

The *ARM X* 'Prophetic' Texts: Their Media, Style, and Structure

JOHN. F. CRAGHAN, C. S. S. R.
Mount Alphonsus Seminary

In 1967 G. Dossin published *ARM X: La correspondance féminine*¹ and thus inaugurated a new period in the study of the Mari "prophetic" texts. In this volume, containing one hundred and seventy-nine letters, there were fourteen which cited prophecies, dreams, or other such forms of divine communication.² Numerically this represented an increase over the previous published texts³ that had already provoked a considerable amount of attention.⁴ As might be expected, Dossin's volume began to attract scholarly interest.

1 G. Dossin, *Archives royales de Mari X: La correspondance féminine*, TCL 31 (Paris, 1967).

2 See the following letters: *ARM X* 4, 6-10, 50-51, 53, 80-81, 94, 100, 117.

3 The published texts are the following: A. 15 = G. Dossin, "Une révélation du dieu Dagan à Terqa," *RA* 42 (1948), 125-34; A. 1121 = A. Lods and G. Dossin, "Une tablette inédite de Mari, intéressante pour l'histoire ancienne du prophétisme sémitique," in H. H. Rowley, ed., *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (Edinburgh, 1950), 103-10; *ARM(T) II* 90; *ARM(T) III* 40, 78; *ARM(T) VI* 45; *ARM(T) XIII* 23, 112-14. The following are available only in a French translation: A. 455, A. 2731 (= A. 2925—see J.-G. Heintz, "Prophétie in Mari und Israel," *Bib.* 52 [1971], 544), A. 4260 in G. Dossin, "Sur le prophétisme à Mari," in J. Nougayrol, ed., *La divination en Mésopotamie ancienne* (Paris, 1966), 78-80, 85-86. Heintz also mentions (*Prophétie*, 548, n. 1) another unpublished prophetic text, viz., A. 222.

4 See W. von Soden, "Verkündigung des Gotteswillens durch prophetisches Wort in den altbabylonischen Briefen aus Mâri," *WO* 1/5 (1950), 397-403; H. Schmökel, "Gotteswort in Mari und Israel," *TLZ* 76 (1951), 53-58; F. M. T. Böhl, "Prophetentum und stellvertretendes Leiden in Assyrien und Israel," *Opera Minora* (Groningen, 1953), 63-80, 480-83; G. Rinaldi, "Oracoli amorriti," *Aevum* 28 (1954), 1-9; M. Noth, "History and Word of God in the Old Testament," *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays*, trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas (Edinburgh, 1966), 179-93; A. Malamat, "Prophecy in the Mari Documents," *Eretz Israel* 4 (1956), 74-84 [in Hebrew]; idem, "History and Prophetic Vision in a Mari Letter," *Eretz Israel* 5 (1958), 67-73 [in Hebrew]; idem, "Prophetic Revelations in New Documents from Mari and the Bible," *Supplements to VT* 15 (1966), 207-27 = *Eretz Israel* 8 (1967), 231-40 [in Hebrew]; H. Schult, "Vier weitere Mari-Briefe 'prophetischen' Inhalts," *ZDPV* 82 (1966), 228-32; F. Nötscher, "Prophetie im Umkreis des alten Israel," *BZ NF* 10 (1966), 178-87; J. H. Hayes, "Prophetism at Mari and Old Testament Parallels," *Anglican Theological Review* 49 (1967), 397-409; J. J. Roberts, "Antecedents to Biblical Prophecy from the Mari Archives," *Restoration Quarterly* 10 (1967), 121-33.

The following year F. Ellermeier published his monograph, *Prophetie in Mari und Israel*⁵, in which he made use of twenty texts, nine of them from the ARM X letters. This courageous undertaking was characterized by a prolonged critique of C. Westermann's view that the biblical prophets, as seen in the Mari materials, are primarily messengers.⁶ Meanwhile in France, J. -G. Heintz presented his doctoral dissertation, *Les lettres "prophétiques" des Archives Royales de Mari et l'Ancien Testament*. Although this is not yet published, its contents can be extracted somewhat from other works by the same author.⁷ Finally this same year saw an article by H. B. Huffmon devoted not only to the earlier Mari texts but also to the ARM X correspondence.⁸

In 1969 the most scientific discussion of the ARM X "prophetic" letters (together with comments on A. 455, A. 2731, and A. 4260) came from the able pen of W. L. Moran.⁹ Although he states, "The task of tracing and elaborating their significance for biblical studies we leave to others,"¹⁰ it becomes apparent that he has taken a stand on several issues. One should also note that his translation of the ARM X letters as well as of the earlier texts appears in the supplement to *ANET*.¹¹

In 1971 W. H. P. Römer published his work on the ARM X texts in general.¹² Although not specifically dealing with the "prophetic" letters, the work offers a great deal of significant information on the political, religious, and social situation of the time. Hence they are to be considered as complementary to the prophetic materials.

1967 serves as a convenient line of demarcation in the consideration of the "prophetic" materials from Mari, for the divergences in the ARM X texts are more than peripheral. Thus, in the newer material it is, by and large, no longer a question of temples and the king's obligation to the same (for example, A. 15; A. 1121; *ARM(T)* II 90; *ARM(T)* III 40). Rather, the newer material is concerned, in general, with the personal safety of Zimri-Lim, the possibility of rebellion, and the ever-present menace in the person of Hammurabi of Babylon.¹³ Thus, in the newer texts the sanctuaries have practically vanished; the question of the king and matters of state is always present.

5 F. Ellermeier, *Prophetie in Mari und Israel* (Herzberg, 1968).

6 See C. Westermann, "Die Mari-Briefe und die Prophetie in Israel," *Forschung am Alten Testament* (Munich, 1964), 171-88; idem, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (Philadelphia, 1967), 115-28.

7 See J. -G. Heintz, "Oracles prophétiques et 'guerre sainte' selon les archives royales de Mari et l'Ancien Testament," *Supplements to VT* 17 (1969), 112-38; idem, "Aux origines d'une expression biblique: *ūmūšu qerbū*, in A. R. M., X/6, 8'?" *VT* 21 (1971), 528-40.

8 See H. B. Huffmon, "Prophecy in the Mari Letters," *Bi.Ar.* 31 (1968), 101-24.

9 See W. L. Moran, "New Evidence from Mari on the History of Prophecy," *Bib.* 50 (1969), 15-56.

10 Ibid., 16.

11 See W. L. Moran, "Akkadian Letters," *ANET*³, 623-25, 629-32.

12 W. H. P. Römer, *Frauenbriefe über Religion, Politik und Privatleben in Mari*, *AOAT* 12 (Neukirchen, 1971).

13 For an effort to date the Mari "prophetic" letters, see J. F. Ross, "Prophecy in Hamath, Israel, and Mari," *HTR* 63 (1970), 15-19.

Another significant divergence is the lack of any clear messenger formula¹⁴ on the part of the gods' emissaries. It was this feature in particular which aroused the interest of scholars in the older texts. Furthermore, the newer letters, as will be seen below, provide evidence of more formal control of such prophetic utterances. One gains the impression that such prophecies were regarded as innovations.

In this article we propose to contribute to the ongoing discussion by commenting on certain aspects of the newer texts, namely, their media, style, and structure. In so doing we will on occasion refer to the Hebrew Bible. While precluding any final judgment on the relationship between the Mari correspondence and Israel's prophets, we will suggest that Israelite prophecy is linked to the patriarchal period. Classical prophecy in Israel was thus not a totally unprecedented creation of the moment.¹⁵

The Media

In the ARM X correspondence as in the earlier texts we are concerned with three basic types of divine¹⁶ communication: (a) prophecies, both public and private (6, 7, 8, 9, 53, 80, 81, 100); (b) dreams (10, 50, 51, 94, 117); (c) oracles resulting from hepatoscopy and extispicy¹⁷ (80, 81, 94) and signs (4). What is significant here is that the omens serve as a control against the "less certain" prophecies and dreams. The following instances are noteworthy:

ARM X 81:22-25: [Ka]kkabī tērtam [lišē]pišma ana zīm tēvētišu¹⁸ Kakkabī [l]īpuš
Let my [S]tar ha[ve] an omen taken and [l]et my Star act according to his omens;

ARM X 94:9¹-13¹: inanna bēlī warkatam bā[r]âm lišaprisma šumma [š]uttum šī
n[a]ḫ[ā]t bēlī šehertim šāti qim[m]a
Then let my lord have the haru[sp]ex examine the matter and if that dream was
(really) s[ee]n, trust¹⁹ this girl.

