

MARI DREAMS

JACK M. SASSON

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL

... *Present Fears*
Are less than horrible imaginings.
Macbeth, I/iii

THE ONEIRIC IMAGINATION, SOMETIMES LUXURIANT AND PHANTASMAGORICAL, feeds upon the personal knowledge and experience of the dreamer. In ancient times, however, the interpretation of dreams was usually assigned to individuals other than the dreamer; for the analytic imagination was not one which could be nurtured without extensive and formal preparations. In literary works, of course, this bifurcation of roles need not have occurred, and the dreams embedded therein were shaped by a poet's omniscient eye, one capable of crafting dreams to suit predicted or known endings. It is not surprising therefore, that when A. Leo Oppenheim chose to take up the problem of dream interpretation in the ancient world,¹ his material was overwhelmingly scientific and literary. At his disposal was but a handful of non-literary examples. Of those he collected from the OB period, only one had come from Mari.² Since then, the corpus of epistolary documentation which mentions or reports dreams has increased. One of these letters, *AbB* V:10,

mentions dreams in a sharp retort.³ The remainder was recovered at Mari.⁴

It is probably due to an accident of discovery that the Mari archives have not, as yet, provided us with letters which testify to the critical ability of an expert Mari dream interpreter, to his powers for decoding the signs and symbols of a night's revelation and for converting them into meaningful acts.⁵ What we do find among the documents are letters which articulate the dreamer's memory of a nocturnal vision. Occasionally, the reaction of the dreamer, or that of the letter's dispatcher, is lightly and perfunctorily registered. My paper, therefore, will only incidentally interpret a particular dream and will only occasionally try to establish a context for its manifestation. Rather, I will focus on the language and the structure of the Mari dream, and try to analyze the manner in which dream sequences are fitted within the mundane information that is usually communicated in letters. For convenience's sake, I will concentrate on three documents from the dossier of a highly placed lady, Addu-dūri. Since these texts report dreams that are fairly representative of oneiric experiences available from Mari, I shall reserve for an appendix brief remarks on the remaining examples.

¹ Oppenheim, 1956. See also his supplementary texts, 1969, and his reassessments, 1966a and 1966b. Further Assyriological discussions on the interpretation of dreams can be found in Falkenstein, 1966 and Bottéro, 1974.

² *PBS* VII/1, #17 (discussed in Oppenheim, 1956:229) and *TCL* I:53 (cf. p. 226). The Mari example (A. 15) discussed by Oppenheim, p. 195, will be broached in Appendix A. It has been frequently translated and widely discussed. For bibliography, see Noort, 1977:202 (sub. No. 8); Ellermeier, 1968:24–8. The most easily accessible translation is by Moran, 1969b:623. Oppenheim did not treat *TCL* XVIII:100: "Tell Sin-ušelli, Šērim-ili says: "This day is dark. I walk a mile and stay worried, and yet you don't resolve my problem. While I dream of you constantly, you (act) as if we have never met or as if I don't exist. And you don't resolve my problem . . ." The problem, as the text clarifies, is most mundane.

³ In a response to stern message from a lady, a man urges that she dream her own dream, *šunat ramnīki attīma taṭṭūli*. This may be taken sarcastically, see Westenholz, 1974:411–2.

⁴ A. 15 (Dossin, 1948:128/130); A. 222 (Dossin, 1975:28); *ARM(T)* X: 10 (?), 50, 51, 94, 100, 117, XIII:112, 113.

⁵ Because of the haphazardous archival techniques obtaining at Mari, I seriously question the potential for officials to retrieve letters with oneiric examples either for consultation or in order to match subsequent activities to the guidelines suggested by a dream (Sasson, 1972). I state this despite the fact that all but one letters with dream sequences (X:117) lay in room 115.

Addu-dūri's exact position in the Mari hierarchy and the nature of her kinship, if any, with the royal family are yet to be determined.⁶ Batto, 1974:64–72, charts her activities within the Mari palace but can only speculate that she may have been a widow of an ally (a certain Hatni-Addu) or that she may have come from Aleppo to accompany Šibtu, the queen. Subsequent information, published by Rouault in *ARMT XVIII*, 234–5, has not appreciably clarified the issue, while Finet's romantic view, 1972:69, that she replaced Šibtu on Zimri-Lim's couch, is far-fetched. She may have been one of Zimri-Lim's sisters. But all this uncertainty in no way alters the obvious fact that Addu-dūri had the king's attention and that she did move easily among Mari's top administrators. She was, therefore, not reticent about conveying her opinions, and she may have felt that her messages and reports of oracular and divinatory activities would elicit appropriate royal response.⁷

Our investigation opens with a fragmentary document, X:117, a letter to Addu-dūri, which was one of three documents (the others being X:105 and 134) recovered from the palace's courtyard (Parrot, 1958: 36–37). Its author, Timlū, is nowhere else attested in the archives. The recoverable passage (11: 4–10) reads as follows:

It was indeed a sign⁸ that when [. . .] Yar³ip-Abba made me leave Kasapā,⁹ I came to you

⁶ See listings of references in *ARMT XVI/1:50*. The reading Hatni-Addu in Addu-dūri's seal is confirmed by Durand's collations, 1981b.

Addu-dūri's dossier was recovered from a number of rooms. 1. *Correspondence: a.* To Zimri-Lim, Rm 115 (II:124; X:50–60); to Mukannišum, Rm 135 (X:61). *b.* From Zimri-Lim, Rm 110 (X:142–143; 147–150); Rm 135 (X:146); from Timlū, Rm 51 (X:117). 2. Allusion to Addu-dūri are made in economic and bureaucratic documents recovered from Rms 5 (in *ARM XII*), 110 (in *ARM VII*), 115 (in *ARM XI* and *XIII*), and 135 (in *ARM XVIII*). For specific entry, see the listings in *XVI/1:50*. This wide scattering of documentation only accentuates the feeling I reported in n. 5. [Addu-dūri's activities are also charted in texts in rooms 134 and 160 (*ARM XXI*).]

⁷ As it apparently did, e.g., in X:143.

⁸ Frankena, 1974:32 restores *ina bū* for the end of l. 5 and translates: "May it be a sign that when "[] in Kasapā brought me out of Yar³ip-Abba's house . . ." While this restoration is plausible, there does not seem to be enough space to accommodate it. Frankena's article collects references

and addressed you as follows: 'I saw a dream *in your behalf*, and in this dream of mine. . .'

