

Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie

Begründet von

Erich Ebeling und Bruno Meissner

fortgeführt von

Ernst Weidner und Wolfram von Soden
und Dietz Otto Edzard

herausgegeben von

Michael P. Streck

unter Mitwirkung von

G. Frantz-Szabó, M. Krebernik, D. Morandi Bonacossi,
J. N. Postgate, U. Seidl, M. Stol und G. Wilhelm

Redaktion:

Theresa Blaschke, Armando Bramanti, Josephine Fechner,
Mandy Greiner, Sabine Heigl, Nathan Morello und Stefan Odzuck

Fünfzehnter Band

Waschung. A – Zypresse
Ausgewählte Nachträge, Index

De Gruyter

2016–2018

im ganzen Reichsgebiet oder H.-Tore oder einfache Stelen errichtet; dieselben Bauwerke werden mitunter auch anderen lokalen Gottheiten gewidmet. In der Peripherie des Reiches kann in ein und demselben Text H. und anderen regionalen Götter gehuldigt werden. H. werden von fast allen urart. Königen bronzene Prunkwaffen (Schilde, Helme, Köcher, Pfeile usw.), sowie andere Metallobjekte aus der königl. Schatzkammer (CTU 4 B passim) gewidmet.

§ 4. Ikonographie. Man hat lange Zeit versucht, die wichtigsten urart. Götter mit auf Tieren stehenden Gestalten zu identifizieren, wobei H. die Figur auf einem Löwen sein sollte (Piotrovskij 1959), ohne dass dies jedoch allg. Zustimmung erfahren hat. Die Bildlosigkeit des H. ist dagegen von Calmeyer (1974) mit Nachdruck vertreten worden. Die Darstellung auf einem Bronzeschild aus Yukarı Anzaf (Belli 1999) hat nun Klarheit gebracht, denn auf dem Rand des beschrifteten Schildes (CTU 4, 23 [B 3-1]) sind eine Reihe von hintereinander nach rechts schreitenden Göttergestalten abgebildet, die sich zum Teil identifizieren lassen (Seidl 2004, 199–201). Außer dem ersten, stehen alle auf Tieren, der zweite Gott ist zweifellos der Wettergott Teišeba auf einem Löwen und mit Blitzen in den Händen, der dritte, in der Flügelsonne und auf einem Stier stehende Gott muss der Sonnengott Šiuini sein (Sonnengott* B. III. a). So bestätigt sich, dass die Götter normalerweise mit Tieren oder Mischwesen assoziiert werden. Die erste Gestalt, die barfuß mit einer langen Lanze (^(g^{is})šuri) und einem Bogen (oder eher einem Schild?) einher schreitet, ist also mit Sicherheit eine Darstellung des Gottes H. Er ist von Flammen umgeben, die in Verbindung mit dem Begriff „Licht“ (*daše*) stehen könnten (Salvini 1991; Belli 1999, 37; CTU 1, 125–128 [A 1-3] 15, 57).

Belli O. 1999: The Anzaf fortress and the gods of Urartu. – Calmeyer P. 1974: Zur Genese altiranischer Motive, II: der leere Wagen, AMI 7, 49–77. – Çilingiroğlu A./Salvini M. 1999: When was the castle of Ayanis built and what is the meaning of the word „šuri“?, in: Çilingiroğlu/R. J. Matthews (ed.), Proceedings of the Fourth Anatolian Iron Ages Colloquium held at

Mersin, 19–23 May 1997 (= AnSt. 49), 55–60. – Durand J.-M. 2003: *muldānum* = « Führer ou Duce », NABU 2003/76. – Fales F. M. 2003: Evidence for West-East contacts in the 8th century BC: the Bukān stele, in: G. B. Lanfranchi/M. Roaf/R. Rollinger (ed.), Continuity of empire (?): Assyria, Media, Persia (= HANEM 5), 131–147. – Freydank H./Saporetti C. 1979: Nuove attestazioni dell'onomastica medio-assira (= Incunabula Graeca 74). – Fuchs A. 1994: Sg. – Lemaire A. 1998: Une inscription arméenne du VIII^e siècle av. J.-C. trouvée à Bukān (Azerbaïdjan iranien), StIr. 27, 15–30. – Piotrovskij B. B. 1966: Il regno di Van: Urartu [Russ. Vanskoe Carstvo (Urartu), 1959]. – Salvini M. 1982: Bemerkungen über die Thronfolge in Urartu, in: H. Klengel (ed.), Gesellschaft und Kultur im alten Vorderasien (= SGKAO 15), 219–227; id. 1991: Una nuova iscrizione urartea, OrNS 60, 344–346. – Saporetti C. 1970: Onomastica medio-assira (= StPohl 6). – Seidl U. 2004: Bronzekunst Urartus. – Teixidor J. 1997–1998: La stèle de Boukan, Annuaire du Collège de France, 732–734. – Zimansky P. 2012: Imagining Haldi, in: H. Baker/K. Kaniuth/A. Otto (ed.), Stories of long ago: Festschrift für Michael D. Roaf (= AOAT 397), 714–723.

M. Salvini

Hammurapi. Fifth king of the First Dyn. of Babylon, 1792–1750 (middle chronology).

§ 1. Sources. – § 2. Name. – § 3. Family. – § 4. Building activities. – § 5. Political history. – § 6. Administration. – § 7. Death.

§ 1. Sources. The sources of information on H.'s reign are curtailed by the very limited availability of Old Bab. data from his capital of Babylon* (Pedersén 2005, 17–68). The evidence for the first 30 years is sparse, mostly from Sippar; there are fewer than 40 dated tablets for this period; some years are not documented at all. The distribution of royal inscriptions is also restricted because it appears that there are no extant texts of this type that can be dated prior to the conquest of Larsa (Charpin 2011, 82). From year 30 on, the evidence becomes much more abundant, represented by a variety of textual types: letters, inscriptions, administrative and private economic tablets as well as lit. compositions. The richest source of information, some of it only made available in recent

years, comes from the archives of Mari* (A. § 8), filtered by local interests.

