

The ENGAR/*ikkarum* at Mari

Jack M. Sasson, Chapel Hill

The Mari archives contain some twenty texts in which the term ENGAR/*ikkarum* (hereafter E/i.) occurs. The documents stem from the periods of the Yaggid-Lim and Šamši-Adad dynasties.¹ In ARMT 15, p. 179, Finet gives the meaning 'cultivateur' to E/i. Bottéro and Birot have, in various publications, attempted a more developed definition.² The CAD and the AHw recognize that, even if the evidence is limited to the OB period, E/i. could not be explained by means of a single entry. The Mari attestations are assigned as follows:

		CAD	AHw
1	"plowman, farm laborer/ <i>Landarbeiter</i> "	ARM 1, 44:8	ARM 1, 68:7; 44, 7ff.
2	"Farmer, small farmer/ <i>Bauer</i> "	ARM 8, 44:8'	ARM 5, 28:28,8, 44:8
3	"Farm bailiff/ <i>Gutsinspektor</i> "	ARM 7, 155:6;8, 67:3	ARM 7, 155:6;8, 67:3

One could, at the outset, dispose of additional material from Mari which clearly deals with 'plowmen.' It is to be noticed that almost all of it stems from the Assyrian period. ARM 4, 11 is a letter Šamši-Adad writes to his son in Mari.³ In it, he berates his son for wishing to give up responsibility for cultivating areas

¹ It is not clear to me why AHw, p. 73b (sub *asakku(m)*, II) renders the sumerogram in ARM 2, 55:36 as *erēšum*. CAD A/2, p. 327 (sub *asakku(b,3)*), which seems influenced by the AHw's reading, also records a similar rendering. It is noteworthy, however, that the material gathered for *errēšum* in both AHw, p. 243b, and CAD, E, pp. 304ff. do not show any OB attestations written with a sumerogram. As it is, an attestation of *errēšum* in Mari, even when written syllabically, is uncertain. *e-ri-ši* occurs in a difficult, 'punny', proverb (Jean, RA 42 [1948], 65:23;29), where the meaning is by no means clear. Cf. Finet, AIPHOS 15 (1958-60), 22; AHw, p. 243b, (sub *errēšu(m)*). Moreover, see the discussion in CAD I/J, pp. 53-54 (sub *ikkaru*).

² ARMT 7, p. 255 n. 1; 9, pp. 262-263 (§25); Syria 41 (1964), 47. See, further, Finet, Syria 41 (1964), 125 with n. 5; Römer, AOAT 12, p. 75 n. 5.

³ To a large extent, the understanding of this text is due to Von Soden's reconstruction, Or NS 22 (1953), 203.

around Tuttul.⁴ The reverse, now fragmentary, contains the reply of Šamši-Adad in which he orders his son to take a number of steps concerning the government of a village which, although lying between Tuttul and Šubat-Šamaš, fell under the latter's authority. It seems possible that this letter bore some relationship to ARM 1, 68. In that text, Šamši-Adad instructs his son to send one of his capable plowmen to IŠKUR.LÚ-ti, who appears in ARM 1,25 as an important official, if not governor, of Šubat-Šamaš.

ARM 5, 30 is another letter from the Assyrian period in which the palace attendant, Tarim-šakim, writes Yasmaḥ-Adad about E/i's. Since their activity is described by means of the verb *erēšum* (1.17), 'to work (a field)', it is clear that we are dealing with 'plowmen.'⁵ It is likely that ARM 5, 54, another letter sent to Yasmaḥ-Adad, involved the same type of workers. AN-asu, a high official in Šubat-Enlil, writes his king requesting an E/i. ARM 1, 44, written by Šamši-Adad, may have reiterated this request which had, apparently, remained unfulfilled.

One more text should be considered at this point although its content may not prove relevant to our subject. ARM 5, 28 is a letter, again from the Assyrian period, in which the occurrence of *ikkarum* depends on accepting a restoration by von Soden. He would read, in l. 28 LÚ *[k-k]a-ri-im*. The traces do not definitely preclude the restoration. It should be observed, however, that at Mari a syllabic writing for *ikkarum* has not as yet been attested. Indeed, the examples gathered in the CAD and the AHw show that, during the OB period, such writing was relative rare.⁶ What complicates matters is that the person labeled *ikkarum*, Taribum, is found nowhere else in the Mari documents.⁷

The sole example from the Zimri-Lim period in which E/i, seems to mean 'plowman' is to be found in ARM 3, 5. Kibri-Dagan writes his lord about the need to have E/i.'s and sluice-workers get together in order to ascertain the condition of a canal.

The main purpose of this paper, offered in tribute to the *doyen* of Sumerian *belles-lettres*, is to collect the Mari evidence on the figure of the E/i. Its conclusions do not mean to dispute the third definition of the CAD and the AHw ("Farm bailiff/*Gutsinspektor*").⁸ However, Mari's rich epistolary, economic, and, to a lesser degree, legal documentation offer us an exceptionally good opportunity to add a welcome dimension to our assessment of this office. By means of prosopographical research, I aim to reconstruct the career of those individuals, 'plowmen' aside, who were given the title of E/i. I shall first discuss those texts, mostly economic and administrative, which reveal little beyond the name of the E/i. I shall then gather letters which speak of unnamed E/i.'s, and finally, collect letters in which an E/i. is identified by name

I. We proceed by discussing, first, the citations of the term E/i. in which the information is limited. Either the E/i is named as a witness to a legal text or is recorded as the sender of staples to the palace. The place of

⁴ Von Soden, *ibid.*, restores Kakkulatam in the break of l. 7. I find this to be unlikely, especially since the context requires an involvement with northern, Euphratean, Mesopotamia. The Tuttul mentioned in the text is likely to be the northern Tuttul (contra, Finet, ARMT 15, p. 137). According to ARM 1, 73 and ARM 4, 27, Yasmaḥ-Adad was pressing his father to let him expand toward Šubat-Šamaš.

