



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Amorites in the early Old Babylonian Period

Boer, R. de

Citation

Boer, R. de. (2014, May 28). *Amorites in the early Old Babylonian Period*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/25842>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/25842>

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

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



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

The ‘Amorite’ population in early Old Babylonian Northern Babylonia

We will take a look at Amorite personal names occurring in texts from Sippar, Kiš and Damrum, Marad, and finally Dilbat. We will consider the role of the people bearing these names in the texts: were they wealthy? Did they own land or other economical resources? How are they distributed over the different archives, were there more ‘Amorites’ in a given city or archive? etc.

4.1 Sippar in the early OB period

4.1.1 *Introduction*

Sippar is by far the richest textual source for the early OB period. It has long been known that Sippar actually consisted of two ‘twin towns’, a few kilometers apart.²²⁵ In the late OB period these two were distinguished from each other by a tribal designation; Tell Abu-Habbah was called Sippar-Yahrūrum and Tell ed-Dēr, Sippar-Amnānum. Sippar-Yahrūrum had Šamaš as its main divinity and Sippar-Amnānum had Annunītum.²²⁶ In addition to this, the Sippar hinterland had a number of villages like Halhalla,²²⁷ Kullizu, Hirītum, and Kār-Šamaš.

4.1.2 *The sources from early OB Sippar*

We can distinguish four groups of texts found during controlled excavations:²²⁸

²²⁵ Charpin 1988b and Charpin 1992.

²²⁶ Annunītum was a manifestation of Ištar, Myers 2002:93-104.

²²⁷ Apparently, archives from Halhalla were found in three baskets during illegal excavations and were subsequently sold to the British Museum, see Stol 1998.

²²⁸ We have excluded the -official- excavations done by Hormuzd Rassam in 1881-1882 (the AH-series in the British Museum) and by Scheil in 1894.

- 1) In 1941 Iraqi archaeologists excavated part of Tell ed-Dēr, they found a large number of OB texts, both early and late.²²⁹ In total, about 315 texts were found, mostly economic-administrative texts and letters.²³⁰
- 2) In the 1970's a Belgian expedition led by De Meyer started excavations at Tell ed-Dēr. The first report of the excavations (1971) contained eight copies, but in 1978 a supplementary sixty-seven tablets were published in copy, mostly from the early OB period.²³¹
- 3) The 'jackpot' of the Belgian expedition was the excavation of Ur-Utu's house in 1974.²³² It is the largest OB private archive found, containing some 2500 texts.²³³ The house and archive were abandoned in the late OB period, but it nevertheless contains a sizeable portion of (unpublished) early OB texts.
- 4) In 1978 Iraqi archaeologists began excavating at Abu-Habbah under the direction of Al-Jadir. The excavations continued into the 1980's and about two hundred OB texts were found.²³⁴ Al-Rawi and Dalley published 137 texts. The texts are essentially family archives. They range in time from the rule of Immerum to Samsu-iluna year 8. Though the amount of early OB texts is relatively modest (about thirty), they have proven to be an important addition.

However, the majority of the Sippar material was excavated illegally at the end of the 19th century. The documents found their way into many collections worldwide, among which the most prominent is undoubtedly that of the British Museum;²³⁵ other important collections are kept in the Louvre in Paris, the Vorderasiatisches Museum in Berlin, and the Yale Babylonian Collection. Important work has already been done by Goddeeris 2002: she went through all of the early OB material from Sippar and was able to establish several larger and smaller dossiers.

²²⁹ See the preliminary report by Baqir and Mustafa 1945, the summary made by Goddeeris 2002:167-169 and Edzard 1970a:13-15.

²³⁰ The economic-administrative texts were published by Edzard 1970a and their copies by Van Dijk in *TIM* 7. The letters remain largely unpublished, see Al-'Adhami 1967 and Leemans 1960:106-107.

²³¹ For the exact archaeological information: Gasche 1978 and the summary in Goddeeris 2002:216.

²³² See Gasche 1989 for the report on Ur-Utu's house.

²³³ See Tanret 2011 for an up-to-date synthesis on Ur-Utu and his archive.

²³⁴ Al-Rawi and Dalley 2000:5.

²³⁵ See Kalla's 1999 article on the history of the Sippar texts in the British Museum.

4.1.3 *Amorites in large family archives from early OB Sippar*

Nobody has studied the role that Amorites (people with Amorite names) actually played in these texts. This chapter attempts to fill this gap by systematically looking at each personal name and to determine what role this person had in a given document: buyer or seller, witness, debtor or creditor etc. We do this in order to establish whether there were many 'Amorites' owning property such as houses and fields and to see how many people with Amorite names witnessed transactions.

We can distinguish about fourteen large separate groups of texts among the early OB texts from Sippar. Two of these are more or less institutional archives: the so-called *TIM 7* organization and the *ED II* organization (see 4.1.5.3 below). The other twelve are private family archives.

We can state with relative certainty that we never possess the complete family archives. Usually, we are best informed about one person who inherited a part of the family's belongings. A typical archive contains 'older' texts from previous generations; documents that had an effect over a long period of time like contracts about the purchase of real estate or an adoption. These 'older' texts are mixed with more recent ones documenting the economic activities of the archive's last owner: loan contracts, lease contracts, administrative texts etc. From this mix of documents we are able to reconstruct part of the family tree and history. However, we never get the full picture. In this study the archives are referred to under the name of the oldest known family member, usually a father or grandfather of the one to whom the archive actually belonged.

Other people occur in these archives as buyers or sellers of property, as neighbors or as witnesses. They tend to belong to the same social milieu as the archive owners: sale contracts were often witnessed by neighbors and they often sold and bought property from each other. An excellent case in point is the group of OB texts from Halhalla, a small village community in the vicinity of Sippar.²³⁶ We shall see that family archives carrying a large proportion of Amorite/other names (not Akkadian or Sumerian) also have a large number of neighbors and witnesses with Amorite/other names. The same holds true for families with only Akkadian and Sumerian names.

If the Amorites had formed some kind of social elite in early OB Sippar, we expect to see that some of the most important families had Amorite origins.

²³⁶ Stol 1998.

The only way we can ascertain this is by looking at the family trees and the social environment in which these families operated. The following assumptions apply:

- Property owners are defined as people who are selling or buying a field or house. People owning a house or field next to the one being sold are also considered owners of property.
- People with an Akkadian (or Sumerian name) *and* a father with an Akkadian or Sumerian name are categorized as Akkadian/Sumerian.
- People with an Amorite name or whose father has an Amorite name are categorized as Amorite. The ‘actual’ Amorite names are in **bold** (according to the criteria on p. 50-51).
- People with a name that is not clearly Akkadian, Sumerian or Amorite are classified as ‘other’, their names are underlined.
- Names which are too broken to put into one of both categories are omitted.
- Whenever family members act together in a text, their family is counted as *one* property owner.
- The same does not apply to the witnesses; if two brothers feature as separate witnesses in a file, they are both counted.
- Family members are not counted amongst the other property owners in a given file. For example: in Abum-halum’s descendants’ file, his son Būr-Sîn and granddaughter Innabatum are not counted as separate property owners.
- The family genealogies are taken or modified from Goddeeris 2002. The reader can find the exact texts and more information belonging to the archives there as well.

4.1.3.1 Abum-halum’s descendants

The name Abum-halum is most probably Amorite.²³⁷ Most of the texts we have in this archive concern his son Būr-Sîn and Būr-Sîn’s daughter Innabatum, who was a *naditum* devotee of Šamaš. The dating of these texts is very early, we find oaths by kings Ammi-šura, Immerum, Sabium/Sumu-la-El and also Apil-Sîn for the last generation.

²³⁷ On this archive: Goddeeris 2002:44-47.

Amongst the property owners there is a relatively high proportion of ‘other’ names, but there are no clear Amorite names.

In the witnesses list from Būr-Sîn’s time non-Akkadian/Sumerian names and patronymics prevail. Amongst the witnesses in Innabatum’s texts the picture is completely different because she was a *naditum*. The witnesses in her text are predominantly fellow *naditum*’s, cloister personnel and priests connected to the Ebabbar temple. We do see three ‘actual’ Amorite names: Yadurum, Yabuš and Yarbi-El.

4.1.3.2 Nūr-Šamaš

Nūr-Šamaš’ father is not known, so there is a possibility that we might be dealing with more than one person by this name in the texts.²³⁸ Nūr-Šamaš apparently had children with three different women. This is reflected in the two genealogies in the Appendix. In addition to these children, Nūr-Šamaš also had a daughter called Sîn-nūri with an unknown woman. All names in Nūr-Šamaš’ family are Akkadian or Sumerian. Of his nephew, Lu-Ninšubur, we also possess a sizeable corpus of texts (see below). The dates for Nūr-Šamaš’ texts are all very early.

Akkadian and Sumerian names are predominant among the property owners in this file, but some interesting remarks can be made about the people with Amorite and ‘other’ names. Three of them are from one text: *MHET* II/1 4. In this text, Nūr-Šamaš buys an eleven IKU field in Haganum from five men, probably brothers. Two of these men have an Amorite name (Samsu-yapuhāt and Ibni-Adad’s son Yahatum), in addition to this, the owner of a neighboring field also has an Amorite name: Yatarum. Perhaps it is no coincidence that a witness in this text also has an Amorite name: Yasirkum. Other witnesses bear names without a clear linguistic affiliation: Parsium son of Lawiti, Adidum, son of Ili-tappê, and Ili-hitan son of Sumentil. It would appear that the Haganum district had a more than average number of people with Amorite and ‘other’ names.

The amount of Amorite/other names in Nūr-Šamaš’ list of witnesses is relatively high. Perhaps this is due to the early date of the texts: older texts tend to show a higher proportion of Amorite/other names. For the second

²³⁸ On Nūr-Šamaš’ file: Goddeeris 2002:47-53. Text *MHET* II/1 10 does not necessarily belong to Nūr-Šamaš’ file, the purchasers in this text are Šū-Šamaš and Nūr-ilīšū (contra Goddeeris 2002:48).

generation of Nūr-Šamaš' file, there are few Amorite/other names, especially compared with witnesses from Nūr-Šamaš' time. An explanation could be the high number of cloister personnel and *nadītum*'s among the Akkadian/Sumerian named witnesses. It would appear that one of Nūr-Šamaš' daughters is a *nadītum*: Bēletum.²³⁹ Another daughter of his, Munawwirtum, was a *kulmašītum* priestess. It appears that Nūr-Šamaš' children had few dealings with people carrying Amorite/other names. This is also true because one of the texts loosely connected to Nūr-Šamaš' file, *MHET* II/1 5, accounts for a number of Amorite/other names.

4.1.3.3 Lu-Ninšubur, son of Šū-Šamaš

Many of the texts in Lu-Ninšubur's file have already been included in the section on Nūr-Šamaš because Lu-Ninšubur is the main buyer of his uncle's and his nephews' property.²⁴⁰ The other property owners unique to this file are found in the Appendix. Most of the documents are from the reign of Sabium. Lu-Ninšubur's family (like Nūr-Šamaš') family only carries Akkadian names. Few ties to persons with Amorite or 'other' names can be established.

Only one name among the other property owners is good Amorite: Abi-Samas. Incidentally it is also one of the very few Amorite names with the sun(-god) as its theophoric element. Because of the size of Lu-Ninšubur's file, the number of witnesses is relatively high. As expected, we have a high proportion of witnesses with Akkadian and Sumerian names. There is nevertheless a handful of 'actual' Amorite names: Abdi-Erah, Adidum, Ahi-asad, Mutum-El, Samiya, Yaqbe-El and Yarbi-El. One of these is the 'mayor'-*rabiānum* of Sippar: Abdi-Erah (see below).

