



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

**Thy Name is Deer, Animal names in Semitic onomastics and name-giving traditions : evidence from Akkadian, Northwest Semitic, and Arabic**  
Dirbas, H.

**Citation**

Dirbas, H. (2017, February 14). *Thy Name is Deer, Animal names in Semitic onomastics and name-giving traditions : evidence from Akkadian, Northwest Semitic, and Arabic*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/45994>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/45994>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/45994> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Dirbas, H.

**Title:** Thy Name is Deer. Animal names in Semitic onomastics and name-giving traditions : evidence from Akkadian, Northwest Semitic, and Arabic

**Issue Date:** 2017-02-14

## 4 Animal Names in Northwest Semitic

### 4.1 Amorite

#### 4.1.1 The onomastic evidence: etymology and classification

As stated above (1.3.2, 1.3.3), Amor. animal terms have been discussed in two types of works: modern manuals and specific articles. Generally, there is a consensus among these works that it is sometimes quite difficult to distinguish the Amor. names from their Akk. cognates, especially the ones belonging to the PS faunal lexicon. In their approach to this issue, Kogan (2003) and, more thoroughly, Golinets (2016) use etymological, phonological, morphological, and syntactical considerations. In this section, I will apply a similar method by classifying the onomastic data into four groups: (1) Akk. terms, (2) Amor. terms, (3) debated terms, and (4) indistinguishable terms. The names mentioned by Millet Albà (2000), for which I could find no textual references in CAAA or ARM, will be excluded from the discussion.

##### 4.1.1.1 Akkadian terms

In his review of Millet Albà's article on animal names in the Mari Archives, Kogan (2003) suggests that an onomastic element should be provisionally regarded as Akk. if:

(1) No WS etymology for the term in question can be proposed (Kogan 2003: 252): *as/šqud*- “hamster” (§83), *as*- “bear” (§21), *barbar*- “wolf” (§19), *būr*- “calf” (§61), *kulīl*- “dragon-fly” (§135), and *lakān*- “(kind of) sheep” (§75).

(2) Specifically Akk. phonological features are observed or the morphological shape of a given term matches with the Akk. cognate but is not attested in other Sem. languages (Kogan 2003: 252ff): *būš*- “kind of bird, hyena” (§113), *iššūr*- “bird” (§106), and *arrab*- “dormouse” vs. *yarbV'*- (§82).

##### 4.1.1.2 Amorite terms

A given onomastic element can be classified as Amor. according to its: (1) etymology, and (2) linguistic features.

#### 4.1.1.2.1 Etymology

The relevant Sem. term has no reflex in Akk. (Kogan 2003: 253; Golinets 2016: 60-64): ‘arād- “wild ass” (§39),<sup>121</sup> ‘ayr- “donkey” (§40),<sup>122</sup> burbur- “kind of bird” (§117), ḥ/ḥasīd- “stork” (?) (in view of Heb. ḥāsīdā) (§103), ya‘īl- “ibex” (§37), and yamām-a “pigeon” (in view of Ar.) (§111).<sup>123</sup> In addition to these, there are a few possibly relevant terms that have not been discussed before (listed in CAAA without an explanation):

- *Ga-aḥ-šu* and *Ga-ḥa-šum*: normalized as *ga’š-/ga’aš* (CAAA 131). Since the proposed form does not have a clear cognate in NWS, one could alternatively think of Ar. ḡaḥš- “donkey foal; young gazelle”<sup>124</sup> (Lane 382), a term which seems to be isolated in Sem. (§41).<sup>125</sup>
- *Gu-ra-tum* (f), *Gu-ri* (gen.), and *Gu-ri-ia*: probably reflect \*gūr- “whelp” (§26).
- *Gu-ur-da-an*: may reflect \*qVrd- “tick” (§133)<sup>126</sup> plus the adjectival suffix -ān (↓4.1.2.1).
- *Gu-za-an* and *Gu-zi* (f): could be connected to Aram. qūzā “weasel” (§91).<sup>127</sup>

#### 4.1.1.2.2 Linguistic features

An Amor. term exhibits phonological, morphological, and syntactical features that are not observed in Akk.

##### 4.1.1.2.2.1 Terms with non-Akkadian phonology and/or morphology

- ‘azz(-at)- “goat” (§64) vs. Akk. *e/inzu* (Kogan 2003: 253; Golinets 2016: 71),<sup>128</sup> provided it is not from √‘zz “strong” (CAAA 268; Streck 2000: 294, n. 3). The sense ‘goat’, however, is more explicit in terms with the infix -Vn-: ‘anz- and ‘inz- (cf. ↓4.1.3.5).
- *dabi-* and *dab(i)’-at* “bear” (§20) are Amor. according to Golinets (2016: 69) because they exhibit no vowel contraction as compared with Akk. *dabû/ dabītu*, which also holds for the Oakk. name *Da-bi-um* (AHw 148).

---

<sup>121</sup> This noun is also attested in Akk. texts as a WS loanword: *ḥarādu* II (AHw 322), *araddu*, and *ḥarādu* A (CAD A/2 212; H 88).

<sup>122</sup> This noun is also attested in Mari texts as a WS loanword: *ḥā/āru* (AHw 328 with etymology <ug. ‘r, he., ar. ‘air; CAD H 118; Streck 2000: 94).

<sup>123</sup> There are also three Amor. loanwords that are not attested in the onomasticon: *baqr-* “cattle, cow”, *buqār-* “calf”, and *šamr(-at)* “wool-bearing (sheep)” (Streck 2000: 85, 87, 116).

<sup>124</sup> The Ḥ-sign for /ḥ/ has some attestations in Amor. names (Streck 2000: §2.168).

<sup>125</sup> No mention of any cognates of this Ar. term in SED 2 or Leslau 1987.

<sup>126</sup> On G- for /q/, see Streck (2000: 198, §2.140).

<sup>127</sup> On Aram. *qūzā*, see Brockelmann (1928: 651); Drower and Macuch (1963: 409).

<sup>128</sup> Akk. *ḥanzu*, *ḥazzu*, and *ḥazzatu* are considered WS loans (CAD H 83; Streck 2000: 96). We have also *azzatu* (CAD 1/2 531) and *a-su*, *a-sa-tum* (not as PN) (ARM 24, p. 24ff). On the etymology of ‘z in NWS, see the discussion by Hug in ThWAT 9: 556-58.

- *ḏab(a)b-*, *ḏubāb(-at)* (dimin.) “fly” (§125) vs. Akk. *zunbu/zumbu/zubbu* (Golinets 2016: 69; Streck 2000: §5.34).<sup>129</sup>

- *ḡazāl-* “gazelle” (§33): while there is a consensus on the Amor. origin of this form (Huffmon 1965: 151; Streck 2000: § 5.22; Golinets 2016: 65), *ḡuzāl(-at)* has been a question of debate: (1) Amor. in the pattern *qutāl* with a diminutive meaning (Huffmon 1965: 151; CAAA 100; Streck 2000: §5.34), (2) Akk. (Stamm 1939: 253; AHW 362; CAD ḡ 265; Kogan 2003:253).

- *ḡimār-* “ass” (§42) vs. Akk. *imēru* (Streck 2000: § 5.30, 70; Kogan 2003: 253; Golinets 2016: 66).

- (*ḡ*)*immar-*: reflects either *’immar-* “lamb” (§62), i.e., the Amor. parallel of Akk. *immeru*, or, less likely, *ḡimār-* “ass” (§29) (Kogan 2003: 253; Golinets 2016: 65).

- *kašb(-ān-)* (§67): could be a metathesis of *kabś(-ān-)* “lambkin” or “lamb-like”, like Heb. *kabśa/kibśa* (Golinets 2016: 69).

- *lab(b)-(a)* (§4): beside its occurrence as a divine epithet (↓4.1.3.1.1), this noun is probably attested in two one-word names: (1) *La-ba* (mas.) from Mari (for a similar masc. name with the Amor. ending *-a*, see *Ya’ūla* “Ibex” in ↓4.1.2.4), and (2) *La-bu-a/a’-nu* from Tell al Rimah, which seems to reflect the original PS form *\*labu’*.

- *ṣabi-(f)* and *ṣabyat-(f)*, if related to *\*ṭaby(-at)* “gazelle, antelope” (§36), suggest Amor. forms vs. Akk. *ṣabītu* and allow one to reconstruct the masc. form *ṣabi-* (Golinets 2016: 70 following Knudsen 2004: 322). Interestingly, both *Ṣabī* and *Ṣabya/e* are used for women in colloquial Ar. (Bed.).

- *pur’uš(-ān)* (CAAA 28) or *purḡuš(-ān)* (Streck 2000: § 2.142) attests the noun *\*pVrḡVt-* “flea” (§124). For Golinets (2016: 74), it may be Amor. because it differs from the Akk. forms *pirša’u*, *pirsa’u*, *piršu’u*, etc. (CAD P 414; AHW 855). Another obvious indicator of the Amor. origin of this form, however, is the suffix *-ān*, which is absent from all the available Akk. examples.

- Morphologically, names ending in the suffix *-a* (mostly fem.) or the diminutive *-atān* (masc.) are also Amor. (↓4.1.2.2).

The terms below, which, as far as I know, have not been discussed before, could also be related to the faunal lexicon:

---

<sup>129</sup> Or the wide scope of Ar. *√ḏbb* “to defend someone, to drive away, to hast” (Lane 951)?

- *Bu-ul-bu-lum* (§109): could be linked to JBaram./Mand. *blbl* and Ar. *bulbul* “nightingale” (Sokoloff 2002: 241b; Drower and Macuch 1963: 55b; Lane 245a). According to SED 2 (\**bVL*-, No. 60), Akk. *bulīlu* “a species of crested bird” (CAD B 310) is a cognate of Ar. *b*.
- *Ḥa-ar-ga-al/Ḥa-ar-ga-lum*: this is clearly a (N)WS form of \**ḥargVL*- “locust” (§126) vs. Akk. *ergīlu* which is absent from the onomasticon (AHw 240; CAD I 176).
- *Ḥa-an-zu-ra*: could be a variant (dimin.?) of *ḥV(n)zīr* “pig” (§77) or \**ʿa(n)zar* “wild cat” (§13).<sup>130</sup> Alternatively, it may also be related to Ug. *ḥnzr* (I) “an official” (DUL 399, 417).
- *Pa-ru-ri*: could reflect an Amor. form (dimin.?) of \**paʿr* “mouse” (§81); the Akk. cognate occurs only in the fem. form *pērūrūtu*, and it is confined to women in the onomasticon.
- *Sà-aḥ-la-ba-an/Sà-aḥ-la-ba-an*: seems to denote \**ṭaʿlab*- “fox”, plus the adjectival suffix -*ān* (like Ug. *ṭʿlbn* and Ar. *ṭaʿlabān*, cf. §16).
- *Zu-ūr-zu-ru-um*, *Zu-ur-zu-ri-ia*, and *ʿZu-ūr-zu-ūr-tum*: if not foreign names, these could be variants of \**zarzī/ūr*- “starling”, like Ar. *zurzūr* (§108) or \**ṣarṣa/ūr*- “cricket”, like Ar. *ṣurṣūr* (§123).

#### 4.1.1.2.2.2 Terms with non-Akkadian syntax

Compound names whose *nomen regens* has the ending *-u* are syntactically Amor., for this ending is a feature broadly attested in the Amor. onomasticon (Golinets 2016: 72ff; Streck 2000: §3.53-56): *Kalbu-DN* vs. Akk. *Kalab-DN* “Dog of DN” (↓4.1.3.3) and *Mūru-DN* vs. Akk. *Mūr-DN* “Foal of DN” (↓4.1.3.6).

#### 4.1.1.3 Debated terms

- Names formed with *ḥagal*- (*Ḥa-ga-li-ia*, *Ḥa-ga-lim*, *Ḥa-ga-lu-um*) have caused much discussion: Gelb suggests ‘*agal*’ without an explanation (CAAA 91, 260); others give “calf” (Duran 1997: 638; Millet Albà 2000: 485; Golinets 2016: 60); for Kogan (2003: 254), the sense “calf” is rather unlikely since the corresponding WS terms are always attested as monosyllabic bases with a stable *i*-vowel. Alternatively, he argues that “Akk. *agalu* ‘an equid’ should probably be taken into consideration but no WS parallel for this interesting term is known so that the nature of the initial laryngeal is hard to establish”. Apparently, Kogan’s argument concerning the sense ‘calf’ is not very accurate, for the *qatl* form is reflected by the Palm. name ‘*Aglībōl* “Calf of Bōl” (↓4.3.3.3). As for Akk. *agalu*, the two PNs cited under this item in CAD A/1 141 (*ʿĀ-ga-lum* and *A-ga-la*) appear to be not accepted in

---

<sup>130</sup> The *Ḥ*-sign for /ʿ/ has some attestations in Amor. names (cf. Streck 2000: §2.143).

AHw 15. Given this and the fact that the sign 𐤇A is rather used for /ḥa/ in Amor. names (Streck 2000: §2.168), it seems most reasonable to consider PWS \*ḥagal- “partridge”, which is found in different onomastic corpora: Ug., Heb., AAr., and Ar. (§113).

- *Namašum/namišum*: explained as “Ichneumon” (with question mark) by Gelb (CAAA, 26). Golinets (2016: 80) rejects this proposition assuming that Gelb thought of the Akk. noun *nammaššû* “herds of (wild) animals” (CAD N/1 233), “Getier” (AHw. 728). His rejection is based on two arguments: (1) the orthography of the forms *Na-mi-šum*, *Na-ma-ši* (gen.), and *Na-ma-ši* does not support the morphological relation with the Akk. noun, and (2) it is difficult to explain how a person can be referred to with a generic term “herds of animals” and not with a specific animal name. Seemingly, Gelb’s assessment is based on Heb. *Nimši/Nmš* (IPN 230) and/or Ug. *Nmš* (PTU 28, 167), the assumed cognates of Ar. *nims* “the Egyptian mongoose” (*Herpestes ichneumon*) (Lane 2854). The original pattern of this word could be *qatal* or *qatil* formation (PHIAP 70, 100), but we still need evidence for it from the NWS lexicon (cf. the mentioned names sub §24).

- *pār-* (§59): Millet Albà (2000: 486-7) mentions *Para*, *Paratum*, *Partum* “Vache” (?), and *Paratān* “Celui-de-la-vache” (?), but without textual evidence. Presumably, she thought of *Pa-a-ra-tim* (gen.), *Pa-ar-tum*, and *Pa-ra-ta-an* (ARM 16/1: 167), which are linked to the verb *BJR* (?) by Gelb (CAAA 16, 285). The Akk. form *pāru* “ein Rind?” (AHw 836b) gets support from Mari *pa\*-ra-tu[m]*, mentioned in a list of animals (ARM 24 42). Durand (1991a: 24) compares this word to Syr. *parrā*, Heb. *par/pāra* and Ug. *prt*, all meaning “young bull, heifer”, and he distinguishes it from Akk. *parru/parratu* “young (female) lamb” (AHw 834; CAD P 189, 192). The Amor. affiliation of the mentioned PNs is explicit in the last example (*Pa-ra-ta-an*), for the suffix *-atān* (a combination of *-at* and *-ān*) is attested in hypoc. and one-word names (cf. ↓4.1.2.2).

#### 4.1.1.4 Indistinguishable terms

Gelb (CAAA, the glossary) listed several terms as Amor., although they belong to the PS faunal lexicon (maybe he did so due to geographical considerations). In principle, however, these terms are indistinguishable from Akk., unless they exhibit one of the morphological or syntactical features mentioned above (i.e., the ending *-u* of the *nomen regens* ↑4.1.1.2.2; and the suffixes *-a/-atān*, with more details in ↓4.1.2.2).

The list below represents this category of terms (cf. the discussion by Kogan 2003: 254; Golinets 2016: 75-78 with the bibliography therein):

'alp- "ox" (§54),<sup>131</sup> 'arḥ- "cow, heifer" (§55),<sup>132</sup> 'arnab(-at) "hare" (§86), 'arwi- "gazelle, ibex" (§29),<sup>133</sup> 'ayyal- "deer" (§30),<sup>134</sup> baqq- "gnat" (§127), ḥuzīr- "pig" (§77),<sup>135</sup> kabś- "young ram" (§67), kalb- "dog" (§14), namal- "ant" (§121),<sup>136</sup> šūrān- "cat" (§13),<sup>137</sup> and zīb(-at)- "wolf, jackal", "vulture" (§18).<sup>138</sup>

#### 4.1.2 Suffixes and endearment forms

##### 4.1.2.1 -ān

This suffix is mainly found in masc. names. It has two functions in Amor.: diminutive and adjectival ending from substantive. The first function occurs usually with hypocoristic names, like (a) the genitive construction, e.g., 'Abdān < 'Abd-DN, (b) the predicate state, e.g., 'Adnān < 'Adnī-'il "The god is my delight", (c) verbal names, e.g., Ya'dunān < Ya'dun-Līm "The tribe delighted", or with diminutive -at Yayda'atān < Yayda'-'el "The god knew", and (d) interrogative sentence names (sometimes in combination with diminutive -at), e.g., Mannatān < Manna-balti-'el "Who is without god?". The second function occurs only with one-word names: (a) animal names, and (b) geographical or ethnic names, like Baśārān and Šam'alān (Streck 2000 §5.52-71).

