A growing conviction that the date-formulae of Zimri-Lim, as extracted by Dossin in his famous Studia Mariana article (1950), cannot adequately represent the actual length of this king's reign has led researchers to reorganize them into a more realistic scheme. Dossin's 32 formulae, now swelled by at least four more, are now regarded as covering anywhere between 14 and 20 years. The following are more recent suggestions:


- «Euphrates» (n° 29) = «Kahat» (n° 4)
- «Elam expedition» (n° 13) = «muballitum» (n° 31)
- «Addu of Mahanum» (n° 18) = «Addu of Appan» (n° 23)
- «Babylon» (n° 11) = «Qarni-Lim» (n° 10)
- «Throne of Dagan» (n° 14) = «Yamhad» (n° 32)
- «Ašlakka II» (n° 3b) = «Habur» (n° 30)
- «Isar-Lim»

However, the lack of useful datable texts assignable to some of these years (e.g. «Qarni-Lim»; «Addu of Appan») permits nothing but guesses. It is now clear, moreover, that many of these correspondences will not prove correct.

2. Materne, 1983: 195 n. 1, has four suggested equations at least the last two of which seem to me unlikely:

- «muballitum» (n° 31) = «Elam expedition» (n° 13)
- «Yamhad» (n° 32) = «Addu of Mahanum» (n° 18)
- «Kahat» (n° 4) = «Throne of Šamaš» (n° 16)
- «Ašlakka II» (3b) = «Eluhtum» (n° 9)

1. Dossin, 1950. As far as I can ascertain it, H. Lewy was the most forceful exponent of shortening Zimri-Lim's reign during the early years of Mari historical scholarship, 1959.

2. Previous discussions conveniently gathered in Sasson, 1980, 5-8 [3.2.6]. The year formulae of Zimri-Lim will henceforth be cited according to the abbreviations given therein. The only slight emendation for the pattern given there is that I now cite one year as «Benjaminites», rather than «Benjammites»; this, to underscore the fact that while the tribe ought to be regarded as bearing a West Semitic name, that name ought not necessarily recall the biblical tribe usually called «Benjammites».
3. Durand, 1983: 158-159, n. 18:
«... l’année de la défaite de l’Eluhtum [n° 9] est postérieure à l’an II d’Ašlakka.»
5. The texts published in ARMT XXIII have come to suggest two more equivalences:
«Census» (n° 26) = «Habur» (n° 30)
«Babylon» (n° 11) = «Yamhad» (n° 32)

Because the year «Addu of Halab» is well represented among ARMT XXIII’s documents, two of the volume’s editors are more precise on locating this year within Zimri-Lim’s reign. D. Soubeyran has devoted a few pages (335-343) to the topic and presents careful arguments in favor of paralleling «Addu of Halab» either to «Benyaminites» (n° 6) or «Ašlakka» (n° 2). In deciding in favor of equivalence to «Benyaminites», Soubeyran depends on archives dealing with preparation and dedication of implements and furnitures sacred to a variety of gods. On the other hand, F. Joannès turns to the documentation regarding wood-workings in order to parallel our year with «Ašlakka».

By overviewing the complete attestations of relevant formulae, I would like to confirm Joannès’s opinion and take advantage of the occasion to remark on the formulation of date-years at Mari.

An overview of the available evidence regarding the construction and the vocabulary of the Mari formulae establishes an important distinction in the manner in which events were commemorated. Before the reign of Zimri-Lim, the chancelleries of his predecessors permitted recall of two separate events under one formula. Thus, two clauses were then joined by means of u:

2. Sumu-Yamam’s n° 1: «Sumu-Yamam ascended the throne and built Halabit» [Two acts, not necessarily consecutive).
4. Yasmah-Adad’s n° 3: «The census was taken; Eponym: Addu-bani». Here no conjunctions are to be found, and it is obvious that the chancellery was merely establishing a parallelism between two differing methods of dating.

