

REVIEW ARTICLES

THE OLD BABYLONIAN TABLETS FROM AL-RIMAH*

JACK M. SASSON

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

AT CHAPEL HILL

This review article of the *editio princeps* of the OB texts found at Rimah concentrates on the archives that are contemporaneous with the rulers of Zimri-Lim of Mari and Hammurabi of Babylon. Since that edition did not present interpretations of the evidence, this review will overview the information that pertains to the social and political life of an Old Babylonian town.

In the last decades, archaeologists have excavated a number of sites in the middle Euphrates valley, recovering archives which have permitted reconstruction of a distant period in the history of the Ancient Near East. These excavations include ones at Tell Hariri (ancient Mari), Tell Shemsharra (Shusharra), Chagar Bazar, Tell al-Rimah, and Tell Ṭaya. As is neatly summed up in its foreword (p. v), the volume under review “constitutes the *editio princeps* of all the Old Babylonian tablets from Tell al Rimah found in the course of excavations conducted on that site from 1964–1971 by Professor David Oates on behalf of the British Schools of Archaeology in Iraq.”

The volume is introduced by Oates. Stephany Dalley, who bore the brunt of this publication, contributes chapters on “The Chronology and History of the tablets from Room II of the palace,” “The Iltani Archives,” and “The [Economic] Tablets of Rooms II and XVII,” the last consisting of 163 and 74 documents respectively. C. B. F. Walker publishes some 33 “Miscellaneous Texts from the Palace Area [chapter IV],” and, in a short appendix (p. 356), gives a digest of 6 additional tablets found too late for proper inclusion within the volume. J. D. Hawkins presents 57 “Tablets from the Temple Stairway [chapter V],” and studies “The Inscribed Seal Impressions [chapter VI].” Exceptionally clear hand copies for all these texts are given in plates 1–109, with photographs of specimen tablets and seal impressions occupying 3 additional plates. Elaborate indices enhance the usefulness of this well-bound and moderately priced volume. These consist of lists of Personal, Divine, Geographical, Months, and *limu* names. A short index of “Words discussed,” a concordance of field and museum numbers, specifically relating each document to its archaeological provenance, conclude a volume which

should become a model of efficient use of space and of promptness of publication.

Complex as the editing must have been, I observed few writers’ lapses (p. 33, 8th l. read ARM II:119), and remarkably few typographical errors: p. 4, n. 25 Andariq¹; p. 8, last para. read ARM:39¹; p. 43’s reference is to IX:27:ii:32¹; text 42:11 should read *mu-ur¹-ki*; 67:18 should read *a-ha¹-šu*; 267:25 should have LÚ¹. A number of incorrect citations of PNs (pp. 257ff.) were obviously due to filing and transferring *ab-di-ištar*, 173¹:3; *a-mur/mu-ur-ša^dUTU*, 62:16, 19¹; *ba-ba-az-zu*, 246¹:4; no *ba-aḥ-di^dIŠKUR* in 208:6 [97:6]; *ik-su-ud-ap-pa-šu*, 81:4; *i-ni-ib^dUTU*, seal 16¹; *ka-ak-su*, 322:vi:31¹; *mu-tu-ḥa-ad-ki-im*, 161:9¹; *šu-re-e*, 244:iii:14¹; *zi-ra-āš¹-še. a-ga-ap-še-ni* is wrongly judged to be a GN rather than a PN. But collation here is surely in order since it is unlikely to have a KI in this context. *pa-aš-(ši)-it-[ḥe]* of 207:i:5, 208:i:5; 210:i:4 should be added to the list of PN. For other suggestions on reading see below, *sub IV*.

After presenting alternate readings and understanding of individual words and passages in the text, this review will concentrate mostly on the Rimah texts which are contemporaneous with the period of Hammurabi of Babylon. In turn, it shall discuss the chronology of Karana’s rulers as could be reconstructed from Mari and Rimah evidence, and offer some comments on the personalities met with in the iltani archives. Finally, this review will offer a short list of alternate readings for PNs and GNs collected in the indices. At the outset, it would be well to state that Dalley’s identification of Rimah with Karana has a good chance of vindication, although one would have liked her to have assessed the Nuzi and 1st millennium evidence concerning Karana (cf. Lewy, *JAOS* 88(1968), 155; Oppenheim *Dream Book*, 260⁹). Text numbers following Roman numerals are those of the ARM(T) series. At my disposal as of this writing are I–XV, XVII/i–XVIII. Text numbers without such numerals refer to Rimah’s archives. As this goes to press, no reviews of this volume were available to me. [See now: Birot, *RA* 72, 187ff.; Anbar, *BiOr* 35, 208ff.; Pomponio, *OA* 16, 332ff.]

*This is a review-article of *The Old Babylonian Tablets from Tell al Rimah*, by Stephanie Dalley, C. B. F. Walker and J. D. Hawkins; with an Introduction by David Oates. xvi + 272 pp. + 112 plates. London: British School of Archaeology in Iraq. 1976.

