

**CANAANITE IN THE AMARNA TABLETS
A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE MIXED DIALECT
USED BY THE SCRIBES FROM CANAAN**

Volume I

Orthography, Phonology

**Morphosyntactic Analysis of the
Pronouns, Nouns, Numerals**

HANDBUCH DER ORIENTALISTIK
HANDBOOK OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

ERSTE ABTEILUNG
DER NAHE UND MITTLERE OSTEN
THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

CONSULTING EDITOR FOR THIS VOLUME

T. MURAOKA

FÜNFUNDZWANZIGSTER BAND
CANAANITE IN THE AMARNA TABLETS
A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE MIXED DIALECT
USED BY THE SCRIBES FROM CANAAN

Volume I



CANAANITE IN THE AMARNA TABLETS

A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE MIXED DIALECT
USED BY THE SCRIBES FROM CANAAN

VOLUME I

ORTHOGRAPHY, PHONOLOGY
MORPHOSYNTACTIC ANALYSIS OF
THE PRONOUNS, NOUNS, NUMERALS

BY

ANSON F. RAINEY



E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1996

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

The CIP-data has been applied for.

ISSN 0169-9423
ISBN 90 04 10521 2 (*Vol. 1*)
ISBN 90 04 10522 0 (*Vol. 2*)
ISBN 90 04 10523 9 (*Vol. 3*)
ISBN 90 04 10524 7 (*Vol. 4*)
ISBN 90 04 10503 4 (*Set*)

© Copyright 1996 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

*This volume is respectfully
dedicated to
Professor Dwight W. Young
and
Professor Sarah Israelit Groll*

CONTENTS

Foreword.....	xiii
Introduction.....	xxiii
Orthographic Problems.....	1
Publication History.....	1
Paleography.....	6
Syllabary.....	7
Dentals.....	8
Velars.....	11
Labials.....	13
Sibilants.....	15
Sonorants.....	20
Glides.....	23
Vowels.....	24
CVC Signs.....	25
Logograms.....	26
General Considerations.....	26
Plural Markers.....	27
Predeterminatives.....	28
Phonetic Complements.....	31
Particular Readings.....	33
Glosses.....	35
Concluding Remarks.....	36
Phonological Features.....	37
Initial <i>E</i> -.....	37
Initial <i>W</i> -.....	38
Radical 1 st <i>W</i>	38
Intervocalic <i>W</i> -.....	39
<i>A</i> > <i>E</i> Before <i>I</i>	39
Nasalization Of Geminated Consonants.....	40

š › L Before A Dental	41
With š- Of Accusative And Dative Suffixes	42
š-Signs For Etymons With /S/	43
Summary	46
Independent Pronouns	47
First Person Singular	47
Nominative	47
Morphology	47
Functions	48
Oblique	53
Forms	53
Dative	54
Accusative	55
Functions	57
Second Person Singular	56
Nominative	56
Morphology	56
Functions	57
Oblique	59
Form	60
Functions	60
Third Person Singular	62
Nominative Masculine	62
Morphology	62
Syntactic Functions	63
Oblique Masculine	65
Oblique Feminine	65
Third Person Dual	66
First Person Plural	66
Nominative	66
Morphology	66
Syntagmas	67
Oblique	68
Second Person Plural	68
Third Person Plural	69
Nominative	69

Oblique	70
Concluding Remarks	70
Suffix Pronouns	71
First Person Singular	71
On Substantives	71
On Finite Verbs	72
Second Person Singular	75
Third Person Singular	76
Masculine	76
Genitive	76
Accusative	77
Feminine	78
Genitive	78
Accusative	80
Second Person Dual	81
Third Person Dual	83
Genitive	83
Accusative	84
First Person Plural	85
Genitive	86
Accusative	87
Third Person Plural	88
Masculine	88
Genitive	88
Accusative	89
Feminine	91
Genitive	91
Accusative	91
Concluding Remarks	91
Deictic Pronouns	93
Reflexive Pronoun	93
Demonstratives	93
Morphology	94
Masculine Singular	94
Feminine Singular	95
Masculine Plural	95

Syntactical Functions.....	95
The Anaphoric Pronouns.....	96
Determinative Pronoun.....	98
Genitive Constructions.....	99
Relative Clauses	100
Determined Clauses	101
Subject Clauses.....	101
Object Clauses.....	102
Interrogative and Indefinite Pronouns	103
Interogative Pronouns.....	103
Substantival Personal	103
<i>mannu(m)</i>	103
<i>mīnu(m)</i>	105
<i>mīyati</i>	108
Substantival Impersonal	109
<i>mīnu(m)</i>	109
<i>mannu</i> "What?".....	111
The Indefinite Pronoun	114
Personal	114
Impersonal	114
<i>mimma (mimmu, mimmi)</i>	114
<i>mimmû</i>	119
Noun Morphosyntax	125
Noun Formations	125
Akkadian	125
West Semitic.....	125
Gender.....	126
<i>ālu</i>	126
<i>awātu</i>	129
<i>namlu</i>	131
<i>hukurtu</i>	131
<i>šābu</i> / ERÍN.MEŠ.....	132
Number.....	135
Duality	136
<i>īnān</i>	136

<i>qātu</i>	137
<i>šēpu</i>	138
Plurality	139
Standard Masculine Plural	140
The Plural Augment <i>-ānū</i> / <i>-ānī</i>	146
<i>ālu</i>	146
<i>ašru</i>	146
<i>ilu</i>	147
The Suffixes <i>-ātu</i> / <i>-āti</i> / <i>-āte</i> / <i>āta</i>	148
<i>awātu</i>	148
<i>banû</i> "Nice, Friendly"	149
<i>dāriātu</i> "Eternity, Forever"	149
<i>epištu</i> / <i>ipištu</i> "Action, Deed"	149
<i>maššartu</i>	150
<i>mātu</i>	151
<i>narkabtu</i>	151
<i>ṭuppu</i>	151
<i>ūmu</i>	151
The Suffixes <i>-ātu</i> / <i>-āti</i> / <i>-ūte</i> / <i>ūta</i>	151
<i>annû</i>	152
<i>arnu</i>	152
<i>awīlu</i>	153
<i>dannu</i>	153
<i>ḫalzuḫlu</i>	153
<i>ḫazannu</i>	153
<i>pānū</i>	156
<i>rābišu</i>	156
<i>šeḫru</i> "small"	157
<i>šanû</i> "another"	157
<i>šāru</i> / <i>sarru</i>	158
<i>unūtu</i>	159
Commodities	161
Status Rectus — Declension	161
Nominative	162
Dependent (Genitive) Case	165
Accusative	165
Confusion Of Cases	170

Bound Forms.....	172
Akkadian Forms.....	172
West Semitic Influence.....	174
Governing Clauses.....	175
Status Absolutus.....	177
Predication.....	180
Concluding Remarks.....	182
Numerals And Numerical Nouns.....	183
Cardinal Numbers.....	183
<i>ištēn</i>	183
<i>šina</i>	184
<i>šalāš</i>	185
<i>erbe</i>	185
<i>ḥamiš</i>	186
<i>sebe</i>	186
<i>samāne</i>	186
<i>ešer</i>	186
<i>ešrā</i>	187
<i>šalāšā</i>	187
<i>erbā</i>	188
<i>ḥanšā</i>	188
<i>me²at</i>	189
Ordinals and Fractions.....	191
<i>Mišlu</i>	191
<i>šanû</i>	191
Multiplicatives and Distributives.....	192
Numerical Nouns.....	194
Aloneness.....	195
<i>edēnu</i>	195
<i>*yahdônu</i>	196
Quantifiers for "All, Every".....	196
<i>gabbu</i>	196
<i>kalû</i>	201

FOREWORD

One could hardly define the present work as a conventional grammar. It is, rather, an essay, or more precisely, a series of essays, on the language of the Amarna texts that derive from the ancient land of Canaan plus the neighboring Alashia. It has long been recognized that those texts reveal a peculiar brand of Akkadian, with many internal variations. The choice of this geographical and dialectical delimitation needs no defense. In spite of skepticism in some circles, Canaan was a recognized geographical entity in the Late Bronze Age and the Canaanites who lived there knew themselves as such and were so denoted by their contemporaries. The geographical span of the identifiable sites from which letters in this dialect were sent corresponds amazingly with territory encompassed by the northern boundary of Canaan as depicted in the biblical border accounts (Num. 34:1-12). The dialectical differences between texts written to the north and to the south of that border are striking and undeniable. That some scribe(s) in Alashia had also learned to write the same kind of interlanguage as that used by the scribes in Canaan proper should not surprise anyone. No one knows if the scribes in Canaan called their native language "Canaanite," but in the light of the dialects known from a later age (Phoenician, Hebrew, Moabite), it would appear to be the most natural designation for us to use in a study such as this.

The original plan called for a one volume study. *CAT 3* was envisaged as a chapter in such a work. When it became a volume in itself, it was realized that more than one volume would be required. Reviewers may argue that this three volume final product could, like the legendary research on the elephant, be condensed to one compact volume. To do so, however, would require the elimination of nearly all the text citations. The user would have to constantly refer to the presently inadequate

editions of the Amarna texts and often would get lost in the shuffle from passage to passage. This way, he will have ample documentation before his very eyes for digesting the import of any particular linguistic phenomenon.

Throughout all three volumes on *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets* the emphasis is on morphosyntax; morphology is not divorced from syntactical function. The three monographs were written in reverse order. Thus CAT 1 was the last and CAT 3 was the first. CAT 1 deals with the basic topics with which any standard grammar normally begins, viz. orthography, phonology, pronouns, nouns and numerals. It was postponed till last for several reasons. The particular subject matter discussed here has received more attention during the century of Amarna study than that of CAT 2 and CAT 3. In one sense, one might say that CAT 1 picks up the leftovers. However, the assembling and analysis of this data has proven to be a reward in itself. Many details, taken for granted by those who do read EA texts, have taken their place in the synchronic and diachronic kaleidoscope of the Late Bronze Age linguistic matrix. Considerable attention was focused on the orthography and phonology as components in the general field of peripheral Akkadian, the language reflected in texts from many sites across the Fertile Crescent dating to the Late Bronze Age (ca. fifteenth to thirteenth centuries B.C.E.). The nominal formations, especially the corpus of West Semitic vocables, have fascinated students of "Canaanite" from the very beginning, mainly because they were deemed helpful in the diachronic study of ancient Hebrew.

The largest volume in the set is CAT 2, devoted to the verbal system. From nearly every point of view, synchronic and diachronic, linguistic and historical, the formation and function of the verbs is crucial. The broadest possibilities for EA studies to contribute to the wider range of ancient near eastern studies exist in the study of the verbal system. This monograph represents over twenty years' research on this subject. Prior to tackling the EA letters from Canaan, I had concentrated for seven years on the teaching of classic Akkadian alongside Ugaritic and other West Semitic dialects. In 1969, I obtained a copy of the dissertation by

W. L. Moran (1950a) and eagerly devoured its contents. It was obvious that Moran had unlocked the mystery of the ancient West Semitic verbal system. Chapter I of *CAT 2* gives a brief review of the scholarly search for the Canaanite verb as revealed in the EA texts. W. L. Moran's contribution was the watershed in that journey. But in spite of the fact that his work was made known to the scholarly world by a series of articles (especially Moran 1950c, 1951, 1960, 1961), there was little acknowledged impact on the study of the North West Semitic dialects until the decade of the 1970's (cf. Blau 1971, 1978; Rainey 1969c, 1971c, 1973c, 1975b, 1976b, 1977, 1978a).

During the past twenty years, several essays have presented various applications of Moran's syntactic principles to the problems of morphology in the EA texts from Canaan (Rainey *loc. cit.*). It was hard to envision a time when an entire volume could be devoted to this topic, so each new phase of our study was presented in the form of an article. Actual composition of the present monograph, *CAT 2*, was only begun during a sabbatical at the University of Pennsylvania in 1988-89. Work on the project was resumed and completed in Tel Aviv during 1990-91.

The writing of *CAT 3*, dealing with the particles and adverbs, was initiated first since that material usually enjoys less attention than other aspects of grammar. Other responsibilities prevented serious work until 1981 when study began in earnest on the particles and adverbs. The draft of that project was completed during a sabbatical in 1983-84 which was spent as visiting researcher at the University of Pennsylvania. After further editing, the study on particles and adverbs now forms an essential concluding monograph to this study of the dialect employed by the Canaanite scribes. Adverbs and certain particles have a crucial role in the formation of clauses and in the determination of their comment (logical predicate) and topic (logical subject). It was useful for the work on later volumes to have wrestled first with the syntax and semantics of the adverbial elements.

The format of all three volumes is virtually the same. Every component of the linguistic corpus is discussed fully with

ample, often more than ample, illustration. Since there is no thorough, up-to-date edition of the autographs or of the transcriptions of all the texts, it was deemed essential to place before the reader many clear examples of each linguistic phenomenon being treated. Not only isolated forms, but whole contexts are usually cited. The user seeking specific information on some aspect of the language of the EA texts has at his fingertips a sufficient collection of clear contexts to make his own judgment on the evidence. There is no need to thumb through an edition of the texts to run down references. Neither is it necessary to page back and forth within one volume or to search through some other volume with one hand while holding one's place in the other. The necessary repetition of citations required by such a method of presentation was felt to be necessary for the efficient use of the volumes. Many contexts are cited numerous times in the three monographs, usually with fairly uniform translations, but not always. The user will doubtless become aware of the free hand nature of the translations, in each case aimed at illustrating the point being made in a particular section. The translations of passages cited are frequently accompanied by references to specific scholarly studies that have contributed to readings and/or interpretations of the specific passage. Thus, the citations often have the nature of philological and linguistic commentaries.

There are no footnotes in the three text volumes. References to scholarly works are cited by the system used in the social sciences: author's last name, date of the publication and relevant page numbers, all in parentheses at the appropriate place. As for the reference bibliography in *CAT 4*, no apology need be made for the inclusion of more than just the works cited; some of the latter are in contiguous fields (Hebrew studies, linguistics, etc.) while important works on the EA texts may not be cited in this present work. The user will doubtless find occasion to seek out works of interest from the reference list. However, the list does not pretend to be a comprehensive bibliography of EA studies.

Cross references within each volume are employed but there is no system of cross references from one monograph to

either of the companion volumes. Such cross referencing is achieved by a detailed index, accompanying the reference bibliography in CAT 4. These were diligently prepared by Linda Meiberg in 1994-95. The user may employ this index to find the discussion on any particular passage in the EA corpus that is treated in any or all of the three volumes.

The texts are cited in accordance with universally acknowledged sigla (cf. Heintz 1982:xix-xxiii). The method of transcription aims at a proper grammatical representation (Rainey 1978b:ix, 1-2) except that Sumerograms are not converted into Akkadian words (Izre'el 1978b:16-17). The grammatical terminology used is generally that accepted in the field of Semitic linguistics with the following exceptions: (a) The so-called genitive case in Semitic is not only borne by the second element in a construct (from which the name genitive is derived), it also designates a substantive or appellative dependent upon prepositions. Such resultant prepositional phrases can express the dative, the ablative or the locative, etc. This case ending is never attached to a word not dependent on a preceding vocable. Therefore, it seems much more appropriate to call it the dependent case, not just the genitive. (b) As for the verbs, the *qatal* is usually referred to as the suffix conjugation, or just *qatal* (the label "perfect" is a gross misnomer since the form has nothing intrinsically to do with completed action). For the prefix conjugation, the following terminology has been adopted (cf. Rainey 1986). Two modes are acknowledged, the indicative and the injunctive. Three tense, or nuance forms, are recognized for each mode. The indicative has the *yaqtul+ø* preterit, the *yaqtulu* imperfect, and the *yaqtulun(n)a* energetic. The injunctive has the *yaqtul+ø* jussive, the *yaqtula* volitive, and the *yaqtulan(n)a* energetic (preserved mainly in Arabic, but also in Ugaritic). The elaboration of these forms and their functions is the subject of a separate monograph, volume two in this series.

Many fine people have contributed to the success of my efforts in producing this work. A great indebtedness must be acknowledged to Professor W. L. Moran, both for his writings

and for the privilege of participating in his seminar at Harvard University during the 1976-77 academic year.

It is also a pleasure to acknowledge the kindness and encouragement of Professor Erica Reiner and her good staff at the Assyrian Dictionary Project in the University of Chicago's Oriental Institute. During several visits in 1976-77, I was permitted to use the dictionary files as well as the proof copy of volumes M/1-2 and the manuscript of volumes N/1-2. Both the information and the hospitality contributed to the pleasure of this research task.

Through the generosity of Professor Giorgio Buccellati, a computer print-out of a sign concordance for nearly all of the EA texts was made available to me. In spite of its limitations as a pioneer work, it has proven useful in tracking down the occurrences of many particles, e.g. *lū*. Our thanks are due to Professor Buccellati and his capable assistants for producing such a tool. It may be hoped that they will achieve further refinements in the future.

My graduate students at Tel Aviv University, and also those in Moran's seminar mentioned above, have provided stimulation and, not infrequently, correction of various errors. The challenge of giving them a head start towards the advancement of EA studies has been the chief motivation for all my work in this area.

A further obligation must be recognized towards those institutions that have facilitated this research. First and foremost, to Tel Aviv University, which granted me three sabbatical leaves, 1976-77, 1983-84 and 1988-89, that could be devoted to EA research and writing. Through the good offices of Professor Anita Shapira, then Dean of the Faculty of Humanities at Tel Aviv University, I was awarded a grant from the Irene Young Endowment Fund for Scientific Publications. This subvention was for expenses incurred in the preparation of scholarly works for publication and it was used to support the work by Linda Meiberg on the Bibliography and Index. The American Council of Learned Societies provided a generous grant in 1976-77 and the Research for Peace Project of Tel Aviv University furnished

stipends in 1980, -81 and -82, that made possible the collation of the EA texts at the Egyptian Museum in Cairo. Both Harvard University (1976-77) and the University of Pennsylvania (1983-84, 1988-89) awarded me visiting research status which made available to me their extensive library collections. Over the years, collation of various tablets utilized in this study has been made possible by the courtesy of several curators: the late E. Sollberger — the British Museum; M. Çiğ — Museum of the Ancient East, Istanbul; and especially M. Saleh — The Egyptian Museum, Cairo. To them and to their staffs, we are deeply indebted.

In 1976-77, a sabbatical from Tel Aviv University made it possible to participate in a seminar by Professor Moran at Harvard University. At that time, a detailed outline for a grammar of the EA texts from Canaan was devised and an extensive bibliography was compiled. It has taken nearly two decades to bring this project to its final culmination. It is a pleasant duty to acknowledge the hospitality of the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations at Harvard University and the Department of Asian and Middle East Studies at the University of Pennsylvania for granting the status of visiting researcher during the respective sabbatical leaves which I spent at their institutions.

CAT 1 is dedicated to two of my teachers who had major roles in shaping the direction taken by my own studies throughout my career. Professor Dwight W. Young gave me countless hours of his time in personal instruction and taught me the fundamentals of language in more than one field. It was he who discerned the gaps in my previous training and provided me with the data and tools to make up for many of my undergraduate deficiencies. This quiet, unassuming fellow Texan stamped an indelible impression on all my research and teaching. The second teacher, Professor Sarah Israelit Groll, took me under her wing when I first came to Israel for advanced study. Again many hours were spent under her tutelage; although the subject matter was ancient Egypt, the linguistic approach and attitudes which she imparted made it possible for me to begin to grasp Polotsky's *torah*; this, in turn, opened up a whole world of

linguistic comprehension, not only in Egyptian but also in Semitic languages as well. I am also happy for this opportunity to thank Professor Groll for her role in introducing me to the administration of Tel Aviv University. That act of kindness and concern led to my subsequent career of over thirty years as a faculty member in this institution of higher learning. May both of them accept this totally inadequate expression of my heartfelt indebtedness to them.

CAT 2 is dedicated to Professor W. L. Moran whose work on the verbal system of the Byblos texts became the magic key to unlocking the secrets of the interlanguage reflected in the EA texts from Canaan. Perusal of this monograph will show my continued indebtedness to Professor W. L. Moran, especially by the multitude of citations from his recently published translations of all the EA epistles (Moran 1987b; 1992). Professor Moran, the undisputed doyen of EA linguistics, has recently retired after a distinguished career, not only in the field of Assyriology and Semitic Linguistics but as a Humanist in the broadest sense. I am proud to have had the opportunity of participating with him in a seminar at Harvard University during 1976-77 at which time I became an adopted member of his circle of devoted disciples. I count it a rare privilege to have enjoyed his friendship in the ensuing years. A small token of my appreciation was expressed in my contribution to his recently published *Festschrift* (Rainey 1990b). There was never any question to whom the monograph on the verbal system should be dedicated. Without W. L. Moran, we might never have come to know the secrets of the Canaanite verb; the dedication of *CAT 2* to him is a sincere expression of my respect and admiration. It is impossible to overestimate the degree to which Moran's work has contributed to every aspect of this present study, all three volumes. Hopefully, his inspiration, if not always his acumen, will be felt throughout.

CAT 3 is dedicated to the memory of Professor H. J. Polotsky. During his lifetime, Professor Polotsky received a rough draft of that volume and was aware of the dedication. He seemed pleased with the treatment of the particles and adverbs.

There is a great debt that I owe to many teachers. First of all, to an English teacher in the fifth grade who made syntax, especially of the adverbs, such an interesting and exciting subject. She was then followed by several excellent English teachers, particularly at the Brown Military Academy and John Brown University. At the California Baptist Theological Seminary, Dr. R. Vernon Ritter first introduced me to Hebrew syntax. Professor Cyrus H. Gordon of Brandeis University inspired me to devote my professional endeavors to original sources; obliquely, he also was responsible for my determination to do something significant on the Amarna Tablets. The many long hours of patient tutelage I received from Professor Dwight W. Young and Professor Sarah Israelit Groll, plus many personal conversations with the late Professor E. Y. Kutscher, and the Akkadian and Sumerian classes of Professor Aharon Shafer, all contributed to my understanding of Semitic and Egyptian syntax. All of this was brought into focus for me by Professor H. J. Polotsky. His lectures on Semitic syntax and classes in Egyptian and Coptic were for me the peak experience in language study. His emphasis on distinguishing topic and comment will be evident in all three volumes of this study. It is to him, the greatest of my teachers, that the third monograph is dedicated.

Needless to say, only the author can be held accountable for any faults or shortcomings in the present work. To produce anything in this field, one needs Rollo May's "courage of imperfection." It is only hoped that errors and omissions are minimal and that the resulting tool will be useful to others.

Anson F. Rainey
Sha^carei Tikva
Passover, 1995

INTRODUCTION

This is the last of the three volumes on the grammar and syntax of the Amarna letters from Canaan. *CAT 3* was written first; its rough draft was completed in 1984. *CAT 2* was completed in 1991. Most of the basic materials for *CAT 1* had been assembled in the spring of 1977 during a sabbatical leave spent as a visiting research scholar at Harvard University. Many of the diachronic and synchronic observations were noted then. Work on this volume was deferred, however, because the topics treated in *CAT 2* and *CAT 3* seemed to require much more extensive research and seemed to be of special interest for the project as a whole. At the time that *CAT 3* was completed, a publisher was sought but there was no interest in publishing a volume solely devoted to the adverbs and particles. Thus, it was decided to finish the whole grammatical and syntactical study before looking again for a publisher. The text of *CAT 1* was finally written during the fall and winter of 1993-1994. This marks a decade of work on the project which had been preceded by nearly two decades of preparation for the task.

As a student at Brandeis University, I had come to realize that the Amarna texts, especially those from Canaan, were a vital source for linguistic, social, historical and geographic information about the ancient inhabitants of the land of Canaan. It was not my good fortune to participate in any formal classes or seminars on the Amarna materials. Nevertheless, I set a goal for myself of laying the necessary ground work for studying them. A knowledge of Ugaritic and the other Northwest Semitic languages and dialects was essential. Since the medium of expression in the Amarna texts was a kind of Akkadian, it behooved me to get as solid a foundation in Akkadian grammar and syntax as possible. Acquaintance with contemporary

Egyptian also appeared to be a logical prerequisite. Several years were devoted to these pursuits and my mentors in that effort have been duly acknowledged in the Forewords of each of these present volumes. After six years of teaching Akkadian and NWS languages, I embarked on an intensive study of the EA texts. Various articles, especially on features of the verbal system, have been published since the final completion of the project seemed to be possible only after many years of spare time work.

The contexts of *CAT 1* cover two basic areas, that of the writing of the texts, including the orthographic and phonological characteristics of their language, and that of the vocables serving to indicate the grammatical subject (often the topic of the clause but sometimes the comment), pronouns (of all classes) and nouns (substantives and adjectives). Numerals and numerics are a specialized brand of nouns (and sometimes adverbs). The subjects in this present volume were deferred to the end because they had already received considerable attention in the past. Nevertheless, they are essential ingredients of any project such as this.

Long ago it was recognized that the pronouns used in the West Semitic texts from Canaan represent an eclectic collection of forms related synchronically to the peripheral dialects of the other Late Bronze Age text collections from sites across the Fertile Crescent. The treatment of Akkadian nouns, especially inflection, often led scholars to the conclusion that the language was "barbaric." Careful analysis can usually trace the processes that were at work in that kind of interlanguage. These are of interest in themselves as well as for their synchronic interest.

The practice of bringing ample citations to illustrate the various usages characterizes *CAT 1* as in *CAT 2* and *CAT 3*.

CHAPTER I

ORTHOGRAPHIC PROBLEMS

At present there is no comprehensive edition of the cuneiform texts of the Amarna tablets either in facsimile or in transcription. For that reason, extensive citations are usually given in this present work as illustrations of the various points being discussed. Anyone approaching these texts for the first time will encounter a bewildering melange of transcription methods reflecting the conventions of Assyriology over the past century. For the cuneiform, there is also a wide variety of hand copies, including the typeset style used by the British Museum during the latter part of the nineteenth century. By way of orientation, a review of the publication history of the EA tablets is in order before the problems of present day orthographic interpretation may be discussed.

PUBLICATION HISTORY

The ensuing remarks are an update of the related chapter in our previous publication of the "scattered" EA texts (Rainey 1978b:5-7).

One tablet (now EA 260) was published in transcription only by J. Oppert (1888:253). The text was later collated personally by J. A. Knudtzon, who republished it in transcription (cf. *infra*). However the cuneiform text never saw publication and the tablet itself cannot be located now (Artzi 1968:170, where an improved transcription is given).

Most of the tablets that reached the Vorderasiatisches Museum of Berlin (202/203 in number, plus three fragments that make joins with texts in the British Museum and other unnumbered fragments) and the Cairo Museum (49/50 texts plus one fragment that makes a join with a British Museum text), along with the first one acquired by the Louvre (now EA 209) and three

that were in the possession of Vladimir Golenischeff (now EA 70, 137, 160) were all published by Hugo Winckler from autographs by L. Abel (Winckler 1889-90). The Golenischeff tablets were evidently given to the Moscow Museum in 1911 (cf. Kühne 1973:2 n. 8).

Those texts obtained for the British Museum in London (95 plus a fragment that makes a join with a Berlin text) were prepared for publication by Carl Bezold and E. A. W. Budge (1892). Some photographs, excellent for their time, were included but the corpus as a whole was printed in the notoriously unsuccessful cuneiform type instead of hand copies.

Four tablets acquired by Rostovitz Bey (now EA 28, 82, 230, 292, subsequently obtained by the British Museum in 1903) and one belonging to Chauncey Murch (now joined to make EA 26) were published in autograph and transcription by V. Scheil (1892:298-309). The Murch fragment was also published by Abel (1892) but after that it seems to have disappeared until it was found by T. G. Allen in the Murch collection (mostly small objects from Egypt) at the Art Institute of Chicago. Records show that it had been acquired by the Institute in 1894. Subsequent republication by Luckenbill and Allen (1916) made possible an improvement in understanding the text.

A new tablet discovered by F. J. Bliss during excavations at Tell el-Ḥesī (now Tel Ḥasi) was placed in the Arkeoloji Müzeleri, Istanbul (now EA 333) and published by Scheil (1893). A more reliable copy and photographs were subsequently published by Hilprecht (1896:Pl. LXIV, No. 147; Pl. XXIV, Nos. 66-67).

The tablets and fragments that had been published up to that time were re-edited by Hugo Winckler, whose work consisted only of transliterations and translations. Those were mostly based on a fresh examination of the texts (Winckler 1896a). An English translation by J. P. Metcalf appeared in the same year (Winckler 1896b).

Meanwhile, excavations at el-ʿAmârnah had produced 22 more texts, mostly fragments, which went to the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford and were published in very inadequate hand

copies by Sayce (1894). They included one fragment which joined to make EA 14, and EA 43, 61, 135, 184, 190, 236, 302, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355. Reference was made to two other unpublished fragments, later known as EA 343 and EA 349, and also to an uninscribed tablet.

The director of the French school of archaeology in Cairo, M. Chassinat, obtained two more tablets (now EA 15, 153) which were published by Scheil (1902). Those texts were subsequently acquired by the Metropolitan Museum of New York; photographs from them were published (Bull 1926); they have been recently republished in transcription and translation by Moran (1988).

All of the nineteenth and early twentieth century publications were superseded by the monumental work of J. A. Knudtzon (1915). He had patiently collated personally all of the texts and fragments except those acquired by Murch and Chassinat. Besides the fact that Knudtzon was the last person ever to see *all* these tablets, his own outstanding ability at reading texts and his thorough mastery of the contents of the Amarna archive made his work a priceless treasure which still stands today (reissued in 1964) as the only reliable witness to most of the original tablets. Sadly, Knudtzon explained that he was unable, for health as well as for financial reasons, to publish hand copies of the original texts. Therefore, he had to content himself with transliterations and translations. The overall accuracy of Knudtzon's work with regard to identification of the individual signs is hardly to be questioned today even though we lack his cuneiform copies. In certain cases where he could not decide or where there was some special problem, Knudtzon provided a list of autographed signs at the end of his text edition to which he referred in his footnotes.

Comparison with previous text editions, especially those of Winckler-Abel, Scheil and Sayce, shows that Knudtzon's transcriptions represent a tremendous advance in precision. Signs, and sometimes whole lines, that previous copyists had missed were properly recorded by Knudtzon. In a myriad of cases, Knudtzon's sharp eye corrected the interpretation of a particular sign. Today it is no secret that the transliterations of

Knudtzon are more reliable than the autographs of his predecessors!

Another significant contribution of Knudtzon's edition was his arrangement of all the tablets in a logical order based on geographical and functional considerations. His numerical system has stood the test of time and is the only accepted method of designating the texts today. By common agreement, they are cited under the prefix EA plus Knudtzon's tablet number. The total number of texts in his edition was 358.

While Knudtzon's work was appearing, a new edition of hand copies made from the tablets in the Berlin Museum was published by O. Schroeder (1915i-j). Schroeder also added a fragment not included by Knudtzon (now EA 360) as well as two texts discovered in excavations at el-^cAmârnah in 1913-14 (now EA 359 and EA 379). His new facsimiles constitute a valuable, independent witness to the Berlin texts but comparison with Knudtzon's sample autographs suggests that Schroeder tended to present the signs in a somewhat normalized form. Nevertheless, Schroeder took careful note of regional differences in the form of specific signs and presented them graphically in a rather complete sign list. Later Schroeder (1917) published an additional fragment (now EA 361).

Six more epistles from el-^cAmârnah were acquired by the Louvre in 1918. Their definitive publication was by Thureau-Dangin (1922a, 1922b). For good measure he added a fresh copy of the other Louvre text (EA 209).

Further excavation at el-^cAmârnah by a British expedition produced one more tablet (now 368) that was added to the collection of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. It was published jointly in facsimile and in transliteration by Smith and Gadd (1925).

The two tablets from el-^cAmârnah written in the Hittite language (EA 31 and 32) were republished in facsimile by Goetze (1930).

Professor Jean Capart heard about an el-^cAmârnah tablet in the hands of a dealer in Paris and by 1934 he had acquired it for the Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire in Brussels (now EA 369).

That very important epistle was published in cuneiform and transliteration by Dossin (1934a-b).

At this stage, S. A. B. Mercer published an edition of all the el-^cAmârnah texts available (1939). Basically, his was only a translation of Knudtzon's work into English with many errors introduced in the process. Mercer had seen the value of Knudtzon's work but lacked the critical acumen to improve upon it. As for the tablets that had appeared subsequent to Knudtzon's work, Mercer added some of them at the end of Knudtzon's numerical sequence, viz. EA 359-361. On the other hand, he tried rather unsuccessfully to insert the epistles in their logical place among the Knudtzon texts.

In the meantime, the Egypt Exploration Society had unearthed eight new fragments from el-^cAmârnah during the excavation campaign of 1933-34. Mercer had applied for permission to include those texts in his edition but was refused. They were finally published for the Society by C. H. Gordon (1947). Gordon also proposed to renumber all texts that had appeared after Knudtzon's edition by adding them at the end of the latter's numerical sequence, a method only partially adopted by Mercer. Gordon's proposal was accepted by E. F. Campbell (1964) in a definitive work on the chronology of the letters.

Therefore, when A. R. Millard published another EA tablet discovered in the files of the British Museum (Millard 1965), he readily assigned the newly discovered text a number in accordance with this new system (EA 378).

Eventually, P. Artzi discovered that Gordon had overlooked one tablet when he revised the numbering of Mercer. This latter was Schroeder's No. 190, which Mercer had called 354a. It was duly pointed out by Artzi (1967a, 1967b). The text was henceforth called EA 379.

All the texts that had appeared after Knudtzon's edition were then assembled and published in transliterations and translations (Rainey 1970, 1978b). But that is not the end of the story. The two illegible fragments in the Berlin Museum were noted by Klengel (1974:262) and assigned the numbers EA 380 and EA 381 by Heintz (1982:xvii, n. 25). Another fragmentary

letter (now EA 382), possibly deriving from the excavations by Petrie in 1891-1892, was published in cuneiform facsimile by C. B. F. Walker (1979).

Finally, the corpus of epistles has now been published, sadly in translation only by Moran (1987b; 1992; cf. Rainey 1989c; 1989-90; Kühne 1993).

PALEOGRAPHY

The last comprehensive study of EA palaeography was undertaken by Schroeder (1915j:75-94). His work was based only on the Berlin tablets. Nevertheless, it must give a representative picture within reasonable limits. The table by Schroeder (1914-15:XII, 73-94; Moran 1975b:146-150) gives a fairly clear picture. There is a recognizable script which can be called "southern" and another which can be called "northern." The Jerusalem letters are written in the latter (Moran 1987b:27 n. 49; 1992:xxii n. 50). The distinct paleographic traditions are those of the texts from Mitanni, Ḫatti, Alashia, Egypt, Babylonia, Phoenicia (with subgroups for Byblos on the one hand and Beirut, Tyre and Sidon on the other), Jerusalem and Amurru. There was, unfortunately, no attempt to refine definitions of the paleography from places such as Hazor, Acco, Megiddo, Shechem, Gezer, Ashkelon and other places in Southern Canaan. Moran (1975b:146-150) dealt specifically with the paleography of the Jerusalem letters based on Schroeder's work. The late E. I. Gordon had begun to make a personal examination of all the EA texts with a view to producing a new edition. His notes contain many paleographic observations but he did not actually collate the entire corpus and his work was never brought to any kind of useful publication. Moran did visit all the Museums and has personally examined nearly all of the EA texts. His collations are invaluable and were utilized in his own recent translations into French (Moran 1987b) and English (Moran 1992). He also graciously made his collations available to a small circle of EA scholars; they have been consulted consistently throughout this present work.

On the basis of Schroeder's table of sign lists, one can discern the main traditions: Those of the northern areas, Mitanni, Ḫatti (and also the city states north of the Nahr el-Kebîr and Kedesh (Moran 1975b:158 n. 5) and those of the land of Canaan (Byblos and all the places south of it; Moran 1975b:158 n. 10). The texts from Egyptian scribes use a ductus like that in the north (Moran 1975b:158 n. 8). There is also a decided affinity between the northern peripheral traditions and that of Middle Babylonia. Such a relationship is, not surprisingly, reflected in the general morphology and syntax of those areas.

What remains to be demonstrated is the chronological and regional affinity of the ductus employed in the West Semitized epistles from Canaan. This present work is an effort to define the language of these latter texts. However, there has been no possibility to attempt a paleographic analysis. It must be admitted, therefore, that this study is "color blind" as far as paleography is concerned. Someone with the background of E. I. Gordon might have achieved the goal of a synchronic and diachronic study of the ductus. Such research needs to be done independently of the linguistic analysis.

SYLLABARY

The Amarna texts were discovered and published before the establishment of Thureau-Dangin's universally accepted syllabary (Thureau-Dangin 1926). That situation was recognized by Knudtzon (1915:979-984), who apologized for the fact that he was unable to represent the scribe's intention in many instances. To aid the cuneiformist in identifying signs that he, Knudtzon, had seen with his own eyes, a system of transcription was adopted whereby any one sign was usually given by its most well known value *at that time*. The TUM sign, for example, was always written *tum*, even though it was already clear that the final *m* was no longer read. Thus Knudtzon wrote *li-tum-ur* (EA 165:24) though he knew full well that the correct interpretation required us to disregard the *m*; now the proper transcription would be *li-tu₄-ur*. Obviously, Knudtzon's transcriptions, though accurately

identifying the signs which he saw, are of little value in representing the correct phonetic structure of the vocables as they were understood by the scribes.

The general situation in the Amarna corpus was discussed in detail with many important illustrations by Böhl (1909:14-26). His observations are useful to this very day. By mid-century, several other archives or collections of texts from the peripheral areas of the Fertile Crescent were discovered and published. Now it was possible to make a comprehensive survey of the use of the Akkadian syllabary throughout the Late Bronze Age cultural horizon. That task was accomplished by G. Jucquois (1966). His impressive synchronic analysis is still the most authoritative summary of the evidence.

From the very beginning (Böhl 1909:21) it was obvious that the mixed usages of the peripheral area, especially confusion of the plosive dentals (*d, t, ʔ*) and the plosive velars (*g, k, q*), were not as prevalent, in fact were almost totally absent, from texts written by Canaanite scribes. The latter seem to have been imbued with a more conservative OB writing tradition. The Amurru texts (Izre'el 1991a:I, 46-53, § 1.8), however, do show considerable influence from the Hurro-Akkadian areas. The same can be said to some degree for Ugarit (Huehnergard 1989:23). The ensuing discussion will deal with only the salient features of orthography among the texts from Canaan. Numerical values in the Thureau-Dangin/Labat system will be added to the signs discussed to facilitate reference to the standard sign lists.

DENTALS. The value /*da*/ is expressed by DA(335). Some of the other dialects may use TA(139) with the value *dá*, e.g. *dá-an-ni-iš* (EA 17:10; *et al.*), *dá-ri-ti* (EA 161:10), but not the scribes from Canaan. Conversely, DA is almost never used for *tá*, unlike the letters from Egypt, e.g. *ša-at-tá* (EA 162:43, 51), *šal-ma-a-tá* (EA 162:22, 24), *tá-ad-din-šu* (EA 99:18), etc. (Cochavi-Rainey 1988:24). The one striking exception is the writing 7-*tá-a-an* "seven times" in the obeisance formula of one specific group of letters (EA 266:8; 267:8; 268:7; 269:8; 270:8; 271:8; 273:7; 274:9; 275:8; 276:8; 277:7; 278:8; 279:8).

The value *ta₅* for UD(381) is often found, almost always in final position where in OB it would have the value *tam*. One instance of non-final position may be ¹*ta₅¹-din-ni* (EA 83:30; Moran 1987b:265 n. 2; 1992:154 n. 2). Knudtzon had transcribed this sign *tú* in accordance with his familiarity with its usage in Assyrian literary texts, a practice which led to considerable misunderstanding among non-cuneiformists regarding the case system in the EA texts. The error was recognized by Knudtzon himself (1915:980) after his transcriptions had gone to press (Böhl 1909:1 §1d, 33 §22d). The most glaring cases are the many accusatives such as *a-wa-ta₅* *a-ni-ni-ta* (EA 73:34') but also the 2nd m.s. independent pronoun in oblique case, *a-na ka-ta₅* (EA 90:16; *et al.*). Another misapprehension was caused by Knudtzon's rendering of *tú* in the 3rd m.s. independent pronoun, where *ut* was in order, thus *š_u-ut* (EA 74:52; *et al.*), *š_u-ú-ut* (EA 67:16; 164:20). The Jerusalem scribe does appear to use UD(381) with the value *tú* in the following passage:

*nu-kúr-tú a-na ia-a-ši / a-di KUR.ḪÁ Še-er-ri^{KI} a-di
URUGin_x-ti-ki-ir-mi-il / šal-mu a-na gáb-bi LÚ.MEŠḫa-zi-a-nu-ti / ú
nu-kúr-tú a-na ia-ši* "There is hostility against me from Mt. Seir
to Gath-carmel; there is tranquility for all the city rulers but
there is hostility against me" (EA 288:25-28; cf. also EA 286:41).

The parallel with nominative *šalmu* seems to assure that the scribe intended to write *nukurtu*.

The value /*ta*/ is expressed by TA(139) = *ṭá*, e.g. *ba-la-ṭá* (EA 74:17. 54), *bal-ṭá-ti* (EA 83:27; *et al.*), *pa-ṭá-ri-ma* (EA 118:37), *pí-ṭá-tu₄* (EA 244:20) *et al.* The Jerusalem scribe, however, uses DA(335) for /*ta*/, e.g. *pa-ṭa-ra-at* (EA 286:35; 289:44; 290:12, 17, 23), *pi-ṭa-tu* (EA 285:16).

DI(457) serves for /*di*/ and /*de*/, e.g. *ti-i-de* (EA 73:39) but the Canaanite scribes do not normally use it for /*ti*/ and /*te*/. One exception is *ṭi-ṭù* (EA 255:5). ḪI(396) does not appear in the Canaan texts with the values *dí*, *tí*, *ṭí*, *ṭé*.

TI(73) is the usual sign for /*ti*/ and also for /*ṭi*/, e.g. *ip-ṭi-ra* (EA 114:9), *ba-la-ṭi-ia* (EA 119:15). In a Tyrian letter,

Albright (1937:203) had read *ša-an-dì-qá-dì-ma* (EA 149:27) and *MU-qá-dì* (EA 149:74). It is also pretty certain that TI can be read *te*₉ on many occasions, e.g. *il-te₉-qa* (EA 84:34), *et al.* At any rate, it seems best to use the *te*₉ value whenever Akkadian grammar requires it. Note also TI = *de*₉, *yi-i-de*₉ (EA 267:15) alongside *ti-de*_{4-e} (EA 38:19).

TE(376) = *te*, *de*₄, *te*₄, appears in all three values; *te* is frequent but the value *ti*₇ is known both from Canaan and from outside it, cf. *ti₇-i-de*₉ (EA 162:40) and *ti-i-de*₉ (EA 162:14). The scribe of EA 362 uses the TE sign almost exclusively at the expense of TI and clearly intends the *i*-vowel, viz. *ti₇-i-ša* (EA 362:30). Thus in places where the grammar would require it, e.g. *ti₇-il-qé* (EA 362:20), *ti₇-ba-ú-na* (EA 362:24) *et al.*; cf. also *ti₇-la-ku* (EA 203:19; 204:20; 205:18), *ti₇-ma-ḥa-šú-nu* (EA 271:21), *ti₇-iq-bu-na* (EA 136:10), *it-ti₇-ia* (EA 267:20), *in₄-né-ep-ša-ti₇* (EA 297:12), *bu-i-ti₇* (EA 264:20). As the final sign of feminine plurals such as *a-wa-te*^{MEŠ} (EA 319:16, 21; *et al.*), or masculine collectives such as ^{LÚ}*ḥa-za-nu-te* (EA 212:8), one is hard pressed to decide the correct value, either *te* or *ti*₇. Also note the Canaanite gloss *ú-ga-ri* \ *ša-de*_{4-e} "field" (EA 287:56). The value *de*₄ is typical of the Jerusalem letters (Moran 1975b:153), e.g. *li-de*₄ (EA 289:46) *et al.* Note the non-Jerusalem *i-de*_{4-ma} (EA 317:25). Generally *de*₄ is a value employed in N. Syria and other peripheral areas but not in the texts from Canaan. Note *te*₄-*ti* (EA 241:6), *te*₄-*iṭ* (EA 213:5).

TIM(94) for *tì* appears only in an ʿAbdi-Ashirta letter, ERÍN.MEŠ *til-la-tì* (EA 60:12).

TÍM(137), better known as TUM, may be intended in three contexts, *i-pé-eš an-nu-tím* "to do this" (EA 73:25), *iš-tu* ^{UZUKA} ^{LÚ}.MEŠ-*tím* "from the testimony of the people" (EA 106:39), *gáb-bi* ^{LÚ}.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-tím*, but these could just as well be scribal errors, TUM in place of TIM = *tì*.

DU is the standard sign for *du*. Outside of Canaan, it is also employed for *tù*, e.g. *tù-uš-ma-ra-aš* (EA 170:8), *tù-še-e-bi-la* (EA 27:32, 34). Once in a text from Canaan, we find *ti-tù* (EA 255:5)

TU(58) is the regular sign for /*tu*/ and also serves for /*tù*/ (with the value *tù*) as seen in *tu-ba-li-tù-na* (EA 114:56), also

ba-al-tú (EA 119:21); *ba-la-tú* (EA 126:15), *ni-ip-tú-ur* (EA 289:29). Note TU = *dú* in one of the early Amurru letters: *i-dú-nu-ni₇* (EA 62:33).

TUM(207) for *tu₄* is used in these texts only in final position where the assumption that mimation has been dropped leads to readings such as *nu-kúr-tu₄* (EA 242:17), *et al.* There is one clear instance of *iš-tu₄* (EA 211:16) showing that scribes in Canaan recognized the sign's value without final *-m*.

VELARS. One category in the consonantal repertoire where great confusion prevails in the orthography of Hurro-Akkadian in the various peripheral centers is that of the velars. Such is not the case in the texts from Canaan.

GA (319) is used extensively and almost exclusively, for *ga*. There is no need to list examples. The only possible instance of a substitute in a text from Canaan has to do with a gloss of disputed meaning. The KA-¹ZI¹-RA of EA 244:14 has been understood as *ga₁₄-zi-ra* "cutting" (Rainey 1974:304) or, perhaps more likely, as *qà-ší-ra* "harvesting" (Campbell 1965:193; Moran 1987b:468-469 n. 1; 1992:298 n. 1). In MB the value *qá* for GA was still in vogue, e.g. *qá-qá-ru* (EA 7:20), *qá-ti* (EA 7:51), as also in Alashia, *ia-qá-ar-ri-ib* (EA 39:18) and Egypt, *li-qá-an-ni* (EA 162:18). Only a limited number of cases are found in texts from Canaan, viz. *il-qá* (EA 106:15), *la-qá* (EA 108:13), *dam-qá* (EA 326:18), SIG₅-*qá* (EA 258:9; 262:10), *qá-rib* (EA 185:23, 32), *ḫal-qá-at* (EA 147:46). The latter text, from Tyre, also has GA = *kà*, viz. *i-kà-ša-dá-ni* (EA 147:35, cf. also lines 18, 22), *kà-bi-ti-ia* (EA 147:39). Examples from Alashia, *ta-ša-kà-an* (EA 38:30), Amurru, *kà-aš-dá-ku* (EA 166:16), *et al.*, and Egypt, *ta-ša-ak-kà-an* (EA 162:36), show that GA = *kà* was used by non-Canaanite scribes. In one Tyrian letter, Albright (1937:203) had read *ša-an-dì-qá-dì-ma* (EA 149:27) and MU-*qá-dì* (EA 149:74).

KA(15) was the normal sign for *ka*. It did not have other values, such as *qà* or *ga₁₄* (concerning which, cf. discussion above). In EA 209:16 Moran (1987b:444 n. 5; 1992:281 n. 5) says that [S]¹AG¹-*qà-di* = *qaqqadi* is almost certain. This would be the only example of KA = *qà* in a text from Canaan.

QA(62) is the standard sign for *qa*, and exceptions such as GA = *qá* are rare (cf. above). On the other hand, QA almost never serves for *ka*₄ in texts from Canaan. The attested cases are: *qa-qa-ri ka₄-pa-^lsi¹-ka₄* "the ground of your treading" (EA 198:7 from Kumidi), also *ki-it-ti-ka₄* (EA 198:10) and *ka₄-li* (EA 198:12), *a-ia-ka₄-mi* (EA 149:52 from Tyre), ^l*al¹-<tap>-ra-^lka₄¹* (EA 318:17 from the north, Artzi 1968; Moran 1987b:542 n. 3; 1992:350 n. 3), and *ba-aš-ta-ka₄* "your honor" (KL 74:300:20).

GI(85) is standard for /*gi*/ and /*ge*/ but does have other values in the Canaanite texts. Elsewhere, one finds readings such as *a-na le-qè-e* (EA 20:9), *i-le-eq-qè* (EA 161:43, 45), *li-il-qè* (EA 19:69) and especially ^{KUR}*Qì-id-ši* (EA 189:11), and even *li-ké-eb-bi-is-si* (EA 23:22, 23). Note the problematic form in a Jerusalem letter, *ig-ge-ú-šu* (EA 288:44; Moran 1987b:517 n. 10; 1992:312 n. 10).

KI(461) is standard for /*ki*/ and /*ke*/ and it is also the normal sign for /*qe*/ and /*qi*/, e.g. the learned introductory imperative *qí-bí-ma* (EA 64:2; 67:1; 77:1; 84:2; 96:2; 130:2) used elsewhere EA 1:2; 3:2; 5:4; 10:1; 19:3). A few texts from Byblos have *qí-ba-ma* (EA 73:33; 83:39; 93:10). Note especially these forms from *leqû*: *íl-qé* (EA 91:19), *el-qé-šu-nu* (EA 294:23); *la-qí* (EA 114:44), *la-qí-ta* (EA 274:15), *a-na la-qí-i* (EA 244:23), *la-qí-i* (EA 263:11, 12). Note the spelling of the following GN: ^{KUR}*Qì-in-sà* (EA 174:12; 175:10; 176:10), which has led Hittologists to adopt the form Kinza! Note the one unusual spelling of a GN, viz. ^{URU}*Ma-gi₅-da^{KI}* (EA 243:11) which happens to derive from Megiddo itself.

QI/QE = KIN(538) appears in two passages outside of Canaan, viz. *il-te-qe* (EA 11:32') and *qí-bí-ma* (EA 17:2). Only twice does it occur in the Byblos texts, in the problematic *i-na lu-qí* (EA 108:17; 109:40; CAD L:253a).

GU(559) serves for /*gu*/, *du-gu-la* (EA 283:9), ^l*Gu-la-ti* (EA 294:24); ^{URU}*Gu-ub-la* (EA 68:5). In Mitanni it has the value *ku₈*, e.g. *ma-aš-ku₈* (EA 27:57), *za-ku₈-ú* (EA 27:27), *et al.* However, this latter value is only documented in the somewhat uncertain Canaanite military epithet ^{LÚ}*ku₈-sí* (EA 299:6; 304:7; 305:7; 306:5[?]; 316:5[?]; 311:8). There is one variant, ^{LÚ}*ku-sí* (EA 303:6). This title is thought to be the equivalent of Egyptian *kú-šì-na* "chariot

driver, groom" (Sivan and Cochavi-Rainey 1992:9, 39, 61; Sivan 1984:237, 238), which has a *-na* suffix.

KU(536) is the standard sign for /ku/ and also for /qu/, for which it has the reading *qú*. Examples of the latter are plentiful, e.g. *am-qú-ut* (EA 142:33; *et passim*), *ti-ma-qú-tu* (EA 73:10'), *li-qú* (EA 83:17; 90:6; 123:38; 132:35) and various other forms from the verb *leqû*.

QUM/QU(191), on the other hand, appears twice in Canaan, only in the Jerusalem letters, *ḥal-qu* (EA 288:40, 56), *ḥal-qu-mi* (EA 286:51), though it was also known in Babylon and Mitanni, viz. *i-ti-qu* (EA 8:16), *ri-qu-ti* (EA 9:35), *up-pu-qu-tù* (EA 27:41). One may note in passing the rare Mitannian usage: *a-na-an-din-ak-ku*₁₃ (EA 27:22, 23).

LABIALS. The texts from Canaan display practically no anomalies in this category. Nevertheless, in rare instances a certain amount of influence from N. Syrian practices can be detected.

BA(5) is, of course, the standard sign for /ba/. One north Canaanite text with little WS influence does have [e]-*pá-šu-mi* (EA 185:49). Another text has *a-ba-at* (EA 211:19) where *a-wa-at* or *a-ma-at* would have been expected.

PA(295) is usual for /pa/ but, while *bá* is quite typical of texts in the north, it is practically never so used in Canaan. A notable exception is *i-na bá-la-aṭ* 'ZI¹-nu "for the maintenance of our lives" (EA 85:15). An Alashia text has *a-na ta-bá-ki* "to pour" (EA 34:51). Another important usage is in spellings of *kabāsu* "tread(ing)," where the sibilant is so often converted to, or represented by Š-signs, e.g. *ka-bá-ši-ka* (EA 213:4; also EA 185:6; 195:7; 198:7; 220:6; 233:8; 241:6; 253:5; 255:5). This latter form seems to have derived from some school exercise learned by the scribes because the word is always used in a more or less standard epithet used in the introduction to an epistle. A few examples with BA do exist, *ka-ba-ši-šu* (EA 234:6; also EA 231:8; 232:5). Note also *gáb-bá* (EA 191:14). One gloss provides an interesting contrast between PA and BA, viz. *i-na pa-an-te-e \ ba-aṭ-nu-ma* (EA 232:10).

BI(214). In keeping with OB practice, this sign serves for /bi/ and /pi/, and also for /pe/. The almost total lack of spellings with PI(383) for /pe/ or /pi/ (cf. below) makes it obvious that BI is the standard sign for writing /pe/ and /pi/. A selection of examples will suffice. A Rib-Haddi letter from Beirut has SAḤAR \ e-pí-ri "dirt, dust" (EA 136:3). Another Beirut letter has e-pí-iš (EA 142:19). Note the WS style verbal form, a-pí-iš (EA 81:18; 108:19; 122:42, 43; 123:10, 12). That BI = pì is standard in these texts has important implications for the transcription of certain foreign words such as pí-tá-ti (EA 70:23, 28 *et passim*; Rainey 1978b:87) and ḥa-pí-ru (EA 286:56 *et al.*; Rainey 1978b:72). In each of those latter cases, outside evidence in the form of spellings in other scripts (Ugaritic, Egyptian) confirms the true consonantal structure. The interpretation of such forms as ú-da-bi-ra (EA 85:68, 81) is difficult. In CAD D:186 ff. the verb is reckoned as *duppuru*; the WS evidence would point to a root **dbr*. Thus the question arises: which of these readings is preferable in the Canaanite letters?

On the other hand, BI is almost never used in the Canaanite texts for bé. That usage is restricted to only a few texts which employ it in writing the vocable bé-li (EA 279:9), bé-li-ia (EA 209:1, 6, 14; 212:10, 11, 13); cf. also from Babylon ¹bé-lí-ia (EA 12:1). This orthography is most likely an old learned spelling preserved in the schools.

BE(69) is the usual sign for /be/. Its most common usage is in the vocable be-li (EA 147:5; 271:9; *et passim*), be-li-ia (EA 106:5; *et passim*). Note the GN ^{URU}Be-ru-ta (EA 114:13; 118:28). There is a PN in the Amurru texts that should be read ¹Be-ti- DINGIR (EA 161:20; 170:3, 28; Rainey 1978b:101; Hess 1993:56-57). By contrast there is a GN which has to be read ^{URU}Baṭ-ru-na (EA 78:19; *et al.*; Dhorme 1908:509-510; Weber 1915:1165; Youngblood 1961:78). The value bi₄ does not seem to be used in the texts from Canaan unless perhaps in ia-aq-¹bi₄¹ (EA 119:36) though that context seems to require ia-aq-¹bu¹!

BÍ(172) appears only in the address formulae of letters. It is widespread in the imperative qí-bí-ma (EA 118:2 *et passim*), which scribes from all regions used, including Byblos, southern

and northern Canaan and N. Syria and other peripheral areas. The Byblos scribe even employs this sign in his unique formula with the Akkadian preterite, *iq-bí* (EA 74:1; 89:1). Otherwise, the BÍ sign is not used for /bi/ at all. It does not serve as *ne* or *bil*. Only a few letters, including those from Jerusalem, avoid this learned spelling and use the standard orthography, *qí-bi-ma* (EA 286:1; 287:65; 290:2), so typical of MB, MA and most peripheral areas (Moran 1975b:151).

PI(383) in its use to represent the semivowels *w* and *y* will be discussed below. In the value *pe/pi* it is attested (Moran 1975b:151) in Mitanni letters in the PN ¹*Pi-ri-is-sí* (EA 27:89, 93; 28:12) and one letter from Assyria also employs it, viz. *pe-šú-ti* (EA 16:10) and *e-pi-ru* (EA 16:14). Elsewhere in the Amarna correspondence it is extremely rare, viz. the Hurrian letter EA 24, Alashia (EA 36:15[?], 37:17), and in the Egyptian vocabulary that was probably written somewhere in Syria (EA 368:1, 4, 5, 14, r.5) and possibly one instance in Byblos (EA 138:8; cf. Edel 1948:23). The Jerusalem letters use it to write the Egyptian word *pi-ṭa-tu₄* (EA 288:51, 57; 290:22).

ÍP/ÉP/TUM(207) appears only once, viz. 1st c.s. *ép-pu-šu* (EA 212:9; Rainey 1978b:70; Moran 1987b:446; 1992:282). As *tum* and *tu₄*, this sign is commonplace, of course.

SIBILANTS. In this category, the texts from Canaan are also relatively conservative vis à vis the other peripheral documents. There are, however, a number of usages worthy of special notice.

ŠA(353) is the normal sign for /ša/ throughout the corpus. The use of NÍG(597) with the value *šá* is restricted to some spellings of the adverb *šanītam* in a few texts from Byblos, *šá-ni-tam* (EA 84:6 *et al.*; 88:9 *et al.*; 102:8; 92:7, 30, 41; 106:13 *et al.*; and Beirut (EA 136:16 *et al.*; 141:8 *et al.*; 142:5 *et al.*).

SA(104) is restricted to one specific vocable. Many of the various writings of *šamû* "heaven(s)" use the SA sign. Typical examples are: ^{AN}*sa-mi* (EA 325:22), ^{AN}*sa-me* (EA 315:15), *et al.* Similar spellings are known from Egypt, e.g. ^{AN}*sa-me-e* (EA 162:79). In all these many passages, one must ask whether the forms are not part of a learned spelling in which SA(104) has the

value $\check{s}a_{10}$. After all, the standard Akkadian form is *šamû*, and the variants with SA are restricted to the Levantine area (CAD Š:339b). Knudtzon's problematic $ka_4-bá-s[a]-ka_4$ (EA 198:7) is to be read $ka_4-bá-šá-sí^1-ka_4$ (collation 27.1.80). There are two clear examples of $\check{s}a_{10}$ in an Amurru letter, viz. $a-ša_{10}-ap-pár$ (EA 170:32) and $i-kà-ša_{10}-du-ni_7$ (EA 170:25) and other Amurru texts found at Ugarit reflect the same usage (Izre'el 1991a:I, 55-56 §1.10). On the other hand, another Amurru letter has LÚ.MEŠ *sa-ar-ru-ti* "criminals" (EA 161:7) with the correct Akkadian form (CAD S:182-183) as against many texts from the Canaanite tradition that spell this vocable with ŠA (Ebeling 1915:1518), e.g. m.s. *ša-ru* (EA 102:26), m. pl. *ša-ru-tu* (EA 108:21). All of these forms in WS texts lack graphic expression of the expected gemination and a letter from Tyre even has an apparent participial form *ša-a-i-ru* (EA 149:82; Moran 1987b:383; 1992:237, with reservations).

The question arises, therefore, with regard to geographical terms in the Jerusalem letters where an etymological /š/ is certain, viz. URU $KUR\check{U}-ru-sa-lim^{KI}$ (EA 290:15; cf. EA 289:14, 29) and $\check{E}-sa-a-ni$ "Beth-shan" (EA 289:20). Comparison with Egyptian transcriptions confirms that the sibilant is an original /š/, and not /š/ or /š/. The Jerusalem letters are known for their deviant use of the sibilant signs in transcriptions of non-Akkadian words (Cross 1962:245 n. 95; 1973:52-53 n. 36; Moran 1975b:152 and 163 n. 51). These probably pertain somehow to the scribe's northern background, i.e. they stem from a dialect or more likely a writing tradition in which the representation of the sibilants was different. There is no orthographic confusion in the writing of Akkadian words in the Jerusalem letters. From the standpoint of purely Canaanite pronunciation, one should most likely read URU $KUR\check{U}-ru-ša_{10}-lim^{KI}$ and $\check{E}-ša_{10}-a-ni$ in the examples cited above. But then we are left with the Canaanite gloss $ú-ga-ri \setminus ša-de_4-e$ "field" (EA 287:56) where the original sibilant was /š/ as demonstrated by Hebrew *šādeḥ*.

ZA(586) is not only the standard sign for /za/ and /ša/, it also has the value *sà* in many instances. In Akkadian verbs one finds *yu-sà-an-ni-qú* (EA 254:18), *i-sà-ḥur* (EA 147:10), *li-sà-ḥur* (EA 151:70). The other examples pertain to West Semitic terms,

ma-as-sà (EA 365:14, 23, 25), *tu-sà-aḥ-mi* (EA 244:8), or geographic names, KUR.MEŠ *Sà-al-ḥi* (EA 126:5), ^{URU}Ul-la-sà (EA 117:42; 60:23) and note ^{URU}Ul-la-às-sà (EA 140:19) and ^{URU}Qí-in-sà (EA 174:12; 175:10; 176:10).

ŠI(449) is the normal sign for /ši/ with few exceptions (see below). However, it also has the occasional value *še*₂₀. In the same letter, which has the spelling *ú-še-ze-ba-an-ni* (EA 74:44), there is also *ú-še*₂₀-ze-bu-[š]e! (EA 74:33; Moran's collation confirmed this reading by Mendenhall 1947a:123-124 n. 3). It can hardly be doubted that the scribe knew the correct form to be *ušezeb-*. Thus, there need be no reservations about transcribing *i-še*₂₀-mé (EA 92:21; 106:38) and *yi-še*₂₀-mé (EA 92:15). The use of the ŠI sign here may have been influenced by the common spelling of the imperative, viz. *ši-mé* (EA 83:14; *et al.*). The question arises, then about the many forms from *wuššuru* such as *yu-ši-ru* (EA 126:22), *yu-wa-ši-ru-na* (EA 71:13), *et al.* The Babylonian form was often like *yu-wa-še-ru* (EA 255:17) with coloring of the thematic vowel because of the following *resh*. In a case such as this, where forms with *ši* predominate, it is most likely that the Canaanite scribes were unaware, or ignored the Babylonian shift. Moran's proposal (1987b:272 n. 2; 1992:159 n. 2) to read [ta/ti-š]a-si₁₇ in EA 86:90, while making good sense in the context, would require a lexical hapax in these texts (*šasû* is never used) and an orthographic anomaly; ŠI is never used here with the value si₁₇.

ŠE(367), besides serving to express *še*, sometimes appears to take the place of *ši*. There is, for example, the verb form cited above where *ši* is to be read *še*₂₀, while *še* has to be read *ši*_x(ŠE), viz. *ú-še*₂₀-ze-bu-[š]i_x(ŠE) (EA 74:44). The scribe has evidently considered *ši* and *še* to be interchangeable. One letter from Egypt (Cochavi-Rainey 1988:71, §2.1.1.4), uses ŠE for the 3rd f.s. suffix almost throughout, even for the dependent (genitive) case, e.g. *it-ti-še* (EA 1:16, 17, 58), *ṭe*₄-em-še (EA 1:36), *pí-še* (EA 1:41), *ma-an-di-še* (EA 1:17), *um-mi-še* (EA 1:25), *É-še* (EA 1:35), UGU-še (EA 1:10). Other examples of ŠE as the 3rd f.s. accusative suffix occur in texts from Canaan, viz. *ti-ìl-qú-na-ši*_x(ŠE) (EA 117:64), [y]i-na-ša-ru-ši_x(ŠE) (EA 130:52). Note also from Amurru: *ú-bá-an-ni-ši*_x(ŠE) (EA 161:40). The same sign can even serve as the

genitive suffix in Byblos: *mu-ut-ši_x*(ŠE) (EA 83:54); *ú-n[u-]te-ši_x*(ŠE) (EA 120:36); *a-na na-ša-ri-ši_x*(ŠE) (EA 103:47). Note also the 3rd f.s. independent pronoun *a-na ša-ši_x*(ŠE). It is questionable how one should read the GN ^{KUR}*Ka-aš-še* (EA 76:15). A letter from northern Canaan with some peculiarities has the following verb form: *i₁₅-ba-aš-ši_x*(ŠE) (EA 179:15).

SI/SE(112) is extremely rare in the texts from Canaan. Once it appears in a Byblos letter, *a-na si-in₄-ni* "concerning ivory" (EA 77:7-8). Here one must read *ši-in₄-ni*, since the word has an original /š/ and is spelled *ši-in₄-ni* in line 10 (Youngblood 1961:183). The same is true of another Byblos verb form: *lu-wa-ši-ra-am* (EA 84:26). One Jerusalem letter uses SI in geographical names where the phoneme is /š/: ^{URU}*L[a-k]i-ši* (EA 288:43) and ^{KUR}*Ka-ṣpa-ši* "the land of the Cassites" (EA 288:36). And note the contrast between ^{KUR}*Ka-ši* (EA 287:72) and ^{KUR}*Ka-ši*[. .] (EA 287:74). Another example from a Jerusalem letter may be read LÚ.MEŠ *a-si-ri* "prisoners" (EA 288:21) or LÚ.MEŠ *a-ši-ri* "some kind of personnel" (Rainey 1967b). It would appear then, that many examples of the SI sign in the Canaanite corpus (it occurs in EA texts from outside Canaan as well), can be read *ši*. However, in EA 198:7 (from Kumidi), read *ka₄-bá-¹si¹-ka₄* (collation 27.1.80). For examples of /si/ with the ZI sign, cf. *infra*.

ZI/ZE(84) serves with both vocalic values as seen by the present-future *tu-še-ze-ba-an-n[i]* (EA 318:20) and the imperative *še-zi-ba-an-ni* (EA 318:8, 14) in the same tablet. Knudtzon did not distinguish these values in accordance with his usual practice of giving one value only for a particular sign. This sign also serves frequently to express /ši/, e.g. *yi-na-ši-ru* (EA 112:15) and a plethora of forms from *našāru*. There are also numerous examples from (*w*)*ašû*, *ú-ši* (EA 120:39), *yu-uš-ši* (EA 232:16), *a-ši* (EA 85:51; *et al.*). Some instances of forms from this verb with ŠI(147) are given below. Note also some nominal forms: *kar₅-ši* (EA 119:25), *ka-ar-ši-ia* (EA 254:61), *qè-e-ši* (EA 131:15), *re-ši-ia* (EA 92:45). For /še/, there are *er-šé-tu₄* (EA 147:30), *er-šé-ti₇* (EA 267:17). The geographical name ^{URU}*Ši-du-na* (EA 85:71; *et al.*) is usually spelled with ZI. For the one example with ŠI, cf. *infra*. ZI can also represent /si/, though such usage is extremely rare in texts from

Canaan (it is common, of course, in other peripheral areas). Note KI.MEŠ *ša ka-bá-sí-ka* (EA 195:7). If Held (1965:398-401) is correct in his interpretation, and it seems that he is, then another example of /si/ can be seen in the WS vocable *ḥa-sí-lu* (EA 263:13).

ŠI/ŠE(147) is also known to the Canaanite scribes. It is most frequent in the vocable *še-ru-ma* "(on the) back" (EA 213:9; *et al.*) and its variants. The Jerusalem scribe uses ŠI on several occasions, e.g. *lu-ši-mi* (EA 286:54), *qar-ši-ya* (EA 286:6); *mu-ši* ^dUTU-ši (EA 288:6); cf. the latter with *ši-it* ^dUTU-aš (EA 162:80; 163:9) from Egypt. For other forms from (*w*)ašû, note the Gt's *it-ta-ši* (EA 239:11), *li-it-ta-ši* (EA 239:20). Once in a Byblos letter there is the geographical name ^{URU}Ši-¹du¹-na (EA 92:33). Finally, there is the geographical name ^{URU}E-ni-ša-si₂₀ (EA 187:12) in a northern text (Weippert 1970:265; Rainey 1970:10-21, 91; 1975d:15). The second sibilant in this name is obviously /š/ as demonstrated by the Egyptian transcriptions of this place name, especially ^ca-y-na-ša-šu (Edel 1966:C_N1, 11). Although the value si₂₀ is rare, it is known from lexical entries at Ugarit (Huehnergard 1989:37) and occasionally in texts from Hattusas (Durham 1976:255, 312 n. 299; von Soden and Röllig 1976:20). The other occurrence of this GN is to be read ^{URU}E-[<]ni[>]-ša-sí (EA 363:4).

SU(7) is restricted in use to a couple of GN's. The main one is ^{KUR}Su-ti₇(^{MEŠ}) (EA 122:34; 123:14; 297:16). This is undoubtedly a learned spelling. Only one scribe treats it differently, viz. LÚ.MEŠ *šu-ti-i* (EA 318:13). The other example is ^{KUR}Su-[<]ba[>]-ri (EA 108:71), another learned spelling. The sign does serve for /su/ in other peripheral dialects, e.g. Mitanni, *e-te-pu-us-su* (EA 27:36) as well as in MB, *ú-na-ak-ki-su* (EA 8:36).

ŠU(555) is likewise restricted to one GN, e.g. ^{URU}Šu-mu-ri (EA 60:23; 62:9), ^{URU}Šu-mu-ra (EA 71:16; 76:35; 140:15, 18). Out of 116 occurrences (Hess 1984:545-547), all have ŠU(555) as the first sign except one, viz. ^{URU}Šú-mu-ri (EA 160:28).

ZU(6) is the standard sign for /zu/, /šú/ (šú), /su/ (sú). The zu occurrences need no documentation. The examples of šú include forms from the verbs *maḥāsu*, *ti₇-ma-ḥa-šú-nu* (EA 271:21), *ma-aḥ-šú-ú* (EA 244:14, WS form), and *našāru*, *i-na-šú-ru*

(EA 119:15), *uṣ-ṣú-ru* (EA 141:41), *li-ṣú-ru* (EA 326:12) *et al.* Also in some WS words, *ṣú-ú-nu* "small cattle" (EA 263:12), *ṣú-ú²-ru-ma* "back" (EA 64:7; 65:5; 232:11; 282:7), also *ṣú-r[i]-ia* (EA 147:39), and the GN ^{URU}*Ḥa-ṣú-ra* (EA 228:4, 22, 15). This sign also serves as *sú*, e.g. in the Mitanni letters, *É-sú* (EA 19:70), *KUR-sú* (EA 19:70), *DAM-sú* (EA 20:24), *šul-ma-an-sú* (EA 28:27). In the Canaanite letters its use is confined to proper nouns and WS words, ¹*Ku-sú-na* (EA 271:21), [K]UR ¹*Sú¹-ba-ri* (EA 100:21), ¹*Sú-ra-ta* (EA 85:21; 232:3; 244:24; *et al.*), (URU) *Ú-sú*(^{K1}) (EA 148:11, 30; 149:49; 150:18), *sú-ki-ni* (EA 256:9), *sú-ú[-sí-ma]* (EA 256:9). In each of these cases comparative evidence from Egyptian and WS sources confirms that the phoneme in question is /s/.

IŠ(21); a late Byblos text uses *iš* for *uṣ*, viz. *iš-ši-ir* for *uṣ-ši-ir* (EA 140:8, 24, 28). Note also, in a text written at Beirut, *yi-pu-iš* (EA 139:11) and *yi-/iš-ši-ra* (EA 139:30-31). These are most likely scribal errors.

EŠ(472) is most often to be read *iš* in the texts from Canaan. The examples are of such a nature that the value *eš* is precluded. Note *iš-tu* (EA 76:45; 79:21, 29, 41; 85:71; 117:11, 69), *ar-ḥi-iš* (EA 73:45'; 78:12'; 95:35; 117:78), *i-pí-iš* (EA 73:25'; 89:11, 43) *i-ri-iš-ti* (EA 85:56). Some of the verbs include *ti-iš-tap-ru-na* (EA 117:8), *ti-iš-pu-ru-na* (EA 118:47), *ti-iš-ku-nu* (EA 74:42), thus also *ti-iš-me* (EA 90:13; 108:29; 118:15), *ti-iš-mu-na* (EA 73:12'; 74:50; 108:50) and many other less unambiguous forms such as *yi-iš-me* (EA 78:17; 79:13; 107:25) *et al.*

AŠ(131) has the value *uṣ₄* in one passage, *li-it!(UT)-r[u]-uṣ₄-mi* (EA 198:24; Moran 1987b:437 n. 2; 1992:276 n. 3; collation 27.1.80). This, too, is probably just a scribal error.

The question of a number of vocables with /s/ as a root consonant that are written with Š-signs in the EA texts from Canaan will be discussed in the chapter on phonology (cf. *infra*, pp. 43-46).

SONORANTS. The following are particular traits of the orthography in texts from Canaan. On the whole, the standard signs, such as *la*, *na*, *ma*, *ra*, etc. are used and the same is true for the VC signs.

Among the *liquids* special note should be taken of the following:

LÍ/LÉ = NI(231) is more rare and mainly characteristic of the Tyrian and a few Byblian texts (also in Amurru). Verb forms are *i-lé-e* (EA 151:10), *ni-i₁₅-ta-lí* (EA 178:4) and *yi-ta-lí* (EA 178:5; Rainey 1989-90:66). From southern Canaan come the imperative *lí-qé* (EA 283:9; Rainey 1989-90:71) and the problematic *mi-lí* (EA 225:6). Megiddo has ^KA_a-*bu-ul-lí* (EA 244:16). Note also the PN ¹Bi-*in₄-e-lí-ma* (EA 256:14). The remaining examples are from the vocable *be-lí-ia* (EA 147:20; 233:15; 251:10; 251:11; also from N. Syria EA 51:13'; 56:36; *et al.*). Other cases are EN-*lí-ia* (EA 151:5, 15, 21, 31; 147:3, 5; *et al.*).

LÌ(449), the IGI sign, often appears where classical Akkadian would require the reading *lim*. The dropping of mimation in MB and the peripheral dialects could lead to the reading *li*. The *lim* value is used in a few isolated instances, e.g. *ša-lim* (EA 34:4; 267:18) and in ^{URU}Ú-*ru-ša₁₀-lim* (EA 289:29; also EA 289:14; 290:15). However, there are instances where the scribe evidently intended the value *li* without any reference to mimation. There are proper nouns such as ¹Mil-*ki-li* (EA 254:27; 289:11, 25), ^{URU}Ma-*ag-da-li* (EA 256:25), ^{URU}Pí-*hi-li* (EA 256:8), ^{URU}Ya-*bi-li-ma* (EA 256:27; i.e. representing WS m.pl. suffix *-îma*). For example the construction EN-*li* (EA 96:23) in which the context (nominative in its clause) would permit the normalization *bēlī* "my lord." It is also possible to read LÚ-*li* / *an-nu-ú* "this, my man" (EA 108:47; direct object in this context), also ¹URU¹-*li* "my city" (EA 118:34; direct object). Some examples in the dependent case, LÚ-*li* (EA 144:28; 225:3), É.GAL-*li* (EA 62:27). On the other hand, at least one scribe seems to use LÚ-LIM as an Akkadogram without reference to the syntactic status of the vocable in question, viz. nominative (EA 74:11) and accusative subject of *yânu* (EA 74:33).

EL(564) frequently has to be read *il₅* because it appears in too many places where *el* would not be expected, e.g. *il₅-la-ka* (EA 294:32), *il₅-la-ak* (EA 189:r. 13), *il₅-la-ku-ni₇* (EA 1:68 from Egypt), *il₅-qé-šu-nu* (EA 294:23), *ni-il₅-qé-šu-nu* (EA 191:19), and therefore most likely *yi-il₅-te-qé* (EA 239:13) rather than *ye-el-te-qé*.

The most frequent form is *yi-il₅-ma-ad* (EA 64:8; 142:18; 282:8; 283:18; 294:14, 25; also EA 63:15).

AN(13) has to be read *il* in over fifty examples, all of them in texts from Canaan. Note some examples, *ya-qí-ìl-li-ni* (EA 244:38), *yi-il-ma-ad* (EA 264:23), *yi-il-qé* (EA 118:18), *yi-il-te-qé-ni* (EA 270:21), *ma-ši-il* (EA 74:18; 90:43). Two Byblos texts written by the same scribe use AN(13) for *ul₁₁*, viz. *tu-ul₁₁-qú-na* (EA 126:6), *tu-ul₁₁-qú* (EA 362:13; Moran 1960:4). A rarity is the value *al₇*, in *al₇-lu-ú-mì* (EA 198:27; CAD A/1:358b) and *li-iš-al₇-mì* (EA 198:11, 14).

Among the *nasals*, the MI(427) can be read *mé* and ME(532) can be read *mì*. Note, for example, the interchangeable use of both signs for the enclitic in the same letter, *la-a-mi* (EA 244:13), and *la-a-mì* (EA 244:15). There is certainly no difference between *ti-iš-me* (EA 90:13; 109:14) and *ti-iš-mé* (EA 86:17) or *eš-me* (EA 105:40) and *eš-mé* (EA 91:23).

NI(231) serves not only for /*ni*/ (and /*lí*/) but also for /*ne*/ where it is transcribed *né*. It must be kept in mind that NE(172) never serves for /*ne*/ in the texts from Canaan (it does appear as *bí*). Therefore, it should not be surprising that NI(231) is used by these scribes in places where grammar would require an *e*-vowel. A frequent case in point is the numerous N forms of *epēšu* (Rainey 1973c:250-254). A selection of pertinent examples is *in-né-ep-šu* (EA 73:28'; 74:21), *ti-né-pu-uš* (EA 74:35; 117:94), *ti-né-ep-šu* (EA 74:27; 76:42), *ti-né-pu-šu* (EA 73:32'). To these may be added *in-né-bi-it* (EA 256:6), *in₄-né-bi-tu* (EA 256:7), *in₄-né-ri-ir* (EA 256:20).

EN(99) not only represents /*en*/ but also /*in*/, with the reading *in₄*. Some undisputed examples are *di-in₄ ki-ti-ia* (EA 119:45), *ti-di-di-in₄* (EA 68:5), *ti-di-in₄* (EA 107:5; 125:6; 76:4; *et passim*), *š¹i¹-in₄-ni* (EA 77:10), *š¹i¹-in₄¹-na-šu* (EA 77:13). There is no reason, therefore, to doubt the validity of *i*-vowel prefix in the following forms: *in₄¹-nam-mu-ru* (EA 142:10), *in₄-nam-ru* (EA 144:17), *in-né-bi-it* (EA 256:6), *in₄-né-bi-tu* (EA 256:7), *in₄-né-ri-ir* (EA 256:20), *in₄-na-ka-aš* (EA 91:15; Youngblood 1961:357), and the various forms of *nenpušu* (Rainey 1973c:250-254): *in₄-né-pu-uš*

(EA 68:17; 92:11), *in₄-né-pu-uš-mi* (EA 228:21), *in₄-né-ep-ša-at* (EA 84:9, 12; 85:73), *in₄-né-ep-šu* (EA 144:26; 30), *in₄-né-ep-ša-ti₇* (EA 297:14), and the PN ¹*Bi-in₄-e-lí-ma* (EA 256:14).

NI₇/NIM(433) is used mainly in word final position. Its classic value, *nim/nem* was known to the Canaanite scribes, e.g. *te-eš-te-nem-me* (EA 62:44, also 41), *iš-te-nem-mu* (EA 261:10), and in word final position when followed by an enclitic, *pu-ḥu-ru-nim-mi* (EA 74:34), *a-na mi-nim-mi* (EA 34:9; 286:18), *am-mi-nim-mi* (EA 250:11), with which may be compared *am-mi-ni-im-ma* (EA 45:15) and *am-mi-ni-mi* (EA 45:23; 98:3). The question arises about the reading of *a-na mi-nim* or *a-na mi-ni₇* (EA 34:47; 71:10; 73:6'; 106:13, 30) and *am-mi-nim* or *am-mi-ni₇* (EA 289:10; 16; 42:21) in the light of over a dozen examples of *a-na mi-ni* (EA 77:18; *et al.*) and *am-mi-ni* (EA 74:48; *et passim* in MB). It seems hardly likely that mimation was intended in *i-[n]a na-da-ni₇* (EA 74:16), *aš-bu-ni₇* (EA 67:12; 62:24, 27; cf. Izre'el 1991a:139-140) or *iq-bu-ni₇* (EA 62:28). With the latter can be compared *i-qāb-bu-ni* (EA 38:26) and *ti₇-iq-bu-ni* (EA 362:25). In MB one finds *iq-bu-ni* (EA 4:10, 32; 7:33) alongside *iq-bu-ni₇* (EA 7:53). Therefore, it seems pretty obvious that one may read *ni₇* in all those places where an enclitic does not follow.

GLIDES. One of the big surprises in the study of the EA texts from Canaan was the use of the sign PI(383) to represent not only *wa, we, wi, wu* but also *ya, ye, yi, yu* (Böhl 1909:48-51, §28a-g). The combination I+A(142A), transcribed *ia*, is also used, normally with the value /*ya*/. The method of transcribing PI and IA is that recommended by Gelb (1970:537; also Borger 1978:97 No. 142a, 156 No. 383) rather than the cumbersome method proposed by von Soden and Röllig (1976:19 No. 104, 43 No. 223) although their *yí* value for IA is adopted where it seemed more useful than Gelb's *ii*. The even more confusing method adopted by Parpola (1970:XV n. 1) might be suitable for Neo-Assyrian letters but it ignores the needs of texts from the western areas during the second millennium B. C. E.

IA(142a) is the standard sign for /*ya*/ in Akkadian words, e.g. *ia-nu* (EA 107:44; *et passim*), *ia-a-ši* (EA 83:8; *et passim*), and it

also does duty for the 3rd m.s. verbal prefix in cases where the prefix vowel is *a*, *ia-di-na* (EA 74:54; *et al.*), *ia-ak-šu-du-na* (EA 130:12), *ia-aš-al-mi* (EA 224:9), ¹*ia-an-ḥa-mi* (EA 83:31; *et al.*), ¹*ia-ap-ti-ḥa-da* (EA 335:9; *et al.*), *ia-aš-tap-pár* (EA 233:16). There is a question whether *a-ia-ka-am* (EA 254:27) is an Assyrian form or whether it should be transcribed as a Babylonian form, i.e. *a-yí-ka-am* (*AHw*:876*b*; *CAD* A/1:232). On the other hand, *a-ia-ka₄-mi* (EA 149:2) is the indefinite pronoun, "somewhere, anywhere," not the interrogative *ayikam* (*contra CAD* A/1:232*a*).

PI(383) almost never serves as an Akkadian element, e.g. *ka-ar-ši-ya* (EA 286:6). There are a limited number of instances where PI expresses the 3rd m.s. verbal prefix with *a*-vowel, at least in accordance with clear instances of a following *a* C sign, *ya-am-lik* (EA 114:20), ¹*Ya-an-ḥa-mu* (EA 270:11), *ya-ar-ḥi-ša* (EA 137:97), possibly ¹*ya¹-¹aš¹-¹mé¹* (EA 90:44) if we follow Schroeder's copy rather than Youngblood's suggestion, (1961:346) to read *yi-¹iš¹-¹mé¹*. The vast majority of 3rd m.s. prefixes did not have an *a*-vowel, e.g. *yi-iš-me* (EA 136:6), *yi-im-lu-uk* (EA 136:36), *yu-uš-ší* (EA 232:16) *et passim*. There are four examples of PI = à in the Jerusalem letters (Moran 1975b:151): *ú-ša-à-ru* (EA 286:21, 24), *à-qa-bi* (EA 286:22), *an-ni-à* (EA 289:9).

VOWELS. Alternations and interchangeability of various Cv signs with *e*-vowels and *i*-vowels, have been discussed above with reference to the respective consonants. The Byblos letters have a particularly remarkable deviation from the norm for 1st Aleph verbs with ³₃-³₄. Infinitive forms from this verb class are only attested with initial *i*- instead of the expected *e*-, e.g. *i-pé-eš* (EA 73:25; 89:43), *i-pé-ša* (EA 129:27; also [i-p]é-ša EA 79:24) and *i-[p]é-ši*. (EA 132:44), *i-pé-eš₁₅* (EA 69:17; 129:29; 362:45; and outside of Byblos, EA 250:21; 364:22) as well as *i-re-ši* (EA 81:38; also *i-re-ši[-i]m* EA 74:19 and [i-r]e-š[i] (EA 90:44), and from Beirut *i-re-bi* (EA 143:18) The earliest attestation to the initial *i* vowel is from Tanaach: *i-pé-ša-am* (TT 2:11); the same letter happens to have the noun *ip-ša-šu-nu* "their work" (TT 2:14). The source of these forms is most likely contamination with nominal forms such as *ipšu/epšu*, which has the meaning "act, deed," only in the

western peripheral texts from Amarna, Taanach and Ugarit (CAD E:168b-169a); its construct form is written syllabically *i-pí-iš* (EA 84:7 *et al.*). The question arises concerning a form in EA 179, a letter which consistently uses the *e* sign with the value i_{15} ; should the transcription be *e-pé-šu* or i_{15} -*pé-šu* (EA 179:17)?

E(308) occasionally has the value i_{15} in texts deriving from the Beqa^c Valley, i_{15} -*ša-ti* (EA 175:13; 176:13), i_{15} -*ša-ti*₇ (EA 174:17; 189:12), *ni-i₁₅-ta-lí* (EA 178:4), i_{15} -*na-ša-ar-šu* (EA 178:6), i_{15} -*na-ša-ar* (EA 179:26), i_{15} -*na-ša-ru* (EA 187:14), i_{15} -*ba-ša-ku-mi* (EA 193:6), i_{15} -*ba-ša-nu* (EA 174:8; 175:7; 176:7).

UM(134) has to be read u_{16} in three letters, since the places where the reading in question appears exclude the possibility of mimation, *ni-nu-u₁₆* (EA 92:44; 250:19; 362:26), *da-na-nu-u₁₆* (EA 362:27). The scribe apparently treated UM as he had learned to treat TUM and LIM, etc.

CVC SIGNS. In most respects the use of CVC signs in the syllabary from Canaan is in accordance with general Akkadian practice, especially OB. Unusual usages are rare indeed.

BIR₅, PIR₆ (79) = NAM. Thureau-Dangin (1940-41) was the first to observe that the PN transcribed by Knudtzon ¹NAM-*ia-wa-zi* (EA 129:82), *et al.*, was identical with ¹Bi-*ri-ia-ma-za* (EA 7:75) and thus should be transcribed today ¹Bir₅-*ia-wa-zi*, etc. This led him to the identification of another vocable, viz. *ši-pir₆-ti* (EA 60:25; 369:22; Moran 1975a:152). On the basis of this syllabic value, Youngblood (1961:249) also identified the GN ^{URU}I-*bir₅-ta* (EA 83:38; 104:52; 105:77?).

GÁB(88) is the correct transcription for all of Knudtzon's *gab* syllables, e.g. *gáb-bi* (EA 69:26, 29; *et passim*).

GAR(597) appears once with the value *kar₅*, viz. *kar₅-ší* (EA 119:26).

GUB(206) is a value for DU employed only in the writing of the GN ^{URU}Gub-*la* (*passim*). On rare occasions it is accompanied by a phonetic complement, *Gub^{ub}-li* (EA 362:26, 32), ^{URU}Gub^{ub}-*li* (EA 131:9), ^{URU}Gub^{ub}-*la* (EA 162:2).

GUR(111) appears in rare instances as *kùr*, viz. *nu-kùr-tu₄* (EA 298:29), [*nu*]-*kùr* (EA 179:19).

KUR(366) is the correct transcription for Knudtzon's KÚR, e.g. KUR.MEŠ (EA 362:34 *et passim*), KUR.MEŠ-i-mi (EA 366:14), KUR.KI.ĤÁ (EA 366:33), for *mātāti, mātātīmi*.

KÚR(60) is the correct transcription for Knudtzon's *kur*, e.g. *nu-kúr-tu₄* (EA 68:12, 19; *et passim*).

PÁR(74) is the correct transcription for all of Knudtzon's *par* syllables, for example, *ša-pár* (EA 92:32; *et al.*), *ia-aš-tap-pár* (EA 233:16).

LOGOGRAMS

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS. The use of Sumerograms in the EA texts from Canaan and in other peripheral EA texts was discussed in detail by Böhl (1909:4-14 §§3-5). Knudtzon (1915:985) gives a list of the principal ideograms and their Akkadian correspondences. Böhl concerned himself mainly with special problems. Since this present work is concerned with morphosyntax rather than matters of lexicography, Böhl's example will be followed. During the past century of Assyriological studies, especially the work on the two dictionaries, great progress has been made in refining the readings of Sumerian logograms and their Akkadian equivalents. There is no need to duplicate the work of *CAD* and *AHw*.

Knudtzon (1899a:104) declared in his first publication of some EA texts that he transcribed them in accordance with the method that he had used in his previous work on Assyrian hymns to the sun god (Knudtzon 1893). This was especially apparent in the normalization of logograms, e.g. the plural form *šābē* for ERÍN.MEŠ. During the intervening years, while he was completing his edition of the EA texts, the Codex Hammurapi was discovered and published. Analysis of that classical OB composition revealed many differences between the NA and the OB dialects (to which the EA peripheral dialects are considerably closer). Therefore, Knudtzon found it necessary to explain some of the many shortcomings of his transcription methods when his own final publication of the EA texts appeared (Knudtzon 1915:979 ff.). To this day, there are still many logograms, the

normalizations of which are quite obscure. Therefore, it seems best to follow the suggestion of Izre'el (1978b:17) and to render the logograms by their commonly accepted Sumerian transcription. Adler (1976) gave the Sumerian value for such signs in caps followed by the Akkadian normalization in parentheses. Such a practice was relatively easy in dealing with the Mitanni documents; reasonable MB normalizations could safely be deduced. On the other hand, the EA texts from Canaan seem to be based on a rather archaic dialect of OB with strong Canaanite influence. Therefore, it is hardly worth the risk of erroneous normalizations to try to make such reconstructions.

The glosses, whereby a Sumerian logogram is followed by a syllabic explanation, usually in West Semitic, represent the scribes' desire to clarify their intended meaning. The WS vocables in these glosses have been thoroughly treated by Sivan (1984).

PLURAL MARKERS. The standard Sumerian markers of plurals and collectives are all employed, but often in unorthodox combinations. Multiple plural markers are characteristic of other peripheral texts as well (Labat 1932:51-52; Huehnergard 1989:86 n. 184).

Reduplication of the logogram is attested, but it is primarily restricted to KUR = *mātu* "land," LUGAL KUR.KUR "king of the lands" (EA 74:2), note also KUR.KUR.KI (EA 74:35, 37). Usually, the reduplicated logogram is augmented by another plural marker: KUR.KUR.KI.MEŠ (EA 76:2; *et al.*), KUR.KUR.MEŠ.KI (EA 74:35; 108:2), KUR.KUR.MEŠ-*i-mi* (EA 362:36), KUR.KUR.ĤÁ (EA 78:2; 83:18), KUR.KUR.KI.DIDLI (EA 106:5).

As expected, the most common ideographic plural marker is MEŠ, e.g. ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ and GIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ (EA 100:22; *et passim*). Its use with syllabically spelled Akkadian words and with predeterminatives will be discussed below.

The use of DIDLI is restricted to examples with KUR and with URU. Unlike standard MB, viz. URU.DIDLI (EA 12:17; cf. URU.DIDLI.KI-*šu* [EA 68:32]), the texts from Canaan usually combine DIDLI with another plural marker: URU.DIDLI.MEŠ

(EA 65:9; 174:22; 283:19), URU.DIDLI.ĤÁ (EA 151:67; *et al.*), URU.DIDLI.KI.ĤÁ (EA 144:25, 30), KUR.KI.DIDLI.ĤÁ (EA 84:1); note also the confused reversal in the order of the signs: DIDLI.URU.KI-*ni* (EA 131:44).

Very common is the use of the collective marker ĤI.A = ĤÁ, e.g. ANŠE.KUR.RA.ĤÁ-*ia* (EA 141:25; 142:26), KUR.KI.ĤÁ (EA 68:3; *et al.*). It seldom appears to have a function different from MEŠ.

The plural MEŠ or collective ĤÁ may even be appended to a syllabic singular form, like the following *ma-lik*.MEŠ (EA 131:21), KASKAL-*ra-na*.ĤÁ (EA 255:23), KASKAL-*ra-ni*.ĤÁ (EA 255:9, 13, 18)

PREDETERMINATIVES. The function and value of predeterminatives can be interpreted in various ways. There is evidence to the effect that they were meant to be read as Akkadian words. For instance, the widespread use of KUR with geographical proper names (not mountains) is supplanted in many instances by syllabic spellings (CAD M/1:417), especially in the Mari and contemporary documents: note, e.g. *ma-a-at* KÁ.DINGIR.RA.KI "the land of Babylon" (ARM 2, 25:15'), *ma-a-at Ia-mu-ut-[b]a-lim*^{KI} "the land of Yamutbalum" (ARM 10, 84:24). These many examples indicate that the predeterminative is evidently to be read as a construct with the following GN. It may also be that the GN can stand in apposition to the predeterminative. Compare, in the same text, *a-na ma-a-at A-ḥa-zi-im* (ARM 1, 69:7) with *ma-a-tam A-[ḥ]a-zi-im ka-la-ša / iṣ-ša-ba-at* "he captured the entire country of Aḥazum" (*Ibid.*, rev. 5'-6'). Therefore, one may also surmise that KUR with geographical proper names in the EA texts was meant to be read *māt* "land of. . ."; some references to the major powers are KUR *Ka-aš-še* (EA 76:15), KUR *Mi-iṣ-ri* (EA 108:64; *et passim*), KUR *Mi-lu-ḥa* (EA 112:20; *et al.*), KUR *Na-aḥ-ri-na* (EA 288:35), KUR *Mi-it-ta-ni-ma* (EA 75:38), KUR *Mi-ta-na* (EA 76:14; *et al.*), KUR *A-la-ši-ia* (EA 114:52), KUR *Ḥa-at-ta* (EA 140:31; 363:11). Some regional entities are KUR *A-mur-ri* (EA 73:15'; *et al.*), KUR *Ki-na-aḥ-na* (EA 137:76; *et al.*), KUR *Ia-ri-im-mu-ta* (EA 68:27; *et al.*),

KUR *Su-te* (EA 122:34; 123:14). Note that Shechem is only mentioned once and then it is KUR *Ša-ak-mi* "the land of Shechem" (EA 289:23). The Lebanese Beqa^c Valley is usually called KUR *Am-qí* (EA 363:8; *et al.*) but also KUR.KUR.MEŠ *Am-qí* (EA 140:27, 29-30); note also the anomalous URU *Am-qí* (EA 170:16). Though the standard expression is URU *Ir-qa-ta* (EA 100:2; *et al.*), there are also four references to KUR *Ir-qa-[t]a* (EA 75:26; also the variants EA 88:6; 139:15; 140:10). Against the usual URU *Ar-da-ta* (EA 104:10; *et al.*), there is also KUR *Ar-da-ta* (EA 140:12; and probably EA 139:15). The Jerusalem scribe writes KUR URU *Gin₈-ti-ki-ir-mi-il* (EA 289:18) and KUR URU *Ru-bu-te*^{KI} (EA 290:11). Once he reverses the order, URU KUR *Ú-ru-sa-lim*^{KI} (EA 290:15) in accordance with his tendency to get things backwards (Rainey 1978c). All these latter combinations are meant to indicate "the land of the city"

The evidence for the function of URU is less decisive. There are, nevertheless, some OA and OB examples where the Akkadian word is spelled out, revealing that it is in apposition to the GN (CAD A/1:382), e.g. *a-na a-lim*^{KI} ^dA-šur (CCT 1 37a:22, and *passim* in those texts), *a-lam De-er*^{KI} (A.1314:16; Dossin 1956:65, from Mari; *passim* in OB texts). There are also a few instances of a construct relationship, e.g. OA *iš-tù a-al* / *Sí-zi-im* (TuM 1, 19b:5-6) and OB *a-al* / *Sippar*(UD.KIB.NUN.KI) (VAS 16, 20:12; cf. also VAB 6, 66:29). There are no syllabic spellings of *ālu* in the EA texts, even when not serving as the predeterminative for a GN. However, there is an example of the logogram with phonetic complement, URU-*la Bu-ru-sí-li* (EA 137:64) in the accusative. It is, therefore, highly likely that the scribes meant for URU GN to be read as an independent word with the GN in apposition, *ālu* GN, *āli* GN, *āla* GN. For convenience only, they will usually be treated in this present work as if they were non-read predeterminatives.

Another high frequency predeterminative is LÚ. As is customary in all Akkadian dialects, LÚ serves as a determinative for words written logographically, e.g. LÚ.İR.MEŠ (EA 288:18), LÚ.DUB.SAR (EA 288:62; 289:47), ¹LÚ.GAL (EA 96:3), LÚ.GÌR (EA 151:69), LÚ.SA.GAZ.MEŠ (EA 89:32; *et al.*), etc., and also for words spelled syllabically, e.g. ^{LÚ}*ar-ni* (EA 136:45; 147:68),

LÚkàr-tap-pí (EA 298:7; *et al.*), LÚmu-ut (EA 84:43), LÚpa-qá-ri-ka (EA 39:18), LÚpa-ma-ḥa-a (EA 162:74; cf. Zorn 1991), LÚra-bi-ṣí (EA 254:15; 298:32), LÚru-ʔì (EA 288:11), LÚše-er-da-ni (EA 122:35; 123:15), LÚtap-pí (EA 264:22), LÚú-e-ú (EA 288:10).

The peripheral dialects, and especially the texts from Canaan, add a plural marker to the predeterminative. This can hardly be a case of MEŠ simply as indicator of a logogram (cf. Huehnergard 1989:88-89) because it is attached to the predeterminative in cases where the substantive being determined is plural but lacks a plural marker itself, e.g. LÚ.MEŠ GAZ (EA 77:24; *et al.*), LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ (EA 254:34), LÚ.MEŠ.MAŠKÍM (EA 83:17; 89:60); cf. from Amurru LÚ.MEŠ.İR (EA 164:9, 10; 166:10). The use of a predeterminative plus plural marker may also define a syllabically written term (which may or may not be in the plural), LÚ.MEŠ *a-ia-bu* (EA 100:35), LÚ.MEŠ *a-ia-bi* (EA 141:33), cf. from Egypt LÚ.MEŠ *a-ia-bé-e* (EA 162:58), LÚ.MEŠ *ḥu-up-ši-ia* "my yeoman farmers" (EA 77:36; *et passim* in Byblos letters). Of course, the syllabically written term may also be in the plural, LÚ.MEŠ *a-bu-tu* (EA 224:14), LÚ.MEŠ *a-bu-ti* (EA 144:34), LÚ.MEŠ *ḥal-zu-uḥ-lu-ti* (EA 67:15), LÚ.MEŠ *Šu-ti-i* (EA 318:13), cf. from Assyria LÚ.MEŠ *Su-tu₄-ú* (EA 16:38) and LÚ.MEŠ *Su-ti-i* (EA 16:40), LÚ.MEŠ *a-ši-ru-ma* (EA 268:17).

A special problem is the understanding of the logogram ERÍN.MEŠ, which is glossed once in an Amurru text:

iš-tu ERÍN.MEŠ ṣa-bi pí-ṭá-te / ṣa LUGAL EN-ia "from the regular troops of the king, my lord" (EA 166:4-5).

Moran (1950a:131-132 n. 163) had noted the fluctuations in the number and gender of verbs and adjectives used with ERÍN.MEŠ. Sometimes it seems to be in apposition to a substantive which carries the case ending commensurate with the syntactic position of the phrase as a whole. All in the same Byblos letter we find nominative ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-tu* (EA 362:19; 129:33-34 by the same scribe), dependent ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti₇* (EA 362:8) and accusative ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ta₅* (EA 362:10). On the other hand, a Jerusalem letter has nominative LÚ.MEŠ.ERÍN *pi-ṭa-ti* (EA 286:54),

LÚ.ERÍN.MEŠ *pi-ṭa-ti* (EA 286:57) and LÚ.ERÍN *pi-ṭa-ti* (EA 286:59); in that text, one must assume that the predeterminative is in construct with *piṭāti*. Byblos also has some examples of this same construct formation: nominative ERÍN.MEŠ *pi-ṭá-ti* (EA 77:27; 103:55-56). In the cases of apparent apposition, one might argue that the predeterminative was quiescent, not meant to be read at all. But in the instances of a construct relationship it can hardly be doubted that the predeterminative was meant to be read as an inflected Akkadian vocable. The glossed example in EA 166:45 from Amurru certainly favors such a view.

PHONETIC COMPLEMENTS. Böhl (1909:11-14 §5) presented a balanced treatment of the use of phonetic complements in these texts. Böhl's examples from the texts written by Canaanite scribes will be reviewed here with some additional observations. It will be noted that throughout this work a graphic choice has been intentionally made with regard to two high-frequency vocables wherever they are written with a Sumerogram plus phonetic complement, viz. *libbu* and *šarru*. The respective Sumerograms for each of these words have acquired syllabic values in Akkadian by virtue of their semantic meaning in Akkadian: LUGAL can be read *šār* (von Soden and Röellig 1976:20 No. 112) and ŠÀ can be read *lib* (Ibid., 44 No. 224). Therefore, the spellings such as LUGAL-*ru*, LUGAL-*ri*, and ŠÀ-*bi*, etc. have been transcribed herein as *šār-ru*, *šār-ri* and *lib-bi* respectively. Spellings such as *nu-KÚR-tu₄* (EA 68:12, 29; *et passim*) have been rendered *nu-kúr-tu₄* like the similar *nu-kùr-tu₄* (EA 102:20; *et al.*), etc.

Besides the usual monosyllabic complements on such high-frequency ideograms as DINGIR, LUGAL, LÚ and URU, there are instances when the final two syllables are added, e.g. KASKAL-*ra-ni*.ĤÁ (EA 255:9 *et al.*), KÚR-*kùr-tu₄*.MEŠ (EA 92:11); 'SAG¹-*qà¹-di* (EA 209:16), LÚ.DUMU.KIN-*ip-ri-ia* (EA 176:31).

On rare occasions there may be a phonetic complement preceding the ideogram, representing the first syllable of the Akkadian word, e.g. *be-EN-ia* (EA 106:41); *nu-KÚR* (EA 75:10; *et passim* in the Byblos letters; Knudtzon 1899b:334-337). Note also

KÚR^{nu} (EA 63:13; 64:9; 283:20) and KÚR^{nu.tu}₄ (EA 103:8) and TÉŠ^{ba-ka} (EA 102:7). And especially worthy of note is *yu-TIL.LA-aṭ-šu-nu* (EA 94:66) instead of the usual *TI.LA* (EA 136:43).

In rare instances, a phonetic complement is appended to what the scribe felt was a sign that might be misread: *am-qut^{ut}* (EA 126:3); *am-qúqut* (EA 184:5, 7; 330:8); URU *Gub^{ub-la}* (EA 129:33, 43; 131:9, 14); URU.MEŠ *Gub^{ub-li}* (EA 362:26, 32).

There are a few passages where the phonetic complement does not conform to the required case ending. As Moran (1950a:110 n. 23) has suggested, these may be "frozen forms" in which the logogram and its complement are taken together as the ideogram. As the subject of *yânu*, which requires the accusative (Moran 1950a:14-15), one finds LÚ^{LUM} (EA 69:23) and LÚ^{LIM} (EA 74:23). Another accusative is in the following:

ù ú-ka-li LÚ^{LIM} / an-nu-ú "but I kept back this man" (EA 108:48).

It would be possible, of course, to read LÚ^{li} "my man," but that seems forced. On the other hand, there is one instance where the dependent case is probably intended:

um-ma Ša-mu-dIŠKUR LÚ^{li} / URU Ša-am-ḥu-na "The message of Šamu-Baal, the man of Šam^ona" (EA 225:3)

The particle *umma* usually takes the dependent case in these western texts and this scribe could have intended to read *awīli* with the case vowel on the bound form as evidently was the practice in WS (cf. Huehnergard 1981; 1989:150-151). In a similar vein, a scribe may have meant to indicate an anaptyctic vowel on the following bound form (cf. Akkadian *qīšti šarri*), even though it would not have been customary in Akkadian:

ia-nu É-ti ḥa-za-ni "There is no city ruler's residence" (EA 89:49).

But these latter two examples may just as well be read LÚ^{LIM} and É^{TI} respectively. They can be contrasted with

ù *ia-nu-um!*(AM) / LÚ.MEŠ-li "there are no men" (EA 362:37-38).

Here the complement indicates the plural accusative ending required by *yānu*.

There is a small group of Byblos texts which use ŠE.IM.ĤÁ as a logogram in both accusative and nominative positions:

ù *ia-ti-na* / ŠE.IM.ĤÁ "so may he furnish grain" (EA 83:32-33); ù 2 MU *am-ma-ša-³u₅* / ŠE.IM.ĤÁ-*ia ia-nu* ŠE.IM.ĤÁ *a-na* / *a-ka-li* "and for two years I have been robbed of my grain, there is no grain to eat" (EA 85:9-11); ù *yu-wa-ši-ra* / ŠE.IM.ĤÁ "so may he send grain" (EA 85:18); [*na-a*]d-*na-ti* ŠE.IM.ĤÁ "I [have gi]ven grain" (EA 85:24, apparently also 27); ù *yu-da-na₇* / ŠE.IM.ĤÁ (EA 85:34-35); *ya-di-nu* ŠE.IM.ĤÁ "he was furnishing grain" (EA 125:16); ù *ia-nu* ŠE.IM.ĤÁ "and there is no grain" (EA 125:25); *a-šar i-ba-ši* ŠE.IM.ĤÁ "wherever there is grain" (EA 125:29).

The confused reading ĤI.ŠE.ĤI.A (EA 86:16) should be corrected to ŠE.IM!.ĤÁ (Youngblood 1961:288-289; cf. Knudtzon 1915:412 n. m.; Moran 1992:159 n. 4), thus:

[u]š-*ši-ir* ŠE.IM!.ĤÁ *a-na* k[*a-ta₅*] "[H]e sent grain to y[ou]" (EA 86:16).

These examples reveal the tendency of Canaanite scribes to adopt certain ideographic writings including a logogram, a common phonetic complement and a plural marker as a "frozen" word sign. Many of the assumed deviations from the Semitic case system consist of just such combined ideograms which in fact say nothing about the case inflection.

PARTICULAR READINGS. There are a few instances of unusual logograms that require comment, for example: GA.KAL (EA 72:2; *et al.*) is written eleven times in the Byblos texts instead of the correct KAL.GA (= kalag.ga), which appears about three

dozen times (EA 68:12; *et passim* in the Byblos texts), and from Jerusalem (EA 286:12, 42; 288:14, 34).

Concerning LÚ.MEŠ ŠĪR! / ¹mar¹-ia-nu-ma (EA 107:42-43), Moran (1992:181 n. 3 and 182 n. 2; 1987b:305 n. 3 and 306-307 n. 2; 1992:181n. 3) has given up his earlier suggestion (Moran 1950a:166) that the sign groups at the end of line 42 represent KEŠDA = ŠĪR (Labat and Malbran-Labat 1976: No. 152). His own collation showed two signs, not one, which seem clearly to be NI and BA. However, that particular line was at the bottom of the tablet and EA scribes are known to distort signs at the margin or edge of a tablet. Therefore, the comparison with the sign in EA 108:15 is still cogent; the same goes for Moran's identification of the sign in question as KEŠDA = ŠĪR. ŠĪR is a word sign which can mean a "troop" of soldiers (Akkadian *kišru*, CAD K:437b-438). Moran's collation confirms Schroeder's reading of the first sign in line 43 as *mar* (Schroeder 1918), which gives the rare logogram for *mariannu* (unrecorded in CAD M/1:281b). Moran's original hunch seems to be confirmed by EA 108:15, which has LÚ.MEŠ ŠĪR : ši-ir-ma. Schroeder had sought in vain for an Egyptian word, *šir, but Moran had seen that ši-ir was the explanation of the Sumerian word sign (both had recognized that the -ma was the Akkadian enclitic). The same sign was probably employed at the end of EA 124:51'. What has survived there could be simply the -ma, but the context favors the view that charioteers and infantrymen were meant.

A sign which earlier researchers left unidentified (e.g. Böhl 1909:9 §3z) has been recognized independently by E. Gordon and Na'aman (1975:54* n. 47) as ÛZ(122b). It is the normal logogram for Akkadian *enzu* "she-goat" (CAD E:180b-182a). Since it always appears in the EA texts with a collective or plural marker, e.g. ÛZ.ĤÀ (EA 55:12) or ÛZ.MEŠ (EA 113:15), the natural assumption would be that it corresponds to the generic use of the plural, *enzātu* (CAD E:182a-183a). Moran (1987b:228 n. 2; 1992:128 n. 2) notes that it takes the place of the more common UDU = šēnu "small cattle."

Some scribes were uncertain about the proper logogram for *kalbu* "dog." Most of the time it is written correctly, viz.

UR.GI₇(= KU) (EA 60:7; 67:17; 71:18; 76:12; 84:8, 17, 35; 85:64; 91:5; 92:7; 108:26, 53; 117:36; 125:39 [with MEŠ]; 130:34; 201:14; 202:13). In letters from the southern coastal plain, the spelling UR.GI₁₂(= GU) is found (Ashkelon: EA-323:18; 324:16; 325:15; Yurša EA-314:14; 316:12). The scribe writing the Yurša letters even wrote UŠ.GI₁₂ (EA 315:16). A text written in Beirut has UR.GI₅(= KI) (EA 138:96). There is no need to speculate about seeming WS case inflection (Moran 1960:6 n.2) or the late Akkadian variations of *-rk-* / *-sk-* (Kühne 1973:145) in these variants; they all have their origin in a poorly learned logogram.

The obvious gloss LÚ.MEŠ UN \ *ma-ša-ar-ta* (EA 136:18) provides the interpretation for [LÚ.MEŠ] UN-*tù* (EA 114:31; Rainey 1989-90:60b) and *ma-qa-ti-ma a-⟨na⟩* UN-*nu* "(they) have attacked our garrison" (EA 116:11; Moran 1952:72 n. 11; 1987b:321 n. 1; 1992:192 n. 1). The same usage was noted at Ugarit (Rainey 1962:142-143, 233; 1965:24; 1967c:78-79, 150 nn. 273, 274, 277, 299; 1973a:44; Huehnergard 1989:66 nn. 133-134, pp. 379-380).

As mentioned above, the respective Sumerograms for *libbu* and *šarru* have acquired syllabic values in Akkadian by virtue of their semantic meaning in Akkadian: LUGAL can be read *šār* (von Soden and Röllig 1976:20 No. 112) and ŠÀ can be read *lib* (Ibid., 44 No. 224). Therefore, the spellings such as LUGAL-*ru*, LUGAL-*ri*, and ŠÀ-*bi*, etc. have been transcribed herein as *šār-ru*, *šār-ri* and *lib-bi* (as in CAD L:165 ff. *passim*) respectively; LUGAL in construct with a following word has also been rendered *šār*.

GLOSSES. The *Glossenkeil*, one or two wedges slanting to the right (Artzi 1963), serves much as the colon in modern writing. It may be used to indicate that a sign or signs at the end of a particular line are actually meant to be read at the end of the line above. Its most widespread use in the EA texts is to indicate the syllabic interpretation of some logogram. One of the most famous aspects of the EA letters from Canaan is the application of WS vocables, usually marked by the *Glossenkeil*, to explain a Sumerian word sign. These WS glosses have had more than their fair share of attention in the past century of EA research; recently they have been thoroughly analyzed in the light of the present

state of linguistic knowledge (Sivan 1984). Throughout the present work, such Canaanite or other WS vocables have been discussed under their proper linguistic category, e.g. nouns, verbs, particles, etc. It would be redundant here to go over the ground covered by Sivan's monograph.

On the other hand, notice should be taken of some Akkadian glosses. Böhl (1909:12-13) had noted that they sometimes are introduced by the *Glossenkeil*, but not always. In the first category, one finds examples such as: SAḪAR \ *e-pé-ri* (EA 136:3), SAḪAR.MEŠ \ *ep-ri* (EA 195:5; cf. also EA 316:4); GIŠ.GÌR.GUB \ *gi-iš-tap-pí* (EA 195:9); IZI \ *i-ša-ti* (EA 185:19, 32; note that all of Ebeling's NE and BÍL examples are actually the same sign, viz. NE/BÍL/IZI 172); LÚ.MEŠ.UN \ *ma-ša-ar-ta* (EA 136:18); LÚ.MEŠ.MAŠKÍM \ *ma-lik*^{MEŠ} (EA 131:21); BA.UG₇ \ *mu-tu-mi* (EA 362:47); UZU.KA \ *pí* (EA 79:12, 22; 145:9; 195:22); LÚ.MAŠÍM \ *ra-bi-iš* (EA 321:15).

Glosses without the *Glossenkeil* include the following: [A]D-ka-ma / a-bi-ka "your father" (EA 96:3-4); URU.MEŠ a-la-nu-ka (EA 209:7); ^dIZI.MEŠ *i₁₅-ša-ti₇* (EA 189:12); DUMU mar-šu (EA 131:37); KUR ma-ta-ti (EA 147:7); A.MEŠ *mé-e-ma* (EA 148:31); i-na BA.UG₇ / i-na mu-ta-a-an (EA 244:31-32); BA.UG₇.MEŠ *ni-mu-ut* (EA 362:11); BA.UG₇ *ni-mu-tu₄* (EA 288:60); KA *pí* (EA 137:72); ŠU *qa-ti* (EA 318:10); 2 ŠU *qa-ti-š[u]* (EA 138:67); AN *sa-me* (EA 220:20; *et passim*); AN.MEŠ *sa-me* (EA 314:13); MÈ *ta-ḥa-[zi]* (EA 245:18); IN *ti-ib-nu* (EA 148:33).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The orthographic practices of the scribes who wrote the EA texts from Canaan have fascinated scholars throughout the century of EA research. Only after a wider variety of peripheral collections became available has it become possible to analyse the EA phenomena in the proper diachronic and synchronic framework. The scribes in Canaan maintained an independent tradition from the Khurro-Akkadian scribal milieu even though they were interacting with scribes from the later "school" and sometimes fell under its influence.

CHAPTER II

PHONOLOGICAL FEATURES

The phonological characteristics of the language employed by the scribes from Canaan are markedly free from many of the features that typify the contemporary peripheral dialects. In most respects, the texts from Canaan show a fairly consistent phonology close to that of Classical Babylonian. There are, nevertheless, a number of details that deserve treatment.

INITIAL E-

The Byblos letters have a particularly remarkable deviation from the norm for 1st Aleph verbs with $\text{ʔ}_3\text{-}\text{ʔ}_4$. Infinitive forms from this verb class are only attested with initial *i-* instead of the expected *e-*. Because of the ambiguity of the syllabary in this period, it is impossible to say for certain whether the Byblos scribes preserved the thematic \bar{e} vowel. Giving them the benefit of the doubt on that point, one may transcribe two forms by *i-pé-eš* (EA 73:25; 89:43) because of the final *eš* sign. This would also permit the renderings *i-pé-ša* (EA 129:27; also *[i-p]é-ša* EA 79:24) and *i-[p]é-ši*. (EA 132:44) as well as *i-re-ši* (EA 81:38; also *i-re-ši[-i]m* EA 74:19 and *[i-r]e-š[i]* (EA 90:44). But there are several attestations to *i-pí-iš*, which could be rendered *i-pé-eš₁₅* (EA 69:17; 129:29; 362:45; and outside of Byblos, EA 250:21; 364:22). The source of these forms is most likely contamination with the noun *ipšu/epšu*, which has the meaning "act, deed" only in the western peripheral texts from Amarna, Taanach and Ugarit (CAD E:168b-169a); its construct form is written syllabically *i-pí-iš* (EA 84:7 *et al.*). The question arises concerning a form in EA 179, a letter which consistently uses the *e* sign with the value *i₁₅*; should the transcription be *e-pé-šu* or *i₁₅-pé-šu* (EA 179:17)? The earliest attestation to the initial *i* vowel is from Taanach: *i-pé-ša-am* (TT 2:11); the same letter happens to have the noun *ip-ša-šu-nu*

"their work" (TT 2:14). A similar form, from *erēbu*, is attested in a Beirut letter, *i-re-bi* (EA 143:18).

There is also one example of the preposition *eli*, or at least UGU, which is written *i-^lli-ia* (EA 122:17). For *idēnu* in place of *edēnu*, cf. *infra* p. 195. Strangely enough, the Boghazköi IZI = *išatu* (KBo 1, 31) has two entries with *i-pé-šu* (lines r. 13', 14'; CAD E:192b) and a fragmentary epistle has *i-re-bi* (KUB 3, 82:11).

INITIAL W-

There are few substantives with initial *w-* that have syllabic spellings in the EA texts from Canaan. The word for "slave" is always written ideographically (ÎR). But there is a denominative verb from this substantive (CAD A/2:220a) of which the G infinitive is *a-ra-ad* LUGAL (EA 112:24; 118:40; 119:43; 144:32), *a-ra-di-ka* (EA 89:17; 114:43) and the D stem infinitive is *ur-ru-ud* LUGAL (EA 191:10; 253:28), and *ur-ru-di-šu* (EA 189:r 17). The word for "month," (*w*)*arḥu*, is always written ideographically (ITU). The presumed (*w*)*arḥiš* is always *ar-ḥi-iš* or *ar-ḥi-iš* (EA 102:30; *et passim*, especially in the Byblos letters). The preposition (*w*)*arki* does have some syllabic spellings, *ar-ki-šu-nu* (EA 130:35; 191:15) and *ar-ki-ia* (EA 280:20), also *ar-ki-ti-ia* (EA 117:10). Although the initial *w-* of the D imperative and the substantival forms is usually preserved in OB (GAG:140, §103i), it was dropped in MB and this is the case in the EA texts from Canaan. Thus, one finds *a-ší* (EA 70:23; 71:26; *et passim*), *a-na a-ša-bi* (EA 138:41), and the infinitive (as d.o.) *uš-ša-ar* (on the WS vocalic pattern; EA 82:22; 113:29; 117:44, 59), etc.

RADICAL 1st W

The OB verb *wuššuru* is treated in MB as *muššuru* but the Canaanite scribes continue to use the OB forms, thus preserving the intervocalic *-w-*. One glaring exception is the scribe from Jerusalem, who knows the MB paradigm (which is also generally common to the N. Syrian peripheral dialects; Böhl 1909:47 n. 1;

Moran 1975b:151). By way of example, one may note the following 1st c.s. forms — from a Canaanite scribe: *ú-wa-še-ru* (EA 255:13); from Mitanni: *ú-maš-šer* (EA 29:150); from Jerusalem: *ú-ma-še-er* (EA 289:35). The Taanach texts contain the more conservative forms, e.g. *tu-wa-še-ru-na* (TT 6:11), putting the date of their use in Canaan back in the fifteenth century B.C.E. Here it would seem that we have a genuine survival of an OB trait. On the other hand, there are a few shortened forms without the first radical: 3rd m.s. *yu-uš-ši-ra* (EA 180:6; 182:8; 269:11, 14; 270:24; 271:18; 279:14); *yu-uš-ši-ir-mi* (EA 280:9); also: 3rd m.s. *yu-ša-ru* (EA 362:10), *yu-ši-ru* (EA 126:22; 131:15; *yu-ši-ra* (EA 104:14; 131:12; 216:15; 281:11, 27; 366:30). Only four Byblos tablets employ the shortened forms. One Rib-Haddi letter written in Beirut has the 3rd m.s. hybrids *yi-iš-ši-ru* (EA 139:34, 36, 38), *yi-iš-ši-ra* (EA 139:30-31).

INTERVOCALIC -W-

Outside of the verbal forms, such as 1st c.s. *ú-wa-še-ru* (EA 255:13) and others cited above, note that intervocalic *-w-* appears in WS texts, e.g. *a-wa-tu* (EA 81:23), etc., while the N. Syrian, Mitannian, Tyrian and Jerusalem letters use *a-ma-tu₄* (EA 29:13, 47, 153), etc. The MA spelling, *a-ba-at* (EA 211:10, 19) is a rare exception in a WS text.

A > E BEFORE I

In MB there is a tendency for short *a* vowels to shift to short *e* when followed by an *i* in the next syllable (Aro 1955:40-49). But the shift is not always carried through, especially in the letters. From the EA archive itself, Aro (1955:41, 43) cites *ú-na-ak-ki-su* (EA 8:36) in contrast to *tu-bé-²i-i-ma* (EA 4:15), both from Babylon. In the Mitanni letters, the shift is more prevalent than in the MB letters known to us (Adler 1976:23-24 with many examples), but this is hardly a phenomenon derived from Hurrian as suggested by Adler. With the lone exception of *tu-¹bé¹-¹u₅¹-na* (EA 250:10), the shift *a > e* before *i* does not occur in the Amarna

texts from Canaan. Even the Jerusalem letters, which show so much influence from N. Syria, do not have it; compare the Mitannian *ú-me-eš-še-ru* (EA 29:69), *up-te-eh-ḫé-er* (EA 20:47) and *li-me-eš-šir-šu-nu* (EA 17:48) with Jerusalem *ú-ma-še-er* (EA 289:35) and *lu-ma-še-er* (EA 288:58; 289:42) and *i-ḫal-li-iq* (EA 286:37). Mitannian *uk-te-eb-bi-du-ši* (EA 23:21) can be compared with Megiddo *yu-ka-bi-id* (EA 145:39; which, as a gloss, could be a purely Canaanite form). Alashia has *ia-qá-ar-ri-ib* (EA 39:19) without the shift, and examples from all over Canaan may be cited: *ú-da-mì-iq* (EA 120:44; most likely 1st c.s.!), *tu-ga-me-ru-nu* (EA 299:25), *yu-la-mi-dá* (EA 272:23), *yi-ma-lik* (EA 94:12; *et al.*), *i-na-ší-ru* (EA 119:15; *et al.*), *ti-^lpa^l-^lṭi^l-^lir^l* (EA 299:25). The absence of this typical MB and peripheral shift marks another conservative trait in the Akkadian used by the Canaanite scribes.

NASALIZATION OF GEMINATED CONSONANTS

This shift occurs frequently in MB and throughout the peripheral area, especially with geminated dentals and the verb *nadānu* in particular (GAG:32-33, §32; Aro 1955:36; Adler 1976:19; Huehnergard 1979:29-190; Berkooz 1937:45; Wilhelm 1970:24-25). The Egyptian Amarna letters generally have the nasalization; for example: *i-na-an-di-nu-na-ši* (EA 1:68), *a-na-an-din-šu-nu* (EA 1:76), *a-na-an-din-šu-nu-ti* (KL 69:277:8) and also *ú-ma-an-de-ši_x* (ŠE) (EA 1:17), while the Egyptian letters from Hattusas vary from *ta-na-an-di-i[n]* (KBo, 1 15 + 19: r.15; also KUB 3, 27: r.8; 67:11') to *ta-na-ad-di-in* (NBC 3934: 3.1) and *tá-na-di-in* (KBo 1, 15 +19: r.17). The only Canaanite town where this phenomenon occurs is Tyre (Finkle 1977:94): *i-na-an-din-ni* (EA 154:13), *i-na-an-din-ni₇* (EA 155:13); and *i-na-an-šár* (EA 150:9), *a-na-an-šár* (EA 147:61; 151:6; 153:15). On the other hand, from Taanach come: *a-na-^ldin^l* (TT 1:10), and *ma-an-ša-ar-^lti^l* (TT 6:7), and from Beirut: *a-na-din-mi* (EA 137:55). A Nuğassi letter has 3rd m.s. *i-ma-an-gur* (EA 51: r. 13), but from Acco we find 1st c.s. *i-ma-gur* (EA 234:27). The stative of *magāgu* "to be stiff, stretched" appears as *ma-an-ga* (EA 106:15), *ma-^lan^l-^lga^l-am-^lmi^l* (EA 362:15; Thureau-Dangin 1922a:92 n. 3; AHw:574b; CAD M/1:28a; cf. Moran 1987b:557-558

n. 3; 1992:360 n. 3). By and large, the Canaanite scribes have not acquired this phonetic shift so common to MB and the other peripheral dialects. The Tyrian scribe may have acquired it as part of his N. Syrian tradition; there are no diagnostic examples from the Jerusalem letters. The Akkadian used by the scribes of Canaan reflects an older dialect than the contemporary peripheral.

Š › L BEFORE A DENTAL

This is, perhaps, the most striking phonetic development from the OB to the MB period (GAG:31, §30g). The shift is not uniformly carried out in the MB letters (Aro 1955:37-38). In Nuzi it is still only partially attested (Wilhelm 1970:19-21), while at Alalakh it is practically absent (Giacumakis 1970:29). In Mitanni it is practically universal (Adler 1976:20-22) and in Carchemish and in Ugarit it predominates in the various verbal forms (Huehnergard:1979:28, 188-189; 1989:114-115). The Amarna letters from Egypt reveal a mixture of old and late forms, e.g. *uš-te-bi-la-ku* (EA 367:3) alongside *ul-te-bi-la-ak-ku* (EA 162:61; 369:3). However, in the Amarna letters from Canaan, the (almost) universal rejection of this shift is one of the principal signs of the archaic nature of the Akkadian base language. One may compare the MB imperative, *kul-da* (PBS 1/II, 24:9), with the Byblos *ku-uš-da* (EA 82:52), the MB *-t-* preterite, *ik-ta-al-d[a]* (EA 10:37), with Byblos *yi-[ik-t]a-aš-du-na* (EA 85:61), or Mitannian *el-te-me* (EA 20:10) with Byblos *eš-te-me* (EA 108:24). Other forms in the Canaanite texts where the shift might have been expected are: *yi-iš-ta-al* (EA 280:25), *yi-iš-ta-ka-nu-ni* (EA 125:31), *iš-ta-ni* (EA 125:21; *et al.*), or the many variants of *iš-ta-ḥa-ḥi-in* (EA 298:12) *et al.* The putative *ú-ul-ta-ša-aš* of EA 82:50 (supported by CAD A/2:424b) has been duly discredited by Moran (1987b:264 n. 6; 1992:152-153); the other two possible cases which he cites there, viz. EA 92:39 and EA 130:41, are to be read *[iš]-t[a-p]a-ru* and *ul-ta-ma!-[n]a* "I will antagonize," respectively. Especially noteworthy is the rare Gtn (with WS imperfect suffix), 1st c.s. *iš-te-nem-mu* (EA 261:10), which fills the semantic slot where most Canaanite letters have the West Semitized Gt

imperfect, *iš-te-mu* (EA 212:14; *et passim*; Rainey 1971:96-101). Of course, the Gtn is quite foreign to the West Semitic languages; therefore, none can doubt the intrusiveness of two examples from the common MB/peripheral paradigm of present tense Gtn's with the *št* › *lt* shift: *él-te₉-né-em-mé* (EA 378:26) and ¹*él¹-¹te₉¹-¹né¹-mé* (EA 300:23), especially since the latter form is paralleled by *iš-[t]e₉-mu* (EA 300:25) in the same context! The scribes who wrote EA 261, EA 300 and EA 378 all wanted to impress pharaoh with the continuous faithful obedience of the city rulers for whom they were writing. So they chose the iterative Gtn to express their meaning. The latter two scribes even went so far as to use the *koine* form from the MB and peripheral dialects which they knew was employed by the Egyptian scribes. That these two examples are unique in the corpus of texts from Canaan should be sufficient proof that the Akkadian dialect adopted by the Canaanite scribes did not have the *št* › *lt* phenomenon. The Tyrian scribe once used *bal-ta-šu* "his honor" (EA 153:14; from *bāštu* CAD B:142a-144a).

We see, therefore, another important feature in which the Akkadian of Canaan resembles OB rather than the contemporary dialects being used through the Levant and Mesopotamia during the Late Bronze Age (Middle Babylonian Period). On the other hand, it is obvious that the Canaanite scribes were aware of this phonetic development in the contemporary international correspondence of their age.

WITH THE Š- OF ACCUSATIVE AND DATIVE SUFFIXES

The peripheral dialects have usually lost the consonantal assimilation or partial assimilation found in the last radical of Babylonian verb forms in juncture with pronominal suffixes beginning with *š* (GAG:30, §30f).

A sibilant or dental + *š* › *ss* in OB and in literary texts. The Amarna archive contained evidence for such shifts in the literary texts found there: *iš-ba-si* (= *išbassi* › *išbat* + *ši*; EA 357:86) and *ú-še-eš-bi-is-su* (*ušešbissu* › *ušešbat* + *šu*; EA 356:37) and *ni-ip-pu-us-su* (= *nippissu* › *nippuš* + *šu* EA 356:60). In MB one finds ¹*iš¹-ša-bat-si* (BE 17/I 33:11), evidently for *išbassi*, while the shift is entirely

ignored at Megiddo, *yi-iš-bat-ši* (EA 244:28, 37; Rabiner 1981:55) and at Byblos, *ša-bat-ši* (EA 106:12). As for sibilants, the Mitanni texts have numerous examples like *e-ep-pu-us-sú-nu* (EA 29:147; Adler 1976:19), *i-te-ri-is-sí* (EA 29:17) and *i-na-aḥ-ḥi-is-sú-nu* (EA 29:152). But at Tunip, the scribe ignores the shift, *i-te-pu-uš-šu-nu* (EA 59:35), *ni-ir-ri-iš-šu-ni*₇ (EA 59:16). At Ugarit (Huehnergard 1979:189; 1989:102-104) one text has *i-ḥu-uz-ši* (RS 16.144:8; Nougayrol 1955:76) and *li-ra-ḥi-iš-šu* (*ibid*, lines 9, 13), while another (possibly older?) has [. . .]*r-ku-us-sú* (Ug 5, No. 2:5; Nougayrol 1968:3). The only example documented from the Canaanite Amarna letters reveals a different situation altogether: *yi-ma-ḥa-aš-ši* (EA 252:19; Albright 1943b:31 n. 17; Rabiner 1981:55); the *ḥ* has assimilated to the *š*. When the final consonant is *n*, mainly with the verb *nadānu*, OB often showed assimilation to the *š* of the suffix pronoun, e.g. *inaddiššum* (CH §17, viii 58). In MB and the peripheral dialects such an assimilation is virtually unknown: Babylon, [*i*] *d-di-in-ši-na-¹ti* (EA 2:11); Mitanni, *at-ta-din-ši* (EA 29:23, 28), but note also a unique form, *na-dá-a-an-sú-nu-ma* (EA 27:21); Egypt *a-na-an-din-šu-nu* (EA 1:76), Tunip, *li-id-din-šu* (EA 59:17), Alashia *i-din-šu* (EA 35:34), Ugarit *id-din-šu* (RS 15.89:7; Nougayrol 1955:53) and *ta-na-din-šu* (*ibid*, lines 13, 15, 16; Huehnergard 1979:190; 1989:101). So it is not surprising that the texts from Canaan also ignore it: *ya-di-in₄-ši* (EA 197:29, 30), *ya-di-in₄-šu-ni* (EA 197:11, 12). This does not mean that their dialect is just another branch of peripheral Akkadian. But it does indicate the distance between this dialect and the idiom in use in the Babylonian homeland from which it had migrated westwards. What the Canaanite scribes are using is an attenuated form of Old Babylonian.

Š-SIGNS FOR ETYMONS WITH /s/

Š-signs for /s/; a problem that may be ascribed to phonological factors has been explained as orthographic by Greenstein and Marcus (1976:60-62). The evidence has been most recently reviewed by Izre'el (Izre'el and Singer 1990:87-100), who suggests a phonetic basis for at least some of the phenomena.

Since most of the vocables are documented not only in the Canaanite letters but also in other peripheral texts, one may perchance look for an explanation in an early, perhaps preclassical, orthographic or phonological tradition. This would join some other features of the archaic Babylonian that the Canaanite scribes had adopted as their medium. In any case, the main examples are as follows:

hasāsu. This verb is attested once in a text from Canaan, viz. from Hazor. It is accompanied by a Canaanite gloss, perhaps because the scribe felt that this verb might be unfamiliar to his addressee, *li-iḫ-šū-uš* \ *ia-az-ku-ur-mi* (EA 228:18). Spellings with š- signs are also found in the Idrimi stele, *ma-an-nu-um-ma / a-wa-te*^{MEŠ} *ša aḫ-šū-šū ú-ul iḫ-šū-uš* (Idrimi 8-9; Greenstein and Marcus 1976:64). Likewise, in thirteenth century letters from Egypt (Cochavi-Rainey 1988:54, §1.14), *taḫ-tá-ša-aš* (KBo 1, 15 + 19: r. 5) and *ta-ḫa-aš-ša-aš* (KUB 3, 27:obv. 14).

kabāsu. In the area of Upe, one finds normal spellings, viz. from Kumidi, *qa-qa-ri ka₄-bá-¹si¹-ka₄* (EA 198:7, collation 27.1.80), and either Kumidi or Damascus (Na'aman 1988), KI.MEŠ *ša ka-bá-si-ka* (EA 195:7). On the other hand, the similar idioms from other Canaanite areas reveal spellings with ŠI, e.g. *qa-qa-ru ša ka-ba-ši-šū* (EA 232:5; 234:5-6; 231:7-8), KI.MEŠ *ša ka-bá-ši-šū* (EA 233:8; cf. EA 185:6) and *ṭi₄-ṭi ša ka-bá-ši-ka* (EA 241:6; also EA 213:5; 220:6). From Shechem comes *e[p-ru] / [ša] ka-bá-ši_x(ŠE)-[ka]* (EA 253:5). Izre'el has suggested that the spellings with ŠI are phonetic and represent influence from WS, where the root is **kbš* (Izre'el and Singer 1990:91 n.1). It seems much less likely that in all these examples ŠI should be read *si₁₇* (von Soden and Röllig 1976:15, No. 261).

nakāsu. This widely documented verb is known from Egypt, *i-na-ak-ki-iš* (EA 367:20) where the IŠ sign can also be transcribed *ís* (Cochavi-Rainey 1988:22). Youngblood (1961:357) has also observed an N stem example, *in₄-na-ka-aš* (EA 91:15), where AŠ can also be read *às* (von Soden and Röllig 1976:1). A

very broken context has a probable D infinitive, *n[u]-ku-[š]u* (EA 284:25) with ŠU. The crucial instance is in a letter that might have been written at Megiddo, viz. *na-ak-šu-mí* (EA 248:15; *AHw*:721a; Rainey 1978b:83; *CAD* N/1:177b), where the context obviously refers to the slaughtering of cattle. Otherwise, contemporary peripheral dialects reveal no spellings of this verb with Š signs.

masiktu. Moran (1950a:161) recognized this feminine adjective in one passage: *KÚR-kùr-tu₄ maš¹-ši-ik-tu₄* (EA 92:11; *CAD* M/1:324b). Once again there is a parallel in the Idrimi stele, *ma-ši-ik-tú* (Idrimi 4; Greenstein and Marcus 1976:64). The homophonous feminine noun also appears in texts from Hattusas (*CAD* M/1:234a) in the spellings *ma-ši-ik-ta* (*KBo* 1, 8:15) and *ma-ši-ik-ta₅* (*KBo* 1, 5:IV, 39).

rakāsu. Two finite forms from this verb are attested in the Byblos letters, viz. *ra-ak-ša-šu* "he bound him" (EA 116:28; Moran 1950a:57; 1987b:321 n. 2; 1992:192 n. 2), and *ra-ak-šu-nu* for *ra-ak-šu-šu-nu* "they bound them" (EA 109:29; Moran 1987b:309 n. 7; 1992:184 n. 7). A widely used noun from this etymon is *riksu* "agreement, treaty." It appears in treaties from Hattusas and Alalakh in spellings with š- signs interchanging with s-signs, even in the same text, viz. the Mattiwaza treaty, *ri-ik-ši* (*KBo* 1, 1: r. 58) and in the duplicate *ri-ik-ši* (*KBo* 1, 2: r. 34, 35) and in the Šunaššura treaty (from Kizzuwatna), *ri-ik-ša-am . . . ir-ku-uš* (*KBo* 1, 5:I, 4). The Pilliya treaty (also from Kizzuwatna) found at Alalakh has *ri-ik-ši* (AT 3:1) and *ri-ik-ša* (AT 3:4). Texts from Carchemish have *ri-ik-ša ir-ku-uš*, one found at Ugarit (RS 17.230:3 = *PRU* IV, p. 153-154; cf. Huehnergard 1979:28), and the other at Emar (Arnaud 1986:210-211, No. 201:24-25; Ikeda 1995:40-41). So all of the examples originate in treaty terminology of the Hittite empire (cf. Izre'el and Singer 1990:92-96).

sarru. Perhaps the most striking problem in this regard is the existence in the Canaanite texts of poorly recognized by-forms of Akkadian *sarru* "false, criminal, fraudulent" (*CAD*

S:180b-184a) and *sarrūtu* "falseness, treachery" (CAD S:185a). The vocables in the EA texts from Canaan are classified as *šāru* (AHw:1193a; Ebeling 1915:1518) and the various spellings certainly support that assumption. There are no instances of the gemination that would reflect the verbal *sarāru* CAD S:174b-175b) and its cognates. The attested EA forms in question are as follows: (1) adjectival, m.s. *ša-ru* (EA 102:26), *ša-ra* (EA 137:42), m.pl. *ša-a-ru-tu* (EA 138:13), *ša-ru-tu* (EA 108:21; 138:15?), *ša-ru-te* (EA 94:7), *ša-ru-ta* (EA 117:29, 31), *ša-ru-ta₅* (EA 131:36; 138:115); substantive, m.s. ^{LÜ}*ša-ru* (EA 185:64), ^{LÜ}*ša-ra* (EA 185:73), ^{LÜ}*ša-ri* LUGAL (EA 100:16), m.pl. ^{LÜ}*ša-ri*^{MES} (EA 185:56; 186:59), ^{LÜ}.^{MES}*ša-ru-tu* (EA 124:48; 137:48; 94:14[?], cf. EA 100:26), ^{LÜ}.^{MES}*ša-ru-tu₄* (EA 102:32), ^{LÜ}.^{MES}*ša-ru-ta* (EA 103:31; 279:31), ^{LÜ}*ša-ru-ta*^{MES} (EA 185:70). There is also an apparent participial, *ša-a-i-ru* (EA 149:82; AHw:1134a).

sebe, sebet. The numeral for "seven" appears in the distributive form as *ši-ib-i-ta-an* (EA 211:4), *ši-ib-e-ta-an* (EA 215:6), *ši-bi-ta-a-an* (EA 196:4). The first two spellings might suggest that the scribe was representing the WS ^cayin., i.e. **šib^citân*. In any event, the Idrimi Statue has *še-eb-i ša-na-ti* (lines 29, 45; AHw:1033b; Gaicumakis 1970:29, §3.10, 104).

SUMMARY. The presence of some of the features in northern Canaanite texts such as EA 185, 186 might suggest a connection with the N. Syrian Hurro-Akkadian tradition. However, most of the examples come from Byblos with a sprinkling from more southerly locations. One may note that among the various etymons, most also happen to have the voiceless velar plosive, *k*, and one etymon has the voiceless velar fricative, *ħ*. The resultant forms might have been generated from instances when the plosive or the fricative was followed immediately by the sibilant, e.g. *ks* > *kš*, *ħs* > *ħš*. That will not explain *kabāšu*, *šāru* or *šib^ci*. The possibility of an archaic brand of Old Babylonian in which these vocables developed, perhaps along with the opposite development of *samû* for *šamû* "heaven" (CAD Š/1:339b), must be kept in mind.

CHAPTER III

INDEPENDENT PRONOUNS

The independent pronouns in the EA texts from Canaan have been treated in a cursory manner in the past (Böhl 1909:26-27, §14). However, many features are worthy of further elucidation, both from the synchronic and from the diachronic point of view. As with all other aspects of the grammar in these texts, the morphological features will not be discussed alone; the syntactical functions will also be dealt with. Although there are various syntagmas that all the independent pronouns share in common, the respective persons often play differing roles in these texts and there are some functions that one person may fulfill and not the others, e.g. the use of the third person pronouns as virtual copula. Therefore, examples of syntactic constructions will be given for each separate person. The example of Adler (1976:25-26) in presenting nominative and oblique pronouns of each person together (rather than separately by case) has been followed here.

FIRST PERSON SINGULAR

NOMINATIVE

MORPHOLOGY. The normal form in all areas of Canaan is *anāku*, written *a-na-ku* (*passim*). Some suggestions have been made about shorter forms, e.g. Held (*apud* Youngblood 1961:334) saw a short form in *a-nu* / *i-de-šu* "I know it!" (EA 89:38-39; or else read *a-nu-⟨ki⟩?* *a-nu-⟨ma⟩?*); this interpretation is possibly strengthened by the parallel *a-na-ku i-d[e]-šu* (EA 89:47). Youngblood also cited *a-nu i-te₉-zi-ib-ši* "I have abandoned it" (EA 114:30) but here it seems most likely that one must read *a-nu-⟨ma⟩* though Youngblood's suggestion that the verb is 1st c.s. is certainly correct (Rainey 1989/90:60b *contra* Moran 1987b:316; 1992:188). The context seems to require "now" in this passage as a contrast to

Rib-Haddi's previous action. Youngblood (1961:33, 368) also tried to argue for *a-nu-ú* in EA:92:23 but there is no reason not to see here the presentation particle *annû* (Rainey 1988b:213). Whether one may see in these two or three doubtful contexts evidence for a short 1st c.s. personal pronoun, **anû*, is still uncertain. Much more convincing evidence than the short forms in Ugaritic, '*an*', and Hebrew, '*anî*', is necessary to establish the short form in Amarna Canaanite. Perhaps in EA 89:38 one should understand *a-nu-⟨ki⟩* like the form to be discussed in the next paragraph.

Naturally, a great deal has been said about *a-nu-ki* (EA 287:66, 69; Sivan 1984:126). The Jerusalem scribe shows that his native Canaanite form had the shift of *â* › *ô* and that the final vowel had become *-î*. His form is comparable to Hebrew '*ânôkî*' but contrasts with Ugaritic '*anâku*' (Ug 5, 130:III, 12').

FUNCTIONS. As would be expected with the nominative pronoun, *anâku* often serves as the subject (topic) of non-verbal clauses. The most frequent syntagma is the local ruler's affirmation of his loyalty, e.g.

a-mur a-na-ku ÌR LUGAL ù / UR.GI₇ ša É-šu "Behold, I am the servant of the king and the (watch)dog of his house" (EA 60:6-7); *a-nu-um-ma a-na-ku* ÌR ša LUGAL EN-⟨-ia⟩ / ù GIŠ.GIR.GUB ša GÌR.MEŠ-šu "Now, I am the servant of the king, ⟨my⟩ lord, and the footstool of his feet" (EA 141:39-40; Moran 1987b:370-371; 1992:227; cf. EA 147:4; 151:4; 185:74; 187:9; 198:10, 13, 16; 209:9; 211:8-9, 14; 212:11; 228:10; 241:9, 19; 254:10-11; 257:7; 264:5; 288:66; 296:9).

The standard order in such "equational" (Gianto 1990:20-36; Rainey 1992b:333-335) clauses is subject-predicate (SP) and the subject is the topic while the predicate is the comment. In subordinate clauses the order is reversed, viz. PS, i.e. comment-topic, for example, this object clause from Byblos:

i-nu-ma / ÌR 'ki¹-it-ti-ka a-na-ku "that your loyal servant am I" (EA 73:42'; cf. Gianto 1990:33-34; Rainey 1992:333).

And also this circumstantial clause from southern Canaan:

i-nu-ma TUR *a-na-ku ù* / *šu-ri-ba-ni a-na* KUR *Mi-iš-ri* "When I was young, then he brought me to Egypt" (EA 296:25-26).

The many examples with SP (topic-comment) order cited above usually are introduced by a presentation particle, *amur* or *anumma*. The subordinate clauses are dependent on one of the conjunctions, *inūma* or *kīma*, etc. However, a main clause can also have the order PS with the independent pronoun in second position:

ÌR LUGAL *a-na-ku* / *u [e]p-ri ša 2* ĠR.MEŠ-*ka* "A servant of the king am I, and the dirt under your two feet" (EA 298:18-19);
ÌR-*ka a-na-ku* "your servant am I" (EA 289:51).

In one Jerusalem passage, the first two clauses are introduced by *amur* and have SP order while the third is joined by the conjunction and has PS order:

a-mur a-na-ku la-a LÚ_h*a-zi-a-nu* / LÚ_ú-*e-ú a-na šàr-ri* EN-*ia* / *a-mur a-na-ku* LÚ_{ru}-*ì šàr-ri* / *ù ú-bi-il* GUN *šàr-ri a-na-ku* "See, I am not (just) a city ruler, a soldier of the king, my lord; look, I am a companion of the king and a bringer of tribute am I" (EA 288:9-12).

A locative clause (cf. Gianto 1990:39-44) also follows the SP order:

ù a-na-ku it-ti / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ťá-at* LUGAL *be-li[-ia]* / *a-šar ti-la-ku a-na-ku it[-ti-šu-nu]* "And I am with the army of the king, [my] lord, wherever it should go, I am wi[th them]" (EA 296:33-35; contrast Moran 1987b:526; 1992:339); *a-nu-ma a-na-ku* / *qa-du* ERÍN.MEŠ-*ia* / *ù* ĠIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ-*ia* / *a-na pa-ni* ERÍN.MEŠ / *pí-ťá-ti₇* "Now, I, with my troops and my chariots, will be at the head of the army" (EA 201:17-18; 202:13 ff.; 203:13 ff.; 204:15 ff.; 205:14 ff.).

The pronoun may serve as the topic in an interrogative clause where, of course, the comment is the interrogative (and any element that may be in apposition to it). Note the following:

ù mi-ia-mì a-na-ku / UR.GI₇ 1-en *ù* / *la-a il-la-ku* "But who am I, a dog, that I should not go?" (EA 201:14-16); *ù mi-ia-ti a-na-ku ù* / *ya-aḥ-li-qú šār-ru* KUR.KI-šu / UGU-ia "But who am I that the king should lose his territory because of me?" (EA 254:8-10); *mi-ia-ti a-na-ku ù la-a* / *ú-wa-še-ru* KASKAL-ra-ni^{HÁ} / *šār-ri* EN-ia "Who am I that I should not expedite the caravans of the king, my lord?" (EA 255:12-14)

A frequent syntagma in the Byblos letters is the use of *anāku* in extraposition, e.g.

a-mur a-na-ku / *nu-kúr-tu₄* UGU-ia 5 MU.MEŠ "Look, as for me, there has been hostility against me for five years" (EA 106:16-17); *a-mur a-na-ku ia-nu* / *ḥa-za-na i-na ar-ki-ti-ia* "Look, as for me, there is no city ruler behind me" (EA 117:9-11); *an-nu-ú a-na-ku ú-ul* / *ma-ša-ar-tu ù ú-ul* / *ba-la-aṭ* LUGAL *a-na* / *ia-ši* "Behold, as for me, I have no garrison and no royal sustenance" (EA 122:28-31); *a-mur a-n[a]-ku pa-nu-ia-ma* / *a-[n]a a-ra-ad* LUGAL "Look, as for me, it is my intention to serve the king" (EA 118:39-40).

The same usage is to be found in the following passage from Jerusalem:

a-mur a-na-ku la-a ^{LÚ}*a-bi* / *ù la-a* ^{MÍ}*ú-mi-ia* \ *ša-ak-na-ni* / *i-na aš-ri an-ni-e* "Look, as for me, it was not my father and not my mother (who) established me in this place" (EA 286:9-11).

All of these examples demonstrate, incidentally, that the element in extraposition is in the nominative in these texts (Moran 1950a:23), unlike English for example. Clauses with extraposition are in fact built on the same principle as the existential clauses above (*supra*, p. 48), except that the P component, the comment, is

itself a clause. That clause contains within it a component that has the extraposed subject as its antecedent, but said component is not the predicate of the comment clause (cf. Rainey 1992b:337 *contra* Gianto 1990:50-53). It is usually a suffix, either the object of a verb or dependent upon a noun or preposition, as in the examples cited above, *i-na ar-ki-ti-ia* "behind me," *a-na ia-ši* "to me," *pa-nu-ia-ma* "my intention (lit. "face")," *LÚa-bi* "my father," *MÍú-mi-ia* "my mother," *ša-ak-na-ni* "placed me," etc.

It is true that extraposition of the independent pronoun may be employed to express a contrast between the speaker and someone else.

LÚ.MEŠ *ha-za-nu-tu* URU.MEŠ-*šu-nu* / *a-na ša-šu-nu* LÚ.MEŠ /
hu!-<up>-šu-šu-nu i-na / *šap-li-šu-nu ù* / *a-na-ku* URU.MEŠ-*ia a-na*
 'A-zi-ri "As for the city rulers, they have their towns, their
 yeo<man far>mers are subservient to them; but as for me, my
 towns belong to Aziru" (EA 125:33-37; also EA 121:11-16;
 122:26-31).

That does not mean that the extraposed element is the predicate or comment or that it is emphasized. The contrast may be emphasized, but that is a matter of discourse, not clause syntax.

The independent pronoun may, nevertheless, be the comment. The nature of the ensuing clause is predicative in as much as *nukurtu* is used predicatively throughout the EA texts (in place of the stative of *nakāru*). The ships of the neighboring rulers are all in Amurru. They are at peace (or: safe) while Rib-Haddi is at war. Thus read:

GIŠ.MÁ.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ / URUŠur-ri URUBe-ru-ta URUŠí-du-na /
gáb-bu i-na KUR^A-*mur-ri šal-mu šu-nu* / *a-na-ku-mi* 'NU'.KÚR
 "As for the ships of the rulers of Tyre, Beirut and Sidon, all are
 in Amurru, they are safe; I am the one at war" (EA 114:9-15;
 contrast Moran 1992:188; 1987b:316).

Rib-Haddi wants to contrast the situation of the ships of the neighboring towns with his own situation. The addition of an

enclitic to the independent pronoun converts it from topic to comment by giving it special emphasis. Shuwardata also wanted to stress his position and that of his partner, ʿAbdi-Kheba in contrast to the other city rulers:

ù / a-na-ku-ma ù ʾR-ḥe-ba / nu-kúr-tu₄ i-na LÚ.ʿSA¹.GAZ "But it is I and ʿAbdi-Ḥeba who are fighting the 'apîrū" (EA 366:19-21).

The same can be done with a verbal sentence. The addition of the enclitic to the pronoun, plus the adjectival phrase, makes *anāku* the comment while the verb is the topic:

a-nu-ma a-na-ku-ma / er-ri-šu \ aḥ-ri-šu "Now, it is I who am cultivating" (EA 365:10-11); *u a-na-ku-ma / ub-ba-lu LÚ.MEŠ ma-as-sà^M[EŠ]* "And it is I who am bringing corvéé workers" (EA 365:13-14); *a-na-ku-ma \ ya-ḥu-du-un-ni / ub-ba-lu LÚ.MEŠ ma-as-sà^{MEŠ}* "It is I, by myself, who am bringing corvéé workers" (EA 365:24-25).

The addition of the phrase "by myself" can raise the pronoun to comment status without an enclitic:

a-na-ku / i-na [i]-de-ni-ia / ʿi¹-na-ša-r[u ra-m]a-ni-ia "It is I [a]lone who guard[s] myse[lf]" (EA 122:19-21; Moran 1950a:174; 1987b:334 n. 1; 1992:202 n. 1).

This is especially clear in rhetorical questions where the interrogative pronoun relinquishes its normal place as the comment:

mi-na i-pu-šu-na a-na-ku i-na / [i]-de-ni-ia "What can I do by myself?" (EA 74:63-64).

Otherwise, in this syntagma the 1st c.s. pronoun is mainly a reinforcement of the 1st c.s. person marker on the verb, which, being energetic, usurps the role of comment from the interrogative pronoun:

mi-na i-pu-šu-na a-na-ku "What can I do?" (EA 119:14; 122:48-49; 130:36-37).

On the other hand, the numeric expression can be the topic rather than the pronoun which can be dispensed with:

a-na-ku 1-en i-ba-ša-ti "I am alone" (EA 282:9; 283:21); cf. *i-ba-šu-ti / 1-en* "I am alone" (EA 284:8)

The most frequent use of the 1st c.s. pronoun with verbs is to provide a contrast. The verb or its negation is not only the grammatical predicate, it is the comment. The contrast is between *anāku* and some other subject (topic) on the discourse level. A good Byblos example is:

li-it-ri-[iṣ] / i-na pa-ni LU[GAL E]N-ia yu-wa-ši-ra / [L]Ú-šu ù yi-zi-iz i-na-an-na ù ak-šu-u[d] / a-na-ku a-na ma-ḥar šār-ri EN-⟨ia⟩
 "May it be pleas[ing] in the sight of the ki[ng], my [lo]rd: may he send his [m]an that he may take up a post now, so that I may co[me] before the king, ⟨my⟩ lord" (EA 74:59-62; cf. also EA 126:23-24 and perhaps EA 93:4-5).

Outside of Byblos, the same usage is in evidence:

ù / ti-na-mu-šu SIG₄ / \ la-bi-tu iš-tu / [š]u-pal ta-pa-ti-ši / ù a-na-ku la-a i-na-mu-šu / iš-tu šu-pal GÌR.MEŠ / šār-ri be-li-ia
 "And the brick may depart from under its mate, but I will not depart from beneath the feet of the king, my lord" (EA 296:16-22; 266:19-25; cf. also EA 242:14-17; 317:17-18; and perhaps EA 189:rev. 2-8).

OBLIQUE

FORMS. Both the dative *yâši* and the accusative *yâti* are employed but in no case does the former have mimation (as against OB *yâšim*). There are some plene spellings, *ia-a-ši* (EA 83:8; 287:28 *et al.*) and *ia-a-ti* (EA 145:26), but in the majority of cases,

one finds *ia-ši* (*passim*, note ^l*ia-ši* EA 63:8) and *ia-ti* (EA 125:38 *et al.*). Some strange hybrids have the respective suffix pronoun appended to the independent form, viz. *ia-ši-ia* (EA 136:10; 197:6, 37; 202:7), and *ia-ti-ia* (EA 109:43; 365:19). For 1st c.pl. forms, cf. *infra.*, p. 68)

DATIVE. Peripheral dialects such as that from Mitanni sometimes use the dative independent pronoun in the classical manner, without a preposition:

𐎠INANNA NIN *ša-me-e ŠEŠ-ia ù ia-ši* / *li-iš-šur-an-na-ši* "May Ištār, the lady of heaven, protect us, my brother and me" (EA 23:26-27).

Such usage in the texts from Canaan is confined to a few Byblos examples:

i-nu-ma ma-ri-iš ia-a-ši "because it is grievous for me" (EA 362:59); *ši-mé ia-a-ši* "listen to me" (EA 85:48); *ši-mé ia-ši* (EA 122:53; 83:14; 93:9).

The standard usage in these texts is with the preposition *ana*. The Taanach texts already use it, even with verbs that take the ventive:

at-ta ta-^laš^l-pu-ra / *a-na ia-ši* "you wrote to me" (TT 1:8-9; Rainey 1977:43); *tu-wa-še-ru* / *a-na ia-a-ši* "you used to send to me" (TT 6:5-6; Rainey 1977:37).

Over fifty examples of *ana yâši* are known from Byblos, Jerusalem, Tyre and in other areas of Canaan. The majority of them express the simple dative nuance, "to me," "for me." However, there are some in which the *ana* seems to be serving as a calque for WS *lamed* in genitive expressions, "(belonging) to me" (e.g. EA 85:67; 122:30-31; 198:21-23; Rainey 1990a).

A Sidonian letter uses the accusative pronoun *yâti* in dative function:

a-ıwa-at-mi / ti-iš-te₉-mé iš-tu aš-ra-[n]u-u[m] / t[ú]-te-ra-am a-na ia-a-ti "The word that you have heard from there, may you send back to me" (EA 145:24-26)

And Shuwardata uses the hybrid *yâtiya*:

šal-ma-at a-na ia-ti-ia / šu-te-ra-at URU.KI-ia / a-na ia-ti-ia "It is well with me; my town has been returned to me" (EA 280:13-15).

Rare are the instances with the preposition *iš-tu*," viz.

šar URU.Ĥa-šú-¹ra¹ / il-te-qé / 3 URU.DIDLI.KI iš-tu ¹ia¹-ši (EA 364:20); *i-nu-ma / LUŠEŠ-ia TUR.¹TUR¹ / na-ka-ar iš-tu / ia-ši u i-ru-ub / a-na URUMu-¹ú¹?¹-ĥa-zi* "that my younger brother became estranged from me and entered into Mō³ĥazi" (298:23-24).

The latter passage must be compared with the following use of the accusative pronoun:

ù ŠEŠ-ia TUR iš-tu ia-ti / i-na-kar₅-mi URUGub-la^{KI} "And my brother, younger than I, has estranged Byblos" (EA 137:16-17; Moran 1990:218).

In spite of the word order, one cannot help wondering if *ištu yâti* might not be an adverbial complement to the verb like *ištu yâši* in EA 298:23-24, in which case the translation could be "And my younger brother has estranged Byblos from me."

ACCUSATIVE. The independent pronoun is rare, being supplanted almost entirely by the 1st c.s. accusative suffix. Note the following:

uš-ši-ra / [GIŠ.]MÁ.MEŠ ti-il-qú mi-im-[ma] / ¹d¹NIN ù ia-ti "Send ships; let them take the Lady's proper[ty] and me" (EA 132:53-55); *ù ia-ti yu-ba-ú* "and he is after me" (EA 125:38).

Also with the hybrid form:

šum-ma LUGAL / *za-ir* URU.K[I]-*šu* *ù* *i-zi-ba-ši* / *ù šum-ma ia-ti-ia*
ù! / *i-pa-ṭá-ra-ni-mi* "If the king hates his city, then I will
 abandon it (to the enemy); but if it is me (that he hates) then I
 will get me away (EA 126:44-47; Rainey 1989-90:61a; cf. also
 Liverani 1967:13 n. 4; Moran 1950a:175; 1987b:340, 341 n. 7;
 1992:206-207 n. 7).

The preposition *kīma* takes *yâti* in the older Akkadian dialects (*yâši* is not used in OA), especially OB (AHw:413a, 476b-477a). In the corpus being studied here, only the hybrid is in evidence:

ia-nu ki-ma ia-ti-ia ÌR *a-na* / *šâr-ri* "There is none like me, a
 servant of the king" (EA 109:43-44); *la-a ti-pu-šu-na* / *ki-ma ia-ti-ia*
 "they are not as I" (EA 365:18-19).

SECOND PERSON SINGULAR

Only the masculine forms are attested in the letters from Canaan. The literary and the Mitanni texts have a few examples of 2nd f.s. (EA 357:5; 26:7, 14, 15, 19, 49). Although it can be assumed on comparative grounds that the Canaanite pronoun was probably *'atta* (as in Ugaritic, *'at*), the Akkadian form is also *atta* and the documented orthography here is uniformly *at-ta*.

NOMINATIVE

MORPHOLOGY. The spellings are *at-ta* without exception, cf. *at-tá* from Egypt (EA 162:7). One literary text, the *Šar Tamḥari*, which was found at Amarna in a somewhat sloppy version which was obviously from N. Syria or Anatolia, has [*a*]-*ta* (EA 359: r. 22) where the Assyrian version has *at-ta*. The spelling with *at* (EA 34:7) from Alashia is obviously to be read *at<-ta>* and in EA 124:35 the scribes intention was certainly *at-<ta>-m[a* (Moran 1987b:337 n. 2; 1992:203 n. 2).

FUNCTIONS. The independent form marks the subject of non-verbal clauses:

a-mur at-ta LÚ em-qú "Behold, you are a wise man" (EA 71:7);
at-ta EN GAL ú-ul / ta-qa-al-mi iš-tu / ši-ip-ri an-nu-ú "You are a great lord, don't ignore this letter!" (EA 76:44-46; Youngblood 1960:177); *u a-¹mu¹-¹ur¹-¹mi¹ / al-⟨tap⟩-ra-¹ka⁴¹ / ù at-[t]a* 'LUGAL¹ G[AL] / *be-li-ia / tu-še-ze-ba-an-n[i] / ù i-na-ba-a-a[t] / a-na LUGAL¹ GAL¹ be-li-ia¹* "And behold, I have written to you because you are the great king, my lord, may you deliver me that I may flee to the great king, [my] lord" (EA 318:16-22).

These are all main "equational" clauses (Gianto 1990:22-36; Rainey 1992b:333-335) where the standard word order is SP (topic-comment). In a subordinate clause, the word order is normally reversed, i.e. PS. However, there is one example where the scribe stayed within the proscribed PS order for subordinate non-verbal clauses even when the normal P element was not the real comment:

ù qí-ba-mi / a-wa-ta₅ an-ni-ta a-na pa-ni / šàr-ri EN-ka i-nu-ma / a-bu ù be-lu at-ta-ma / a-na ia-ši ù a-na ka-ta₅ / pa-ni-ia na-ad-na-ti
 "So speak this message before the king, your lord, because you are father and master to me and it is to you that I have turned my face" (EA 73:33-38).

The verbal clause, with fronting of *ana kâta*, makes it clear, as Gianto (1990:27-28) recognized, that the emphasis in both clauses is on Amanappa's being the official responsible for the welfare of Rib-Haddi. He is "father and master" to him. But in the subordinate non-verbal clause, the consistent order is PS. So the P, i.e. the comment, should be *abu u bēlu*. Gianto observed that the enclitic attached to the personal pronoun, *attāma*, is for emphasis. What needs to be recognized here is that enclitic *-ma* in verbal and non-verbal clauses can raise a component to the status of comment (logical predicate) even though it is not the grammatical predicate of the syntagma. This is what has happened here. The

scribe felt constrained to follow the order PS in which S is the independent pronoun even though he intended that the pronoun should be the comment (which is normally the P element in non-verbal clauses). He overcomes this constraint by affixing the enclitic and thus attracting the intonation to the pronoun for emphasis (Rainey 1992b:333-334).

The independent pronoun can also mark the subject of a verbal clause even though the verb form itself contains a person marker, sometimes with no apparent syntactical or discourse constraint. The examples include the suffix conjugation:

at-ta ša-ap-ra-ta "You have written" (EA 203:9-10; 204:9; 205:9);
at-ta-mi na-ad-[n]a-ta / *DUMU-nu a-na* LUGAL "You have given
 our sons to the king" (EA 83:36-37).

A contrast on the discourse level between topics in two sentences led to the employment of the independent pronoun in the following:

ù mi-na i-pu-šu-«na» / *[a-n]a-ku i-na i-de-ni-ia at-ta* / *[qa-]la-ta a-na*
 URU.MEŠ-ka i-nu-ma / *[yi-]i[l]-te₉-qú-šu-nu* LÚ.GAZ.MEŠ "And
 what can 'I' do by myself? You (yourself) [ne]glected your
 towns when the 'apîru men took them!" (EA 90:22-25; Gianto
 1990:86).

Also the prefix stative of *idû*:

at-ta / *ti-de-mi* "You know" (EA 15); *at-ta ú-ul* / *ti-i-de*
 KUR_A-mur-ri "Don't you know Amurru?" (EA 73:14-15);

Perhaps the independent pronoun is employed here as an indication that the forms are not meant to be jussive. The pronoun can also serve as the subject of an imperative. Note the following where it follows its verbal predicate:

ša-ni-tam k[u-u]š-[d]a at-ta / *ki-ma a[r]-hi-^fiš¹* "Furthermore, come
 yourself in a hurry!" (EA 95:34-35; Moran 1992:169; 1987b:287).

With the infinitive absolute used finitely (Moran 1950a:57-59; 1950c; 1952), the independent pronoun is necessary to mark the subject unless the latter is a personal name or other substantive.

a-pa-ši-m[i] / at-ta ki-ta it-[ti] DUMU.MEŠ / ʾİR-A-ši-ir-ta ù / la-qú-ka "(If) you make a covenant with the sons of ʿAbdi-Ashirta, then they will seize you" (EA 132:32-35).

Note the contrast in topics in the following construction where the different word order in the two clauses is surely related to the subordinate status of the first clause (nominalized by the determinative pronoun *ša*, cf. *infra*, pp. 102-102) which is actually in extraposition in spite of the coordinating conjunction:

ù ša / te-ri-šu at-ta / ù a-[na-ku] id-di-nu "And what you request, then I will give it" (EA 34:48-49; Kühne 1973:11 n. 47).

Finally, there is an example of the pronoun being emphasized by enclitic *-ma*, where the king does, in fact, single out Rib-Haddi as the one city ruler who continually writes so many letters:

a[l-lu-]mì / [i]a-aq-bu šār-ru EN-li a[-na] / mi-ni at-ta-ma ti-iš-tap-ru-na / a-na ia-ši "B[e]h[ol]d, the king, my lord says 'Why do you continually write to me?'" (EA 117:4-7).

OBLIQUE

One of the strange anomalies in the pronominal repertoire of the EA texts from Canaan is the use of *kâta* as the only oblique independent form (Albright and Moran 1948:242-243). It is not documented as an independent accusative but only as a dative, dependent on the preposition *ana*. In other words, it fulfills the function for which one might have expected *kaši(m)*. OA uses *kuwâti* for Genitive, Dative and Accusative functions (Hecker 1968:74). Archaic OB has *kuʾati* for Genitive and Accusative but

ku'āšim for the Dative (Whiting 1987:9). So the diachronic and synchronic influences that might have led to the EA Canaanite use of *kâta* for all three cases remains a mystery.

FORM. The fact that a few spellings have *ka-ta* (EA 90:26; 139:39) shows that the rest of the examples must be read *ka-ta₅* and not *ka-tam*. Knudtzon had led everyone astray by following the NA practice and transcribing *ka-tú*; Ebeling (1915:1437) had already noted that Knudtzon was wrong and rendered them *ka-tam*. The value *ta₅* had not been established in his day. However, the fact that the *tam* sign was used so frequently indicates that it must have been the original sign chosen by the Canaanite scribes in their school(s). Could it be that their choice was influenced by the desire to adhere somehow to the OB practice of appending mimation to the dative? Perhaps the answer to that question will never be known. There is one scribal error in a Jerusalem text where WA has been substituted for TAM, thus read *ka-ta₅!(WA)* (EA 287:70). In one other place, the lengthened vowel is expressed, *ka-a-ta₅* (EA 138:126), possibly because the clause is interrogative.

FUNCTIONS. All examples are dependent on the preposition *ana* and the prepositional phrases serve as adverbs with one possible exception (cf. *infra*). Practically all of the instances are adverbial complements to various verbs and, in the usual WS word order of these texts, come after the verb. Among the governing verbs are those of speaking, e.g.

aq-ta-bi ù aš-ta-ni / a-na ka-ta₅ "I spoke to you repeatedly" (EA 82:5-6); *aq-bi a-na ka-ta₅* "I spoke to you" (EA 82:21; cf. also EA 86:8-9; Moran 1987b:272 n. 2; 1992:159 n. 2);

or of writing:

a-[na] / [m]i-ni ti-iš-ta-pa-ru-na š[u-nu] / [a-n]a ka-ta₅ "Wh[y] are th[ey] continually writing [t]o you?" (EA 124:37-39; 90:10-11; 91:7; 114:27);

There are examples with *wuššuru* "to send":

ù uš-ši-ir-ti-šu / qa-du ERÍN.MEŠ til-la-ti a-na ka-ta₅ "and I will send him with support troops to you" (EA 82:12-18); *u ki-na-na la-[a]uš-ši-ir[-t]i / KASKAL-ra-na a-na k[a-t]a₅ / a-nu-ma i-[š]u-[ši-]ru / KASKAL-ra-na dam-qá-ta / a-[n]a ka-ta₅* "and thus I did not send a caravan to y[o]u; now I am s[en]ding a caravan to you" (EA 316:21-25);

and with *nadānu* "to give":

ù yi-di-na a-na ka-ta₅ "that he may give to you" (EA 93:11; 101:36-37).

Note the following with *kašādu* "to come, to arrive":

a-n[u-m]a / [ka]-aš-da-ti a-na k[a-t]a₅ "Now I'm already coming to you" (EA 93:6-7).

Quite a number of others are with forms of *našāru* "to guard":

ù ti-na-ša-ru URU a-na ka-ta₅ "and they will guard the city for you" (EA 85:22; 90:15-16, 47; 132:57-58; 230:14-16);

or *šabātu* "to capture":

ù šum-ma ni-le-ú / [ša-]ba-at URUBaṭ-ru-na / [a-n]a ka-ta₅ "And if we are able [to se]ize Baṭruna [fo]r you" (EA 93:19-21).

Note especially the following:

ia-nu URU ša-a ti-ir-ti-ḥu / a-na ka-ta₅ "There is no town that will remain to you" (EA 103:54-55).

An unusual Canaanite rendering of a Mesopotamian idiom is the following:

ma-at-ti ma-gal / a-na ka-ta₅ "I would seriously die for you" (EA 289:50-51; 287:70; Finkelstein 1969; Rainey 1989-90:71b; *contra* Moran 1987b:514 n. 20; 1992:330 n. 20).

Finally, there are two instances of fronting in which the adverbial phrase is promoted to the status of comment in the clause:

ù a-na ka-ta₅ / pa-ni-ia na-ad-na-ti "and it is to you that I have turned my face" (EA 73:33-38; Gianto 1990:27-28); [*a-mur*] *a-na ka-ta na-ad-na-ti / [pa-ni-i]a* "[Behold,] it is to you (alone) that I have turned" (EA 93:26-27; Gianto 1990:153).

Finally, there is one case where the phrase seems redundant because the governing verb has a 2nd m.s. pronominal suffix with dative force:

ù al-lu-ú ut-ta-šir₉-ka / i-na qa-ti LÚ.DUMU ši-ip₆-riš-ia a-na ka-ta₅
/ 1 *me* GUN URUDU.MEŠ "And behold, I have sent to you by the hand of my messenger to you one hundred talents of copper" (EA 34:16-18).

Actually, *a-na ka-ta₅* modifies the messenger and is adjectival in this passage.

THIRD PERSON SINGULAR

The function of the 3rd m.s. independent pronouns as anaphoric pronouns are treated along with the deictic pronouns (cf. *infra*, pp. 96-98).

NOMINATIVE MASCULINE

MORPHOLOGY. From Mitanni comes the form *š_u-ú* (EA 26:42, 45) and also from Assyria (EA 16:14) and from Egypt (162:77). However, elsewhere in peripheral Akkadian the OA and MA form *šūt* is well known, viz. from Nuzi, Alalah, Ugarit and

Hattusas (*AHw*:1290b). This is also the standard form in the EA letters from Canaan. It would be easy simply to admit that the Canaanite scribes adopted the Assyrian form from their peripheral contemporaries but for another salient fact. It will be observed below that the Canaanite scribes employ a set of dual pronominal suffixes which are otherwise documented only in archaic OB (cf. *infra*, pp. 81-85). Therefore, one must also mention that *šūt* as the 3rd m.s. form used in archaic OB (Whiting 1987:9-10). This not to say that the Canaanite scribes did not get their 3rd m.s. pronoun from an Assyrian or peripheral source. Still the possibility that an archaic OB trait has survived in the OB base language of these letters is intriguing.

The usual writing is *šu-ut* which Knudtson wrongly transcribed as *šu-tú* thus producing the form typical of NA, with which he was already familiar (*AHw*:1293b; cf. Rainey 1978b:95; Albright and Moran 1950:167; Moran 1952:78 n. 22). On occasion the long vowel is indicated, *šu-ú-ut* (EA 67:16; also EA 164:20 from Amurru).

SYNTACTIC FUNCTIONS. The pronoun serves in non-verbal clauses as the topic, i.e. the logical subject. Perhaps the best known context is the following:

[š]*a-ni-tam mi-nu šu-ut* / 1[R]-*A-ši [-ir-]ta* UR.GI₇ *ù yu-ba-ú* / [la]-*qa ka-li* URU.MEŠ *šàr-ru* (sic!) ^dUTU / [a-n]*a ša-a-šu šà* KUR *Mi-ta-na* / *ù šàr* KUR *Ka-aš-še šu-ut* "Further, who is 'Abdi-Ashirta, the dog, that he seeks to take all the cities of the king, the Sun [fo]r himself? Is he the king of Mitanni land or the king of the Cassite land?" (EA 76:11-15; Moran 1987b:146; 1992:255; also EA 79:45; 84:16-17;92:41).

Another good example is the following :

*i-še*₂₀-*mé* / *iš-tu* ^{UZU}KA LÚ.MEŠ-*tu*₄ LÚ *em-qu šu-ut* "I have heard people's testimony that he is a wise man" (EA 106:38-39; Moran 1987b:302; 1992:179; cf. the broken contexts EA 95:20; 132:24; 255:17).

On occasion, the independent pronoun appears as the subject of a verbal clause, sometimes to stress the identity of the actor, generally with reference to a specific person or object previously mentioned.

ù al-lu-ú-mi¹ Ya-aš-da-ta / ÌR-ka ù šu-ú-ut!(TE) / yi-ru-ub-mi it-ti-[i]a i-na^{MÊ}ta-ḥa-[zi] "And behold, Yashdata is your servant and he entered into the battle with me" (EA 245:15-18); *a-nu-ma¹A-ma-an-ap-pa it-ti-ka ša-al-šu / šu-ut yi-de ù ia-ta-mar pu-uš-[qa] / ša UGU-ia* "Now Aman-appa is with you, ask him; he knows and has seen the pressu[re] that is on me" (EA 74:51-53; cf. also EA 85:28; 317:19-25).

Referring to a certain messenger of his who was unable to go to Šumur, Rib-Haddi says:

šu-ut i-da-gal / 2 ITI a-ši-ib it-ti-ia "He has spent two months while located with me" (EA 114:40-41; contrast Moran 1992:189; 1987b:316).

As subject of passive verbs:

ù mi-im-ma ša na-da-an / be-li-ia a-na / ÌR-šu ù šu-ut / la-qí-i "And whatever my lord has given to his servant, it has been taken!" (EA 263:14-17); *a-nu-ma ṭup-pí ša-nu / ù ka-li ú-nu-tu-ia / ša it-ti¹Ia-pa-^dIŠKUR / šu-ut yi-ša-kan / i-na pa-ni šàr-ri* "Now, (here is) my second tablet and (a list of) all the implements of mine that are with Yapa^c-Haddi, may it be placed before the king" (EA 119:55-59; Rainey 1989-90:61a; contrast Moran 1987b:328-329; 1992:197).

Finally, the independent pronoun can act as the subject of an infinitive absolute when the latter is functioning as a finite verb, for example:

ù la-qa-ma / [š]u-ut 2 URU an-ni-[t]a "and he took those(!) two towns" (EA 76:19-20).

An especially interesting syntagma is the use of the independent pronoun in apposition to an accusative suffix for reinforcement:

ù *ia-aq-bi* LUGAL ù *yu-wa-ši-ra* / LÚ-*ia* LÚ.MEŠ-*šu ti-ša-šu-na*
 UGU-*ia* / *ur-ra mu-ša at-ta-mi na-ad-[n]a-ta* / DUMU-*nu a-na*
 LUGAL ù *uš-ši-ra-šu šu-ut* "So may the king also give the order
 and may he release my man. His people are complaining
 against me day and night, 'You handed over our son to the
 king!' So release him, especially him!" (EA 83:34-37; Moran
 1950a:22, 156; 1952:78 n. 22; 1987b:266 n. 4; 1992:154 n. 4;
 Youngblood 1961:149).

OBLIQUE MASCULINE

The accusative *šu'āti/šu'āta* is documented only in anaphoric function (Ebeling 1915:1524; cf. *infra*, pp. 96-98). As an independent pronoun, only the dative, *šâšu*, is found. It is governed by the preposition *ana* in every case but one (EA 36:23) where it is dependent on *ina* but evidently with the meaning of *ana*. Thirteen times the spelling is *ša-a-šu*, six times *ša-šu*. The usual meaning of *ana šâšu* is "to him(self)" (e.g. EA 71:19). The exact nuance of the phrase depends on the particular usage of the preposition in each context.

OBLIQUE FEMININE

There are no attestations in the texts from Canaan for the 3rd f.s. independent nominative pronoun *šī* or *šīt*. The dative pronoun appears twice, governed by *ana* in each case: *a-na ša-a-še* (EA 73:23); *a-na ša-še* (EA 120:37). With only two examples, it is impossible to decide whether the transcriptions should be *ša-a-ši_x*(ŠE) or whether the normal Akkadian *šâši* has somehow shifted to *šâše*.

One instance of accusative *ši-a-ti* (EA 129:20) can probably be taken as anaphoric and will be treated in the relevant section (*infra*, p. 98).

THIRD PERSON DUAL

One isolated example of an independent dual pronoun is documented. The dual suffixes will be treated separately. Suffice it to say that the importance of these duals for the history of Akkadian morphology is far out of proportion to their small number of examples (Moran 1973; Whiting 1972; 1987:15-16). The passage in question deals with two people and the context is clear:

ù ¹*Sú-ra-ta* LÚ URU*Ak-ka*^{KI} / *ù* ¹*In₄-tá* !-¹*ru*¹?-*ta* LÚ URU*Ak-ša-pa* /
šu-ni-ma in₄-né-ri-ru \ *na-az-a-qú* / *i-na* 50 ^{GIŠ}GIGIR.ĤÁ / *a-na*
mu-ĥi-ia "And Surata, the ruler of Acco and Intaruta, the ruler of Achshaph, these two also, have come to my aid" (EA 366:22-26; Moran 1992:364 n. 2; 1987b:562 n. 2; 1973:51; contra Albright 1975:114-115).

FIRST PERSON PLURAL

NOMINATIVE

MORPHOLOGY. The independent nominative pronoun for 1st c.pl. appears over a dozen times in these texts from Canaan. No hints as to the WS form in the scribes' native tongue are given; the standard Akkadian *nīnu* is used throughout. The fuller spelling *ni-i-nu* (EA 194:5; 239:18) is rare. Four texts from the land of ^cAmqi all use the form *ni-i₁₅-nu* (EA 174:8; 175:7; 176:7; 363:7); all four epistles use E = *i₁₅* uniformly. Six times the spelling *ni-nu* is found, once with an enclitic, *ni-nu-mi* (EA 362:11). The most remarkable spelling is *ni-nu-UM* = *ni-nu-u₁₆* (EA 92:44; 250:19; 362:26). There is no historical or comparative analogy for mimation of this form. Youngblood (1961:371) calls the spellings with *ni-nu-um* "misguided erudition on the part of the scribes." In the latter passage there is also the 3rd m.s. stative *da-na-nu-u₁₆*, where no mimation can be justified. Therefore, it is also possible that the three instances with final UM are meant to have some special accenting on the final syllable, thus the lengthened final vowel by means of *-u₁₆*.

SYNTAGMAS. There are three cases where the pronoun serves as the topic of a non-verbal clause where the comment is fronted for extra emphasis:

ù šum-ma nu-kúr-ta₅ la-a ti-pu-šu / ù nu-kúr-tu₄-ka ni-nu-u₁₆ "But if you do not join in the war, then we will be your enemies" (EA 250:18-19); *ù 3(?) ŠEŠ ni-nu-u₁₆* "And the three(?) of us are brothers . . ." (EA 92:44; Moran 1992:167 n. 11; Youngblood 1961:371; Weber 1915:1184); [ÌR.MEŠ LUGAL UR *Ĥa-a*]t-ti₇ ni-nu "[Servants of the king of the land of Ĥa]tti are we" (EA 197:24).

There are also several examples in which the pronoun, as the topic in the non-verbal clause, takes its usual place in first position (cf. Gianto 1990:20-25).

a-mur ni-i-nu / ÌR.MEŠ šàr-ri "Behold, we are servants of the king" (EA 239:18-19; also EA 116:55-56; 131:25; 194:5-8).

For the subject of an existential clause using the stative copula, four examples are documented, all in almost identical letters from the land of ʿAmqī:

a-mur-mi ni-i₁₅-nu i₁₅-ba-ša-nu / a-na^{KUR} Am-qī "Behold, we belong to the land of ʿAmqī" (EA 174:8-9; 175:7; 176:7; 363:7).

One instance of extraposition, where the singular pronoun is more usual, is the following:

a-mur ni-nu a-na mu-ĥi-ka₄ / 2 IGI-ia "Behold, as for us, my two eyes are on you" (EA 264:14-15).

As a grammatical subject reinforcing the person marked by the finite verb, note the following:

u mi-na-am-mi ni-pu-šu-na / ni-nu "But what can we do ourselves?" (EA 98:21-22); *šum-ma LUGAL be-li / la-a yu-ša-ru ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-ta₅ / ù ni-nu-mi BA.UG₇.MEŠ ni-mu-ut* "If the

king, my lord, does not send regular troops then we will die!"
(EA 362:9-11); perhaps also EA 227:22).

Finally, there is the case of this pronoun serving as the subject for an absolute infinitive which is employed as a finite verb:

ša-bat-mi / ni-nu-u₁₆ URU.MEŠ *Gubub-li / ù da-na-nu-u₁₆* "If we seize the towns of Byblos, then we will be strong"
(EA 362:9-11).

OBLIQUE

The scribes from Canaan do not use the normal Akkadian independent pronouns for the 1st c.pl. Instead, the scribes from Byblos and from Tyre have adopted hybrids like those used for 1st c.s. (cf. *supra*, p. 54) built on the real Akkadian 1st c.s. forms. The dative pronoun, always dependent on the preposition *ana*, appears in the phrase *a-na ia-ši-nu* "to/for us" (EA 73:31; 74:41; 85:11; 100:13, 41; 122:44; 149:51; 151:44). This is *yâši* + *-nu*. Knowing that the preposition *kīma* prefers the accusative pronouns (*AHw*:413a, 476b-477a), a Byblos scribe wrote *ki-ma ia-ti-nu* (EA 74:26) even though he also employed *a-na ia-ši-nu* (EA 74:41).

SECOND PERSON PLURAL

Only in one letter is the nominative 2nd m.pl. independent pronoun documented (2x). The function of the forms, which are standard Akkadian, is to reinforce the actor as expressed by the verbs. In fact, that function may even imply that the explicit pronoun is intended to be the comment, the logical predicate, of the clause:

at-tu-nu tu-ša-ab-li-ṭú-na-nu / ù at-tu-nu / \ \ ti-mi-tu-na-nu "It is you who can give us life and it is you who can put us to death"
(EA 238:31-33; Moran 1992:295; 1987b:464).

Just as the Canaanite scribes preferred *kâta* for the 2nd m.s. dependent pronoun in all functions, they also used 2nd m.pl. *kâtunu* for the plural. At least this is the testimony of the one example documented:

i[š]-tap-ru ¹*Ri-ib-ad-d[a]* / *a[-n]a ka-tu-nu a-na ti-la-ti* "Rib-Haddi will be writing to you for an auxiliary force" (EA 92:35-36).

THIRD PERSON PLURAL

Only the masculine is documented. There are not many examples and most of them are strictly routine.

NOMINATIVE

The form is standard Akkadian *šunu*, always written *šu-nu*. The functions are also the same as those for the other persons. The pronoun can be the topic of a non-verbal clause, e.g.

[a-n]u-ma ki-ma MUŠEN ša i-na li[b-bi] / *[hu]-ḥa-ri \ ki-lu-bi ša-ak[-na-at]* / *[ki-]šu-ma šu-nu i-na lib-bi* ^{U[RU]Gub-l]a} "[N]ow like a bird pla[ced] in a cage, [th]us are they within [Byblos]" (EA 81:34-36); *u al-la š[u-]nu i-na-na / it-ti-ka* "And behold, t[h]ey are now with you" (EA 101:14-15; also EA 90:55).

This pronoun also appears as the topic of an interrogative clause:

mi-ia šu-nu / i-nu-ma i-pu-šu ar-na "Who are they that they should commit treason" (EA 362:68-69).

One of the ^cAbdi-Ashirta letters has what might be a simple tautology, use of the pronoun along with a verb already marked for person:

a-nu-um-ma 4 LÚ.MEŠ / *ša aš-bu-ni₇ i-na É.GAL-ši / ù iq-bu-ni₇ šu-nu a-na ia-ši* "Now, there were four men who were staying

in its palace, and *they* (are the ones who) said to me . . . " (EA 62:27-29; cf. Izre³el 1991a:267).

Another usage is as the subject of an infinitive being used finitely:

'*ša*¹-*bat-mi šu-nu* URU.⟨MEŠ⟩.KI *Gub-li* "They have seized the towns of Byblos" (EA 362:28-29).

OBLIQUE

Only the dative *šâšunu* is documented (for the anaphoric accusative *šunūti* in EA 148:44, cf. *infra*, p. 98). The plene spelling *ša-a-šu-nu* appears twice in the texts from Canaan (EA 81:42; 362:37; also 27:94 from Mitanni). One defective passage is to be read: *i-nu-ma pa-ši-iḥ a-na* ⟨*ša*⟩-*šu-nu* " Since it is tranquil for ⟨th⟩em" (EA 362:57). In another place read: *a-⟨na⟩ ša-šu-nu* (EA 103:10). All examples are dependent on a preposition, either *ana* (13 x) or *ištu* (2 x).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Though the use of independent pronouns in these texts is fairly routine, there are certain unique innovations. viz. *yâšiya*, *yâtiya*, *yâšinu*, *yâtinu*, that show the "creative" thinking on the part of some scribes (in this case from Byblos and Tyre). Obviously, the rich repertoire of pronouns in normal Akkadian was either unknown to the scribes of Canaan or else it was consciously rejected in their interlanguage.

CHAPTER IV

SUFFIX PRONOUNS

Only a few salient features of the suffix pronouns in the EA texts from Canaan have been treated in the past (Böhl 1909: §15, pp. 27-29; Dhorme 1949:356-360 = 1951:470-474). In many respects, they are the regular Akkadian forms, but there are some departures from the classical norm which require special comment. A few rare examples provide some crumbs of West Semitic usage. The ensuing treatment is by person and number. The case functions will be discussed together under each person.

FIRST PERSON SINGULAR

ON SUBSTANTIVES. The scribes from Canaan knew both the short form, *-ī*, and the uncontracted *-ya*. The latter is almost always written *-ia* but *WA = ya* is also used (e.g. EA 148:1; 149:1). The standard distinction in usage between the contracted and uncontracted forms in Akkadian viz. that the former appears on singular nominatives, accusatives and vocatives, while the latter is on genitives and plurals (GAG:84, 86, §65a, i), seems to be generally followed by NWS languages such as Ugaritic (Gordon 1965:36, §6.6) and Phoenician (Friedrich and Röllig 1970:47, §112). The practice in the EA texts from Canaan follows the same general lines but with some deviations (Rainey 1969a:108-109). The use of *-ī* on nominative singulars is widely documented, e.g.

yu-ḥa-mi-iṭ be-li / uš-šar ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ti₇ "May my lord hasten to send the regular troops" (EA 362:7-8); *ù yu-ḥa-mi-tá be-li / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ta₅* "So may my lord hasten the regular troops" (EA 362:40-41); *i-nu-ma ša-ti-ir be-li / a-na maḥ-ri-ia* "When my lord wrote to me" (EA 362:42-43); *la-a yi-iš-mé LUGAL be-li* "May my lord not listen . . ." (EA 362:48).

Yet even in the same text, the scribe had a lapse of memory and wrote:

ʿù¹ *yu-ša-am* LUGAL *be-li-ia* "So may the king, my lord, come forth" (EA 362:60).

And such is the case when *bēlu* is written ideographically, e.g

li-il-ma-ad šâr-ru EN-*ia* "May the king, my lord, be apprised" (EA 366:11); *ù li-de-mi* / LUGAL EN-*ia* / *ù li-di-na* LUGAL EN-*ia* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ta* "So may the king, my lord, be apprised and may the king, my lord, assign regular troops" (EA 363:15-18; also EA 151:22-25, 49; 307:7; 317:19-20; 364:24-28; 365:8, 30-31).

Note ŠEŠ-*ú-a* "my brother" (EA 37:19) from Alashia.

Besides appearing on singular substantives (including the infinitive) in the dependent case, *-ya* also appears on plurals, duals, and even on a singular accusative: *ti-i-de pa-ar-ša-ia* "you know my behaviour" (EA 73:39'). A Canaanite gloss with the nominative dual bound form is: *ḥe-na-ia* "my eyes" (EA 144:18) = **cēnâya*.

On plurals, one finds:

ù ú-ul tu-uš-mu-n[a] / *a-wa-tu-ia* "But my words are not heeded" (EA 91:31; cf. EA 90:16; 89:8); *ù ka-li ú-nu-tu-ia* "and all my implements" (EA 119:56; here the dependent case is expected).

A text from Megiddo has the gloss: *a-na-ku-ma \ ya-ḥu-du-un-ni* "I myself" (EA 365:24). The gloss is the WS equivalent of *i-na i-de-ni-ia* "by myself" (EA 74:64; *et al.*) and probably represents **yaḥ^odōnnî* (cf. Rainey 1978b:73). The use of *-ni* as the 1st c.s. pronominal suffix is noteworthy.

ON FINITE VERBS. The accusative suffix is *-ni* as would be expected both from Akkadian and from the WS dialects. It can be attached to jussive and precativ forms without any connecting vowel since such verbs have Ø as their modal suffix:

ù *yi-din-ni* / LUGAL *i-[n]a qa[-a]t LÚ-li ša yi-la-ak* / *i-na pa-ni*
 ERÍN.MEŠ *pi-tá-at* LUGAL "So may the king put me in the
 charge of the man who will go at the head of the king's regular
 troops" (EA 144:27); *li-ba-lu-uṭ-ni* "May he give me life"
 (EA 198:20); *ù li-ba-lu-uṭ-ni* / LUGA[L] EN-*ia* "So may the king,
 my lord, give me life" (EA 198:30-31).

But in the same context, the suffix can be joined without a vowel
 on one verb and by means of *-am* (with assimilation of the *-m*) on
 another:

ù LUGAL EN[-*i*]a *lu-ú yi-da-an-ni* / *ù yi-ip[-q]i-id-[n]i i-na ŠU*
 /¹*Pa-ḥa-na-te* LÚMAŠKÍM-*ia* "So may the king, my lord,
 recognize me and may he place me under the authority of
 Paḥanate, my commissioner" (EA 60:30-32).

Numerous examples of *-anni* (*←am + ni*) could be cited. The
 addition of this suffix combination may interfere with the WS
 verbal modal system in that the imperfect suffix *-u* may be
 preempted. The following examples can be compared, all of them
 in questions where the WS imperfect is required: *yi-na-ší-ra-an-ni*
 (EA 112:14); beside [*yi-n*]a-*ša-ru-ni* (EA 17) and *yi-na-ší-ru-ni*
 (EA 112:18). The Jerusalem letters have Babylonian *ú-še-ri-ba-an-ni*
 (EA 286:13) and Assyrian *li-il-qé-a-ni* (EA 288:51). Many other
 examples could be cited. A small number of verbs have the
 accusative suffix joined by an *-i-* vowel; one of these is apparently
 a WS verb of the class with identical second and third radicals:
ya-qi-il-li-ni "(he) belittles me" EA 245:38); *yi-ik-ki-mi-ni* "may he
 deliver me" (EA 283:16; cf. also line 26).

Forms suffixed to verbs of the suffix conjugation (all
 examples are third person) have a connecting vowel on the 3rd
 m.s. as seen in the following: *ša-ak-na-ni* (EA 286:10; 288:15);
ša-ba-ta-ni (EA 288:25); note also the 3rd m.pl. *du-ub-bu-ru-ni*
 "(they) have expelled me" (EA 248:16).

There is no evidence that the dative *-a(m)* was used in
 these texts although the ventive is quite frequent. The suffix *-ni*
 is used for the dative throughout. Of course, the most frequent

usage is the complement *ana yâši*. Even without a connecting vowel or syllable, the *-ni* can still express the dative:

li-id-din-ni / LUGAL EN-*lî-ia* 20 LÚ.MEŠ "May the king, my lord, grant me twenty men" (EA 151:14-15).

The most frequent usage is, however, to attach the accusative pronoun by means of the ventive suffix as is done when the accusative nuance is intended:

ù uš-ši-ra-ni / [2]0 LÚ.MEŠ ^{KUR}Mi-lu-*ḥa* 20 LÚ.MEŠ ^{KUR}Mi-iš-*ri*
"So send me [twe]nty men of Cush (and) 20 men of Egypt"
(EA 108:66-67).