⁵ The difficulty in this text revolves around the mention of *[i-lu-na-ki-ri-šu!]* described as LÚ·NIM·MA(KI). Since this man is known from the Zimri-Lim period as an official (Dossin, *Mission archéologique de Mari* 2/3, p. 256; ARMT 5, p. 132; ARM 7, 194:6'; 13, 8:19), it might be appropriate to recall the suggestion that a class of workers/functionaries, rather than an ethnicon, might be involved here. See, lastly, Birot, ARMT 9, p. 287 (§69(g)). Additionally, this PN is Semitic in etymology, not Elamite.

⁶ See, also, YOS 13, 200:12,15.

⁷ Yasmaḥ-Adad has written to allow Taribum to pay, in installments, some 5 minae of silver in exchange for which his field would be 'released' [For discussion of this term see, lastly, Birot, *Syria* 41 (1964), 50-51]. But the order was countermanded by Šamši-Adad.

⁸ One could be wary of accepting the distinction made between definitions 2 and 3.

origin for these shipments is sometimes indicated. By and large, however, no elaborations are made beyond such data. In these cases, therefore, only prosopography offers evidence on the E/i's activities.

A). ARM 7, 155 (= ARMT 12, 559). Dated to Zimri-Lim's era. Ilu-ka-AN receives a very large quantity of *burrum*- and *kinītum*-cereals.⁹ from *mu-tu* ^d*da-gan*/LÚ ENGAR *gu-ru* ^dIM¹. The Mari texts record a number of persons bearing the name Mut(u)-Dagan.¹⁰ During the Sumu-Yamam period, a ditch-digger(?) was given this name (SY A:ix 39). The other attestations, all from the reign of Zimri-Lim, may have referred to three(?) other persons. A Hanean of the Amur(r)u-clan lived in Mari (TEM III:ii 39). An Elamite – again probably the title of a profession rather than an ethnicon¹¹ – was similarly named. A rather well-appointed dignitary, living outside Mari, has left us evidence of his involvement with the central palace. It is likely that this last Mutu-Dagan should be identified with the E/i. of ARM 7, 155. ARM 7, 202:iii [2'] and 249:1' record him as sending 2 sheep and as receiving clothing, respectively. In ARM 7, 185:ii 15 Mutu-Dagan joins the company of merchants, messengers/diplomats, and warriors, while in ARM 8, 42:6' and 85:33 he witnesses an important juridical decision, along with other second-echelon officials of Mari and its provinces.¹²

Guru-Addu, whence Mutu-Dagan came, is now well-represented in Mari's archives. Except for ARM 13, 38:7, no attestation follows with the determinative KI (ARM 7, 155:6; ARM 9, 114:v 4; ARM 11, 132:4; ARM 12, 712:13).¹³ In one text, ARM 12, 712, Guru-Addu is listed alongside Abullat and Dēr. We do know, from ARM 13, 33, that the last was within a day's journey from Mari.¹⁴ ARM 13, 38, a text which will be discussed below, implies that Guru-Addu lay in proximity of Mišlan. Not surprisingly, Dēr and Mišlan are mentioned together in ARM 6, 3. Other passages place the latter in Terqa's district.¹⁵

B). ARM 8, 44:8'. A loan document from the Zimri-Lim era. Among the witnesses listed in ARM 8, 44 is *i-din-an-nu* LÚ ENGAR¹. Aside from the mention of a weaver by that name (ARM 13, 1:vii 77), the citations for Iddin-Annu(m) show him to be an important person whose base of influence may have been Zuqaqen (ARM 7, 225:5' = 226:45), a village which, apparently, lay in the district of Terqa or Mari. As a leader, Iddin-Annu was expected to send sheep to the palace (*ibid.*), contribute funds toward supplying an army (ARM 9, 253:iv 5), and, along with other *bēl bilātim*, levy taxes destined for the King's coffers (ARM 7, 217:8). His real profession, however, seems to have been that of a jeweler/smith (ARM 13, 19:22), a career which he apparently followed since Sumu-Yamam's reign (RA, 64 [1970]:24:10:5). A rather unusual document concerning Iddin-Annu is published as ARM 8, 62. A group of distinguished individuals, composed of district governors, royal emissaries, commissioners, and, not incidentally, jewelers, were asked to 'guarantee', on pain of payment of 20 mina of silver, that Iddin-Annu would not abandon his work. The text is witnessed by a veritable 'who's who' of Mari officialdom.¹⁶ It should be noted, however, that the other witnesses of

⁹ For discussion of these terms, see Birot, ARMT 9, pp. 291-292 (§23). Note that in the duplicate, ARM 12, 559, *kinītum* does not occur.

¹⁰ For variations in writing this name, see H. Huffmon, Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts [hereafter: APN], 1965, p. 53.

¹¹ See above, note 5.