Timlū's dream, by which her sign was confirmed, is not extant, with lines of narrative continuity found only at the end of the letter wherein Addu-dūri is asked: "Send me the scarf of your head; may I smell the fragrance of my lady and may my heart, having died, revive (thereby)."¹⁰

That Timlū is socially dependent on Addu-dūri is clear from her address where she labels the latter "my lady," and from the homage she planned to pay (cf. Dossin, 1938–40:70:2–3). Kasapā, the town which Timlū has left, is in Kurda's territory. But we need not be concerned here with the circumstances which found Timlū so far from Mari and with her relationship to Yar³ip-Abba. What is interesting is the phrase *šuttam amurakkim*. While the accusative of *šuttum* is often associated with the verb *amārum* (or *naṭālum*), when speaking of dream manifestations, suffixing a dative (with ventive) to *amārum* is rare. The few examples I have collected suggest that *ARMT X*'s rendering, "j'ai vu pour toi un rêve," is closer to the mark than, say, Moran's (1969:45) "I had a dream concerning you."¹¹ And if this understanding is correct, X:117 implies that Addu-dūri, or anyone for that matter, can commission certain individuals to receive dreams on their behalf.¹²

for the occurrence of *lū ittum(-ma)* with (*ša*) *inūma*. Of these, only VI:76:5–8 offers a close parallel to our passage. See also *OBTR* 153:5–8. I have adopted *ARMT X*'s asseverative use of *lū*.

⁹ For this GN see *TAVO* 3:145–6; *ARMT XVI/1:19*, and the entry in *RIA*.

¹⁰ Moran, 1980:188.

¹¹ Moran, 1969a:45. The evidence for noun in accus. + *amārum* + ventive + dative suffix is as follows:

(G prec.) *AbB* II:56:8—(timber) *limurūnikkum-ma*
(G. imperf.) *AbB* II:175:15—(straw) *ammarakkunūšim*
(Gtn. imper.) *AbB* VI:199:37—(ox) *atammaram-ma*.

¹² Thorkild Jacobsen has written me as follows: "For what it may be worth I suggest that when Timlū was driven out of Kasapā she sought refuge with Addu-dūri and used a dream favorable to the latter, as a means to get access to her. The dative in [*šū-ut-ī*]a-am a-mu-ra-ki-ī[m-ma] 'I saw a dream for you' I would understand along the lines of English: 'I have news for you!'. In the present letter she uses this dream, which presumably was known only to the two of them, as a

What is intriguing about this hypothesis is that Mari's archives include two other letters in which Addu-dūri reports dreams. In *ARM* X:51, Addu-dūri communicates a dream reported to her by Idin-ili, a *šangūm*-priest of Itūr-Mer. In doing so, Addu-dūri involves herself rather lightly; for, as she concludes the dream report, she perfunctorily restates the divine advice delivered within the message. Therefore, Addu-dūri's role in this instance is not too dissimilar from ones in which she communicates the results of extispicies (X:54–55), of an inquest (X:58), of an investigation (X:59), etc. It is not clear whether special significance is to be attached to having a priest of Itūr-Mer channeling Bēlet-bīri's message;¹³ if this be fluidity in cultic allegiance, it would not be unusual for Mari. But here two points can be made. 1. X:10 makes it plain that incubation at Itūr-Mer's temple in Mari quickens the reception of dreams (verb: *amāru*), and 2. As far as present documentation indicates,

'password' (CAD I p. 308. 3a.) to prove that the letter actually comes from her."

Two fragmentary letters which Kibri-Dagan, governor of the Terqa district, dispatched to the king show that even non-commissioned dreams must be delivered to those most affected by their portents. Of interest to us are II. 16–18 of XIII:113: "This man recounted that dream and he placed the onus on me (*arnam eḷiya utēr-ma*) with the following words: 'Write to the king!'" The idiom *arnam [eli x] turrum* occurs in III:12:23 (exchanged by the same correspondents!) and there it likewise implies fulfilling the transmission of a message: (Formerly the Benjaminites used to roam at will; the king went on a campaign giving strong orders to the officials) "I placed the onus on them, so that, as it used to be, no one from among the troublemakers can now come from the Upper Region to his settlement." Note however that *AHW*, 1335 (D. 15dB) still maintains that the idiom in III:12 is *uznam turrum*.

XIII:112, also from the same writer, reveals the price paid by those who fail to communicate a dream to the proper authorities. When a man saw a dream in which a god [read in I. 1': AN^{lum}-*ma*, as in 8'] delivers an ukase, then fails to transmit it, the same dream is repeated the next night [but slightly accented on the active role to be played by the message's ultimate recipients, [compare *būtum šū inneppiš-ma* of I. 3' with I. 10' *teppešāšu-ma*], the man was stricken ill. See also *OBTR* 65.

XIII:112, 113 will be discussed in Appendix A.

¹³ This Idin-ili may be identified with the *kumrum*-priest of VIII:1:37 ['Assyrian' period]. *ARM* XXI:333:43 mentions an Ea-lamassi *mu-hu-ū* of Itūr-Mer

Bēlet-bīri, "Lady of Divination," did not have a temple either at Mari or at its environs.¹⁴

The dream itself is dramatically unimpressive. While it is possible that it is Addu-dūri herself, if not her scribe, who chose to shape its contents in such a rigidly static manner, Idin-ili's own memory assigns no active role for the dreamer. We are told nothing about Idin-ili's whereabouts when Bēlet-bīri manifested herself to him; nothing about the locale, the time, the circumstance; we are given no hints regarding his mental state at any point during the vision.¹⁵ Only a touch of movement in his tableau is suggested by the dative suffix in *izzizzam-ma* (l. 19). But because of the paucity of similar constructions, it is hard to judge the kineticity of that particular act, and the ending may merely convey a ventive dimension that is hard to assess. Moran's (1969b:631) "DN stepped up to me," seems too intense while *ARMT* X's "se tenait (devant moi)" would be more plausible were an imperfect used here. However, whatever the motion implied by the suffix, it is counterbalanced by the preterit conjugation, which freezes the whole scene into a precise moment in the past. The message of Bēlet-bīri, despite the potentially contradictory tenor of its two distinct sections, is meant to assure the king of the goddess's solicitude.¹⁶ It ends abruptly; and

¹⁴ With *AHW*, 118 and 130 and contra *CAD* B. 265 ("Lady of [Erum—a GN]"). While Bēlet-bīri's name became that of Mari's 10th month, as yet no personal names from Mari incorporate the goddess's. See now XXI:34:4–5, 10: "4 UDU {UDU} NITAH, *a-na* ^dNIN-be-ri . . . *i-na ma-ri*(KI)."

