

**“YEAR : ZIMRI-LIM OFFERED A GREAT THRONE  
TO SHAMASH OF MAHANUM”  
An Overview of One Year in Mari  
PART I : The Presence of the King\***

Jack M. SASSON  
The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Just over a month ago, at a colloquium *Bible et Orientalism* held in this very hall, I proposed that Mari offers a splendid opportunity to researchers who would recreate chapters in the history of an Old Babylonian city-state. I suggested that the Mari letters allow us not only to reconstruct the political moments in the biographies of its kings, in particular Yasmah-Adad and Zimri-Lim, but also to recover important dimensions in Mari's historiographic perceptions. Moreover, when Mari's bureaucratic archives are placed within a linear, chronological sequence, the researcher would be able to capture a portrait of palace life for a dozen or so contiguous years during the time of Zimri-Lim. Thus a political biography of Zimri-Lim can be set within a social and economic portrait of the city he ruled, and the whole can be controlled by our awareness and appreciation of the historiographic perceptions which obtained among his subjects.<sup>1</sup>

In this session, I begin to tale the pulse of Mari's official life by concentrating on one of Zimri-Lim's years, labelled by the bureaucrats : “Year : Zimri-Lim offered a great throne to Šamaš of Mah(a)num.”<sup>2</sup> As Birot's fundamental study has shown, this particular year occurs within the following sequence of year names : “Zimri-Lim defeated the Benyaminites in Saggatum and killed their kings,” “Zimri-Lim captured Ašlakka [probably coeval with “Zimri-Lim offered his statue to Addu of Halab”],” our year, hereafter labelled “Šamaš,” then “Zimri-Lim took the census in his land,” and “Zimri-Lim fortified Dur-Yahdullim.”<sup>3</sup> In

\* When preparing this presentation in the Spring of 1983, the volumes with administrative contents that were at my disposal included ARM(T) VII-IX, XI-XIII, XVIII as well as ARM XXI a copy of which J.-M. Durand kindly advanced me. In all about 270 texts dated to our year had been published therein. Durand also provided me with 175 catalogue entries (hereafter labelled M.). Subsequently, P. Talon furnished me with 15 entries for texts which will appear in his ARMT XXIV.

Since this paper was presented in May-June 1983, a flood of texts and studies has come to enrich our information. Not to speak of the articles in the *MARI* series, new volumes include : J.-M. Durand's ARMT 21, with its rich commentary and its frequent allusions to unpublished materials, J.-R. Kupper's ARMT XXII, with its many texts datable to our year, and ARMT XXIII, which is veritable treasure trove (texts edited and studied by G. Bardet's and by others). Even if at the time of this revision, I have not had the opportunity to fully appreciate their contents (ARMT XXII-XXIII reached me late in the Spring of 1984) they must be certainly be taken into consideration. The text of this paper, therefore, has been modified most appreciably in order to update the various tables.

1. “On Reconstruction the Histories of Early Israel and of Mari,” forthcoming, *Colloques de Strasbourg*. The study includes a literary analysis of the Yahdun-Lim disk in order to assess the historical consciousness of the scribe during its creation.

2. For this year, see Dossin, *Studia Mariana*, 1950, 56-57 (no. 16). I have emended the GN in the formula given there to read *ma-ah<sup>1</sup>-ni-im* (or *ma-ha<sup>1</sup>-ni-im*) rather than Dossin's *ma-nu-ni-im*.

3. M. Birot, *Syria* 55 (1978), 333-343. For convenience sake, I refer to abbreviated forms of the year-formulae as given in ARTANES, 4 (1980);, 3.2.6.

reconstructing the year “Šamaš,” therefore, a scholar will have at his disposal almost 600 documents, averaging about 50 per month. However, these are unevenly divided over the year, a fact that seems to have more to do with the schedule of modern-day publications than with the fortunes of archaeological discoveries. We note, for example that when XXIII appeared it appreciably increased the testimony for month v and, to a lesser extent, of months iv and vi, while the publication of XXII (room 135) has enriched the documentation for month xii. Moreover, it is certain that one of the as yet unplaced years of Zimri-Lim will come to parallel “Šamaš,” at least during its early months. As of now, we must also add to our roster of “Šamaš” the few texts datable to the “Ašlakka II.”<sup>4</sup>

At its most powerful moment during the reign of Zimri-Lim Mari directly controlled territory which stretched over 600 kilometers along the Euphrates, from present day Hitt northward toward Raqqa. Its power was felt along the shores of the Khabur some 75 kilometers upstream from its conjunction with the Euphrates.<sup>5</sup> Thus, even if we keep in mind the likelihood that pockets of territory along these rivers lay beyond Mari’s influence, it is nevertheless striking to note that the area within Mari’s control was appreciably larger than the size of Judah and Israel combined. It is not surprising, therefore, that a particular date formulation for a year may not be adopted as quickly in some segments of Mari’s territory as in others.

In the case of the year which became known as “Šamaš,” some scribes continued to use the previous formulation, “Capture of Ašlakka,” but declared it to be an ŪS.SA year, that is, one following the regular year so named. This formulation was used into the second month, although I have catalogue entries which would extend this formulation well into the year’s end. However, such entries need to be verified since they may well belong either to the regular “Ašlakka” formulation (i.e. the year previous to “Šamaš”), or to an altogether different year-formula which we now know to have been invoked some years later and which came to celebrate the fact that “Zimri-Lim captured Ašlakka *the second time*.” The two texts which are certainly to be dated to the repeat (ŪS.SA) “Ašlakka,” stem from 19.i (IX :7) and 26.ii (VIII :94). Since these texts mention personnel well-known to Mari, they may well have been composed in the “capital” itself. I could not, however, establish contexts or find continuity in the activities of the persons cited in these documents during the year “Šamaš” which, ostensibly, ran parallel to it in terms of time. It may be that these were written at some provincial center where the scribe was not alerted in time to the “official” formulation.<sup>6</sup>

To complicate matters Jean-Pierre Materne has recently suggested that the formula “Šamaš” was not the only one in use during the year I am reconstructing. According to him, the year “Zimri-Lim captured Kahat” ran parallel to it. While he is beyond doubt right in maintaining that the year “Kahat” ought to be placed earlier in Zimri-Lim’s reign, I rather think it a full-fledged year which was neither provincial nor temporary, and which probably belongs just before “Euphrates.” This is particularly so since we have texts that are dated to the first month, ŪS.SA of that year. Materne’s reconstruction, inspired by a desire to collapse Zimri-Lim’s formulae into a more plausible equation with the length of his reign, is based mostly on collating

4. Here are statistics for the number of documents per month :

i.	25	ii.	47	iii.	47	iv.	64
v.	78	vi.	52	vii.	54	viii.	37
ix.	47	x.	31	xi.	49	xii.	63

5. Cf. RGTC,3 ( = TAVO 7.3), s.v. Qattunan, Tuttul (Balih), Rapiqum, Ida. On the last two, see Anbar, IOS 5(1975), 1-17.

6. Since the above was written, D. Soubeyran’s discussion regarding positioning the year “Addu of Halab” (XXIII, pp. 335-343) has led me to develop further theories regarding this peculiar tendency on the part of the Mari chancellery to tolerate more than one (as many as three) differing formulations for the same year; forthcoming in *MARI*. The following quotation may be relevant :

Such observations [on contents and stylistics of Zimri-Lim date formulae] 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 formula 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.

the king's voyage to nearby Dēr during the 11th month of "Kahat" as well as "Šamaš." But on other occasions (notably during the years "Elahut," "Benyaminites," as well as "Census") about this time of the lunar calendar the king travelled to Dēr, where he participated in one of the few festivals fixed to the 11th month, regardless of the actual season in progress at that time. For this as well as for other reasons it is best not to follow Materne's hypothesis.<sup>7</sup>

Reconstructing life at a palace by studying the corpus of documents which stem from one single year is itself a very artificial undertaking for, except on very few occasions, the life of a palace bureaucracy does not normally recognize calendric demarcations. Some activities are initiated and completed in a few days, and may have no reference to events either in past years or in future ones; other activities are continuous and are likely to spill into succeeding years even as they began in past ones.