¹² Note that in lines 5 and 8 of ARM 8, 85 one could read *i-[zi]-sà-[re-e]* and *yi-im¹-si-AN*. These two are known from Bottéro, RA 52 (1958), 167 No. 34:12-13 as elders of Saggartum who purchased *suqūqū*-positions.

¹³ Note that ARM 12, 559, a duplicate of ARM 7, 155, does not record the toponym. Cf., Birot, ARMT 12, p. 186 n. 1.

¹⁴ See further, Birot, ARMT 12, p. 89 n. 1; RA 66 (1972), 134-136.

¹⁵ See, further, Birot, Syria 41 (1964), 46-47. Add ARM 7, 88:14, 18; 263:i.1; iv.7'; Jean, RÉS (1937), 106:13; W.F. Leemans, Foreign Trade in the Old Babylonian Period, pp. 106-107: 16a:5.

¹⁶ Interestingly enough, we have a similar text (ARM 8, 53) which concerns another jeweler/smith, Hīmit-Erra (cf. ARM 8, 92:4; 94:13; 99:5; 13, 19:13, 21). The fine, in this case, is smaller, and the luminaries less imposing.

ARM 8, 44, while known elsewhere in Mari documents, do not seem to be prestigious. This observation does not, of course, invalidate the above reconstruction,¹⁷

C). ARM 8, 67:4-5: Zimri-Lim period. The name of *mu-ut-ra-me-em* LÚ ENGAR occurs in this very curious legal text. In it, Mut-ramem pledges to vouch for(?) a lady and her daughter (*qātāt* fPN₁ u fPN₂ . . . *ilqe*). The daughter is known from ARM 8, 88:9 to have become a member of the palace's housekeeping staff. Mut-ramem is called the "E/i. of Šuri-Ḥammu, man of Zarri, an Amnanu-clansman [of the Benjaminite tribe]." Except for the scribe – who must have been quite aged since he served Sumu-Yamam (ARM 8, 63:32) – all the identifiable witnesses were from outside Mari. Two of these, Ḥasqudan and Ami-samuḥ lived in Niḥadi; a third, Zu-ḥizan, was a citizen of Bīt-zarḥan. These villages were to be found in Terqa's district.¹⁸ The other witnesses were either associated with tribal groups (Yom-ḥammu-clan¹⁹), or attached to Šuri-Ḥammu (Bunu-Ištar, Yaspuk-El). Bunu-Ištar is associated with the area around Karana²⁰.

The semi-settled condition of the Benjaminites and some Ḥanean clans might explain the unusual manner in which Mut-ramem is identified in ARM 8, 67. He is not "*PN, LÚ ENGAR (ša) za-ar-ri(ki), Am_x-na-an (KI), LÚ šú-ri-ḥa-am-mu-ú" probably because, to the Mari scribe, his identity was closely linked to Šuri-Ḥammu, a leader of a Benjaminite clan, rather than to a specific locality.²¹

Mut-ramem, himself, is known from other Mari texts. The most intriguing among these was published by Bottéro in RA 52 (1958), 167 No. 311. In it, Mut-ramem, labeled an "elder (LÚ ŠU.GI)" in the neighboring province of Saggartum, gives a 'gift' to the palace after which he becomes a *suqāqu* (cf. also, ARM 5, 25; 1, 119).²² Confirmation that this position was held by him for a length of time may be derived from ARM 7, 198. Mut-ramem appears in line iv 21' of this damaged text which lists a number of *suqāqu*. It is to be noted that among his companions are mentioned the well-known Baḥdi-Lim and the *suqāqu* Yantin-El and Baqirum. In ARM 7, 180 iv:35, Mut-ramem appears as one who controlled a *babtum* composed of 17 individuals. A diligent prosopographical reconstruction reveals no discernable pattern of employment and/or residence of these persons. From ARM 7, 180, two other men are known to have led *babtu*: Ili-ešuh and Dagan-ašraya (lines 12', 37'). In ARM 7, 217:18, the latter was considered a *bēl bilātim*, 'tax collector.'²³ Finally, Mut-ramem contributes financially toward equipping a military expedition (ARM 9, 258:ii 14). The LÚ ĪSUR 'oil-presser' of

¹⁷ Ana-Šamaš-taklāku: ARM 8, 82:9; 9, 27:iii 8; ARM 13, 1:11 28; iii 56; SY A:iii 59. Warad-Šamaš: ARM 9, 19:10; 24:ii 8; 256:4; 13, 1:ii 78. Taḥtu-pi-El: ARM 8, 82:10. For ARM 9, 284:1 read, with CAD K, 92(a, 1), [1 q]a-an-nu-um . . .

¹⁸ See Birot, Syria 35 (1958), 21-22. Add ARM 13, 123:22.

¹⁹ Kupper, Nomades, pp. 20ff, 73ff.

²⁰ A Bunu-Ištar is associated with a Ḥanean clan, Amur(r)um, TEM III:ii:36. From the Assyrian period, we have a Bunu-Ištar who was influential near Karana (ARM 5, 70; 130). Note also that al-Rimah's archive knows of a Bunu-Ištar, Iraq 30 (1968), 89, who is allied to Zimri-Lim. A homonym is recorded in ARM 9, 24:41 = 27:39.