3. The supporting document is XXIII: 42 wherein a-delivery of clothing at Zurrubban is said to occur «when he/they dug the Habur». It is dated 18.v. «Throne of Samaš». I do not quite see the necessity to eliminate «Habur» from the date-formulae, as suggested by G. Bardet, ARMT XXIII, pp. 40-41.
4. This fact is a plausible extrapolation from the documents dated «Addu of Mahanum», wherein a trip to the Mediterranean coast was taken by Zimri-Lim, ARMT XXIII, pp. 453ff. P. Villard, who edited most of the relevant documents prefers to parallel «Yamhad» with «Addu of Mahanum» (n° 18), cf. ARMT XXIII, p. 462-63. This cannot be settled as long as the published texts dated to «Yamhad» remain so sparse. It is suggestive, however, that documents are so dated come from the 22.iv (VIII: 79) and 1.v (VIII: 25), presumably when the trip is still in process and this would tend to weaken Villard’s hypothesis.
5. Cf. ARMT XXIII, pp. 335-343; 133 n. 2 (Joannès). See below, note 16.
In the case of Zimri-Lim’s reign, however, there is only one year name \( [n° 6] \) with coordinated clauses; but these clauses reflect actions that were obviously simultaneous: « Zimri-Lim was victorious over the Benyaminites and killed their kings ». Furthermore, variations on this formula make it clear that the scribe also did not distinguish a time span between the two acts since he either ignored the information regarding the Benyaminite kings \( [n° 6a, c] \), or used the verb \( dākum \) to control both \( damdum \) and \( šarrum \) \( [n° 6b] \). In the only other example in Zimri-Lim’s formulae wherein the conjunction \( u \) is used, it coordinates direct objects and not clauses: « Zimri-Lim razed the fortification of Mišlan and (of) Samanum ».

An important detail for this argument is provided by the famous letters sent by Yasim-Sumu to Šunuhrhalu and to the king. Writing to the secretary (XIII : 47), a man who was not particularly more highly positioned than himself, Yasim-Sumu is frank:

With regards naming the year about which you wrote me as follows: « Year: Zimri-Lim dedicated a great throne to Dagan ».

But this throne is not yet dedicated. I am therefore sending along a letter to the king. The name of the year (should be): « Zimri-Lim went to the help of Babylon, (marking) the second time into Larsa » ...

The letter which Yasim-Sumu sent the king is available as XIII : 27. Here, its author approach the subject rather gingerly, almost as an aside to other matters that need the king’s attention. Yasim-Sumu does not volunteer a reason since it obviously may reflect on his efficiency. But the point to be made here is that Yasim-Sumu’s suggestion regarding the alternate name for the year actually contains asyndetic references to two separate, albeit possibly consecutive, acts. In view of the observation made above about the tendency of Zimri-Lim’s chancellery not to concatenate two events into one year-name, it is interesting to note that Yasim-Sumu’s formulation as given in XIII : 47 and 27 has yet to be found in actual documents \( ^6 \).

Such observations allow me to tentatively suggest that if the chancellery during Zimri-Lim’s reign found it necessary to commemorate two distinct events – possibly one of which was ceremonial, the other dependent on the caprice of nature or politics –, it chose an avenue that differed from its predecessor’s: it assigned each event its own year name and used this particular formulae seemingly at whim. But it must be noted here that once they entered information by means of one year-name, scribes apparently never needed to reintegrate it into another year-name. Thus, I have so far failed to identify one example of a text, even when available in « duplicates », that was recopied in order to be assigned another formula. The scribes simply knew which years were coeval.

As to what led specific scribes to prefer one year-name over the other is a matter which cannot find easy solution. I had once thought that it depended on the location of the scribe; on whether he belonged to the palace in Mari or to those of provincial capitals. This may still be a valid hypothesis, but it cannot be applicable to all occurrences. Although they may well compete with paralleling year-dates, some formulae (among which were « Throne of Šamaš » and « Census ») seem to have attracted strong allegiance from the scribes.

Applied to « Addu of Halab », this observation suggests that another formula, probably recalling martial events, was used coevally by the Mari chancellery. This matter can be broached by raising one more issue regarding Zimri-Lim’s formulations. This pertains to the precise meaning of the language in the formula: \( šanat Zimri-Lim šalamša ana Addu ša Halab ušēlū. \) Does it suggest that Zimri-Lim sent his statue to

\[ 6. \text{D. Soubeyran understands differently the implications of XIII : 47 and 27, ARMT XXIII, p. 343.} \]
Halab? Or does it really mean that he offered it to the manifestation of that specific Addu who, we know, was housed in Mari itself? The verb šulūm (§ of elūm) is found during the Zimri-Lim period in other formulae:

- n° 16 - « Z.L. dedicated a great throne to Šamaš of Mahanum »
- n° 19 - « Z.L. dedicated a golden throne « to » Diritum »
- n° 21 - « Z.L. dedicated his statue to Hatta of Kakkulâtum »

In these formulae the deity and the geographical name are linked by ša, which does not clarify the query posed above. However, one more formula can be of help:

- n° 14 - « Z.L. dedicated a great throne to Dagan who is in Terqa [ana Dagan ša ina Terqa] »

Where it not for this particular formulation with ina, rather rare among the Mari attestations, one could not be certain that the god was in fact receiving his offering in his own hometown.

