian’ deities, we have Teššup,¹⁸ Kušuḥ¹⁹ and Šimika,²⁰ which are very well attested and represent more than 20 percent of the individuals PNs.²¹ From these deities, Teššup stands out with a very high rate of appearances, as well as being part of the name of Tigunāni’s king, Tunip-Teššup.

Within the group of primary deities, we also encounter the presence of the name Arki-Ištar (ar-ki-^dIŠTAR > IŠ₈-TÁR)²². Here, again, we face the problem regarding the correct reading of the logogram. Is it *Ištar*, *Šawuška* or *Išhara*? It is difficult to argue in favour or against any of the Hurrian readings since so far *Šawuška* has only appeared, during the first part of the second millennium, in syllabic reading in the Hurrian names from Alalaḥ,²³ apart from the theonym mentioned in the Hurrian texts from Mari.²⁴ However, this could also mean that such important deity could not be left aside from Hurrian onomastics and its presence is actually expressed through the logogram. In any case, the problem remains unsettled until new documents can shed some light on the matter.

The PNs from Tigunāni do not reflect any theophoric associated to the so-called secondary deities (e.g. Ḫepat, Išhara, Allani) as well as Kumarbi (or Ukur).

§ Minor Deities

The group of minor deities is not particularly conspicuous regarding quantity. However, we find different examples of several names holding the deities from the mountains Pišaiš,²⁵

¹⁸ Arip-Teššup (3); Arit-Te(ššup); Arum-Te(ššup); Arum-Teššup (6); Irip-Teššup; Ḫaš-Teššup (2); Teššup-ewri (4); Tunip-Teššup (Tuniya being the abbreviated/hypocoristic form of the name); Eḫlip-Teššup (7); Ikkit-Te(ššup); Teššup-[...]; Pikum-Teššup; Terip-Teššup.

¹⁹ Ḫašip-Kušuḥ (2); Kušuḥ-atal (2); Kušuḥ-šarri; Kušuḥ-ewri (5); Eḫlip-Kušuḥ.

²⁰ Ḫaš-Šimika; Eḫlip-Šimika (3).

²¹ The ‘Pan-Hurrian’ deities are attested in 44 different individuals.

²² According to Richter (VHN 648 fn. 1166) given the vocalism of this name is more likely to be Akkadian than Hurrian.

²³ See the Hurrian PNs from Alalaḥ VII. VHN 405.

²⁴ Thureau-Dangin 1939: 4, l. 17.

²⁵ Arip-Pišaiš; Ḫawirim-Piš(aiš) (2).

Kalli²⁶ and Kešiyar,²⁷ and the deity from the cities of Kulmiš²⁸ and, probably, Kulpi,²⁹ Kepel³⁰ and Taḥuḫe.³¹ The name ‘Ara’, from the PNs Arum-Ara and Ḥašip-Ara has also been considered as a theonym.³² However, this name could also be understood as an abbreviated form of the names Arum-Ara(nziḫ) and Ḥašip-Ara(nziḫ), well attested in the onomastic.

§ Divinised Entities

Given the different provenance of the *Ḥabirus* from Tigunāni, the Hurrian PNs reveal a wide variety of divinised entities, which, somehow, could help to picture the regions from where they might have come. The most common, as happens in the vast majority of the cases, is the name of the city of Nawar.³³ There are also several individuals whose names reproduce the cities of Kaneš,³⁴ Anšal³⁵ and Niniveh.³⁶ We also encounter several *Ḥabirus* names mentioning the River Tigris³⁷ and Ḥasur.³⁸

§ Common Theophoric Elements

Lastly, the group of common theophoric elements does not present any particular characteristic. Names with ‘ewri’,³⁹ ‘ulme’,⁴⁰ ‘eni’,⁴¹ ‘atal’,⁴² ‘muši’,⁴³ or ‘šarri’,⁴⁴ appear

²⁶ Kirip-kali.

²⁷ Eḫlip-Kešiyar.

²⁸ Kulmiš-ewri. The city of Kulmiš is only mentioned during the Old Babylonian period (RGCT 3: 144) and its location is currently unknown.

²⁹ Šinen-kulpe; Teḫeš-kulpe.

³⁰ Aniš-Kepel.

³¹ Awa-Teḫuḫe; Memen-Taḫuḫe.

³² VHN 378.

³³ Akat-Nawar; Ar-nawar (5); Arum-Nawar; Eḫlip-Nawar; Ḥašim-Nawar (2); Nawar-kešḫe; Nawar-atal (2); Nawar-kulpe; Nawar-taḫe; Šatum-Nawar.

³⁴ Ar-kaniš.

³⁵ Anšal-ewri (2).

³⁶ Ninu(a)-atal (2); Ninua-šarri (2).

³⁷ Aranzi (2); Aranziḫ-ewri (8); Ḥašip-Ara(nziḫ?); Ḥašip-Aranziḫ; Kirip-Aranziḫ.

³⁸ Arum-Ḥasur; Eḫlip-Ḥasur; Ḥašip-Ḥasur.

³⁹ Ewri-ma (3); Ḥišmen-ewri (2); Kanik-ewri; Nupur-ewri; Anšal-ewri (2); Kummen-ewri; Aranziḫ-ewri; Kulmiš-ewri.

⁴⁰ Ḥašip-ulme.

⁴¹ Akat-eniš; Eniš-akum; Šukrum-eniš.

⁴² Kilum-atal; Kutuk-atal; Nawaru-atal (2); Talpu-atal; Talpuš-atal; Tan-atal; Teššen-atal; Arum-atal; Šeren-atal; Ninu(a)-atal; Kazamp-atal.

disseminated in the corpus.

In overall, the PNs from Tiguṇāni have revealed a remarkable amount of theophorous related to the Pan-Hurrian deities which could be the demonstration of the character that the Hurrian pantheon had during the end of the Old Babylonian period.

⁴³ Wantin-muša.

⁴⁴ Ḫašip-šarri (2); Kilm-šarri (2); Nupur-šarri (4); Paip-šarri; Šawlu-Šarri; Talpu-šarri; Ḫu..ur-šarri; Šatušarri; Ninua-šarri.

List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Tigonāni

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Akap-ahī		H/S		a-ga-ba-ḥi	ag=a=b-ahī	My brother came up	Ḥabiru Prism: Col VII, 49
Akap-še			2	a-ga-ap-še	ag=a=b-še	The brother came up	Ḥabiru Prism: Col I, 7; VI, 3
Akap-taḥe				a-ga-ap-ta-aḥ-e	ag=a=b-taḥe	The man came up	Ḥabiru Prism: Col VII, 40
Akat-eniš				a-ga-at-e-ni-iš	ag=ad-eni=ž	The god brought (him) up	Ḥabiru Prism: Col I, 35
Akat-Nawar				a-ga-ta-na-wa-ar	ag=ad-Navar	Nawar brought (him) up	Ḥabiru Prism: Col VII, 28
Akup-we				a-ku-ub-be	ag=o=b(m!)-ve?	That of the one	Ḥabiru Prism: Col III, 49
Amul-tuk			2	a-mu-ul-tu-uk	am(m)=o/ul-to/uk	Tuk brought (him) here	Ḥabiru Prism: Col VI, 34; VIII, 26
Aniš-Kepel				a-ni-iš-gi-bé-el	an=i=ž-kebel(i)	May <i>Kepali</i> be (the) Joy!	Ḥabiru Prism: Col IV, 23
Anšal-ewri			2	an-ša-al-ew-ri	Anžal(?) -ewri	Anšal is the lord	Ḥabiru Prism: Col I, 20; VI, 23
Ar-kaniš				ar-ka-ni-iš	ar-Kaniš	Kaniš gave (him)	Ḥabiru Prism: Col VIII, 52
Ar-kiš		?		ar-ki-iš	ar-kiž?	Kiš gave (him)	Ḥabiru Prism: Col V, 12
Ar-nawar			5	ar-na-wa-ar	ar-Navar	Nawar gave (him)	Ḥabiru Prism: Col III, 20; IV, 29; VI, 42; VIII, 41; VIII, 45
Ar-nupur			2	ar-nu-pur	ar-no/ubor(i)		Ḥabiru Prism: Col IV, 33; V, 43
Aranzi			2	a-ra-an-zi	Aranzi	Tigris	Ḥabiru Prism: Col II, 22; V, 4

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Aranziḫ-ewri			8	a-ra-an-ši-iḫ-ew-ri / a-ra-an-zi-iḫ-ew-ri	Aranziḫ-evri	Tigris is the lord	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 50; II, 16; III, 55; III, 58; IV, 12; V, 5; V, 41; Wilhelm-Akdoğan: 159 Vs. I 1
Arin				a-ri-in	ar=i-n(na)	Give (him)!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 29
Arip-nupur			2	a-ri-ip-nu-pur	ar=i-b-no/ubor	Nupur gave (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 42; I, 55
Arip-Pišaiš				a-ri-ip-pí-ša-i-iš	ar=i-b-Pišaiž	Pišaiš gave (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 10
Arip-purani				a-ri-ip-pu-ra-ni	ar=i-b-po/urani	The omen gave (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 42
Arip-šenniš				a-ri-ip-še-ni-iš	ar=i-b-šen(a)=ni=ž	The brother gave (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 31
Arip-Teššup			3	a-ri-ip-te-eš-šu-up	ar=i-b-Teššob	Teššup gave (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 36; VIII, 3; VIII, 18
Arit-te				a-ri-it-te	ar=i-t(b!)-Te	Teššup gave (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 22
Ariya			2	a-ri-ia	ar=i=ya	He/She gave (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 17; VII, 39
Arki-Ištar/Šawuška?				ar-ki- ^d IŠTAR (IŠ ₈ -TÁR)	arg=i-IŠTAR		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 26
Arrika		?		ar-ri-ga			Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 41
Arum-Ara				a-rum-a-ra	ar=o=m-Ara	Ara / Ara(anziḫ)? gave him	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 6; II, 11
Arum-atal				a-ru-um-ma-tal	ar=o=m-adal	The strong gave him	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 24
Arum-Ḫasur				a-rum-ḫa-sù-ur	ar=o=m-Ḫasur	Ḫasur gave him	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 29; IV, 32

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Arum-ḫute			2	a-rum-ḫu-te	ar=o=m-ḫo/udi	ḫute gave him	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 2; Wilhelm-Akdoğan: 160 Rs. IV 16
Arum-Nawar				a-rum-na-wa-ar	ar=o=m-Navar	Nawar gave him	Wilhelm-Akdoğan: 159 Vs. II 10
Arum-šašar				a-rum-ša-ša-ar	ar=o=m-šašar(i)	Šašar gave him	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 5
Arum-šurwit				a-rum-šu-úr-wi-it	ar=o=m-šo/urvid(i)	Šurwit gave him	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 28
Arum-te				a-ru-um-te	ar=o=m-Te	Teššup gave him	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 52
Arum-Teššup			6	a-rum-te-eš-šu-up	ar=o=m-Teššob	Teššup gave him	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 46; II, 48; III, 39; IV, 8; VI, 39; VI, 51
Arun				a-ru-un	ar=o=n(na)	Give (him)!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 47
Arunku				a-ru-un-gu	aro/ung(i)=u		Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 35
Arunna				a-ru-un-na	ar=o=nna	Give (him)!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 21
Arušan				a-ru-ša-an	ar=ož=a=n(na)	He/She gave (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 35
Aruzza				a-ru-uz-za	aro/uzz(i)=a	He is like the evil	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 3
Atakku				a-da-ak-ku	ad=a=kk=o		Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 31
Atal-šuku				a-ri-šu-ku	adal-šo/ug(i)=u	Šuku is strong	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 59
Atriu				at-ri-ú	adr=i=o		Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 46

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Atta			2	at-ta		Father	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 39; V, 24
Attan			2	at-ta-an	att=a=n(na)	Father	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 44; VI, 45
Attannu				at-ta-an-nu	attann(i)=u	Father	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 32
Attanu				at-ta-nu	attan(i)=u	Father	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 16
Awa-teḫupe				a-wa-te-ḫu-be	av=i-teḡo/ube	Teḫupe, save (him)!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 8
Awar-tuk				a-wa-ar-tu-uk	av=ar-to/uk	Tuk saved (him) repeatedly	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 41
Ayan				a-ia-an			Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 23
Eḫlešše				eḫ-le-eš-še		Salvation	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 28
Eḫli			3	eḫ-li	eḡl=i	Save (him)!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 39; V, 2; V, 55
Eḫlip-Ḫasur				eḫ-li-ip-ḫa-sù-ur	eḡl=i=b-Ḫasur	Ḫasur saved (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 41
Eḫlip-Kešiyar				eḫ-ʿli-ip ¹ -gi-ši-a-ar	eḡl=i=b-Kešiyar	Kešiyar saved (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 53
Eḫlip-Kušuḫ				eḫ-li-ip-ku-šu-uḫ	eḡl=i=b-Kužo/uḡ	Kušuḫ saved (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 41
Eḫlip-Nawar				eḫ-li-ip-na-wa-ar	eḡl=i=b-Navar	Nawar saved (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 38
Eḫlip-Šimika			3	eḫ-li-ip-ši-mi-ga	eḡl=i=b-Šimiga	Šimika saved (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 17; IV, 22; VII, 21

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Eḫlip-Teššup			7	eḫ-li-ip-te-eš-šu-up	eḫl=i=b-Teššob	Teššup saved (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 38; III, 6; III, 56; IV, 35; IV, 40; VI, 31; VII, 36
Ekka				e-ek-ka	ekk=a		Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 48
Ekki				e-gi-gi	ekk=i		Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 30
Elli			2	el-li	ell=i		Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 38; I, 47; V, 30
Eniš-akum				e-ni-iš-a-ku-um	eni=ž-ag=o=m	The deity brought him up	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 12
Epirrakki				e-bi-ir-ra-ki		Young lord	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 46
Epšun-tuk				ep-šu-un-tu-uk	ipš=o=n(na)-to/k	Tuk, make (him) pleasing!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 43
Eriri				e-ri-ri			Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 17
Ewri-atal				ew-ri-a-tal	evri-adal	The lord is strong	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 4
Ewri-kipa				ew-ri-ki-ba	evri-kib(i)=a		Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 51
Ewri-ma			3	ew-ri-ma	evri-ma	The lord is Ma	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 19; II, 55; III, 1
Ezuk				e-zu-uk	ež=o=g		Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 34
Ḫalut				ḫa-lu-ut	ḫal=o=t(ta)	Carry me away!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 19
Ḫanaya				ḫa-na-a-ia	ḫan=a=ya		Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 25

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ḫanu(w)azzi(?)				ḫa-nu-az-zi		Childhood?	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 36
Ḫapira			2	ḫa-bi-ra	ḫabir(u)=a	He is like a Ḫabiru	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 13; VI, 9
Ḫapli				ḫa-ab-li	ḫabl=i		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 46
Ḫariš[...]				ḫa-ri-iš-X			Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 24
Ḫarizza				ḫa-ri-iz-za	ḫarizz(i)=a		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 40
Ḫaruḫul				ḫa-ru-ḫu-ul			Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 18
Ḫaš-Šimika				ḫa-aš-ši-mi-ga	ḫaž-Šimiga	Šimika listened	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 48
Ḫaš-Teššup			2	ḫa-aš-te-eš-šu-up	ḫaž-Teššob	Teššup listened	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 37; V, 18
Ḫaši			2	ḫa-ši	ḫaž=i	Listen!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 7; VII, 46
Ḫašim-Nawar			2	ḫa-ši-im-na-wa-ar	ḫaz=i=m(b!)-Navar	Nawar listened	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 13; II, 15; VIII, 51
Ḫašinna				ḫa-ši-in-na	ḫaž=i=nna	Hear (it/him)!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 11
Ḫašip-Ara				ḫa-ši-ip-a-ra	ḫaž=i=b-Ara	Ara / The Tigris listened	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 58
Ḫašip-Aranziḫ				ḫa-ši-ip-a-ra-an-ši-iḫ	ḫaž=i=b-Aranziḡ	The Tigris listened	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 14
Ḫašip-Ḫasur				ḫa-ši-ip-ḫa-sù-ur	ḫaž=i=b-Ḫasur	Ḫasur listened	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 30
Ḫašip-Kušuḫ			2	ḫa-ši-ip-ku-šu-uḫ	ḫaž=i=b-Kužog	Kušuḫ listened	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 48; VI, 11

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ḫašip-šarri			2	ḫa-ši-ip-šar-ri	ḫaž=i=b-šarri	The godking listened	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 13; Wilhelm-Akdoğan: 160 Rs. III 11
Ḫašip-ulme				ḫa-ši-ip-ul-me	ḫaž=i=b-olme	The servant listened	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 21
Ḫaššuwa		?		ḫa-aš-šu-ú-a			Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 44
Ḫašta				ḫa-aš-ta	ḫast=a=∅		Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 59
Ḫaštakkuri				ḫa-aš-ta-ak-ku-ri			Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 54
Ḫašten				ḫa-aš-te-en	ḫast=i=n(na)		Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 40
Ḫawirim-Piš(aiš)?		?	2	ḫa-wi-ri-im-bi-iš			Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 5; VIII, 11
Ḫeluk				ḫé-lu-uk	ḫel=o=g	He/She did not say	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 36
Ḫerru				ḫe-ir-ru			Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 5
Ḫerruk				ḫé-er-ru-uk	ḫerr=o=g		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 35
Ḫeršu			3	ḫe-er-šu	ḫerž=o		Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 10; V, 44; I, 54
Ḫešallam				ḫi-ša-al-la-am	ḫežal(i)=n(i)=a=m(e)/m(a)	He is like a friend	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 42
Ḫišmen-ewri			2	ḫi-iš-me-en-ew-ri	ḫižm=i=n(na)-evri	Lord, make (him) shine!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 58; V, 32
Ḫu..ur-šarri				ḫu-x-[u]r-šar-ri			Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 50
Ḫuin				ḫu-i-in	ḫu=i=n(na)	Call (him)!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 33

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ḫulluwiš		?		ḫu-ul-lu-wi-iš			Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 49
Ḫupaḫ(ḫ)e				ḫu-ba-ḫi			Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 12
Ḫuttan				ḫu-ut-ta-an	ḫo/utt(i)=a=n(na)	Like/according to the prayer	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 11
Ikkit-Te				ik-ki-it-te	ikk=i=b>t-Te		Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 42
Ikuzza				i-ku-uz-za	igo/uzz(i)=a	Like the middle?	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 3
Intazu				in-da-a-zu			Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 50
Intiya				in-ti-ia	ind=i=ya		Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 30
Ipšun-tuk				ip-šu-un-tu-uk	ipš=o=n(na)-to/k	Tuk, make (him) pleasing!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 43
Irip-Teššup				i-ri-ip-te-eš-šu-up	ir=i=b-Teššob	Teššup gave (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 5
Iriya			2	i-ri-ia	ir=i=ya	He/She gave (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 51: I, 52
Iškirinti			2	iš-ki-ri-in-ti			Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 5; VII 23
Iyuhul			3	i-iu-ḫu-ul			Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 48; VI, 17; VII, 7
Iziya				i-zi-ia	iž=i=ya		Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 10
Kaki				ka-a-gi	Kag=i		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 13
Kanik-ewri				ka-ni-ik-ew-ri	kan=i=g-evri		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 22

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kaniu				ka-ni-ú	kan=i=o		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 1
Kannatal		?		ka-an-na-tal			Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 53
Kaplam				ka-ap-la-am	kabl(i)=a=m(e/a)		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 2
Katirḫe			4	ka-at-ti-ir-ḫe		To the one who said	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 39; II, 27; VI, 32; VIII, 27
Kattiri				ka-at-ti-ri		He said (the name)?	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 7
Kazamp-atal				ka-za-am-ba-ri/tal	kaž(?)=amb-adal		Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 49
Kazinna				ka-zi-in-na	kaž(?)=i=nnā		Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 29
Kazip(-)a				ka-zi-ba			Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 43
Kelli				ge-el-li	kell=i	Keep (him) untouched!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 41
Kešḫen-ewri				ge-eš-ḫe-en-ew-ri	kešḫe=n(na)-evri	The throne is the lord	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 52
Kešlum				ge-iš-lum	kešl=o=m		Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 53
Kezzi			3	gi-iz-zi	kezz=i		Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 54; VII, 23; VIII, 28
Kilum-atal				gi-lum-a-tal	kel=o=m-adal	The strong made him healthy/happy	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 25
Kilum-šarri			2	gi-lum-šar-ri	kel=o=m-šarri	The godking made him healthy/happy	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 18; Wilhelm-Akdoğan: 159 Vs. I 4

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kipuya			2	ki-bu-ú-ia	kib=o=ya		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 16; VIII, 7
Kirip-Aranziḫ				ki-ri-ip-a-ra-an-ši-iḫ	kir=i=b-Aražiḡ	The Tigris liberated (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 40
Kirip-kali				ki-ri-ip-ka-li	kir=i=b-Kalli(?)	Kali liberated (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 6
Kiripu				ki-ri-bu			Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 21
Kirtuk				ki-ir-tu-uk	kir-to/uk		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 32
Kulmiš-ewri				ku-ul-mi-iš-ew-ri	ko/ulmiš-evri	Kulmiš is the lord	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 27
Kulpe				ku-ul-pe			Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 47
Kummen-ewri			2	ku-um-me-en-ew-ri	ko/umme=n(na)-evri	Kumme is the lord	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 17; III, 23
Kun-šekki				ku-un-še-ek-ki(?)	ko/un-šekki		Wilhelm-Akdoḡan: 159 Vs. 1 2
Kupe-šaki				ku-be-ša-ki	ko/ub=i-šagi		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 4
Kuraiš				ku-ra-i-iš	ko/ur=ai=ž		Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 1
Kurše				ku-úr-še			Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 20
Kušuḫ-atal			2	ku-šu-uḫ-a-tal	Kužo/uḡ-adal	Kušuḫ is strong	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 34; VIII, 37
Kušuḫ-ewri			5	ku-šu-uḫ-ew-ri	Kužo/uḡ-evri	Kušuḫ is the lord	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 40; III, 26; IV, 9; V, 33; VIII, 43
Kušuḫ-šarri				ku-šu-uḫ-šar-ri	Kužo/uḡ-šarri	Kušuḫ is the godking	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 38

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kutanti				ku-ta-an-ti	kudandi		Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 8
Kutuk-atal				ku-du-uk-a-tal	kud=o=g-adal	The strong did not fall	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 3
Kutukka			2	ku-tu-uk-ka	kud=o=kk=o>a=∅	He did not fall	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 26; VII, 17
Kuzza				ku-uz-za	kozz(?)=a		Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 2
Kuzzi				ku-uz-zi	kozz(?)=i	Keep (her/him) back!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 20
Kuzzi-wena				ku-uz-zi-we-na	kozz(?)=i-wena	Wena, keep (her/him) back!	Salvini 1996:123, 5
Kuzzur				ku-uz-zu-ur			Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 15
Kuzzuri				ku-uz-ʿzu ¹ -ri			Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 45
Kuzzuri				ku-uz-zu-ri			Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 45
Mazaya				ma-za-a-ia	maz=a=ya	He/She offered help	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 47
Memem				me-me-en	meme=n(na)	He is Meme	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 53
Memem-Taḫupe				me-me-en-da-ḫu-be	meme=n(na)-taḫo/ube		Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 41
Nakam				na-ga-am	nag=a=m(b!)		Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 52
Nakti-ma				na-ak-ti-ma			Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 36
Našmi				na-áš-mi			Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 25

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Natukki				na-tu-uk-ki	nad=o=kk=i		Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 4
Nawakku				na-wa-ak-ku	nav=a=kk=o		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 54
Nawar-atal			2	na-wa-ar-a-tal	Navar-adal	Nawar is strong	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 3; IV, 31
Nawar-kešḫe				na-wa-ar-ge-eš-ḫi	Navar-kešḫe	Nawar is the throne	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 37
Nawar-kulpe				na-wa-ar-ku-ul-be	Navar-ko/ulbe	Nawar is Kulpe	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 55
Nawar-taḫe				na-wa-ar-da-aḫ-e	Navar-taḫe	Nawar is a/the man	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 2
Nawaru-atal			2	na-wa-ru-a-tal	nav=ar=o-adal	Strong, make him pasture!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 15; VIII, 50
Nawaru-še				na-wa-ru-še	nav=ar=o-še	Brother, make him pasture!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 19
Ninu			2	ni-nu			Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 50; Wilhelm-Akdoğan: 159
Ninu(a)-atal			2	ni-nu-a-tal	Ninu(a)-adal	Ninua (Niniveh) is strong	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 9; II, 49
Ninua-šarri			2	ni-nu-a-šar-ri	Ninua-šarri	Ninua (Niniveh) is the godking	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 26; IV, 16
Nipram				ni-ip-ra-am	nibir(i)(?)=a=m(e/a)		Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 43
Nupur-ewri				nu-pur-ew-ri	no/ubor-evri		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 30
Nupur-ki-pa				nu-pur-ki-pa	no/ubor-kib(i)=a		Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 34
Nupur-šarri			4	nu-pur-šar-ri	no/ubor-šarri		Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 44; IV, 21; V, 27; Wilhelm-

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
							Akdoğan: 160 Rs. IV 19
Nupurikka				nu-pur-ik-ka	no/ub=o/ur=i=kk=i>a=∅		Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 21
Nupuya				nu-pu-ú-ia	no/ub=o=ya		Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 43
Nupuzza				nu-pu-uz-za	no/ubo/uzz(i)=a		Wilhelm-Akdoğan: 159 Vs. II 9
Nuzza				nu-uz-za	no/uzz=a		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 6
Paip-šarri				ba-i-ip-šar-ri	pa=i=b-šarri	The deitiking brought (him) up	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 48
Pait-ter				ba-i-it-te-er	pa=i=b>t-ter(i)	Teri built	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 56
Pakašti				ba-ka-aš-ti			Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 42
Panpuḫi		?		pan-pu-ḫi			Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 10
Panumki		?	2	pan-um-gi			Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 4; III, 13
Parti				ba-ar-ti	pard=i		Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 12
Paruwa			2	ba-ru-a			Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 28; III, 36; IV, 11
Pattikki(?)				ba-at-ti-ik(?)-ki(?)	patt=i=kk=i		Wilhelm-Akdoğan: 159 Vs. I 5
Pikum-Teššup				bi-ku-um-te-eš-šu-up	pig=o=m-Teššob		Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 42
Pikunna				bi-ku-un-na	pig=o=nna		Wilhelm-Akdoğan: 159 Vs. I 3

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Puḫan				pu-ḫa-an	po/uḡ(i)=a=n(na)	He is a substitute	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 35
Puḫi-šen				pu-ḫi-še-en	po/uḡ=i-šen	Replace the brother!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 18
Puḫiya				pu-ḫi- ^r ia? ¹	po/uḡ=i=ya	Replace!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 14
Punke				pu-un-gi			Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 14
Puranti				pu-ra-an-ti	puranti	Euphrates	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 33
Purra		?		bu-úr-ra			Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 26
Purraka				pur-ra-ka			Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 8
Šarnitham				ša-ar-ni-it-ḫa-am	šarnith(e)=a=m(e/a)		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 53
Šarrum-atta				šar-rum-ad-da	šarr=o=m-atta		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 19
Šattal				ša-at-ta-al			Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 2
Šatum-a				ša-du-ma	šad=o=m-A		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 24
Šatum-ke[war](?)				ša-du-um-ge- [...]	šad=o=m-kevar(i)	Kevari substituted him	Wilhelm-Akdoğan: 160 Rs. III 15
Šatum-Nawar				ša-du-um-na-wa-ar	šad=o=m-Navar	Nawar substituted him	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 47
Šatušarri				ša-du-šar-ri	šad=o-šarri	Godking, substitute (him)!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 14
Šaun				ša-ú-un	ša=o=n(na)	Make (him) perfect!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 3

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šawlu-Šarri				ša-wa-lu- ^d šar-ri	šavl=o-šarri		Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 24
Šemaḫul				še-ma-ḫu-ul			Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 21
Šenaya				še-na-a-ia	šena= <i>āya</i>		Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 53
Šeren-atal				še-re-en-a-tal	šer=i=n(na)-adal	Strong, make (him) pleasant!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 51
Šeren-ḫuḫ				še-re-en-ḫu-uḫ	šer=i=n(na)-ḫo/uḫ	Father?, make (him) pleasant!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 27
Šešwanai				še-eš-wa-na-i	šešf=an=a=(n)i		Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 43
Šinen-kulpe				ši-né-en-ku-ul-be	šin=i=n(na)-ko/ulbe	Kulpe, do/make the second!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 51
Šinen-tukki			2	ši-né-en-tu-ug-gi	šin=i=n(na)-to/ukki	Tukki, do/make the second!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 3; VI, 6
Šukrum-eniš				šu-uk-ru-um-e-ni-iš	šo/ugr=o=m-eni=ž		Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 36
Šukumše				šu-ku-um-ši	šugumše	Compensation (lost child?)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 24
Šurwit			2	šu-úr-wi-it			Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 45; VI, 50
Takaya				ta-ga-a-ia	tag=a=ya	He is good	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 34
Talpu-atal				ta-al-pu-a-tal	talb=o-adal	Strong, make (him) big!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 16
Talpu-šarri				ta-al-pu-šar-ri	talb=o-šarri	Godking, make (him) big!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 7
Talpuš-atal				ta-al-pu-úš!-a-tal	talb=o=ž-adal	May the strong make (him) big!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 55

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tan-atal				ta-na-ta-al	tan-adal	The strong made	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 26
Tappuka		?		tap-pu-ka			Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 38
Tari-'Ammu				ta-ri-am-mu	tar=i-'ammu		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 25
Teḫeš-kulpe				te-ḫe-eš-ku-ul-pe	teḡ=i=ž-ko/ulbe	May Kulpe raise (him)!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 37
Teḫḫin				te-eḫ-ḫi-in	teḫḫ=i=n(na)	Let (him) prosper!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 23
Teḫun				te-ḫu-un	teḡ=o=n(na)	Let (him) prosper!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 22
Temmiḫi				te-em-mi-ḫi			Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 25
Terikka				te-ri-ik-ka	ter=i=kk=i>a=∅		Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 12
Terip-Teššup				te-ri-ip-te-eš-šu-up	ter=i=b-Teššob		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 27
Teruwa				te-ru-a			Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 17
Teš-ḫuḫ				te-eš-ḫu-uḫ	te=e=ž-ḫo/uḡ	May the father? pronounce (him)!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 4
Teššen				te-eš-še-en	tešš=i=n(na)	Make (him) solemn!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 44
Teššen-atal				te-eš-še-en-a-tal	tešš=i=n(na)-adal	Strong, make (him) solemn!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 19
Teššup-ewri			4	te-eš-šu-up-ew-ri	Teššob-evri	Teššup is the lord	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 29; VI, 52; VIII, 47; Wilhelm-Akdoğan: 160 Rs. IV 17

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Teššup- [...]				te-eš-š[u-....]	Tešš[ob]-...		Salvini 1996:126, 20
Tišen				ti-še-en		Heart	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 1
Titanni		?		di-ta-an-ni			Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 14
Tiwar				ti-wa-ar		Saying?	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 36
Tiyarnil				ti-ia-ar-ni-il	tiyar(i)=ni=l(la)	They are a spindle?	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 40
Tukki				tu-uk-ki			Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 10
Tukkizza				tu-uk-ki-iz-za	to/ukkizz(i)=a		Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 31
Tunip-Teššup				tu-ni-ip-te-eš-šu-up	to/un=i=b-Teššob	Teššup provided (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Colophon 4
Tuniya				tu-ni-ia	to/un=i=ya	He/She provided (him)	Salvini 1996:107, 1
Turin				tu-ri-in	tur=i=n(na)	Take (him) away!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 19
Tutu-miš				tu-du-mi-iš	to/ud=o-miš		Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 56
Ukun				ú-gu-un	o/ug=o=n(na)		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 11
Ullutti				ul-lu-ut-ti	o/ull=o=tti	Destroy me!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 28
Ulluya				ul-lu-ú-ia	o/ull=o=ya	He/She destroyed (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 39
Ulmi-kiriš				ul-mi-ki-ri-iš	olm=i-kiriš		Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 11

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ulmikka				ul-mi-ik-ka	olm=i=kk=i>a=∅	He/She did not destroy (him)	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 9
Unap-še				ú-na-ap-še	un=a=b-še	The brother came	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VII, 14
Urikkam				ú-ri-ik-ka-am	ûr=i=kk=i>a=m(ma)	You do not want to!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 19
Ušše			2	ú-uš-še	ušš=e	Go!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col III, 44; IV, 50
Uzren				uz-re-e-en	o/uziri=n(na)		Ḫabiru Prism: Col V, 51
Uzuri				ú-zu-ri			Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 22
Uzuzar				ú-zu-za-ar			Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 56
Wantin-muša				wa-an-ti-in-mu-ša	fandi=n(na)-muž(i)=a	Righteous, make (him) good!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 53
Zazi			2	za-a-zi / za-zi	zaž=i	Feed (him)!	Ḫabiru Prism: Col IV, 46; VI, 15
Ziwar				zi-wa-ar			Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 40
Zizi			2	zi-i-zi	ziz=i	Chest	Ḫabiru Prism: Col II, 42; VIII, 38
Zukkup				zu-uk-ku-up	zo/ukk=o=b(m!)		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 37
Zuzu				zu-ú-zu			Ḫabiru Prism: Col VI, 8
Zuzun				zu-ú-zu-un	zo/uz=o=n(na)		Ḫabiru Prism: Col I, 14
Zuzzi				zu-uz-zi	zo/uzz=i		Ḫabiru Prism: Col VIII, 48

Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Ebla (Tell Mardih)

The connection between the city of Ebla and the Hurrians has always been of extremely value. Some native Eblaite (e.g. Aštapi, Išhara, Šalaš or Ḫebat) deities had a particular influence on the Hurrian pantheon,¹ and the city of Ebla itself, at least for the Hurrian background, has been linked to the setting of the ‘Son of Release’ and connected with the storm-god Teššup. However, the documents retrieved from Tell Mardih regarding the Old Babylonian Ebla (Mardih III), unfortunately, do not tell us much of the socio-cultural life of the city. It is known that Ebla was conquered, like many other cities throughout the ANE, by the Amorites, but the material regarding the population, and particularly Hurrian onomastic, has been restricted to the few documents that have been retrieved from the site.²

§ Nature of Hurrian PNs in the Ebla Texts

The Hurrian PNs recovered from the texts consist on only nine examples, and none of them bear a theophorous. We only have names carrying common theophoric elements such as ‘evri’,³ ‘eni’,⁴ ‘mušni’,⁵ šarri,⁶ ‘talma’,⁷ or hypocoristics,⁸ and two kinship-related hybrid Amorite-Hurrian PNs.⁹

Therefore, the information that could be extracted regarding any deity of the Hurrian pantheon is extremely limited, unless we understand the names ‘Eḫliya’ and ‘Tupkiya’ as hypocoristics for the Hurrian storm-god Teššup.