²¹ Šuri-Ḥammu has left us traces of his wide-ranging activities in Mari's archives. At times friendly to Zimri-Lim (ARM 2, 104; 7, 226:[33]), he played, it seems, a mediating role between the palace and his brethren (ARM 2, 53). Still, he was suspect enough to cause authorities to track his movements (ARM 2, 105; 6, 73; 13, 132). There seems to have been no love lost between Kibri-Dagan and Šuri-Ḥammu, possibly because many of the latter's followers were living, at one point, in Terqa (ARM 2, 36; 58; CRRA 18, p. 60 [written by Kibri-Dagan?]).

Like Niḥadi, Zarri is also to be found in Terqa's district (Birot, Syria 35 (1958), 21). According to ARM 13, 123:13-20, it lay about a day's journey from Terqa proper. See also ARM 9, 253:12.

²² The other two 'elders' who also became *suqāqu*, Izi-sare and Yimsi-El, are recorded in ARM 8, 85:[5], 8, a text which was discussed above.

²³ Other references: for Ili-ešuh (RA 66 [1972], 126:5); for Dagan-ašraya (SY A:xi 65 [heads a large number of workers]; ARM 8, 1:42; envelope 15; II:101:14 [mason]).

ARM 7, 120:38' may have been a homonym. All these attestations combine to describe a person who was responsible to higher authorities for small groups of workers.

D). ARM 8, 97:3.²⁴ Reign of Zimri-Lim. This tablet records that a very large quantity of sesame was sent by *a-na-da-gan-ták-la-ku*, the ENGAR of *di-zi-im*(KI). Other documentations of Ana-Dagan-taklāku do not add anything of substance beyond speaking of his *É/bītum* (ARM 9, 237:16) whence came *burrum*-cereal (ARM 9, 237:16; 11, 40:4; 189:8; 12, 141:12) and chick-peas (ARM 11, 189:8).²⁵ The persons associated with such *bītātu* in ARM 9, 237 as well as in ARM 12, 141, are officials of the palace.²⁶ It would seem, then, that at one point in his career, Ana-Dagan-taklāku worked in Mari proper. His *bītum* was nothing more than a storeroom under his supervision where grains were stocked.

Dizum is a locality that is not recorded in other Mari texts. It would not be foolhardy, however, to speculate that it lay within Mari's direct supervision.

E). ARM 11, 79:5. This document, written during the Zimri-Lim era, records the receipt in Aḫ-nari (for which see above) of ZÍZ.ZU.UM *ki-na-tum* from *i-lí-i-din-nam*, LÚ ENGAR *ša aḫ-la-mu²/tim²*.²⁷ Ili-iddinam's career is not easy to unravel, for we have a large number of citations which obviously refer to homonyms.²⁸ For at least 2 Ili-iddinams, we could reconstruct separate occupations. One dealt with metal working; to be more precise, with ornamental articles. Occasionally, this Ili-iddinam was involved in money-lending (ARM 8, 22:8; 23:8; 31:5; 32:6; 33:5; 78:8; RA 64 [1970], 22:4:6(?)). The E/i. of ARM 11, 79, may be the person mentioned most often, with other palace officials. Along with other well-known dignitaries, he witnessed a legal ceremony in which judges defined the property of a deceased high official (ARM 8, 87). ARM 8, 10 finds him negotiating the sale of a slave to a well-placed bureaucrat. Finally, our E/i. may be the Ili-iddinam whose ovine contribution was recorded, in ARM 9, 243, as markedly smaller than that of Terqa's Kibri-Dagan.

F). ARM 12, 554:5. Reign of Zimri-Lim. As already observed by Birot, this text is probably a duplicate of ARM 12, 553. If so, this text would record that Ili-ka-AN received a fair quantity of *burrum*-cereal from [*i-lí-tu*]-*ra-ya* LÚ ENGAR *ša* [XX]. ARM 12, 553 records the name as Ili-turiya, and specifies that the transaction took place in *maškan* Abullat. Birot refers to an unpublished text which speaks of the *ikkarum* of *a-bu-la-at*. It is not known whether or not Ili-turaya appears there.²⁹ At any rate, beyond these two texts, we have two more listings of this PN: ARM 12, 115:5, a text similar in nature to the ones mentioned above, and SY A:i 45, a census-list of Sumu-Yamam, possibly, but not necessarily, referring to a homonym.

On the assumption that an abbreviated form of Ili-turaya *could* be Ili-tura, two more documents are now treated.³⁰ Under Ili-tura's supervision (ARM 9, 22), clothing is issued to 5 young men, most of whom are

²⁴ cf., Birot, ARMT 9, pp. 250 n. 1; 255 n. 3.

²⁵ ARM 11, 189 specifies that the outlay was made *i-na a-aḫ-na-ri*. According to Burke, ARMT 9, p. 132, Aḫ-nari, rather than a GN, was a place where grain was divided. She bases this conclusion on lectures given by Dossin. Cf., also ARMT 12, p. 251.

²⁶ In ARM 9, 237:12 read *hi¹-id-la-ka¹*, as in ARM 12, 141:8. See further ARMT 12, p. 261.

²⁷ Burke, ARMT 9, p. 33 n. 1, reads the last sign as *mu*, and adds: "Le signe *MU* n'est pas assuré; on peut lire *Aḫ-la-tim¹*, mais ce toponym nous est inconnu." The functionary Aḫlamu is indeed known in Mari's administration (Huffmon, APN, p. 21; ARMT 12, p. 252), but his name is always associated with reception of oil (once, ARM 11, 212, of sesame). Although, as we saw above in ARM 8, 67 an E/i. could be associated with a PN, we do know, from ARM 7, 155 (ARM 12, 559), that he could also represent a GN (possibly, originally, a PN) to which the determinative KI is not appended.

