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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 Ha-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 HA-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. -iʔ (i'?), as seen from the writing in No. 7 (p. 9): Ha-am-mu-ra-BI-iʔ (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-iʔ (i'?).

In V R 44, 21 ab, the name Hammurabi = kimtu rapaštu, ‘extensive family,’ apparently not a correct translation, but rather a popular rendering. The point has been made that the equivalent rapaštu for ra-BI indicates the pi-pronunciation for BI; had BI been pronounced bi, the equivalent would probably have been rabitu (kimtu rabitu). 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 = kêt-tum, ‘just, right.’

The correct form of Hammurabi being Am-mu-ra-pi-iʔ (i'?), it is clear that the Biblical form בָּן אָדָם (Gen. 14 1. 9) was...
correctly handed down so far as the first part of the name am-mu = אֶּמֶׁ, and also, so far as the ב is concerned. The final ב in בָּאָמַם is difficult to explain. It appears that this ב was constant in the versions; note LXX Αμμαρφαλ, but in Gen. 14 χ the Greek λ is sup ras in Αβ (Swete's edition). The ב of the Genesis text cannot be a formal error for ב or another guttural, nor is it probably a repetition of a supposed form לָלָל to follow בָּאָמַם (thus, OLZ, 1907, col. 237). It is more likely that this final ב of בָּאָמַם represents an original ב = אֶּמֶׁ; Amrapi (or -pi). In the Phoenician alphabet ב = ל·לב, while one form of the ב is ל (Schröder, Φων. Sprache, pp. 76 ff.; Tafel A and B), which might easily have been converted into ב under the influence of the other royal name in the same passage בָּאָמַם, where the ב seems to be correct. This name בָּאָמַם (LXX, βαβυλικά, βαλγικά) has been tentatively identified with the Babylonian proper name Tuddula (Pinches, Trans. Vict. Inst., xxix, 47, 73, and see Brown's Hebrew Lexicon, p. 1062). If my supposition is correct that ב is a conversion of an original ב in בָּאָמַם, this further confirms the Babylonian pronunciation Ammura-pi. The final guttural represented by the character י in Ammura-pi-י may have been a soft medial י, a form of the name which disappeared at an early date. This final י in Ammura-pi(י) was no doubt similar in character to the guttural in the initial ב in the form Hammurapi which merges into an י (Am) in Babylonian (see above), as well as in the Hebrew form בָּאָמַם.

As to the meaning of Ammura-pi, it seems established by Ungnad, op. cit., that the first part of the name Ammu is the name of a god. The second part rapi-י I regard as a participle descriptive of this deity, it may be, from a stem1 rapi = רָפָא, 'heal,' 'cure,' since it is not impossible to reproduce an י by means of an aspirate. As just indicated, the double writing of the first part of the name הָמָמ-אָמַמ =

1 The stem rapi is not yet found in Babylonian except in the name Nabat-rapi cited above, which may be a Western Semitic form; but rapi would be a perfectly appropriate element in the name Hammurabi (see Ungnad, op. cit., p. 12).
Bibl. certainly goes far to demonstrate this principle.\(^2\) Furthermore, in Clay, *Babylonian Expedition*, x. p. 57, A, we find the proper name *Nabû-ra-pa* = Aramaean *עוּבְרָה* (= *Amu-ri-i*), ‘Nebo hath healed.’ It does not appear, therefore, too strained to suggest the solution that *Am-mu-ra-pi-i* (*= i^K*) means ‘Ammu is the healer.’

\(^3\) Ungnad says: “ob man aber im Babylonischen mit dem Kehlaut wiedergegeben hätte, ist zweifelhaft,” thus ignoring the significance of the double form *Hammu-ammu*, cited by himself.