I. Comments on individual texts (with thanks for M. Stol for reading these proposals).

-1:28. *ha-at-ki-im*. Cf., Mari GN, XV, 125; I:138:5; VII:180:iii:27'. A city at the outer edge of Saggartum's district, it borders on the territory of Ili-Ištar of Šuna (cf., JCS 25(1973, 72-73). Because of its location on the Habur, Saggartum seems ideal as a meeting place for Zimri-Lim and his allies (cf., II:120; XIV:108-109; XVIII:8). The point at issue in this text seems to be whether the meeting will take place there (Zimri-Lim's idea) or at Qattunan, further upstream, at the edge of Mari's territorial limits.

-1:37. *kī-ma' ša-<da> -ag-di-im-ma* may be plausible, but it might require too many emendations. I. 38: *ḥa-a-rum* [x x] (??).

-2:21-22. *-ši-na-ti* probably refers to *mātātum*. Note XIII:146:21-22.

-3:8 *a-pu' [-lu]* (??). Stol suggests *a-d[a-bu-bu]* (??)

-4:7 The restoration [*i-na li-i*] *b-bi* makes little sense in the context.

-8:1 Perhaps Dalley's earlier reading of the PN as Yaḫin-Addu (*Iraq* 30(1968), 90) might be more likely (cf. Mari's homonym, Huffmon, APN, 41).

-13:18. *a-[w] a-[at . . .]*; I. 26 *ka-r[a-n] a [(KI)]*.

-14:12 DUMU-MEŠ is unlikely; 14, LÚ *a-wa'-ti-šu*; I. 15, *ú-sa-al-lam-šu* (cf. II:16:16) There is one more sign at the end of the line 18. It is not likely that Saggartum is spelled *sa-ga-ra-da* [KI]. The mention of Šamsi-Adad makes it unlikely, in my opinion, that this letter was sent to Ḥatnurapi. It is vexing that this text is in such a poor state of preservation since it apparently contained the provisions of a treaty.

-16:6 possibly for *ana ra'imut+šu* (AHw, 144b; OB (2x)!); cf. XIV:6:29 (*a-na ra-i-mu-ut-ka*).

-20:9-12 Translate perhaps as follows: "I am now sending you my page, having instructed him about my wishes."

-30:9 *mu-ta-aš'-[di'-im']*. This peculiarly shaped *as* is similar to one in II:25:14.

-31:10 one is tempted to suggest *ga-mir'*, but *mir* is not attested in OB. Stol wonders about *qá-b[i]* (??).

-33:14 Is *kadrú* at stake here?

-34:6-7 The idiom occurs also in XIII:142:43-44.

-35:9 Comparison with 31:5 gives the equation *abum* = *awtlum* for this context.

-39:15 Perhaps a translation "pay attention" is strong enough for *awātam kašārum*, since it is unlikely that Napsuna-Addu was in a position to dictate orders to Iltani.

-42:11-20. On this heavy political joke, see below. "Just as" for *akkīma* (l. 11) would be exceptional in OB. Note *akkīma* (again with *lamādu* !) in XIV; 66:37. Subjunctive after *īstuma* (l. 21) is to be noted.

-43:9-10 the technical idiom *riksam paṭārum* is, according to AHw 849b, (G,7), known heretofore only in SB.

-47:9 DAM (??).

-56:6 Note the exceptional *ana šimim wabālum* (Š). I. 7 read perhaps *pī-qá-at*

-60:10. Stol suggests reading *i[t']-ti-ki*,

-61:7-8. *bītam nasāhum*, 'to evacuate a house'. Dalley's mention of 67:10 and 83:7 refers to a different idiom: *ana GN nasāhum*.

-63:9 Dalley's suggestion to read TÚG^{ki} (p. 64) is bolstered by 76:8, a context related to this one.

-64:7 "prepare for it" seems more likely to me.

-65. Although *marāšum* does occur in a Mari letter (XIII:112) in which hair and fringes of a coat are involved, I don't think that this text has much to do with sickness or affliction. Perhaps *tarāšum* is at stake here, a verb known to occur at Mari in the D-stem (XIII:55) with the meaning "to put together (statues)". Hence (?) the idea of "making whole" could make sense in this context [See now Attw. 1327b].

-66:11 *ra-ba'-a-tim* (cf. V:35:28, near Karana!).

-69:13 LÚ[KÁ.DINGIR.RA (KI)]. I. 14 *i-ba-aš-šu*.

-70:8 *šu-ba-ti-ki* (not a GN!).

-71:7 *a-na GN [uš'-te']-eš-še-er*. Although I have no concrete proposal to make, it seems doubtful to me to expect 'tablets' in 1.9.

-73:1 does the last sign belong to a line from Lo.e. not copied? *dam'* is likely as last sign of 1.5.

-79 On the technical feasibility of ice-making at a place such as Rimah, see M. N. Bahadori, "Passive Cooling System in Iranian Architecture," *Scientific American*, Feb. 1978 pp. 144-154.

-81:9 The PN may be *šú-úr-ku-lim*, i.e. 'Rock of all.' A similarly shaped *šú* is known from I:97:5.

-93:5 *ṁta-aš-mu-ya ša'*. Line 11: "what will you respond to me?"

-94:4-7 "I have written to you up to 5 times about the *bihru*- personnel of GN."