¹⁵ I use the term 'vision' here purposefully since I share the opinion that a distinction between 'dream' and 'vision' cannot be substantiated either through the analysis of vocabulary or through dissecting the forms and structure of the phenomena. On this point see Oppenheim, 1956:188, 190, 192, 205–6, 225–7; Ehrlich, 1953:8–12; Hanson, 1978: 1408–9 (with bibliography).

¹⁶ Von Soden, 1980:210 reads *šar¹-ru-tum* at l. 12 and prefers to restore *na-am-la-a[k-t]i²* at its end: "Das Königtum ist meine Domäne." However Mari's two other attestations of *namlaktum* are applicable to human realms (Finet, 1966:19:12; XIII:143:13). Translate, therefore, : "Kingship is his [. . . ?] and the dynasty his permanent state. Why, (therefore,) is he constantly climbing siege towers? He ought to be protecting himself." Thus, in assuring the king of the stability of his reign and the permanence of his line, the goddess chides him for his reliance on warfare. [See collocations below.]

with it ends the dreamer's participation. Only Addu-dūri retains space to deliver her own anxiety about the king's welfare.¹⁷

This anxiety is most immediately recognized in a dream which Addu-dūri herself experienced (X:50). While two other Mari texts, X:94 and 100 (see APPENDIX), contain dreams reported by their experiencers, Addu-dūri's is certainly the most remarkable manifestation of oneiric imagination yet available. To sustain the interest of the reader through the ensuing analysis which may become too intricate, I have resorted to a convention by which I distinguish between two Addu-dūris: the one who is reporting the dream will be given in ordinary roman letterings, while the one whose movement are charted within the dream will be in small caps (ADDU-DŪRI). The translation given below will be refined as the investigation progresses.

- 1-2 Tell my lord: Addu-dūri, your maid-servant, says:
 3-7 Since the *šulum* of your father's house, I have never had a dream (such as) this. Previous portents of mine (were as) this pair (?).
 8-12 In my dream,¹⁸ I entered Bēlet-ekallim's chapel; but Bēlet-ekallim was not in residence. Moreover, the statues before her were not there. Upon seeing this, I broke into uncontrollable weeping.
 13 This dream of mine occurred during the night's first phase (lit. during the evening watch).
 14-20 I resumed (*dreaming*), and Dada, priest of Ištar-pišra, was standing at the door of Bēlet-ekallim('s chapel), but a hostile voice kept on uttering: "*tūra dagan, tūra dagan.*"
 20-21 This is what it kept on uttering . . .

It is the descriptive power of Addu-dūri, rarely equalled in non-literary documents, as well as her choice of vocabulary, that infuses the message with its uncanny quality. From the outset, she presents the king with her judgment on what is to follow, for she admits that what is to unfold presently had never been matched since major events overtook the king's

¹⁷ On other dreams reported by third parties, see Appendix A.

¹⁸ Craghan, 1974:43-5 argues that *ina šuttiya* is a West Semitic idiom.

ancestors. Between this assessment and the detailing of the dream, Addu-dūri inserts a statement that is not easily evaluated: *ittātūya ša pānānum annittān*. While the meaning 'portent' for *ittum* is available to Mari, such a rendering may harm the logic of the full statement. Since Addu-dūri has just disclosed the unprecedented nature of the dream's contents, it may be best to understand this declaration contrastively. Therefore, Addu-dūri is informing Zimri-Lim that the dream is but a reproduction, a reenactment, of an episode drawn from actual experience; the dream partakes of experience that is just a shade removed from reality.¹⁹

While it is probable that Addu-dūri meant to be explicit about the tenor and significance of *šulum* of l. 3, one cannot be certain how Zimri-Lim reacted to its usage; for whatever its pristine connotation *šulum* permutated equivocally and, by the OB period, it had come to mean either 'restoration' or 'destruction' of a royal line. In our case, modern authorities have ranged themselves quite evenly behind each definition.²⁰ Therefore, however innocent Addu-dūri's choice of words may be, from Zimri-Lim's perspective (as well as from ours), the antonymic potential within *šulum* invests this letter with a dimension rarely available to epistolary texts. For even as it foreshadows the ambiguity that will remain constant throughout the letter—at least through l. 21a—it also forces the reader of the missive to enter into a sustained dialogue with its author regarding her own understanding of her dream. Additionally, because the use of *šulum* bodes ill to those who would trust a letter to clearly deliver its conclusions (termed as requests, warnings, factual presentations, etc . . .), it encourages them to gauge nuances for every term, to *interpret* every passage, in order to decode the letter's ultimate message.

In narrating her dream, Addu-dūri is naturally selecting and sequencing memories to suit an understanding that is meaningful to herself, for dreams narrated are, after all, dreams interpreted. Although

¹⁹ On nightmares which result from objective experience, see Hadfield, 1954:180-1.

²⁰ *AHW*, 1269 (B, 1); Borger, *EAK*, 9:1:5 (cf. Grayson, *ARI*, I, §140 and n. 72). Earlier literature is cited in Römer, 1971:26, n. 5. For antonymic amphibolism, see English "to cleave" which may mean "to split" as well as "to join." Derivatives of the German *aufheben* can sometimes display this tendency. Note also the D-stem of Hebrew *bārak* "to bless," which can also mean "to curse" as in Ps 10:3; Prov 27:14.

she sees herself as entering the goddess's temple, her role as an actor within the dream is at first totally passive. From then on, the ADDU-DŪRI of the dream loses her identity completely, and it is only the voice of the interpreter, that of Addu-dūri of the flesh, which can be heard. What she has to say is given in easily decodable symbols: Bēlet-ekallim, a deity with special attachment to females in the Mari palace, was not in her shrine and the statues ordinarily assembled around her or in front of her had left their places. Note how the interpreter's voice easily slips over the statues in order to first attend to the goddess's disappearance. ADDU-DŪRI may not have had such a spectral reach, but Addu-dūri needed to alert Zimri-Lim to a specific sequence: Bēlet-ekallim's disappearance was not a casual occurrence, but it was a voluntary abandonment of the shrine, an abandonment which was quickly duplicated by the images of other gods, of (deceased) ancestors, perhaps even of living worshippers.