I have gone to some length regarding what may seem obvious: That « Addu of Halab » recalls the dispatching of Zimri-Lim’s statue to Halab rather than to a shrine for that god in Mari itself. But this is necessary in order to introduce as a major piece of evidence XXII: 248, dated to 3.x. « Benyaminite ». It reads as follows:

31 1/6th shekels of silver, for the mounting of the statue of the king, that is to go to Aleppo. In care of Yašub-Ašar, at the bitumen room, 4th time.

Dossin, 1939: 107, cites another text regarding the same matter:

27 5/6th minas of copper, from Dagan of Terqa, to make the statue of the king, that will go to Aleppo.

It is unfortunate that Dossin did not register a date for the latter citation; but, if the pattern for producing and dedicating such votive figurines is any indication, it probably fell just earlier in the same year: The mounting of a statue with precious metal usually took place somewhere between its casting and its outfitting with weapons and accoutrements, belts, headgears, etc... [cf. XXII: 307, « 2 1/5th shekels of mountain lapis-lazuli for the belt of the statue of the king (god ?) of Der ».]

We have now arrived at a preliminary conclusion: Since XXII: 248 is dated pretty late in « Benyaminite », albeit a year that was swelled by an intercalated 13th month, the above mentioned hypothesis of Charpin, Durand and Soubeyran needs further

---

7. Princesses given as spouses to cement political relations brought their own gods to their new homes, see Sasson, 1973: 76-77. It is probable that when Shiptu came to Mari, shrines were established for Addu of Halab not only in the capital (XXI: 48: 9-10; [30.xi.« ? »]) but in the outlying regions as well (XIV: 9). A correspondent could, therefore, adjure Shiptu « By Addu, lord of Halab, and of your father » (X: 156: 10-11), even if Yarim-Lim’s personal god, we known, was Sin ; Dossin, 1953: 65: 27.

8. Especially when the verb has a strong consonant in third position, there is an overwhelming tendency to use the subjunctive, although occasional examples of an ipuS or an i{rud can be found. In the case of third-weak verbs, however, the form in the indicative can occur as likely as not. One can notice, however, that the formula « Throne of Šamaš » appended to the naptan sarrim texts of room 111 (XI) is uniformly couched in the indicative! I cannot explain the phenomenon, since other rooms are not as consistent in this regard.

Occasionally, the verb šulūm could be replaced by šupušum, eg. XXIII: 406.