-113:4 ^dNIN *ma-aš'-ša-ar-tim* is certainly preferable as a reading.

-114:6 The GN may be *ka-nun-na'* KI cf. 319:36.

-116:4 DINGIR *be-li-ki* (for *be-el-ki* ?). Kupper, *apud* JCS 25 (1973), suggests ^d*be-le-<et>-ki*.

-122:4 Perhaps ^dNIN³.KAR.RA.AK¹. It may be that the Kaniš of l. 16, as well as the one in 33:16, refers to a village in the vicinity of Karana (cf. RHA 35(19), 73 n. 1) rather than to the Anatolian city. *aḫatki* of l. 10 may be the antecedent of *ṭurdišši* of l. 14.

-130:10-13: "Why don't you send the fish-roe(?) in treated (?) water?"

-131:9 *e-li-šu-«nu» ar-ta-ši*, "and I sought a favor from him"; I. 13 "and he did not send a letter."

-138:12, 14 *gašarum* may be the W.S. word *gezer*, found in the plural, of Gen. 15:17: "Parts of sacrificed animal." Note also *gZR* in the Sefire inscription with the meaning of 'conclude' a covenant [Fitzmeyer, *Bib. et Or.* 19, 1967; pp.

32-33, 56-57 (last ref. courtesy of J. Van Seters)].
 -144:30ff: *uš-ta-bi-lam/ me-ḫi-ir tup-pi-ya/ ù 2/3 MA.NA* [X]/ *a-na PN?* *šu-bi-lam* (reading mostly agreeing with Kupper's suggestion given on p. 118).
 -147:8-9 *e-ri²-qú/qí* (cf. IX:28:4) / *us-tè-eb-bi-ir-ma* [Dt *šebèrum*; but cf. Von Soden, ZA 66(1977), 283]. 1. 17 (G pres. of *tarùm*) "I shall bring you (before me)"
 -153:5-6. For Syntax and morphology of *lū ittum*, see Frankena, *Festschrift H.A. Brongers*, 1974, 28ff. "Let it be a sign: the serving woman came to Andariq and [read *ù* rather than *SÍG*] you dispatched Azzu-ena"
 -154:11,13 *kāširatum* also occurs in XIII:1:xiii:13.
 -155:10 *iš-šu²-[ú]* or, less likely *iš-lu²-[ú]*. Stol suggests *iš-qú-[lu]* or *iš-ku-[nu]*.
 -159:5 *ki-[ma wu-ur-] ti be-lí-ya*
 -161:9-10 [GEME-*i*] PN/ [*ka*] -*li* . . . : "Thus you said: 'Mutu-ḫadkim has detained my girl; (please) effect her release' ". 1. 13-19: "And I . . . approached M. and had him send a letter to A. (in which) M. said as follows: 'Even if I do not release her, we shall . . .'"
 -299:13. Perhaps *i-te-qum-ma*
 -308:5 *za-AB-ri* (KI) or (much less likely) *za-UB/ár-ri* (KI); thus either Zabri or Zarri.
 -Seal No. 8 Although difficult to find an appropriate reading for the 3rd sign of the second line, it is nevertheless better to expect a PN here rather than the peculiar rendering of Hawkins. [read perhaps DUMU *ka-rib²-šarri*, but *rib* is not attested in O.B.]
 Seal 17. Sumu-ami may be known as a man from Andariq in XVIII:62:7.

II. *The Rulers of Karana contemporaneous to the reign of Hammurabi of Babylon.*

The Mari archives reveal that Karana was ruled by three kings: Samu-Addu [Huffmon, APN, 54-55]; Ḫatnu-rapi [XIV:106; 109; XVIII:15]; and Askur-Addu [APN,22]. (H) aqba-hammu is known from these same archives but is never considered as Karana's ruler [APN 36; X:174]. During the 'Assyrian' inter-regnum, a Ḫasidanum [APN, 36; cf. *Iraq* 35(1973), 175 (Tell Ṭaya)], may have been Karana's governor. Dalley argues, mostly on the basis of her understanding of events as they transpired, that: (p. 33)

. . . the sequence of rulers may run: Samu-Addu while the Assyrians ruled Mari; possibly Hasidanum as Assyrian governor either preceding or succeeding Samu-Addu; Ḫatnu-rapi when Assyrian power declined at Šamši-Adad's death; Aškur-Addu son of Samu-Addu, supporter of Zimri-Lim; Aqba-hammu, son-in-law of Samu-Addu who accepted domination of Hammurabi of Babylon.