Compared to the other suffixes found in animal names, -ān is the most frequent one, and its adjectival function agrees with the onomastic evidence from Eb. (Bonechi 2011-12),<sup>139</sup> Akk.,<sup>140</sup> and Ar. (↓5.2.1). The list below contains all the available examples from Mari and elsewhere:

<sup>131</sup> No mention of PNs under this term in AHW 83 or CAD A/1 364.

<sup>132</sup> No mention of PNs in AHW 67 or CAD A/2 263.

<sup>133</sup> The names *Ar-wi-u*/<sup>f</sup>*Ar-wi-tum*/<sup>f</sup>*Ar-bi-tum*, etc. are treated as Akk. (Stamm 1939: 253; AHW 73; CAD A/2 294). For Streck (2000: § 2.43), UR III *Ar-bī-um* is Amor.

<sup>134</sup> No mention of PNs in Stamm (1939: 253-55) or AHW 24, but CAD A/1 225 lists OB <sup>f</sup>*A-ia-la-tum* as a WS fem. formation. Yet, we have some Akk. attestations from MB Emar and MA Nuzi.

<sup>135</sup> All PNs formed with this noun are treated as Akk. in CAD H 266 and AHW 362.

<sup>136</sup> Treated as WS in CAD N/1 208 and as Akk. in AHW 725.

<sup>137</sup> The form *šūrān-* is not confined to Akk. For it and other forms with metathesis in the Aram. dialects and Ar., see Huehnergard (2008: 411ff).

<sup>138</sup> Since no raptors in Akk. PNs (↑3.4.1), this form is most probably Amor. *ḏīb-* as Streck (2000: §5.70) suggests.

<sup>139</sup> *Gūr(r)ā-nu* "Whelp-like" (§26), *Karrānu* "Ram-like" (§68), *Naššān* "Hawk-like" (§98), *Būšānu* "Rock partridge-like" (?) (§113), *Birbīrrānu* "Lizard-like" (§119), and *Šaššammānu* "Ant-like" (§121).

<sup>140</sup> E.g., *Uznānu* "One with large ears" and *Qaqqadānu* "One with big head" (Stamm 1939: CAD U 261).



(1) Amor./Akk. (↑4.1.1.4): 'Alpān “Ox-like” (§54), 'Arhān “Cow-like” (§55), 'Ayyalān “Deer-like” (§30), Baqqān “Gnat-like” (§127), Huzirān “Pig-like” (§77), and Kalbān “Dog-like”<sup>141</sup> (§14).

(2) Amor. (↑4.1.1.2, 4.1.1.2.2.1): 'Anzān “Goat-like” (§64), 'Arādān “Wild-ass-like” (§39), Bāzānum “Falcon-like” (?) (§95),<sup>142</sup> Burburān “burbur-bird-like” (§117), Di'bān “Wolf-like” (§18), Hi-im-ma-ra-an, normalized as 'Immarān “Lamb-like” (§30) or Himārān “Donkey-like” (§42),<sup>143</sup> Kasbān “Young-ram-like” (§67), Labu'ān “Lion-like” (§4), Purgušān “Flea-like” or “Full-of-fleas” (§124), Qaw/ūzān “Weasel-like” (§91), Qurdān “Tick-like” (§133), and Ša'labān/Šu'alān “Foxy” (§16).

#### 4.1.2.2 -at/-atān

The suffix *-at* has a diminutive function in two types of Amor. masc. names (Streck 2000: §4.9): (1) shortened names, like *Binatum* < *Bin-DN* “Son of DN” and *Dimratum* < *Dimri-DN* “DN is my protection”, and (2) one-word names, like 'Aminatum “True”, Rapu'atum “Healed”, and a few animal names: Ġuzālatum “Little gazelle” (§33), Ya'ilatum “Little ibex” (§37), Hi-ma-ra-ti (gen.), normalized as Himāratu “Little ass” < himār- (§42) or 'Immaratu “Little sheep” (§62), and Huziratum “Little pig” (could also be Akk.) (§77). In addition, there are two names in which this suffix occurs with the above-mentioned *-ān*:<sup>144</sup> Di'batān “Little wolf” (§18) and Pāratān “Little young bull/heifer” (§59; ↑4.1.1.3). This combination seems to correspond to the diminutive *f(u)'aylān* in Ar. (↓5.2.4).

#### 4.1.2.3 -īya

A diminutive suffix which is more observed in masc. names: (1) hypocoristica, e.g., 'Abdiya < 'Abd-DN “Servant of DN”, 'Aḥīya < 'Aḥi-DN “DN is my brother”, Dimriya < Dimri-DN “DN is my protection”, (2) in combination with the diminutive *-at*, e.g., Iš'atiya < Iš'i-DN “DN is my help”, and (3) in interrogative-sentence names: Manniya < Manna-ballti-'el “Who is without god?” (Streck 2000: §5.74-5.78). As for one-word names, in which this suffix is less attested, most of the available examples derive from animal names: Di'biya “Little wolf” (§18), Dabiya “Little bear” (§20), Hagaliya “Little partridge” (§113), Gūriya “Little whelp” (§26), Ġazāliya “Little gazelle” (§33), Pārātiya “Little young bull/heifer” (§59), and Zu-ur-zu-ri-ia, normalized either as Šuršuriyā “Little cricket” (§123) or as Zur-zuriya “Little starling” (§108).

<sup>141</sup> Or the shortened form of *Kalb-DN* type (↓4.1.3.3).

<sup>142</sup> On the etymology of this term, see ↓4.1.3.4.

<sup>143</sup> This form is attested in the GN *Hi-ma-ra-an*<sup>ki</sup> (CAAA 2276).

<sup>144</sup> On this combination, see Streck (2000: §5.57-58, 63, 65, 68).

#### 4.1.2.4 -a

The fem. noun in Amor. has two endings *-at* and *-a* in pausa. While in compound names *-a* designates the gender of the theophoric element and the name-bearer, e.g., *'Annu-yap'a* (f) vs. *Dagan-yapu'* (m), in most one-word and shortened names it only expresses the feminine gender of the name-bearer, e.g., *'Amina* (f) “True”, *Batahra* (f) “Chosen”, and *Tanūḥa* (f) < *Tanūḥ-mātum* “The country has calmed down” (Streck 2000: §4.3-6). Animal names are special among the one-word names in this aspect, that they express the feminine gender of the species in question (ibid §4-6): *'Ayyala* (f) “Hind” (§30), *Ġazāla* (f) “She-gazelle” (§33), *Ḥuzīra* (f+m) “Sow” (§77), *Inza* (f) “She-goat” (§64), *Ya'ila* (f+m) “She-ibex” (37), and *Yamāma* (f) “Pigeon” (§111). The two masc. names, i.e., *Ya'ila* and *Ḥuzīra*, can be taken as nicknames or expressions of tenderness, like the above-mentioned ones with *-at* (4.1.2.2).

#### 4.1.2.5 Diminutive

According to Streck (2000: §5.33-34, §5.51), Amor. has three diminutive forms: (1) *qutāl*,<sup>145</sup> observed in *Buqāqum* “Little gnat” (could also be Akk; §127), *Ḍubābum* “Little fly” (§125), and *Ġuzālum* “Little gazelle” (§33) (could also be Akk.), (2) *qitāl*, reflected in *Biqāqum* “Little gnat” (§127), and (3) *qutē/īl* < *\*qutayl*, found in one example which is not related to animals: *Ḥunīn* “Graciously-treated”.

#### 4.1.3 Animal names in theophoric names

Animal terms in Amor. theophoric names occur as DN, predicates, and construct nouns (animal-of-DN). In the subsections below, I will deal with these names from a linguistic and cultural perspective.

##### 4.1.3.1 Lion

###### 4.1.3.1.1 Labba (§4)

As a divine epithet/deity name, *Labba* is more attested in Akk. names from the older periods (↑3.3.1) than in Amor., where we have only three examples: *'Ammu-Labba* “Labba is the (paternal) ancestor”, the tentative name *'Amti-Labba* “Maid-servant of Labba”, and *Šumu-Labba* “Descendant of Labba”. Whether the vowel /a/ in this form is the fem. marker (Golinets 2016: 70) or a variant of the status absolutus which is otherwise vowelless

---

<sup>145</sup> This pattern occurs in two types of Ar. names: (1) masc. names with the diminutive-hypocoristic suffix *-a(t)*, like *'Ubāda* < *'Abd-DN* (CIK 559), *Ḍu'āla* “Wolf” (§19), *Usāma* “Lion” (by-form) (§9), and (2) fem. names, like *Bunāna* (Ikmal 10 863), meaning “Odour” (i.e., of sheep, goats, camels, etc.) from *banna* (Lane 285).

(Streck 2011: 454),<sup>146</sup> it is in either case an indicator of the Amor. affiliation of this form. The other assumed *la-ba*-names, i.e., *Ša-du-um-la-ba*, *Ša-du-un-la-ba* and *Ša-du-u(m)-la-bu-a* (CAAA 144), are dubious, for *šadum/n* is probably a Hurrian element, and it is not certain that *la-ba* is Amor. or even Sem. in these names (Golinets 2016: 70; Streck 2000: 260). Interestingly, the noun *labb-* is not confined to theophoric names as is the case in Akk.; it is also reflected by two masc. one-word names: *Labba* and, the variant, *Labu'ān* (↑4.1.1.2.2.1). In MB Emar, the term reappears again as an epithet of Dagan in the form *lab'-*: *Lab'u-Dagan* “Dagan is a lion”.

#### 4.1.3.1.2 The question of \*'aš/š(a)d- (§2)

The element \*'aš/š(a)d- is used as an appellative and DN in Eb. PNs, where it is explained as “lion” in view of Ar. *asad-* (ARES 3 324; Krebern timer 1988: 76); it is much more observed in Amor. PNs. Both Gelb (CAAA 13) and Millet Albà (2000: 480) have the same meaning “lion”, while others suggest “warrior” in view of Old Sab. 's<sup>1</sup>d “men, soldiers, warriors” (Huffmon 1965: 169; Durand 1991: 82 fn. 4; Streck 2000: 321, note 2; Golinets 2016: 80). In the AAr. onomasticon, 's<sup>1</sup>d is used as a theophoric element in Old Sab. and as a one-word name in the other languages/scripts.

The earliest occurrence of 's<sup>1</sup>d as a name of the animal is in the Saf. inscriptions, where it is attested some twenty times in the OCIANA corpus. For example:

- By Flt son of Tm son of Flt son of {Bhs2} son of 'dnt and he camped on the edge of an area of sand, then the lion injured him, so, O Lt, let there be security (Al-Jallad 2015: 266).
- AbaNS 121: By S<sup>1</sup>l is the lion ('s<sup>1</sup>d); a rock drawing of a lion accompanies this inscription.



Tracing by Ababneh (2005)

<sup>146</sup> Streck (2000: §3.43, n. 1) compares *Labba* with other divine names/epithets with a long consonant: *Hadda*, *Kakka*, *Yamma*, *'Abba*, etc.

In view of this information, it seems probable that the sense “warrior” is secondary and that Ar. preserved the original meaning. The sense “warrior” could have emerged from a legend in which a king, an eponymous ancestor, or the like was associated with the lion. Over time, probably, the epithet replaced the concrete term and became a theophoric element with a particular reference to a class of ‘divine’ warriors. This proposition can be supported by the fact that other animal terms in Sem. languages are used as designations of leaders, nobles, and warriors.<sup>147</sup> One could also assume that the Eb. and Amor. names belong to an astral myth, in which Leo, as a deity, plays a heroic role. This might be reflected by two Amor. names formed with *maṭar*- “rain” (*’Aśdī-maṭar*) and *√yp* “to irradiate” (*’Aśdī-ēpuḥ < yapu*). The rain and irradiation are two characteristics of *naw’ al-asad* “Leo” in Ar. (Ibn Qutayba 1988a: 53f). As a constellation name, *h’s<sup>l</sup>d/’s<sup>l</sup>d* is early recorded in Saf. inscriptions (Al-Jallad 2014: 227a).

#### 4.1.3.2 Bear (*dabi’*-, §20)

Beside its use as a one-word name in Akk., Amor., Ug., Aram., and Ar., the element *dabi’*- “bear” occurs in two theophoric names: *Šumu-dabi’* “Descendant of the bear” and *’Ammu-dabi’* “The (paternal) ancestor is a bear”.<sup>148</sup> Since the term has no clear association with any deity, it can be explained as an honorific title.<sup>149</sup>

#### 4.1.3.3 Dog (*kalb*-, §14)

Names of *Kalbu-DN* type are frequent in Amor. (vs. Akk. *Kalab-DN*): *Kalbu-Āmi* “Dog of Āmi”, *Kalbu-Samana* “Dog of the demon Samana”, *Kalbu-’Anat* “Dog of ‘Anat”, *Kalbu-’Aštar* “Dog of ‘Aštar”, and *Kalba-’el* “Dog of God”. In addition to the general sense *kalb* = ‘*abd/ward* “slave, servant” in this type (§3.3.2), the name *Kalbu-Samana* can be explained differently: a horrifying name or a negative nickname in view of the image of the demon Saman.<sup>150</sup> In addition to *Kalbu-DN* type, we have the tentative name *’A-ia-ka-al-ba* “Where

<sup>147</sup> For some examples in Ug. and Heb., see Miller (1970).

<sup>148</sup> These two names are cited by Millet Albà (2000: 485) without textual references.

<sup>149</sup> Bears, which must be identified as the Syrian Brown Bear (*Ursus arctus syriacus*), clearly fascinated humans from early on and representations of them have been found in fourth- and third-millennium levels in archaeological sites in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Iran. According to the Drehem documents (UR III period), bear cubs were captured in the mountains and delivered to “comic entertainers” or “musical entertainers”, who apparently used them in their performances (Michalowski 2013a: 305-06). As for the symbolism of the animal, in a NA text the Babylonian king is tied at the city gate of the inner city of Nineveh like a bear (CAD D 17). In the Bible, the bear is a paradigm of a dangerous animal from which there is no escape (Forti 2008: 62-3).

<sup>150</sup> The demon is depicted as a traditional enemy of the healing goddess Gula (§3.3.2). It attacks infants, young men and women and prostitutes, and it is described with a lion’s mouth, dragon’s teeth, eagle’s claws and the tail of a scorpion. The overall visualization, however, was that of a dog. The demon bore several

is the (female) dog?”, the interrogative structure of which reminds us of Eb. *’Ay-parru* “Where is the young bull?” and *Ma(n)-parru* “Who is the young bull?” (§59), where *parru* could denote a deity, such as Baal after his descent to the netherworld. Thus, does the element *kalb-* in our Amor. name portray a deity? Is it a thanksgiving name related to Gula’s healing dog (§3.3.2) or is it merely a ‘humorous’ nickname based on a phrase that was said by the bearer?

#### 4.1.3.4 Falcon? (*bāz-*, §95)

The element *bāz/bwz* appears in Eb. and Amor. PNs, but the etymology is debated. ARES 3: 207: “falcon” in view of Palm. *bzy* (late attestation); CAAA 16: no translation; CAD B 185: a foreign word of unknown origin in view of a NA text which reads: “I received the tribute from Egypt, elephants, *ba-zi-a-ti*, (and) monkeys”; AHW 117b: “Meerkatze?”; Stamm (1939: 254): an error for *pagitum* “female ape”. In his comment on Millet Albà’s translation “faucon” (2000: 478), Kogan (2003: 254) writes “Interpretation of *bāz-* as ‘falcon’ is most unlikely since all known WS parallels are very late and rightly thought to be borrowed from Iranian”. Yet he does not give an alternative interpretation of the Eb. and OB names. A similar opinion is given by Encyclopaedia Iranica: “Because they do not belong to the avifauna of the Arabic countries, [these birds] were imported by merchants from Greece, Turkestan, Persia and India . . . . The Persian name *bāz*, passed into Arabic before Islam, was applied apparently through ignorance to every sporting bird”.<sup>151</sup> For Al-Ġāḥiẓ (1965 6: 478): *al-bāzu ‘indahum a’ġamiy wa al-ṣaqrū ‘arabiy*: “They (i.e., grammarians/lexicographers) consider *bāz* a Persian word and *ṣaqr* an Arabic one”. Concerning Heb. *bāz* “plunder, spoil” (HALOT 117), this sense fails to explain theophoric names like Eb. *Ba-zi-LUM* “God is my B.” and Amor. *Bazī-Ištar* “Ištar is my B.”. In view of this analysis, I suggest two hypotheses: (1) the element *bāz-* in the Eb. and Amor. PNs has the same form as the Persian word but with a different (unknown) meaning, (2) it has the same meaning and should therefore be considered an Indo-Sem. term. If the latter hypothesis is correct, Amor. *Bazī-’Aštar* “DN is my falcon” would reflect a specific association between the goddess of love and war and the bird, which is also evidenced in an older non-Sem. literary text, a Sumerian hymn to Inanna (the equivalent of Ištar):

*The gods are (mere) birds, (but) I am a falcon* (MU.TIN = *kasūsu*);

---

terrifying titles: ‘fierce dog of Enlil’, ‘vicious dog of Enki/Ea’, ‘lion of damgalnuna/Damkina’, ‘blood-spilling dog of Ninisina’, and ‘blood-drinking dog of Nintinuga’ (Böck 2014: 99ff).

<sup>151</sup> <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/baz-mid>.

