

## The Name Hammurabi

J. DYNELEY PRINCE

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

IN *ZA*, xxii (1909), pp. 7-13, A. Ungnad presents an interesting treatise on the form *Hammurabi*, giving (pp. 7-9) a list of eight different readings of the name. From this list Ungnad rightly deduces the three facts: (1) That *H<sub>a</sub>-am-mu-ra-BI* is equivalent to *Am-mu-ra-BI* (cf. Nos. 6 and 8, where the first syllable is written AM and not *H<sub>A</sub>-AM*). (2) That the last syllable BI should be pronounced *pi* (cf. No. 8, where the last syllable of the name is written PI, clearly to be pronounced *pi*). BI has also the value *pi*, which confirms this idea. (3) Ungnad shows that there was originally a guttural spirant after the *pi*-syllable; viz. *-iḥ* (*i'?*), as seen from the writing in No. 7 (p. 9): *H<sub>a</sub>-am-mu-ra-BI-iḥ* (*i'?*), Johns, *PSBA*, xxix. (1907), p. 177. It is, therefore, evident that the correct pronunciation of the name in Babylonian was *Am-mu-ra-pi-iḥ* (*i'?*).

In V R 44, 21 *ab*, the name *Hammurabi* = *kimtu rapāstu*, 'extensive family,' apparently not a correct translation, but rather a popular rendering. The point has been made that the equivalent *rapāstu* for *ra-BI* indicates the *pi*-pronunciation for BI; had BI been pronounced *bi*, the equivalent would probably have been *rabitū* (*kimtu rabitū*). It should be remarked that the translation *kimtu*, 'family,' for *hammu* is also seen in the equivalent *Am-mi-sa-dug-ga* = *kimtum kêt-tum*, V R 44, 22, *ab*; i.e. *am-mi(mu)* = *kimtu*, probably by popular association; *sa-dug-ga* = *kêttum*, 'just, right.'

The correct form of *Hammurabi* being *Am-mu-ra-pi-iḥ* (*i'?*), it is clear that the Biblical form אַמְרַפֶּל (Gen. 14 i. 9) was

correctly handed down so far as the first part of the name *am-mu* = אַמ, and also, so far as the *ם* is concerned. The final ל in אַמְרַםִּל is difficult to explain. It appears that this ל was constant in the versions; note LXX Αμαρφαλ, but in Gen. 14<sup>9</sup> the Greek λ is *sup ras* in A<sup>b</sup> (Swete's edition). The ל of the Genesis text cannot be a formal error for ן or another guttural, nor is it probably a repetition of a supposed form לַמְלֶךְ to follow אַמְרַםִּל (thus, *OLZ*, 1907, col. 237). It is more likely that this final ל of אַמְרַםִּל represents an original ' = אַמְרַםִּי; *Amrapé* (or *-pi*). In the Phœnician alphabet ל = ל ל, while one form of the ' is ך (Schröder, *Phœn. Sprache*, pp. 76 ff.; Tafel A and B), which might easily have been converted into ל under the influence of the other royal name in the same passage תַּדְעֵל, where the ל seems to be correct. This name תַּדְעֵל (LXX, θαργαλ, θαλγαλ) has been tentatively identified with the Babylonian proper name *Tudhula* (Pinches, *Trans. Vict. Inst.*, xxix, 47, 73, and see Brown's *Hebrew Lexicon*, p. 1062). If my supposition is correct that ל is a conversion of an original ' in אַמְרַםִּל, this further confirms the Babylonian pronunciation *Am-mu-ra-pi*. The final guttural represented by the character *iḥ* in *Am-mu-ra-pi-iḥ* may have been a soft medial *h*, a form of the name which disappeared at an early date. This final *h* in *Ammurapi(iḥ)* was no doubt similar in character to the guttural in the initial *Ḥa* in the form *Ḥammurapi* which merges into an א (Am) in Babylonian (see above), as well as in the Hebrew form אַמְרַםִּל.

As to the meaning of *Ammurapi*, it seems established by Ungnad, *op. cit.*, that the first part of the name *Ammu* is the name of a god. The second part *ra-pi-iḥ* I regard as a participle descriptive of this deity, it may be, from a stem<sup>1</sup> *rapû* = אַרַּפּ, 'heal,' 'cure,' since it is not impossible to reproduce an א by means of an aspirate. As just indicated, the double writing of the first part of the name *ḥammu-ammu* =

<sup>1</sup> The stem *rapû* is not yet found in Babylonian except in the name *Nabû-rapû* cited above, which may be a Western Semitic form; but *rapû* would be a perfectly appropriate element in the name *Hammurabi* (see Ungnad, *op. cit.*, p. 12).

Bibl.  $\text{𒀭}$  certainly goes far to demonstrate this principle.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, in Clay, *Babylonian Expedition*, x. p. 57, A, we find the proper name *Nabû-ra-pa'* = Aramæan  $\text{נבון ראפא}$ , 'Nebo hath healed.' It does not appear, therefore, too strained to suggest the solution that *Am-mu-ra-pi-ih* (=  $\text{im}$ ) means 'Ammu is the healer.'

<sup>3</sup> Ungnad says: "ob man aber ein  $\text{𒀭}$  im Babylonischen mit dem Kehllaut wiedergegeben hätte, ist zweifelhaft," thus ignoring the significance of the double form *hammu-ammu*, cited by himself.