

*THE AMORITE CALENDAR.*

IN the February article under this title an attempt was made to collect the slight evidence which seemed to bear upon the identity of a calendar of months used in Babylonia, but apparently not Babylonian nor even Sumerian in origin. No attempt was made to go behind the published texts, except to guard against a too slavish acceptance of their first editions. Many of these texts are extremely difficult to read, but as scholars become more familiar with the handwriting of the cuneiform scribes, better results may be obtained, and every edition of fresh texts from the earlier periods of Babylonian history may be expected to produce fresh evidence bearing on the subject.

In the meantime, Dr. Th. Friedrich has published in full the texts of the tablets found by Professor V. Scheil at Sippara and now preserved in the Imperial Ottoman Museum at Constantinople. Many of these had been given, in transcription and translation only, in *Une Saison de fouilles à Sippar*, from which we have already quoted (p. 129), a method of publication which made it difficult to be sure of the original. Further, the rapidity with which such documents perish in their new surroundings warns us to make every effort to get them published before their evidence is once more, and finally, lost to the world. As might be expected, these *Altbabylonische Urkunden aus Sippara* give us welcome information on many points. Thus the cuneiform rendering of the Biblical Kittim has now been found, as *Ki-ti-im*, in the remarkable proviso inserted in the lease of a carriage for a year, viz., that it should not be used to go to Kittim. If this be really what is intended, we must suppose that such a journey from Babylonia to the coast of the Mediterranean sea was actually undertaken,

sometimes at any rate, in a carriage. This speaks volumes for the security of the roads under Hammurabi and his son Samsu-iluna, in whose eighth year this lease was drawn up. It further throws light upon the amount of intercourse between East and West when, not a Royal caravan nor an armed embassy, but a private citizen could contemplate such a journey.

In particular, these new texts furnish some welcome additions and corrections to what was available before. A further number of texts which will shortly be published, from the same place and period, afford welcome confirmations and enable us to take a step or two forward. They make certain the conjectured emendations of Dûr-Rammânu and Dûr-Abi into Isin-Rammânu and Isin-Abi. It may now be questioned whether these two months really belong to the "Amorite" calendar. They would be more in place in the "Early Sumerian" of Sargon I., given by Dr. H. Radau in his *Early Babylonian History* (p. 287 f.), where eight out of the nine month names already known begin with *EZEN*, or Isin. Surely this was a most priestly calendar, when each month was named after its festival. Now Dr. Radau has been able to fix these eight months with respect to their order and the corresponding later names are known. He has no name for Adar, Ab, or Marchesvan. Now we saw that Isin-Rammânu answered to Adar. If Isin-Abi is really connected with the month Ab, this should fill the blank fifth space in Dr. Radau's list. These suggestions must await further evidence before they are accepted, but amid the hundreds of unpublished deeds of Sargon's time, we may expect to find some dated in the months of Isin-Abi and Isin-Rammânu, names which at present are only found in deeds of the period of the First Dynasty of Babylon. There we may also find the name of the month answering to the later Marchesvan.

We should thus lose two months out of our former "Amorite" calendar, but their transference to the "Early Sumerian" calendar clearly does not affect the placing of the other months nor the attribution of them to an "Amorite" source. Thus, for example, Mamîtu still precedes Adar and answers to Šebat, but it is not transferred to the "Early Sumerian" calendar, for the month there preceding Adar is already known to be *EZEN-AMAR-A-SI*. Again, the removal of Isin-Abi from the "Amorite" calendar is a great relief, as we now have room for Šadûtu with which we found it to be equivalent. This month then clearly answers to Abu. We are still left with the difficulty that if Elûlu be the same as Ulûlu, Tiru should be Ab. The suggestion already made (p. 128) that Elûlu may be the "Amorite" name for Tišrî would solve the difficulty, but we must wait for more evidence.

In compensation for the lost months, Dr. Friedrich's new texts bring us at least one fresh name, apparently Šelaša (Sipp. 323, l. 6), which does not belong to the other calendars and which we may therefore add provisionally to the "Amorite" list. In the cuneiform documents, the name of the month Ab is spelt A-bu (genitive, A-bi); Dr. Friedrich, however, publishes a text (Sipp. 355, l. 10) dated in the month Ab-bi, which he regards as a mere variant for Abi. Unfortunately, there is nothing in the text to fix the month. It is just possible that we have here the "Amorite" name answering to Abib. It is not likely that there is any connexion between Abu and Abib, and although the year may once have begun in Adar, as it certainly did begin in Tišrî in the time of Gudea, it is difficult to see what shifting of epoch could bring Ab to Abib. On the other hand we do not yet know the meaning of the month name Abu, while Abib is supposed to refer to the "opening of flowers," etc., in other words is given a Hebrew deriva-

tion. If this derivation of Abib be correct, the form Abbi would answer to it very well. Until, however, we have evidence to show that Abbi is not for Abi, or to show that Abbi answered to some other month than Ab, we cannot press the point. If Abib really answered to the later Nisân, we already know that the "Amorite" name for that month was Rabûtu, not Abbi.

