Amorites in the early Old Babylonian Period

Boer, R. de

Cover Page

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/25842 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Boer, Rients de
Title: Amorites in the Early Old Babylonian Period
Issue Date: 2014-05-28

Amorite personal names, Amorite language

3.1 Introduction

The Amorite language is mostly known through personal names and loan words in Akkadian or Sumerian texts. It is important to distinguish between an Amorite ethnicity and an Amorite language because both are too often put together.

What we call the Amorite language differs grammatically from Akkadian on three major points:[141] the 'imperfect-performative' verbal beginning /ya-/ instead of /i-/; the change of word-initial /w/ to /y/ (Akkadian /waqar/ versus Amorite /yaqar/, 'is precious'); Amorite has a predicative in /a/, as in Ammi-ṣaduqa 'my paternal grandfather is righteous', not seen in Akkadian.

Most people, like Gelb, Knudsen, and Streck, consider the Amorite onomasticon as a reliable source to reconstruct a lost (North-)West-Semitic language. Because of this, there have been attempts to connect Amorite to languages such as Ugaritic and Aramaic.[142] Others, such as Durand hold a completely different opinion:[143] the 'Amorite language' is a modern day phantom created by scholars. What we perceive as Amorite is nothing more than a manifestation of the multitude of more or less mutually intelligible Semitic languages: a language continuum. The clearest evidence that something like an Amorite language did exist comes from Mari. Charpin and Ziegler have devoted an article on the status of the Amorite language.[144] From the texts that these authors published we know that Yasmah-Addu was not able to speak 'Amorite', despite his clear Amorite name. A fragment from an unpublished Mari document refers to an ancient polyglot:

---

[141] For more, see Gzella 2011 and Knudsen1991.
[142] Lipiński 2001:50-55 and Greenfield 1969.
[143] Durand 2012b.
[144] See Charpin and Ziegler 2007, also for the bibliography concerning this matter.

'That man can (speak) the Akkadian, Amorite and Subarean language!'[145]

The mentioning of an Amorite language here might reflect a Semitic language different from Akkadian, or the notion of a vernacular called Amorite.[146] With regard to the Amorite language, Durand 2012b might be right when he sees the OB Ancient Near East as speaking a variety of Semitic dialects, with one *grand critère unificateur*: that the form *yaprus/iprus* denotes a past tense.[147] Akkadian is in this constellation the canonized written language[148] and different 'Amorite dialects' were the vernacular, to quote Durand:[149]

> Les divers parlers amorrites devaient être assez proches de l'akkadien pour ne pas mériter qu'on leur donne aujourd'hui la nomenclature de « langue perdue à redécouvrir », même si les particularismes - surtout d'articulation ou d'accent de phrase que la notation de longues finales « abusives » nous font clairement deviner - devaient gêner la compréhension immédiate ; il devait à l'époque être aussi facile de passer d'une façon de dire à une autre que pour un arabophone cultivé actuel de naviguer entre les divers arabes vernaculaires.

This perhaps explains why we cannot classify a large number of Semitic personal names as either clearly Akkadian or Amorite: in a language continuum it would be an artificial distinction. We will nevertheless make this distinction in the following chapters, because the study of these names does reveal interesting information. Unfortunately, we can only make the assumption that somebody is an Amorite when he or she carries an Amorite name or patronym, but at the same time we need to keep in mind the insights and reservations from the above ethnicity debate.

Durand's idea is actually a combination of two different models to explain the situation: on the one hand a diglossic model in which Amorite is the spoken language and Akkadian the written language. On the other hand a dialect-continuum model between Amorite and Akkadian.

---

[145] Durand 1992b:125, citing letter A.109 lines 14-16: LÚ *šu-[ú li-ša-an a]k-ka-di-i, a-mu-ur-ri-i ù šu-ba-ri-i i-le-i*. See also Charpin and Ziegler 2007:59 note 22. The same ethnicities are found in an Old Assyrian verdict, Veenhof 2008:89.

[146] Durand 2012b:167.

[147] Durand 2012b:186.

[148] That is: the Ešnunna dialect as the result of Ešnunnean imperialism from ca. 1850 BC onwards and Samsi-Addu's conquests, cf. Durand 2012b:170-171 and Charpin 2012a.

[149] Durand 2012b:189.

This chapter will continue with an overview of the abundant literature written on the Amorite language. After this, we shall see how personal names classified as Amorite, can be used in other ways as well: as markers of ethnicity and as proof of migration.

3.2 Amorite personal names and the study of the Amorite language

From the 1880's onwards texts from the OB period started to be published and studied. Scholars soon remarked that some royal names were not Akkadian, but nonetheless clearly Semitic.[150] The laconic textual evidence invited wild speculations about the Amorites. For example, Clay speculated that they already constituted a major power in the third millennium influencing Sumerian-Akkadian culture.[151] The Amorite names, bearing theophoric elements also lent themselves as a source for a supposed Amorite religion.[152]

In 1916, Chiera published a large and fragmentary ten-column tablet (five columns on each side) containing a large amount names, most of which are Amorite.[153] The tablet stems from Nippur and was clearly the result of scholarly activity.

A pioneering study had been written by Bauer in 1926 concerning the Amorites.[154] He distinguishes between the MAR.TU people (Amorites) and the 'East-Canaanites'. Amorites were originally to be found in the KUR MAR.TU, the 'mountain' of the MAR.TU people, located on the north-eastern fringes of Mesopotamia. They were partly recognizable by the suffix *-ānum* to their names. The East-Canaanites, on the other hand, invaded Mesopotamia from the Ur III period onward and founded several kingdoms after the Ur III collapse. Bauer's observations provoked heavy criticism.[155]

---

[150] Like Pinches in 1880, but also Pognon, Sayce and Winckler, see F. Hommel 1897:88f for the earliest historiography of the Amorites. For more early references: Buccellati 1966:5.

[151] Clay 1919.

[152] Breitschaft 1918.

[153] Chiera 1916:111-125, plates XXXVIII-XXXIX.

[154] Evidently he and Landsberger worked together, because two years earlier Landsberger had also addressed the issue: Landsberger 1924.

[155] For all the references regarding this discussion see Buccellati 1966:7 note 12.

After Bauer, it was most notably Gelb who had taken an interest in the Amorite personal names as a source for an Amorite language. In 1958 he published a grammatical sketch of Amorite. Three years later he commented upon Kupper's *Nomades* in an influential review article.[156] Gelb wanted to undertake a more comprehensive study of the Amorite language by systematically employing the large corpus of personal names. In 1980 this resulted in his book *A Computer-Aided Analysis of Amorite.* Gelb was however never able to finish his work before his death in 1985.