The Jerusalem scribe uses the *-anni* in dative function also with suffix verbs:

[*a-*]mur KUR ^{URU}Ú-*ru-ša*₁₀-*lim an-n[i-]ta* / [*l*]a-a ^{LÚ}AD.DA.A.NI
la-a um-mi-i[a] / [*n*]a-*ad-na-an-ni* \ ŠU \ *zu-ru-uḥ* [*šar-ri* KAL].GA
/ [*n*]a-*ad-na-an-ni a-na ia-a-ši* "be]hold, as for this land of
Jerusalem, neither my father nor my mother gave (it) to me;
the [stro]ng arm of [the king] gave (it) to me" (EA 287:25-28;
Moran 1975b:163 n. 52; 1987b:512-513 n. 7; 1992:329 n. 7;
Huehnergard 1987d:48 n. 2;).

Special note must be taken of what might be an example of a reflexive use of the dative. The verb in question has been taken as 3rd m.s. with the accusative *-ni* (Moran 1992:206; 1987b:340). It is outwardly a G stem with geminated second radical and could have been used as a transitive D (suiting Moran's translation) but there is no *y-* prefix for the 3rd m.s. Taking the verb as 1st c.s. with the 1st c.s. accusative/dative suffix, one may render the passage as follows:

šum-ma LUGAL / *za-ir* URU.K[I]-*šu* *ù i-zi-ba-ši* / *ù šum-ma ia-ti-ia*
*'ù*¹ / *i-pa-ṭá-ra-ni-mi 'ù*¹ / *uš-ši-ra* LÚ-*ka yi-[na-ša-a]r-ši* "If the
king hates his city, then I will abandon it (to the enemy); but if

it is me (that he hates) then I will get me away. Then send your own man, let him gu[ar]d it!" (EA 126:44-48; Rainey 1989-90:61a).

This dative nuance with verbs of motion is expressed in Hebrew by means of the *lamed* preposition (Joüon and Muraoka 1991:488-489, §133d).

SECOND PERSON SINGULAR

Only the 2nd m.s. is attested in the texts from Canaan; no 2nd f.s. examples appear. The only 2nd m.s. suffix pronoun in use is *-ka*, which is nearly always written with the KA sign. Of the seven instances of QA = *ka*₄, three are the suffix pronoun (EA 198:7, 10; 318:17; KL 74:300:20). The majority of attestations express the genitive, usually on nouns in the dependent case, e.g. *a-na* / *a-bi-ka* (EA 132:12-13; 117:22), *ki-it-ti-ka*₄ (EA 198:10) including infinitives, e.g. *a-di ka-ša-di-ka* (EA 256:31), *ša ka-pa-ši-ka* (EA 213:5; 255:5), UGU *a-ra-di-ka* (EA 114:43) *qa-qa-ri ka₄-pa-ší¹-ka₄* "the ground of your treading" (EA 198:7 from Kumidi). For attachment to the accusative, cf. *ti-din* / *ba-aš-ta-k[a]* "may (she) establish your honor" (EA 73:4-5; also EA 71:5; 95:5).

The accusative function is not widespread either:

iš-ta-pár-ka šâr-ru / *i-na* LÚMAŠKÍM "The king sent you as commissioner" (EA 71:9-10); *ḥa-za-na ša yu-ra-du-ka* "a city ruler who serves you" (EA 114:66); *ki-na-an-n[a]* / *ur-ru-du-ka a-na-ku* "Thus I am serving you" (EA 189:rev. 3'; infinitive?); [*ú*]-*ul ta-aq[-bu a-n]a EN-ka ù* / *yu-wa-ši-ru-n[a-k]a i-na* / *pa-ni ERÍN.MEŠ pí[-tá]-ti* "Will you not spea[k t]o your lord so that he will send you at the head of the regular troops?" (EA 77:21-23).

The dative pronominal suffix *-ku(m)*, which is in use in MB and in other peripheral dialects (e.g. EA 3:34; 8:21; 27:17, 18; 162:5, 6, 28, 46, 59; Ug. 5 28:13, rev 20'; Ug 5 29: rev. 3'; AT *8:8; AT *126:27), is never used in any text from Canaan. Instead, the dative complement, *ana kâta* is employed. Moran (1987b:542 n. 3;

1992:350 n. 3) points to one possible case of the accusative suffix pronoun being used in the dative: $^1al^1\text{-} \langle tap \rangle \text{-}ra\text{-}^1ka_4^1$ (EA 318:17; Artzi 1968).

THIRD PERSON SINGULAR

MASCULINE

GENITIVE. The well known and oft discussed examples of the WS 3rd m.s. genitive pronominal suffix in a letter from Megiddo were noted by Böhl (1909:27, §15 a) and Dhorme (1914:360 = 1951:473) but both of them misinterpreted the evidence. The examples are the glosses: EGIR-*šu* \ *aḥ-ru-un-ú* "afterwards" (EA 245:10) and *i-na ŠU-šu* \ *ba-di-ú* "from his hand" (EA 245:35). Both Böhl and Dhorme thought the *-ú* represented *-ô* < **ahû*. However, Virolleaud had found that the sign \dot{U} was used on an alphabet text to represent syllabically the Ugaritic consonant *h* (KTU 5.14:6; Virolleaud 1957:203) and rightly deduced that the Ugaritic scribe had intended to indicate that the letter *h* was to be pronounced **hû* (actually it was probably **hô* "ho!"). Virolleaud also noted the passages from EA 245. The two forms in question must represent 2aḥrônhû and 2bâdihû respectively (Rainey 1969a:108). The 3rd m.s. genitive suffix was therefore, *-hû*. This is commensurate with the comparative evidence. The accusative suffix from the same text will be discussed below. Another passage may contain an additional example of the WS 3rd m.s. genitive suffix:

[y]u-u[š]-ši-[ra] / $^1šâr\text{-}ri$ EN-ia qa-ti-ḥu / da-an-na-[t]a "May my king, my lord, send forth his powerful hand" (EA 284:18-20; Na³aman 1975:43* n. 57; Moran 1987b:506 n. 3; 1992:324 n. 3).

The *-ḥu* in *qa-ti-ḥu* could very well be transcribed *u₅* or 2u_5 since it appears to be meant for the WS 3rd m.s. suffix, *-hû* (Na³aman 1975:43* n. 57).

Throughout the corpus of letters from Canaan, the normal Akkadian suffix *-šu* is employed. On nouns in the nominative it

may be attached without any connecting vowel as in Akkadian, e.g., *šu-um-šu* "his name" (EA 147:51), *mi-nu ti-la-at-šu* "What are his support troops?" (EA 71:20). On the other hand, the case vowel may appear, e.g. *ḥa-za-nu-šu* "his city ruler" (EA 114:48), *še-ḥu-šu* "his breath" (EA 147:21); note also *a-bu-šu* (EA 147:8), *mi-im-mu-šu* "its property" (EA 89:46; i.e. *mimmûšu*) and the plural *a-w[a]-tu-[š]u* "his words" (EA 89:38), where a vowel before the suffix would be expected. Note *yi-¹da¹-ni-in₄ lib-bu-šu* "his heart became strong (= his intention was reinforced)" (EA 91:12; Greenberg 1955:38; Moran 1992:165 n. 2; 1987b:282 n. 2)., where proper Akkadian inflection would call for *libbašu* with an anaptyctic vowel.

For nouns in the genitive, note *iš-tu* ^{UZU}*pí be-li-šu* "from the mouth of his lord" (EA 147:44), *a-na mu-ḥi-šu* "to him" (EA 270:28), KÛ.BABBAR.ĤÁ *ip-ṭi-ir-ri-šu* "his ransom money" (EA 245:34), *i-na aš-ra-ni-šu* "in his places" (EA 147:10), *gáb-bi a-wa-te-šu* "all of his words" (EA 225:13). There are also numerous cases of the genitive pronoun as the subjective genitive on infinitives, *ki-ma ša qa-bi-šu* "according to his command" (EA 329:20) or as the objective genitive, *aš-šum ur-ru-di-šu* "in order to serve him" (EA 189:r. 2, 17); *ù la-a / i-ma-gur na-da-an-šu* "but I did not agree to hand him over" (EA 234:27).

On accusatives, the suffix can be attached without a connecting vowel, e.g. *mi-ši-i[l]-šu / i-kúl* "half of it (the fire) consumed" (EA 151:56) though the case vowel may also appear: *ša id-din ri-ig-ma-šu i-na ša₁₀-mì* "who gives his voice in the heavens" (EA 147:13).

ACCUSATIVE. A gloss from Megiddo gives the WS 3rd m.s. accusative suffix: *da-ku-šu \ ma-aḥ-šú-ú* "they had smitten him" (EA 245:14). The WS vocable is evidently *maḥšûhû* (cf. Dhorme 1914:360 = 1951:473). Thus, *-hû* is the WS accusative pronoun.

Apart from the gloss discussed above, the accusative suffix is regularly the Akkadian *-šu*. It is used on the West Semitized suffix conjugation verbs just as is the WS suffix in the gloss, e.g. the "Akkadian" verb being glossed *da-ku-šu* "they killed him" (EA 245:14). Note the 1st c.s. verbs with 3rd m.s. accusative

suffix: *ù la-a na-ad-na-ti-šu* "but I did not give him up" (EA 108:62; Rainey 1989-90:60); *ù al-lu-ú na-ad-na-ti₇-šu* "And behold, I have handed him over" (EA 254:36); [*uš*]-*ši-ir-ti-šu* (EA 114:34) and *uš-ši-ir-ti-[š]u* (EA 114:53), "I sent him"; *šu-ši-ir-ti-[šu]* "I have arranged [it]" (EA 325:19).

On verbs of the prefix conjugation the suffix is attested with the preterite, *yi-il-qé-šu* "he took him" (EA 245:30), *yu-ta-šir₄-šu* "he released him" (EA 245:31), with the jussive, *yi-iš-al-šu* "may he ask him" (EA 60:21), and with the imperfect, *ú-wa-ši-ru-šu* "I have been sending him" (EA 114:35), *i-na-ša-ru-šu* "I am guarding him" (EA 142:16). The Megiddo scribe seems to be attaching the accusative suffix to the imperfect energetic, *nu-ub-ba-lu-uš-šu* "we must send him" (EA 245:7),

The application of the suffix to verbs in the volitive is also documented e.g. *yu-wa-ši-ra-šu* "may he send him" (EA 117:77). Here the question arises as to whether the verb forms may actually have the Akkadian ventive to which the accusative suffix is attached. One thing is certain: none of the constructions with the accusative suffix have orthographic gemination which would have to represent the *-a(m)* morpheme of the ventive. In texts not from Canaan, the accusative attached to the ventive (with gemination) is rare: *tu-ka-ša-da-aš-šu* "expedite his journey" (EA 3:11), though it is relatively well known with the dative, *ma-an-nu i-qa-ab-ba-aš-šu-um* "who will speak to him?" (EA 7:22; also EA 7:26; 16:25; 19:36, 37; 21:14; 51:6). Throughout the letters from Canaan, the dative is not expressed by the 3rd m.s. suffix *-šu(m)*. Instead, the phrase *ana šâšu* is employed.

FEMININE

GENITIVE. Finkelstein (1969:33) noted that another gloss indicated the 3rd f.s. genitive suffix: *a-na ZAG.𐎠𐎢𐎣 <A>-ši \ up-sí-ḫi* "to its utmost extremity" (EA 366:34; Rainey 1978b:3435, 98). The final *-ḫi* could also be transcribed ²*i*; the resulting WS form would then probably be *-hî*. However, this form presents quite a surprise from a comparative point of view. On the other hand, one must entertain a certain reservation about this interpretation. The

initial Sumerogram evidently has its plural (collective) marker defectively written, 𒄩 for 𒄩.A = 𒄩.Á. Who is to say that the 𒄩 sign after *up-sí* is not also the defectively written marker of plurality? It is not unknown for the WS gloss word to appear without a pronominal suffix that is attached to the word being glossed (cf. e.g. BÂD-ši \ *ḫu-mi-tu* "its wall" EA 141:44). Therefore, the final 𒄩 of the gloss in EA 366:34 may not be the WS 3rd f.s. pronoun at all!

The genitive 3rd f.s. suffix in Akkadian is normally *-ša*; but in the passage dealt with above the word being glossed, the Sumerogram, has the suffix *-ši*! As a matter of fact, there is considerable deviation from the Akkadian usage among the peripheral dialects. The suffixes *-ši* and *-ša* are used interchangeably, usually with a preference on the part of a scribe for one or the other (cf. Izre³el 1991a:100-101; Huehnergard 1989:128-131). In the western areas, *-ši* predominates.

Over a dozen examples are recorded of *-ši* functioning as the genitive suffix. On the nominative, one finds: BÂD-ši \ *ḫu-mi-tu* "its wall" (EA 141:44). On the infinitive standing in the accusative as an object governed by a finite verb:

ša-ḫa-aṭ-ši i-le-ú ù ṣa-bat-ši / la-a i-le-ú "To attack it they are able, to capture it they are not able" (EA 106:11-12); *ù la-a ti-le-ú la-qa-ši* "but they are not able to take it" (EA 83:21); *ù yu-ba-ú / la-qa-ši* "and he seeks to take it" (EA 91:22); *ù a-na-ku i-ba-ú a-šé-ši* "but I seek its coming forth" (EA 362:58).

It can also appear on a preposition, UGU-ši "against it" (EA 106:9) and in numerous cases on nouns in the dependent, or genitive, case:

a-di a-bu-li-ši "up to its gate" (EA 106:12); *i-na É.GAL-ši* "in its palace" (EA 62:23,24); *[i-n]a lib-bi-ši* "[wi]thin it" (EA 62:12); *[š]u-pal tap-pa-ti-ši* "beneath its partners" (EA 296:19, 21?); *qa-du URU.DIDLI.ḫÁ-ni-ši* "with its towns" (EA 283:20); *a-na na-ša-ri-ši* "in order to protect it" (EA 62:51; 62:10, 12; 114:29?); *um-ma*

URU *Ir-qa-ta* / ù LÚ.MEŠ *ši-bu!*(ŠE)-*ti-ši* "The message of 'Irqata and its elders" (EA 100:3).

Examples of *-ša* are relatively rare; outside of Canaan, they come from Babylon (EA 4:34; 10:47), Egypt (EA 162:41), Mitanni (EA 21:15). From within Canaan, they are found in the Jerusalem letters, on a substantive in the nominative:

URU KUR *Ú-ru-ša*₁₀-*lim*^{KI} *šu-mu-ša* / URUÉ.^dNIN.IB "A town of the territory of Jerusalem, its name being Bīt-NINIB" (EA 290:15); *pa-ṭa-ra-at* / [KUR.ḪI.]A LUGAL EN *gáb-ba-ša* "Alḏ the [land]s of the king, my lord, have deserted" (EA 286:35-36); *ḫal-qà-at* KUR *šar-ri gáb-ba-ša* "the land of the king is lost" (EA 288:24);

and on the accusative: *la-qé-mi* / [gáb]-*b[a]-š[a]* ¹*E-en-ḫa-mu* "Yanḫamu took all of it" (EA 286:27).

There are four examples of *-še* for the 3rd f.s. genitive suffix. These remind one of the fact that EA 1, from Egypt, uses *-še* throughout (EA 1:16, 17, 36, 25, 41; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:70-71, §2.1.1.4). The passages from Canaan are all in Byblos texts; on the nominative: *mu-ut-še* "her husband" (EA 83:54); on the genitive: *i-na e-de-ni-še* "by herself" (EA 90:8), *qa-du a-ḫa-ti-ia ù DUMU.MEŠ-še* "with my sister and her children" (EA 89:22); uncertain: *kil-¹li-še* (EA 77:11).

ACCUSATIVE. Nearly twenty instances of accusative *-ši* are found in the texts from Canaan. One finds them on the imperfect: *a-na-ku ub-ba-lu-ši* "I will deliver it" (EA 255:24), *ki-i₁₅ a-kal-lu-ši* "How could I withhold her?" (EA 254:40); *ti-il-qú-na-ši* "they will take it" (EA 131:17); on the jussive: *la-a-mi yi-iš-bat-ši* "May he not seize it" (EA 244:28, 37); on the plural imperative: *ù uš-še-ru-ši* "so expedite them!" (EA 255:11); and on forms representing the WS suffix conjugation: *i-te₉-zi-ib-ši* / [ka-li LÚ.MEŠ] UN-*tú* "[All of the] garrison troops have abandoned it" (EA 114:30-31); *ù la-qú-ši* "then they will take it" (EA 131:60).

There are no examples of a dative 3rd f.s. suffix. There is one instance when the suffix is joined to an imperative by the

ventive morpheme, viz. *ù uš-ši-ra-aš-ši* "then send it!" (TT 2:11). On the other hand, there are two examples of *-še* (to be read *ši_x[ŠE]?*) as accusative in texts by Canaanite scribes (and one from Amurru, EA 161:40). One is on a plural imperfect, *ti-ìl-qú-na-še* "They will take it" (EA 117:64); and another on an Akkadian form in a subordinate clause (also with imperfect *-u*), viz.

šum-ma ia-[nu] / LÚ-LÌ ša ú-še₂₀-ze-bu-[š]e is-tu qa-ti-n[u] "Since there is no man who can deliver [i]t from o[ur] hand!" (EA 74:32-33; according to Moran's collation).

SECOND PERSON DUAL

The existence of dual pronouns and pronominal suffixes in Old Akkadian and in archaic Old Babylonian was demonstrated by Whiting (1972). Subsequently, Moran (1973) showed that such duals are also attested in the western peripheral areas, Egypt, Alashia, Ugarit and the Phoenician coast. Only four examples of the 2nd c.du. are recorded and, for three of them, Moran now has serious doubts. He has abandoned his former interpretations as 2nd c.du. in favor of 1st c.du. However, the form, *-kunī*, is the 2nd c.du. in Whiting's examples and a review of the contexts will show that the 2nd c.du. is perfectly acceptable in all cases.

The Ugarit letter contains a passage addressed to two people, a high ranking personage and his wife. The greeting employed is:

lu-ú [šul¹-mu a-na [mu]h-ḥi-ku-ni "May it be well with the two of you" (Ug 5, 54:21).

The passage from Alashia appears to be problematic at first glance. In the immediately preceding context, as noted by Moran (1973:52), the "merchant/business agent" of the king of Alashia is referred to (line 30). Though the lines are badly preserved, it is highly probable that said *tamkaru* had been charged with the task of with executing a new (trade) agreement with the recently enthroned king of Egypt (cf. EA 34:50-53; also

EA 33:9-11 in spite of Moran's expressed reservations 1987b:200 n. 11; 1992:107 n. 11).

ù lu-[ú te-né]-pu-uš ki-it-tu / i-na bi-[ri]-ku-ni "so ma[y] a treaty [be ma]de between the two of you" (EA 34:42-43).

The remaining two passages have to do with a legal dispute that arose between Rib-Haddi of Byblos and Yapa^c-Haddi of Beirut. Considerable property belonging to the former had fallen into the possession of the latter. It would appear that Yapa^c-Haddi owed some taxes or tribute to the king of Egypt, perhaps as the result of his acquiring the property of Rib-Haddi. In any case, Rib-Haddi makes it clear that the king should send his own representative who should be charged with deciding the dispute between Yapa^c-Haddi and the crown (*contra* Moran 1987b:315 n. 5; 1992:188 n. 5; Rainey 1989-90:606). As for his property, Rib-Haddi insists that the king may do with it as he pleases. Pharaoh may take all the property or he may hand over all or part of it to Rib-Haddi. That Rib-Haddi really expressed that position on the matter is clear from the contexts:

[yu-wa]-ši-ra šàr-ru LÚMAŠKÍM-šu / [ù yu-]pa-ra-aš be-ri-ku-[n]i / [ka-li] mi-im-mi ša-a / [yu-ul]-qú iš-tu ša-a-šu / [yi-il-qé] "[May] the king [s]end his commissioner [and may he de]cide between the two of you; [all of] the property that [will be ta]ken from him (Yapa^c-Haddi), [may he (the king or the commissioner) take]" (EA 113:17-21; Moran 1987b:315 n. 6; 1992:188 n. 6); *ù / an-nu-ú LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM šàr-ri / yu-wa-ši-ru-na [šàr¹-ru ù / ia-aq-bi šàr-ru a-na ša-šu-nu / ù tu-pa-ri-šu be-ri-ku-ni / šum-ma ia-di-nu šàr-ru a-na ÌR-šu / ù i-di-in₄ ù šum-ma ap-pu-[n]a-ma / yi-il-qé LUGAL gáb-ba a-na ša-[š]u* "And behold, the king is sending royal commissioners, so may the king speak to them that they may decide between the two of you; if the king wants to give (some or all of the disputed property) to his servant (either Yapa^c-Haddi or Rib-Haddi himself), then give; or otherwise, let the king take it all for himself" (EA 116:29-36; Rainey 1989-90:606).

The use of the 2nd c.du. pronoun is a decisive factor in the proper understanding of this particular legal dispute.

THIRD PERSON DUAL

GENITIVE. The contexts for the 3rd c.du. suffix, *-šunī*, are generally less obscure. There is one passage, however, where Moran (1973:52-53) had some difficulty. The problem was not with the dual suffix pronoun but rather with another vocable which, at least since Knudtzon, had been taken for the 3rd f.pl. suffix pronoun. Even though the letter in question is from Egypt and not from Canaan, it is important to deal with its reference to the 3rd c.du. Here is the passage:

e la te-še-me ši-na / LÚ.DUMU.KIN-ka ša pí-šu-ni sà-a-ru "Don't listen to your **two** messengers whose mouths are deceitful" (EA 1:85-86)

The *ši-na* is not a feminine plural suffix; it is the numeral "two." Incidentally, this also applies to an earlier passage in the same letter:

ù i-la-ak I-en lib-bi ši-na / [ù la] il₅-te-qé KÛ.BABBAR.MEŠ (etc.) "and one of the two goes [without] his taking silver (etc)" (EA 1:69-70).

The usual custom was to send diplomatic messengers two by two. Of the various missions sent to Egypt from Babylon, a certain pair of diplomats had aroused the anger of pharaoh.

Two of the 3rd c.du. suffixes come from Megiddo letters. There is no doubt that the pronoun refers to two people:

ù ¹Sú-ra-ta / yu-ta-šir₉ / ¹La-ab-a-ia ù ¹Sú-ra-ta / yu-ta-šir₉-mi
ld¹ŠKUR-me-her / a-na É-šu-ni "and Surata sent Lab²ayu free and Surata sent Ba¹lu-meher free to their homes" (EA 245:41-45; cf. Rainey 1989-90:70); *ù a-nu-um-ma 2 DUMU.[MEŠ] / ¹La-ab-a-ya*
ti₇-id[-di]n-na / KÛ.BABBAR.MEŠ-šu-ni a-na LÚ.MEŠ ¹SA¹.GAZ

/ [u] a-na LÚ.MEŠ KUR S[u-ti] / [a-n]a i-pé-e[š nu-kúr-ti] / [UG]U-ia "And now the two son[s] of Lab²ayu have given their money to the ^capîru-men and to the S[utu] men [in order] to mak[e war agai]nst me" (EA 246:r. 5-10; Greenberg 1955:45; Na²aman 1975:39-40; Moran 1987b:471 nn. 2-4; 1992:300 nn. 2-4).

Thus far, all the examples cited are genitive in function; the 3rd c.du. suffix is added to a substantive. Five more similar instances occur in EA 250, which is a letter from Ba^clu-meher, the ruler of Gath-padalla. The reference throughout this letter is to the two sons of Lab²ayu:

tu-ur-ri-šú-m[i] 2 DUMU LÚ¹ar-ni 'LUGAL' [b]e-lí-ia / 2 DUMU 'La-ab-a[-y]a pa-ni-šu-ni / a-na ḫal-lí-iq KUR 'šàr-ri EN-ia / EGIR-ki ša ḫu-l[i]i[q] LÚ¹a-bu-šu[-ni] "The two sons of the traitor, the two sons of Lab²ayu, have set their face to cause the defection of the territory of the king, my lord after the[ir] father caused defection" (EA 250:5-8); [šú?]-[r]i-[b]a 'Mil-ki-li / [a-n]a m[u-ḫ]i-[-š]u-ni yi-'in⁴-'na¹-'bi¹-'il¹ / [šú-ul]-m[a]!-[n]u-u[m] i-n[a] lib-bi-šu-ni / [ù] k[i-ia-a]m a-še-et UZUZI / 'Mi[l-ki]-l[i] a-na [-šú-r]i-ib 2 DUMU La-ab-a-ya / [i]-n[a] 'URU¹P[i]!-ḫi>-l[i] a-na ḫal-lí-i[q] EGIR-k[i-t]i / KU[R] L[UGAL E]N[-i]a i[t]-t[i-š]u-ni "Milkilu caused to enter(?) in to them; a present was exchanged between them and thus the soul of Milkilu longs to ensconce the two sons of Lab²ayu in Peḫel(!) in order to cause the defection of the far extremity(?) of the territ[ory] of the k[ing], m[y] lor[d, along with them" (EA 250:32-38).

Though the latter passage is replete with difficulties, the main sense is clear and the use of the 3rd c.du. suffixes makes perfect sense.

ACCUSATIVE. In EA 250 there are also two examples of the accusative 3rd c.du., viz. *ù ip-pal-šu-ni* "But I answered them" (EA 250:19, 48). The verb is Akkadian present in form but without the WS imperfect suffix it can be translated as a preterite. The

author of the letter is stressing his reply to the two sons of Lab²ayu, so the dual suffix is in order.

One final passage remains, and there the context does not specify a dual referent for the suffix. However, it is possible to deduce from the suffix that two chariots are all that are involved (Moran 1973:53):

ù yi-il₅-qé GIŠGIGIR.MEŠ *i-na* URU AŠ-tar-ti₇ *ù ya-di-in₄-šu-ni a-na*
 LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ *ù la-a ya-di-in₄-šu-ni a-na* LUGAL EN-ia "And
 he took chariots from Ashtaroth and he gave them to the 'apîru
 men and did not give them to the king, my lord"
 (EA 197:10-12).

On the other hand, the context of the letter might suggest that the dual is meant to indicate the chariot forces of two towns (Rainey 1989-90:66-67).

FIRST PERSON PLURAL

Throughout the letters from Canaan, the suffix *-nu* is employed. This suffix has no counterpart in Akkadian other than the person marker on the 1st c.pl. stative. However, it is typical of Hebrew and can certainly be taken as the WS 1st c.pl. suffix of the scribes' native language. This assumption is confirmed by a gloss:

ù SAG.DU-nu \ ru-šu-nu / i-na qa-te-ka "and our head is in your
 hands" (EA 264:18-19)

Once the WS suffix even appears in a text by an Egyptian scribe, viz.

i-na bi₄-ri-nu "between us" (EA 1:63; Cochavi-Rainey 1989:39-40;
 1988:71 §2.1.1.4).

This can be compared with the correct form, *i-na bi₄-ri-ni*, from Mitanni (EA 19:32).

GENITIVE. All in all there are over a dozen examples of the genitive 1st c.pl. suffix pronoun. Naturally, some are on nouns such as the nominative noun in EA 264:18 cited above. For an example of nominative plural, cf.

ù ti-da-ga-lu / LÚ.MEŠ a-ia-bu-nu ù / ti-ka-lu ep-ra "Then our enemies will see and they will eat dirt!" (EA 100:34-36; cf. EA 74:15-16;).

Note also the following example of a construction with the accusative:

ù / li-de-mi / ar-na-nu "and let him discover our crime" (EA 239:23-24); *ú-ul aš-pu-r[u] / ar-na-nu a-na* LUGAL "Have I not been writing about our 'crime' to the ling?" (EA 89:66-67; Youngblood 1961:336; contra Moran 1992:163).

Genitive constructions are plentiful throughout the corpus, for example:

id-n[a]-mi LÚSA.GAZ.MEŠ LÚša-ri^{MEŠ} / *šār-[r]i be-li-nu* "Hand over the ^c*apīru*, the traitors to the king, our lord" (EA 185:56-57; cf. also EA 100:5, 7, 31; 191:20-21; 244:4, 7; 288:61); *ma-ri-iš a-na* IGI.MEŠ-nu "It is distressing for us" (EA 131:26; Moran 1992:212); *i-na ba-l[a]-tá* ZI-nu "to sustain our lives" (EA 74:17; 90:39; 107:38).

Also to be included in this category are prepositional constructions:

ù ša-ka-an / ip-ṭi-ra bi₄-ri-nu "and he established a ransom payment between us" (EA 114:8-10); *ù ni-pu-uš šal-ma bi-ri-nu* "so we can make peace between us" (EA 136:13; Moran 1992:217 n. 1; 1987b:356 n. 1; cf. also EA 117:67; 118:53); *ša-ri / šār-ri ú-ul ti-na-mu-uš / iš-tu mu-ḥi-nu* "May the breath of the king not depart from us" (EA 100:36-38); *[i-nu-]ma da-an-nu / [LÚSA.]GAZ¹.MEŠ / UGU-nu* "[tha]t the [^c*ap*]īrū are stronger

than we are" (EA 307:8-10; for UGU-*nu* "to us," cf. also EA 100:30).

Other genitive constructions appear in the passages cited in the following section.

ACCUSATIVE. The dative 1st c.pl. suffix pronoun is the only one of the standard Akkadian forms preserved in these texts and it occurs but once in an early Amurru text:

še-ez-zi-bá-an-na-ši-mi iš-tu / ŠU-ti ERÍN.MEŠ URUŠe-eḫ-la-li^{KI}
 "Save us from the hand of the troops of Sheḫlali!" (EA 92:29).

Here the usage is actually with a verb that normally takes the accusative (CAD E:424-425) albeit frequently attached by the ventive as here.

Three interesting passages contain the 1st c.pl. accusative suffix *-nu* showing that the WS pronominal form is preferred instead of *-ni(y)āti* (GAG:42, §41i). One text also has the genitive suffix attached to an infinitive as its object:

yu-uš-ši-ra / LUGAL be-li^{GIŠ}GIGIR.MEŠ / *a-na la-qé-n[u l]a-a /*
ti7-ma-ḫa-šú-nu ÌR.MEŠ-*nu* "May the king, my lord, send chariots to take u[s], lest our servants smite us" (EA 271:18-21).

The next passage is open to differing interpretations. When taking the text as it stands, the following is possible:

DUMU.MEŠ / *ÌUša-ri šàr-ri / tu-ba-ú-na-nu / URUIr-qa-ta*
tu-b[a-ú] / ki-ta a-na šàr-ri "The sons of the traitor to the king are seeking after us (to join them); the city of ʿIrqata seek[s] only loyalty to the king" (EA 100:15-19; cf. Moran 1987b:293 n. 4; 1992:173 n. 4;).

The final passage to be considered has the accusative 1st c.s. on one verb (collated by Sh. Izreʿel, summer 1979; Naʿaman 1979:679 n. 29) and the accusative 1st c.pl. suffix on the second verb:

u lu-ú / yi-it-ra-ni ¹LUGAL¹ EN-ia / *iš-tu qa-at* / LÚSA.GAZ.MEŠ
la-a / tu-ga-me-ru-nu / LÚSA.GAZ.MEŠ-tu₄ "So may 'the king',
 my lord, get me away from the ^c*apîrûtu* lest the ^c*apîrûtu*
 destroy us" (EA 299:21-26; Moran 1992:341 n. 2; 1987b:529 n. 2).

THIRD PERSON PLURAL

MASCULINE

GENITIVE. Two examples exist for what appears to be a WS 3rd m.pl. suffix. One of the contexts is from Jerusalem; the suffix is attached to a vocable that is evidently WS in the accusative:

a-mur KUR [UR]^U[G]az-ri^{KI} KUR URU Aš-qa-lu-na^{KI} / ù
 URUL[a-ki-š]^{iKI} i-din-nu a-na ša-šu-nu / NINDA.ĤÁ Ĭ.ĤÁ ù
mi-im-ma \ ma-aḥ-sí-ra-mu "Behold, the land of Gezer, the land of
 Ashkelon and Lachish gave them bread and oil and all their
 needs" (EA 287:14-16; cf. Barker 1969:48 *contra* Schroeder 1915h;
 Sivan 1984:243; CAD M/1:116a).

The WS vocable is evidently **maḥsiru* somehow comparable with Heb. *maḥsôr* (Winckler 1896a:20*). The suffix has been justly compared with Heb. *-āmô, -ēmô*, evidently from **-humû* > **-humô* by dissimilation (Bauer and Leander 1922:215 §21j; cf. CKG:107-108 §32m, 157 §58g, 258 §911 z).

The second attestation of this suffix is attached to a noun in the adverbial accusative which is employed as a locative preposition:

nu-pu-ul-mi / ta-aḥ-ta-mu ù / ti-ma-ḥa-šú-ka "Fall down beneath
 them that they may smite you" (EA 252:25-27; Ebeling
 1915:1528; Albright 1943b:32 n. 24; Barker 1969:124; Sivan
 1984:128 and n. 13, 278;).

Apart from those two examples, all the other genitive 3rd m.pl. suffixes have the standard Akkadian form, *-šunu*. Of the thirteen clear attestations, one is attached to a noun in the

nominative: *be-lu-šu-nu* (EA 96:21); five are suffixed to accusatives:

ù lu-ú ti-pu-šu ip-ša-šu-nu "that they should do their work" (TT 2:14; Rainey 1977:52); *al-lu-ú ha-za-na-šu-nu da-ku* "Behold, they have slain their city ruler" (EA 89:21); *ù t[i₇]-il-qú-na hi-ši-ih-ta-šu-nu* "and they get what they need" (EA 126:13); *ù ti₇-il-qe 'a-ba-šu-nu* "and it captured their father" (EA 362:20);

one of which is an infinitive governed by a finite verb: *ù tu-ba-ú-na la-qa-šu-[nu]* "and they are seeking to capture th[em]" (EA 79:29); and the remainder are in the dependent case as genitives or as the object of a preposition:

it-ti-šu-nu (EA 35:50); *ar-ki-šu-nu* (EA 130:35); *ki-ma / lib-bi-šu-nu* (EA 108:12-13; 125:42); *a-na bi₄-ri-šu-nu* (EA 74:42); *ka-li ip-ši-^fšu-nu* (EA 119:23); *i-na šap-li-šu-nu* (EA 125:36); *a-na a-ka-li-šu-nu* (EA 79:34).

ACCUSATIVE. In this category, the Canaanite scribes departed from the Akkadian norm. They did not use the Babylonian *-šunūti*, which still survives in MB (e.g. EA 8:29; 9:35; 11:obv. 17; Aro 1955:58). The Canaanite EA texts employ *-šunu* throughout. This is, of course, the standard accusative 3rd m.pl. suffix in Assyrian (GAG:43 §42g). The Mitannian scribes used both *-šunu* and *-šunūti* (Adler 1976:27-28) even in the same context (EA 20:68-69); this ambivalence is also reflected in Nuzi (Gordon 1938:40-41) and in the Level IV texts from Alalakh (Giakumakis 1970:33-34). A similar situation prevails in the texts from Hattusa (Labat 1932:59). At Carchemish *-šunūti* is dominant but *-šunu* is also used (Huehnergard 1979:33); the situation at Ugarit is reversed, where *-šunu* is almost exclusively employed (Huehnergard 1979:198-199; 1989:132).

The question arises as to whether the Amarna usage in the texts from Canaan is a legitimate Assyrianism or simply a reduction of the paradigm whereby the genitive *-šunu* takes over the accusative function. In this regard, the independent 3rd m.s. *šūt* should be taken into consideration. It might also be an

Assyrianism although it seems more likely that it is a survival from an archaic OB dialect.

Whatever the diachronic answer to the question of preference for *-šunu*, the documented examples occur with a wide range of verb forms from the prefix conjugations, among them the Akkadian present (where the WS system is not dominant):

a-di ú-ba-a-šu-nu / be-lu-šu-su "until their owner looks for them" (EA 96:22); [*am-mi-n*]_{i7} [*l*]*a-a i-ša-al-šu-nu* "Why doesn't he interrogate them?" (EA 288:47; Nitzan 1973:24; Moran 1992:331; 1987b:516).

On the WS imperfect, one finds:

an-nu-ú la-a ia-di-nu-šu-n[u] / ¹*Ia-pa-d* IŠKUR *a-la-ka*₁₃ "Behold, Yapa^c-Haddi does not let them go" (EA 114:58).

There are also preterites:

ni-da-ak-š[u-nu] "we attacked them" (EA 185:45); [*ni*]-*ša-al-šu-nu* "[we] asked them" (EA 185:56); *ù il-qé-šu-nu* "but he took them" (EA 185:61).

All the injunctives are represented, viz. precative, jussive and volitive:

[*l*]*i-iš-al-šu-[n]u* / *šàr-ru* "May the king ask them" (EA 251:1-2); *ù ni-il* ₅*-qé-šu-nu* "that we may capture them" (EA 191:19); *uš-ši-ra* / ^LUMAŠKÍM *yi-il-qa-šu-nu* "send a commissioner that he may arrest them" (EA 118:32-33).

Perhaps the most interesting form is on a 1st c.s. imperfect energetic form with a rare orthographic gemination of the *nun*; the accusative suffix refers to *unūtu* "implements, equipment":

ut-ta-aš-še-ru-un-na-šu-nu "I really am sending them" (KL 72:600:8; Rainey 1976b:338-339; *contra* Wilhelm 1982:124).

FEMININE

GENITIVE. The 3rd f.pl. pronominal suffix appears once, *a-na [li]b-bi-ši-na* "among them" (EA 92:10), evidently with reference to cities (Moran 1992:166 n. 1; 1987b:283 n. 1; Youngblood 1961:367).

ACCUSATIVE. The one accusative example employs the genitive *-šina*. The situation is probably comparable with that of the masculine 3rd m.pl. accusative suffix, but in many contemporary dialects documentation is lacking (for Alalakh, cf. Giakumakis 1970:34). One Mitanni text evidences the use of *-šināti* (EA 28:44, 45).

*ù yi-din-ni / LUGAL i-[n]a qa[-a]t LÚ-li ša yi-la-ak / i-na pa-ni
ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-at LUGAL / a-na ša-al URU.DIDLI.K[I.Ĥ]Á ša
in₄-né-ep-šu / a-na LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ / ù tú-ta-ar!(RI)-ši-na
i-na / qa-ti-ia ù i-le-i a-ra-ad / LUGAL EN-ia ki-i-ma LÚ.MEŠ
a-bu-ti-nu / pa-na-nu-um* "So may the king put me in the charge
of the man who will go at the head of the king's regular troops
to call to account the towns that have joined the *ʿapīru* men in
order that you may return them to my charge and so that I
may be able to serve the king, my lord, like our fathers in the
past" (EA 144:26-32; *AHw*:1151b; Moran 1992:230 n. 3;
1987b:375: n. 2)

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This review of the suffix pronouns has demonstrated that the scribes from Canaan had learned a mixed repertoire in the course of their training. Their choice of suffix pronouns included some archaic forms such as the duals and perhaps also 3rd m.s. *šūt*. Their preference for *-šunu* and avoidance of *šunūti* may be due either to Assyrian influence or to a simple peripheral tendency.

It is only on rare occasions that we find some true WS suffixes. These latter provide interesting and not too surprising witnesses to forms which could mostly have been predicted on

comparative grounds. Only the surprising 3rd f.s. form (see below) is unexpected. Perhaps it accounts for the widespread use of Akkadian *-ši*.

The clear-cut WS examples are brought together here for convenience:

1st c.s. Genitive *he-na-ia* "my eyes" (EA 144:18) = **cênâya*.

3rd m.s. Genitive: *aḥ-ru-un-ú* "afterwards" (EA 245:10) = **aḥrônhu*; *ba-di-ú* "from his hand" (EA 245:35) = **bâdihu*; *qa-ti-ḥu* "his hand" (EA 284:19) = **qâtihu*; accusative: *ma-aḥ-ṣú-ú* "they had smitten him" (EA 245:14) = **maḥṣûhu*.

3rd f.s. Genitive: *up-sí-ḥi* "to its utmost extremity" (EA 366:34) = **²upsihi* (with reservations, cf. *supra* pp. 78-79).

1st c.pl. Genitive *ru-ṣu-nu* "our head" (EA 264:18) = **rôšunu*.

3rd m.pl. Genitive *ma-aḥ-sí-ra-mu* "their needs" (EA 287:16) = **maḥsiramô*; *ta-aḥ-ta-mu* "beneath them" EA 252:26) = **taḥtamô*.

CHAPTER V

DEICTIC PRONOUNS

This chapter includes four categories of pronouns. Their common denominator is the function of indicating, or pointing to, a particular component in the immediate discourse context. The reflexive pronoun highlights its antecedent; the demonstratives and the anaphorics single out an element either close or remote; the determinative pronoun makes some component more specific.

REFLEXIVE PRONOUN

Six of the eight occurrences of *ramānu* "self," are in citations by Byblian scribes of a command from pharaoh: *ú-ṣur-mi ra-ma-an-ka* "Guard yourself!" (EA 119:9; 122:10; 123:30-31; 125:9; 126:31; 130:16-17). In reply to just such an admonition, Rib-Haddi asks the rhetorical question:

iš-t[u] / ma-ni i-na-ša-ru-na / ra-ma-ni-ia "with whom shall I defend myself?" (EA 125:11-13; Moran 1950a:169; 1987b:313 n. 1; 1992:186 n. 1).

A Beirut scribe, writing for Rib-Haddi, uses the reflexive pronoun adjectivally:

ši-ba-ti ù mur-ṣú dan-nu / a-na UZU ra-ma-ni-ia "I am old and there is a grievous disease in my own flesh" (EA 137:29-30).

DEMONSTRATIVES

The demonstrative and the anaphoric pronouns are treated together here since the latter fulfill the function of distant demonstratives. The Mitanni dialect attests the Babylonian distant demonstrative *ullû* for the singular and the Assyrian

distant demonstrative *ammû* for the feminine singular and for plurals (Adler 1976:29-30). Neither of those demonstratives are documented for the letters from Canaan. Instead, the 3rd m.s. and 3rd m.pl. independent pronouns, both nominative and accusative/genitive, are used. This echoes the practice known from later WS dialects (cf. biblical Hebrew, Joüon and Muraoka 1991:115, §36[d]).

The Akkadian *annû* (< *annī* + case ending) is used throughout the corpus. The fact that it also corresponds orthographically to an introductory particle, *annû* (Rainey 1988b:211-213), is possibly a coincidence. That latter particle is not Akkadian; it is restricted to the EA letters from Canaan. So the scribes might have adopted the orthography of the demonstrative to represent their WS presentation particle. Functionally, the demonstrative and the presentation particle must not be confused.

MORPHOLOGY

MASCULINE SINGULAR. The most common nominative spelling is the Babylonian *an-nu-ú* though there are attestations of *an-nu* (EA 129:49; 137:77; both used for dependent case). The Jerusalem scribe used the Assyrian spelling, *an-ni-ú* (EA 287:29; 290:25; Moran 197b:152). There is also the peculiar *an-ni-WA* (EA 289:9), which Moran reads as an accusative, *an-ni-à* (Moran 1975b:151, 153), but which could also be read *an-ni-ya*. Mimation is attested once, *an-nu-um* (EA 250:55) in apposition to an adverbial accusative. The nominative form sometimes appears in an accusative syntagma (similarly in Emar; Ikeda 1995:97).

The dependent case (genitive) is expressed by *an-ni* (EA 196:40; 280:37) except for Jerusalem, which has the Assyrian *an-ni-e* (EA 286:11; Moran 1975b:153). For a rare mimation, note *an-ni-im* (EA 187:11).

The accusative shows more variants. The short form *an-na* is preferred (EA 196:32; 197:7; 273:26; probably also EA 64:6; 117:19; 283:5, 15; 284:18). The plene spelling *an-na-a* is strictly Egyptian (EA 99:5; 367:3; 370:3; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:77-78

§2.1.2.1). Mimation is sporadic, *an-na-am* (EA 237:30; also EA 45:13 from Ugarit and EA 369:2 from Egypt; Moran 1975a:151 n. 2; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:77-78 §2.1.2.1).

FEMININE SINGULAR. The nominative is attested in the spelling *an-ni-tu* (EA 289:15; also EA 95:30). The spelling *an-ni-tu₄* is not found in texts from Canaan (EA 19:70 *et al.*).

The dependent case form is *an-ni-ti* (EA 129:41; 286:58; 287:20; 288:52, 58; 333:26) or *an-ni-ti₇* (EA 215:12). Once *an-ni-ta₅* stands where a genitive would be expected (EA 98:24).

The accusative is usually *an-ni-ta* (EA 73:34; 76:20; 93:25; *et al.*); *an-ni-ta₅* is also found sporadically (EA 251:11; 263:22; 362:66).

MASCULINE PLURAL. The standard form is *an-nu-tu* (EA 101:26; 104:46; 117:17). There is one example of *an-nu-tu₄* which in fact stands where a genitive is required (EA 73:25); one could read *i-pé-eš an-nu-tím*, but that seems a bit far fetched. For accusatives, the normal Akkadian form *an-nu-ti* (EA 292:52) is used but there is the anomalous *an-nu-ta₅* (EA 227:9; 294:26). The problem of the final vowel will be discussed with regard to other substantives having the *-ūtu* ending (cf. *infra*, pp. 151-161). One of the ^cAbdi-Ashirta letters has *an-ni-na* (EA 62:50), which may reflect a form deriving indirectly from a Hurrian source (Izre³el 1991a:102-103 §2.1.2).

SYNTACTICAL FUNCTIONS

Ebeling (1915:1376) had already noted that *an-nu-ú* might occur in a syntagma where the accusative would be expected (EA 108:49; 117:52, 77; 134:27; 313:13), or sometimes where the dependent case is required (EA 137:77). A Jerusalem letter also has *ip-ša an-ni-ú* (EA 287:29). There is also the adverbial accusative *u₄-ma* ¹*an¹-nu-¹um¹* "At this time" (EA 250:55; cf. Campbell 1965:204, "These days"). Note the following context:

ù šu-pu-ur-mì / a-na É.GAL UGU / [a]-wa-ti an-ni-ta₅ "So write to the palace about this matter" (EA 98:22-24).

The many instances where *annû* is used for other cases than the nominative might suggest that it was considered indeclinable by the WS scribes; perhaps some of them thought that *annû* was a *status absolutus*. However, there are enough other mistakes (e.g. EA 98:24 above) to suggest that the scribes were just careless here and there in the use of the demonstrative.

THE ANAPHORIC PRONOUNS

The independent pronouns of the third person can be used anaphorically and in that capacity they fulfill the function of the distant demonstrative. Such a function is typical of Akkadian (GAG:40, §41b; "jener" is a preferable rendering to von Soden's "dieser") and of WS dialects, e.g. Phoenician (Friedrich and Röllig 1970:51, §114), biblical Hebrew (Joüon and Muraoka 1991:115, §36[d]) and Old Aramaic (Degen 1969:59, §39). Biblical Aramaic has a set of pronouns developed from the near demonstratives plus the deictic element *-k* (Rosenthal 1963:20, §32), but the third person pronouns are also attested in that function (Dan. 2:32, 44).

The anaphoric usage is clearly illustrated in the following passages where the pronoun refers back to a specific antecedent in the previous clause:

ù mi-im-ma ša na-da-an / be-li-ia a-na / ÌR-šu ù šu-ut / la-qí-i "And whatever my lord has given to his servant, that has been taken!" (EA 263:14-17); *a-nu-ma tup-pí ša-nu / ù ka-li ú-nu-tu-ia / ša it-ti ¹la-pa- dIŠKUR / šu-ut yi-ša-kan / i-na pa-ni šār-ri* "Now, (here is) my second tablet and (a list of) all the implements of mine that are with Yapa^c-Haddi; may that be placed before the king" (EA 119:55-59; Rainey 1989-90:61a).

Examples of the nominative 3rd m.s. pronoun in demonstrative function are rare:

ù ú-ul il-teḡ-qa mi-im-ma^{MEŠ} / ša DINGIR.MEŠ-ka LÚUR.GI₇ šu-ut "so that that dog may not take the possessions of your god(s)" (EA 84:34-35; Moran 1987b:268 n. 10; 1992:156 n. 11); *ša-ni-tam*

a-nu-[ma] / [a!-n]a ^{KUR}*Mi-ta-na i-ba-aš-ši* / [UR.G]I₇ *šu-ut*
 "Furthermore, now that [do]g is aligned 'with' Mitanni"
 (EA 90:19-21; Moran 1950a:160; contrast Youngblood 1961:341,
 344; Moran 1987b:280 n. 4; 1992:164 n. 4).

There are a few more instances of the oblique 3rd m.s., *šu²āti / šu²āta*, e.g. it appears as an accusative governed by *kīma* in a letter from Byblos:

a-mur É ^{URU}*Šur-ri / ia-nu É-ti ḥa-za-ni / ki-ma šu-a-ta* "Look, as
 for the palace of Tyre, there is no city ruler's palace like that
 one" (EA 89:48-50).

As the object of a transitive verb the following example is clearly anaphoric:

gáb-bi KÛ.BABBAR u GUŠKIN LUGAL / ta-di-nu-ni a-na
DUMU.MEŠ ÌR-A-ši-ir-ti / ù šu-a-ti ta-di-nu-ni DUMU.MEŠ
ÌR-A-ši-ir-ti / a-na šār-ri da-an-ni "All of the silver and gold of
 the king have they given to the sons of 'Abdi-Ashirta and the
 sons of 'Abdi-Ashirta have given that to a strong king"
 (EA 126:63-66; Izre²el 1987:91; contrast Moran 1992:207 n. 12).

One broken context provides an illustration of the anaphoric pronoun in direct apposition to an accusative:

a-na pī-i DUMU.MEŠ ÌR[-Aš-]r[a-]ti / yi-pu-u[š a]r-⟨na⟩ šu-w[a]-
t[a₅] "At the command of the sons of 'Abdi-Ashirta he
 committ[ed] 'that' cr[ime]" (EA 138:116-117).

As for the apposition to a noun in the dependent case, in the next example, the anaphoric pronoun thus has the force of a distant demonstrative:

ù la-a / i-qú-ul LUGAL is-tu URU [š]u[-a-]ti / iš-tu KUR-šu "So
 may the king not keep silent concerning [th]at city, concerning
 his territory" EA 149:40-42; confirmed by Moran's collation).

Of special interest are two cases in which the anaphoric pronoun appears in the *status absolutus* (cf. GAG:79, §62h; 163, §113n); one temporal and the other locative:

ša-ni-tam iš-tu / ta-ri a-bi-ka iš-tu / UD.KAM.MEŠ / šu-wa-at in₄-né-ep-ša-at / KUR.MEŠ a-na LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ
 "Furthermore, since the return of your father from Sidon, since that very day, the territories have joined the 'apirū men' (EA 85:69-73; Moran 1992:157, *contra* Albright and Moran 1950:168; Youngblood 1961:280); ŠEŠ *at-ta / ù na-ra-mu i-na aš-ri šu-wa-at* "You are a brother and a friend in that very place" (TT 2:3-4; CAD N/1:344a; cf. Glock 1983:60 n. 25).

A broken context has the feminine singular:

[ù] / URUBat-ru-na ir-ti-ḫ[a-at a-na ia-ši] / ù ti-ba-ú-na-ši la-q[a-a] / [la]-qé-mi ši-a-ti [ù URUGub-la] / [ti-]il-q[ú]-na "[But] Baṛōna rema[ins to me] and they are seeking to cap[ture] it; if that one is [ta]ken, then [they wil]l take [Byblos]" (EA 129:17-21; Moran 1987b:346 nn. 11-12; 1992:210 nn. 11-12).

The anaphoric accusative plural is attested once:

li-i-de₄ / LUGAL a-na LÚ.GÌR sa-ru-ti šu-nu-ta₅ [ù] / i-pu-uš KUR LUGAL a-na LÚ SA.GAZ "May the king be apprised concerning those evil *trooper(s)* [since] he has taken over the king's land for the 'apiru man" (EA 148:43-45; contrast Moran 1987b:381; 1992:235).

DETERMINATIVE PRONOUN

The determinative pronoun is always *ša*, often written plene, *ša-a*. Its functions are those of normal Akkadian. The use of *ašar* in these texts is never comparable with Hebrew ^ʔ*ašer* (*contra* Garbini 1960:105); *ašar* is a noun in construct acting either as a preposition or as a subordinating conjunction. The following is a selection of representative examples of *ša*.

GENITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

The determinative pronoun *ša* often serves to express the periphrastic genitive, especially when the dependent substantive is a proper noun, e.g.

LÚ_{ha}-za-nu ša URUŠí-du-na "the city ruler of Sidon" (EA 114:5), LÚ ša URUGaz-ri "the ruler of Gezer" (EA 298:3-4; 299:4; also EA 315:3; 319:5; 67:14); LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM ša-a / URUŠu-mu-[ra] "the commissioners of Šumur" (EA 118:51-52); ^dNIN ša-a URUGub-la "The Lady of Byblos" (EA 130:4; *et passim* in the Byblos texts).

The dependent noun substantive can also be an infinitive, e.g. *ti-tù ša ka-pa-ši-ka* "the clay of your treading" (EA 255:5; *et al.*). No examples were found of a prolectic suffix pronoun as is found occasionally in standard dialects and frequently elsewhere in peripheral, e.g. *še²šu šikaršu ša \ ma^cšariša* "the grain and beer of its (a town) tithe" (RS 16.153:10-11; PRU III, 147; cited by Huehnergard 1989:228).

An unusual feature of some passages is the placing of the *nomen regens* in the construct state before the pronoun *ša*. This is obviously under the influence of the normal construct formations and represents carelessness on the part of some scribes. Examples are:

ti₄-i₁ ša ka-pa-ši-ka "the clay of your treading" (EA 213:5); ERÍN.ĤÁ *pí-tá-at ša* LUGAL EN-ka₄ "the regular troops of the king, your lord" (EA 141:22, 30, 46); LÚMAŠKÍM \ *ra-bi-iš / ša* LUGAL EN-ia "the commissioner of the king, my lord" (EA 321:15).

This can even happen when the *ša* introduces a relative verbal clause:

a-wa-at ša / qa-ba LUGAL EN-ia "The word which the king, my lord, spoke" (EA 294:11-12); [*a*]-*wa-at ša iš-tap-pár / [LUGAL]*

EN-*ia* "[The w]ord which [the king], my lord, wrote" (EA 278:9-10); *ù / a-ba-at ša-a / š[a]-pár L[UGAL EN-i]a* "and the word which the k[ing, m]y [lord], has written" (EA 211:9-11).

The determinative pronoun and its dependent component may also be dependent on a preposition:

UGU / *ša [m]a-an-ni yu-pa-šu ki-a-ma / ÌR ki-it-ti-ka UGU a-ra-di-ka* "For what is your loyal servant treated thus, for serving you?" (EA 114:4-6); *ki-ma ša yu-uš-ší / iš-tu pí-i / ^dUTU iš-tu / ša₁₀-me-e ki-na-an-na / yu-up-pa-^lšu^l-mí* "according to what has proceeded from the mouth of the Sun from heaven, thus it is done" (EA 232:16-20); *u l[u]-ú i-ru-da-am / LUGAL EN-ia ki-ma ša / A.A.-ia u t[á-p]á-ti-[ia]* "and I will verily serve the king, my lord, just as (did) my father and [my] colleagues" EA 300:20-22; *contra* Moran 1987b:513 n. 2; 1992:341 n. 2); *ù a-nu-ma / ú-še-ši-ru-mì / ki-ma ša qa-bi-šu* "and now I am preparing according to his command" (EA 329:18-20).

Note the construction: *ša-a 2 ša-a 3* "some twice, some three times" (EA 116:43; Moran 1992:192 n. 7; 1987b:322 n. 7).

RELATIVE CLAUSES

The determinative pronoun also serves as the relative pronoun introducing adjectival clauses. This usage is commonplace in the standard Akkadian dialects. Note that here the form is *ša* with no instances of an earlier, inflected pattern.

The clauses may represent actions or situations that prevailed in past time:

di-nu an-nu-ú di-in₄ ki-ti-ia / ša qa-bi-ti "This case is a case of my loyalty, which I have declared" (EA 119:45-46); *ip-šu / ša-a la a-pí-iš iš-tu / da-ri-ti* "a deed which has never been committed" (EA 122:41-43; 123:9-11);

or in the present:

šá-ni-tam a-na LÚ^{URU}Gub-la ša i₁₅-ba-aš-ša / it-ti-ia a-nu-um-ma i-na-ša-ru-šu "Furthermore, as for the ruler of Byblos who is with me, now I am guarding him" (EA 142:15-16); *mi-na i-pu-šu-na / a-na-ku ša-a aš-ba-ti / i-na lib-bi LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ* "What can I do, who am situated among the *ʿapîru* men?" (EA 130:36-38);

or the future:

ù / ia-nu URU ša-a ti-ir-ti-ḫu / a-na ka-ta₅ "and there will not be a city that will remain to you" (EA 103:53-55).

The relative pronoun may introduce adjectival phrases rather than clauses:

ù / ú-šur URU šār-ri ša-a / it-ti-ka "so guard the city of the king that is in your charge" (EA 130:17-19).

Note the negated adjectival phrase in this proverbial passage:

A.ŠÁ-ia aš-ša-ta / ša la m[u-]ta ma-ši-il "My field is like a woman without a husband" (EA 74:17-18; 90:42-43).

DETERMINED CLAUSES

SUBJECT CLAUSES. Determined clauses can stand as subjects in their sentences as in the following:

ša iš-ḫa-[a]ḫ KUR LUGAL / šār^{URU}Ší-du-n[a] "The one who has attacked the king's territory is the king of Sidon" (EA 148:39-40; Greenberg 1955:41; Moran 1987b:381; 1992:235); *ša-a yu-da-^lnu^l pa-na-nu i-na^{URU}Šu-mu-ra / [y]u-da-na⁷ ^li^l-na-na i-na^{URU}Gub-la* "What used to be given in Šumur, may it now be [g]iven in Gubla" (EA 85:36-37; Moran 1992:156).

The determined clause can also be the subject of negative existential clauses:

[ù] *ia-nu* [š] *a yi-iq-bi m[i-]a[m]-ma* / [*a-na ša-š*] *u* UGU^{URU} *Šu-mu-ra* "[But] there was no one [w]ho said an[y]thing [to hi]m about Šumur" (EA 91:10-11); *ù ia-nu* / *ša-a yu-ba-ù ar-ki-šu-nu* "but there is no one who will call him to account" (EA 130:34-35; Rainey 1989-90:61b).

OBJECT CLAUSES. The determined clause may also be the object in a verbal clause. The construction might be obscured by the use of the coordinating conjunction in the following Tyrian passage, but the syntactic function is certain nevertheless:

ša ta-aš-me iš-tu KUR *Ḳi-ni-aḥ-na* / *ù šu-pur a-na ia-ši* "Whatever you have heard from Canaan, then send to me (EA 151:50-51).

In the following passage the same clause modifies an antecedent:

ù a-wa-ta₅ mi-im-ma / *ša ti-iš-mé* / *iš-tu aš-ra-nu-um* / *šu-up-ra-am it-ḫi-¹ia¹* "And whatever word that you have heard from there, send to me" (TT 1:15-18).

The conjunction need not obscure the fact that the determined clause is the object:

ù ša / *te-ri-šu at-ta* / *ù a-[na-ku] id-di-nu* "And what you request, then I will give it" (EA 34:48-49; Kühne 1973:11 n. 47).

The Tyrian scribe uses a determined clause as the object of *idû* "to know."

i-de₄ / LUGAL^d *UTU EN-l[i] ša ḲR [ki-ti]* / [É.GAL-] *li A-bu-LUGAL* "The king knows the one who is a servant of [the palace] is Abimilki" (EA 152:53-55; *contra* Moran 1992:239); *ù i-de₄ ša-a-i-ru* Á LUGAL *ša ia-nu* "And the traitor knows that as for the arm of the king, it is missing" (EA 149:82).

In both of these passages, the *ša* is practically a replacement for *kî*.

CHAPTER VI

INTERROGATIVE AND INDEFINITE PRONOUNS

The two categories of pronouns treated in this chapter have some morphological relationship between them. Within the letters from Canaan, they both include some noteworthy departures from standard Akkadian.

INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS

SUBSTANTIVAL PERSONAL

Four different pronouns serve in the capacity of the substantival personal pronoun "who?" One is the standard Akkadian form, another is a misused Akkadian form, and the last two are evidently Canaanite. It was noticed early on that this situation must reflect the WS background of the scribes in Canaan, whose native tongue probably had **miya* for the personal and **ma(n)* for the impersonal interrogatives (as in Hebrew; Böhl 1909:29-30 §18). With the discovery of Ugaritic, it was noted that that NWS language has two forms, personal *my* and *mn(m)*, which correspond to the impersonal *mh* and *mn(m)* (Loewenstamm 1980:56-60 = 1959:72-75). Therefore, it would seem that the EA evidence, including both the reversal of roles for *mannu* and *mīnu* and the WS *miy(y)a*, *miy(y)ati*, must truly reflect the situation in early NWS.

mannu(m). It should be no surprise that *mannu* is frequently attested as the substantival personal interrogative pronoun. On the other hand, it is of diachronic interest that the high frequency peripheral variant, *mannummê*, is never used in the EA texts from Canaan (CAD M/1:218b-219a). About three examples of *mannu* functioning as a personal interrogative are known from the Byblos letters and elsewhere (CAD

M/1:214b-215a). The form shows inflection for nominative and dependent cases. Nominative examples are:

ù ma-an-nu / ù a-nu-ma gáb-(bu)-mi a-na m[u-ḥ]i-ia / [ù] m[a]-a[n-n]u i-re-ṣ[a]-an-ni "For who—seeing that everyone is against me—who is to rescue me?" (EA 127:14-16; Moran 1992:207; 1987b:342); *ù ma-an-nu il-teḡ-qa-¹ni¹ / i[š-]tu qa-ti-šu* "Then who will rescue m[e] from his hand?" (EA 82:24-25; Moran 1992:152; Albright and Moran 1948:246 n. 19; Youngblood 1961:232); *ma-an-nu / yi-na-ṣí-ra-ni* "Who will protect me?" (EA 130:19-20).

Three times it occurs in an oft repeated refrain (cf. Galán 1993):

ma-an-nu LÚ-lu₄ / ù ša-pár LUGAL / EN-šu a-na ša-[šu] / ù la-a yi-iš-¹mu¹-mi "Who is the man to whom the king has written that would not listen?" (EA 232:12-15); *u ma-an-nu LÚ kal-bu / ša la-a yi-¹iš¹-mu / a-na LÚMAŠKÍM LUGAL* "but who is the man, the dog, who would not listen to the commissioner of the king?" (EA 322:17-19; also EA 319:19-21).

The genitive is also attested in the circumlocution employing the determinative pronoun *ša*:

ša-ni-tam GIŠ.MÁ.MEŠ ša ma-ni / i-zu-zu UGU-ia ú-ul / LÚ.MEŠ URUAr-wa-da "Furthermore, whose ships are arraigned against me? Are they not the men of Arvad?" (EA 101:11-13); *i-na UD.KÁM.MEŠ ša-a ma-ni / a-pí-iš ip-šu an-nu-ú* "In whose days has such a deed been committed?" (EA 108:18-19).

The same genitive nuance is expressed by the pronoun dependent on *ana*, a construction typical of the WS texts (Rainey 1990a:173):

a-na ma-an-ni / URU.MEŠ an-nu-tu ú-ul a-na LUGAL "Whose cities are these, are they not the king's?" (EA 101:25-26).

mīnu(m). One of the unique features of these texts is the use of *mīnu(m)* as the substantival personal interrogative (Youngblood 1961:88-89). The examples are all in the nominative. All of the passages are in Byblos texts:

mi-nu / ʾĪR-A-ši-ir-ta ʾĪR / UR.GI₇ ù 'yi¹-il-qú / KUR LUGAL a-na ša-a-šu / *mi-nu ta-la-at-šu* / ù KAL.GA i-na LÚGAZ GA.KAL / *til-la-at-šu* "Who is 'Abdi-Ashirta, the slave, the dog, that he should take the land of the king for himself? Who are his support troops that he be strong? His support troops are strong because of the 'apīru" (EA 71:16-22; also EA 76:11-16; 88:9-11; 123:38-40; 125:40-43).

In a similar vein, note the following:

[ša-n]i-tam *mi-nu nu-kúr-tu₄* / [UGU] LUGAL ú-ul ʾĪa-ya-a "[Further]more, who is at war [against] the king? Is it not Haya?" (EA 101:1-2; *contra* Moran 1987b:295 n. 2; 1992:174 n. 2).

Most striking is the following text where *mīnu* meaning "who?" is in contrast to *mannu* meaning "what?" This is a reversal of the normal role of the Akkadian substantival interrogatives:

iš-tu ma-an-ni i-na-ša-ru-na / *iš-tu na-ak-ri-ia* / ù *iš-tu LÚ.MEŠ ḫu-up-ši-ia* / *mi-nu yi-na-ší-ra-an-ni* / *šum-ma LUGAL 'yi¹-na¹-ší-ru* / ʾĪR-šu [ù ba-al-ṭá-]ti / [ù šum-ma]a [ša]r-ru la-a / [yi-n]a-ša-ru-ni *mi-nu* / *yi-na-ší-ru-ni* "By what means shall I protect myself? By means of my enemies or by means of my yeoman farmers? Who will protect me? If the king will protect his servant, [then I will surv[ive, but i]f the [ki]ng does not [pro]tect me, who will protect me?" (EA 112:10-18; Moran 1950a:169; 1987b:313 n. 1; 1992:186-187 n. 1; cf. also EA 119:10).

There is one final text where both *mīnu* and *mannu* appear in parallel passages, *vz.* with the same verb. Albright and Moran (1948:241-242) render the two pronouns as "who?" and "what?" respectively, taking them in their normal Akkadian values.

Though the weight of evidence is in their favor, it must be noted that *mīnu* here could be a synonym of *mannu* (Youngblood 1961:234):

ú-ul yi-iš-ma ḏR-A-ši-i[r-ta] / ù ma-an-nu il-teḡ-qa-^fni¹ / i[š-]tu qa-ti-šu "Lest 'Abdi-Ashirta should hear about it, or who would rescue m[e] from his hand" (EA 82:24-25; Moran 1992:152; Albright and Moran 1948:246 n. 19; Youngblood 1961:232); *a-nu-ma GA.KAL i-na / ar-ni an-nu-ú ù i-na ar-ni / ša-ni mi-nu il-teḡ-qa-ni* "Now, he is strong through this crime, and from another crime what/who could protect me?" (EA 82:39-41; Moran 1987b:263; 1992:152; Albright and Moran 1948:242).

mīya.. This pronoun, written *mi-ia* or *mi-ia-mi*, *mi-ia-mi* with enclitic *-mi*, has long been recognized as a true WS form (Böhl 1909:29 §18c). With the discovery of Ugaritic, it was noted that the alphabetic spelling of the interrogative pronoun in that language was *my* which is the consonantal reflection of EA *mi-ia* (Ginsberg 1936a:149; Loewenstamm 1980:56-57 = 1959:72-73). However, no one seems to have thought it worth mentioning that this pronoun, unlike the forms discussed above, seems to be indeclinable. All of the attested occurrences are in the nominative and often correspond to other contexts where *mannu* or personal *mīnu* are employed with the nominative case ending. Whether the *-y-* might have been geminated is impossible to determine. The original form might best be represented by **mīyā*.

This pronoun appears mainly in Byblos texts but also elsewhere. There are only five examples of the short form without the enclitic *-mi*, and they are all from the later correspondence of Rib-Haddi, two each in EA 129 and EA 362, epistles with very close textual affinities, undoubtedly from the same scribe. The most distinctive passages are the following in which the pronoun is the subject of a verb:

'mi¹-ia i-ra-mu ù a-mu-^fta¹ "Who will be loyal if I should die?" (EA 114:68; Moran 1950a:77); *mi-ia 'yi¹-zi-zu a-na pa-ni* ERÍN.MEŠ LUGAL "Who can withstand the king's troops?" (EA 362:65).

The other three instances are all predicates in non-verbal clauses with the personal pronoun *šu-nu* as topic:

[*mi*]-*ia šu-nu* UR.GI₇.[MEŠ] *k[a-al-bu]* (EA 129:7), *mi-ia šu-nu* UR.GI₇.MEŠ "Who are they, the dogs?" (EA 129:81); *mi-ia šu-nu / i-nu-ma i-pu-šu ar-na ù da-a-ku* LÚMAŠKÍM *sú-ki-na* ¹*Pí-iwu-¹ri*¹ "Who are they that they should commit a crime and kill the commissioner Piwuru?" (EA 362:68-69).

The forms with enclitic *-mi* mostly conform to the formulae mentioned above but there are two instances where it functions as the subject of a verb:

mi-ia-mi yi-ma-lik i-zi-za [i]-na pa-ni / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-at* LUGAL *be-lí-ia* "Who would advise to resist the regular troops of the king, my lord?" (EA 94:12-13; *contra* Moran 1987b:285; 1992:169); *mi-ia-mi yu-ma-gi-ir / ur-ru-ba it-ti* ¹*šār-ri* EN-*ia* "Who will grant to enter (that I may enter) into the presence of the king, my lord" (EA 283:10-11; *contra* Moran 1987b:504-505; 1992:323).

The non-verbal clauses with an independent pronoun as copula (or topic) from Byblos are like those cited above with *mi-ia*:

šá-ti-tam mi-¹ia¹-mi šu-ut i-n[u-m]a il-[qé] / *ka-li* LÚ.MEŠ *a-[di]* GU₄.[MEŠ] ¹*it¹-ti-š[u-nu]* "Furthermore, ¹who¹ is he that he has taken all of the men wi[th] the catt[le] with th[em]?" (EA 92:41-42; Youngblood 1961:370; Moran 1987b:284 nn. 8-10; 1992:166.n. 8, 167 nn. 9-10); *mi-ia-mi / DUMU.MEŠ* ¹*İR-A-ši-ir-ta /* ¹*İR* UR.GI₇ *šār /* ^{KUR}*Ka-aš-ši ù šār /* ^{KUR}*Mi-ta-ni šu-nu* "Who are the sons of ^cAbdi-Ashirta, the slave, the dog, the king of the Cassite land or the king of Mitanni?" (EA 104:17-21); *ša-ti-tam mi-ia-mi šu-nu* DUMU.MEŠ / ¹*İR-A-ši-ir-ta* ¹*İR* UR.GI₇ "Furthermore, who are they, the sons of ^cAbdi-Ashirta, the slave, the dog?" (EA 117:35-36; also EA 84:16-17; 85:63-64; 116:16-17; 108:25-26; 138:21).

At least nine of the "dog formula" passages, replies to an order from pharaoh, use the interrogative *mi-ia-mi*. Some of them have the 1st c.s. independent pronoun as topic as in the following example:

mi-ia-mi / a-na-ku UR.GI₇ I-en / ù la-a il-la-ku "Who am I, a dog, that I should not go?" (EA 202:12-14; 201:14-16; cf. also EA 217:13-16).

Others have "man" as the topic:

ša-ni-tam mi-ia-mi / LÚ UR.GI₁₂ u la-a / yi-iš-te-mu a-wa-ta₅ / LUGAL EN-ia "Furthermore, who is the man, the dog that he would not heed the word of the king, my lord?" (EA 323:17-20; also EA 314:14-16; 316:11-12; 324:16-18; 325:12-14; Rainey 1971c:98-99); *mi-ia-mi LÚ kal-bu / u la-a yi-iš-mu / a-na a-wa-ti₇ LUGAL EN-šu / DUMU dUTU* "Who is the man, the dog, that he would not listen to the words of the king, his lord, the son of the Sun?" (EA 320:22-25).

mîyati. Four examples are attested of the interrogative pronoun *mîya* with an additional deictic element, *-ti*. The nature of this suffix is obscure and current explanations are not very convincing (Krahmalkov 1969). On the other hand, there can be no doubt as to the meaning of the form since it appears in contexts identical with *mi-ia-mi*:

mi-ia-ti a-na-ku ù la / iš-te₉-mu a-na MAŠKÍM LUGAL EN-ia "Who am I that I should not listen to the commissioner of the king, <my> lord?" (EA 220:11-12); *ù mi-ia-ti a-na-ku ù / yi-iḫ-li-qi₄ šār-ru KUR.KI-šu / UGU-ia* "But who am I that the king should lose his territory because of me?" (EA 254:8-10); *mi-ia-ti a-na-ku ù la-a / ú-wa-še-ru KASKAL-ra-ni^{HÁ} / šār-ri EN-ia* "Who am I that I should not expedite the caravans of the king, my lord?" (EA 255:12-14); *u mî-ia-ti₇ a-na-ku 'ú¹ [a-na-ku] / ÌR* "But who am I? 'Then' [I] am a (loyal) servant" (EA 197:5-6; Rainey 1989-90:66b).

SUBSTANTIVAL IMPERSONAL

A certain confusion in the use of the Akkadian interrogative pronouns for the impersonal has also been noted (Böhl 1909:29, §18b). Nevertheless, there is ample attestation to the Caananite scribes' knowledge of the proper Akkadian forms.

mīnu(m). Whether by chance or by conscious practice on the part of the scribes, the standard declinable impersonal interrogative pronoun is not attested in the nominative case. Many examples of the accusative are known, four of them with mimation:

ù mi-n[a-a]m / a-qa-bi a[-na-k]u "And what could I say?" (EA 92:29-30); *mi-na-[am¹ id-¹din¹ a-na ša[-š]u-nu* "What has he given to t[he]m?" (EA 92:43); *u mi-na-am-mi ni-pu-šu-na / ni-nu* "but what can we do?" (EA 98:21-22); *ša-ni-tam mi-na-am-mi ep-ša-ku-mi / a-na šār-ri EN-ia* "Furthermore, what have I done to the king, my lord?" (EA 245:36-37).

Of the forms without mimation, about fourteen are objects of the verb *epēšu* "to do," only two of which are 3rd m.s.:

[m]i-na [yi¹-pu-šu a-na ša[-š]u-nu "What is he doing to them?" (EA 73:19; this is the most likely rendering, following Moran 1991:142 n. 1; 1987b:249 n. 1); *ù mi-na yi-pu-šu a-na ia-ši-nu* "And what will he do to us?" (EA 74:41).

All the others are with 1st c.s. verbs, most of which are energetic. This rhetorical question is so frequently used by the Canaanite scribes of Byblos that only a selection need be given here:

mi-na / i-pu-šu-na ù a-na-ku / la-a i-le-ú a-la-[k]a₁₃ / a-na Šu-mu-ra "What can I do since I am unable to go to Šumur?" (EA 104:36-39; also EA 71:33; 74:63-64; 81:50-51; 92:15-16; 117:92; 119:14; 122:48-49); *šum-ma mi-ta-ti mi-na / i-pu-šu-na a-na-ku* "If I die, what can I do?" (EA 119:17-18).

Two examples with the suffix conjugation are reminiscent of the more conservative passage, EA 245:36-37, cited above (with mimation and the Akkadian 1st c.s. suffix):

mi-na ip-ša-ti a-[na] / ¹Ia-pa-d¹ŠKUR "What have I done to Yapa^c-Haddi?" (EA 113:11-12); *mi-na ip-ša-ti₇ a-na ¹Mi-il-ki-lí* "What have I done to Milkilu?" (EA 249:6).

Once the pronoun appears as the object of *nadānu* "to give":

*m[i-n]a [n]a-da-an š[u]-u[t a]-na ia-š*i** "W[ha]t did *he* give to m_ce?" (EA 85:28; Moran 1987b:269; 1992:156).

Rarely it appears as the object of *qabû* "to say," always in 1st c.s. :

mi-na a-qa-bu-na / ap-pu-na-ma "What more can I say?" (EA 119:53-54); *mi-na a-qa-bu-na / a-na LÚ.MEŠ ħu-up-ši-ia* "What can I say to my yeoman farmers?" (EA 85:11-12; also EA 81:33; Moran 1987b:262 n. 10; 1992:151 n. 10).

The expression *ana mīni* "why?" is so commonplace as to require no citations; it is documented in this corpus with the spelling *a-na mi-ni* over a dozen times (EA 77:18; 83:7; 91:7; 94:4; 108:51; 112:7; 113:28; 117:8, 30; 124:38; 134:28; 138:80; 140:8). Other examples employing the NIM sign are most likely to be read *a-na mi-ni₇*, although the accusatives cited above with explicit use of *-am* might suggest that a few scribes really intended *a-na mi-nim* (EA 71:10; 73:6; 102:10; 106:13, 30).

Of special interest, however, are the six instances of "why?" expressed by this pronoun in the adverbial case with the *-u(m)* suffix. They are mainly concentrated in two later epistles of Rib-Haddi (cf. *supra*, p. 275):

ša-ni-tam mi-nu-um ia-di-nu / mi-im-ma ù ba-la-ta₅ / LUGAL a-na LÚ.MEŠ ħa-za-nu-ti ib-ri-ia / ù a-na ia-ši la-a-mi / ia-di-nu mi-im-ma "Furthermore, why does the king give goods and sustenance to the city rulers, my colleagues, but to me he does

not give anything?" (EA 126:14-18); *mi-nu-mi la-a yu-da-n[u] / iš-tu É.¹GAL¹ mi-im[-m]u / a-na ia-ši* "Why are goods not issued to me from the palace?" (EA 126:49-51); *ù mi-nu-um yi-i[q-ta-b]u / ¹Īa-mu-[-ni-]ri / a-di ma-ti i-zi[-za-]ti₇ it-ti-šu* "But why does °Ammunīri keep ta[lkin]g about how long I have [been stay]ng with him?" (EA 138:131-133; cf. line 136 with broken context, also EA 284:14).

mannu "WHAT?" The reverse phenomenon to the use of *mīnu(m)* as a personal interrogative is the use of *mannu* with impersonal meaning (Böhl 1909:29 §18b; Loewenstam 1980:59-60). This may be due to the influence of a WS impersonal interrogative pronoun like Hebrew *mā^h* and Ugaritic *mh* but that is only speculation. There are full spellings such as *ma-an-nu*, *ma-an-na*, *ma-an-ni*, but also some defective examples in the dependent case, viz, *ma-ni*. Mimation is not employed in these impersonal passages. For some strange reason CAD M/1:212b cites all these entries under the form *manni* with *manna* and *mannu* in parenthesis as alternates.

The use of Akkadian *mannu* follows the normal pattern of case inflections. For the nominative:

ma-an-nu mu[-ta]-nu / UGU-ḫi ANŠE.MEŠ [i]-nu-m[a] / la-a ta-la-ku-[na] / ANŠE.MEŠ "What pes[tile]nce affects the asses 'so that' the asses cannot wa[lk]?" (EA 96:14-17; Moran 1987b:289 n.2; 1992:170 n. 2).

And for the accusative:

ma-an-na ep-ša-ti a-na LUGAL EN-ia "What have I done to the king my lord?" (EA 286:5; Böhl 1909:29 §18b; Loewenstam 1980:59-60; Zimmern 1891b:246 n. 2).

The dependent case is documented with several prepositions in syntagmas indentical with those of *mīnu*. For example there is the construction with *ana* as the equivalent of Hebrew *lāmā^h* "why?"

a-na ma-ni i-pu-šu ki-ta / it-ti-šu "Why should I make an alliance with him?" (EA 125:39-40; Moran 1950a:20).

The two presumed examples cited CAD M/1:213a from the Adapa Myth discovered among the Amarna documents are obviously personal, and not impersonal (EA 356:22, 41-42), as seen from the context. Adapa is being asked "For whom are you dressed in mourning?" and he explains that it is for two deities that have perished from the land.

There are three examples dependent on UGU (*eli / muḥḥi*):

‘UGU¹ *ma-an-ni / iš-tap-pár ʾİR-ḥe-[b]a / a-na LÚ.MEŠ URUQí-il₅-ti₇* "Why did ‘Abdi-Ḥe[b]a write to the men of Keilah?" (EA 280:16-18; Moran 1987b:502; 1992:321); UGU / *ša [m]a-an-ni yu-pa-šu ki-a-ma / ʾİR ki-ti-ka UGU a-ra-di-ka* "For what reason is your loyal servant so treated? For serving you?" (EA 114:41-43; Moran 1987b:316; 1992:189).

The passages with *ištu* were first interpreted correctly by Moran, who dealt with them in the context of Rib-Haddi's difficult situation; note how impersonal *ma-an-ni* contrasted with the personal *mi-nu* in the same context:

iš-tu ma-an-ni i-na-ša-ru-na / iš-tu na-ak-ri-ia / ù iš-tu LÚ.MEŠ ḥu-up-ši-ia / mi-nu yi-na-ší-ra-an-ni "With what shall I guard, with my enemies or with my yeomen farmers? Who would guard me?" (EA 112:10-13; Moran 1987b:313 n. 1; 1992:186 n. 1; 1950a:169; also EA 123:31-32; 125:12-14).

Finally there is a striking adverbial usage signifying "How many?" (Böhl 1909:30 §18e). CAD M/1:211b and AHw:603a place these passages under a separate entry, *mani* (following von Soden 1967:294-295). Moran (1950a:21) saw that the basic form was really *mannu* in spite of the consistently defective writing. The attested constructions were all temporal, either *ma-ni* UD.KÁM.MEŠ or *ma-ni* UD.KÁM.MEŠ-ti "How many days?" "How long?" The final vowel might be the Akkadian adverbial -ī

(GAG:163, §113k) but it is far more likely that it is nothing but an anaptyctic vowel required by the geminated *n*, this in spite of the defective orthography. The form would thus be a construct, **manni*.

Four of the six examples are from the Byblos correspondence:

ma-ni UD.KÁM.MEŠ-*ti la yi-na-mu-uš / iš-tu* KÁ.GAL *ù ú-ul ni-le-ú / a-ša-am a-na* EDIN "How long has he not withdrawn from the gate so that we are unable to go forth to the countryside" (EA 88:19-21; Moran 1950a:159-160; 1960:17 n. 2; 1975a:156 n. 2, 156-157; 1987b:275 n. 4; 1992:161 n. 4); [*m*]*a-ni* / UD.KÁM.MEŠ-*ti ú-wa-ši-ru-šu / ù la-a yi-le-ú / i-re-ba a-na* URUŠu-*mu-ra* "How often did I send him and he was unable to get into Šumur?" (EA 114:35-37); *yi-du* LUGAL *ma-ni* UD.KÁM.MEŠ / *yi-pu-šu du-um-qa / a-na ia-ši* "The king knows how often he has treated me kindly" (EA 119:39-41; Moran 1950a:70, 146; 1987b:328; 1992:197); *ù ma-ni* UD.KÁM.MEŠ / *ti-ša-šu* URU UGU-*ia* "How long has the city been angry with me?" (EA 122:38-39; Moran 1987b:334; 1992:201).

The remaining two passages were from the southern coastal plains.

ù yi-de-mi šâr-ru EN-*ia i-nu-ma / ma-ni* UD.K[ÁM.ME]Š *tu-!bé¹-!u⁵-na* UGU-*ia / 2 DUMU La-ab-a-ya* "May the king, my lord, be apprised that—for how many days!—the two sons of Lab²ayu have been after me" (EA 250:9-11; cf. Moran 1987b:475; 1992:303).

The last of these two latter examples is really a rhetorical question. Therefore, *ma-ni* may still be classed as an interrogative pronoun (*contra* Izre'el 1978b:27).

ma-ni / UD.KÁM.MEŠ-*ti yi-ša-al-la-[u]-š[i]* "How long has he gone on plundering it!" (EA 292:44-45; Moran 1987:521; 1992:335).

THE INDEFINITE PRONOUN

The Akkadian indefinite pronouns are built upon the interrogatives (GAG:49-51, §48). Thus, they also distinguish personal and impersonal. The EA texts from Canaan make use of Akkadian forms without adopting any clear WS vocables that might fulfill this function.

PERSONAL

There is only one example that may be construed as the personal indefinite pronoun, *mamma* (< *man* + *ma*) and the context is so obscure that it has even been taken as a misspelling of the impersonal pronoun (Moran 1987b:346 n. 5; 1992:210 n. 5). In fact, it is more likely that Knudtson's [*m*]a-am-ma (EA 129:9) is to be read [*k*]i!-am-ma "thus."

IMPERSONAL

In the impersonal category, there are many examples but the picture is complicated. The Akkadian *mimma* (< *min* + *ma*) appears throughout the corpus. In standard Akkadian it usually means "anything, everything, whatever," etc. and is indeclinable. On the other hand, *mimma* also serves as the base for a substantive by the addition of case inflection, thus nominative: *min* + *ma* + *u* > *mimmû*; dependent (genitive): *min* + *ma* + *i* > *mimmê*; accusative: *min* + *ma* + *a* > *mimmâ*. The usual meaning of this substantive is "possessions, property, goods" (cf. CAD M/2:80a-83a). There are, in fact, many contexts where the latter formation seems to express the meaning "something, anything," so that the semantic distinction between indeclinable *mimma* and declinable *mimmû* is often blurred (von Soden 1931:205). That has led to considerable contamination in the use of the two terms by the scribes from Canaan.

mimma (*mimmu*, *mimmi*). First, it must be observed that the usually indeclinable *mimma* does decline according to case in

some clear contexts (Youngblood 1961:249). Spellings are usually plene, i.e. *mi-im-ma*, *mim-ma*, *mi-im-mi*, *mi-im-mí*, *mi-im-mu*, but occasionally defective, viz. *mi-ma*, *mí-ma*, *mi-mu*. An erroneous spelling, *mi-am-ma* (EA 85:73; 91:10-11), also occurs. It is definitely not some kind of original form (Youngblood 1961: 281; *contra* Ebeling 1915:1469).

In the nominative function one finds the following two examples:

al-lu-mi ¹*Ri-ib-d* IŠKUR / *i-na qa-ti-ka ù mi-im-mu* / *ša*
 <*in*₄>-*né-ep-šu a-na ša-šu* UGU-*k[a]* "Behold, Rib-Haddi is in your
 charge and whatever happens to him is your responsibility"
 (EA 83:40-42; Youngblood 1961:249; Ebeling 1915:1404; Rainey
 1973c:252); *la-a qa-bi mi-mu a-na ša-šu* "Nothing was said to him"
 (EA 234:20; Rabiner 1981:66, §4.2.4).

Four instances of the dependent (genitive) case occur in combination with the construct form *gáb-bi*. In three cases *gáb-bi mi-im-mi* is syntactically nominative:

gáb-bi mi-im-mi / *ša yi-pu-šu* / LUGAL EN-*ia a-na* KUR-*šu* /
gáb-bu SIG₅.GA / *ma-gal ma-gal* "As for everything that the king,
 my lord, is doing for his land, it is all very, very good"
 (EA 262:7-11); *gáb-bi mi-im-mi* / *ša yi-te-pu-uš* / LUGAL
 EN-*ia!*(EN) *a-na* KUR-*šu* / SIG₅.GA *ma-gal* "Everything that the
 king, my lord, has done for his land is very good" (EA 258:6-9;
 probably also EA 259:6-8; Moran 1987b:468 n. 1; 1991:311 n. 1).

In the other it is accusative:

gáb-bi mi-im-mi / *ša yi-iq-bu* / LUGAL EN-*ia* / *iš-te-nem-mu*
 "Everything that the king, my lord, says, I am heeding"
 (EA 261:7-10; Moran 1987b:487-488; 1992:312).

There are two instances in which *mi-im-mi* is dependent on an infinitive. In both of these examples, the pronoun stands as its objective genitive:

ú-ul ni-le-ú / i-pé-eš mi-im-mi "We are unable to do anything" (EA 89:42-43); *ù la-a i-lé-ú [i-p]é-eš / mi-im-mi* "But we are unable [to]do anything" (EA 116:52-53).

Finally, the dependent form is wrongly used for the accusative of a finite verb:

[*l*] *a-a yi-qa-bi mi-im-^fmi¹ / [a-n]a ša-šu* "He did [n]ot say anything to him" (EA 234:16-17).

Note that, in this same text, *mi-mu* appears in line 20 as the subject of a passive verb.

It so happens that nearly all the contexts having *mi-im-ma*, *mi-ma*, *mì-ma* are all syntactically in the accusative. Many of the passages demonstrate the indefinite nature of the pronoun, especially with the meaning "everything."

[*ù*] *li-iḫ-šu-uš-mi / \ ia-az-ku-ur-mi / ¹šàr-ri EN-ia / mi-im-ma ša / in₄-né-pu-uš-mi / UGU ^{URU}Ḫa-šú-ra^{KI} / URU.KI-ka ù / UGU ÌR-ka* "[So] may my king, my lord, take thought for everything that has been done against Hazor, your city, and against your servant" (EA 228:18-25).

Several of the references concern pronouncements by the king of Egypt to which a local ruler has responded with obedience:

^f*ù¹ mi-im-ma ša / yi-iq-ta-bu / [šà]r-ru ^fiš¹-te-mu* "And everything that the king says I am obeying" (EA 253:29-31); *u mì-ma / ša i-qa-ab-bi / LUGAL EN-ia a-na ia-ši / iš-teḡ-me ma-gal ma-gal* "and everything that the king, my lord, has said to me, I have heeded carefully" (EA 298:14-17); *mi-im-ma ša qa-ba / LUGAL EN-ia a-na ia-ši / iš-te-mé-šu ma-gal / SIG₅-iš* "As for everything that the king, my lord, said to me, I have listened to it very well" (EA 297:8-11); *u mi-im-ma ša ša-pár / L[UGAL] EN-ia a-na ia-ši / iš-teḡ-mu-uš-šu / ma-gal ma-gal* "And as for everything that the k[ing], my lord, has written to me, I am obeying it dilligently" (EA 320:18-21);

and is taking steps to fulfill:

'mi¹-im-ma ša it-ta-š[i] / iš-tu pí-i LUGAL EN-ia / a-nu-ma i-na-ša-ru KÁM.UD / u mu-ša! "Everything that has proceeded from the mouth of the king, my lord, now I am keeping day and night" (EA 326:20-23; CAD M/2:295); *mi-im-ma ša qa-ba LUGAL EN-ia / a-nu-ma i-na-ša-ru KÁM.UD / u mu-ša a-wa-ta₅ LUGAL EN-ia* "As for everything that the king, my lord, has said, now I am keeping day and night the word of the king, my lord" (EA 315:10-12).

The following context could be interpreted as a reference to "everything" in the same abstract sense as in the previous citations, but it also pertains to concrete objects in view of the transitive verb that governs it:

ù / yi-il₅-te-qé / mi-im-ma / ša iq-bi / 'šàr-ru / be-li-ia "And he has taken everything of which the king, my lord, spoke" (EA 239:12-17).

Negative clauses require the translation, "anything," as exemplified by the following:

ù la-a / ep-pu-šu mi-im-ma a-¹di¹ / yu-šu-¹te¹-ru LUGAL a-wa-ta₅ / a-na 'İR-šu "But I will not do anything until the king sends word back to his servant" (EA 280:37-40); *'ù¹ ia-nu / ša <ia>-aq-bi mi-im-ma a-na / 'İR-A-ši-ir-ta* "And there is no one who has said anything to 'Abdi-Ashirta" (EA 75:27-29); *ú-ul / ti-iš-mu-na mi-im-ma / ù šap-ru a-na ša-a-šu* "They do not hear anything but what they write to him" (EA 82:10-12); *[ù] ia-nu 'ša¹ yi-iq-bi m[i-]a[m]-ma / [a-na ša-š]u UGU URUŠu-mu-ra* "[But] there is no one who said anything [to hi]m about Šumur" (EA 91:10-11).

including an expression from Alashia:

ù la-a ti-š[a]-¹kán¹ / mi-ma i-na lib-bi-ka₄ "So do not take anything to heart (EA 34:12-13; also from Amurru EA 170:7-8).

Some of these clauses also admit of the translation "goods, property," i.e. *mimmâ*. For example:

li-iš-al-šu-[n]u / šār-ru šum-ma la-qí-ti₇ / mi-im-ma aš-šum
 LÚ_{ha}-za-ni "May the king ask them if I have taken anything
 from the city rulers" (EA 251:1-3); *ù a-na ia-ši la-a-mi / ia-di-nu*
mi-im-ma "but to me he doesn't give anything" (EA 126:17-18).

The one case where *mimma* is the subject of a passive verb may, in fact, be due to semantic confusion rather than true recognition of the indeclinable indefinite pronoun:

ù mi-im-ma / yu-da-na-ni a-na a-ka-li-šu-nu / ia-nu mi-im-ma a-na
ia-š[i] "And something was furnished to me for them to eat; I
 don't have anything" (EA 79:32-34; Moran 1950a:155 n. 84;
 1987b:260 n. 1; 1992:150 n. 2; Rainey 1975c:404).

Both instances of the indefinite pronoun could be taken as forms of *mimmâ* "goods, property." In the latter clause *mi-im-ma* is the subject of the negative particle *yânu*, which, as long recognized (Moran 1950a:14-15), takes an accusative as subject in the WS texts from Canaan (with the exception of Jerusalem). Actually, the indefinite pronoun in all of these contexts with *yânu* can be construed as "anything," or "goods, property."

[šu]m-ma ia-nu mi-im-ma / [a-]na ia-ši a-na la-qé /
 ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ "[Si]nce I don't have anything to purchase
 horses" (EA 85:73-74; 112:25-27; 94:76; 116:42-43; 117:14; *[i]-ia-nu*
mi-im-ma / i-na 'É¹-*ia* "There is nothing in my house"
 (EA 316:18-19).

One Jerusalem passage seems to link the indefinite pronoun with commodities:

*i-din-nu a-na ša-šu-nu / NÍG.ḪÁ Ì.ḪÁ ù mi-im-ma *
ma-aḥ-sí-ra-mu "They have given to them bread and oil and
 whatever they lacked" (EA 287:15-16).

mimmû. The EA texts from Canaan often refer to "goods, supplies, property," and the forms developed from the indefinite impersonal pronoun are used. It must be observed that final vowel length is never expressed in the orthography of these forms; it is assumed here on the basis of standard Akkadian grammar. In some cases it would be possible to transcribe *mi-im-me* for *mimmê* rather than *mi-im-mi*. Nearly all attested spellings show gemination, viz. *mi-im-mu*, *mi-im-ma*, *mi-im-mi*, *mi-im-me*, but *mi-mu* is attested. The erroneous spelling, *mi-am-ma* (EA 132:18) also occurs (Youngblood 1961: 281; *contra* Ebeling 1915:1469). Two extreme cases are the constructs written *mi-im* (EA 137:74; 139:37). Some contexts require a plural meaning and four times the term is designated by a plural marker: *mi-im-ma*^{MEŠ} (EA 84:34), *mi-im-mi*^{MEŠ} (EA 84:32), *mi-im-mi*^{HÁ} (EA 142:28), *mi-im-mi-ia*^{HÁ} (EA 141:27).

The inflection for case is generally correct but not without some deviations. The nominative as subject of passive verbs and the accusative as object of transitive verbs are properly indicated in EA 126, viz.

ša-ni-tam mi-nu-um ia-di-nu / mi-im-ma ù ba-la-tà / LUGAL a-na LÚ.MEŠ ḥa-za-nu-ti ib-ri-ia / ù a-na ia-ši la-a-mi / ia-di-nu mi-im-ma ù pa-na-nu / a-na LÚ a-bu-ti-ia yu-ša-ru / iš-tu É.GAL.MEŠ KÛ.BABBAR.MEŠ / ù mi-im-mu a-na ba-la-ti-šu<nu> . . . ù / mi-im-mu [la-a-]mi / yu-da-nu [a-na i]a-a-ši . . . mi-nu-mi la-yu-da-n[u] / iš-tu É.GAL mi-im[-m]u / a-na ia-ši "Furthermore, why does the king provide goods and supplies to the city rulers, my colleagues, but to me he does not give anything? But formerly, there were sent to my fathers from the palace silver and supplies for the(ir) maintenance . . . but goods are [no]t sent [to] me . . . why are goods not furnished to me from the palace? (EA 126:14-21, 26-28, 49-51).

Moran (1950a:174) had suggested that *mimmâ u balâṭa* might be a hendiadys. There also seems to be a play here on the noun *mimmâ* in line 15 and the pronoun *mimma* in line 18. In any event, the cases seem to be fairly clear.

The following nominative form is subject of a passive verb from the suffix conjugation:

\ *ḥa-sí-lu URU.MEŠ-nu be-li-ia / ù mi-im-mu ša na-da-an / be-li-ia a-na / ÌR-šu* "Destroyed are the cities of my lord and the property which my lord gave to his servant" (EA 263:13-16; Held 1965:399).

It also appears as the subject of a stative, intransitive verb:

šum-ma ma-gal ma-ad / KÙ.BABBAR GUŠKIN a-na lib-bi-ši a-na É DINGIR.MEŠ-ši / ma-ad mi-im-mu "Since there is very much silver and gold in it; the temple of its gods has much property" (EA 137:60-62); *i-nu-ma ma-id mi-mu-šu ki-ma / a-ia-ab* "because its property is vast like the sea" (EA 89:43-44; also EA 89:52-53, 57-59; EA 86:10-12).

An example of the nominative in an interrogative, non-verbal clause is the following:

⟨la-⟩a ia-aš-ku-un [L]UGAL ŠÀ-šu / i-na mi-im-mi ša yi-iš-ši-ru / ¹A-zi-ru a-na ša-šu mi-im-mu / ša yi-iš-ši-ru a-ya-ti Šu-mu-⟨ru / ù mi-im ḥa-za-ni LUGAL / š[a d]a-ak yi-iš-ši-ru / a-na ka-ta a-mur ¹A-zi-ru / ar-⟨nu⟩ LUGAL EN-ia "May the king [no]t pay attention to the property that ^cAziru is sending to him! The property that he is sending, whence (does it come)? (It is from) Šumur! And it is the property of the king's city ruler wh[om he has s]lain that he is sending! Look, ^cAziru is a reb⟨el⟩ to the king, my lord!" (EA 139:33-40; Rainey 1989-90:63b).

One Byblos scribe seems to have had difficulty expressing the accusative plural:

ù lu-wa-ši-ra be-li-ia / LÚ.MEŠ ù ti-ìl-qú mi-im-mi^{MEŠ} / ^dDA.MU-ia a-na ma-ḥar BE-ia / ù ú-ul il-teḡ-qa mi-im-ma^{MEŠ} / ša DINGIR.MEŠ-ka LÚ UR.GI₇ šu-ut "So may my lord send men that they may take the properties of my Adonis lest that dog

take the possessions of your gods" (EA 84:30-35; Moran 1987b:268 n. 10; 1992:156 nn. 1011; cf. EA 132:53-55).

The proper form should have been *mimmê* but the scribe alternates between an *i*-vowel and an *a*-vowel while using the MEŠ as plural marker. However, the form with an *i*-vowel is in construct with ^dDA.MU while the form with an *a*-vowel is followed by a periphrastic genitive construction with *ša*. Another construct plural with final *i*-vowel is subject of a stative 3rd m.pl. verb:

la-a / *ḫal-qú mi-im-mi* / LUGAL "Properties of the king are not lost" (EA 96:19-21; Moran 1987b:288; 1992:173).

One broken context seems to have an accusative as object of a transitive verb (which unfortunately has to be restored in large part):

ù ia-nu ša-a / [*yi-il*]-*qú mi-im-ma-šu iš-tu* / [LÚ.MEŠ]-*ia* "And there is no one who [can ta]ke his property from my [men(?)]" (EA 113:26-28).

The accusative as subject of *yânu* can also have the meaning "possessions," as seen in the following quite obvious context:

ù i-še₂₀-mé *ù ia-nu-um* ¹*mi*¹-¹*im*¹-*ma* / *ù i-nu-ma ia-nu-¹um*¹
LÚ.MEŠ *ti-¹la*¹-¹*ta*⁵¹ *ša a-¹ša*¹-¹*at*¹ / ¹*a*¹-¹*na*¹ *ia-a-ši* "But he heard that there were no supplies and that there were no auxiliary troops that came forth to me" (EA 92:21-23; Rainey 1975b:421; *contra* Moran 1987b:283; 1992:166).

This text must be compared with the passages cited above under *mimma*, in which the translation "anything" was adopted.

As for the dependent case, there is a question as to how the word should be rendered when it is governed by the construct *kali*. It would appear from the following contexts that

"property, possessions" is intended, i.e. *mimmê/mimmî* and not the indefinite pronoun "everything."

ù ka-li mi-im-mi ÌR-A-ši-ir-ta / na-[a]d-nu a-na 'DUMU'.MEŠ *ù i-na-na* / 'da'-an-nu *ù* GIŠ.MÁ.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ *mi-ši* / la-*qú qa-du mi-im-mi-šu-nu* "And they have given all the property of 'Abdi-Ashirta to (his) sons so that now they are strong and they have even taken over the military ships with their supplies" (EA 105:25-28; cf. EA 105:32, 38, 81); *ka-li* / *mi-im-me ša-a yu-ú-ul-qú-na* / *iš-tu ša-a-šu-nu a-na* LUGAL "All the properties that are being taken from them belong to the king" (EA 117:67-69); *ka-li mi-im-mi-ia* > *yi-il-qé-šu* / *šār-ru* EN-[i] [gáb-ba] / *a-na ša-'a'-šu 'ù* / [ú-nu-te š]f-*he-ru-ta* / *ia-di-nu* EN-li *a-na* ÌR-^dI[ŠKUR] "As for all of 'my' property, may the king, [my] lord take it [all] for himse[lf], but the [s]mall [objects] my lord may want to give to 'Abdi-H[addi]" (EA 119:46-51; Rainey 1975b:400 n. 5).

Likewise, the contexts where the pronoun in question is governed by the construct *gabbī* indicate that material goods are intended, especially when referring to things which local rulers were commanded to assemble and prepare for the imminent arrival of the Egyptian army:

a-nu-ma šu-ši-ir-ti gáb-bi m[i-i]m-mi / [NÍG].MEŠ KAŠ.MEŠ GU₄.MEŠ UZ.MEŠ / [Š]E.MEŠ IN.MEŠ *gáb-bi m[i-i]m-mi* / [š]a *qa-ba* LUGAL EN-*ia* [ù] / [a-n]u-ma *šu-ši-ir-ti[-šu-nu(?)]* "Now I have prepared all the goods: food, strong drink, oxen, small cattle, grain, straw, all the supplies that the king, my lord, commanded. Now I have prepared [them(?)]" (EA 325:15-19; Moran 1987b:228 n. 2; 1992:128 n. 2; cf. EA 113:15); *ù a-na-nu-um-ma šu-ši-ra-ku* / *qa-du* ANŠE.KUR.RA.ĤÁ-*ia* *ù* / *qa-du* GIŠ.GIGIR:ĤÁ-*ia* *ù qa-du* / *gáb-bi mi-im-mi-ia*^{HÁ} / *ša i-ba-aš-ša it-ti* / ÌR *ša* LUGAL EN-*ia* *a-na* / *pa-ni* ERÍN.ĤÁ *pí-tá-at* *ša* LUGAL 'EN'-*ia*. "And now I am prepared with my horses and with my chariots and with all my supplies which are at the disposal of a servant of the king, my lord, before the arrival of

the army of the king <my> lord" (EA 141:24-30; also EA 142:25-31).

Such texts as those which mention the actual items being prepared provide the proper background for interpreting less explicit contexts:

gáb-bi mi-im-mi / ša yi-qa-bu / šār-ru be-lí / ú-še-ši-ru-mi "I will prepare all the supplies which the king, my lord, commands" (EA 223:7-10); *'u¹ gáb-bi mi-im-mi ša / 'ša¹-pár LUGAL EN-ia / 'a¹-na ia-ši gáb-ba / 'lu¹-ú ep-pu-šu-mi* "and as for all the supplies about which the king, my lord, wrote to me, I will verily prepare everything" (EA 378:14-17).

Other contexts also exhibit a link between *gabbi mimmé* and concrete items such as cattle:

i-nu-ma gáb-bi mi-im-me / ša yi-id-din šār-¹ru¹ / 'EN¹-ia a-¹na¹ ÌR-[š^u] / [na]m-š^u-mi / 'LÚ¹.MEŠ^{URUT}a-aḥ-n[a-k]a / [u] na-ak-š^u-mì / GU₄.MEŠ-ia "that the men of Taa[nach] have pillaged all the property that the king, my lord, gave to [his] servant [and] they have slaughtered my cattle" (EA 248:10-16).

Various other passages also confirm the meaning of "goods, supplies, property." There is the case of the logistic sustenance required for the maintenance of a military garrison:

a-¹mur¹ 'pa¹-na-nu i-na / 'UD¹.¹KÁM¹.¹MEŠ¹ a-bu-ti-ia / LÚ.¹MEŠ¹ ma-ša-ar<-ti> LUGAL / i[t-t]i-š^u-nu ù mi-im-mi / LUGAL UGU-[š]u-nu "Look, formerly in the days of my ancestors, the king's garrison troops were with them and the king's supplies were at their disposal" (EA 122:11-15; Moran 1987b:333; 1992:201).

Another valuable illustration comes from the case concerning Rib-Haddi's property that had fallen into the hands of Yapa^c-Haddi and that was the subject of considerable

correspondence and litigation; the reference there to material goods is obvious:

ù / šum-ma ap-pu-na-ma yi-il-qé / LUGAL mi-im-mi-ia iš-tu / LÚ.MEŠ ha-za-nu-ti a-na ša-a-šu "or, on the other hand, let the king take my property from the city rulers for himself" (EA 118:17-20).

The addition of the 1st c.s. pronominal suffix also confirms the concrete meaning of *mimmî* in this passage. Another reference with 3rd m.s. suffix pronoun can only refer to concrete property:

ú-ul la-qí¹IR-A-ši-ir-ta / qa-du mi-im-mi-šu ki-ma qa-bi-ia "Was not 'Abdi-Ashirta captured with his possessions as I had said?" (EA 117:27-28); *ú-u[l] / la-qí¹IR-A-ši-ir-t[a] / qa-du mi-am-mi-šu* "Was not 'Abdi-Ashirta taken with his possessions?" (EA 132:16-18).

Even without a suffix pronoun, some passages can only deal with property:

u¹ma¹-an-nu gāb-ba! / mi-im-me ša¹i¹-ba¹-aš-ši /¹a¹-na ia-ši "And what is all the property that belongs to me?" (EA 378:21-23).

Finally, there is evidently reference to the accusative plural in the following rhetorical question by Lab³ayu:

yi-il-te-qú šār-ru / mim-mé-ia ù mim-me /¹Mil-ki-li a-yí-ka-am "The king is taking my possessions but where are the possessions of Milkilu?" (EA 254:25-27)

CHAPTER VII

NOUN MORPHOSYNTAX

The morphology of substantives and adjectives will be discussed together because some of the substantives, especially plural forms, have acquired what appears to be an adjectival inflection. Conversely, some adjectives also assume the nature of substantives.

NOUN FORMATIONS

AKKADIAN. The various noun classes of Akkadian are employed in these texts as in any other dialect. The principal difficulties that arose from Knudtzon's edition were partially corrected in the glossary by Ebeling (1915), and others have been included in the Supplement to his glossary (Rainey 1978b:61-99). Of special note in this regard are *pitātu* (*ibid.*, p. 87) and *tillatu* (*ibid.*, p. 96). When Böhl (1909:30-32, §20) was studying the noun formations in the EA corpus, there were still many facets of true Akkadian morphology that had not as yet been formulated properly. A century of lexical research as reflected in *CAD* and *AHw* has led to more precision in transcribing Akkadian vocables, especially those containing *s*, *š*, or *z*, and *d*, *t*, or *ṭ*, etc. For the use of *nukurtu* as a stative, cf. *infra*, p. 181.

WEST SEMITIC. As for the WS nominal forms reflected in glosses and proper nouns, a thorough analysis has been made by Sivan (1984; also Barker 1969) and by Hess (1993a, 1984). Therefore, there is no need to repeat their conclusions here. Their results are of special importance for the morphology of WS in the Late Bronze Age in spite of the limited corpus of vocables with which Hess and Sivan were able to work. The evidence from their studies may be compared with the testimony of WS loan words in Late Egyptian (Sivan and Cochavi-Rainey 1992). Some

grammatical observations from the WS vocables in EA will be dealt with in the relevant sections below.

GENDER

The markers for masculine and feminine are the standard forms of Akkadian. The most outstanding departures from the norm in the corpus under discussion pertain to vocables of one gender in Akkadian and of another gender in WS.

ālu. The most striking example is *ālu*/URU "town, city," which is masculine in Akkadian but invariably construed as feminine in the WS texts (Albright 1943a:17 n. 60; Moran 1950a:129 n. 149). Examples include many instances when URU is the determinative for a proper geographical name; there is reason to assume that, in this function, it was also read as an Akkadian word either in construct or in apposition to the GN. Preference will be given here to those cases where URU (or URU.KI) stands alone but examples of proper GN's cannot be ignored.

The feminine gender is demonstrated by feminine attributes in apposition:

ù a-nu-um-ma a-na-an-šár / URUŠur-ri URU ra-bi-tu / a-na LUGAL be-li-ia "And now I am guarding the city of Tyre, the great city, for the king, my lord" (EA 147:61-63); *i-nu-ma šal-ma-at URUGub-la / GEMÉ ki-it-ti ša LUGAL* "that Byblos, the faithful handmaiden of the king, is safe" (EA 68:10-11; also EA 74:6; 140:7; Youngblood 1961:20-21); *šal-ma-at URUŠi-du-na GEMÉ-ti / LUGAL* "Sidon, the handmaiden of the king, is safe" (EA 144:12).

One also finds URU as the antecedent to feminine resumptive pronouns:

[ia-n]u LÚ.MEŠ [i-na] ʿlib¹-bi URUʿŠu¹-ʿmu¹-ri^{KI} / [a-na na-š]a-ri-ši "[There are n]o men [wi]thin Šumur [to pro]tect it" (EA 62:9-10; also line 12); *ù [lu-ú i-]ʿšar¹-ra-pu-ni⁷ / [i-na]*

ʾIZI¹-te^{MEŠ} [U]RUʾŠu¹-mu-ri^{KI} / ù É.GAL-ši ERÍN.MEŠ
 URUŠe-eh-la-li^{KI} "then the troops of Šeḫlali [would] burn Šumur
 and its palace with fire" (EA 62:18-20); *mi-lik-mi a-na* 'URU'[-ka] /
 [ú-]ʾul¹ *yi-il-qé-ši* ʾIR[-A-ši-ir-ta] "Take thought for [your] city
 [le]st ʿAbdi[-Ashirta] take her" (EA 90:11-12); *a-mur ma-á²-du* /
 LÚ.MEŠ *ra-i-mu-ia a-na lib-bi* URU.KI / TUR LÚ.MEŠ *ša-ru-tu*
i-na lib-bi-ši "Behold, many are the men who support me within
 the city; few are the traitorous men within it" (EA 137:46-48); ù
lu-ú-mi / *li-ik-ki-im-mi* / *šār-ru* URU.KI-šu *la-a-mì* / *yi-iš-bat-ši* /
 ʾLa-ab-a-yu "So may the king verily deliver his city lest Lab²ayu
 seize it" (EA 244:25-28); *a-nu-um-mi* / *i-na-ša-ru-um-mi* /
 URUḤa-šú-ra^{KI} / ʾqa¹-du URU.DIDLI.ḤÁ-ši "Now I am guarding
 the city of Hazor with its towns" (EA 228:13-16); URU KUR
 ʾU-ru-ša-lim^{KI} *šu-mu-ša* / URU É.NIN.URTA / URU *šār-ri*
pa-ṭa-ra-at "A town of the territory of Jerusalem, its name
 (being) the town of Bīt-NIN.URTA, a town of the king, has
 defected" (EA 290:15-17).

With these may be contrasted a passage from Amurru with an anticipatory 3rd m.s.suffix:

aš-šum bá-na-i-šu ša URUŠu-mur / *šār-ru* EN-ia *iq-ta-bi* "The king,
 my lord, spoke concerning the construction of Šumur"
 (EA 161:35-36).

As the subject of verbal clauses, URU and proper city names are construed with the 3rd f.s. This is demonstrated in some of the examples given above and also in numerous others. The attested verbal congruence with 3rd f.s. suggests that *ālu* and its WS counterparts (Ug. ʿr, *qarītu*, Heb., ʿir, *qiryāh*, Moabite *qr*, *qrt*, *qryt*, Phoen. *qrt*) were considered to be collectives.

There are quite a few instances of the suffix conjugation. First examples will be cited with URU(KI) standing as the logogram for an independent noun:

ḥal-qá-at URU-šu *ḥa-li-iq* É-šu "Lost is his city, lost is his estate"
 (EA 147:46); *ga-am-ra-at-mì* / URU.KI *i-na* BA.UG₇ "The city is

consumed by pestilence" (EA 244:30-31; Moran 1987b:468; 1992:298); *šal-ma-at a-na ia-ti-ia / šu-te-ra-at URU.KI-ia / a-na ia-ti-ia* "It (the city) is at peace with me, my city has been returned to me" (EA 280:13-15; Moran 1987b:502; 1992:321); *i-nu-ma šal-ma-at URU.KI-š[u]* "that his city is safe" (EA 226:7; 268:9); *i-nu-ma šul-ma-at / URU.KI šâr-ri / ša it-ti-ia* "that safe is the city of the king which is in my charge" (EA 330:19-21).

The same rule of congruence applies when the city is actually named. It is highly likely that URU(.KI) was also meant to be read:

i-na LÚ.MAŠKÍM šâr-ri / ša i-šu-ú i-na URUŠu-mu-ur / ba-al-ṭá-at URUGub-la "By the king's commissioner whom he has in Šumur the city of Byblos is supplied" (EA 68:19-21); *in₄-né-ep-ša-at URUŠu-mu-ur / tar-ba-aš BE-ia ù É[ur]-¹šu¹ a-na ša[-š]u* "Šumur, my lord's court and [h]is [be]dchamber, has gone over to him ('Abdi-Ashirta)" (EA 84:12-13); *ù a-nu-ma i-na-an-na ši-ih-ta-at / URUŠu-mu-ur a-di a-bu-li-ši* "And now Šumur is besieged up to its city gate" (EA 106:10-11); *ù i-na-an-[na] / ša-ab-ta-at URU.KI Šu-mu-ri* "And now the city of Šumur is captured" (EA 131:7-8; also EA 256:27); *URUGub-la ki-ma URUḪi-ku-up-ta-aḫ / [i]-ba-ša-at a-na šâr-ri* "Byblos like Memphis belongs to the king" (EA 84:37-38).

Note the 3rd f.s. verb with two towns as the subject in the following

ù na-ak-ra-at-mi / URUŠi-ga-ti^{KI} ù / [U]RUAm-pi^{KI} "And Shigata and Ampí are hostile" (EA 98:10-12).

That passage may provide the solution for interpreting another text:

ap-pu-na-ma a-nu-ma pa-aṭ-ra-at / URURŠu¹-mu-ra ù URUE-ar-[ḫ]a "Moreover, now Šumur and Bīt-Arḫa have defected" (EA 83:28-29).

A few instances of the prefix conjugation are also documented. The following set of examples may not be exhaustive but it is fairly representative:

ù ta-aq-bu / URU "then the city will say . . ." (EA 89:40-41; 122:41); *ti-ša-šu* URU UGU-*ia* "The city is angry with me" (EA 122:39); *ú-ul ti-pu-uš* / URU *ar-na* "lest the city revolt" (EA 122:48; Moran 1987b:334; 1992:201); *ú-ul ti-né-pu-^fuš¹* URU *a-na* GAZ.MEŠ "Let not the city be joined to the *‘apîrû*" (EA 117:94); *ù [l]a-a ti-zi-za* / URU *Šu-mu-r[i]* "then Šumur will not withstand" (EA 38:7; 98:24; 107:33-34; 116:59); *la-a tu-uš-mu* / *a-wa-ti* "My word is not heeded" (EA 138:96-97).

awātu. The evidence is mixed with regard to *awātu*, which is feminine in Akkadian. Frequently, it is clear that a particular scribe used the word as a feminine, e.g. when it is modified by a feminine demonstrative pronoun:

ù qí-ba-mi / *a-wa-ta₅ an-ni-ta* "So speak these words" (EA 73:33-34; also EA 38:7-8; 98:22-24; 116:58-59; 263:22).

The singular (with 1st c.s. possessive pronoun) is also attested as the subject of a 3rd f.s. verb:

la-a tu-uš-mu / *a-wa-ti* "My word is not heeded" (EA 138:96-97).

On the other hand, there are numerous instances when *awātu* is treated as masculine (CAD A/2:43a; Izre'el 1978b:28, §4.1.1; 1991a:107, §2.3.1.1.1.). The phenomenon is not exclusively Canaanite but peripheral. Note the use of the 3rd m.s. demonstrative as modifier in a letter from Amurru:

ù UGU a-ma-ti šu-wa-ti / *iz-za-az a-di pa-tá-ri-šu* "And because of this matter, I am staying until his departure" (EA 166:28-29).

The resumptive 3rd m.s. pronoun points to the same usage in a Gezer letter:

a-wa-at ul-te-bi-la / LUGAL EN-ia DINGIR.MEŠ-ia / ^dUTU-ia a[-n]a ia-ši / a-nu-um-ma i-šu--ši-ru-šu "As for the word that the king, my lord, my deity, my Sun-God, sent to me, now I am preparing it" (EA 267:9-12).

Likewise, the adjectives reveal it in a text from Tyre:

ù a-na-ku ša ú-bal a-ma-ta₅ / DÜG.GA ù a-na-a-ma li-im-na / a-na LUGAL be-li-ia "It is I who bring a good and likewise a bad word to the king, my lord" (EA 149:15-17).

The plural may be accompanied by the m.pl. demonstrative, e.g.

ù li-ma-ad / a-wa-te^{MEŠ} ÌR-ka an-nu-ti "So learn these words of your servant" (EA 292:51-52).

Several contexts have *awātu* as the subject of a 3rd m.s. verb:

la-a / ia-tu-ru-na a-wa-tu "Word does not come back" (EA 126:53-54); *ù ša it-ta-ši a-ma-tú / iš-tu UZU_{pī}^{MEŠ} LUGAL / a-na ÌR-šu šu-ut i-pu-uš* "for whatever command has issued from the mouth of the king to his servant, that he has done" (EA 155:43-45).

The following verb is also 3rd m.s. even though the subject has a m. pl. modifier:

i-na-na yu-qa-bu a-wa-tu / ša-ru-tu i-na pa-ni šār-ri "Now (a) lying word(s) is/are being spoken before the king" (EA 108:20-23; Izre'el 1987:85; cf. Moran 1987b:305-306; 1992:181).

And the plural is frequently documented as the subject of a 3rd m.pl. verb:

ù ú-ul tu-uš-mu-n[a] / a-wa-tu-ia "But my words are not heeded" (EA 89:37; also EA 74:50; 89:8-10, 37; 90:16-17; 91:29-30).

namlu. Another possible collective is *namlu* "ant(s)." It appears once in the EA correspondence in the well known proverb from a Lab³ayu letter:

... *ki-i na-am-lu / tu-um-ḥa-ṣú la-a / ti-ka-pí-lu ù ta-an-ṣu-ku / qà-ti*
LÚ-li ša yi-ma-ḥa-aš-ši ". . . when ants are smitten, they do not
 just curl up but they bite the hand of the man who has smitten
 them" (EA 252:16-19; Albright 1943b:3l; Rainey 1989-90:68-69).

Albright had noted the *qatl* formation, *namlu*, as identical with the Arabic collective; an individual "ant" in Arabic is *namlatu*, which may be compared with Hebrew *n³mālā^h*. Moran (1987b:479; 1992:305) has taken *namlu* as a feminine singular. The verbs are in any case 3rd f.s. imperfect expressing habitual action. Such verb forms, as well as the 3rd f.s. accusative suffix on the verb in line 19, would be acceptable with the collective. The OB attestations of the masculine PN's *Namālu* and hypocoristic *Namālatu[m]* are recognized as WS (CAD N/1:208a; Gelb 1980:163, 628 Nos. 4993, 4994; Harris 1955:100b). The Akkadian word for "ant" is masculine *kulbābu* (CAD K:501b-502) but the rare synonym *lamattu* (Malku VI 61), suspected of being WS (CAD L:67b), is feminine and might represent a metathesis, viz. **namaltu* > **lamantu* > *lamattu*. The sum total of all this evidence seems to favor Albright's suggestion that *namlu* is meant to be a collective (Rainey 1989-90:68b).

nukurtu. The noun *nukurtu* is modified by feminine singular adjectives and 3rd f.s. statives even when the plural postdeterminative MEŠ is appended:

ù! *i-na-an-na / KÚR-kùr-tu₄^{MEŠ} ma[š-]šī-ik-tu₄ i[t-]ti-[ia*
i]n₄-né-pu-uš "And now, nasty war has been waged against me"
 (EA 92:10-11; CAD M/1:324b; Moran 1950a:161; 1987b:282;
 1992:166; Youngblood 1961:367); *a-nu-ma^{URU}ṣu-mu-ur*
nu-kùr-tu₄^{MEŠ} ma-gal / KALAG.GA UGU-ši ù UGU-ia
KALAG.GA-at "Now, as for Ṣumur, the war against it is severe,
 and against me it is severe" (EA 108:8-9).

However, there are several examples of the use of *nukurtu* as a predicative form in lieu of the stative of *nakāru* (cf. *infra*, pp. 155-156, 181).

šābū / ERÍN.MEŠ. Another unusual case in point is the collective *šābū*, which is masculine in standard Akkadian but feminine in some WS contexts (CAD Š:54). Knudtzon (1915:1590 regarding EA 73:21) and Ebeling (1915:1538) took the feminine examples as equivalents of *ummānu*. However, it appears that the EA value of ERÍN.MEŠ in the EA correspondence as a whole (including Canaan) can be deduced from a gloss in an Amurru letter: ERÍN.MEŠ *ša-bi pí-ṭá-te* (EA 166:4). It can also be assumed from that entry that, as a predeterminative, ERÍN.MEŠ was actually read as a word. Such is at least the case when it is accompanied by the Egyptian term for "archers," *piṭātu*. Although one may prefer a literal rendering, "archer troops" (Moran 1992: *passim*), the intention is always "regular army troops" in contrast to "garrison" (*maṣṣartu*) or "auxiliary" (*tillatu*, *rēšūtu*) troops; in this study "regular troops" is preferred as reflecting the semantic, rather than the literal, nuance.

The syntactic relation between the generic ERÍN.MEŠ and the specific military term, such as *piṭātu*, varies from passage to passage. The generic predeterminative may be a construct governing the dependent explicit designation, e.g. nominative subject of an infinitive used finitely:

a-šé-mi ERÍN.MEŠ / *pí-ṭá-ti* "The army has come forth"
(EA 73:12-13; Rainey 1989-90:58b; with finite verbs EA 76:31-32;
77:26-27; 81:45-46; 137:44-45; 191:11-13);

and the accusative:

ù yu-wa-ši-ru-na / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti* "so that he will send troops" (EA 71:13-14; 82:49-50; 95:37; 108:30-32; 111:18; 112:37-38; 116:72-73 = 121:47-48; 118:41-43; 123:41-42; 124:50-52; 136:38-39; 141:45-46; 174:20-21; 196:32; 197:l.ed; .282:10-11; 283:25-26; 362:10); *uš-ši-ra* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti* "send regular

troops" EA 76:38; also EA 85:80; 90:60; 94:10-11; 107:29-30; 114:45; 132:13-14, 48-49); ¹*Ri-ib-d*ĪŠKUR / *šu-mi-it* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ťá-at* / *šâr-ri* "Rib-Haddi has slain the king's troops" (EA 119:19-21).

On the other hand, the predeterminative may stand in apposition to the specific term, in which case the latter is inflected with the proper case ending, nominative:

ù tu-ša ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ťá-tu* "and the regular troops came forth" (EA 362:19; also EA 137:49; 244:19-20; 285:15-16; 287:20-21, 23:288:51-52, 57-58,; 290:22);

or accusative:

ù li-di-na LUGAL EN-*ia* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ťá-ta* "so may the king furnish regular troops" (EA 363:17-18); *ù yu-ħa-mi-ťá be-li* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ťá-ta₅* "so may my lord hasten regular troops" (EA 362:40-41; also 269:11-12; 281:11-12, 27-28; 362:9-10); *ia-nu-mi* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ťá-ta₅* "there are no regular troops" (EA 362:17-18; also EA 93:26; 129:30).

There are just seven instances when the logogram is marked by the collective, i.e. ERÍN.ĤÁ (EA 91:48; 114:62; 123:40; 141:22, 30, 31, 46) and these encompass only four texts. None of those passages contain any objective indicators of the gender intended.

In line with general Akkadian practice, ERÍN.MEŠ is often treated as masculine singular, this in spite of the plural marker. The modifying adjective is one indicator:

uš-ši-ra ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ťá-ti* / *ra-ba* "Send a large force" (EA 76:38-39); *i-nu-ma yi-la-[ak]* ¹*A-ma-an-ap-pa* / *i-na* ERÍN.MEŠ *še-e[h]-r[i ù]* *aš-ta-pár* / *a-na* É.GAL *ù yu-w[a-ša-]ra* / *ù yu-wa-ša-ra* *šâr-ru* ERÍN.MEŠ / *ra-ba* "When Amanappa came with a small force, I wrote to the palace and the king sent a large force" (EA 117:23-27).

The verbal agreement is another:

a-nu-ma i-teg-li ERÍN.MEŠ *i-na* / ^{URU}*Gub-la ù la-qa-ši_x*(ŠE) "Now, should troops advance against Byblos, they will take it" (EA 124:12-13; Moran 1987b:336; 1992:203); *ù-ul yi-ma-qú-ta* ERÍN.MEŠ *ka-ra-^tši¹* / UGU-*ia* "Let not the army attack me" (EA 83:43-44); ERÍN.MEŠ *la-a yu-ša-r[u]* "the army is not being sent" (EA 126:40); *šum-ma* MU.MEŠ ¹*an¹-ni-ta ù-ul / yu-ša-na* ERÍN.¹MEŠ¹ [*pí-t*]*a-ti* "If this year the army does not come forth" (EA 77:26-29).

The two Jerusalem examples are not necessarily diagnostic here since they might be following the Babylonian practice of using the 3rd m.s. for 3rd f.s.,

ù lu-ši-mi LÚ.MEŠ.ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-^tta-ti* / LUGAL EN-*ia* "So may the the troops of the king, my lord, come forth" (EA 286:54-55); *šum-ma i-ba-aš-ši* LÚ.ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-^tta-ti / i-na* MU *an-ni-ti i-ba-aš-ši* KUR.ĤÁ / LUGAL EN "If there are troops in this year, the territories of the king will remain (his)" (EA 286:57-59).

Note that the same text uses 3rd f.s. [*h*]*al-qa-at* KUR.ĤÁ in line 60; *ibašši* may be used here like an indeclinable existential particle.

In other contexts, the term is treated as 3rd f.s. One is hard pressed to find a reason for this unless the term is being treated as a collective. There are two examples of 3rd f.s. modifiers:

a-di a-ší / [ERÍN.ME]Š *pí-^tá-ti ra-bi-ti* "until the coming forth of a large military force" (EA 127:38-39); *ù ¹yu¹-[ši-ru]* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-^tá-ta₅ GAL-ta₅* "so may he se[nd] a large army force" (EA 127:38-39).

There are also many cases of 3rd f.s. verbal agreement:

ù šum-ma ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-^t[á-ti] / i-ba-ša-at* "But if there is a military force" (EA 103:55-56); *ù mi[-na] / ti-¹pu¹-šu* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-^tá-tu* "Then wh[at] will the army do?" (EA 129:33-34);

¹MU¹.KÁM.MEŠ *tu-ša-na* / [ERÍN.M]EŠ *pí-tá-ti* "For years, the army would come forth" (EA 76:31-32; Moran 1987b:256 n. 6; 1992:147 n. 6); *ù lu-ú ti-ra-ḥa-aṣ* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ti-šū* / *ša LUGAL EN-ia* ^dUTU-*ia* DINGIR.MEŠ-*ia* / ^UZUSAG LÚ.MEŠ *a-ia-bi-šū* "and may the army of the king, my lord, my sungod, my deity, smash the head of his enemies" (EA 141:31-33).

On the other hand, some contexts have 3rd m.pl. verbs for this term. This may be another means of treating it as a collective. Two of the earliest attestations are in an Amurru letter:

ù [lu-ú i-]šar¹-ra-pu-ni₇ / ¹i¹-¹na¹ [I]ZI-te^{MEŠ} UR[U]š¹-mu-ri^{KI} /
ù É.GAL-š[i] ERÍN.MEŠ URUŠe-eh-la-li^{KI} "then [would] the troops of Šehlali have [b]urned Šumur and i[ts] palace with fire" (EA 62:18-20; Izre'el 1991a: II, 11); *ša i-dú-ku-ni₇ / [ERÍN.MEŠ*
URUŠe-e]ḥ-la-li^{KI} "which [the troops of Še]ḥlali had slain" (EA 62:33-34; Izre'el 1991a: II, 13).

Another double reference comes from the Lebanese Beqa^c Valley:

i-[nu]-ma ¹i¹-p[u-š]u[-m]¹ ERÍN.MEŠ LÚ.SA.GAZ.MEŠ /
nu-kúr-ta UGU-ia ù [ša]-ab-tu-mi / URU.DIDLI.ḤÁ Išār-ri EN-ia
DINGIR-ia ^dUTU-*ia* "when the ^c*apīru* troops made war against me and seized the towns of the king, my lord, my deity, my sungod" (EA 185:13-15).

Finally, there are two passages from Byblos:

iš-tap-pa-ar ḤR-A-ši-ir-ta a-na ERÍN.MEŠ / AŠ É.NIN.URTA
pu-ḥu-ru-nim-mi "Abdi-Ashirta wrote to the troops, 'Assemble at Bīt-NIN.URTA'" (EA 74:30-31); ERÍN.MEŠ URUGubub-li di-ku
 "The troops of Byblos are slain" (EA 131:9).

NUMBER

Singulars which are considered collectives have been discussed in the previous section. The question of duality and

plurality in these texts is complicated by several factors. The use of the postdeterminatives MEŠ and 𒄩𒀭 are sometimes employed for concepts that are grammatically singular or collective. Syllabic spellings of substantives in the plural are not always diagnostic. The scribes almost never employ a WS plural form, but their use of Akkadian plural markers had developed as the result of peripheral practices representing more than one tradition. Their interaction with the scribes of Egypt, N. Syria and perhaps even Babylon itself, as well as Assyria, may have led to their adoption of various terms, especially nomenclature for social classes and for political ranks, which had acquired its own plural morphologies.

DUALITY

There are very few indications of dual forms. The principal vocables reckoned as dual are parts of the body, viz. "eyes," "hands" and "feet." In the case of such terms, one does not find the dual marker as a postdeterminative as it should be in standard Akkadian. The evidence presented below will demonstrate that the scribes from Canaan used the dual marker, MIN = 2, as a predeterminative. Even when they did use it, they were also accustomed to add the plural marker, MEŠ, as a postdeterminative! It is possible, therefore, that the MIN sign was meant to be read as a numeral, *šina* (cf. *infra*, pp. 184-185).

īnān. One of the rare examples of a dual without MEŠ is accompanied by a Canaanite gloss revealing the WS dual nominative, albeit in the bound form:

ù in₄-nam-ru / 2.IGI-ia \ ḥe-na-ia "and my two eyes brightened"
(EA 144:16-17).

The reconstructed WS form is **ēnâya*. The oblique form would presumably be **ēnêya* (**ēnayya*) but documentation is lacking. The logographic orthography here, viz. 2 IGI, without a postdeterminative MEŠ, has only a limited representation:

ù lu-ú ti-mu-ru 2.IGI ÌR-ka "and may the two eyes of your servant behold" (EA 141:34); *a-mur ni-nu a-na mu-ḫi-ka₄* / 2.IGI-ia "Behold, as for us, my two eyes are (focused) on you" (EA 264:14-15).

At least one context could be taken as an indication that the MIN sign was meant to be a predeterminative and not a numeral. The class determinative UZU, "flesh," precedes the MIN:

a-di a-ta-mar UZU.2.IGI.ʹMEŠ¹ / LÚ¹ḫa-za-an ša ʹšār-ri "Until I behold the two eyes of the official of the king" (EA 237:16-17).

Otherwise, the UZU is omitted,

ù la-mu-ur-mi / 2.IGI.MEŠ LUGAL EN-ia "and that I may behold the two eyes of the king, my lord" (EA 288:40-41; also EA 288:30-31; 131:26; 142:10; 145:29).

Once the collective postdeterminative is applied:

a-di im[u-r]u 2.IGI.ḫÁ / ERÍN.MEŠ pī-ṭ[á-at] ša LUGAL EN-ia "until I see the eyes of the reg[ular] troops [of] the king, my lord" (EA 141:45-46; Moran 1987b:371 n. 7; 1992:226 n. 6).

It should be noted that other peripheral texts employ the logographic orthography IGI.MEŠ without the numeral (EA 16:15; 27:24, 26, 27, 30, 31)

qātu. Twice the numeral 2 is used with the word for "hand." Unfortunately, the one syllabic example has a missing sign, so there is no way of knowing whether the dual oblique suffix was meant to be *-ē* or *-ī*. The second example is written logographically.

u na-da-an 2 qa-<te>(?)<š>u / *a-na* LÚ.[S]A.GAZ "And he gave his two han<ds> to the *‘apīru*" (EA 298:26); *u 2 ŠU ša* [LUGAL] "and the two hands of [the king]" (EA 326:11).

The context of the following passage also strongly suggests the dual even though there is no determinative:

ù SAG.DU-*nu* \ *ru-šu-nu* / *i-na qa-te-ka* "And our head is in your hands" (EA 264:18-19).

šēpu. The other logical dual is the word for "feet." There is a group of examples, all from the same scribe, in which the logogram GÌR is followed by a phonetic complement. Since the singular construct is *šēp*, the addition of the vocalic suffix in these passages would logically imply that the dual is intended, viz.

a-na šu-pa-li / *up-ri* GÌR-*pí* LUGAL EN-*ia* / 7 ù 7 *am-qú-ut*
"beneath the dust of the feet of the king, my lord, seven (times)
and seven (times) I have fallen" (EA 363:4-6; also EA 175:5;
176:5; 177:4; 178:3; cf. also EA 182:3).

These can be compared with the following orthography where the plural postdeterminative is employed:

GIŠ.GÌR.GUB *ša* GÌR.MEŠ-*p[í]* / LUGAL EN-*ia* "the foot stool of
the feet of the king, my lord" (EA 106:6-7; cf. also EA 185:4;
187:4).

The phonetic complement seemed certain to Knudtzon but is less so in Schroeder's copy. Another entry has a defectively written numeral and the collective postdeterminative:

a-na 1(sic) GÌR.ḤÁ-*pí* LUGAL "at the two(!) feet of the king"
(EA 228:5).

The sign used in the spellings listed above, viz. BI, can be read *pé* or *pí*. One might expect, however, that if the scribes had intended to represent a dual oblique form such as the typically Assyrian *šēpē*, they would have used the BE sign instead. At least the balance of probability here is in favor of the Babylonian dual *šēpī*, contrary to Knudtzon's normalization.

Other passages have the plural postdeterminative MEŠ with the dual predeterminative (numeral), even preceded by the generic predeterminative UZU:

ep-ri ša 2.UZU.GÌR.MEŠ-*ka* "the dust of your two feet" (EA 303:5; cf. also EA 303:7; 305:8-9); *ep-ra ša* / 'UZU'.2.GÌR.MEŠ-*ka* "the dust of your two feet" (EA 328:6-7; cf. line 10 without numeral).

Most other entries lack the predeterminative UZU but have the 2 and the MEŠ:

2.GÌR.MEŠ (EA 321:10; also EA 233:7; 234:5; 255:4; 292:4; 297:4; 298:7, 19; 321:7-8; 364:9; 366:5).

Three examples have the UZU but no numeral, UZU.GÌR.MEŠ-*ka* (EA 304:6; 305:6; 319:7) and over thirty places have simply GÌR.MEŠ (EA 116:60; *et passim*).

PLURALITY

All of the various standard plural morphemes of Akkadian (Reiner 1966:65 §5.3.4.5) are represented in the corpus as well as the postdeterminatives for plural, MEŠ, and for collective, DIDLI, ḪÁ. A few texts have an orthography in which MEŠ or ḪÁ is applied to the morphologically singular form of the substantive, viz.

a-wa-at^{MEŠ} LUGAL "the king's words" (EA 192:10), KASKAL^{MEŠ-na} "caravans" (EA 194:22); KASKAL-*ra-na*^{ḪÁ} "caravans" (EA 255:23); KASKAL-*ra-ni*^{ḪÁ} "caravans" (EA 255:9, 13, 18); ^dIZI.MEŠ *i₁₅-ša-te* (EA 189:12); *mar-ši-te*^{MEŠ} "possessions" (EA 137:74), LÚ.MEŠ *ma-šar-ta₅*^{MEŠ} "guardsmen" (EA 289:30), *nu-kúr-tu₄*^{MEŠ} "hostilities" (EA 102:7; similarly EA 69:14; 106:8, 45; and 92:11), LÚ^š*a-ri*^{MEŠ} "traitors" (EA 185:56; 186:59).

Sometimes the MEŠ may have been added because the singular and the plural could be represented by the same syllabic

orthography, for example *a-wa-ta₅^{MEŠ}* (*passim*), *a-wa-te^{MEŠ}* (*passim*), *ú-nu-tu^{MEŠ}* (KL 72:600:10, 13, 23).

STANDARD MASCULINE PLURAL. The earliest documented example of the nominative plural pertains to an apparently WS (Albright 1931:221; 1944b:24 n.) or Egyptian (Lambdin 1953b:150) military term in the Taanach texts:

ša-ni-tam la-a-mi / 'i¹-na ma-an-ša-ar-^ti¹ i-^tba¹-^tšu¹ / 'ḥa¹-na-ku-u-ka "Furthermore, your retainers are not in the garrison" (TT 6:6; CAD H:76b; Rainey 1977:59; Glock 1983:61).

Similarly, it appears on an Akkadian term:

ù ti-da-ga-lu / LÚ.MEŠ a-ia-bu-nu ù / ti-ka-lu ep-ra "so that our enemies may see and eat dirt" (EA 100:34-36); *a-ia-bu LUGAL nu-KÚR it-<ti>-ia ù LÚ.MEŠ / ḥa-za-nu-šu* "the enemies of the king are at war with me as are his city rulers" (EA 114:47-48; Moran 1987b:316; 1992:189).

As the last example above illustrates, there is a minority of plural forms from *ḥazannu* with the standard substantival plural markers, *-ū* and *-ī*. Besides the nominative form from EA 114:48 cited above, there are numerous instances of the dependent (genitive) case:

ki-ma LÚ.MEŠ ḥa^{MEŠ}-za-ni "like the city rulers" (EA 137:13); *la-q[ú] / [NÍG.G]A LÚ.MEŠ ḥa-za-ni-ka* "The[y] have taken [the proper]ty of your city rulers" (EA 109:20-21; Moran 1987b:309 n. 4; 1992:184 n. 4); *u ka-li LÚ.MEŠ / [ḥ]a-za-ni-ka tù-da-ku[-n]a* "and all your city rulers are being slain" (EA 132:49-50); *al-ku-ni qa-du LÚ.MEŠ ḥa-za-ni-ku-nu* "Come with your city rulers" (EA 117:62; nominative for dependent case!).

The following example may be accusative providing it is in apposition to the predeterminative LÚ.MEŠ; otherwise, it is simply another dependent form:

ù [šu-]u[p-š[i-]i]ḫ LÚ.MEŠ / ḫa-za-n[i LUGAL] i-na
 KUR.KUR.MEŠ "So [give] pe[ac]e to the [king's] city rulers in
 the territories" (EA 121:50-51; Thureau-Dangin 1922a:201 n. 4;
 Moran 1987b:333 n. 4; 1992:201 n. 4).

Finally, in one passage the scribe has mixed a plural
 predeterminative with a singular form; the accusative is subject of
yānu:

i-ia-nu LÚ.MEŠ ḫa-za-na LU[GAL] k[i-ma i]a-ši / a-na LUGAL
 "The king has no royal city ruler l[ike m]e" (EA 138:26-27).

A frequently used substantive is the plural *pānū* "face"
 (Ebeling 1915:1488-1489; Rainey 1978b:86). Many of the forms
 with pronominal possessive suffixes were only recognized later
 as plurals (AHw:819b). The plural nominative with 1st c.s. suffix is
pānūya rather than the normal Akkadian *pānūʾa*:

pa-nu-ia a-na a-la-ki / a-na a-ma-ri pa-ni LUGAL be-li-[i]a "My
 intention is to go to see the face of the king, 'my' lord"
 (EA 151:8-9); ù pa-nu-ia a-na i-re-bi / a-na ur-ru-ud ʾšār-ri EN-ia
 "but my intention is to enter in (to the Egyptian palace) and to
 serve the king, my lord" (EA 295:r.9-10); a-mur a-n[a]-ku
 pa-nu-ia-ma / a-[n]a a-ra-ad LUGAL "Behold, as for me, it is my
 intention to serve the king" (EA 118:39-40; 119:43-44); ʾSIG₅¹
 pa-nu-ia a-na / muḫ-ḫi LUGAL be-li-ia / ki-i-me e-nu-ma /
 ip-qí-id-ni LUGAL be-li-ya / a-na na-ša-ri URU-šu "My attitude is
 as genuine toward the king, my lord, as when the king, my
 lord appointed me to protect his city" (EA 148:18-22; cf. Moran
 1987b:381; 1992:235).

The preservation of the case vowel before the 3rd m.pl.
 suffix is also proof of the plural form, grammatically and
 contextually:

[pa-]nu-šu-nu a-na ša-ba-ti URU.K[I Gub-la] "Their [in]tention is
 to seize the city of [Byblos]" (EA 129:31; ka-li LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ

na-ad-nu / pa-ni-šu-nu a-na ia-ši "All the ^c*apîru* men have turned their faces against me" (EA 79:10-11).

Doubtless, the plethora of forms in expressions like *a-na pa-ni* (*passim*), *et al.*, reflect the plural construct in the oblique case.

A participle used as a substantive rather than as an adjective, has the standard *-û* suffix preserved before the 1st c.s. suffix, viz. LÚ.MEŠ *ra-i-mu-ia* "the men, my supporters" = "the men who support me" (EA 137:47).

The full independent WS plural suffix, *-ûma*, is seen in LÚ.MEŠ *a-ši-ru-ma* "troops" (EA 268:19; Izre'el 1978b:29, §4.2) and *mar-ia-nu-ma* "chariot warriors" (EA 107:43). The Akkadian nominative plural appears in ¹LÚ¹.MEŠ *a-si-ru* "prisoners" (EA 287:54; or *a-ši-ru* "troops," Rainey 1967b). It is a question sometimes as to whether a predeterminative is an independent word with a substantive in apposition (Albright and Moran 1950:165a). When the predeterminative carries the plural marker, MEŠ, it remains to decide whether the noun in apposition is also plural in form or singular; just such a case in point is NA₄.MEŠ *eḫ-li-pa-ak-ku* "chunks of raw glass" (EA 314:19; 323:14, 16).

The oblique WS suffix, *-îma*, may be intended on the following Egyptian military term: LÚ.MEŠ *we-i-ma* "soldiers" (EA 108:16), also LÚ.MEŠ *we-e-[ma]* (EA 109:22); also *li-mi-ma* "the peoples/nations" (EA 205:6; and perhaps also EA 195:13; Moran 1987b:433 n. 2; 1992:273 n. 2)

The oblique WS plural suffix is intended in the following passage although it could be enclitic *-ma* suffixed to the normal oblique Akkadian, *-î*. The substantive is the plural subject of *yânu*, which, in these texts, is always in the accusative case.

šum-ma-mi / i-ia-nu pa-ni-ma / ša-nu-ta₅ i-na / ¹La-ab-a-ya "Since Lab³ayu has no other intention" (EA 244:38-41; Moran 1987b:468; 1992:298; Rainey 1989-90:68a).

It must be admitted that in a parallel context the Akkadian oblique suffix is adopted and there is no *-ma* syllable to be reckoned with:

ù *a-nu-ma* / *i₁₅-na-an-na ia-nu* / *pa-ni ša-nu-ta₅ iš-tu* / *ur-ru-ud šār-ri* "And now there is no other intention except to serve the king" (EA 253:25-28)

For the Akkadian oblique suffix, *-ī*, cf. 4 ITU-*ḫi*^{MEŠ} "four months" (EA 138:23); it is probably to be understood in several other examples:

LÚ.MEŠ *a-ia-bi-šu* "his enemies" (EA 141:33); 'LÚ¹.MEŠ¹ *a-ši-ri* "troops" (TT 5:10); LÛ.MEŠ *a-si-ri* "prisoners" or *a-ši-ri* "troops" (EA 288:21), LÚ.MEŠ *be-li* URU "lords of the city" (EA 102:22); LÚ.MEŠ *ḫa-ba-ti* "robbers" (EA 126:16); LÚ.MEŠ *ḫu-up-ši* "yeoman farmers" (EA 77:36; *et passim*); LÚ.MEŠ *we-²i* "soldiers" (EA 129:12); SAḪAR.MEŠ *ep-ri* "dirt" (EA 195:5); *ia-nu-um!*(AM) / LÚ.MEŠ-*li* "there are no men" (EA 362:37-38);

especially:

a-na LÚ.MEŠ *ḫa-za-nu-ti ib-ri-ia* "to the city rulers, my colleagues" (EA 126:16).

There are places where the bound form has a final vowel and is most likely plural:

ù *uš-šu[r]* *lu-ú na-ša-ra-ta aš-ru* / LUGAL *ša it-ti-ka* "So guard! may you be on guard (in)? the places of the king that are in your care" (EA 99:8-9; 367:4-5); *ú-šur-mi* / *aš-ri* LUGAL *ša it-ti-ka* "Guard the places of the king that are in your care" (EA 293:10-11); *a-nu-ma a-na-ša-ru-mi* / *aš-ri* LUGAL *ša it-ti-ia* "Now I am guarding the places of the king that are in my care" (EA 322:15-16; also EA 321:24-26).

This assumption pertains especially to the instances of *ip-ši* as accusative forms of *ipšu* "deed, action" (CAD I/J:168; cf. *AHw*:383; Izre'el 1978b:28). Ebeling (1915:1405) had assigned some forms of *epištu* / *ipištu* as the plurals of *ipšu*; these latter will be discussed below (cf. *infra*, pp. 149-150). The following oblique

examples, some of them the bound form, can be recognized as plural by the context:

yi-de LUGAL *be-li* / *ip-ši ša yi-pu-šu-ni* / ¹*Ia-an-ḥa-mu* / *iš-tu a-ši-ia* / [*i*]š-tu mu-ḥi LUGAL EN-*ia* "May the king, my lord, be apprised of the deeds which Yanḥamu is committing against me since my departure from the presence of the king, my lord" (EA 270:9-13; Moran 1987b:494; 1992:316); *i-nu-ma ba-al-ṭú* / LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM.MEŠ ù / *a-da-bu-ba ka-li ip-ši[-š]u-nu* "while the commissioners live, then I will disclose their activities" (EA 119:21-23; Moran 1987b:328; 1992:197); [*a-m*]ur *ip-ši* ¹*Pi-i-ia* / 'DUMU' M¹*Gu-la-ti* / [*a-na*] *ia-ši* "[Beh]old the deeds of Piya son of Gulati [against] me" (EA 294:16-18); *ú-ul ia-qú-ul-mi* / LUGAL *be-li a-na ip-ši* UR *an-nu-ú* "May the king not ignore the deeds of this dog!" (EA 137:25-26; contrast CAD K:72b; Moran 1987b:357; 1992:218).

The context suggests that the following term is also in the plural, with the oblique suffix *-ī*, since in all three contexts it stands as the object of the verb:

yi-ka-lu ka-ar-ši-ia "He is denouncing me" (EA 254:16; Izre'el 1987:83; Moran 1992:307 n. 2); *i-ka-lu ka-ar-ši-ya* "they are denouncing me" (EA 286:6); [*ú*]-ul *yi-iš-me* LUGAL *karš-ši* / [Ī]R EN-*ia* "May the king not listen to the slanders against the [serva]nt of the king" (EA 119:20).

An Egyptian epistle even shows lengthening of the oblique plural suffix; perhaps this orthography is due to the interrogative nature of the sentence:

am-mi-ni la-a tá-a-ku-ul kar-ši-i-šu "Why didn't you denounce him?" (EA 162:16; McCarter 1973:15-17; Moran 1987b:402 n. 4; 1992:250 n. 4).

The orthography in a number of instances reveals the *-ī* suffix, viz.

iš-tu AN *sa-mi-i* "from the heavens" (EA 298:3; 301:2, 8; 378:2-3, 6-7, 24-25; *et al.*); *iš-tu* AN *sa-mi* (EA 316:7; 324:24; 325:2, 14; 331:9).

Over against that limited group of spellings, there is a plethora of examples with the *-ē* suffix:

iš-tu AN *sa-me-e* (EA 231:10, 13; 234:2; 235:3; 320:4; 366:8); *iš-tu* AN.MEŠ *sa-me* (EA 314:13); *iš-tu* AN *sa-me* (e.g. EA 220:20; 233:11; 234:8; *et al.*).

To these must be added others such as

iš-tu ša-me-e (EA 232:7); *iš-tu ša-me* (EA 195:19); *i-na* AN *ša-me-e* (99:24); *i-na* AN *ša-me* (EA 195:17, 19).

The orthography *iš-tu* AN-*ú* (EA 326:2) is either meant to be adverbial or else it is a simple mistake, nominative in place of oblique. Finally, there is *a-na* AN.MEŠ / *ša-me-ma* (EA 264:15-16), which might reflect the WS suffix. In any case, one must reckon with the possibility that the forms with *-ē* may be due to the reduction of a diphthong; this assumption is based on comparison with the Heb. *šāmāyim*.

The above must be compared with the WS glosses for the word for "water" in the Tyrian letters:

a-na A.MEŠ *mé-e-ma* "for water" (EA 148:31); *a-n[a]* ⟨*na-da-ni*⟩ / A.MEŠ \ *mé-ma* "to ⟨grant⟩ water" (EA 155:9-10; Moran 1987b:390; 1992:241); A \ *ʿmé¹-ʿma¹* (EA 146:20).

Here it looks as though the form represents the reduction of a diphthong, cf. Hebrew *mayim* and the (Phoenician/Canaanite) name of the Hebrew letter *mēm* (which was written in Proto-Sinaitic script by Egyptian \mathfrak{n} , the hieroglyphic sign for water).

Apart from those examples, there is no other evidence from the Canaanite EA texts for the *-ē* suffix. From Alashia, one

finds *a-na DUMU-e-šu* "to his sons" (EA 37:6) and from Egypt there are LÚ.MEŠ *a-ia-bé-e ša* LUGAL (EA 162:56) and *a-ia-bé-e* LUGAL (EA 367:21), "the enemies of the king." Some official writing to Rib-Haddi of Byblos used the expression *a-na* ÌR.MEŠ-*e* LUGAL "to the servants of the king" (EA 96:27).

Although most of the forms cited above as proof of the *-ī* suffix might be transcribed as if the ending were *-ē*, e.g. *bé* instead of *-bi*, *-le* instead of *-li*, *-re* instead of *-ri*, *-še₂₀* instead of *-ši*, and *-te₉* instead of *-ti*, such a rendering seems hardly justified. Certain forms with the *-i* sign lend weight to the common sense assumption that the normal masculine plural oblique case ending for Akkadian words was *-ī*. Likewise, the corresponding WS suffix was *-ī(ma)*. It was indeed unfortunate that Knudtzon normalized so many logograms in accordance with his previous experience from working on Neo-Assyrian hymns and prayers, e.g. his *arḥê*, *imêrê*, *mârê*, *sisê*, *šâbê*, etc.

THE PLURAL AUGMENT *-ānū* / *-ānī*. Attestation of the plural suffix *-ānū* / *-ānī* is limited to three vocables. In most cases it is clear that specific entities are being referred to, specific towns, places or deities. However, since two of these vocables are not documented in this corpus with the *-ū* / *-ī* suffix, it is not possible to ascertain whether the *-ānū* / *-ānī* suffix is the only one used simply to augment short, monosyllabic substantives, or whether the need to specify particular towns and deities was paramount (Goetze 1946b; Reiner 1966:62-63; GAG:77, §61i; Izre'el 1991a:113).

ālu. The word for "town, city" seems always to take the morpheme *-ānū* / *-ānī* as its plural marker. Examples are as follows: URU.MEŠ *a-la-nu-ka* (EA 209:7); URU.MEŠ-*nu* (EA 124:39); URU-*la-nu* (EA 130:33); [URU].DIDLI.ĤÁ-*nu* (EA 208:14); URU.'DIDLI'.ĤÁ¹-*nu* (EA 280:32); URU.MEŠ-*ni-ia* (EA 124:40); URU.DIDLI.ĤÁ-*ni-ši* (EA 228:16); DIDLI.URU.KI-*ni* (EA 131:44)..

ašru. Two references to specific places are documented: *aš-ra-nu* (EA 230:6); *i-na aš-ra-ni-šu* "in his places" (EA 147:42;

CADA/2:456a). However, there are many places where the bound form has a final vowel and is most likely plural (cf. *supra*, p. 143).

ilu. All the examples of plural forms from *ilu* are written logographically, DINGIR.MEŠ. Those that have a phonetic complement are all on the *ilānū* pattern. Sometimes these plurals are subjects of a 3rd m.pl. verb:

DINGER.¹MEŠ¹ *li-iš-a-lu* / ¹š^u¹-*lum-ka* "May the gods seek your welfare" (TT 1:5-6); DINGIR.MEŠ-*nu-ka* / *ù* ^dUTU *lu-ú i-du-ú-ni* "May your gods and the sungod be my witnesses" (EA 161:32-33; Izre'el 1991a:250); [*n*]*a-ad-nu* DINGIR.MEŠ-*nu* [*ù*] "(If) the/our gods grant [that]" (EA 134:10; *contra* Moran 1987b:354 n. 3; 1992:216 n. 3).

On the other hand, there are also passages where the verb is in the 3rd m.s. and the impression is that the plural of the substantive was conceived as a kind of abstract. The plural forms are, nevertheless *ilānū* and there is no hint of the *-ūt* suffix:

EN DINGIR.MEŠ-*nu* / *ZI-ka li-iš-šur* "May the lord, the deity, protect your life!" (TT 2:2-3; Rainey 1977:50); DINGIR.MEŠ-*nu* / *š^u-lum-ka š^u-lum É-ka* / *li-iš-al* "May the deity seek your welfare (and) the welfare of your house" (EA 96:5-6); *ù il₅-la-ak* / DINGIR.MEŠ-*nu-ka* *ù* ^dUTU-*ka* / *a-na pa-ni-ia* "and your deity and your sungod went before me (EA 189:r. 13-15; Moran 1987b:428; 1992:270).

Then there are those instances when the divine plurality is identified with pharaoh.

a-na š^{ar}-ri EN-*ia* / DINGIR.MEŠ-¹*nu*¹-*ia* *ù* ^dUTU.MEŠ-*ia* / [*ù*] *š^a-ri-ia* / *qí-bí-ma* "To the king, my lord, my Deity and <my> sungod [and] my life breath, speak!" (EA 281:1-3); *a-na š^{ar}-ri* EN-*ia* ^dUTU-*ia* / DINGIR.MEŠ-*ia* *qí-bí-ma* "To the king, my lord, my sungod, my Deity, speak!" (EA 366:1-2; also EA 378:1).

These examples can be compared with the use of the plural verb with the Egyptian deity, Amon (Moran 1950a:62; cf. also Rainey 1977:50-52):

^dA-*ma-na* DINGIR *ša* LUG[AL] [*be-li-k*]a / *ti-di-nu* TĒŠ-*ka i-na* /
pa-ni LUGAL *be-li-ka* "May Amon, the god of the kin[g] [yo]ur
[lord] grant your honor in the presence of the king, your lord"
(EA 71:4-6; 86:3-5; Moran 1951:35; 1964:80-82).

Undoubtedly these passages reflect a use of the plural to denote "excellence" like the use of the plural ^e*lôhîm* in biblical Hebrew (Jouön and Muraoka 1991:500-501, §136d).

THE SUFFIXES *-ātu* / *-āti* / *-āte* / *-āta*. The normal plural marker for feminine adjectives, and for many feminine and also many masculine nouns, is characterized by the *-t* suffix preceded by a long *ā* vowel, i.e. *-āt-*. As with the *ūt-* suffix discussed below, there are indications that this suffix was triptotic (cf. for Amurru texts Izre'el 1991a:121 §2.3.2.2, 172 §3.1.2, 186 §3.3.1.1.3) rather than diptotic as in Akkadian and Arabic. A few examples of feminine plurals with accusative *-am* have appeared at Mari (Finet 1956:62, §26b,c) and the three terms so treated, *baz(a)hātam* "outposts" (CAD B:184a), "gendarmerie" (AHw:117b), *ummānātam* "troops," *šipātam* "wool," appear to be reckoned as feminine collectives (Matouš 1964:50, §39e; 1992:49, §39e).

awātu. The plural of this vocable is more easily discernible when there is a pronominal suffix because then one finds the preservation of the case vowel. In the following example the governing verb is also 3rd m.pl.,

ù ú-ul tu-uš-mu-n[a] / *a-wa-tu-ia* "but my words are not heeded"
(EA 91:29-30; also EA 74:50; 89:8-10, 37; 90:16-17).

That the form is plural may be deduced for other bound forms with final vowel. This assumption is reinforced by the occasional addition of the plural postdeterminative MEŠ, e.g.

ù li-ma-ad / a-wa-te^{MEŠ} *ìR-ka an-nu-ti* "so be apprised of these words of your servant" (EA 292:51-52; 362:5, 49; 378:23-24).

There are numerous construct forms without the MEŠ. The final vowel on the bound form may be *-ē*, *a-wa-te* LUGAL EN-*ia* (EA 315:17), or *-ī*,

ù iš-te-mu / gáb-bi a-wa-ti šàr-ri EN-*ia* "and I am obeying all the words of the king, my lord" (EA 64:17-18; EA 63:9; 65:8; 216:13; 217:8; 218:8; 220:10; 317:10; 327:1).

Uncertainty remains concerning some unbound forms in the Jerusalem letters with final *-a* plus MEŠ. Note the differing forms of the modifying adjective:

še-ri-ib a-wa-ta₅^{MEŠ} / [*b*]*a-na-ti a-na šàr-ri* "Present pleasant words before the king" (EA 288:64-65); *še-ri-rb a-wa-ta₅*^{MEŠ} *ba-na-ta / a-na* LUGAL EN-*ia* (EA 287:67-68; 286:62-63).

One is hard pressed to decide whether these are simply examples of the singular form marked as plural by the MEŠ or whether the forms are triptotic plurals.

banû "NICE, FRIENDLY." The only plural feminine forms of this adjective are those cited in the previous paragraph. All examples are in the accusative; one has final *-i*, two have final *-a*.

dāriātu "ETERNITY, FOREVER." One scribe from Canaan used the expression *a-di da-ri-ia-ta* "forever" (EA 294:35). The usual formation would have been *adi dārīti* (CAD D:114b). But in the passage cited here, not only is the uncontracted plural employed, but also what appears to be an adverbial accusative suffix.

epištu / ipištu "ACTION, DEED." Certain forms of this vocable were listed by Ebeling (1915:1405) as plurals of *epšu / ipšu*, but the plural of that word is formed with the masculine suffixes, *-ū* and *-ī*. Therefore, it is more likely that the examples discussed here

are really from *epištu* / *ipištu*, i.e. a few western scribes knew the feminine substantive so widely used in Babylonia. One of the forms in question is certainly plural from the context:

ù yi-pu-šu ip-ša-ta₅ ša-r[u-t]a₅ "and he went on with his tr[eacher]ous activities" (EA 131:36; Moran 1950a:46; 1987b:350; 1992:213).

The m. pl. adjective and the 3rd m.s. imperfect verb form (here for continuous action in the past) demonstrate that the scribe is referring to a series of deeds, not just one. This is one of the clearest contexts where the accusative feminine plural is triptotic.

The other passage may not necessarily represent the plural, especially since there is no case vowel on the bound form. The correct reading was furnished by Schroeder (1915g:175):

i₁₅-de ip-še-et-šu ša / ¹*Mil-ki-li UGU-ia* "I know the deed of Milkili against me" (EA 254:18-19; cf. Rabiner 1981:20, 21 n. 11; Moran 1987b:482 n. 2; 1992:307 n. 3).

maššartu. The usual designation for "garrison troops" is a singular form in apposition to a determinative with the plural marker, for example LÚ.MEŠ *ma-ša-ar-tu* (EA 81:50); ERÍN.MEŠ *ma-ša-ar-tu* (EA 126:25); LÚ.MEŠ *ma-ša-ar-ta* (EA 78:39; *et al.*). The Jerusalem scribe wrote LÚ.MEŠ *ma-šar-ta₅*^{MEŠ} (EA 289:30) and LÚ.MEŠ *ma-šar-tu₄* LUGAL (EA 289:36).

A scribe from Beirut, writing a letter for Rib-Haddi of Byblos, is the only one who actually employed the full plural form:

i-ia-nu / LÚ.MEŠ *ma-ša-ra-ta₅* "There are no garrison troops" (EA 138:30-31).

The accusative here is customary in this dialect for the subject of *yânu* (Moran 1950a:14-15). So the present example would appear to be further testimony to the triptotic nature of the *-āt-* plural suffix.

mātu. Once a Tryian scribe used the expression *i-na muḫ-ḫi* / KUR *ma-ta-ti* "over the lands" (EA 147:7). A Byblos text has *a-na la-qé* KUR.KUR.MEŠ-*i-mi* "to take over territories" (EA 362:36). The latter should evidently be normalized *mātātīmi*.

narkabtu. With all the logographic orthographies of the word for "chariots," only once is there a phonetic complement:

ù 'ti'[-na-am]-mi-šu GIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ-*ta* / ŠEŠ[.MEŠ-*i*]a
DUMU.MEŠ-*ia* ÌR.MEŠ-*ka* / a-'na' [m]a-'ḫar' ¹A-*ma-an-ḫa-at-pí*
"Then my colleagues, my juniors, your servants, di[spat]ched
chariots to Aman-ḫatpi" (EA 185:52-54; Landsberger *apud*
Bottéro 1954:98; Moran 1987b:423 n. 5; 1992:266 n. 6).

There is no reason to render GIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ-*ta* as a singular as Moran has done (1987b:422; 1992:266). The phonetic complement points to *narkabāta*, another instance of the triptotic feminine plural.

ṭuppu. The proper plural form of "tablets" is not used in the texts from Canaan; cf. *ṭup-pí*^{MEŠ} (EA 74:10) and *ṭup-pa*^{MEŠ} (EA 129:8). Two examples from broken contexts appear in the Qatna letters, viz. *ṭup-pa-te*^{MEŠ} (EA 51:r. 5) and *ṭup-pá-te-šu* (EA 52:5).

āmu. The plural for "days" is only represented by one phonetic complement; viz. *ma-ni* UD.MEŠ-*ti* "How many days" (EA 292:45; Izre'el 1978b:30).

THE SUFFIXES *-ātu* / *-ūti* / *-ūte* / *-ūta*. The plural marker for masculine adjectives in Akkadian is *-ūt-*, a suffix which is homophonous with the suffix employed in forming abstracts. One major difference between the masculine plural adjectival suffix and the abstract suffix is that the former is supposed to be diptotic while the latter is triptotic since it is ostensibly a singular. The evidence presented below will demonstrate that this suffix is applied not only to masculine plural adjectives but also to other

word classes, especially social and political ranks and designations. The broader application of this suffix is a phenomenon common to the peripheral dialects in general (*GAG*:77, §61k; Böhl 1909:34, §23b; Giacomakis 1970:45, §6.8; Izre'el 1991a:113, §2.3.2.1.; Huehnergard 1979:46-47; 1989:146 and n. 118; van Soldt 1991:426-427).

annû. For this demonstrative (cf. *supra*, pp. 94-960 the standard plural form is *an-nu-tu* (EA 101:26; 104:46; 117:17). One example of *an-nu-tu*₄ stands where a genitive is expected:

ù ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ ḫa-za-nu-te tu-ba-ú-na / i-pé-eš an-nu-tu₄ a-na
 ʾĪR-A-ši-ir-ta "And all the city rulers are seeking to do this (these [things]?) to 'Abdi-Ashirta" (EA 73:25).

The scribe may have intended *i-pé-eš an-nu-tím*, but that is only a speculation. For accusatives, the normal diptotic Akkadian form is found:

ù li-ma-ad / a-wa-te^{MEŠ} ʾĪR-ka an-nu-ti "So be apprised of these words of your servant" (EA 292:52).

But there is also attestation of the triptotic form bearing the *-a* suffix:

u i₁₅-nu-ma iš-te-me a-wa-te^{MEŠ}-ka / an-nu-ta₅ "and when I heard these words of yours" (EA 227:9); ù yi-il₅-ma-ad LUGAL EN-ia / a-wa-at ʾĪR-šu an-nu-ta₅ "So may the king, my lord be apprised of these words of his servant" (EA 294:26; Izre'el 1987b:26, §2, 28, §4.1.1, 30, §4.2).

arnu. In one partially broken context there is possibly an example of the *-ūti* suffix in the expression, "men of wrongdoing, traitors." The passage is: *a-na* LÚ.MEŠ *ar-nu-ʾti*¹(?) "to the traitors" (EA 142:23; *CAD* A/2:299a). BB has cuneiform TI with a question mark. Knudtzon (1915:596 n. e) stated that the traces were more suitable to reading ʾú¹ but this does not make good sense

grammatically. The genitive is clearly required by the context and the spelling *ar-nu-?* certainly suggests *-¹ti¹*.

awīlu. The abstract *awīlūtu* is recognized as an occasional plural for *awīlu* by *AHw*:91a while *CAD* A/2:58-61 does not. The latter assigns many examples of LÚ.MEŠ in the EA texts to *awīlūtu* "mankind." Actual documentation in the EA texts is restricted to two examples, one of them a clear nominative:

ù ti7-pa-ti4-ru-¹na¹ LÚ.MEŠ-tu "then the people will desert"
(EA 362:35).

The other passage requires the genitive:

iš-tu UZUKA LÚ.MEŠ-tím "from the testimony of the people"
(EA 106:39).

There the TUM sign = *tím* but may be a simple error for some other sign such as TIM = *tì*.

dannu. Once the masculine plural of this adjective occurs in a broken context:

[pa-]na-nu URUŠu-mu-ra ù LÚ.MEŠ[-ši] / [da]n-nu-¹tu⁴¹
'i¹-ba-aš-šu "[Fo]rmerly Šumur and [its] men were [st]rong"
(EA 81:48-49).

ḫalzuḫlu. Normally this Hurrianized vocable does not take the plural in *-ūt-* (*CAD* Ḫ:57). A broken context has *gáb-bu LÚ.MEŠ ḫal-zu-uḫ-lu-ti ša KUR-ka* "all the fortress commanders of your land" (EA 67:15).

ḫazannu. "City ruler," was often considered as a rank or class and the plural was formed with the *-ātu/-ūti/-ūte/-ūta* suffix. Nearly all instances have the predeterminative LÚ.MEŠ, which, if it was meant to be read, was in apposition and not construct. The nominatives are often in extraposition:

LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-tu* URU.MEŠ-*šu-nu* / *a-na ša-šu-nu* "As for the city rulers, their cities belong to them" (EA 125:33-34; also EA 118:45-46); *a-nu-ma* / [!] *ḥa-za-nu-tu ti-du-ku-[na šu]-nu* / URU-*la-nu* "Now, as for the city rulers. it is [th]ey who are attacking our city" (EA 130:31-33; Moran 1987b:349 n. 1; 1992:212 n. 1).

But sometimes they appear as subjects of a 3rd m.pl. verb:

ki-na-na ti-iq-bu-na / LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-tu*₄ "Thus the city rulers are saying" (EA 73:29-30; Youngblood 1961:116-117); *ù* LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-tu ú-ul* / *ti-iš-mu-na mi-im-ma* / *ù šap-ru a-na ša-a-šu* "but the city rulers don't hear anything but what they write to him" (EA 82:10-12; Albright and Moran 1948:243 n. 5).

In one passage, there seems to be an error in the case ending on a form dependent on *gabbi*:

ù gáb-bi LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-tu*₄ / *šal-mu-šu* "But all the city rulers are at peace with him" (EA 125:10-11).

One might read *gáb-bi* LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-tím*, but this is more likely a simple scribal error. Another possibility is that the scribe was thinking: *gabbi awīlūti ḥazzānūtu* "all the men, namely the city rulers."

A scribe from Amurru evidently construed the relationship to the predeterminative as construct rather than apposition. In spite of the broken context, the example seems clear:

[*am(?)-mi(?)-n*]_{i7} ^f*i*¹-[*k*]_a-[*a*]_z-*zi-bu-ni*₇ / [LÚ.MEŠ] *ḥa-za-nu-te*^{MEŠ}
a-na pa-ni-ka "[Wh]y do the city rulers lie to you?" (EA 62:39-40; Izre'el 1991a:II,12-13).

The oblique form with final *-e* (always expressed orthographically by the TE sign) appears in several other contexts, at least three of them clearly genitive/dependent in case:

gáb-bi LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-te* (EA 362:54); *ka-li* LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-te* (EA 73:24); *ka-li* LÚ²*ḥa-za-nu-te* (EA 212:8).

Two accusatives in which the term "city rulers" may be either accusative or genitive, depending on the relationship with the preceding LÚ.MEŠ, have the same form:

LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-te-ku*(sic!) (EA 230:9); LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-te-ka* (EA 230:17).

However, the examples with TE are outnumbered by those with TI, as seen by these dependent forms:

a-na ḥa-za-nu-ti (EA 89:57); *a-na* LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-ti* (EA 126:16); *i-n[a]* / *pa-ni* LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-ti* (EA 107:23-24); *iš-tu* LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-ti* (EA 77:25); *iš-t[u]* / *[k]a-li* LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-ti* "more than all the city rulers" (EA 124:37); *ki-ma* LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-ti* (EA 125:32; also EA 92:57); *gáb-bi* LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-zi-a-nu-ti* (EA 288:56).

The Jerusalem orthography LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-zi-a-nu-ti*, which is an Assyrian form (Moran 1975b:154), appears in contexts, some of which are broken, as accusatives (EA 285:19; 286:19) or as the subject of *yānu* (EA 287:24).

The somewhat surprising forms are the triptotic plural accusatives with final *-a*.

ù nu-da-bir₅ LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-ta iš-tu* / *lib-bi* KUR.KUR.KI "that we may drive out the city rulers from within the territories" (EA 74:34-35); *u a-mur-mi* / LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-ta*^{MEŠ} / *ša it-ti-ia* "But consider the city rulers who are associated with me" (EA 365:15-17; Moran 1987b:560; 1992:363).

nakru. Although the stative forms of the verb *nakāru* appear several times, there is only one nominative plural example of this stative adjective. It is of special interest, not only for its rarity in these texts, but also because it appears alongside the

predicative use of *nukurtu* with a plural subject (cf. *infra*, p. 181 for further discussion):

*ù li-pa-qa-ad KUR.KI-šu LUGAL la-a-mì / til-qú-ši LÚ.MEŠ
na-ak-ru-tu / i-nu-ma ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ia nu-kúr-tu a-na ia-ši-ia / a-na-ku
i-na-ša-ru URUKu-mì-di URU LUGAL / [E]N-ia* "May the king
pay attention to his land lest the enemies take it; while my
associates are hostile to me, I am guarding Kômidi, the city of
the king, my [lor]d" (EA 197:35-39).

pānū. Twice this plural substantive has the adjectival plural marker. One example of the dependent case is in an obscure context:

ia-nu [i]-na pa-nu-[t]e TÈŠ-ši-na "Their dignity is not in the
faces"(?) (EA 120:23; Moran 1987b:331 n. 13; 1992:200 n. 13).

The other instance is perfectly clear. Both the substantive and its modifying adjective have the masculine plural marker with an *-a* case ending. No better illustration of the triptotic nature of the *-ūt-* suffix could be found.

ù i-ia-nu-um pa-nu-ta₅ ša-n[u-]ta₅ / a-na ia-ši "But I have no other
intention" (EA 250:57-58).

rābiṣu. The Akkadian term for "commissioner" in the Egyptian administration is almost always written logographically, especially in the plural. One obscure passage has:

ʾa¹-[n]a [qa-at] / LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM-ut LUGAL be-ʾli¹[-ia] "i[n] the
[charge of] the commissioners of the king, [my] lo[r]d"
(EA 129:13-14; Moran 1987b:346 n. 6; 1992:210 n. 6).

The *-ut* sign is apparently an indication that one should read *rābiṣūt šarri*, a plural construct with zero case vowel. A fragmentary letter, evidently from ʿAbdi-Ashirta, has two identical readings in broken contexts: LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM-ʾti¹.

Since *rābišu* is an active participle, it can take the masculine plural ending of the adjective in Akkadian and this seems to be the case in the examples cited here even though the term is used as a title of office. Thus, at least two scribes construed the plural as *rābišūtu*.

šḥru "small." A triptotic adjectival m. pl. is attested in a Megiddo letter:

ù DUGUD \ *yu-ka-bi-id* / ŠEŠ.ĤÁ *šé-eh-ru-ta₅* "and he honors my junior colleagues" (EA 245:39-40).

šanû "another." This adjective has the masculine plural forms in *-ūtu* / *-ūte* / *-ūta*. The nominative example is decisive in the understanding of its context:

ša-ni-tam / *a-na mi-ni ti-iš-mu-na* / LÚ.MEŠ *ša-nu-tu*
"Furthermore, why should other men hear/be heard?"
(EA 108:50-52).

Moran (1987b:306; 1992:182) took the verb as 2nd m.s. with the imperfect energetic expressing a question. The LÚ.MEŠ *ša-nu-tu* would have to be in the accusative or at best in an adverbial case. The interpretation given above assumes that the verb is 3rd m.pl. and that LÚ.MEŠ *ša-nu-tu* is the subject. There are cases in which forms like *ti-iš-mu-na* are written by a scribe as an error for the G passive, which should have been *tu-uš-mu-na* (EA 74:50; Youngblood 1961:149). It would appear that Rib-Haddi did not want the king to get his information from other men, especially since they would probably give a report contrary to his own view.

The same intention on the part of Rib-Haddi is expressed in the passage containing a genitive plural:

la-a yi-iš-mé LUGAL *be-li* / *a-wa-te*^{MEŠ} LÚ.MEŠ *ša-nu-te* "May the king not heed the words of other men" (EA 362:48-49; Moran 1987b:557; 1992:360).

The most remarkable forms are the triptotic accusative masculine plurals with final *-a*. All three examples are in the same expression used in three different epistles, evidently by three different scribes. The sentences are negative existential clauses with *yânu* and its subject in the accusative plural:

ù a-nu-ma / i₁₅-na-an-na ia-nu / pa-ni ša-nu-ta₅ iš-tu / ur-ru-ud šâr-ri "And now there is no other intention except to serve the king" (EA 253:25-28); *šum-ma-mi / i-ia-nu pa-ni-ma / ša-nu-ta₅ i-na¹La-ab-a-ya* "Since there is no other intention to Lab³ayu" (EA 244:38-41); *ù i-ia-nu-um pa-nu-ta₅ ša-n[u-]ta₅ / a-na ia-ši* "But I have no other intention" (EA 250:57-58).

šāru / sarru "false, criminal, fraudulent." The phonetic problems pertaining to these vocables has been discussed elsewhere (cf. *supra*, pp. 45-46). Since a link between them cannot be easily denied, they will be treated together here. The plural of this normal Akkadian adjective, *sarru* "false, criminal" (CAD S:182), is employed only once in a Tyrian letter:

li-i-de₄ / LUGAL a-na LÚ.GÌR sa-ru-ti 'šu¹-nu-ta₅ "May the king be apprised concerning those treacherous soldiers" (EA 148:43-44).

The Amurru letters also use it: *LÚ.MEŠ sa-ru-tù* (EA 158:22); *[LÚ.MEŠ s]a-ar-ru-ú-tu₄* (EA 159:41); *a-na LÚ.[ME]Š sa-ar-ru-ti* (EA 160:30); *a-na LÚ.MEŠ sa-ar-ru-ti* (EA 161:7).

It is not so easy to distinguish between substantival and adjectival usage for this term. Two epistles from the northern Beqa^c Valley have what may be reckoned as substantival logograms, viz. *LÚša-ri^{MEŠ}* (EA 185:56; 186:54) and *LÚša-ru-ta^{MEŠ}* (EA 185:70).

In the ensuing discussion, all the plural forms of *šāru / šarru* will be treated together since they can practically all be construed as adjectives. As for the basic form, note *ša-a-ru-tu* in a broken context (EA 138:13). There are five other examples of the nominative:

i-na-na yu-qa-bu a-wa-tu / ša-ru-tu i-na pa-ni šār-ri "Now treasonous words are being spoken before the king" (EA 108:20-21); *a-mur ma-ā²-du / LÚ.MEŠ ra-i-mu-ia a-na lib-bi URU.KI / TUR LÚ.MEŠ ša-ru-tu i-na lib-bi-ši* "Behold, many are the men who support me within the city; few are the traitorous men within it" (EA 137:46-48); *ti₇-iq-bu-¹na¹ L[Ú.MEŠ] ¹ša¹-ru-¹tu¹ / [a-wa-te ša-ru-]te a-[na LUGAL] be-lí-ia* "Traacherous men have been saying [treacher]ous [things] t[_o the king] my lord" (EA 94:14-15; Moran 1987b:285; 1992:168); *[na-ak-ru] / LÚ.MEŠ ša-ru-tu iš-t[u LUGAL]* "The treacherous men [have rebelled] agai[nst the king]" (EA 124:47-48; Moran 1987b:337 n. 6; 1992:204 n. 6); *ti-de i-nu-ma LÚ.MEŠ / [š]a-ru-tu₄ šu-nu* "Know that they are traitorous men" (EA 102:31-32; Moran 1987b:296; 1992:175).

The five clear accusatives all have a final *-a* vowel and are thus triptotic.

a-wa-te ša-ru-ta aš-ta-pa-ru / a-na EN-ia ù ti-qa-bu a-na mi-ni / ti-iš-ta-pa-ru a-wa-te ša-ru-ta "Have I been writing treasonous words to my lord so that you say 'Why do you write treasonous words?'" (EA 117:29-31; cf. Moran 1987b:323; 1992:193); *ù yu-ša-am-ri-ir šār-ru / ^dUTU LÚ.MEŠ ša-ru-ta iš-tu / [li]b-bi KUR-šu* "And may the king, the sungod, expell the traitorous men from the land" (EA 103:30-32; Moran 1987b:298; 1992:176); *ù lu-[ú] / ni-du-bu-ur / LÚ.MEŠ ša-ru-ta iš-tu KUR šār-ri / EN-ia* "and we will expel the traitorous men from the land of the king, my lord" (EA 279:19-21); *u[l] i[q]-bu a-¹wa¹-ta₅ ša-ru-¹ta₅¹(!) m[i-i]m-ma / a-na LUGAL b[e-lí]-ia* "I do not speak any treacherous word to the king my l[ord]" (EA 94:7-8; collated 29.1.80); *ù yi-pu-šu ip-ša-ta₅ ša-r[u-t]a₅* "and he continued with his treacherous activities" (EA 131:36; Moran 1950a:46; 1987b:350; 1992:213; cf. also EA 138:115).

unūtu. The word for "utensil, implement," has as its plural in OB *uniātum*, *unētum* and *unātum* (AHw:1422b). But in MB peripheral the plural is *unūtu*, a form indistinguishable from the

singular. Thus it is treated here with the other forms having plurals in *-ūt-*. The contexts and the use of the postdeterminative MEŠ assure that all the forms discussed below are plurals.

The nominatives, even bound forms, all have a final *-u*.

ù ú-ul tu-wa-aš-ša-ru-na / ú-nu-tu^{MEŠ}-šu / qi-bi ù lu-ú / tu-wa-aš-ša-ru-na / ú-nu-tu^{MEŠ}-šu "But his accouterments are not being sent" (KL 72:600:9-13; Wilhelm 1982:123-124; Rainey 1976b:337-338); *a-na mi-ni⁷ ID¹? TAB-na / ú-nu-tu^{MEŠ}-nu* "Why are our accouterments . . . ?" (KL 76:600:22-23; Wilhelm 1982:127 n 22); *a-nu-ma tup-pí ša-nu / ù ka-li ú-nu-tu-ia / ša it-ti¹Ia-pa^dIŠKUR* "Now, here is my second tablet and all my moveable property that is with Yapa^c-Haddi" (EA 119:55-57; Rainey 1989-90:61a).

Note that in the last passage, *unūtūya* should have been in the dependent case governed by the bound form *kali*. The "second/other" tablet mentioned in EA 119:55 is evidently EA 120 and there is found the proper bound form in the same syntagma:

[ka-li] ú-nu-te ša i[t-ti] / [¹Ia-pa]-^dIŠKUR "[All] the moveable property that is w[ith] Yapa^c-Haddi" (EA 120:1-2); *a-nu-ma ka-li ú-nu-[t]e / a-na ma-ḥa[r] šār-[ri uš]-ši[-ir]-ti / [i-n]a [li]b-bi¹tup¹-pí* "Now all the moveable property [have] I se[nt] to the ki[ng] wi[th]in a 'tablet'" (EA 120:40-42).

The same final *-e* vowel marks the dependent case after prepositions on both the bound and the unbound form:

šap-ra-ti⁷-mì / 2-šu 3-šu UGU ú-nu-te / ¹Bi-ri-di-ya / a-na ka-ta⁵ "I have written two or three times to you about the accouterments of Biridiya" (KL 72:600:1-4); *[ù iš]-tu ú-nu-te ša i-ia-nu* "[And fr]om the implements that are not (available in Egypt)" (EA 34:26).

The accusative forms show a variety of vocalic endings. One has the expected Babylonian form with *-i*:

ša-ni-tam ù a-nu-ma / ú-nu-ti^{MEŠ} yu-ba-al LÚ.DUMU ši-ip-ri-ka
 "Furthermore, and now your ambassador has brought
 implements" (EA 34:18-19).

Another has the *-e*:

uš-ši-ir ú-n[u-]te-ši_x(ŠE) / a-na ša-ši_x(ŠE) "Send her implements
 to her" (EA 120:36-37).

And one has final *-a*:

[la]-qa-ḥu ú-nu-ta₅-šu-nu "They [to]ok their implements"
 (EA 287:36).

COMMODITIES. Some examples are found in which bulk commodities, written logographically, have either the collective or the plural marker: KÛ.BABBAR.ḪÁ "silver" (TT 1:11; EA 369:9; 371:32); GUŠKIN.ḪÁ "gold" (EA 369:9); GUŠKIN.MEŠ (EA 91:18); NINDA.ḪÁ "bread, food" (EA 287:16, 44); NINDA.MEŠ (EA 131:42, 45; 186:27; 226:16; 324:12; 325:16); KAŠ.MEŠ "drink" (EA 324:13; 325:16); IN.MEŠ "straw" (EA 325:17). Note especially the "Akkadogram" for "grain, barley," with frozen phonetic complement: ŠE-IM.ḪÁ (EA 85:10; 91:16); ŠE-IM.MEŠ (EA 224:8).

STATUS RECTUS — DECLENSION

The declinable state of nouns is fully operative in the EA texts from Canaan. This includes substantives, adjectives, nominal and adjectival verbal forms (infinitive and participle) and also the various relevant classes of pronouns discussed in the previous chapters. The case system common to Semitic languages is alive, evidently because not only the Akkadian dialect used by the scribes but also their WS mother tongue employed it. The question that arises is "What contribution do these texts make to the diachronic history of the case system in WS?" It is necessary, therefore, to present the evidence of the corpus under study in a

manner that will make the data available to students of WS linguistics.

On the basis of Knudtzon's transcriptions, it would be impossible to arrive at the real picture. This is particularly true with regard to feminine forms with the sign UD as their final syllable. Knudtzon assigned it the value *tú* according to the Neo-assyrian practice with which he was familiar from his previous work. By the time his edition was coming to completion, it was recognized that the same sign could and should be read *tam*, or in modern practice *ta₅* when the mimation was not expected. The error was recognized by Knudtzon himself (1915:980) after his transcriptions had gone to press (Böhl 1909:1 §1d, 33 §22d). The most glaring cases are the many accusatives such as *a-wa-ta₅* *a-ni-ni-ta* (EA 73:34').

As in all the post classical dialects (and already in late OB, including Mari, Jucquois 1966:260), mimation was disappearing in the Amarna letters. However, the scribes from Canaan were still aware of it and sporadic instances occur. Examples with the final *-um* sign are adverbial, not nominative, e.g. *a-nu-um-ma* (EA 141:39; *passim*), *ia-nu-um* (EA 92:21, 22) *mi-nu-um* (EA 126:14); *pa-na-nu-um* (EA 106:32). Dependent forms with final *-im* are rare, *i-na aš-ri an-ni-im* "in this place" (EA 187:11); the infinitive generally lacks mimation, the exception being *i-re-ši-im* (EA 74:19). One is hard pressed to find an accusative with final *-am*, *ip-ša an-na-am* "this deed" (EA 270:33); *šum-ma i-ia-nu ŠÀ ša-na-am* "since there is no other intention" (EA 136:41). The syllabic signs for closed syllables with final *-m* that served so often to represent the final syllable of forms with mimation, such as *lim*, *rum*, *tam* and *tum*, can usually be transcribed without the *-m*, viz. *li*, *rù*, *ta₅* and *tu₄*, respectively (for detailed discussion, cf. Jucquois 1966:260-262).

NOMINATIVE. The nominative case, marked by *-u(m)* for the singular and *-u/-ū* for the plural, is the normal predicative form, i.e. it stands as the subject and predicate of nominal clauses and as the subject of verbal clauses. The functionality of this case marker in the present corpus is easily demonstrated by examples

from a high frequency term such as *šarru* "king." The majority of instances have only the logogram LUGAL but on many occasions a phonetic complement is employed and in this present work, LUGAL is then transcribed *šār* for convenience (just as Knudtzon did for a construct form):

lu-ú i-de šār-ru "May the king be apprised" (EA 74:5); *šum[-m]a / a-na DAM-ia ša-pár šār-ru* "If the king should write for my wife" (EA 254:38-39).

Apparent exceptions to this scrupulous usage are found in the letter from some southern scribe (Na'aman 1979:676-677) who writes:

ù yi-il₅-ma-ad šār-ri EN-ia "So may *my* king, my lord, be apprised" (EA 64:8, also lines 14-15; EA 63:3; 65:7-8).

The combination *šār-ri EN-ia* is of extremely high frequency as a word pair in the dependent case. The scribe may have simply used them without distinction. Nevertheless, he has been given the benefit of the doubt in the translation above by assuming that he meant *šarrī* "My king." Another epistle from the same southern source has:

li-il-ma-ad šār-ru EN-ia "May the king, my lord, be apprised" (EA 366:11; also lines 17-18).

However, the Jerusalem scribe seems to have used "my king" as a sort of vocative, more precisely, as the subject of precative verb forms:

ù li-is-kín šār-ri a-na KUR-šu "May my king show concern for his land" (EA 287:13); *ù li-is-kín šār-ri a-na ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ta-ti* "and may my king show concern for the regular troops" (EA 287:17); *li-iš-al-mi / šār-ri LÚMAŠKÍM.MEŠ* "May my king ask the commissioners" (EA 287:33-34); *li-iš-al-mi šār-ri a-na ša-šu-[nu]* "May my king inquire concerning the[m]" (EA 287:43); *li-de₄-mi*

šār-ri "May my king be apprised" (EA 287:48); *li-de₄-mi šār-ri*
EN-ia "May my king, my lord, be apprised" (EA 287:57).

In parallel passages in another letter, the same scribe used LUGAL without a phonetic complement. So the examples from EA 287 could also be careless errors.

Byblos scribes usually handle these two vocables correctly as regards case:

li-il₅-ma-ad LUGAL *be-li* "May the king, my lord, be apprised" (EA 75:35); *ša-ni-tam a-ta-[ta] / la yu-šé-bi-la be-li a-na* ḪR-*šu* "Furthermore, if my lord should not have wor[d] sent to his ser[vant]" (EA 88:34-35; Moran 1987b:276 n. 9; 1992:161 n. 11); [*yu-š*]i-*[r]u be-li* ERÍN.MEŠ *ma-ša-a[r-ta]* "My lord will send garrison troops" (EA 131:6); *šum-ma* LUGAL *be-li / la-a yu-ša-ru* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ta₅* "If the king, my lord, does not send regular troops" (EA 362:9-10; also lines 7, 40, 42, 48, 51, 66).

In spite of his general consistency, the scribe of EA 362 does make one mistake:

ʿù¹ *yu-ša-am* LUGAL *be-li-ia* "So may the king, my lord, come forth" (EA 362:60-61).

The Byblos scribes are also fairly consistent with the ideographic EN-*li* "My lord" as nominative, as one of the conventional pair:

yi-iš-me šār-ru / EN-li "May the king, my lord, give heed" (EA 103:5-6; EA 75:7; 78:7; 81:6; 91:42);

or alone (EA 78:17; 79:13).

A gloss demonstrates the nominative case ending preserved before a pronominal suffix:

ù SAG.DU-*nu* \ *ru-šu-nu / i-na qa-te-ka* "And our head is in your hands" (EA 264:18-19).

An abundance of nominative plural forms have been cited in the previous section and need not be repeated here.

DEPENDENT (GENITIVE) CASE. It is certainly unnecessary to cite examples of the case ending *-i(m)* (plural *-i/i*). There can be no doubt that the Canaanite scribes were fully aware of its function as were most writers of peripheral Akkadian. In this present work, an attempt has been made to employ a more comprehensive term than the traditional "Genitive." The reason for this is that the case ending *-i* in Semitic languages denotes any nominal form dependent upon, or governed by a preceding vocable. When said vocable is another noun then the latter stands in its "construct" form and the main accent is on the governed word; the meaning is that the governed word is the genitive of the governing word, e.g. *awāt šarri* "word of the king" = "the king's word." However, the governing noun may also be one of those terms that also serves as a preposition such as (*w*)*arki*, in which case the governed word has the same *-i* suffix though the meaning is prepositional, e.g. *ar-ki* / ¹*A-zi-ri* "after Aziru" = "behind Aziru" = "in support of Aziru" (EA 98:6-7). Finally, words governed by other prepositions and particles also take the *-i* suffix, e.g. *ana šarri bēliya* "to the king, my lord." For this reason, it seems more appropriate to call the case marked by *-i* the dependent case and not just the genitive.

ACCUSATIVE. It is the accusative case that provides so much interesting material. It fulfills all the normal functions of Akkadian and there are a few examples of WS words as well.

The most common usage, of course, is as the direct object of a transitive verbal form, e.g.

i-pu-uš-mì / *nu-kúr-ta₅ i-na LÚ.MEŠ KUR Gi-na UGU da-ku-mì* / *LÚa-ba-nu* "Make war with the men of the land of Gina because they killed our father" (EA 250:16-18); *šār-ra EN-ia* / *i-ru-du* "I serve the king, my lord" (EA 250:58-59); *ti-il-qú URU-la^{KI}* "that they may take the city" (EA 137:80); *ù ia-di-cin* URU-*la Pu-ru-zi-li* / *a-na a-ša-bi-ia* "and may he gi(ve) the city Puruzili

for my dwelling" (EA 137:64-65); [šu-u]t LÚ ša-a yu-ba-ú / 'lum¹-na a-n[a E]N[-š]u šum-ma du-na du-na-ma / 'ú¹-ba-ú a-na-ku [a-n]a EN-ia "[H]e is the man who seeks evil fo[r] [h]is [lo]rd while it is only strength that I seek [fo]r my lord" (EA 109:53-55).

The object may be cognate to its governing verb:

i-nu-ma yu-l[a-mi-nu] / lum-na lum-na-ma a-na ia-[ši] "that he is committing grievous evil against me" (EA 113:12-13; also EA 116:41-42).

Some verbs take an infinitive as their direct object, in which case the latter is in the accusative case. The verbs attested in the corpus of EA letters from Canaan with an infinitive as object are as follows:

ù LÚ.MEŠ / *ħu*-<ub>-š*i*-ia pa-ṭá-ra-ma tu-ba-ú-na "But it is to desert that my yeoman farmers are seeking" (EA 114:21-22); šá-ni-tam šum-[ma] / ¹URU¹Gub-la ú-ba-ú ša-ba-ta "Furthermore, if he seeks to take (even) Byblos" (EA 88:21-22); ù a-na-ku la-a i-le-ú / a-la-ka₁₃ a-na til-la-ti / a-na ^{URU}Šu-mu-ra "And I am unable to go to the help of Šumur" (EA 105:29-31; also EA 102:17-19, 24-25; 104:36-39); ù ú-ul ni-le-ú / a-ša-am a-na EDIN.MEŠ "And we are unable to go forth to the open fields" (EA 88:20-21; Moran 1975a:156-157; also EA 81:21-22; 104:49-51); šá-ni-tam / š*i*-me-e ia-š*i* ħu-mi-ta₅ ki-ma / ar-ħi-iš ka-ša-da "Furthermore, listen to me! Make haste to arrive quickly!" (EA 102:29-31); mi-ia-mi yi-ma-gi-ir / ur-ru-ba it-ti ¹šár-ri EN-ia "Who would agree (dare?) to enter into the (presence of) the king, my lord?" (EA 283:10-11; Rainey 1989-90:71; *contra* Moran 1987b:505 n. 3; 1992:324 n. 5); mi-ia-mi yi-ma-lik i-zi-za [i]-na pa-ni / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭá-at LUGAL be-lí-ia "Who has dared to stand before the army of the king, my lord?" (EA 94:12-13; *contrast* Moran 1987b:285; 1992:168); ú-ul na-a[d-]nu-n[i i-r]e-ba "They didn't permit me to enter" (EA 138:58); uħ-ħu-ra-ta / a-ša "You were late coming forth" (EA 102:9-10).