14 ARM X 117:10-11 is, unfortunately, broken. If Moran's restoration is correct (*New Evidence*, 45), then it is not the god Annum who sends the messenger but a woman bearing a name with this theophoric element.

15 The fact of a link between Mari and Israel is not questioned here. Rather it is the manner of establishing that link which is discussed. For this question see R. Rendtorff, "Reflections on the Early History of Prophecy in Israel," *Journal for Theology and Church* 4 (1967), 14-34, and my own forthcoming study, "Mari and its Prophets," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 5 (1975).

16 For variety in the media of divine revelation in the ancient Near East, see M. Lichtenstein, "Dream Theophany and the E Document," *JANES* 1/2 (1968-69), 52-53.

17 For the use of oracles in ARM X, the terminology used, etc., see Römer, *Frauenbriefe*, 29-30.

18 Commenting on Ludlul I:51, W. Lambert remarks: "The tēvētu are not the omens themselves, but the viscera of the sacrificial animals on which they were based. This agrees with the circumstances of this institution. The omens *per se* are clear and unambiguous" (*BWL*, 284). One should note, however, that Malamat, *History and Prophetic Vision*, 67, 69, 72, translates the phrase *ina tēvētim* in A. 1121:8, 25 as "visions." See also Roberts, *Antecedents*, 126.

19 See Moran, *New Evidence*, 44, n. 1.

These instances of controlling both prophecies and dreams²⁰ through the word of the haruspex are instructive.²¹ Although we have only these two explicit statements of such control,²² it is not unreasonable to suspect that this procedure was adopted whenever the fringe and hair were sent along with the letter. (The fringe and hair will be discussed below.) What this implies is that both dreams and prophecies had to be checked by the normal Mesopotamian methods of divine communication. Consequently a presumption was established whereby dreams and prophecies were judged suspect until vindicated by hepatoscopy or extispicy. "In this system dreams and prophecies can never demand qualified acceptance or reveal absolute imperatives. They can merely 'propose' – it is the haruspex who 'disposes'."²³

ARM X 81 appears to indicate the legal processes involved in authenticating a revelation. In this letter Innibana the prophetess (*āpiltum*) advises Zimri-Lim regarding the city of Sharrakiya. She then adds: *anumma šartī u sissiktī addinakkim lizakkū* "I hereby give you my hair and my fringe; let them declare (me) free."²⁴ In the G stem the verb *zakūm* means 'to become free from specific claims or obligations' and in the D stem 'to free, release . . . referring to taxes and other dues'.²⁵ From the context it is not a question of physical cleanliness;²⁶ on the contrary, it appears to refer to legal cleanliness, that is, release from certain obligations. An affirmative reply on the part of the haruspex can alone declare the prophetess "clean."²⁷

20 A. L. Oppenheim points out that the symbolic dreams had to be submitted to the *šā'ilum*; see Oppenheim, *Dream-book*, (Philadelphia, 1956), 225.

21 For the biblical *bārūm* note Balaam in Num. 22-24. In this regard see S. Daiches, "Balaam—A Babylonian *bārū*," *Hilprecht Anniversary Volume* (Leipzig, 1909), 60-70; R. Largeton, "Les oracles de Bile'am et la mantique suméro-akkadienne," *Travaux de l'Institut Catholique de Paris* (Paris, 1964), 10, 37-50; T. H. Gaster, *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament* (New York, 1969), 303-10.

22 See also A. 1121:24-25: *u ina tēvētim ittanazzaz[ū]*? "Furthermore he (if singular = the god Adad) / they (if plural = the prophets) keep(s) showing up in the omnia." Concerning the subject see Moran, *New Evidence*, 21, n. 1.

23 *Ibid.*, 23. For divination in Mari see A. Finet, "La place du devin dans la société de Mari," in Nougayrol, ed., *La Divination*, 87-93. For divination in general see A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago, 1964), 206-27; C. J. Gadd, "Some Babylonian Divinatory Methods and their Inter-Relations," *Divination*, 21-34. For a comparison of such methods with the methods employed in the Bible in the search for God, note O. García de la Fuente, *La búsqueda de Dios en el Antiguo Testamento* (Guadarrama, 1971).

24 ARM X 81:16-18. For the translation see Moran, *New Evidence*, 22, 33.

25 CAD Z, 26b, 29a, 30b.

26 By his translation "sie mögen reinigen" von Soden seems to imply physical cleanliness; see "Einige Bemerkungen zu den von Fr. Ellermeier in 'Prophetie und Israel' (Herzberg, 1968) erstmalig bearbeiteten Briefen aus ARM 10," *UF* 1 (1969), 199.

27 See Moran, *New Evidence*, 23; also Finet, *La place du devin*, 93; *idem*, "Les symboles du cheveu, du bord du vêtement et de l'ongle en Mésopotamie," *Annales du centre des religions* (Brussels, 1969), 3, 126.

It is interesting that we find a similar declaratory statement regarding cleanliness in Lev. 13-14 where the *piel* of the verb *ṭbr* is used.²⁸ To be sure, these chapters are concerned with something physical, namely, leprosy. However, it is official recognition of a return to one's former status as well.²⁹

In the dream reports the phrase *ina ṣuttiya* "in my dream" is attested. The clearest examples³⁰ are the following:

ARM X 50:8-9: *ina ṣuttiya ana bū dBelet-ekallim [ē]rubma*
In my dream I [e]ntered the temple of Belet-ekallim;

ARM X 51:8-10: *ina ṣuttiya dBelet-biri izzizamma kī'am iqbēm*
In my dream Belet-biri stepped up to me and spoke to me thus.

The phrase is also verified in the earlier literature:

A. 15:9-12: *ina ṣuttiya anāku u awīlum itīya [išt]u Sagaratimki ina ḥašim elim*
ana Mari^{ki} ana alākim pānū'a šaknū
In my dream I made up my mind to go together with (another) man [fro]m the fortress of Sagaratum in the upper district to Mari.³¹

What is noteworthy is that the phrase *ina ṣuttiya* is a West-Semitic³² and hence another indication that Mari shared in both Mesopotamian and West Semitic worlds.³³ This is seen in the fact that the phrase *ina ṣuttiya* is not followed by a verb 'to see', either *amārum*³⁴ or *naṭālum*.³⁵ Generally the pronominal suffix is omitted and the verb 'to see' follows in a relative clause with the *ša* either expressed or implied. Thus, the ordinary Akkadian formulation is: *ina ṣutti(m) (ša) amuru* or *ina ṣutti(m) (ša) aṭṭalu* "in my dream" or literally "in the dream which I saw." The following examples may suffice:

28 Note Lev. 13:6 *wēra'ab hakkōbēn 'ōtō bayyôm haššēbî'î šēnît wēbinnēb kēbāb hannega' wēlō' pāsāb hannega' bā'ōr wēṭibrō hakkōbēn mispaḥat bî'* "And the priest will examine him once more on the seventh day. If the sore is dying out and has not spread on the skin, the priest shall declare him clean; it was (just) eczema." One should also note the declarative use of the *piel* of *ṭm'* in these chapters as well.

29 See K. Elliger, *Leviticus, HAT* (Tübingen, 1966), 182, n. 16; H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 4th ed. (Munich, 1965), 4/2:757-63.

