



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

# A history of early Old Babylonian Northern Babylonia and the Lower Diyala Region (ca. 2000-1900 BC)

## 6.1 Introduction

Whereas the history of southern Mesopotamia under the dominance of Isin (and later Larsa) is relatively well documented from the fall of the Ur III empire around 2000 BC onwards,<sup>546</sup> we know next to nothing about the situation in northern Babylonia after the Ur III empire's collapse. Texts from Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region become numerous only after 1900 BC. From 1880 BC onwards we see a multitude of smaller kingdoms in this region and almost each one is ruled by a king with an Amorite name. We are more or less in the dark about this region's history, population and culture for the period 2000-1900. One major question for this period is: were there already Amorites present in this area? And if so, where did they come from, how did they seize power and how were they organized? These questions cannot be answered outright because we lack any narrative and textual sources. However, as we shall see, it is possible to gain some indirect evidence about the pre-1900 period from later or earlier dated texts.

## 6.2 Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region in the Ur III period

The textual finds from Northern Babylonia in the Ur III period are very scant, especially when compared with the rich textual finds from southern Mesopo-

---

<sup>546</sup> Charpin 2004a:57-152 is still the norm for early Old Babylonian history. Wu Yuhong 1994a deals for the most part with the history of the Diyala region and Ešnunna in particular. Edzard 1957 must still be mentioned here, because of the fundamental research he did on this period.

tamia: Puzriš-Dagan, Girsu, Umma, Ur and Nippur, and recently the Garšana and Iri-Sagrig archives.

Since Steinkeller's groundbreaking article,<sup>547</sup> Ur III scholars have in general understood the Ur III kingdom as consisting of a directly governed core, supplemented with a more loosely controlled periphery and several vassal states, acting as a buffer.<sup>548</sup> In spite of its lack of sources, northern Babylonia is considered a part of the core of the Ur III state. These northern territories were conquered by Ur-Namma, the Ur III dynasty's founder, a feat which is reflected in the prologue of the 'Ur-Namma Law Code' and the 'Ur-Namma Cadastre'.<sup>549</sup> According to Steinkeller we know of the following Ur III provinces in northern Babylonia: Sippar, A.HA (not located), Urum (not located), Puš (not located), Kutha, Babylon, Kiš, Kazallu, Giritab (not located), and Apiak (not located). One might also consider Ešnunna and Išim-Šulgi (not located) in the Diyala region<sup>550</sup> and Marad which is on the frontier of northern and southern Babylonia. Each of these provinces had its own ENSI<sub>2</sub>-governor.

In Sallaberger 1999a:208-210 we can find a useful list of sites that have provided texts datable to the Ur III period. From northern Babylonia we can list the following places:

#### 6.2.1 *Ešnunna/Tell Asmar*

The American excavations at Tell Asmar yielded large numbers of Ur III texts, which have been published very sporadically. The expedition's epigraphist mentions that the Ur III texts contain year names from Šulgi 30 to the second year of Ibbi-Sîn.<sup>551</sup> Ešnunna was governed under the Ur III kings by an ENSI<sub>2</sub>. According to the information given by Jacobsen, the first ENSI<sub>2</sub> was Urguedinna (Šulgi 31), followed by Bamu (Šulgi 46), Kallamu (Šulgi 47, transferred from Kazallu to Ešnunna, governing until at least Amar-Sîn 9) and finally Itūriya, whose son Šū-ilīya declared himself an independent ruler of Ešnunna somewhere during Ibbi-Sîn's reign.<sup>552</sup> Whiting, who was charged with the tablets' publication almost half a century later, mentions that the total number of OB and Ur III texts amounts to 1400. Apart from the early Old

---

<sup>547</sup> Steinkeller 1987.

<sup>548</sup> However, see the comments by Sallaberger 1999a:197.

<sup>549</sup> See Frayne 1997 *RIME* 3/2 p.16 and p. 50-56 and Kraus 1955.

<sup>550</sup> Steinkeller 1987:22-23.

<sup>551</sup> Jacobsen 1940:159.

<sup>552</sup> Jacobsen 1940:196.

Babylonian letters and a few other texts,<sup>553</sup> no integral dossiers have been published over the years.<sup>554</sup>

### 6.2.2 *Sippar-Amnānum/Tell ed-Dēr*

One loan of barley from Ur III was found by Iraqi archaeologists at Tell-ed Dēr.<sup>555</sup> It is dated to the year Šū-Sîn 9, it contains seven names, of which four are Akkadian, one Sumerian and the two others undeterminable.

Two other texts (*TIM* 7 115 and 116), also published by Edzard, seem to stem from the intermittent period between Ur III and the time of the local rulers of Sippar, they are highly interesting and unique, but provide no evidence for an Ur III Amorite presence.

### 6.2.3 *Tell Išān-Mizyad*

Išān-Mizyad<sup>556</sup> is situated some 5 km north of Tell al-Uhaimir (Kiš). This large site has provided evidence of occupation from the Old Akkadian to the Neo-Babylonian period. The site has yielded two groups of texts from the Ur III period.<sup>557</sup> An economic-administrative archive consisting of 30 texts from the time of Ibbi-Sîn and 84 undated lists of workers. Candidates for Išān-Mizyad's ancient name have been: Akkad,<sup>558</sup> Bāb-Ea,<sup>559</sup> and Zimahula<sup>560</sup>, but none of these have been accepted until now. The texts were published by two Iraqi Assyriologists: Rashid 1984 published most of the lists of workers and Al-Mutawally published other texts.<sup>561</sup>

---

<sup>553</sup> Like Gelb's 1968 an 'Old Babylonian List of Amorites'.

<sup>554</sup> Whiting 'cherry-picked' the other texts and published several articles on individual texts (Whiting 1977a, 1985a, 1985b and 1987b), for Ur III: Whiting 1976, 1977b and 1979. It appears that Reichel is now charged with the publication of the Ešnunna texts, see Reichel 2001a, 2001b, 2003 and 2008.

<sup>555</sup> Published by Edzard 1970a as text 1.

<sup>556</sup> For the site in general: Karg and Streck 1994:317-318.

<sup>557</sup> A general description by the site's excavator is Mahdi 1986.

<sup>558</sup> Weiss 1975:442-451.

<sup>559</sup> Rashid 1984:188 (ʾ ʾ ʾ).

<sup>560</sup> Al-Mutawally 1989:329.

<sup>561</sup> The texts themselves were published in copy : Al-Mutawally 1989. Preliminary reports are: Al-Mutawally 1982 (in Arabic) and Al-Mutawally 1991 (in English).

6.2.4 *Evidence from the large Ur III archives of southern Babylonia*

It is estimated that at least some 100,000 tablets from the Ur III period are kept in collections worldwide. The largest part (about 95%)<sup>562</sup> of them stem from the large institutional archives at Girsu, Umma, Puzriš-Dagan (Drehem), Ur, and private houses in Nippur.<sup>563</sup> Recently, two large private archives were published from Garšana and Iri-Sagrig.<sup>564</sup> In addition to this, two smaller private archives are currently known. The first is from the merchant Tūram-ilī<sup>565</sup> and the second belonged to an entrepreneur called SI.A-a.<sup>566</sup>

All these large Ur III archives contain haphazard information on the inhabitants of northern Babylonia, mostly in the form of names of people stemming from northern cities. An important tool is the volume on Ur III in the series *Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cuneiformes (RGTC)*.<sup>567</sup> This book, in spite of its age (1974) is still useful, because it not only gives us the place names, but also the names of the people associated with them (mostly their Ur III ENSI<sub>2</sub>-governors), see the Appendix to chapter 6.

6.2.5 *Provisory conclusions*

The few references from Ur III northern Babylonia do not tell us very much. What is important, nonetheless, is the fact that the onomasticon in this region seems predominantly Akkadian, with a Sumerian element and a few personal names that cannot directly be assigned to any language. Even though some of the names might be considered as Amorite,<sup>568</sup> it remains problematic to definitely label some names as Amorite. Note that none of the texts or persons from northern Babylonia has the gentilic MAR.TU added to them.

Based on the *current* information on northern Babylonia during the Ur III period there is no sign of any significant Amorite presence, perhaps not even

---

<sup>562</sup> Michalowski 2002:25.

<sup>563</sup> For the archive of Ur-Nusku DAM.GAR: Garfinkle 2012:109-136.

<sup>564</sup> Owen and Mayr 2007 and Owen 2013.

<sup>565</sup> See Van de Mierop 1986b and Garfinkle 2002, as well as the additional texts published by Mohammed Taher 2010. A comprehensive study was eventually published by Garfinkle 2012.

<sup>566</sup> See Garfinkle 2003 and Garfinkle 2012.

<sup>567</sup> Edzard and Farber 1974, important additions to this corpus are the review articles by Owen 1981 and Waetzoldt 1975.

<sup>568</sup> For example from the lists published by Rashid 1984: *bu-za-nu-um* (number 22 p.196 ii:11), *za-zi-na-ru* (number 21 p.195 ii:11), and *zi-za-ra-núm* (number 19 p.193 iii:8).

any Amorite presence at all in this region. This is in contrast to the Diyala region, where an influential Amorite group entertained relations with the rulers of Ešnunna from the end of the Ur III period onwards.

### 6.3 Two Amorite populations: one in the North, one in the South

It is no longer credible to state that ‘the Amorites’ seized power all over Mesopotamia right after the fall of the Ur III empire. There were many successor states to the Ur III domination, but none of these was ruled by people with clear Amorite names or affiliations. That came only later.<sup>569</sup>

The Ur III sources seem to point out only two places where there were significant numbers of Amorites (MAR.TU).<sup>570</sup>

- 1) The first group is found in the Ur III heartland. Michalowski has attempted to show that many people from this area designated as MAR.TU were in all probability members of the military and/or an elite (royal) bodyguard.<sup>571</sup> These people must have been highly organized militarily and this would very well explain why they took power in Larsa around or after 1975 BC.<sup>572</sup> It also explains why the Larsa kings traced their ancestry back to one of the most important Ur III Amorites, Naplānum, who could have been the leader of the Ur III royal bodyguard under Šulgi and Šū-Sîn<sup>573</sup>. This Naplānum supposedly lived in a town near Larsa called Kisig, where we might expect more Amo-

---

<sup>569</sup> We refrain from the discussion regarding Išbi-Erra’s roots: it does not seem plausible that the Isin kings were of Amorite stock, because there is nothing or little to proof this, see also Michalowski 2011:118.

<sup>570</sup> Here we draw heavily on Michalowski’s 2011 study on the (Ur III) Amorites.

<sup>571</sup> Michalowski 2011:105-110.

