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ABSTRACT

In Neo-Assyrian cuneiform sources, Libyan names are rarely found. This paper identifies two additional such names in the sale document StAT 2 53 from Assur, dated 700 BCE, which concerns the sale of a bathhouse in the city of Guzana. The paper begins by summarising the contents of StAT 2 53, before turning to the suspected names. The first name, borne by Uṣirḫiššūrīti “the Egyptian”, is shown to be Libyan. This identification is based on morphological and historical analysis, as well as comparison with similar names from North Africa. The second name, written Ḥanabel, should be understood as a variant of the well-known name Ḥallabēš. Attestations of this name indicate that most (and perhaps all) men so named associated with individuals bearing Egyptian names. This observation strengthens prior suggestions that name comes from North Africa. Among these suggestions, the most convincing is that Hallabēš is a Libyan name. Finally, the paper considers when and why Uṣirḫiššūrīti “the Egyptian” and Ḥallabēš came to Guzana. It cautiously suggests these men were among those deported from Samaria to Guzana by the Assyrian army, in an event recorded by the Book of Kings, among other sources. The appearance of such cosmopolitan men in StAT 2 53 coincides with heightened Assyrian and Egyptian trade interests in the Levant, to which a range of documentary sources attests.

INTRODUCTION

In the cuneiform onomasticon of the Neo-Assyrian Empire, Libyan names are rarely identified. Only six have been adduced with conviction, held by no fewer than nine individuals. In Akkadian and Egyptian sources, these names appear as follows: Lamintu (Ev. Nmrt); Nikkû (Ev. Nkkû); Pišamêliki (Ev. Pmkkî); Šilkannî/Sîlkannî/Uûlîk kanu’ (Ev. Wsrkn); Šusânuqû/Susînuqû (Ev. Šnkû); and Tâkî:pâ’ti (Ev. Tkrû). The name Ḥallabēš (Ev. Ḥrbsû), which occurs in StAT 2 53, is also likely Libyan, and will be discussed shortly.

The scarcity of Libyan names in Neo-Assyrian sources may be contrasted with the abundance of etymologically Egyptian names, well over a hundred of which are attested for the period 700–612, mostly in documents postdating the Assyrian invasions of Egypt. In this article, I draw attention to two further Libyan names, found in a private legal document from Assur, published by Donbaz and Parpola as StAT 2 53.

THE SOURCE

StAT 2 53 is a fairly standard instrument of purchase, dated 1-VII-700. For convenience, a transliteration and translation of the document is given at the end of this article. The document comprises at least seventeen documents with preserved eponyms falling between 708–621. The contents of StAT 2 53 have no obvious connection to other documents from the archive. The document records how one Qišrištû ("qiš-rar-sar-a, l. 8) made a purchase in Guzana ("mgu-zan-u, l. 7, modern Tel Halaf), from Sama’ the Samaritan ("sma-a-ti, "si-mir-rar-ara, l. 2), for fifty sheqels of silver (l. 9). The object purchased was a tu-arru, clearly a building since it is described as having “beams and doors, and a wall” (l. 5). The word tuu-arru is a hupas legomenon, but since the structure is later referred to as a “bathhouse” (i-tus, l. 11), the editors’ translation as “bath” is certain. Part of the structure sold is said to lie between the properties of Ribibsî ("ribi-bi-si") and Ḥanabès ("ha-na-be-eš", both l. 6). The deed states that payment has been made and the transaction completed (l. 10–12), and further warns that any contravention of the sale will incur a fine to Adad of Guzana (l. 13–r.5).

A list of witnesses is given, among whom are probably representatives of both the buyer and the vendor. To the circle of the vendor in Guzana likely belonged three personnel of the Adad Temple (r. 6, 8, 11), a chief brewer associated with the governor of Guzana (r. 20), and at least two further men whose names invoke the god Adad (r. 10, 14). The witnesses include such cosmopolitan men as “Zanbûlû, Arbû” ("za-an-ba-a-u-r-r₃₄ arba-bi, r. 7), “Addabû’i, merchant” ("10-bi-i-di’" [6] dam.ṛ₃₄, r. 10), and three
ubârus “foreign residents” (r. 15–17), among them Pašt-Iatu ("paššt-ia, r. 15), whose name Schwemer considered Aramaic or Hebrew.20

**IDENTIFYING THE NAME UȘIRIHUBRTI**

Of particular interest in STAT 2 53 is the reference to one “Uširihubrti, the Egyptian” ("uš-ššt-ra-hi-bu-ru-riš-tu tiš-ta-rara-a, r. 9). The origin of this man’s name has hitherto remained elusive. Donbaz and Parpola offered no etymology, and Raja Mattila, writing in the Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire, suspected the name to be of Egyptian derivation, "probably containing the theophoric element Wer-br-" (i.e. Osiris).21

I would propose instead to understand "uš-šš-št-ra-hi-bu-ru-riš-tu as an Assyrian rendition of the hieroglyphic name ḫmr waš. This name, of unknown meaning, is attested on an unprovenanced bronze axe now in the Cairo Museum,22 ascribed by Yoyotte and Colin to the time of the Twenty-Second to Twenty-Fourth Dynasties.23

The relationship between the cuneiform and hieroglyphic writings of this name can be established through the comparison of similar names attested in both scripts.24 The transcription of ḫmr waš as uš-šš is paralleled in cuneiform renditions of waš Werbrtu25 as ARGER uš-šš-ra-puru;26 uš-šš-ra-šš-puru,27 and "uš-šš-šš-kur-mu.28 The last two spellings are aphetistic, showing the loss of u-Anluta.29 All three display the liquid shift r to t, paralleled by the cuneiform for Egyptian (t) r to bring up.29 Transcriptions without this shift, as in the spelling Usirihubrti, are altogether more common, and include all attested Neo-Assyrian writings of the theophoric name “Horus” (Eg. Hr),31 and all writings of the name component "who has given him” (Eg. tš-sā-taš).32 As usual in Neo-Assyrian texts, the Egyptians is represented by Akkadian.33 Parallels for transcription ušš as cuneiform rš are provided by "pu-tš-šš-tru" and "pu-tš-šš-tru" (Eg. Pš-tš-tru, “The one whom Osiris has given”). Transcriptions of Egyptian h are rare in cuneiform, but earlier parallels show the expected correspondence with h; the Amarna letters give bi-nu (Eg. hnu),35 bu-bu-an-nu (Eg. hnu),36 bu-bu-an-nu na-bu-š (Eg. hnu š)37 and na-ab-ta (Eg. hnu š).38

The second half of the writing, hi-bu-ru-riš-tu for ḫmr brtu, either contains an exccesant consonant (cf. Akk. "ma-an-ti-me-aš-hi-e for Eg. ma-an-ti-me-ūt-tiš-tu, “Montu is at the fore”), or reflects an aspect of the hieroglyphic name not preserved in its sole attestation. Since neither photograph nor handwriting of the tablet was published, it is possible that the name was erroneously transliterated. The relevant line must be collated.

