āpilum of Mari. A Reappraisal

Paolo Merlo

UGARIT-FORSCHUNGEN

Internationales Jahrbuch
für die
Altertumskunde Syrien-Palästinas

Herausgegeben von
Manfried Dietrich · Oswald Loretz

Band 36
2004

Ugarit-Verlag Münster
2005

āpilum of Mari

A Reappraisal*

Paolo Merlo, Rome

1 Introduction

1.1

In Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical studies, it is customary to distinguish between two primary modes of receiving a revelation by a prophet: mediate (usually called *divination*, i. e. applying traditional techniques of inquiring) and intuitive (usually called *prophecy*, i. e. where the message of God comes to the prophet without a medium).

Another distinction, usually applying to the form taken by the divine communication, is between requested oracles (1 Kings 22; Jer. 37,17; 38,14–16, Ezek 14,1–5) and oracles that occur spontaneously (2 Sam. 7,4; 12,1; 1 Kings 20,13; Jer. 26,1–6).

It is important to note that it is not possible to join these two types of distinctions so that "mediate" revelations are also "requested," whilst "intuitive" revelations are "spontaneous." In fact, not every "requested" oracle can be attributed to "mediate" divination, because also a genuine prophecy may be "requested" (1 Sam. 9,6–10; 1 Kings 14,5; 2 Kings 1,16 etc.). Therefore whilst "mediate" divination is always "requested," "intuitive" prophecies may be either "requested" or "spontaneous."

1.2

If we confine our attention to the intuitive prophecies attested at Mari, it appears that prophetic messages were transmitted by various specific categories of person, among whom the most frequent are the *muḫḫûm* (fem. *muḫḫūtum*), and the *āpilum* (fem. *āpiltum*).

Studies on Mari prophecies generally distinguish between these two categories of specialist on the basis of function, attributing "spontaneous" prophecy to the *muḫḫûm*, and "requested" prophecy to the *āpilum*. Such a distinction should

* This paper was originally presented to the International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, held in Groningen on July 2004.

be based on both linguistic and documentary evidences, but a clear-cut distinction between these two categories of specialist does not fully correspond to the documentation from Mari. Moreover, in the case of the *āpilum* specialist, linguistic evidence—on closer examination—would in fact seem to contradict this distinction.

This paper seeks to re-examine the issue as a whole, reaching some conclusions which, despite some uncertainties, are more in keeping with the documentation currently in our possession.

2 Linguistic data

2.1

Most scholars postulate a derivation of the term *āpilum* from the verb *apālu(m)*, meaning "to answer." If we translate *āpilum* as "answerer," the natural conclusion[1] is that this specialist's activity represents an answer to a query previously posed by another person, potentially on behalf of a third party.

However, a number of scholars, though accepting the translation of "answerer" for *āpilum*, have noted that this etymology does not correspond perfectly to the documentation from Mari, since explicit questions are never addressed to the *āpilum*. These scholars have not, however, suggested a valid alternative etymology.[2]

Looking more closely at the existing literature, a possible alternative meaning for the verb *apālu(m)* can be found in the bilingual lexical texts from Ebla, and specifically the so-called Ebla vocabulary (VE) and its supplements (EV), according to the preliminary reconstruction by G. Pettinato.[3]

As early as 1980, before the publication of MEE 4, the Italian scholar Pelio Fronzaroli noted that the bilingual lexical lists from Ebla contained several equivalents of the Sumerian eme-bala, all deriving from the Semitic root *'*pl*.[4] Briefly, the entries VE 179 and EV 072 state the following equivalences:[5]

[1] Cf. among others J.-M. Durand in ARM 26/1, 386; J.-M. Durand, *Les prophéties des textes de Mari*, in J.G. Heintz (ed.), *Oracles et prophéties dans l'antiquité. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 15–17 juin 1995*, Paris 1997, 125; H. B. Huffmon, *A Company of Prophets: Mari, Assyria, Israel*, in M. Nissinen (ed.), *Prophecy in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context: Mesopotamian, Biblical, and Arabian Perspectives*, Atlanta 2000 (SBLSS 13), 52; D. Charpin, *Prophètes et rois dans le Proche-Orient amorrite: nouvelles données, nouvelles perspectives*, in D. Charpin, J.-M. Durand (eds.), *Florilegium marianum VI. Recueil d'études à la Mémoire d'André Parrot*, Paris 2002 (Mémoires de NABU 7), 8.