The task of writing a grammar of Amorite was taken up by Streck, who wrote *Das amuritische Onomastikon der altbabylonischen Zeit 1.*[157] This is the first in an announced series, but no other volumes have appeared since then. Significantly, the Amorite verb is not treated in this volume.[158] The book was criticized by Charpin.[159] Streck published several other articles pertaining to the Amorites. One article looks at the distribution of Amorite personal names over the course of the OB period.[160]Lastly, we must not forget the work by Huffmon 1965 done on the Amorite names in the Mari corpus and Knudsen's research on the Amorite language.[161]

3.2.1 *Excursus: Amurrum as a personal name*

The word Amurrum was also used as a personal name. It occurs mostly in the early OB period and was always written syllabically.[162] One would suspect a

---

[156] Gelb 1961a 'The Early History of the West Semitic Peoples'. We must not forget the important Ešnunna text TA 1930 615 that Gelb published in 1968. This list of Amorite names is a unique document showing several contingents of Amorites living in the city.

[157] A similar article by the same author had already appeared in the *RlA* 9 (Streck 1998).

[158] A grammatical sketch of the language (including the verb) is found in Streck 2011, see also the work by Golinets 2010a and Golinets 2010b (an unpublished thesis on the Amorite verb in Old Babylonian personal names).

[159] Charpin 2005/2006, other reviews are: Tropper 2000, Pruszinszky 2001 and Knudsen 2002.

[160] Streck 2004b. According to him there was a strong Amorite presence along the Middle Euphrates and in Northwest Syria. Babylonia had fewer Amorites, who were progressively assimilated. In Streck 2002 he explores the social-economic structures of nomads by looking at their transhumance and agricultural patterns (the 'dimorphic zone') as well as other modes of subsistence taking into account tribal structures.

[161] Knudsen 1991, 2002, and 2004.

[162] The name is attested up to the reign of Samsu-Iluna (*CT* 8 46:11-12).The female name Amurrītum, is seen in the Mari texts (eg. *ARM* 9 291 iii:24', *ARM* 13 xiii:18, *ARM* 22

political or tribal agenda, but the name occurs in families with predominantly Akkadian names. When we look further we find that 'geographical' names are quite common in the OB period.[163] But do ethnic names such as Amurrum or Akkadûm exist?[164] For the name Akkadûm ('the Akkadian') we might suppose that the person came from the city of Akkad, but there was no town (or land) called 'Amurrum'[165]: the conclusion seems to be that the name Amurrum *does* refer to an Amorite identity or ethnicity. Michalowski mentions three occurrences of the personal name Amurrum in Ur III documents (written *a-mu-ru-um*)[166]. In the OB texts from the Mananâ-dynasty there are at least two distinct persons with this name: Amurrum, son of Lana-AN, and Amurrum, son of Sîn-bāni, as well as several references without patronym.[167]

From early OB Sippar we have parts of a family archive in which a man called Amurrum was active, he was the son of Dammāqtum.[168] He seems to have acquired a lot of land: probably all references to an 'Amorite' area in the Sippar texts refer in reality to the area in which Amurrum son of Dammāqtum had owned fields. The personal name Amurrum occurs furthermore in OB Sippar, Šaddupûm, and Nippur.[169] We also have the female variant 'Amurrītum'.[170] Another explanation is offered by Stol: 'son of Amurrum'

52:3, *ARM* 22 71:13 (*hi-in-ni-bu a-mu-ri-tum*, here perhaps an ethnic qualifier?) and A.3151 i:49).

[163] Well known are the names composed with the town of Akšak or Sippar (Mār-Sippar etc.), or the clearly political late OB names 'Uruk-libluṭ' (cf. Pientka 1998:183) etc. Another example is a name such as 'Kanišītum (*CT* 2 23:23 and *CT* 8 32b:2), cf. Stamm 1939:268-271 ('Bezeichnungen nach Herkunft und Beruf').

[164] Akkadītum (*TIM* 7 166:17), Akkadûm (*CT* 8 4b:20).

[165] At least not in early OB Babylonia.

[166] Michalowski 2011:106. It is not certain whether Michalowski is right in taking the logogram 'MAR.TU' also as a logographic rendering of the personal name Amurrum: the Old Babylonian evidence seems to contradict this. Attinger 2011 also criticized Michalowski in a short article on his reading of the logogram MAR.TU.

[167] *SCT* 39:17, A 32113:21 (unpublished OI Chicago, courtesy M. Stol), *R* 36:4-5, *R* 3:2, *R* 3:17, *R* 11:3, *R* 13:16, *R* 17:4, *R* 31:10.

[168] Amurrum son of Dammāqti (Dammāqtum) and father of Apil-maraṣ, Takūn-mātum and Qarassumīya in *MHET* II/1 5:19-20, *CT* 8 38b:3, *CT* 45 1:3 (case of *BDHP* 31), *CT* 4 48b:4-5, and *MHET* II/1 19:11-12.

[169] Sippar: *tab-ni-iš₈-tár* DUMU.MUNUS *a-mu-ru-um* (*CT* 8 39a:31), *na-ra-am-ta-ni*, DUMU.MUNUS *a-mu-ru-um* (*CT* 8 46:11-12), *ša-pí-ia* DUMU *a-mu-ru-um* (*CT* 6 28:27), and 1 SAG.ÌR *a-mu-ri*, (*AbB* 7 128:5'). Šaduppûm: *ga-ab-ba-mi-ia*, *a-sà-li-ia* DUMU.ME *a-mu-ri-im* (Al-Hashimi 1964 21:18-19). Nippur: *a-mu-ru-u*, *PBS* VIII/1 98:9.

[170] Written as *a-mu-ri-tum*: *TIM* 7 90:9, *TIM* 7 92:5, *TIM* 7 93:2, *TIM* 7 100:8, *TIM* 7 97:6', *TCL* 1 65:31, *AbB* 6 47:13, *AbB* 7 129:13', 22', *VS* 13 3:2.

could in some cases refer to an Amorite ancestor.[171] Durand established that Amurrum was also the name of a Bensimalite clan. Within the Bensimalites it belonged to the Yabasa confederation.[172]

3.3 Amorite names as ethnicity markers and what constitutes an Amorite name?

The study of the Amorite population in the early OB period is essentially the study of Amorite personal names. The many Amorite names found in the cuneiform record is their most visible remnant. However, the usage of personal names to determine ethnicity is complicated: there are many cases in which a personal name is in fact not a reliable indication of ethnicity. Nevertheless, despite this problem it is unwise to dismiss the Amorite personal names as a source of ethnicity all together. We can still use them as a historical source if we bear in mind the many pitfalls, but also the recent insights from the ethnicity discourse.

3.3.1 *Personal names as markers of ethnicity*

In other academic fields, such as anthropology or public health studies, the best way to determine a person's ethnicity is by simply asking the people.[173] Such an approach is of course impossible in ancient studies. The methodological problem that imposes itself is: can we use the Amorite personal names found in early OB texts as reliable markers of ethnicity?

As opposed to Assyriology,[174] there has been a lot of progress in studying personal names in other historical disciplines. Especially in Medieval Studies

---

[171] Stol 2004:705-706.

[172] Durand 2004a:182, but already earlier: Sasson 1998:122. The same tribe reoccurs perhaps in an administrative text from Tell Leilan : Ismail 1991 text 135: LÚ.ŠU.GI.MEŠ *a-mu-ur-ra-yu*: 'the elders of Amurrum'.