9. D. Soubeyran now quotes an unpublished documents which is dated to « Year : Zimri-Lim had his bronze statue fixed in the temple of Addu of Halab » (ARMT XXIII, p. 333, n. 15). This formulation, alamsu ša zabas ina etsa _IL sa halabu utsizzu, does not quite resolve the quandary as nicely as the one with regard the « throne of Dagan » quoted above, since the temple of Addu of Halab could well be in Mari itself. What would be nice is something like *alamSu ana _IL sa halab utsizzu wēlā. Unless it be deemed a scribal mistake, the formula can read (e.g. at XI: 113: « ... ana an ša halab », to the god of Halab »; and this may imply dispatching to Halab itself.
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refinement. «Addu of Halab», therefore, probably followed — not preceded — «Benyamintes» 10. The question now becomes: How much later? «Addu of Halab» is attested, so far, by the following texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Contents and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.i</td>
<td>XXII : 53</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Oil for fem. royal personnel. Addu-duri, who died sometimes before iii. «Census» [Materne, 1982: 197,12], establishes this year as preceding «Census». Almost a copy of expenditures for 5.iv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.i</td>
<td>XXII : 78</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Listing of personnel for wool shearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.i</td>
<td>XXIII : 394</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Grease, for chariots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.i</td>
<td>XXIII : 155</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Material for leather work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXIII : 183</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Glue for weapon of Dagan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.i</td>
<td>XXI : 303</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Glue to carpenters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.i</td>
<td>XXIII : 515</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Scented(?) wood, to perfumer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.i</td>
<td>XXIII : 409</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Grease for chariots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXI : 304</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Glue to artisans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXIII : 184</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Glue to make bows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.i</td>
<td>XXII : 185</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Copper to make saws. XXI : 268, dated 19.x. «Euphrates», may refer to one of these transactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.i</td>
<td>XXIV : 11</td>
<td>«Z»</td>
<td>Grain to official.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.i</td>
<td>XXII : 216</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>New scythes. Cf. sub 23.iii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.i</td>
<td>XXI : 305</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Dye materials. Abi-Šamaš's dossier stretches from «Euphrates» to «Aslakka».</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.i</td>
<td>XXIII : 400</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Grease for chariot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.i</td>
<td>XXIII : 157</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Dye for 'Ipadahatum, known from «Euphrates» to «Šamaš».</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.i</td>
<td>XXI : 205</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Silver borrowed from Ahusina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.i</td>
<td>XXI : 306</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Dyes, received by 'Ipadahatum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.i</td>
<td>XXI : 322</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Clothing, weapons sent to Yasim-Sumu in Suprum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.iii</td>
<td>XXI : 323</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Wool received from Takun-šubat (same name as Takuna) to make textile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.iii</td>
<td>XXIII : 185</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Glue for woodworker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.iii</td>
<td>XXI : 264</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Scythes. Cf. sub ?.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXIII : 186</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Glue for woodworkers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXIII : 382</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Vessel for princess Bahlatum, the priestess.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Yet another text (n° 11365), cited without a date by Limet, 1984: 521, may refer to the same statue: «81 shekels of gold, for the mounting of a big statue of the king». Soubeyran’s opinion that the fragmentary and undated (?) XXII : 213 be assigned to the same occasion (XXIII, p. 337, [k]) is plausible. However, Kupper’s reading of the remaining signs would suggest that a royal statue was in some way related to Dagan of Terqa. In the case of the royal statue dedicated to Addu of Halab reference is to the metal brought out from the property of Dagan of Terqa.
29.iii XXII : 259 135 Purchase of minerals (to make glass?) from Yašub-Nar.

2. iv XXI : 121 134 Oil for workers.

5. iv XXII : 54 135 Oil for fem. royal personnel. See above, sub 1.i.

10. iv XXII : 265 135 Oil outlays; from Ili-Asraya and Balumenuhhe. See below.

XXIII : 188 215 Glue to workers.

XXIII : 516 215 Wood board for chariot's horns.

12. iv XXI : 265 160 Stones for the throne of Šamaš and for the statue of the king. The throne was dedicated sometime during «Ašlakka» since the year following was named after the event.

The «statue of the king» cannot, of course, be the one sent to Halab. It is not likely to be the one sent to Hatta of Kallulātum, a few years removed from this event. [XXI : 289/292 ; XXIV : 128].

XXIII : 159 215 Dye for weaver.

XXIII : 189 Glue for chariot.

XXIII : 190 215 Glue for footstools, one to Šamaš.

XXIII : 393 215 Grease to artisans, for Dagan's weapon.


22. iv XXI : 298 160 Materials for the throne of Šamaš.

XXIII : 213 215 Materials for the weapons of a number of Dagan avatars; of Sin. The two texts are not exact duplicates, the 2nd expanding on the first. Cf. sub 12.iv.

XXI : 317 134 Bitumen, received by 2 PN.

27. iv XXI : 307 160 Glue to fix lamassatum on socle 11.


9. v IX : 47 5 Delivery of grain in Der. Official known until the year «Elam».

XXII : 279 135 Oil expenditure. Broken.


27. v XXIII : 380 215 šammu-stone as tool.

XXIII : 520 215 wooden boards «for Hammurabi of Babylon, when Abi-mekim travelled».


1. vii XXI : 244 135 Silver to make many rings. Personnel widely known.

6. vii XXI : 124 134 Oil; Ili-šraya and Balumenuhhe.