[2] Cf. among others L. Cagni, *Le profezie di Mari*, Brescia 1995, 21; K. van der Toorn, *Old Babylonian Prophecy between the Oral and the Written*, JNWSL 24, 1998, 59–60; M. Nissinen, *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East*, 2003 (SBLWAW 12), 6.

[3] G. Pettinato, *Testi lessicali bilingui della biblioteca L. 2769*, Napoli 1982 (MEE 4).

[4] P. Fronzaroli, *Gli equivalenti di eme-bal nelle liste lessicali eblaite*, StEb 2, 1980, 91–

eme-bala : *a-pá-lu-um*
eme-bala : *a-pi₅-lu-um*
eme-bala : *tá-tá-pi₅-lu*
eme-bala : *a-pá-um*

According to Fronzaroli's analysis, now widely accepted, all four equivalents are to be correlated with the Semitic root *'*pl*, and can thus be translated as "spokesman," "interpreter." More specifically:

- the first and fourth equivalents of eme-bala should be an infinitive or the name of a profession /'appā(l)um/;
- the third equivalent is a verbal noun *Gt with the prefix *ta-* (*taptarisum*), or *Dt with vocalic assonance (*taptarrisum* from **tuptarrisum*), interpreted by Kienast and Pettinato as a *nomen agentis*, /ta'tap(p)ilu(m)/[6];
- the second equivalent is the participle /'āpilum/ which corresponds exactly to the form attested at Mari, and which is under consideration in this paper.

All three Eblaite glosses thus suggest a uniform meaning for the root *'*pl*, relating to eme-bala "interpreter." The possibility that the root *'*pl* may also mean "to interpret," besides "to answer," finds further confirmation in other, more recent, bilingual Sumerian-Akkadian lists. Actually, the Old Babylonian recension (A) of the acrographic list Sag = *awīlum* state the following equivalence:

eme-bal : *na-pa-al-tum* (Sag A IV,29)[7]

2.2

Taking this evidence into account, it might be suggested that at least one of the words attested in the Eblaite glosses survived until the Old-Babylonian period, and was thus still used at Mari to indicate a specialist in prophetic communication.

[5] MEE 4, 218 restored from texts MEE 4.2; 4.12; 4.75 and 4.81. Cf. further M. Krebernik, *Zu Syllabar und Orthographie der lexikalischen Texte aus Ebla. Teil 2 (Glossar)*, ZA 73, 1983, 7; G. Conti, *Il sillabario della quarta fonte della lista lessicale bilingue eblaita*, Firenze 1990 (Miscellanea Eblaitica 3), 94; G. Pettinato, *Religione ed economia ad Ebla. Appunti di lessicografia eblaita, II*, RSO 70, 1996, 1–13 spec. 6–8, changing his preceding opinion maintened in id., *I vocabolari bilingui di Ebla. Problemi di traduzione e di lessicografia sumerico-eblaita*, in L. Cagni (ed.), *La lingua di Ebla*, Napoli 1981, 275.

[6] B. Kienast, *Nomina mit T-Präfix und T-Infix in der Sprache von Ebla und ihre sumerischen Äquivalente*, in L. Cagni (ed.), *Il bilinguismo a Ebla*, Napoli 1984, 228 and 246; G. Pettinato, *Appunti di lessicografia eblaita, II*, cit., 8. Cf. also W. G. Lambert, *A Vocabulary of an Unknown Language*, MARI 5, 1987, 409.

[7] M. Civil, *The Sag-Tablet*, MSL SS1, Roma 1986, 24; cf. further G. Conti, *Il sillabario*,

If this hypothesis is correct, the Mari term *āpilum* should not be translated "answerer," but rather "interpreter."[8]

3 Prophetic texts of Mari

It is now important to check if the translation "answerer" fits the contents of the Mari documents. The word *āpilum* (or the fem. *āpiltum*) occurs in 13 prophetic letters from Mari.[9]

3.1 A.1121+A.2731

In the long letter from Nūr-Sîn to the king A.1121+A.2731[10] we find first (lines 13–45) a prophecy spoken by the *āpilū* of the god Addu of Kallassu, and then (lines 46–62) the prophecy of an *āpilum* of the god Addu of Aleppo.

