

Two Recent Works on Mari

Author(s): Jack M. Sasson

Source: *Archiv für Orientforschung*, 27. Bd. (1980), pp. 127-135

Published by: Archiv für Orientforschung (AfO)/Institut für Orientalistik

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41636423>

Accessed: 23-05-2016 18:33 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Archiv für Orientforschung (AfO)/Institut für Orientalistik is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Archiv für Orientforschung*

Two Recent Works on Mari

By Jack M. Sasson (Chapel Hill)

Archives royales de Mari, X: Correspondance féminine. Transcrite et traduite par Georges Dossin, avec la collaboration de André Finet. 300 pp. Paris, Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1978. FF. 250,00.

Edward Noort, *Untersuchungen zum Gottesbescheid in Mari. Die «Mari prophetie» in der alttestamentlichen Forschung.* x, 159 pp. (Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 202). Kevelaer, Butzon & Bercker und Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, 1977. DM 50,—.

Within recent memory, a publication of syllabic cuneiform documents can scarcely be recalled which has evoked as much interest, comments, and interpretation as Georges Dossin's 1967 edition of ARM X. The handsomely copied letters, 179 in all, were unusual not only because they comprised the largest corpus of correspondence to and from females coming from any restricted period of ancient Near Eastern history, but because among them were a number of letters which practically doubled the body of Mari material dealing with 'prophetic' themes. Normally, academic ethics would have encouraged the scholarly world to await the editor's own transcription and translation, if not his interpretation, of these texts before partaking of their riches. But ARM X proved to be too full of assyriological details that whetted the appetite of the linguist, too exciting in its promise for the historian of religion, too enticing for those who were assessing the role of women in ancient societies; in short ARM X attracted so powerfully that academic conventions were skirted. At least two volumes appeared, those of Römer, AOAT 12, 1971, and of Batto, 1974, together with about a dozen articles treating basically assyriological matters; another two monographs, those of Ellermeier and Huffmon, both published in 1968, and scores of papers, investigated the Mari 'prophecies' and their import for the development of Hebraic prophetic traditions. Noort's volume, treated below, is the third volume to be included in this last category. In this twofold review, we consider it first.

Noort has combed the primary literature and collected 28 examples from Mari which could loosely be termed prophetic either in form, substance or function. To be sure, these texts incorporate a wide variety of religious experiences, ranging from ecstatic revelations to dream visions. One text, A. 222, classified by Noort as 'unpublished' had in fact already been presented *in toto* by Dossin in RA 69 (1975), 28—30. Moreover, Dossin dates that particular text to the Yaḥdun-Lim period, which, if proven correct, would make it the earliest of all other examples. Noort's files on Mari's religious life, a spot check reveals, are well nigh complete (add Annunitum in X: 8, p. 53). But his careful listing of the occasion in which deities, mostly associated with 'prophetic' activities, appear in the Mari texts (pp. 53ff.), is now superseded by the appearance of ARM XVI/1 (M. Birot, J.-R. Kupper, O. Rouault, *Répertoire analytique* (2^e volume), première partie: *Noms Propres*. Paris, Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1979). Noort's assembling of secondary materials, up until the time of his book's publication, is so respectably complete that this review will try to lighten its own burden by citing completely only items which are not listed on pp. 111—132: Within that bibliography a couple of entries are either incompletely or inaccurately given (e. g. Heintz's 5th item, McDonald's only entry; Sasson's 1st) but these are easily corrected by checks and balances whenever any subject is pursued further. Noort's translations cannot be regarded as independently arrived at, but follow those of the most respected authorities (but cf., e. g. p. 78's III: 40: 16—18 and note CAD's reading, K, 198; read the DN in n. 1 of p. 62 as *ma'-aḥ* (rather than BAḤ)). The volume contains very few typos (e. g. p. 105, n. 1 middle: *byśr'l*), is pleasantly arranged, and, despite the smallish typeset, is easily readable. The indices are very useful, allowing the reader quick reference to items of interest. The price is tolerable.

Noort's study is densely packed, with footnotes rivaling the text in complexity of argu-

mentation and in richness of details. After an «introduction», the author establishes criteria for pursuing his task of analysing those Mari texts commonly regarded as 'prophetic'. These criteria have been often recalled by previous researchers, and include: 1. queries concerning the (non)spontaneity of the divine message; 2. the place in the Mari pantheon of the deities involved in prophetic messages; 3. details of the message's contents; 4. the terminology associated with the recipients of the message; 5. the rank, sex, and place of the message carriers within Mari society (oddly enough scant attention is paid to prosopography, and (too) much to their title); and 6. the role, if any, that these played in the cult. A section (pp. 35–52) tries to deal with the archaeological setting whence came our texts and where worship of the various gods took place. Though commendable as an object of interest, it is really doubtful whether these pages contribute much to the topic at hand.

Utilizing the criteria he has established and his analyses of individual 'prophetic' texts, Noort asks whether a uniform type of prophecy could be found at Mari, and whether that which we do have could be compared with the prophetic experience in Israel. It is upon Noort's perspective and upon his scepticism over the profit to be had by comparing Mari to Biblical prophecy that I would like to dwell a bit longer.