Furthermore, there are many methods by which to evaluate such activities. One may focus on *bureaucrats*, a term which can be stretched to include the king, his family and his entourage. One may select specific *groups of workers* and analyze their interactions within that period of time. One could concentrate on specific *institutions* and try to chart their fortunes within one year. One may locate *specific goods and products* and pursue their flow in and out of the palace. Each of these methods may require differing researching techniques, and all will need to be tested by similar explorations within the Mari archives from other date-years. Ideally, each one of these approaches will need to be taken for the very same year, allowing the researcher to perceive the problem from different angles. On this occasion, I shall concentrate on the king and on his activities.

Although the Mari year officially began a new cycle in the month of Urāhum, I can detect no celebration during that particular month which would either claim the attention of the Mari citizenry or betray the recognition that a new cycle of activities had begun. Likewise, I could not detect a specific festivity that seems to close the year at the end of the 12th month, Ebūrum.<sup>8</sup> As a matter of fact, except for an occasional "fixed" festival, e.g. the celebrations in honor of Dīretum at Dēr, which, as mentioned above, occurred during the 11th month (Kiskissum), only the loan documents required payment at a specific month of the lunar calendar (Abum, the 4th month). This formula can be replaced with one which seems better suited to an agricultural cycle, stating that loans in silver and grain will be due during the harvest period, at the threshing-floor (U<sub>4</sub>.BURU<sub>4</sub>.KISLAH.TA). But there is serious doubt whether the first of these formulae is to be taken literally.<sup>9</sup> This note of caution will be defended as we turn to problems raised by the Mari calendar.

The year at Mari was measured by 12 of the moon's cycles each of which took about 29 1/2 days to complete. To approximate such a cycle, we presume that months varied between 30 and 29 days, six of each, in order to reach the 354 days of the lunar year. However, as was the case in Ur (M. Sigrist, RB 84 [1972], 380), Mesopotamians did not alternate these months, but may have decided on length of each month through other methods. In the case of the year "Šamaš" at Mari, the 2nd, 4th, 5th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 11th, and 12th month, each had 30 days. Even if each of the remaining months turned out to have 29 days, then this particular year will still measure at least 357 days, about 3 days longer than the "normal" lunar year, but still 8 1/2 days shorter than the solar year. During "Šamaš," and the succeeding one "Census", we have two stretches of 3 months, each of 30 days (i.e. vii-ix "Šamaš"; xi-xii "Šamaš" → i "Census"). Since such length in the lunar month may have resulted from an inability to spot the waxing moon's crescent, it might be that the second three-month period, from xi "Šamaš" through i "Census," fell during

7. "L'Année de Kahat dans la chronologie du règne de Zimri-Lim," *MARI* 2(1983), 195-199. Anbar, IOS 9(1979), 6-7, makes "Kahat" coeval with "Euphrates," and in this he is followed by the editors of ARMT XXI and XXIII as well as by Charpin. See the last's article on Asqudum in this volume (§ 1.1.4). I rather think that the sequence is as follows: "Year : X" → "Throne of his father" → "Kahat ≅ Annunitum" → "Euphrates" etc...

8. But see **Table F.24** and the comments thereon.

9. Contra, G. Boyer, ARMT VIII, pp. 215-216.

cloudy months, i.e., during the late autumn-early winter season.<sup>10</sup> We shall refine this conjecture later.

This last observation permits me to broach a subject which will need some attention if we are to better appreciate the life patterns in an ancient city-state. One may be able to reconstruct the year on the basis of *relative menology*, recreating activities within one year simply by gauging their sequence according to available documents. However, if we seek to understand these activities in connection with seasonal conditions and agricultural cycles that obtained in the Middle-Euprates valley, it is crucial to establish an *absolute menology*.

Two approaches can be taken to link the lunar calendar to the solar cycle. The first depends on the etymology of a month's name in order to establish the season within which that month functioned; but his approach, while it may have been meaningful in the hoary past when a month was first given its name, is neither accurate nor trustworthy for the second millennium.<sup>11</sup> The other avenue depends on finding correlations between the agricultural activities that are dated by the ancient scribe and those dependent on the seasonal cycle.

The Mari calendar was brought into harmony with an agricultural cycle by ad hoc intercalation of a month at critical junctures : most commonly after the 12th or at either side of the 5th month. However, we have attestations of intercalation after the second (Malkānum, year "Census") and after the sixth (IGI.KUR, year "Babylon") months. During those years of Zimri-Lim which are placeable in a sequence, the Mariyite intercalated an Ebūrum II at the end of the year "Benyaminites" and inserted, a Malkānum II at the end of the second month of the year "Census," thus sandwiching our "Šamaš" within lengthened year. This procedure must have allowed him better fit between the lunar and solar calendar until 64 months later when he inaugurated a series of intercalations which lengthened a twelve-month period into 15 months : one month was inserted on either side of the sixth month, IGI.KUR, of the year "Babylon" and one before the sixth month of the following year "Throne of Dagan." In other words, a stretch from the 5th month of "Babylon" through the 5th month of "Throne of Dagan" -- which would normally include only 13 months, ended up having 16 full months ! Its length thus compares well with the famous "last year of confusion," just before the Julian calendar was inaugurated on January 1st, 46 B.C.E.<sup>12</sup>

10. Since I wrote my assessment on the Mari calendar for the *Jones Festschrift*, 120-121; 137, the number of "Šamaš" months which lasted 30 days has increased (Malkānum [ii] : XXI : 273, XXI, p. 550 n. 61; Kinūnum [vii] : XXIII : 81; Dagan [viii] : VII : 102 +, 239, XI : 97-98; Liliātum [ix] : XII : 147 + unpublished information). So far no (new) month of 29 days has been established. Since I can conjecture the presence of only two months, both (ii and xi) during the year "Census," which seem to have lasted 29 days, it may well be that Mari did not try to balance lengths of days within each month in order to obtain an aggregate of twelve 29-day months, the normal lunar year. If so, we may then have to regard the Mari year as  $12 \times 30 = 360$  days and have to endure the havoc that this condition will create to our recreation of a number of festivals and celebrations !

More immediately, this observation, if proven correct, will also turn untenable my attempt at establishing the range of winter months by appealing to possible difficulty in sighting the waxing of the moon.

11. Note the judicious remarks of D. Charpin, RA 76 (1982), 2-3. In this respect, we might note that our own calendar does not pay much attention to etymology; otherwise, we would have had to find more accurate names for September ("7th month") — December ("10th month").

12. See conveniently ARTANES 4, p. 8 (§ 4.1.2.1). D. Charpin kindly informs me that T.H. 82 239 bears the following date : iti *ta-aš-ni-it* IGI.KUR UD.14.KAM, "Babylon." See now Charpin, (art. cit. in n. 7), 1.2.2. An Abum II is also attested in XXII : 98, but it cannot be established, as of now, whether the text dates to Zimri-Lim's reign.