Usually the object of an infinitive will follow it in these texts and be dependent upon it, i.e. as an objective genitive. But note the following object of an infinitive which has a possessive pronoun as its subjective genitive:

ša-ni-tam an-nu-ú iš-tu / ša-pa-ri-ka tu-pa a-na mu-ḫi-ia
 "Furthermore, behold, since your sending a tablet to me," i.e.
 "since you sent a tablet to me" (EA 256:29-30; cf. Moran
 1987b:484; 1992:309).

One of the remarkable features of the Canaanized EA texts is that the existential negative particle *yānu(m)* takes its subject in the accusative (Böhl 1909:72 §34f; Moran 1950a:14-15, 110 n. 23; Albright and Moran 1948:248 n. 28).

šum-ma ia-nu ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭá-ta₅ "If there is no army"
 (EA 129:49, also 30); *ia-nu-mi / mu-ta-na a-na KUR.MEŠ* "There is
 no epidemic in the territories" (EA 362:49-50); *ù ia-nu-um*
'mi¹-im¹-ma / ù i-nu-ma ia-nu-um LÚ.MEŠ ti-'la¹-nu¹-ta₅
 "that there are no supplies and that there is no support troop"
 (EA 92:21-22); *ia-nu / ḫa-za-na i-na ar-ki-ti-ia* "There is no
 city-ruler behind me" (EA 117:9-10); *ù i-ia-nu-um pa-'nu¹-ta₅*
ša-n[u]-ta₅ / a-na ia-ši "But I have no other intention"
 (EA 250:57-58); *[i]-ia-nu mi-im-ma / i-na 'É¹(?)-ia* "There are no
 supplies in my house(?)" (EA 316:18-19).

Finally, the adverbial accusative is very much in evidence in these texts. Some of the examples are WS though most are Akkadian. One true WS noun in pure adverbial accusative is *le-lá-ma* "evening" (EA 195:12-13). This is Canaanite **lél* (∗*layl-*) plus the accusative like Hebrew *laylā^h* (Sivan 1984:131); the same Canaanite vocable appears as a gloss, GI₆-ša \ 'le¹-la¹(?) (EA 243:13). An Akkadian adverb ending in *-ānumma* is glossed by a Canaanite adjective in the adverbial accusative, plus the enclitic particle, *-ma*, apparently by attraction from the *-ma* on the preceding Akkadian form: TIL.LA-*nu-um-ma* \ ḫa-*ia-ma* "alive" (EA 245:6). Another true WS noun serves as a preposition in

adverbial accusative, viz. *ta-aḥ-ta-mu* (EA 252:26). That form evidently has the old 3rd m.pl. pron. suffix with syncope < **taḥtāhimu* (Albright 1943b:32 n. 24). Note also the obscure accusative plural, *pa-ni-mu* "before them"(?) (EA 155:46; Sivan 1984:133) with the same suffix.

Some locative adverbs also seem to have the accusative ending plus some other element such as the enclitic *-mi* or the deictic *-k-*, viz. the interrogative *a-ia-mi* (EA 131:43) or *a-ya-mi* (EA 138:123) "where?" (cf. also *a-ia-ka-am*, EA 254:27) and the indefinite *a-ia-ka₄-mi* "(some)where" (EA 149:52-53).

A number of standard Akkadian adverbs occur in the accusative, especially the pair, *urra(m) u mūša(m)* "day(-light) and night." Mimiation is rare and when it occurs, it is only on one of the pair: *ur-ra* / [ù] *mu-ša-am* (EA 73:20-21); *mu-ša ur-ra-am* (EA 362:33). Now and then, *urra* is replaced by *ūma*, usually written ideographically; thrice we find UD.KÀM-*ma* (EA 292:24; 293:13; Izre³el 1978b:48). There is one combination of an accusative pl. adverb with a singular:

KIN.<NIM> *še-ri*^{MEŠ} / *u le-lá-ma* "morning(s) and evening"
(EA 195:12-13; CAD L:184a; AHw:121a).

One cannot be sure whether or not mimiation was in force on the adverb *ša-ni-tam*, so ubiquitous in these letters. Knudtzon had transcribed them *ša-ni-tú*, but Ebeling (1915: 1514) had correctly seen that the final sign was to be read *tam*. Albright (1943a: 15 n. 45) compared Hebrew adverbs such as *ḥinnām* and favored the preservation of the *-m* in the EA texts; Izre³el (1978b:67), noting MB readings such as *ša-ni-ta* (EA 7:76; AHw:1164), preferred the rendering *ša-ni-ta₅*. However, this adverb belongs to the Babylonian stock, which is an older dialect than MB, and its usage in the EA texts may be as an archaism. So, even though the question remains open, in this present work, *ša-ni-tam* has been arbitrarily adopted; there is a good chance that it is correct.

Support for the mimiation on *šanītam* is the adverb *kīam* "thus," also with an accusative suffix and mimiation, which appears

in the Canaanite texts as *ki-ia-am* (EA 250:15, *et al.*), and even *ki-i-ia-am* (EA 251:7).

Other substantives or adjectives in the adverbial accusative include ¹*ḥa¹-mu-tam* "promptly" (EA 285:29; Moran 1975b:155); *pa-na* "formerly" (EA 137:83; perhaps an error for *pa-na-⟨nu⟩*), and *ri-qú-tám* (EA 87:7), *ri-qú-tam* (EA 137:10) and *ri-qa-mi* (EA 137:21) meaning "empty(-handed)" (cf. Heb. *rêqām*; Albright 1950:387; Youngblood 1961:87; *AHw*:998b). Once an adverbial accusative is employed along with another adverbial complement that takes the form of a locative adverb:

ù pu-ia a-wa-te^{MEŠ} aq-bu / a-na šār-ri ki-ta-ma "and from my mouth I speak words to the king truthfully" (EA 107:10-11; cf. Moran 1987b:304; 1992:180-181).

There, in fact, the accusative *kitta(m)ma* bears the enclitic *-ma* for special emphasis, "It is *truthfully* that I speak words from my mouth to the king" (cf. Rainey 1976a).

Note the temporal use of an adverbial accusative with repetition and enclitic *-ma* for emphasis:

ša-at-ta ša-ta-ma "year by year" (EA 38:11; Böhl 1909:71, §34; also EA 33:27, 31).

This may be compared with a similar text having an adverbial accusative to express time:

¹*šum¹-ma* MU.KÀM *an-ni-ta / [i]a-nu ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ta / [ù] GA.KAL a-di / [da-r]i-ti* "[I]f this year there is no army, [then] he will be entrenched for[ev]er" (EA 93:25-28; Moran 1950a:161; also EA 117:56; 129:49).

Once the accusative is used with *ubāna*, literally "(by) a finger's breadth,"

¹*ú¹-ba-na la-a* GAZ \ *de₄-¹ka¹-¹ti¹* "I was almost killed" (EA 287:73).

The usual practice in this idiom is to place the adverb in the *status absolutus*, evidently because it is not just the name of a member of the body, but also the name of a standard measure of width (cf. *infra*, pp. 178-179).

One isolated example may represent an adverbial accusative ending intentionally carried over to a feminine plural:

a-di da-ri-ia-ta "forever" (EA 294:35).

CONFUSION OF CASES. The impression has been that the case system in Canaanite is in the process of breaking down during the Amarna period and that evidence to that effect is abundant in the EA letters. The evidence assembled above belies this assumption, especially the specific functions of the accusative. Nevertheless, there are errors in the marking of cases which cannot be ignored. The few examples assembled below would suggest that they are by and large simple scribal errors. The main cause for such mistakes was most likely the graphic medium, viz. the very complex cuneiform script. The tendency to treat most vocables as logograms (Akkadograms) must have been at work as well. Note, e.g., the many singulars marked as plurals by addition of the Sumerian postdeterminatives (*supra*, pp. 139-140).

Here and there one finds mistakes like the following (for misuse of the nominative near demonstrative, cf. *supra*, pp. 94-95):

ù yu-ba-ú / [*la*]-*qa ka-li* URU.MEŠ *šar-ru* dUTU "and he seeks to [ta]ke all the towns of the king, the sungod" (EA 76:12-13); *ù a-nu-um-ma a-na-an-šár* / URUŠur-ri URU *ra-bi-tu* / *a-na* LUGAL *be-li-ia* "and now I am guarding Tyre, the great city, for the king" (EA 147:61-63).

Misunderstandings could arise with regard to the collective pronouns, e.g.

ù gáb-bi LÚ.MEŠ *ha-za-nu-tu₄* / *šal-mu-šu* "But all the city rulers are at peace with him" (EA 125:10-11); *ka-li a-wa-ta₅* / LUGAL

bé-li-i<a> / iš-te-mu "All the word(s) of the king, m<y> lord, I am obeying" (EA 212:12-14).

In each case the scribe has evidently ignored the construct relationship that is supposed to constitute the connection between *gabbi* and *kali* (both of them bound forms) and has applied the case ending appropriate to the status of the entire phrase. The first passage is a nominal clause in which "all the city rulers" are the subject, thus *ḥa-za-nu-tu*₄. The second example is a verbal clause in which "all the words" are the direct object. The plurality of *a-wa-ta*₅ might be questioned on the grounds of orthography but it has been observed above that plurals in *-āt-* are often triptotic. On the other hand, singular bound forms sometimes have preserved their case endings.

Another source of apparent errors are logographic writings with frozen phonetic complements (cf. Moran 1950a:110 n. 23). E.g., the subject of *yānu* should be in the accusative (cf. *supra*, p. 167) but logograms do not always follow this rule:

ia-nu-um LÚ-LUM "There is no man" (EA 69:23); *ia-[nu]* / LÚ-LIM (EA 74:33); *ia-nu É-TI ḥa-za-ni* / [k]i-ma šu-a-ta "There is no city ruler's palace [I]ike that one" (EA 89:49-50); *ù ia-nu* / [ŠE-I]M a-na a-ka-li-šu-nu "but there is no [gra]in for them to eat" (EA 105:84-85); *mu-ta-nu-ú* [UGU]-¹ḥi¹ / LÚ.MEŠ-Ú "a plague against people?" (EA 96:12-13).

One of the examples, *bīti ḥazāni*, may simply have a false anaptyctic vowel on the analogy of ¹ḥi¹-šī-¹iḥ¹-ti LUGAL "necessities of the king" (EA 111:24); *nu-kūr-ti*₇ LÚ.MEŠ S[A].GAZ "the hostility of the *apīru* men" (EA 243:20). Proof that the last example cited above is truly a frozen logogram may be deduced from the several instances of ŠE-IM.MEŠ (EA 224:8) and ŠE-IM.ḤÁ (EA 83:23; 85:18, 24, 35; 9:16).

Another possible source of confusion would be the variant practices with regard to the connection between predeterminatives such as LÚ.MEŠ and ERÍN.MEŠ and their specific substantives. Sometimes it is a matter of construct, so that

the generic LÚ.MEŠ or ERÍN.MEŠ were construed as bearing the case while the specific term was dependent upon it and thus in the genitive. In other instances, the relation between the generic and the specific term was one of apposition so that the proper case ending was borne by the latter. Numerous illustrations of these two syntagmas have been given in the preceding sections.

BOUND FORMS

Substantives in the Semitic languages can assume a bound form either followed by another substantive in the dependent (genitive) case or with the appendage of a possessive pronominal.

AKKADIAN FORMS. In most nominal constructions, Akkadian substantives in the bound form lose their case vowel and have either -Ø suffix or an epenthetic vowel. Naturally, such forms are attested in the EA letters from Canaan.

Note the following masculine singular nominatives with -Ø suffix:

a-nu-ma / di-nu an-nu-ú di-in₄ ki-ti-ia "Now, this case is a case of my loyalty" (EA 119:44-45); *ša-ni-tam da-mi-iq-mi / a-na pa-ni* LUGAL BE-ia *i-pí-iš / ʾIR-A-ši-ir-ti* UR.GI₇ "Furthermore, is the deed of ʿAbdi-Ashirta, the dog, pleasing in the sight of the king, my lord?" (EA 84:6-8).

The Jerusalem scribe also formed the singular construct of *ipšu* by adding the epenthetic vowel as suffix instead of inserting it between the second and third radicals:

a-mur ip-ša an-ni-ú ip-ši ¹Mil-ki-DINGIR / *ù ip-ši* DUMU.MEŠ *La-ab-a-ya* "Consider the deed! This is the deed of Milkili and the deed of the sons of Labʾayu" (EA 287:29-30; Moran 1987b:511; 1992:328).

Note also an example of *šāru* "wind, breath" from Tyre with epenthetic -i:

ša-ri / šār-ri ú-ul ti-na-mu-uš / iš-tu mu-ḥi-nu "May the breath of the king not depart from us" (EA 100:36-38).

Feminine singular bound forms with $-\emptyset$ suffix are also widely attested:

ACCUSATIVE — *a-wa-at* ÌR-šu "his servant's word" (EA 131:39; 234:11; 301:16); *a-wa-at* / LUGAL "the word of the king" (EA 144:13-14); *a-wa-at* / *ka-az-bu-ti₇* "a word of falsehood" (EA 362:52-53); GENITIVE — *i-na ša-me* / *a-wa-at* LUGAL EN-*ia* "on hearing the words of the king, my lord" (EA 144:17-18); *gáb-bi* / [*a*]-*wa-at šār-ri* "every word of the king" (EA 330:12).

Other feminines built on the feminine marker $-t$ instead of $-at$, have an epenthetic $-i$, in place of the $-\emptyset$; note the following:

NOMINATIVE — *ù a-nu-um-ma* ¹*da*¹-*a*[*n-na-a*]t / *nu-kúr-ti₇* LÚ.MEŠ S[A].GAZ / *i-na* KUR.KI "And now str[on]g is the hostility of the *apīru* men in the land" (EA 243:19-21; Rabiner 1981:92, §5.1.1.1.2); ACCUSATIVE — *ù la-a a-kal-li* / *e-ri-iš-ti₇* LÚ¹*ra-bi-ší-ia* "and I have not withheld my commissioner's request" (EA 254:14-15); *ki-i₁₅ la-a* / *ip-pi-šu ši-pí-ir-ti šār-ri* "How could I not carry out the king's demand?" (EA 254:45-46); GENITIVE — ÌR *ki-ti šār-ri* "the loyal servant of the king" (EA 242:5); BROKEN — ¹*ḥi*¹-*ši-¹iḥ*¹-*ti* LUGAL "the king's requirements" (EA 111:24).

An analogy to the forms listed above may be the following example where the word for "house" stands as subject of the negative existential particle, *yānu*, and should be in the accusative. The epenthetic $-i$ vowel has no grammatical force:

ia-nu É-ti ḥa-za-ni / [*k*]i-*ma šu-a-ta* "There is no city governor's house like that one" (EA 89:49-50; Moran 1950a:110 n. 23;).

Older dialects varied in the choice of bound forms for "hand" between $-\emptyset$ and others with epenthetic $-i$. Both of these alternatives are attested in this corpus:

ACCUSATIVE — *ta-an-šu-ku* / *qà-ti LÚ-lì* "they will bite the hand of the man" (EA 252:18-19); *u <yu>-uš-ši-ra* / \ *qa-at-šu* LUGAL EN-*ia* / *'it¹-ti-ia* "and may the king, my lord, send his hand to me" (EA 299:19-21; Izre'el 1976:51 §5.1.2.3; 1977:163; Moran 1987b:529 n. 1; 1992:341 n. 1); GENITIVE — *iš-tu qa-at šàr-ri* "from the king's hand" (EA 79:29; *et passim*); *i-na qa-ti¹A-taḥ-ma-ia* "by the hand of Atahmaya" (EA 364:12-13; *et passim*).

With possessive suffixes, the accusative marker *-a* may appear on some forms with the feminine marker *-t* in lieu of the \emptyset , e.g.

dNIN *ša URUGub-la ti-din* / *ba-aš-ta-¹ka¹ i-na pa-ni* / *šàr-ri* EN-*ia*
 "May the Lady of Byblos establish your honor before the king,
 your lord" (73:4-6)

The word "father" preserves the case endings before suffixes as in standard Akkadian:

NOMINATIVE — LÚ*a-bu-nu* (EA 250:14), LÚ*a-bu-šu-ni* (EA 250:8);
 GENITIVE — LÚ*a-bi-nu* (EA 250:41); ACCUSATIVE — LÚ*a-ba-nu*
 (EA 250:18).

WEST SEMITIC INFLUENCE. Two purely WS vocables show the case vowel before possessive suffixes:

NOMINATIVE — *ru-šu-nu* "our head" (EA 264:18); ACCUSATIVE —
ta-aḥ-ta-mu "beneath them" (EA 252:26).

That testimony to the preservation of case vowels before possessive suffixes in the WS mother tongue of the scribes provides the most likely explanation of some Akkadian substantive forms in these texts on which the case marker is also maintained in spite of the normal Akkadian elision. Similar interference of the WS native tongue on the language of the Akkadian texts of Ugarit has been widely discussed (Huehnergard 1989:152-154; van Soldt 1991:421-423 n. 46).

One member of the following word pair preserves the case vowel before suffixes and this may have influenced the other word:

an-nu-ú ar-nu-ia / ù an-nu-ú / 'hi¹-tú-ia "Behold my crime and behold my sin" (EA 253:18--20).

CAD H/211a takes both forms as plurals. Those two forms can be compared with an accusative,

ti-de pa-ar-ša-ia "you know my behaviour" (EA 73:39).

Normal Akkadian would have had *arnī* and *paršī*.

Preservation of the case vowel on substantives in construct with a following genitive also appear here and there. They are reminiscent of similar phenomena in the Akkadian texts from Ugarit (Huehnergard 1981; 1987c:300-301; 1989:149-152; van Soldt 1991:421-423 n. 46), which surely reflect the fact that bound forms in Ugaritic still carried their case endings as in Classical Arabic (Sivan 1988). Examples of Akkadian singulars with case endings on the bound form in the EA texts from Canaan are:

NOMINATIVE — *ù la-a / ka-ši-id a-wa-tu / LUGAL EN-ia a-na ÌR-šu* "But the word of the king, my lord, has not reached his servant" (EA 136:21-23; cf. also EA 155:46); ACCUSATIVE — *ù-bal a-ma-ta₅ LUGAL be-li-ia* "I bear the command of the king, my lord" (EA 147:40); *ù la-a iš-te-mé a-ma-ta₅ LUGAL be-li-šu* "but if he ignored the command of the king, his lord" (EA 147:45; 323:19-20); GENITIVE — *a-di ka-ša-di LUGAL EN-ia* "until the arrival of the king, my lord" (EA 227:14); *a-na na-ša-ri / KUR.'HÁ¹ LUGAL* "to protect the lands of the king" (EA 60:12-13; Izre'el 1991a:118, §3.3.1.2.1).

GOVERNING CLAUSES. There are a few examples of a substantive in the construct form governing a clause (GAG:219, §166). Note two examples with *ipšu*, each with a different placement of the epenthetic vowel. In the first example, the

construct form is also the subject of the passive verb in the dependent clause; in the second, the construct is the object of the transitive verb in the dependent clause.

ù k[i-i] i-pí-iš / yu-pa-šu a-na LÚ-[i]i ša a-ši-b a-na URU.KI-šu / yu-pa-šu ia-a-ši "and just as is done to a ruler who resides in his own city should be done unto me" (EA 138:73-75; Moran 1987b:363; 1992:222); *ù l[i-i]i¹-d[e₄] šàr-ru EN-ia / [DI]N[GIR-i]a dU[TU]-ia i[p-š]i i-pu-uš / ¹A-ma-an-ḥa-at-pí LÚ^{URU}Tu-šu-ul-ti^{KI} / UGU [U]RU.DIDLI.ḪÁ.KI šàr-ri EN-ia* "M[ay] the king, my lord, [m]y [g]o[d], my sun[*god*], be 'apprised of' the d[ee]d that Amanḥatpe, the ruler of Tushultu, committed against the [c]ities of the king, my lord" EA 185:9-12; Moran 1987b:421, 423 n. 3; 1992:265, 266 n. 4).

A temporal nuance may be realized by constructions with *ūmu* "day" in the bound form governing a clause depicting action that took place in the past or in the future:

i-na UD aš-mé "When I heard" (EA 364:21; note the absence of the Akkadian subjunctive); *iš-tu u₄-mi uš-ši-i[r-ti] / ṭup-pa an-na-am* "from the day (note singular) I sent this tablet" (EA 237:19-20); *ṛa¹-ṛmur¹-mi a-na ú-mi tu-šú / ù i-né-pu-ša-at gáb-bi / KUR.MEŠ a-na LUGAL be-li-ia* "Look, on the day when you come forth, then will be turned back all the lands to the king, my lord" (EA 362:62-64; this context demonstrates that the verb has to be future, Moran 1950a:77, 102).

Note the following noun phrase in extraposition:

ù LÚ la yu-ra-du / LUGAL yi-ra-ru-šu "But as for the man who does not serve, the king will anathematize him" (EA 193:17-18).

Four examples employ the construct of *awātu* to govern a dependent clause. The *awāt* is actually the logical direct object of a transitive verb of speaking or saying in the respective dependent clauses:

a-na KUR.ĤÁ *A-mur-ri a-wa-at-mi / ti-iš-te₉-mé iš-tu aš-ra-[n]u-u[m] / t[ú]-te-ra-am a-na ia-a-ti* "concerning the territories of Amurru, whatever word that you have heard from there, you must report to me" (EA 145:24-26; cf. Moran 1987b:376; 1992:231); *ù a-wa-at yi-qa-bu / šār¹-ru EN-ia iš-te₉-mu* "and whatever word the king, my lord will speak, I will heed" (EA 250:60; Moran 1987b:476; 1992:304); *ù yu-te-ru- / na-ni šār-ru be-lí-ia / a-wa-at yu-te-ru-na / ù a-na a-wa-at / šār-ri iš-mu* "and the king, my lord, will reply to me whatever word that he wishes to reply and I will obey the word of the king" (EA 251:11-15; Moran 1987b:478; 1992:305); *a-wa-at ul-te-bi-la / LUGAL EN-ia DINGIR.MEŠ-ia / dUTU-ia a[-n]a ia-ši / a-nu-um-ma i-šu-ši-ru-šu \ a-na 'LUGAL' EN-ia / dUTU iš-tu AN^{sa-me}* "As for the word which the king, my lord, my deity, my sungod, sent [to] me, now I am preparing it for the king, my lord the sungod from heaven" (EA 267:9-14; Moran 1987b:492; 1992:315).

Those sentences apparently led to a hypercorrection on the part of a few scribes by which the bound form of *awātu* was employed to govern a dependent clause which itself is introduced by the determinative pronoun *ša* in its function as relative pronoun!

[a]-wa-at ša iš-tap-pár / [LUGAL] EN-ia dUTU / [iš-t]u AN^{sa-me} a-na ia-ši / [a-nu-]ma i-šu-ši-ru-šu / [a-na LUGA]l EN-ia / [dUTU i]š-tu / [AN]^{sa-me} "As for [the w]ord that [the king,] my lord, the sungod [fro]m heaven, has written to me, [no]w I am preparing it [for the kin]g, my lord [the sungod f]rom heaven" (EA 278:9-15); *[iš-]te-mé a-wa-at / ša iš-pu-ur LUGAL EN-ia / a-na ĩR-šu* "[I] have heard the word which the king, my lord, wrote to his servant" (EA 293:8-10).

STATUS ABSOLUTUS

The unique Akkadian predicative state of nouns, the *status absolutus*, is not usually a major factor in the peripheral Akkadian

of the Late Bronze Age. Vocatives in the Levant are in *status rectus*, usually with a possessive pronoun:

be-lí um-ma URUTù-ni-ip LÚÏR-ka "My lord, the message of Tunip, your servant" (EA 59:5, 18; also EA 51:r. 3, 5; *et al.*); EN-li-mi a-na LÚ.MEŠ sa-ar-ru-ti / [š]a [i]-[ká]l-lu-ú-ni₇ kàr-ši-ia / a[-na pa-n]i EN-ia la te-še-em-mé "My lord, don't listen to the traitorous men who are slandering me before the king, my lord" (EA 161:30-32).

The scribes from Canaan probably learned the "administrative" usages of the *status absolutus*, for numerals and measures, etc. Clear examples are hard to find because of the logographic nature of most lists of commodities, etc.

The use of *ištēn* "one" in the *status absolutus* is evidenced in several of Shuwardata's letters:

šum-ma 1-en GU₄ "or one ox" (EA 280:27; or construct?); *a-na-ku 1-en i-ba-ša-ti* "I am the only one" (EA 282:9; 283:21; 284:9).

Emphasis on a locative is found in one of the Taanach letters:

ŠEŠ at-ta / ù na-ra-mu i-na aš-ri šu-wa-at "You are a brother and beloved in *that* place" (TT 2:3-4; Glock 1983:60 n. 25, who did not understand the possibility of *status absolutus*).

Adverbs in the *status absolutus* are of particular interest. Such a formal grammatical category is not at all typical of WS; the examples treated here evidently derive from the repertoire of Akaddian adverbs known to the WS scribes of the EA tablets. Some examples may be built on analogy of other, more frequent forms.

Reference was made *supra*, p. 170, to an accusative use of *ubāna* (EA 287:73). Two other EA examples and one from Ugarit (AHw:1399a) adopt the *status absolutus*, *ú-ba-an* (EA 264:8, 12; 273:22; Nougayrol 1956:222. RS 17.383:33). In these passages, *ubān*

serves as an idiom: "(by a) finger (width)," i.e. "(by an) inch," meaning "scarcely, barely." The fact that *ubānu* is also the technical name for a measure must explain the use of the absolute form (GAG:79, §62d).

Where one might object to an absolute form, such as with *šaddaqadim* "last year" (AHw:1123), the Tyrian scribe writes MU-*qá-dì* (EA 149:74) and in another line *ša-an-dì-qá-dì-ma* (EA 149:27), both dependent on *ištu*. It appears that the final *-m*, originally a radical of the second component (*qadmu*, AHw:891b; CAD Q:295), was dropped as if it were only mimation (although the second instance is ambiguous).

There is also the commonplace *inanna* (*in + anna*; GAG:163, §113n) and once simply *ù an-na* (EA 117:19), which might be an error for *ù an-nu*. WS texts show a preference for *ma-gal* instead of *danniš*. Whatever the derivation of *magal* may be (CAD M/1:28-31), it evidently was understood as being in *status absolutus*.

Finally, there is the unique *tu-ma-al* (EA 362:14, 16) instead of the usual OA and OB *ti-ma-li-(ma)* (AHw:1359b). One would be tempted to see here a Canaanite variant except for two important points: (1) the *status absolutus* itself, which is not a WS feature, and (2) the *-ā-* vowel in the second syllable — a true Canaanite form would have to be **tumôl* › *temôl* › *ʔeṯmôl*, as in Hebrew. Such a Canaanite form would have been written **tu-mu-ul*, or perhaps **ti-mu-ul*. Therefore, *tu-ma-al* must be an attempt to reproduce an Akkadian form. As an indicator of time, the *status absolutus* might have seemed a logical formation in the eyes of a Canaanite scribe. It may be a matter of chance, but Akkadian *timālu* does not seem to be attested among Akkadian dialects in the *status absolutus* (AHw:1359b-1360a).

Status absolutus was obviously known to the scribes of the EA texts from Canaan. But it is sufficiently rare in this corpus to show that such a morphosyntactic status was foreign to them. The various adverbial expressions in which the *status absolutus* is employed were probably learned as such. The same would most likely be true of numerals, weights and measures. The absence of vocatives in the *status absolutus* strengthens this impression.

PREDICATION

Since the Canaanite scribes do not make much use of the *status absolutus*, it is necessary to make a few observations about the predicate function of substantives and adjectives. Substantives can, of course, be the predicate of non-verbal clauses, e.g.

a-na-ku IR *ki-ti-ka* "I am your loyal servant" (EA 108:22; Gianto 1990:22); *i-nu-ma a-bu ù be-lu at-ta-ma / a-na ia-ši* "since it is you who is father and lord to me" (EA 73:36-37; Gianto 1990:25, 27-28; Rainey 1989-90:334).

As the above examples demonstrate, this same function is shared with pronouns.

On the other hand, the employment of substantives in the permansive (stative) is almost unknown in these texts. One noteworthy exception is a learned expression found in a Jerusalem letter:

lu-ú a!-mi-la-tu-nu "Be ye men!" (EA 289:26; *AHw*:90b; *CAD* A/2:54b; Rainey 1989-90:71b; *contra* Moran 1975b:162 n. 42; 1987b:518-519 n. 3; 1992:333 n. 3).

This idiom is well attested in older Akkadian and was evidently learned by the Jerusalem scribe as part of his peculiar northern training.

Adjectives, particularly those derived from stative verbs, do appear in the stative and as such they simply reflect the normal suffix conjugation pattern of the stative verb. In contrast, one may note the declined adjective (nominative) as predicate in one clause followed by the stative in another:

i-nu-ma qa-bi₄ a-na pa-ni LUGAL / a-n[a U]RU.KI URU-lu-mi dan-na-tu / la dan-na-at a-na pa-ni / ERÍN.MEŠ LUGAL be-li-ia
 "Although it may be said in the king's presence concerning th[e c]ity, 'The city is strong,' it will not be strong in the face of

the troops of the king, my lord" (EA 137:100-103; Moran 1987b:359; 1992:218).

Here one must take note of the permansive use of the ubiquitous substantive *nukurtu*. The stative form of *nakāru* is fully functional in these texts (e.g. EA 298:23; 98:5, 10, 335:16; 137:67; 256:22; *et al.*). Nevertheless, there are a number of cases in which *nukurtu* is apparently being used as a logogram for the verbal stative:

ù ka-li KUR.KUR.MEŠ nu-kúr-tu₄ a-na ša-šu "And all the territories are hostile to him" (EA 73:36); *i-nu-ma nu-kúr-tu₄ ¹A-zi-ru / it-ti-ia* "because Aziru is hostile to me" (EA 126:9-10); *¹E-ta-ga-ma pa-wu-ri / URUQí-id-ši ù / ¹A-zi-ra nu-kúr-tu₄ / it-ti ¹Bir₅-ia-wa-zi / nu-kúr-tu₄* "Etakkama, the prince of Kedes and Aziru are at war; with Biryawaza they are at war" (EA 151:59-63; contrast Moran 1992:238; 1987b:386).

That the vocable *nu-kúr-tu₄* in the above passages may have been utilized here as a logogram is suggested by three considerations. One is the fact that it is indeclinable. The first example, with feminine plural subject, might be taken as a 3rd f.s. collective adjective. But in the second passage, the subject is 3rd m.s., Aziru. In the third example, the subject is plural, consisting of two personal names.

Another factor is the use throughout of the standard logogram for the verb and related forms, viz. KÚR (Knudtson's *kur*). Finally, there are some other instances where the orthography is apparently defective, viz. *nu-kúr* or perhaps *nu-KÚR* (= *nuKÚR*):

al-lu-mi / DUMU.MEŠ ¹IR-A-ši-ir-ta nuKÚR / a-na LUGAL "Behold, the sons of 'Abdi-Ashirta are hostile to the king" (EA 118:28-30; Moran 1987b:326; 1992:196); *ka-li KUR.MEŠ nuKÚR a-na ia-ši* "A[II] the territories are hostile to me" (EA 130:43; Moran 1987b:348; 1992:212); *[nu-]KÚR KUR.MEŠ A-mur-ri* "[Ho]stile are the lands of Amurru" (EA 179:19).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Unlike the situation with the verbal system, the construction of noun forms and their usages in Akkadian and in the local WS dialect(s) were fairly identical. The main glaring difference in morphology (part from the lexicon) was the masculine plural suffixes. The evidence from the EA texts is scant in comparison with that in the syllabic texts from Ugarit (Sivan 1984:108, §2.1; Huehnergard 1989:147-148). There are very few illustrations of the independent suffixes *-ûma* and *-îma*. Furthermore, the feminine plurals with Akkadian *-ātu/-āti* plus the triptotic *āta*, prevail and there is no hint of the "Canaanite" forms with *-ôtu/-ôti*. One cannot argue from instances such as *a-bu-tu-ka* (EA 109:8), *et al.*, for a Canaanite form in *-ôtu-* since the plural *abbūtu* is also known in contemporary Alalakh and in EA outside of the southern ("Canaanite") area (CAD A/1:72b).

Another interesting factor is the tendency to use singular forms of substantives with logographic markers of the plural (MEŠ, ḪÁ, DIDLI, in various combinations). It is hard to believe that the scribes used such constructions in a spoken language. How would they differentiate between singular and plural? They would hardly pronounce MEŠ or ḪÁ! Therefore, the notation of plural substantives appears to furnish an argument in favor of a more widely used written code than for a spoken language.

The case system, especially for singulars, is practically the same in Akkadian and in WS. This has been demonstrated for Ugaritic and shows up in the EA texts as well (cf. discussion *supra*, pp. 161-172). The frequent preservation of case vowels on the singular bound forms seems to reflect WS influence. The accusative for the subject of the negative existential particle, *yānu*, is foreign to Akkadian and must represent WS speech.

The use of text glosses and of logographic writings also suggests a language used more for writing than for speaking. Of course native speakers of Akkadian used many Sumerian logograms but they were not in the habit of glossing them with an Akkadian word.

CHAPTER VIII

NUMERALS AND NUMERICAL NOUNS

The corpus of EA letters from Canaan has a limited number of numerical expressions. The numerals themselves are used sparingly inasmuch as the texts contain very few lists of commodities. When there are such lists, the numerals are written logographically as is customary in cuneiform writing. The ordinals and fractions are barely attested. Of special interest for the study of the WS influences in the interlanguage employed are the syntactic usages of some of the numeric vocables, especially the words for "every, all."

CARDINAL NUMBERS

The actual numbers are rarely employed in syllabic spellings or even with phonetic complements on their respective logograms. The following citations will illustrate the use of the cardinal numerals in these texts.

ištēn. The numeral "one" is always written DIŠ, often with a phonetic complement, conventionally transcribed here *1-en*. It is never inflected for case, i.e. it is always in *status absolutus*. The normal attributive position is before the thing being counted, as in a list of items: *1-en* GIŠ^r*ir-šu* "one bed" (EA 34:20). This format is reflected in the highly rhetorical passage from Shuwardata:

šum-ma el-teḡ-qé LÚ / ù *šum-ma 1-en* GU₄ / ù *šum-ma* ANŠE *iš-tu*
/ *mu-ḫi-šu* "If I have taken a man or even one ox or a donkey
from him!" (EA 280:26-29).

On the other hand, the placement of the numeral after the item being counted, done for emphasis in normal Akkadian, is attested several times in the letters:

ù *mi-ia-mì a-na-ku* / UR.GI₇ 1-en ù / *la-a ì-la-ku* "But who am I, some dog, that I would not go?" (EA 201:14-16; and also EA 202:12-14; 247:14-16); ù *ra-aš-pa-ti₇* \ *b[a-n]i-t[i]* / É 1-en URU *Ma-an-ḥa-ti₇ šum-šu* "and I have rebuilt a certain place, Manḥatu by name" (EA 292:29-30; Izre'el 1978b:28, §4.1.1); LÚ <1>-en *da-a-kà* / ù LÚ *en¹* (sic!) *la[-qá]* "One man he has killed, and another man he has captured" (EA 154:19-20).

Note the variation in the placement of the numerals "one" and "twelve" in the following narrative passage:

ù *na-da-[a]n* / [¹T]*a-aḥ-ma-ya* / GAL 1-en KÚ.GI / ù 10+2¹ *ta-pal* TÚG.GADA.MEŠ "And [T]aḥmaya has given a golden goblet and twelve sets of linen garments" (EA 265:10-13; Moran 1987b:491 nn. 2-3; 1992:314 nn. 2-3).

The predicative use of *ištēn* with the stative of the verb "to be" is especially noteworthy:

a-na-ku 1-en *i-ba-aš-ša-ti* "I am alone" (EA 282:9; 283:21; 284:8-9);
or "I alone remain."

šina. The use of the logogram for "two" MIN as the dual marker has been discussed in the previous chapter (cf. *infra*, pp. 136-139). Unlike normal Akkadian the MIN always precedes the thing being marked as dual. The function of MIN as a cardinal or as a unit in higher numbers such as 12 (EA 265:13) or 42 (EA 34:22) is in standard form.

Note the following entries in a list of items sent from Alashia:

ù 2 ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ / . . . ù 2 *ku-ši-ti* GADA "and two horses . . . and two linen robes" (EA 34:22-23; Moran 1987b:198; 1992:106).

One possible example of the numeral spelled syllabically is in the following difficult text:

a-mur URUGub-li URU-lu^{KI} *ši-na* / *ma-ad mi-im* LUGAL *a-na lib-bi-ši* "Behold, as for the city of Byblos, the city of (the) two, great is the property of the king within it" (EA 137:73-74; cf. Moran 1987b:358, 361 n. 14; 1992:219, 221 n. 14).

The *ši-na*, as recognized by Moran (*loc. cit.*), is hardly a sensible possessive suffix as rendered by Knudtzon. In the previous context, Rib-Haddi complained about the sons of ʿAbdi-Ashirta, who had gained control in Byblos. In another letter he spoke of the city being divided into two factions (EA 138:71-73). So perhaps here is an awkward reference to either the two sons of ʿAbdi-Ashirta or to the two warring factions within the city. A conclusive answer escapes us.

Incidentally, two hitherto unrecognized examples of the numeral *ši-na* have also been detected in one of the letters sent from Egypt, viz. EA 1:

e la te-še-me ši-na / LÚ.DUMU.KIN-*ka ša pí-šu-ni sà-a-ru* "Don't listen to your two messengers whose mouths are deceitful" (EA 1:85-86).

The *ši-na* is not a feminine plural suffix; it is the numeral "two." This also applies to an earlier passage:

ù i-la-ak 1-en lib-bi ši-na / [*ù la*] *il₅-te-qé* KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ "and one of the two goes [without] his taking silver" (EA 1:69-70).

šalāš. The number "three" is never documented syllabically in the texts from Canaan; cf. the following:

ša-ni-tam a-mur / *šār* URU^U*Ha-šú-¹ra¹* / *il-te-qé* 3 URU.DIDLI.KI *iš-tu ¹ia¹-ši* "Furthermore, look, the king of Hazor has taken three cities from me" (EA 364:17-20)

erbe. The number "four" is never documented syllabically in the texts from Canaan; cf.

'4' GADA ù 4 GÚ.GADA "Four linen garments and four scarves" (EA 34:25); *iš-tu* 4 ITU *ú-ul* 'yi¹-mur-mi pa-ni LUGAL "for four months he has not had an audience with the king" (EA 138:78).

hamiš. The number "five" is never documented syllabically in the texts from Canaan; cf.

*a-mur a-na-ku / nu-kúr-tu*₄ UGU-ia 5 MU.MEŠ "Behold, as for me, there has been hostility against me five years" (EA 106:16-17); ù *at-ta-din* 5 GUN ZABAR "and I have given five talents of copper" (EA 151:47); ù 5 LÚ.MEŠ TUR / ù 5 LÚ.MEŠ *a-ši-ru-ma* "and five servants (lads) and five troopers(?)" (EA 268:18-19; Izre'el 1978b:27, §3); 5 KÙ.GI.MEŠ HUR ŠU "five gold hand rings" (KL 72:600:17; cf. Wilhelm 1982:126).

sebe. Only the distributive forms reveal a number of syllabic spellings of the number "seven," viz. *ši-ib-i-ta-an* (EA 211:4), *ši-ib-e-ta-an* (EA 215:6), *ši-bi-ta-a-an* (EA 196:4). The ŠI sign for a word which has /s/ in Akkadian is discussed *supra*, p. 46. The first two examples suggest that the scribe was representing a WS form, *šib^citân or at least an approximation.

samāne. The number "eight" is never documented syllabically in the texts from Canaan; cf. the lone example of the logographically written distributive, which is possibly an error for "seven,"

8-it-šu ù 7-ta-a-an "eight times and seven times" (EA 85:5).

ešer. The number "ten" is never documented syllabically in the texts from Canaan; cf. the logographic entry:

a-nu-ma / 10 MÍ.MEŠ / \ mi-ki-tu / \ ia-pa-aq-ti "Now I have acquired ten attractive women" (EA 64:20-21; cf. Krahmalkov 1971; Loretz and Mayer 1974; Moran 1987b:239 n. 2; 1992:135-136 n. 2); *i-nu-ma iš-tu / 10 ŠE-ti ka-ša-di[-i]a a-na*

URU A.PÚ.MEŠ / *uš-ši-ir-ti* DUMU-*ia a-na* É.GAL NUN
 "Although within ten seconds of my arrival at Beirut, I sent my
 son to pharaoh's palace" (EA 138:75-77; Moran 1987b:363, 366 n.
 17; 1992:222, 224 n. 17).

ešrā. The number "twenty" is never documented syllabically in the texts from Canaan. Reference is occasionally made to groups of twenty men for military purposes. The numeral is always expressed logographically:

li-id-din-ni / LUGAL EN-*lí-ia* 20 LÚ.MEŠ *a-na* / *na-ša-ri* URU
 LUGAL *be-li-ia* "May the king, my lord, give me twenty men to
 guard the city of the king, my lord" (EA 151:14-16); *ù uš-ši-ra-ni*
 / '20' LÚ.MEŠ KUR *Mi-li-ḥa* 20 LÚ.MEŠ KUR *Mi-iš-ri* / *a-na*
na-ša-ar URU *a-na šār-ri* "So send me 'twenty' men of the land
 of Nubia (and) twenty men of the land of Egypt to guard the city
 for the king" (EA 108:66-68); LÚ.MEŠ *ma-šar-ta*^{MEŠ} *ša*
tu-ma-še-er / *i-na ŠU* ¹*Ḥa-ya* DUMU *Mi-ia-re-e* / [*l*]*a-qé-mi*
¹*Ad-da-ya ša-ka-an* / *i-na É-šu i-na* ^{URU}*Ḥa-za-ti*^{KI} / [*ù*] '20'
 'LÚ'.MEŠ *a-na* KUR *Mi-iš-ri*^{KI} / *ú-ma-še[-er]* "The guardsmen
 whom you sent in the charge of Ḥaya son of Miyare^c, Addaya
 took; he placed (them) in his palace in Gaza [and] 'twenty' men
 he sent to the land of Egypt" (EA 289:30-35).

One might also request twenty teams of horses:

ù lu-wa-ši-ra 20 *ta-pal ša* SIG₅-*qú* / ANŠE.KUR.RA *a-na* ÌR-*šu*
ma-du LÚ.MEŠ / *it-ti-ia* "and may he send twenty teams of the
 best horses to his servant — there are many men with me"
 (EA 106:42-44).

šalāšā. The number "thirty" is never documented syllabically in the texts from Canaan but it appears rather often in logographic writing:

ù ia-di-na / 4 ME LÚ.MEŠ 30 *ta-pa*[*l*] ANŠE.KU]R.'RA'.MEŠ /
ki-ma na-da-ni a-na ¹*Sú-¹ra¹-¹ta¹* / *ù ti-na-ša-ru* URU *a-na ka-ta*^š

"And may he grant 400 men and 30 pair[s of h]orses, as were given to Surata, and let them guard the city for you" (EA 85:19-22; similarly EA 72:3; 76:26; 90:46; 100:21-22; 107:39-40; 131:11-13).

Note also the following shipment:

[a]l-lu-ú uš-ši-ir-ti a-na L[UGAL E]N-ia / 30 NA₄ eḫ-lu-pa-ak-[k]u
 "Behold, I have sent to the k[ing] my [lo]rd, thirty chunks of raw glass" (EA 323:15-16; Oppenheim 1973:260a).

erbā. The number "forty" is never documented syllabically in the texts from Canaan. Probably as a multiple of twenty, i.e. two units of twenty men each, it appears, written logographically, in a broken context, 40 LÚ.MEŠ (EA 85:27) and in the following:

ù i-[ri-bu-m]i / 40 LÚ SA.GAZ.MEŠ a-na mu-[ḫ]i
¹[A-ma-an-ḫa-]at-pí "And forty ^c*apîrû* men en[tere]d in to [Amanḫ]atpi" (EA 185:46-47; Greenberg 1955:41-42).

ḫanšā. The number "fifty" is never documented syllabically in the texts from Canaan. The logographic numeral does appear a few times, especially in requests for personnel. The reference is most likely to a "platoon," the standard unit of fifty men (Shulman 1964:58-59):

ù lu-ma-še-er LUGAL 50 LÚ.MEŠ ma-šar-ta "so may the king send fifty guardsmen" (EA 289:42); [uš-ši-]ra 50 ME LÚ.MEŠ u 50 ME L[Ú.ME]Š š[a] / [KUR Me-lu]-ḫa 50 G¹ŠGIGIR "[Sen]d fifty or a hundred men (Egyptians) and fifty or a hundred m[en] 'of' [the land of Melu]ḫḫa (and) fifty chariots" (EA 132:56-57; Pintore 1972:103 n. 9; Moran 1987b:353 n. 6; 1992:215 n. 6).

Note also the following monetary reference (to shekels):

ù ša-ka-an / ip-ṭe₆-ra be-ri-nu 50 KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ "and he set a ransom price between us, fifty (shekels) of silver" (EA 114:8-9).

me²at. The plural of the numeral for "hundred" is written syllabically in the declinable form one time:

ša-ni-tam / yu-wa-ša-ra-ni-mi LUGAL EN[-ia] / 2 *me-ti* LÚ.MEŠ
a-na na-ša-ri / ›[a-n]a na-ša-ri‹ URU.DIDLI.ĤÁ LUGAL EN[-ia]
 "Furthermore, may the king, [my] lord send me two hundred
 men to guard ›[t]o guard‹ the cities of the king, [my] lord"
 (EA 196:33-36).

Because he was dealing with two hundred, the scribe used this plural form, evidently *mêti(m)* as in the Mari texts (cf. *CAD M/2:1a-b, passim*). Here the numeral "2" was evidently considered to be in the construct while the *mêti(m)* was reckoned as its genitive.

When only one hundred is intended, the form was the singular *status absolutus*:

aššum NA₄ *me-ku ša i-bá-aš-ši / it-ti-ia at-ta-din / a-na* LUGAL
be-l[i]-ia / 1 me-at KILÁ "Concerning the chunks of raw glass
 that are with me, I have given one hundred shekels to the king,
 [my] lord" (EA 196:33-36).

But note also the orthography for "five hundred" in an Alashia letter (not WS in tenor):

e-nu-ma a-na UGU-ka 5 *me-at* URUDU *ul-te-bi-la-ak-ku* "When I
 sent five minas of copper to you" (EA 35:10).

All the other attestations are logographic with ME so that the grammatical form is indistinguishable. The item(s) or persons being counted should, in accordance with Akkadian grammar, be declined according to their function in the clause. One clear instance is:

li-di-nam-mi šar-ru / 1 ME LÚ.MEŠ *ma-an-ša-ar-ta₅ / a-na na-ša-ri*
 URU.KI-šu "May the king grant one hundred guardsmen to
 guard his city" (EA 244:34-36)

The logogram ME can stand without a preceding numeral for "a hundred" as in

ME LÚ.MEŠ KUR.MEŠ *Ka-ši* "a hundred men from the lands of Cush" (EA 131:13).

But normally "one hundred" is written 1 ME (EA 34:18; 80:11'; 91:18; 244:35). The unit numeral naturally precedes the ME to indicate larger amounts, viz. 2 ME (EA 33:15; 71:24; 95:39); 3 ME (EA 93:12; 131:12); 4 ME (EA 76:24; 85:20; 90:46[?]).

līmu "THOUSAND." The expression ^dUTU *li-mi-ma* is rendered in CAD L:197a, "the sun of the thousands." However, Moran (1987b:441, 433 n. 2; 1992:279, 273 n. 2) prefers "Sun of (all) peoples," taking *li-mi-ma* as WS **li²mīma*. The term would thus be cognate to Ugaritic *lim* = **li²mu*, Heb. *l²ōm* and the WS noun documented in Akkadian lexical texts, *li-i-mu* as a synonym for *kimtu* "family, clan" (CAD L:198).

The few numerical usages are written syllabically and the form is *status absolutus*:

[ú-ul t]a-di-in₄ li-im KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ / [ù] 1 ME KÙ.GI.MEŠ ù ip-ta-ù-ur / [iš-tu mu-ù-ia] "Will you not pay a thousand (shekels) of silver [and] one hundred (shekels) of gold so that he will leave me be?" (EA 91:17-19; Youngblood 1961:358; cf. Moran 1987b:281; 1992:165); [i!]-nu-ma yu-ba-[ú] / 2(?) li-im KÙ.BABBAR / iš-tu qa-ti-ia "that(!) he demands 2(or 3) thousand (shekels) of silver from me" (EA 270:14-16; cf. Moran 1987b:294-295; 1992:316); 5! li-im [. . .] "five thousand [. . .]" (EA 287:54).

Once the number is accompanied by the plural postdeterminative:

at-ta-din 4! ME KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ / UGU 1 li-me^{MEŠ} / a-na qa-ti ša / LÚra-bi-ší 'LUGAL' / ša UGU-ia "I have paid four hundred (shekels) on the one thousand (owed?) into the hand of the

commissioner who is over me" (EA 313:7-11; cf. Moran 1987b:538 n. 4; 1992:347 n. 4).

ORDINALS AND FRACTIONS

There is practically no documentation for either fractions or ordinal numbers. Of the latter, one numerical adjective is attested and one fraction name is used a couple of times.

mišlu. The word for "half" appears in two contexts, one from Beirut (Rib-Haddi letter) and one from Tyre.

a-nu-ma URU.KI [m]i-ši-[il-]ši *ra-im* / *a-na* DUMU.MEŠ
 1)R-A-ši-i[r-]ti ù *mi-ši-il-ši* / *a-na be-li-ia* "Now, as for the city,
 [h]al[f] of it favors the sons of 'Abdi-Ashirta and half of it
 (favors) my lord" (EA 138:71-73); ù É šār URU.Ú-ga-ri-it KI / *i-ku-ul*
*i-ša-tu*₄ *mi-ši-i[l-]šu* / *i-kúl* ù *mi-ši-il-šu ia-nu* "And fire
 destroyed the palace of the king of Ugarit; it destroyed half of
 it, and half of it not" (EA 151:55-57; Moran 1987b:386 n. 4;
 1992:239 nn. 4-5).

šanû. The ordinal "second" also expresses the meaning "another" (cf. *supra*, pp. 151-158). That is most obvious with the plural adjectival forms, *ša-nu-tu* (EA 108:52), *ša-nu-ta*₅ (EA 244:40; 250:57; 253:27), *ša-nu-te* (EA 362:49).

Of the singulars, some of them can only mean "another," e.g.

šum-ma i-ia-nu ŠA ša-na-am "If there is no other intention"
 (EA 136:41; also EA 119:41-42; 371:18; cf. EA 244:38-41); *ú-ul* /
yi-il-qé-šu LÚ *ša-nu a-na ša-šu* "Let no one else take it for
 himself" (EA 117:69-70; EA 113:4-5; 138:136; 185:69-71; 241:17);
al-lu 1A-*ma-am-ma-ša ša-nu* / *ša-al-šu* "Here is the other
 Aman-maššu, ask him" (EA 114:51-52).

On the other hand, there are some passages where "second" is the most obvious rendering:

a-nu-ma *ṭup-pí* *ša-nu* / *ù ka-li ú-nu-tu-ia* / *ša it-ti* ¹*la-pa-d* ¹ŠKUR / *šu-ut yi-ša-kan* / *i-na pa-ni šār-ri* "Now, as for my second tablet and all my possessions that are with Yapa^c-Haddi, may it be placed before the king" (EA 119:55-59; Rainey 1989-90:61a); *a-nu-ma* GA.KAL *i-na* / *ar-ni an-nu-ú* *ù i-na ar-ni* / *ša-ni mi-nu il-te₉-qa-ni* "Now, he is strong through this crime and from a second crime who will rescue me?" (EA 82:39-41).

There are passages, of course, where *šanû* can be rendered "a second" or "another."

LÚ-*ia ut-ta-ši-ir a-na ma[-ḥa]*r / EN-*ia* *ù la-qú* 2 ANŠE.KUR.RA-*šu* / *ù LÚ ša-nu la-qí* LÚ-*šu* "I sent my man to my lord and his two horses were taken and a second (another) man was taken, a man of his" (EA 83:10-12; Moran 1987b:264; 1992:153); *al-lu-ú uš-ši-i*[r-]t[i] / ÌR LUGAL *ša-n*[a-a]m "Behold, I have sent a second (another) servant of the king" (EA 306:22-23); *ù / ti-mu-ru* URU.K[I i]-*nu-m*[a ERÍ]N.MEŠ *ša-nu* [\] *a-ša-bu* / *a-na* URU.KI *ù t*[i-m]a-*ga-r*[u] / *i-re-bi a-na* U[RU].KI "but the city saw that a second (another) force were/was located in the city and it a[gre]ed to my entering the c[it]y" (EA 138:60-63; Rainey 1989-90:63a); *a-ṇu-ma* ¹*La-ab-a-ya* / ¹*ša¹-nu¹* ¹ÌR-*He-ba* "Now ^cAbdi-Ḥeba is a second (another) Lab^aayu" (EA 280:33-34).

MULTIPLICATIVES AND DISTRIBUTIVES

The EA letters from Canaan are especially noted for their peculiar obeisance formulae (Salonen 1967:64, 66-70). The many shorter versions will be reviewed below but first the complete formulation must be cited in order to make clear the scribes' full intention:

a-na GÌR.MEŠ *šār-ri* / EN-*ia* DINGIR.MEŠ-*ia* / ^dUTU *iš-tu* AN^{sa-me} / 7-*šu* 7-TA.ÀM / *uš-ḥé-ḥi-in* *ù / ka-ba-tu-ma* / *ù se-ru-ma* "At the feet of the king, my lord, my deity, the sungod from heaven, seven times and seven each have I prostrated myself, both forwards and backwards" (EA 233:9-15); *a-na* 2

GÌR.MEŠ LUGAL EN-*ia* / ^dUTU *ša iš-tu s[a-]mì-i* / 7-*šu u*
 7-TA.ÀM / *lu-ú iš-ta-ḫa-ḫi-in* / *ka-bat-tum-ma u* / *še-ru-ma* "At
 the two feet of the king, my lord, the sun who is from heaven,
 seven times and seven each have I verily prostrated myself
 forwards and backwards" (EA 298:9-14); *a-na* 2 GÌR.MEŠ
 LUGAL EN-*ia* / DINGIR.MEŠ-*ia* ^dUTU-*ia* ^dUTU / *ša iš-tu*
 AN^{sa-me} 7-*šu* / *u* 7-TA.ÀM *lu-ú am-qut-ma* / *ka-bat-tum u*
še-ru-ma "At the two feet of the king, my lord, my deity, my
 sungod, the sun that is from heaven, seven times and seven
 each have I verily fallen down, forwards and backwards"
 (EA 299:7-11; also EA 64:4-7; 65:4-5; 213:6-9; 215:4-9; 232:6-11;
 282:4-11; 315:5-7; 316:6-9; 319:9-14; 320:10-15; 323:6-9; 324:7-9;
 325:7-9; 326:5-8; 366:7-10; EA 378:5-10).

The selections cited were chosen because they contain all the characteristic elements in the formula. The intention is to express the act of obeisance required of subordinates visiting the Egyptian court: prostration seven times on the belly and seven times on the back, an aerobic feat of no small consequence.

Of interest here is the numerical formulation, which in its fullest utilizes two constructions. The first is the numeral, presumably with the adverbial suffix *-ī* plus the 3rd m.s. pronominal suffix *-šu*. At Ugarit (Salonen 1967:74 for references) the second numeral also has the same construction, viz. 7-*šu*, as do many of the letters from EA (EA 60:5; 161:3; 185:7; 187:7; 202:6; 317:4; 318:5). The formulation is then: "seven times (forwards) and seven times (backwards)." However, there must be some doubt about the adverbial *-ī*. There are some orthographies which actually preclude it, viz. 7-*it-šu* (EA 84:5; 315:6; 323:7) and 7-*it* (EA 88:3; 235:8). Along with the evidence produced below, one may conjecture that the intended form was **šeb^cit(šu)*.

What is so remarkable about the large majority of EA letters that employ this formula is that the second numeral is often followed by TA.A.AN which should represent the Sumerian distributive *ta* plus *àm* (cf. Borger 1978:96, No. 139; CAD I/J:278b, 279b, A/2:255a). Sometimes the scribes wrote 7-*šu* 7-TA.ÀM (EA 68:8; 294:5; *et passim*) while usually they joined the

numericals by the conjunction, 7-šu ù 7-TA.ÀM (EA 224:6; *et passim*) or 7-šu u 7-TA.ÀM (EA 242:7-8; *et passim*). There are a fair number of scribes who wrote simply 7 u 7 (EA 126:3; *et passim*) or 7 ù 7 (EA 63:6; 174:7; 209:5; *et al.*) and once there is simply 7 7 (EA 140:4). Note also 7-tam!(PI) ù 7 (EA 138:4).

The use of the multiplicative 7-šu is understandable. The use of the distributive 7-TA.ÀM is less so. Knudtson consistently read 7-ta-a-an, and not without reason. There are indications that the Canaanite scribes were not always aware of the Sumerian element involved. First, there are those scribes who wrote 7-tá-a-an using the DA sign (EA 266:8 and a dozen other texts). That would more likely be a graphic (or phonetic) variant for an Akkadian (or WS) element than for a Sumerian logogram. Secondly, and even more decisive, are the abundant examples of 7-ta-an (EA 83:6 and over twenty other texts) and even 7-ta-na (EA 212:5; 315:6; 323:7; 326:6). Such variants strongly suggest that the Canaanite scribes viewed the component in question as a Semitic adverbial suffix, i.e. -ān, an element used in the formation of Akkadian numerical adverbs (GAG:95, §71b). Confirmation of this suggestion may be derived from three syllabic orthographies: 7 ù ši-ib-i-ta-an (EA 211:4); 7 ù ši-ib-e-ta-an (EA 215:6); 7 a-n[a pa-ni] / ši-bi-ta-a-an (EA 196:3-4). The initial š, and the apparent allowance for a guttural consonant in the first two examples suggest that the form might be WS, i.e. *šib^citān. If not, then the form may be an Akkadian numeric adverb like ša-ni-ia-nu "a second time" (EA 162:57; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:214, §2.6.2.3; CAD Š/1:384b) and šalšīānu (CAD Š/1:262b-263a).

There is one instance of 8-it-šu ù 7-ta-a-an (EA 84:5) where the first numeral may be a simple scribal error, eight in place of the usual seven. Rib-Haddi tells about being stabbed 9-ta-an "nine times" (EA 82:39; also EA 81:24).

NUMERICAL NOUNS

The vocables discussed in this section express a numerical value or quality. Several of them have particularly interesting usages in the EA texts from Canaan.

ALONENESS.

The terms for "aleness" are only used adverbially in the corpus under discussion, either in prepositional phrases or with an adverbial suffix.

edēnu. Like most 1st weak vocables (nominal forms, especially infinitives) that begin with *e-* in standard Akkadian, nearly all the forms of this substantive begin with *i-* (cf. *supra*, pp. 37-38). An exception is *i-na e-de-ni-ši_x*(ŠE) (EA 90:8). The attested forms are always in a prepositional phrase (mostly with *ina*) with a possessive pronominal suffix attached (either 1st c.s. or 3rd f.s.). There are some references to Byblos "by itself," viz.

URUGub-la *i-na i-de-ni-ši_x*(ŠE) / *ir-ti-ḥa-at a-na ia-ši* "Byblos by itself remains to me" (EA 124:9-10; 90:7-8; 91:20-22).

Rib-Haddi often asks a rhetorical question about his ability (inability) to act on his own:

mi-na i-pu-šu-na a-na-ku i-na / [*i-de-ni-ia*] "What can I do by myself?" (EA 74:63-64); *ù mi-na i-pu-šu-na* / [*a-n*]a-ku *i-na i-de-ni-ia* "But what can I do by myself?" (EA 90:22-23; Youngblood 1961:344; also EA 81:50-51; 134:15-16).

One scribe preferred the preposition *ana*, unless this is simply a scribal error.

mi[-n]a / [*i*]-[*u-šu-na a-na-ku a-na i-d[e-ni-]ia*] "What can I do on my own?" (EA 91:25-26).

Note the concomitant use in combination with the reflexive pronoun:

a-na-ku / *i-na* [*i-de-ni-ia*] / ¹*i-na-ša-r[u ra-m]a-ni-ia* "I, by myself, must guar[d mys]elf" (EA 122:19-21; Moran 1987b:334 n. 1; 1992:202 n. 1).

**yaḥdônu*. Once the Megiddo scribe used the WS equivalent of Akkadian *edēnu*. The form may be comparable with Arabic *waḥdānī*. However, the Megiddo orthography would also permit other interpretations. For example, the word might be **yaḥûd + um*, i.e. a *qatûl* with adverbial suffix. The adverbial interpretation is attractive in view of the prepositional phrases employed with *edēnu*. On the other hand, the WS form appears to be a gloss to *a-na-ku-ma* "It is (only) I." In such a case, it would be construed as a nominative and the form should thus be **yaḥ^odônnî*. Whatever the exact morphology, the lone attestation is:

ù / *a-na-ku-ma* \ *ya-ḥu-du-un-ni* / *ub-ba-lu* LÚ.MEŠ *ma-as-sà*^{MEŠ}
 "But it is (only) I, by myself, who bring the corvée workers"
 (EA 365:23-25).

QUANTIFIERS FOR "ALL, EVERY"

The indefinite pronoun *mimma*, which often means "anything, everything," has been discussed *supra*, pp. 114-118. Two substantives are employed in these texts to express "all, every," viz. *gabbu* and *kalû*. The former is actually a later development in the Akkadian language while the latter is typical of OA and OB. Both are found in the peripheral dialects and it is not surprising that the scribes from Canaan demonstrate familiarity with them.

gabbu. The substantive *gabbu*, generally favored by scribes outside of Byblos, can stand independently as the subject of a clause. Note the following examples of non-verbal sentences:

a-na ia-ši-ia a-na-mi LUGAL *gáb-bu* "(Whatever) is mine, it is to the king that it all belongs" (EA 197:6; Rainey:1989-90:66b; contrast Moran 1987b:435; 1992:275); *a-mur aš-ra-nu ša i-ba-ša-ti-7* / URU.MEŠ-*ka gáb-bu* "Behold, as for the places where I am (responsible), all are your cities" (EA 230:6-7); ù *a-nu-ma gáb-⟨bu⟩-mi a-na m[uḥ-ḥ]i-ia* "since now al⟨l⟩ are against me!" (EA 127:15; cf. Moran 1987b:342; 1992:207).

In the following passage, the independent form is in apposition to a bound form:

gáb-bi mi-im-mì / ša yi-pu-šu / LUGAL EN-ia a-na KUR-šu / gáb-bu SIG5.GA / ma-gal ma-gal "As for everything that the king, my lord, does for his land, it is all very, very good" (EA 267:7-11).

A broken context begins a quote: *gáb-bu-um-mi* (EA 145:27).

Sometimes the independent substantive is subject of a 3rd m.s. verb:

ga-mi-ir gáb-bu i-na na-da-ni / i-na ba-la-at ZI-ia "Everything is used up in payment for sustaining my life" (EA 117:75-76; Moran 1987b:323-324; 1992:194; cf. also EA 102:12; 107:38-39); [ù] / [I]a-a in₄-né-pu-uš *gá[b-b]u / a-na ERÍN.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ* "[that] all (of them) [n]ot join the *‘apîrû* troops" (EA 68:16-18; Moran 1987a:211; 1987b:242; 1992:138).

On other occasions, the verb is 3rd m.pl. In such cases, *gabbu* may be independent:

ti-de i-nu-ma gáb-bu / ša-ru "Know that all are traitorous" (EA 102:25-26; Moran 1987b:296; 1992:175); *ia-a-nu-mi 1-en LÚ[h]a-zi-a-nu / a-na šār-ri EN-ia ḫal-qu gáb-bu* "There is not one city ruler left to the king, all are lost!" (EA 288:40); *na-ak-ru gáb-bu* "All are hostile!" (EA 106:49); *i[p]-li-ḫu gáb-bu* "All have become frightened" (EA 151:69);

or it may be in apposition to a plural subject:

GIŠ.MÁ.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ / URU^rŠur¹-ri URUBe-ru-ta URUŠí-du-na / *gáb-bu i-na KUR A-mur-ri šal-mu šu-nu* "As for the ships of the men of Tyre, Beirut (and) Sidon, everyone in Amurru, they are at peace" (EA 114:12-14; contrast Moran 1987b:316; 1992:188); *ù lu-ú ti7-de / i₁₅-nu-⟨ma⟩ ša-al-mu / URU.DIDLI.[H]Á-ka gáb-bu*

"So may you be apprised that your cities are all safe"
(EA 230:30-32).

Similarly, *gabbu* may be the resumptive element for a plural subject in extraposition:

a-nu-ma LÚ.MEŠ ša na-ad-na-ta / a-na ia-ši in₄-na-ab-tu gáb-bu
"Now, as for the men whom you assigned to me, all have fled"
(EA 82:31-32); *ù URU.DIDLI.ĤÁ [š]a i-ba-ša-ti₇ / [l]u-ú na-aš-ru /*
gáb-bu a-na ka-ta₅ "As for the towns where I am (responsible),
they are all verily being protected for you" (EA 230:14-15).

Once the nominative independent form seems to stand in apposition to the understood subject of a 1st c.pl. verb:

ù lu-ú ni-pa-aš gáb-bu-ma / nu-kúr-ti "so that we may all wage war" (EA 366:31-32; Moran 1987b:562; 1992:364).

The independent accusative form is often the direct object of transitive verbs:

ù yi-iq-bi gáb-ba i-na pa-ni-ka "that he may recount everything in your presence" (EA 85:32); *ù šum-ma ap-pu-[n]a-ma / yi-il-qé*
LUGAL *gáb-ba a-na ša-[š]u* "Or, on the other hand, let the king take everything for himself" (EA 116:35-36); *la-qa-a / ¹A-zi-ru*
gáb-ba "Aziru has taken everything" (EA 125:23-24; Moran 1987b:338; 1992:204; cf. also EA 131:33-34); *šu-ši-ra-ku gáb-ba* "I have prepared everything" (EA 144:21); *u a-nu-ma šu-ši-ra-t[i] /*
gáb-ba "and now I have prepared everything" (EA 227:13-14; also EA 324:15); *a-nu-ma / i-pu-šu gáb-ba* "Now I am doing everything" (EA 328:25-26).

In one passage, the accusative seems almost to be adverbial because of the peculiar verb:

ti-iḫ-ta-ti gáb-ba "I have become destitute of everything"
(EA 102:13; Moran 1987b:296; 1992:175).

Another text, which may not reflect WS influence, has *gáb-bu* as the bound form in a broken context:

[ù] *gáb-bu* LÚ.MEŠ *ḫal-zu-uḫ-lu-ti ša KUR-ka* "[and] all the fortress commanders of your land" (EA 67:15).

All the letters from the Canaanite sphere of influence have *gáb-bi* as the bound form for all cases. In verbal clauses, the verb agrees with the *nomen rectum* dependent on the bound form. This is in accordance with ancient Hebrew practice (GKC:467, §146c; Youngblood 1961:30; Moran 1950a:61-62). As will be seen in the examples below, there are some differences between the EA Canaanite and the BH system.

For the non-verbal clause, cf.

a-ia-mi / gáb-bi DIDLI.URU.KI.-*ni* LUGAL *be-li-ia / iš-tu* 'lib¹-[b]i-*šu-nu* NÍG.MEŠ *u ŠE.MEŠ / [i-ba-aš-šu]* "Wherever all the cities of the king, my lord, are, food and drink [are to be found]" (EA 131:43-46; Moran 1987b:350; 1992:213).

The following example has a logographic predicate so that the person and number of the stative verb is impossible to determine. However, judging from the noun phrase *gabbi mimme*, the 3rd m.s. seems likely.

gáb-bi mi-im-me / ša yi-te-pu-uš / LUGAL EN-ia!(EN) a-na KUR-*šu / SIG₅.GA ma-gal* "Everything that the king, my lord, has done for his land is very good" (EA 258:6-9; 262:7-11).

A broken context does have a 3rd m.s. stative verb although the *nomen rectum* appears to be feminine plural.

ḫa[-l]i-[i]q-mì gáb-bi / U[RU.KI.MEŠ] LUGAL iš-tu qa-t[i-ia] "Lost are all the ci[ties] of the king from [my] control" (EA 207:19-20).

When the *nomen rectum* is feminine singular, then the verb is 3rd f.s., as in the following passages from Tyre:

ù 'tar¹-gu₅-ub gáb-bi / KUR-ti iš-tu ri-ig-mi-šu "All the land is frightened at his cry" (EA 147:14-15; Moran 1987b:397 n. 4; 1992:234 n. 4); ù gáb-bi KUR-ti pal-ḫa-at / iš-tu pa-ni be-li-ia "and all the land trembles before my lord" (EA 147:32-33; 149:44-45; 153:6-8);.

Two passages from Byblos have what would normally be understood as a feminine plural *nomen rectum* but the verbal predicate is 3rd f.s.

ù gáb-bi KUR.ḪÁ L[UGAL] / a-di KUR Mi-iš-ri ti-né-ep-šu / a-na LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ "and all the territories of the ki[ng] as far as Egypt will go over to the 'apîrû men" (EA 88:32-34; Moran 1950a:62; 1987a:210; 1987b:275; 1992:160); i-nu-ma / na-ak-ra-at-mi / gáb-bi KUR.MEŠ ar-ki / 'A-zi-ri "while the entire land became hostile following Aziru" (EA 98:4-7; cf. also Moran 1987b:290; 1992:171).

Still, it is possible that the logographic KUR.ḪÁ and KUR.MEŠ may have been considered feminine singular as in this Jerusalem passage:

pa-ta-ra-at / [KUR.ḪÁ] LUGAL EN-*ia* gáb-*bi*-ša "The [lan]d(s) of the king, <my> lord, has deserted in its entirety" (EA 286:35-36).

When the *nomen rectum* is masculine plural, the verbal predicate is 3rd m.pl.

a-nu-ma gáb-bi / 'LUGAL¹.ḪÁ¹ ša LUGAL ERÍN.MEŠ Hur-ri / 'tu¹-¹ba¹-ú-ni₇ KUR.ḪÁ / a-na ḫa-ba-li iš-t[u] / [Š]U-ia "Now all the kings of the king of the Hurrian army are seeking the lands to snatch (them) from my [contr]ol" (EA 60:13-17); ù gáb-bi LÚ.MEŠ i-ra-²a₄-mu-šu "and everyone loves him" (EA 106:40; cf. also EA 106:20-21); ù gáb-bi LÚ.MEŠ ḫa-za-nu-tu₄ / šal-mu-šu "and all the city rulers are at peace with him" (EA 126:10-11).

The *nomen rectum* in the following entry, URU.DIDLI.ḪÁ has a 3rd m.pl. verb. Usually the word for city is taken as feminine in these texts.

i-nu-ma na-ak-ru gáb-bi / URU.DIDLI.ḪÁ KUR Ga-ri "when all the cities of the land of Garu became hostile" (EA 256:22-23).

kalû. The older quantitative substantive, *kalû*, is favored by the Byblos scribes. All but about half a dozen examples in this corpus come from their texts. Only bound forms are attested in the EA texts and the orthography is always *ka-li* (except for *ka₄-li* EA 198:12 and *ka<-li>* EA 130:43). Unlike other dialects, where the bound form inflects for case, the EA texts (nearly all from Canaan) reveal that the local scribes understood this substantive to be from a *qatil* formation. In other words, they used *kali* as if it were from a root **klī* rather than **kla*. There is no hint of the WS **kull*. As for the word order in the clauses cited below, it is certainly not governed by any distinction between determinate or indeterminate as Gianto (1990:68-79) sought to show. The word order in the clauses is based on the syntactic and semantic function of each sentence. As Gianto was forced to recognize, the SV order of his type (b) clauses is the normal order in independent clauses while the VS order of his type (a) is standard for dependent clauses expressing result or purpose (Gianto 1990:78-79; cf. Rainey 1992b:338b-339a)

As typical samples of the accusatives, note the following:

ú-ul yu-pa-ḫi-ra ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ "Lest he assemble all the *‘apîrû* men" (EA 71:28-29; 85:77-78; 91:23-24); *la-qú* LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ / *ka-li* KUR.KUR.ḪÁ "The *‘apîrû* men have taken all the territories" (EA 83:77-78; 81:7-8; 91:19-20; 92:41-42; 103:56-57; 114:37-38; 140:26-27).

Note especially the interesting case of the dependent *nomen rectum* with an accusative case ending! This phenomenon is probably a misuse of the accusative whereby the quantifier is mistakenly considered as being in apposition to the quantified.

ka-li a-wa-ta₅ / LUGAL bé-li--i-a / *iš-te-mu* "Every word (all the words?) of the king, my lord, I am heeding" (EA 212:12-14).

There is also an accusative bound form governing a relative clause with *ša!*

ù ka-l[i] / ša-a eš-mu aš-pu-ru "And all that I hear, I report" (EA 115:15-16).

The nominative bound forms are the most significant for syntactic analysis. There are quite a few non-verbal clauses with *kali* as the subject:

ka-li / URU.MEŠ a-na ša-šu-nu "All the cities belong to him" (EA 104:12-13; 103:10-11); *ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ it-ti-šu* "All the 'apîrû men are with him" (EA 82:8-9); *ù ka-li KUR.KUR.KI nu-kúr-tu₄ a-na ša-šu* "And all the territories are hostile to him" (EA 74:40; 109:58; 130:43); *ka-li / mi-im-me ša-a yu-ú-ul-qú-na / iš-tu ša-a-šu-nu a-na LUGAL* "All the property that is taken from them belongs to the king" (EA 117:67-69; cf. Rainey 1990a; contrast Moran 1987b:324; 1992:194).

Note the dependent *nomen rectum* with nominative case ending!

a-nu-ma tup-pí ša-nu / ù ka-li ú-nu-tu-ia / ša it-ti ¹*Ia-pa-d* ¹*ISKUR* "Now (here is) my second tablet and (wherein are listed) all of my paraphernalia that is with Yapa^c-Haddi" (EA 119:55-57; contrast Moran 1987b:328-329; 1992:197).

This can be compared with EA 212:12-14 cited above, where the *nomen rectum* has the accusative case ending.

As for verbal clauses, the verb is expected to agree with the *nomen rectum*. There is one instance of a passive 3rd m.s. verb:

ka-l[i m]i-am(sic!) ¹IR-A-ši-ir-ta / it-ti-šu-nu la-a la-qí "Not all the proper<ty> of 'Abdi-Ashirta in their possession was taken away" (EA 105:19-20; Moran 1987b:300; 1992:178).

There is one questionable example of 3rd f.s. which is probably really a scribal confusion for 3rd m.pl.

ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ *ma-ša-ar-ti* / *ša-a ir-ti-ḫu mar-ša-⟨at⟩(?)* "All the garrison troops that remain are ill" (EA 103:47-49; Rainey 1973c:256; Moran 1987b:298 n. 3; 1992:176 n. 3).

Moran (*loc. cit.*) accepted the suggestion to read *mar-ša-⟨at⟩* (Rainey *loc. cit.*) but that solution does not really solve anything. The verb in the relative clause that defines LÚ.MEŠ *ma-ša-ar-ti* is 3rd m.pl. *ir-ti-ḫu*, and, like the 3rd f.s. *ir-ti-ḫa-at* (EA 91:19-23; 124:9-10), was probably used by the scribe as a form from the suffix conjugation rather than as an Akkadian prefix conjugation verb (Rainey 1973c:255-256). Therefore, one would have expected a 3rd m.pl. verb in the main clause, i.e. **maršū*.

Earlier in the same letter, LÚ.MEŠ *maššarti* is the subject of a 3rd m.pl. verb:

šum-ma / *in₄-na-b[i-]tu ka-li* / LÚ.MEŠ *ma[-ša-]ar-ti iš-tu* / URUŠu-mu[-r]a "Since(!) all the ga[rri]son troops have fled from Šumur" (EA 103:37-38).

Throughout the Byblos letters, LÚ.MEŠ *maššartu* and ERÍN.MEŠ *maššartu* are consistently treated as masculine plural (EA 79:30; 112:34; 117:79-81; 125:14; 130:37cf. also Moran 1987b:318 n. 5; 1992:190 n. 6).

Three other passages attest to 3rd m.pl. for constructions with *kali*:

ša-ni-tam ka-li URU.MEŠ-*ia* / [*i*]n₄-*né-ep-šu a-na* LÚ.MEŠ G[AZ.MEŠ] / *ù ka-li-šu-nu [ma-gal nu-KÚR]* / *it-ti-ia* "Moreover, all of my towns have defected to the *‘a[pîrû]* men and all of them are [exceedingly hostile] to me" (EA 116:37-40); *u ka-li* / LÚ.MEŠ / [*ḫ*]a-za-ni-ka *tù-da-ku[-n]a* "and all your city rulers will be killed" (EA 132:49-50); *ka-li* LÚ.¹MEŠ¹ / [*ḫa-za-nu-ti*] *šal-mu a-na* ÌR-A-*[ši-ir-ta]* "All your [city rulers] are at peace with *‘Abdi-Ashirta*" (EA 90:27-28; Youngblood 1961:345; Moran

1987b:280 n. 7; 1992:164 n. 7); *ka-li / mi-im-me ša-a yu-ú-ul-qú-na*
/ *iš-tu ša-a-šu-nu* "All the property that is taken from them"
(EA 117:67-69).

But note that the verb in the last example, *yu-ú-ul-qú-na*, should normally be taken as 3rd m.s. (cf. Izre'el 1987, who does not discuss this particular example).

**CANAANITE IN THE AMARNA TABLETS
A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE MIXED DIALECT
USED BY THE SCRIBES FROM CANAAN**

Volume II

**Morphosyntactic Analysis of
the Verbal System**

HANDBUCH DER ORIENTALISTIK
HANDBOOK OF ORIENTAL STUDIES
ERSTE ABTEILUNG
DER NAHE UND MITTLERE OSTEN
THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

CONSULTING EDITOR FOR THIS VOLUME

T. MURAOKA

FÜNFUNDZWANZIGSTER BAND
CANAANITE IN THE AMARNA TABLETS
A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE MIXED DIALECT
USED BY THE SCRIBES FROM CANAAN

Volume II



CANAANITE IN THE AMARNA TABLETS

A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE MIXED DIALECT
USED BY THE SCRIBES FROM CANAAN

VOLUME II

MORPHOSYNTACTIC ANALYSIS OF
THE VERBAL SYSTEM

BY

ANSON F. RAINEY



E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1996

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

The CIP-data has been applied for.

ISSN 0169-9423
ISBN 90 04 10521 2 (*Vol. 1*)
ISBN 90 04 10522 0 (*Vol. 2*)
ISBN 90 04 10523 9 (*Vol. 3*)
ISBN 90 04 10524 7 (*Vol. 4*)
ISBN 90 04 10503 4 (*Set*)

© Copyright 1996 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

*This volume is respectfully
dedicated to
Professor W.L. Moran*

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	xix
In Search of the Canaanite Verb.....	1
Pioneer Studies (Pre-WW I).....	2
The Interim (Between the Wars).....	4
The Breakthrough (Post WW II).....	5
Suffix Conjugation.....	5
Prefix Conjugation.....	6
Infinitive.....	8
Recent Developments.....	8
Modes and Tenses.....	9
Barth-Ginsberg Law.....	10
Jerusalem Scribe.....	10
D Stem Forms.....	11
Hybrid Forms.....	13
Concluding Remarks.....	15
The Akkadian Base Language.....	17
Mimation.....	18
Initial Vowels in 1 st Weak Verbs.....	19
Initial <i>W</i>	19
Radical 1 st <i>W</i>	19
<i>A</i> > <i>E</i> Before <i>I</i>	20
Nasalization of Geminated Consonants.....	21
Š > <i>L</i> Before a Dental.....	21
With The Š- of Accusative and Dative Suffixes.....	23
Assyrianisms.....	24
3 rd Masculine Plural.....	26
Old Babylonian in Canaan.....	28
The Late Bronze Jargon in Canaan.....	31

Prefix Conjugation — Person and Number	33
<i>y-</i> for 3 rd Masculine Singular	34
<i>t-</i> for 3 rd Feminine Singular	37
<i>t-</i> for 2 nd Masculine Singular	39
∅- for 1 st Common Singular	40
<i>t- . . . -ū/-ūna</i> for 3 rd Masculine Plural	43
<i>t- . . . -ū/-ūna</i> for 2 nd Masculine Plural	45
<i>n-</i> for 1 st Common Plural	46
Concluding Remarks	47
 Prefix Conjugation — G & Gp Stems	 49
The Active G Stem	50
Akkadian Forms	50
(<i>w</i>) <i>abālu</i>	50
<i>akālu</i>	51
<i>alāku</i>	51
<i>amāru</i>	51
(<i>w</i>) <i>ašû</i>	51
<i>dabābu</i>	52
<i>dagālu</i>	52
<i>dâku</i>	52
<i>epēšu</i>	52
<i>ezēbu</i>	52
<i>ḥadû</i>	53
<i>ḥalāqu</i>	53
<i>idû</i>	53
<i>izzuzu</i>	53
<i>kalû</i>	53
<i>kapālu</i>	54
<i>kašādu</i>	54
<i>leqû</i>	54
<i>lamādu</i>	55
<i>le²û</i>	55
<i>magāru</i>	55
<i>maḥašu</i>	55
<i>malāku</i>	55

<i>maqātu</i>	56
<i>mātu</i>	56
<i>nadānu</i>	56
<i>namāšu</i>	57
<i>našāru</i>	57
<i>qabû</i>	58
<i>qālu</i>	59
<i>qerēbu</i>	59
<i>raʾāmu</i>	59
<i>šabātu</i>	59
<i>šaʾālu</i>	59
<i>šakānu</i>	59
<i>šapāru</i>	60
<i>šemû</i>	60
<i>tarāšu</i>	61
<i>tāru</i>	61
The Barth-Ginsberg Law	61
The Ancient Semitic Pattern	62
Hebrew	63
Ugaritic	64
The Amarna Evidence	65
<i>yaqtul</i>	65
<i>yaqtil</i>	67
<i>yiqtal</i>	69
Summary and Conclusions	73
Gp — The Passive of the Basic Stem	75
Attestation	76
<i>(w)arû</i>	76
<i>dâku</i>	76
<i>epēšu</i>	77
<i>leqû</i>	77
<i>mahāšu</i>	78
<i>nasāhu</i>	78
<i>qabû</i>	78
<i>šapāru</i>	78
<i>šemû</i>	79

Diachronic Significance	80
Prefix Conjugation — Gt & Gtn Stems	81
The Scribal Conventions.....	81
Lexical Gt's from Akkadian	82
Verbs of Motion.....	82
(<i>w</i>) <i>ašû</i>	82
<i>elu</i>	83
<i>erēbu</i>	86
<i>ezēbu</i>	87
<i>kašādu</i>	88
Verbs of Repetition	89
<i>qabû</i>	89
<i>šanû</i>	90
Verbs of Reflexive Action.....	92
<i>ša'ālu</i>	92
<i>šakānu</i>	92
West Semitic Lexical Gt's.....	93
<i>amāru</i>	93
<i>našābu</i>	94
<i>šemû</i>	95
Verbs with no Lexical Gt.....	98
<i>leqû</i>	98
<i>riāhu</i>	101
<i>šapāru</i>	101
* <i>šhḥn</i>	109
<i>epēšu</i>	111
The Gtn Stem.....	113
<i>alāku</i>	113
<i>šemû</i>	114
Prefix Conjugation — N Stem.....	117
Passive of Transitive Verbs	117
<i>apālu</i>	117
<i>kašāšu</i>	117
<i>mašā'u</i>	118
<i>maḥāšu</i>	118

<i>paṭāru</i>	119
<i>šaḥātu</i>	119
<i>šakānu</i>	119
<i>šemû</i>	120
Reflexive Actions	121
<i>abātu / na^ʔbutu</i>	121
<i>epēšu / nenpušu</i>	123
<i>malāku</i>	126
<i>na^ʔarruru</i>	127
<i>nabalkutu</i>	129
<i>namāru</i>	129
<i>našû</i>	130
<i>paṭāru</i>	131
<i>šaḡû</i>	132
Prefix Conjugation — D, Dt, Dp	133
Morphological Problems	133
Contamination of G and D Stem Forms	133
G Present-Futures as D Stem	133
Prefix <i>i-</i> on D Stem Forms	135
Ambiguous Orthography	136
Geminated Radicals	136
Prefix Vowels	136
Thematic Vowel	137
D Stem Verbs	138
Factitive Verbs	138
<i>bulluṭu</i>	138
<i>bu^ʔû</i>	140
<i>dubbubu</i>	146
<i>dubburu</i>	146
<i>*qubbulu</i>	148
<i>urrudu</i>	148
Causative Verbs	149
<i>ḥulluqu</i>	149
<i>ḥummuṭu</i>	150
<i>kubbudu</i>	150

<i>kullu</i>	151
<i>lamādu, lummudu</i>	151
<i>magāru, mugguru</i>	152
<i>muššuru</i>	152
<i>puḥḥuru</i>	153
<i>ṣeḥēru, ṣuḥḥuru</i>	153
<i>turru</i>	154
<i>wuššuru</i>	157
"Intensive" Verbs.....	168
<i>kalû, kullû</i>	168
<i>kašādu / kuššudu</i>	168
<i>maḥāṣu, muḥḥuṣu</i>	169
<i>maqātu</i>	169
<i>na²āṣu</i>	170
<i>našāru, nuṣṣuru</i>	171
<i>palāḥu, pulluḥu</i>	172
<i>*raḡāṣu (raḥāṣu)</i>	173
<i>ša²ālu</i>	174
<i>šātu, šuttu</i>	175
<i>ṭarādu, ṭurrudu</i>	176
The Dt Stem	176
The Dp Stem	179
Prefix Conjugation — Š & H Stems	181
Š Stem Causatives.....	181
<i>erēbu/šūrubu</i>	181
<i>tāru/*šutūru</i>	182
<i>(w)abālu šūbulu</i>	182
<i>(w)aṣû/šūṣu</i>	183
Š Stem Factitives.....	183
<i>balātu/šubulṭu</i>	183
<i>ḥalāqu/šuhluqu</i>	184
<i>pašāḥu/šupšuhū</i>	184
<i>*šḥn</i>	185
Special Lexical Meanings	186
<i>ešēru/šūšuru/šutēšuru</i>	186

<i>ezēbu/šūzubu</i>	188
Canaanite H Stem Forms	190
<i>hlq</i>	190
* <i>mwt</i>	190
* <i>qll</i>	191
* <i>rym</i>	192
* <i>ysʿ</i>	192
Concluding Remarks	193
Prefix Conjugation — Modes and Tenses	195
The so-called "Subjunctive"	195
Peripheral Dialects	196
The Texts from Canaan	197
The Akkadian Votive	202
Stock Expressions	202
With Accusative Suffix	203
<i>šapāru</i>	203
<i>wuššuru/muššuru</i>	204
<i>leqû</i>	205
<i>izuzzu</i>	206
<i>turru</i>	210
<i>(w)ašû</i>	208
Conclusion	211
The Precative	211
Morphology	212
Syntax	214
Conclusion	219
West Semitic Modes and Tenses	221
The Basic Patterns	221
The Indicative Mode	222
Preterite	222
In Main Clauses	222
In Subordinate Clauses	223
Akkadian <i>iparras</i> as Ws Preterite	225
Contrast with Imperfect	225

Imperfect	227
Terminology	227
Present	228
Future	230
Past Continuous	232
Circumstantial	234
Energic	234
Interrogative Sentences	236
Associated with Questions	239
Conditional Sentences	239
Asseverations	241
Argumentative	243
Subordinate Clauses	244
The Injunctive	244
Jussive	245
Morphology	245
Wish, Request, Command	246
Purpose Clauses	249
Conditional Sentences	252
Complex Sentences	254
Volitive	254
Terminology	254
Morphology	255
Wish, Request, Command	256
Purpose Clauses	257
After a Verb of Fearing	260
Conditional Sentences	260
Complex Sentences	261
Evaluation	262
Energic	263
The Imperative	265
Morphology	265
Canaanite	265
Akkadian	266
Anomalous Forms	269

Plural	270
With Pronominal Suffixes.....	272
Syntagmas.....	273
Introductory Formulae	273
Blessing.....	274
Presentation Particle	274
Exhortation.....	276
Commands.....	277
Requests.....	278
Advice	278
Adjurations.....	278
Apodoses.....	278
Purpose Clauses	279
Suffix Conjugation — Morphology.....	281
Person Markers.....	283
Akkadian First Common Singular	283
Canaanite First Common Singular	284
Second Masculine Singular	287
Third Masculine Singular	287
Third Feminine Singular.....	288
First Common Plural	289
Second Masculine Plural.....	290
Third Masculine Plural	290
Third Feminine Plural?	293
Thematic Forms	295
<i>qatal</i>	296
<i>qatil</i>	301
<i>qitil/qetil</i>	306
<i>qatul</i>	306
<i>qittul = pitrus</i>	306
<i>naqtal</i>	307
<i>quttul</i>	309
<i>quttil</i>	310
<i>qattul</i>	312
<i>quttal</i>	312

<i>šuqtil</i>	312
<i>hiqtil</i>	315
Summary.....	316
Suffix Conjugation — Special Hybrids.....	317
The Preformative Statives.....	317
<i>išû</i>	317
<i>ibašši</i>	319
<i>izuzzu</i>	321
<i>idû</i>	323
<i>le²û</i>	328
Other Suffix Conjugation Hybrids.....	333
Reflexive Stems.....	333
<i>nenpušu</i>	333
<i>etpušu</i>	338
<i>ḥatû</i>	338
<i>riāḥu</i>	338
Verbs of Motion.....	339
<i>(w)ašû</i>	339
<i>elû</i>	339
<i>erēbu</i>	341
Other Verbs.....	342
<i>epēšu</i>	342
<i>ezēbu</i>	342
<i>ra²āmu</i>	343
Concluding Observations.....	346
Suffix Conjugation — Syntax.....	347
Past Tense.....	348
Transitives.....	348
Verbs of Motion.....	349
Statives.....	350
Present Tense.....	352
Future Tense.....	355

Protases	355
Apodoses	358
Purpose Clauses	363
Optative	364
Summary	366
The Infinitive — Morphology	367
Theme Forms	367
G Stem	367
<i>qatāl</i>	367
<i>qitīl/qitāl</i>	375
N Stem	376
D Stem	377
<i>quttul</i>	377
<i>quttal/quttāl</i>	378
<i>qattil</i>	379
š Stem	380
št Stem	381
Inflection	381
Dependent	381
Accusative	382
Finite	382
The Infinitive — Morphosyntax	383
As a Finite Verb	383
Past Narrative	384
"As Soon As"	385
Conditional Sentences	386
Paranomastic Usage	389
Direct Object of Another Verb	390
<i>bu^{ʔʔ}û</i>	391
<i>le^ʔû</i>	393
<i>amāru</i> "to See"	396
<i>ḥummuṭu</i>	396
<i>magāru</i>	397
<i>namguru</i>	397
<i>malāku</i>	397

<i>nadānu</i>	398
<i>qālu</i> "to Keep Silent"	398
<i>qu</i> ^{ʷû}	398
<i>ṣabû</i> "to Desire"	398
<i>uḥḥuru</i> "to Be Late, to Delay"	399
Attributive	399
The Infinitive — Morphosyntax (Cont.)	401
Expressions of Purpose	401
<i>ana</i>	401
<i>aššum</i>	406
<i>ina</i>	407
<i>ištu</i>	407
Circumstantial	408
Concurrent	408
Prospective	410
<i>ana ūmi/ina ūmi</i>	410
<i>adi</i>	411
Retrospective	412
<i>adi</i>	412
<i>ištu</i>	412
Correspondent	413

INTRODUCTION

The history of research leading up to the present monograph is outlined in Chapter I. It remains to explain something of the logic behind the organization of this volume. In the companion study on the Particles and Adverbs, justification was given for the practice of making extensive quotations from complete contexts in order to illustrate the various usages discussed. The reasons given back in 1984 have not lost their validity. The absence of a comprehensive transcription of all the EA texts means that the reader must still refer to the splendid but outdated edition of Knudtzon (1915) and the small (also obsolete) text collection published by the present author (Rainey 1978b).

Critical evaluations of the project by various scholars led me to the recognition that the linguistic features of the parent language, which was originally a conservative form of Old Babylonian, would have to be isolated and clarified before trying to analyze the peripheral and the specifically Canaanite features. Therefore, Chapter II is devoted to the Akkadian dialect adopted by the Canaanite scribes as their base language. The ensuing chapters then deal with the verbal system of the EA texts from Canaan under four categories: (1) the prefix conjugation (Chapters III - X); (2) the imperative (Chapter XI); (3) the suffix conjugation (Chapters XII - XIV); and (4) the infinitive (Chapters XV - XVII). It was deemed necessary to devote a chapter to each aspect of the respective conjugation pattern and, as could be expected, eight chapters deal with various facets of the prefix conjugation. The suffix conjugation was surveyed in only three chapters and surprisingly, there were enough interesting traits of the use of the infinitive to warrant three chapters as well. The reader will not find the customary numbering of paragraphs so

much in vogue today. On the other hand, there are ample cross references between the chapters and subdivisions. Furthermore, vol. 4 contains a separate list of references with all the bibliographical entries and a text index that facilitates comparison between the treatments of individual texts in all the parts of this three volume work.

CHAPTER I

IN SEARCH OF THE CANAANITE VERB

The centennial of the el-Amarna discoveries was celebrated in 1987. At a symposium commemorating the end of the first century of Amarna studies, the course of scholarly progress towards an understanding of the verbal system in these cuneiform documents was reviewed (Rainey 1987c). From the standpoint of language, there is no more distinctive feature of the Amarna letters than their verb forms. It is no wonder that Assyriologists found the texts difficult and frustrating; they represent such a radical departure from the Akkadian norm that many were disposed to call them "barbaric." Today that charge can no longer be sustained, especially for the letters written from the land of Canaan, that is, the Levant south of the Nahr el-Kebîr and ancient Kedesh on the Orontes.

North of that border, it was obvious almost from the beginning that the epistles were composed in a dialect having features not known elsewhere. Later discoveries, such as the Boghazköi, Nuzi and Alalakh archives, demonstrated that northern Mesopotamia, northern Syria and Anatolia had witnessed the development of an Akkadian strongly flavored by the Hurrian language spoken by large segments of the mid-second millennium population there. This Hurrianized Akkadian enjoyed considerable prestige in that area due to the flowering of Hurrian society and the rise of the political state (or empire) of Mitanni. Reference will be made to studies in that dialect below. The present monograph will touch on it only when it is necessary to elucidate some particular synchronic point. Instead, the emphasis here will be on those letters written in the special hybrid dialect, a sort of pidgin, or jargon, or more appropriately, the "interlanguage" (Gianto 1990:11), used by the "school" of scribes who belonged to the geographical (and socio-political) entity known as Canaan.

One of the surprising facts of the Amarna archive is that the dialect in question is limited to a particular geographical area, one that corresponds amazingly with the "Land of Canaan" as defined in the Bible (Num. 34:1-12; Ezek. 47:13-48:29). It is the same geographical area encompassed by the topographical list from Thutmose III's first military campaign (Rainey 1982:336-337).

The most significant contribution of Amarna studies to West Semitic linguistics has been delineation of the verbal system in the texts from Canaan. Since those epistles are written in Akkadian, it has not been easy to discern the exact measure of Canaanite influence. Only a small number of real Canaanite verb forms appear (cf. *infra*, pp. 65-73, concerning the Barth-Ginsberg Law). Nevertheless, there is enough Canaanite "interference" in the Akkadian morphology to reveal a few salient features of the local paradigms and the syntax was markedly un-Akkadian.

One must recognize, however, that when the Amarna letters were first discovered, even the knowledge of standard Akkadian grammar was still at an elementary level among western scholars. Furthermore, the refinements of West Semitic grammar and syntax were still being elucidated by the pillars of our profession, men such as Nöldeke, Barth and others. Therefore, it was difficult to separate the West Semitic factors from true Akkadian in the Amarna letters. It was also easy to confuse the evidence from texts representing various dialects in the Amarna corpus; no one had as yet heard of Hurrian, and its influence on the texts not from Canaan was not properly understood. Therefore, in the Canaanized texts, there were too many opportunities for superficial comparisons with Hebrew.

PIONEER STUDIES (PRE-WW I)

In spite of several useful studies contributed during the last decade of the nineteenth century (e.g. Zimmern 1890a, Knudtzon 1899a, 1899b, 1899c), the fundamental study of the Canaanite verb can be said to begin with the essays of Böhl (1909) and Ebeling (1910). Both these men had had access to the new

edition being prepared by J. A. Knudtzon (1915) and for which Ebeling was making the glossary. Subsequently, they were followed by Dhorme (1913, 1914), whose work surpassed them only by its naïve assumptions of Hebrew prototypes in the Amarna letters. But before touching on some of the West Semitic morphology that they emphasized, notice must be taken of a brilliant but neglected essay by D. H. Müller (1906), in which the clausal syntax was shown to be strikingly similar to that of biblical Hebrew. Müller demonstrated, with numerous examples, that the coordinating conjunction, *u*, was functioning in the Amarna letters from Canaan like the Hebrew *w^a*-. Only one of his passages will be cited here; it illustrates the coordinating conjunction marking a logical connection between clauses, the second deriving from the first:

mi-ia-mi / L^UUR.GI₁₂ *u la-a* / *yi-iš-te-mu a-wa-ta₅* / LUGAL EN-*ia*,
 "Who is the dog *that* he would not heed the word of the king,
 my lord?" (EA 323:17-20; Müller 1906:3-7).

The salient features of the Canaanite verb which Böhl (1909:42-48) and Ebeling (1910:56-58) demonstrated extensively were generally morphological departures from the Akkadian norm. Above all, there were abundant examples of the Suffix Conjugation functioning as in ancient Hebrew but in a manner unlike what was known of Akkadian (cf. *infra*, pp. 347-366). There were many examples of *qatal* in transitive temporal usage, such as *ša-pár*, "he sent" (EA 126:4). The first person forms usually are marked by the *-ti* suffix known from Hebrew rather than the *-āku* of Akkadian, for example, *ša-pár-ti*, "I sent" (EA 126:34). Everyone was struck by the special treatment given to the Prefix Conjugation. Third person forms were characterized by the affixing of consonantal *y*- plus vowel. Scholars recognized that the PI-sign, which served in the older Akkadian dialects for *wa*, *we*, *wi*, *wu*, was used by the Amarna scribes to write *ya*, *ye*, *yi*, *yu* (cf. Gelb 1970:537, 539-540). They also noted that forms having the *i*- prefix, representing 3rd person in Akkadian, served to express 1st singular in these letters. By the same token, they observed

that the *t-* prefix frequently occurred with an *i-* vowel rather than the customary *a-* vowel of Akkadian. Unfortunately, they misinterpreted the significance of the *i-* vowel in these instances. It was assumed that the vowel was representative of Canaanite verbal forms and comparisons were made with the biblical *yiqṭōl* / *ʔeqṭōl* pattern (cf. Böhl 1909:54; Ebeling 1910:46-47; also Dhorme 1913:377-381). Only decades later did progress in the study of Hebrew morphology in its historical perspective make it clear that this direct comparison with Hebrew was out of order (for details, cf. below regarding the Barth-Ginsberg Law). For the time being, the works of Böhl and Ebeling remained the standard references for Hebrew scholars seeking illustrations of fourteenth century B.C.E. verbal forms. This led to some serious misconceptions regarding the diachronic development of verbal morphology within the Canaanite family.

THE INTERIM (Between the Wars)

The discovery of ancient Ugaritic with its cuneiform alphabetic texts tended to overshadow the West Semitized Amarna tablets; the decipherment and subsequent analysis of the Ugaritic language engaged the talents of the leading Hebrew scholars. Only rarely was reference made to the Amarna texts for illustrative material. A notable exception to this neglect was the recognition by Herdner (1938) that both Ugaritic and Canaanite had a 3rd m.pl. built on the *taqtulû* / *taqtulûna* pattern. One scholar who was deeply involved in the study of Ugaritic also had the wisdom to take a new look at the Amarna letters from Canaan, viz. W. F. Albright. The fruit of his labors found expression in a series of articles (Albright 1937, 1942a, 1942b, 1943a, 1943b) devoted to individual texts. Albright's notes to these text studies were full of important observations on West Semitic linguistics, some of which are still valid today. His most famous commentary pertained to a "proverbial saying". This "proverb," supposedly almost "pure Canaanite," has only four words that are properly West Semitic: *kî, namlu, tumḥaṣu, tanšuku*.

. . . *ki-i na-am-lu / tu-um-ḥa-ṣú la-a / ti-ka-pí-lu ù ta-an-ṣu-ku / qà-ti LÚ-li ša yi-ma-ḥa-aš-ši* ". . . when ants are smitten, they do not just curl up but they bite the hand of the man who has smitten them" (EA 252:16-19; Albright 1943b:31; cf. *infra*, pp. 65, 78, 148-149).

Albright's own reconstruction of the Canaanite proverb reveals that he assumed a *yiqátal* pattern for Canaanite (Albright 1943b:29, also n. 18 on p. 31). In spite of his many brilliant insights, Albright was far from unlocking the secrets of the verbal system.

THE BREAKTHROUGH (Post WW II)

One of Albright's own students, G. E. Mendenhall (1947b:5-7), took up the question of *yiqátal* in Northwest Semitic and demonstrated that no such verbal form was functioning in either Ugaritic or the Canaanite of the Amarna letters. Mendenhall thus acknowledged that he was confirming the opinion of Ebeling (1910:52) that the Canaanite scribes really did not have a *yiqátal* in their native tongue and often used the Akkadian *iparras* forms as if they were Canaanite D stem. Unfortunately, this doctoral thesis remained unpublished and its conclusions ignored.

It was another student of Albright's who finally solved the real mystery of the Canaanite verbal system. W. L. Moran (1950a) made a syntactical analysis of the Amarna letters from Byblos, choosing that corpus because it consisted of nearly seventy texts, all from one city. The approach was properly syntactic but by that means the functions of the principle morphemes of the verbal system were defined. Moran can truly be credited with discovering the Canaanite verbal system.

SUFFIX CONJUGATION. During the course of his research, Moran found that he had arrived independently at a conclusion reached many decades earlier by J. A. Knudtzon, namely that the suffix conjugation had been developed in Semitic from the non-

verbal clause (Knudtzon 1892; Moran 1950a:34-39 and n. 87 on p. 121). Both transitive and stative forms could serve to express past, present or future meaning. The suffix conjugation did not, therefore, express completed action or state as taught by S. R. Driver (1892:13-26; Moran 1950a:34). The full range of tense functions fulfilled by the suffix conjugation was amply illustrated by Moran from the Byblos letters.

Such a wide spectrum of tense functions proves that the suffix conjugation was originally tenseless but that it was adopted to express temporal nuances in accordance with (1) the nature of the respective verb and (2) the syntagma. With stative verbs Moran found a predominance of present tense usages; with transitive verbs there were more past tense examples. Because the latter usage was so standard in the Byblos letters, Moran could rightfully assume that the suffix conjugation had virtually taken over the entire preterite function (Moran 1950a:51). As for the future tense function, nearly all of Moran's examples have the suffix conjugation form in clauses introduced by the conjunction, *u*, being dependent on a preceding clause, either as an apodosis of a conditional sentence or as the consequence of an injunctive. In a later essay (Moran 1961:65) he recognized that this function of the suffix conjugation was a development of its optative nuance as noted earlier in some Ugaritic passages by H. L. Ginsberg (1936:177).

Concerning the morphology of the Suffix Conjugation, Moran noted that in the G stem, there was a tendency to use *qatal* for the transitive verbs and *qatil* for the statives, but this was fairly well understood already. On the other hand, Moran noted carefully the distinction between active and passive with transitive verbs. This was a distinct *qatal* /*qatil* contrast. There is no evidence of a *qutil* passive as in Arabic (Moran 1950a:116-117 n. 70).

PREFIX CONJUGATION. Moran's contributions to the study of the Prefix Conjugation were no less spectacular than for the suffix forms. They placed the entire system of West Semitic verbal nuances on a new footing.

The presence of an imperfect *yaqtulu* (3rd m.pl. *taqtulûna*), which Moran called "the indicative" in accordance with Arabic grammars, confirmed Mendenhall's thesis that there never was a *yiqátal* pattern in West Semitic. The Canaanite *yaqtulu* fulfilled all the functions of the Akkadian *iparras* (Moran 1950a:39-49; 1951). Above all, *yaqtulu* is the standard form for present-future. But it also became clear that *yaqtulu* could express continuous or repeated action in the past. Usually a temporal adverb was employed, thus confirming the past time of the clause and its verbal action.

Although translators had long recognized that many *yaqtul* forms had to be rendered as jussives, they did not try to describe the jussive as a modal conjugation pattern. It was Moran who carefully assembled the evidence to prove that *yaqtul* was clearly distinct from *yaqtulu*, and that it was primarily a jussive in function.

The role of *yaqtul* as preterite was of little consequence in the Byblos letters, though not entirely absent. Moran was led to suspect that those preterites were simply due to Akkadian influence; it remained for subsequent studies to confirm *yaqtul* as an effective tense in Canaanite of this period (cf. below). Alongside the jussive, Moran discovered the volitive *yaqtula*, which functioned like the jussive and may have originally been a more emphatic form (Moran 1950a:89-104; 1960). The Akkadian precativè is relatively rare in the Byblos letters but now and then it serves to open a chain of injunctives. In line with his usual practice of following the accepted terminology of Arabic grammar, Moran called the *yaqtula* "subjunctive". He nevertheless classed it as a volitive along with the jussive. He admitted that the formal correspondence with the Akkadian ventive made some examples doubtful.

The energetic in these letters had been noted already by Ebeling (1910:69-73). However, he had included all the Imperfect plurals in *-ûna*, not realizing that they represented the West Semitic *yaqtulu* mode. Neither did he draw any comparative conclusions from the observable differences between the Arabic and the EA energetics. Moran clarified the distinction between

energies and true WS imperfects (1950a:53-56), and identified the one almost certain instance of an injunctive (*yaqtulan[n]a*) energetic:

pal-ḥa-ti LÚ.MEŠ *ḥu-u*[*p-ši-ia*] / *ul ti-ma-ḥa-ša-na-[ni]*, "I fear [my] yeoman [farmers], lest they smite [me]" (EA 77:36-37; Moran 1950a:86, 100-101).

Consequently, Moran had thus far accounted for five prefix patterns: *yaqtulu* "indicative," *yaqtulun(n)a* "indicative" energetic, *yaqtul* jussive, *yaqtula* "subjunctive," and *yaqtulan(n)a* "subjunctive" energetic. He was not yet willing to concede the existence of a West Semitic *yaqtul* preterite because the past tense function was normally filled by the suffix forms. The fact that the suffix forms expressed the past tense (especially single instance) in Phoenician (Segert 1976:191-195, §64.4), as against the prefix forms for future and for continuous past, supported Moran's view. In this respect, Byblos Akkadian was diachronically the precursor of later Phoenician.

INFINITIVE. Of special interest is Moran's identification of the infinitive used as a finite verb (Moran 1950a:57-59; 1950b; 1952; *infra*, pp. 383-388). Its subject may be expressed by a noun or a nominative pronoun. It might indicate a past event but frequently stands in the protasis of a conditional sentence without a conditional particle.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

A detailed commentary on the Byblos letters EA 68-96 was written by R. F. Youngblood under the guidance of Moshe Held (Youngblood 1961). It was replete with valuable linguistic observations. However, it remained an unpublished dissertation and, for those few who obtained copies, it did not have an index. Youngblood was aware of Moran's work and utilized it to some extent, but seems not to have realized the far-reaching importance of Moran's conclusions. In any case, Youngblood scored an important "first" in recognizing the Amarna scribes'

knowledge of *ibašši* as a stative (von Soden 1952a:102, §78b), so that they conjugated it like the suffix conjugation: *i-ba-ša-ti*, (also *i-ba-aš-ša-ku*), *i-ba-ša-ta*, *i-ba-ša-at*, *i-ba-ša-tu-nu*, et al. (Youngblood 1961:120-121, 343; Rainey 1973c:242-261; cf. *infra*, pp. 319-321).

MODES AND TENSES. Böhl and Ebeling wrote their studies long before Assyriologists came to the realization that there was a real tense form in Akkadian marked by the infix *-t-*. Therefore, the past tense forms with the infix were all classed as Gt. Even after the *iptaras* tense was identified, it did not occur to scholars interested in the Amarna texts to ask themselves how the Canaanite scribes utilized the *t-* forms. As it turns out, they usually employ a form with infix *-t-* only when there is a particular lexical nuance for the Gt stem, such as with verbs of motion. But on occasion they may simply choose the *-t-* form of a weak verb as their theme form upon which to build their West Semitic conjugation. In such cases there is no special nuance to the infix; the scribes were simply aware that, in the peripheral dialects of the Middle Babylonian/Assyrian period, the *-t-* forms served exactly as their simple preterite counterparts, without any difference in function. The Canaanite scribes also knew the significance of the *-tan-* forms, which they inserted now and then as Akkadianisms in their West Semitized texts (Rainey 1971c). The search for these infix forms led to an unexpected by-product, namely the proof that outside of Byblos the *yaqtul* preterite was still an active tense conjugation.

Further studies revealed more examples of the *yaqtul* preterite (Rainey 1975a:401-403, 410-411) and, even at Byblos, one could find valid examples. The existence of the *yaqtul* preterite was also accepted by Moran (1975a:149 n. 2). It has now become possible to define the modes and tenses of the Canaanite Prefix Conjugation; there are six patterns in the Prefix Conjugation, divided into two modes with three conjugations in each mode. The patterns of the indicative can legitimately be called "Tenses" (Rainey 1985). The system as a whole and in its constituent parts will be discussed in detail later on (cf. *infra*, pp. 221-264). With the Canaanite pattern thus established, it has also become possible to

define its survivals in biblical Hebrew (Rainey 1986, 1988c) and in Ugaritic (Rainey 1987a:397-398). This is the major by-product of research in the Amarna letters from Canaan.

BARTH-GINSBERG LAW. It was after H. L. Ginsberg had demonstrated that Barth's law of thematic vowels in the Hebrew G stem prefix and suffix conjugations was also functional in Ugaritic (Ginsberg 1932-33:382-383; 1939:318-322), that Albright also looked for it in the el-^cAmârnah tablets (Albright 1943a:17 n. 60) albeit in his presumed *yiqátal*. So a thorough study of the phenomenon was still needed (Rainey 1978a; cf. *infra*, pp. 61-75).

The forms attested in the syllabic spellings of proper nouns as well as all the glosses and other West Semitic vocables from Ugarit, Alalakh and Amarna have been brought together in a glossary and analyzed grammatically by D. Sivan (1984). In fact his discussion of the verbal forms makes possible a synchronic comparison of the Ugarit and Alalakh materials with the Canaanite evidence from Amarna.

Once the Barth-Ginsberg Law is recognized as valid for Canaanite, it becomes obvious that the forms which so impressed Böhl and Ebeling and the other pioneer students, namely *yi-iš-pu-ur*, are nothing but hybrids. The Akkadian *išpur* has been furnished with a Canaanite consonantal prefix. The *tišpur* forms and the 1st person *Øišpur* are built in the same manner, an Akkadian *išpur* with a Canaanite prefix. There can be no question of comparing these hybrids with the late Hebrew *yišmōr* forms, which have undergone attenuation of the prefix vowel, not in the Amarna period but sometime in the Byzantine age (Rainey 1978:12*-13*). Therefore, we are in a better position to understand the linguistic history of Massoretic Hebrew.

JERUSALEM SCRIBE. It was always obvious that the scribe of the Jerusalem correspondence stood somewhat apart from the authors of the other epistles from Canaan. An analysis of the verbal forms in terms of their semantic function was made by Sh. Nitzan (1973:53-64, 96-98). He noted that the Jerusalem letters use

the Prefix Conjugation for past tense but for the present-future they employ the Akkadian *iparras* forms. Only in some direct quotations does the scribe adopt the West Semitic *yaqtulu*, as in the following example where the quotation is introduced by Akkadian *aqabbi* in its function as an expression of repeated action in the past, while the verbs within the direct quote are West Semitic *yaqtulu*'s to express present action:

a-qa-bi a-na LÚMAŠKÍM LUGAL E[N-ia] / am-mi-nim-mi ta-ra-ia-m[u] / LÚḫa-pí-ri ù LÚ.MEŠḫa-zi[-a-nu-ti] / ta-za-ia-ru ù ki-na-an-na / ú-ša-à-ru i-na pa-ni LUGAL EN-ia, "I repeatedly said to the commissioner of the king, [my l] ord, 'Why do you favor the 'Apîrû and hate the city [rulers] so that thus I am being slandered before the king, my lord?'" (EA 286:17-21).

Shortly afterwards, Moran entered the lists again with a masterful analysis of the Jerusalem letters, particularly from the standpoint of the strong Assyrian influence evident in verbal morphology. There is a mixture in these letters of Babylonian and Assyrian forms unknown in the other texts from Canaan (Moran 1975b:153-154). A particularly striking case of Assyrian morphology, lack of contraction and lack of harmonious vowel coloring, is applied to a verb form with the Canaanite Imperfect suffix, *-u*:

a-qa-bi ḫal-qa-at-mi KUR.ḪÁ LUGAL-r[i] / la ta-ša-mé-ú a-na ia-a-ši, "I repeatedly said "The king's lands are lost (but) you do not listen to me" (EA 286:49-50).

D STEM FORMS. The publication of an Amarna-type letter from Kâmed el-Lôz provided the correct vocalization of the Prefix Conjugation in the D Passive. In the following excerpts, the first has a seldom recognized D Passive and the second has a typical G Passive:

qí-bi ù lu-ú / tu-wa-aš-ša-ru-na / ú-nu-tu^{MEŠ}-šu . . . ù / qí-bi ù lu-ú / tu-ud-da-nu-n[a], "Speak that his implements may be sent . . .

so speak that they may be given" (KL 72:600:11-13, 20-21; Rainey 1976; Wilhelm 1982:126).

Now it is clear that the old Canaanite D Passive was vocalized like the Arabic, *viz.* *yūqattal*, rather than like the Hebrew *y^aquṭṭal*, which is evidently secondary.

In his study of the Gezer Amarna letters, Sh. Izre'el devoted his attention to the form of the active D stem Suffix Conjugation (and also to the Š stem). He demonstrates that it was *quttil*, which almost seems to be a hybrid between Akkadian D Stative, *purrus*, and Hebrew Piel, *qittēl* (Izre'el 1976:60-64; 1978b:74-78). Besides the ubiquitous *uš-ši-ir-ti*, *uš-ši-ir-ta*, *uš-ši-ir*, *uš-ši-ra-at* forms of *wuššuru*, he could also point to some real Canaanite verb forms, e.g. 3 ms *ḥu-lí-iq* (EA 250:8, 39) and 3 cpl *du-bi-ru* (EA 104:27).

Izre'el's case is considerably strengthened by the documentation of forms for the D stem infinitive. That the usual infinitival form of *wuššuru* in the Byblos letters was *uš-ša-ar* (EA 82:22) had been observed by Youngblood (1961:231), who noted that the theme vowel should be short *ā* because otherwise a Byblian scribe would have written *uš-šu-ur*, which would resemble the later, mainly Assyrian, form of this verb's infinitive (GAG:141, §103q; AHw:1485).

The proof of the true West Semitic nature of these *quttalu* infinitives was furnished by the multilingual dictionary from Ugarit. There one finds *ḥu-wa-ú* for **ḥuwwayu*, "to give life" (Ug 5, 137:II, 17') and *pu-la-ṭu* for **pullaṭu*, "to rescue, deliver" (Ug 5, 137:II, 20'; Rainey 1969:108).

Incidentally, Izre'el also concluded that the *šu-ši-ir-ti* type Š forms of the Prefix Conjugation are an indication that the causative stem in Canaanite may have had an original **huqtil* pattern in spite of the one example of *ḥi-iḥ-bi-e* (EA 256:7), which seems to stand for **hiḥbi[?]* or **hiḥbi[?]* (Izre'el 1978b:77 n. 245). One wonders if the theme vowel may not have been lengthened in this latter form because of quiescent aleph, which then might have led to vowel harmony affecting the vowel of first syllable, thus **huḥbi[?]* > **huḥbi* > **hiḥbi*.

HYBRID FORMS. Today it is possible to define more clearly the process whereby the Canaanite scribes built their pseudo-Akkadian verb forms in conformity with the Canaanite conjugation patterns and syntactic functions. A primary aim of our research has been to isolate those elements which are truly Canaanite from those which are merely "pidgin Akkadian." All told, three linguistic strands have been found woven together in the language of the Amarna texts from Canaan. First of all, there is the Old Babylonian dialect that serves as the stock language. The scribes of Canaan had learned this dialect, probably late in the Middle Bronze Age, and preferred to use it as their Akkadian basis instead of the contemporary Middle Babylonian, which formed the base for the peripheral dialects present in other archives from this period. The scribes from Canaan do know and understand Middle Babylonian and its peripheral extensions, and on occasion they even insert a Middle Babylonian verb form as a sort of gloss, an Akkadianism (e.g. the Gtn *eltenemme*, EA 300:23 and EA 378:26), but they prefer their more archaic brand of Old Babylonian, e.g. with the 3 m.s. independent pronoun *šūt* and verb forms without the *št* > *lt* shift (cf. *eštemû* in EA 300:25). However, their Akkadian base language has undergone some independent developments of its own and the resultant forms are without parallels in either West Semitic or other contemporary peripheral dialects, e.g. the infinitives of 1st Aleph verbs, *i-pé-šu* (EA 82:46) instead of *e-pé-šu* (EA 179:17) and *i-re-ba* (EA 114:37) instead of *e-re-ba* (EA 98:20). This second linguistic strand can perhaps be defined as "colloquialism." Finally, there is the direct influence of the native West Semitic language(s) spoken by the scribes. Considering the geographical distribution of the West Semitized texts, it is not inappropriate to assume that that West Semitic language was Canaanite. The Canaanite Amarna scribes seldom utilized a purely West Semitic verbal form. There are, of course, many purely West Semitic verb forms in the proper names (cf. Sivan 1978, 1984; Hess 1984, 1993a), but by and large, the scribes preferred hybrid formations. It was their general custom to pick out one Akkadian form from the paradigm of each verb and to ring the changes on it according to the Canaanite modes

and tenses. As a result, we have an almost complete set of West Semitic conjugation morphemes attached to Akkadian verb forms. This process was discussed in detail by Izre'el (1978b:78-79) in conjunction with his study of the Gezer letters (also Izre'el 1976:65-67); these verbal base forms will be referred to herein as themes (actually logograms). Those in the Megiddo and Shechem letters and their Canaanite inflections have been tabulated by Rabiner (1981:67-81); the Tyrian forms were analyzed by Finkle (1977:88-110).

Often the scribes would take the present-future Akkadian 3 m.sg. as their theme, e.g. they usually chose *illak* from *alāku* and *ubbal* from *wabālu* even though it seems certain that their native tongue had a thematic *-i-*, **yalik* and **yabil*. Why they did not choose to use *illik* and *ubil* is a mystery. They also preferred the present-future *idaggal* from *dagālu* even though there may have been a real West Semitic verb with a thematic *-u-*. The prefix stative of *bašû*, the present-future *ibašši*, was their theme for the suffix conjugation of the verb, "to be," e.g. *ibaššāti*, "I am," so they also used the present-future as the suffix conjugation theme for some other verbs, viz. *ippušti* from *epēšu* (EA 280:12) and *irrubāti* from *erēbu* (EA 253:21) and the like. (Rainey 1973c:249-250, 258-260). For the verb *leqû*, they normally used the preterite *ilqe* but now and again they followed the practice of other peripheral dialects and borrowed the Past with infixed *-t-*, that is, *ilteqe*. With *šemû*, "to hear," they used the present-future *išemme* now and then, but for the most part they took the preterite *išme*.

In order to give an idea of how the system worked, the following table records selected forms from *šemû*; the theme is in bold type; although references are not furnished, all the forms are documented in the texts (cf. Ebeling 1915:1511-1513; Rainey 1978b:94):

Pret. 1st c.s. *iš-me* = \emptyset + **išme** + \emptyset

Imperf. 1st c.s. *iš-mu* = \emptyset + **išm** + u

Pret./Juss. 3rd m.s. *yi-iš-me* = y + **išme** + \emptyset

Imperf. 3rd m.s. *yi-iš-mu* = y + **išm** + u

Imperf. 3rd m.pl. *ti-iš-mu-na* = t + **išm** + ûna

Imperf. Pass. 3rd m.pl. *tu-uš-mu-na* = tu + **šm** + ûna

Pret. (sic!) 3rd m.s. *yi-še₂₀-mé* = y + **išemme** + Ø

Pret. (sic!) 1st c.s. *i-še₂₀-me* = Ø + **išemme** + Ø

Besides the West Semitic inflectional morphemes applied to many Akkadian verbs, there is also the matter of syntax. It is here that the strongest West Semitic influence is felt. Not only are the hybrids markedly different in outward shape from standard Akkadian forms, but they also appear in non-typical word order and often express semantic nuances which, while corresponding to the standard Akkadian categories, are usually realized in Akkadian by other forms and combinations.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

It should be obvious now that none of the old reference tools for the Amarna letters is an adequate guide for the student today. But thanks to the patient labors of many scholars, especially in the light of Ugaritic, there is a better understanding of West Semitic morphology and syntax. The nature of Akkadian in its relevant dialects (Old Babylonian, Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian) is also more clearly defined. It is easier today to sort out the different factors at play in the peculiar "dialect" of the Amarna letters from Canaan. Their unique "encoding" of Canaanite thoughts in Akkadian dress becomes a fascinating object of research. When and where the scribes came to a mutual agreement to write in that particular manner is still a mystery; that they did establish such a consensus, apparently as early as the fifteenth century B.C.E. (Rainey 1977), is a matter of wonder and admiration. The study of how their method was applied is a gold mine for the history of the West Semitic verb. It is also the proper

backdrop for a synchronic study of neighboring text groups such as those from Amurru (Izre'el 1985, 1991a) and Egypt (Cochavi-Rainey 1988).

A summary of all the evidence, systematically organized and thoroughly documented, is the object of this present monograph.

The vast majority of verbal forms in the Amarna texts from Canaan are in the prefix conjugation pattern. For that reason, the prefixed verbal forms will receive considerably more attention. First, Chapter III is devoted to the peculiar characteristics of the person, gender, number and modal/tense morphs in this corpus of texts. Because of the special nature of the evidence, it was deemed advisable to treat the prefix forms of the various stems (G, D, Š, N, etc.) in Chapters IV-VIII. The morphosyntactic system for expressing tense and mode, undoubtedly the most important aspects of the entire Canaanized verbal system in these texts, is the subject of Chapters XI-XII. The suffix conjugation, including its morphology (inflection and stems) and syntax, is brought together in Chapters XIII-XIV. The infinitival forms are treated in Chapters XV-XVII.

CHAPTER II

THE AKKADIAN BASE LANGUAGE

Any effort to search out the West Semitic elements in the Amarna letters from Canaan must first attempt to identify and distinguish both the original features of the Akkadian base language and the colloquialisms that developed in the jargon used by the Canaanite scribes. The verbal themes, or stem forms, that they used as the base for building their hybrid verb forms were generally those of the standard Akkadian stems: G, Gt, N, D, Dt, Š. The instances of confusion between G and D stem morphology will be discussed under the latter. But before dealing with the actual hybrid forms, it is necessary to delineate the kind of Akkadian being used. It will be seen that most of the scribes have drawn on a particular linguistic stock of forms representing a dialect of Old Babylonian that, while preserving what appear to be some archaic features, nevertheless, exhibits traits that developed in the later stages of OB (Moran 1987b:27; 1992:xxi-xxii). Distinctive Middle Babylonian developments are surprisingly rare, especially in view of the fact that these scribes were receiving communications from Egypt and elsewhere that were couched in fairly good MB style Akkadian. Assyrian forms are typical of only two sources, Jerusalem and Tyre.

The paleography of the Amarna letters is an important element in the determination of the scribal traditions. The table by Schroeder (1915j:73-94; Moran 1975b:146-150), though based on the Berlin tablets only, gives a fairly clear picture. There is a recognizable script which can be called "southern" and another which can be called "northern." The Jerusalem letters are written in the latter (Moran *loc. cit.*). Knudtzon personally collated nearly all the texts as did Moran and the late Edmund Gordon. A comprehensive work on palaeography alone would require a separate volume, especially if it did justice to the comparative materials from other archives (cf. Moran 1987b:24-26 and

especially n. 48; 1992:xix-xxii, n. 49). The raw material for such a study may be available in the notes left by E. Gordon.

Orthographic practices and the syllabary will be dealt with throughout this present volume, but only as they arise in connection with specific verbal forms and spellings. The phonetic features of the peripheral dialects in the MB period, as they are reflected in the cuneiform syllabary, have been treated in depth and breadth by Jucquois (1966). His work has provided the data base for all subsequent studies, such as the present one. The emphasis in this and the subsequent chapters will be on linguistic features, morphological and syntactical.

MIMATION

As in all the post classical dialects (and already in late OB, including Mari, Jucquois 1966:260), mimation was disappearing in the Amarna letters. However, the scribes from Canaan were still aware of it and sporadic instances occur, e.g. *i-ka-ša-da-am* (EA 362:34), *yu-ša-am* (EA 362:60). Such ventives will be discussed more thoroughly in the chapter on the modes and tenses (cf. *infra*, pp. 202-211). On occasion, the true 1st c.s. dative pronominal suffix is intended: *li-di-nam-mi* (EA 244:34) but usually the ventive lacks mimation and dative force, as seen in this fifteenth century example from Taanach:

at-ta ta-^faš¹-pu-^fra¹ /a-na ia-ši "You have written to me" (TT:1:8-9;
Rainey 1977:43)

The infinitive generally lacks mimation, the exception being *i-re-ši-im* (EA 74:19). The dative pronominal suffixes are also without it: *li-di-na-ku* (EA 87:12). The syllabic signs for closed syllables with final *-m* that served so often to represent the final syllable of forms with mimation, such as *lim*, *tam* and *tum*, can usually be transcribed without the *-m* (for detailed discussion, cf. Jucquois 1966:260-262). One obvious example is *ni-mu-tu₄* (EA 288:61), where there is no grammatical justification whatever for a final *-m* (Nitzan 1973:62; Moran 1975b:166 n. 78).

INITIAL VOWELS IN 1st WEAK VERBS

While some of the non-WS texts (i.e.. from Mitanni, N. Syria or Amurru) still display the plene writing of initial vowels in finite forms of the IIIrd weak verbs (GAG:126, §97c), such spellings are absent from the Canaanized epistles. One may compare Mitannian 3rd m.s. *i-il-la-ak* (EA 19:57) and Amurru *i-il-la-ká-am* (EA 166:30) with *il-la-lak¹* (EA 230:12); 1st c.s. *e-ep-pu-uš* (EA 19:45) with 1st c.s. *ep-pu-šu* (EA 254:46), 3rd m.pl. *ú-ub-ba-lu* (EA 20:25, 28) with 1st c.s. *ub-ba-lu-šu* (EA 296:39), or 3rd pl. *ú-uš-ša-ni* (EA 55:13) with 1st c.s. *uš-ša-am* (EA 88:51). So while that distinctive feature of OB spelling survived in the peripheral dialects of N. Syria, it was rejected by the scribes of Canaan.

INITIAL W

Although the initial *w-* of the D imperative and the substantival forms is usually preserved in OB (GAG:140, §103i), it was dropped in MB and this is the case in the EA texts from Canaan. Thus, one finds *a-ší* (EA 70:23; 71:26; *et passim*), *a-na a-ša-bi* (EA 138:41), and the infinitive (as d.o.) *uš-ša-ar* (on the WS vocalic pattern; EA 82:22; 113:29; 117:44, 59), etc.

RADICAL 1st W

The OB verb *wuššuru* is treated in MB as *muššuru* but the Canaanite scribes continue to use the OB forms, thus preserving the intervocalic *-w-*. One glaring exception is the scribe from Jerusalem, who knows the MB paradigm (which is also generally common to the N. Syrian peripheral dialects; Böhl 1909:47 n. 1; Moran 1975b:151). By way of example, one may note the following 1st c.s. forms — from a Canaanite scribe: *ú-wa-še-ru* (EA 255:13); from Mitanni: *ú-maš-šer* (EA 29:150); from Jerusalem: *ú-ma-še-er* (EA 289:35). The Taanach texts contain the more conservative forms, e.g. *tu-wa-še-ru-na* (TT 6:11), putting the date of their use in Canaan back in the fifteenth century B.C.E. Here it would seem that we have a genuine survival of an OB trait. On

the other hand, there are a few shortened forms without the first radical: 3rd m.s. *yu-uš-ši-ra* (EA 180:6; 182:8; 269:11, 14; 270:24; 271:18; 279:14); *yu-uš-ši-ir-mi* (EA 280:9); also: 3rd m.s. *yu-ša-ru* (EA 362:10), *yu-ši-ru* (EA 126:22; 131:15; *yu-ši-ra* (EA 104:14; 131:12; 216:15; 281:11, 27; 366:30). Only four Byblos tablets employ the shortened forms. One Rib-Haddi letter written in Beirut has the 3rd m.s. hybrids *yi-iš-ši-ru* (EA 139:34, 36, 38), *yi-iš-ši-ra* (EA 139:30-31). Outside of the verbal forms, note that intervocalic *-w-* appears in WS texts, e.g. *a-wa-tu* (EA 81:23), etc., while the N. Syrian, Mitannian, Tyrian and Jerusalem letters use *a-ma-tu₄* (EA 29:13, 47, 153), etc. The MA spelling, *a-ba-at* (EA 211:10, 19) is a rare exception in a WS text.

A > E BEFORE I

In MB there is a tendency for short *a* vowels to shift to short *e* when followed by an *i* in the next syllable (Aro 1955:40-49). But the shift is not always carried through, especially in the letters. From the EA archive itself, Aro (1955:41, 43) cites *ú-na-ak-ki-su* (EA 8:36) in contrast to *tu-bi-²i-i-ma* (EA 4:15), both from Babylon. In the Mitanni letters, the shift is more prevalent than in the MB letters known to us (Adler 1976:23-24 with many examples), but this is hardly a phenomenon derived from Hurrian as suggested by Adler. With the lone exception of *tu-¹bi¹-¹u⁵¹-na* (EA 250:10), the shift *a > e* before *i* does not occur in the Amarna texts from Canaan. Even the Jerusalem letters, which show so much influence from N. Syria, do not have it; compare the Mitannian *ú-me-eš-še-ru* (EA 29:69), *up-te-eḫ-ḫé-er* (EA 20:47) and *li-me-eš-šir-šu-nu* (EA 17:48) with Jerusalem *ú-ma-še-er* (EA 289:35) and *lu-ma-še-er* (EA 288:58; 289:42) and *i-ḫal-li-iq* (EA 286:37). Mitannian *uk-te-eb-bi-du-ši* (EA 23:21) can be compared with Megiddo *yu-ka-bi-id* (EA 145:39; which, as a gloss, could be a purely Canaanite form). Alashia has *ia-qá-ar-ri-ib* (EA 39:19) without the shift, and examples from all over Canaan may be cited: *ú-da-mi-iq* (EA 120:44; most likely 1st c.s.!), *tu-ga-me-ru-nu* (EA 299:25), *yu-la-mi-dá* (EA 272:23), *yi-ma-lik* (EA 94:12; *et al.*), *i-na-ší-ru* (EA 119:15; *et al.*), *ti-¹pa¹-¹ṭi¹-¹ir¹* (EA 299:25). The

absence of this typical MB and peripheral shift marks another conservative trait in the Akkadian used by the Canaanite scribes.

NASALIZATION OF GEMINATED CONSONANTS

This shift occurs frequently in MB and throughout the peripheral area, especially with geminated dentals and the verb *nadānu* in particular (GAG:32-33, §32; Aro 1955:36; Adler 1976:19; Huehnergard 1979:29-190; Berkooz 1937:45; Wilhelm 1970:24-25). The Egyptian Amarna letters generally have the nasalization; for example: *i-na-an-di-nu-na-ši* (EA 1:68), *a-na-an-din-šu-nu* (EA 1:76), *a-na-an-din-šu-nu-ti* (KL 69:277:8) and also *ú-ma-an-de-ši_x* (ŠE) (EA 1:17), while the Egyptian letters from Hattusas vary from *ta-na-an-di-i[n]* (KBo 1 15 + 19: r.15; also KUB 3, 27: r.8; 67:11') to *ta-na-ad-di-in* (NBC 3934: 3.1) and *tá-na-di-in* (KBo 1 15 +19: r.17). The only Canaanite town where this phenomenon occurs is Tyre (Finkle 1977:94): *i-na-an-din-ni* (EA 154:13), *i-na-an-din-ni₇* (EA 155:13); and *i-na-an-šár* (EA 150:9), *a-na-an-šár* (EA 147:61; 151:6; 153:15). On the other hand, from Taanach comes: *a-na-^ldin^l* (TT 1:10), and from Beirut: *a-na-din-mi* (EA 137:55). A Nuğassi letter has 3rd m.s. *i-ma-an-gur* (EA 51: r. 13), but from Acco we find 1st c.s. *i-ma-gur* (EA 234:27). By and large, the Canaanite scribes have not acquired this phonetic shift so common to MB and the other peripheral dialects. The Tyrian scribe either learned it from North Syria or perhaps from a N. Syrian teacher with whom he studied in Egypt. The Jerusalem letters have no examples of the present future from *nadānu*, *našāru* or *magāru*, so there is no way to ascertain whether this trait was present in that scribe's dialect or not. Again, the Akkadian used by the scribes of Canaan reflects an older dialect than the contemporary peripheral.

Š › L BEFORE A DENTAL

This is, perhaps, the most striking phonetic development from the OB to the MB period (GAG:31, §30g). The shift is not uniformly carried out in the MB letters (Aro 1955:37-38). In Nuzi it is still only partially used (Wilhelm 1970:19-21), while at Alalakh

it is nearly absent (Giacumakis 1970:29). In Mitanni it is practically universal (Adler 1976:20-22) and in Carchemish and Ugarit it also predominates in the verbal forms (cf. Huehnergard:1979:28, 188-189). The Amarna letters from Egypt reveal a mixture of old and late forms, e.g. *uš-te-bi-la-ku* (EA 367:3) alongside *ul-te-bi-la-ak-ku* (EA 162:61; 369:3). However, in the Amarna letters from Canaan, the (almost) universal rejection of this shift is one of the principal signs of the archaic nature of the Akkadian base language. One may compare the MB imperative, *kul-da* (PBS 1/II, 24:9), with the Byblos *ku-uš-da* (EA 82:52), the MB *-t-* preterite, *ik-ta-al-d[a]* (EA 10:37), with Byblos *yi-[ik-t]a-aš-du-na* (EA 85:61), or Mitannian *el-te-me* (EA 20:10) with Byblos *eš-te-me* (EA 108:24). Other forms in the Canaanite texts where the shift might have been expected are: *yi-iš-ta-al* (EA 280:25), *yi-iš-ta-ka-nu-ni* (EA 125:31), *iš-ta-ni* (EA 125:21; *et al.*), or the many variants of *iš-ta-ḥa-ḥi-in* (EA 298:12) and others. The putative *ú-ul-ta-ša-aš* of EA 82:50 (supported by CAD A/2:424b) has been duly discredited by Moran (1987b:264 n. 6; 1992:152-153 n. 6); the other two possible cases which he cites there, viz. EA 92:39 and EA 130:41 are to be read *[iš]-t[a-p]a-ru* and *ul-ta-ma!-[n]a* "I will antagonize," respectively. Especially noteworthy is the rare Gtn (with WS imperfect suffix), 1st c.s. *iš-te-nem-mu* (EA 261:10), which fills the semantic slot where most Canaanite letters have the West Semitized Gt imperfect, *iš-te-mu* (EA 212:14; *et passim*; Rainey 1971:96-101). Of course, the Gtn is quite foreign to the West Semitic languages (cf. *infra*, pp. 113-116); therefore, none can doubt the intrusiveness of two examples from the common MB/peripheral paradigm of present tense Gtn's with the *št* > *lt* shift: *él-te₉-né-em-mé* (EA 378:26) and ¹él¹-¹te₉¹-¹né¹-mé (EA 300:23), especially since the latter form is paralleled by *iš-[t]e₉-mu* (EA 300:25) in the same context! The scribes who wrote EA 261, EA 300 and EA 378 all wanted to impress pharaoh with the continuous faithful obedience of the city rulers for whom they were writing. So they chose a universally acknowledged Akkadian stem, the iterative Gtn, to express their meaning. The latter two scribes even went so far as to use the *koine* form from the MB and peripheral dialects which they knew was employed

by the Egyptian scribes. Thus, they injected these two Akkadianisms with the *št* > *lt* shift! That these two examples are unique in the corpus of texts from Canaan should be sufficient proof that the basic Akkadian dialect adopted by the Canaanite scribes did not have the *št* > *lt* phenomenon. We see, therefore, another important feature in which the Akkadian of Canaan resembles OB rather than the contemporary "peripheral" dialects being used throughout the Levant and Mesopotamia during the Late Bronze Age (Middle Babylonian period). On the other hand, it is obvious that the Canaanite scribes were aware of this phonetic development in the international correspondence of their age.

WITH THE Š- OF ACCUSATIVE AND DATIVE SUFFIXES

The peripheral dialects have usually lost the consonantal assimilation or partial assimilation found in the last radical of Babylonian verb forms in juncture with pronominal suffixes beginning with *š* (GAG:30, §30f).

A sibilant or dental + *š* > *ss* in OB and in literary texts. The Amarna archive contained evidence for such shifts in the literary texts found there: *iš-ba-si* (= *išbassi* < *išbat* + *ši*; EA 357:86) and *ú-še-eš-bi-is-su* (*ušēšbissu* < *ušēšbit* + *šu*; EA 356:37) and *ni-ip-pu-us-su* (= *nippussu* < *nippuš* + *šu* EA 356:60). In MB one finds ¹*iš-ša-bat-si* (BE 17/I 33:11), evidently for *išbassi*, while the shift is entirely ignored at Megiddo, *yi-iš-bat-ši* (EA 244:28, 37; Rabiner 1981:55) and at Byblos, *ša-bat-ši* (EA 106:12). As for sibilants, the Mitanni texts have numerous examples like *e-ep-pu-us-sú-nu* (EA 29:147; Adler 1976:19), *i-te-ri-is-sí* (EA 29:17) and *i-na-aḥ-ḥi-is-sú-nu* (EA 29:152). But at Tunip, the scribe ignores the shift, *i-te-pu-uš-šu-nu* (EA 59:35), *ni-ir-ri-iš-šu-ni* (EA 59:16). At Ugarit (Huehnergard 1989:102-104) one text has *i-ḥu-uz-ši* (RS 16.144:8; Nougayrol 1955:76) and *li-ra-ḥi-iš-šu* (*ibid*, lines 9, 13), while another (possibly older?) has [. . .]*r-ku-us-sú* (Ug 5, No. 2:5; Nougayrol 1968:3). The only example documented from the Canaanite Amarna letters reveals a different situation altogether: *yi-ma-ḥa-aš-ši* (EA 252:19; Albright 1943b:31 n. 17; Rabiner

1981:55); the *ṣ* has assimilated to the *š*. When the final consonant is *n*, mainly with the verb *nadānu*, OB often showed assimilation to the *š* of the suffix pronoun, e.g. *inaddišši* (CH §146). In MB and the peripheral dialects such an assimilation is virtually unknown: Babylon, [*i*]d-di-in-ši-na-^lti¹ (EA 2:11); Mitanni, *at-ta-din-ši* (EA 29:23, 28), but note a unique form, *na-dá-a-an-sú-nu-ma* (EA 27:21); Egypt *a-na-an-din-šu-nu* (EA 1:76), Tunip, *li-id-din-šu* (EA 59:17), Alashia *i-din-šu* (EA 35:34), Ugarit *id-din-šu* (RS 15.89:7; Nougayrol 1955:53) and *ta-na-din-šu* (*ibid*, lines 13, 15, 16; Huehnergard 1989:101). So it is not surprising that the texts from Canaan also do not have it: *ya-di-in₄-ši* (EA 197:29, 30), *ya-di-in₄-šu-ni* (EA 197:11, 12). This does not mean that their dialect is just another branch of peripheral Akkadian. But it does indicate the distance between this dialect and the Babylonian homeland from which it had migrated westwards. What the Canaanite scribes are using is an attenuated form of Old Babylonian.

ASSYRIANISMS

The two main focal points for Assyrianisms in the texts from Canaan are Jerusalem and Tyre. The Assyrian traits in the Jerusalem letters were analyzed in detail by Moran (1975b:152-154). Moran brings numerous other Assyrian features besides verb forms but only the latter will be discussed here. Moran enumerates the following:

(1) The precativative takes the Assyrian form wherever it differs from the Babylonian (10x): 1st c.s. *la-mur-mi* (EA 286:40), *la-mur* (EA 286:46), *le-lu-ub* (EA 286:46; an obvious error for *lērub*, Moran 1975b:164 n. 59; Rainey 1978c:144-145), 3rd m.s. *lu-ši-mi* (EA 286:56), *lu-ma-še-er* (EA 288:58; 289:42), *lu-ma-šir₉* (EA 290:20), *lu-ma-še-ra* (EA 285:28; 287:18), *lu-ti-ra* (EA 290:21).

(2) Verbs 1st aleph₃₋₅ are consistently Assyrian in form (13x), G present, *te₉-ep-pa-ša* (EA 287:71), *e-pa-aš* (EA 289:9) and probably *ep-pu-šu* (EA 287:19; with vowel harmony, *eppušū* < *eppašū*, though the script would permit the Babylonian reading, *ip-pu-šu* = *ippušū*), G preterite, *e-pu-šu* (EA 289:12), *e-pu-šu-né*

(EA 290:5), G infinitive, *e-ra-ba* (EA 286:43), *e-za-bi-ša* (EA 287:20), Gt present *e-tel-li* (EA 287:45), Š present, *ú-še-ru-bu* (EA 287:11, vowel harmony), Š imperative, *še-ri-ib* (EA 286:62; 287:67; 288:64).

(3) The Jerusalem scribe apparently uses the Assyrian stative form from *dâku* as the theme for his suffix conjugation forms, namely *d[e₄-k]a* (EA 288:41), *de₄-k[a]* (EA 288:45), and *de₄-ka-ti* (EA 287:73). The use of TE for a syllable with *d* goes back to an ancient syllabary, at least as old as the Isin-Larsa period, that distinguished /di/ from /de/ (Moran 1975b:161 n. 34). Thus the value *de₄* for TE is not a Hurrianism (*contra* Artzi 1968:167).

(4) Third weak verbs have uncontracted forms characteristic of Assyrian, viz. *ta-ša-mé-ú* (EA 286:50), *te-le-qé-ú* (EA 288:38, but with Babylonian vowel harmony!), *li-il-qé-a-ni* (EA 288:59), *ig-ge-ú* (EA 288:44).

The Tyrian letters, which have many features in common with the Jerusalem texts, also present some Assyrian verbal formations (Finkle 1977:88 ff.). The most striking examples are:

(1) 1st aleph, G present-future, *i-ra-ab* (EA 150:11), and *i-ra-bu* (EA 151:13); the prefix follows the colloquial pattern with *i-*, though the thematic vowel is according to the Assyrian model. Note the colloquial infinitive (with *i-*) in Babylonian style, *i-re-bi* (EA 149:28).

(2) 1st aleph, G preterite, *ta-aš-me* (EA 151:36). Note the Babylonian form, *iš-me* (EA 147:17, 30, 34, 41; 151:2).

(3) 1st aleph, G *-t-* preterite, *aš-te-me* (EA 154:5), *aš-te-mu* (EA 149:42), *ta-aš-te-me* (EA 149:56; Finkle 1977:91). Note the Babylonian form, *iš-te-me* (EA 147:45; 153:12)

(4) 1st aleph, G precative *le-ru-ub* (EA 149:19, 78). Note that *li-ru-ub* with colloquial use of 3rd m.s. for 1st c.s. is also possible—the next clause has *li-mur* (EA 149:20, 78).

(5) 1st aleph, Gtn preterite (?), *i-ta-zi-ib* (EA 149:50). The context calls for past tense, with an emphasis on the long term (Abimilki has had to stay away from his seaboard town of Usu for an extended period of time). The Assyrian *t-* preterite of the G stem or the preterite of the Gt would be *ētizib* (cf. Hecker 1968:149, §90a) or *ētezib* (Mayer 1971:68). If the spelling *i-ta-zi-ib* reflects the scribe's knowledge of the paradigm, then the *a* vowel

would only be preserved before geminated *z*; thus, *ītazzib* (< **ītanzib*).

Moran (1975b:164 n. 58) has noted the Assyrian Š imperatives, namely *še-zi-ba-an-[ni]* (EA 381:14) and also *še-zi-bá-an-na-ši-mi* (EA 62:30), but with the reservation that they may be merely the result of misunderstanding the Babylonian form. The scribes may have thought that one could form the imperative simply by removing the prefix from *tušēzib*. Another superficially Assyrian form, *i-pa-aš* (EA 196:32, 41) is certainly a Canaanite adaptation to represent the WS transitive suffix conjugation 3rd m.s. The Assyrian form would have to be *eppaš*, 3rd m.s. present future. But the contexts in EA 196 make it clear that a past tense is required and a punctiliar one at that. Therefore, *i-pa-aš* most likely represents a past tense verb on the *qatal* pattern (Rainey 1973c:239). As Moran has remarked, some of these sporadic "Assyrianisms" might be due to a simple lack of understanding regarding proper Babylonian (Moran 1975b:164 n. 58). Others may be due to some WS morphological feature.

3rd MASCULINE PLURAL

Some very archaic texts from Mari, dating to approximately the Isin-Larsa period, have produced a few examples of 3rd m.pl. verb forms with preformative *ti-* (ARM 19, 41:3; 42:3; 43:3; 44:3; 45:3; 382:10; M 10556, Durand 1982). All but two of these are administrative dockets employing an as yet unidentified verb, *mazā³u*. In similar contexts, when the subject is in the singular, the formulation with that verb is:

1 guruš / *ru-si* / *im-za-³a* (ARM 19, 46:1-3).

But when the subject is plural the formula is

5 guruš / *ru-si* / *tim-za-u* (ARM 19, 42:1-3).

Both the singular and plural forms have been recognized as preterites, which is not only commensurate with the morphology,

but also is what one would expect from administrative documents ("descriptive texts"; Levine 1963). One text has an entry of commodities followed by a plural subject and the verb form *ti-ku-lu* "(They) have consumed" (ARM 19, 382:10). A legal document recording the sale of real estate concludes as follows:

ÉŠ-GID šu sí-kà-ti /tim-ḥa-šú / NINDA ti-ku-lu /kaš ti-iš-tá-u /ù Ì
ti-il-tap-tu "The surveyors who drove in the stakes; bread they
have eaten, beer they have drunk and with oil they have
anointed themselves" (M 10556: Durand 1982:81-83).

The distinction between the singular and plural forms of these verbs has been the subject of much discussion (Limet 1975:48; Westenholz 1978:165b; Gelb 1981:64; Edzard 1985:85-86; Izre'el 1987:87-88). Although it has been suggested that the 3rd m.pl. with *ti-* may have been common Semitic (Ezdard *loc. cit.*) or at least part of the western dialect of Old Akkadian, it seems more likely that the true source is West Semitic. The archaic tablets in question derive, after all, from Mari. Obviously, during the "Mari Age" under Zimri-Lim and under the intruder, Yasmaḥ-Addu, a form of northern Old Babylonian was adopted by the scribes. The prestige of this Babylonian was so great as to suppress the local "Amurrite" language except in proper nouns and in a few syntactic features. The process that led to the archaic plurals, *timza²ū*, *tikulū*, *timḥašū*, *tišta²ū* and *tiltapatū*, was probably identical with that at work in Ugaritic and Canaanite. The use of the 3rd f.s. (with *t-* prefix) with collective nouns would have led to the adoption of forms with the *ti* prefix for plurals while preserving the *-ū* suffix. The modal and tense distinctions of the plural, viz. the addition of the *-na* suffix for indicative imperfect and its absence (-Ø) for indicative preterite, jussive and volitive (cf. *supra*, pp. 9-10; *infra*, pp. 221-234) were perpetuated, at least in Ugaritic and Canaanite, on the newly developing *t-* forms.

Incidentally, one might have even ventured to suggest that *timza²ū*, *timḥašū* and *tišta²ū* reflect the Barth-Ginsberg law, something not present in the later Amurrite names from Mari (Rainey 1978a:*8-*9). However, the other G stem verb, *tikulū*,

would have had to be **tākulū*, so the Barth-Ginsberg law is out of the question here. In any case, the *ti-* prefix in the Canaanized plurals from the Amarna archive is nothing but the result of carrying over the initial vowel of the theme from a 3rd m.s. Akkadian form, usually *iparras* or *iprus*, to the other persons (cf. *infra*, pp. 73-75, concerning the implications of the Barth-Ginsberg law). Therefore, one can find no justification for seeking some proto-Semitic or proto-West Semitic plural form with the *ti-* prefix (Edzard 1985:85-86).

On the other hand, Izre³el (1987:88-89) has observed that there are enough plural forms in the Amarna texts from Canaan that have neither a *y-* nor a *t-* prefix, to preclude any suggestion that the basic Akkadian utilized by the scribes had had a *t-* prefix for masculine plurals in its paradigm. Note, for example, *i-du-ku-šu* (EA 75:26; Moran 1987b:254 n. 4; 1992:146 n. 4), *i-pu-šu* (EA 83:9; *et al.*), *iz-zi-bu-ni* (EA 366:18), *i-zi-bu* (EA 73:13), *i-ti-zi-bu* (EA 93:22), *ip-ḥu-ru-ni*₇ (EA 149:61), ¹*ip¹-pa-ṭá-r* (EA 292:50), and also *i-qa-bi-ú* (EA 288:54).

Therefore, the possibility that the Canaanite of the Amarna scribes might have an ancient ancestor or relative spoken at Mari prior to the Amurrite dominance is tantalizing. It can only be hoped that further documentation of that dialect will shed more light on the problem. On the other hand, it is obvious that the world of the Mari letters, from the reign of Zimri-Lim and his contemporaries, was the time when Old Babylonian became the international language of diplomacy and commerce (the Old Assyrian in Anatolia was a more parochial matter). The question remains as to just what brand of Old Babylonian formed the basis for the language adopted by the authors of the EA letters from Canaan.

OLD BABYLONIAN IN CANAAN

The question arises as to when and from where this brand of Akkadian came to the land of Canaan. There are known at present seven cuneiform texts dating to the Old Babylonian

(Middle Bronze) period discovered in Canaan itself (Anbar and Naʿaman 1986-87:7-11).

The oldest may be the legal text found out of context at Hazor (Hallo and Tadmor 1977). None of its forms reflect the West Semitized verbal system known from the Amarna letters but some peripheral features are in evidence: *ig-ru-ú* (line 4), G preterite 3rd m.pl. of *gerû*, appears in a standard legal idiom attested in Babylonian and peripheral dialects (CAD G:62; Hallo and Tadmor 1977:6); ¹*i*-*re-bu* (line 7), G preterite 3rd m. pl. of *erēbu*, a peripheral form with thematic *-e-* or *-i-*, known not only from Alalakh, *i-re-bu* (AT 12:7; Hallo and Tadmor 1977:9 n. 49; suggested to Tadmor by A. Shafer), but also from Beirut, where Canaanite pidgin forms are attested, viz. 1st c.s. *i-re-bu* (EA 137:34), and 3rd c. pl. *ti-re-bu* (EA 137:42; 138:134), from Byblos, 3rd m.pl. with ventive, *i-re-bu-ni*₇ (EA 127:19) and from Ḥasi in the Beqa^c Valley, 3rd m.pl. *i-re-bu-mi* (EA 186:50), *i-re-bu-ni* (with ventive, EA 185:20), *i-re-bu-na* (EA 185:36, 40). Mimation in the Hazor legal text appears on some independent nouns but has been dropped from a noun in construct even though the case ending is still preserved (Hallo and Tadmor 1977:9). Its grammar and style may seem provincial compared with the contemporary documents of Mari and southern Babylonia, but its verbal modes and tenses are basically OB.

The same may be said, more or less, of the Shechem letter (Shechem 1378:5; Böhl 1926, 1974), which Landsberger judged to be "in gutem Altbabylonisch schreiben" (Landsberger 1954:59 n. 121); its principal verb forms are: *tu-uš-pí-la-an-ni* (Shechem 1378:5), 2nd m.s. preterite plus ventive and 1st c.s. accusative suffix from the quadriliteral, *šupēlu*, *tu-ša-ab-ba-lu-[ni-ni]*, 2nd m.s. present subjunctive with 1st c.s. dative suffix (*ibid.*, line 7) from *šūbulu*, *ta-pa-ul-[an-ni]* (*ibid.*, line 9), 2nd preterite (for *tāpulanni*) or present (for *tappalanni*) from *apālu*, *il-ta-na-pá-tù* (*ibid.*, line 11), 3rd m.pl. Gtn present subjunctive from *lapātu* (Landsberger *loc. cit.*; *contra* Albright 1942a:31 nn. 28, 29), *ar-tu-ú-[ub]* (*ibid.*, line 15), 1st c.s. indicative past tense with infix *-t-*, from *ra²ābu li-ša-ḫi-¹za-an-ni¹* (*ibid.*, line 20), 3rd m.s. Š precative of *aḫāzu* with ventive and 1st c.s. dative suffix. The verbs all come at the end of

their respective clauses as in good Akkadian, especially OB, and in contrast to the Amarna texts from Canaan. But in spite of Landsberger's dictum about the OB character of this text, even he had to admit that several points of syntax, viz. *ul . . . ša* (lines 6-7), the use of *inūma* to introduce a "that" clause (line 9) and the conjunction *u* to express consequence ("so that"), are "provinziell" (*loc. cit.*). We might add the use of *ana muḥḥiya* (instead of *ana yāši* or *ana šēriya*), which is typical of MB and its contemporary peripheral dialects (*CAD M/2:175b*). That is to say, though the letter seems to be OB in script and verbal usage, it reflects some syntactic phenomena that later become standard in the periphery, especially in Canaan.

Anbar's administrative fragment from Hebron (Anbar and Naʿaman 1986-87:3-12) seems to be good OB as far as script is concerned. There is, however, the loss of mimation typical of late OB and there is the *-t-* preterite form, *ir-te-ḥu*, which could represent the peripheral preference for *-t-* forms in weak verbs (Anbar and Naʿaman 1986-87:6). It might also reflect the predilection evidenced in the Byblos Amarna texts to use such forms of *riʿāḥu* as the equivalent of WS statives (Rainey 1971b:93-94; 1973c:255-256).

The Hazor liver model fragments (Landsberger and Tadmor 1964), found in an LB I archaeological context, within a temple, have inscriptions that can be classified as OB but with some hints at a provincial origin. The verbal system of tenses and moods is definitely Akkadian: 3rd m.s. D stem future of *kanāšu*, *ú-ka-na-aš* (Frag. A, text a); 3rd m.s. G stem future, *i-ba-ar* (*ibid.*, text e); 3rd m.s. G stem future, *i-ka-al* (Frag. B, text f:2; with possible 3rd f.s. subject, Landsberger and Tadmor 1964:210 n. 22); 3rd m.pl. G stem present with ventive, from *tāru*, *i-tu-ru-ni* (Frag. B, text g). On the latter form, the clear absence of mimation for the plural dative is noteworthy.

The recently discovered fragments from Hazor, though found in Iron Age contexts, show affinities with the cuneiform horizon of Mari. The first (Hazor M/5142/31050) is a roster containing PN's of typical Mari types, most of them built on well known WS patterns, all of which could be considered "Amurrite"

but not necessarily "Canaanite" (Horowitz and Shafer 1992a:21-33). The second text, a fragmentary letter, has the uncontracted ventive form *iq-bi-am* (Hazor A2/3423/92/17-23086: line 8).

THE LATE BRONZE JARGON IN CANAAN

The Taanach letters, dating from LB I, i.e. the mid-fifteenth century B.C.E. (Glock 1983:58-59), share the same OB traits and lack of MB traits as the Amarna letters from Canaan. They also have a strong West Semitic flavor, especially in the verbal usages (Rainey 1977). The various forms will be cited and analyzed under their respective categories. Therefore, only a general summary need be given here. The two texts that probably were sent from Gaza (TT 5, 6) have clear Canaanisms; their ductus is almost identical with that of the Megiddo Amarna texts. The remaining two (TT 1, 2) present a mixture of standard OB style and usage with some other, more Canaanized features; their ductus is similar to certain Amarna letters, e.g. EA 63 and EA 64 (probably from southern Canaan; Na³aman 1979:676-677), EA 235 from Acco and EA 228 from Hazor (Glock 1983:59). Therefore, we have in the Taanach epistles our earliest testimony for the use of the system of verbal morphosyntax discovered in the Amarna letters from Canaan.

The political, social and cultural factors that led to the establishment of a "school" of scribes, all following these agreed conventions, can only be guessed at. If, as Moran suggested, this was a real spoken pidgin, how did these bureaucratic practitioners come to speak it? The proper nouns, both personal and geographic names, show no reflection of such a pidgin — they are purely West Semitic (cf. Sivan 1984).

One thing does seem clear: those who elected to use such a jargon had inherited an Old Babylonian dialect having some archaic but also some late OB features. They held that dialect in such veneration that they kept it alive in opposition to the almost world-wide trend to adopt the Middle Babylonian dialect at the expense of the classical tongue.

It has been suggested that the hybrid language of the EA texts from Canaan was actually used in the courts and schools of the Late Bronze Age. Technially, it seems more correct to call it an "interlanguage" (Gianto 1990:10-11; Rainey 1992b:330b-331a) rather than a pidgin (Moran 1992:xxi). Moran has most recently defined this hybrid in a most appropriate manner:

The language can only be described as an entirely new code, only vaguely intelligible (if at all) to the West Semite because of the lexicon, and to the Babylonian because of the grammar (Moran 1992:xxii)

In fact, the idea of a "code" had occurred to this writer many years before. The practice was imagined in which a messenger used the Akkadian text, with its West Semitic verbal system and word order, as a kind of "pony" from which he sight-translated into Canaanite for the benefit of the recipient or the recipient's representative (such as an official at the Pharaonic court or at the headquarters in Gaza). The message might, in turn, be translated into Egyptian for Pharaoh's ears. This hypothetical usage may be compared with what appears to have been the practice at Ugarit, where translations into Ugaritic were prepared from what may have been Akkadian originals. At least the Ugaritic epistles show strong Akkadian influence in the word order.

To what degree the scribes and officials of Canaan actually spoke this "interlanguage" is impossible to ascertain. If they did, then they must have been at varying degrees of proficiency in attaining the target language. The result must be reflected in the many variations in verbal morphology. The syntax, however, certainly reflects their native West Semitic mother tongue(s).

CHAPTER III

PREFIX CONJUGATION — PERSON AND NUMBER

The principle of word building adopted by the Canaanite scribes for their verb forms was described in the first chapter (cf. *supra*, pp. 14-15). A glance at the glossary developed by Ebeling (1915) will reveal the scribal preferences for any particular verb. Sometimes they used only one form, either the Akkadian present-future or the preterite as their base, "theme," but sometimes they varied their selections between the two. In the case of some weak verbs, they even adopted the Akkadian past form with the *-t*-infix (wrongly called the perfect) as was frequently done by other peripheral scribes (cf. the remarks of Gordon 1938:215-219). There are very few purely Canaanite verb forms apart from those in personal or geographic names. Identification of the theme is the first step in analyzing any Canaanized hybrid.

Assyriologists were immediately struck by the pattern of person markers in the Amarna texts from Canaan. The obvious departures from the standard Akkadian patterns, which had been painstakingly established during the latter decades of the nineteenth century, were the subject of considerable discussion (Böhl 1909:48-51; Ebeling 1910:46-50, 51-52; Dhorme 1913:377-383). Understandably, it was something of a sensation to find, in the Amarna correspondence, West Semitic morphs and patterns, some of which were foreign to Akkadian.

Before reviewing the WS elements, however, it must be noted that some scribes used them only sparingly, giving preference to standard Akkadian forms. Such would appear to be the case with the scribe of EA 127, a letter from Byblos. Two of the earlier letters from Amurru, from ^cAbdi-Ashirta (EA 60, 371), do exhibit most of the WS features for the prefix conjugation, but another letter (EA 62) avoids the *y*- prefix; in fact, the Amurru Amarna letters have a unique morphological mix of their own (Izre²el 1985:134-136; 1991a:131-142, §2.4.1.1). The Tyrian letters

also use many purely Akkadian prefix verb forms and only occasionally a WS hybrid; even so, the WS modal and tense system (discussed *infra*, pp. 221-264) does seem to be recognized (Finkle 1977:88-98). The penchant of the Jerusalem scribe for Akkadian forms of the present-future, with WS forms restricted almost entirely to direct quotations, is well known (Nitzan 1973:57-59; Moran 1975b:153-154). The two lengthy epistles from Mayarzana of Ḥasi, in the Lebanese Beqa^c Valley, also eschew the *y-* prefix though some acquaintance with the WS modal and tense system seems evident (EA 185; 186). Furthermore, throughout the correspondence exhibiting strong WS influence, there is a scattering of Akkadian forms without a consonantal prefix, mainly 3rd person, but not exclusively, from 1st aleph and 1st waw roots. There are compelling reasons to assume that the Canaanite scribes were using such forms as themes for the WS suffix conjugation. The arguments in support of that interpretation will be presented under the discussion of the suffix conjugation pattern (*infra*, pp. 342-345).

There are no documented verb forms in the West Semitized texts for the 2nd f.s., the 2nd f.pl. or the 3rd f.pl. This is an accidental happenstance, as least for the 2nd person forms. For the persons that are represented, only a selection of typical forms are cited below. Nevertheless, it was felt that a generous sampling was necessary because of the unique nature of the texts involved.

y- FOR 3rd MASCULINE SINGULAR

Scholars were astonished to find so many finite forms beginning with the Akkadian PI sign. It was recognized, however, that this sign, which also had the values *wa, we, wi, wu*, was being used here for the values *ya, ye, yi, yu*. These values will be transcribed thus throughout this work following the lead of Gelb (1970:537; also adopted by Borger 1978:156, No. 383), *contra* the values adopted by von Soden and Röllig (1976:43), viz. *ia₈, ji, iú*. Malbran-Labat (1976:177) has adopted a compromise, giving *ia₈* as well as *ju^{i.a.}*

The vowel accompanying this consonantal prefix can be either *-a-*, *-i-*, or *-u-*. The *-u* is confined to the Gp, D and Š stems, and G stem verbs 1st *waw*. The *-a-* is relatively rare and this was the cause of much misunderstanding about the diachronic development of the WS prefix patterns of the G stem (cf. *infra*, pp. 61-75, on the Barth-Ginsberg law). The overwhelming majority of forms have the *-i-* vowel, simply because the theme chosen from the Akkadian paradigm was the 3rd m.s. on the *iprus* pattern. The three syllabic prefix alternatives, *ya-*, *yi-*, and *yu-* can be illustrated by unequivocal orthographies as follows:

Those forms with *ia-* are the easiest to identify, namely, *ia-ta-mar* (EA 74:52), *ia-ak-šu-du-na* (EA 130:2), *ia-mu-tu* (EA 138:27); *ia-di-in₄* (EA 116:46), *ia-di-na* (EA 74:54; 85:19, 76; 100:33; 117:78; 118:11, 16; 137:39), *ia-di-nu* (EA 105:85; 110:50; 116:34; 119:51; 125:16; 126:14, 18), *ia-di-nu-šu-nu* (EA 114:58); *ia-aq-bi* (EA 83:34; 101:32; 116:32), *ia-aq-bu* (EA 101:19; 105:88; 117:7; also EA 119:36); *ia-qú-ul* (EA 132:44; 137:25, 94), *ia-qú-ul₁₁* (EA 137:59), *ia-qá-ar-ri-ib* (EA 39:19), *ia-aš-al* (EA 224:10), *ia-aš-ku-un* (EA 108:59; 139:33); *ia-aš-ku-n[u]* (EA 113:6), *ia-aš-pu-ur* (EA 117:60; probably also EA 247:9), *ia-aš-pur* (EA 250:23), *ia-aš-pu-ru* (EA 89:36; 138:123), *ia-aš-pu-ra* (EA 234:23; 250:28; possibly also EA 138:67), *ia-aš-ta-pár* (EA 233:16), *ia-tu-ru-na* (126:54), *ia-az-ku-ur-mi* (EA 228:19). Except for about five instances, all of the examples are from Byblos texts (or Rib-Haddi's correspondence while he was a political exile residing at Beirut).

Forms in which the PI sign must be read *ya-* are *ya-am-li-ik* (EA 105:6), *ya-am-lik* (EA 114:20), *ya-ar-ḥi-ša* (EA 137:97), and in the PN, ¹*Ya-an-ḥa-mu* (EA 270:4). These are the only forms in which the second sign, completing the first syllable, assures that the vowel is *-a-*. Knudtson's transcriptions would add a few more examples, but without confirmation by an immediately following aC sign: *ya-di-^lin¹* (EA 337:13), *ya-di-na* (EA 93:11), *ya-di-nu* (EA 117:42; 225:10), *ya-qú-lu* (EA 140:5), *ya-qí-il-li-ni* (EA 245:38). The latter are possible but unprovable. Given the dozens and dozens of other forms in which the PI sign must be read *yi-*, it would seem that these *ya-* spellings are mere exceptions to the general

rule. For one thing, *yarḥiša* is nothing but a pseudo-verb developed from the adverb *arḥiš* (pointed out to me by Sh. Izre'el) Yanḥamu is a personal name of unusual vocalic pattern (Amorite?). True Canaanite verbs might be represented in *yamlik* (Rainey 1987a:10*) and also *yaqūlu* and *yaqillini* (or: *yiqillini*). The case for reading *ya-di-nu*, etc. is considerably weaker; though *yaddin-* could be a way of echoing Canaanite **yatin-* /**yattin-*, *yiddin-* is just as likely a normalization.

For the reading *yi-*, confirmation by a following syllable is much more plentiful: *yi-in₄-na-pí-iš* (EA 250:33), *yi-iz-zi-iz* (EA 250:42), *yi-iḥ-di* (EA 142:9; 144:16), *yi-i-de₉* (EA 267:15), *yi-ik-šū-du* (EA 227:15), *yi-il₅-ma-ad* (EA 64:8; 142:18; *et al.*), *yi-il-ma-ad* (EA 264:23; 337:17; 366:17), *yi-il₅-qé* (EA 197:10; 245:25), *yi-il-qé* (EA 116:36; *et al.*), *yi-il₅-qé-ni* (EA 284:12), *yi-il-qé-šū* (EA 119:47; 245:30), *yi-il-qé-ši* (EA 90:12; 95:33), *yi-il₅-qe-šū-nu* (EA 281:14, 29), *yi-il-qé-šū-nu* (EA 129:79), *yi-il₅-qa* (EA 197:27), *yi-il-qa* (EA 71:30; 91:6), *yi-il-qa-ni* (EA 81:32), *yi-il-qa-nu* (EA 138:68), *yi-il-qa-šū-nu* (EA 118:33), *yi-il-qú* (EA 71:18; *et al.*), *yi-il-qú-ši_x*(ŠE) (EA 124:15), *yi-im-qú-ut* (EA 295:17), *yi-id-din* (EA 248:11), *yi-ip-tú-ra* (EA 234:21), *yi-iš-bat* (EA 138:28; 250:46), *yi-iš-bat-ši* (EA 244:28, 38), *yi-iš-al-šū* (EA 60:21), *yi-iš-me* (EA 119:26; *et al.*), *yi-iš-mé* (EA 94:4; *et al.*), *yi-iš-me* (EA 78:17; *et al.*), *yi-iš-mé* (EA 85:16, 75; *et al.*), *yi-iš-ma* (EA 82:23), *yi-iš-mu* (EA 109:16, 18; *et al.*), *yi-iš-mu* (EA 118:54), *yi-iš-mu-na* (EA 85:7), *yi-iš-te-mé* (EA 211:13), *yi-iš-te-mu* (EA 323:19; *et al.*), *yi-iš-te₉-mu* (EA 233:18), *yi-iš-pu-ra-am* (EA 362:22), *yi-iš-ta-pár* (EA 73:26), *yi-iš-ta-pa-ru* (EA 103:20; 112:7, 119:8), *yi-iš-tap-ru* (EA 106:14), *yi-iš-ta-pa-ra* (EA 130:15), *yi-iš-tap-pa-ra* (EA 130:9), *yi-iš-tap-ru-na* (EA 121:7), *yi-it-ru-uš* (EA 103:40; 250:22).

Readings with *yu-* followed by a uC sign are rare indeed, but by their nature, they confirm the necessity to read *yu-* in many other instances, purely on semantic grounds. The attested forms which have syllabic confirmation are: *yu-ú-ul-qú* (EA 117:33), *yu-ú-ul-qú-na* (EA 117:68), *yu-up-pa-šū* (EA 232:20), *yu-uq-ba* (EA 83:16), *yu-uq-bu* (EA 83:19), *yu-uš-ši-ra* (EA 182:8; *et al.*). These demonstrate that PI must be read *yu-* in forms of the G passive, and the D active stems. To these can be added the Š stem and

undoubtedly the 1st waw verbs in the G stem. If further proof were needed, one may also compare the spellings for the persons other than 3rd person, which usually have *tu-* or *ú-* as the first sign (cf. discussion below).

t- FOR 3rd FEMININE SINGULAR

As is well known, one of the fundamental distinctions between the Babylonian and the Assyrian dialects is that the former generally used the 3rd m.s. prefix form for the 3rd f.s. (GAG:99, §75h). However, OB does have some archaic examples as does the poetic OB (hymnisch-epische). Therefore, it is possible that the Old Babylonian dialect which is the basis for the Canaanite pidgin Akkadian also had preserved the distinct forms for 3rd f.s. with the *t-* prefix. The other peripheral dialects vary in their adherence to the Babylonian pattern. The Mitanni letters almost never use a separate form for 3rd f.s. (Adler 1976:41) and the Hattusas dialect avoids a *t-* form altogether (Labat 1932:64). Only one text has *t-* 3rd f.s. forms at Carchemish (Huehnergard 1979:52-53). But at Ugarit, where a WS language was the native tongue, *t-* forms are plentiful (Huehnergard 1989:158-159).

One can hardly avoid the conclusion that the forms used in the Canaanized Amarna texts were in accordance with WS practice, viz. the distinguishing of 3rd f.s. verbs with *t-* from 3rd m.s. with *y-*.

The Akkadian paradigm would call for *-a-* as the prefix vowel with the *t-* prefix in the G stem. But for the 3rd f.s., such forms are practically non-existent. An epistle from Egypt has two: *ta-mu-ur* (EA 1:90), and *ta-ka-ša-ad* (EA 1:60); but the same text also has *ti-na-din* (EA 1:24; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:141, 144) and may even have a good Babylonian form, viz. *ip-t[i-i]* (EA 1:41). From Byblos come two others: *ta-ša-aš* (EA 82:50; Moran 1987b:264 n. 6; 1992:152 n. 6; *contra* CAD A/2:424b) and *ta-ap-šu-uḥ* (EA 107:31), while a Rib-Haddi letter written in Beirut has *ta-aq-bi* (EA 138:111) alongside *ti-iq-bi* (EA 138:44), which latter represents the standard practice of the scribe throughout the remainder of that particular epistle.

As with the 3rd m.s., prefixes with an *-i-* vowel are the rule. The forms come not only from Byblos but from other places located throughout Canaan. The G stem examples are: *ti-mu-ru* (EA 138:61), *ti-pu-uš* (EA 122:47), *ti-ša-šu* (EA 122:39), *ti₇-iḫ-la-aq* (EA 274:14), *ti-zi-za* (EA 107:33), *ti-ik-šu-du* (EA 221:14), *ti-le-eq-qé* (EA 228:35), *ti-id-di-in₄* (EA 68:5), *ti-di-in* (EA 74:3), *ti-di-in₄* (EA 76:4; *et al.*), *ti-din* (EA 73:4; *et al.*), *ti-na-mu-uš* (EA 100:37), *ti-na-mu-šu* (EA 296:17), *ti₇-na-mu-šu* (EA 292:13), *ti-na-ma-šu* (EA 266:19), *ti-iq-bi* (EA 138:44), *ti-ra-ḫa-aš* (EA 141:31), *ti-ra-am* (EA 323:22). From the N stem we have: *ti-né-pu-uš* (EA 74:35; 117:94; 129:80) and *ti₇-né-pu-^luš¹* (EA 87:19); and from what might be meant for a Gt: *ti-ir-ti-ḫu* (EA 103:54), or a G stem from the standpoint of WS, but built on the Akkadian *-t-* past. Peripheral forms with *ti-* prefix are found at Emar (Ikeda 1995:73).

The prefix *-u-* vowel appears where it would be expected, for example, in verbs with 1st waw: *tu-uš-sa* (EA 234:7) and *tu-ša-na* (EA 86:14). The G passive stem, which is foreign to standard Akkadian, is also well represented: *tu-pu-uš* (EA 281:13), *tu-ra* (EA 245:8), *tu-ul-qé* (EA 91:8), *tu-ul-qú* (83:15; 132:15), *tu-um-ḫa-šú* (EA 252:17), *tu-sà-aḫ-mi* (EA 245:8), *tu-uš-mu* (EA 138:96). For the D stem, one also finds: *tu-da-bi-ir* (EA 76:39) and most probably *tu-b[a-ú]* (EA 100:18) and *tu-ba-ú* (EA 70:26; or 3rd c. pl. *tu-ba-ú-na*), *tu-ra-du* (EA 257:20).

So the situation is parallel to that of the 3rd m.s., viz. very few *ta-* prefixes (even though they would be the normal Akkadian forms, unlike the situation in 3rd m.s.), some *tu-* prefixes where semantic or phonetic factors would be expected to require them, and many, many *ti-* prefixes in spite of the fact that they have no real precedent in the standard Akkadian paradigm.

The fact that 3rd f.s. is distinguished from 3rd m.s. is most reasonably explained as due to the influence of the WS language of the scribes, just as was the case in the Akkadian texts from Ugarit. It is not necessary to posit some Assyrian influence here. On the other hand, the preference for the *ti-* prefix instead of the correct Akkadian *ta-* has nothing to do with the original Canaanite morphology, as will be demonstrated further on (cf. *supra*, pp. 14-15, *infra*, pp. 73-75).

t- FOR 2nd MASCULINE SINGULAR

No examples are recorded of the 2nd f.s. in verbs since none of the texts are addressed to women. The 2nd m.s. forms show the same general pattern of variation in the prefix vowel as do the 3rd f.s.

A few specific verbs seem to have been employed in the standard Akkadian form, with the *ta*- prefix. For *nadānu* the Byblos scribes have [*t*]a-*di-in*₄ (EA 91:17) and [*t*]a-*din-ni* (EA 83:30; Moran 1950a:93, 96, 106; Youngblood 1960:246). A Tyrian letter has [*t*]a-*din* (EA 150:35). Byblos occasionally uses the *ta*- prefix for *qabû*: *ta-aq-[bi]* (EA 77:21), *táq-bi* (EA 86:15), *táq-bu* (EA 73:7; also Tyre, EA 145:23) and *táq-bu-ú* (EA 96:7), but see the many examples of the *ti*- prefix below. A letter from Alashia has *ta-qáb-bi* (EA 38:8, 13). For *palāhu* one example comes from Byblos: *ta-pa-la[-ah]* (EA 82:26). From *šakānu* the Alashia letters have both *ta-ša-kà-an* (EA 38:30) and *ti-^lša^l-kán* (EA 34:12) in the G stem and also *ta-ša-ki-in* (EA 35:50) in the N stem, alongside *ti-na-qú* (EA 34:12). Twice a Byblos letter has Gt (or Gtn?) forms from *šanû* with *ta*-: *ta-aš-ta-na* (EA 82:14) and *ta-aš-ta-ni* (EA 82:27). The forms of *šapāru* all have the Akkadian prefix: *ta-aš-pur* (EA 38:24), *ta-aš-pu-ra* (EA 77:7; 95:7; TT 1:8), *ta-aš-tap-ra* (EA 34:8; 102:14), perhaps because these forms were part of the traditionally fixed phraseology of the scribal craft. A Jerusalem letter uses two 2nd m.s. forms with *ta*-, viz. *ta-ra-ia-mu* (EA 286:18) and *ta-za-ia-ru* (EA 286:20).

It seems proper to list as correct Babylonian forms the handful of examples where vowel coloring seems certain: *te-ep-pu-šu* (EA 96:26), *te-ri-šu* (EA 34:49), *te-ri-iš-šu* (EA 35:17, 22, 23), and the Gtn *te-eš-te-nem-me* (EA 62:41, 44). The Tyrian scribe adopts an Assyrian form, *ta-aš-te-me* (EA 149:56; Finkle 1977:109-110). On the other hand, one must prefer *ti-iš-me* to *te₉-eš-me* (EA 90:13), *ti-iš-mé* to *te₉-eš-mé* (EA 86:17), and *ti-iš-mu-na* to *te₉-eš-mu-na* (EA 74:50); the *eš* sign appears too often in places where the reading *iš* must be expected. Furthermore, a Taanach text has *ti-iš-mé* (TT 1:16) and from Sidon comes *ti-iš-te₉-mé* (EA 145:25).

Of course, the forms from the irregular verb *idû* have *ti-* in Akkadian, so it is no surprise to find *ti-de* (EA 69:5; *et al.* including EA 102:21), *ti₇.de* (EA 230:20) and *ti-i-de* (EA 73:15; *et al.*).

There still remain over a dozen forms that violate the Akkadian paradigm by clearly adopting the *ti-* prefix: *ti-il₅-la-ku-un!*(EN)-*na* (TT 6:9), ¹*ti¹-il₅¹-la-ku-¹na¹* (TT 6:14), *til-la-ku-na-mí* (EA 250:26), *ti-ta-ša-am* (EA 97:7), *ti-it-[ta-š]ú-na* (EA 244:19; Moran 1987b:469 n. 2; 1992:299 n. 2; citing E. Gordon), *ti₇-du-ku-nu* (EA 138:40 f.), *ti-pu-šu* (EA 250:18), *ti-zi-ib-ši* (EA 287:50), *ti-zi-ib-ši_x*(ŠE) (EA 129:48), *ti-le-ú* (EA 83:20; *et al.*), *ti-ma-ḥa-aš* (EA 77:12), *ti-ma-qú-tu* (EA 73:10), *ti-iq-bi* (EA 83:45), *ti-iq-bu* (EA 71:12), *ti-qa-bu* (EA 117:30; 124:35; 252:23), *ti-¹pa¹-¹te₆¹-¹er¹* (EA 138:11), *ti-ša-i-lu* (EA 89:40).

The *tu-* prefix appears where expected: in the G stem of verbs 1st waw, *tu-ša-na* (EA 73:9), *tu-ša-ab* (EA 34:52, actually in an Alashia text where the forms are not necessarily WS); in the D stem, *tu-ḥal-li-iq-mi* (EA 97:9), and the many forms of *wuššuru*, *tu-wa-še-ru* (TT 6:5), *tu-wa-še-ru-na* (TT 6:11), *tu-wa-ši-ra* (EA 34:9), *tu-wa-ši-ru* (EA 90:50), *tu-wa-ši-ru-ni* (EA 34:48), *tu-wa-š_i-ru-na* (EA 103:53); and the Š stem, *tu-še-zi-ba-an-ni* (EA 318:20), *tu-šu-ru-ba-ni* (EA 300:18).

Ø- FOR 1st COMMON SINGULAR

The prefix for 1st c.s. in Akkadian is *Øv-*. This can be seen by comparing *taprus* with *aprus*, *taparras* with *aparras*, *tērub* with *ērub*, *tuparras* with *uparras*, etc. The second person prefix is, of course, *tv-*; to form a first person form from second person, one just drops the *t*. The same holds true for the language of the Amarna letters from Canaan but the variation in prefix vowels does not always comply with the Akkadian paradigm, particularly in the G, Gt and N stems. Only a representative selection of examples will be cited.

To be sure, there are abundant cases of proper forms, with *Øa-* as the prefix. The conventional formula of obeisance in most peripheral archives ends with *amqut*, "I have fallen (prostrated)." In the EA letters it is usually written *am-qú-ut* (EA

passim), or in a variant such as *am-qut* (EA *passim*). Nevertheless, three texts have *im-qú-ut* (EA 260:5; 317:6; 318:7). Good spellings such as *al-la-ak-mì* (EA 189: r. 6) and *a-al-la-ak-mì* (EA 191:16) are matched by *i-la-ak* (EA 155:69), *il-la-ku* (EA 201:16; 202:14), *il₅-la-ka* (EA 294:32), and *il₅-la-lu-mì* (EA 193:16). For *a-qa-bi* (EA 92:30; 286:17, 39, 49), *a-qa-bu-na* (EA 85:11; 119:53) and the most unusual Jerusalem spelling, *à-qa-bi* (EA 286:22; Moran 1975b:151), there are also *i-qa-bi* (EA 106:46), *i-qa-bu* (EA 127:30), and *i₁₅-qa-bi* (EA 180:16). One finds *aš-pu-ur* (EA 138:31,42; 362:18) and *aš-pu-ru* (EA 362:52 *et passim*) but once the Tyre scribe uses *iš-pu-ur* (EA 147:70). A high frequency verb is *našāru*, represented by *a-na-ša-ar* (EA 60:22; 127:37; 138:29; 231:16), *a-na-ša-ru* (EA 221:12; *et passim*) and other similar variants. But there are also forms such as *i-na-ša-ru* (EA 65:10; *et passim*), *i-na-ša-ru-na* (EA 112:10; 125:12), not to mention *i-na-šì-ru* (EA 119:15; 130:49), *i-na-šì-ru-na* (EA 123:32), and *i-na-šì-ra* (EA 123:27) as well as *i₁₅-na-ša-ar* (EA 179:26) and *i₁₅-na-ša-ru* (EA 187:20; 220:25). Furthermore, one also finds *iš-šú-ru* (EA 220:15; 292:23; 293:12; 294:12) and even (Rainey 1975b:408, 413, 417; 1978b:84) *ú-šur-ru* (EA 337:28), ¹*uš¹-šúr-¹šu¹* (EA 230:13), *ú-šur-ru-na* (EA 252:28), *ú-šur-ru-šu-nu* (EA 252:31), *uš-šú-ru* (EA 141:41; 142:12), and *uš-šur-ru-na* (EA 252:8)! Clearly, the prefix *Øa-* can be replaced by *Øi* or even *Øu-* without any change in meaning.

The alteration between *Øa-* and *Øi-* is not confined to G present and preterite; for Gt (Gtn) note the ubiquitous *aš-ta-pa-ar*, *aš-tap-pár*, *aš-ta-pa-ru* (*passim*) alongside *iš-ta-pár* (EA 90:14), *iš-tap-ru* (EA 85:6; 106:18; 114:21), *iš-tap-pa-ar* (EA 134:31) and *iš-tap-ru* (EA 85:55). A possible N stem form is *i-ma-la-ku* (EA 191:9; *contra* CAD B:71b; M/1:155b and Moran 1987b:430; 1992:271).

On occasion, the typical Akkadian vowel coloring (*a/ā* > *e/ē*) is expressed correctly, but this is almost never uniform for any particular verb. For example, for *epēšu*, from Tyre comes *e-te-pu-uš* (EA 153:5; 154:9) while Beirut gives us *i-te₉-pu-šu* (EA 138:46); there are also *i-pu-uš* (EA 38:9; 317:18), *i-pu-šu* (EA 114:26; 125:39; 328:26), *i-pu-ša* (EA 83:24), *i-pu-šu-na* (EA 74:63; *et passim*) and *i-pu-ša!(MA)-am* (EA 136:28). One may compare the following, all

from *erēbu*: *e-ru-ub-mi* (EA 286:39) with *i-ru-ub* (EA 102:31), *e-ri-ub* (EA 180:14) with *i-re-ba* (EA 137:34), not to mention *i-ra-ab* (EA 150:11) and *i-ra-bu* (EA 151:13), as well as *i-te-ru-ub* (EA 155:31) and *i-te₉-ru-ub* (EA 104:44).

A purist would prefer to read *ep-pu-šu* (EA 254:46; 280:38) and *ep-pu-šu-mi* (EA 378:17), *ep-pu-šu-na* (EA 92:15; 249:10), but in view of the spellings beginning with *i*- listed above, the question seems purely academic. Knudtzon's *ip-pu-šu*, etc. are just as plausible. Likewise, one might insist on reading *ez-zi-ib* (EA 88:20) and *ez-zi-ba* (EA 294:31) but they exist alongside *i-zi-bu* (EA 138:47), *i-zi-ba-ši* (EA 126:45) and even *i-te₉-zi-ib* (EA 82:43; 83:46, 49; 103:16). From *šemû*, the few cases like *eš-me* (EA 105:40), *eš-mé* (EA 91:26), *eš-mu* (EA 116:16), *eš-te-me* (EA 108:24) and *eš-te₉-mé* (EA 82:35), are overshadowed by the forms like *iš-me* (EA 136:15; 147:17, 30, 34; 260:8), *iš-mé* (EA 34:11; 39:12; 317:12, 22, 24), *iš-mu* (EA 251:15), and the ubiquitous *iš-te-me*, *iš-te-mé*, *iš-te-mu*, *iš-te₉-mu* etc. that are documented plentifully throughout the corpus. For *le²û* we have an isolated Babylonian form, *e-le-é²-e* (EA 238:8) and an Assyrian (from Jerusalem), *a-la-á²-e* (EA 286:42; 287:58; Moran 1975b:154), but the dominant spellings are *i-le-ú* (EA 82:22; *et al.*), *i-le-e* (EA 81:21), *i-lé-e* (EA 151:10), *i-le-i* (EA 144:32), *i-le-²i* (EA 102:19) and *i-la-ú-mi* (EA 137:27; probably not an Assyrianism, Moran 1975b:164 n. 67).

Of course, for *idû* there is nothing surprising in finding forms like *i-de* (EA 83:9; *et passim*), and *i₁₅-de* (EA 254:28, 32). This "prefix-stative" takes *īde* for 1st c.s. in Akkadian (GAG:102, §78b, 152, §106q; cf. Rainey 1973c:244-247)

On the whole, the *Øu*- prefix appears where it would be expected. In verbs 1st waw, the G stem forms are usually correct, e.g. *ub-ba-lu* (EA 365:19, 25), *uṣ-ṣú-na* (EA 333:16), *ú-ša-ab* (EA 260:14), *et al.*, but there is also *i-ba-lu* (EA 326:19), where the *Øi*- prefix has intruded. Most of the D stem forms are normal, e.g. *ú-ba-ú* (EA 74:64; 109:55), *ú-ba-ú-na-ši* (EA 143:15), *ú-da-bi-ra* (EA 85:68), *ú-ka-li* (EA 108:48), *ú-wa-še-er* (EA 255:13), *ú-wa-ši-ir* (EA 333:24), *uš-ši-ru-na-ši* (EA 142:16), but again, one finds *i-wa-ši-ir* (EA 137:8; Rainey 1975b:419). In the Š stem, note *ú-še-ez-zi-bá-šu-nu* (EA 62:31).

The denominative D stem *urrudu* (from [*w*]ardu), shows *ur-ra-ad* (EA 84:30), *ur-ra-da* (EA 294:33), *ur-ra-du* (EA 189: r. 24; *et al.*), and *ú-ra-du-šu* (EA 257:18). On the other hand, one also finds *i-ru-du* (EA 250:51, 59), *i-ru-da-am* (EA 300:20), and *i-r[i]-du* (EA 186:7).

The quadriliteral verb, developed from *šuka*²²*unu*, *šukênu* (GAG:158, §109m; *AHw*:1263), exhibits *Øu-* in the G preterite, *uš-ḫé-ḫi-in* (EA 221:7; *et al.*), *uš-ḫé-ḫi-in₄* (EA 223:6; 242:8), *uš-ḫe-ḫi-in₄* (EA 222:6; certainly also EA 214:6 according to Moran's collation), but with infixes *-ti-* we find, *iš-ta-ḫa-ḫi-in* (EA 298:12), *iš-ti-ḫa-ḫi-in* (EA 301:10), *iš-tu-ḫa-ḫi-in* (EA 331:10-11) and *iš-tu-ḫu-ḫi-in* (EA 325:8).

Therefore, the mass of evidence indicates that, for the 1st c.s. of the prefix conjugations, the prefix vowel of the G stem 3rd m.s. often intruded, so that we find *Øi-* in place of either *Øa-*, *Øe-* or *Øu-*. In other words, it is mainly the absence of a consonantal prefix, that is, the presence of a *Ø* - prefix, that indicates 1st c.s.

t- . . . *-ū* / *-ūna* FOR 3rd MASCULINE PLURAL

One of the most interesting morphological features of the prefix conjugation in the Amarna texts from Canaan is the predominance of the prefix *tv-* for the 3rd m.pl. (Böhl 1909:52-53; Ebeling 1910:48-50). The same construction was found in Ugaritic and the isogloss with the EA texts was duly observed (Herdner 1938). Albright, followed by Moran (Albright and Moran 1948:243-244), had thought that these forms were 3rd f.s. forms but later Moran (1951) demonstrated that the syntactic alternations between forms with *-ū* and forms with *-ūna* was modally conditioned (parallel to 3rd f.s. with *-Ø* / *-a* and *-u*, respectively) and therefore represented true plural forms. Nevertheless, the fact that 3rd f.s. forms can take a feminine collective (e.g. EA 252:16-19; Albright 1943b:31 n. 15), or even a plural subject (EA 77:37; 103:22), strongly suggests that this was the source of the analogical replacement of an original *y-* by the *t-* prefix in the plural forms (Moran 1951:35b).

It has been argued that there are also 3rd m.s. forms in these texts with the *y-* prefix, and various examples were listed in Ebeling 1915 (*passim*). Izre²el (1987) has collected the suggested examples, sixteen in number, and analyzed them. All but two could be explained as singulars. The two forms in question are both from *namāšū*; their respective contexts are:

ù *la-a yi-na-mu-šu-n[a]* /*[a-]bu-tu-ka iš-tu a-[b]u-[ti-ia]* "but your fathers never did desert [my] father[s]" (EA 109:7-8); *ya-di-in₄*
^dUTU TE[Š-ia !] /*i-na pa-ni-ka ù šu-up-ši-i[ḫ] ÌR.MEŠ-ka !* /ù *la-a*
yi-na-mu-šu /iš-tu mu-ḫi-ka "May the sun-god grant [me!] digni[ty] in your presence and (you) bring tranquili[ty] to your servants[!] and they will never defect from you" (EA 113:32-35).

As Izre²el points out (1987:86-87), the rule of modal congruence (Moran 1950a:81-88; 1951:33; 1960:9-11) should require that in the latter context the final vowel be the injunctive plural (jussive or volitive). The first example is even more obvious; the subject is masculine plural and there is no apparent reason for the singular energetic (with *-una*). So we must posit *yinammušūna* and *yinammušū*. The new translation by Moran (1987b:314; 1992:187) assumes [ÌR-ka] at the end of line 33. In that case, he must also assume a violation of the modal congruence. Thus, we have suggested [ÌR.MEŠ-ka]. However, Moran may be right and that would eliminate one of the anomalous forms. In EA 109:7, one may conjecture that the scribe changed his mind in mid-stream, switching from singular to plural in his thinking and thus producing a singular form with the plural ending. At any rate, *yinammušūna* may be a *hapax*.

