

« YEAR : ZIMRI-LIM DEDICATED HIS STATUE TO ADDU OF HALAB » LOCATING ONE YEAR IN ZIMRI-LIM'S REIGN

Jack M. SASSON

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 scheme¹. Dossin's 32 formulae, now swelled by at least four more, are now regarded as covering anywhere between 14 - and 20 years². The following are more recent suggestions :

1. Anbar, 1981 : 91, offers a wholesale paralleling of known formulae, with explanations appearing in *IOS* 9 (1979), 1-8.

« Euphrates » (n° 29)	=	« Kahat » (n° 4)
« Elam expedition » (n° 13)	=	« <i>muballiṭum</i> » (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)
« Išar-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 :

« <i>muballiṭum</i> » (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 « Benyaminites », rather than « Benjaminites » ; 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 « Benjaminites ».

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* ».

4. Charpin, 1985 : 454 n. 4.

« Throne of his father » [n° 1] « Annunitum of Šehrum » [n° 22] « Euphrates » [n° 29] = « Kahat » [n° 4].

5. The texts published in *ARMT XXIII* have come to suggest two more equivalences :

« Census » (n° 26) = « Habur » (n° 30) ³

« Babylon » (n° 11) = « Yamhad » (n° 32) ⁴

The formula « Year : Zimri-Lim has dedicated his statue to Addu of Halab » [n° 20] until now had not attracted much chronographic attention, primarily since few documents could be assigned to it before the publications of *ARM(T) XXI-XXIII*. Charpin and Durand had pondered this year's precise position when postulating the arrival of Shiptu to Mari. They placed this particular event somewhere at the end of « Euphrates » or at the start of « Benyaminites », and posited that « Addu of Halab » is equivalent to the beginning of the year « Benyaminites ».

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 ⁵ ». 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* :

1. Yahdun-Lim's n° 6 : « Yahdun-Lim went to Hen [cf. *MARI* 4, 307 n. 70] and annexed him the Benyaminite settlement » [Two acts, *perhaps* consecutive].

2. Sumu-Yamam's n° 1 : « Sumu-Yamam ascended the throne and built Halabit » [Two acts, *not necessarily* consecutive].

3. Šamši-Adad's n° 1 : « Šamši-Adad captured DUMU-Addu and built Dagan's temple » [Two acts *probably* not connected].

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 Šamaš ». 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 that 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 Šunuhrahalu 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 documents⁶.

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 šalamšu ana Addu ša Halab ušēlû*. Does it suggest that Zimri-Lim sent his statue to

6. 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 itself⁷ ? The verb *šulûm* (Š of *elûm*) is found during the Zimri-Lim period in other formulae⁸ :

n° 16 – « Z.L. dedicated a great throne to Šamaš of Mahanum »

n° 19 – « Z.L. dedicated a golden throne « to » Dirîtum »

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 hometown⁹.

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. « Benyaminites ». 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 Aleppo¹⁰.

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 Dēr].

We have now arrived at a preliminary conclusion : Since XXII : 248 is dated pretty late into « Benyaminites », 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 correspondant 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 *ipuš* or an *iṛud* 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 šarrim* 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 *šulûm* 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, *alamšu ša zabar ina é ša 4IM ša halab^{ki} ušzizzu*, 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 **alamšu ana 4IM ša halab^{ki} ina halab^{ki} ušēlû*.

Unless it be deemed a scribal mistake, the formula can read (e.g. at XI : 113) : « ... *ana an ša halab^{ki}*, to the god of Halab » ; and this may imply dispatching to Halab itself.