<sup>572</sup> This idea is not new; see Weeks 1985, Whiting 1995 and recently Michalowski 2011:109 and 119. The Larsa ‘king’ who ‘ruled’ at this time was Samium (ca. 1976-1942). There is almost no information about this man. (Fitzgerald 2002:31-35). Nor is it certain that it was Samium who broke free from Isin’s rule, but it is likely that Larsa was under Isin’s rule after the Ur III collapse (Charpin 2004a:69. In any case, Larsa was independent from the rule of Zabāya (1941-1933) onwards.

<sup>573</sup> Michalowski 2011:108, on Naplānum: Steinkeller 2004:37-40 and Fitzgerald 2002:18-25 and p. 165-167.

rites, perhaps Naplānum's kinsmen and family.<sup>574</sup> This military background in turn also explains the title *rabiān amurrim* carried by early OB (Larsa) kings: Charpin has argued for a common background of the royal title *rabiān amurrim* and the later OB military titles UGULA MAR.TU and GAL MAR.TU (both *rabi amurrim*): *rabiān amurrim* and *rabi amurrim* both designate someone as 'chief of the (military) Amorites'. In this view these early OB kings claimed leadership of a military Amorite elite.<sup>575</sup>

- 2) The second group of 'Amorites' stem from the KUR MAR.TU, which is not in Syria according to the Ur III sources, but to the north-east of the Ur III state, in the upper Diyala valley behind the Jebel Hamrin.<sup>576</sup> It is not a country, but rather a vaguely defined area, that was a frontier region from whence the Ur III armies conducted military campaigns against polities up north (Urbilum, Simurru) or further in the Zagros (Šimaški).

It is possible that Naplānum and his men originated from this area in the Zagros foothills.<sup>577</sup> Before and subsequent to the Ur III collapse in 2002 BC it is possible that other Amorites trickled down the upper Diyala valley into the lower Diyala region where we encounter them in the early Ešnunna texts from 2000 BC onwards. There is sparse evidence that they were pastoralists: a reference to a pasture or 'nomadic encampment' (*nawûm*) is found in an early Ešnunna letter<sup>578</sup> and a locality outside of Tutub is called 'the tents' (*kuštarātum*).<sup>579</sup>

---

<sup>574</sup> Steinkeller 2004:38. This reminds us of an early Išbi-Erra year name: MU URU.KI MAR.TU BA.HUL (Išbi-Erra year 8 = Ibbi-Sîn 16), 'The year: the MAR.TU town was destroyed'. This MAR.TU town could very well have been a Southern Mesopotamian town containing an Amorite garrison or mercenaries, fighting for the Ur III king.

<sup>575</sup> Charpin 2007:170. The texts in the Lu-igisa archive (Walters 1970) provide many additional occurrences of people with Amorite names in the early Old Babylonian kingdom of Larsa.

<sup>576</sup> Michalowski 2011:93-105.

<sup>577</sup> Michalowski 2011:104.

<sup>578</sup> Whiting 1987a AS 22 23:12.

<sup>579</sup> ŠA *ku-uš-ta-ra-tum*, JCS 9 p. 78 no. 26:5-8, MU BÀD *hu-ri-ib-šu-um*<sup>ki</sup>; *ku-uš-ta-ri*<sup>ki</sup>, JCS 9 p. 118 no. 101:4, undated. These texts are however dated between ca. 1900 and 1870 BC.





Map 1 The Presence of Amorite People (in Purple) and the 'Amorite land' (KUR MAR.TU, in Red) around 2000 BC

### 6.3.1 *The homeland of the Amorites*

Was this 'KUR MAR.TU' then the 'homeland' of the Amorites? Traditionally it has always been thought that the Amorites came from the region of the Djebel Bishri in Syria, from where they purportedly descended the Euphrates and penetrated the Ur III empire. That this theory is anachronistic was demonstrated by Michalowski 2011. However, another view was promoted by Charpin and Durand.

Their view has two major components, the *kispum* ritual of the Babylonian kings<sup>580</sup> and the so-called ‘toponymie en miroir’.<sup>581</sup> Charpin and Durand have put forth the idea that Amorite migration waves can be identified in three of the four ‘reigns’ (BALA/*palûm*) in the famous ‘Hammurabi genealogy’. This is a text from Ammi-šaduqa’s reign describing food offerings to deceased members and related persons of the royal house (called a *kispum* ritual). The tablet containing the *kispum* ritual enumerates a number of eponymous ancestors, Babylonian kings, and other people connected to the Babylonian royal house. In the middle of the list we find the ‘reign’ of the Amorite troops (BALA ERIN<sub>2</sub> MAR.[TU]), Hana troops (BALA ERIN<sub>2</sub> *he-a-[na]*), Gutium (BALA *gu-ti-um*), and any ‘reign’ that was not written on this tablet (BALA *ša i-na tup-pí an-ni-i la ša-at-ru*). The first three ‘reigns’ represent according to Durand and Charpin phases in the history of the Amorite group to which the Babylonian kings belonged.<sup>582</sup> These ‘reigns’ are interpreted as their itinerary (see map 2).<sup>583</sup>

The second argument was worked out by Charpin as the mirror topography. Earlier, scholars had already pointed to this mirror topography,<sup>584</sup> in which two different regions carried the same name. It is a fact that several geographical names occur more than once across the Near East in the Old Babylonian period. Charpin has three explanations for this phenomenon: pure chance, the result of deportations, and Amorite migration waves.<sup>585</sup> He points out that none of the ‘mirror topography’ names already existed before the Old Babylonian period. In addition, a number of these geographical names are in fact tribal names. Amorite tribes would have renamed newly settled territories after their places of origin.

---

<sup>580</sup> Finkelstein 1966, with Lambert 1968, Birot 1980, Charpin and Durand 1986, and Durand 2012a. The whole significance of the *kispum* ritual is again thoroughly revisited by Jacquet in 2002. He places it in a wider context stating that it is a cult aimed at the royal family as well as the tribe at large to which the Amorite kings belonged.

<sup>581</sup> Charpin 2003.

<sup>582</sup> Charpin and Durand 1986:166-170 and Durand 2012a:38-39.

<sup>583</sup> Wossink’s theory (2009) connects to the idea that the Amorites came originally from Northern Syria.

<sup>584</sup> See for example Stol 1976:70: ‘We find that Emutbalum/Yamutbalum could designate, at the same time, both the kingdom of Larsa and tribal groups in the North, that did not depend on Rim-Sin’.

<sup>585</sup> Charpin 2003:12-18.



Map 2 Amorite Migration Waves after Charpin and Durand

### 6.3.2 *Amorite settlement patterns and migration waves*

There is no direct evidence for an Amorite migration wave into Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region. However, the Amorite personal names and their distribution allow us to draw some conclusions.

The absolute percentages of Amorite personal names are the highest in Kiš and Damrum and Tutub (both 9%), the Degree of Homonymy is also the lowest for these two sites (0.09 and 0.11, see chapter 3) The Tutub texts are among the oldest texts in the whole corpus (ca. 1900 until 1870 BC), while the other (Diyala) texts are usually from a period several decades (and thus generations) later. An explanation might be that the Amorite component was less acculturated (visible in the adopting of Akkadian names) in Tutub in this early period. The high number of Amorite personal names in Kiš and Damrum might be explained by the hypothesis that the urban elites in towns such as Sippar and Kiš had prevented the settlement of too many (lower status) Amo-

rites within their city walls.<sup>586</sup> As a result, these people were more or less forced to settle in the countryside. We can compare the situation at Damrum and Kiš with Sippar and Halhalla: the Amorites seem mostly settled in smaller towns around the old traditional urban centers.

The research done on the occurrence of hapax and dis legomenon names has shown clearly that the Amorite and ‘other’ names occur relatively less frequent than the Akkadian and Sumerian names.<sup>587</sup> The fact that Amorite names occur once or twice more often might be indicative of a migration wave, where the names of newcomers are less frequent than those of the indigenous population. However, this information might also be interpreted differently: Amorite names could have been less frequent in the cities than in the countryside, or they were becoming less popular.

The strongest indication against an Amorite migration wave was also provided by the Amorite personal names. The main theophoric elements are the Moongod Erah and ‘the God’ El: exactly the same as for the Akkadian names (the Moongod Sin and ‘the God’ Ilum) in early OB Northern Babylonian and the Diyala region. The early OB Amorite names show little affinity with the Amorite names in the later dated Mari archives, where we encounter the main gods of the middle Euphrates and the Levant as the main theophoric elements: Addu and Dagan. The fact that early OB Amorite and Akkadian names show these similarities, suggests a period of acculturation. This means that the early OB ‘Amorites’ might have been indigenous to the region or that they were acculturated to the local population over the course of a few generations.

### 6.3.3 *Amorites in the Zagros: Simurru and Choga Gavaneh*

Ahmed published a highly interesting text in his 2012 dissertation (already mentioned in chapter 2). The inscription is from Iddin-Sîn, a king of Simurru<sup>588</sup>

---

<sup>586</sup> See Chapter 3.

<sup>587</sup> As a reminder: the total percentage of Amorite names in Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region is 8%. Of all the Amorite names, 86% occur only once or twice. Of all the Akkadian/Sumerian names, 73% occur only once or twice.

<sup>588</sup> Ahmed 2012:218 and p. 297-302, puts Simurru and its country beyond the Jebel Hamrin mountain range (the western part of the KUR MAR.TU in map 1).

(ca. 2030-2000 BC).<sup>589</sup> He tells us explicitly that he defeated Amorites during his reign.<sup>590</sup>

<sup>75</sup> Mad/k/qia-[x] <sup>76</sup> Šawa/i/piya-[x] <sup>77</sup> Magiba-ni(?) <sup>78</sup> Ahatum <sup>79</sup> (and) Awilānum, <sup>80-81</sup> the Amorite leaders <sup>82</sup> he slew them <sup>83-85</sup> and he chased away the Amorites from his territory (=Iddin-Sîn's). <sup>86</sup> The god Nišba, <sup>87</sup> his lord, <sup>88-89</sup> had heard his word(s) <sup>90-91</sup> (and) he destroyed the lands, <sup>92-94</sup> he slew the Amorites and the Šimaškians.

This text establishes without a doubt an Amorite presence in the upper Diyala region or at least the Zagros foothills and validates the argument that the 'KUR MAR.TU' lay around the Jebel Hamrin. However, this is not all: three of the names of the Amorite *rabiānum*'s are linguistically undetermined and two of them are Akkadian.<sup>591</sup>

A group of texts that completely turn our ideas about Amorites and Akkadians upside down was recently published by Abdi and Beckman. They published 56 texts, 28 fragments and a cylinder seal from a site deep in the Zagros mountains: Choga Gavaneh. The texts are not dated, but they have OB characteristics.<sup>592</sup> The personal names are overwhelmingly Akkadian, but there are also Amorite names<sup>593</sup> and mention of Amorite *mandu* soldiers from Dēr.<sup>594</sup>

It seems easiest to assume that Choga Gavaneh was home to a Mesopotamian merchant colony trading along the Great Khorasan Road (a trading route linking Mesopotamia with Central Asia). Along this route at least two commodities were headed for Mesopotamia: lapis lazuli and tin from Afghanistan.