²⁸ With slight variations, the following duplicates the statement made in JCS 25 (1973), 75 n. 80. To the references given there, add SY A:xii 74.

²⁹ ARMT 12, p. 89 n. 1. Abullat seems to be within Mari's district, not too distant from Guru-Addu and Dēr. But note the renderings in CAD A/1, p. 87 (3); Z, p. 70 (2, a); E, p. 187 (2, a); GAG, Supplement (AnOr 47), §135g.

³⁰ It is not clear to me, however, what would be the etymology for the second element in this PN.

known from other texts as workers in Mari and Terqa. The material seems to have been woven at Terqa then brought to the palace. ARM 9, 24 (and its 'partial' duplicate 27) lists 17 men who "followed the 'master' (17 LÚ.MEŠŠ *ša wa-ar-ki* LÚ)".³¹ This group consisted of 5 cooks, 6 grooms, and 6 all-purpose servants (LU.MEŠŠ *ša re-eš* LÚ). Among the last group which included a barber, there is mention of an Ili-tura (ARM 9, 27:iii 14).

II. In this section we will discuss attestation of the E/i. in epistolary context where no personal names are attached to this office.

G). ARM 10, 108.³² This letter, as well as ARM 10, 107, was sent to Abba(y)a by Zibbatum, a lady otherwise unattested elsewhere in Mari's archive.³³ ARM 10, 107 makes it clear that her correspondent, to whom she calls herself 'sister,' was a ruler, for he is congratulated on past victories and warned of future battles.³⁴ Whether Abba(y)a is to be considered a nickname for Sumu-Yamam, Yasmaḥ-Addad, or Zimri-Lim cannot be decided here. In ARM 10, 108, Zibbatum reminds her 'brother' that when she came to Mari requesting a field, 15 *ikū* of land were given to her in Tizraḥ.³⁵ After writing a second time, this land was 'released' in her behalf. This second act of generosity, however, created difficulties. Should one accept to read 1 LÚ EN[GAR] in line 15, it would appear that an unnamed E/i., belonging to the district of the addressee, came to seize the field. Zibbatum requests that, by means of her own messenger, a tablet be sent Mašiya which would confirm her control over the 'released' field.

Obviously, Zibbatum's problem with the E/i. occurred, not when the field was given (*nadānum*) to her, but when it was 'released (*wuššurum*)' in her behalf without, apparently, the evidence of written documentation. At this point, the E/i., who must have represented the interest of the palace, arrived to remove the field from under her control. This distinction between *nadānum* and *wuššurum* has already been noted by Birot in connection with ARM 2, 55³⁶, a text to which we now turn.

H). ARM 2, 55 was sent to Zimri-Lim from somewhere near Tuttul where Yasmaḥ-Adad, an official, exercised power. The obverse is badly fragmented. In the reverse, we have the following (ll. 26ff): "My lord has

³¹ The exact meaning of 17 LÚ.MEŠŠ *ša warki* LÚ escapes me. Cf., Birot ARMT 9, pp. 341-342 (§137, c).

There is a curious, but perhaps accidental, tendency at Mari (but cf. TCL, 1:189) to form a group of workers out of 17 individuals (e.g. ARM 7, 180:iv 30'; 181:11'; ARM 9, 26:19'-20'; 25:tr. lat. 2(2X17)).

Except for Iddin-Addu who is known as a Ḫanean in TEM III:i:18, and Aḫum whose name was too popular to allow proper control, none of the 6 *ša reš* LÚ are registered in Mari.

Birot reads ARM 9, 234:10-11 "(awīl) (?) ENGAR (?) At(?)-ti-Me-er(?) i-na/a-aḫ-na-ri . . ." While the cuneiform signs might favor the reading of LÚ in l. 10, they do not seem very encouraging for that of ENGAR.

An additional difficulty should now be highlighted. Among the large number of texts from Mari of this (ARM 9, 234) type which have been published mostly in ARMT 11 and 12, two formulae predominate (cf. ARMT 9, pp. 262-263 §24-25) to describe the staple's point of origin: *ina É PN* or *itti PN*. At times, a combination of these formulae are found: *itti PN ina É PN*. ARM 9, 234 employs the *itti PN* formula. Again, of the numerous documents which contain this form, only once (ARM 9, 219) does a PN *not* follow *itti*. In ARM 11, 271:4 a gentilic is recorded in the place of a PN. Since the P/GN *at²-ti-me-er²* is otherwise unattested, whatever information we have in ARM 9, 234:10-11 leads nowhere. For this reason ARM 9, 234 will not be considered in this survey.

³² Text treated by Römer, AOAT 12, pp. 79-80. On the basis of the mention of Mašiya, in l. 21, Römer (p. 2) dates this text to the Assyrian period. For this reason, we discuss it here. It should be noted, however, that ARM 8, 92:8 shows him to have survived, with so many other bureaucrats, Yasmaḥ-Adad's debacle. Šubat-Šamaš, a GN which is most often mentioned in the Assyrian correspondence, is attested in the succeeding period, e.g. Bottéro, Problème des Habiru §29:16; CCRA 18, p. 66:9.

³³ A homonym occurs in ARM 13, 1:iii 2.

³⁴ Römer, AOAT, 12, pp. 38-39.

³⁵ In the district of Terqa, cf. RA 66 (1972), 178.