²³⁹ None of the texts concerning her (*CT* 8 28b, *CT* 48 30 and 59) mention her explicitly as a *nadītum*. But the fact that her father had given her possessions (claimed by her brothers in *CT* 48 30) and that she adopts a niece called Šāt-Aya as her heir (*CT* 48 59), is evidence enough for her status as a *nadītum*.

²⁴⁰ Goddeeris 2002:53-57. Goddeeris read Awīl-Ilabrat, but Tanret 1996:200-201, has made a convincing argument to read all instances of the name LÚ-^dNIN.ŠUBUR.(KA) in Sumerian as Lu-Ninšubur.

4.1.3.4 Dada-waqar’s daughters

Dada-waqar himself does not feature in these texts, but his three daughters do: Nuṭṭubtum, Narubtum and Ullum-eršet.²⁴¹ It is possible that he did not have any male offspring, because all three of his daughters are priestesses active in acquiring and selling real estate. Nuṭṭubtum and Narubtum are both *nadītum*’s of Šamaš and Ullum-eršet is a *kulmašītum*. Of the four texts in this file, one is dated to Immerum, one to Sabium and two to Apil-Sîn.

Two of the four texts in this file are witnessed by cloister officials and temple personnel. This accounts for about a third of the total witnesses. Two of them are in the category ‘other’: Bulālum son of Akum and Idādum son of Pala-Sîn. The names Akum and Idādum do not seem clearly Akkadian or Amorite. It appears that most families providing officials and priests to the temple and cloister of Šamaš come from families with only Akkadian and Sumerian names, which is also the case with other officials from the early OB period.²⁴²

4.1.3.5 Imgur-Sîn’s sons Annum-pîša and Qîš-Nunu

This archive concerns Imgur-Sîn’s sons Annum-pîša and Qîš-Nunu,²⁴³ as well as Annum-pîša’s children. Annum-pîša is one of the main protagonists in what Goddeeris calls the ‘TIM 7’ organization. Here only the property deeds of this family will be considered, because the texts published in *TIM 7* (Edzard 1970a) are almost exclusively loan contracts handed out by Annum-pîša. He must have had a long life because he is attested from Immerum to Sîn-muballiṭ. Obviously, the texts we have do not do justice to the wealth that Annum-pîša must have had as a result of his credit activities attested in *TIM 7*, so he must have owned more than these texts allow us to believe.

We see two Amorite names as property owners in this file; Iṣi-qatar and Yabušum. In the list of witnesses, the proportion Akkadian and Sumerian names versus Amorite and ‘other’ names is 46:5. It is perhaps no coincidence that three of the Amorite and ‘other’ names are all from one document, *TCL 1* 66/67.

²⁴¹ Goddeeris 2002:57-58.

²⁴² One can consult the study by Tanret and Suurmeijer 2011 for a complete listing.

²⁴³ Goddeeris 2002:58-59.

4.1.3.6 Dammāqtum's descendants

This family had large landholdings in the early OB period and seems to have had an Amorite origin. The name of one of its members attests to this: he is called Amurru.²⁴⁴ It is very likely that a whole tract of land (*tawwirtum*) was named after this man Amurru.

The early date of some of the documents and the Amorite roots of this family are reflected in the relatively high proportion of Amorite and 'other' names. Special mention must be made of Asaliya's children, Mayatum and Sumu-Erah, who had close connections to the family.²⁴⁵

We seem to have the actual archives of two *nadītum*'s from the family: Takūn-mātum and Huššutum. As a result of this, we frequently encounter cloister officials, accounting for 25% of the witnesses.

4.1.3.7 Arwium's sons

The family of Arwium must have been important in early OB Sippar.²⁴⁶ One of his sons, Ikūn-pīša, was the main recipient of the letters found in 1941 at Tell ed-Dēr. The family had dealings with the family of Dammāqtum's descendants. The only dated text from this file is from the reign of Sumu-la-El, though their lives also covered the reigns of the independent rulers of Sippar. The obvious political importance of this family is not reflected in this family's real estate holdings. The surviving documents show only that Arwium exchanged a four IKU field with Nūr-Šamaš.²⁴⁷ His son Hāliqum had furthermore sold a one IKU date-palm garden to the family of Dammāqtum's descendants, more specifically to Takūn-mātum, the daughter of Amurru (and a certain Rabatum, who is indicated as her 'mother'). This garden is later contested by Hāliqum's daughter Hiššatum (*CT* 45 1), but also by Hāliqum himself and a one Sumu-ramê and his sons (*CT* 6 42a). However, all of these claims are rejected.

²⁴⁴ Goddeeris 2002:60-62.

²⁴⁵ Goddeeris 2002:63-64.

²⁴⁶ Goddeeris 2002:62-63.

²⁴⁷ Three surviving documents also attest to Arwium's crediting activities (*TIM* 7 17, 51 and 130), which are not taken into consideration, because they contain no information about real estate holdings.

4.1.3.8 Sîn-eribam’s descendants (Akšaya’s family)

The dossier of this family is the largest in early OB Sippar and covers at least four generations.²⁴⁸ The main files within this archive seem to have concerned Sîn-remēni, Iltāni, Akšāya and Huzālatum. They must have had some link with the central authorities in Babylon, because in *CT* 4 19b Sîn-remēni has dealings with royal landholdings and his brother Nakkārūm is called ‘servant of Sumu-la-El’ on his seal.²⁴⁹ Everybody in this important family carries an Akkadian name, making an Amorite descent less likely. The high proportion of Amorite names is partly due to the fact that this family has many activities in Halhalla, texts from this town show many Amorite names.

From all the early OB files, this file has the largest amount of witnesses. It should not be surprising that the number of Amorite and ‘other’ witnesses is also high. We encounter the social elite from the village of Halhalla, including the priests of the local god Ikūnum (Abum-ṭābum and Warad-Amurrim), the local authorities (*rabiānum*’s Šamaš-ilum and Imgur-Sîn, the NU.BANDA₃ Awīl-ilim), Sîn-ilum the son of Pūm-rabi, Dawdānum’s family, and Nabi-Šamaš the son of Ahūni. The family of Sîn-eribam’s descendants had dealings with all these families. For only one connected family we have also part of the archives: the Me’isum family (see below). Some cloister and Šamaš temple personnel is also found among the witnesses these occurrences are due to the *nadītum*’s within the family: Iltāni, Huzālatum, Lamassā, and Amat-Šamaš.

The proportion of Akkadian/Sumerian versus Amorite/other witnesses is 195:53. Because of this large number, there is also a large number of ‘actual’ Amorite names: 21. It is interesting to note that most of these names are found in only five texts: *CT* 4 9b, *CT* 6 46 and *MHET* II/1 25, 29 and 51. These texts account for 14 of the 21 Amorite names. This demonstrates that people with Amorite names tend to appear clustered together in texts.

4.1.3.9 The Me’isum family

This is another important family from early OB Halhalla.²⁵⁰ The father of the main actor Utu-zimu has a linguistically undetermined name: Me’isum. Utu-zimu was a chief merchant at the time of Apil-Sîn.

²⁴⁸ Goddeeris 2002:64-71, Harris 1969, Stol 1998:439-441, Kalla 2002:135-136 and p. 153.

²⁴⁹ Frayne 1990:326.

²⁵⁰ Goddeeris 2002:76-78 and Stol 1998:443.

This family had clear links with the family of Sîn-erībam's descendants. Amongst the witnesses we see the same names and families as we did in that archive; this is partly due to the fact that three texts belong to both files. The most important reason is however the shared social milieu of both families who lived in early OB Halhalla.

4.1.3.10 Ipqu-Ištar's descendants

This is a smaller file²⁵¹, all five texts are dated to the reign of Apil-Sîn. No single person with an Amorite/other name owns property in the transactions that survived from this family's archive.

Several of the witnesses found in this file also occur in Halhalla texts. In addition, the same witnesses often feature in more than one text. This could either mean that the transactions were made around the same period, or that the fields bought were in very close proximity, witnesses are often neighbors and people from the same social milieu. There are almost no people with Amorite or 'other' names in this family's file, which is surprising, in view of the link with Halhalla that some witnesses have.

4.1.3.11 Abum-ṭābum's sons

This is a medium-sized file.²⁵² All texts are from the reigns of Sabium and Apil-Sîn. It is obvious that we have the texts from the files of Amat-Šamaš. The proportion of Akkadian and Sumerian names versus Amorite and 'other' names is 13:2. There are two 'actual' Amorite names, both of them belonging to *nadītum*'s, which is a rarity because these women usually have stereotypical names. One of these women, Yataratum, daughter of Šamaš-rabi, appoints Etel-pi-Sîn, the son of Abum-ṭābum, as heir. This often happens between a niece and her uncle or nephew, so it could be that Abum-ṭābum and Šamaš-rabi have the same father.

²⁵¹ Goddeeris 2002:78-79.

²⁵² Goddeeris 2002:79-81.

4.1.3.12 Puzur-Akšak’s family

Puzur-Akšak came originally to Sippar from Šadlaš (*MHET* II/1 109 :4-5).²⁵³ The commercial activities of his son Erib-Sin are well documented. His daughter Lamassī was a *naditum*. There are relatively few property owners with an Amorite or ‘other’ name in this dossier.

The fact that this is an ‘immigrant’ family makes this file more interesting. The oldest member, Puzur-Akšak, must have had connections to his home town Šadlaš which were continued by his son Erib-Sin. Šadlaš probably had a strong ‘Amorite’ presence.²⁵⁴ The number of witnesses with Amorite or ‘other’ names in this file is however low. The high number of witnesses with Akkadian and Sumerian names is again in part to be explained by a *naditum*, Iltāni, daughter of Puzur-Akšak.

4.1.3.13 Important family archives we do not have

We do not have a complete picture of early OB Sippar. There are important families that we know of, but of which we do not have any texts. The most important example is perhaps the family of the SANGA’s of Šamaš.²⁵⁵ The SANGA was both the most important priest and main administrator of Šamaš’ Ebabbar temple. We know the family of the SANGA’s of Šamaš mostly because they witnessed a lot of transactions like sales and leases. As the most important witnesses they often impressed their cylinder seal on the tablets. These impressions contain useful information about the priestly family. The SANGA’s of Šamaš all belonged to one family and the office was handed down from father to son.²⁵⁶ The earliest known SANGA was called Annum-pi-Šamaš, son of Warad-Sîn. This family must have had its roots in Sippar, consequently

²⁵³ Goddeeris 2002:135-141, Harris 1962:9 and Harris 1976:148-151. On Šadlaš: Stol 2006-2008a.

²⁵⁴ We have several references to rulers of Šadlaš with Amorite names, see chapter 7.

²⁵⁵ Actually, the title ‘SANGA of Šamaš’ could refer to three offices: the ‘first’ SANGA of Šamaš was the most important one, he led Šamaš’ Ebabbar temple in Sippar-Yahrūrum (Tell Abu-Habbah). From the reign of Sabium onwards, we see that a ‘second’ SANGA took office (who was later called the ‘SANGA of Aya’). Finally, there was a separate SANGA for Šamaš’ Edikuda temple in Sippar-Amnānum (Tell ed-Dēr). We are dealing here with the first SANGA of Šamaš.