That ancient Hebrews lived in a cultural vacuum can hardly be conceded nowadays. Israel and Judah, as the OT testifies, constantly strove to be accepted among their neighbors. Even when they sought to retain the (religious) traditions which they regarded as characteristically theirs, they nevertheless adopted and adapted much from superior civilizations. Much better aware of the debt that Israel owes its neighbors, thanks to the wealth of epigraphic materials which the decipherments of the 19th century have placed within easy access, Biblical scholarship has mirrored this tension between integrity and integration. On the one hand, scholars are constantly promoting materials to 'parallel' those from the Bible; on the other, they are eager to retain and explain those individual traits, unavailable to other societies, which have allowed Israel's heritage to endure. Since, in general, Biblical scholars are not disposed, either because of training or predilection, to give much credit to the Talmudic thinkers for transforming a basically levantine

culture into one that transcended regional characterizations, Ancient Near Eastern texts have been called upon to define Israel's uniqueness. In the past half century, especially since the discovery of Ugarit, Nuzi and Mari, this movement to establish Israel's dependence on its contemporaries as well as to locate its iconoclastic tendencies, has followed cycles, or more precisely, spirals, that are quite predictable.

Typically, these cycles/spirals find their beginning in an announcement or a rumor that a well stocked archive has been found in such-and-such a place and that its discoverers are wont to date it to the Bronze Age. Unverifiable statements are reported to the effect that personal, place, or divine names, closely resembling Biblical ones, occur among the documents. One or two OT scholars — characteristically Americans, since it is among them that historical (better: historicizing) consciousness seems most highly developed — clamor for publication of evidence. The cycle/spiral reaches its apogee when, with the publication of texts selected precisely because of their OT 'parallels', impressive and apparently firm evidence of interrelationship or dependence is drawn, to the satisfaction of a large number of Biblical scholars. The publication of a larger corpus of materials from that site, however, begins the swing toward the perigee of the spiral; for the availability of a larger number of such documents now permits not only the establishment of more precise contexts for the previously published selections, but it allows the assyriologists to begin shaping a civilization in all its uniqueness and to explore its characteristics which often are unmatched even among those cultures that are nearer in time and space. Moreover, the publication of a larger body of texts allows the philologist to develop meanings for a terminology that had been superficially linked to Biblical equivalents. In other words, what occurs at this stage is a recognition, articulated or otherwise, that, by virtue of narrow selectivity, the early evidence from a particular site had been *biblicized* and that, consequently, the conclusions thus derived had been severely distorted. While in some circles, either because of pietistic positions or because of time-lag in appreciating the assyriologists' contributions, the early, often sensational, propositions are maintained a bit longer, responsible Biblical scholarship ends up by assessing its gains in modest terminology.

Noort's book can be placed squarely within this last phase of the spiral. His conclusions will no doubt be accepted by a majority of Biblical scholars. But even as he wrote in 1975 and is now read, the focus of attention had shifted from Mari to places further northwest, and closer to Israel's borders. With the discovery of Ebla, the spiral had begun its steady climb to a new apogee . . .

This gloomily — if not cynically — stated account of Biblical-Ancient Near East connections is given not to deride the enterprise, for — as noted above — some benefit is ultimately born by these transactions, but to urge that some goals be set up *before* plunging into comparative undertakings. In the matter of Mari prophecy, even at its earliest date when, during the forties, Jean and Dossin published documentation which could be construed as relevant to the Biblical materials of the same genre, a number of questions could have been posed which would have alerted scholarship to the complexity of the problem.

1. *What is the purpose of the inquiry?* Is it to say that kings consulted the gods before they set out on martial journeys? Is it to prove that the clergy of an individual city-state thought it imperative that the gods be involved in any major political decisions facing the rulers? But we already had evidence of such activities, mostly from the first millennium, from Israel's immediate as well as distant neighbors. Is it that Mari projected such concern further into the past than previous documentation? But is this such an overriding discovery that its ramifications are to be restricted only to comparison between Israel and Mari?

2. *What are the differences in contexts?* Was the inquirer interested in establishing whether those involved in prophetic texts were priestly or laity? But if so, it is remarkable how few scholars bothered with prosopographical detailings and remained content with accepting titles — or their absence —, mentioned in each text under study, as evidence to be tested against that derived from the Old Testament. But this approach ignores the fluidity of positions that is clearly recognizable in the Mari archives [cf. the conclusions of Rouault's excellent study of Mukannišum, ARMT XVIII, and, in the matter of a particular 'prophet', cf. below, *sub* 7: 6]. Even more troubling is the fact that the comparisons are made among texts belonging to radically different genres

and preserved in a radically different mode of communication. Those of Mari are derived from epistolary archives, written in the heat of the moment, so to speak. The Biblical ones, even when dependent, in terms of time-setting and vocabulary, on «authentic» formulations, were preserved by an audience which found in their alternate warnings and promises powerfully persuasive arguments by which to achieve redemption and salvation. In their selectivity and survival within the OT canon, the Biblical prophecies can scarcely be compared with those of Mari; the latter having been haphazardly stored, along with documents of varying types and importance, in rooms which saw much daily activity [cf. my remarks in *Iraq*, 34 (1972), 55–67]. Their own recovery depends on the fortune of the spade wielder. Furthermore, the events which an individual prophecy in the OT uses as backdrop were not established by the Biblical historiographer strictly on historical development, but were also shaped under didactic and religious considerations. In the case of Mari, since that task was never entrusted to palace thinkers, we are left to speculate on the historical occasion which necessitated each and every divine pronouncement.

3. Finally, questions will have to be entertained concerning the language used in the respective prophecies: *Can one presume that etymological kinship in specific vocabulary and formulaic equivalence in idiomatic usage* — items upon which a goodly amount of Bible-Mari parallelisms centers [cf. Noort, pp. 24–32; 69–82] — *are necessarily useful as means by which to compare prophecies separated in time and space?* Two separate issues can be presented here, the first of which, moreover, is two-pronged and concerns the contents of the Mari 'prophetic' document.