III. *Iltani archive.* a). On "Observations on Grammar, Syllabary and Vocabulary" (pp. 36-38), it might be useful

to collect some of the idioms and constructions so far peculiar to Rimah. Dalley is careful to note many of these in her comments to individual texts. *itti x ekemum* (93:7-8); Št of *redûm* without *ana* (99:10-11); the same with accus. suff. (134:30); the same in the stative (133:22); Št of *awûm* governing a person (115:19[cf. AIB 7:129:14'; BiOr, 35,208]) *antum* (for *amtum*) 122:22 [cf. GAG 31 f]; *ana šimim šubulum* (56:6); *dummuqam eli*+suffix *rašûm* (131:9); *salûtum* ('alliance') also in Shemshara (132:19); *ina pî tuppim erêbum* (161:20-21); DUMU *ešemim* (in 138 and 150; used to describe the sender of a letter); *ana PN erêšum* ('request from') 129:10-11. b). Comments on the social stratification and selected correspondants at Rimah. *i. The King and the Queen.* Our information on Aqba-hammu is limited by the nature of the archives that have been uncovered. Most of the letters are sent to Iltani, his wife (57-92). Only 4 (93-96) were sent to other officials. In addition to a very interesting palace in Karana (description in *Iraq* 32(1970), 4-9 cf. Jean RÉS (1939), 63) Aqba-hammu probably had residences at Bununewe (cf. 254-259; 261 where meals are given), Z/Šarbat, Ḫurunat, Qaṭara, and may have had access to one at Andariq. Very much like Mari's Zimri-Lim, Aqba-hammu travelled extensively within his domain (cf. 71; 73-74; 77-78; 89; 91) as well as to neighboring land. He travels to Babylon to pay tribute to his overlord (69) and to Sippar to visit a *naditu*, kin of his wife (134).

His letters to Iltani allude to a number of concerns. He instructs her to make or to send clothings (57; 59-60; 80), to transfer personnel (61-62; 67; 75; 81; 83; 134; 161), and to gather men and materials for tribute to Babylon (69-70). At one point he criticizes her for not keeping him abreast of events (68); at another, he threatens, no doubt exaggeratingly, to cut her into pieces for trifling infractions (158). But he could also be very gentle, displaying solicitude towards her (58). Matters concerned with justice (90), land-holdings (88), and the cult (58-59; 79) are his to decide. That he waged war successfully is clear from 72 (cf. 82). Of interest is 65, since it supplements the meager information which we have from Mari on the use of the *šartum* and *sissiktum* to assess the reliability of prophets and diviners (cf. Finet, *Annales du Centre d'Études des Religions, Université Libre de Bruxelles*, 3 (1969?), p. 114 (No. 19); pp. 125-130). It is implied that extispicy made upon these objects (hair and fringes) was used to determine whether or not the gods were sending a message to the ruler when they 'struck' a young man.

Iltani's activities closely match those of Šiptu, Zimri-Lim's main wife. An exception, however, can be noted from the Mari evidence so far published: Iltani obviously controlled land, perhaps as part of her inheritance as daughter of a former king of Karana. It might be noted, however, that Iltani needed permission from her husband to

proceed with harvesting and to raise the necessary laborers for the task (cf. 94). It is likely that fields in two localities were expressly placed at her disposal, perhaps as part of her inheritance: Badrum and Yašibatūm (cf. 145: 156: 157). It may be significant that when Aqba-hammu had some Yašibatūm individuals arrested, their possessions were handed over to Iltani (95). We cannot know how literally to interpret the instances in which shepherds, donkey-drivers, and other personnel from Yašibatūm are spoken of as Iltani's (cf. 145). It may not be necessary to think them as actually attached to her own household, independent of that of her husband the king. One could note however, text 163, a letter to Iltani from an unknown addressee who gives an account of work on (Iltani's) threshing-floor. That she may have personally enjoyed the profit derived from 'her' textile industry (cf. 106-107) cannot be substantiated. We shall have more to say about Iltani's activities as we assess those of her correspondents in the archives.

ii. *Rimah officials and other correspondents. A. 1. NAPSUNA-ADDU* sends a large number of letters to Iltani (20-56). All other attestations of this PN in the Rimah archives (cf. p. 261 q.v.) refer to this same man. That he occupied a position of some distinction is clear from the occasional moment when he gives orders to Iltani (39:11-15). Once, he speaks of Aqba-hammu as *abum*, 'father' (31:5), a term which, however, does not necessarily imply filial relations. To him he does not hesitate to appeal directly if Iltani does not give him satisfaction (76; cf. 63). We are not sure where his seat of power lay. A letter that Iltani wrote to Aqba-hammu may place Napsuna-Addu in Zarbat (74). One may therefore speculate that Napsuna-Addu was in charge of the palace that was found there. He is in constant correspondence with Iltani, discussing matters pertaining to personnel and foodstuff. One letter of Napsuna-Addu to Iltani is of particular interest. 42:6-23 reads:

Concerning what you have previously written: 'I have sent you small fish favored by Aqba-hammu'. In accordance with the fact that (*akkīma*) your husband Aqba-hammu learns (to appreciate) small fish in Qaṭara and Karana, I have from old favored big fish in Shubat-Enlil, Ekallatum, Mari, and Babylon. Now since big fish are not available you are sending me small ones. But who shall eat them?