²⁵⁶ With the exception of the last known first SANGA (time of Ammi-šaduqa) who was an uncle of the previous SANGA. In one case the office was also handed over from brother-to-brother (time of Ammi-ditana). See the useful genealogy and study in Tanret 2010:237.

we find no Amorite names in the surviving texts. The family seems nonetheless to have followed a certain pattern in name-giving, but all names are Akkadian.²⁵⁷

The second important archive or archives that we are lacking are those of Sippar's 'mayors': the *rabiānum*'s.²⁵⁸ As opposed to the SANGA this office was not held by one family. The exact function and tenure of the *rabiānum* has been discussed many times, without providing us a definite answer. This is partly due to the fact that the word *rabiānum* was used differently throughout the OB period.²⁵⁹ For OB Sippar, a number of *rabiānum*'s are attested. It seems that the people holding this office did not do so for life. The most recent discussion is in Seri 2005.²⁶⁰ What the *rabiānum* did exactly in (early) OB Sippar will not be discussed further, it is nonetheless clear that he was an important local official. As is the case with the SANGA's, we encounter the *rabiānum*'s mainly as witnesses to transactions. The following men are attested as early OB *rabiānum*:

- Abdi-Erah²⁶¹
- Amri-ilišu²⁶²
- Awīl-Ištar²⁶³

²⁵⁷ On this sequence: Tanret 2010:201-202.

²⁵⁸ See already Harris 1975:60-62 and Stol 1976:81-82. See Charpin 2007:169-170 on the translation of this title.

²⁵⁹ Two different, but connected, interpretations are a kind of (Amorite) tribal leader and the leader of a local community. See Stol 1976:73-96.

²⁶⁰ Seri 2005:51-96 and the important review article by Charpin 2007, notably p. 170-176. Charpin has demonstrated convincing parallels between the *rabiānum* seen in southern Mesopotamia and the *sugāgum* from the Mari texts.

²⁶¹ The same name is also found in VAS 8 64:7', undated (context unclear) and MHET II/1 34:2, Sabium (as the owner of a neighboring field). *ab-di-a-ra-ah*, CT 8 4a:36, Sîn-muballiṭ, *ab-di-a-ra-ah*, MHET II/1 109:19, Sîn-muballiṭ, *ab-di-ra-ah ra-bi-a-an* ZIMBIR^{KI}, CT 8 1a:10', Sîn-muballiṭ, *ab-di-a-ra-ah*, VAS 9 40:14, Sîn-muballiṭ 14.

²⁶² Probably a sandhi for Amūr-ilišu, *am-ri-i-lí-šu ra-bi-a-nu-um*, CT 47 16:18, Sîn-muballiṭ 13.

²⁶³ Awīl-Ištar was a common name in OB Sippar, however an Awīl-Ištar, son of Marduk-nāšir is mentioned in CT 48 5:3, Hammurabi 37. Two slaves are sold in this text by three of Marduk-nāšir's children to Ibni-Marduk, also a son of Marduk-nāšir. The only precisely dated text in which an Awīl-Ištar, *rabiānum* features is CT 48 1, from Sîn-muballiṭ 12, a time difference of 49 years, making it unlikely, but not impossible that the same man is involved. If this is true, then we have a father and son exercising the *rabiānum* office. *a-wi-il-iš-tár ra-bi-<a>-nu*, CT 47 12:8, Sîn-muballiṭ, *a-wi-il-iš-tár ra-bi-a-nu*, CT 48 1:10, Sîn-muballiṭ 12, *a-wi-il-iš-tár*, VAS 8 71:29, Sîn-muballiṭ.

- Marduk-nāšir²⁶⁴
- Sumu-Akšak²⁶⁵

One can immediately see in the footnotes the following points: almost all of the examples are from the time of Sîn-muballit, with Marduk-nāšir as the notable exception. For the years Sîn-muballit 12, 13 and 14 we have three different men as *rabiānum*: Awīl-Ištar, Amri-ilīšu and Sumu-Akšak. However, more interesting for our purposes is the fact that two of these five men bear an Amorite name: Abdi-Erah and Sumu-Akšak.

There are strong indications that the king of Babylon appointed the *rabiānum* in Sippar, despite Seri's statement to the contrary.²⁶⁶ Charpin argues that the council of elders put forward a candidate who was in turn ratified by the palace.²⁶⁷ Let us consider the case of Išar-Lim.²⁶⁸ This man was a general of Išme-Dagan, who was able to ally himself closely with Hammurabi of Babylon around 1770 BC. In Hammurabi's 24th year, we see that Išar-Lim had become the *rabiānum* of Sippar. It seems hard to believe that in this case the elders of Sippar would have put forward the stranger Išar-Lim as their *rabiānum*. Perhaps he was appointed directly by Hammurabi as some kind of reward. Additional evidence is found on the seal impression of the *rabiānum* Abdi-Erah, found on *MHET* II/1 109: *ha-ʿab ʿdi-ra-ah*, *DUMU a-lī-ILLAT-ti*, *ir a-pil*-^dEN.ZU. This inscription tells us that Abdi-Erah's father had an Akkadian name (Ali-tillati) and that he had this seal made under Apil-Sîn's reign. In addition to this we can state that a servant line dedicated to a king (*ir a-pil*-^dEN.ZU) was not

²⁶⁴ ^dAMAR.UTU-*na-ši-ir*, *CT* 4 7a:1, Apil-Sîn 9, ^dAMAR.UTU-*na-šir ra-bi-a-num*, *MHET* II/5 692:19', undated, ^dAMAR.UTU-*na-ši-ir, ra-bi-a-an* ZIMBIR^{KI}, *MHET* II/5 837:8-9, undated, ^d[^dAMAR.UTU-*na-šir ra-bi-a-nu-um*, *TCL* I 73:30, Sîn-muballit, ^dAMAR.UTU-*na-šir*, 'x x' ra x x [...], *TLB* 222:5'-6', undated.

²⁶⁵ *su-mu-ÚH*^{KI} *ra-bi-an* ZIMBIR^{KI}, *MHET* II/1 100(+*CT* 45 18):16, Sîn-muballit, *su-mu-ÚH*^{KI}, *CT* 2 46:17, Sîn-muballit 14, *su-mu-ÚH*^{KI}, *CT* 2 47:16, undated.

²⁶⁶ Seri 2005:95: 'That the *rabiānum* was not a royal appointee becomes clear from *rabiānum* seals' (...).

²⁶⁷ Charpin 2007:172. Mainly based on evidence from Mari and a letter from Šaduppûm.

²⁶⁸ For more detailed information, see: Collon 1987, supplemented by Van Koppen 2002 and Charpin and Ziegler 2003:198.

common in the early OB period. It is very well possible that Apil-Sîn or Sîn-muballiṭ had promoted Abdi-Erah to this post.²⁶⁹

Sumu-Akšak is a special case, this person and his family have been studied recently by Van Koppen and Lacambre.²⁷⁰ They describe how Sumu-Akšak is encountered as a high ranking official from Sîn-muballiṭ 12 to 14. He first occurs as a witness (as the son of Munawwirum) to the sale of a royal field²⁷¹ and subsequently as the *rabiānum* of Sippar. Two of his sons are known as well: Muti-Amnānum²⁷² and Zimri-hammu,²⁷³ both good Amorite names. Van Koppen and Lacambre speculate that Sumu-Akšak may have been a disgraced Ešnunna official. He must have fled to the Babylonian court during a political crisis over Narām-Sîn's succession around Sîn-muballiṭ's 12th or 13th year. After the political crisis, Sumu-Akšak returned home to Ešnunna. His son Mutu-Amnānum served the new Ešnunnean king Dānum-tahaz and his other son Zimri-hammu had a career as a Babylonian official under Hammurabi.

To sum up: there is some evidence that the *rabiānum* was nominated by the Babylonian king in the early OB period. It is not surprising that these *rabiānum*'s were men of influence and standing. That two of them had Amorite names is evidence that an elite with Amorite affinities *and* connections to the Babylonian court existed.

2.3.14 Conclusions: Amorites in large early OB Sippar family archives

The evidence from the files discussed in the preceding sections can be recapitulated in the table below:²⁷⁴

²⁶⁹ If Abdi-Erah was indeed appointed as *rabiānum* by Apil-Sîn, we would have to explain the fact that Marduk-nāšir was also a *rabiānum* attested in the reigns of Apil-Sîn and Sîn-muballiṭ.

²⁷⁰ Van Koppen and Lacambre 2008-2009:168-173.

²⁷¹ VAS 13 9:13 and its case Szlechter *TJA* plate 44 UMM H 56:13 dated to Sîn-muballiṭ 12.

²⁷² BM 81641, seal inscription (published by Van Koppen and Lacambre 2008-2009): [m]u-ti-am-na-nu-um, [DU]MU su-mu-ŪH^{KI}, [IR d]a-an-nu-um-ta-ha-az.

²⁷³ JCS 11:23 no. 10:14

²⁷⁴ This table only considers the property owners and witnesses from early OB Sippar. For a more complete picture considering all people from early OB Sippar, see chapter 6.

File name			Akk/Sum names	% of total	Am/other names	% of total	Am. names	% of total
1	Abum- halum	property owners	4		5		-	
		witnesses	90		26		5	
		total	94	75%	31	25%	5	4%
2	Nūr- Šamaš	property owners	26		14		6	
		witnesses	90		37		12	
		total	116	69%	51	31%	18	11%
3	Lu- Ninšubur	property owners	25		3		1	
		witnesses	90		20		7	
		total	115	83%	23	17%	8	6%
4	Dada- waqar	property owners	10		3		-	
		witnesses	44		7		2	
		total	54	84%	10	16%	2	3%
5	Imgur- Sîn	property owners	13		2		2	
		witnesses	46		5		2	
		total	59	89%	7	11%	4	6%
6	Dammāq tum	property owners	6		7		4	
		witnesses	62		23		10	
		total	68	69%	30	31%	14	14%
7	Arwium	property owners	1					
		witnesses	3					
		total	4	-				-
8	Sîn- erībam	property owners	41		24		8	
		witnesses	195		53		21	
		total	236	75%	77	25%	29	9%
9	Me'isum	property owners	13		3		1	

		witnesses	52		19		11	
		total	65	75%	22	25%	12	14%
10	Ipqu-Ištar	property owners	8		-		-	
		witnesses	27		1		1	
		total	35	97%	1	3%	1	3%
11	Abum-ṭābum	property owners	13		2		2	
		witnesses	89		14		5	
		total	102	86%	16	14%	7	6%
12	Puzur-Akšak	property owners	13		2		1	
		witnesses	88		5		1	
		total	101	94%	7	6%	2	2%
Grand total			Akk/Sum names	% of total	Am/other names	% of total	Am. names	% of total
		property owners	173	73%	65	27%	25	11%
		witnesses	876	81%	210	19%	77	7%
		total	1049	79%	275	21%	102	8%

Although it is difficult to determine whether certain names are Amorite or not, the category of Amorite and ‘other’ names comprises barely 21%. The people with Akkadian and Sumerian names form a large majority of 79%. So, even if we take an extreme viewpoint, namely: all people with an Amorite and ‘other’ name are Amorite or have Amorite origins, the Amorites remain a (sizeable) minority. If we take a minimalist position and count only the ‘actual’ Amorite names, the number is even smaller: 8%.²⁷⁵

There is a difference between the percentages of property owners and witnesses; there are slightly more people with Amorite and ‘other’ names as property owners (27%) than as witnesses (19%). However, it would go too far to interpret this as evidence for an Amorite landowning elite.

All of the twelve families under consideration had at least one daughter who was a *naditum*. The social environment of these women is often limited

²⁷⁵ This percentage includes people with an Akkadian/Sumerian/‘other’ name but with a father carrying an Amorite name.

to their own family, other *naditum*'s and temple and cloister personnel. This personnel carried almost always Akkadian or Sumerian names and as a consequence, they are responsible for a very large percentage of the total number of Akkadian and Sumerian names, showing again how biased our documentation actually is.