**Usirihubrti as a Libyan Name**

The name written Werbrtu on the Cairo axe doubtless belongs to the large group of Libyan names known from hieroglyphic sources.31 This judgment is based on a range of factors (morphological, genealogical, and historical). Firstly, the name Werbrtu, like other Libyan names, does not appear to be etymologically Egyptian, and is spelled using group writing, a system used to transcribe foreign or otherwise unfamiliar words into Egyptian.40 Secondly, its first and only attestation links it to the magnates and rulers of the Twenty-Second to Twenty-Fourth ‘Libyan’ Dynasties, whose own ancestral ties with the nomadic groups of North Africa were first recognised by Stern and Möller,41 and subsequently elucidated by Yoyette.42 Yoyette drew particular attention to the idiosyncratic features of these dynasties, including their use of such titles as mš/š(r) “the Ma(shwesh)” and “ḥrw-š(r)-general”. Both these titles were borne by Werbrtu, who is named ẖmr ṣmn “great ms of the Ma, ḫrw-š(r)-general” on the Cairo dagger.43 Noteworthy too is the determinative governing ṣmn in this inscription, which depicts the two-feathered headdress characteristic of canonical portrayals of the Tjehenu in Egyptian artwork of the New Kingdom.44 Thirdly, the name Werbrtu shares idiosyncratic components with several better-attested names from the Libyan onomastic.45 The component Wer- is shared by the names ḫmr Wbrtu,46 and the component br- by ḫmr Mbrtu47 and ḫmr ṣmn Mbrtu.48 In final defence of a connection to North Africa, the corpus of Libuco-Berber inscriptions from Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco contains names which share components with Werbrtu, as well as other names from the Libyan onomastic.49 For example, the names written in hieroglyphic as Šnk, ṭrk, Mbrtu, ṣmnr and Werbrtu are attested in the Libuco-Berber inscriptions as Šnk,50 ṭrk,51 Mbrtu,52 Mbrtu,53 ṣmnr,54 and Usbrtu.55 From the third and last of these names, a Libuco-Berber form of Werbrtu may tentatively be reconstructed as *Usbrtu or *Usbrtu.

**Usirihubrti as an “Egyptian”**

In STAT 2 53, Usirihubrti’s African heritage is confirmed by his description as an “Egyptian” ("mi-sir-ra-a-a") a gentile which makes his background—or at least his perceived cultural-linguistic affiliation—abundantly clear.57 It should be noted that that the vast majority of individuals in Neo-Assyrian sources with etymologically Egyptian names are not identified by a gentile of any kind; among at least thirty individuals in the Assyrian corpus explicitly identified as “Egyptian”, barely a third have names that are of clear Egyptian etymology, and most of the remainder bear East or West Semitic names. This phenomenon is not easily explained; it is perhaps possible that Egyptian names, which are overwhelmingly constructed using easily discernible preformative and divine elements (e.g. Akk. ṣmnr = Eg. ṣmr; Akk. ḫmr = Eg. Hr), contrasted so strongly with the predominantly Semitic onomastic of the Neo-Assyrian Empire that further specification was unnecessary.
The writing of the gentilic nisbe ㎛ỉ-šir-ra-a-a “the Egyptian” is of interest. Such nisbes may stand in apposition to another noun, in the genitive, or in isolation with substantive meaning. The nisbe is usually preceded by one of two determinatives: the land determinative KUR (ٜ) or the human determinative LÙ (ٛ). As Mario Fales has recently observed, applications of the nisbe with prefixed LÙ determinative usually concern people or groups which “entertained political and/or economic relations with the Assyrian empire but who were not incorporated (yet/an any longer) within its boundaries and thus were not subjected to the ‘inner’ jurisdiction of the provincial areas.” This observation holds for many “Egyptians” mentioned in Neo-Assyrian state documents. Accordingly, the military group encountered by Shalmaneser III at Qarqar, the Egyptian traders of the Lebanese coast, the Egyptian emissaries retasked at eighth-century Nimrud, the Egyptian specialists being deported from Egypt by Esarhaddon, and the Egyptian armies mentioned in royal queries to the sun god are all specified as ٛٛ.msšur ānu, rather than ٛ.msšur ānu. By contrast, the prefixed LÙ is applied largely to persons or groups settled within the bounds of the empire, and incorporated within its administrative structure. Indeed, none of the gentilically identified “Egyptians” in Neo-Assyrian private legal documents is specified with the determinative KUR, instead marked with LÙ, or in rare cases (confined largely to an unpublished archive from Assur) with no determinative at all. Like other Egyptians identified as ٞ.msšur ānu, Uširri-qippan was an active participant in the legal framework of the Empire, and likely to have been regarded as a settled inhabitant.

**Identifying the Name Ḥallabēṣê**

In STTG 2 53:6, one ٛ.hu-na-bē-eš is identified as the owner of the property neighboring the bathhouse sold by Sama’. Writing in PNA, Heather Baker listed this as an example of the otherwise unattested name Ḥanābēṣ, of unknown origin and meaning. Donbath and Parchola more plausibly suggested that ٛ.hu-na-bē-eš is a variant spelling of the well-known name Ḥallabēṣê. This name has been variously considered equivalent to the Phoenician Ḥibî, to the Greek Ḫēlô, or to the Egyptian name transcribed by Ranke as Ḥibis. This Egyptian name is itself of disputed etymology, considered either an indigenous Egyptian name (Ḥi-Br “Horus Bes”, Ḥi-Br “Bes has flown”, or of uncertain translation), or otherwise a Libyan name.

The following section argues for an African, and specifically Libyan origin for the name, on the following grounds. First, men named Ḥallabēṣê in Neo-Assyrian sources cluster disproportionately alongside individuals bearing Egyptian names. This strengthens arguments for an African rather than Phoenician origin for the name. Second, previous arguments that the name has an indigenous Egyptian etymology are unpersuasive on orthographic and phonetic grounds. Finally, several men named Ḥibis were related to persons with Libyan names, or to those who bore characteristic titles of the ‘Libyan’ dynasts. Accordingly, Lebây’s proposal to understand Ḥibis as a Libyan name remains the most convincing.