Although the ending is obscure, I nevertheless believe this letter to be saturated with heavy humor, if not sarcasm. Napsuna-Addu compares the little fish that are favored by Aqba-hammu (cf. No. 40) with the big ones which he favors. It is probably that in alluding to the places in which Aqba-hammu acquired his taste for little fish, -relatively less powerful city-states such as Karana and Qaṭara- and in

contrasting them to the major powers where he -Napsuna-Addu- learnt to favor big ones, Napsuna-Addu was twitting Iltani (cf. 41 for a similar context). Of interest is the sequence of GN that are given in 1. 16-19. This sequence clearly follows the order of power as it was held, during a generation or so, in the Middle Euphrates Valley: Shubat-Enlil recalls the dominance of Shamshi-Adad, while Ekallatum, Mari, and Babylon respectively allude to the ascendancies of Ishme-Dagan (short tenure), Zimri-Lim, and finally Hammurabi. 2. MUTU-HADKIM's seal impression is unfortunately hardly preserved (p. 255). His dossier is at once ample and intriguing. It is clear that he was a man of some stature since he corresponds, seemingly on equal terms, with Iltani and gives advice to Aqba-hammu (61). He travels to Aššur (98), Šubartum (133) and perhaps even Babylon (161) [if one interprets thus 11. 11-14]. In general, he seems to be in charge of personnel since it is to him that others, including Iltani, turn to request slaves and additional manpower (97). Moreover, he is in a position to supply equipment and clothing (100). Texts 207-210, dated within months of each other, reveal that a group of women placed in Mutu-hadkim's charge (207-208:i:8) are once labelled as belonging to the *beltum*. References such as 106:10, 13; 207:iv:9; 208:iv:8 indicate that this *beltum* was none-other than Iltani. These bits of information may mean that Mutu-hadkim was a merchant working for Aqba-hammu's household, travelling in his behalf, and responsible over the human resources available to the crown.

The intriguing aspect of Mutu-hadkim's career takes its cue from Dalley's comment to 97. There, she wonders about the likelihood that Mutu-hadkim's presence is attested at Mari in II:23, and 122. To be sure, the matter is complicated by the mention of a man with the same name in IV:80, a letter written during the so-called 'Assyrian' period. There, Išme-Dagan asks that his brother at Mari inform others of the content of his missive. Among those mentioned are Išar-Lim and Mutu-hadkim. Now the latter, in every Mari occurrence that stem from the same period, is revealed as a commander in charge of Yasmah-Adad's armies (cf. Anbar, *Is. Or. St.* 3(1973), 21 and, earlier, Finet, *AIPHOS* 15(1957-58), 31-32). During Zimri-Lim's reign, however, we note that Išar-Lim was at odds with Mari. According to II: 124:2-14, in a state of drunkenness a trusted man by the name of Kunan blurted out that an assistant to Zimri-Lim was betraying Mari's secrets to Išar-Lim. VI:70 as well as II:23 indicate that Išar-Lim, during a period in which Atamrum of Andariq was struggling against Mari (cf., Rouault, *RA* 64(1970), 111ff.), was one of Hammurabi of Babylon's confidants. Now II:23 finds Mutu-hadkim within the same circle of advisors to the Lawgiver. Therefore, it may well be that both Išar-Lim and Mutu-hadkim, once Yasmah-Adad was dethroned and Mari came under new management, found

fortune elsewhere, eventually selling their expertise to Babylon.

II:122 indicates that a large contingent of Babylonian soldiers ‘guided’, perhaps even ‘led’ (*alik pani šabim*) by Mutu-hadkim, were on their way to replace Atamrum of Andariq with Babylon’s candidate. We know that, in this instance, Zimri-Lim succeeded in placing his own man on that throne: his (future) son-in-law Himdiya (JCS 25[1973], 62-63). The latter found it prudent to walk the tightwire that stretched between Babylon and Mari (cf. X:84). After that, we hear nothing more about Andariq and its fate until the Rimah archives. There, however, it is clear that the city had come to be under Karana’s sphere of influence, if not control. Since Mutu-hadkim is linkable to Andariq by texts 98 and 100, it may not be too bold, if Dalley’s suggestion is well taken, to assert that he came to be in charge of that city in addition to the functions delineated above.

3-5. KIŠŠURUM considers himself Iltani’s servant. Indeed the tone of his letters to her are extremely polite, if not servile. His seal, (No. 15, p. 254) however, is fancier than those of his masters. His functions, as may be gathered from his dossier, parallel that of Mari’s Mukannišum, a man now well known to us thanks to the efforts of Rouault in ARMT XVIII. Essentially a *factotum*, Kiššurum was apparently in charge of a storehouse in which were kept garments (105), wool (106), foodstuff (108; 129), and metals (109). He headed a task-force made up of repairmen (36:7-15), but is more generally concerned with personnel attached to Iltani (107; 127; 157). He seems very much *au-courant* of the king’s travels (105; 110; 111). Probably because he had to direct the king’s meals (108) and to prepare for festival celebrations (110), he is granted an allotment of wine and beer (267-271).

His locale is certainly that of Iltani. This is clear not only from 125:15, but from comparison of texts 156 and 157. In the first of these, Iltani writes her husband asking him to direct Nannabatani and Inib-Šamaš to allot her fields in 2 localities. In his reply, Aqba-hammu agrees with her request, but adds the name of Kiššurum among those ordered to fulfill the task. This is so, very likely, because Kiššurum, in charge of personnel on Iltanu’s side of the border, was also to be told of the royal decision.

