

63) Dababa, Tabbaba and Tapapa – In an Old Akkadian account of workers from Kiš (MAD 5 45 iii 4) one of the workers, Edamu, is mentioned as servant of a person named Tab-ba-ba. It is the latter's name, on which this paper will focus. Tabbaba is a typical Elamite hypocoristic name, formed by means of reduplication of the last syllable. This type of hypocoristic is by far the most frequent one in all historical periods of Elamite¹. The meaning of the base *tap-* is not precisely known, but Hinz and Koch² assign a meaning « servant » to it (based on the occurrence of this element as second part of appellatives, e.g. ha-za-tap, ki-gal-tap and mu-la-tap).

Two names are at first sight related to Tabbaba. The first one is Dababa, always spelled Da-ba-ba and attested in a Presargonic cylinder seal (RA 7 56-57; a scribe) and in Old Akkadian texts from Kiš (MAD 5 62 : 12) and Nuzi (HSS 10 146 : 10, 154 ii 17, 155 iii 4). The second one is Tapapa, a person who has given his name to an Elamite place (^{ur}Dimtu ša ^mTapapa, « tower of Tapapa »). His name is spelled ^mTa-pa-pa and occurs in an inscription of Assurbanipal (BIWA 60 A vii 62).

Although these anthroponyms seem to be related, Hinz and Koch³ do not insert cross-references between the various spellings and consequently believe the three names to be distinct from each other. Apparently the reason to separate the names is threefold : (1) the difference between *b* and *p* (Da-ba-ba and Tab-ba-ba vs. ^mTa-pa-pa); (2) the difference between *d* and *t* (Da-ba-ba vs. Tab-ba-ba and ^mTa-pa-pa); (3) geminate vs. non-geminate writings (Da-ba-ba and ^mTa-pa-pa vs. Tab-ba-ba). The opinion of Hinz and Koch is surprising and their motives are rather weak, as will be pointed out below.

The first two elements can be easily dismissed as a reason to separate the names. The Elamite cuneiform system very often has interchanges between *b* and *p* or *d* and *t*. Some of the numerous examples are an-du-uk-ni vs. an-tu₄-uk-ni (both Middle El.); ^{hal}Ab-

¹ P. Meriggi, *La scrittura proto-elamica*, vol. 1, Rome, 1971, 182-184; W. Hinz, *Neue Wege im Altpersischen* (GOF III/1), Wiesbaden, 1973, 106; M. Mayrhofer, *Onomastica Persepolitana : das altiranische Namensgut der Persepolis-Tafelchen* (SÖAW 286), Wien, 1973, 306-309; R. Zadok, review of W. Hinz, *Neue Wege*, *BiOr* 34 (1977), 77-78; Id., "A Tentative Structural Analysis of Elamite Hypocoristica", *BNF* N.F. 18 (1983), 96-107.

² W. Hinz & H. Koch, *Elamisches Wörterbuch* (AMI. Ergänzungsband 17), Berlin, 1987, 286.

³ W. Hinz & H. Koch, l.c., 259, 260 and 286.

ba-la-a, ^{hal}Ab-ba-la-a-ia and ^{hal}Ab-ba-la-ia (all Achaemenid El.) vs. ^{be}Ap-pa-la-a-a (Neo-El.), rendering Akk. Aplaya; el-man-da vs. el-man-ti (both Achaemenid El.); hu-ud-da-° (Middle El., Neo-El., Achaemenid El.) vs. hu-ut-ta-° (Middle El., Neo-El., Achaemenid El.). This phenomenon is also clearly attested in the El. renderings of Old Iranian names and words and the phonological implications of it have already been frequently studied ⁴.

The third aspect of Hinz's and Koch's motive to treat Dababa, Tabbaba and Tapapa separately is gemination vs. non-gemination. In Elamite gemination was probably intended to indicate the distinction between the two series of stops : tense /p/, /k/ and /t/ and lax /p'/, /k'/ and /t'/ ⁵. This could enhance Hinz's and Koch's hypothesis that Tabbaba cannot be the same as Dababa and Tapapa. Nevertheless two elements weaken the hypothesis.

The three spellings occur in Akkadian texts from the Presargonic, Old Akkadian and Neo-Assyrian periods. This makes phonological considerations (e.g. related to gemination) more difficult, as there is no comparative Elamite material, in other words one simply does not know how the Elamites would have written this name.

In addition other Elamite examples indicate that the distinction tense – lax is not always consequently indicated in Elamite. Various roots have both geminated and non-geminated spellings : both spellings ^{be}Ak-ku-ut (Neo-El.) and A-ku-ut (Old Babylonian from Susa) render the anthroponym Akkut, “we are pious”; *a pepe*, “food” is spelled ab-be-be and ha-be-be (both Achaemenid El.); Achaemenid Elamite *harinip*, “land workers” is written ha-ri-nu-ip and har-ri-nu-ip; *hazzaka-*, “big” is spelled az-za-ka₄, ha-iz-za-ka₄, and ha-za-ka₄; the Achaemenid El. base ⁶*suta-*, “to hope, expect” appears in three different spellings : su-da, su-tuk and su-ud-da; the forms of the widespread Elamite root *šar(r)-*, “to enforce” are spelled ša-ar-°, šá-ir-°, šá-ra-° and šar-ra-°.

Concluding this paper one may thus safely assume that the three spellings Da-ba-ba, Tab-ba-ba and ^mTa-pa-pa refer to one name, i.e. Tapa-pa, a hypocoristic of Tapa-, possibly meaning “servant”.

Jan TAVERNIER (18-08-2005) Jan.Tavernier@arts.kuleuven.be
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven – Faculteit Letteren, Blijde Inkomststraat 21, B-3000 LEUVEN
(BELGIQUE)

⁴ Cf., most recently, M.W. Stolper, “Elamite” in : R.D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, Cambridge, 2004, 70.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ A form su-da-áš-ni occurs once in Neo-Elamite.