<sup>589</sup> Ahmed 2012:244-245.

<sup>590</sup> Taken from Ahmed 2012 p. 257-258, lines 75-94: <sup>1</sup>ma-di/ki-a-[x], <sup>1</sup>ša-wa/wi/pi-a-[x], <sup>1</sup>ma-gi-ba-<sup>ni</sup>(?), <sup>1</sup>a-ha-<sup>tum</sup>, <sup>1</sup>Ia-wi-la-núm, <sup>1</sup>ra-bí-a-nu, <sup>1</sup>a-mu-ri-im, <sup>1</sup>i-ne-er-šu-nu-ti, <sup>1</sup>à a-mu-ra-am, <sup>1</sup>i-na kúl-le-<sup>e</sup>(?)-<sup>šu</sup>, <sup>1</sup>iṭ-ru-«ud»-us-sú, <sup>1</sup>ni-iš-ba, <sup>1</sup>be-el-šu, <sup>1</sup>a-wa-as-sú, <sup>1</sup>iš-me-ma, <sup>1</sup>ma-tá-tim, <sup>1</sup>ú-ha-li-iq, <sup>1</sup>a-mu-ra-am, <sup>1</sup>ú si-maš-kà-am<sup>ki</sup>, <sup>1</sup>i-ne-er.

<sup>591</sup> Ahmed 2012:271-272.

<sup>592</sup> Abdi and Beckman 2007:46: early eighteenth century.

<sup>593</sup> Abdi and Beckman 2007:48 state that 13 out of 180 complete personal names are Amorite, a more conservative count would find only one: Hammurabi in *ChG* 20:v5'.

<sup>594</sup> The text is *ChG* 18, in which 7 *mandu* (could there be a link to the term *ummān-mandu*?) soldiers from Dēr are mentioned, 3 substitute soldiers from Agade and 8 soldiers from Šilli <son?> of Idi. The town of Dēr in *ChG* 18 (written BĀD<sup>ki</sup>) is most likely the Transtigradian town along the Zagros foothills (mostly written BĀD.AN<sup>ki</sup> though), but could also be a town in Elamite territory (see De Graef 2007:96).

The Mesopotamian merchants would themselves typically trade in textiles.<sup>595</sup> The texts do seem to support such a hypothesis,<sup>596</sup> but why has almost everybody an Akkadian name? Where are the Elamite or Gutian names? Or was Choga Gavaneh an all-Mesopotamian outpost? Perhaps people this far in the Zagros simply carried Akkadian names (Sumerian names are absent). Why are there so many female names in the ration lists? Enough questions that we will not be able to answer here.

Mention must also be made of Arim-Lim<sup>597</sup>, *rabiān* MAR.TU, whose inscription was found at Mē-Turān, where the Diyala river breaks through the Jebel Hamrin mountains.<sup>598</sup> A certain Ahi-maraš ruled there as well.<sup>599</sup>

To conclude, we cannot be sure about the Amorites' 'homeland'. This notion presupposes again the outdated theory concerning mass migrations. Charpin, Durand, and Michalowski do seem to be correct that the Amorites from the Ur III period came down from the Diyala river basin from the Zagros foothills, from what the Ur III scribes conveniently called the KUR MAR.TU. The fact that none of the early OB Amorite names contains Addu or Dagan does not suggest a Syrian homeland for the early OB Amorites.<sup>600</sup> However, linguistically we cannot deny a connection between the languages behind the Early OB Amorites' names and the Mari era Amorites. But that does not necessarily imply a common homeland.

---

<sup>595</sup> Perhaps from the Diyala region, given the Diyala syllabary and month names? Note also the name Nūr-Tišpak (*ChG* F1:5', cf. Abdi and Beckman 2007:47).

<sup>596</sup> Cloths: *ChG* 3, 4, 17. Donkeys (for caravans): *ChG* 2, 15, 44. Soldiers (perhaps to escort caravans or protect the settlement): *ChG* 5, 18, 31.

<sup>597</sup> His death is commemorated in the year name found on the Šadlaš/Nērebtum treaty, cf. Greengus 1979:74-77, Wu Yuhong 1994a:54-61, and Wu Yuhong 1994b.

<sup>598</sup> Frayne 1990 E4.16.1.

<sup>599</sup> Known from an unpublished Mē-Turān text, see Wu Yuhong 1994a:52.

<sup>600</sup> If we look at the most prominent divine names in Ebla personal names we find mostly gods such as Damu, Yišar, Malik and 'the God': Il. Names composed with Dagan and Addu (Adda in Ebla) are present, but less frequent. Interesting is the total absence of the Amorite Moongod Erah in the Ebla material. For these observations I used the list of Ebla names in Pagan 1998:269-392.

## 6.4 The political situation of Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region between ca. 2000-1900 BC

Under the Ur III kings the entire region was divided into provinces, ruled by ENSI<sub>2</sub>'s.<sup>601</sup> After the fall of the Ur III empire at the hands of the Elamites and Šimaškians there were at least seven polities (that we know of) independently active in Mesopotamia: the Šimaški-confederation, Simurru, Assur, Malgium, Dēr, Ešnunna, and Isin. The first three; Šimaški,<sup>602</sup> Simurru,<sup>603</sup> and Assur<sup>604</sup> fall outside of the scope of this study, in the following section we will take a look at the situation in the other towns from Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region between ca. 2000-1900 BC.

### 6.4.1.1 Ešnunna/Tell Asmar

The excavations at Ešnunna yielded texts from the Ur III period into the early OB period. Ešnunna had broken free from Ur III's yoke sometime after Ibbi-Sîn's third regnal year (2024): Šū-ilīya, the son of the Ur III ENSI<sub>2</sub> Itūriya, proclaimed himself 'king of the land of Warûm'.<sup>605</sup> Šū-ilīya also took the divine determinative in front of his name, the only Ešnunna king to do so.<sup>606</sup> He exchanged gifts with Išbi-Erra of Isin, who was in power from 2019 BC onwards.<sup>607</sup>

Šū-ilīya was succeeded by Nūr-ahum (perhaps around 2010 BC?).<sup>608</sup> However it is not clear what the exact connection between the two was: in a year name Šū-ilīya's heir apparent (IBILA LUGAL) is called Ikūn-pi-Tišpak.<sup>609</sup> From the apocryphal Puzur-Numušda letter we learn that Nūr-ahum was also

<sup>601</sup> Steinkeller 1987 and Sallaberger 1999:190-199.

<sup>602</sup> Michalowski 2009-2011.

<sup>603</sup> Ahmed 2012:237-302 and Frayne 2009-2011.

<sup>604</sup> Veenhof 2008:122-130.

<sup>605</sup> Warûm is the territory of Ešnunna, Išme-Dagan of Isin (1955-1937) claims in a recently published Akkadian inscription that he was also the king of Warûm: George 2011:90.

<sup>606</sup> Whiting 1987a:26, Wu Yuhong 1994a:2-5, and Charpin 2004a:64-65.

<sup>607</sup> Known from the unpublished text 1931-T148, cited by Whiting 1987a:115.

<sup>608</sup> Many authors state that Šū-ilīya might have been killed by Zinnu, the ENSI<sub>2</sub> of Subartu around 2010 BC (based on the Puzur-Numušda letter). This idea is refuted by Michalowski 2011:194-198, who translates the relevant passage in the Puzur-Numušda letter differently, making Zinnu an ENSI<sub>2</sub> who took prisoners in Subartu.

<sup>609</sup> Whiting 1977b:174 n. 10, Jacobsen 1940:173 no. 47.



allied to Išbi-Erra.<sup>610</sup> However, another important alliance was struck between Nūr-ahum and the Amorite chief Abda-El. A daughter of Nūr-ahum was married to Ušašum, the son of Abda-El.<sup>611</sup>



Map 3 The Political Situation after the Ur III collapse

Nūr-ahum was in turn ousted from the Ešnunna throne by Kirikiri: a man bearing what appears to be an Elamite name.<sup>612</sup> This event happened together with the destruction by fire of the Ešnunna palace and the desecration of the

<sup>610</sup> Michalowski 2011:197.

<sup>611</sup> Whiting 1987:26. What can this tell us about the hierarchy between Nūr-ahum and Abda-El? Did the stronger one present his daughter in marriage, or was it the other way around? In OB Mari Zimri-Lim married of his daughters to his vassals, and he in turn married a daughter of his overlord, the king of Aleppo. See the remarks by Whiting 1987a:27-28.

<sup>612</sup> See the remarks by Wu Yuhong 1994a:12.



Šū-Sîn temple.<sup>613</sup> Kirikiri probably founded his new dynasty around 2005 BC.<sup>614</sup> Even though Kirikiri was the ENSI<sub>2</sub> of Ešnunna, he was also the *king* of the land of Warûm.<sup>615</sup> Kirikiri must have understood the importance of continued Amorite support and he married his son Bilalama to a daughter of Abda-El.<sup>616</sup> Kirikiri's son-in-law Ušašum (who calls him 'my brother') even wrote a letter to Kirikiri.<sup>617</sup>

Bilalama<sup>618</sup> succeeded his father on Ešnunna's throne,<sup>619</sup> this must have been not long after the fall of the Ur III empire (2002 BC), his reign lasted for ten or twenty years. It should come as no surprise that Bilalama, with his suspected Elamite roots married off his daughter, Šimat-Kubi,<sup>620</sup> to Tan-ruhuratir, the king of the Šimaški confederation and ENSI<sub>2</sub> of Susa.<sup>621</sup>

Textual remains from Bilalama's time show that he was in contact with most of the important rulers of lower Mesopotamia at that time: Šū-ilīšu of Isin,<sup>622</sup> Šū-Kakka of Malgium,<sup>623</sup> Anzabazuna of Simurru,<sup>624</sup> Tan-ruhuratir of the Šimaški, and Ilum-mutabbil of Dēr<sup>625</sup>. Apart from these city rulers,

---

<sup>613</sup> These events were reconstructed by Reichel 2003:368.

<sup>614</sup> Maybe even at roughly the same time that the Elamite/Šimaški confederation conquered Ur.

<sup>615</sup> This is known from the famous Bilalama cylinder seal. Reichel 2003 has shown that Nūr-Ahum's official seal was recut and presented to Bilalama by his father Kirikiri.

<sup>616</sup> Reichel 2003:368 and Whiting 1987a:28. Again: what tells this about the underlying hierarchy, was Abda-El now the stronger party, because his daughter married to Ešnunna's ruler? Saporetti 1998:77 believes that a year name from Nērebtum also commemorates the wedding between Bilalama and Abda-El's daughter (Greengus 1979:34 no. 54): MU *ru-bu-um* DUMU.MUNUS *ha-ab-di-[e]l i-hu-zu*.