For those families with suspected Amorite origins (that is: one of the family members has an Amorite or 'other' name), we can state that the proportion of Amorite and 'other' names among the property owners and witnesses found in their family archives is higher than among families with only Akkadian and Sumerian names. Within these archives we have several texts that show people with actual Amorite names clustered together.²⁷⁶ Examples of such families are Abum-halum's descendants, Dammāqtum's descendants, and Me'isum's descendants. The oldest generations of these families have invariably Amorite or 'other' names (Abum-halum, Dammāqtum's son Amurru and Me'isum). The younger generations all carry good Akkadian or Sumerian names; showing (perhaps) a tendency towards assimilation, or at least a decreased popularity of Amorite and 'other' names.

The file of Abum-halum's descendants demonstrates also that the proportion of Amorite/other names was relatively higher earlier in the early OB period: the texts from Būr-Sîn's time have more witnesses with Amorite and 'other' names than those from his daughter Innabatum, even if we compensate for the temple and cloister personnel in Innabatum's texts.

Nūr-Šamaš' family, having only Akkadian and Sumerian names has a relatively high count of Amorite and 'other' names in their documents; a plausible explanation might be the very early date of many texts from this file: many documents include oaths by Ilum-ma-Ila, Immerum and Sumu-la-El.

Families without suspected Amorite roots can nonetheless have a high number of Amorite or 'other' names in their family archives. An example of such an archive is the one of Sîn-eribam's descendants. In fact, the highest total of Amorite names is found in that file: 29 in total, accounting for almost a third of the total percentage of actual Amorite names in Sippar. The interesting thing is, that this family, together with that of Me'isum, had most of its dealings in Halhalla. If we add the number of Amorite names from Me'isum's file, we get a total of 41 names, 40% of the total. This may suggest that a large part of the Amorite population did not live in Sippar itself, but rather in the

²⁷⁶ The best examples are: *CT* 4 9b, *CT* 6 46, *MHET* II/1 5, 29 and 51 and *MHET* II/5 588.

surrounding villages. This phenomenon also occurs in the late OB period, where Kassite and other mercenaries also inhabited settlements and fortresses away from the main towns.

The people with ‘actual’ Amorite names are often seen as witnesses only once or twice; it is clear that the vast majority of the Amorite name carrying population is not documented in the texts from the more well-to-do indigenous Sippar families.

4.1.4 *Amorites in smaller archives from early OB Sippar*

The surviving documents from early OB Sippar do not only concern larger family archives. An almost equal amount of texts concerns families or persons who feature only once, twice or three times in the Sippar corpus, that is why we can call them ‘smaller files’. To study the amount of property owners with an Amorite or ‘other’ name versus those with an Akkadian or Sumerian name, they were all assembled into one large table (see the Appendix to chapter 4). This is only done for the property owners as it seems superfluous to also discuss the personal names found in the witness lists in these smaller files. This only made sense for the larger family archives in order to get an idea about their social milieu, but not for many much smaller files.

Grand totals	Akk/Sum names	% of total	Am/other names	% of total	Am. names	% of total	Am. families	% of total
property owners	579		178		80		68	
		76%		24%		11%		9%

The totals in percentages of property owners are about the same as the twelve families we considered here above. This only confirms the general picture: about 75% of the property owning population bore good Akkadian or Sumerian names, and 25% of the population did not. Of the total property owning population, 11% carried actual Amorite names.²⁷⁷

We can notice some of the same phenomena as we did for the people with Amorite names in the larger family archives. The first is that people with

²⁷⁷ This does not mean that 11% of the property owning population are Amorites. Some of the names that were qualified as ‘other’ (by underlining them) might in fact be Amorite. As stated above, the actual number of Amorite names might be slightly higher, but at least not more than 25% of the total population (the Amorite/other names).

Amorite names tend to occur clustered in certain texts.²⁷⁸ These texts are not full of Amorite names, but usually have two or three good Amorite names, attesting to a social milieu with Amorite ties. A second phenomenon we already saw with the larger family archives is the importance of Halhalla. Several texts with a strong Amorite presence are again from Halhalla.²⁷⁹

4.1.5 *Amorites as debtors, creditors, lessees and in various other roles*

After having reviewed people with Amorite names who own property and witness texts, it is time to see what other roles they had in the cuneiform texts. We will take a look at people with Amorite names as debtors or creditors, in lease contracts, in the so-called *ED II* organization and in various other contexts.

4.1.5.1 Debtors/Creditors

The total number of creditors found in early OB Sippar is 36, with the gods *Sîn* and *Šamaš* occurring as creditors as well.²⁸⁰ Some of these creditors are well known to us from a specific organization or a file of documents, like *Annum-piša*,²⁸¹ *Ir-Enlil* and his daughter *Amat-Šamaš*,²⁸² or *Urduku*.²⁸³ However, most creditors are seen lending silver or barley in only a single text. Except for a few linguistically unclear names or patronyms, all creditors bear Akkadian or Sumerian names.²⁸⁴ People investing in business ventures (to be distinguished from creditors) are also uniquely carrying Akkadian or Sumerian names.²⁸⁵

²⁷⁸ Examples are: *MHET* II/1 16, 17, 26, 34, 43, 56, 74, 99, *CT* 4 33b and 47b, *CT* 8 26b, *CT* 45 6, *CT* 48 10, *BDHP* 10, and *BE* 6/1 7.

²⁷⁹ Like *MHET* II/1 26, 56, 99, and *CT* 47 7. A list with confirmed Halhalla texts is found in Stol 1998:417.

²⁸⁰ *Sîn*: *ED* II 37 and *Šamaš*: *CT* 6 40, *YOS* 14 148, *CT* 47 117 and *TIM* 7 16. See Charpin 2005c for more on gods as creditors.

²⁸¹ The son of *Imgur-Sîn* and brother of *Qiš-Nunu*, known from the *TIM* 7 organization.

²⁸² Goddeeris 2002:106-107.

²⁸³ Known from the *ED* II organization, Goddeeris 2002:216-217.

²⁸⁴ These linguistically unclear names are: *Amat-Šamaš* LUKUR ^dUTU d. *Agganānum* (GEME₂-^dUTU LUKUR NÍG ^dUTU, DUMU.MUNUS *ag-ga-na-nu-um*, *CT* 4 21b:3-4; *Kišiya* (*ki-si-ia*, *ED* II 36:3), and *Zablum* (*za-ab-lum*, *PBS* VIII/2 195:4).

²⁸⁵ The six people investing in business ventures are: *Adad-iddinam* and *Warad-Amurru* (^dIM-*i-din-nam*, ^ù IR-^dMAR.TU, *BAP* 79(=VAS 8 8):1-2); *Agum* (*a-gu-um*,

There are 81 different debtors to the loans from early OB Sippar, a sizeable number of them carrying linguistically undeterminable names or patronyms (18, see Appendix), but only a few actual Amorite names or patronyms occur: Mutum-Upi, Hayam-didu, and Yantin-El.

Whereas the creditors carry Akkadian or Sumerian names, about 25% of the debtors have Amorite or ‘other’ names or patronyms. However, this is insufficient to argue that these people were poorer. Many of the debtors with Amorite or ‘other’ names occur in the *ED II* or *TIM 7* texts.

4.1.5.2 Leases

Almost all (field) leases we have from early OB Sippar concern fields leased by *nadītum* women.²⁸⁶ Some of these *nadītum* women are from families with apparently Amorite ties: Innabatum (Abum-halum’s family), Huššutum (Dammāqtum’s family) and Ruttum and Yaphatum, the daughters of Iši-qatar.

The lease documents from early OB Sippar contain 39 different lessees. Less than a quarter of the lessees carries an Amorite or ‘other’ name, which roughly coincides with the percentage of Amorite and ‘other’ names found among the property owners.

4.1.5.3 The *ED II* Organization

The texts from the ‘*ED II* Organization’ were excavated by Belgian archaeologists at Tell-ed Dēr in the 1970’s.²⁸⁷ The *ED II* Organization (termed ‘the central building of complex AI’ by Goddeeris 2002:216-220) was housed in a residential quarter and its documents are all dated to the early OB period.

The largest group of texts was found in ‘sondage A’ and published in copy in 1978.²⁸⁸ The total number of texts and fragments amounts to 75. Goddeeris identified two chronologically and prosopographically different groups, one

Edubba 7 115:4); Akšak-rabi (ÚH^{KI}-ra-bi, *Edubba* 7 123:3); Awīl-ilim (*a-wi-il*-DINGIR, *TIM* 7 15:2); Dādiya (*da-di-ia*, *Edubba* 7 122:2), and Nabi-Enlil (*na-bi*-^dEN.LÍL, *TIM* 7 28:2).

²⁸⁶ See Goddeeris 2002:100-104.

²⁸⁷ The name is derived from the abbreviation of the book in which most of the texts were published, *Tell ed-Der II progress reports* edited by De Meyer in 1978.

²⁸⁸ De Meyer 1978:147-184. Eight texts were already found during the first campaign in February 1970. Maps of these excavations (Plan 3 and 5) can be found at the end of De Meyer *et al* 1971.

from the time of Sîn-muballit,²⁸⁹ and the other from the period of Sippar’s independent rulers.²⁹⁰ For the latter group (the *ED* II organization) Goddeeris distinguishes between crediting, commercial, agricultural and administrative activities in the texts. The questions which interests us here is: what role did people with Amorite personal names play in this organization? In order to answer that question, we must look at all the Amorite and linguistically uncertain personal names from the texts, which can be found in the Appendix to Chapter 4.²⁹¹

The amount of Amorite and ‘other’ names is relatively low in the text corpus of the *ED* II organization: about 15%. The number of ‘actual’ Amorite names is much lower, only 9, which is 5%. Given the very early date of these texts, these percentages are very low. We would have expected a higher proportion of Amorite names, as in other early OB documents.

The people central to the *ED* II organization seem to have exclusively carried Akkadian and Sumerian names (Ur-dukuga, Ennum-Sîn, Šu-Ninsun, Sîn-iddinam, and Enlil-ennam): their milieu existed also primarily of people with Akkadian and Sumerian names. However, some of their business dealings, like their crediting and agricultural activities involve people with Amorite or ‘other’ names.²⁹² In addition, the *ED* II text corpus is the only one providing us with year names of the Sippar ruler Ammi-šura (see chapter 5).

4.1.5.4 Amorite and ‘other’ names occurring in various texts

A large number of people with Amorite and ‘other’ names occur in administrative lists registering rations, expenditures, etc. We will consider these first, after which the Amorite names in other contexts will be studied (see Appendix).

The numerous administrative lists with personal names are seldom dated and it is therefore difficult to assign such texts to the early OB period without prior detailed prosopographical research. The *TIM* 7 organization has many administrative texts datable to the early OB period. A large number of unique

²⁸⁹ Goddeeris 2002:150; *ED* II 34, 35, 36 and 37.

²⁹⁰ Goddeeris 2002:217-220.

²⁹¹ It is difficult to determine for every text published in *ED* I and *ED* II whether they belonged to the *ED* II organization or not, for the sake of argument we have chosen to include all texts, except for those belonging to the separate archive from Sîn-muballit’s era.

²⁹² Eg. the field leases *ED* II 62 and 68, but also *ED* II 29.

‘other’ names are only found in these texts. Only a few actual Amorite names figure in the *TIM* 7 texts.

There are 28 persons with Amorite names in the administrative lists from the *TIM* 7 organization and 97 people with ‘other’ linguistically uncertain names. There are 515 Akkadian/Sumerian names. This means that 20% of the people had an Amorite or ‘other’ name, and 4% an ‘actual’ Amorite name. These percentages are lower than those for the property owners. This is probably due to the general low percentage of Amorite and ‘other’ names in the *TIM* 7 organization and reflects the social environment in which it functioned.