The first prophecy, pronounced by several *āpilū*-prophets,[11] is reported in the first person singular, as if it were pronounced by the god Addu himself; this prophecy is introduced (lines 13f.) by a phrase with controversial meaning: *ina têrētim Addu* (…) *izzaz ummāmi*, literally translated "During the (performing of the) oracles, Addu (…) stood by, saying." According to the interpretations of some scholars,[12] the *āpilum* prophet was just explaining the oracle's response to the act being performed by the diviner. However, this interpretation does not necessarily imply—as Durand suggests—the existence of two acts of divination, one performed by the diviner and another by the *āpilum* through an interrogation. More simply, it may be presumed that during the extispicy performed by a diviner, the *āpilū*-prophets interpret or elaborate the divine message into a speech.[13]

[8] This possibility was already proposed in P. Fronzaroli, *Gli equivalenti*, cit., 95; W. L. Moran, *An Ancient Prophetic Oracle*, in G. Braulik et al. (eds.), *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel*, Fs. N. Lohfink, Freiburg 1993, 254 note 5; G. Pettinato, *Appunti di lessicografia eblaita, II*, cit., 8.

[9] RA 78, 1984 (A.1121+); FM 7, 38 (A.1968); ARM 26/1, 194 (A. 4260); ARM 26/1, 195 (A. 3420); ARM 26/1, 199 (A.925+); ARM 26/1, 204 (A.2264); ARM 26/1, 208 (A.2233); ARM 26/1, 209 (A.4996); ARM 26/1, 219 (M.13496+); ARM 26/1, 223 (M.9601); FM 6, 1 (A.3760) ARM 26/2, 371 (A.428); ARM 26/2, 414 (A.431+).

[10] Edition in B. Lafont, *Le roi de Mari et les prophètes du dieu Adad*, RA 78, 1984, 7–18. Cf. most recently J.-M. Durand, *Florilegium marianum VII. Le culte d'Addu d'Alep et l'affaire d'Alahtum*, Paris 2002 (Mémoires de NABU 8), n. 39.

[11] Cf. line 29: "This is what the prophets said," *annītam āpilū iqbû*.

[12] Cf. M. Anbar, *note brève*, RA 75, 1981, 91; J.-M. Durand, *In vino veritas*, RA 76, 1982, 45–47.

[13] K. van der Toorn, *Old Babylonian Prophecy Between the Oral and the Written*, JNWSL 24, 1998, 55–70 spec. 59–60. A translation of *āpilum* by "interpreter" fits perfectly with this text. Against the interpretation that implies two acts of divination cf. also B. Pongratz-Leisten, *Herrschaftswissen in Mesopotamien*, Helsinki 1999 (SAAS 10)

The second prophecy, proclaimed by an *āpilum*-prophet of the god Addu of Aleppo is an appeal to king Zimri-Lim to behave justly to the oppressed (*ḫablum u ḫabiltum*). This moral plea is introduced by a phrase that in no way suggests that the prophecy was a requested one: "a *āpilum*-prophet (…) came with PN to me and said to me as follows: write to your Lord (…)" (*āpilum* (…) *itti PN illikamma kīam iqbêm ummāmi ana bēlīka šupur* (…)). Nor is the strongly admonitory tone of this prophecy suited to a "requested" prophecy; on the contrary, it bears all the hallmarks of a message sent independently to the king.

3.2 A.1968

The letter A.1968[14] sent by Nur-Sîn to king Zimri-Lim, like the one discussed above, contains the text of a prophecy pronounced by Abīya, *āpilum* of Addu of Aleppo, introduced with the formula "Abīya, *āpilum* of the god Addu, lord of Aleppo, came to me and said (…)" (*Abīya āpilum ša Addi bēl Ḫalab illikamma kīam iqbêm*).

The structure of the oracle follows a precise ideological scheme, starting by recollecting historical events relating to previous successions to the throne of Mari, and stressing that the current king Zimri-Lim occupies the throne of his forefathers only thanks to the god Addu. Afterwards, the oracle exhorts the king to enact justice ("If anyone cries out to you for judgement (…)") and to avoid going to war without first having requested and received an oracle favourable to this undertaking ("if you go off to the war, never do so without consulting an oracle (…)").

Both the introductory formula of this message, and the contents of the prophecy with its appeal to the king's religious and moral obligations,[15] suggest a prophecy sent spontaneously to the king, rather than a requested prophecy.