It may well be that the ad hoc nature of intercalation presents us with a problem that is as difficult to control as that of the year-formulae of Zimri-Lim. While I do not doubt that Hibirtum II and Ebūrum II were intercalations with "official" sanction, I wonder about the permanence of Malkānum II and IGI.KUR II. The matter also revolves on the concept of "year" as conceived by the scribe. To clarify these points I offer the following charts :

a. XXII : 276 has a colophon which totals of outlays of oil and sesame for "two years and 4 months, from [ix "Euphrates"] to [xii "Ašlakka"], inclusive." The accounting includes intercalated xii/II "Benyaminites" (cf. iii : 8-10) in the definition of "year." That intercalation therefore, was regarded as "official" :

"Euphrates"									ix	x	xi	xii
"Benyaminites"	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii	ix	x	xi	xii
												b
"Ašlakka"	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii	ix	x	xi	xii

This long stretch of time, just over 5 years, without intercalation may mean that the Mari calendar was pretty well in harmony with the sun's cycle in "Šamaš." However, at least in some quarters which may not have been central to the main administration, some tinkering was felt to be still necessary, for just after the end of "Šamaš," a second Malkānum was inserted in "Census."

With this inference in mind, we can turn to the archives from "Šamaš" itself in order to find correlations between the Mari menology and ours. Kupper has recently tried to use information on the agricultural life at Mari to do just that.<sup>13</sup> His finding, however, cannot be correct for every one of Zimri-Lim's years, since we know how ad hoc and irregular intercalation was at Mari; so that an Urāhum of one year will not likely fall on the same Gregorian month the year after. Moreover, the bulk of his information came from letters; but since these cannot be linked, as yet, to specific years, their evidence is practically unusable. But Kupper's approach is nevertheless useful and we can extract from it the evidence that *burrum*-cereal was delivered in the year "Šamaš" for the threshing-floor on 23.iii (XII :206) and on 7.ii "Dur-Yahdullim" (XII : 553-4), 22 months later. Since the intercalation that occurred after ii "Census" was not likely "official," (see note 12), we may assume that the calendar fell anywhere between 10 and 22 days behind the solar cycle -- depending on whether or not the intervening months were all of 30 or half of 29 days. Now since, as has been suggested, harvesting in the Old Babylonian period was

(suite note 12)

A glance at this chart will indicate that :

1. The scribe obviously did not regard the word "year" as equivalent to the months *within* a year-formula (i.e a span from i → xii), since he would have had to deal with 3 such formulae.

2. The account does not calculate by months. Otherwise, the scribe would have had to add them up as 27, which would have been recast as "2 years 5 months."

3. Rather, the scribe used the word "year" only when his accounting included one with a continuous sequence of 12 months. And if, within that sequence, one of the full years included an intercalary month, as is in the case of "Benyaminites," he *did not include that intercalated month* in his calculation of the number of months involved during the transaction, obviously regarding it as "officially" part of "Benyaminites."

b. Birot, op. cit. 335-336, cites S.143-85 with the following colophon : "[accounting regarding] 6 years and 3 months, from [iv "Dur-Yahdullim"] until [v "2nd Ašlakka"] inclusive." Now, according to our present information we should have the following sequence if we take the known intercalation into account :

"Dur-Yahdullim"				iv	v	vi	vii	viii	ix	x	xi	xii
"Hatta"	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii	ix	x	xi	xii
"Elam"	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii	ix	x	xi	xii
"Addu of Mahanum"	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii	ix	x	xi	xii
"Babylon"	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii	ix	x	xi	xii
"Dagan of Terqa"	i	ii	iii	iv	b v	b vi	vii	viii	ix	x	xi	xii
"2nd Ašlakka"	i	ii	iii	iv	b v							

1. As in the above example, the scribe obviously did not regard the word "year" as equivalent to a year-formula, since he would have had to deal with 7 such formulae;

2. Unlike the above example, the scribe did not apply the term "year" to complete sequences i → xii. Had he done so, he would have had to (awkwardly) speak of "5 years, 14 months," i.e. 9 (from "Dur-Yahdullim") + 5 (from "2nd Ašlakka").

3. The scribe, furthermore, did not proceed from calculating on the basis of months. Had he done so, he would have had 9 + 12 + 12 + 12 + 14 + 13 + 5 = 77 months and would have had to report that his account spanned \*6 years, 5 [not 3 months].

I am therefore forced to conclude that, if the reading of the colophon is confirmed, *the scribe actually took into account, and therefore regarded as official, only one of the intercalated months which we now know to obtain during the years "Dur-Yahdullim" and "2nd Ašlakka."* (Note also Birot's comment, op. cit., 336 n. 1.) Were I to choose the particular month that was chosen for inclusion, I would certainly not include IGI.KUR/II "Babylon" among the candidates.

c. Birot cites S.108-194 (*Syria* 55[1978], 334-335), dated to iii "Dur-Yahdullim," whose accounting of precious metal stretches over the years "Šamaš" and "Census." This colophon would certainly have of more immediate relevance to our dilemma, for publication of this text will allow us to note whether ii/II "Census" was "official" enough to be included in the scribe's accounting.

13. *Symbolae... de Liagre Böhl*, 1973, 266-270.

10 to 20 days earlier than our own because of warmer climate, we can suppose that it occurred in early April; with threshing and winnowing of the grains taking place within a month later (i.e. during May). We may, therefore, posit that iii "Šamaš" was coeval with May, straddling into June.<sup>14</sup>

Likewise, wool from sheep-shearing was entered into storage on 16.xii of our year (XXII : 93-95), which, given climatic conditions that seem to have obtained in the OB period, would indicate that the first half of Ebūrum was equivalent to our March. I would therefore slightly amend (and correct) the table I offered at the colloquium to read as follows :

**Table A : CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN LUNAR AND SOLAR CALENDARS DURING THE YEAR "ŠAMAŠ"**

i.	Urāhum	March/April	vii.	Kinunum	Sept./Oct.
ii.	Malkānum	April/May	viii.	Dagan	Oct./Nov.
iii.	Lahhum	May/June	ix.	Liliātum	Nov./Dec.
iv.	Abum	June/July	x.	Bēlet-biri	Dec./Jan.
v.	Hibirtum	July/Aug.	xi.	Kiskissum	Jan./Feb.
vi.	IGI.KUR	Aug./Sept.	xii.	Ebūrum	Feb./March <sup>15</sup>

From all evidence, the year "Šamaš" was a relatively peaceful one, but the effects of the warfare which highlighted the previous years can still be felt in the bureaucratic activities, especially as it concerned the redistribution of personnel apparently brought by conquest. We could have inferred these peaceful conditions during "Šamaš," since the year-formula *succeeding* the year under inspection normally reflects the events recorded in the sample year. This observation remains in effect even if we are coming closer to realizing that each year of Zimri-Lim's reign may, in fact, have been recalled by more than one formula (as many as three !)<sup>16</sup>

**Table B : CONGRUENCE OF DATE-FORMULAE AND MAJOR ACTIVITIES**

<i>Zimri-Lim's Date formulae</i>	<i>Activities of Importance</i>
	Settled Euphratean nomadic groups (or/and <sup>?</sup> ) repaired Euphratean banks, dikes, etc...
"Put the banks of the Euphrates in order"	War against Benyaminites
"Defeated the Benyaminites"	Capture of Ašlakka
"Captured Ašlakka"	Presentation of throne to Šamaš
"Offered a great throne to Šamaš"	Census taking
"Took the census in his land"	Fortifications at Dur-Yahdullim
"Fortified Dur-Yahdullim"	Votive offering to the god Hatta
"Offered his statue to Hatta"	Dispatch of reinforcement to Elam
"Went to Elam's aid"	etc...

We can be a bit more specific about the circumstances which precipitated the naming of the year "Šamaš," since we have information which speaks of the manufacture of throne as well as

14. J. Neuman and R.M. Sigrist, "Harvest Dates in Ancient Mesopotamia..." *Climactic Changes* 1(1978), 2139-262; especially p. 246.