**Ḥallabēṣê as an Associate of Persons With Egyptian Names**

Examining the attestations of the name Ḥallabēṣê in Neo-Assyrian cuneiform, it is apparent that most, and perhaps all, men named Ḥallabēṣê associated with persons bearing Egyptian names. This observation strengthens arguments that the name Ḥallabēṣê itself originated in North Africa.

The corpus contains the following individuals: Ḥallabēṣê 1. (ٛ.bat-še-si), Ḥallabēṣê 2. (ٛ.bat-la-bē-a-eši, ٛ.bat-bi-la- [..]), Ḥallabēṣê 3. (ٛ.bat-la-bē-si, ٛ.bat-la-bē-si), Ḥallabēṣê 4. (ٛ.bat-la-bē-a-ti), and Ḥallabēṣê 5. (ٛ.bat-na-bē-a). Of these individuals, four (2-5) definitely associated with persons with Egyptian names, and another (1) may be identical with Ḥallabēṣê 5.

Ḥallabēṣê 2. acted as a witness alongside Pāt-Eṣē (Eg. Ps-di- 3st, “The one whom Isis has given”) the “commander of fifty” and Ṣa-a-huru 2. (Eg. Ḫ-dq-br, “May Horus be sound!”) in the archive of the Ninevite courtier Ṣar-rā-ṣar-u-ṣur. This archive mentions numerous other persons with etymologically Egyptian names.

Ḥallabēṣê 3. is a minor character in the so-called “Egyptian Archive” from Assur, and appears in STTG 2 192: 4 (6298) as the father of a man borrowing silver. Witnesses to this document include Tā-bi ʔ-parti 1. (Eg. Ḫ-br-inti-su, “It is Pharaoh who has given him”) and Ḫur-wāt 1. (Eg. Ḫ-ha-i, Ḫorus is sound). Ḥallabēṣê 3. also appears as witness to the silver loan STTG 2 177: r. 2 (6178), where he is listed immediately before Abī-nāṣir (Eg. Ḫ-br).

Ḥallabēṣê 4. is attested as witness to the Ninevite wife sale SAA 14 161: r. 21 (6238), in which the individuals Amu-tēsē 2. (Eg. Ḫ-nun-ir-āt-su, “It is Amun who has given him”), Nītīr-Eṣā-rāu (Eg. Ḫ-n-bt-3-ti-r-u, “Isis is strong against them”), Ṣi-hū 4. (Eg. Ḫ-dq-br, “The face [of DN] has said”), and Ṣā-timāu (Eg. Ḫ-tôm-3t-Im-su, “May Apis seize them”) also feature.

The putative Ḥallabēṣê 5. is attested in STTG 2 53 (the same document as Uširri-qippan) as ٛ.ha-na-bē-eš (L 6), and is identified as the owner of a property neighboring the bathhouse sold at Guzana by the Samaritan Sama’.

Ḥallabēṣê 1. appears in the letter SAA 16 63 (undated), where one ٛ.bat-be-si (r. 9) gives testimony concerning crimes committed by servants against the governor of Guzana. Ḥallabēṣê 1. is described as a “Samarian” (ٛ.lu-maš-nu-a-ti, r. 9), and those against whom he informs include Ḫ-pār-š[a-wa] and ٛ.lu-nu-a-tu (L. 4), both of whom have Aramaic or Hebrew names. Since a man named Ḫ-pār-š[a-t] also appears in STTG 2 53, alongside Ḥallabēṣê 5., the suggestion that these sets of men are identical seems reasonable. IHallabēṣê 1. and 5. are indeed the same, this may also explain why STTG 2 53 features a servant of the governor.
of Guzana, a man with whose comrades Ḥallabēṣē and Paltî-Iāû have a working relationship in SAA 16 63.

From the preceding discussion, it is clear most (and perhaps all) men named Ḥallabēṣē in Neo-Assyrian documents had links to persons with Egyptian names. On the basis of this observation, the name is itself almost certainly of North African extraction.

**Ḫallabēṣē as a Libyan Name**

The appearance of Ḥallabēṣē S. alongside an “Egyptian” with a Libyan name in ST 2 53 prompts reconsideration of Leakh’s theory that Ḥallabēṣē is itself a Libyan name. Against an indigenous Egyptian origin for the name Ḥrbṣ, Leakh provided the following three arguments. First, he noted that the majority of the name’s hieroglyphic and demotic spellings begin with characters that are either ambiguous, or altogether incompatible with spellings of the names Ḥr “Horus”. This is a significant blow to Kuentz’s proposition that the name spells Ḥr-Bṣ, “Horus-Bes”. Second, Leakh correctly noted that cuneiform spellings of the name Ḥallabēṣē consistently indicate the consonant I, which is never used to transcribe the strong r at the end of the name Horus. Finally, he adduced three early attestations of the name Ḥrbṣ associated with Libyan names and titles. A man named Ḥrbṣ appears as the son of ḫknṣ(1) on a series of canopic jars. Another man named Ḫrbṣ (sic) appears on a Serapeum Stela dated to Year 37 of Sheshonk V as the son of ‘nb-hḥr, “great chief of the Libu” (mas/tur 3 n Ṣ). In absence of a plausible Egyptian etymology, and in view of the name’s unusual orthography and association with names and titles of the ‘Libyan’ dynasts, Leakh concluded that the name Ḥrbṣ is Libyan.

Colin considered this judgment problematic, and excluded the name from his corpus on two grounds. First, he observed that the letter ḫ is otherwise unattested in his corpus of Libyan names. This criticism appears damming, until one considers that another putative Libyan name identified by Leakh, Ḥχrc̱j, was excluded on the same grounds. For comparison, Colin’s corpus contains only two names beginning with the letter p, and only four beginning with the letter n, none of which was excluded on the grounds of rarity. Second, Colin noted that the majority of the Egyptian attestations of Ḥrbṣ occur in the Ptolemaic period. This cannot be understood as a criticism of Leakh’s proposal, as the name is question is already securely attested centuries earlier.

In view of the strong association between the name Ḥallabēṣē and Egyptian names in cuneiform; the absence of plausible indigenous etymology for the Egyptian name Ḥrbṣ, the name’s association with Libyan name-bearers and dynasts identified by Leakh, and the fragile grounds on which the name was excluded from the Libyan onomasticon by Colin, the balance of probabilities suggests that Ḥrbṣ is indeed a Libyan name, and with it, the name Ḥallabēṣē.