Similar in function, but in charge of storehouses in another town, possibly Kanunna (cf. 319:36), is AMISUM, who dispatches fruits and bandages (112-113). AMUR-ŠA-ŠAMAŠ (cf. index) was in charge of leather workers at Andariq.

6-10. URI-ADAD uses greeting formulae which invoke Šamaš and Marduk in one instance (115), and Geštinanna in others (116-117) [The subject is treated in Dalley’s JCS 25(1973), 79-88]. 117 may indicate that he was newly transferred to Iltani’s charge from that of Aqba-hammu. We cannot tell whether it was he or another person who so

irritated the king that he was fined 2 minas of silver (90). At any rate, we only know of his functions as a supervisor of personnel and of pack animals (116). Once he interferes in behalf of IMGUR-ŠAMAŠ, a man otherwise known to collect and (?) pay *šibšum* taxes raised on his *btum* (174). Further information on this person is derived from snippets of references. 37 informs us that he was in charge of tools for an unspecified trade, and of personnel (63). 76 very likely assigns Imgur-Šamaš to the circles of the above-discussed Napsuna-Addu, for whom he travels on errand (26). I would not be surprised if it is he who appears as the messenger of VI:27:8. Why is Imgur-Šamaš under the impression that Iltani slandered him (115), we have no way of knowing.

One of Imgur-Šamaš’s errands takes him to MAŠIYA, a man in charge of textile workers (22, 142), plausibly under Mutu-hadkim’s authority (101; 118:21). Mašiya’s dossier permits us to see how transfer of workers in the textile industry took place. It is clear that Mašiya was able to control only those personnel under his roof and was probably under constraints to retain a constant number of workers (142). For this reason, he would let some go only if he could have them replaced. Also in charge of personnel and entrusted with travels in behalf of the crown were (H)AMMI-ŠURI and (H)ABDI-IŠTAR. Attested to mostly as personnel managers were ABDI-ADAD, in a town called Mar’atan, ŠIṬANUM, in the more major town of Qaṭara, and IBAL-IŠHARA likely to be found in Halanum [For references, see the Index, s.v.].

RIŠ-ADAD (118-119) is notable for his elaborate greeting formulae which invoke Šamaš and Marduk in both letters and add the name of Adad and Geštinanna in the second. His good wishes are noteworthy; for they ask that Iltani be honored by “the god who knew her father’s house”, i.e., Samu-Addu, and “in the city where she lives.” Such moments, in which the gods are called upon to honor an individual, are not terribly frequent in OB letters (CAD K, 17, 5). Living in Kisurra, he writes Iltani with no specific requests in mind, but merely to ask that he be remembered. 119 startles us by indicating that Iltani once lived in Ešnunna.

B. In this sub-section are discussed personalities not always directly under the crown’s orders, and whose dossier stands out from those mentioned above.

1. UŠI-NAWIR was very likely the highest official under Aqba-hammu. He travels with the king and was empowered to resolve difficulties brought to his attention (141 and the fragmentary 155). It might be that he felt confident enough to give the queen, Iltani, a hard time. This would depend on a rendering for 129:9-14 which would read as follows: “Yesterday the king requested *ḫazannu*-vegetables from¹ Uši-nawir [*ana PN eṛešum*, an idiom attested to mostly in

EA and NA], but there were none, so that he [Uši-nawir (?)] quarreled with the lady . . .". The only letter addressed to him that is extant, 96, is written by the king. Despite its halting state of preservation, the tablet shows Uši-nawir seemingly acting for the king in affecting the release of some individuals.

2. YARKIBA-ADDU may well be the same man as one known in Mari under the name of Yarkiba/Yarkab-Addu [APN, 47; XIII:145]. One reference merits special attention. According to "Habiru" §29, p. 23 [RAI, IV, 1954], Habiru who were with Askur-Addu (of Karana *sic*) had gone over to Yarkab-Addu in Shubat-Shamash. The relationship between the two leaders, seems quite friendly. The former's letter to Zimri-Lim, quoted in *Syria* 19 (1938), 120-121, shows him to be an ally of Zimri-Lim. Nevertheless, XIII: 145 finds him having to reassert his loyalty to Mari. It may very well be, therefore, that Yarkiba-Addu, too, was one of those who took advantage of Zimri-Lim's years of troubles to free himself from Mari's orbit. At any rate, the Rimah letter which he sends to Iltani is written with the tone of an equal rather than that of a servant.

3-4. ZAKURA-HAMMU and IBBI-SIN were both priest-officials. The first writes 138 using an idiosyncratic scribe who spells his addressee's name *Eltani*. After a purple-proposed greeting, he vehemently denies having "eaten the *gašarum*". If my suggestion that the term should be equated with W. S. *gzar* is well-conceived, then it may be that our man was guilty of an infraction of a (royal) taboo concerned with personnel. Ibbi-Sin was a priest of the goddess of Andariq. His letter, 140, is not particularly informative about his activities except that he had access to (precious?) stones and that he had a taste for condiments.