For more harvest evidence, compare XI : 79 (27.iii "Šamaš") and XII : 559 (13.ii "Dur-Yahdullim").

15. Evidence collected by G. Bardet, XXIII, pp. 5-15, indicates that, in our year, dispensing wool to workers took place most urgently during the 1st half of Urāhum (i) and again during the 2nd half of Ebūrum (xii). The wool, of course, may have been in storage from the previous harvesting; but it is possible that such large outlays were meant to empty the storerooms in preparation for the arrival of new wool. Bardet's remarks therefore remain relevant, even if we have evidence of wool outlays and purchases occurred throughout the year.

16. See D. Soubeyran, XXIII, p. 343 n. 56 and my forthcoming (*MARI*) study on the year "Addu of Halab."

of various objects sacred to Šamaš. This material is now handily collected by Soubeyran, XXIII, p. 336, and it indicates that the enterprise began in the year “Benyaminite” -- hence two years previously. An accounting of the gold used on the throne dates to 1.ix “Benyaminites” (add M. 10635 to Soubeyran’s chart). Outlays of *šamnum*-stones (XXI : 265 -12.iv) and skins (XXI : 298 -22.iv) for manufacturing it come from the year “Addu of Halab,” a year likely to parallel “Ašlakka.” Since the throne was probably presented with a footstool and a statue of Šamaš holding an emblem and a weapon, it is important to note that these too found completion during the years immediately preceding “Šamaš.” We cannot, however, establish the precise moment in the year “Ašlakka ≅ Addu of Halab” in which the presentation was made.<sup>17</sup>

Similarly we can be a bit more specific about the census that took place in “Šamaš” and which provided the name for the following year “Census.” While personnel lists are fairly frequent at all periods during Zimri-lim’s reign, it is a fact that an abnormally large number of documents come to us from our year. These texts can mention a handful of persons, or can list large numbers. The documentation belongs to three distinct categories, the first of which pertains to the redemption (verb : *paṭārum*) of personnel captured in Zimri-Lim’s battles. This category will not be reported here, and the reader is referred to Villard’s admirable review of the evidence in XXIII, pp. 476-503. The bulk of these administrative liberations of personnel took place between 17-v and 30-vii, although conscientious scribes recapitulated the information in later months [add ? M. 7168 - ?xi].

The second category includes documents which record the shifting of personnel among various segments of the palace’s administration, and may well reflect modifications entered into distributions which took place two years previously, during viii-ix “Benyaminites.” Those involved may have been prisoners, as is clear from certain documents (cf. Villard, op. cit., p. 485, n. 88), and may not have had anyone who could redeem them. This category includes XXIII : 78 (?ii), XXIII : 425 (16.viii) and a special case, for which see below, XXIII : 84 = ? 423 (24.iv). Also belonging here is XXII : 62 (and less likely 73-75; Yasmah-Adad period<sup>3</sup>). One may note, however, that such texts are available from all periods of Mari administrations.

The third category collects texts which are as yet unpublished and are known to me through catalogue entries. Here the term *tēbibtum*, which is rather rarely attested in the bureaucratic texts at our present disposal, is commonly attested. I list here those texts known to me :

Table C : CENSUS TAKING DURING “ŠAMAŠ”

Date	Text n <sup>o</sup>	Contents	Remarks
21.x	M.8388	frag.	
3.xi	M.11382	PN, ♂	
5.xi	M.6674	PN ♂ <i>tēbib</i> . NG	
8 ?xi	M.7453	PN ♂.GĪR Sammetar Hali-hadun, Yašub-Dagan Haqba-ahum	Colophon reminds of XIII : 1’s (19.x.“Ašlakka”)
10 ?xi	M.7090	PN, <i>tēbibtum</i>	
25.xi	M.8321	PN ♂, <i>tēbib</i> . GIBIL <i>ša halas</i> Mari <sup>ki</sup>	note : GIBIL (cf. XXIII : 427, Saggartum district)
1.xii	M.7180	PN ♂ ; <i>nasihī</i> ; si.lá NG; <i>tēbib</i> .; Našer district	

17. Further on this matter can be found in the articles cited above, note 6.

The same argument can also be made about the thrones ultimately dedicated to Dagan (of Terqa) and to Adad. Both were in the process of manufacture during the year “Šamaš” at 4.iii (T.108) and 8.iv (T.128) as well as 15.v (cf. ARMT XXI, p. 371 n.\*\*). Both may have found completion by the end of v. since XXI : 131 records the dispensation of oil to shine (the gold<sup>3</sup>) of 2 thrones. Consult Soubeyran for more details.

	M.7175	PN ♂; šu.bar.ra; Našer district	“duplicate” of preceding ?
11.xii	M.6625	PN	
?. ?	M.8328	NP; dam.gār warad ekallim	
	M.8646	NP ♂; 9NP; Saggaratum : 3	
	M.12101	NP ♂; si.lá NG; Terqa	

We need not delve here into the characteristics of the *tēbibtum*. Kupper’s various studies are still fundamental, even if more information on the subject has since been published.<sup>18</sup> What we do want to emphasize is that the process was highly elaborate, and required the attention of a number of officials as well as the king’s. This is clearly noticeable when inspecting XIV : 61-63 where, in one case (no. 62), six separate steps were necessary, involving the king, a governor, a *sugāgum*, an officer, and 10 witnesses; all these to register no more than eight individuals ! The term *tēbibtum* is sometimes preceded by a conjunction (*inūma tēbibtim* : XIV : 66 : 5; also in Chagar Bazar) or a prepositional phrase (*ina pān tēbibtim* : XIV : 61 : 8; 62 : 7; 63 : 7), placing the act in a temporal setting. It would be most surprising, therefore, if census-taking -- as distinguished from troop-mustering, could be completed during unstable conditions. One more remark : I could not identify any cultic activity during the last months of “Šamaš” which is specifically linkable to the census-taking project.

The relatively peaceful character of the year “Šamaš” is confirmed by the lack of administrative documents which refer to the manufacture of weapons in appreciable quantity.<sup>19</sup> We have mention of only quality hauberks ( ? *gurpisum*) from 29.vii (XXII : 308). One axe may have been stored for future warfare (*pāš nītim*, XXIII : 385 - 29.vi). The various mentions of leather bottles need not indicate warlike preparations. It is not clear whether records of arrow manufacturing exist (cf., XXIII : 407 -1.vi). Those weapons manufactured out of precious metal must certainly have served non-martial ends (XXI : 231 -25.iii “Šamaš?”; M.7047 -23.viii). Swords, spears, and especially bows, were produced most often to be given as gifts, the last commonly dispatched with items of clothing (see below, Tables F and G), betraying their ceremonial, if not fashionable, destination :

25.v	XXIII : 414	tallow for compound bows.
12.vii	XXI : 275	10 lances, 10 swords, 6 big (chariot) rings
19.vii	XXI : 276 ≅ 7	10 lances, 10 swords, 6 big (chariot) rings

Except for XXI : 280 (21.x), the numbers of pegs, clasps, and rivets are mostly modest : XXIII : 384 (3.iv); M. 6786 (5.v); XXII : 190 (11.xi). Many of these items were probably needed to manufacture chariots and parts of chariots.<sup>20</sup> Whether the manufacture of chariotry can be related to any specific act of the king other than martial — ceremonial, cultic, or peregrinative — is difficult to establish since we cannot gauge the time span between collecting primary material and delivering the final product.