The report insists that it was the goddess, but not necessarily her statue, that was no longer in residence, and this is emphasized by using the *wašābum* (in the G-stem), a verb that is attached to the presence of deities and not normally to their *šalmū*. While this observation may not ultimately bear practical distinctions,²¹ it does permit the dream reporter to force attention not on the cultic aspect of the goddess's presence, but on the theological import of her disappearance. For, if, as other Mari materials suggest (e.g. X:4:31–34; 8:12–18), Bēlet-ekallim was one of those deities (the others being Dagan, Addu, and Itūr-Mer) charged with protecting the king during his military ventures, then her voluntary exit could only portend evil days ahead.²²

²¹ "It makes no difference whether we see [in dreams] the goddess herself as we have imagined her to be or a statue of her. For whether gods appear in the flesh or as statues fashioned out of some material, they have the same meaning. But when the gods have been seen in person, it signifies that the good and bad fulfillments will take place more quickly than they would have if statues of them had been seen." Artemidorous, [1975]:114. On the statues of the gods, see most recently Renger's treatment in *RIA* 3/4: 307–14.

²² Moran, 1969b:630, n. 82 suggests that the goddess was a patron of the Lim dynasty. It is not possible to ascertain whether "Lady of the palace" was but an epithet of a goddess whose worship was widespread in Mesopotamia. Bibliography on this goddess is in Noort, 1977:55 and n. 2 of p. 55. Her Mari (?) temple is mentioned in IX:14 and in Finet, 1974–7:

It is also not clear how Addu-dūri expected her king to understand the statement she makes next. She writes: *u āmur-ma arṭup bakām* (l. 12). The line is divisible into two brief segments, each with its own emphasis. The first has a conjunction; the second ends with a word (too?) precise in its full writing of the last syllable (*ba-ka-a-am*).²³ But the nuances yet escape us: Is the conjunction to be understood as consecutive, explicative, consequential, digressive? Is *-ma* to be judged as merely coordinative or as an emphatic particle (Finet, *ALM*:§100c, p.280)? Is the plene writing of the last word to be regarded as pausal (Finet, *ALM*:§101–2, pp.282–5)? *amārum* can, of course, regulate both the word for dream (*šuttum*) or the oneiric scene which unfolded in ADDU-DŪRI's temple. Were one to follow the first of these two possibilities ("And when I saw [this dream], I broke into uncontrollable weeping") it would indicate that Addu-dūri awakened from her sleep and, instantly understanding its meaning, lulled herself weeping into another dream sequence. This interpretation would allow for Addu-dūri's precise annotation that the sinister vision occurred during the night's first third (*šuttī annitum ša barartim*—ll. 13–24) and would permit her to inaugurate a second dream (l. 14—*atūr-ma*) which, consequently, must have occurred during the second third of the night.

But it might just be possible that the subject of *āmur* of l. 12 is the ADDU-DŪRI of the dreamworld. In this case, we are permitted to recreate the following scenario: ADDU-DŪRI enters the temple, observes the alarming scene, and begins to shed tears without restraint. For reasons that will be suggested presently, the wakened Addu-dūri inserts l. 13 as an aside because Zimri-Lim must recognize that what will follow happened during the night's *second* watch.

Those who have commented on our text have regarded *atūr* of l. 14 as construed in hendiadys with an *āmur* that, since it occurs in l. 12, must be *sous-entendu*. However, in XIII:112:7'–8' a full version of the construction obtains: *itūr šuttam iṭṭul*, and on the basis of material cited in *AHw*, 1333 G6, one may question whether the same construction necessarily obtains in X:50:14. One may proceed, therefore, with the hypothesis that *atūr* of l. 14 introduces a narrative

126 and n. 35–7. A number of *ARM XXI* texts speak of sacrifices before this deity.

²³ Compare II:32:14 where *bakām*, in a similar phrase, is given as *ba-ka-am* ("Like a child he broke into continuous weeping, saying . . .").

section which allows the reader to hover within the realms of dream on the one hand, and that of awakened reality on the other. Addu-dūri herself makes no attempt at guiding the king to the precise level of imagination required to fully comprehend the meaning of the lines following. And when that portion of her dream description ends in the midst of l. 21, Addu-dūri does not even clarify her own perspective on the matter, for she fails to add lines which would establish boundaries of that particular scene, lines such as those found in A. 15 (Dossin, 1948:130:40) or variations thereof (e.g. X:94:9; XIII:112:5'ff; 113:16-17). On the contrary, Addu-dūri immediately moves to yet another realm of perception, that of prophetic ecstasy (ll. 21b-26)—albeit not her own—before lamely summing up with her own response to all the preceding events (ll. 27-28). *Atūr*, therefore, might be understood in its primary meaning, “I returned,” perhaps even “I turned back.” Referring to ADDU-DŪRI of the dream world, *atūr* resumes the oneiric experience as seen by a woman who has never really awakened from her sleep. Because of the ambiguity in its usage, *atūr* of l. 14 may permit the listener, in this case Zimri-Lim, to imagine his trusted maidservant as walking back toward the entrance of Bēlet-ekallim's shrine when she suddenly meets Dada, the priest of Ištar-pišra.²⁴ Whether this Dada was alive or (recently) deceased is, as we shall soon note, of interest.²⁵ That

²⁴ The significance of time in oneirocritical literature is a debated issue, see Oppenheim, 1956:240-1; Hanson, 1978:2406-7, with n. 46, for bibliography.

²⁵ In 1980a: 133 I was uncautious about Dada's status. I had reasoned on the basis of an equation between Dada of our text and a Dada who was a well-known money-lender at Šamaš's temple (see listing in *ARMT XVI/1*: 83 sub 2°, to which probably join those sub 3° and 5°). On this score, it can be noted that other lenders (e.g. Asqudum and Habduma-Dagan) similarly functioned on two levels. Other lenders, such as Ibbi-Šahan and Šamaš-rabi, were prominent bureaucrats.

My equation faces the fact that the dated texts mentioning Dada the moneylender (all in *ARM VIII*) are attributable to Zimri-Lim's last years: “Babylon,” #22-23; “Dagan/Šamaš,” #26; and “Hnd Ašlakka,” #74. Texts from as yet unsequenced formulae: “Habur,” #24; “Yamhad,” #25, 30, 79; “Addu of Appan, II,” #28. If Dada's ghost was manifesting itself to Addu-dūri, then X:50 was penned while Hammurabi was masterminding Mari's fall. On the chronology and its sequence, see, conveniently, Sasson: 1980b:6-7.

Addu-dūri needed to supply the king with Dada's title and affiliation *may* indicate either that Zimri-Lim was not immediately familiar with this man or that Addu-dūri was underscoring the supernatural nature of the meeting. But the main reason for the elaboration on Dada may have been only to prepare Zimri-Lim for the role that the priest was to presently play.