Turning to the 150 or so documented forms of 3rd m.pl. with *t-*, one is struck by the paucity of forms with *ta-*. Quite a few of those recorded by Ebeling (1915: *passim*) can be demonstrated to be 3rd f.s., often with *ālu* "city" as the subject. There remain: *ta-di-nu-ni* (EA 126:64, 66), *tal-qú-ni* (EA 70:16, in a broken context), *ta-ša-mé-ú* (EA 286:50; note Assyrianizing vocalization and lack of contraction, Moran 1975b:153, 164 n. 63) and *ta-aš-pu-ru-na* (EA 138:122). The latter appears in a text which also

uses *ti-iš-pu-ru-na* (EA 138:137). But to this handful of *ta-* forms, one may add a few with characteristic vowel coloring: *te-lé-ú-na* (EA 249:3), *te-èl-qú-ni* (EA 180:22), *te-èl-qú-na* (EA 126:13), *te-pa-šu* (EA 197:14), *te-né-pu-šu-na* (EA 138:93) and *te₉-e-te-pu-šu* (EA 129:88).

The mass of examples from the G and related stems have *ti-*. The predominance of the TI sign in these spellings assures that the occasional TE sign must be read *ti₇*, for example, *ti-la-ku* (EA 101:34) alongside *ti₇-la-ku* (EA 203:19), *ti-la-ku-na* (EA 73:16; 109:35; 126:12) and *ti₇-la-ku-na* (EA 249:5), or *ti-iq-bu-na* (EA 73:29; 129:32; 250:15, 40) and *ti₇-iq-bu-na¹* (EA 94:14; also 136:10; 197:16; 362:21), *ti-ma-ḥa-šú-ka* (EA 252:27) and *ti₇-ma-ḥa-šú-nu* (EA 271:21), *ti-na-ša-ru* (EA 85:22; *et passim*) and *ti₇-na-ša-ru* (EA 180:8). The theme chosen from the Akkadian paradigm may be the present, e.g. *ti-da-ga-lu* (EA 197:41), *ti-ma-ga-ru* (EA 138:62), or the preterite, *ti-il-qú* (EA 84:32; *et passim*), *ti-iš-ba-tu* (EA 137:40); note also the Gt, *ti-iš-te₉-mu-na* (EA 216:18; 250:52).

The prefix *tu-* is represented in the usual categories — 1st waw G stem: *tu-ub-ba-lu-na* (EA 224:14), *tu-ba-lu-na* (EA 101:22; 108:39, 53; 117:18; 126:58-59); G passive: *tù-da-ku-na* (EA 132:50), *tu-ul-qú-na* (EA 108:58), *tu-da-nu* (EA 137:6; 138:43), *tu-da-nu-na* (EA 83:23; TT 2:20), and also *tu-ud-da-nu-n[a]* (KL 72:6000:21), *tu-uš-mu-na* (EA 89:10; *et al.*). But especially the D stem: *tu-ba-ú-ni* (EA 60:15), *tu-ba-ú-na* (EA 73:24; *et al.*), *tu-ba-ú-na-nu* (EA 100:17), also *tu-¹bé¹-¹u₅¹-na* (EA 250:10), and *tu-wa-ši-ru-na* (EA 125:44). Of special note, however, are the D stem forms showing intrusion of the *ti-* prefix: *ti-ba-ú-na* (EA 129:29), *ti₇-ba-ú-na* (EA 362:24), *ti-ba-ú-na-ši* (EA 129:19), *ti-dáb-bi-bu* (EA 138:49), *ti-dáb-bi-ru* (EA 138:69), *ti-pa-li-ḥu-na* (EA 105:22), and *ti₇-pa-ṭe₄-ru-na* (362:35).

t- . . . -ū /-ūna FOR 2nd MASCULINE PLURAL

Due to the accident of discovery, the 2nd m.pl. in prefix forms of the verb is attested in only one certain context (for the 2nd m.pl. imperative, also with the *-ū* suffix, cf. discussion *infra*, pp. 270-272):

at-tu-nu tu-ša-ab-li-tú-na-nu / ù at-tu-nu / \ ti-mi-tu-na-nu "You give us life and you put us to death" (EA 238:31-33; Moran 1987b:464 n. 2; 1992:295 n. 2).

The first verb is a hybrid built on the Akkadian preterite *tušabliṭ-* plus the WS imperfect plural suffix *-ūna*. The second verb is marked by the gloss sign and is evidently a WS H(?) causative; its prefix vowel probably represents regressive assimilation due to the long *ī* vowel of this middle weak root. Thus, **timītūnani* < **tumītūnani*. That the suffix is from the WS repertoire is confirmed by the plural imperatives (cf. *infra*, pp. 270-272), which almost without exception (EA 147:36; 280:19) have *-ū* or the energetic *-ūna*.

One Amurru letter (EA 170) has two 2nd m.pl. forms side by side, one with the *-ūni* suffix typical of the Amurru corpus (Izre'el 1985:142; 1991a:136, §2.1.1.1) and the other with a unique example of a "literary" Akkadian form with the proper suffix, *-āni*:

ŠÀ-bá-ku-nu la tù-uš-ma-ra-ša-ni₇ / ù mi-im-ma i-na ŠÀ-ku-nu la ta-šak-kán-:nu-ni₇ "Do not trouble your heart and do not take anything to heart!" (EA 170:40-41).

It can hardly be doubted that the 2nd m. pl. suffix in *-ū* reflects true WS morphology. It occurs in an Akkadian text from Ugarit, *ta-al-ta-qu-mì* (RS 8.279:8'; Nougayrol 1955:170; Huehnergard 1979:229-230 and n. 238; 1989:159-160) but is not typical of the other peripheral dialects.

n- FOR 1st COMMON PLURAL

The normal Akkadian prefix in the G, Gt, Gtn and N stems for 1st c.pl. is *ni-*, taken from the first syllable of the 1st c.pl. pronoun, *nīnu* (GAG:98, §75e). Only two examples have been suggested as West Semitized forms with *na-*, namely a G stem volitive *na-^lad^l-na pa-ni-nu* "we will devote ourselves" (EA 89:16; Albright and Moran 1950:166; but cf. *infra*, pp. 295, 405); and an N stem imperfect *ni-⟨nu⟩ na-lá-qú* "w⟨e⟩ are being taken over" (EA 131:22; Moran 1987b:350 n. 6; 1992:213 n. 6). On the other

hand, the substitution of *na-* for correct Akkadian *ni-* is known at Ugarit (Huehnergard 1979:229; 1989:159) and in treaties and legal texts from Carchemish (Huehnergard 1979:53). In three instances, *nu-* was substituted for *ni-*: *nu-du-uk* (EA 197:17), *nu-ú-du-lu* (EA 100:39), *nu-¹uš¹-pu-ru* (EA 85:84; not passive! Moran 1987b:270; 1992:157). As with the other persons, the 1st c.pl. is documented with G present and preterite as themes for the hybrid forms, e.g. *ni-da-gal* (EA 74:57), *ni-ma-qú-[ut]* (EA 74:32), *ni-na-ša-ar* (EA 181:9), *ni-na-ša-ru* (EA 100:9, 30), ¹*ni¹-¹re¹-bu-ka* (EA 138:12) and *ni-di-nu* (EA 112:52), *ni-il-qú* (EA 103:57), *ni-iš-bat* (EA 138:101), *ni-iš-mu-ú* (EA 200:7), *ni-iš-pu-ru* (EA 112:53) as respective examples. Note also the reflexive Gt's, *ni-tel-lí* (EA 264:15), but *né-e-ta-lí* (EA 178:4; or: *ni-i₁₅-ta-lí?*), *ni-te-pu-uš-mi* (EA 138:45), *ni-te₉-pu-uš* (EA 73:22; 105:33). Note the aberrations: *ni-am-qú-ut* (EA 100:6), *ni-[u]m[?]-¹qu¹-ut* (EA 200:5). The prefix staves may also appear in 1st c.pl., usually with the expected forms: *ni-de* (EA 108:43), *ni-le-ú* (EA 88:20; *et al.*), *ni-la-ú* (EA 211:18), *ni-zi-iz* (EA 279:18).

Besides four cases cited above where *nu-* has usurped the place of *ni-*, the *nu-* prefix is documented for the usual classes of verbs, e.g. 1st waw, *nu-ub-ba-lu-uš-šu* (EA 245:7) and the D stem, *nu-ba-li-iṭ* (EA 85:38), *nu-bal-li-iṭ* (EA 68:28), and *nu-da-bir₅* (EA 74:34). But in two instances, the *ni-* has usurped the place of *nu-*: *ni-du-bu-ur* (sic! EA 279:20) and *ni-wa-aš-ši-ru-šu* (EA 197:18).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The most important contribution of the evidence cited above to the understanding of the West Semitic verbal morphology is the deviation from standard Akkadian prefixes. The *y-* for 3rd m.s. and the *t-* for 3rd m.pl. are the most striking examples. The 2nd m.pl. *-ū(na)* suffix instead of the Akkadian *-ā* is also worthy of note. This latter contrast with Akkadian was not so strongly felt by the earlier grammarians of EA, perhaps because it was not yet clear that Akkadian did not use *-ū*.

As will be seen in the next chapter, the choice of *Ø-* prefix for the 1st c.s. and the concomitant disregard, in most cases, for

the proper vowel for 1st c.s. in Akkadian was the cause for considerable misunderstanding of the paradigm and its systematic application. Too often, superficial similarities with Massoretic vocalizations led to false conclusions concerning the diachronic significance of the evidence from the Canaanite EA letters. Comprehension of the table presented above (pp. 14-15) would prevent many misapprehensions in the comparative value of the EA data. The ensuing discussions will strive to distinguish between the true Canaanite elements and the features deriving from a practical development of peripheral forms.

CHAPTER IV

PREFIX CONJUGATION — G AND G_p STEMS

The Akkadian of the Canaanite scribes had the usual repertoire of verbal stems: G, G_t, N, D, D_t and Š. There are some rare and unusual instances of G_{tn} and Š_t forms, the implications of which will be discussed under the appropriate heading. The occasional use of *i* vowel prefixes instead of prefixes with *u* in the D and Š stems will be dealt with under the respective headings; they are colloquial features, analogic developments from the G stem prefixes, and not Canaanisms. True West Semitic features exist in the G_p and the D_p and also the very rare examples of H causatives, all of which are totally foreign to Akkadian. This present chapter will concentrate on the basic G and G_p stems; those are the stems built primarily on the Akkadian G stem themes.

As with the person markers treated in the previous chapter, only the prefix conjugation will be studied here. The reason for this departure from the customary practice is that the syntactical categories of the prefix conjugation are considerably different from those of the suffix conjugation, even though the latter was in the process of usurping some functions of the former. The morphosyntactical approach adopted in this work focuses on the morphological realization of intended semantic (syntactic) nuances. Therefore, the suffix conjugation, with its different morphological system, will be treated as a separate entity, including all the stem forms.

Though the tense and modal system will be treated in a subsequent chapter, it will be necessary here to remark on the use of the Akkadian present-future, preterite and preterite with infixes *-t-* (the so-called "perfect") forms as such, especially since they seem to have been chosen by the Canaanite scribes somewhat arbitrarily for each particular verb, without necessarily intending to imply their tense function in Akkadian. Spelling out

the details of this practice on their part is one of the chief objectives of this work. Note that many of the "present" forms cited in this chapter actually express jussive/volitive or preterite in their respective contexts while the "preterites" and so-called "perfects" (with *-t-*) may express present, future or past continuous as well as preterite and jussive/volitive. In this chapter, the emphasis is on form rather than the WS modal/tense function.

THE ACTIVE G STEM

AKKADIAN FORMS.

It is remarkable that the Canaanite scribes usually chose one particular form from the Akkadian paradigm to serve in all the tense and modal functions of their own system (Rainey cited by Izre³el 1978b:79 and n. 257). It should be noted that in Ebeling's day, Assyriologists had not all come to the realization that the G present-future was characterized by gemination of the second radical. The Akkadian scribes, especially those of the Assyrian tradition, but also the Babylonians, did not feel obligated to express the gemination orthographically. The peripheral scribes had learned the same orthographic principle. Therefore, a perusal of the glossary will reveal many instances where only the thematic vowel identifies the original Akkadian tense form. A review of the principal high-frequency verbs in the corpus is most revealing. Both weak and strong verbs are lumped together here, otherwise, the picture would be distorted. It should be remembered that the Jerusalem letters generally use the true Akkadian verbal system for present-future while the Tyre letters often use the Akkadian present-future and preterite in their proper tense functions. The order followed is that of the CAD whereby 1st waw verbs come under A (similar to Ebeling 1915).

(*w*)*abālu*. The unanimous preference is for *ubbal* as the theme. There are no examples in the WS texts of *ubil*

(Huehnergard 1987:191-193; Gelb 1961:126; Reiner 1966:93). The gemination is often not expressed orthographically, e.g. 3rd m.s. *yu-ba-lu* (EA 113:41; et al.), 1st c.s. *ú-ba-al* (EA 327:9), 3rd m.pl. *tu-ba-lu-na* (EA 108:39; et al.), but it can be, 1st c.s. *ub-ba-lu* (EA 365:14, 25), 3rd m.pl. *tu-ub-ba-lu-na* (EA 224:14; 365:22)

akālu. Of the few forms documented, *ikkal* is the theme for Byblos, *ti-ka-lu* (EA 100:36), Shechem, 3rd m.s. *yi-ka-lu* (EA 254:16; Izre'el 1987:83), and Jerusalem (where the Akkadian present-future is used instead of the WS imperfect; Nitzan 1973:57-59), 3rd m.pl. *i-ka-lu* (EA 286:6). But *īkul* is employed in a text from Tyre: 3rd m.s. *i-ku-ul* (EA 151:56), *i-kūl* (EA 151:57).

alāku. Here again we see a verb for which the WS texts have no example of the Akkadian preterite form. The present-future, *illak*, is the theme for nearly all conjugated forms from WS texts: 3rd m.s. ^l*il¹-la-ku* (EA 92:39), *yi-la-ak* (EA 144:27; 197:26), *yi-la-ku* (EA 179:16; 365:27), 2nd m.s. energetic *til-la-ku-na-mi* (EA 250:26), 1st c.s. *i-la-ak* (EA 155:69), *il-la-ku* (EA 201:16; 202:14), *il₅-la-ka* (EA 294:32), *il-la-ku-mi* (EA 193:16), 3rd m.pl. *ti-la-ku* (EA 101:34), *ti-la-ku-na* (EA 73:16; et al.). There are some isolated cases of 1st c.s. *al-la-ak-mi* (EA 189: r. 6; 191:16). Nevertheless, the documented imperative singulars (EA 102:15; 136:11, 27) are *alik* with the *i* thematic vowel.

amāru. By contrast, the WS texts use only the preterite, *īmur*, as the theme, with one possible exception. In EA 364:21, ^l*a¹-^lma¹-ru* might be either a finite form, perhaps even a Canaanism, "I continually ordered," but it is more likely an infinitive (Moran 1987b:560 n. 3; 1992:362 n. 3). The principal forms are: 3rd m.s. *yi-mur* (EA 138:61; et al.), 3rd f.s. *ti-mu-ru* (EA 138:61), 1st c.s. *i-mur* (EA 147:45; 155:35), *i-mu-ru* (EA 141:45; Moran 1987b:371 and n.7; 1992:227, 228 n. 6), 3rd c.pl. *ti-mu-ru* (EA 137:11; 138:36; 141:34).

(*w*)*ašû*. The evidence is ambiguous. One finds, e.g. 3rd m.s. *yu-uš-ší* (EA 232:16), 3rd f.s. *tu-uš-ša* (EA 234:17), 1st c.s. *uš-ša-am*

(EA 88:51) and *uṣ-šú-na* (EA 333:16) but there are also forms like 3rd m.s. *yu-ša-na* (EA 74:39; 77:27), 3rd f.s. *tu-ša-na* (EA 76:31; *et al.*), 2nd m.s. *tu-ša-na* (EA 73:9), *tu-šú* (EA 362:62), where the scribe may or may not have intended gemination.

dabābu. The only two examples from WS texts use the present-future theme: 1st c.s. *a-da-bu-ba* (EA 119:23), 3rd m.pl. *ti-dāb-bi-bu* (EA 138:49), the latter of which is certainly for the D stem (Rainey 1973c:254 and n. 96).

dagālu. The WS texts know only the *idaggal* form as their theme, e.g. *i-da-gal* (EA 75:19; *et al.*), *yi-da-ga-lu* (EA 85:62), 3rd m.pl. *ti-da-ga-lu* (EA 101:34; 120:34!), 1st c.pl. *ni-da-gal* (EA 93:12).

dāku. Only the preterite, *idūk*, seems to have been used, e.g. 2nd m.s. *ti₇-du-ku-nu* (EA 138:40, 41), 1st c.s. *a-du-uk-šu-nu* (EA 138:29), 3rd m.pl. *ti-du-ku* (EA 75:33), *ti-du-ku-na* (EA 104:34; *et al.*), and note *nu-du-uk* (EA 197:17).

epēšu. Although a few forms show gemination; most of the time the scribe uses a theme that is probably based on the preterite, *īpuš*, though the script is naturally ambiguous, cf. e.g. 1st c.s. *ip-pu-šu-na* (EA 249:10) and *i-pu-šu-na* (EA 74:63; *et al.*) in identical contexts. Note two transitive instances of the theme taken from the preterite with infixes *-t-*: 3rd m.s. *yi-te-pu-uš* (EA 258:7), 1st c.pl. *ni-te₉-pu[-u]š* (EA 105:33).

ezēbu. The only three examples with a consonantal personal prefix lack the gemination, namely 3rd m.s. *yi-zi-ib* (EA 197:40), 3rd f.s. *ti-zi-ib-ši* (EA 287:50), *ti-zi-ib-ši_x* (ŠE) (EA 129:48). Of the 1st c.s. forms, two lack gemination: *i-zi-bu* (EA 138:47), *i-zi-ba-ši* (EA 126:45); but two have it: *iz-zi-ib* (EA 88:29), *iz-zi-ba* (EA 294:31). An imperative even takes the geminated form as its base: *iz-zi-ib-mi* (EA 294:29). There are two 3rd m.pl. forms, one with and one without gemination: *i-zi-bu* (EA 73:13), *iz-zi-bu-ni₇* (EA 366:18); these will be treated as reflecting the pidgin suffix conjugation (cf. *infra*, pp. 342-343).

hadû. Only one suffix form is documented; it occurs in letters from Beirut, 3rd m.s. *yi-iḥ-di* (EA 142:9; 144:15); less likely is the alternate transcription is *ya-aḥ-di* (note the *i* theme characteristic of western peripheral).

ḥalāqu. The Jerusalem letters use the Akkadian present-future; thus, 3rd m.s. *i-ḥal-li-iq* (EA 286:37) used transitively as if D (Ebeling 1915:1413 n. 1); elsewhere, the preterite is the base: 3rd m.s. *iḥ-li-iq* (EA 186:66, 68), 3rd f.s. *ti₇-iḥ-la-aq* (EA 274:14), 1st c.s. *iḥ-la-aq* (EA 270:29). Note the 3rd m.s. transitive form *ya-aḥ-li-qú* (EA 254:9), which might represent a causative stem (cf. *infra*, p. 190).

idû. Naturally, this verb has only the preterite, *īde*, which serves for 3rd m.s. and 1st c.s. Since it was recognized by the Amarna scribes as a stative (Rainey 1973c:244-247; cf. *infra*, pp. 323-328), there are many forms without a consonantal suffix. However, there are also numerous examples of this verb functioning within the WS modal system. Therefore, there is a considerable number of forms (and variants) such as 3rd m.s. *yi-de* (EA 70:24; *et passim*) and 2nd m.s. *ti-de* (EA 100:23; *et passim*), as well as one 3rd m.pl. *ti-du* (EA 105:36) and one 1st c.pl. *ni-de* (EA 108:43).

izzuzu. Apart from three examples of the present-future theme without prefixed *y-*, which are most likely to be reckoned as suffix conjugation forms (cf. Rainey 1973c:248-249; cf. *supra*, pp. 322-323), the prefix conjugation forms prefer the preterite theme, e.g. 3rd m.s. *yi-iz-zi-iz* (EA 250:42), *yi-zi-iz* (EA 74:61; *et passim*), *yi-zi-za* (EA 132:48), *yi-zi-zu* (EA 362:65), 1st c.s. *iz-zi-iz* (EA 197:20), *iz-zi-iz-mi* (EA 245:9), *i-zi-za* (EA 71:25), *i-zi-zu-na* (EA 124:16), 1st c.pl. *ni-zi-iz* (EA 279:18).

kalû. Only two forms are attested in the WS texts, both with the Akkadian present-future gemination but in one case with the thematic vowel of the D preterite (Rabiner 1981:79): 1st c.s. *a-kal-li* (EA 254:13, 14), *a-kal-lu-ši* (EA 254:40).

kapālu. An Akkadian G present, with intransitive meaning (CAD K:174-175), is used in the proverb about the ants:

. . . *ki-i na-am-lu / tu-um-ḥa-šú la-a / ti-ka-pí-lu ù ta-an-šu-ku / qà-ti*
 LÚ-li ša *yu-ma-ḥa-aš-ši* ". . . when ants are smitten, they do not
 just curl up, but they bite the hand of the man who has smitten
 them" (EA 252:16-19; Albright 1943b:3l; Rainey 1989-90:68b-69a;
 cf. *infra*, pp. 148-149).

kašādu. The WS texts have the preterite theme: 3rd m.s. *ia-ak-šu-du-na* (EA 130:12; possibly reflecting Barth's law), *yi-ik-šu-du* (EA 227:15), and present-future 1st c.s. *i-ka-ša-da-am* (EA 362:34).

leqû. From this high-frequency verb, only two Akkadian present-futures are attested in the WS texts and they are both from Jerusalem: 3rd f.s. *ti-le-eq-qé* (EA 288:35), 3rd m.pl. *ti-le-qé-ú* (EA 288:38). The latter form, as Moran (1975b:164 n. 63) has noted, is evidently comprised of three morphological components, the WS *t-* prefix for 3rd m.pl., Babylonian vowel coloring, and Assyrian lack of final vowel contraction (cf. also Izre²el 1987:89-90).

Throughout the rest of the WS corpus, the preference is for the preterite theme, or occasionally for the preterite with *-t-* infix. Here is a representative selection of the many preterite themes: 3rd m.s. *yi-il-qé* (EA 116:36; *et passim*), *yi-il-qú* (EA 71:18; *et passim*), 3rd f.s. *ti-ḫil-qé* (EA 362:20), 2nd m.s. *ti-il-qú* (EA 138:41), 3rd m.pl. *ti-il-qú* (EA 84:32; *et passim*), *ti-il-qú-na* (EA 104:22, 25, 32), *et al.*

Of the forms based on the *-t-* preterite, many lack any consonantal prefix and one must suspect that, in the mind of the Canaanite scribe, they were to be reckoned syntactically with the suffix conjugation (cf. *infra*, pp. 339-341). There are still a few, nevertheless, that do have WS suffixes: 3rd m.s. *yi-il-te-qú* (EA 254:25), *yi-il-te₉-qú* (EA 109:17, 19; Moran 1950b:167-168), *yi-il-te-qé-ni* (EA 270:27), *yi-il₅-te-qé* (EA 239:13), *yi-il₅-te-qú* (EA 280:31), 3rd m.pl. *ti-il-te₉-qú-na* (EA 71:15).

lamādu. This verb is used frequently in the WS letters, usually in the jussive; all prefix forms have the preterite as their theme: 3rd m.s. *yi-il-ma-ad* (EA 264:23; 337:17; 366:17), *yi-il₅-ma-ad* (EA 64:8; *et passim*), *yi-il-ma-du* (EA 251:9).

le²û. In spite of its Akkadian role as a preformative stative, this verb is usually conjugated in the WS texts (Rainey 1973c:247-248). The theme is the present-future: 3rd m.s. *yi-la-û* (EA 326:15), *yi-le-û* (EA 114:36; 124:53, Izre²el 1987:81), 2nd m.s. *ti-le-û* (EA 83:20; *et passim*), *ti-le-û-na* (EA 82:6), 1st c.s. *i-le-û* (EA 82:22; *et passim*), *i-le-e* (EA 81:21), *i-lé-e* (EA 151:10), *i-le-i* (EA 144:32), *i-le-²i* (EA 102:9), *i-le-é²-e* (EA 238:8), *e-la-û-mi* (EA 137:27), and the Assyrianizing Jerusalem forms (Moran 1975b:154) *a-la-²e-e* (EA 286:42; 287:58), 3rd m.pl. *te-le-û-na* (EA 249:13), 1st c.pl. *ni-le-û* (EA 88:20; *et passim*), *ni-la-û* (EA 211:18).

Three examples without consonantal prefixes are to be taken as statives: 3rd m.s. *i-le-e* (EA 79:39) and 3rd m.pl. *i-le-û* (EA 106:12, 13).

maḡāru. Only two examples in the WS texts, perhaps to be considered as D (cf. EA 283:10): 3rd f.s. *ti-ma-ga-ru* (EA 138:62), 1st c.s. *i-ma-gur* (EA 234:27), unless they are N.

maḡāšu. All documented forms have the present-future theme, perhaps to represent D: 3rd m.s. *yi-ma-ḡa-aš-ši* (EA 252:19), 3rd f.s. *ti-ma-ḡa-ša-na-[ni]* (EA 77:39; Moran 1950b:60, 86, 100-101, 128 n. 118), 3rd m.pl. *ti-ma-ḡa-šú-ka* (EA 252:27), *ti₇-ma-ḡa-šú-nu* (EA 271:21).

malāku. The scribes vary between the present-future theme: 3rd m.s. *yi-ma-lik* (EA 94:12), *yi-ma-li-ku* (EA 104:16; 114:12), which was probably meant for D or N stem in the light of the precativ 3rd m.s. ¹li¹-¹ma¹-lik (EA 94:72; a likely reading in spite of Youngblood's objections, 1961:386). On the other hand, there are preterite themes, mainly for WS jussives, some with the normal Akkadian *i* theme, but with the WS prefix vowel, viz. 3rd m.s. *ya-am-li-ik* (EA 105:6), *ya-am-lik* (EA 114:20), while others (all

but one from Beirut) have a *u* theme but an *i* prefix vowel: 3rd m.s. *yi-im-lu-uk* (EA 136:40), *yi-im-lu-ku* (EA 142:17; 216:20), 1st c.s. *im-lu-uk* (EA 136:26).

maqātu. In the epistolary introduction, nearly all Canaanite scribes use the preterite, *amqut*, or some spelling variant for the plural, *nimqut* (cf. EA 100:6; 200:5). However, this is a learned formula, standard in epistles from all over the Levant (Salonen 1967:6-70, 74-76; CAD M/1:242b-243a). Only one clear example has the preterite in the message of a letter, 3rd m.s. *yi-im-qú-ut* (EA 295:17). The other passages all use the present-future theme, probably to represent a D stem nuance (unattested for good Akkadian): 3rd m.s. or 1st c.s. *i-ma-qú-^fut¹* (EA 173:2), 3rd m.s. *yi-ma-qú-ta* (EA 81:31; 83:43), 2nd m.s. *ti-ma-qú-tu* (EA 73:10), 1st c.s. *ni-ma-qú-^fut¹* (EA 74:32).

mātu. It is most difficult to determine which Akkadian tense form is being preferred. One ideographic spelling is BA.UG₇-at (EA 87:31) for *amât*. All the other instances in WS texts have vocalic endings which, in Babylonian, would require gemination of the last radical and a return of the root vowel, *u*, as the theme, i.e. *amuttu* (GAG:143, §104f). The 3rd m.s. *ia-mu-tu* (EA 138:27) looks purely WS, as does the 3rd m.pl. *ta-mu-tu-na* (EA 362:44). The 1st c.s. *a-mu-tu* (EA 137:52; 285:30) and *a-mu-^fta¹* (EA 114:68; 130:51) could be either for *amuttu* and *amutta* or *amūtu* and *amūta* respectively. The latter is more likely in view of the 1st c.s. BA.UG₇.MEŠ^{ni-mu-ut} (EA 362:11); so one may also posit a preterite theme for the Jerusalem spelling BA.UG₇^{ni-mu-tu}₄ (EA 288:60-61).

nadānu. There are only two examples of the present-future form, one from Beirut and one from Taanach (Rainey 1975b:397-404): 1st c.s. *a-na-din-mi* (EA 137:55), *a-na-^fdin¹* (TT 1:10); it is not certain whether the latter form is functioning in an Akkadian or a WS syntagma (Rainey 1977:55-56). Nearly all the other instances of this verb in the WS texts from Amarna use the preterite theme with a few examples of the preterite with infixes *-t-*. Byblos

shows a preference for forms such as 3rd m.s. *ia-di-in*₄ (EA 116:46), *ia-di-nu* (EA 105:85; *et passim*), and *ia-di-na* (EA 74:54; *et passim*), which might imply that 3rd m.s. forms with initial PI are to be read: *ya-di-in*₄ (EA 113:32), *ya-di-nu* (EA 225:10), *ya-di-na* (EA 93:11), *ya-di-na*₇ (EA 127:27) *et al.* However, the 3rd f.s. forms, *ti-di-in* (EA 74:3), *ti-din* (EA 73:4; *et passim*), *ti-id-di-in*₄ (EA 68:5), *ti-di-in*₄ (EA 76:4; *et passim*), and the 3rd m.pl. *ti-di-nu* (EA 71:5; 86:4; 87:6; 95:5; Moran 1950b:62-63), suggest that some Byblos scribes used the PI sign rather than the *ia* precisely because they intended *yi-di-in*₄ etc.! Nevertheless, *ya-ti-na* (EA 83:31) might represent the true Canaanite (Phoenician, also Ugaritic) form, viz. **yatin* (Youngblood, 1961:248). The Tyrian scribe has 1st c.s. *id-din* (EA 155:27; Finkle 1977:89, 90). For 1st c.pl., in addition to the Akkadian forms, *ni-din-mi* (EA 191:20) and *ni-di-nu* (EA 112:52), Albright and Moran (1950:166) pointed to *na-ad-na* (EA 89:16) as 1st c.pl. Hence, we may posit a Canaanite prefix *na-*.

One Egyptian letter uses 3rd m.s. *yi-ta-din* (EA 369:28; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:143-144). The Tyrian scribe had a penchant for 3rd m.s. *it-ta-din* (EA 149:39; 155:24) and 1st c.s. *at-ta-din* (EA 148:6; *et passim*).

namāšu. This verb always appears in the present-future theme, usually with the *u* thematic vowel, e.g. 3rd m.s. *yi-na-mu-šu* (EA 250:53) *et al.*, but there are two instances of an *a* theme: 3rd m.s. *yi-na-ma-aš* (EA 196:42) and 3rd f.s. *ti-na-ma-šu* (EA 266:19).

našāru. In the majority of cases, this verb appears in the present-future theme (Rainey 1975b:404-419), e.g. 3rd m.s. *yi-na-ša-ra-ni* (EA 119:10), *yi-na-ša-ru-ni* (EA 112:17) and other variants, 1st c.s. *a-na-ša-ru* (EA 221:12; *et passim*) and other variants, 3rd m.pl. *ti-na-ša-ru* (EA 85:22; *et passim*), *ti-na-ša-ru* (EA 180:8), 1st c.pl. *ni-na-ša-ar* (EA 181:9), *ni-na-ša-ru* (EA 100:9, 30). There are many 1st c.s. forms based on the Akkadian present-future 3rd m.s. theme + Ø preformative: *i-na-ša-ru* (EA 65:10; *et passim*) with other variants. But the most significant variation is in the numerous forms with *i* thematic vowel: 3rd m.s. *yi-na-ší-ru* (EA 112:14), *yi-na-ší-ru-ni* (EA 112:18), *yi-na-ší-ra-an-ni* (EA 112:13;

121:10), *yi-na-ší-ra-ni* (EA 130:20), 1st c.s. *i-na-ší-ru* (EA 119:15); 130:49), *i-na-ší-ru-na* (EA 123:32), *i-na-ší-ra* (EA 123:27), 3rd m.pl. *ti-na-ší-ru* (EA 130:48). It has long been recognized that these *i* theme forms reflect the scribes' feeling that the themes with geminated second radical must be equated with D stem (Ebeling 1910:52; Albright and Moran 1950:165-166; Youngblood 1961:151-152; Rainey 1975b:417-419; cf *infra*, pp. 171-172). Further confirmation derives from 1st c.s. *ú-na-šár* (EA 327:5).

On the other hand, there is an appreciable number of epistles which use the preterite theme. Apart from 3rd m.pl. *ti-šú-ru* (EA 88:41, also line 25; Youngblood 1961:316-317), all the examples are 1st c.s., *aš-šur-^fmi¹* (EA 364:14), *i-šú-ru* (EA 220:15; 292:23; 293:12; 294:12). A special group of forms seem to take the 2nd m.s. imperative as their theme (Rainey 1974:306; 404-417 *passim*; 1978b:84)! All of them are, in fact, 1st c.s., *uš-šú-ru* (EA 141:41; 142:12), *^fuš¹-šur-^fšu¹* (EA 230:13), *uš-šur-ru-na* (EA 252:8), *ú-šur-ru* (EA 337:28), *ú-šur-ru-šu-nu* (EA 252:31), *ú-šur-ru-na* (EA 252:28).

qabû. There are a number of forms with the present-future theme, e.g. 3rd m.s. *yi-qa-bi* (EA 234:16), *yi-qa-bu* (EA 117:83; *et passim*), and *i-qa-bu* (EA 106:30), 2nd m.s. *ti-qa-bu* (EA 117:30; 124:35; 253:23), 1st c.s. *a-qa-bi* (EA 92:30; and Jerusalem EA 286:17, 39, 49), *a-qa-bu-na* (EA 85:11; 119:53), *i-qa-bi* (EA 106:46), *i₁₅-qa-bi* (EA 180:16), 3rd m.pl. *yi-qa-bu* (EA 124:17; 131:41), *yi-qa-bu-na* (EA 116:8), *i-qa-bu-ni₇* (EA 127:10).

However, there is very extensive use of the preterite theme, for example: 3rd m.s. *iq-bi* (EA 68:2; *et passim*), *yi-iq-bi* (EA 85:23; *et passim*), *yi-iq-bu* (EA 129:84; *et passim*), *ia-aq-bi* (EA 83:84; *et passim*), *ia-aq-bu* (EA 101:19; *et passim*), 3rd f.s. *ta-aq-bi* (EA 138:11), *ti-iq-bi* (EA 138:44), *ta-aq-bu* (EA 89:40; 122:41), *ti-iq-bu* (EA 138:90), 2nd m.s. *taq-bi* (EA 86:15), *ti-iq-bi* (EA 83:45), *taq-bu* (EA 73:7), *taq-bu-ú* (EA 96:7), *ti-iq-bu* (EA 71:12), 1st c.s. *aq-bi* (EA 75:28; *et passim*), *aq-ba* (EA 121:25), *aq-bu* (EA 107:10; 109:15), *aq-bu-na* (EA 138:82), 3rd m.pl. *ti-iq-bu* (EA 138:40; 185:55; 186:58), *ti₇-iq-bu-ni₇* (EA 362:17, 25), *ti₇-iq-bu-na* (EA 94:14; 137:10; 197:16; 362:21).

qālu. Usually this verb appears in the suffix form. The examples of the prefix conjugation can have either the present-future theme, e.g. 3rd m.s. *i-qa-al* (EA 185:67), 2nd m.s. *ta-qa-al-mi* (EA 74:13, 48; 76:45; 90:57), or the preterite theme: *i-qú-ul* (EA 149:41, from Tyre), *ia-qú-ul* (EA 132:44; *et passim*), *ya-qú-lu* (EA 140:5), 2nd m.s. *ta-qú-ul* (EA 139:5).

qerēbu. Note *ia-qá-ar-ri-ib* (EA 39:19; from Alashia).

raʾāmu. Of all the attested examples of this verb, only two have a consonantal suffix. The rest are probably to be considered as "preformative statives" or suffix conjugation (cf. *infra*, pp. 343-345). The two forms in question represent both the present-future theme, 2nd m.s. *ta-ra-ia-mu* (EA 286:18; hybrid with WS tense function in direct discourse, Nitzan 1973:41, 61), and the preterite, 3rd f.s. ^ʾša¹ *ti-ra-am* / ^dUTU, where the verb must represent a translation of the Egyptian perfective passive participle, *mry*.

sabātu. The few attested forms in WS texts use the preterite theme, e.g. 3rd m.s. *yi-iš-bat* (EA 138:28), *yi-iš-ba-tu-ši* (EA 137:62; Moran 1987b:361 n.12; 1992:220 n. 12; Izreʿel 1987:81-82), 3rd m.pl. *ti-iš-ba-tu* (EA 137:98), *ti₇-iš-ba-tu* (EA 137:40), 1st c.pl. *ni-iš-bat* (EA 138:101).

šaʾālu. There seems to be a decided preference for the preterite theme, viz. *ia-aš-al-mi* (EA 224:10), *yi-iš-al-šu* (EA 60:21), and *yi-ša-al* (EA 124:23; *et passim*). Three forms, viz. 3rd m.s. *yi-ša-i-lu* (EA 89:15, 34, 45), *yi-ša-a-lu* (EA 89:12, 13) and 2nd m.s. *ti-ša-i-lu* (EA 89:40), have the present-future theme but appear to be intended to function as D stem (Albright and Moran 1950:165-166).

šakānu. The few attested forms are not only preterite, but they look like pure WS verb forms: 3rd m.s. *ia-aš-ku-un* (EA 108:59), *ia-aš-ku-nu* (EA 113:6), with the exception of 1st c.s. *ni-iš-kán* (EA 149:52), which, being from Tyre, is probably an error for the present-future *ni-ša!-kán*.

šapāru. There are three or four problematic cases of the present-future theme, 3rd m.s. *i-ša-pa-ru* (EA 123:29), 2nd m.s. *ti-ša-pa-ru* (EA 93:8), *ta-šap-pár* (EA 102:38; for the suffix conjugation form, *ta-šap-pár-ta*, line 10, cf. *infra*, pp. 338, 345-346). The first two express repeated action in the past, not because they are Akkadian present forms, but because of the WS imperfect suffix, *-u* (cf. *infra*, pp. 232-233).

There are numerous forms built on the preterite theme plus the various Canaanite tense and modal suffixes, for example: 3rd m.s. *ia-aš-pu-ur* (EA 117:60; 247:9), *yi-iš-pur-mì* (EA 250:23), *ia-aš-pu-ru* (EA 89:36; 138:23), *ia-aš-pu-ra* (EA 234:23; *et al.*), *yi-iš-pu-ra-am* (EA 362:22), 2nd m.s. *ta-aš-pu-ra* (EA 77:7; 95:7; TT 1:8). 1st c.s. *aš-pu-ur* (EA 138:31, 42; 362:18), *aš-pu-ru* (EA 83:44; *et passim*), 3rd m.pl. *ta-aš-pu-ru-na* (EA 138:122), *ti-iš-pu-ru-na* (EA 138:137), *ti-iš-pu-ru-na* (EA 118:47), 1st c.pl. *ni-iš-pu-ru* (EA 112:53).

šemû. There are only a handful of forms based on the present-future theme; all of them have \emptyset suffix. Two of them are definitely past tense (Rainey 1975b:424-426; Moran 1987b:273 n.1; 1992:159 n. 1), viz. 3rd m.s. *i-še₂₀-me* (EA 87:18), and 1st c.s. *i-še₂₀-me* (EA 87:15); and one other probably is, viz. 3rd m.s. *i-še₂₀-mé* (EA 92:21; cf. Moran 1987b:283; 1992:166). Another could be simple past, i.e. an error for *yišme* or *yišteme*, but it could also be expressing past continuous like the Akkadian present-future, in spite of the WS consonantal prefix: 3rd m.s. *yi-še₂₀-mé* (EA 92:15; Rainey 1975b:420-421; cf. Moran 1987b:282; 1992:166). The last one, 1st c.s. *i-še₂₀-mé* (EA 106:39), could be present (Moran 1950b:67) or past (Moran 1987b:303; 1992:179). Note that these are all spellings in which the *ši* sign could simply be an error for *iš*.

One form listed by Ebeling as G present, viz. *yi-ša-ma* (EA 227:10), is actually N stem (Rainey 1975b:421-422; cf. *infra*, p. 120).

There is an abundance of forms using the preterite theme; a selection of some of the most frequent will suffice: 3rd m.s. *yi-iš-me* (EA 119:26; *et passim*), *yi-iš-mé* (EA 94:4; *et passim*), *yi-iš-me* (EA 78:17; *et passim*), *yi-iš-mé* (EA 85:16; *et passim*), *yi-iš-mu*

(EA 109:16, 18; *et passim*), 2nd m.s. *ti-iš-me* (EA 90:13; 109:14), *ti-iš-mé* (EA 86:17), 1st c.s. *eš-me* (EA 105:40), *eš-mé* (EA 91:23), *iš-me* (EA 136:15; *et al.*), *iš-mé* (EA 317:12, 22; *et al.*), *iš-mu* (EA 251:15), 3rd m.pl. *ti-iš-mu-na* (EA 82:11; 108:51), 1st c.pl. *ni-iš-mé* (EA 185:50; 186:52), *ni-iš-mu-mi* (EA 185:75), *ni-iš-mu* (EA 211:14). Note that the 2nd m.s. forms could be transcribed *te₉-eš-me* and *te₉-eš-mé* respectively, but nothing would be gained thereby.

tarāšu. All the G stem examples of this verb are precativ except for two jussives based on the preterite theme: 3rd m.s. *yi-it-ru-uš* (EA 103:40; 250:22).

tāru. The three attested forms are probably all on the preterite theme, though two of them, with vocalic suffixes might be on the Babylonian present-future base: 3rd m.s. *ia-tu-ru-na* (EA 126:54), 1st c.s. *a-tu-ur* (EA 136:33), 3rd m.pl. *ti-tu-ru-na* (EA 134:14).

When one realizes that for most verbs, only one theme or the other is used, it becomes evident that the indicators of tense and mode must be other than the standard Akkadian distinction between the *iparras* and the *iprus* patterns. The actual WS system of tense and modal expression will be dealt with in chapter 10 (cf. *infra*, pp. 221-264).

THE BARTH-GINSBERG LAW.

Meanwhile, it remains to treat another important feature of the G stem verbs used in these texts, viz. the distinction between the colloquial use of prefix vowels, as outlined in the preceding chapter, and the actual Canaanite patterns of vocalization that existed in the scribes' mother tongue. It is important for the diachronic study of the North West Semitic dialects that the true linguistic situation in the Amarna texts from Canaan be clearly delineated. Much confusion generated by the older interpretations of the Amarna dialect evidence can thereby be dispelled.

The original pattern of the G stem morphology for ancient Hebrew was discovered by J. Barth (1889, 1894). The vocalic system that he delineated will be discussed below. An important milestone in the study of Northwest Semitic was H. L. Ginsberg's discovery that Ugaritic possessed the same system of vocalization that Barth had found in Hebrew (Ginsberg 1932-33:38-838; 1939:318-322). Albright (1943a:17 n. 60; 1943b:31 nn. 17, 20) was quick to grasp the implications of Ginsberg's discovery for the Amarna texts from Canaan although he tried to apply it to a presumed *yaqatal* pattern which does not actually exist in Northwest Semitic. The discovery and publication of a large selection from the Mari tablets gave new impetus to the study of the so-called Amurrite personal names in the Middle Bronze Age (Huffmon 1965; Buccellati 1966; Gelb 1968,1980; Sasson 1972). It soon became clear that Amurrite, as reflected in these PN's, was thoroughly West Semitic but lacked the typical Barth-Ginsberg developments. At that time, no one thought to examine the evidence from the Amarna letters written in Canaan (Rainey 1978a). Ebeling (1910:45-50), Böhl (1909:48-58) and Dhorme (1913:376-382; 1914:49-59; 1951:412-419, 445-456) dealt with problems of the prefix vowels in the EA verbs, but only Ebeling (1910:47) made reference to Barth's work, and then just to his discovery that the *i* thematic vowel had originally been more prevalent in ancient Hebrew than was reflected in the Tiberian tradition (Barth 1889). Ebeling and the others were so impressed by the ubiquity of verbal forms in the Canaanized texts that had *yi-*, *ti-*, and *Øi-* prefixes, that they jumped to the superficial conclusion that EA forms such as *yi-ik-šu-du* (EA 227:15), *yi-im-qú-ut* (EA 295:17), *yi-ip-tú-ra* (EA 234:21), *yi-iš-pu-ra-am* (EA 362:22) and *yi-it-ru-uš* (EA 103:40; 250:22) were the equivalent of Hebrew *yīšmōr*. Their view was passed on to some of the leading grammars of biblical Hebrew (Bauer and Leander 1922:194, §14x; Bergsträsser 1929:78, §14f¹).

THE ANCIENT SEMITIC PATTERN. The evidence now at hand suggests the following patterns for Semitic languages in general. The most ancient witness is Akkadian. The Akkadian 3rd m.s. is of

no value here, of course, because the ancient prefix *ya-* became *i-* in all G stem verb classes of Akkadian; neither is there any relevance in the *iparras* forms since their choice of thematic vowel is conditioned by factors other than the Barth-Ginsberg law (GAG:113, §87c; 135, §101b; 137, §102f; 138, §103b; 139, §103f). The original prefix vowel is found in the 2nd singular and plural and 1st singular forms of the preterite, e.g. *taprus / aprus*, *tapqid / apqid*, *tašbat / ašbat*. So it is clear that the ancient pattern of vocalization goes back to proto-Semitic *yaqtul*, *yaqtil*, *yaqtal* (GAG:98, §75e).

The same patterns are discernible in the Amurrite PN's, especially from Mari. Representative examples are: *Yagmur-Ilu*, *Yantin-Ilu*, and *Yasma^c-Ilu*, all of them written syllabically; *Ia-ag-mu-ur-DINGIR* (ARM 7, 169:12), *Ia-an-ti-in-DINGIR* (ARM 5, 35:27), and *Ia-ás-ma-aḥ-DINGIR* (ARM 6, 22:16), respectively (Huffmon 1965:63-78, especially p. 64). Names like these, with the simple prefix conjugation form plus -Ø suffix, could be either jussive or preterite. Corresponding Akkadian names from Mari such as *Iddin-Sîn* (ARM 5, 47:5) and *Išme-Dagan* (ARM *et passim*) suggest that they are preterites. The corresponding Amurrite jussive/optative PN's seem to have a *la-* proclitic particle (Huffmon 1965:78-81).

Now it is well known that the testimony of Akkadian and Amurrite corresponds to the patterns in use in Arabic, e.g. *yaktub*, *yaḍrib*, and *yamraḍ* (Fischer 1972:105, §216). So the oldest documented Semitic language, Akkadian, and the oldest documented West Semitic language, Amurrite (the evidence from Eblaite has still to be evaluated), and the most conservative living Semitic language, classical Arabic, all point to an original set of patterns for the prefixes of the finite verbs: *yaqtul*, *yaqtil*, *yaqtal*.

HEBREW. It was Barth's discovery that Hebrew had originally employed the first two of those ancient patterns, viz. *yaqtul*, *yaqtil*, but that the third was not *yaqtal*, but rather *yiqtal*, which he thought was the original (Barth 1894:4-5). The situation in Tiberian Hebrew has been obscured by a much later phenomenon, viz. the attenuation of short *a* vowels in closed, unaccented syllables to short *i / e* (cf. *infra*, pp. 73-75). Thus, ancient

**yašmur* eventually became *yišmōr* and **yattin* became *yittēn*. However, there are verbal roots, the morphology of which prohibits the closing of the first syllable, and they reveal the system of forms delineated by Barth. Among roots with a reduplicated second radical, one finds *yāsōb* (1 Ki. 7:15), *yāḡēn* (Isa. 31:5; originally G but later understood as H stem; Barth 1889:175; Bergsträsser 1929:135, §27d), but *yērak* (Isa. 7:4), which derive from the *yaqtul*, *yaqtīl* and *yiqtal* patterns respectively. The hollow roots (those with IInd *w / ū* or *y / ī*) also show the same three basic forms: *yāqûm* (Ex. 21:19), *yāšîm* (Gen. 30:42), and *yēbôš* (Isa. 29:22) respectively (Bergsträsser 1929:142-145, §§28a-d). It was Barth's contention that many *yaqtīl* verbs had become either *u* theme or *a* theme during the course of time (Barth 1889:42). As is well recognized, the *yiqtal* verbs either have their *a* theme either semantically, because they are stative in meaning, or phonetically, because there is a guttural consonant in the second or third root position, or both due to conditions being present (at least some IIIrd yod verbs must have originally had the *yiqtal* pattern; Joüon and Muraoka 1991:205, §79e-).

UGARITIC. As mentioned above, Ginsberg (1932-33:382-383; 1939:318-322) discovered that Ugaritic displayed the same patterns as did biblical Hebrew. The almost strictly consonantal Ugaritic script limited his examples to 1st c.s. of the prefix conjugation where the aleph signs varied according to the prefix vowel. Thus, one could surmise that Barth's law was at work on the basis of forms such as: *amlk* = *²*amluk-*, *amt* = *²*amût-*, *atn* = *²*atin-*, *ašr* = *²*ašîr*, and finally *ilak* = *²*il'ak-*, *išal* = *²*iš'al-* (for references and other examples, cf. Gordon 1965:71, §9.9).

Ginsberg's analysis of finite verb forms in the alphabetic texts has been confirmed by Ugaritic PN's preserved in syllabic transcription (Gröndahl 1967:57-59; cf. also Sivan 1984:147-158 *et passim*), as illustrated by the following examples with the corresponding alphabetic spellings: ¹*Ia-ku-un-DINGIR* = *yknīl* = **Yakun-'Ilu* (for the references, cf. Sivan 1984:239; Gordon 1965:410b); ¹*Ia-šu-ub-DINGIR* = **Yašub-'Ilu* (Sivan 1984:282); ¹*Ia-ti-nu* (cf. *ytn*, finite verb) = **Yatinu* (Sivan 1984:292; Gordon

1965:415b-416a); and finally ¹Ig-ma-ra-dIŠKUR (cf. *ygmr*, PN) = *(Y)igmar-Haddu (Sivan 1984:220; Gordon 1965:380).

THE AMARNA EVIDENCE. With this picture in mind, viz. the patterns *yaqtul*, *yaqtil* and *yiqtal*, it is necessary to examine the evidence from the Canaanized Amarna letters to see if traces of the Barth-Ginsberg law may be found (Rainey 1978a:9*-13*).

yaqtul. As noted already by Ebeling (1910:46) and Dhorme (1913:377 = 1951:416), the original Canaanite pattern is reflected in a gloss from Hazor:

[ù] li-ih̄-šu-uš-mi / \ ia-az-ku-ur-mi / Iš̄ar-ri EN-ia / mi-im-ma ša / in₄-né-pu-uš-mi / UGU URUḪa-šú-ra^{KI} / URU.KI-ka ù / UGU ÌR-ka "May the king, my lord, be mindful (gloss: take thought) of all that has been done against Hazor, your city, and against your servant" (EA 228:18-24; CAD Ḫ:123b; Z:22b.

The form, *ya-az-ku-ur* = **yazkur*, 3rd m.s. jussive, clearly signifies the Canaanite translation of Akkadian *lihsus*. The jussive modal conjugation pattern will be discussed in a subsequent chapter (cf. *infra*, pp. 245-254). So this gloss reveals that the true WS pattern is *yaqtul*, with an *a* vowel in the prefix. (Barker 1969:33-34)

A 3rd f.s. Canaanite form with a singular collective subject was noted by Albright (1943b:31 n. 17):

. . . ki-i na-am-lu / tu-um-ḫa-šú la-a / ti-ka-pí-lu ù ta-an-šu-ku / qà-ti LÚ-lì ša yi-ma-ḫa-aš-ši". . . when ants are smitten, they do not just curl up but they bite the hand of the man who has smitten them" (EA 252:16-19; Albright 1943b:31; cf. Rainey 1989-90:68b-69a; *supra*, pp. 4-5, *infra*, p. 78).

Although a form like **tanšuku*, with the *ta-* prefix, could be good 3rd f.s. in Assyrian and occasionally in poetic or late Babylonian (cf. *supra*, pp. 37-38), the syntactic environment in this context shows that the form is most likely Canaanite.

Other instances of Canaanite, neither hybrid nor Akkadian, forms include the following:

i-ia-nu LÚ.MEŠ^h*ha-za-na* LU[GAL] *k[i-ma i]a-ši / a-na* LUGAL *ša-a ia-mu-tu* [UGU *bé-l*]*i-ia* "The king does not have a ro[yal] city-ruler l[ike m]e, who would die [for] my [lor]d" (EA 138:26-27).

The prefix indicates that the Beirutian scribe intended WS **yamûtu*, certainly not Akkadian *imuttu*. Even more certain is the purely Canaanite for in this next passage, where the verb can only be Canaanite **tamûtûna*, 3rd m.pl. imperfect:

ù i-du i-nu-ma ta-mu-tu-na "and they know that they will die" (EA 362:44),

To these may be added two examples of *šakānu*, since this verb can have the meaning, "place, put, impose," etc. in WS (for Ugaritic, cf. Gordon 1965:490a) as well as in Akkadian:

[ú]-u[l i] *a-aš-ku-un / lum-ni[-ia i]-na lib-bi-¹ka¹* "[Do]n't think bad of me" (EA 108:59-60; *contra* Moran 1987b:307 n. 9; 1992:182 n. 10); *!a ia-aš-ku-un* [L]UGAL ŠÀ-šu / *i-na mi-im-mi ša yi-iš-ši-ru / ¹A-zi-ru a-na ša-šu* "May the king [no]t pay attention to the things that Aziru is sending to him" (EA 139:33-35; Moran 1987b:368 n. 7; 1992:226 n. 8); *ù ú-ul y[i-pu-šu] / ar-na ù ia-aš-ku[-n]u / i-na lib-bi-šu* "that is not co[mmitting] a crime or harbori[n]g, in his heart" (EA 113:5-6; with Moran 1987b:315 n. 3; 1992:188 n. 3).

The forms **yaškun* and **yaškunu*, all in WS idioms, are the only G stem 3rd m.s. prefix forms of this verb in the texts from Canaan (EA 119:58 has an N form, not a G present; Rainey 1975b:422; cf. *infra*, pp. 119-120). It stands to reason that they should reflect true Canaanite verb forms.

Sivan (1984:148) includes the somewhat enigmatic form introduced by the gloss sign: *ia-ak-wu-un-¹ka¹* (EA 145:28), which he renders "He will be honest with you" (more likely jussive or

preterite). His derivation is from *kānu*, and he presupposes a scribal error for **yakûn* (probably **yakun*).

There should be no doubt that the real Canaanite forms reflect *yaqtul*. This would justifiably lead one to suspect that the non-WS verb, *šapāru*, which is so ubiquitous in the Gt (Gtn?), may have been intentionally dressed in Canaanite vocalization when appearing in the G stem, viz. *ia-aš-pur* (EA 250:23), *ia-aš-pu-ur* (EA 117:60), *ia-aš-pu-ru* (EA 89:36; 138:123), [*ia-a*]š-*pu-ra* (EA 138:67)

yaqtil. This vocalization is documented by a Canaanite gloss which not only shows the contrast between the Akkadian and the WS forms, but also demonstrates the absence of a *yaqattal* verb form in the WS G stem (Rainey 1975b:423):

a-nu-um-ma a-na-ku-ma / er-ri-šu \ aḥ-ri-šu / i-na URUŠu-na-ma KI
 "Now, (it is) I (who) am cultivating (gloss: am cultivating) in
 Shunem" (EA 362:10-12; CAD Ḥ:96; Barker 1969:45).

The gloss, *aḥ-ri-šu*, was given to clarify the hybrid, *er-ri-šu*, which is Akkadian 1st c.s. present-future plus the WS *-u* imperfect suffix. The Canaanite form was 1st c.s. **ahriṣu*, "I am cultivating." In the original publication of this text, Thureau-Dangin (1922a:97) transcribed *iḥ-ri-šu*, simply because he was unaware of the WS linguistic rule. The first cuneiform sign is *v+h*, which would leave the question open. Thureau-Dangin should have followed Knudtzon's example in transcribing the other instance of the same verb form. Although the signs are partially effaced, the reading is certain; Knudtzon correctly rendered the passage as follows:

a-nu-ma / ṛi¹-ri-šu \ aḥ-r[i-šu] "Now, I am cultivating (gloss: am
 cult[ivating])" (EA 226:10-11).

Knudtzon was evidently more aware of the requirements of WS linguistics. In any case, he was correct in assuming the presence of an *a* vowel in the 1st c.s. prefix. From these two examples, the Canaanite thematic vowel is seen to be *i* rather than the *u* of

Hebrew, e.g. *yaḥarōš* (Isa. 28:24). Classical Arabic has both *ʾaḥriṭu* and *ʾaḥrutu* (colloquial Palestinian is *aḥrot*). Akkadian has an *i* theme in the principal dialects but OAkk has one documented instance of 1st c.s. *ā-ru-uš* (Smith 1932:296, line 9) and an *a-u* pattern existed in later Assyrian (for references, cf. *CAD* E:285-289). The verb, *yḥrt*, is documented in Ugaritic (Rainey 1971b:164-165) but the vocalic pattern is unknown.

Further examples of *yaqtil* may be adduced from the exclusively EA usage of *malāku* in the meaning, "to care for, to show concern" (*CAD* M/1:156b). Hybrids based on the Akkadian verb are often used to express this nuance, e.g. the G precativē, *li-im-li-ik* (EA 149:8, 54; *et al.*) and the D or N precativē, *li-ma-lik* (EA 94:72). The latter suggests that 3rd m.s. *yi-ma-lik* (EA 94:12) and *yi-ma-li-ku* (EA 104:16; 114:48) are also meant to be D or N. The Beirut letters show a *u* thematic vowel in hybrid forms: 1st c.s. *im-lu-uk* (EA 136:26), 3rd m.s. *yi-im-lu-uk* (EA 136:36, 40) and *yi-im-lu-ku* (EA 142:17; also EA 216:20). However, two jussives in the Byblos letters seem to reflect the real Canaanite vocalization:

ya-am-li-ik šār-ru / a-na URUŠu-mu-ra "May the king show concern for Šumur" (EA 105:6-7); *ù ya-am-lik LUGAL / a-na URU-šu ù ÌR-šu* "And may the king show concern for his city and his servant" (EA 114:20-21).

The antiquity of the *i* theme for this verb is attested in both Akkadian and Arabic; the Hebrew *yimlōk* with its *u* theme (which also pops up in the Beirut references cited above), like *yaḥarōš* (cited above), illustrate the process posited by Barth (1889:185), by which many *i* theme verbs either had two themes, *i* or *u*, or else shifted to another pattern, frequently to the *u* theme but sometimes to the *a* theme (when there was a guttural in the second or third position of the root).

It has long been noted that *ia-ti-na* (EA 83:31) probably represents the true Canaanite form of the verb, "to give," documented as *ytn* in both Phoenician and Ugaritic (Böhl 1909:21, §9d, 50 §28f; Dhorme 1914:50-51; 1951:447; Youngblood 1961:248). By the same token, there are numerous Byblos spellings like 3rd

m.s. *ia-di-in₄* (EA 116:46), *ia-di-nu* (EA 105:85; *et passim*), and *ia-di-na* (EA 74:54; *et passim*), which surely reflect the WS vocalization even though they preserve the Akkadian second radical.

There are some PN's which also reflect the *yaqtil* pattern. One clear example is *Ia-ab-ni-DINGIR* = *Yabni-²ilu* (EA 328:4), also known from Ugarit (alphabetic *ybnil*, syllabic as in EA; Gordon 1965:373b; Gröndahl 1967:335b, 390b; Sivan 1984:212). Another, *Ia-¹aḫ¹-ti-ri* (EA 296:4), is evidently from the root ^c*tr*; thus, *Ya^cṭiri* (*contra* Hess 1993a:79-80; the final vowel is a dependent case ending, as proven by *ep-ri* in line 5; cf. Albright 1942b:33 n. 7; Marcus 1948:223-224). Two other PN's that might be G stem *yaqtil* could also be H causatives; for example, *Iā-aḫ-zi-ba-da* (EA 275:4; 276:4) = *Ya^czib-Hadda*; though Arabic has both *i* and *u* thematic vowels for this root, the Akkadian semantic parallels to this PN are Š stem (Stamm 1939:170) and Hebrew has *u* as the thematic vowel of G. Note also *Ia-ap-ti-iḫ-^dIŠKUR* (EA 288:45) and *Ia-ap-ti-ḫa-da* (EA 335:9), which represent *Yaptiḫ-Hadda* (Hess 1993a:86). The Hebrew G has an *a* theme; cf. the PN *Yiṭtāḫ* and Ugaritic *ypth* (Gröndahl 1967:58).

The apparent *yaqtil* verbal form, *ya-ar-ḫi-ša* (EA 137:97), is actually a denominative from the adverb *arḫiš* (personal observation by S. Izre²el)!

yiqtal. While the 3rd m.s. forms with unambiguous cuneiform signs are crucial for establishing the *yaqtul* and *yaqtil* patterns, it is the 3rd f.s. that provides the crucial documentation for *yiqtal*. Albright (1943a:17 n. 60) recognized the true Canaanite nature of the negative jussive in the following context:

yi-ki-im LUGAL / *be-li* KUR-šu / *iš-tu qa-te* / LÚ.MEŠ
SA.GAZ.MEŠ / *la-a te-eḫ-la-aq* "May the king deliver his land
from the grasp of the ^c*apirū* men lest it be lost!" (EA 274:10-14).

The verbal root, *ḫlq*, with the meaning, "lost," is known from Ugaritic (Gordon 1965:402b) as well as Akkadian. Albright was aware that Akkadian *ḫalāqu* was an *i* theme verb and that the

proper Babylonian form for this nuance would be *lā iḥalliq* (e.g. ARM 5, 87:23). It was also obvious to him that the form of the verb in this passage, whether it be transcribed *te-eh-la-aq* or *ti-7-iḥ-la-aq*, corresponded to the known Hebrew and Ugaritic pattern for stative verbs in the prefix conjugation, viz. an *a* theme with an *i/e* prefix vowel. So everything points to **tiḥlaq* / *teḥlaq* as a true Canaanite verbal form in spite of the absence of a gloss sign or other indicator. By the same token, there is every justification for rejecting Knudtzon's transcription *aḥ-la-aq* in the following :

*ù lu-ú yu-uš-ši-ra / LUGAL be-li / ^{G15}GIGIR.MEŠ ù lu-ú /
yi-il-te-qé-ni / a-na mu-ḥi-šu la-a / iḥ-la-aq* "And may the king, my
lord, send chariots and may he take me to him, lest I be lost!"
(EA 270:24-29; Izre^cel 1978b:73)

The verb in the negative final clause is surely Canaanite **iḥlaq*, which, once again, is the proper vocalization for a stative verb.

In the following example of 3rd m.s., the first two signs are admittedly ambiguous, but this time Knudtzon transcribed them correctly. He may have reasoned, quite logically, that the scribe used the PI sign instead of the *ia* sign precisely because he intended to write an *i* prefix vowel:

*šum-ma LUGAL be-li yi-iḥ-na-nu-ni ù / yu-te-ru-ni a-na URU.KI ù
a-na-šár-š[i]* "If the king, my lord, will be gracious to me and
return me to the city, then I will guard i[t]" (EA 137:81-82).

Ebeling (1910:46-47) had noted the exact Hebrew parallel, *yehenan* (Amos 5:15). The Akkadian cognate, *enēnu*, evidently had a *u* theme (*AHw*:217b; *CAD* E:164b where the entry *enēnu* C is probably the G stem of *enēnu* A on pp. 162-164), and the same was usually true for biblical Hebrew, as demonstrated by the predominance of forms such as *yāḥōn* (Dt. 28:50), *tāḥōn* (Ps. 59:6) and *ʔāḥōn* (Ex. 33:19).

Although the following form could correspond to the true Canaanite vocalization purely as the result of coincidence, one may cite the 1st c.s. form in a letter from Megiddo:

ù *ir-ka-ab-mi* / *it-ti* ¹*Ya-aš-da-ta* "So I mounted up with Yashdata"
(EA 245:11-12).

The theme of *rakābu* in Akkadian is *a* (A*Hw*:944b) and the proper form would have been *arkab*. The prefix vowel *i* in this passage could be due simply to the process of using the Akkadian 3rd m.s. as the theme with Ø- prefix for 1st c.s. Nevertheless, it is worthy of note that the Hebrew form is ²*erkab* (2 Sam. 19:27), so the Megiddo scribe could have intended to represent Canaanite ²*irkab*.

Another verb common both to Akkadian and to the WS dialects is *lamādu*. In both language families, this verb has an *a* thematic vowel; note, for instance, biblical *yilmad* (Dt. 17:19); that *a* theme undoubtedly expresses the idea that learning is primarily a subjective thing (thus the stative pattern) even though the verb may take a direct object. Unfortunately, no 1st c.s. examples are documented in the EA texts, so there is no way of knowing whether the scribe would have used the proper Akkadian, *almad*, or a Canaanized *ilmad*. However, there are numerous 3rd m.s. forms, all of them functioning within the framework of Canaanite syntax, viz. *yi-il-ma-ad* (EA 264:23; *et al.*), *yi-il₅-ma-ad* (EA 64:8; *et passim*) and *yi-il-ma-du* (EA 251:9). These, too, may simply be combinations of the Akkadian 3rd m.s. *ilmad* as theme, plus the *y*-prefix, but it may not be pure coincidence that the resultant form corresponds to the **yilmad-* that we would expect in Canaanite.

By the same line of reasoning, an example from *ša²ālu*, "to ask," from an Amurru letter may be included, in spite of the Akkadian accusative suffix:

[*a-mur*] / [¹*Pa*]-*ḥa-na-te*¹ L[^Ú*M*][*AŠKIM-ia*] / *yi-iš-al-šu* LUGAL
d[UT]U / *šum-ma la a-na-ša-ar* / URU²*Šu-mu-ri* URU²*Ull-la-sà* /
i-nu-ma L^Ú*MAŠKÍM-ia* / *i-na ši-pir₆-ti* LUGAL dUTU "[Behold,]
[*Pa*]ḥanate, [my] co[missioner], may the king, the sun god, ask
him whether I guard(ed) the city of Sumur (and) the city of
Ullasa while my commissioner is(was) on a mission of the king,
the sun god" (EA 60:19-25; Rainey 1975b:410-411; Moran
1987b:234 n. 6; 1992:132 n. 6).

The jussive function of this verb is according to WS syntax (Izre³el 1985:251). Therefore, it is not amiss to observe that **yiš²al* would be the expected WS jussive form; cf. Hebrew (indicative) *yiš²al* (Ex. 22:13).

On the other hand, there are two examples of verb forms that violate Barth's law whereby *yaqtal* > *yiqtal*, and one of them is from *ša²ālu*, viz. 3rd m.s. jussive *ia-aš-al-mi* "May the king ask" (EA 224:10). The other is 3rd m.s. preterite from *na²āšu*, that is, *ia-an-aš-ni* "he despised me" (EA 137:23); contrast Hebrew *yin²aš* (Prov. 15:5). These are just the opposite of Akkadianisms; the Amurrite PN's with their preservation of *yaqtal* immediately come to mind. Could these forms reflect a contemporary Amurrite dialect, or are they simply scribal aberrations?

Finally, it remains to deal with a PN that also defies Barth's law, namely that of the renowned commissioner, Yanḥamu. His name is documented in all the nominal cases: *Ḫa-an-ḫa-mu* (EA 85:23; *et al.*), nominative; *Ḫa-an-ḫa-mi* (EA 83:81; *et al.*) and *Ḫa-an-ḫa-mi* (EA 117:61; *et al.*), dependent; *Ḫa-an-ḫa-ma* (EA 106:36; *et al.*), accusative. The same name with the same vocalization appears a century later at Ugarit (Sivan 1984:253); in fact, it seems to have been quite popular there (Gröndahl 1967:58, 336). But even more remarkable is the total absence of this ostensibly "Amurrite" PN from any of the Middle Bronze Age sources available (Gelb 1980)! It does not appear in any of the "Amurrite" PN's of the Ur III period (Buccellati 1966:210-211) or from Mari (Huffmon 1965:237-239; Birot, Kupper and Rouault 1979:221). The earliest attestation of the name *Yanḥamu* appears to be AT 189:2 from Alalakh Stratum IV, fifteenth century B.C.E. (Wiseman 1953:136; Dietrich and Loretz 1970:93). So if *Yanḥamu* is supposed to be "Amurrite," it is strangely absent from the known Amurrite societies.

Now there is no known cognate for this root (*nḫm*) in Akkadian and the G stem is missing in Hebrew and the Aramaic dialects, but it is present in Arabic, albeit with an *i* thematic vowel! One possibility that ought to be considered is an original G stem preterite/jussive in which the *i* thematic vowel shifted to *a*. The conditions for such a vowel shift may have been as follows:

(1) the name is obviously a sentence name shortened by the dropping of the theophoric element (Albright 1943a:10 n. 15). In such a combination, viz. **Yanḥim-ʔilu*, the last syllable of the verb would have received at least a secondary accent, as in biblical *ḥaṣār šûʿāl* (Josh. 15:28; *et al.*). This accent, on an originally closed syllable, would have permitted the operation of Philippi's law (Philippi 1878:42; Bergsträsser 1918:149), that is, the shift of *ī* to *ā*, **Yanḥim* > **Yanḥam*. The hypocoristic PN, frozen in its vocalic shape, was nominalized by the addition of the case endings, which did nothing to change the fixed vocalization. If this should prove to be the correct explanation of the name *Yanḥamu*, it still remains a mystery why a similar process did not affect the other known PN's with a *yaqtil* vocalic shape, such as *Yaʿtir-* and *Yatin-*.

The Jerusalem scribe, however, provides us with two very weird spellings of this PN, viz. ¹*E-en-ḥa-mu* (EA 286:28; probably also to be supplied in EA 285:10) and ¹*Ye-éʔ-en-ḥa-mu* (EA 289:45), which could also be transcribed ¹*i₁₅-in₄-ḥa-mu* and ¹*Yi-iʔ-in₄-ḥa-mu* respectively. The scribe seems to be trying to spell this PN in accordance with the Barth-Ginsberg law, i.e. *Yenḥamu* / *Yinḥamu*. This is the same scribe who demonstrates a tendency to get mixed up, to turn things around (Rainey:1978c). A scribe who could write ¹*I-li-mil-ki* (EA 286:36) when he really meant ¹*Mil-ki-li* (EA 289:5) or ¹*Mil-ki-ili* (DINGIR) would not be beyond trying to write *Yinḥamu* for *Yanḥamu*.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. The examples assembled above show that the Barth-Ginsberg law was functioning in all Canaanite glosses and all *yaqtil* PN's. This confirms the synchronic relationship with Ugaritic and the diachronic relationship with Hebrew. The Barth-Ginsberg law must have been operative in the mother tongue of the WS scribes who wrote the Amarna letters sent from Canaan.

The resultant conclusion has far reaching consequences for the evaluation of most verb forms in the Amarna letters from Canaan, a fact that has been stressed elsewhere (Rainey 1971b:164; 1978a:12*-13*). Ebeling (1910:46), Böhl (1909:56, §8t) and Dhorme (1913:37-381 = 1952:413-418) all assumed that the

verbs in this corpus built on the *yikšud* pattern were somehow related to the shape of the biblical Hebrew verbs with the *yišmōr* pattern. Their assumption was taken up and cited in most of the standard grammars of biblical Hebrew; it was viewed as a diachronic fact. However, the *yišmōr-yittēn* verb forms actually reflect the shift of *ā* to *ī* known as attenuation. The evidence for that shift, especially as it pertains to nominal forms, is that it began to operate in the very late Roman period. An important line of evidence is the vocalization of the Babylonian as against the Tiberian system (Bergsträsser 1918:146-147). The witness of Jerome's transcriptions, albeit mainly from nominal forms (Siegfried 1884:77), strongly suggests that attenuation of *ā* > *ī* in closed, unaccented syllables had not generally taken place. Jerome represents *ā* by *a*, e.g. *yāšûb* = *jasub*, while both *ā* and *ī* appear as *e* when in combination with *y-*, viz. *yaḥrōš* = *jeros*, *yašpīqû* = *jesphicu*, and *yišʔaḡ* = *jesag*, *yitmāhû* = *jethmau*, but also MT *yizbʔlēnî* = *iezbulen* (Siegfried 1884:48). Analysis within Tiberian Hebrew of comparable verb and noun forms makes it clear that an original *ā* generally behaves the same in the verb as in the noun; cf. e.g. *mišmōr* — *yišmōr*, *māqôm* — *yāqûm*, *maʕamād*, *yaʕamōd*, though some contrasts also occur, e.g. *mehqār* — *yaḥqōr*, *mattān* — *yittēn*. However, the behavior of middle weak verbs such as *yāšûb* and *yāšîl* vs *yēbōš* and 1st guttural verbs like *yaḥgōr* vs *yehzaq* prove that the Barth-Ginsberg shift of *yaqtal* > *yiqtal* is a phenomenon distinct from the attenuation that led to *yaqtul* > *yiqtōl* and *yaqtīl* > *yiqtēl*. The Amarna Canaanite and Ugaritic evidence treated herein shows that the shift of *yaqtal* > *yiqtal* must go back to at least as early as the second millennium B.C.E., at least for those two languages.

So why does one find numerous forms in the Amarna texts from Canaan such as 1st c.s. on the *Øiprus* pattern, 2nd m.s. on the *tiprus* pattern and 3rd m.s. (only a dozen or so G stem!) on the *yiprus* pattern? This is hardly representative of a vocalic shift in the Canaanite mother tongue of the scribes; the glosses and the PN's are all against such a view. Internal analysis of Tiberian Hebrew and comparison with other systems of vocalization (Babylonian, LXX, Jerome) contradict an early date for the shift of

yaqtul › *yiqtol*. The conclusion seems inescapable that the prefix *i* vowel in so many Canaanite Amarna verb forms (*yi-*, *ti-*, *Øi-*) is a colloquialism confined to the Akkadian interlanguage being used by scribes whose mother tongue was Canaanite. This interlanguage phenomenon derives (as indicated *supra*, pp. 14-15) from the adoption of Akkadian themes, either of the *iparras* or *iprus* type, to which the Canaanite consonantal person morphemes, *y-*, *t-* and *Ø-*, were applied. Personal names and the occasional gloss of a purely Canaanite verb form reveal that in the mother tongue, the Barth-Ginsberg law was operative. In other cases, where the same verbal root serves both Akkadian and Canaanite, the forms written by the scribes seem to reflect their native vocabulary, e.g. *ia-aš-ku-un*, *yi-il-ma-ad*, and similar forms mentioned above. Cases like *ia-aš-al-mi* and *ia-an-aš-ni* may perhaps be viewed as hypercorrections on the part of scribes who took Akkadian 1st c.s. *ašbat*, *amḥaš*, and 2nd m.s. *tašbat*, *tamḥaš*, as their theme. There is always the outside chance, of course, that they derive from some dialect in which *yaqtal* had not shifted to *yiqtal*, but that is not very likely (cf. the discussion of Yanḥamu, *supra*, pp. 72-73).

Gp — THE PASSIVE OF THE BASIC STEM

By the end of the nineteenth century, it was reasonably clear to Assyriologists that there was no G passive for the true Akkadian G stem. Therefore, the presence of just such passive forms in the Amarna letters from Canaan was already noted as a purely West Semitic phenomenon (Böhl 1909:60-63; Ebeling 1910:59-60). The basic pattern is *yuqtal-*, as one might have expected from Arabic. A few examples have the Akkadian present as theme; 3rd f.s. *tu-ša-bat* (EA 85:46), might be a simple error for *tu-uš-bat*, as noted long ago (Ebeling 1910:60; Youngblood 1961:278). It has long been recognized that G passives existed in Ugaritic (Gordon 1965:80-81, §9.31), but in the absence of any 1st c.s. forms the prefix vowel remains unattested in the Ugaritic consonantal texts; that the thematic vowel was *a* (as was to be expected) is seen in examples such as:

*ktlakn /ǧlmm = *ki tul²akâni ǧalmâmi* "When the (two) lads were sent" (KTU 1.4: r. V, 42-43).

ATTESTATION. The earliest attestation of the G passive comes from the fifteenth century Taanach letters:

ša-ni-tam šum-ma ^GGAG!.[NI].Ú.TAG.GA URUDU.ḪÁ /
i-ba-aš-šu ù 'lu'-ú tu-da-nu-na "Furthermore, if there are copper
arrows (Sachs 1939:373-373), then let them be given"
(TT 2:19-20; Rainey 1977:37-38; Glock 1983:60).

The other documented forms will be presented according to the respective verbs:

(*w*)*arû* (WS **yrrw* < **wrrw*). Ebeling had not recognized the nature of the Canaanite gloss in the following passage; he had suggested that it might be a Sumerian gloss on an Egyptian word, *aḥ-me*, with the meaning of "stall" (Ebeling 1915:1601). The correct understanding of the passage is reflected in the translation by Albright, Mendenhall and Moran (1955:485a) but the interpretation was first explained in detail by Campbell (1965:198 n. 11).

ù tu-sà-aḥ-mi \ tu-ra / MÍ.ANŠE.KUR.RA-ia "But my mare was shot (gloss: shot)" (EA 245:8-9; Rabiner 1981:11).

The gloss is the Gp preterite 3rd f.s. (Rabiner 1981:98, §5.2.2.2; 101, §5.2.3). It translates the hybrid Gp 3rd f.s. from *nasāḫu* (cf. *infra*, p. 78).

dâku. Two examples of the passive from this verb are attested. Although the first in a somewhat broken context, its content is reasonably certain:

ù pa[l-l̥]a-ti a-n[a-k]u / la-a-mi ú-da-a-k[a . . .] "And I am af[ra]id
lest I be kille[d]" (EA 131:27-28; Moran 1960:14; 1987b:349, 351
n. 7; 1992:212, 213 n. 7).

The form *ú-da-a-k[a]* is Gp volitive 1st c.s. in a negative result clause after a verb of fearing (Moran 1960:14). The second form is in a letter closely associated with EA 131; this time in the apodosis of a conditional sentence:

šum-ma i-na-na / qa-la-ta ù ¹Pi-ḥu-ra / la-a yi-zi-za i-na /
^{URU}*Ku-mi-di u ka-li LÚ.MEŠ / [ḥ]a-za-ni-ka tù-da-ku[-n]a* "If now
 you keep silent and Piḥura does not make a stand in Kumidi,
 then all your city rulers will be killed" (EA 132:46-50).

The form *tù-da-ku[-n]a* is Gp imperfect 3rd m.pl. These same two epistles happen to have three examples of the Gp suffix forms (EA 131:9, 22; 13:45) and perhaps one of the Gp participle (EA 131:20).

epēšu. One of the examples from this verb shows gemination of the second radical, i.e. the form has the Akkadian present-future as its theme:

ki-ma ša yu-uš-ší / iš-tu pí-i / ^dUTU iš-tu / sa-me-e ki-na-an-na /
yu-up-pa-^fšu¹-mi "According to what is issued from the mouth
 of the sun god from heaven, thus it shall be done" (EA 232:16-
 20; Moran 1987b:459; 1992:291).

The other forms do not show gemination, viz. 3rd m.s. preterite *yu-pa-aš-mi* (EA 137:96) and 3rd m.s. imperfect *yu-pa-šu* (EA 114:42; 138:74, 75, 135; 271:26; 272:21). The spelling *tu-pu-uš* (EA 281:13) is an error for an active form, evidently 3rd f.s. *ti-pu-uš* or something similar (cf. translation by Moran 1987b:503; 1992:322).

leqû. It happens that all of the documented examples come from the Byblos correspondence. In a few cases, the scribe has written AN as the second sign, which is read *il* in active forms; here it is to be transcribed *ul₁₁*. The Forms with modal -Ø suffix (preterite and jussive) show vowel coloring in the thematic vowel: 3rd m.s. jussive *yu-ul-qé* (EA 105:82), 3rd f.s. preterite ^f*tu¹-ul-qé* (EA 91:8, note 3rd m.s. active preterite *yi-il-qa* in line 6!). The 1st c.pl. *nu-ul₁₁-qa-am-mi* (EA 362:23) may be parsed as volitive

or as ventive by modus attraction from the preceding *yi-iš-pu-ra-am* (EA 362:22). The remaining forms have other suffixes which preempt the thematic vowel: 3rd m.s. imperfect *yu-ul-qú* (EA 86:11), *yu-ú-ul-qú* (EA 117:33), and imperfect energetic *yu-ú-ul-qú-na* (EA 117:68), 3rd f.s. imperfect *tu-ul-qú* (EA 83:15), 3rd m.pl. jussive/volitive *tu-ul-qú* (EA 132:15), 3rd m.pl. imperfect *tu-ul-qú-na* (EA 90:18; 108:58), *tu-ul₁₁-qú-na* (EA 126:6; Moran 1987b:341 n. 2; 1992:206 n. 2).

maḥāṣu. There is one attested form, 3rd f.s. (with feminine collective subject) *tu-um-ḥa-ṣú* (EA 252:17; Albright 1943b:31 n. 15).

nasāḥu. One example is documented; it is explained by a WS gloss (cf. *supra*, p. 76):

ù tu-sà-aḥ-mi \ tu-ra / MÍ.ANŠE.KUR.RA-ia "But my mare was shot (gloss: shot)" (EA 245:8-9; Rabiner 1981:11).

qabû. Two forms that appear to be built on the Akkadian present-future theme: 3rd m.s. *yu-qa-bu* (EA 108:20; with pl. subj.! Moran 1987b:305-306), [*yu*]-*qa-bu* (EA 85:65); but they could also be N stem, viz. *yi-qa-bu* = **yiqqabu* (cf. CAD Q:41b-42b). The other two examples are contrasting 3rd m.s. preterite and imperfect forms:

ú-ul yu-uq-ba i-na / UD.KAM.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM la-qú LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ / ka-li KUR.MEŠ ú-ul ka-a-ma / yu-uq-bu i-na UD.KAM.MEŠ-⟨ka⟩ / ù la-a ti-te-ú la-qa-ši "Was it not said in the days of the commissioners, 'The 'apîrû men have taken all the territories'? Let it not be said in ⟨your⟩ days, 'And you are unable to take them'" (EA 83:16-20; *contra* Moran 1950a:142 n. 252; 1960:4; 1987b:265 n. 1; 1992:154 n. 1; Youngblood 1961:243)

šapāru. The supposed passive forms from this verb are illusory. The first, in EA 94:1, is to be read [*i*]š-[*t*]a-pár (Youngblood 1961:381; Moran 1987b:286 n. 1). The second,

nu-u[š]-pu-ru (EA 85:84) is an erroneous spelling for an active form, **nišpuru*.

šemû. The Rib-Haddi correspondence provides all the examples. Unlike *leqû*, no examples are documented with -Ø tense/modal suffix, so there is no way of knowing whether such forms would have had vowel coloring or not. One construction is rather unusual, representing an impersonal statement:

[a-]nu-ma ki-a-ma aš-→pu-ru a-na 'É'.¹GAL¹ / [ù] la-a yu-uš-mu / [a-n]a ia-ši "[N]ow, thus [I] was writing to the 'palace' [but] no one was listening [t]o me" (EA 132:51-52; cf. Moran 1987b:352; 1992:214).

In another context (from Beirut), the 3rd f.s. appears:

la-a tu-uš-mu / a-wa-ti "My word is not heeded" (EA 138:96-97).

Elsewhere, the form is always 3rd m.pl. with *awātû* "words" as subject, evidently construed as a calque on a Canaanite masculine (cf. Hebrew *d³bārîm*). A typical context is:

ù ú-ul tu-uš-mu-n[a] / a-wa-tu-ia "But my words are not heeded" (EA 91:29-30; similarly EA 89:10, 37; 90:17;122:55).

On occasion, the scribe confused the active and passive constructions:

ù ú-ul ti-iš-mu-na a-wa-tu-ia (EA 74:50); šum-ma a-wa-te-ia tu-uš-mu-[na] (EA 117:32).

In the first instance, the verb is active 3rd m.pl. with an apparent accusative with nominative case ending. The verb was probably meant to be passive, *tušmûna* (cf. Youngblood 1961:149) though Moran (1987b:250; 1992:143) takes the verb as 2nd m.s. (or 2nd m.pl. of respect?) and considers the direct object to be an error for *awātēya*. The second example has the proper passive form for the

verb but its subject has the oblique case ending, which is probably an error for *awātūya*. As Youngblood surmised (*loc. cit.*), the scribes may have tended to confuse the two means of expressing the central idea. One may wonder if the cause for this confusion might have been the interference of other impersonal constructions such as the singular passive cited above, or the widely known use of 3rd m.pl. verbs in impersonal expressions, thus the confusion between *tišmûna* and *tušmûna*. The absence of the thematic vowel in this IIIrd weak verb may have contributed to the tendency to confuse the active and passive forms.

DIACHRONIC SIGNIFICANCE. The presence of the finite G passive in the EA texts from Canaan is of special importance for the diachronic study of the West Semitic languages. Only survivals of the Gp exist in Hebrew and most of them have been obscured in the Massoretic vocalization (Joüon and Muraoka 1991:166-168 §58). Gp is present in Ugarit (cf. *supra*, pp. 75-76), Aramaic (Degen 1969:66) and of course in Classical Arabic. It does not appear in any native dialect of Akkadian. The Ugaritic and Aramaic evidence and the EA testimony from Canaan do strengthen the argument for the Gp in ancient Hebrew. However, it seems obvious that Gp has almost disappeared during the Israelite monarchial period. Phoenician and Moabite show no traces of it, either.

CHAPTER V

PREFIX CONJUGATION — Gt & Gtn STEMS

This chapter is devoted to two stems, one of which is common to Akkadian and to WS, and another which is totally foreign to the latter.

THE SCRIBAL CONVENTIONS

In Chapter IV, several cases were noted in which the scribes chose an *iptaras* form from the Akkadian paradigm to serve as the theme for a particular verb. There was evidently no intention on their part of implying that the infixed *-t-* had any special semantic force. On the other hand, the ensuing discussion will indicate that the Canaanite scribes seem to have known about certain verbs with lexical Gt's in Akkadian (Rainey 1971b).

As mentioned in previous chapters, the existence of a tense form with infixed *-t-* in the Akkadian system was not yet known to scholars such as Böhl and Ebeling when they were working on the Amarna corpus. Therefore, numerous G preterites with infixed *-t-* (wrongly denoted the perfect by Assyriologists today) were classified as Gt in their respective studies of the verb and in the glossary to Knudtson's edition (Ebeling 1915). For the dialects outside of Canaan, more recent studies have carried out the proper classification, e.g. for the Mitanni letters, Adler's (1976:255-344) and for the MB letters, Aro's glossary (Aro 1957).

It remains to sort out the various forms with infixed *-t-* in the Amarna letters from Canaan so as to distinguish between those G preterites with infixed *-t-* that are simply serving as themes for the WS G stem, without any special significance being assigned to the infixed *-t-*, and those for which the Canaanite scribe really intended to express some semantic nuance by means of the infix.

LEXICAL GT'S FROM AKKADIAN

Since the semantic force expressed by the Gt stem of certain verbs in Akkadian was evidently known to the Canaanite scribes, they occasionally used such Gt's whenever that special nuance was appropriate to the context of their message.

VERBS OF MOTION.

The stem with infixes *-t-* can express a partitive or separative idea with verbs of motion (GAG:121, §92e). The Gt forms conjugated as suffix verbs will be dealt with in a subsequent chapter (cf. *infra*, pp. 339-341).

(*w*)*ašû*. Only three forms with consonantal person prefixes are documented. The first is 3rd m.s. with either a volitive or a ventive suffix:

yi-di-i[n] / [DING]IR ša LUGAL 'EN¹-ia / *ú yi-ta-ša* / 'LUGAL EN-ia *qa-du* / ERÍN.MEŠ.GAL-š*u* "May [the go]ld of the king, my lord, grant that the king, my lord, come forth with his army" (EA 337:13-17).

So the idea of coming forth *from* Egypt is expressed by the infixes *-t-*, while the apparent ventive gives the nuance of coming *hither*. The second example is 2nd m.s. with ventive suffix:

[*i*]-*de₉* *ki-i-ma* / 'la¹-*mi-in* šum-ka / a-na pa-ni LUGAL *ù* / 'la¹-*a ti-ta-ša-am* / [*i*]-š-tu ^{KUR}Mi-iš-ri "[I] know that your name is slandered before the king so that you cannot come forth from Egypt" (EA 97:4-8; Moran 1987b:289; 1992:170).

The third example is a corrected reading by Moran (1984:299):

i-nu-ma la-ma-ad-mì / *ù* l[a]-*a-mì ti-it-[ta-š]ú-na* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-~~tá~~-tu₄* "when he learned that the regular troops are not [coming] forth" (EA 244:18-20).

Several other instances of this verb in the Gt (or G preterite with *-t-*), are either in the Tyre letters, e.g. 3rd m.s. *it-ta-ší* (EA 147:6 *et passim*) or other borderline contexts like 3rd m.pl. [*it-t*]a-šú-ni₇ (EA 67:10) or from Jerusalem, *it-ta-šú-ú* (EA 286:48). The 3rd m.s. *it-ta-ší* (EA 279:11) and *it-ta-ši* (EA 239:11; 326:20) may have been meant for suffix conjugation forms like the 3rd f.s. hybrid *it-ta-ša-at* (EA 297:19; Rainey 1971b:90; 1973c:256; cf. *infra*, p. 339).

elû. The Canaanite scribes' recognition of a lexical Gt for this verb is demonstrated by three examples of the Akkadian present-future. The first is in an epistle that has some WS features, but the WS tense nuance, whether volition or past indicative, is hard to establish in this context:

ù a-nu-ma ni-i₁₅-ta-lí i-na KUR.MEŠ / [x] ye-ta-lí / [ù]
i₁₅-na-ša-ar-šu / [a]-d[i] ka₄-ša-du(sic!) / LÚGAL EN-ia "And now,
we have ascended(?) into the mountains (!); [x] has ascended
[and] I will/am guard(ing) him [u]nt[il] the arrival of the
official, my lord" (EA 178:4-8; Rainey 1989-90:66a).

The 1st c.pl. *nītalli* and the theme of 3rd m.s. *yētalli* appear to be Assyrianisms. The anaptyctic vowel with the *-t-* infix would be *-e-* in Babylonian or it would become *-i-* in Assyrian if the second radical, *l*, were not geminated. The second verb form, incidentally, was taken by Knudtson and by Moran (1987b:417; 1992:262) as a GN, *Yi-ta-ni*. But there is no justification for reading an otherwise unknown GN when the form has the same sequence, *-ta-ni(=lī)*, as the verb in the previous line. In view of the 3rd m.s. imperfect *yi-qa-bu* in line 21, it is obvious that the scribe knows and uses the WS modal system. Therefore, in the narrative report of an epistle such as this, one may justifiably conjecture that the *-Ø* suffix on the forms *nītalli* and *yētalli* can also indicate *past* tense while the *-Ø* suffix on *ninašsaršu* could reflect the jussive.

The second instance of the Gt present-future is in a Jerusalem letter. In the Jerusalem letters the narrative present-futures of all verbal stems are nearly always strictly Akkadian in form.

*li-iš-al-mi šār-ri a-na ša-šu-[nu] / ma-ad NIG.ĤÁ ma-ad Ĭ.ĤÁ
 ma-ad TÚG.ĤÁ-¹ti¹ / a-di e-tel-li¹Pa-ú-ru^{LÚ}MAŠKÍM šār-ri / a-na
 KUR^{URU}Ú-ru-ša₁₀-lim^{KI} "May my king requisition for the[m]
 much food, much oil and much clothing until Pawuru, the
 king's commissioner, ascends to Jerusalem" (EA 287:43-46).*

The verb form, *ētelli*, is an Assyrianism (Moran 1975b:153), typical of the Jerusalem letters.

The third context is highly poetical. It has been taken in the past to reflect Canaanite poetry (Weber 1915:1324; Böhl 1914:337 = 1953:375; Jirku 1933:116), but note has not been taken of the Akkadian morphosyntax. That the text has Canaanite glosses might reflect the existence of a Canaanite original, but then again, it might mean just the opposite! In any case, the verbs are 1st c.pl. Akkadian present-future, including the Gt of *elû*, and reveal that the scribe was striving to compose a poetic passage in good, standard Akkadian:

*a-mur ni-nu a-na mu-ĥi-ka₄ / 2 IGI-ia šum-ma ni-tel-lí / a-na AN *
*ša-me-ma šum-ma / nu-ra-ad i-na er-šé-ti₇ / ù SAG.DU-nu *
ru-šu-nu / i-na qa-te-ka "Behold, as for us, my (sic!) two eyes are
on you; if we should ascend to heaven (= heavens), if we
should descend to hell, then our head (= our head) is in your
hands" (EA 264:14-19).

Even though the narrative context of this epistle is strongly WS and pidgin, it would be stretching credulity to make the two verbs, *nītelli* and *nurrad*, into WS preterites with -Ø suffix. The implications of the fact that the scribe felt it necessary to use good Akkadian forms in a poetic passage is worthy of consideration for the light it sheds on their attitude to high literary language. After all, literary compositions were present in their local libraries.

On the other hand, there are two passages where the theme form might be the G stem *iptaras* of *elû*. However, the sense of each context suggests that there is here an intentional use of the Gt nuance. In both cases, the forms clearly reflect the WS imperfect modal nuance of repeated action in the past and they

bear the proper WS *-u* suffix. The first example has the 3rd m.s. consonantal prefix:

*ù an-nu-ú i-na-na / nu-KÚR ¹Ia-pa-^dIŠKUR it-ti ¹A-zi-ri / a-na ia-ši
 ù al-lu-ú *ša-bat* ^{GIŠMÁ-ia} / ù al-lu-ú *ki-na-na-ma yi-te₉-lu* / *i-na*
¹lib¹-bi *a-ia-ba aš-šum *ša-ba-at* / ^{GIŠMÁ.MEŠ-ia} "And behold, now
 Yapa^c-Haddi is hostile along with Aziru against me, and
 behold, he has seized my ship, and behold, thus he is going out
 on the high seas in order to seize my ships" (EA 114:15-20).**

The second example has the modal suffix but lacks the consonantal prefix; it happens to be in a letter which avoids the *y*-prefix throughout:

*ù an-nu-ú i-qa-bu BE-ia / ki-ma pa-na-nu-um i-te₉-lu ¹IR-Aš-ra-tu₄ /
 a-na *šé-ri-ia* ¹da¹-¹na¹-¹ku¹ "And behold, I am/have been saying,
 'My lord, when formerly ^cAbdi-Ashirta was attacking me, I was
 strong'" (EA 127:30-32; Moran 1950a:124a n. 104; 1987b:342;
 1992:207; Rainey 1971b:88).*

Moran has discovered that, in a similar passage, where Knudtzon had read an impossible form, *i-ti-i[l-][i]k*, the correct reading had to be the Gt of *elû*,

*ù a-nu-ú i-te₉-¹èl¹-lu! / [i-]na-an-na a-na *še-ri-ia* "And behold he is
 attacking me now" (EA 92:23; cf. Moran 1987b:283: n.3; 1992:166
 n. 3).*

This leads to another instance in which the *lu* sign was confused with the *lik* sign, perhaps because of sloppy writing on the part of the scribe:

*a-nu-ma / ki-ma iš-[tap-]ru a-na ka-ta₅ UGU / ^{URU}Šu-mu-ra
 a-nu-ma i-te₉-lu! / ù a[*ḫ-*]ta-ni ERÍN.M[EŠ] a-na / [na-ša-ri-]ši ù
 a-nu-*<ma>* i-te₉-zi-ib-ši / [ù pa-aṭ-ru LÚ.MEŠ] UN-tù ù / [ki-na-na
 iš-tap-]ru "Now, as (*contra* Moran 1987b:317 n. 4; 1992:189-190
 n. 5) I was wr[iti]ng to you concerning Šumur, now I was going*

up (there) and I ex[ho]rted the troops to [guard i]t, but now I have abandoned it [and] the garrison [troops have departed (Moran 1987b:318 n. 6; 1992:190 n. 7)] and [thus I have been writing] (Moran 1987b:318 n. 7; 1992:190 n. 8)" (EA 114:26-32).

Knudtzon's *i-ti-lik* is an impossible form for *alāku*, for which we would have to have *ittalak*. Therefore, reading the last sign as *lu* seems to be the only reasonable solution. Incidentally, all of the above forms, with *-u* suffix, show that the use of the TI sign need not be taken as an Assyrianism (the Assyrian form would have to be *ētiliu*). The transcriptions adopted here assume a Babylonian form; the resultant verb, *i-te₉-lu*, is here taken as Gt imperfect 1st c.s. like the preceding *iš-[tap-]ru*. The next 1st c.s. form, *i-te₉-zi-ib-ši*, is understood as a Babylonian form serving as Gt preterite with *-∅* suffix.

Finally, there are three passages, all from Byblos, where forms with infixes *-t-* have either the Akkadian ventive or a *-∅* modal suffix but no consonantal person marker. In every context the verb expresses the idea of mounting an attack, possibly reinforced by the ventive in two cases, but probably also reflected in the infixes *-t-*. One of them (EA 88:17) is expressing past action; another (EA 124:12) is in the protasis of a conditional sentence while the other (EA 81:46) is in the apodosis. All three are fulfilling syntactic roles where the WS suffix conjugation is frequently used by the Byblos scribes. The theme involved may be simply the G preterite with *-t-*, or the Gt preterite or even the Gt present or Gtn preterite, i.e. *iteli* / *itelâ(m)* or *itelli* / *itellâ(m)*. The most likely explanation is that these forms are employed here as intentional Akkadianisms standing syntactically for the 3rd m.s. suffix conjugation. For that reason, their respective contexts are dealt with among the true suffix conjugation verbs in Chapter 13, *infra*, pp. 339-341).

erēbu. The Gt of this verb means "to enter for an extended period" (AHw:460b). There are two examples of WS imperfect, 3rd m.s. *yi-te-r[u-bu!]* (EA 117:39) and 1st c.s. *i-te₉-ru-bu* (EA 104:44) and one 1st c.s. preterite *i-te-ru-ub* (EA 155:31). One preterite will

be discussed as a possible calque on the WS suffix conjugation (*infra*, p. 342).

ezēbu. This verb has a Gt recognized by the dictionaries (AHw:268b; CAD E:416a). In the EA correspondence, it seems to express the transitive idea of "abandoning" (CAD E:417a). There are six instances of 1st c.s. forms spelled *i-ti-zi-ib*, which cannot be classed as Assyrianisms since that would call for *ētizib*. Instead, the forms in question probably represent an orthographic peculiarity in which TI is to be read *te*₉. Two 3rd m.s. examples have the obvious Babylonian spelling *i-te-zi-ib* (EA 74:9; 148:42); in both cases they express past time and, at least in the Byblos passage (EA 74:9), may be reckoned as a theme for the suffix conjugation (cf. *infra*, pp. 342-343). The Tyrian context (EA 148:42) probably reflects Akkadian morphosyntax, i.e. the G preterite with infix -t- or the Gt preterite. The one documented 3rd m.pl. form is *i-TI-zi-bu* (EA 93:22), for which the correct orthography would have been *i-te₉-ez-bu* for *ītezbū*. So the scribe may have been thinking of Gt present-future or the Gtn preterite, with geminated second radical, thus *ītezzibū* (cf. Youngblood 1961:376). In either case, the demands of grammar require that one transcribe the second sign as *te*₉.

One 1st c.s. example from Tyre appears to be a partly Assyrianized form, but if so, it has to be reckoned as a Gtn preterite with geminated second radical; the spelling is *i-ta-zi-ib-šu* (EA 149:50). A Gt present form seems unlikely but not impossible even though the context appears to require the past tense:

il-qè ¹Zi-im-re-da ^{URU}Ú-sú / iš-tu ^{İR}dì-ka i-ta-zi-ib-šu / ù ia-nu
A.MEŠ ia-nu GIŠ.MEŠ a-na ia-ši-nu "Zimredda has taken Usu
from <your> servant; I have abandoned (or: am abandoning) it
and there is no water or wood for us" (EA 149:49-51; Moran
1987b:383; 1992:1992:236).

The six other 1st c.s. forms with the TI sign can, with reasonable certainty, be transcribed *i-te₉-zi-ib*. Two of them are

past tense; one of them *i-te₉-zi-ib-ši*, is cited *supra*, pp. 85-86; the other is:

ù a-nu-ma i-na / URUŠu-mu-ra i-zi-za-ti / i-nu-ma ma-ri-iš LÚGAL / UGU nu-kúr-ti i-te₉-zi-ib / URUGub-la ù ia[-nu] / ¹Zi-im-re-da [ù] / ¹Ia-pa-^dIŠKUR [it]-ti-ia "And now I have taken up position in Šumur because the officer is in distress (or: sick) over the hostility; I have abandoned Byblos [but] Zimredda and Yapa^c-Haddi are[n't wi]th me" (EA 103:13-19; cf. Moran 1987b:297; 1992: 176; *contra* Moran 1987b:298 n. 1; 1992:176 n. 1).

Four other examples of the same spelling all appear in a syntagma where the jussive is required:

šum-ma / 2 ITU ia-nu ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-ti / ù i-te₉-zi-ib URU.KI / ù pa-ať-ra-ti ù / bal-ťá-at ZI-ia a-di / i-pé-šu i-pí-iš lib-bi-ia "If in two months there are no regular troops, then I will abandon the city and I will depart and my life will be saved, while I do whatever I desire" (EA 82:41-46); *šum-ma ki-a-ma la-a ti-iq-b[u?] a-na ša-šu / ù i-te₉-zi-ib UR[U] ù pa-ať-ra-ti ša-ni-tam šum-ma la-a / tu-te-ru-na a-wa-ta₅ a-na ia-ši / ù i-te₉-zi-ib URU / ù pa-ať-ra-ti qa-du LÚ.MEŠ / ša i-ra-a-mu-ni* "If thus you do not spea[k] to him, then I will abandon the city and I will depart; furthermore, if you do not send back word to me, then I will abandon the city and I will depart with the men who are loyal to me" (EA 83:45-51; Moran 1987b:266 n. 7; 1992:154 n. 7); *uš-si-ra / LÚMAŠKÍM yi-il-qa-šu-nu / ú-ul >DIŠ< i-te₉-zi-ib UR[U]-li / ù i-pa-ťá-ra / a-na mu-ħi-ka* "Send a commissioner; let him seize them, lest I abandon my city and go off to you" (EA 118:32-36).

kašādu. There is one isolated form of this verb with infixes *-t-* which might be just the G *iptaras* theme, but which could also express the separative idea:

[a]-di yi[-ik-t]a-aš-du-na šar-ru / ù yi-[d]a-ga-lu šar-ru / ĪR ki-ti-šu "[Un]til the king should come [fo]rth and see to his loyal servant" (EA 85:61-62).

VERBS OF REPETITION.

There are a number of verb forms with the infix *-t-* that clearly indicate repeated action, often in the past. The "habitative" and "durative" nuances of some lexical Gt's in Akkadian (GAG:121, §92f) reflect an overlapping in Akkadian between the Gt and the Gtn stems. The WS dialects, which did not develop forms with the infix *-tan-*, may have expressed the iterative function by means of the stem with infix *-t-*. In the Amarna texts from Canaan, there are certain verbs with the *-t-* infix that often seem to express the repetitive, habitative or iterative nuance.

qabû. There are four examples of this verb with infix *-t-*. One of them, with a scribal error, *iq-ta!(BA)-bi* (EA 275:9), is probably just the Akkadian G past with *-t-* infix. The second, *[ti-i]q-ta-bu* (EA 86:10), has the WS imperfect suffix or else is a preterite plural, but the context is unclear. However, the remaining two instances clearly have to do with repetition. Note the pairing with a *-t-* form of a second verb, *šanû*, which is the explicit vehicle for expressing repeated action (cf. discussion *infra*, p. 90).

aq-ta-bi ù aš-ta-ni "I said and said again" or "I said over and over again" (EA 82:10).

One may argue with some degree of plausibility that the first verb form has resulted from analogy with the second. Or it could be said that both these forms are actually Gtn preterites. There is a final example in which only the context makes it clear that the repetition of several acts in the past is intended; again, the form might be Gtn (Rainey 1976b:338):

šap-ra-ti7-mì / 2-šu 3-šu UGU ú-nu-te / ¹Bi-ri-di-ya / a-na ka-ta₅ ù / ti7-iq-ta-bi "I have written to you twice or three times, concerning the implements of Biridiya and (each time) you have said . . ." (KL 72:600:1-5).

Note, incidentally, that the prefix *ti-* indicates a hybrid, interlanguage form (not something from West Semitic! *contra* Wilhelm 1982:124 n. 5).

šanû. This denominative verb from the numeral for "two" (AHw: 1165b) means "to do something a second time," "to do again." It happens that all attested forms in the WS texts from Canaan have infixed *-t-*. The 3rd m.s. forms do not have a prefixed *y-* and all but one have *-Ø* modal suffix.

The iterative force of these forms is clearly seen in EA 82 (cf. the translations by Albright and Moran 1948:241-242; *contra* Youngblood 1961:229). First, Rib-Haddi says to Aman-appa: *aq-ta-bi ù aš-ta-ni / a-na ka-ta₅* "I said to you time and again . . ." (EA 82:5-6) and then quotes his message about his need for deliverance; then he says *ù / ta-aš-ta-na a-wa-ta₅ a-na ia-ši* "and you repeatedly replied to me . . ." (EA 82:13-14). The latter verb form evidently has the ventive unless the *-na* is due to dittography from the preceding line (cf. Youngblood, *loc. cit.*). The same repetitive nuance is probably to be understood in line 25 where *ta-a[q-ta-bi]* is the most likely form to be restored. Then later on, Rib-Haddi once again reminds Aman-appa of his reply: *ù ta-aš-ta-ni a-wa-ta₅ a-na ia-ši* (EA 82:27).

With only those two exceptions (EA 82:13-14, 27), these *-t-* forms of *šanû* follow a preceding verb, as with *aq-ta-bi* (EA 82:5-6) cited above. It was noted in the discussion of that same passage that the infixed *-t-* in *aq-ta-bi* could be by attraction from the following *aš-ta-ni* (*supra*, p. 113). The same might be said for the first verb form in the next example:

an-nu-ú i-na-na / iš-ta-ḥa-aṭ-ni ¹*A-zi-ru / ù iš-ta-ni* "Now, Aziru has repeatedly attacked me" (EA 125:19-21).

However, it is by no means certain that any of the above would have been iterative without the helping verb. In fact, there are several places where the verb being augmented clearly has no iterative morpheme of its own. The repeated action in these latter contexts is expressed solely by the helping verb:

aq-bi aš-ta-ni a-na ¹*Pa-ḥa-na-te* / ^{LÚ}*MAŠKÍM-ia le-qa-mi* / *ERÍN.MEŠ til-ta-ti a-na na-ša-ri* / *KUR.ḤÁ* ¹*LUGAL* "I said repeatedly to Paḥanate, my commissioner, "Take auxiliary troops to guard the territories of the king" (EA 60:10-13; Izre²el 1985:251, 262; 1991a:261, §3.7); *ša-ni-tam šap-ra-ti a-na* *LUGAL EN-ia* *ù iš-ta-ni* "Furthermore, I wrote repeatedly to the king, my lord" (EA 136:17); *a-nu-ma* [PN?] *DUMU ši-ip-ri-[ia]* / [*uš*]-*ši-ir-ti-šu* *ù aš-ta-ni* / [*m*]*a-ni* *UD.KAM.MEŠ ú-wa-ši-ru-šu* / *ù la-a yi-le-ú* / *i-re-ba a-na* ^{URU}*Šu-mu-ra* "Now, as for [PN?], my emissary, I repeatedly [se]nt him; [h]ow many days did I send him and he was unable to enter into Šumur?" (EA 114:32-37; Moran 1987b:316; 1992:198).

In the last quotation, the ensuing rhetorical question was cited to emphasize how the context stresses the repeated action in the past, viz. by the use of the adverbial expression, *ma-ni* *UD.KAM.MEŠ*, along with the WS imperfect verb forms, *ú-wa-ši-ru-šu*, *yi-le-ú*.

Finally, a letter from Tyre employs a 3rd m.s. form after a 3rd m.pl. verb form. Both are Akkadian forms (without WS prefixes), a practice typical of the Tyrian correspondence on the whole:

Ḫi-im-re-da ^{URU}*Ši-du-na* / *ù* ¹*A-zi-ra* ^{LÚ}*ar-ni* *LUGAL* / *ù* ^{LÚ}.*MEŠ* ^{URU}*Ar-wa-da it-mu-ni* / *ù iš-ta-ni ma-mi-ta i-na be-ri-šu-nu* / *ù ip-ḥu-ru-ni*⁷ ^{GIŠMÁ}.*MEŠ* ^{GÌR}.*MEŠ-šu-nu* / *a-na ša-ba-ti* ^{URU}*Šur-ri* ^{GEMÉ} *LUGAL* "Zimredda (of) Sidon and Aziru, the king's rebel, and the men of Arvad have sworn and repeated the oath between themselves and their ships and troops have assembled in order to seize Tyre, the king's handmaiden" (EA 149:57-63).

On the other hand, when the main verb is *aš-tap-pár*, then one might suspect that it, too, was intentionally expressing the repetition (EA 126:53-55; cf. also EA 75:17-18; 88:4-5). The relevant passages will be treated along with all the occurrences of *-t-* forms from *šapāru* (cf. *infra*, pp. 101-109).

VERBS OF REFLEXIVE ACTION.

The Canaanite scribes were also aware of certain other Akkadian verbs with lexical Gt stems that expressed a particular kind of action, in some sense reflexive or reciprocal.

ša'ālu. The Gt of this verb has the meaning, "to consult, to investigate" (GAG:121, §92*d*; 130-131, §92*g-h*). The action is transitive, as illustrated by the imperative *ši-ta-a-al-ši* "consult her" (EA 29:46, from Mitanni). Shuwardata, a ruler in S. Canaan (possibly Gath; Na'aman 1979:682-684), urged Pharaoh to investigate certain allegations that had been made against him:

ša-ni-tam / yi-iš-ta-al LUGAL be-li / šum-ma el-te₉-qé LÚ / ù šum-ma I-en 'GUD' / ù šum-ma ANŠE iš-tu / mu-ḫi-šu
 "Furthermore, may the king, my lord, inquire whether I have taken a man or whether one ox or whether an ass away from him" (EA 280:24-29; Rainey 1971b:89).

šakānu. There is one passage where the Gt of this verb, complemented by the preposition *kīma*, means "to compare" (Liverani 1967:8 n. 1; 1971:264 n. 6 = 1979:83; Moran 1987b:339 n. 3; 1992:205 n. 3; not discussed in either CAD Š/1:151b-151b or AHW:1137b):

ša-ni-tam a-_{cna} mi-ni yi-iš-ta-ka-nu-ni / šār-ru ki-ma LÚ.MEŠ ḫa-za-nu-ti / LÚ.MEŠ ḫa-za-nu-tu URU.MEŠ-šu-nu / a-na ša-šu-nu LÚ.MEŠ / ḫu!-_{<up>}-šu-šu-nu i-na / šap-li-šu-nu ù / a-na-ku URU.MEŠ-ia a-na ¹A-zi-ri / ù ia-ti yu-ba-ú "Furthermore, [w]hy does the king compare me with the city rulers? As for the city rulers, their towns belong to them, their yeoman farmers are subservient to them; but as for me, my towns belong to Aziru and he is seeking (to get) me" (EA 125:31-38).

The context makes it clear that a comparison is meant. Rib-Haddi makes his own unfavorable comparison to show Pharaoh how different his own situation is.

WEST SEMITIC LEXICAL Gt's

In three instances, there may be evidence for WS Gt in verbs that normally do not have a lexical Gt in Akkadian. If that assumption should be correct, then the Canaanite scribes would seem to have chosen Akkadian forms corresponding to the *-t-* forms in their mother tongue.

amāru. This verb has no Gt in Akkadian. It was surprising to find that the same root, ^ʔ*mr*, with the meaning "to see" as in Akkadian, appears in Ugaritic with an infix *-t-* although it has transitive force, thus probably meaning "to look, gaze":

ytmr . b^cl / bnth (= *yittamiru Ba^clu binātihu*) "Baal looks at his daughters" (KTU 1.3:I, 22-23); *išt . išt^m . yitmr . ḥrb . lṯt* (= ^ʔ*išātu, ʔišātuma! yi^ʔtamiru ḥarba laṯūšata!*) "Fire, Fire! He sees a burnished sword" (KTU 1.2:I, 32).

The following example from the Rib-Haddi correspondence might be just an adoption of the G preterite with *-t-* infix as the theme. The prefix *ia-* is unusual, and comparison with the Ugaritic evidence would suggest that the vocalic pattern for Canaanite Gt's ought to have been **yiqtatil-*. The past tense of the Byblos example is guaranteed by the *-Ø* suffix (Rainey 1990b:409-412; 1975b:422-426):

a-nu-ma¹ A-ma-an!-ap-pa it-ti-ka ša-al-šu / šu-ut yi-de ù ia-ta-mar pu-uš-[qa] / ša UGU-ia "Now Aman-^ʔappa is (there) with you. Ask him. He knows and he has seen the difficu[lt]y that besets me" (EA 74:51-53).

The following 1st c.s. example is in a broken context and thus somewhat ambiguous as to the time factor:

[ù] URU.KI *ša i₁₅-ba-as-š[a-]ti / [i-n]a lib-bi-ši a-nu-um-ma / [n]a-aš-ra-ti-ši / a-di a-ta-mar* ^{UZU}2.IGI.¹MEŠ¹ / ^{LÜ}*ha-za-an ša ṣār-ri / EN-ia* "[But] as for the city in which I am, now I

guarded (or: am guarding) it until I saw (or: shall see) the eyes
of the king's city ruler" (EA 237:13-16).

The problem stems from [n]a-aš-ra-ti-ši, which could be present or past tense. As a transitive, one might expect past tense but this is not a hard and fast rule. Then we have a-ta-mar, which would normally be future after *adi*. However, WS usage would call for the imperfect suffix *-u*. In any event, Akkadian would not use the form with *-t-* infix for the future. So there is some cause for suspicion that behind this form stands an original Canaanite Gt from the root ²*mr*. The other context with *a-ta-mar* is on a broken last line of a difficult tablet (EA 197:43); no conclusions can be drawn from it.

našābu. A putative WS verb from this root is recognized by CAD N/2:33b and AHW:755a. All of the examples come from the Tyre letters (Finkle:1977:101). The common WS verbal root, **nšb*, means "to be erect," or in causative stems, "to erect" (Jean and Hoftijzer 1965:184). The Tyrian forms with infixed *-t-* immediately bring to mind the Hebrew tD from the cognate root **yšb*, *hiṭyaššēb* "to take a stand, to take up a position" (Ex. 34:5, etc.). Two of the passages in question present little problem in interpretation:

šar URU^UHa-šú-ra / i-te-zi-ib É-šu ù it-ta-ša-lab¹ / it-ti LU^USA.GAZ
"The king of Hazor has abandoned his house and has taken up
a position with the ^c*apîru*" (EA 148:41-43); i-de₄ LUGAL be-li
e-nu-l¹ma¹ / i-na ŠÀ! ^d*ab-ba ni-ta-š[a-a]b* / ia-nu A.MEŠ ù ia-nu
GIŠ.MEŠ / a-na ia-ši-nu "The king, my lord, knows that we are
situated in the midst(!) of the sea; we have no water or wood"
(EA 151:41-44).

The third context has been partly misunderstood by the commentators. Albright (1937:198 n.9) thought that the verb was being wrongly used in an active (i.e. transitive) sense. This same understanding has also been followed by Moran (1987b:378; 1992:233).

*ša it-ta-ša-ab gáb-bi KUR-ti / i-na pa-ša-ḥi i-na du-ni ZAG *
ḥa-ap-ši-šu, "Who the whole land is stabilized in peace by the
 might of 'his' arm" (EA 147:12), i.e. "by whose arm"

The solution lies in the recognition that this passage, an Egyptianizing eulogy on pharaoh, reflects the Egyptian use of both participles and relative forms as epithets. The participial clause, e.g. "who gave forth his voice in heaven like the storm god while all the land was in fear through his voice" (EA 147:12-13) has the antecedent as the subject of the main verbal action. It is pharaoh who gives his voice. But the clause in which the verb is an Egyptian relative form has a subject other than the antecedent (Polotsky 1976:7-13). The antecedent is represented by some other element in the subordinate clause; in this case it should have been the pronominal suffix on the word *ḥa-ap-ši* "arm." The scribe simply forgot to add it. Note that Albright, in his attempted translation of the passage into classical Egyptian, supplied the suffix, i.e. he read *ḥpš.f* (Albright 1937:198 n. 12). Moran also supplies the suffix in his translation without noting that it is missing in the original cuneiform text (Moran 1987b:378, "de son bras"; 1992:233, "of his arm").

šemû. A verb of very high frequency in the Amarna texts is *šemû* "to hear" (Rainey 1971b:96-101). In Akkadian there seems to be only a very limited use of Gt with this verb, mainly in late texts (AHw:1213a). The two MB examples cited by Aro (1957:102) are precatives and probably represent the usurpation of preterite functions by the preterite with *-t-* infix (Rainey 1971b:96 n. 65). On the other hand, the Gt stem of this verb is documented in WS. In Ugaritic we find the imperative: *ištm^c . wtqg udn* (= *ʔištami^c wattaqig ʔudna*) "give heed and be attentive of ear" (KTU 1.16:VI, 42, also 29-30). A biblical Hebrew toponym is the Gt infinitive, *ʔešt^amô^{a^c}*, Eshtemoa (Josh. 21:14; 1 Sam. 30:28; 1 Chron. 4:17, 19; 6:42; = *ešt^amô^h*, Josh. 15:20).

To be sure, there are some contexts in the Canaanite Amarna letters where the form with infixed *-t-* is probably nothing more than the G stem *-t-* preterite as theme, e.g. 1st c.s.

eš-te-me (EA 108:24); *eš-te₉-mé* (EA 82:35). However, the frequent occurrences of the *-t-* forms from this verb in the Amarna letters consist mainly of replies to instructions received by local rulers from the king of Egypt. A good example is the following:

iš-te-mé / a-wa-te^{MEŠ} *ša iš-pu-ur / LUGAL EN-ia a-na ÌR-šu / ú-šur-mi*^{LÚ}*MAŠKÍM-ka / ù ú-šur URU.DIDLI.HÁ ša / LUGAL EN-ka a-nu-ma / ¹iš¹-šú-ru ù a-nu-ma / ¹iš¹-te-mu UD.KAM-ma / ù mu-ša a-wa-te*^{MEŠ} *ša / LUGAL EN-ia* "I have listened to the words which the king, my lord, sent to his servant, 'Protect your commissioner and protect the cities of the king, your lord.' Now I am protecting and now I am obeying day and night the words of the king, my lord" (EA 292:17-26).

One could simply assume that this scribe has used the G preterite with *-t-* infix as his theme. That is certainly possible, but the widespread use of forms with infix *-t-* in contexts where "heeding, obeying," is so appropriate strongly suggests that the infix was meant to carry the same nuance as in the Ugaritic imperative cited above. A clear-cut distinction between *išme* "he listened," and *išteme* "he heeded," can be seen in a poetic passage from Tyre, which, while Egyptian in idiom and flavor (Albright 1937:199), reveals a brilliant use of the Akkadian interlanguage in rendering the flowery style of the original Egyptian poetic composition(s) that must have stood behind the Akkadian composition as we have it:

ša iš-me a-na LUGAL be-li-šu ù / ú-ra-ad-šu i-na aš-ra-ni-šu / ù it-<ta>-šī^{UTU} *i-na muḥ-ḫi-šu / ù i-sà-ḫír še-ḫu DÛG.GA iš-tu UZU*^{pí} *be-li-šu / "He who listened to his lord and serves him in his place(s), then the sun god comes forth to him and the sweet breath from the mouth of his lord restores (him)" (EA 147:41-44); ù la-a iš-te-mé a-ma-ta₅ LUGAL be-li-šu / ḫal-qá-at URU-¹šu¹ ḫa-li-iq É-šu / ia-nu šu-um-šu i-na gáb-bi / KUR-ti i-na da-ri-ti* "But (as for) he (who) heeded/heeds not the word of the king, his lord, his city is lost, his house is lost, his name shall not exist in the whole land forever" (EA 147:45-48); *a-mur / ÌR-da ša*

*iš-me a-na ›a-na‹ be-li-šu / šul-mu URU-šu šul-mu É-šu / šum-šu
a-na da-ri-ti* "Behold the servant who listens/listened to his lord,
his city is at peace, his house is at peace, his name endures
forever" (EA 147:48-51).

The *išme* forms have an adverbial complement, *ana (šarri) bēlišu*, while *išteme* governs a direct accusative, *amāta*. The use of the prefixed tense forms in the Tyrian letters does not conform to the pattern typical of most other letters from Canaan. Therefore, these Tyrian anomalies make it necessary to look elsewhere for more conclusive proof of the relationship between forms with infixed *-t-* and those without.

Such a contrast is observable in the so called "dog formula," several variations of which are documented among the epistles in the Ashkelon correspondence, e.g. one context has infixed *-t-*:

mi-ia-mi / LÚUR.GI₁₂ u la-a / yi-iš-te-mu a-wa-ta₅ / LUGAL EN-ia
"Who is the dog that he should not heed the word of the king,
my lord" (EA 323:17-20; also EA 324:16-18; 325:12-14);

while a parallel passage uses the Akkadian preterite form as its model,

mi-ia-mi LÚkal-bu / u la-a yi-iš-mu / a-na a-wa-te LUGAL EN-šu
"Who is the dog that he should not listen to the words of the
king, his lord" (EA 320:22-24; also EA 322:17-19).

Both verbs have the WS imperfect suffix *-u*. The form with infixed *-t-* might be construed as *yištemmû*, Gt present future, but the form without the infix is based on the Akkadian G preterite theme. The proverbial nature of this saying assures that the tense is present-future, that is, the original tense of the Akkadian theme is irrelevant! The WS prefix and suffix determine the tense and mode, viz. indicative imperfect. The form with the infix takes a direct object in the accusative, *a-wa-ta₅*, the form without the infix takes an indirect object in the form of an adverbial complement.

The many replies to pharaoh's communications mentioned above reflect the desire on the part of local rulers to impress their master with how attentive they had been in listening to a message from the king. Therefore, they used the forms with infixes *-t-* in the "reflexive" sense. Note that the first example cited above (EA 292:17-26) begins with *iš-te-mé* without the presentation particle *anumma*. Further on, *anumma* serves to introduce the affirmation that pharaoh's orders are being carried out, *a-nu-ma* / ¹*iš-šú-ru ù a-nu-ma* / [*i*]š-*te-mu*. The form from *našāru* has no infixes *-t-*, only that from *šemû*. The reason is that the scribe wants to stress the "heeding" in the sense of the WS Gt. This point must be emphasized so as to avoid the superficial assumption that, in other contexts, where *išteme* or *ištemû* do follow *anumma*, the resemblance to the well known Akkadian syntagma of *anumma* plus a *-t-* preterite (GAG:104, §80c; Heimpel and Guidi 1969:148-152) is only coincidental.

Therefore, it would appear that the scribes of Canaan frequently used forms with infixes *-t-* from the verb *šemû* because they had a Gt stem in their mother tongue.

VERBS WITH NO LEXICAL Gt

Finally, there are some verbs for which forms having infixes *-t-* are fairly prevalent but for which one is hard pressed to find a satisfactory explanation. They are grouped together here, not because there is any solid reason to posit a functioning Gt, but simply for easy reference. At least, most of them add further proof that the Akkadian preterite with infixes *-t-* was not a vital, functioning tense form in this dialect or in the mother tongue of the scribes. The few examples that do occur can be reckoned as Akkadianisms.

leqû. The dictionaries either do not have a Gt for this verb (AHw:544b-546a) or, if recognizing Gt forms (CAD L:131a), do not assign them any special semantic category. CAD (L:131a, 135a) cites the following forms from an Akkadian epistle, evidently written to a queen of Ugarit, as examples of Gt:

na-mu-ur-te-e / ša¹Ur-tá-ni / il-ta-qa-a / e-ni-in₄-na a-nu-ma / 1 GAL GUŠKIN 1^{SÍ}GADA / 1 me-at^{SÍ}G_hu-us-ma-ni / 1 me-at^{SÍ}G_{ta}-kíl-ta / a-na¹A-bi-ma-ni / at-ta-din il-te-qa-ki "He has taken the audience gifts of Urtana (CAD N:254b); now then, one gold cup, one wool garment, one hundred (shekels of) blue-green wool, one hundred (shekels of) blue-purple wool, to Abimānu I have given (and) he has taken for you" (RS 12.33:r. 1'-9'; Nougayrol 1955:14-15; Virolleaud 1951:54-55).

Huehnergard (1979:244, 259-261; 1989:171-172) does not deal with these particular forms at all. It is hard to see why *CAD* saw them as Gt unless they took the final verb as a future. All of them are most likely G preterites with *-t-* infix.

There are not very many forms with infixed *-t-* from this verb in the Canaanite Amarna texts, as against the plethora of G stem examples. Some of the *-t-* forms, viz. those without a consonantal suffix, can be taken as Akkadian G preterites with *-t-* infix: 3rd m.s. *il-te₉-qé* (EA 74:23; 81:8, 47), *il₅-te-qé* (EA 280:22), 1st c.s. *el-te₉-qé* (EA 280:26), 3rd m.pl. *il-te₉-qú-mi* (EA 69:10), *il₅-te₉-qú* (EA 237:5), *il₅-te₉-qú-ú* (EA 237:2, 11; 238:6, 25, 27). But two of the forms lacking consonantal suffix serve functions other than that of a preterite or any other normal function in the Akkadian dialects. One of the examples in question expresses the future!

la-a / i-le-ú uš-ša-ar-[šú] / ú-ul yi-iš-ma¹IR-A-ši-i[r-ta] / ù ma-an-nu il-te₉-qa-n[i] / i[š-]tu qa-ti-šú "I am unable to send [him] lest 'Abdi-Ashirta should hear, and who would rescue m[e] from his hand?" (EA 82:21-25).

The other is a volitive:

ù ú-ul il-te₉-qa mi-im-ma^{MEŠ} / ša DINGER.MEŠ-ka^{LÚ}UR.GI₇ šu-ut "But let not that dog seize the property of your god(s)!" (EA 84:34-35).

The forms with WS consonantal prefix generally conform to the Canaanite modal/tense system, with one glaring exception:

gáb-bi a-wa-te^{MEŠ} / *šār-ri EN-ia* / *i-ba-aš-ši* / *a-di it-ta-ši* / *LÚGAL*
ù / *ye-el-te-qé* / *mi-im-ma* / *ša iq-bi* / *šār-ru* / *be-li-ia* "All the
things (*awātē*) of (= for) the king, my lord, are on hand (*contra*
Moran 1987b:464 n. 1; 1992:296 n. 1) for the coming forth of the
officer that he may take the supplies of which the king, my
lord, spoke" (EA 239:8-17).

One would have expected *yittaṣ(š)û* and *yelteqû*, 3rd m.s. imperfects. In this case, the form with infix -t- may have been due to "modus attraction" with the preceding verb which itself is probably a pseudo-infinitive, cf. *adi ētelli* (EA 287:45). The "proper" hybrid imperfect form does occur, e.g. as a future:

a-na-ku aq-bu / [*šum-ma* UD.K]ÁM.MEŠ *yi-iš-mu šār-ru* / [*ù*
UD].KÁM.MEŠ *yi-il-teḡ-qú-šu-nu* / [*ù šum*]-*ma mu-ša yi-iš-mu ù* /
[*mu-š*]a *yi-il-teḡ-qú-šu-nu* "I say (or: have been saying), 'If one
(sic! Moran 1987b:309 n. 2; 1992:184 n. 2) da]y the king should
hear, [then in one da]y he could seize them, [and i]f one night
he should hear, then [one nigh]t he could catch them"
(EA 109:15-19).

Also as a present:

pu-uḥ-ri-iš-mi / *yi-il-te-qú šār-ru* / *mim-mi-ia* "The king is taking
over my property completely" (EA 254:24-26);

alongside a past continuous:

ša-ni-tam ¹*La-ab-a-yu* / BA.UG₇ *ša ye-el-te-qú* /
URU.DIDLI.ḪÁ-*ni-nu ù* / *a-nu-ma* ¹*La-ab-a-yu* / ¹*ša*¹-¹*nu*¹
¹*İR-ḥe-ba ù* / [*ù* < >] *ye-el-te-¹qú¹* URU.DIDLI.ḪÁ-*n u*
"Furthermore, Lab²ayu is dead, who used to take over our
cities, but now ⁶Abdi-Kheba is another Lab²ayu and he is taking
over our cities" (EA 280:30-35).

And finally, there is a clear-cut example of the very non-Akkadian jussive:

ù lu-ú yu-uš-ši-ra / LUGAL be-li / ^{G1}ŠGIGIR.MEŠ ù lu-ú /
 yi-ìl-te-qé-ni / a-na mu-ḫi-šu la-a / iḫ-la-aq "Thus may the king,
 my lord, send chariots and may he take me unto himself lest I
 perish" (EA 270:24-29; Izre³el 1978b:61-61).

In short, all the forms of *leqû* with infixed *-t-* may simply represent the use of the G *t*-preterite as theme. Rarely, the bare form, *ilteqe*, may stand alone, probably as a calque for WS **laqaḥ(a)*. Otherwise, the tense and modal nuances are generally expressed by WS prefixes and suffixes.

riāḫu. With one exception, the forms of this verb in the Canaanite Amarna texts are hybrids of the suffix conjugation (Rainey 1971b:93-94; 1973c:255-256; cf. *infra*, pp. 338-339). It may be that the G preterite with infixed *-t-* was chosen as the theme for all forms in accordance with a known tendency among peripheral scribes to prefer *-t-* augmented forms for weak verbs (cf. Gordon 1938:215). Nevertheless, one cannot escape the impression that the scribes associated some reflexive nuance with the stative concept, "to remain, to be left over." The one prefix form is 3rd f.s. imperfect with "city" as subject (feminine in accordance with Canaanite, not Akkadian usage, CAD A/1:379a):

šum-ma / la-a ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭá-ṭa la-a / tu-wa-ṣi-ru-na ù / ia-nu
 URU ša-a ti-ir-ti-ḫu / a-na ka-ta₅ "If you do not send the army,
 then there is no town that will remain to you: (EA 103:51-55).

šapāru. The most complex situation pertains to the forms of *šapāru* with infixed *-t-*. Some of them have orthographic gemination of the second radical, e.g. 3rd m.s. *iš-tap-pa-ar* (EA 74:30), *iš-tap-pa-ar* (EA 121:1), *iš-tap-pa-ra-ni* (EA 305:17), *ia-aš-tap-pár* (EA 233:16), *yi-iš-tap-pa-ra* (EA 130:9), and 1st c.s. *aš-tap-pár* (EA 88:13; *et passim*), *iš-tap-pa-ar* (EA 134:31); morphologically, they can be based on the present-future of the Akkadian Gt or on the preterite of the Akkadian Gtn. Other forms have no express gemination, but they have vocalic suffixes without eliding the thematic vowel, which implies gemination of

the second radical: 3rd m.s. *yi-iš-ta-pa-ru* (EA 112:7), *yi-iš-^fta¹-pa-ru* (EA 103:20), *yi-iš-ta-pa-ra* (EA 130:15), 2nd m.s. *ti-iš-ta-pa-ru* (EA 117:31), 1st c.s. *aš-ta-pa-ru* (EA 89:7; *et passim*), 3rd m.pl. *ti-iš-ta-pa-ru-na* (EA 124:38; Moran 1987b:336; 1992:203). One can hardly doubt that gemination is intended; note, for example, that *yi-iš-tap-pa-ra* (EA 130:9) and *yi-iš-ta-pa-ra* (EA 130:15) appear in parallel clauses in the same letter. On the other hand, it will become clear in the ensuing discussion that the gemination in these forms has become little more than an orthographic convention (cf. the discussion of this phenomenon by Youngblood 1961:140).

There are also forms with vocalic suffixes that elide the thematic vowel, thus precluding gemination of the second radical: 3rd m.s. *iš-tap-ra-am* (EA 321:17), *iš-tap-ru* (EA 92:35; 106:30), *iš-tap-ra-an-ni* (EA 253:10; *et al.*), *yi-iš-tap-ru* (EA 106:14), *yi-iš-tap-ru-na* (EA 121:7), 2nd m.s. *ta-aš-tap-ra* (EA 34:8; 102:14), *ti-iš-tap-ru* (EA 124:36), *ti-iš-tap-ru-na* (EA 117:8), 1st c.s. *iš-tap-ru* (EA 85:6; *et al.*), *iš-tap-ru* (EA 85:55; 133:15). Such examples as these can only be based on the G preterite with infixed *-t-* or on the Gt preterite. They certainly cannot be derived from the Akkadian Gtn stem.

Finally, there are many forms without a vocalic suffix that do not show gemination of the second radical orthographically, but which could be interpreted either way because the scribe was not obligated to express a double consonant in the spelling: 3rd m.s. *iš-ta-pár* (EA 108:1; *et passim*), *iš-ta-pár-ka* (EA 71:9), *yi-iš-ta-pár* (EA 73:26), 1st c.s. *aš-ta-pa-ar* (EA 74:49; *et passim*), *aš-ta-pár* (EA 81:22; *et passim*); these latter forms are by far the most numerous.

Semantic analysis reveals that gemination or lack of it does not seem to be a factor in determining the verbal nuance. A single action in the past is expressed in the opening clause in many of Rib-Haddi's letters:

¹*Ri-ib-^dIŠKUR iš-ta-pár / a-na ¹EN-šu . . .* "Rib-Haddi has written to his lord . . ." (EA 108:1; 116:1; 119:1; 123:1; 124:6-7; also EA 94:1, Moran 1987b:286 n. 1; 1992:168 n. 1).

Another version proves the simple past tense of the verb in this formula:

¹*Ri-ib-ad-da iq-bi a-na* EN-*l[i-šu]* "Rib-Hadda said to [his] lor[d]" (EA 74:1; also EA 68:1-2; 75:1-2; 76:1-2; 78:1-2; 79:1-2; 81:1; 83:1-2; 88:1; 89:1-2; 92:1-2; 105:1; 106:1; 107:1-2; 109:1; Salonen 1967:62-63).

The reference in both cases is, of course, to the letter in hand, a single instance. At least once, and perhaps twice (EA 121:1-2), a scribe used a form with geminated second radical in this syntagma:

[¹] *Ri-ib-^dİŠKUR iš-tap-pár* / [*a*]-*na* EN-*šu* "Rib-Haddi has written [t]o his lord" (EA 122:1).

So all of these may be reckoned as Akkadianisms, i.e. standing for the G preterite with infix *-t-*. Note, however, that there is no distinctive function for the infix; it has lost the special force that it carried in OB and now expresses the same simple past tense like the plain preterite. It is used in this manner in the letters from Tyre (EA 148:4; 149:24, 55; 151:49; 154:6).

But the fact is that forms with clear gemination also serve to express single instances in the past, precluding any possibility of their having iterative force, for example:

a-wa-at iš-tap-pár / LUGAL EN-*ia* DINGIR.MEŠ-*ia* / [^d]UTU-*ia* *a-na ia-ši* / [*a-nu*]-*ma i-šu-ši-ru-šu* / [*a-n*]*a* LUGAL EN-*ia* "As for the word which the king, my lord, my god(s), my sun-[god] has sent to me, [no]w I am preparing it [fo]r the king my lord" (EA 276:9-13).

The "word" sent by the king is singular (construct without final vowel) and, like most replies to royal commands, this epistle undoubtedly refers to a specific message recently received from the court. The reference may also be to a particular emissary who had just brought a message. Note this example with gemination:

LÚDUMU ši-ip-ri / ša iš-tap-pár šār-ri EN-ia / a-na ia-a-ši / iš-te-me a-wa-te^{MEŠ}-šu / [m]a-gal ma-gal "As for the emissary whom my king, my lord, has sent unto me, I heeded his words very diligently" (EA 302:11-15).

This may be compared with an almost identical context where the verb lacks gemination (the thematic vowel being elided) but has the ventive suffix:

LÚMAŠKÍM \ ra-bi-iš / ša LUGAL EN-ia / ša iš-tap-ra-am / LUGAL EN-ia^dUTU / iš-tu AN^{sa-me} / a-na ia-a-ši / iš-te₉-me / a-wa->wa<-te^{MEŠ}-šu / [ma]-gal ma-gal "As for the commissioner of the king, my lord, whom the king, my lord, the sun-god from heaven, has sent to me, I have heeded his words very diligently" (EA 321:15-23; similarly EA 145:11-13; 253:7-10; 254:6-7; 305:17; 329:15).

In another passage, a form with gemination appears in context with a real Akkadianized Gtn, but still it is in a relative clause which has as its antecedent a single "word" (construct without final vowel), and therefore, it must be referring to a single instance in the past.

iš-te₉-né-me / a-wa-at LUGAL EN-ia / ša iš-tap-pa-ra-an-ni "I am heeding the word of the king, my lord, which he sent to me" (EA 305:15-17).

It would be easy to write off all the forms discussed above as simple confusion between the Akkadian G preterite with infix *-t-* and the Gtn preterite. They lack the typical WS *y-* prefix and have either *-Ø* suffix or the ventive. Note, incidentally, how many of the examples cited are in subordinate clauses *without* any trace of the Akkadian subjunctive marker!

Examination of the examples with WS consonantal *y-* as prefix reveals that the infixed *-t-* and the gemination (or lack of it) play little, if any, role in determining the tense and mode of the respective forms. It is evidently the *-Ø* suffix that serves to mark

the following verbs as past tense within the syntactic framework of these letters:

i-nu-ma yi-iš-ta-pár a-na LÚ.MEŠ / URU Am-mi-ia "Because he wrote to the men of Ammiya" (EA 73:26-27); *ša ya-aš-tap-pár / be-lí-ia a-na ĪR-šu / yi-iš-te₉-mu* "What my lord has written to his servant, he will heed" (EA 233:16-18).

In both cases, one might take the forms as Gtn preterites signifying that the subject has written more than once (thus Rabiner 1981:4, 75). However, EA 73 is dealing with a specific instance and quotes that message, while the second text must be seen in the context of the orders issued by pharaoh to each key city ruler to get ready for a military campaign. The message is undoubtedly the response to a particular communication from pharaoh.

Two other instances of this verb have the ventive suffix; they appear in parallel passages from the same letter, each dealing with a specific message sent by the king. Both passages reflect gemination of the second radical although only the first expresses it orthographically:

i-nu-ma yi-iš-tap-pa-ra / šār-ru a-na ia-ši a-nu-ma / I-ri-ma-ia-aš-ša / ia-ak-šu-du-na a-na mu-ḫi-ka ú-ul ka-ši-id / a-na mu-ḫi-ia i-nu-ma / yi-iš-ta-pa-ra šār-ru / a-na ia-ši ú-ṣur-mi / ra-ma-an-ka ù / ú-ṣur URU šār-ri ša-a / it-ti-ka ma-an-nu / yi-na-ṣf-ra-ni "Inasmuch as the king has written to me, 'Now Irimayassa is coming to you,' he has not arrived; inasmuch as the king has written to me, 'Protect yourself and protect the king's city that is in your charge,' who will protect me?" (EA 130:9-20).

In the latter instance, one might assume that numerous messages had been sent out admonishing the local rulers to see to the safety of their respective towns, but in the first case, there was a message about the arrival of a single emissary. Can one believe that said emissary was preceded by a series of letters announcing his coming? A similar context has a 2nd m.s. verb:

i-nu-ma ta-aš-tap-ra a-na ia-ši / a-lik-mi i-zi-iz a-na URU $\dot{\text{S}}$ u-mu-ur /
*a-di ka-ša-di-ia / [t]i-de i-nu-ma nu-kúr-tu₄*MEŠ / KAL.GA *ma-gal*
 UGU-ia / *ù ú-ul i-le-ú! a-la[-ka]m* "Inasmuch as you have written
 to me, 'Go, take up a position at $\dot{\text{S}}$ umur until I arrive,' [k]now
 that hostilities are very strong against me and I am unable to
 g[o]" (EA 102:14-19).

Examples of 1st c.s. with -Ø suffix also serve to express single instances in the past. Despite the badly broken context, EA 92:12, 16, 38, 44) uses *aš-tap-pár* four times, each concerning a different message sent by Rib-Haddi to the king. The Tyrian letters employ the spelling, *aš-ta-pár*, when dealing with specific instances in the past (EA 148:23; 149:11, 70; also from Byblos, EA 91:7). Quite a few of the documented forms refer to Rib-Haddi's earlier correspondence with Amenhotep III and his ministers about the misdeeds of ^cAbdi-Ashirta. Most of the contexts seem to call for a simple preterite meaning, and in fact, parallel contexts use the G preterite, *aš-pu-ur* (EA-138:31; 362:18-20). A typical example with the infix -t- is the following:

ù aš-ta-pa-ar a-na / a-bi-ka uš-ši-ra-mi / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ti šār-ri / ù
tu-ul-qú ka-l[i] / KUR i-na UD.KÁM.MEŠ "So I wrote to your
 father, 'Send forth regular army troops and all the land will be
 captured in a day'" (EA 132:12-16; cf. EA 117:63 for the
 ideogram without MEŠ; Moran 1987b:309 n. 2, 352 n. 1;
 1992:184 n. 2, 214 n. 1).

Similar statements reiterate this identical theme with slight variations (EA 108:28; 117:24; 121:41).

One also finds certain contexts in which the form itself is evidently past tense, but nevertheless, it is followed in the next clause by an imperfect verb, e.g.

a-nu-ma ki-a-ma aš-ta-pa-ar a-na É.GAL / *ù ú-ul ti-iš-mu-na*
a-wa-tu-ia "Now, thus did I write to the palace, but my words
 are not heeded(sic!)" (EA 74:49-50; for the misspelled passive
 verb form, cf. Ebeling 1915:1370 n. 1; Youngblood 1961:149);

*ša-ni-tam aš-ta-pár a-na LÚ.MEŠ ma-ša-ar-ti / ù a-na ANŠE.
KUR.RA.MEŠ ù la-a / tu-da-nu-na* "Furthermore, I wrote for
garrison troops and for horses (cavalry) but they were/are not
given" (EA 83:21-23; also EA 81:22).

Still, a specific request made at a certain time seems to be indicated in each of these instances. The fact that the ensuing imperfect verbs are all passives (correct or misspelled) may have a bearing on these contexts (cf. *infra*, p. 234). With regard to EA 74:49, it should be noted that this is the only time a verb with $-\emptyset$ follows *anūma kīamma*, the other instances having a form with $-u$, e.g. 3rd m.s. *yi-iš-^rta¹-pa-ru* (EA 103:20), 1st c.s. *aš-ta-pa-ru* (EA 89:7), and 1st c.s. *iš-tap-ru* (EA 85:6-7); in all three cases the ensuing clause has an imperfect verb.

By contrast, there are three times when Rib-Haddi wanted to stress that he had had to write repeatedly to the palace. In such cases, the scribe might have been thinking of the Gtn preterite; two of the pertinent examples have orthographic gemination. But to render Rib-Haddi's complaint unmistakably clear, he reinforced the first verb with a form of *šanū* having infixed $-t-$:

aš-tap-pár aš-ta-ni la-a / ia-tu-ru-na a-wa-tu / a-na ia-a-ši "I wrote
repeatedly (but) no word came back to me" (EA 126:53-55; cf.
EA 75:17-18).

One final passage of this type contrasts earlier multiple communications with the sending of a subsequent single embassy:

*aš-tap-pár aš-ta-ni a-n[a ERÍN.MEŠ ma-ša-ar-ti] / ù la-a tu-da-nu-na
[ù la-a] / yi-iš-mé LUGAL be-li a-wa-t[e ÌR-šu] / ù i-wa-ši-ir
LÚDUMU š[ip-ri-ia] / a-na É-ti É.GAL ù i[a?-tu-ur] / ri-qú-tam
i-ia-nu ERÍN.MEŠ ma-ša-a[r-ta₅] / a-na ša-a-šu* "I wrote
repeatedly f[or garrison troops], but they were not given [and]
the king, my lord, did [not] listen to the word[s of his servant];
so I sent [my] ambas[sado]r to the palace but he re[turned]

empty-handed, no garrison troops being with him"
(EA 137:5-11).

The question remains as to whether the repetition of the earlier messages could have been stated without the helping verb, *aš-ta-ni*.

When we come to examine all the forms of *šapāru* with infixes *-t-* on which the WS imperfect suffix is appended, the contrast with the examples discussed above proves most interesting. There are two cases where the absence of a WS consonantal prefix did not prevent the scribe from using the WS imperfect suffix, *-u*. The forms in question, both from Gulba letters, do not show gemination of their second radical (their thematic vowel is elided) and they are not in subordinate clauses where the Akkadian subjunctive suffix might be conjectured:

[*al*]-¹lu¹-¹mi¹ ¹iš¹-*tap-ru* / ¹Ri-*ib-ad-d[a]* / *a[-n]a ka-tu-nu a-na ti-la-ti*
 "[Be]hold (Moran 1950a:161), Rib-Hadda is (has been) writing
 t[o] you(pl.) for auxiliary troops (Youngblood 1961:361)"
 (EA 92:35-36); *a-na mi-ni₇ iš-tap-r[u]* / ¹Ri-*ib-^oIŠKUR tu^o-pa a-na*
ma-ḥar be-li-š[u] "Why does Rib-Haddi send a tablet to hi[s]
 lord?" (EA 106:30-31).

Quite a number of the relevant instances pertain to the "dialogue" between Rib-Haddi and Pharaoh during the former's troubles with the sons of ^cAbdi-Ashirta. That correspondence has been given considerable attention by scholars (cf. for example Liverani 1971). The extraordinary number of letters sent by Rib-Haddi to the Egyptian king stirred up considerable irritation on the part of Pharaoh and this finds expression in the responses from Egypt (e.g. EA-106:13-15; EA 117:6-9). Those responses are known mainly from allusions in Rib-Haddi's own letters. Apparently, the king had replied more than once to the effect that Rib-Haddi should "be on guard" and look out for himself (rather than always pestering the imperial authorities for support and protection) as indicated by several allusions in the Byblos texts. Rib-Haddi responds:

a-na mi-ni yi-iš-ta-pa-ru / šar-ru EN-li a-na ia-ši / ú-sur-mi lu-ú na-šir-ta "Why does the king, my lord, write to me, 'Guard! May you be watchful'" (EA 112:7-9; likewise EA 119:8-9; 121:7-8).

And Pharaoh's letters must have charged, or implied, that Rib-Haddi was not telling the truth:

a-wa-te ša-ru-ta aš-ta-pa-ru / a-na EN-ia ù ti-qa-bu a-na mi-ni / ti-iš-ta-pa-ru a-wa-te ša-ru-ta "(Is it) false words (that) I am writing to my lord? that you should say, 'Why do you write false words?'" (EA 117:29-31); cf. *ù be-li i-de i-nu-ma / la-a aš-pu-ru a-wa-at / ka-az-bu-te a-na be-li-ia* "And my lord knows that I do not write lies to my lord" (EA 362:51-53).

Rib-Haddi's exasperation with Pharaoh's impatience provides us with two more examples of these *-t-* forms in the imperfect mode:

[k]i-a-ma ti-qa-bu at-cta>-m[a] / [t]i-iš-tap-ru a-na ia-ši iš-t[u] / [k]a-li LÚ.MEŠ ha-za-nu-ti a-[na] / [m]i-ni ti-iš-ta-pa-ru-na š[u-nu] / [a-n]a ka-ta₅ URU.MEŠ-nu a-na š[a-šu-nu] / [URU].MEŠ-ni-ia la-qa¹A-z[i-ru] "Thus yo<u> are saying, 'You write to me mor[e] than [a]ll the (other) city-rulers! Why should they write to you! (Their) cities belong to th[em]. My [citi]es, Aziru has taken!" (EA 124:35-40).

Whatever the original motive for choosing themes with infixed *-t-* and frequent gemination of the second radical, the forms discussed here find their usual tense and modal expression in the WS suffixes, either *-Ø* or *-u*. The *-t-* forms are generally optional; there are often close parallels with G stem preterite themes lacking the infix.

*š^hhⁿ. The verb forms appearing to have this root were evidently generated in Hurrian speaking areas from *šukēnu*, "to prostrate oneself" (GAG:158, §109m; AHw:1263). The phenomenon appears, for example, at Nuzi. Although there is no lexical Gt in Akkadian for this quadrilateral verb, the examples

with infixed *-t-* are discussed here because of the possibility that there may have been some feeling of reflexiveness on the part of the scribes, i.e. "to prostrate oneself." It is worth noting that all the forms in question (with and without *-t-*) are known in the Amarna archive only from texts written in Canaan. In addition, there are a few examples from Ugarit and Hattusas (*AHw*:1293). The Assyrian form of *šukēnu* appears a few times in epistolary greeting formulas, e.g.

ul-ta-ka-in / a-na di-na-an EN-ia at-ta-lak "I have prostrated myself; as a substitute for my lord I have gone (agreed to go)" (Finkelstein 1953:13X, No. 62:3-4; 63:3-4).

The verb form, *ul-ta-ka-in* (= *ultaka²²in*) appears to be G past with infixed *-t-* but the question has been raised whether it is not iterative (*AHw*:1263a).

Though there are many examples of the simple preterite in the Amarna letters (e.g. *uš-ḫé-ḫi-in* EA 221:7; *et al*; *uš-ḫé-ḫi-in₄* EA 223:6; 242:8), the majority have an infixed *-t-* (*iš-ta-ḫa-ḫi-in* EA 298:12; *et passim*; *iš-ti-ḫa-ḫi-in* EA 301:10; *et al.*; *iš-tu-ḫa-ḫi-in* EA 331:10-11). Most of these latter are preceded by the emphatic particle, *lū*. The suggestion that these are iterative forms is tempting, especially because of the usual prostration formula as exemplified in the following:

7-šu ù 7-ta-a-an / lu-ú iš-ta-ḫa-ḫi-in / UZUka-bat-tum-ma / ù UZUše-ru-ma "Seven times and seven times I have verily prostrated, on the stomach and on the back" (EA 305:11-14).

Interestingly enough, the ensuing line in the same letter begins with a Gtn present-future, *iš-te₉-né-me* (EA 305:15), which can only be viewed as an Akkadianism!

Nevertheless, it is impossible to refute the accepted view that these are merely G preterites with infixed *-t-* from the "Hurrianized" root of *šukēnu*. Their appearance in the obeisance formulas, where the usual verb is the Akkadian G preterite *amqut*, is a curiosity.

epēšu. Neither does Akkadian have a documented lexical Gt for this verb. The unique Amarna usage of the N stem from *epēšu* will be discussed in the next chapter. But because there are about half a dozen cases of forms with infix *-t-* that have the same idiomatic nuance as the Amarna N stem, they must be Gt stem forms since the G stem would hardly have served the same purpose (Rainey 1971b:91-93; 1973c:254-255).

To be sure, there are three passages where the transitive nature of the construction indicates that the scribes have used the G preterite with infix *-t-* as the theme for simple past tense. In an earlier study they had been interpreted as possible reflexive Gt's with the force of suffix conjugation verbs taking adverbial accusatives (Rainey 1973c:255). Although they may in some sense represent a calque on WS suffix verbs, the assumption that they carried a reflexive nuance was undoubtedly wrong and is refuted by those contexts in which the identical meaning is expressed by purely G stem forms. The three particular passages in question are as follows:

ki[-n]a-na i-te₉-p[u-u]š / 'nu¹-KÚR a-na ia-ši "Th[u]s, he has ma[d]e war against me" (EA 105:39-40); *al-lu-mi / 'Ia-pa-dIŠKUR i-t[e₉-p]u-[uš] / ar-na* "Behold, Yapa^c-Haddi has committed a crime" (EA 113:7-9); *iš-tu i-re-bi ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭá-ti / i-te₉-pu-uš-mì 'La-ab-a-yu / nu-kúr-ta₅ i-na mu-uḫ-ḫi-ia* "Since the return (home) of the standing army, Lab^ayu has made war on me" (EA 244:9-12).

Another purely transitive example has the WS prefix *y-* showing that the *-t-* form is simply a theme:

gáb-bi mi-im-mì / ša yi-te-pu-uš / LUGAL EN-ia!(EN) a-na KUR-šu / SIG₅.GA ma-gal "Everything that the king my(!) lord has done for his land is very good" (EA 258:6-9).

The reflexive nuance of the other passages is best demonstrated by the ensuing context where Gt's alternate with N stem forms:

[ù] tu-^lba!^l-ú-na ur-ra / [ù] mu-ša-am a-šé ERÍN.MEŠ / pí-tá-ti ù ni-te₉-pu-uš / a-na ša-a-ši_x(ŠE) ù ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ_ha-za-nu-te tu-ba-ú-na / i-pé-eš an-nu-tu₄(sic!) a-na ^lIR-A-ši-ir-ta / i-nu-ma yi-iš-ta-pár a-na LÚ.MEŠ / ^{URU}Am-mi-ia du-ku-mi EN-ku-nu / ù in-né-ep-šu a-na / LÚ.MEŠ GAZ ki-na-na ti-iq-bu-na / LÚ.MEŠ_ha-za-nu-tu₄ ki-na-na / yi-pu-šu a-na ia-ši-nu / ù ti-né-pu-šu ka-li KUR.MEŠ / a-na LÚ.MEŠ GAZ "[And] they are seeking day and night the coming forth of the army that we may join ourselves to it and all the city rulers are seeking to do this to ‘Abdi-Ashirta because he wrote to the men of Ammiya, ‘Slay your master and join the ‘apîru men.’ Thus the city rulers are saying, ‘Thus will he do to us and all the lands will go over to the apîru men.’" (EA 73:20-33).

Both the Gt and N forms express the meaning "to join, to side with" (Moran 1987a):

ù ti-iq-bi URU.KI i-^lzi^l-bu-šu / ni-te-pu-uš-mi a-na ^lA-zi-ri ù / aq-bi ki-i i-te₉-pu-šu a-na ša-šu / ù i-zi-bu LUGAL be-li ù yi-iq-bu / ŠEŠ-ia ù [yi]-^lit^l-mi a-na URU.KI / ù ti-dáb-bi-bu ù! LÚ.MEŠ BE URU.KI / [ti-^lt]e-pu-šu-mi a-na DUMU.MEŠ ^lIR-Aš-^lra-^lti "And the city said, 'Abandon(pl.) him! Let us side with Aziru!' But I said, 'How can I side with him and abandon the king, my lord?' And my brother spoke and [sw]ore to the city and they conspired together and the nobles of the city went over to the sons of ‘Abdi-Ashirta" (EA 138:44-50; Rainey 1973c:254; also Moran 1987b:363, 365 n. 10, 366 nn. 11, 12; 1992:222, 224 nn. 10, 11, 12).

Two other examples complete the list:

te₉-e-te-pu-š[u] / [KUR.MEŠ] a-na LÚ.MEŠ ^lSA^l.G[AZ.MEŠ] "[The lands] have gone over to the ‘ap[îrû] men" (EA 129:88-89); qa-^lbu^l DUMU.MEŠ / [^lIR-]A-ši-ir-ta a-na / [LÚ.MEŠ] GAZ.MEŠ ù LÚ.MEŠ / [ša i-]te₉-ep-šu "The sons of [‘Abdi-]Ashirta spoke to the ‘apîrû [men] and to the men [who have] gone over (to them)" (EA 121:19-22; Moran 1987b:332; 1992:200).

The latter form might be restored [ti-]te₉-ep-šu, 3rd m.pl. Gt preterite with WS *t*- prefix. This is the only example of this syntagma where the verb does not have an adverbial complement signifying to whom the people involved have become aligned.

One is reminded of Hebrew *b^ahillāḥ^amô* (2 Ki. 8:29; 9:15; 2 Chron. 22:6) versus Moabite *bhlthmh* (= **behiltaḥimô?* Mesha Stele, KAI 181:19). Cf. also *w^anibr^akû* (Gen. 18:18) and *w^ahitbār^akû* (Gen. 22:18) in identical contexts. It may be significant that these Amarna Gt's come from Byblos and Beirut where 10th century Phoenician had the Gt. In any case, these few examples of Gt instead of N stem in this particular semantic function are an important witness to the nature of the two verbal stems.

THE Gtn STEM

Some of the Gt verbs discussed above may have had iterative force. The possibility was explored as to whether some of the apparent Gt present-futures (with geminated middle radical) might actually be Gtn preterites (e.g., concerning *šapāru*, cf. *supra*, pp. 101-110). It was seen that even geminated forms could refer to a single instance in the past (cf. EA 305:15-20, *supra*, pp. 102-106). The only clearly recognizable Gtn forms are, in fact, those with an unassimilated *-tan-* infix. However, there is no basis for assuming that West Semitic had ever had a *-tan-* infix like Akkadian (*contra* Speiser 1955a). Perusal of the glossaries to the Amarna tablets (Ebeling 1915; Rainey 1978b:61-99) reveals that the epistles from Canaan seldom utilize the Akkadian Gtn and there are no Dtn or Štn forms. When the Canaanite scribes did employ such an iterative construction, it is worthy of special note. One noteworthy feature is the use of the Gtn present-future form to refer to iterative action that has already taken place. With two exceptions, such constructions do not have any WS modal suffixes; they stand as Akkadianisms replacing the WS imperfect of the G and/or Gt stems.

alāku. One time a Gtn is attested; it is in a letter from Lab^aayu, ruler of Shechem, and the context suggests that the form

was a response to a charge made by pharaoh. However, the Amarna letters from Egypt do not attest to any Gtn's though the stem is found in the Egyptian texts found at Boghazköi (Cochavi-Rainey 1988:174). In any event, it is remarkable that Lab²ayu's scribe employs a Gtn, augmented by the WS imperfect *-u* suffix, to describe the customary behavior of Lab²ayu's son. That son has, in the meantime, been remanded into custody. So the customary behavior being discussed is now terminated; it is a thing of the past!

ša-ni-tam / a-na ¹DUMU.MU-*ia* *ša-pár šàr-ru / ú-ul i*₁₅-*de i-nu-ma*
 / ¹DUMU.MU-*ia it-ti / LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ / it-ta-na-la-ku / ù*
al-lu-ú na-ad-na-ti7-šu / i-na ŠU ¹Ad-*da[-i]a* "Furthermore, the
 king has written concerning my son; I did not know that my
 son was consorting (running around) with the ^c*apîrû* men! But,
 behold, I have turned him over to (the commissioner)
 Adda[y]a" (EA 254:30-37; Moran 1975a:149).

šemû. Counting two examples in an Amurru letter that is generally not WS in style (Izre²el 1991a:381,§6.3), there are six Gtn forms of this verb. The Amurru passage clearly uses the Gtn present-future to express present iterative, customary action (Izre²el 1991:156,§2.4.2.3.1):

[*i-nu-m*]a ¹*i*¹-[*k*]a-[*a*]z-*zi-bu-ni*₇ / [LÚ.MEŠ] *ha-za-nu-te*^{MEŠ} *a-na*
pa-ni-ka / [ù t]e-eš-te-nem-me a-na ša-šu-nu / [ù ¹*I*]a-*ma-ia i-nu-ma*
i-šap-pár / [a-na mu]h-¹hi-¹ka¹ ù i-ka-az-zi-ib / [a-na pa-n]i-ka ù
te-eš-te-nem-me / [a-na a-iva-]te^{MEŠ}-*šu* "[Whe]n the city-rulers lie
 to you [and y]ou listen to them! [And Y]amaya, when he writes
 [t]o you and lies [t]o you and you listen to his [wor]ds!"
 (EA 62:39-45; Izre²el 1985:*8; 1991a:13; Moran 1987b:237 nn. 9,
 10; 1992:134 nn. 9, 10).

Only one of the attestations in a Canaanite letter has a WS imperfect suffix. The form in question stands in a context where many other letters have a Gt with the WS imperfect (cf. *supra*, pp. 78-80):

gáb-bi mi-im-me / ša yi-iq-bu / LUGAL EN-ia / iš-te-nem-mu "I am heeding everything that the King, my lord, says" (EA 261:7-10).

The subordinated verb, *yi-iq-bu*, has the form of a WS imperfect. On the other hand, it is tempting to see here an Akkadian subjunctive since similar contexts usually pertain to some specific instruction received from pharaoh. But there are so many other relative clauses without the Akkadian subjunctive that one must resist the temptation. On the contrary, the phrase, "every thing," probably assures us that the reference is to every communication that pharaoh *has been sending*, i.e. to all of the king's recent instructions. The Gtn form, *iš-te-nem-mu*, is present iterative on two counts: the theme is Akkadian Gtn present-future, and the modal suffix in WS imperfect.

The next example uses the Gtn present-future theme with -Ø suffix in a context where other letters have the Gt with -Ø suffix (cf. e.g. EA 292:17-26; 328:17-26; Rainey 1975b:96-101):

iš-te₉-né-me / a-wa-at LUGAL EN-ia / ša iš-tap-pa-ra-ni / à a-nu-ma a-na-ša-ru / a-šar 'LUGAL' *ša / it-t[i-]ia* "I have heeded the word of the king, my lord, which he sent to me and now I am guarding the place of the king which is assigned to me" (EA 305:15-20).

Cf. the discussion of *iš-tap-pa-ra-ni*, which could itself be a Gtn preterite (*supra*, p. 104).

Finally, there are two examples that even have the MB shift, *št* > *lt*. One of them is in a context similar to the passage just cited:

u a-nu-ma [é]l-t[e₉-n]é-mé / a-na a-w[a-]t[e^{ME}]Š L[UGA]L EN-ia / 'u¹ iš-[t]e₉-mu [a-n]a a-wa-te^{MEŠ} / 'Ma-i[a^{LÚM}]AŠ[KÍ]M [LU]GAL / EN-ia^{1d1}[UTU] iš-tu / AN^{sa-ma}D[UMU] 'd1[UTU] "And now [I] a[m] heeding the words of the ki[ng], my lord, and I am heeding the words of Maya, [the co]mm[issio]ner of the [ki]ng, my lord, the [sun god] from heaven, the s[on of] the sun god" (EA 300:23-28; *infra*, p. 278).

The other is a variation on the "dog formula" used by vassals in expressing their subordination and obedience to their lord:

[u m]a-an-nu-mì a-na-ku UR.GI₇ / [u ma]-an-nu 'É¹-ia / 'u¹
 'ma¹-an-nu x[. . .]-ia¹ / u 'ma¹-an-nu gáb-ba / mi-im-me ša
 'i¹-ba¹-aš-ši / 'a¹-na ia-si u a-wa-te^{MEŠ} / LUGAL EN-ia dUTU
 'iš¹-tu / AN^{sa-mi-i} ú-'ul¹ / él-te₉-né-em-me "[And w]ho am I, a
 dog, [and w]ho are my household and who are my [. . .] and
 who are all that I have that the words of the king, my lord, the
 sun god from heaven, I should not heed?" (EA 378:19-26).

Other formulations of this type use forms such as *yi-iš-mu* (EA 320:22-24; 322:17-19) or *yi-iš-te-mu* (EA 323:17-20; also EA 324:16-18; 325:12-14), i.e. the WS imperfect of the G or the Gt stem. In fact, the parallels between those forms and this Akkadian Gtn present-future confirmed the semantic nature of the WS imperfect (Rainey 1971b:96-101).

CHAPTER VI

PREFIX CONJUGATION — N STEM

There are relatively few N stem verb forms in the Amarna letters from Canaan. Nevertheless, those that we do find are often of special interest. Furthermore, a couple of forms originally taken to be G present-future have been re-evaluated and shown to be better understood if taken as N stem. It should also be noted that in such cases, the gemination of the first radical due to assimilation of the *-n-* stem morpheme was not expressed orthographically. Other hints, such as thematic vowel and context, were the only indicators of N stem.

PASSIVE OF TRANSITIVE VERBS

The existence of the Gp stem (cf. *supra*, pp. 75-80) meant that there was a morphological vehicle ready at hand for expressing the passive of transitive verbs. Nevertheless, the N stem does fulfill a similar function on occasion and since the Gp stem does not exist in Akkadian, it is not surprising that some N forms are utilized, even when other scribes may have used the Gp for the same verb.

apālu. The corrected reading of one cuneiform sign by Gordon and Moran has led to the following example of an N stem preterite 3rd m.s. (Moran 1987b:476 n. 4; 1992:476 n. 4):

yi-in₄-^fna¹-^fpi¹-^fil¹! / [š^u-ul]-^fma¹!^fnu¹-um i-^fna¹ lib-bi-š^u-ni "A
[treaty] gift was paid between the two of them" (EA 250:33-34).

kašāšu. The two examples of this normally *a-u* verb (CAD K:286) both have an *-i-* theme vowel. The best solution seems to be to take them as N stem forms, even though the first radical is not geminated orthographically (Rainey 1974:304; 1978b:76):

šu-ut i-de ʿiʿ[-*nu-ma ia-nu* L]Ú *ša-na* / *ù Amé-e* i-[*n*]a-š[*a*]-*šu-nu-ma*
 / *šu-ut yu-TIL.LA-aṭ-šu-nu* / *i-nu-ma i-ka-ši-iš a-na-ku* / LÚ.MEŠ
 GAZ! *nu-kūr-tu i-na ia-ši* / *ù šu-ut TE.LA-aṭ-šu-nu-ma* "He
 knows t[hat there is no] other [ma]n and (that) I am/was
 bringing them water; he must supply them because I am being
 impoverished, the ʿ*apîru* men are at war with me so he must
 supply them" (EA 94:64-69; cf. Youngblood 1961:385; Moran
 1987b:285; 1992:168).

The financial connotation of this verb, concerning the exaction of services or payments of debts (CAD K:286; AHw:462) seems appropriate for these contexts where the ability to furnish supplies is in question. The Gublites can then be understood as complaining about the economic burden of Aziru's aggression:

ù a[nu-m]a i-na-na / l[*a-qa/qi* U]R[UṢ]u-m[*u-ri* ʿ]A-zi-ru / *ù*
ti-mu-[r]u ʿLÚʿ.ʿMEŠʿ ʿURUʿ[G]ubʿubʿi-ʿiʿ / *a-di ma-ti ni-ka-ši-šu*
 DUMU ʿĪR-[*A-ši-ir-ti*] "And n[ow] then Aziru has t[aken]
 ʿŠumurʿ and the ʿmenʿ of Byblos saw it (and said), 'How long
 will we be impoverished by the son of ʿAbdi-[Ashirta]?,"
 (EA 138:34-37; cf. Moran 1987b:362, 365 n. 7; 1992:221, 223 n. 7).

mašāʾu. The N stem of this verb appears three times in the Rib-Haddi letters. Originally, it was thought to be *mašāḥu* (Ebeling 1910:65; 1915:1466). One of the contexts is clear; the others are virtually identical but broken:

ù 2 MU am-ma-ša-ʾu / ŠE^{im}HÁ-*ia* "And for two years I have
 been plundered of my grain" (EA 85:9-10; cf. also EA 90:63;
 91:61; Youngblood 1961:272-273, 358; AHw :625a; CAD
 M/1:362b; Moran 1987b:269, 279, 281; 1992:156, 164, 165).

maḥāṣu. The scribes are aware, of course, that the first radical on an N stem prefix form was geminated. This is seen in two cases dealing with the same incident that have an N preterite 1st c.s. form of this verb. In one place at least (EA 82:38), the scribe has added the accusative suffix *-ni* as if the form were G stem 3rd

m.s. *imḥašni* (Albright and Moran 1948:248 n. 25). It would appear that the scribe got somewhat confused when he switched from the active to the passive, especially when the active clause contained a special idiom with a stative verb plus an adverbial accusative. The first passage (EA 81:24) is in such a broken context that little can be gained from citing it (cf. Youngblood 1961:220). The second context is as follows:

ù iq-bi a-na LÚ ù iz-zi-iz / GÍR ZABAR UGU-ia ù am-ma-ḥa-aš-ni / 9-ta-an "So he spoke to a man and he rose up against me (with) a bronze dagger and I was smitten nine times" (EA 82:37-39; Moran 1987b:263, cf. 264 n. 5; 1992:152 n. 5).

paṭāru. Of the two occurrences of this verb where the N stem is involved, one is treated below in the next section because it seems to express a reflexive action (cf. *infra*, pp. 131-132). The true passive example, 3rd m.pl. *ip-pa-ṭá-ru* (EA 292:50), appears alongside 3rd f.s. *in₄-né-ep-ša-at* (EA 292:46), which is conjugated as a suffixed verb form.

The normal 3rd m.pl. forms of the prefix conjugation have *t- -u(-na)*. It is likely that the form in question here is an Akkadianism; the preserved theme vowel suggests present-future *ippaṭṭarū*.

šahāṭu. Ebeling (1915:1508) was correct (*contra* Albright 1943b:31 n. 20 and Moran 1987b:479; 1992:305, 306 n. 4; also CAD Š/1:87b) that, in *ki-i a-na-ku i-ša-ḥa-ṭú* (EA 252:20), the verb is from *šahāṭu*. It is either *šahāṭu* A, "to attack" (CAD Š/1:88-92a) or *šahāṭu* B, "to strip off" (CAD Š/1:92b-95a). If from A, then the passage means "How I am being attacked!" (EA 252:20; cf. CAD Š/1:92b). But if it is from B, then one could translate "How I am being stripped!", which would suit the context since Lab³ayu is complaining about the loss of two of his towns and of his patrimony and family cult statue (Rainey 1989-90:69a).

šakānu. That N stem forms of this verb may occur in the Amarna corpus without orthographic gemination of the first

radical is demonstrated by an MB royal letter, *i[t-t]i-ka i ni-ša-ki-in* "that we may side [wit]h you" (EA 9:22; cf. *infra*, p. 128). Two examples are attested in a letter from Alashia; the first is paralleled by the stative, *la-a ša-ki-in* (EA 35:15).

a-ḫi ki-i ʿše¹-ḫé-er URUDU *i-na liḫ-bi-ka la-a i-ša-ki-in* "My brother, that the copper is a small amount, let it not be put in your heart (i.e. "may it not be taken to heart")" (EA 35:12); *it-ti šār Ḫa-at-ti₇ ù it-ti šār Ša-an-ḫa-ar / it-ti-šu-nu la ta-ša-ki-in* "With the king of Hatti and with the king of Shanghar, with them you are not ranked" (EA 35:49-50; Moran 1987b:202, 203 n. 10; 1992:108, 109 n. 10; Vincentelli 1973:143-144).

Therefore, in the following passage from Byblos, an N stem form has been proposed (Rainey 1975b:422; 1989-90:61a; *contra* Moran 1987b:329; 1992:197). The passage pertains to another tablet (undoubtedly EA 120; Moran 1987b:330 n. 1; 1992:199 n. 1) listing the disputed items in a lawsuit:

a-nu-ma ṭup-pí ša-nu / ù ka-li ú-nu-tu-ia / ša it-ti ʿIa-pa^d IŠKUR / šu-ut yi-ša-kan / i-na pa-ni šār-ri "Now, as for my other tablet having all my implements that are with Yapa^c-Haddi, may it be placed before the king" (EA 119:55-59).

This removes an anomaly; all WS texts use the G preterite theme.

šemû. The N stem provides a similar solution to another anomalous form in the following:

u i₁₅-nu-ma iš-te-me a-wa-ti₇^{MES}-ka / an-tu-ta₅ u a-šī TI^dUTU ána (AN) ia-ši / u ki yi-ša-ma aḫ!-di-am ri[-iš-ta₅!] / u i₅-la-ti-ya ia-ša-at ša-li-ʿmu¹(?) "And when I heard these words of yours and the coming forth of the life force of the sun god to me, I rejoiced joy[fully(?)] and my exultation sprang forth altogether" (EA 227:8-13; Rainey 1975b:421-422; Moran 1987b:456 n. 3; 1992:289 n. 3).

REFLEXIVE ACTIONS

Apart from the passives of transitive verbs discussed above in the previous section, there are a number of N stem verb forms that express some kind of reflexive nuance; that is, the subject of the verb is in some way being committed or has some kind of self-involvement in the action. In most cases, there is an Akkadian precedent, but not always.

abātu / na²butu. The G stem of this verb is only attested for OA (CAD A/1:45). Elsewhere, it is the N stem that carries the meaning "to run away, to flee." Thus, in the Amarna letters from Canaan, there are seven (possibly eight) instances of this verb. None of them have a consonantal prefix; only one seems to have the imperfect *-u* suffix. There is, therefore, the possibility that the WS scribes thought of these forms as calques on their own suffix conjugation.

The initial syllable sign alternates between IN and EN (= *in₄*), which is surely only an orthographic variation. However, the second syllable of the singular regularly has the NI sign. This could be taken as case of Assyrian vowel harmony, but in MA, that same vowel remains unassimilated to the following: 3rd m.s. preterite *in-na-bi-it* (Mayer 1971:67 for references). Therefore, it has been assumed here that some vowel coloring has occurred in the peripheral jargon; the second sign is transcribed *né*. Perhaps some analogy has developed from *innepuš* (see below). Goetze (1956:85 n. 1) had noted that the thematic vowel in *innabitu* etc. does not elide in OB. Such is generally the case in the Amarna examples except for two plurals. For one example of *-a-* theme, cf. EA 318:21 below.

One of the 3rd m.s. forms occurs in a text that may not reflect WS morphosyntax:

ù [i]-ma-¹gar¹ na-da-an / L^USA.GAZ.MEŠ ù il-qé-šu-nu-mi a-na mu-ši / ù in-na-bi-¹it¹-mi a-na L^USA.GAZ.MEŠ "So [he] agreed to hand over the *‘apîrû* men, but he took them by night and he fled to the *‘apîrû* men" (EA 185:61-63).

The two other singulars are in the same context:

ki-i qa-bi-mi / i-na pa-ni-ka ¹*Mu-ut-^dIŠKUR-mi / in-né-bi-it* ¹*A-ia-ab*
 / \ *hi-iḫ-bé-e ki-i in₄-né-bi-tu / šār* ^{URU}*Pí-ḫi-lì iṣ-tu / pa-ni*
 LÚ.MEŠ *ra-bi-ṣī \ sú-ki-ni / šār-ri EN-šu li-ib-lu-uṭ / šār-ru EN-ia*
li-ib-lu-uṭ / šār-ru EN-ia šum-ma i₁₅-ba-ši / ¹A-ia-ab i-na ^{URU}*Pí-ḫi-lì*
 "How is it said in your presence, 'Mut-Ba^clu has deserted; he has
 hidden Ayyāb.'? How could the king of Peḫel desert from the
 commissioners (overseers) of the king, his lord? May the king,
 my lord, live! May the king, my lord live! If Ayyāb is in Peḫel!"
 (EA-256:4-13).

It is hard to believe that *kī innebitu* reflects the Akkadian subjunctive; the preceding *kī* does not govern a subjunctive. So the *-u* on *innebitu* is apparently the WS imperfect suffix. Since *na²butu* is not transitive, the gloss sign in line 7 can hardly signify anything other than that a Canaanite word follows, viz. *ḫi-iḫ-bé-e* (**hiḫbē²*) "he has hidden."

There is, however, one instance where the 3rd m.pl. seems not to elide the thematic vowel, but the crucial sign in question is broken:

ù uš-ši-^cra LÚ.MEŠ *ma-ša-ar-ta / a-na* ^{URU}*Šu-mu-ra* *ù / a-na*
^{URU}*[I]r-qa-ta šum-ma / in₄-na-b[i-]tu ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ ma[-ša-]ar-ti*
iṣ-tu / ^{URU}Šu-mu[-ra] "and sen^cd garrison troops to Šumur and
 to 'Irqat in case all the garrison troops have fled from Šumur"
 (EA 103:34-39; cf. Moran 1950a:11; 1987b:298; 1992:176).

Two wedges are seen as the beginning of the third sign in *in₄-na-b[i-]tu*. In Schroeder's copy they do resemble the beginning of BI; however, there is still the possibility that they represent the beginning of AB. In the other two plural examples, the thematic vowel is definitely elided, e.g.

a-nu-ma LÚ.MEŠ *ša na-ad-na-ti / a-na ia-si in₄-na-ab-tu gāb-bu*
 "Now the men that you assigned to me have all fled"
 (EA 82:32).

The last plural form also seems to have suffered a misspelling, the second sign being omitted; otherwise, we would have to posit an unlikely form such as **in²abtū*:

*pa-na-nu da-ga-li-ma / [LÚ]¹ KURMi-iš-ri ù in₄-<na>-ab-tu /
 'LUGAL¹.MEŠ^{KUR}Ki-na-aḥ-ni iš-tu pa-n[i-šu] "Formerly, seeing
 a man of Egypt, then the kings of Canaan fled bef[ore him]"
 (EA 109:44-46).*

One possible *-a-* theme form is the following 1st c.s. present-future:

*ù at-¹ta¹ LUGAL GAL / be-li-ia / tu-še-zi-ba-an-ni / ù
 i-na-ba-a-a[t](?) / a-na LUGAL GAL be-li-[ia] "So may you, great
 king, my lord, deliver me that I may escape to the great king,
 my lord" (EA 318:18-22; Artzi 1968:170; in contrast to the
 interpretation by Moran 1987b:542 n. 4; 1992:350 n. 4).*

epēšu / nenpušu. The most striking use of the N stem in the entire Amarna corpus is the idiomatic expression meaning "to join, become aligned with" (Moran 1987a; CAD E:235). The most attention has been directed to the hybrid suffix conjugation forms (Rainey 1973c:250-254; cf. *infra*, pp. 333-337), but there are several prefix conjugation forms. In the following transcriptions, note that the NI sign has been consistently transcribed *né* in the verb forms as befitting the normal Akkadian pattern; the sign NE (Labat No. 173) is never used in the EA texts with the value *ne* (it often does appear with the old value *bī*), so there is no sound reason not to transcribe NI by *né* when grammar is in favor of it. The TI signs serving to represent the prefix have not, however, been rendered *te*₉ because one cannot be sure whether the scribe intended to employ the correct vocalization or whether (more likely) he was simply using a pidgin prefix based on the theme of the 3rd m.s.

A volitive 3rd m.s. example happens to represent the same reflexive nuance as the others, but with a different twist, having a prepositional phrase with UGU as its complement; here the

meaning is "to turn against." Since a ventive is not typical of this verb, it is possible to understand the form as a WS volitive in a result clause after another volitive:

*ù la-a / [yi-i]š-^fte₉¹-ma šâr-ru / [EN-ia] ù yi-né-pu-^fša¹ / [Šu-t]a
UGU-ia "But if the king, [my lord, does] not give heed, then
[Shut]a will turn against me!" (EA 234:30-33; cf. Moran
1987b:460; 1992:293).*

There are two partly broken 3rd m.s. forms with *i-* prefix in a text which avoids the *y-*; the first is probably preterite, the second imperfect:

*ù ki-i i-qa-bu LUGAL a-na mi-ni₇ iš-tap-r[u] / ¹Ri-ib-^dIŠKUR *ṭup-pa
a-na ma-ḥar be-li-š[u] / UGU lu-um-ni ša pa-na-nu-um i-né-p[u-uš]
/ ù a-nu-ma i-na-an-na la i-né-pu-š[u] / ki-šu-ma i-na-an-na a-na
ia-a-ši "But how can the king say, 'Why does Rib-Haddi keep
sending a tablet to his lord concerning an evil which was do[ne]
formerly?' But right now, is not the same thing being do[ne],
even now, unto me?" (EA 106:30-34; cf. Moran 1987b:303 n. 7;
1992:180 n.8; Rainey 1989-90:60a).**

The imperfect 3rd f.s. based on the N preterite theme, with elision of the thematic vowel, illustrates this special nuance of *nenpušu*:

*ù šu[m-ma la-a yi-iš-mu!] / [L]UGAL BE-ia a-na a-wa-te Ì[R-šu] / ù
in₄-né-ep-ša-c-at[>] ^{URU}Gub[-la] / a-na ša-šu ù gâb-bi KUR.ḪÁ
L[UGAL] / a-di ^{KUR}Mi-iš-ri ti-né-ep-šu / a-na LÚ.MEŠ
SA.GAZ.MEŠ "But i[f] the [k]ing, my lord, does not heed the
words of [his] ser[vant], then Byblos will go over to him
(^cAbdi-Ashirta) and all the territories of the k[ing] as far as
Egypt will go over to the ^c*apîrû* men" (EA 88:29-34; Moran
1950a:62, 74; Greenberg 1955:37; Rainey 1973c:252).*

Note that, after *šumma*, the imperfect is called for. Therefore, the verb, *tinnepšu*, cannot be 3rd m.pl. (*contra* Ebeling 1915:1404).

Another 3rd f.s. example, this time with preservation of the thematic vowel, has been interpreted by scholars in the past as the 3rd m.pl.:

ki-na-na ti-iq-bu-na / LÚ.MEŠ₅ha-za-nu-tu₄ ki-na-na / yi-pu-šu a-na ia-ši-nu / ù ti-né-pu-šu ka-li KUR.MEŠ / a-na LÚ.MEŠ GAZ "Thus the city rulers are saying, "Thus he will do to us and all the territories will go over to the 'apîrû men'" (EA 73:29-33; Moran 1950a:62; 1987a; 1987b:248, 249 n. 4; 1992:141, 142 n. 4; Rainey 1973c:251).

The N preterite 3rd f.s. appears in a Byblos text, once for certain and possibly a second time (but in the passive sense) providing that the emendation proposed by Mendenhall can be accepted:

ù an-nu-uš i-na-an-na / iš-tap-pa-ar ʾĪR-A-ši-ir-ta a-na ERÍN.MEŠ / AŠ É.NINIB pu-ḫu-ru-nim-mi ù / ni-ma-qú-ut UGU URUGub-la šum-ma ia-[nu] / LÚ-li ša ú-še₂₀-ze-bu-ʾšīxʾ('ŠE') iš-tu qa-ti-n[u] / ù nu-da-bir₅ LÚ.MEŠ₅ha-za-nu-ta iš-tu / lib-bi KUR.KUR.KI ù ti-né-pu-uš ka-li KUR.KUR.MEŠ.KI / a-na LÚ.MEŠ 'GAZ' ù [k]i-t[u] ti-in-«né-pu-uš»-ma / a-na ka-li KUR.KUR.KI ù pa-aš-ḫu DUMU.MEŠ / ù DUMU.MÍ.MEŠ a-«na» da-ri-ti UD.KAM.MEŠ "And now 'Abdi-Ashirta has written to the troops, 'Assemble in Bīt-Ḥôrôn(?) and let us pounce upon Byblos; because there is no man who who can rescue it from our grasp, and we will exterminate the city rulers from within the territories and all of the territories will go over to the 'apîrû men and a 'treaty' will be «made» for all the territories and the sons and daughters will be at peace forever more'" (EA 74:29-38; Mendenhall 1947a; Rainey 1989-90:58b *contra* Moran 1953:78 n. 4; 1987b:252 n. 7; 1992:144 n. 7).

In the same letter we also find a 3rd m.pl. form built on the Akkadian N stem preterite theme. The form in question has elision of the thematic vowel, but it has the *t-* prefix typical 3rd c.pl. in the WS texts:

ù iq-bi a-na LÚ.MEŠ URU Am-mi-ia du-ku-mi / [E]N-la-ku-nu ù i-ba-ša-tu-nu ki-ma ia-ti-nu / ù pa-aš-ḥa-tu-nu ù ti-né-ep-šu ki-ma / [a-w]a-te^{MEŠ}-šu ù i-ba-aš-šu ki-ma / LÚ.MEŠ GAZ "And he spoke to the men of Ammiya, 'Slay your [I]ord so that you become like us and so that you will be at peace,' and they went over in accordance with his words and they became like the 'apîrû men' (EA 74:25-29; Moran 1950a:31; 1961:64-65; 1987b:250, 252 nn. 7, 8; 1992:143, 144 nn. 7, 8; also Greenberg 1955:34; Rainey 1973c:250).

The N stem imperfect 3rd m.pl., built on the preterite theme, without eliding the thematic vowel, occurs in a Rib-Haddi' letter from Beirut:

ù ti-iq-bu URU.KI al-lu-mi ^l[Ri-ib-ad-di] / a-ši-ib a-na URU.A.PÚ a-ya-mi LÚ-lu / ša a-lik iš-tu KUR.MEŠ Mi-iš-ri a-na maḥ-ri-šu / ù te-né-pu-šu-na a-na ^lA-zi-ri "And the city is saying, 'Behold. [Rib-Haddi] is in Beirut; where is the man who came from Egypt to him?' So they are joining Aziru" (EA 138:90-93; cf. Moran 1987b:366:n. 19; 1992:224 n. 19).

The last form is a 3rd m.pl. jussive/volitive built on the N preterite theme. It concludes a chain of volitional clauses that begins with an imperative:

uš-ši-ra ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭá-ti / ra-ba ù tu-da-bi-ir / a-ia-bi LUGAL iš-tu / lib-bi KUR-šu ù / ti-né-ep-šu ka-li / KUR.KUR.MEŠ a-na šâr-ri "Send a great army and you will exterminate the enemies of the king from within his land and all the territories will go over to the king" (EA 76:38-42; Moran 1950a:62; especially Moran 1987a:210).

malāku. There is one occurrence of this verb where the N stem is possible. The form has been taken to be 3rd m.pl. G (CAD B:71b; M/1:155b) but it seems to make better sense as 1st c.s. Furthermore, the N stem of this verb, expressing "to take counsel, to consider," is more suitable to the context:

ù *i-ma-la-ku ba-li-mì / ur-ru-ud* LUGAL EN-*ia* "But would I consider not serving the king, my lord?" (EA 191:9-10).

Moran (1987b:430; 1992:271) seems to have taken the form as 3rd m.pl. impersonal. Admittedly, the interpretation proposed here assumes a 1st c.s. N stem with WS imperfect suffix (Rainey 1989-90:66; Moran 1992:271). The text as a whole does not have any unequivocal traits of a Canaanized epistle. Nevertheless, the 1st c.s. prefix *i-* is a common feature of the interlanguage and it should not be surprising if it occurs in a letter such as this.

na²arruru. This quadrilateral verb was evidently first discerned by Albright (1934:105; 1943a:12 n. 34). Outside of EA, the verb has subsequently been identified in OB and especially in Mari. The Mari and EA contexts are all military in nature (CAD N/1:7; AHw:694a). Unlike the OB/Mari forms, those from EA show gemination of the *-n-* due to assimilation of the ². The initial vocalic prefix is written either *in-* or *en-*, so the prefix vowel cannot be strictly defined. They will all be represented here as if it were uniformly *i-*.

Of the six examples documented in the Amarna archive, all of them seem to derive from Canaan, though two of the epistles are from ^cAbdi-Ashirta, whose dialect is not strictly that of the other WS texts (cf. Izre²el 1985:380-381) and a third text is so broken as to preclude exact dialectical definition (EA 173). Two letters (EA 256 and EA 366) are WS in their general morphosyntax.

Five of the forms are either certainly or probably 1st c.s. The other is 3rd m.pl. The most broken text has a spelling error, *in-né-ri-ri* (EA 173:3); the context seems to suggest that the form is 1st c.s. (Moran 1987b:413; 1992:259) and the thematic vowel, *-i-* indicates that the theme is preterite. One of ^cAbdi-Ashirta's letters is also badly broken: the form, *in₄-né-ri-ir* (EA 371:25), is presumably also 1st c.s. preterite (Moran 1987b:566; 1992:367). The two examples from the other ^cAbdi-Ashirta letter both refer to the same event. The 1st c.s. independent pronoun assures that both of the verb forms are also 1st c.s.:

[ù in-n]é-ri-ir a-na-ku iš-tu URU^{Ur}[qat^{KI}] "[so] I, myself, [went] to help from 'Ir[qat]" (EA 62:13); ù i-nu-ma in-né-ri-ir a-na-[k]u / iš-tu URU^{Ur}Ir-qat^{KI} ù ak-[š]u-ud-m[i a]-na-ku / i-na URU^{Šu}Šu-mu-ri^{KI} ù ia-nu LÚ.MEŠ / ša aš-bu i-na É.GAL-ši "but when I rushed to help from 'Irqat and I ar[r]ived in Šumur, then there were no men located in its palace" (EA 62:21-24; Izre³el 1985:7*).

One of the apparent 1st c.s. examples was formerly taken as 3rd m.s. (Albright 1943a:35). This context is not particularly easy to interpret. It is obscured by the use of Sumerian logograms in the preceding line. Nevertheless, it is possible to arrive at a satisfactory rendering:

a-di iš-tu / GÁN.BA ¹DI.^dAMAR.UTU / URU^{Ashtar}Aš-tar-ti in₄-né-ri-ir / i-nu-ma na-ak-ru gāb-bi / URU.DIDLI.ĤĀ^{KUR}Ga-ri "Still, from the market place(?) of Silim-Marduk(?) I rushed to the help of Ashtaroth because all the towns of Garu were hostile" (EA 256:19-23; cf. Moran 1987b:484 n. 4; 1992:309-310 n. 3).

The one certain 3rd m.pl. form is written without a consonantal *-y-* prefix and was evidently considered by the scribe to be an Akkadianism. Therefore, he seems to have deemed it necessary to clarify his meaning by adding a pure Canaanite gloss:

ù ¹Sú-ra-ta LÚ URU^{Akka}Akka^{KI} / ù ¹In₄-da!-¹ru¹?-ta LÚ URU^{Ak}Ak-ša-pa / šu-ni-ma in₄-né-ri-ru \ na-az-a-qú / i-na 50 ^{GIŠ}GIGIR.ĤĀ / a-na mu-ḥi-ia "But Surata, the ruler of Acco and Indaruta, the ruler of Achshaph, they (two) hastened to help me (were called out) with fifty chariots" (EA 366:22-26; Moran 1973:51; 1987b:562; 1992:364; Finklestein 1969:33).

The gloss, representing WS *naz^caqū* (Finklestein 1969:33), is itself WS N stem 3rd m.pl. of the suffix conjugation. It is likely, therefore, that the scribe of this letter was using *innerrirū*, without prefixed *-y-*, as if it were a suffix conjugation verb. Note that there is a similar use of *izzibūni*, an Akkadian present serving

syntactically as a prefix conjugation verb, in the same text (EA 366:18).

nabalkutu. This quadriliteral verb appears but once in the WS texts. The form is WS jussive/volitive 3rd m.pl. and refers to a local population that might abandon their allegiance to pharaoh if their town is occupied by the Amurru forces (CAD N/1:17a):

ù [y]i-[*din* LUGAL ERÍN].MEŠ ù / *ni-iš-bat* UR[U.K]I I[*a-a*
ti-il-qé-ši] / ERÍN.MEŠ DUMU.MEŠ ÌR-*Aš-ra-ti a-na* [*ša-šu-nu*] / ù
ti-bal-ki-^ftu¹ LÚ.MEŠ-*ši* "So may [the king g]i[ve troop]s that we
may take the ci[ty] I[est] the troops of the sons of ^cAbdi-Ashirta
[take it] for [themselves] and its people change allegiance"
(EA 138:100-103; Moran 1987b:367 n. 23; 1992:224 n. 23).

This same idiom is attested in the MB royal correspondence:

a-na qa-an-ni KUR / ^f*ku¹-^fuš¹-da-am-ma i ni-ba-al-ki-ta-am-ma* /
[*it-t*]i-*ka i ni-ša-ki-in* "Come to the border of the land that we
may change our allegiance and side [wit]h you" (EA 9:20-22;
CAD N/1:17a; Moran 1987b:81-82 nn. 3-4; 1992:18-19 nn. 4-5;
von Soden 1952b:431).

namāru. The letters from Beirut and Sidon happen to use the N stem from this verb in a particular idiom. One example is based on the present-future theme and the other employs the preterite theme (with elision of the thematic vowel). Both forms have to be 3rd m.pl. even though the subject is feminine dual (the eyes) and neither form has a consonantal prefix. Therefore, it is quite possible that these particular verb forms were considered to represent the suffix conjugation pattern. The two passages in question are:

ù *en-du-um* / [*iš*]-*te-me a-wa-te*^{MEŠ} DUB LUGAL EN-*ia* / ù
yi-iḫ-di ŠĀ-ia ù / [*i*]n₄-*nam-mu-ru* 2 IGI.MEŠ-*ia ma-gal* "And when
[I] heard the words of the tablet of the king, my lord, then my
heart rejoiced and my two eyes brightened" (EA 142:7-10); ù

*i-nu-ma iš-te-mé a-wa-at / LUGAL EN-ia i-nu-ma iš-tap-pár a-na
 ̀R-šu / ù yi-iḫ-di lib-bi-ia ù / yi-[š]a-qí SAG-ia ù in₄-nam-ru / 2
 IGI-ia \ ḫi-na-ia i-na ša-me / a-wa-at LUGAL EN-ia "And when I
 heard the word of the king, my lord, that he wrote to his
 servant, then my heart rejoiced and my head was raised and
 my two eyes brightened upon hearing the word of the king,
 my lord" (EA 144:13-17)*

It should be noted that the G stative of this verb is used in another poetic idiom attested in three of the epistles from southern Canaan (EA 266:12, 15; 292:10, 12; 296:14, 16).

našû. The same text mentioned with the N stem gloss, **naz^caqû* (cf. *supra*, p. 128), has another enigmatic gloss that might also be interpreted as an example of the N stem.