30 The phrase *ina ṣuttiya* is probably preserved in ARM X 117:10-11, although the beginning of the phrase is broken. For the older texts the phrase most likely appears in ARM(T) XIII 112, 113, although they are broken as well.

31 For both a translation and description of this account, see Oppenheim, *Dream-book*, 195.

32 I am grateful to Prof. Moshe Held for this observation. Any errors in developing this suggestion are entirely my own.

33 See. A. Malamat, "Mari and the Bible: Some Patterns of Tribal Organization and Institutions," *JAOS* 82 (1962), 143-50; idem, "Aspects of Tribal Societies in Mari and Israel," in Kupper, ed., *La Civilisation de Mari*, 129-38; H. Cazelles, "Mari et l'Ancien Testament," *ibid.*, 73-90; A. Petitjean and J. Coppens, "Mari et l'Ancien Testament," in H. Cazelles, ed., *De Mari à Qumran*, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 24 (Paris, 1969), 3-13.

34 CAD A², 8b.

35 AHw., 767a.

Ludlul III:29-30: *ašlušma šuttu ana[ṭal] ina šutti aṭṭalu mušṭiya*
 "A third time I saw a dream and in my night dream which I saw . . ."36

CT 34:28, i, 67: *ina šutti ša āmuru u niši ūammarūni*
 "In a dream which I and also (other) people saw . . ."37

However, in a late Babylonian text concerning Nabonidus and Belshazzar we do find a pronominal suffix (1 com. sing.) attached to *šuttu(m)*:

Kakkabu rabû dDilbat kakkab Kaksidi dŠin u dŠamaš ina šuttiya ātamar
 In my dream I saw the Great Star, Venus, Sirius, the moon, and the sun.³⁸

Besides its sixth century B.C. date one should also note that it does employ the verb 'to see' (*amāru[m]*), albeit in a principal clause. Nevertheless the usage differs from what one might call the traditional Akkadian pattern described above.

In Biblical Hebrew the pronominal suffix (1 com. sing.) is attached to the phrase *baḥ^alôm*:

Gen. 40:9: *baḥ^alômî w^e binnēb-gepen l^e pānāy*
 In my dream there was a vine in front of me.

Gen. 41:22: *wā'ere' baḥ^alômî w^e binnēb šeba' šibb^o lîm 'ōlōt b^e qāneh 'eḩad*
 "In (another) dream of mine I saw seven ears of grain growing on a single stalk."³⁹

It should be noted that *baḥ^alômî* is always followed by *binnēb*. Hence once the circumstance, namely, "in my dream," is given, the action moves immediately to the object of the dream. Even where *baḥ^alômî* is used with the verb 'to see' (Gen. 41:22), no direct object is provided as in the late Babylonian text. Rather the action presses forward to the noun and/or participle following *binnēb*.⁴⁰

In the Ugaritic literature we similarly find the pronominal suffix attached without any verb 'to see':

IK: 150-51, 296-97:
dbḥlmy il ytn
bḏrty ab adm
 Whom in my dream El bestowed,
 in my vision the Father of Man.⁴¹

The same usage is also observed with the 3 masc. sing. pronominal suffix:

36 *BWL*, 48. This neo-Babylonian usage is also borne out by the annals. See Streck, *Asb.* 626-27. For a similar Middle Babylonian use see E. F. Weidner, *Afo* 10 (1935-36), 5:9.

37 This plate is a barrel-cylinder of Nabonidus.

38 A. T. Clay, *YOS* 1 (New Haven, 1915), 55.

39 See also Gen. 40:16; 41:17. The LXX translates the Hebrew literally except in Gen. 40:16. *anî baḥ^alômî* becomes *Kagō eidon enyption*—hence the use of the verb 'to see' and the omission of the pronoun after the noun. For the Greek usage see A. Oepke, "onar," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 5:220-34.

40 Note that in Gen. 31:10 we have the verb 'to see' and simply *baḥ^alôm* without any pronominal suffix; *w^e binnēb* then follows.

41 For the translation see H. L. Ginsberg, *ANET*³, 144.

IK: 35-37:

wbhlmb il yrd

bdbrtb ab adm

And in his dream El descends,

in his vision the Father of Man.⁴²

The expression *ina šuttiya* thus appears to be a West-Semitism. When one does find the expression used in the late Babylonian text, its usage remains distinct from that of Mari, Ugarit, and the Bible. In this regard Oppenheim's remarks are telling:

This dream report (A. 15) disregards the "pattern" in nearly every respect. The conventional references to the circumstances in which the dream was experienced are omitted; the dream-story is full of apparently irrelevant details. It is not the god who comes to the sleeper nor is any incubation involved . . . it is possible that there existed in the religious outlook of the people of Mari a fundamental difference between those who were oriented towards Mesopotamian civilization, from which they received not only the language but also the religious pattern, and those who preferred to remain in the orbit of their native civilization."⁴³

Style

The word *kakkabum*⁴⁴ appears in the salutation of some nineteen letters in *ARM X*. For example:

ARM X 80:1-3: *ana Kakkabī qibīma umma sinnišat Inibšīnāma*
Speak to the Star. Thus Inibšīna.

The authors of these letters are: Kirū(m), Erešti-Aya, Narāmtum, Inibšīna, and Šimātum.⁴⁵ As Moran argues, "Since all except the last are called his 'daughter' and most address him as 'father', 'Star' must be a sobriquet practically reserved to the family circle and was perhaps a term of affection."⁴⁶

What is striking about the salutation is the absence of the deferential cliché *amatkāma* 'your female servant'.⁴⁷ For example, in the six "prophetic" letters sent by Šibtu, Zimri-Lim's chief spouse,⁴⁸ the salutation begins *ana bēliya* 'to my lord' and ends *amatkāma* 'your female

42 Ibid., 143.

43 *Dream-book*, 195.

44 See *CAD K*, 47a; *AHW.*, 421b.

45 Kirū(m): *ARM X* 31:1; 32:1; 33:1; 34:1; 35:1; Erešti-Aya: *ARM X* 36:1; 37:1; 38:1; 40:1; 41:1; 42:1-2; Narāmtum: *ARM X* 44:1; 45:1; 46:1; Inibšīna: *ARM X* 80:1; 81:1; 82:1; 83:1; Šimātum: *ARM X* 95:1.

46 Moran, *New Evidence*, 33. Note that Moran reads *Šibātum* rather than *Šimātum*. See also J. M. Sasson, "Biographical Notices on some Royal Ladies from Mari," *JCS* 25 (1973), 76.

47 See *CAD A*², 85 a; *AHW.*, 45b.

48 For an earlier statement regarding Šibtu see G. Dossin, "Šibtu, reine de Mari," *Actes du XXI^e congrès international des orientalistes* (Paris, 1949), 142-43. For the importance of this woman in the *ARM X* volume, see now P. Artzi and A. Malamat, "The Correspondence of Šibtu, Queen of Mari in *ARM X*," *Orientalia* 40 (1971), 75-89.

servant'. On the other hand, when *kakkabum* is used in the *ARM X* letters, *amatkāma* is usually not employed. The only exception to this rule is *ARM X 95* where Šimātum writes:

ana bēliya Kakkabim qibīma umma sinnišat Šimātum amatkāma
Speak to my Lord, the Star. Thus Šimātum, your (female) servant.⁴⁹

This usage may suggest that Šimātum, who is never referred to as a *mārat šarrim* 'a daughter of the king',⁵⁰ occupies a somewhat lesser niche in the family tree.⁵¹

With regard to the public prophecies⁵² Moran has carefully studied the typology in the introduction. The elements involved are: (1) designation of the recipient by profession, name, or both; (2) place of prophecy; (3) the verb *tebûm* 'to arise', but only in the case of professionals;⁵³ (4) formulae introducing the direction quotation; and (5) the direct quotation itself.⁵⁴ Thus:

ARM X 53:5-7: lūp]ilum ina bīt Hišamētim Iši-aḫu šumšu itbēma ummāmi . . .
"In the temple of Hišamētum the [pro]phet, Iši-aḫu by name, arose and (spoke) thus . . ."