¹ See Archi 1992, 1994, 1998a, 2002.

² Kupper 1980, 2005.

³ Ewri-talma.

⁴ Anum-enni.

⁵ Eanta-mušni.

⁶ Eḫlip-šarri.

⁷ Ta<l>m(i)- ‘Ammī.

⁸ Eḫliya; Tupkiya.

⁹ Pent(i)- ‘Ammu and Ta<l>m(i)- ‘Ammī.

List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Ebla

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Anum-eni				a-nu-um-e-ni	an=o=m-eni	The deity rejoiced	Kupper 2005: S.46
Eanta-mušni				e-an-da-mu-uš-ni	eand(i)=a-mušni		Kupper 2005: S.46
Eḫliya				eḫ-li-ia	eḫl=i=ya	He/She saved (him)	Kupper 1980: S.50, 16
Eḫlip-šarri				eḫ-li-ip-šar-ri	eḫl=i=b-šarri	The godking saved (him)	Freydank-Salvini 1984: 38
Ewri-talma				ew-ri-ta-al-ma	evri-talm(i)=a	The lord is big	Kupper 2005: S.46
Pent(i)-'Ammu		H/S		bi-en-dam-mu	fend(i)=i-'ammu	Paternal-uncle, make (him) good!	Kupper 2005: S.46
Pirtu				bi-ir-du	pird=o		Kupper 2005: S.46
Ta<l>m(i)-'Ammī		H/S		ta-<al>-ma-am-mi	talm=i-'amm=ī	Paternal-uncle, make (him) big!	Kupper 2005: S.46
Tupkiya				tu-up-ki-ia	to/upki=ya or to/upk=i=ya		Kupper 2005: S.46

Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Kaneš (Kültepe)

The Hurrian presence in the Assyrian merchant colony of Kaneš, at least from an onomastic point of view, was already identified during the 1930's.¹ Besides those individuals who did not reside in the *kārum* and whose location was known (e.g. Eḫli-Addu presumably from Tunip),² the vast majority were residents of the commercial colony. However, it is not clear how many were part and came with the Assyrian merchants,³ how many were already there,⁴ and how many came for different reasons. In any case, they seemed to have been active participants in the daily life as it is shown by the commercial letters⁵ and the legal records,⁶ as well as from the fact that they may have controlled the tin route across the mountains to Aššur.⁷

During the first half of the second millennium, Kaneš was probably the most western and northern part of the entire ANE –or rather said periphery of the ANE- holding a melting pot of different cultures. The onomastics from Kültepe, particularly the theophoric elements from the native “Anatolian” population from Kaneš, have revealed that Luwians, Hittites, Ḫattians and a pre-Indo-European substrate, not only worshipped their deities but they also had the practice of bestowing theophorous among their individuals. Frequent elements corresponded to the storm-god (*Taru* for Ḫattians, *Tarḫuna* for Hittites), the Luwian sun-god (*Tiwad*) and Šanta, the goddess from Ḫattuša *Inar* and his consort *Ḫaba(n)tali*, the divinised mountains Daḫa(ya),

¹ Gustavs 1936-1937.

² Wilhelm 2008: 1987.

³ The area around the Ḫabur triangle was vastly populated by Hurrians, and many of its cities and kingdoms were politically controlled by them. Thus, in their way to Kaneš, the Assyrian merchants were obliged to cross this land and interact with the locals, a situation that could have involved commercial transactions, especially in the trading of textiles and Hurrian slaves (Dercksen 1996: 163).

⁴ As it is known, the Hurrian *Urheimat* was located in the Trans-Caucasian region (Burney 1989b, 1997; Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 2007) from where they could have accessed the city of Kaneš without the Assyrian direct mediation.

⁵ See Kammenhuber (1977: 142-143) for a list of witness and trading individuals with Hurrian names, and Hecker 1996.

⁶ Veenhof 2008: 12, fn.11.

⁷ Dercksen 1996: 163.

Zipalanda, Liḫša, Tuḫaliya and Šarpa, the river Nakiliyat, the deities Ḫešta, Ḫuzziya and Tamešiet.⁸ At the same time, the Assyrians brought with them their hometown deities (Aššur, Adad, Ištar, Sîn, Amurru, Anum, Ea and Šamaš), which were also reflected in their PNs, as well as probably their cults that were developed in the shrines built for them.⁹ Therefore, it would not be strange to find an analogous situation with the Hurrian material, despite its low percentage among the entire onomastics retrieved from the Kültepe archives.¹⁰

§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Kültepe Texts

In general terms, the vast majority of the names appertain to male individuals who resided in the city and were not very akin to the use of theophorous in their names.

§ Kinship

Regarding kinship, we only find traces of names related to the figure of the brother¹¹ and the sibling,¹² which are not extended throughout the onomastics. The interpretation of this low quantity (a rare phenomenon in the Hurrian onomastic of the first part of the second millennium) could be opened to many speculations. However, any conjecture would be extremely fragile in terms of evidence, given the reduced knowledge of the Hurrian presence at Kaneš.

§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names

The theophoric elements are fairly extended throughout the onomastics except for the theophorous. These are very few among the primary deities as well as for the minor ones.

⁸ Taracha 2009: 27.

⁹ Hirsch 1972.

¹⁰ The Hurrian PNs list compiled for this work is, most probably, partially complete. The quantity of the Kültepe tablets (more than 23.000) and the way they have been published preclude us to make a full and thorough scan. The same happens with the lack of an updated onomasticon of the site. However, the quantity of different PNs exceeds the 2.800 examples.

¹¹ Akap-še(n); Iri(p)-šeni; Pala-šeni; Unap-še(n); Unap-šenni.

¹² Menna; Muš-menni.

§ Primary and Secondary Deities

To this group, we only have the presence of Teššup, Šimiga, and the hybrid (Hurrian-Semitic) name with the storm-god *Addu*. The names related to Teššup, ‘Ḫašip-Teššup’ (Teššup listened (him)),¹³ was found in a document that appertained to the level Ib,¹⁴ although it was not originated at the site but rather somewhere in the Tigris Valley or the Zagros Piedmont.¹⁵ It is the only name in the entire Kültepe onomasticon, although foreign, who carries the theophorous for the Hurrian storm-god.

The second Hurrian theophorous belongs to the sun-god Šimiga (Šim(i)gem-adal) and was attested in two individuals that apparently resided in the *kārum*.

The theophorous *Addu* was attested in three different individuals. The first two belonged to residents of the site, Šim(i)gim-*Addu* (The sun is Addu),¹⁶ while the third, Eḫli-*Addu*, appertained to an individual from another city (probably Tunip?)¹⁷ which had established, during the level Ib, commercial bonds with that of Kaneš.

§ Minor Deities

This group of theophorous is also very limited among the names. The first deities correspond to the names of the kings from Ḫaššum, Aniš-ḫurpi,¹⁸ and Mama, Anum-ḫirpi,¹⁹ with whom Kaneš kept trading relationships.²⁰ The remaining anthroponyms corresponded to the, allegedly, deities Kepel(i)²¹ and Meme.²²

¹³ Also attested in Mari, Šušarrā and Šubat-Enlil.

¹⁴ According to the ‘lower’ middle chronology, the level *kārum* II is usually dated ca. 1958-1821 (Veenhof 2007) and the level *kārum* Ib ca. 1785-1720 (Günbatti 2008: 118).

¹⁵ Michel 2010.

¹⁶ Here the element ‘Šim(i)ge’ does not correspond to the Hurrian theonym for the sun-god but the noun for the word sun (Wilhelm 2008: 183, fn. 17.).

¹⁷ Wilhelm 2008: 187.

¹⁸ Wilhelm 2008: 189.

¹⁹ Miller 2011: 68.

²⁰ Wilhelm 2008: 190.

²¹ Aniš-Kepel.

²² Ewri-Meme (2).

§ Divinised Entities

The divinised entities are also scarce. We have a name mentioning the Tigris,²³ another the mountain²⁴ and the city of Nawar,²⁵ all common in the Hurrian onomastic.

§ Common Theophoric Elements

This group is widely the most extensive of the Hurrian PNs from Kültepe. It seems that they reproduce or continue with the third millennium tradition in the sense that they conform the major group of theophoric elements (although they mention only five elements), especially beyond the theophorous. To these appertain the words for strong,²⁶ god,²⁷ lord²⁸ and godking,²⁹ the most common theophoric elements of the entire Hurrian onomastic.

²³ Arašših-atal.

²⁴ Papan-taḫe.

²⁵ Ḫašim-Nawar; Ḫašim-Nawarna.

²⁶ Atal-šarri; Ḫuḫum-(a)tal; Atalli; Titin-atal; Nap-atal; Natu-(a)tal; Ḫar(i)p-atal; Kupe-atal; Kupin-atal; Nanip-adal.

²⁷ Eniš-arim; Eniš-arum; Ušḫu-eni.

²⁸ Erwe-šarri; Ewri; Ewri-atal; Ewri-karim; Ewri-muša; Ewrim-adal.

²⁹ Ari-šarri; Nanip-šar(ri); Nanip-šarri; Nupar-šarim; Takip-šarri; Takip-šarri; Takni-šarri; [T/S]alip-šarri.

List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Kaneš

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
[T/S]alip-šarri				[T/Š]a-li-ip-ša-ri			Michel 2010:78
Abī-šawuri				a-bi ₄ -ša-wu-ri	abi-šavori	Šavori-weapon is my father?	Garelli 1963:155
Akap-še				a-ga-áp-ší / a-kà-ab-ši	ag=a=b-še	The brother came up	Garelli 1963:155 / Donbaz 2003:49
Akiya				a-gi/ki-a	ag=i=ya	He/She came up	Gwaltney 1977:23
Akkuzzi	f			a-ku-za			Gustavs 1936- 1937:14
Akuya	f		2	a-gu/ku-a(-a) / a-gu-ú-a			Gwaltney 1977:23 / Michel 1987:56
Aniš-ħurpi				an-ni-iš-ħu-ur-bi	an=i=ž-ħo/urvi	May Ĥurpi be the Joy!	Laroche 1966:346
Aniš-Kepel				a-ni-iš-ki-be-el	an=i=ž-kibel(i)	May Kepali be the joy!	FAOSB 4, 370:33
Anum-ħirpi				a-nu-um-ħi-ir-bi	an=o=m-ħirpi	ħurpi pleased him	Balkan 1957:6, l.1
Ara-wurħe				a-ra-wu-ur-ħe			Gustavs 1936- 1937:148
Aranap-šu		?		a-ra-na-áp-šu	aran=a=b-šu?		Garelli 1963:155
Arašših-atal				a-ra-ši-ħa-tal	Aražig-adal	The Tigris is strong	Dercksen 1996:163
Ari-šarri				a-ri-LUGAL	ar=i-šarri	Godking, give him!	Dercksen 1996:163
Arinni				a-ri-ni	ar=i=nni	Give (him)!	Gustavs 1936- 1937:148
Ariya				a-ri-ia	ar=i=ya	He/She gave (him)	Laroche 1966:38 Nr. 120.1

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Aštu				áš-tù	aštu	Woman	Garelli 1963:155
Atal-šarri				a-tal-LUGAL	adal-šarri	The Strond is the godking	Veenhof 2008:18
Atalli				a-ta-li	adal=(n)i	The Strong	Balkan 1974:36
Atana				a-da-na			Donbaz 2006:275
Ataya				a-ta-ia	ad=a=ya		Kryszat 2008:172
Attue				a-tu(-e)	att(e)=ve / atto/u=(v)e	That (new-born?) of the woman	Kryszat 2008:168
Attukki				a-tù-ki	attukki	Young woman	Donbaz 2006:275
Awala	f			a-WA-a-lá			Zehnder 2010:135
Azzu	f			a-zu(-e)	azz(e)/azzo/u=ve	That (new-born?) of the woman	Laroche 1966:50 Nr. 219
Azzukkanni	f			a-zù-ka-ni-in	azzukkanni	She is like a young woman	Sturm 2000:496
Eḫli-Addu				eḫ-li-a-du	eḡl=i-Addu	Addu, save (him)!	Hecker 2008:103
Eniš-arim				e-ni-iš-a-ri-im	eni=ž-ar=i=m(b!)	The god gave (him)	Donbaz 1988:7
Eniš-arum				e-ni-iš-a-ru-um / e-ni-iš-a-ru-(um!)	eni=ž-ar=o=m	The god gave him	Garelli 1963:156 / Fs. Matous Bd. II S. 292 LB 1218:4
Erati				e-ra-dí	eradi	Bird	Gwaltney 1977:35
Eririya				e-ri-ri-a	erir=i=ya	He/She gave (him)	Gustavs 1936- 1937:147

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ewri			3	e-wi-ir-ì / e-wa-ri-a / e-ew-ri	evri	The Lord	Garelli 1963:155 / VS 26, 54:8
Ewri-atal				ew-ri-a-tal	evri-adal	The Lord is strong	Garelli 1963:155
Ewri-karim				e-wa-ri-ga-ri-im	evri-kar=i=m(b!)	The lord defetead (the enemy)	Garelli 1963:156
Ewri-muša				ew!-ri-mu-ša	evri-muž(i)=a	The lord is the righteous	Garelli 1963:156
Ewrim-adal			2	Eb-ri-ma-da-al / E-wa-ri-ma-da-al	evri=m-adal	The Lord is strong	Balkan 1965:148, fn 1
Ĥaluli				ĥa-lu-li	ĥaluli	Wine/grape	Laroche 1966:56 Nr. 260 / Gwaltney 1977:36
Ĥamar				ĥa-am-ar			Donbaz 2006:275
Ĥapiya				ĥa-bi-a	ĥap=i=ya		Gustavs 1936-1937:147
Ĥar(i)p-atal				ĥa-ar-pá-tal	ĥar=(i)=b-adal / ĥar(a)b-adal		Yakubovich 2009:210
Ĥaruĥul				ĥa-ru-ĥu-ul/ur			Laroche 1966:62, Nr. 314
Ĥašim-Nawar				ĥa-ší-im-na-wa-ar	ĥaž=i=m(b!)-Navar	Nawar listened	Bilgiç 1945-1951:27
Ĥašim-Nawarna				ĥa-ší-im-na-wa-ar-na	ĥaž=i=m(b!)navar(i)=na	That from Nawar listened?	FAOSB 2, 29:9
Ĥašip-Te(š)šup				ĥa-ši-ip(!)-te-šu-up	ĥaž=i=b-Teššob	Teššup listened	Michel 2010:72
Ĥuĥum-(a)tal				ĥu-ĥu-me-tal	ĥo/uğ=o=m-(a)dal		Michel 1991:Nr 236:2
Ĥupitam			2	ĥu-bi ₄ -tá-am	ĥo/ubid(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a bull-calf	Garelli 1963:156 / Gwaltney 1977:36

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ḥupitum			2	ḥu-bi-tum	ḥo/ubid(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a calf	AKT III 87:36, 40 / VS 26, 32:18
Ḥutiya				ḥu-tí-ia	ḥo/ud=i=ya	He/She blessed (him)	Kryszat 2008:176
Ḥuzira	f			ḥu-zu-ra			Laroche 1966:75 Nr. 423 / Zehnder 2010:167
Ḥuziri				ḥu-zi-ri			Matouš 1974:198
Iri-šeni				i-ri-še-en-ni	ir=i=(b)-šen(a)=ni	Brother, endow (him)!	Lewy 1928:968
Kakki				ga-ki-i	kakk=i		Garelli 1963:156
Kakkiya				ga-gi-a	kakk=i=ya		Gustavs 1936-1937:147
Kalia				?	kal=i=ya		Kryszat 2008:177
Kani				kà-ni			Garelli 1963:156
Kapziya		?		qá-ap-zi-a	kapž=i=ya?		Garelli 1963:156
Karakkuna				kà-ra-ku-na	kar=a=kk=o=n(n)a		Donbaz 2006:275
Keliya				ke-li-a	kel=i=ya	He/She made (him) healthy/happy	Garelli 1963:156
Kiki				ki-ki(-i)	kig=i	Let the third (number three) be here!	Laroche 1966:92 Nr. 569.1
Kipal				ki-ba-al			KKSK 825:2
Kipsim				ki-ip-si-im			Gustavs 1936-1937:149

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kukku				ku-ku-WA / ku-ku-ú	ko/ukk=o		FAOSB 4, 191:15 / Laroche 1966:96 Nr. 603.1
Kuliya				ku-li-a	ko/ul=i=ya		Laroche 1966:97 Nr. 612
Kulziya	f			ku-ul-zi-a	ko/ulž(?)=i=ya		Garelli 1963:144
Kupe-atal				ku-be-a-tal	ko/ub=i-adal		Donbaz 1993:139
Kupin-atal				ku-bi-na-tal	Kubi=n(na)-adal	Kubi is strong	Balkan 1965:148, fn. 1
Kupiya				ku-bi-a	ko/ub=(i)=ya		Gustavs 1936-1937:147
Kutukkatil				ku-du-qá-ti-il ₅	kud=o=k(k)=a(o!)=dil(la)	We did not fall	Donbaz 2006:275
Kuz-kuzim				ku-úz-ku-zi-im			Laroche 1966:103 Nr. 672
Kuzari				ku-za-ri	koz(?)=ar=i		Garelli 1963:157
Kuziya				ku-zi-a	koz(?)=i=ya		Deller 1958:191
Kuzu				ku-zu			Gustavs 1936-1937:149
Kuzuzarim				ku-zu-za-ri-im			Donbaz 1989:87
Luzena				lu-zi-na	lo/uz=i=n(n)a		Gwaltney 1983 Nr. 4:38; 37
Meme-ewri			2	me-me-ib-ri / me-me-bi-ir	meme-evri	<i>Meme</i> is the lord	Garelli 1963:157 / Laroche 1966:118 Nr. 800
Menna				me-en-na		Sibling	Garelli 1963:157

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Muš-menni				[mu-u]š-me-ni	muž-men(a)=ni	The righteous is the sibling	ICK I 152:20; ICK II 46:2
Mušue		?		mu-šu-a(e!)	mužu=(v)e	From the righteous?	Garelli 1963:157
Muza		?		mu-za(-a)			Zehnder 2010:227
Nanip				na-ni-ip	nan=i=b	(He/She) struck down?	Gwaltney 1977:46
Nanip-adal				na-ni-ba/pa-tal	nan=i=b-adal	The strong struck down	Donbaz 2006:275
Nanip-šar(ri)				na-ni-pì-šar ₅	nan=i=b-šarri	The godking struck down	Garelli 1963:157
Nanip-šarri			2	na-ni-ip-LUGAL	nan=i=b-šarri	The godking struck down	Garelli 1963:157
Naniya				na-ni-ia	nan=i=ya	He/She struck down	Laroche 1966:127 Nr. 862.3-4
Nap-atal				na-pá-tal			Garelli 1963:157
Natu-(a)tal				na-du-ta-al	nad=o=-(a)dal		Balkan 1965:148
Nupa-nani				nu-ba-na-ni			Lewy 1928:968
Nupar-šarim				nu-ba-ar-ša-ri-im	no/ubar-šarri		Dercksen 1996:163
Pala-šeni				pá-al-šé-e-ni	pal=a=∅-šen(a)=(ni)		ATHE 48:19
Paliya				pá-li-a	pal=i=ya	He/She knew?	Garelli 1963:157
Papan-taḫe				pá-pá-an-ta-aḫ-e	paba=n(na)-taḫe	The mountain is the man	Larsen 2002:167, 39

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Paz(i)ya				ba-zi-a	faž=i=ya	He/She brought (him) in	Gustavs 1936-1937:147
Pirati				be/bi-ra-ti	p/wiradi	Foreign guest	Michel 2010:72
Puliya				pu-li-a	po/ul=i=ya		Laroche 1966:149 Nr. 1045
Purame				pu-ra-me-e	purame	Slave	Donbaz 2001:107
Puzi				pu-zi	po/uz=i		AKT I Nr. 77:25
Puziya				pu-zi-a	po/uz=(i)=ya		Gustavs 1936-1937:147
Šatiya	f			ša-tí-a	šad=i=ya	He/She gave (him) back	Deller 1958:193
Šazua	f			ša-zu-a			AKT III 110:21, 30
Šim(i)gem-adal			2	ší-im-ge-ma-tal /ší-ig-ma-tal	Šimige=m-adal	Šimiga is strong	Wilhelm 2008:183
Šim(i)gim-Addu			2	ší-im-ki-ma-du / ší-im-ki-ma-dim	šimigi=m-Addu	The sun is Addu	Wilhelm 2008:183
Šuḥurpiya				šu-ḥu-ur-pí-a	šuḡr?		Garelli 1963:157
Taḥa				ta-ḥa(-a)	tag(e)=a	He is like a man	Laroche 1966:169 Nr. 1201
Taki				ta-ki-e	tagi	Good	Gustavs 1936-1937:147 / Garelli 1963:157
Taki-ki			2	ta-ki-ki	tag=i-ki(aže)	Sea, make (him) good!	Donbaz 2001:113, fn. 15; 2008:48
Takilukku				ta-ki-lu-ku	tag=il=o=kk=o		ICK II 310:x+12

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Takip-šarri				ta-ki-ip-LUGAL-ri	tak=i=b-šarri	The godking made (him) good	Laroche 1966:170 Nr. 1208
Takip-šarri				da-ki-ip-ša-r[i]	tak=i=b-šarri	The godking made (him) good	Michel 2010:76
Takni-šarri				[D]a-ak-ni-ša-ri	tagn=i=šarri?		Michel 2010:76
Taliya				ta-li-a	tal=i=ya		KKSK 541:3
Tamariya				ta-[a]m-r[i-a]	tarm=ar=i=(ya)?	He/She made (him) drink?	KKSK 534:7
Tarmana				tár-ma-na			Garelli 1963:157 / Dercksen 2008:90
Tetiya			2	tí-tí-a	ted=i=ya		Garelli 1963:157; Laroche 1966:186 Nr. 1342.1
Tili-nari				tí-li-na-ri			Garelli 1963:157
Tatikkanna				Ta-ti-ig-ga-an-na	Tad=i=kk=i>a=nna	He/She did not love (him)	Laroche 1966:181 Nr. 1306
Titin-atal				tí-tí-na-tal	tidi=n(na)-adal	Tidi? is strong	Garelli 1963:157
Tiwara				tí-wa-ra-a			Donbaz 2006:276
Tuḥniš				du-ùḥ-ni-iš	to/uḡn=i=š		Laroche 1966:187 Nr. 1358
Tuḥuš-mati				du-ḥu-uš-ma-ti	to/ug=o=š-madi		Hecker 1996:294, l. 12
Tuliya				tù-lí-a	to/ul=i=ya		KUG 6:16; 27:39, 40
Tuniya				du-ni-a	to/un=i=ya	He/She sat him down	Laroche 1966:189 Nr. 1375

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tura				tù-ra-a	to/ur=a		Donbaz 2006:276
Turup-ani				tù-ru-pá-ni	to/ur=o=b(m!)-ani	The joy brought him (?)	Laroche 1966:190 Nr. 1383 / Kryszat 2008:162
Tuša				tù-ša	to/už=a		Hecker 2008:103
Tutiki				du-dí-ki	to/udiǵ(i)=i		Deller 1958:187
Uki				ú-ki/ku	o/ug=i/u		Donbaz 2006:276
Ukup-turuš				ú-ku-up-tù-ru-uš	o/ug=o=b(m!)- tur(i)=už		AKT III Nr. 1:5
Ukuriri				ú-ku-ri-ri			KKSK 429:43
Unap-še				ú-na-áp-še	un=a=b-še	The brother came	Hecker 1996:294, l. 1 / Veenhof 2008:12
Unap-šenni				ú-na-áp-šé-ni	un=a=b-šen(a)=n(i)	The brother came	Donbaz 2001:107
Ušhanyiya				uš-ḥa-ni-a			Fs. Larsen S. 180 Kt n/k 27:19
Ušhu-eni				uš-ḥu-e-ni	o/ušḥ=o=∅-eni or o/ušḥ=o=-eni	The godking bestowed (him) / Godking, bestow (him)!	Fs. Oelsner S. 299 Nr. 4:20
Ušše				ú-šé-e	ušš=e	Go!	Michel2010:78-80
Zakuya				za-gu-a	zag=o=ya		Deller 1958:195
Zike				zi-ki	zig=i		Donbaz 2006:276 / Kryszat 2008:186
Ziliya				zi-li-a	zil=(i)=ya		Gustavs 1936- 1937:148

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Zuzu				zu-zu			Matous 1986:146
Zuzua				zu-zu-a			Gustavs 1936-1937:148
Zuzzuni		?		zu-zu-li		<i>Zuzzunni</i> -animal?	Laroche 1966:215 Nr. 1590.2.5

Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Alalaḫ VII

The appearance of Alalaḫ in the historical records of the ANE occurs during the height of the Old Babylonian period, particularly when Zimri-Lim controlled Mari, and when the city was part of the kingdom of Yamḫad with its capital in Ḫalab. However, the city of Alalaḫ was probably founded early in the Middle Bronze age, later becoming the capital of the region called Mukiš.¹

The connection between Alalaḫ and the Hurrians goes back, at least, to the time of Hammurabi of Babylon (1792-1750). However, the presence of Hurrianized toponyms in the texts from the level VII might indicate that Hurrians were dwelling in the region for a long time before they appeared in the written sources.²

The Hurrian PNs from Alalaḫ VII, which corresponds to the seventeenth century (late Middle Bronze Age) when the city was under the dominion of the Kingdom of Yamḫad, were retrieved from documents which consisted, mainly, of ration lists, contracts, legal deeds, letters and list of individuals.³ These texts reflect a considerable presence of Hurrian population, at least from an onomastic point view. According to Draffkorn,⁴ nearly 38 percent of the individuals attested in the texts bear Hurrian names. However, this amount should be reviewed and confronted in a new and encompassing work of the entire onomasticon from Alalaḫ since the latter has committed several philological imprecisions and did not have the complete epigraphic material at her disposal.⁵

The fate of the Hurrians in Alalaḫ did not vanish when Ḫattušili I destroyed the city in the

¹ Von Dassow 2008: 12.

² Astour 1977: 128-130, 1978: 10-11.

³ Draffkorn 1959: 6-7.

⁴ Draffkorn 1959: 118.

⁵ Von Dassow 2008: 73, part. fn. 178.

early sixteenth century.⁶ In contrast, during the successive history of Alalah, particularly during the level IV (fifteenth century), Hurrians became the most prominent socio-cultural group of the society, a fact that was revealed by the high number of individuals (not necessarily from Hurrian origin) who bore Hurrian PNs.⁷

§ Nature of Hurrian Personal Names in the Alalah Texts

The Hurrian PNs retrieved from the tablets of Alalah VII (ca. 400 names) were not limited to any social class or particular group but were distributed among the entire society.⁸ We find individuals that appertain to the royalty, palace officials, priests, landholders, scribes, mayors, judges, military chiefs or craftsman officers, as well as palace workers, agricultural workers, bakers, and soldiers, among others.⁹ Therefore, as Astour pointed out, “il n’y avait aucune relation entre la position sociale d’un individu et l’affiliation linguistique de son nom.”¹⁰

A second aspect, particularly relevant for the present work, is the significant amount of theophorous lay out in the names (except for those appertaining to minor/local deities), which turns the Hurrian onomastics from Alalah in the most theophoric one of the first half of the second millennium.

§ Kinship

The kinship names do not display any particular characteristic, although they represent a relatively minor group in the overall onomastics. Names with the figure of the ‘sister’,¹¹ ‘sibling’,¹² and ‘brother’¹³ are well attested. It also appears, as in the case of Šubat-Enlil or

⁶ Von Dassow 2008: 5-6, part. fn.7. See, particularly, the autobiographical annals from Ḫattušili I.

⁷ Von Dassow 2008: 71-ff.

⁸ Von Dassow 2008: 74.

⁹ Draffkorn 1959: 119.

¹⁰ Astour 1978: 11.

¹¹ Ḫašup-elli.

¹² Menni; Mur-meni; Ninu-meni; Nu-menni; Taḫšu-meni.

¹³ Ašmu-šenni; Šennakka; Šennakki; Šenni; Aup-še; Šarrup-še; Šarrup-šenni.

Ebla, the Amorite name for the figure of the paternal-uncle in hybrid Hurrian names.¹⁴

§ Theophoric Elements in Personal Names

The theophorous names are probably the hallmark of the Hurrian onomastic from Alalah VII. They represent not only quantity (ca. 64 individuals bore theophorous names) but also quality since they reproduce the structure of the Hurrian pantheon at its upper level.

§ Primary and Secondary Deities

The Hurrian PNs from Alalah reproduce all the deities from the Pan-Hurrian pantheon. The sun-god Šimiga,¹⁵ the moon-god Kušuḫ¹⁶ and the storm-god Teššup¹⁷ appear as theophorous in the names, being the latter the most attested.

In connection with the figure of the storm-god, we have a group of hybrid names, so far the largest in the entire Hurrian onomastic from the first half of the second millennium, bearing the west-Semitic god *Addu* as distinctive theophorous.¹⁸ This type of name is also attested in Mari,¹⁹ Šubat-Enlil²⁰ and Šušarra²¹ though in a much lower quantity. However, the issue here is to understand the socio-cultural and religious connotations behind this type of name. Was it a hybrid name from the Semitic or Hurrian perspective, or from both?²² If for one moment we could attach names and population, it would be logical to think that Hurrians added the figure of the west-Semitic god as part of a process of cultural hybridisation and religious homologation with its own storm-god. They could have seen similar attributes between Teššup

¹⁴ Pent(i)-‘Ammu (4); Talma-‘Ammu (2).

¹⁵ Zilliš-Šimiga.

¹⁶ Kušuḫ-atal (3).

¹⁷ Ari-Teššup; Arip-Teššup; Inni-Teššup; Ewrit-Te(ššup) (2); Teššub-kuni.

¹⁸ Eḫli-*Addu*; Eḫlim-*Addu*; Ewri-*Addu*; Iri-*Addu* (2); Irip-*Addu*; Niwar-*Addu*; Penti-*Addu* (4); Taki-*Addu*; Tunip-*Addu*; Uḫlap-*Addu*; Wiri-*Addu*.

¹⁹ Ewri-*Addu*, which belonged to a slave, most probably a prisoner of war, and Mati-*Addu*.

²⁰ Takir-*Addu*.

²¹ ^fArtim-*Addu*.

²² It could also be argued that people from diverse origins were compelled to adopt hybrid names to blend in a society whose majorities appertain to Semitic and Hurrian groups. However, a process of this nature is less likely given the complexity that PNs had for the ancient populations.

and *Addu*, which in a mostly semitised-amoritised background would seem feasible. The shreds of evidences in the texts have proven a broad diffusion of the cult of Addu which covered extensive areas from northern Syria (Ḥalab, Kallasu, Alalaḥ) to northern Mesopotamia (Šeḥna, Kaḥat, Nagar, Andarik, Terqa, or Mari).²³ Though the onomastic proofs point to Alalaḥ (or the Kingdom of Yamḥad and its surroundings) as the place where this onomastic hybridisation probably took place, (although the texts of L. VII belong to a slightly later period than those from Šubat-Enlil or Mari).²⁴ Therefore, the incorporation of *Addu* as a theophorous element in the Hurrian onomastics is a clear demonstration that the figure of the storm-god not only had a leading role inside the pantheon but also that Hurrians had been influenced by external groups (Amorites/West-Semites) in their religious conceptions.

Another interesting feature of the Hurrian names from Alalaḥ is that they are the only ones who mention, syllabically, the deity Šawuška²⁵ (apart from the names of the third millennium). This is, so far, the only archive from the first part of the second millennium that has revealed the presence of this deity in the onomastics, despite having seen in Mari, Ašnakkum, Tigonāni or Chagar Bazar the logogram for Ištar (IŠ₈-TÁR). Thus, we may wonder if this logogram was in fact related to Šawuška or mostly to Išḥara (see below) or the actual Ištar, because the onomastics from Alalaḥ also reveal the name Ištar-wanni (IŠ₈-TÁR-ba-an-ni) which could also be interpreted as Išḥara-wanni or Šawuška-wanni. In this sense, we also encounter theophorous for Išḥara in both logographic and syllabic forms.²⁶

Related to the previous groups, we have a hybrid name (Semitic-Hurrian), written in syllabic, which corresponds to the proper deity Ištar.²⁷ This name might have followed a similar pattern to those bearing *Addu* since the figure of Ištar was represented through the

²³ Schwemer 2007: 155.