**Table D : MANUFACTURE OF CHARIOTRY DURING “ŠAMAŠ”**

24.ii	XVIII : 45	harness material
30.ii	XXI : 273	materials for wheels (bronze)
19.iv	XXII : 218	[ <i>labdu</i> -harness? manufacture?]
26.iv	XXIII : 413	tallow to make <i>hallu</i> sections of wheels
4.v	XXIII : 194	varnish to work on chariot

18. *Studia Mariana*, 99ff; *Nomades en Mésopotamie*, 23-29. See also the remarks of B. Lafont, XXIII, pp. 323-326.

19. See the remarks of O. Rouault, ARMT XVIII, p. 178-180; Durand, XXI, 280-289.

20. On chariots and their manufacturing, see O. Rouault, XVIII, 159-161, F. Joannès, XXIII, 133-137, and especially Durand, XXI, pp. 280-289.



25.v	XXIII : 197	summary of varnish outlays to manufacturers of chariots.
26.v	XXIII : 198	varnish for Itur-Mer's chariot.
1.vi	XXIII : 512	<i>labdu</i> -harness <sup>?</sup>
13.vii	XXIII : 513	<i>labdu</i> -harness <sup>?</sup>
?viii	XXIII : 211	dye for chariot <sup>?</sup>

We have no sure information that the king travelled outside of his own kingdom during “Šamaš”. This may be a bit puzzling for we do know that Zimri-Lim gave his daughter Naramtum as wife to king Šarraya of Elahut (= ? Razama) earlier in the year (cf. XXIII : 84 ≅ 423 -24.iv; dowry ? list in XXII : 232). [Even as the administrative documents show her to be sending gifts to her father a year later (IX : 129), Naramtum's letters prove that the princess did not live happily ever after (X : 44-46).]

By inspecting the *naptan šarrim* documents, however, we can set up a brief list of visits which the king undertook to nearby towns and villages :

**Table E : KING'S TRAVELS.** [ ] = unclear purpose

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Text/cat. n°</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>Return by</i>
1.	[3.ii	IX : 219 : i : 6'-12' <sup>21</sup>	?	4.ii (M.10207)]
2.	3.iii	XI : 74	?	9.iii (XXI : 155)
3.	[26.iii	XXI : 156	<i>ina irrātīm</i> <sup>22</sup>	27.iii (XXI : 207)]
4.	16.v	XII : 229 (XI : 86)	Zurubban <sup>?</sup>	19.v (IX : 42) <sup>23</sup>
5.	7.vi	XVIII : 49	in Terqa <sup>?</sup>	
6.	11.vi	XXIII : 25	?	26.vi (IX : 44; XI : 95)
7.	24.vii	XI : 104	Guru-ilim	25.vii (XI : 105)
8.	21.ix	XII : 143	Appan	23.ix (XI : 59)
9.	16-17;	XXI : 164; M.10316	Dēr	
	19.xi	Materne, n° 106-7		21.xi (XII : 167)

We can be sure of the king's activity at few places to which he travelled. Appan, Guru-ilim, Zurubban and Dēr were all within a day or so journey from the capital. To judge from the brief duration of the king's absence from Mari, the other voyages, destination unknown, were similarly close to the capital. Each of the known palaces had shrines, and it is possible that the king had to offer sacrifices at these stops. This is certainly likely in the case of Dēr, wherein a yearly festival was “fixed” to the middle of the 11th month.<sup>24</sup> Appan had a shrine to honor Addu, and at Guru-ilim, according to testimony best known from the year “Addu of Mahanum,” officials and personnel were assembled to take the oath of the god.<sup>25</sup>

21. According to Birot's restorations, although the formula is not usual.

22. Durand reads *ina nirātīm*. It may be that the term is to be connected with *irrētum*, “dike.” A dam on the Khabur is repeatedly mentioned in the Mari text. See next footnote.

23. Bardet, XXIII, p. 19, n. 23, thinks that the trip was taken by Šura-hammu.

Note XXIII : 42 (18.v) : clothing taken out from Dariš-libur's control to give to PN, in Zurubban, “when they dredged the Khabur.” The activity probably provided the name for one of Zimri-Lim's formulae which may now be regarded as coeval with “Census.” Another opinion is offered by G. Bardet, XXIII, pp. 40-41.

24. On the festival dedicated to Dīretum, see Birot, RA 66 (1972), 134-136; Sasson *Jones Festschrift*, 129f.

25. On kuru-ilim, see XVI/1, sub Guru-Addu. The reading Guru-ilim follows Durand's suggestion. The oaths during the year “Addu of Mahanum” may have been connected with Zimri-Lim's battles on Babylons side; (XXIII 86 -12.xi; 235 - ? ? [same year ?]; 236 - ? ?; VIII : 88 -24.xii; perhaps also IX : 291).

On the cult of Dīretum at Dēr, see Birot, RA 66 (1972), 134-136; Sasson, *Jones Festschrift*, 129ff.

On extensive sacrifices at Mari and nearby shrines during 4 months of an unknown year, see the dossier compiled by B. Lafont, XXIII, 231-251.

Can we detect any immediate palace preparations for these voyages of the king ? Here, we must pay attention to the formulae which indicate the purpose of the documents under examination. Particularly relevant terminology associated with transfer of material goods are : ZI.GA, which indicate the withdrawal of goods from storage, and ŠU.TI.A PN *itti* PN, which reflect the direction of the transfer. We can observe that the trips registered as :

E.2 (3.iii) was preceded by outlays of water bottles (XVIII : 46, -1.iii; XXI : 301, -3.iii);

E.4 (16.v) took place in the midst of a very busy season of greeting guests and preparing for family festivities (see below, and XXIII, pp. 17-21);

E.6 (11.vi) required that ceremonial (sacrificial) gold knife be dispatched for the king;

E.7 (24.vii) occurred just after the *kinūnum* festival (see below). We have seen above that outlays for preparing weapons and chariotry occupied artisans during 12-17.vii;

E.8 (21.ix) occurred as the *tēbibtum* was under way. Additionally gifts were being readied for Šarraya of Razama (XXII : 253, two days later);

E.9 (16-19.xi) took place as the *tēbibtum* was still in progress.

We can next try to collate the king's movement during "Šamaš with occasions that are cultic or ceremonial :

**Table F : CULTIC OCCASIONS DURING "ŠAMAŠ"**

[c. = clothing, f. = food, g. = grain, k./M = king in Mari, o. = oil, t. = tallow, w. = wool]

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Text</i>	<i>Context</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
1.	20.i	XXIII : 418	t. <i>ana li-KI-ba-tim ša a.gàr inūma šarrum išram imhuru</i>	cf. H.1; much tallow at this time
2.	6.ii	M.10616	f. <i>ana niš ilim</i>	k./M (IX : 219)
3.	7.ii	XI : 108	f. <i>ana taqribtim</i>	k./M (IX : 219)
4.	16.ii	XII : 192	f. <i>kispum</i> of k. + <i>ana maliki</i>	k./M (XI : 70). H.3-5
5.	1.iv	XII : 209	o. <i>kispum</i> + <i>ana maliki</i>	k./M (XI : 81)
6.	19.iv	RA 69,27	bathing of gods	k./M, 20th (XII : 213). "Šamaš"?
7.	?iv	XXIII : 463	f. <i>ana pūdim ša</i> <sup>d</sup> [PN?]	on <i>pūdim</i> , cf. XXIII, pp. 386-387
8.	2.v	XXIII : 9 ≅ XXIII : 11	c. <i>inūma zammērim</i>	H.14
9.	7.v	XII : 223	f. <i>ana taqribtim</i>	k./M
10.	17.v	M.7112	w. <i>inūma zammērim</i>	cf. E.4; H.21
11.	17.v	XXIII : 22	c. <i>ana PN nin.d.ra inūma hu-li-li</i>	E.4
13.	9.vii	XXIII : 350 ≅ 490 : 1-4	o. <i>pašaš LÚ.LÚ.M. inūma kinūn b.ekal.</i>	k./M (XI : 99 -10.vii)
14.	14.vii	XXIII : 26	c. to ♀; <i>inūma zammērim</i>	H.29; k./M (XII : 243)
15.	16.vii	XII : 244	f. <i>kispum</i>	k./M (XI : 102)
16.	?vii	XXIII : 351	o., bathing of gods <i>inūma si-[x x]-im</i>	