The new recipients of divine revelations according to *ARM X* are a *šangûm* 'priest' (*ARM X 51*) and an *assinnu* (*ARM X 80*),⁵⁵ which has been translated 'eunuch', 'homosexual', or 'cult-player'.⁵⁶ The question has also arisen whether *ARM X 80* refers to a new recipient, namely, a professional female speaker. The text reads:

Lines 6-9: *inanna l(?)sinnišat qabbātum (qa-ba-tum) ša Da[gañ] ša Terqa^{ki}*
[i]llikamma kī'am iqbêḥm
Now the female speaker of Da[gañ] of Terqa [c]ame and spoke to me thus.

49 *ARM X 94* is also by Šimātum and is most likely to be restored after the manner of *ARM X 95*. See Moran, *New Evidence*, 43, n. 3.

50 Inibšina does not address Zimri-Lim as "father" although she calls him "Star" but without adding *amatkāma*. Recently Sasson has distinguished two Inibšina's: (1) Zimri-Lim's sister who gets the second largest amount of oil among the Mari royal ladies; and (2) a daughter of Zimri-Lim and the author of *ARM X 80* (and presumably 81-83). See Sasson, *Biographical Notices*, 60-61. Although M. Birot originally took Inibšina to be Zimri-Lim's daughter, in a later communication he pointed out two texts with a seal bearing the inscription: *sinnišat Inib[šina] mārat Yaḫd[un-Li:n]* "Inib[šina], daughter of Yaḫd[un-Lim]." Although the reading is not certain, in Birot's judgment it is probable enough to show that Inibšina was not Zimri-Lim's daughter but rather his sister. See M. Birot as cited in J. Renger, *ZA* 58 (1967), 148, n. 262. Since *kakkabum* is used without *amatkāma* in the salutation of the letter and since Inibšina does not refer to Zimri-Lim as "father," the author of *ARM X 80-83* is probably Zimri-Lim's sister rather than his daughter.

51 According to Sasson (*Biographical Notices*, 68) Šimātum is a sister to Kirû(m) and Zimri-Lim's daughter. One should note that *ARM X 95:5-6 attāma ana mārtim u ana apiltim taddinanni* "You (Zimri-Lim) have made me daughter and heiress" is legalistic enough to exclude father-daughter relationship.

52 Public prophecies include: *ARM X 7, 8, 50, 53, 81; ARM(T) XIII 23, 114; A. 455.*

53 By "professional" is meant either *āpilum-āpiltum* or *mubḫûm-mubḫûtum*.

54 See Moran, *New Evidence*, 24-26.

55 The term *assinnu* probably occurs in the following broken texts: *ARM X 6:6; 7:25.*

56 For 'eunuch' see Dossin, *Sur le prophétisme à Mari*, 83; Ellermeier, *Prophetic*, 69. For 'cult-

Although Moran, as mentioned above, has constructively studied the typology in the introduction to the public prophecies, his study does not discuss the typology to be examined below. In our judgment such a typology argues in favor of reading *qabbātum*.

A combination of *a'ākum* and *qabûm* can be verified from the older "prophetic" texts:

A. 15:7-9: *Malik Dagān awīl Šakka il[li]kamma kī'am iqbêḥm ummāmi*
Malik-Dagan, a Šakkite, ca[me] and spoke to me thus . . . ;

A. 1121:41-43: [*šamūtam*] *awīlāpilum ša dAdad bēl Ḥalabki [ana Abu] ḥalim*
illikamma kī'am iqbêḥm [ummāmi]
[Furthermore] the *āpilum* of Adad, the lord of Ḥalab, came [to Abu-]Ḥalum and spoke to me thus . . . ;

ARM(T) III 40:9-12: *awīl[m]uḥḥûm ša d[D]agān illi[ka]mma awātam kī'am*
[i]qb[êḥm] ummāmi
An [ec] static of [D]agan ca[m]e and spoke a word [to me] thus . . . ;

ARM(T) XIII 114:8-10: *aššat awīlim illikamma aššum řēm Bābiliki kī'am iqbêḥm*
ummāmi
A man's wife came and spoke to me thus about news concerning Babylon . . .

The common element in this format is clearly: *illikamma kī'am iqbêḥm ummāmi* "He came and spoke to me thus." When the name of a god appears, then a designation such as *āpilum* or *muhḥûm* is present. Although ARM(T) II 90:16-18 is broken, it is probable that it would not support this conclusion. When the name of a god does not appear, then we have simply: *aššat awīlim* 'a man's wife' or *Malik Dagān awīl Šakka* 'Malik-Dagan, a Šakkite'.⁵⁷

Both Ellermeier⁵⁸ and Dossin⁵⁹ read the cuneiform as follows: *qa-ma-tum*, which Dossin then translates as 'ecstatic prophetess'.⁶⁰ On the other hand, Huffmon renders the entire phrase 'the lady Qamatum' because of the determinative designating a personal name.⁶¹ Römer⁶² and von Soden⁶³ both read *qabbātum*. The latter remarks, moreover, that although he does not find the word attested elsewhere, it is simply the feminine form of *qabbā'um* 'speaker'. Hence it is another designation for a female prophet. In the final analysis Moran is in the camp of Römer and von Soden: ". . . *qa-ma-tum* looks like a personal name because of the first determinative, but this is virtually excluded by the following phrase, 'of Dagan' . . . Or is the right reading *qa-ba-tum* and the form *qabbātum* (*parrāst* formation), 'a (professional) speaker' (Akk. *qabûm*)?"⁶⁴

player' see Moran, *New Evidence*, 30, 35, 52. For 'homosexual' see B. Landsberger, *WZKM* 56 (1960) 120, n. 31; von Soden, *AHw.*, 75b; idem, *Einige Bemerkungen*, 198; Römer, *Frauenbriefe*, 22. *CAD A2*, 341-42, agrees with Moran's more neutral stance.

57 Concerning Malik-Dagan see Dossin, *Une révélation*, 132-34.

58 See *Propétie*, 69.

59 See *Sur le prophétisme à Mari*, 83.

60 Loc. cit.

61 See *Prophecy in the Mari Letters*, 115.

62 See *Frauenbriefe*, 22.

63 See *Einige Bemerkungen*, 199.

64 *New Evidence*, 53. For the *parrāst* formation see von Soden, *GAG*, §550.

The typology discussed above suggests that we have a noun similar to *āpiltum* and *muhḫūtum*—and hence another term for the female recipient of a divine revelation.

In translating *qa-ma-tum* as 'ecstatic prophetess' Dossin is perhaps thinking of West Semitic *qûm*. In this regard, however, the regular verb 'to arise' in the Mari "prophetic" texts is *tebûm*. It is employed regularly in the introductory formulae:

tebûm and *qabûm*:

ARM(T) XIII 23:6-8: *aplûm ša Dagān ša Tut[tul] itbēma kī'am iqbi ummāmi*
The *aplûm* (variant of *āpilum*)⁶⁵ of Dagan of Tut[tul] arose and spoke thus . . . ;

tebûm and *dabābum*:

ARM X 81:4-6: *Innibana āpiltum itbēma kī'am idbub ummāmi*
The *āpiltum* Innibana arose and spoke thus . . .

tebûm alone:

ARM X 50:22-23: *muhḫutum ina bī Annunūtim itbēma ummāmi*
The female ecstatic arose in the temple of Annunitum and (spoke) as follows . . .⁶⁶

Basing himself on texts in Exodus, Jeremiah, and Deuteronomy that deal with sending-going, commanding-speaking, W. Holladay has suggested that Jeremiah understands himself to be a covenant mediator become prophet after the manner of Moses in particular.⁶⁷ In view of the typology of the Mari public prophecies where the verb *tebûm* is employed and in view of Jeremiah's link with Moses, ARM(T) XIII 23 and ARM X 81 thus offer more than passing interest. Jer. 1:17 states that God commanded Jeremiah to rise (*qûm*) and speak all that he commanded the prophet. Deut. 18:15, 18 mention that God will raise up the prophet (causative of *qûm*).⁶⁸ It should be noted that P. -R. Berger has already called attention to other texts as well.⁶⁹

Structure

As mentioned earlier, the majority of the ARM X texts are concerned with the person of Zimri-Lim and particularly with the beginnings of those events which brought about his downfall. In this the newer texts clearly deviate from the older ones, all of which,

65 For the relationship between *āpilum* and *aplûm* see Moran, ANET³, 625, n. 29; also Roberts, *Antecedents*, 132, n. 10. For a sound solution to the *muhḫûm-muhḫûm* problem, see H. Wohl, "The Problem of the *muhḫû*," JANES 3/2 (1970-71), 112-18.