**When and Why Did Usirihūrūti and Ḥallabēṣē Come to Guzana?**

Having considered the origins of their names, we now contemplate how Usirihūrūti and Ḥallabēṣē came to Guzana, and what they were doing there. Usirihūrūti’s status as witness to the tablet suggests he was considered a permanent resident in the city, since he and the other witnesses were specifically chosen to provide testimony in the case of “any revocation, lawsuit or litigation” whether undertaken “in the future [or] at any time, whether [by] Sama’ or his sons, his grandsons, his brothers, his relatives or any litigant of his” (l. 12 – r. 5). Likewise, Ḥallabēṣē was the owner of property in Guzana, and likely too a permanent or semi-permanent resident.

The date of the tablet is significant, for if the tablet’s eponym has been correctly restored, ST 2 53 dates to 700 BCE. It is therefore the earliest dated Neo-Assyrian private document to mention an “Egyptian”. Tablets from the Nimrud ‘Wine Lists’ reveal that “Egyptian scribes” and “Kushites” were present at Tiglath-Pileser III’s Nimrud court already by the mid-eighth century, but no “Egyptian” is attested in a private source before 700.

The appearance of Usirihūrūti and his colleague Ḥallabēṣē at Guzana, long before the conquests of Esarhaddon (r. 680–669) and Assurbanipal (r. 668–624) brought large numbers of Nile dwellers to Mesopotamia, therefore requires special explanation. The most straightforward reason for their appearance is deportation in wake of the Assyrian campaigns in the Levant, to which diverse sources attest.

The first Assyrian royal inscriptions to record the deportation of “Egyptians” from the Levant are those of Sennacherib (r. 705–681), who personally claimed to have captured alive “(Egyptian) charioteers and Egyptian princes” (En ṣīgig3ṣu umbnailu lugal3 u mu-su-ra-ra, a) during engagements with a hostile confederation at Eltekeh in 701. It is faintly conceivable that the men in ST 2 53 arrived in Mesopotamia as captives of this campaign, as Balogh and Radner have persuasively argued in relation to the high-ranking and military men mentioned in the house sale SAA 6 142 from Nineveh, dated 16-III-692. The men listed in that document include Śīl-Asūr, the “Egyptian scribe” (b₃₂[b₃₂] mu-su-ra-ra, a), Rāṣū (Ep. r₁.a), Ḥūr-wāṣī 1. (Ep. b₁w₆₂₃, “Horus is sound!”), Ḥūr-wāṣī 2. (Ep. b₁w₆₂₃), and Ṣūṣu-qunu (Ep. Šínk) “in-law of the king [of Assyria]”. Nevertheless, in the case of ST 2 53 this explanation is highly unlikely. The time that had elapsed between the battle and the appearance of these men in the documentary life of Guzana is simply too short.

Another possibility, which I cautiously propose as the more plausible, is that Usirihūrūti and Ḥallabēṣē were among the deportees taken from Samaria to Guzana by the Assyrian armies of Shalmaneser V (r. 726-722) or Sargon II (r. 721-705). Such deportations are famously recounted by the Book of Kings (2 Ki. 17: 3–6, 18: 9–11), which states that “Shalmaneser, king of
Assyria" attacked Israel after King Hoshea conspired to form an alliance with "So, king of Egypt", usually identified as Osorkon IV of Tanis. After a siege lasting three years, the city was captured, and the inhabitants were taken to Guzana and Haran (2. Ki. 17: 6). Although Assyrian sources leave the chronology of the campaign open to dispute, the royal inscriptions of Sargon II state that the Assyrian army destroyed and plundered the city, deporting numerous inhabitants from the region. Elements of the conquest are corroborated by the Babylonian Chronicle, by Josephus (Jewish Antiquities IX 15), and so too by Assyrian administrative documents indicating that Samaritans found their way to Guzana.

The suggestion that Usir̲ḫ̲u-hurri and Hallabēṣe were taken from Samaria to Guzana would account well for the cosmopolitan group attested in StAT 2 53, which includes men with Levantine and Libyan names, as well as individuals with ties to Guzana and Samaria. The vendor of the property in Guzana is described as a "Samaritan", and the witnesses include both a servent of the governor of Guzana (t. 20) and the individual Palŝ̲-Iaū (“palŝ̲-līt-iaū”, t. 15), whose name is either Aramaic or Hebrew.

The Egyptian presence in the Levant prior to the Assyrian deportations should be viewed against a background of international trade and military interests in the region, to which numerous contemporary sources attest. The Assyrian sources include: the summary inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III, which record the creation of a royally-sanctioned trading post or bīt kārī shortly after the king's conquest of Gaza in 734, intended to manage trade with the neighbouring Nile Valley; a well-known letter from Nimrud in which Qardī-Assur-lāmūr reports to Tiglath-Pileser III on the undesirable involvement of "Egyptians" (mušušu-a-a) in the Levantine wood trade near Tyre; and Sargon II's Khorsabad Annals, in which the king claims to have "mixed together the people of Assyria and Egypt" and "made them trade with each other" following the Assyrian victory at Rapšu in 720.

The hieroglyphic Kawa III and Kawa VI stelae further indicate that Taharqo of Kush obtained Levantine wood for the Amun Temple at Kawa in 683 and 681, showing that Egyptian trade interests in the region were upheld. Of further relevance are a passage in the Book of Ezekiel recording Egypt's importance to the cloth trade at Tyre (Ezek. 27: 7), and two discoveries made at Samaria: of a vase fragment of Osorkon II and of a scarab and clay sealing of the Twenty-Second or Twenty-Third Dynasty.

If Usir̲ḫ̲u-hurri, Hallabēṣe, or their families were involved in Levantine trade of the kind alluded to above, this would comfortably explain their presence in the region of Samaria at the time of the deportations. In StAT 2 53, Usir̲ḫ̲u-hurri is listed immediately prior to “Adad-bi-di, merchant” (t. 10), and it is possible the two men's professions were related. The appearance of a putative "Arabi" (t. 7) is also significant, given the importance of such men to navigation of the desert routes of the Sinai and Negev, on which both Egypt and Assyria came to rely.

**CONCLUSIONS**

In closing, the findings of this paper may be outlined as follows: Usir̲ḫ̲u-hurri is a transcription of a Libyan name known from Egypt; the name which appears in StAT 2 53 as Hanābeṣ should be understood as a variant spelling of Hallabēṣe, another name which is very likely Libyan; and the presence of Usir̲ḫ̲u-hurri and Hallabēṣe at Guzana in StAT 2 53 may be explained with reference to Assyrian deportations from the Levant, coinciding with well-documented Egyptian and Assyrian trade interests in the region.
A 1924 = Ass 8642a = StAT 2 53; after Donbaz and Parpola 2001, 44–45, with emendations as indicated above.