²⁴ Zeeb 1991.

²⁵ Arip-Šawuška (3); Wanti-Šauška (3).

²⁶ Anti-Išḥara; Eḥli-Išḥara (2); Eḥli-Išḥara (2) (eḥ-li-^dIŠDAR); Enni-Išḥara (en-ni-^dIŠDAR); Ewri-^dIšḥara; Ewri-Išḥara; Nuwašši-Išḥara; Panti-Išḥara <wa>-an-di-IŠTÁR (U.DAR); Panti-Išḥara; Taki-Išḥara; Tupki-Išḥara; Wanti-Išḥara (3); Išḥara-terra (IŠDAR-te-ir-ra).

²⁷ Taki-Ištar.

goddess Šawuška in the Hurrian world.

Lastly, from the group of secondary deities we have the presence of Kubaba,²⁸ Ḫebat²⁹ and, for the first time in the entire onomasticon, the Hurrian war-related-goddess Aštabi.³⁰

§ Minor Deities

A very interesting fact is the complete absence of minor or local deities among the Hurrian names from Alalaḫ. Given the nature of this onomasticon, we could have expected to find a wide and extended variety of these. However, at least from the current knowledge of the Hurrian onomastics, we were not able to identify any of them.

§ Divinised Entities

The divinised entities appeared to suffer a similar situation to that of the minor deities. We only have the mentioning of the figures of Nawar,³¹ the sea³² and the mountain,³³ and for only one individual each.

§ Common Theophoric Elements

Unlike the divinised entities and minor deities, the common theophoric elements are well spread (in quantity and variety) throughout the onomastics. Among them, we encounter ‘šarri’,³⁴ ‘talmi’,³⁵ ‘eni’,³⁶ ‘ewri’,³⁷ ‘kešḫe’,³⁸ ‘mušni’³⁹ and ‘atal’ which, surprisingly, appears

²⁸ fAlli-Kubaba.

²⁹ Ḫebat-šeḫirni.

³⁰ Aštabi-šarra (5).

³¹ Nawar-atal; Nawar-šarri.

³² Nuni-kiaše.

³³ Papanni.

³⁴ Araš-šarri; Eḫlum-šarri; Ewri-šarri; Muš-šarri; Nupar-šarri; Nupar-šarri; Šatun-šarri; Šatup-šarri; Šenien-šarri; Tatmi-šarru; Nawar-šarri.

³⁵ Ayapi-talma; Ewri-talma; Mulun-talame; Muš-talma.

³⁶ Akkul-enna; Eḫlum-eni; Eni-muša; Enni-Išḫara; Išme-eni; Mušum-eni; Tuppi-enni.

³⁷ Ewrani; Ewri-Addu; Ewri-ḫawuwe; Ewri-Išḫara; Ewri-kipa; Ewri-ma; Ewri-muša; Ewri-naḫi; Ewri-tuppa; Ewri-uzzi; Wanti-ewri.

³⁸ Kešḫe-[...] .

³⁹ Pentam-mušuni.

only three times.⁴⁰

The inexistent or low percentage of minor deities and divinised entities makes us think if the fashion of bestowing theophorous names could have been in detriment towards the rest of the theophoric elements. However, a large quantity of gods are well-represented in the PNs making Alalah, together with Mari, the best examples for the reflection of the Hurrian pantheon in the onomastic material.

⁴⁰ Kušuḫ-atal; Nawar-atal; Pent-adal.

List of Hurrian Personal Names in the Texts from Alalah VII

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Aḥ-muša				aḥ-mu-ša	aḡ-muža		AIT 268
Aḥ-mušan				aḥ-mu-ša-an	aḡ-muža=n(i)		AIT 239:7
Aḥiya				a-ḥi-ia	aḡ=i=ya	He/She came up	Oliva 2005:16
Akam-Tuya		?		a-gam(?) -du(?) -ya(?)	ag=a=m-Tuya?		Draffkorn 1959:127
Akar-ki-pa		?		a-gàr-ki-ba	ak=ar-kiba		Kienast 1980:53
Aki(p)-ḥiše				a-ki-ḥi-še(?)	ag=i=b-ḥiše?	ḥiše brought (him) up	Draffkorn 1959:128
Akkan				a-ka-an	akk=a=ān		Draffkorn 1959:20
Akkat-mati	f			ak-ka-at-ma-ti	akk=ad-madi	Mati? brought (him) up	AIT 409
Akki				ak-ki	akk=i	Bring (him) up!	Draffkorn 1959:22
Akkul-enna			3	ak-ku-ul-e-na / ak-kul-DINGIR.MEŠ	akk=o=l-en(i)=na		Draffkorn 1959:22; Zeeb 1992:414
Alli-Kubaba	f			al-li-ku-pa-pa	alli-Kubaba	The Lady is Kubaba	AIT 178:3
Alli-turaḥḥe	f			al-li-tu-ra-ḥi	alli-turaḥḥe	The lady is manly	AIT 178
Ammakku		?		am-ma-ak-ku			Draffkorn 1959:22
Ammarikki				am-ma-ri-ik-ki/am-ma-ri-ik-e	amm=ar=i=kk=i		Draffkorn 1959:128; Zeeb 2001:642.
Anamu		?		a-na-mu			Draffkorn 1959:22

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ananu-meni-anat		?		a-na-nu-me-ni-a-na-at			Draffkorn 1959:22
Aniya				a-ni-ia-e	an=i=ya		Draffkorn 1959:22
Anti-Išḫara				an-di-IŠDAR	and=i-Išḫara		Draffkorn 1959:130
Apriya				ab-ri-ya			Draffkorn 1959:20
Aram-muzuni				a-ra-am-mu-su-ni	ar=a=m-mužuni		Draffkorn 1959:23
Aram-ra			3	a-ra-am-ma-ra	ar=a=m-Ra		Draffkorn 1959:23
Araš-šarri				a-ra-aš-šar-ri	ar=a=ž-šarri		Draffkorn 1959:131
Ari-Teššup				a-ri- ^d IM	ar=i-Teššob	Teššup, give (him)!	Draffkorn 1959:24
Ari[...]				a-ri-X-[...]	ar=i=[...]		Draffkorn 1959:23
Arim-mu				a-ri-im-mu	ar=i=m(b!)-mu	The righteous gave (him)	Draffkorn 1959:24
Arip-[...]				a-ri-ip-[...]	ar=i=b-[...]		Draffkorn 1959:23
Arip-Šawuška			3	a-ri-ib-ša-uš-ka / a-ri-ib-ša-[uš-ka]	ar=i=b-Šavoška	Šawuška gave (him)	Draffkorn 1959:24; Oliva 2005:16
Arip-Teššup				a-ri-ib-te-eš-šu-bi	ar=i=b-Teššob	Teššup gave (him)	Draffkorn 1959:24
Ariš-nupar			2	a-ri-iš-lu-bar / a-ri-iš-nu-bar	ar=i=ž-no/upar	May Nupar give (him)!	Draffkorn 1959:25
Ariya			2	a-ri-ia	ar=i=ya	He/She gave (him)	Draffkom 1959:24: Zeeb 2001:643

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ariyan				a-ri-ya-an	ar=i=ya=an		Draffkorn 1959:25
Arun-napara				a-ru-un-na-pa-ra	ar=o=n(m!)-Napara?	Napara gave him	Draffkorn 1959:25
Arunti				a-ru-un-di	arundi		Draffkorn 1959:25
Aruriya				a-ru-ri-ia	ar=o/ur=i=ya	He/She gave (him)	AIT 206
Ašmu-šenni				aš-m[u]-še-en-ni	ažm=o-šen(a)=ni		Draffkorn 1959:26
Aštabi-šarra			5	aš-ta-bi-LUGAL / aš-ta-bi-LUGAL-ra	Aštabi-šarri	Aštabi is the godking	Draffkorn 1959:25; Oliva 2005:10
Ataiš-Nupar				a-da-iš-lu-bar	ada=i=ž-Nupar		Zeeb 1993:452
Atar-Kupiya		?		a-tar-ku!-bi-a	ad=ar-kupiya		Oliva 2005:10
Attiyān				at-ti-ia-an	att=i=ya=an		AIT 261:14
Aup-še				a-ub-še			Draffkorn 1959:26
Awaruš-kienni				a-wa-ru-uš-ki-en-ni	avar=o=ž-kien=ni		Draffkorn 1959:131
Ayapi-Talma				a-ia-bi-ta-al-ma			AIT 239
Eḫ-muša			2	eḫ-mu-ša	eḡ-muža		Draffkorn 1959:29
Eḫ-mušan				eḫ-mu-ša-an	eḡ-muža=an		Draffkorn 1959:29
Eḫelta				e-ḫe-el-da			Draffkorn 1959:27

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Eḫelu				e-ḫi-lu	eḡl=o		Draffkorn 1959:27
Eḫeya				e-eḫ-e-ya	eḡl=i=ya		Draffkorn 1959:27
Eḫli-Addu		H/S	8	eḫ-li-a-du	eḡl=i-Addu	Addu, save (him)!	Draffkorn 1959:27; Oliva 2000:62; Oliva 2005:10
Eḫli-Aštar		H/S		eḫ-li-aš-tar	eḡl=i-Aštar	Aštar, save (him)!	Draffkorn 1959:27
Eḫli-ešta?		H/S		eḫ-li-[eš]ʔ-ta	eḡl=i-Ešta	Ešta, save (him)!	Zeeb 1992:411
Eḫli-Išḫara			2	eḫ-li- ^d IŠDAR	eḡl=i-Išḫara	Išḫara, save (him)!	Draffkorn 1959:28
Eḫli-Išḫara			2	eḫ-li-iš-ḫa-ra / eḫ-li- ^d iš-ḫa-ra	eḡl=i-Išḫara	Išḫara, save (him)!	Draffkorn 1959:28
Eḫlikku				eḫ-li-ik-ku	eḡl=i=kk=o/u	He/She did not save (him)	Draffkorn 1959:28
Eḫlim-Addu		H/S		eḫ-lim-a-du	eḡl=i=m(b!)-Addu	Addu saved (him)	Draffkorn 1959:27
Eḫlu- [...]				eḫ-lu-[X X]	eḡl=o[...]		Draffkorn 1959:29
Eḫlu-we				eḫ-lu-we	eḡl=o=m-ve		Draffkorn 1959:29
Eḫlum-eni			2	eḫ-lu-me-ni	eḡl=o=m-eni(a)	The god saved him	Draffkorn 1959:29; Kienast 1980:61
Eḫlum-mata				eḫ-lum-ma-ta	eḡl=o=m-Mata	Mata saved him	Draffkorn 1959:29
Eḫlum-šarri				eḫ-lu-up-LUGAL-ri	eḡl=o=b(m!)-šarri	The godking saved him	AIT 176
Elli				e-el-li	ell=i	Sister	Draffkorn 1959:30

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Eni				e-ni	eni=(na)	God	Draffkorn 1959:30
Eni-muša				e-ni-mu-ša	en(i)=i-muž=a	The god is righteous	Draffkorn 1959:30
Enni-Išhara				en-ni- ^d IŠDAR	enn=i-Išhara	The god is Išhara	Draffkorn 1959:30
Ewiya				e-wi-ya	ev=i=ya		Draffkorn 1959:31
Ewrani	f			ew-ra-a-ni		The lord	Draffkorn 1959:61
Ewri-Addu		H/S		ir-wi-ri-a-du	evri-Addu	The Lord is Addu	Draffkorn 1959:36
Ewri- ^d Išhara				ib-ri- ^d iš-ḥa-ra	evri-Išhara	The Lord is Išhara	Draffkorn 1959:31
Ewri-ḥawuwe				e-wa-ri-ḥa-ú-we	evri-ḥavu=ve	The Lord is from Ḥawu?	Draffkorn 1959:30
Ewri-kipa			11	e-wa-ri-ki-ba / ew-ri-ki-ba	evri-kib(i)=a	The Lord is Kipa	Draffkorn 1959:30, 61 / Oliva 2005:11
Ewri-ma				e-wa-ri-ma	evri-ma	The Lord is Ma?	Draffkorn 1959:30
Ewri-muša			4	e-wi-ir-mu-ša / wa-ri-mu-za	evri-muž=a	The Lord is righteous	Draffkorn 1959:31, 62
Ewri-naḥi				e-pa-ar-na-ḥi	evri-naḥi	The Lord is Naḥi	Draffkorn 1959:30
Ewri-šarri				ew-ri-LUGAL	evri-šarri	The Lord is the godking	Draffkorn 1959:62
Ewri-talma			2	ew-ri-dal-ma	evri-talma	The Lord is big	Draffkorn 1959:61
Ewri-tuppa				ew-ri-dub-ba	evri-do/upp=a		Draffkorn 1959:61

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ewri-uzzi				ew-ru-uz-zi	evri-uzz=i		Oliva 2005:4
Ewrit-Te			2	wa-ri-it-te	evri=t(m!)-Te(ššup)	Teššup is the lord	Draffkorn 1959:62
Ewruza				ew-ru-za			Draffkorn 1959:62
Ĥaruĥulla				ĥa-ru-ĥu-ul-la	ĥaruĥle		Draffkorn 1959:32
Ĥaše-[...]				ĥa-še-[X X]			Draffkorn 1959:32
Ĥašip-ta				ĥa-ši-ib-ta	ĥaž=i=b-ta	Ta? Listened	Draffkorn 1959:32
Ĥašiya				ĥa-ši-ya	ĥaž=i=ya	He/She listened (him)	Draffkorn 1959:32
Ĥaššu				ĥa-aš-šu	ĥašš=u		Draffkorn 1959:32
Ĥašup-elli				ĥa-šu-ub-e-li	ĥaž=o=b(m!)-el(a)=ni	The sister listened him	Draffkorn 1959:33
Ĥebat-šeĥirni				^d ĥe-bat-še!-ĥi-ir-ni	Ĥebat-seġirni	Ĥebat is the fate	Kienast 1980:53
Ĥerše			3	ĥe-er-še	ĥerž=i		Draffkorn 1959:33
Ĥeršu				ĥe-er-šu	ĥerž=o		Draffkorn 1959:33
Ĥeršulla				ĥe-er-šu-ul-la	ĥerž=o-ulla?		AIT 43
Ĥezam-muĥuli				ĥe-za-am-mu-ĥu-li			Draffkorn 1959:33
Ĥišša				ĥi-iš-ša	ĥišš(i)=a		Draffkorn 1959:34

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Hišulaši				hi-šu-la-a-ši			Draffkorn 1959:132
Hupammu				hu-ba-am-mu	ho/ubamm?		Draffkorn 1959:34
Hupampi				hu-ba-am-bi			Draffkorn 1959:34
Hupuš-Teka				hu-pu-uš-te-ka	ho/up=o=ž-teka		AIT 268
Huten	f			hu-te-en	ho/udi=(a)=n(na)	She is like a prayer	AIT 178
Ikuwa				i-ku-wa			Draffkorn 1959:132
Immeni				im-me-ni			Draffkorn 1959:132
Inni-Teššup				in-ni- ^d IM	inn=i-Teššob		Draffkorn 1959:35
Innu-tupka				ʽIN(?) ¹ -nu(?) ¹ -TUP-ka			Draffkorn 1959:133
Iri-Addu		H/S	2	i-ri-a-du	ir=i-Addu		Draffkorn 1959:35
Irip-Addu		H/S		i-ri-ba-du	ir=i=b-Addu		Draffkorn 1959:35
Irip?		?		i-ri-ba/ma/ku			Draffkorn 1959:133
Irša-panti				ir-ša-wa-an-di	irža-fand=i		Draffkorn 1959:36
Išhara-terra				IŠDAR-te-ir-ra			Draffkorn 1959:134
Išhara/Šawuška-wanni				IŠ ₈ -TÁR-ba-an-ni	Išhara/Šawuška-fann(i)=a		AIT 178

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Išme-eni				iš-me-e-ni	išm=i-en=(n)i		Oliva 2005:3
Kaite			2	ga-i-te			Draffkorn 1959:37
Kakka				ka-ak-ka	kakk=a=∅		Draffkorn 1959:37
Kakme				ka-ak-me			AIT 271:14
Kammuša				kam-mu-ša	Kamm=o-ša(?)		Draffkorn 1959:37
Kana-we				ka-na-we	kana=we		Draffkorn 1959:38
Kana(-)wa				ga-na-wa			Oliva 2005:16
Kaparta				ka-ba-ar-ta			Draffkorn 1959:37
Kaššina				kaš-ši-na	kaž(?)=i=nna		Draffkorn 1959:38
Kattiri				ka-ti-ri		The (name) has said	Draffkorn 1959:37
Kazira-nupše				ka-zi-ra-nu-up-ši	kažir(i)=a-no/upže?		AIT 258:30
Keli-kuni				ki-li-ku-ni	kel=i-kuni	Kuni, satisfied (him)!	Draffkorn 1959:38
Kelliya				ki-il-li-ia	kell=i=ya	He/She satisfied (him)	Draffkorn 1959:38
Keltie				ki-el-ti-e		Health	Draffkorn 1959:38
Kerazze				ke-ra-ze	kerazzi		Draffkorn 1959:39

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kezzi				ge-iz-zi	kezz=i		Draffkorn 1959:38
Kiapzi				ki-ab-zi			Draffkorn 1959:136
Kinni			2	ki-in-ni	kinn=i		Draffkorn 1959:39
Kirazi				ki-ra-zi			AIT 205
Kirra				gi-ir-ra	kirr=a		AIT 373
Kirran				ki-ir-ra-an			Draffkorn 1959:39
Kirri				ki-ir-ri	kirr=i	Free (him)!	Draffkorn 1959:39
Kišhe[...]				ki-iš-ḥe- [...]	kežge[...]		Draffkorn 1959:39
Kizzi				gi-iz-zi	kizz=i		Zeeb 1992:411
Kulla				gu-ul-la			Draffkorn 1959:40
Kumunna	f			ku-mu-un-na	ko/um=o/u=nna		AIT 43
Kumurra				ku-mu-ur-ra	ko/um=o/urr=a		Draffkorn 1959:40
Kunna				ku-un-na	ko/unn=a		AIT 141
Kunni				ku-un-ni	ko/unn=i		Kienast 1980:53
Kunzu				ku-un-zu	ko/unz=o	Bend!	AIT 243:20

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Kunzu-uḫli				ku-un-zu-uḫ-li	ko/unz=o=u/oḡli		Draffkorn 1959:40
Kunzun				ku-un-zu-un	ko/unz=o=n(na)	Bend him!	AIT 261:18
Kuraz(z)e				ku-ra-az-ze			Draffkorn 1959:41
Kurazzi				ku-úr-ra-az-zi			Draffkorn 1959:41
Kurpišan				kur-bi-ša-an	kurb=i=ž-an		Draffkorn 1959:40
Kurri				ku-úr-ri	kurr=i		Draffkorn 1959:41
Kušaya				ku-ša-ya	ko/už=a=ya		Draffkorn 1959:42
Kušue				ku-šu-e	Kožo/u=ve	From Kužu	Draffkorn 1959:42
Kušuḫ-atal			3	ku-uš-ḫa-ta-[al] / ku-ša-aḫ-a-dal	kužo/uḡ-adal	Kuzuḫ is strong	Draffkorn 1959:42
Kutie	f			ku-di-e	kud=i	Let (her) fall!	Draffkorn 1959:40
Kuwan				ku-wa-an	kuv=an		Draffkorn 1959:41
Kuwari	f			ku-wa-ri	Kuvari		AIT 178
Kuwen				ku-we-en	kuv=i=		Draffkorn 1959:41
Kuzzi			2	ku-uz-zi	kuzz=i	Keep back!	Draffkorn 1959:41
Kuzzuri				ku-uz-zu-ri	kuzzur(a)=i		Draffkorn 1959:41

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Meniya				me-ni-ia	Men=i=ya		Zeeb 1992:419
Menni				me-en-ni	men(a)=ni	Sibling	Draffkorn 1959:43
Mueta				mu-e-da			Kienast 1980:53
Mulun-talame	f			mu-lu-un-ta-la-am-e	mo/ul=o=n(m!)- talame		AIT 178:16
Mur-meni				mu-ur-me-ni	mo/ur-men(a)=ni		Draffkorn 1959:43
Murra-te		?		mu-úr-ra-te	mo/urr=a-te		Draffkorn 1959:43
Murruwe				mu-úr-ru-we	mo/urr=o-ve		Draffkorn 1959:43
Muš-muwe				mu-uš-mu-bi	muž-muve		Draffkorn 1959:44
Muš-šarri				mu-uš-LUGAL-ri	muž-šarri=(a)	The godking made (him) good	Draffkorn 1959:44
Muš-talma				mu-uš-ta-al-ma	muž-talm(i)=a	The big made (him) right	Draffkorn 1959:44
Mušum-eni				mu-šu-me-ni	muž=o=m-eni	The god made him right	Draffkorn 1959:44
Mušum-Uni				mu-šu-mu-ni	muž=o=m- <i>Uni</i>	Uni made him right	Draffkorn 1959:44
Mušuwe				mu-šu-we	muž=u-we		Draffkorn 1959:44
Mutiya				mu-ti-ia	mud=i=ya		Kienast 1980:53
Muzi				mu-zi			Zeeb 1992:414

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Nakkušše			5	na-ak-ku-uš-še	nakk=u-ušš=e		Draffkorn 1959:44
Nanakka				na-na-ak(?) -ka	nan=a=kk=a		AIT 98b
Našwe			3	na-aš-we	naž=ve		Draffkorn 1959:45
Nawar-atal				na-wa-ar-a-dal	navar-adal	Nawar is strong	Draffkorn 1959:44
Nawar-šarri				[n]a-wa-ar-LUGAL	navar-šarri	Nawar is the godking	Draffkorn 1959:44
Nikiya				ni-ki-i-ya	nik=i=ya		Draffkorn 1959:45
Ninu-meni				ni-nu-me-ni	ninu-men(a)=ni		Draffkorn 1959:45
Niwar-Addu		H/S		ni-wa-ri-a-du	Navar-Addu	Nawar is Addu	Oliva 2005:15
Nu-menni				nu-me-ni	nu-men(a)=ni		AIT 243:8
Nuni-kiaše				nu-ni-ki-a-še	nun=i-kiyaže		Draffkorn 1959:45
Nupar-kipa			2	lu-bar-ki-ba	no/upar-kib(i)=a		Draffkorn 1959:42
Nupar-šarri			2	lu-bar-LUGAL	no/upar-šarri		Draffkorn 1959:42
Nupar-šarri				nu-bar-ša-ri	no/upar-šarri		Zeeb 1992:411
Nupar-taki			2	lu-bar-ta-gi	no/upar-taggi		Draffkorn 1959:42
Nupar-wanti			2	lu-bar-wa-an-di	no/upar-fandi		Draffkorn 1959:43

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Nuparra				lu-par-ra			AIT 204 Rs. 1
Nupu			3	lu-bu / nu-bu / lu-ú-bu			Draffkorn 1959:136
Nupun				lu-bu-un			Draffkorn 1959:136
Nuwašši-lšhara				nu-wa-aš-ši- ^d lš-TÁR			Draffkorn 1959:45
Nuzzan				nu-za-an	no/uzz=a=n(na)		Draffkorn 1959:46
Paḥlikku				pa-aḥ-li-ik-ku	paḥl=i=kk=o/u		AIT 256:16
Paišena				pa-i-še-na	pa=i-šena?		Draffkorn 1959:46
Pakaya	f			pa-ga-ya	pag=a=ya		Draffkorn 1959:46
Pakki		?		pa-ak-ki			Oliva 2005:20
Palieya				ba-li-e-ya			Draffkorn 1959:138
Paliya				ba-li-ia	pal=i=ya		AIT 203
Paliyan				ba-li-ya-an	pal=i=ya=an		Draffkorn 1959:46
Panti-lšhara				<wa>-an-di-IŠTÁR (U.DAR)	fand(i)=i-lšhara	lšhara, make (him) good!	Oliva 2005:10
Panti-lšhara				wa-an-di- ^d iš-ḥa-ra	fand(i)=i-lšhara	lšhara, make (him) good!	Kienast 1980:59
Papanni				ba-bi-in-ni	paba=nni	He is a mountain	AIT 55

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Paya		?		pa-a-ya			Draffkorn 1959:46
Pent-adal				be-en-ta-dal	fend(i)=i-adal	Strong, make (him) good!	Draffkorn 1959:47
Pent(i)-'Ammu		H/S	4	bi-en-tam-mu / bé-an-tam?-mu	fend(i)=i-'ammu	Paternal-Uncle, make (him) good!	Draffkorn 1959:47 / Oliva 2005:9
Pentam-Mušuni			2	bi-en-tam-mu-šu-ni	fend(i)=a=m(b!)-mužuni	Mušuni made (him) good	Draffkorn 1959:47
Penti-...]				bi-en-ti-...]	fendi[...]		Draffkorn 1959:47
Penti-Addu		H/S	4	bi-en-di-a-du / be-in-[d]i-IŠKUR	fend(i)=i-Addu	Addu, make (him) good!	Draffkorn 1959:47 / Oliva 2000:61
Penti-eni			4	bi-en-di-li / bi-en-di-í-lí / bi-en-di-é-lí	fend(i)=i-eni	God, make (him) good!	Draffkorn 1959:48
Pentu				bi-en-du			Draffkorn 1959:48
Pirzi				bi-ir-zi			Draffkorn 1959:48
Pištaya				bi-iš-da-a-ia			Draffkorn 1959:139
Piya	f			bi-i-ya	Pi=i=ya (?)		Draffkorn 1959:139
Puriš-pappiḫu				bur-iš-pa-ab-bi-ḫu	pur=i=ž-Pappiḫu		Draffkorn 1959:139
Purra			4	pur-ra			Draffkorn 1959:48
Puttal				pu-ut-tal			Draffkorn 1959:139
Puya				pu-ú-ya			Draffkorn 1959:139

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Puzi	f			pu-(ú-)zi	Po/uz=i		Draffkorn 1959:139
Puzi-en	f			pu-zi-en	Po/uz=i-en(i)		AIT 178:7
Puzirri				pu-zi-ir-ri			Draffkorn 1959:140
Šakkum(?)				ša-ak-ku/ma-AN			Draffkorn 1959:140
Šamatiaš				ša-ma-ti-aš[-X]			Draffkorn 1959:140
Šamaya				ša-ma-ya	šam=a=ya		Draffkorn 1959:51
Šaraḥḥe				šar-r[a-ḥ]e	šaraḥḥe	Belonging to the king?	AIT 26
Šarriya				šar-ri-ya	šarr=i=ya		Draffkorn 1959:141
Šarrup-še				šar-ru-ub-še	šarr=0=b(m!)-še		Draffkorn 1959:51
Šarrup-šenni				šar-ru-ub-še-en-ni	šarr=o=b(m!)-šen(a)=ni		Draffkorn 1959:51
Šarruwe				šar-ru-we	šarru=ve	From the king?	Draffkorn 1959:51
Šatip-ḥeraš				ša-te (?) -ba-i/ḥé-ra(?) -i[š?]	šat=i=b-ḥeraš?		Draffkorn 1959:141
Šatu-ada				ša-t[u]-a- ^r da? ¹			Draffkorn 1959:50
Šatun-šarri				ša-du-un-LUGAL	šad=o=n(m!)-šarri		Draffkorn 1959:50
Šau				sa-a-ú	ša=o		AIT 178

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Šena-šituri	f			še-na-ši-tu-ri	šena-šiduri		Draffkorn 1959:52
Šenien-šarri				še-ni-en-šar-ri			Draffkorn 1959:51
Šennakka				še-en-na-ak-ka	šen(a)=n(i)=a=kk=a		Zeeb 1992:414
Šennakki				še-en-na-ak-ki			Draffkorn 1959:51
Šenni				še-en-ni	šen(a)=ni		Draffkorn 1959:51
Šerriku				še-ir-ri-ku(?)			Draffkorn 1959:141
Šertiya				še-ir-di-ia	šerd=i=ya		Draffkorn 1959:141
Šutiya				šu-ti-ya	šud=i=ya		Draffkorn 1959:143
Ta'e				ta-a		Man	Draffkorn 1959:56
Taḥ-pazi				ta-aḥ-pa-zi	taḡ-pazi?		Draffkorn 1959:55
Taḥe			3	ta-aḥ-e	taḥe	Man	Draffkorn 1959:54
Taḥeya				ta-aḥ-e-ya	taḡ=i=ya		Draffkorn 1959:55
Taḥšu-meni				taḥ-šu-me-ni			Zeeb 1994:468
Taki				ta-ki	tag=i	Make (him) good!	AIT 216: 15, Rs. 33
Taki-Addu		H/S		ta-gi-a- ¹ du ¹	tag=i-Addu	Addu, make (him) good!	Draffkorn 1959:52

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Taki-Išḫara				ta-gi-iš-ḫa-ra	tag=i-Išḫara	Išḫara, make (him) good!	Draffkorn 1959:53
Taki-Ištar				ta-ki-iš-tar	tag=i-Ištar	Ištar, make (him) good!	Draffkorn 1959:53
Takki				ta-ak-ki	takk=i	Make (him) good!	Draffkorn 1959:55
Taku			2	ta-a-ku			Draffkorn 1959:53
Talli-...]				ta-al-li-[X?]	tall=i[...]		Draffkorn 1959:55
Talma-' <i>ammu</i>		H/S	2	tal-ma-am-mu	talm=a-' <i>ammu</i>	The paternal-uncle is big	Draffkorn 1959:55
Tamar-(ta?)ḫi	f			ta-mar-(ta?)ḫi	tam=ar-(ta?)ḫe		Draffkorn 1959:55
Tane-mati	f	?		ta-ne-ma-ti			Draffkorn 1959:55
Tariya				da-ri-ia	tar=i=ya		AIT 55
Taršu-wani		?		[t]ar-šu-wa-ni	tarž=o-fani		Draffkorn 1959:55
Taruka				ta-ru-ka			Draffkorn 1959:143
Tašal-kuni				ta-ša-al-ku-ni	taž=a=l-k/ouni		AIT 269
Tatmi-šarru		?		da-ad-mi-LUGAL			Oliva 2005:8
Tattiya				ta-at-te-e-ya	tatt=i=ya		Draffkorn 1959:56
Teššub-kuni				te-eš-šu-ub-ku-ni	Teššob-kuni		Draffkorn 1959:56

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Tillakkunu				til-la-uk-ku-nu			AIT 95
Tillie				ti-il-li-e			Draffkorn 1959:57
Timunna	f	?		ti-mu-un-na			Draffkorn 1959:143
Tipnae	f			di-ib-na-e			Draffkorn 1959:57
Tišuḫi				ti-š-u-ḫi	tiž=u-ḫe		Draffkorn 1959:57
Tulpi				tu-ul-bi			Draffkorn 1959:57
Tuniim-mu				tu-ni-im-mu	t/oun=i=m(b!)-mu	The righteous endowed (him)	Draffkorn 1959:58
Tunip-Addu		H/S		du-ni-pa-du	t/oun=i=b-Addu	Addu endowed (him)	Draffkorn 1959:58
Tunniya				tu-un-ni-ia	tunn=i=ya		AIT 411
Tupki-išḫara				tu-up-ki-iš-ḫa(!)-ra			RA 108, S. 29, AT 2095: 5
Tuppi-enni				tub-bi-en-ni	tupp=i-en(a)=ni		Draffkorn 1959:58
Tuppi-limma				tub-bi-lim-ma	tupp=i-limm=a		Draffkorn 1959:58
Turruwe			2	tur-ru-we	turr=u-ve		Draffkorn 1959:59
Uḫlakki				uḫ-la-ag-gi	uḡl=a=k(b!)-ki		Draffkorn 1959:60
Uḫlap-Addu		H/S		uḫ-la-ab-a-du	uḡl=a=b-Addu		Draffkorn 1959:60

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Ukur-akki				ú-ku-ur-ak-ki	U/ogur-akki		Draffkorn 1959:60
Umpi				úm-bi	o/umb=i		AIT 34
Unaya				ú-na-ya	un=a=ya	He/she came	Draffkorn 1959:61
Upe		?		ú-bi			Draffkorn 1959:60
Upulikku				ú-bu-li-ik-ku	o/ub=o/ul=i=kk=o/u		Zeeb 2001:521
Uriatu				ú-ri-a-du			Draffkorn 1959:61
Ušše				Ú-uš-še	ušš=e	Go!	Draffkorn 1959:61
Ušta				uš-da			Kienast 1980:53
Uštanni				uš-ta-an-ni		(war) Heroe	Kienast 1980:55
Wanti				wa-an-di	fand=i	Make (him) good!	Draffkorn 1959:62
Wanti				wa-an-di	fand(i)=i	Make (him) good!	Oliva 2005:10
Wanti- [...]				wa-an-di[-X?]	fand(i)=i[...]		Draffkorn 1959:62
Wanti- ^d lšhara			2	wa-an-ti- ^d iš-ħa-ra / wa-an-di-diš-ħa-ra	fand(i)=i-lšhara	lšhara, make (him) good!	Draffkorn 1959:63
Wanti-ewri				wa-an-ti-EN	fand(i)=i-evri	Lord, make (him) good!	Draffkorn 1959:63
Wanti-Šawuška			3	wa-an-di-ša-uš-ka	fand(i)=i-Šavoška	Šawuška, make (him) good!	Draffkorn 1959:63

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Wanti-yamu				wa-an-di-ia-mu!	fand(i)=i-		Oliva 2005:10
Wantiya				wa-an-di-ia	Fand(i)=i=ya	He/She made (him) good	Draffkorn 1959:63
Wariš-nakušḥi		?		wa-ri-ši-lá-kuš-ḥi			Draffkorn 1959:62
Waruzzi				wa-ru-uz-zi			Draffkorn 1959:62
Watekuni				wa-te-ku-ni			Draffkorn 1959:62
Wikken				wi-ik-ki-en			Draffkorn 1959:146
Wiri-Addu		H/S		wi-ri-a-du	fir=i-Addu		Draffkorn 1959:64
Wuli- [...]				wu-li-i- [...]	ful=i[...]		Draffkorn 1959:64
Wullura				wu-ul-lu-ra			Draffkorn 1959:64
Wunza	f			wu-un-za	fo/unz=a		AIT 178
Wuruḥzi				wu-úr-ru-uḥ-zi			Kienast 1980:62
Zazip				za-zi-ip	zaž=i=b	fed?	AIT 182: 29
Zike				zi-ge	zig=i		Draffkorn 1959:49
Zikil-kipa				zi-gi-il-ki-ba			Kienast 1980:58
Zilli				zi-il-li	zill=i		Draffkorn 1959:147

NAME	G	?	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION
Zilliš-Šimiga				zi-il-li-iš-ši-mi-ga	zill=i=ž-Šimiga		Draffkorn 1959:50
Zirra				zi-ir-ra			Draffkorn 1959:50
Zirri	f			zi-ir-ri			Draffkorn 1959:50
Zukrasi				zu-uk-ra-si			Draffkorn 1959:147
Zukriya				zu-uk-ri-ya	zogr=i=ya		Draffkorn 1959:147
Zunna			2	zu-un-na			Draffkorn 1959:50
Zuya-šeya				zu-ia-še-ia			Draffkorn 1959:148

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This work has been focused on the study of the first and second phase of the Hurrian pantheon, from a historical-onomastic perspective. The objective has been to analyse the Hurrian PNs from the third and the first part of the second millennium to perceive and understand, as far as possible, the substantial changes that the structure of the Hurrian deities went through. The analysis of the onomastic material presented in the preceding chapters had the intention to serve as a reflection/s of the structure of the pantheon, particularly through the theophoric elements presented in the PNs.