*The Anunna-gods are goring (among) themselves, (but) I am a cow* (No. 7: 27-28 in Cohen 1975: 606).

A similar association between a divinity and the falcon is found in the Islamic tradition (↓5.4.6.1.1.1). Presumably, this association did not emerge all of a sudden or only due to Persian influence; it represents the survival of an ancient Near Eastern belief as the onomastic evidence suggests.

#### **4.1.3.5 Small cattle: goat ('anz-, §64)**

The only possible example with this element is *Ḫa-an-za*-<sup>d</sup>IM, which could be normalized as 'Anzu-Haddu "Goat of Haddu".<sup>152</sup> If this is correct, the name parallels Akk. *Inzi-Aia* "She-goat of Ea" (NA). This type apparently belongs to the same semantic field of 'cow-and-calf' motif (*Būr-DN*) and 'ewe-and-lamb' motif (*Immer-DN*), both expressing the special affiliation of the believer to a protective deity, i.e., trust names (↑3.3.3.3, 3.3.5). Alternatively, the name could belong to a superstition in which a certain goat was connected to Addu's cult (i.e., it was believed to have a healing or blessing power).

#### **4.1.3.6 Equids: foal (mūr-, §44)**

As stated above (↑4.1.1.2.2.2), the Amor. affiliation of the element *mūr-* is reflected by the ending *-u* of the *nomen regens* of two names of *Mūru-DN* type "Foal of DN" (vs. Akk. *Mūr-DN*): *Mūru-Dagan* (Golinets 2016: 73) and *Mūru-Aštar*. This type can be understood as an indication of belonging to the deity with a special notion of tenderness or as an expression of youth and vivaciousness (cf. ↑3.3.6).

#### **4.1.4 Animal names: reasons for their use**

This topic has been briefly dealt with in Assyriology (i.e., Lipiński 1978; Millet Albà 2000: 478). In the following subsections, I will elaborate on it by discussing two theories: totemism and the metaphor theory.

##### **4.1.4.1 *Ditāna* and the question of totemism**

Various words based on the Sem. root *ddn/dtn* have served as names of tribal units, geographical names, eponymous ancestors, and animal(s) (possibly mythical) (Michalowski 2013). As for the animal, Landsberger (1934: 94) connected Akk. *ditānu* (LB = Sum. AL-IM) "aurochs" (CAD D 164) or "Wisent?" (AHw 173) with Heb. *dišōn* "addax".<sup>153</sup> Given its

---

<sup>152</sup> The ending *-a* of the *nomen regens* has some attestations in Amor. names (cf. the examples in Streck 2000: §3.54c, 3.66).

<sup>153</sup> On the zoological identification "Mendes-Antilope, *Adax nesomaculatus*", see Donner (1995: 249).

late occurrence in Akk. sources, *ditānu* is thought to be of (N)WS origin: < \**daytan-* or \**taydan-* (Marchesi 2006: 9, fn. 23). Durand (1988) makes an etymological connection between Akk. *ditānu*, Heb. *dīšōn*, and Mari *tišānu*, which is mentioned in lists of exotic animals (UDU.ḪÁ *ti-ša-ne*) and in a letter (*ti-ša-na-nu-um*), and supposed to denote “chamois ou mouflon montagnard”. Similarly, Streck (2000: §2.114) proposes a PS root \**dtn* for these three terms. Golinets (2016: 66), who also assigns Mari *tišān-* to Amor., adopts a compromise: ‘sheep’ or ‘aurochs’. For Militarev/Kogan (SED 2, p. 296), the comparison between the three terms is rather unlikely due to phonetic and semantic considerations. Some animal terms, among them Mari *tišānu* and MB/NA *te/ušēnu* “eine Art Büffel?” (AHw 1352), possibly go back to \**tayš-ān-*. On the other hand, Heb. *dīšōn* is rather related to Akk. *daššu* “buck”, both belonging to \**dayš-* (SED 2, p. 297).

In his study of early Sem. literature, Steinkeller (1992: 259-62) identifies *ditānu* with the animal ÉRIN + X which is associated with the god Šamaš in Eb. texts. The evidence perhaps points to a mythical creature, that is, the human-faced bull.

For Lipiński (1978: 105-109), *ditānu* should be a kind of antelope rather than an aurochs and thus compared with the symbolic animal of the god Amurru which is most likely a gazelle or an antelope. The tribal name, or sometimes-divinized eponymous ancestor, is attested in several Akk. and Amor. names from Sargonic, Ur III and OB times, e.g., *Me-ditān* “The sacred power of D.”, *’Ilī-Ditāna* “D. is my god”, *Ammī-Ditāna* “D. is my (paternal) ancestor”, *’Abī-Ditāna* “D. is my father”, *’Šumu-Ditāna* “Descendant of D.”,<sup>154</sup> in addition to Ug. *Bn-Dtn* “Son of D”.<sup>155</sup> Based on this, Lipiński (1978: 109ff) goes on to conclude that *Ditānu*’s figure is closer to the tribal totem than to a historical figure.

Beside the fact that neither the etymology nor the zoological identification of *ditānu* is clear, three objections arise against Lipiński’s hypothesis:

(1) Amurru and the antelope: this god, whose emblem was not only a crooked staff (*gam-lu*) but also a large mouse (in later sources), was a purely Mesopotamian theological construct to symbolize the presence of Amorites (cf. Beaulieu 2005: 36, 37, fn. 35).

---

<sup>154</sup> For these and more examples of *Ditāna*-names, see CAAA (126-27) and Marchesi (2006: fn. 28). On the Amor. suffix /a/ in these names, see Streck (2000: 272).

<sup>155</sup> A set of Ug. literary and religious texts refer to *Ditānu* as an ancestor of the kings (Vidal 2006: 168-69). For example, RS 24.272: 1-4 reads *kymgy’ adn’ lm rbm’ m dtn wys’al mtpṭ yld wy’y nn dtn* ... “When the lord of the great gods goes to Ditanu and asks (of him) the ruling of the child, then Ditanu answers him, etc.” (Pardee 1983: 128-31).

(2) Animals and cult in Mari texts: except for our information on the use of some animals as sacrifices at concluding treaties, i.e., the donkey and rarely the puppy and the goat,<sup>156</sup> there is no single reference to animals (real or mythical) as symbolic ancestors or such.<sup>157</sup>

(3) Anthropological considerations: according to Goldenweiser, a notable anthropologist who discussed the main ‘supposed’ features of totemism, one can postulate a totemic origin only when there is sufficient information on a special association between the tribe/clan and the animal it is named after (Goldenweiser 1913: 372). Based on the available data, it is impossible to establish such an association in the case of Amor. *ditānu*.

#### 4.1.4.2 Animal names as metaphors and affective terms

Names referring to small cattle, i.e., the lamb (*’immar-*) and goat (*’anz-*, *’azz-*), may evoke a notion of tenderness, for these animals symbolize innocence and belong to the religious language of the ancient Near East (↑3.3.5). The same could hold for two other kinds of animals: (a) rodents, like the hare (*arnab-*) and hamster (*ašqud-*), and (b) harmless birds, like the dove/pigeon (*yamam-a*) and stork (*ḥašid-*) (Millet Albà 2000: 478). The partridge (*ḥagal-*) probably belongs to this group or, alternatively, denotes beauty.

According to the proverbial locutions and metaphorical expressions used in Mari texts, the dog carries negative connotations. Imprudent people are compared to hasty bitches: “the bitch in her hastiness gave birth to blind puppies” (ARM 1 5: 11), while vicious persons are compared to biting dogs: “like a rabid dog, one does not know where he will bite” (ARM 3 18:15).<sup>158</sup> The animal also evokes inferiority as we infer from Kirû’s letter to her father Zimri-līm: “they respect a dog more than me” (LAPO 18 1288 = ARM 10 32: 2’-3’). Yet the term is frequent in the Amor. onomasticon, especially among nomads (as a one-word name ↓4.1.4). It could be a ‘derogatory’ nickname or a given name. In the latter case, naming practices among modern nomads could help us to solve the contradiction. A Najdi *Tslēb* < *Kulayb* “Little dog” was named so because his parents wanted him to be like a dog (i.e., against foes; ↓5.4.2.2.3).

---

<sup>156</sup> An OB letter from Mari reads: *ana ḥayārim qaṭālim birīt ḥana u Idamaraš mērānim u ḥazzam iššūnim-ma bēli aplaḥmā mērānim u ḥazzam ul addin [ḥa]yāram mār atānim [a]nāku ušaqtīl salimam birīt ḥana u Idamaraš aškun* “In order to kill a donkey (i.e., to conclude a treaty) between the nomads and (the people of) Idamaraš, they brought to me a puppy and a she-goat, but I obeyed my lord and did not give (permission for the use of) a puppy and a she-goat. I caused a foal of a she-donkey to be killed. I established peace between the nomads and (the people of) Idamaraš” (ARM 2 37: 6-14 = LAPO 16 283).

<sup>157</sup> For the Amor. religious practices, particularly the use of stones and trees as cultic objects, see Durand (2005).

<sup>158</sup> On these proverbs/expressions with other parallels from the ancient Near East, see Bodi (2015: 75-80).



In line with the metaphoric use of animals in Mari letters, a name like *Šaḥû* “Pig” (Akk.) could indicate loyalty, for a servant is compared to a fattened pig: “Bēl-šunu, your servant, that like a pig one fattens, you slaughter him, nobody helps you (lit. nobody seizes your hands)” (ARMT 26/1 5: 24).

Names referring to equids can be interpreted in different ways, depending on the symbolism of the animal in question. The donkey (*ḥimār-*) seems to carry negative connotations because this name is attested only for a slave (see the table in ↓4.1.5). Regarding the wild ass (*‘arād-* and *par’-*), there is no information on its connotations in Mari texts. In his approach of the NA name *Arādu* in view of animal similes in royal narratives, Gaspa (2008: 144) writes: “a nickname such as *Arādu* could, then, fit fearful and easily frightened persons”. The problem with such a statement is that royal narratives cannot be taken as a criterion for understanding animal similes in a nomadic milieu. In the Bible, the wild ass is a metaphor for wilderness and hostility (Daniel 5:21; Genesis 16: 12).<sup>159</sup> In the late pre-Islamic and transitional (*muḥaḍram*) poetry, it is never used in a derogative way, which is certainly the opposite of its domestic counterpart (Stetkevych 1986: 104-05). Generally, the wild ass enjoyed positive connotations, like swiftness and wild temper (Bauer 1992).

Similarly, names referring to wild ungulates mostly evoke positive attributes. The gazelle (*ḡazāl-*) and deer (*‘ayyal-*) have always been symbols of savage beauty, activeness, and attractiveness.<sup>160</sup> The ibex (*w/ya‘īl-*) may symbolize agility and nobility.<sup>161</sup>

Names of wild carnivorous animals indicate prestige, power, and nobility. The lion (*labu’-/laba*) was considered a noble animal, especially through its association with divinity. The wolf (*ḡīb-*), whose relation with deities is unclear, symbolizes fierceness. Given naming practices in the modern Middle East, it seems possible that names of such animals were given to protect the child from sickness and demons (↓5.4.4). On the other hand, names of small carnivorous animals which are less dangerous to farmers and nomads, e.g., the mongoose (*namīš-*) and the fox (*šu‘al-*), could be understood as expressions of endearment or metaphors for deception and cunning, and therefore as a wish that the name-bearer will be able to cope with difficult situations.

---

<sup>159</sup> For more information on the zoological designation and connotations of the wild ass, see also the discussion by Beyer in ThWAT 9: 593-94.

<sup>160</sup> In the Gilgameš Epic, the gazelle represents the concept of spontaneity and freedom (Westenholz and Koch-Westenholz 2000: 437). In a NA poetic composition, it symbolizes the beloved’s body “Ditto, [whose] thighs are a gazelle in the plain” (SAA 3, 14).

<sup>161</sup> This animal in particular was usually associated with the god Enki (Jacobsen 1978: 111). In Ar. dream literature, it means a notable person/leader (Al-Akili 1992: 289).

Insect names, e.g., the gnat (*baqq-*), flea (*parġūš-*), cricket (*šaṣsar-*), and fly (*dubāb*) appear to be less friendly (Millet Albà 2000: 478). Presumably, they were given either as negative nicknames (in reference to smallness or devouring) or as apotropaic names, i.e., their sense was thought to be negative enough not to attract demons.

#### 4.1.5 Animal names in society

An examination of the social status of individuals bearing animal names in the Mari Archives shows that they were of urban and nomadic background and that they belonged to all social strata (the table also contains individuals with Akk. names):<sup>162</sup>

No.	Name	Meaning	Status
1	'Alpān	Bull-like	nomadic chieftain
2	'Arḥum (f)	Cow	weaver
3	'Arnabu (f)/ 'Arnabatum (f)	Hare	several female workers in the workshops
4	'Arrabum (Akk.)	Dormouse	free individual
5	'Arwītum (f)	Gazelle	(1) princess, (2) 'harem' women, (3) servants
6	'Ašqudum (Akk.)	Hamster	(1) <i>Limum</i> official, (2) diviner, (3) palace-shepherd
7	'Ayyala (f)	Hind	(1) singer, (2) servants, and (3) dependent women
8	'Ayyalum	Deer	(1) king of Abbatum, (2) dependent individuals
9	'Arādān	Wild ass	nomadic chieftain
10	<i>Baqqānum</i>	Gnat-like	messenger of Šamši-Addu I
11	<i>Baqqum</i> (f)	Gnat	weaver
12	<i>Bāzatum</i>	Falcon (?)	(1) weaver, (2) servant

---

<sup>162</sup> All the names are listed alphabetically in ARM 16/1 and Millet Albà (2000). For more information on the females, see Ziegler (1999).

13	<i>Buqāqum</i>	Little gnat	(1) <i>sugāgu</i> “leader, chief” of Sapīratum, (2) governor of Sūḫum, (3) nomad, (4) important figure
14	<i>Būr-Nunu</i> (Akk.)	Calf-of-Nunu	(1) free individuals, (2) metalworkers, (3) weaver, (4) boatman of the palace, (5) scribe
15	<i>Būṣiya</i> (Akk.)	Rock partridge or Hyena	(1) official in Saggarātum, (2) person from Ešnunna
16	<i>Dabi’atum</i> (f)	She-bear	weaver
17	<i>Dabi’um</i>	Bear	(1) palace official, (2) manufacturer of beer containers, (3) slave, (4) two nomads
18	<i>Ġazāla/Ġuzālatum</i> (f)	Gazelle	(1) princess, (2) dependent women, (3) weavers
19	<i>Ḥagalum</i>	Partridge	free individuals, (2) slave, (3) ruler of the city of Rapiqum
20	<i>Ḥimārum</i>	Donkey	slave
21	<i>Kabśatum</i> (f)	Ewe	(1) dependent women, (2) female workers in the workshops
22	<i>Kalbān</i>	Dog-like	nomad
23	<i>Kalbatum</i>	Bitch	weaver
24	<i>Kalbu</i>	Dog	two nomads
25	<i>Kurkusānum</i> (Akk.)	Piglet	(1) free individual, (2) slave
26	<i>Mērānum</i> (Akk.)	Puppy	court physician of Šamši-Addu I
27	<i>Purğušānum</i>	Flea-like	free individual
28	<i>Šēlebum</i> (Akk.)	Fox	free individuals, (2) <i>assinum</i> of the temple of Annunitum, (3) priest

The table shows that animal names were used for males and females from the elite (princes/princesses, chiefs, governors) and the lower social class (workers, slaves). Yet some differences can be observed: women from the lower social class bear the same names as princesses: *Arwītum* (No. 5) and *Ġazāla* (No. 18) (both indicate beauty and elegance), but not vice versa. No princess, for example, is called *Dabi’atum*, *Kalbatum* or any of the names we have examined in UR III data concerning the female workers in Garšana (↑3.6.2.1), which suggests that such names were somehow restricted to commoners and the lower-class population. Regarding males, *Ĥimārum* (No. 20) could be confined to slaves, as it is not borne by any free individuals.

Significantly, there are three individuals with cultic positions: *Ašqūdum* (No. 6), and two *Šēlebum*’s (No. 28), which indicates that there was no restriction on using animal names in the religious circle. The former, *Ašqūdum* appears in several letters,<sup>163</sup> none of which shows a play on his name by his enemy,<sup>164</sup> and we can therefore conclude that it was not considered a humorous or derogatory term.

An interesting case is the physician *Mērānum* (No. 26), whose name is perhaps an occupational title related to the healing-puppy belief (↑3.3.2). Names formed with *kalb-* (No. 22-24), on the other hand, seem to have been more common among the nomads than among the rural and urban population, as is the situation in our Ar. data (§14).

## 4.2 Biblical and epigraphic Hebrew

### 4.2.1 The onomastic evidence

Attestations of Heb. animal names come from two kinds of sources: (1) reliable sources (the OT; inscriptions discovered in official excavations or otherwise commonly accepted as authentic), and (2) dubious sources such as the Moussaieff collection (published by Deutsch and Lemaire 2000).

The table below exhibits Heb. animal names in view of their cognates in the onomastica of the other Sem. Languages. The rightmost column gives the corresponding paragraph number in the appendix (App.):

---

<sup>163</sup> *Ašqūdum* served both Šamši-Addu and Zimri-Līm, and during the latter’s reign he took charge of several diplomatic and military affairs as a representative of the king. For more information on his correspondence with the king and his mention in other letters, see ARM 26/1: 71-221.