1 [ku-um*]ik-līt-tā ṣu-pu-ṣi i-i-ki-nū
2 [su-*]i*ma-n* a-mu-rī-na-sa
3 [a*m]u]tu-ci-zi ša-ga-zu-ni
4 [e]ni-tu-a-ni-su-man

five fingernail impressions

5 tu-ni a-di-u*wa-*lu-lā a-di-yig-*lā
6 i-ga-*ri bī-ti-*te-rū-bi-ti-ši-bī-ti-*te-ba-na-be-ci
7 ša-su-ma-ša ina*ša-gu-zu-ni
8 aš-šu-ma-ša ina*ša-gu-zu-ni
9 inaš-ši-bi 50 gīm*ša kī.babbar il-qi
10 ka-ri gu-nur-sum an
11 ē-tu ni-a-v e-ti ip la-qi
12 tu-ri de ni duq-duq lá-si
13 man-ru ša ina wiš iša ina-im-a-tu-me
14 luš*ma-ma luš dunma*-ūš
du-na*-ši-ša
15 luš dunma*-ši-ša luš-*še*-ši-ša
16 luš qu-ab-šu luš miš-ma*-ši-ša
17 ša de-niša qa-duš-ta*ši-ša
18 u dunma*-ši-ša-ša-[a-ša-ši-ša]
e. 19 10 mau ki.babbar ša-lū 1 mau-ša
20 kuši rak-šu ina bar-ši 10 [ša]
r. 1
2 ašši-i na*ši-ši-ša ina ši-kā-an
2 4 ašši.kur ra babbar*šu te ina-ši 2 [30]
3 ašši-i kaskal rab-ša ku-pi a-na 10 *še*-ši
4 a-na er-sa u ši-e-r ū-na de ni-ši
5 duq-duq ma la-ša-qi

6 igši*ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*šrim bi
7 igši*ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
8 igši*ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*šum bi
9 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
10 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
11 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
12 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
13 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
14 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
15 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
16 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
17 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
18 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
19 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
20 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
21 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi
22 igši*išši-ši-ašši-ša-gir-pašša*šu a*snum bi

(five fingernail impressions)

5 A tušu (bath) with its beams (and) doors, and a wall between Rib‘iš and Banabes (=Baalbêc), (property of Sama‘ in the city of Guzana—
8 Qederaya, chief [...], has contracted and bought it for fifty shekels of silver.
10 The money is paid completely. The bathroom in question is acquired and purchased. Any revocation, lawsuit or litigation is void.
13 Whoever in the future, at any time, whether Sama‘ or his sons, his grandsons, his brothers, his relatives or any litigant of his who seeks a lawsuit or litigation with Q[i]sa[ra] and his sons,
19 shall place ten minas of refined silver (and) one m[a]na of pure gold in the lap of Adad who resides in G[uzana], shall tie four white horses at the feet of S[a] who resides in Haran, and shall return the money tenfold to its owner. He shall contest in his lawsuit and not succeed.

6 Witness Abba-ra-ra, scholar.
7 Witness Zanbalā, Arab.
8 Witness Abbar, scholar of the temple of Adad.
9 Witness Uti-r[i]i, Egyptian.
10 Witness Adda-bi-di, merchant.
11 Witness Adad-abu-asur of the temple.
12 Witness Hai-er,[ ]
13 Witness Ga-bi.
14 Witness Adda-sa[a], son of Huriri.
15 Witness P[r]ašu, visitor.
16 Witness M[r]ašu, dirtoo.
18 Witness Mini-ab[i], leather worker of In-nêmeqi.
19 Witness Si-râmn [and] Alara, his [...],
21 [Witness] Ya-ya,
23 Month Tishri (VII), 1st day, eponym year of Mi[tu]n.
24 One shekel of silver for his fingernail.
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NOTES

1 For reading and commenting on drafts of this article, I give my sincerest thanks to Eva Miller, Orla Polten, Karen Radner, Günter Vittmann, Martin Worthington, and to JAE1’s anonymous reviewers. The abbreviations used in this paper may be consulted at http://cdli.ox.ac.uk/wiki/doku.php?id=abbreviations_for_assyriology and http://www.egyptologyforum.org/EEFrefs.html (noting PNA not PNAE, and RIL for Chabot 1940). The numbers (1, 2, 3, etc.) following normalised personal names refer to those used by the PNA. Following the convention of the PNA and SAA, asterisks indicate dates determined by post-canonical eponym (see PNA 1/1, p. xvii–xx).

2 ‘Libyan names’ refers to those names whose association with lands to the west of the Nile is determined using a range of morphological and historical factors (see especially Colin 1996). By wider Egyptological convention, which I attempt here to avoid, the term ‘Libyan’ is used indiscriminately to refer to an entire range of ethnic groups and associated cultures originating in North Africa, referred to in Egyptian texts as the “Tjechnu”, “Tjemehu”, “Meshwesh”, “Ma”, and “Reba”, among other names (see Snape 2003, 93–106, and Cooney 2011). Issues attendant in ascribing ethnicity on the basis of onomastics are outlined by Fales 2013, 51–52, footnote 11; suffice here to say that the presence of a Libyan name is not sufficient grounds to call the bearer ‘Libyan’.

3 On the name Lamintu (Eg. ẖarrt), see Ranke 1935, 204, no. 11; Demot Nb 725 (see further the Korrekturen und Nachträgliche to the Demot NL 193); Tallqvist 1918, 120; Onasch 1994, i.56; Yoyotte 1957–1960, 24; Colin 1996, i.68–69, ii.50–55. In the Neo-Assyrian corpus this name is attested only of a king of Hormopolis (‘Nimlot E’ in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal, spelled 𒂠ša-ma-in-ti, 𒂠ša-ti-in-ti, see PNA 2/II, 652. For a recent obiter dictum that the name means “Der zum Panther (anni) gehört”, see Zauzich 2013, 416, footnote 30.

4 The name of Necho I (Eg. ẖmẖw) is attested in the Assyrian royal inscriptions as Nīk(ē). For the spellings and references, see PNA 2/II, 963. The name is otherwise unattested as a personal name in Assyria, but appears at Neo-Babylonian Sippur in BM 120052: r. 20 as 𒂠ša-kā-ḫi (Zadok 2005, 95). Griffith (1909, 243, note 7) considered the Egyptian form an atypical revival of the Old Kingdom name Ny₂₃₂₃₂, “Belonging to the kas (i.e. souls)”, see further Ranke 1935, 213, no. 16; so too Rholland 2004, 485; PNA 2/II, 963; Demot Nb, 624–625 (against the demotic readings, see Depauw and Clarisse 2002). Griffith’s hypothesis has been convincingly refuted on orthographic grounds by Leahy (2011, 56–565), confirming suspicions that the name was not originally Egyptian. I am grateful to Claus Jürman for bringing this article to my attention (8/04/2015). Like the demotic writing of Pšmḥ as Pḥ₂₃₂₃₂-ḫu “the mixed-drink vendor” (Ray 1990, 197; Quaeghebeur 1990)), the spelling Ny₂₃₂₃₂ must be considered a secondary development. If Perdu’s analysis of the relationship between the Twenty-Fourth and Twenty-Sixth Dynasties is correct, it stands to reason that the name Necho (and with it Psammetichus) is Libyan (Perdu 2002; Leahy 2011, 566). For the etymology of Necho as “Necho the Wise”, see Rholland 2011. I thank Luigi Prada for this reference (09/04/15).