It is evident, not only through the onomastic material but also from the textual narratives,¹ that during the second millennium the head of the Hurrian pantheon was in the hands of the storm-god Teššup.² The PNs from this period have revealed that Teššup's theophorous³ was, by far, the most used in the Hurrian anthroponyms (followed by that of Kušuḫ and Šimiga).⁴ The evidence has also revealed that it was fairly well distributed throughout those archives which held a significant amount of Hurrian PNs.⁵ In addition to his figure as a storm-god, we also encounter in the hybrid group of Hurrian PNs the Semitic storm-god Addu's theophorous who leads the position, (though its presence was primarily at Alalah). Thus, and despite the name (whether Hurrian, Semitic or hypocoristic), the presence of the storm-god was the main occurrence in the theophoric names.

However, this did not seem to be a continuation of the preceding millennium.⁶ The first and

¹ See especially the “Kumarbi Cycle” and the “Song of Release” for Teššup's fights and conflicts with the rest of the deities.

² Wilhelm 1989: 49; Schwemer 2001: 444-ff., 2008: 3.

³ Also considering the use of the hypocoristic variant ‘Tuniya’, although strictly not a theophorous.

⁴ See Annex 1 (“Number of Individuals Bering...”) for the total amount of individuals with the theophoric names.

⁵ With the exceptions of Ebla, Terqa, Tuttul, and Kaneš (the theophorous here appertains to an individual who did not reside at the colony and came from northern Syria).

⁶ Popko 1995: 96.

so far only attestation, in syllabic writing, of Teššup's name, as we have seen, comes from the PN of an individual from the city of Puzriš-Dagan during the period of the III Dynasty of Ur, at the end of the third millennium BC.⁷ The other attestation, instead, occurs in the Tiš-atal inscription (probably from the Gutian period or beginning of Ur III)⁸ where the storm-god is written logographically (^dIŠKUR).⁹ Moreover, nothing, so far, has been revealed about this deity prior to the second millennium. Certainly, he was a Hurrian native god (despite its unclear etymology)¹⁰ and occupied a prominent place in the pantheon since he also appears in the Urartian sources from the first millennium after Ḫaldi, the chief god of the pantheon.¹¹ However, the idea that he stood at the head of the gods from time immemorial¹² it is not contrasted with the existing evidence, which suggest significant changings in the Hurrian religious scenario from the end of the third millennium and beginning of the second. The two most important Hurrian religious documents from the third millennium (Tiš-atal and Atal-šen Inscriptions) are not dedicated to his figure but on the contrary to Kumarbi's.¹³

During the 1970's, the Hurrian pantheon was believed to have a West version and an eastern one.¹⁴ This idea was the result of considering the Hurrians not as an indivisible socio-cultural unit but as a set of tribes with dialectical varieties and religious differences that were manifested, among other things, in the composition of their pantheons (Western vs. Eastern). Gods such as Teššup, Šawuška, Šimige or Kušuḫ, were believed to be part of a 'Pan-Hurrian' structure,¹⁵ while Ḫebat, Šalaš, Allani, Iṣhara or Aštabi, for instance, represented the regional variations of each Hurrian "tribe". However, recent studies have relativized this position and

⁷ *Te-šub-še-laḫ*. Schneider 1932, 33; 44:9; Meyer 1937-1939. The text in which this individual appears has been dated to ca. 2031 BC (Zadok 1993: 229).

⁸ Wilhelm 1998: 118.

⁹ Wilhelm 1998: 119, l. 20.

¹⁰ It has been proposed that this name might hold the word for "leader" ('tešuḫi') or the root for "noble/distinguished" ('tešš-'). See VHN 540; BGH 462.

¹¹ Burney 1993; Salvini 1989.

¹² Schwemer 2008: 3.

¹³ Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati 2009: 62-ff.

¹⁴ Kammenhuber 1976; Laroche 1976; Haas 1978; Diakonoff 1981.

¹⁵ Trémouille 1999: 278.

argued that the opposition Eastern pantheon-Western pantheon should not be exaggerated.¹⁶ The documentation found in the west (e.g. Ḫattuša, Mari, Ugarit or Emar) is much larger and therefore more diversified, making a quantitative and not qualitative differentiation, with respect to the east. Moreover, to support this idea it has also been stated that the analysis of the Hurrian onomastics from the entire ANE have shown that the same gods have been used everywhere to build the theophoric elements used in the names.¹⁷ However, and although the general validity that this claim may have, the onomastic analysis performed in this work has revealed some regional differences worth mentioning.

In the first place, it is true that the so-called ‘Pan-Hurrian’ deities are attested in almost every archive holding Hurrian theophorous. For instance, and as it was mentioned before, Teššup is the most common theophorous and is almost always attested in archives with Hurrian theophorous (except for Tuttul, and, for now, Kaneš).¹⁸ Despite appearing in fewer archives than Teššup, a similar situation occurs with Kušuḫ and Šimiga. The Hurrian moon-god is displayed as a theophorous in more names than Šimiga, while the latter is attested in different names from more archives.

However, regarding names, the goddess Šawuška should be, at least provisionally, removed from this ‘Pan-Hurrian’ group (of PNs) from the first half of the second millennium. She only appears in a clear syllabic form in the PNs from Alalaḫ, while the remaining possible logographic attestations (in Mari, Chagar Bazar, Tigunāni and Tell al-Rimaḫ) most likely do not appertain to her. This seems to be a paradigmatic case since she had an active role in the religious life from the third millennium,¹⁹ and she also took place in several mythic narratives as well as in cultic, ritual, deity lists, and festival or divinatory texts from the second

¹⁶ Trémouille 2000: 121.

¹⁷ Trémouille 2000: 121; Richter 2001.

¹⁸ The theophorous holding Teššup which was found in a letter from the Kültepe archive appertained to an individual that did not reside in the colony and was originally from Syria.

¹⁹ Trémouille 2009: 99. For the role of Šawuška in the Ur III court see Sharlack 2002: 106.

millennium.²⁰ Moreover, together with Teššup she led the pantheon from the city of Nuzi and that from the State of Mittani.²¹ Nonetheless, and for reasons beyond our knowledge, the Hurrian onomastics from the first half of the second millennium is not in line with the importance that she had in the society.

In the second place, we also find a similar situation with Ḫebat. The onomastic material from this part of the millennium does not reproduce her theophorous in line with her position inside the pantheon. We only possess some examples from Mari and Alalaḫ,²² while in the rest of the Old Babylonian archives seems completely absent, not only as a theophoric element in Hurrian names but also in Semitic ones.²³

We have also encountered an analogous situation to that of Šawuška and Ḫebat with the case of Išḫara. This goddess, although with a lower position in the pantheon to that of Šawuška and, probably, Ḫebat, is only attested in theophorous from Mari, Alalaḫ and Chagar Bazar.²⁴

Other important deities from the pantheon, such as Aštabi, Allani, Kumarbi or Šalaš, also appear very in relatively few examples: at Mari we only have Allani, Kumarbi and Šalaš, at Tuttul Allani, at Chagar Bazar possibly Šalaš, at Tell Leilan Kumarbi, and Aštabi, which is only attested at Alalaḫ.

Finally, it is important to address the presence of an enigmatic deity, at least for the Hurrian tradition, such as Ukur. This god has been attested in the PNs from Mari, Šemšārā, Karana and Alalaḫ. Besides the Hurrian onomastic sphere, he is almost absent from any Hurrian-related texts. The only references come from some Hittite documents²⁵ which mention Ukur as a deity

²⁰ For the role of Šawuška in the different texts see Wegner 1981. For a summary see Trémouille 2009: 101.

²¹ Wilhelm 1989: 51.

²² It is understandable the presence of her theophorous in the Alalaḫ material since her origin was in the city of Ḫalab (Aleppo) (Trémouille 1997: 217).

²³ See Trémouille 1997: 233-235.

²⁴ Apart from the Hurrian names, she is also attested in the same archives within Semitic PNs (see the corresponding annexes for the Semitic examples).

²⁵ KBo 4.13 + VI 33; KBo 19.128 II 10 e IV 19; KUB 26.39 Ro I 26'.

from Ḫayaša/Azzi,²⁶ a region located to the north of the Kingdom of Išuwa and east from the city of Šapinuwa, which was inhabited by Hurrian population.²⁷ However, these texts are much later than the theophorous found in the PNs and cannot be taken as proofs. Thus, we believe that the connection should be focused on the well-known relationship that existed between Ukur and his master Nergal, and the association that the Hurrians made between the latter and the figure of Kumarbi, already during the third millennium. The theonym ‘Ukur’ (see § Mari: Primary and Secondary Deities) could have been used as another way, i.e. an epithet, to refer to Kumarbi.

As we have shown, Hurrian PNs, particularly the theophoric ones, have served as a complementary source for the study of the Hurrian gods by, among other things, showing the substantial changes that took place inside the structure of the pantheon. However, could they also serve to elucidate, or at least hypothesise, a reasonable explanation of why the structure of the gods changed? In this sense, we believe that some elements could be taken into account even though they do not necessarily have to be related.

In the first place, Hurrians altered its written syntactic structure when forming *Satznamen*, at least a vast majority of them.²⁸ It is likely that the syntax of these PNs, different from that of the language, had been acquired not by adopting a new linguistic structure (otherwise it would have been evident in the texts) but by copying a particular type of onomastic construction (verb+subject). If this were the case, then it would be reasonable to ask whom they copied from. There is a certain probability that Hurrians might have copied these sentence-name type from the Semites;²⁹ but to do so, they must have done it at an early stage, much earlier than

²⁶ RGCT 6: 59, 63.

²⁷ Trémouille 2000: 132.

²⁸ See (§1.7.3.d.1) for the exception of this type of *Satznamen*.

²⁹ Wilhelm 1998: 122, 2008: 181.

when the Hurrian names began to appear in the written sources.³⁰

However, which Semitic population brought such influence to the Hurrians? Were these Akkadians, Eblaites, Amorites, (proto-)Canaanites or any other Semitic group that lived in the Syro-Mesopotamian region during, roughly, the middle of the third millennium? Whichever group it was, it had to have contact with the Hurrians when they were still carrying names with a pristine Semitic syntax (i.e. the verb at the beginning) because Akkadians (and much later Amorites) tended to form their names either with the verb at the beginning or the end, alternating the 'standard' Semitic syntax. The position of the verb at the end was probably the consequence of adopting the cuneiform scripture from Sumerians, who set the verb at the end of the phrase.³¹ Therefore, if the Hurrians adopted this *Satzname* type we have to entertain the possibility that it had to be before this syntactic change. And this contact must have been for a considerable period³² since a substantial change like this does not occur overnight; it requires a period of interaction, processing, adaptation, incorporation, utilisation and, above all, reconfiguration to be reproduced by those who intend to continue with such practice.

In the second place, Hurrians began to incorporate the use of theophorous during the end of the third millennium. Until now, the sources have shown that this practice did not take place in their territories (northern Mesopotamia or Syria) but in southern Mesopotamia (Ur and Puzriš-Dagan). Moreover, it began in contemporary with the pressure of Amorite migration which, massively, ended up settling in many cities from Syria and Mesopotamia, later making up kingdoms ruled by them.³³

In third place, and connected to the previous point, the mythological narratives tell us that

³⁰ There are several examples (e.g. Taḫiš-atal, Unap-šeni) of Hurrian *Satznamen* already in the Sargonic period. For the entire list see the Hurrian Personal Names from the third millennium.

³¹ Caplice 2002: 27.

³² Buccellati and Kelly-Buccellati (1999: 12-14) have proposed that Hurrians inhabited the city of Urkeš at the latest from the beginning of the third millennium.

³³ On this see the classical work by Buccellati 1967. More recently, see Buccellati 1992; Whiting 1996; Nichols 2004.

the head of the pantheon shifted from the god Kumarbi to Teššup.³⁴ It is possible to establish as a narrative pattern the different disputes between Kumarbi and Teššup, which in turn reflected the cosmological contraposition of the sky and the underworld;³⁵ basically a god who ruled the pantheon and was not ready to accept the loss of the throne, and one that has managed to conquer the maximum summit of the *thecosmos*. In this way, the mythological cycle seems to close its narrative with the consolidation of the final victory of the storm-god over Kumarbi. However, if the actual Hurrian pantheon suffered such changes, when and why did they happen? Is it possible to find a historical correlate of what the texts narrate?

We think that the answers to these questions are to be found regarding the second point, i.e. the massive arrival/settlement of the Amorite population. The link between these phenomena lies in this interstice between the interactions of these two socio-cultural groups (and probably others) and the internal changes that the Hurrian society must have undergone. It is too much of a coincidence that Hurrians began to use theophorous, modified the structure of the pantheon by pointing Teššup (i.e. the storm-god) as chief, and incorporated deities from other backgrounds (e.g. Ḫebat, Šalaš, Kubaba, Išhara) during the ‘amoritesation’ of the Syro-Mesopotamian region.³⁶ Therefore, the combination of external elements (mainly Amorite influences) and internal (unfortunately unknown and hard to perceive them) resulted in a new pantheon configuration and its reflection in the onomastics.

As we have mentioned in the introduction of this work, we believe that the Hurrian pantheon can be organised in the three different phases: pre-Amorite, Amorite and post-Amorite. These coincide, roughly, with the second part of the third millennium, the first half of

³⁴ See, particularly, the “Kumarbi Cycle”. The “Song of Release”, instead, reveals (among other things) the consolidation of Teššup’s primacy and the power he has over the mundane world. For different interpretations of the mythological texts see Wilhelm 2001, 2013; de Martino 2000b, 2012; Von Dassow 2014; Bachvarova 2014a, 2014b.

³⁵ Pecchioli 2001.

³⁶ Moreover, the hybrid examples of Hurrian names are often formed with Amorite words (see the examples with the Amorite word for the figure of the paternal-uncle ‘*Ammu*, e.g. Talmi-‘*Ammī*; Penti-‘*Ammu*) or theonyms (the most common case is that from Addu e.g. Eḫli-*Addu*; Ewri-*Addu*; Penti-*Addu*; Tunip-*Addu*; Uḫlap-*Addu*).

the second millennium and the appearance, development and fall of Mitanni. Thus, from our perspective, the division between east and west does not represent substantial changes; the possible echo that might have had among the scholars who studied the Hurrian pantheon should be left aside. The main division of the Hurrian pantheon is vertical, not horizontal; it is temporal, not spatial. While it is true that there were considerable particularities, especially with the advent of Mitanni and the incorporation of divinities alien to the cultural background of the ANE (i.e. Indo-Aryan), the central structure of the pantheon fluctuated in time and not much in space.

We believe that any thorough analysis of the Hurrian pantheon must consider these three phases. It is for this reason that our approach has focused on the development and transition between the first and second phase, which still needs further analysis and from different perspectives, but that nevertheless have revealed significant changes in the interior of the realm of the gods.

ANNEXES

Hurrian Personal Names from the Babylonian Region and Miscellaneous

NAME	G	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE
Tulpip-še			túl-pí-ip-še	to/ulbi=i=b-šen		Black 1991: 25, IM 85455: 1	Awal
Akuya			a-gu-ú-a(-a) / a-gu-ia	ag=o=ya	He/She brought (him) up	YOS 12, 180: 3; 330:9	Babylon
Eriri			e-ri-ri / i-ri-ri			AbB 9, 44: 1; YOS 12, 238: 5	Babylon
Ḫazip-Arašši(ḫ)			ḫa-a-zi-ba-ra-a-zi	ḫaž=i=b-Aranžig	The Tigris listened (him)	AbB 10, 50: 4, 12	Babylon
Kuntulla	f		ku-un-du-la	ko/und=o=lla		AbB 1, 130: 29; AbB 7, 13:17	Babylon
Kunzi			ku-un-zi-i	ko/unz=i	Bend!	AbB 8, 125: 4	Babylon
Nupar-kipa			nu-bar-ki-ba	no/ubar-kib(i)=a		AbB 13, 79: 5	Babylon
Šennam			še-en-na-am	šen(a)=n(i)=a=m(e/a)	He is like a brother	VS 22, 2: 27	Babylon
Zuzzu			zu-uz-zu	zo/uzz=o		YOS 12,251: 4	Babylon
Akap- [...]			a-ga-ap- [...]			Charpin 1977:53	Dilbat
Akap-taḫe		2	a-ga-ap-ta-e	ag=a=b-taḫe	The man came up	Charpin 1977:52	Dilbat
Apuška			a-bu-uš-ka			Charpin 1977:55	Dilbat
Arip-ki			a-ri-ip-ki	ar=i=b-Ki	The sea gave (him)	Charpin 1977:55	Dilbat

NAME	G	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE
Arip-Teššup			a-[ri-i]p-te-[eš-šu-up]	ar=i=b-Teššob	Teššup gave (him)	Charpin 1977:53	Dilbat
Arteya			ar-te-ia	ard=i=ya		Charpin 1977:55	Dilbat
Eniš-a[kum?]			e-ni-ša-kum?	eni=ž-ag=o=m	The god took/brought him up	Charpin 1977:56	Dilbat
Eteya			e-te-ia	ed=i=ya		Charpin 1977:56	Dilbat
Ewri-kipa			ep-ri-ki-ba(!)	evri-kib(i)=a		YOS 13, 316: 11	Dilbat
Ḫupita		2	ḫu-bi-da	ḫo/ubid(i)=a=(me/a)	He is like a bull-calf	Charpin 1977:54	Dilbat
Ḫupitu			ḫu-bi-du	ḫo/ubid(i)=u=(me/a)		Charpin 1977:54	Dilbat
Ḫuwiš			ḫu-wi-iš	ḫuv=i=ž		Charpin 1977:56	Dilbat
Kanzi			ga-an-zi	kanz=i		Charpin 1977:56	Dilbat
Kazziya			ka-az-zi-ia	kazz=i=ya		VS 7, 65:13	Dilbat
Kušuḫ-atal			ku-zu-uḫ-a-dal	kužo/uḡ-adal	Kušuḫ is strong	Charpin 1977:54	Dilbat
Matiya			ma-di-ia	mad=i=ya	He/She made (him) wise	Charpin 1977:57	Dilbat
Paliya			ba-li-ia (or zu-li-ia)	pal=i=ya	He/She knew?	Charpin 1977:56	Dilbat
Pentiya			pí-in-di-ia	fend(i)=i=ya	He/She made him good	Charpin 1977:54	Dilbat
Šau-mati			ša-ú-ma-ti			Charpin 1977:54	Dilbat

NAME	G	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE
Šena-Tilla			še-na-til-la	šen=a-Tilla	The brother is Tilla	Charpin 1977:54	Dilbat
Taḥaya			ta-ḥa-ia	taḡ=a=ya		Charpin 1977:54	Dilbat
Teššup-atal			te-eš-su-ub-a-tal	Teššob-adal	Teššup is strong	Charpin 1977:55	Dilbat
Tuppa-šenna			du-pa-še-en-na	tupp=a-šen=a	A brother is (was?) here	Charpin 1977:53	Dilbat
Unam-šenna		2	ú-nam-še-en-na / ú-na-am-še-en-na	un=a=m(b!)-šen=n(n)a	The brother came	Charpin 1977:55	Dilbat
Zizzi			?	zizz=i	Chest?	Charpin 1977:57	Dilbat
Zulki			su-ul-gi			VS 7, 53:1	Dilbat
Ḥašiya			ḥa-ši-ia	ḥaž=i=ya	He/She listened (him)	Dūr-Abiešuḥ: 11:1	Dūr-Abiešuḥ
Zulki			zu-ul-gi			Dūr-Abiešuḥ 8: 1	Dūr-Abiešuḥ
Akukki			a-ku-ki	ag=o=kk=i		BIN 9 S. 25f., BIN 10, 157:3	Isin
Akuya			a-gu-a	ag=o=ya	He/She brought him up	BIN 10, 186 Rs. 1	Isin
Munup-tuk			mu-nu-up-tuk	mo/un=o=b(m!)-tuk		BIN 9, 520:11	Isin
Ḥažip-Teššup			ḥa-zi-ip-te-šu-up	ḥaž=i=b-Teššup	Teššup listened (him)	AbB 10, 81: 9', 13'	Kiš
Nunakka			nu-na-ak-ka	no/unn=a=kk=a		YOS 13, 478: 8	Kiš

NAME	G	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE
Nutunna			nu-du-un-na	no/udun(i)=na		YOS 13, 96: 15	Kiš
Takaša	f		ta-ga-ša		Beauty	YOS 13, 35: 1	Kiš
Eniš-akum			e-ni-šá-gu-um / e-ni-iš- agu- um / e-ni-iš-gu-um	eni=ž-ag=o=m	The god took/brought him up	Kisurra: S. 33	Kisurra
Ĥažip-Navar			ĥa-ši-ip-na-bar	ĥaž=i=b-Navar	Nawar listened (him)	FAOS 2, 76: 18	Kisurra
Ĥaštu			ĥa-aš-tu			YOS 8, 134: 28	Larsa
Kuzari			ku-za-ri	koz(?)=ar=i	Keep (him) back!	YOS 12, 63: 3	Larsa
Akuya			a-gu-ú-a	ag=o=ya	He/She brought (him) up	BE 6/2, 6: 3; 29:3	Nippur
Kušuĥ-ewri			ku-ši-ĥi-im-ri	Kužo/uĥ-evri	Kušuĥ is the lord	YOS 14, 60: 19	Šaduppum
Akap-[...]			a-ga-ab-[...]	ag=a=b-[...]		Finkelstein 1955:2	Sippar
Akiya			a-ki-ia	ag=i=ya	He/She brought (him) up	CT 4, 42a: 28	Sippar
Aku-šenna			a-gu-še-en-na	ag=o-šen=na	The brother brought (him) up	TLOB 41: 24	Sippar
Arau			a-ra-ú	ar=av	I gave (him)?	Dekiere 6, 917	Sippar
Arip-Teššup			a-ri-ip-te-eš-šup	ar=i=b-Teššob	Teššup gave (him)	TLOB 41:25	Sippar
Aštuĥa	f		aš-tu-ĥa			TCL 1, 109:14	Sippar
Ĥašiya	f		ĥa-ši-ia	ĥaž=i=ya	He/She listened (him)	KB 4, S. 44 Nr. IV: 1	Sippar

NAME	G	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE
Hazip-Teššup			ḥa-zi-ip-te-šu-up	ḥaž=i=b-Teššob	Teššup listened	CT 6, 4 IV 11	Sippar
Keliya			ke-li-ia	kel=i=ya	He/She was satisfied	Dekiere 6, 852	Sippar
Kuti	f		ku-te-e	kud=i	Let (him) fall!	CT 45, 44: 1	Sippar
Kuzzari			ku-uz-za-ri	kozz(?)=ar=i	Keep (him) back!	PBS 8/2, 252: 29	Sippar
Paḥar-šen			pa-ḥa-ar-še-en	faḡar-šena	The brother is good	CT 8, 38b: 18f	Sippar
Paḥaya	f		pa-ḥa-ia	paḡ=a=ya		Finkelstein 1955:1	Sippar
Paila			ba-i-la	pail(i)=a	According to the building	ARN 172 Rs. 8'	Sippar
Partiya			pa-ar-di-ia	pard=i=ya		Dekiere 1, 59: 8	Sippar
Puriya			pu-ri-ia	po/ur=i=ya		Dekiere 6, 926:3	Sippar
Šan(i)p-atal			sa-an-ba-tal	šan=(i)=b-adal		Richter 2005b: 255	Sippar
Šituri			ši-du-ri	Šiduri	Girl	BM 17212: 2	Sippar
Takaša	f		ta-ga-ša			Finkelstein 1955:1	Sippar
Attiya			at-ti-ia	att=i=ya	He/She made (him) big?	MDP 24, 345:13	Susa
Ela			e-el-la		Sister	MDP 10, 99:10	Susa
Kikiya			gi-i-gi-ia	kig=i=ya	He/She delivered the third (kid)	MDP 28, 546 Rs. 10	Susa

NAME	G	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE
Kukiya			ku-gi-ia / ku-ki-ia	ko/ug=i=ya		MDP 10, 104: 6; MDP 23 S. 207	Susa
Kukkiya			ku-uk-ki-ia	ko/ukk=i=ya		MDP 24, 334: 24	Susa
Kuliya			ku-li-ya	ko/ul=i=ya		MDP 22 S. 190	Susa
Kuntiy			ku-un-di-ia	ko/und=i=ya		MDP 22, 101: 3	Susa
Kuti			ku-di	kud=i	Let (him) fall!	MDP 22, 135 Rs. 3	Susa
Kutiya			ku-di-ia	kud=i=ya	He/She dropped (him)	MDP 22, 126: 4	Susa
Tatta			ta-at-ta	tatt=a=∅		MDP 22, 161:4,9	Susa
Tukkiya			tu-uk-ki-ia	to/ukk=i=ya		MDP 22, 53: 35	Susa
Kuwarim			ku-wa-rum			OBCTHB 24: 13	Tell Haddad
Nunakka			nu-na-ak-ka	no/unn=a=kk=a		Zadok 1994: 48	Tell Muhammad
Ewri			e-ew-ri	evri		Durand 1987: 21	Tell Qal'at al Hādī
Akukki			a-ku-ki	ag=o=kk=i		Yamada 2008: 50, T06-4, l.14	Tell Tabatum
Menna			me-na-a	menna	Sibling	Saporetti 1995: 12, 2001: 90	Tell Yelḫi
Taḫa-šeni			ta-ḫa-še-ni	taḡ=a-šen(a)=ni		Saporetti 2001: 91	Tell Yelḫi
Ipša-ḫali			ip-ša-ḫa-li	ipš=a-ḫal=i?		BASOR 95, S. 20 Kol. B 4	Unknown

NAME	G	X ²	TRANSLITERATION	NORMALISATION	TRANSLATION	PUBLICATION	PLACE
Kušuḫ-ewri			ku-zu-uḫ-ew-ri	Kužo/uḡ-evri	Kušuḫ is the lord	RA 57, S. 178 Nr. 5: 1	Unknown
Tirim-adal			ti-ir-ma-da-al			BASOR 95, S. 20 Col. A 16	Unknown
Ḫažip-Teššup			ḫa-zi-ip-te-šu-up	ḫaž=i=b-Teššup	Teššup listened (him)	Nisaba 4, S. 146 Nr. II, 39: 1	Uruk

Hurrian Theophoric Elements in the Second Millennium Personal Names

PAN-HURRIAN DEITIES	SECONDARY DEITIES	MINOR DEITIES	NON HURRIAN DEITIES	DIVINISED ENTITIES	COMMON THEOPHORIC ELEMENTS
Kušuh	Allani	Abari	<i>Addu</i>	Anšal (place)	Allai
Šawuška/IŠTAR	Aštabi(l)	Ala	<i>ʾtar</i>	Aranžig (river)	Ardi
Šimika	Ḫebat	Ara		Arrapḫa (place)	Atal
Teššup	Iḫara	Ḫurmiš (place)		Ašiḫum (place)	Eni
	Kubaba	Ḫurpi		Eše (earth)	Ewri
	Kumarbi	Kalli (mountain)		Ḫabur (river)	Kešḫe (Throne)
	Šalaš	Kelti (?)		Ḫašur (river)	Kiaze
	Ukur	Kepali (?)		Ḫawur (sky)	Mušni
		Kešiyar (mountain)		Igar (place)	Šarri
		Kulmiš (place)		Kakka (place)	Talmi
		Kulpi		Kaniš (place)	Ulme
		Meme (?)		Kiyaze/Kiyaše (Ki) (sea)	
		Naye (Na)		Kumme (place)	

		Pairi		Nawar (place)	
		Pišaiš (mountain)		Ninua (place)	
		Šandalluk		Pabani (mountain)	
		Šayu		Purandi (river)	
		Šerriš		Šuri (place)	
		Šuriḥe			
		Šuwala			
		Taḥupe (place?)			
		Takidu			
		Takidu			
		Tašmiš			
		Taya			
		Tulla			
		Yazu			

Number of Individuals Bearing Hurrian Theophorous in the Second Millennium¹

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMŠĀRA		TIGUNĀNI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAḤ		ALALAḤ		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		TOTAL
	X ²	X	X ²	X	X ²	X	X ²	X	X ²	X	X ²	X	X ²	X	X ²	X	X ²	X	X ²	X	X ²	X	MAX
<i>Addu</i>	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	-	2	1	3	-	30
Allani	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Aštabi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	5
Ḥebat	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	6
Išhara	2	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	17	-	-	-	-	23
IŠTAR/Aštar	5	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	4	2	-	-	-	-	12

¹ The X² represents the maximum number of names with a theophorous while X the minimum.