(a) Assyriologists have often observed that even in the corpora of documents which stem from the same period but from different sites, technical terminology and bureaucratic religious titles sometimes bear appreciably different nuances. With regards to Mari, because its chancellery and scribal schools seem to yield much more commonly than their southern equivalents to West Semiticisms, this technical vocabulary is not always fixed. Consequently, the same terms and titles, as is demonstrable in a few cases, can convey slightly different meanings or functions. This observation is worth keeping in mind for yet another reason.

Some of the letters which are placed within the corpus of Mari «prophecy» did not originate in Mari, but in other localities. Thus, even when similar vocabulary is encountered in all the texts at our disposal, we have to bear in mind that scribal traditions in those areas may have differed sharply from Mari's.

(b) The other matter concerning textual contents is a bit more hypothetical in its framing, but might yet be worth placing in this agenda of inquiry. There is a good possibility, as suggested by our documentation, that Mari's citizenry spoke a West Semitic language which, for convenience' sake, we might call «Amorite». The epistolary archives upon which our information on Mary prophecy is based, were written, as almost all other examples from that site, in Akkadian. One might assume that whenever the gods felt moved to contact their human flock, they used a language that was understandable to it: Amorite. We therefore must take into consideration that all those messages which we study so carefully are, in effect, *translations* made by scribes; translations which moreover might be perpetuating the style and formulae not so much of the divine messages themselves, but of the scribal schools and their traditions. Whether the scribes at the receiving end felt it necessary to *retranslate* into the original Amorite when reading before the king is yet one more complication that might have affected the transmission of the message.

The second of these issues is concerned with the completeness of the divine message as reported in any of the Mari texts. In my comments to ARMT X: 8, (below), I try to show that the divine message and its recipient are by no means the only ones to receive attention from those charged with responding to the god's wishes. In our case, at least three other personalities are involved in communicating that message — but, interestingly enough, *not* its original recipient. It should also be noted that three distinct exemplars of that message, written over two different days, reach the king, and that, it is very possible, an emissary ready to communicate the same message *orally* (in Amorite?) reached the same destination. In view of all this, it seems unlikely to suppose that the text, over which modern scholarship pores to extract information for comparison with the Biblical prophetic traditions, is complete in its recording of the divine message, or that we shall ever be in a position to reconstruct in its entirety, and recover in its full

power, any single prophetic revelation from Mari. For that to be achieved, cassette recorders would have had to be invented centuries before our time.

* * *

But meanwhile the task of the historian is still to try to reconstruct as complete a picture of an ancient civilization as possible. Mari, with a large and variegated documentation, spanning but a couple of generations of the early 18th century B. C., comes closer than most other city-states in allowing the researcher to fulfill this enterprise. As of this writing, hundreds of letters, and administrative and legal documents have been published. We have been most fortunate that their presentation reaches us, under the auspices of the ARMT series, in a welcome pre-digested form. Georges Dossin has been responsible, either individually or cooperatively, for almost every one of these volumes. It is pleasure to greet his latest effort, ARMT X. Ably aided in his task by Finet, Dossin has given his readers a work which, once more, underscores the benefits to be gained when a veteran of Mari scholarship offers his opinions on even the most intractable of passages.

The volume follows the successful formula of its predecessors in the series. Brief summaries of each text are given by way of introduction (pp. 1—18). The texts themselves are given in transliterations and, in facing pages, in translations. Notes are provided at the end, pp. 252—287, with which to support difficult renderings or to propose plausible solutions. A bonus includes indices of personal, place, and divine names as well as a listing of a selected vocabulary (pp. 288—299). In view of the heavy utilization of ARM X, it is nevertheless remarkable how often ARMT offers fresh — and persuasive — readings and proposals for translations [e. g. at 29: 9; 28: 4; 31: 15—16; 41: 4'—9'; 42: 8'—12'; 69: 7, 9; 74: 25; 79: 8; 84: 23, 26; 97: 11—12; 121: 6; 139: 10—14]. There are, to be sure, examples in which arguable offerings are promoted [e. g. at 30: 6, 10; 31: 9, *passim*; 37: 27—29; 46: 13'; 53: 12—13; 55: 17—20; 56: 11; 60: 19; 73: 8; 90: 37; 94: 6—7; 111: 15—16; 118: tr. 3—4]. One can but be grateful for having a debate launched even in these last instances. In the few examples offered below, I hope that Messieurs Dossin and Finet would find testimony to the interest which their work has evoked.

[Below, the following abbreviations are observed: Batto = B. F. Batto, *Studies on Women at Mari*, Baltimore, 1974; Moran = W. L. Moran, «New Evidence from Mari on the History of Prophecy», *Biblica* 50 [1969], 15ff.; Römer = W. H. Ph. Römer, *Frauenbriefe über Religion* ... (AOAT 12), Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1971.]

1: 12. Are we dealing with a deity Ištara-danna? [also in X: 87; cf. J. J. M. Roberts, VT 21 (1971), 246 who mentions Ištara-danna]; l. 22. Room for ... *be-li* / *li-ih-d[u]*; *sub* notes (p. 252) to l. 3. A. 3151 v: 25 reads *ga-bi-ya'-tum*. A *ga-bi-tum* (female?) occurs in RA 64 (1970), p. 36, No. 32: 2 [Also Sumu-Yamam period.]

2: 6. This is probably the same name as the one read *ma-an-na-še*, cf. XVI/1, 149.