All of this has lately allowed two authors to pen full length biographies of the king (Charpin 2003; Van De Mieroop 2005) that replace all previous efforts (not to mention various popular accounts in several languages).

§ 1.1. *Year names.* The order of the 43 year names of H.'s reign is well established on the basis of ten date lists (Datenlisten*; Horsnell 1999, 39–45). One of these is particularly informative: the unorthodox partially preserved *Date List O* provides fuller than usual accounts of the Sum. versions of eight year names in its preserved sections, even if some of them are out of order (OECT 2, pl. 5f.; Horsnell 1999, 200–203, 275–277). Amplifier forms of year name 14 and year name 38 are documented in two promulgation documents that contain the Sum. versions of the formulae, PRAK 2, 33 D14 (Horsnell 1999, 150) and PBS 5, 95 (ibid. 159).

The choice of events for commemoration in year names reveals specific aspects of the self-representative strategies of the crown. H.'s first two year names were conventional: ascension to the throne, followed by a debt release decree. This was followed by year names describing cultic events until year seven, which celebrated the “capture” of the cities of Uruk and Isin. Except for years ten and eleven, named after victories over Malgium* (§ 4) and Rapiqum*, the year formulae of the next decades described cultic events, building activities and canal work. Then, with year 30, the pattern changed and the next nine were dedicated mostly to military affairs, while the last three years were once again named after the erection of a cultic statue and wall building. The narrative of these names follows a familiar trajectory: consolidation of rule, ascent to major stature with the defeats of Elam and then Larsa (year names 30, 31), engagement and dominance in the political and military conflicts of the time, followed by a brief period of hegemony and peace. Year name 40 may allude to votive offerings designed to ward off infirmity or approaching death (§ 7 below).

§ 1.2. *Inscriptions.* H. is the earliest king of his dynasty whose commemorative inscriptions have survived. There is some classificatory uncertainty because some texts on stone were written in poetic Sum. diction and could possibly be considered as lit. rather than inscriptional, although the distinction may be modern and irrelevant. Currently, 19 such texts and a few fragments are known (RIME 4, 332–357), all from the last third of his reign. The inscriptions, mostly preserved on stone, but some on Old Bab. or even much later tablet copies, were written in both Akk. and Sum., some redacted in parallel versions in both languages. It may be that most of them were set up separately in the two language formats and the preservation of versions in one language without an equivalent in the other is due to chance of discovery. These texts dealt with construction work on temples and city walls but also commemorated military victories.

§ 1.3. *Laws.* The best-known monumental composition from the reign of H. is uncontestedly the text of his law collection or “code,” inscribed on stela that were placed in major cities of his kingdom (CH, Roth 1997², 71–142; Borger, BAL³ 2–50; Gesetze* A. § 3.6). The text very much expands on earlier models, while preserving their basic organizational structure. These were the Sum. *Laws of Ur-Namma** (§ 3.4; Gesetze* A. § 2.2) and *Laws of Lipit-Ishtar** (§ 6; Gesetze* A. § 3.1) that had been inscribed on stone monuments, even if we know them primarily in school tablet copies (together with a few remnants of stone versions of the latter), but the author consciously chose to redact H.'s text in Akk. rather than Sum. (the relationship, if any, with the Akk. *Laws of Ešnunna* [Gesetze* A. § 3.5] is more difficult to analyze). The text undoubtedly went through various redactions, but the final version was created towards the end of H.'s reign. The primary source for modern editions is a stela, taken to Susa as booty by an Elam. army (Šutruk-Nahhunte* § 1) more than half a mill. after it was first set up. Its original provenance is usually cited as Sippar, but

the evidence for this is circumstantial at best (Van De Mieroop 2011, 306 n. 2f.). Other similar stela fragments were discovered in Susa and we now have more than 50 contemporary as well as later tablet copies, some of them taken directly from stone monuments that survived into later times but have not been recovered, others used for school instruction and scholarly investigation (including a commentary) down to Late Bab. time.

For sources of the CH s. Maul 2012, 76 n. 1; add Jiménez 2014, 13 (NA).

The CH, like its Sum. predecessors, was structured as an expanded version of a certain type of royal monumental inscription with a prolog, narrative and an epilog that exhorted future kings to observe H.'s legal pronouncements and lay extensive curses on anyone who might want to alter them, deface, rewrite or destroy the stela. The narrative portion consists of 282 preserved "just pronouncements" (*dīnāt mišārim*) as the epilog (xlvi 1) designates them. The prolog extolled the pious deeds of H., describing the vast extent of his kingdom by listing his deeds on behalf of the major cities of his realm.

While parts of the CH have rightfully been used as evidence in discussions of political and ideological aspects of H.'s reign, principles of Mesopot. conceptualizations of kingship and hegemony and, most profusely, in debates concerning Mesopot. law and jurisprudence, the text also has to be viewed as an integrated whole. As such, it is the most prominent example of H.'s self-representational strategies designed to present the king as the shepherd of multitudes, ruler of an astoundingly extensive kingdom sanctified by divine authority and master of justice and righteousness, principles that were exemplified by the almost 300 examples of regulation and model verdicts that form the narrative sections of the monumental inscription.

These exemplary cases covered a wide variety of subjects, from regulations of dispute resolutions, penalties for grave injuries, sections regulating various aspects of social life, damage to property, family and

inheritance matters, injury or death in professional activities, tariffs and rents down to matters concerning ownership of slaves and many other circumstances. These provisions were construed in the traditional casuistic manner on the pattern "if ... then ..." (Recht* § 6). According to one recent opinion (Sallaberger 2010, 52–56), the general import of these exemplifications of royal justice were to define more generally (1) the principle of written law in legal transactions that required a broad range of economic transactions to be documented by a sealed tablet that listed witnesses who could be called upon to verify the contracts; (2) the obligation of social responsibility that promoted active participation of all citizens in economic life and required them to take responsibility and care for their actions; and (3) the role of local institutions concerning individuals, at the city, urban district and individual level, including panels of elite or prominent members of the community who settled dispute resolutions.