Depending on how one reads the cuneiform of l. 17, two differing scenes can be reconstructed. Von Soden has recently reiterated his preference for (*izzaz-ma*) KAŠ *ū-na-aq-qa'*. Dada, therefore, would have libated beer (or—as von Soden suggests following an emendation—offered a sacrifice) before proceeding with his invocations of ll. 19-21.²⁶ To my mind, however, *ARMT X*'s reading of l. 17 is not only syntactically and grammatically more elegant, but it is also contextually more pregnant. As an alarmed and tearful ADDU-DŪRI turned towards the shrine's exit, a scene crystallized in a frightful state of frigidity, Dada was standing at the entrance, blocking ADDU-DŪRI's path. His face was motionless, but a cry, hostile and harping, emanated from him: *tūra dagan; tūra dagan!* Addu-dūri is extremely parsimonious in this account; she does not squander words on preparing the scene or on ushering her character; she does not waste vocabulary in concluding it. Entrance and exit are abrupt, disjunctive, tense; yet conclusive and final. Moreover, because she draws a scene that is integral and complete within itself, Addu-dūri needs neither background nor denouement to fully realize her dream. And, unlike the dream sequence which had just preceded—one in which ADDU-DŪRI's activities were given by means of verbs which affirm human involvement (*erēbum*, *amārum*, [*raṭāpum*] *hakām*, *tārum*)—this tableau contains verbs in forms which focus the attention upon the subject, Dada, and the peculiarity of the act: Dada is standing (G imperfect but connoting the stative), *but* (-*ma*, used contrastively) a voice kept on uttering (Gtn imperf.) as follows: *tūra* (imper. with ventive) *dagan*.

The voice's plaint is obviously the message upon which the scene focuses. Not only is it introduced by a verb in an iterative stem, but Addu-dūri twice records it, and frames the whole within repetitions of *kīam ištanassi*. The use of *tārum* and the reliance on an iterative form suggests a tenuous parallelism with the

²⁶ Von Soden, 1980:210 (cf. his 1969:198, followed by Römer, 1971:27 and n. 6). Von Soden also considers emending KAŠ to SISKUR.

previous scene which likewise refers to the same verb (l. 14) and implies a continuous act (*arṭup bakâm*, l. 12). But it remained to Zimri-Lim to decode the meaning behind the message itself. And at this stage the ambiguity which was instilled at the outset by the use of *šulmum* in 1.3 gains new space and gathers momentum.

Tūra dagan can be analyzed as a full sentence containing an imperative (with a non-mimmed ventive) and means something like “O Dagan, return (here) /come back/ reconsider.”²⁷ However, it can be regarded as a proper name. Indeed, Kupper (1971: 118 n. 3) has made a case for connecting it with the name of a Mari ruler who reigned a hundred or so years before Zimri-Lim. Our dilemma was doubtlessly shared by Zimri-Lim. One can readily appreciate the advantage and the implication of opting for the first of these two possibilities. ADDU-DŪRI’s horrifying initial vision in which the deity and her attendants had left their shrine, can now be counterbalanced by a summon for Dagan to return to the aid of his beloved, Zimri-Lim.²⁸ And *if* it were but the ghost of the departed whom ADDU-DŪRI faced, *it might just be possible* that a lore, perhaps available to Mari’s citizenry, gave further comfort to Zimri-Lim even as it provides us with a tentative explanation for Addu-dūri’s aside of l. 14: “If a ghost appears in a man’s house and it cries during the evening watch, the man will not live long; If it appears in the night watch: fulfillment of wish; (peaceful) ending of one’s days” (*CT* 38:26:35–37). Therefore, Zimri-Lim would have been comforted to know that Dada did not make his appearance until *after* the conclusion of the evening watch (*šuttī annītum ša barartim*)!

But it might also occur to the king that Dada was not pleading for Dagan to protect Mari, but was invoking the memory of a previous ruler. We do not have to suppose, as did Kupper, that Zimri-Lim’s own ancestors extinguished Tūra-Dagan’s line, to realize why Zimri-Lim would have felt discomfort at the mention of this name. For a king who had to be prompted in his duties toward the *eṭemmu* of his own father (III:40—and contrast the piety of Šamši-Adad,

I:65), it could not have augured well, at best, to be reminded of yet one more neglect of duty or, at worse, to become haunted by the sins of the ancestors (cf. I:3).²⁹

By choosing to share her dream with the king, Addu-dūri is, of course, but fulfilling the wishes of the gods. But she is also staking a clear claim for herself as worthy of divine notice, and hence capable of channeling information crucial to the future welfare of Mari. Her own perception of the dream’s implication can be plausibly assessed. For rather than admitting to physical (cf. XIII:12) or emotional (cf. A.15) derangements which could be provoked by subconscious anxiety, Addu-dūri immediately turns to a differing account concerning divine revelation, and introduces it simply by *šanītam*. This adverb allows her to suggest that she was remaining within the same subject even as she broaches a seemingly new one.³⁰ She reports that a female ecstatic (*muhhūtum*) rose to warn the king against travelling abroad (II. 22–26). Thereafter, Addu-dūri gives her own advice (27–28) and informs the king of her dispatch of hair and garment fringes (29–33). With this last act, however, Addu-dūri betrays the fact that she remained worried about the negative tenor of her dreams.³¹

ARM X:50 ends, therefore, on an apprehensive note. Foreboding and prickly dread, conveyed by Addu-dūri through an exceptionally vivid recollection of one night’s dreams, have now become Zimri-Lim’s. At a time when he was receiving contradictory messages—some comforting; others of dire warnings—from the gods and streams of advice from his subjects, Zimri-Lim may well have dismissed this particular manifestation. That it was ambiguous in its allusions may have drained him of any will to act purposefully. But we, who are in a position to predict Mari’s fate more clearly than could Zimri-Lim or his advisors, might wish that he had learnt to react better to trustworthy presentiments.

²⁷ Cf. *ARMT* X, p. 262; *AHW*, 1333a. This name also occurs from the Sūmu-Yamam period (cf. XVI/1, s.v.) and from that of Zimri-Lim where it is borne by a tribal chieftain (e.g. XXI:9:2).

²⁸ See Zimri-Lim’s seal impression at VII:259. For this and other Zimri-Lim seals, see, conveniently, *IRSA* IV:F:76c, d. There Zimri-Lim is also labelled as Dagan’s *šaknum*.

²⁹ Kupper’s study of the chronology of the *šakkanakku* period, 1971, will have to be amended due to Durand’s recent collations of the seal inscriptions, 1981.