<sup>617</sup> AS 22 10.

<sup>618</sup> The name should probably be read as Billama, it occurs in this form on the brick inscription from his daughter (*MDP* 2 80 and *MDP* 14 24; *bil-la-ma*). It is written on a cylinder seal from a son of his as *bi-la-ma* (Frayne 1990 E5.3.4.5) and also on a cylinder seal offered to his daughter Šimat-Kubi (Frayne 1990 E4.5.3.3).

<sup>619</sup> Saporetti 2002:61-74 also wrote on Bilalama.

<sup>620</sup> There are also two cylinder seals mentioning Šimat-Kubi: one servant seal from Susa (Frayne 1990 E4.5.3.2007) and a seal offered by Bilalama to Šimat-Kubi (Frayne 1990 E4.5.3.3).

<sup>621</sup> *MDP* 2 80 and *MDP* 14 24, see also Wu Yuhong 1994a:13. For the sequence of the Šimaški and later Sukkalmah rulers: Vallat 2007 and 2009.

<sup>622</sup> Whiting 1987b:30-32.

<sup>623</sup> Whiting 1987b:34-35 with De Boer 2013b.

<sup>624</sup> Whiting 1987b:30.

<sup>625</sup> Whiting 1987a:28-29 n. 88.

Bilalama entertained close relations with two Amorite families which will be discussed in a later section. Bilalama was perhaps also the Ešnunna ruler who conquered Tutub.<sup>626</sup>

No less than eight letters in the Ešnunna correspondence were sent to Bilalama, many of them concern Amorites and the political situation.

- AS 22 11 (sender unknown, probably Ušašum) this letter was sent shortly before the funeral of the important Amorite chief Abda-El, the writer pleads with Bilalama to send him expensive gifts for the funeral.
- AS 22 12 (from Battum, wife of Abda-El) Battum complains to Bilalama about her servants.
- AS 22 13 (sender unknown, but probably a ruler higher in rank) the writer reproaches Bilalama about the way he addresses him.<sup>627</sup>
- AS 22 14 (from Adallal) fragmentary letter.
- AS 22 15 (from Ilum-lu-watar) this letter was written by the son of another important Amorite leader: Usû. He reminds Bilalama that Usû had sent a funerary gift for Bilalama's grandfather (the unknown father of Kirikiri). Now Ilum-lu-watar wants Bilalama to send him a gift for Usû's funeral.
- AS 22 16 (sender unknown) the letter is about a slave girl.
- AS 22 17 (sender unknown, but probably a ruler higher in rank) the writer reproaches Bilalama about the confinement of a messenger.
- AS 22 18 (sender unknown) three unconnected fragments.
- AS 22 23 (sender and addressee unknown) this letters mentions a discourse held by Bilalama concerning a threat to Kunzānum.

Another important source for Bilalama's contacts with Amorites are his year names. In contrast to the letters which mention good contacts between Bilalama and the Amorites, the year names commemorate conquests over the Amorites:<sup>628</sup>

---

<sup>626</sup> See Saporetti 1998:94, attributed to Nūr-ahum by Wu Yuhong 1994a:7.

<sup>627</sup> Whiting 1987a:56-57 and Wu Yuhong 1994a:17 differ in their interpretation of this letter.

<sup>628</sup> For all the variants: Saporetti 1998:77-93 and Wu Yuhong 1994a:18-19. Charpin 2004a:67: 'La correspondance royale montre également que les relations de Bilalama avec les Amorites furent tantôt bonnes et tantôt hostiles;...' Wu Yuhong 1994a:18: 'Although the evidence above shows a good relationship between Bilalama and the Amorites in the Diyala region, from other letters and the year names of Bilalama we know that there were

- *OIP* 43 date 55 MU MAR.TU A.ŠÀ *i-bi-<sup>d</sup>E*[N.ZU] BA.AB.RA, ‘Year: the Amorite(s) of ‘The-field-of-Ibbi-Sîn’ were defeated.
- *OIP* 43 date 64 MU MAR.TU (BALA) *i-šur<sup>ki</sup>* BA.GAZ.A, ‘Year: the Amorite(s) of Išur were killed’.
- *OIP* 43 date 65 MU MAR.TU BALA *i-šur<sup>ki</sup> bi-la-la-ma*.RA MU.NA.AN.SIM, ‘Year: the Amorite(s) gave the rule of Išur to Bilalama’.
- *OIP* 43 date 66 MU MAR.TU KÁ-<sup>d</sup>*i-ba-um* BA.AB.RA, ‘Year: the Amorite(s) of Ka-Ibaum were defeated’.
- *OIP* 43 date 67 MU.ÚS.SA MAR.TU KÁ-<sup>d</sup>*i-ba-um* BA.AB.RA, ‘Year: after the Amorite(s) of Ka-Ibaum were defeated’.
- *OIP* 43 date 68 MU.ÚS.SA MAR.TU KÁ-<sup>d</sup>*i-ba-um* BA.GAZ MU.ÚS.SA.BI, ‘The second year after the Amorite(s) of Ka-Ibaum were killed’.
- *OIP* 43 date 70 MU *bi-la-la-ma* ENSI<sub>2</sub> ÁŠ.NUN<sup>ki</sup> SAG+DU MAR.TU ŠU.TÍBIR.RA BL.IN.RA, ‘Year: Bilalama, the ENSI<sub>2</sub> of Ešnunna struck the Amorite(s) on the head with the fist’.
- *OIP* 43 date 81 MU MAR.TU GÚ IM.GAR (attribution to Bilalama’s reign uncertain), ‘Year: the Amorite(s) submitted’.

These year names mention Amorites from three localities: Išur, Ka-Ibaum and A.šà Ibbi-Sîn. Let’s take a closer look at these:

Išur is known from Bilalama’s year names, a letter,<sup>629</sup> and a year name from Warassa,<sup>630</sup> almost a century later.<sup>631</sup> In all cases the kings of Ešnunna took control of Išur or defeated it.

Ka-Ibaum is only mentioned in Bilalama’s year names. Place names of the type KÁ-<sup>d</sup>DN<sup>ki</sup> are rare, the most famous one is Babylon (KÁ.DINGIR.RA<sup>ki</sup>, archaic writing: KÁ.DINGIR<sup>ki</sup>),<sup>632</sup> but most others occur only in lexical lists.<sup>633</sup> A god called ‘<sup>d</sup>*i-ba-um*’ is not known from other sources,<sup>634</sup> but Ibaum is perhaps

---

also many battles between them’. We follow Wu Yuhong’s translation of the year names, see his comments: Wu Yuhong 1994a:19-20.

<sup>629</sup> AS 22 12:18, a son of a certain Šū-Išhara is going to Išur.

<sup>630</sup> Saporetti 1998:321.

<sup>631</sup> A place name written as ni.šur<sup>ki</sup> (=i-šur<sup>ki</sup>) is mentioned in a version of the Anzu epic, Saggs 1986:27 line 146, but this is probably not connected to the early OB Išur.

<sup>632</sup> Lambert 2011, note also the writing ‘BAR.KI.BAR’ for Babylon in a Pre-Sargonic inscription: Lambert:2011:73.

<sup>633</sup> *MSL* 11:132 v:35-39: KÁ-<sup>d</sup>LÚ.LÀL<sup>ki</sup>, KÁ.DINGIR.RA<sup>ki</sup>, KÁ-<sup>d</sup>IŠTARAN(KA.DI)<sup>ki</sup>, KÁ-<sup>d</sup>KASKAL<sup>ki</sup>, KÁ-<sup>d</sup>GEŠTIN (read in *MSL* 11 as LUGAL).AN.NA<sup>ki</sup>.

<sup>634</sup> In Dilbat the Uraš temple was called É-<sup>d</sup>*i-bi-a-nu-um*, George 1993:102 no. 493.

a deified (Amorite) ancestor: exactly the same name occurs in the List of Amorites published by Gelb.<sup>635</sup> Also,  $\text{K}\bar{\text{A}}\text{-}^{\text{d}}\text{i-ba-um}$  does not carry the geographical determinative  $\text{KI}$ . It is a possibility that we should actually read the name as *Bāb-Ibaum* ( $\text{K}\bar{\text{A}}$  is Akkadian *bābum*).

A.šà-Ibbi-Sîn is perhaps the most obscure place name. This type of place name is only known for one other locality:  $\text{URU}\text{A.}\check{\text{Š}}\bar{\text{A}}.\check{\text{ŠIR}}^{\text{KI}}$  near Kutalla.<sup>636</sup> The name  $\text{A.}\check{\text{Š}}\bar{\text{A}}\text{-i-bi-}^{\text{d}}\text{E}[\text{N.ZU}]$  could rather refer to a field where some kind of battle took place than to an actual town.

To sum up: the Amorites that Bilalama fought were located in very small or obscure towns: not even one of them is found in the Harmal Geographical List, which otherwise does mention obscure towns in the Diyala region.<sup>637</sup> It is likely that the Amorites were defeated in temporary settlements or towns that had only been founded shortly before the battles.

It is not certain who succeeded Bilalama; a son of his is called Šalilamilkum. This name is written on a duck weight.<sup>638</sup> Bilalama's immediate successor seems to have been the ephemeral Išar-ramāšu,<sup>639</sup> the connection between him and Bilalama is unknown.

The next rulers on Ešnunna's throne were Ušur-awāssu,<sup>640</sup> Azuzum,<sup>641</sup> Ur-Ninmarki,<sup>642</sup> and Ur-Ningišzida<sup>643</sup>. The letters and year names from this period hardly contain any clues about Ešnunna's political history or the Amorites. This does not mean that nothing happened; we just have no information.<sup>644</sup>

The Amorites are frequently mentioned in the early OB Ešnunna letters, but often in a broken context.<sup>645</sup> Amorites occurring in better preserved letters:

---

<sup>635</sup> Gelb 1968:40 line 14: *i-ba-um*, normalized by Gelb as 'Jibâ'um'.

<sup>636</sup> Charpin 1980:347.

<sup>637</sup> *MSL* 11:56-59.

<sup>638</sup> Frayne 1990 E4.5.3.5.

<sup>639</sup> Saporetti 2002:79-80 has the idea that Išar-ramašu was in fact a eunuch who seized the throne.

<sup>640</sup> Saporetti 2002:74-79.

<sup>641</sup> Saporetti 2002:80-83.

<sup>642</sup> Saporetti 2002:185-189.

<sup>643</sup> Saporetti 2002:189-190.

<sup>644</sup> It serves little use to repeat what has already been stated by Whiting 1987a:29, Wu Yuhong 1994a:19-25 and Charpin 2004a:67-68.