5 The name of Psammetichus I (Eg. Pšmḥḥ) is attested in the Assyrian royal inscriptions as Pišemelki. For the spellings and references, see PNA 3/1, 997. On the rogue spelling “ša-sa-mi-is-ki” as a scribal error, see Worthington 2012, 77–78, 124. As it appears in Neo-Assyrian sources, the final portion of the name diverges considerably from the Egyptian. Conceivably it was influenced by šnimk to rule” (Ray 1990, 197; Martin Worthington also points out to me that the name could be understood as the phrase piša melki, “her utterance is my advice” (09/04/15). The name is attested in Persian Babylonian as pa-sa-mi-is-ki (Eded 1980; Onasch 1994, i.164, footnote 608–609), and at Sippur as pa-sa-mi-is-ki (Bongenaar and Haring 1994, 70). As with Necho, the name is probably Libyan (Ray 1990, 196; Schneider 2001, 164; Leahy 2011, 565), a supposition strengthened by morphological compatibility with the Libyan onomastics (Colin 1996, i.121), and recent analysis of the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty’s descent (Perdu 2002).

6 On the name Ślikānu/Ślikānu/Usīkanu’ (Eg. Ššktnw), see Ranke 1935, 87, no. 2; Demot Nb, 129 (see also Korrekturen und Nachträgliche to the Demot NL, 141); Albright 1956, 24; Colin 1996, i.61–63, ii.20–36. Neo-Assyrian sources attest to three individuals with this name: ʾni-šu-kas-ni (Osorkon IV) in the inscriptions of Sargon II, on whom see Fuchs 1998, III; 8, and PNA 3/II, 1421–1422; the servant ʾni-šu-kas-nu from Assur in StAT 2 268: 1, 2 (646* or 629*), see PNA 3/II: 1422; and the witness ʾni-šu-kas-nu from Assur in StAT 3 97: 14 (date lost), see PNA 3/II, 1422.

7 On the name śsusānu/śusānu/susānu (Eg. Ššknt), see Ranke 1935, 330, no. 6; Demot Nb, 105, 970, 974; Tallqvist 1918, 204; Onasch 1994, i.53; Colin 1996, i.71–72, ii.61–88. Two individuals with this name are attested in Neo-Assyrian sources: the in-law of Senacherib attested in SAA 6 142: r.12 as šu-se-an-ku (692), and the king of Busiris attested as šu-se-ṣi-in-qu in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal, see PNA 3/III, 1161.

8 On the name Taklišātu (Eg. ḫtḥt), see Ranke 1935, 394, no. 25; Demot Nb, 105; Tallqvist 1918, 228; Colin 1996, i.74, ii.106–114. In the Neo-Assyrian corpus, one individual with this name is attested as a witness at Nineveh, in SAA 14 26: r. 4 as ʾaš-kā-da-at-ti (645*), and in SAA 14 154: r. 11 as ʾaš-kēl-ta-ti (627*), see PNA 3/II, 1303. Vittmann, 1984, 65, provides a Neo-Babylonian example; the name also appears as ʾaš-kēl-ta-ti in BM
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59410: 15 and CT 56, 87 III: 16; and as Ṣak-ka-ta-a' in BM 59410: r. 20’ and CT 56, 664 ii.15’, see Bongenaar and Haring 1994, 71; Zadok 1992, 143. These and the other (very approximate) figures given in this article are based on my own tabulation of the personal names in PNA, as well as those in Radner, K., IV. Die beiden neassyrischen Privatarchive (forthcoming). On the invasions, see RINAP 4: Onasch 1994; Borger 1996; Kahn 2006; Radner 2008; Kahn and Tammuz 2009, all with references to expansive further literature. For a short thematic summary of the Egyptian presence in Assyria, see Huber 2006.

A 1924 = Ass 8442a = STAT 2 53 (700); Donbaz and Parpola 2001, 44–45.

The eponym preserved on s. 2 is fragmentary, but may be restored as lim-me ṣm-[m-r-n]. This being the only eponym to begin with ṢM. Identical restorations are given in Radner 1997, 308, and Donbaz and Parpola 2001, 45. For the date of Mitintu, see Millard 1994, 101.

Pedersen 1986, 106–107; not all the tablets can be dated.

The site is located close to the Syriar-Turkish border, centred on 36°49’34”N; 40°22’22”E.

See Ponchia 2003, 275–76, superseding the reading Ṣm-[m-r-n] “the Damascene,” which is based on sa-imirū, a form unattested in non-literate texts. I am thankful to Ran Zadok for bringing this reference to my attention. The name Sama is West Semitic, see PNA 3/1, 1081; Tallqvist 1918, 191; Zadok 1977a, 119, and is held by another “Samarian” in the undated administrative list CTN 3 99: ii 20.

Described as a “Haus” in Radner 1997, 249, footnote 1296.

Simo Parpola suggests the word is Aramaic, noting similarities to the Syr. ta₂nu₂-twōna₂, “an inner room; a garner” and J.Aram. ta₂wōna₂ “Gemach, Kammer,” see: Smith 1903, 606; and Dalman 1938, 440 (personal correspondence, 16/9/2014).

I am most grateful to Ran Zadok for his comments concerning the likely division of the witnesses in STAT 2 53 (11/9/14).

On the nuances of dam-gar₂, tamkāra during the Neo-Assyrian period, see Radner 1999.

The term ūbaru (ṣuḫuṣ), customarily translated “visitor,” describes a resident alien or envoy of high status, usually enjoying special support from the local government, see CAD, vol. 20, U and W, 10–11. For the term in an administrative context, see SAA 7 151: ii.2 (undated); for a legal context see the court decision STAT 2 173: 1 (636’ or 625’), delivered after a group of “Egyptian merchants” (dām-gar₂ ṣm-[m-r-n]-a-a) entered the house of Hakubaya as ūbaru and met with misfortune at the hands of five men. The related expression bēs uḥrēṣu appears in SAA 1 153: r. 6 (undated), in reference to the lodging place of the dignitaries of Sidon.