See the two studies of Birot and Bottéro in the XXVI^e *RAI* volume, 1980, and especially paragraphs 28–35 of the latter’s work.

³⁰ Finet, *ALM* § 47f; contra Koch, 1972:56.

³¹ Heintz *apud* Ramlot in *Supplement, Dictionnaire de la Bible*, 889.

APPENDIX

I have divided the treatment of the remaining dreams from Mari into two sections, one which considers dreams reported by parties other than the dreamers, the second studies dreams communicated by those who experienced them.

A. The dreams that are reported by intermediaries include XIII:112 and 113, both of which were mentioned above. Except for the repetition of the god's message in XIII:112—a repetition necessary to fully explain the dreamer's illness and, hence, to underscore persistence of the message—this text seems little inclined to dramatize the dream or to establish contexts for the dreamer's involvement.

It is unfortunate that XIII:113 is so badly preserved in precisely the lines which report a dream. What is clear is that the dream was quite brief (lines 9–15[?]) and that it recreates soldiers at the ready in fortified cities. Movement within the dream seem to be minimal. Kibri-Dagan, who reported the dream to his king, fails in this instance (as he may well have in XIII:112) to even name the dreamer. X:10 contains yet another dream (?), transmitted by the queen. Unhurried, Šibtu takes time to report first that all is well at home before she turns to a vision of Kakkalide (verb: *amārum*) received while sleeping in the temple of Itūr-Mer. The dream/vision appears to be very favorable to Zimri-Lim and relies on the use of the stative and the imperfect to convey timelessness and permanence, with the stative describing the positions of the actors and the condition of inert objects while the imperfect characterizing the human speech.³²

By every measure, A.15, often studied and translated,³³ contains the most elaborate dream reports within this category. The text was written late in Zimri-Lim's reign since its dispatcher, Itūr-Asdu, succeeded Bahdī-Lim in administering the Mari palace.³⁴ The dreamer, Malik-Dagan, lived in a

village in the Sagaratum district. The dream is narrated in the full style that is better attested in literary documentation. While it is obvious that the core of the dream is the divine message addressing Zimri-Lim, its reporter—or, rather, its first interpreter, Malik-Dagan—is quite resourceful in enhancing the message's import by recourse to detailed setting, vivid similes, richly subtle vocabulary, and, as I will try to show, sarcasm.

At the outset, Malik-Dagan establishes a central place for himself within the dream by furnishing all sorts of information which does not seem to be immediately relevant to the ensuing message. He tells us that a companion, nameless and ultimately futureless, was with him as he left Sagaratum for Mari. He specifies that he meant to traverse the Upper District. But, finding himself, instead, in Terqa (i.e., having taken the river road³⁵), he instantaneously (*kīma erēbiya-ma*) enters the temple of Dagan and bows before the god. The whole passage (ll. 13–15) in which verbal forms of *erēbum* are thrice repeated within two lines, highlights the almost unexpected—perhaps even involuntary—turn which overtook an innocent voyage. It therefore underscores the urgency with which the god's will summons Malik-Dagan to its presence.

Likewise occurring simultaneously is Dagan's first speech which coincides with Malik-Dagan's genuflection (*ina šukēniya*—l. 15). This notice is made for at least two reasons: it permits the report to stress Malik-Dagan's awareness of the religious meaning of the setting and it indicates his position vis-à-vis the deity, the last measure being a common feature to oneiric accounting (Hanson, 1978:1410). The vocabulary employed to introduce Dagan's communication (*Dagan pišu ipie-ma kīam iqbē-m*) is usually reserved for literary documents, and is not attested in Mari's epistolary archives. My own reading of Dagan's speech is that it is highly sarcastic,³⁶ for Dagan, who seems particularly sensitive to neglect (e.g. III:8, 17, 40; X:62), *knows* that Zimri-Lim had *not* come to terms with the Benjaminsites! The main point that Dagan wants to make, however, is not found in another dream

³² Two large rafts are blocking (*parkū*—stative) the river, with the king and the soldiers riding (*rakib*—stative). Those on the right were shouting (*išāssū*—imperf.) to those on the left. They said: 'Kingship, scepter and throne are (?) stable (*qāmat*—stative)' (and) 'The Country, Upper and Lower, is given (*nadnat*—stative) to Zimri-Lim.' And the soldiers, as one body, shared the refrain (*ippal*—imperf.): 'To Zimri-Lim only are they given (*nadnat*—stative).' These rafts were docked? (*raksū*—*ma* [but cf. *ina kār* GN *arkus* in Dossin, 1956:65:22–23]) at the palace's gate and . . ."

It is very likely that the dream was inspired by actual observation, however long in the past, of a royal (re)installation ceremony. On this last topic, see Grayson, 1975:78–86; Tadmor, 1958:28 and n. 52.

³³ Fullest bibliography in Ellermeier, 1968:24.

³⁴ Birot, 1972:137–9; contra, Kupper, 1982:46 n. 18.

³⁵ For the two routes between Sagaratum and Mari, see II:120:14–27: "(Atamrum answered me [Buqaqum] as follows): 'We shall go as far as Sagaratum. In Sagaratum, we shall deliberate and we shall write with certainty whether we shall go to Mari (directly) or detour through the steppe.' While in Sagaratum, I [Buqaqum] will write my lord as to which way, through the steppe or by way of the river, he will proceed."

For the difficult *ina pāniya* of l. 13, see Moran's discussion, 1969b:623, n. 1.

³⁶ Contra: Gadd, 1966:23: ". . . a god talking in a strain of curious naïveté to a quite ordinary man."

sequence which might have immediately followed on the first (as we find in X:50) nor in one which is repeated almost verbatim the next night (as is learned from XIII:112), but is prompted by Malik-Dagan's unsatisfactory reaction and by his obviously false assumptions about the end of the interview.

Dagan's second speech is a tirade which is given as a twofold statement. The first, (ll. 24b–31) is pungent, chiding, and is couched mostly in rhetorical formulations: Why had Zimri-Lim not consulted Dagan regularly? Were he to have done otherwise, Dagan would surely have delivered the Benjaminites in his hands so that, by now, they would have been suing for peace! The second statement (ll. 32–39) delivers the message which Malik-Dagan is to present to the king.³⁷ It is much more direct in its demands yet, interestingly enough, it is given in hyperbolic similes whose language is made tangible by the starkness of its colors and the aroma of its vocabulary. While much philological ink has already been spilled to ascertain the precise meaning of lines 37–38's highly picturesque language, its intent is clear and the overall thrust of Dagan's second speech is manifest.³⁸ It was left to Zimri-Lim to dare ignore such powerful warnings.³⁹

For lack of a better slot in which to evaluate it, I place here the dream report (A.222) published in Dossin, 1975:28. Dossin's own opinion is that the text displays orthographic features which ought to date it to the Yahdun-Lim period.⁴⁰ If this is the case, then this text will stand as the earliest example to contain dream reports in non-literary documents. The document itself is a memorandum which appends a note to authenticate the dreamers veracity, but requests that the veracity of the dream be tested. We never learn the names of the correspondents.