<sup>645</sup> *AS* 22 3:6'; 4:11; 5:4

- AS 22 6 (sender unknown; to ‘my lord’) the text mentions an attack by the Amorites on a city.
- AS 22 7 (sender unknown; to Nūr-Ištar) the letter is about a certain Zihadi who commanded 2000 Amorites marching against Nūr-Ištar.
- AS 22 9 sender unknown; to ‘my lord’) a report from a commander assuring the king that he can withstand an Amorite attack.
- AS 22 20 (sender and addressee unknown) a letter mentioning Amorites who went ‘to the mountains’.
- AS 22 27 (sender and addressee unknown) the writer had summoned the Amorites and he mentions a news report from Išim-Šulgi.
- AS 22 46 (sender unknown; to Bibi-x-ku) the letter mentions that the Amorites have taken a decision about Tutub.

#### 6.4.1.2 Amorite dynasties in the Diyala region

Around 2000-1980 BC, the time of Bilalama of Ešnunna and Išbi-Erra and Šū-ilīšu of Isin, we are relatively well informed about two important families of Amorite chiefs: Abda-El and Usû, and less well informed about some other Amorite leaders: Šamāmum, Ilānum, Gā’ušum and Birbirum.

##### 6.4.1.2.1 Abda-El and Ušašum

Abda-El was already mentioned a few times because of the dynastic marriages between his family and two ruling dynasties at Ešnunna. Abda-El<sup>646</sup> himself was apparently married to a woman called Battum.<sup>647</sup> An unnamed daughter of Nūr-ahum was married to Abda-El’s most important son Ušašum.<sup>648</sup> When Nūr-ahum was replaced by Kirikiri, Abda-El married off his daughter to Bilalama, Kirikiri’s son.<sup>649</sup> The ‘deal’ of these marriages was probably that the Ešnunnean kings had an Amorite political ally, and perhaps also his military

---

<sup>646</sup> His ‘title’ may have been *rabiān amurrim*, following Whiting 1987a:26.

<sup>647</sup> AS 22 12 and Whiting 1987a:27.

<sup>648</sup> Is this the ‘wife of Ušašum’ occurring in an administrative text from Isin? *BIN* 9 238:10, DAM ú-’ša-šum’/MAR.[TU].

<sup>649</sup> Reichel 2003.

support: Gelb's List of Amorites has different 'sections' of Amorites, Abda-El (it could be a homonym) is mentioned twice as section leader.<sup>650</sup>

Abda-El and Ušašum were the recipients of frequent gifts from Bilalama,<sup>651</sup> but also from Išbi-Erra: he is mentioned in *BIN* 9 316 (from Isin, dated Išbi-Erra 12/VII):<sup>652</sup> a large four column tablet recording the disbursement of oil to 'territories' of the Amorites: two of the mentioned Amorites are Abda-El and his son Ušašum.<sup>653</sup> This shows the extent of Abda-El's influence: he was recognized in Isin and in Ešnunna.

Abda-El had at least one other son, called Awilānum. This Awilānum died during the reign of Bilalama, because a gift is recorded for his funeral.<sup>654</sup> Incidentally, an Amorite chief called Awilānum was reportedly killed by Iddin-Sîn of Simurru at around the same time.<sup>655</sup>

Abda-El himself died during the reign of Bilalama, because Bilalama received a letter from (probably) Ušašum and one from Battum referring to his death.<sup>656</sup> Ušašum also corresponded with one of Bilalama's successors: Ušur-awāssu.<sup>657</sup>

<sup>650</sup> Gelb 1968:40 line 9 and:41 line 41. Gelb's text does not explicitly mention a military role for these Amorites.

<sup>651</sup> Whiting 1987a:28 n. 85.

<sup>652</sup> There are many similar, less specific texts registering 'gifts' (NÍG.ŠU.TAG<sub>4</sub>.A) to Amorites.

<sup>653</sup> *BIN* 9 316 col i 1 DUG.ŠAGAN [i].DÜG.GA, *i-túr*-DINGIR, 1 KUŠ DÜG.[...]bi/[...]ta, m[i...i], <sup>1</sup>m[u...], GÌR *nu-hi*-DINGIR, <sup>1</sup>*la-nu-um*, <sup>1</sup>*la-mu-ma-nu-um*, <sup>1</sup>*me-wi-um*, GÌR *en-um*-<sup>d</sup>EN.ZU, <sup>1</sup>*la-ú-šum*, <sup>1</sup>*nu-úr*-<sup>d</sup>EN.ZU, <sup>1</sup>*ab-de-il*, <sup>1</sup>*ú-ša-šum*/DUMU.NI, *ik-ba-nu-um*, *ma-si-id-a-nu-um*, GÌR UR-<sup>d</sup>XX, col ii <sup>1</sup>*ša-ma-mu-um*, 1 DUG ŠAGAN Ì.DÜG.GA, DAM *ša-ma-mu-um*, GÌR *bu-la-la-tum*, <sup>1</sup>*ma-na-nu-um*, GÌR *gu-sà-ni*, <sup>1</sup>*i-da-ne*-DINGIR, <sup>1</sup>*du-si-mu-um*, <sup>1</sup>*sà-ab-ra-nu-um*, <sup>1</sup>*ib-ra-nu-um*, <sup>1</sup>*hu-ni-na-nu-um*, <sup>1</sup>*da-tum-pi<sub>5</sub>*-DINGIR, <sup>1</sup>*a-hi-da-nu-um*, 1 DUG.ŠAGAN Ì.DÜG.GA, LÚ-<sup>d</sup>MAR.TU, GÌR *šu-iš<sub>8</sub>-tár*, <sup>1</sup>*e-me-šum*, col iii <sup>1</sup>*da-i*-<sup>r</sup>x x', <sup>1</sup>*da-ni-iš-me*-<sup>r</sup>x', <sup>1</sup>*i-na-nu-um*, GÌR *ša-gul-lum*, <sup>1</sup>*la-pi<sub>5</sub>-il*, <sup>1</sup>*a-sa-súm*, <sup>1</sup>*ma-ra-súm*, <sup>1</sup>*bu-kà-nu-um*, <sup>1</sup>*na-a<sub>7</sub>-ta-nu-um*, GÌR *i-din*-<sup>d</sup>EN.ZU, [<sup>1</sup>x]-*ma-nu-um*, [<sup>1</sup>x]-*ku-bu-um*, [<sup>1</sup>x]-*ú-lu-um*, [<sup>1</sup>]e-*ti-um*, [<sup>1</sup>]ku-*bu-e-el*, <sup>1</sup>*a-bi-ad-e-el*, <sup>1</sup>*da-tum*, GÌR uš, col iv [<sup>1</sup>.x+] 25 KUŠ DÜG.GAN.TÚG, [...K]UŠ UDU.BI 1 60, 20 DUG.ŠAGAN, KUŠ <sup>r</sup>x x', 8 KA.TAB.ŠÈ, NÍG.ŠU.TAG<sub>4</sub>.A, KI MAR.TU.E.NE, ITI DU<sub>6</sub>.KÛ, MU.ÚS.SA BÀD, *li-bur*-<sup>d</sup>iš-bi-, *èr-ra* BA.DÛ.

<sup>654</sup> Whiting 1987a:115.

<sup>655</sup> Probably not the same man, but nevertheless interesting: Ahmed 2012:257-258 (see also the section 'Amorites in the Zagros').

<sup>656</sup> AS 22 11 and 12

<sup>657</sup> AS 22 24.

## 6.4.1.2.2 Usû and Ilum-lu-watar

Less attested than Abda-El is Usû, whose name is written differently in a number of sources: *ú-su<sub>4</sub>-e*,<sup>658</sup> *i-su<sub>4</sub>-e*,<sup>659</sup> *i-š<sub>u</sub>-e*,<sup>660</sup> *ú-si-í*,<sup>661</sup> and *u-si-um*.<sup>662</sup>

According to Whiting, Usû occurs in Ešnunnean administrative documents from the reigns of Šū-iliya, Nūr-ahum, and Bilalama:<sup>663</sup> men of Usû, sometimes denoted as ‘Amorite’, received rations and precious items. A brother of Usû ‘and his Amorite’ is mentioned in the unpublished text 1931-T613. In the Isin Craft Archive, there are likewise many references to Usû the Amorite (*ú-sí-i* MAR.TU). His messengers (LÚ KIN.GI<sub>4</sub>.A) received rations and various items.<sup>664</sup>

The son of Usû was called Ilum-lu-watar,<sup>665</sup> which is explicitly stated in AS 22 13. This same Ilum-lu-watar asks Bilalama for a funerary gift for his father in AS 12 15.

## 6.4.1.2.3 Other important Amorites

The chariot (<sup>GIŠ</sup>GIGIR) of Gā’ušum the Amorite is repaired three times.<sup>666</sup> Ilānum the Amorite occurs as a recipient of gifts.<sup>667</sup> Samāmum the Amorite also receives goods,<sup>668</sup> as does his son,<sup>669</sup> his wife Intinum,<sup>670</sup> and messengers

---

<sup>658</sup> AS 22 15:2’.

<sup>659</sup> In Ešnunna administrative documents, see the references cited by Whiting 1987a:61.

<sup>660</sup> AS 22 13:11’.

<sup>661</sup> Eg. BIN 9 324:7.

<sup>662</sup> BIN 9 39:6.

<sup>663</sup> Whiting 1987a:58 and 61.

<sup>664</sup> BIN 9 39:6, 324:7, 325:8, 326:5-6, 395:27, 34, 408:5, AAICAB 1,1 pl. 79 Ashm 1932-280:7.

<sup>665</sup> See Whiting 1987a:58 for remarks on the reading of this name.

<sup>666</sup> BIN 9 187:8, 191:5, BIN 10 86:4. He is also mentioned in BIN 9 409:7.

<sup>667</sup> BIN 9 190:3, 225:7, 316:7, 408:11.

<sup>668</sup> Written as *sà-ma-mu-um* and *ša-ma-mu-um*. BIN 9 224:2, 276:6, 316:18, 20, 326:21, 383:3, 390:13, and 406: 4.

<sup>669</sup> BIN 9 326:21, DUMU *sà-ma-[mu]-um*.

<sup>670</sup> BIN 9 406:6 *in-ti-nu-um* DAM *ša-ma-mu’-um*.

of his.<sup>671</sup> Birbirum carries the title *rabiānum* in one text<sup>672</sup> and is qualified as Amorite in another.<sup>673</sup>

#### 6.4.2 *Malgium*

Even though the exact location of Malgium is still unknown, we can count it amongst the Northern Babylonian polities. It was probably located somewhere along the Tigris between the mouth of the Diyala river and Maškan-šāpir. Mayr recently published a group of nine clay tags from the early OB kingdom of Malgium.<sup>674</sup> The tags themselves yield little historical interest, but they were sealed with servant's seals of two Malgium kings: Nabi-Enlil and Šū-Amurru. On one seal Nabi-Enlil's father is mentioned: Šū-Kakka, this man occurs in the Ešnunna royal archives as the recipient of a diplomatic gift.<sup>675</sup> The tablet documenting the gift is datable to the time of Bilalama: ca. 1996 BC.