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMŠĀRA		TIGUNĀNI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAḤ		ALALAḤ		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		TOTAL
Kubaba	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2
Kumarbi	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	5
Kušuḥ	16	-	2	-	1	-	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	5	-	-	-	38
Šalaš	4	1	2	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
Šawuška	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	6	-	-	-	-	7
Šerriš	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	4
Šimika/e	8	7	3	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	5	-	2	-	26
Teššup	23	19	1	0	6	5	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	3	4	-	6	-	1	-	78
Ukur	15	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMŠĀRA		TIGUNĀNI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAḤ		ALALAḤ		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		TOTAL
TOTAL / SITE	84	-	13	-	10	-	44	-	0	-	2	-	0	-	7	-	62	-	20	-	6	-	255
MINOR DEITIES																							
Abari	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ala	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ḥurpi	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	3
Ḥurmiš	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Kalli	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Kelti	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMŠĀRA		TIGUNĀNI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAḤ		ALALAḤ		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		TOTAL
Kepali	8	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	10
Kešiyar	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Kulmiš	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Kulpi	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Meme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
Naye (Na)	50	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	66
Pairi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pišaiš	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	8
Šandalluk	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMŠĀRA		TIGUNĀNI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAḤ		ALALAḤ		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		TOTAL
Šayu	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Šuriḥe	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Šuwala	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Taḥupe	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Takidu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tašmiš	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Taya	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Tulla	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2
Yazu	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMŠĀRA		TIGUNĀNI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAḤ		ALALAḤ		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		TOTAL
Ziz(z)i	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

List of Hurrian Main Deities Theophorous

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAḪ		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
MAIN DEITIES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>ADDU</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>fArtim-Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Eḫli-Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Eḫlim-Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Ewri-Addu</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Ewri-Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
<i>Inna-Addu (?)</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Iri-Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Irip-Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Kabi-Addu (^dIM)?</i>	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Matim-Addu</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Niwar-Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Penti-Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Šim(i)gim- Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAḤ		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
<i>Taki-Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Takir-Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Tunip-Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Uḫlap-Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Wiri-Addu</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALLANI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
fAllanni	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
fArip-Allani	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
fīšmen-Allani	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
AŠTABI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Aštabi-šarra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
ḪEBAT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
fAllai-Ḫebat	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
dḪebat- šeḫirni	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
fMen-Ḫepat	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
fTalmu-Ḫebat	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
ʿUru-Ḫebat	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uḫiriš-Ḫebat	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IŠHARA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
[...]-iṣhara	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anti-Išhara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eḫli- ^d IŠDAR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eḫli-Išhara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enni- ^d IŠDAR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
Ewri- ^d Išhara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hazip- ^d Išhara	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ibni- ^d Išhara	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IŠDAR-terra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nuwašši- Išhara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Panti- ^d Išhara	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Panti-U.DAR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Taki-Išhara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
Tupki-Išhara	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tupki-Išhara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wanti- ^d Išhara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IŠTAR/Aštar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
[...]ip- ^d IŠTAR	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arki- ^d Ištar	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ḫazip-IŠTAR	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
fiŠTAR-šaki	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
IŠTAR-wanni	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pazi-IŠTAR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Taki-Ištar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
fTalme-IŠTAR	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KUBABA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
fAlli-Kubaba	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
fKupapuzzi	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Purit-Kubaba	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
KUMARBI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arip- Kumarwe	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kumarwe-atal	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kumarwe- ewri	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KUŠUḪ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arim-KušuḪ	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arip-ku[šuḪ]	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eḫlip-KušuḪ	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
Hāzip-Kušuḥ	3	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kušuḥ-...	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kušuḥ- [...]	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kušuḥ-atal	6	-	3	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Kušuḥ-ewri	1	-	-	-	1	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Kušuḥ-šarri	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ŠALAŠ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>f</i> Ipqu- ^d šala(š)	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
fdŠalaš-niki	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
fdŠalaš-tappi	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
fdŠalaš-turiya	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Šawuška	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arip-Šawuška	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wanti-Šauška	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ŠIMIKA/E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arip-Šimika	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
Eḫlip-Šimika	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ṫTarim-Šimiga	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ḫaš-Šimika	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ḫazip-Šimika	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ḫazip-Šimike	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Inib-Šimika (^d UD)	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nawar- Šemike	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nenip- [Šimi]ke(?)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
Šim(i)gem- adal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Šime(ki)- takup (?)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tawen-Šimeki	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zilliš-Šimiga	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TEŠŠUP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
[... r]it-Te	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
[...-Teš]šup	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
[...]-Teššup	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
Ari-Teššup	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arip-Teššup	5	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	
Arit-Te	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Arum-Te	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Arum-Teššup	1	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Atti- ^d IM (Atti- Teššup)	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Eḫlip-Teššup	1	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Ewrit-Te	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
Ḥaš-Teššup	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ḥazip-Teššup	7	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	-
Ikkīt-Te	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Inni-Teššup	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Irip-Teššup	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kabi-Teššob (^d IM)	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kipam-Teššup	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kirip-Teššup	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAH		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
Nawar- Teššup	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pikum-Teššup	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Šarri-Teššup (LUGAL- ^d IM)	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Šukrum- Teššup	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Terip-Teššup	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Teššup-...]	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Teššup-atal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Teššup-ewri	-	-	-	-	1	-	4	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAḤ		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
Teššup-Kuni	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tunip-Teššup	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
UKUR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
[...]- ^d Ukur	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arip-Ukur	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Awi-Ukur	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ḥazip-Ukur	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Panti-Ukur	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CITY NAME	MARI		CHAGAR BAZAR		ŠEMĀRĀ		TIKUNANI		EBLA		TUTTUL		TERQA		TELL AL- RIMAH		ALALAḤ		TELL LEILAN		KANEŠ		DILBAT	SIPPAR	KIŠ	URUK	ŠADDAPUM
Tar-Ukur	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tizeḡe-Ukur	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
^d Ukur-atal	4	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ukur-akki	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAN	Cassin, Elena and Glassner, Jean–Jacques (1977) <i>Anthroponymie et Anthropologie de Nuzi, Vol. I: Les Anthroponymes</i> . Malibu: Undena Publications.
AASOR	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research. Boston.
AbB	Altbabylonische Briefe in Umschrift und Übersetzung. Leiden.
AFO	Archiv für Orientforschung. Wien.
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology. Princeton.
AKT I	Bilgiç, Emir et al. (1990) <i>Ankara Kültepe Tabletleri I (Ankaraner Kültepe-Tafeln)</i> . Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi.
AKT II	Bilgiç, Emir and Bayram, Sabahattim (1995) <i>Anakara Kültepe Tabletleri II (Ankaraner Kültepe-Tafeln)</i> . Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi.
AKT III	Bilgiç, Emir and Günbatti, Cahit (1995) <i>Ankaraner Kültepe-Texte III. Texte der Grabungskampagne 1970</i> . Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
AIT	Wiseman, Donald J. (1953) <i>The Alalakh Tablets</i> . London: The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara.
Amurru I	Durand, Jean–Marie [Ed.] (1996) <i>Amurru 1. Mari, Ébla et les Hourrites. Dix ans de travaux. Bd.1: Actes du colloques international (Paris, mai 1993)</i> . Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
Amurru II	Charpin, Dominique and Durand, Jean–Marie [Eds.] (2006) <i>Amurru 2. Mari, Ebla et les Hourrites. Dix ans de travaux. Bd.2: Actes du colloques international (Paris, mai 1993)</i> . Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
Amurru III	Nicolle, Christophe [Ed.] (2000) <i>Amurru 3. Nomades et sédentaires dans le Proche–Orient ancien. Compte rendu de la XLVIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Paris, 10–13 juillet 2000</i> . Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
AnOr	Analecta Orientalia. Rome.

AnSt	Anatolian Studies. London.
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament. Münster.
APN	Tallqvist, Knut L. (1914) <i>Assyrian Personal Names</i> (=ASSF 43/1). Helsinki.
ARCANE	Sallaberger, Walther and Schrakamp, Ingo [Eds] (2015) <i>Associated Regional Chronologies for the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean</i> . Turnhout: Brepols.
ARES	Archivi Reali di Ebla. Studi. Rome.
ARET	Archivi Reali di Ebla. Testi. Rome.
ARM	Archive Royale de Mari. Paris.
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research. New Haven/Cambridge.
ASSF	Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae. Helsinki.
ATHE	Kienast, Burkhard (1960) <i>Die altassyrischen Texte des Orientalischen Seminars der Universität Heidelberg und der Sammlung Erlenmeyer-Basel</i> (UAVA 1). Berlin: De Gruyter.
AUCT I	Sigrist, Marcel (1988) <i>Neo Sumerian Accounts Texts in the Horn Archaeological Museum</i> . Andrews University Cuneiform Texts, Volume I. Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press.
AUCT II	Sigrist, Marcel (1988) <i>Neo Sumerian Accounts Texts in the Horn Archaeological Museum</i> . Andrews University Cuneiform Texts, Volume II. Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press.
AUCT III	Sigrist, Marcel and Gavin, Carney E.S. (1988) <i>Neo Sumerian Accounts Texts in the Horn Archaeological Museum</i> . Andrews University Cuneiform Texts, Volume III. Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press.
AuOr	Aula Orientalis. Sabadell.
BA	Beiträge zur Assyriologie (und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft). Leipzig.
BABELAO	Bulletin de l'Académie Belge pour l'Etude des Langues Anciennes et Orientales. Louvain.
Babyloniaca	Babyloniaca: Études de philologie assyro–babylonienne. Paris.

BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research. New Haven.
BASP	The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists. Michigan.
BE	<i>The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania. Series A: Cuneiform Texts.</i> Philadelphia.
BCT	Catalogue of Cuneiform Tablets in Birmingham City Museum. Warminster. Bethesda.
BGH	Richter, Thomas (2012) <i>Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen.</i> Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
BGNAS	Bulletin of the Georgian National Academy of Sciences. Tiflis.
BiAr	Biblical Archaeology. New Haven.
BibMes 16	Rouault, Olivier (1984) <i>Terqa Final Reports N° 1. L'archive de Puzurum.</i> Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 16. Malibu: Undena Publications.
BibMes 25	Chavalas, Mark and Hayes, John [Eds.] <i>New Horizons in the Study of Ancient Syria.</i> Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 25. Malibu: Undena Publications.
BibMes 26	Buccellati, Giorgio and Kelly–Buccellati, Marilyn [Eds.] (1998) <i>Urkeshe and the Hurrians. Studies in Honor of Lloyd Cotsen.</i> Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 26. Malibu: Undena Publications.
BibMes 29	Rouault, Olivier (2011) <i>Terqa Final Reports No. 2 – Les textes des saisons 5 à 9.</i> Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 29. Malibu: Undena Publications.
BIN	Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection J.B. Nies. New Haven–London–Oxford.
BzNNF	Beiträge zur Namenforschung. Neue Folge. Heidelberg.
CANE	Sasson, Jack [Ed.] (1995) <i>Civilizations of the Ancient Near East.</i> New York: Hendrickson Publishers.
CBR	Currents in Biblical Research. London.
CDLB	Cuneiform Digital Library Bulletin. www.cdli.ucla.edu
CDLJ	Cuneiform Digital Library Journal. www.cdli.ucla.edu

- CDOG 3 Meyer, Jan–Waalke and Sommerfeld, Walter [Eds.] (2004) *2000 v. Chr.: Politische, wirtschaftliche und kulturelle Entwicklung im Zeichen einer Jahrtausendwende*. Saarbrücken Drukerei und Verlag.
- CELR Sawyer, John E.A. and Simpson, J.M.Y. [Eds.] (2011) *Concise Encyclopedia of Language and Religion*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Chagar Bazar III Tunca, Önhan and Baghdo, Abd el–Massih [Eds.] (2008) *Chagar Bazar (Syrie) III. Les trouvailles Épigraphiques et sigillographiques du chantier I (2000–2002)*. Peeters: Leuven.
- CRAI Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles–Lettres. Paris.
- CST Fish, T. (1932) *Catalogue of Sumerian tablets in the John Rylands Library*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- CT Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum. London.
- CTA Herdner, Andrée (1963) *Corpus des tablettes en cuneiformes alphabetiques decouvertes it Ras Shamra–Ugarit de 1929 it 1939. (texte, figures et planches)*. MRS X. Paris: Imprimerie nationale Geuthner.
- CTU Salvini, Mirjo (2008) *Corpus dei Testi Urartei*. 3 Vols. Rome: Istituto di studi sulle civiltà dell’Egeo e del Vicino Oriente.
- CUSAS Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology. Bethesda.
- Dekiere 1 Dekiere, L. (1994) *Old Babylonian Real Estate Documents from Sippar in the British Museum, Part 1. Pre-Hammurabi Documents*. Paris: Recherches et Publications.
- Dekiere 6 Dekiere, L. (1998) *Old Babylonian Real Estate Documents from Sippar in the British Museum. Part 6 Documents from the Series 1902-10-11 (From Zabium to Amni-Saduqa)*. Paris: Recherches et Publications.
- DUL del Olmo Lete, Gregorio and Sanmartín Ascaso, Joaquín (2015) *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the alphabetic Tradition*. 3rd

- Ed. Leiden: Brill.
- Dūr-Abiešuḫ Van Lerberghe, Karel and Voet, Gabriella (2010) *A Late Old Babylonian Temple Archive from Dūr-Abiešuḫ*. Bethesda: CDL Press.
- Eblaitica 3 Gordon, Cyrus and Rendsburg, Gari [Eds.] (1992) *Eblaitica: Essays on the Ebla Archives and Eblaite Language. Volume 3*. Winon Lake: Eisenrauns.
- FAOS 7 Gelb, Ignace and Kienast, Burkhard (1990) *Die alt-akkadischen Königsinschriften des Dritten Jahrtausends v. Chr.* Freiburger Altorientalische Studien 7. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- FAOS 8 Kienast, Burkhard and Sommerfeld, Walther (1994) *Glossar zu den Altakkadischen Königsinschriften*. Freiburger Altorientalische Studien 8. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- FAOSB 2 Donbaz, Veysel (1989) Keilschrifttexte in den Antiken-Museen zu Stambul II. Freiburger Altorientalische Studien 2. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- FAOSB 4 Ulshöfer, Andrea M. (1995) *Die altassyrischen Privaturkunden*. Freiburger Altorientalische Studien 4. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Fs Dietrich Loretz, Oswald – Metzler, Kai A. and Schaudig, Hanspeter [Eds.] (2001) *Ex Mesopotamia et Syria Lux. Festschrift für Manfred Dietrich zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (AOAT 281). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Fs. Alp Otten, Heinrich – Akurgal, Ekrem – Ertem, Hayri and Süel, Aygül [Eds.] (1992) *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Sedat Alp*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi.
- Fs. Astour Young, Gordon D. – Chavalas, Mark and Averbeck, Richard [Eds.] (1997) *Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons: Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour on his 80th Birthday*. Bethesda: CDL Press.
- Fs. Burney Sagona, Antonio [Ed.] (2004) *A View from the Highlands. Archaeological Studies in Honour of Charles Burney*. Ancient Near

- Eastern Studies. Supplement 12. Leuven: Peeters.
- Fs. Civil Michalowski, Piotr - Steinkeller, Piotr - Stone, Elizabeth E. and Zettler, Richard L. [Eds.] (1991) *Velles Paraulas. Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Miguel Civil on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (AuOr 9). Sabadell.
- Fs. Erkanal Avunç, Betül [Ed.] (2006) Hayat Erkanal'a Armağan. Kültürlerin Yansimasi / Studies in Honor of Hayat Erkanal. Cultural Reflections. Istanbul: Homer Kitabevi.
- Fs. Friedrich von Kienle, Richard – Moortgat, Anton – Otten, Heinrich – von Schuler, E. – Zaumseil, W. [Eds.] (1959) *Festschrift Johannes Friedrich zum 65. Geburtstag am.27 August 1958 gewidmet*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter –Universitätsverlag.
- Fs. Fronzaroli Marrassini, Paolo [Ed.] (2003) *Semitic and Assyriological Studies Presented to Pelio Fronzaroli by Pupils and Colleagues*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Fs. Garelli Charpin, Dominique and Joannès, Francis [Eds.] (1991) *Marchands, diplomates et emperuers. Études sur la civilisation mésopotamienne offertes à Paul Garelli*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Fs. Gernot Wilhelm Fincke, Jeanette [Ed.] (2010) *Festschrift für Gernot Wilhelm anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 28. Januar 2010*. Dresden: ISLET.
- Fs. Güterbock Bittel, Karl - Houwink ten Cate, Johannes and Reiner, Erica [Eds.] (1974), *Anatolian Studies Presented to Hans Gustav Guterbock on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (PIHANS 35). Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten te Leiden.
- Fs. Haas Richter, Thomas – Prechel, Doris – Klinger, Jörg [Eds.] (2001) *Kulturgeschichten. Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücken Drukerei und Verlag.
- Fs. Heger Anschütz, Susanne [Ed.] (1992) *Texte, Sätze, Wörter und Moneme. Festschrift für Klaus Heger zum 65. Geburtstag*. Heidelberg:

- Orientverlag.
- Fs. Heinrich Otten Neu, Eric and Rüter, Christel [Eds.] (1988) *Documentum Asiae minoris antiquae. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag.*
- Fs. Hrouda Calmeyer, Peter - Hecker, Karl - Jakob-Rost, Liane and Walker, C.B. F. [Eds.] (1994) *Beiträge zur Altorientalischen Archäologie und Altertumskunde. Festschrift für Barthel Hrouda zum 65. Geburtstag.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Fs. Imparati De Martino, Stefano and Pecchioli Daddi, Franca [Eds.] (2002) *Anatolica Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati* (Eothen 11). Florence: LoGisma Editore.
- Fs. J.W. Meyer Becker, Jörg – Hempelmann, Ralph and Rehm, Ellen [Eds.] (2010) *Kulturlandschaft Syrien. Zentrum und Peripherie. Festschrift für Jan-Waalke Meyer* (AOAT 371). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Fs. Jacobsen Lieberman, Stephen [Ed.] (1975) *Sumerological Studies in Honor of Thorkild Jacobsen.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Fs. Kienast Selz, Gerbhard [Ed.] (2003) *Festschrift für Burkhard Kienast zu seinem 70. Geburtstage dargebracht von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen* (AOAT 274). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Fs. Lambdin Golomb, David [Ed.] (1987) *Working With No Data. Semitic and Egyptians Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin.* Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake.
- Fs. Landsberger Jacobsen, Thorkild and Güterbock, Hans [Eds.] (1965) *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday, April 21, 1965.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Fs. Laroche AA.VV. (1979) *Florilegium Anatolicum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche.* Paris: Editions E. De Boccard.
- Fs. Larsen Dercksen, Jan. G [Ed.] (2004), *Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen* (PIHANS 100). Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten te Leiden.
- Fs. Levi della Vida AA.VV. (1956) *Studi Orientalistici in onore di Giorgio Levi della Vida. Vol. I.* Rome: Istituto per l'Oriente.

- Fs. Levine Chazan, Robert – Hallo, William and Schiffman, Lawrence [Eds.] (1999) *Ki Baruch Hu. Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Judaical Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Fs. Machinist Vanderhooft, David and Winitzer, Abraham [Eds.] (2013) *Literature as Politics, Politics as Literature. Essays on the Ancient Near East in Honor of Peter Machinist*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Fs. Matouš Hruška, Blahoslav and Komoróczy, Géza [Eds.] (1998) *Festschrift Lubor Matouš* (Assyriologia V). Budapest: Eotvos Lorand Tudományegyetem Okori Történeti Tanszék.
- Fs. Nissen Kühne, Hartmut – Bernbeck, Reinhard and Bartl, Karin [Eds.] (1999) *Fluchtpunkt Uruk. Archäologische Einheit aus methodischer Vielfalt: Schriften für Hans Jörg Nissen*. Rahden: Verlag Marie Leidorf.
- Fs. Oelsner Marzahn, Joachim and Neumann, Hans [Eds.] (2000), *Assyriologica et Semitica. Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 18. Februar 1997* (AOAT 252). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Fs. Otten II Neu, Eric and Rüster, Christel [Eds.] (1988) *Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Fs. Özgüç Özgüç, Nimet – Mellink, Machteld – Porada, Edith and Özgüç, Tahsin [Eds.] (1993) *Nimet Özgüç'e Armağan. Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors: Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Fs. Popko Taracha, Piotr [Ed.] (2002) *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Warsaw: Agade.
- Fs. Postgate Heffron, Yağmur – Stone, Adam and Worthington, Martin [Eds.] (2017) *At the Dawn of History. Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honour of J. N. Postgate*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Fs. Sanmartín del Olmo, Lete Gregorio – Feliu, Lluís and Millet, Adelina [Eds.] (2006) *Šapal tibnim mû illakû. Studies Presented to Joaquín Sanmartín on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Aula Orientalis–

- Supplementa 22) Sabadell: Editorial AUSA.
- Fs. Silva Castillo del Olmo Lete, Gregorio and Barreyra Francaroli, Daniel [Eds.] (2009) *Reconstruyendo el pasado remoto. Estudios sobre el Próximo Oriente Antiguo en homenaje a Jorge R. Silva Castillo*. Aula Orientalis Supplementa 25. Sabadell: Editorial AUSA.
- Habiru Prism Salvini, Mirjo (1996) *The habiru prism of the King Tunip–Teššup of Tikunani*. Rome: Istituto editoriali e poligrafici internazionali.
- HIROSE Gomi, Tohru – Hirose, Yoko, Hirose and Kazutaka (1990) *Neo–Sumerian Administrative Texts of the Hirose Collection*. Potomac: Capital Decisions.
- HSS Harvard Semitic Series. Cambridge.
- HUCA Hebrew Union College Annual. Cincinnati.
- HUS Watson, Wilfred G.E. and Wyatt, Nicolas [Eds.] (1999) *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Leiden: Brill.
- ICK Inscriptions cunéiformes du Kultepe (Prague). ICK I = B. Hrozný (1952) (Monografie Archivu Orientálního XIV). ICK II= L. Matouš (1962).
- IHzO Eichler, Ernst – Hilty, Gerold – Löffler Heinrich – Steger, Hugo and Zgusta, Ladislav [Eds.] (1995) *Namenforschung / Name Studies / Les noms propres. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik / An International Handbook of Onomastics / Manuel international d'onomastique*. Berlin – New York: De Gruyter.
- IOS Israel Oriental Society. Tel Aviv.
- IRAQ Iraq (British School of Archaeology in Iraq). London.
- IRSA Sollberger, Edmund and Kupper, Jean–Robert (1971) *Inscriptions royales sumériennes et akkadiennes*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- ITT 5 Inventaire des tablettes de Tello conservés au Musée Impérial Ottoman. Paris.
- JANER Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religion. Leiden.
- JAOS Journal of the American Oriental Society. Baltimore.
- JCS Journal of Cuneiform Studies. New Haven.

JHS	Journal of Hebrew Scriptures. www.jhsonline.org
JIAS	Journal of the Institute of Asian Studies.
JIES	Journal of Indo–European Studies.
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies. Chicago.
JoL	Journal of Linguistics. Cambridge.
JoP	Journal of Pragmatics.
JSOT Suppl	Journal of the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series. Sheffield.
JWAS	Journal of Western Asiatic Studies. Tokyo.
JWP	Journal of World Prehistory. New York.
KB 4	Peiser, Felix E. (1896) <i>Texte juristischen und geschäftlichen Inhalts</i> . Berlin: Reuther & Reichard
Kisurra	Goddeeris, Anne (2009) <i>Tablets from Kisurra in the Collections of the British Museum</i> . Weisbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
KKSK	Hecker, Karl – Kryszat, Guido - Matouš, Lubor and Karlova, Univerzita (1998) <i>Kappadokische Keilschrifttafeln aus den Sammlungen der Karlsuniversität Prag</i> . Prague: Praha: Institute of Ancient Near Eastern Studies.
KTU	Dietrich, Manfred – Loretz, Oswald and Sanmartín, Joaquín (2013) <i>Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und anderen Orten. Dritte, erweiterte Auflage. The Cuneiform Alphabetic Text from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places. Third, Enlarged edition (AOAT 360/1)</i> . Münster: Ugarit–Verlag.
KUB	Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi. Berlin.
KUG	Hecker, Karl (1966) <i>Die Keilschrifttexte der Universitätsbibliothek Giessen</i> . Giessen: Universitätsbibliothek.
MAD	Gelb, Ignace G. (1952–1970) <i>Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary</i> . Chicago: The Chicago University Press.
MARI	Annales de recherches interdisciplinaires. Paris.
MDOG	Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient–Gesellschaft zu Berlin. Berlin.
MDP 14	Mémoires de la mission archeologique de Susiane. Paris.

- MDP 54 Mémoires de la délégation archéologique en Iran. Paris.
- Mozan 2 Milano, Lucio et Al. (1991) *Mozan 2. The Epigraphic Finds of the Sixth Season*. Malibu: Undena Publications.
- MVAeG Mitteilungen Vorderasiatisch–ägyptische Gesellschaft. Berlin.
- MVN Materiali per il vocabolario neosumerico. Rome.
- N.A.B.U. *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires*. Paris.
- NISABA Nisaba – Studi assiriologici messinesi. Messina.
- NPN Gelb, Ignace G. – Purves, Pierre M. and MacRae, Allan A. (1943) *Nuzi Personal Names*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- NRVN Çiğ, M. and Kızılyay, H. (1965) *Neusumerische Rechts- und Verwaltungsurkunden aus Nippur 1* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi Ankara.
- OBCTHB Muhamed, Ahmad Kamil (1992) *Old Babylonian cuneiform texts from the Hamrin Basin, Tell Haddad*. London: Nabu Publications.
- OBTR Dalley, Stephanie and Walker, C.B.F. Hawkins, J.D. (1976) *The Old Babylonian Tablets from Tell al Rimah*. London: British School of Archaeology in Iraq.
- OLZ Orientalistische Literaturzeitung. Berlin.
- OR Orientalia. Roma.
- OrAnt Oriens Antiquus. Rome.
- OrEx Oriens Extremus. Wiesbaden.
- PBS The University of Pennsylvania. The University Museum - Publications of the Babylonian Section. Philadelphia.
- PDP 55 Pugliese Carratelli, Giovanni [Ed.] (2000) *La Parola del Passato 55: La civiltà dei hurriti*. Naples: Machiaroli Editore.
- PDT 1 Kızılyay, Hatice – Salonen, Armas and Çiğ, Muazzez (1954) *Die Puzris–Dagan–Texte der Istanbul Archäologischen Museen. Teil I: Nrr. 1–725 (AASFB 92)*. Helsinki.
- PDT 2 Yıldız, Fatma and Gomi, Tohru (1988) *Die Puzris–Dagan–Texte der Istanbul Archäologischen Museen. Teil II: Nrr. 726–1379 (FAOS 16)*. Stuttgart: Steiner Franz Verlag.

- PET Krebernik, Manfred (1998) *Die Personennamen der Ebla-Texte. Eine Zwischenbilanz*. Berlin: Reimer Verlag.
- PIHANS Publications de l'Institut historique et archeologique néerlandais deStamboul/Uitgaven van het Nederlands historisch-archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul. Leiden.
- Princeton Sigrist, Marcel (1990) *Tablettes du Princeton Theological Seminary. Epoque d'Ur III* (Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund 11). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum Publication.
- PRU I Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit. Paris.
- PRU II Virolleaud, Charles (1957) *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit. Textes en cuneiforms alphabétiques des archives est, ouest et centrales*. Mission de Ras Shamra, tome 7. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale & Klincksieck.
- PTU Gröndahl, Frauke (1967) *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*. Rome: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut.
- RA *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale*. Paris.
- RAI 04 Bottéro, Jean (1954) *Le Problème des Habiru*. À la 4^e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Cahiers de la Societe Asiatique 12. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- RAI 25 Hartmut, Kühne – Nissen, Hans and Renger, Johannes [Eds.] (1982) *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn* (Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient I/1). Berlin: Dietrich Reiner Verlag.
- RAI 42 van Lerberghe, Karel and Voet, Gabriella [Eds.] (1999) *In Languages and cultures in contact. At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro-Mesopotamian Realm. Proceedings of the 42th RAI*. Leuven: Peeters.
- RAI 48 Van Sold, Wilfred [Ed.] (2005) *Ethnicity in Ancient Mesopotamia. Papers Read at the 48th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale Leiden, 1-4 July 2002*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

- RAI 53/2 Kogan, Leonard – Koslova, Natalia – Loesov, Sergey and Tischenko, S. [Eds.] *City Administration in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 53^e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*. Vol. 2. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- RBL Review of Biblical Literature. www.bookreviews.org
- RGCT 3 Groneberg, Brigitte (1980) *Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes 6. Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der altbabylonischen Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- RGTC 6 Del Monte, Giuseppe and Tischler, Johan (1978) *Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes 6. Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- RGTC 6/2 Del Monte, Giuseppe (1992) *Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes VI. Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte 6/2*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- RHA *Revue hittite et asianique*. Paris.
- RhM *Rheinische Museum für Philologie*. Cologne.
- RHR *Revue de l'histoire des religions*. Paris.
- RIH Ras Ibn Hani.
- RIME The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods. Toronto.
- RIA Reallexikon der Assyriologie. Berlin.
- RSO Ras Shamra – Ougarit. Publications de la Mission Française Archéologique de Ras Shamra–Ougarit. Paris.
- RSO 1 Callot, Olivier (1983) *Une maison à Ougarit. Étude d'architecture domestique*. Ras Shamra – Ougarit I. Mémoire n° 28. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- SAT I Sigrist, Marcel (1993) *Text from the British Museum. Sumerian Archival Text 1*. Bethesda: CDL Press.
- SAT III Sigrist, Marcel (2000) *Texts from the Yale Babylonian Collections. Part 2*. Bethesda: CDL Press.
- SCCNH Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians.

- SEb Studia Eblaitica. Roma.
- SEL Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul vicino oriente antico. Verona.
- Šemšara 1 Eidem, Jasper and Læssøe, Jørgen (2001) *The Shemshara Archives 1. The Letters*. Copenhagen: Munskgaard.
- Šemšara 2 Eidem, Jasper (1992) *The Shemshāra Archives 2. The Administratives Texts*. Copenhagen: Munskgaard.
- SET Jones, Tom B. And Snyder, John W. (1959) *Sumerian Economic Texts from the Third Ur Dynasty*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- SMS 2/7 Rouault, Olivier (1979) *Terqa Preliminary Reports, No 7: Les documents épigraphiques de la troisième saison*. Syro–Mesopotamian Studies 2/7. Malibu: Undena Publications.
- SMSJ The (Canadian) Society for Mesopotamian Studies Journal. Toronto.
- STTI Donbaz, Veysel and Foster, Benjamin (1982) *Sargonic Texts from Telloh in the Istanbul Archaeological Museums*. Philadelphia: Occasional Publications of the Babylonian Fund.
- SUBARTU 2 Ismail, Farouk - Sallaberger, Walther - Talon, Philippe and Van Lerberghe, Karel (1996) *Administrative Documents from Tell Beydar (Seasons 1993-1995)* (Subartu 2). Leuven: Brepols.
- Syracuse Sigrist, Marcel (1983) *Textes économiques néo–sumériens de l'université de Syracuse*. Paris: Recherche sur les civilisations.
- TAD Langdon, Stephen (1911) *Tablets from the Archives of Drehem*. Paris: Paul Geuthner.
- TCL Textes cuneiforms, Musées du Louvre. Paris.
- TLOB Richardson, Seth (2010) *Texts from the Late Old Babylonian Period* (JCS - Supplemental Series 2). Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- TRU Legrain, Léon (1912) *Le temps des rois d'Ur*. Recherches sur la société antique d'après des textes nouveaux. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- UDT Nies, James B. (1920) *Ur Dynasty Tablets* (Assyriologische

- Bibliothek 25). Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
- UET Burrows, Eric (1935) *Ur Excavations Texts II. Archaic texts*. London: Harrison and Sons.
- UET III Legrain, Léon (1937–1947) *Business Documents of the Third Dynasty of Ur*. London: British Museum Publications.
- UF Ugarit Forschungen. Münster.
- UG *Ugaritica. Mission de Ras Shamra*. (Paris 1939–1978)
- VHL Nozadze, Nana (2007) *Vocabulary of the Hurrian Language*. Tiflis.
- VHN Richter, Thomas (2016) *Vorarbeiten zu einem hurritischen Namenbuch. Erster Teil: Personennamen altbabylonischer Überlieferung vom Mittleren Euphrat und aus dem nördlichen Mesopotamien*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- VS Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin/Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin. Leipzig-Berlin.
- WA *World Archaeology*. London.
- WO *Die Welt des Orients*. Göttingen.
- WZKM Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. Viena.
- YOS Yale Oriental Series. Babylonian Texts. New Haven–New Haven–London.
- ZA *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Verwandte Gebiete*. Berlin.
- ZDMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Wiesbaden.
- ZDPV *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*. Stuttgart–Wiesbaden.
- ZP *Zeitschrift für Phonetik*. Berlin.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abd-el-Jawad, Hassan

- 1986 "A Linguistic and Sociocultural Study of Personal Names in Jordan",
Anthropological Linguistics 28: 80-94.

Adrados, Francisco R.

- 1998 "El cómo y el cuándo de las más antiguas influencias orientales en Grecia", in:
Cunchillos, J.L. - Galán, J.M. - Zamora, J.A. and Villanueva de Azcona, S.
[Eds.] *Actas del Congreso: El Mediterráneo en la Antigüedad: Oriente y Occidente, Sapanu*.
Publicaciones en Internet II
[<http://www.labherm.filol.csic.es>]

Ahmed, Kozad

- 2012 *The Beginnings of Ancient Kurdistan (c. 2500-1500 BC). A Historical and Cultural Synthesis*. Ph.D. Diss. Universiteit Leiden.

Aklujkar, Ashok

- 1996 "The Early History of Sanskrit as a Supreme Language", in: Houben, J. [Ed.]
Ideology and Status of Sanskrit. Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language.
Leiden: Brill, 59-85.

Al-Rawi, Farouk N.H.

- 1992 "Two Old Akkadian Letters Concerning the Offices of Kala'um and nārum",
ZA 82: 180-185.

Albright, William F.

- 1974 "Northwest-Semitic Names in a List of Egyptian Slaves from the Eighteenth
Century B.C.", *JAOS* 74: 222-233.

Algeo, John and Algeo, Katie

- 2000 "Onomastics as an Interdisciplinary Study", *Names* 48: 265-274.

Algeo, John

- 2010 "Is a Theory of Names Possible?", *Names* 58: 90-96.

Allerton, David J.

- 1987 "The Linguistic and Sociolinguistic Status of Proper Names. What are they, and
Who do they Belong to?", *JoP* 11: 61-92.

Amsler, Mark E.

- 1979 *Literary Onomastics and the Descent of Nations: the Example of Isidore and*

Vico”, *Names* 27: 106-116.

Anderson, John M.

2003 “On the Structure of Names”, *Folia Linguistica* 37: 343-398.

2007 *The Grammar of Names*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2004 “On the Grammatical Status of Names”, *Language* 80: 435-474.

André-Salvini, Béatrice and Salvini, Mirjo

1998 “Un nouveau vocabulaire trilingue sunérien-akkadien-hourrite de Ras Shamra”, *SCCNH* 9: 3-31.

2000a “A New Trilingual Vocabulary from Ras Shamra and the Relationship between Hurrian and Urartean”, *SCCNH* 10: 267-275.

2000b “Le liste lessicale e i vocabolari plurilingui di Ugarit. Una chiave per l’interpretazione della lingua hurrica”, *PDP* 55: 321-348.

Archi, Alfonso

1983 “L’Anatolia pregreca”, in: AA.VV. *Forme di contatto e processi di trasformazione nelle società antiche / Modes de contacts et processus de transformation dans les sociétés anciennes*. Pisa-Roma: Publications de l’École française de Rome, 465-481.

1984 “The Personal Names in the Individual Cities”, in: Fronzaroli, P. [Ed.] *Studies on the Language of Ebla. QuSem* 13: 225-251.

1992 “Substrate: Some Remarks on the Formation of the West Hurrian Pantheon”, *Fs. Alp*: 7-14.

1995 “Šalaš consort of Dagan and Kumarbi”, *Fs. Houwink Ten Cate*: 1-6.