For decades, there has been a vigorous debate concerning the legal status of the CH. Most early scholars categorized it as a formal law code (and it is often cited as such outside of Assyriology), but more recently scholars have argued that this is an anachronistic notion and that there is little or no evidence for the statutory use of the text in dispute resolutions (Roth 1995; ead. 2000; Wilcke 2007; with earlier lit. resp.). Not all agree; e.g., Démare-Lafont (2000; ead. 2013) would view texts such as CH as acts of legislation that were intended to be permanent but were subject to amendment or suspension for local purposes.

There is a growing consensus that CH, by means of classic Mesopot. principles of listing plausible as well as often imaginary or even implausible examples to generate general unwritten principles and codes of behavior, defined broad notions of justice and correct models of social action, but not a collection of strictly defined legal norms. As Yoffee (2016, 1056) has observed, "the majority of legal practice, as opposed to the legal proclamations by kings, was designed to reinforce local power". At a certain

level, the CH worked to regulate such practice and to control and perhaps even weaken the power of such local, often oppositional authority in matters concerning economic and civic life as well as dispute resolutions.

The prolog to the CH presents the king as a beneficent “shepherd” to his people (i 51). This metaphor was only partly apt. Once he had conquered the south, H. and his subordinates imposed a highly structured and stratified administrative system on the newly acquired territories mainly run by officials installed by Babylon, who oversaw other executives drawn from local elites, confiscating Rīm-Sîn*’s royal estates and appropriating the local corvée system that required all able bodied free men to provide service to the crown for military, labor, artisanal and other duties in exchange for land or grain rations (Fiette forthc.). He also issued a debt cancellation edict to recharge the local postwar economy (Charpin 1991).

Justice was administered according to the new structures. Private contractual matters and torts were left in the hands of local elites at the urban ward, rural irrigation districts or city level, while administrative disputes were decided by the various bureaucratic authorities in charge. In cases of ambiguity, indecision or contestation of verdicts, matters could be sent up to the crown and even to the very person of the king (Leemans 1968; Ishikida 1998; id. 1999). H.’s verdicts may seem just to us, but it is important to keep in mind that all of this took place in the context of a polity that was almost continually at war and had to balance the use of manpower for agriculture, animal husbandry, craft production, etc. with the need for bodies for the army, which also engaged in public works and other undertakings. This required a smoothly working administrative system that properly maintained the loyalty of local power structures while simultaneously keeping them fully controlled. But H. was hardly beneficent. Like most Ancient Near Eastern monarchs who have gained modern admiration because of their extensive conquests, he was undoubtedly a tyrant whose deeds

left in their wake paths of death, destruction and shattered displaced lives (Michalowski, CKU 11f.). The prolog to CH provides vivid testimony of the devastation he wrought.

§ 1.4. *Literary texts.* H. was celebrated in Sum., Akk. and bil. compositions, some of them on stone, making it sometimes difficult to distinguish between “lit.”/school texts and royal inscriptions (Rutz/Michalowski 2016). These may be summarized as:

a) Six Sum. poems traditionally classified as “royal hymns” (*Hammurapi A–F*): From Sippar (A: VS 10, 210 (+)² VS 10, 209), possibly from Larsa (B: TCL 16, 61, J. J. A. van Dijk, MIO 12 [1966] 64–66), Nippur (C: ISET I 111 Ni. 4225), and a tablet from Nippur with three hymns, the first two duplicated on a tablet from Kish (D, E, F: CBS 4503 = PRAK B 11; Sjöberg 1972).

b) An Akk. hymn to Marduk (F. N. H. al-Rawi, RA 86 [1992] 79–83; T. Oshima, Babylonian prayers to Marduk [2011] 191–197). No royal name is preserved in the legible 16 lines, but it is possible to ascribe it to H.

c) A fragment of an unprovenanced school exercise tablet modeled on traditional Sum. royal hymnographic patterns with sections marked as kirugu and kišu (A. Cavigneaux, Fs. P. Attinger 82f.).

d) A school exercise, probably from Sippar, that originally contained a Sum. version, with some Akk. glosses, of the epilog section of the CH (Sjöberg 1991).

e) A piece of an Old Bab. stone monument, probably from Sippar (BM 90842, LIH 2, 172–176 = CT 21, 40–42; s. Wasserman 1992; transl. K. Hecker, TUAT 2/5 [1989] 726f.), with parts of a bil. hymnic text addressed directly to the king. There is also a much later tablet copy from a Pers.-period library of the Šamaš temple in Sippar (Fadhil/Pettinato 1995).

f) A fragment of a diorite stele from the Gipar in Ur* (B. § 3.1.3c [p. 374f.]) with a first person bil. in the name of H. (UET 1, 146, described by L. Woolley/M. E. L. Mallowan, UE 7 [1976] 6 as “a war memorial

put up by the Bab. king after his subjection of the south country”). There are pieces of a similar object with the same text, of unknown provenance (YOS 9, 39–61), an unprovenanced tablet copy of the Sum. text, with a few glosses (TLB 2, 3), an unpubl. stone fragment (RIME 4, 357), two more from museums (LIH 60 = CT 21, 40–42; A 3518, Van De Mierop 2011, 338), and a Middle Bab. school copy from Babylon (VS 24, 41; Pedersén 2005, 89f. M6: 68); for stone fragments of H. s. in general Van De Mierop 2011.

g) Fragments of a bil. basalt monument from Kiš (LIH 67, found by C. Bellino in the early 19th cent. on the surface of Tall al-Uḫaimir; P. R. S. Moorey, Kish excavations 1923–1933 [1979] nos. 16–22; the first one was found next to the ziggurat on Tall al-Uḫaimir, while the find spots of the rest are unknown; s. RIME 4, 357). It is not certain that these pieces all belong to the same object.

h) A Neo-Bab. or perhaps even Middle Bab. school tablet from Nippur contains a bil. lex. excerpt from the series *Nabnitu* (MSL 16, 315) on the obv. and a passage from a bil. H. inscription on the rev. (Sjöberg 1974–1975, 161).

i) A poorly preserved fragment of an Akk. lit. composition that dealt with major events of H.’s reign, including the conquest of Ešnunna and Mari. It contains the only mention of Zimrī-Līm in any source from Babylonia (Rutz/Michalowski 2016; for an important although epigraphically uncertain restoration s. Ziegler 2016).