3. Kunšimatum is a good example of a person who survived the leadership transitions, retaining an important place in the administration. I doubt Batto's hypothesis, that she was a wife of Yasmah-Adad. For further listing of her name, see XVI/1, 141 2° + 3°; l. 19. [*di-na-am/di-nam*] *ú-ša-ḥa-az-ma*, «I shall try them» (the context suggests a legal matter is at stake); rev. On slander and its vocabulary, see JESHO, 20 (1977), 110—112; 5'. *ri-i[t]-ti-im-ma-a' iṣ-ba-at*, and cf. ALM § 101d (p. 283); 6'—8'. ... «he promotes before you calumnies against me»; 16'. Either *bu-[ul-li-ī]* or *bu-[li-ī]*; 18'. Note unusual *an-na-tu-um* (cf. GAG § 45a).

4. ARMT offers many readings and interpretations which differ from previous attempts (bibliography on p. 252); l. 6. The search is still on for a proper reading and understanding of the first (2) sign(s); Lines 6'—11' of the Mari text treated by Nougayrol, JCS 21 (1967), 229—232 [A. 4222], are reminiscent of the type of questions raised in this letter. That text, however, is datable to Zimri-Lim's last years on the throne. Further, see X: 177: 8ff.

5: 2. *sŠi-<ma?>-tu[m* ... (a typo!). On the sender and the political circumstances, see JCS 25 (1973), 69—72; l. 31. AHw, 917a (D 1b) restores *-šu* after *bu-*; l. 35. *ih'-ḥi-id*; cf. Moran's review of ARMT [forthcoming, JAOS]: [*i*]'*-ḥi-id*; l. 40. AM.MA is not likely to be a «pseudo-sumérogramme» (p. 253). Read perhaps ŠEŠ-*ma*.

In the dated texts from Mari, Ḥaya-Sumu's activities are charted during the 4 years sequence which ends about 6 years before Zimri-Lim's demise [Throne of Šamaš, Census, Dūr Yaḥdun-Lim, and Ḥatta]. Those of Sima-ilahanem (or however the name is to be read) are attested during Zimri-Lim's last years; cf. Birot, RA 66 (1972), 131—139.

6: 9, 11, 1'. It should be emphasized that the restorations here, which would implicate Hammurapi of Babylon, are extremely tentative.

7: 6. Šelibum is known as an *assinnum* in X: 80: 4 and as a *šangûm*-priest in VII: 180: iv: 34' [cf., further, XVI/1, 196]. This is more likely to

indicate a fluidity in title or appellation, likewise found in the administration and the bureaucracy, than a reflection on Šelibum's rise in ecclesiastical circles. If the same man is at stake here, it might also indicate that the first term may not indicate a 'eunuch', since it is unlikely that those cut out for that position could be rendered whole for the latter one. [Bibliography on *assinnum* in Noort, p. 70, n. 1.] The reverse movement is as unlikely; l. 22, end, could be restored on the basis of 8: 14 as *ú-ma-a[l-la]*, despite the presence of *ú* in 8: 15.

8. Together with VI: 45, this text shows the complex routes taken before prophetic materials are placed before the king:

- a. The message of Annunitum of Mari reaches Aḥatum, Dagan-malik's girl;
- b. Aḥatum reports it to the *šangûm* Aḥum;
- c. The same day Aḥum:
 - i. takes hair and fringes,
 - ii. writes down the message on a tablet (VI: 45),
 - iii. takes the tablet, hair and fringes to Baḥdi-Lim;
- d. Baḥdi-Lim dispatches the tablet, hair and fringes to the king.
- e. The next day, Aḥum goes to Šibtu and repeats the message (orally?);
- f. Šibtu writes the message on a tablet and dispatches it with (more) hair and fringes. It is possible that Aḥum is sent along with the message.

Thus Zimri-Lim ends up receiving: 1. letter of Aḥum (from Baḥdi-Lim); 2. Baḥdi-Lim's own letter, together with hair and fringes; 3. Letter of Šibtu — with message —, together with (more) hair and fringes; 4. possibly also Aḥum.

This seemingly very cumbersome process is not merely an indication of a bureaucracy gone to extremes (on which cf. also *Iraq* 34 (1972), 55—67) but also that, in dire times, as clearly indicated by the contents of the messages at stake, elaborate means are established by the governors to make sure that the governed are not exacerbating, deliberately or otherwise, tensions and contributing to the aura of instability that besets any authority that is fighting for survival. Socio-anthropologists have spoken of this contest between «structure» and «anti-structure» as occurring between the secular and religious authorities under conditions that seem to obtain at Mari of the Zimri-Lim period. See, generally, Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*, Chicago, 1969 and his collection of essays *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*, Ithaca, N. Y. 1974.

9. I have studied this text, offering different renderings and translations in some crucial contexts, in a paper, «An Apocalyptic Vision from Mari?»: Speculations on ARM X: 9», appearing in the first issue of the *Cahiers de Mari* [= *Syria*].

10: 10. Note that a reading ŠĀ.BA is attested in XIII: 45: 13; (Or should one read *ba-ma* there also?).

11: 6. ARMT's explanation, p. 254, for *šalmū* (m. pl.) does not take into account the form *šalmā* (f.) found in X: 10: 4; l. 21. With Römer, p. 42, n. 2, we may translate: «Only in tribute will he come to term with my lord».

12: 29. Printing error: add } after *-{nu}*; l. 34. *šja ip-tu-ú?* How does one seal with the 'leather strips' of a seal?

15. Ascribing this letter to Šimatum is indeed plausible. Note that Kirum, her sister and rival for their common husband's affection, is also involved in the cult (cf. X: 113: 20—22 and Batto, 128—129).