Finally there remains a ‘rest category’ of Amorite and ‘other’ names occurring in text genres not treated above. A short summary sketching a person’s role in the text is given after every name (see Appendix). These people had various roles in the texts: there are a number of slaves (with ‘other’ names), people mentioned in letters, but mostly people involved in lawsuits and other disputes. However, no pattern emerges for the people with Amorite or ‘other’ names in these texts.

4.1.6 Conclusion: the Amorite personal names in early OB Sippar

Despite the interest that the Amorite personal names attracted, little research was done towards the geographical differences between text corpora with Amorite names. The Amorite personal names found in the early OB texts from Sippar show some remarkable features.

In total, there are about 355 individuals with Amorite names in the early OB Sippar corpus.²⁹³ The most striking feature is the fact that almost no name contains the theophoric element Addu/Adad or Dagan.²⁹⁴ They were the two most important gods in Amorite personal names of the early 18th century BC Mari archives. Instead, the gods that we find the most in early OB Amorite personal names are Yarah/Erah and El/Ila. Only a few examples of Samsu/Samas are known.²⁹⁵

²⁹³ This figure does not include the names of Amorite rulers; moreover, the number could be a little higher or lower, because the same person could have been accidentally counted twice (for example: once with his patronym and once without).

²⁹⁴ But note the name Nahum-Dagan (*CT* 4 10:33) and the uncertain examples concerning Adad/Addu.

²⁹⁵ Abi-Samas, *a-bi-sa-ma-as*, *MHET* II/1 46:3, Sabium 13 ; Samsiya; *sa-am-si-ia*, *TIM* 7 73:9, undated; Samsu-yapuhāt, ^dUTU-*ia-pu-ha-at*, *MHET* II/1 4:4, Immerum, and Samsu-i[...] *sa-am-su-i* [...], *TIM* 7 74:9, undated.

Yarah/Erah was the name of the Amorite and West Semitic moongod.²⁹⁶ His Akkadian counterpart was called Sîn and in Sumerian he was called Nanna. The name Yarah/Erah is always written syllabically and never with a logogram, or even the divine determinative.

El (which simply means 'god') is a problematic case. He is often considered as an undefined 'father-god' at the head of the West Semitic pantheons,²⁹⁷ much like Anum in the southern Mesopotamian pantheon. In any case, the Mari texts seem to show that he had no temples or cult in Syria. Durand concludes that most occurrences of 'El' (written as DINGIR or syllabically) simply mean 'the god' or 'a god' and not a specific god called 'El'.²⁹⁸ What the exact role or significance of this 'El' was in the early OB period remains unclear, but it would seem that the Amorites used it as a theophoric element in much the same way as the Akkadian *ilum*: to denote *a* god, but no god in particular.

If personal names are any indication of the popularity of certain gods, we might conclude that Addu and Dagan were of little interest to the early OB Amorites in Sippar. Yarah/Erah does not feature frequently in personal names along the Middle Euphrates and Northern Syria.²⁹⁹ However, the undefined 'El' is popular in both early OB and Mari-era Amorite names.

A possible explanation for Yarah/Erah's predominance in Amorite names from early OB Sippar could be the general popularity of the Moongod in Old Babylonian Mesopotamia. The Akkadian Moongod Sîn is by far the most often attested theophoric element in Akkadian personal names. The Sumerian Moongod Nanna is also often seen in Sumerian names. This general popularity of the Moongod in southern Mesopotamia may have influenced Amorite parents to also give their children names composed with the Amorite Moongod Yarah/Erah.

²⁹⁶ Edzard 1976-1980:260 and Durand 2008:214-215.

²⁹⁷ This is at least true for the pantheon of Ugarit.

²⁹⁸ Durand 2008:180-181.

²⁹⁹ Compare for example the number of names composed with Addu and/or Dagan with those containing Yarah/Erah in Mari's *Répertoire analytique* (ARM 16/1; 'Noms divins apparaissant dans les anthroponymes' (p. 257-268). Streck 2004a:425 writes that Addu was the most popular element in 'nomadic names', then Dagan and thirdly Yarah.

The following table represents the linguistic categorization of the early OB Sippar population (from the independent rulers until Šîn-muballit). The names and name-pairs are divided according to their language.³⁰⁰

Patronym→ Name ↓	Amorite	Akkadian	Sumerian	linguistically uncertain patronyms	no patronym written	Total
Amorite	26	64	-	37	105	232
Akkadian	104	1780	119	416	997	3416
Sumerian	1	93	24	6	81	205
linguistically uncertain names	18	199	15	99	312	643
Total	149	2136	158	558	1495	Grand Total: 4496

People with an Amorite name	5%
People with an Akkadian name	76%
People with a Sumerian name	5%
People with an 'other' name (linguistically undetermined)	14%

We can draw the following conclusions from these data:

³⁰⁰ It must be made clear that this table does not represent the sum of all people found in the texts. This would be impossible because the names written without patronym are only counted once. Special mention must be made of the only two Hurrian names that were found in the corpus: Puhšenni (*pu-úh-še-en-[ni]*, *TIM* 7 95:2, undated), and Šîn-mālik s. Pahar-šen (^dEN.ZU-*ma-lik*, DUMU *pa-ha-ar-še-en*, *MHET* II/1 2:17-18, Ilum-ma-Ila, ^dEN.ZU-*ma-lik*, DUMU *pa-ha-ar-še-en*, *CT* 8 38b:18-19, Ilum-ma-Ila). Streck 2004b made a similar study, but for the study of OB Sippar he only used the indices found in the *MHET* II series, which is less than half of the total corpus available.

- The percentages and numbers of Sumerian and Amorite names are very much the same. Sumerian was a substrate language and 'Sumerian' is no longer considered a distinct ethnicity in OB times, whereas Amorite can be regarded as such. One could make the assumption that Amorite names were already present in significant numbers before the OB period. Unfortunately, we are badly informed about Ur III Sippar, but the evidence seems to suggest that 'Amorite' names were only found in Sippar from the early OB period onwards. The shared 5% percentage and different *a priori* assumptions about Sumerian and Amorite 'ethnicity' nevertheless show us again the precarious situation when defining an ethnicity based on the language of personal names.
- There are no people with an Amorite name and a Sumerian father; which seems logical because Sumerian names could be seen as a manifestation of a Babylonian cultural tradition. The Amorites would have little incentive to name their children with the non-Semitic Sumerian names. On the other hand: it does seem that Amorites freely used Akkadian names and adopted many facets of Sumerian/Akkadian religious culture, such as the veneration of city gods by Amorite rulers. So, there is no reason to exclude the possibility that Amorite parents could not name their children with a common Sumerian name such as Nanna-mansum. It is interesting to note that in the Ur III period, one-fifth of the people marked as 'MAR.TU' actually carried Sumerian names. However, they are almost all from Girsu, where almost everybody had a Sumerian name, according to Michalowski this is at the most indicative of onomastic habits.³⁰¹
- If we count all people with an Amorite name and/or an Amorite patronym we get a percentage of 8% of the population with an Amorite link. If we include the linguistically undetermined 'other' names as well, 19% of the population had an Amorite or 'other' name. If we also count all the Amorite and undetermined patronyms, we get to 31 %.
- In short, amongst the population of early OB Sippar (as we know it through the surviving text corpus), the percentage of people with an Amorite linguistic affiliation is minimally 8% and at the most 31%. The real figure must be somewhere in between.

³⁰¹ Michalowski 2011:110-111.

- There is a high proportion of linguistically undetermined names. This is partly due to the conservative classification of certain names. Most of such names are in fact probably Akkadian rather than Amorite or Sumerian. At least two names are Hurrian and some Elamite names are probably also found amongst them, but these numbers are negligible.
- It is interesting that more people had an Akkadian name with an Amorite father's name (104) than vice-versa (64). It has already been stated above that over the generations Amorite personal names tend to disappear and these figures seem to support this argument.³⁰² The Amorite population (people with Amorite names) quickly assimilated into the indigenous population, as far as the personal names allow us to see.

4.2 Kiš and its vicinity in the early OB period

4.2.1 *Introduction*

The area around Kiš was particularly dynamic in the early OB period, especially along the canals flowing towards the south to Marad and Kazallu. This territory was caught between the rivaling kingdoms of Isin, Babylon and Malgium. The ancient city of Kiš was actually a twin city.³⁰³ The collection of western tells at the site carries the name Uhaimir (main deity: Zababa). The eastern mounds are the part of Kiš called Hursagkalama in antiquity, the main mound being Tell Ingharra (main deity: Inanna/Ištar).³⁰⁴ Surface surveys of the area of Kiš have indicated a sizeable number of settlements for the Old Babylonian period.³⁰⁵ Towns like Damrum, Kibalmašda, Sagdanipad, Dunnum, and others must have been located in the vicinity of Kiš.

³⁰² This was also a conclusion by Streck 2004b:325-329 based on a comparison of data from different periods of time within the Old Babylonian period.

³⁰³ A phenomenon that was not isolated in the Old Babylonian period, another example are the two Sippar's.

³⁰⁴ Gibson 1972:4.

³⁰⁵ Gibson 1972:49 and p. 186.

4.2.2 *The sources from early OB Kiš and Damrum*

It is important to distinguish at least four main groups of texts from the early OB area of Kiš:

- 1) Texts from the so-called ‘Mananâ-dynasty’. This group of texts is of the most interest for us (see below).
- 2) Texts from Kiš proper, excavated by De Genouillac in 1911-1912. De Genouillac excavated mainly the area around Tell Ingharra as well as the ziggurat and its surroundings at Uhaimir.³⁰⁶ The texts found by him were divided over the Louvre and the Museum of Antiquities in Istanbul. De Genouillac himself published most of the French tablets in 1924 and 1925.³⁰⁷ The letters were edited by Kupper in 1959. Documents located in Istanbul were in turn published by Kraus 1972 and Donbaz and Yoffee 1986.³⁰⁸
- 3) Texts found by the Anglo-American expedition between 1923 and 1933, which ended up in Oxford.³⁰⁹ They have been published for the most part in *OECT* 13 (Dalley and Yoffee 1991) and *OECT* 15 (Dalley 2005).
- 4) The dossier of Adad-nada and his *naditum* daughter Unnubtum. This archive deserves special mention. It was dug up illicitly and most of it ended up in Yale. It is dated to the Babylonian kings Apil-Sîn and Sîn-muballit. Charpin discussed the documents and concluded that they stem from Damrum.³¹⁰ Goddeeris gave an overview of the texts, which was in turn supplemented by Charpin and studied in depth by Barberon.³¹¹ Charpin connected one of the oldest texts from this archive, *YOS* 14 334, to the ‘Mananâ-dynasty’ file of Ahūnum, son of Nūr-Ea. It is very likely that this archive was found at the same time as the ‘Mananâ-dynasty’ texts and the archive of Alammuš-nāšir (dated around Samsu-Iluna’s reign and also from Damrum).³¹²

³⁰⁶ Gibson 1972:69.

³⁰⁷ *PRAK* 1 and *PRAK* 2. Charpin 2005a published five additional texts from the ‘bureau of brick production’ (for which see Goddeeris 2002:294-299 and Charpin 2005a:169-171).

³⁰⁸ See also the short article by Yoffee 1977.

³⁰⁹ On the excavations, see Gibson 1972:70f and Moorey 1978.

³¹⁰ Charpin 1979b:191.

³¹¹ Goddeeris 2002:302-304, Charpin 2005a:171-172, and Barberon 2012:154-155.

³¹² Personal communication Charpin.