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 :

Date	Text	Room	Contents and Comments
1.i	XXII : 53	135	Oil for fem. royal personnel. Addu-duri, who died sometimes before iii. « Census » [Materne, 1982 : 197,12], establishes this year as <i>preceding</i> « Census ». Almost a copy of expenditures for 5.iv.
6.i	XXII : 78	135	Listing of personnel for wool shearing.
7.i	XXIII : 394	215	Grease, for chariots.
15.i	XXIII : 155	215	Material for leather work.
	XXIII : 183	115	Glue for weapon of Dagan.
16.i	XXIII : 156	215	Materials for headgear.
17.i	XXI : 303	160	Glue to carpenters.
20.i	XXIII : 515	215	Scented(?) wood, to perfumer.
22.i	XXIII : 409	215	Grease for chariots.
25.i	XXI : 196	134	Gold/silver of ¹ Dagan of Terqa. By Etel-pi-šarrim ¹ [cf. 28.ix.« Ašlakka », below] & Addu-muballit.
	XXI : 304	160	Glue to artisans.
	XXIII : 184	215	Glue to make bows.
26.i	XXII : 185	135	Copper to make saws. XXI : 268, dated 19.x.« Euphrates », may refer to one of these transactions.
30.i	XXIV : 11	« Z »	Grain to official.
?i	XXII : 216	135	New scythes. Cf. <i>sub</i> 23.iii.
1.ii	XXI : 305	160	Dye materials. Abi-Šamaš's dossier stretches from « Euphrates » to « Ašlakka ».
8.ii	XXIII : 62	160	Grease for chariot.
11.ii	XXIII : 400	215	Grease for chariot.
20.ii	XXIII : 157	215	Dye for 'Ipadahatum, known from « Euphrates » to « Šamaš ».
21.ii	XXI : 205	134	Silver borrowed from Ahušina.
23.ii	XXI : 306	160	Dyes, received by 'Ipadahatum.
24.ii	XXIII : 158	215	<i>ibid.</i>
25.ii	XXIII : 395	215	Grease for chariots.
27.ii	XXI : 322	134	Clothing, weapons sent to Yasim-Sumu in Suprum.
9.iii	XXI : 323	134	Wool received from Takun-šubat (same name as Takuna) to make textile.
22.iii	XXIII : 185	?	Glue for woodworker.
23.iii	XXI : 264	134	Scythes. Cf. <i>sub</i> ?i.
	XXIII : 186	215	Glue for woodworkers.
	XXIII : 382	160	Vessel for princess Bahlatum, the priestess.
24.iii	XXIII : 411	215	Grease for bows.
26.iii	XXIII : 187	215	Glue to workers.

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-Nār.
2.iv	XXI : 121	134	Oil for workers.
5.iv	XXII : 54	135	Oil for fem. royal personnel. See above, <i>sub</i> 1.i.
10.iv	XXII : 265	135	Oil outlays ; from Ili-Ašraya 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.
15.iv	XXIII : 191	215	Glue to woodworkers.
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. <i>sub</i> 12.iv.
	XXI : 317	134	Bitumen, received by 2 PN.
27.iv	XXI : 307	160	Glue to fix <i>lamassatum</i> on socle ¹¹ .
28.iv	XXIII : 160	215	Dye for weaver.
1.v	XXIII : 161	215	Dye for artisan.
	XXIII : 379	160	Dye for artisan.
4.v	XXIII : 162	?	Dye for artisan.
6.v	XXIII : 192	215	Glue footstool ; <i>sahirtum</i> .
9.v	IX : 47	5	Delivery of grain in Der. Official known until the year « Elam ».
	XXII : 279	135	Oil expenditure. Broken.
20.v	XXI : 308	160	Leather worker gets supply. Dada in Mukannišum's letters (XVIII : 27).
26.v	XXI : 122	134	Ili-ašraya dispenses oil. See below.
27.v	XXIII : 380	215	<i>šammu</i> -stone as tool.
	XXIII : 520	215	wooden boards « for Hammurabi of Babylon, when Abi-mekim travelled ».
6.vi	XXI : 123	134	Ili-ašraya dispenses oil. See below.
9.vi	XXIII : 354	215	Scented wine, to the king.
24.vi	XXIII : 365	215	Bread for a jeweler.
	XXIII : 366	215	Expanded « duplicate » of above. Different seals.
1.vii	XXII : 244	135	Silver to make many rings. Personnel widely known.
6.vii	XXI : 124	134	Oil ; Ili-ašraya and Balumenuhhe.