[173] Outside of the Humanities, research has -for example- been done in studies into public health to establish ethnicity based on a person's first -and surname found in databases. This has been done to analyze disease and health patterns among different ethnic groups.

[174] The pioneering effort by Stamm from 1939 is still a work of reference. Others contributions are: Stol 1991, Zadok 1977, and recently Radner 2005.

we can see new efforts both in methodology and in gaining more insights into naming patterns, migration and ethnicity.[175]

A number of studies into public health claim to demonstrate the accuracy in predicting a person's ethnicity based on his or her personal name.[176] How do these name-based ethnicity classification methods work? In a target population the number of personal names from a certain ethnicity is classified according to a *reference list* of names from that ethnicity and they are in turn compared to the actual amount of people from that ethnicity. This actual number was usually known because the people had self-identified their ethnicity. The results seem to be promising: from a survey of thirteen such studies, the sensitivity (the percentage of people correctly ascribed to a certain ethnicity) lies between 67 and 95 %.[177] There are however a number of limitations to the used methodology for the present study:[178]

1) There are differences over time in naming patterns. This logical fact is however often forgotten in Assyriology. New names are sometimes invented, older names are forgotten, or they suddenly become popular again, and other names are shunned because of negative connotations (i.e. nobody would call his son Adolf nowadays). Sometimes we can establish why certain trends have happened and sometimes not.

2) There are regional differences in naming patterns: a common name in one region might be rare in another. In the OB period this is very clear for names composed with local city gods that are almost never used in other cities.

3) Our information is not representative for the population. The vast majority of the names preserved are masculine names; female names and women in general are underrepresented in the material.[179] Connected to this is the fact that Mesopotamian names only have patronyms added after their names, the mother's name is almost never mentioned. We have in general the names and texts of the upper strata of society, the poorer people are underrepresented in the corpus.

---

[175] See the contributions in Greule and Springer 2009 and Bourin and Chareille 2010.

[176] Mateos 2007 conveniently assembled the methodology and results of thirteen selected studies, most of them from the fields of public health.

[177] Mateos 2007:254.

[178] Mateos 2007:255-259. For a similar survey of limitations connected to the Roman Near East, see Macdonald 1998:182-189.

[179] Except of course in the Sippar material, where the *nadītum* priestesses are well represented in the corpus.

4) Studies into other historical periods have shown that people tend to use names (like identities) in a number of flexible ways. As an example: studies from the (ancient) Egyptian world have shown that people could have different sets of names according to the social context in which they operated:

- Indigenous people could adopt the names of members of the ruling elite to associate themselves with them.[180]
- In Coptic manuscripts, Christians could bear Arabic names.[181]
- A man could have a Greek name in a military context and an Egyptian one in a private context.[182]

These examples show that identity and name giving in the ancient world are far more flexible than we would like to think. The phenomenon of double names is also known in Mesopotamia, but mostly during the Hellenistic period.[183] People in Mesopotamia sometimes received a new name when they entered a new phase in life; a prince ascending the throne, a man or woman being consecrated to a god, an official entering royal service, etc.[184] Apart from hypocoristic names, we have only a few examples of people carrying two totally different names.[185]

5) There are differences in the strength of association between a name and an ethnicity. Some names might not be a strong indication of Amorite ethnicity. Either, because a certain name could be good Akkadian or Amorite such as ^{d}IM-*ma-lik*, which could be Akkadian Adad-mālik or Amorite Addu-mālik. Oftentimes, a typical Amorite god such as Erah is used to identify Amorite names. However, Erah is also seen in connection to Akkadian style-names, producing hybrid Amorite-Akkadian names, examples are Ibni-Erah or Ipiq-Erah, found in texts

---

[180] Lambertz 1911, because this article was not available, we refer to Boiy 2005:47 for this information. For more on Egyptian double names: Calderini 1941, Calderini 1942, Martin 1956, Leclercq 1963 and De Meulenaere 1966.

[181] Legendre 2012.

[182] Clarysse 1985. A similar example is known from Hellenistic Uruk: the governor of Uruk was called Anu-uballiṭ, but he had received the Greek name Nikarchos from the Seleucid king Antioch: Boiy 2005 and Radner 2005:32 n. 178.

[183] Boiy 2005.

[184] Radner 2005:28-35.

[185] These are mentioned by Radner 2005 n. 182 and n.183: Šēlebum alias Iddin-Lagamal (Stol 1991:210) and Nakarum alias Ikūn-pi-Sîn (Van Koppen 1999).

from Šaduppûm. A name such as Abi-Erah could then be either Akkadian or Amorite. The identification of someone's ethnicity based on a personal name is more accurate if the names of the distinguishable ethnicities belong to widely varying languages. This is problematic for Amorite, because it is related to Akkadian.

6) There are names that defy qualification. Apart from reduplicated names like Bagaga, Hanhanum, Šeršedum etc., and other 'nonsense' names like Hašekunu, Lašiku, Rašahu etc.,[186] there are also many names which are clearly Semitic, like Mudādum or Kusānum. Because Amorite and Akkadian are both Semitic languages, it is sometimes impossible to classify a name as either Amorite or Akkadian. Coincidentally, the same problem exists for prosopographical studies in first millennium Babylonia, where people could have Akkadian names, but also names from a variety of other (West)-Semitic languages: Aramaic, Hebrew, Phoenician etc.[187]

7) Families with Amorite names tended to assimilate into the local societies by giving their children Akkadian names. This makes it even harder to identify people as Amorites, for example: an Amorite king could have an Akkadian name like Babylon's Apil-Sîn and Sîn-muballiṭ. Somebody proclaiming himself as an Amorite could even have an Elamite name such as Kudur-mabuk, the father of the Larsa kings Warad-Sîn and Rīm-Sîn.

8) Problems in normalization and spelling of names: the same name is sometimes spelled slightly different, or a logogram is to be read different. One of the main differences between Ur III Amorite names and OB Amorite names, is that the Ur III ones tend to end with -*ānum* and the OB names not, having other typical features.[188] This was already seen by earlier scholars.[189] Here we can add an additional piece of information regarding the difference or -supposed difference between the Ur III and OB Amorite names: the reading of the logogram DINGIR. Traditionally, the generic word for 'God' or 'a God' has been understood to have been 'El' in Amorite. Proof for this reading is found in

---

[186]Some of these are undoubtedly due to bad copies or damaged tablets.

[187] Zadok 1977.

[188] Names of the *yafʿal*-DN type and names such as Abdi-DN, Sumu-DN etc.