After Šū-Amurru there must have been another king called Imgur-Sîn, and possibly his father Ili-abi: a brick inscription from Imgur-Sîn's palace was reportedly found near Jemdat Nasr.<sup>676</sup>

Only two kings of Malgium were known to us previously: (Mut)takkil-ilissu son of Ištaran-asû, and Ipiq-Ištar, son of Apil-ilišu.<sup>677</sup> The aforementioned Ipiq-Ištar is known to have been king of Malgium around 1763 BC; he was probably defeated by Hammurabi in 1761 BC.<sup>678</sup> All the Malgium kings carried a divine determinative in front of their names, however, Imgur-Sîn's father Ili-abi, only known from Imgur-Sîn's inscription, does not have the determinative.

---

<sup>671</sup> *BIN* 9 423:8 and 425:17.

<sup>672</sup> *BIN* 9 199:8-10, *bir<sub>5</sub>-bī-ru-ma, ra-bī-a-nu-um-ma*.

<sup>673</sup> *BIN* 9 392:3, *bir<sub>5</sub>-bī-ru-um* MAR.TU.ŠÈ.

<sup>674</sup> Mayr 2012 and De Boer 2013b.

<sup>675</sup> Whiting 1987b.

<sup>676</sup> Englund CDLI 2013.

<sup>677</sup> Frayne 1990 *RIME* E4.11.1 and E4.11.2. A new inscription of (Mut)takil-ilissu was published by Arnaud 2007.

<sup>678</sup> Charpin 2004a:330 and Van Koppen 2005.



6.4.3 *Dēr*

Dēr (Sumerian: BÀD.AN<sup>KI</sup>)<sup>679</sup> has never been excavated: partly because of erosion of the site and because it was a military outpost during the Iraq-Iran war. Dēr was an important city governing one of the roads from Susa to Babylonia.<sup>680</sup> A number of inscriptions of rulers of Dēr have been found and published. Dēr became an independent state towards the end of the Ur III empire. Nidnūša was Dēr's earliest known ruler. His name carries a divine determinative in his only inscription:<sup>681</sup> perhaps a remnant of Ur III practices, dropped by the other rulers of Dēr. Another ruler of Dēr, Ilum-mutabbil was a contemporary of Ešnunna's Bilalama.<sup>682</sup> In his inscriptions he boasts to have defeated Elam, Anšan and Šimaski, and to have aided Paraḥšum.<sup>683</sup>

A ruler of Dēr called Abba was a contemporary of Sabium of Babylon (1844-1831 BC), his name is known from a seal inscription found at Ešnunna<sup>684</sup> and a seal impression of a servant's seal in the British Museum.<sup>685</sup> Another ruler known only from a servant's seal impression found at Susa is Iram-x-x.<sup>686</sup> Finally, a certain Iddinūnim is known from one inscription as 'king of Dēr' (not: GÌR.NITA<sub>2</sub>), he was the son of Nūr-mātīšu.<sup>687</sup>

All rulers of Dēr (except Iddinūnim) called themselves 'viceroy' of Dēr (GÌR.NITA<sub>2</sub> (*šakkanakkum*) BÀD.AN<sup>KI</sup>), the true king being Dēr's main god Ištarān.<sup>688</sup> This theological fiction<sup>689</sup> is also seen with the early OB rulers of

---

<sup>679</sup> Not to be confused with another town near Kisurra and Zabalam (Verkinderen 2006) or the multiple Dēr's known from the Mari texts.

<sup>680</sup> For Dēr in the texts from Susa: De Graef 2007.

<sup>681</sup> Frayne 1990 *RIME* E4.12.1.

<sup>682</sup> Whiting 1987a:28-29 n. 88. A messenger of Ilum-mutabbil, called Ušur-awāssu, receives travel provisions in two unpublished Ešnunna administrative documents.

<sup>683</sup> Frayne 1990 E4.12.2.

<sup>684</sup> Frayne 1990 E4.12.3; his name is only partly preserved as [...] *ba*. It is very likely that he is the same man as the viceroy of Dēr known from Blocher 1992:57 no. 152, see Verkinderen 2005.

<sup>685</sup> Blocher 1992:57 no. 152. The impression was found on BM 22704 (case) and BM 22693 (tablet), and it has an oath by Sabium.

<sup>686</sup> *MDP* 43 1699, see also Verkinderen 2006:114.

<sup>687</sup> André-Salvini and Salvini 1997.

<sup>688</sup> Ištarān is even called the king (LUGAL) of Dēr in one of Ilum-mutabbil's texts: E4.12.2.2.

<sup>689</sup> On this subject see also Charpin 2004a:65 and Kupper 1967:123-125.

Ešnunna, who were ‘city ruler’ (ENSI<sub>2</sub> = *iššakkum*) by the grace of Tišpak.<sup>690</sup> The same can be said of Assur’s early Old Assyrian rulers, who were also ‘city rulers’ (called either *iššiakkum* or *waklum*) appointed by the god Assur.<sup>691</sup>

#### 6.4.3.1 Excursus on the title GÌR.NITA<sub>2</sub>

Charpin already suggested that the above titles are somehow remnants of the Ur III empire.<sup>692</sup> The Ur III state had only one king residing in Ur, but the provincial administration was in the hands of an ENSI<sub>2</sub>. It is noticeable that we specifically encounter the title GÌR.NITA<sub>2</sub> at Dēr and in the Diyala region to designate the local ruler. This is the case in:

- 1) Išim-Šulgi.<sup>693</sup>
- 2) The Būr-Sîn/Ilšu-nāšir archive purportedly from Nērebtum.<sup>694</sup>
- 3) Šaduppûm.<sup>695</sup>
- 4) Uzarlulu.<sup>696</sup>
- 5) Diniktum.<sup>697</sup>
- 6) Akšak.<sup>698</sup>
- 7) Rapiqum.<sup>699</sup>

---

<sup>690</sup> This only changed during the rule of Ipiq-Adad II (ca. 1862-1818), cf. Charpin 2004a:130.

<sup>691</sup> Veenhof 2008:20-21.

<sup>692</sup> Charpin 1999c:102-103.

<sup>693</sup> Written syllabically as *ša-ka-na-ku-um*: IM 49219:32 and IM 49274:23, Al-‘Adhami 1967, plates 5-8.

<sup>694</sup> We frequently encounter Ali-bānišu s. Lipit-Sîn GÌR.NITA<sub>2</sub> and Šamaš-nāšir s. Sîn-iqīšam (b. Satluma and Lipit-Enlil) GÌR.NITA<sub>2</sub> as witnesses. For the archive see Lutz 1931a, Greengus 1979:6-8, and Greengus 1986:5-6.

<sup>695</sup> Tutub-māgir was appointed as GÌR.NITA<sub>2</sub> by the king of Ešnunna, see Stol 1976:82. Next to the *šakkanakkum*/GÌR.NITA<sub>2</sub> there was the *rabiānum* in Šaduppûm, several *rabiānum*’s were active in Šaduppûm: see Hussein 2008:28 n. 143.

<sup>696</sup> See Stol 1976:82: Igihluma. Part of Igihluma’s archive was found by Iraqi archaeologists, but only some texts have been published: Suleiman 1966:291-294 (D2, 112), p. 339-342 (D2 438), p. 378-382 (D2 188), Suleiman 1978:130-132, Al-Adhami 1971 no. 43-47.

<sup>697</sup> *TIM* 2 16: see Stol 1976: 83.

<sup>698</sup> *CT* 48 27:2, a man called Inbūša is GÌR.NITA<sub>2</sub>, however this text carries the date Hammurabi 30.

<sup>699</sup> Charpin 1999c.

Stol sought to equate the Sumerogram GÌR.NITA<sub>2</sub> with the Akkadian *rabiānum*.<sup>700</sup> However, the case of Dēr also points towards a tradition that -during the time that Ešnunna had not yet taken control of the whole of the Diyala region (pre-1825)-,<sup>701</sup> the title GÌR.NITA<sub>2</sub> (*šakkanakkum*) was used by many independent rulers of the Diyala region.<sup>702</sup>

#### 6.4.4 Isin

What specific information can we gather from the early OB Isin Craft Archive with regard to the political situation in Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region? Van de Mieroop has identified five steps in the production process of the craft archive:<sup>703</sup> (1) the delivery of raw materials, (2) distribution of the materials to the craftsmen, (3) manufacture, (4) receipt of the finished products, and (5) disbursement of finished products. It is in the last category (containing almost 500 texts), that we might find some scraps of information: some of the goods produced in the workshop were given as (diplomatic) gifts to political entities, among which Amorites. The clearest examples are *BIN* 9 152 and 316.<sup>704</sup>

<sup>700</sup> Stol 1976:82-83.

<sup>701</sup> Approximately the year when Ipiq-Adad II took Nērebtum according to the eponym chronicle: Glassner 2004:160-164.

<sup>702</sup> It is noteworthy that in the case of Išim-Šulgi we see the title spelled as *ša-ka-na-kuum*. However Stol's idea GÌR.NITA<sub>2</sub>=*rabiānum* is supported by the inscriptions of some early OB rulers who call themselves *rabiān*+tribal name:

1) Itūr-Šamaš, king of Kisurra, calls himself *rabiān* Rababi: *i-tūr-<sup>d</sup>UTU, ra-bi-an, ra-ba-bi-KE<sub>4</sub>, DUMU i-din-DINGIR, ENS<sub>2</sub>, KLSUR.RA<sup>ki</sup>, KI.ĀG <sup>d</sup>UTU, ù an-nu-ni-tum* (*RIME* 4 E.4.7.1 p. 651-652).

2) Sumu-Šamaš from the town Šadlaš calls himself *rabiān* Amnān Šadlaš : *su-mu-<sup>d</sup>UTU, DUMU a-pil-<sup>d</sup>EN.ZU, ra-bi-a-an, am-na-an ša-ad-la-áš* (*CT* 48 83). In addition to this, another chief of Šadlaš bears the name Sumu-Amnānim, but he calls himself king in the two extant inscriptions.

3) Two kings of Uruk also declare themselves kings of the Amnānum tribe: Sîn-kāšid in numerous inscriptions (see *RIME* 4 E4.4.1f p. 440-464) and Sîn-gāmil (*RIME* 4 E4.4.3 p. 466). See also the Anam letter: Van Koppen 2006 and De Boer 2014 on the early OB Amorite tribes.