<sup>164</sup> Durand (LAPO 18, p. 433/b) mentions an interesting example of a word-play name: in Šimatum’s letter to her father Zimri-Līm, the name of his traditional enemy Simaḥ-ilāni-ia (or Simaḥ-ilānē) of Kurda, meaning “Joy of my gods”, is written as Sima-ila-ḥanē, *Si-ma-i-la-ḥa-né-e-im*, i.e., “Sima-il, the nomad”. The first part of the name could also reflect Simma-Ila “Evil of god” or “Plague of god”.

No.	Name	Meaning	Akk.	Eb.	Amor.	Ug.	Pho.	Aram.	Ar.	App.
1	‘Akbōr, ‘kbr, ‘kbry	Jerboa	*			*	*	*	*	79
2	‘Ārād	Wild ass			*				*	39
3	‘glyw, ‘Eglōn, ‘Eglā (f)	Calf, Heifer				*	*		*	56
4	‘Ēpay, ‘Ēpā ‘wpy, ‘py	Bird							*	93
5	‘Ēper, ‘Oprā	Young deer							*	34
6	‘Īrā(m), ‘Īrī, ‘Īrū ‘yr’, ‘ym	(young) Donkey		*						40
7	‘Ōrēb, ‘rb	Raven, Crow	*						*	104
8	‘Ārāḥ	Cow	*		*					55
9	‘Arṣā	Woodworm <sup>165</sup>								134
10	‘Ayyā	Falcon								100
11	‘bl	Camel				*			*	49
12	‘Immēr, ‘mr	Lamb	*	*	*	*				62
13	‘lp	Bull			*					54
14	‘prḥ, Pārū <sup>a</sup> ḥ	Chick, Young bird (? < *parḥ-) <sup>166</sup>							*	116
15	‘Ūzay	Goose (? < *’a/iw(a)z-, waz(z)- )								103
16	‘yṣ	Weasel (? < *’a(n)yaṣ-) <sup>167</sup>			*					91
17	Be’or, Ba’ārā(f), B’r’	Camel							*	50

<sup>165</sup> Following Glatz (2001: 29), who does not give an explanation. Apparently, this understanding is based on Ar. *araḍa* “wood-fretter” (Lane 48c). Zadok (PHIAP 75) suggests *’arṣ* < \*’rḍ “land, earth” plus the suffix -ā.

<sup>166</sup> Zadok (PHIAP 114) connects *Pārū<sup>a</sup>ḥ* to *prḥ* “bud, shoot”.

<sup>167</sup> The publishers of the seal on which this name occurs give an uncertain interpretation “(God) has hastened” (?) (Deutsch and Lemaire 2000: 217).

18	<i>Beker, Bīkrī, Bkry</i>	Young camel						*	*	51
19	<i>Bādān</i>	Old ibex (? < Ar. <i>badan</i> )						*	*	32
20	<i>Blbl</i>	Nightingale (? < Ar. <i>bulbul</i> )			*				*	109
21	<i>Dəbōrā</i> (f)	Bee					*		*	122
22	<i>Dg'</i>	Fish				*				137
23	<i>Dišōn</i>	Addax	*							38
24	<i>Ga'al, G'ly</i>	Black beetle (?Ar. < ḡu'al)						*	*	130
25	<i>Gālāl, Gll</i>	Turtle (?)								120
26	<i>Gazzām</i>	Grasshopper								126
27	<i>Gəmallī</i>	Camel						*	*	52
28	<i>Gōg</i>	Spider (? < Syr. <i>gəwagāy</i> ) <sup>168</sup>				*		*		132
29	<i>Gūnī</i>	Black-winged partridge (?) <sup>169</sup>								113
30	<i>Hā-'aryē</i>	Lion								1
31	<i>Ḥāgāb, Ḥagābā</i> <i>Ḥgb</i>	Locust		*		*				126
32	<i>Ḥaglā</i> (f), <i>Ḥglh</i>	Partridge			*	*			*	113
33	<i>Ḥamūṭal/Ḥamīṭal</i> (f)	Lizard (? < *ḥVm(V)ṭ-) <sup>170</sup>						*		119
34	<i>Ḥamōr</i>	Donkey	*	*	*				*	42
35	<i>Ḥarḥūr</i>	Raven, Crow (? < Akk. <i>ḥaḥḥūru</i> )	*							105

<sup>168</sup> They could also be lallative names (PHIAP 137).

<sup>169</sup> Based on Noth (IPN 320) and Glatz (2001, 29); alternatively, it may be a gentilic based on *gw(')* "community, corporation" (Zadok 2009: 120).

<sup>170</sup> Following Noth (IPN 39, fn. 1.) and Stamm (1980: 125), who argue that the suffix *-al* in this name functions as a diminutive. Alternatively, it could consist of *Ḥm* (the Son-god) and \**ṭal* "dew", like *Yhwṭl* (PHIAP 47, 181).

36	<i>Ḥēled, Ḥelday, Ḥuldā</i> (f), <i>Ḥldy</i>	Mole					*		*	88
37	<i>Ḥēzīr</i>	(wild) Pig	*		*	*			*	77
38	<i>Hgbh</i>	Locust <sup>171</sup>								126
39	<i>Kālēb, Klb</i>	Dog	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	14
40	<i>Kpr, Kprh</i> (f)	Lion(ess)					*			3
41	<i>Layiš</i>	Lion						*	*	5
42	<i>Lē'ā</i> (f)	Cow		*					*	58
43	<i>Nāḥāš/Nāḥšōn</i>	Serpent							?	118
44	<i>Nəqōdā</i>	Crake (? < Akk. <i>niqūdu</i> ).	*							103
45	<i>Nīmšī, Nmš, Nmšy</i>	Mongoose (? < Ar. <i>nims</i> )			*	*			*	24
46	<i>Nšr</i>	Vulture						*	*	97
47	<i>Nūn</i>	Fish	*						*	137
48	<i>Par'ōš, Pra's</i>	Flea	*	*	*	*	*		*	124
49	<i>Pənnā</i> (f)	Coral								137
50	<i>Pir'am</i>	Wild ass		*					*	45
51	<i>Prpr</i>	Kind of bird (sparrow or partridge). <sup>172</sup>								117
52	<i>Qōrē, Qrh, Qry</i>	Partridge								113
53	<i>Raḥam</i>	Egyptian vulture (? < * <i>raḥam-</i> ) <sup>173</sup>							*	94
54	<i>Rāḥēl</i> (f)	Ewe							*	71

<sup>171</sup> This name, which should be distinguished from *Hgb*, consists of three elements: the definite article /h-/, the element *gōb* “locust”, and the suffix -h (Deutsch and Lemaire 2000: 218). The fact that a definite article in a PN is rather unusual allows us to doubt this name, which comes from a dubious source, i.e., a text from a private collection whose authenticity may not be assured.

<sup>172</sup> The publishers of the seal on which this name occurs are uncertain about the meaning “(God) mastered” (?) (Deutsch and Lemaire 2000: 221).

<sup>173</sup> Provided it is not from *rḥm* “to love” (PHIAP 81).

55	<i>Ribqā</i> (f)	(lassoed) Cow/Sheep <sup>174</sup>								61
56	<i>Rymh</i>	Worm							*	134
57	<i>Šāpām/n, Špn</i>	Rock hyrax					*			90
58	<i>Šārāp</i>	Cobra								118
59	<i>Šeber</i>	Lion (?)								9
60	<i>Šib'ōn</i>	Hyena (?)			?				*	22
61	<i>Šibyā</i> (f + m), <i>Šby'</i> (f)	Antelope			*			*	*	36
62	<i>Škwy</i>	Cock (?)								116
63	<i>Šōbāl</i>	Lion cub (? < Ar. <i>šibl</i> )							*	8
64	<i>Šōbēbā</i>	Lizard (? < * <i>ḏabb</i> )						*	*	119
65	<i>Šōpār, Šippōr,</i> <i>Šippōrā</i> (f)	Bird				*		*		107
66	<i>Šū'āl, Š'l</i>	Fox	*	*	*	*		*	*	16
67	<i>Sūsī</i>	Horse	*					*		47
68	<i>Taḥaš</i>	Dolphin; Dugong (?) <sup>175</sup>								137
69	<i>Tirḥānā</i>	Ibex (? < Akk. <i>turāḥu</i> )	*							38
70	<i>Tōla'</i>	Worm								134
71	<i>Yā'ēl</i> (f), <i>Ya'ālā,</i> <i>Y'l, Y'ly</i>	Ibex			*	*		*	*	37
72	<i>Yālōn</i> < <i>'Ayyālōn</i>	Deer	*	*	*				*	30

<sup>174</sup> Glatz (2001: 29) gives “Kuh” without an explanation; Stamm (1980: 131ff) “Strick zum Fesseln von Schafen”; similarly, Zadok (PHIAP 91) derives it from *rbq* “tie fast”. In the same context, we have JBArām. *rbq, rbq'* “cattle stall” (Jastrow 1903: 1446), Syr. *rāḥāqā, rāḥāqtā* “threshing (with cattle)” (Brockelmann 1928: 710), and Ar. *rabīq/rabīqa*, i.e., lamb, sheep, ewe, or goat having its head put into *ribq* “lariat” (Lane 1021b).

<sup>175</sup> Given the other possible etymologies of *Taḥaš* (“leather”; “belt”), the sense *Tursiops aduncus/truncatus* (if that is indeed the kind of dolphin meant) is by no means certain. For a comprehensive discussion of this name, see Free and Vos (1992: 94).



73	<i>Yāmīmā</i> (f)	Pigeon, Dove			*				*	111
74	<i>Yōnā, Ynh</i>	Dove, Pigeon		*					*	111
75	<i>Ze'ēb</i>	Wolf		*		*			*	18
76	<i>Zizā</i>	Cicada, Worm (? < *zīz-)	*							123

## 4.2.2 Suffixes and endearment forms

### 4.2.2.1 -ōn

This is the Can. reflex of *-ān* with the typical shift  $\bar{a} > \bar{o}$ . It functions as adjectival, diminutive, substantive and hypocoristic suffix (PHIAP 160). There are only few examples with this suffix: *‘Eglōn*, *Dišōn*, *Nāḥšōn*, *Šib’ōn*, and *Yālōn*, where it could be either adjectival or diminutive. In general, this suffix seems to be much less attested in Heb. animal names than in their Akk. (↑3.2.1), Amor. (↑4.1.2.1), and Ar. (↓5.2.1) parallels.

### 4.2.2.2 -ay

This hypocoristic suffix is quite common in Aram. names, but there is some reason to believe that *-ay* in Heb. names is not necessarily the result of Aram. influence (PHIAP 162). As in the other biblical names, it is mostly found in masc. names: *‘Ēpay*, *Ūzay*, and *Ḥelday*. Epigraphic names ending in *-y* can render this suffix or *ī/ē* (↓4.2.2.3): *‘kbry*, *‘wpy*, *‘py*, *Bkry*, *G’ly*, *Ḥldy*, *Nmšy*, *Qry*, *Škwy*, and *Y’ly* (PHIAP 157).

### 4.2.2.3 -ī/ē

More than 72 names in the OT end in this suffix, most of which are masc. The ones related to animals are: *Bikrī*, *Gəmallī*, *Nimšī*, and *Sūsī*. According to Zadok (PHIAP 156-57), it is originally either *nisba* (e.g., *‘Ibrī*, *Garmī*, *Ḥōrī*) or the possessive pronoun suffix 1st sg.

## 4.2.3 Animal names in theophoric names

Heb. names never refer to the deity as any kind of animal (Fowler 1988: 302). The three examples of theophoric names containing animal terms are in the construct form (i.e., the animal-of-DN type):

(1) The honorific name *‘Ārī’ēl* “Lion of El” (§1) (Rechenmacher 2012: 164), which parallels Nab. *Šb’[’]lhy* (?) (§7) and Ar. *Asad Allah* (§2).

(2) *glyw* “Calf of Yhw” (§56), which can be understood as an expression of belonging to the deity with a special notion of tenderness. The name parallels Akk. *Būr-DN*<sup>176</sup> and Palm. *ʿAglibōl*<sup>177</sup> (Rechenmacher 2012: 164; PHIAP 60).

(3) *Kālēb* (§14), provided it is the shortened forms of *Kalb-DN* type (Rechenmacher 2012: 164).

#### 4.2.4 Animal names: reasons for their use

Two theories have been suggested concerning animal names in the OT: the totemistic theory and the metaphoric theory.

The totemistic theory is deeply rooted in late 19<sup>th</sup>- and early 20<sup>th</sup> c. anthropology and its particular concerns. The initiator of this theory was Robertson Smith (1912 [1880]), who applied McLennan’s hypothesis on totemism among ancient nations<sup>178</sup> to pre-Islamic Arabia (§5.4.1) and the OT. Robertson Smith’s main argument is that animal names in the OT are originally tribal names, but they survived later as GNs and PNs. The other two pieces of evidence of totemism are: (1) echoes of an ancient system of kinship through women (Robertson Smith 1912: 477), and (2) the biblical theme about the Jewish worship of all manner of creeping things and unclean beasts (Ezek. viii. 10, Deut. iv. 17, 18) (Robertson Smith 1912: 479). Based on this, he reaches the conclusion that totemism was not only known in ancient Arabia but also in Moab, Edom, and the land of Canaan (Robertson Smith 1912: 475). This theory was elaborated by two other scholars with some modifications. In his study of Heb. proper names, Gray dedicated one chapter to animal names and totemism, concluding that the small numbers of animal names as individual was due to the transition from a totem tribal to a national organization of society. In addition, the use of the names of ‘unclean’ animals is due to the sacred character of these animals in totem worship (Gray 1896: 86-114). Similarly, Murison believes that animal names are originally tribal names, so he argues against the poetical interpretation (or the metaphoric theory below): “To say that these names were given for poetical reasons fails to explain

---

<sup>176</sup> See ↑3.3.3.2.

<sup>177</sup> See ↓4.3.3.3.

<sup>178</sup> According to McLennan (1869-70), the typical representation of totemism is among the aborigines of America and Australia. These people believe that they are descended from the totem, which is revered as a protector and a friend, and whose name they bear. The line of descent is through the mother, who gives her totem to her children. Persons of the same totem are not allowed to marry. A change in the system of the kinship along with other circumstances may operate to produce homogenous groups inheriting a single totem and totem name from father to son. Once a stock becomes dominant, its totem god may come to command of all the tribes in a group and the other tribal gods become subordinate deities.

either their tribal use or why animal names are much rarer in later times, while animal symbolism is much more common” (Murison 1901: 180).

The foundation of the totemistic theory, i.e., the tribal origin of animal names, collapses when we consider the other NWS data (↑4.1; ↓4.3), which undoubtedly show that they are originally individual (unless one establishes their tribal background somewhere in the pre-historic time). Even if one may find some tribal names referring to animals, it is very probable that they are originally individual (i.e., eponymic). Moreover, an animal name does not prove any totemic origin without sufficient information on the association between the tribe and the animal it is named after (↑4.1.4.1).

Concerning the metaphor theory, which is accepted by most scholars, the concept is that animal names should be taken as metaphors, either in a descriptive sense or as a wish that the bearer would be like the animal mentioned. The not so flattering ones can be understood as ‘mocking’ nicknames (Meyer 1906: 247, 308ff; IPN 229ff; Miller 1970; Toperoff 1995: XXXIII; Glatz 2001). The metaphoric use of animal names is explicitly reflected by several passages in the OT. For example, the blessing of Jacob (Gen 49) uses a series of animals for characterizing the descendants of the twelve tribes, or the tribes themselves: Judah is a young lion, who would exercise power over his brothers; Issachar is a raw-boned donkey, who would submit to forced labor; Dan is a snake, who would provide justice and protection for his people; Naphtali is a doe, who would bear beautiful fawns; and Benjamin is a ravenous wolf, who would devour the prey and divide the plunder. Similarly, the god is compared to strong animals, i.e., the bull, horse, lion, and vulture (Korpel 1990: 523-559; Borowski 2002a: 408-410). In other places animal terms (i.e., bull, lion, goat, and wild ungulates) designate leaders, princes, and warriors (Miller 1970: 180ff). Domestic animals (sheep, lamb, equids, and heifer) were particularly effective in illustrating innocence, loyalty, and devotion (Borowski 2002: 297-8); while insects provided images of destruction and devouring (Borowski 2002: 303).<sup>179</sup>

The metaphoric dimension of using animal names can be supported by the epigraphic evidence. Some cylinder seals (mostly come from dubious collections, cf. ↑4.2.1) have a picture of the animal whose name is born by the owner himself, e.g., *ʾbl* “Camel” with the picture of a Bactrian camel (Deutsch and Lemaire 2000: 165, No. 149), *ʾzryw* (son of) *Hgbh* “The locust” with the picture of a locust (Deutsch and Lemaire 2000: 17, No. 11), *Šʾl* “Fox” (son of *Mky*) with the picture of a running fox (Deutsch and Lemaire 2000: 84, No.

---

<sup>179</sup> More information on animal imagery in the OT is available in Toperoff 1995.