*An overview of one year in Mari*

17.	1.ix	XI : 112	g. <i>ana paššur dumqi</i>	k./M <sup>?</sup> ; XI : 98 (30.viii) and M.10230 (3.ix)
18.	9.x	XI : 64	g. <i>ana taqribtim</i>	k./M
19.	1.xi	XII : 156	o. <i>kispum</i>	k./M, <i>MARI</i> 2, 196 <sup>10</sup>
20.	1.xii	XII : 173 = IX : 214 : vi : 14-22	f. <i>kispum, ana malikī</i> (in XII : 173)	k./M on 30.xi (XII : 172)
21.	2.xii	XII : 174	f. <i>ana zurā'im</i>	cf. IX : 214 : vi : 23-26
22.	17.xii	XI : 68	f. <i>inūma kila'ūtim</i>	k./M (XII : 181 -16th; M.10213 -17th)
23.	17.xii	XVIII : 42	gifts, same celeb.	cf. <b>Table G.16</b>
24.	30.xii	XII : 188	f. <i>ana tu'imātim ša é mí.din-</i> <i>gir m.</i>	may not be cultic
25.	2. ?	XXIII : 46	c. to gods	for festival ?

This roster has to be allocated to different categories of cultic occasions. Few of these dates can be allocated to festivals specifically to honor the gods : **F. 13** (honoring Bēlet-ekalli -9.vii), **F.6, 16** (the bathing of the gods -19.iv; ? .vii). But these moments, too, seem to have incorporated festivities of “private” nature. Thus, Durand has recently made a good case for locating the consecration of prince Yaggid-Lim around this time (*MARI*, 3, 133-135).<sup>26</sup> Indeed, it may well be that **F.17** (*paššur dumqi*) and the various *inūma zammērim* as well as the *inūma kila'ūtim* entries may have to be deleted from our list, although the conjunction of the last two with festive gatherings may indicate that holy days were at stake. **F.21** (food *ana zurā'im*) cannot be fully defined as yet, while **F.24** may be an end of the year festival.<sup>27</sup>

The entries that remain in this list find the king involved in two types of activities. Some of these may have required the presence of the gods, e.g. **F.1** (*inūma šarrum išram imhuru*) and possibly also **F.7** (*ana pūdim ša* <sup>d</sup>[ ]), if it can be connected with the undated XXIII : 436, a text which comes closest to suggesting that the *marzeah* institution known in the West Semitic world (and especially Ugarit) was available to Mari.

The remaining documents within this category involve the king in memorial ceremonies whose cultic nature cannot be questioned. They also indicate that during “Šamaš” the king’s presence at Mari is certain for the *kispum* ceremonies. Talon has concluded as much in his recent study (AIPHOS 22 [1978], 64). We should note, however, that the bulk of the information we now have about this commemoration for the departed has come from the “peaceful” years, e.g. “Census” and “Dur-Yahdullim”; during the years in which Zimri-Lim was campaigning, we have little information about the *kispum* during large chunks of time.<sup>28</sup> Similar positions can be

26. *MARI* 3, 133-135. Zimri-Lim may have had two sons, one of whom, Yahdun-Lim, apparently died young (Dossin, *Syria* 20, 106). The festivities may have been connected with the weaning of the child, an event which, as we know from other Near Eastern folk, occurred when a child was anywhere between 3 and 5 years of age.

27. As suggested in the *Jones Festschrift*, 135-136. On the *zammērum* occasions, see now G. Bardet, *XXIII*, pp. 18-19, and J.-M. Durand, *MARI* 3, 136. Note the connection between these occasions and the outlays of gift [**Table H**] destined to (visiting) monarchs.

The *kila'ūtim* can take place in the *hosh* (É) of important individuals. *XXII* : 276 : i.36-42.

28. See the table drafted by P. Talon in his AIPHOS article, p. 72. We have information, however, on food offering “*ana malikī*” from iv and x “Hatta,” on *nīš ilim* ceremonies from i-ii, “Benyaminites,” and on *taqribatum* festivities from ix-x of the same year.

maintained with regard to *nīš ilim* and *taqribtum* ceremonies, since these appear to be strongly linked to the *kispum* memorials.<sup>29</sup>

One final tabulation may bear on the movement of the king during a specific year. It lists recording of gifts exchanged between the king and leaders from various capitals or their representatives.<sup>30</sup> The assumption is that at some moments when such transfers are said to occur *in Mari* — as contrasted to the time when they take place elsewhere —<sup>31</sup> the king may have had either to be in his capital or to travel to one of his towns (either Terqa or Appan) in order to receive the dignitaries and acknowledge their “gifts.” But because I sense some shift in pattern between the reception of such goods and their disbursement, it is best to enter the information into separate tables.

**Table G : INCOMING GIFTS DURING “ŠAMAŠ”**

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Text</i>	<i>From (PN)</i>	<i>Of (GN)</i>	<i>Contents</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
1.	20.i	XXIV.186	Amud-pi-El	Qatna	clothing	<b>F.1/H.1,7</b>
2.	2.iii	XXIV.107	Yarim-Lim-Yamhad	copper	<b>E.2</b>	
3.	7.iv	XXIII : 225	PN <sub>1,2</sub>	merchants	clothing	
4.	28.iv	VII : 237	Yarim-Lim	Yamhad	vases...	”Beny.” <sup>?</sup>
6.	16.vi	M.8994	Aplahanda	Carchemish	clothing	<b>F.12/H.30</b>
7.	18.vi	XVIII : 41	Yarim-Lim	Yahruru <sup>?</sup>	clothing	
8.	7.vii	M.6109	Haya-Sumu	Ilaṣura	bow	in Terqa <sup>?</sup>
9.	7.vii	XXII : 113	Yarim-Lim	Yahruru <sup>?</sup>	clothing	cf. 1. 15
10.	15.vii	M.12102	?	?	vases...	<b>F.14-15</b>
11.	24.viii	XXIII : 575	Amud-pi-El	Qatna	chariotry	cf. XXI : 255 (“Census”)
12.	15.ix	M.7132	Dahat-abim	Nazala	gold object	
13.	21.ix	M.10409	Hali-hadun	Upper Country	silver objects	<b>E.8 (Appan)</b>
14.	4.x	XXII : 288	Zina	Yamhad	haZQuru (metal <sup>?</sup> )	igi.lugal <b>F.18</b>
15.	10 <sup>?</sup> .xi-i	XXII : 125	Sin-mušallim <sup>32</sup>	Saggaratum	clothing	
16.	17.xii	XVIII : 42	Haya-Sumu Habdu-hanat	Ilaṣura (Rabban) <sup>33</sup>	bow wooden object	cf. <b>F.22,23</b>

29. The king travelled to Hanat the 28.vii “Dur-Yahdullim” (XI : 250; XXI : 110), to Dēr on the 29th (XII : 605), probably returning to Mari for the *nīš ilim* on the next day (XII : 206). Lafont’s recent study for XXIII (pp. 231-251) of a dossier that seems homogeneous indicates that the *nīš ilim* occasion may have been repeated as much as 3 times certain months. The relationship between this ceremony and the mass oath takings that are now better attested thanks to XXIII (cf. above, note 25) cannot be entertained here. One thing for certain, however, is that there cannot be direct linking between the two dossiers since the diviner Asqudum, who is prominent in the texts gathered by Lafont, had died before the year “Addu of Mahanum.”