11. We know of this matter through a series of texts, now studied by G. Bardet, *ARMT* XXIII, p. 55 and F. Joannès, *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.

13.vii	XII : 265	5	List of rarely attested fem.
10.viii	XII : 266	5	<i>naptan šarrim</i> , with troops, at Mari.
? .viii	XI : 113	111	<i>naptan šarrim</i> , with troops, at Mari.
[9.xi	XXI : 197	160	Probably not « Addu of Halab »].
18. ?	M.A.R.I. 4,	?	Šiptu is mentioned.
?	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 »

REFERENCE
XXII : 284 [4.x. « Benyaminites »].

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

See note ¹².

Must be *earlier* than iii. « Census »

XXII : 53 [1.i].

Must be *earlier* than « Throne of Šamaš »

XXI : 265 [12.iv+XXI : 298 [22.iv].

12. Ili-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 « Dür Yahdulim » that two other functionaries, Ahlamu and Ilu[šu]-našir begin to take charge, the latter undoubtedly Balumenuhhe's own son. By the year « Elam », our records regarding oil expenditures becomes much sparser, and we can no longer follow the movements of bureaucrats in charge.

TABLE I : Officials in Charge

A=Ahlamu B=Balumenuhhe I=Ili-ašraya In=Ilušu-našir { }=« 2nd Benyaminites » (n° 3)
[]=« Addu of Halab »

year	Ben	Hal/Aš1	Šam	Cens	D-Y.L.	Hatta	Elam
month i				I	I	Ā	
ii			B	B	I ¹	In	A
iii			I	I	I	I	In
iv		{B/I}	B	B/I	B/I	A	
v		{I}	B/I	I	I	In	I
vi	{B}	{I}	B	B	B		
vii		{B/I}	B/I	I	I	A	A ¹
viii	B	B	B		In		
ix	B	I	I	I	I		
x		B	B	B	In/A	A	
xi			I	I	In	In	
xii		B	B	I	A [?]		

The chart gives us some insight into the rythm 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 »].

Ili-ašraya makes his appearance in « Throne of Addu »/« Ašlakka ». 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 v/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, Ili-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 viii. « Hatta ». But came the tenth month, and his son, Ilušu-nasir, 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

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 predecessors¹³.

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

REFERENCE

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 »]. XXII : 284 [?.?]
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. XII : 266 [10.viii]+XI : 113 [?.viii]

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.

this is well reflected in the chart. Ili-ašraya himself seems to fade out at around iii. « Hatta », leaving the newcomers to begin their own partnership. According to *ARMT* IX, p. 267 [33], Ili-Ašraya is supposed to be datable to a month in « Eluhut ». If substantiated, this fact would make it difficult to assign « Elahut » around the time of « Ašlakka II ». See above for literature.

This chart could also confirm the fact that, despite the occurrence of Malkānum II (XXI : 212-2 ; 281) there were no « official » intercalations between « Addu of Halab/Ašlakka – Throne of Šamaš », between « Throne of Šamaš – Census », and very likely between « Census – Dur-Yahdulim » since, looking across the chart, we find the same person fulfilling his duty the same month across these particular year. Intercalation during these years would have affected the sequence by forcing disjunction in the parallel columns. This may also suggest that the *abum tašnitum* occurring, unfortunately without a year-date, in XXII : 98 ought not be locatable within these specific years. The recovery of this document in room 135, a room that has yielded mostly « early » texts (see the following note), would direct the search towards Zimri-Lim's early period.

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 160 we have : VIII : 33, many texts in XXI (consult « Avertissement »), and A.4540 (Dossin, 1975 : 27). « Archaic texts » are cited by Durand, 1982 : 81.

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 »).