88), *ʿrb* “Raven” (son of *Nby*) with the picture of a bird, possibly a raven (Avigad 1981: 305), and *Yʿl* “Ibex” with the picture of an ibex.<sup>180</sup>

Generally, animal names in the OT are more attested among males than among females. Apparently, the parents preferred to give their sons names of animals denoting strength and power (bull, lion, wolf, vulture), speed (falcon), wealth (horse, camel), swiftness and wild temper (ibex, wild ass), and cunning and skills (weasel, mongoose, hyrax, fox, mole). Daughters, on the other hand, received names symbolizing fertility (cow, heifer, ewe), elegance (gazelle, antelope), and blessing/affection (dove, small birds) (Glatz 2001: 28).

In line with the metaphoric theory, one could also consider the apotropaic aspect of animal names. Given the concept of the secret name in the OT (↑2.2.2.1) and the use of apotropaic names among Jewish communities in Europe and Russia (Hand 1984: 2-4) and among the people of the modern Middle East (↓5.4.4), it seems probable that the inhabitants of ancient Syria-Palestine also used animal names to protect their children from sickness (names of carnivorous animals) and demons (names of insects and serpents).

Lastly, some animal names could be based on toponyms (i.e., circumstantial names), like *ʿOprā*, which is also attested for two towns (Joshua 18:23; Judges 6: 11). The fem. form of this name suggests that the individual (1 Chr 4:14) was born in one of these two towns and thus named after it. The same may hold for *ʿŌrēb* “Raven”, the name of a Midianite captain who was captured by Gedon’s band and killed at Raven Rock (TDOT 11: 342).

#### 4.2.5 Animal names in society: status and cultic affiliation

Animal names seem not to be limited to ordinary people; they are also found among notable and wealthy figures as well as cultic figurers. Examples of chieftains from the OT are: *Ḥamōr* “Donkey” the Hivite (Gen 34: 2), *Pir’am* “Wild ass” of Jarmuth (Joshua 10: 3), *ʿĪrām* “Foil” of Edom (Gen 36:43; 1 Chr onicles 1:54), and the two Midianite princes *ʿŌrēb* “Raven” and *Ze’ēb* “Wolf” (Judges 7:20-25). The occurrence of such names among notable figures is supported by the epigraphic sources, i.e., personal seals. The privilege of possessing a seal in ancient times was generally limited to wealthy people and chieftains. As stated above (4.2.4), some of the owners even had iconographies of the animals their names refer to. Regarding cultic figures, the OT provide us with five examples: the prophetess *Dābōrā* “Bee”, whose name could be symbolic or secondary (honorific title or nickname) in view of her image as a fighting woman (Judges 4-5), *Ḥēzīr* “Pig”, a priest (1 Chr 24:15), *Ḥuldā* (f) “Mole”, a prophetess (2 Kings 22; 2 Chr 34), *Tōla’* “Worm”, a judge

---

<sup>180</sup> Some images of these seals are available in Glatz 2001: 28.

(Judges 10:1-2), and *Yōnā* “Dove”, a prophet (Jonah). Similar cultic figures with animal names are also attested in Akk. (↑3.6.2.3) and Mari (↑4.1.4).

### **4.3 Epigraphic Northwest Semitic (Ugaritic, Aramaic, and Phoenician-Punic)**

#### **4.3.1 The onomastic evidence: etymology and classification**

The epigraphic NWS onomasticon contains a high number of animal names. Whereas the Pho-Pu. names are highly certain, many of the Ug. names discussed by Watson (2006, 2007) are tentative. On the other hand, the Aram. inscriptions also exhibit names which have been roughly classified as Ar. In order to address these issues, I shall arrange the material in three subsections: (1) names based on Common Sem. elements or elements which are reliably attested in the NWS lexicon, (2) tentative names in the Ug. onomasticon, and (3) the question of Arabian-like names in the Aram. onomasticon.

##### ***4.3.1.1 Common Semitic/Northwest Semitic elements***

These form the majority as the table below shows (note that the rightmost column gives the corresponding paragraph number in the appendix [App.]):

No	Element	Ug.	Pho-Pun.	Aram.						App.
				Old/Off.	Hat.	Palm.	Nab.	OSyr	Dura	
1	‘VgVr- “kind of bird”	‘grn								109
2	*‘abVw- “fish”	‘by (?)								137
3	*‘akbar- “jerboa”	‘kbr, Ak-ba-ru	‘kbr, ‘kbr’, ‘kbrm, ‘kbrt (f)	‘kbr						79
4	*‘aqrab- “scorpion”				‘qrbn	‘qrbn	‘qrb	‘qrb	Ακαραβανης, Ακραβανης	131
5	*‘igl- “calf”	‘gl, ‘glt, (bn) ‘glt	‘gl		‘gyly, ‘bd‘gylw (‘Ogēlō)	‘gylw, ‘gyl’	‘gl’		Αγγουλ, Αγουλος	56
6	*‘VnVq- “female kid”	‘nqt (?)								63
7	*‘Vṣṣūr- “bird”	(bn) ‘ṣr								106
8	*‘a(n)yaṣ- “weasel”	Yṣu (?)								91
9	*‘a/irbay- “locust, grasshopper”	Irbn								126
10	*‘alp- “bull”	Alpy, Il(i)piya								54

11	*'arn/m- "wild goat"	<i>Imn, Urn</i> <sup>181</sup>								28
12	*'arnab(-at) "hare"	<i>(bn) Arnbt</i>			'rnb					86
13	*'arway- "lion"			'ry						1
14	*'atān- "donkey-mare"	<i>Atn</i>								48
15	*'ayyal- "deer"	<i>(bn) Ayl,</i> <i>(bn) Ayln,</i> <i>(bn) Aylt,</i> <i>A-ia-li</i>								30
16	*'i/arw-ān- "calf"					'rwn'				61
17	*'ibil- "camel"	<i>Ibln (?)</i>								49
18	*'immar- "lamb"	<i>Imrn, Imrt</i>								62
19	*'VbbVL- "kind of bird"	<i>Abbly</i>								117
20	*'baqar- "large cattle"	<i>Bqrt</i>								57
21	<i>bāz</i> "falcon" (?) <sup>182</sup>						<i>Bzy</i>			95
22	*'bV'Vr "beast of burden, camel"			<i>B'r, B'rm</i>					<i>Βαειρις (?)</i>	50
23	*'bVkVr(at) "young (she-) camel"					<i>Bkrw (f)</i>	<i>Bkrw</i>	<i>Bkry</i>		51

<sup>181</sup> Watson (2006: 449) suggests "puppy-dog" in view of Akk. *urānu*.

<sup>182</sup> On this term in Eb. and Amor. PNs, see ↑4.1.3.4.

24	* <i>bVl</i> - “kind of small bird”	<i>Bl</i> (?)								109
25	* <i>dayš-ān</i> - “buck” or * <i>tayš-ān</i> - “wild horned animal” (chamois, ram, or the like)	<i>Ttn</i> (?)								38
26	* <i>da/ubb</i> - “bear”	<i>Dby</i>		<i>Di-ib-ba-a</i> , <i>Dib-bu-ú-a</i>						20
27	* <i>ḡiʿb</i> - “wolf”			<i>Di-iʿ-ba-a</i>			<i>Dʿybw</i>			18
28	* <i>di/ab(b)ūr</i> - “bee, wasp”		<i>Dbr</i>							122
29	<i>dVg</i> - “fish”	<i>Dg</i>								137
30	* <i>dVlVl</i> - “frog”	<i>Da-li-li</i> , <i>Dll</i>								136
31	* <i>ḡVr(r)</i> - “worm”	<i>Ḍrm</i> (maybe pl.)								134
32	* <i>gady</i> - “kid”	( <i>bn</i> ) <i>Gdy</i> , <i>Gadya</i>		<i>Gdy</i> , <i>Gdyw</i>	<i>Gdyʿ</i>		<i>Gdyw</i>			65
33	* <i>gam(a)l</i> - “camel”					<i>Gmlʿ</i>	<i>Gmlw</i>		Γαμλ	52



34	* <i>gūr-</i> , “whelp”			<i>Gwr</i> , <i>Gwry</i> , <i>Gwrw</i> <sup>183</sup>		<i>Gwr’</i> , <i>Gwry</i>			Γοραιος, Γοραια (f), Γορας (?)	26
35	* <i>gawzal-</i> “dove, brood”	<i>Gūzalu</i> , <i>Gzl</i>								111
36	* <i>gūg-</i> “insect, spi- der” <sup>184</sup>	<i>Gg</i>								132
37	* <i>gVb-</i> “locust”					<i>Gwb’</i> ( <i>Gōbā</i> )				126
38	* <i>gVrVd(-Vn)-</i> “rodent, rat”	<i>Grdn</i> , <i>Grdy</i>								80
39	* <i>ḡVrVn-</i> “raptor, eagle”	<i>Ḡrn</i>								100
40	* <i>ḡVzāl-</i> “gazelle”	<i>Ḡzly</i> , ( <i>bt</i> ) <i>Ḥzli</i> , <i>Ḥa-zi-lu</i> , <i>Ḥu-zi-la-a</i>								33
41	* <i>ḥagal-</i> “partridge”	<i>Ḥgln</i> <sup>185</sup>								113
42	* <i>ḥagVb-</i> “locust”	<i>Ḥgby</i> , <i>Ḥgbt</i> ,								126

<sup>183</sup> These could also be the shortened forms of a name like *Gwrḇ’l* (attested in Porten and Yardeni 2014: 39). Cf. Aram. *gwr* “to go into exile; to dwell” (Jastrow 1903: 229; Tal 2000: 138).

<sup>184</sup> The root \**gūg-* is uncertain; it is based on Syr. *gəwagāy* “spider” and Mehri *gugā* “flea” (SED 2, No. 77).

<sup>185</sup> The name is understood as “Calf” by Watson (2007: 95), which is very unlikely, for Ug. has a separate sign for ‘*ayn*, as reflected in the names based on \**‘igl-*. On the occurrence of \**ḥagal-* “partridge” in Amor, see §4.1.1.3.

		<i>Hgbn</i> , <i>Ha-ga-ba-nu</i>								
43	* <i>hargVL</i> - “locust, cricket”						<i>Hrglw</i>			126
44	* <i>huld</i> - “mole”		<i>Ḥld</i> (f)			<i>Ḥld'</i>				88
45	* <i>hV(n)zīr</i> - “pig”	( <i>bn</i> ) <i>Ḥnzr</i> , <i>Ḥzr</i> , <i>Ḥzrn</i>		<i>Ḥzrn</i> , <i>Ḥzyr</i> , <i>Ḥzyr'</i> , <i>Ḥnzr</i>						77
46	* <i>hVwVy</i> - “snake”		<i>Ḥwt</i> <sup>186</sup>		<i>Ḥwy</i>		<i>Ḥyt</i>			118
47	* <i>hVm(V)ṭ</i> - “reptilian, serpent”			<i>Ḥmṭṭ</i> , <i>Ḥa-</i> <i>am-ṭu-ṭu</i> <sup>187</sup>				<i>Ḥmṭṭ</i>		119
48	* <i>hVrVp</i> - “sheep”	<i>Ḥrpn</i> (?)								66
49	* <i>k(V)dVr(r)</i> - “sand- grouse” <sup>188</sup>	( <i>bn</i> ) <i>Kdrn</i>								115
50	<i>kā/ēpīr</i> - “young li- on” <sup>189</sup>		<i>Kpr</i>	<i>Kpr</i> , <i>Ka-pi-</i> <i>ru</i>						3
51	* <i>ka/irr</i> - “ram”	<i>Karra</i> ,								68

<sup>186</sup> Presumably also a name of a goddess (Donner and Röllig 1968: 102, No. 89).

<sup>187</sup> This name as well as the OSyr. one may reflect Heb. *ḥōmāṭ* “reptile”, JBArām. *ḥumṭā* “chameleon”, or Ar. *ḥamṭīṭ* /*ḥumṭūṭ* “serpent” (see \**hVm(V)ṭ*- in SED 2, No. 99). Another possibility might be a connection with Syr. *ḥmeṭ*, *ḥemṭā* “pustule, sepsis” (Drijvers and Healey 1999 As40, p. 118; Brockelmann 1928: 239).

<sup>188</sup> This root does not occur in SED 2, although Brockelmann (1928: 319) pointed to the relation between Syr. *kudrā* “vulture” and two other Sem. terms, i.e., Ar. *kudrī* and *kudārī* “large pin-tailed sandgrouse” (Ma'lūf 1932: 215) and Akk. *kudurrānu* “Hahn” (Stamm 1939: 255; AHW 499b) or “crested bird, wren” (CAD K 494; CDA 165). The Akk. term probably has the same meaning as its Ar. cognate.

<sup>189</sup> Provided the attested names are not based on *kpr*<sub>1</sub> “compensation” or *kpr*<sub>3</sub> “village” (DNWSI 531).

		<i>Kar(r)anu,</i> <i>Kry, (bn)</i>								
52	* <i>kabš</i> - “young ram”			<i>Kbš</i>						67
53	* <i>kalb</i> - “dog”	<i>Klb, Klby,</i> <i>Klbyn</i> , <sup>190</sup> <i>Kal-bu, Kál-</i> <i>bi-ia</i>	<i>Klb’lm,</i> <i>Klb’l,</i> <i>Klb’,</i> <i>Klby</i>	<i>Klbw, Klby</i>	DN (↓4.3.3.2)	<i>Klby, Klb’,</i> <i>’klb</i>	<i>’klbw,</i> <i>Klbw,</i> <i>Klybw,</i> <i>Klybt (f)</i>	<i>Klb’,</i> <i>Brklb’</i>	<i>Βαρχαλβας</i>	14
54	* <i>kawdan</i> - “mule”	<i>(bn) Kdn</i>								43
55	* <i>kurkiy</i> - “goose”	<i>(bn) Krk</i> , <sup>191</sup> <i>Krky</i>								101
56	* <i>la’ayat</i> - “head of large cattle”	<i>’La-e-ia-a</i> (?)								58
57	* <i>labV</i> ’- “lion”	<i>La-ab-i-ia,</i> <i>Lbiy</i>	<i>Lb’, Lbt</i> (f)	<i>Lb’t</i>						4
58	* <i>lVlV</i> ’- “kid”	<i>La-li-i, (bn)</i> <i>Llit</i>								69
59	* <i>layt</i> - “lion”			<i>Lyt’</i>						5

<sup>190</sup> *Klbyn* can also be explained through Eb. *Kalbiyānum* “Dog-fly; Tick” (§135).

<sup>191</sup> It could also reflect *krk*, *ku-ri-/e-ku* “a device made of bronze; pick” (Tropper 2000: 287; DUL 455).

60	* <i>ma/i'(a)z</i> - “goat”					<i>M'zyn</i> (gentilic) <sup>192</sup>				70
61	* <i>muhr</i> - “foal”					<i>Mhr</i> , <i>Mhrw</i> <sup>193</sup>				44
62	<i>na'bā</i> “crow, type of eagle” (Aram.)					<i>N'b'</i>				105
63	* <i>na/iṣ(š)</i> - “raptor, hawk”	<i>Na-ṣi</i> , ( <i>bn</i> ) <i>Nṣ</i> ,				<i>Nṣ'</i> (f)				98
64	* <i>nam(V)l</i> - “ant”	<i>Ni-ma-la-ia</i>	<i>Nml</i>				<i>Nmylw</i>			121
65	* <i>namir</i> - “leopard”		<i>Nmr</i>	<i>Nmrw</i>			<i>Nmrw/a</i> , <i>Nmr'</i>		<i>Ναμαρος</i>	10
66	<i>nūn</i> - “fish” <sup>194</sup>			<i>Nnt</i> (?)			<i>Nnwt</i> (?)			137
67	<i>namVš</i> - “mongoose”	( <i>bn</i> ) <i>Nmš</i>								24
68	* <i>nVš/sr</i> - “vulture”			<i>Nšrw</i>	DN (↓4.3.3.4)	<i>Nšry</i>	<i>Nšrw</i>			97
69	<i>nāṣōr</i> “cricket” (Aram.)				<i>Nṣr</i>				<i>Νασωρ</i>	123

<sup>192</sup> Another possibility is that this name is a reflex of the Heb. name *Ma'azyāh* “Yahu is my refuge/protection” (PHIAP 51), which also occurs in Aram. texts from Elephantine: *M'wzy*, *M'wzyh*, *M'zy* (Porten and Lund 2002: 373).

<sup>193</sup> Alternatively, Syr. *mhr* “to instruct”, *mahhar* “injurious” (Brockelmann 1928: 376), or Ar. *māhir* “skilled” (Lane 2740c).

<sup>194</sup> This root does not occur in SED 2; cf. *nwn* in DNWSI 722 and also the Akk. and Ar. cognates (< Aram.) sub App. §137.