Dr. Friedrich's edition shows that the unusual word *idar* (p. 129), whose meaning was conjectured from the context to be the same as *irûb* (p. 128), is actually *irûb* on the original; thus bringing this text into complete parallelism with the others. He also shows that Šubutim is the correct reading here; and not Subutim as was conjectured (p. 129).

The period at which this race of Amorites settled in Babylonia is not yet ascertained. Some writers have apparently assumed that because the First Dynasty of Babylon was Amorite the invasion of Babylonia by the Amorites should be placed not long before. In the time of Sargon I., king of Akkad, usually dated about B.C. 3800 on the authority of Nabonidus the antiquary king of Babylon, numerous references are made to the land of Martu, usually identified with Amurru. These are taken to refer to the same Western land as was designated by the same name in the time of Sennacherib. That we know by its inclusion of Tyre, Arvad, Gebal, Gaza, Ekron, Ashkelon, Ashdod, Samsimuruna, Judah, Edom, Moab, Ammon, etc., to be Western Syria and Palestine, extending across the Jordan. Sargon's conquests in the West are therefore taken to mean an Empire bounded by the Mediterranean on the West. Doubt has, however, been thrown on this view since Dr. T. G. Pinches and others pointed out the existence of the Amurri and a land of Martu in the vicinity of Babylon. We may ask, "Had the location of the name

and race changed ? ” It seems possible that the “ Amorites,” who once, in Sargon’s time, were settled in the West, had now reached Babylonia in such numbers as to give their name to a district there. This view was held by many, but in the *Revue Semitique* (1897, p. 166 f.) Mr. Thureau Dangin published part of a land survey from Telloh, probably connected with the purchase of large estates for the Crown, which mentioned a governor of the land of Martu, with the distinctly West Semitic name of Uru-malik. This man occupied the same position as Rim Sin in the time of Ḥammurabi, and as the monument is dated on palaeographical grounds even anterior to Sargon I. we must recognize that the Amorites in the time of Sargon I. were not only in the West but also in great force in Babylonia itself. That the native Babylonians do not call the First Dynasty of Babylon “ Amorite ” is more easily accounted for, considering the Amorite complexion of the monarchs’ names, if we suppose that the Amorites were already ancient inhabitants.

We may now ask whether there is any evidence of the “ Amorite ” calendar in Babylonia before the days of the First Dynasty. In an article published in the *Revue d’Assyriologie* (iv. p. 84) Mr. Thureau Dangin drew attention to the fact that, in the time of Sargon I., alongside of the dating by the month names which we have called “ Early Sumerian,” dates were given in months whose names were *Baḥir arkû*, *Zabittu*, and *Ḥani*. These are evidently Semitic, but not translations of the Early Sumerian, Sumerian, or Babylonian month names. One of these names at once strikes us as Amorite, *Zabittu* is surely the same as *Zibittu*, *Sibutu*, etc. The name *Baḥir arkû* denotes an intercalary *Baḥir*, as *Addaru arkû* denotes *Ve-Adar*. This fact apparently led Dr. Radau to identify *Baḥir* with *Adar*, but there were in early times other inter-

calary months, a second Nisan, a second Elul, and there really seems to be no reason why an intercalary month should not have been inserted whenever needed. At any rate, the mere fact that the month is intercalary does not identify it with Adar more than Nisan or Elul. The word Bahir seems to be connected with the word *bahru*, which means a "brazier" or "censer." Now this is also the meaning of the "Amorite" month name Kinûnu, which, if the same as the Canaanite Kanun, answers to the later Marchesvan. In view of the fact that the whole of the Early Sumerian calendar refers to festivals, it would be unwise to conclude that this month was called the "brazier" because the weather was especially "hot" in that part of the year. The reference may rather be to some festival in which the "brazier," or "censer," bore a prominent part. The Phoenician month name Marzeah seems to have been taken from some festival (see G. A. Cooke's *North Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 95, 121 f., 303), and this festival had a wide vogue among the West Semites. Without prejudice to the questions whether Marzeah was the name of a whole month or only of the five epagomenous days of the year or rather of the festival held during them, and without deciding upon its place in the year, we may remark that *masrahu*, a term often occurring in dates of the First Dynasty of Babylon, is a very similar word. The root *šarâhu* means "to cry aloud," as would the root *razâhu* from which Marzeah would be derived in Babylonia. It is tempting to suppose that Marzeah originally meant exactly the same as *masrahu*. The exact meaning of this word is not known, but its ideogram *GIŠ-KU-ŠU-NIR* seems to connect it with *ŠU-NIR*, the ideogram of *Šurinnu*, which does mean "brazier" or "censer," as do both the month names Bahir and Kinûnu. It would be hasty to conclude that Marzeah was a month and identical with Bahir and Kinûnu, and, therefore, fell