§ 1.5. *King lists and chronicles*. H. was mentioned in a list of kings of Larsa, where he followed Rīm-Sîn, and was also named in a list of kings of the Old Bab. dynasty (*King List B*) preserved in a somewhat unreliable version on a Neo-Bab. tablet, where he is ascribed a reign of 55 years (Königslisten* und Chroniken. B. § 3.1: 15 [p. 89], § 3.7: 6 [p. 100]). H. also occurs in a list of royal names from Nineveh, incorrectly explained (V R 44 i 21 = K 4426 + Rm. 617; s. § 2e below). The king was mentioned in two Late Bab. chronicles: *The chronicle of early kings B* obv. 1–8 (Chron-

icle 20, Grayson, ABC 155; Glassner 2004, 272f.) describes his defeat of Larsa and he is also mentioned in a broken context in the *Chronicle of market prices* obv. 7 (Chronicle 23, ABC 178; Glassner 2004, 296f.). His name was undoubtedly listed in a broken passage in the *Neo-Ass./Neo-Bab. dynastic chronicle* (Chronicle 8, ABC 141; Glassner 2004, 130f.).

§ 1.6. *Letters sent by Hammurapi* (for letters to H. s. Fiette 2016). 211 letters:

a) To Sîn-iddinam, governor of the Larsa province: 98 letters, s. the list in Sîn-iddinam* § 2 and add AbB 14, 1–3 (but delete AbB 13, 44).

b) To Šamaš-ḫāzir, the land manager of the Larsa province (Fiette forthc.), sometimes together with other officials: 95 letters, s. the list in Šamaš-ḫāzir*.

c) To Iddin-Ea: AbB 14, 117.

d) To Ibni-Sîn and Marduk-nāšir: AbB 8, 50, 53.

e) To Luštar-Zababa and Bēlanum: AbB 9, 32.

f) To Zimrī-Līm*, king of Mari: ARM 28, 1, 4f.

g) To Buqāqum, sheikh of Sapīratum: ARM 7, 51f.; 28, 6f.

h) To Baḫdī-Lim, governor of Mari: ARM 6, 51, 53f.; 28, 8.

i) Unknown recipients: AbB 8, 19; ARM 28, 9.

§ 2. Name. H.’s name was Amorite. The first element of his name, spelled *Ḫa(-am)-mu(-um)*, *Am-mu*, was ‘*ammu*, “father’s brother”, “older male relative” (Name*, Namengebung. E. § 5.2). This epitheton transfers the strong relationship between blood relatives in tribal structures to the bond between god and name-bearer: god protects the name-bearer as does an important male member of the family.

The second element of H.’s name is rendered as *rabi* or *rapi*. There can be no doubt, however, that the interpretation *rāpī* >(?) *rāpī*, “is healing”, is the correct one (s. the discussion in Streck 1999, esp. 663–665 and 667f.):

a) Three unpubl. Old Bab. texts from Larsa preserve the unambiguous spelling

ra-pi: YBC 4362, 6496, and 6508 (all texts collated, s. Streck 1999, 659). This writing also occurs in a Neo-Ass. letter that mentions an old tablet of H., SAA 10, 155: 8, 10.

b) /p/ is also attested for other bearers of the same name: note the writing of the name of a king of Ḫana as *Am-mi-ra-pi* (Syria 37, 205: 32; also wr. *-ra-bi-iḫ*, i. e., *rāpī*) and the example of a 13th cent. king of Ugarit whose name was written in syll. cun. as *Am-mu-ra-bi*, *A-mu-ra-bi* or *Am-mu-ra-ap-e* (RSOu. 22, p. 87: 4) but as *MRPi* (DUL 165f.) in the Ugar. alphabet. Note, moreover, that the element *-ra-pi* also occurs in other Amorite names (Streck 1999, 661).

c) The usual Old Bab. spelling *ra-bi* is ambiguous. Consistent spellings in names like *li-bi-it* for *lipit* and *i-bi-iq* for *ipiq* in texts from southern Bab. show that the sign *bi* could be used as an archaism for /pi/ (Streck 1999, 658).

d) The root *rp*’, “to heal”, occurs frequently in the Amorite onomastic elements *yarpa’*, *rip’alī* and *rapū*’, *rapū’a*, whereas the root *rbī* is considerably less frequent (*yarbī*, *tarbī*) (Streck 1999, 663f.). Moreover, the root *rp*’ is amply attested elsewhere in the NW Sem. onomasticon, but the root *rbī* is not (ibid. 664f.). The deity “healed” the wound of childlessness through the birth of the new child.

e) There are some hints that already in ancient times the interpretation of the second name element was sometimes unclear: in Alalah we find *Ḫa-am-mu-GAL* (Streck 1999, 665f.), using the logogram for “large/great”. The Ugar. scribal exercise KTU 5, 22: 21 provides the writing *’mrbi*; the text features mistakes, and the spelling with *i* at the end shows that despite *b*, *rāpī* is meant. The 1st mill. name list V R 44 i 21 offers the incorrect interpretation of ^m*Ḫa-am-mu-ra-bi* as *kimta rapaštu*, “extensive family”, misconstruing the sentence structure of the name, which is not surprising because the list includes other unreliable analyses of personal names (Streck 1999, 667).

To summarize: H.’s name should be understood as *’Ammu-rāpī*, “Father’s

brother (i. e. god) is healing (the wound of being childless)”.