Ayala, in her dream, saw (verb: *naṭalum*) as follows:

A Šehru-woman and a Mari woman quarreled at the gate of Annunītum's (shrine), beyond town.⁴¹ The one

from Šehru said to the one from Mari: 'Return my utensils. Either, you, sit! or, I myself shall sit.'⁴²

The translation of the crucial lines is very tentative, and it differs from that of Dossin. We have very little information with which to penetrate this dream. Šehrum was a locality within Mari's immediate district,⁴³ and it may well be that the struggle between the two ladies was but allegorical, if not parabolic, of Šehrum's claim for a residence in which to house the goddess. In time, we know, the goddess did enter the city.⁴⁴ This is sheer speculation and one should be content for now to observe how the static quality of a dream that is witnessed by an omnipresent eye is defeated by recourse to verbs which evoke bodily movement and human contact (Gt of *ṣalum*, D of *rārum*, and *wašābum*).

B. Two other dreams are reported by the dreamers themselves. In X:94, Šimatūm, daughter of Zimri-Lim and wife of his vassal, reports a dream which is remarkably laconic. A question arose about the presence of a certain girl who belongs (?) to a temple functionary. Šimatūm dreams of an official (?) who communicates a positive response. The king is to investigate the authenticity of the dream and to act accordingly.⁴⁵

⁴¹ *kawītum* is attributive to the temple of Annunītum, and hence the building is distinguished from another within Mari (cf. X:8:5: *ina bit Annunītima ša libbi ālim*).

⁴² Dossin, 1975: 28 renders lines 11–13 as follows: "Rends-moi ma fonction de grande prêtresse, / ou bien, toi, siège / ou bien que ce soit moi qui siège." See also his comments on p. 30. However, *enūtum* with such a meaning is attested only in SB and NB. Furthermore, the idea that the priesthood is disposable at will—even in dreams—seems to me unproven. Finally, I could not find evidence for a "seat" for priestesses.

Von Soden's *AHW*, 1481 (2.c.) cites this usage of *wašābum* under "being (in GN)." I rather think that the locale is one where legal disputes are resolved, cf. *CAD* B, 19–20 and *BIN* I:42 (NB) which is mentioned there; Kienast, *ABUK*, 93.

On the use of the correlative conjunction *ūlū(ma)* . . . *ūlūma* with imperative in the first segment, see *AbB* VI:63:7–9.

⁴³ Most recently, Wilcke, 1979:48 (s.v.). According to XXI:17 and 49 sacrifices were made at Šehrum.

⁴⁴ *Studia Mariana*, 57, #22. Note, however, that as late as the year "Dagan," this goddess was still not attached to Šehrum, Dossin, 1975:25:6–7. My hypothesis depends on acceptance of a theory which regards many of Zimri-Lim's date years as paralleling better attested ones; see Sasson, 1980b: § 3.2.6.5 (p. 7).

⁴⁵ Von Soden's reading for I. 13', 1980:211, is not convincing. Maybe read <li->!e'-em-ma, "may my lord look after the girl and may she be called here."

³⁷ For whatever it is worth as a comment to biblical scholars, one could notice how two versions of the same message may be found in the same text and how both developed from the same context.

³⁸ For lines 37–38, see the discussion of Moran, 1969b:623, notes 6 and 7; Heintz, 1971:544; Finet, 1974: 41, n. 5; Craghan, 1974:51, n. 5.

³⁹ One cannot assess here precisely why Itūr-Asdu did not send Dagan-Malik, preoccupied with offering sacrifices, or why he did not dispatch hair and garment fringe samplings.

⁴⁰ It might be noted that the legal documentation from the Yahdun-Lim period does not reflect the same orthographical peculiarity in the shaping of the *ú* sign (cf. VIII:55:10; 61:1'; 70:3; 75:16).

Perhaps even more starkly self-serving is Yanana's dream recorded in X:100. This particular dream is interesting because it is interrupted by a long historical insert. Yanana (otherwise unknown) has a servant (daughter?) who had been pressed into palace duty and whose release does not seem to be forthcoming. Dagan's presence may have been felt in a dream or in a vision, but the precise vocabulary employed here is still not clear.⁴⁶ Yanana, for some reason, thought it necessary to add that no one touched her while she was having her séance with the god. Dagan's own question to Yanana, "Are you travelling North or South," makes sense when it is remembered that Yanana's hometown, Ganibatam, lay to Mari's north. By responding that she was heading toward Mari but had yet to secure her servant's release (ll. 11–13), Yanana gives occasion for Dagan's categorical statement which, however, does not find space until lines 23–25. Dagan's message to Zimri-Lim is quite flattering to the king since it indicates that only Zimri-Lim can resolve Yanana's problem (i.e., not even the god himself can resolve it). Yanana does not rely entirely on Dagan's soothing words to regain her servant, but sandwiches background information meant to clarify the contexts which finds her frustrated, yet justified in her search: "When my lord went to Andariq [cf. II:32–18–19] the *zimzimu* [obscure] of my 'girl' contested (?) it with Sammetar [a powerful official]. I went to him; he consented, reconsidered, and, turning against me, he did not give me my 'girl'" (ll. 14–21). Yanana's own plea (ll. 26–27), that the king mind the god's message, concludes a letter which reads, if not like a legal brief, certainly like an opportunistic petition.

⁴⁶ Discussion in ARMT X, 271.

I am happy to record here my debt to Thorkild Jacobsen for his close reading of my paper. J.-M. Durand kindly placed ARMT XXI at my early disposal. In a letter dated 3/11/1982 he offered the following collations:

ARM X:50:

l. 5 : (. . .) *it-ta-tu*-{*TU*}-*ia* ; toute la ligne 6 est écrite sur érasures.

l. 9 : *e*-ru-ub-ma* (. . .)

l. 15 : Dans ARMT XXI, j'ai proposé une lecture *Eštar bi-iš-ra* "Eštar Bišréenne"; Le culte de la déesse semble indiquer la région du mont Bišri.

ll. 27–28 : si incroyable que cela puisse paraître, il faut lire les deux lignes en les inversant, malgré la transcription et la copie !!

a-na pa-ag-ri-šu na-ša-ri-im

be-lī a-ah-šu la i-na-ad-di

l. 31 : *a*-[na-ku] ak-nu-ka-am-ma* ; il faut abandonner l'idée de M1 !