[189] Bauer 1926 and Buccellati 1966.

the syllabic writing of names such as Sumu-la-El as *su-mu-le-el*.[190] A variant of the word for 'God' is 'Il' as in Hayab-Il: *ha-ia-ab-ì-il*.[191] Because of this, the logogram for 'God', the sign DINGIR, is always translated as 'El' in Amorite names. However, in some names the DINGIR sign should apparently be read differently. An example is the name Yahatti-DINGIR. It is usually classified as an Amorite name because it begins with the diphthong /ya/, as a consequence, the DINGIR sign is then read as El, giving the name Yahatti-El. However in some syllabic spellings of this name we learn that we should read the DINGIR sign as *ilum*, giving us the name Yahattilum or Yahat-ilum:[192]

> Yahatilum s. Hadamu
> > da *ia-ha-ti*-DINGIR, *R* 15:2
> > *ia-ha-ti*-DINGIR, *R* 19:17
> > *ia-ha-ti-<u>lum</u>*, DUMU *ha-da-mu*, *R* 45:28-29
> > ᵈEN.ZU-*a-bu-šu, ù ia-ha-ti*-DINGIR, DUMU *ha-da-mu*, *R* 55:3-5

Another example of problems with spelling has to do with the diphthong /ya/ at the beginning of a personal name. It is often taken as a sign that a name is Amorite. This diphthong is usually the beginning of a verbal form, (in Akkadian verbal forms never begin with a diphthong). However, this diphthong is not always written the same. We already knew that in the Mari texts the consonants /i/ followed by /a/ changed to /ê/, and something similar appears to have been happen-

---

[190] IM 49222, Al-'Adami 1967, pl. 11 and 12:22.

[191] *MHET* II/1 29:18-19. Some scholars read this name however as *ha-ia-ab*-ni-*il* (ni=*ì*).

[192] Other examples:

Sama-El(?) son of <u>Hilhilum</u>
> *sa-ma*-DINGIR, DUMU *hi-il-hi*-DINGIR, *RSM* 39:17-18
> *sa-ma*-DINGIR, DUMU *hi-il-hi-lum*, *RSM* 55:6-7

Bunu-mašar s. <u>Elilum</u>
> *bu-un-ma-šar* DUMU ˹*e-li*˺-*lum, MHET* II/1 51:23
> *bu-nu-ma-šar* DUMU *e* ˈ-*li*-DINGIR, *CT* 4 33b:18-19

<u>Šubannilum</u> s. Yakum
> *šu-ba-ni*-DINGIR, DUMU *ia-ku-um R* 41:3-4
> *šu-ba-an-ni-lum*, DUMU *ia-ku*-[*um*] , *R* 51:12-13

<u>Yahmiṣ-Ilum</u> s. Yamhanum
> *ia-ah-mi-ṣi-lum*, DUMU *ia-am-ha-núm, R* 16:17-18
> *ia-ah-mi-iṣ*-DINGIR, DUMU *ia-am-ha-nu-um, R* 45:24-25.

ing in the early OB period, some Amorite names are spelled with the diphthong /ye/ at the beginning instead of /ya/:

> Yeslimum (Mananâ dynasty texts)
>> *ia-ès-li-mu-um,* dumu *na-gi₄-sa-nu-um*, R 2:17-18, Nâqimum c
> Yaškit-El (or Êškit-El) (Dilbat)
>> *ia-aš-ki-it*-dingir, dumu *as-sà-lum,* Gautier *Dilbat* 1:19-20,
>> Sumu-la-El 6/III
>> *e-èš-ki-it*-dingir, dumu *a-sà-lum, TLB* 1 249:18'-19', undated
> Yerhaqum (Mananâ dynasty texts)
>> *ia-er-ha-qum, YOS* 14 78:10, Mananâ ab

Even though scribes were trained in carefully editing Akkadian texts, there were no fixed rules in writing down things that fell outside of their education,[193] an excellent example is the Amorite name of the Marad king Halun-pi-umu that was rendered by different scribes as:

> *a-lu-pú-ú-mu, a-lum-bi-ú-mu, ha-lam-bu-ú, a-lum-pí-ú-mu, a-li-im-pu-mu, a-lum-pu-mu,* and *ha-lu-un-pí-mu*

The above limitations affect the degree with which we can use a certain name as the indicator of an ethnicity. However, names *can* be a useful tool in subdividing *populations* into two or more ethnicities, with an acceptable margin of error. It is important to stress that this does not always hold on the individual level: there are enough examples from the OB period in which a person with an Akkadian name was of Amorite stock and vice-versa.

The key ingredient in the aforementioned public health studies into the name as an indicator of ethnicity is the reference list. This list contains the personal names that are considered to be unique to a certain ethnicity. Translated to the research into the Amorites: we would need a reference list containing certified Amorite names. This automatically brings us to a second methodological problem: how can we define a name as Amorite?

---

[193] There were more or less stringent rules on how to write down Akkadian personal names. The same did not wholly apply to Amorite names, even though the famous Chiera list enumerates a number of Amorite names that were probably used for scribal education.

3.3.2 *What constitutes an Amorite name?*

Whether a given name is Amorite or not is a matter of debate: each scholar essentially uses his own 'system'. For some names there can be little or no discussion, but other names are for example clearly Semitic, but not attributable to either Akkadian, Amorite or some other language. Here is where the discussion is and some scholars, like Gelb in his *Computer-Aided Analysis of Amorite,* use a very broad definition: 'All the names that *I considered* to be either unquestionably or *possibly* Amorite were collected in standard Assyriological transliteration (...)'.[194] A more restrained approach is preferred here.[195] All personal names found in the early OB texts fall into four linguistic categories: Akkadian, Sumerian, Amorite and 'other'. The names qualified as 'other' are names which are neither clearly Sumerian, Akkadian nor Amorite, despite being sometimes clearly Semitic. The criteria for selecting a name as Amorite are the following:[196]

- Names carrying a verbal form that starts with the prefix /Ya/Yu/Yi/Ye or the verbal form /Işi/:
    - Yakun-ašari, *ia-ku-un-a-ša-ri, CT* 48 10:6
    - Yahqub-El, *ia-ah-qú-ub*-DINGIR*, TIM* 7 69:iv1
    - Yantin-El, *ia-an-ti-in*-DINGIR, *CT* 4 22c:5
    - Yadidum, *ia-di-du-um, R* 23: 9
    - Işi-sarê , *i-şí-sà-re-e, CT* 47 16 :22
    - Işi-qatar, *i-şí-qá-tar, TCL* 1 73:4, 35
- Names with clear Amorite theophoric elements like Samsu/Samas ('sun(god)'), Yarah/Erah ('moon(god)'), or El/Ila ('god):
    - Abi-Samas, *a-bi-sa-ma-as MHET* II/1 46:3
    - Samsu-i-[...], *sa-am-su-i-*[...]*, TIM* 7 74:9
    - Abi-Yarah, *a-bi-a-ra-ah*, R 5:4
    - Abdi-Erah, *ha-ab-de-ra-ah,* IM 49219 : 46
    - Milki-la-ila, *mi-il-ki-la-i-la, MHET* II/1 43:22
    - Yahwi-El, *ia-ah-wi-el, UCP* 10/3 2:24, Mananâ c

---

[194] Gelb 1980:2, emphasis added by the present author.

[195] See also the criteria used by Huffmon 1966:13-18, and his list of Amorite names on p. 19-60.