70	* <i>par(a)</i> - “wild ass”	<i>Pri, Pru</i>					<i>Pr</i> <sup>195</sup>			45
71	* <i>parr</i> - “young of small or large cattle”	( <i>bn</i> ) <i>Prtn, Prt</i>								59
72	* <i>pi/ard</i> - “equid, mule”	<i>Prd, Prdn, Prdny</i> (f)								48
73	* <i>pVl</i> - “elephant”					<i>Pyl’</i>				85
74	* <i>pVl(y)</i> - “louse”	<i>Ply, Pl-la-ia</i>								128
75	* <i>pVrgVt</i> - “flea”	<i>Prgt</i>	<i>P/Br’s</i>							124
76	* <i>pVšpVš</i> - “kind of insect”	<i>Ptp̄t</i>								127
77	* <i>qaml</i> - “louse”					<i>’qml (Aqqamil), Qml’</i>				128
78	* <i>qawq</i> - “pelican, cormorant”					<i>Qwq’</i>				102
79	* <i>qVr(V)r</i> - “frog”	<i>Qrr, Qrrn</i>				<i>Yqrwr</i>				136
80	* <i>qVšam</i> - “locust”	<i>Qšm</i>								126
81	<i>qōpā</i> “ape” (Aram.) <sup>196</sup>					<i>Qwp’, Qwpyn</i> (pl.)				84

<sup>195</sup> Beyer (ThWAT 9: 593) suggests the word was not native to Aram. Alternatively, it could reflect JBaram. *pr*’ “a type of fish” (Sokoloff 2002: 927a).

<sup>196</sup> Provided it is not (a nickname) based on *qwp* “basket” (Beyer 2004: 474ff, with another instance from a JPArām. inscription; DNWSI 1004).

82	<i>qōzā</i> “weasel” (Aram.)			<i>Qu-za-a</i>		<i>Qwz’</i>	<i>Qwz’</i>			91
83	* <i>raḥam-</i> “raptor” (mostly Egyptian vulture)						<i>Rḥmh,</i> <i>Rḥmy</i> <sup>197</sup>			99
84	* <i>raḥil-</i> “ewe”						<i>Rḥylt</i>			71
85	* <i>raqq-</i> “turtle”	<i>Rqn (?)</i>								120
86	* <i>sā/ūs-</i> “moth”	<i>Ss, Ssn</i>	<i>Ss’</i>							129
87	* <i>su/inūn(Vw/y)-at</i> “swallow”	<i>Snnt</i>								110
88	* <i>ša’n-</i> “small cattle”	<i>Šin</i>					<i>Š’yn</i>			73
89	* <i>šVp(p)Vr-</i> “(individual) small bird, sparrow”	<i>(bn) Špr,</i> <i>Šprn, Šu-pa-ra-nu</i>				<i>Špr’ (m + f),</i> <i>Špry</i>				107
90	* <i>sVwsVw-</i> “horse”	<i>Ssw, Su-suwa, Ššw</i>				<i>Sws’</i>				47
91	* <i>tapan-</i> “hyrax”		<i>Špn</i>							90
92	* <i>tawr-</i> “bull”	<i>Tr</i>		<i>Tu-ri-i</i>		<i>Twry</i>	<i>Twr’,</i>			60
93	* <i>tV(V)l-, *ta’lab-</i> “fox”	<i>T’lbn, T’l,</i> <i>T’ln, T’lb,</i> <i>Ša’alānu,</i>		<i>Ta-a’-la-a,</i> <i>Ta-al-a</i>						16

---

<sup>197</sup> Or from *rḥm* “to love”.

		<i>Ša-a-la-na</i>								
94	*ṭaby(-at) “gazelle, antelope”			<i>Ṭbyw, Ṭby, Ṭa-bi-i/ia</i> <sup>198</sup>			<i>Šbyw</i>			36
95	*w/ya‘il- “ibex”	<i>Y‘l</i>		<i>W‘lw</i>						37
96	<i>zabōg-</i> “lizard” (Aram.)				<i>Zbwg</i>					119
97	*zarzī/ūr- “starling”					<i>Zrzyrt, 'zrzyrt</i>				108
98	*zīz- “kind of insect” (worm, cicada)	<i>Zṣn</i>								123

---

<sup>198</sup> Or the shortened forms of a theophoric name with the element *ṭāb* “good” (Zadok 1977: 142; Maraqtan 1988: 168).

#### 4.3.1.2 Tentative names in the Ugaritic onomasticon

In addition to the above-mentioned Common Sem./NWS elements, Watson (2006, 2007) discusses a considerable number of ‘tentative’ animal names. The only name which is explained through the Ug. lexicon is *Npr* “Bird” in view of *npr* “to fly”.<sup>199</sup> The other names are explained through Sem. and non-Sem. ‘counterparts’. Based on Watson’s etymological approach, I shall classify these names into eight categories (according to their linguistic affiliation) with a reference to any possible alternative etymology in the footnotes. Names that have cognates in the other Sem. languages will be identified according to their numbers in the appendix (App. = §):

(1) Akk. cognates: *Abyy* “Water bird” (Akk. *abaya* “water-fowl”),<sup>200</sup> *Ayh* “Caterpillar” (Akk. *uyāhu*),<sup>201</sup> *Aky* “Owl” (Akk. *akkû*), *Apn* “Bird” (Akk. *appānu*), *Arbn* “Water-fowl” (Akk. *aribānû*), *Argb/Arkbt* “Bird” (Emar-Akk. [a]r-ga-bu), *Arspy* “Fish” (Akk. *arsuppu*, *er-suppu*), *Illm*, *I-la-la-[a]m* (f) “Camel” (Akk. *ilulaya*), *Isg* “Bird” (Akk. *usigu*), *Bšy* “Bird; Rock-partridge” (Akk. *būšu*, §113),<sup>202</sup> *Dmr(n)* “Sheep” (Akk. *zamartum*),<sup>203</sup> *Gmḥ(n)* “Bull” (Akk. *gumāhu*),<sup>204</sup> *Hby* “Gazelle” (Akk. *ḥāb/pum*),<sup>205</sup> *Hly* “Shrew” (Akk. *ḥulû*, *ḥulium*, §83), *Hlln/y* “Bird” (Akk. *ḥulālu*), *Hlpn* “Bird” (Akk. *ḥuluppu*),<sup>206</sup> *Hpsry* “Mouse” (Akk. *ḥab/am(a)šīru*, §83), *Hqn* “Water bird” (Akk. *ḥūqu*), *Hršn* “Goldfinch” (Akk. *ḥurāšānu*), *Kmy* “Waterfowl” (Akk. *kumû*), *Kpyn* “Eel” (Akk. *kuppû*, §137),<sup>207</sup> *Krb* “Bird” (Akk. *kurûbu*), *Krmt* “Butterfly” (Akk. *kurmittu*),<sup>208</sup> *Kšy* “Crab” (Akk. *kušû*),<sup>209</sup> *Ktln* “Broad-necked bird” (Akk. *kutlānu*), *Ldn* “Chick” (Akk. *līdānu*), *Lkn* “(a kind of) Sheep” (OA *lakānu*, §75), *Mmrn* “Puppy” (Akk. *mūrānu*, §27),<sup>210</sup> *Nbzn* “(suckling) Goat/Lamb” (Akk. *nabāzu* “to suckle” in reference to goats),<sup>211</sup> *Nggn* “Donkey” (Akk. *nagāgu* “to bray”), *Nnr*, *Nan-ni-ra-ia* “Bird” (Akk. *nannaru*),

<sup>199</sup> Cf. Aram. *npr* and Ar. *nfr*, both meaning “to flee” (Brockelmann 1928: 441; Lane 2823c).

<sup>200</sup> Or a hypocoristicon of a name like *Abi-DN* “DN is my father” or *Ab-X* “The father is X”.

<sup>201</sup> Or *Ayyāhu* < *Ayya-aḥ(u)* “Where is the brother?” (a compensation name?), given some Amor. examples with the adv. *’ayy(a)*, e.g., *A-ia-a-ḥu*, *A-ia-a-bi* “Where is the brother/father”, etc. (CAAA 13, 40 sub *’ayya*).

<sup>202</sup> Or Syr. *bšy* “to examine” (Brockelmann 1928: 85).

<sup>203</sup> Or from *√dmr* “to protect”, which is common in the Amor. onomasticon (CAAA 296).

<sup>204</sup> Cf. also Ar. *ḡāmīḥ/ḡamūḥ*, which is specifically used in reference to a refractory horse (Lane 450).

<sup>205</sup> Or Ar. *ḥb’* “to hide” (Lane 693).

<sup>206</sup> Or Common NWS *ḥlp*/Ar. *ḥlf* “to succeed” (cf. Stadel in ThWAT 9: 286; Lane 792).

<sup>207</sup> Or JBaram. *kpyn* “famished” (Sokoloff 2002: 595a).

<sup>208</sup> It could also be a hypocoristicon of *krm* “vineyard” (DUL 455; Halayqa 2008: 189).

<sup>209</sup> Or simply Kassite.

<sup>210</sup> An alternative option is JBaram./Syr. *mwr’n*, *mwr’n’* “eel; parasitic worm” (Brockelmann 1928: 404; Sokoloff 2002: 650a).

<sup>211</sup> Or *nbz*, meaning “receipt, lot” in Aram. (DNWSI 711; Sokoloff 2002: 339a) and “to call” in Ar. (Lane 2758a).



*Npl* “Caterpillar” (Akk. *nappillu*), *Prgn* “Meadow-sheep” (Akk. *pargānū*),<sup>212</sup> *Ssg* “Raptor” (Akk. *sassukku* with Ug. *g* = Akk. *k*), *Šry* “Snake” (Akk. *šerru*, *šē/īru*, §118), *Škm* “Donkey” (?) (Akk. *šāgimu* “braying donkey”),<sup>213</sup> *Trzy* “Butterfly” (Akk. *turzu*), *Trn* “Hen” (?) (Akk. *turunnu*), *Tar?-pa-š[u]* (f) “Otter” (Akk. *tarpašu*), *Tiy*, *Ša-i-ia* “Raptor” (Akk. *šiy*, Emar *ša-ai*).

(2) Ar. cognates: *Aym* “Snake” (Ar. *aym/ayn*),<sup>214</sup> *Ḥmny* “Tick” (Ar. *ḥamn-at*),<sup>215</sup> *Šml* “Raptor” (Ar. verb “to be hard”).<sup>216</sup>

(3) Aram. cognates: *‘qy* “Magpie” (Aram. *‘qh*).<sup>217</sup>

(4) Heb. cognates: *Gn* “Partridge” (Heb. *gūnī*), *Ḥpn* “Tadpole” (Heb. PN *Ḥpny*), *Kny*, *Ki-ni-ia* “Gnat” (Heb. *kēn*).<sup>218</sup>

(5) Hamito-Sem.: *Bgrt* “Pigeon”.<sup>219</sup>

(6) Harsusi of Oman: *Gdrn* “Worm” (?).

(7) Non-Sem.: *Ḥrr* “Snake” (?) (Egyp.),<sup>220</sup> *Apt* “Snake” (Hurr.).

(8) miscellaneous:<sup>221</sup> *Arđn* “Bird”, *Ittr* “Goat”, *Udr(n)* “(type of) Horse”, *Dwn* “(a kind of) Horse”,<sup>222</sup> *Gmz* “(a kind of) Horse”, *Hrgb* “Eagle”, *Hrsn* “Dove”, *Lḥr* “Ewe”, *Mšrn* “Frog”, *Ppn* “Mouse”, *Ray* “Snake”, *Rny* “Bullock”, *Ssl* “Sheep/cattle”, *Tan* “Spider”, *Tkn* “Insect”,<sup>223</sup> *Twyn* “Insect”.

It is clear from our classification and analysis that the majority of these names are explained by Watson through the Akk. lexicon. Leaving aside the fact that the NWS/Ar. lexi-

<sup>212</sup> The name could also reflect *\*parg-* “a kind of bird (hen, quail)” (§116).

<sup>213</sup> Or Ar. *šakama* “to bit”, *šukm* “requital”, *šakim* “lion”, etc. (Lane 1588ff).

<sup>214</sup> The root *ym* in Ar. gives another meaning which is supposed to be the primary one “a man/woman having no partner” (Lane 137c). Another possibility is that Ug. *Aym* reflects a name such as *Ayyūm* < *Ayya-um* “Where is the mother?” (a compensation name), like the above-mentioned *Ayḥ*.

<sup>215</sup> For an alternative NWS etymology, see ↓4.3.1.3.1.

<sup>216</sup> Deriving an animal name from a general meaning in another language is very speculative.

<sup>217</sup> This Aram. term as well as its Ar. parallel (*‘aq‘aq*) are presumably based on the voice of the bird in question. Yet Ar. *√‘qq* gives more options for explaining Ug. *‘qy*, e.g., “disobedient, bitter water, cleft” (Lane 2095ff).

<sup>218</sup> We can also think of Common Sem. *kwn* “to be reliable”, JBaram. *kny’ prww* “an unclean bird” (Sokoloff 2002: 588a), or any other derivation of *kny* “to name”.

<sup>219</sup> The root is not mentioned in SED 2. Alternatively, thus, we can think of JBaram./Syr. *bgr<sub>1</sub>* “to block; to harm”, JBaram. *bgr<sub>2</sub>* “to mature” (Sokoloff 2002: 185b; Brockelmann 1928: 58), or the Ar. name *Baḡir* “Abundant; Big-belled” (Lane 153b).

<sup>220</sup> Or Sem. *ḥrr* “to be free”, “to dry up, burn up, shrivel” (DUL 368; Halayqa 2008: 162).

<sup>221</sup> These names are mentioned in Watson 2007: 108-09.

<sup>222</sup> Or based on WS *dw* “sick” (Halayqa 2008: 127; Lane 928) plus the ending *-ān*.

<sup>223</sup> Or Heb. *tkn* “to examine” (HALOT 1733).

con is rich enough to give alternative results (not necessarily related to animal names), the absence of most of the alleged Akk. counterparts from the Akk. onomasticon itself (of the total 41 items only 7 are attested) makes us wonder about their considerable occurrence in the Ug. onomasticon.

#### 4.3.1.3 *The question of Arabic/Arabian-like names in the Aramaic onomasticon*

A given name can be classed as Arabian-like according to three criteria: (1) the etymology, (2) the noun pattern, and (3) the hypocoristic ending, i.e., Ar. -īy vs. Aram. -āy.<sup>224</sup>

##### 4.3.1.3.1 Etymology

Several Nab., Palm., and Hat. names have been considered Ar. However, an investigation of the Aram. lexicon in specific and the NWS lexicon in general suggests alternative explanations for some of them:

- Palm. and Hat. *b'* could reflect Syr. *abbā* "lizard" (PNPI 102; Abbadi 1983: 134) or *Abba*/*Abbay*, i.e., the Ar. hypocoristic of *Abd-DN* type (Beyer 1998, No. H 11, 1; 13, 2; 96; 101, 1).
- OAram. *G'l*, Palm./OSyr. *G'l* (m + f) can be explained through Ar. *ǧu'al* "black beetle" (PNPI 82; Al-Jadir 1983: 367) or the Syr. root *g'l* "to entrust" (Drijvers and Healey 1999: As19: 1).
- Palm. *Hld'* is supposed to derive from Ar. *√hld* "to last" (PNPI 88); the ending -ā (could be the status emphaticus or a hypocoristic) may indicate an Aram. form of Central Sem. *\*huld* "mole" (§88).
- Palm. *Hmnwn* is thought to be the diminutive of Ar. *ḥamn(-at)* "louse, tick" (PNPI 89); it could also reflect Nab. *ḥmn* "chapel" (DNWSI 381-2).
- Palm. *Qrd'* is linked to Ar. *qird* "ape" (PNPI 110); Syr. *qerdā* "tick, castor bean" (Brockelmann 1928: 693) seems more probable. The Ar. cognate is *qurad*, pl. *qurād* (both are attested in the onomasticon, cf. §133).
- Nab. *Šb'(w)* and Palm. *Šb''* are explained through Ar. *sabV'* "lion; wild beast" in view of Greek trans. Saboas (Cantineau 1932: 148; PNNR 164-5). Alternatively, they could derive from Common Sem. *\*šb'* "seven", i.e., premature child, the seventh child, or the child born on/in the seventh day/month.

---

<sup>224</sup> See the discussion by Gzella in ThWAT 9: 770.

- Nab. *Zrq* is thought to reflect Ar. *zawraq*, lit. “boat”, and also the numerous stars above the horizon (PNNR 166), which is unlikely because this term is quite late and absent from the onomasticon. Alternatively, the name could derive from Aram. *zrq* “to throw, scatter” or Syr./Hat. *zrq* “to shine, to be blue” (DNWSI 342; Drower and Macuch 1963: 171b), both having the same meaning in Ar. In relation to this, we can also think of two birds having names from the same root in Ar.: *zurraq* “black-winged kite” and *zurayq* “jay”, given that both are found in the onomasticon (§100, 109).

Given these examples, names which can be ‘reliably’ classed as Arabian-like are the ones lacking a clear Aram./NWS etymology (based on DUL; DNWSI; Halayqa 2008; HALOT). This applies to the following examples:

- Palm. *ʾwy* (relative ?) and Nab. *ʾwyw* are based on √ʾww/y “to howl”, cf. Sab. *Mʾwyt*, CAR. *Muʾāwiya*, and Saf. *Mʾwy* (§19).

- Palm. *ʾlg*, Nab./Palm. *ʾlg* mostly reflect Ar. *ʾlğ* “wild ass” (PNNR 164) or any other derivation from the same root, e.g., *ʾaliğ* “strong” *ʾilāğ* “healing” (PNPI 105; §49).<sup>225</sup>

- Nab. *Ḥšpw* seems to denote Ar. *ḥi/ušf* “fawn (PNNR 166), which is also found in the classical onomasticon (§38).

- Nab. *Whšw* is obviously from Ar. *waḥš* “wild beast”, for the word-initial \*/w/ would have become /y/ in NWS (cf. §138).