§ 3. Family. H. was the fifth member of the First Dynasty of Babylon: the son of *Sīn-muballiṭ** – his predecessor on the throne – grandson of *Apil-Sīn** and descendant of *Sumu-la-el**. We know this not only from king lists, but from the monarch’s own pronouncements that mentioned his father, grandfather and more distant relative, *Sumu-la-el*, who was considered the founding ancestor of the lineage, alongside *Sumu-abum**, who never sat on the throne of Babylon (Charpin 2003, 111). His only known sibling may have been a sister named *Iltani* who served as a *nadītum* dedicated to the sun god in Sippar. Two other *nadītums* in Sippar may conceivably have been daughters of H.: *Ruttum* (Tyborowski 2010, 60–62; Richardson 2017; but she may in fact be daughter of H. of Kurda) and *Lamassani* (Barberon 2012, 67), but direct evidence is lacking. Another daughter, whose name is not preserved, was married off to *Šilli-Sīn**, the ruler of Ešnunna, according to an Ešnunna year name. The names of two of his sons, *Mutu-numaḫa* and *Sumu-ditāna*, the latter described as the “elder/st” (FM 2, 119: 5f.; ARM 26/2, 375: 7), are known only because they visited Mari (Lion 1994), but this does not mean that H. did not have other offspring. He was succeeded by still another son, *Samsu-iluna** (who considered himself as the “mighty heir” of H.).

§ 4. Building activities are primarily documented in year names and inscriptions, and therefore it is certain that the record is incomplete. The first documented large project was the (re)building of the wall of the cloister for women dedicated to the sun god *Šamaš* in Sippar (YN 4). Over the years, H.’s patronage would extend to other major works in Sippar, but also in Babylon, Kutha, Ešnunna, Kiš, and in other places. In his 20th year he founded a city named *Bašu** (*Šapaza**), probably located near Babylon (YN 21, AbB 2, 84: 4f.).

Under H.’s rule, the crown also organized major projects designed to protect

and improve the movement of water in the kingdom. YN 9 commemorated work on a canal named *Ḥammu-rāpī-beġal*, “Hammurapi (provides) Abundance”. The 24th year was named after the dredging of the Euphrates and a canal or canal basin named *Tilimda-Enlila* (perhaps to be read in Akk.), “Enlil’s Waterjar”. YN 33 described the digging of waterworks named *Ḥammu-rāpī-nuḫuš-nišī*, “H. is (the Bearer of) Prosperity for the People.” This was an ambitious undertaking that probably began at *Dūr-Sîn-muballiṭ*-(*abim-wālidija*), “Fortress of Sîn-muballiṭ (the Father Who Engendered Me)”, near Nippur and then ran down through the major southern cities to Uruk, Larsa, Ur and then Eridu, on the verge of the marshes and the Persian Gulf for over approximately 200 km (Richardson 2015; Van Lerberghe et al. 2017). This may have been the name given to a major project that replaced or dredged in places the main branch of the Euphrates. There is evidence to suggest that climate changes had resulted in low river flow silting up and excessive reed growth in canals, and also gave rise to serious flooding (Cole/Gasche 1998). It is possible that work on walls of Sippar, referenced in the YNs 23, 25, and 43, was designed to protect against such inundations. The same may be true of similar works in Rapiqum*, N of Babylon on the Euphrates, and the construction of a wall named *Kār-Šamaš** on the Euphrates close to Babylon, both referenced in H.’s penultimate year name.

§ 5. Political history. Very little is known about the reign of Sîn-muballiṭ*, H.’s father and predecessor on the throne of Babylon. Documents from the reign of the former originated in Kiš, Damrum and Sippar. H. presumably inherited a small polity that controlled a limited amount of territory around Babylon that included at least Sippar, Kiš and perhaps Borsippa. As H. began his rule, Babylon was hemmed in by much more powerful states: Šamši-Adad’s* I extensive kingdom of upper Mesopotamia in the far N, Ešnunna close by to the E, Elam further to the SE and just downriver, Rīm-Sîn’s* I Larsa kingdom

that now controlled all southern Babylonia. The few surviving documents from the first years of his rule probably came from Sippar and perhaps Isin. YN 7 commemorated the brief “seizing” (dib) of Uruk and Isin (cities once allied with his father) in the S, while YN 10 was named after a defeat of Malgium* (§ 4), not far from Babylon towards the E, and the following year celebrated a victory over Rapiqum. But the propagandistic wording of the year formulae cannot be taken at face value as revealed by the rich information embedded in the Mari correspondence. Malgium would quickly recover from its temporary misfortune while Rapiqum was soon retaken by Ešnunna, but was eventually handed over to Babylon by the northern king Šamši-Adad I as a gift in gratitude for H.’s refusal to join Ešnunna in an alliance against his own kingdom. The events that led up to this are indicative of H.’s secondary role in the complex political and military interactions between the various kingdoms of Mesopotamia and Syria at the time; the scope of his rule and resources at hand were hardly comparable to those enjoyed by his more powerful neighbors. The monarch’s early year names focus primarily on religious offerings, but this does not mean that his kingdom was not involved in interstate politics or warfare.

H.’s fortunes were on the upswing and eventually, in his 16th year, he joined in an alliance with Šamši-Adad I and Ibal-pi-el* II, who was now the king of Ešnunna, to invade the land governed by his old enemy Malgium. The expedition was a success and Malgium had to pay the coalition an enormous amount of silver to lift the siege of its capital city. Soon after, however, H.’s ally Šamši-Adad I met his fate and his vast kingdom fell apart, opening space for new actors on the scene, including Zimri-Lim*, the new king of Mari, whose archives have provided a wealth of information on the political, diplomatic and military events of the next twelve years. The political changes in the Near East that followed the dissolution of the great kingdom would have far-reaching effects, eventually allowing H. to expand his reach and attain hegemony in

Mesopotamia and parts of Syria. Among other matters, we learn that Ešnunna invaded the land of Mari and at the same time that Zimri-Lîm was forced to suppress an uprising of Jaminite tribesmen in his lands. H. dispatched an army of five generals to aid the Mari king.

Seeking to exploit the new political situation, the ruler of Elam began complex negotiations with polities that he viewed as subordinate, Mari, Larsa, Babylon and others, sometimes pitting them against each other, to involve them in a war against Ešnunna. This resulted in the sacking of the city and its territory, which was now occupied by Elam. The Elam. ruler then turned against Mari and a large-scale Elam. invasion ravaged parts of Syria, involving vassals in the area in a complex web of alliances and betrayals but also plotting to involve various polities in a planned attack on Babylon. But H.'s forces, in alliance with Mari, Aleppo and other powers, defeated the interlopers at the battle of Ĥirî-tum. The Elamites then withdrew, but not before once again sacking the territory and very city of Ešnunna. But although some defeated Ešnunna generals betrayed their new Elam. sovereign and declared their allegiance to H., once the occupiers were gone they elected a new king in the person of one Šilli-Sîn*, a man of humble origins.