³⁶ Syria 41 (1964), 50.

'released' 4 villages in a desolate region. In 4 villages in Ara'itum³⁷, 'they' had me relinquish control, so that I could not satisfy the *muškēnū* (who said as) follows: 'The villages of your brothers and their fields are 'released (*wuškūrum*)' while you, you have given (*nadānum*) our fields to the palace.' When I heard the orders of my lord, that he 'released' these 4 villages, I sent my servant. It is he who abolished the authority of the palace.³⁸ [It is he (?)] who made the LÚ.ENGAR infringe on the king's taboo [rest unclear]."

Two acts with important consequences seem to be detailed here. One was undertaken by the palace, the other by Yasmaḥ-Adad under orders from the palace. In the first, 4 villages, in the 'wasteland,' were 'released.' Whether this 'release' implied an exemption from taxes or removal from palace ownership is not immediately relevant to us.³⁹ Suffice it to say that this act angered the *muškēnū*. They complained that, to add insult to injury, land which they worked was now placed under direct palace control. This deed, it would seem, was linked to a decision which removed 4 villages in Ara'itum from Yasmaḥ-Adad's control. We cannot know, of course, why Zimri-Lim took such an action, but it is clear that his official did not particularly relish executing the orders. Note that when Yasmaḥ-Adad sent his servant to 'release' the 4 villages, this act (l. 35) is described as *qāt ekallim napāsum*. The same terminology is employed in l. 29 concerning the villages in Ara'itum.

The role of the E/i in this text is not clear.⁴⁰ The use of *ṣakānum* with *asakkum* is exceptional.⁴¹ Whatever the precise meaning, it would have us understand that the E/i was, in some way, bound by an oath (cf., l. 37) to his king, probably requiring him to collect 'dues' on 'unreleased' land. By his action, albeit following the king's direction, Yasmaḥ-Adad's servant placed the E/i in the unpleasant position of infringing on his lord's taboo.⁴²

I). ARM 13, 125. Were it not for the good advice of Kibri-Dagan, governor of Terqa, the E/i of this text might have found himself in a similarly uncomfortable situation. Zimri-Lim makes a decision that is counter to the desire of his governors. Those charged with taking appropriate action are confounded, with the result that blame, if not an actual (cultic(?)) offense, befalls them. While its obverse is, unfortunately, damaged, the reverse of ARM 13, 125, also not complete, has the following (lines 2'-12'): 'The E/i's (plural) will receive blame; and, in the future I will not be able to satisfy my lord.⁴³ If it pleases my lord, may he not promise to 'release' to anyone even one *iku* of land from the land which I have assigned. In the future, therefore, the E/i's will not commit an offence (LÚ ENGAR-MEŠ *ḥiṭītam la irāššū*).'⁴⁴

J). ARM 10, 151. This letter was addressed to Zimri-Lim's queen. Its sender, Yarim-Lim, was not the king of Yamḥad, as has been assumed.⁴⁵ Rather, he was a client of Zimri-Lim, a man who has left us a dossier concerning his relationship with the palace. Often, his activities seem to be linked with those of Šuri-Ḥammu (see above.) Most revealing is ARM 2, 53, a letter sent to the king informing him that Yarim-Lim and Šuri-Ḥammu were on their way to Mari in order to convey a Benjaminite ultimatum. In ARM 2,93, Kibri-Dagan tells his lord of Yarim-Lim's arrival at Mari.⁴⁶ This letter adds the precious information that Yarim-Lim was a man of Yaḥrur. Now, this last was a town near Ekallatum named after a Benjaminite clan which, obviously, settled it. Another

³⁷ Cf.(?), ARM 13, 139:20.

³⁸ Read l. 35 with AHw, p. 735a: [*šu*]-*ma qa¹-at e-kál-lim ip-pu-uš*.

³⁹ Cf., Kraus, *Edikt Ammi-šaduqa*, p. 46; Birot, *Syria* 41 (1964); 50-51.

⁴⁰ One could always theorize that E/i, in this text, may better be rendered by 'plowman'.

⁴¹ See the entries in the CAD and the AHw sub. *asakku(m)*.

⁴² Note the allusion of ARM 13, 125:11'-13', discussed below.

⁴³ But cf., CAD A/2, p. 157 (3').

⁴⁴ Is Kibri-Dagan equating *nēmettam irāššū* (l. 4') with *ḥiṭītam irāššū* (ll. 11'-12'; cf., ARM 1, 18:15)?

⁴⁵ Römer, *AOAT* 12, pp. 80-81, 81 n. 8; Artzi and Malamat, *OrNS* 40 (1971), 86-88; Sasson, *BiOr* 28 (1971), 356.

⁴⁶ Read in l. 6': [*ya-ri*]-*im-li-im*.

letter which might have been written by Kibri-Dagan (CRRA 18, p. 60) recalls the words Šuri-Ḫammu addressed to Dadi-Ḫadnu, a minor potentate in the Upper region. It seems that the former was bent on fermenting ill-feelings between the latter and Yarim-Lim.⁴⁷ Finally, Yarim-Lim is listed, together with other imposing officials, as contributing silver to the palace (ARM 9, 257:28).