*li-il-ma-ad šar-ru EN-ia / i-nu-ma LÚ SA.GAZ 'ša' / yi-na-aš-ši \
 na-aš-ša-a / i-na KUR.KI.ḪÁ na-da-an / DINGIR-lu₄ ša šar-ri
 EN-ia a-na ia-ši / ù i-du-uk-šu "May the king, my lord, be
 apprised that, as for the ^c*apîru* who rose up (has risen up) in the
 territories, the god of the king, my lord, has delivered to me
 and I have smitten him" (EA 366:11-16; Na³aman 1975:120;
 Rainey 1978b:32-33; Moran 1987b:561-562 and n. 1; 1992:366
 and n. 1).*

It is possible, of course, that the gemination of the š in both or either of these forms is purely graphic. However, there is a good possibility that the scribe intended as the gloss, **našša²a* < **nanša²a*, 3rd m.s. N stem suffix conjugation. If that be the case, then perhaps the verb form being glossed might also be intended for N stem, **yinnašši* 3rd m.s. based on the Akkadian N present-future theme with WS *y-* and -Ø for the past tense. Such a meaning as required by this context is compatible with the N stem of **nš²* in Hebrew. That verb, in both Akkadian and WS, is transitive in the G stem. Although *CAD* (N/2:103a) places this passage under the intransitive G, they also record an instance of the meaning "to rise up against" for the N stem (*CAD* N/2:112a).

The closest attested Hebrew parallel is with the tD stem:

wa² ^adôniyyā^h ben-Ḥaggîṭ miṭnašše² lē^(?)mōr ² ^anî ²emlōk wayya^cas lô rekeb^h upārāšim wah^amiššim ²iš rāšim l²pānā(y)w "And Adonijah the son of Haggith has exalted himself, saying 'I will reign,' and he made for himself a chariot and fifty riders to go before him" (1 Ki. 1:5).

One is also reminded of the Akkadian verb *tebû* and its semantic nuances, "to rise up," and "to rebel" (AHw:1342-1343), especially the participle, *tēbû*, which can designate an "insurgent" (AHw:343b).

paṭāru. Two prefix forms of this verb have an *-i/e-* theme vowel which suggests that they are N stem. Although the G stem is the standard in these texts for expressing the idea of "departing," there are also good Akkadian examples of the N stem carrying this same meaning (AHw:851a-b).

The first relevant Amarna context is this negative admonition:

ù a-[nu-m]a i-na-an-na ša-ap-ru-mi / LÚ.ME[Š] ¹ša¹ URU.Gub[^{ub}]-la a-na ia-ši / la-a-mi ti-¹pa¹.¹te⁶.¹er¹ iš-tu URU.A.PÚ.KI.MEŠ "And n[ow] then men of Byblos have written to me, 'Don't leave Beirut!'" (EA 138:9-11; Moran 1987b:362; 1992:221; cf. Rainey 1975b:419).

The example in the second passage is a WS 3rd m.pl. imperfect in the apodosis of a conditional sentence introduced by *inūma* (Rainey 1992a:181):

i-nu-m[a] / i-ka-ša-da-am KUR.KUR.MEŠ.KI / ù ti⁷-pa-te⁴-ru-¹na¹ LÚ.MEŠ-tu / a-na la-qé KUR.KUR.MEŠ-i-mi / a-na ša-a-šu-nu ù ia-nu-AM / LÚ.MEŠ-li a-na na-ša-ar URU.KI.Gub-li / URU.KI LUGAL EN-ia "If I conquer the territories, then the men will desert to take territories for themselves, and there will be no men to guard Byblos, the city of the king, my lord"

(EA 362:33-37; Rainey 1978b:20-21; Moran 1987b:558 n. 4; 1992:361 n. 4; 1960:pp. 4, 15).

šaqû. It happens that a form from this verb cited above in connection with *namāru* (cf. *supra*, pp. 129-130) is also recognized by *AHw*:1181a as a unique instance of the N stem. The idiom is reminiscent of the similar use of *našû* discussed above. The clause in question, *yi-[š]a-qi SAG-ia* "My head was raised up/elevated" (EA 144:16), deals with a series of past actions. Therefore, this form cannot be Akkadian G present-future.

CHAPTER VII

PREFIX CONJUGATION — D, Dt, Dp

The factitive, or causative stems characterized by gemination of the second radical comprise one of the most intriguing aspects of the verbal system in the Amarna letters from Canaan. This chapter will deal with the D stem and its derivatives, the Akkadian Dt and the WS Dp.

MORPHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

The basic Akkadian patterns of the D stem were reasonably well understood by the Canaanite scribes. There were, nevertheless, a number of factors that led to complications in the morphology. Most of those features can be accounted for as pidgin developments. Only a limited degree of true WS influence can be detected.

CONTAMINATION OF G AND D STEM FORMS.

G PRESENT-FUTURES AS D STEM. Among the complicating phenomena in the analysis of the D stem is the fact that these scribes often seem to have looked upon the Akkadian present future forms as D (noted already by Ebeling 1910:52). It is not always possible, however, to be sure that a particular scribe chose an Akkadian G stem theme with gemination in order to express a D stem nuance. Individual cases will be dealt with in the ensuing discussion.

Ebeling (*loc. cit.*) pointed to the causative precative *li-ba-lu-uṭ-ni* "May he give me life" (EA 198:20) as evidence for confusion between G and D stems. The precative should take the same thematic vowel as the D preterite but here it has the G present-future as its theme. Another case in point would be *lu-ḥa-mu-uṭ* "May (the king) hasten (troops)" (EA 88:40, also to be

completed in line 24; Rainey 1975b:415 n. 173). If they had been proper D stem forms, then both these precatives should have had the *-i-* theme vowel, of course.

Precative forms from outside the Canaanite dialectal sphere suggest that Western Peripheral may have recognized a D stem for *našāru* "to guard, keep." One of them is from an Amurru letter:

¹A-zi-ri LÚÛR-ka / i-na aš-ra-nu la tu-wa-aḫ-ḫe-er-šu / ar-ḫi-iš
uš-še-ra-šu / ù KUR.MEŠ ša LUGAL EN-ni li-na-aš-šár "Aziru is
your servant. Do not delay him there. Send him quickly and let
him protect the lands of the king, our lord" (EA 169:12-15;
Izre²el 1985:248).

The other is from Alalakh:

DINGIR.MEŠ ša AN u KI / li-bal-li-ṭú-ú-šu li-na-ša-ru-šu "May
the gods of heaven and the nether world keep him alive and
protect him" (*Idrimi Stele*, lines 99-100; cf. CAD B:59a; *contra*
Giacumakis 1970:91).

These examples provide the background for a phenomenon observed by Albright and Moran (1950:165-166). They noted the forms of *našāru* in EA 112, namely 3rd m.s. *yi-na-ša-ru-ni* (EA 112:17) versus *yi-na-ší-ru* (EA 112:14), *yi-na-ší-ru-ni* (EA 112:18), *yi-na-ší-ra-ni* (EA 112:13) and *yi-na-ší-ra-an-ni* (EA 112:20) and explained them as follows: "the Can. scribes treated the unfamiliar Acc. *iqattal* as a Can. *pi^cel*" (*loc. cit.*). To those forms may be added the 1st c.s. *i-na-ší-ru* (EA 119:15; 130:49), *i-na-ší-ru-na* (EA 123:32), *i-na-ší-ra* (EA 123:27) and the 3rd m.pl. *ti-na-ší-ru* (EA 130:48). The unusual *-i-* theme in these examples is difficult to explain except as a contamination from the D stem.

Albright and Moran were themselves commenting (*loc. cit.*) on the 3rd m.s. *yi-ša-i-lu* (EA 89:15, 34, 45). If it were not for the 1st c.s. forms from *našāru* cited above, one would be tempted to transcribe *yu-ša-i-lu* and *yu-na-ší-ru*, etc.

PREFIX VOWEL *i*- ON D STEM FORMS. Another phenomenon related to the confusion between G present-futures and D stems verbs is the analogic carry-over of the prefix vowel *i*- to real D stem verbs: 3rd m.s. *i-ba-li-iṭ* (EA 147:9; Tyre), *i-bá-al-^rli¹-iṭ* (EA 152:53; Tyre); *i-ḥa-li-iq* (EA 287:37; Jerusalem), *i-ka-al* (EA 138:130), *yi-ša-i-lu* (EA 89:35, 45), *yi-* / [*i*]š-ši-*ra* (EA 139:30-31; cf. Knudtzon 1915:589 n. g), *yi-iš-ši-ru* (EA 139:34, 36, 38), 2nd m.s. *ti-pa-ṭe₆-er* (EA 138:11; or N stem? Cf. *supra*, p. 131), *ti-ša-i-lu* (EA 89:40); 1st c.s. *i-ba-lu* (EA 326:19), *i-ba-ú* (EA 362:58), *i-r[i]-du* (EA 186:7), *i-ru-du* (EA 250:51, 59), *i-ru-dam* (EA 300:20), *i-wa-ši-ir* (EA 137:8), 3rd m.pl. *ti₇-ba-ú-na* (EA 362:24), *ti-ba-ú-na* (EA 129:29; 362:45), *ti-ba-ú-na-ši* (EA 129:19), *ti-dáb-bi-ru* (EA 138:69), *ti-pa-li-ḥu-na* (EA 105:22), 1st c.pl. *ni-du-bu-ur* (EA 279:20), *ni-wa-aš-ši-ru-šu* (EA 197:18).

It was thought by Ebeling (1910:61-62) and Dhorme (1914:39-41 = 1951:434-436) that these vocalic variations between preformative *u* and *i* vowels reflected the existence of a Canaanite vowel like the vocal shewa in Hebrew. A much better explanation is that given above, namely that the *i* vowel of the Akkadian G stem 3rd m.s., whether *iparras* or *iprus* (also 1st c.pl. *niparras* and *niprus*), has been carried over analogically to some D stem verbs of various persons just as it has been carried over from the G 3rd m.s. to the 1st c.s., 2nd m.s. and 3rd m.pl. suffixes. In other words, this is more likely to have developed as an interlanguage phenomenon rather than as some kind of West Semitic trait.

Of particular interest are the forms of *turru* with *i*- as the preformative vowel. The contexts all require a transitive meaning and the forms are found, not in Canaanized texts, but in letters from Tyre or other non-WS sources: 1st c.s. present-future, *i-ta-ar-ra-aš-šu* (EA 59:20), 3rd m.s. past with *-t-* infix, *it-te-er* (EA 29:126; 148:38; 149:13, 31; Albright 1937:202 n. 3), same plus 1st c.pl. accusative suffix, *i-te-er-ni* (EA 149:12), 3rd m.pl. preterite, *i-it-te-ru-šu* (RS 4.449:12; Virolleaud 1936:23). Note also *i-na-ka-ru* for *ú-na-ka-ru* at Emar (Ikeda 1995:79). One can hardly explain the use of the *i*- prefix in these widely scattered texts as WS vocalization; they are simply confusion with G *iparras* forms.

A word is in order here about the synchronic evidence from Ugarit. A D stem 1st c.s. form such as *amid* (KTU 1.14:II,5),

which must represent **ʷamaʷid-*, indicates that the prefix vowel for first person, at least, was *a*. On the other hand, a PN based on the D participle is documented at Ugarit in the syllabic orthography: *mu-na-ḥi-mu* (for references, cf. Sivan 1984:253). The D participle must have been **munahḥimu*, with the normal *u* vowel. The question remains open concerning the Ugaritic prefix vowel for second and third persons and for the first plural. Did they have *a* like the 1st c.s. or did they have *u* like the participle? The most unlikely possibility in Ugaritic would be an *i* as the prefix vowel of the D (and Š) stems.

AMBIGUOUS ORTHOGRAPHY.

GEMINATED RADICALS. It must always be borne in mind that the ancient scribes who wrote Akkadian did not feel compelled to express gemination in the orthography. This fact had fooled scholars for many years with regard to the Akkadian G stem present-future; older textbooks represented gemination of the second radical of such forms as optional. The D stem forms should have given them a clue. In any case, the Canaanite scribes may express the gemination by use of syllabic signs but they often do not. Reconstruction of the forms (normalization) must always reckon with gemination of the second radical (of the last radical on Babylonian hollow roots, cf. *turru*, *infra*, pp. 154-157) as a morphological feature of D stem verb forms.

PREFIX VOWELS. When the prefix is *Øv-* or *tv-*, the cuneiform signs are pretty unambiguous. The 1st c.s. has the *ú* sign unless the form is one of those with *i-* discussed above. The *tv-* suffixes are almost always written with the *tu* sign; *tù* in this function is confined to the non-WS Aziru letters or the Mitanni correspondence (*tù-bal-la-tá-an-ni* (EA 169:7, *tù-ma-ra-aš*, EA 170:80; with Š stem EA 19:36, 38; 27:2, 4, 33). An exception is a text from Sidon which employs *tú-te-ra-am* (EA 145:26) and *tú-ti-ra-an-ni* (EA 145:10). The most glaring exceptions, however, are those with *ti-* or *ti₇* mentioned in the preceding section above. There the TE has been rendered *ti₇* because of the 1st c.s. forms

with I signs, never with E (= i_{15}). The 1st c.pl. forms have the NU sign.

The 3rd m.s. forms present a different problem. Only in cases such as *yu-uš-ši-ra* (EA 271:18 *et al*) does the orthography confirm that the PI sign is to be read *yu*. Most D stem forms, however, do not have an initial closed syllable; therefore, the orthography cannot distinguish the vowel. Note, e.g. *PI-ba-li-iṭ* (EA 74:55; 85:18) where one can hardly deny that the proper reading is *yu-ba-li-iṭ* on the analogy of *nu-ba-li-iṭ* (EA 85:38), *nu-bal-li-iṭ* (EA 68:28) and *tu-ba-li-ṭú-na* (EA 114:56): the aberrant *i-ba-li-iṭ* (EA 147:9) and *i-bá-al-li-iṭ* (EA 152:53) are from Tyre. The overwhelming majority of D stem prefix forms with consonantal prefixes have a *u* vowel; this is exactly what would be expected on comparative grounds (Akkadian, Arabic). Therefore, it is with reasonable assurance that D forms are transcribed *yu-ra-du* (EA 193:17), *yu-wa-ši-ru* (EA 112:37), etc.

THEMATIC VOWEL. The preferred thematic vowels will be discussed under the individual verbs. One particular detail should be pointed out here, viz. the cases where the final radical is *r*. These often reveal a shift of $i > e$ (GAG:12, §9h) when the *r* closes the syllable. The evidence in the Amarna texts is equivocal. Forms with a closed final syllable are relatively rare in the prefix conjugation. One finds a few instances like 1st c.s. preterite *ú-wa-ši-ir* (EA 333:24) which may be compared with 1st c.s. preterite with infix -*t*- (or lexical Dt?) *ut-te-er* (EA 189:r. 15; note the 3rd m.s. S stem *yu-šu-te-er* EA 292:37). Among the imperatives with -Ø suffix, there is *uš-še-er* (EA 35:17, 41; 162:53; Alashia and Egypt only) but more often *uš-ši-ir* (EA 34:35; 82:28; 120:36; 121:42; Alashia but also Byblos). The forms with vocalic suffixes show the variants such as *yu-wa-še-ru* (EA 255:17) and *yu-wa-ši-ru* (EA 112:37). The variation between the *i* and the *e* is probably nothing but a "remembrance" of the Babylonian rule (*uwaššer* rather than *uwaššir*). What this seems to mean is that a few scribes had faithfully learned the correct Akkadian form, *uwaššer*, and had used it as their theme for verbal forms with Canaanite prefixes and suffixes. Other scribes, evidently working on the

analogy with most D stem forms, which have an *i* theme, simply used syllabic signs having an *i* vowel, regardless of the final *r*.

A few cases such as *yu-šar-mi* (EA 131:32) where it might be a more accurate representation of the scribe's intention to read with *šir*, instead of *šar* because of the tense factor will be discussed in their proper place (e.g. the 3rd m.s. precative *li-wa-aš-šir*, EA 149:17, 76, from Tyre).

D STEM VERBS

The following discussion will cover the D stem verbs used by the Canaanite scribes according to three semantic categories: factitive, causative and intensive. Note will be taken of the themes chosen by the scribes upon which they imposed their West Semitic modal and tense morphemes. Of particular interest is their choice of thematic vowel. It will be seen that the *i* theme predominates for all tenses although some *a* theme forms do occur. All comparative evidence points to an *i* theme for the WS dialects. The correspondence between the Akkadian D preterite (and precative) theme and the basic D theme in WS did not escape the notice of the Canaanite authors.

The verbs will be cited according to the D infinitival form unless the D stem usage is rare; in such cases, the G stem infinitive will precede that of the D stem

FACTITIVE VERBS.

bulluṭu. With the exception of two prefix forms (3rd m.s. EA 105:83; 1st c.s. EA 123:26), and five precatives (3rd m.s. in oaths: EA 85:39, 86; 256:10, 11; 289:37), the overwhelming majority of G stem forms from this verb are in the stative (Ebeling 1915:1388). The G stem means "to be alive, to live, to have life, to have sustenance." The D stem forms express a factitive nuance, "to give life, to give sustenance." The most frequent D stem idiom in the Amarna texts is that of furnishing sustenance to someone in the form of food supplies (which are called *balāṭu*, CAD B:52a, a substantival use of the G infinitive):

li-iš-mé šar-ru a-wa-te ÌR-šu / ù ia-di-na ba-la-ṭá ÌR-šu / ù yu-ba-li-iṭ ÌR-šu "May the king heed the words of his servant and may he grant the sustenance for his servant and may he supply his servant" (EA 74:53-55); *yi-iš-mé šar-ru EN-li a-wa-te / ÌR ki-ti-šu ù yu-wa-ši-ra / ŠE.IM.ĤÁ i-na lib-bi GÍŠMÁ ù yu-ba-li-iṭ / ÌR-šu* "May the king, my lord, heed the words of his faithful servant and may he send grain in a ship that he may sustain his servant" (EA 85:16-19).

Note the jussives with *i* theme vowel. The two documented forms with *a* theme happen to be written ideographically with the appropriate phonetic complements: 3rd m.s. *yu-TIL.LA-aṭ-šu-nu* (EA 94:66), *TE.LA-aṭ-šu-nu-ma* (EA 94:69; cf. *supra*, pp. 117-118).

In some contexts, namely those with 1st c.pl., the best rendering would be "to obtain supplies," although one might think of "to furnish supplies":

i-na LÚMAŠÍM šar-ri / ša i-šu-ú i-na URUŠu-mu-ur / ba-la-ṭá-at URUGub-la / a-nu-um-ma Pa-ḥa-am[n]a-ta / LÚMAŠÍM LUGAL ša i[-n]a URUŠu-mu-ur^{KI} i-[d]e-mì / pu-uš-qa-am \ ma-gal! / ša UGU URUGub-la / iš-tu KUR^Ia-ri-im-mu-ta / nu-ba-li-iṭ "By the commissioner whom he has in Šumur, Byblos is supplied. Now Paḥam[n]ata, the king's commissioner in Šumur, knows the great pressure on Byblos; from the land of Yarimmuta we get supplies" (EA 68:19-28; Moran 1950a:146; cf. 1987b:243 n. 3; 1992:138 n. 3); *li-[i]d-mì-iq i-na pa-ni / šar-ri EN-ia ù yu-da-na₇ / ŠE.IM.ĤÁ mu-ú-ša KUR^Ia-ri-mu-ta / ša-a yu-da-^Inu¹ pa-na-nu i-na URUŠu-mu-ra / [y]u-da-na₇ [i]-na-na i-na URUGub-la / [ù] nu-ba-li-iṭ a-di ti-š[a-i!-l]u! / [a-n]a URU-li-ka* "May it please the king, my lord, that grain be given, the produce of Yarimmuta; that which was being supplied formerly in Šumur, may it be supplied [n]ow in Byblos [that] we may get supplies until you i[n]vestiga[te](!) [concerni]ng your city" (EA 85:33-39; Moran 1950a:158; 1987b:271 n. 4; 1992:157 n. 6; CAD B:61; M/2:249b).

One scribe seems to have been confused by this idiom and almost produced a hybrid G/D form:

[š]a-ni-tam qí-ba-mi a-na [LUGAL] / ù yu-da-na a-n[a^{URU}Gub-la] / mu-ú-ša ša^{KUR}Ia-r[í!-mu-ta] / ki-ma na-da-ni-šu [pa-na-nu] / a-na^{URU}Šu-mu-ra [ù] / ni-ub-lu-uṭ a-di y[i-ša-i-lu] / šār-ru a-na URU-šu "[Fu]rthermore, speak to [the king] that the produce of Yar[imuta] be given t[o Byblos] as it was given [formerly] to Šumur [that] we may be sustained until the king in[quires] concerning his city" (EA 86:31-37; Youngblood 1961:284, 291).

Note the same usage with the 3rd m.pl.:

mi-lik a-na ÌR ki-ti-k[a] p[a-n]a-nu / iš-tu^{KUR}Ia-ri-mu-ta / tu-ba-li-ṭú-na LÚ.MEŠ / hu-up-ši-ia "Take thought for yo[ur] faithful servant; f[orm]erly, from the land of Yarimuta my yeoman farmers got supplies" (EA 114:54-57; following Moran 1950a:44; 1987b:316-317; 1992:188-189).

Actually, the verb form, *tuballitūna*, could have an indefinite subject, "they," with the yeoman farmers as the object, i.e. "they were supplying my yeoman farmers".

The two Tyrian 3rd m.s. forms with *i* prefix (cf. *supra*, p. 137) seem to express a more abstract concept based on Egyptian royal ideology, viz. that of "infusing life." It is particularly clear in one of the poetic passages where pharaoh is described as:

ša i-ba-li-iṭ i-na še-ḫi-šu DÙG.GA "who gives life by his sweet breath" (EA 147:9; Albright 1937:198 nn. 6, 12).

The second example, *i-bá-al[-l]i-iṭ* (EA 152:53), is in an obscure but apparently similar, context. One might debate whether this idiom should be viewed as factitive, or whether it actually should be classified in the category of causatives.

bu²²û. The idea of "making a search" is the basic meaning of this verb, the meanings "to wish, to ask (also demand), to intend" being especially typical of peripheral Akkadian (*CAD* B:363-364). With only two exceptions (*ú-ba-ú* EA 88:22; *ú-ba-a-šu-nu* EA 96:21), the 3rd m.s. forms have consonantal *y*-

prefixes. The 3rd m.pl. forms usually have *tu-* as the prefix but one scribe, the author of EA 129 and EA 362, uses *ti-* or *ti₇*. One Jerusalem example follows the purely Akkadian pattern typical of that scribe, viz. *ú-ba-á²-ú* (EA 287:35). The Jerusalem spelling is matched by three other texts in the use of a syllabic sign to represent the geminated second radical, namely 3rd m.s. *yu-ba-á²-ú* (EA 244:43; 250:56) and 3rd m.pl. *tu-¹bi¹-¹u⁵¹-na* (EA 250:10), which latter is unique in reflecting an *i/e* vowel in the second syllable. It is like an MB form (cf. 2nd m.s. *tu-bi-²i-i-ma* EA 4:15, 1st c.s. *ú-bi-²u-ú* BE 17 23:30). Elsewhere, the geminated second consonant is expressed graphically only as a syllable boundary between vowels. All of the Canaanized forms are in the imperfect tense.

The particular nuance or aspect of "seeking" is fairly broad. The thing being sought may be represented by an accusative pronominal suffix. The most basic semantic nuance (in more classical Akkadian also) is the simple process of looking for something:

a-šar i-ba-ša-at / ši-pí-ir-ti LUGAL EN-ia / ša-ri TIL.LA-ia ù ú-ba-[ú-n]a-ši / ù uš-ši-ru-na-ši / a-na LUGAL EN-ia ša-ri TIL.LA-ia "Wherever the request of the king, my lord, the breath of my life, is located, then I wi[ll se]lek it and I will send it to the king, my lord, the breath of my life" (EA 143:13-17; cf, also EA 96:19-22).

One may also be seeking someone for the purpose of doing harm to him:

DUMU.M[EŠ] / ^{LÚ}ša-ri šar-ri / *tu-ba-ú-na-nu* "The son[s] of the king's rebel are after us" (EA 100:15-17); *ù / a-na-ku URU.MEŠ-ia a-na ¹A-zi-ri / ù ia-ti yu-ba-ú* "But as for me, Aziru has my towns and he is after me" (EA 125:36-38).

The object of the search may be expressed by a prepositional phrase as complement to the verb. Various semantic nuances are possible:

šu-nu ki-ma / UR.GI₇ *ù ia-nu* / *ša-a yu-ba-ú ar-ki-šu-nu* "They are like dog(s) but there is no one to investigate them" (EA 130:33-35; contrast Moran 1987b:348; 1992:212); *ù yi-de-mi šār-ri* EN-ia *i-nu-ma* / *ma-ni* UD.KA[M.ME]Š *tu-¹bé¹-¹u₅¹-na* UGU-ia / 2 DUMU *La-ab-a-ya* "May the king, my lord, be apprised that for many days the two sons of Lab²ayu have been after me (pressuring me)" (EA 250:9-11).

Another nuance is that of making a demand for something:

yi-de LUGAL *be-li* / *ip-ši ša yi-pu-šu-ni* / ¹*Ia-an-ḥa-mu* / *iš-tu a-šé-ia* / [i]š-tu *mu-ḥi* LUGAL EN-ia / [i]-*nu-ma yu-ba-[ú]* / 2 *li-im* -KÛ.BABBĀR / *iš-tu qa-ti-ia* "May the king be apprised of the things which Yanḥamu is doing to me since my leaving the presence of the king, my lord, viz. that he is demanding two thousand (shekels of) silver from me" (EA 270:9-16).

On the other hand, one may be seeking in one's heart, i.e. desiring, something:

ša-ni-tam ú-ul ti-i-de / *at-ta* KUR *A-mur-ri ur-ra* / *mu-ša tu-ba-ú-na* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti* "Furthermore, don't you know the land of Amurru? Day and night, they are longing for the regular army" (EA 82:47-49);

or some activity (i.e. to do some deed), which itself can be either of a positive or a negative nature, of which the following examples provide an interesting contrast:

URU*Ir-qa-ta tu-b[a-ú]* / *ki-ta a-na šār-r[i]*] "Iṣqata des[ires] loyalty to the king" (EA 100:18-19); *ù ú-ba-á²-ú ar-na kab-ta* GAL "And they sought (to commit) a very serious crime" (EA 287:35; Akkadian preterite from Jerusalem); *ù ar-na a[r-na-ma]* / [t]*u-ba-ú-na* "And they are seeking (to commit) crime upon cr[ime]" (EA 109:24-25; for the translation, cf. Moran 1987n:308; 1992:182).

Both positive and negative are contrasted in the following highly rhetorical passage:

[šum-m]a LÚ ša-a yu-ba-ú / [l]um-na a-n[a] 'EN¹[-š]u šum-ma du-na du-na-ma / 'ú¹-ba-ú a-na-ku [a-n]a EN-ia "[Wheth]er (I am) a man who seeks evil for [hi]s lord, or whether it is strength upon strength that I seek [fo]r my lord" (EA 109:53-55).

This idiom is not confined to the Canaanized texts from Canaan. It is well known in official legal documents of the Hittite empire (CAD B:364):

ma-an-nu-me-e a-ma-ta / mi-im-ma ša-bur-ta ù le-mut-ta a-na muḥ-[ḫi] ¹Pí-i]a-ši-il-li la-a 'ú¹-bá-²a-a "Nobody will seek any malicious or evil thing agai[nst Piy]ashilli" (KBo 1 1:30-31); šum-ma a-na ¹ZAG.ŠEŠ-na lu-ú a-na DUMU-šu DUMU.DUMU-šu ma-am-ma ma-ši-ik-ta ú-ba-²a-a a-na LUGAL KUR URU Ḫa-at-ti / \ ù a-na DUMU.MEŠ KUR URU Ḫa-at-ti LÚKÚR-šu-nu šu-ú-ut "If anyone plots evil against Pendeshena or against his son or his grandson, he is the enemy of the king of Khatti and of the people of Khatti" (KBo 1 8:32-33); ša m[a-ši-i]k-ta ú-ba-²a-a "who seeks evil" (NBC 3934: r. 5'; Goetze 1947:243; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:*48; from Egypt); a-na muḥ-ḫi ¹A-mis-tam-ri / ma-ru-uš SAG.DU-šu ub-ta-²i-i "she sought personal harm to 'Amistamru" (RS 17.159:6-7; Nougayrol 1956:126).

An important syntagma with *bu²²ú* is its government of an infinitive as direct object (cf. *infra*, pp. 391-393). Such constructions are apparently unique to the Amarna texts from Canaan although the government of a verb by means of a prepositional phrase as adverbial complement is known elsewhere in Akkadian dialects, especially from peripheral areas.

When the infinitive is serving as the direct object, it usually follows its governing verb directly and this most probably reflects WS syntax. There is, however, one instance in which it is fronted and is given special emphasis by the addition of enclitic *-ma*:

ù LÚ.MEŠ / *ḥu-^cup>-ši-ia / pa-ṭá-ra-ma tu-ba-ú-na* "And as for my ye[om]en farmers, it is to desert that they desire" (EA 114:21-22).

Like the passage cited above, the following infinitives also have as their subject the subject of the governing verb, viz. "to go," and "to do":

ù *yu-ba-ù / a-la-k[a₁₃] a-di* URUGub-la "And he seeks to com[e] as far as Byblos" (EA 85:52-53).

ù *ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ ḥa-za-nu-te tu-ba-ú-na / i-pé-eš an-nu-tu₄* (sic!) *a-na* ḪR-A-ši-ir-ta "And all the city rulers desire to do this to °Abdi-Ashirta" (EA 73:23-25; cf. also EA 79:23-25; 129:29).

Numerous texts employ a hybrid or WS infinitive form (probably modeled on the WS pattern) from *leqû*, which in turn takes an objective genitive:

2 URU.KI.MEŠ *ša ir-ti-ḥu a-na [ia-ši] / ù tu-ba-ú-na la-qa-šu[-nu] / iš-tu qa-at šār-ri* "As for the two towns that remain to me, now they are seeking to take th[em]" (EA 79:27-29; 129:18-19; cf. also EA 76:10, 12-13, 15-16; 78:12; 81:10; 91:13, 22-23).

The object of the infinitive may also take the accusative case, in which instance it may be fronted, even preceding the main verb for emphasis:

a-nu-ma la-qû URU^Ull-la-sà ù / URU^Şu-mu-ra *tu-ba-ù-na la-qa* "Now they have taken Ullasa and it is Şumur they're trying to take!" (EA 105:23-24)

In parallel semantic contexts, the verb *şabātu* may also fulfill this function:

ù *a-nu-ma / ti₇-ba-ú-na şa-bat* URU.MEŠ Gub-li "And now they are seeking to seize the towns of Byblos" (EA 362:23-24).

The following context was probably meant to contain the same construction:

šum-ma-mí / i-ia-nu pa-ni-ma / ša-nu-taš i-na ¹*La-ab-a-ya / ša!*(A)-*ba-at* ^{URU}*Ma-gid₆-da*[^{KI}] / *yu-ba-á²-ú* "since Lab²ayu has no other intention; it is the seizure of Megiddo that he's seeking" (EA 244:38-43; Moran 1987b:469 n. 6; 1992:469 n. 6).

By contrast, in the syntagmas with the verb (*w*)*ašû* as object, the infinitives have a subject different from that of their governing verb:

ù gáb-bi LÚ.MEŠ *ha-za-nu-ti₇ / la-a ra-i-mu i-nu-ma / tu-šú* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ťá-tu / i-nu-ma pa-ši-iḫ a-na šu-nu / ù a-na-ku i-ba-ú a-šé-ši / i-nu-ma ma-ri-iš <a-na> ia-a-ši* "But all the city rulers are unhappy that the army might come out because it is tranquil for them, but I seek its coming forth because it is bitter <for> me" (EA 362:54-59); [*ù y*]i-*de* LUGAL EN-*ia* / [*i-nu-ma*] ^{KUR}*A-mur-ri ur-ra / [mu-ša] tu-ba-ú a-ša pí-ťá-ti* "[but] the king, my lord, should know [that] Amurru seek<s> day and night the coming forth of the army" (EA 70:24-26; Rainey 1974:302; Moran 1987b:246 n. 4; 1992:140 n. 4).

The infinitive may be subordinated in an adverbial complement dependent on the preposition *ana* as in these two instances:

a-nu-ma gáb-bi / ¹LUGAL¹.¹ḪA¹ ša LUGAL ERÍN.MEŠ Ḫur-ri / [t]u-[b]a-ú-ni₇ KUR.ḪÁ / a-na ha-ba-lí iš-t[u] / [Š]U-ia ù ŠU L¹[¹MAŠKÍM] / [š]a LUGAL EN-[ia] "Now, all the kings of the king of the Hurrian army [a]re [se]eking to snatch the territories from my [han]d and the hand [o]f the [com]missioner] / [o]f the king, my lord" (EA 60:13-18; *contra* Moran 1987b:234 n. 5; 1992:132 n. 5); UD-*ma a*[*n*]-*nu-um a-na ḫal-li-iq / KUR LUGAL EN-ia yu-ba-á²-ú* ¹*Mil¹-¹ki¹-¹li¹* "Today, Milkilu is seeking to cause the loss of the territory of the king, my lord" (EA 250:55-56; Campbell 1965:204).

In the last example, the object of the desiring is expressed by an adverb that refers to the topic discussed in the previous lines, viz. that the writer of the letter be allowed to travel to pharaoh's court:

a-nu-ma ki-a-ma ú-ba-ú ur-ra / mu-š[a "Now, it is thus that I am longing for day and night" (EA 74:64-65).

dubbubu. The only D stem example is in the suffix conjugation (cf. *infra*, p. 309).

dubburu. Although OB spellings reflect *duppuru*, CAD D:186-188 recognizes the existence of *dubburu*, especially in EA; AHw:1380 wrongly assumes *ṭuppuru* (Moran 1981). All of the EA examples come from Canaan. The meaning must be "to expel, to exterminate." Rib-Haddi complains about his treacherous brother:

*ù a-m[ur-mi] / LÚ-lu ar-nu a-[n]a na-[d]a-na[-ni] a-n[a] / >a-na<
 ¹A-zi-ri y[i-p]u-[u]š ip-ša G[AL] / ù la-qi <NÍG>.GA ù
 y[u-]dab[-b]i-[r]a[-n]i "And be[hold], as for (that) rebellious man,
 in order to pay Aziru, he committed a great crime and took the
 <treasure and expelled [m]e" (EA 138:103-106; Moran
 1987b:364, 367 nn. 24-25; 1992:222, 224 nn. 24-25).*

The form is 3rd m.s. preterite with 1st c.s. accusative suffix attached by means of the ventive. The 3rd f.s. in the next example could either be ventive or volitive (which are identical in the orthography); the context would call for a jussive or a volitive following the imperative:

*i-na UD.KAM.MEŠ / [an-nu]-ti uš-ši-ra ERÍN.MEŠ [pí-tá-ti] / [ù
 tu-]da-bi-ra-šu i[š-tu] / [KUR A-mur-]ri "At [thi]s time, send
 [regular] troops [that they may] expel him f[rom Amur]ru"
 (EA 85:79-83; for the temporal adverbial expression, cf. Moran
 1950a:158; 1987b:270; 1992:157; Greenberg 1955:37; Youngblood
 1961:281).*

A similar context lacks the *-a* suffix:

uš-ši-ra ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti* / *ra-ba* ù *tu-da-bi-ir* / *a-ia-bi* LUGAL
iš-tu / *lib-bi* KUR-šu "Send a large army and it will expel the
king's enemies from his land" (EA 76:38-41).

The form is obviously the WS jussive built on the Akkadian preterite theme.

Again, in the following example, one cannot say whether the 1st c.s. form has the ventive or the WS volitive suffix. A jussive or volitive would be perfectly natural in the apodosis (Moran 1950a:73-74, 102-103), especially with an ideal, hypothetical case such as this:

i-nu-ma 1 *ḥa-za-nu* / *lib-bu-šu* *it-ti* *lib-bi-ia* / ù *ú-dab-bi-ra*
¹İR-A-ši-ir-ta / *iš-tu* KUR A-mur-ri "If one city ruler were of the
same mind with me, then I would expel 'Abdi-Ashirta from
Amurru" (EA 85:66-69; Greenberg 1955:37; Moran 1950a:102).

The one real 3rd m.pl. form (*contra* Ebeling 1915:1394-1395) is a preterite. It requires the full context to be properly understood:

ù *ti-mu-ru* URU.¹KI ¹i¹-nu-m[a] ERÍN.MEŠ *ša-nu* \ *a-ša-bu* (sic!)/
a-na URU.KI ù *t[i-m]a-ga-r[u]* / *⟨a-na⟩ i-re-bi-š-u* (sic!) *a-na*
U[RU¹.KI ù *t[i-]iq-bu* / *a-na ša-a-su a[l]-lu-ú-mi* BA.UG₅ /
be(!)-èl-nu ki-i ta-aq-bu mi-it / ¹Ri-ib-ad-di *ki-ka-n[u]* *iš-tu* /
ŠU.MEŠ^{qa-ti-š[u]} *la-a-mi [ia-a]š-pu-ra* / *a-na* KUR.MEŠ *Mi-iš-ri* ù
yi-i[l]-qa-nu / *qa-du* DUMU.MEŠ-nu ù *ti[-da]b-bi-ru* / ERÍN.MEŠ
¹A-zi-ri *iš-t[u]* URU.KI "So the city saw that another army was
situated (sic!) against the city and they agreed ⟨to its⟩ entering
the city and they said to him, 'Behold, our lord is dead? How
can you say, "Rib-Haddi is dead!" (Those) like us are free from
his control? May he not [wr]ite to the lands of Egypt that he
may capture us with ou[r] children!' So they expelled the army
of Aziru from the city" (EA 138:60-70; Moran 1987b:363;
1992:222; Rainey 1989-90:63).

Two forms of the 1st c.pl. are attested. One of them, the jussive *nu-da-bir*₅, is cited *supra*, p. 125. The other is a strange hybrid; the scribe seems to have confused the Akkadian G present-future with the D but then he may have gotten flustered and hypercorrected when he tried to make up for his initial mistake:

ù l[u]-ú ni-zi[-i]z / UGU-šu-nu ù lu-[ú] / ni-du-bu-ur / LÚ.MEŠ
 ša-ru-ta / iš-tu KUR šār-ri / EN-ia "And let us oppose them and
 let us drive the rebellious men from the land of the king, my
 lord" (EA 279:18-23).

qubbulu. *CAD*, following an oral suggestion by A. Horowitz that was accepted by Moran (1975a:148), lists this D stem verb for EA 252:18 with the meaning "to fight" (*CAD* Q:292b). Albright's equation was with Hebrew *qibbēl*, "to accept, receive" (Albright 1943b:31 n. 16) but *qubbulu*, "to receive," is very late in Akkadian (only NB; *CAD* Q:191a-b). Though the text has been cited previously in this work (cf. *supra*, pp. 5, 65, 78), it will be unnecessary to repeat it here. It seems more appropriate to see here the verb *kapālu* (*qapālu*) "to curl up" (transitive and intransitive; *CAD* K:174-175; Rainey 1989-90:68b-69a).

urrudu. The verb *arādu/urrudu* "to serve," a denominative from (*w*)*ardu* "slave" (cf. *infra*, pp. 259, 378), is exclusive to the EA texts from Canaan (*CAD* A/2:220). In spite of six examples where the infinitive is formed in the G stem pattern, *a-ra-ad* LUGAL (EA 144:32; also EA 112:24; 118:40; 119:43), *a-ra-di-ka* (EA 89:17; 114:43), the finite forms are all evidently D stem. The theme vowel is *-a-* with four exceptions. The 1st c.s. forms such as the jussive ¹ur¹-¹ra¹-¹ad¹ (EA 84:30), the apparent volitive *ur-ra-da* (EA 294:33) and the imperfect *ú-ra-du-šu* (EA 257:18) are representative of the most common pattern. Thus 3rd f.s. [t]u-ra-du-šu (EA 257:20) and 3rd m.s. *yu-ra-ad* (EA 207:7), *yu-ra-du* (EA 193:7), *yu-ra-du-ka* (EA 114:66) and *ú-ra-ad-šu* (EA 147:42; from Tyre) follow the same pattern. Four variant forms show that this denominative was not a standard construction: *i-ru-du*

(EA 250:51, 59), *i-ru-da-am* (EA 300:20; cf. *infra*, p. 259) and *i-ri-du* (EA 186:7) plus the more widely documented *ur-ru-du* (EA 189:r. 21, 24; 197:22; 241:11; 264:24; 295:9). These latter are obviously imitations of the D infinitive, *ur-ru-ud* LUGAL (EA 191:10; 253:28; and EA 189: r. 17); note also *ur-ra-di* (EA 294:20).

CAUSATIVE VERBS.

This category includes verbs with an intransitive G stem. The D stem is employed in a transitive, or causative meaning.

hulluqu. Only four D stem prefix forms are attested for this verb although the G stem stative and prefix conjugations are fairly frequent (given the nature of the troubles described in so many of the letters). The object of all these forms is always a place or geographical/political entity and the meaning is not necessarily literally "to destroy," but "to cause to be lost (from effective Egyptian political control)" (Moran 1987b:289 n. 1; 1992:170 n. 1; Greenberg 1955:44; cf. also the remarks of Campbell 1965:203 n. 20).

The Jerusalem scribe uses the 3rd m.s. Akkadian G present future as a causative. Since he always uses the Akkadian present-future for present-future and the suffix forms for the past tense, it would seem that he is doing the same here. A present meaning suits this particular context admirably, though perhaps the past tense could not be entirely ruled out if we wish to take this verb as a hybrid D preterite:

U-li-mil-ku / i-ḫal-li-iq gāb-bi KUR šār-ri "Ilimilku (sic! = Milkilu) is destroying all the territory of the king" (EA 286:36-37; Rainey 1978c:142).

A real 3rd m.s. D stem preterite (without *y-* prefix) appears alongside a 2nd m.s. preterite:

[*la*]-*a tu-ḫal-li-iq* / [KUR.MEŠ LUGAL] 'ú¹-*ḫal-li-iq* / [KUR.MEŠ LUGAL] / [I]R-A-*ši-ir-ta* "You did [no]t destroy [the territory

of the king]; [°Abdi-Ashirta] destroyed [the territory of the king]" (EA 97:9-12; Moran 1987b:289 n. 1; 1992:170 n. 1).

The last form is 3rd m.s. WS imperfect built on the Akkadian D preterite theme. It represents a present tense contrast to a D stem prefix form in the previous clause (*contra* Gevirtz 1973a:100-101):

ù a-mur ¹*I-ta-at-ka-ma* / *hu-li-iq* KUR *Qi-is-sà u an-nu-ú* / ¹*Ar-za-wu-ya qa-du* ¹*Bi-ri-da-aš-wa* / *yu-ḥa-li-qú* KUR *A-pí* "Behold, Itatama (sic! = Etakama) caused the loss of the land of Kedesh and lo, Arzawuya, with Biridashwa, is causing the loss of the land of Api" (EA 197:31-34; Rainey 1975b:418).

ḥummuṭu. The D stem of this verb is exclusive to the Amarna texts from Canaan. The MA passages cited by CAD Ḥ:63 have been shown by *AHw*:316b-317a to belong to the D stem of *ḥamāṭu* B, "to burn (trans.), to fire (vessels)." Three examples (including an imperative, EA 102:29) have an *-a* suffix which could be volitive or ventive. All of the attested forms are injunctives.

In three instances(including two precatives, EA 88:24, 40; Rainey 1975b:415), the verb takes as its direct object the infantry (and chariotry):

ù yu-ḥa-mi-ṭa be-li / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ṭa*₅ "So may my lord hasten the regular army" (EA 362:40-41).

However, there are three other examples (including the one imperative) where this verb governs an infinitive as direct object:

yu-ḥa-mi-iṭ be-li / *uš-šar* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ṭi ki-ma* / *ar-ḥi-iš* "May the king hasten to send (or: hasten the sending of) the regular army quickly" (EA 362:7-8; also EA 129:78-79); *šá-ni-tam* / *ši-me-e ia-ši hu-mi-ṭa*₅ *ki-ma* / *ar-ḥi-iš ka-ša-da* "Furthermore, listen to me, hasten quickly to come" (EA 102:28-30; cf. *infra*, pp. 396-397).

kubbudu. The Mitanni letters use the D stem of this root numerous times, but there is only one occurrence of a prefix

verbal form in the WS texts. It is a gloss on the Sumerian logogram DUGUD and certainly must reflect the cognate Canaanite verb (Böhl 1909:83, §37m; Sivan 1984:177). It is 3rd m.s. D preterite:

ša-ni-tam mi-na-am-mi ep-ša-ku-mi / a-na šār-ri EN-ia / i-nu-ma SIG-ia \ ya-qí-íl-li-ni / ù DUGUD \ yu-ka-bi-id / ŠEŠ.HÁ-ia šé-eh-ru-ta₅ "Furthermore, what have I done to the king, my lord, that he should have belittled me and honored my junior colleagues?" (EA 245:36-40)

kullu. One example of this verb is found in a Rib-Haddi letter from Beirut. Since the scribe was uncertain that his form would be properly understood, he glossed it with a Canaanite word:

a-na URU-ia ŠE[.IM] / i-ka-al \ ḥa-ší-ri "For (= from?) the city, he is holding (gloss: detained) the grain" (EA 138:129-130).

This is evidently a misspelling of *ukāl*, which often has a timeless, or stative tense function (GAG:102, §78b). The gloss may be a stative participle, **asīrī*, with *hireq compaginis* (Moran 1961:60, 69 n. 52). Since there is no G stem for *kullu*, one must either posit that the scribe intended a D or else that he was constructing his own hypercorrected G form and using it as a stative. In fact, the gloss and the absence of a *y-* prefix on *i-ka-al* may support this view. Moran (1987b:364; 1992:223) renders "on retient," "is held back." The gloss also gives credence to the idea that a form without a consonantal prefix may actually be a calque on a Canaanite participle or stative of the suffix conjugation.

lamādu, *lummudu*. The G stem prefix forms of this verb with their "stative" meaning are well known. Only two D causatives are attested in the Amarna archive, one is in an epistle from Egypt (EA-162:30; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:175) and the other is in a difficult context from another letter that was written in Canaan:

ù *yu-la-mi-dá* / LUGAL *be-li* ERÍN.MEŠ-šu ᵍ[^lŠGIGIR]-šu *a-na*
ia-š[i-i]a "And may the king, my lord, order his infantry (and)
 his [chariotry] to me" (EA 272:23-25).

The awkwardness of all translations for this passage (*CAD* L:58a; Moran 1987b:496; 1992:317) shows that the nuance in this context is not easy to reconcile with the general usage of this verb in the D stem, viz. "to instruct." In fact, Bezold and Budge indicate that the *la* sign is damaged. Perhaps it is an error for *ḥa*; the resulting emendation would give *yu-ḥa-mi-dá*, which is exactly the form used elsewhere in similar contexts (cf. above)! It also would make better sense in the present context (Rainey 1989-90:70a).

magāru, *mugguru*. Only one instance of what may be a D stem (*CAD* M/1:42a):

mi-ia-mi yu-ma-gi-ir ur-ru-ba it-ti ^lšār-ri EN-ia "Who has achieved entrance to the king, my lord?" (EA 283:10-11).

muššūru. The semantic development of this verb discussed under *wuššuru* (cf. *infra*, pp. 157-168), viz. the shift whereby the original "to release," became "to send," affected the MB forms (with *m* > *w*) as well as the conservative forms that preserved the original *w*. The meaning, "to send," is not restricted to Canaanite epistles (*AHw*:1485); it appears in letters from pharaoh: *um-te-še-ra-ak-ku* "I have sent to you" (EA 369:5; 367:6; 370:7). The Jerusalem letters also have four attestations, two of which are 3rd m.s. preterites with the ventive:

*am-mi-ni*₇ DUMU ^{LÚ}KIN *k[i-ma ar-ḥi-i]š* / *la-a ú-ma-še-ra* ^lšār^l[-ru
 EN-ia] / [*k[i-na-a[n-n]a ú-ma-š[e-ra]*] / [*E-en-ḥa-*]mu *e-m[u-qa]*
 "Why did the king not send an emissary q[uickly]? Thus
 [Yanḥa]mu has sent a fo[rce]" (EA 285:7-10; Na³aman 1975:97;
 Moran 1987b:507 n. 3; 1992:325).

A reasonable hypothesis for the change in meaning from "releasing" to "sending" is that the latter nuance developed from

the use of the ventive with *muššuru/wuššuru*. However, in the texts as we now have them, there are many examples without the ventive that carry the meaning "to send." Such is the case with the other attestations from Jerusalem:

LÚ.MEŠ *ma-šar-ta₅*^{MEŠ} *ša tu-ma-še-er / i-na ŠU* ¹*Ḫa-ya* DUMU
Mi-ia-re-e / [l]a-qí-mi ¹*Ad-da-yu ša-ka-an / i-na É-šu i-na*
 URU^{Ḫa-za-ti}^{KI} / [ù 2]0 ¹LÚ¹.MEŠ *a-na* ^{KUR}*Mi-iš-ri*^{KI} / *ú-ma-še[-e]r*
 "The guardsmen whom you sent under the command of Ḫaya,
 son of Miya-Rē^c, Addayu has taken and placed in his house in
 Gaza, [and] he sent [twe]nty men to Egypt" (EA 289:30-35).

Note, incidentally, that the Jerusalem scribe reflects accurately the Akkadian shift *i* > *e* before syllable closing *r*.

puḫḫuru. The D preterite serves as theme for WS imperfect with present tense meaning:

a-nu-ma i-te₉-li ERÍN.MEŠ *i-na / URU* *Gub-la ù la-qa-ši_x*(ŠE) /
i-na-na a-di yu-pa-ḫi-ru ka[-li] / URU.MEŠ ù yi-il-qú-ši_x(ŠE) "Now,
 an army came up against Byblos and took it; now again he is
 assembling al[1] the cities and he will take it" (EA 124:12-15;
 contrast Moran 1987b:336; 1992:203);

and for a WS volitive:

ú-ul yu-pa-ḫi-ra ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ *ù / ji-il-qa* ^{URU}*Ši-ga-t[a]*
 "Lest he assemble all the ^c*apîrû* men and take Shigata"
 (EA 71:28-30; also EA 85:77-79).

šeḫēru, ṣuḫḫuru. There is only one attested prefix example of this verb and it has been interpreted variously as Akkadian G stem (but with past tense meaning! CAD Ṣ:123a) or as a D stem (AHw:1420b). It would appear from the context that the CAD rendering was on the right track as far as the general meaning of the passage was concerned, but the form in question is surely D stem:

šá-ni-tam ù in-du-um / yu-ša-ḫi-ra-am a-na ia-ši / ù im-lu-uk iš-tu / lib-bi-ia "Furthermore, and when he (i.e. Aziru) tightened up on me, I took counsel in my heart" (EA 136:24-26).

CAD has suggested comparison with Hebrew *qāṣēr* "short." However, the usage in this passage is probably a calque on WS **šrr*, "to be narrow," in the causative stem, cf. *uḫ^acēṭ hāṣēr lô* (2 Chron. 28:22). Note that the Akkadian D preterite provides the theme. The use of the ventive is practically unique (cf. CAD §:123b for one NB example, YOS 9 80:27), especially in the earlier periods; its use here enhances the directional nature of the action.

turru. Because of the common epistolary expression, "to send back a word (reply)," it is not surprising that the causative of *tāru* "to return" should appear in the Amarna letters. Some scribes in Canaan formed their own Š stem conjugation of *tāru* (cf. *infra*, p. 182), apparently because the WS idiom contained the causative of the verbal root **twb* (Youngblood 1961:244). However, most epistles in the EA archive use the D stem. There is an abundance of examples from the non-WS texts, but also quite a few from Canaan. Aside from the stock expression, "to send a reply," the D stem of this verb can also signify the return of people, political entities (towns) and other things. The Akkadian D preterite provides the basic theme; six out of the ten attestations in Canaanite letters have an *e* thematic vowel. Three have an *i* vowel, unless we should read the *ti* sign as *te*.

An epistle that does not use the *y-* prefix has a 3rd m.s. form with WS imperfect suffix with 1st c.s. dative pronominal suffix:

ù a-di-mi ú-ti-ru-ni7! / šu-uṭ mu-ul-ka / ša ú-ša-aṭ mil-ka / [I]Pa-a-pu
 "And he still replies to me, 'Denounce the government! He who denounces the king is Pāpu'" (EA 333:19-22; cf. Albright 1942b:33-34 n. 8; Rainey 1989-90:72b).

One of the 3rd m.s. forms is WS imperfect in the protasis of a conditional sentence; it has a 1st c.s. accusative suffix:

šum-ma LUGAL *be-li yi-iḫ-na-nu-ni ù / yu-te-ru-ni a-na* URU.KI *ù a-na-šár-š[i]* [ki¹-[ma] / >ki< *pa-na* "If the king, my lord, will be gracious to me and return me to the city, then I will guard it as in the past" (EA 137:81-83; cf. Moran 1987b:361 n. 15; 1992:221 n. 15).

The other two 3rd m.s. forms are imperfect energetic and one has the 1st c.s. suffix *-ni* as indirect object:

ù yu-te-ru-/na-ni šār-ru be-lí-ia / a-wa-at yu-te-ru-na / ù a-na a-wa-at / šār-ri iš-mu "And the king may return to me whatever word that he may return and I will give heed to the word of the king" (EA 251:11-15).

All three 2nd m.s. forms are from Sidon. One appears to be a hybrid, possibly treated as third weak! The vowel after the first radical is *a* but there is an *i* vowel after the final root consonant:

ù yi-din-ni / LUGAL i-[n]a qa[-at] LÚ-lì ša yi-la-ak / i-na pa-ni ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-at* LUGAL / *i-na ša-al* URU.DIDLI.KI[.Ḫ]Á *ša in₄-né-ep-šu / a-na LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ / ù tú-ta-ar!(RI)-ši-na i-na / qa-ti-ia* "So may the king put me in the charge of the man who is coming at the head of the king's army to investigate the towns that have gone over to the ^c*apîrû* men, and may you(!) return them to my control" (EA 144:26-32; Moran 1987b:375 n. 2; 1992:230-231 n. 3).

The actual spelling is *tú-ta-ri-ši-ná*; perhaps the final, otiose, *i* vowel was meant to be the ventive but was assimilated to the *i* vowel of the 3rd f.s. accusative suffix, or it might be an overhanging vowel that occurs here and there in forms with *-Ø* suffix plus an accusative suffix pronoun (cf. e.g. *yi-ik-ki-mi-ni*, EA 283:16, cited by Kühne 1971:370 n. 4). Still, the possibility of a scribal error of RI in place of AR is equally probable. The prefix is expressed by the UD sign which almost never has the value *tú* in the EA and other peripheral letters. However, the other two 2nd m.s. examples from Sidon (below) have *tú* as their prefix;

therefore, Moran felt justified in adopting that reading here (Moran 1987b:375 n. 2; 1992:230-231 n. 3; von Soden and Röllig 1976:42 No. 221). The other attestations also carry the ventive suffix:

[*lu-ú*] *ti-i-de i-nu-ma / šal-[m]a-ku ù at-ta iš-tu / šul-mi-k[a i]š-tu / ma-ḥar šār-ri [E]N-ia / ša-a-ri* ^{UZUKA} \ *pi-ka / tú-ti-ra-an-ni* "[May] you be apprised that I am well and that (is because?) you, from your well being (or: blessing) from the presence of the king, my lord, the breath of your (his?) mouth, have returned to me" (EA 145:5-10; Moran 1987b:376 nn. 2-3; 1992:231 nn. 2-3); *a-na KUR.ḪÁ A-mur-ri a-wa-at-mi / ti-iš-teg-mé iš-tu aš-ra-[n]u-u[m] / t[ú]-te-ra-am a-na ia-a-ti* "The word that you have heard from there concerning Amurru, send back to me" (EA 145:24-26).

There is one 1st c.s. form, this time with infixes *-t-*, in a text which employs the Akkadian prefix forms for present-future (and past continuous) alongside the Canaanized suffix forms for past tense, much like the Jerusalem letters. It is EA 189 from northern Canaan, perhaps from the same scribal tradition as the Jerusalem scribe. The temptation to see here the Akkadian past with infixes *-t-* as expressing the *result* of previous actions in the manner of OB is very appealing:

ù ka-aš-da-ti7 ù il5-la-ak / DINGIR.MEŠ-nu-ka ù dUTU-ka / a-na pa-ni-ia ù URU.DIDLI.ḪÁ ut-te-er / a-na LUGAL EN-ia iš-tu / LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ aš-šum ur-ru-di-šu "But I arrived and your god(s) and your sun god were going before me so that I brought back the cities to the king, my lord, from the *apîru* men in order to serve you" (EA 189:13-17).

One of the two 3rd m.pl. forms has to do with carrying messages but in the immediate context the idiom "to reply" is expressed by the Š infinitive (*a-na šu-te-er / a-wa-ti* EA 108:49-50). Nevertheless, it is the D stem that is employed by the scribe of this letter when he wants to describe the activity of diplomatic couriers:

mu-ša / tu-ba-lu-na ù mu-ša / tu-te-ru-na LÚ.MEŠ / DUMU ši-*ip-ri*
ša-a šār-ri / iš-tu pa-ni UR.GI₇ "By night the couriers of the king
 bring and by night they take back because of the dog"
 (EA 108:52-55).

The second passage apparently is defective; the subject of the verb has to be supplied (cf. Moran 1987b:371 n. 6; 1992:228 n. 5):

šá-ni-tam ù a!-mur <ERÍN.MEŠ> *ša* LUGAL EN<-ia> / ^dUTU-*ia*
 DINGIR.MEŠ-*ia* *ša-ri* TIL.LA-*ia* / *tu-ti-ru* [g]i-mi-li ÌR-*šu*
 "Furthermore, and behold, may <the army> of the king, <my>
 lord, avenge his servant" (EA 141:36-38; CAD G:74b).

wuššuru. The most frequent D stem verb in the EA corpus is this one. The more proper MB forms, used mainly by the Jerusalem scribe, have been treated under *muššuru* (cf. *supra*, pp. 152-153). The customary orthography in most of the other texts from Canaan preserves the first radical but does not represent the gemination of the second. Spellings with gemination are typical of some non-WS texts, e.g. the later texts from Amurru: 3rd m.s. *ú-wa-aš-ši-ra-an-ni* (EA 171:13), 1st c.s. *ú-wa-aš-šar-šu* (EA 171:29) and also *ú-wa-aš-šar-ra-an-ni* (EA 165:36; 171:5; and Qatna EA 53:69); a borderline case is 1st c.pl. *ni-wa-aš-ši-ru-šu* (EA 197:18).

On the other hand, a few shortened forms without the first radical almost always have orthographic gemination. Note: 3rd m.s. *yu-uš-ši-ra* (EA 180:6; 182:8; 269:11, 14; 270:24; 271:18; 279:14); *yu-uš-ši-ir-mi* (EA 280:9); but also: 3rd m.s. *yu-ša-ru* (EA 362:10), *yu-ši-ru* (EA 126:22; 131:15; *yu-ši-ra* (EA 104:14; 131:12; 216:15; 281:11, 27; 366:30). Only four Byblos tablets employ the shortened forms. One Rib-Haddi letter written in Beirut has the 3rd m.s. hybrids *yi-iš-ši-ru* (EA 139:34, 36, 38), *yi-iš-ši-ra* (EA 139:30-31) while a non-Rib-Haddi letter from Byblos has 3rd m.s. *iš-ši-ir* (EA 140:8, 24, 28) for the suffix conjugation form usually written *uš-ši-ir* (EA 86:16; *et al.*). From Alashia comes 1st c.s. *uš-šar* (EA 35:45). An example of 1st c.s. *i-wa-ši-ra* (TT 2:23) comes from 15th century Taanach.

In sharp contrast to *muššuru*, the *wuššuru* forms show an overwhelming preference for an *-i-* thematic vowel rather than *-e-*. The few forms with an *-e-* theme are restricted to four texts. The two earliest were found at Taanach: 2nd m.s. *tu-wa-še-ru* (TT 6 :5), 2nd m.s. energetic *tu-wa-še-ru-na* (TT 6:11); and 2nd m.s. imperative *uš-še-ra-šu-^rnu¹* (TT 5:13). From Tyre comes 1st c.s. *uš-še-er* (EA 151:45) and in a Mut-Ba^clu letter we find 3rd m.s. *yu-wa-še-ru* (EA 255:17), 1st c.s. *ú-wa-še-ru* (EA 255:13), and 3rd m.s. precative *li-wa-še-ra* (EA 255:22).

The normal meaning of the D stem of this verb in Akkadian is "to release, to permit," etc. (AHw:1484a-1487a). Such a meaning is attested, alongside the more recent semantic development, in the non-WS texts of the various peripheral areas, e.g even from an epistle in the Amurru correspondence:

EN-ia iš-tu pa-^rna¹-nu-um-ma / a-ra-a²-a-am a-na LÚ.İR.MEŠ /
LUGAL EN-ia ù LÚ.MEŠ GAL-bu-te^{MEŠ} / ša URUŠu-mu-ri la-a
ú-wa-aš-ša-ru-ni-ni "My lord, for a long time I have wanted to
be a servant of the king, my lord, but the officials at Šumur
would not permit me" (EA 157:9-12; Izre^el 1991a:II, 18-19).

Another text, the morphosyntax of which at least partially adheres to the WS patterns, has:

ù ti7-iq-bu-na / al-ka-am-mi nu-du-uk ¹Bir5-ia-wa-za / ù la-a
ni-wa-aš-ši-ru-šu a-na / [KURTa]h-še "And they are saying, 'Come!
Let us attack Biryawaza and not permit him (to go to) [the land
of Takh]si!" (EA 197:16-19; Rainey 1989-90:67).

But the most important attestation of this meaning is EA 123. In the same letter, we find this verb also used in the meaning "to send." The release of three captured men is the subject of Rib-Haddi's petition:

[u]š-ši-ir ¹Pf-hu-ra / [LÚ].MEŠ KUR Su-te d[a-ku] / [LÚ] še-er-da-ni
[ù] / [l]a-qú 3 LÚ [ù] / [š]u-ri-bu ^ri¹?[-na] / ^{KUR}Mi-iš-ri [šum-ma] /
[l]a-a yu-wa[-ši-ru] / šu-nu šar-ru EN[-li] / [a-]di ti-pu-šu[-na] /

ar-na UGU-*ia* / [šum-] *ma i-ra-am šà[r-ru]* / [E]N-*li ÌR ki-t[i-šu]* / [ù] *uš-ši-ra* / [3] LÚ ù *ib-lu-ṭá* . . . 3 LÚ *ša-a šu-ri-ib* / ¹Pí-ḥu-*ra* *uš-š[i-]ra* ù *bal-ṭá-ti* / ¹ÌR-*i-ra-ma* / ¹SUM.^dÌŠKUR ¹ÌR¹.LUGAL
 "Paḥura sent the Sution [m]en; they s[lew] a Sherdanian [man and th]ey took three men [and] [s]ent (them) t[o] Egypt. [If] the king, [my] lor[d] does not re[lease] them, they will [ag]lain commit a crime against me. [I]f the k[ing], my [lo]rd, loves [his] faith[ful] servant, then release (or: send) the [three] men that I may live The three men whom Paḥura sent (to Egypt) send that I may live, (viz.) ^cAbdi-rāma, Yattin-Haddu/Ba^cl, ^cAbdi-milki" (EA 123:13-34).

Admittedly, one is hard pressed to distinguish the exact nuance of the imperatives and the imperfect *yu-wa[-ši-ru]*; *wuššuru* is juxtaposed to *šurubu*. Nevertheless, it seems most likely that Rib-Haddi is pleading for the men's release, and what better verb to use than *wuššuru*? The imperatives here happen to have the ventive and a logical explanation for the semantic shift of this verb from "to release, to permit" to the direct nuance "to send" is that it developed as a lexical variant derived from the ventive.

With the meaning "to send," *wuššuru* is employed when referring to the sending of goods and gifts (EA 34:46-48; 85:17-18; 130:33-39; 296:14-17) but the majority of cases deal with the sending of people, either individuals (EA 64:10-13; 74:59-61; 77:21-23; 83:34-35; 89:54-55; 95:31-32; 100:11-12; 114:35-37; 116:30-33; 117:66, 76-77; 137:8-9, 79-80; 151:44-46; 280:9-10; 33:23-26) or military units (e.g. EA 71:13-14, 21-23, *et passim*). Of special interest is its use concerning the expediting of caravans (EA 255:8-11, 12-14, 14-20; 264:9-10) or the sending of ships (EA 143:18-21; cf. EA 245:28-30). It can even depict the sending forth of one's hand (EA 299:20). But the most vivid idiom is the sending of cities to the flames (EA 125:40-45; 185:18, 23, 31, 39). Imperatives, infinitives and the suffix conjugation forms are all employed throughout the corpus of Canaanite correspondence in these semantic nuances.

There can be no doubt that the ventive contributed something to the semantic development. Though it is not a

mandatory addition in order to give the meaning "to send," it is present in numerous syntactic environments. Note the following Alashia example of the preterite with the ventive:

a-na mi-nim-mi la-a tu-wa-ši-ra / LÚDUMU ši-ip-ri-ka a-na maḥ-ri-ia
 "Why didn't you send your emissary to me?" (EA 34:9-10).

Another preterite with the ventive ending is attested in a circumstantial clause employed in the strongly Canaanized epistle written by the leaders from ʿIrqata:

i-nu-ma yu-wa-ši-r[a LU]GAL / EN-nu 1D[UMU]-Bi-ḥa-a [ù] /
yi-iq-bi a-na ia[-ši-nu] . . . "When the [ki]ng, our lord, sent
 D[UMU]-Biḥā [and] he said to u[s] . . . (EA 100:11-13).

A Byblos example of the preterite even has the *-a-* thematic vowel!

[ù] aš-ta-pár / a-na É.GAL ù yu-w[a-ša-]ra / >ù yu-wa-ša-ra, ʿšār¹-ru
 ERÍN.MEŠ / *ra-ba* "[and] I wrote to the palace and he se[n]t
 >and he sent< a large army" (EA 117:24-27).

Moran (1960:16-18; 1987b:323; 1992:193) translates the second clause as if it were a purpose clause but this is hardly suitable in the context. Rib-Haddi is simply recounting what happened in the past. There can be no doubt here that the *-a* suffix is the Akkadian ventive, not the WS volitive. On the other hand, the thematic vowel from the Akkadian present-future is fixed by the orthography as *-a-* but it has no influence on the tense of the clause.

Some other forms have the *šar* sign with *-Ø* suffix and one might feel constrained to argue that *šir₉* is the correct reading. One of these particular contexts actually requires the preterite form:

[ù] / yu-šir₉-mi LUGAL ab-b[u-ka] / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ta₅ TUR ù
ʿyi¹-f[l-]q[é] / gāb-ba "[But] the king, [your] fath[er], sent a small
 force and he to[ok] everything" (EA 131:31-34).

In line 6 of the same text we find [yu-š]i-[r]u, in line 12 *yu-ši-ra*, and in line 15 *yu-ši-ru*. So one should probably read *yu-šir₉-mi* in line 31 above. The other context with this same spelling calls for a jussive:

la-a yu-wa-šir₉ LUGAL be-li MU \ ša-ni-ta₅ a-ni-ta₅ / a-na DUMU.MEŠ ʾĪR-A-ši-ir-ta ù ti-dí-šu-ʾna¹ DUMU!.<MEŠ> / gáb-bi-šu-nu a-na KUR.MEŠ LUGAL be-li-ia "Should the king, my lord, not send this year against the sons of ʿAbdi-Ashirta, the sons, all of them, will tread down the lands of the king, my lord" (EA 362:66-68; Rainey 1978b:22-23; *contra* Moran 1987b:557; 1992:360).

This is evidently a case of the negated jussive (i.e. the equivalent of a positive imperative) in the protasis of a conditional sentence without *šumma*. The next is an unquestionable jussive with *-a*-theme (in good Akkadian this would be a positive affirmation unsuitable to the present context, cf. Edzard 1973:129):

[u] lu[-ú] ʾyu¹-ʾwa¹-ʾša¹-a[r] / ERÍN.M[EŠ] ʾpí¹-ʾtá¹-ʾta¹-[š]u "[so] ma[y] he send his regular troop[s]" (EA 300:15-16).

When an *-a*- theme form does have present-future reference, it is because of a WS modal suffix. Note the WS imperfect with final *-u*:

šum-ma LUGAL be-li / la-a yu-ša-ru ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ta₅ / ù ni-nu-mi BA.UG₇.MEŠ^{ni-mu-ut} / ù URU.MEŠ Gub^{ub-li} / tu-ul₁₁-qú "If the king, my lord, does not send regular troops then we will die and the cities of Byblos will be taken" (EA 362:9-13).

The other documented example has the augmented suffix of the WS imperfect energetic:

[šum-ma] *la-a yu-wa-ʾša¹-ru-na / [a-na URU.KI Gub-l]a ù la-qú-ši* "[If] he does not send [to Bybl]os then they will take it" (EA 131:59-60; Moran 1987b:350; 1992:213).

There are a few genuine preterites with an *-i-* thematic vowel and $-\emptyset$ modal suffix. Only one happens to be 3rd m.s.:

LUGAL *b[e]-li yu-uš-ši-ir-ni / a-na [e]-pu-uš(sic!) nu-kúr-ti₇ / i-na [U]RUQ_f-il₅-ti₇* "The king, my lord, sent me to make war on Keilah" (EA 280:9-10).

The rest are 1st c.s., viz. a long form from Tell el-Ḥesī, a hybrid long form from Beirut and a short form from Tyre:

ù / [i-na-n]a ¹¹Ra-pí-DINGIR ù-wa-^fši-^fir¹ "So [no]w I have sent Rāpī-²Ilu" (EA 333:23-24); *ù i-wa-ši-ir L^UDUMU š[ip-ri-ia] / a-na É-ti É.GAL* "so I have sent [my] em[issary] to the palace" (EA 137:8-9); *a-nu-um-ma / uš-še-er ¹DINGIR.LUGAL L^UKIN-ri / a-na maḥ-ri LUGAL be-li-ia* "Now I have sent ²Ilimilku, my emissary, to the king, my lord" (EA 151:44-46).

The form *uš-ši-ru-ši-(mi)* (EA 185:18, 23, 31, 39) is most likely to be reckoned as suffix conjugation rather than prefix preterites.

Since it is obvious from all the examples treated above that the tense and mode of the prefix forms from *wuššuru* are not determined by the thematic *-a-* vowel, it remains to analyze the plethora of forms with *-i-* theme. It will be clear that the determining factor is the WS modal suffix and that numerous forms cannot be preterite in meaning as would be required by the Akkadian paradigm.

Forms with *-i-* theme vowel and WS imperfect suffix express the full spectrum of "present tense" nuances, e.g. in a general present:

mi-ia-ti a-na-ku ù la-a / ú-wa-še-ru KASKAL-ra-ni ^{HÁ} / šār-ri EN-ia "Who am I that I should not expedite the caravans of the king, my lord?" (EA 255:12-14); *mi-nu UR.G[I₇.MEŠ] / ¹DUMU.MEŠ ¹İR-A-ši-ir-t[a] / ù >ù< ti-pu-šu-na / ki-ma lib-bi-šu-nu ù / tu-wa-ši-ru-na URU.MEŠ / šār-ri i-na ⁴IZI* "Who are the do[gs], the sons of ^cAbdi-Ashirta, that they do whatever they want and send the cities of the king up in flames?" (EA 125:40-45);

ša-ni-tam / Ì.MEŠ ù GADA.MEŠ a-na mi-ni₇ la-a / tu-wa-ši-ru-ni
 "Furthermore, why do you not send me oils and garments?"
 (EA 34:46-48).

Also in the protasis of conditional sentences:

šum-ma ŠE.MEŠ qè-e-ší la-a yu-ši-ru / LUGAL ERÍN.MEŠ
'pí¹-¹ta⁵ a-na URU.KI Gub-l[a] / ù la-q[é]-m[i] ti-il-qú-na-ši "If by
 the season of summer grain the king does not send regular
 troops to Byblos, they will surely take it" (EA 131:15-17; Moran
 1950a:176; *contra* Moran 1987b:349, 350 nn. 2, 3; 1992:212, 213
 nn. 2, 3; Rainey 1989-90:62a; cf. also EA 123:18-22, 50-52);

or in a purpose clause dependent on another imperfect (Moran
 1950a:81; 1951:33-34):

a-di [y]i-du šàr-ru / a-[n]a KUR.MEŠ-šu ù yu-wa-ši-ru / ERÍN.MEŠ
pí-tá-ti-šu ù / yu-ša-ap-ši-ḥu KUR.MEŠ-šu "Until the king takes
 cognizance of his territories that he may send regular troops
 and that he may pacify his territories" (EA 112:36-39)

Another well known function of the imperfect is to
 express continued or repeated action in the past. There are
 several attestations of *wuššuru* reflecting the various nuances of
 this specific WS meaning (indicated by the Akkadian present in
 standard dialects):

[pa-n]a-nu-um Ba-az-ú-nu / DUMU Na-ar-sí tu-wa-še-ru / a-na
ia-a-ši "[For]merly you used to send Baz²unu, son of Narsi, to
 me" (TT 6:4-6); *[m]a-ni UD.KÁM.MEŠ ù-wa-ši-ru-šu / ù la-a*
yí-le-ú / i-re-ba a-na URU.Šu-mu-ra "How often have I sent him
 and he was unable to enter Šumur?" (EA 114:35-37); *ù pa-na-nu .*
. . . ù yu-ši-ru be-li ERÍN.MEŠ / a-na ša-a-šu-nu "And formerly . . .
 and my lord was sending troops to them" (EA 126:18-23); *a-mur*
/ ¹[La-a]b-a-ia a-bi-ia / [yu-ra-d]u šàr-ra EN-šu / [ù šu-ut]
yu-wa-še-ru / [ka-li KASKAL]-ra-ni Ḫ^A / [ša yu-wa-š]e-ru šàr-ru /
a-na KUR.Ḫa-na-gal-bat / a-na KUR.Ka-ra-du-ni-ia-aš "Behold,

[Lab]ʔayu, my father, [was serv]ing the king, his lord, [and he] expedited [all the cara]vans [that] the king [would se]nd to Ḫanigalbat, to Babylonia" (EA 255:14-20); <la->a ia-aš-ku-un [L]UGAL ŠÀ-šu / i-na mi-im-mi ša yi-iš-ši-ru / ¹A-zi-ru a-na ša-šu mi-im-mu / ša yi-iš-ši-ru a-wa-ti Ṣu-mu\ -ru / ù mi-im-<mu> ¹Ḫa-za-ni LUGAL / š[a d]a-ak yi-iš-ši-ru / a-na ka-ta "May the [k]ing <no>t pay attention to the property which Aziru has been sending to him; the property which he has been sending is things of Ṣumur; and the proper<ty> of the king's city ruler wh[ic]h he k[il]led, he has been sending to you" (EA 130:33-39).

There is also a full spectrum of energetic nuances. First, there is the simple emphasis on the verbal action:

LUGAL EN-ia ša-pár a-na mu-ḫi-[i]a ¹Ḫa-a-ia / a-na qa-bi KASKAL-ra-ni ḪÁ / ^{KUR}Ḫa-na-gal₉-bat an-nu-ú / ú-wa-še-ru-na ù uš-še-ru-ši "The king, my lord, sent Ḫāya to [m]e to say "This Khanigalbat caravan, I am sending, so expedite it!" (EA 255:8-11); an-nu-ú ^{LÚ.MEŠ}MAŠKÍM šār-ri / yu-wa-ši-ru-na ¹šār¹-ru ù / ia-aq-bi šār-ru a-na ša-šu-nu / ù tu-pa-ri-šu be-ri-ku-ni "Behold, it is the king who actually sends the royal commissioners, so may the king speak to them that they should adjudicate between the two of you" (EA 116:30-33; with Moran 1973:52 *contra* Moran 1987b:320; 1992:191).

or to express an urgent committal to action on the part of the speaker:

a-šar i-ba-ša-at / ši-pí-ir-ti LUGAL EN-ia / ša-ri TIL.LA-ia ù ú-ba-[ú-n]a-ši / ù uš-ši-ru-na-ši / a-na LUGAL EN-ia ša-ri TIL.LA-ia/ [š]á-n[i-t]am a-nu-um-ma i-na i-re-bi / [G¹]ŠMÁ.ḪÁ ša LUGAL EN-ia / [š]a sí-ki-pu / i-na ^{URU}PÚ.ḪÁ uš-si-ru-n[a-ši!] "Wherever the king's consignment is, I will sea[rc]h for it and I will send it to the king, my lord, the breath of my life; ¹Furthermore¹, now, with the arrival of the king, my lord's, ships, [whi]ch have sailed into Beirut, I will send [it]" (EA 143:13-21; Moran 1987b:374 n.2; 1992:229 n. 2; CAD S:73b).

One of the most frequent uses of the energetic is in questions. The earliest example is from Taanach:

ša-ni-tam a-na ¹*mi*¹-[*ni*₇] / ¹*la*¹-¹*a*¹ *tu-wa*-[¹*ša*¹-*ru*-¹*na*] / *šu-lum-ka*
a-na ¹*ia*¹[-*ši*¹] "Furthermore, wh[y] 'don't' you se[¹nd¹] your
greeting to m[e]?" (TT 1:12-14; Rainey 1977:39).

And, where an imperfect is required in a purpose clause dependent on another imperfect or a stative (Moran 1950a:81-82; 1951:33), an energetic imperfect may be used if the context is interrogative:

*a-na mi-ni*₇ / *qa-la-ta* *ù* *la-a ti-iq-bu a-na šār-ri* / *ù* *yu-wa-ši-ru-na* /
ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti* *ù* / *ti-il-te₉-qú-na* / ^{URU}*Šu-mu-ra* "Why are you
silent and do not speak to the king that he may send regular
troops that they may take Šumur?" (EA 71:10-16; cf. also
EA 114:59-62); [*ú*]-*ul ta-aq[-bu a-n]a EN-ia* *ù* / *yu-wa-ši-ru-n[a-k]a*
i-na / *pa-ni* ERÍN.MEŠ.*pí[-ṭá]-ti* *ù* / *tu-ša-am-ri-ru* LÚ.MEŠ GAZ /
iš-tu LÚ.MEŠ [*ḫ*]*a-za-nu-ti* "[W]on't you spea[k t]o your lord so
that he may sen[d y]ou at the head of the regular army so that
you may drive out the *‘apīru* men from the city rulers?"
(EA 77:21-25).

The greatest enigma surrounds the many forms with the *-a* suffix. It has been demonstrated above that *wuššuru* often takes the Akkadian ventive. Only two possible jussives with *-Ø* suffix have been noted (EA 300:15-16, *supra*, p. 161; EA 362:66-68, *supra*, p. 161). On the other hand, of the 2nd m.s. imperatives, six or seven have *-Ø* suffix as against nearly fifty with *-a*; furthermore, nearly all of the precatives also have *-a*. Admittedly, *wuššuru* can take the WS imperfect and imperfect energetic suffixes at the expense of the ventive with no loss of meaning; the suffix conjugation forms also lack any ventive morpheme (cf. *infra*, p. 311). Moran's demonstration of the *yaqtula* volitive in the Byblos texts (Moran 1950a:89-104; 1960) rests on a broad spectrum of examples, many from verbs that do not ordinarily take the ventive in Akkadian (cf. discussion *infra*, pp. 254-264). But several

of the verbs he cites do sometimes have a lexical ventive, including verbs of motion, speaking and giving. One of those verbs is *wuššuru*. With the few exceptions mentioned above, the overwhelming majority of injunctive forms from *wuššuru* have the *-a* suffix. There are, in fact, some twenty attestations of prefix forms from *wuššuru* plus *-a* in injunctive contexts! The same question must be posed for them as for the imperatives: Is the *-a* suffix Akkadian ventive or WS volitive? The Hebrew cohortative *-āh* was carried over sometimes to the 2nd m.s. imperative (Ps. 17:13; 74:22; 82:8; *et al.*) but are we justified in seeing the *-a* suffixes on the imperatives of *wuššuru* as carry overs from the volitive? The ensuing repertoire of examples all have injunctive force; they may be jussives with the Akkadian *-a* superseding the WS \emptyset or they may be the WS volitive *-a*. One might be tempted to see here a convergence of the Akkadian and the WS elements. Since the verb *wuššuru* often took the ventive, perhaps the injunctive form with *-a* (the volitive) came to be preferred over that with \emptyset (the jussive).

In light of the questions posed above, it is noteworthy that injunctives of *wuššuru* that depend on a preceding precativ are usually accompanied by a chain of other injunctives, all of them in the jussive with \emptyset suffix, which would make the *wuššuru* form the only *yaqtula* in the chain; note the following typical examples:

ù li-it-ru-uš / i-na pa-ni šàr-ri EN-ia ù / lu-ú yu-ši-ra ¹Ia-an-ḥa-ma /
 ù lu-ú ni-pa-aš gá-bu-ma / nu-kúr-ti ù lu-ú tu-te-er / KUR.KI.ḪÁ
 ša šàr-ri EN-ia / a-na ZAG.ḪI.⟨A⟩-ši \ up-sí-ḥi "May it be pleasing
 in the sight of the king, my lord, that he send Yanḥamu so that
 we can all make war and so that you will gain back the
 territories of the king, my lord, to their utmost extremity"
 (EA 366:28-34; similarly EA 74:59-61 and probably EA 182:6-13).

These injunctives of *wuššuru* may be dependent on a preceding jussive and are often followed by another jussive. In injunctive chains such as these, the *wuššuru* form is alone in having the *-a* suffix:

ù lu-ú / yi-de LUGAL / ip-ša an-na-am / ù lu-ú yu-uš-ši-ra /
 LUGAL be-li / ^{GI}ŠGIGIR.MEŠ ù lu-ú / yi-il-te-qé-ni / a-na mu-ḫi-šu
 la-a / iḫ-la-aq "So may the king be apprised of this deed and may
 the king, my lord, send chariots that he may take me to himself
 lest I perish" (EA 270:21-28; cf. EA 64:10-13; 83:34; 85:17; 89:54;
 121:47; 139:29-33).

The earliest attestation of this verb with *-a* suffix is in a confusing chain of injunctives:

ša-ni-tam li-ru-¹ba¹-¹am¹ IDINGIR-Ra-pí-² / a-na URURa-ḫa-bi ù
 lu-[ú] / i-wa-ši-ra LÚ-ia a-na maḫ-ri-ka / ù lu-ú i-pu-šu ḫa-at-nu-ta₅
 "Furthermore, let Ilu-Rāpi³ enter into Raḫābu and le[t] me send
 my man to you and let me/them make a marriage
 arrangement" (TT 2:21-24; Rainey 1977:52, 54).

The third verb in this chain is problematic. Perhaps it is an error for *i-pu-uš!* or *i-pu-ša*; it is only remotely possible that it is 3rd m.pl.

The most frequent usage of injunctive *wuššuru* is as an independent jussive/volitive or as the first injunctive in a chain of purpose clauses. All of the examples have *-a* suffix, as do some of the ensuing verbs in the associated chains, e.g.

ù LÚ-ia / an-nu-ú yu-wa-ši-ra-šu šàr-ru / ki-ma ar-ḫi-is ù ia-di-na /
 LÚ.MEŠ ma-ša-ar-ta!(RA) a-na / na-ša-ar ÌR ki-ti-šu ù URU-šu
 "And as for this man of mine, may the king send him quickly
 and may he grant garrison troops to protect his faithful servant
 and his city" (EA 117:76-80; cf. also EA 95:31, Youngblood
 1961:31, Moran 1987b:287 n. 2; 1992:169 n. 2; EA 104:14-15;
 116:72; 117:66, 92; 118:42; 123:41; 137:79-80; 180:6-9; 216:15-17;
 269:11-13, 14-17; 279:14-15; 281:11-12, 27-28).

Finally, there are two instances of injunctive *wuššuru* in the apodosis of a conditional sentence. Since this is a common function for both the jussive and the volitive (Moran 1950a:74), these two examples cannot be used to decide the proper understanding of the injunctives with *-a*:

šum-ma līb-bi LUGAL *be-li-ia* / *a-na* URU.KI *Gub^{ub}-la* ù / *yu-ši-ra be-li*
 3 ME ERÍN.MEŠ 30 GIŠGIGIR.MEŠ / ME LÚ.MEŠ KUR.MEŠ
Ka-ši ù *ti-na-ša-ru* / URU.[K]I *Gub^{ub}-la* "If the king, my lord, is
 concerned about Byblos, then let my lord send three hundred
 (regular) troops, thirty chariots, one hundred men of the lands
 of Cush that they may protect Byblos" (EA 131:10-14); *šum-ma*
i-ia-nu / *yu-uš-ši-ra* / LUGAL *be-li* GIŠGIGIR.MEŠ / *a-na la-qé-n*[*u*
l]*a-a* / *ti₇-ma-ḥa-šú-nu* ÌR.MEŠ-*nu* "If not, then may the king, my
 lord, send chariots to take u[s]est our servants smite us"
 (EA 271:17-21).

"INTENSIVE" VERBS

In this category we have placed those D stem prefix forms which pertain to verbs for which the basic orientation of the G stem is not significantly altered by its use in the D. It is possible, of course, that a particular scribe really intended to express a more "intensive" action by his preference for the D stem, even without precedent from the parent language. In other instances, one might suspect that a Canaanite idiom, with a WS verb in the D stem, stands behind some unusual Akkadian D form. Allowance must also be made in a few particularly difficult forms for simple scribal confusion.

kašû, *kullû*. The D stem of this verb is rare in Akkadian (CAD K: 102b-103a). One example occurs in a Byblos text:

i-nu-ma uš-ši-ir-ti 2 LÚ / DUMU *ši-ip-ri a-na* URU *Šu-mu-ra* / ù
ú-ka-li LÚ-*lí* / *an-nu-ú a-na šu-te-er* / *a-wa-ti a-na šār-ri* "When I
 sent two emissaries to Šumur, then I held back this man in
 order to send word back to the king" (EA 108:46-50).

kašādu, *kuššudu*. Several D stem attestations of this verb in the non-WS texts from Amarna carry causative meaning, "to send," i.e. "to cause (someone) to arrive," like the Š stem *šukšudu* (CAD K:281b). However, the lone attestation in a text from Canaan is only partially preserved, viz. [*yu*]-*kaš-si-id* (EA 293:22)

and the context does not seem to have place for a direct object or a destination. Therefore, it is more likely that the meaning intended was closer, or identical with that of the G stem. Line 19 of the same text has [y χ -kaš-]ša-ad, with an -a thematic vowel, which Knudtson took as G stem.

maḥāṣu, muḥḥuṣu. The D stem of this verb seems to carry the same basic meanings as the G stem (CAD M/82a-83b). The one passage where the D stem might be found has an ambiguous orthography. It is equally possible that the form is built on the Akkadian 3rd m.s. G stem theme. It has an -a- thematic vowel but the context seems to call for a preterite. The relevant passage (EA 252:19) has been cited above (*supra*, pp. 5, 65, 78, 148-149). The form in question is to be read either *yi-ma-ḥa-aš-ši* or *yu-ma-ḥa-aš-ši*. As noted before, the Canaanite scribes seem to have confused the Akkadian G *iparras* forms with the D stem in many instances. This present context might also be just such a case, whether we choose to read the prefixed PI sign as *yi-* or *yu-*.

maqātu. The D stem of this verb is extremely rare in Akkadian (CAD M/1:248b) and its attested meanings do not suit the five passages to be discussed here. Furthermore, the orthography of the EA forms is clearly G stem. Nevertheless, given the scribes' tendency sometimes to equate the Akkadian G present-future with the D stem, these five examples are mentioned in this chapter because they express a common nuance apart from that evidence in the usual epistolary formula (*amqut/nimqut* "I/we have fallen "prostrated my-/ourself[s]). All of the references are to making an attack, "falling upon" an enemy. To be sure, this is a valid G stem meaning (CAD M/1:247b-248b) in Akkadian but the fact that the WS modal nuances are based on the *iparras* theme suggest that the scribes thought of such action as properly D stem. Two of the forms are 3rd m.s. negative jussive:

ú-ul yi-ma-qú-ta [UGU] / [URU-]ia ù yi-il-qa-ni "Let him not fall upon me in order to capture me" (EA 81:31-32; Moran 1987b:261; 1992:151); *ú-ul yi-ma-qú-ta* ERÍN.MEŠ *ka-ra[-š]i* /

UGU-*ia* "Let not an expeditionary force fall upon me"
(EA 83:43-44; Moran 1987b:265; 1992:153).

One is 2nd m.s. imperfect in a purpose clause following a stative
other WS imperfects:

*a-na mi-ni₇ / qa-la-ta ù la-a taq-bu / a-na šàr-ri EN-li-ka / ù tu-ša-na
qa-du ERÍN.MEŠ / pí-tá-ti ù ti-ma-qú-tu / UGU^{KUR}A-mur-ri*
"Why do you keep silent and do not speak to the king, your
lord, in order that you should come forth with the regular
army so that you can attack Amurru?" (EA 73:6-11).

A broken context seems to have a 1st c.s. (or 3rd m.s.?) preterite:

[ù GI¹]ŠGIGIR-t[i UGU] / [^{KUR}Am-qi¹ i-ma-qú-u[t] "(with my
troops?) [and chariots] I(?) fell [upon the land of] 'Amqi'
(EA 173:1-2).

And finally, there is a 1st c.pl. injunctive (jussive or volitive):

AŠ É.NINIB *pu-ḥu-ru-nim-mi ù / ni-ma-qú-ut UGU URUGub-la*
"Assemble in Bit-NINIB and let us fall on Byblos" (EA 74:31-32).

na²āšu. This is a rare verb in Akkadian and the finite forms
are G stem with *-a-* thematic vowel (CAD N/2:53). The two
Amarna attestations are in one letter written in Beirut. One is
definitely not D stem, viz. 3rd m.s. *ia-an-aš-ni* "(my brother)
scorned me" (EA 137:23) but the other has an *-i-* theme and can
most logically be reckoned as a hybrid 3rd m.pl. D stem preterite:

*ù ti-mu-ru L[Ú.MEŠ É]-ia / i-nu-ma la-a na-di-in KÛ.BABBAR
ti-iš-la-ḥu / a-na ia-ši ki-ma LÚ.MEŠ ḥa^{MEŠ}-za-ni ŠEŠ-ia / ù
ti-na-i-šú-ni* "And the m[en of] my [house] saw that no silver
was given (and) they ridiculed(?) me like the city rulers, my
colleagues, and they scorned me" (EA 137:11-14; cf. Albright,
Mendenhall and Moran 1955:483b; cf. Moran 1987b:359 n. 2;
1992:219 n. 2).

našāru, *nuššuru*. Peripheral texts attest to the rare use of D stem with this verb (CAD N/2:46a; Rainey 1974:306; 1975b:417-418; 1978b:84). From the fifteenth century B.C.E. we have:

DINGIR.MEŠ ša AN u KI / *li-bal-li-tú-ú-šu li-na-ša-ru-šu* "May the gods of heaven and earth keep him alive and protect him" (*Idrimi Stele*, lines 99-100; cf. CAD B:59a)

Another such precative is found in an Amurru letter:

¹A-zi-ri LÚÛR-ka / *i-na aš-ra-nu la tu-wa-aḥ-ḥe-er-šu / ar-ḥi-iš uš-še-ra-aš-šu / ù KUR.MEŠ ša LUGAL EN-ni li-na-aš-šár* "Aziru is your servant. Do not delay him there. Send him quickly and let him protect the lands of the king, our lord" (EA 169:12-15; cf. Izre³el 1985:170; 1991a:I, 165 §2.4.2.11).

But in a Canaanized letter a 1st c.s. D form is also attested:

[i]š-te-mé MAŠ[KÍM] / LUGAL *a-na ia-ši / a-na na-šár URU.DIDLI.KI.ḤI[A a-n]a / ¹šár-ri BE-ia [ù] / ú-na-šár ¹ma¹-gal* "[I] have heeded the words of the commis[sioner] of the king to me to guard the citie[s fo]r the king, my lord, [and] I will guard (them) very diligently" (EA 327:1-5).

The absence of the suffix *-u* leaves two alternatives of modal interpretation. The usual form in this syntagma is the WS imperfect (for examples, cf. Rainey 1975b:404-405; Rainey 1971b:97-100). The \emptyset suffix could mean that here we have a WS jussive or it could simply indicate that *ú-na-šár* is intended to be taken as a regular Akkadian D present-future. In any event, it seems obvious that the scribe recognized a D stem for *našāru*.

So there was ample justification for the suggestion of Albright and Moran (1950:165b-166a; cf. *supra*, p. 58) that the forms of *našāru* with geminated second radical and usually an *-i*-thematic vowel were considered to be D stem. There are eight such forms, limited to five Byblos letters. The 3rd m.s. examples are all in the WS imperfect, *yi-na-ší-ru* (EA 112:14), *yi-na-ší-ru-ni*

(EA 112:18), though two of them have accusative suffixes attached by means of the Akkadian ventive, viz. *yi-na-ṣí-ra-an-ni* (EA 112:13; 121:10), *yi-na-ṣí-ra-ni* (EA 130:20). The 1st c.s. attestations include the WS imperfect *i-na-ṣí-ru* (EA 119:15; 130:49), the imperfect energetic *i-na-ṣí-ru-na* (EA 123:32), and the volitive *i-na-ṣí-ra* (EA 123:27). The 3rd m.pl. form is jussive/volitive *ti-na-ṣí-ru* (EA 130:48). Because of the 1st c.s. prefix *i-* and the 3rd m.pl. *ti-*, we have transcribed the 3rd m.s. prefixes by *yi-* rather than *yu-*.

In fact, those *-i-* theme formations alternate with *-a-* themes in identical syntagmas; compare, e.g. the following examples:

iš-tu ma-an-ni i-na-ša-ru-na / iš-tu na-ak-ri-ia / ù iš-tu
 LÚ.MEŠ_{hu}-up-ši-ia / mi-nu yi-na-ṣí-ra-an-ni / šum-ma LUGAL
 'yi¹-¹na¹-¹ṣí¹-ru / IR-šu [ù ba-al-¹á-]ti / [ù šum-m]a [šà]r-ru la-a /
 [yi-n]a-ša-ru-ni mi-nu / yi-na-ṣí-ru-ni "From whom shall I guard?
 From my enemies? And from my yeomen farmers who will
 protect me? If the king will 'protect' his servant, [then] I [will
 live,] [but i]f the [ki]ng does not [pro]tect me, who will protect
 me?" (EA 112:10-18).

As a consequence, it may follow that the preference among some Canaanite scribes for the Akkadian G present-future theme of *našāru* might reflect a calque on some Canaanite D stem verb. Neither Akkadian (apart from the Alalakh and Amurru references treated above) nor the WS dialects attest to a D stem for *našāru*.

palāhu, *pulluḫu*. The D stem of this stative verb is relatively rare (AHw:813b); in normal Akkadian, the D stem is causative in meaning. However, this does not seem to be the case with the Amarna example(s), which can be rendered exactly like the G. The one certain passage is 2nd m.s.:

la tu-pal-la-a[h] "Do not fear" (EA 102:36; Moran 1987b:296; 1992:175).

One may view this verb as WS negative jussive but outwardly it is identical with the Akkadian prohibitive (GAG:106, §81h; Edzard 1973:131).

Another example, with an *-i-* theme, was most probably meant by the scribe to be taken as D stem. It is WS 3rd m.pl. imperfect:

i-na a-ší ERÍN.MEŠ / pí-ťá-ti ka-^lli] ^lmi^l-am ^lİR-A-ši-ir-ta / it-ti-šu-nu la-a la-qt ù ^{GIŠ}MÁ.MEŠ-šu-nu / a-ša ki-ma iš-tu KURMi-iš-ri / ki-na-na la-a ti-pa-li-ĥu-na "With the coming forth of the regular army, all the property of ^cAbdi-Ashirta was not taken with them, and their ships sailed duly out of Egypt. Therefore, they do not fear" (EA 105:18-22; cf. Moran 1987b:300; 1992:178; CAD K:472a).

**rağāšu (raĥāšu)*. There are four passages, two in Ugarit and two in Amarna, which attest to a verb probably from the root **rğš* (Sivan 1984:160 n. 13, and 264). The meaning is "to smash." The Hebrew and Aramaic reflexes are **ršš* and **r^{cc}* respectively (Rainey 1979:158-161). What leads one to think of the D stem is the usage in texts found at Ugarit. Both examples are injunctives, one a true precativ and the other a hybrid precativ:

šum-ma ú-ra še-ra / a-na-ku BA.UG₇ mi-ta-ku / ù ša ^{MÍ}Ku-ba-ba DUMU.MÍ Tá-k-a-an / DAM-ia iš-tu ŠEŠ-ia / >ša< i-ĥu-uz-ši / ^dİŠKUR li-ra-ĥi-iš-šu / ^{GIŠ}GU.ZA la ú-ra-bi / É.ĤÁ la i-ši-ib / ^dİŠKUR EN ĤUR.SAG Ĥa-zi / li-ra-ĥi-iš-šu "If in the future I die, then as for the one who has taken Kubaba, daughter of Tak³an, my wife, from my brother, may Baal smash him, (may) he not magnify (his) throne, may (his) palace not flourish — may Baal, lord of Mount Khazi smash him!" (RS 16.144:4-13; Nougayrol 1955:76);

and also:

šum-ma i-na-an-din DINGIR.MEŠ a-na ŠU-ti-ni / ù lu-ú ni-ra-aĥ-ĥi-iš ^{UZUDUR}-šu i-na KI-ti!(BAR) / ù i-gám-me-ru-ni₇

I-en še-ra-ni-ia "If the god gives (him) into our hand, then we will verily smash his *face(?)* in the earth(?), and my adversaries will be annihilated" (RS 20.33:30-32'; Nougayrol 1968:74).

In view of those passages, it may be tentatively suggested that the following example from Beirut be defined as a hybrid D stem form:

ù lu-ú ti-ra-ḥa-aš ERÍN.HI.<A> *pí-tá-<ti>-šu / ša* LUGAL EN-*ia* dUTU-*ia* DINGIR.MEŠ-*ia* / UZUSAG.DU LÚ.MEŠ-*a-ia-bi-šu* "and may the army of the king, my lord, my sun god, my deity, smash the head of his enemies" (EA 141:31-33).

The fourth example of this verb is from the suffix conjugation and will be discussed there (cf. *infra*, p. 306).

ša²ālu. The D stem of this verb is extremely rare (AHw:1152a). The first to identify D forms in an Amarna text were Albright and Moran (1950:165b). In the tablet that they were discussing (EA 89), it is most likely that the scribe considered all of his forms of this verb as D, with *-a-* as well as with *-i-* thematic vowel:

i-na-na la-a 'yi¹-ša-a-lu šàr-ru / *a-na ḥa-za-¹ni¹-šu a-na a-ḥi-ia* yi-<iš-me> LUGAL *a-wa-te-ia / ú-ul* 'ki¹-¹na¹ *a-wa!*(NA)-*ti-šu-nu / šum-ma šàr-ru yi-ša-i-lu / ù na-¹ad¹-na pa-ni-nu a-na a-ra-di-ka* "Now the king does not inquire concerning the city ruler, concerning my brother(-in-law). May the king heed my words. Their words are not true, 'If the king inquires, then we have set our faces to serve you'" (EA 89:12-17); *šum-ma a-na a-ḥi-[ia] / yi-ša-i-lu šàr-ru . . . ù šum-ma a-na a-ḥi-ia / ti-ša-i-lu ù ta-aq-bu / URU an-nu-ú la-a ḥa-za-nu ša-al / šàr-ru UGU-šu . . . šum-ma a-na ḥa-za-ni* ^{URU}Šur-ri / *la-a yi-ša-i-lu šàr-ru* "If concerning [my] brother(-in-law) the king should inquire . . . and if concerning my brother(-in-law) you should inquire, then the city will say 'This is not the city ruler. Inquire, oh king, concerning him' . . . Will the king not inquire concerning the

city ruler of Tyre?" (EA 89:33-34, 39-42, 44-45; Albright and Moran 1950:164).

It must be admitted, however, that the presence of a G imperative in line 41 weighs somewhat against the view that the prefix forms are D stem. The G imperative was undoubtedly a widely used form, in writing as well as in speech. Therefore, the thematic *-i-* on all the prefix forms but one can best be explained by assuming hybridization following the pattern of the D stem. All of the prefix forms in question here are WS imperfect, with the expected *-u* suffix. Syntactically, they are all found in the protases of conditional sentences.

šātu, šuṭtu. The only D stem attestations for this verb are from EA 333 (cf. *AHw*:1205a) as discovered by Albright (Albright 1942b:33 n. 8, 35 n. 19). There is one 3rd m.pl. WS imperfect:

lu-ú ti-i-de i-nu-ma / tu-ša-ṭú-na ¹DI.KUD.¹d¹¹IŠKUR¹ / *ù*
¹Zi-im-re-da / pu-uḥ-ri-iš "May you be apprised that Shipti-Baal
 and Zimredda have behaved in a treasonous manner together"
 (EA 333:4-7).

Then we have a form that could either be Akkadian 3rd m.s. present-future or WS preterite (with *-Ø* prefix):

ša ú-ša-aṭ mil-ka / [1]Pa-a-pu ù uš-ši-ir-¹šu¹ / [a-n]a pa-ni-ia "The
 one who is/has been behaving/behaved treacherously is Pāpu,
 so send him to me" (EA 333:21-23).

AHw:1205a takes these forms as Gp but that is hardly likely since one of them clearly has an accusative, *mil-ka*.

The third form in this epistle, *šu-uṭ mu-ul-ka*, remains enigmatic. It could be a G imperative but Albright had proposed to see in it a gerund or "construct infinitive." The main drawback of Albright's suggestion is that *mulka* is in the accusative while the dependent case would be more proper for the object of a nominal form.

ṭarādu, *ṭurrudu*. While the G stem of this verb means "to send," the D means "to drive out, expel" (AHw:1381a). Unlike the OB letters, which employ *ṭarādu* as a standard word for sending, the Amarna archive has only two attestations. Obviously, *wuššuru* has taken the place of G stem *ṭarādu* while the D stem functions were more often fulfilled by *dubburu*. One of the Amarna examples is 1st c.s. G preterite (EA 62:38) while the other is 3rd m.s. D preterite:

i-nu-ma yi-mur LÚŠEŠ-ia i-nu-ma / a-šī LÚDUMU šip<ri>-ia ri-qa-mi / i-ia-nu ERÍN.MEŠ ma-ša-ar-ta₅ it-ti-šu / ù ia-an-aš-ni ù ki-na-an-na / yi-pu-uš ar-na ù yu-tá-ri-id-ni / iš-tu URU-li^{KI} "When my brother saw that my ambassador came forth (from Egypt) empty-handed, no garrison troops being with him, then he scorned me and committed treason and expelled me from the city" (EA 137:20-25).

THE Dt STEM

Among the Amarna letters from Canaan, one does not find any examples of the Dt stem serving as the passive of the D stem. This remarkable departure from good Akkadian practice can be accounted for by the presence in West Semitic of a Dp conjugation (cf. *infra*, pp. 179-180). Even the number of D stem preterites with infixes *-t-* are extremely limited, mainly confined to a few possible forms from *turru* (cf. *supra*, pp. 154-157) and *wuššuru*. These latter will be dealt with here since they may reflect a special usage and not be preterites at all.

Some of the *wuššuru* forms with infixes *-t-* are clearly future in meaning and cannot, therefore, reflect the Akkadian *-t-* preterite. Some of the examples have a geminated infix, *-tt-*, possibly by analogy with the G stem where 1st waw verbs have forms like 3rd m.s. *it-tab-lu* (EA 29:23) and *it-ta-ša-ab* (EA 29:154). The most striking feature in some cases is the use of an *-a-* thematic vowel! This theme could only represent the present-future of the Akkadian Dt! The crucial passage for our discussion is the following:

ù *yi-iq-bi a-na ia-a-[-ši] / i-na-mí SÀG GIŠMÁ \ a-na-yi /
 ú-ta-aš-ša-ru-uš-šu / a-na šar-ri* "And he said to me, 'In a ship I
 will send him away to the king'" (EA 245:27-30).

This 1st c.s. form, *ú-ta-aš-ša-ru-uš-šu*, not only has the *-a-* theme, it also has the WS imperfect suffix, *-u*, and probably the imperfect energetic *-n(a)* assimilated to the *š* of the accusative suffix (Rainey 1976b:338-339). The transitive meaning precludes any thought of the passive Dt. Therefore, if one can assign any meaning at all to the infix, it must be separative. Therefore, we have translated "send him *away*."

The same epistle has three examples of *wuššuru* with infixed *-t-* that are clearly preterites. They are all written with the SAR sign, most naturally rendered *šar*, but admittedly, it could be transcribed *šir*₉ (von Soden and Röllig 1976:35, No. 184). The particular contexts are:

ù *yi-íl-qé-šu / Išú-ra-ta ù yu-ta-šar-šu / iš-tu URUHi-na-tu-na^{KI} /
 a-na É-šu . . . ù Išú-ra-ta yu-ta-šar / ILa-ab-a-ia ù Išú-ra-ta /
 yu-ta-šar-mí IŠKUR-me-her / a-na É-šu-ni* "So Surata took him
 and he released him from Hannathon to his home . . . so Surata
 released Lab³ayu and Surata released Baal-meher to their
 home" (EA 245:30-33, 41-45).

This is one of the few contexts where the original Akkadian meaning, "to release," is appropriate. It deals with a prisoner from whom a ransom was accepted in order to set him free. As mentioned above, one could transcribe the three verbs in question: *yu-ta-šir*₉-*šu*, *yu-ta-šir*₉, and *yu-ta-šir*₉-*mí* respectively. That would permit the assumption that the scribe was simply using the Akkadian D preterite with infix *-t-* as his theme.

The same could be said for the 1st c.s. preterites in one of the Alashia letters:

ù *a-nu-ma ut-ta-šir*₉ / LÚDUMU š*i*-*ip-ri-ia a-na maḥ-ri-ka*₄ / ù
*al-lu-ú ut-ta-šir*₉-*ka / i-na qa-ti LÚDUMU š*i*-*ip-ri-ia a-na ka-ta*₅ . . .
*ut-ta-šir*₉ / [i-na qa-ti LÚDUMU š*i*]*ip-ri-ia* "And now I have sent*

my ambassador to you and, behold, I have sent to you by the hand of my ambas<sa>dor . . . I have sent [by the hand of] my [am]bassador" (EA 34:14-17, 30-31).

Furthermore, there are some 1st c.s. preterites with unmistakable *-i-* thematic vowels. One of them, [*ut-t*]a-še-er (EA 173:14), is in a broken context. However, the other, from Byblos, is clear:

LÚ-ia ut-ta-ši-ir a-na ma[-ḫa]r / EN-ia "I have sent my man to my lord" (EA 83:10).

Finally, there is a 1st c.s. form with *-e-* thematic vowel that has definite present-future meaning. It has the WS imperfect energetic suffix plus a 3rd m.pl. accusative suffix pronoun. The context and the WS modal suffix eliminate any possibility of this form being preterite. Furthermore, there is no resemblance to the Akkadian function of the *-t-* preterite with *anumma* (contra Wilhelm 1982:124 n. 8, who cited Heimpel and Guidi 1969 for support).

ù / ti₇-iq-ta-bi / a-nu-ma i-na ŠU-^lti^l / LÚšú-ḫa-ri-ia / ut-ta-aš-še-ru-un-na-šu-nu "And you said (each time), 'Now I am sending them by the hand of my servant'" (KL 72:600:4-8).

Although the preceding verb is probably iterative (Rainey 1976:338), the geminated infix in *ut-ta-aš-še-ru-un-na-šu-nu* cannot possibly have that meaning. Since the passive and the preterite are also ruled out, the only possible nuance for the infix would be the separative. This context is not as clear cut as EA 245:27-30 cited above because of the *-e-* theme. Nevertheless, the frequent use of the ventive with D stem forms of *wuššuru* is suggestive. If the scribes knew that *wuššuru* could have a special nuance with the ventive, then perhaps some of them also felt that the infixed *-t-* could have the separative function. This would create a situation similar to that of normal Akkadian verbs of motion. On them the ventive directs the action towards the speaker while the infixed *-t-* directs it away from some reference point.

THE Dp STEM

Some passive forms from *wuššuru* were recognized by the pioneer scholars in EA 126 (Böhl 1909:61; Ebeling 1910:59-60; Dhorme 1913:383 = 1951:420). However, they did not classify them as specifically D stem, probably because they were not sure that *wuššuru* did not function in the G. Furthermore, they may not have realized just how much of a departure from normal Akkadian this would be. The first of these two passages is as follows:

*ù pa-na-nu / a-na LÚa-bu-ti-ia yu-ša-ru / iš-tu É.GAL.MEŠ
KÛ.BABBAR / ù mi-im-mu a-na ba-la-ṭi-šu-*<nu>* / ù yu-ši-ru be-li
ERÍN.MEŠ / a-na ša-a-šu-nu / ù a-nu-ma / a-na-ku aš-pu-ru a-na
be-li-ia a-na ERÍN.MEŠ ù ERÍN.MEŠ ma-ša-ar-tu / la-a tu-*[ša-ru]* ù
mi-im-mu *[la-a-]mi / yu-da-nu [a-na] 'ia'-a-ši* "but formerly to my
ancestors there were being sent money and material for the *<ir>*
sustenance and my lord was sending troops to them. But now I
write to my lord for troops and a garrison is not *s[ent]* nor is
material given to me" (EA 126:18-23).*

The first verb, *yu-ša-ru*, is 3rd m.s. because *kaspū u mimmū* are treated as a hendiadys like *mimmā u balāṭa* in line 15 (Moran 1950a:174); the imperfect mode (with *-u*) after *panānu* reflects continuous or iterative action in the past (Moran 1950a:43-47). The correct rendering of the 3rd f.s. *tu-*[ša-ru]** was also seen by Moran (1950a:174).

The second context, in the same epistle, is also in the negative; the form is 3rd m.s. for the collective ERÍN.MEŠ (Moran 1950a:131 n. 163):

ERÍN.MEŠ *la-a yu-ša-r[u] / ù LÚDUMU ši-ip-'ri'*[ia]* / la-a
tu-ša-šu-na* "A force is not give[n] and my ambassador
you/they are not sending forth" (EA 129:40-43).

The second verb is considered either a plural of majesty or a 2nd m.s. imperfect energetic (Moran 1950a:62-63). It would be especially

interesting if it were 3rd m.pl. imperfect (active) with an impersonal subject. The latter would signify another means of expressing the passive.

Since these were passives of the short form of *wuššuru*, they could not be of much help in determining the vocalization of the Canaanite D passive in strong verbs. The *yuššaru* forms looked just like the Gp *yuppaš-* forms. The letter from Kâmid el-Lôz cited in the discussion of the Dt also provided the solution to the Dp vocalization:

ù ú-ul tu-wa-aš-ša-ru-na / ú-nu-tu^{MEŠ}-šu / qi-bi ù lu-ú
tu-wa-aš-ša-ru-na ú-nu-tu^{MEŠ}-šu "But his implements are not
sent! Speak that his implements be sent!" (KL 72:600:9-13).

It was the nominative *ú-nu-tu^{MEŠ}-šu* plus the exact parallel with a known Gp verb that clinched the interpretation of *tu-wa-aš-ša-ru-na* as Dp 3rd m.pl. imperfect. That parallel was:

ù qi-bi ù lu-ú tu-ud-da-nu-^Ina¹ "So speak that they be given"
(KL 72:600:19-21).

These two constructions are remarkable for their use of the indicative to express purpose after an imperative. With active verbs, the jussive or the volitive would surely have been used (Moran 1950a:81-88, especially 87). The latter passage, with *lū tuddanūna*, brings to mind a similar use of the same verb after *lū* in a Taanach letter (TT 2:19-20; Rainey 1976:340).

Now, *tu-wa-aš-ša-ru-na* can be legitimately used as evidence for the original Canaanite D passive vocalization of the suffix conjugation. That form was *tuqaṭṭalūna*. The discovery of this isogloss with Classical Arabic marks another milestone in the comparative linguistics of the West Semitic dialects.

CHAPTER VIII

PREFIX CONJUGATION — Š AND H

In contrast to the many D stem verbs used by the Canaanite scribes, there is a relative paucity of Š stem forms. One underlying reason that comes to mind is that the Š stem was probably missing in Canaanite (like Phoenician, Hebrew, Moabite). Still, these scribes were using Akkadian as their base language, so it is not surprising that some Š stem forms do occur. For easy reference, the verbs discussed will be listed with by the G infinitive followed by that of the Š.

Š STEM CAUSATIVES

erēbu / šūrubu. Two examples come from the Jerusalem letters, where the prefix verbs are basically Akkadian, usually present-future. In this case, however, the Akkadian preterite is employed instead of a suffix conjugation form for the past tense, perhaps because of the "literary" nature of the passage, i.e. a translation of an Egyptian idiom:

zu-ru-uh šār-ri KAL.GA / ú-še-ri-ba-an-ni a-na É LÚa-bi-ia "The mighty arm of the king has installed me in my father's house" (EA 286:12-13).

Another form (3rd m.pl.), *ú-še-ru-bu* (EA 287:11), is in a broken context; it appears to be present-future with Assyrian vowel harmony (c *ušērabū*; Moran 1975b:153). From Tyre comes another broken passage, [*ú*]-*še-ri-ib-ka* (EA 149:33). Finally, one Canaanite text has a form that looks like a hybrid based on the Š infinitive (*šūrub-*):

[*t*]u-*šu-r[u]-ba-ni / a-na URU.DIDLI.KI-ni-[i]a* "(May) [yo]u reinstall me in [m]y cities" (EA 300:18-19).

târu / *šutûru. Only in the Amarna letters from Canaan do we find a few Š forms from this verb (AHw:1336a; Youngblood 1961:244). There are imperatives (EA 83:23; KL 74:300:15), a hybrid infinitive (EA 108:49), a 3rd f.s. suffix form (EA 280:14), and two prefix forms based on the theme of the hybrid infinitive, *šu-te-er* (EA 108:49). One of them is 3rd m.s. imperfect:

ù la-a >¹ep¹< / ep-pu-šu mi-im-ma a-¹di¹ / yu-šu-¹te¹ru LUGAL a-wa-ta₅ / a-na ÌR-šu "But I will not do anything until the king sends word back to his servant" (EA 280:37-39).

The second form is a jussive:

ù NU-id a-na ¹Re-a-na-ap / L^UMAŠKÍM ù yu-šu-te-er / URU.KI i-na qa-te-ia ù / ú-še₂₀-šu-ru a-na pa-ni / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-at LUGAL EN-ia "So command Re^c-anap, my commissioner, that he may return my city to my charge; then I will make the preparations for the regular army of the king, my lord" (EA 292:36-40).

(*w*)*abālu* / *šūbulu*. The Š of this verb is known from the letters outside Canaan, e.g. from Egypt (EA 367:3; 369:3; 370:3), Alashia (EA 35:20; 40:15), but only appears twice in the Canaanite texts. One instance demonstrates how a scribe could use an Akkadianism that he had apparently learned in school. The form has the *š > l* shift and is in a clause dependent on a noun in construct:

a-wa-at ul-te-bi-la / LUGAL EN-ia DINGIR.MEŠ-ia / dUTU-ia a[-n]a ia-ši / a-nu-um-ma i-šu-ši-ru-šu / a-na ¹LUGAL¹ EN-ia "As for the word which the king, my lord, has sent to me, now I am arranging it for the king, my lord" (EA 267:9-13).

The other passage is in a Rib-Haddi letter. The scribe employed the SI sign with the value *šé*, an unusual but not unknown value here (EA 77:8; 84:26; Youngblood 1961:318). That orthography misled Ebeling (1910:43) into thinking that this was an example of

št > ss, i.e. *yussēbila* < *yuštēbila*. Such a shift and such a spelling are unwarranted. The passage is not without difficulties but it is possible to suggest several improvements in the reading and the interpretation:

šá-ni-tam a-wi- / la yu-šé-bi-la be-li a-na ĪR-š[u!] / ki-ma ar-ḫi-iš a-na
 MAŠKÍM! ù na-⟨ša⟩-ri >U[RU]⟨ / URU.KI a-na ša-šu ù bal-⟨tá⟩-ti
 "Furthermore, may my lord send a man to h[is] servant in a
 hurry as commissioner(!) and (to) guard the city for him so that
 I may l*i*ve" (EA 88:34-39; cf. Moran 1950a:160; 1987b:276 n. 10;
 1992:161 n. 12; Youngblood 1961:318).

(w)ašû / šūšû. Only one example comes from a Canaanite text. To understand the context, one should remember that in Egyptian, "to go in," means to enter Egypt (to visit the palace) while "to go out, to come forth," means "to leave Egypt." The form in question may be either 2nd m.s. imperfect enclitic, 2nd m.pl. (of "majesty"), or 3rd m.pl. imperfect:

ù a[l-lu uš-ši-ir]-tī / LÚDUMU ši-⟨ip⟩-ri-ia a-n[a LUGAL b]e-li-ia /
 ERÍN.MEŠ la-a yu-ša-r[u] / ù LÚDUMU ši-⟨ip⟩-r[i-ia] / la-ā
 tu-ša-šú-na "And be[hold] I have [sent] my ambassador t[o the
 king] my [l]ord; an army is not being sent and [my]
 ambassador you/they are not sending forth" (EA 126:38-42).

Š STEM FACTITIVES

The three verbs treated in this section are stative in the G stem. The Š stem means to "cause (someone) to enter (the particular state of being)." All of them also have D stem causatives in Akkadian.

balātu / *šublutu*. The D stem is used extensively in the Amarna texts from Canaan, usually with the meaning, "to furnish supplies" (cf. *supra*, pp. 138-140). The Š stem is unique to the Amarna texts (CAD B:63a) and is only documented for this one passage:

at-tu-nu tu-ša-ab-li-tú-na-nu / ù at-tu-nu / \ ti-mi-tu-na-nu "You (pl.) give us life and you(pl.) give us death" (EA 238:31-33; Moran 1987b:464; 1992:95).

ḫalāqu / šuḫluqu. The regular causative for this verb is in the D stem. The Š stem is documented in the meaning "to help to escape," but only in NA and NB. The Š stem does not carry the meaning "to destroy," but that idea can be expressed by the ŠD stem. The Št stem means "to cause permanent damage" (CAD ḫ:39b-40a; AHw:311a). The one Amarna example is in a letter from Kedesh on the Orontes which has typical WS features. Semantically, the Š stem form under discussion here expresses the same nuance as the D stem examples in other letters, viz. "to cause (lands, cities, etc.) to be lost to Egyptian control" (Moran 1987b:429 n. 2 and 289 n. 1; 1992:270 n. 2 and 170 n. 1). This explicit context makes that meaning perfectly clear:

ur-ru-du LUGAL EN-ia ù gáb-bi KUR.[MEŠ-ka] / ú-ša-aḫ-li-iq
¹*Bir₅-ia-wa-za* "I serve the king, my lord, but Biryawaza is causing all [your] land[s] to fall away" (EA 189:24-25).

Biryawaza was known as an important commissioner in the Lebanese Beqa^c Valley. In the preceding sections of the letter, he had been accused by Etakkama, ruler of Kedesh, of turning loyal city states over to the ^c*apîru* men. These latter people were so designated precisely because they were reputedly not acknowledging Egyptian authority.

pašāḫu / šupšuḫu. The Š stem is widely used in Akkadian as well as the D (AHw:840-841). The Byblos letters make frequent use of the Š imperative (EA 74:59; 113:33; 121:50; 132:59). There are two 3rd m.s. prefix forms, both of them in purpose clauses. One is an imperfect virtually dependent on another imperfect to express purpose (Moran 1950a:81; 1951:33):

a-di [y]i-du šār-ru / a-[n]a KUR.MEŠ-šu ù yu-wa-ši-ru /
ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ti-šu ù / yu-ša-ap-ši-ḫu KUR.MEŠ-šu "Until the

king takes heed to his territories and sends his army in order to pacify his territories" (EA 112:34-39).

The other is a jussive virtually dependent on another injunctive (either volitive or jussive):

ù / *yu-wa-ši-ra šār-ru* 'ERÍN¹.MEŠ-šu / *pí-tá-ti[-š]u* / *ù yu-ša-ap-ši-iḥ* KUR-šu "So may the king send his troops, his regulars, that he may pacify his land" (EA 118:41-44).

*šḥḥn. The verb forms appearing to have this root were evidently generated in Hurrian speaking areas from *šukēnu*, "to prostrate oneself" (GAG:158, §109m; AHw:1263). The phenomenon appears, for example, at Nuzi. The examples with infix *-t-*, which all have an *i-* prefix, were discussed in Chapter V on the Gt (cf. *supra*, pp. 109-110). All the forms in question (with and without *-t-*) are known in the Amarna archive only from texts written in Canaan. In addition, there are a few examples from Ugarit and Hattusas (AHw:1293). When there is no infix *-t-*, the verb is treated as a quadriconsonantal of the Š class, hence their inclusion here. The ubiquitous parallels in the "obedience formulae," usually with *amqut* "I have fallen down," etc., explain the selection of the root *šḥḥn "to get low." The forms with the infix *-t-* may have some reflexive nuance. The other attested forms are all 1st c.s. preterites in one of three orthographies: *uš-ḥé-ḥi-in* (EA 221:7; 232:9; 233:13; 234:9; 366:9), *uš-ḥé-ḥi-in₄* (EA 223:6; 242:8; probably also EA 214:6), and *uš-ḥe-ḥi-in₄* (EA 22:9); note also the defective *ḥé-ḥi-in₄* (EA 235:9). Only one representative passage will be cited here; it is particularly noteworthy for its explicit description of the process of doing obedience:

um-ma ¹Sú-ra-ta / LÚ^{URU}Ak-ka ÌR ša šār-ri / ep-ru ša ĞÌR.MEŠ-šu
ù qa-qa-ru ša ka-ba-ši-šu / a-na ĞÌR.MEŠ LUGAL EN-ia / ^dUTU
iš-tu ša-me-e / 7-šu 7-ta-a-an / *uš-ḥé-ḥi-in* / i-na pa-an-te-e \ *ba-aṭ-nu-ma* / *ù ši-ru-ma* \ *šú-ú²-ru-ma* "Thus (said) Surata, ruler of Acco, the servant of the king, the dirt under his feet and the

ground of his tread, 'At the feet of the king, my lord, the sun god from heaven, seven times (and) seven times I have gone low, on the stomach and on the back'" (EA 233:3-11).

SPECIAL LEXICAL MEANINGS

The two verbs discussed in this section have special lexical meanings attached to the Š stem. These are semantic functions known throughout the Akkadian dialects and evidently learned by the Canaanite scribes.

ešēru / *šūšuru* / *šutēšuru*. Ebeling (1915:1383-1384) had originally confused these Š forms with (*w*)*ašāru* / *wuššuru*. The special semantic nuance reflected in the Amarna tablets is common to OA and OB (CAD E:358) but it is not the only meaning for the Š of this verb. The fundamental idea, from the verb, *ešēru* "to be straight, is "to make (something/someone) go/be straight." The developed meaning is "to put in order, to prepare." The passages are usually replies to an order from pharaoh to make ready for the arrival of the Egyptian army by getting together supplies and men. When the writer wished to state that his preparations were completed, he used a hybrid form of the suffix conjugation (cf. *infra*, pp. 313-314). But when he meant to say that he was engaged in such preparations, he used a West Semitic imperfect of the prefix conjugation. In either case, the replies were 1st c.s. There is one example of an Assyrianized present-future theme, viz. *ú-še₂₀-šu-ru* < **ušeššaru* (EA 292:39). The text was discussed above (cf. *supra*, p 182). Otherwise, the theme is usually from the Š preterite; typical examples of the "correct" orthography are these general statements:

gáb-bi mi-im-mi / ša yi-qa-bu / šar-ru be-lí / ú-še-ši-ru-mi
 "Everything that the king, my lord, says, I am preparing"
 (EA 223:7-10; probably also EA 233:18-20; 247:19).

But the following passage illustrates the contrast between the imperfect in present time and the preterite in past time:

LÚDUMU *ši-ip-ri* / *ša* LUGAL EN-*ia* / *ša iš-tap-r-an-n[i]* / *iš-te₉-me a-wa-te^M[EŠ-š]u* / *ma-gal ma-gal* / *ù a-nu-ma* / *ú-še-ši-ru-mì* / *ki-ma ša qa-bi-šu* "As for the ambassador of the king, my lord, that he sent to me, I have heeded [h]is words very diligently and now I am making preparations according to what he said" (EA 329:13-20; cf. also EA 302:11-18).

Then we have several hybrid forms with *i-* prefix attached to a theme that resembles that used for the suffix conjugation, i.e. *šūšir / *šūšer (cf. Izre'el 1978b:74-75 and *infra*, pp. 313-314):

a-wa-at iš-¹tap¹-pár / LUGAL EN-*ia* DINGIR.MEŠ-*ia* / ^dUTU-*ia* *a-na ia-ši* / *a-nu-ma i-šu-ši-ru-šu* / *a-na* LUGAL EN-*ia* "As for the thing that the king, my lord, my deity, my sun god, wrote to me, now I am preparing it for the king, my lord" (EA 277:8-12; also EA 267:12 [*supra*, p. 182]; 276:12; 278:12; and without accusative suffix: EA 216:10; 226:15; 316:23; 325:20); *a-wa-at iq-ba(sic!)-bi* / [LU]GAL EN-*ia* / [DINGIR].MEŠ-*ia* ^dUTU-*ia* / [*a-n*]a *ia-ši i-šu-še-ru-šu* / [*a-na*] LUGAL EN-*ia* "As for the thing that the [ki]ng, my lord, my [dei]ty, my sun god, said [t]o me, I am preparing it [for] the king, my lord" (EA 275:9-14; Moran 1987b:499; 1992:319).

Finally, CAD E:359a assigns a special Amarna meaning to two forms with infixes *-t-*. These are subsumed under a unique category of *šūtešuru*, signifying "to dispatch." One of these examples is a precativum in an Alashia letter which does not show WS grammatical features:

ù e-ni-in₄-na ŠEŠ-ia 'DUMU'? [*ši-ip-ri*]r[*i-i*]a / *ḥa-mu-ta li-iš-t[e-š]i-ra-a[m-m]a* / *šu-ul-ma-na ša* 'ŠEŠ¹-[*i*]a / *lu-uš-a-al* "So now, may my brother dispatch my ambassador¹ quickly that I may inquire about my brother's welfare" (EA 37:13-15; cf. Moran 1987b:205 nn. 5-6; 1992:110 nn. 5-6).

The other example is in an epistle from Beirut. In spite of the broken context, the meaning seems fairly certain:

[iš-te-m]e a-wa-te^{MEŠ} DUB ša uš-te₉-fšir₄¹-šu / [a-na ia-ši] LUGAL EN-ia "[I have hear]d the words of the tablet which the king, my lord, has dispatched [to me] (EA 142:6-7; compare the suggestion by Moran 1987b:373 n. 1; 1992:229 n. 2).

It is hard to say, on the basis of these two examples, but it would appear that the infix *-t-* here must have had separative force. If so, this is then the only lexical Št verb used in the Canaanite Amarna letters.

ezēbu/šūzubu. Besides the various causative nuances of the Š stem related to the G stem meaning of "to leave, to abandon," etc., this verb has a specialized Š stem semantic function. It is the meaning, "to deliver, to save" (CAD E:424-425; AHw:264b). The most prevalent verb expressing this meaning in the Canaanite Amarna letters is G stem *ekēmu*, but there are four prefix examples and three imperatives from *šūzubu*. The imperatives are all Assyrian in form (EA 62:30; 318:8, 14). Two of the prefix forms are in relative clauses from the same Byblos letter. Both of them are 3rd m.s. without the *y-* prefix, which suggests that they derive from a corpus of learned expressions (especially relative clauses); their orthographies do look, in fact, like Akkadianisms. The theme for both forms has been vocalized here as present-future (reading *ze* instead of *zi*):

AŠ É.NIN.IB pu-ḫu-ru-nim-mi ù / ni-ma-qú-ut UGU^{URU}Gub-la šum-ma ia-[nu] / LÚ-LIM ša ú-še₂₀-ze-bu-ši_x(ŠE) iš-tu qa-ti-n[u]
 "In Bīt-NINIB assemble ye that we may attack Byblos; behold, there is no man who can deliver it from our grasp" (EA 74:30-31; Moran 1953:78 n. 4; 1987b:252 nn. 9-11; 1992:144 nn. 9-11); ù ki-na-na pa-al-ḫa-ti ma-gal ma-gal ›i-nu-ma‹ / [i]-nu-ma ia-nu LÚ ša ú-še-ze-ba-an-ni / [iš]-tu qa-ti-šu-nu "So thus I am very much afraid since there is no one who can deliver me from their hand" (EA 74:43-45).

Note that the first form, *ušezzebuši*, could be Akkadian subjunctive in a relative clause introduced by *ša*, but that would be practically

unique in these texts. Instead, we prefer to see the WS imperfect. The second form has its accusative suffix attached by means of the ventive morpheme.

The 2nd m.s. form is in a passage from a letter by Dagān-takala, whose texts are more N. Syrian in style than they are Canaanite (Artzi 1968). The same text has two of the Assyrian style imperatives; the finite form is vocalized here as present-future, though the context seems to require the WS jussive. Its accusative suffix is attached by means of the ventive, which is typical of the Š forms of this verb in the corpus of texts from this area:

ù at-¹ta¹ LUGAL GAL / be-li-ia / tu-še-ze-ba-an-ni / ù i-na-ba-a-a[t] / a-na LUGAL GAL be-li-ia "So thou, (O) great king, my lord, deliver me that I may esca[pe] to the great king, my lord" (EA 318:18-22; Artzi 1968:170; contrast the rendering of Moran 1987b:542 and n. 4; 1992:350 n. 4).

The final example also comes from a text that is hardly West Semitic in its flavor. The context seems to require a preterite but the form has gemination of the second radical as if it were an Akkadian present-future. However, when we note that the imperative also has gemination it becomes obvious that this is merely an orthographic or phonetic feature and not a tense determinant.

ù iq-bu-ni₇ šu-nu a-na ia-ši / še-ez-zi-bá-an-na-ši-mi iš-tu ŠU-ti / ERÍN.MEŠ URUŠe-eh-la-li^{KI} ù ú-še-ez-zi-[bá-š]u-nu / iš-tu ŠU-ti ERÍN.MEŠ URUŠe-eh-la-li^{KI} "So they said to me, 'Deliver us from the hand of the troops of She^clalu,' so I deliver[ed th]em from the hand of the troops of She^clalu" (EA 62:29-32; cf. the remarks of Izre³el, who does not deal with the gemination, 1985:76, 168, *8; 1991a:278, 309).

This is a narrative of a past event that began with a preterite verb, *iq-bu-ni₇* "they said . . ." The context thus demands that the form *ú-še-ez-zi-[bá-š]u-nu* be interpreted as a preterite. Since this is an

Amurru text, its use of the verb form in question must be judged in the light of the practices in that corpus.

CANAANITE H STEM FORMS

There are a few prefix forms that have been interpreted as Canaanite H stem causatives (Sivan 1984:174-176). Although some of them are surely Canaanite causative forms, they each reflect problems of orthography and morphology. It is, therefore, impossible to achieve a clear diachronic interpretation of the H stem in 14th century Canaanite.

ḥlq. This root is common to Akkadian and WS. The 3rd m.s. transitive *ya-aḥ-li-qi* "that he should lose" (EA 254:9) might be WS H stem (cf. *supra*, p. 53).

**mwt*. The example from this root is the most certain of all. The passage has already been cited above because of the parallelism with an Š stem formation of *balātu* (cf. *supra*, pp. p. 184). It will be useful to cite it again:

at-tu-nu tu-ša-ab-li-tú-na-nu / ù at-tu-nu / \: ti-mi-tu-na-nu "You (pl.) give us life and you(pl.) give us death" (EA 238:31-33; Moran 1987b:464 n. 2; cf. Moran 1992:295 n. 2; Rainey 1989-90:68a).

The context and the orthography leave no room for doubt that we have here a 2nd m.pl. Canaanite H stem form, **timîṭûnanû*. The one glaring "problem" is the initial prefix vowel. On comparative grounds (Akkadian and Arabic), we might have expected **tumîṭûnanû*. Comparison with Hebrew would have suggested **tamîṭûnanû* (< **tuṣamîṭûnanû*). It would appear that we have here a case of assimilation, the prefix vowel assimilating to the long thematic vowel. However, against that notion is the fact that the parallel verb is **tušabliṭānanu*, with the normal *tu-* prefix. Vowel assimilation, **tuṣamîṭûnanû* > *timîṭûnanû*, seems to be the most sensible solution.

**qll*. The causative form from this root appears as a gloss in a Megiddo letter. The Sumerogram, SIG (plus Akkadian 1st c.s. possessive suffix!), corresponds to Akkadian *qatnu*, *qatānu* (CAD Q:163b-164a; 173b-175b) rather than to Akkadian *qalālu* (CAD Q:55a). Although the Akkadian D stem, *qullulu*, suits the present context, the orthography of the form in question cannot possibly represent an Akkadian D; there was no justification for classifying our passage under *qullulu* (CAD Q:57b). The form as written by the Megiddo scribe can only be that of a Canaanite causative verb (Böhl 1909:64, §32a; Ebeling 1915:1446); the G stem from this root is stative in meaning and built on the *yigtal* pattern (Rainey 1978a:*9a, 11*a and n. 53). From the Sumerogram (written with the 1st c.s. Akkadian pronominal suffix!) and the context, its meaning is certain:

ša-ni-tam mi-na-am-mi ep-ša-ku-mi / a-na šār-ri EN-ia / i-nu-ma
 SIG-ia \ *ya-qí-il-li-ni* / ù DUGUD \ *yu-ka-bi-id* / ŠEŠ.ḪÁ-ia
šé-eh-ru-ta 5 "Furthermore, what have I done to the king, my
 lord, that he has belittled me and honored my younger
 colleagues?" (EA 245:36-40).

A special problem arises from the fact that the prefix is written with the PI sign (wrongly given as *ia-* in CAD Q:57b). Under most circumstances, it is notable that scribes use the PI sign when the prefix vowel is either *u* or *i*, not *a*. Of course some *ya-* readings do occur (cf. *supra*, p. 35-36), but they are the rare exceptions. So, in the present case, the form may have been **yuqillini* or **yiqillini* although **yaqillini*, the usual assumption in the literature, is not impossible.

The connecting vowel before the accusative suffix is also something of an enigma. Comparison with the verb in antithetic parallelism, *yu-ka-bi-id*, proves that the tense of both verbs is preterite. Pharaoh had done something, apparently specific, to belittle Biridiya in relation to the other city rulers.

Therefore, **yaqillini* / **yiqillini* / **yuqillini* is based on the *yaqtul* zero form, i.e. the *e/i* vowel between the final root consonant and the accusative suffix is anaptyctic, to preserve the

gemination of the last radical. Obviously, it could not be *-u* because that would change the tense to imperfect; it could not be *-a* since that would change the tense and mood to volitive. It must have the value of \emptyset to preresent the preterite.

**rym*. Sivan (1984:157 and n. 13, 164) has dealt with the attestations of this root in PN's from the West Semitic area, especially Ugarit. Because of the presence of so many examples in Ugarit, where Ugaritic does not seem to have an H causative, Sivan has suggested that the actual root was **rym* and not a causative from **rwm*. There is one isolated orthography in a broken context from northern Canaan, viz. *ia-ri-im* (EA 186:77).

**yš*². There is one gloss from this root which can hardly be anything other than an H causative (Sivan 1984:175):

yu-uš-ši-ra <¹šàr-ri / EN-*ia* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ti* / *ma-a²-da ma-gal* /
ù yi-ki-im-ni / \ *ia-ší-ni* "May the king, my lord, send a very
 large army that he may deliver me (gloss: that he may take me
 out)" (EA 282:10-14).

The problem here is that, in this form, the prefix syllable is written *ia-* so there is little doubt that the form has to be reconstructed **yāš²nî*. The Hebrew form, *yôš²ēnî* (Micah 7:9), harks back to the original **wš²*. If such a form were identical in ancient Canaanite, we would have expected to find a syllabic spelling such as **yu-ší-ni* (<**yawš²nî*). Perhaps we must assume that the Canaanite H causative was based on the biconsonantal root **š²*. This would contrast with the other Semitic languages; even in Arabic, the causative stem of 1st waw verbs is treated as triconsonantal (Fischer 1972:115, §242).

There is one additional form that was at one time interpreted as an H stem from this root:

ù ta-aš-ta-ni a-wa-ta₅ a-na ia-ši / *uš-ši-ir-mi* GIŠMÁ *a-na* /
 KUR*ia-ri-mu-ta* *ù ú-ša-ka* / KÛ.BABBAR.MEŠ *lu-bu-ši iš-tu*
ša-šu-nu "And you have repeatedly said to me, 'Send a ship to

Yarimuta and silver for clothing will *be issued* for you"
(EA 82:27-30).

Ebeling (1910:64) classed the form, *ú-ša-ka*, as a 1st c.s. Canaanite H form and he was followed by Albright and Moran (1948:247) and by Youngblood (1961:232-233), the latter of whom even posits a ventive ending for this Canaanite form! In the final analysis, there are too many anomalies required to make this a 1st c.s. H prefix form. In fact, Moran (1987b:263 and n. 3; 1992:152 n. 3) now favors an Akkadian G present-future.

The context is that of a purpose or result clause after an imperative. We should either have a jussive, a volitive or a suffix form (Moran 1950a:82-86, and 31-34 respectively). Since there is no consonantal prefix and the 1st c.s. seems unwarranted (Amanappa is most probably not in Yarimuta himself), the odds are in favor of a suffix form. Therefore, we propose to see here an Hp 3rd m.s. with KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ as the subject (in construct with *lu-bu-ši*). In other words, one might reconstruct **(h)úša²ka* < **huwša²ka*. The 2nd m.s. suffix pronoun can have dative function, whatever the verb form may be.

Admittedly, an Hp suffix form in a reply from an Egyptian official may tax our credulity. Moran's resort to a simple Akkadian G present-future does have the advantage of simplicity.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

H STEM. Unfortunately, not much can be learned from these forms about the H stem prefix conjugation in Canaanite of the Amarna period.

The three verbs from which we have reconstructed Canaanite forms, viz. *timîtûnanû*, **yaqillini* / **yiqillini* / **yuqillini* and **yaši²ni*, seem to point in different directions. If all of these three verb forms are really H causative, then we have evidence for a prefix *Ci-* in hollow roots beside *Ca-* for 1st waw. From a diachronic point of view, it is difficult to see just where these forms would fit in to the overall WS pattern of causative stems.

The solution may be that an internal Canaanite phonetic tendency has blurred the picture, e.g. the prefix vowel in *timîâtûnanû* might be the result of vowel harmony.

The problems pertaining to the H stem suffix form will be dealt with in a later chapter (cf. *infra*, p. 315).

Š STEM. The question also arises as to whether there may be evidence here for the presence of a real Š stem in the WS mother tongue of the scribes. The Š stem verb forms treated above are all of truly Akkadian verbs. Some are from high-frequency expressions (e.g. the forms of *šûzubu*). An innovation, such as the Š of *târu*, is more likely a simple construction devised by local scribes rather than some hint of an underlying WS Š verb. Under the present circumstances, it seems unlikely that the S dialect spoken by the scribes of these letters possessed a Š stem like Ugaritic.

The Š stem suffix conjugation forms are discussed above (cf. *infra* pp. 312-315).

CHAPTER IX

PREFIX CONJUGATION — MOODS AND TENSES

Since the system of modes and tenses reflected in the Amarna letters from Canaan may reflect the true WS pattern of the Late Bronze Age, the question naturally arises: What of the normal Akkadian conjugation patterns which serve to signify various syntactic positions or semantic nuances? Since some of the morphological features identified by Moran as Canaanite are homophonous with verbal suffixes of classical Akkadian, viz. *-u* (like the Akkadian so-called subjunctive) and *-a(m)* (like the Akkadian ventive), it will be necessary to play the devil's advocate and to justify the use of such features as Canaanite morphemes rather than as Akkadian.

THE SO-CALLED "SUBJUNCTIVE"

True modality in Akkadian is expressed by various morphosyntactic constructions (Edzard 1973), some of which involve the use of the verbal marker of subordination, *-u* in Babylonian dialects, and *(-u) + -ni* in Assyrian (GAG:108-109, §83). However, this so-called "subjunctive" marker does not, in itself, express the *subjunctive* nuances of the European or other languages. It is purely a position marker indicating that the clause in which the verb so marked stands happens to be dependent on some element in a main clause. Such subordinated clauses may be dependent on: (1) the relative pronoun *ša*; (2) a subordinating conjunction such as *inūma, adi, ištu et al.*; (3) a substantive in the bound form (construct). Nominal phrases standing in these same syntactic positions are marked by the dependent case (genitive) on the substantive (GAG:108, §83a; Adler 1976:64, §48; Edzard 1973:124 n.7). However, there are some truly modal syntagmas in which the *-u* suffix is employed, viz. the positive and negative asseverations (Edzard 1973:129, 132). It will be seen in the

ensuing discussion of the Canaanite modal system that other forms, viz. the jussive with \emptyset and the volitive with *-a*, serve these same purposes.

PERIPHERAL DIALECTS. Among the various dialects of peripheral Akkadian during the Late Bronze Age, the use of the Akkadian subordination marker is not consistent. The Mitannian letters do show a remarkable degree of uniformity, using the *-u* suffix whenever the rules of Babylonian grammar require it, and not employing it erroneously where it would not belong (Adler 1976:64-66, §48). The chancery scribes of the Mitannian empire had evidently learned their Babylonian fairly well. In one isolated case, the Assyrian *-ni* appears, viz. *ša i-ra-²a-ma-an-ni-ni* "the one who likes me" (EA 17:15). The private archives from Nuzi display some inconsistency in the use or non-use of the *-u* (Gordon 1938:219, §5.10), but the Assyrian *-ni* is almost non-existent (Wilhelm 1970:40, §9; with three examples). At the other end of the Mitannian empire, in Alalakh, the relative clauses (dependent on *ša*) regularly have the proper *-u* suffix (Giacumakis 1970:53, §8.11). Circumstantial clauses introduced by *inūma* do not show this consistency. Of course, one of Giacumakis' examples, viz. *ša . . . i-il-la-kam* (AT 108:8-10) is invalid because the verb has the ventive which precludes the use of the *-u*! Nevertheless, one may compare *i-nu-ma . . . i-ḫi-ir* (AT *409:45) with *i-nu-ma . . . i-ḫi-ru* (AT *35:8-12), both meaning "when . . . he chose" (cited Giacumakis 1970:53, §8.11, and 62, §10.6, respectively). Both of those examples are date formulae from Stratum VII, dating to the end of the OB period. The inscription on the Idrimi statue often uses the *-u* in main clauses where it should not be (Giacumakis 1970:53, §8.12 for examples). In this case, the explanation of Aro (1954-56:364), viz. that these are mistakes of barbaric Akkadian, seems the most likely.

The same inconsistency, use or misuse of the *-u* marker, is evident in the Akkadian texts from Hattusas (Labat 1932:79-80). The correspondence from Carchemish also shows the lack of *-u* in about half of the instances when it would be expected (Huehnergard 1979:60). It would appear that the grammatical

level of the scribes in the Hittite empire was lower than that of their Mitanni predecessors.

The Akkadian texts written by Egyptian scribes, from both the 14th and the 13th centuries B.C.E., usually have the subjunctive when Akkadian grammar would demand it, but there are a few cases, both in the earlier texts (from EA) and the later Ramesside correspondence found at Boghazkoï, where the *-u* is missing (Cochavi-Rainey 1988:191-192, §2.4.9; 1990b:21-22).

The corpus of Amurru letters, which also spans the 14th and the 13th centuries B.C.E., shows no use of the Akkadian subjunctive marker whatever (Izre'el 1985:171, §2.4.4; also 1991a:166, §2.4.4). And note also from Cyprus: *i-nu-ma tu-ša-ab a-na* GI⁵GU.ZA / *šar-ra-ta¹-ka* "when you take your seat on the throne of your royalty" (EA 34:52-53).

Likewise, the native scribes of Ugarit do not use the subjunctive form in their everyday compositions (letters, economic and legal documents). Only one case of the proper use of the subjunctive is documented (Huehnergard:1979:242-243; 1989:169; cf. van Soldt 1991:440).

Therefore, one must take note of the fact that Levantine scribal traditions, Ugarit and Amurru, show a distinct aversion to the Akkadian marker of subordination. While other peripheral areas, e.g. Nuzi, Alalakh, Carchemish, Hattusas, Egypt, reveal that the scribes were familiar with the function of the Akkadian *-u* suffix, they were somewhat lax in employing it. With this background in mind, one may review the evidence from the texts originating in Canaan.

THE TEXTS FROM CANAAN. It can be stated categorically that the scribes writing Akkadian in Canaan do not use the subjunctive marker, either the Babylonian or the Assyrian. Such a sweeping statement will seem brash, if not impertinent, in view of the fact that one does find the *-u* ending on subordinated verbs, e.g. in relative clauses (rare indeed):

*gáb-bi mi-im-mi / ša yi-pu-šu / LUGAL EN-ia a-na KUR-šu /
gáb-bu* SIG₅.GA / *ma-gal ma-gal* "As for everything that the

king, my lord, is doing for his land, it is all very, very good" (EA 262:7-11); *gáb-bi mi-im-mì / ša yi-iq-bu / LUGAL EN-ia* "Everything that the king, my lord, says, I am obeying" (EA 261:7-10); *a-šar ti-la-ku* "wherever you go" (EA 296:4'); *a-di a-šar ti7-la-ku* "to wherever you go" (EA 203:19; EA 204:19; 205:1);

and in "that" clauses:

i-nu-ma / ʿyu¹-ba-ú la-qa / KUR LUGAL a-na ša-a-šu "that he seeks to take the land of the king for himself" (EA 76:15-16); *i-nu-ma yi-iš-ta-pa-ru šàr-ru / EN-li* "Inasmuch as the king, my lord, keeps writing" (EA 119:8).

However, the contention that the *-u* suffix in such cases is not the Akkadian marker of subordination, but rather the WS marker of the indicative imperfect, can be validated in two ways. Under the appropriate section below (*infra*, pp. 222-244), the modal function of this WS *-u* suffix (and its concomitant plural marker, *-ūna*) will be demonstrated; it will be seen that the *-u / -ūna* suffix appears regularly in main clauses where no subordinating element exists. One can point to over thirty instances where Akkadian would employ the *-u* but where these texts from Canaan have *-∅*.

(1) First of all, we have the preformative statives, for which one could argue that any peripheral scribe might treat them as something different from the prefix conjugation (in peripheral, the stative, even 3rd m.s., often lacks the subjunctive *-u*),

li-iš-al LUGAL LÚMAŠKÍM-šu ša i-de₄ / KURKi-na-aḥ-na "May the king ask his commissioner who knows Canaan" (EA 148:46-47); *ù SIG₅ / e-nu-ma i-de₄* "And it is well that he know" (EA 147:70-71); *LÚ-li ša i-ba-aš-ši i-na URUGub-la* "the man who is in Byblos" (EA 74:12); *aš-šum NA₄me-ku ša i-bá-aš-ši / it-ti-ia* "concerning the raw glass that is with me" (EA 148:5-6).

Contrast the following construction in a text from Egypt:

LÚpá-ma-ḥa-a ša ḥa-an-ni-pa i-de₄-e-i-ú "the commissioner who knows villainy" (EA 162:74; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:192; 1990b:21).

(2) On the other hand, the following preterites and *t*-preterites cannot be explained away; the Canaanite scribe simply did not use the Akkadian marker of subordination even when he eschewed the WS 3rd m.s. *y*- prefix. This dictum applies to relative clauses:

[U]RU.KI.ḪÁ ša il-qé / ʾĪR-Aš-ra-ti "the towns which ʿAbdi-Ashirta has taken" (EA 92:17-18); lu-ú i-de LUGAL EN-ia i-nu-ma / šal-ma-at URUŠġ-du-na^{KI} GEMÉ-ti / LUGAL EN-ia ša i-din a-na qa-ti-ia "May the king, my lord, be apprised that Sidon, the handmaiden of the king, my lord, which he has given into my charge, is at peace" (EA 144:10-12); URU LUGAL / ša ip-qt-id i-na qa-ti-ia "the king's city which he has entrusted to me" (EA 151:6-7); URU.DIDLI.ḪÁ ša NU-id LÚGAL / EN-ia i-na qa-ti-ia "the towns which the officer, my lord, entrusted to me" (EA 23:4-5)

which include some apparent translations of Egyptian royal epithets, clauses dependent on the determinative or the relative pronoun, some pertaining to pharaoh:

ša id-din ri-ig-ma-šu i-na sa-me ki-ma dIŠKUR "who gave his voice in the heavens like Baal" (EA 147:13-14); DUMU d[U]JTU ʿša¹ ti-ra-am / dUTU "son of the sun-god whom the sun-god loved" (EA 323:22-23).

and two describing a loyal or disloyal servant of the king:

ša iš-mé a-na LUGAL be-li-šu ù / ú-ra-ad-šu i-na aš-ra-ni-šu "who obeyed the king, his lord, and serves/served him in his place" (EA 147:41-42); ù ša la iš-te-mé "and as for the one who has not obeyed" (EA 153:12).

These may reflect Egyptian participles or relative forms.

There are also numerous "that" clauses and circumstantial clauses:

ù yi-de LUGAL be-li / i-nu-ma il₅-te-qé / URU.KI-ia ÌR-Ĝe-ba / is-tu qa-ti-ia "and may the king, my lord, be apprised that 'Abdi-Kheba took my town from me" (EA 280:21-24); *e-nu-ma / iq-bi LUGAL be-li-ia* "when the king, my lord said . . ." (EA 147:35-36; cf. also lines 33-34); SIG₅ *i-nu-ma iš-bat URUGub-la* "Is it good that he take Byblos?" (EA 84:36); *ù i-nu-ma iš-te-mé a-wa-at / LUGAL EN-ia i-nu-ma iš-tap-pár a-na ÌR-šu* "and when I heard the word of the king, my lord, when he wrote to his servant" (EA 144:13-14).

Note also the following clause dependent on a noun in construct:

a-wa-at iš-tap-pár / LUGAL EN-ia DINGIR.MEŠ-ia / [d]UTU-ia a-na ia-ši "the word which the king, my lord, my deity, my sun-god, wrote to me" (EA 276:9-11).

Even the Jerusalem letters, which generally restrict the WS imperfect forms to quotations from direct speech, and use the Akkadian present (*iparras*) for the epistolary text, ignore the Akkadian subjunctive:

e-nu-ma à-qa-bi "because I say" (EA 286:22; Moran 1975b:151).

(3) Therefore, it is not surprising that other forms having the WS prefix *y-* appear in subordinate clauses without the Akkadian subjunctive marker, e.g. relative clauses:

gáb-bi mi-im-mi / ša yi-id-din šàr-[r]u / 'EN¹-ia a-[n]a ÌR-[šu] "everything which the ki[n]g, my lord, gave to [his] servant" (EA 248:10-12); *ia-nu / ša ya-aq-bi mi-im-ma a-na / ÌR-A-ši-ir-ta* "There is none who has said anything to 'Abdi-Ashirta" (EA 75:27-29); *ša ia-aš-tap-pár LUGAL / be-lí-ia a-na ÌR-šu / yi-iš-teg-mu* "what the king, my lord has written to his servant, he is obeying" (EA 233:16-18);

and also circumstantial clauses:

i-nu-ma yi-iz-zi-iz / UGU^{URU}Šu-na-ma ù UGU^{URU}Bur-¹qú¹-na / ù UGU^{URU}Ha-ra-bu "when he attacked Shunem and Burquna and 'Arrabu" (EA 250:42-44); *ša-ni-tam i-nu-ma yi-iq-bi¹Ia-an-ḥa-mu / [na-a]d-na-ti-mi ŠE.IM.ḤÁ a-na¹Ri-ib-^dISKUR* "Furthermore, if Yanḥamu has said, 'I [have] given grain to Rib-Haddi" (EA 5:23-24); *i-nu-ma yi-iš-ta-pár a-na LÚ.MEŠ / URU^{URU}Am-mi-ia* "because he wrote to the men of Ammia" (EA 73:26-27).

To these we may add some 1st c.s. and 2nd m.s. examples:

i-nu-ma aq-bi a-na LÚGAL / ¹Pu-ḥu-ri "when I said to the officer Paḥurru" (EA 19:16-17); *u i₁₅-nu-ma iš-te-me a-wa-te^{MEŠ}-ka / an-nu-ta₅* "and when I heard these words of yours" (EA 227:8-9); *ù qa-la-ta / [a-na ip-ši-š]u-nu i-nu-ma ti-iš-me / [URU^{URU}Ul-l]a-sà la-qú* "but you kept ignoring [th]eir [deed] when you heard that they had taken [Ul]asa" (EA 109:13-15).

In conclusion, it may prove useful to cite a passage in which the subordinated verbs do not have the Akkadian subjunctive marker but in which the verb of the main clause does have a *-u* suffix:

ù a-wa-ta ša-a i-de / ù ša-a eš-te-me aš-pu-¹ru¹ / a-na šar-ri EN-ia "and the word which I know or which I have heard, I write to the king, my lord" (EA 108:23-24; cf. also EĀ 233:16-18 cited *supra*, p. 200).

The passage speaks about the character of a faithful servant and the point is that such a servant always reports the facts to the king. Thus, the suffix *-u* on *ašpuru* signifies habitual behavior. Such forms with WS imperfect meaning will be treated below. It suffices here to point out that this text shows clearly that a Canaanite scribe ignored the Akkadian positional suffix *-u* but utilized the WS modal suffix *-u*. There can be no doubt that the

EA texts from Canaan have an entirely different system of verbal suffixes than that required by the rules of normative Akkadian.

THE AKKADIAN VENTIVE

The situation is different with regard to the Akkadian ventive. It will be demonstrated below that the Canaanite scribes were well aware of the function of that suffix. One finds both *-a* and *-am*, even in cases where there is no enclitic or personal suffix on the verb. The scribes are especially sensitive to the semantic nuances applied to verbs of motion and verbs of communication (speaking, writing) by the addition of the ventive, and they make good use of them. When the application of the *-a(m)* conflicted with the need for a WS verbal suffix, then the scribes had to make some kind of compromise or accommodation. Various solutions to that dilemma will be seen below (Rainey 1991-93).

STOCK EXPRESSIONS. The Canaanite scribes were familiar, of course, with the use of the ventive in letters which they received from outside of Canaan (mainly from Egypt). Recognition of such forms would have been part of their training. The letters from pharaoh to local Canaanite rulers have:

ṭup-pa an-na-a uš-te-bi-la-ku . . . LUGAL um-te-eš-še-ra-ku / Ḫa-an-ni "this tablet have I sent to you . . . the king has sent to you Ḫanni" (EA 367:3, 6-7; Rainey19788:37); *ṭup-pa an-¹na¹-¹am¹ / ul-te-bi-la-ak-ku . . . um-te-še-ra-ak-ku Ḫa-an-ia* "this tablet have I sent to you . . . I have sent to you Ḫanya" (EA 369:3, 5; Rainey 1978b:41).

Therefore, it is not surprising to find the following Akkadianism in a text which is obviously a reply to just such a pharaonic message:

a-wa-at ul-te-bi-la / LUGAL EN-ia DINGIR.MEŠ-ia / ^dUTU-ia a[-n]a ia-ši "As for the word which the king, my lord, my sun-god, sent to me" (EA 267:9-11).

WITH ACCUSATIVE SUFFIX. The Jerusalem letters, which use mainly Akkadian prefix forms, also apply the ventive plus accusative suffix:

zu-ru-uḫ šār-ri KALAG.GA / ʿù¹-še-ri-ba-an-ni a-na É LÚa-bi-ia
 "The strong arm of the king installed me in my father's house"
 (EA 286:12-13; cf. EA 300:17-19).

The Byblos letters contain several examples of the ventive plus accusative 1st c.s. *-ni* in purely indicative contexts. The same tablet which has *mi-nu / yi-na-ší-ru-ni* "who will protect me?" (EA 112:17) also has *mi-nu yi-na-ší-ra-an-ni* (EA 112:13). Other examples of the same phenomenon are: [*m*]i-nu yi-na-ša-ra-ni (EA 119:10); *mi-nu yi-n[a-ší-]ra[-an-ni]* (EA 121:10); *ma-an-nu / yi-na-ší-ra-ni* (EA 130:19).

šapāru. Another standard usage is the ventive with *šapāru* "to send in writing," as in this Taanach letter:

at-ta ta-ʿaš¹-pu-ʿra¹ / a-na ia-ši "you have written to me"
 (TT 1:8-9; Rainey 1977:43).

And there are numerous stock expressions with this verb employed by the Canaanite scribes when replying to a message from pharaoh:

iš-teg-né-me / a-wa-at LUGAL EN-ia / ša iš-tap-pa-ra-ni "I continually heed the word of the king, my lord, which he sent to me" (EA 305:15-17; also EA 145:11-13; 253:7-10; 254:6-7; 304:15-17; 329:13-15); LÚMAŠKÍM \ *ra-bi-iš / ša LUGAL EN-ia / ša iš-tap-ra-am / LUGAL EN-ia . . . a-na ia-a-ši* "As for the commissioner of the king, my lord, whom the king, my lord has sent to me" (EA 321:15-20; 32:17-20).

Within a more West Semitized context, the same verb can also be in the preterite with ventive, even with the WS 3rd m.s. suffix *y-*. Note the following "that" clauses:

i-nu-ma yi-iš-tap-pa-ra / šar-ru a-na ia-ši "Inasmuch as the king has written to me" (EA 130:9-10, 14-16; also EA 77:6-8; 102:14).

wuššuru / muššuru. The most ubiquitous verb with the *-a* suffix in the corpus of Canaanite texts is *wuššuru / muššuru* (cf. *supra*, pp. 185-186, 191-205). The unique western meaning for this verb, "to send," may have developed from the original meaning, "to release," plus the ventive (*supra*, pp. 157-168). It may be impossible to prove that theory; in the texts one finds forms both with and without the ventive in the meaning "to send." Nevertheless, it is notable how many of the examples of this verb do carry an *-a* suffix. Many of these are in injunctive contexts and will be discussed below (*infra*, pp. 257-261). Here it is important to note the few instances when the *-a* is present, but the meaning is not injunctive.

[ù] *aš-ta-pár / a-na É.GAL ù yu-w[a-ša-]ra / >ù yu-wa-ša-ra*
 'šar¹-ru ERÍN.MEŠ / *ra-ba* "[and] I wrote to the palace and he
 se[n]t >and he sent< a large army" (EA 117:24-27).

Moran (1960:16-18; 1987b:323; 1992:193) translates the second clause as if it were a purpose clause but this is hardly suitable in the context. Rib-Haddi is simply recounting what happened in the past. In spite of the *-a*- theme vowel, there can be no doubt here that the *-a* suffix is the Akkadian ventive, not the WS volitive. The same holds true for the following, which is an interrogative sentence and cannot possibly be injunctive:

a-na mi-nim-mi la-a tu-wa-ši-ra / LÚDUMU ši-ip-ri-ka a-na maḥ-ri-ia
 "Why didn't you send your emissary to me?" (EA 34:9-10;
 Moran 1987b:198; 1992:105).

This Alashian text is paralleled by a similar question from Jerusalem:

am-mi-ni₇ DUMU LÚKIN k[i-ma ar-ḥi-i]š / la-a ú-ma-še-ra 'šar¹[-ru
 EN-ia] "Why did the king not send an emissary q[quickly]?"

(EA 285:7-10; cf. Na³aman 1975:97; Moran 1987b:507 n. 3; 1992:325 n. 3).

Another preterite with the ventive ending is attested in a circumstantial clause employed in the strongly Canaanized epistle written by the leaders from ^cIraqata:

i-nu-ma yu-wa-ši-r[a LU]GAL / EN-nu ¹D[UMU]-Bi-ḥa-a [ù] / yi-iq-bi a-na ia[-ši-nu] . . . "When the [ki]ng, our lord, sent D[UMU]-Biḥā [and] he said to u[s] . . . (EA 100:11-13).

These certain examples of the ventive raise the question of the *-a* suffix that appears with most of the imperative forms of *wuššuru*, viz. *uššira* (*passim*) and also on many examples of the precativ. It seems logical to assume that these were also *ventives* in spite of the temptation to see them as *modus attraction* from a volitive *-a* used on regular prefix forms in injunctive contexts; cf. the similar phenomenon in Hebrew:

qûmāh ²elôhîm šoṭṭāh hā²āreṣ "Arise oh God, judge the earth"
(Ps. 82:8).

Youngblood (1961:94-95) surveyed all the *uššira* imperatives and found that while the simple *uššir* means simply "send" (elsewhere), *uššira* always means "send (to me, the speaker)." One does not find *uššira . . . ana yâši* but a circumlocution may be used, *uš-ši-ra-mi . . . it-ti-ia* (EA 82:15; Youngblood 1961:230; cf. also *infra*, pp. 331-332, 335).

leqû. Besides the usual verbs of motion and of speaking, etc., it would appear that the Canaanite scribes had also learned some special nuances for particular verbs. One of the most important of these is *leqû* "to take." The scribes were fully aware that the ventive of this verb can express "to bring along (with)." They would have encountered this usage in epistles from other contemporary sources. Note, for example, this passage from a Mitanni letter:

ù *ṭup-pa* / *ša il-qà-a al-ta-ta-as-sí-ma* [ù *a*]-*ma-t[i]-šu el-te-me* "I have carefully read the tablet which he had brought along" (EA 19:11; CAD L:133b).

A Jerusalem text also has this nuance on a precative:

lu-ma-še-er / *šār-ru* LÚMAŠKÍM ù *li-il-qé-a-ni* / *a-na ia-a-ši* (for *ka-ta₅*) *a-di ŠEŠ.MEŠ* ù BA.UG₇ / *ni-mu-tu₄ it-ti šār-ru* (sic!) EN-*nu* "May the king send the commissioner and may he take me away to *you*(!) with (my) colleagues that we may die with the king our lord" (EA 288:58-61).

But the clearest example of this particular usage is found in a letter from Biryawaza:

ù *yi-la-ak* ¹Ar-*za-wu-ya* / *a-na* URUQ_i-*i[s-sà]* ù *yi-il₅-qa* / ERÍN.MEŠ ¹A-*zi-[ri u yi]-iš-ba-at* / URUŠ^a-*ad-du u yi-di-in₄-ši a-na* / LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ *u la-a yi-di-in₄-ši* / *a-na* LUGAL EN-*ia* "and Arzawuya went to Ke[desh] and he *took along* the troops of Azi[ru and he] seized the town of Shaddu and he gave it to the *ʿapîru* men and did not give it to the king, his lord" (EA 197:26-31)

izuzzu. Another verb which sometimes takes the ventive to express a particular nuance is the irregular *izuzzu* "to stand." With the ventive, it may signify something like "to take a stand," "to present oneself," much like the Hebrew *hiṭyaššēb*. In OB we have:

PA.PA ù DUMU.É *ṭup-pa-a-ti* / *iz-zi-zu-ni-ma* "The PA.PA officer and the archivist presented themselves" (VAS 7, 198:14-15 = VAB 6, 254:14-15 = AbB 6, 215).

and OA:

A-šùr *be-li* / *i-zi-za-¹ma¹ iš-tù a-bu-ul šé-n[i]-im* / *a-dí a-bu-ul ni-ší-im qà-¹qé¹-re-e* / *a-na A-šùr be-[l]i-a e-zi-ib* "Asshur, my lord, stood by me, so I reserved the ground between the sheep gate

and the people's gate for Asshur, my lord" (Landsberger and Balkan 1950:224, 8-11; 225 CAD E:420b; Q:119a).

and also in MB:

ù pa-^fan¹ be-li-šu ú-zu-uz-zu / i-na-an-na a-na pa-ni be-lí-ia-ma / ú-zu-uz-za "And before his lord they stand; now it is before my lord that I present myself" (PBS 13, 6:16-18);

and in literary texts from Amarna itself:

i-lu iš-te-en i-na pī-i ba-a-bi iz-za-^fza¹ "A god is standing at the gate" (EA 357:55); *ša ša iz-za-za qáb-la-šu li-pu-la LUGAL* "those (expenses) of the ones who help him in battle, let the king pay" (EA 359:19; Rainey 1978b:12-13).

There are some examples of *izuzzu* in the Canaanite letters where the *-a* suffix has to be ventive since the context requires an indicative, not an injunctive, e.g.

ša-ma-ma šu-nu / >šu-nu< i-nu-ma i-teg-ru-bu / i-na URUŠu-mu-ra / URU.MEŠ an-nu-tu GIŠ¹MÁ¹.^fMEŠ¹ / ù DUMU.MEŠ ʾĪR-A-ši-i[r-] \ ta / i-na šé-ri ù / [i]z-^fzi¹-za UGU<-šu-nu> ù / la-a i-le-ú / a-ša ù ep-ša-at URUGub-la / [a]-na LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ "If they hear that I am entering into Šumur, these cities (will be in) ships and the sons of ʿAbdi-Ashirta (will be) on land and I will be up against <them> and I will be unable to go forth lest Byblos go over to the ʿapîrû men" (EA 104:43-52).

The entire string of clauses constitutes the protasis of a conditional sentence of which the protasis is a clause beginning with an absolute infinitive (Rainey 1989-90:59b-60a; *contra* Moran 1950a:164; 1987b:300 n. 3; 1992:177 n. 3). The first clauses of the apodosis are non-verbal and the subsequent clause is indicative, viz. *la-a i-le-ú*. Therefore, *[i]z-^fzi¹-za* can hardly have any other WS modal stance than indicative. The scribe felt that he needed the lexical nuance of the ventive, "to take a stand," with UGU, "to

stand up against." Therefore, he used *izzizza* as 1st c.s. indicative imperfect without any WS indicator of mood or tense!

The same conclusion seems unavoidable with regard to *yizzizza* in the next passage:

šum-ma i-na-na / qa-la-ta ù¹Pí-ḫu-ra / la-a yi-zi-za i-na /
URUKu-mi-di u ka-li LÚ.MEŠ / [ḫ]a-za-ni-ka tù-da-ku[-n]a "If now
 you keep silent and Paḫura does not take up position in
 Kômidi, then all of your [ci]ty rulers will be sla[i]n!"
 (EA 132:46-50; Rainey 1989-90:62).

Moran (1950a:98; 1960:14; 1987b:352; 1992:214) takes the clause *ù¹Pí-ḫu-ra / la-a yi-zi-za i-na / URUKu-mi-di* as the apodosis. But this leaves the next clause, *u ka-li LÚ.MEŠ / [ḫ]a-za-ni-ka tù-da-ku[-n]a*, dangling by itself. The latter is, in fact, the apodosis, the dreaded result of possible pharaonic negligence. So even if Piḫurra's failure to take/hold his position in Kômidi is part of the apodosis, then it must agree in mood with the verb in the next clause, *tù-da-ku[-n]a*. However, it seems more likely that Piḫurra's being posted in Kômidi is viewed here as a necessary condition to prevent the slaying of the city rulers. Therefore, this clause must be part of the protasis, which happens to have a suffix conjugation verb (the modal equivalent of a prefix conjugation indicative). Therefore, whether in the protasis or in the apodosis, *yi-zi-za* must be indicative; it follows, then, that the *-a* suffix is Akkadian ventive and not WS volitive.

(*w*)*ašû*. Definite lexical force attaches to the ventive used with (*w*)*ašû* "to go out," viz. "to come forth." Some of the contexts where this construction is employed require an indicative, not a volitive:

[i-d]_{e9} *ki-i-ma / [l]a-mi-in šum-ka / a-na pa-ni LUGAL ù / [l]a-a*
ti-ta-ša-am / [i]š-tu^{KUR}Mi-iš-ri "[I kn]ow that your name is
 [vi]llified before the king so that you [can]not come forth [f]rom
 Egypt" (EA 97:4-8; cf. also CAD L:123b; Moran 1987b:289;
 1992:170).

The form *ti-ta-ša-am* (for Akkadian *tattaš[s]âm*) is either Gt present or preterite (less likely Gtn preterite), the infix *-t-* expressing the separative nuance. The context expresses no injunctive nuance. The second clause is a result clause, not a purpose clause, and even if it were the latter, it would be dependent on a nominal clause (= indicative) which would require an indicative in the clause expressing purpose. Therefore, the only possible definition of *ti-ta-ša-am* is as an Akkadian ventive in an indicative syntagma.

The same holds true for the next example:

[*ša-ni-tam a-na-k*]u la uš-ša-am "[Further, as for m]e, I cannot come out" (EA 88:51; Youngblood 1961:321).

Moran (1987b:275, 276 n. 12; 1992:160-161 n 9) took the verb *uš-ša-am* to be 3rd m.s. as a parallel to EA 87:17, but Youngblood (1961:321) compares EA 87:29 and adopts the reading above. The resulting 1st c.s. verb must be in an indicative context (even Moran's 3rd m.s. could hardly be injunctive here).

It is not possible to construe the following example as volitive; it is clearly parallel to a preceding preterite:

ù aš-pu-ur / ù tu-ša ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-tu / ù ti7-il-qé 'a-ba-šu-nu "so I wrote and the army came forth and it captured their father" (EA 362:18-20; Moran 1960:4; 1987b:556; 1992:359-360; *contra* Moran 1950a:178); ù aš-pu-ur / a-na LUGAL be-li-ia . 'ù¹ tu-ša ERÍN.MEŠ / [ù] ti-il-qé URUŠu[-m]u-ri ù / [IIR-A-ši-]ir!-ti "and I wrote to the king, my lord, and the army came forth [and] it took Šu[m]ur and [Abdi-Ash]irta" (EA 138:31-34).

The form *tu-ša* is obviously preterite in both passages..

A few passages reveal a special solution to the conflict between the need for an Akkadian ventive and for a WS indicative on the same form. The scribe simply adds the energetic *-na* to the ventive! This could presumably stand for an energetic volitive (cf. discussion *infra*, pp. 263-264), but the latter was so rare in the Canaanite Amarna texts as to cast doubt on its

existence there at all. So the scribe(s) in question seem to have felt that ventive plus *-na* would solve their dilemma.

The first text is a purpose clause dependent on an indicative:

a-na mi-ni₇ / qa-la-ta ù la-a taq-bu / a-na šàr-ri EN-li-ka / ù tu-ša-na qa-du ERÍN.MEŠ / pí-tá-ti ù ti-ma-qú-tu / UGU KUR_A-mur-ri "Why do you keep silent and not speak to the king, your lord, so that you come forth with the army and so that you fall on Amurru?" (EA 73:6-11).

The other two passages are in the protasis of conditional sentences with *šumma*. In all of Moran's examples, he never found a volitive in a *šumma* clause.

šum-ma ap-pu-na-ma yu-ša-na šàr-ru / ù ka-li KUR.KUR.KI nu-kúr-tu₄ a-na ša-šu / ù mi-na yi-pu-šu a-na ia-ši-nu "If the king comes forth and all the countries are against him, then what can he do to us?" (EA 74:39-41; Moran 1987b:250; 1992:)143; *šum-ma MU.MEŠ a[n]-^lni¹-ta ú-ul / yu-ša-na ERÍN.MEŠ [pí-t]á-ta / ù in-ni[-ip-ša-a]t ka-li / KUR.KUR.KI.MEŠ a[-na LÚ.MEŠ GA]Z* "If this year the army does not come forth, then all the countries will go [over] t[o the *apîru* me]n" (EA 77:26-29; Moran 1987b:257; 1992:148).

Finally, the same interpretation, ventive plus indicative energetic *-na*, must apply to the following:

ša-ni-tam ú-ul aš-ta-pár a-na šàr-ri / a-nu-ma 2 LÚ^{KUR}Mi-iš-ri šu-nu / tu-ša-na ša-ri a-na ia-ši / ù la-a a-ša "Furthermore, did I not write to the king: 'Now, as for those two Egyptians, my breath will come forth to me'? But it did not come" (EA 117:53-56; contrast Moran 1987b:323, 325 n. 11; 1992:193, 195 n. 11).

turru. It remains to note that, in one instance, *tú-ti-ra-an-ni* (EA 145:10), Moran (1987b:375; 1992:231) renders this ventive of

turru as a preterite although it is an injunctive; cf. *t[ú-te-ra-am* in the same text (EA 145:26; Moran 1987b:376 n. 6; 1992:232 n. 6).

CONCLUSION. The foregoing illustrations prove that the Akkadian ventive was used extensively in the EA letters from Canaan. Most of the examples are preterite, i.e. Akkadian verb formations plus the $-\emptyset$ suffix of the past tense (applicable to both Akkadian and WS). The final passage has a chain of past events:

[¹Zi-ir]-dam-ia[-a]š-da / p[a-]tá-ar iš-t[u] / [¹B]ir₅-ia-wa-za i[-ba-ši] / it-ti ¹Šu-ta Ì[R] / šàr-ri i-na URU ¹UN¹[-ti] / [¹]a-a yi-qa-bi mi-im[-m]i / [a-n]a ša-šu tu-uš-ša / [E]RÍN.MEŠ LUGAL EN-ia i-ba[-ši] / it-ti-ši i-na URU Ma-gíd-da^[K1] / la-a qa-bi mi-mu a-na ša-š[u] / ù yi-ip-ṭú-ra a-na mu-ḥi-ia / ù a-nu-ma / ia-aš-pu-ra ¹Šu-ta a-na ia-ši i-din-mi / ¹Zi-ir-dam-ia-aš-da / a-na ¹Bir₅-ia-wa-za "[Zir]damyashda departed from [B]iryawaza; he wa[s] with Shuta, the servant of the king in the garrison town; he said nothing to him; the king's army came forth; he was with it in Megiddo; nothing was said to him; then he departed to me and now Shuta has written to me: 'Give Zirdamyashda to Biryawaza'" (EA 234:11-26; Rabiner 1981:99-100, §5.2.2.3; Moran 1987b:460, 461 n. 4; 1992:29 n 4).

THE PRECATIVE

Another verbal construction peculiar to Akkadian is the precative. It is used frequently by the Canaanite scribes in spite of the existence of a WS conjugation pattern which fulfills the same functions (the jussive; cf. *infra*, pp. 244-254; Rainey 1993). The precative is formed by combining the particle *lū* with the forms of the prefix conjugations used for the preterite (Edzard 1973:130-131). The particle may originally have been a marker for conditional, primarily unreal conditions (Huehnergard 1983:573b). It has been argued that Akkadian *liprus*(*ū*/*ā*) and *laprus* (in Assyrian) cannot have developed from *lū* + **yaprus* or *lū* + **aprus* respectively (Huehnergard 1983:574-575; Edzard 1973:131). However, the argument from phonetic shifts alone is

inadequate. The factor at work in the Akkadian precative paradigm is *differentiation of person* which is a semantic need that can override the usual phonetics if the latter would lead to obscurity. Third person *liprus* preserved an echo of the original *y-* which was needed as a 3rd m.s. person marker; in Babylonian the vowel class of the *lū* was admissible in first person *luprus* because there was no danger of confusion with the third person. In Assyrian, on the other hand, *laprus* kept an echo of the original *ʔ-* by analogy with the third person's echoing its *y-*. That the precative constructions of the stative and the forms with preformative *t-* all have *lū* is sufficient proof that the original particle at play in the third and first persons was also *lū*; there is no need to posit the existence of a particle **la* (*contra* Huehnergard 1983:574b-575a).

MORPHOLOGY. The scribes generally use the correct forms for the precative with only a few divergences noted below. Nearly all of the documented examples are 3rd m.s. A selection of the principal constructions are as follows: *li-ib-lu-uṭ* (EA 85:39, 86; 256:10, 11; 289:37); *li-id-mì-iq* (EA 85:33); *li-ru-ub* (EA 149:78); *li-iḫ-šu-uš-mi* (EA 228:18); *li-il₅-ma-ad* (EA 75:35; 238:29; 282:8; 335:14); *li-il-qé et al.* (EA 285:18 *et al.*); *li-im-li-ik et al.* (EA 149:8, 54; 155:14, 70; 263:18 *et al.*); *li-din et al.* (EA 102:6; 286:53; 288:49 *et al.*); *li-iš-ṣur* (EA 84:28); *li-šú-ru* (EA 326:12); *li-ip-qí-id et al.* (EA 148:28; 253:32); *li-is-ki-in et al.* (EA 285:26; 290:29 *et al.*); *li-iš-al et al.* (EA 96:6; 97:3; 148:46; 151:21 *et al.*); *li-iš-me et al.* (EA 88:23; 290:19 *et al.*); *li-it-ri-iš et al.* (EA 92:46; 106:35 *et al.*); *li-iz-kur* (EA 289:41). There are two 3rd m.s. forms with *-u-* instead of *-i-* as the prefix vowel, viz.

ù lu-uḫ-di LUGAL EN-ia / a-na I-tag-ga₁₄-ma ÌR-šu "So may the king, my lord, rejoice in Etaggama, his servant" (EA 189:19-20);
lu-uk-šu-da-am-mì / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭá-at LUGAL [EN-ia] / ù MAŠKÍM.MEŠ-šu "May the army of the king, [my lord] come hither" (EA 191:11-13).

Note also the correct Babylonian example from (*w*)*ašû*: *li-ši-mi* (EA 286:51) alongside Assyrian *lu-ši-mi* (EA 286:56) in the same Jerusalem text (Moran 1975b:153).

For 1st c.s. there are three Assyrian forms from Jerusalem (Moran 1975b:153): *la-mu-ur* (EA 286:46); *la-mur-mi* (EA 286:40); and *le-lu-ub* (EA 286:46; for *lērub*). From Tyre one also finds 1st c.s. *le-ru-ub* (EA 148:16; 151:17) but in the same context the 1st c.s. *li-mur* (EA 148:17) which may be an indication that the Tyrian scribe has simply used 3rd m.s. forms for first person; if so, then read *li-ru-ub*.

For the D stem there are some instances where the scribes observed the correct Babylonian 3rd m.s. form: *li-ši-ra* (EA 94:71; *lū + uššera*); *li-wa-še-ra* (EA 255:22); *li-wa-aš-šir*₄ (EA 149:17, 76); *li-te-ra-an-ni* (EA 96:32). On the other hand, there are some instances when the typical Assyrian 3rd m.s. form appears (particularly from Jerusalem): *lu-ma-še-er* (EA 288:58; 289:42); *lu-ma-šir*₉ (EA 290:20); *lu-ma-še-ra* (EA 285:28; 287:18); *lu-ti-ra* (EA 290:21). But from Byblos, there are also: *lu-wa-ši-ra-am* (EA 84:26; 106:26, 42); and elsewhere with suffixes: *lu-w[a-a]š-ši-ra-an-ni-mi* (EA 238:9); *lu-wa-ši-ra-ni* (EA 263:23).

It is a question whether 3rd m.s. *li-sà-ḥír* (EA 151:70) is D stem or N: most likely it is the latter (cf. CAD S:52b-53a).

The verb *idû* presents a unique picture. The OB and OA precativum was *lū ide*, which is somewhat anomalous. It probably derived from the function of the preterite, *ide*, *tīde*, etc., as a syntactic stative (GAG:102, §78b). The precativum *lū ide* corresponded to *lū paris*. The EA texts from Canaan often use *lū ide*, usually written *lu i-de* (EA 68:9; *et al.*), but some of the scribes created a more "conventional" injunctive, *li-de-(mi)* (EA 174:18; *et al.*). However, the fact that a WS jussive pattern was in use in these texts led to the adoption of forms such as *lu-ú yi-de* (EA 243:21; *et al.*; cf. *infra*, p. 249).

The apparent confusion on the part of the WS scribes between the Akkadian G present and the D stem may have led to the following examples in which a form other than the **yiprus* was joined to the *lū*: *li-^lda^l-gal* (EA 74:10); *lu-ḥa-mu-uṭ* (EA 88:40); *lⁱl^l-mu-^lḥu^l?-[šú]* (EA 209:10); *li-ma-lik* (EA 94:72; possibly N

stem); *li-pa-qa-ad* (EA 197:35); *li-qáb-bi-šu-nu* (EA 171:17; not Canaanite).

Some other stems are represented by the following: Possibly Gt — [*li-*]*iš-te-mé* (EA 63:11); Gtn according to *AHw*:702b — *li-it-ta-din* (EA 148:9, 13, 26; 151:37); Dt(?) — *li-it-te-er* (EA 149:84), unless this is simply a use of the Akkadian *-t-*preterite.

SYNTAX. The various syntagmas in which the precative appears are similar to those of standard Akkadian but they often show the influence of the local WS dialect. One striking difference is, of course, the fact that these precatives, like most verbs in the corpus under study, come at the head of their clauses rather than at the end (Finley 1979:60-61). One exception is the introductory formula used in three Tanaach letters:

^dIŠKUR ZI-*ta-ka li-iš-šur* "May Baal preserve your life!" (TT 5:3; 6:3); EN DINGIR.MEŠ-*nu / ZI-ka li-iš-šur* "May Baal, the great god, preserve your life!" (TT 2:2-3; Rainey 1977:50).

This is a well known formula, documented in Mari:

DINGIR-*lum na-^fpr¹-iš-ta-ka / ^faš¹-šu-mi-ia li-iš-šú-ur / ^fna¹-pr¹-iš-ta-ni a-na da-ri-iš u₄-mi-im / DINGIR-*lum ^fli¹-iš-šú-ur* "May god protect your life for my sake; may god protect our life forever!" (ARM 4, 59:6-8; *AHw*:738a);*

and also in Cassite letters:

^d*Gu-la a-ši-ib-ti* ^{URU}*I-si-in nap-šá-ti-ka li-iš-šur* "May Gula, who dwells in Isin, protect your life!" (Lutz 1919:No. 30:4-5; Waschow 1936:10-11; Salonen 1967:60-61); BÀD.DINGIR.KI ù ^d*KA.DI / na-ap-ša-^fat¹ be-lí-ia li-iš-šur / DINGIR.MEŠ ma-la be-lí / pa-al-ḫu-šu-nu-ti / na-ap-ša-a-ti ša be-lí-ia / li-iš-šur* "May Dēr and Išaran protect the life of of my lord! May all the gods that my lord worships protect the life of my lord!" (Radau 1908: No. 5:6-11; Waschow 1936:20; Salonen 1967:60).

The other Taanach letter has a different formulation. It is WS in flavor and in word order, but still uses the precative (Rainey 1977:51):

DINGIR.MEŠ *li-iš-a-lu* / ¹šu¹-*lum-ka šu-lum* / ¹É¹-*ka*
 DUMU.MEŠ-*ka* "May the gods show concern for your welfare,
 the welfare of your household (and) of your children!"
 (TT 1:5-7).

The precative is in the plural in accordance with the subject. The same formula appears in an EA letter from an Egyptian official to Rib-Haddi, but here the precative is 3rd m.s., evidently taking the subject as a "plural of majesty":

DINGIR.MEŠ-*nu* / *šu-lum-ka šu-lum É-ka* / *li-iš-al* "May the deity
 show concern for your welfare (and) the welfare of your
 household" (EA 96:4-6; Youngblood 1961:398; Moran 1987b:288;
 1992:170).

Likewise, the same plural subject with 3rd m.s. precative is found in a text from Yapa^c-Haddi:

[DINGIR.M]EŠ *šu-lum-ka li-[iš-a]*! "May [the dei]ty [show
 concern] for your welfare!" (EA 97:3).

Once a Byblos author uses the precative in an oft repeated formula where the Byblos scribes normally make use of the 3rd f.s. WS jussive, *tiddin*, instead (e.g. EA 73:4; 74:3) *et al.*). The lone example of the precative in this syntagma has the 3rd m.s. for the 3rd f.s. subject, which is, of course, in accordance with the standard Babylonian practice:

^dNIN *ša* ^{URU}Gub-*la* / DINGIR LUGAL BE-*ia li-din* / TÉS^{ba}-*ka a-na*
pa-ni LUGAL *be-li-ku* (sic!) / ^dUTU KUR.DIDLIMEŠ.KI "May the
 Lady of Byblos, the deity of the king, my lord, give you dignity
 in the presence of the king, your lord, the sun-god of the
 lands!" (EA 102:5-8).

Another familiar syntagma is the oath formula. Besides two broken passages from Byblos (EA 85:39-40, 86), there are two complete texts from Peḫel and Jerusalem respectively:

li-ib-lu-uṭ / šār-ru EN-ia li-ib-lu-uṭ / šār-ru EN-ia šum-ma i₁₅-ba-ši / ¹A-ia-ab i-na URUPí-ḫi-lì "May the king, my lord, live! May the king, my lord, live! If Ayyāb is in Peḫel" (EA 256:10-13; Moran 1987b:483, 484 n. 1; 1992:309 and n. 1); li-ib-lu-uṭ šār-ri / lu-ú ir-pí-šu ¹Pu-ú-ru / pa-ṭar i-na ma-aḫ-ri-ia / i-na URUḪa-za-ti i-ba-aš-ši "As the king lives, his official Pawura has left me! He is in Gaza" (EA 289:37-40).

It is possible that the precative is intended by the Sumerogram TI in the following two texts:

ù / DINGIR.MEŠ KUR-k[a] ¹TI¹ ga-am-ru DUMU.MEŠ-nu MÍDUMU.MÍ.MEŠ<-nu> / ¹GIŠ¹ É!-nu i[-n]a na-da-ni₇ i-na KUR¹Ia-ri-mu-ta / i-na ba-l[a]-ṭá "As the god(s) of your land ¹live¹, our sons, <our> daughters, the furniture of our house, are used up in payment in Yarimuta for our sustenance" (EA 74:14-17; Youngblood 1961:122, 133); ù TI DINGIR-ka! / ¹Mi-ya LÚ¹URU¹A-ra-aš-ni / iṣ-ša-bat URUAr-[d]a-ta "but as your god lives, Miya, the ruler of Arashni has seized Ar[d]ata" (EA 75:29-31; Youngblood 1961:163; Moran 1987b:253; 1992:145).

Though the second passage is now called in question (Moran 1987b:254 n. 6; 1992:146 n. 6), the first one is certain. Whether the scribe intended the precative or not is unprovable. He might have had the stative in mind, just as in the following:

i-nu-ma ba-al-ṭú / LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM ù / a-da-bu-bu ka-li ip-ši-šu-nu "As the commissioners live, I will report all their deeds" (EA 119:21-23; CAD B:57a; contrast Moran 1950a:134 n. 187); e-nu-ma LUGAL ¹EN¹[-ia] / TIL.LA e-nu-ma it-ta-ṣu-ú LÚ¹MAŠKÍM¹.M[EŠ] / a-qa-bi ḫal-qa-at-mi KUR.ḪÁ šār-ri / la ta-ša-mé-ú a-na ia-a-ši "As the king, [my] lord, lives, whenever the commissio[ners] came forth, I have been saying ¹The lands

of the king are lost!' (but) they have not been listening to me"
(EA 286:47-50; Nitzán 1973:72).

The most frequent use of the precative in the Canaanite letters is as the first in a chain of injunctive clauses, the subsequent verb forms being either WS jussives or volitives (cf. *infra*, pp. 251-252), e.g.

li-iš-me šār-ru a-wa-te ÌR-šu / ù ia-di-na ba-la-ṭá ÌR-šu / yu-ba-li-iṭ
/ ÌR-šu ù / a-na-ša-¹ra¹ [URU] ¹ki¹-it-ti-šu a-di ¹NIN¹-nu /
DINGIR.MEŠ-nu a[-na ka-ta₅] "May the king listen to the words
of his servant so that he grant his servant's sustenance, and
may he sustain his servant so that I may protect his loyal [city]
with our Lady (and) our god(s) f[or you]!" (EA 74:53-57).

The precative itself may even be preceded by an independent particle *lū*:

ù lu-ú-mi / li-ik-ki-im-mi / šār-ru URU.KI-šu la-a-mì / yi-iš-bat-ši /
¹La-ab-a-yu / . . . ù lu-ú / li-di-nam-mi šār-ru / 1 ME LÚ.MEŠ
ma-an-ša-ar-ta₅ / a-na na-ša-ri URU.KI-šu / la-a-mì yi-iš-bat-ši /
¹La-ab-a-yu "May the king verily deliver his city lest Lab²ayu
seize it . . . so may the king provide one hundred guardsmen to
protect the city lest Lab²ayu seize it!" (EA 244:25-38; Campbell
1965:193; Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:485a; Rabiner
1981:99, 110); uš-ši-ra-am-mi ^{LÚ}DUMU.KIN-ka / it-ti-ia a-na
ma-ḥar / LUGAL BE-ka ù lu-ú / li-di-na-ku ERÍN.MEŠ ù
GÍŠGIGIR.MEŠ / i-zi-ir-ta₅ a-na ka-ta₅ / ù ti-šú-ru URU "Send
your ambassador to me, to the presence of the king, your lord,
and he will verily grant you troops and chariots as help for
you, that they may guard the city" (EA 87:9-14).

Since the Jerusalem scribe uses WS constructions for the suffix conjugation but not for the prefix conjugation (except for a few examples of direct speech), a considerable number of precatives are employed. They may even appear in a chain of injunctives:

ù li-it-ru-uš i-na pa-ni LUGA[L *ù*] / *lu-ma-še-ra* LÚ.MEŠ *ma-šar-ta* / *ù le-lu(sic!)-ub ù la-mu-ur 2 I[GI]* / LUGAL EN-*ia* "May it be right in the king's sight [that] he send garrison troops, so that I may enter(!) and so that I may see the two e[yes] of the king, my lord" (EA 286:44-47; Nitzan 1973:62, 75); *li-din* LUGAL *pa-ni-šu a-na* LÚ.MEŠ *pi-ṭa-ti* / *ù lu-ši* LÚ.MEŠ ERÍN *pi-ṭa-ti* / LUGAL EN-*ia* "May the king give his attention to the army so that the army of the king may come forth" (EA 286:53-55); *ù li-is-kín šar-ri a-na* ERÍN.MEŠ *pi-ṭa-tu ú* / *lu-ma-še-ra* ERÍN.MEŠ *pi-ṭa-ti a-na* LÚ.MEŠ / *ša ip-pu-šu ar-na a-na šar-ri* EN-*ia* "May the king take thought for the army so that he may send the army against the men who are committing crime against the king, my lord" (EA 287:17-19; Moran 1987b:512 n. 6; 1992:329 n. 6; also EA 298:41-42; 290:19-21).

At the same time, the precativ e may be in a clause dependent on what appears to be a preceding WS jussive in a direct quote:

a-na-ku a-qa-bi e-ru-ub-mi / *it-ti šar-ri* EN-*ia* *ù la-mur-mi* / 2 IGI LUGAL EN-*ia* "I have been saying, 'May I enter in to the king, my lord, that I may see the two eyes of the king, my lord'" (EA 286:39-41; Nitzan 1973:69)

The Tyrian scribe happens to share this use of the precativ e in injunctiv e chains:

li-it-ta-din LUGAL *be-li-ia* / *pa-ni-šu a-na ÌR-šu* / *ù li-id-din* URUÚ-sú^{KI} / *a-na ÌR-šu* DUG \ *a-ku-ni* \ *mi-ma* / *a-na ši-te-šu* *li-it-ta-din* / LUGAL *be-li-ia* 10 LÚGÌR / *a-na na-ša-ri* / URU-*šu* *ù le-ru-ub* / *ù li-mur pa-ni* LU[GAL] *be-li-ia* "May the king, may lord, take thought for his servant so that the town of Usû may give to your servant an amphora of water for him to drink; may the king, my lord, provide ten troopers to protect his city so that I may enter in and so that I may see the face of the ki[ng] my lord" (EA 148:9-17; contrast Moran 1987b:380; 1992:235).

Note that *AHw*:702b takes *li-it-ta-din* in these passages as Gtn. Perhaps rightly, but the scribe seems to distinguish royal "giving" from that of some other element, such as *Usû*, for which he used *li-id-din*.

CONCLUSION. The emphasis in this discussion has been on 3rd m.s. and 1st c.s. forms because the other persons have the uncontracted *lū* in the precativ and they can just as well be WS jussives or volitives.

Such is the case when injunctive *lū* appears with the Canaanite 3rd m.pl. jussive/volitive which has a consonantal *t*-prefix:

ù lu-ú / ti-na-ša-ru URU.KI "And may they protect the city!"
(EA 136:19; Moran 1951:34 n. 11; 1950a:84); *ù lu-ú ti-mu-ru* 2
IGI.MEŠ ÌR-ka "And may your servant's two eyes behold . . ."
(EA 141:34).

No Canaanite scribe uses the cohortative particle *i* with 1st c.pl. The one supposed instance of this particle (with an imperative) is obviously to be read DUMU!·MEŠ (EA 138:137). Although the cohortative constructions with *i* are known in the non-WS texts (EA 9:21, 22; 20:79; 23:30; 41:22), the Canaanite scribes employ *lū*, viz.