3.3 A.4260 (ARM 26/1, 194)

Tablet A.4260 (ARM 26/1, 194), probably attached to the letter from Yasim-El A.431+ (ARM 26/2, 414), contains various messages and requests from an *āpilum* of Šamaš. The *āpilum* first asks for a throne and the consecration of a daughter of the king in honour of Šamaš,[16] and then intervenes on behalf of

66–68.

[14] Edition in J.-M. Durand, *Le mythologème du combat entre le Dieu de l'Orage et la Mer en Mésopotamie*, MARI 7, 1993, 41–61. Cf. also J.-M. Durand, *Le culte d'Addu d'Alep*, cit., FM 7, n. 38.

[15] Cf. on this subject M. Nissinen, *Das kritische Potential in der altorientalischen Prophetie*, in M. Köckert, M. Nissinen (eds.), *Propheten in Mari, Assyrien und Israel*, Göttingen 2003 (FRLANT 201), 1–32, spec. 19–22.

[16] About the identity of this woman cf. J.-M. Durand, *Les documents épistolaires du palais de Mari*, vol. 3, Paris 2000 (LAPO 18), 390–391.

some earlier requests by the gods Addu, Dagan and Nergal. The introductory formula to the prophetic message does not provide any specific information, being the customary "Thus (said) the *āpilum* of Šamaš (...)."

The historical context of this message is an important hint against a translation of *āpilum* with "answerer": actually, the letter was written shortly after a victory won by Zimri-Lim, for which the king had promised votive offerings to the divinities (lines 13ff. and lines 24ff.), but he had not fulfilled them.[17] Following this, the prophet, in the name of Šamaš, announces the future victory against Ḫammurabi king of Kurdâ, and warns the king to issue an edict of forgiveness (*andurārum*) after this victory so that he can demonstrate that he is a just king (lines 32–43).

Also in this case, the exhortative nature of the prophecy and the appeal to promises made earlier by the king, but not yet fulfilled, strongly suggest a spontaneous rather than requested prophecy.

This conclusion is further reinforced if A.4260 is indeed the tablet attached to the letter from Yasim-El ARM 26/2, 414. In fact, the text of the latter tells us that Atamrum, *āpilum* of Šamaš, refused to communicate indirectly the divine message to the king, instead he asked for a "discreet" (*naṣrum*) scribe, to whom he could dictate the message directly, exhorting the king to act according to the dictates of the divine words. This behaviour of the *āpilum* does not suite to a requested prophecy.

3.4 A.3420 (ARM 26/1, 195)

In the letter A.3420 (ARM 26/1, 195) the queen-mother Addu-dūrī relates to king Zimri-Lim a message from the *āpilum* Iṣi-aḫu concerning the king's servants behaviour following his departure. The oracle is introduced with these words: "in the temple of Ḫišamītum, the prophet called Iṣi-aḫu arose and so (said) (*itbīma ummāmi*)."

This way of revealing an oracle by standing up in a temple is a form which also recurs in revelations by ecstatics (*muḫḫûm*);[18] it is thus impossible to distinguish on the grounds of this act between the prophecy of a *muḫḫûm* and that of an *āpilum*. In other words, there is nothing to suggest that the *āpilum* was requested to proclaim this prophecy.

[17] On the historical circumstances of this letter cf. D. Charpin, J.-M. Durand, *La prise du pouvoir par Zimri-Lim*, MARI 4, 1985, 293–343 spec. 332–333, and D. Charpin, *Prophètes et rois*, cit., FM 6, 29–31.

[18] Cf. for instance ARM 26/1, 215:15–16. On the meaning of the verb *tebûm* in Mari cf. J.-M. Durand, ARM 26/1, 387 note n. 52.

3.5 A.925+ (ARM 26/1, 199)

The first part of the long letter from Sammētar, governor of Terqa, to king Zimri-Lim (A.925+ = ARM 26/1, 199) contains an oracle proclaimed by Lupaḫum, *āpilum* of Dagan. This is the oracle generally cited by scholars to demonstrate that the *āpilum* performed his activities on request.