66 See also ARM X 53:5-7. For the relationship of Ugaritic *tb'* to Akkadian *tebûm*, see H. L. Ginsberg, *The Legend of King Keret*, BASOR Supplementary Studies 2-3 (New Haven, 1946), 33.

67 See W. Holladay, "The Background of Jeremiah's Self-Understanding," JBL 83 (1964), 153-64; idem, "Jeremiah and Moses: Further Observations," JBL 85 (1966), 17-27.

68 See J. Muilenburg, "The 'Office' of the Prophet in Ancient Israel," in J. P. Hyatt, ed., *The Bible in Modern Scholarship* (Nashville, 1965), 86-89.

69 See P. -R. Berger, "Einige Bemerkungen zu Friedrich Ellermeier: Prophetie in Mari und Israel (Herzberg, 1968)," UF 1 (1969), 209. Here Berger refers to Deut. 34:10; Matt. 24:11; Mark 13:22; Luke 7:16.

with the exception of *ARM(T)* XIII 23, 114, dealt with the king as the patron of temples. However, it should be noted that A. 455, A. 2731, and A. 4260 resemble the older ones insofar as they treat cultic matters.⁷⁰

Because of a common danger it is not by chance that the *ARM X* texts evince a somewhat regular pattern not unlike some of the Old Testament oracles. The constant elements are: (1) the presence of a danger, either expressed or implied; (2) the intervention on the part of the god; (3) the mention of receiving the divine revelation from the one designated by the god and/or the sending on of the fringe and hair; and (4) the warning by the writer of the letter to the effect that the king be cautious.⁷¹

These elements are found in *ARM X* 50, 80, 81; they are substantially present in *ARM X* 4, 7, 10, 51, and 53. In *ARM X* 6 and 8 only the warning is missing.

The following texts serve to illustrate this structure:

(1) the presence of a danger:

ARM X 80:11-14: *Salīmātum ša awīl Ešnunna^{ki} 72 dāštumma⁷³ šapal tibnim mû illakû*

The peace overtures of the man of Esnunna are (sheer) treachery. Beneath the straw flow waters;

ARM X 50:24-25: *ana ḥarānim lā tallak ina Mari^{ki} šibma*

Do not go on the expedition. Remain in Mari;

(2) intervention on the part of the god:

ARM X 80:14-19: *u ana šētim ša uqaššaru⁷⁴ akammissu⁷⁵ aīšu uballaq u makkūršu*

70 See Dossin, *Sur le prophétisme à Mari*, 78-80, 85-86.

71 The following study was unavailable to me: K. Koch, "Die Briefe 'prophetischen' Inhalts aus Mari," *UF* 4 (1972), 53-77. A summary of the article may be found in *ZAW* 86 (1974), 112.

72 Concerning the king of Ešnunna see J. -R. Kupper in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, 1971), 1/2:15.

73 See *CAD D*, 118b; *AHw.*, 164b-65a. Moran opts for a variant of *dāšātum*, viz., *dēšātum*, in *ARM X* 4:44; see *New Evidence*, 48, n. 3.

74 *K[q]ašārum* in the D stem means 'to tie together, to surround with a fence or net, to fortify, to assemble . . .' (*CAD K*, 261b-262a; *AHw.*, 457a). The meaning of the entire phrase thus seems to be: "But I will gather him into a net which I will draw tight." At first Moran translates: "I shall gather him into a net which holds fast"; *New Evidence*, 52-53. Then he goes on to remark, "Instead of 'which holds fast', perhaps 'which I shall draw tight'"; *ibid.*, 53, n. 1. Heintz reflects the same hesitation: ". . . 'mais dans un filet, qui tient fermement, je le prendrai' . . . il est peut-être possible de traduire également par: 'que je tiendrai serré'"; *Oracles prophétiques*, 130. Dossin misses the point entirely by rendering: "I will gather him along with the wheat which I shall harvest"; *Sur le prophétisme à Mari*, 83. He wrongly reads *še-im* instead of *še-tim*, while taking *qšr* in its West Semitic sense; see Moran, *New Evidence*, 53, n. 1; Heintz, *Oracles prophétiques*, 130. See now N. M. Waldman, "Akkadian *kašāru* Semantic Equivalents," *JNES* 28 (1969), 250-54.

75 This hostile sense of *kašāsum* is further illustrated by *Atra-ḥašis* III:iii, 53-55 *ša lā imtalkūma iškunu a[būba] nišī ikmīsu ana ka[rāšī]* "Who did not consider but brought about a fl[ood] and consigned the people to destruc[tion];" see W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *Atra-ḥašis* (Oxford, 1969), 96-98. Compare *Gilg* XI:168-69 *aššu lā imtalkūma iškunu abūbu u nišīya imnū ana karāšī* "Because he did not

ša išt u aqdamī [l]jā šulput(u?)⁷⁶ ušalpa]t

But I will gather him into a net which I will draw tight. I will destroy his city and devastat[e] his property which from days of old has n[o]t been devastated;

ARM X 50:26: u anākūma ātanappal
and I alone will be responsible

(3) mention of receiving the divine intervention or revelation from the one designated by the god and/or sending on of the fringe and hair:

ARM X 80:20: annūtam iqbēm
This is what she told me;

ARM X 50:29-33: anumma šārti u sissikti sinništīm (?)⁷⁷ aknukamma ana šēr
bēliya ušābilam
I hereby seal the woman's (?) hair and fringe and send (them) to my lord;

(4) warning:

ARM X 80:21-27: inanna pagarka ušur balum tērtim ana libbi ālim[ki] lā
terru[b] kī'am ešme ummāmi ana ramānišu išanarr[ar] ana ramānika lā
tašt[a]narra[r]
Now guard yourself. Do not g[o] into the city without an omen. I have heard the following report: "He is continually mo[v]ing about by himself." Do not [k]eep mo[v]ing about by yourself;

ARM X 50:27-28: bēlī aḥšu lā inaddi ana pagrīšu našārim
My lord is not to neglect guarding himself.

(a) The presence of danger

The danger confronting Zimri-Lim is constant, yet the ways of expressing that danger differ. In ARM X 51 and 53 it is simply implied. In ARM X 4 Zimri-Lim is concerned with an attack by the forces of Išme-Dagan; he is informed that no battle will take place. In

think but brought about the flood and gave my people over to destruction." The Era Epic IV:19 employs not only the verb *kamāsu* but also the noun *šētu*: *ana šēti takmissunūti tābir tātabat qurādu Erra* "You gathered them into the net, you spread (them) out, you destroyed (them), O hero Erra;" see L. C. Cagni, *L'epopea di Erra*, Studi semitici 34 (Rome, 1969), 106.