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Artemidorus of Daldis [ca. 2nd century].
 [1975]: *Oneirocritica*. Cited from R. J. White, *The Interpretation of Dreams*. [Noyes Classical Studies].
- Batto, B. F.
 1974: *Studies on Women at Mari*.
- Birot, M.
 1972: "Simahlânê, roi de Kurda," *RA* 66:131–9.
 1980: "Fragment de rituel de Mari relatif au *kispum*," in *Death in Mesopotamia* [XXVI^e *RAI*]. 139–50.
- Bottéro, J.
 1974: "Symptômes, signes, écritures en Mésopotamie ancienne," in *Divination et Rationalité*. 70–197.
 1980: "La Mythologie de la mort en Mésopotamie ancienne," in *Death in Mesopotamia* [XXVI^e *RAI*]. 25–52.
- Castellino, G.
 1955: "Rituals and Prayers Against Appearing Ghosts," *Orientalia* 24:240–74.
- Craghan, J. F.
 1974: "The ARM X 'Prophetic' Texts . . .," *JANES* 6:39–57.
- Dossin, G.
 1948: "Une Révélation du dieu Dagan à Terqa," *RA* 42:125–34. [Text A. 15.]
 1956: "Une lettre de Iarîm-Lim, roi d'Alep . . .," *Syria* 33:63–9.
 1975: "Tablettes de Mari," *RA* 69:23–30. [Text A.222.]
- Durand, J.-M.
 1980: (with J. Margueron) "La Question du harem royal . . .," *Journal d. Savants* Oct.–Dec.: 253–80.
 1981a: "À Propos des légendes des empreintes de sceaux . . .," *RA* 75:180–1.
 1981b: "Note brève (#5)," *RA* 75:188.
- Ehrlich, E. L.
 1953: *Der Traum im Alten Testament*.
- Ellermeier, F.
 1968: *Prophetie in Mari and Israel* [Th. Or. Arb., 1].
- Falkenstein, A.
 1966: "'Wahrsagung' in der sumerischen Überlieferung," in *La Divination en Mésopotamie Ancienne* [XIV^e *RAI*]. 43–68.
- Finet, A.
 1966: "Adalšenni, roi de Burundum," *RA* 60:17–28.
-
- ARM X:51:
 l. 12 : *šar*-ru-tum na-x-x-at-sù*. Le *šar* "archaïque" de Mari, soit H1+IŠ; j'ai collecté beaucoup d'exemples. "*di-ru-tum*" est donc à oublier définitivement.

- 1970: "Les Symboles de cheveu . . .," in *Eschatologie et Cosmologie* [CER Annales, 3], 101–30.
- 1972: "Le *ṣuḫārūm* à Mari," in *Gesellschaftsklassen im Alten Zweistromland* [XVIII^e RAI, 1970.] 65–72.
- 1974: "Citations littéraires dans la correspondance de Mari," *RA* 68:36–47.
- 1974–7: "Le Vin à Mari," *AfO* 24:122–31.
- Frankena, R.
1974: "Dit Zij U Een Teken," in *Vruchten van de Uithof* [Festschrift H. A. Brongers]. 28–36.
- Gadd, C.
1966: "Some Babylonian Divinatory Methods . . .," in *La Divination en Mésopotamie ancienne* [XIV^e RAI]. 21–34.
- Grayson, A. K.
1975 *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*.
- Hadfield, J. A.
1954: *Dreams and Nightmares*.
- Hanson, J. S.
1978: "Dreams and Visions in the Graeco-Roman World . . .," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, II, 23/2: 1395–427.
- Heintz, J.-G.
1971: Review of Ellermeier, 1968, in *Biblica* 52:543–55.
- Koch, K.
1972: 'Die Briefe 'Prophetischen' Inhalts aus Mari . . .,' *UF* 4:53–77.
- Kupper, J.-R.
1971: "La Date des *Šakkanakku* de Mari," *RA* 65:113–8.
1982: "Les Pouvoirs locaux dans le royaume de Mari," in *Les Pouvoirs locaux en Mésopotamie . . .* [IHEB]. 43–53.
- Moran, W. L.
1969a: "New Evidence from Mari on the History of Prophecy," *Biblica* 50:15–56.
1969b: "Akkadian Letters," in *ANET*, 3rd edition, 623–32.
1980: Review of *ARMT X*, in *JAOS* 100:186–9.
- Noort, E.
1977: *Untersuchungen zum Gottesbescheid in Mari* [AOAT, 202].
- Oppenheim, A. L.
1956: *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East* [APS, Transactions, 46/3].
1966a: "Perspectives on Mesopotamian Divination," in *La Divination en Mésopotamie Ancienne* [XIV^e RAI]. 35–43.
1966b: "Mantic Dreams in the Ancient Near East," in *The Dream and Human Society*, ed. by G. E. Von Gruntenbaum and R. Cailliois. 341–50.
1969: "New Fragments of the Assyrian Dream-Book," *Iraq* 31:153–65.
- Parrot, A.
1958: *Mission Archéologique de Mari, II, Le Palais. Vol. I: Architecture*.
1959: *Mission Archéologique de Mari, II, Le Palais. Vol. 3: Documents et Monuments*.
- Römer, W. P. Ph.
1971: *Frauenbriefe über Religion, Politik und Privatleben in Mari . . .* [AOAT, 12].
- Sasson, J. M.
1972: "Some Comments on Archive Keeping at Mari," *Iraq* 34:55–67.
1980a: "Two Recent Works on Mari," *AfO* 27:127–35.
1980b: *Dated Texts from Mari: A Tabulation* [ARTANES, 4].
- Von Soden, W.
-1969: "Einige Bemerkungen zu den von Fr. Ellermeier . . . [1968]," *UF* 1:198–9.
1980: Review of *ARMT X*, in *Orientalia* 49:208–12.
- Tadmor, H.
1958: "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Aššur . . .," *JCS* 12:22–40; 77–100.
- Talon, Ph.
1978: "Les Offrandes funéraires à Mari," *AIPHOS* 22:53–75.
- Westenholz, J. G.
1974: Review of *AbB V*, in *JNES* 33:409–14.
- Wilcke, Cl.
1979: "Truppen von Mari in Kurda," *RA* 73:37–50.