The opening lines state that Lupaḫum arrived from Tuttul, answering with a salvation oracle the message that the king had committed to him in Saggarātum in these words: "to Dagan of Terqa entrust me" (*ana Dagan ša Terqa piqdanni*). The latter phrase presents some interpretative difficulties, and has been understood by Durand as the task of obtaining a verification/confirmation (*piqittum*) for a prophecy.[19] However, D. Charpin does not accept this hypothesis, since the verb *paqādum* is never found with this meaning in prophetic texts from Mari,[20] furthermore it seems that the verification of prophecies employed classic methods of divination, rather than another prophecy.[21]

The second part of the oracle (lines 30–40) where Lupaḫum warns the king not to enter into an alliance with the king of Ešnunna without first consulting the god, also seems to confirm the autonomous nature of the prophecy. As a matter of fact, the *āpilum* prophets take the side of the cult officials, supporting the requests made by the latter regarding the kingdom's foreign policy.[22]

3.6 A.2264 (ARM 26/1, 204)

In the letter A.2264 (ARM 26/1, 204) the priestess Inib-šina relates the text of an oracle, which unfortunately has been only partially preserved, proclaimed by the *āpiltum* Innibana. The introductory formula of the message: "Innibana, the prophetess, arose and spoke as follows" (*itbīma kīam idbub*) is the one generally used in prophetic texts from Mari, and is perfectly suited to spontaneous prophecies.

3.7 A.2233 (ARM 26/1, 208:5–14)

In the first part of the letter A.2233 (ARM 26/1, 208:5–14), Šībtu, the wife of Zimri-Lim, relates the message of a prophecy introducing it in the following way: "Qīšti-Dīrītim, an *āpilum* of Dīrītum, on the second day [came] to the gate

[19] So J.-M. Durand in ARM 26/1, p. 388.

[20] D. Charpin, *Prophètes et rois*, cit., FM 6, 20 note n. 113.

[21] D. Charpin, *Prophètes et rois*, cit., FM 6, 21–22. In addition cf. ARM 26/1, 225:15f. and 26/1, 239:10'f.; in these two letters the diviners (*mār bārîm*) are called in order to interpret some profetic dreams.

[22] M. Anbar, *"Thou Shalt Make No Covenant With Them" (Exodus 23.32)*, in H. G. Reventlow, Y. Hoffman, B. Uffenheimer (eds.), *Politics and Theopolitics in the Bible and Postbiblical Literature*, Sheffield 1994 (JSOTSS 171), 41–48 spec. 46.

of the palace and sent to me the following message" (*Qīšti-Dīrītim āpilum ša Dīrītim* ud.2.kam *ana bāb ekall*[*im illikam k*]*īam išpuram* [*ummāmi*]). There is no reason to suppose that the *āpilum*'s arrival at the palace was requested beforehand; on the contrary, it seems more likely that the prophet Qīšti-Dīrītim presented himself spontaneously, perhaps to deliver a written message.

3.8 A.4996 (ARM 26/1, 209)

The letter by Mukannišum A.4996 (ARM 26/1, 209) recounts two prophecies, the first against the kingdom of Babylon, whilst the text of the second has been lost. Both prophecies are introduced by the standard formula "a *aplûm* of DN arose and said as follows" (lines 6–8: *aplûm ša Dagan ša Tuttul itbēma kīam iqbi ummāmi*; or lines 15–17: *aplûm ša Bēlet-ekallim itbēma kīam i*[*qbi ummāmi*]). It has already been noted that this formula, also used for the *muḫḫûm*, probably indicates an independent initiative by the prophet.

3.9 M.13496+ (ARM 26/1, 219)

The letter M.13496+ (ARM 26/1, 219) is of particular interest for the thesis of this paper because it makes the autonomous nature of the prophetic message explicit. In this letter the anonymous sender (the beginning of the tablet is broken), relates to the king a strong rebuke proclaimed by an *āpilum* of the goddess Ninḫursag: "on the day of the sacrifice in the temple of Ninḫursag, an *āpilum* of Ninḫursag arose and spoke as follows (*itbīma kīam idbub ummāmi šūma*): Once, twice even three times I expressed my request before Zimri-Lim, but he did not give me anything (…)."

The text of this reproof, in addition to the king's failure to react, suggest that the *āpilum* found himself in a situation of conflict with the king, and gave his messages independently from him.