⁷⁶ The first sign at the beginning of line 19 seems to be *la*. Dossin (*Sur le prophétisme à Mari*, 83), Ellermeier (*Prophetie*, 69), and Huffmon (*Prophecy in the Mari Letters*, 116) neglect the negative particle and thus translate: "and his possession which (exists) from ancient times I will utterly destroy." These translations furthermore read the text as: *šu-ul-pu-tam*. It must be admitted that the translation given above is based on a scribal error; hence it should read: *šu-ul-pu-tu*. Such stative use of the *š* conjugation is attested after antecedents such as *mātum*, *ātum*, and *bītum*; cf. *AHw.*, 536b. With Moran "We assume an error, *šulput* for *šulputu* (cf. ARM II 48:19; III 5:20; V 46:6). A reading *šulputam* would obviate this difficulty, but we see no reason for a ventive;" Moran, *New Evidence*, 53, n. 2.

⁷⁷ This reading is suggested by von Soden, *Einige Bemerkungen*, 198; on the other hand, Moran reads *anāku*; *New Evidence*, 38, n. 3.

ARM X 6:3'-4' the intention of the enemy is succinctly phrased: *awīlum šû mādātīm ana mātim annūtim ušām* "This man is determining⁷⁸ many things for this country." In ARM X 7:8-9 the test takes the form of a revolt: *¹Zimri-Lim ina bārtim ilattakūka* "O Zimri-Lim, they will test you with a revolt."

The most artistic presentation of the danger is that given in ARM X 80:13-14: *šapal tibnim mû illakū* "Beneath the straw there flow waters." After stating that the peace negotiations of the man of Ešnunna are treacherous, the writer quotes a proverb. By saying that water is to be found underneath the straw,⁷⁹ the author is implying that one cannot be satisfied with merely external appearances. Correcting Ellermeier's faulty translation,⁸⁰ von Soden paraphrases the proverb: "The surface is deceptive."⁸¹ Ultimately the political situation for Zimri-Lim was such that the surface of the water was not sufficient; the undercurrent had to be taken into account.

(b) Intervention on the part of the god

The manner of the god's intervention finds various expressions. A familiar symbol of destruction is that of the net or basket as in ARM X 80:14-15: *u ana šērim ša uqaššaru akammissu* "But I will gather him into a net which I will draw tight." Parallels to this from the earlier literature are:

A. 15:37-38: *u šarrā[nī] ša mārē-yamīna ina išsussul awīlbā'ī[rīm] x x x šišunūtīma*⁸²

And the king[s] of the Yaminites I will x x x them into a fi[sh]erman's basket;

ARM(T) XIII 23:9-10: *ana pūgim upaḫḫarka*
I will gather you (Babylon) into a net.

The biblical parallels to the net as a symbol of destruction are illustrative. Both Ezekiel (12:13; 17:19-20; 32:3) and Hosea (7:12) use this figure to advantage.⁸³ Amos'

78 Von Soden reads the verb *še'ûm* (*Einige Bemerkungen*, 198), translating 'to strive after'.

79 For the reading of the Sumerian logogram IN.NU.DA as Akkadian *tibnum* see *SL* 2/2:362; and for the meaning, cf. also E. Solberger, *Correspondence TCS* 1 (Locust Valley, 1966), 137.

80 Ellermeier, *Prophezie*, 69, translates: "Under the straw water comes up."

81 *Einige Bemerkungen*, 198.

82 It should be noted that *sussul bā'irim* is simply a 'fisherman's basket'; see *AHw.*, 1063b-64a; M. Held, *JAOS* 88 (1968), 92, n. 45. There is no support for Malamut's (*Prophecy in the Mari Documents*, 82) 'fisherman's spit', which is accepted by Moran, *ANET*³, 623, n. 7. As far as the verb is concerned, we must candidly admit our ignorance because of the break at this point. Malamut, *Prophecy in the Mari Documents*, 82, followed by Moran, *ANET*³, 623, n. 6, suggests the Š stem of *bašālum*, hence 'to have cooked'. However, since we are dealing with a fisherman's basket and not with a fisherman's spit, this suggestion is not likely. Dossin, *Une révélation*, 131, followed by Heintz, *Oracles prophétiques*, 130, offers the D stem of *pašālum*, hence 'to lead away'. Finally von Soden suggests the Š stem of the same verb (*Verkündigung des Gotteswillens*, 398; *AHw.*, 841b). However, regarding *pašālum* the D and Š stems are not otherwise attested; on the other hand, the Gtn stem is somewhat common; e.g., *TCL* 3:58 *eli erbi rettišunu iptāššilū kīma kalbi* "They kept crawling on all fours like a dog"; *TCL* 3:345 *aššu eṭir napīštišunu eli erbi rettišunu iptāššilūma* "In order to save themselves they kept crawling on all fours." I wish to express my gratitude to Prof. Held for these references.

83 For Ezekiel see W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel*, *BKAT* (Neukirchen, 1969), 386-87.

expression (4:2) concerning the women of Samaria is not far removed from that of the A. 15 text: *w^enissā' 'et^ekem b^ešinnô^tw^e'ab^arūt^eken b^ešîrôt dūgāb* "They will drag you away by hooks and the last of you in fish pots." Both in Mari and the Bible the divine intervention is to be regarded as decisive.⁸⁴

As might be suspected from the very nature of the intervention, it very often involves the god's pronouncement of the enemy's defeat. Such pronouncements include the following:

ARM X 6:4¹-8¹: ul ikaššad bēlī immar ša ilum awīlim šāti ippēšu takaššassu u elišū tazaz ūmūšu qerbū ul iballut

He will not be successful. My lord will see what the god[dess] will do to this man. You will defeat him and will stand over him. His time is short. He will not live;⁸⁵

ARM X 8:12-18: nakrīka ana qātika umalla⁸⁶ u awīlī Šarrākīya ašabbatma ana karāš^dBēlet-ekallim akammissunūti

I will deliver your enemies into your hand. Furthermore, I will seize the men of Sarrakiya and will collect them for the destruction of Belet-ekallim;

ARM X 53:16: [an]āku kabsākšunūti

I have crushed them [my]self.⁸⁷

Referring to *ARM(T) XIII 114:13-14: [l]ā iḫāš u ma[mman] [l]ā iḫā[š]*⁸⁸ "He is [n]ot to worry, he is [n]ot ev[er] to worr[y]," J. Hayes finds a parallel to Isa. 7:3-9 where Isaiah offers Ahaz an oracle of assurance and a denunciation of the enemy as part of that assurance.⁸⁹ It is clear that the newer Mari texts quoted above provide more parallels to the biblical oracles against the nations since these texts focus chiefly on the menace in the person of Hammurabi of Babylon. One is reminded of the prophets opposing Micaiah ben

84 For a discussion of the Mari and biblical evidence see Heintz, *Oracles prophétiques*, 129-31, 135-37.

85 In a recent article ("Aux origines d'une expression biblique: *ūmūšu qerbū*, in A. R. M., X/6, 8?") *VT* 21 [1971], 528-40) Heintz has attempted to connect the expression *ūmūšu qerbū* with the biblical "Day of the Lord." It is noteworthy that Heintz is here following the holy war solution to the "Day of the Lord" proposed by G. von Rad, "The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh," *JSS* 4 (1959), 97-108. More convincingly, however, Moran, *New Evidence*, 37, n. 3, prefers to see the expression *ūmūšu qerbū* as part of the Old Babylonian omen literature, citing the following phrase, *ul iballut*, as belonging to the apodoses of the same literary corpus.

86 For the relationship of *ana qāt X mullūm* to the biblical *nātan b^eyād* see Moran, *ANET*³, 623, n. 5; Malamat, *Prophecy in the Mari Documents*, 82; and Heintz, *Oracles prophétiques*, 126. The expression *ana qāt X mullūm* is typically Old Babylonian; note, e.g., the Epilogue to the Code of Hammurabi, LI:19-21 *šū'āti ana qāt nakrīšu limālūšūma* "May she (Ištar) deliver that (man) into the power of his enemies."