16. R. Glaeseman, *apud* Y. Al-Khalesi, *BiMes* 8, 1976, 73ff., uses this text, as well as X: 136, to measure the surface of the sanctuary roof and thence to locate the last within the Mari palace.

18. 5. UD. 5¹.KAM.

20. This letter is related to II: 117. Read in l. 16 [*i-na É-ka*] as in II: 117: 11; In II: 117: 9 one might read [*la-a*]. In II: 117: 12 *dumqi* refers to ZĪD *dumqi(m)* of X: 20: 4. Thus CAD D, 182 (7) ought to be corrected accordingly. On *butum-tum*, add to the bibliography of ARMT X, p. 256, Stol, TMM, 1979, 8ff.

25: 14. It would be nice to be able to read, as in XIII: 28: 9, *iš¹-hu-t[ú]*.

27. Connect perhaps with Jean, «excerpta», (RÉS, 1939), p. 68, which also concerns the sick child of Šamaš-našir (cf. XVI/1, 192).

29: 5. Perhaps *a-na SAL ki¹-ri-im*, although the gen. for this PN is *ki-re-e-em* in 135: 3; l. 9. on *abullātim kalām* as only occasionally implying «confinement within city gates», see JESHO 20 (1977), 103, n. 32; lines 8ff. offers an example of how difficult it is always to decide on the parameters of quotations. It is possible to offer the following rendering: «As to Sin-ašarēd, they have retained him, but he wrote to the village/king [cf. p. 258] as follows: «Heaven forbid that they lead away my servants». [Now] he has taken in his wife and former sons in preference to my household and your [i. e. Šunuḥ-raḥalu's] younger servants. As for me, he does not love me, and has not even given me a servant to wash my feet . . .».

This letter is obviously about a woman, probably a daughter of the king [cf. JCS 25 (1973), 76], married unhappily to a prince [Sin-ašarēd ?] of a far away land. [But cf. XVI/1, *sub* this PN, p. 181]; l. 23. [*lu-uk-šu-jud*] is possible.

32. A very difficult text. If the readings UR.KU, 'dog' of lines 12 and 3' are ever confirmed then, in addition to the note of p. 259, one might look at VT 26 (1976), 199—207; l. 9'. *wa-bi-il* (typo); lines 11'—15' might be regarded as dripping with sarcasm, cf. JBL 97 (1978), 96. For different renderings for this section of the text, see JCS 25 (1973), 68—69.

34: 5—8. «You have written me often about the prospect of my coming to you, but my lord has not (yet) released me officially [i. e. by means of a written document, cf. ALM § 66e]».

35: 13. The forms of the pret. *dākum* differ in their syllabifications, *i-du-uk*, *i-tu-uk-šu*, and *i-tu-uk* in 13, 14, 15 respectively. The scribe of this, as well as other Kirum missives, does not seem overly experienced. One might conjecture, therefore, that in light of the context, the scribe was searching for an N-stem pret. [Probably **iddik*, albeit unattested elsewhere as far as the dictionaries are concerned]. If so, the rendering for 10ff. might be: «Further, Zimri-Ḥammu [for first sign of l. 12 read *zi¹*], the shape of which recalls its equivalent in I: 75: 22 (almost!) was killed. People say (that) a lion killed him, and it also killed two women».

36: 22—26. For different readings and translation of this passage, see Batto, 99—100; 106, n. 43—44. A rendering which would accept ARMT's *ulammidanni* of l. 24, but not its conjecture that *ul* is to be found in the next line, might be: «My rations of food and clothing which (my) father has asked to be delivered to me [hendiadys], let them give me (so that) I do not go hungry».

37: 24. With Batto, 100, read: *lu-bu-ši/ LĀL ù Ī.GIŠ ṭā-ba-am/[š]u-bi-lam*.

38: 17. Last sign should be *às* (typo).

40: 12'. Restore perhaps *a-na*; l. 13'. Some form of the verbs *leqūm/nadānum* is expected at the end. Perhaps the sign presented as *x* in line 12' is to belong here.

41: 6'—7'. Kraus, *Festschrift Böhl* (1973), 255, No. 34 proposes to read: *ši-pi ši-ri(?) be-el-ti-ia a-pa-š[a]-aš-ši*.

43: 14. Neither ARMT's reading of the last vocable (*um-m[a¹-ni¹?*]) nor that of Batto for the same (p. 99 *ṭup-pa-[tim]*) inspires confidence. In XIV: 72: 11, *ežub* is followed by *la*. Although this is possible in our line, we would be stuck with a fragment of a sign at the end. It is possible, however, to consider that the last sign belongs to the obverse. Collation is needed.

For lines 18—20, Batto's understanding is preferable, especially if one were to doubt ARMT's restoration of *-ni* in l. 20. The whole passage is reminiscent of a saying (?), invoked in differing vocabularies, in I: 27: 22—23; cf. Marzal, *Studia Pohl*, 11, 31—37, and CAD K, 542 (2): «If one treats the soldier in a friendly way he will show respect (?) to his master (and accept a nice gift)» [but cf. von Soden ZA 66 (1977), 292, who refers to AHw 605a [*manū(m)* N] for a different restoration of l. 23]. At any rate, ARMT's conjecture, that prisoners brought into the temple are doing honor to Erišti-Aya, seems to me far-fetched.

44: 12. *ka₄* is not unknown to Mari; cf. X: 80: 15 *ú-ka₄-aš-qa-ru*, and OBTR 82: 6.