Yarim-Lim's letter to Šibtu concerns an order the queen sent to him:⁴⁸

You have written me concerning the 'fortified' [A.ŠÀ *dunnim*, i.e. developed (?) located in a fortified area (?)] field which Ḫamanu plowed, (and) said as follows: 'Just as Ḫamanu has given/paid the ZI.BI for the field, now let Ḫatni-Addu give/pay the ZI.BI for the field, and let him plow.' This is what you said. I have not, (however), given this field; the E/i. told me and I was angry with him. Since he had given (the field) without my permission, I have taken his own field and my own plow (-team) is plowing (it). But I have not settled the matter (yet), – there are *muškēnū* bordering the field – and the E/i. has been (too) quick (?) in giving (the field) to Ḫamanu. Now I have sent the E/i. Let him settle this matter of the field. Let him choose from my own palace (-property, [i.e. domain?]) fields (belonging) to *muškēnū*, (and) let him give Ḫatni-Addu as much as possible.

We do have some record of this text's other participants. Ḫam(m)anu's career spanned a number of reigns. It is possible that he began his career during the Sumu-Yaman period, when he was an official in charge of personnel (SY B:VIII:7) and of well-stocked storehouses (RA 64 (1970), 22 ff.)⁴⁹ In all contexts, including *Mélanges Dussaud* II, p. 986:16, he appears to be a power in a territory between (Northern) Tuttul and Kurda which included the villages of Yabliya and Ḫarbe. Later perhaps, we find him displaying his influence in Dēr, a village near Mari.⁵⁰ Ḫatni-Addu, a Suḫu-tribesman (VII:213:15), was also influential in the same general region, since, at one point, he became an ally of Atamrum of Andariq.⁵¹

The activities related in ARM 10, 151 show that those involved acted in a circumscribed manner. Ḫamanu receives the right to plow a *dunnum* -field after he pays or gives the ZI.BI. It is not clear who receives or enjoys this benefit. Even when the E/i.'s error in judgment becomes manifest, Ḫamanu retains control of the land. Ḫatni-Addu, ultimately, is assigned land which the E/i. removes from *muškēnū*'s hands. It is to be noted that there seems to be a consistency in the *muškēnū*'s bad fortunes whenever land is to be redistributed. Yarim-Lim has the power to decide the allotment of land to Ḫatni-Addu. He chooses to remove land from the *muškēnū*, but has to turn to the E/i. to complete the transaction. Yarim-Lim has the means to punish the E/i. by removing land from under the latter's dominion. It is clear, however, that this authority could be counter-manded by the queen who, probably, would act for the palace. As for the E/i, his situation was not enviable. He collects(?) ZI.BI payments(?) and assigns land on behalf of Yarim-Lim. When his error is discovered, however, he compensates for it by losing the right to plow even his 'own' fields. It is clear that the land mistakenly apportioned to Ḫamanu would not return to him. Additionally, it could not have been too pleasant a task to remove land from the hands of the long-suffering *muškēnu*.

III. This last section will assess the epistolary documents in which the E/i.'s name is given.

K). XIII:38. Yasim-Sumu writes ARM 13, 38 to Zimri-Lim. A problem had arisen as a result of a decision taken, apparently unilaterally, by this palace *factotum*. An E/i. of Guru-Addu, Samum, had to fulfill an assigned agricultural task.⁵² Because water was not available in the district where he normally operated, Yasim-Sumu

⁴⁷ Šuri-Ḫammu accuses Yarim-Lim of persuading Zimri-Lim to arrest Dadi-Ḫadnu's servant. The latter is urged to retaliate by attacking Yaḫrur.

⁴⁸ ARM 10, 151 is treated by Römer, and Artzi/Malamat, see note 45, above.

⁴⁹ *Ḫa-ma-an-na* of SY A:xi 42 appears to be a homonym.

⁵⁰ Huffmon, APN, p. 34.

⁵¹ Note the short, but important resumé of A. 9901, *apud* Kupper, RA 53 (1959), 99. Very likely, this Ḫatni-Addu was known from the period of Sumu-Yamam, RA 64 (1970), 43:9.

⁵² See below, p. 4, and notes 13-15.

permitted Samum to take over 160 *ikū* of land belonging to the citizenry of Mišlan. This locality, which lay within Mari's immediate control, was inhabited by Benjaminites.⁵³ Apparently, a certain Yabinum⁵⁴ lodged a protest, perhaps even – the text is broken here – threatened violence. Ultimately, Samum is dispatched to Zimri-Lim in the hope that the latter could solve the problem.

This text does allow us to extract some further information on the position and function of the E/i. He heads and directs a team of plowmen; he is assigned to work a specific parcel of land. While his direct orders came from a palace official, his ultimate responsibility may have been to the king. Samum himself bore a name which is attested in other Mari texts. Despite the fact that the internal evidence afforded by these documents does not permit unqualified dating, it is likely that they stem from Zimri-Lim's reign.⁵⁵ ARM 13, 142 discusses a dispute concerning water rights between the writer, Yawi-Ila, and Bali-Eraḥ. The latter is known, from ARM 2, 114 (and ARM 6, 39), to have cared for Zimri-Lim's estates. In the second half of ARM 13, 142, Yawi-Ila asks his lord that 3 wine-makers be sent to Samum to enable him to process grapes, held by Mašum, which were imported from Nagabbinu.⁵⁶ ARM 13, 149 discusses matters of similar concerns. Both Mašum and Samum are listed in ARM 9, 272, a text of unknown dating, as receiving (?) gifts from the palace.