11. We know of this matter through a series of texts, now studied by G. Bardet, ARMT XXIII, p. 55 and F. Joannes, ibid, p. 137. I would just like to mention here that Mukannišum's letters published in XIII and XVIII seem to come from Zimri-Lim's early period.
Year : Zimri-Lim dedicated his statue to Addu of Halab

13.vii XII : 265 5 List of rarely attested fem.
10.viii XII : 266 5 naptan šarrim, with troops, at Mari.
? .viii XI : 113 111 naptan šarrim, with troops, at Mari.
[9.xi XXI : 197 160 Probably not « Addu of Halab »].
? XXII : 61 135 Assignment of fem.
? XXII : 284 135 Ration for artisans; 3rd to 12th month. Written in « Šamaš » ?].

From this listing we could draw the following inferences regarding the dating of « Addu of Halab »:

Must be later than « Benyaminites »

Must be earlier than « Hatta » since Balumenuhhe disappears from scene

Must be earlier than iii. « Census »

Must be earlier than « Throne of Šamaš »
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XXII : 284 [4.x. « Benyaminites »].

See note 12.

XXII : 53 [1.i].


12. Ilī-ašraya and Balumenuhhe (the name knows many spellings) were responsible for dispensing of oils for the king's meal. In ARMT XII, 18-19, Birot had already noted the fact that these two officials - one bearing a Semitic, the other a Hurrian, name - rotated their responsibility on a monthly basis. It is only in the year « Dur Yahdulim » that two other functionaries, Ahlamu and Ilu[lu]-nāšir begin to take charge, the latter undoubtely Balumenuhhe's own son. By the year « Elam », our records regarding oil expenditures becomes much sparer, and we can no longer follow the movements of bureaucrats in charge.

TABLE I: Officials in Charge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>Ben</th>
<th>Hall/As</th>
<th>Šam</th>
<th>Cens</th>
<th>D.-Y.L.</th>
<th>Hatta</th>
<th>Elam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>B/I</td>
<td>B/I</td>
<td>B/I</td>
<td>B/I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>[B/I]</td>
<td>B/I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>In/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart gives us some insight into the rhythm in occupying an official post. Since « Euphrates » has so far not yielded information on this position, we cannot observe it before the year « Benyaminites ». Balumenuhhe appears in two consecutive months in « Benyaminites », and hence we may presume that he had the job all to himself then [XXI : 126 ought to be dated to « Elam »].

Ilī-ašraya makes his appearance in « Throne of Addu »=Aslakka ». But once the intercalation at the end of « Benyaminites », which may well have affected the newly established pattern, is duly taken into account, the operation seems to fall into an alternate-month tour-of-duty. It worked rather smoothly even as we note occasional doubling of personnel during vi/vii. « Šamaš » and iv. « Census » / « Dur-Yahdulim ». [I interpret these occasions as moments in which the Balumenuhhe could not fulfill his job completely, possibly due to illness, and had to turn over his duties to his partner, Ilī-ašraya]. But worth noting is the fact that this did not force a re-rotation of activities since the same pattern of monthly assignments obtained after these occasions.

Having returned to his desk, Balumenuhhe continued his job until vi. « Hatta », when he either died or was too incapacitated to continue functioning. As yet, we do not know who replaced him during vii. « Hatta ». But came the tenth month, and his son, Ilušu-nāšir, shared the post with another newcomer, Ahlamu. From that point on, it becomes difficult to establish a clear pattern for the dispensation of oil, and

- 583 -
The sequence of year-names, as established in 1978 by Birot from a host of evidence is «Euphrates – Benyaminites – Ašlakka – Throne of Šamaš – Census» etc. Given the above considerations, it seems plausible that «Addu of Halab» should be coeval with «Ašlakka». Moreover, except for stray examples, the texts belonging to this year are drawn from the adjoining rooms 134-135 as well as from room 160 and 215. The preponderance of texts from these rooms are datable to either Zimri-Lim’s early years or to those of his predecessors.\(^{13}\)

As to the manner in which these years dovetailed into each other we must consider that «Addu of Halab» is:

1. A full year – as distinguished from ús.sa («year following») with a tendency either to peter out within a few months after its initial use or to find sporadic attestation at unexpected periods [see below on «2nd Benyaminites»].
2. A Mari – not «provincial» – year. This is clear from meals taken there, as well as from the rich array of Mari officials who people its documents.