30. See now Durand’s fine discussion of the terminology involved, ARMT XXI, 512-515.

31. See, as one example, the exciting dossier gathered by P. Villard on the king’s possible (probable<sup>?</sup>) voyage to Yamhad and Ugarit, XXIII, pp. 457-475; Sasson BA 47 (1984) 246-251.

32. On Sin-mušallim, see XXIII, p. 193. He was most likely transferring gifts that had reached him in Saggaratum.

33. Cf. XVI/1, s.v.; XXI : 11 : 12’. The identification is by no means assured, and Habdu-hanat may well be a well-known carpenter.

**Table H : DISBURSEMENT OF GIFTS DURING “ŠAMAŠ”**

[*dip.* = diplomat, *ch.* = chieftain, *k.* = king, *m.* = messenger, *off.* = official, *sug.* = *sugāgū* ]  
[*b.* = bow, *c.* = clothing, *ch.* = chariotry, *f.* = furniture, *s.* = silver, *t.* = textile, *v.* = vessels]

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Text</i>	<i>to PN</i>	<i>of GN</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Gift</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
1.	20.i	XVIII : 62	PN <sub>1-11</sub>	Andariq	LÚ <i>ša bilātim</i>	c.	XXI : 380 <sup>?</sup> <b>G.1/F.1</b>
2.	2.ii	XXI : 233	PN <sub>1-5</sub> +	Province	<i>off.</i>	v.	oath <sup>?</sup> <b>F.2</b>
3.	13.ii	XVIII : 63	Aqba-hammu	Andariq <sup>?</sup>	<i>dip.</i>	t.	<b>F.4</b> <sup>34</sup>
4.	16.ii	ibid.	Asirum	Amaz	<i>m.</i>	c.	ibid.
5.	16.ii	XXIV.187	Zabug	Amaz	<i>m.</i>	c.	ibid.
6.	16.iii	XXIII : 41	Aqba-Hammu	Andariq <sup>?</sup>	<i>dip.</i>	t.	month stay <sup>1</sup>
7.	16.iii	ibid.	Hammi-šagis	Qatna	<i>m.</i>	ch./ t.	
8.	6.iv	XXIII : 21	Numušda-anha	?	?	c.	
9.	9.iv	XXIII : 20 ≅ XXIII : 21	Haya-Addu	Šamdadum	<i>sug.</i>	c./b.	
10.	10.iv	XXIII : 21	Aham-arši	Babyl.	<i>m.</i>	c.	
11.	10.iv	ibid.	Šamaš-mūšeziḅ	Babyl.	<i>m.</i>	c.	<sup>35</sup>
12.	10.iv	ibid.	Sangaya	Andariq	<i>m.</i>	c.	XXI : 380 : 8
13.	?iv	XXIV.188	Zimri-Addu	Mari	<i>m.</i>	c.	<sup>36</sup>
14.	2.v	XXIII : 12	Šuri-hammu	Amnanum	<i>ch.</i>	b.	
15.	5.v	XXI : 336	PN <sub>1-3</sub>	Sutu	<i>ch.</i> <sup>?</sup>	c.	
16.	10.v	XXIII : 34	PN <sub>1-2</sub>	Razama <sup>?</sup>	<i>m.</i>	c.	<sup>37</sup>
17.	12.v	XXIII : 13 ≅ XXIII : 15	ibid.	ibid.		c.	
18.	13.v	XXIII : 14 ≅ XXIII : 15	Pulhu-Addu	Ubrabu	<i>ch.</i>	c.	
19.	15.v	XXIII : 442 ≅ 443	Sibkuna-Addu	Šuda	<i>k.</i>	oil wor- ker	
20.	15.v	XXIII : 17	Buran	Šuda	<i>m.</i>	c.	<b>H.26</b>
21.	16.v	S.215.322 ≅ XVIII, p. 109	?	?	<i>k.</i>	c.	XXI : 338 <sup>?</sup>
22.	18.v	XXIII : 42	Yatarum	Han. <sup>?</sup>	<i>sug.</i> <sup>?</sup>	c.	8

34. To understand XVIII : 63's first lines, cf. ARMT XXI, 409, note 58bis. The text which suggested to him this reading is now published as XXIII : 41 (**H.6**).

35. Šamaš-mūšeziḅ may have arrived in Mari on 19.ii (cf. XXI : 406). Is the presence of Andariq and Babylon messengers an indication that a big campaign is about to begin?

36. "... when he went to Babylon." Obviously bearing gifts to Hammurabi, even as he conveyed Zimri-Lim's response.

37. See the comments of G. Bardet, XXIII, p. 36.

38. May be related to the Yatarum of XXI : 380 : 10.

23.	?v	XXI : 339	Yawi-erah Ili-nehim	Amnan. Yamin.	LÚ.TUR ibid.	c. b. <sup>39</sup>
24.	4.vii	XXII : 151	PN <sub>1-2</sub>	Suhu	<i>off.</i>	c.
25.	9.vii	ibid.	Bur-nunu	? <sup>40</sup>		c.
26.	?vii	ibid.	Buran	Suda <sup>1</sup>	<i>m.</i>	c.
27.	?vii	ibid.	PN <sub>1-5</sub>	Kurda <sup>41</sup>		c.
28.	?vii	ibid.	Yarkab-Addu	Yamhad	<i>m.</i>	c.
29.	12.vii	ibid.	Anu-harwi	Zalwar	<i>k.</i>	c./b.
30.	12 <sup>?</sup> .vi- i	XXI : 340	Qištima- <sup>d</sup> [ ]	Carchemish	<i>m.</i>	c. <sup>42</sup>
31.	26.vii	XXI : 342	Hammurabi	Babyl.	<i>k.</i>	c. <sup>43</sup>
32.	27.vii	XXIII : 90b	[PN <sub>1,2</sub> ]	?	<sup>44</sup>	c.
33.	27.vii	XXI : 278	Šura <sup>1</sup> - [hammu]	Amnan.	<i>ch.</i>	v./f.
34.	24.ix	XXII : 253	Šarraya	Razama	<i>k.</i>	v.

Compared to the list of incoming gifts which can be drawn from other date-years (e.g. “Benyaminites”), the roster of “official” presentations seems paltry indeed. It is very possible, of course, that our records are still incomplete. However, the fact that **Table G** contains documents from throughout the year “Šamaš” makes it likely that future additions will not be substantial. It is also possible, of course, that different interpretations will be advanced once the documents known to me from catalogue entries find publication. But if we expand this table by including even those fragmentary entries, it nevertheless remains striking how few items of substance seem to have been brought to Mari as gifts during “Šamaš.” And since the calendar of the king’s travel as drawn in **Table E** does not show him to have made foreign trips, the likelihood that he received gifts by meeting rulers “abroad” diminishes. Note too that during the last months of the year the king was probably too preoccupied with the census and its taking (**Table C**) to engage in major entertaining, although qualitatively the evidence in **G.12-16**, stemming from a period that is coeval with the census process, does not appreciably differ from the material drawn from previous months.

**G.4**, which may have to be dated from the year “Benyaminites,” mentions the Yamhadian couple, Yarim-Lim and Gašera, as well as a Yamhadian official Samsi-Addu.<sup>45</sup> If this document is indeed datable to “Šamaš,” their gifts may be in response to a large dispatch of tin which they had received a few months earlier (VII : 86 : 11-16 -21.xii. “Ašlakka”).<sup>46</sup> Talon will be publishing **G.2** which has Yamhad sending copper almost two months earlier. The Zinab who is mentioned a few months later as bringing almost 32 mana of *haZQuru*-metal ( ? ) was probably their envoy (**G.14**).