1994 “Studies in the Pantheon of Ebla”, *Or* 63: 249-262.

1998a “The Former History of Some Hurrian Gods”, in: Alp, S. and Süel, A. [Eds.] *III. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 16-22 Eylül 1996 – Acts of the III^d International Congress of Hittology, Çorum, September 16-22, 1996*. Ankara: 39-44.

1998b “The Regional State of Nagar According to the Texts of Ebla”, *Subartu* 4/2: 1-15.

2002 “Formation of the West Hurrian Pantheon: The Case of Išhara”, in: Aslihan, Y. and Hoffner, H. [Eds.] *Recent Developments in Hittite Archaeology and History. Papers in Memory of Hans G. Güterbock*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 21-33.

2013 “Ritualization at Ebla”, *JANER* 13: 212-237.

Ashley, Leonard

- 2001 “Forty Years with the American Name Society”, *Names* 49: 222-226.
- Astour, Michael C.
- 1964a “Greek Names in the Semitic World and Semitic Names in the Greek World”, *JNES* 23: 193-201.
- 1964b “Second Millennium B.C. Cypriot and Cretan Onomastica Reconsidered”, *JAOS* 84: 240-254.
- 1965 *Hellenosemitica. An ethnic and cultural study in West Semitic Impact on Mycenaean Greece*. Leiden: Brill.
- 1972 “Ḫattušiliš, Ḫalab and Ḫanilgabat”, *JNES* 31: 102-109.
- 1973 “A North Mesopotamian Locale of the Keret epic?”, *UF* 5: 29-39.
- 1977 “Continuité et changement dans la toponymie de la Syrie du Nord”, in: AA.VV. *La Toponymie antique. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 12-14 juin 1975*. Leiden: Brill, 117-141.
- 1978 “Les hourrites en Syrie du nord”, *RHA* 36: 1-22.
- 1987 “Semites and Hurrians in Northern Transtigris”, *SCCNH* 2: 3-68.
- Averbeck, Richard E.
- 2010 “Temple Building among the Sumerians and Akkadians (Third Millennium)”, in: Boda, M. and Novotny, J. [Eds.] *From the Foundations to the Crenellations. Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible* (AOAT 366). Münster: Ugarti-Verlag, 3-34.
- Bachvarova, Mary R.
- 2005 “Relations between God and Man in the Hurro-Hittite ‘Song of Release’”, *JAOS* 125: 45-58.
- 2014a “Hurro-Hittite Narrative Song as a Bilingual Oral-Derived Genre”, in: Taracha, P. [Ed.] *Proceedings of the Eight International Congress of Hittitology. Warsa, 5-9 September 2011*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo.
- 2014b “The Hurro-Hittite Song of Release (Destruction of the City of Ebla)”, in: López-Ruiz, C. [Ed.] *Gods, Heroes, and Monsters: A Sourcebook of Greek, Roman, and Near Eastern Myths in Translation*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 290-299.
- Bagnall, Roger S.
- 1982 “Religious Conversion and Onomastic Change in Early Byzantine Egypt”, *BASP* 19: 105-124.
- Bahrani, Zainab

- 2006 “Race and Ethnicity in Mesopotamian Antiquity”, *WA* 38: 48-59.
- Balkan, Kemal
- 1957 *Letter of King Anum-Hirbi of Mama to King Warshama of Kanesh*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimev.
- 1965 Review: “L. Matouš, *Inscriptions cuneiformes du Kultepe II (Prag 1962)*” *OLZ* 60: 146-162.
- Barr, James
- 1968 “The Ancient Semitic Languages – The Conflict Between Philology and Linguistics”, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 67: 37-55.
- Barry III, Harry and Jackson, Jared J.
- 2007 “Names in the Hebrew Bible”, *Names* 55: 372-378.
- Barth, Fredrik
- 1969 “Introduction”, in: Barth, F. [Ed.] *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 9-38.
- Beal, Richard
- 2002 “The Hurrian Dynasty and the Double Names of Hittite Kings” *Fs. Imparati*: 55-70.
- Bean, Susan S.
- 1978 *Symbolic and Pragmatic Semantics: A Kannada System of Address*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- 1980 “Ethnology and the Study of Proper Names”, *Antrophological Linguistics* 22: 305-316.
- Beaulieu, Paul A.
- 2005 “The god Amurru as Emblem of Ethnic and Cultural Identity”, in van Sold, W.H [Ed.] *Ethnicity in Ancient Mesopotamia*. Leiden: Brill, 31-46.
- Beckman, Gary
- 1996 *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (2nd Ed.). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- 2002 “The Pantheon of Emar”, *Fs. Popko*: 39-54.
- 2004 “Pantheon. A. II. Bei den Hethitern”, *RIA* 10: 308-316.
- Beekes, Robert
- 2010 *Etymological Dictionary of Greek. Volume One*. Leiden: Brill.
- Ben-Rafael, Eliezer and Sharot, Stephen
- 1991 *Ethnicity, religion and class in Israeli society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Benedict, Warren C.
 1960 “Urartian and Hurrians”, *JAOS* 80: 100-104.
- Benveniste, Émile
 1976 *Problèmes de linguistique générale II*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Berger, P-R
 1970 Review: “Frauke Gröndahl: Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit”, *WO* 5: 271-282.
- Bernabé, Alberto
 2009 “El extraordinario embarazo de Kumarbi”, *Fs. Silva Castillo*: 23-30.
- Biga, Maria Giovanna
 1998 “The Marriage of Eblaite Princess Tagriš-Damu with a Son of Nagar’s King”, *Subartu IV/2*: 17-22.
 2014 “Third Millennium Political and Cultural Landscape”, in: Cancik-Kirschbaum, E. Brisch, N. and Eidem, J. [Eds.] *Constituent Confederate, and Conquered Space. The Emergence of the Mittani State*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 93-110.
- Bin-Nun, Shoshana
 1975 *The Tawananna in the Hittite Kingdom*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Bittel, Karl
 1980-1983 “Kubaba. B. Ikonographie”, *RIA* 6: 261-264.
- Black, Jeremy
 1991 “Eme-sal Cult Songs and Prayers”, *Fs. Civil*: 23-36.
- Blanár, Vincent
 1970 “Der linguistische und onomastische Status des Eigennamen”, *ZP* 30: 138-148.
 2009 “Proper Names in the Light of Theoretical Onomastics”, *Namenkundliche Informationen* 95/96: 89-157.
- Brett, Mark. G. [Ed.]
 2002 *Ethnicity and the Bible*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bryce, Trevor
 2005 *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bodin, Walter R.
 1987 “Linguistics and Philology in the Study of the Ancient Near Eastern Languages”, *Fs. Thomas Lambdin*: 39-54.
- Bolz, William G.
 2000-2001 “The Invention of Writing in China”, *OrEx* 42: 1-17.

Bonechi, Marco

- 1998 “Remarks on the III Millennium Geographical Names of the Syrian Upper Mesopotamia”, *Subartu* IV/1: 219-241.
- 2001 “Ebla”, in: Joannés, F. [Ed.] *Dictionnaire de la civilisation mésopotamienne*. Paris: Robert Laffont, 248-254.

Bordreuil, Pierre

- 2002 “Un Scribe étranger et/ou dur d’oreille”, *Fs. Dietrich*: 67-71.

Borger, Rykle

- 2010 *Assyrische-Babylonische Zeichenliste* (AOAT 305). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Bork, Ferdinand

- 1906 “Mittani-Namen aus Nippur”, *OLZ* 9: 588-591.
- 1909 “Die Mittanisprache”, *MVAG* 14, 1/2.
- 1932-1933 “Studien zum Mitani,” *AfO* 8: 308-314.
- 1932 “Mitani-Glossen un anderes”, *OLZ* 35/6: 377-381.
- 1939 *Der Mitani-Brief und seine Sprache*. (Altkaukische Studien I). Leipzig.

Bottéro, Jean

- 1949 “Les inventaires de Qatna”, *RA* 43: 1-40.
- 1955 *Le problème des Ḫabiru à la 4^e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (Cahiers de la Société Asiatique 12). Paris.
- 1982 “Los ḫabiru, los nómades y sedentarios”, in: Silva Castillo, J. [Ed.] *Nómadas y pueblos sedentarios*. Mexico D.F.: El colegio de México, 91-106.
- 1987 *Mésopotamie. L’écriture, la raison et les dieux*. Paris: Gallimard.

Bright, William

- 2003 “What IS a Name? Reflections on Onomastics”, *Language and Linguistics* 4: 669-681.

Bromberg, Christian

- 1982 “Pour une analyse anthropologique des noms de personnes”, *Langages* 66: 103-124.

Buccellati, Giorgio

- 1966 *The Amorites of the Ur III Period*. Naples: Istituto orientale di Napoli.
- 1967 “Ebla and the Amorites”, *Eblaitica* 3: 83-104.
- 1995 “Eblaite and Amorrite Names”, *IHzO*: 856-860.
- 1996 *A Structural Grammar of Babylonian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- 1998 “Urkeš as Tell Mozan: Profiles of an Ancient City”, *BibMes* 26: 11-34.

- 1999 “Urkesk and the Question of Early Hurrian Urbanism”, in: Hudson, M. and Levine, B.A. [Eds.] *Urbanization and Land Ownership in the Ancient Near East*. Cambridge: Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology: 229-250.
- 2005 “The Monumental Urban Complex at Urkesk”, *SCCNH* 15: 3-28.
- 2010 “Semiotics of Ethnicity: The case of Hurrian Urkesk”, *Fs. Gernot Wilhelm*: 80-88.

Buccellati, Giorgio and Kelly-Buccellati, Marilyn

- 1995-1996 “The Royal Storehouse of Urkesk: The Glyptic Evidence from the Southwestern Wing”, *AfO* 42-43: 1-32.
- 1996a “The Seals of the King of Urkesk Evidence from the Western Wing of the Royal Storehouse AK”, *WZKM* 86: 65-100.
- 1996b “The Courtiers of the Queen of Urkesk. Glyptic Evidence from the Western Wing of the Royal Storehouse AK”, in: Lebeau, M. [Ed.] *About Subartu. Studies Devoted to Upper Mesopotamia / À propos de Subartu. Études consacrées à la haute Mésopotamie*. Vol 2. Turnhout: Brepols, 195-216.
- 1997 “Urkesk. The First Hurrian Capital”, *BiAr* 2: 77-96.
- 1999 “Das archäologische Projekt Tall Mozan/Urkeš”, *MDOG* 131: 7-16.
- 2001 “Überlegungen zur funktionellen und historischen Bestimmung des Königspalastes von Urkeš. Bericht über die 13. Kampagne in Tall Mozan/Urkeš: Ausgrabungen im gebiet AA, Juni-August 2000”, *MDOG* 133: 59-96.
- 2002 “Tar’am-Agade, Daughter of Naram-Sin, at Urkesk”, *MDOG* 133: 11-31.
- 2007 “Urkesk and the Question of the Hurrian Homeland”, *BGNAS* 175: 141-151.
- 2009 “The Great Temple Terrace at Urkesk and the Lions of Tish-atal”, *SCCNH* 18: 33-69.

Bulliet, Richard W.

- 1979 *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Burkert, Walter

- 1985 *Greek Religion. Archaic and Classic*. [English transl.] Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Burney, Charles

- 1956 “Eastern Anatolia in the Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age”, *AnSt* 8: 157-209.
- 1989a “The Khirbet Kherak Question and the Early Trans-Caucasian Background”, in: Miroschedji, P. [Ed.] *L’Urbanisation de la Palestine à l’âge du Bronze ancien*.

- Actes du Colloque d'Emmaüs. Part II. Paris: British Archaeological Reports.
- 1989b "Hurrians and Proto-Indo-Europeans: the Ethnic Context of the Early Trans-Caucasian Culture", *Fs. Özgüç*: 45-52.
- 1993 "The god Haldi and the Urartian state" *Fs. N. Özgüç*: 107-10.
- 1997 "Hurrians and Indo-Europeans in their Historical and Archaeological Context", *JWAS* 18: 175-193.
- Burney, Charles and David, Marshall L.
- 1971 *The People of the Hills, Ancient Ararat and Caucasus*. New York and Washington: Praeger.
- Bush, Frederic W.
- 1964 *A Grammar of the Hurrian Language*. PhD. Diss. Brandeis University.
- Campbell, Dennis R.
- 2008a "The Old Hurrian Verb", *SMEA* 49: 75-92.
- 2008b "Split Ergativity in Hurrian", *ZA* 98: 262-294.
- 2015 *Mood and Modality in Hurrian*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Campbell, Edward F.
- 1964 *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Campbell, Lyle
- 1999 *Historical Linguistics. An Introduction*. Edinburgh: MIT Press.
- Campbell, Lyle and Mixco, Mauricio
- 2007 *A Glossary of Historical Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Caplice, Robert
- 2002 *Introduction to Akkadian*. (4th Ed.) Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Cassin, Elena
- 1938 *L'adoption à Nuzi*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Cassin, Elena and Glassner, Jean-Jacque
- 1977 *Anthroponymie et Anthropologie de Nuzi. Volume Premier. Les Anthroponymes*. Paris: CNRS.
- Catagnoti, Amalia
- 1997 "Les listes des ḪÚB.(KI) dans les textes administratifs d'Ebla et l'onomastique de Nagar", *M.A.R.I* 8: 563-596.
- 1998 "The III Millennium Personal Names from the Ḫabur Triangle in the Ebla, Brak and Mozan Texts", in: Lebeau, M. [Ed.] *About Subartu. Studies Devoted to Upper Mesopotamia / À propos de Subartu. Études consacrées à la haute*

- Mésopotamie*. Vol 2. Brepols: Turnhout, 41-66.
- 2010 “L’onomastica dei testi di Ebla nel contesto siriano del III millennio a.C.”, in: AA.VV. *Atti del XXII Congresso internazionale di scienze onomastiche (Pisa, 28 agosto-4 settembre 2005)* Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 459-472.
- Catsanicos, Jean
- 1989 “Un texte hourrite nomman Zimri-Lim”, *NABU* 42: 27-28.
- 1996 “L’apport de la bilingue de Hattusa à la lexicologie hourrite”, *Amurru I*: 197-296.
- Charpin, Dominique
- 1977 “L’onomastique hurrite a Dilbat et ses implications historiques”, in: Marie-Thérèse Barrelet et Al. [Eds.] *Méthodologie et critiques. I, Problèmes concernant les Hurrites*. Paris: C.N.R.S., 51-69.
- 1990 Review: “Abdulillah Fadhil. Studien zur Topographie und Prosopographie der Provinzstädte des Königreichs Arraphe”, *RA* 84: 94-95
- 2000 “Tigunānum et l’horizon géographique des archives de Mari”, *NABU* 2000/58: 63-64.
- 2014 “Tigunani”, *RIA* 14 1/2: 30-31
- Charpin, Dominique and Durand, Jean-Marie
- 1997 “Aššur avant l’Assyrie”, *Mari* 8: 367-391.
- Charpin, Dominique and Ziegler, Nele
- 2003 *Mari et le Proche-Orient à l’époque amorrite. Essai d’histoire politique* (Florilegium Marianum 5). Paris: NABU.
- Chiera, Edward and Speiser, Ephraim A.
- 1926 “A New Factor in the History of Ancient East”, *ASOR* 6: 75-92.
- Cervelló, Josep
- 2005 “Los orígenes de la escritura en Egipto: entre el registro arqueológico y los planteamientos historiográficos”, in: Serrano, G. and Oliva, J. [Eds.] *Escrituras y lenguas del Mediterráneo en la antigüedad*. Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 191-239.
- Çilingiroğlu, Altan and Sagona, Antonio
- 2004 “Charles Burney in the Near Eastern Highlands”, *Fs. Burney*: 3-11.
- Civil, Miquel
- 1973 “The Sumerian Writing System: Some Problems”, *OrNs* 42: 21-34.
- Clay, Albert

- 1912 *Personal Names from the cuneiform Inscriptions of the Cassite Period*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Cohen, A. P.
2011 “Naming”, *CELR*: 304-308.
- Cooper, Jerrold S.
1999 “Sumerian and Semitic writing in ancient Syro-Mesopotamia”, *RAI* 42: 61-67.
- Coseriu, Eugenio
1986 *Introducción a la lingüística*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Dalfovo, Albert T.
1982 “Logbara Personal Names and Their Relation to Religion”, *Anthropos* 77, 1/2: 113-133.
- Delaporte, Louis
1911 “Tablettes de Dréhem”, *RA* 8: 183-198.
- Dalley, Stephanie
1984 *Maria and Karana. Two Old Babylonian Cities*. London-New York: Longman.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich
1881 *Wo Lag Das Paradies? Eine Biblisch-Assyriologische Studie*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichsische Buchhandlung.
- Deller, Karlheinz
1958 “Indices zu CCT V”, *OrNs* 27: 184-198.
1981 “Indexes to Part II”, *SCCNH* 1: 467-496.
- Dercksen, Jan G.
1996 *The Old Assyrian Copper Trade in Anatolia* (PIHANS 75). Istanbul-Leiden: Nederlandshistorisch-archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul.
- Derks, Ton and Roymans, Nico [Eds.]
2009 *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity. The Role of Power and Tradition*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Di Vito, Robert
1993 *Studies in Third Millennium Sumerian and Akkadian Personal Names. The Designation and Conception of the Personal God*. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Diakonoff, Igor M.
1967 *Yazyki drevneĭ Peredneĭ Azii* (Languages of ancient West Asia), Moscow.
1971 *Hurrisch und Urartäisch*. Munich: MSS-Beiheft. Beiheft 6, Neue Folge.

- 1975 “Ancient Writing and Ancient Written Language: Pitfalls and Peculiarities in the Study of Sumerian”, *Fs. Jacobsen*: 99-121.
- 1981 “Evidence on the Ethnic Division of the Hurrians”, *SCCNH* 1: 77-89.
- Diakonoff, Igor M. and Greppin, John A.
- 1991 “Some Effects of the Hurro-Urartian People and Their Languages upon the Earliest Armenians”, *JAOS* 111: 720-730.
- Diakonoff, Igor M. and Starostin, Sergej A.
- 1986 *Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian language*. Munich: MSS-Beiheft. Neue Folge 12.
- Diaz-Andreu, Margarita – Lucy, Sam Babic, Stasa and Edwards, David
- 2005 *Archaeology of Identity: Approaches to Gender, Age, Status, Ethnicity and Religion*. New York: Routledge.
- Dietrich, Manfred
- 2004 “Der hurritische Kult Ugarits zwischen König und Volk”, in: Hutter, M. Hutter-Braunsar, S. [Eds.] *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität* (AOAT 318). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 137-155.
- Dietrich, Manfred and Loretz, Oswald
- 1969 “Hurritisch *fa/ent- in ugaritischen Personennamen”, *UF* 1: 211-213.
- Dietrich, Manfred and Mayer, Walther
- 1995 “Sprache und Kultur der Hurriter in Ugarit”, in: Dietrich, M. and Loretz, O. [Eds.] *Ugarit. Ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum im Alten Orient. Ergebnisse und Perspektive der Forschung*, Band I. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 7-42.
- 1997 “Hurritica Alalahiana”, *UF* 28: 177-188.
- 1999 “The Hurrian and Hittite Texts”, *HUS*: 58-75.
- 2010 *Der hurritische Brief des Dušratta vom Mītanni an Amenhotep III. Text, Grammatik, Kopie* (AOAT 382). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Dirlmeier, Franz
- 1955 “Homerisches Epos und Orient”, *RhM* 98: 18-37.
- Donbaz, Veysel
- 1988 “The Business of Ašēd, an Anatolian Merchant”, *Afo* 35: 48-63.
- 1993 “Some Remarkable Contracts of 1-B Period Kültepe Tablets II”, *Fs. Özgüç*: 131-154.
- 2003 “*Lamniš ulā ezebši* “He Shall Not Leave Her in a Bad Situation (wickedly)”, *Fs. Kienast*: 47-50.

- 2006 “Some Rarely Attested Old Assyrian Onomastics from the Unpublished Sources”, *Fs. Erkanal*: 274-279.
- Donnellan, Keith S.
- 1972 “Proper Names and Identifying Descriptions”, in: Davidson, D. and Harman, G. [Eds.] *Semantics of Natural Language*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 356-79.
- Dowden, Ken
- 2006 *Zeus*. Abingdon-New York: Routledge.
- Draffkorn, Anne
- 1959 *Hurrians and Hurrian at Alalah: An Ethno-Linguistic Analysis*. PhD. Diss. University of Pennsylvania.
- Du Toit, Briand [Ed.]
- 1978 *Ethnicity in Modern Africa*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Durand, Jean-Marie
- 1987a “Tell Qal’at al Hādī”, *NABU*: 20-21.
- 2006 “La lettre de Labarna au roi de Tigunânnum, un réexamen”, *Fs. Sanmartín*: 219-227.
- Dumézil, George
- 1995 *Mythe et épopée*. (1st ed. 1968) Paris: Gallimard.
- Edwards, Douglas and McCollough, Thomas [Eds.]
- 2007 *The Archaeology of Difference. Gender, Ethnicity, Class and The “Other” in Antiquity* (AASOR 60/61) Boston: ASOR.
- Edzard, Otto
- 1980-1983 “Ku(g)-Baba”, *RIA* 6: 209.
- 1989 “Mardaman”, *RIA* 7: 357-358.
- 1998a “Name, Namengebung (Onomastik). A. Sumerisch”, *RIA* 9: 94-103.
- 1998b “Name, Namengebung (Onomastik). B. Akkadisch”, *RIA* 9: 103-116.
- 2003 *Sumerian Grammar*. Leiden: Brill.
- Edzard, Otto and Kammenhuber, Annelies
- 1972-1975 “Hurriter, Hurritisch”, *RIA* 4: 507-514.
- Eidem, Jasper
- 1991 “An Old Assyrian Treaty from Tell Leilan”, *Fs. Garelli*: 109-135.
- 1992 *The Shemshāra Archives 2. The Administratives Texts*. Copenhagen: Munskgaard.
- 2008 “Apum: A Kingdom on the Old Assyrian Route”, in: Veenhof, K. and Eidem, J.

- Mesopotamia. The Old Assyrian Period* (OBO 160/5). Freiburg: Academic Press Fribourg.
- 2011 *The Royal Archives from Tell Leilan. Old Babylonian Letters and Treaties from the Lower Town Palace East* (PIHANS 117). Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten te Leiden.
- 2011-2012a “Šušarrā”, *RIA* 13 1/2: 360-362
- 2011-2012b “Šubat-Enlil. A. Philologisch”, *RIA* 13 1/2: 227-229.
- Eidem, Jasper and Læssøe, Jørgen
- 2001 *The Shemshara Archives I. The Letters*. Copenhagen: Munskgaard.
- Šemšāra 2 Eidem, Jasper (1992) *The Shemshāra Archives 2. The Administrative Texts*. Copenhagen: Munskgaard.
- Eissfeldt, Otto
- 1968 “Renaming in the Old Testament”, in: Ackroyd, P. and Lindars B. [Eds.] *Words and Meanings. Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 69-79.
- Ellis, Richard S.
- 1968 *Foundation Deposits in Ancient Mesopotamia*. New Haven-London: Yale University Press.
- Emberling, Geoff
- 1995 *Ethnicity and the State in Early Third Millennium Mesopotamia*. PhD. Diss. University of Michigan.
- Emberling, Geoff and Yoffee, Norman
- 1999 “Thinking about Ethnicity in Mesopotamian Archaeology and History”, *Fs. Nissen*: 272-280.
- Fadhil, Abdulillah
- 1983 *Studien zur Topographie und Prosopographie der Provinzstädte des Königreichs Arrapḫe*. BaF 6. Mainz: Verlag Philipp Von Zabern.
- Fales, Mario F.
- 2004 “Rileggendo gli inventari di Qatna”, *KASKAL* 1: 63-128.
- 2013 “Ethnicity in the Assyrian Empire: A View from the *Nisbe*. (I): Foreigners and “Special” Inner Communities”, *Fs. Machinist*: 47-73.
- 2015 “Ethnicity in the Assyrian Empire: A View from the *Nisbe*. (II): Assyrians”, *Isimu* 11-12: 183-204.

- 2017 “Ethnicity in the Assyrian Empire: A View from the *Nisbe*. (III): “Arameans” and Related Tribalists”, *Fs. Postgate*: 133-177.
- Farber, Walther
- 1988 Review: “Diakonoff, I.M. und S.A. Starostin: Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian Language”, *ZA* 78: 314-316.
- Feliu, Lluís
- 1998 “Dagan ša ḪAR-ri at Terqa”, *NABU*: 47.
- 2003 *Dagan in the Bronze Age Syria*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Fenton, Steve and Bradley, Harriet
- 2002 “Introduction”, in: Fenton, S. and Bradley, H. [Eds.] *Ethnicity and Economy. ‘Race and Class’ Revisited*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 1-6.
- Finkelstein, Jacob J.
- 1955 “Subartu and Subarians in Old Babylonian Sources”, *JCS* 9: 1-7.
- Finkelstein, Israel
- 2012 *The Forgotten Kingdom. The Archaeology and History of Northern Israel*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Finkelstein, Israel and Silberman, Neil
- 2002 *The Bible Unearthed. Archaeology’s New Visions of Ancient Israel and the Origin of Its Sacred Texts*. New York: Touchstone.
- Földi, Zsombor
- 2013 “Gleanings from the Antiquities Market: A Contribution to the Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Royal Inscriptions”, *CDLB* 2013/3.
- Foster, Benjamin
- 1982a “Ethnicity and Onomastics in Sargonic Mesopotamia”, *Or* 52: 297-354.
- 1982b “An Agricultural Archive from Sargonid Akkad”, *ASJ* 4: 7-51.
- Fought, Carmen
- 2006 *Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fournet, Arnaud
- 2012 “About *ENI*, the Hurrian Word for ‘God’”, *JNES* 71: 91-94.
- 2013a *A Manual of Hurrian*. Lille: La Garenne Colombes.
- 2013b “Eléments de morphologie et de syntaxe de la langue hourrite”, *BABELAO* 2: 3-52.
- Fraser, Peter M.
- 2000 “Ethnics as Personal Names”, in: Hornblower, S. and Matthews, E. [Eds.] *Greek*

Personal Names. Their value as Evidence. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 149-157.

Frayne, Douglas

1997 “On the Location of Simurrum”, *Fs. Astour*: 243-269.

2008 “The Zagros Campaigns of the Ur III Kings”, *SMSJ* 3: 33-56.

Frege, Gotlob

1892 “Über Sinn und Bedeutung”, *ZPPK* 100: 25-50.

Freydank, Helmut and Salvini, Mirjo

1984 “Zu den hurritischen Personennamen aus Kār-Tukultī-Ninurta”, *SMEA* 24: 33-56.

Friedrich, Johannes

1935 “Zum Subaräische und Urartäischen”, *AnOr* 12: 122-35.

1939 “Kleine Beiträge zur churitischen Grammatik”, *MVAeG* 42/2. Leipzig.

1969 “Churritisch”, in: Spuler, B. [Ed.] *Handbuch der Orientalistik: Keilschriftforschung und alte Geschichte Vorderasiens* 1/2. Leiden: 1-30.

Földi, Zsombor

2013 “Gleanings from the Antiquities Market: A Contribution to the Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Royal Inscriptions”, *CDLB* 2013/3.

Fowler, Jeaneane D.

1988 *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew* (JSOT Suppl 49). Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Fuch, Andreas

2009 “Sargon II”, *RIA* 12: 51-61.

Gadd, Cyril J.

1937 “Tablets from Chagar Bazar, 1936”, *Iraq* 4: 178-185.

1940 “Tablets from Chagar Bazar and Tall Brak 1937-1938”, *Iraq* 7: 22-66.

Gandulla, Bernardo

2005 *Los hebreos en el Gran Canaán. Del Bronce Antiguo al Bronce Tardío.* Buenos Aires: Editorial Canaán.

García, José A.

2006 “Identidad y alteridad en Bajtin”, *Acta Poética* 27: 47-61.

García Trabazo, José V.

2002 *Textos religiosos hititas. Mitos, plegarias y rituales. Edición Bilingüe.* Madrid: Trotta.

Gardiner, Alan

1936 "The Egyptian Origin of Some English Personal Names", *JAOS* 56: 189-197.

1954 *The Theory of Proper Names. A Controversial Essay* (2nd Ed.). London: Oxford University Press.

Garelli, Paul

1963 *Les Assyriens en Cappadoce*. Paris: Librairie Adrien Maisonneuve.

Geertz, Clifford

1966 "Religion as a Cultural System", in: Baton, M. P. [Ed.] *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion*. London: Routledge, 1-46. (Reprinted 2010)

Gelb, Ignace J.

1944 *Hurrians and Subarians*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

1955 "The Name of Babylon", *JIAS* 1: 25-28.

1956 "New Light on Hurrians and Subarians", *Fs. Levi della Vida*: 378-392.

1958a "La lingua degli amoriti", in: *Rendiconti dell'Accademia nazionale dei Lincei*. Serie 8° (XIII). Roma

1958b "The function of Language in the Cultural Process of Expansion of Mesopotamian Society", in: Kraeling, C. Adams, R. [Eds.] *City Invincible. A Symposium on Urbanization and Cultural Development in the Ancient Near East*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 315-328.

1959 "Hurrians at Nippur in the Sargonic Period", *Fs. Friedrich*: 183-195

1960 "Sumerians and Akkadians in Their Ethno-Linguistic Relationship", *Genava* 8: 258-271.

1961 "The Early History of the West Semitic Peoples", *JCS* 15: 27-47.

1962 "Ethnic Reconstruction and Onomastic Evidence", *Names* 10: 45-52.

1980 *Computer-Aided Analysis of Amorite*. Chicago: The Chicago University Press.

Gelb, Ignace J. Purves, Pierre M. and MacRae, Allan A.

1943 *Nuzi Personal Names*. Chicago: The Chicago University Press.

Geller, Markham J.

1995 "The Influence of Ancient Mesopotamia on Hellenistic Judaism", *CANE*: 43-54.

de Genouillac, Henri

1911 *La trouvaille de Dréhem. Étude avec un choix de textes de Constantinople et Bruxelles*. Paris: Paul Geuthner.

Giacumakis, George

- 1970 *The Akkadian of Alalakh*. Phd. Diss. Brandeis University.
- Giorgieri, Mauro
- 1998 “Die erste Beschwörung der 8. Tafel des Šalašu-Rituals,” *SCCNH* 9: 71-86.
- 1999a “Die hurritischen Kasusendungen”, *SCCNH* 10: 223-256.
- 1999b “Zu den hurritischen Personennamen in den Amarna-Briefen”, *SMEA* 41: 63-83.
- 2000a “Schizzo grammaticale della lingua hurrica”, *PDP* 55: 171-277.
- 2000b “L’onomista hurrita”, *PDP* 55: 278-295.
- 2009-2011 “Sonnengott. A. III. b. Hurritisch. Philologisch”, *RIA* 12: 614-615.
- Girbal, Christina and Wegner, Ilse
- 1987 “Zu einer neuen hurritisch-urartäischen Grammatik”, *ZA* 77: 142-154.
- Goetze, Albert
- 1936 *Hethiter, Churriter und Assyrer. Hauptlinien der vorderasiatischen Kulturentwicklung im II. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Oslo.
- 1937 Review: “Subartu. Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte und Völkerkunde Vorderasiens. By Von Arthur Ungnad. Berlin – Leipzig”, *JAOS* 57: 104-109.
- 1938-1940 “An unrecognized Hurrian verbal form”, *RHA* 5/36: 103-108.
- 1939 “‘To Come’ and ‘To Go’ in Hurrian” *Language* 15: 215-220.
- 1940a “The Genitive of the Hurrian Noun”, *RHA* 5/39-40: 193-204.
- 1940b “The Hurrian Verbal System”, *Language* 16: 125-140.
- 1953 “The Theophorous Elements of the Anatolian Proper Names from Cappadocia”, *Language* 29: 263-277.
- 1957 “On the Chronology of the Second Millennium B.C.”, *JCS* 11: 53-61; 63-73.
- 1963 “Šakkanakkus of the Ur III Empire”, *JCS* 17: 1-31.
- Gragg, Gene
- 1973 “Linguistics, Method, and Extinct Languages: The Case of Sumerian”, *OrNs* 42: 78-96.
- Grayson, Albert K. and Sollberger, Edmond
- 1976 “L’insurrection générale contre Narām-Suen”, *RA* 70: 103-128.
- Green, Alberto
- 2003 *The Storm-God in the Ancient Near East*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Gröndahl, Frauke
- 1967 *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*. Rome: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut.
- Gudde, Erwin G.
- 1998 [1949] *California Place Names: The Origin and Etymology of Current Geographical*

Names. 4th Ed. Berkely and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Günbatti, Cahit

2008 “An Eponym List (KEL G) from Kültepe”, *AoF* 35: 103-132.

Gurney, Oliver R.

1977 *Some Aspects of Hittite Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Güterbock, Hans G.

1938 “Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babyloniern und Hethitern bis 1200”, *ZA* 44: 45-149.

1948 “The Hittite Version of the Hurrian Kumarbi Myths: Oriental Forerunners to Hesiod”, *AJA* 52: 123-134

1954 “The Hurrian Element in the Hittite Empire”, in: Hoffner, H.A. [Ed.] (1997) *Perspectives on the Hittite Civilization: Selected Writings of Hans Gustav Güterbock*. Chicago: The Chicago University Press, 179-185 [Originally published in (1954) *Cahiers d’Histoire Mondiale* 2: 383-394]

1980-1983 “Kumarbi”, *RIA* 6: 324-330.