87 For *kabāsum* see *CAD K*, 7; *AHW*, 415.

88 For the semantic value of *ḫāšum* here note the following: F. Ellermeier, "Das Verbum *ḫūš* in Koh 2:25," *ZAW* 75 (1963), 197-217; Heintz, *Oracles prophétiques*, 121-22; and P. -E. Dion, "The 'Fear Not' Formula and Holy War," *CBQ* 32 (1970), 568-69.

89 See J. H. Hayes, "The Usage of Oracles against Foreign Nations in Ancient Israel," *JBL* 87 (1968), 85.

Imlah: "Go up to Ramoth-gilead; you shall succeed. The Lord will deliver it over to the king" (1 Kgs. 22:12). Jeremiah's foe, Hananiah, spoke in much the same way: "Thus says the Lord: 'Even so, within two years I will break the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, from off the neck of all the nations'" (Jer. 28:11). The oracle proclaiming the enemy's doom thus functions as an oracle of salvation for the king. Consequently the oracle against the nations is hardly an invention of the classical prophets; it is at home in the ancient Near East from a very early date.

(c) Mention of receiving the divine intervention or revelation from the one designated by the god and/or sending on of the fringe and hair

In ARM X 80:20 Inibšina, the writer of the letter, merely concludes her report: *annūtam iqbêṁ* "This is what she told me." What is somewhat surprising is that, unlike ARM X 50:29-33 examined above, there is no mention of sending on the fringe and hair. This practice is documented in both the older and newer "prophetic" texts:

A. 15:53: *u aššum awīlum šû taklu*⁹⁰ *šārassu u sissi[k]tašu ul ilqe*
And since that man is trustworthy, I did not take his hair and his fr[on]ge;

ARM(T) VI 45:14-17: [*a*]numma tuppi Aḥim [š]ārtam u sissiktam ša muḥḥūtim
[ana š]ēr bēliya [uštābi]lam
I [h]ereby [se]nd Aḥum's letter and the female ecstatic's [h]air and fringe [to]
my lord;

ARM(T) XIII 112:11¹-15¹: *inanna anumma sissikti šubāt[i]šu u itqam ša qaqqadišu*
ana šēr bē[i]iya uštābi[!]am
I now hereby sen[d] to my lo[r]d the fringe of his gar[m]ent and a lock of his head;

ARM X 8:19-28: *ina šanîm ūmim* ¹*Aḥum šangûm ṭēmam annēm šārtam u sissiktam*
ublamma ana bēliya ašpuram šārtam u sissiktam aknukamma ana šēr bēliya uštābilam
The second day Aḥum the priest brought me this report, the hair, and the fringe; and
I have written to my lord. The hair and the fringe I have sealed and sent to my lord.⁹¹

M. Noth understands this act of taking hair and hem as a magical one. These items can be relatively easily taken from a man and once taken, they are enough to keep a hold on him. Should the situation merit it, one can cast spells on the hair and hem. In turn, since the hair and hem are connected with the whole man, they will have an analogous effect on the wearer even when he is not there.⁹² By cutting off the hem of Saul's garment (1 Sam. 24:5), David thus acquired a magical power over him.⁹³

90 This reading will be discussed below, n. 102.

91 For other references to the hair and fringe see A. 455; ARM X 7:23-27; 50:29-33; 81:19-20.

92 See M. Noth, "Remarks on the Sixth Volume of Mari Texts," JSS 1 (1956), 328; also Nötscher, *Propbetie*, 183.

93 See Noth, *Remarks*, 328. For the fringe as a source of power, see J. de Fraine, "Fimbria vestimenti," *Verbum Domini* 25 (1947), 218-30; F. Vattioni, "'Et tetigit fimbriam vestimenti eius' (Mt. 9, 20)," *Augustinianum* 5 (1965), 533-38; E. Haulotte, *Symbolique du vêtement selon la Bible* (Paris, 1966), 79-80.

However, the more recent "prophetic" material confirms a legal rather than a magical purpose. As A. Malamat has argued, "in addition to serving as guarantees there is the physical aspect for the seizure of the cloak-fringe and hairlock, as proof of the owner's identity."⁹⁴ The purpose, therefore, of this action is twofold: (1) to identify the person; and (2) to guarantee his truthfulness. Against this background D. Conrad has discussed 1 Sam. 15:27; he sees Saul's seizure of part of Samuel's garment as an action whereby Samuel may be identified and, more importantly, tested as to the veracity of his bitter message against Saul.⁹⁵

The question still remains: why were the hem and hair demanded in some cases and not in others? A. Finet has recently addressed himself to this question. He maintains that the symbols are not sent unless they are explicitly mentioned.⁹⁶ However, his principal criterion is the social status of the recipient.⁹⁷ Thus, the *šangûm* of ARM X 51, the *āpilum* of A. 1121, and the *qâmatum* (*sic*) of ARM X 80 are not obliged to send the symbols precisely because they occupy a higher echelon in the hierarchy.⁹⁸ In ARM X 7, on the other hand, the hem and hair of the *assinnu* must be taken; similarly in ARM(T) VI 45 the symbols must be taken from the *muhhūtum*.⁹⁹ The *assinnu* and the *muhhūtum* (as well as the *muhhûm*) are thus obliged, in this view, because of their inferior social standing.

The argumentation adopted by Finet is subject to some criticism. First of all, it does not distinguish between prophecies and dreams. Secondly, although it is true that the symbols are not mentioned in A. 1121, this need not be due to the status of the recipient as an *āpilum*. Rather, it should be remarked A. 1121 speaks of Zimri-Lim in the third person as opposed to the second person style of the oracles. Moreover, A. 2731 now identifies Nur-Adad, Zimri-Lim's ambassador, as the writer of A. 1121. In A. 2731 we find the use of the second person and the statement of repeated attempts to have the oracle followed. Hence the symbols may have been sent earlier.¹⁰⁰ A more cogent reason, also pointed out by Moran,¹⁰¹ is that Aleppo was outside Zimri-Lim's jurisdiction.

Something other than the status of the recipient seems to be demanded by the evidence of the texts. Moran appears to have provided a sufficiently probable answer. For dreams there does not seem to be any absolute rule and matters may have been left in large part to personal judgment.¹⁰² Concerning other predictions or warnings to the king, if they were

94 *Prophetic Revelations*, 226.

95 See D. Conrad, "Samuel und die Mari- 'Propheten,'" in W. Voigt, ed., *XVII Deutscher Orientalistentag*, ZDMG Suppl. 1 (Wiesbaden, 1969) 1:273-80.

96 See *Les symboles*, 118.

97 *Ibid.*, 122; Conrad, *Samuel*, 277, apparently shares the same view.

98 See Finet, *Les symboles*, 122-23.

99 *Ibid.*, 123-24.

100 See Moran, *New Evidence*, 21.

101 *Loc. cit.*

102 Regarding dreams the symbols are mentioned in ARM X 50:29-33 and ARM(T) XIII 112:11¹-15¹. Contrary to Moran, *New Evidence*, 39, the symbols sent in ARM X 50:29-33 are not those of the writer of the letter but of the *muhhūtum*. For this see von Soden, *Einige Bemerkungen*, 198, who reads *sinnistim*

communicated privately, the symbols were never demanded, no matter who was the recipient. "On the other hand," concludes Moran, "it seems they had to be handed over if the message was announced publicly, that is, in the temple and presumably in the presence of worshippers."¹⁰³ In the case of private prophecies the king could, therefore, act at his own discretion. However, in the case of public prophecies the king was subject to greater pressure. Hence possession of the symbols acted as a deterrent against prophets too casually giving vent to their inspirations.

This discussion points up the problem of orthodoxy and the prophetic word, a perennial problem in Israel's history. To be sure, there are the norms of Deut. 13:1-6 and 18:13-22, but Jer. 23:9-40 graphically illustrates their limitations.¹⁰⁴ The biblical situation is such that the prophet cannot invoke any infallible criterion until the fulfillment of his message. Certainly the conviction with which he speaks plays a role, but it is not the absolute norm.¹⁰⁵ What is significant in the study of Mari and Israelite prophecy is that in the latter there is no recourse to omnia in order to prove the truthfulness of the prophet's word. Yahweh's word was not to be manipulated by man's "objective" criteria.