4.2.2.1 Texts from the ‘Mananâ-dynasty’

The so-called Mananâ-dynasty texts are a collection of private archives with some internal coherence. They are dated to a handful of local kings and Babylon’s first king Sumu-la-El. The king that occurs the most in these text is Mananâ, that is why the totality of these kings are referred to as the ‘Mananâ-dynasty’. The texts are mostly sale and lease contracts. Their interest lies in the many different year names to which these economic documents are dated. These year names give us important clues about the period’s political situation.

The first illegally excavated documents surfaced around 1910.³¹³ Since then the corpus was growing steadily to about 215 known texts at present. At the end of the 1950’s Rutten published 41 texts from the Louvre, which came from the collection of Allotte de la Fu  e.³¹⁴

Simmons wrote a number of articles concerning early OB tablets in the Yale collections. In two of them he tried to identify archives and gave an overview of the then-known year names of the Mananâ-dynasty kings³¹⁵. These tablets were eventually published with additional comments in *YOS* 14.³¹⁶ The dossier was expanded and studied by Charpin at the end of the 1970’s.³¹⁷

Charpin first concluded that a town called ‘Ilip/Kibalma  da’ was probably the origin of the documents.³¹⁸ In addition, he offered the following sequence for the Mananâ-dynasty kings: Sumu-dit  na (Marad), Haliyum, Abdi-Erah,³¹⁹ Manan  , N  qimum, Ahi-mara  , Sumu-Yamutbal, Manium and lastly Sumu-la-

³¹³ Johns first remarked the texts in 1910, after which Langdon 1911 and Thureau-Dangin 1911 immediately published a number of them.

³¹⁴ Rutten 1958, 1959 and 1960.

³¹⁵ Simmons 1960 and 1961.

³¹⁶ Simmons 1978:5-10.

³¹⁷ Making Pomponio’s study from 1976 largely redundant: Charpin 1978a, 1978b, 1979a, 1979b and 1980.

³¹⁸ Charpin 1978a:18.

³¹⁹ A king of Tutub is also called Abdi-Erah. Most authors assume that the Manan  -dynasty king and Tutub king are the same person (Wu Yuhong 1994:40-41, Charpin 2004:90). They are probably two different persons: Abdi-Erah is in fact one of the most common Amorite names allowing for homonymy. In addition, the new chronology that is proposed for the early OB period does not allow for the Tutub and Manan  -dynasty occurrences to be contemporaneous.

El.³²⁰ In his review of *YOS* 14, Charpin 1979b divides the material into several dossiers.

Charpin was later convinced that the most probable ‘capital’ of the Mananâ-dynasty kings was in fact Damrum.³²¹ A different view of the situation was presented by Wu Yuhong and Dalley (1990), who proposed that the area of Kiš was controlled by a sedentary king and a nomad king.³²² Even though a definitive answer to this matter is still lacking, we will accept Charpin’s idea in which Damrum is the origin of the Mananâ-dynasty texts. Goddeeris 2002 gave a very useful overview of the material and its dossiers, Charpin expanded on her work and added several new attestations.³²³

4.2.3 *Amorites in archives from early OB Kiš and Damrum*

The approach to the Amorite names in the Kiš and Damrum corpus is essentially the same as for the Sippar corpus: we will first take a look at the larger family archives and see which family members carried Amorite or ‘other’ names, after which we will do the same for the property owners and witnesses in these archives. At the end the smaller files are considered.

4.2.3.1 Šumšunu-watar

Šumšunu-watar’s archive is with 34 texts by far the largest archive in the early OB Kiš and Damrum corpus.³²⁴ His family carries only Akkadian and Sumerian names. Šumšunu-watar’s own name is unique in the early OB period, meaning ‘Their name is exceedingly great’. Almost the whole archive can be dated to only a handful of Mananâ year names.

There are considerably more people owning property with Amorite and ‘other’ names than people with Akkadian or Sumerian names. For the list of witnesses we can see that the Akkadian and Sumerian names form the majority, but there is a relative high proportion of Amorite and ‘other’ names: 41:31, including many ‘actual’ Amorite names. The Šumšunu-watar archive is dominated by the occurrence of a limited number of persons and families:

³²⁰ Charpin 1978a:40 and Charpin 2004a:96.

³²¹ Charpin 1999 and Charpin 2004:89-90 n. 320.

³²² See also the criticism by Charpin 2004a:89-90 n. 320.

³²³ Charpin 2005a:168-172.

³²⁴ Goddeeris 2002:268-272.

Susinum's children, Ili-atāya's children (most notably Idiš-Zababa who probably worked for Šumšunu-watar) and Ili-kitti's children.

4.2.3.2 Šissu-nawrat son of Bēlum

Šissu-nawrat's archive contains at least 19 texts and seems to stem from Kiš.³²⁵ We have no additional information about his family except for his father's name. The archive is dated mostly to the reign of Yawium, king of Kiš, but also contains a few texts dated intermittently to Mananā and Abdi-Erah.

The number of 'other' property owners is relatively low, with a slight majority of people carrying Akkadian or Sumerian names. A unique feature is that the number of witnesses with Amorite and 'other' names is higher than the people carrying clear Akkadian and Sumerian names.

4.2.3.3 Sîn-iddinam, son of Sanīya and his brothers

With its 27 texts, this is the second largest archive in the Mananā-dynasty corpus.³²⁶ An interesting aspect about this family is that most people carry good Akkadian names, but there is one man called Amurrum.

The proportion of property owners with Akkadian and Sumerian names versus Amorite and 'other' names is 5:14, with 7 actual Amorite names. Sîn-iddinam had a many dealings with Adidum, Amur-ilam's family, Yakûm and Birbirum: all families and persons with Amorite or 'other' names.

4.2.3.4 Dulluqum, son of Hadamu

One of the smaller files in the Mananā corpus with 8 texts.³²⁷ The family has clear Amorite affinities through a name such as Yahattilum (not Yahatti-El, because of the syllabic writing *ia-ha-ti-lum*, DUMU *ha-da-mu* in R 45:28-29).

Dulluqum's file has strong ties with that of Sîn-iddinam. However, we find only a few Amorite and 'other' names compared to other files in the Mananā-dynasty corpus.

³²⁵ Goddeeris 2002:284-286.

³²⁶ Goddeeris 2002:265-268.

³²⁷ Goddeeris 2002:263-264.

4.2.3.5 Ibbi-Ilabrat son of Puzur-Ilaba

This is a small file of texts containing mostly loans and dated to the last years of Sumu-la-El's reign.³²⁸ One text is even dated to Šîn-iddinam of Larsa year 5, suggesting a conquest of the area of Kiš by Larsa. Because of the large number of loans in this file, we have relatively few property owners. Ibbi-Ilabrat's social environment had relatively few people with Amorite or 'other' names.

4.2.3.6 Kalāya's children

This file contains 9 texts, one of which is unpublished (A.32133 in Chicago).³²⁹ Most of the family's names appear to be non-Akkadian and non-Sumerian. An interesting point is that this family archive acquaints us more with the cult of Nanna in Damrum through the person of Šimat-Kubi, a *nadītum* of Nanna. They had many dealings with the family of Yerhaqum.

4.2.3.7 Ilum-ma son of Mallum and Dadušme-El son of Manmanum

The exact relationship between Dadušme-El and Ilum-ma is unclear.³³⁰ Dadušme-El buys Ilum-ma's property not long after Ilum-ma had acquired it. The file contains 10 texts, all are concerned with the sale of real estate. Ilum-ma bought a lot of property from the (numerous) sons of Ubasum and the sons of Paratīya, both families have many non-Akkadian/Sumerian names.

The high proportion of Amorite and 'other' names in the list of witnesses attests to the frequent contact of Dadušme-El and Ilum-ma with an Amorite environment. Many of the same families recur in the texts: Ubasum's sons, Paratīya's sons, but also the sons of Ea-šulūli and several men not directly connected to a larger family.

³²⁸ Goddeeris 2002:273-274.

³²⁹ Goddeeris 2002:262-263.

³³⁰ Goddeeris 2002:275-276.

4.2.3.8 Šū-Ninhursag

No other family members of Šū-Ninhursag are known.³³¹ His file is relatively small with 7 texts in which very few people with Amorite and ‘other’ names occur.

4.2.3.9 Yerhaqum’s sons

This is a relatively small file with 7 texts.³³² All members of this family carry names that are not clearly Akkadian or Sumerian. In most documents, Nupānum buys property from his two brothers. As Goddeeris already stated, it is probable that they are selling (parts of) their inheritance.³³³ This is not uncommon because some pieces of property cannot be divided physically in a satisfactory way. Because Nupānum is often buying from his brothers in this file and because these brothers often own neighboring plots, we only see a few other property owners occurring in this file.

4.2.3.10 Amorite names in smaller files from early OB Kiš and Damrum

The remaining texts from early OB Kiš and Damrum that belong to smaller files are also included in the Appendix to chapter 4. The proportion of property owners with an Akkadian or Sumerian name versus property owners with an Amorite or ‘other’ name is 44:33, with 9 people carrying an ‘actual’ Amorite name. The proportion of witnesses with Akkadian or Sumerian names versus Amorite or ‘other’ names is 201:94 with 23 ‘actual’ Amorite names.

4.2.3.11 The presence of Amorites in early OB Kiš and Damrum

To put the above mentioned families and the property owners and witnesses featuring in their family archives better into perspective, we can look at this table:

³³¹ Goddeeris 2002:264-265.

³³² This file shares a text with the file of Kalaya’s children: *YOS* 14 93, it will not be included here.

³³³ Goddeeris 2002:276.

File name			Akk/Sum names	% of total	Am/other names	% of total	Am. names	% of total
1	Šumšunu- watar	property owners	14		23		3	
		witnesses	41		31		10	
		total	55	50 %	54	50 %	13	12%
2	Šissu- nawrat	property owners	13		10		3	
		witnesses	41		42		10	
		total	54	51%	52	49%	13	12%
3	Šin- iddinam son of Saniya	property owners	5		14		7	
		witnesses	50		34		16	
		total	55	53%	48	47%	23	22%
4	Dulluqum son of Hadamu	property owners	0		5		1	
		witnesses	24		9		2	
		total	24	63%	14	37%	3	8%
5	Ibbi- Ilabrat	property owners	9		2		0	
		witnesses	29		9		2	
		total	38	78%	11	22%	2	4%
6	Kalāya's children	property owners	7		5		2	
		witnesses	18		13		5	
		total	25	58%	18	42%	7	16%
7	Illum-ma and Dadušme- El	property owners	10		12		4	
		witnesses	23		22		7	
		total	33	49%	34	51%	11	16%
8	Šū- Ninhursag	property owners	7		2		-	
		witnesses	24		9		1	
		total	31	74%	11	26%	1	2%
9	The sons of Yerhaqum	property owners	3		3		1	
		witnesses	13		10		3	

		total	16	55%	13	45%	4	14%
	Other files	property owners	44		33		9	
		witnesses	201		94		23	
		total	245	66%	127	34%	32	9%
Grand total			Akk/Sum names	% of total	Am/other names	% of total	Am. names	% of total
		property owners	112	51%	109	49%	30	13%
		witnesses	464	63%	273	37%	79	11%
		total	576	60%	382	40%	109	11%

Many of the observations that were made on the Sippar corpus are also valid for this corpus. However, one large bias of the Sippar corpus is not present for the Kiš and Damrum corpus: the presence of the *naditum* women devoted to Šamaš.

The people with an Akkadian and Sumerian names form again the majority, albeit smaller than in Sippar. If we take a maximalist position and consider all people with an Amorite or ‘other’ name as Amorite, the Amorites would appear as a large minority. On the other hand, if we take a minimalist position and count only the people with ‘actual’ Amorite names (11% of the total), the number is much smaller. As was the case with the Sippar Amorites, the true percentage of people with an Amorite background must lie between 11%-40%.