Gustavs, Arnold

1936-1937 “Mitanni-Namen in altassyrischen Texten aus Kappadokien”, *AfO* 11: 146-150.

Gwaltney, William C.

1977 “Indices of Proper Names from the *EL* Old Assyrian Texts”, *HUCA* 48: 19-68.

1983 *The Pennsylvania Old Assyrian Texts* (HUCA Supplements 3). Cincinnati.

Haarmann, Harald

2014 “Ethnicity and Language in the Ancient Mediterranean”, in: McNerney, J. [Ed.] *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 17-33.

Haas, Volkert

1978 “Substratgottheiten des Westhurratischen Pantheons”, *RHA* 36: 59-69.

1989 “Ein Preis auf Wasser in hurritischer Sprache,” *ZA* 79: 261-271.

1994 *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. Leiden: Brill.

Haas, Volkert and Wilhelm, Gernot

1969 “Zum hurritischen ergativ”, *OrNs* 38: 553-556.

Hadjú, Mihály

2002 “History of Onomastics”, in: Nyirkos, I. [Ed.] *History of the Study of Toponyms in the Uralian Languages*. Debrecen-Helsinki: 7-45.

Hall, Jonathan M.

- 1997 *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hallo, William
- 1978 “Simurru and the Hurrian Frontier”, *RHA* 36: 71-83.
- Harris, Rivkah
- 1972 “Notes on the Nomenclature of Old Babylonian Sippar”, *JCS* 24: 102-104.
- Hawkins, John D.
- 1980-1983 “Kubaba. A. Philologisch”, *RIA* 6: 257-261.
- 1981 “Kubaba at Karkamish and Elsewhere”, *AnSt* 31: 147-76.
- Hazenbos, Joost
- 2006 “Hurritisch und Urartäisch”, in: Streck, M. [Ed.] *Sprachen des Alten Orients*, Darmstadt: WBG, 135-158.
- Healey, John F.
- 1990 “The Early Alphabet”, en Hooker, J.T. [Ed.] *Reading the Past. Ancient Writing from Cuneiform to the Alphabet*. Berkeley and California: University of California Press, 197-258.
- Hecker, Karl
- 1996 “Zur Herkunft der Hethitischen Keilschreift”, *SCCNH* 8: 291-303.
- Heidegger, Martin
- 2005 *Introducción a la fenomenología de la religión*. Madrid: Biblioteca de Ensayo Ciruela. (transl. from German edition: *Phänomenologie des religiösen Lebens. Einleitung in die Phänomenologie der religion.*)
- Heimpel, Wolfgang
- 1974 “Sumerische und Akkadische Personennamen in Sumer und Akkad”, *AfO* 25: 171-174.
- 2003 *Letters to the King of Mari. A New Translation, with Historical Introduction, Notes, and Commentary*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Heintz, Jean-Georges
- 1982 *Index Documentaire d'El-Armarna 1. Lista/Codage des textes. Index des ouvrages de référence*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- 1995 *Index Documentaire d'El-Armarna 2. Bibliographie des textes babyloniens d'El-Amarna [1888 à 1993] et Concordance des sigles EA*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Hess, Richard
- 1999 “The Onomastics of Ugarit”, *HUS*: 499-528.

- Heubeck, Alfred
 1955 “Mythologische Vorstellungen des Alten Orients im archaischen Griechentum”,
Gymnasium 62: 508-525.
- Hilgert, Markus
 1998 *Drehem Administrative Documents from the Reign of Šulgi*. Chicago: The
 University of Chicago Press.
- Hillers, Delbert R.
 1970 Review: “*Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit* by Frauke Gröndahl”, *JNES*
 29: 298-300.
- Hirsch, Hans
 1972 *Untersuchungen zur altassyrischen Religion*. Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag.
- Hock, Hans H.
 1991 *Principles of Historical Linguistics* (2nd ed.). Berlin-New York: Mouton de
 Gruyter.
- Hoffner, Harry A.
 1988 “The Song of Silver”, en: Neu, E. and Rüster, C. [Eds.] *Fs. Heinrich Otten*: 143-
 166.
 1998a *Hittite Myths*. (2nd edition). Atlanta: Scholars Press.
 1998b “Hurrian Civilization from a Hittite perspective”, *BibMes* 26: 167-200.
 1998c “Name, Namengebung. C. Bei den Hethitern”, *RIA* 9:116-121.
 2008 *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*. Atlanta: Shcolars Press.
- Holmstedt, Robert
 2006 “Issues in the Linguistic Analysis of a Dead Language, with Particular
 Reference to Ancient Hebrew”, *JHS* 6: 2-21.
- Hommel, Fritz
 1913 “Mitanninamen in den Drehem-Tafeln”, *OLZ* 16: 304-306.
- Hopkins, Grace S.
 1932 *Indo-European *DEIWOS and Related Words*. New York: Kraus Reprint
 Corporation.
- Huffmon, Herbert B.
 1965 *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Text. A Structural and Lexical Study*.
 Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Illingworth, N.J.J.
 1988 “Inscriptions from Tell Brak 1986”, *Iraq* 50: 87-108.

Ismail, Farouk

1991 *Altbabylonische Wirtschaftsurkunden aus Tall Leilan (Syrien)*. Ph.D Diss. Universität Tübingen.

Ivanov, Vyacheslav

1998 “Horse Symbols and the Name of the Horse in Hurrian”, *BibMes* 26: 145-166.

Jacobsen, Thorkild

1939a *The Sumerian King List*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

1939b “The assumed conflict between Sumerians and Semites in Early Mesopotamian history”, *JAOS* 59: 485-495.

1970 “Mesopotamian Gods and Pantheons”, in: Moran, W. [Ed.] *Toward the Image of Tammuz and Other Essays on Mesopotamian History and Culture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Jahn, Brit

2007 “The Migration and Sedentarization of the Amorites from the Point of View of the Settled Babylonian Population”, in: Heinz, Marlies and Feldman, Marian [Eds.] *Representations of Political Power*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 193-209.

Jensen, Peter

1890 “Vorstudien zur Entzifferung des Mitanni”, *ZA* 5: 166-208.

1891 “Vorstudien zur Entzifferung des Mitanni. II”, *ZA* 6: 34-72.

1899 “Zur Erklärung des Mitanni”, *ZA* 14: 173-181.

Jespersen, Otto

1963[1924] *The Philosophy of Grammar*. 8th ed. London: George Allen & Unwin LTD.

Jirku, Anton

1969 “Ugaritische Eigennamen als Quellen des ugaritischen Lexikons”, *ArOr* 37: 8-11.

Jones, Siân

1997 *The Archaeology of Ethnicity. Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*. London and New York: Routledge.

Justeson, John S.

1986 “The Origin of Writing Systems: Preclassic Mesoamerica”, *WA* 17: 437-458.

Kammenhuber, Annelies

1959 *Das Palaische* (RHA 17). Paris.

1974 “Historisch-geographische Nachrichten aus der althurrischen Überlieferung, dem altelamischen und den Inschriften der Könige von Akkad für die Zeit vor

- dem Einfall der Gutäer (ca. 2200-2136)”. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 22 (1974 ([publ. 1976]): 157-247.
- 1976 “Neue Ergebnisse zur hurrischen und altmesopotamischen Überlieferung in Boğazköy”, *OrNs* 45: 130-144.
- 1977 “Die Arier im Vordern Orient und die historischen Wohnsitze der Hurriter”, *OrNs* 46: 129-143.
- Kamp, Kathryn A. and Yoffee, Norman
- 1980 “Ethnicity in Ancient Western Asia during the Early Second Millennium B.C.: Archaeological Assessments and Ethnoarcheological Prospectives”, *BASOR* 237: 85-104.
- Kassian, Alexei
- 2009 “Notes on Hurro-Urartian Phonology and Morphology”, *AoF* 36/2: 234-242.
- 2010 “Hurro-Urartian from the lexiconstatistical viewpoint”, *UF* 42: 383-451.
- 2011 Review: “N. Nozadze, *Vocabulary of the Hurrian Language*”, *Babel und Bibel* 6: 517-522.
- 2014 “Lexical Matches between Sumerian and Hurro-Urartian: Possible Historical Scenarios”, *CDLJ* 2014/4: 1-23.
- Katz, Jerrold
- 1972 *Semantic Theory*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Kelly-Buccellati, Marilyn
- 1998 “The Workshops of Urkeš”, *BibMes* 26: 35-50.
- 2004a “Andirons at Urkesh: New Evidence for the Hurrian Identity of the Early Trans-Caucasian Culture”, *Fs. Burney*: 67-89.
- in print “Urkesh Ceramic Evidence for Function and Emulation Processes” in *A volume in memory of P. E. Pecorella*.
- Kessler, Karlheinz
- 1980 *Untersuchungen zur historischen Topographie Nordmesopotamiens* (TAVO Nr. 26). Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Khačikyan, Margarita L.
- 1978 “Dialektnoje cleneniye khurritskogo jazyka”, *Drevnij Vostok* 3: 39-46.
- 1985 *Churritskij i urartskij*. Yerevan.
- 1987 “On Some Models in Hurrian Onomastics”, *SCCNH* 2:153-155.
- 1999 “The Hurrian Verb Revisited”, *SCCNH* 10: 257-265.
- Killebrew, Ann E.

- 2005 *Biblical Peoples and Ethnicity. An Archaeological Study of Egyptians, Canaanites, Philistines, and Early Israel, 1300-1100 B.C.E.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Kienast, Burkhard
- 1979 "The Name of the City of Babulon", *Sumer* 35: 246-248.
- 1980 "Die altbabylonischen Kaufurkunden aus Alalah", *WO* 11: 35-63.
- Kinlaw, Dennis F.
- 1967 *A Study of the Personal Names in the Akkadian Texts from Ugarit.* PhD. Diss. Brandeis University.
- Kleinerman, Alexandra and Oved, David
- 2009 *Analytical Concordance to the Ġaršana Archive (CUSAS 4).* Bethesda: CDL Press.
- Klengel, Hörst
- 1992 *Syria 3000 to 300 B.C. A Handbook of Political History.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag GmbH.
- Knudtzon, Jürgen A.
- 1915 *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln.* 1 Vol. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Kraus, Fritz R.
- 1970 *Sumerer und Akkader: Ein Probleme der altmesopotamischen Geschichte.* Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co.
- Krebernik, Manfred
- 2001 *Tall Bi'a/Tuttul II. Die altorientalischen Schriftunde (WVDOG 100).* Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag.
- 2002 "Zur Struktur und Geschichte des älteren sumerischen Onomastikons", in: Streck, M. and Weninger, S. [Eds.] *Altorientalische und semitische Onomastik (AOAT 296).* Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1-74.
- 2014 "dU.GUR", *RIA* 14/3-4: 296-297.
- Kripke, Saul
- 1980 *Naming and Necessity.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kryszat, Guido
- 2008 "Herrscher, Kult und Kultradtition in Anatolien nach den Quellen aus den altassyrischen Handelskolonien - Teil 3/1: Grundlagen für eine neue Rekonstruktion der Geschichte Anatoliens und der assyrischen Handelskolonien in spätaltassyrischer Zeit", *AoF* 35: 156-189.

Kroch, Anthony S.

2001 “Syntactic Change”, in: Baltin M. and Collins C. [Eds.] *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher, 699-729.

Kuhrt, Amélie

1995 “Ancient Mesopotamia in Classical Greek and Hellenistic Thought”, *CANE*: 55-65.

2000 *The Ancient Near East c. 3000-330 BC, Vol. 1*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kupper, Jean-Robert

1957 *Les nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari*. Liège: Presses universitaires de Liège, Les Belles Lettres

1978 “Les Hourrites a Mari”, *RHA* 36: 117-128.

1980 “Une tablette paleo-babylonienne de Mardikh III”, *SEb* II/4-5: 49-51.

1998 *Lettres royales du temps de Zimri-Lim (ARM 28)*. Paris.

2005 “Un contrat paléo-syrien de Tell Mardikh”, *Akkadica* 126: 45-49.

Kurylowics, Jerzy

1956 “La position linguistique du nom propre”, *Onomastica* 2: 1-14.

Labat, Rene

1988 *Manuel d'Epigraphie Akkadienne* (6 ed). Paris: Geuthner.

Lacambre, Denis

2010 “L'administration de Chagar Bazar (Ašnakkum) à l'époque de Samsī-Addu”, *RAI* 53/2: 97-113.

Lacambre, Denis and Millet Albà, Adelina

2008 “Le nom ancien de Chagar Bazar”, *Chagar Bazar III*: 143-154.

Lacheman, Ernest

1939 “Nuziana”, *RA* 36: 81-95.

1985 “The Pantheon of Mari”, *Mari 4*: 525-539.

1986 “The Reading of the Divine Name Šakkan”, *OrNs* 55: 152-158.

Lambert, Wilfred G.

1987 “Hurrian names on a Seal?”, *OrAnt* 26: 13-16.

1976-1980 “Išḫara”, *RIA* 5: 176-177.

1978 “The Mesopotamian Background of the Hurrian Pantheon”, *RHA* 36: 129-140.

1981 “The Reading of AMA.GAN.ŠA”, *ASJ* 3: 31-36.

1990 “Ancient Mesopotamian Gods: Superstition, Philosophy, Theology”, *RHR* 207:

- 115-130.
- 2011 “Babylon: Origins”, in: Cancik-Kirschbaum, E. - van Ess, M. and Marzahn, J. (Eds.), *Babylon. Wissenskultur in Orient und Okzident/ Science Culture Between Orient and Occident*. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 71-76.
- Landsberger, Benno
- 1924 “Über die Völker Vorderasiens im dritten Jahrtausend”, *ZA* 35: 213-238.
- Langendonck van, Willy
- 2007 *Theory and Typology of Proper Names*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Langhe de, Robert
- 1945 *Les textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et leurs rapports avec le milieu biblique de l'ancien Testament*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
- Laroche, Emanuel
- 1948 “Teššub, Ḫebat et le cour”, *JCS* 2: 113-136.
- 1955 “Les textes hourrites”, *PRU* 3: 325-335.
- 1957 “Fragment hourrite provenant de Mâri”, *RA* 51:104-106.
- 1960a “Études hourrites”, *RA* 54: 187-202.
- 1960b “Koubaba, déesse anatolienne, et le problème des origines de Cybèle”, en *Elements orientaux dans la religion grecque ancienn. Colloque de Strasburg 22-24 mai 1958*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 113-128.
- 1963 “Le Dieu Anatolien Sarrumma”, *Syria* 4: 277-302.
- 1966 *Les Noms des Hittites*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- 1968 “Documents en langue hourrite provenant de Ras Shamra”, *Ugaritica* V: 447-544.
- 1976 “Pantheón national et pantheon locaux chez les Hourrite”, *OrNs* 45: 94-99.
- 1980 *Glossaire de la langue hourrite*. Paris: Editions Klincksieck.
- 1982 “Documents hittites et hourrites”, en: Beyer, D. [Ed.], *Meskéné/Emar. Dix ans des travaux, 1972-1982*. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 53-60.
- Larsen, Mogens T.
- 2002 *The Aššur-nādā Archive (Old Assyrian Archives, volume 1)*. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten te Leiden.
- 2015 *Ancient Kanesh. A Merchant Colony in Bronze Age Anatolia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Layton, Scott C.
- 1990 *Archaic Features of Canaanite Personal Names the Hebrew Bible*. Atlanta:

Scholar Press.

Le Goff, Jacques

- 2001 "Prefacio", in: Bloch, M. *Apología para la historia o el oficio de historiador*. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude

- 1964 *Mythologiques, T. I : Le Cru et le cuit*. Paris: Plon.
1966 *The Savage Mind* (English Transl.) London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Lewy, Julius

- 1928 Review: "G. Contenau, Les tablettes de Kerkouk et les origines de la civilisation assyrienne (Babyloniaca IX/2-4, Paris 1926)" *OLZ* 31: 964-968.
1938 "Notes on Pre-Hurrian Texts from Nuzi", *JAOS* 58: 450-461.

Limet, Henry

- 1972 "L'étranger dans la société sumérienne", in: Edzard, O. [Ed.] *Gesellschaftsklassen im Alten Zweistromland und in den angrenzenden Gebieten. XVIII. Rencontre assyriologique internationale, München, 29. Juni bis 3. Juli 1970*. München: De Gruyter, 123-138.
1995a "Onomastique sumérienne", *IHzO*: 851-854.
1995b "Anthroponymie akkadienne", *IHzO*: 854-856.
2005 "Ethnicity", in: Snell, D. [Ed.] *A Companion to the Ancient Near East*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 370-383.

Lion, Brigitte and Michel, Cécile

- 2012 *Scritture cuneiformi: storia, usi, decifrazione*. [Italian transl. and edit. by Fales, M.] Udine: Forum.

Liverani, Mario

- 1978 "L'élément hurrite dans la Syrie du nord. ca. 1350-1200", *RHA* 36: 149-156.
1993 "Model and Actualization", in: Liverani, M. [Ed.] *Akkad, the First World Empire. Structure, Ideology, Traditions*. Padova: Sargon, 43-67.
1999a *Le lettere di el-Amarna 1. Le lettere dei "Piccoli Re"*. Brescia: Paideia Editore.
1999b *Le lettere di el-Amarna 2. Le lettere dei "Grandi Re"*. Brescia: Paideia Editore.
2013 *The Ancient Near East: History, Society and Economy* (3rd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
2014 [2013] *Imaginar Babel. Dos siglos de estudios sobre la ciudad oriental antigua*. Barcelona: Bellaterra.

Loprieno, Antonio

- 1995 *Ancient Egyptian. A Linguistic Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Louden, Bruce
- 2011 *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lucy, Sam
- 2005 "Ethnic and Cultural Identities", in: Diaz-Andreu, Margarita et al. *Archaeology of Identity: Approaches to Gender, Age, Status, Ethnicity and Religion.* New York: Routledge, 86-109.
- Lüddeckens, Erich
- 1985 "Die theophoren Personennamen im pharaonischen, hellenistisch-römischen und christlichen Ägypten", in: AA.VV. *Ägypten, Dauer und Wandel: Symposium anlässlich des 75 jährigen Bestehens des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, am 10. Und 11. Oktober 1982.* Mainz: Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, 105-113.
- Luraghi, Nino
- 2008 *The Ancient Messenians: Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, John
- 1997 *Semantics. Vol. 1.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maidman, Maynard P.
- 1995 "Nuzi: Portrait of an Ancient Mesopotamian Provincial Town", *CANE*: 931-947.
- 2010 *Nuzi Texts and their Uses as Historical Evidence.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Maiocchi, Massimo
- 2011 "A Hurrian Administrative Tablet from Third Millennium Urkesh", *ZA* 102: 191-203.
- Malbran-Labat, Florence
- 1999 "Langues et écritures à Ougarit", *Semitic* 49: 65-101.
- 2002 "Textes religieux et multilinguisme à Ougarit", *Hethitica* 15: 173-181.
- Markey, T.L.
- 1982 "Crisis and Cognition in Onomastics", *Names* 30: 129-42.
- Marmaridou, A. Sophia
- 1989 "Proper Names in Communication", *JoL* 25: 355-372.

Márquez-Rowe, Ignacio

- 1998 “Notes on the Hurro-Akkadian of Alalah in the Mid-Second Millennium B.C.E.”, *IOS* 18: 63-78.
- 2008 Review: “Wegner, Ilse. *Eine Einführung in die hurritische Sprache*. 2nd edition”, *RBL* 10.

Martínez, Javier and De Vaan, Michiel

- 2013 *Introduction to Avestan*. Leiden: Brill.

de Martino, Stefano

- 1992 *Die mantischen Texte* (ChS I/7). Rome: Multigrafica Editrice.
- 2000a “El regno hurrita di Mittani: Profilo storico politico”, *PDP* 55: 68-101.
- 2000b “Il ‘Canto della liberazione’: Composizione letteraria bilingue hurrico-ittita sulla distruzione di Ebla”, *PDP* 55: 296-320.
- 2004 “A Tentative Chronology of the Kingdom of Mittani from its Rise to the Reign of Tušratta” in: Hunger, H. and Pruzsinsky, R. [Eds.] *Mesopotamian Dark Age Revisited. Proceedings of an International Conference of SCIEM (Vienna 8th-9th November 2002)* Viena: Osterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 35–42.
- 2011 *Hurrian Personal Names in the Kingdom of Ḫatti*. Florence: Logisma editore.
- 2012 “The ‘Song of Release’ Twenty-nine Years after its Discovery”, *AoF* 39: 208-217.
- 2014 “The Mittani State: The Formation of the Kingdom of Mittani”, in: Cancik-Kirschbaum, E. Brisch, N. and Eidem, J. [Eds.] *Constituent Confederate, and Conquered Space. The Emergence of the Mittani State*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 61-74.

de Martino, Stefano and Giorgieri, Mauro

- 2007 “Hurritisch *ašti* “Ehe(frau)”, *AoF* 34: 126-148.
- 2008 *Literatur zum hurritischen Lexikon* (LHL). Vol. 1: A. Florence: Logisma editore.

Masetti, Maria Grazia and Rouault, Olivier

- 2011-2012 “Terqa (Tall ‘Ašāra; nA Sirqu)”, *RIA* 13 7/8: 596-603.

Matouš, Lubor

- 1974 “Prozesseinleitung gegen den *kaššārum* nach ‘kappadokischer’ Urkunde I 695”, *Fs. Güterbock I*: 195-200

Matthews, Donald and Eidem, Jesper

- 1993 “Tell Brak and Nagar”, *Iraq* 55: 201-207.
- Matthews, Elaine and Hornblower, Simon
- 2000 “Introduction”, in: Hornblower, S. and Matthews, E. [Eds.] *Greek Personal Names. Their value as Evidence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-14.
- Mayer, Walter
- 1996 “The Hurrian Cult at Ugarit”, in: Wyatt, N. Watson, W.G.E. and Lloyd, J.B. [Eds.] *Ugarit: Religion and Culture. Proceedings of the Edinburgh University International Colloquium 20-23 July 1994*. Münster, Ugarit-Verlag, 205-211.
- Mbiti, John S.
- 1991 [1975] *Introduction to African Religion*. 2nd Ed. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- MacGinnis, John
- 2012 “Evidence for a peripheral language in a Neo-Assyrian tablet from the Governor's Palace in Tušhan”, in *JNES* 71: 13-20.
- 2014 *A City from the Dawn of History: Erbil in the Cuneiform Sources*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Meek, Theophile J.
- 1931-1932 “Some Gleanings from the last excavations at Nuzi”, *AASOR* 13: 1-12.
- 1932 “The Akkadian and Cappadocian Texts from Nuzi”, *BASOR* 48: 2-5.
- 1935 *Old Akkadian, Sumerian, and Cappadocian Texts from Nuzi* (HSS, Vol. X) Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mehrotra, Raja R.
- 1982 “Impact of Religion on Hindi Personal Names”, *Names* 30: 43-47.
- Meijer, Deiderik J.W.
- 1986 *A Survey in Northeastern Syria* (PIHANS 58). Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut.
- Melchert, Craig
- 2003 *The Luwians*. Leiden: Brill.
- Messerschmidt, Leopold
- 1899 *Mitanni-Studien* (MVAG 4/4). Berlin.
- Meyer, G. Rudolf
- 1937-1939 “Die älteste Erwähnung des hurrischen Wettergottes Tešup”, *Afo* 12: 366-371.
- 1939-1941 “Noch einige “Mitanni”-Namen aus Drehem- und Djoḥa”, *Afo* 13: 147-152.
- Michalowski, Piotr

- 1986a “Mental Maps and Ideology: Reflections on Subartu”, in: Weiss, H. [Ed.] *The Origin of Cities in Dry Farming Syria and Mesopotamia in the Third Millennium B.C.* Connecticut: Four Quarters Pub Co, 129-156
- 1986b “The Earliest Hurrian Toponymy: A New Sargonid Inscription”, *ZA* 76: 4-11.
- 2000 “Sumer Dreams of Subartu: Politics and the Geographical Imagination”, in: Van Lerberghe, K. and Voet, G. [Eds.] *Languages and Culture in Contact. At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro-Mesopotamian Realm.* Leuven: Peeters, 305-315.
- Michel, Cécile
- 1991 *Innāya dans les tablettes paléo-assyriennes. I Analyse. II Editions des textes.* Paris: Editions Recherche ser les Civilisations.
- 2001 *Correspondance des Marchands de Kanish au début du II^e millénaire avant J.-C.* Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- 2010 “Deux textes atypiques découverts à kültepe”, *JCS* 62: 71-80.
- 2011-2012 “Šubartu”, *RIA* 13: 225-227.
- Milano, Lucio
- 1991 “Philological Presentation”, *Mozan* 2: 15-26.
- Mill, John Stewart
- 1882 *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive, Being a Connected View of the Principles of Evidence, and the Methods of Scientific Investigation* (8th ed.). New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Miller, James C.
- 2008 “Ethnicity and the Hebrew Bible: Problems and Prospects”, *CBR* 6:170-213.
- Miller, Jarred L.
- 2001 “Anum-Ḫirpi and his Kingdom”, *Aof* 28: 65-101.
- Molino, Jean
- 1982 “Le nom proper dans la langue”, *Langages* 66: 5-20,
- Möller, Lucie A.
- 1995 “Methods and Problems in Proper Name Lexicography”, *IHzO*: 324-328.
- Moran, William L.
- 1992 *The Amarna Letters.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Morpurgo Davies, Anna
- 2000 “Personal Names and Linguistic Continuity”, in: Hornblower, S. and Matthews,

- Elaine. [Eds.] *Greek Personal Names. Their value as Evidence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 15-39.
- Müller, Gerfried G.W.
- 1993 Review: “Hurritisch. Volkert Haas (Hrsg.) *Hurriter und Hurritisch*”, *BiOr* 50: 439-445.
- Muscarella, Oscar W.
- 1988 “Lion Foundation Peg”, in: *Bronze and Iron. Ancient Near Eastern Artefacts in The Metropolitan Museum of Arts*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 374-377.
- Negri Scafa, Paola
- 2005 “Ethnical and Cultural Aspects related to Personal Names: the Names of the Scribes in the Kingdom of Arrapha”, *RAI* 48: 245-251.
- Needham, Joseph
- 1975 *Dentro de los cuatro mares. El diálogo entre occidente y oriente*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Neu, Eric
- 1996a *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I* (StBoT 32). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz.
- 1996b “La bilingüe hourro-hittite de Ḫattuša, contenu et sens”, *Amurru* 1: 189-195.
- Nicolaisen, Wilhelm F.H.
- 1995 “Name and Appellative”, *IHzO*: 384-193.
- Nichols, Johanna
- 2003 “Diversity and Stability in Language”, in: Joseph, B. and Janda, R. [Eds.] *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 283-310.
- Nichols, John
- 2004 *Amorite Agro-Pastoralism and the Early to Middle Bronze Age Transition in Syria*. PhD. Diss. Johns Hopkins University.
- Nougayrol, Jean
- 1960 “Documents du Habur”, *Syria* 37: 205-214.
- 1968 Review: “*Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit (= Studia Pohl, 1)* by Frauke Gröndahl”, *RA* 62: 163-165.
- Nougayrol, Jean and Laroche, Emanuel
- 1955 “Le bilingue accado-hourrite”, *PRU* 3: 309-324.
- Nozadze, Nana

- 2007 *Vocabulary of the Hurrian Language*. Tiflis: Society of Assyriologists
Bibliologists and Caucasiologists.
- Odelain, Olivier and Séguineau, Raymond
- 1978 *Dictionnaire des noms propres de la Bible*. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf.
- Oliva Mompeán, Juan
- 2000 “A Forgotten Text from Alalakh VII”, *JCS* 52: 61-65.
- 2004 “La cuestión hurrita. Luces y sombras en la memoria antigua del Próximo Oriente”, *Huelva Arqueológica* 19: 171-203.
- 2005 “New Collations and Remarks on Alalakh VII Tablets”, *JNES* 64: 1-22.
- 2006 “Collations of Middle Babylonian Alalakh Tablets in the British Museum”, *AuOr* 22: 325-332.
- 2008 “Los hurritas en la antigua Siria: un balance provisional”, en: Vita, J.P. and Zamora, J.A. [Eds.] *Las culturas del Próximo Oriente Antiguo y su expansión mediterránea*. Zaragoza: Instituto de Estudios Islámicos y del Oriente Próximo, 145-165.
- Oppenheim, Leo A.
- 1977 *Ancient Mesopotamia. Portrait of a Dead Civilization*. Rev. Edition 1977 by Erica Reiner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Otten, Heinrich
- 1980-1983 “Kušuh”, *RIA* 06: 382-383.
- Owen, David I.
- 1981 Review: “RGCT 2”, *JCS* 33: 244-269.
- 1992 “Syrians in Sumerian Sources from the Ur III Period”, *BibMes* 25: 107-175.
- Pagan, Joseph M.
- (1998) *A Morphological and Lexical Study of Personal Names in the Ebla Texts*. (ARES III). Rome: Missione Archeologica Italiana in Siria.
- Pappi, Cinzia
- 2014 “Tuttul. A. Philologisch”, *RIA* 14 13/14: 233-236.
- Pardee, Dennis
- 1987 “Epigraphic and philological notes”, *UF* 19: 199-217.
- 1988 “An evaluation of the proper names from Ebla from a West Semitic perspective: the pantheon distribution according to genre” *ARES* I: 119-151.
- 1989-90 “Ugaritic proper nouns”, *AfO* 36-37: 390-513.
- 1996 “L’ougaritique et le hurrite dans les textes rituels de Ras Shamra – Ougarit”,

in: Briquel-Chatonnet, F. [Ed.] *Mosaïque de langues. Mosaïque culturelle. Le bilinguisme dans le proech-orient ancien*. Paris: Jean Maisonneuve, 63-80.

Parker, Robert

2000 “Theophoric Names and the History of Greek Religion”, in Hornblower, S. and Matthews, E. [Eds.] *Greek Personal Names. Their value as Evidence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 53-79.

Parrot, André and Nougayrol, Jean

1948 “Un document de foundation hourrite”, *RA* 42: 1-20.

Patri, Sylvain

2009 “Aspects de la position génétique du hourrite”, *SCCNH* 18: 341-354.

Pecchioli, Daddi F.

2001 “Lotte di dei per la supremazia celeste,” in: Ribichini, S. – Rocchi, M. and Xella, P. [Eds.] *La questione delle influenze vicino-orientali sulla religione greca: Stato degli studi e prospettive della ricerca: Atti del Colloquia Internazionale, Roma, 20-22 maggio 1999*. Rom, 403-411.

2003 “From Akkad to Hattuša: the history of Gurparanzaḥ and the river that gave him its name,” in: *Fs. Fronzaroli*: 476-494.

Pettinato, Giovanni

1974-1977 “Il calendario di ebla al tempo del re ibbi-sipis sulla base di TM.75.G.427” *AfO* 25: 1-36.

2000 *Ebla, una ciudad olvidada. Arqueología e historia*. Madrid: Trotta. [Trad. del italiano: (1999) *La città sepolta. I misteri di Ebla.*]

Pfeiffer, Robert H. and Speiser, Ephraim A.

1935-1936 *One Hundred New Selected Nuzi Texts*. AASOR 16.

Pinker, Steven

2007 *The Stuff of Thought. Language as a Window into Human Nature*. New York: Viking.

Pike, Dana P.

1990 *Israelite Theophoric Personal Names in the Bible and their Implications for Religious Studies*. PhD. Diss. University of Pennsylvania.

Pomponio, Francesco

1984 “Notes on the Fara Texts”, *OrNs* 53: 1-18.

Popko, Maciej

1995 *Religions of Asia Minor*. Warsaw: Academic Publications Dialog.

Prechel, Doris and Richter, Thomas

2001 “AbraKadabra oder Althurritisch”, *Fs. Haas*: 333-371.

Pruzsinszky, Regine

2003 *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Emar*. SCCNH 13. Bethesda: CDL Press.

Pulgram, Ernest

1954 *Theory of Names*. Berkeley: American Name Society.

Puhvel, Jaan

1989 ‘Hittite Regal Titles: Hattic or Indo-European?’, *JIES* 17: 351-61.

Quaegebeur, Jan and Vandorpe, Kateljin

1995 “Ancient Egyptian Onomastics”, *IHzO*: 841-851.

Rainey, Anson

1995 *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets. A Linguistic analysis of the Mixed Dialect used by Scribes from Canaan*. Leiden: Brill.

2014 *The El-Amarna Correspondance. A New Edition of the Cuneiform Letters from the Site of El-Amarna based on Collations of all Extant Tablets*. Leiden: Brill.

Rasmussen, Carl G.

1981 *A Study of the Akkadian Personal Names from Mari*. PhD. Diss. University of Dropsie.

Reiner, Erica

1966 *A Linguistic Analysis of Akkadian*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.

Renfrew, Colin

1987 *Archaeology and Language: The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins*. London: Penguin Books.

Ribichini, Sergio and Xella, Paolo

1991 “Problemi di onomastica ugaritica. Il caso dei teofori”, *SEL* 8: 149-170.

Richter, Thomas

1998a “Anmerkungen zu den hurritischen Personennamen des *ḫapiru*-Prismas aus Tigonānu”, *SCCNH* 9: 125-134.

1998b “Die Lesung des Gottemamens AN.AN.MAR.TU”, *SCCNH* 9: 135-137.

2001 “Theophore Elemente hurritischer Personennamen altbabylonischen Datums aus Syrien und dem Osttigrisgebiet”, in: Wilhelm, G. [Ed.] *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 563-575.