<sup>703</sup> Van de Mieroop 1987a:9-18 and Van de Mieroop 1986c.

<sup>704</sup> Already quoted by Wu Yuhong 1994a:10. There are many similar, less specific texts registering 'gifts' (NÍG.ŠU.TAG<sub>4</sub>.A) to Amorites.

- *BIN* 9 152 (Išbi-Erra 16/II) records the gift of 890 sheep and goat skins for Amorites when Elam was defeated. The document is supervised by a son of the king called Adda.<sup>705</sup>
- *BIN* 9 316 (Išbi-Erra 16/VII) is a large four column tablet recording the disbursement of oil to ‘territories’ of the Amorites: two of the mentioned Amorites are Abda-El and his son Ušašum.<sup>706</sup>
- Only a few Northern Babylonian cities are mentioned: a group of cities centered around the canal that flowed southwards from Kiš towards Marad; Apiak, Kiritab, and Mur.<sup>707</sup>
- Interesting are the references to Borsippa, a town that has few OB attestations.<sup>708</sup>
- Karhar, a city reputedly in the central Zagros is mentioned twice:<sup>709</sup> a messenger from Karhar received sandals and bags<sup>710</sup> and two *rēdûm* soldiers from Kiš received sandals for the journey to Karhar.<sup>711</sup>

#### 6.4.5 Other cities: Borsippa and Kiš

Borsippa was perhaps also a ‘kingdom’ (that is: (semi)-independent polity). From the apocryphal Puzur-Numušda letter we learn that an ENSI<sub>2</sub> called Puzur-Tutu held sway there in the final Ur III days and that he switched sides to Išbi-Erra.<sup>712</sup> Borsippa’s importance in the immediate post-Ur III days is underlined by the many references to it in the Isin Craft Archive (see above). The same might have been true for Kiš, which is also mentioned in the Puzur-Numušda letter: here the ENSI<sub>2</sub> is called Šū-Enlil, who is otherwise unknown.<sup>713</sup>

---

<sup>705</sup> *BIN* 9 152:1-10, 1 KUŠ.UDU.‘BABBAR’, 2 KUŠ.SILA<sub>4</sub> KIN.[GI<sub>4</sub>].A, 890 KUŠ.UD[U.MÁ]Š, NÍG.KEŠ<sub>2</sub> KÙ.BABBAR.Š[È], NÍG.BA MAR.TU, U<sub>4</sub> GIŠ.TUKUL ELAM.A, BA.‘SÌG’.GA.A, [...], [x]X.ŠÈ BA.KEŠ<sub>2</sub>, GÌR *a-da* DUMU.LUGAL.

<sup>706</sup> See footnote 651 for a transliteration.

<sup>707</sup> Van de Mieroop 1987:110, for more on these towns: Kraus 1955:55f.

<sup>708</sup> It is the destination of several journeys (KASKAL): *BIN* 9 391:3, *BIN* 9 415:18, *BIN* 9 479:3, *Rochester* 243:24 and the destination of a gift: *BIN* 9 414.

<sup>709</sup> Levine 1972-1975:120-121.

<sup>710</sup> *BIN* 9 424:6.

<sup>711</sup> *BIN* 10 149:7-8.

<sup>712</sup> Michalowski 2011:198-199. Curiously, a man also called Puzur-Tutu is the ENSI<sub>2</sub> of Babylon in *MVN* 8 139:iii 9.

<sup>713</sup> Michalowski 2011:198.

## 6.4.6 Other cities: Sippar

But what was the situation in the other cities such as Tutub, Nērebtum, Sippar etc.? Of course because of the lack of sources we can never know for sure, but there is some fragmentary evidence that at least Sippar functioned with a large degree of autonomy. This idea is not new and was first posited by Veenhof,<sup>714</sup> who compared Sippar's early OB autonomy to the situation in Assur. Seri agrees with Veenhof,<sup>715</sup> but she distinguished 'the city' (*ālum*) from other local institutions such as the 'mayor'-*rabiānum* and the city elders (*šibūt ālim*), for which she was criticized by Charpin and Stol.<sup>716</sup> The evidence for Sippar's greater autonomy in the pre-Sumu-la-El period is summarized hereunder:

- 1) An early loan contract from Tell ed-Dēr (*ED II 27*, dated to Ammišura) mentions an incomprehensible clause mentioning 'the decree of the city', l. 9-10: *a-na a-wa-at, a-li-im ú-la ZU.ZU*.<sup>717</sup>
- 2) Veenhof 1999 n° 2 attests to a legal measure taken by Immerum and 'the city' to redeem sold property that might have been sold out of dire economic needs. A highly interesting text, lines 9-11 read: *iš-tu A.ŠÀ ù É, im-me-ru-um pa-ṭā-ra-am, iq-bu-ú wa-ar-ki a-wa-at/a-li-im*. 'After Immerum had ordered the redemption of fields and houses, after the decree of the city'.
- 3) There are many early OB texts which mention an oath of the city with the oath of a Babylonian king; this practice fell into disuse during the reign of Hammurabi.<sup>718</sup>

---

<sup>714</sup> Veenhof 1999:612-613.

<sup>715</sup> Seri 2005:156.

<sup>716</sup> Charpin 2007:178-179 and Stol 2007:213-214.

<sup>717</sup> Prof. Stol has noted that ZU.ZU might be Sumerian for Akkadian *ula ilammad* 'he has nothing to do with', even though one expects *ula idû* (he will know). See also YOS 14 35:15, and Veenhof 1972:419-420.

<sup>718</sup> *Sabium and Sippar* : MHET II/1 40, CT 8 23a, MHET II/1 46, BE VI/1 12, CT 2 39, MHET II/1 25, MHET II/1 42, MHET II/1 43, CT 47 20, VAS 9/10, CT 48 14, CT 45 3, MHET II/1 41. *Apil-Sîn and Sippar* : MHET II/5 697, MHET II/1 57, BDHP 67, MHET II/1 51, BBVOT 1 145, CT 47 4 en 5, BDHP 55, MHET II/1 56, MHET II/1 47, MHET II/1 68, MHET II/1 76, MHET II/1 71, MHET II/1 77, MHET II/1 50, BBVOT 1 142, MHET II/1 70, MHET II/1 74, MHET II/1 67, CT 4 47a. *Apil-Sîn, Sippar and Annunitum(!)* : CT 45 7, CT 8 29b. *Sîn-muballit and Sippar* : CT 8 4b, MHET II/1 90, BDHP 40, MHET II/1 96, BDHP 40, MHET II/1 91, CT 47 9, MHET II/1 97, CT 47 17, CT 47 16, CT 45 17, CT 47 14, MHET II/1 88, MHET II/1 92, CT 47 8, MHET II/1 118, CT 2 36, CT 4 45b, BAP

- 4) The *TIM 7* organization. This business was run by a number of families, the two best known to us are the Imgur-Sîn family and the family of Arwium, whose son Ikūn-pîša is the most important person in the letter archive. Even though the organization had contacts with local rulers, it appears to operate on its own: there are no indications that it was subordinate or connected to any ruler.

In the century after the fall of the Ur III dynasty, Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region seem to have contained several small city-states and kingdoms. At least the town of Sippar seems to have enjoyed some autonomy from its local rulers such as Ilum-ma-Ila and Immerum. The fact that the post-Išbi-Erra Isin kings almost exclusively mention cultic activities in their year names obscures to us any military encounters with polities in Northern Babylonia or the Diyala region.<sup>719</sup> This changes with the advent of Larsa around 1932 BC, where Gungunum and his successors are not afraid to boast about their military victories: here we see confrontations with Bašimi (Gungunum 3), Anšan (Gungunum 5), Malgium (Gungunum 19), Isin (Abi-sare 9), etc. But Larsa could only venture upwards along the Tigris, being blocked off along the Euphrates by Uruk and Isin: that is why we do not see any references to Northern Babylonia in these early Larsa year names. However, up the Tigris Larsa would find Malgium.

In any case, it appears that in the time directly after the fall of the Ur III empire there were not yet any states led by ‘Amorites’ in Mesopotamia. A noticeable feature is the divine determinative carried by some of the kings of Ešnunna, Malgium, Dēr and Isin. This was probably some kind of remnant of Ur III practices. The rulers of Ešnunna and Dēr quickly abandoned this, but it was perpetuated by the Isin and Malgium kings.

#### 6.4.7 *How did the Amorites take power?*

The Amorites did not so much ‘migrate’ in the conventional sense of the word. Rather they seemed to follow a common Mesopotamian pattern of set-

---

37, *CT* 8 16c, *BE* 6/1 20, *BAP* 32, *BDHP* 34, *MHET* II/1 87, *TCL* 1 70, *VAS* 8 27, *MHET* II/1 89, *CT* 8 1a, *MHET* II/1 105, *CT* 6 42b(=*MHET* II/1 110), *MHET* II/1 111, *VAS* 8 52/53, *VAS* 8 58/*CT* 4 50b, *CT* 47 19, *YOS* 14 163.

<sup>719</sup> But note the ‘Sumerian Epistolary Miscellany’ letter (an OB school exercise text) *SepM* 2, written by Sin-tillatī to Isin king Iddin-Dagan (1976-1956 BC) about an ambush by armed Amorites near the Diyala site of Kakkulātum (Kleinerman 2011:116-117).

tlement, also followed by the Kassites and (to a degree) the Arameans: they started out as mercenaries and ended up controlling the territory.<sup>720</sup> This has already been suggested earlier by Weeks 1985. His theories have been discarded by Charpin. The interpretations in this study differ from that of Weeks on some crucial points.

There was such a thing as an Amorite ethnicity in the Ur III and early OB period. We had already distinguished between at least two groups of Amorites: the descendants of the Ur III mercenaries in southern Babylonia, who essentially founded the first royal dynasty at Larsa,<sup>721</sup> and the Amorites from the Ur III 'KUR MAR.TU' who came down from the upper Diyala valley into the lower Diyala valley and Northern Babylonia. In the first case, the Amorites were already militarily organized and could presumably take power relatively easily. In the second case, they must have settled around the old cities in the Diyala valley and Northern Babylonia as mercenaries and/or farmers and pastoralists. Right after the fall of the Ur III empire we see that some important groups of Amorites (like the families of Abda-El or Usû) were in close contact with the major states Ešnunna and Isin and we might presume the same for Sippar, Malgium, Dêr, and other cities.

The Amorites did not operate as one block: Bilalama's diplomatic ties with some groups and fights with others is evident. From Bilalama's year names we know that the Amorites were probably settled in temporary or new towns.<sup>722</sup> That they were settled in the countryside rather than inside the larger cities was argued in chapter 4. Perhaps they already garrisoned some Ur III strongholds such as Išim-Šulgi under the kings of Ur,<sup>723</sup> which they were able to retain after Ešnunna had proclaimed its independence. It is not likely that the Amorites migrated in large numbers from the KUR MAR.TU, but as the Amo-

---

<sup>720</sup> Charpin 2004a:57 n. 134.