(d) Warning

The fourth element in the structure is the warning issued by the writer. Thus, it is a question of a judgment made by the writer on the basis of the divine revelation. As was

and Berger, *Einige Bemerkungen*, 208, who reads *awiltim*. In ARM X 51, 94, 117 (in this last text the reading is only probable since the letter is broken at this point) and ARM(T) XIII 113 the dreams are merely communicated to the king. In this connection A. 15:53 is instructive since the translation of the text determines the reasons for not sending the symbols: *u aššum awiltum šû X-lu šārassu u sissi[k]tašu ul ilqe* "And since that man is X-lu, I did not take his hair and his fri[n]ge." The suggested readings of the cuneiform are: (1) *taklu* 'trustworthy'; see A. L. Oppenheim, "The Archives of the Palace of Mari," *JNES* 13 (1954), 131; Malamet, *Prophetic Revelations*, 225, n. 2; Moran, *ANET*³, 623, n. 9; Heintz, *Prophetie*, 545; Roberts, *Antecedents*, 133, n. 23); (2) *qallu* 'of lowly background'; see von Soden, *Verkündigung*, 399; (3) *kallu* 'an official'; see Dossin, *Une révélation*, 132; Noth, *Remarks*, 328; (4) *kallu* 'a fast messenger'; see Ellermeier, *Prophetie*, 27, 29, 97-110). Ellermeier (reading 4) seems to have adopted that suggested by von Soden (reading 2) insofar as, in his view, a 'fast messenger' is one 'of lowly background'. Taken in itself, this is hardly a reason for not taking the symbols; rather, the opposite would seem to obtain, viz., because of such a background one might need greater assurance. (It should be noted that von Soden in *AHw.*, 894b, does not cite the A. 15 text; rather he refers the reader to *taklu*, thereby abandoning his translation 'of lowly background' in favor of 'trustworthy'.) Moreover, Oppenheim notes that the designation *qallu* is always written *qa-al-lu*, never *qal-lu*; see *The Archives*, 131. A priori one cannot dismiss Dossin's view (reading 3) that the status of official dispensed from the obligation of sending the symbols—a view subsequently developed by Finet, as seen above. In view of the total situation, however, since the purpose was that of identity and guarantee of veracity, *taklu* (reading 1) appears more cogent than the status of official.

103 Moran, *New Evidence*, 19-20.

104 See R. Davidson, "Orthodoxy and the Prophetic Word," *VT* 14 (1964), 407-16.

105 For a discussion of this problem see H. J. Kraus, *Prophetie in der Krisis*, *Biblische Studien* 43 (Neukirchen, 1964); T. W. Overholt, *The Threat of Falsehood*, *SBT* 2/16 (Naperville, 1971); J. L. Crenshaw, *Prophetic Conflict*, *BZAW* 124 (Berlin, 1971); F. L. Hossfeld and I. Meyer, *Prophet gegen Prophet*, *Biblische Beiträge* 9 (Fribourg, 1973).

previously indicated, the general tone of these letters is the grave peril facing Zimri-Lim. A recurring expression, therefore, is *paġaršu našārum* 'to guard oneself':

ARM X 50:27-28: *bēlī aḫšu lā inaddi ana paġrišu našārim*

My lord is not to neglect guarding himself;

ARM X 51:17-19: *inanna bēlī ana našār paġrišu lā igge*

Now my lord must not neglect guarding himself;

ARM X 81:25-26: *!Kakka[bī] paġaršu lišsur*

Let [my] Star guard himself.

On at least two occasions, moreover, the command for the king to protect himself is found in the god's intervention:

ARM X 7:11-15: *paġarka ušur wardī ebbīka ša tarammu itātika šukun*

Guard yourself. Place around yourself servants, your officials, whom you love;

ARM X 51:14-16: *ana išdimtim¹⁰⁶ ana mīnim ūtenelli paġaršu [lišsur]*

Why does he keep going up to the tower? Let him [gua]rd himself.

The writer is not infrequently given to repeated exhortations. One such exhortation concerns the king's precarious activity of roaming about by himself:

ARM X 80:27: *ana ramānika lā tašt[a]narra[r]¹⁰⁷*

Do not [k]eep mo[v]ing around by yourself;

ARM X 7:18-19: *ana ramānik[a] lā tattana[lla]k*

Do not keep go[ing] around by your[self];

ARM X 51:14-15: *ana išdimtim ana mīnim ūtenelli*

Why does he keep going up to the tower?

What is striking is the use of the *tan* infix in the verbs. Secondly a verb of motion is employed.¹⁰⁸

The warning is intimately bound up with the danger and the god's reaction to that danger. It is not by chance that it usually concludes the letter, since it is a line of action flowing from the danger and the god's assistance. Furthermore it indicates that the god's intervention was never absolute. It required the king's cooperation, at least as far as his personal safety was concerned.

106 For the reading *išdimtim* as opposed to his original *bī kimtim*, see Moran, *New Evidence*, 56, addenda.

107 Dossin, *Sur le prophétisme à Mari*, 83, translates: "As to your person, do not be afraid." Similarly Heintz, *Oracles prophétiques*, 123: "As to your person, do not be wavering." It must be urged that the exhortation not to fear makes little sense after lines 21-24. For the equation *šarārum* = *alākum* and the translation of *šarārum* as 'to move about', see Dion, *The "Fear Not" Formula*, 568, and Moran, *New Evidence*, 53, n. 3.

108 For the Ntn conjugation of *šarārum* see GAG, § 101g.

Conclusions

These observations on the media, style, and structure of the ARM X "prophetic" texts have revealed both similarities and dissimilarities between Mari's "prophets" and Israel's prophets. These final remarks are calculated to summarize some of these points.

By far the most patent line of demarcation is the content of the revelations. While the earlier texts highlighted cultic needs and the king's role in satisfying these needs, the ARM X texts have emphasized the personal safety of the king in the most precarious of circumstances. On the other hand, Hosea's attack on the Canaanite fertility rite, Amos' battle for justice for the underprivileged, Isaiah's demand for faith, and Ezekiel's sermons on the fall of the nation as the condition for the rise of the people could not even be envisioned in Mari. In the power of its language and the resourcefulness of its preachers Israelite prophecy is unrivalled. Nevertheless, to compare Mari "prophecy" with classical Israelite prophecy implies respecting the time differential. Approximately a millennium separates the "prophets" of Mari from the first of Israel's classical prophets.

With few exceptions Mari "prophecies" were directed to the king and have survived because of bureaucratic controls. On the other hand, such "prophets" did not address the general public, announcing a message which applied to both king and subject. In Israel's early monarchy, including the divided kingdom, Nathan, Gad, Ahijah, and Shemaiah also functioned in court circles. The extent of their prophetic work is not preserved but such silence should remind us that Israelite prophecy also came under the law of growth and development.

Ultimately the difference between Mari "prophecy" and Israelite prophecy is the difference between Mari and Israelite religion. Yahweh is not Dagan. The king, even as conceived in the Judean royal ideology,¹⁰⁹ was not absolute; the control he exercised could never totally and perpetually overcome the prophetic utterance. The state itself was not invincible. Contrary to ancient near eastern theology, the state could flounder in weakness while Yahweh remained unassailable. Israelite religion could see in disaster the condition for national rebirth. The faith of Israel was not the faith of Mari. Yet when the God of Israel chose to send a prophet, he chose a means of revelation which had been in vogue in Mari centuries before.¹¹⁰

109 See K. Seybold, *Das davidische Königtum im Zeugnis der Propheten*, FRLANT 107 (Göttingen, 1972).

110 For an excellent survey of extrabiblical and biblical prophecy see L. Ramlot "Prophétisme," *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* 8:811-943.