[196] For another opinion: see Streck 1998-2001.

- Names that contain clearly Amorite words: mutu ('man'), Ab-du/Habdu ('servant'), Sumu/Samu ('offspring'), As(s)ad/Asdu ('warrior'), Bahlu ('lord'):
    - Mutum-me-El, *mu-tu-me-el, JCS* 9 p. 114 no. 87:11
    - Mutum-ramê, *mu-tam-ra-me-e, MHET* II/1 25:24
    - Sumu-tamar, *su-mu-ta-mar, JCS* 9 p. 80 no. 32:2'
    - Sumu-nihum, *su-mu-ni-hu-um, RSM* 48:14
    - Ahi-asad, *a-hi-a-sa-ad, CT* 8 4a:51
    - Abdi-Erah, *ab-di-ra-ah, TIM* 3 11:12
    - Bahlu-lu-[...], *ba-ah-lu-lu-*[...]*, JCS* 9 p. 110 no. 71:14
- Names that contain clearly Amorite words for family members: Hālum (maternal uncle), Bunu/Bina (son):
    - Ammi-šagiš, *am-mi-ša-gi-iš, Edubba* 7 82:2
    - Hammi-ṣura, *ha-mi-ṣú-ra*, BM 16474:4″
    - Buni-halum, *bu-ni-ha-lum, Edubba* 7 113:3
    - Bunu-mašar, *bu-nu-ma-šar, MHET* II/1 72:4
- Names that are not immediately identifiable as Amorite, but which nevertheless belong to other people who are of clear Amorite descent: Amīnum (brother of Samsi-Addu), Haliyum (king of the Mananâ dynasty), etc.

3.4 Quantitive Research into Early Old Babylonian Amorite Personal Names

3.4.1. *Introduction*

This section takes all personal names from one site together and studies them together and in relation to other sites using statistical methods. In order to get a fuller understanding of the Amorite personal names, this section also takes the early OB material from the Diyala region into consideration.

All the personal names found in published texts from Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region (ca. 10450 individuals[197]) were put into one Excel spreadsheet. The spreadsheet gives for each name its frequency (number of attestations), language, and the site where it was found, for example:

---

[197] Only complete, readable names were included.

Utu-mansum	13	s (=Sumerian)	Sippar/Kiš&Damrum
Apil-Sîn	12	ak (=Akkadian)	Sippar/Kiš&Damrum/Marad/Dilbat/ Nērebtum/Nūr-Šamaš' archive

The database is comprised of texts from seven 'cities': Sippar, Kiš and Damrum (counted as one),[198] Marad, Dilbat, Tutub, Nērebtum and the Nūr-Šamaš archive. These seven cities are all situated in Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region; all texts are from the period of ca. 1900 till 1820 BC. The amount, variety, and dating of the documents from each city differs: for some cities, like Tutub or Dilbat we only have parts of one family archive. For other cities like Sippar or Kiš and Damrum we have several family archives. Using the frequency lists for each city and a 'total' containing all names, it is possible to perform many interesting quantitative calculations. Many of the insights and calculations below were taken from the works of Pascal Chareille; a French medievalist specialized in the usage of statistics and personal names. A short overview of the corpus for each city:

3.4.2 *Archives from Northern Babylonia:*

3.4.2.1 Sippar

The early OB Sippar corpus is by far the richest and largest for this time: it contains approximately 900 texts.[199] These texts can be divided into twelve large family archives, two large institutional archives, as well as several smaller groups of texts. The Sippar texts are a varied lot, it contains: loans, sales, pledges and leases of real estate, court documents, administrative texts, letters etc. They cover the time of the local Sippar kings until the reign of Sîn-muballiṭ: ca. 1885-1792 BC.

---

[198] The files from the Mananâ dynasty (=Damrum) and Kiš (which essentially only contains the Ṣīssu-nawrat archive) are treated as one corpus.

[199] Goddeeris 2002:33-222.

3.4.2.2 Kiš and Damrum

This corpus contains texts from several archives from Kiš, the nearby located town of Damrum, and their vicinity.[200] It is the second largest corpus of early OB texts: we have ca. 235 texts spread over nine family archives and several smaller dossiers. The genres of texts from this area are comparable to Sippar: mostly sales of real estate, slave sales, loans and some lease contracts, administrative accounts, memos etc. They span a period of time from ca. 1885-1845 BC.

3.4.2.3 Marad

The Marad corpus contains 35 texts. Most of them are from the Ilum-bāni family archive. Other smaller files of texts are probably related in some way to this family archive.[201] The archive contains mostly loans and texts concerning the sale, pledge or transfer of real estate. The Marad texts cover the period of time between ca. 1885 and 1860 BC.

3.4.2.4 Dilbat

The texts from Dilbat all stem from one large family archive: the Iddin-Lagamal archive. This archive has ca. 75 texts.[202] It covers a period of time from ca. 1880 to 1740 BC, but for this study only the texts from the period between 1880 and 1792 are taken into account (the reigns of Sumu-la-El until Sîn-muballiṭ). The vast majority of the texts concern the purchase of real estate by members of the Iddin-Lagamal family. In addition, some other text genres are also represented. For example: leases, legal documents concerning property rights, adoptions contracts, and administrative documents.

---

[200] Goddeeris 2002:251-304.
[201] De Boer 2013a.
[202] Goddeeris 2002:225-249.

3.4.3 *Archives from the Diyala region:*

3.4.3.1 Tutub

All texts from Tutub are from the so-called Sîn temple archive, it contains 111 texts.[203] The dating of this archive is difficult, but it probably ran from ca. 1900 until 1870 BC. It contains mostly loan documents and sales of real estate.

3.4.3.2 Nērebtum

Several groups of texts stem from Nērebtum. Most of them are from the time that the kings of Ešnunna ruled Nērebtum, but this was after the early Old Babylonian period. However, one group of documents does cover part of this early period: the Būr-Sîn/Ilšu-nāṣir archive.[204] The bulk of the archive was already published by Lutz.[205] The oldest texts in the archive belonged to Būr-Sîn. He was a chief merchant (UGULA DAM.GAR) and the son of one Ibbi-Tišpak.[206] The earliest 13 texts have Būr-Sîn as the main actor, 74 later dated texts have his son Ilšu-nāṣir as creditor. Apart from loan contracts we also have sale contracts, hire contracts, memos, and a court record. Texts are dated from Sîn-abūšu through the Ešnunna kings Ipiq-Adad II, Dādūša and finally Ibal-pi-El II: ca. 1840-1765 BC.

2.2.3 Nūr-Šamaš archive

The exact provenance of this archive is unknown: it was found by illicit diggers.[207] The vast majority of the texts from this archive are loans issued by a

---

[203] Harris 1955.

[204] Greengus 1979:6-8 and Greengus 1986:5-6. DeJong Ellis 1988:124 made the valid point that we only have statements from dealers as to this archive's provenance: it might just as well not be from Nērebtum.