ù 'lu¹-ú ni-zi-'iz¹ / UGU-šu-nu ù lu-[ú] ni-du-bu-ur / LÚ.MEŠ
ša-ru-ta "And let us take a stand against them and let us drive
out the miscreants" (EA 279:18-21); *ù lu-ú ni-pa-aš gáb-bu-ma /*
nu-kúr-ti "and let us all make war" (EA 366:31-32); *ù lu-ú*
ni-ip-tú-ur URU.Ú-ru-sa-lim^{KI} "And let us desert Jerusalem"
(EA 289:29; Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:489a).

The latter example, from the Jerusalem letters, could have legitimately been classified by Moran (1975b:153) as an Assyrianism in view of the close adherence by the Jerusalem scribe to the Assyrian pattern in the precativ. Whether the use of injunctive *lū* with 1st c.pl. verbs in the texts from other places than

Jerusalem should be classified as Assyrianisms is an open question. The usage is more likely a simple extension of the particle on the analogy of the other persons in the precativ paradigm.

It is clear from the examples adduced that the Canaanite scribes were well versed in the morphology and the use of the precativ. There are, nevertheless, a few minor deviations from the normal Akkadian paradigm forms.

The Canaanite scribes frequently incorporate the precativ into their letters and often use it in parallel with forms based on the WS injunctive jussive and volitive. The gloss of a precativ by a WS jussive (EA 228:18) will be discussed in the next chapter (*infra*, p. 254).

CHAPTER X

WEST SEMITIC MODES AND TENSES

The core of the peculiar jargon developed by the scribes of Canaan in the Amarna Age is the system of verbal modes and tenses. The Akkadian syntactic verb markers reflected in the EA texts from Canaan have been explored in the previous chapter. The next step is to demonstrate how the West Semitic system is employed and how it conflicts with the usual Akkadian norms.

It was Moran (1950a; 1951; 1960) who first deciphered the "code" by which the Akkadian verb forms of the Byblos dialect were made to express the nuances of the local Canaanite dialect of the scribes. Certain morphological features which have only been alluded to or taken for granted in the previous chapters will be seen to be temporal and modal indicators. It was these conjugational forms which Moran analyzed in their respective syntagmas to arrive at a system of modes and tenses that is both coherent within itself and commensurate with the known patterns of better attested dialects from a later period (particularly biblical Hebrew; Rainey 1986, 1988).

THE BASIC PATTERNS

It would appear that six basic patterns were originally in use in the NWS verbal system. They divide naturally into two modes, the former being concerned with tenses, the latter with volition. Each mode has three conjugations and a certain symmetry may be observed between their respective functions. Their arrangement and proposed nomenclature are (Rainey 1990):

INDICATIVE		INJUNCTIVE	
Preterite	<i>yaqtul, -û</i>	Jussive	<i>yaqtul, -û</i>
Imperfect	<i>yaqtulu, -ûna</i>	Volitive	<i>yaqtula, -û</i>
Energic	<i>yaqtulun(n)a</i>	Energic	<i>yaqtulan(n)a</i>

Besides the plural suffixes given above, it must be remembered that the 3rd m.pl. forms have the *t-* prefix (Ebeling 1910:48-49, 51-52; Herdner 1938; Izre'el 1987; cf. *supra*, pp. 43-45). Justification for our choice of nomenclature will be presented in the ensuing discussion of each pattern. One could say that Ebeling had successfully identified the indicative preterite (Ebeling 1910:46-50) and energetic (*Ibid.*:69-73) although he failed to see that the many indicative imperfect plurals were not necessarily energetics just because they had the *-ûna* suffix. He apparently did not recognize the correct meaning of a few of the jussive *yaqtul* forms (e.g. the gloss *ia-az-ku-ur* in EA 228:19; Ebeling 1910:46) but did not draw the necessary conclusion that the jussive was the Canaanite counterpart to the Akkadian precative. He did, however, recognize that the Akkadian *iparras* was not paralleled by a Canaanite **yaqattal* (*ibid.*:51-52; Mendenhall 1947:5-7).

The function of the respective conjugation patterns can best be demonstrated by citing contexts in which the same verb appears in two different functions. Thus, the ensuing discussion will frequently deal with not one but two of the patterns posited above. The synchronic relationships with Ugaritic (Rainey 1987:397-400) may be touched upon when necessary.

THE INDICATIVE MODE

PRETERITE.

This conjugation pattern is distinguished morphologically by the use of the standard personal prefixes plus $-\emptyset$ suffix on all the attested singulars (no 2nd f.s. forms are documented) and on 1st c.pl. The suffix for 3rd m.pl. and 2nd m.pl. is *-û* (in contrast to *-ûna* of the imperfect).

IN MAIN CLAUSES. The *yaqtul* preterite was relatively rare in the Byblos texts; the predominant form for expressing action in the past was the suffix conjugation (Moran 1950a:30-31, 51-52; cf. *infra*, pp. 348-352). Therefore, Moran was inclined to accept the *yaqtul* preterites as Akkadianisms (Moran 1950a:51). In the next

section it will be shown that *yaqtul* preterite was often used as a contrast to *yaqtulu* present/future, especially outside of Byblos. However, there are many other examples of the *yaqtul* preterite, especially in 3rd m.s. with the Canaanite *y-* prefix, which surely indicate that the preterite was a living tense form in spoken WS of the time. Take, for example, the report from Biryawaza, commissioner of Kômidi about the misdeeds of some rulers in his district:

yi-mur-ma ¹*Bi-ri-da-aš-wa ip-ša an-na / ù yi-nam!*(MAŠ.NA)-*mu-uš*
 URU *Ya-nu-am-ma* UGU-*ia / u yi-du-ul* KA.GAL *a-na* EGIR-*ia / ù*
yi-il₅-qé ^{GIŠ}GIGIR.MEŠ *i-na* URU *Aš-tar-ti₇ / ù ya-di-in₄-šu-ni a-na*
 LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ / ù *la-a ya-di-in₄-šu-ni a-na* LUGAL EN-*ia /*
yi-mur-ma šār URU *Bu-uš-ru-na / ù šār* URU *Ḫa-lu-un-ni u ti₇-pa-šu*
/ nu-kúr-ta it-ti ¹*Bi-ri-da-aš-wa / a-na mu-ḫi-ia . . . ù yi-la-ak*
¹*Ar-za-wi-ia / a-na* URU *Qi-i[s-sà] ù yi-il₅-qa / ERÍN.MEŠ* ¹*A-zi-[ri u*
yi!]-iš-ba-at / URU *Ša-ad-du u ya-di-in₄-ši a-na / LÚ.MEŠ* SA.GAZ *u*
la-a ia-di-in₄-ši / a-na LUGAL EN-*ia* "Biridashwa saw this deed
 and caused Yanû^cammu to defect from me and locked the gate
 behind me and took chariots from Ashtaroth and turned both
 of them over to the ^c*apîrû* and did not turn them over to the
 king, my lord. Then the king of Bušrûna and the king of
^cAlunni saw, and they began hostilities with Biridashwa against
 me . . . and Arzawiya went to Qi[ssa (= Kedes)] and he took
 Azi[ru]'s troo[ps and sei]zed Shaddu. Then he gave it to the
^c*apîru*-men and did not give it to the king, my lord"
 (EA 197:7-16, 26-32).

Note that all the verbs in the passage cited have to be past tense even though two of them, *yinammuš* and *yillak*, utilize the Akkadian present as their base form, or theme.

IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES. Special note should be taken of certain preterite verb forms which appear in relative clauses. Three points are significant: (1) these forms are also paralleled by *qtl*'s; (2) the prefix verbs in this slot never have the Akkadian subjunctive marker; (3) only rarely do the verb forms have the WS

3rd m.s. prefix *y-*. Three examples of *išpur* appear in the Gezer letters and were discussed by Izre'el (1978b:61):

iš-te-mé / a-wa-te^{MEŠ} *ša iš-pu-ur / LUGAL EN-ia a-na ÌR-šu* "I have heard the words which the king, my lord, sent to his servant" (EA 292:17-19; likewise EA 294:6-8); [*iš-*]*te-mé a-wa-at / ša iš-pu-ur LUGAL EN-ia / a-na ÌR-šu* "I have heard the word which the king, my lord, sent to his servant" (EA 293:8-10).

Compare these Akkadian preterites with the following, where a *qtl* verb is used instead:

a-nu-ma / iṣ-[š]ú-ru a-wa-at ša / qa-^fba¹ LU[GAL] EN-ia a-na ia-ši "Now I am keeping the word that the ki[ng], my lord, spoke to me" (EA 294:11-13); *mi-im-ma ša qa-ba / LUGAL EN-ia a-na ia-ši / iš-te-mé-šu ma-gal / SIG₅-iš* "As for everything that the king, my lord, said to me, I have heeded it very well" (EA 297:8-11); *mi-im-ma ša qa-ba LUGAL EN-ia / a-nu-ma i-na-ša-ru KÁM.UD / u mu-ša a-wa-ta₅ LUGAL EN-ia* "Everything which the king, my lord, has said, now I am keeping the word of the king, my lord" (EA 315:10-12); *u mi-im-ma ša ša-pár / L[UGAL] EN-ia a-na ia-ši / iš-te₉-mu-uš-šu / ma-gal ma-gal* "And everything that the k[ing], my lord, has sent to me, I am heeding it very diligently" (EA 320:18-21).

In the next passage, one verb in a relative clause lacks the *y-* prefix (and has the Akkadian ventive) while a second verb in a subordinated clause does have it:

[ù] ^{LÚ}[*ra-*]bi-iṣ / [ša] LUGAL ¹EN¹-ia / [š]a iš-^fpu¹-ra-^fam¹ / [L]UGAL EN-i[a] ¹a¹-^fna¹ i[a-ši] / a-nu-ma iš-te₉-me / gáb-bi a-wa-te^M[^{EŠ}] / ša yi-iq-^fbi¹ / ¹Ma-ia ^{LÚ}MAŠKÍM / a-na ia-ši a-nu-ma i-pu-šu gáb-bi "And] as for the [com]missioner [of] the king, my lord, [wh]ich the [k]ing, m[y] lord, sent to me, now I have heard all of the words which Maya the <com>missioner spoke to me; now I am doing everything" (EA 328:17-26; Moran 1987b:548; 1992:354).

AKKADIAN *iparras* AS WS PRETERITE. Because the expressions cited above with (y)*aqtul*+Ø usually seem to relate to something specific which the king has said/sent, evidently in a letter just received, all the relative clauses are past tense, dealing with a single instance. Therefore, it may be surmised that the following, with an apparent Akkadian G present, is also preterite in meaning:

šá-ni-tam / gáb-bi URU.KI.ĤÁ-ia ša i-qa-bi a-na pa-ni BE-ia / i-de
 be-li šum-ma ta-ru i-na UD.KÁM / pa-ťá-ar ERÍN.MEŠ
 KI.KAL.KASKAL+x.BAD be-li[-i]a / na-ak-ru gáb-bu
 "Furthermore, as for all the towns of which I spoke in the
 presence of my lord, my lord knows whether (or not) they
 have returned; on the day that the expeditionary force
 departed, they all became hostile!" (EA 106:45-49; cf. Moran
 1987b:303, 304 n. 9; 1992:179, 180 n 10).

In fact there are some very clear instances of Akkadian *iparras* forms with -Ø suffix that can only be preterite in function. Note, for example, the forms *yi-nam!*(MAŠ.NA)-*mu-uš* (EA 197:8) and *yi-la-ak* (EA 197:26) cited above (*supra*, p. 223). Additional examples are:

ù a[n-n]u-ú i-še₂₀-me a-na / a-wa-te^{MEŠ}-ka ù ú-wa-š[ir₄-šu] / ù
 uš-ša-am ri-qú-tám / ù i-še₂₀-me e-nu-ú ia-nu-um 'ERÍN'.MEŠ /
 it-ti-šu "And b[eho]ld, I heeded your words and I sent [him] but
 he came back empty-handed and he heard that there were no
 troops with him" (EA 87:15-19; Rainey 1975b:424-426; Moran
 1987b:273 n. 1; 1992:159cf. Youngblood 1961:298).

Probably *ú-ba-a[l]* (EA 327:9) also belongs here.

CONTRAST WITH IMPERFECT. There are a number of contexts, especially from outside Byblos, where prefix forms with -Ø suffix were directly contrasted with prefix forms having -u. The former expressed single instances in the past while the latter denoted present/future continuous (Rainey 1971c:96-102).

iš-te-mé / a-wa-te^{MEŠ} *ša iš-pu-ur / LUGAL EN-ia a-na ÌR-šu / ú-šur-mi* ^{LÚ}*MAŠKÍM-ka / ù ú-šur URU.DIDLI.ĤÁ ša / LUGAL EN-ka a-nu-ma / ʿiš¹-šú-ru ú a-nu-ma / ʿiš¹-te-mu UD.KÁM-ma / ù mu-ša a-wa-te*^{MEŠ} *ša / LUGAL EN-ia* "I have heeded the words which the king, my lord, sent to his servant, 'Guard your commissioner and guard the cities of the king, your lord.' Now I am guarding and now I am heeding day and night the words of the king, my lord" (EA 292:17-26; Rainey 1975b:406-407).

The zero form (*yaqtul*), *iš-te-mé*, refers to the single event of hearing the message sent by the king (i.e. having the tablet read aloud). The *yaqtulu* forms, *ʿiš¹-šú-ru* and *ʿiš¹-te-mu*, affirm the continuous compliance with the king's instructions, "day and night." Especially striking here is the contrast between *iš-te-mé* and *ʿiš¹-te-mu*, 1st c.s. forms of *šemû* "to hear" (with the preformative vowel of 3rd m.s., cf. *supra*, pp.40-43); It is the suffix *-u* on the latter that sets it apart as present/future. On the one hand, *išteme/ešteme* is used frequently in letters responding to a message from Pharaoh when the writer wishes to indicate that he has heard (i.e. had read to him) the message from the king (EA 141:8, 23; 142:[6],8; 144:13; 145:11, 27(?); 178:13; 192:10; 196:5; 213:10; 216:6; 217:7; 220:9; 221:8; 227:7; 243:8; 246:8; 247:11; 253:7; 254:6; 269:8; 294:6; 297:10, 17; 299:12; 301:15; 302:14; 303:13, 19; 304:15; 319:15; 321:21; 326:13; 327:1; 328:21; 329:16; 330:11; 364:10). On the other hand, present and future compliance with the king's instructions is expressed by forms with the *-u* suffix as in EA 292:24 cited above. The force of *eštemû / ištemû* (*eštemu / ištemu*?) is further demonstrated by a context in which it is parallel to a real Akkadian Gtn present:

u a-nu-ma [é]l-t[e₉-n]é-mé / a-na a-w[a-]t[e^{ME}*]š L[UGA]L EN-ia / ʿu¹ iš-[t]e₉-mu [a-n]a a-wa-te*^{MEŠ} / ʿMa-i[a ^{LÚ}M]AŠ[KÍ]M [LU]GAL / EN-ia ^{ʿd1}[UTU] *iš-tu / AN*^{sa-ma} ^D[UMU] ^{ʿd1}UTU "And now [I] a[m] heeding the words of the ki[ng], my lord, and I am heeding the words of Maya, [the co]mm[issio]ner of the [ki]ng, my lord, the [sun god] from heaven, the s[on of] the sun god" (EA 300:23-28; Rainey 1971b:97-98; *supra*, pp. 114-116).

In spite of the preponderance of *qtl* to express the past tense of transitive verbs at Byblos, there are still instances of the same *yaqtul-yaqtulu* contrast:

i-na-an-na / tu-ma-al ša-al-ša-mi / ti7-iq-bu-ni ia-nu-mi /
 ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ťá-ta₅ ù aš-pu-ur / ù tu-ša ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-tu / ù*
ti7-il-qé¹ la-ba-šu-nu . . . ù be-li i-de i-nu-ma / la-a aš-pu-ru a-wa-at /
ka-az-bu-te a-na be-li-ia "Now previously they said to me, 'There
 is no regular army force,' so I wrote and a regular army force
 came forth and it seized their father And my lord knows
 that I never write a word of falsehood to my lord"
 (EA 362:15-20, 51-53; cf. discussion by Rainey 1971c:102).

The contrast between *ašpur* and *ašpuru* is that between a past event and habitual practice.

IMPERFECT.

TERMINOLOGY. A word is in order about the choice of the term imperfect (Rainey 1986a:7). In his dissertation, Moran called the *yaqtulu* form "indicative" following the usual practice of Arabic grammars. In Arabic the zero form had lost its preterite function almost entirely (except for the negative *lam yaqtul*, *lammâ yaqtul*, Fischer 1972:96, §194), and the energetic in *-un(n)a* had long before given some of its functions to the energetic in *-an(n)a* (cf. *infra*, pp. 234-244), so there was no need to differentiate between various forms; the only prefix indicative was *yaqtulu*. Note, however, that Wright had mentioned the fact that the suffix conjugation in Arabic also functions in indicative contexts (Wright 1896:52, §79).

Presently, Moran and others, e.g. Huehnergard, prefer the term "durative" which they apply to WS *yaqtulu* and to Akkadian *iparras*. That these forms can, and frequently do, express durative action is certainly true, but they can also express punctiliar action in the future. In such cases as those treated below, the durative notion is hardly appropriate as Moran himself had acknowledged:

. . . though in present contexts the form, as is natural, carries a durative force, still this is not true of its use in future contexts where it expresses the simple fact of the occurrence of an action in the future (Moran 1950a:48).

Huehnergard has objected that, if "durative" does not cover single actions in the future, neither does imperfect. However, one can only endorse the citation by Moran (1950a:49) of S. R. Driver's description of the imperfect's use for future actions:

The same form [the imperfect] is further employed to describe events belonging to the *future*: for the future is emphatically τὸ μέλλον and this is just the attribute specially expressed by the imperfect. . . . that which is in the process of coming to pass is also that which is *destined* or *must* come to pass (τὸ μέλλον) . . ." (Driver 1892:28-29).

With these points in mind, one may also acknowledge Moran's assertion that *yaqtulu* is not primarily a tense (Moran 1950a:48). It will be seen herein that it can express present, future and past continuous actions. Its main semantic feature is expression of action not completed. That is not to say that the ancient Canaanite scribes had no sense of time. Quite the contrary, the ensuing discussion will show that they were perfectly aware of the time factor in their linguistic expression.

PRESENT. The function of *yaqtulu* as a present is clearly demonstrated in a gloss which also happens to strengthen the case for *yaqtulu* as the WS counterpart to the Akkadian *iparras* (cf. *supra*, p. 67; Rainey 1975b:423):

a-nu-um-ma a-na-ku-ma / er-ri-šu \ aḥ-ri-šu / i-na URUŠU *na-ma*^{KI}
 "Now, it is I who am cultivating in Shunem" (EA 365:10-12).

The hybrid form *errišu* is Akkadian 1st c.s. with gemination, plus the WS indicative imperfect suffix *-u*. The gloss, with exactly the same meaning, stands for the cognate WS form ^{*2}*aḥrišu* (⋀^{*2}*aḥriṯu*),

a purely WS construction without gemination but with the same *-u* suffix. The particular context, with introductory *anumma* "now," is present tense.

Another firm context is this passage from Megiddo:

ù a-nu-ma i-na-ša-ru¹ / URUMa-gi₅-da^{KI} / URU.KI šàr-ri EN-ia / 'UD¹/KÁM ù GI₆-ša \ l[e-l]a / UD.KÁM i-na-ša-ru / 'iš¹-tu A.ŠÀ.MEŠ / i-na GIGIR.MEŠ ù G[I₆-ša] / i-na-ša-ru BÀD 'URU¹.K[I] / šàr-ri EN-ia "And now I am guarding Megiddo, the city of the king, my lord, day and night; by day I am guarding from the open fields in chariots and by night I am guarding the wall of the city of the king, my lord" (EA 243:10-18; Rainey 1975b:404-405).

There is certainly no pretext here for deriving the present-future nuance from the Akkadian *iparras* theme upon which the verb forms are built. This is abundantly clear in the following excerpts from the same epistle, first:

[a]-nu¹-ma iṣ-ṣú-ru / [UR]U.KI LUGAL EN-ia dU[TU]-ia / a-di ka-ša-di / LÚMAŠKÍM šàr-ri EN-ia / dUTU-ia (EA 220:15-19);

but later on:

a-nu-ma i₁₅-na-ša-ru / URU.KI ša šàr-ri EN-ia / dUTU-ia ša it-ti-ia / a-di ka-ša-di / LÚMAŠKÍM šàr-ri EN-ia / dUTU-ia (EA 220:25-30);

and both passages are to be rendered:

"Now I am guarding the city of the king, my lord (line 27: which is in my charge) until the arrival of the commissioner of the king, my lord (and) my sun-god" (Rainey 1975b:405).

The present tense is the natural vehicle to serve as an indicator of habitual action as illustrated by the following passage:

mi-ia-mi ^{LÚ}*kal-bu* / *u la-a yi-iš-mu* / *a-na a-wa-te* LUGAL EN-šu
 "Who is the dog that he would not listen to the words of the king, his lord?" (EA 320:22-24; 322:17-19); *mi-nu* / ^Ì*İR-A-ši-ir-ta*
^Ì*İR* / UR.GI₇ *ù [y]i-il-qú* / KUR LUGAL *a-na ša-a-šu* "What is
 'Abdi-Ashirta, a slave? a dog? that he should take the land of
 the king for himself?" (EA 71:16-19).

Again, one must observe that forms like *yi-iš-mu* and *[y]i-il-qú* prove that the Akkadian preterite theme acquires its present tense nuance by the addition of the *-u* suffix. Likewise, it is equally certain that the following *yi-iš-te₉-mu* and *iš-te₉-mu* forms are built on the Akkadian *-t-* preterite and not on the Gt present (*ištemme*; which is homophonous, of course, with the Gtn preterite):

mi-ia-mi / ^{LÚ}UR.KU₈ *u la-a* / *yi-iš-te₉-mu a-wa-ta₅* / LUGAL EN-*ia*
 "Who is the dog that he would not obey the word of the king, my lord?" (EA 323:17-20; also EA 324:16-18; 325:12-14); *mi-ia-ti*
a-na-ku *ù la* / *iš-te₉-mu a-na* MAŠKÍM LUGAL EN-*ia* "Who am I
 that I should not listen to the commissioner of the king, <my>
 lord?" (EA 220:11-12).

FUTURE. The future tense is exemplified by various passages, e.g. conditional sentences, both protasis and apodosis (Moran 1950a:72, 74-75):

ù šum-ma ap-pu-na-ma yu-ša-na šār-ru / *ù ka-li* KUR.KUR.KI
nu-kúr-tu₄ a-na ša-šu / *ù mi-na yi-pu-šu a-na ia-ši-nu* "But if,
 moreover, the king should come forth and all the lands are
 hostile to him, then what can he do to us?" (EA 74:39-41);
šum-ma a-wa-te-ia tu-uš-mu-[na] / *a-di yu-ú-ul-qú* ¹*A-za-ru ki-ma*
a[-bi-š]u "If my words be heeded, Aziru will yet be captured like
 his father" (EA 117:32-33).

Compare also the following dependent clauses where the *-u* suffix is WS imperfect and not Akkadian subjunctive as one might suppose at first glance; cf. *supra*, pp. 195-202, for the

demonstration that the Akkadian subjunctive was not used by the Canaanite scribes.

i-na-ša-ru-šu / a-di yi-im-lu-ku LUGAL "I am guarding him until the king takes counsel (concerning his servant)" (EA 142:16-17); *a-nu-ma / a-na-ša-ru / URU šār-ri EN-ia a-di ti-ik-šu-du / a-wa-at šār-ri / EN<-ia> a-na ia-ši* "Now I am guarding the city of the king, my lord, until the word of the king, <my> lord, reaches me" (EA 221:11-16); *a-di yi-du* "until he takes cognizance" (EA 12:36; 182:14); *a-di yu-šu-te-ru* "until he responds" (EA 280:38-39); *a-nu-ma ki-ia-am / qa-la-ta a-di-mi / yi-il-ma-du šār-ru / be-lí-ia a-wa-ta₅ / an-ni-ta₅* "And thus you keep silent, (saying) 'Until the king, my lord, looks into this matter'" (EA 251:7-11).

It must be noted that all the verbs in clauses dependent upon *adi* cited above are built on the theme of the Akkadian preterite, viz. *yi-im-lu-ku*, *ti-ik-šu-du*, *yi-du*, *yu-šu-te-ru*, *yi-il-ma-du*. Their future tense is determined by the clear indications of their contexts. Therefore, it is obvious that the *-u* suffix on the verbs is the WS indicator of indicative imperfect and not the Akkadian subjunctive marker. Therefore, in the following examples, one may state with confidence that the future meaning is signified by the suffix *-u* and not because the verb forms happen to be constructed on the Akkadian present theme:

a-šar ti-la-ku "wherever you go" (EA 296:4'); *a-di a-šar ti₇-la-ku* "to wherever you go" (EA 203:19; 204:19; 205:18); *a-di a-šar yi-qa-bu* "to wherever you say" (EA 195:31; 201:21); *ia-nu a-šar er-ru-bu* "There is nowhere I can enter" (EA 76:21; also EA 71:34).

Another important syntagma requiring the *yaqtulu* is the purpose clause when it is dependent on a verbal clause having either the indicative or a suffix conjugation form of the verb. This was one of Moan's most significant discoveries concerning the syntax of the Byblos letters (Moran 1950a:81-82; 1951:33-34; 1960:9-12):

i-na-na a-di yu-pa-ḫi-ru ka[-li] / URU.MEŠ *ù yi-il-qú-ši_x*(ŠE) "Now he is again assembling all the towns in order that he seize it (Byblos)" (EA 124:14-15); *a-na mi-ni₇ / qa-la-ta ù la-a / ti-iq-bu a-na šār-ri / ù yu-wa-ši-ru-na* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ti ù ti-il-te₉-qú-na* / URUŠu-mu-ra "Why do you keep silent and not speak to the king that he should send the regular troops in order that they occupy Šumur?" (EA 71:10-16); LUGAL / KURKa-aš-ši ù LUGAL KURMi-ta-ni šu-nu / ù ti-il-qú-na / KUR šār-ri a-na / ša-šu-nu "Are they the king of the Cassites and the king of Mitanni that they take the land of the king for themselves?" (EA 104:19-24).

All of the verb forms in the purpose clauses, viz. *yi-il-qú-ši_x*(ŠE), *yu-wa-ši-ru-na*, *ti-il-te₉-qú-na*, are all built on Akkadian preterite or *-t-* preterite themes. Their future nuance is due to the *-u* suffix.

PAST CONTINUOUS. One of Moran's most important discoveries was the function of the indicative imperfect to express repeated or continuous action in the past (Moran 1950a:43-47):

pa-na-nu / [LU]GAL KURMi-ta-na nu-KÚR *a-na a-bu-tu-ka* / 'ù¹ *la-a ti!(PI)-na-mu-šu-¹na¹* / [a]-bu-tu-ka *iš-tu a-¹bu¹-t[i-ia]* "Formerly, the king of Mitanni was hostile with your fathers but your [fa]thers never abandoned [my] fathers" (EA 109:5-8; cf. Moran 1950a:124a n. 104; cf. Izre'el 1987:87);

or, when a nominal (non-verbal) sentence is coupled with an imperfect verbal clause:

pa-na-nu LÚ.MEŠ *ma-ša-ar-ti / šār-ri it-ti-ia ù / šār-ru ia-dī-nu* ŠE.IM.ḪÁ / *iš-tu* KUR¹*Ia-ri-mu-ta / a-na a-ka-li-šu-nu* "Formerly, the king's garrison troops were with me and the king was furnishing grain from Yarimuta for their sustenance" (EA 125:14-18; Moran 1950a:44, 96).

Thus, one finds many examples with the WS imperfect to express past continuous action (EA 114:54-57; 117:43-44; 118:50-53; 126:18-23; 138:94-95). Moran (1950a:45; 1961:63) has seen fit to cite

the following passage in its entirety because it demonstrates so clearly the refinements of tense nuance achieved by the alternation between *yaqtulu* and *qatal* verb forms:

mi-ia-mi / DUMU.MEŠ ʾİR-A-ši-ir-ta / ʾİR UR.GI₇ LUGAL /
 KURKa-aš-ši ù LUGAL KURMi-ta-ni šu-nu / ù ti-il-qú-na / KUR
 šār-ri a-na / ša-šu-nu pa-na-nu / ti-i[l-q]ú[-n]a URU.MEŠ /
 ḥa-za-ni-ka ù qa-la-ta / an-nu-ú i-na-na du-bi-r[u] / LÚMAŠKÍM-ka
 ù la-qú / URU.MEŠ-šu a-na ša-šu-nu a-nu-ma la-qú URUUl-la-sà /
 šum-ma ki-a-ma qa-la-ta / a-di ti-il-qú-na / URUŠu-mu-ra ù / ›ù
 ti-du-ku-na LÚMAŠKÍM / ù ERÍN.MEŠ til!(BI)-la-ti / ša i-na
 Šu-mu-ra "Who are the sons of ʿAbdi-Ashirta, the slave, the
 dog? Are they the king of the Cassites and the king of Mitanni
 that they take the land of the king for themselves? Previously,
 they were taking over the towns of the city rulers, and you
 kept silent. Behold, now they have expelled your commissioner
 and have taken your towns for themselves. Behold, they have
 taken Ullasa. If you thus remain silent, they will take Šumur in
 addition and they will kill the commissioner and the auxiliary
 troops who are in Šumur" (EA 104:17-36; Moran 1987b:299 n. 1;
 1992:177 n. 1).

Each of the three occurrences of *tilqûna* has a different temporal nuance; that following *panānu* describes a series of actions conducted in the past. The suffix verb, *qâlāta*, defines responses in the past and then in the present in the conditional sentence).

Normally, *pānānu(m)* comes at the head of such clauses of repeated, or continuous action in the past. Nevertheless, other factors, such as the subordination of the clause, may change the order so that *pānānu* may come later in the clause. Note the following relativized clause in which past continuous is contrasted symmetrically with a volitive expressing a wish for the present:

*ša-a yu-da-ʾnu*¹ pa-na-nu i-na URUŠu-mu-ra / [y]u-da-na⁷ ʾi¹-na-na
 i-na URUGub-la "What used to be sold formerly in Šumur, let it
 be sold now in Byblos" (EA 85:36-37; cf. Moran 1950a:43, 95).

CIRCUMSTANTIAL. Finally, Moran (1950a:47) also noted some illustrations of the circumstantial function of *yaqtulu*. One of them, dependent on *kīma*, was cited *supra*, pp. 85-86, where a suggested correction of Knudtzon's reading provides two *yaqtulu* past continuous verbs instead of one:

a-nu-ma / ki-ma iš-[tap-]ru a-na ka-ta₅ UGU / URUŠu-mu-ra a-nu-ma i-te₉-lu! / ù a[h-]ta-ni ERÍN.M[EŠ] a-na / [na-ša-ri-]ši ù a-nu-⟨ma⟩ i-te₉-zi-ib-ši / [ù pa-a₇-ru LÚ.MEŠ] UN-tù ù / [ki-na-na iš-tap-]ru "Now, as (*contra* Moran 1987b:317 n. 4; 1992:189 n. 4) I was wr[it]ing to you concerning Şumur, now I was going up (there) and I ex[ho]rted the troops to [guard i]t, but now I have abandoned it [and] the garrison [troops have departed (Moran 1987b:318 n. 6; 1992:190 n. 7)] and [thus I have been writ]ing (Moran 1987b:318 n. 7; 1992:190 n. 8)" (EA 114:26-32).

In the other passage, the circumstantial clause does not have a subordinating conjunction; it is followed by a negative existential clause, also referring to past time:

ša-ni-tam šār KUR⟨Mi⟩-ta-[n]a a-ši / a-di URUŠu-mu-ra ù yu-ba-ú / a-la-¹ka₁₃¹ a-di URUGub-la ù i[a]-nu / A.MEŠ(!) a-na ʿša¹-te-šu ù ta-ra / a-na KUR-šu "Furthermore, the king of ⟨Mi⟩tanni came out as far as Şumur and when he was seeking to come to Byblos, there was no water for him to drink so he returned to his land" (EA 85:51-55).

It is also possible to translate: "and he was seeking to come to Byblos but there was no water for him to drink." The nature of *yuba²²û*, as a past continuous is obvious by its place between two *qtl* verbs.

ENERGIC.

Ebeling did recognize the energetic forms in the EA texts and collected all the references in a section of his study (Ebeling 1910:69-73). The sufformative is *-una*, perhaps *-unna*. The clearest

example of the gemination of the *nûn* is from Kāmed el-Lôz: *ut-ta-aš-še-ru-un-na-šu-nu* "I am most assuredly sending them" (KL 72:600:8; Rainey 1976b:338-339; Wilhelm 1982:124). Another apparent indication of gemination is *ti-il₅-la-ku-un!(EN)-na* (TT 6:9; Rainey 1977:37, 40; 1976b:338-339; Sachs *apud* Albright 1944b:24 n. 88). Orthographically unexpressed gemination might also be a factor in the presence or absence of a vowel before suffixes attached to the energetic (cf. KL 72:600:8 cited above). Forms having such a vowel are: *yu-te-ru-/na-ni* (EA 251:11-12; with dative suffix); *yu-wa-ši-ru-n[a-k]a* (EA 77:22; acc. suff.); *ti[l]-la-[k]u-na-mi* (EA 250:26); *ú-ba-[ú-n]a-ši* (EA 143:15); *uš-ši-ru-na-ši* (EA 143:16); cf. also the apparent injunctive volitive energetic *ti-ma-ḥa-ša-na-n[i]* (EA 77:37; *infra*, pp. 263-264). Examples of what may be the energetic with the loss of the final *-a* and the assimilation of the ungeminated *-n-* are: *i-na-ša-ru-um-mi* (EA 228:14); *ni-ik-šu-du-um-mi* (EA 245:5); *ú-ta-aš-ša-ru-uš-šu* (EA 245:29); *nu-ub-ba-lu-uš-šu* (EA 245:7); note that *yi-na-ší-ra-an-ni* (EA 112:13; 121:10) is evidently a ventive plus suffix.

The energetic is a strengthening of the imperfect (with one injunctive exception discussed below (cf. *infra*, pp. 263-264). It does not seem to be compulsory in any syntagma, but rather serves as an optional means for strengthening the force of the verb (cf. e.g. EA 121:7-10 with EA 123:29-32; Zewi 1987:183). Since Ebeling's day, various studies have contributed to further refinement of our understanding of these energetic forms. Moran's discoveries concerning the nature and function of the imperfect, especially the proof that the 3rd m.s. plural was *taqtulūna*, corrected Ebeling's classification of the forms by eliminating the plurals from consideration (Moran 1950a:53-56; 1951). In fact, there is no way to distinguish in the script between the indicative imperfect plural and the indicative energetic plural. The main focus must be on the singulars, for only with them can a satisfactory classification of syntagmas be achieved. Aistleitner (1957:263-269, 280-286) adduced the EA energetic forms in his discussion of the energetic in Ugaritic. He seemingly was unaware of Moran's work and commits some basic errors in his classification. The main fault

lies in his unawareness that the EA texts can use either the Akkadian preterite theme, *iprus*, or the present, *iparras*, for building imperfect forms (cf. discussion, *supra*, pp. 50-61). So he sought to distinguish between the energics on Akkadian preterites and those on the Akkadian present. This and also his comparison (negative) with the Assyrian subjunctive *-uni* were irrelevant. Williams (1972:80-81) made reference to Moran's study of the EA energetic in his study of the energetic in biblical Hebrew; again, a confusion of the singulars and the plurals (in Hebrew especially) vitiated somewhat the validity of the argument (cf. the remarks by Rainey 1975d:185-187). Blau (1978:127) deduced, like Rainey (1975d:186), that the indicative energetic with *-una* must be the ancestor of the energetic survivals in Hebrew (imperfect with accusative suffixes *-enhû*, *-ennû*, etc.) and Aramaic (with *-[i]nn-* preceding accusative suffixes on the imperfect). The most recent, and most thorough, discussion of the energetic in the EA texts is by T. Zewi (1987:172-188). The ensuing discussion is based largely on her classification and analysis of the texts (energetic suffixes on plural imperatives will be discussed *infra*, pp. 271-272).

INTERROGATIVE SENTENCES. The majority of the passages in which this energetic suffix is added to the imperfect verb are questions. In clauses having an interrogative particle or phrase, such as *ana mîni* "why?" there may have been felt a need to give additional emphasis to the verbal action as the focus (the logical predicate) of the question. Without such emphasis, the interrogative particle or phrase is itself the logical predicate.

Several examples reflect the writer's rhetorical question "what can I *do*?" The point is, of course, that he feels powerless in a given circumstance. Often the idea is that he is helpless because he is by himself:

mi-na i-pu-šu-na a-na-ku i-na / [i]-de-ni-ia "What can I do by myself?" (EA 74:63-64; 81:50-51; 90:22-23; 91:25-26; 134:15-16);

or sometimes the emphasis may be on the writer himself as a particular individual:

mi-na i-pu-šu-na a-na-ku "What can I do?" (EA 115:10; 117:92; 119:14; 122:48-49; 130:30-31; 249:10-11); *šum-ma mi-ta-ti mi-na i-pu-šu-na* "If I am dead, what can I do?" (EA 119:17-18).

Once, we have a plural energetic in the same syntagma:

u mi-na-am-mi ni-pu-šu-na / ni-nu "and what are we to do?" (EA 98:21-22).

Sometimes another attendant circumstance is proffered as justification:

mi-na i-pu-šu-na / a-na-ku ša-a aš-ba-ti / i-na lib-bi LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ "What shall I do who is located among the 'apîrû men?" (EA 134:15-16); *mi-na / i-pu-šu-na ù a-na-ku / la i-le-ù a-la-ka¹³ / a-na šu-mu-ra* "What can I do since I am unable to go to Šumur?" (EA 104:36-39); *ù mi-na ip-p[u-š]u-[na] / ù aš-tap-pár* LÚ KIN-ia a-na LUGAL 'BE¹-ia "What can I do since I have (already) sent my emissary to the king, my lord?" (EA 92:15-16).

Other verbs also take the energetic in similar rhetorical questions:

ia-nu ŠE.IM.ĤÁ a-na / a-ka-li a-na ia-ši-nu mi-na a-qa¹-bu-na / a-na LÚ.MEŠ *hu-up-ši-ia* "There is no grain for us to eat (so) what can I say to my yeoman farmers?" (EA 85:10-12); *mi-na a-qa-bu-na / ap-pu-na-ma* "What more can I say?" (EA 119:53); *a-ia[-mi] / i-zi-zu-na a-na-ku* "Where can I stay?" (EA 124:15-16);

and especially the following:

iš-tu ma-an-ni i-na-ša-ru-na / iš-tu na-ak-ri-ia / ù iš-tu LÚ.MEŠ *hu-up-ši-ia / mi-nu yi-na-ší-na-an-ni* "From whom should I be on guard? From my enemies? And from my yeoman farmers, who will protect me?" (EA 112:10-13; contrast Moran 1950a:169; 1987b:312; 1992:186; Rainey 1975b:416 nn. 185, 190); *i-nu-ma*

i-ša-pa-ru / šār-ru ù-šur-mi / ra-ma-an-ka iš-tu ma-ni / i-na-ší-ru-na "Inasmuch as the king has written, 'Protect yourself!' from whom shall I be on guard?" (EA 123:29-32); *iš-t[u] ma-ni / i-na-ša-ru-na ra-ma-ni-ia ù URU [LUGAL]* "From whom shall I protect myself and the city of [the king]" (EA 125:11-13).

The following compound sentence probably contains a question, depending on how one interprets the particle *ki-i*:

i-nu-ma šap-ra-ta / a-na ia-a-ši ù!-šur-mi / LÚ.MEŠ ša ša-ab-tu URU / ki-i uš-šur-ru-na LÚ.MEŠ "Inasmuch as you have written to me, 'Keep watch on the men who have seized the town,' how can I keep watch over the men?" (EA 252:5-8).

There are also a number of 2nd m.s. energetics in interrogative clauses:

ša-ni-tam a-na [mi¹-[ni₇]] / [la¹]-[a¹] tu-wa-[ša¹-[ru]-[na¹]] / šu-lum-ka a-na [ia¹]-[ši¹]] "Furthermore, why do you not send to me regarding your welfare?" (TT 1:12-14); *a[l-lu-]mì / ia-aq-bu šār-ru EN-li a[-n]a / mi-ni at-ta-ma ti-iš-tap-ru-na / a-na ia-ši* "Behold, the king, my lord, says, 'Why do you continually write to me?'" (EA 117:6-9); *a-na mi-ni la-a tu-te-ru-[n]a / a-wā-ta₅ a-na ia-a-ši* "Why do you not send word back to me?" (EA 83:7-8); *a-na mi-ni ti-iš-mu-na / LÚ.MEŠ ša-nu-tu* "Why do you listen to other men?" (EA 108:51-52); *aq-ta-bi ù aš-ta-ni / a-na ka-ta₅ ú-ul ti-le-ú-na / la-qa-ia iš-tu qa-at / 𒀭R-A-ši-ir-ta* "I have said repeatedly to you: 'Are you unable to rescue me from the power of 'Abdi-Ashirta?'" (EA 82:5-8).

One 3rd m.s. form occurs in a context that lends itself to translation as a question (for an alternative view, cf. *infra*, p. 244):

[a-nu]-ma ki-a-ma-am iš-tap-ru a-na šār-ri EN-ia / ù la-a yi-iš-mu-na a-wa-te-ia "[No]w thus have I been writing to the king, my lord, but doesn't he even listen to my words?" (EA 85:6-7).

ASSOCIATED WITH QUESTIONS. The next category includes clauses that are either consecutive after a question or else juxtaposed to an interrogative "that"-clause. The interrogative nuance has evidently been carried over to the associated clause. This is especially true of purpose clauses in which an indicative imperfect is required after a question:

a-na mi-ni₇ / qa-ta-ta ù la-a / ti-iq-bu a-na šàr-ri / ù yu-wa-ši-ru-na
 / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti ù / ti-ìl-te₉-qú-na / URU Šu-mu-ra* "Why do
 you keep silent and not speak to the king that he send the
 regular troops in order that they may occupy Šumur?"
 (EA 71:10-16; also EA 77:18-25; 114:61-63).

In the next example, the energetic also serves to convert a verb with the ventive *-a* suffix into an indicative:

a-na mi-ni₇ / qa-la-ta ù la-a táq-bu / a-na šàr-ri EN-li-ka / ù
tu-ša-na qa-du ERÍN.MEŠ / pí-ṭá-ti ù ti-ma-qú-tu / UGU
KUR^A-mur-ri "Why have you kept silent and do not speak to the
 king, your lord, so that you can come forth with the army and
 attack Amurru?" (EA 73:6-11; Rainey 1990:418-419).

A "that"-clause in juxtaposition to a question also contains an energetic:

i-nu-ma yi-iš-tap-ru-na / šàr-ru EN-ia a-na ia-[š]i / ù-šur-mi
[r]a-m[a-a]n-k[a] mi-nu yi-n[a-ší]-ra[-an-ni] "Inasmuch as the king,
 my lord, has written to me, 'Protect 'yourself,' who will prote[ct
 me]?" (EA 121:7-10).

CONDITIONAL SENTENCES. There are numerous instances when an energetic is used in the protasis of a conditional sentence:

šum-ma-mi a-na-ku / uš-šú-na UGU KUR / ša LUGAL ù a-na ia-ši
/ in₄-né-ep-ša-ta "If I go forth against the land of the king, then
 you will be on my side" (EA 333:15-18; cf. Moran 1987b:551, 552
 n. 8; 1992:356, 357 n. 8).

Moran (1953; 1987b:551, 552 n. 7; 1992:356, 357 n. 7) claims that *šumma* here is not the conditional particle but rather a presentation particle, "Look." On the other hand, one wonders if this clause may not, in fact, be a question: "If I go forth against the land of the king, then will you be on my side?" The next examples are much clearer:

šum-ma / la-a ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ťá-⟨ta⟩ la-a / tu-wa-⟨ši⟩-ru-na ù ia-nu*
 URU *ša-a ti-ir-te₉-ḥu / a-na ka-ta₅ ù šum-ma* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ť[á-tu] /*
i-ba-ša-at ka-li KUR.MEŠ / *ni-ìl-qú a-na šâr-ri* "If you do not send
 regular troops, then there is no town that will remain to you;
 but if there will be regular troops, then we will take all the
 lands for the king" (EA 103:51-57); *šum-ma la-a / tu-te-ru-na*
a-wa-ta₅ a-na ia-ši / ù i-te₉-zi-ib URU ù / *pa-at-_rra-ti qa-du* LÚ.MEŠ
 / *ša i-ra-a-mu-ni* "If you do not send word to me, then I will
 abandon the city and I will go away with the men who are
 devoted to me" (EA 83:47-51); *šum-ma / šâr-ru yu-wa-ši-ru-na*
 LÚ.MEŠ / ^{KUR}*Mi-iš-ri ù ^{KUR}Mi-lu-ḥa / ù ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ*
a-na qa-at / LÚ-ia an-nu-ú ki-ma / ar-ḥi-iš ù bal-ťá-ti / a-na a-ra-ad
šâr-ri EN-*ia* "If the king sends men of the land of Egypt and of
 the land of Nubia and horses in the charge of this man of mine
 quickly, then I will live to serve the king, my lord"
 (EA 112:18-24); [ù *šum-ma*] *la-a yu-wa-[š]a-ru-na / [a-na*
 URU.KI *Gub-l]a ù la-qú-ši* "[But if] he (the king) does not send
 (troops) [to Gub]a, then they will seize it" (EA 131:15-18; Moran
 1987b:349; 1992:212).

The next two examples reflect the conversion of an Akkadian ventive with *-a* suffix to an indicative by means of the energetic *-na* (Rainey 1990b:418-419):

ù *šum-ma ap-pu-na-ma yu-ša-na šâr-ru / ù ka-li* KUR.KUR.KI
nu-kúr-tu₄ a-na ša-šu / ù mi-na yi-pu-šu a-na ia-ši-nu "And,
 moreover, if the king comes forth and all the lands will be
 hostile to him, then what can he do to us?" (EA 74:39-41);
šum-ma MU.MEŠ *a[n]-ni-ta ú-ul / yu-ša-na* ERÍN.ME[Š *pí-ť]á-ti /*
 ù *in-né-[ep-ša-a]t ka-li / KUR.KUR.KI.MEŠ [a-na* LÚ.MEŠ *GA]Z*

"If this year the reg[ular ar]my does not come forth, then all the lands will join the [^capī]ru men" (EA 77:26-29).

Assuming that the two verb forms with *-u* + gemination do represent the energetic, i. e. **-unmi* > *-ummi* and **-unšu* > *-uššu* (cf. *supra*, p. 235), then we have an example of the energetic in both the protasis and the apodosis, the latter also serving to express a promise or an asseveration:

*šum-ma-mi yi-pu-šu-mi / DINGIR.MEŠ-nu ša šār-ri EN-nu / ù
ni-ik-šu-du-um-mi / ^lLa-ab-a-ia ù TIL.LA-nu-um-ma \ ḥa-ia-ma /
nu-ub-ba-lu-uš-šu a-na šār-ri EN-nu* "If the deity of the king, our lord, grants that we catch Lab²ayu, then it is *alive* that we must send him to the king, our lord" (EA 245:3-7).

The following is a conditional sentence without *šumma*:

*ù yu-te-ru-/na-ni šār-ru be-lí-ia / a-wa-at yu-te-ru-na / ù a-na
a-wa-at šār-ri iš-mu* "So let the king return to me whatever word that he would return, and I will heed the word of the king" (EA 251:11-15)

There are a few cases where the energetic is used in the apodosis of a conditional sentence. In one of these, the apodosis is itself a question (EA 119:17-18; cf. *supra*, p 237). In two other passages, there is special stress on the carrying out of some action, cf. below.

ASSEVERATIONS. Like the rhetorical questions, first person examples predominate in the asseverative use of the energetic. The two texts mentioned above as being in the apodosis of conditional clauses reflect intense feeling or strong asseveration. One example is in the apodosis of a temporal conditional sentence:

ù an-nu-[ú] / ka-ši-id a-na URUPí-ḥi-lì / ù is-te-mu-na a-w[a-]t[e-ka]
"And behold, as soon as he arrives in Peḥel, I will surely obey [your] orders" (EA 256:33-35).

The second, a well known letter from Lab³ayu, is charged with emotional content. The precise nuance of the verb in question has long been a subject of discussion:

ša-ni-tam šum-ma ti-qa-bu / ap-pu-na-ma / nu-pu-ul-mì / ta-aḥ-ta-mu ù / ti-ma-ḥa-ṣú-ka / i-bi ú-ṣur-ru-na "Furthermore, if you should say, moreover, 'Fall down beneath them that they may smite you,' my enemy (or: the enemies) I will most certainly watch out for!" (EA 252:23-30; cf. Rainey 1989-90:68b-69a).

And the ensuing sentence reiterates the asseveration:

LÚ.MEŠ ša ṣa-ab-tu₄ URU <ù> / i-li šu-sú-mì a-bi-ia / ù ú-ṣur-ru-šu-nu "The men who seized the town <and> my god are the plunderers of my father, and I will certainly watch out for them" (EA 252:29-31).

Promises and assurances to send something characterize the following examples:

a-šar i-ba-ša-at / ši-pi-ir-ti LUGAL EN-ia / ša-ri TIL.LA-ia ù ù-ba-[ú-n]a-ši / ù uš-ši-ru-na-ši / a-na LUGAL EN-ia ša-ri TIL.LA!-ia "Wherever the request of the king, my lord, may be, then I will surely look for it and I will send it to the king, my lord, the breath of my life" (EA 143:10-17); *ù / ti₇-iq-ta-bi / a-nu-ma i-na ŠU-t[i] / LÚṣú-ḥa-ri-ia / ut-ta-aš-še-ru-un-na-šu-nu* "And you said (each time), 'By the hand of my servant I will verily send them'" (KL 72:600:4-8; Rainey 1976:338-339; cf. Wilhelm 1982:124); *LUGAL EN-ia ša-pár a-na mu-ḥi-[i]a Ḥa-a-ia / a-na qa-bi KASKAL-ra-ni ḤÁ / KURḤa-na-gal₉-bat an-nu-ú / ú-wa-še-ru-na ù uš-ši-ru-ši* "The king, my lord, sent to me Ḥāya to say 'Behold, I am surely sending Ḥanigalbat caravans, so expedite them!'" (EA 255:8-11).

If the form is really energetic, i.e. *-unšu > -ššu (cf. *infra*, p. 235), then this passage also belongs in the same category:

ù ¹Sú-ra-t[a] / yi-il₅-qé-mi ¹La-[ab-a-ia] / iš-tu ^{URU}Ma-gid₆-da[^{KI}] /
 ù yi-iq-bi a-na ia-a[-ši] / i-na-mi ŠÀ ^{GIŠ}MÀ \ a-na-yi /
 ú-ta-aš-ša-ru-uš-šu / a-na šàr-ri "But Surata took Lab²ayu from
 Megiddo and he said to me, 'By ship will I send him to the
 king'" (EA 245:24-30).

Such an energetic asseveration may also be applied concerning a third person:

i-nu-ma yi-iš-tap-pa-ra / šàr-ru a-na ia-ši a-nu-ma / ¹I-ri-ma-ia-aš-ša
 / ia-ak-šu-du-na a-na / mu-ḫi-ka ú-ul ka-ši-id / a-na mu-ḫi-ia
 "Inasmuch as the king has written to me, 'Now Irimayassa will
 surely come to you,' he has not come to me" (EA 130:9-14).

ARGUMENTATIVE. Finally, there are a few passages where the force of the energetic seems to be mainly charged with emotion. This usage is perhaps an extension of the asseverative discussed above, which also reflects deep feelings. Especially noteworthy is the use of the energetic in a Taanach letter where a senior official is chiding a local ruler:

ša-ni-tam la-a-mi / ¹i¹-na ma-an-ša-ar-¹ti¹ i-¹ba¹-[šu] /
¹ḫa¹-na-ku-u-ka ù la-a-mi / ti-il₅-la-ku-un!(EN)-na at-t[a] / a-na
 maḫ-ri-ia ù šum-ma-mi / tu-wa-še-ru-na ŠEŠ-ka / ša-ni-tam i-na
^{URU}Ḫa-za-ti / i-ba-ša-ti ù la-a-mi / ¹ti¹-¹il₅¹-la-ku-¹na¹ a-na
¹maḫ¹-[r]i-ia "Your warriors are not in the garrison and you do
 not come yourself to me nor do you send your brother;
 furthermore, I am in Gaza and you do not come to me!"
 (TT 6:6-14)

The verb in line 5 may also have been energetic, viz. *tu-wa-še-ru[-na(?)]*. In any case these 2nd m.s. forms, all in negative clauses, express the anger of the sender.

The same use of the energetic may be seen in the following:

ERÍN.MEŠ la-a yu-ša-[ru] / ù ^{LÚ}DUMU ši-ip-[ri]-[ia] / la-a
 tu-ša-šú-na "The army is not being sent and you are not sending

forth my ambassador" (EA 126:40-43); *aš-tap-pár aš-ta-ni la-a / ia-tu-ru-na a-wa-tu / a-na ia-a-ši* "I have been writing repeatedly (but) word does not come back to me" (EA 126:53-55).

Two other passages may also belong to this category:

[a-nu]-ma ki-a-ma-am iš-tap-ru a-na šār-ri EN-ia / ù la-a yi-iš-mu-na a-wa-te-ia "[No]w thus have I been writing to the king, my lord, but he doesn't even listen to my words!" (EA 85:6-7; cf. *supra*, p. 238); *an-nu-ú. LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM šār-ri / yu-wa-ši-ru-na šār-ru* "Behold, the king is sending royal commissioners" (EA 116:30-31; cf. *infra*, pp. 247-247)

SUBORDINATE CLAUSES. Two examples in subordinate clauses may also belong, in fact, to the previous section. Their contexts appear to be charged with emotion. One of them has to do with a painful dispute over property:

ù y[u]-wa-ši-ra LUGAL ^[LÚ¹]MAŠKÍM¹ / [ù] y[u-p]a-r[i-i]š [b]e-ri-nu ka-li / mi-im-me ša-a yu-ú-ul-qú-na / iš-tu ša-a-šu-nu a-na šār-ri ú-ul / yi-íl-qé-šu LÚ ša-nu a-na ša-šu "So may the king send a commissioner that he may decide between us; all the property that was taken from them belongs to the king; let not another man take it for himself!" (EA 117:66-70).

The other was cited above (*supra*, p. 241). One energetic form is subordinated to a noun in construct: *a-wa-at yu-te-ru-na* "whatever word that he would return" (EA 251:13). Again, it may have been the emotion involved which dictated the use of the energetic.

THE INJUNCTIVE

Three other conjugation patterns are posited for the injunctive mode. Inasmuch as the proof for the existence of one pattern may derive from contrasts with syntagmas using one of the indicative patterns (especially the imperfect), examples will be

brought of such contextual parallels employing two different forms and expressing two different nuances.

JUSSIVE

The jussive was not clearly defined by Ebeling or any of the other early grammarians of EA, though many translators rendered it correctly in context. Furthermore, Ebeling (1910:46) did recognize the correct meaning of a gloss from Hazor containing the jussive, which in fact proves its existence in the native language of the scribes:

[ù] *li-ih-šu-uš-mi* / \ *ia-az-ku-ur-mi* / ^l*šār-ri* EN-*ia* / *mi-im-ma ša* / *in₄-né-pu-uš-mi* / UGU ^{URU}*Ha-šú-ra*^{KI} / URU.KI-*ka* ù / UGU *ÌR-ka* "[So] may the king, my lord, take thought for everything that has been done against Hazor, your city, and against your servant" (EA 228:18-25).

The very fact that the gloss, *ia-az-ku-ur*, defines an Akkadian precativè, is adequate witness to the presence of real jussive forms in Canaanite. Of course, this assumption has behind it the comparative material from Hebrew (Driver 1892:51-55) and Arabic (Fischer 1972:96-97, § 195) and now also Ugaritic (Rainey 1987a:397-398). However, one of Moran's most important achievements was the delineation of the syntactic functions of the jussive in the Byblos dialect (Moran 1950a:49-51; 1951).

MORPHOLOGY. The prefix jussive forms have -Ø suffix on the 3rd m.s., 2nd f.s., 2nd m.s., 1st c.s. and 1st c.pl., and -*ū* on the 3rd m.pl. and 2nd m.pl. The third weak verbs are characterized by their bare thematic vowel in final position on the singulars and on 1st c.pl., e.g. jussive *ia-aq-bi* (EA 83:34) and *yi-iq-bi* (EA 85:32) as against imperfect *yi-iq-bu* (EA 129:84), jussive *yi-iš-me* (EA 79:13) in contrast to imperfect *yi-iš-mu* (EA 320:23). The plurals are also easy to distinguish by their suffixes, imperfect -*ūna* but jussive -*ū*. It is obvious that the jussive conjugation pattern is identical with that of the preterite.

WISH, REQUEST, COMMAND. This is the most common function of the jussive in the texts just as it is the most prevalent usage in the West Semitic languages in general. Many translators have recognized the jussive nuance of the various examples. Perhaps the most discussed syntagma is the wish or blessing formula used in Rib-Haddi's letters (cf. Youngblood 1961:11-13). There are two formulations, in fact, one addressed to high officials and the other addressed directly to pharaoh. First the idiom applied in letters to officials:

^dNIN ša URUGub-la ti-din / ba-aš-ta-¹ka¹ i-na pa-ni / šâr-ri EN-ka
 "May the Lady of Byblos grant your dignity in the presence of the king, your lord!" (EA 73:4-6; also EA 69:5-8; 70:3-5; 77:3-6; for EA 71:4-6 and EA 95:3-6 cf. *infra*).

And for the king, the blessing is:

[^d]NIN ša URUGub-la / ti-id-di-in₄ du-na / a-na LUGAL be-li-ia
 "May the Lady of Byblos grant strength to the king, my lord"
 (EA 68:4-6; also EA 74:2-4 *et passim* in the Rib-Haddi letters).

The verb form employed is 3rd f.s. *tiddin*. When two deities are invoked, the jussive form is 3rd m.pl. *tiddinû*:

^dA-ma-na û / >û< ^dNIN ša URUGub-la / ti-di-nu TÊŠ-ka i-na pa-ni / šâr-ri EN-li-ka-ma "May Amon and the Lady of Byblos grant your dignity in the presence of the king, your lord!" (EA 95:3-6).

From this it becomes obvious that in the following passages either the name of the second deity has been inadvertently omitted or else the scribe was using a "plural of majesty":

^dA-ma-na DINGIR ša ¹LUGAL¹ [be-li-k]a / ti-di-nu TÊŠ-ka i-na / pa-ni LUGAL be-li-ka "May Amon, the deity of the king, [yo]ur [lord], grant your dignity in the presence of the king, your lord!" (EA 71:4-6 and EA 86:3-5; Albright 1946:12; Moran 1950a:62, 63; 1951:35 n. 14; 1964:80-81; Youngblood 1961:84).

Lest there should be any doubts that *tiddin/tiddinū* in these contexts is jussive, one must not forget the one instance when the same formula is employed using the Akkadian precative, *liddin*, viz. EA 102:5-8 (cf. *supra*, p. 215).

As a third person command, the jussive may also be a verb which governs an infinitive in the accusative:

yu-ḥa-mi-it be-li / uš-šar ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭá-ti₇ ki-ma / ar-ḥi-iš "May my lord hasten to send regular troops in a hurry!" (EA 362:7-9).

The jussive can be followed by imperatives. In this example the jussive is a stative verb with impersonal subject; it is then followed by a direct imperative:

ù / yi-it-ru-uš i-[n]a p[a-n]i / EN dUTU KUR.ḤÁ ù / id-na-ni 20 ta-pal / ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ a-na ia-ši / ù uš-ši-ra til-la-ta / ki-ma ar-ḥi-iš / a-na URUŠu-mu-ra a-na / na-ša-ri-ši_x(ŠE) "And may it be pleasing in the sight of the lord, the sun-god of the lands, so give me twenty spans of horses and send an auxiliary force quickly to Šumur to protect it" (EA 103:39-47).

Or the jussive may introduce a chain of volitives in clauses of purpose or intended result; these latter can have the same subject as the initial jussive or they can have another subject:

yi-iš-mé šar-ru EN-nu / a-wa-te ÌR.MEŠ ki-ti-šu / ù ia-di-na NÍG.BA / a-na ÌR-šu ù ti-da-ga-lu / LÚ.MEŠ a-ia-bu-nu ù / ti-ka-lu ep-ra "May the king, our lord, listen to the words of his loyal servants and may he give a present to his servant so that our enemies may see and eat dirt!" (EA 100:31-36).

These examples are sufficient to illustrate the general usage in this syntagma. The next example is deceptive at first sight, viz. EA 116:30-33. The jussive has been thought to be dependent on an indicative energetic which Moran (1950a:50) originally took to be a "virtual command." Since then, he has recognized that it is indicative; we have categorized it as an expression of strong,

argumentative force (*supra*, p. 244). The ensuing jussives are logically related but not syntactically subordinated to the indicative energetic:

an-nu-ú LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM šàr-ri / yu-wa-ši-ru-na šàr-ru ù / ia-aq-bi šàr-ru a-na ša-šu-nu / ù tu-pa-pa-ri-šu be-ri-ku-ni "Behold, the king is sending royal commissioners so may the king speak to them so that they may decide between the two of you" (EA 116:30-33; Moran 1973:52).

Naturally, the jussive also serves to express negative wishes. It is a peculiar feature of the EA texts from Canaan that the Akkadian negative particles, *ul* and *lā*, have each encroached on the semantic spheres of the other. This can be seen by comparing negative jussives from the same verbs, one example with *lā* and the other with *ul*.

la-a yi-iš-mé LUGAL be-li / a-wa-te^{MEŠ} LÚ.MEŠ ša-nu-ti "May the king, my lord, not listen to the words of other men!" (EA 362:48-49; 126:62-63); [*ú*]-*ul yi-iš-me LUGAL kar₅-ší / 'ËR¹ ki-ti-šu* "May the king not listen to the slander of his loyal servant!" (EA 119:26-27).

Note the use of *lā* and *ul* in the same letter:

ù la-a <i>a-¹qúl¹-mì / LUGAL EN-ia iš-tu / ¹URU¹Šu-mu-ur^{KI} "And may the king, my lord, not keep silent concerning Šumur!" (EA 68:14-16; also EA 139:5-6, 10); *ù ú-ul / [ia]-qúl¹-mì LUGAL iš-[tu] / [UR]U.DIDLI.KI.-šu* "And may the king not keep silent concer[ning] his [ci]ties" (EA 68:30-32; also EA 132:43-45; 76:44-46; 90:57).

On occasion the jussive may be reinforced by the optative particle *lū*. Forms with a *t-* prefix, i.e. 3rd f.s., 2nd m.s., 3rd m.pl. and 2nd m.pl. would thus be identical in form with the Akkadian precativ. However, forms of 3rd m.s., with prefixed *y-*, represent an obvious substitute for the precativ. This is particularly clear

with regard to the verb *idû* "to know." Instead of the standard OB construction, *lū īde*, or the new hybrid precative *līde* (cf. *supra*, p. 213), we find examples such as:

ù lu-ú yi-de / šār-ru EN-ia a-na KUR.KI-šu "So may the king, my lord, take cognizance of his territory!" (EA 243:21-22; also EA 60:30; 245:46; 307:6).

Other 3rd m.s. jussives with the injunctive *lū* are the following:

[*l*] *u-ú yi-il-ma-ad šār-ru / EN-ia 'i¹-nu-ma iz-zi-bu-ni / gāb-bi ŠEŠ.ĤÁ-ia* "May the king, my lord, be apprised that all my colleagues have abandoned me!" (EA 366:17-19); *lu-ú yi-iš-me LUGAL EN-ia / a-wa-te ÌR-šu* "May the king, my lord, give heed to the words of his servant!" (EA 136:6-7); *u lu-ú / yi-it-ra-ni! EN-ia / is-tu qa-at / LÚSA.GAZ.MEŠ* "So may he deliver me!" (EA 299:21-22; Izre³el apud Na³aman 1979:679 n. 29; cf. Izre³el 1977:165);

Usually the jussive stands at the head of its clause but note the following striking exception:

a-nu-ma ṭup-pí ša-nu / ù ka-li ú-nu-tu-ia / ša it-ti ¹Ia-pa-dIŠKUR / šu-ut yi-ša-kan / i-na pa-ni šār-ri "Now (here is) another tablet and all my implements that are with Yapa^c-Haddi; let it be placed before the king" (EA 119:55-59).

PURPOSE CLAUSES. Another widespread use of the jussive is in clauses of purpose or intended result. As Moran has noted, due to the paratactic sentence structure in these epistles, it is often difficult, not to say impossible, to distinguish between wishes, requests and commands on the one hand, and clauses of purpose on the other (Moran 1950a:88; 1960:6 n. 1). Though there may be logical subordination between clauses in these injunctive chains, it is not realized by the use of subordinating conjunctions. Instead, the clauses are joined by the coordinating conjunction *u* or joined asyndetically. The choice of mood, injunctive or indicative,

operates according to what Moran has called "modal congruence (Moran 1950a:81-88; 1951:33; 1960:9). If the initial clause contains an indicative (including *qtl* forms), then the purpose clause will also contain indicatives. Conversely, if the initial clause contains an injunctive (including imperatives), then the verbs of the purpose clauses will also be injunctives. First, some examples following an imperative:

qa-bi₄-ti₇ a-na LUGAL be-lí-[i]a uš-ši-ra-mi / 'ERÍN'.MEŠ' pí-ťá-ti ù ti-il₅-¹qé¹ l¹R-Aš-ra-ta "I said to the king, my lord, "Send the army that it may capture "Abdi-Ashirta" (EA 94:10-11; Moran 1950a:84; 1960:12 n. 1; Youngblood 1961:384); *ù uš-ši-ra ERÍN.MEŠ / pí-ťá-ti ù ti-il-qé-šu / ù ta-ap-šu-uh* KUR LUGAL "So send the army that it may capture him so that the land of the king may become tranquil" (EA 107:29-31; Moran 1950a:82); *uš-ši-ra ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-ti / ra-ba ù tu-da-bi-ir / a-ia-bi LUGAL iš-tu / l¹b-bi KUR-šu ù / ti-né-ep-šu ka-li / KUR.KUR.MEŠ a-na šār-ri* "Send a large army that it may drive out the enemies of the king from the midst of his land and so that all the lands may side with the king" (EA 76:38-43).

Note that *ti-né-ep-šu* is 3rd m.pl. jussive.

The jussive in a purpose clause may also be reinforced by the optative particle *lū*. The ensuing passages have jussives in 1st c.pl. The construction is foreign to Babylonian, but evidently was correct in Assyrian, although the evidence is restricted to OA and very scanty. ÇAD L:225a and GAG:106, §81g, both cite the same text, viz. *lu ni-iš-me-ma / lu né-pu-uš* "As soon as we hear, we will do" (BIN 4 106:17-18 = EL 244:17-18). Hecker (1968:129-129, §71) does not cite this text, and has no attestations for 1st c.pl. The *lū niprus* pattern appears in a small number of contexts in the EA letters from Canaan, but, with the exception of one Jerusalem passage, can hardly be ascribed to Assyrian influence. It is more likely a simple use of the *lū yiprus* construction with the 1st c.pl.

[*yi-i*]š-[*me* LUGAL] / [LÚ.]MEŠ *ha-za-nu-[ti-šu] / ù 'lu¹-ú ni-zi-¹iz¹ / UGU-šu-nu ù lu-[ú] ni-du-bu-ur / LÚ.MEŠ ša-ru-ta*

"[Ma]y [the king] [he]e[d his] city rulers so that we may take a stand against them and so that we may drive out the miscreants" (EA 279:18-21); *ù lu-ú ni-pa-aš gáb-bu-ma / nu-kúr-ti* "and let us all make war" (EA 366:31-32; cf. *infra*, pp. 251-252 for the full citation); *id-nu-mi gáb-bi e-ri-iš-ti-šu-nu / a-na LÚ.MEŠ URUQí-il-ti / ù lu-ú ni-ip-tú-ur URUÚ-ru-sa-lim^{KI}* "And let us desert Jerusalem" (EA 289:29; Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:489a).

The purpose clause may be dependent upon a volitive without itself taking the *-a* suffix:

yu-ḥa-mi-tá uš-šar ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ti / LUGAL ù yi-il-qé-šu-nu ù / ti-né-pu-uš KUR.MEŠ a-na LUGAL BE-i[a] "May he hasten to send the king's army so that he may capture them and so that the lands may go over to the king, my lord" (EA 129:78-80); *[yu-wa]-ši-ra šar-ru^{LÚ}MAŠKÍM-šu / [ù yu]-pa-ra-aš be-ri-ku-[n]i* "May the king send his commissioner [so that he] may decide between the two of you" (EA 113:17-18; Moran 1950a:82-83; 1973:52); *ù y[u]-wa-ši-ra LUGAL^{LÚ}MAŠKÍM^{LÚ} / [ù] y[u-p]a-r[i-i]š [b]e-ri-nu* "So may the king send the commissioner [so that] he may decide between us" (EA 117:66-67).

There are also injunctive chains that begin with an Akkadian precativ (cf. *supra*, p. 217):

ù li-di-na LUGAL EN-ia / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ta / ù ni-pu-uš / URU.DIDLI.ḤÁ LUGAL EN-ia / ù ni-ša-ab / a-na URU.DIDLI.ḤÁ / LUGAL EN-ia DINGIR-ia / dUTU-ia "So may the king, my lord, furnish troops that we may rebuild(?) the cities of the king, my lord, and so that we may settle in the cities of the king, my lord, my deity" (EA 363:17-23); *ù li-it-ru-uš / i-na pa-ni šar-ri EN-ia ù / lu-ú yu-ši-ra^{LÚ}Ia-an-ḥa-ma / ù lu-ú ni-pa-aš gáb-bu-ma / nu-kúr-ti ù lu-ú tu-te-er / KUR.KI.ḤÁ ša šar-ri EN-ia / a-na ZAG.ḤI.⟨A⟩-ši \ up-sí-ḥi* "So may it be pleasing in the sight of the king, my lord, so that he may send

Yanḥamu and so that we may all make war and so that you may restore the lands of the king, my lord, to its farthest extent" (EA 366:28-34; Finklestein 1969:33).

Purpose clauses may also express a negative wish or purpose:

ia-aq-bi LUGAL *a-na* 3 URU.MEŠ / ù ^{GIŠ}MÁ LÚ.MEŠ *mi-ši* / ù *la-a ti-la-ku a-na* / ^{KUR}A-mur-ri "May the king speak to the three cities and the ship of the expeditionary force so that they go not to Amurru" (EA 101:32-35); ù *lu-ù-mi* / *li-ik-ki-im-mi* / *šar-ru* URU.KI-šu *la-a-mi* / *yi-iš-bat-ši* / ^ILa-ab-a-yu "So may the king deliver his city lest Lab²ayu capture it" (EA 244:25-29); ù *lu-ú* / *li-di-nam-mi šar-ru* / 1 ME LÚ.MEŠ *ma-an-ša-ar-ta₅* / *a-na na-ša-ri* URU.KI-šu / *la-a-mi yi-iš-bat-ši* / ^ILa-ab-a-yu "So may the king furnish one hundred garrison troops to guard his city so that Lab²ayu may not capture it" (EA 244:33-38); *yi-ki-im* LUGAL / *be-li* ^{KUR}Šu / *iš-tu qa-te* / LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ / *la-a ti₇-iḫ-la-aq* / *la-q₁-ta* / ^{URU}Ša-bu-ma^{KI} "May the king deliver his city from the hands of the ^c*apîrû* men lest Šabuma be lost (captured)" (EA 274:10-16; Albright 1943a:17 n. 60); ù *lu-ú yu-uš-ši-ra* / LUGAL *be-li* / ^{GIŠ}GIGIR.MEŠ ù *lu-ù* / *yi-il-te-qé-ni* / *a-na mu-ḫi-šu la-a* / *iḫ-la-aq* "So may the king, my lord, send chariots so that they may take me lest I perish" (EA 270:24-29; Rainey 1978a:11*).

CONDITIONAL SENTENCES. There are also many instances where the apodosis of a conditional sentence has a verb in the jussive. One of the clearest illustrations of the form is the following where the apodosis is introduced by the coordinating conjunction:

šum-ma LUGAL *be-li* / *la-a yu-ša-ru* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ta₅* / ù *ni-nu-mi* BA.UG₇^{ni-mu-ut} / ù URU.MEŠ *Gub^{ub}-li* / *tu-ul₁₁-qú* "If the king, my lord, does not send the army then we will die and the towns of Byblos will be taken" (EA 362:9-13; Rainey 1978b:18-19; Moran 1987b:556; 1992:359-360).

The apodosis may, however, be introduced asyndetically as so often in standard Akkadian:

*šum-ma lib-bi LUGAL ba-li uš-ša-[ar] / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-ti
ia-aš-pu-ur a-na / ^IIa-an-ħa-mì ù a-na ^IPí-ħu-ra / al-ku-mi qa-du
LÚ.MEŠ ħa-za-ni-ku-nu / le-qú-na ^{KUR}A-mur-ri* "If the king does
not intend to send the army, let him write to Yanħamu and to
Piħura, 'Go with your city rulers, take Amurru'" (EA 117:59-63;
Moran 1987b:324; 1992:194).

The apodosis may also consist of several clauses:

*šum-ma ia-[nu] / LÚ-LIM ša ú-še₂₀-ze-bu-^fšix¹(^fŠE¹) iš-tu
qa-ti-n[u] / ù nu-da-bir₅ LÚ.MEŠ ħa-za-nu-ta is-tu / lib-bi
KUR.KUR.KI ù ti-né-pu-uš ka-li KUR.KUR.MEŠ.KI / a-na
LÚ.MEŠ 'GAZ' ù 'ki¹-tu ti-in-⟨né-pu-uš⟩-ma / a-na ka-li
KUR.KUR.KI ù pa-aš-ħu DUMU.MEŠ / ù ^{MÍ}DUMU.MÍ.MEŠ
a-⟨na⟩ da-ri-ti UD.KÁM.MEŠ* "If there is no man who can deliver
it from [o]ur hand, then let us expel the city rulers from the
lands and all the lands will side with the ^capîru men and a treaty
may ⟨be made⟩ for all the lands and the sons and daughters will
be at peace for ever more" (EA 74:32-38; Mendenhall
1947a:123-124).

Finally, there is one possible instance of a jussive in the protasis of a conditional sentence. Moran (1950a:73) had signaled the use of the volitive in the protasis and had noted the evidence of similar usages in Hebrew (GKC:494, §159*d-e*; cited by Moran 1950a:134 n. 190). In biblical Hebrew both jussives and cohortatives can serve in the protasis. Note that in the ensuing passage, the protasis seems to consist simply of a jussive clause but the apodosis apparently begins with a verb in the indicative imperfect (though its interpretation is disputed):

*la-a yu-wa-šar LUGAL be-li MU\ša-ni-ta an-ni-ta₅ / a-na
DUMU.MEŠ ^{ĪR}A-ši-ir-ti u ti-dì-šu-^fnu¹ DUMU.⟨MEŠ⟩ /
gáb-bi-šu-nu a-na KUR.MEŠ LUGAL be-li-ia* "(If) the king, my

lord, does not send (troops) this year against the sons of
 ‘Abdi-Ashirta, then the son(s) (of ‘Abdi-Ashirta) will all
 trample(?) the lands of the king, my lord" (EA 362:66-68).

COMPLEX SENTENCES. The following example might be looked upon as a conditional sentence but it is more likely a complex sentence made up of two juxtaposed clauses, the first being the topic, the second being the comment (Rainey 1992a:186-191). In fact, the "comment" may consist of three clauses, the first one containing a negative jussive:

*i-nu-ma yi-iq-bu a-na pa-ni LUGAL / BA.UG₇ \ mu-tu-mi a-na
 KUR.MEŠ / la-a yi-iš-mé LUGAL be-li / a-wa-te^{MEŠ} LÚ.MEŠ
 ša-nu-te ia-nu-mi / mu-ta-na a-na KUR.MEŠ ša-lim iš-tu
 pa-na-⟨nu⟩-¹um¹ "Inasmuch as he says in the king's presence,
 'There is death in the lands,' may the king, my lord, not listen to
 the words of other men! There is no epidemic in the land; it is
 healthier than before" (EA 362:46-50; CAD M/2:296a).*

VOLITIVE

TERMINOLOGY. The term "volitive" has been borrowed from Moran (1950a: *passim*), who applied it to all injunctives. Moran, in turn, had adopted the term "volitive" from Joüon (1923:307-312, §114; Joüon and Muraoka 1991:373-379, §114). The *yaqtula* conjugation pattern was called "subjunctive" by Moran, following the convention of Arabic grammar (Moran 1950a:89-104). When Moran presented the evidence gathered in his dissertation to a wider audience, he called the conjugation pattern simply the "Early Canaanite *yaqtula*" (Moran 1960). That article had considerable impact on Semitic linguistics (Moscatti *et al.* 1964:135; Fleisch 1968; Blau 1971; cf. now Rainey 1991-93).

"Volitive" has been arbitrarily chosen as the title for the *yaqtula* conjugation pattern to distinguish it from the jussive and the imperative. However, that distinction is one of convenience only since volitive and injunctive would both be valid definitions for all conjugation patterns in this non-indicative mood.

MORPHOLOGY. The characteristic feature of this conjugation pattern is assumed to be the following (using Arabic as a model): the 3rd m.s., 3rd f.s., 2nd m.s., 1st c.s. and 1st c.pl. are marked by an *-a* suffix; the 3rd m.pl. and the 2nd m.pl. are identical with those of the preterite and the jussive, i.e. they lack the *-na* suffix of the imperfect. This means that all injunctive 2nd and 3rd plurals except energics, which are virtually unattested, are the same. If the *yaqtula* conjugation pattern is to be identified in the EA texts from Canaan, then it is only on the singulars and the 1st c.pl. No injunctive glosses of purely Canaanite verbs are known with the volitive *-a* suffix, except for the apparent Canaanite imperative *ku-na* (EA 147:36; cf. *infra*, pp. 265-266).

The greatest obstacle to distinguishing volitive forms in these texts is the fact, as recognized by Moran (1950a:91-92; 1960:2), that they are written in Akkadian and Akkadian has the homophonous morpheme known as the ventive, i.e. the suffix (on singulars) *-a(m)*. For that reason, an intensive survey of all the texts in question was made in search of evidence for the Akkadian ventive (cf. *supra*, pp. 202-211). It was seen that ventives are prevalent throughout the corpus. Izre³el (1978b:80-82) had made a similar study, with special reference to the Gezer letters but against the background of the corpus as a whole, and had come to similar conclusions. Many verbs with *-a* suffix are those which naturally took the ventive in Akkadian. Rabiner (1981:99-100) also noted that forms with *-a* in EA 234 (from Acco) appear on preterites; they seem to function like the forms with \emptyset both as preterites and injunctives. Therefore, the use of the ventive is evidently more widespread than one might deduce just from reading Moran's presentation. As the ventive occurs on truly preterite verb forms in this corpus, those which appear in injunctive contexts could just as well be ventives in the WS jussive mode. Moran did prove beyond all doubt that those forms were injunctive and not indicative. He provided numerous contrasts between verbs with *-u*, which are indicative (our imperfect), and those with *-a*, which are injunctive. But he also demonstrated that the jussives and the injunctives with *-a* all can serve in the same syntagmas! Who is to say that the *-a* forms are not simply jussives

with Akkadian ventive? The ensuing discussion will be limited to those examples where an Akkadian ventive might not be required. It will be seen that in most cases, there is a possible ventive on some other verb in the immediate context, so that modus attraction could also have been at work.

The examples will be cited according the same syntactic constructions as those described for the jussive.

WISH, REQUEST, COMMAND. The plethora of texts in which a request and a chain of further injunctive clauses begin with a form of *wuššuru* will not be adduced here since there is too strong a possibility that the *-a* suffix really is the ventive. On the other hand, there are other verbs with similar meanings, such as *ḥummuṭu* "to hasten":

ki-n[a-na] / yu-ḥa-mi-tá uš-šar ERÍN.MEŠ *p[í-tá]-t[i]* / LUGAL *ù yi-ìl-qé-šu-nu ù / ti-né-pu-uš* KUR.MEŠ *a-na* LUGAL 'BE¹-i[a]
"The[refore] may he hasten to send the army in order that it may capture them and that the lands be si[de] with the king, my lord!" (EA 129:77-80);

and from the same scribe:

ù yu-ḥa-mi-tá be-li / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ta₅ ù ni-UG₇.BA* "So may my lord send the army or we will die" (EA 362:40-41; Rainey 1978b:2-21).

The D stem of this verb is rare in any case, but it must be noted that the use of the ventive with the G stem *ḥamāṭu* is widespread (CAD H:62b-63a). A unique construction is the verb form derived from the adverb *arḥiš* (as noted by S. Izre³el; cf. *supra*, p. 69; *contra AHw*:943b). In light of the two passages with *ḥummuṭu*, it is logical to assume that this *hapax* also has the ventive:

ù ya-ar-ḥi-ša LUGAL *be-li-[ia]* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá[-t]a₅ ù ti-iš-ba-tu*
/ URU *ki-ma ar-ḥi-iš* "So may the king, [my] lord, hasten the troops that they may seize the city quickly!" (EA 137:97-99).

Another verb appearing in a negative wish is *puḥḥuru* "to assemble," which is also used generally with the ventive (AHw:810b-811b):

ú-ul yu-pa-ḥi-ra ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ ù / yi-il-qa
URUŠi-ga-t[a] / ù URUAm-pí "Let him not assemble the *ʿapîru*
 men that he may take Shigata and Ampí" (EA 71:28-31; also
 EA 85:77-79).

PURPOSE CLAUSES. When dependent upon another injunctive clause, purpose clauses take a jussive or volitive verb. The following negative result clause employs *šemû* "to hear," which does not characteristically take the ventive (AHw:1211a-1213b):

aq-bi a-na ka-ta₅ la-a / i-le-ù uš-šar-[šu] / ù-ul yi-iš-ma
ÌR-A-ši-i[r-ta] / ù ma-an-nu il-te₉-qa-n[i] / i[š-]tu qa-ti-šu "I said
 to you, 'I am unable to send [him] lest 'Abdi-Ashirta hear, and
 who will deliver me from his hand?'" (EA 82:21-25; Moran
 1960:4; Albright and Moran 1948:246 n. 17).

Another verb which does not normally take the ventive is *našāru* "to protect, guard." However, in the following passage, the purpose clause is dependent upon an injunctive of *wuššuru*, which, as we have seen, probably developed extensive use of the ventive. Therefore, one could argue that the ventive on the second verb is due to modus attraction from the first:

ša-ni-tam / yu-wa-ši-ra šār-ru ANŠE.KUR.RA.⟨MEŠ⟩ a-na /
›a-¹na⟨ ÌR-šu u a-na-ša-ra URU.KI "Furthermore, may the king
 send horse⟨s⟩ to his servant so that I may protect the city"
 (EA 117:71-73; Rainey 1975b:414).

Modus attraction is a bit more difficult to maintain for the next passage though one might argue that the scribe wished to alternate between verbs with $-\emptyset$ and verbs with *-a*, for whatever reasons.

li-iš-mé šār-ru a-wa-te ÌR-šu / ù ia-di-na ba-la-tá ÌR-šu ù / a-na-ša-^rra¹ [URU] ^rki¹-it-ti-šu a-di ^rNIN¹-nu / DINGIR.MEŠ-nu a[-na ka-ta₅] ù yi-da-ga[l LUGAL] / [KUR]-šu ù [URU-šu] "May the king heed the words of his servant and may he provide his servant's sustenance that his servant may live and so that I may protect his loyal [city] with our Lady, our deity, fo[r you] and to that [the king] may see his [land] and [his city]" (EA 74:53-58; Youngblood 1961:152; Rainey 1965b:414; Moran 1987b:253 n. 15; 1992:145 n. 15).

Another verb which does not usually take the ventive is *epēšu* (but note that in the idiom *alākam epēšum*, this verb usually does have the ventive! CAD E:201b). But again, the preceding imperative certainly has the ventive and modus attraction may have been at play:

šu-te-ra a-wa-ta₅ / a-na ia-ši ù i-pu-ša a-na-ku / ki-ta it-ti ÌR-A-ši-ir-ta / ki-ma ¹Ia-pa-^dÍŠKUR ù ¹Zi-im-re-[d]a / ù bal-tá-ti
 "Send word back to me or I will make an alliance with
^cAbdi-Ashirta like Yapa^c-Haddi and Zimredda that I may live"
 (EA 83:23-25; Moran 1950a:100; 1987b:264; 1992:153).

Perhaps a better case might be made for the next passage. The verb in question, *maḥāšu* "to smite," does not customarily take the ventive. Still, it occurs in a negative result clause (*contrast* Izre³el 1978b:63) after an imperative with the ventive:

ù yi-iq-bu / a-na ia-ši id-na-^rni¹ / DAM-ka ù / DUMU.MEŠ-ka ù lu-ú / i-ma-ḥa-ša "And he is saying to me, 'Give me your wife and your children or else I will attack!'" (EA 270:17-21; Moran 1987b:494-495; 1992:316-317).

In spite of what one might expect, *dubburu/duppuru* "to go away, to expel" (intransitive and transitive of the D stem) does not seem to take the ventive in classical Akkadian (CAD D:186-188; AHw:177). Like the examples above, this one has an imperative with the ventive:

ù *i-na* UD.MEŠ / [*an-nu-ti uš-še-ra* ERÍN.MEŠ [GAL] / [ù *tu-du-bi-ra-šu i[š-tu]* / [^{KUR}A-*mur-ri* "So in [the]se days, send a [large] army [that it may] expel him f[rom Amur]ru" (EA 85:79-82; Youngblood 1961:281; Moran 1950a:158; 1987b:271 n. 10; 1992:158 n. 12; cf. EA 76:38-41 without -a).

The verb *arādu/urrudu* "to serve," a denominative from (*w*)*ardu* "slave" (cf. *supra*, pp. 148-149, *infra*, p. 378), is unique to the EA texts from Canaan (CAD A/2:220). It seldom takes the -a, and its semantic range is hardly commensurate with the ventive. Nevertheless, it does happen to be more or less homophonous with MB (*w*)*arādu* "to go down," a verb of motion that would naturally take the ventive on many occasions. Furthermore, the contexts where *urrudu* does have an -a suffix are in tandem with another form having -a which is most likely a ventive:

[*u*] [*u-ú*] 'yu¹-¹wa¹-¹ša¹-a[r] / 'ERÍN¹.¹MEŠ¹ 'pr¹-¹tá¹-¹ta¹-š[*u*] / šu-nu / [t]u-šu-r[*u*]-ba-ni / a-na URU.DIDLI.KI-ni-ia / u l[*u*]-ú i-ru-da-am / LUGAL EN-ia "[So] may he send h[is] troops; it is they who can install me in my towns that I may truly serve the king, my lord" (EA 300:15-21; Izre²el 1978b:14; Moran 1987b:530; 1992:341).

The syntagma is difficult to define because of the possible lacuna in the latter part of line 17, but there may not be anything missing there. Assuming the interpretation given above, the clause *šu-nu* / [t]u-šu-r[*u*]-ba-ni is not necessarily injunctive; in fact, it is more likely indicative. So the status of the clause with *i-ru-da-am* may not be injunctive either. It would appear, then, that the suffix -am on the latter verb is truly a ventive, the result of modus attraction from the preceding Š form from *šūrubu*, which would by nature be appropriate for the ventive.

The final passage to be discussed here has several special features. The imperative on which the subsequent purpose clause depends is in the plural, apparently with the energetic -na; the verb in the purpose clause, *izuzzu*, is used frequently with the ventive in good Akkadian (*supra*, pp. 206-208).

ù / uš-ši-ru-na-ni 50 ta-pal / ANŠE.KUR.RA ù 2 ME ERÍN.MEŠ
 GÌR.MEŠ / ù i-zi-za i-na URUŠi-ga-ta / i-na pa-ni-šu a-di / a-ší
 ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-ti "So send to me fifty spans of horses and two
 hundred foot troops so that I may take up a position in Shigata
 facing him until the coming forth of the army" (EA 71:22-27).

AFTER A VERB OF FEARING. Moran (1950a:100;1960:14) noted that, in Arabic, the subjunctive *yaqtula* follows verbs of fearing (Wright 1898:25). It so happens that, in this regard, there is one lone example in the EA texts from Canaan. Furthermore, the verb, a G passive of *dâku*, is one which does not take the ventive in Akkadian. There is no contextual reason to suppose modus attraction to explain the *-a* suffix on the verb in question. Although the final sign is somewhat defaced on the tablet, it is most probably *k[a]* (Moran 1987b:351 n. 7).

pa[l-h]a-ti a-n[a-k]u / la-a-mi ú-da-a-k[a] "I am afraid lest I be
 killed" (EA 131:27-28).

CONDITIONAL SENTENCES. Note the following example in the protasis of a conditional sentence:

i-nu-ma / [a]-mu-ta mi-nu / 'yi¹-na-ša-ru-š_x(ŠE) "If I die, who will
 protect it?" (EA 130:50-52; Moran 1960:14; 1950a:73).

Now the verb *mātu* "to die" does sometimes take the ventive in literary Akkadian (CAD M/1:424a):

mūt bubāti u šummi limūta "let him die the death of hunger and
 thirst" (Langdon 1931:Pl. 5:9; cited CAD B:302a); [*i*]na šuttati
amātama "Shall I die in the pit?" (*Ibid.*, Pl. 3:26); *qarrādān šina*
imuttānim "two heroes will die" (YOS 10, 31:ix, 27).

It should be remembered that the Semitic root **mwt/mūt* belongs to a class that defines the transition from one state to another (Landsberger 1926:362; 1976:9). Therefore, the ventive was not felt by the ancient Mesopotamians to be out of place on this verb.

The ensuing cases of the *-a* suffix come in a chain of injunctives which comprise the apodosis of a conditional sentence. The first verb in the injunctive chain is an imperative (Moran 1950a:74) with the ventive suffix:

[šum-]ma *i-ra-am* ¹šar¹-[ru] / [E]N-li ÌR ki-t[i-šu] / [ù] uš-ši-ra / [3] LÚ ù *ib-lu-ṭá* / ù *i-na-ṣí-ra* / URU *a-na šàr-ri* "[I]f the ki[ng], my [lo]rd, cares for [his] faithf[ul] servant, [then] send the [three] men that I may survive and that I may protect the city for the king" (EA 123:23-28; Rainey 1975b:414).

It was observed above that *dubburu/duppuru* does not seem to normally take the ventive (*supra*, p. 258). So in the apodosis of this conditional sentence there is no reason to assume modus attraction:

i-nu-ma 1 *ḥa-za-nu* / *lib-bu-šu it-ti lib-bi-ia* / ù *ú-da-bi-ra* ÌR-A-ši-ir-ta / *iš-tu* ^{KUR}A-mur-ri "If there were one governor of the same mind as I, then I would drive out ^cAbdi-Ashirta from Amurru" (EA 85:66-69; Moran 1960:15).

COMPLEX SENTENCES. The following passage is very complex indeed. It begins with an *inūma* clause as topic and continues with an oath as comment. The oath itself is in the form of a conditional sentence introduced by *inūma*, the apodosis is what appears to be an injunctive clause the verb of which has the *-a* suffix. Although this latter verb is a verb of speaking, it is not one that generally appears with the ventive suffix (CAD D:186b-188b) like some other verbs of speaking.

i-nu-ma qa-bi a-na / *pa-ni šàr-ri* ¹Ri-ib-^dIŠKUR / *šu-mi-it* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-at šàr-ri i-nu-ma ba-al-ṭú* / LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM.MEŠ ù / *a-da-bu-ba ka-li ip-ši[-š]u-nu* "Inasmuch as it is said in the king's presence, 'Rib-Haddi has caused the death of the king's army,' as the commissioners live, I shall report all their deeds" (EA 119:18-23; Moran 1960:15; 1950a:100; 1987b:329 n. 2; CAD D:7a).

EVALUATION. It is abundantly clear that the EA texts have not given us any conclusive evidence for the existence of a Canaanite *yaqtula* pattern. In spite of Moran's brilliant mustering of the evidence, it is still possible to argue that the *-a* suffix is merely the Akkadian ventive. Moran was not unaware of the problem. His main argument was the injunctive nature of all the various contexts in which he found this *-a* suffix in the Byblos letters. However, the *-a* suffix almost always was attached to verbs which tend to be employed with the ventive and in many of the examples cited, especially the purpose clauses, there were other, parallel verbs with the same syntactic function but with the $-\emptyset$ suffix of the jussive. There are no glosses or strictly Canaanite verbal forms with the *-a* suffix (unlike the evidence for the WS imperfect and jussive). Furthermore, even in the Byblos corpus, there were some instances where the *-a* suffix appeared in past narrative and in some *inūma* clauses (topic clauses in complex sentences); those contexts were completely unsuitable for an injunctive and leave little doubt that the *-a(m)* suffix is the Akkadian ventive (Moran 1960:16-17). Outside of the Byblos corpus, there are many more preterites and other passages where the ventive was employed.

The synchronic and diachronic evidence was also adduced by Moran but he refused to base his case on it (Moran 1960:11-13). He did point out the more than theoretical possibility that *yaqtula* had survived in the Hebrew cohortative (Moran 1961:64 = 1965:73-74). And he stressed the similarity in function between the Arabic subjunctive and *yaqtula* in the Byblos texts (Moran 1950a:102-104). In fact, *yaqtula* finds an unequivocal witness in Ugaritic, in spite of the limited nature of the orthography. The following cohortative context is indisputable:

*iqra . ilm n[^cmm] = *²iqra²a ²ilī,a na[^cmīma]* "I herewith invoke the g[oodly] deities" (KTU 1.23:1; Gordon 1965:72; Rainey 1985b; 1987a:398-399).

The diachronic witness of the Hebrew cohortative and the Arabic subjunctive also strengthens the case for an early NWS

yaqtula pattern. The contrast between *yaqtulu* and *yaqtula*, the latter being employed in a syntactically subordinate manner, was not lost on Arab grammarians, who observed that *yaqtula* bears the accusative, or subordinate, suffix, while *yaqtulu* has the nominative, or independent ending.

As far as the EA evidence goes, Moran was probably on the right track when he suggested that the Canaanite scribes probably employed Akkadian ventives in injunctive contexts because it was homophonous with a *yaqtula* in their native tongue. The present review of the EA examples seems to suggest that such was the case. However, the almost complete parallelism between the use of the jussives and the forms with *-a(m)* suffix indicates that, if there was a *yaqtula* in Amarna Age Canaanite, it was hardly distinguishable in its nuances from the jussive. It might be assumed that the original, fullblown *yaqtula* was a more emphatic injunctive than the simple jussive. This is certainly not true in the EA letters.

Are these injunctive forms with *-a(m)* suffix Akkadian ventives recruited to serve as Canaanite *yaqtula*'s? Or were they simply true Akkadian ventives standing in as Canaanite jussives having an additional lexical (not modal) indicator of direction (ventive)? The answer to these questions cannot be given on the basis of the materials at hand. The comparative evidence from Ugaritic, Hebrew and Arabic suggests that the Canaanite scribes had a *yaqtula* in their native repertoire which made them partial to Akkadian ventives (cf. the remarks of Izre³el 1978b:82).

ENERGIC

Finally, there is one Byblos occurrence of an injunctive energetic. It is in a negative purpose clause after a verb of fearing. Moran (1950a:60, 100-101) construed the form as 3rd f.s. with a collective 3rd m.pl. subject.

pal-ḥa-ti LÚ.MEŠ ḥu!-¹up¹[-šī-ia] / ul ti-ma-ḥa-ša-na-n[i] "I am afraid of [my] tenant [farmers] lest they smite m[e]" (EA 77:36-37).

The injunctive nature of the verb form seems assured by its role in a negative purpose clause. Moran had noted that injunctives can appear after verbs of fearing (cf. *supra*, p. 260 regarding EA 131:27-28). Other explanations could be suggested, however. The *-a* suffix could be the Akkadian ventive even though *maḥāṣu* does not normally take the ventive (cf. *supra*, p. 258 regarding EA 270:17-21). A less likely possibility is that the suffix is the missing 3rd f.pl., i.e. *-āna*, but the subject is a plural masculine noun; such a masculine plural can take a 3rd f.s. verb (Moran 1950a:60, 131-132 n. 163). Therefore, the best solution at present seems to be that we do have here a true injunctive energetic.

The injunctive energetic is also documented in Ugaritic, in the same text from which was cited the 1st c.s. volitive.

*iqran . ilm n^cmm = *ʔiqraʔan(n)a ʔilīma na^cimīma* "I will invoke the goodly deities" (KTU 1.23:23; Gordon 1965:72; Rainey 1985b; 1987a:398-399).

The strongest motivation for positing an ancient *yaqtulan(n)a* is the presence of just such an energetic in Arabic. While the Canaanite EA texts have indicative energetics in *-un(n)a*, this one, lone example (EA 77:36-37) is the only injunctive energetic. Forms like *yi-na-ṣī-ra-an-ni* (EA 112:13), *yi-na-ṣī-ra-ni* (EA 130:20), and *yi-na-ṣa-ra-ni* (EA 119:10) are all in questions; the accusative suffix is attached by means of the ventive; they are paralleled by *yi-na-ṣī-ru-ni* (EA 112:18) in the same syntagma.

Diachronically, the indicative energetic survived in Hebrew in the accusative suffixes *-enhû*, *-ennû*, *-enhā*, and perhaps also *-ekkā* (Rainey 1975b:186b; Blau 1978; Rainey 1986:10-12). It is possible that the injunctive energetic survived in the same accusative suffixes when they appear on the cohortative (Huehnergard 1988:23; Rainey 1988a:36). As for the Arabic energetic, T. Zewi has demonstrated that it functions in many injunctive syntagmas but also in some indicative constructions, such as the interrogative sentence (Zewi 1987:6-74).

CHAPTER XI

THE IMPERATIVE

The imperative cannot be divorced from the prefix conjugation injunctives. Formally, the imperative usually represents the basic stem form to which the personal markers of the prefix conjugation pattern can be attached. Such is the case with Akkadian and WS. In the older grammatical studies of the EA texts, the imperative was almost completely ignored. Böhl did not discuss it. Ebeling (1910:58-59, §8) wrongly thought that it displayed no unusual features. Dhorme (1913:371-376 = 1951:407-412) did try to deal with it but deduced all the wrong diachronic conclusions.

MORPHOLOGY

CANAANITE. Only two true Canaanite imperatives are attested. The clearest is from a verb which does not exist in Akkadian (the two homophonous verbs, *napālu* A and B have entirely different meanings and semantic ranges, *CAD* N/1:272b-277a). Furthermore, the imperative in question, from a 1st *Nun* root, preserved the first radical, unlike Akkadian in which the initial consonant is dropped in the imperative. The example in question is, in fact, in a very West Semitized context:

nu-pu-ul-mi / ta-aḥ-ta-mu ù / ti-ma-ḥa-ṣú-ka "Fall beneath them that they may smite you!" (EA 252:25-26; Knudtzon 1915:1601; Albright 1943b:32 n. 23).

There is another possible Canaanite form which appears with a gloss sign in a letter from Tyre:

i₁₅-nu-ma / iq-bi LUGAL be-li-ia \ \ ku-na / a-na pa-ni ERÍN.MEŠ GAL ù iq-bi / ÌR-du a-na be-li-šu \ \ ia-a-ia-ia "When the king, my lord, said 'Be ready for (the coming of) the great army,' the

servant answers 'Yes, yes, yes!' (EA 147:35-38; CAD K:171b; Albright 1937:197).

Unless the form is a unique example of the Akkadian plural suffix *-ā*, or the Akkadian ventive suffix *-a(m)*, both of which are highly unlikely on a Canaanite verb form, this imperative of **kwn/kūn* must have an injunctive *-a*. The injunctive *-ā* of ancient Hebrew is often attached to the imperative .

qûmā^h ʔelôhîm šoṗṭā^h hāʔāreṣ "Arise, oh God, judge the earth" (Ps. 82:8).

This possibility might have bearing on the many imperatives of *wuššuru*, viz. *uššira* (*passim*) and also on many examples of the precativ. On the one hand, it seems logical to assume that those were simply ventives in spite of the temptation to see them as *modus attraction* from a volitive *-a* (cf. *supra*, pp. 204-206). Nevertheless, the *-a* suffix on what appears to be a purely Canaanite verb, *ku-na*, argues for some injunctive significance, at least by homophony, for the many *-a* suffixes on imperatives (and perhaps on precatives and other prefix verbs). In turn, that might strengthen the argument in favor of positing a true WS *yaqtula* rather than the Akkadian ventive in the EA texts (cf. discussion *supra*, pp. 254-264).

AKKADIAN. As for the Akkadian imperative forms, the standard vocalic patterns are attested (departures from the norm will be treated below).

For the G stem of the strong verb, one finds:

qutul

bu-lu-uṭ "live!" (TT 1:4); *du-gu-la* "look!" (EA 283:9; for *dugla* with ventive); *ku-uš-da* "come!" (EA 82:52; 86:6; 95:34; *ku-uš-di* in broken context, EA 95:15, unexplained); *qû-ru-ud-mi* "call out, entreat!" (EA 69:38; 87:25; Moran 1987b:274 n.4; 1992:160 n. 4; Civil 1984:294-295 and n. 21; CAD Q:126); *šu-pur* (EA 38:17;

149:56; 151:51); *šu-pu-ur-mi* "send!" (EA 98:22); *šu-up!-ra-am* "send hither!" (TT 1:15-18).

qitil

mi-li-ik (EA 132:8); *mi-lik* (EA 114:54, 67; *et al.*); *mi-lik-mi* "take thought!" (EA 90:11); *pí-qí-id* "command!" (TT 2:13);

qital

li-ma-ad "learn, be apprised!" (EA 34:3; 58:4; 70:11; *et al.*); also *li¹-ma-ad* (EA 284:6).

From a verb IInd *Aleph*:

ša-al (EA 89:41; 256:16, 17, 19; 264:11); *ša-a-la* "ask!" (EA 113:4; Moran 1987b:314, cf. 315 n. 2; 1992:187 and n. 4).

From Ist *Aleph* verbs:

a-mur (*passim*); *a-mu-ur-mi* "behold, look!" (EA 185:42, 64; *et al.*); especially as a presentation particle (Rainey 1989b); *i-pu-uš-mi* "make (war)!" (EA 250:16, 41); cf. from Egypt *e-pu-uš* (EA 38:22; 162:39; 367:13); *a-li-ik-mi* (EA 136:11, 27); *a-lik-mi* "go!" (EA 102:15); *al-ka-am-mi* "come!" (EA 197:17).

From Ist *Nun* verbs:

(*q*)*utul*

ú-šur (EA 126:32; *et al.*); *ù-šur-mi* (EA 112:9; *et al.*); *ù-šur-mi* "guard, protect!" (EA 117:84; *et al.*); cf. from Egypt *uš-¹šur¹* (EA 117:84); *uš-šur* (EA 367:4, 14; 370:4; Rainey 1978b:84)

(*q*)*itil*

i-di-in₄ (EA 116:35); *i-din-mi* "give!" (EA 234:24).

From IIIrd *Aleph* verbs:

li-qé "take!" (EA 107:16); *li-qá* (EA 120:25); *li-qa-mi* "take away!" (EA 60:11; 95:35; 37-39); *ši-me* (EA 79:20); *ši-me-e* (EA 102:29); *ši-mé* (EA 83:14; *et al.*); *ši-mé-ma* (EA 317:21); *ši-mé-mi* "listen!" (EA 294:8).

From a IIIrd weak verb:

qí-bi (EA 73:43; *et al.*); *qí-bi-ma* (EA 286:1; 287:65; 290:2); *qí-bí-ma* (EA 363:2; 365:2; 366:2; 367:2; 370:2); *qí-bi-mi* (EA 362:1); *qí-ba-mi* "speak!" (EA 73:33; *et al.*).

From the irregular verb *izuzzu*: *i-zi-iz* "stand, stay" (EA 102:15).

Moran (1987b:283 n. 5; 1992:166 n. 5) reads a Gt plural imperative, ¹*at*¹-[*la*]-*ku* "go forth!" (EA 92:37). It is an alleged quotation from a message by pharaoh.

An imperative, also plural, from the N stem is from the irregularly conjugated verb *nēnpušu* (cf. *supra*, pp. 123-126; Rainey 1973c:250-254), viz. *in₄-né*-[*ep-šu*] (EA 81:12), unless the broken text (at the right hand edge) could be completed *in₄-né*-[*ep-ša-tu-nu*] (2nd m.pl. suffix conjugation), which seems a bit too long for the available space.

Imperatives are naturally attested for the D stem as well. From the strong verb: *bu-li-iṭ* "grant life!" (EA 215:16) and the MB forms from *wuššuru* typical of the Jerusalem letters: *mu-še-ra* "send!" (EA 287:52; 289:45). The most prevalent form, however, is the short imperative. Although this latter form is known from MA (Mayer 1971:77, §78), it had already begun to appear in OB, e.g. *ú-še-er* (CT 29, Pl. 4c:6; *AbB* 2, 126:6). There can be no doubt that the Canaanite scribes inherited it from later OB and not from Assyrian. This is the most widely attested imperative in the entire EA corpus, with close to fifty occurrences. Besides *uš-ši-ir-mi* "send!" (EA 82:28; 120:36; 121:42), there are nearly forty examples with an *-a* suffix. e.g. *uš-ši-ra* (EA 75:43; *et passim*); *uš-ši-ra-am-mi* (EA 96:28); *uš-ši-ra-mi* (EA 82:15; *et al.*). Youngblood (1961:94-95) surveyed all the *uššira* imperatives and found that while the

simple *uššir* means simply "send!" (elsewhere), *uššira* always means "send (to me)!" One does not find *uššira . . . ana yâši* but a circumlocution may be used, *uš-ši-ra-mi . . . it-ti-ia* (EA 82:15; Youngblood 1961:230; cf. *supra*, p. 205, *infra*, p. 271-272).

The D stem imperative from *turru* "to return," appears twice: *te-ra-ni* "send back to me!" (EA 114:25); *ti-ir-nu-mi* "return to us (our cities)!" (EA 138:138).

One example from *bu²²û* "to seek" is also known; it is singular with an *-a* suffix: *bu-a-mi* "seek!" (EA 92:24). Judging from the context, it looks as though it is 2nd m.s. with ventive suffix rather than Akkadian 2nd c.pl. Since that epistle comes from an Egyptian official, an Akkadian 2nd c.pl. is not impossible.

Imperatives from the Š stem are rare. There is the Akkadian *še-zi-ba-an-ni* "deliver me!" (EA 318:8, 14) and another with erroneous gemination of the second radical, *še-ez-zi-bá-an-na-ši-mi* "deliver us!" (EA 62:30). From the Š of *târu*, exclusively in EA Canaanite (*AHW*:1336a): *šu-te-ra* "send back!" (EA 83:23; Youngblood 1961:244); *šu-te₉-ra-ni-mi* "send to me!" (KL 74:300:15; Edzard 1976:64).

ANOMALOUS FORMS. It is hard to define the following examples except as aberrations from the norm:

(1) *ur-ru-ba* "enter!" (EA 283:8) — it could be analogous to the D infinitive in line 11, also written *ur-ru-ba* "to enter" (*CAD* E:269a), i.e. it should have been **urriba*.

(2) *iz-zi-ib-mi* "abandon!" (EA 294:29; Rainey 1974:298; Izre²el 1978b:79) — gemination of the second radical, probably by analogy with the subsequent *iz-zi-ba* "I will (verily) abandon" (EA 294:31).

(3) *uš-¹šur¹* (EA 117:84); *uš-šur* (EA 367:4, 14; 370:4; Rainey 1978b:84) — all the examples except the first are in letters sent from Egypt, and the Byblos spelling is a quotation from pharaoh's letter; the gemination is evidently an analogy with the preterite (Cochavi-Rainey 1988:144, §2.4.2.3). The plural form,

ʾú¹-ša-ru-m[i] (EA 100:14) with preservation of the (wrong) thematic vowel seems to be an analogous construction derived from the Akkadian present; so here, too, the second radical is probably geminated, i.e. *uṣṣarūmi*.

(4) *da-gal-šu* "examine him!" (EA 107:18) — the imperative is built on the Akkadian G present (Rainey 1978b:68), possibly for D stem. Ebeling (1910:58) had cited this form as if it were the proper *qatal* Akkadian imperative. Even the imperative with proper thematic vowel, *du-gu-la* (EA 283:9), is evidently built on the analogy of *ur-ru-ʾba¹* in the same context (EA 283:8; cf. *supra*, p. 269). The correct form, with the *-a* suffix, should have elided the theme vowel, i.e. **dugla*; cf. *kušda* (EA 82:52; *et al.*). So the scribes may have intended **daggalšu* and **duggula* respectively.

(5) *pu-ḥu-ru-nim-mi* "assemble!" (EA 74:31) — the form in Akkadian would be *puḥrānimmi* for 2nd c.pl. (Youngblood 1961:142) assuming that G stem is intended. The presence of the thematic vowel, even if incorrect, could indicate that the scribe had the D stem in mind, in which case the proper Akkadian form would have been *puḥḥirānimmi*. It is impossible to determine what the original intention was. Either the transitive D or the intransitive G would suit the context.

(6) *pa-at-ra-an-ni* "he has left me" (EA 287:50) — This form had been taken for an imperative (Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:488b) but it clearly is not as Moran has noted (1987b:511, 513 n. 14; 1992:328, 330 n. 14).

PLURAL. It is amazing that Ebeling and Böhl did not notice the striking difference between the 2nd c.pl. forms in the EA texts and the standard forms of Akkadian. Whereas Akkadian uses the *-ā* plural suffix for masculine and feminine, the EA texts from Canaan always employ *-ū* (cf. *supra*, pp. 45-46). Besides the apparent Canaanite form *ku-na* (EA 147:36; *supra*, pp.265-266) discussed above, which seems more likely to be singular, there is one instance of a plural imperative where the proper Akkadian

ending is employed. The context is important for the correct understanding of the form:

UGU *ma-an-ni* / *iš-tap-pár* ¹IR-*Ĥe-ba* / *a-na* LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}Qⁱ-*il₅-ti₇*
 / [*l*]-*qa-mi* KÛ.BABBAR.MEŠ *ù* / [*a*]-*ku-ni a-na ar-ki-ia* "Why did
 'Abdi-Kheba write to the men of Keilah, "Take money and
 follow me!" (EA 280:16-20).

The other attested plural imperatives have *-ū* as the plural person marker:

al-ku-mi "go!" (EA 117:62); ¹*at*¹-[*la*]-*ku* "go forth!" (EA 92:37;
 Moran 1987b:283 n. 5; 1992:166 n. 5); *du-ku-mi* "kill!" (EA 73:27;
 74:25; 81:12); *i-zi-bu-šu* "desert him!" (EA 138:44); ¹*ú*¹-*ša-ru-m[i]*
 "guard!" (EA 100:14); *in₄-né-ep-šu* "become allied/aligned!"
 (EA 81:12; Moran 1987a); *uš-ši-ru* "send!" (EA 90:45; 134:26);
uš-še-ru-ši "expedite it!" (EA 255:11; Rainey 1989-90:69b; cf.
 Moran 1987b:483 n. 1; 1992:308 n. 1).

Especially noteworthy are two examples with the ventive suffix: [*a*]-*ku-ni* (EA 280:20; cited above); and *pu-ḥu-ru-nim-mi* (EA 74:31) discussed above with regard to its basic form (*supra*, p. 270). These plurals have some bearing on the question of the *-a* suffix applied to so many singular imperatives. They strengthen the impression that the *-a*, like the *-ūni(m)*, must also have been intended for the ventive, not the WS volitive (cf. *supra*, pp. 205, 268-269).

The picture is different with regard to two instances where the energetic is applied to the imperative. The contexts are important:

šum-ma lib-bi LUGAL *ba-li uš-ša-[ar]* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti*
ia-aš-pu-ur a-na / ¹*Ia-an-ḥa-mi* *ù a-na* ¹*Pí-ḥu-ra* / *al-ku-mi qa-du*
 LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-ni-ku-nu* / *le-qú-na* ^{KUR}A-*mur-ri* "If the king does
 not intend to send the army, let him write to Yanḥamu and to
 Piḥura, 'Go with your city rulers, take Amurru'" (EA 117:59-63;
 Moran 1987b:323; 1992:193).

The first imperative, *al-ku-mi*, has the simple plural suffix. The second has *-ūn(n)a*. The other passage is:

ù / uš-ši-ru-na-ni 50 *ta-pal* / ANŠE.KUR.RA *ù* 2 ME ERÍN.MEŠ
GÌR.MEŠ / *ù i-zi-za i-na* URUŠ*i-ga-ta* / *i-na pa-ni-šu a-di* / *a-ší*
ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ťá-ti* "So send to me fifty spans of horses and two
hundred foot troops so that I may take up a position in Shigata
in front of him until the regular army comes forth"
(EA 71:22-27).

The form *uš-ši-ru-na-ni* is a "plural of majesty" applied to pharaoh and the *-na* suffix has to be the energetic (Youngblood 1961:94-95; cf. *supra*, pp. 205, 268-269). There is evidently no way of distinguishing the energetic injunctive plural from the indicative energetic plural due to the orthography.

WITH PRONOMINAL SUFFIXES. The accusative suffix is usually attached to the bare imperative form:

da-gal-šu "examine him!" (EA 107:18); *ša-al-šu* "interrogate him!"
(EA 74:51; *et al.*); *ša-al-šu-nu* "interrogate them!" (EA 230:18);
uš-ši-ir-šu "send him!" (EA 333:22); and pl. *uš-še-ru-ši* "expedite
it!" (EA 255:11); *i-zi-bu-šu* "desert him!" (EA 138:44).

Occasionally, the accusative suffix is attached to the ventive: *uš-ši-ra-aš-ši* "send it!" (TT 2:11); *uš-ši-ra-šu* "send him!" (EA 84:41; 126:43). The verb *šūzubu* "to save, deliver, rescue," often takes the object being saved in the accusative attached by means of the ventive (CAD E:424a-425b). Such is the case with the two documented imperatives: *še-zi-ba-an-ni* "deliver me!" (EA 318:14); *še-ez-zi-bá-an-na-ši-im* "deliver us!" (EA 62:30; note the dative 1st c.pl. suffix pronoun which is evidently being used accusatively).

Conversely, the 1st c.s. dative is expressed by the accusative suffix attached to the ventive, a practice not uncommon in the peripheral dialects generally, namely: *id-na-ni* "give to me!" (EA 103:42; 270:18; 333:12); *te-ra-ni* "return to me!" (EA 114:25);

uš-še-er-an-ni (EA 35:25), *uš-še-ra-an-ni* (EA 35:26), *uš-ši-ra-ni* "send to me!" (EA 70:17; 76:24; 108:66).

These suffixed forms tend to confirm what other lines of argument suggest, viz. that the *-a* suffix attached to the imperative really is in fact the Akkadian ventive, at least in nearly all instances. The ventive on other injunctive forms, e.g. the jussive and the Akkadian precativ, should not be surprising.

SYNTAGMAS

It remains to survey the uses of the imperative in the EA texts from Canaan. One important syntactical feature that almost goes without saying is the fact that the imperative almost always comes at the head of its clause. Such is not always the case in letters from neighboring areas, e.g. Amurru (cf. e.g. EA 158:11-13; Izre²el 1985:245, §3.4.1.4). A glaring exception in the Canaanite epistles is the introductory formulae which generally follow established patterns accepted in international scribal circles (Salonen 1967:62-63; Knudtzon 1913).

INTRODUCTORY FORMULAE. One Rib-Haddi letter opens with an imperative, and that in a syntagma that is usually filled in the earlier Byblos letters by a finite preterite verb, *iqbi* (cf. e.g. EA 74:1-2; *et al.*):

¹*Ri-ib-d*ĪŠKUR-*di qí-bi-mi / a-na* LUGAL *be-li-ia* "Rib-Haddi (says)
"Speak to the king, my lord!" (EA 362:1-2).

Many other letters follow the common international pattern; note that the imperative is written with the *bí* sign, which is otherwise quite rare in these texts, thus showing the ancient, learned nature of this formula:

a-na LUGAL EN-*ia* DINGIR-*ia* ^dUTU-*ia* / *qí-bí-ma / um-ma*
ĪR-*re-ša* ĪR-*ka* "To the king, my lord, my god, my sungod,
speak! Thus (says) ^cAbdi-rēša, your servant" (EA 363:1-3;
further examples: EA 365:1-3; 366:1-3).

The Jerusalem letters employ the same formula, but with the common *bi* sign:

[a]-na ¹LUGAL EN-ia qí-bi-ma / um-ma ¹İR-Ĥe-ba İR-ka-ma "[T]o the king, my lord, speak! Thus (says) 'Abdi-Ĥeba, your servant" (EA 286:1-2; also EA 285:1-2; 287:1-2; 288:1-2; 289:1-2; 290:1-2; and to the scribe EA 287:64-65).

A diluted tradition is reflected in those letters where the enclitic *-ma* is not attached to the imperative:

a-na ¹LUGAL ^dBE-ia qí-bi / um-ma ¹Ia-ma İR-ka "To the king, my lord, speak! Thus (says) Yamma, your servant" (EA 230:1-2).

BLESSING. An unusual blessing formula comes from the 15th century B.C.E. in a Taanach letter: *bu-lu-uṭ dam-qí-[iṣ]* "Live well!" (TT 1:4; Rainey 1977:43). Two instances of the same greeting occur in Alalakh, where the correct reading is: *bu-lu-uṭ SIG₅!-qí-iṣ* (AT 109:3; 116:15; correctly understood *AHw*:157a; the entry for **dumqiṣ* in *CAD* D:180a is to be deleted).

PRESENTATION PARTICLE. The imperative of *amāru* "to see," is used as a presentation particle. This function is unknown in classical Babylonian but its distribution in the peripheral dialects is of the utmost interest. One finds it numerous times in the texts from Canaan and it also appears in the Egyptian correspondence (EA 1:28; 162:30, 67) including texts from the 13th century B.C.E. which were sent from Egypt to Hattusas (Cochavi-Rainey 1988:228). The example recorded from Ugarit (*CAD* A/2:19) is actually in a letter sent from Amurru (RS 17.116:9', 21'; Nougayrol 1956:132, 133; Izre'el 1985:2471991a:154). The scribes of Ugarit do not seem to have used it (Huehnergard 1989:193-201). Some examples are cited for Hattusas, but with the exception of a letter from Hattusili III to Kadashman-Ellil II (*KBo* 1, 10:50), all the texts using *amur* as a presentation particle were written by Egyptian scribes (Cochavi-Rainey 1988:228), including the treaty between Ramesses II and Hattusili III (*KBo* 1, 7:*passim*). The Egyptian

version of that same treaty confirms that the use of the corresponding imperative from the Egyptian verb "to see," viz. *ptr*, was being used in the same function (Rainey 1989a). It would appear that this is a calque within the sphere of Egyptian control over the Canaanite population. The same function in rare instances reflects sporadic influence on the scribes at Hattusas following the extensive correspondence with the scribes of Ramesses II).

The original nature of *amur* as an imperative was not really lost. The earliest documented example, in a Taanach letter from the 15th century B.C.E., carries the 1st c.sg. acc. pronominal suffix:

¹i¹-¹na¹-an-na a-mur-ni i-nu-ma / i-pu-¹šu¹ ¹DÛG¹.¹GA¹ it-ti-ka
 "Now, behold me, that I will do good for you!" (TT 2:17-18;
 Rainey 1977:46).

On occasion, the imperative *amur* governs a nominal direct object:

a-mur i-pí-iš / ¹URU¹ Šur-ri "Behold the deed of Tyre!"
 EA 89:10-11; Youngblood 1961:329); *a-mur ip-ša an-ni-ú ip-ši*
¹Mil-ki-DINGIR / ú ip-ši DUMU.MEŠ La-ab-a-ya "Behold this
 deed, the deeds of Milkilu and the deeds of the sons of
 Lab'ayu!" (EA 287:29-30; also apparently EA 288:7-8 where
 <*a-mur*> must be supplied); *ša-ni-¹tam¹ a-mur ar-na ¹ša¹!* /
 [yi]-pu-iš ¹A-zi-ru "Furthermore, behold the crime which(!)
 Aziru has [co]mmitted!" (EA 140:20-21; and possibly also EA
 106:4 and 140:18-19).

This happens even when the direct object is in extraposition to the clause that follows:

a-mur / İR-da ša iš-me a-na >a-na < be-li-šu / šul-mu URU-šu šul-
mu É-šu / šum-šu a-na da-ri-ti "Behold, the servant who has
 obeyed his lord: his city is at peace, his house is at peace, his
 name endures forever" (EA 147:48-51).

In the following Jerusalem passage, the awkward context seems to require that the particle *amur* or something comparable should probably be supplied:

⟨*a-mur*⟩ *ḥa-an-pa / ša iḥ-nu-pu a-na mu-ḥi-ia* "Behold, the audacity that they have exercised against me" (EA 288:7-8; contrast Moran 1987b:515; 1992:331).

An optional addition to *amur* is the enclitic *-mi*. Whether this is to mark the ensuing clause as direct speech, or whether it is the Canaanite enclitic for emphasis is open to question. Enclitic *-ma* is never used with *amur*. The optional nature of the enclitic with *amur* may be seen from the two passages in the same epistle, one with an enclitic and one without it:

a-mur-mi a-na-ku IR *ša Išār-ri* "Behold, I am a servant of the king" (EA 264:5); *ša-ni-tam a-mur ni-nu a-na mu-ḥi-ka₄ / 2 IGI-ia* "Furthermore, behold (as for) us, my(*sic!*) eyes are towards you" (EA 264:14-15).

This is not the place to discuss the many other aspects of this function from the point of view of a presentation particle. Those are treated elsewhere (cf. CAT 3:202-210).

EXHORTATION. Once the imperative from *alāku* "to go" is used as an exhortation:

ù im-lu-uk iš-tu / ŠÀ-ia a-li-ik-mi a-na-ku / i-pu-ša!(MA)-am
DÜG.GA \ *tu-ka / it-ti-šu ša¹Am-mu-ni-ra* "then I took counsel in my heart, 'Come, I will make an alliance with 'Ammunīra'" (EA 136:26-29; CAD E:223a; Moran 1987b:356 n. 5; 1992:217 n. 5; 1963:173-174)

The 1st c.s. independent pronoun, *anāku*, might suggest that the verb *a-li-ik-mi* is 1st c.s. Akkadian preterite serving as a jussive, i.e. *allikmi* instead of the imperative *alikmi*. Against such an interpretation, it must be remembered that the texts from Canaan

never use the Akkadian preterite as their theme for hybrid verb forms; they invariably use *-llak* (cf. *supra*, p. 51). But note also that the imperative *a-li-ik-mi* occurs earlier in the same letter (EA 136:11). Compare the following example taken from biblical Hebrew:

l'kāh niṭrā'eh pānīm "Come! Let us confront one another!"
(2 Ki. 14:8).

COMMANDS. Naturally, the imperative is to be found expressing direct orders, especially from the king, e.g. in this quote from a royal message recently received:

a-na mi-ni yi-iš-ta-pa-ru / šār-ru EN-li a-na ia-ši / ú-šur-mi lu-ú na-šir-ta "Why does the king write to me, 'Guard! May you be on guard?'" (EA 112:7-9);

or from his officials,

šum-ma / šār-ru EN-li ANŠE.MEŠ / bu-a-mi ANŠE.MEŠ / LUGAL "If the king is owner of the asses, look for the asses of the king" (EA 96:22-25); *ù a-nu-ma / ia-aš-pu-ra 1Šu-ta / a-na ia-ši i-din-mi / 1Zi-ir-dam-ia-aš-da / a-na 1Bir5-ia-wa-za* "But now Shuta has written to me, 'Hand over Zirdamyashda to Biryawaza!'" (EA 234:22-26).

Such a royal command might even be construed as an invitation:

ù [š]a-ap-r[a] 1šār-ri E[N-i]a / a-na ia-ši ur-ru-1ba1 [it-ti] \ 1šār-ri EN-ia / du-gu-la lí-qé "And the king, [m]y lo[r]d, wrote to me, 'Enter in [to], the king, my(sic!) lord, behold, take!'" (EA 283:7-9; cf. Moran 1987b:505 nn. 2-3; 1992:324 nn. 3, 5).

But on the other hand, it may also embody a threat,

ù yi-iq-bu / a-na ia-ši id-na-1ni1 / DAM-ka ù / DUMU.MEŠ-ka ù lu-ú / i-ma-ḥa-ša "And he is saying to me, 'Give me your wife

and your children or else I will attack!" (EA 270:17-21; Moran 1987b:495; 1992:317).

REQUESTS. A vassal may use the imperative in addressing the king, obviously not from a position of seniority. Given the subservient status of the vassal rulers in Canaan, one should view such imperatives as requests or even entreaties, but there is no breach of etiquette involved when using the imperative. In such cases, the imperative seems to be an expression of desire directed to the second person, e.g.

ša-ni-tam mi-li-ik / URUGub-la URU ki-ti-ka "Furthermore, take care of Byblos, your loyal city" (EA 132:8-9; CAD M/1:156b).

ADVICE. Sometimes an appeal to the king may be construed as a form of advice. That was certainly the intention of Rib-Haddi in the following:

uš-ši-ra ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-ti / ra-ba ù tu-da-bi-ir / a-ia-bi LUGAL iš-tu / lib-bi KUR-šu ù / ti-né-ep-šu ka-li / KUR.KUR.MEŠ a-na šār-ri "Send a large army and you can drive the enemies of the king from the midst of his land and all the lands will become loyal to the king" (EA 76:38-43).

ADJURATIONS. Some vassal ruler may pressure one or several of his peers by means of the imperative:

ù ki-i-am ti-iq-bu-na / 2 DUMU La-ab-a-ya a-na ia-ši i-pu-uš-mì / nu-kúr-ta₅ i-na LÚ.MEŠ KURGi-na "So thus the two sons of Lab^aayu are saying to me, 'Make war against the men of Gina!'" (EA 250:15-17; and cf. also Shuwardata's EA 280:16-20 cited *supra*, p. 271).

APODOSES. One of the options for the apodosis of a conditional sentence is the imperative (Moran 1950a:74). A Taanach letter has the earliest documented example in a letter with WS syntax:

ù / šum-ma ga-am-ra-at ^{GIŠ}BAN / i-pé-ša-am ù uš-ši-ra-aš-ši / i-na ŠU ^IPu-ur-da-ya "And if the bow is finished being made, then send it by the hand of Purdaya" (TT 2:9-12; Rainey 1977:45, 61).

There are several good illustrations from Byblos, e.g.

šum-ma lib-bi šār-ri [a-n]a / na-ša-ar URU-šu ù / ÌR-šu uš-ši-ra / LÚ.MEŠ ma-ša-ar-ta / ù ti-na-šī-ru URU "If it is the king's desire [t]o protect his city and his servant, send garrison troops that they may guard the city" (EA 130:44-48; cf. also EA 107:20-22; 112:30-39; 114:44-46; 116:34-35; 123:23-26; 129:49-50).

PURPOSE CLAUSES. Like other injunctives, the imperative can also appear in clauses of intended result after another injunctive. Strangely enough, this function of the imperative is ignored by Moran (1950a:83-86). The number of examples is admittedly small. Two of them come from the same epistle:

ša-ni-tam yi-iš-mé / šār-ru EN a-wa-te ÌR-šu / ù uš-ši-⟨ra⟩ LÚ.MEŠ ma-ša-ar-ta / a-na ^{URU}Šu-mu-ra ù / a-na ^{URU}[I]r-qa-ta "Furthermore, may the king heed the words of his servant and send garrison troops to Šumur and to 'Irqata'" (EA 103:32-36); ù / yi-it-ru-uš i-[n]a p[a-n]i / EN ^dUTU KUR.ḪÁ ù / id-na-ni 20 ta-pal / ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ a-na ia-ši / ù uš-ši-ra til-la-ta / ki-ma ar-ḫi-iš / a-na ^{URU}Šu-mu-ra a-na / na-ša-ri-ši_x(ŠE) "So may it be pleasing in the sight of the lord, the sungod of the lands, and give me twenty spans of horses and send auxiliary troops quickly to Šumur to protect it" (EA 103:40-47; Moran 1987b:298; 1992:176).

The other-clear cut passage is also probably from the same scribe; at least it stems from the same chronological period in the Byblos correspondence:

ù yi-i[š-me] / [šā]r-ru a-wa-te ÌR-šu ù uš-ši-ra-ni / [2]0 LÚ.MEŠ ^{KUR}Mi-li-ḫa 20 LÚ.MEŠ ^{KUR}Mi-iš-ri / a-na na-ša-ar URU a-na šā[r-r]i / ^dUTU EN-ia "So may the [ki]ng he[ed] the words of his

servant, and send to me twenty men of Miluḥḥa and twenty men of Egypt to guard the city for the k[in]g!" (EA 108:65-69).

Finally there is the broken passage, EA 133:10-14, where the crucial verb has to be supplied at the end of a broken line.

CHAPTER XII

THE SUFFIX CONJUGATION — MORPHOLOGY

At the beginning of Amarna research, scholars were struck by the unusual morphology of the suffix conjugation. The close resemblance to forms known from biblical Hebrew, mainly the 1st c.s. suffix *-ti*, indicated that WS influences were at work (Zimmern 1890a). After a century of study in the language of the EA tablets, it may be possible to summarize the accumulated evidence and present a more comprehensive picture of the suffix conjugation as it functions in the texts from Canaan. It should be remarked, incidentally, that even the Jerusalem (Nitzán 1973:56, §4.32) and the Tyrian (Finkle 1977:105-107) letters, which generally go their own way in the use of the prefix conjugation patterns, employ the WS suffix forms extensively, especially for past tense.

Knudtzon (1892), evidently followed by Bergsträsser (1929:11) and independently Moran (1950a:34-39), concluded that the suffix conjugation, both the Akkadian stative and the WS so-called "perfect," had developed from the nominal sentence. More recently, Buccellati has developed this theme with regard to the Akkadian suffix conjugation (1968). There has been of late some disagreement as to whether the suffix conjugation forms of Akkadian should be classed as verbs (Kraus 1984:10-13) or not (Huehnergard 1986, 1987). From the standpoint of surface morphology, the suffix conjugation forms do share certain features with the prefix conjugation, e.g. they can take the Akkadian positional subjunctive (marker of subordination) and the Akkadian ventive suffix. Although the suffix conjugation in Akkadian is generally applied to the verbal adjectives from the respective root and stems to express a stative for intransitive verbs or a passive of transitive verbs, there are some verbs whose suffix conjugation forms express transitive meaning (a large collection of examples was assembled by Rowton 1962). On the

other hand, the suffix conjugation was, perhaps as a later development, applied to nouns to express the permansive. Huehnergard (1987b:229-232) would now prefer to distinguish the two main classes of suffix forms: from the verbal adjective and from nouns, and transitives related to transitive verbs. The former, he would call "predicative forms" and include their clauses in the non-verbal category. For the latter, the transitives of the suffix conjugation, he would call "pseudo verbal." This proposal is attractive from a descriptive point of view. The term "stative," which is often applied to the suffix conjugation of Akkadian and also of Egyptian (e.g. Callendar 1975:22-23, §3.5.2.2), would best be reserved to verb classes and not to a conjugation pattern (Landsberger 1967:142 n. 15; cited by Huehnergard 1987b:229 n. 50 and Reiner 1970:292) but it has become so commonplace in discussion of the suffix forms that it can hardly be avoided today. The term "pseudo-verbal" for the suffix conjugation forms from transitive verbs in Akkadian has some justification but will be avoided here since it is not particularly relevant to the WS languages. At least one may note that the use of suffix forms from transitive verbs for transitive meaning demonstrates the potential of the suffix pattern, even in Akkadian where passive, permansive and stative meanings predominate. The truly verbal, transitive, function is realized more fully in the WS dialects. On the other hand, the traditional term, "perfect," applied to the suffix conjugation pattern in Hebrew, Arabic, Aramaic, Phoenician, etc., will be strictly avoided here because it is definitely a misnomer. The syntactic discussion (Ch. 14) that will follow the description of the morphological features in the Canaanite EA texts will demonstrate that there is nothing, inherent or developed, in the basic construction of the suffix conjugation to associate it with "completed action." The western tradition, beginning with Ewald (1831-33:II, 112) and fostered and made popular by Driver (1892:13-26), of supposing that the suffix conjugation was primarily expressing completed action is thoroughly misguided. For this reason the term "perfect" should be abandoned once and for all. It should be stricken from our grammar books.

For convenience, the term "suffix conjugation" will often be supplanted in our ensuing discussion by the noncommittal theme, *qtl* (cf. Gordon 1965:68, §9.4). That latter term has gained wide acceptance in practical discussions and it is hoped that its use here will make for a more readable text.

MORPHOLOGY

For all practical purposes, the Canaanite scribes used the suffix forms as calques on their own native conjugation patterns. As a result, the same process of hybridization came into play, thus producing morphological constructions which have no precedents or parallels in the cuneiform world, even among the peripheral dialects. There are also a number of glosses and other constructions that represent true Canaanite *qtl* verb forms. These are useful for demonstrating the original Canaanite forms (Sivan 1984:136-145) and for comparison with the Akkadian and hybrid creations that comprise the majority of the forms in this category.

PERSON MARKERS

AKKADIAN FIRST COMMON SINGULAR. The most striking morphological divergence of WS from the Hamito-Semitic pattern is the abandonment of the *-k-* element for first person singular. However, the Canaanite scribes knew this older element from their study of Akkadian where they encountered the standard *-āku* suffix. Of the nearly 120 examples of 1st c.s. *qtl* forms, twenty-eight have the regular Akkadian form with *-āku*. They represent about sixteen different verbs and include the G, D and Š stems. The G forms of this type with stative or passive meaning are:

ar-ba-ku "I have entered" (TT 2:6; Rainey 1977:60 *contra* Glock 1983:60), *ar-na-ku* (EA 253:16; 254:11), *aš-ba-ku* (EA 62:16, 18), *ḥa-ad-ia-ku* (EA 154:10), *ḥa-ṭá-ku* (EA 253:17; 254:12); *ma-ʿša¹-ku* (EA 127:34), *mar-ša-ku* (EA 106:23; 306:22), *na-aš-ra-ku* (EA 142:11), *pal-ḥa-ku* (EA 102:28; 155:33), *šal-ma-ku* (EA 34:3; 145:6).

The Megiddo letters employ two such forms as transitive verbs:

ša-ni-tam mi-na-am-mi ep-ša-ku-mi / a-na šār-ri EN-ia
 "Furthermore, what have I done to the king, my lord?"
 (EA 245:36), *al-lu-ú-mi na-ad-na-ku / 'ŠU¹.KAM šār-ri* "Behold, I
 have furnished the request of the king" (EA 242:9-10; Moran
 1979; Rabiner 1981:95, §5.2.1.1.1).

A broken context contains another example on a verb of speaking:

[g]āb-bi mi-im-mi / [ša iš-m]e qa-ba-ku / [a-na LUGAL E]N-ia
 "[E]verything [that I have heard, I have reported [to the king],
 my [lo]rd" (EA 259:7),

which matches a D stem form used in a Megiddo letter:

ša-ni-tam du-ub-bu-ba-ku-mi / UGU ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ia "Furthermore, I
 exhorted my colleagues" (EA 245:1-2; cf. Rabiner 1981:68,
 §4.5.1.1).

Furthermore, the Š stem forms, which would be passives in normative Akkadian, are transitive in these texts: *šu-še-ra-ku* (EA 144:19), *šu-ši-ra-ku* (EA 141:24; 142:25; 144:21; 191:14), "I have prepared."

Finally, the hybrid forms developed from the so-called preformative stative, *ibašši* (GAG:102, §78b; Youngblood 1961:120-121), can also take the Akkadian 1st c.s. suffix, *-āku*: *i-ba-aš-ša-ku* (EA 248:20); *i₁₅-ba-ša-ku* (EA 143:29); *i₁₅-ba-ša-ku-mi* (EA 193:6).

CANAANITE FIRST COMMON SINGULAR. Over eighty percent of 1st c.s. *qtl* forms in the EA texts from Canaan have a personal suffix *-ti*. An Akkadian stative with *-āku* is glossed by a Canaanite form with *-ti*:

'la¹(!) *ma-ša-ku \ ší-ir-ti* "I am not adequate (I am hard pressed)"
 (EA 127:25).

Three problematic instances of *pal-ḥa-tu* (EA 129:82; 137:68; 138:120) in the late Rib-Haddi correspondence are hardly evidence for 1st c.s. (Böhl 1909:46, §27 I; Ebeling 1910:56); they represent either the feminine stative participle (Moran 1987b:361 n. 13, 367 n. 28; 1992:220 n. 13, 225 n. 29) or a corrupt text (Moran 1987b:347 n. 29; 1992:211 n. 28).

Of the nearly one hundred forms with the WS *-ti* suffix, about eighty percent have the suffix attached to the Akkadian form with its connective *-ā-* vowel. In other words, the *-ti* simply displaced the *-ku* on the Akkadian stem form; except for a few special constructions to be discussed below, the principal G stem examples are:

al-ka-ti (EA 107:48; *et al.*); *aš-ba-ti* (EA 81:20; *et al.*); *bal-ṭá-ti* (EA 83:27; *et al.*); *da-ag-la-ti* (EA 266:9, 10, 13; 296:11, 12, 14), *da-ag-la-ti₇* (EA 292:8, 9, 11); *di₁₂-ka-ti* (EA 287:73); *ep-ša-ti* (EA 89:17; *et al.*); *ep-ša-ti₇* (EA 249:6); *ḥa-ad-ia-ti* (EA 147:27); *ḥa-di-ia-ti* (EA 147:29); *ka-aš-da-ti* (EA 93:7); *ka-aš-da-ti-šu* (EA 138:80); *ka-aš-da-ti₇* (EA 189: r. 13); *lem-né-ti* (EA 180:19); *ma-ka₄-ti* (EA 116:11; AHw:591a); *ma-aq-ta-ti* (EA 63:6; *et al.*); *ma-aq-ta-ti₇* (EA 138:4); *mi-ta-ti* (EA 119:17); *mi-ta-ti!*(UD) (EA 138:137); *na-ad-na-ti* (EA 73:38; *et al.*); *na-ad-na-ti-šu* (EA 108:65); *na-ad-na-ti₇-šu* (EA 254:36); *na-aš-ra-ti* (EA 227:5); *na-aš-ra-ti₇-ši* (EA 237:15); *pa-al-ḥa-ti* (EA 116:50); *pa-aṭ-ra-ti* (EA 82:44; *et al.*); *qa-la-ti* (EA 81:20); *ra-aš-pa-ti₇* (EA 292:29); *ša-ak-na-ti* (EA 266:16; EA 288:32); *ša-ak-na-ti₇* (EA 257:13); *ša-ap-ra-ti* (EA 117:13, 15, 21; EA 284:13); *šap-ra-ti* (EA 96:30; EA 139:16); *šap-ra-ti₇* (KL 72:600:1; Rainey 1976b:338; Wilhelm 1982:184).

In other stems we have N *in₄-né-ep-ša-ti₇* (EA 297:12) and Š *šu-ši-ra-ti₇* (EA 193:21).

There is no warrant, however, for assuming that the *-āti* suffix is in any way related to WS constructions: it is simply a carry over from the Akkadian form (Ebeling 1910:57-58). Although certain patterns with a connective *-ā-* exist in Arabic (e.g. *maddāta*; Wright 1898:69 D) and in Hebrew (*sabbôṭā*;

GKC:176-177, 203), there is no reason to associate them with the attested form in the EA texts.

The true WS verb forms (including glosses) show that the native suffix was actually *-ti* without any connecting *-ā-* vowel. Two strong verbs are attested:

ia-pa-aq-ti "I have issued" (EA 64:23; Krahmalkov 1971:140-143);
[na]-aa-ša-ap-ti "I was [di]stressed" (EA 93:5; CAD Q:146a);

as are four middle weak verbs:

nu-uḫ-ti "I am at rest" (EA 147:56); *ma-at-ti* "I (would) die" (EA 287:70; 289:50; Finkelstein 1969:33b-34; Moran disagrees; 1987b:514 n. 20, 1992:330 n. 20); *ší-ir-ti* "I am hard pressed" (EA 127:34; Moran 1987b:343 n. 9; 1992:208 n. 9); *ši-ir-ti* "I am maligned" (EA 252:14).

One certain third weak verb also shows the *-ti* suffix: $[ba^1-{}^1ni^1-{}^1ti^1]$ "I have built" (EA 292:29) = **banîti* < **baniytî* (Sivan 1984:142, §1.2.1). Two forms which may represent roots with gutturals in the third position are *ba-ṭi-i-ti* "I am at rest" (EA 147:56), possibly = **baṭihṭi* (Albright 1937:192 n. 2), and *ša-mi-ti₇* "I have heard" (EA 362:5), which was at least probably inspired by WS **šami^ctî* (Rainey 1973c:238; Sivan 1984:141, §1.2.1). By the same token, one finds *la-qi-ti* (EA 109:30) and *la-qi-ti₇* (EA 251:1) which might be echoes of WS **laqihṭi*.

Therefore, it is not so surprising to find hybrid forms without the characteristic *-ā-* of Akkadian. In fact, there are nearly twenty instances of hybrids with only the *-ti*. The G stem examples are:

a-ší-ti (EA 227:9); *[da-ak]-ti-šu* (EA 81:16); *i-re-eb-ti* (EA 263:8);
ka-ša-ad-ti-šu (EA 138:80); *qa-bi-ti* (EA 119:46; 132:31, 37; 263:20);
qa-bi₄-ti₇ (EA 94:10); *qí-bi₄-ti* (EA 137:72); *ša-pár-ti* (EA 126:34; 256:31).

The *-ti* suffix is favored with D stem verbs:

bu-i-ti₇ (EA 264:6, 20); *ur-ra-ad-ti* (EA 296:27); *uš-ši-ir-ti* (EA 70:12; *et al.*); *uš-ši-ir-ti-šu* (EA 82:17; 114:34, 35) *uš-ši-ir-ti₇-šu* (EA 180:4; 208:9); *uš-še-er-ti* (EA 151:26); *uš-še-er-ti₇* (EA 265:4); *uš-ši-ir-ti* (EA 105:14; Ebeling 1910:63); *mu-še-er-ti* (EA 287:53; Ebeling 1910:63; Böhl 1909:47);

and also with the Š stem:

šu!-hi-iz-ti (EA 153:9); *šu-ri-ib-ti* (EA 116:24); *šu-ši-ir-ti* (EA 324:12; 325:15, 19); *šu-ši-ir-ti₇* (EA 337:19); *šu-še-er-ti* (EA 213:13).

SECOND MASCULINE SINGULAR. There are no attested forms for 2nd f.s. The 2nd m.s. examples all have *-āta* except for *na-šir-ta* (EA 112:9) and D stem *uš-ši-ir-ta* (EA 194:22). The G stem examples are:

aš-ba-ta (EA 91:3; 116:65); *er-ba-ta* (EA 102:37); *lam-da-ta* (EA 102:9); *lum-da-ta* (EA 98:26); *mi-[t]a-t[a]* (EA 87:30); *na-ša-ra-ta* (EA 99:8; 117:84); *qa-la-ta* (EA 71:11; *et al.*); *ša-ak-na-ta* (EA 211:22); *ša-ak-na-ta-ni* (EA 149:47); *ša-ap-ra-ta* (EA 201:11; *et al.*); *ša-ap-ra-⟨ta⟩* (EA 206:10); *šap-ra-ta* (EA 252:5);

while there are also N stem *in₄-né-ep-ša-ta* and Š *šu-šu-ra-tá* (EA 367:15; from Egypt, Cochavi-Rainey 1988:166, §2.4.5.1).

THIRD MASCULINE SINGULAR. Because classical Arabic shows an *-a* vowel on 3rd m.s. forms of the *qtl* conjugation pattern, viz. *qatala*, *qattala*, *'aqtala*, etc., which also shows up in Hebrew before suffix pronouns, e.g. *šəmāranî* (Gen. 25:20), it is interesting that a few *qtl* forms in the EA texts also had such a final vowel (Ebeling 1910:57). Furthermore, there is evidence that the vowel existed in Ugaritic; note forms such as: *yša*, *šna*, *m̄la* (Gordon 1965:69, §9.6; cf. Sivan 1984:136-138). There is also the Ugaritic term in syllabic texts which appears once as *ša-ma-t[a]* "It is transferred" (RS 15.86:16; Nougayrol 1955:52; Boyd 1975:205-206). The morpheme is known on WS PN's from the Ur III period as

well (Buccellati 1966:219-220). Gelb (1965:79) suggested that this *-a* suffix was originally a marker of predication. The relevant forms from the Canaanite EA corpus are as follows:

dam-qa (EA 326:18); SIG₅-*qa* (EA 258:9; 262:10; 315:15); *da-an-qa* (EA 84:27); *da-a-kà* (EA 154:19); *di-ka* (EA 132:42); *di₁₂-ka* (EA 288:41, 45); *ḥa-¹ba¹-ta* (EA 113:14); *la-qa-a* (EA 125:23; 134:34); *ša-pa-ra* (EA 65:7); *ša-ap-ra* (EA 283:7); *ša-ar-ra* (EA 151:53); *ta-ra* (EA 85:54; 124:53); also *i-ba-aš-ša* (EA 141:28); *i₁₅-ba-aš-ša* (EA 142:15, 19, 29).

These few examples from among dozens of 3rd m.s. verb forms can only be taken as possible hints to the existence of the short *-a* vowel on the native Canaanite of that day. Most 3rd m.s. forms have *-Ø* suffix.

THIRD FEMININE SINGULAR. A Jerusalem gloss, *a-ba-da-at* "it is lost" (EA 288:52) suggests that with the addition of the 3rd f.s. suffix *-at*, the thematic vowel did not elide. In the same epistles, a hybrid Akkadian form, *pa-ṭa-ra-at* "it has defected" (EA 286:35; 289:44; 290:12, 17, 23), also preserved the thematic vowel contrary to the standard Akkadian form, *pa-aṭ-ra-at* (EA 272:14). Another hybrid Canaanite form, *ia-ša-at* "(it) went forth" (EA 227:11), is equivocal; it ought to represent **yaša'at* (cf. Ug. *yšat* Gordon 1965:70, §9.8). Another example with the thematic vowel preserved is *n[a]-ki-ra-at* "(It) became hostile" (EA 335:16). The spelling NA.KAR₅-*ra-at* (EA 137:67) is evidently logographic (Moran 1987b:361 n. 13; 1992:220-221 n. 13). One other enigmatic form is *iz-zi-la-at* (EA 140:17), often taken as an Akkadian form with assimilated infix *-t-*. It might be a WS verb from the root **z²l* "to go out, to be depleted," in which case it might be D stem. The hybrid *i-pu-ša-at* "(It) has become" (EA 273:10) may in fact be built on the Akkadian present theme, *ippuš*, like the 1st c.s. *ip-pu-uš-ti* (EA 280:12).

Here and there, the final syllable sign may have been lost or inadvertently skipped, e.g. *mar-ša-⟨at⟩* (EA 103:49; Rainey 1973c:256; Moran 1987b:298 n. 3; 1992:176 n. 3) and *ša-ab-ta-⟨at⟩*

(EA 179:24). In a broken context, we find *a-ší-it* (EA 250:35), the significance of which is enigmatic.

Apart from the above mentioned instances, the usual formation of the 3rd f.s. is by the addition of the suffix *-at* to the appropriate Akkadian form after elision of the thematic vowel. In other words, the forms are normal Akkadian. A selection of examples are:

ga-am-ra-at (EA 273:11; *et al.*); *ḫal-qa-at* (EA 288:24; *et al.*);
kà-aš-dá-at (EA 149:64); *na-ad-na-at* (EA 138:98); *na-aš-ra-at*
 (EA 255:25; *et al.*); *pal-ḫa-at* (EA 147:32; *et al.*); *pa-aš-ḫa-at*
 (EA 127:41; *et al.*); *ša-ab-ta-at* (EA 252:9, 12, 22); *šal-ma-at*
 (EA 280:13; *et passim*).

From *danānu* one finds *dan-na-at* (EA 137:102); *da-an-na-at* (EA 145:14; 243:19); *da-na-at* (EA 63:13; *et passim*). Hollow roots provide *da-kà-at-šu-nu* (EA 149:65) and *ta-ra-at* (EA 137:51). Verbs Ist Waw: *aš-ba-at* (EA 69:9); *a-ša-at* (EA 92:22; *et al.*); and Ist Aleph: *a-ba-da-at* (EA 288:52; Canaanite gloss cited *supra*); *ep-ša-at* (EA 104:5').

FIRST COMMON PLURAL. Only one example is attested of the 1st c.pl. in the *qtl* conjugation pattern and that one has a peculiar spelling, evidently influenced by an equally unusual spelling for the independent 1st c.pl. pronoun:

ù a-nu-ma / ti7-ba-ú-na ša-bat URU.MEŠ *Gub-li / ù ti7-iq-bu-ni*
ša-bat-mi / ni-nu-u₁₆ URU.MEŠ *Gub^{ub}-li / ù da-na-nu-u₁₆*
a-mur-mi / 'ša¹-bat-mi šu-nu URU.⟨MEŠ⟩.KI *Gub-li / ù da-an-nu*
 "And now they seek to capture the towns of Byblos and they said to me, 'If we seize the towns of Byblos, then we will be strong'; behold, they have seized the town⟨s⟩ of Byblos and they are strong" (EA 362:23-29).

The context is cited in full to demonstrate that there can be no doubt about the 1st c.pl. form. The parallel spellings of the 1st c.pl. independent pronoun, *ni-nu-u₁₆*, and the 1st c.pl. *qtl*, *da-na-nu-u₁₆*,

prove the intention of the scribe. That it uses the UM sign in both vocables is without any logical explanation. Therefore, we have transcribed the *um* signs in the two contexts as *u₁₆* to make the verbal meaning clear.

SECOND MASCULINE PLURAL. The 2nd m.pl. is documented only twice (in the same Byblos text): *pa-aš-ḥa-tu-nu* (EA 74:27) and on the hybrid *i-ba-ša-tu-nu* (EA 74:26). The suffixes are standard Akkadian. Nothing can be learned about the contemporary Canaanite suffixes.

THIRD MASCULINE PLURAL. Three clear Canaanite forms show that in the G stem the thematic vowel did not elide with the addition of the 3rd m.pl. suffix, *-ū*. The first of these contexts, with **ḥasilū*, is:

la-qt-i / gāb-bi iš-tu Ê-ti ÌR-ka / la-qt-i KÛ.BABBAR.MEŠ la-qt-i / LÚ.MEŠ la-qt-i UDU.UDU.MEŠ \ šú-ú-nu / \ ḥa-sí-lu URU.MEŠ-nu be-li-ia "Everything has been taken from the house of your servant; the silver has been taken; the personnel have been taken; the flock has been taken; the towns of my lord have been demolished" (EA 263:9-13; Held 1965:398-401; Moran 1987b:489 n. 3; 1992:313 n. 3).

A Jerusalem letter has two more WS forms, one an active and the other a passive from the very same root (**lqh*). Both of these examples also reveal the preservation of the thematic vowel:

[la]-qa-ḥu ú-nu-ta₅-šu-nu "They took their tools/weapons" (EA 287:36); *mu-še-er-ti a-na šār-ri* 'EN¹[-ia] / [x] 'LÚ¹.MEŠ *a-ší-ru* 5 *li-im* [y] / [ù] '8¹ LÚ.MEŠ *ú-bi-li-mi* KASKAL.ḤÁ LUGA[L] / *la-qt-ḥu¹ i-na* 'ú¹-ḡa¹-ḡri¹ \ *ša-de₄-e* [a-na] / URU*Ia-lu-na*^{KI} "I sent to the king, [my] lord, x foot troops, five thousand [. . . and] eight porters of the caravans of the king; they were taken in the open territory of Ayalon" (EA 287:53-57; cf. Moran 1987b:514 nn. 17-18; 1992:330 nn. 17-18).

In the same letter, we are justified in viewing another form as reflecting the WS form of a 3rd m.pl. *qtl* with the thematic vowel preserved:

*li-de*₄ [šār]-ri / *gāb-bi* KUR.ĤÁ 'ša¹-li-mu a-na ia-a-ši nu-kúr-tú
"May my [ki]ng be apprised: all the lands are at peace; against
me there is hostility" (EA 287:11-12).

So these constructions evidently bear witness to three genuine WS verbal forms: **hasilū*, *laqaḥū*, *laqiḥū*, and *šalimū*.

A fifth example of this particular type seems to be used in an oath:

ù *i-de-mi* / LUGAL *be-li i-nu-ma* DINGIR.MEŠ URUGub-la /
qa-di-šu ù *mur-ṣú-ú ma-gal* / ù *ḥi-i*₁₅-tí ep-⟨ša⟩-ti a-na
DINGIR.MEŠ / *ki-na-an-na la-a i-re-bu* / *a-na ma-ḥar* LUGAL
be-li-ia "So may the king know, as the gods of Byblos are holy,
that the illness is serious and I have committed my sin against
the gods, thus I cannot enter into the presence of the king, my
lord" (EA 137:30-35; Moran 1987b:357-358, 359-360 nn. 3-4;
1992:218, 219 nn. 3-4).

The 3rd m.pl. *qa-di-šu* in this syntagma may be compared with *baḥū* in the following oath:

i-nu-ma ba-al-tu / LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM.MEŠ ù / *a-da-bu-ba ka-li*
ip-ši-[š]u-nu "As the commissioners live, I will continue to
report their deeds" (EA 119:21-23; cf. CAD B:57a, D:7a; Moran
1960:15).

A Ugaritic term used in syllabic cuneiform texts dealing with transfers of real property (cf. above concerning the 3rd m.s.) happens to appear once in the 3rd m.pl., viz.

an-nu-tù a-na pa-ni LUGAL / ŠÀM.TIL.LA.BI.ŠÈ \ *ša-ma-tù* /
*a-na*¹ *A-ri-ra-di* / [ù] *a-na* DUMU.MEŠ-šu *a-na da-ri-ti* "These have
devolved for their full price to Ariradu [and] to his sons

forever" (RS 16.147:12-15; Nougayrol 1955:90; Huehnergard 1989:68 n. 142, 165).

The preservation of the thematic vowel in the 3rd m.pl. might reflect an original feature of Ugaritic (Sivan 1984:139).

Another Canaanite gloss shows the elision of the thematic vowel, but for a very good reason:

*ù ir-ka-ab-mi / it-it¹Ya-aš-da-ta / ù a-di ka-ša-di-ia / ù da-ku-šu *
ma-aḥ-šú-ú "So I mounted up with Yashdata but by the time I arrived, they had slain him" (EA 245:11-14).

There can be no doubt about the meaning of the gloss. It is certain that the final *-ú* sign represents the 3rd m.s. accusative pronominal suffix (Borger 1967:239; Rainey 1969a:108). Therefore, the reconstructed form would be **maḥṣūhu* and the elision of the thematic vowel is probably due to the addition of the accusative suffix. Compare, however, *mi-iḥ-šú¹-mi*, passive from the same verb (EA 313:4; collation 31.1.80), albeit in a text that does not show definite features of a Canaanite scribal tradition.

There are a few examples of Akkadian verbs which, nevertheless, have not elided the thematic vowel, perhaps in some measure due to the morphology of the corresponding Canaanite word:

a-ša-ú (EA 105:17); *a-ša-bu* (EA 138:62; *contra* Moran 1987b:366 n. 15; 1992:224 n. 15); *sé-ki-pu* "(which) have been sailed" (EA 143:20; CAD S:73b).

The forms *i-zi-bu* (EA 73:13) and *iz-zi-bu-ni* (EA 366:18) are evidently based on the Akkadian present as theme. Thus, preservation of the thematic vowel is a function of the gemination of the second radical.

There are approximately 130 other G stem examples of 3rd m.pl. *qtl* forms attested in the EA texts from Canaan. All of them that are from strong roots show the expected elision of the thematic vowel.

THIRD FEMININE PLURAL? Ebeling listed a few *qtl* forms as 3rd f.pl. The presence of such forms would be a major exception to the general picture whereby feminine plural subjects usually have either a 3rd m.pl. or 3rd f.s. verb (Moran 1950a:61). Of course, standard Akkadian does have the *-ā* suffix for 3rd f.pl. and it is not impossible that a true Akkadian form of this nature was employed. This would seem to be the case in the following example:

ú-ul 'ki¹-na¹ a-wa!(NA)-ti-šu-nu "Their words are not true"
(EA 89:14; Albright and Moran 1950:164; Moran 1950a:29;
1950c:170-171 n. 18).

With this text may be compared a passage from an epistle written in Egypt:

ù ú-ul ki-i-na / gáb-bi a-wa-te^{MEŠ} ša tàš-pur UGU-ši-na "And all
the words concerning which you wrote are untrue"
(EA 162:19-20; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:156).

Therefore, it is likely that the scribe was intentionally using an Akkadianism. Perhaps he had learned this particular phrase in school.

Another passage with a verb listed by Ebeling as 3rd f.pl. is the following:

ša-ni-tam šum-ma / ap-pu-na-ma a-nu-ma pa-aṭ-ra / URUŠ[u-]mu-ra
ù URUÉ-Ar-[h]a "Furthermore, if, moreover, now Šumur and
Bīt-Arkha have defected" (EA 83:27-29).

However, Moran (1950a:60) adduced another example in which the subject is plural masculine while the verb has the *-a* suffix:

ù LÚ.MEŠ / [h]a-za-nu-tu ú-u[l] tar-ša it-ti-ia "And the city rulers
are not just to me" (EA 109:60-61; cf. also Moran 1987b:308-309;
1992:183).

So the passage in EA 83:27-29, with two towns as the subject (i.e. two feminines in Canaanite), may be following the same rule as EA 109:60-61), viz. with a 3rd m.s. verb.

There are five instances of *a-ša* which have plural subjects. In one case the subjects are feminine:

ù ^{GIŠ}MÁ.MEŠ-šu-nu / *a-ša ki-ma ki-ti iš-tu* ^{KUR}Mi-iš-ri "And their ships duly went forth from Egypt" (EA 105:20-21; CAD K:472a).

Moran (1950a:61) agreed that the verb might be 3rd f.pl. However, in the same epistle we have:

‘LÚ¹.MEŠ ^{KUR}Mi-iš-ri / [š]a *a-ša iš-tu* ^{URU}Ull-la-sà [a]-nu-ma it-ti-ia šu-nu "As for the Egyptians who came forth from Ullasa, [n]ow they are with me" (EA 105:83-84).

Here Moran (1950a:60) cites the passage as an example of the singular verb form with a masculine plural subject!

Three more instances of *a-ša* occur in another Byblos letter. On the surface, it appears that in all three cases, the subject is two Egyptians whom Rib-Haddi had sent to Egypt but who had not returned.

ù 2 LÚ / ^{KUR}Mi-iš-ri *ša-a ša-ap-ra-ti / a-na É.GAL ú-ul a-ša* "But the two Egyptians whom I sent to the palace have not come forth" (EA 117:12-14); *a-nu-ma 2 LÚ an-nu-tu / tu-ba-lu-na tu-p-pí a-na šār-ri / ù an-na ú-ul a-ša* "Now these two men were bringing a tablet to the king but, behold, they have not come forth" (EA 117:17-19); *ša-ni-tam ú-ul aš-ta-pár a-na šār-ri / a-nu-ma 2 LÚ ^{KUR}Mi-iš-ri šu-nu / tu-ša-na ša-ri a-na ia-ši / ù la-a a-ša* "Furthermore, did I not write to the king, 'Now these two are Egyptians, the breath of the king will come forth to me?' But they did not come forth" (EA 117:53-56).

With regard to these passages, Moran (1950a:62) said that the verbs might be dual or singular but that the evidence was not decisive. It so happens that the normal singular of the *qtl*

conjugation was *a-šī* (EA 85:51; 109:63; 116:61; 137:21). The three passages in EA 117 cited above all pertain to "coming forth" from Egypt. Therefore, it is quite logical to suggest that all three verb forms are, in fact, 3rd m.s. *ašī* + ventive *-a*. In the last passage, the writer added the ventive to *tūšī*, thus producing *tūšā*; but to avoid the impression of a volitive, he added the energetic *-na* (cf. discussion *supra*, pp. 209-211). That the *qtl* forms of (*w*)*ašû* should also have the ventive makes excellent sense.

A final passage is one where Albright and Moran (1950:166) posited a 1st c.pl. verb with *na-* prefix (cf. *supra*, p. 46, *infra*, p. 405). Actually the verb form could have 3rd f.pl. stative *nadnā* though the subject would have properly been *pānūnu* rather than accusative *pānīnu*:

ù na-[a]d-na pa-ni-nu a-na / a-ra-di-ka "Our faces are set to serve you" or: "We have set our faces to serve you" (EA 89:16-17; Albright and Moran 1950:166).

From the discussion above, it does not seem probable that there are any genuine 3rd f.pl. verb forms in the *qtl* conjugation pattern with the ancient Semitic *-ā* suffix except with the expression, *ul kīnā* (EA 89:14). This particular form is an Akkadianism appearing in what was probably a learned phrase. Therefore, it seems likely that Canaanite preferred either the 3rd m.pl. or the 3rd f.s. with plural feminine subjects.

THEMATIC FORMS

The choice of thematic structures in the *qtl* conjugation pattern as employed in the Canaanite EA letters has been of considerable interest. Note that by thematic form we mean a vocalic pattern which carries meaning; this is in contrast to what we have termed the theme, which is an Akkadian thematic form used primarily for its lexical significance only. In the *qtl*, as against the prefix conjugation pattern, the scribes usually employ a vocalic pattern which carries semantic as well as lexical meaning, even when they are using an Akkadian verb. As is well known,

the basic patterns in the Semitic languages for the G stem of this conjugation are *qatal*, *qatil* and *qatul*. Even in the late 19th century, Assyriologists had become aware that Akkadian favored the *qatil* above the others. The contrast with the WS languages was clearly discerned. WS normally used *qatal* for transitives and verbs of motion, *qatil* and *qatul* for statives and sometimes for the passive. In Akkadian, on the other hand, the suffix conjugation pattern was almost completely devoted to expressing the stative and passive; thus the strong preference in the G stem for *qatil* or occasionally *qatul*, although *qatal*'s with stative meaning are also known (e.g. *rapaš* "wide"). Nevertheless, a transitive function for certain verbs in the suffix conjugation did develop (even in *qatil*). There is considerable evidence for this phenomenon in "classic Babylonian" (Rowton 1962). But examples can also be cited from the MB letters in the EA archive:

DUMU.MÍ LUGAL GAL *i-na* 5 GIŠ^rGIGIR^r [*a-n*]a
 KUR^rMi^r.^riš^r.^rri^r.^ri^r ^rna^r.^rš^ru^r.^rú^r.^rš^ri^r "As for the daughter of the
 great king, they brought her in five chariots to Egypt"
 (EA 11:22); 40 ^rma^r-na GUŠKIN *ša na-šu-ni* "the forty minas
 which they brought to me" (EA 7:71); 20 *ma-na* GUŠKIN *ša*
na-ša-a ul ma-li "The twenty minas of gold which he brought
 were not complete" (EA 10:19; CAD M/1:179b); *a-ma-ta ba-ni-ta*
ša ul-tu pa-na i-na qá-at šar-ra-ni / ma-aḥ-ra-nu-ma "the state of
 friendly relations which we have taken over from earlier kings"
 (EA 7:37-38; Oppenheim 1967:114; CAD B:82b); *du-ul-la*
ša-ab-ta-ku-ma "I am engaged in a project" (EA 7:63; *loc. cit.*).

Because the EA letters from Canaan represent such a unique symbiosis of Akkadian and WS, it should be no surprise that use of the three forms, *qatal*, *qatil* and perhaps *qatul*, reflects mainly the WS system, but with some interference from the Akkadian usages.

qatal. The normal WS use of *qatal* as transitive is illustrated by the Canaanite forms *ia-pa-aq-ti* (EA 64:23) and [*la*]-*qa-ḥu* (EA 287:36). There are, nevertheless, a few attestations of

intransitive meaning for *qatal* forms. For instance, there is an ubiquitous verb, *qâlu* "to keep silent" (CAD Q:72b-73a):

šum-ma qa-al LUGAL *a-na* URU.KI / *gâb-bi* DIDLI.URU.KI
 KUR *Ki-na-aḥ-ni ia-nu a-¹na¹ ša-šu* "If the king keeps silent
 concerning the city, none of the towns of Canaan will be his"
 (EA 137:75-76).

The ensuing passage includes a *qatal* stative, *na-ka-ar*, and a *qatal* transitive, *na-da-an*. The *i-ru-ub* form is probably also to be considered as *qtl* (Izre'el 1978b:53); it will be treated under special constructions (cf. *infra*, pp. 341-342).

li-il-ma-ad LUGAL / *EN-ia i-nu-ma* / ^{LÚ}ŠEŠ-*ia* TUR.[TU]R /
na-ka-ar iš-tu / ia-ši u i-ru-ub / a-na ^{URU}Mu-¹ú¹-ḥa-zi / *u na-da-an*
 2 *qa-<te>-šu / a-na* ^{LÚ}[S]A.GAZ.KI "May the king, my lord, be
 apprised that my younger brother has become hostile to me
 and he has entered into Mōḥazu and he has proffered his two
 hands to the 'apîru" (EA 298:20-27).

This use of *nakar* should be compared with *nakirat* in the following:

li-il₅[-m]a-ad / 1šâr-ri EN-*ia ki-ma* / *n[a]-ki-ra-at* ^{URU}La-ki-ši / *ù*
ša-a[b-t]a-at ^{URU}Mu-ú¹-ra-aš-ti "May my king, my lord, be
 apprised that Lachish has become hostile and Mō³rashti has
 been taken" (EA 335:14-17).

Concerning the passive *šabtat*, cf. below.

The verb of motion, *kašādu* "to reach, arrive at, come," normally appears in *qatil* (CAD K:271b) but takes the *qatal* form in a Jerusalem letter:

[. . .] / [k]a-ša-ad *a-na mu-ḥi-ia* [. . .] / *na-ad-na-ti* 10 ^{LÚ}IR.MEŠ
 [a-na qa-]¹ti¹[-šu] / ¹Šu-ú-ta ^{LÚ}MAŠKÍM *šâr-ri ka-š[a-ad] / [a]-na*
mu-ḥi-ia 21 ^{MÍ}DUMU.MÍ.MEŠ / [8]0 ^{LÚ}.MEŠ *a-šî-ri na-ad-na-ti /*
 [a-]na *qa-ti* ¹Šu-ú-ta ^{NÍ}G.BA LUGAL EN-*ia* "[PN c]ame to me

[. . .]; I handed over ten slaves [to his char[ge]; Shuta, the commissioner of the king, ca[me t]o me; twenty-one servant girls, [eig]hty troopers (or: prisoners), I handed over [t]o the charge of Shuta, a gift to the king, my lord" (EA 288:16-22; Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:488b; Rainey 1967a; Moran 1987b:515. 516 n. 4; 1992:331, 332 n. 4).

Another verb of motion, *paṭāru* "to depart, defect," also takes *qatal* as its suffix conjugation form although its standard form in Akkadian is *paṭer* (AHw:849-851 *passim*).

ki-na-an-na li-ib-lu-uṭ šār-ri / lu-ú ir-pí-šu ¹*Pu-ú-ru / pa-ṭa-ar i-na ma-aḫ-ri-ia / i-na* URU *Ḫa-za-ti i-ba-aš-ši* "Thus, as my king lives, his nobleman, Puwuru, has verily departed; he is in Gaza" (EA 289:37-40); *i-ka-lu ka-ar-ši-ia \ ú-ša-a-ru / i-na pa-ni* LUGAL EN-ri (!) ¹*R-ḫé-ba / pa-ṭa-ar-mi a-na šār-ri* EN-šu "They are slandering me (I am being slandered) in the presence of the king, my(!) lord, "Abdi-Kheba has defected from the king, his lord" (EA 286:6-8).

For the transitive function of *qatal*, a WS 3rd m.pl. in a Jerusalem letter confirms the usage in contemporary Canaanite:

[*la*]-*qa-ḫu ú-nu-ta₅-šu-nu* "They took their tools/weapons" (EA 287:36; cf. *supra*, p. 290).

A widely used verb with transitive meaning in the suffix conjugation *šabātu* "to seize" appears in one of the Shechem letters four times, twice in a transitive and twice in a passive meaning:

ú!-šur!-mi / LÚ.MEŠ ša ša-ab-tu URU "Keep watch on the men who seized the town!" (EA 252:6-7; Rainey cited by Moran 1987b:479 n. 1; 1992:306 n. 1); *ša-ab-ta-at-mi* URU "the town was taken" (EA 252:12); *ù / ša-ab-ta-at-mi 2* URU-ia "And my two towns are seized" (EA 252:21-22); LÚ.MEŠ *ša ša-ab-tu₄* URU <ù> / *i-li* "the men who seized my town <and> my god" (EA 252:29-30).

These forms, 3rd m.pl. and 3rd f.s., do not reveal the thematic form, which in Akkadian should be *šabit* (CAD Š:5b).

The following passage provides the 3rd m.s. with the WS thematic vowel *-a-* characteristic of transitive verbs:

*lu-ú i-de LUGAL EN-ia / i-nu-ma nu- KÚR¹A-zi-ru¹it¹-ti-ia / ù
ša-bat 12 LÚ.MEŠ-ia ù ša-ka-an / ip-ti-ra be-ri-nu 50
KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ ù / LÚ.MEŠ ša-a [u]š-ši-ir-ti a-na /
URUŠu-mu-ra ša->ab<-bat i-na / ¹URU¹Ya-aḫ-li-ia* "May the king, my lord, be apprised that Aziru is hostile to me and he has seized twelve of my men and fixed a ransom between us, fifty silver (shekels), and the men whom I sent to Šumur he seized in Ya'lia" (EA 114:6-12; contrast Moran 1987b:316, 317 n. 2; 1992:188. 189 n. 2).

Further on, the writer used the transitive *ša-bat* once again (EA 114:17). Note also the transitive use of *ša-ka-an* "he placed, fixed." This verb appears frequently in the Canaanite letters in the *qatal* (EA 98:13; 138:60; 174:15; 175:12; 176:12; 286:26; 287:60; 288:5; 289:32; 292:34; 326:16), thus signaling one of the foremost departures from standard Akkadian usage. The suffix conjugation theme for this verb in Akkadian is the well known *šakin* (AHw:1135); for a possible transitive *šakin* in this corpus, cf. *infra*, p. 370; for passives cf. *infra*, pp. 303-306.

Another important *qatal* transitive is *šapāru* "to send." The instances of *šapar* cannot be taken as examples of the infinitive because the subject either precedes the verb or else is in the nominative after it. Note the following:

LUGAL EN-li ša-pār a-na mu-ḫi-[i]a ¹Ḫa-a-ia "The king, my lord, has sent Ḫa²ya to [m]e" (EA 255:8); ¹Ḫa-an-ia ša-pār / šār-ru EN-ia ^dUTU / iš-tu AN^{sa-me} a-na ia-ši "The king, my lord, the sun god from heaven, sent to me Ḫanya" (EA 301:12-14).

An additional verb which has passive *qatil* in Akkadian but transitive *qatal* in the EA texts from Canaan is *ḫabātu* "to rob, plunder" (CAD Ḫ:10; AHw:303b).

LÚ.MEŠ *ḫa-pí-ru ḫa-bat gáb-bi* KUR.ḪÁ LUGAL "The 'apîrû men have stolen/plundered all the king's lands" (EA 286:56).

Likewise, the transitive *dâku* "to kill" has passive *qatil* in the suffix conjugation while the transitive *qatal* is frequent in our corpus, e.g.

a-mur ¹A-zi-ru ¹A-du-na šâr ^{KUR}Ir-qà-ta / *da-ak* šâr ^{KUR}Am-mi-ia /
 ù šâr ^{KUR}Ar-da-ta / ù ^{LÚ}GAL *da-ak* ù *la-qa* / URU.MEŠ-šu-nu
 "Look, Aziru has killed Adôna, king of 'Irqat; he killed the king of Ammiya and the king of Ardat and he has killed the official, and he has taken their towns" (EA 140:10-14).

The suffix theme for *epēšu* "to do, make" is the passive *epiš*, but in the Canaanite EA texts, special transitive forms in *qatal* were developed. The best known is the active hybrid form *a-pa-aš* as illustrated in the following:

a-mur ar-na ša / *a-¹pa¹-aš* ¹A-zi-ru *i-na šâr-ri* "Behold the crime which Aziru has committed against the king" (EA 139:12-13; contrast Moran 1950a:178; 1987b:368 and n. 3; 1992:225, 226 n. 4).

One text from the Beqa^c Valley adopts *i-pa-aš* as the transitive form:

la-a i-pa-aš ep-ša *an-na* LÚ *iš-tu* / *da-ri-ti* "A man has never committed this deed" (EA 196:32-33); ù *la-a* / [*ia*]-*qù-ul* LUGAL EN-*ia* / [*iš*]-*tu ep-ši an-ni ša* / [*i*]-*pa-aš* ¹Bi-ri-da-aš-*wa* "And may the king, my lord, not keep silent concerning this deed which Biridashwa has committed!" (EA 196:38-41; Rainey 1973c:239).

A Byblos epistle employs both the active *apaš* and the passive *apiš*:

ù ¹Pa-ḫu-ra / *a-pa-aš ep-ša ra-ba* / *a-na ia-ši* "And Paḫura has committed a great (mis)deed against me" (EA 122:31-33); ù *al-le-e* / *ta-aq-bu* URU *ep-šu* / *ša la a-pí-iš iš-tu* / *da-ri-ti a-pí-iš* /

a-na ia-ši-nu "And behold the city is saying 'A deed that has never been done before has been done to us'" (EA 122:40-44; Rainey 1973c:238-239).

The ubiquitous verb of speaking, *qabû*, appears frequently in the Canaanite letters in the *qtl*. The active (transitive) is written *qa-ba*:

mi-nu qa-ba mi-im-ma / a-na ša-a-šu "Who said anything to him?" (EA 134:35-36; cf. also EA 63:7; 263:26; 294:13; 297:8; 315:10, 14; 323:13; 325:18; 331:16).

Examples will be given below of the passive, which is written *qa-bi*.

qatil. The most prevalent, and probably the most original, thematic form for the suffix conjugation is *qatil*. Naturally, some *qatil*'s expressing a stative are found in these texts. Even the gloss *ba-ṭi-ti* < **baṭiṭi* "I am secure, at rest" (EA 147:56) confirms the stative function of *qatil* for the Canaanite of that period. Some typical examples are:

da-mi-iq it-ti-ka / a-na ia-ši "It is good for me (to be) with you" (EA 74:62-63); *ia-nu mi-im-mu a-na ia-ši / ga-mi-ir gáb-bu i-na na-da-ni / i-na ba-la-aṭ ZI-ia* "I have no property, it is all used up in payment for my sustenance" (EA 117:74-76); *ù ḥa-di lib Ṛ-ka* "and the heart of your servant rejoiced" (EA 141:11); *ḥal-qá-at URU-[š]u ḥa-li-iq É-šu* "his city is destroyed, his house is perished" (EA 147:46).

Verbs of motion also appear in *qatil*. In contrast to Hebrew *hālak*, the Canaanite scribes used *alik* (note that they also preferred *illak* as the theme for the prefix conjugation, *supra*, p. 51).

a-ya-mi LÚ-lu / ša a-lik iš-tu KUR.MEŠ *Mi-iš-ri a-na maḥ-ri-šu* "Where is the man who has come to him from Egypt?" (EA 138:91-92; CAD A/1:220b).

Note the following passage from Tyre where *alāku* apparently has the well attested Akkadian idiomatic connotation, "to render service" (cf. CAD A/1:309a-310b):

a-mur LÚ^{URUP}[Ú]-*ru-ti i-na* / [1] G^ŠMÁ *a-li-ik ù* LÚ^{URU}Šⁱ-*du-[n]a i-na* 2 G^ŠM[Á] / [i]-*la-ak ù a-na-ku i-la-ak qa-du gáb-bi* G^ŠMÁ-*ka*¹ "Behold, the ruler of Beirut served in one ship and the ruler of Sidon serves in two ships while I will serve with all your ships" (EA 155:67-69; Moran 1987b:391; 1992:242).

Another verb of motion popular in the EA texts is *kašādu* "to reach, arrive, come," and it can appear in either *qatal*: as in the Jerusalem letter EA 288:16-22 (*supra*, pp. 297-298) or *qatil* (the standard Akkadian usage; CAD K: 271b):

ù la-a ka-ši-id / i-re-šu ù uš-ši-ir-ti-šu "As soon as the request arrives, I will send it" (EA 82:16-17; Moran 1950a:53; 1987b:263; 1992:152).

Since even in standard Akkadian, *qatil* can express a transitive action, it is not surprising that some examples appear in the EA texts from Canaan. The WS forms, ¹*ba*¹-¹*ni*¹-¹*ti*¹ "I have built" (EA 292:29) <^{*}*banîti* and ⁷*ša-mi-ti*₇ "I have heard" <^{*}*šami'tî* (EA 362:5), reveal the transitive use of *qatil*. However, each of these verbs is vocalized in accordance with phonetic and thematic considerations prevailing in certain of the NWS languages, viz. the Barth-Ginsberg law (cf. *supra*, pp. 61-75). Verbs with a guttural as second or third radical take *yiqtal* in the G prefix conjugation pattern and either *qatil* or *qatul* in the suffix conjugation pattern (Barth 1894:1-2).

It was noted that the Canaanite EA texts prefer *šakan* as the transitive of *šakānu* (cf. *supra*, p. 299). However, there is also an apparent transitive of *šakin* in the following passage:

*ù i-še*₂₀-*me e-nul-ú ia-nu-um* ¹ERÍN¹.MEŠ / *it-ti-šu ù te!*-*né-pu-[u]š* / ^{URUBat}*ru-na a-na ša-šu* / *ù ERÍN*.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ *ù* G^ŠGIGIR.MEŠ / *ša-ki-in*₄ *i-na lib-bi-š*_i / *ù la!*

i-nam-mu-šu-ni₇ / [i]š-tu pí KÁ.GAL uruGub<-la>^{KI} "And he (°Abdi-Ashirta) heard that there were no troops with him; then Baṭruna went over to him and he placed °*apîrû* troops and chariotry in <its> midst and they do not depart from the entrance of the city gate of Byblos" (EA 87:18-24; Rainey 1975b:424-425; Youngblood 1961:300; Moran 1950a:159; 1987b:273 nn. 1-3; 1992:159-160 nn. 1-3).

Admittedly, one might take ERÍN.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ ù GIŠGIGIR.MEŠ as the collective subject of *šakin*, but it is more likely that the verb would then be 3rd f.s. (Moran 1950a:61). The larger context has been cited here to make it clear why it is more fitting to take *šakin* as a transitive.

In spite of the evidence for Canaanite **laqaḥû* (cf. *supra*, p. 298), one still finds examples of transitive *qatil* from *leqû*:

¹*Sú-ra-ta / la-qí-mi KÙ.BABBAR.ĤÁ ip-ṭi-ri-šu / i-na ŠU-ti-šu \ ba-di-ú* "Surata took his ransom money from his hand" (EA 245:33-35); *la-a la-qí-šu-nu* "he did not capture them" (EA 129:83).

There is also the following difficult passage where (w)*abālu* "to bring" (CAD A/1:20b) is perhaps more likely than *apālu* "to pay":

ia-nu mi-i[m-ma] a-na / ša-šu-nu ša-a 2 ša-a 3 a-bi-'il¹ / KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ ip-ṭi-ri "They have no property, one brought two, another three (shekels of) silver as ransom money" (EA 116:42-44; cf. Moran 1987b:322 n. 7; 1992:192 n. 7).

The most significant feature of *qatil* in these texts from Canaan is its function as the passive (Moran 1950a:116-117 n. 70). Of course, *qatil* is the standard passive of transitive verbs in Akkadian. Nevertheless, there is no trace whatever of a Canaanite passive *qutil(a)* like the Arabic. Instead, there are Canaanite glosses and other forms which confirm *qatil* as the theme form for the passive.

qa-bi / qa-ar-šī-ia \ šī-ir-ti / i-na pa-ni ¹LUGAL-*ma be-li-ia* "I have been slandered" (EA 252:13-15).

Note that this particular scribe mixed up the Akkadian idiom, which should have been like the Jerusalem version:

i-ka-lu ka-ar-ši-ya \ ú-ša-a-ru "They are eating a chunk of my flesh \ I am being slandered" (EA 286:6; Nitzán 1973:62, §4.36, 89, §6.2)

Here the Akkadian idiom (which goes back to OB, CAD K:222b-223a) is couched in the 3rd m.pl. present but is glossed by the indicative imperfect 1st c.s. of the same WS verb. The Shechem scribe is dealing with a past event and thus prefers the *qtl* for both the Akkadian and the Canaanite verb; *qa-bi* is to be reckoned as passive (in contrast to active *qa-ba*, cf. *supra*, p. 301). The Aramaic parallel cited by Held 1961:12b, viz. *kršy ʔyš lʔ ʔmrt* "you did not slander anyone" (KAI 269:2) is 4th century B.C.E. and may be nothing more than a mix-up of the metaphor just like the Shechem passage under discussion here. In any case, the most important point is that *šī-ir-ti* is 1st c.s. passive on a Canaanite verb.

The Canaanite active form [*la*]-*qa-ḥu* (EA 287:36) has its passive counterpart in the same text (cf. *supra*, p. 290):

la-qí-ḥu ¹*i-na* ¹*ú-l-ga* ¹*-ri* \ *ša-de₄-e* [*a-na*] / URU *la-lu-na* ^{KI} "They were taken in the open territory of Ayalon" (EA 287:56-57; cf. Moran 1987b:514 nn. 17-18).

Many examples could be cited of passive *qatil*'s corresponding to active *qatal*'s. A representative selection will suffice to illustrate the point. First, passive *a-pí-iš* for active *a-pa-aš*:

ù al-le-e / taq-bu URU *ep-šu / ša la a-pí-iš iš-tu / da-ri-ti a-pí-iš / a-na ia-ši-nu* "And behold, the city is saying, 'A deed which has never been done has been committed against us'" (EA 122:40-44).

Passive *di-ka* for active *da-ak*:

ú-ul / ia-qú-ul LUGAL a-na i-[p]é-ši / an-nu-ú i-nu-ma di-ka / LÚ.MAŠKÍM "May the king not keep silent concerning this deed, that the commissioner has been killed!" (EA 132:43-46).

Passive *la-qí-i* for active *la-qa, la-qa-a*:

i-[r]i-[i]b-ti a-na É-ti / be-[l]i-ia la-qí-i / gáb-bu iš-tu É-ti ÌR-ka / la-qí-i KÙ.BABBAR la-qí-i / LÚ.MEŠ la-qí-i UDU.UDU.MEŠ \ šú-ú-nu / \ ḥa-sí-lu URU.MEŠ-nu be-li-ia / ù mi-im-mu ša na-da-an / be-li-ia a-na ÌR-šu ù šu-ut / la-qí-i "I have entered into the house of my lord; everything has been taken from the house of your servant; the silver has been taken; the personnel have been taken; the cattle have been taken; the cities of my lord have been demolished and the property which my lord gave to his servant has been taken" (EA 263:8-17; Held 1965:398; Moran 1987b:489 n. 3; 1992:313 n. 3).

The active *na-da-an* in the passage cited above is matched by passive *na-di-in*:

ù ti-mu-ru [LÚ¹.MEŠ¹ [É]-ia / i-nu-ma la-a na-di-in KÙ.BABBAR ti-iš-la-ḥu / a-na ia-ši ki-ma LÚ.MEŠ ḥa^{MEŠ}-za-ni ŠEŠ-ia "And the men of my house saw that the money that you used to send to me was not given like (to) the city rulers, my colleagues" (EA 137:11-13).

Finally, alongside the active *šakan*, one finds many passives from the same verb. Note, for example, the 3rd f.s. form in the following passage, which surely has been derived from the passive *šakin*:

ki-ma MUŠEN.MEŠ ša / i-na lib-bi ḥu-ḥa-ri \ ki-lu-bi / ša-ak-na-at ki-šu-ma a-na-ku i-na / URUGu[b-l]a "Like birds placed in a cage, thus am I in By[bl]os" (EA 74:46-49 = EA 78:13-16; 79:35-38; 81:34-36; 90:39-42; 105:8-10; 116:18-20).

qitul / qetil. Two verbs reveal suffix forms with this pattern instead of *qatal*. Both have *ṣ* and a guttural (*ḥ* or *ǧ*) in the root, so they might be the cause of the special vocalization. One verb, *maḥāṣu*, uses this theme for the passive: 3rd m.s. *mi-iḥ-iš* (EA 220:24), *me-ḥi-iš* (EA 264:8, 12); 3rd m.pl. *mi-ḥi-šú* (EA 273:23), *me-eḥ-šú¹-mì* (EA 313:4); and *mi-ḥi-ša* (EA 335:8, dual?). The other verb, **raǧāṣu / raḥāṣu*, has one apparent form that could be 3rd m.s. active or passive (with plural subject), viz. 3rd m.s. *ri-ḥi-iš-mi* (EA 127:33; Rainey 1989-90:61b; cf. *supra*, pp. 173-174).

qatul. There is one example that appears most likely to be in the *qatul* pattern though other interpretations are possible. It is in a Jerusalem letter and the context is:

*a-mur LUGAL EN-ia ša-du-uq a-na ia-a-ši / aš-šum LÚ.MEŠ
Ka-ši-yi* "Behold, (o) king, my lord, I have a just case with regard to the Cushites" (EA 287:32-33; cf. Moran 1987b:513 n. 8).

The form *ša-du-uq* (CAD Š:59b) is evidently predicative as signaled by the *-Ø* suffix. It appears to be the same element as *šaduq / šaduqa* in Amorite PN's, e.g. *Aḥiṣaduq*, 'Ammiṣaduqa' (Huffmon 1965:257). As such a predicating element, it is unlikely that the thematic form might be that of the G absolute infinitive like Hebrew *šādôq* (Böhl 1909:25, §13g; Sivan 1984:144, §1.3.1). The syntagma, with an impersonal 3rd m.s. subject, is like *ma-ri-iš ma-gal a-na ia-ši* "It is most excruciating for me" (EA 114:50) and *da-mi-iq a-na ia-ši* "It is good for me" (EA 116:48). Incidentally, there is no way to justify taking *šarru bēliya* as the subject (*contra* Cazelles 1973:76, who does not understand that *amur* begins a new topic!).

Note that, in Babylonian, *marāṣu* normally takes the form *maruṣ* in the suffix conjugation, though *marāṣ* and *mariš* are also known in Assyrian (CAD M/1:269a). The EA texts know only *mariš*. For *i-ru-ub*, cf. *infra*, p. 342).

qittul = pitrus. The suffix conjugation hybrids with infix *-t-* for a few verbs will be discussed in the next chapter (*infra*, pp.

339-342). There is, however one obscure passage where a Gt stative may be intended:

ù a-na-ku a-tu-ur a-na É-ia / ù id-du-ul É iš-tu / pa-ni-ia "And I returned to my house (palace) but the house was locked in my face" (EA 136:33-35)

Rather than assuming that the form *id-du-ul* is active with Rib-Haddi's brother as the subject (Moran 1987b:356 n. 6), it is more suitable to the context (the brother is not mentioned explicitly in the letter) to take the form in question as a passive (CAD E:26b). However, it is not necessary to posit an N stem as does CAD. For N one would expect *innedil*. CAD does list Gt as an attested stem for this verb, but it does not devote a special paragraph to that stem. *AHw* does not list any Gt for *edēlu*. What seems a most likely possibility is that the form is really the Gt suffix conjugation form, perhaps *iddul* < **itdul*.

naqta. Four glosses provide confirmation of the Canaanite N stem theme form for the suffix conjugation pattern. The vocalization is just what one would have expected on diachronic grounds, e.g. the *-a-* vowel of the stem prefix is not attenuated as it is in Hebrew *nīp^cal*. Other special N stem hybrids will be dealt with in the next chapter (*infra*, pp. 333-337). One of the glosses has been assumed to be 3rd m.pl. In spite of considerable disagreement about the Akkadian verb being glossed, the general meaning is fairly clear:

ša-ni-tam ú-ul ti-i-de / at-ta^{KUR}A-mur-ri ur-ra / mu-sa tu-ba-ú-na / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭá-ti ú-ul ta-ša-aš / \ na-aq-ša-pu "Furthermore, don't you know Amurru? Day (and) night they are asking for the army. Don't be angry!" (EA 82:47-51; Albright and Moran 1948:242, 244 n. 6; Youngblood 1961:235-236; CAD B:363a; Moran 1987b:264 n. 6; 1992:152 n. 6; *contra* CAD A/2:424b).

The form *ú-ul ta-ša-aš* must be 2nd m.s. negative jussive. Amurru was treated as 3rd m.pl. with the verb *tu-ba-ú-na*, and many

scholars have assumed that it is subsequently treated as a collective (Albright and Moran 1948:242, 244 n. 6; Youngblood 1961:235-236; CAD B:363a; Moran 1987b:264 n. 6). They thus assumed that the gloss is 3rd m.pl., *qtl* as the translation of a 3rd f.s. preterite. The negation by *ú-ul* could then be a rhetorical question. However, it may be a negative jussive (used here instead of *lā*, as is sometimes the case). The gloss may then be an N infinitive added to confirm the meaning of the Akkadian verb.

The second gloss from the same N stem is 1st c.s., translating the same Akkadian verb:

[*a-mur a*]-*ta-ša-aš a-na-ku* / [\ *na*]-*aq-ša-ap-ti* / [*i-n*]*a a-wa-te-ka*
 "[Behold] I was angered [a]t your words" (EA 93:4-6; Youngblood 1961:375; Moran 1987b:285 n. 1; *contra* CAD A/2:424b; cf. also CAD Q:14a).

Another 3rd m.pl. gloss translates an irregular Akkadian verb, which the scribe probably felt should be explained.

*ù*¹*Sú-ra-ta LÚ URU Ak-ka*^{KI} / *ù*¹*In₄-tá!-ru*^{1?}-*ta LÚ uru Ak-ša-pa* /
šu-ni-ma in₄-né-ri-ru \ na-az-a-qú / *i-na* 50 ^{GIŠ}GIGIR.ĤÁ / *a-na mu-ḥi-ia* "And Surata, the ruler of Acco, and Intaruta, the ruler of Achshaph, the two of them, hastened to help with fifty chariots to me" (EA 366:22-26; Finklestein 1969:33a; CAD N/1:7b; Moran 1973:51; 1987b:562 nn. 2-3; 1992:364 nn. 2-3; *contra* Albright 1975:114-115).

From the same letter comes another gloss which up to now has not been considered as an example of the N stem (cf. *supra*, pp. 130-131).

li-il-ma-ad šar-ru EN-ia / *i-nu-ma LÚ SA.GAZ* ¹*ša*¹ / *yi-na-aš-ši \ na-aš-ša-a* / *i-na KUR.KI.ĤÁ na-da-an* / DINGIR-*lu₄ ša šar-ri EN-ia a-na ia-ši* / *ù i-du-uk-šu* "May the king, my lord, be apprised that as for the ^c*apîru* who rose up (has risen up) in the territories, the god of the king, my lord, has delivered to me and I have smitten him!" (EA 366:11-16; Na³aman 1975:120;

Rainey 1978b:32-33; Moran 1987b:561-562 and n. 1; 1992:363 and n. 1).

It is possible, of course, that the gemination of the š in both or either of these forms is purely graphic. However, it is most likely that the scribe intended as the gloss, **našša'a* < **nanša'a*, 3rd m.s. N stem suffix conjugation. If that be the case, then the verb form being glossed might also be intended for N stem, **yinnašši* 3rd m.s. based on the Akkadian N present-future theme with WS *y-* and *-Ø* for the past tense. Such a meaning as required by this context is consistent with the N stem of **nś*ʔ in Hebrew. That verb in both Akkadian and WS is transitive in the G stem. Although CAD (N/2:103a) places this passage under the intransitive G, they also record an instance of the meaning "to rise up against" for the N stem (CAD N/2:112a). Therefore, we apparently have the 3rd m.s. N stem suffix form here.

quttul. This standard theme for the Akkadian D stem has only three examples in the texts under discussion. As the stative of the D stem, they should be passive in nature but this is not the case. One is from a verb of speaking for which the D stative *du-ub-bu-ba-a-ku-ma* means "I am being pestered" (YOS 2 70:8; cited CAD: D:12b). The same form in a Megiddo letter is transitive:

ša-ni-tam du-ub-bu-ba-ku-mi / UGU ŠEŠ.ĤÁ-ia "Furthermore, I spoke before my colleagues" (EA 245:1)

The other verb, *dubburu*, is also normally passive in the stative, e.g. *ina qašemma dubburū* "They (the cattle) have been removed to the steppe" (ARM 5 37:9; cited CAD D:187b). But one of the Canaanite scribes uses even the correct D stative theme in transitive meaning:

[*u*] *na-ak-šu-mi* / GU₄.MEŠ ù / *du-ub-bu-ru-ni* "[and] they (the men of Taanach) have slaughtered my oxen and expelled me" (EA 248:15-17).