There is a difference in the percentages of property owners and witnesses: there are slightly more people with Amorite and ‘other’ names as property owners (49%) than as witnesses (37%). Hardly evidence for an Amorite land-owning elite, but nonetheless interesting, especially when compared to the Sippar situation.

The proportion of Akkadian and Sumerian names versus Amorite and ‘other’ names in many files is practically the same. The amount and proportion of the different name groups vary a little bit for each file, showing again that people with Amorite and ‘other’ names tend to appear clustered in certain text groups or files. The families with suspected Amorite roots (eg. containing Amorite and ‘other’ names) are Dulluqum, Kalāya’s children, Ilum-ma and Dadušme-El and Yerhaqum’s sons: all files with high amounts of Amorite

and ‘other’ names. The file of Sîn-iddinam contains most Amorite names, both absolute and relative.

The chronological window for the Kiš and Damrum corpus is about forty years (ca. 1885-1845), instead of the ca. ninety years for the Sippar corpus (ca. 1885-1791). This prevents us from making meaningful statements about the distribution of the names over time.

4.2.4 *People borrowing in early OB Kiš and Damrum*

Just as we did for the Sippar corpus, we will now look at other roles people (other than property owner or witness) had in the early OB Kiš and Damrum texts. Apart from texts registering the sale of real estate, we also have many loan contracts in which a total of 32 creditors and 72 debtors occur.³³⁴ Some of the creditors are known from larger files, but many creditors occur only once. Most debtors occur only once as well. Another approach was chosen than with the Sippar corpus, presenting the debtors and the creditors per file in the Appendix to chapter 4.

As was the case with the property owners and witnesses: some of the more interesting observations are made when we compare the data with Sippar. As opposed to Sippar, we have many creditors with Amorite or ‘other’ names,³³⁵ but none of them seems to bear names that are without a doubt Amorite.

A sizeable number of the debtors carry linguistically undeterminable names or patronyms (31, that is 43% of the total amount of debtors), but we see only a few ‘actual’ Amorite names or patronyms: 11 (about 15% of the total). These percentages are roughly the same as for the property owners and witnesses in early OB Kiš and Damrum. The Sippar figures were again lower: there we had 18 debtors with a linguistically undetermined name (22% of the total of 81 debtors) and only 3 people with an ‘actual’ Amorite name (4% of the total). In short: when we compare the data of Kiš and Damrum with Sip-

³³⁴ The Kiš and Damrum corpus also has a few other types of texts. These will not be dealt with separately because each genre has too few texts to say anything meaningful about the number of names. Administrative texts (*R* 65, 67, 68, *RSM* 51, 52, 54, *YOS* 14 167, *OECT* 13 82, 125, 138, 189, 190, 208, 268 and *BM* 103180), slave sale contracts (*R* 37, 38, 39 and 40, *TIM* 5 11), hire contracts (*YOS* 14 87), lawsuits (*R* 41, *JCS* 4:70 *YBC* 4375, *YOS* 14 79), sureties (*YOS* 14 123, *BM* 108915), field leases (*R* 46 and 47, *BBVOT* 1 62 and 63) and a division of an inheritance (*JCS* 4:68 *UIOM* 2393).

³³⁵ Sîn-iddinam s. Sanīya, Kalāya’s children (Laliya, Hunāya and Šimat-Kubi), Ilalah, Ananiya, Kurkuzānum, Dibu s. Azuna, Katitum, Gabrilum, and Ha’ikum.

par, we have again more people with an Amorite and ‘other’ name, both as creditor and as debtor.

4.2.5 *The Amorite personal names in early OB Kiš and Damrum*

Many of the observations and disclaimers made on the Sippar corpus apply to Kiš and Damrum as well. Again, only Erah and El feature as theophoric elements in the Amorite names: never Addu or Dagan. In two instances we see the eponymous ancestor Ditana. A total of 117 persons with a clear Amorite name were counted.

The following table represents in essence the linguistic categorization of the early OB Kiš and Damrum population. The names and name-pairs are divided according to their language.³³⁶

Patronym→ Name ↓	Amorite	Akkadian	Sumerian	linguistically uncertain patronyms	no patronym written	Total
Amorite	13	7	-	21	45	86
Akkadian	16	196	15	108	346	681
Sumerian	-	7	3	1	27	38
linguistically uncertain names	15	45	-	63	138	261
Total	44	255	18	193	556	Grand Total: 1066

People with an Amorite name	8%
People with an Akkadian name	64%

³³⁶ This table does not represent the sum of all people found in the texts; this would be impossible because the names written without patronym are only counted once.

People with a Sumerian name	4%
People with an ‘other’ name (linguistically undetermined)	24%

Compared to early OB Sippar, we have slightly more people with an Amorite name and slightly fewer with a Sumerian name. The percentage of people with an Akkadian name is however significantly lower than in Sippar and consequently the number of people with a linguistically undetermined name is significantly higher.

If we look at the number of people with an Amorite name and/or an Amorite patronym we get a total percentage of 11%. If we look at the linguistically undetermined names and patronyms *and* the Amorite names we get a percentage of 44%. So, the percentage of people with an Amorite linguistic affiliation is minimally 11% and at the most 44%. Again, the real figure must be somewhere in between.

As in Sippar, there are more people with an Akkadian or Sumerian name and Amorite patronym (16) than there are people with an Amorite name and an Akkadian or Sumerian patronym (7), suggesting again a pattern of acculturation of people with an Amorite name. There is however only a low percentage of Amorite-Amorite name pairs (only 1,2%), which is however still higher than in Sippar (0,5%).

4.3 Marad in the early Old Babylonian period

4.3.1 *Introduction*

From the two towns Marad³³⁷ and Kazallu,³³⁸ only Marad has (recently) been the object of an archaeological survey.³³⁹ Kazallu’s exact location is still unknown. We have references to these cities from most of Mesopotamia’s history, from the Akkadian until the Neo-Babylonian period. In Old-Babylonian studies they are often mentioned together because it seems that they formed the core of a kingdom in the early OB period. Some OB tablets coming from

³³⁷ Edzard 1957:127-128 and Edzard 1987-1990c:351-352.

³³⁸ Edzard 1957:126-127 and Edzard 1976-1980:542-543.

³³⁹ Hannun 1997-1998 (in Arabic), Al Hussayny 2010.

these towns (mostly Marad) have found their way to the antiquities market in the beginning of the twentieth century.³⁴⁰

The tell of Marad is located some fifty kilometers south of Kiš, halfway between Babylon and Isin on the Abgal canal. This canal branched from the Kiš branch of the Euphrates to the south of this city. The towns of Apiak, Kiritab and probably Kazallu were also situated on this canal as it flowed south towards Marad. One specific branch of the Abgal canal, flowing from its left flank is the Me-Enlil canal.³⁴¹ This canal is frequently mentioned in the Marad texts and also in one of the year names of the Mananâ dynasty.³⁴²

4.3.2 *The sources from early OB Marad: the Ilum-bāni family archive*

The illegally excavated archive of the Ilum-bāni family sheds some light on the situation in Marad from ca. 1880 to about 1850 BC.³⁴³ The main body of the archive must have belonged to Sîn-līdiš and Ku-Ninšubur, sons of Ilum-bāni. Other children of Ilum-bāni are also attested in the archive. Marad is the most likely provenance because most of the texts carry an oath by its city god Lugal-Marad.³⁴⁴ It has often been assumed that kings of Marad also controlled Kazallu,³⁴⁵ but there are reasons to doubt this. In addition to the 18 documents from the Ilum-bāni family archive, there are about 17 other texts from early OB Marad (and/or its vicinity), consisting of smaller files, some of them are (indirectly) connected to the Ilum-bāni family.³⁴⁶

4.3.3 *The Amorite personal names in early OB Marad*

The rulers of Marad all bear clear Amorite names: Halun-pi-umu, Sumu-ditāna, Sumu-numhim, Sumu-atar, and Yamsi-El. By contrast, we have almost no trace of people with a clear Amorite name in texts from this city. A plausible explanation could be that we have basically one archive and some

³⁴⁰ The reconstructions in Wu Yuhong 1998, can be modified on several points, see De Boer 2013a.

³⁴¹ Cole and Gasche:28-30.

³⁴² Charpin 1978:25, Haliyum c: MU.ÚS.SA ^{1D}ÁB.GAL Û ^{1D}ME-^dEN.LÍL.[LÁ] *is-ki-r[u]*, ‘Year after the year in which he dammed the Abgal canal and the Me-Enlil canal’

³⁴³ See De Boer 2013a.

³⁴⁴ See Stol 1987-1990:148-149 on this god.

³⁴⁵ Eg. Wu Yuhong 1998:221 and Charpin 2004:87-88.

³⁴⁶ See De Boer 2013a.

(un)related texts (as is the case in Dilbat with the Iddin-Lagamal family archive). The main protagonists in the Ilum-bāni family archive all carry good Akkadian or Sumerian names. From the Sippar and Kiš and Damrum archives it has become clear that Amorite names tend to show up in groups or in documents concerning people with Amorite names. In general, people rarely went beyond their own social environment; they would often witness each other’s transactions, own neighboring fields and houses etc. So it could be that Ilum-bāni’s family had no direct dealings with Amorites and that this is the reason why we do not encounter them (yet) in Marad texts.³⁴⁷

4.4 Dilbat in the early Old Babylonian period

4.4.1 Introduction

Much has already been written about (early) Old Babylonian Dilbat.³⁴⁸ Dilbat is situated at Tell Deylem. Apart from a short campaign by Hormuzd Rassam in the 19th century, there has only been a surface survey by Armstrong,³⁴⁹ making the archaeological situation largely unknown. Nevertheless, Dilbat must have played an important role in the economy of the Babylonian state as it was situated in Babylon’s hinterland.

³⁴⁷ A number of names with an unclear linguistic affiliation occur nevertheless:

Bakāya MUHALDIM, *ba-ka-a* MUHALDIM, *AUCT* IV 6:18

Gunānum² s. Mašum, *ḡu-ḡ-na-nu-um* DUMU *ma-šum*, *RSM* 37:24.

Idisaqar AGA.ÚS, *i-di-ḡsa-ḡ-qar* AGA.ÚS, *AUCT* IV 6:17.

Kasānum, *ka-sa-nu-um* ŠEŠ.A.NI, *YOS* 14 125:17.

Kulānum s. Uštaki, *ku-la-nu-um* DUMU *uš-ta-ki*, *EGHS* 2:23, *ku-la-a-nu-um*¹ ŠU.I, MD 5 (MAOG IV):15, *ku-la-nu-um* DUMU *uš-ta-ki-um*², *Speleers* 253:18.

Lulāgum NU^{GIŠ}KIRI₆, *lu-la-gu-um* NU^{GIŠ}KIRI₆, *AUCT* V 126:18.

Nibiya s. Lulum-waqar, *ni-bi-ia* DUMU *lu-lu-um-wa-qar*, Durand *HEO* 18 207:3’.

Supābum s. Balagum, *sú-pa-bu-um*, DUMU *ba-la-gu-um*, *YOS* 14 117:9-10.

Wanāya s. Habil-ili, *wa-a-na-a-a* DUMU *ha-bil-i-lí*, *Speleers* 234:22.

³⁴⁸ See most recently Goddeeris 2002:225-230, see also the additional comments by Charpin 2005a:167. In fact, the most pertinent publications are: Klengel 1976, Desrochers 1978, Koshurnikov 1984 (article in Russian), Koshurnikov and Yoffee 1986, and Yoffee 1988.