[205] Lutz 1931 (often abbreviated as *UCP* 10/1). Other texts from this archive are found in Greengus 1979 (quoted as *OBTIV*) Greengus 1986 (quoted as *UCLMA* 9), *TIM* 3 124-127.

[206] Greengus 1986:5 n. 15. This is known from the text *OBTIV* 29 and Būr-Sîn's seal found thereupon, as well as *UCLMA* 9/2827 (published by Greengus 1986:238) and *UCLMA* 9/2831(published by Greengus 1986:239). See Charpin 1991c for the collation of the seal found on *OBTIV* 29: *bur*-ᵈEN.Z[U], [DUMU *i*]-*bi*-ᵈT[IŠPAK], ÌR *i**-[*pí*]-*iq**-[ᵈIM].

[207] The texts were published by Van Dijk in *TIM* 3 and studied by Rashid 1965.

man called Nūr-Šamaš. Almost all 121 texts are dated with year names from a king ruling in the Lower Diyala region: Sîn-abūšu. This king probably ruled between ca. 1865 and ca. 1823.

In a table we can summarize the following information (see next page):

	Sippar		Kiš and Damrum		Marad		Dilbat		Nērebtum		Nūr-Šamaš		Tutub		Total	
Number of individuals	6732		1417		296		650		396		390		576		10457	
Number of different pe personal names	2589		982		236		419		262		274		453		3888	
Number of hapax legonmenon names	1719		749		194		304		190		204		367		2601	
Number of dis lego-menon names	334		135		28		60		44		46		63		515	
% of hapax names	66%		76%		82%		73%		73%		74%		81%		66%	
% of hapax and dis legomenon names	79%		90%		94%		87%		89%		91%		95%		80%	
Number/% of Akkadi-an names	1631	63%	611	62%	183	78%	333	80%	202	77%	228	83%	278	61%	2341	60%
Number/% of Sumeri-an names	139	5%	38	4%	17	7%	18	4%	10	4%	5	2%	16	4%	192	5%
Number/% of Amori-te names	195	8%	87	9%	3	1%	8	2%	17	6%	10	4%	39	9%	298	8%
Number/% of Un-known names	622	24%	246	25%	33	14%	60	14%	33	13%	31	11%	120	26%	1055	27%
Condensation	0.38		0.69		0.80		0.64		0.66		0.70		0.79		0.37	
Average number of persons per name	2.60		1.44		1.25		1.55		1.51		1.42		1.27		2.69	
Degree of Homonymy	0.17%		0.09%		0.19%		0.22%		0.33%		0.29%		0.11%		0.14%	

3.4.4 *Concerning hapax and dis legomenon names*

In studying personal names one must distinguish between the 'stock of personal names': the total amount of possible names that were once given to children in a certain time and region, and the 'corpus of personal names': the amount of names currently at our disposal for study.[208] Differently put: the corpus of names we have is only a sample of the stock of personal of names that once was.

A hapax (legomenon) name is a name occurring only once in a given corpus. A dis (legomenon) name is a name occurring twice in a given corpus. Hapax and dis names are important in lists of personal names for various reasons: they are indicative of the richness or extent of a given corpus. However, hapax and dis legomenon names might also point towards strangers in a given locality. How? The idea is that people carrying a unique name have a high probability of being (offspring of) immigrants: their names simply do not conform to the local name usages.

As an example we might compare an immigrant country such as the United States with a non-immigrant country such as North Korea. We might expect the number of hapax names to be relatively high in the United States due to the high number of immigrants. North Korea on the other hand, would have a lower amount of hapax names, due to its largely autochthonous population sharing much of the same stock of names. So, a relatively high number of hapax and dis legomenon names might be an indication of immigration. We can calculate the amount of hapax names as follows:[209]

$$percentage\ of\ hapax\ names = \frac{\text{total amount of hapax names in a corpus}}{\text{total amount of different names in a corpus}}$$

For the largest corpus, the Sippar texts, 66% of the names are hapax names, for the smaller corpora this number is higher and averages at ca. 76%. For the total we again have 66% hapax names, but this is probably due to the weight of the Sippar corpus in the total.

If we take the hapax *and* dis legomenon names we arrive at much higher numbers: for Sippar 79% of the names occur only once or twice, for the other

---

[208] Chareille 2008:41.
[209] Chareille and Darlu 2010:49.

archives we arrive at an average of 91%. Among all the personal names from Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region, 80% of the names occur only once or twice.

These high numbers of hapax and dis legomenon names suggest either a high variation of the stock of possible personal names or perhaps a high number of immigrants. In order to delve into this deeper, we have to take the language of the personal names into consideration.

The main hypothesis is that the supposed immigrants would be the Amorites carrying Amorite and 'other' names and the autochthonous population would be carrying Akkadian, Sumerian and 'other' names. If the people carrying the Amorite names are in fact immigrants, we would expect their names to occur more often as hapax and dis legomenon names.

3.4.5 *Onomastic Case Studies*

3.4.5.1 The case of Sippar's Amorite onomasticon

Of the 195 Amorite names found in Sippar, only 27 occur three times or more, the other 168 names are hapax and dis names: 86%. This is higher than the 79% of hapax and dis names occurring for Sippar as a whole.

If we consider the 'other' names, the situation is even more interesting. There are 622 names that were not assigned to either the category Akkadian, Amorite or Sumerian, so they were classified as 'other'. Of these 622 names, only 26 occur three times or more, so the percentage of hapax and dis names in the 'other' category is 96%, much larger than the 79% for Sippar's total.

What about the majority of the population who bore Akkadian and Sumerian names? Of the total 1820 Akkadian and Sumerian names, 1287 are hapax and dis names, that is 70%: significantly lower than for the Amorite and 'other' names.

Conclusion: the proportion of names occurring only once or twice is higher for the group of Amorite and 'other' names. This attests to their rarity vis-à-vis the Akkadian and Sumerian names. An explanation for this relative newness of these names into the local stock of personal names could be immigration.

Only 8% of the available names account for more than half of the popula-tion:[210] this means that there was a core set of very frequently used personal names. Were there Amorite names amongst this core set? Not really: the first 'Amorite names' to appear on the list are Abi-Erah[211] (8 occurrences, no. 165) and Yarbi-El (8 occurrences, no. 160).[212] The other 'popular' Amorite names belonging to this 8% core set are:

- Adidum   (7 occurrences, no. 161)
- Mutum-El   (7 occurrences, no. 175)
- Iṣi-ašar   (6 occurrences, no. 204)
- Nāqimum   (6 occurrences, no. 212)
- Yantin-El   (6 occurrences, no. 230)
- Abdi-Erah   (5 occurrences, no. 231)
- Ahi-šakim   (5 occurrences, no. 234)
- Haliyatum   (5 occurrences, no. 244)
- Hayab-El   (5 occurrences, no. 245)
- Samu/Sumu-Erah   (5 occurrences, no. 272)
- Yatarum   (5 occurrences, no. 284)

These 13 most popular Sippar Amorite names account for nearly 5% of the core set of names, lower than the total percentage of Amorite names (8%): another indication that Amorite names were less frequent than Akkadian and Sumerian ones.