in Marchesvan ; but it seems scarcely likely that all this is mere coincidence. Whether a festival could be shifted from one month to another is very doubtful, but it could give its name to the month in which it fell, and months were apparently shifted ; whether as the result of the want of means to keep the lunar and solar year in harmony, or from other considerations now obscure to us. On the question of the shifting of months see Dr. H. Radau's *Early Babylonian History* (p. 287 ff.).

There does not seem to be any Babylonian root likely to lead to the month name Ḫanî, though it is not well to be too dogmatic on such a point while such a small proportion of the material already in our museums is published ; but the word is exactly like many elements of West Semitic names and it may not be too presumptuous to suppose that it meant the "month of favour." This is the meaning usually ascribed to the name Šadûtu, on the ground of words preserved in Assyrian letters of the seventh century B.C., which may themselves be due to West Semitic influence. It would be too much to say that Šadûtu was a Babylonian word because a derivation could be found in the Assyrian dictionaries. Both Ḫanî and Šadûtu may be "Amorite" names ; but that they seem to have the same meaning suggests the identity of the months indicated by them.

Whatever may ultimately be proved for these months, and it will be noted that as yet they are "single instances" and we have no documentary evidence as to what part of the year they fell in, it seems probable that "Amorite" best describes their affinities. It is certain that they are not translations of the names of the other calendars in use at the same period. We may say that these "Amorite" names go back to the time of Sargon I. It remains to be seen whether the other names we have called "Amorite"

occur so early. It would have been disconcerting for our theory if we had to assume that the Amorites first appeared in Babylonia in the 23rd century B.C. But we have seen that they were in Babylonia at least as early as the time of Sargon I. How many more of these "Amorite" months are named in the hundreds of tablets of that early period already in our Museums we cannot say yet.

The much abused Cappadocian tablets, which witness to the use of cuneiform script in the far West, about Caesarea and Boghaz Keui, mention months unknown elsewhere. Professor Delitzsch, who first made their contents intelligible, is inclined on palaeographic and other grounds to place them as early as the 23rd century B.C. They have many affinities with Assyria, as in the method of dating by the *limmu*, or Eponymy, exactly as in the Assyrian Eponym Canon, the occurrence of many personal names compounded with Ašur, etc. The list of month names which Delitzsch (in the *Abhandlungen der philol. histor. Classe der Sachsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, xiv. no. iv. pp. 207-270) rescues for us comprises Biḳawarta, Zizuim, Zaratim, Ab Šarâni and Kuzallu. The last we have already met with (p. 131) in Assyria and Palmyra. The name Ab Šarâni can scarcely be identified with Ab until we know in what part of the year it fell. Zaratim looks Semitic at any rate. The others do not seem to have any connexion with the "Amorite" calendar, but may be borne in mind. The tablets, however, still sorely need a critical edition of their texts and these names may ultimately turn out to be quite different in form from what Delitzsch has given as the best that can be made of the present editions.

In the land of Ḥana, wherever that may be, cuneiform writing was also in use. Mr. Thureau Dangin has published in his *Tablettes chaldéennes inédites* (no. 85) a tablet from Ḥana where Assyrian influence was also strong, as is



shown by the use of the homer as a measure of grain, a measure hitherto unrecognized on Babylonian soil. The homer is also West Semitic, and the names in the text show the same complexion, one Išarlim, that of the king of Ḫana, being regarded by many as an exact equivalent of Israel. This tablet is dated in the month Teritim, a name which at once recalls the "Amorite" Tiru. It would bear the same relation to it that the Babylonian Tašrîtum bears to Tišrî. If this be really the same month, it is a further argument against the reading Tirinu already doubted (p. 129). Dr. Friedrich's texts also support Tiru. The aberrant *-nu* may be an error for *-tum*.

It is, of course, unfortunate that we cannot yet present a full list of the months of the "Amorite" calendar, nor even fix the sequence of those we know. We do not yet know that there may not be some which will have to follow Dûr-Rammânu and Dûr-Abi. It might have been wiser to wait till we knew more before saying anything about them, but such as it is this tentative list may guide some one to further research and even lead to the recognition of month names in places where they have not yet been suspected.

C. H. W. JOHNS.