2004a “Die Ausbreitung der Hurriter bis zur altbabylonischen Zeit: eine kurze

- Zwischenbilanz”, *CDOG* 3: 263-311.
- 2004b *Untersuchungen zu den lokalen Panthea Süd- und Mittelbabyloniens in altbabylonischer Zeit* (AOAT 257). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- 2005a “Qatna in the Late Bronze Age. Preliminary Remarks”, *SCCNH* 15: 109-126.
- 2005b “Kleine Beiträge zum hurritischen Wörterbuch”, *AoF* 32: 23-44.
- 2006 “Hurriter und Hurritisch im bronzezeitlichen Syrien”, in: Prechel, D. [Ed.] *Motivation und Mechanismen des Kulturkontaktes in der Späten Bronzezeit*. Florence: LoGisma editore, 145-178.
- 2010 “Ein Hurriter wird geboren ... und bennant”, *Fs. J.W. Meyer*: 503-528.
- 2012 *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- 2016 *Vorarbeiten zu einem hurritischen Namenbuch. Erster Teil: Personennamen altbabylonischer Überlieferung vom Mittleren Euphrat und aus dem nördlichen Mesopotamien*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Richter, Thomas and Lange, Sarah
- 2012 *Das Archiv des Idadda* (QS 3). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Richter, Wolfgang
- 1969 Review: “*Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit: Studia Pohl. Dissertationes scientificae de rebus orientis antiqui 1* by Frauke Gröndahl”, *ZDMG* 119: 351-355.
- Rieken, Elisabeth
- 2009 “Die Tontafelfunde aus Kayalıpınar” [mit einem Beitrag von Gernot Wilhelm], in: Pecchioli Daddi, F. - Torri, G. and Corti, C. [Eds.] *Central-North Anatolia in the Hittite Period. New Perspectives in Light of Recent Research. Acts of the Conference held at the University of Florence (7–9 February 2007)*. Rome: Herder Editrice, 119–145.
- Ristvet, Lauren
- 2005 *Settlement, Economy, and History in the Tell Leilan Region, Syria 3000-1000 BC*. Phd. Diss. University of Cambridge.
- Rivera Dorado, Miguel
- 2012 *Popol Vuh. Relato maya del origen del mundo y de la vida*. 2nd Ed. Trotta: Madrid.
- Roaf, Michael
- 2005 “Ethnicity and Near Eastern Archaeology: The Limits of Inference”, in *RAI* 48: 306-315.

Roberts, Jimmy J.M.

- 1972 *The Earliest Semitic Pantheon. A Study of Semitic Deities Attested before Ur III.*
Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Roche-Hawley, Carole

- 2001 *Recherches sur la prosopographie du royaume d'Ougarit de la fin du XIV^e siècle au début du XII^e siècle a.v. J.-C.* PhD. Dissert. Université de Paris-Sorbonne (Paris IV).
- 2005 "Introduction à la civilisation d'Ougarit", in: Michaud, J.-M. [Ed.] *Le Bible et l'heritage d'Ougarit.* Sherbrooke: GGC Éditions, 29-44.

Rouault, Olivier

- 1977 *Terqa Preliminary Reports, No 7: Les documents épigraphiques de la troisième saison (SMS 2/7).* Malibu.
- 1984 *L'archive de Puzurum (BibMes 16).* Malibu.
- 1992 "Cultures locales et influences extérieures: le cas de Terqa", *SMEA* 30: 247-256.
- 2011 *Terqa Final Reports No. 2 – Les textes des saisons 5 à 9 (BibMes 29).* Malibu.

Rowton, Michael B.

- 1965 "The Topological Factor in the *Habiru* Problem", *Fs. Landsberger: 375-387.*

Rubio, Gonzalo

- 1999 "On the alleged pre-Sumerian substratum", *JCS* 51: 1-16 .
- 2005 "The linguistic landscape of early Mesopotamia", *RAI* 48: 316-322.
- 2011 "Gods and Scholars: Mapping the Pantheon in Early Mesopotamia", in: Pongratz-Leisten, B. [Ed.] *Reconsidering the Concept of Revolutionary Monotheism.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 91-118.
- 2013 "From Sumer to Babylonia. Topics in the History of Southern Mesopotamia", in: Chavalas, M. [Ed.] *Current Issues in the History of the Ancient Near East.* Claremont: Regino Books, 5-51.

Russell, Bertrand

- 1903 *The Principles of Mathematics.* London. (Reprint by Routledge, London, 2010).
- 1918 *The Philosophy of Logical Atomism.* London. (Reprint by Routledge, London, 2010).

Said, Edward W.

- 1979 *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books.

Sallaberger, Walther

- 1996a "Introduction", in: Ismail, F. Sallaberger, W. Talon, P. and Van Lerberghe, K.

- [Eds.] *Administrative Documents from Tell Beydar (Season 1993-1995). Subartu II*. Turnhout: Brepols, 31-32.
- 1996b “Calendar and Pantheon”, in: Ismail, F. Sallaberger, W. Talon, P. and Van Lerberghe, K. [Eds.] *Administrative Documents from Tell Beydar (Season 1993-1995). Subartu II*. Turnhout: Brepols, 85-87.
- 1998 “Der antike Name von Tell Beydar: Nabada (*Na-ba₄-da^{ki}/Na-ba-ti-um^{ki}*)”, *NABU* 1998: 122-125.
- 2007 “From Urban Culture to Nomadism: A History of Upper Mesopotamia in the Late Third Millennium”, *Varia Anatolica* 19: 417-459.
- Sallaberger, Walther and Schrakamp, Ingo
- 2015 “Conclusion”, *ARCANE*: 297-304.
- Sallaberger, Walther and Talon, Philippe
- 1996 “Transliterated Texts”, *Subartu* 12: 127-174.
- Salvini, Mirjo
- 1978 “Hourrite et Urarteen”, *RHA* 36: 157-172.
- 1979 “Confronti lessicali fra hurrico e urarteo”, *Fs. Laroche*: 305-314.
- 1988a “Die hurritischen Überlieferungen des Gilgameš-Epos und der Kešši-Erzählung”, in: Haas, V. [Ed.] *Hurriter und Hurritisch*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag, 157-172.
- 1988b “Un texte hourrite nommant Zimrilim”, *RA* 82: 59-66.
- 1989 “Le panthéon de l’Urartu et le fondement de l’état”, *SEL* 6: 79-91.
- 1991a “Note su alcuni nomi di persona hurriti”, *SEL* 8: 175-180.
- 1991b “Betrachtungen zum hurrisch-urartäischen Verbum”, *ZA* 81: 120-132.
- 1992 “Nuovi confronti fra hurrico e urarteo”, *SMEA* 29: 217-225.
- 1995a “Ougarit et les Hourrites”, en: Yon, M. Sznycer, M. and Bordreuil, P. [Eds.] *Le pays d’Ougarit autor de 1200 av. J.-C.* Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 89-97.
- 1995b “Una lettera di Ḫattušili I relative alla spedizione contro Ḫaḫḫum”, *SMEA* 34: 61-80.
- 1996a *The Ḫabiru prism of the King Tunip-Teššup of Tikunani*. Rome: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali.
- 1996b “Excursus: The name Tupkiš”, in: Buccellati, G. and Kelly-Buccellati, M. “The Seals of the King of Urkesh Evidence from the Western Wing of the Royal Storehouse AK”, *WZKM* 86: 65-100.

- 1998 “The Earliest Evidence of the Hurrians before the Formation of the Reign of Mittanni”, *BibMes* 26: 99-115.
- 2000a “La civiltà dei Hurriti, popolo dell’Asia Anteriore Antica. Introduzione alla storia degli studi e alla documentazione testuale”, *PDP* 55: 7-24.
- 2000b “Le più antiche testimonianze dei Hurriti prima della formazione del regno di Mittani”, *PDP* 55: 25-66.
- 2000c “I Hurriti sulla costa orientale del Mediterraneo”, *PDP* 55: 103-113.
- 2015 “Urartu. A. Philologisch”, *RIA* 14: 389-394.
- 2015 *Les textes hourrites de Meskéné/Emar* (AnOr 57). Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Sanmartín Ascaso, Joaquín
- 1999-2000 “Sociedades y lenguas en el medio sirio-levantino del II milenio a.C.: Ugarit y lo hurrita”, *AuOr* 17: 113-123.
- Saporetti, Claudio
- 1970 *Onomastica Medio-Assira*. Rome: Biblica Institute Press.
- 1981 “Qualche dato di Confronto fra Nomi di Persona Hurriti”, *SCCNH* 1: 305-307.
- 1995 “Testi da Tell Yelkhi del periodo Isin-Larsa I”, *Mesopotamia* 30: 5-38.
- 2001 “Testi da Tell Yelkhi del periodo Isin-Larsa II”, *Mesopotamia* 36: 89-102.
- Sartori, Giovanni
- 1987 *The Theory of Democracy Revisited. Part one: The Contemporary Debate*. New Jersey: CQ Press.
- Sasson, Jack
- 1974 “Ḫurrians and Ḫurrian Names in the Mari Texts”, *UF* 6: 353-400.
- 1979 *Hurrian Personal Names in the Rimah Archives* (Assur 2/2). Malibu: Undena Publications.
- 1980 Review: “The Old Babylonian Tablets from Al-Rimah”, *JAOS* 100: 453-460.
- Saussure de, Ferdinand
- 1995 *Cours de linguistique generale*. Paris: Éditions Payot & Rivages.
- Sawyer, John F.
- 2011 “Names: Religious Belief”, *CELR*: 302-304.
- Sayce, Archibald H.
- 1890 “The Language of Mitanni”, *ZA* 5: 260-274.
- Schneider, Nikolaus
- 1932 *Die Drehem- und Djohatexte im Kloster Montserrat (Barcelona) in Autographie*

und mit systematischen Wörterverzeichnissen herausgegeben (AnOr 7). Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Schult, Hermann

1969 Review: "Gröndahl, Frauke: Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit", *ZDPV* 85: 197-200.

Schwemer, Daniel

2001 *Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.

2008a "Šāla. A. Philologisch", *RIA* 11/7-8: 565-567.

2008b "Šāluš, Šālaš", *RIA* 11/7-8: 590.

2008c "The Storm-Gods of the Ancient Near East: Summary, Synthesis, Recent Studies. Part II", *JANER* 8/1: 1-44.

Sciarone, Bondi

1967 "Proper Names and Meaning", *Studia Linguistica* 21: 73-86.

Searl, John R.

1969 *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Segert, Satinslav

1995 "Ugaritic Names", *IHzO*: 860-866.

Seppänen, Aimo

1974 *Proper names in English: A study in semantics and syntax*. Tampere: Dept. of English Philology, University of Tampere

Severi, Carlo

2010 "Nous et Eux. Réflexions sur la différence culturelle". *Conférences du Collège de France*. <http://conferences-cdf.revues.org/214> (accessed 29/12/2015).

Sharlach, Tonia

2002 "Foreign Influences on the Religion of the Ur III Court", *SCCNH* 12: 91-114.

Sigrist, Marcel

1979 "Nouveaux noms géographiques de l'empire d'Ur III", *JCS* 31: 166-170.

1990 *Tablettes du Princeton Theological Seminary. Époque d'Ur III* (Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund, 10). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum.

1991 *Documents from Tablet Collections in Rochester/New York*. Bethesda: CDL Press.

1995 *Neo-Sumerian Texts from the Royal Ontario Museum. The Administration at*

- Drehem*. Bethesda: CDL Press.
- 2004 *Neo-Sumerian Texts from the Royal Ontario Museum*. Administrative Texts
Mainly from Umma. Bethesda: CDL Press.
- Sigrist, Marcel - Figulla, Hugo and Walker, Christopher
- 1996 *Catalogue of the Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum II*. London: British
Museum Publications.
- Singer, Itamar
- 1991 “Appendix III. A Concise History of Amurru”, en: Izre’el, S. *Amurru Akkadian:
A Linguistic Study*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 135-195.
- Sivan, Daniel
- 1984 *Grammatical analysis and glossary of the Northwest Semitic vocables in
Akkadian texts of the 15th-13th C. BC. from Canaan and Syria* (AOAT 214).
Kevelaer: Nuekirchen-Vluyn.
- Sjöberg, Åke W.
- 1976 “The Old Babylonian Eduba”, *Fs. Jacobsen*: 159-179.
- Skibo, James and Feinman, Gary [Eds.]
- 1999 *Pottery and People: A Dynamic Interaction*. Salt Lake City: The University of
Utah Press.
- Smeets, Rieks
- 1989 “On Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian Language”, *BiOr* 46: 259-279.
- Smith, Anthony D.
- 1986 *The Ethnic Origin of the Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Smith, Elsdon C.
- 1954 “The Name of God in the Revised Standard Version”, *Names* 2: 101-105.
- Smith, Sidney
- 1949 *The Statue of Idri-mi*. London: The British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara.
- Sokal, Alan and Brichmont, Jean
- 1997 *Impostures Intellectuelles*. Paris: Editions Odile Jacob.
- Sollberger, Edmund
- 1980 “Two New Seal-Inscriptions”, *AnSt* 30: 63-65
- 1986 *Administrative Texts Chiefly Concerning Textiles*. (L. 2752). ARET VIII. Rome:
Missione Archaeologica Italiana in Siria.
- Sollors, Werner
- 1989 “Introduction: The Invention of Ethnicity”, in: Sollors, W. [Ed.] *The Invention*

of Ethnicity. Oxford: Oxford University Press, ix-xx.

Solmsen, Friedrich

1989 "The Two Near Eastern Sources for Hesiod", *Hermes* 117: 413-422.

Sommer, Ferdinand and Falkenstein, Adam

1938 *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattusili I. (Labarna II.)*. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Sørensen, Holger S.

1963 *The Meaning of Proper Names*. Copenhagen: G.E.C. GAD Publisher.

Speiser, Ephraim A.

1930 *Mesopotamian Origins. The Basic Population of the Near East*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

1933a "Ethnic Movements in the near East in the Second Millennium B. C. The Hurrians and Their Connections with the Ḫabiru and the Hyksos", *ASOR* 13: 13-54.

1933b "The Ethnic Background of the Early Civilizations of the Near East", *AJA* 37: 459-466.

1940-1941 *Introduction to Hurrian* (ASOR 20). New Haven: The American School of Oriental Research.

1948 "Hurrians and Subarians", *JAOS* 68: 1-13.

1953-54 "The Hurrian Participation in the Civilization of Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine", in: Finkelstein J.J. and Greenberg, M. (1967) *Oriental and Biblical Studies: Collected Writings of E. A. Speiser*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 244-269.

1954 "The Alalakh Tablets", *JAOS* 74: 18-25.

1964 *Genesis. Introduction, Translations and Notes*. (The Anchor Bible 1). Garden City: Doubleday & Company.

Spolsky, Bernard

2011 "Jewish Religious Multilingualism", in: Omoniyi, T. [Ed.] *The Sociology of Language and Religion. Change, Conflict and Accommodation*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 14-28.

Stamm, Johann J.

1939 *Die Akkadischen Namengebung* (MVAG 44). Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.

Stein, Diana

1989 "A Reappraisal of the Šauštatar Letter from Nuzi", *ZA* 79: 36-60.

Steinkeller, Piotr

- 1982 “The Question of Marḥaši: A contribution to the Historical Geography of Iran in the Third Millennium B.C.”, *ZA* 72: 237-265.
- 1988 “Daguna’s Seal”, in *Nabu* 1988, p. 32.
- 1993 “Early Political Development in Mesopotamia and the Origins of the Sargonic Empire”, in: Liverani, M. [Ed.] *Akkad, the First World Empire. Structure, Ideology, Traditions*. Padova: Sargon, 107-129.
- 1998 “The Historical Background of Urkesh and the Hurrian Beginnings in Northern Mesopotamia”, *BibMes* 26: 75-98.

Stewart, George R.

- 1958 “And Adam Gave Names. A Consideration of Name-Lore in Antiquity”, *Names* 6:1-10.

Streck, Michael

- 2000 *Das amurritische Onomastikon der altbabylonischen Zeit. Band 1: Die Amurriter. Die onomastische Forschung. Orthographie und Phonologie. Nominalmorphologie*. (AOAT 271/1). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- 2013 “Remarks on Two Recent Studies on Amorite”, *UF* 44: 309-327.

Streck, Michael and Weninger, Stefan [Eds.]

- 2002 *Altorientalische und semitische Onomastik* (AOAT 296). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Süel, Ayül

- 2013 “Hurrian Texts from Ortaköy/Şapinuwa. Forward”, *KASKAL* 10: 129.

Summerell, Orrin F.

- 1995 “Philosophy of Proper Names”, *IHzO*: 368-372.

Talon, Philippe

- 1996 “Personal Names”, in: Ismail, F. Sallaberger, W. Talon, P. and Van Lerberghe, K. [Eds.] *Administrative Documents from Tell Beydar (Season 1993-1995). Subartu II*. Turnhout: Brepols, 75-80.

Taracha, Piotr

- 2009 *Religions of Second Millennium Anatolia*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Teixidor, Javier

- 1977 *The Pagan God: Popular Religion in the Greco-Roman Near East*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Thureau-Dangin, François

- 1912 "Tablette de Samarra", *RA* 12: 1-4.
- 1931 "Vocabulaires de Ras Shamra", *Syria* 12: 225-266.
- 1939 "Tablettes Hurrithes provenant de Mâri", *RA* 36: 1-28.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H.
- 1987 "Israelite Religion: The Onomastic and Epigraphic Evidence", in: Miller, P. - Hanson, P. and MacBride, D. [Eds.] *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 157-194.
- Tinney, Steve
- 1995 "A New Look at Naram-Sin and the "Great Rebellion"", *JCS* 47: 1-14.
- Tischler, Johan
- 1988 'Labarna', *Fs Otten* II: 347-58.
- Trémouille, Marie-Claude
- 1997 *dHebat. Une divinité syro-anatolienne*. [Eothen 7]. Florence: LoGisma editore.
- 1999 "La religion des Hourrites: état actuel de nos connaissances", *SCCNH* 10: 277-291.
- 2000 "La religion dei Hurriti", *PDP* 55: 114-170.
- 2009 "Šauška, Šawuška. A. Philologisch. *RIA* 12: 99-103.
- 2011-2012 "Tašmišu. Divinité du cercle de Teššub (Wettergott*)", *RIA* 13 1/6: 475-476.
- Tunca, Önhan
- 2008 "1. Présentation et context archéologique des trouvailles", *Chagar Bazar* III: 3-15.
- Tunca, Önhan and Baghdo, Abd el-Massih
- 2008 "Index Général. 3. Noms de personnes", *Chagar Bazar* III: 358-378.
- Turri, Luigi
- 2015 "*Vieni, lascia che ti dica di altre città*". *Ambiente natural, umano e politico della valle dell'Oronte nella tarda età del bronzo*. Udine: Forum.
- Ullman, B. L.
- 1927 "The Origin and Development of the Alphabet", *AJA* 31: 311-328.
- Ungnad, Arthur
- 1909 "Untersuchungen zu den im VII. Hefte der Vorderasiatischen Schriftdenkmäler veröffentlichten Urkunden aus Dilbat", *BA* 6/5: 8-21.
- 1923a *Die ältesten Völkerwanderungen Vorderasiens. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Kultur der Semiten, Arier, Hethiter und Subaräer*. Breslau: Selbstverlag.
- 1923b "Das hurritische Fragment des Giglamesch-Epos", *ZA* 35: 133-140.

- 1936 *Subartu. Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte und Völkerkunde Vorderasiens*. Berlin – Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Uyechi, Roy
- 1961 *A Study of Ugaritic Alphabetic Personal Names*. PhD. Dissert. Waltham.
- Van de Mierop, Marc
- 1994 “The Tell Leilan Tablets 1991: A Preliminary Report”, *OrNs* 63: 305-344.
- Van de Velde, Mark L.
- 2012 “Agreement as a Grammatical Criterion for Proper Name Status in Kirundi”, *Onoma* 37: 127-139.
- Van Der Leeuw, Gerardus
- 1975 *Fenomenologia della religione*. Turin: Bollati Boringhieri.
- Van Dijk, J.
- 1971 *Nicht-kanonische Beschwörungen und sonstige literarische Text* (VS NF 17). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- 1982 “Fremdsprachige Beschwörungstexte in der Südmesopotamischen literarischen Überlieferung”, *RAI* 25: 97-110.
- Van Dijk, Jan - Albrecht Goetze and Mary I. Hussey
- 1985 *Early Mesopotamian Incantations and Rituals* (YOSBT 11). New Haven-London: Yale University Press.
- Van Driel, G.
- 2005 “Ethnicity, How to Cope with the Subject”, *RAI* 48: 1-10.
- Van Gessel, Ben. H. L.
- 1998 *Onomasticon of the Hittite Period. Part One*. Leiden: Brill.
- Van Lerberghe, Karel
- 1996 “The Beydar Tablets and the History of the Northern Jazirah”, in: Ismail, F. Sallaberger, W. Talon, P. and Van Lerberghe, K. [Eds.] *Administrative Documents from Tell Beydar (Season 1993-1995)*. *Subartu* II. Turnhout: Brepols, 119-126.
- Van Soldt, Wilfred H.
- 1991 *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit. Dating and Grammar* (AOAT 40). Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer / Neukirchener Verlag Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- 2003 “The Use of Hurrian Names at Ugarit”, *UF* 35: 681-707.
- Vanstiphout, Herman L.J.
- 2009 “Die Geschöpfe des Prometheus, Or How and Why Did the Sumerians Create

Their Gods?”, in: Porter, B. [Ed.] *What Is a God? Anthropomorphic and Non-Anthropomorphic Aspects of Deity in Ancient Mesopotamia*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 15-40.

Veenhof, Klaas. R.

2007 “The Old Assyrian List of Year Eponyms. Corrections, Additions and Chronology”, *NABU* 49: 58-62.

2008 “Some displaced Tablets from Kārum Kanesh (Kültepe)”, *AoF* 35: 10-27.

Verhoeven, Mark

2004 “Beyond Boundaries: Nature, Culture and a Holistic Approach to Domestication in the Levant”, *JWP* 18: 179-282.

Vidal, Jordi

2015 “Reflexiones historiográficas sobre el orientalismo antiguo”, in: Vidal, J. and Da Riva, R. [Eds.] *Descubriendo el Antiguo Oriente. Pioneros y arqueólogos de Mesopotamia y Egipto a finales del s. XIX y principios del s. XX*. Barcelona: Bellaterra, 25-36.

Vincente, Claudine A.

1991 *The 1987 Tell Leilan Tablets Dated to the Limmu of Habil-Kinu (Volumes I and II)*. PhD. Dissert. Yale University.

Virolleaud, Claude

1930 “Les tablettes de Mishrifé-Qatna”, *Syria* 11: 311-342.

Vita, Juan Pablo

1999 “The society of Ugarit”, *HUS*: 455-498.

2009 “Hurrian as a living language in Ugaritic Society”, *Fs. Silva Castillo*: 219-231.

Volk, Konrad

2004 “Beschriftete Objekte aus Tall Mozan/Urkeš”, *MDOG* 136: 87-101.

Vološinov, Valentin N.

1986 [1929] *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. [English Transl.] Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Von Dassow, Eva

2007 *State and Society in the Late Bronze Age Alalah under the Mittani Empire*. (SCCNH 17). Bethesda: CDL Press.

2014 “Piecing Together the Song of Release”, *JCS* 65: 127-162.

Walcot, Peter

- 1966 *Hesiod and the Near East*. Cardiff: Wales U.P.
- Walther, Hans
- 1973 “Zu den gesellschaftswissenschaftlichen Grundpositionen der Namensforschung”, in: *Der Name in Sprache und Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Theorie der Onomastik*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 13-30.
- Waterman, Thomas T.
- 1920 *Yurok Geography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Watson, Wilfred G. E.
- 2004 “La lengua y la historia de los hurritas y de los urarteos. Panorama bibliográfico”, *AuOr* 22: 267-301.
- 2007 “La lengua y la historia de los hurritas y de los urarteos: Bibliografía complementaria”, *AuOr* 25: 293-310.
- 2010 “La lengua y la historia de los hurritas y de los urarteos: segunda bibliografía complementaria”, *AuOr* 28: 93-119.
- 2001 “Ancient Near East Religions”, *CELR*: 6-8.
- 2012 “Ugaritic Onomastics (8)”, *AuOr* 30: 323-351.
- 2013 “La lengua y la historia de los hurritas y de los urarteos: tercera bibliografía complementaria”, *Au Or* 31: 109-138.
- Wegner, Ilse
- 1981 *Gestalt und Kult der Ištar-Šawuška in Kleinasien*. AOAT 36. Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer / Neukirchener Verlag Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- 1990 “Phonotaktischer *n*-Verlust in Jussivformen des Bogazköy-Hurritischen”, *Or NS* 59: 298-305.
- 1992 “Die selbst-ständige Personalpronomina des Hurritischen”, *SMEA* 29: 227-238.
- 1994 “Hurritische Verba dicendi mit einfacher und doppelter Absolutiv-Rektion”, *AoF* 21: 161-170.
- 1995 “Der Name der Ša(w)uška”, *SCNNH* 7: 117-120.
- 2004 “Überlegungen zur zeitlichen Einordnung und geographischen Herkunft des hurritischen Mari-Briefes 7+6”, *AoF* 31: 101-104.
- 2007 *Hurritisch. Eine Einführung*. 2nd edition. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- West, Martin L.
- 1995 “Ancient Near Eastern Myths in Classical Greek Religious Thought”, *CANE*: 33-42.
- Westenholz, Aage

- 1975 *Old Sumerian and Old Akkadian Texts in Philadelphia Chiefly from Nippur. Part One* (BibMes 1). Malibu: Undena Publications.
- Westenholz, Joan G.
- 1992 “Oral Traditions and Written Texts in the Cycle of Akkade”, in: Vogelzang, M.E. and Vanstiphout, H.L.J. [Eds.] *Mesopotamian Epic Literature: Oral or Aural?*. Lewiston: Edwin Miller, 124-154.
- 1997 *Legends of the Kings of Akkad. The Texts*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- 2000 “Emar - The City and its God”, in: Van Lerberghe, K. and Voet, G. [Eds.] *Languages and Cultures in Contact. At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro-Mesopotamian Realm*. Leuven: Peeters, 145-167.
- Whiting, Robert
- 1976 “Tiš-Atal of Nineveh and Babati, Uncle of Šū-Sīn”, *JCS* 28: 173-182.
- 1996 “Amorite Tribes and Nations of Second-Millennium Western Asia”, *CANE*: 1231-1242.
- Widdowson, Henry G.
- 1996 *Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiggermann, Frans
- 1999a “Nergal. A. Philologisch”, *RIA* 9/3-4: 215-223.
- 1999b “Nergal. B. Archäologisch”, *RIA* 9/3-4: 223-226.
- Wilcke, Claus
- 1988 “A Note on Ti’āmat-bāšti and the goddess Ša(w)uška of Nineveh”, *Drevnij Vostok* 5: 21-26. [English summary 225-227].
- Wilhelm, Gernot
- 1970 *Untersuchungen zum Hurro-Akkadischen von Nuzi* (AOAT 9). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Ugarit-Verlag.
- 1985 “Hurritische Lexikographie”, *Or* 54: 487-496.
- 1988 “Gedanken zur Frühgeschichte der Hurriter und zum hurritisch-urartäischen Sprachvergleich”, in: Haas, V. [Ed.] *Hurriter und Hurritisch*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag Konstanz GmbH, 43-67.
- 1989 *The Hurrians*, Wearminster. [Updated German translation: (1982) *Grundzüge der Geschichte und Kultur der Hurriter*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft]
- 1991 “A Hurrian Letter from Tell Brak”, *Iraq* 53: 159-168.
- 1992a “Zum hurritischen Verbalsystem”, *Fs. Heger*: 659-671.

- 1992b *Das Archiv des Šilwa-Teššup*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- 1993-1997 “Mittan(n)i, Mittani, Maitani”, *RIA* 8: 287-296.
- 1994 “Kumme und *Kummar: Zur hurritischen Orstnamenbildung”, *Fs. Hrouda*: 317-319.
- 1995 “The Kingdom of Mitanni in Second-Millennium Upper Mesopotamia”, *CANE*: 1243-1254.
- 1996a “L’etat actuel et les perspectives des études hurrites”, *Amurru* 1: 175-187.
- 1996b “Zu den hurritischen Namen der Kültepe-Tafel kt k/k 4”, *SCCNH* 8: 335-341
- 1997 “Introduction: Recent Trends in Nuzi and Hurrian Studies”, *SCCNH* 10: 3-11.
- 1998a “Die Inschrift des Tišatal von Urkeš”, *BibMes* 26: 117-143.
- 1998b “Name, Namengebung. D. Bei den Hurritern”, *RIA* 9: 121-127.
- 2001 “Das hurritisch-hethitische “‘‘ Lied der Freilassung””, in: Kaiser, O. [Ed.], *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Ergänzungslieferung* (TUAT). Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 82-91.
- 2004a “Hurrian”, in: Woodward, R. [Ed.] *World’s Ancient Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 95-118.
- 2004b “Urartian”, in: Woodward, R. [Ed.] *World’s Ancient Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 119-137.
- 2006 “Die hurritische Tafel Kp 05/226”, *MDOG* 138: 233-236.
- 2008 “Hurrians in the Kültepe Texts”, in: Dercksen, J.G. [Ed.] *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian Period*. Leiden: Brill, 181-194.
- 2009 “Die Götter der Unterwelt als Ahnengeister des Wettergottes”, in: Hartstein, F and Rösel, M. [Eds.], *JHWH und die Götter der Völker. Symposium zum 80. Geburtstag von Klaus Koch*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH, 59–75.
- 2014a “EA 24”, in: Rainey, A. *The El-Amarna Correspondance. A New Edition of the Cuneiform Letters from the Site of El-Amarna based on Collations of all Extant Tablets*. Leiden: Brill, 189-241.
- 2014b “Tilla (^{gud}Ti-el-la). B. Hethitisch, Hurritisch.”, *RIA* 14 1/2: 45-46.
- 2015 “Urkeš”, *RIA* 14: 417-418.
- Wilhelm, Gernot and Akdoğan, Rukiye
- 2010 “Ein Täfelchen über Gerstenrationen aus Tigonānu (?)”, *AoF* 37: 159-162.
- Wilkinson, Richard H.
- 2003 *The Complete Gods and Goddesses of Ancient Egypt*. London: Thames &

Hudson.

Winckler, Hugo

1910 “Die Arier in den Urkunden von Böghaz-köi”, *OLZ* 13: 289-301.

Wiseman, Donald J.

1953 *The Alalakh Tablets*. London: The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara.

1954 “Supplementary Copies of Alalakh Tablets”, *JCS* 8: 1-30.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig

2001 *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. 2nd edition. (Originally published in 1922)
London: Routledge.

2009 *Philosophische Untersuchungen. Philosophical Investigations*. (Originally published in 1953) Oxford: Blackwell.

Yakubovich, Ilya S.

2009 *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.

Yamada, Shigeo

2008 “A Preliminary Report on the Old Babylonian Texts from the Excavation of Tell TAban in the 2005 and 2006 Seasons: The Middle Euphrates and Habur Areas in the Post-Hammurabi Period”, *Al-Rāfidan* 29: 47-62.

2011 “A Pudûm Rotation List from Tell Taban and the Cultural Milieu of Ṭabatûm in the Post-Hammurabi Period”, *RA* 105:137-156.

Xella, Paolo and Pomponio, Francesco

1997 *Les dieux d'Ebla. Étude analytique des divinités éblaïtes* (AOAT 245) Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Zabeeh, Farhang

1968 *What is in a name? An Inquiry into the Semantics and Pragmatics of Proper Names*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Zadok, Ron

1983 “A Tentative Structural Analysis of Elamite Hypocoristica”, *BzNMF* 18: 93-120.

1989 “Notes on the Historical Geography of Mesopotamia and Northern Syria”, *Abr-Nahrain* 27: 154-169

1993 “Hurrian and Strange Names in Sumerian Sources”, in: Rainey, A. [Ed.] *Kinattūtu ša dārāti. Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 219-245.

1994 “Elamites and Other Peoples from Iran and the Persian Gulf Region in Early Mesopotamian Sources”, *Iran* 32: 31-51.

- 1999/2000a “Geographical, Onomastic, and Lexical Notes”, *AfO* 46/47: 208-212.
- 1999/2000b Review: “Mirjo Salvini, the Habiru Prism of King Tunip-Teššup of Tikunani”, *AfO* 46/47: 351-358.
- 2000 “Somo non-Semitic Naes in Akkadian Sources”, *NABU* 2000/7: 10-12.
- Zeeb, Frank
- 1992 “Studien zu den altbabylonischen Texten aus Alalah. I: Schuldscheine”, *UF* 23: 405-438.
- 1993 “Studien zu den altbabylonischen Texten aus Alalah. II: Pfandurkunden”, *UF* 24: 447-480.
- 1994 “Studien zu den altbabylonischen Texten aus Alalah. III: Schuldabtretungsurkunden”, *UF* 25: 461-476.
- 2001 *Die Palastwirtschaft in Altsyrien nach den spätaltbabylonischen Getreidelieferlisten aus Alalah (Schicht VII)* (AOAT 282). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Zehnder, Thomas
- 2010 *Die hethitischen Frauennamen. Katalog und Interpretation* (DBH 29). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz.
- Zelinsky, Wilbur
- 2001 *The Enigma of Ethnicity: Another American Dilemma*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- Zgusta, Ladislav
- 1995 “Names and their Study”, *IHzO*: 1876-1890.