5. We leave to the last the dossier of the literate YASITNA-ABUM. To Iltani (150, 152) and to the otherwise unknown Ibbi-ulmaš (151) he writes heart-rending letters, complaining of neglect, unconcern, even of evil designs. The best preserved is 150 in which this 'ghost's son' gives literary wings to his expressions as he accuses Iltani of having sent him to scribal school in Andariq only to neglect him. He appeals to her to remember her promises and to take him back in her household. The metaphor DUMU *ešemim* is peculiar to these archives. It may be, as Dalley suggests in her note to 138:5, that this alludes to an orphan or to one born after his father's death. However, since the writers who use this metaphor, Zakura-hammu and Yasitna-abum, invoke Šamaš and Marduk and may have both belonged to priestly circles, 'ghost's son' may be a technical term with ecclesiastical connotations.

C. In this section we gather information on a group of women correspondents.

1. LAMASSANI may well have been a real sister of Iltani.

To judge by her name, ('My angel') she may have come to Aššur to worship and attend its god whom she invokes in her blessings (121 [chronologically earlier], and 122). Her letters sent from there, however, exhibit no obvious 'Assyrianisms', which may indicate that she joined a group whose scribes were familiar with Rimah's epistolary tradition. In 120 she requests barley rations claiming that in Aššur staples were extremely expensive. It is not necessary, however, to follow Dalley's suggestion that this situation betrays military conflicts linkable to ones discussed in AbB 2:23. Lamassani was surely exaggerating—as is the case of many correspondents in the Mari archives—in order to extract as many favors as she could. Certainly her missives do indicate that trade routes were open, with personnel and goods freely moving between the two stations, hardly indicating the presence of warlike conditions.

2.-3. YATAR-AYA and BELASSUNU. The second of these two women has received scholarly attention (lastly, Batto, *Studies on Women in Mari* (1974), 61ff.) while the first was cautiously suggested as a secondary wife of Zimri-Lim (Sasson, JCS 23(1973), 59²). These speculations were based on incomplete evidence from Rimah. As this time, however, it might well be worthwhile to reassess the data and restructure the comments made previously.

Yatar-Aya: MARI. RA 50(1956), 68:i:19: She receives oil and is listed in this sequence: Šiptu-Dam-ḥuraši-Yatar-Aya-Inibšina-Belassunu. RIMAH: 123: She writes to Iltani that she had received her shipment of waterskins and looks forward to joining her at a forthcoming festival. 124: She writes to Iltani that Belassunu's child/servant is ill and that the king is providing for his care. 125 and 127: She writes to Iltani badly preserved letters which deal with personnel and which mention Kiššurum. 126: She writes to Iltani and expresses concern over her own reputation. 159: She writes her 'lord' that she is sending clothing. 166: [Too damaged]. 61: Aqba-hammu shares with Iltani the good advice of Mutu-hadkim that Yatar-Aya's house should not be evacuated^(?). 62: Aqba-hammu reminds Iltani of his above-stated instructions. 67: Aqba-hammu tells Iltani of his instructions to Yatar-Aya concerning servants that are to be returned to Karana. Yadrak-addu, Belassunu's child/servant, is mentioned.

Belassunu. MARI. [Menial workers and homonyms not included.] VII:206:9': She receives a cut of meat and listed in this sequence: Šiptu-Dam-ḥuraši [Wives of Zimri-Lim]-Inibšina [daughter of Zimri-Lim]-Belassunu—"Daughter of the king." RA 50(1956) :68:i:21 [see above, *sub Yatar-Aya*]. X:174: Haqba-hammu, her 'son' asks that she interferes with Hamu-šagiš, official at Qattunan, to have an armed contingent sent to him. RIMAH. 155: She writes her 'mother' that she will visit her. The rest is fragmentary but mention of Qaṭara is made. 161: She receives a letter from her 'brother', Yarim-Lim, assuring her that her servant-girls

will be released. 79: Aqba-hammu writes to Iltani that she, the goddess, and Belassunu ought to use ice stored in Qaṭara. 124: see above, sub Yatar-Aya. 143: Azzu writes to Iltani that Belassunu does not want to stay with her husband Abdu-šuri, and that she wants to leave, together with her children, to her brother-in-law's house in (?) Andariq. 202: Together with a bevy of Rimah's luminaries (including Azzu) she contributes small animal to a shepherd's charge. 207-208. [Homonyms].

We base our reconstructions on 2 points: 1. that the two women mentioned in Mari and Rimah are actually the same persons; 2. that Iltani's archives, with Aqba-hammu as king, cannot be earlier than the fall of Mari and hence inform us about events in the Middle Euphrates valley when Babylon was reaching its peak of influence. Because of the slot she occupies in the list of oil dispensation, I had speculated in my JCS article that Yatar-aya was one of Zimri-Lim concubines or secondary wives, holding a prime position in one of Mari's provincial palaces. In the case of Belassunu, I had speculated that she was a daughter of Zimri-Lim, married to a Karana's prince. That the last hypothesis was not well-founded was pointed out by Batto (pp. 62-63), who noted that Belassunu's slot was not among Mari's princesses. I offer now the following amended reconstruction.