3.4.5.2 The case of the Diyala region Amorite onomasticon

The Early OB Sippar documentation carries a lot of weight, so let us consider a wholly different corpus and take all of the Diyala sites together (Tutub, Nērebtum, and the Nūr-Šamaš archive).

There is a total of 1362 individuals in the texts from the three Diyala sites who carry 989 different personal names, no less than 914 of these are hapax

---

[210] The 284 most frequent names account for 3502 of the 6732 names that make up Sip-par's corpus: $\frac{284}{3502} = 8{,}1\%$

[211] This name could technically also be an Akkadian name.

[212] The frequency list is also alphabetic, that is why Abi-Erah has a higher position than Yarbi-El, despite the fact that both names occur 8 times in the early OB Sippar corpus.

and dis names: 92%. The number of Amorite names is 63,[213] which is 6%. Only two Amorite names occur more than once or twice (Abdi-Erah (4) and Sumu-Erah(3)), so the percentage of hapax and dis names is 97%(!). What about the 'other names? We have 180 and only three of them occur three times or more (Gagum (7), Munānum (4), and Manānum (3)), so the percentage of hapax and dis names is even higher for the 'other' category: 98%.

Let us compare that to the 'indigenous' Akkadian/Sumerian population; there is a total of 589 different names for the Diyala region texts, 492 of these are hapax and dis names, making for 84%, again lower than for the Amorite and 'other' names.

3.4.5.3 The total Northern Babylonian and Diyala Amorite onomasticon

The above calculations can be done for all the individual cities, but the most interesting is of course to consider the whole corpus of personal names. Of the total amount of 298 Amorite names, 255 are hapax and dis names: 86%. Higher than the total of hapax and dis names: 80%. So, only 43 Amorite names occur three times or more.

There are 1055 'other' names on a total of 3888 different personal names: 27%. Only 218 of these names occur three times or more. So the percentage of hapax and dis names for the unknown names category is 79%, surprisingly close to the total amount of names occurring only once or twice: 80%.

How many hapax and dis names does the Akkadian and Sumerian name-carrying population have? 2533 of the total of 3888 names are Akkadian or Sumerian. Hapax and dis names are for Sumerian 153; and 1703 for Akkadian: this makes 73%.[214] This means that the 'indigenous Akkadian/Sumerian' population had less hapax and dis names than the population carrying an Amorite (86%) or unknown (79%) name: the same results as for the Sippar and Diyala corpus.[215]

Under section 3.4.5.1 we took a look at the core set of names in Sippar, we will do the same for the whole corpus. About half of all the persons (5317) in the texts carry one of the 355 most frequent names, differently put: 9% of the

---

[213] Less than the total from the table (17+10+39=66), because a few names occur in more than in city.

[214] $\frac{153+1703}{2533} = 73\%$.

[215] This is of course not such a surprise: the Sippar corpus accounts for 64% of the individuals and 67% of the names.

names was carried by 51% of the people.[216] Which is the most frequent Amorite name? At no. 124 we find Abi-Erah (13 occurrences). The other 'popular' Amorite names belonging to the 9% core set are

- Sa/Sumu-Erah (11 occurrences, no. 147)
- Abdi-Erah   (11 occurrences, no. 148)
- Adidum   (9 occurrences, no. 206)
- Mutum-El   (8 occurrences, no. 244)
- Nāqimum   (8 occurrences, no. 245)
- Yarbi-El   (8 occurrences, no. 246)
- Amurrum   (7 occurrences, no. 283)
- Iṣi-ašar   (7 occurrences, no. 284)
- Yahqub-El   (7 occurrences, no. 285)
- Yantin-El   (7 occurrences, no. 286)
- Yaqub-El   (7 occurrences, no. 287)
- Aqba-ahum   (6 occurrences, no. 348)
- Haliyum   (6 occurrences, no. 349)
- Hayab-El   (6 occurrences, no. 350)
- Yatarum   (6 occurrences, no. 351)

Only 15 of the 355 most popular early OB names are Amorite, which is 4%, much lower than the total percentage of Amorite names, which is 8%. This proves again that Amorite personal names are relatively much rarer than other names, most notably Akkadian ones.

The relative rarity of Amorite names might be the result of immigration (many hapax and dis names as the result of a new population), but could also mean that -for example- the city dwelling population tended to have less Amorite names than the countryside population, or that the upper strata of society had less Amorite names.

---

[216] The reason why we have not taken exactly 50% of the population has to do with the frequencies: 5306 persons have names that range from the most frequent ones until and including all the ones with a frequency of 6. If we had wanted exactly 50%, we would have to forego a few names with a frequency of 6, which would present problems, because -in this case- it would be nonsense to distinguish between names with the same frequency.

3.4.6 *Condensation, number of individuals per name, and degree of homonymy*

Another method for looking at the personal names is to see how 'rich' a given corpus is: that is how many names are available for a given population. In order to get an idea of the richness of the corpora we are studying, scholars have been using traditionally two indicators, the first is called the 'condensation' which reflects the total amount of personal names available for the sample population. It is calculated as follows:[217]

$$condensation = \frac{\text{total amount of different personal names in a corpus}}{\text{total number of individual persons in a corpus}}$$

The resulting number ranges between 0 and 1. A low condensation indicates that only a few different names were used in the corpus. A high condensation indicates a large amount of different personal names for the people within the corpus.[218] An area with a high number of immigrants would necessarily also have a high condensation.

Again the Sippar corpus is different from the other corpora: it has the lowest condensation of all with 0.38, whereas Kiš and Damrum, Marad, Dilbat, Nērebtum, Nūr-Šamaš and Tutub all have relatively high condensation numbers around 0.70. The total has a condensation of 0.37, undoubtedly again due to the heavy influence of the Sippar corpus. If we were to take these numbers at face value, we would state that Sippar was less an area of immigration than the other cities. A false assumption because the condensation in its simplicity does not account for the high number of hapax and dis legomenon names.[219]

The second traditional indicator to study a corpus of personal names is to calculate the number of individuals per name. It is actually the inverse calculation of the one done for the condensation:[220]

$$average\ number\ of\ individuals\ per\ name = \frac{\text{total number of individual persons in a corpus}}{\text{total amount of different personal names in a corpus}}$$

---

[217] Chareille 2008:42.

[218] If the condensation is 1, this means that everybody has a different name.

[219] For a critique of these 'traditional' methods: Chareille 2008:43-51.

[220] Chareille 2008:42.

A high number here suggests a small stock of personal names, and a low number a large stock of personal names (when it is 1, it means that everyone in the population has a different name). The results for our corpora from Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region is the same as for the condensation: Sippar would have the smaller stock of personal names than the other corpora and the total would follow again Sippar. The criticism towards this indicator is the same as it was for the condensation: it does not account for the large number of hapax and dis legomenon names.