The third example is *uḫ-ḫu-ra-ta a-ša* "you have delayed coming forth" (EA 102:9), from *uḫḫuru* "to be late, to delay," here with an infinitive as direct accusative.

quttil. The standard theme for D stem *qtl*'s is *quttil*, as demonstrated by Izre³el (1978b:74-78). The crucial question with regard to this D theme is its diachronic significance. Akkadian has *quttul*; the ancient dialect from which Hebrew developed evidently had *qittil* (Blau 1971:152-158). The assumption of Ebeling (1910:63) and Dhorme (1914:37-38 = 1951:432-433) that EA *quttil* was due to the influence of WS *qôtil* (Heb. *pôlêl*, Arabic *fâ^cala*) really has nothing to commend it. The lengthened vowel of WS *qôtil* < *qâttil* is a lengthening of the first vowel in place of lengthening of the second radical, e.g. *qa:til* instead of *qat:il*. The EA forms usually have orthographic gemination. It is certainly unreasonable to assume forms with *qo:t.il*. Although there are no glosses to prove the contemporary Canaanite form, there is a pair of verbs which were native to Canaanite as well as Akkadian, viz. *ḫu-li-iq* (EA 197:32) and *ḫu-lí-iq* (EA 250:8, 39) "he destroyed." and *du-bi-ru* "they expelled" (EA 104:27). Furthermore, there is the evidence of the D infinitive forms from Ugarit, viz. *ḫu-wa-ú* for **ḫuwwayu*, "to give life" (Ug 5, 137:II, 17') and *pu-la-ṭu* for **pullaṭu*, "to rescue, deliver" (Ug 5, 137:II, 20'; Rainey 1969a:108). The *-u-* vowel in the first syllable is highly suggestive for the EA forms since the D infinitive of *wuššuru* in the Canaanite EA texts is *uš-ša-ar* (EA 82:22) as noted by Youngblood (1961:231; he realized that the theme vowel should be short *a* because otherwise a Byblian scribe would have written *uš-šu-ur*, which would resemble the later Akkadian form of this verb's infinitive).

Therefore, *quttil* as the theme form for the D stem suffix conjugation in these texts might reflect the true D stem theme in contemporary Canaanite. But how does it relate to Hebrew *qittēl*? It seems impossible to explain the relationship as diachronic, i.e. that *qittil* developed from *quttil*. But then, there is no reason to assume that Hebrew is a direct, linear descendant from the Canaanite spoken by the EA scribes. When dealing with the causative stem, one is faced with certain evidence in favor of rival

patterns, *u-i* and *i-i*. Furthermore, it seems highly probable that the D stem form borrowed from Canaanite into Egyptian was *qittal*, apparently a development from an original *qittil*. For example, the loan word, "to bless" in Egyptian inscriptions of the late New Kingdom has the form (in Egyptian "syllabic" writing) *bí-ra-kú* (Sivan and Cochavi-Rainey 1992:57-58) and this vocalic pattern is characteristic of several verbs. Of course, there is always the possibility that the Egyptians borrowed the D infinitive. In that case, their borrowed **qittal(u)* could easily be comprehended as a counterpart to the *quttalu* of Ugaritic.

From a purely descriptive point of view, *quttil* seems to be built on the active *-i-* thematic vowel of the secondary stems plus the *-u-* vowel of the prefixes in the secondary stems (person markers in the prefix conjugation and the nominalizing prefix, *mu-*, of the participle). One distinct possibility is that the suffix conjugation theme is nothing but the 2nd m.s. imperative, i.e. *quttil!* If that suggestion should turn out to be correct, then all the speculations about synchronic and diachronic developments are a waste of time.

The various attestations pertain to only eight verbs, one of which, *wuššuru*, is of very high frequency. All the others are known from one or two, or perhaps four examples. There are over a dozen spellings for *wuššuru*, the principal ones being: 3rd m.s. *uš-ši-ir* (EA 86:16; *et passim*); 3rd f.s. *uš-ši-ra-at* (EA 117:50; 138:125); 2nd m.s. *uš-ši-ir-ta* (EA 194:22); 1st c.s. *uš-ši-ir-ti* (EA 34:52; *et passim*); *uš-še-er-ti* (EA 151:26); *uš-šir₄-ti₇* (EA 265:4) *et al.*; also *mu-še-er-ti* (EA 287:53; Jerusalem). The other verbs are: *bu²²û* — 1st c.s. *bu-i-ti₇* (EA 264:6, 20); 3rd m.pl. *bu¹-û* (EA 104:53; Rainey 1989-90:59b); *dubburu* — 3rd m.pl. *du-bi-ru* (EA 104:27); *ḥulluqu* — 3rd m.s. *ḥu-li-iq* (EA 197:32), *ḥu-lí-iq* (EA 250:8, 39); *muššuru* — cf. *wuššuru* above; *nuddû* — 3rd m.s. *nu-di-ni* "he has cast me aside" (EA 283:23; *AHw*:709; *CAD* N/2:309; Moran 1987b:505 n. 4); *puḥḥuru* — 3rd m.s. *pu-ḥi-ir* (EA 76:17; 129:91; 132:20); 3rd m.pl. *pu-ḥi-[ru]* (EA 295:21) and almost certainly *pu!(MU)-ḥi-ru* (EA 290:8; Zimmern 1891c:141 n. 5; Greenberg 1955:49; Rainey 1978c:149; *contra* Moran 1975b:151, 162 n. 42; 1987b:520 n. 2; 1992:334 n. 2); *turrušu* — *tu-ur-ri-šú-mi* (EA 250:5).

qattul. The possibility that a D stative in this pattern, typical only of Assyrian, has been posited for one passage by Moran. If he is correct, then the form is expressing the passive in accordance with standard Akadian usage:

ù ra-^lbi^l-šú LÚ e[m-^{qú} šu-ut] / ša ka-bu-ut ma-^lgal^l "and the commissioner [was] a wi[se] man, who was highly respected" (EA 129:15-16; cf. Moran 1987b:344, 346 nn. 7-8; 1992:209, 210 n. 7).

quttal. Only one D stem *qtl* takes this form and it is an anomaly. The verb is denominative from (*w*)*ardu* "slave," and is based on an infinitive **urrudu* / **urradu* (only bound forms are attested) as well as a G infinitive *arādu* (again only bound forms attested). The one D stem *qtl* is 1st c.s.:

i-nu-ma TUR *a-na-ku* ù *šu-ri-ba-ni a-na* ^{KUR}*Mi-iš-ri* / ù *ur-ra-ad-ti*
LUGAL / *be-li-ia* ù *iz-zi-iz-ti* / *i-na* KÁ.GAL LUGAL *be-li-ia*
"When I was young, he (Yanḫamu) installed me in Egypt and I served the king, my lord, and I stood in the gate of the king, my lord" (EA 296:25-29).

Note that *urradti* stands between a Š stem *qtl*, *šūribani*, and a G stem hybrid of *izzuzu* (cf. *infra*, pp. 321-323), built on the Akkadian 3rd m.s. present plus 1st c.s. suffix. Therefore, it seems obvious that *urradti* is also a hybrid, based on the infinitive or, more probably, on the 3rd m.s. Akkadian present (if such existed) plus 1st c.s. suffix.

šuqtil. Izre²el (1978b:74-75) observed that *šuqtil*, the theme form for Š stem *qtl*'s, reflects the same *u-i* vocalization as the D stem *quttal*. A major problem arises here, however, in that an original Canaanite Š stem is not very likely for the contemporary Canaanite. The likelihood that the theme is simply taken from the 2nd m.s. imperative is thus increased. Forms from three verbs are attested: *šūšuru*, *šūrubu*, and *šutūru* (restricted to the EA texts from Canaan, *AHw*:1336a).

All of the examples from *šūšuru* "to prepare" (CAD E:358a; Rainey 1978b:70) are responses to an order from pharaoh to prepare supplies and manpower in view of the impending arrival of an Egyptian expeditionary force (Schulman 1964:63-64 n. 99; Reviv 1966b). Thus, most of the forms are 1st c.s. as the rulers report their compliance. The initial order from Egypt is found in EA 367, a letter sent by pharaoh to Indaruta, the ruler of Achshaph:

ù lu-ú šu-šu-ra-tá a-na pa-ni / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭa-ti LUGAL NINDA ma-a-ad / GEŠTIN gáb-bu mi-im-ma ma-a-ad "and may you be prepared in anticipation of the king's troops, food being plentiful, wine (and) everything else being plentiful" (EA 367:15-17; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:*32, *34).

The precative, *lū šūšurāta*, is here translated as a stative though it has been taken as transitive (Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:484b; Moran 1987b:563; 1992:365). However, it would appear that the supplies being mentioned are not the direct object of the verb but rather the subjects of circumstantial clauses with the statives, *ma-a-ad* as their predicates. This is typical of Egyptian syntax and may reflect the linguistic background of the Egyptian scribe (Cochavi-Rainey 1990:62-63).

The replies to this command from Beirut and from Rôgišu in the northern Beqa^c Valley employ the proper Akkadian 1st c.s. suffix although they attach it to the hybrid *šūšir-* rather than to the proper *šūšur-* of the Egyptian text. In three of the Beirut passages, the verb is stative in meaning; one lengthy citation will suffice to show the semantic context:

šá-ni-tam i-nu-ma ša-pa-ar šar-ru / EN-ia dUTU-ia a-na ÌR-šu / ù i-pí-ri ša GÌR.MEŠ-šu / šu-ši-ir-mi a-na [p]a-ni / ERÍN.ḪÁ pí-ṭá-at ša LUGAL EN-ka₄ / iš-te-mé ma-gal ma-gal / ù a-na-nu-um-ma šu-ši-ra-ku / qa-du ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḪÁ-ia ù qa-du / gáb-bi mi-im-mi-ia^{ḪÁ} / ša i-ba-aš-ša it-ti / ÌR ša LUGAL EN-ia a-na / pa-ni ERÍN.ḪÁ pí-ṭá-at ša LUGAL EN-ia "Furthermore, when the king, my lord, my sun god, wrote to his servant and the dust of

his feet, 'Prepare in anticipation of the troops of the king, your lord', I heeded very diligently and now I am prepared with my horses and with everything of mine that there is with the servant of the king, my lord, in anticipation of the troops of the king, my lord" (EA 141:18-30; cf. also EA 142:25-31).

In another letter an intransitive and a transitive appear together:

ù i-de / LUGAL i-nu-ma šu-še-ra-ku i-na pa-ni ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-ti
LUGAL EN-ia / šu-ši-ra-ku gáb-ba ki-ma qa-bi LUGAL EN-ia "And
 may the king be apprised that I am prepared in anticipation of
 the troops of the king, my lord; I have prepared everything in
 accordance with the command of the king, my lord"
 (EA 144:18-21).

Compare the following transitive as well:

lu-uk-šu-da-am-mì / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-at LUGAL / ù
MAŠKÍM.MEŠ-šu ù a-na-[k]u / šu-ši-ra-ku gáb-bá "Let the army
 of the king and his commissioners arrive and I (will) have
 (already) prepared everything" (EA 191:11-15; cf. Moran
 1987b:430; 1992:271).

The other six examples of 1st c.s. have the *-āti* suffix (EA 193:21; 227:13) or plain *-ti*. The contexts are all transitive, e.g.

a-nu-ma šu-ši-ir-ti NINDA.MEŠ / KAŠ.MEŠ Ì.MEŠ ŠE.MEŠ
GU₄.MEŠ / ÛZ.MEŠ a-na pa-ni ERÍN.MEŠ LUGAL EN-ia "Now I
 have prepared food, beer, oil, grain, oxen, goats, in anticipation
 of the troops of the king, my lord" (EA 324:12-14; Na³aman
 1975:54* n. 47; Moran 1987b:546 n. 2; 1992:352 n. 1; also
 EA 325:15-19).

The other spellings are: *šu-še-er-ti* (EA 213:13); *šu-ši-ir-ti₇*
 (EA 337:19); *šu-ši-ra-ti* (EA 227:13); *šu-uš-ši-ra-ti₇* (EA 193:21).

The one truly passive example is from the Š stem of *târu*, which is a special creation by some of the Canaanite EA scribes.

ip-pu-uš-ti nu-kúr-ta / šal-ma-at a-na ia-ti-ia / šu-te-ra-at
 URU.KI-ia / a-na ia-ti-ia "I make war; it is well with me; my
 town has been returned to me" (EA 280:12-15).

This is also the only Š 3rd f.s. *qtl*.

The last verb in this group, *šūrubu*, is represented by 1st c.s. *šu-ri-ib-ti-šu-nu* (EA 123:17), 3rd m.s. *šu-ri-ib* (EA 112:49, also 46; 122:37; 123:33 and 3rd m.pl. [š]u-ri-bu (EA 123:17). All of the examples are transitive. For 3rd m.s. with an accusative 1st c.s. suffix, *šu-ri-ba-ni*, cf. *supra*, p. 312 (EA 296:25-29).

hiqtil. One lone example of a Canaanite verb, introduced by the gloss sign, bears witness to the H stem suffix form. The context is:

ki-i qa-bi-mi / i-na pa-ni-ka ¹Mu-ut-^dŠKUR-mi / in-né-bi-it ¹A-ia-ab
 / \ *ḥi-iḥ-bi-e ki-i in₄-né-bi-tu / šār ^{URUP}f-ḥi-li iš-tu / pa-ni LÚ.MEŠ*
ra-bi-šf \ sú-ki-ni / šār-ri EN-ia "How is it said in your presence,
 'Mut-Baal has deserted, he has hidden Ayyâb'? How could the
 king of Peḥel desert from the presence of the commissioners?"
 (EA 256:4-10; Albright 1943a:10-11; Albright, Mendenhall and
 Moran 1955:486; Moran 1987b:483; 1992:309).

Albright (1943a:11) felt that the scribe had forgotten the proper Akkadian term, *puzzuru* "to hide," so he inserted a Canaanite word with the gloss sign; so the scribe used his native verb from the root **hb'*. This form is evidence for the H stem prefix vowel *-i-*, which is thought to have developed from an original *-u-* (Blau 1971:152-158), this in spite of synchronic evidence in Hebrew pointing to an original *-a-*, e.g. the 1st Waw verbs, *hôrîd* < **hawrid*. On the other hand, Heb. *hēqîm* indicates an *-i-* vowel, the diachronic significance of which has been much debated (Moran 1961:62 = 1965:71). The orthography of the form under discussion is also problematic. The main possibilities are: *ḥi-iḥ-bi-i₁₅*, *ḥi-iḥ-bé-e*. What was the exact form that the scribe was trying to represent? Was it **hihbî*, **hihbi* or **hihbē(')*? It is likely that the third radical, *aleph*, was quiescent.

SUMMARY. It can be seen from the above that four trends are at work in the scribal choice of thematic form in the suffix conjugation pattern. On occasion, they employ a purely Canaanite verb form, represented as best they can in syllabic cuneiform script. Sometimes they use an Akkadian verb in its original thematic form. This practice is most clearly discerned in the transitive use of *qatil*, forms like *šakin*, etc., or the D stem examples in *quttul*, even when the verb is expressing transitive meaning contrary to normal Akkadian grammar. The third trend, and the most illuminating, is the employment of thematic forms in accordance with the principles of West Semitic. Such a practice is represented by the contrasts between transitive *qatal* and passive *qatil* with particular verbs such as *leqû*, *dâku*, *epēšu*, etc. It is when such a process can be properly isolated and identified that we have the best evidence for the semantic categories of the contemporary Canaanite. Finally, there are some instances when the scribes simply followed their usual practice for the active prefix conjugation, viz. to adopt a theme from the Akkadian lexical stock and to inflect it with the WS suffixes. It is an open question whether the *quttul* and *šuqtil* patterns are the result of such a process, i.e. use of the D and Š imperative forms as themes, or whether *quttul* and *šuqtil* reflect an original Canaanite pattern. A final possibility, which would be a fifth trend, is that thematic forms like *quttul* and *šuqtil* may have been special developments within the mixed language, the so-called jargon of these texts. With the material presently at hand, it is impossible to give a satisfactory answer to those questions.

CHAPTER XIII

SUFFIX CONJUGATION — SPECIAL HYBRIDS

Besides the routine aspects of morphology in the suffix conjugation, there are a number of special hybrid features in the EA texts from Canaan which caught the attention of scholars from the very beginning. After a century of research, in classical Akkadian, in the peripheral dialects, and in NWS languages, it is possible to place these special phenomena in proper perspective. This chapter will attempt to trace the processes at work in the EA texts from Canaan which produced these unusual formations.

THE PREFORMATIVE STATIVES

One of the special features of Akkadian syntax that was unknown to the pioneer students of the EA tablets is the existence of a group of verbs, some defective, that generally lack a real stative conjugation but whose prefix forms function syntactically as statives (*GAG*:102, §78b; Hecker 1968:122, §74a). Of the eight verbs in this category, *ukāl*, the present-future of *kullu*, meaning "to hold," does not occur in the WS texts from EA, and neither does *išqallal*, the present-future of *šūqallulu* "to hang." Though *uqa"ā*, the present-future of *qu"ū* "to expect," can have this function (Hecker *loc. cit.*), it appears in the Canaanite texts only in the WS indicative imperfect: 1st c.s. *ū-qa-mu* "I am awaiting" (EA 136:38); 3rd m.pl. *tu-qa-ū-na* "(they) are awaiting" (EA 195:20; in EA 73:20 and EA 129:54, the reading is *tu-bal-ū-na*, Rainey 1973c:262). That such indicatives are specifically differentiated from the tenseless stative function will become obvious in the treatment of other verbs in this group.

išū. One of the defective verbs included here is *išū*, which is nevertheless transitive in Akkadian and means "to have." Such standard usage can be found in the non-WS letters from EA, e.g.

ù GUŠKIN ša-nu-ú ma-²-du ša pa-tá la i-šu-ú "and much other gold that had no limit" (EA 27:28).

However, Ebeling (1915:1430) and Moran (1950a:9; 1987b:242; 1992:138) suggested that the two occurrences of this verb in Byblos expressed a meaning and a syntactic function identical to the existential particles of Hebrew (*yēš*) and Ugaritic (*iṯ* = *²*iṯ*, ²*êṯ*).

i-na LÚMAŠKÍM šār-ri / ša i-šu-ú *i-na* URUŠu-mu-ur / ba-al-ṭá-at
URUGub-la "Byblos is sustained by the king's commissioner
whom he (the king) has in Šumur" (EA 68:19-21).

Ebeling and Moran render here, "the king's commissioner who is in Šumur." However, this interpretation is not very attractive because the very next sentence achieves their meaning without the use of *išû*:

a-nu-ma ¹Pa-ḥa-am-[na]-ta / LÚMAŠKÍM LUGAL ša i-¹na¹ /
URUŠu-mu-ur^{KI} "Now, Paḥamnata, the king's commissioner
who is in Šumur" (EA 68:22-24).

The second passage which Ebeling and Moran adduce looks on the surface as if it might support their view. If *išû* were transitive here, then there would be no need for the dative complement, *ana yâšî*.

[ti]-¹i¹-de ^dNIN / ša URUGub-¹la¹ šum-ma ¹i¹?-šu / URUDU.MEŠ ù
¹ši¹-¹in⁴¹-ni [a]-¹na¹ / >a-na< ia-ši "The Lady of Byblos knows if I
have copper and ivory" (EA 77:8-11; Youngblood 1961:183;
Moran 1987b:257, nn. 2-3; 1992:148 nn. 2-3; cf. Rainey
1973c:243).

The word ¹i¹?-šu is written on the edge of the tablet and Schroeder's copy shows the beginning of the *i* sign. Even though he does not show much space after the first part of the *i*, it is not impossible that the original reading was ¹i¹-[ba]-šu, or else we should read ¹i¹-<ba>-šu. In the Byblos correspondence and

elsewhere in Canaan, the commonly used syntagma for the expression of possession would be *ibaššû ana yâši* (Rainey 1990a:174).

The example from Sidon seems to make better sense if *išu* is understood to mean "he has."

ù la-a ti-ik-šu-du-na / ša-a-ri pí-i-šu / a-na ma-ḥar ÌR.MEŠ-šu ša
i-šu[-ú?] / i-na KUR.ḤÁ Šú-uḥ-ri "and his utterances do not
 reach his servants whom he has in the lands of Šuḥri"
 (EA 145:19-22; Rainey 1973c:243 n. 50; contrast. Moran
 1987b:376 n. 5; 1992:231 n. 5).

In short, the evidence for an atypical usage of *išû* to express existence instead of possession is most tenuous. In view of the abundance of forms of *bašû* to express existence (cf. *infra*), it would be wise to reserve judgement.

ibašši. A crucial verb in the discussion of the suffix conjugation is *bašû*. As noted above, the Akkadian present, *ibašši*, functions as a stative (usually in imperfect tense meaning) in standard Akkadian (GAG:102, §78b). This is true of OA, OB and literary Akkadian as well as MB and the peripheral dialects (CAD B:145b-155a); preterites and precatives do occur when a past tense or injunctive nuance is required, but G present *ibašši* is the dominant form. In CH, *ibašši* serves as the present while N stem *ibbašši* and *ittabši* express the future and the past respectively (cf. examples CAD B:158b, 160a).

The texts from Canaanite scribes (Ebeling 1915:1390; Rainey 1978b:67) including the Taanach letters (Rainey 1977:58-59) present an interesting conjugation table, unique in the cuneiform world. There are no 3rd m.s. forms with the Canaanite *y-* prefix typical of most prefix verbs. All the 3rd m.s. texts do have final *-i* (including EA 179:15 where the final *še* sign surely is to be read *ši_x*), except two epistles from Beirut where the forms end in *-a*. This latter can hardly be the ventive or the Canaanite volitive. Instead, it is to be compared to the final *-a* that appears occasionally on *qtl* verbs (cf. *supra*, p. 287-288).

All instances of 3rd f.s. have *i-ba-ša-at* (EA 84:38; *et al.*). The Akkadian present thus serves as the theme to which the Canaanite (and Akkadian) 3rd f.s. suffix *-at* is appended! The 2nd m.s. forms have the suffix *-āta*, i.e. *i-ba-ša-ta* (EA 73:40; TT 6:17). The 2nd m.pl. is likewise *i-ba-ša-tu-nu* (EA 74:26) and *i-ba-aš-ša-tu[-nu?]* (EA 246:r. 3). But most significant of all, the 1st c.s. forms have in three cases the Akkadian suffix, *-āku*, viz. *i-ba-aš-ša₁₀-ku* (EA 248:20), *i₁₅-ba-ša-ku* (EA 143:29; 193:6) while the others have the hybrid suffix *-āti*, *i-ba-ša-ti* (EA 78:19; *et al.*), *i-ba-ša-ti₇* (EA 230:3, 6), except for one obvious scribal confusion, *i-ba-šu-ti* (EA 284:8). The 1st c.pl. forms, all from one scribe, are *i₁₅-ba-ša-nu* (EA 174:8; *et al.*) and *i₁₅-ba-ša-⟨nu⟩* (EA 363:7).

Therefore, there is no reason not to include all the 3rd m.pl. forms among the suffix conjugation verbs as well. Like the 3rd m.s. *ibašši*, the 3rd m.pl. *ibaššû* are identical with the standard Akkadian forms. They never have the *y-* prefix or the *t-* prefix typical of 3rd m.pl. in these texts. The attested 3rd m.pl. forms are *i-ba-aš-šu* (EA 74:21, 28; 81:49; 366:27), *i-ba-šu* (EA 89:19; 101:17; 107:42; 134:17), *i-ba-šu-û* (EA 285:23), *i₁₅-ba-šu-mi* (EA 185:50). Two of the forms which Ebeling interpreted as 3rd m.s. are actually the 3rd m.pl.:

a-nu-ma ¹A-zi-ru DUMU / ¹İR-A-ši-ir-ta qa-du / ŠEŠ.MEŠ-šu i-na
^{URU}Du-ma-aš-qa / ^ù uš-ši-ra ERÍN.MEŠ / pí-ṭá-ti ^ù ti-il-qé-šu / ^ù
ta-ap-šu-uh KUR LUGAL / ^ù šum-ma ki-a-ma i-ba-šu / ^ù ¹la¹-a
ti-zi-za / ^{URU}Šu-mu-ra "Now Aziru, son of ^cAbdi-Ashirta, with
his brothers are in Damascus, so send the army that it may
capture him and the land of the king may become peaceful; but
if thus they be (here), then Šumur will not stand (against them)"
(EA 107:26-34; Rainey 1973c:249; cf. Moran 1950a:98; 1987b:304;
1992:181); šá-ni-tam yi-il₅-ma-ad LUGAL EN-ia / *i₁₅-pí-iš* ŠEŠ-šu ša
i₁₅-ba-aš-¹ša¹ / *i-na* ^{URU}Gub-la i-nu-ma na-¹da¹-[an] /
DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ ša ¹Ri-¹ib¹-¹d¹¹IŠKUR¹ / ¹ša¹! *i₁₅-ba-aš-šu*
it-ti-¹šu! / *a-na* LÚ.MEŠ ar-nu-¹ti¹! ¹ša¹ / šār-ri ša i-na
^{KUR}A-¹mur¹-r[i] "Furthermore, may the king, my lord, learn the
deed of his brother who is in Byblos, that he has handed over
the sons of Rib-Haddi who were with him(!) to the traitors to

the king who are in the land of Amurru!" (EA 142:18-24; Rainey 1973c:249 n. 68, 262).

It was Youngblood (1961:120-121) who first recognized that the EA scribes from Canaan used *ibašši* as the theme for their hybrid suffix conjugation verb "to be" because they knew about its status as a prefix stative in Akkadian. Syntactically, all the inflected forms of *bašû* in these texts (including those from Taanach) function as *qtl*'s.

The invention of *ibaššâku*, *ibaššâti*, *ibaššâta*, *ibaššât*, *ibaššânu* and *ibaššâtunu* generated other hybrids including some from *izzuzu* and others from verbs not originally belonging to the "prefix statives." The description of the additional hybrids on this pattern will be given below.

izzuzu. Treatment of the irregular verb *izzuzu* by the Canaanite scribes is mixed. There are over a dozen instances of prefix forms, in the various modes: e.g. 3rd m.s. indicative imperfect *yi-zi-zu* (EA 362:65), and probably with ventive *yi-zi-za* (EA 132:48; cf. *supra*, pp. 53, 206-208), jussive *yi-zi-iz* (EA 74:61; 89:55; probably also EA 113:37, 44); and preterite *yi-iz-zi-iz* (EA 250:42), *yi-zi-iz* (EA 132:10), ; 3rd f.s. volitive (?) *ti-zi-za* (EA 107:33); 1st c.s. preterite *iz-zi-iz* (EA 197:20; 245:9); indicative energetic *i-zi-zu-na* (EA 124:16); volitive *i-zi-za* (EA 71:25; 104:49!); 1st c.pl. jussive *ni-zi-iz* (EA 279:18).

On the other hand, there are 1st c.s. statives to which the suffix has been appended on the model of the *ibaššâti* forms. One of them expresses the present:

ù a-nu-ma i-na / URUŠu-mu-ra i-zi-za-ti "and now I am stationed in Šumur" (EA 103:14-15).

Another is in past tense:

i-nu-ma TUR a-na-ku ù / šu-ri-ba-ni a-na KURMi-iš-ri / ù ur-ra-ad-ti LUGAL / be-li-ia ù iz-zi-iz-ti / i-na KÁ.GAL LUGAL be-li-ia "When I was you, then he sent me down to Egypt and I

served the king, my lord, and I stood (was stationed) in the city gate of the king, my lord" (EA 296:25-29).

It can even be in the future:

a-di ma-ti i-zi-[za]-ti₇ it-ti-šu "How long shall I stay with him?" (EA 138:133).

A question arises about the 3rd m.s. forms which lack the *y-* prefix. Many of the contexts are obscure but they all seem to be past tense.

a-nu-ma 3-ta-an i-zi-iz UGU-ia MU.KÁM.MEŠ / a-ni-ta "Now three times he has attacked me this year" (EA 85:8-9); *ù iq-bi a-na LÚ ù iz-zi-iz / GÍR ZABAR UGU-ia* "and he spoke to a man and he attacked me with a bronze dagger" (EA 82:37-38; Albright and Moran 1948:247-248 n. 24; Moran 1987b:264 n. 5; 1992:152 n. 5).

There are also three forms which are written in the theme of the Akkadian G present, *izzazzu*, which could be 3rd m.s. imperfect or 3rd m.pl. *izzazzū*. The parallel verb forms are *il₅-te₉-qú-ú*: (EA 237:2; 238:27) and *il₅-te₉-qú* (EA 237:5), which could be 3rd m.pl. if one assumes a purely Akkadian form (Moran 1987b:463, 464; 1992:294, 295), *ilteqû*. However, one of the two texts in question has *i₁₅-ba-aš-š[a-]ti* (EA 237:13), a clearly Canaanite hybrid; therefore, it seems logical to assume that the scribe would have used the *t-* prefix if he were intending to represent the prefix conjugation. Of course, it is possible that the absence of either the *y-* or the *t-* prefix may indicate that the scribe was using the prefixless verb forms as equivalent of his own *qtl* conjugation pattern. In that case, *ilteqû* and *izzazzū* would simply be 3rd m.pl.

[*i*]₅-te₉-qú-ú ¹La-a[b-a-ya] / *ù iz-za-az-zu* UGU URU.DI[DLI.ḪÁ] / *ša* ¹šar-ri EN-ia / *ù il*₅-te₉-qú URU.DIDLI.ḪÁ / *ša* ¹LUGAL EN-ia "They have taken La[b^aaya] and they have attacked the cit[ies] of the king, my lord, and they have taken the cities of

the king, my lord" (EA 237:2-6); *a-nu-um-ma / iš-tu u₄-mi uš-ši-^rir^l[-ti] / ṭup-pa an-na-am / i-na É.GAL [ù] / iz-za-zu U[GU-ia]* "Now, from the day [I] sent this tablet to the palace, they have attacked [me]" (EA 237:18-22); *ù il₅-te₉-qú [. . .] / ù iz-za--zu UGU[-ia] / ù il₅-te₉-qú URU.DIDLI[.ḪÁ] / ša LÚGAL EN-ia* "and they took [. . .] and they attacked [me] and they took the citie[s] of the official, my lord" (EA 238:25-28).

In any case, the forms of *izzuzu*, with their *-a-* thematic vowel, must be viewed as past tense. The *ilteqû* forms could all be Gtn preterite; the plural accusatives, "cities," could imply iterative action, one attack after another. Then the *izzazzu* forms could be for Akkadian *iparras* form in past continuous.

idû. Perhaps the most high frequency verb from among the Akkadian "preformative statives" is *idû* "to know" (GAG:102, §78b). The Akkadian preterite, *īde*, *tīde*, etc., was the basic conjugated form in this stative function; 1st c.s. was *īde* like the 3rd m.s. This usage is also known in the other peripheral dialects, e.g. from Egypt:

ù im-ma-ti ta-aš-pu-ra LÚ-ka DUGUD / ša i-de₄ a-ḫa-at-ka "but when have you sent one of your important men who knows/knew your sister?" (EA 1:15-16; Pintore 1972a; Moran 1975a:156 n. 1; 1987b:62 n. 4; 1992:3 n. 4; Cochavi-Rainey 1990b:21).

The texts from Canaan do not show any 1st c.s. forms with the *-(ā)ti* suffix or any other persons with suffixes from the *qtl* pattern. On the other hand, personal prefixes, *y-*, *t-* and *n-* are common. There are two examples of Canaanite imperfect as future:

a-di ^ryi^l-du šār-ru / a-^rna^l KUR.MEŠ-šu ù yu-wa-ši-ru / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭá-ti-šu ù / yu-ša-ap-ši-ḫu KUR.MEŠ-šu "until the king is apprised concerning his lands and sends his army and pacifies his lands" (EA 112:36-39; also EA 182:14-15).

And there are two others as present:

[*ia*]-*nu* 'LÚ' *ša yi-iq-b[i]* / *ki-ti-ia a-na pa-ni šar-ri* / EN-*ia ki-ti-ia yi-du* <LUGAL> / *yi-du LUGAL ma-ni UD.KÁM.MEŠ* / *yi-pu-šu du-um-qa* / *a-na ia-ši i-nu-ma* / *ia-nu lib-bi ša-na a-'na' ia-ši* / *pa-nu-ia-ma a-na a-ra-ad* / *šar-ri EN-ia* "There was [n]o man who tol[d] the king of my loyalty; <the king> knows my loyalty; the king knows how long a time he has done good to me because I have no other intention; it is my purpose to serve the king, my lord" (EA 119:36-44).

All the other instances of this verb lack any prefix modal suffixes except -Ø. The majority of occurrences are injunctive, with or without a personal prefix. The definition and categorization of these many injunctives is a special challenge. The OB and OA precative was *lū ide*, which is somewhat anomalous (cf. *supra*, p. 213). It probably derived from the function of the preterite, *ide*, *tīde*, etc., as a syntactic stative. The precative *lū ide* evidently corresponded to *lū paris*. Such injunctives are plentiful, mainly in the Byblos texts. Contrary to a former suggestion (Rainey 1973c:245-246), those particular constructions may not be understood as affirmations. They must be interpreted as real injunctives.

lu-ú i-de šar-ru / EN *i-nu-ma šal-ma-at* URU *Gub-la GEMÉ* / *ki-it-ti ša šar-ri iš-tu UD.KÁM.MEŠ* / *ša ab-bu-ti-šu à 'an'-nu-uš i-na-an-na* / *i-te-zi-ib šar-ru URU ki-it-ti-šu* / *iš-tu qa-ti-šu* "May the king, the lord, be apprised that Byblos, the faithful handmaiden of the king, has been at peace since the days of his fathers, but now the king has abandoned his faithful city!" (EA 74:5-10).

Numerous other passages of this type may be cited (EA 68:9; 76:7; 78:7; 81:6; 116:6; 144:10; *et al.*).

Some of the scribes in Canaan created a more "conventional" injunctive, conforming to the precative pattern, viz. *li-de-(mi)* (EA 174:18; *et al.*).

li-de-mi / šār-ru EN-ia i-nu-ma / iš-tu i-re-bi ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ti / i-te₉ -pu-uš-mì¹La-ab-a-yu / nu-kúr-ta i-na mu-uḫ-ḫi-ia "May the king, my lord, be apprised that, since the army has gone home, Lab³ayu has made war against me!" (EA 244:8-12; Rainey 1973c:244).

However, the WS jussive pattern led to the adoption of forms such as *lu-ú yi-de*. For example, another Megiddo letter has the parallel text to that cited just above:

ù a-nu-um-ma d[a]-a[n-na-a]t / nu-kúr-ti₇ LÚ.MEŠ¹SA¹.GAZ i-na KUR-ti ù lu-ú yi-de / šār-ru EN-ia a-na KUR.KI-šu "And now the hostility of the ^c*apîrû* men is in[tensi]ve in the land, so may the king take cognizance of his land" (EA 243:19-22).

As jussives the prefix forms with $-\emptyset$ suffix can be used without the particle *lū*, for example:

yi-de šār-ru EN-li / i-nu-ma¹Pu-ba-á-la / ¹DUMU ÌR-A-ši-ir-ta / i-te₉ -ru-ub a-na^{URU}Ul-la-sà "May the king, my lord, be apprised that Pu-Ba^cla, the son of ^cAbdi-Ashirta, has entered into Ullasa!" (EA 104:6-9).

In the same manner, forms without the *y-* prefix can also serve as injunctives:

i-de lib-bi / LUGAL EN i-nu-ma ni-na-ša-ru / ^{URU}Ir-qa-ta a-na sa[-š]u "May the heart of the king know that we are protecting the town of ^cIrqata for him!" (EA 100:8-10; Moran 1987b:293 n. 2; 1992:173; cf. also e.g. EA 106:47; 137:30-31; 144:19, 22; 260:12-13; 304:22-23; 305:23-24).

The practical understanding of such forms is clear from their contexts but the theoretical classification is another matter. Were they, in the eyes of the scribes, simply jussives without the *y-* prefix, or were they considered to be statives in the optative mode? Two similar passages, both with 1st c.s. *īde*, but with an

essential difference, may shed some light on this question. The first example is that of a purpose clause which is dependent upon an imperative:

ù / te-ra-ni a-wa-ta₅ ù i-de / ip-ša ša i-pu-šu "So send back word to me that I may know the thing that I must do" (EA 114:24-26).

The second is a purpose clause dependent upon an indicative question:

a-na mi-ni la-a tu-te-ru-[n]a / a-wa-ta a-na ia-a-ši ù / i-de ip-ša ša i-pu-[šu] "Why do you not send word back to me so that I may know the thing that I must d[o]?" (EA 83:7-9; the context of EA 85:59-60 is unclear).

In accordance with the rule of modal congruence for purpose clauses (Moran 1950a:81-89), *ide* in EA 114:24-26 ought to be an injunctive, viz. a jussive. By the same rule, *ide* in EA 83:7-9 ought to be an indicative, i.e. the equivalent of an imperfect since the preceding clause also contained an imperfect energetic, 2nd m.s. *tuterrūna*. However, there is another possible common denominator which might have been the factor behind this usage, viz. the status of *ide* as a stative. The stative, like the suffix conjugation in all its nuances, is syntactically the equivalent of the indicative imperfect; on the other hand, the suffix conjugation, including statives, can express succession after injunctives, especially the imperative (Moran 1950a:139 n. 228). This future tense function of *qtl* will be discussed at length in the next chapter (cf. *infra*, pp. 358-365). The conclusion seems to be that the Canaanite scribes did have a feel for the stative function of the verb *idû* and that they employed it as such within the modal framework of their epistolary language (in spite of the obvious inflectional differences).

Of further interest are the many passages where *ide*, *tide* and *nide* express the indicative past, present or future. In the preterite no modal suffix other than the normal -Ø would be expected:

a-na-ku Ṛ *ki-ti-ka* / *ù a-wa-ta ša-a i-de* / *ù ša-a eš-te-me aš-pu-r[u]*
 / *a-na šār-ri* "I am your faithful servant and the thing which I
 have learned and the thing which I have heard, I write to the
 king" (EA 108:22-25); *i-nu-ma ni-de* *ù* KAL.GA / *ni-iq-bi* *a-na*
 LUGAL KAL.GA "When we became aware that they were
 strong, we sai<d> to the king, "They are strong"" (EA 108:43-44;
 Moran 1987b:306, 307 n. 7; 1992:182 n. 8).

The parallels in each case to another preterite assures the tense value of 1st c.s. *īde* and 1st c.pl. *nīde* respectively.

The context shows that the next example also has to be interpreted as a preterite:

ša-ni-tam / *a-na* ¹DUMU.MU-*ia* *ša-pār šār-ru* / *ú-ul i₁₅-de i-nu-ma*
 / ¹DUMU.MU-*ia* *it-ti* / LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ / *it-ta-na-la-ku*
 "Furthermore, the king has written concerning my son; I did
 not know that my son was associating with the *ʔapîrû* men"
 (EA 254:30-35).

The present tense examples, of which there are almost twenty, do not have the imperfect *-u* suffix. Rib-Haddi said to his commissioner:

ú-ul / *ti-i-de* ^{KUR}A-*mur-ri i-nu-ma* / *a-šār da-an-ni ti-la-ku-na*
 "Don't you know Amurru, that they will follow the strong
 one?" (EA 73:14-16); *ti-i-de pa-ar-ša-ia* / *i-nu-ma i-ba-ša-ta i-na* /
¹URU¹ *Šu¹-mu-ra i-nu-ma* / ¹Ṛ¹ *ki¹-it-ti-ka a-na-ku* "You know my
 behavior when you were in Šumur, that I am/was your loyal
 servant" (EA 73:39-42).

In a letter to Pharaoh he says:

a-nu-um-ma ¹Pa-*ḥa-am[-n]a-ta* / LÚMAŠKÍM LUGAL *ša i[-n]a* /
 URU¹ *Šu-mu-ra* ^{K1} *i-[d]e-mì* / *pu-uš-qám \ ma-gal* / *ša* UGU
 URU¹ *Gub-la* "Now Paḥamnata, the king's commissioner, who is
 in Šumur, knows the great pressure that is on Byblos"
 (EA 68:22-26)

The Tyrian letters do not use *īde* injunctively but only as an indicative present (or future, cf. *infra*, pp. 352-358), e.g.

li-iš-al LUGAL / ^{LÚ}MAŠKÍM-šu ša *i-de*₄ ^{KUR}Ki-na-aḥ-na "May the king ask his commissioner who knows Canaan!" (EA 148:46); LUGAL *i-de*₄ šu-u[m]-ma ša-ak-na-ta-ni / *i-na* ^{LÚ}MAŠKÍM *i-na* ^{KUR}Šur-ri "The king knows whether he appointed me as commissioner in Tyre" (EA 149:47-48; cf. also EA 149:81-82; 152:53-55; 155:58-59).

The ruler of Shechem also says:

*i*₁₅-*de ip-še-et* / ¹Mil-ki-li UGU-ia "I know the deed of Milkili against me" (EA 254:28-29).

Note that in the same epistle, *īde* is also used in a preterite sense (EA 254:30-35; *supra*, p. 326-327).

The 3rd m.pl. *īdû* is also used with present meaning:

i-nu-ma ša-ṭe₆-er be-li / *a-na maḥ-ri-ia ù a-nu-mi* / *ù i-du i-nu-ma ta-mu-tu-na* "Since my lord has written to me, now they know that they will die" (EA 362:42-44).

The examples with future tense significance are rare, two or three at best. One from Byblos (EA 83:9) has already been compared with an injunctive (cf. *supra*, p. 326). An additional passage, from Tyre, reads as follows:

*a-nu-um-ma iš-pu-ra a-na be-li-ia ù SIG₅ e-nu-ma i-de*₄ "Now I have written to my lord and it is good that he know" (EA 147:70).

le²û. The other prefix stative that is treated according to the prefix conjugation pattern is *le²û* "to be able." Injunctives do not seem to be attested, probably due to the special semantic nuance of this verb. Most of the forms are inflected as indicative imperfects expressing present tense. The Jerusalem letters avoid

WS inflections and employ acceptable Akkadian forms, just as they do for other prefix verbal constructions (cf. below). One Jerusalem form is a Babylonian construction:

ù la-a i-le-é²-e e-za-bi-ša / KUR.ĤÁ URU^{URU}Ū-ru-ša₁₀-lim^{KI} "And I am unable to abandon it, (namely) the territory of Jerusalem" (EA 287:62-63);

Two other instances are Assyrian in form:

ù la a-la-á²-e / e-ra-ba iš-tu(sic!) LUGAL EN-ia "And I am unable to come before(!) the king, my lord" (EA 286:41-43; Moran 1975b:154); *la-a a-la-á²-e / mu-še-ra* KASKAL.MEŠ / *a-na šār-ri* EN-ia "I am unable to send caravans to the king, my lord" (EA 287:57-59; Moran *loc. cit.*).

There are a few instances in the Byblos and other texts where *le²û* appears without any prefix conjugation modal suffix (other than the original -Ø). Comparison between forms with WS imperfect suffixes and those with none reveals that they all express the same meaning. For 3rd m.s. with *y-* and imperfect *-u* note:

a-nu-ma / [PN] DUMU *ši-ip-ri-[ia]* / [*uš*]-*ši-ir-ti-šu* *ù aš-ta-ni* / [*m*]*a-ni* UD.KÁM.MEŠ *ú-wa-ši-ru-šu* / *ù la-a yi-le-ú* / *i-re-ba a-na* URU^{URU}Šu-*mu-ra* "Now, as for [PN,] my ambassador, I have sent him repeatedly; how long have I been sending him and he has been unable to enter Šumur!" (EA 114:35-37);

where the context indicates repeated action in the past. To express that nuance the scribe felt compelled to use an imperfect form of *le²û*. On the other hand, for the protasis of a conditional sentence, the bare form, with Ø suffix, is used:

[*šum-m*]*a la-a i-le-e* / [*šār-r*]*u la-qa-ia iš-tu* / [*qa-at*] *na-ak-ri-šu* / [*ù* *i*]_{n₄}-*né-ep-ša-at* / [*ka-l*]*i* KUR.KI.MEŠ / [*a-na* Ī]_{R-A}-*ši-ir-ta* "[If the kin]g is unable to rescue me from his enemies, [then al]l the

lands will be joined to ‘Abdi-Ashirta’ (EA 79:39-44; also EA 92:51);

However, other Byblos scribes use the WS imperfect in the same syntagma:

šum-ma la-a ti-le-ú la-qa-^fia¹ / iš-tu qa-at na-ak-ri-ia ù / te-ra-ni a-wa-ta₅ "If you are unable to deliver me from my enemies, then send me word" (EA 114:23-25).

When a question was involved, the imperfect energetic was used:

aq-ta-bi ù aš-ta-ni / a-na ka-ta₅ ú-ul ti-le-ú-na / la-qa-ia iš-tu qa-at / ʾĪR-A-ši-ir-ta "I have said to you repeatedly, 'Are you unable to deliver me from ‘Abdi-Ashirta?’" (EA 82:5-8).

The 1st c.s. imperfect forms, written *i-le-ú*, are almost all present in meaning:

mi-na / i-pu-šu-na ù a-na-ku / la-a i-le-ú a-la-^fka₁₃¹ / a-na šu-mu-ra "What can I do since I am unable to go to Šumur?" (EA 104:36-39; also EA 82:22; 102:24; 105:29, 87; 109:56; 113:29; 116:52; 126:7; 264:9).

The same letter employs the future tense in the apodosis of a conditional sentence:

ša-ma-ma šu-nu / >šu-nu< i-nu-ma i-te₉-ru-bu / i-na^{URU} šu-mu-ra / URU.MEŠ an-nu-tu <i-na>^{GIŠMÀ}.MEŠ / ù DUMU.MEŠ ʾĪR-A-ši-i[r-]ta / i-na šé-ri ù / [i]z-[z]i-za UGU-<šu-nu> ù / la-a i-le-ú / a-ša ù ep-ša-at^{URU} Gub-la / [a]-na LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ a-na^{URU} I-bir₅-ta / al-ka-<ti> ù 'bu¹-ú in₄-né-ep-ša / a-na LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ "If they hear that I am entering into Šumur, these cities (will be in) ships and the sons of ‘Abdi-Ashirta (will be) on land and I will be up against <them> and I will be unable to go forth lest Byblos go over to the ‘*apîrû* men.'" (EA 104:43-52; Rainey 1989-90:59b).

In one letter, there might be a distinction between present with *-u* and past with *-Ø*:

šá-ni-tam / i-nu-ma ta-aš-pu-ra a-na ia-ši / a-lik-mi i-zi-iz a-na
 URUŠu-mu-ur / a-di ka-ša-di-ia / [t]i-de i-nu-ma nu-kúr-tu₄^{MEŠ} /
 KAL.GA ma-gal UGU-ia / ù ú-ul i-le-¹hē¹ a-la[-k]₁₃
 "Furthermore, inasmuch as you have written to me, 'Go, take
 up a position in Šumur until my arrival,' you should know that
 hostilities are very intense against me and I was unable to go"
 (EA 102:13-19; Moran 1987b:296; 1992:175).

This passage may be compared with another further on:

ù ki-na-an-na la i-le-ú / a-la-ka₁₃ "and thus I am unable to go"
 (EA 102:24-25).

In fact, *i-le-ú* in line 24 strongly suggests that the unique spelling in line 19, *i-le-¹hē¹* is nothing but an illusion; the disputed form is much more likely to be read *i-le-ú!*

The usual nuance of the 1st c.s. forms with *-Ø* suffix is, as with most of the other persons, present tense:

a-nu-ma / [ki-a]-ma aš-ba-ti ù qa-la-ti i-na / [lib-bi URU-]ia la-a i-le-e
a-ša / [a-na EDIN.MEŠ] "Now, [th]us I sit and I keep quiet
 [with]in my [town]; I am unable to go forth [to the open field]"
 (EA 81:19-22; Moran 1987b:262 n. 5; 1992:151); ù URU.KI ša
i₁₅-ba-aš-ša-ti / i-na lib-bi-ši la-a e-le-ē²-e / na-ša-ar-ši "And as for
 the city within which I am, I am unable to protect it"
 (EA 238:7-9).

Nearly all of the sentences containing a form of *le'ú* are in the negative. One exception to this rule also happens to have future connotation; the text is from Sidon:

ù yi-din-ni / LUGAL i-[n]a qa[-a]t LÚ-li ša yi-la-ak / i-na pa-ni
 ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-at LUGAL / a-na ša-al URU.DIDL.KI.[Ĥ]Á ša
in₄-né-ep-šu / a-na LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ / ù tú-ta-ri-ši-na i-na /

qa-ti-ia ù i-lé-i a-ra-ad / LUGAL EN-ia ki-i-ma LÚ.MEŠ a-bu-ti-nu / pa-na-nu-um "May the king assign me to the man who is coming at the head of the king's army to attack the citie[s] which have gone over to the ^c*apîrû* men so that it may return them to my authority and I will be able to serve the king, my lord like my fathers before!" (EA 144:26-34 Moran 1987b:375 n. 2; 1992:230-231 n. 3).

An example of the positive and the negative in the same context also illustrates the 3rd m.pl. without a WS prefix or a WS imperfect *-na* suffix:

ù a-nu-ma i-na-an-na ši-iḫ-tá-at / URUŠu-mu-ra a-di a-bu-li-ši / ša-ḫa-aṭ-ši i-le-ú ù ša-bat-ši la i-le-ú "And now Šumur is hard pressed (plundered) up to its gate; to press it hard (to plunder it) they are able, but to conquer it they are not able" (EA 106:10-13; CAD A/1:84b; Moran 1950a:29; 1987b:302; 1992:179).

Finally, it should be noted that all forms of *le'û* employed in these texts govern some infinitive in the accusative, *alāka*, *uššar(a)*, *našār(a)*, *erāba*, etc. In effect, the constructions with *le'û* can be called "verbal compounds." One apparent exception to the rule that *le'û* governs an infinitive is the following passage from Tyre where the infinitival accusatives are unexpressed but implied from the context:

pa-nu-ia a-na a-la-ki / a-na a-ma-ri pa-ni LUGAL be-li-[i]a / ù la-a i-lé-e iš-tu / qa-ti¹Zi-im-re-da URUŠí-du-na^{KI} "My intention is to come and to see the face of the king, my lord, but I am unable because of Zimredda (of) Sidon" (EA 151:8-11; contrast Moran 1987b:385; 1992:238).

In summary, one can say that the Canaanite scribes do use forms of *le'û* as "prefix statives" on some occasions but they never append the personal suffixes of the *qtl* conjugation pattern. On the other hand, they most often inflect *le'û* as a prefix verb, using the

WS person markers and modal suffixes of the imperfect and the imperfect energetic.

OTHER SUFFIX CONJUGATION HYBRIDS

If the conjugation of *ibašši* with personal suffixes of the WS *qtl* pattern, which evidently fostered the similar application of such constructions to *izzuzu*, did not bear fruit with regard to *idû* and *le'û*, it was productive with regard to other verbs, mainly those of a reflexive or particularly stative nature.

REFLEXIVE STEMS.

nenpušu. Since the forms of *bašû* in these texts were all based on the Akkadian present 3rd m.s. *ibašši*, the N stem of that verb was ignored (except for the lone example of Ntn preterite, *ittabšû* in TT 2:26). So the Canaanite scribes evidently sought another means to express "to become." Their choice fell on the N stem of *epēšu*. The majority of passages, however, cannot be precisely rendered "become"; they pertain to those groups or persons who transferred their allegiance to one political factor or the other, usually the *ʿapîru* ([SA.]GAZ) or, conversely, the king of Egypt. The best rendering is "to align oneself with, to join" (Moran 1987a). An example of this special idiom also illustrates the contrast between *bašû* and *nenpušu*:

gāb-ḫbi URU.MEŠ-*ia ša i-na* ḪUR.SAG \ *ḫa-ar-ri ù i-na aḫi a-ia-ab*
/ *i-ba-aš-šu in-né-ep-šu a-na* ERÍN.MEŠ GAZ "All of my towns
that are in the mountains and on the sea coast have committed
themselves to the *ʿapîrû*" (EA 74:19-21).

Moran (1950a:62) had recognized that both verbs were 3rd m.pl. (and not 3rd m.s. plus Akkadian subjunctive) and Youngblood (1961:138) remarked that they reflect the use of 3rd m.pl. for a feminine plural subject (*ālāniya* in Byblos is always treated as feminine! Albright 1943a:17; Moran 1950a:129 n. 149) in the Canaanite *qtl* conjugation pattern.

However, unlike *ibašši*, *nenpušu* is inflected both according to the prefix and the suffix conjugation patterns. The theme adopted for both patterns is, nevertheless, the same; it is the 3rd m.s. N stem preterite, *innepuš*. The initial syllable sign is *in* or EN, which latter has been uniformly transcribed *in*₄ in all our transliterations; ample justification for this practice is furnished by the spellings in EA 77:28 and EA 362:63; cf. below). Likewise, the second syllable sign is invariably NI, which has been transcribed here as *né*; the sign NE (Labat No. 173) is never used in the EA texts with the value *ne* (it often does appear with the old value *bī*), so there is no sound reason not to transcribe NI by *né* when grammar is in favor of it.

The majority of the attested forms from *nenpušu* show elision of the thematic vowel when vocalic suffixes are added, viz. 1st c.s. *in*₄-*né-ep-ša-ti*₇ (EA 297:12), 2nd m.s. *in*₄-*né-ep-ša-ta* (EA 333:18), 3rd f.s. *in-né-ep-ša-at* (EA 77:28), 3rd m.pl. *in-né-ep-šu* (EA 74:21), and *in*₄-*né-ep-šu* (EA 79:19; 81:41; *et al.*). On the other hand, there is 3rd f.s. *i-né-pu-ša-at* (EA 362:63), where the thematic vowel is not elided. Some prefix forms also drop the thematic vowel, e.g. 3rd f.s. *ti-né-ep-šu* (EA 8:33), 3rd m.pl. *ti-né-ep-šu* (EA 74:27; 76:42), while others do not: 3rd m.s. *yi-né-pu-ša* (EA 234:32), 3rd m.pl. *ti-né-pu-šu* (EA 73:32), and *te-né-pu-šu-na* (EA 138:83). It is hardly likely that those latter forms reflect the Akkadian present theme (*inneppuš-*); some scribes simply did not obey the rules of Akkadian phonology. The supposed preterite 3rd m.s. *yi-in*₄-*na-pí-iš* (EA 250:33) has been corrected by Moran (1987b:476 n. 4; 1992:304 n. 4) to *yi-in*₄-¹*na*¹-¹*pí*¹-¹*il*! Note also the use of the same theme for the 2nd m.pl. imperative *in-né-ep-šu* (EA 73:28; 81:12; Moran 1950a:150) and for a form which can hardly be anything else but an infinitive, *in*₄-*né-ep-ša* (EA 104:53; cf. *infra*, p. 377). The syntactic functions of the prefix forms have already been discussed (*supra*, pp. 123-126).

The most striking morphological feature of *nenpušu* is the use of hybrid forms from the suffix conjugation. Their semantic nuances and their syntactic contexts are illustrative of the role of the N stem from *epēšu* in the EA texts from Canaan. It is not surprising that one function is as the passive of the G stem, this in

spite of the fact that G passives from *epēšu* do occur (cf. *supra*, pp. 77, 300-301, 304). Three passages with what must be taken as *qtl* forms illustrate this function, one from Hazor:

[ù] *li-ih-šu-uš-mi* / \ *ia-az-ku-ur-mi* / ¹*šar-ri* EN-*ia* / *mi-im-ma ša* / *in₄-né-pu-uš-mi* UGU ^{URU}*Ha-šú-ra*^{KI} / URU.KI-*ka* ù / UGU ^{IR}-*ka*
 "[So] may my king, my lord, remember everything that has been done against Hazor your city and against your servant" (EA 228:18-25; Rainey 1973c:252-253).

Another is in a somewhat broken context from Byblos:

i-na-an-na / KÚR-*kùr-tu₄*^{MEŠ} ¹*maš¹-ši-ik-tu₄* *it-ti-[ia]* ¹*in₄-né-pu-uš* "Now a vicious aggression has been perpetrated against [me]" (EA 92:11; Moran 1950a:161; Youngblood 1961:367; Rainey 1973c:252).

The third selection requires an obvious emendation:

al-lu-mi ¹*Ri-ib-* ^d*IŠKUR* / *i-na qa-ti-ka* ù *mi-im-mu* / *ša* [<]*in₄-né-ep-šu a-na ša-šu* UGU-¹*ka*¹ "Behold, Rib-Haddi is in your charge and everything that is/has been done to him is your responsibility" (EA 83:40-42; Moran 1950a:31; 1987b:265,266 n. 6; 1992:153, 154 n. 6; Youngblood 1961:317; cf. also Rainey 1973c:252).

The forms in EA 106:30-34 were evidently intended to be taken as prefix verbs (cf. *supra*, p. 124).

The meaning "to become" is actually rare. Two passages with that nuance evidently reflect what must have been a popular proverbial saying. The first example provides the only instance of the 1st c.s. suffix with this verb:

ša-ni-tam ù *in₄-né-ep-ša-ti₇* / *ki-ma ri-qi* URUDU \ *sí-ri* / *hu-bu-ul-li* / ¹*iš¹-tu qa-at* / LÚ.MEŠ ¹*Su¹-te*^{MEŠ} "Furthermore, so I have become like a damaged copper pot due to the Sutû" (EA 297:12-16; Rainey 1973c:251; 1989-90:71b-72a; contrast

Moran 1987b:522 n. 4, 527 n. 1; 1992:335 n. 4; Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:490a);

The second example is in the 3rd f.s.:

a-mur ip-ši / ¹Pé-e-ia DUMU ^{MÍ}Gu-la-t[i₇] / a-na ^{URU}Gaz-ri ^{MÍ}GEMÉ-ti₇ / ša LUGAL EN-ia ma-ni / UD.KÁM.MEŠ yi-šal-la-l[u]-š[i] / ù in₄-né-ep-ša-at [ki-ma] / ri-qi hu-bu-l[i] / a-na ša-šu "Behold the deed of Pe³ya, son of Gulati, against Gaza, the handmaiden of the king, my lord; how long will he plunder it so that she becomes [like] a damaged pot because of him?" (EA 292:41-49; contra Moran 1987b:522 n. 4; 1992:335 n. 4).

A third example is from Byblos:

ù iq-bi a-na LÚ.MEŠ [^{URU}Baṭ-ru-n]a / [du-]ku-mi EN-ku-nu ù in₄-né-[ep-šu] / [a-na] LÚ.MEŠ GAZ ki-ma ^{URU}Am-m[i-ia] / [ù] in₄-né-ep-šu ar-⟨nu⟩ a-na [ia-ši] "And he said to the men of [Baṭrun]a, 'Kill your lord and jo[in] the ^c*apîrû* men like Amm[īya] [and] they became trai⟨tors⟩ to [me]" (EA 81:11-14; Rainey 1973c:252; Moran 1987b:261-262 n. 2; 1992:151 n. 2).

The 2nd m.pl. imperative *in₄-né-[ep-šu]* cited above reflects the third nuance for which *nenpušu* is best known in the EA texts from Canaan, viz. "to become (allied) with, to join." With this meaning there are nearly twenty examples of the suffix conjugation and ten examples of the prefix conjugation. Over a dozen of these verb forms reflect the defection of people or towns, i.e. political bodies, to the (SA.)GAZ = '*apîru*. That had led to the assumption that *nenpušu* in such contexts meant "to become (^c*apîrû*)" (Liverani 1979). However, the other passages refer to defection to someone, including the speaker:

šum-ma-mi a-na-ku / uš-šú-na UGU KUR / ša LUGAL ù a-na ia-ši / in₄-né-ep-ša-ta "If (when) I go forth against the land of the king, then will you be with me?" (EA 333:15-18; cf. Moran 1987b:551, 552 n. 7; 1992:356, 357 n. 7).

or to another person, such as ^cAbdi-Ashirta (cf. EA 79:18-26, 38-44 cited below) or his son Aziru (EA 138:93) or conversely, the king of Egypt:

¹a¹-¹mur¹-mi a-na ú-mi tu-šú / ù i-né-pu-ša-at gáb-bi / KUR.MEŠ
a-na LUGAL be-li-ia "Behold, on the day that you come forth,
then all the lands will become aligned with the king, my lord"
(EA 362:62-64).

Moran (1987a) has pointed out that these latter prove conclusively that "to become" is impossible; the town or people cannot "become" ^cAbdi-Ashirta, Aziru or the king! Moran explains the nuance "to become (allied with)" as a corollary to the active use of *epēšu* with "city" as the object, with the meaning "to take over" (Moran 1987a:211; CAD E:202a, citing EA 174:22; 176:17; 179:17; 363:19 [all from the same scribe] plus Mari references)).

EA 148:45 and EA 79:24 are cited by Moran as additional examples of this idiom with G stem *epēšu*. The latter passage seems to reflect both the G and the N stem usages:

[šum-m]a ia-nu ERÍN.MEŠ pí-¹pí-[-tá-ti] / ù in₄-né-¹ep¹-šu ka-[li] /
[KUR.]MEŠ a-na LÚ.¹MEŠ¹ ¹GAZ¹.MEŠ ši-me / [iš]-tu ša-ba-at
URUÉ-A[r-ḥa] / [a-na] pí-i ¹IR-A-ši-ir-ta / [ù] ki-na-na tu-ba-ú-na /
[i-p]é-ša^{URU} Gub-la ù / ^{URU}Baṭ-ru-na^{KI} ù in₄-[né-ep-šu] / ka-li
KUR.KUR.MEŠ a-na LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ . . . ša-ni-tam / [šum-m]a
la-a i-le-e / [šàr-r]u la-qa-ia iš-tu / [qa-at] na-ak-ri-šu /
[ù i]n₄-né-ep-ša-at / [ka-l]i KUR.KI.MEŠ / [a-na ¹IR-A-ši-ir-ta "[I]f
there are no troops then al[1] the lands will become aligned
with the ^capîrû men. Listen! [Si]nce the capture of Bît-A[rḥa] at
the command of ^cAbdi-Ashirta, [then] thus they have been
seeking [the take]over of Byblos and Baṭruna so that all the
lands will [become aligned] with the ^capîrû men . . .
Furthermore, [if] the [kin]g is unable to rescue me from [the
hand of] his enemies, [then] [al] the lands will become aligned
[with] ^cAbdi-Ashirta" (EA 79:18-26, 38-44; Moran 1987a:258;
1987b:259; 1992:149).

etpušu. Although there are some prefix examples of this verb with identical meaning to *nenpušu* (cf. *supra*, pp. 111-113), none of the examples can be assigned with certainty to the suffix conjugation pattern.

ḥatû. This verb, meaning "to smite" (CAD H:151a-152b; AHw:336b) seems to be represented once in what may be a conflation of a *ti-* prefix and a *-ti* suffix. The strange form appears in a Byblos letter:

*ù an-nu-ú i-na-an-na ti-ir-bu / a-na É-ti ri-qi ga-mi-ir gáb-bu /
ti-iḥ-ta-ti gáb-ba* "And now, you will enter an empty house,
everything is used up, I am despoiled of everything"
(EA 102:11-13; Albright 1941:48; Moran 1987b:296; 1992:175).

Support for the interpretation of *ti-iḥ-ta-ti* as a 1st c.s. suffix form comes from a similar construction, *ta-šap-pár-ta* in the previous line (EA 102:10; cf. *supra*, p. 60, *infra*, pp. 345-346).

riāḥu. With one exception, the forms of this verb in the Canaanite Amarna texts are hybrids of the suffix conjugation (Rainey 1971b:93-94; 1973c:255-256; cf. *supra*, p. 101).

It may be that the G preterite with infixed *-t-* was chosen as the theme for all forms in accordance with a known tendency among peripheral scribes to prefer *-t-* augmented forms for weak verbs (cf. Gordon 1938:215). Nevertheless, one cannot escape the impression that the Canaanite scribes associated some reflexive nuance, expressed by a Gt, with the stative concept, "to remain, to be left over."

That the forms in the Canaanite texts which do not have a consonantal prefix are to be reckoned as *qt'l*'s is demonstrated by the 3rd f.s.:

*ù il-qe / [ka]-li URU.MEŠ-ia URUGub-la / [i]-na i-de-ni-ši ir-ti-ḥa-at
/ [a]-na ia-ši ù yu-ba-ú [erasure] / la-qa-ši* "and he has taken all of
my towns; Byblos alone remains to me and he is seeking to
take it" (EA 91:19-23; also EA 124:9-10).

Another example which has been taken for a dual because two towns are involved, might also be a defectively written 3rd f.s. since the normal rule with a feminine plural subject is either masculine plural or feminine singular (Moran 1950a:61). So the following rendering may be suggested:

URUGub-la ù ¹URUBaṭ-ru[-na] / [ir-t]i-ḥa-at a-na ia-ši ù 2 ¹URU
 'yu¹-[ba]-ù / [la]-¹qa¹-a "Byblos and Baṭruna remain to me and
 (these) two towns he is seeking to take " (EA 81:9-11).

The similar contexts with 3rd m.pl. forms must also be reckoned as *qtl*'s:

URUGub-*la* ḡa-du 2 URU.MEŠ ir-ti-ḥu a-na ia-ši "Byblos with two towns remain to me" (EA 74:22); a-nu-¹ma¹ 2 URU ša ir-ti-ḥu / [a]-[na] ia-ši yu-ba-ù la-qa "Now he is seeking to take the two towns that remain to me" (EA 76:9-10); URUŠu-mu-ra / ù URUIr-qa-ta ir-ti-ḥu / a-na LÚGAL "Šumur and ʿIrqata remain to the officer" (EA 103:11-13); ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ ma-ša-ar-ti / ša-a ir-ti-ḥu mar-ša-at "All of the garrison troops that remain are ill (EA 103:47-49; Rainey 1973c:256 n. 101).

VERBS OF MOTION

(w)ašû. Gt forms of this verb have been treated in an earlier chapter (cf. *supra*, pp. 82-83). There is one 3rd f.s. hybrid suffix form:

ù a-nu-ma iš-te-m[é] / ša₁₀-ri ša LUGAL DÙG-ta / ù it-ta-ša-at / a-na ia-ši ù pa-ši-iḥ / lib-bi-ia ma-gal "And now I have heard the sweet breath of the king, and it has come forth to me so that my heart is greatly relieved" (EA 297:16-21; Rainey 1971b:90; 1973c:256).

elû. For Gt forms of this verb within the prefix conjugation pattern, cf. *supra*, pp. 83-86. Some of those examples have a consonantal prefix but a few are characterized as prefix

conjugation only by the indicative imperfect *-u* (EA 92:23; 114:27; 127:31). However, there are a few others, all 3rd m.s., without any consonantal *y-* and with either *-Ø* or the Akkadian ventive, which seem to fill syntactic slots normally occupied by a *qtl*. One of these passages, with two examples, is a simple past narrative:

[šá-ni-t]am aš-tap-pár LÚDUMU.KIN-ia i-nu-ma / [il-q]é
 URU.KI.ĤÁ-ia ù i-te₉-la!-a[m] / [a-n]a še-ri-ia ù a-nu-um-ma /
 [i-n]a-an-na il-qé URUBaṭ-ru-na / 'ù' i-te-la-am a-na še-ri-ia /
 [ma?]-ḥar URU UGU! pí KÁ.GAL / [URU]Gub-la "[Furtherm]ore I
 have sent my emissary when he took my cities and came
 [aga]inst me and even now he has taken Baṭruna and he has
 come against me, [be]fore(?) the city, at the entrance of the city
 gate of Byblos" (EA 88:13-19; cf. Rainey 1975b:425 and nn.
 253-258; Youngblood 1961:312-313; Moran 1987b:274, 275
 nn. 2-3; 1992:160, 161 nn. 2-3).

The forms in question combine infixed *-t-* with the Akkadian ventive, both natural additions to this verb of motion; *itelâm* and *ilqe* may be taken as purely Akkadian forms and *aštappar* is most probably Gtn preterite. Still, it would seem likely that the 3rd m.s. verbs are at least calques on Canaanite suffix forms.

In the next passages Moran (1987b:336; 1992:203) assumes that we have a conditional sentence. There is no conditional particle unless *a-nu-ma* is considered at error for *i-nu-ma*. Taken at face value, the passage and the following sentence would seem to represent straight narrative reporting. But if that should prove to be the case, then the "taking" of Byblos in the first clause would be an event not easy to identify in the course of Rib-Haddi's troubled career. However, the use of *a-di* "still, again" (= Heb. 'ôḏ) in the next sentence does seem to suggest that we have here a series of events, not a hypothetical, conditional clause followed by a report:

a-nu-ma i-te₉-li ERÍN.MEŠ i-na / URUGub-la ù la-qa-ši_x(ŠE) /
i-na-na a-di yu-pa-ḥi-ru ka-[li] / URU.MEŠ ù yi-il-qú-ši_x(ŠE)"Now,

the army came up against Byblos and took it; now he is again mustering al[*l*] the cities and he will take it" (EA 124:12-15).

Here *i-te₉-li* is in tandem with *la-qa-ši_x*(ŠE), a *qtl* verb. The next clause is in the WS indicative imperfect. Therefore, it is quite probable that *iteli*, in the mind of the scribe, is filling the syntactic slot of a *qtl*.

In the third passage, *itela* and *ilteqe* are in the apodosis of a conditional sentence.

ʾšum¹-ma 2 ITI.MEŠ la-a tu[-ša-na] / [ERÍN].MEŠ pí-tá-ti ù i-te₉-la-[am!] / [I]R-A-ši-ir-ta ù il-te₉-qé 2 U[RU] "If in two months the army does not come forth, then 'Abdi-Ashirta will come up and he will take the two to[wns]" (EA 81:45-47; Rainey 1973c:259).

The fact that the second verb can only be the Akkadian *-t*-preterite in form, precludes taking *i-te₉-la-[am]* as a defective writing for *itellam*, the Akkadian Gt present. From the standpoint of Canaanite syntax, such Akkadian preterite forms can hardly be considered as anything else but calques for underlying WS *qtl* verbs.

erēbu. For this verb there are two 1st c.s. hybrids built on the Akkadian present as theme. They are in parallel passages from two of the Shechem letters (contrast the view expressed by Rainey 1973c:258):

an-nu-ú ar-nu-ia / ù an-nu-ú / ʾhi¹-tú-ia i-nu-ma / ir-ru-ba-ti i-na URUGaz-ri^{KI} "Behold my crime and behold my sin, that I entered into Gezer" (EA 253:18-22); ša-ni-tam / i₁₅-ba-aš-ši ar-ni-ia / i-nu-ma ir-ru-ba-ti / a-na URUGaz-ri "Furthermore, my crime is that I entered into Gezer" (EA 254:19-22)

In the light of these 1st c.s. hybrids, one must also consider the following example of what appears to be a simple Akkadian G preterite (cf. *supra*, p. 297):

li-il-ma-ad LUGAL / EN-*ia i-nu-ma* / ^{LÚ}ŠEŠ-*ia* TUR.[TU]R /
na-ka-ar iš-tu / *ia-ši u i-ru-ub* / *a-na* ^{URU}Mu-¹ú²-*ḫa-zi* / *u na-da-an*
 2 *qa-<te>-šu* / *a-na* ^{LÚ}[S]A.GAZ.KI "May the king, my lord be
 apprised that my younger brother has become hostile to me
 and he has entered into Mōḫazu and he has proffered his two
 ha<nd>s to the ^c*apîrû!*" (EA 298:20-27).

Izre³el (1978b:53) had noted that *i-ru-ub* was sandwiched between *na-ka-ar* and *na-da-an* and therefore, in the mind of the Gezer scribe it must have had the force of a *qtl*.

Of the forms with infixes -*t*- (cf. *supra*, pp. 86-87), only one may be suggested as a calque on the *qtl*. It is 3rd m.s. and lacks the consonantal prefix:

yi-de šar-ru EN-*li* / *i-nu-ma* ¹Pu-*ba-á²-la* / ¹DUMU ÌR-A-*ši-ir-ta* /
i-te₉-ru-ub a-na ^{URU}Ull-*la-sà* "May the king, my lord, be apprised
 that Pu-Ba^cla, the son of ^cAbdi-Ashirta, has entered into
 Ullasa!" (EA 104:6-9).

OTHER VERBS

epēšu. Several forms from this verb have already been discussed (*supra*, p. 368). Here it remains to deal with a special 1st c.s. hybrid based on the Akkadian present rather than on the usual Akkadian stative theme:

ip-pu-uš-ti nu-kúr-ta / *šal-ma-at a-na ia-ti-ia* / *šu-te-ra-at*
 URU.KI-*ia* / *a-na ia-ti-ia* "I made war, all is well with me, my
 town has been returned to me" (EA 280:12-15).

ezēbu. The remarkable point about the hybrids of this verb is that they also seem to be based on the Akkadian present rather than on the preterite. Shuwardata reported to Pharaoh that only he and three other rulers were still fighting on the king's side (EA 366:20-28), but as for his immediate colleagues, those who were supposed to be closely linked with him, they had all deserted his cause:

[l]u yi-il-ma-ad šàr-ru / EN-ia ʿiʿ-nu-ma iz-zi-bu-ni / gáb-bi
 ŠEŠ.ĤÁ-ia "[M]ay the king, my lord, be apprised that all my
 colleagues have abandoned me!" (EA 366:17-19; Rainey
 1973c:260).

The form *izzibūni* with its geminated second radical is clearly expressing an action that has already taken place. Thus, it is on a par with *ibaššāti*, *izzizāti*, *irrubāti* and *ippušāti*, a calque on WS *qtl* built on the Akkadian present form. Therefore, it is probably justified to view the next form of *ezēbu* in the same light.

šum-ma / ti-iš-mu-na a-ší-mi ERÍN.MEŠ / pí-ṭá-ti ù i-zi-bu
 URU.MEŠ-šu-nu / ù pa-aṭ-ru "If they hear 'The army has come
 forth,' they will leave their cities and depart" (EA 73:11-14;
 Rainey 1973c:259; Moran 1950a:149; Rainey 1989-90:58b; cf.
infra, pp. 36, 370, 384).

The status and function of *paṭrū* is perfectly obvious. Syntactically it is WS *qtl* expressing a future action in the apodosis of a conditional sentence (Moran 1950a:74). The verb of the protasis is indicative imperfect, which imposes a future meaning on what follows (Moran 1950a:32-33). The parallelism between *i-zi-bu* and *pa-aṭ-ru* implies that the former is a calque on the WS *qtl*.

raʿāmu. This verb, "to love," reflects the stative nuance of personal commitment. Two forms in the EA texts from Canaan have been taken by *AHw*:952a as participles. It may be that the participle was chosen as the theme for some of the *qtl* forms. On the other hand, the tendency to preserve the *qatil* pattern must have been a factor. Note the singular:

a-nu-ma URU.KI mi-ši-i[l]-ši ra-im / a-na DUMU.MEŠ
 ʾİR-A-ši-ʿirʿ-ti ù mi-ši-il-ši / a-na be-li-ia "Now, as for the city, half
 of it favors the sons of ʿAbdi-Ashirta and half it (favors) my
 lord" (EA 138:71-73; Rainey 1973c:260).

There is also a plural:

ù gáb-bi LÚ.MEŠ ħa-za-nu-te / la-a ra-i-mu i-nu-ma / tu-šú
 ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-tu / i-nu-ma pa-ši-iḫ a-na šu-nu / ù a-na-ku i-ba-ù
 a-šé-ši / i-nu-ma ma-ri-iš ia-a-ši "But all the city rulers do not
 want that the army should come forth because it is well with
 them; I desire its coming forth because it is grievous for me"
 (EA 362:54-56; Rainey 1973c:260; 1978b:21).

The contrast between the *qtl* form *ra-i-mu* and the imperfect *i-ba-ù*, one governing a clause and the other an infinitive, serves to underscore the semantic nuance of *ra'āmu*, viz. "to want, desire."

Another shade of meaning is "to be loyal, to support." This is demonstrated by the nominal use of the participle in the following:

a-mur ma-á²-du / LÚ.MEŠ ra-i-mu-ia a-na lib-bi URU.KI / TUR
 LÚ.MEŠ ša-ru-tu a-na lib-bi-ši "Behold, many are my supporters
 within the city (while) few are the wicked men within her"
 (EA 137:46-48; Rainey 1973c:260 n. 123).

Although there are some prefix hybrids of this verb such as the WS imperfects, 2nd m.s. *ta-ra-ia-mu* (EA 286:18), 3rd m.s. *i-ra-mu*, and the preterite 3rd f.s. *ti-ra-am* (EA 323:23), there is also one 3rd m.pl. Akkadian present form without a WS consonantal prefix that certainly would seem to be used as a calque on the stative *qtl*:

at-ta ú-ul / ti-i-de ^{KUR}A-mur-ri i-nu-ma / a-šar da-an-ni ti-la-ku-na
 / ù an-nu-uš i-na-an-na / [ú]-ul i-ra-a-mu a-na ¹IR-A-ši-ir-ta
 "Don't you know Amurru, that they always follow the strong
 one? But now, they don't favor 'Abdi-Ashirta!" (EA 73:14-18;
 Rainey 1973c:261).

With the above-cited passage in mind, it is worth considering some other Akkadian prefix forms which probably are functioning within the framework of WS syntax as calques on the *qtl* pattern.

The clearest context with 3rd m.s. is:

[šum-]ma i-ra-am šà[r-ru] / [E]N-li ÌR ki-t[i-šu] / [ù] uš-ši-ra / [3]
 LÚ ù ib-lu-ṭa / ù i-na-ši-ra / URU a-na šàr-ri "[I]f the ki[ng,] my
 lord, cares for [his] loy[al] servant, [then] send [three] men that
 I may live and that I will protect the city for the king"
 (EA 123:22-28; cf. also EA 89:63; 121:61).

The form could represent the Akkadian G present (or preterite for that matter). In the protasis of a conditional sentence, the texts from Canaan usually have either the WS imperfect, *yaqtulu*, or a stative of the suffix conjugation. This particular context, with the verb *ra'āmu* "to love," would be quite appropriate for the use of the suffix stative form.

Other 3rd m.pl. examples of this verb, based on the Akkadian present theme, are:

ù / pa-aṭ-ra-ti qa-du LÚ.MEŠ / ša i-ra-a-mu-ni "and I will depart
 with the men who support me" (EA 83:49-51); ù gāb-bi LÚ.MEŠ
 i-ra-'a₄-mu-šu "and all the men like him" (EA 106:40; cf. EA
 110:3).

If one must reckon these verbs forms as Akkadianisms, at least one may presume that they are most likely fulfilling the syntactic function of an underlying Canaanite verb which operated something like Hebrew *ʾāhōb*, which exhibits both stative *ʾāhēb*, and transitive *ʾōhēb* as well as other related finite forms (Young 1952-1953).

šapāru. There is the unusual passive form, *a-na mi-ni₇ ta-šap-pār-ta* "Why were you sent?" (EA 102:10; Moran 1950a:163). And in addition, one also finds instances of stock expressions such as *ša iš-pu-ur* / LUGAL EN-*ia* "that the king, my lord sent" (EA 292:18-19) where the Akkadian preterite is most likely a calque on the WS *qt*. Parallel passages can also have a suffix form in place of the preterite: *ša ša-pār* / L[UGAL] EN-*ia* (EA 320:18-19; 211:10-11). In the mind of the Canaanite scribe, the verbal form represented a single, specific instance in the past (Izre'el 1978b:55, §7.1.1, 61, §7.2.3.1).

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

It has been noted above that the Cananite scribes demonstrate a surprising knowledge of the function and use of the Akkadian preformative statives, especially *ibašši* and its various conjugation forms for other persons. One might even cite the evidence for forms like *ibaššāti*, etc., as further corroboration of the view that the preformative statives were truly recognized as a special case by the original Mesopotamian grammatical tradition. The opposite side of the coin is that the scribes of Assyria and Babylonia in the previous and contemporary periods did not use a stative, *baši*, *bašâku*, etc.

The underlying question that recurs with every discussion of a peculiarity like this one in the Canaanites' Akkadian interlanguage is that of origins. When and where did the scribes of Canaan learn to write Akkadian? Obviously, their original teachers had brought to them a very sophisticated knowledge of the finer nuances of Akkadian grammar and syntax.

These hybrid forms, which caught the eye of the earlier grammarians from the very beginning of Amarna studies, can be seen today as a tantalizing indication, not only of the Canaanite scribes' comprehension of their originally acquired Akkadian (i.e. Old Babylonian) but also as a testimony to their productivity in the generation of analogous forms for verbs other than *ibašši* and *izuzzu*. Throughout this and previous chapters, the question has arisen concerning Akkadian 3rd m.s. and 3rd m.pl. prefix forms from various verbs and stems to which the WS prefixes, *y-* and *t-*, have not been added. Frequently, it has been suggested that such forms were calques for WS suffix verbs (Izre'el 1978b:55, §7.1.1, 61, §7.2.3.1).

CHAPTER XIV

SUFFIX CONJUGATION — SYNTAX

With all the attention given to the morphology of the suffix conjugation in the EA letters, a syntactical analysis was not attempted until the work of Moran (1950a:28-34; 1961:64-65 = 1965:74-75). Though he restricted himself to the Byblos letters, his observations hold true for the other EA texts from Canaanite scribes.

It will become clear in the following discussion that the *qtl* conjugation pattern did not serve primarily to express completed action. The suffix conjugation will be seen to fulfill various functions, some of them past, some present, some future. Many of the syntagmas are indicative but others are modal, injunctive or optative.

The picture that emerges from this fourteenth century B.C.E. corpus of texts is that *qtl* is in the process of taking over various functions that originally had been fulfilled by the prefix conjugation patterns. The seeming parity, or polarity, between a prefix conjugation, and a suffix conjugation is illusory. Each developed from different origins and different linguistic needs. Only gradually did the NWS dialects arrive at the stage reflected in biblical Hebrew, ancient Phoenician and Moabite. Ugaritic and the EA texts from Canaan reflect a somewhat earlier stage.

As with all other facets of these documents, the symbiosis of east Semitic and west Semitic must be taken into account. The scribes were aware of the accepted Akkadian functions of the suffix conjugation and the differences between that and their native Canaanite was never far from their thinking. The degree that they played on one wavelength or the other is what makes the linguistic study of these letters so fascinating.

The various syntagmas in which suffix forms are employed in these texts will be dealt with in terms of their tense nuances, past, present or future.

PAST TENSE

Moran's survey of the Byblos evidence did reveal a preference for *qtl* in past tense declarations (Moran 1950a:30). There are, to be sure, a certain number of prefix preterites in the Byblos letters (cf. *supra*, pp. 222-227). However, there are many more *qtl*'s in this preterite function, and in a few crucial expressions the Byblos scribe prefers *qtl* where other scribes use the *yqtl* preterite.

TRANSITIVES. A typical example is the ubiquitous context in which a vassal acknowledges a message from the king. Most Canaanite examples have a prefix form with infix -*t*- from *šemû* "to hear, to heed," e.g from Beirut:

šá-ni-tam iš-te-me a-wa-te^{MEŠ} 'DUB¹ *ša šâr-ri EN-ia* "Furthermore, I have heard the words of the tablet of the king, my lord" (EA 141:8-9; also EA 234:8; 254:6; 292:17-19; 302:14; 328:21; 364:10; *et al.*; cf. *supra*, pp. 225-226; Rainey 1971c:97-101).

By contrast, the same stereotyped response in a letter from Byblos is formulated thus:

a-nu-ma ša-mi-ti₇ a-wa-te^{MEŠ} / LUGAL EN-ia "Now I have heard the words of the king, my lord" (EA 362:5-6; cf. *supra*, p. 302).

The great majority of past tense narrative forms of *qtl* are, as in the syntagmas discussed above, transitives. The contrast between a past action and a current action is illustrated by the following:

ù a-mur ^I*I-ta-ak!*(AT)-*ka-ma* / *hu-li-iq* ^{KUR}*Q**i-is-sà u an-nu-ú* / ^I*Ar-za-wi-ya qa-du* ^I*Bi-ri-da-aš-wa* / *yu-ḥa-li-qú* ^{KUR}*A-pí* "And behold, Etakkama has caused the loss of Kedesh and behold, Arzawiya, with Biridashwa, is causing the loss of the land of Api" (EA 197:31-34; Rainey 1975b:418; cf. Moran 1987b:289 n. 1,

436 n. 6; 1992:170-171 n. 1, 275 n. 6; Greenberg 1955:44; contra Gevirtz 1973a:100-101).

Likewise, a passage from a Byblos letter:

*ù an-nu-ú i-na-na / nu-KÚR ¹Ia-pa- ^dIŠKUR it-ti ¹A-zi-ri / a-na ia-ši ù al-lu-ú *ša-bat* ^{GIŠ}MÁ-ia / ù al-lu-ú ki-na-na-ma *yi-te₉-lu* / i-na ¹lib¹-bi a-ia-ba *aš-šum* *ša-ba-at* / ^{GIŠ}MÁ.MEŠ-ia* "And behold now, Yapa^c-Haddi is hostile with Aziru against me and, behold, he seized my ship and, behold, likewise, he is going out to sea in order to seize my ships" (EA 114:15-20).

There one finds the stative *nu-KÚR* (or: *nu-kúr*) in present tense, the transitive *ša-bat* for single instance in the past (seizing only one ship) and the imperfect *yi-te₉-lu* to express the present continuous action.

VERBS OF MOTION. Another familiar context is the obeisance formula so prevalent in the introduction to epistles throughout the peripheral area, viz.

a-na KI.TA / ^{GÌR}.MEŠ BE-ia 7 u 7 *am-qut* ^{ut} "At the feet of my lord seven times and seven times I have fallen" (EA 126:2-3; Salonen 1967:66-71).

A small handful of texts, one or perhaps two from Beirut and five or six from somewhere in southern Canaan (Na^ʔaman 1979:676-677), substitute a suffix form for the almost universally attested Akkadian preterite *amqut* "I have/am fallen." The documented *qtl* examples are:

a-na ^{GÌR}.MEŠ ¹šàr-ri EN-ia *am-qut* / 7 ù 7 *mi-la-an-na* / *ma-aq-ta-ti*
a-na ^{GÌR}.MEŠ ¹šàr-ri EN-ia "At the feet of the king, my lord, I have fallen, seven times and seven times have I fallen at the feet of the king, my lord" (EA 283:4-6; also EA 63:6, 65:5; 282:4; 336:5); *a-na* KI.TA ^{GÌR}.MEŠ LUGAL EN-li-i[a] / 7-tam ù 7 ¹ma¹-aq-ta-ti₇ "Beneath the feet of the king, my lord, seven times

and seven times have I fallen" (EA 138:3-4; probably also EA 137:3-4).

Two texts employ the unusual form *ma-aq-ti-ti* (EA 64:5; 284:4, 5, 22). The Ugaritic translations of this formula also use a *qtl* conjugation with forms from **qyl* "to fall" (probably cognate to Akkadian *qiʔālu*, von Soden 1967:295-296, cf. CAD Q:75b-76a), viz. *qtl* = **qilti*(?) "I have fallen" (KTU 2.12:11; *et al.*), *qlny* "we have fallen" (KTU 2.11:7; *et al.*).

Note the following verbs of motion in past narration, the first in *qtl*, the second in *yqtl* preterite:

ù al-ka-ti / a-na É-šu aš-šum / e-pu-uš DÜG.GA bi-ri-⟨nu⟩ / ù a-na-ku a-tu-ur a-na É-ia "So I went to his place in order to make a friendship treaty with him, then I returned to my place" (EA 136:30-33; Moran 1987b:356 n. 5; 1992:217 n. 5).

STATIVE. Stative and passive *qtl*'s can also be in past tense, of course. An example of *ibašši* has been noted:

šá-ni-tam yi-il₅-ma-ad LUGAL EN-ia / i₁₅-pí-iš ŠEŠ-šu ša i₁₅-ba-aš-¹ša¹ / i-na URUGub-la i-nu-ma na-¹da¹-[an] / DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ ša¹Ri-¹ib¹-¹d¹IŠKUR¹ / ¹ša¹ i₁₅-ba-aš-šu it-ti-¹šu¹! / a-na LÚ.MEŠ ar-nu-¹ti¹! ¹ša¹ / šār-ri ša i-na KUR^A-¹mur¹-r[i] "Furthermore, may the king, my lord, learn the deed of his brother who is in Byblos, that he has handed over the sons of Rib-Haddi who were with him(!) to the traitors to the king who are in the land of Amurru" (EA 142:18-24; Rainey 1973c:249 n. 68, 262; cf. *supra*, pp. 320-321).

The 3rd m.s. *i₁₅-ba-aš-¹ša¹* is present tense, but in the object clause, past tense transitive *na-¹da¹-[an]* is paralleled by past tense (actually past perfect!) 3rd m.pl. *i₁₅-ba-aš-šu*. The following example is also in a subordinate clause:

ti-i-de pa-ar-ša-ia / i-nu-ma i-ba-ša-ta i-na / ¹URU¹Šu¹-mu-ra "You know my behavior when you were in Šumur" (EA 73:39-41).

The intransitive *ḥadû* "to rejoice" can appear in the same syntagma as a prefix or as a suffix conjugation verb. Compare the parallel passages from identical contexts as formulated in two different epistles, both written in Beirut:

ù en-du-um / [iš]-te-me a-wa-te^{MEŠ} DUB LUGAL EN-*ia* / *ù yi-iḥ-di ŠÀ-ia* *ù / [i]n₄-nam-mu-ru* 2 IGI.MEŠ *ma-gal* "And when [I] heard the words of the tablets of the king, my lord, then my heart rejoiced and my eyes brightened greatly" (EA 142:7-10; also EA 144:15); *ša-ni-tam iš-te-me / a-wa-te*^{MEŠ} 'DUB' *ša šār-ri* EN-*ia* . . . *ù ḥa-di ŠÀ ÌR-ka* "Furthermore, I heard the words of the tablet of the king, my lord, . . . and the heart of your servant rejoiced" (EA 141:8-11; also EA 209:7).

A Tyrian letter uses 1st c.s. *ḥa-ad-ia-ti* in the same context (EA 147:25-27).

The stative *qtl* is especially functional in expressing a state of affairs which prevailed for some time in the past. This is especially clear when the clause in question is introduced by *pānānu* "Formerly." Note the following:

[a]-mur pa-na-nu LÚ.MEŠ *a-bu-ti-ia* / *'da¹-nu nu-KÚR a-na* *ša-šu-¹nu¹ / [ù] ma-ša-ar-ti / [LUGAL] it-¹ti-¹šu-nu ba-l[a-aṭ] / [LUGAL] UGU-¹šu-nu* "Behold, formerly, as regards my fathers, hostilities were strong against them, [but] the [king's] garrison was with them, [the king's] pro[visions] were (provided) for them" (EA 130:21-25; Moran 1950a:124a n. 104); *[pa]-na-nu* URU¹ *ṣu-mu-ra* *ù* LÚ.MEŠ[-*ši*] / *[da]n-nu-¹tu₄¹ 'i¹-ba-aš-šu* *ù* LÚ.[MEŠ] / *[ma-]¹ša¹-ar-¹tu¹ it-ti-nu* "Formerly, Šumur and [its] men were strong and garrison troops were with us" (EA 81:48-50; CAD D:99b-100a; Moran 1987b:261; 1992:151; in 1950a:124a, Moran still classed *ibašši* as a present; cf. also EA 112:50-53; 121:11-15).

A stative can also express a situation which, while perhaps obtaining at the present, was the result or continuation of what had prevailed for a considerable time:

[*lu-ú*] / ¹*i-de* LUGAL EN-*li i-nu-[ma]* / *šal-ma-at* URU*Gub-la*
 GE[*MÉ-ka*] / ¹*iš-tu!(IŠ)* *da-ri-it* UD.[*KÁM.*]MEŠ "May the king,
 my lord, be apprised that Byblos, [your] hand[maiden], has
 been at peace since of old" (EA 75:7-9; cf. Youngblood 1961:160;
 Rainey 1973c:241; Moran 1987b:254 n. 1; 1992:146 n. 1).

From these passages it may be seen that even something that had taken place in the past was not necessarily viewed as punctiliar.

One final text will illustrate the nuances possible with transitive *qtl*, passive *qtl* and stative *qtl* (in circumstantial function) interwoven with the imperfect for repeated action in the past:

a-nu-ma / [PN] DUMU *ši-ip-ri-[ia]* / [*uš*]-*ši-ir-ti-šu* *ù aš-ta-ni* /
 [*m*]*a-ni* / UD.KÁM.MEŠ *ú-wa-ši-ru-šu* / *ù la-a yi-le-ú* / *i-re-ba*
a-na URU*Šu-mu-ra* *ša-ab-tu* / *ka-li* KASKAL.MEŠ *a-na* *ša-a-šu* /
a-na nu-KÚR *ša-a* UGU-*ia* *ù* UGU / URU*Šu-mu-ra* *šu-ut i-da-gal* /
 2 ITU *a-ši-ib it-ti-ia* "Now, as for [PN], [my] emissary, I [s]ent
 him repeatedly—how many times did I send him and he was
 unable to enter Šumur? All the routes to it have been seized
 through the hostilities against me and against Šumur. He has
 seen two months while sitting with me" (EA 114:32-41; contrast
 Moran 1987b:316; 1992:188-189).

PRESENT TENSE

In view of the function of the stative suffix conjugation in classical Akkadian and also in ancient Egyptian, it should not be surprising that the present tense should be represented in the texts from Canaan written under the influence of West Semitic. Practically all of the *qtl* forms expressing present tense are statives or passives. In fact, Moran (1950a:30) only found one active verb in present tense:

ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ *it-ti-šu* / *ù* LÚ.MEŠ *ha-za-nu-tu ú-ul* /
ti-iš-mu-na mi-im-ma / *ù šap-ru a-na* *ša-a-šu* "All the *apîrû* men
 are with him and the city rulers don't hear anything but what
 they write to him" (EA 82:8-12).

Some glosses are stative presents, e.g. *ší-ir-ti* "I am pressed" (EA 127:34); *ši-ir-ti* "I am slandered" (EA 252"14). Typical present tense statives in declarative sentences are:

ti-de i-nu-ma / LÚGAL ù LÚ.MEŠ *be-li URU-lì / šal-mu it-ti*
 'DUMU'.MEŠ ÌËR-Aš-*ra-ta* "May you be apprised t{hat} the
 officer and the nobles of the city are at peace with the sons of
 'Abdi-Ashirta!" (EA 102:21-23); *yi-de-mi šâr-ru EN-ia / i-nu-ma*
šal-ma-at URU.KI-¹šu¹ "May the king, my lord, know that his
 city is at peace!" (EA 226:67; cf. EA 68:10; 144:11; 257:10; 268:9).

The contrast between stative *qtl* and transitive *yaqtulu* imperfect is clearly illustrated in the following:

ù *gáb-bi* LÚ.MEŠ *ha-za-nu-te / la-a ra-i-mu i-nu-ma / tu-šú*
 ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-tu / i-nu-ma pa-ši-iḥ a-na šu-nu / ù a-na-ku i-ba-ù*
a-šé-ši / i-nu-ma ma-ri-iš ia-a-ši "But all the city rulers do not
 want that the army should come forth because it is tranquil for
 them; I desire its coming forth because it is grievous for me"
 (EA 362:54-56; Rainey 1973c:260; 1978b:21).

An even more striking contrast concerns essentially the same verb form, a *qtl* of the Š stem; *šūšerāku / šūširāku* can have stative/passive meaning, "I am prepared" (EA 141:24; 142:25), or it can be transitive with past tense reference, "I have prepared" (EA 191:14). And in one context it appears in both nuances:

ù *i-de / LUGAL i-nu-ma šu-še-ra-ku i-na / pa-ni* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti*
 LUGAL EN-*ia / šu-ši-ra-ku gáb-ba ki-ma qa-bi* LUGAL EN-*ia* "So
 may the king be apprised that I am prepared in anticipation of
 the army of the king, my lord! I have prepared everything
 according to what the king, my lord, commanded"
 (EA 144:18-21).

Here one must note the numerous impersonal statives (Moran 1950a:64-65). Two are cited in the passage above, *pa-ši-iḥ*

a-na šu-nu "it is tranquil for them" (EA 362:57; cf. EA 297:20), and *ma-ri-iš ia-a-ši* "it is grievous for me" (EA 362:59; cf. EA 84:24-25; 103:7-8; 114:50; 116:54-55; 131:26). Another is *damiq*; one such example underscores the difference between stative verbs in *qtl* and transitives in *yaqtulu*:

ša-ni-tam da-mi-iq i-na pa-ni / šar-ri ša ki-ma ^dIŠKUR¹ / *ù* ^dUTU
i-na ša-me i-ba-ši / ù ti-pu-šu-na DUMU.MEŠ / *ÌR-A-ši-ir-ta ki-ma*
/ lib-bi-šu-nu "Furthermore, is it pleasing to the king, who is
 like Baal and Shamash in heaven, that the sons of °Abdi-Ashirta
 are doing as they please?" (EA 108:8-13).

A present state may be the result of a process that has been going on in the past:

a-nu-ma a-na-ku la-a e-la-ú-mi / i-re-ba a-na KUR.MEŠ *Mi-iš-re-e /*
ši-ba-ti ù mur-šú dan-nu / a-na UZU *ra-ma-ni-ia* "I am unable to
 enter into Egypt; I am old and my own flesh has a grievous
 sickness" (EA 137:27-30).

The hybrid stative *ši-ba-ti* could be rendered "I have become old." Moran (1950a:29) noted a number of other clear examples of this type:

ù an-nu-ú i-na-an-na ti-ir-bu / a-na É-ti ri-qi ga-mi-ir gáb-bu /
ti-iḫ-ta-ti gáb-bu "Behold, now, you will enter an empty house;
 everything is used up, I am wholly ruined" (EA 102:11-13); *ù*
a-nu-ma i-na-an-na ši-iḫ-tá-at / ^{URU}Šu-mu-ur *a-di a-bu-li-ši* "And
 even now, Šumur is ravaged up to its city gate" (EA 106:10-11;
 cf. CAD A/1:84).

It should be clear that the stative nuance of *qtl* in the EA texts from Canaan correlates positively with the norm for the suffix conjugation in Akkadian and, from the standpoint of tense, with the function of the same conjugation pattern in classical Egyptian. Stative verbs generally appear in the suffix conjugation pattern to express a present situation. They can, of course, serve

to express a state that prevailed in the past. Transitives and verbs of motion, on the other hand, do not normally express present tense by means of the suffix forms.

FUTURE TENSE

The most fascinating usage of the suffix conjugation is for actions or states to be accomplished in the future. There are several specific syntagmas in which a *qtl* verb has future reference. Moran (1950a:30-34) had defined these syntactic functions for the Byblos texts and his categories hold true for the rest of the corpus.

PROTASES. There are over a dozen instances in which *qtl* conjugation forms (including Akkadian prefix statives) appear in the protasis of a conditional sentence. Nearly all of them are stative in nuance and refer to present-future.

There are three examples of *ibašši*:

ù šum-ma ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭ[á-ti] / i-ba-ša-at ka-li KUR.MEŠ / ni-il-qú a-na šār-ri "But if there will be regular troops, we will take all the lands" (EA 103:55-57); *šum-ma i-ba-aš-ši LÚERÍN.MEŠ pi-ṭa-ti / i-na MU an-ni-ti i-ba-as-ši KUR.ĤÁ / LUGAL EN₁-ia* "But if there will be regular troops this year, the lands of the king will remain (his)" (EA 286:57-59; cf. also EA 289:15-17).

One passage has the impersonal *damiq*:

ù šum[-ma] da-mi[-iq] / i-na pa-ni-ka ù / š[u]-ku-un i-na / LÚMAŠKÍM-ši DUGUD i-n[a] / pa-ni LÚ.MEŠ ḥa-za-nu-ti LU[GAL] "And if it be amenable to you, then appoint as commissioner one who is respected by the king's city rulers" (EA 107:20-24; Moran 1975a:155; 1987b:304, 305 n. 2; 1992:181 and n. 2).

Two conditional sentences have prefix stative forms of *le²û* (cf. *supra*, pp. 331-332). These are in contrast to the usual WS

imperfect forms of this verb:

[šum-m]a la-a i-le-e / [šār-r]u la-qa-ia i-š-tu / [qa-at] na-ak-ri-šu /
[ù i]n₄-né-ep-ša-at / [ka-l]i KUR.KI.MEŠ / [a-na]IR-A-ši-ir-ta "[I]f
[the kin]g is unable to deliver me from his enemies, [then al]l
the lands will [j]oin 'Abdi-Ashirta' (EA 79:39-44; also EA 92:51).

Likewise, there is what appears to be a calque on the *qtl* from the WS verb that corresponds to *ra²āmu* "to love, prefer, like" (cf. *supra*, pp. 343-345):

[šum-]ma i-ra-am 'šār¹-[ru] / [E]N-li IR ki-t[i-šu] / [ù] uš-ši-ra /
[3] LÚ ù ib-lu-ťá / ù i-na-ší-ra / URU a-na šār-ri "[I]f the ki[ng],
my [I]ord, loves [his] faithful servant, [then] send [three] men
and that I may live and that I may protect the city for the king"
(EA 123:23-28).

Two other passages deal with someone's possible death, obviously a reference to something in the future:

[šum-ma] at-ta mi-[t]a-t[a ù] / [a-na-ku] BA.UG₇-at "[If] you 'die',
[then I] will die" (EA 87:30-31); šum-ma mi-ta-ti mi-na /
i-pu-šu-na "If I should die, then what could I do?"
(EA 119:17-18).

Another pair of contexts contain the 2nd m.s. of *qālu* "to keep silent":

šum-ma ki-a-ma qa-la-ta / a-di ti-ìl-qú-na / URUŠu-mu-ra ù / >ù<
ti-du-ku-na LÚMAŠKÍM / ù ERÍN.MEŠ til!(BI)-la-ti / ša i-na
Šu-mu-ra "If thus you keep silent until they take Šumur, then
they will slay the commissioner and the auxiliary troops that
are in Šumur" (EA 104:31-36); šum-ma i-na-na / qa-la-ta ù
Pi-ḥu-ra / la-a yi-zi-za i-na / URUKu-mi-di u ka-li LÚ.MEŠ /
[ḥ]a-za-ni-ka tū-da-ku-na "If now you keep silent and Paḥura
does not take up a position in Kōmidi, then all the city rulers
will be killed" (EA 132:46-50; Rainey 1989-90:62).

Especially noteworthy is the *qtl* of *zêru* "to hate," since it is a transitive verb. The time reference is present-future:

šum-ma LUGAL / *za-ir* URU.K[I]-*šu* *ù* *i-zi-ba-ši* "If the king should hate his city, then I would abandon it" (EA 126:44-45; Rainey 1989-90:61a; *contra* Moran 1987b:340, 341 n. 7; 1992:206, 206-207 n. 7).

There are two passages which could have past tense reference in the protasis. One has a verb of motion, *paṭāru* "to depart (fall away)."

ša-ni-tam šum-ma / *ap-pu-na-ma a-nu-ma pa-aṭ-ra* / URUŠ[u-]*mu-ra* *ù* URUÉ-Ar-[*h*]a / 'yi'!(UT)-*din-ni i-na qa-at* / ¹*Ia-an-ḫa-mi* *ù* *ia-ti-na* / ŠE.IM.ḪÁ *a-na a-ka-li ia-ši* "Furthermore, if, moreover, now Šumur and Bit-Arkha have defected, let him assign me to the charge of Yanḫamu that he may issue grain for me to eat" (EA 83:27-32; cf. Moran 1987b:265 n.2; 1992:154 n. 2; Youngblood 1961:248).

And finally, there is one example of a transitive verb which can most easily be rendered as a past tense, thus making an unreal condition. Nevertheless, it could also be interpreted as a future:

ša-ni-tam ki-i₁₅ šum[-m]a / *a-na DAM-ia ša-pár šār-ru* / *ki-i₁₅ a-kal-lu-ši ki-i₁₅* / *šum-ma a-na ia-ši* / *ša-pár šār-ru* / *šu-ku-un GÍR ZABAR* / *i-na lib-bi-ka* *ù* / BA.UG₇ *ki-i₁₅ la-a* / *ip-pu-šu ši-pí-ir-ti šār-ri* "Furthermore, how, if for my wife the king had written, how could I withhold her? Because if the king had written to me 'Put a bronze dagger into your heart and die,' how could I not carry out the directive of the king?" (EA 254:38-46; cf. Rabiner 1981:95).

The same problem with regard to the determination of tense pertains to the following conditional sentence which is not introduced by *šumma*:

ma-an-nu LÚ-lu₄ / ù ša-pár LUGAL / EN-šu a-na ša-[šu] / ù la-a yi-iš-^fmu¹-mi "Who is the man, (who) if the king has written/should write to him, who would not heed?" (EA 232:12-15; Rabiner 1981:95)

APODOSES. There are over twenty examples of suffix conjugation verb forms in the apodosis of a conditional sentence (for Byblos, cf. Moran 1950a:74; for elsewhere cf. Albright 1942b:34 n. 16 who cites GKC 496, §159q for Hebrew). In such contexts as these there can be no question that the reference is to the future. Moran (1950a:75) has noted that the conditional sentence in West Semitic is essentially two independent clauses which explains why, unlike Akkadian, the apodosis is so frequently joined by the conjunction. When the conjunction is missing, the apodosis is usually injunctive (e.g. EA 112:30-39) or interrogative (e.g. EA 112:16-18). The conjunction is normal, however, when the verb of the apodosis is from the suffix conjugation.

Exceptions to this latter rule are known from the Jerusalem letters. Note that the employment of a gloss in the first example cited below is especially worthy of note; it confirms that a suffix conjugation form in the apodosis is an original feature of the native WS dialect of the scribe:

[ù] *šum-ma ia-a-nu-mi ERÍN.MEŠ pi-ṭa-tu₄ / i-na MU an-ni-ti ḫal-qa-at a-ba-da-at / \ gáb-bi KUR.ḪÁ šàr-ri EN-ia* "[But] if there are no regular troops this year, all the lands of the king, my lord, are lost" (EA 288:51-53); *ù šum-ma ia-a-nu ERÍN.MEŠ pi-ṭa-tu₄ / pa-ṭa-ra-at KUR šàr-ri a-na LÚ.MEŠ / \ ḫa-pí-ri* "But if there are no regular troops, the land of the king will defect to the 'apîrû men" (EA 290:22-24); *šum-ma i-ba-aš-ši LÚ.ERÍN.MEŠ pi-ṭa-ti / i-na MU an-ni-ti i-ba-aš-ši KUR.ḪÁ / LUGAL EN-⟨ia⟩ ù šum-ma ia-a-nu-mi LÚ.ERÍN pi-ṭa-ti / [ḫ]al-qa-at KUR.ḪÁ LUGAL EN-ia* "If there are regular troops in this year, the lands of the king, <my> lord, will still be (his), but if there are no regular troops, the lands of the king, my lord, will be lost" (EA 286:57-60).

The use of the conjunction to introduce the apodosis is the general rule. This function is also known elsewhere in some other Akkadian dialects (OA — Hecker 1968:235-236, §138a; OB Mari — Finet 1956:225-226 §§82c-f), especially the peripheral (Nuzi — Gordon 1938:229; Mitanni — Adler 1976:79; Alalakh — Giacomakis 1970:63; Carchemish — Huehnergard 1979:124-125; Egypt — Cochavi-Rainey 1988:232-233, §2.10.1; Amurru — Izre'el 1985:334-335, §4.6.1; 1991a:326, §4.6.1; Ugarit — Huehnergard 1979:330-331 and n. 580; 1989:242). The following passage is unusual in that the verb of the protasis is a preterite and thus shows that the condition is not referable to the future. The apodosis, with a stative of *idû*, may also be viewed as present-future:

šum-ma la-a / iš-mé a-na LÚḫa-za-ni / ú šu-ut i-de₄-ma "If I have not heeded the commissioner, then he surely knows/will know" (EA 317:23-25; cf. Moran 1987b:541; 1992:349).

The majority of examples with the conjunction are from Byblos. The use of a *qtl* in the apodosis of conditional clauses introduced by *šumma* usually accompanies either a verbless clause or an imperfect (energetic) in the protasis:

šum-ma / šar-ru yu-wa-ši-ru-na LÚ.MEŠ / KURMi-iš-ri ù KURMi-lu-ḫa / ù ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ a-na qa-at / LÚ-ia an-nu-ú ki-ma / ar-ḫi-iš ù bal-tá-ti / a-na a-ra-ad šar-ri EN-ia "If the king will send Egyptians and Nubians and horses in the charge of this, my man, with haste, then I will survive to serve the king, my lord" (EA 112:18-24); *šum-ma MU.MEŠ a[n]-^rni¹-ta ú-ul / yu-ša-na ERÍN.MEŠ [pí-t]á-ti / ù in-né[-ep-ša-a]t ka-li / KUR.KUR.MEŠ a[-na LÚ.MEŠ GA]Z* "If this year the regular army does not come forth, then all the lands will be[come aligned] w[ith the *‘apīru* [men]" (EA 77:26-29; also EA 79:39-44, *supra*, p. 356; EA 93:25-28).

In the following example, the apodosis apparently consists of two suffix conjugation verbs even though the first is

apparently built on the Akkadian present (in spite of the lack of orthographic gemination) as theme (cf. *supra*, p. 343):

šum-ma / ti-iš-mu-na a-ší-mi ERÍN.MEŠ / pí-tá-ti ù i-zi-bu
 URU.MEŠ-*šu-nu / ù pa-aṭ-ru* "If they hear 'The regular army has
 gone forth,' then they will abandon their towns and depart"
 (EA 73:11-14; Rainey 1989090:58b; cf. *infra*, pp. 370, 384).

However, this 3rd m.pl. passage must be compared with the following 1st c.s. where the first verb in the apodosis is a jussive, also from *ezēbu*:

*šum-ma ki-a-ma la-a ti-iq-¹bu¹(?) / ù i-te₉-zi-ib UR[U] ù / pa-aṭ-*ra-ti*
ša-ni-tam šum-ma la-a / tu-te-ru-na a-wa-ta₅ a-na ia-ši / ù i-te₉-zi-ib
 URU ù / *pa-aṭ-*ra-ti qa-du* LÚ.MEŠ / ša i-ra-a-mu-ni* "If thus you
 do not speak, then I will abandon the ci[ty] and depart;
 moreover, if you don't send word back to me, then I will
 abandon the city and depart" (EA 83:45-51).*

In fact, in the above example, one might argue that the suffix form, *paṭrāti*, is dependent on the jussive, *itezib*, rather than being an independent part of the apodosis. On the other hand, the following two clause apodosis has a 3rd f.s. *qtl* (Rainey 1973c:252) in tandem with a prefix form, evidently the jussive 3rd m.pl. (Moran 1950a:62):

ù šu[m-ma la yi-iš-mu] / [L]UGAL BE-ia a-na a-wa-te Ì[R-šu] / ù
in₄-né-ep-ša-⟨at⟩^{URU}Gub[-la] / a-na ša-šu ù gáb-bi KUR.ĤÁ
 L[UGAL] / *a-di^{KUR}Mi-iš-ri ti-né-ep-šu / a-na LÚ.MEŠ*
 SA.GAZ.MEŠ "But i[f] the king, my lord, [does not heed] the
 words of [his] ser[vant], then Byblos will become aligned with
 him (‘Abdi-Ashirta) and all the lands of the k[ing] as far as
 Egypt will become aligned with the ‘*apîrû* men" (EA 88:29-39; cf.
 Moran 1987a:210 and n. 8; 1987b:275; 1992:160).

It may not be coincidental that in the first apodosis clause, the verb is *qtl* and stands at the head of the clause while in the second

clause, the verb comes in second position and is in the prefix jussive. One must admit, however, that instead of a 3rd m.pl. jussive, it could be 3rd f.s. imperfect.

Furthermore, a stative can also come in second position in the apodosis:

šum-ma-mi a-na-ku / uš-šú-na UGU KUR / *ša* LUGAL *ù a-na ia-ši*
/ *in₄-né-ep-ša-ta* "If I go forth against the land of the king, then will you be aligned with me?" (EA 333:15-18).

Suffix forms also appear in the apodoses of conditional sentences which had a protasis introduced by an infinitive without *šumma*:

ša-bat-mi / ni-nu-u₁₆ URU.MEŠ *Gub^{ub}-li* / *ù da-na-nu-u₁₆* "If we seize the towns of Gubla, then we will be strong" (EA 362:25-27; Moran 1950a:57; 1950c:170).

It is in such a syntagma that we find four examples of transitive suffix conjugation forms:

al-lu / pa-ṭá-ri-ma LÚ.MEŠ *ḥu-ub-ši* *ù / ša-ab-tu* LÚ.MEŠ
GAZ.MEŠ / URU "Behold, if the yeomen farmers depart, then the *‘apīru* men will seize the city" (EA 118:36-39; Moran 1950a:57; 1950c:169b-170a); *a-pa-ši-m[i]* / *at-ta ki-ta it-[ti*
DUMU.M]EŠ / *ĪR-A-ši-ir-ta* *ù / la-qú-ka* "If you make a treaty wi[th the son]s of *‘Abdi-Ashirta*, then they will capture you" (EA 132:32-35; Ebeling 1910:77; Moran 1950a:176-177; 1950c:70; 1960:10 n. 1; 1987b:352 n. 4; 1992:215 n. 4); *ba-li a-ší* ERÍN.MEŠ
pi-ṭá-tu / *[i-na MU]^{ša-an-ti} an-ni-ti* / *[ù la]-qú-mi* URU.[KI].[MEŠ]
Gub^{ub}-li "If the regular tro[ops] do not come forth this year, [then] they will [take] the citi[es] of Byblos" (EA 132:32-35; Moran 1950a:170a); *a-ší-mi* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-tu* *ù ša-mu / a-na*
ú-mi ka-ša-di-ši *ù / ta-ra-at* URU.KI *a-na* LUGAL *be-li-ia* "If the regular troops come forth they will hear of the day of its arrival and the city will return to the king, my lord" (EA 137:49-51; Moran 1950c:170a).

Like one passage cited above (EA 83:45-51), there are several others in which the first clause of the compound apodosis has an injunctive while the second has a suffix form. The latter could possibly be interpreted as representing a purpose clause dependent on the injunctive rather than a parallel member of the apodosis:

ʿšum¹-ma lib-bi LUGAL be-li-ia / a-ʿna¹ na-ša-ʿar¹ URU-šu ù ya-[d]i-ʿna⁷ / BE-ia ʿLÚ¹.MEŠ ma-ša-ar-cti ʿa¹-[n]a ʿURU¹ / ʿù¹ na-aš-ra-at "If the king, my lord, is of a mind to protect his city, then let my lord give garrison troops for the city that it may be protected" (EA 127:26-29); šum-ma / 2 ITU ia-nu ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-ti / ù i-te₉-zi-ib URU.KI / ù pa-ať-ra-ti ù / bal-ťá-at ZI-ia a-di / i-pé-šu i-pí-iš lib-bi-ia "If in two months there are no regular troops, then I will abandon the city and I will depart so that my soul shall live until I can do whatever I wish" (EA 82:41-46; Moran 1987b:263; 1992:152).

Likewise, the much discussed passage, EA 74:29-38 (cf. *supra*, p. 125), has a *qtl* stative which is evidently dependent upon a preceding jussive (partly restored):

šum-ma ia-[nu] / LÚ-LIM ša ú-še₂₀-ze-bu-ʿšix¹(ʿŠE¹) iš-tu qa-ti-n[u] / ù nu-da-bir₅ LÚ.MEŠ ħa-za-nu-ta iš-tu / lib-bi KUR.KUR.KI ù ti-né-pu-uš ka-li KUR.KUR.MEŠ.KI / a-na LÚ.MEŠ ʿGAZ¹ ù [k]i-t[u] ti-in<né-pu-uš>-ma / a-na ka-li KUR.KUR.KI ù pa-aš-ħu DUMU.MEŠ / ù DUMU.MÍ.MEŠ a-na-da-ri-ti UD.KÁM.MEŠ "Since/if there is no man who can rescue it from our grasp, and we will exterminate the city rulers from within the territories and all of the territories will be aligned with the ʿapîrû men; so let a ʿtreaty be <made> for all the territories so that the sons and daughters will be at peace forever more" (EA 74:29-38; Mendenhall 1947a; Moran 1953:78 n. 4; 1987b:250, 252 nn. 10-13; 1992:143, 144 nn. 10-12, 145 n. 13).

All these contexts show that the apodosis with *qtl* is closely related to the intended result clauses after an injunctive.

PURPOSE CLAUSES. The logical nexus between the purpose clause and the apodosis of a conditional sentence is clearly seen in the following passage from Tyre:

ma-an-nu ba-la-aṭ LÚ.GÍR / e-nu-ma la-a it-ta-ṣí / ša-a-ru iš-tu
 UZU^{pr} LUGAL *be-li-šu / ù ba-li-iṭ šum-ma LUGAL iš-ta-pár /*
 [a]-na ÌR-šu ù *ba-li-iṭ / [a-na] da-ri-ti* "What is the life of foot
 soldier when/if the breath from the mouth of his lord has not
 come forth? If the king has written to his servant, then he lives
 [for]ever" (EA 149:21-26)

As with the two examples in the passage cited above, the following statives express intended results. Here they are predicated on the fulfillment of an imperative:

3 LÚ *ša-a šu-ri-ib / ¹Pí-ḥu-ra uš-š[i-]ra / ù bal-ṭá-ti* "Send the three
 men whom Piḥura had sent (to Egypt) in order that I may
 survive!" (EA 123:33-35); *du-ku / [E]N!-la-ku-nu ù i-ba-ša-tu-nu*
ki-ma ia-ti-nu / ù pa-aš-ḥa-tu-nu "Slay your lord(!) so that you
 may be like us and so that you may be at peace!" (EA 74:25-27;
 cf. EA 73:27; 81:12; Moran 1987b:252 n. 7; 1992:144 n. 7;
 Youngblood 1961:139).

The latter passage may be compared with EA 107:29-31 where the intransitive prefix form, *ta-ap-šu-uḥ*, is employed instead of a suffix form.

The key verb in the next citation is also most likely an imperative, but since it has a nominal subject, it may just as well be meant for a 3rd m.s. jussive (without a *y-* prefix):

ù i₁₅!(A)-na-an-na / i₁₅-dín ìl LUGAL EN-ia DINGIR-ia ^dUTU-ia /
ù ša-ab-ta<-at> URUṬú-bi-ḥi / ù i₁₅-ra-ar ŠEŠ-ia / ù i₁₅-na-ša-ar
URUṬú-bi-ḥi / a-na LUGAL EN-ia DINGIR-ia ^d1[UTU-ia] "But
 now, may the god of the king, my lord, my god, my sun god,
 grant that Ṭôbiḥi be conquered, and I will disavow my brother
 and I will protect Ṭôbiḥi for the king, my lord, my god, [my
 sun] god!" (Rainey 1975b:413; CAD A/2:236a).

Finally, the *qtl* stative in this text is clearly linked to the 1st c.s. volitive in the preceding clause:

šū-te-ra a-wa-ta₅ / a-na ia-ši ù i-pu-ša a-na-ku / ki-ta it-ti
ÌR-A-ši-ir-ta / ki-ma¹ Ia-pa-^dÌŠKUR ù¹ Zi-im-re-[da] / ù bal-tá-ti
 "Send back word to me and I will make a treaty with
 ʿAbdi-Ashirta like Yapa^c-Haddi and Zimre[dda] so that I may
 live" (EA 83:23-27; cf. also EA 88:39; Moran 1987b:276 n. 10;
 1992:161 n. 12).

The function of these suffix conjugation verbs in clauses of intended result is a frequent usage in biblical Hebrew (GKC:333, §112*q, r*). It is one of the many obvious contradictions to the erroneous concept that *qtl* was basically an expression of completed action.

OPTATIVE. Two passages interpreted by Finkelstein (1969:33b-34) demonstrate the optative function of the *qtl*, in spite of Moran's reservations (Moran 1987b:514 n. 20; 1992:330 n. 20). The expression in question is a Canaanite rendering of an expression well known in MB (also in Mari), *ana dinān bēliya lullik* "I would readily serve as a substitute (sacrifice) for my lord" (CAD D:148b-149a; Salonen 1967:59-60). The Canaanite examples, from Jerusalem, are as follows:

LÚú-e-é² ʿšār¹-ri a-nu-ki / ma-at-ti a-na ka-ta₅!(WA) "A soldier of
 the king am I, I would die for you!" (EA 287:69-70); *ma-at-ti*
ma-gal / a-na ka-ta₅ ÌR-ka a-na-ku "I would readily die for you,
 your servant am I" (EA 289:50-51).

The following example of a verb of motion would appear to be an asseveration. Certainly [*ka*]-*aš-da-ti* is an expression of assurance to Rib-Haddi, to whom it was allegedly addressed:

[a-mur a-]ta-ša-aš a-na-ku / [\ na-]aq-ša-ap-ti / [i-n]a a-wa-te-ka
a-nu-^fma¹ / [ka]-aš-da-ti a-na ka-^fta₅ / [ki-]a-ma ti-ša-pa-ru / a-na
ia-ši "[Behold, I] was distressed ([a]ngry) [a]t your words, 'Now

I am [co]ming to you', [th]us you keep writing to me"
(EA 93:4-9).

The same passage contains a past tense stative, [*na-]aq-ša-ap-ti* which glosses a prefix conjugation preterite from a rarely used verb (Youngblood 1961:375; supported by Moran 1987b:285 n. 1; 1992:167 n. 1; *contra* CAD A/2:424).

SUMMARY

From the evidence presented above, it can be readily seen that Moran (1950a:34-39; 1961:64-65 = 1965:74-75) was not exaggerating the diachronic importance of the EA texts from Canaan for the study of the suffix conjugation pattern in the NWS dialects. The subject is of such importance that it merits a summary at this point. In the ensuing remarks, the synchronic relationship between the suffix conjugation functions and those of the prefix conjugation patterns will be pointed out.

The three basic time frames for the *qtl*—past, present and future—reflect the adaptation of this originally timeless conjugation pattern. The past tense function, which became widespread in Ugaritic prose and in later Phoenician, was prominent in Byblos and present elsewhere. It represents an encroachment on the natural territory of the prefix *yaqtul* preterite. The predominating nuance is transitive or intransitive verbs of motion though statives and passives are also found.

The present tense function of *qtl* is more typical of statives and passives and is consistent with the original usage of the suffix conjugation (as found in classical Akkadian). The present tense forms fill the same syntactic slots as non-verbal clauses and clauses with an indicative imperative *yaqtulu*, the latter being more widely preferred for transitive expression. Here one may single out the force of the *qtl* in the initial clauses for which modal congruence requires indicative imperfect verbs in the following purpose clauses.

Those syntagmas with future reference, namely the protasis and apodosis of conditional sentences, the purpose

clauses predicated on an injunctive, and the optative, all represent the adoption of *qtl* as a substitute or a surrogate for the injunctives of the prefix conjugation pattern. The *qtl*'s are often employed in parallel with an injunctive, viz. the jussive or the volitive. In such cases, the *qtl* is generally employed for stative nuances while the prefix forms express motion or the transitive. There are naturally occasional exceptions; transitive *qtl*'s were noted in this syntactic function.

Such a wide spectrum of usages, paralleled by practically all of the main suffix forms, surely points to the suffix conjugation in many of these functions as something of a late comer in the Semitic languages. This is not to deny its prehistoric origin. But diachronically, one gets the impression that in the second millennium B.C.E., *qtl* was still in the process of expanding its field of employment in the NWS dialects.

Hopefully, this wide spectrum of usages and nuances in three time frames will finally convince one and all that the *qtl* conjugation pattern did not originate in an expression of completed action. On the contrary, the stative nuance, which certainly reflects the continuous and not the punctiliar, seems to be more ancient and original. The adaptation of *qtl* forms for transitive verbs apparently led to the past tense usage. The optative usage, probably originally frequent in wishes and affirmations, led to the various injunctive functions. The suffix conjugation pattern deserves to be treated in terms of its actual functions and not in terms of an outdated and unrealistic theory. A more inappropriate term than "perfect" could hardly be imagined!

CHAPTER XV

THE INFINITIVE — MORPHOLOGY

Previous studies have noted some of the salient features of morphology pertaining to the infinitive (Böhl 1909:63, §31; Ebeling 1910:59, §10) and Moran has dealt with the most striking syntactical usages (Moran 1950a:57-59; 1950c; 1951). On the other hand, because there are so many infinitive forms throughout the corpus, no one study has ever summarized all the evidence from the Cananite EA texts.

THEME FORMS

The following are the various theme forms employed in these texts. Most of them are the standard forms of classical Akkadian but a few of them represent deviations that are of special interest.

G STEM

qatāl. Over two hundred examples of infinitive forms are derived from this theme including those from weak verbs. The same theme form is employed in all the various syntagmas. The picture, then, is that of normal Akkadian usage, one basic infinitival form for all functions, unlike Hebrew, which developed special forms for construct situations while reserving the *qāṭōl* < *qaṭāl* for certain "absolute" usages. The evidence for Ugaritic is mixed (Rainey 1971b:166-167, §9.25-9.27), but generally favor *qatāl* as the predominant form. The strong verbs the infinitive of which takes the *qatāl* in the letters from Canaanite scribes are: *balātu*, *baqāmu*, *dabābu*, *daḡālu*, *kabāsu/kabāšu*, *kašādu*, *lamādu*, *maqātu*, *nadānu*, *namāšu*, *našāru*, *pašāḥu*, *paṭāru*, *ṣabātu*, *ṣapāru*.

To those may be added the 1st Waw verbs (which have lost their initial consonant in line with all peripheral dialects), (*w*)*arādu* "to descend," and (*w*)*ašābu* "to sit, dwell, reside." 1st Aleph verbs without vowel coloring are: *abātu*, *akālu*, *alāku*, *amāru*, including the denominative verb (from *ardu* < *wardu* "slave"), *arādu* "to serve."

The 1st Aleph verbs with vowel coloring do not present a uniform picture. To be sure, there are a few instances of standard Babylonian forms e.g.

¹ú / *la-a ni-la-ú* / *e-ze-eb a-ba!-at!* / *šār-ri EN-ia* "And we cannot abandon the word of the king, my lord" (EA 211:17-20),

where the Babylonian infinitive governs a typically Assyrian form of the noun. A letter written by an Egyptian official to the ruler of Byblos, which has WS features, also employs a Babylonian form:

la-a-mi / *an-ti-in₄-nu e-re-eb* / LÚ.ME[Š] *ša URUŠu-mu-ri^{KI}* / [a]-n[a] URU.KI-ia "I will not permit the men of Šumur to enter my city" (EA 96:7-10; Youngblood 1961:399-400; 1962:26).

On the other hand, the Jerusalem letters have Assyrian *e-ra-ba* (EA 286:43) and *e-za-bi-ša* (EA 287:62; Moran 1975b:153); cf. the 1st Aleph with original ²₁, *e-re-š[i]* "to seek" (EA 289:7). Scribal negligence evidently is to blame for the following from Beirut:

aš-šum / *e-pu-uš DÜG.GA bi-ri-⟨nu⟩* "in order to establish a treaty between us" (EA 136:31-32; probably also [e]-*pu-uš* in EA 280:10).

The form *e-pu-uš* is evidently nothing but a slip whereby the thematic vowel of the G preterite and imperative was inserted.

Special deviations in the Byblos letters for 1st ³ and ²₄ verbs are discussed below under *qitāl* / *qitīl* forms.

The IInd Aleph verb *ša²ālu* may have had *šālu* as exemplified in *a-na ša-al URU.DIDLI.KI.[H]Á* (EA 144:29; cf. also the broken context EA 92:40), but a marginally Canaanized text

also seems to have *b[a-]lu ša!-a-al* PN (EA 185:68; correction according to Moran 1987b:423 n. 8; 1992:267 n. 9).

The IInd Waw/ \bar{U} (middle weak) verbs attested are *dâku*, *da-k[i]* (EA 134:12) and *târu*, *ta-ri* (EA 85:70). One example is attested from *rêšu* "to assist," *re-šî-ia* (EA 92:45).

For IIIrd Aleph verbs the situation is more complex. In many instances, an inflectional case vowel is expected and its relationship to the thematic *-ā-* vowel is hard to determine, particularly when the syllabic sign can be transcribed as *Ce* or *Ci*.

The one IIIrd ʔ_1 verb with infinitives attested in this corpus is *(w)ašû* "to go out." One letter from Biryawaza treats the infinitive of this verb as having a strong aleph in the third position:

ù / ki-ma a-ša-i dUTU.MEŠ / iš-tu ša-me ki-na-an-na / tu-qa-ú-na
İR.MEŠ / a-ša-i a-wa-te^{MEŠ} / iš-tu UZUKA / \ pí-i be-li-šu-nu
 "And like the coming(s) forth of the sun god from heaven, thus
 the servants are looking forward to the coming(s) forth of the
 words from the mouth of their lord" (EA 195:17-23).

The fact that these forms, *a-ša-i*, are in construct with their subject and the second form is an accusative, suggests that the scribe intended both of them to indicate the plural. Therefore, we have rendered "coming(s) forth." The fact that the subjects of both infinitives have the MEŠ determinative might even be a strengthening of the plural meaning here. Other accusative forms, which are not in construct, have a final *a* vowel, evidently meant to be long:

ù ú-ul ni-le-ú / a-ša-am a-na EDIN.MEŠ "and we are unable to go
 forth to the open fields" (EA 88:20-21; Moran 1975a:156-157); *la-a*
i-le-e a-ša / [a-na EDIN.MEŠ] "I am unable to go forth [to the
 open fields]" (EA 81:21-22; Moran *loc. cit.*); *ù / la-a i-le-ú / a-ša*
 "and I am unable to go out" (EA 104:49-51); *uḥ-ḥu-ra-ta / a-ša*
 "You were late coming" (EA 102:9-10).

The same orthography may also stand for the construct:

[. . .] *tu-ba!-ú-na* *a-ša pí-ťá-ti* "they are see<king> the coming forth of the army" (EA 70:26).

But surprisingly enough, accusatives in construct can also be written like genitives:

[ù] *tu-ba!-ú-na ur-ra* / [ù] *mu-ša-am a-šé ERÍN.MEŠ* / *pí-ťá-ti* "[And] they are seeking day [and] night the coming forth of the army" (EA 73:20-22); *ù la-a-mì ni-le-ú* / *a-šé KÁ^a-bu-ul-li* / *ša-aḥ-ri* / *iš-tu pa-ni* ¹*La-ab-a-ya* "And we are unable to go out the city gate because of Lab³ayu" (EA 244:15-17).

The same holds true when there is a suffix pronoun as the subject of the infinitive:

ù a-na-ku i-ba-ú a-šé-ši "But I seek its coming forth" (EA 362:58).

A similar form may serve in the finite function of the infinitive, this time with an enclitic:

šum-ma / *ti-iš-mu-na a-šé-mi ERÍN.MEŠ* / *pí-ťá-ti* *ù i-zi-bu URU.MEŠ-šu-nu* / *ù pa-aṭ-ru* "If they hear 'The army has come forth,' then they will leave their towns and depart" (EA 73:11-14; Rainey 1989-90:58b; cf. *supra*, pp. 343, 360; *infra*, p. 384).

Admittedly, the infinitive in this passage might simply be the object of *tišmûna*, in which case it would be a *nomen regens* plus the enclitic (thus Youngblood 1961:112). But comparison with the following passage tends to provide support for the rendering we have preferred above (cf. *infra*, pp. 385-386):

a-šé-mi ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-tu *ù ša-mu* / *a-na ú-mi ka-ša-di-ši* *ù ta-ra-at URU.KI a-na LUGAL be-li-ia* "As soon as the army comes forth and they hear about the day of its arrival, then the city will return to the king, my lord" (EA 137:49-51; cf. Moran 1950c:170a; 1987b:358 and 360 n. 9; 1992:218, 220 n. 9).

Likewise for the following, where the infinitive in a conditional sentence, in construct with its subject, is negated by *bali*:

[*a-mur-m*]i *ba-li a-šé* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-t[á-ti]* / [*i-na* MUŠ]^{a-an-ti} *a-ni-ti*
 "[Behold], if there is no coming forth of the army [in] this
 [y]ear" (EA 129:40-41; Moran 1987b:347 n. 20; 1992:211 n. 19).

Such forms are expected, of course, when the infinitive is dependent upon a preposition, as constructs and with pronominal suffixes:

a-di / a-šé ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ti* "until the coming forth of the army"
 (EA 71:26-27; also EA 70:23; 79:31; 82:19; 105:18-19; 127:38-39; cf.
 also EA 334:8); *iš-tu a-šé-ia* "after I came forth" (EA 270:12).

In all of these cases where the ZI sign has been used, we have transcribed *a-šé* on the assumption that the intended form is **(w)ašā'i* › *ašé*.

One verb with IIIrd 3 is widely documented, viz. *leqû* "to take (to capture, to rescue)." All the Byblos occurrences of this verb have an *a* vowel in the first syllable, thus conforming to the Assyrian rather than the Babylonian pattern. There is reason to believe, however, that this pattern is due to a Canaanite or peripheral tendency, although Assyrian influence cannot be entirely ruled out. The other peripheral dialects do not present a uniform picture; some of them have forms with first syllable *le-* (e.g. Mitanni, EA 20:9) while others have *la-* (Hattusas, Labat 1932:155) or both (Ugarit, Huehnergard 1989:182).

More problematic is the second, or theme, vowel. Even the Assyrian form preserved the *ā* vowel, e.g. *a-na ūp-pí-im ša kà-ri-im / lá-qá-im* "to bring a tablet of the Kārum" (KTH 16 A:9-11; cited by Hecker 1968:215, §127g). Therefore, it should not be surprising to find the suffixless accusative form with an *a* class vowel, apparently representing long *â*:

URUŠu-mu-ra tu-ba-ú-na la-qa "Šumur they are seeking to take"
 (EA 105:23); *a-nu-¹ma¹* 2 URU *ša ir-ti-hu / a[-n]a ia-ši¹ yu¹-ba-ú*

la-qa / [*a-na ša-a-šu*] "Now, the two towns which remain to me, he is seeking to take [for himself]" (EA 76:9-11; Youngblood 1961:172).

The latter of those passages can be compared with the continuation of the same letter where the same infinitive is in construct with its direct object:

ù yu-ba-ú / [*la-qa ka-li URU.MEŠ šàr-ru*(sic!) ^dUTU / [*a-n*]a
ša-a-šu / . . . *i-nu-ma* / ¹*yu*¹-*ba-ú la-qa KUR LUGAL a-na ša-a-šu*
"And he is seeking [to ta]ke all the towns of the king, the sun
god, [fo]r himself . . . that he is seeking to take the land of the
king for himself" (EA 76:12-16; also EA 91:13).

To these may be added the various broken passages where lengthening of the final vowel of the infinitive is represented graphically:

ù šu-nu y[u-ba-ú] / [*la-]qa-a* "And these he [is seeking] [to ta]ke"
(EA 73:12-13); *ù 2* ¹URU¹ *y[u-ba-]ú* / [*la-q*]a-a "And the two
towns he is seeking to [ta]ke" (EA 81:10-11).

It would seem that the scribes knew the independent accusative form of *leqû* as **laqâ* and the construct form as **laqâ*. But the situation is not so simple. Accusatives in construct with its object are also attested with an *e* class vowel:

šum-ma la-a ti-le-ú la-qé ÌR-k[*a*] "If you are unable to rescue
yo[ur] servant" (EA 114:44); *mi-ia-mi yi-ma-gi-ir / ur-ru-ba it-ti*
¹*šàr-ri EN-ia / le-qé-ma GUŠKIN!* ù GUŠKIN.GUN / ¹*šàr-ri EN-ia*
"Who would agree to entering in to the king, my lord, to take
gold and red gold?" (EA 283:10-13; Rainey 1989-90:71).

Perhaps these scribes were making a hypercorrection, assuming **laqê* / **leqê*. Note that the latter form is the only instance in the texts from Canaan with first syllable *le-* (possibly influenced by the imperative *lé-qé* in line 11)

Accusative forms with suffix pronouns as their direct object invariably have an *a* vowel, for an assumed **laqā-*:

la-qa-ia (EA 79:40; 82:7); *la-qa-ši* (EA 83:20; 91:23); *la-qa-šu[-nu]*
(EA 79:28); *la-qa-[-ši-na]* (EA 124:53).

For the "absolute" use of the infinitive to strengthen a finite verb, the evidence is mixed. All examples are from Byblos:

[ù] *la-qa-ma* ^{URU}Gub[-*la*] / [iš-*t*]u *qa-ti-ka la-a-[mi]* /
[*yi-il-qu*]-*ši*_x(ŠE) *a-di da-r[i-ti]* "[But] to take Byblos from your
hand, [he will] never [take] it" (EA 124:54-56; cf. Moran
1987b:337,338 n. 10; 1992:203, 204 n. 10).

The final *a* vowel is consistent with other examples of this verbal usage (Moran 1950a:57). But note the following:

ù *la-^lqé^l-^lmi^l* *ti-il-qú-na-ši* "then they will surely capture it"
(EA 131:17; cf. Moran 1950a:176).

The scribe may have been thinking of an original **laqē'a* > **laqê*.

When the infinitive is in the dependent case, after a preposition, it is also in construct with its object. The Megiddo scribe has a unique construction:

a-na la-qé-i / ^{URU}Ma-gi-id-da^{KI} "to capture Megiddo"
(EA 244:23-24; Rabiner 1981:82 §4.5.4).

It is possible that the scribe intended his form to be read **laqî*, but he may have meant **laqē'i*. Other scribes, from Byblos and Tyre, make use of a shorter form:

a-na la-qé / ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ "to get horses" (EA 112:26-27;
likewise EA 124:52; 362:36; from Tyre: EA 148:32-33; 154:16-17).

The same bound form is used with suffix pronouns as the object:

a-na la-qé-ši "to take it" (EA 137:46); *a-na la-qé-ši-m[a]* "to take it" (EA 120:33); *a-na la-qé-n[u]* "to rescue u[s]" (EA 20).

These forms could also be read *la-qí*, *la-qí-ši* etc. It is impossible to know whether the scribe was thinking of *laqî*, *laqē-*, or whether he was simply constructing a form with the necessary case ending.

Another attested weak verb, with IIIrd ²₄, is *šemû*. Once it appears in the well known adverbial function as reinforcement of a finite verb (for discussion, cf. *infra*, pp. 389-390), in this instance a G passive present-future:

ù ša-ma ú-ul / [tu-u]š-mu-na "but they are really not heeded" (EA 89:9-10).

Comparison with *a-ša-b[a l]a a-ši-ib* "he is really not located" (EA 92:10) shows that the form in this function must be in the accusative, thus **šamâ*. However, in another syntagma, where strong verbs have either zero or the mysterious *-ī* (cf. *infra*, pp. 383-384), viz. as a finite verb, the same orthography is found:

ša-ma-ma šu-nu "If they should hear" (EA 104:43; cf. Rainey 1989-90:59b).

In the two instances of dependent forms the orthography is *i-na ša-me* (EA 120:38; 144:17), reflecting the same problem as the comparable forms of *leqû*. Should these two examples perhaps be read *ša-mì*? Both of them are bound forms followed by their direct object.

Two verbs which are IIIrd Y/*Ī* are attested. One of these, *qabû* "to speak," appears in a particular syntagma, after *kīma* in construct with its subject:

ki-ma qa-bi LUGAL EN-ia "as the king, my lord, said" (EA 114:21; also EA 155:12; 216:11; 220:13-14; 323:11-12; 325:21-22).

Also with suffixes as the subject:

ki-ma qa-bi-ia (EA 117:28); [*ki-m*]a *qa-bi-ka* (EA 193:22); *ki-ma ša qa-bi-šu* (EA 329:20; also EA 302:18).

The bound form is followed by its direct object, in the form of a direct citation:

LUGAL EN-*li ša-pár a-na mu-ḥi-[i]a* ¹*Ḥa-a-ia* / *a-na qa-bi*
KASKAL-*ra-ni*^{ḤA} / ^{KUR}*Ḥa-na-gal*₉-*bat an-nu-ú* / *ú-wa-še-ru-na* *ù*
uš-še-ru-ši "The king, my lord, sent to me Ḥāya to say "This
Ḥanagalbat caravan I am sending, so expedite it!" (EA 255:8-11).

The other verb is *šatû* "to drink." One Byblos example has a suffix as subject:

ù i[a-nu / A.MEŠ! *a-na š[a]-te-šu* "but there was no water for him
to drink" (EA 85:53-54).

However, the Tyrian scribe adopted a special unique form to be discussed below.

qitil/qitāl. The Byblos letters have a particularly remarkable deviation from the norm for 1st Aleph verbs with ³₃-³₄. Infinitive forms from this verb class are only attested with initial *i-* instead of the expected *e-*. Because of the ambiguity of the syllabary in this period, it is impossible to say for certain whether the Byblos scribes preserved the thematic *ē* vowel. Giving them the benefit of the doubt on that point, one may transcribe two forms by *i-pé-eš* (EA 73:25; 89:43) because of the final *eš* sign. This would also permit the renderings *i-pé-ša* (EA 129:27; also [*i-p*]é-ša EA 79:24) and *i-[p]é-ši*. (EA 132:44) as well as *i-re-ši* (EA 81:38; also *i-re-ši-[i]m* EA 74:19 and [*i-r*]e-š[*i*] (EA 90:44). But there are several attestations to *i-pí-iš*, which could be rendered *i-pé-eš*₁₅ (EA 69:17; 129:29; 362:45; and outside of Byblos, EA 250:21; 364:22). The source of these forms is most likely contamination with the noun *ipšu/epšu*, which has the meaning "act, deed," only in the western peripheral texts from Amarna, Taanach and Ugarit (CAD E:168b-169a); its construct form is written syllabically *i-pí-iš*

(EA 84:7 *et al.*). The question arises concerning a form in EA 179, a letter which consistently uses the *e* sign with the value i_{15} ; should the transcription be *e-pé-šu* or i_{15} -*pé-šu* (EA 179:17)? The earliest attestation to the initial *i* vowel is from Tanaach: *i-pé-ša-am* (TT 2:11); the same letter happens to have the noun *ip-ša-šu-nu* "their work" (TT 2:14). A similar form, from *erēbu*, is attested in a Beirut letter, *i-re-bi* (EA 143:18).

Strangely enough, the Boghazköi IZI = *išatu* (KBo 1, 31) has two entries with *i-pé-šu* (lines r. 13', 14'; CAD E:192b) and a fragmentary epistle has *i-re-bi* (KUB 3, 82:11).

For the verb *šatû*, the texts from Tyre have a form not known elsewhere. All of the examples are dependent on *ana*; the bound form is followed by a nominal subject:

*e-nu-ma it[-t]a-din / LUGAL be-li-ia A.MEŠ a-na ši-ti / ÌR
MÍMa-ya-a-ti* "When the king, my lord, gave water for the
servant of Mayāti to drink" (EA 155:24-26).

In two other similar contexts the form in question governs a suffix pronoun as subject:

a-na ši-ti-ya "for me to drink" (EA 151:39); *a-na ši-te-šu* "for him
to drink" (EA 148:13; 155:10).

The one infinitival form, hitherto unrecognized, from *izzuzu* is constructed like the preterite with accusative ending:

*mi-ia-mi yi-ma-lik i-zi-za [i]-na pa-ni / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-at LUGAL
be-lí-ia* "Who would consider standing up to the army of the
king, my lord?" (EA 94:12-13).

N STEM

One of the glosses has been assumed to be 3rd m.pl. It may very well be an infinitive in the nominative, used absolutely only to explain the basic meaning of the verb being glossed. If it really is an infinitive, then it testifies to *naqtal* as the N stem infinitive

form. In spite of considerable disagreement about the Akkadian verb being glossed, the general meaning is fairly clear:

ša-ni-tam ú-ul ti-i-de / at-ta ^{KUR}*A-mur-ri ur-ra / mu-sa tu-ba-ú-na*
/ ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti ú-ul ta-ša-aš / \ na-aq-ša-pu* "Furthermore,
don't you know Amurru? Day (and) night they are asking for
the army. Don't be angry!" (EA 82:47-51; Albright and Moran
1948:242, 244 n. 6; Youngblood 1961:235-236; CAD B:363a;
Moran 1987b:264 n. 6; 1992:152 n. 6; *contra* CAD A/2:424b).

The form *ú-ul ta-ša-aš* must be 2nd m.s. negative jussive. Amurru was treated as 3rd m.pl. with the verb *tu-ba-ú-na*, and many scholars have assumed that it is subsequently treated as a collective (Albright and Moran 1948:242, 244 n. 6; Youngblood 1961:235-236; CAD B:363a; Moran 1987b:264 n. 6; 1992:152; CAD Q:146a). They thus assumed that the gloss is 3rd m.pl., *qtl* as the translation of a 3rd f.s. preterite. The negation by *ú-ul* could then be a rhetorical question. However, it may be a negative jussive (used here instead of *lā*, as is sometimes the case). The gloss may then be an N infinitive added only to confirm the meaning.

The only N stem hybrid infinitive attested is also a preterite form with the accusative case ending added:

a-na ^{URU}*I-bir*₅¹-*ta / al-ka ù b[u]-ú in*₄^{né-ep-ša / a-na} LÚ.MEŠ
GAZ.MEŠ "I went to 'Ibirta but they sought to join the 'apîrû
men" (EA 104:52-54; Rainey 1989-90:59b).

D STEM

Few are the D stem infinitives on the standard Akkadian pattern. The deviations from the Akkadian theme form adopted by the scribes in Canaan have a special interest for WS linguistics.

quttul. Surprisingly, this is not the usual D stem theme for the infinitive in these texts from Canaan. The one strong verb appearing in the normal Akkadian theme form is in the following Tyrian passage:

ù GIŠ.MEŠ *a-na šu-ḥu-ni-ia* "and wood to warm me" (EA 147:66; for the full context, cf. *infra*, p. 403).

Three examples of the denominative from MB *ardu* "servant," also conform to the *quttal* pattern.

ù *i-ma-la-ku ba-li-mì / ur-ru-ud* LUGAL EN-*ia* "And would I consider not serving the king, my lord?" (EA 191:9-10); *ia-nu / pa-ni ša-nu-ta₅ iš-tu / ur-ru-ud šār-ri* "There is no other intention other than to serve the king" (EA 253:26-28); ù *ut-te-er / a-na* LUGAL EN-*ia* *iš-tu / LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ aš-šum ur-ru-di-šu* "And I brought back (the towns) to the king, my lord, from the *apîrû* men in order to serve him" (EA 189:15-17).

quttal / quttāl. It is now clear that this was the standard D stem infinitival theme form in Ugaritic. The quadrilingual dictionary has *pu-la-ṭu* for **pullaṭu* "to rescue, deliver" (*Ug* 5, 137:II, 20') and *ḥu-wa-ú* probably for **ḥuwwayu* "to give life" (*Ug* 5, 137:II, 17'; Rainey 1969a:108). Three verbs are attested in the Amarna letters from Canaan with this same theme form. One example is from the denominative of *ardu* which has been discussed above:

[*a-m*]ur *ip-ši* ¹*Pí-i-ia* / ¹DUMU ¹LÚ*Gu-la-ti₇* / [*a-na*] *ia-ši* LÚ.MEŠ-*ia* / *š[a] uš-ši-ir-ti a-na / ur-ra-di i-na* ^{URU}*Ia-pu* / ù *a-na na-ša-ri / É-ti \ šu-nu-ti* LUGAL EN-*ia* / ù *al-lu-ú il₅-qé-šu-nu* / ¹*Pí-i-ia* DUMU *Gu-la-ti* "[Beh]old the deed(s) of Pīya son of Gulati [against] me; as for my men whom I sent to serve in Joppa and to guard the granary of the king, my lord, then behold Pīya son of Gulati took them" (EA 294:16-24).

The Tyrian scribe probably had this form in mind, but confused it with the 1st c.s. suffix form:

ù *id-din pa-ni-ia / a-na ur-da-ti-šu* [ù] / ^{IMf}*Ma-ia-a-ti BE-ti-ia* "And I will set my face to serve him [and] Mayāti, my mistress" (EA 155:27-29).

The most frequent verb in this theme is from *wuššuru*, which, as mentioned previously (*supra*, pp. 157-168), has the special meaning "to send" in western peripheral texts, especially EA. Youngblood (1961:231-232) has observed that if this pattern represents a true Canaanite vocalization, then the thematic *a* vowel must have been short; otherwise it would have shifted to *ô* and in the cuneiform script it would have been written *uš-šu-ur*.

All the attested forms are direct objects governed by other verbs, e.g.

la-a-mi i-le-ú uš-šar / ^{GIŠ}MÁ.MEŠ-*ia a-na aš-ra-nu* "I am unable to send my ships there" (EA 126:7-8; also EA 82:21-22; 105:86-87; 113:28-30; 117:43-44; 129:77-79).

In addition to the various *ši-ti* forms from *šatû* in the Tyre correspondence (*supra*, p. 376), there is also one apparent D stem form of the infinitive:

a-na na-da-an me-e a-na šu-ta-ia "to give water for me to drink (or: for watering me)" (EA 147:65; for context cf. *infra*, p. 403).

qattil. A letter from Gath-padalla has two infinitives in the *qattil* theme from a root attested in Ugaritic. Since this is also the D infinitive form of Hebrew, it may have been preferred in the dialect of some EA scribes:

yi-de-mi šar-ru EN-ia [i]-n[u]-ma / *tu-ur-ri-šú-m[i]* 2 DUMU ^{LÚ}ar-ni ¹LUGAL ¹[b]e-lí-*ia* / 2 DUMU ¹La-ab-a[-y]a *pa-ni-šu-ni* / *a-na ḥa-lí-iq* KUR ¹šar¹-*ri EN-ia* "May the king, my lord, be apprised that the two sons of the traitor to the king, my lord, the two sons of Lab²ayu, have set their faces to destroy the land of the king, my lord" (EA 250:4-7); *a-na ḥal-lí-iq* / KUR LUGAL EN-*ia yu-ba-d'-ú* ¹Mil¹-¹ki¹-¹l[i] "Milkilu seeks to destroy the land of the king, my lord" (EA 250:55-56).

Tagu of Gath-carmel has three other infinitives with this theme:

ù bu-i-ti₇ pu-ḫi-ir / KASKAL.ḪÁ *i-na qa-at ŠEŠ-ia* "And I sought to organize a caravan under the charge of my brother" (EA 264:6-7); *la-a i-le-ú uš-šir₄* / KASKAL.ḪÁ-*ia a-na* ¹*šār-ri EN-ia* "I am unable to send the caravan to the king, my lord" (*Ibid.*, lines 9-10); *i-na-an-na bu-i-ti₇ uš-šir₄* / KASKAL.ḪÁ-*ia a-na* ¹*šār-ri* / \ EN-*ia* "Now, I sought to send my caravan to the king, my lord" (*Ibid.*, lines 20-22).

The use of both *puḫhir* and *uššir* show that *qattil* was the scribe's real understanding of the proper theme for the D stem infinitive.

The Jerusalem scribe has only one D stem infinitive and it conforms to the *qattil* pattern even though it has the characteristic initial *m-* which the Jerusalem scribe prefers for *wuššuru*:

la-a a-la-á-e \ mu-še-ra KASKAL / *a-na šār-ri EN-ia* "I am unable to send a caravan to the king, my lord" (EA 287:27-29).

Š STEM

The few Š stem infinitives attested all have a *šuqtil* theme rather than the appropriate Akkadian *šuqtul*. This is not surprising for the Š from *tāru*, a stem usage exclusive to the Amarna texts from Canaan (AHw:1336a):

ù ú-ka-li LÚ-LIM / *an-nu-ú a-na šu-te-er* / *a-ṽa-ti a-na šār-ri* "But I kept this man back in order to send back word to the king" (EA 108:48-50).

This non-standard pattern also prevails with the Š of *ešēru*, a verb frequently used in the correspondence about making preparations for the arrival of the Egyptian army. Over and over again one finds:

a-na šu-ši-ri a-na pa-ni ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-at LUGAL EN-*ia* "to prepare for the arrival of the army of the king, my lord" (EA 191:4-6; also EA 201:12-13; 203:11; 204:12; 205:10; 206:11; 216:8; 292:31-32).

The synchronic significance of this form is hard to determine. It is not typical of any other peripheral dialect. Is it influenced by a Canaanite pattern? After all, there is no clear evidence that Canaanite had a real Š stem. But it could be the influence of a corresponding Canaanite H stem infinitive. Evidence for the vocalization of the Ugaritic Š stem infinitive is lacking. The suffix conjugation pattern for this Š verb in the Amarna letters from Canaan, which is also on the *šuqtil* theme (cf. *supra*, pp. 312-315), comes immediately to mind.

Št STEM

One example is attested of Št stem. It is from *šutēšuru* "to dispatch" (CAD E:359a):

*al-lu-ú uš-ši-i[r-]t[i] / ÌR LUGAL ša-n[a-a]m / a-na šu-^fta^l-ši-r[i] /
ù a-na da-ga-al / [pa-ni] LUGAL ^dUTU i[š-tu AN^{sa-mi-i}] "Behold, I
have sent another royal servant in order to dispatch (messages)
and in order to have an 'audience' with the king, the sun god
f[rom heaven]" (EA 306:22-27).*

INFLECTION

Since the infinitives are nominal forms, it is to be expected that they will be inflected as substantives. On the whole, this is the situation with only a few striking exceptions. In the following two chapters, the syntagmas in which the infinitives are to be found will be discussed at length. It may, nevertheless, prove useful to bring together here some of the salient features of infinitival inflection with special reference to departures from the usual norms.

DEPENDENT. The majority of infinitive forms are dependent upon prepositions. The normal case ending is naturally *-i*. There is one instance of an erroneous accusative ending in which the infinitive form is actually in construct with a following substantive:

ga-am-ru DUMU.MEŠ-*nu* MÍDUMU.MÍ.MEŠ-⟨*nu*⟩ / GIŠ! É-*nu*
i[-n]a na-da-ni₇ i-na ^{KUR}*Ia-ri-mu-ta / i-na ba-l[a]-tá* ZI-*nu* "Our sons
 and our daughters (and) the implements of our houses are all
 used up to pay in Yarimuta for the sustenance for our lives"
 (EA 74:15-17; Youngblood 1961:122, 133; contrast Moran
 1987b:251 n. 5; 1992:144 n. 5).

As Youngblood (1961:134) has observed, the proper form would be *ina balāt napištinu* with zero case ending.

ACCUSATIVE. In the same text cited above, there is an accusative: *ba-la-tá ÌR-šu* "the sustenance of his servant" (EA 74:54). Infinitives governed by finite verbs normally take the accusative unless they are in construct, e.g.

la-a-mi i-le-ú uš-šar / GIŠMÁ.MEŠ-*ia* "I am unable to send my
 ships" (EA 126:7-8).

FINITE. The example of an apparent nominative, *a-ša-bu* (EA 138:62) is probably 3rd m.pl. of the suffix conjugation (Rainey 1989-90:63). Infinitives standing in the function of finite verbs either have zero suffix or else an *-i*, which Moran (1961:60 = 1965:67-68) has compared to the *hireq compaginis* known from a number of examples in biblical Hebrew.

CHAPTER XVI

THE INFINITIVE — MORPHOSYNTAX

Discussion of the various syntagmas in which the infinitive is used will also entail explication of certain morphological variations, mainly inflectional suffixes, which accompany certain syntactic functions. The categories defined for the Canaanite EA texts are similar to those for Akkadian in general (Aro 1961), but in most syntagmas there are some unusual or distinguishing features of the Canaanite usages.

AS A FINITE VERB

One striking use of the infinitive, which does not have parallels in Akkadian, is its function as a finite verb in an independent clause. To Ebeling (1915:1491) goes the credit for this discovery. Practically all of the relevant passages were noted by Moran at one time or another (Moran 1950a:57-59; 1950c; 1952; 1961:61-62 = 1965:69-70). The construction is so unique in cuneiform texts (while documented for Ugaritic, Phoenician and Hebrew) that it seems appropriate to discuss every one of them here.

The examples cited below will be seen to have either $-\emptyset$ (e.g. *ša-bat-mi* EA 129:32; 362:25) or an $-i$ vowel (e.g. *pa-tá-ri-ma* EA 118:37; *ma-ti-ma* EA 89:38) as suffix. They also appear frequently with enclitic $-ma$ or $-mi$. The $-\emptyset$ tends to underline the "absolute" nature of these infinitival forms, except, of course, when the infinitive is in construct with a dependent subject or object. It would be interesting to know if the $-\emptyset$ represents a West Semitic development. The $-i$ vowel has been compared by Moran to the *hireq compaginis* known from a few forms in biblical Hebrew (Moran 1961:60 = 1965:67-68). A problem arises with regard to infinitives IIIrd Aleph or IIIrd Weak. Herein, transcriptions have been adopted such as *a-šé-mi* (EA 73:12) on the assumption that

the scribe intended to express **ašēmi* < **(w)ašā²īmi*, i.e. with the *-i* suffix. It also seems likely that the preservation of this suffix indicates a long vowel, hence *-ī*. The variations between \emptyset and *-i* with infinitives dependent on prepositions is a matter to be treated separately (cf. *infra*, pp. 402-403).

With one exception (EA 287:46; where the text is broken at the end of the line), all these infinitives are followed by an enclitic, either *-ma* to mark it as the logical predicate, or *-mi* signifying direct speech and/or to mark the logical predicate. Also, with few exceptions, all these infinitives are followed by their subject, either a substantive or an independent pronoun in the nominative. However, if the subject of the infinitive is identical to the subject of the finite verb in the following clause (which is logically linked to the infinitival clause), then the subject of the infinitive being used finitely need not be explicitly represented (EA 109:44-46; Moran 1950c:170 n. 16; EA 129:20-21; Moran 1987b:344, 346 n. 12; 1992:209, 210 n. 11; EA 116:10-12; Moran 1952:77 n. 11; 1987b:321 n. 1; 1992:192 n. 1),

PAST NARRATIVE. There are fewer examples of this usage than might be expected from synchronic comparison with Ugaritic (Gordon 1965:80, §9.29) and diachronic comparisons with later dialects such as Phoenician and Hebrew (Moran 1950c:169, 171). The key Amarna passage is in a Jerusalem letter:

pa-ṭa-a!-ri! / [IA]d-da-ya a-di LÚ.MEŠ ma-šar-ti LÚú-e-e / [ša i]-din šār-ri "[A]ddaya departed with the garrison troops [which] my king [had] given" (EA 287:46-48; Moran 1952:77a; 1987b:513 n. 13; 1992:330 n. 13).

The next example was not recognized by Moran but seems to be explained best as an example of the infinitive in finite usage:

šum-ma / ti-iš-mu-na a-šé-mi ERÍN.MEŠ / *pí-ṭá-ti ù i-zi-bu* URU.MEŠ-šu-nu / *ù pa-aṭ-ru* "If they hear 'The army has come forth,' then they will abandon their towns and they will depart" (EA 73:11-14; Rainey 1989-90:58; cf. *supra*, pp. 342-343, 360, 370).

The clause with **ašêmi* is the object of the verb *tišmûna*. Another infinitive in a broken context has also gone unrecognized:

ù [a]-la-ak-mi a-na-⟨ku⟩ a-na URU.A.PÚ[^{KI}] / a-na da[-ba-b]i a-na ma-ḥar Ḥa-mu-ni[-ri] "So ^T! [w]ent to Beirut in order to plead before ^cAmmuni[ra]" (EA 138:51-52).

The verb here is usually interpreted as a finite form; *allakmi* with zero suffix could be a preterite in these texts. However, it seems more commensurate with Canaanite scribal practice to posit an infinitive here alongside a defective writing of the 1st c.s. independent pronoun (certainly not a shortened *²*ana!*).

The last passage in this category was observed by Moran after the completion of his initial studies on the finite use of the infinitive. His subsequent analysis of the context involves some major improvements to the text:

yi-de / [LU]GAL i-nu-ma ma-qa-ti-ma a-⟨na⟩ UN-nu / ù ṣa-ab-tu-ši_x(ŠE) DUMU.MEŠ ḪR-A-ši-ir[-t]a "May the king be apprised that there was an attack ag[ainst] our garrison(!) and the sons of ^cAbdi-Ashirta have captured it!" (EA 116:10-12; Moran 1952:77 n. 11; 1987b:321 n. 1; 1992:192 n. 1).

"AS SOON AS." Three passages reflect a temporal relationship between the clause with the infinitive and the following clause. The best of these is from (*w*)*ašû* (cf. *supra*, p. 370) and has a 3rd f.s. subject; its clause is linked with a following clause having a 3rd m.pl. suffix verb:

a-šê-mi ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-tu ù ṣa-mu / a-na ú-mi ka-ša-di-ši ù ta-ra-at URU.KI a-na LUGAL be-li-ia "As soon as the army comes forth and they hear about the day of its arrival, then the city will return to the king, my lord" (EA 137:49-51; cf. Moran 1950c:170a; 1987b:358 and 360 n. 9; 1992:218 and 220 n. 9).

Admittedly, this complex could be rendered as a conditional sentence, "If the army comes forth" However, the insertion of

the clause about the Byblians' hearing "of the estimated time of arrival" of the Egyptian army strengthens the impression that the temporal relationship is being stressed.

Another such complex sentence with a temporal clause is the following:

ù ma-ti-ma šu-ut a-nu-ki? / i-de-šu "And as soon as he died, I learned of it" (EA 89:38-39; Moran 1950c:170a; 1987b:277; 1992:162; Youngblood 1961:333-334).

The reference is to someone whose death had already taken place. Another past event with similar temporal relationship has to do with a man sent by Rib-Haddi to a neighboring ruler:

ka-š[a-d]i-ma LÚ-ia ù / ra-ak-[š]a-šu "As soon as my man arrived, he bound him" (EA 116:27-28; Moran 1950a:57; 1950c:169; 1952:77 n. 11).

CONDITIONAL SENTENCES. Seven or more passages where the infinitive is employed finitely have conditional connotation. The infinitive form in question introduced the protasis (Moran 1950a:74) and corresponds to the suffix conjugation in similar contexts. Two of these were recognized already by Ebeling (1915:1491):

pa-ťá-ri-ma šu-ut [ù] / ia-nu ša-a yu-ba-lu [tup-pt-ia] / a-na mu-ħi-ka "If he departs, [then] there is no one who can deliver [my letter(s)] to you" (EA 113:40-42; Moran 1950a:57-58; 1950c:170); *al-lu / pa-ťá-ri-ma LÚ.MEŠ ħu-up-ši ù / ša-ab-tu LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ / URU* "Behold, if the yeomen farmers desert, then the *apīru* men will seize the city" (EA 118:37-39; Moran 1950a:57; 1950c:169-170; *contra* CAD A/1:358b).

Two other passages, from texts that were written by the same scribe (cf. Moran 1987b:341 n. 1; 1992:206 n. 1), serve to elucidate each other and also to confirm their interpretation (Moran 1950c:170):

ù ti-[i]q-bu-na ša-bat-mi n[i-nu] / URU.KI.MEŠ *Gub^{ub}-li ù mi[-na]*
 / 'ti¹-¹pu¹-š^u ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-tu* "And they are saying, 'If w[e]
 capture the town(s) of Byblos, then wh[at] can the army do?'"
 (EA 129:32-34; Moran 1987b:346 n. 16; 1992:210 n. 15); ù
 ti⁷-iq-bu-ni ša-bat-mi / ni-nu-u₁₆ URU.MEŠ *Gub^{ub}-li / ù*
da-na-nu-u₁₆ "And they are saying, 'If we capture the town(s) of
 Byblos, then we will be strong'" (EA 362:25-27).

The next passage requires some corrections to Knudtson's readings (Ebeling 1910:77); but nevertheless, it provides an excellent example of the infinitive in the protasis of a conditional sentence:

ù š[a-al-š^u] / šum-ma la-a qa-bi-ti / a-na ša-a-š^u a-pa-ši-m[i] / at-ta
 ki-ta it-[ti] DUMU.MEŠ / ʾĪR-A-ši-ir-ta [ù] / la-qú-ka "But a[sk
 him] if I didn't say to him, 'If you make a treaty wi[th] the sons
 of ʿAbdi-Ashirta, then they will seize you'" (EA 132:30-35;
 Moran 1950c:170b).

The following has a hitherto unrecognized infinitive. Moran had taken the form in question to be a dual suffix form, *šamâ-ma "they heard" (Moran 1987b:300 n. 3; 1992:177 n. 3), but such a dual form is otherwise unattested in this corpus and in fact is completely uncalled for. The full context is:

ša-ma-ma šu-nu / >š^u-nu< i-nu-ma i-te⁹-ru-bu / i-na URU.Šu-mu-ra
 / URU.MEŠ *an-nu-tu <i-na>* GIŠMÀ.MEŠ / ù DUMU.MEŠ
 ʾĪR-A-ši-i[r-]ta / i-na šé-ri ù / [i]z-[z]i-za UGU-<š^u-nu> ù / la-a
 i-le-ú / a-ša ù ep-ša-at URUGub-la / [a]-na LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ "If
 they hear that I am entering into Šumur, these cities (will be in)
 ships and the sons of ʿAbdi-Ashirta (will be) on land and I will
 be up against <them> and I will be unable to go forth lest Byblos
 go over to the ʿapîrû men" (EA 104:43-53; Rainey:1989-90:59a;
 contra Moran 1987b:300 n. 3; 1992:177 n. 3).

Two more passages have transitive infinitives without an immediately expressed subject. Instead of its subject, each

infinitive is followed by its direct object. One of the contexts in question would appear to be relatively free of exegetical complications:

pa-na-nu da-ga-li-ma / ¹LÚ¹ KURMi-iš-ri ù in₄-<na>-ab-tu /
[LU]GAL.MEŠ^{KUR}Ki-na-a[h]-ni iš-tu pa-n[i-šu] "Formerly, if they
saw a man from Egypt, then the [ki]ngs of Canaan would flee
from be[fore him]" (EA 109:44-46; Moran 1950a:57; 1950c:170
n. 16).

The second passage is somewhat broken but the meaning is reasonably certain:

[*la*]-qé-mi ši-a-ti [ù URU.KIGub^{ub}-la] / [ti-]il-q[ú]-na "If they capture
it (Baṭrôna), [then] they will take [Byblos]" (EA 129:20-21;
Moran 1987b:344, 346 n. 12; 1992:209, 210 n. 11).

The infinitive is transcribed here as if it derives from **laqāṛi* > **laqê*. The direct object is expressed by the independent 3rd f.s. accusative pronoun, a true rarity in these texts. The restoration at the end of line 20 is problematic; the width of the tablet does not seem to permit all the signs proposed in the restoration. Perhaps the scribe finished his line by turning upwards along the edge, a not uncommon custom.

Finally, there exists one example of a negated infinitive in the protasis of a conditional sentence. The negation is accomplished by dependence on the negative particle *bali*. Although the syntax is different, viz. an adverbial phrase introduced by this negative preposition, it would appear that this was the accepted means of negating the infinitive in a conditional protasis:

[*a-mur-m*]i ba-li a-šé ERÍN.MEŠ pí-†[á-ti] / [i-na MUŠ]^{a-an-ti} an-ni-ti
/ [ù la-]qú-mi ¹URU.¹MEŠ¹ ¹Gub¹ub¹-la "[Behold], without the
coming forth of the arm[y in] this [y]ear, [then] they [will ta]ke
the town(s) of Byblos" (EA 129:40-42; Moran 1987b:347 n. 20;
1992:211 n. 19).

PARANOMASTIC USAGE

The syntagma of strengthening a finite verb by the adverbial use of the absolute infinitive is widely attested in OA and in OB, where the pattern is *qatālumma iqattal/iqtul*, etc. (GAG:202-203, §150a; Aro 1961:112-115). However, it is extremely rare in MB; only one example is cited by the grammars, *šá-a-lu ú-ul i-šá-a-la-an-ni* "He certainly didn't ask me" (BE 17/1 42:15; Aro 1955:122; 1961:114; GAG:203). An Egyptian epistle from the Ramesside period has: *ù la-qú-ú ul il-qa-aš-š[u-nu?]* "He verily did not take th[em?]" (KUB 3, 27:r. 19; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:183, §2.4.4). Otherwise, this construction seems to be unattested in the peripheral dialects. The infinitive is presumed to be in the locative-adverbial case (GAG:202). There are some instances in Assyrian when the infinitive stands in the accusative (GAG:203), including the MA examples (CAD N/1:290): *nu-pu-ša na-ap-pí-ša* (KAV 109:12) and *nu-pu-ša na-pí-ša* "air out (the garments)" (KAV 99:14).

Ugaritic employs the locative-adverbial with *-u* (not the nominative as Moran 1950a:127 n. 133, had assumed), as in the following:

*rġb . rġbt [...] hm . ġmu . ġmit = *raġābu raġibti . . . humma ġamā²u ġami²ti* "Are you verily hungry? . . . Or are you verily thirsty?" (KTU 1.4:33-34); *bu . tbu = *bā²u tubā²u* "She verily came" (KTU 1.16:VI 3); *šsu . aššu = *šōšī²u ²ašōšī²u* "I will verily bring out" (KTU 2.34:up.ed. 2).

This is remarkable because the four examples from the Byblos texts have the infinitive in the accusative!

None of the four Byblos passages is satisfactory; all are broken or problematic. The case ending is certain, however, as in the following:

ù ša-ma ú-ul / [tu-u]š-mu-na "But they were verily not [he]deded" (EA 89:9-10); *a-na [li]b-bi-ši-na a-ša-b[a l]a a-ši-[i]b* "In their midst he is verily not located" (EA 92:10); *[ù] la-qa-ma^{URU}Gub[-la] /*

[iš-t]u qa-ti-ka la-a-[mi] / [yi-il-qú]-ši_x(ŠE) a-di da-r[i-ti] "[And] taking Byb[los] from your hand [he will] not [take] it forev[er]" (EA 124:54-56).

The final example is more difficult to interpret morphologically though the syntagma is clear:

ù la-^lqé^l-^lmi^l ti-il-qú-na-ši "then verily they will capture it" (EA 131:17; Moran 1950a:57, 176).

Perhaps the orthography was meant by the scribe to represent *laqē-mi*, with vowel coloring in proximity to the missing guttural.

DIRECT OBJECT OF ANOTHER VERB

One of the most frequent usages of the infinitive is as the object of a governing verb (Aro 1961:74-108). By such combinations, various modal nuances were expressed. It should be noted that the infinitive in this position takes the accusative case. This is usually signified by the *-a* suffix but if the infinitive governed its own object as a dependent noun or suffix, then it may take the bound form with *-Ø* suffix, cf. *i-pé-eš₁₅ ar-ni* "to commit a crime" (EA 362:45) with *[i-p]é-ša^{URUGub-la}* "to conquer Byblos" (EA 79:24; Moran 1987a:212). When the infinitive is third weak, the accusative *-a* may be expressed, e.g. *la-qa^{URUGub-la}* "to take Byblos" (EA 91:13), or may lead to a contracted form, e.g. *a-šé KÁ^{a-bu-ul-lí} \ ša-aḥ-ri* "to go out the city gate" (EA 244:16). An enclitic, such as *-mi*, may intervene between the construct and its dependent subject or object, e.g. *a-ba-at-mi^{URUMa-gid₆-da}[KI]* "to destroy Megiddo" (EA 244:42-43).

The ensuing catalogue of examples is arranged according to the governing verbs. In each case at least one example of every infinitive governed by the particular verb will be given and special features of the syntax will be highlighted. The majority of cases have the infinitive after the governing verb; only rarely does the infinitive precede its governing verb as in the standard Akkadian dialects (GAG:203, §150e). One may note that, in Mari,

among the verbs governing an infinitive, only *raṭābu* "to continue," has its infinitive after the finite form; this construction is considered a West Semitism (Finet 268, §93d; GAG:183, §130d).

bu²²û. This is the second most frequently used verb to govern the infinitive (ca. 23 attestations). Its special meaning, "to seek, desire," is definitely of western peripheral provenance, mainly in the EA texts from Canaan but also in Ugarit and Hattusas (CAD B:363-364; cf. *infra*, pp. 140-146); only rarely does it appear in Nuzi or in NA contexts. The idiom is obviously a calque on some WS verb; roots such as the cognate to *bu²²û*, Ugaritic **bġy*, or others such as **bq̄t* or Heb. **drš*, come to mind. One Ugaritic passage does employ the imperative *bq̄t* to translate *bu²²û* in a well known idiom (KTU 2.39:34; Rainey 1971b:162), but it is unattested with an infinitive as object.

The range of infinitives used with *bu²²û* is as follows; first two examples in which the infinitive precedes the finite verb:

a-ba-at-mi ^{URU}*Ma-gid₆-da*^[K1] / *yu-ba-á²-ú* "He is seeking to destroy Megiddo" (EA 244:42-43); *ù* LÚ.MEŠ / *ḥu-<ub>-šī-ia pa-tá-ra-ma tu-ba-ú-na* "But my yeoman farmers are seeking to desert" (EA 114:21-22).

As mentioned above, the infinitive usually comes after its governing finite verb. One verb of motion happens to have the same subject as the governing verb:

ù yu-ba-ú / *a-la-k*^[a₁₃] *a-di* ^{URU}*Gub-la* "And he was seeking to come as far as Byblos" (EA 85:52-53).

But another verb of motion has a subject different from that of the governing verb:

[*ù*] *tu-ba¹-ú-na ur-ra* / [*ù*] *mu-ša-am a-šé* ERÍN.MEŠ / *pí-tá-ti* "[And] they are seeking day and night the coming forth of the army" (EA 73:20-22; also EA 70:20); *ù a-na-ku i-ba-ú a-šé-ši* "But I am seeking its (the army's) coming forth" (EA 362:58).

A transitive infinitive, on the other hand, has the same subject as the governing verb and may express its own object as a dependent noun or pronoun:

[ù] *ki-na-na tu-ba-ú-na / [i-p]é-ša* URUGub-la ù / URUBaṭ-ru-na^{KI}
 "[And] thus they are seeking [to con]quer Byblos and Baṭrôna"
 (EA 79:23-25; for this meaning of *epēšu*, cf. Moran 1987a:212).

One might argue that, because of the final *-a* on the infinitive, the following GN's are not in the dependent case but rather in the accusative. However, the preservation of a case vowel on a nominal form in the construct, i.e. *[i-p]é-ša*, is not unknown in Akkadian written by WS scribes (Huehnergard 1989:150-151). Nevertheless, the usual bound form in the infinitive has $-\emptyset$ suffix:

ù *ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ ḫa-za-nu-te tu-ba-ú-na / i-pé-eš an-nu-tu₄*(sic!)
a-na ḪR-A-ši-ir-ta "And all the city rulers are seeking to do this
 to 'Abdi-Ashirta" (EA 73:23-25); ù *ti-ba-ú-na i-pé-eš₁₅ ar-ni* "But
 they are seeking to commit treason" (EA 362:45; also
 EA 129:29).

A contrived N stem infinitive of *epēšu* also has the same subject as its governing verb:

a-na URUI-'bir₅¹-ta / *al-ka ù 'bu¹-ú in₄-né-ep-ša / a-na* LÚ.MEŠ
 GAZ.MEŠ "I went to 'Ibirta but they sought to join the 'apîrû
 men" (EA 104:52-54; Rainey 1989-90:59a; *contra* Moran
 1987b:300 n. 5; 1992:177 n. 3).

Infinitives of the transitive *leqû* also have the same subject as their governing verb and usually govern their own object as a dependent noun (EA 91:13) or pronoun (EA 79:28; 91:22-23). But for emphasis, the object of the infinitive may be placed at the head of the clause, before the governing verb:

URUṢu-mu-ra *tu-ba-ú-na la-qa* "And Ṣumur (itself) they are
 seeking to take" (EA 105:23-24; also EA 73:1-13).

The same epistle may employ both constructions:

a-nu-¹ma¹ 2 URU ša ir-ti-ḫu / a[-n]a ia-ši ¹yu¹-ba-ú la-qa / [a-na ša-a-šu] "Now, the two towns that remain to me he is seeking to take [for himself]" (EA 76:9-11); *ù yu-ba-ú / [la]-qa ka-li URU.MEŠ šàr-ru*(sic!) ^dUTU / [a-n]a ša-a-šu / . . . *i-nu-ma / ¹yu¹-ba-ú la-qa KUR LUGAL a-na ša-a-šu* "And he is seeking [to take] all the towns of the king, the sun god, for himself . . . that he is seeking to take the king's land for himself" (EA 76:12-16).

Once the object of the infinitive appears as an accusative pronoun attached to the governing verb!

[. . . *ù*] / ^{URU.KI}*Baṭ-ru-na ir-ti-ḫ[a-at a-na ia-ši] / ù ti-ba-ú-na-ši la-q[a-a (?)]* "[And] Baṭrôna rema[ins to me] and they are seeking to ta[ke] it" (EA 129:17-19).

Various other transitive infinitives governed by finite forms of *bu²²û* show the same constructions; the object of the infinitive is usually dependent upon it:

ù bu-i-ti₇ pu-ḫi-ir / KASKAL.ḪÁ i-na qa-at ŠEŠ-ia "And I sought to assemble caravans in the charge of my brother" (EA 264:6-7); *i-na-an-na bu-i-ti₇ uš-šir₄ / KASKAL.ḪÁ-ia a-na ¹šàr-ri / \ EN-ia* "Now, I sought to send caravans to the king, my lord" (EA 264:20-22; also EA 117:43-44).

But for emphasis, the object may precede the finite verb:

šá-ni-tam šum-[ma] / ¹URU¹Gub-la ú-ba-ú ša-ba-ta "Furthermore, if he seeks to take (even) Byblos" (EA 88:21-22).

le²û. This is the verb used most frequently with an infinitive as object, some thirty-three times. In this manner the nuance "to be able" is realized; however, in the texts at hand, all the examples of *le²û* are negated — in order to express the idea "to be unable"! As with *bu²²û*, the overwhelming majority of examples

place the infinitive immediately after its governing finite verbal form. There are intransitive verbs of motion, such as *alāku*:

ù a-na-ku la-a i-le-ú / a-la-ka₁₃ a-na til-la-ti / a-na^{URU}Šu-mu-ra
 "And I am unable to go the help of Šumur" (EA 105:29-31; also
 EA 102:17-19, 24-25; 104:36-39).

Similar intransitive examples are also attested with the motion verb, (*w*)*ašû*,

ù ú-ul ni-le-ú / a-ša-am a-na EDIN.MEŠ "And we are unable to
 go forth to the open fields" (EA 88:20-21; Moran 1975a:156-157;
 also EA 81:21-22; 104:49-51).

But this verb can also be transitive. In the following example it is followed by its object as dependent genitive:

ù la-a-mi ni-le-ú / a-šé KÁ^a-bu-ul-lí \ ša-aḥ-ri "And we are unable
 to go out the city gate" (EA 244:15-17).

The infinitive of the verb of motion *erēbu* is only attested with adverbial complements, not with direct objects:

ù la-a ni-le-ú / e-re-ba a-na^{URU}Šu-mu-ri "And we are unable to
 enter in to Šumur" (EA 98:19-20; 114:36-37); *ù la a-la-á²-e / e-ra-ba*
iš-tu (sic!) LUGAL EN-ia "And I am unable to enter in to(!) the
 king, my lord" (EA 286:42-43; for the Assyrian form, cf. Moran
 1975b:153).

On the other hand, a transitive infinitive of an action verb may appear without an object:

ù la-a-mi ni-le-ú / ZÚ.SI.GA ba-qa-ni \ ka-š¹-ra "And we are
 unable to do the plucking (and) harvesting" (EA 244:13-14); *ù /*
[la-m]i te-lé-ú-na LÚ.MEŠ-tu₄ / *[da-g]a-la i-na mu-ḫi-i[a?]* "And the
 men are [no]t able [to se]rve you" (EA 249:12-14; cf. Moran
 1987b:474; 1992:302).

A variety of infinitives from transitive action verbs can be found governed by a finite form of *le²û*, normally with the object dependent upon the infinitive, e.g.

ù i-lé-i a-ra-ad / LUGAL EN-ia ki-i-ma LÚ.MEŠ a-bu-ti-nu / pa-na-nu-um "that I may be able to serve the king, my lord, like my fathers in the past" (EA 144:32-34); *ú-ul ni-le-ú / i-pé-eš mi-im-mi* "We are unable to do anything" (EA 89:42-43; also EA 116:52-53; 69:17-18).

The object of the infinitive can be multiple:

ʿû¹ / la-a ni-la-ú / e-ze-eb a-ba!-at! / šar-ri EN-ia / ù LÚ.MAŠKÍM / ša-a ša-ak-na-t[a] / UGU-ia "And we are unable to abandon the word of the king, my lord, and the commissioner whom you have appointed over me" (EA 211:17-23).

It can also be comprised of a dependent suffix with its own explicatory apposition:

ù la-a i-le-é²-e e-za-bi-ša / KUR.ĤÁ URUÚ-ru-sa-lim^{KI} "And I am unable to abandon it, viz. the land of Jerusalem" (EA 287:62-63).

The infinitive of *leqû* distinguishes two forms, one with a dependent noun, viz.

šum-ma la-a ti-le-ú la-qé ĨR-k[a] "If you are unable to take yo[ur] servant" (EA 114:44),

and the other with suffix pronouns:

ú-ul ti-le-ú-na / la-qa-ia iš-tu qa-at / ĨR-A-ši-ir-ta "Are you unable to deliver me from the hand of ʿAbdi-Ashirta?" (EA 82:6-8; also EA 79:39-41; 83:20; 124:53).

Other transitive action infinitives governed by forms of *le²û* are: *mu-še-ra KASKAL* "to send a caravan" (EA 287:27-29);

na-ša-ar-ši "to guard it" (EA 238:9); [*ša-]**ba-at* URUBaṭ-ru-n[*a*] "[to ta]ke Baṭrôna" (EA 93:20); *uš-šir*₄ / KASKAL.ḪÁ-*ia a-na* lšâr-ri EN-*ia* "to send my caravans to the king" (EA 264:9-10); *uš-šar* / GIŠMÁ.MEŠ-*ia a-na aš-ra-nu* "to send my ships there" (EA 126:7-8; also EA 82:222; 113:29).

For emphasis, the infinitive as object may be placed at the head of the clause:

ša-ḫa-at-ši i-le-ú ù ša-bat-ši / *la i-le-ú* "To besiege it they are able but to capture it they are not able" (EA 106:12-13); 'ù' *uš-šar-šu-nu a-na* URUŠu-mu-ra / [I]a-a i-le-[ú aš-š]um 'GIŠ'MÁ.[MEŠ] 'URU'Ar-wa-da "But to send them to Şumur I am unab[le bec]ause of the ships of Arvad" (EA 105:86-87).

These must be compared with a unique instance in which the object begins the clause but the governed verb of which it is the object is expressed by an adverbial complement of purpose which itself appears at the end of the clause:

URUŠur-ri / *la-a i-lé-ú-ni*₇ *a-na ša-bat* "Tyre they are unable to capture" (EA 149:65-66).

amāru. One very difficult passage has a transitive infinitive governed by a verb form of *amāru* that has caused many problems of interpretation (cf. Moran 1987b:560 n. 3; 1992:362 n. 3). It is possible even to take the governing form as an infinitive but that would create a syntagma for which there is no precedent. The following rendering takes it as an imperfect expressing continuous action in past time with the meaning "to muster (troops)" (*contra* Rainey 1978b:26-27, 63).

i-na UD *aš-me ù* 'a'-ma-'ru' / *i-pé-eš*₁₅ *nu-kúr-ti* / *i-na ša-a-šu* "From the day when I heard I have been mustering to make war with him" (EA 364:21-23).

ḫummuṭu. Of the lesser documented verbs, this one appears twice, both in injunctive contexts. In one instance it is

itself in the imperative and in the other case it is a volitive (or jussive with ventive ending):

šá-ni-tam / ši-me-e ia-ši hu-mi-ṭa₅ ki-ma / ar-ḫi-iš ka-ša-da
 "Furthermore, listen to me! Make haste to arrive quickly!"
 (EA 102:29-31); *ki-n[a-na] / yu-ḫa-mi-ṭá uš-šar ERÍN.MEŠ*
p[í-ṭá]-t[i] "Th[us], may he make haste to send the army:
 (EA 129:77-79; cf. *supra*, p. 150).

maḡāru. This verb governs the infinitive of *nadānu* in two passages:

ù la-a / i-ma-gur na-da-an-šu "But I did not agree to surrender him" (EA 234:26-27; also EA 185:61-62, 64).

namguru. Likewise, the N stem of the above also governs, or is complemented by, two accusative infinitives in a passage fraught with difficulties:

mi-ia-mi yi-ma-gi-ir / ur-ru-ba it-ti¹šār-ri EN-ia / le-qé-ma
 GUŠKIN! *ù GUŠKIN.GUN /¹šār-ri EN-ia* "Who would agree (dare?) to enter into the (presence of) the king, my lord, to take the gold and the red gold of the king, my lord?" (EA 283:10-13; Rainey 1989-90:71; *contra* Moran 1987b:505 n. 3; 1992:324 n. 5).

malāku. Two contexts occur in which this verb governs a negated infinitive:

ù i-ma-la-ku ba-li-mì / ur-ru-ud LUGAL EN-ia "But would I consider not serving the king, my lord?" (EA 191:9-10; *contra* CAD B:71b); *mi-ia-mi yi-ma-lik i-zi-za [i]-na pa-ni / ERÍN.MEŠ*
pí-ṭá-at LUGAL be-lí-ia "Who would dare to stand before the army of the king, my lord?" (EA 94:12-13).

Actually, the latter example and possibly also the former may be from the N stem. The fact that they have different theme vowels may be a matter of geographical provenances.

nadānu. For expressing the idea of "permission" this verb is used. The subject of the infinitive is always different from that of the governing verb:

la-a-mi / an-ti-in₄-nu e-re-eb / LÚ.ME[Š] ša URUŠu-mu-ri^{KI} / [a]-n[a] URU.KI-ia "I will not permit the men of Šumur to enter my city" (EA 96:7-10; Youngblood 1962).

Once the subject of the infinitive appears as an accusative suffix on the governing verb:

ú-ul na-a[d-]nu-n[i i-r]e-ba "They didn't permit me to enter" (EA 138:58).

qālu. The one case where this verb seems to govern an infinitive happens to have the negative *balu*.

la-a i-qa-al¹ šār-ru / EN-ia b[a-]lu ša!-a-al¹A-[m]a-an-ḥa-at-pí "May the king, my lord not keep silent without investigating Amanḥatpi" (EA 185:67-68; Moran 1987b:423 n. 8; 1992:267 n. 9).

qu²²û. A lone instance of this verb with an unusually formed infinitive is attested. The morphological peculiarities of *a-ša-i*, a construct in the accusative, are discussed in the preceding chapter (cf. *supra*, p. 369).

ki-na-an-na / tu-qa-ú-na ÌR.MEŠ / a-ša-i a-wa-te^{MEŠ} / iš-tu UZUKA / \ pí-i be-li-šu-nu "Thus, the servants await the coming forth of the words from the mouth of their lord" (EA 195:19-23; Moran 1987b:432; 1992:273).

šabû "to desire." If the following broken context is properly restored, the object appears to come after the governing verb and before the infinitive:

a-di ti-iš-bu [ar-na] / GAL i-pé-ša "Still they were determined to commit a great [crime]" (EA 129:26-27; cf. an alternative

interpretation by Moran 1987b:346 nn. 13, 15; 1992:210 nn. 13, 15).

uḥḥuru. Finally, this verb serves to add a temporal dimension to the action of its governed infinitive, which in each case is a verb of motion having the same subject as the finite form which governs it:

uḥ-ḥu-ra-ta / a-ša "You were late coming forth" (EA 102:9-10);
ša-ni-tam la-mi / [tu-uḥ-ḥ]i-ra ka-ša-da "Furthermore, don't [be
 la]te arriving" (EA 102:32-33).

ATTRIBUTIVE

Although the function of the infinitive as the direct object of a finite verb is substantival in nature, it is also verbal in that the infinitive itself nearly always governs either a dependent noun or pronoun as its subject or as its own direct object. Instances when an infinitive is viewed strictly as a noun are confined to an attributive function in which the infinitive is nominalized by the relative pronoun *ša* (Aro 1961:58-67). Examples are confined to two verbs, (*w*)*ašābu* "to sit" (1x) and *kabāsu / kabāšu* (13x).

The attested examples are all in introductory formulae of obeisance. The writer describes himself as a humble object designated for pharaoh's use:

um-ma ¹*Bir*₅-*ia-wa-za / ʾIR-ka SAḤAR.MEŠ \ ep-ri / ša GÌR.MEŠ-ka*
ù / KI.MEŠ ša ka-bá-sí-ka / GIŠ.GU.ZA ša a-ša-bi-ka / ù
GIŠ.GÌR.GUB \ gi-iš-tap-pí / ša GÌR.MEŠ-ka "Thus (says)
 Biryawaza, your servant, the dust of your feet, the ground of
 your treading, the chair of your sitting, and the footstool of
 your feet" (EA 195:4-10).

This is the only example with two infinitives. Elsewhere, only one is used: *ṭi*₄-*iṭ ša ka-bá-ši-ka* "the clay of your treading" (EA 213:5; 220:6; 241:6; 255:5); *qa-qa-ru ša ka-ba-ši-šu* "the ground of his treading" (EA 232:5; also EA 185:6; 231:8; 366:6; with KI.MEŠ

EA 233:8; 234:6); *i[p-ru] / [ša] ka-bá-š[e-ka]* "the dust of your treading" EA 253:3-4). One example consists of a construct relationship instead of employing the more customary syntax with the relative *ša*, viz. *qa-qa-ri ka₄-bá-sí!-ka₄*. "the ground of your treading" (EA 198:7).

In such cases as these, the dictionaries (*CAD* K:8a; *AHw*:415b) classify the relevant forms as verbal, i.e. as infinitives and not as substantives on the *qatālu* pattern. All of the examples cited also have a subject expressed by the suffix pronoun.

CHAPTER XVII

THE INFINITIVE — MORPHOSYNTAX (CONT.)

It remains to survey the functions of the infinitive in adverbial expressions, viz. in constructions with a preposition. These formations are the most ubiquitous of all the usages of the infinitive and might be considered such a commonplace as to warrant little special attention. However, it will be seen that these adverbial phrases form an essential part of the message in many verbal and even some non-verbal clauses in the EA letters. The WS word order that generally prevails in the EA texts from Canaan affects the place assigned to the adverbial vis à vis the governing verb. Examples gleaned from the EA texts in question will be discussed below under their respective semantic headings and according to the governing preposition. Of the 160 or so instances of prepositional phrases with infinitives, only a representative selection can be cited here. Emphasis will be on especially clear examples illustrating the main categories of usage, plus certain passages exhibiting unusual word order and/or semantic nuance

EXPRESSIONS OF PURPOSE

Over 100 examples, nearly two thirds of the entire collection, serve to express purpose. Except for a very few cases, the preposition involved is *ana* (Aro 1961:119-214)

ana. Moran (1950a:81) had observed that prepositional phrases with *ana* governing the infinitive were widely used in the Byblos texts, but he also noted that such was typical Akkadian usage anyway (GAG:202, §150h). The distinguishing feature of the EA texts from Canaan is that these adverbial complements generally follow the verb which governs them. Some typical examples are:

ù *yu-wa-ši-ra* / 1 LÚGAL *a-na na-ša-ri-ia* "So may he send one official to protect me!" (EA 64:12-13); *li-di-nam-mi šàr-ru* 1 ME LÚ.MEŠ *ma-an-ša-ar-ta₅* / *a-na na-ša-ri* URU.KI.-šu "May the king send one hundred garrison troops to guard his city!" (EA 244:34-36); *ki-i-me e-nu-ma* / *ip-qí-id-ni* LUGAL *be-li-ia* / *a-na na-ša-ri* URU.-šu "As when the king, my lord, appointed me to guard his city" (EA 148:20-22; cf. also EA 155:49-50);
 ù *ip-ḥu-ru-ni₇* GIŠMÁ.MEŠ-šu-nu / GIŠGIGIR.MEŠ-šu-nu ERÍN.MEŠ GÌR-šu-nu / *a-na ša-ba-ti* URUŠur-ri GEMÉ LUGAL "And they have assembled their ships, their chariots, (and) the foot soldiers in order to capture Tyre, the handmaiden of the king" (EA 149:61-63).

In all of these particular passages, the direct object of the governing verb is the subject of the infinitive. The direct object of the infinitive is dependent upon it, either as a suffix pronoun or as a noun in the dependent case.

For emphasis, the adverbial may be placed at the head of its clause, before the governing verb:

a-na ḥal-li-iq / KUR LUGAL EN-*ia yu-ba-á²-ú* ¹Mil¹-¹ki¹-I[i] "It is to subvert the land of the king that Milkili is seeking" (EA 250:55-56).