39. See also XXI : 370 (broken date). Yawi-Erah was Šuri-hammu’s servant. Ili-Nehim is known at this time to be liberating his wife and brother, XXIII : 76, 77 (cf. 421), and see below. Note the comments of P. Villard, XXIII, pp. 495-496.

40. Bur-Nunu may have been placed in this list purely for convenience’s sake, for he is a “hunter who brought a duck to the king.”

41. Of the “5 Habiru-men who arrived from Kurda,” 2 have Hurrian, 2 East Semitic names, with only one bearing a West Semitic name.

42. “*maratum*-clothing, (of/from) PN, when he came from Carchemish.” Durand understands differently the text, cf. XXI, pp. 452-453.

43. See below.

44. The text is broken but refers to outlays of clothing to 2 *girseggū* who came to Mari from somewhere.

45. See Durand’s conjectural collation, *Mari*, 2(1983), p. 94.

46. *Ibid.*, p. 77.

We can speculate similarly in the case of Aplahanda of Carchemish and his gift (G.6; cf. VII : 86 : 17-20 -21.xii “Ašlakka”). Qatna’s gifts include clothing (G.1); the chariot and (spare ?) parts sent on 24.viii may have been part of a “standing order,” since a year later Amud-pi-El sends a nearly identical gift (G.11). Haya-Sumu of Ilašura sends gifts twice over a 5-month span (G.8, 16). As husband to two of Zimri-Lim’s daughters, he could do no less; even if things were not too smooth among the sisters.<sup>47</sup> The Yarim-Lim of G.7 is likely to have been a chieftain of the Yahruru; this because of the modest nature of his gift.<sup>48</sup>

Likewise, it is interesting to survey the gifts that Mari disbursed (Table H). We have to be careful here and list only those persons who were not resident to the capital, although, in some cases, the dividing line between gifts to foreigners and supplies to provincial leaders is often difficult to demarcate. Nevertheless, a few matters may be broached :

1. Whereas we have attestations of disbursements from months i-iii, months iv, v and vii are the most richly documented, albeit with a gap for month vi. After that, practically silence ! It is very tempting, but likely very simplistic, to find a reason in the palace’s preoccupation with carrying out the *tēbibtum*.

2. As to the lack of information for month vi, I can only observe that during the six week period from 15.v to 4.vii are attested 3 travel occasions (E.4-6). We have noted that the reverse situation seems to obtain in the matter of *incoming gifts* (G.6-7).

3. Tables F.8-12 and H.14-23 combine to tell us that months iv-v, summertime during “Šamaš,” witnessed much activities. In fact, evidence marshalled by Bardet and Villard (XXIII, pp. 17-21; 476-503), impressively reconstruct the final acts of a great *šulḥa* that obtained between Zimri-Lim and his foes of a couple of year previous, the Benyaminites, who had come to battle Mari at the gate Sagaratim itself. Various tribal and clan leaders came during these months in order to partake of Zimri-Lim’s hospitality and to liberate family members who were captured by Mari. In one striking case, a lieutenant of the tribal chieftain Šura-hammu, a man by the name of Ili-nehim (H.23), succeeded in obtaining releases of a wife and a sister (XXIII : 76, 77) who were captured by one of Zimri-Lim’s commanders, Yassi-Dagan (cf. XXIII : 421). Ili-nehim’s wife may have been parcelled as booty to Zimri-Lim himself, and the king showed his munificence by releasing her *gratis* !

4. The occasions in which foreign kings, as distinguished from tribal leaders, who received gifts from Mari are few in numbers. Sibkuna-Addu of Šuda is given (lent ?) an oil presser (H.19), a rather peculiar gift to a staunch ally who had aided in the battle against the very Benyaminites who were now being feted. His own diplomat, Buran, visited Zimri-Lim for at least a couple of months (H.20, 26). The name of the king who is to receive the clothing dispatched on 16.v (H.21) has not been published yet.

But the most intriguing piece of information, however, is found within H.31. It records items of clothing and shoes from Kaphtor “which Bahdi-Lim took to Hammurabi of Babylon, but which they returned here; *ša ana šēr KN LUGAL GN PN ūbilma uterrūnim*” [for construction, see AbB I : 61 : 8’-11’]. Where we to take Bahdi-Lim’s action literally, the future (?) palace attendant had gone to Babylon on a diplomatic mission and taken along these items as gifts.<sup>49</sup> When and why did he go, we cannot tell. We cannot be sure that the trip itself occurred during “Šamaš.” We can only note that at one point in his career, Bahdi-Lim did correspond directly with Babylon in behalf of his king (VI : 18, 51, 53).

The involvement of the king in purely personal transactions can be lightly noted here, although it is not my intention here to distinguish between undertakings private in nature (i.e. Zimri-Lim acting for his personal gain) and royal in purpose (i.e. Zimri-Lim acting on behalf of the state). The matter is difficult to resolve and I can only tentatively suggest that relatively scarce goods — e.g. tin, precious metals and stones, elaborate outfits of clothing, compound bows —

47. Durand offers the latest assessment of the situation in *MARI* 3(1984), 162-171.

48. Durand, *ibid*, 137-138.

49. In XXI, p. 455, Durand renders : “[clothing:] ce que chez Hammu-rabi, le roi de Babylone, Bahdi-Lim devait porter, que l’on a retourné...” His scenario, which implies that materials were taken out of stock and given to Bahdi-Lim before cancellation of his trip, is plausible but appears to me to presume inordinate efficiency on the part of the palace’s bureaucrats.

may help to establish the status of those to whom they are destined. Therefore, whenever I read of such products moving in out of Mari, for the time being I presume that they are destined for the highest official of the land, the king, and for his immediate family. Into this category, it may be possible may be placed transactions which either originate or ends into the *pisan šarrim*, a term which may be rendered "ROYAL ACCOUNT."<sup>50</sup> Among the fund-raising activities for the king's private coffers during "Šamaš" are the ransoming of prisoners, an activity which has been ably studied by Villard (XXIII, especially, pp. 501-503). As he indicates, the amount of cash raised served to make purchases of raw materials (wool, alum, tin), and these may well have been processed to create the finished products needed for the extensive exchanges of gifts that obtained among royalties and their immediate entourage.

Likewise, the king's private control may have extended to the cash and cattle raised by payments of silver from individual purchasing the rights to represent the king in outlying villages. The dossier regarding the sale of *sugāgūtum* -rights is yet to be published, but for the year "Šamaš," it will include M.11558 [15.vii], 11708 [16.x], 11198 [19.x], the dates of which may connect them with the *tēbibtum* activities.<sup>51</sup>

The last remarks do not contain information of immediate relevance to the matter of the king's presence at Mari during one year of his reign. Because it is most difficult to link the epistolary archives to specific moments of Zimri-Lim's life, the effects of the king's presence upon the palace and its organization remain conjectural. We have followed Zimri-Lim's movements by means of circumstantial evidence; we have located him at various cultic and ceremonial activities; we have had him involved in taking the census of his kingdom. From these, we have been able to substantiate the contention that "Šamaš" was a relatively peaceful year for Zimri-Lim. The bureaucrats, therefore, were left to accomplish their task of supplying the palace and of directing its day-to-day tasks in relative tranquility. Their own activities during "Šamaš" will have to be investigated on a future occasion.

---

50. See for now ARMT IX, pp. 311-312; XVIII, p. 177.

51. T. 46 [2.viii] and 21 [24.xi], may likewise belong here.