#### 4.3.1.3.2 Noun patterns

Arabian-like names exhibit the following patterns:

(1) the preservation of the word-initial \*/w/, i.e., *Wʾlw* (OffAram.) vs. NWS *Yaʾ(i)l* “Ibex”.

(2) the diminutive(s) QTyL (in view of other examples in Greek trans.):<sup>226</sup>

- Nab. *Dʾybw* “Little wolf”, *Klybw* “Little dog”, *Klybt* (f) “Little bitch”, *Rḥylt* “Little ewe”, and *Ṣʾyn* “Little lamb” (the Aram. form is *ʾān*), Palm. *Gʾylw/y* “Little black beetle”,<sup>227</sup> and Palm./Hat. *ʾgylʾ/ʾgylw* “Little calf”<sup>228</sup> (could also be the hypocoristic of *ʾAglībōl* ↓4.3.3.3).

<sup>225</sup> Heb. *ʾlg* is an unlikely cognate because it is a metathesis of *lʾg* “stammer” (HALOT 828).

<sup>226</sup> On diminutives in Graeco-Ar. names, see Al-Jallad (2015a).

<sup>227</sup> The term also occurs in the Eb. bilingual lexical list of animal names: *giʾlānum*, *gi-la-(a-)núm* = ZA-GIR (Sjöberg 1996: 22).

<sup>228</sup> Cf. Greek trans. reflecting *Ogeylat* in Al-Jallad (2015a: 31).

(3) aQTL pattern, which could be the broken plural aQTuL, aQTāL, etc. or, more probably, the elative aQTaL in view of other examples in Greek trans.:<sup>229</sup>

- The only clear example is Nab. *'klbw* and its Palm. parallel *'klb* (Greek trans. *Aklab*) “Rabid”. Palm. *'qml* does not belong here, for it is attested in Greek. trans. as *Aqqimil*, i.e., a Syr. form, meaning “The decayed one” (< \**qaml* “louse”). The name is formed with the prefix *'an-*: *anqitil* > *aqqitil* (PNPI 72).

#### 4.3.1.3.3 Names ending in the suffix -w: ‘Arabicized’ forms?

This suffix is more observed in the Nab. onomasticon than in the Palm. one (see the examples in ↑4.3.1.1). Most scholars agree that it reflects a case ending in triptote Ar. proper nouns (Nöldeke 1885: 73ff; Diem 1981: 336ff; Blau 2006 with the bibliography therein).<sup>230</sup> According to Blau (2006: 28), the proper nouns lacking the suffix -w are, as a rule, of the *af'al* morpheme type or terminate in *-(a)t* and *-n*.<sup>231</sup> In later Nab. texts, the *w* appears on all words of Ar. origin, and even occasionally on Aram. ones, suggesting that it had become an orthographic relic rather than a living part of the language, like *dnh npšw fhrw br šly rbw gdymt mlk tnh* “This is the memorial of Fihir son of Sullay, tutor of Gaḏimat king of Tanūh” (LPNab 41; discussed in Macdonald *et al.* 2015: 30). Regarding PNs, another Nab. inscription (JSNab 39) shows that while the son’s name ends in the suffix -w (*Škwḥw*), the father’s has the Aram. ending *-ā* (*Twr* “Bull”). The name *Škwḥw* is apparently *qatūl* form from Aram. *škḥ* “to find; can (as a modal verb)” (cf. Gzella in ThWAT 9: 749-51; Sokoloff 2002: 1144a). An Ar. etymology of the name is highly unlikely.<sup>232</sup> In the same context, two Palm. examples show that the Aram. equivalent of -w, i.e., *-ā*, occurs in originally one-word Ar. names (no Aram. etymology can be proposed for them): *'bs* < *'bs* “Austere” (PNPI 103) or “Lion” (epithet) and *'lg* “Wild ass; Strong” (↑4.3.1.3.1). We can term these ‘Aramaicized’ forms.

Given this information, it seems probable that some of the alleged animal names with the suffix -w derive from Aram. nouns. Let us examine the following cases:

- Nab. *Hwtw* could be from Ar. *ḥūt* “fish, whale” (PNNR 166) or Aram. *ḥwt* “to be loathsome” (Sokoloff 1990: 193; Jastrow 1903: 441).

---

<sup>229</sup> On the elative and broken plural in Saf. and Graeco-Ar., see Al-Jallad (2015: §4.4.2, 6.2; 2015a: 49).

<sup>230</sup> In shortened names like *'bdw* it could be a hypocoristic.

<sup>231</sup> There are only two exceptions: the DN *Mntw* “the goddess Manōtu/Manāt” with the suffix *-at* (cf. its attestations in Healey 2001: 132) and *'klbw* of the *af'al* pattern (↑4.3.1.3.2); these are extremely limited in their distribution and restricted mainly to the Sinai and Hisma.

<sup>232</sup> Ar. *škḥ* is considered archaic, for it occurs only in one word, i.e., *šawkaḥa*, understood as “latch” or the like (Al-Zabīdī 1969 6: 510).

- Nab. *Prpryw* has been linked to Ar. *furfur/furfūr* “sparrow” (PNNR 164); alternatively, it could be a ‘compensation name’ from Syr. *prpr* “to writhe” (Brockelmann 1928: 604) or a nickname from JPArām. *prpryn* “a type of food, dish” (Sokoloff 1990: 450a).

- Nab. *Ḥmlw* is supposed to reflect Ar. *ḥamal* “lamb” (PNNR 166; §75); it could also derive from Syr./Man. *ḥml*<sub>1</sub> “to put away, gather in grain into storage” or Syr./JBArām. *ḥml*<sub>2</sub> “to have mercy” (Brockelmann 1928: 239; Drower and Macuch 1963: 149; Jastrow 1903: 477).

- Nab. *Šbytw* could be the diminutive of Ar. *šabaṭ* “sun-spider” (Cantineau 1932 2: 148) or from JBArām. *šbyt* “annulled” (Sokoloff 2002: 1107b).

- Nab. *Nmylw* (PNNR 167) could be the Ar. diminutive of Common Sem. *\*naml* “ant” or from JBArām. *nmyl* “harbor” (Sokoloff 2002: 756b).

- Nab. *Ḥwrrw/Ḥwyrw* could reflect Ar. *ḥuwār* “young camel” (PNNR 165) or any of the Arām. derivations of *ḥwr* “to be white; to bore a hole”, etc. (cf. the discussion by Beyer in ThWAT 9: 257; DNWSI 356-57; Brockelmann 1928: 222).

If the alternative proposed Arām. etymology of these names is correct (like *Škwḥw* above), the attachment of the Arabian suffix *-w* allows us to term them ‘Arabicized’ forms.

### 4.3.2 Suffixes and endearment forms

#### 4.3.2.1 *-ān(V)*

This suffix is absent from our Pho-Pu. names but is frequently found in their Ug. parallels. Grøndahl (PTU 25c) suggests that it functions as a diminutive ending in animal names and plant names. Yet one cannot rule out the adjectival function of this suffix in view of: (1) its wide occurrence in Ug. nouns denoting adjectives and substantives (see the examples in Tropper 2000: 271-73), and (2) the fact that most of the examples we have are masc. names, which is the same in the Eb., Amor., and Ar. counterparts (also adjectival). Ug. names which explicitly denote animals are the following: *Ayln* “Deer-like” (§30), *Ibln* “Camel-like” (§49), *Imrn* “Lamb-like” (i.e., innocent) (§62), *Irbn* “Grasshopper-like” (§126), *Ḥzrn* “Pig-like” (§77), *Ḥgln* “Partridge-like” (§113), *Ḥgbn/Ḥa-ga-ba-nu* “Locust-like” (§126), *Ḥrpn* “Sheep-like” (?) (§66), *Kar(r)anu* “Ram-like” (§68), *Prdn* “Mule-like” (§48), *Ssn* “Moth-like” (§129), *Šprn/Šu-pa-ra-nu* “Bird-like” (§107), *Qrrn* “Froggy” (§136), and *Tʾlbn* and *Tʾln* “Foxy” (§16). Beside these, there are two examples in which *-ān* is used with the suffix *-at*: *ḡltn* (§56) and *Prtn* (§59), both meaning “Heifer-like”, if they are fem. names, or “Little young bull” if *-at* is merely a hypocoristic suffix attached to masc.

names. The latter hypothesis is supported by two similar Amor. masc. names with *-atān*: *Ḍi'batān* “Little wolf” and *Parratān* “Little young bull” (↑4.1.2.2).

#### 4.3.2.2 *-iy(V)*, *-a/āy(V)*

This functions as a hypocoristic-diminutive ending in NWS in general (Beyer 1984: 445; Lipiński 2001: 230; Maraqten 1988: 109; PTU 25c, 50-52; van Soldt 2010). The following examples could be hypocoristica of two-element names: Ug. *Lab'īya* < *Labu'-DN* “DN is a lion” or “Lion of god” (§4), Ug. *Alpy/Il(i)piya* < *Alp-DN* “Bull of god” in view of similar names in Akk. (§54), and Ug. and Pho. *Klby* < *Kalb-DN* “Dog of god”. The Palm. counterpart of the latter name could be: (1) from *Kalb-DN*, (2) a hypocoristicon of a verbal/nominal-sentence name with *Kalb* as a DN (↓4.3.3.2), or (3) adjectival, meaning “canine” in view of Syr. *kalbāy* (Brockelmann 1928: 328). Palm. *Nšry* is a hypocoristicon of a verbal/nominal-sentence name with *Nešr* as a DN (↓4.3.3.4).

Except for Dura Γοραιος and Γοραια (f), which are formed by Aram. *gwr* “whelp” plus *-ay*, all the other one-word names in this suffix are found in Ug.: *Dby* “Little bear” (§20), *Ḥmny* “Little tick” (?) (§133), *Ḥuzilāya* (syll. *Ḥu-zi-la-a*) “Little gazelle” (§33), *Kry* “Little ram” (§68), *Nimalāya/Ni-ma-la-ia* “Little ant” (§121), and *Prdny* (f) “Little she-mule” (§48). *Klbyn* could reflect *Kalb* (plus *-īy-* and *-ān*) “Little dog-like” or “Dog-fly; Tick” in view of Eb. *Kalbiyānum* (§135).

#### 4.3.3 Animal names in theophoric names

Theophoric names in epigraphic NWS, particularly Aram. (Hat. and Palm.) and Ug., contain several animal terms. As in Akk. (↑3.3) and Amor. (↑4.1.3), these terms occur as DNs, predicates, and construct nouns (i.e., animal-of-DN). In the following subsections, I will discuss these types in view of the literary and archeological evidence.

##### 4.3.3.1 *Lion (labu'-, §4)*

The fem. form *labu'at* occurs as a DN in Ug. *'bdlbit* “Servant of the lioness (goddess)”, mentioned on lists of military men. The name is also engraved as *'bdlb't* (and wrongly as *'bdlbt* and *'bdl't*) on five arrowheads from el-Khadr (north-west of Bethlehem) ca. 1100 BCE (Cross and Milik 1954) and on early Phoenician arrow-heads said to be from Ru-weiseh (near Sidon-Sida); it is lacking in the classical Pho-Pun. onomasticon (Röllig 1995: 350). Such an occurrence on lists of military men and arrowheads may suggest the existence of a mercenary body of soldiers, mainly bowmen (Cross and Milik 1954). The cult of the lioness deity is also attested in south-west Canaan for the same period by a biblical toponym mentioned in Josh 15:32 and 19:6 as (Byt) *lb'wt* (DDD 524). The epithet *lb't*

could refer to any of the three chief Canaanite goddesses: Asherah, Astarte, and Anat. Under the epithet *qudšu*, Asherah is represented standing on a lion on numerous Egyptian stelae dedicated to her, together with Min and Rasheph (DDD 524ff; Wiggins 1991).

The form *labu* also occurs in Ug. theophoric names: *‘mlbu* (cf. Amor. *‘Ammu-Labba*) “L. is the people/paternal ancestor”, *Šmlbi* (cf. Amor. *Šumu-Labba*) “Descendant of L.”, and *Aḫi-labu* “My brother is a lion” or “L. is my brother”.

#### 4.3.3.2 Dog (*kalb-*, §14)

The common Sem. *Kalb-DN* type is reflected by Pho-Pun. *Klb’lm* and *Klb’l*. Structurally, *kalb-* here corresponds to *‘abd-* “slave, servant” (Thomas 1960: 425-26). The term also seems to bear a cultic significance in its designation of a particular religious functionary. At Kition, a Phoenician settlement in Cyprus, dogs were part of the ‘workforce’ of a temple dedicated to Astarte and Mukol (Stager 1991: 39-42). Dog bones were discovered in a 6<sup>th</sup> BCE temple to Astarte in Beirut (Elayi 2010: 166). It is impossible, however, to establish this sense in names (PNPPI 331).

The element *kalb-* appears as a DN in two Hat. theophoric names: *Klbml’* “The dog made full” (Beyer 1998: H 287) and *Brklb’* “Son of the dog” (Abbadi 1983) or “The adoptive son of the dog” (Beyer 1998: H 145,3; 317), which also occurs in OSyr. (Drijvers and Healey 1999 As48: 1; As49: 5; As50: 5) and in Dura as *Βαρχαλβας* (Grassi 2012: 169ff). The element *Kalbā* probably denotes Nergal (Aram. Nergōl), the ancient Mesopotamian deity of the netherworld, the god of pestilence and sudden death. In Hatra, this god was worshipped in the guise of Heracles as well as in more local manifestations. The inscriptions refer to him as *Nrgl* or *Nrgwl klb’*, meaning “Nergōl the dog” or, more likely, “Nergōl of the dog/keeper of the dog” (Dirven 2013: 150-51 and the bibliography therein). Statuettes of dogs were also found in small shrines related to the Nergal’s cult. Nergal’s association with the dog was not confined to Hatra; it was widespread in the northern parts of Syria and Mesopotamia during the Parthian domination, most probably due to the Persian influence, where dogs are intimately connected with the underworld (Dirven 2013: 151-52). According to Dirven (2009: 47ff), Nergal should be identical with the “Lord with his Dogs” mentioned in *The Fall of Idols* by Jacob of Sarug (451–521 AD) as one of the deities that received a cult in Harran:

*He (that is Satan) put Apollo as idol in Antioch and others with him,*

*In Edessa he set Nebo and Bel together with many others,*

*He led astray Harran by Sin, Baalshamin and Bar Nemre*

*By my Lord with his Dogs and the goddess Taratha and Gadlat* (cited in Dirven 2009: 47).

A related important work about pre-Christian religion in Harran and Edessa, the *Doctrine of Addai* does not mention the “Lord with his Dogs” (Dirven 2009). Yet it certainly preserves echoes of his cult in the name of the Edessene ruler, *Bar Kalbā* “Son of the dog” (Phillips 1876: 17, 18, 31, 39).

#### 4.3.3.3 Bovine (§54-61)

Bovine terms are widely used as divine epithets in Ug. literature. The god 'Ilu, for example, is known as *tr* “the bull”, *tr abh* “the bull, his father”, *tr aby(/k/h) il* “the bull, my (your, his) father, 'Ilu”, *tr il d p'id* “the bull, the god of mercy”, and *tr ltpn* “the bull, the sagacious one” (Rahmouni 2008: 318-29). The divine monster of 'Ilu, 'tk is known as 'igl il 'tk “the calf of 'Ilu, 'tk” (Rahmouni 2008: 256). Although none of these epithets occurs as a DN in the Ug. onomasticon, they help us to understand the semantics of one-word and suffixed names referring to bovines: *Alp*, 'gltn, *Prt* etc. In the same context, the Ug. name *Ibrd* (*ibr* + *d*) could be translated as “Haddu is a bull”,<sup>233</sup> given that *d* is used for Hddu in KTU 4.33:26; 4.628:5 (DDD 573b). The same may hold for Pho. 'brb'l and 'brgd “DN is a bull” (?) (PNPPI 259).

In the Palm. onomasticon, DNs are amply attested as PNs. In addition to *Yarhibōl* “Moon of Bōl”, *Malkibōl* “Messenger of Bōl”, and *Ba'alšamīn* “Lord of heaven(s)”, we have 'glbw'l ('Aglibōlā) “Calf of Bōl”, the name of the moon-god, who is usually depicted with horns and a lunar halo decorating his head (Gawlikowski 1990: 2620). 'Aglibōlā is thought to be reflected through three Ar. forms/variations: Palm. 'gylw ('Ogeilu), Hat. 'bd'gylw ('Abd-'Ogeilu), and its assumed hypocoristicon 'g' ('Oggā) (Beyer 1998: 163-64; Gawlikowski 1990: 2621). Given the classical Ar. onomasticon, however, 'bd'gylw could alternatively be a nickname meaning “The little calf, 'Abd” or a name of 'Abd-of-ancestor/PN type, like 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib and 'Abd al-Asad (↓5.3).

#### 4.3.3.4 Vulture/eagle (nVšr-, §97)

The association of nVšr- “vulture/eagle” (or raptor in the general sense)<sup>234</sup> with deities occurs as early as ancient Sem. religions. The term is used in two Ug. divine epithets: *ab nšrm* “father of raptors” for Hrgb, and *um nšrm* “mother of raptors” for Šml, his female counterpart (Rahmouni 2008: 14-17, 76-77). From Ebla we have the Sum. divine epithet:

---

<sup>233</sup> Cf. *ibr* (I) “bull, horse” in DUL 11-12.