46: 14'. Perhaps read *qa-qa-di-i ú-ka-[a-al]*, and cf. II: 39: 56; XIII RAI, 63: 49 (different sense!).

49: 3'. XVI/1, 75 doubts the existence of a PN Bannum, and suggests, rightly, that *mannum* be read here.

50. This is a very complex 'prophetic' letter. It incorporates a doublefold dream received by Addu-dūri under circumstances or in appearance strongly reminiscent of previous visions. At first, she sees the temple of Bēlet-ekallim as empty, prognosticating a future sacking of Mari, abandoned by its goddess. In the second part, she sees a high-priest of Ištar-pišra, very likely (recently) deceased, who, in an *eery* voice assumed by ghosts [cf. Hoffner, JBL 96 (1967), 398], stands before the gate of Bēlet-ekallim, repeatedly appealing to Tūra-Dagan, a ruler in Mari's past [so, after Kupper, RA 65 (1971), 118 n. 3].

ll. 29—30. «My hair-parings and my fringes», since Addu-dūri's visions are to be tested for authenticity. For attempts to read the first sign of line 31, see Moran, p. 38 and n. 3 ([*anāku*, so too Ellermeier, ThOrAr 1, 66]; von Soden [UF, 1 (1969), 198], Berger, *ibid.* 209, Batto, 74 n. 20, and Finet, *Annales, Centre d'étude des Religions*, 3, 113 n. 59 all read *sinništīm*).

56: 5. The PN here might be read *zu-hu'*- (erasure)-*tu* and compared with the physician from the 'Assyrian' period (A. 2756: 5 = Finet AIPHOS 14 (1954—57), 132). Persons belonging to that profession traveled constantly, cf. BASOR 190 (1968), 46—54; lines 21—22. On fines levied by the palace, see JESHO 20 (1977), 109—110.

58: 9—12. In view of lines 13—18 restore perhaps: [1 *ki-š*]a-am ša É-i/ [DUMU-i ik-nu-]uk' / a-na ya-[ú-uš-^dIM]/ id-di-in. Collation of the end of l. 9 might, however, yield KÛ.BABBAR.

61: 4—7. Slightly different transcription given by Rouault, XVIII, 169; l. 5 perhaps *ep-te-e-[ma]*, «I opened»; l. 6. A PN É-a-AN may be at the end of the line, cf. XIII: 1: v: 62.

67: 10. This line is complete, without conjecturing 2 lost signs.

72. A damaged line (erased ?) on the side is not transliterated.

73: 14. *Awilum* in this line probably refers to Yaphur-Lim (contra, p. 265) who himself was a ruler in Idamaraz, cf. XVI/1, 214.

74. Slightly different renderings in JCS 25 (1973), 65 and in Römer, 49—50; l. 20. *li-ti-ya'*.

75: 24. *ta-ra-[ni-iš]-šu' šu-lum* (no room for *ù*). The verb here is G imper. of *tarûm* (cf. XIV: 75: 14); cf. l. 23 for D imper. from *târum*.

76. Cf. Anbar, Or 48 (1979), 109—111; l. 5. The verb *alākum* is used here, much as in Hebrew, as an auxiliary. Translate, therefore, «Begin to resolve your own problems!». If the restoration is right at the end of line 14, then the *bēlum* here is Inib-šarri's husband and not her father. This in view of II: 113: 19.

78: 11—12. «Am I not living in a foreign country?»

79: 7—11. «When [PN] died, I could not (even)

cry 10 days for him [in mourning], (since) they took me out of the city and I had to go to GN.»

84: 34. *it-ti'* [*be-li-ne iš-lu-tú*], cf. ll. 8, 30.

86: 9'. AHW's (1360a) reading, [*e-ri-iš*] *ti-me-er-tam/bēli lā ikalla*, seems to me far fetched.

90. This text has been discussed in JESHO 20 (1977), 91; line 11, 19. *ù*₅ [rather than *el*]; cf., also, 91: 6, 4' (CAD L, 18 [c, 1']); lines 19—21: «The rest (is) 4 shekels of silver. Let him (i. e. Idin-Sin?) come and arrange (the matter) with Mutu-Bisir's «sons»; l. 27. With Römer, 82, read *i-na-di-in*.

93: 3. *še-wi-rum-ub'-ri-it*; l. 25. In conformity with ARMT's previous transliterations, read *a-di-^lma-ti*.

94: 12'. Perhaps *t[a'-a]k-la-at*, even if this verb is not attested with *šuttum*. Moran, 44, followed by AHW, 1293a, proposes *n[a-a]t-la-at*; l. 13'. The sequence of verbs does not favor the restoration proposed by ARMT.

97: 17. As suggested already in BiOr 28 (1971), 356, no language is to be restored at the end of this line. The *li-ib* sticking out at its end belongs to l. 36. Thus 17—19 could be rendered: «Heaven forbid that they would give her as gift».

99: 16—17. Römer's restoration at the beginning of l. 16 (p. 69, n. 2) is more likely, implying the following rendering: «... Let my lord act so that I may not be abandoned ([*ša la*] *e-ze-bi-ya*) in GN».

100: 7. The objections against invoking the D stem of *šalālum* here, presented already by Moran, 54 n. 3, are not well met in the remarks of p. 271.

102: 5. An imperfectly written form of greeting, as in 103: 4, may be at stake here rather than a PN. On remarks to line 3 (p. 272), correct reference to read p. 354b.