In order to deal with the problems posed by the indicators 'condensation' and 'average number of individuals per name', Chareille has come up with another indicator that he calls the 'Taux d'Homonymie'.[221] In English this would translate roughly as 'Degree of Homonymy'. This indicator is less sensible to the size of a given population *and* accounts for the hapax and dis legomenon names. It describes the probability one has of choosing at random two individuals with the same name from the sample population. The calculation is:

$$TH = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K} nk(nk - 1)}{n(n - 1)}$$

TH is the 'Taux d'Homonymie'
n is the size of the population
nk is the number of times a given name occurs in the sample

Applied to the corpora from early Old Babylonian Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region we get:

	Sippar	Kiš&Damrum	Marad	Dilbat	Nērebtum	Nūr-Šamaš	Tutub	Total
Degree of Homonymy	0.17%	0.09%	0.19%	0.22%	0.33%	0.29%	0.11%	0.14%

If the *TH* is 1 it means that everybody in the population has the same name, when it approaches 0 it means that the stock of names is very rich. An exceptionally low number is found for the Kiš and Damrum and Tutub corpora, showing that the variation in names is the highest there. Higher numbers are found for Nērebtum and Nūr-Šamaš: indicative of a slightly more homoge-

---

[221] Chareille 2008:156-157 and p. 191.

nous name base. The Degree of Homonymy for Sippar, Marad, Dilbat and the total levitates around 0.15%.

A lower Degree of Homonymy suggests a larger stock of personal names and higher amounts of hapax,[222] as well as dis legomenon names. In a migration context this might indicate a higher influx of immigrants. For the Kiš and Damrum corpus this is especially interesting, because -as we shall see in chapter 4- when dealing with the separate family archives we see that Kiš and Damrum harbored more Amorites than Sippar. If people with an Amorite name are in fact descendants of an Amorite migration wave.

3.4.7 *Popular Names and Popular Gods*

In section 3.4.5.3 we had a look at the most popular Amorite names in the early OB corpus. But what about the most popular Akkadian, Sumerian, and unknown names? In the Appendix to chapter 3 we will find a list with the top 100 most popular names. Included in the table is their absolute frequency, the language of the name (ak=Akkadian, am=Amorite, s=Sumerian, o='other') and the cities where the name occurs.

The most popular early OB name is Sîn-iddinam. The whole top-10 consists of Akkadian names, the first Amorite name is not even on this list, as we already knew, it is Abi-Erah, no. 124. The first Sumerian name is Nanna-mansum, no. 15. The only other Sumerian name is Lu-Nanna, no. 88. There are no 'other' names in the top 100, so 98% of the names are Akkadian: a very high and unexpected number.

The 25 most popular names occur in almost all seven cities (Kiš and Damrum is counted as one). Notable exceptions are Amat-Šamaš (no. 19, only Sippar) and Lamassi (no. 23, Sippar and Tutub). The explanation is again the heavy influence of the Sippar corpus. There are many Sippar texts featuring *nadītum*'s: Amat-Šamaš and Lamassi are both typical *nadītum* names, and, incidentally, two of the only 7 female names occurring in the top 100.[223] This highlights again the lopsided nature of our corpus: we should have a 50-50 distribution of male and female names, but men occur more in often in texts from Mesopotamia's patriarchal culture.

---

[222] Chareille and Darlu 2010:50.
[223] The other female names are: Bēlessunu (no. 46), Iltāni (no. 69), Erištum (no. 90), Narāmtum (no. 91), and Aya-tallik (no. 95).

Perhaps the most striking feature of this list is the absolute popularity of Sîn/Nanna (the Moongod) in the personal names. 36 of the 100 names are composed with the god Sîn:

1	Sîn-iddinam	22	Būr-Sîn	55	Erīb-Sîn
2	Sîn-erībam	27	Iddin-Sîn	61	Sîn-ilum
4	Sîn-remēni	28	Sîn-bāni	67	Sîn-puṭram
5	Warad-Sîn	31	Ibbi-Sîn	68	Sîn-ublam
7	Imgur-Sîn	32	Sîn-māgir	71	Sîn-bēl-Ilī
9	Sîn-iqīšam	41	Sîn-ennam	74	Etel-pî-Sîn
12	Sîn-abūšu	42	Sîn-išmeanni	79	Ennam-Sîn
13	Sîn-šeme	43	Ibni-Sîn	81	Narām-Sîn
14	Išme-Sîn	44	Nabi-Sîn	85	Lu-Nanna
15	Nanna-mansum	45	Sîn-rabi	88	Sinīya
20	Sîn-gāmil	49	Sîn-muballiṭ	99	Sîn-imitti
21	Sîn-nāṣir	52	Nūr-Sîn	100	Sîn-nada

The second most popular god in personal names is the "personal God" (ilum),[224] which is attested in 12 names:

3	Ilšu-bāni	35	Ilšu-ibbīšu
6	Nabi-ilīšu	38	Ilī-iddinam
10	Nūr-ilīšu	56	Ilšu-abūšu
16	Warad-ilīšu	64	Apil-ilīšu
18	Awīl-ilim	76	Ilī-bāni
24	Narām-ilīšu	98	Ilum-bāni

---

[224] See Streck 2003-2005b for a summary of the bibliography on this subject.

If we then take a look at the 43 most popular Amorite names (in this case: Amorite names occurring three times or more):

1	Abi-Erah	16	Yatarum	30	Iṣi-sarê
2	Sumu-Erah	17	Abum-halum	31	Milkum
3	Abdi-Erah	18	Ahi-šakim	32	Mutum-me-El
4	Adidum	19	Haliyatum	33	Samu-ki-El
5	Mutum-El	20	Haya-šarrum	34	Samukum
6	Nāqimum	21	Yadidum	35	Yadihatum
7	Yarbi-El	22	Iṣi-gatar	36	Yadihum
8	Amurrum	23	Su-Ila	37	Yahkudum
9	Iṣi-ašar	24	Yahwi-El	38	Yakûm
10	Yahqub-El	25	Amīnum	39	Yaqbe-El
11	Yantin-El	26	Ašdiya	40	Yarši-El
12	Yaqub-El	27	Badiya	41	Yaškur-El
13	Aqba-ahum	28	Binniya	42	Yataratum
14	Haliyum	29	Hayam-didum	43	Yatar-El
15	Hayab-El				

We can see immediately that the Moongod Erah and El ('God') are the two most popular (and only) theophoric elements in these early OB Amorite personal names. This is a striking parallel with the Akkadian personal names. This parallel pleads against the 'Amorites' as newcomers, because such a phenomenon is typically the result of long-term contact and/or acculturation. We would have expected to see Addu and Dagan as the main gods in Amorite personal names, as it is the case in the Mari archives (our richest source for Amorite personal names). However, we cannot dismiss entirely the hypothesis that the 'Amorites' had settled in the region somewhere between 2000 and 1900 BC and that they took Erah and El as the main element in personal names over the course of several generations, resulting in the list of Amorite names seen above (which was made from texts dated between 1900 and 1791 BC). The fact that these Amorite names differ from the Mari Amorite names is strong evidence against the theory that these early OB Amorites came from Syria.