At this moment, Babylon solidified its place in the power politics of the area. The subsequent conquest of the Larsa kingdom after a six-month siege of the capital city, however, was pivotal to H.'s fortunes (YN 31): he acquired control over the whole S of Babylonia, eliminated a rival polity and gained access to the written cultural capital of ancient Sumer and Akkad. Importantly, H. did not do this alone, but was able to rally to his side Mari, Andariq and Malgium, as well as Yamutbal (Jamutbal*) tribesmen. The allied army from Mari continued to aid H. against rebel tribesmen who, benefitting from the war, took to raiding Bab. settlements, although Zimri-Lîm desperately tried to get his armies back to deal with local problems. With the rebels vanquished, H. turned to administering the large southern territory he now controlled.

The Mari letters provide information on many details of these complex events, which can only be summarized here.

With new resources at hand, control of a large area and freedom of movement, H.'s regime proceeded with new initiatives. Prior to this time, the two major powers in Babylonia were Larsa in the S and Ešnunna to the E. Having eliminated the former, he turned against the latter (with the help of some Mari troops) and conquered it the next year, even though Šilli-Sîn, the king of Ešnunna, was his son-in-law. This time Zimri-Lîm had taken side with the latter and four months later H. moved against Mari. His 33rd year formula celebrated three events: the construction of elaborate waterworks, the restoration of Sumer and Akkad and the victory over two rival states, Malgium and Mari; he also conquered other cities in Syria, including Tut-tul* (A. § 2.2) on the Balîḥ river. Thus ended the reign of H.'s sometimes treacherous and duplicitous ally, Zimri-Lîm. Two years later, H. withdrew his occupying forces from Mari, having destroyed the city and driven out the population. The conquest of Mari and other power centers in the area opened the Euphrates corridor into Syria, even if he did not permanently exploit the opportunities at hand; this would be of importance for his successors on the throne of Babylon, who would try to expand power northwards.

The last decade of H.'s reign is poorly documented. There is evidence that Babylon continued to be involved in N Mesopot. affairs, controlling some cities and sending armies to pacify foes. One important source for how H. wanted to be viewed by both contemporaries and generations to come is the prolog to his CH, written some time during the last four and a half years of his life, which listed his beneficial actions towards the cities of his realm. The enumeration is extensive and leaves no doubt that he wanted to be viewed as the master of all the world around him and the last man standing in the complex game of kings that he had been involved in for much of his time on the throne, having overcome

the minor status of Babylon at the time of his enthronement.

Like most Mesopot. conquerors before him, the supreme power he had attained was fleeting and ephemeral as most of H.'s military and organizational activities were short-lived. A little over a decade after his death, rebellion and other events led to the disintegration of the S and the loss of the areas he had won from Larsa less than 25 years earlier; his successors had to adjust to new realities and to redesign the scope and spread of the Bab. polity, attempting to exploit the power vacuum H. had left up the Euphrates. The preserved memory of CH, copies of other writings and lit. mentions aside (Hurowitz 2005), his most lasting work may have been the waterworks of *Ḥammu-rāpī-nuḥuṣ-nišī*. We have little evidence to go on, but it is possible that shutting down of this source of water for the S could have been a factor in the war against a rebellion conducted by his successor Samsu-iluna, who subdued the insurgents with much brutality. These events had grave long-lasting consequences, including a partial abandonment of cities along its route. Almost a century after the death of H., these waterworks would be reopened by his great grandson Abī-eṣuḥ (Richardson 2015).

This is but a brief summary of the complex political events of H.'s time; for a fuller account see the two biographies mentioned above (§ 1) and the more detailed information analyzed by Charpin/Ziegler 2003 and Charpin 2004 that take full account of the Mari documentation.

§ 6. Administration. The available H. epistolary materials provide rich information on the administration of his realm, focusing mainly on daily affairs, but contain little political data (aside from the letters sent to Zimrī-Līm of Mari and his officials Buqāqum and Baḥdī-Līm). Here are some examples:

§ 6.1. *Taxes*. Delivery of cattle: AbB 1, 1. Barley tax: AbB 9, 192. Oxen and sheep: AbB 13, 8–9. *igisû*-payment: AbB 13, 19.

§ 6.2. *Fields* (cf. Stol 2004, 735f.; Fiette forthc.). Field for a seal-cutter: AbB 4, 1.

Fields for merchants: AbB 4, 2f. Field for a mounted messenger: AbB 4, 4. Field for the governor of Badtibira: AbB 4, 5. Fields for fishermen: AbB 4, 6. Fields for *iššiakku* state farmers: AbB 4, 8; 9, 190. Fields for a scribe and for an overseer of weavers: AbB 4, 10. Field for a *rēdûm* soldier: AbB 4, 15. Field for a gardener: AbB 4, 16. Fields for cooks: AbB 4, 24. Fields for various temple attendants: AbB 4, 27. Field for a smith: AbB 4, 31. Field for a *gerseqqû* attendant: AbB 4, 32. Fields for basket menders: AbB 4, 37. Fields for musicians: AbB 9, 188, 193.

§ 6.3. *Legal affairs*. Sending of witnesses: AbB 2, 2. Problems with fields: AbB 2, 6, 9; 4, 12; 9, 190. An instance of a bribe: AbB 2, 11. Theft of barley: AbB 2, 12. Problems with cattle: AbB 2, 15. *hibiltu* "crime": AbB 2, 19. Barley loan: AbB 2, 24. Deserters: AbB 13, 10. Thieves: AbB 13, 12. Theft of cattle: AbB 13, 41.

§ 6.4. *Ransoming a prisoner of war*: AbB 9, 32.