Date	Text	Room	Contents and Comments
{ } = « 2nd Benyaminites ».			
[] = « 2nd Ašlakka » or « Ašlakka II ».			
2.i	XXIII : 32	215	Reception of clothing, bows.
4.i	VIII : 71	108	Legal ; [Ries, ZA 1981 : 78]. Involving Rimši-El, attested mostly « early ».
{10.i.B ²	XXII : 245	135	Silver to jewelers}.
{12.i.B ²	S.143.36	143	Clothing from Yamhad ; cf. XVIII, pp. 108-9}.
13.i	M.11596	108	Clothing account.
	XXIV : 168	« Z »	Gifts from Kurda, through messengers.
20.i	XI : 15	111	Utensils.
23.i	M.10608	?	Honey. Cf. next entry.
27.i	XII : 19	5	Delivery of honey.
?i	IX : 11	5	<i>naptan šarrim</i> . Could be .xii.
2.ii	XI : 16	111	<i>naptan šarrim</i> ?
5.ii	XI : 17	111	<i>naptan šarrim</i> .
{?ii	M.11942	108	Receipt. Zimri-Lim's seal}.
{24.ii	MARI 3, 262	?	Account of copper}
{13.v	XXIV : 56	« y »	Livestock delivery}
{16.v.B ²	XI : 48	111	Grains from the <i>latifundium</i> of Tukla}.
{16.vi.B ²	XXIII : 51	215	Wool to personnel »}.
[20.vi	XXIII : 422	24	materials ? for Babylonian nurse}.
{25.vi.B ²	XII : 108	5	Oil, for <i>kispum</i> , Balumenuhhe}.
{?vi.B ²	XXII : 86	135	Wool outlay}.
{22.vii.B ²	XXIII : 27	215	Clothing dispatched to ?}.
{?vii.B ²	XXII : 86	135	Wool outlay}.
{ ?vii	XXIV : 157	« y »	gifts to Mari messengers}.
[11.viii	M. 11392	108	Silver objects}.
{20/30.viii.B ²	XII : 109	5	Reception of legumes}.
30.viii	IX : 5	5	Grain delivery, Rimši-ili, cf. 4.i.
[?viii	XXI : 147	160	Fat from sacrifices}.
8.ix	M. 6054	115	Wool account.
[14.ix	M. 11940	108	Sheep, for <i>suqāqūtum</i> }.
17.ix	IX : 2	5	Oil, Ili-ašraya ; <i>n. šarrim</i> .
	XI : 12	111	Vessels to Šilli-Šamaš.
19.ix	XXII : 87	135	Wool reception.
	M.A.R.I. 4, 343 ?	?	Clothing to queens.
20.ix	M. 11745	108	Copper account.
28.ix	XII : 15	5	Grain delivery from Etel-pi-šarrim ; cf. 25.i. « Addu of Halab ».
30.ix	M. 13369	115	« Economic » text.
[?ix	M. 7020	115	Gold and silver}.
i.x	XXII : 124	135	Clothing <i>inūma Ištar</i> . [In « Dūr-Yahdulim » and « Hatta » usually in 9th month !].
	M. 89	?	<i>naptan šarrim</i> ; cf. Materne, 1982 : 196n.
5.x	XII : 16	5	Oil, Balumenuhhe.

9.x	IX : 3	5	<i>naptan šarrim</i> , with troops, at Mari.
[10.x	XXI : 177	160	<i>naptan šarrim</i> , in Mari].
	[IX : 9	5	oil ; probably « Ašlakka » II].
	[M. 11942	108	Sheep].
11 [?] .x	M. 6689	115	Legal ?
[15.x	IX : 10	5	<i>naptan šarrim</i>].
18.x	M. 11361	108	Silver account.
	M. 12715	108	Gold account.
	M. ?	?	Meals ; cf. Materne, 1982 : 196n.
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.
27.x	M. 18	?	Food outlay for month ; cf. Materne, 1982 : 196n.
	[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 ; <i>ša</i> DI.KU ₅ .
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.
14.xi	XI : 13	111	Ingredients for cake.
	M. 6809	115	Truffles ? [N.B. if fresh, available only in early spring !].
20.xi	M. 11126	75	<i>naptan šarrim</i> .
24.xi	XXIV : 92	« Z »	Receipt of vases.
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 <i>kispum</i> .
	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.
21.xii	VII : 86	110	Dispatch of tin, to Yamhad and elsewhere.
22 [?] .xii	M. 6034	115	Tin dispatch. Related to above ? Possibly dupli- cate.
29.xii	M. 11232	108	Juridical.
? .xii	XXIII : 104	108	Memorandum, royal outfitting.
10. Adnatum	VIII : 78	135 ¹	Juridical ; drafted in Carchemish !
[9.?	M. 11747	108	Clothing account].