<sup>234</sup> On the distinction between, or indeed confusion, of eagle and vulture, see the discussion by Beyer in ThWAT 9: 510-11.



BE  $\dot{A}^{mu\dot{s}en}$   $\dot{A}^{mu\dot{s}en}$  “Adarwan, the lord of the eagles” (Pomponio and Xella 1997: 16-18) and the Sem. PN *Na-sa-ra-’Il* “The god is a vulture/eagle” (?), provided it is not based on  $\sqrt{n\dot{s}r}$  “to protect” or the like.

In the Hat. onomasticon, the element *nešrā* (Aram. form) denotes the sun-god,<sup>235</sup> known as *māran nešrā* or *nešrā māran* “Nešra, our lord”.<sup>236</sup> It is also quite common in theophoric names: *Brnšr’* “(the adoptive) Son of Nešrā”, *’bdnšr* “Servant of Nešrā”, *Nšryhb* “Nešrā gave” (i.e., granted the son), *Nšr’qb* “Nešrā protected”, *Nšrltb* “(May) Nešrā do good”, and the hypocoristica *Nšr’* and *Nšry* (Beyer 1998: 149, sub *nešrā*). The god Naš/sr also occurs as early as the ASAr. inscriptions and later in the Qur’an and the classical narrative sources (Viré 1993: 1012; Ibn Al-Kalbī 1995). Presumably, the vulture was connected to a certain ‘Arabian’ deity, and through time his cult spread over several areas. The epithet replaced the real name and thus became a theophoric element, like *Labu’(at)* “Lion(ess)” in Akk, Amor., and Ug., *Būr* “Calf” in Akk., *Kalb* “Dog” in Hat., and so on.

In view of the frequency of Nešrā in PNs, Beyer (1998 H 1024, p. 149) understands the Hat. name *’hd’qbw* as *’Aḥīd’oqābū* “Prisoner of the eagle (god)”, assuming an Ar. by-form of Nešrā. This proposition seems unlikely, for: (1) the name has no semantic parallel, i.e., “Prisoner of DN”, (2) there is no mention of a deity called ‘Uqāb in the narrative sources related to idols in the pre-Islamic time (e.g. Ibn Al-Kalbī 1995), and (3) the name can be vocalized in different ways, e.g., *Aḥad-’aqibu/’uqbu* “The child/successor is unique/alone”.

#### 4.3.3.5 Locust? (*ḥgb-*, §126)

The Ug. name *’bdḥgb* indicates the god Resheph, known as *ršp ḥgb*. Several proposals have been offered concerning the etymology of this name: (1) “DN (of the) locust” in view of *\*ḥagab-* “locust, grasshopper” and the destructive connotation of the god (PTU 84, 134f; DUL 357), (2) “DN, the gatekeeper (of the netherworld)” in view of Ar. *ḥaḡaba*, and (3) “DN of *ḥgb*-toponym”.<sup>237</sup>

#### 4.3.4 Animal names: reasons for their use

Having investigated the linguistic aspects of animal names in epigraphic NWS, I will now discuss their cultural background. The discussion considers the following theories: (1) totemism, (2) the astral theory, and (3) the metaphor theory.

<sup>235</sup> The metaphoric representation is clearly the eagle (Beyer in ThWAT 9: 510-11).

<sup>236</sup> For a discussion of the possible identification of Nešra, see Tubach (2013).

<sup>237</sup> See the summary in Münnich (2013: 151).

#### 4.3.4.1 *Aram and the question of totemism*

According to Lipiński (2000: 52ff), the name Aram is to be vocalized with a long vowel, i.e., Arām, denoting the ‘broken’ plural of *ri’m* (in view of Ar.), meaning “wild bulls”. This is also supported by the iconography. The representation of the Storm-god Hadad in the Syro-Hittite art standing on the back of a bull expresses the belief that the wild bull assists the ‘Aramaeans’ totemic group. This argument is in line with Lipiński’s view concerning *Dītāna* in particular (↑4.1.4.1) and animal names in Sem. languages in general: “They may have put the baby into what was conceived to be a proper relationship with the tribal totem” (Lipiński 2001: 582). Leaving aside the unclear etymology of Ara/ām, the iconographic evidence regarding the (wild) bull is not confined to the ‘Arameans’ but is as old as the Neolithic era (↑3.3.3.2). One wonders why such an etymological connection is not observed in the names of the social groups mentioned in the Eb., Ug., or Akk. sources, although the bull as well as some other animals are widely used as representations of deities and as theophoric elements in PNs (↑3.3; 4.1.3; 4.2.3; 4.3.3).

#### 4.3.4.2 *The astral theory*

Quite similar to the view of some Assyriologists regarding animal terms and astral bodies (↑3.4.2), Negev dedicated a small section of his work on Nab. PNs to “Celestial Bodies and Allied Personal Names” (PNNR 160-64). The section contains 54 names that are supposed to be based on astral names in CAr., almost one third of them denote animals. Negev’s theory is inspired by the name *Klbw*:

It is obvious that no Semitic parent would have named his child by the name of this abominable creature. It then occurred to me to look at the names of celestial bodies in Arabic. Indeed, this is the name of one of the most prominent heavenly constellations...” (PNNR 160).

This theory is quite unlikely, for there is no information how old most of astral names in CAr. are or, even if they were used in antiquity, how widespread they were (Macdonald 1999: 259). In addition, Negev’s statement concerning *Kalbū* simply projects modern concepts about animals on ancient cultures and ignores the fact that animal connotations may differ from one society to another or even from one family to another. As indicated above (3.3.2), the dog, as a healing animal, occupied an important place in ancient Sem. traditions. Nab. *Kalbū* could be the hypocoristic form of *Kalb-DN* type. It may also be connected to the concept of ‘animal names against foes’, which survived among the nomads of Arabia until recent times (↓5.4.2.2.3). The name of the donkey (*ḥimār*), which is considered an ‘abominable’ animal, also occurs in the onomasticon, but it is not mentioned as an

astral name. So why would a ‘Semitic’ parent give his son such a name? The fact that animal names are used for both astral bodies and people does in no way mean that the latter are based on the former, unless there is sufficient evidence for this practice.

#### 4.3.4.3 *Animal names as metaphors*

Names of domestic animals can be explained as positive designations, for these animals served as symbols of prosperity, fertility, loyalty, and devotion. The concept of prosperity is apparent in the Pho. inscription of Kulamuwa: “Now whoever had never possessed a sheep, I made lord of flock. And whoever had never possessed an ox, I made owner of a herd and owner of silver and lord of gold” (Younger 2000: 148a). The importance of the bull (*tr*) is illustrated through the occurrence of its name as a designation of deities (↑4.3.3.3). In the Ug. epic of Kirta the bull and the gazelle are used as terms of leadership, heroism, and nobility (Miller 1970: 178, 185). Names referring to cows (*lt*, *bqr*, *prt*), ewes (*rh/hl*), and their offspring (*‘gl*, *imr*), may denote affection and welfare: “Like the heart of a cow for her calf, like the heart of a ewe for her lamb, so is the heart of Anatu after Ba’lu” (Pardee 1997: 270). In the same semantic field lies the image of a suckling domestic animal common to the curses of the OAram. treaties: “And should seven mares suckle a colt, may it not be sa[ted! And should seven] cows suckle a calf, may it not be sated! And should seven ewes suckle a lamb, [may it not be sa]ted....( Sefire I A III 22-23 in Lipiński 1975: 1 49).<sup>238</sup>

Likewise, names of equids probably carried positive connotations (swiftness, wealth, and devotion), for these animals were generally highly prized in Syria-Palestine. Equid burials have been excavated in several places (↑3.3.6). The horse was the consummate prestige animal. Ug. literature mentions chariot horses, and a series of veterinary texts dealing with the care of sick horses illustrate the importance of the horse and its unique role (Borowski 2002: 291). The horse’s association with beauty is expressed in the Ug. phrase *śśwm n’m* “fine (looking), choice horses” (KTU<sup>2</sup> 2.45:17, 19–20) and its Amarna-Akk. parallel *sîsû banûtu* “beautiful horses” (EA 22 I: 1) (Cohen 1996: 112). As for the donkey, its high value is equally apparent in the Ug. legend of Aqhat, as the hero’s sister Pagat, prepares the animal to carry her father to the fields (Borowski 2002: 291). Yet it seems possible that its name was given as an expression of devotion.

---

<sup>238</sup> For more information on bovine imagery in Aram. literature, see the discussion by Beyer in ThWAT 9: 813-14.

Names referring to wild carnivorous animals, i.e., the lion (*ary/w, kpr, lb'*), whelp (*iran, gwr*), bear (*db*), wolf (*d'b, d/z'b*), and leopard (*nmr*), can be explained as designations of nobility, strength, or voracity. The lion served as a symbol for deities and warriors (↑4.3.3.1). The bear is linked to a god in a Ug. text “DN lay [down] like a bear” (DUL 260). The leopard provides an emblem of monarchy in the Epic of Zimri-Līm, where the king is depicted as *nimru ananātīm* “the leopard of battles” (Guichard 2014: col. II: 18). In the Ahiqar proverbs, the leopard appears as a voracious animal (Lindenberger 1983: 108; Porten and Yardeni 1993: 22-53).<sup>239</sup>

Names of wild ungulates probably evoke positive attributes, such as swiftness and nobility. Generally, these animals were connected with deities and rulers. Syrian cylinder seals from the mid-19<sup>th</sup> c. to the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> c. BCE represent the ibex with deities (Teissier 1984: 86). The stage/wild-goat (*špr*) is associated with the god Resheph in the Pho. inscription of Azatiwada “So I built it by the grace of Ba'al and by the grace of Resheph of the stages (*Ršp šprm*)” (Younger 2000a: 150). The gazelle in the ancient Near Eastern literature represents an iconic and vivid expression of savage beauty, attractiveness, and spontaneity (Gaspa 2008: 154-55). The term *zby* “gazelle, antelope” is used as a designation of a hero, leader, or prince in the Ug. epic of Kirta (Miller 1970: 185). Likewise, the ibex (*w/ya'il*) in Ar. dream literature means a person with an important position in the government who is well connected with the ruler (Al-Akili 1992: 289).

Remarkably, names of insects and reptilians are the most frequent ones: locust/grasshopper (*arby, gb, hgb, hrgl, qsm*), louse (*ply, qml*), scorpion (*'qrb*), bee/wasp (*dbr*), fly (*dbb*), worm (*dr*), flea (*prgt/pr's*), tick (*hmn* ?), lizard (*'b, zbwg-*), snake (*hwy*), and chameleon/serpent (*hmt*). Generally, insects provided images of destruction and devouring, as is apparent in the curses of the Sefire treaties: “And for seven years may the locust devour! And for seven years may the worm devour” (I,A,III,26-27 in Lipiński 1975: 49). Lines 30-31 of the same passage represent more insects beside carnivorous animals: “May the gods send every kind of devourer to Arpad and [may devour] its people [the mo]uth of the snake, and the mouth of the scorpion, and the mouth of the bear of woe, and the mouth of the panther, and the mouth of the louse, and the [wasps...]” (Lipiński 1975: 49-50). Similarly, the description of Anat's frenzy in the Ug. myth of Baal utilizes the insects imagery: “Under her are heads like bulls, above her are hands like locusts, heaps of fighters' hands are like (heaps of) grasshoppers” (Pardee 1997: 250). The army of King Kirta is

---

<sup>239</sup> For more information on leopard imagery, see the discussion by Beyer in ThWAT 9: 480-81.

also compared to grasshoppers: “Like grasshoppers you will invade the field, like locusts the edges of the steppe-lands” (Pardee 1997a: 334).

As for birds, names of raptors (*anq*, *ḡrn*, *nšr*, and *rḥm*) seem to illustrate leadership and power, for some occur as divine names and epithets (↑4.3.3.4). Raptors in Ug. literature are used metaphorically when describing the powerful weapons made by Kothar for Baal in his struggle against Yamm (Borowski 2002: 301; Pardee 1997: 249). On the other hand, names denoting small birds (*ʿsr*, *špr*, *zrzy/wr*) can be interpreted as designations of beauty, innocence, and blessing/affection. The dove (*gzl*, *ymmt*) was considered the sacred bird of a goddess (perhaps Astarte) worshipped at Beisān. The inhabitants of Syria in antiquity are reported to have honored doves as deities because its association with Semiramis, who, upon passing away, “turned into a dove” (DDD 263 and the references therein). A text from Hat. links the dove to friendship: *gōzla brāḥmē* “young dove to the friend” (Beyer 1998: H1029,2).

Names referring to the fox (*tʿlb*, *tʿl*), weasel (*anyš*), mongoose (*nmš*), and rock hyrax (*špn*) probably evoke cunning, management, and skill. In the Bible, for example, foxes are used as illustrative of false prophets (Ezekiel 13:4) and cunning and deceitful persons (Luke 13:32).<sup>240</sup> Hyraxes appear as skilled animals, although they are not powerful (Proverbs 30:26). The term *nims* in colloquial Ar. is a designation of an astute and shrewd person (Hinds and Badawi 1986: 887a; ↓5.4.6.1.2).

Regarding fish names, they are quite frequent in the Ug. onomasticon (§137), undoubtedly due to the coastal location of the city. Regrettably, however, Ug. literature does not provide us with information on fish imagery. The positive connotations of fish elsewhere in Sem. literature<sup>241</sup> allow us to propose a similarly positive background.

#### 4.3.5 Animal names in family and society

Since Pho., OAram., Nab., and Hat. hardly provide us with information on this topic, I will limit my brief discussion below to Ug. and Palm.

---

<sup>240</sup> The same holds for Ar. literature (↓5.4.2.2.1).

<sup>241</sup> This is reflected by an etiological explanation in the Babylonian Talmud “(the order of the letters) nun, samekh, ‘ayin (intimates that) fish is a remedy for the eye” (BT 20b/24), available online at: <http://cal.huc.edu/comment.php?coord=7103501020224>. In the Tobit story (6: 16-17), fish intestines have an apotropaic function. In Ar. dream literature, a fish symbolizes money, benefit, and earning (Al-Akili 1992: 162).

#### 4.3.5.1 The Ugaritic onomasticon

Animal names are quite frequent in the Ug. onomasticon, but they are not among the eight most popular names.<sup>242</sup> If the names suggested by Watson (2006, 2007) are correct (see the discussion in ↑4.3.1.2), we would have ca. 130 animal names of the total estimate of ca. 2500 names (including the non-Sem. ones).<sup>243</sup> A considerable amount of the Ug. animal names are of the common type *bn-PN* “Son of PN” (see the table in ↑4.3.1.1). The ones with the suffix *-t*, e.g., *Bn Imrt* “Ewe”, *Bn Llit* “Heifer”, and *Bn Snnt* “Swallow”, could be matronyms or patronyms (if we assume that the suffix *-t* functions as a hypocoristic-diminutive ending in masc. names in view of the other Sem. languages). The Ug. *bn-PN* type can be compared to Ar. *nasab ibn/bint-X* “Son/daughter of so and so”, which is also quite common in the onomasticon. Several examples of Ar. *nasab* are originally nicknames; particularly the ones indicating animals (↓5.4.6.3).

#### 4.3.5.2 The Palmyrene onomasticon

An examination of the main list of PNs (PNPI 2-56) and the reconstructed family trees (Piersimoni 1995) yields the following remarks concerning the distribution of animal names in family and society:

- Generally, animal names are attested for wealthy people (as we can infer from their occurrence on family tombs belonging to the elite).
- They occur much more frequently among the males (ca. 26 names) than among the females (3 names).<sup>244</sup>
- ‘*gylw* “Little calf” is one of the ten most popular names (attested ca. 60 times). Interestingly, three members of the Qsm’ family bore this name: ‘*gylw* s. ‘*gylw* s. ‘*gylw* (Piersimoni 1995, No. 50).
- Beside ‘*gylw*, there are four papponyms: ‘*zrzyrt* “Starling” (No. 76), ‘*Ḥld*’ “Mole” (No. 371), ‘*b*’ “Lizard” (?) (No. 145), and ‘*Qrd*’ “Tick” (attested three times in the ‘*Qrd*’ family, No. 70).

---

<sup>242</sup> These are *Yanḥamu*, *Kurwanu* (Anatolian), ‘*Abdi-milki*, *Adunu*, *Munahḥmu*, ‘*Abdi-Yariḥ*, ‘*Abdu*, and ‘*Tūb-Ammu* (Nougayrol 1968: 16).

<sup>243</sup> On this estimation, see O’Connor (2006: 273).

<sup>244</sup> Fem. names are amply attested in the onomasticon (ca. 150 examples), and some of them were also borne by males. See the main list in PNPI 2-56.

- There is one possible case of 'harmonic' names: *'rwn'* "Calf" br. *'gylw* "Little calf" (No. 14).
- Some names are only found among the ancestors (the heads of the families): *Bzy* "Falcon" (No. 328), *'klb* "Rabid" (No. 133), *G'lw* "Beetle" (No. 174), *Gml'* "Camel" (No.176), *Gwr'* "Whelp" (No. 178), and *Yqrwr* "Frog" (No. 236). These could be nicknames.
- The other names occur only once or twice among the descendants, e.g., *Bkrw* (f) "Young camel" (No. 318), *Qml'* (No. 467), and *Şpry* "Little bird" (two times, No. 111, 324).