§ 6.5. *A slave-girl runs away*: AbB 13, 18.

§ 6.6. *Canals and water*. Digging canals: AbB 2, 4, 55. Opening of a canal: AbB 4, 19. Low water: AbB 4, 39. Water for Larsa and Ur: AbB 4, 80. Too much water: AbB 4, 85. *Gabûm* canal: AbB 9, 194. Openings of unattended canals: AbB 13, 5.

§ 6.7. *Building and sending boats, boatmen*. Building of a cargo ship: AbB 2, 8, 59. Ships to be sent: AbB 13, 42. Boatmen to be sent: AbB 14, 225.

§ 6.8. *Sheep shearing, shepherds*. AbB 2, 25, 29. Dispatching of men to carry out shearing: AbB 14, 117.

§ 6.9. *Trees*. Cutting of trees: AbB 2, 56. Forest: AbB 4, 20.

§ 6.10. *Calendar matters*. Intercalary month *Ulûl*: AbB 2, 14.

§ 6.11. *Cult*. Procession of goddesses of Emûrbalum to Babylon: AbB 2, 34; 5, 135. Silver for the *Kittum* temple: AbB 13, 31.

§ 6.12. *Military affairs*. Troops in Rāp-iqum: AbB 13, 25.

§ 7. Death. H. may have become ill or feeble, perhaps succumbing to old age, by his 40th year (Pientka-Hinz 2008; Charpin 2010). A tablet dated by a unique composite year name (H. Holma, ASSF 45/3 [1914] no. 5; HG 6, 1947) incorporating H.'s 43rd date formula with the accession year name of his son and successor Samsu-iluna was issued on day 10 of the fifth month, suggesting that the new king had taken over (Horsnell 1999, 43; Charpin 2004, 333), although otherwise documents continued to be dated as H. 43 for the rest of the year. Moreover, in a letter (AbB 14, 130) Samsu-iluna claimed to have taken over the throne from his sick (verb partially restored) father and issued a debt relief proclamation to solidify his claim to rule. H.'s subsequent fate is unknown.

Barberon L. 2012: Les religieuses et le culte de Marduk dans le royaume de Babylone (= Mémoires de NABU 14). – Charpin D. 1991: L'application des édits de *mišarum*: traces documentaires, NABU 1991/76; id. 2003: Hammurabi de Babylone; id. 2004: Histoire politique du Proche-Orient amorrite (2002–1595), *Annäherungen* 4, 25–480; id. 2010: “Sentant sa mort prochaine ...”, NABU 2010/75; id. 2011: Babylon in der altbabylonischen Zeit: eine Hauptstadt von vielen ... die als einzige übrig blieb, in: E. Cancik-Kirschbaum/M. van Ess/J. Marzahn (ed.), *Babylon: Wissenskultur in Orient und Okzident* (= *Topoi* 1), 77–89. – Charpin D./Ziegler N. 2003: Mari et le Proche-Orient à l'époque amorrite: essai d'histoire politique (= FM 5). – Cole S. W./Gasche H. 1998: Second and first-millennium BC rivers in northern Babylonia, in: Gasche/M. Tanret (ed.), *Changing watercourses in Babylonia: towards a reconstruction of the ancient environment in lower Mesopotamia* (= MHEM 5/1), 1–64. – Démare-Lafont S. 2000: Codification et subsidiarité dans les droits du Proche-Orient ancien, in: E. Lévy (ed.), *La codification des lois dans l'antiquité: actes du colloque de Strasbourg* 27–29 novembre 1997, 49–64; ead. 2013: L'écriture du droit en Mesopotamie, in: O. Artus (ed.), *Loi et justice dans la littérature du Proche-Orient ancien* (= ZABR Beih. 20), 69–83. – Fadhil A./Pettinato G. 1995: Inno ad Hammurabi da Sippar, *OrAntMisc.* 2, 173–187. – Fiette B. 2016: Trois lettres écrites à Hammurabi dans les archives de Sin-iddinam, NABU 2016/83; id. forthc.: Le Palais, la terre et les hommes: la gestion du domaine royal de Larsa d'après les archives de Šamaš-hazir. *Mémoires de NABU* 19. – Glassner J.-J. 2004: Mesopotamian chronicles (= SBL WAW 19). – Horsnell M. J. A. 1999: The year names of the first dynasty of Babylon. –

Hurowitz V. A. 2005: Hammurabi in Mesopotamian tradition, *Fs. J. Klein* 497–532.

Ishikida M. Y. 1998: The structure and function of dispute management in the public administration of Larsa under Hammurabi, *Orient* 33, 66–78; id. 1999: The *ilkum* institution in the provincial administration of Larsa during the reign of Hammurabi (1792–1750 BC), *Orient* 34, 61–88. – Jiménez E. 2014: On the commentary to the code of Hammurabi and the Babylonian god of ordeals, NABU 2014/84. – Leemans W. F. 1968: King Hammurabi as judge, *Fs. M. David* 2, 110–122. – Lion B. 1994: Des princes de Babylone à Mari, *Gs. M. Birot* 221–234. – Maul S. M. 2012: Tontafelabschriften des Kodex ‘Hammurabi’ in altbabylonischer Monumentalschrift, *ZA* 102, 76–99. – Pedersen O. 2005: Archive und Bibliotheken in Babylon: die Tontafeln der Grabung Robert Koldeweys 1899–1917 (= ADOG 25). – Pientka-Hinz R. 2008: Midlife crisis and Angst vor dem Vergessen?: zur Geschichtsüberlieferung Hammurabi von Babylon, in: K.-P. Adam (ed.), *Historiographie in der Antike* (= ZAW Beih. 373), 1–25. – Richardson S. 2015: Re-digging Hammurabi's canal, NABU 2015/94; id. 2017: Goodbye, princess: Iltani and the DUMU.MUNUS LUGAL, *JCS* 69, 67–108. – Roth M. T. 1995: Mesopotamian legal traditions and the laws of Hammurabi, *Chicago Kent Law Review* 71, 13–40; ead. 1997: Law collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor (SBL WAW 6); ead. 2000: The law collection of king Hammurabi: toward an understanding of codification and text, in: Lévy (ed.), *La codification des lois dans l'antiquité*, 9–31. – Rutz M./Michalowski P. 2016: The flooding of Ešnunna, the fall of Mari: Hammurabi's deeds in Babylonian literature and history, *JCS* 68, 15–43.