³⁴⁹ Armstrong 1995 and 2001.

4.4.2 *The sources from early OB Dilbat: the Iddin-Lagamal family archive*

Almost all of the texts known from early OB Dilbat concern one large family archive: the Iddin-Lagamal archive.³⁵⁰ As is often the case, we do not have the whole archive, but only those parts that were handed down via a particular branch of the family. The texts known to us come through the subsequent fathers and sons Iddin-Lagamal, Nāhilum, Huzālum and finally Marduk-nāšir.³⁵¹ Most of the early OB texts here under consideration are from the time of Iddin-Lagamal and his son Nāhilum (Sumu-abum to Sîn-muballit). The texts from Huzālum and Marduk-nāšir are dated to the reigns of Hammurabi and Samsu-iluna and are therefore left out of this study.

4.4.3 *The Amorite personal names in early OB Dilbat*

There is little to be added to the existing studies, where it not that the focus here is slightly different. Do we see any Amorites in the Dilbat corpus? The short answer is: almost none. The most probable explanation is that we have information from only *one* family archive (as was the case with the Ilum-bāni archive from Marad). As we saw in the Sippar corpus, the occurrence of people with Amorite names depends on the archive. Some people or families apparently had more contacts or affinity with Amorites than others. It is clear that the Iddin-Lagamal family did not belong to those families with obvious ties to an Amorite community. Another explanation for the absence of Amorite names might be that there were very few Amorites present in Dilbat.

Among the personal names we counted eight names that are classified as certainly Amorite (just 2%) and another 54 names as ‘other’ (12%): names that are not classifiable as either Akkadian, Sumerian or Amorite. Both percentages are much lower than those from Sippar or the Kiš and Damrum texts. Interesting is the man Yaškit-El whose name is twice written completely different: once as Yaškit-El and once as Êškit-El.³⁵² In any case, in the Appendix to chapter 4 are all the names that were qualified as ‘unknown/other’ and Amorite from the early OB texts from Dilbat.

³⁵⁰ The late OB material has been collected and commented upon by Pientka 1998:409f.

³⁵¹ See Goddeeris 2002:232 for a family tree.

³⁵² *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. Note also the spelling *ye-e-eš-ki-it-DINGIR*, *YOS* 14 291:2 (not the same person).

Given the relatively low proportion of Amorite and ‘unknown/other’ names found among the inhabitants of Dilbat, it is perhaps no surprise that we also find very few people carrying these names owning land. The Iddin-Lagamal family only has members with Akkadian or Sumerian names.

It is interesting to see that one well attested family member, Nāhilum, bought property in the city centre, most notably a number of *burubalûm* plots that are situated along the main or broad street (SILA DAGAL.LA).³⁵³ The table in the Appendix shows 67 Akkadian and Sumerian property owners (85%) and 12 Amorite and ‘other’ property owners (15%). The latter percentage is much lower than the one we found in Sippar or Kiš and Damrum. This confirms again the general picture: the Iddin-Lagamal family archive shows mostly ‘indigenous’ Akkadian/Sumerian names and almost no Amorite names.

4.5 The ‘Amorite’ presence in Northern Babylonia

In this chapter we have surveyed almost all personal names found in documents from early Old Babylonian Northern Babylonia, specifically the cities Sippar, Kiš and Damrum, Marad and Dilbat. The goal was to establish what social-economic role people with an Amorite name played in texts from the early OB period.

The results are not straightforward. First the absolute numbers: the vast majority of the population in Northern Babylonia must have carried Akkadian names. Basing ourselves mainly on the Sippar and Kiš and Damrum corpora, we can estimate that about 65-75 % had clearly identifiable Akkadian names, then there is a small minority of ca. 5% Sumerian names and of 5-10% of Amorite names. The remaining percentage was categorized as ‘other’ names, but most of these must be Akkadian or in a Semitic dialect similar to it. If we look at the two family archives from Dilbat and Marad, the percentage of Akkadian names is even higher: but having only one archive from both of these cities gives us an incomplete picture. The fact that the part of the population with Amorite names is a clear minority makes it all the more surprising that almost all known kings in Northern Babylonia during the early OB period had an Amorite name.

³⁵³ Explicitly indicated on the following documents: *OECT* 13 269, 270, 271, 273 (buyer: Iddin-Lagamal and Ilšu-bāni) and 274, Gautier *Dilbat* 4 (buyer: Iddin-Lagamal), 12, 15, 16, 29, 31 and 36 and finally *VAS* 7 3.

Now to the ‘property owners’. When we compare the data from Kiš and Damrum with Sippar, we can make some interesting observations.

Grand total large Sippar families ³⁵⁴		Akk/Sum names	% of total	Am/other names	% of total	Am. names	% of total
	property owners	173	73%	65	27%	25	11%
	witnesses	876	81%	210	19%	77	7%
	total	1049	79%	275	21%	102	8%

Grand total Kiš and Damrum		Akk/Sum names	% of total	Am/other names	% of total	Am. names	% of total
	property owners	112	51%	109	49%	30	13%
	witnesses	464	63%	273	37%	79	11%
	total	576	60%	382	40%	109	11%

First of all: the percentage and amount of Amorite/other names is significantly higher for Kiš and Damrum (40%) than it is for Sippar (21%), but the percentage and amount of actual Amorite names is about the same (8% and 11%). Based on this information we might state that the Kiš and Damrum region had relatively more people with a (supposed) Amorite background.

However, in both corpora certain files account for a higher percentage of Amorite and ‘other’ names. In the case of the Sippar corpus, these are at least two files associated with Halhalla (Šîn-erībam and Me’isum). The Kiš and Damrum corpus is more balanced, but we can note that it is mostly a corpus stemming from Damrum, with Šissu-nawrat’s file almost exclusively accounting for the data from Kiš. Damrum did not have the prestige and history of older towns like Sippar and Kiš: it is essentially a small town located in the periphery of Kiš. We might expect that the old urban elite in towns such as Sippar and Kiš had prevented the settlement of too many (lower status or military?) Amorites within their city walls. As a result, these people were more or less forced to settle in the countryside. We can compare the situation at Kiš and Damrum with Sippar and Halhalla: the Amorites seem mostly settled in

³⁵⁴ We have excluded the smaller Sippar files where the percentages for the property owners were almost the same.

smaller towns around the old traditional urban centers. This may also explain the near absence of Amorite names from the Dilbat and Marad corpora.

We now return to the question of whether we can speak of an Amorite land-owning elite. According to our sources, the answer is yes and no. It is a fact that the kings ruling over Northern Babylonia, both the local ones and the kings of Babylon, were of Amorite origin. At least for the Babylonian kings, we know that they owned large tracts of land and property in the cities. This is known from the texts of princess Iltāni, a sister of Hammurabi who administered part of the royal domains surrounding Sippar.³⁵⁵ From a unique document published by Al-'Adami we learn that Sumu-la-El had the authority to give houses in Sippar.³⁵⁶ The entourage of the Babylonian and other Amorite kings must have included men of Amorite origin of a high social standing (tribal leaders?). These men were in turn awarded with land for their service. A possible example is a *rabiānum* of Sippar, Sumu-Akšak (see above section 4.1.3.13).

A few of the larger families seem to have had Amorite origins: the families of Abum-halum, Me'isum, and Dammāqtum at Sippar, and those of Yerhaqum, Dulluqum, Ilum-ma, and Dadušme-El at Damrum. These cannot be identified immediately as *large* landowners, but at least we have an idea about their genealogies and holdings: their families carry at least one name that is not Akkadian or Sumerian.

On the other hand, why is it not possible to state clearly that an 'Amorite' landowning elite existed in early OB Northern Babylonia? The most important reason is the unbalanced picture we obtain from our sources. For several reasons we only have a very small part of the total documentation that was once written, and all the texts once written only reveal a limited part of ancient society. The cuneiform documentation primarily reflects the activities of the urban elite and large urban institutions. It does not seem that much Amorite families belonged to this urban elite, an elite that must have been indigenous for many generations. Instead, groups of people with Amorite names occur in larger numbers in the village of Halhalla or the small town of

³⁵⁵ The file of the two princesses called Iltāni, the one being the daughter of Sîn-muballit and the other the daughter of probably Abi-ešuh, needs to be studied again. Until that time, see Harris 1962, Harris 1969, Stol 1987 and Klengel 1999.

³⁵⁶ Al-'Adhami 1997.

Damrum, suggesting that most of the people with Amorite names must have lived outside of the large urban centers. These people were not automatically pastoral nomads, a persistent paradigm caused by the Mari-era nomads.³⁵⁷ In fact, almost no evidence from the early OB texts attests to any animal husbandry at all. What we can say with relative certainty is that Amorites tended to live segregated from the larger urban populations. This is proven by the fact that they often occur clustered together in certain texts and that they only occur sporadically in the documentation from the urban centers. Most of the non-elite Amorite population probably lived in an environment with little recourse to writing.

The recent ideas by Durand concerning the nature of the population carrying Amorite names might provide another explanation.³⁵⁸ He suggested that what we perceive nowadays as ‘Amorite’ was in fact part of a Semitic language continuum comprised of many different local dialects. These different dialects are obscured to us because of the fact that scribes tended to use a uniform standardized *koine* of Akkadian in the documents. The situation is similar to the modern Middle East where many (non-written) dialects of Arabic exist alongside an official (but largely artificial) Modern Standard Arabic used in the media. Durand states that Amorite names are more likely a sign of social position instead of ethnicity or identity. In this view, the rich urban elite would have Akkadian and Sumerian names, whereas the countryside population tended to have more names composed in the local dialect, appearing to us as ‘Amorite names’.³⁵⁹ However, Durand’s ideas do not account for the Amorite names carried by almost all early OB kings in Northern Babylonia. It would be unwise to dismiss an Amorite ethnicity completely because there are still sufficient indications for the existence of such an identity and ethnicity (see chapter 2). Even so, there was probably no such thing as a strong Akkadian-Amorite dichotomy as the current paradigm surrounding the Amorites wishes to make us believe. The solution is most likely somewhere in between: there probably was a ruling elite with Amorite names and affiliation, but the linguistic situation could have been just as Durand described: a continuum of different but mutually understandable Semitic languages. If the Akkadian of Ešnunna was the standard written language, then we would not have expected

³⁵⁷ See Michalowski 2011.

³⁵⁸ Durand 2012.

³⁵⁹ In fact, this recalls Buccellati’s ideas (eg. Buccellati 1992) about the countryside speaking Amorite and the city population speaking Akkadian.

people from the Diyala region and Northern Babylonia to have carried Amorite names as well: so there must be some new component here. However, these Amorite names or the people that carried them were apparently not perceived as completely alien by the indigenous population. The nature of our documentation is also of influence: we mostly have loans and sale contracts; not the genre of texts to mention ethnic differences or tensions. Therefore, it is also hard to distinguish any trend among the debtors and creditors: whether people with Amorite names tended to incur more debt than people with Akkadian/Sumerian names, or that there were more creditors with Amorite names etc. The loan contracts are hardly an indicator of relative wealth or poverty.

There seems to be a strong tendency towards acculturation of people with Amorite and 'other' names: while the older generations could have good Amorite names, the younger generations tend to carry more and more Akkadian names. This seems like a contradiction, because we would perhaps expect people to adopt the names of the new Amorite elite, but the reverse is the case. Because we have no texts from the period in which the Amorite kings took control over Northern Babylonia (ca. 1900), it is difficult to establish which families belonged to the entourage of these kings. Some families might have adopted Akkadian or Sumerian names already at a very early stage, which makes them unidentifiable to us in the period from which we do have texts. This also explains why over the course of the Old Babylonian period the Amorite names disappear from the Babylonian onomasticon.