104: 1. Kibri-Dagan's name is surely to be restored here, cf. 114: 6; l. 6. Despite the notes on this line on p. 272, text should read *tú* (TU) rather than ARMT's *tū₄* (TUM), an attestation which would be unique to Mari. For shape, see XV, p. 6 No. 30; l. 3'. Too many breaks in context to suggest a reading *u₄* for the conjunction.

105: 9—10. Note the unusual allocation of signs at the end of 9 and beginning of 10.

107. This as well as 108 have been discussed in AOAT 25, p. 406; l. 9. For another suggested restoration, see BiOr 28 (1971), 355b.

109: 17. Mari has given us some strange shapes for *ù*, cf. XV, p. 9, No. 264. Perhaps the fourth sign in this line ought to be regarded as a conjunction.

110: tr. lat.: 1 (i. e. l. 18). If reading is correct for the fourth sign, then render [*i-n*]a-na-na' since it looks more like the UD sign.

111: 13. The same form, spelled out *iz-zu-ra-anni*, occurs in V: 4: 11 and is parsed sub *nazārūm* in XV, 238; l. 21. XVI/1, 131 regards this as the PN Itiya.

114. Tariš-ḥattum is insisting that before anyone accuses her of ordering a certain girl's jewelry to be taken away, either a witness (in this case the messenger mentioned in l. 16) or a document containing that order be brought forward. Thus translate line 14—20: «Now, let my messenger come here or have them produce my document which (indicates that) when I wrote, they stripped away the jewelry box of this girl on my orders».

115. From everything we know of Ḥaya-Sumu and his activities, it is quite unlikely that he could have authored, under the 'hypocoristic' Ḥayaya, this letter (as suggested in ARMT X, p. 274).

123: 7. With Römer, p. 37, n. 1, the verb is to be connected with *patānum* II [AHw, 847]; l. 22. Cf. Batto, p. 82.

125. On *šitrum*, see now Kutscher/Wilcke, ZA 68 (1978), 122—123.

126: 5. The notes to that line, p. 276, indicate that a transcription *ugbattum* is possible for NIN.DINGIR.RA. The same could be said for its occurrence in 123: 11. l. 9. Despite the remarks on reading the sumerogram MAŠ.KAR.RA on p. 276, the traces are not very favorable. Admittedly other efforts (e. g. Batto, 26, *pa¹-ni-tim*; Römer, 70, *an¹-né-tim*) are no more convincing.

127: 5. XVI/1, p. 226, is surely more correct in suggesting reading the PN as [... l]a¹-ri-im-ba-aḥ-li (cf. also XVI/1, 144).

128: 10. Batto's reading, p. 18, as *aḥi-ša-me¹-tam* is likelier.

129: 5, 20 (and 130: 3¹, 14¹). Both AHw, 1054b, and CAD (e. g. M/2, 283b *sub muštahḥizu*) prefer the reading *simmum*.

129 has been repeatedly studied; see the bibliography in Batto, 36, n. 103, to which add Veenhof, *Phoenix* 14 (1968), 149. A different reading of the main body of the text is given by Moran in his review of ARMT X, forthcoming in the JAOS.

131. This, as well as 133, have been placed in the context of wine trade by Finet, AfO 25 (1974—77), 122—131; cf. also 126, n. 33 and 130, n. 67.

133: 5ff. Cf. CAD M/1, 277.

135. According to XIV: 118, poor Kirum was not allowed to leave Ḥaya-Sumu's palace. Sad fate!

136: 13—14. A defense for the reading of this line is made by Finet, AfO 25 (1973—77), 127 n. 52.

137: 11. Surely a PN is to be expected here. See, possibly, XVI/1, 53, *sub Aḥatum* (No. 35°).

139: 3. Perhaps read *ṭdu-šu-UB-[tim]* and cf. XVI/1, 87 (s. v.). In view of TEM IV: i: 8, however, one is sorely tempted to restore *du-uḥ¹-ša¹-[tim]*, and recover here the name of yet one more daughter of Zimri-Lim; l. 17. Perhaps «your heart»; lines 26—27. A quote within quote is at stake in line 26, and we might restore *ad-di-in-ši* in l. 27 in view of lines 14—16. Thus, translate lines 20ff. «If, on account of this woman, Yarim-Lim becomes very angry and writes something about it, I will tell him the simple truth [for

line 23, see Moran's review, forthcoming JAOS] as follows: 'this girl was not given (since) Gašera wrote me to say: 'do not give her to him'; I have therefore given her to Aplaḥanda'. [This is what I will respond].» Gašera, wife of Yarim-Lim of Yamḥad, is interfering in her husband's desire to increase his harem by seeking a girl/daughter from his son-in-law.

141: 25—28. Moran's rendering for these lines, BASOR 200 (1970), 53, is more likely: «This is to be a token: When it rains, recall me to mind so you will not forget me».

143: 15. Cf., rather, Kraus, RA 64 (1970), 53—55 (followed by Batto, 68).

150: 11. Both Finet and Marzal, as cited in the remarks of p. 281, read *i-ḡi¹-ul-la*. Perhaps one might read *i-ku-ul la* ... and translate lines 8ff.: «... It is like the proverb which goes as follows: 'The fire that consumes the reed would have (already) consumed its [the reed's] companions'. Is it not the same for them now?».

151. I still insist that the letter could not have been written by Yarim-Lim of Yamḥad (cf. AOAT 25, 407—408 *contra* ARMT X, 15, No. 151: «Yarim-Lim, sans doute le roi d'Alep ...»). Rather it is by a homonymous Benjaminite leader; cf. XVI/1, 227, 2°; l. 6. read the PN *ḥa-ma-nu* and cf. RA 66 (1972), 179; XVI/1, 98. The Japanese study of S. Shibayama, *Cultura Antiqua*, 28 (1976), 1—22, is known to me only through a synopsis prepared by Y. Tomabechi. To be noted is the understanding 'watercourse' for *dunnum*.