3.10 M.9601 (ARM 26/1, 223)

The letter fragment M.9601 (ARM 26/1, 223)[23] and the letter A.3760 (FM VI, 1) recount some prophetic messages concerning the journey of boats charged with sacrifices to the god Dagan. The text of these messages is fragmentary but they are introduced by formulas resembling those of other prophetic messages: "This *āpilum*-prophet ca[me and said] (…)" (M.9601:5': *āpilum šū illi*[*kam kīam iqbêm*]), and "an *āpilum*-prophet arose and, as he had repeatedly said to Bīnum and his servants, spoke as follows (…) (A. 3760:6–9: *āpilum itbīma kīma ištiššu šinīšu awātam ana Bīnim u wardīšu ša ina Terqa wašbū kīam iqbi ummāmi*).

[23] Cf. now D. Charpin, *Prophètes et rois*, cit., FM 6, text n. 2.

Both the introductory formulas and what can be understood of the contents of the messages tend to suggest a spontaneously expressed rather than a requested prophecy.

3.11 A.428 (ARM 26/2, 371)

The letter from Yarim-Addu A.428 (ARM 26/2, 371) sent to Zimri-Lim from Babylon, relates the text of two prophecies addressed to king Išme-Dagan who at that time was lying ill in Babylon. The two prophecies are introduced with similar phrases: "A *āpilum*-prophet of Marduk stood at the gate of the palace, proclaiming incessantly (…)" (*āpilum ša Marduk ina bāb ekallim izzizma kīam ištanassi*) and "Directly he stood at the gate of Išme-Dagan proclaiming incessantly in the midst of the whole citizenry as follows (…)" (*kīma pānīšunūma ina bāb Išme-Dagan izzizma ina puḫur mātim kalîša kīam ištanassi ummāmi*). These phrases clearly show that the *āpilum* was not permitted to enter the palace, perhaps due to the nature of his message, which criticized the policies of the king of Babylon at the time.[24]

Neither the form nor the contents of these prophecies allow a classification of these messages as requested prophecies.

4 Conclusion

The previous analysis demonstrates that the contents of the prophecies proclaimed by *āpilū*-prophets, with their frequently admonitory and critical stance towards the king, do not allow a classification of the prophecies of the *āpilum* as requested prophecies. Similarly, the formulas introducing the prophetic messages of the *āpilum* show no characteristics that justify a labelling of these messages as "requested." Besides, we do not find explicit statements that questions have been asked, as is the case, by contrast, in A.996:6 (ARM 26/1, 207) and in A.3217:2' (ARM 26/1, 212) "I offered the signs to drink (and) inquired" (*ittātim ašqi aštālma*)[25], or in A.2209 (ARM 26/1, 216) which relates the question posed to the *nabû* of the Ḫaneans.

All this, together with the fact that the *āpilū*-prophets are frequently strongly linked to a god in whose name they appear to speak (cf. above all A.1968), makes it more appropriate to translate the term *āpilum* as "interpreter" rather than "answerer."

This translation is based not only on documentary evidence from Mari, but also has an exact precedent in the bilingual lists from Ebla, and an indirect con-

[24] Cf. D. Charpin, *Prophètes er rois*, cit., FM 6, 28.

[25] On this asyndetic construction cf. C. Wilcke, *ittatim ašqi aštal: Mantik in Mari?*, RA 77, 1983, 93 "befragte ich (…) während ich (sie mit Wein) bewirtete," interpreting the verb **šâlum* with two accusatives. Otherwise J.-M. Durand, who interprets "the signs" as persons, cf. J.-M. Durand, *In vino veritas*, RA 76, 1982, 43–50

firmation in the Old-Babylonian list Sag = *awīlum*.

Finally, it is worth pointing out that this translation of *āpilum* may also be valid at Nuzi; however, the scarce documentary evidence from Nuzi precludes any certainty on this point.[26]

[26] CAD A/II, s. v. *āpilu* B, 170. According to CAD, a garment is issued to the *āpilum* of PN and, as the word *āpilum* is followed by a PN and not a DN, it seems more suitable to understand here "spokesman" instead of "anwerer." About the *āpilum* at Nuzi cf. also W. Mayer, *Nuzi-Studien* I. *Die Archive des Palastes und die Prosopographie der Berufe*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978 (AOAT 205), 140–141; B. Lion, *Les mentions de «prophètes» dans la seconde moitié du II^e^ millénaire av. J.-C.*, RA 94, 2000, 23–24.