We need to inspect now one more table before attempting a final conclusion, and this one deals with the attestations for the year «Ašlakka». Unfortunately, this poorly attested year is known to me mostly from catalogue entries graciously furnished me by Durand; they should be available in forthcoming volumes.
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1. A full year – as distinguished from ús.sa («year following») with a tendency either to peter out within a few months after its initial use or to find sporadic attestation at unexpected periods [see below on «2nd Benyaminites»].
2. AMari–not «provincial» – year. This is clear from meals taken there, as well as from the rich array of Mari officials who people its documents.

We need to inspect now one more table before attempting a final conclusion, and this one deals with the attestations for the year «Ašlakka». Unfortunately, this poorly attested year is known to me mostly from catalogue entries graciously furnished me by Durand; they should be available in forthcoming volumes.

\(^{13}\) For the archaeological and architectural contexts, see Parrot, 1958: 72-3; Margueron, 1982: 622 (index). Room 134 has provided us with a number of texts published in: XIII (n° 137), XVIII (n° 34, 39-40, 43, 45-46, 50-67) and XXI (see listing in ARMT XXI, «Avertissement»).

Texts from Room 135 are published as: VIII (n° 51, 53, 55, 57, 61, 63-64, 70, 76, 78 – of which only the last is a Zimri-Lim document, from the year «Ašlakka», interestingly enough), X (n° 43, 61, 146, 164), XVIII (n° 1-14, 16-18, 23-28, 30-32, 35-38, 68-70), XIX (cf. p. 2-3), XXII (all texts: latest dated to «Benyaminites»); Dossin, 1970: 43 (Sumu-Yamam), A: 4509 (Kupper, 1973: 166 n. 2 [Šamši-Adad, «king of Agade»]).


From 215 we have: VIII : 77; XVIII : 19, 29, 41, 44, 47-49; ARMT XVIII, p. 109 [to be published by G. Simonet], all, when datable, are to «Šamaš»; XIX (šakkanakku, cf. p. 1); XXIII, cf. p. 215 («Šamaš and earlier + sporadic «Census»).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Contents and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{2nd}</td>
<td>«Benyaminites».</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2nd]</td>
<td>«Ašlakka»</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>«Ašlakka II».</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.i</td>
<td>XXIII : 32</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Reception of clothing, bows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.i</td>
<td>M.11596</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Clothing account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.i</td>
<td>XI : 15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Utensils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.i</td>
<td>M.10608</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Honey. Cf. next entry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.i</td>
<td>XII : 19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Delivery of honey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?.i</td>
<td>IX : 11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>naptan šarrim. Could be .xii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.ii</td>
<td>XI : 16</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>naptan šarrim?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.ii</td>
<td>XI : 17</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>naptan šarrim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[20.vi</td>
<td>XXIII : 422</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>materials for Babylonian nurse].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[?.vii</td>
<td>XXII : 86</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Wool outlay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.viii</td>
<td>IX : 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grain delivery, Rimši-ili, cf. 4.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[?.viii</td>
<td>XXI : 147</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Fat from sacrifices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.ix</td>
<td>M. 6054</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Wool account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14.ix</td>
<td>M. 11940</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Sheep, for suqāqūtim].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.ix</td>
<td>IX : 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oil, Ili-ašrāya ; n. šarrim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.ix</td>
<td>XI : 12</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Vessels to Šilli-Šamaš.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.ix</td>
<td>XXII : 87</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Wool reception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.ix</td>
<td>M. 11745</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Copper account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.ix</td>
<td>XII : 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grain delivery from Etel-pi-šarrim ; cf. 25.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[29.ix</td>
<td>M. 13369</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>«Addu of Halab».</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[30.ix</td>
<td>M. 13369</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>«Economic» text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[30.ix</td>
<td>M. 13369</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Gold and silver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.x</td>
<td>XXII : 124</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Clothing ināma Ištar. [In «Dūr-Yahdulim » and «Hatta » usually in 9th month !].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.x</td>
<td>XII : 16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oil, Balumenuhhe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9.x IX : 3 5 naptat šarrim, with troops, at Mari.
[10.x. XXI : 177 160 naptat šarrim, in Mari].
[IX : 9 5 oil ; probably « Ašlakka » II].
[M. 11942 108 Sheep].
11.x M. 6689 115 Legal ?
[15.x IX : 10 5 naptat šarrim].
18.x M. 11361 108 Silver account.
M. 12715 108 Gold account.
19.x XIII : 1 115 List of female weavers.
XXII : 10 135 List of females deceased or reassigned.
[Obviously related to preceding].
20.x XXI : 189 160 Bread for Elahut messengers.
23.x XXII : 187 135 Copper for a cauldron.
[M. 10673 P Food. Same as above ?].
[29.x M. 6868 115 Clothing].
30.x M. 5833 115 Objects.
30.x XXII : 70 135 fem. from Appan.
?.x M. 12436 108 Clothing.
?.x M. 12320 108 Silver account ; ša DI.KU,.
8.xi IX : 4 5 Grain.
9.xi M. 6046 115 Objects delivered.
[M. 11556 108 Dispatch of clothing].
10.xi M. 11200 108 Leather and clothing.
13.xi M. 11752 108 Dispatch of rings.
M. 6809 115 Truffles ? [N.B. if fresh, available only in early spring !].
20.xi M. 11126 75 naptat šarrim.
26.xi XXII : 71 135 Personnel movement.
27.xi XII : 17 5 Grain delivery.
29.xi M. 12433 108 « Economic » text.
[30.xi M. 10983 134 Fragment].
1.xii M. 10004 115 food for kispum.
XXIV : 266 « Z » Oil for the king.
3.xii M. 7106 115 Wool purchase.
5.xii XII : 18 5 Grain delivery.
M. 5955 115 Bronze utensils.
M. 11810 108 Dispatch of a bronze object.
14.xii M. 6032 115 Bronze account.
20.xii XI : 14 111 Semolina from Emar.
22.xii M. 6034 115 Tin dispatch. Related to above ? Possibly duplicate.
29.xii M. 11232 108 Juridical.
?.xii XXIII : 104 108 Memorandum, royal outfitting.
10. Adnatum VIII : 78 135 Juridical ; drafted in Carchemish !
[9.? M. 11747 108 Clothing account].
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Year: Zimri-Lim dedicated his statue to Addu of Halab