L). ARM 10, 160. Šibtu receives this letter from Šubnalū.⁵⁷ In it, this palace bureaucrat, who must have been on an inspection tour at the time of writing, discusses the case of an E/i. named, appropriately enough, Yazraḥ-Addu. We know very little, outside of this text, about this man. ARM 7, 187 is very fragmentary, with only his name fully extant in line 1 15'. It is possible that ARM 8, 100:15 refers to him in a legal (?) text which mentions Zalpaḥ.⁵⁸ But, as is made clear from the mention of Dēr in ARM 10, 160:10, the events unfolded within a day's journey from the central palace. Yazraḥ-Addu had taken some agricultural products from (the temple of the god) Ḫatta, and had brought them to the palace. During this transaction, a girl belonging to him was taken as 'guarantee'. Šubnalū writes Šidqi-Epuḥ, another official in charge of provisioning, and asks that this girl be released. In a reply, Šidqi-Epuḥ elaborates on the affair and offers a familiar excuse: "I have not had the 'female guarantee' jailed. They have jailed his 'female guarantee' on order of the *šāpiṭum*,⁵⁹ (which was) as follows: 'Yazraḥ-Addu had taken the *namkattū*-(wagons ?) of *amannum*-plants, which are in Ḫatta, and brought them into the palace'." Eventually, the 'female guarantees' of the other E/i.'s were released, but not that of Yazraḥ-Addu. For it seems that when Yazraḥ-Addu brought the shipment to the palace of his district, he lost the *namkattū*-(wagons ?) of some 20 (loads ?) of *amannū*-plants.

We do not know whether Šubnalū's mission was an unusual act of interference in events which concerned a provincial governor (*šāpiṭum*). Furthermore, it is not clear on whose authority he is acting. Did the king ask him to investigate the matter and report to the queen? What indicates that the E/i. in this text was a person of some stature rather than a 'plowman' – if one may be allowed an expression of mild cynicism –

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ We do know of a palace functionary by that name, but he lived during the Assyrian period, ARM 8, 19:14.

⁵⁵ But cf., Finet, Syria 41 (1964), 125.

⁵⁶ It is not clear whether Nagabbinū is to be located near Mari or in the Upper Country. Since ARM 13, 142 was written by Yawi-Ila when he stayed in Šubat-Enlil, perhaps this GN is to be equated with one mentioned in a Middle Assyrian text, BRM 4, 49:26, (cf., Grayson, Assyrian Royal Inscriptions, §361: *na-gab-ne/bi¹-ḫe*).

⁵⁷ For Šubnalū and his activities, see Iraq 34 (1972), 60-61. ARM 10, 160: was treated by Römer, AOAT 12, pp. 75-77.

⁵⁸ Unusual for Mari, this document gives the name of each witness's father. Yazraḥ-d[IM] is given as father of Yaššib-Dagan. This PN, better known in Mari as Yaššib-Dagan, Huffmon, APN, p. 42, was born by at least two individuals. One was a jeweler (ARM 7, 192:8; 9, 12:4; 30:4; 188:10; 265:3), the other, probably the son of our Yazraḥ-Addu, was a tribal chieftain who worked for Zimri-Lim (remaining attestations of Yaššib-Dagan in Huffmon, APN, *ibid.*).

⁵⁹ See Marzal, JNES 30 (1971), 196-203.

is precisely this willingness on the part of Šubnalū to recommend countermanding the orders of a governor and the approval of Šidqi-Epuḫ. As it is, aside from the cause of justice, Yazrah-Addu is the sole beneficiary of Šubnalū's recommendations to the queen. These recommendations, it should also be noted, were offered despite acknowledgment that the *namkattū*, whose loss created Yazrah-Addu's difficulties, were still missing.

For our purpose, this text adds a few more details about the E/i. Most noteworthy is the realization that the E/i.'s trustworthiness was not taken for granted.⁶⁰ An E/i. stood ready to back his honesty by offering a human 'guarantee' as hostage. The role of the *šūpītum* in deciding the fate of the 'guarantee' is also worth noting. Finally, line 23 indicates that more than one E/i. were operating simultaneously, even in a given locale.

In evaluating each one of the thirteen entries presented above, it might be profitable to pose the following, awkwardly rendered, questions:

1. What position did the E/i. hold in his community *before* he was tapped for this post?
2. In what manner, under what circumstance, and by whom has he chosen?
3. What were his assigned responsibilities?
4. Who were his immediate superiors?
5. Who were his immediate 'clients'?
6. What was the length of his term in office?

Although answers to these questions may not obtain for each entry, the conclusion that one derives from an assessment, I fear, neither forges new definitions for E/i. nor redefines old ones. Simply stated, this conclusion would hold that, at Mari at least, the E/i. — again, 'plowman' aside — possessed widely differing backgrounds, performed a variety of (agricultural) duties, and seemed to follow no specific guidelines in his relations to his superiors. This observation confirms an earlier opinion which maintained that most second- (and third-) echelon officials were, in essence, *factota*, all-purpose bureaucrats.⁶¹ It may not be too bold to speculate that, lacking a pre-determined set of qualification and a prescribed line of duty, both the selection and the performance of the E/i. were guided by unestablished criteria.

⁶⁰ The wide ranging dishonesties and shenanigans of a Mari bureaucrat are recounted in ARM 7, 263.

⁶¹ Iraq 34 (1972), 59. It is likely that this applied in Mari proper as well as in the provinces, cf., Marzal, OrNS 41 (1972), 368-369, 376-377.