Read by pād-a₁-ia₁-s₁-a₁ by Schwemer in PNA 3/1, 982, apparently assuming haplography in ū-baru. Donbaz and Parpola read instead ṣm-[m-r-n]-a₁. The name on the following line, ṣm-[m-r-n]-a₁ appears as well to invoke Ia₁. PNA 3/1L 1422.


23. For discussions of the transcription of Egyptian words into cuneiform, see inter alia: Steindorff 1890, citing earlier literature on p. 332; Ranke 1910; Albright 1946; Albright 1956; Vycichl 1966; Fales 1974; Ossing 1978; Edel 1988; Leahy 1980; Zadok 1992; Leahy 1993; Zellner 1994; Zadok 1977; Zadok 1983; Zadok 1995; Mattila 2002; Zadok 2005; and the numerous entries on etymologically Egyptian names, mostly by Rajia Mattila, in the PNA.

24. Ranke 1935, 87, no. 2; see further spellings in Colin 1996, ii.20–36.

25. STAT 3 97: 14 (date lost), perhaps better with –ir-, see endnote 36.

26. STAT 2 268 (644’ or 629’): 1, 2, as śi-ir-kā-a-mu.


28. Albright 1956, 24, attributed the loss of –ir- in writings of Wštrk to confusion with the Akkadian conjunction a “and, or.” The potential for confusion in cases of –ir- is further suggested by Akkadian scribes’ near-universal preference for the sign ū (rather than ū or ū) in word-initial position, one of the very few ‘rules’ of Akkadian orthography to have met with widespread acceptance, see Westendorf and Wasserman apud Worthington 2012, 55, footnote 193.

29. Leahy 1993, 56, TIM 11 14 r. 7 (date lost), g. Coptic * ṣm-[m-r-n] (Wb i.4 i.14); perhaps also in the name ṣm-[m-r-n] TIM 11 3: 2 (612’), if Leahy’s proposal (1993, 59) to understand the name as Eg. ṭy (accepted).

30. E.g. ṣm-[m-r-n] in STAT 2 177: r. 3 (617’); and AD-Ḫuru 1–2. in ND 2306: r. 17 (687) and TIM 11 10: r. 7 (eponymy of Mannu-ki-Ḫarba), see PNA 1/1, 10, the latter perhaps better understood as ṭi-[m-r-n] “Horus is (my) father” than as a hybrid name. See further footnote 86, below.

31. E.g. PNA 1/1, 109, Amu-tēše 1–3.

32. The writings ṣm-[m-r-n] ṣm-[m-r-n] ṣm-[m-r-n] for Eg. ṣm-[m-r-n] in the royal inscriptions of Esarhaddon (see RINAP 4), and perhaps also the above-cited spelling of Wštrk are among very few exceptions to this rule (see Ranke 1910, 91). The word aššiṣa, presumably also referring to Upper Egypt, is also spelled with ṣ in a passage from Sargon II’s Display Inscription, see Fuchs 1994, 349, 1100–1111. Notes that in Neo-Babylonian sources, Egyptian ṣ is usually represented by Akkadian s, see footnote 94 below, and further Ranke 1910, 91.

33. SAA 11 169: 13 (undated).

34. STAT 1 11: r. 8 (undated).


12
comment on linguistic affiliation, but rather a historical shorthand used to describe a group of names and inscriptions which are historically and morphologically related, based on the balance of probabilities. On the ties between Libyan names and Libyan identity, especially into later Egyptian history, see: Winnicki 2009, 401–402; De Meulenaere 1956, 255–256; and Leahy 1980.

RIL, no. 2.

RIL, no. 7.

RIL, no. 290 (Mhd); RIL, nos. 413, 290 (Mhd/Mdr), transcribed in Neo-Punic as M’sr (Jongeling 1984, 10, 188, apud Colin, i.66).

RIL, no. 680.

RIL, no. 1.

On the equation of Muṣur (III) with Egypt, see Kessler 1997. For an excellent discussion of nisbes and the problems associated with discussions of ethnicity in the Neo-Assyrian Empire, see Fales 2013.

von Soden 1995, §60.

Fales 2013, 57.

Kurkh Monolith = BM 118884 = RIMAP 3 Shalmaneser III A.0.102.2: ii 92 (1 lim erinše iš ku muṣur-ra-a-a). Two further extensions from Nimrud and Nineveh do not preserve the relevant passage. The ‘columns’ of the stela refer by convention to the recto and verso.


ND 2765 = CTN 5.14 = SAA 1 110: r. 5 (maḫ-ṣur muṣur-ra-a); the letters, therefore, do not antedate the conquest of Damascus by Tiglath-Pileser III (732 B.C.) and the integration of its territory into the Assyrian provincial system” (Eph al 1982, 55).

Nineveh (Prism S) S = Bu 91–5–9 218 = RINAP 4 Esarhaddon 9: 10 (BA ku muṣur-a-a).

See SAA 4 (Starr 1990) passim.

This is suggested independently by Fales (2013, 57), and supported by analysis of “Egyptians” in the Neo-Assyrian corpus.

A possible exception appears in PNA 2/II 1422 as muṣur-ra-a-a (Menas(s)è 3), but collation by Faist gives the reading ku muṣur-a-a-a “from Suṟru” (2007, 158).

PNA, 1/II, 449.

Donbaz and Paprols 2001, 44–55, footnote 6. Note that /n/ and /l/ are both apicals with similar points of articulation (Allen 2012, 22).

Leahy 1993, 57.

Griffiths 1951, 219.

Ranke 1935, 253, no. 27; elsewhere transcribed as ḫbrs, ḫlr, and ḫt-Bs.


John Ray/apud Leahy 1980, 60.

Griffiths 1951; Wiseman 1966, 156.