153: 6. Partum, it is now clear, is yet another(!) daughter of Zimri-Lim. Information on her is available through perusal of XVI/1, 167 [especially VII: 91: 5; XIV: 81: 45; ARMT X, p. 252 (note to l: 3)].

154: 2¹. Despite II: 77: 2, normalize this PN as Abu-mekim, cf. XVI/1, 48.

156. This letter indicates that the strains occurring between Aleppo and Mari were exacerbated by personal animosity between the new king, Hammurabi — brother of Šibtu — and his brother-in-law Zimri-Lim; line 10: on *aššum* DN as an oath, cf. Veenhof, JCS 30 (1978), 186—188.

159. This document has been treated by Heintz, *Semitica* 22 (1972), 6, as an example of a literary *Hofstil*.

160. Discussed in AOAT 25, 409—412 and most recently by Finet in *Akkadica* 8 (1978), 13—14.

169: 6ff. «You wrote as follows: 'Why have you not written me concerning your illness?'. Is it done that someone writes his brother about sickness? I write (only) good news, as follows: 'Having been ill, I became well (by) now'».

166 and 167. Aside from the PNs involved, the parallelisms between lines 1—12 of the first and second letters make it clear that the scribe merely copied parts of one into the other. His arrangement of the lines differs somewhat. The main points of divergence include:

- a. 1. 4. *a-ya-a-ḫi-im* vs. *a-ya-a-ḫi*
 b. 1. 6. *uš-ta-an-ni-im-ma* vs. *uš-ta-aš-ni-im-ma*
 c. 1. 9. *bu-ul-lu-ṭim* vs. *bu-ul-lu-ṭi-im*

A few remarks on these may be in order. It is noticeable that 166 has two occasions in which occurs *ana qāt PN addinma*. In the first instance, 1. 4, the scribe decided to use the mimated form of the PN, while in the second — and last — occasion, he did not (rev. 8'). Now, if 166 were written before 167, it may be that the scribe, in writing 1. 4 of the second text, either was influenced by, or, better, kept in mind, the non-mimated form of 166: 8'.

With regard to the difference in b.), the scribe is dealing with forms of the verb *šanūm* III that, in view of the attestations assembled in AHw, 1166, was not likely to have been resorted to often in epistolary documents. The difference in signs, *an* vs. *aš*, is, of course, minimal. The scribe may

therefore have decided to display a bit of learnedness and in the first case used the Dtn form [rather than the Dt which would have had quite a different meaning] and in the second the Št. It might be noted that either form gives meaning that is similar. (Different analysis of forms in ARMT X, 285, *sub* 167: 6).

The third instance of divergence, c.), can be understood from the perspective of a scribe who, having more room in 167, since his word *bulluṭim* occurs at the end of a line, takes the luxury of filling space by dividing *ṭim* into *ṭi-im*. This, incidentally, might be considered as another reason to suppose that 166 was written before 167.

177: 5. CAD L, 128 (b) reads *iš-te'-ne-ši-im* and renders: «The god has already questioned the man who constantly plotted evil against her».

Šumma Izbu XIX ll. 129—135

(above p. 67, new text)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 129. BE GU ₄ .ḪI.A ina TÙR 'x' [...] | 129. If oxen [...] in an animal-pen — — [...] |
| 130. BE GU ₄ .ḪI.A ina SILA.DAGAL.LA [...] '-su'-su [...] | 130. If oxen '...' in a city-square [...] |
| 131. BE GU ₄ ina ÍD A.MEŠ 'x x' [x] '-ab?' -bi-ru: ina ÍD [...] | 131. If an ox '...' water in a river: in a river [...] |
| 132. BE GU ₄ ina SIZKÚR LUGAL in-'na-gi- iš-ma in'-ne-ru-ub DUMU LUGAL UR[U ...] | 132. If an ox butted(?) and (then) fled during a royal sacrifice — — the king's son [...] a city |
| 133. BE GU ₄ ina GAZ-šú KA.KA-si UGU DUMU EN-š[ú ...] | 133. If an ox was repeatedly crying out while being killed — — onto the son of its owner [...] |
| 134. BE GU ₄ ina GAZ-šú KI ú-tar-rak SUHUŠ URU.B[I ...] | 134. If an ox was striking the ground while being killed — — the foundation of that city [...] |
| 135. 66. 'M ÀMU.ŠID.'[BI.IM ...] | 135. 66 'numbered lines' [...] |

Philadelphia.

S. M. Moren.

Notes

130. For the verb *nasāsu* used with oxen, see JNES 19 (1960) 35 lines 122—123. Perhaps a G preterite or a Gtn present of this verb should be restored here.

132. The precise meaning of *nagāšu* in this context is uncertain. The lexical equivalence SIMUL = *nagāšu ša alpi* (CT 18 37 ii 15) implies that there was a nuance of *nagāšu* specifically

related to oxen (for discussion of SIMUL see Heimpel *Tierbilder* 83—87). The meaning of the N-stem, used here but unattested elsewhere so far as I know, is unclear.

For *nērubu*, see Leichty *Izbu* 226, commentary entries 490 and 491: KAR = *ner-ru-bu* and KAR = *la-sa-mu*. Commentary entry 489, which equates *nērubu* with *erēbu* (BE GU₄ ina É LÚ in-ne-ru-ub-mai-ru-bu, appears to represent a scribal confusion.