Not belonging to the year «Aslakka», but in need of consideration is XXII: 276 [=Kupper, 1973], dated to 2.v. «Throne of Šamaš», that is to the year immediately following «Aslakka». It gives account of transfer of oil product over a span of almost 2 1/2 years. Therein are recorded data for each one of «Aslakka»'s 12 months (col. iii : 11-iv : 15). It is perfectly possible, of course, that the scribes had at their disposal records which have not as yet come to light. But this type of listing is essentially no different from what we have had in the case of XXII: 284, discussed above. Each gives an account for various transactions, listing items as if they were extracted from homogeneously formulated dates. But if this were really the case, it becomes difficult to account for the absence, in either one of our examples, of materials that were specifically dated as «2nd Benyaminites», a formula which undoubtedly was coeval with «Aslakka».

The evidence of the table offered above, then, strongly suggests that «Aslakka» must also be regarded as a formula in use during an entire year, much as was «Addu of Halab». Even if we dismiss from consideration the texts attributable to «2nd Aslakka», or to «Aslakka II» – the last a formula in use almost a decade later –, the variety of documents, and the major Mari personalities that occur therein, make it impossible to regard «Aslakka» as a partially used formulation. Consideration of how the scribe resorted to the formula «2nd Benyaminites» could be of interest here.

Except for 3 occurrences at 10,12 and 24.i, all the dated attestations for this formula are located in the 5th to 8th months, just before «Aslakka» came to common use. This is certainly odd, since we ought to presume that «2nd Benyaminites» was but a temporary year-name, conveniently allowing the scribe to await directive from the chancellery. But, if anything, «2nd Benyaminite» seems to have been invoked occasionally not necessarily before «Aslakka», but rather after «Addu of Halab» had begun to peter out. Without wishing to exaggerate the usefulness of such spare evidence, we could nevertheless note that «Addu of Halab» has given 15 texts for the 1st month, 9 for the 2nd, 8 for the 3rd, 16 for the 4th, 10 for the 5th, 4 for 6th, 3 for the 7th, 2 for 8th. The pattern is that of common usage during the first 4 months, then a sharp decrease until practical disappearance of «Addu of Halab» formulae in the middle of the 8th month.