Hallabé 1, CT 53 46: r. 9 (undated), see PNA 1/II, 443.
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77 Hallabēkē 2. TIM 11 15: r. 14 (634*); TIM 11 3: 1, 5, 8, 15, r. 13 (612*); TIM 11 10: l. 6; see PNA ibia.
78 Hallabēkē 3. StAT 2 192: 4 (629*); StAT 2 177: r. 2 (617*); see PNA ibia.
79 Hallabēkē 4. SAA 14 161: r. 21 (623*); see PNA ibia.
80 Hallabēkē (5), StAT 2 53: 6 (700); not listed in PNA, possibly identical with Hallabēkē 1.
81 TIM 11 15: r. 12 (634*); see PNA 3/1, 1001; these same two men are likely attested in TIM 11 7: r. 12, 14 (612*); cf. TIM 11 10: r. 6, l. 1 (eponymy of Mannu-ki-Arabai).
82 TIM 11 15: r. 14 (634*).
83 Ismail and Postgate 1993, republished in Mattila 2002; see especially Leahy 1993.
85 StAT 2 192: r. 3 (629*); PNA 2/II, 482; Leahy 1993, 59; Zadok 1979b, 64; Edel 1980, 25; Zeidler 1994, 43.
86 StAT 2 177: r. 3 (617*); PNA 1/1, 87. Günter Vittmann (personal communication, 12/04/15) kindly points out that the name cannot simply be hr “Horus,” and tentatively suggests ‘i-hr “O Horus!” following the Late Period pattern /i/ (interjection) + god’s name, (e.g., E.-hnu, “O Khonsu!”), Ranko 1952, 260, no. 2). This name should not be confused with i-br “O face [of DN],” which would have lost its final /r/ in pronunciation.
87 SAA 14 161: r. 15 (623*): PNA 1/1, 109; Ranko 1910, 27; Tallqvist 1918, 14, 23; Zadok 1979b, 67.
88 SAA 14 161: r. 5 (623*); PNA 2/II, 960; Ranko 1910, 31.
89 SAA 14 161: 12, 14 (623*); PNA 3/1, 1170; Steindorff 1890, 53; Ranko 1910, 34, 38; Tallqvist 1918, 205; Edel 1980, 30.
90 Ranko 1910, 35; Ranko 1935, 388, no. 2; cf. the Babylonian attestation cited in Zadok 2005, 96–97.
91 StAT 2 53: 6 (700).
92 PNA 2/II, 959; PNA 3/1, 982.
93 The possibility that Paššu-ia 1 and 2 are identical is already entertained by Schwemer, PNA 3/1, 982.
94 The name is true of the attestations of Hallabēkē in the Neo-Babylonian sources known to me. One “la-ba-bi-su” appears in BM 57337: 1’ from Sippar, along with a number of other men with Egyptian names, including “bu-ū-ru” (Eg. Br, “Horus”) and “bu-ū-ru-[ma-su]” (Eg. Br, “Horus be sound!”), see Wiseman 1966, 156; one “la-ba-bi-su &gal,[10]-u” appears in BM 59410: 1 (Bongenaar and Haring 1994, 59) along with the Babylonian names “pa-su-ma-kī (l. 4) and “ta-k-la-a-ta (l. 15); the names “la-ba-bi-su” (r. 1) and “la-ba-bi-su” (r. 14) occur in BM 57701 (Bongenaar and Haring 1994, 63) alongside other Egyptian names. Further examples are cited in Zadok 1992, 141, no. 22, and Zadok 1993, 73. The name also appears in an unpublished text from Claremont, IAC 292, as “la-ba-bi-su” again alongside Egyptian names (personal communication from Ran Zadok, 10/13/13).
96 Leahy 1980, 51, no. 116–16; for ‘aknu as a Libyan name, see Colini 1996, ii.15–16.
97 Leahy 1980, 50, no. 4.
98 Colini 1996, ii.122–123.
100 Colini 1996, ii.43.
101 Colini 1996, ii.50–57.
102 On the discovery of the documents, see Mallowan’s foreword to Kinnier Wilson 1972; for the layout of the apartments, see Dalley and Postgate 1984. And the map adjacent to p. 1. For the translations, see Kinnier Wilson 1972. As Fales 1994, 363, noes, ‘wine lists’ is a misnomer as the majority of the texts are so damaged that the materials to which they refer cannot be ascertained. A group of “Egyptian scribes” (bohs) and group of “Kushites” (bohs) are attested in CTN 19 (745 or 732 BCE, for the date see Dalley and Postgate 1984, 22). Also note attestations of the personal name “the Kushite” (bohs) in CTN 1: 6; 21; CTN 1 19: 25, and perhaps in the broken context CTN 3 120: 2. For Egyptian scholars at the Assyrian court following the invasions of Egypt, see Radner 2009.
103 See conveniently Radner 2012, 475, footnote 5.
104 Balogh 2011, 70.
105 Radner 2012.
106 Radner considered the name’s etymology uncertain (2012, 472) and it was not listed in PNA. It could perhaps be equated with Eg. t(3)[w], known from New Kingdom sources and also from those of the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty (Ranko 1935, 227, no. 10).
107 PNA 2/II, 481–482.
108 PNA 2/II, 482.
109 I thank one of JAEL’s anonymous reviewers for suggesting this possibility.
110 See further Oded 1979, 69–74.
111 See Park 2012, 98, for a convenient summary of the disagreements.
112 Fuchs 1994, 303, l. 21.
113 Fuchs 1994, 308, l. 15.
114 Fuchs 1994, 313, l. 16–16 (context damaged); cf. Oded 1979, 52.
115 RINAP 1, p. 18, no. 2.
116 See Oded 1979, 6, 14–15, Aside from StAT 2 53, the relevant documents include SAA 6 34 (709) and SAA 16 63 (undated). As late as 613*, a man called “kus-wa-a,” The Kushite, was attested at Guzana as witness to fragmentary legal settlement, TH 110 l. 1 (613*), so too TH 108: 4 (625*), see PNA 2/1, 643.
117 Ran Zadok, personal communication (11/9/2014).
118 PNA 3/1, 982.
120 SAA 19 22 (c. 734) = ND 2715 = CTN 5 155.
121 Fuchs 1994, 314, l. 17–18.
122 Macadam 1949, 4–14, pls. 5–6:ib it, 32–40, pls. 11–12, 12, 18, 20–21; see further Spalinger 1978, 26–28; Kahn 2006, 250–53.
Reisner, Fisher, and Lyon 1924, ii, pl. 56. cf. i, p. 247 and p. 334, fig. 205.
Rowe 1936, 205, no. 875, pl. 22 (scarab); Rowe 1936, 265, S104 (A), pl. 29 (seal).
A group of “Egyptian merchants” (lāqālṣum-su-ṣur-ra-a-e) is attested in STAT 2 173; 1, 6–7 (636’ or 625’). Donbaz and Parpola also restore “[Egyptian] merchant” (lāqālṣum-su-ṣur-ra-a-e) in STAT 2 271: 2. As this document contains no Egyptian names and cannot be assigned to any particular archive, one supposes the restoration is based on the “two scarab impressions” reportedly borne by the tablet. An “oval scarab impression” also appears on the sale document STAT 2 273 (625’), in which the vendor Taš-Bēl is stated to be “an Egyptian” (lālṣum-su-ṣur-ra-a-e).