Belassunu may well have been a Karana princess; thus a (half) sister of Iltani and a daughter of Samu-Addu. That she calls Iltani her 'mother' in 155 is not uncommon way for younger sisters [even in modern-day Middle East] to call their elders. This would be doubly true if one of these is a queen. She may have been given as a concubine to Zimri-Lim and placed in the palace at Qattunan. This would explain why she receives a missive from her brother-in-law Aqba-hammu, who was then merely an employee of Karana's crown. We note that the RA document in which she is listed among Mari's queens and princesses was dated to the year 'Kaḫat', one of the last years of Zimri-Lim. With Mari's fall, Belassunu and her royal children were taken back and placed within Abdu-šuri's household. We know nothing about the latter except that he was not one to make our heroine happy. According to 143, she asked to return to her brother-in-law's household. This could be either Aqba-hammu [through Iltani] or, maybe more likely because of the Andariq context, Mutu-hadkim. The link to the latter, however, may have been through the obscure Abdu-šuri. At one point or another, she may have gotten to Qaṭara (155, 79).

Concerning Yatar-Aya, we could speculate that she too originated in Karana, became one of Zimri-Lim's spouses, and then was brought back to the area of Andariq. The remaining letters in both of these women's dossiers reveal them to make the same requests, in terms of personal goods, and favors, as those of Iltani's other correspondents. 4. AZZU's letters are from a milieu that is distinctly Hurrian(ized). 143, mentioned above (*sub Belassunu*),

shows Azzu as interfering in the marital difficulties of Belassunu. The rest of her dossier indicates that Azzu was a woman of some importance, receiving nice quantities of barley (188), and contributing small animals to the care of the central administration (202-203). 144, which requests personnel from Iltani, opens by invoking the storm god and Šala. Now the latter is known from Mari's onomasticon as Šala and, very likely, Šalaš (IX:253:iv:13; XIII:1:iii:26). Some scholars have proposed a Hurrian context for this deity, wife of Adad (cf., Edzard, *WdM*, 118; Frankena, *Takultu*, 112; Laroche, *Recherches*, 57). If so, then it might be legitimate to transcribe the sumerogram for the storm god as Teš(š)ub. We do note that this letter refers to persons with appellatives that are Hurrian in derivation (in addition to Azzu, Attap-naya, and probably Pašattaya). Since other greeting formulae consistently associate Geštinanna with Adad, our suggestion might well be legitimate. But note that Dalley, *JCS* 25(1973), 85-86 use the same observation to conclude that the two female deities, Geštinanna and Šala, were essentially the same. I find added comfort, however, in the fact that in the same letter that opens with a reference to Šala, Azzu invokes Geštinanna (144:14), thus making it unlikely that the two were conceived as the same deity.

5-7. AZZU-ENA calls herself a 'woman from Ašala'. This GN is known to us in the form of Ašal from a letter written by the governor of Karana (V:43:9). In this letter, it is placed in contiguity with Talmuš, a locality certainly not far from Rimah (cf. Goetze, *JCS* 7(1953), 62⁷⁸, but cf. J. Lewy, *AIPHOS* 13(1953), 299², who relates to "the island town of *Talmeš/Talbiš* referred to in the so-called *Annals of Tukulti-Ninurta II*"). Azzu-ena pleads with Mutu-hadkim to remember his pledge to supply her with a slave-girl. Another correspondent with the Hurrian name of INIP-NAYA writes 153 to Iltani, mentioning Azzu-ena in a context that is difficult for me to assess. She also speaks of military difficulties as she entreats the queen for provisions. ŠAWALUM-NADKI writes 146 to Iltani from a Hurrian(ized) milieu. Her messenger with a distinctly Hurrian name (Kani-azzu) is conveying objects requested by Iltani, and is to be loaded back with a return favor.

8. AMAT-ŠAMAŠ, a *naditu* in Sippar writes 2 letters to her (real[?]) sister Iltani. In 133 she informs her that 2 servants, purchased in (?) Subartu, escaped but were arrested in Karana. She begs for their return. 134 recalls Aqba-hammu's generous promise when he visited her (in Sippar), and asks that she be given fresh slaves to replace older ones.

IV. *Alternate readings for PN and GN.* We follow the indexing as given on pp. 257-266. Whenever available, I mention whether homonyms are available at Mari or at Chagar Bazar. See above, section I., for further suggestions.

is¹-ka-ta-nu (for ab-ka-ta-nu) M.

a-ka-ta-tu-ub-ki¹

a-ri-ya' (in 248:r:6- same as in 232:10).

a-ru-um-a-tal'

ar-za-tum' CB.

a-ma' -an' -ta-hi (in 318:8) M.

^dEN.ZU-be-li'

ḥi-za-al' -lu

ka-an-za-az' -ni'

ku' -ti-ya (for qù-ti-ya)

qa-li-a-tum CB.

ša-ma-ḥu' -ul/li (in 322:i:28')

ta-al-lu' -ḥu-ul (in 224:28)

zi-zu-pa'

zu-uz-zi-wa' -ri'

GN

ma-aš-ša-[tum] (in 245:i:24) = ma-aš-ša-du (KI') (of 226:8)

ra-ba'-(a)-tim (in 66:11, 15, 17)