<sup>721</sup> An idea from Michalowski 2011:119.

<sup>722</sup> Ka-Ibaum, Išur etc.

<sup>723</sup> Išim-Šulgi could have had an important meaning to the Amorites. Little is known about this town (Edzard 1976-1980:178, *RGTC* 3:111, Owen 1997:378-379), but it is tentatively located to the north of Ešnunna. The town could have been established by king Šulgi as some kind of military fortress. However, we cannot prove this, even though one can refer to a list of tax payers among Išim-Šulgi's military: *CT* 32 pl. 19-22 (cf. Steinkeller 1987:32 fig. 2, Sallaberger 1999a:198-199 and the reedition *NISABA* 8 19), see also text Nesbit A, published by Owen 1997:369-370. It is possible that groups of Amorites had populated this fortress and gained some kind of autonomy at the end of the Ur III period and into the early OB period.

rites' political power grew through alliances and dynastic marriages, it must have become more attractive to some others to associate themselves with an Amorite or at least some tribal identity.

Since military power is often a prerequisite to take political power, the Amorites must have had some military power base in order take control of such a large part of Mesopotamia. The Amorite military organization is echoed in the later attested military ranks (UGULA/GAL MAR.TU). An indication that some of the Amorites were mercenaries in the service of the major states such as Isin and Ešnunna is provided by the great number of gifts issued to Amorite chiefs in Isin and texts such as Gelb's 1968 List of Amorites. The major states and other quasi independent cities such as Sippar, were perhaps increasingly dependent on Amorite military support to ward off other tribal groups or belligerent neighbors.

Little is known about the Amorite military in the early OB period.<sup>724</sup> Well known are however military ranks composed with the word MAR.TU: especially the UGULA MAR.TU and the GAL MAR.TU. These high ranks are often translated as 'general'. The term GAL MAR.TU (*rabi amurrim* = leader of the Amorites) is seen mostly in Mari (it originated in Ešnunna) and the UGULA MAR.TU (exact Akkadian reading still debated but probably also *rabi amurrim*) in Babylonia.<sup>725</sup> Earlier authors had coined several theories concerning the UGULA MAR.TU; mostly that he was the leader of a group of Amorite mercenaries helping Amorite kings to power.<sup>726</sup> The prevalence of these titles suggests that the Amorite military organization was a distinctive feature.

In the kingdom of Babylon under Hammurabi, an UGULA MAR.TU commanded about 300 men,<sup>727</sup> while at Mari a GAL MAR.TU could command as

---

<sup>724</sup> Through the Mari texts we are well informed about the military around the time of Samsi-Addu and Zimri-Lim, see for example Durand 1998, Abrahams 1997, Ziegler 1997, and Ziegler 2008. Note also the early OB letter *AbB* 9 118.

<sup>725</sup> For UGULA MAR.TU = *rabi amurrim*: Charpin 2007:170, for an overview in general: Stol 2004:805-810, older literature is Charpin 2004a:282-284 and Charpin 1987b. The title occurs from the time of Hammurabi onwards (Stol 2004:805).

<sup>726</sup> Eg. Harris 1975:94 or Voth 1982:131. Lafont 2008:39 n. 71 wrote that he is not surprised that the considerable military role of the Amorites in the Ur III empire resulted in the high ranks GAL MAR.TU and UGULA MAR.TU during the OB period.

<sup>727</sup> This is best exemplified in the text *ARM* 22 270, collated by Durand 1987:618, see also the commentary by Joannès 2002:175 and the letter *ARM* VI 28 (= *LAP* 17 673):13-15. Voth 1982 has devoted a chapter to the UGULA MAR.TU in his thesis.



many as a 1000 men.<sup>728</sup> He could have a secretary called DUB.SAR MAR.TU (*tuṣṣar amurrim* ‘scribe of the Amorites’)<sup>729</sup>. In late OB times, an UGULA MAR.TU could also act as a middleman in providing harvesters.<sup>730</sup>

Unique is the title of the Yamhad general Bin-Dammu, found in the Tell Leilan texts: SAG.GAL MAR.TU.MEŠ, which perhaps means something like ‘field marshal of the Amorites’.<sup>731</sup> Two attestations of an AGA.ÚS MAR.TU (‘Amorite foot soldier’) are found in a text from the Diyala region,<sup>732</sup> as well as Larsa.<sup>733</sup> Amorite *mandu* soldiers from Dēr and Akkad are found in an OB text from remote Chogha Gavaneh (Western Iran).<sup>734</sup> Amorite troops (EREN<sub>2</sub> MAR.TU) are seen in late OB sources from Babylonia proper as well.<sup>735</sup>

A text dated to Sumu-El 25 mentions the unique term *amurrūtum alākum* as a kind of corvée comparable to the later known *ilkam alākum*.<sup>736</sup> We might interpret the term *amurrūtum* here in the same way as *rêdūtum* in later OB text: ‘soldiership’.<sup>737</sup> The relevant text starts with an amount of silver: [x] mina and 2 shekels, which is his *ilkum* (GÚ.BI.ŠÈ). After this we have a 5 IKU field located within ‘Bûbi’ (probably a watering district). The amount of silver reflects perhaps the yield of the field. A certain Hupašum will fulfill (lit. ‘go’) the *amurrūtum* of his father Ipqu-Sîn.<sup>738</sup> If he does not fulfill the *amurrūtum* he must pay the amount of silver (‘return it’), when this happens, Ipqu-Sîn must

<sup>728</sup> Durand 1998:365-366 and Charpin 2004a:283. See Abrahami 1998 for a list of GAL MAR.TU’s active in Northern Mesopotamia.

<sup>729</sup> *ARM I* 60 = *LAP O* 17 672 and *ARM II* 13 = *LAP O* 17 457, with commentary by Durand 1998:33 n.i. See also Charpin 2004a:283 with Al-Adhami 1971 text 50 (IM 67139:18).

<sup>730</sup> Stol 1976:91-93 and Stol 2004:807-810. One cannot help but wonder whether these harvesters were perhaps nomads recruited by the UGULA MAR.TU. See most recently Rositani 2011 on harvest labor contracts.

<sup>731</sup> Vincente 1991 no. 15:5’.

<sup>732</sup> The man carries the Akkadian name Pir-ilišu cf. Lutz 1931b, with bibliography in Viaggio 2009:385 n. 17.

<sup>733</sup> *TCL* 10 53:7.

<sup>734</sup> Abdi and Beckman 2007:54 (*ChG* 18). On the etymology of the term *mandu*: Adali 2011:32-34, 63, and 173-189.

<sup>735</sup> *TLOB* 44 (Aš 18) mentions several groups of ‘Amorite’ troops led (or provided) by men carrying Akkadian names, but belonging to Hana, Elamite, Kassite and Yamutbal contingents. *RFH* 3 (Meek 1917, date uncertain) lists an amount of sesame as provisions for EREN<sub>2</sub> MAR.TU. There are undoubtedly other examples.

<sup>736</sup> Stol, Mander, Pers and Rositani 2006:206-207 (III-23, A12).

<sup>737</sup> Stol 2004:783 n. 977 and p. 814-815.

<sup>738</sup> Curiously, Hupašum is the son of one Ipiranni on the cylinder seal impressed on the tablet. Maybe he was adopted by Ipqu-Sîn in order to perform the service.

fulfill the *amurrūtum*. In other words: a 5 IKU field is given to Hupašum, who might earn [x] mina and 2 shekels of silver by cultivating it. In return he must perform *amurrūtum* service: work as a soldier. If he does not work as a soldier, he forfeits the usufruct of the field and he must pay the expected yield of the field in silver: [x] mina and 2 shekels. When this is the case, his father Ipqu-Sîn is nevertheless expected to work as a soldier (*amurrūtam illak*). This text provides very strong evidence for a connection between the term ‘Amorite’ and military service.

Finally, we must mention the *rabiān amurrim*. This office was studied extensively in the past by Stol and more recently by Seri.<sup>739</sup> A *rabiānum* was usually a local ruler of a city and/or tribe. There are several examples of Amorite *rabiānum*’s from the early OB period. Special mention must be made of the little known cylinder seal impression belonging to Hammurabi of Babylon found on a clay bulla at Mari. Hammurabi is called ‘king of the Amorites’ and ‘king of Akkad’ on his cylinder seal.<sup>740</sup> A high official in Hammurabi’s service carries the title *šāpir amurrim*.<sup>741</sup>

The idea that the Amorites did not actually ‘migrate’, but rather took over power from the urban elites, makes many modern theories and research around migration less applicable: these do not address matters of conquest. There are however certain ideas and theories that might shed more light on the Amorites taking power, most notably the concept of ‘elite transfer’.

This model (also called ‘elite dominance’) was originally thought up by British archaeologist Colin Renfrew as an explanation for language change.<sup>742</sup> However, the model also has a wider archaeological and historical application. It basically states that a small group of well organized invaders is able to replace the ruling elite of a territory by force. During this process, some economic and social structures change, but most others stay the same. There are many examples in history of such an ‘elite transfer’: the Norman conquest of England, the Indo-Aryan invasion of India, the colonization of the Americas by the Spanish etc. This model might also prove useful in explaining

---

<sup>739</sup> Stol 1976:73-89, Seri 2005:51-96 and the remarks in the reviews by Stol 2007:212-214 and Charpin 2007:169-175.

<sup>740</sup> Charpin 2001a:28: x [...], [LU]GAL MAR.T[U], DUMU <sup>d</sup>EN.ZU-*mu-ba-lī-i*[t], IBILA.NI, LUGAL KI.U[RI]. ... king of the Amorites (or: Amurrim), son of Sîn-muballit, his heir, king of Akkad.

<sup>741</sup> Išar-Lim, who was originally in the service of Išme-Dagan. He supposedly governed Mari for Hammurabi after his conquest: Van Koppen 2002 and Stol 2004:805.

<sup>742</sup> Renfrew 1987:131-133.

how the Amorites took control in Northern Babylonia and the Diyala region around 1900 BC.

Some Amorite leaders must have felt powerful enough to topple the governments of the territories and cities they were already harrasing or which they were paid to protect. The local ruling elites were then replaced by tribal leaders, who were already accustomed to living in the area, even though their powerbase did not live in the cities, but in the countryside.

Due to the fact that we have almost no textual sources illuminating the political situation between ca. 1980 and 1900 BC, we cannot link the Amorite 'dynasties' who took over political power (i.e., the descendants of people like Abda-El, Usû etc.) to the Amorite dynasties known almost one hundred years later: the time of Sumu-abum and his contemporaries.