Sallaberger W. 2010: König Hammurabi und die Babylonier: wem übertrug der Kodex Hammurabi die Rechtspflege?, in: P. Charvát/P. M. Vlčková (ed.), *Who was king? Who was not king? The rulers and the ruled in the Ancient Near East*, 46–58. – Sjöberg Å. W. 1972: Prayers for king Hammurabi of Babylon, in: J. Bergman et al. (ed.), *Ex orbe religionum: Studia Geo Widengren XXIV mense apr. MCMLXXII, quo die lustra tredecim feliciter explevit, oblata ab collegis, discipulis, amicis, collegae magistro amico congratulantibus*, 58–72; id. 1974–1975: *Miscellaneous Sumerian texts* 1, *OrS* 24, 159–181; id. 1991: Was there a Sumerian version of the laws of Hammurabi?, *Fs. M. Civil* 219–225. – Stol M. 2004: *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft in altbabylonischer Zeit, Annäherungen* 4, 641–975. – Streck M. P. 1999: Hammurabi oder Hammurapi?, *ArOr.* 67, 655–669. – Tyborowski W. 2010: The daughters of the kings of Babylon and their role in the Old Babylonian economy and society, in: Charvát/Vlčková (ed.), *o.c.*, 59–70. – Van De Mieroop M. 2005: Hammurabi of Babylon: a biography; id. 2011: Hammurabi's self-presentation, *Or.* 80, 305–

338. – Van Lerberghe K. et al. 2017: Water deprivation as military strategy in the Middle East, 3,700 years ago, *Méditerranée*, <https://mediterranee.revues.org/8000>. – Wasserman N. 1992: A bilingual report of oracle with a royal hymn of Hammurabi, *RA* 86, 1–18. – Wilcke C. 2007: Das Recht: Grundlage des sozialen und politischen Diskurses im Alten Orient, in: id. (ed.), *Das geistige Erfassen der Welt im Alten Orient: Beiträge zu Sprache, Religion, Kultur und Gesellschaft*, 209–244. – Woolley L./Mallowan M. E. L. 1976: Ur excavations: the Old Babylonian period (= UE 7). – Yoffee N. 2016: The power of infrastructures: a counternarrative and a speculation, *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 23, 1053–1065. – Ziegler N. 2016: The flooding of Ešnunna?, *NABU* 2016/41.

P. Michalowski (§§ 1.1–5, 3–5, 7) –
M. P. Streck (§§ 1.6, 2, 6)

Handel (trade). B. Bei den Hethitern.

§ 1. Merchants in the Hittite world. – § 2. Trading contacts, items traded. – § 3. Risks, rewards, royal protection measures. – § 4. Exports from Hatti.

§ 1. Merchants in the Hittite world. Though Hatti, kingdom of the Hittites, was part of the LBA international trading network, references to actual Hitt. merchants in written sources are rare. Hittites themselves seem to have played no significant role in the world of international t. (*Handel* A.* § 10; *Handelskolonien** §§ 3,1–3,2; Hoffner 2001, 180). Most goods imported into the kingdom, ranging from essential commodities to luxury items, were acquired through foreign intermediaries, as tribute (*Tribut* D*) from the kingdom's vassal states (e.g. CTH 147, transl. Beckman, *HDT*² 166–168), or through “gift” exchanges between Hitt. kings and their foreign peers (*Pferd* A. II.* § 2.5; Bryce 2003, 95–106). Even within Hatti, there is little evidence of a class of merchants plying their wares between the kingdom's towns and cities or in local markets. As Hoffner (2001, 181) comments, the Hitt. term for merchant, *unnattallaš*, refers exclusively to wealthy and important men who under royal protection conducted the business of international t. with allied countries. Sometimes, the places of origin of these men are mentioned in Hitt. texts. They included

Ura* on Anatolia's SE coast and Kaniš* (*A.* § 3c) in the Cappadocian region. The men of Ura in particular seem to have played a major role as agents of the Hitt. king in arranging shipments of goods from Ugarit* on the eastern Mediterranean coast to the Hitt. homeland (RS 17.130 and dupls. 17.461; 18.3 = PRU 4, 103–105).

A fragment of a Hitt. lit. text refers to the operations of “merchants” within the Hitt. world: “We, the merchants of Ura and Zallara*, are coming, and have plenty and abundance in our possession. We are bringing many NAM.RA-people (deportees). We are driving cattle, sheep, horses, mules and asses in large numbers. We have barley and wine in large amounts in our possession. We have in our possession valuable items as well: silver, gold, lapis lazuli, carnelian, Bab. stone, quartz, copper, bronze, and tin – whatever is within our prerogative, all in large amounts” (KBo. 12, 42: 2'–13' [CTH 822]; transl. Hoffner 1968; id. 2001, 184f.; Klengel 1979, 73f.). This textual remnant does not make clear whether the so-called merchants were travelling to Hattuša or a foreign destination. Nor does it indicate their actual role. Based on the size and range of the consignment, Klengel (1979, 75) argued that its components were not t. items assembled by private merchants; rather, the persons concerned were agents of the king, employed to escort the goods to their final destination (s.a. *Metalle* und Metallurgie. A. II.* § 2).

§ 2. Trading contacts, items traded. One can conclude that there were trading contacts, on a fairly regular basis, between Hatti and other countries, including Babylon, Assyria, Mittani, the Syro-Palestinian states, Egypt, and Cyprus, as indicated by both artefactual and textual evidence (s. Cline 1994, 70). By contrast, Cline (1991) notes the sparseness of items of Mycenaean origin found in a Hitt. context and vice versa. This, he believes, reflects a long-lasting embargo of trading activity imposed by the Hittites upon Mycenaean Greeks, for political or military reasons, wherever the Hittites exercised control. In support of his theory, Cline cites