?.?	M. 9968	115	<i>naptan šarrim.</i>
?.?	M. 5220	115	Bronze. Cf. 5 ; 14.xii.
[?.?]	M. 8742	115	Grain owed the palace].
[?.?]	M. 9067	115	Gold objects].
[?.?]	M. 10074	115	Kitchen utensils].

Not belonging to the year « Ašlakka », but in need of consideration is XXII : 276 [=Kupper, 1973], dated to 2.v. « Throne of Šamaš », that is to the year immediately following « Ašlakka ». 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 « Ašlakka »'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 « Ašlakka »¹⁴.

The evidence of the table offered above, then, strongly suggests that « Ašlakka » 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 Ašlakka », or to « Ašlakka 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 « Ašlakka » 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* « Ašlakka » 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* « Ašlakka », 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 « Ašlakka ». 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 [« Ašlakka »] 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] ».

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.i, 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 control¹⁶.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANBAR, M.

1979 « Note brève », *RA* 75 : 91.

BIROT, M.

1978 « Données nouvelles sur la chronologie du règne de Zimri-Lim », *Syria* 55 : 332-343.

CHARPIN, D.

1985 « Les archives du devin Asqudum dans la résidence du chantier A », *M.A.R.I.* 4 [=À *Propos d'un cinquantenaire : Mari, bilan et perspectives*] : 453-466.

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 datable 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 consecrated 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 datable 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).

CHARPIN, D. and DURAND, J.-M.

1985 « La prise du pouvoir par Zimri-Lim », *M.A.R.I.* 4 : 393-343.

DOSSIN, G.

1939 « Les Archives économiques du Palais de Mari », *Syria* 20 : 97-113.

1950 « Le Panthéon de Mari », pp. 141-150 in *Studia Mariana*. Leiden : E.J. Brill.

1956 « Une lettre de Iarim-Lim, roi d'Alep, à Iašûb-Iahad, roi de Dir », *Syria* 33 : 63-69.

1970 « Archives de Sûmu-Iamam, roi de Mari », *RA* 64 : 17-44.

1975 « Tablettes de Mari : 1. Le « bain des déesses », 2. Le songe d'Ayalâ », *RA* 69 : 23-30.

DURAND, J.-M.

1982 « Sumerien et Akkadien en Pays Amorite », *M.A.R.I.* 1 : 79-89.

1983 *Textes administratifs des salles 134 et 160 du palais de Mari*. Paris : Paul Geuthner.

KUPPER, J.-R.

1973 « La voix de l'opposition à Mari », pp. 166-178 in *La voix de l'opposition en Mésopotomie*. Brussels : IHEB.

1973 « Le calendrier de Mari », pp. 266-270 in *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae ... de Liagre Böhl dedicatae*. Leiden : E.J. Brill.

LEWY, H.

1959 « The Synchronism Assyria-Ešnunna-Babylon », *WdO* 2 : 438-453.

LIMET, H.

1985 « Bijouterie et orfèvrerie à Mari », *M.A.R.I.* 4 : 509-521.

MARGUERON, J.C.

1982 *Recherches sur les palais Mésopotamiens de l'Age du Bronze*. I-II. Paris : Paul Geuthner.

MATERNE, J.P.

1983 « L'Année de Kahat dans la chronologie du règne de Zimri-Lim », *M.A.R.I.* 2 : 195-199.

PARROT, A.

1958 *Mission Archéologique de Mari. II. le Palais : 1. Architecture*. [BAH, 48.] Paris : Paul Geuthner.

SASSON, J.M.

1973 « Biographical Notices on Some Royal Ladies from Mari », *JCS* 25 : 59-78.

1980 *Dated Texts from Mari : A Tabulation*. [ARTANES, 4]. Malibu : Undena.