I am now ready to formulate the hypothesis that neither one, nor two differing year-formulae were available to the scribe as he placed a date on administrative and juridical documents. In fact, I should not be shocked to discover one day that even a larger number of formulae were competing during one single year! In the case of the year that followed the 13-month long «Benyaminites», it would seem that the scribe first turned to two formulae, «Addu of Halab» and «Aslakka». Indeed the evidence cited under i. «Benyaminites» shows that the scribe chose from among three! Within three fortnights, however, the scribe seems to have settled on only one, «Addu of Halab»; and only during the 5th to 7th months was he likely to revert to two formulae, this time including «2nd Benyaminites». In the 8th month, after a brief

14. I would therefore amend only slightly J.-M. Durand's opinion as expressed to me by letter: «I think that one may propose that [«Aslakka»] was a name given at the end of the year, and it is for this reason that we find it mentioned in Kupper's text [1973=ARMT XXII : 276]». 
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resort to many formulae, a solid attachment to «Ašlakka» obtained. The use of «2nd Ašlakka» remains to be gauged. I suspect that the present pattern will remain. It can be noticed, that even in the forty odd days which opened the year after «Benyaminites», only once, at 20°, did the scribe use two formulae on the very same day 15. This observation can likewise be applicable to the remaining months wherein documents bear differing formulations. Again, I do not know how such a feat was managed over the many bureaus in the palace, not to speak of those in the provincial palaces. In Zimri-Lim’s days, when life appears to be less managed than during the administration of his predecessors, his administration was nevertheless obviously not without central bureaucratic control 16.
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15. Because of a crucial break in the formula of XI : 15, we could attribute the text to «Ašlakka II», and hence we could remove that sole example from consideration. However, all other examples published in XI refer to «Ašlakka».

16. I now need to confront the arguments presented by D. Soubeyran for preferring a parallel between «Addu of Halab» with «Benyaminites» rather than one with «Ašlakka».

1. He suggests that the «Addu of Halab» evidence fills the gap better with «Benyaminites» than with «Ašlakka». However, the documentation for «Benyaminites» only slackens for months iv-vi, with an abundance of attestations for the royal meal at months i-iii. Moreover, there are many occasions in which the scribe would have used two formulae for the very same day. Soubeyran’s hypothesis would not result in as neat a match as that obtaining above.

2. He finds a natural progression in the preparation of sacred implements when «Addu of Halab» is equated with the early months of «Benyaminites». This would be especially so when one considers the «opening of the mouth» ceremonies that are dateable to the 9th and 10th month of «Benyaminites» and which concern furnishings being prepared in the early months of «Addu of Halab». While it may make perfect sense to imagine that this ceremony occurred at the end of the process of fabrication, it needs to be asked why would implements sacred to Šamaš be consacrated during the year «Benyaminites» when this particular act actually provided the name for the year after «Ašlakka»? As Soubeyran himself admitted, his scheme would leave the year «Ašlakka» almost totally bereft of any cultic preparation, crowding all within the span «Addu of Halab/Benyaminites». The «mouth opening» ritual itself is still a mystery to us, and it cannot be totally dismissed that it may have been a symbolic act which took place at any time during (indeed may even have preceded) the artisan’s involvements. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that this is by far Soubeyran’s most potent argument (cf. also ARMT XXIII, pp. 191 ; 355).

3. Soubeyran skirts the evidence of XXII : 248 which tells us that the king’s statue was receiving its finishing touches, prior to its shipment to Aleppo, on the tenth month of «Benyaminites». Accordingly, his scheme would mean that all these documents dateable to «Addu of Halab» were commemorating an act that was yet to happen. For this he depends on XXI : 265, assuming that the «statue of the king» that was declared in preparation on 12.iv. «Addu of Halab» was the same that was sent to Aleppo. This is not likely to be the case : 1. because the evidence is that Mari’s artisans were constantly producing sacred furnishings (e.g. at least 5 different thrones for divinities were under constructions in half a dozen years); 2. because the šammu-stone given out to fabricate it (as well as Šamaš’s throne) was an implement apparently used in the early stages of fabrication; 3. and – a lesser argument – because the statue sent to Aleppo was of bronze (ARMT XXIII, p. 333 n. 15), and šammu-stones, while they could be dispensed to smiths, are apparently not useful to work on metal (cf. XXIII, pp. 448-449).
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