In this passage, as in many others, the subject of the governing verb is also the subject of the infinitive of purpose, e.g.

ù ŠEŠ-*ia* TUR *iš-tu ia-ti* / *i-na-kar₅-mi* URUGub-la^{KI} / *a-na na-da-ni* URU.KI-*li* / *a-na* DUMU.MEŠ ÌR-¹A-š¹-ir-ti "And my younger brother has alienated the city of Byblos from me in order to give the city to the sons of 'Abdi-Ashirta" (EA 137:16-19).

It should be noted in this example that, though the infinitive is in construct with its direct object, it carries an *-i* suffix rather than the customary *-Ø*. As mentioned previously (*supra*, pp. 383-384), there is no way of knowing for sure whether this is just a reflection of the prevailing situation in Canaanite (i.e. case

endings still preserved on constructs), or whether the *-i* is the enigmatic suffix *-i* found on infinitives in other syntactic positions. Many examples of this possible dependent case ending on the infinitive in construct could be cited (e.g. EA 60:12-13; 148:15-16; 150:6-7; 151:15-16; 196:35-36; 220:30-31; 253:35).

A different arrangement is for the object of the infinitive of purpose to precede it while the subject follows it as a dependent genitive suffix or substantive. Note the following text where the objects of the respective infinitives are themselves the dependent objects of a preceding infinitive of purpose:

ù a-nu-um-ma a-na-an-šár / URUŠur-ri URU ra-bi-tu / a-na LUGAL be-li-ia a-di / i-wa-šf ZAG LUGAL da-na-tu i-na muḥ-ḥi-ia / a-na na-da-an me-e a-na šu-ta-ia / ù GIŠ.MEŠ a-na šu-ḥu-ni-ia
 "And now I am guarding Tyre, the great city, for the king, my lord, until the mighty arm of the king shall come forth to(sic!) me in order to give water for my drinking and wood for my warming" (EA 147:61-66).

Admittedly, the suffixes on the two D stem infinitives, *šuttāya* and *šuhḥuniya*, may also be construed as objects (cf. *supra*, pp. 378, 379), "for watering me," and "for warming me." However the next example clearly seems to have a suffix pronoun as the subject of the G stem infinitive:

ù li-id-din URUÚ-sú^{KI} / a-na ÌR-šu DUG \ a-ku-ni \ mi-ma / a-na ši-te-šu "So may Usu give to his servant a jar of water for him to drink!" (EA 148:11-13; contrast Moran 1987b:380; 1992:235; likewise EA 151:37-40; 155:7-10, 24-26; also EA 79:32-33; 125:16-18).

The preceding object of the infinitive of purpose may also be the subject of an existential clause, either negative:

ù i[a-]nu / A.MEŠ! a-na š[a]-te-šu "But there is no water for him to drink" (EA 85:53-54; also EA 85:10-11; 101:6-10; 107:37-38; 125:25-26);

or positive:

ù LÚ.MEŠ [ḫu-]ub-ši / pa-aṭ-ru a-na URU.ME[Š] / a-šar i-ba-ši
ŠE.IM.ḤÁ / a-na a-ka-li-šu-nu "And the yeomen farmers have
departed to towns where there is grain for them to eat"
(EA 125:r. 27-30).

In one exceptional case the object of the infinitive of purpose is first of all the object of the main verb while the infinitive is in a relative clause; the scribe has neglected to employ a resumptive pronoun in the relative clause:

ù il₅-te₉-qú URU.DIDLI.[Ḥ]Á / ša LUGAL EN-ia ša [NU]-i[d] /
šar-ru EN-ia i-na qà-t[i-ia] / a-na na-ša-ar "They have captured
the cities of the king, my lord, which the king, my lord
[intru]sted to [me] to guard" (EA 237:5-8).

Instead of taking a direct object, an infinitive of purpose may itself have an adverbial complement:

a-nu-ma eš-me pu-ḫi-ir-mi / ka¹-li LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ / [a-n]a
ma-qa-ti UGU-ia "Now I have heard, 'He has assembled all the
ṣapîrû men [t]o fall on me'" (EA 91:23-25; cf. EA 94:74-76).

Clear examples of these adverbials expressing purpose are non-verbal clauses with *libbu*, "desire, intention" (CAD L:170b-171b).

šum-[ma] / lib-bi šar-ri a-na / ba-la-aṭ ÌR-šu ù / URU-li-šu uš-ši-ra
⟨LÚ.MEŠ⟩ / [m]a-ša-ar-ta ù / ti-na-ša-ru URU-ka ù / ÌR-ka "If it is
the king's desire that his servant and his city should live, send
garrison troops that they may protect your city and your
servant!" (EA 112:30-36).

There the subjects of the infinitive were not identical with the person whose desire was being queried, namely the king. In other texts, the king is also the subject of the infinitive:

'šum¹-ma lib-¹bi¹ LUGAL be-li-ia / a-[n]a na-ša-[a]r URU-šu "If it is the king's desire to protect his city" (EA 127:26-27; also EA 130:44-45).

A similar nominal expression with *pānū* expressing the meaning, "intention," also contains a subject identical to that of the infinitive of purpose:

pa-nu-ia-ma a-na a-ra-ad / šār-ri EN-ia "It is my intention to serve the king, my lord" (EA 119:43-44; also EA 118:39-41; 129:31; 151:8-9; 295:r. 9-10; and 149:28-29, Moran 1987b:383 n. 3; 1992:237 n. 2).

Verbal clauses with a similar meaning confirm this relationship; the subject of the governing verb is identical to that of the infinitive of purpose:

ù na-[a]d-na pa-ni-nu a-na / a-ra-di-ka "We have set our faces to serve you" = "We have committed ourselves to serve you" (EA 89:16-17; Albright and Moran 1950:166), or "Our faces are set to serve you" (cf. *supra*, pp. 46, 295); *ù a-nu-u[m-m]a / [t]a¹-ri-iš pa-ni[-šu] / a-na la-qé-i / URUMa-gi-id-da^{KI}* "And now he has set [his] face to take Megiddo" (EA 244:21-24); *yi-de-mi šār-ru EN-ia [i]-n[u]-ma / tu-ur-ri-šú-m[i] 2 DUMU L^Uar-ni 'LUGAL¹ [b]e-lí-ia / 2 DUMU ¹La-ab-a[-y]a pa-ni-šu-ni / a-na ḥa-lí-iq KUR 'šār¹-ri EN-ia* "May the king, my lord, be apprised [t]hat the two sons of the traitor to the king, my lord, the two sons of Lab³ayu, have set their faces to subvert the land of the king, my lord!" (EA 250:4-7).

Finally, there are a few instances where the prepositional phrase is employed in place of an injunctive (precative or jussive) in a widely used syntagma — expressing the desire that the king be apprised or take cognizance of the situation at hand.

ù a-na la-ma-di / 'LUGAL¹ EN-ia "So for the king's information" (EA 274:17-18; 265:14-15).

aššum. There are also two passages like those just cited in which the preposition *aššum* is used instead of *ana*.

ù aš-šum la-ma-ad / LUGAL EN-*ia* ^dUTU / *ša is-tu* [AN^{sa}]-*me* "So in order that the king, my lord, the sun god from [hea]ven, may be informed" (EA 301:21-23; apparently also EA 308:r. 2-8; 309:25-28); *aš-šum la-ma-de₄-ka* "For your information" (EA 287:59).

Infinitives of purpose dependent on *aššum* may also complement verbal clauses (Moran 1950a:81). First, examples where the subject of the infinitive is identical with that of the governing verb:

ù al-lu-ú ki-na-na-ma yite₉-lu / *ina li[b]-bi a-ia-ba aš-šum ša-ba-at* / GIŠMÁ.MEŠ-*ia* "And behold, thus he is going out to sea in order to seize my ships" (EA 114:18-19); *ù al-ka-ti* / *a-na É-šu aš-šum* / *e-pu-uš* DÛG.GA *bi-ri-⟨nu⟩* "So I went to his house in order to make a treaty between us" (EA 136:30-32; cf. Moran 1987b:356; 1992:217).

The subject of the infinitive may also be the object of the governing verb as in the following:

ù ut-te-er / *a-na* LUGAL EN-*ia* *iš-tu* / LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ *aš-šum ur-ru-di-šu* "And I restored the cities to the king, my lord, from the *‘apîrû* men in order to serve him" (EA 189:r. 15-17)

The infinitive of purpose may also be a component in a non-verbal clause. Here the whole context is cited to place the example in proper perspective:

šá-ni-tam li-it-⟨ri⟩-iš a-na be-EN-ia / *ù lu-wa-ši-ra 20 ta-pal ša* SIG₅-*qú* / ANŠE.KUR.RA *a-na ÌR-šu ma-du* LÚ.MEŠ / *it-ti-ia aš-šum-ma a-la-ki-ia* / *a-na nu-kúr-ti*^{MEŠ} LUGAL BE-*ia* "Furthermore, may it please my lord that he may send twenty

teams of the best horses to his servant; many are the men with me for my participation in the king's wars" (EA 106:41-45; contrast Moran 1987b:303; 1992:179).

The addition of enclitic *-ma* to the preposition suggests that its phrase is the logical predicate (Rainey 1976a). The writer may have wanted to stress that it was to fulfill his military obligations to the king that he had to, or would have to, assemble so many men: "It is for fighting the king's battles that so many men are needed."

The ensuing passage with *aššum* seems a bit awkward. This is the kind of expression where one might have expected *ištu* instead:

yi-ki-im-ni DINGIR-LIM *ša* LUGAL 'EN¹-[i]a / *aš-šum i-pé-eš*₁₅
nu-kúr-ti i-na 'LÚ¹.MEŠ ^K[URG]i-na / 'İR.MEŠ LUGAL EN-ia
 "May the god of the king, my lord, deliver me *concerning* making war with the men of [G]ina, servants of the king, my lord!" (EA 250:20-21).

ina. The following passage might be taken as concurrence, i.e. "while seizing . . .," but it is far more likely that this is simply an error of *ina* in place of *ana*:

ù i-na-na iš-ši-ir / LÚ.MEŠ-šu *i-na ša-ba-at* KUR.KUR.MEŠ /
Am-qí *ù* KI.KI "And now he has sent his men in order to seize the states of 'Amqu and the places" (EA 140:28-30; contrast Moran 1987b:369; 1992:226).

ištu. The following protestation of loyalty on the part of a vassal was formulated by the use of a negative assertion of purpose. Here the preposition *ištu* has the meaning "apart from" = "except":

ia-nu / *pa-ni ša-nu-ta*₅ *iš-tu* / *ur-ru-ud šār-ri* "There is no other intention except to serve the king" (EA 253:26-28; Moran 1987b:408; 1992:306).

CIRCUMSTANTIAL

Certain prepositions combine with the infinitive to express action or state circumstantial to the main clause.

CONCURRENT

The preposition used to express concurrence is *ina* (Aro 1961:215-251). Some nine or ten examples are found in this corpus. One passage from Tyre reflects a clear translation, or calque, on the Egyptian circumstantial phrase, *m ḥtp* "at peace," viz.

*ša it-ta-ša-ab gáb-bi KUR-ti / i-na pa-ša-ḥi i-na du-ni ZAG *
ḥa-ap-ši "He of whom all the lands have become stable being at
peace by the might of (his) arm" (EA 147:11-12)

Two striking passages use this syntagma to compare the present situation, exemplified by the imperfect verb forms, with that which will prevail in the future:

i-na ba-la-ṭi-ia i-na-ší-ru / URU šār-ri a-na ša-a-šu ù / šum-ma
mi-ta-ti mi-na / i-pu-ṣu-na "While I'm alive, I am guarding the
king's city for him, but if I am dead, what can I do?"
(EA 119:15-18); [*i-na-ší-ru i-na / [b]a-la-ṭi-ia i-nu-ma [a]-mu-ta*
mi-nu / 'yi'-na-ša-ru-ši (ŠE) "I am guarding while I'm alive;
when I die, who will guard it?" (EA 130:49-52).

An obscure and broken passage (at the bottom of the tablet) seems to be using the adverbial phrase to express "as soon as," viz.

[š]á-n[i-t]am a-nu-um-ma i-na i-re-bi / ¹GIŠ¹MÁ.ḤÁ ša LUGAL
EN-ia / [š]a sí-ki-pu / i-na URUPÚ.ḤÁ uš-ši-ru-n[a] / MÍGEMÉ ša
LUGAL EN-ia "Furthermore,¹ now with the entry of the ships
of the king, my lord, that sailed into Beirut, the handmaiden of
the king, my lord, I began sending . . ." (EA 143:18-22; CAD
S:73b; contrast Moran 1987b:373; 1992:229).

A time frame relative to a past event is also reflected in the following:

ù yi-iḫ-di lib-bi-ia ù / yi-[š]a-qí SAG-ia ù in₄-nam-ru / 2 IGI-ia \ ḫi-na-ia i-na ša-me / a-wa-at LUGAL EN-ia "And my heart rejoiced and my head was lifted up and my eyes became bright upon hearing the word of the king, my lord" (EA 144:15-18; cf. EA 120:38).

The past event may be expressed by the stative:

da-mi-iq ki-a-ma pa-¹ni¹ LUGAL / i-na ša-pa-ri-ka a-na [Í]R-[ka] / šu-ri-ib-mi Ḫa-ia a-na / URUŠu-mu-ra "It was pleasing to the king when you sent to [your] servant, 'Cause Ḫaya to enter Šumur!" (EA 112:40-43).

Note in the passage just cited that the circumstantial infinitive has an adverbial complement ("to [your] servant") and a direct object, namely the quotation.

Instances of *gamāru* in the stative governing a circumstantial adverbial infinitival phrase reflect a present situation that is the culmination of a process that had been going on for a considerable length of time:

ga-am-ru / DUMU.MEŠ-šu-nu DUMU.MÍ-šu-nu GIŠ.MEŠ É.MEŠ-šu-nu / i-na na-da-ni i-na KUR<Ia>-ri-mu-ta / i-na bá-la-aṭ [Z]I-nu "Their sons, their daughters (and) their household goods are used up in paying to <Ya>rimuta to keep ourselves alive" (EA 85:12-15; Youngblood 1961:133-134; also EA 74:16; 75:11-14; 81:38-41; 9:36-39; 112:28; 117:75); *ù ga-am-ra-at / KUR LUGAL EN-ia / i-na pa-ṭá-ri i-na LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ* "The land of the king, my lord, has finished going over to the *apîrû* men" (EA 273:11-14; cf. EA 272:11-17; Na²aman 1979:680; Moran 1992:318 n. 5; cf. also the broken context, EA 313:5-6).

A negative existential clause uses the circumstantial phrase with the meaning of "since," viz.

[i]-ia-nu mi-im-ma / i-na 'É¹-ia i-n[a] / [i]re[-bi-]ia a-na ša-šu
 "There is nothing in my house since my entering into it"
 (EA 316:18-20).

And the same appears to hold true for a positive existential clause:

ša-ni-tam / i-na ka-⟨ša⟩-ad ¹Ap-pí-ḥa a-na maḥ-ri-ia / ši-si-tu₄
 UGU-ia "Furthermore, since Appaḥa ca⟨m⟩e before me, there
 has been an outcry against me" (EA 69:24-26).

In these two passages, the preposition *ina* may have the nuance "from," but need not be translated "since." Since it may be rendered "when," they must be distinguished from those with *ištu* (cf. *infra*, pp. 412-413).

PROSPECTIVE

Adverbial phrases with infinitives may also express action to take place in the future.

ana ūmī . . . / ina ūmī . . . One means of placing an action in the future is the construction with *ana ūmī* + the infinitive as a dependent.

a-šé-mi ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-tu* ù *ša-mu* / *a-na ú-mi ka-ša-di-ši* ù /
ta-ra-at URU.KI *a-na* LUGAL *be-li-ia* "If the regular army comes
 forth and they hear about the time of its arrival, then the city
 will return to the king, my lord" (EA 137:49-51).

On the other hand, *ina* is most likely to have been the preposition used in the following passage:

^{KUR}A-*mur-ri ur-ra* / [mu-ša] *tu-ba-⟨ú⟩ a-ša pí-ṭá-ti* / [i-na
 UD].KÁM.MEŠ *ka-š[a-a]d* / [ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-]ṭá-ti* ^{KUR}A-*m[ur-ri]* /
 [. . . *in*₄]-*né-ep-ša-[at]* / [gáb-bu a-n]a *šar-r[i EN-ia]* "Amurru is
 seek⟨ing⟩ day and night the coming forth of the army; [at the

ti]me of [the ar]my's ar[riv]al, Am[urru . . . wi]ll go ove[r
entirely t]o the kin[g, my lord]" (EA 70:25-30).

When comparing the two passages, the [UD].KÁM.MEŠ in the second suggests that the final vowel on *ú-mi* in the first could represent the plural. For that reason the translation "time," has been preferred. However, in both instances, the singular may really be intended, the logogram in the second passage being only a convention.

adi. Infinitives dependent on *adi* pertain to an action expected in the future, i.e. "until" (Aro 1961:254-257). All of the documented examples are with one of two verbs, *kašādu* (9x) and (*w*)*ašû* (11x). Only representative passages will be cited:

*ù la-a ka-ši-id / i-re-šu ù uš-ši-ir-ti-šu / qa-du ERÍN.MEŠ til-la-ti
a-na ka-taš / a-di a-šé ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ti / a-na na-ša-ar ZI-ka* "And
as soon as the request arrives, I will send him with auxiliary
troops for you until the regular army's coming forth, to protect
your life" (EA 82:16-20; also EA 70:23; 71:26-27; 79:31; 79:16-17;
105:18-19; 127:38-39; 334:8).

Practically all the instances with *kašādu* also have to do with the anticipated arrival of the army or the king at the head of the army. Similarly, a commissioner wrote to Rib-Haddi of Byblos:

a-lik-mi i-zi-iz a-na URU.Šu-mu-ur / a-di ka-ša-di-ia "Go, take up a
position at Šumur until my arrival!" (EA 102:13-16).

Several texts are affirmations that a ruler is guarding his assigned city until the arrival of the Egyptian army:

*ù uš-šú-ru URU.KIPÚ.ĤÁ / a-na LUGAL EN-ia a-di ka-ša-di /
ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ti LUGAL EN-ia* "And I am guarding Beirut for
the king, my lord, until the arrival of the army of the king, my
lord" (EA 142:12-14; also EA 100:39-41; 103:25-29; 178:6-8;
220:15-19; 227:5-7).

Two other passages have different semantic contexts. One deals, like the above mentioned examples, with a future event:

ša-pár-ti a-na ša-šu / a-di ka-ša-di-ka / iš-tu KASKAL-ra-ni-ka "I have written to him (to come) by the time you arrive from your mission" (EA 256:31-33; cf. an alternative below).

RETROSPECTIVE

adi. The last passage with *adi* deals with something that happened in the past:

ù a-di ka-ša-di-ia / ù da-ku-šu \ maḥ-ṣú-ú "But before my arrival, they had smitten him" (EA 245:13-14).

ištu. There are eight examples of the infinitive with *ištu* signifying "since" (cf. Aro 1961:258-259). Five of them refer to past events after which there took place another event in the past. Two of the latter instances were simple, one time acts:

i-nu-ma iš-tu / 10 ŠE-ti ka-ša-di[-i]a a-na ^{URU}A.PÚ.MEŠ / *uš-ši-ir-ti DUMU-ia a-na* É.GAL NUN "because ten seconds after my arrival in Beirut, I sent my son to the great palace" (EA 138:75-77; Moran 1987b:366 n. 17; 1992:224 n. 17); *ša-ni-tam an-nu-ú iš-tu / ša-pa-ri-ka ṭup-pa a-na mu-ḥi-ia / ša-pár-ti a-na ša-šu / a-di ka-ša-di-ka / iš-tu KASKAL-ra-ni-ka* "Furthermore, behold, after your sending a tablet to me, I wrote to him before your arrival from your journey" (EA 256:29-33).

Note that the former is an intransitive verb with dependent suffix as subject; the second is transitive, also with a suffix as subject followed by its object in the accusative.

The other three past events actually are acts, the effects of which have continued up to the time of the writing of the letter:

ša-ni-tam iš-tu / ta-ri a-bi-ka iš-tu / ^{URU}Ší-du-na *iš-tu* UD.KÁM.MEŠ / *šu-wa-at in₄-ne-ep-ša-at /* KUR.MEŠ *a-na*

LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ "Furthermore, after your father returned from Sidon, from that very time, the lands have joined the *‘apîrû* men" (EA 85:69-73); *li-de-mi / šâr-ru EN-ia i-nu-ma / iš-tu i-re-bi* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ti / i-te₉-pu-uš-mi* ¹*La-ab-a-yu / nu-kúr-ta₅ i-na mu-uḫ-ḫi-ia* "May the king, my lord, be apprised that, since the army went back (to Egypt), Lab²ayu has made (been making?) war against me!" (EA 244:8-12); *li-ma-ad / i-nu-ma iš-tu ka-ša-ad /* ¹*A-ma-an-ap-pa a-na mu-ḫi-ia / ka-li* LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ *na-ad-nu / pa-ni-šu-nu a-na ia-ši a-na / KA \pí-i* ¹*R-A-ši-ir[-ta]* "Be apprised that, since the coming of Aman-appa to me, all the *‘apîrû* men have set their faces against me at the command of *‘Abdi-Ashirta!*" (EA 79:7-12).

Three texts refer to past events that led up to actions being carried out in the present:

[*iš*]-*tu ša-ba-at* URU^É-A[*r-ḫa*] / [*a-na*] *pí-i* ¹*R-A-ši-ir-ta / [ù] ki-na-na tu-ba-ú-na / [i-p]é-ša* URUGub-la *ù /* URUBaṭ-ru-na^{KI} "Since the seizure of Bīt-A[*rḫa*] at the command of *‘Abdi-Ashirta*, thus they are seeking to capture Byblos and Baṭrôna" (EA 79:21-25); *ša-ni-tam iš-tu pa-tá-ri /* ERÍN.MEŠ LUGAL EN-*li-ia / muḫ-ḫi-ia la-a i-na-an-din-ni /* LÚ^{URU}Ší-du-na / LÚ.MEŠ-*ia a-ra-da / a-na er-šé-ti / a-na la-qé* GIŠ.MEŠ / *la-qé* A.MEŠ *a-na ši-t[i]* "Furthermore, since departure of the troops of the king, my lord, from me, the ruler of Sidon has not been permitting me (and) my men to go down to the land to take wood (and to) take water to drink" (EA 154:11-17); *yi-de* LUGAL *be-li / ip-ši ša yi-pu-šu-ni /* ¹*Ia-an-ḫa-mu / iš-tu a-ší-ia / [i]š-tu mu-ḫi* LUGAL EN-*ia* "May the king, my lord, be apprised of the deeds which Yanḫamu is committing against me since I came forth from the king, my lord!" (EA 270:9-13).

CORRESPONDENT

When the action of the main clause is said to conform or to correspond to some other action, the infinitive dependent on *kīma* is used for the latter (cf. Aro 1961:285-289). For example,

Rib-Haddi of Byblos wants a military contingent like that assigned to Surata of Acco:

ù ia-di-na / 4 ME LÚ.MEŠ 30 ta-pa[l A]NŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ / ki-ma na-da-ni a-na 1Sú-1ra1-1ta1 "So may he grant four hundred men (and) thirty team[s of h]orses as were given to Surata" (EA 85:19-21; Moran 1987b:269, 270 n. 3)

Note that the subject of the infinitive is not overtly expressed. Thus, one may translate the infinitive as a passive (cf. Moran 1987b:269; 1992:156) or one may assume (correctly in this case) that the subject of the infinitive is identical with that of the main verb. It would, of course, be pharaoh who would make such an assignment of troops, i.e. "just as (he) gave to Surata."

The infinitive may have a different subject from that of the main verb, in which case it may be expressed by a dependent suffix as in the following rhetorical question:

ú-ul la-qr 1IR-A-ši-ir-ta / qa-du mi-im-mi-šu ki-ma qa-bi-ia "Was not 'Abdi-Ashirta captured along with his property, just as I had said?" (EA 117:27-28).

Six passages make reference to the compliance (or non-compliance) with pharaoh's orders. The sender of the letter wishes to affirm that he has obeyed a specific command from the king, e.g.

šu-ši-ra-ku gāb-ba ki-ma qa-bi LUGAL EN-ia "I have prepared everything just as the king, my lord, has commanded" (EA 144:21; also EA 193:21-24; 216:10-11; 220:11-14; 323:9-13; 325:20-22).

The ruler of Tyre complained that pharaoh's orders concerning the welfare of his servant have not been carried out. The infinitive employed here, viz. *qabi*, harks back to a finite preterite, *iqbi*, in the previous sentence. The passage in question is as follows:

LUGAL *iq-bi a-na ÌR-šu [ù] / a-na ÌR^{Mf}Ma-ia-a-ti / a-na na-da-ni
 še-ḫu ù a-n[a] <na-da-ni> / A.MEŠ \ mi-ma a-na ši-te-šu / ù la-a
 i-pu-uš-šu-ni₇ ki-ma qa-bi LUGAL be-li-ia / la-a i-na-an-din-nu-ni₇*
 "The king commanded concerning his servant [and] the servant
 of Mayati that the breath (of life) be given and that water be
 given for him to drink; but they have not acted in accordance
 with the command of the king, my lord; they are not giving to
 me" (EA 155:7-13; Moran 1987b:390; also EA 155:39).

One or two passages employ *kīma ša* plus the infinitive in
 the same syntagma:

ù a-nu-ma / u-še-ši-ru-mi / ki-ma ša qa-bi-šu "And now I am
 preparing in accordance with what he commanded"
 (EA 329:18-20; cf. also EA 302:16-18).

**CANAANITE IN THE AMARNA TABLETS
A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE MIXED DIALECT
USED BY THE SCRIBES FROM CANAAN**

Volume III

**Morphosyntactic Analysis of
the Particles and Adverbs**

HANDBUCH DER ORIENTALISTIK
HANDBOOK OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

ERSTE ABTEILUNG
DER NAHE UND MITTLERE OSTEN
THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

CONSULTING EDITOR FOR THIS VOLUME

T. MURAOKA

FÜNFUNDZWANZIGSTER BAND
CANAANITE IN THE AMARNA TABLETS
A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE MIXED DIALECT
USED BY THE SCRIBES FROM CANAAN

Volume III



CANAANITE IN THE AMARNA TABLETS

A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE MIXED DIALECT
USED BY THE SCRIBES FROM CANAAN

VOLUME III

MORPHOSYNTACTIC ANALYSIS OF
THE PARTICLES AND ADVERBS

BY

ANSON F. RAINEY



E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1996

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

The CIP-data has been applied for.

ISSN 0169-9423
ISBN 90 04 10521 2 (*Vol. 1*)
ISBN 90 04 10522 0 (*Vol. 2*)
ISBN 90 04 10523 9 (*Vol. 3*)
ISBN 90 04 10524 7 (*Vol. 4*)
ISBN 90 04 10503 4 (*Set*)

© Copyright 1996 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

*This volume is respectfully
dedicated to the memory of*

Professor H. J. Polotsky

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	xiii
Adverbial Morphemes.....	1
Suffixes.....	1
Accusative <i>-a(m)</i>	1
Adverbial <i>-um(ma), -um</i>	5
Adverbial <i>-ānu(m)</i>	6
Terminative <i>-iṣ</i>	7
Distributive <i>-iṣam</i>	8
Sufformative <i>-ī < *-ai</i>	8
Sufformative <i>-ī</i>	8
Status Absolutus.....	9
Prepositions and Prepositional Phrases.....	11
Simple Particles and Adapted Nouns.....	11
<i>Adi</i>	11
<i>ana</i>	12
<i>ašar</i>	21
<i>aššum</i>	22
<i>bādi</i>	23
<i>balu, bali</i>	23
<i>eli</i>	25
<i>enūma</i>	31
<i>ina</i>	31
<i>ištu</i>	35
<i>itti</i>	37
<i>kī</i>	38
<i>kīka</i>	38
<i>kīma</i>	39
<i>lām(a)</i>	39
<i>qadu</i>	39
<i>taḥtamu</i>	40

Combinations.....	40
<i>arki</i>	40
<i>arkītu</i>	42
<i>biri, beri</i>	42
<i>idēnu</i>	43
<i>libbu</i>	43
<i>māḥru</i>	44
<i>muḥḥi</i>	45
<i>pānu, pānū</i>	47
<i>pû</i>	53
<i>qaqqadu</i>	54
<i>qātu</i>	54
<i>sēru</i>	60
<i>ša lā</i>	61
<i>šaplu, šupalu</i>	61
<i>ūmu</i>	64
Conjunctions	67
Subordinating	67
<i>adi</i>	68
<i>ašar</i>	70
<i>aššu</i>	72
<i>aššum</i>	72
<i>eli</i>	73
<i>endum, indum</i>	73
<i>īnu, ēnu</i>	73
<i>inūma, enūma</i>	74
<i>kî</i>	89
<i>kīma</i>	93
<i>šumma</i>	94
Coordinating.....	97
Orthography	97
Functions.....	98
Locative Adverbs.....	109
Interrogative.....	109
<i>ayya</i>	109

<i>ayyakam</i>	110
Indefinite	110
<i>ayyaka(m)mi</i>	110
Demonstrative	111
<i>annakam</i>	111
<i>annânum</i>	111
<i>annikâ</i>	112
<i>annikê(m)ma</i>	112
<i>annikānu</i>	112
<i>ašrānu</i>	112
<i>pô^h ?</i>	114
Temporal Adverbs	115
Interrogative	115
<i>mati</i>	115
<i>mani ūmī/ūmāti</i>	115
Concurrent	116
<i>agāmi</i>	116
<i>anumma</i>	116
<i>inanna</i>	118
<i>adi</i>	119
Subsequential	122
* ² <i>aḥrônhû</i>	122
<i>arkānu</i>	122
<i>arkīšu</i>	122
<i>maḥari</i>	122
Retrospective	123
<i>pānānu(m)</i>	123
<i>šaddiqdi(m)</i>	126
<i>šalšāmi</i>	127
<i>tumāl</i>	127
Durative	128
<i>dārīš, dārītu</i>	128
<i>ūma/urru (u) mūša</i>	132
<i>ūmi, ūmišamma</i>	135

Modal Adverbs	137
Interrogative	137
<i>kī</i>	137
<i>ana mīni(m)</i>	138
Demonstrative	139
<i>kīʾam</i>	139
<i>kīnanna</i>	141
<i>kīšumma</i>	142
Qualitative	143
<i>damqīš</i>	143
Quantitative	144
<i>appūnamma</i>	144
<i>danniš</i>	145
<i>magal</i>	146
Of Swiftmess	147
<i>arḥiš</i>	147
<i>ḥamutta(m), ḥamuttiš, ḥamittu</i>	148
Social, Communal	149
<i>yahdōn-</i>	149
<i>idēnu</i> (for <i>edēnu</i>)	149
<i>puḥriš</i>	150
Introductory Adverbs	151
Presentation Particles — "Now"	151
<i>anumma</i>	151
<i>inanna</i>	154
<i>annûš</i>	154
Presentation Particles — "Behold"	155
<i>annû</i>	155
<i>allû</i>	159
<i>amur</i>	167
Unit Markers	174
<i>umma</i>	174
<i>šanītam</i>	180
Conditional Particles	183
Conditional - <i>tumma</i>	183

Questions.....	183
Object Clauses.....	183
Oaths.....	185
Disjunctives.....	185
Conditional Protases.....	187
Conditional <i>LŪ</i>	190
Conditional <i>INŪMA</i>	191
The Optative Particle.....	193
Asseverative.....	193
Injunctive.....	195
Oaths.....	200
Negative Particles.....	201
Non-Verbal.....	201
<i>yānu(m), iyyānu(m)</i>	201
<i>lā</i>	206
<i>ul</i>	207
Verbal Negation.....	209
Declarative Main Clauses.....	210
Interrogative Clauses.....	214
Conditional Clauses.....	217
Relative Clauses.....	219
Circumstantial Clauses.....	220
Object Clauses.....	220
Negated Injunctives.....	221
Positive Oaths.....	225
Summary.....	226
Enclitic Particles.....	227
Enclitic <i>-MA</i>	227
On Verbs.....	228
On Pronouns.....	230
On Adverbs.....	231
On The Direct Object.....	233
Summary.....	234
Enclitic <i>-MI</i>	234

Direct Quotations.....	237
Emphasizing Particle	240
On Verbs.....	240
On Adverbs and Particles.....	243
On Prepositions.....	245
Summary.....	248
 The Interjection	 249
 Topic And Comment	 251
Terminology and Rationale	252
Non-Verbal Clauses	254
Equational Clauses	254
Clauses with Adverbial Component.....	259
Extraposition.....	262
Verbal Clauses.....	264
Narrative Discourse (Indicative).....	265
Verb-Subject.....	265
Subject-Verb.....	267
Injunctive Discourse	272
Interrogative Clauses	274
Compound Sentences	280

INTRODUCTION

The adverbial phenomena of the peripheral Akkadian dialects such as those of Nuzi, Hattusas, Ugarit, and especially the Amarna archive have generally been neglected in the grammars (e.g. *GAG*:161, §112c). Böhl (1909:69-77) and Dhorme (1914:360-363 = 1951:474-477) did treat some of the principal forms, and recently Adler (1976:67-91) has dealt with the particles and adverbs of the Mitanni letters. Those from the texts written by scribes from Amurru have been treated by Izre'el (1985:274-357; 1991a:280-337), and in like manner those from texts originating in Egypt have been dealt with by Cochavi-Rainey (1988:193-247). The following discussions will concentrate on those EA texts which show West Semitic influence, viz. those from the land of Canaan plus some of the Alashia letters. As in other aspects of the dialect represented by such epistles, one may distinguish three linguistic strands among the particles and adverbs: (1) forms deriving from the Old Babylonian base language; (2) variants which seem to have developed in the periphery zones, often as extensions of more standard formations; and (3) purely West Semitic expressions or calques of West Semitic constructions. But not only are the morphological traits of significance; one may often detect a special West Semitic syntactical usage with respect to a good Akkadian form.

Treatment of the materials at hand will be in accordance with the topical sequence of *GAG* and Adler (*loc. cit.*). The particles and adverbs of the EA tablets are built on the same principles as Akkadian and the other Semitic languages (cf. *GAG*:161-162). The adverbial suffixes will be summarized first, with reference only to resultant forms. Afterwards, the respective particles and adverbs will be treated under their semantic categories.

Inasmuch as the Canaanized EA letters comprise a unique combination of linguistic strands, their text is intrinsically of special interest. Furthermore, the particular nuances expressed by the adverbs and particles in these documents are frequently so unusual that ample documentation is justified. The fact that there is no modern transcription for most of these letters makes it mandatory that such documentation include more than just a word or two. Therefore, one will find a plethora of citations for each point being made. There is also a degree of redundancy in that the same passage may be cited in more than one place in the work. Wherever possible, the need to turn to some other chapter or section for an illustration has been avoided. On occasion, a particular usage or vocable is so unique that all known contexts are cited. Whenever the citation reflects an improved reading or translation, the appropriate bibliographical references are given. However, there are some cases when the rendering is new, not anticipated, as far as could be discerned, in the scholarly literature. For these, the reader will have to compare the standard editions (Knudtzon 1915; Rainey 1978b; and the translations by Moran 1987b; 1992). An index recording all the passages treated or alluded to throughout this and the accompanying volumes on the verbal system and on the substantives facilitates cross referencing.

CHAPTER I

ADVERBIAL MORPHEMES

The order followed in this chapter corresponds to that adopted by von Soden (GAG:162-163, §113). As would be expected from texts having such a peculiar dialect mixture, the Akkadian morphemes will predominate. However, because of the main object of this study, special emphasis will be placed on the Canaanite elements.

SUFFIXES

ACCUSATIVE *-a(m)*. One true WS noun in pure adverbial accusative is *le-lá-ma* "evening" (EA 195:12-13). This is Canaanite **lél* (<**layl-*) plus the accusative like Hebrew *laylā^h* (Sivan 1984:131; cf. *infra*, pp. 2, 132); the same Canaanite vocable appears as a gloss, GI₆-ša \ 'le¹-¹la¹(?) (EA 243:13; cf. *infra*, p. 134). Another true WS noun serves as a preposition in adverbial accusative, viz. *ta-aḥ-ta-mu* (EA 252:26; cf. *infra*, p. 40). That form evidently has the old 3rd m.pl. pron. suffix with apocopation <**taḥtáhimu* (Albright 1943b:32 n. 24). Note also the obscure accusative plural, *pa-ni-mu* "before them"(?) (EA 155:46; Sivan 1984:133) with the same suffix. Two other adverbs with pronominal suffixes have apocopated their vocalic endings, viz. *aḥ-ru-un-ú* (EA 245:10) for **aḥrônhû* "afterwards" (cf. *infra*, p. 122) and *ya-ḥu-du-un-ni* (EA 365:24) for **yaḥdônnî* "by myself" (cf. *infra*, p. 149).

Besides such vocables as those discussed above, which are clearly nouns in adverbial accusative, there are also some locative adverbs that also seem to have the accusative ending plus some other element such as the enclitic *-mi* or the deictic *-k-*. These latter are the interrogative *a-ia-mi* (EA 131:43) or *a-ya-mi* (EA 138:123) "where?" (cf. also *a-ia-ka-am*, EA 254:27; *infra*, pp. 109-110) and the indefinite *a-ia-ka₄-mi* "(some)where" (EA 149:52-53; cf. *infra*, p. 110-111).

A number of standard Akkadian adverbs occur in the accusative, especially the pair, *urra(m) u mūša(m)* "day(-light) and night." Mimation is rare and when it occurs, it is only on the second: *ur-ra / [ù] mu-ša-am* (EA 73:20-21); *mu-ša ur-ra-am* (EA 362:33). Now and then, *urra* is replaced by *ūma*, usually written ideographically; thrice we find UD.KAM-*ma* (EA 292:24; 293:13; Izre³el 1978b:48), but these confirm the normalization for the other instances that lack the phonetic complement (EA 315:11; 326:22; cf. *infra*, pp. 132-135). Note also *ú-ma an-nu-ta₅(=tam)* "these days (sic!)" (EA 252:21; Albright 1943b:31 n. 21). There is one combination of an accusative pl. adverb with a singular:

KIN.·NIM> *še-ri*^{MEŠ} / *u le-lá-ma* "morning(s) and evening"
(EA 195:12-13; CAD L:184a; AHw:121a).

One cannot be sure whether or not mimation was in force on the adverb *ša-ni-tam*, so ubiquitous in these letters. Knudtzon had transcribed them *ša-ni-tú*, but Ebeling (1915: 1514) had correctly seen that the final sign was to be red *tam*. Albright (1943a: 15 n. 45) compared Hebrew adverbs such as *hinnām* and favored the preservation of the *-m* in the EA texts; Izre³el (1978b:67), noting MB readings such as *ša-ni-ta* (EA 7:76; AHw:1164), preferred the rendering *ša-ni-ta₅*. However, this adverb belongs to the Babylonian stock, which is an older dialect than MB, and its usage in the EA texts may be as an archaism. So, even though the question remains open, in this present work, *ša-ni-tam* has been arbitrarily adopted; there is a good chance that it is correct.

The adverb *kīam* "thus," also with an accusative suffix and mimation, appears in the Canaanite texts as *ki-ia-am* (EA 250:15, *et al.*), and even *ki-i-ia-am* (EA 251:7). This would strengthen the impression that forms from the Babylonian stock do carry mimation. The Byblian scribes use *ki-a-ma* (Youngblood 1961:148-149), but once we find *ki-a-ma-am* (EA 85:6) where the scribe wished to emphasize the adverbial function (Youngblood 1961:272). The forms *an-ni-ka* (EA 1:92) or *an-ni-ka-a* (for MB, cf. CAD A/2:132b) from Egypt (EA 1:34 *et al.*; Cochavi-Rainey

1988:209), for *annikâ* "here," go back to OB *anniki²am*. The Canaanite texts have only *an-ni-ke-ma* (for *annikêma* or for *annikêmma*?) from Megiddo (EA 365:28; Rabiner 1981:84) and *an-ni-ka-nu* from Jerusalem (EA 287:52; cf. for further discussion *infra*, p. 6).

Other substantives or adjectives in the adverbial accusative include *pa-na* "formerly" (EA 137:83; perhaps an error for *pa-na-⟨nu⟩*), and *ri-qú-tám* (EA 87:7), *ri-qú-tam* (EA 137:10) and *ri-qa-mi* (EA 137:21) meaning "empty(-handed)" (cf. Heb. *rêqām*; Albright 1950:387; Youngblood 1961:87; *AHw*:998b), and *ḥa¹-mu-tam* "promptly" (EA 285:29; Moran 1975b:155). There is one instance where an adverbial accusative is employed along with another adverbial complement that takes the form of a locative adverb:

ù pu-ia a-wa-te^{MEŠ} aq-bu / a-na šar-ri ki-ta-ma "and from my mouth I speak words to the king truthfully" (EA 107:10-11).

There, in fact, the accusative *kitta(m)ma* bears the enclitic *-ma* for special emphasis, "It is *truthfully* that I speak words from my mouth to the king" (cf. Rainey 1976a; *infra*, p. 233).

Note the temporal use of an adverbial accusative with repetition and enclitic *-ma* for emphasis:

ša-at-ta ša-ta-ma "year by year" (EA 38:11; also EA 33:27, 31).

A Canaanite name of the harvest season, attested only in one context, is also a hitherto unrecognized adverbial accusative:

šum-ma ŠE.MEŠ qè-e-šī la-a yu-ši-ru / LUGAL ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ta₅ a-na URU.KI Gub-¹la¹ / ù la -¹qé¹-¹mi¹ ti-il-qú-na-ši "If by the (time of) summer grain the king does not send the regular army to Byblos, they (the enemy) will surely capture it" (EA 131:15-17; cf. Moran 1950a:57, 176; 1984:349, 350 n. 3; *CAD* Q:243b).

The is confirmed by a similar text having an adverbial accusative to express time:

ʿšum¹-ma MU.KAM an-ni-ta / [i]a-nu ERÍN.MEŠ pi-ṭá-ta / [ù]
 GA.KAL a-di / [da-r]i-ti "[I]f this year there is no army, [then] he
 will be entrenched for[ev]er" (EA 93:25-28; Moran 1950a:161;
 also EA 117:56; 129:49);

which is itself confirmed by the parallel adverbial phrases in the following passage:

[ù] šum-ma ia-a-nu-mi ERÍN.MEŠ pi-ṭa-tu₄ / i-na MU an-ni-ti
 ḫal-qa-at a-ba-da-at / gāb-bi KUR.ḪÀ šār-ri EN-ia "[But] if there is
 no army in this year, all the lands of the king, my lord, are lost"
 (EA 288:51-53; also the positive, EA 287:20-21).

Once the accusative is used with *ubāna*, literally "(by) a finger's breadth,"

ʿú¹-ba-na la-a GAZ \ de₄-ʿka¹-ʿti¹ "I was almost killed"
 (EA 287:73).

The usual practice in this idiom is to place the adverb in the *status absolutus*, evidently because it is not just the name of a member of the body, but also the name of a standard measure of width (cf. *infra*, p. 9).

The following isolated example may be just a scribal error but it can also be an adverbial accusative ending intentionally carried over to a feminine plural, where the dependent case ending, *-i*, is what would normally be required:

a-di da-ri-ia-ta "forever" (EA 294:35).

Finally, an Akkadian adverb ending in *-ānumma* (cf. *infra*) is glossed by a Canaanite adjective in the adverbial accusative, plus the enclitic particle, *-ma*, apparently by attraction from the *-ma* on the preceding Akkadian form:

TIL.LA-nu-um-ma \ ḫa-ia-ma "alive" (EA 245:6; for the passage, cf. *infra*, pp. 6-7, 232).

ADVERBIAL *-um(ma)*, *-u(m)*. The standard Akkadian locative adverbial suffix, *-um* (GAG:87-88, §66), is documented in the Canaanite EA letters in its various usages. Ubiquitous forms such as the adverb *anumma* or the conjunctions *indum* and *inūma*, belong to the Babylonian stock. Their functions will be discussed under the appropriate categories. However, indisputable locatives occur in the formulae for obeisance which make reference to parts of the body, e.g. *kabattumma* "on the belly," which CAD K:14a takes as a WS word in a word pair with *šērumma* or *šašalumma* "on the back" (for references, cf *infra*, p. 232). This particular expression is peculiar to the EA texts although similar obeisance formulae are known from Ugarit as well (Salonen 1967:75-76; Loewenstamm 1967 = 1980:246-248). Even though it would appear that all three of these particular locatives are Akkadian lexemes (*contra* CAD K:14a), one also finds a variation of the formula in which a true Canaanite word is substituted, or rather glossed, especially *šuhrumma* "on the back," and the gloss *baṭnu(m)ma* "on the belly"; the most striking example is in a letter from Acco:

i-na pa-an-te-e \ ba-aṭ-nu-ma / ù še-ru-ma \ šú-ú²-ru-ma "on the chest (on the belly) and on the back (on the back)"
(EA 232:10-11; CAD B:78b; S:139b, 261b).

Note that the first gloss translated is an Akkadian prepositional phrase. So the second gloss can be taken as a genuine Canaanite adverbial form.

Two Rib-Haddi epistles, one from Byblos and one from Beirut, use the inanimate interrogative pronoun with *-um(mi)*:

mi-nu-mi (EA 126:49); *mi-nu-um* (EA 126:14; 138:131, 136, 137).

This term is equivalent to the widely used prepositional phrase *ana mīni(m)* "why."

Unless it is an error, there is one case of what would normally be a cognate accusative, which instead has the adverbial suffix *-um*,

ù *yi-la-mu-nu-ni* ¹*Bir₅-ia-wa-za* / *lam-nu-um a-na pa-ni-ka* EN-*ia*
 "But Biryawaza is/has been committing a great evil against me
 in your presence, my lord" (EA 189:6-7; CAD L:117b, 120b).

And in a similar vein, the following passage also has an adverbial complement:

a-nu-ma yi-ka-lu ka-ar-ši-ia / *ḥa-ba-lu-ma* "Now I am being
 slandered in a harmful way" (EA 254:16-17; CAD H:3b).

The use of the locative suffix together with pronominal suffix may be seen in the form *pu-ia* "from/with my mouth" (EA 107:10; for the context, cf. *supra*, p. 3-4). As an example of the suffix without mimation, note the *hapax* *ḥa-mi-it-tù* "quickly, promptly" (EA 137:79).

ADVERBIAL *-ānu(m)*. A very important adverb in this category is *pānānum*, which often plays a key role in verbal constructions expressing continuous action in the past (with the imperfect *yaqtulu*; Moran 1950a:43-44) but in other instances as well (cf. *infra*, pp. 123-126).

One occurrence from Jerusalem is recorded for the form *an-ni-ka-nu* "here, hither" (EA 287:52), an adverb shared with Ugarit (CAD A/2:132) and comprising another northern affinity of the Jerusalem letters (Moran 1975b:154 and n. 73 on p. 165). A Rib-Haddi letter has *ar-¹ka¹-nu* "afterward" (EA 95:38). Contrary to CAD A/2:45b, there is no *ašrānu* meaning "here" (Rainey 1978b:66), but there are a few examples of the normal Akkadian usage, viz. "there" (two from Byblos, one used absolutely [EA 102:31] and the other dependent on a preposition, *a-na aš-ra-nu* "thither" [EA 126:8]); likewise, there is also one prepositional example from Sidon, *iš-tu aš-ra-nu-um* "from there" (EA 145:25).

Finally, there is the *hapax* written TIL.LA-*nu-ma*, evidently for *balṭānumma* "alive" (CAD b:66b), from Megiddo (EA 145:6), where it is glossed by the Canaanite adverbial accusative, *ḥa-ia-ma* (cf. *supra*, p. 4; *infra*, p. 232).

TERMINATIVE *-iš*. Much rarer in the Canaanite texts are adverbs with the terminative suffix *-iš*. The only frequent form is *arḥiš* and it appears in these letters (only from Byblos and two Alashia texts having WS features) always in combination with *kīma* (CAD A/2:257a). The contexts require a meaning such as that adopted by the CAD, viz. "as soon as possible." A Rib-Haddi epistle written in Beirut expresses the same thing by *ki-ma ḥa-^Imu¹-ti-iš* (EA 137:92).

While the peripheral texts from Mitanni and elsewhere make frequent use of *danniš*, it is absent from all the WS letters except one obscure passage from Tyre (written *dan-niš*, EA 146:13). Instead, the WS texts, mainly from Byblos but also from other areas, have *magal* (for discussion, cf. *infra*, pp. 10, 146-147).

Once we find *SIG₅-iš* (EA 297:11 from Gezer) and once *ana dārīš* (EA 287:11 from Jerusalem; Moran 1975b:155).

The Alashia letters use *našriš* "safely, surely," a form known elsewhere only in one Alalakh text (AT 110:8, 11; AHw:757a; CAD N/2:51b).

Finally, there is one formation that appears to be an invention of the Canaanite scribes, since it is unattested elsewhere, viz. *puḥriš* "together" (AHw:876b). In both instances, it is used absolutely, without a preposition (cf. Albright 1942b:34 n. 9; Moran 1975a:150 n.3), once in the letter sent from Lachish, *pu-uḥ-ri-iš* (EA 333:7) and once from Shechem, *pu-uḥ-ri-iš-mi* (EA 254:24).

From the above, it should be obvious that *-iš* was not native to the Canaanite language, a conclusion expected from the comparative evidence. The preference is usually for other forms or else some original creation is adopted, e.g. *kīma arḥiš*, *puḥriš*. In this light, we may view the aberration *an-nu-uš* in three Byblos letters (CAD A/2:143a for references; cf. semantic discussion, *infra*, pp. 154-155). It would appear that some scribe chose to add *-(i)š* to the demonstrative pronoun *annû* (CAD A/2:138b) or to a homophonous presentation particle, serving as a substitute for *anumma*. The other examples of *annû* without an adverbial suffix will be treated *infra*, pp. 155-159.

DISTRIBUTIVE *-išam* The Tyrian scribe makes use once of *u₄-mi-ša-ma* "daily" (EA 148:24).

SUFFORMATIVE *-ī* < **-ai*. The usual prepositions, e.g. *adi*, *arki*, *bēri*, *eli*, *itti*, have this ending. The particles *adīmi* and *adi* (cf. *infra*, pp. 68-70, 119-122) are to be included, along with *mati* (cf. *infra*, p. 115) and also *ša-al-ša-mi* (EA 362:14, 16; cf. *infra*, p. 127). For the use of this ending plus a suffix pronoun, not dependent upon a preposition, note EGIR-*šu* for *arkīšu* "afterwards" (EA 245:10: CAD A/2:281a; also EA 250:28). Another such independent usage is evidently the temporal designation, *u₄-mi ma-ḥa-ri* "tomorrow" (TT 5:14; CAD M/1:50b; Albright 1944b:24; probably also to be read in TT 6:29). The Canaanite *maḥari* is here in apposition to Akkadian *ūmi*, both with the adverbial ending; unless, of course, the preposition *ina* has been lost at the end of the previous line (Rainey 1977:45), which would mean that both forms are simply in the dependent case. This latter solution is certainly the most reasonable.

SUFFORMATIVE *-ī*. The possibility must also be entertained that some such adverbial *-ī* is present on forms of the absolute infinitive when the latter is serving in its unique WS function as a narrative form. Note the following examples:

ka-š[a-d]i-ma LÚ-ia ù / ra-ak-[š]a-šu "As soon as my man arrived, he bound him" (EA 116:27-28; Moran 1950a:57; 1950c:169; 1952:77 n. 11); *ù ma-ti-ma šu-ut a-nu-ki?* / *i-de-šu* "And as soon as he died, I learned of it" (EA 89:38-39; Moran 1950c:170a; 1987b:277; 1992:162; Youngblood 1961:333-334); *pa-tá-ri-ma šu-ut* "(If) he leaves" (EA 113:40);

Here an adverbial suffix is more likely since there is no precedent for a dependent (genitive) suffix in such a syntactical position. This *-ī* has been compared to the *hireq campaginis* of ancient Hebrew (Moran 1961:60, 62). The same suffix is also thought by Moran (1961:60, 69 n. 52) to appear three times on participial forms as well:

di-ki "the slain" (EA 131:22; passive, Moran 1950a:117); *ḥa-ṣí-ri*
 "holds back" (EA 138:80, 130; CAD Ḥ:166b).

Whatever its morphologic base, these forms on infinities and participles can hardly represent an Akkadian feature. They must be distinguished from the true Akkadian suffix $-ī < *-ai$. Therefore, it seems logical to accept Moran's view (Moran 1961:60, 62) that this $-ī$ is of WS origin.

STATUS ABSOLUTUS

Adverbs in the *status absolutus* are of particular interest. They may also be reckoned as forms with \emptyset -suffix. Such a formal grammatical category practically unknown in WS; the examples treated here evidently derive from the repertoire of Akkadian adverbs known to the WS scribes of the EA tablets. Some examples may be built on analogy of other, more frequent forms.

Reference was made *supra*, p. 4, to an accusative use of *ubāna* (EA 287:73). Two other EA examples and one from Ugarit (AHw:1399a) adopt the *status absolutus*, *ú-ba-an* (EA 264:8, 12; 273:22; Nougayrol 1965:222. RS 17.383:33). In these passages, *ubān* serves as an idiom: "(by a) finger (width)," i.e. "(by an) inch," meaning "scarcely, barely." The fact that *ubānu* is also the technical name for a measure must explain the use of the absolute form (GAG:79, §62d).

Where one might object to an absolute form, such as with *šaddaqaḍim* "last year" (AHw:1123), the Tyrian scribe writes MU-*qá-dì* (EA 149:74) and in another line *ša-an-dì-qá-dì-ma* (EA 149:27), both dependent on *ištu*. It appears that the final *-m*, originally a radical of the second component (*qadmu*, AHw:891b; CAD Q:295), was dropped as if it were only mimation (although the second instance is ambiguous).

There is also the commonplace *inanna* (*in + anna*; GAG:163, §113n) and once simply *ù an-na* (EA 117:19), which might be an error for *ù an-nu*. Mention has already been made of the preference in WS texts for *ma-gal* instead of *danniš*. Whatever the

derivation of *magal* may be (CAD M/1:28-31), it evidently was understood as being in *status absolutus* (cf. *infra*, pp. 146-147).

Finally, there is the unique *tu-ma-al* (EA 362:14, 16) instead of the usual OA and OB *ti-ma-li-(ma)* (AHw:1359b). One would be tempted to see here a Canaanite variant except for two points: (1) the *status absolutus* itself, which is not a WS feature, and (2) the *-ā*-vowel in the second syllable — a true Canaanite form would have to be **tumôl* › *temôl* › *ʔetmôl*, as in Hebrew. Such a Canaanite form would have been written **tu-mu-ul*, or perhaps **ti-mu-ul*. Therefore, *tu-ma-al* must be an attempt to reproduce an Akkadian form (cf. *infra*, pp. 127-128). As an indicator of time, the *status absolutus* might have seemed a logical formation in the eyes of a Canaanite scribe. It may be a matter of chance, but Akkadian *timālu* does not seem to be attested among Akkadian dialects in the *status absolutus* (AHw:1359b-1360a).

CHAPTER II

PREPOSITIONS AND PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES

Although the standard repertoire of prepositions from the Akkadian stock language is in use in the usual functions, there are also some departures from the norm, reflecting WS expressions; here and there one even finds a true Canaanite form. The division between simple prepositions and prepositional combinations adopted by von Soden (GAG:161, §112a-b) is followed here (for *aššum* and *ašar*, however, we prefer classification with the latter, rather than the former category). While in GAG the prepositions are treated according to their predominance in the Akkadian language, here they will be discussed in alphabetical order.

SIMPLE PARTICLES AND ADAPTED NOUNS

adi. The special adverbial usages of *adi* as the equivalent of Canaanite/Hebrew *‘ôd* will be treated *infra*, pp. 119-122. As noted by CAD (A/1:123), the Canaanite letters prefer *qadu* for the meaning "with." However, there are two instances in the Jerusalem letters (EA 287:47; 288:60) where *a-di* can only have the meaning "with." These have been duly noted by Moran (1975b:154) as further examples of the strong N. Syrian/Assyrian flavor of the Jerusalem correspondence. Surprisingly, there are two passages in the Byblos texts where the same intention is evident:

ù / *a-na-ša-ru* [URU *k*]i-it-ti-šu *a-di* 'NIN¹-nu / DINGIR.MEŠ-nu
a-[*na ka-ta*₅] "so that I may guard his [fa]ithful [city] with our
Lady (and) our gods for you" (EA 74:55-57; Rainey 1975b:414);
mi-[*i*]a-[*m*]i šu-ut i-nu-[*m*]a il-[*qé*] / *ka-li* LÚ.MEŠ *a*-[*di*] GUD.M[*EŠ*]
it-ti-š[*u*] "Who is he that he took all the men along [with] the
catt[le] with him?" (EA 92:41-42; Moran 1987b:284 n. 10;
1992:167 n. 10; citing Na³aman).

The other standard nuances are amply represented. In a spatial, i.e. geographical, sense, *adi* means "as far as,"

iš-tu / URUGub-li / *a-di* URUÚ-ga-ri-ti "from Byblos to Ugarit"
(EA-98:9; also EA 85:52, 53).

Of particular interest is the Jerusalem use of *adi* . . . *adi*,

a-di KUR.ĤÁ še-e-ri KI *a-di* URUGin g-ti-ki-ir-mil "from the lands
of Seir as far as Gath-carmel" (EA 288:25-26; Albright,
Mendenhall and Moran 1955:488b; cf. also EA 117:41).

Very widespread is the temporal nuance, "until," e.g. *a-di*
*da-ri-ṯi*¹ "forever" (EA 189:27; also EA 93:27; 209:9; 294:34), which
is especially common with the infinitive, *a-di ka-ša-di-ia* "until my
arrival" (EA-244:13; *et passim* with various verbs).

ana. One text utilizes the spelling *àna* (AN), viz. EA 227:7,
9, 13 (Rainey 1975b:421-422 n. 235; 1978b:63). Apocopated forms
are generally rare in the Canaanite texts:

*a-ṯi*¹[*a-š*]i (EA 138:135); *a-mi-ni* (EA 125:31); *a-ša-šu-nu*
(EA 103:10);

they are more characteristic of the Mitanni letters (Adler 1976:67).

An unusual passage has the enclitic *-mi* affixed to the
preposition for emphasis:

a-na ia-ši-ia a-na-mi LUGAL *gāb-bu* "(What is) mine, all (belongs)
to the king" (EA 197:6) i.e. "(As for what is) mine, it is to the
king that it belongs" (cf. *infra*, p. 236, 245).

There are a number of idiomatic uses which reflect
Canaanite syntax (Moran 1950a:17). The meaning "from" is
derived from the use of *ana* to introduce the complement of *qālu*
"to be silent, to ignore" (EA 74:13, 48; plus ten other examples)
alongside *ištu* in the same function (EA 68:14, 31; plus six other

passages). Youngblood (1961:27) compared the latter usage with the following biblical expression:

ʔal teḥ^{ra}š mimmenî "Don't ignore me!" (Ps. 28:1),

to which may be added,

ʔal taḥ^arēš mimmennû mizz^aḏq "Don't cease to cry out for us" (1 Sam. 7:8).

To the passages with *ana* one may compare

heḥ^erîš lāh "He says nothing to her" (Num. 30:5, 8, 12, 15); and
ʔel-dim^aāfi ʔal-teḥ^{ra}š "Keep not silent at my tear(s)" (Ps. 39:13).

In fact, the use of *qâlu* in this idiom, "to keep silent about something (rather than taking appropriate action)," is a feature of the Canaanite EA texts (*AHw*:895 with its roots in OB and its continuation in NA, *CAD Q*:72-73). It also occurs in one non-WS epistle from Tunip (EA 59:29, 30, 37-38) which introduces the adverbial complement by *aš-šum*, which is a more natural Akkadianism.

Moran (1950a:17) had also noted that the idiom *ana kussî* with forms of (*w*)*ašābu* (EA 34:52; 116:66) is contrary to standard Akkadian usage, which is *ina kussî* (*CAD A*/2:390-392 *passim*). However, this use of *ana* seems to be a peripheral phenomenon (*KBo* 1, 8:8, 16; *KUB* 3, 14:12; Nougayrol 1956:88, RS 17.353:2; *ibid.*, 85, RS 17.338:3; *CAD A*/2:390, 405; *CAD K*:590-591) alongside *ina kussî* (EA 17:11; *KBo* 1, 1:56 *et al.*). The origin of the idiom with *ana* may very well be WS, but if so, it was apparently not confined to Canaan. Moran (1950a:17) had also made reference to the similar usage in Ugaritic, which had already been observed by scholars, note e.g.

yṯb . lkḫt . ʔalⁱyn / b^l "He sat on the throne of the mighty Baal" (*KTU* 1.6:I, 58); *yṯb . lksⁱ mlk* "He sat on the throne of the kingdom" (*KTU* 1.16:VI, 23-24).

Two other combinations cited by Moran (*loc. cit.*) are probably typical of Akkadian, especially during the MB/MA period contemporary with the EA texts. These are *ana pānī* "before, in the presence of" (*AHw*:821b), and *ana pī* (EA 79:12, 22), meaning "according to the command of" (*AHw*:873b). Moran also noted *a-na i-^lde^l[-ni-]ia* "by myself" (EA 91:26), to which we may add [*a-]na i-de-ni-ši* "by it-/herself" (EA 91:21). He compared this formation with Hebrew *l^obaddî* (Moran 1950a:17). The use of *edēnu/idēnu* with a preposition is exclusively Byblian and otherwise unknown in normal Akkadian (*CAD* E:27), but the usual formula at Byblos is *ina idēni-*, which will be treated *infra*, p. 149.

Note must also be taken of the expressions with *šemû* "to hear, heed, listen" (Moran 1950a:17). As Moran indicated, the Akkadian verb usually takes the accusative (cf. *AHw*:1211b-1212b *passim*, especially with the direct object *awāta[m]*). One may point out an interesting contrast in which the G stem takes an indirect object while the Gt has the accusative (Rainey 1971b:98-99):

u la-a yi-iš-mu / a-na a-wa-ti₇ LUGAL "that he would not listen to the word of the king" (EA 320:23-24; 322:17-19); *u la-a /yi-iš-te-mu a-wa-ta₅* / LUGAL "that he would not heed the word of the king" (EA 323:18-20; 324:16-18; 325:12-14).

In fact, biblical Hebrew *šāma^c l^a- / ^ael* is not more frequent than the construction of *šāma^c b^a-*; cf. by way of example Dt. 30:8; Ps. 81:12).

Another usage of *ana*, practically ignored up to now, is in expressions of possession. Such a function is foreign to OA (Hecker 1968:177-178) and OB (*GAG*:164; *AHw*:47-48). These older dialects had a set of independent possessive pronouns (*GAG*:45-46; Hecker 1968:78-79) which obviated other constructions. The contrast between *kûm* "yours" and *ana kâši* "for you," is clearly demonstrated by the following:

ša-at-tam ku-um nu-um . . . še-um ša ús-sà-an-na-qú / ú-ul a-na ka-ši-im "This year, what is yours is ours . . . the grain that is

being meted out is not for you" (Frankena 1968:14, No. 16+17:8-12; CAD K:288a, 480a).

The context and the Dt verb in the subordinate clause prove that there is a juxtaposition here of genitive and dative pronominal expressions. It is as a dative that one must also interpret the instructions in the following OB letter dealing with the distribution of grain rations:

0,0.I *še-a-am a-na a-ya-ši* / 0,0.I *še-a-am a-na ša-šu* "One seah for me, one seah for him" (*AbB* 2, 163:8-9; Frankena 1966:106).

The dative usage of *ana* is also widespread in the MB period, including especially the peripheral areas. One notes the ubiquitous expressions of well being such as,

šulmu ana . . . "It is well with . . .," and *lū šulmu ana (muḥḥi)* "May it be well with . . .!" (Salonen 1967:59-77 *passim*),

used in the opening paragraphs of so many letters. The Ugaritic epistles, which are translations from Akkadian, have a literal reflex of the injunctive expression using *lamed*, viz.

*yšlm lk = *yišlam leka (leki)* "May it be well with you!" (Rainey 1968b:136).

However, when stating that all is well or when inquiring as to the welfare of someone, the Ugaritian scribes used the preposition ^c*m* (Rainey 1975a:25) corresponding to *itti* in Akkadian. But it would appear that, in the western peripheral areas, the fact that *lamed* can have both a dative and a derived genitive force, led the Canaanite scribes to use the dative *ana* in a similar extension in order to express possession.

Labat (1932:83-84, 98-99) had noted long ago the use of *ana* for expressions of possession in the Hittite archives, especially in treaties being composed in Hittite and translated into Akkadian:

¹A-zi-ra a-na ka-a-ša ¹Dup-pi- ^dIŠKUR-¹ub¹ a-bi a-bi-ka šu-ú "As for Aziru, he (was) to you, Duppi-Teshub, your grandfather" (KUB 3, 14:2; Weidner 1923:76).

The Akkadian version of this treaty is happily paralleled by the Hittite version where the Akkadian determinative pronoun is employed as an Akkadogram to represent the genitive relationship,

¹A-zi-ra-aš tu-el ŠA [¹Dup-pi- ^dIŠKUR-ub . . .] (Friedrich 1926:4).

There is also one such instance of *ana* (together with the verb *ibašši*) in the EA letter from Assyria that is written in a Mitanni style of Babylonian (cf. the remarks by von Soden 1952b:434),

šum-ma i-na še-ti i-zu-uz-zu / a-na LUGAL né-me-lu i-¹ba ¹aš-ši / ù li-zi-iz-ma i-na ¹še¹-t[i-m]a / li-mu-tu a-na LUGAL-ma ¹lu¹ né-me-lu "If their standing out in the open sun is profit to the king—then let them stand out in the open sun, let them die and let there be profit to the king himself!" (EA 16:46-49; CAD Š:152b).

This usage of *ana* also appears at Ugarit:

ŠE.MEŠ-šu KAŠ-šu / ša \ ma-a²-ša-ri-ša / ù UDU.MEŠ \ ma-aq-qa-du / a-na ¹Ia-ší-ra-*na* >-ma / KÛ.BABBAR šar-ra-ku-ti / ù KÛ.BABBAR sú-sà-pí-in-nu-ti / a-na ¹Ia-ší-ra- *na* >-ma "Its grain, its beer, of its tithe and the sheep (the pasturage tax), (belong) exclusively to Yāširānu; the money of the festal offerings and the money of the 'best men' prerogatives (belong) exclusively to Yāširānu" (Nougayrol 1955:147, RS 16.153:10-16; CAD M/1:252b).

However, the relatively high frequency of this same usage in the Canaanite EA texts (as against the N. Syrian letters) suggests that it reflects a WS feature, even if it may prove to have been absorbed earlier into the western OB dialect. First, we may

note the many examples in negative existential clauses with *yânu*.
From Byblos:

[i]a-nu ÌR ki-ma ¹Ia-an-ḥa-mi / a-na ¹LUGAL¹ ÌR ki-ti "There is no servant like Yanḥamu, a true servant of the king" (EA 118:55-56).

From Kumidi:

ù i-ia-nu-mi / ANŠU.KUR.RA ù i-ia-nu / GIŠGIGIR a-na ia-ši "But I have no horse and no chariot" (EA 198:21-23).

There are several similar statements from Byblos (EA 79:34; 85:74;107:43, 45 *et al.*) and examples with *ul* instead of *yânu*:

ù ú-ul / ba-la-aṭ LUGAL a-na / ia-ši "And I don't have the king's sustenance" (EA 122:30-31; cf. the same statement but with *yânu*, EA 130:39-41); ù URUŠí-du-na / ù!(ŠI) URUBe-ru-ta ú-ul / a-na LUGAL "And Sidon and Beirut are not on the king's side" (EA 118:30-32).

Likewise, the genitive use of *ana* is employed in a rhetorical question,

a-na ma-an-ni / URU.MEŠ an-nu-tu ù-ul a-na LUGAL "Whose cities are these? Are they not the king's?" (EA 101:25-26).

These should be compared with the other examples with *yânu* from Byblos,

ia-nu KUR.MEŠ Ki-an-aḥ-¹ni ¹a-na LUGAL "The lands of Canaan do not belong to the king" (EA 130:39-41);

and similarly from Jerusalem,

ia-a-nu-mi I-en LÚṛḥa ¹zi-a-nu / a-na šâr-ri EN-ia "The king, my lord, does not have one city-ruler" (EA 288:39-40).

This latter may be contrasted with another passage in the same epistle, but using *lā*:

a-mur a-na-ku la-a LÚ_h*a-zi-a-nu* / LÚ_ú*e-ú* <*a-na-ku*> *a-na šār-ri*
EN-*ia* "Behold, I am not just a city ruler; a soldier am <I> of the
king, my lord" (EA 288:9-10 = 285:5-6; Liverani 1967:15 n. 4;
Moran 1987b:516 n. 1; 1992:331 n. 1; *contra* Albright,
Mendenhall and Moran 1955:488b).

In three formulations, *ana* follows the pattern of the letter from Assyria cited *supra* and introduces the adverbial complement to *bašû* (in its stative conjugation pattern; cf. Rainey 1973c:249-250). Perhaps *ana* is just an error for *ina*:

a-mur-mi ni-i₁₅-nu i₁₅-ba-ša-a-nu / *a-na* KUR *Am-qi*
URU.DIDLI.ĤÁ LUGAL EN-*ia* "Behold, we belong to the land
of ʿAmqi, the cities of the king, my lord (EA 174:8-10; 175:7-8;
176:7-8).

But there can be no doubt about the following Byblos text:

[*a-mu*]*r-mi* URUGub-*la ki-ma* URUĤi-*ku-up-ta-aḥ* [*i*]-*ba-ša-at a-na*
šār-ri "[Beho]ld, Byblos, like Memphis, belongs to the king"
(EA 84:37-38).

Likewise, with *ri²āḥu*, in a string of passages, e.g.

URUGub-*la i-na i-de-ni-ši_x(ŠE)* / *ir-ti-ḥa-at a-na ia-ši* "Byblos alone
remains mine" (EA 124:9-10; cf. EA 74:22, *et al.*).

The possessive as the natural extension of the dative function can be seen in the following:

šum-ma i-ba-aš-ši KUR *an-ni-tu* / *a-na šār-ri am-mi-ni₇e-nu-ma* /
URUĤa-*za-ti* K^I *a-na šār-ri ša-ak-na-at* / *a-mur* K U R
URUGin₈-*ti-ki-ir-mi-il a-na* ^I*Ta-gi* "If this land belongs to the king,
why, like Gaza, does it stay loyal to the king? Behold, the

territory of Gath-carmel belongs to Tagi" (EA 289:15-19; cf. Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:489a).

In fact, quite a few of the best examples pertain to the possession of cities and territory. The Jerusalem passage cited above is paralleled by several allusions in the Byblos letters:

a-mur!(NA) LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-tu* 'URU'.MEŠ / *a-na ša-šu-nu ù pa-aš-ḥu* "Behold(!) the city rulers, they have their towns and they are at peace" (EA 118:45-46; not conditional clause as in Moran 1950a:71; 1987b:326; 1992:196; cf. also EA 125:33-34).

Likewise:

ù / a-na-ku URU.MEŠ-*ia a-na* ¹*A-zi-ri* "And as for me, my cities belong to Aziru" (EA 125:36-37); ^{URU}*ṣu-mu-ra a-na ša-šu* "Ṣumur belongs to him" (EA 140:15); *a-na ša-šu-nu* ^{URU}*Ar-da-ta / URU*^{URU}*Ya-aḥ-li-ia URU*^{URU}*Am-bi / URU*^{URU}*šī-ga-ta ka-li / URU.MEŠ a-na ša-šu-nu* "They have Ardata, Yaḥlia, Ambi, Shigata, all the cities are theirs" (EA 104:10-13).

The latter passage may be compared to the apodosis of the following conditional statement:

šum-ma MU.KAM *a-ni[-ta]* / *ia-nu* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ti ù k[a-li]* / KUR.MEŠ *a-na* LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ "If this year there are no regular troops, then a[II] the lands will belong to the *‘apîrû*" (EA 117:56-58).

In such a case, the non-verbal apodosis actually must be translated by the future tense. Nevertheless, most clauses of this nature pertain to the present, as in the following object clause:

ù yi-de šār-ru i-nu-ma / ÌR ki-ti a-na-ku a-na ša-šu "and the king knows that I am a loyal servant of his" (EA 119:24-25).

Finally, there is a beautiful example in a circumstantial clause:

i-nu-ma / a-bu ù be-lu at-ta-ma / a-na ia-ši "because it is you who is my father and master" (EA 73:35-36; cf. *infra*, p. 230).

These various formations can all be paralleled by the WS dialects. In Ugaritic:

d²in . bn . lh "who has no son" (KTU 1.17:I, 18); *bl ʔit / bn . lh* "He has no son" (KTU 1.17:I, 20); *bnšm . dt . ʔit . ʔalpm . lhm* "Personnel who have no oxen" (KTU 4.422:1); *ʔd¹ . ʔin . ḫzm lhm* "which don't have arrows" (KTU 4.180:1);

In Phoenician:

l²sy / hbrk / hhtm z "Belonging to ʔAšay, the blessed, this seal" (Diringer 1934:251, No. 97; Rainey 1966b:188).

In Hebrew:

w²kī yeš-lī-kōl "and because I have everything" (Gen. 33:11); *w²kōl ʔašer-ʔattāh rōʔeh lī-hūʔ* "and everything that you see is mine" (Gen. 31:43); *kī lī kol-hāʔāreš* "because all the earth is mine" (Exod. 19:5); *kī zebaḥ gādōl lī labbaʿal* "because I have a great sacrifice to Baal" (2 Ki. 10:19); *ʔēn lāh wālād* "She has no child" (Gen. 11:30); *w²lārāš ʔēn-kōl* "and the poor man had nothing" (2 Sam. 12:3).

Two other passages have what appears to be a WS idiom corresponding to the Babylonian, *ana dinān bēliya lullik*, "May I be a substitute for my lord" = "I would lay down my life for my lord" (e.g. EA 12:25; for other references, cf. CAD D:148b-149a; Salonen 1967:59). The two contexts are in two Jerusalem letters, in the final "postscripts" addressed to the scribe who was to receive the letters (first noted by Finklestein 1969:33-34; notwithstanding the objections by Moran 1987b:514 n. 20; 1992:330 n.20; Rainey 1989-90:71b). They seem to be employing the WS suffix verb forms here in their optative function (cf. especially Ginsberg 1932-33:387):

ma-at-ti a-na ka-ta₅!(WA) "I would die for you!" (EA 287:70);
ma-at-ti ma-gal a-na ka-ta₅ "I would verily die for you" EA 289:50).

There are a number of passages where Ebeling (1915:1374) assumed that *ana* was erroneously used instead of *ina*. Several cases are from EA 137 and EA 138. Moran (1950a:112 n. 41) argues that these are instances in which WS *lamed* can function in nuances such as "from" (cf. *supra*, pp. 12-13), and other equivalents. His assumption that WS influence may even be at work in similar usages from the Hittite archives (Labat 1932:100) is probably also correct. For other possible instances of *ina* for *ana*, cf. *infra*, pp. 34-35.

On the other hand, Izre³el (1978b:65) pointed to *a-na ša* (EA 271:26) as a Canaanism, resembling Hebrew *la³ ašer*. But *ana ša* is also at home in Akkadian (GAG:230, §174h; *AHw*:48b). Note that it is used in some of the N. Syrian EA letters (Ebeling 1915:1374). Concerning *aššu*, cf. *infra*, p. 72.

ašar. The prepositional use of *ašru* in the construct (*AHw*:85), meaning, "to, towards" was noted by Ebeling (1915:1381) for the following:

a-šar da-an-ni ti-la-ku-na "They will follow the strong (one)"
 (EA 73:16).

To this example may be added another from a Jerusalem text:

URU *šar-ri pa-ṭa-ra-at* / 'a¹-šar LÚ.MEŠ^{URU} QÍ-íl-ti^{KI} "The town of the king has deserted to the men of Qilti" (EA 290:16-18; *CAD* A/2:415b).

A similar function is well known for Ugaritic *atr* (Rainey 1971b:161; 1974:301; 1978:65; Aartun 1978:50-51).

All the EA instances of *ašar* meaning "from" (EA 27:20; 28:45; 29:50, 140, 141, 144) are in texts from Mitanni (Adler 1976:69) and find parallels elsewhere only in a few examples from Nuzi (Gordon 1938:224-225; *CAD* A/2:415b-416a). Thus, it is

obvious that they are limited to the Hurrian speaking areas and may be attributed to idiomatic influence from Hurrian. Since Akkadian does not have the meaning "footsteps," for this vocable, the derivation from *ašru* "place" seems preferable (*contra* Aartun *loc. cit.*).

aššum. By and large, this preposition functions in accordance with standard Akkadian usage. In a few cases, it takes the *-ma* enclitic (EA 42:19; 106:44; 138:12, 33; 309:25), but these need not be classed as a separate vocable (CAD A/2:468-469). On occasion, one may find a form like *aš-šu* (EA 10:44) in MB (Aro 1957:15-16). For the subordinating conjunction *aš-šu-ú* (EA 34:13), cf. *infra*, p. 72).

Böhl (1909:70 §33o) noted three places where *aššum* appears to have separative force, both temporal and locative (also duly recorded by CAD A/2:470b-471a). In an epistle that is not written in the WS style but rather in the northern, "Hurroakkadian" dialect, from Akizzi of Qatna, the temporal usage is found twice:

aš-šum KÁM.6.UD-*mi i-zi-iz-mi* 'KUR¹.MAR¹.[TU] "for six days he has been staying in Amurru" (EA 55:23); *aš-šum pa-na-nu-um-ma* "from before" (EA 55:65).

Also from Sham^côna in the northern Jezreel Valley comes this passage with temporal nuance:

šum-ma / 'tu¹-ub-'ba¹-lu-na / LÚ.MEŠ *a-bu-tu-nu* / *aš-šum* UD.KAM.MEŠ / 'Ku-sú-na / LÚa-bi-nu "whether our ancestors have brought (tribute) since the days of Kôšôna, our ancestor" (EA 224:13-18).

Finally, the locative separative meaning is illustrated by the following text of unknown provenance:

šum-ma la-qí-ti₇ / *mi-im-ma aš-šum* LÚ_ha-za-ni "whether I have taken anything from the city ruler" (EA 251:2-3).

bâdi. This truly WS prepositional formation, written *bd* in Ugaritic (Gordon 1965:383a) and in Phoenician and Punic (Friedrich and Röllig 1970:23, 31), is added as a gloss, *bâdihu*, in Megiddo:

ù ¹šú-ra-ta / la-qi-mi KÙ.BABBAR.ĤÁ ip-ti-ir-ri-šu / i-na ŠU-ti-šu \
ba-di-ú "But Surata took his ransom money from his hand"
 (EA 245:35).

This equation confirms the assumption that Ug./Phoen. *bd* is a contraction of *ba-* + *yadi*. The use of *ba-* in the meaning "from" is no surprise in the light of Ugaritic (Gordon 1965:92-93, 95-96). For example, note KTU 3.5:17, 19, where *bd* means "from the hand" in the same expression where *ištu qāti* appears in the Akkadian versions of the royal grants (Rainey 1969b:207-209). Furthermore, the expression *ina qāti* itself quite often means "from the hand" in good Akkadian, as is well known (for references cf. Rainey 1969:107 and n. 5).

That the contraction of **bayadi* led to **bâdi* with a long vowel seems most likely in view of the Phoenician and Punic transcriptions with an *o-* vowel in PN's, e.g. ¹*Bu-di-ba-al* (Tallqvist 1914:65), *BODMILKAR* and others (Benz 1972:283-286; Friedrich and Röllig 1970:31).

balu, bali. The basic meaning of this preposition is "without" (*CAD* B:70b). Although Moran (1950a:14) had argued that its usage in the Byblos letters was WS, there are many examples of *balum* with the infinitive, particularly of the verb *ša²ālu, šālu*, "to ask," in both OA and OB (*CAD* B:70a, 71b; Aro 1961:293-294). It is also the negation of the infinitive that predominates in the EA texts from Canaan, e.g.

la-a i-qa-al ¹šār-ru / EN-ia ¹ba¹-lu ša!¹-a-al ¹A-ma-an-ḥa-at-pí "Let not the king, my lord, keep silent, without asking (correction by Moran's collation; Moran 1987b:423 n. 8; 1992:267 n. 9) (EA 185:67-68) Amenhotep!" ; ù *i-ma-la-ku ba-li-mi* / ur-ru-ud LUGAL EN-ia "But would I (*contra* *CAD* B:71b; M/1:155b)

contemplate not serving the king, my lord?" (EA 191:9-10; cf. *infra*, pp. 236, 295); *šum-ma lib-bi LUGAL ba-li uš-ša-[ar]* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ťá-ti* "If it is the king's wish not to send regular troops" (EA 117:59-60).

Concerning this latter passage, Moran compared Heb. *w^alibbô bal ʿimmāk* "but his heart is not with you" (Prov. 23:7), where *bal* negates a nominal clause. But neither in Heb. nor Phoen. does one find *bal* as negation of the infinitive (Joüon 1923:493, §160*m* ; Joüon and Muraoka 1991:607, §160*m* n. 1; Friedrich and Röllig 1970:161). Instead, Heb. uses *bilti* to negate the infinitive (e.g. Gen. 3:11; 4:15; 19:21; etc.).

In the EA texts from Canaan, especially those from Byblos, the infinitive may also serve as the verb in a conditional protasis, and in such instances, one finds that it is negated by *bali*:

[*šum-ma-m*]i *ba-li a-ší* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ť[á-ti]* / [*i-na* MU š] *a-an-ti an-ni-ti* "[If] there is no coming forth of the regular troops [in] this [y]ear" (EA 129:40-41).

The infinitive governed by *ana* to express purpose, which is a normal and high-frequency usage in Akkadian, may also be negated by *bali*:

a-na ba-li šu-ri-bi / ŠE.MEŠ *a-na* ^{URU}*šum-mu-ri* "not to permit the bringing of barley into Šumur" (EA 98:17-18).

This brings us to the final construction repeated often in the earlier Byblos letters as a component in the Canaanite proverb about the wife without husband who is like a field without cultivation/cultivator (EA 74:18-19; 74:16-17; 81:38; 90:43-44). The phrase is:

aš-šum ba-li / *i-re-ši[-i]**m* "because (it is) without one who plants it" (EA 74:18-19; CAD B:71b; E:305b; Youngblood 1961:135), or "because (it is) without cultivation" (Moran 1950a:14; Marcus 1973:286).

Youngblood's arguments in favor of seeing here a writing of *errēšu*, "cultivator" (also *CAD*) are cogent; a person would complete the parallel of the "husband" in the analogy. However, this is not decisive. Inasmuch as all the other examples above were negations of the infinitive, it is far more likely that *i-re-ši-im* in these proverbial expressions is also an infinitive (with Moran and Marcus). The simile would still hold, even without the complete symmetry assumed by Youngblood.

eli. One of the most complex situations concerns the preposition *eli*, which was used sparingly in MB, being replaced for the most part by the constructions *ana /ina muḫḫi* (Aro 1955:99-100). Syllabic spellings of *eli* are extremely rare in the EA corpus. A text from the Hittite king has *e-li* (EA 42:16) and one Mitanni letter has *e-li-i-[-šu]* (EA 29:76). Otherwise, the Mitanni letters use the form *el*, which is documented only rarely in OB literature (*AHw*:200b); in one text (EA 27:12, 108), UGU is used in expressions that parallel the use of *el* in other Mitanni letters and certainly should be read thus. In the overwhelming majority of passages in the EA texts where UGU occurs, however, the question is, how should it be read? For several reasons, it would seem more likely that the WS texts intended that UGU standing alone should be read *eli* (*AHw*:668b; *contra* Youngblood 1961:25). The evidence is as follows: (1) One passage uses the spelling *i-^lli¹-ia* in tandem with UGU (EA 122:17). (2) With only a few exceptions to be discussed subsequently, the use of UGU dependent on a preposition (*ana/ina/ištu*) is confined to non-WS letters. The two major exceptions are an epistle from Tyre (EA 147:6, 26, 39, 43, 52, 64) and another from Jerusalem (EA 288:32), the latter having *a-na UGU-ḫi-ia*. From Alashia, only the non-WS texts use UGU with prepositions (EA 35:3, *et passim*; EA 39:5). (3) UGU-ḫi used independently is also rare. Only EA 147:39 uses it apart from a letter sent by some high-ranking Egyptian official (though it has a possibly WS verb, the tenor of the text is non-WS), viz. EA 96:13 *et passim*. Also from Egypt, we have independent *mu-ḫi-ia* (EA 1:68, 69), *mu-ḫi-šu* (EA 1:76) and independent UGU (EA 1:10,49?, 66; EA 162:20; cf. Cochavi-Rainey

1988:204-205). The syllabic forms of independent *muḥḥi* are also documented for Hattusas and other texts deriving from Hatti (CAD M/2:175a). (4) Except for EA 147 and EA 288 cited above, the WS texts always use a syllabic spelling, never UGU, when employing *muḥḥi* in combination with a preposition (*ana/ina/ištu*). In other words, the Canaanite scribes seem to have made a point of avoiding UGU after prepositions. But they do have a vast number of passages where UGU appears independently. The preposition + *muḥḥi* constructions are almost invariably used to express direction, "to, from," and usually facilitate the addition of a suffix (in place of an oblique pronoun dependent on *ana/ina/ištu*). The many other nuances, as outlined below, are expressed by independent UGU. As the semantic categories will suggest, the contexts seem more appropriate for *eli* than for independent *muḥḥi*.

The semantic categories for *eli* / UGU are generally consistent with the wide range of nuances attached to Hebrew **c*alay / *c*al.

(1) "Upon," in the physical sense, occurs only once, defined by a phonetic complement:

aš-ba-ta UGU-li / [G^lS^g]U.ZA É *a-bi-ka* "You have been seated on the throne of your father's house" (EA 33:10-11).

(2) "Over, more than," seems to be intended in the following :

at-ta-din 4 me KÛ.BABBAR / UGU 1 li-me MEŠ "I gave four hundred (shekels of) silver plus one thousand" (EA 313:7-8, not a clearly WS text);

with which the Ugaritic compounds such as *tl̄tm l mit* "thirty plus one hundred," *et al.*, should be compared (cf. also Loewenstamm 1969:177-178 = 1980:317).

(3) "Over, in charge of, in authority over," usually applies to officials, e.g.

LÚ^{ra}-bi-ší 'LUGAL' / ša UGU-ia "the commissioner of the king who is over me" (EA 313:10-11; also EA 211:21-23 and EA 225:10-12).

(4) "Concerning," with verbs of writing, speaking, asking, knowing, as in these examples:

la-a ti-iš-pu-ru-na / a-na šār-ri UGU-ia-ma / ù UGU I¹a-an-ḥa-mì
 "They do not write to the king about me and about Yanḥamu"
 (EA 118:47-49); *yi-de LUGAL a-na ÌR-š¹u / UGU ip-ši an-ni* "May
 the king take cognizance of his servant concerning this matter!"
 (EA 280:36-37).

Examples like the former, with *šapāru*, are numerous in both the WS texts (EA 92:17; 106:30-32; 114:27; 298:31-33) and the Egyptian (EA 1:10; 162:20; cf. also EA 96:30-31; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:204-205); such is also the case with *qabû* (EA 91:10-11) and *ša²ālu* (EA 89:42-43; 92:25; Youngblood 1961:368). Within the same semantic range, fall the interrogatives:

UGU *ma-an-ni / iš-tap-pár ÌR-Ḥe-¹ba¹* "For what (reason) was
 'Abdi-Ḥeba writing" (EA 280:16-27); UGU / ša 'ma¹-an-ni
yu-pa-š^u ki-a-ma / ÌR ki-ti-ka "For what (reason) is your faithful
 servant treated thus?" (EA 114:41-43; Moran 1950a:112).

(5) The same text just cited also continues with a related usage, namely "because of, as a result of," when Rib-Haddi goes on to ask the question:

UGU *a-ra-di-ka* "because of serving you?" (EA 114:43).

Another case is:

ya-aḥ-li-qú šār-ri KUR.KI-š^u / UGU-ia "That the king should lose
 his territory because of me" (EA 254:9-10; Greenberg 1955:44);

cf. also the following example:

ù UGU *a-ma-ti šu-wa-ti* "because of that matter" (EA 166:28, from Amurru; Izre²el 1985:327).

(6) "For, in behalf of" with the verb *mātu* "to die." This meaning was noted by CAD, but it can hardly be said to appear "passim in letters of Rib-Addi" (CAD M/1:423a). It only occurs in three contexts, each in a letter from Beirut:

UGU LUGAL EN-*ia* BA.UG₇ *a-na-ku* "For the king, my lord, I would die" (EA 136:42); *ù yi-de be-li i-nu-ma* UGU-*šu` a-mu-tu* "And my lord knows that for him I would die" (EA 137:52); *i-ia-nu* LÚ.MEŠ⁵*ha-za-na* LU[GAL] *k[i-ma i]a-ši / a-na* LUGAL *ša-a ia-mu-tu* [UGU *be-l*]*i-ia* "The king has no ro[yal] city ruler [like me], who would die [for] my [lo]rd" (EA 138:26-27).

(7) "Incumbent upon," to indicate responsibility, e.g.

ha-ba-li-ia UGU-*ia* "The damage to me is your responsibility" (EA 82:3; Albright and Moran 1948:242); *mi-im-mu / ša* *in₄-né-ep-šu a-na ša-šu* UGU-¹*ka* "Everything that happens to him is your responsibility" (EA 83:41-42; Youngblood 1961:249); UGU SAG.DU-*ia* *ma-am-ma-an / ša it-tab-šu a-na* URU.KI.DIDL.ĤÁ "I am responsible for everything that happens (has been happening) to the cities" (TT 2:15-16; Maisler [Mazar] 1936:55-56; Rainey 1977:60).

In the latter passage, *eli qaqqadiya* (UGU SAG.DU-*ia*) has been compared with *b^arôšî* "on my head" (1 Chron. 12:20; cf. Josh. 2:19; Maisler [Mazar] 1936:55-56) and *al rôšêkâ* "on your head" (2 Sam.-1:16).

(8) "To, towards," a well known meaning of *al* in Hebrew as well as in Aramaic (Bühl 1915:558a), also is attested for UGU, e.g.

LÚ *ša ti-iš-ta-[pár-šu]* / UGU-*nu* "The man whom you have sent to us" (EA 100:29-30); *du-ub-bu-ba-ku-mi* / UGU ŠEŠ.ĤÁ-*ia* "I spoke to my brothers" (EA 245:1-2); *šum-ma i-ia-nu* Š À

ša-na-am / UGU LUGAL EN-*ia* "since there is no other attitude towards the king, my lord" (EA 136:41-42).

For a non-WS example, cf.

i-il-la-kà-am / *ša-ar-ru ša* LUGAL EN-*ia* / UGU-*ia* "The breath of the king, my lord, is come to me" (EA 164:12-14; Izre²el 1985:327).

These examples reflect a function that other contemporary texts expressed by the use of *ana muḫḫi*.

(9) A somewhat related meaning is found in five passages where even Knudtzon felt the need to transcribe UGU by *eli* rather than *muḫḫi*. They all deal with logistic support (*balātu*) given by the Pharaoh to his vassals (EA 112:51; 121:14; 122:15, 27; 130:25) and are parallel to the possessive function of *ana* (cf. *supra*, pp. 14-20), as demonstrated by the following examples:

a-¹mur¹ ¹pa¹-na-nu i-na / UD.¹KÁM¹.¹MEŠ¹ *a-bu-ti-ia* / LÚ.¹MEŠ¹ ¹ma¹-ša-ar<-ti> LUGAL / *it-ti-šu-nu ù mī-im-mi* / LUGAL UGU-šu-nu ù *an-nu-ú* / *a-na-ku ia-nu ¹ba¹-la-aṭ* / *šār-ri i-¹li¹-ia ù* / *ia-nu* LÚ.¹MEŠ¹ *ma-ša-ar-ti* / *šār-¹ri¹ [i]t-ti-ia* "Behold, formerly, in the days of my fathers, the king's garrison troops were with them and the king's property was at their disposal, but as for me, there are no provisions of the king at my disposal, and there is no garrison of the king with me" (EA 122:11-19; Moran 1992:201); ù *ba-[la]-aṭ* / *šār-ri* UGU-šu ù / *an-nu-ú a-na-ku ú-ul* / *ma-ša-ar-tu ù ú-ul* / *ba-la-aṭ* LUGAL *a-na ia-ši* "and the king's provisions were (given) to him, but behold, as for me, I have neither a garrison force nor the king's provisions" (EA 122:26-31; cf. also 130:39-41).

Furthermore, in EA 122:17, the prepositional expression is spelled *i-¹li¹-ia*, which must be parallel to UGU.

(10) Finally, there is the use of UGU in expressions of hostility towards someone, "against," particularly in combination

with *nukurtu*, "war, hostility, enmity." Usually the reference is to real acts of violence or the threat of violence. Although the examples are numerous, only two will be cited:

da-na-at nu-kúr-tu UGU-ia ù UGU Iš^u-wa-ar-da-ti "The hostility is strong against me and against Shuwardata" (EA 271:11-12);
da-an-nu LÚ.SA.GAZ.MEŠ / UGU-nu "The ^c*apîrû* are strong against us" (EA 299:19; also EA 93:18; 307:10).

The hostility is not necessarily overt; it may also be emotional, for example,

LÚ.MEŠ-šu *ti-ša-šu-na* UGU-ia "His men are angry with me" (EA 83:35; also EA 122:39; CAD A/2:423b).

Nevertheless, a real attack may be indicated, as seen in the following passages:

ti-ma-qû-tu / UGU ^{KURA}-mur-ri "you should attack the land of Amurru" (EA 73:10-11; also 74:32; 83:44; 91:14,25; Youngblood 1961:90; CAD M/1:247b); *i-zi-iz-mi* / IĪR-A-ši-ir-ta UGU-ia "Abdi-Ashirta attacked me" (EA 132:10-11; also EA 85:8; 279:18-19); *šum-ma-mi a-na-ku* / uš-šú-na UGU KUR / ša LUGAL "If I go forth against the land of the king" (EA 333:15-17); *i-na-an-na pu-ḫi-ir* / 'ka¹-li LÚ.MEŠ GAZ UGU ^{URU}Ši-ga-ta / [ù] ^{URU}Am-bi "All of the ^c*apîru* men have assembled against Shigata and Ambi" (EA 76:17-19; cf. EA 91:23-25).

Various other unfriendly acts were committed (*epēšu*, *nēpušu*) against someone (EA 123:21; 185:10-12; 228:21-23; 254:28-29). As a result of hostility, pressure could be applied against a victim (*pušqa* — EA 68:25-26, 74:52-53; *muṣu* — A 75:18; Youngblood 1961:161-162; *manga* — EA 106:16; CAD M/1:28a). For a similar use of *muḫḫi* with regard to *mūtānu*, "plague," cf. EA 96:12-15, *infra*, p. 45).

UGU also can function as a subordinating conjunction. It will be treated *infra*, p. 73.

enūma. The Jerusalem letters use this northern spelling and employ *enūma* in four passages with the meaning "as, like," a logical extension from the semantic parallel between *inūma* / *enūma* and *kî* as a subordinating conjunction (cf. *infra*, pp. 74-89).

Here *enūma* is simply being used like prepositional *kî* (Moran 1975b:155). The correct interpretation of these passages was already anticipated in the translations by Albright, Mendenhall and Moran (1955:488) and the phenomenon was elucidated specifically by Moran (1975b:166 n. 74), whose renderings are as follows:

ip-ša-ti₇ e-nu-ma LÚ₇ḫa-pí-ri "I have become like an 'apîru" (EA 288:29); *ša-ak-na-ti / e-nu-ma* GIŠMÁ *i-na lib-bi* A.AB.BA "I'm sitting like a ship in the midst of the sea" (EA 288:32-33); *am-mi-ni₇ e-nu-ma / URUḫa-za-ti* KI *a-na šār-ri ša-ak-na-at* "Why, like Gaza, does it remain loyal to the king?" (EA 289:16-17); *ù lu ni-pu-uš-mi e-nu-ma / DUMU.MEŠ* I₇*La-ba-a-ya* "or should we do like the sons of Lab³ayu?" (EA 289:21-22).

ina. This preposition, nearly always written syllabically, appears in all of the common usages. Once in a Byblos text we find (on the edge of the tablet):

AŠ É.NINIB "in Bīt-NINIB" (EA 74:31; Youngblood 1961:141).

There are also a few special nuances worthy of note. Just once do we find the enclitic particle of direct speech attached to the preposition:

i-na-mi ŠÀ GIŠMÁ / *a-na-yi* "inside of a ship" (EA 245:28).

The ablative meaning "from" is well known in good Akkadian (AHw:308b), especially in the expression "from the hand of . . ." (CH VI, 48 *et. al.*). It should not be surprising, therefore, to find *i-na ŠU-ti-šu* "from his hand" (EA 245:35) about the acceptance of a bribe. For the gloss on this phrase with Canaanite *ba-di-ú*, cf. *supra*, p. 23).

Moran (1950a:18) noted one example with the sense "according to":

i-na pí-šu "according to his command" (EA 81:18).

One may suggest that this is in fact a prepositional combination; it is included in the section below under *pû* (cf. *infra*, p. 53).

Böhl (1909:69); Moran 1950a:17-18) had already pointed out the use of *ina* in the meaning "as, in the capacity of" as illustrated by a few passages (AHw:564b). Especially striking are those concerning the commissioner:

iš-ta-pár-ka šār-ru / i-na LÚMAŠKÍM "The king has sent you as commissioner" (EA 71:9-10); *ù lu-wa-ši-ra 1Ia-an-ḥa-ma / i-na* LÚMAŠKÍM "and may he send Yanḥamu as commissioner!" (EA 106:36-37); *ù šu-ku-un i-na / LÚMAŠKÍM-ši DUGUD i-1na1 / pa-ni* LÚ.MEŠḥa-za-nu-ti LU[GAL] "and appoint as its commissioner (one who is) respected by the ki[ng's] city rulers!" (EA 107:19-24; Moran 1975a:155); *ša-ak-na-ta-ni / i-na* LÚMAŠKÍM *i-na* URUŠur-ri "You have appointed me as a commissioner in Tyre" (EA 149:48).

To these may be added the expression,

i-na lu-qi "as captives(?)" (EA 108:17; 109:40; AHw:564b),

though the noun in question is a *hapax* of unclear definition (CAD L:253a). This function of *ina* is paralleled by similar usage of *b-* in other WS languages, especially Hebrew; for examples of this *beth essentiae* in MT, cf. Joüon and Muraoka (1991:486-487, §133c).

There are also cases of *ina* functioning like the *beth pretii* (GKC:380, §119p) to express the designated price of an item of exchange.

ip-pa-tá-ru LÚ.MEŠ *i-na* 30 KÛ.BABBAR *ù iš-tu 1Pé-e-ya i-na* 1 ME KÛ.BABBAR "Men are ransomed for thirty (shekels) of silver, but from Pē³ya for 100 (shekels of) silver" (EA 292:50-51).

The same usage appears in the following set of expressions:

i-na ba-la-aṭ ZI-ti-n[u] "for the sustenance of our lives" (EA 75:14; also EA 74:17; 85:15; 90:39; 12:29; 117:76); [*i-n*]a *ba-la-ṭi-[ia]* "for [my] sustenance" (EA 77:14); *i-na ZI-nu* "for our lives" (EA 107:39).

All these cases are concerned with barter (Moran 1950a:18).

Ebeling (1915:1424) had already recorded the use of *ina* to indicate, "by means of," which may be viewed as an extension of the normal Akkadian instrumental (AHw:380b-381a; Youngblood 1961:68), but one may also note clear Heb. parallels with *b-*, e.g.

'am (Yiśrā'ēl) nōša^c b-YHWH "A people (Israel) saved by YHWH" (Dt. 33:29 and Isa. 45:17).

The EA examples are:

i-na LÚMAŠKÍM šar-ri / ša i-šu-ú *i-na* URUŠu-mu-ur / *ba-al-ṭá-at* URUGub-la "By the king's commissioner, whom he has (Rainey 1973b:243) in Šumur, Byblos is sustained" (EA 68:19-21); *mi-nu ti-la-at-šu* / ù dannat (KAL.GA) *i-na* LÚGAZ dannat (GA.KAL) *ti-la-at-šu* "What is his auxiliary force that it is so strong? It is by means of the 'apīru that his auxiliary force is strong" (EA 71:20-22; cf. Greenberg 1955:33; Youngblood 1961:71).

Youngblood (1961:50, 392) has pointed to two cases where *ina* may mean "with," something which would not be normal Akkadian usage (CAD I/J:141b). The first is somewhat doubtful, or at least may be differently understood:

šá-ni-tam a-nu-ma *i-na-an-na* / *i-na-mu-šu ur-ra* 'mu¹[-ša] / *i-na nu-kür-ti*MEŠ ša UGU-[ia] "Furthermore, now I am pulling back (withdrawing) day and night because of the hostilities that are against [me]" (EA 69:12-14; cf. Youngblood 1961:41, 43; contrast Moran 1987b:243; 1992:138).

The verb *namāšu* generally means "to depart (from)" (CAD A/1:221-222) and is often construed with *ištu* (e.g. EA 67:23). In the passage cited above, one might construe the *ina* as an error for *ana* (cf. other examples, *infra*). However, Youngblood's construction, taking *ina* as a reflex of Canaanite *b-*, "with," requires a most atypical construction for *i-na-mu-šu*. It seems more appropriate to suggest that it was "because of," or better, "during" the "hostilities" (plural of *nukurtu*) against Rib-Haddi that his tenant farmers were defecting.

The second passage is quite broken, but Youngblood's reconstruction, which is supported by Moran's collation, seems highly probable:

ù!([S]I + <LU>) 'ku¹-¹uš¹-da i-¹na¹ [ERÍN.MEŠ] / 'p¹-¹tá¹-ti-šu "[So] come with his (Pharaoh's) regular [troops]!" (EA 95:17-18; Youngblood 1961:388; Moran 1987b:287 n. 1; 1992:169 n. 1).

Sometimes *ina* may be used by a scribe who confused it with *ana* (for the reverse tendency, cf. *supra*, p. 2). On occasion, this may give the appearance of a special usage for *ina*. The scribe(s) of EA 139 and EA 140 lean quite strongly to *ina* where *ana* would have been more appropriate.

ù yi-/¹iš¹-ši-ra ma-ša-ar-ta i-na/ URU-šu, "and may he send a garrison force to his city!" (EA 139:30-33); ša-ni-tam a-na mi-ni iš-ši-ir šar-ru i-na ¹A-zi-ri, "Furthermore, why did the king send to Aziru?" (EA 140:9).

Moran (1950a:17) had compared two similar contexts with forms of the verb *qālu* "to keep silent," one with *ana* (EA 139:10) and the other with *ina* (EA 140:5-6), but the latter epistle has so many other instances where *ina* is used in place of *ana* that one cannot admit here of a special function for *ina* (cf. *supra*, p. 13, for discussion).

Youngblood (1961:312-313) has noted a parallel between Heb. 'ālāh b^a- "to go up against, to attack" (Jer. 48:18; also Isa. 7:6), and this passage:

a-nu-ma i-te₉-li ERÍN.MEŠ i-na / URUGub-la ù la-qa-ši_x(ŠE) "Now the army came up against Byblos and took it" (EA 124:12-13; CAD E:116b; Rainey 1973b:257).

He also noted that here *ina* was parallel to *ana šēri* in some other texts (cf. *infra*, pp. 60-61).

ištu. The spellings of this preposition are usually the normal *iš-tu*, but once we find *iš-tu₄* (EA 211:16) and there are several cases, mainly from Rib-Haddi, of *iš-tu* (EA 76:45; 79:29; 85:70; 103:31; 117:11; 340:7), to which can be added the scribal error *iš-iš* (EA 75:9).

Besides the usual nuances for this preposition, viz. "from," etc., we find some interesting divergences from the norm. Moran (1975b:15) pointed to *iš-tu* as the equivalent of *itti* in EA 286:43, i.e. as a variant of *išti* (CAD I/J:283; note especially the Middle Assyrian examples of *ištu*). This was just another indication of the Assyrian, or northern peripheral flavor of the dialect reflected in the Jerusalem EA letters.

A clear West Semitic usage of *ištu* was noted by Böhl (1909:70; also Moran 1950a:18; Youngblood 1961:88), viz. "more than," an idiom typical of Heb. *mi(n)*. The best examples are:

LÚDUMU.ʽKINʽ LUGAL URUAk-ka / ka₄-bi-it *iš-tu* LÚDUMU
ši-ip-r[i-a] "The ambassador of the king of Acco is more
 honored than [my] ambasad[or]" (EA 88:47; CAD K:16a); ŠEŠ-
ia TUR *iš-tu ia-ti* "my brother, younger than I" (EA 137:16).

Other possible cases of this same usage are EA 106:15 and EA 362:50 (CAD M/2:296a).

The instrumental function of *ištu* was discerned by Albright (1943a:12 and n. 29) in the following passage from across the Jordan:

iš-tu / É ša DI.ᵈAMAR.UTU / URUAš-tar-ti in₄-né-ri-ir "at the instance of the house of Shulum-Marduk, the city of Ashtartu came to (our) assistance" (EA 256:19-21).

The Byblos examples were analyzed by Moran (1950a:169; 1975b:165 n. 68). The instrumental nuance is prominent in the interrogative (rhetorical) expression having a verb in the imperfect 1st c.s.:

iš-tu ma-an-ni i-na-ša-ru-na "With what shall I protect?"
(EA 112:10; also EA 123:31-32; 125:11-12).

A parallel passage has,

ki a-na-ša-r[u ra-ma-ni-ia] "How shall I protect myself?"
(EA 122:11; Moran 1950a:174).

while others with a verb in the 3rd m.s. have,

mi-nu yi-na-ši-ra-an-ni "Who will protect me?" (EA 112:13;
119:10; Moran 1950a:169).

The reversal of the pronouns, with *mannu* for the impersonal and *mīnu* for the personal (Böhl 1909:29), supports Moran's view (Moran 1987b:313 n. 1; 1992:186 n. 1).

Of special interest is the usage "from within," as illustrated by the following passage from Tyre citing instructions from some previous letter sent by Pharaoh (cf. *infra*, p. 113):

ša ta-aš-me iš-tu ^{KUR}*Ki-na-aḥ-na / ù šu-pur a-na ia-ši* "Whatever
you have heard from within Canaan, send to me!"
(EA 151:50-51; Rainey 1964; Mangano 1990:176-177).

The ruler of Tyre responds to this command by reporting events that took place in cities and states that were not themselves in Canaan, viz. Danuna, Ugarit, Kedesh (of the Orontes) and Amurru (Rainey 1964: 1971a:171; *contra* Astour 1965:348 n. 22). The force of *ištu* in Pharaoh's request is thus to be understood as referring to Abimilki's location in Tyre, i.e. in a major city of Canaan. Tyre is viewed as a center to which political and military intelligence was expected to be sent. Abimilki certainly did not

interpret *ištu* to mean that Pharaoh specifically wanted information from, i.e. concerning, places within Canaan.

One enigmatic passage remains. Rib-Haddi complained that no city rulers supported him, *iš-tu* URUŠu-mu-ra (EA 117:11). Moran (1950a:171) rendered "because of Šumur." Perhaps it could mean "except for, besides," but it is not clear that Šumur had a *ḫazannu*; it was the seat of the commissioner from Egypt. The question remains open.

itti. The usual spelling is *it-ti*, but there is also *it-ta-šu* (EA 105:33, 39; 120:31; 122:26), and a number of defective spellings, *it-ia* (EA 114:47; TT 1:18), *it-ka* (EA 85:31; 209:15; 283:14), and *it-šu-nu* (EA 130:24). According to *AHw*:576a, there is one use of KI as an ideogram for *itti* in the EA letters, but the passage in question can best be interpreted as follows:

ur-ru-¹ba¹ [it-ti] \lšār-ri EN-ia / du-gu-la lī-qé "Enter in [to], the king, my(sic!) lord, behold, take!" (EA 283:9).

The verbs are rendered according to *CAD* E:269a. Schroeder's facsimile shows that there is room for the [*it-ti*] at the end of line 8; that *šarri bēliya* is meant to be dependent on a preposition is clear from the case ending. Comparison with lines 12-13 gives further support (Rainey 1989-90:71):

mi-ia-mi yu-ma-ge-er / ur-ru-ba it-ti lšār-ri EN-ia / le-qè-ma
GUŠKIN!(KÛ+40) ù GUŠKIN!(KÛ+40) SU₄ / lšār-ri EN-ia "Who will grant to enter (that I enter) into the presence of the king, my lord, to take the gold and the red gold of the king, my lord?" (EA 283:10-13; Moran 1987b:505 nn. 2-3; 1992:505 nn. 2-5).

These two examples of *urruba itti* belong to a special group of passages where *itti* is the equivalent of Ugaritic *‘m*, meaning "to, towards," which also has parallels in Hebrew *‘et* and Phoenician *t* (Izre³el 1978a). Ebeling (1915:1430) had already hinted at this meaning for *itti* in EA; Albright (1944b:17 n. 27) noted it in a Taanach letter:

šu-up-ra-am it-ti-ia "Send to me!" (TT 1:18).

Albright and Moran (1948:245) also found it in two Byblos passages:

uš-ši-ra-mi LÚ-ka it-ti-ia / a-na É.GAL "Send your man to me to the palace!" (EA 82:15-16); *uš-ši-ra-am-mi LÚ.DUMU.KIN-ka / it-ti-ia a-na ma-ḥar / LUGAL BE-ka* "Send your ambassador to me, to the presence of the king, your lord!" (EA 87:9-10; Moran 1950a:19; Izre²el 1978a:205-206).

A similar statement comes from Jerusalem:

e-ru-ub-mi / it-ti šàr-ri EN-ia "I will go in to the king, my lord" (EA 286:39-40; Izre²el 1978b:66).

Note also the following from Gezer:

u <yw>-uš-ši-ra / \ qa-at-šu LUGAL EN-ia / 'it 1-ti-ia "May the king, my lord, send forth his hand to me!" (EA 299:19-21; Izre²el 1977:164).

kî. As a preposition, *kî* "as, like" is very rare in the WS texts. Three times it appears as *ki* (EA 69:29; 95:24; 126:8), and once as *ki-e* [i.e. *ki-i*₁₅] (EA 138:96) in a text that also uses *ki-i*. The spelling *ki-a* (EA 118:40) is most likely a scribal error, whether for *ki-i* or for *ki-ma*.

kīka. The attestation for this rare prepositional form is confined to EA 1:30, 46, 56, 91 (CAD K:351a; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:201, §2.5) and to EA 138:66 (and probably also line 112). It seems to be an expansion of *kī*, similar to *kīša* (CAD K:445b-446a) and *kīšuma* (CAD K:465). The one passage in a WS text is awkward:

ki-i ta-aq-bu mi-it / 1Ri-ib-ad-di ki-ka-nu iš-tu / ŠU.MEŠqa-ti-šu la-a-mi [ia-a]š-pu-ra / a-na KUR.MEŠ Mi-iš-ri ù yi-1il1-qa-nu /

qa-du DUMU.MEŠ-*nu* "How can you say 'Rib-Haddi is dead, (those) like us are out of his hands, that he write not to Egypt so that he seize us with our children?'" (EA 138:65-69).

kīma. This is the standard preposition for "as, like" in the WS EA texts, appearing numerous times. It is also the preposition used in compounds, such as *kīma arḫiš*, *kīma ḥamuttiš* and *kīma mādiš*, to be discussed *infra*. The usual spelling is *ki-ma*. Once in a text from Tyre, one finds the spelling *ki-i-ma* (EA 148:20). The Mitanni letters use *ki-i-ma* and *ki-i-me-e* (Adler 1976:68; Gordon 1938:225). In the EA texts from Canaan, there is nothing unusual in the semantic functions.

lām(a). The preposition *lām* "before" is attested just once, in a Tyrian letter:

la-am kà-ša-ad LÚKIN-*ri* LUGAL *be-li-ia* "before the arrival of the ambassador of the king, my lord" (EA 147:22; CAD L:53a).

qadu. The usual preposition for expressing "with" is either *itti* (cf. *supra*) or *qadu* (CAD A/1:123a). The one instance of a WS text using *adi* "with" is treated *supra*, p. 11. Of course, *qadu* generally means "together with," while *itti* means, "with, in the company of." This can be illustrated by an epistle which uses both prepositions:

URUGub(-*la*) *qa-du* 2 URU.MEŠ *ir-ti-ḥu* "Byblos together with two cities remain" (EA 74:22);

further on, the same scribe says:

¹*A-ma-an-ap-pa it-ti-ka ša-al-šu* "Aman-apa is with you, ask him!" (EA 74:51); *da-mi-iq it-ti-ka / a-na ia-ši* "It (will be) good for me (to be) with you" (EA 74:62-63).

Note *qadu* + *mi* for emphasis in two passages to be dealt with *infra*, p. 245.

tahtamu. The WS preposition that may have influenced the use of *šaplī*, *šupal* and *šupalī* is probably *taht-*, well known from all the WS languages. It is attested once in a context having strongly Canaanized language from one of the Shechem letters. Note that the imperative is Canaanite and not Akkadian, and that the preposition is in the adverbial accusative case and takes the Canaanite 3rd c.pl. pronominal suffix:

nu-pu-ul-mi / *ta-aḥ-ta-mu* "Fall beneath them" (EA 252:25-26; Albright 1943b:32 n. 24).

COMBINATIONS

Following von Soden (*GAG*:167), formations included in this class consist mainly of nouns, frequently the names of parts of the body, which function secondarily as prepositions, either independently or in combination with a simple preposition. In the latter situations they often supply the base for attaching a pronominal suffix; this applies to those simple prepositions which do not themselves take suffixes; it also represents a tendency to replace the oblique independent pronouns of standard Akkadian. When used independently, these nouns take one of the familiar adverbial cases, viz. adverbial accusative, locative, *status absolutus*, etc. As in the previous section, the vocables will be treated in alphabetical order rather than adhering strictly to the listing in *GAG*:167-169, §115.

arki. This particular preposition (◁OB *warki* ◁**warkay*) occurs frequently in combination with *ana* but also appears five times independently, written both syllabically and ideographically (EGIR).

Twice it has the meaning of being "behind" someone in the sense of giving them backing, support:

gáb-bi KUR.MEŠ *ar-ki* / ¹*A-zi-ri* "All the lands are behind Aziru" (EA 98:6); *a-li-ik-mi* EGIR / ¹DUMU ÌR-*A-ši-ir-ta* "Follow the son of 'Abdi-Ashirta'" (EA 136:11-12).

But it can also mean to pursue someone with hostile intent:

šu-nu ki-ma UR.GI₇ ù ia-nu / ša-a yu-ba-ú ar-ki-šu-nu "They are like dogs but there is no one who will seek after (i.e. investigate them) them" (EA 130:33-35; *contra* CAD B:363).

Twice we find one scribe using this preposition in a temporal expression:

EGIR-ki *ša hu-ul-li-iq* "after he had destroyed (caused to be lost)" (EA 250:8, 38; *contra* Moran 1973:51 and n. 6).

For the temporal expression *arkīšu* "afterwards" (used by this same scribe, among others), cf. *infra*, p. 122.

The constructions with another preposition, in this case only *ana*, can also be sorted into almost the same semantic categories. To give backing, or to go in support of someone can be seen in the following:

ù ša-a la-a / i-la-ak a-na EGIR LUGAL EN-ia "even those who do not follow the king, my lord" (EA 149:45-46; from Tyre);
[l]e-qa-mi KÛ.BABBAR.MEŠ *ù / [a]l-ku-ni a-na ar-ki-ia* "Accept silver and come, follow me!" (EA 280:19-20).

The temporal nuance appears in the following Tyrian report:

ù ša-ar-ra ŠEŠ-šu / a-na EGIR-šu "and his brother has become king after him" (EA 151:53-54).

The Phoenician expression for such instances is *tḥtnm* (**taḥtênom*), "in their place, in place of them" (Eshmun^cazor; KAI 14:9).

Finally, there is one passage where *ana arki* must mean simply "behind,"

u yi-du-ul KÁ.GAL a-na EGIR-ia "and he locked the gate after (behind) me" (EA 197:9; cf. *iš-tu pa-ni-ia* EA 136:34, *infra*, p. 52).

arkītu. Once this form is used like *arki*, in the sense of giving backing to someone:

a-mur a-na-ku ia-nu / ḥa-za-na i-na ar-ki-ti-ia "Behold, as for me, I have no city-state ruler behind me" (EA 117:9-10; contrast CAD A/2:283b).

Another apparent example of *arkītu*, in a badly preserved context, may be unique in its usage, meaning "far side." Recent collations by Moran and Rainey have not improved the reading, but E. Gordon (cited by Moran 1987b:477 n. 6; 1992:304 n. 6) concluded that the [t]i was actually the final [m]e sign from the end of line 23 (from the obverse). However, if Knudtzon did happen to read the signs correctly, the passage may be rendered as follows:

*a-n[a] ḥal-lí-i[q] EGIR-k[i-t]i / K[UR] L[UGAL] E[N-]i]a
i[t]-t[i]-šū-ni* "to cause the loss of the far side of the king, my lord's territory with the two of them" (EA 250:37-38; Rainey 1978b:64; cf. Moran 1973:51 n. 7; 1987b:477 n. 6; 1992:304 n. 6).

If ^{URU}P[í]-<ḥi>-l[i] is really intended in line 37, then the reference is to the territory of Peḥel on the west side of the Jordan Valley. The geographical allusion would be quite appropriate and would add perspective to our understanding of the historical situation.

biri, beri. This preposition, meaning "between," almost always is dependent upon *ina, ana* or *ša* (GAG:169, §115q; AHw:128a) during all periods. Such is the case with MB and the contemporary peripheral dialects (CAD B:247). Three WS examples with *ina* occur among the WS tablets, one from Alashia (EA 34:33), one from Tyre (EA 149:60) and only one from a Byblos letter (EA 69:11). Another Byblos text has *a-na be-ri-šu-nu* (EA 74:42). On the other hand, there are an unusually large number of independent usages, all from Byblos:

(1) 1st pl. suff., *bi-ri-nu* (EA 136:13), also *bi-ri-⟨nu⟩* (*Ibid.* 32), *be-ri-nu* (EA 109:29; 114:9; 117:67; 118:53); (2) 2nd du. suff.,

(Moran 1973:50, 52), *be-ri-ku-ni* (EA 113:18; 116:33); (3) 3rd pl. suff., *be-ri-šu-nu* (EA 116:51).

The phenomenon of such a frequent use of the independent preposition has been ascribed by Youngblood (1961:46-47) to the influence of WS *bēn*, which also appears most of the time without supporting prepositions.

idēnu. Combinations with this noun (= *edēnu*) are treated under Modal Adverbs (*infra*, p 149), because of the fact that they clearly represent a known Canaanite adverbial, viz. **yaḥdôn-*, "alone, aloneness."

libbu. The prepositional usages of this noun are generally the same as in normal Akkadian. All of the prepositional examples are written with the ideogram ŠÀ, here rendered *lib* for convenience' sake. No instances of locative *libbu(m)*, with or without supporting prepositions, are documented for the WS texts. The noun functions prepositionally without a supporting preposition only once in the WS texts, viz.

ša lib-bi / ḥu-ḥa¹-ri "which is in a cage" (EA 105:8-9),

while the parallel passages all make use of *ina*,

ša i-na lib-bi ḥu-ḥa-ri (EA 74:46; 78:14; 79:15-16; 90:40),

suggesting that the first passage is simply in error. However, three examples of this usage without a supporting preposition and without the locative *-u(m)*, appear in the office copy of a letter from Egypt (EA 1:9, 20, 69; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:202).

Dependent on *ina*, the meaning is "within, in the midst of," e.g. of the sea (EA 114:19; 288:33), of a ship (EA 85:18; 244:28), of a palace (EA 89:53), or of a text, i.e. of a tablet (EA 120:42; 193:23; 253:9), and quite frequently of a city (EA 62:9, 12; 78:16; 81:36; 292:35). The latter usage, concerning a city, is expressed by one scribe with *ana* (EA 137:44, 47, 48). Twice there is an allusion to

driving people out (*dubburu*) of the land(s), expressed by *iš-tu lib-bi* (EA 74:34-35; 76:40-41).

Note a very broken context with a locative nuance for *ištu libbi*:

¹*iš* ¹-*tu* ŠÀ-ši *ta-šap-pár* "from within it (the city) you shall write" (EA:102:38).

Perhaps the following passage with its more literal intent can illustrate the semantic origin of *libbu* as a preposition:

ù *im-lu-uk iš-tu ŠÀ-ia* "then I took counsel from my heart (i.e. from within myself)" (EA 136:26-27; CAD I/J:288a; M/1:155b).

Then there is the following passage which expresses the nuance, "among," viz.

aš-ba-ti / i-na lib-bi LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ "I am situated among 'apīrū men" (EA 130:37-38).

In conclusion, there is a most problematic passage where *ina libbi* just might be the equivalent of *ina biri*,

¹*yi*¹-¹*in*₄¹-¹*na*-¹*pi*¹-¹*iš*¹ / [¹*šu-ul*]-¹*ma*¹-¹*nu*¹-¹*um*¹ ¹*i*¹-¹*na lib-bi-šu-ni* "A [gift] of alliance has been made (cf. CAD E:221b; Rainey 1973c:251) between the two of them" (EA 250:33-34; Moran 1973:50).

maḥru. There are no examples of this word acting as a preposition without depending upon a primary preposition. It always means, "(to/from) the presence of . . ." and is either followed by a prepositional suffix, e.g. *a-na maḥ-ri-ia* (EA 69:25), or by a *nomen rectum*, e.g. *a-na ma-ḥar šār-ri* (EA 74:62). Once there is the aberrant spelling, *a-na ma-ḥar-ri* PN (EA 137:15) in a text which uses the proper form in several other places (EA 137:65, 69, *et passim*). Twice we find *iš-tu ma-ḥar LUGAL* "from the presence of the king" (EA 92:20; 145:8).

The following is evidently an example of ideographic writing, unusual for these texts:

i-na 'IGI' ^d*ab-ba ni-ta-š*[a-a]b "We are facing the sea" (EA 151:42).

Possible incomplete spellings, with an unusual form of *maḥ*, are found in one text which presents quite a number of other problematic features:

a-na maḥ!-<ri>-šu (EA 138:92); [*a-n*]a *maḥ*-<ri>-ka (EA 138:124; Knudtson 1915:584 n. e, 586 n. c; but for another explanation, cf. under *šēru*, *infra*, p. 73).

muḥḥi. Very rare is the use of this vocable as an independent preposition. This is the case in the entire EA corpus. The spelling UGU-*ḥi* appears in EA 147:39 (from Tyre), and an epistle from some senior Egyptian official also employs it, viz.

mu-ta-nu-ú UG[U-*ḥi*] / LÚ.MEŠ-*ú* *ù i-na* [UGU-*ḥ*]i / ANŠE.MEŠ *ma-an-nu m*[u-ta]-*nu* / UGU-*ḥi* ANŠE.MEŠ [i]-*nu-ma* / *la-a ta-la-ku* / 'ANŠE'.MEŠ "Is it a pestilence agai[nst] people or agai[nst] donkeys? What sort of pe[st]ilence is it against the donkeys that the donkeys should not go forth?" (EA 96:12-17; Youngblood 1962:24; cf. Youngblood 1961:400).

This latter text is generally non-WS in tenor with the exception of one verb form. It is useful to compare the long letter from Egypt which uses *mu-ḥi-ia* (EA 1:68, 69), *mu-ḥi-š*u (EA 1:76) and independent UGU (EA 1:49?, 65; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:204-205). Given the other possible Egyptianizing tendencies of the Tyrian texts (Albright 1937: Grave 1980b, 1982), one may suggest that *muḥḥi* as an independent preposition is characteristic of the Egyptian(izing) scribes. It does not seem to be typical of the EA texts from Canaan, unless, of course, one prefers to take the independent usages of the ideographically written UGU (cf. *supra*, pp. 25-35) as a presentation of *muḥḥi* instead of *eli* as we have done.

The compound formations in WS texts never have UGU; they always employ a syllabic spelling. The compounds are used mainly to reinforce the nuance of the preposition, or even more often, to facilitate the use of suffix pronouns. On OB, *ana muḫḫi* does occur rarely (GAG:186, §115h) but it is unknown in OA; in MB and MA the combinations with primary prepositions come into widespread use, especially in the peripheral dialects (CAD M/2:175b; Adler 1976:69-70; Huehnergard 1979:81-82, 269-270; 1989:190-191; Labat 1932:169; *et. al.*). Thus, constructions governing pronominal suffixes are quite widespread in this corpus, viz.

a-na mu-ḫi-ia, a-na mu-ḫi-ka, a-na mu-ḫi-šu, iš-tu mu-ḫi-nu, etc.

In only four instances is *mu-ḫi* followed by a *nomen rectum*, three times by LUGAL (EA 180:12-13; 270:12-13; 296:14-15) and once by 2 DUMU *La-ab-a-ya* (EA 250:26). Only twice in the WS texts does one find a plene syllabic spelling, viz. *mu-uḫ-ḫi* (EA 244:12; 296:15).

The combination with *ana* generally means "to, towards," for example:

ù da-ag-la-ti / a-na mu-uḫ-ḫi LUGAL EN-ia "then I looked to the king, my lord" (EA 296:14-15; cf. *i-na mu-ḫi-ka*¹, EA 249:12-14); *a-mur ni-nu a-na mu-ḫi-ka*₄ / 2 IGI-ia "Behold, as for us, my two eyes are on you" (EA 264:14-15); *ù lu-ú / yi-il-te-qé-ni / a-na mu-ḫi-šu* "and may he take me to himself!" (EA 270:26-28), *et al.*

However, the most interesting usage is in contexts dealing with overt or covert hostility. The key passages have *nukurtu*. First, the most natural constructions are those combinations with *ana*:

ù nu-kúr-tú^{MEŠ} / KAL.GA *a-na mu-ḫi-ia* "and the hostility is great against me" (EA 286:41-42).

On the other hand, there are also examples with *ina*:

i-te₉-pu-uš-mi ¹*La-ab-a-yu / nu-kúr-ta₅ i-na mu-uḫ-ḫi-ia* "Lab²ayu has become hostile (has conducted hostilities) against me" (EA 244:11-12).

In another case we find a unique expression which appears to reflect WS lexemes:

<a-mur> ḫa-an-pa / ša iḫ-nu-pu a-na mu-ḫi-ia "Behold, the villainy that he/they committed against me" (EA 288:7-8; Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:488b; CAD ḫ:76b, 81a).

Therefore one can understand the hostile intent reflected in the following examples:

ù a-nu-ma gáb-<bu>-mi a-na m[u-ḫ]i-ia "And now all are against me" (EA 127:15); *ti!-la-ku-na-mi a-na mu-ḫi* 2 DUMU *La-ab-a-ya* "Are you going out against the two sons of Lab²ayu?" (EA 250:26; Campbell 1965:203).

The converse expression, *ištu muḫḫi*, generally has the meaning "away from" in the simple directional sense, e.g. "to go out from" (EA 270:12-13 with *ašû*) or "to depart from" (EA 100:36-38; 113:34-35; both with *namāšû*; EA 91:18-19, with *paṭāru* Gt!). But one interesting passage has the meaning "to (take) away from," viz.

šum-ma el-te₉-qé LÚ / *ù šum-ma I-en* GU₄ / *ù šum-ma ANŠE iš-tu / mu-ḫi-šu* "If I have taken a man or a single ox or an ass from him!" (EA 280:26-29; cf. 1 Sam. 12:4).

pānu, pānū. Although the function of *pānu* in prepositional combinations is common to all Akkadian dialects (*AHw*:821), the usages in the EA texts, especially those from Canaan, are worthy of note. It should be mentioned that, although *AHw*:821 lists the prepositional idioms as *ana pān*, etc., the construct forms in the EA texts usually exhibit spellings like *a-na pa-ni* ERÍN.MEŠ (*passim*), which at least suggest that it is the plural form that serves in these

expressions, i.e. *ana pānī*. The forms with dependent pronominal suffixes would be spelled the same with either singular or plural.

An adverbial usage worthy of note is the use of *ana pānī*, "on the face" in the sense of (falling) forward (Salonen 1967:67). This is a semantic parallel to the expression *kabattumma* "on the belly" (cf. *supra*, p. 6) in the formulae of obeisance. A representative passage is:

7-šu a-na pa-ni 7-ta-an am-*qut* "seven times forward (and) seven times (backward) I have prostrated" (EA 189:4).

The other nine instances (EA 193:3; 195:14-15; 196:3-4; 201:7-8; 203:7-8; 204:7-8; 205:7-8; 209:7-8) are all from texts that show some affinity and evidently reflect a localized scribal practice, apparently in the area of the Damascene and the Lebanese Beq'ah Valley.

One typical nuance, "to go at the head of, to lead" (*CAD* A/1:317b-318b, 344-346a; *AHw*:33a), appears in some interesting and partially unique contexts. Etakkama, ruler of Kedesh (on the Orontes = Qidšu), justified his success in a recent military action by claiming to Pharaoh that,

il₅-la-ak / DINGIR.MEŠ-*nu-ka* ù ^dUTU-*ka* / *a-na pa-ni-ia* "Your Deity and your Sun went before me" (EA 189:rev. 13-15; Greenberg 1955:43; *CAD* A/1:318b).

The same Etakkama is accused by neighboring rulers of actually working for the enemy:

ù *a-li-ik!*(UK) ¹E-*ta-ka₄-ma* / LÚ URU KUR Q¹-*in-sà* / *a-na pa-ni ERÍN*.MEŠ KUR *Ḫa-at-ta* "and Etakkama, the ruler of the city state of Kedesh, went at the head of the Hittite army" (EA 363:9-11; also 174:11-14; 175:9-11; 176:9-11).

Many texts have to do with orders from Pharaoh to the city-state rulers to be prepared to march in the vanguard of the Egyptian army:

*i*₁₅-*nu-ma* / *iq-bi* LUGAL *be-li-ia* \ *ku-na* / *a-na pa-ni* ERÍN.GAL
 "When the king, my lord, said, 'Be at the head of the great
 army!' (EA 147:35-37; CAD K:171b; also EA 202:9-11).

The replies are stated in the form of non-verbal sentences, as exemplified by Biryawaza, the commissioner of Kumidi:

a-nu-ma a-na-ku qa-du / ERÍN.MEŠ-*ia* ù ^{GIS}GIGIR.MEŠ-*ia* / ù
qa-du ŠEŠ.MEŠ-*ia* / ù *qa-du* LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ-*ia* / ù *qa-du* /
 LÚ.MEŠ *Su-te-ia* / *a-na pa-ni* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ti*₇ / *a-di a-šar*
yi-qa-bu / ^ILUGAL *be-li-ia* "Now I, with my troops and my
 chariots and with my colleagues and with my *‘apîrû* and with
 my *Sûtû* will be in the forefront of the regular army to
 wherever the king, my lord, commands" (EA 195:24-32;
 contrast Greenberg 1955:43).

Many city state rulers answered in the same vein (EA 201:17-21;
 202:15-19; 203:13-16; 204:15-18; 205:13-17; 206:13-17; also
 EA 240:4-7).

A different application is made of *ana pānī* in some of these
 same letters, viz. "in anticipation of." The form of the original
 Egyptian command established the formula for the subsequent
 messages of compliance:

lu-ú šu-šu-ra-tá a-na pa-ni / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ti* LUGAL "May you
 make preparations in anticipation of (the arrival of) the king's
 regular troops!" (EA 367:15-16; likewise EA 141:21-22; 191:6-8;
 203:11-12; 204:12-14; 205:10-12; 206:11-12; 337:8-12).

An abundance of responses are represented in the corpus; a
 typical reply is:

*ki-ia-am šu-ši-ir-ti*₇ / IGI.KÁR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ / \ *ma-aṭ-ni-ia a-na*
 / *pa-ni* ERÍN.MEŠ LUGAL / EN-*ia* "Thus I have prepared
 supplies in anticipation of the army of the king, my lord"
 (EA 337:19-23; Moran 1984:299; 1987b:554-555 n. 1; 1992:358
 n. 1; also EA 292:38-40; 324:12-14 and evidently EA 65:11-13).

One of the responses employs *i-na pa-ni* (EA 144:14-20), as does one allusion to the king's order (EA 216:8-9).

The broadest area in which *ana pānī* and *ina pānī* overlap is that signifying "before, in the presence of." Such a usage is ubiquitous with verbs of speaking, e.g.

qí-ba-mi . . . a-na pa-ni / šār-ri EN-li-ka "Speak . . . before the king, your lord" (EA 73:33-35; 84:19; 106:46; 119:18-19, 36-37; 131:41; 362:46; also EA 62:39-40, 43-44),

and,

li-iq-bi / i-na pa-ni šār-ri "Let him speak before the king" (EA 251:5; also EA 85:32, 65-66; 108:21,43-44; 116:8-9; 239:26-27; 256:5).

The same is true for expressions with *damāqu* and *tarāšu*, as the following examples attest:

šá-ni-tam da-mi-iq-mi / a-na pa-ni LUGAL (EA 84:7; also EA 326:18) along with *ša-ni-tam da-mi-iq i-na pa-ni / šār-ri* (EA 108:8; also EA 107:21 and with injunctives, EA 64:11; 85:33) "Furthermore, is it pleasing in the sight of the king?"

Also,

li-^lit^l-ri-iš / a-na pa-ni LUGAL (EA 92:47-48; also EA 106:35) along with *li-it-ru-uš / i-na pa-ni šār-ri* (EA 366:28-29; also EA 198:19-20 according to collation 27.01.80, also Moran 1987b:437 n. 2; 1992:276 n. 3; and EA 286:44) "May it seem right in the sight of the king!"

Furthermore, on the ethical plane, one finds negative statements such as:

^lla^l-mi-in šum-ka / a-na pa-ni LUGAL "Your name is vilified before the king" (EA 96:5-6; CAD L:123b; also EA 180:19 and

EA 189:6-9); *ú-ša-a-ru / i-na pa-ni* LUGAL "I am slandered before the king" (EA 286:7, 21).

Other frequent examples with *ina pānī* are as follows:

ti-din / ba-aš-ta-¹ka¹ i-na pa-ni / šār-ri EN-ka "May she grant you dignity in the eyes of the king, your lord!" (EA 73:4-6; 77:5-6; 95:5-6; also EA 71:5-6; CAD B:142b); DUGUD *i-¹na¹ / pa-ni* LÚ.MEŠ_{ha-za-nu-ti} "LUGAL¹ "respected by the king's city-state rulers" (EA 107:21; Moran 1975a:155-156).

Finally, *ina pānī* can be used in a truly literal sense,

šu-ut yi-ša-kan / i-na pa-ni šār-ri "It is placed (N!), Rainey 1975b:422) before the king" (EA 119:58-59).

Another idiom in which both *ana pānī* and *ina pānī* are employed is "to stand against, oppose," viz.

mi-ia ¹yi¹-zi-zu a-na pa-ni ERÍN.MEŠ LUGAL "Who can stand up to the king's troops?" (EA 362:65); *mi-i[a-mi] / šu-nu* UR.GI₇ *ù ti-z[i-zu-na] / i-na pa-ni* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭ[á-ti] / šār-ri* "Who are they, the dogs, that they [should sta]nd up to the regular tro[ops] of the king?" (EA 108:25-28; Moran 1950a:162; also EA 71:26; EA 94:12-13 either [a]-na or [i]-na).

Three special instances of *ina pānī* are worthy of note. The first is,

i-ba-šu i-na pa-ni-ia "They were on good terms with me" (EA 89:19; Albright and Moran 1950:164).

With the above example Youngblood (1961:331) compared *miyyôm ^ašer hāyîṭî l-pāneykā* (1 Sam. 29:8) as proof that the Byblos idiom is WS.

Another WS idiom may be the background for the following:

ù KAL.GA *i-na pa-ni-šu-nu* "So they are strong in their own eyes" (EA 108:42; cf. Num. 13:33).

The same may hold true for the next example, especially since the verb is WS in spite of the Akkadian precative form (CAD Z:22):

ù *li-iz-kur šàr-ri i-na pa-ni-šu* "My sovereign should keep (this) in mind" (EA 289:41; cf. Ps. 109:14).

Practically all of the instances of *ištu pānī* seem to be WS. A more literal, and quite vivid, example is the following:

ù *a-na-ku a-tu-ur a-na É-ia / ù ed-du-ul É iš-tu / pa-ni-ia* "Then I returned to my home but the house (palace) was locked (Gt stative < **etdul*; contra CAD E:26b, *AHw*:822a and Moran 1987b:356 n. 6; 1992:217 n. 6) before me!" (EA 136:33-34).

Otherwise, the nuance is "in (fear) of" and is well represented in Heb. by various combinations of *mippānê*. Akkadian idioms in this vein are all very late, mostly NA and NB (*AHw*:822a with cross references to 735b and 812) and could be due to Aramaic influence, particularly since there are definite parallels in the use of the Aramaic loan, *lapān(i)* (*AHw*:534b; CAD L:80b). The EA passages have to do with fear,

ù *gáb-bi KUR-ti pal-ḥa-at / iš-tu pa-ni be-li-ia* "All the land is afraid of my lord" (EA 147:32-33).

Some typical biblical expressions of this type are:

niḥlû mippānāw (Gen. 45:3); '*attāḥ yārē*' *mippānêhem* (Dt. 7:19); '*al-tîrā*' *mippānāw* (2 Ki. 1:15).

Concerning flight from an enemy, note the following texts:

pa-na-nu da-ga-li-ma / LÚ KUR Mi-iṣ-ri ù in₄-ab-tu / 'LUGAL' .MEŠ KUR Ki-na-aḥ-ni iš-ti pa-n[i-šu] "Formerly, just to

see a man of Egypt—and all the kings of Canaan would flee fro[m his presence]" (EA 109:44-46; Moran 1950a:57; also EA 256:7-9); *iz-zi-ib-mi URU.KI-ka / iš-ti pa-ni* ¹*Pí-i-ia* "Leave your city because of Pi²eya!" (EA 294:29-30; Izre²el 1978b:66).

One may compare the ubiquitous biblical idiom *wayyānûsû mippānāw* (1 Sam. 19:8, *et al.*).

Rib-Haddi had sent his female relatives to Tyre for fear of (*iš-tu pa-ni*) ^cAbdi-Ashirta (EA 89:23; Albright and Moran 1950:164). Later on, the king's messengers were going to, and coming from, Rib-Haddi only under cover of darkness,

iš-tu pa-ni UR.GI₇ "for fear of the dog" (EA 108:56; Moran 1950a:18-19).

Biridiya, the ruler of Megiddo, reported in anguish:

ù la-a-mì ni-le-ú / a-šé KÁ a-bu-ul-lí \ ša-aḥ-ri / iš-tu pa-ni
¹*La-ab-a-ya* "And we are not able to go out of the city gate for fear of Lab²ayu" (EA 244:15-17; Artzi 1969-70:6 translates *mipp²nē*).

pû. There are almost no examples of prepositional combinations with *pû* in the meaning "according to," like Heb. *kāpî*, *lāpî*, ^c*al pî*, ²*el pî*, or like Akkadian *ana pî* or *kî pî* (cf. Aro 1957:76 for contemporary MB examples). The closest we can come to is the following passage with *ina pî*,

i-na pí-šu a-pí-iš / [ip-]šu an-nu-ú a-na ia-ši "At his command this deed was done to me" (EA 81:18; Moran 1950a:18).

The other usages documented for the WS epistles in EA are literal in meaning, i.e. "from the mouth of" Most of them speak of blessings that come from the mouth of Pharaoh (EA 147:19-20, 43-44; 195:23; 232:17-18; 326:21 *et al.*). A few refer to declarations or statements from the mouth of someone (EA 106:39, and especially EA 79:11-12, 22; Youngblood 1961:201).

qaqqadu. Perhaps mention should be made of the one passage from Taanach treated above under *eli* (*supra*, p. 28) because it is parallel to the use of *eli* (i.e. UGU) without a second component in the meaning "(the responsibility is) on" The relevant context is:

UGU SAG.DU-*ia ma-am-ma-an* / *ša it-tab-šu a-na*
 URU.KI.DIDLI.ḪÁ "I am responsible for everything that has
 been happening to the cities" (TT 2:15-16; Maisler [Mazar]
 1936:55-56; Rainey 1977:60).

qātu. Although the grammars do not recognize the prepositional combinations with *qātu* as adverbial in nature, there are some instances when a literal meaning is not apparent. In view of the WS form *bādi* (EA 245:35) with its Ugaritic and Phoenician parallels, *bd* and **bôd*, discussed above (*supra*, p. 23), there is every reason to expect that some of the combinations of preposition plus *qātu* lend themselves to a more abstract interpretation. In such formations, *qātu* is not only dependent upon the preposition, but it is itself in construct with a dependent noun or pronoun. The forms vary between *qa-at* and *qa-ti* (ŠU-*ti*), rarely *qa-te* (which might suggest a dual construct as could *qa-ti*, for that matter, but it seems unlikely). What we seem to have is the same partial preservation of the case vowel known in OB (GAG:82, §64c).

Many are the instances when *ana qāt(i)* refers to something given to an emissary for him to deliver to its destination (AHw:911a). The following is a typical example of just such a context:

[ù] *ʾuš¹-ši-ir ʾšār-ru* / EN-*ia šu-lu-uḫ-ta* / *i-na qa-at ʾTa-aḫ-ma-ia* /
a-na ia-ši "[And] the king, my lord, has sent me a dispatch by
 the hand of Ptahmaya" (EA 265:7-10).

Close parallels can be cited (EA 364:10-13; also EA 145:11-12), including Rib-Haddi's complaint that a tablet from the king was not given,

[i]-na qa-at LÚ-ia "into the hand of my man" (EA 83:14; Youngblood 1961:243).

The figurative nature of these expressions is underlined by the following:

ù qa-bi-ti / i-na qa-ti ¹Pa¹-wu-ra / a-wa-ta₅ an-ni-ta₅ "And I spoke this word by means of Pawūra" (EA 263:20-21).

Compare the above with the Heb. expression,

ka' ašer dibber YHWH b²yaq¹ Mōše^h (Ex. 9:35; cf. 1 Ki. 15:29; 16:12, 34; et al.).

The emissary, with his diplomatic status, headed the convoy or entourage. Still, the gifts or other goods sent in his charge were said to be *ina qāti*, "in (his) hand" (EA 34:16-17; 35:34; cf. Gen. 32:16; 38:20; 1 Sam. 11:7), even when personnel such as slaves and slave girls, etc., were concerned (EA 288:18, 22, where the defaced prepositions could be restored either as *ina* or *ana*). Mitanni texts prefer *ana qāti* in these functions (EA 17:33; 20:34).

When a commissioner was sent to arrest his son, Lab²ayu complied:

ù al-lu-ú na-ad-na-ti 7-šu / i-na ŠU ¹Ad-da-¹ia ¹ "And behold I gave him into the hand of Addaya" (EA 254:36-37; cf. 1 Ki. 18:9; Dt. 19:12).

But even more striking Heb. parallels exist for the following:

i-na qa-at LUGAL EN-nu ¹ni¹-din-mi / a-ia-bi-šu "Into the hand of the king, our lord, we will give his enemies" (EA 192:20-21; cf. Num. 21:34; Dt. 2:24, 30; 3:2; Judg. 16:24; 1 Sam. 24:4; et al.).

In the next example, the usage may not seem to be so figurative, since a written judicial decision is probably meant. Nevertheless, the usage is striking and unusual:

ù ia-di-na ki-ti-ia¹ / i-na qa-ti-ia "and may he present me with my (document of) vindication!" (EA 118:16-17; cf. CAD K:470a; also Moran 1950a:95, 172; 1987b:327 n. 1; 1992:196 n. 1).

To receive ransom money from someone is also expressed by the phrase,

i-na ŠU-ti-šu \ ba-di-ú "from his hand" (EA 245:35; for the Canaanite gloss, cf. *supra*, p. 23).

It must be admitted, however, that this idiom is common in classical Akkadian (*AHw*:910a-b).

A major category of figurative passages has to do with administrative responsibility or military command (*AHw*:910a). One can speak of,

URU LUGAL / *ša ip-qi-id i-na qa-ti-ia* "the king's city which he had entrusted to me" (EA 151:7; also EA 144:24-25, 31-32; 268:8-11; cf. 2 Chron. 23:18; 24:11).

Tagu, ruler of Gath-carmel, reported on his efforts to organize caravans and to send them to Pharaoh:

KASKAL.ĤÁ *i-na qa-at ŠEŠ-ia* "caravans in the charge of my brother" (EA 264:7); on *i-na qa-at / LÚtap-pí-ia* "in the charge of my colleague" (EA 264:22-23).

Soldiers may also be placed "in the hand" of someone:

LÚ.MEŠ *ma-šar-ta₅MEŠ ša tu-ma-še-er / i-na ŠU IĤa-ya* "the garrison troops which you sent under the command of Ĥaya" (EA 289:30-31; also EA 117:50-51; cf. 2 Sam. 18:2).

Compare the following with *ana qāt*:

šum-ma / šār-ru yu-wa-ši-ru-na LÚ.MEŠ / KURMi-iš-ri ù KURMi-lu-ḥa / ù ANŠE.KUR.RA a-na qa-at / LÚ-ia "If the king

will send men of Egypt and Nubia and cavalry in the charge of my man" (EA 112:18-22).

Personal responsibility for the welfare of someone is reflected in the following:

ù SAG.DU-*nu* \ *ru-šu-nu* / *i-na qa-te-ka* "and our head is in your hand(s)" (EA 264:18-19); *ta-din-ni i-na qa-at* / ¹*!a-an-ḫa-mi*, "Put me in the charge of Yanḫamu" (EA 83:30-31; Moran 1950a:93, 96, 106; Youngblood 1961:248); *al-lu-mi* ¹*Ri-ib- IŠKUR* / *i-na qa-ti-ka* "Behold, Rib-Haddi is in your charge" (EA 83:40-41; also EA 60:30-32; 144:26-27).

Finally, the combinations with *ištu* provide some interesting nuances. In one case, it expresses the person being subjected to a demand:

[i!]-*nu-ma yu-ba-[ù]* / 2 *li-im KÛ.BABBAR* / *iš-tu qa-ti-ia* "in that he is demanding two thousand (shekels of) silver from me" (EA 270:14-16; cf. Isa. 1:12; Ezk. 34:10; cf. Held 1976:233 n. 23; also Greenstein 1979:329 nn. 1, 3).

The majority of passages, however, have to do with deliverance "from the hand" of a hostile element. The idiom is widespread in biblical Hebrew (e.g. Gen. 32:11; Num. 35:25; Judg. 2:16 and many others). The Akkadian idiom is with *eṭēru*, generally complemented by *ina qāt(i)* (*AHw*:264d; *CAD* E:403). One instance with *ištu* is recorded from Ugarit and wrongly assigned by *AHw* and *CAD* (*loc. cit.*; after Lettinga 1948:112) to *eṭēru*, which makes no sense in the context. The verb there is, in fact, a hybrid from *turru* "to return," with contamination from the G stem that sometimes occurs in a few peripheral texts (Rainey 1975b:419):

in-na-an-na / *iṣ-ba-tu-šu-ma* / ù *iš-tu qa-ti-šu-nu* / *i-it-te-ru-šu*
 "Now they caught him and from their custody they returned (extradited) him" (RS 4.449; Virolleaud 1936:23).

The EA examples of deliverance "from the hand of" occur with various other verbs, including *šūzubu*:

ù iq-bu-ni₇ šu-nu a-na ia-ši / še-ez-zi-bá-an-na-ši-mi iš-tu ŠU-ti / ERÍN.MEŠ URUŠe-eh-la-li^{KI} ù ú-še-ez-zi[-bá-š]u-nu / iš-tu ŠU-ti ERÍN.MEŠ URUŠe-eh-la-li "and they said to me, "Deliver us from the hand(s) of the troops from Sheḥlalu! So I delivered them from the hand(s) of the troops of Sheḥlalu" (EA 62:29-32; CAD E:424b, takes ŠU-ti as dual; cf. RS 17.340:11; Nougayrol 1956:49); *šum-ma ia-[nu] / LÚ-li ša ú-še₂₀-ze-bu-[š]e iš-tu qa-ti-¹nu¹* "Behold, there is no one who will save it (the city) from our hand" (EA 74:32-33; Mendenhall 1947a:123-124; Moran 1953:78 and n. 4; Greenberg 1955:34).

Three other texts have *leqû*,

ú-ul ti-le-ú-na / la-qa-ia iš-tu qa-at / ÍR-A-ši-ir-ta "Are you unable to rescue me from the hand of 'Abdi-Ashirta?" (EA 82:6-8, also 24-25; Albright and Moran 1948:243; Greenberg 1955:36); *šum-ma la-a ti-le-ú la-qa-¹ia¹ / iš-tu qa-at na-ak-ri-ia* "If you are unable to deliver me from the hand of my enemies" (EA 114:23-24; Moran 1950a:170).

Another passage reflects the special EA usage of *ekēmu* (Rainey 1978b:69):

yi-ki-im LUGAL / be-li KUR-šu / iš-tu qa-te / LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ "May the king, my lord, deliver his land from the hands of the 'apîrû men!" (EA 274:10-13).

And finally, with *tarû* "to lead away,"

u lu-ú / yi-it-ra-ni LUGAL-ia / iš-tu qa-at / LÚ.SA.GAZ.MEŠ "and may my king lead me out of the hand of the 'apîrû!" (EA 299:21-23; Bottéro 1954:110; Izre'el 1976:23; 1977:165; Rainey 1978b:96; Na'aman 1979:679 n.29; Moran 1987b:529 n. 2; 1992:341 n. 2).

Another unusual nuance involves the abandonment of someone:

ù 'an¹-nu-uš i-na-an-na / i-te-zi-ib šār-ru URU ki-it-ti-šu / iš-tu qa-ti-šu "And now the king has abandoned his loyal city" (EA 74:8-10; CAD A/2:143a).

To the above passage, Youngblood (1961:130) cites as a biblical parallel:

lô' 'āzab ḥasdô wa^amittô mē'im 'ādônî (Gen. 24:27).

For the literal usage with *yad*, cf.

wayyašlêk hall'hi miyyādô (Judg. 15:17; and cf. also 2 Chron. 30:16; 35:11).

A similar passage is EA 151:35-36. But there is another example, this time with the D stem of *nadû* (AHw:709a),

nu-di-ni Išār-ri EN-ia / iš-tu qa-ti-šu "My king, my lord, has cast me out of his hand" (EA 283:23-24).

Perhaps the most unusual idiom, for which a close biblical parallel was not found, is *ištu qāt(i)* in the sense of "due to." Ebeling (1915:1449) had long ago suggested this meaning, albeit with a question mark, for the following:

"And I have become like a damaged pot" (Rainey 1973c:251; 1978c:89) 'iš¹-tu qa-at / LÚ.MEŠ 'Su¹-ti⁷MEŠ "due to the men of the land of the Sūtû" (EA 297:11-16).

Another instance may also be cited from Tyre:

"I want to come and to see the face of the king, my lord" ù la-a i-lé-e iš-tu / qa-ti 'Zi-im-re-da "but I am unable to because of Zimredda" (EA 151:8-11).

For a parallel, one may compare passages like the following example:

wattikbaḍ yaḍ-YHWH ʔel-hāʔAšdôḍîm (1 Sam. 5:6; similar passages in the same chapter),

which suggest that the nuance "due to, because of," derives only from the primary preposition, *ištu*, and that the combination with *qātu*, "hand = strength, force, activity," is fortuitous.

šēru. This widely used component in normative Akkadian prepositional phrases (*CAD* Ṣ:140-141) appears only a few times in such combinations among the EA WS texts (the first three occurrences noted here are from Byblos). The *i-na šē-ri* of EA 104:48 means "on land" in contrast to "(in) ships" (EA 104:46; Greenberg 1955:38); *contra* the classification in *CAD* Ṣ:141. The other Byblos references, all of them *ana šēri*, have been recognized by *CAD* Ṣ:140 as a Canaanite idiom; the verb is always Gt of *elû* (Rainey 1971c:88), frequently with lexical ventive. The meaning in all the passages concerned is "to go up against, to attack." Note the parallel usage of *etlû* with *ina* expressing the same nuance (EA 124:12-13) treated under *ina* (cf. *supra*, pp. 34-35). The passages are:

ù i-teḡ-ʔla ʔ-a [m] / a-na še-ri-ia ù a-nu-um-ma / [i-n]a-an-na ìl-qé
 URUBaṭ-ru-na / [ù] i-te-la-am a-na še-ri-ia "and (when) he was attacking me; and now he has taken Baṭrūna and he is attacking me" (EA 88:14-17; Rainey 1973c:259; 1975b:425; Youngblood 1961:312-313); *ù a-nu-ú i-teḡ-èl-ʔlu ʔ / [i]-na-an-na a-na še-ri-ia*
 "then, behold, he will now attack me" (EA 92:23-24; Rainey 1975b:421; Moran 1950a:161); *ki-ma pa-na-nu-um i-teḡ-lu*
 ʔR-Aš-ra-tu₄ / a-na še-ri-ia "When formerly ʔAbdi-Ashirta used to attack me" (EA 127:31-32; Rainey:1973c:257).

Youngblood (1961:312-313) has drawn attention to the biblical parallels with Heb. ʔālā^h ʔel and ʔālā^h ʔal, for example, Num. 13:31 and Josh. 22:12.

Twice in a Rib-Haddi letter from Beirut, there is what appears to be an erroneous usage of the Sumerogram, MAḤ, which represents the adjective *šīru* "exalted, august" (CAD Š:210). The scribe evidently intended MAḤ for *šēru* "field, country" instead of using EDIN (Moran 1987b:366 n. 19; 1992:224 n. 19):

a-ya-mi LÚ-lu / ša a-lik iš-tu KUR.MEŠ Mi-iš-ri a-na MAḤ-šu
 "Where is the man who has come from Egypt to him?"
 (EA 138:91-92; read [*a-na MAḤ-ia*] in line 89?); *a-ya-mi i-nu-ma*
*ia-aš-pu-¹ru¹ / LUGAL be-èl-ka [*a-n*]a MAḤ-ka* "Where? since the
 king, your lord, writes to you?" (EA 138:123-124).

This seems a more likely interpretation than the assumption that the scribe made the same mistake *twice* (or even thrice) for *maḥ-ri* (cf. *supra*, p. 45). The contexts seem to require either *ana muḥḥi* or *ana šēri*; the use of *ana maḥri* "to towards" is not unknown but is also not commonplace (CAD M/1:107a), and is otherwise unattested in the EA corpus.

ša lā. This combination, parallel to *ba-li* "without" appears four times, always in the same proverbial statement:

A.ŠÀ-*ia aš-ša-ta / ša la mu-ta ma-ši-il* "My cultivable land is like a
 woman without a husband" (EA 74:17-18; also EA 75:15-16;
 81:37; 92:42-43).

It is a common Akkadianism, mainly in later dialects (GAG:169, §115s; von Soden 1969:25**; AHw:251a) but Youngblood (1961:136) suggested Heb. *b^alô²* as a parallel (cf. e.g. Jer. 23:13) and Marcus (1973:284) compared Ugaritic *dbl*. It would appear that *ša lā muta* is taken here as a modifier of *aššata*, to be translated, "husbandless." That would account for the accusative ending on *muta* instead of the expected genitive.

šaplu, *šupālu*. The prepositional use of *šaplu* is a recognized feature of Akkadian (GAG:168, §115g). Since the forms of *šupālu* are often interchangeable with *šaplu* in the WS EA texts, they are

included here. The problem of definition is similar to that of (*w*)*arki* (cf. *supra*, pp. 40-41) with an additional similarity, viz. the application of the *-ī* adverbial suffix (GAG:163, §113k), otherwise unattested with these two vocables. It might be supposed that *šaplû* (◁ *šaplīum*) and *šupālû* (◁ *šupālīum*) are intended; these are adjectival formations (AHw:1174b-1175a, 1278b), the former of which is attested in non-WS EA documents (EA 369:30; also EA 162:80) as is the adverbial *šapliš* (EA 22:II, 70; III, 3; IV, 11; EA 25:IV, 48; Adler 1976:326). The forms are all construct governing a following genitive; the constructs with *-Ø* are interchangeable with those having *-i* (*-ī*).

There are four instances where no auxiliary preposition is used; first *šaplu* + *-i*:

'*na*¹-*ad-nu* ANŠE.KUR.RA *šap-li*-¹*šu*¹ "They have put a horse under him" (EA 88:47; Youngblood 1961:320); ÌR *ki*-[*it-ti*] / [*ep-ru*] *šap-li* 2 KUS.E.SIR / [*šà*]r-¹*ri*¹ EN-*ia* "A lo[yal] servant, [the dust] under the two sandals of the 'king', my lord" (EA 295:4-5; cf. Na³aman 1979:674; AHw:1174b).

And *šupālu* + *-Ø*:

ÌR-*ka ep-ri šu-pa-al* GÌR.MEŠ-*pí* / [*šà*]r-¹*ri*¹ EN-*ia* "Your servant, the dust of the bottom of the feet of the king, my lord" (EA 185:4-5; 187:4-5).

The latter is paralleled at Tyre by *ištu šupāl* (cf. *infra*, p. 63).

The normal combination in Akkadian is with *ina* (GAG:168). The god Amon is said to have placed Upper and Lower Egypt, and the (land of) the rising and the setting sun,

i-na šu-pa-al / 2 GÌR LUGAL "beneath the two feet of the king" (EA 369:28-32; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:207),

Only once is *ina* used in a WS context. Concerning the city-state rulers, Rib-Haddi enviously remarks that their cities are loyal to them (*a-na ša-šu-nu*, cf. *supra*, p. 19), and he adds:

LÚ.MEŠ / *ḥu!-<up>-šu-šu-nu i-na / šap-li-šu-nu* "their yeoman farmers are subservient to them" (EA 125:33-36; based on collation by Moran (1987b:339 n. 4; 1992:204 n. 4; Weber 1915:1226; Rainey 1978b:73).

Expressions with *ana* are all confined to the formulae of obeisance (Salonen 1967:67-68). One broken context may be the exception, but this much of it seems clear:

a-na šu-pal GÌR.MEŠ / Išār-ri "beneath the feet of the king" (EA 186:10-11).

Four passages use the ideographic writing KI.TA, so that the grammatical form remains obscure. Two are from Byblos and two are from Beirut, but all were written on behalf of Rib-Haddi and follow the same pattern:

a-na KI.TA GÌR.MEŠ be-li-ia "beneath the feet of my lord" (EA 362:3; also EA 126:2-3; 137:3-4; 138:3-4).

Four other texts, all from the Lebanese Beq^hah, have an even more obsequious formula:

a-na šu-pa-li / up-ri GÌR-pī LUGAL EN-ia "beneath the dust of the feet of the king, my lord" (EA 363:4-5; likewise EA 174:5-6; 175:4-5; 176:4-5).

Another declaration of submission, related to the obeisance phrases, comes from Tyre and employs *ištu*. The formulation is zealously pleonastic, to say the least:

a-na-ku ep-ru iš-tu šu-pa-al GÌR.MEŠ / UZUše-ni LUGAL be-li-ia "I am the dust from beneath the feet, the sandals, of the king, my lord" (EA 149:4-5; without GÌR.MEŠ EA 147:4-5; 151:4-5; 155:4-5; without *šupāli*, EA 154:4-5).

In a broken context, from an entirely different geographical area:

ÌR LUGAL EN-ia / iš-tu ša šu-p[a-li] / 'up¹-ri ša! GÌR[-pí] /
 [LUG]AL EN-ia "The servant of the king, my lord, from
 bene[ath] the dust of the 'feet' of [the ki]ng, my lord"
 (EA 183:5-8).

The ultimate professions of subservience come in the "brick formula," where the writer declares that as a brick will not depart,

iš-tu šu-pal tap-pa-ti₇-šu "from beneath its mate,"

so he will not depart,

iš-tu šu-pal 2 GÌR.MEŠ / LUGAL "from beneath the feet of the king" (EA 292:13-17 = EA 296:16-22; also EA 266:19-25),

ūmu. In this category, only those constructions with *ūmu* are included which conform to the criteria of truly adverbial expressions. The use of *ūmu* to denote "day" in the sense of a period in which someone lived, etc., or *ūma* "by day" are excluded (cf. *supra*, p. 2; *infra*, pp. 132-136).

Only two types of formations are thus treated below, those in which *ina ūmi* has true adverbial force and (*ina / ana*) *ūm(i)* governing a verbal phrase or clause. There do not seem to be any examples of *ūm* not dependent upon a preposition governing a phrase or clause.

The spellings are usually UD.KÁM(.MEŠ), rarely *u₄-mi* or *ú-mi*. The fairly frequent use of MEŠ might suggest that the final vowel of the syllabic spellings is in fact for the plural, i.e. *ūmī*. However, there are a few cases of plural ideographic spellings where the singular is clearly meant. In such instances, spellings like *a-na ú-mi* or *iš-tu u₄-mi* are either singular constructs with the dependent case vowel preserved, or else they are constructs with adverbial *-ī*.

There is one controversial passage where the text does not seem complete; the context seems to demand a contrast rather than a parallel:

ú-ul yu-uq-ba i-na UD.KAM.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠMAŠKÍM *la-qú*
 LÚ.MEŠGAZ.MEŠ / *ka-li* KUR.KUR.ĤÁ *ú-ul ka-a-ma / yu-uq-bu*
i-na UD.KAM.MEŠ-⟨ka⟩ / *ù la-a ti-le-ú la-qa-ši* "Was it not said in
 the day(s) of the commissioners, 'The 'apīrū men have taken all
 of the territories'? And will they not say in ⟨your⟩ days, 'And
 you are unable to take it?'" (EA 83:16-20; Rainey 1989-90:59a;
 contrast Greenberg 1955:36; Moran 1950a:142 n. 252; 1960:4;
 1987b:265 n. 1; 1992:154 n. 1; Youngblood 1961:243).

Moran (1950a:142 n. 252; followed by Youngblood 1961:243) thought at first that *ina ūmi* in line 19 was a dittography. Later he (Moran 1960:4; 1987b:265 n. 1; 1992:154 n. 1) suggested that ⟨LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM⟩ should be supplied as in line 17. Knudtson (1915:401) had translated "in (future) days," followed by Greenberg (1955:36). If this were the case, then we would have a true adverbial phrase; but such a usage is without precedent and we therefore suggest the correction ⟨-ka⟩ or the like (cf. above). Both instances of *ina ūmi* would thus seem to be in the category excluded from discussion in this section (Rainey 1989-90:59a).

The Byblos letters speak of how quickly an Egyptian force could take the enemy's strongholds,

i-na UD.KAM / *ti-il-qú-na-ši*_x(ŠE) "in a day they could take it"
 (EA 117:63-64).

In two similar passages the plural is used, *i-na* UD.KAM.MEŠ (EA 108:56-57; 132:16), — a strange feature if "(one) day" is meant — perhaps a case of misused ideograms.

The construction could serve with the infinitive for past and future:

ta-ru i-na UD.KAM / *pa-tá-ar* ERÍN.MEŠ KI.KAL.KIB *be-li-^li'a*
 "They returned (to rebellion) on the day of the departing of my
 lord's field army" (EA 106:47-48; Moran 1950a:157); *a-na ú-mi*
*ka-ša-di-ši*_x(ŠE) "on the day of its (the army's) arrival"
 (EA 137:50; the latter scribe has a tendency to use *ana* for *ina*, cf.
supra, pp. 21, 34).

As a corollary to the last two examples with a dependent infinitive, the adverbial phrase sometimes governs a clause; in the past:

i-na UD *aš-mé* "When I heard" (EA 364:21; note the absence of the Akkadian subjunctive); *iš-tu u₄-mi uš-ši-i[r-ti]* / *ṭup-pa an-na-am* "from the day (note singular) I sent this tablet" (EA 237:19-20);

or in the future:

¹*a¹-I mur¹-mi a-na ú-mi tu-šú* / *ù i-né-pu-ša-at gáb-bi* / KUR.MEŠ *a-na LUGAL be-li-ia* "Look, on the day when you come forth, then will all the lands be turned back to the king, my lord" (EA 362:62-64; this context demonstrates that the verb has to be future, Moran 1950a:77, 102).

CHAPTER III
CONJUNCTIONS

The relationship between words, phrases and clauses in the WS letters from Canaan often represents such a radical departure from standard Akkadian syntax that the differences were discerned even at the turn of the century (Böhl 1909:78-79, §36c). One of the best ways to demonstrate the WS syntax is by a systematic study of the particles which introduce dependent phrases and clauses and those which serve to link independent clauses.

SUBORDINATING

Generally, the subordinating conjunctions are identical with certain prepositions. The distinction is syntactical, viz. that instead of governing substantives, the conjunctions govern clauses. Clauses thus subordinated are capable of filling the same adverbial functions in a complex sentence as do other adverbial constructions. In spite of the apparent identity of those prepositions and their homophonous conjunctions, *CAD* treats the respective vocables under separate headings, distinguishing, e.g. between prepositional *ištu* and conjunctive *ištu* (*CAD* I/J:284b-288a). The same procedure is followed herein out of recognition that syntactic function is a valid criterion for categorization.

In Akkadian, subordinate verbal clauses take the subjunctive conjugational marker on their verbs (MA has a subjunctive indicator for both verbal and non-verbal clauses; Mayer 1971:59-60 [§65], 112 [§102.3]). The WS dialects, however, do not have a corresponding, purely positional, subjunctive (Rainey 1971b:165-166); instead, the mode of the subordinated verb is semantically conditioned. That the subordinate clause frequently has WS indicative imperfect (*yaqtulu*) might

erroneously lead to the superficial impression that Canaanite scribes in the EA archive were using the regular Akkadian positional subjunctive. But in many cases the subordinate clause has the WS indicative preterite (*yaqtul*) which bears no resemblance to Akkadian subjunctive *iprusu*. Many examples will be given below of subordinated clauses with purely WS verbal forms.

Instead of treating the various conjugations in order of frequency and predominance, they will be discussed below in straight alphabetical order.

adi. The main function of this conjunction in the WS EA texts is to express "until" (CAD A/1:112b). One example from Jerusalem, to be understood as governing the stative or an injunctive, expresses "as long as," viz.

a-di LUGAL EN-*ia* TIL.LA "As long as the king, my lord, lives" (EA 286:16).

The meaning "until" can refer to an event in the past, in which case the verb is also past tense:

a-nu-um-ma / ʿna¹-aš-ra-ti-ši / *a-di a-ta-mar* UZU².IGI / LÚ^ha-za-an ša ʾšār-ri EN-*ia* "Now, I protected it until I saw the two eyes of the official of the king, my lord" (EA 237:14-17); *a-di it-ta-ši* / LÚGAL ù ye-el-qé / *mi-im-ma* / ša iq-bi / ʾšār-ru / be-li-ia "until the official came forth and took everything that the king, my lord, had commanded" (EA 239:11-17).

The first instance concerned a city that had just been taken from the writer (EA 237:1-14); the second had to do with something kept until the official came to take it. So there is no doubt about the past tense of the verbs dependent on *adi*. It is noteworthy that neither *a-ta-mar* (G past with infix -t- or preterite of reciprocal Gt? Cf. Rainey 1971c:90-91) nor *it-ta-ši* (Gt separative of motion verb; Rainey 1971c:90) has the Akkadian subjunctive marker -u, which is simply not employed in the EA WS texts..

The majority of subordinate clauses with *adi* relate to the future. Since the Jerusalem texts avoid WS imperfects (except when quoting direct speech; Rainey 1975b:396 and n. 7), it is significant to find:

a-di e-tel-li ¹*Pa-ú-ru* "until Pawūru comes up" (EA 287:45; Gt present, verb of motion; Rainey 1971b:87).

This present-future verb does not append the Akkadian subjunctive. The same holds true for the Tyrian example:

a-di / i-wa-ši ZAG LUGAL *da-na-tu* "until the strong arm of the king comes forth" (EA 147:63-64).

The remaining examples all contain WS imperfects with *-u*. That this sufformative is not the Akkadian subjunctive is easy to prove. For example, in one and the same text we find:

uš-šú-ru . . . a-di ka-ša-di ERÍN.MEŠ "I am guarding (the city of Beirut) until the arrival of the troops" (EA 142:12-14);
i-na-ša-ru-šu / a-di yi-im-lu-ku LUGAL "I am guarding him until the king takes counsel (concerning his servant)" (EA 142:16-17).

This parallel between an infinitive and a *yaqtulu* can be seen in the following two passages from separate letters:

ù a-nu-um i₁₅-na-ša-ru / URU.KI ša šar-ri EN-ia / ^dUTU-ia *ša it-ti-ia / a-di ka-ša-di / LÚMAŠKÍM* LUGAL EN-ia "And now I am guarding the city of the king, my lord, my sungod, which is in my charge, until the arrival of the commissioner of the king, my lord, my sungod" (EA 220:25-30); *a-nu-ma / a-na-ša-ru / URU šar-ri* EN-ia *a-di ti-ik-šu-du / a-wa-at šar-ri / EN<-ia> a-na ia-ši* "Now I am guarding the city of the king, my lord, until the word of the king, <my> lord, reaches me" (EA 221:11-16).

Both parallels involve WS imperfect built on the Akkadian preterite! Such is a commonplace in these subordinate clauses:

a-di yi-du "until he takes cognizance" (EA 12:36; 182:14); *a-di yu-šu-te-ru* "until he responds" (EA 280:38-39).

The following example has a similar verb form; the enclitic *-mi* is evidently an indicator of direct speech:

a-nu-ma ki-ia-am / qa-la-ta a-di-mi / yi-il-ma-du šār-ru / be-lí-ia a-wa-ta₅ / an-ni-ta₅ "And thus you keep silent, (saying) 'Until the king, my lord, looks into this matter'" (EA 251:7-11; cf. *infra*, p. 239).

The next passage must have 1st c.s. WS imperfect built on the Akkadian preterite, not 3rd m.pl. or 3rd m.s. subjunctive,

a-di i-^lmu^l-^lru^l 2 IGI.ĤÁ / ERÍN "until I see the eyes of the troop" (EA 141:45; for the idiom, cf. EA 237:14-17, cited *supra*, p. 68, and contrast the "correct" WS pl. *ti-mu-ru 2 IGI*, EA 141:34).

Although the WS imperfect can also be built on the Akkadian present, e.g. *a-di yi-ma-li-ku* (EA 146:12), the *-u* is still to be understood as WS imperfect, the element which gives the form its future meaning (Rainey 1975b).

There is one isolated example with the precative, but the addition of an enclitic *-mi* to the conjunction may indicate that an adverb, "still, yet," is intended (cf. *infra*, pp. 119-122, also p. 244).

a-di-mi li-de-mi / LUGAL EN-ia / ù LUGAL EN-ia / li-im-lu-uk-mi / a-na ÌR-šu "Yet may the king, my lord, be apprised and may the king, my lord, take counsel concerning his servant!" (EA 364:24-28).

The purely adverbial uses of *adi*, a decided WS feature, will be treated in the section on temporal adverbs, *infra*, pp. 119-122).

ašar. This conjunction, the construct of *ašru* "place," serves in Akkadian (CAD A/2:413-415a) generally with the meaning "where, wherever." That it is purely the construct of *ašru* and not a

true relative can be easily demonstrated. Note the following passage where the usage is exclusively nominal:

a-mur-mi a-na-ku ÌR-ka / i-na aš-ri ša i-ba-ša-ti₇ / a-mur aš-ra-nu ša i-ba-ša-ti₇ / URU.DIDLI.ĤÁ-ka gáb-bu "Behold, I am your servant in the place where I am. Behold, the places where I am are all your cities" (EA 230:4-7; Rainey 1971b:161).

This should dispel any illusion that we have here the precursor of Heb. ^ʔ*ašer*, although the latter may have truly developed from the construct of ^ʔ*ašr*. However, the Hebrew relative developed, it was hardly under the influence of EA Akkadian!

The documented examples have either the stative or the WS imperfect. For the former, note the following passage:

a-šar i-ba-ša-at / ši-pí-ir-ti LUGAL EN-ia / . . . ù ú-ba-ʽú¹-ʽna¹-ši "Wherever the king, my lord's behest may be, I will search for it" (EA 143:13-15; collated 27.01.80),

which has many parallels, e.g. from Ugarit (Rainey 1971b:162) including a translation to Ugaritic:

atr . it . bqt / w . štn . ly "Wherever it is, inquire and send it to me!" (KTU 2.39:34-35).

Other stative clauses:

a-na URU.MEŠ / a-šar i-ba-ši ŠE.IM.[ĤI].A "to the towns where grain is" (EA 125:29); *a-šar na-ak-ru* "wherever they are hostile" (EA 191:17); *ù a-šar nu-kúr-tu₄* "wherever there is hostility" (EA 189:4').

The remaining passages are in the present-future, viz. WS imperfect, even though the forms themselves are ostensibly Akkadian present; the final *-u* on the verb forms is not to be construed as the Akkadian subjunctive:

a-šar ti-la-ku "wherever you go" (EA 296:35); *a-di a-šar ti7-la-ku* "to wherever you go" (EA 203:19; 204:19; 205:18); *a-di a-šar yi-qa-bu* "to wherever you say" (EA 195:31; 201:21); *ia-nu a-šar er-ru-bu* "There is nowhere I can enter" (EA 76:21; 71:34).

aššu. An Alashia letter uses this conjunction once. It would appear to be a variation of the contracted *an(a) ša* (GAG:230, §174) and the meaning is "as soon as" (CAD A/2:460). For some reason, the EA passage was overlooked by CAD.

aš-šu-ú / eš₁₅-ma-am ù a-nu-ma ut-ta-šir₉ / LÚDUMU ši-ip-ri-ia a-na mah-ri-ka₄ "As soon as I heard, then I sent my ambassador to you" (EA 34:13-15).

aššum. The use of *aššum* as a conjunction, that is, with a dependent clause, is quite rare in the EA texts. It occurs twice in non-WS epistles (EA 2:6; 29:66), once in a letter of Alashia, once in a text from Tyre, and once from Beirut, and once from some other Canaanite town. The Alashia passage is relatively straightforward and simple:

aš-šum ŠU-ti dMAŠ.MAŠ i-ba-aš-ši i-na KUR-ia "because the 'hand of Nergal' (i.e. pestilence) is in my land" (EA 35:37; CAD A/2:466b).

The Tyrian passage is not easy. A key word is badly effaced and the overall context is hard to discern.

aš-sum ḥa-dì-ia-ti la ti-^fx¹-^fy¹ / er-šé-tu₄ "Because I rejoiced, the country did not . . ." (EA 144:29-30).

In a broken context, there is also an apparent example from an unidentified Canaanite source:

[aš-šu]m iš-te-mu / gāb-bi a-wa-te^{MEŠ} / Išār-ri EN-ia "[Becau]se I am heeding all the words of the king, my lord" (EA 266:19-21).

The Beirut example expresses purpose:

ù al-ka-ti / a-na É-šu aš-šum / e-pu-uš DUG.GA bi-ri-⟨nu⟩ "so I went to his house in order to make an alliance between ⟨us⟩" (EA 136:30-32).

eli. The following appears to be a unique use of UGU governing a clause:

i-pu-uš-mì / nu-kúr-ta₅ i-na LÚ.MEŠ^{KUR}Gi-na UGU da-ku-mì / LÚa-ba-nu "Make war against the men of Gina because they killed our father" (EA 250:16-18).

endum, indum. This conjunction, meaning "when," is known in MA in the form *entu* (Finkelstein 1953:136), but elsewhere, throughout the northern peripheral zone (Nuzi, Mitanni, Hattusas, Ugarit), it appears in the form *undu(m)* (AHw:1420b). Böhl (1909:76) was inclined to separate the two forms, but this seems unlikely. The *undu(m)* form is widely used in the Mitanni letters (Adler 1976:338-339) and also in the Hurrian language (Laroche 1977:283 for references; Bush 1964:240-241), so if it is not a true Hurrian word, it is at least borrowed into Hurrian, perhaps from an original Akkadian *entu(m)/endu(m)*.

The two examples, in texts that derive from Beirut, are quite clear in meaning:

ù in-du-um / yu-ša-ḫi-ra-am a-na ia-ši / ù im-lu-uk iš-tu / ŠÀ-ia "and when it got too tight for me, then I took counsel in my heart" (EA 136:24-27; CAD Š:123a; AHw:1420b); *ù en-du-m / [iš]-te-me a-wa-te^{MEŠ} DUB LUGAL EN-ia / ù yi-iḫ-di ŠÀ-ia* "and when I heard the contents of the letter of the king, my heart rejoiced" (EA 142:7-9).

īnu, ēnu. Only twice do we find this subordinating conjunction, both times from Byblos. One example was recognized from the very beginning (Ebeling 1915:1425; Youngblood 1961:299-300):

SIG₅-mi / 'i¹-'pí¹-iš 'LUGAL¹ BE-ia i-nu-ú / 'ša¹-pár¹ 'LUGAL¹
 "Gracious was the action of the 'king', my lord, when he wrote
 ... " (EA 92:30-33; CAD I/J:153a).

The other passage is due to a corrected reading deriving from Albright and cited by Moran (1950a:159; for further discussion, cf. Youngblood 1961:299-300).

ù i-še₂₀-me e-nu!-ú ia-nu-um ERÍN.MEŠ / it-ti-šu "and he has
 heard that there is no army with him" (EA 87:18-19; for the
 tense, cf. Rainey 1975b:424-426).

A further comment is in order; the meaning in this latter context is not "when," but "that," to introduce an object clause. In other words, the form *ēnu* has acquired the meaning of *inūma*. One of the notable features of this epistle is the use of 'an¹-'nu¹-ú (EA 87:15) instead of *anumma*. So *e-nu-ú* may stand for *enūma* in this scribe's own practice.

inūma, enūma. This is the most widely used subordinating conjunction; it serves to introduce clauses of every kind (Rainey 1989; 1990?). In function, *inūma/enūma* is the counterpart of WS *kî* (Albright 1937:202 n. 3; 1943b:31; 1944:21 n. 50); it makes the relative scarcity of *kî* in the WS EA texts all the more surprising (for *kî*, cf. *infra*, pp. 89-93). On the other hand, we find *inūma/enūma* in a much wider range of usages than in normal Akkadian (Youngblood 1961:20; Rainey 1989b, 1992a).

As an extension of the calque with *kî*, there are, in the Jerusalem letters, a few instances of *enūma* as a preposition (cf. *supra*, pp. 36-37). A different peripheral phenomenon, more common in N. Syria (especially Ugarit) and Hattusas, is the use of *inūma/enūma* as a substitute for the presentation adverb, *anumma* (CAD I/J:158b-159a); the EA examples will be treated with the other temporal adverbs (cf. *infra*, pp. 89-93).

The clauses governed by *inūma/enūma* can be either adverbial or substantival. The former are by far the most numerous and will be treated first.

A frequent usage of *inūma* is to introduce temporal clauses (Moran 1950a:76). Such circumstantial clauses in standard Akkadian would naturally come between the grammatical subject and the verb, but they may also come at the beginning of the sentence. The following is a selection of examples:

i-nu-ma uš-ši-ir-ti 2 LÚ / DUMU ši-ip-ri a-na URUŠu-mu-ra / ù ú-ka-li LÚ-li / an-nu-ú a-na šu-te-er / a-wa-ti a-na šār-ri "When I sent two emissaries to Šumur, then I detained this man of mine to send word back to the king" (EA 108:46-50; Moran 1950a:76); *i-nu-ma TUR a-na-ku ù / šu-ri-ba-an-ni a-na KUR Mi-iš-ri* "When I was young, he sent me down to Egypt" (EA 296:25-26); *i-nu-ma yi-mur LÚŠEŠ-ia i-nu-ma / a-ší LÚDUMU šip-ri -ia ri-qa-mi / i-ia-nu ERÍN.MEŠ ma-ša-ar-ta₅ it-ti-šu / ù ia-an-aš-ni* "When my brother saw that my ambassador came out (of Egypt) empty-handed, no garrison troops with him, then he scorned me" (EA 137:20-30; cf. *infra*, p. 244).

Although the introduction of such temporal clauses is the standard function of *inūma*, the very un-Akkadian syntax of the above examples must not be overlooked. The "main" clause to which the *inūma* clause is circumstantial is introduced by the conjunction *u* in accordance with West Semitic and not Akkadian practice (cf. *infra*, pp. 100-104).

Furthermore, the circumstantial clause with *inūma* may come after its main clause, as is frequently the case:

a-na ta-bá-ki a-na [qa-qa]-di-ka / uš-ši-ir-ti i-nu-ma tu-ša-ab a-na GIŠGU.ZA / LUGAL-¹ta¹-ka "I have sent to anoint your head when you take your seat on your royal throne" (EA 34:51-53, from Alashia); *ti-i-de pa-ar-ša-ia / i-nu-ma i-ba-ša-ta i-na URU¹Šu¹-mu-ra* "You know my behavior when you were in Šumur" (EA 73:39-41; Moran 1950a:150).

Note the following case which borders on the conditional, "as long as." In its formation it is a firm affirmation, almost as in an oath:

i-nu-ma ba-al-tú / LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM ù / a-da-bu-ba ka-li ip-ši-šu-nu "While the commissioners live, then I will report all their deeds" (EA 119:21-23; contrast Moran 1950a:134; 1987b:328; 1992:197).

The nuance we have preferred is proven by the parallel passage in which the initial adverbial clause is introduced by the temporal particle *adi*, "until, as long as" (EA 286:16; CAD B:57a; cf. also *supra*, p. 68).

Another passage which borders on the conditional is this one:

e-nu-ma aš-te-mu / šu-um LUGAL ù šu-um um-ma-ni!-šu / ù pal-ḥu ma-gal ù gáb-bi / KUR-ti pal-ḥa-at "When I hear the mention (name) of the king and the mention (name) of his army, then they will fear greatly and all the land will fear" (EA 149:42-45).

Sometimes the circumstance is not so much temporal as causal (Moran 1950a:70). This seems to be the best explanation for a number of the clauses such as these:

i-na / URUŠu-mu-ra i-zi-za-ti / i-nu-ma ma-ri-iš LÚGAL "I took up a position in Šumur because the official was ill" (EA 103:13-15; Moran 1950a:70); *šu-ut yu-TIL.LA-aṭ-šu-nu / i-nu-ma i-ka-ši-iš a-na-ku* "He is supporting them since I have been impoverished" (EA 94:66-67; Rainey 1978b:76).

The causal nature of the clause is especially obvious in the following:

ù aš-ta-par a-na LUGAL be-li-ia / e-nu-ma u₄-mi-ša-ma / il-qè šār URUŠí-du-na / LÚGÌR-ia "And I have been writing to the king, my lord, because daily the king of Sidon has seized a trooper of mine" (EA 148:23-26); *ù ki-na-an-na / ú-ša-à-ru i-na pa-ni LUGAL EN-ia / e-nu-ma à-qa-bi ḥal-qa-at-mi / KUR.ḤÁ LUGAL EN-ia* "And thus I am maligned before he king, my lord, because I

say, "The lands of the king, my lord, are lost" (EA 286:20-23; Moran 1975b:151).

This causal nuance is usually expressed in Akkadian by means of *aššum* or *ištu*, (GAG:232-233 §176).

Another adverbial function is the introduction of result clauses. Some of those cited by Moran (1950a:79), e.g. EA 76:14-16 and EA 362:68-69, might be classified otherwise, but some are definitely expressing action or state consequent upon another action or state (evidently EA 90:23-25). Here is a possible example:

a-nu-ma i-tan-ḫu / a-na na-ša-ar / KUR LUGAL [i]-nu-ma / mar-ša-ku ma-gal "Now I have so toiled to look after the king's land that I have become very ill" (EA 306:19-22).

Note also the following construction with a result clause:

mi-na-am-mi ep-ša-ku-mi / a-na šar-ri EN-ia / i-nu-ma SIG-ia \ ya-qf-il-li-ni "What have I done to the king, my lord, that he belittles me?" (EA 245:36-38; CAD K:17a; and for the same formula, cf. EA 113:11-13 and EA 249:6-7).

For *inūma* introducing the protasis of a conditional sentence, cf. *infra*, pp. 191-192.

The second main category of *inūma* clauses is that of the substantive (Moran 1950a:67-69). These substantive clauses can fill various positions in a sentence, just as in Akkadian. It should be noted that such clauses, "that"-clauses, are introduced in classical Akkadian by *kīma*, (GAG:233, §177; CAD K:364) which is quite rare in the West Semitic EA texts (cf. *infra*, pp. 93-94). The later dialects, such as Neo-Babylonian, have *kī* (Dietrich 1969:76), and we have already expressed our surprise that *kī* was not more widely used in the Canaanite EA texts because of the cognate West Semitic *kī*. However, the use of *inūma* in the meaning "that" is widespread in the peripheral dialects; it occurs in Hattusas, Alalakh (Idrimi) and EA (including non-West Semitic texts, e.g.

from Qatna [EA 53:59], Amurru [EA 161:13, 14, *et. al.*] and Egypt [EA 162:78]). The Ḥarmal texts seem to have a few instances, which suggests that this extended use of *inūma* had developed already in Old Babylonian, probably as a logical extension of the temporal nuance (CAD I/J:161).

The most widely attested function of the "that"-clause introduced by *inūma* / *enūma* is as the object of certain verbs, especially *idû*, "to know," e.g.

lu-ú i-de LUGAL EN-*ia* / *i-nu-ma šal-ma-at* URUGub-*la* "May the king be apprised that Byblos is tranquil!" (EA 68:9-10; *contra* Rainey 1973b:245); [ù] ¹*lu-ú ti-de be-l[í]* / [*i-nu-ma ša-ar-p[u]*] / URU.DIDLKI.MEŠ-*ka* ù / KISLAḤ \ *ma-aš-ka-n[a-ti-]ka* / [*i-na IZI*].MEŠ *i-ša-ti* "[And] may you, my lord, be apprised [t]hat burned are your cities and your places [with fi]re!" (EA 306:28-32; Moran 1987b:534-535 and n. 6; 1992:344 n. 6; Na'aman 1979:680-681 n. 34).

Note that the object clause follows its verb unlike classical Akkadian usage which generally places the object clause before the verb (GAG:233 §177b). Such passages are ubiquitous in the West Semitic epistles (Ebeling 1915:1426) but the same usage also appears in letters from Egypt (where West Semitic influence is moderate):

ù *lu-ú ti-ti-deg i-nu-ma* / *ša-lim* LUGAL *ki-ma* ^dUTU-*aš* / *i-na AN^{sa-me-e}* "And may you be apprised that the king is tranquil like the sun in heaven!" (EA 367:22-24; also EA 162:78-79; 369:24-25; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:244, §2.12, 284, §3.4.1).

It is also to be found in the texts of Aziru, ruler of Amurru, where a strong North Syrian (so-called Mitanni dialect) influence is evident in every aspect of the language:

ù EN-*ia lu-ú i-de*₄ *i-nu-ma* / BAR-*šu-nu ša ú-nu-te*^{MEŠ} *ša id-din* / LUGAL EN-*ia* ¹*Ḥa-ti-ip i-le-eq-qè* "And my lord, may he know that half of the implements that the king, my lord, had given,

Ḥatip has taken!" (EA 161:41; also EA 161:13; 164:44; 165:16; 166:16; Izre'el 1985:232 §3.4.1, 296-297 §4.3.2).

Another verb that serves in closely parallel contexts is *lamādu*, "to be apprised," e.g.

li-il-ma-ad šār-ru EN-ia / *i-nu-ma* LÚSA.GAZ 'ša¹ / *yi-na-aš-ši* \ *na-aš-ša-a* / *i-na* KUR.KI.ḤÁ *na-da-an* / DINGIR-lu₄ *ša šār-ri* EN-ia *a-na ia-ši* / *ù i-du-uk-šu* *ù* / 'lu¹-ú *yi-il-ma-ad šār-ru* / EN-ia 'i¹-nu-ma *iz-zi-bu-ni* / *gāb-bi* ŠEŠ-ia "May the king, my lord, be apprised that, as for the *apîrû* who rose up in rebellion in the lands, the god of the king, my lord, has given over to me and I have smitten him; but may the king, my lord, be apprised that all of my colleagues have abandoned me" (EA 364:11-19; for other passages cf. Ebeling 1915:1426).

In a few passages object clauses introduced by *inūma* are attested after the verb *šemû*, "to hear," e.g.

ša-ma-ma šu-nu / *šū-nu* *i-nu-ma i-te₉-ru-bu* / *i-na* URUŠu-mu-ra / URU.MEŠ *an-nu-tu₄* *⟨i-na⟩* GIŠ'MÁ¹.MEŠ¹ / *ù* DUMU.MEŠ IĪR-A-ši-¹ir¹-ta / *i-na -šé-ri* *ù* / 'iz¹-¹zi¹-za *⟩*UGU¹ *ù* / *la-a i-le-ú* / *a-ša* *ù* *ep-ša-at* URUGub-la / 'a¹-na LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ " (If) they *⟩*they¹ hear that I have entered into Šumur, (the men of) these cities (will be) *⟨*in¹ ships and the sons of Abdi-Ashirta (will be) on land and I will have to stand fast and I will not be able to go forth and Byblos will go over to the *apîrû* men" (EA 104:43-52; *šamâma* is absolute infinitive followed by independent pronoun, *contra* Moran 1950a:164; 1987b:300 n. 3; 1992:177 n. 3; Rainey 1989-90:59b-60).

Likewise, we find the following example as object of the verb *amāru*, "to see,"

i-nu-ma yi-mur LÚŠEŠ-ia *i-nu-ma* / *a-ši* LÚDUMU *šip-⟨ri⟩-ia ri-qa-mi* / *i-ia-nu* ERÍN.MEŠ *ma-ša-ar-ta₅ it-ti-šu* / *ù ia-an-aš-ni* "When my brother saw that my ambassador came forth empty-handed,

there being no garrison troops with him, then he despised me"
(EA 137:20-23; also EA 137:12; 138:61).

The one possible reference with *malāku*, "to think, consider," (EA 116:14) is not so clear (Moran 1950a:70; *contra* CAD M/1:156b). Such an object clause may also follow *qabû* "to speak,"

la-a i-qa-bi-ú a-na pa-ni LUGAL EN-ia / *e-nu-ma ḫal-qa-at* KUR
LUGAL EN-ia / *ù ḫal-qu gāb-bi* LÚ.MEŠ *ḫa-zi-a-nu-ti* "Aren't they
even saying before the king, my lord, that the lands of the
king, my lord, are lost and that all of the city rulers are lost?"
(EA 288:54-56; Nitzan 1973:68).

The substantival *inūma* clauses as objects of the verb *šaʾālu* "to ask, inquire," indicate a kind of conditional nuance by which the conjunction may be translated "if" or "whether." All of the passages with this nuance in the letters from Canaan pertain to the same semantic context, viz. that the king should ask his commissioner for information about a particular situation, e.g.

ù yi-ša-al LUGAL EN-ia / LÚMAŠKÍM *i-nu-ma a-na-ku a-na-ša-ru*
/ KÁ.GAL URU.Ḫa-az-za-ti *ù* KÁ.GAL / URUIa-pu "So may the
king ask his commissioner whether I am guarding the gate of
Gaza and the gate of Joppa!" (EA 296:30; Rainey 1975b:407-408;
further examples are EA 155:66-67; 208:10-14; 287:33-34).

The phenomenon is peripheral and not just West Semitic. This can be seen from the following passage in a letter from Tunip written in the North Syrian dialect of the Mitanni empire. Of course, the Akkadian of the Hurrian scribes in the northern Levant had also undergone a certain amount of West Semitic influence.

ù li-iš-al-šu-nu be-lí-ni la-bí-ru-te-šu \ am-ma-ti / ù i-nu-ma-mi
ni-i-nu ša la be-lí-ni šār KURMi-iš-ri KI "So may our lord ask them,
viz. his senior advisors (= elders), whether, then, we don't
belong to our lord, the king of Egypt!" (EA 59:11-12; CAD L, p.
29a; Laroche 1976:47).

Rather than asking someone, the king may be urged to consult written records:

li-^lda^l-gal LUGAL tu^p-pí^{MEŠ} / ša É a-bi-šu i-nu-ma ú-ul ÌR ki-ti / LÚ-li ša i-ba-aš-ši i-na URUGub-la "May the king examine the tablets in his father's palace, whether the man who is in Byblos is not a loyal servant!" (EA 74:10-12; Moran 1950a:151 *contra* Youngblood 1961:132).

The nominal direct object in a verbal clause may itself be further specified by a "that"-clause which stands in apposition to it:

yi-il₅-ma-ad LUGAL EN-ia / i₁₅-pí-iš ŠEŠ-šu . . . i-nu-ma na-^lda^l-[an] / DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ . . . "May the king, my lord, be apprised of the deed of his brother . . . that he handed over the children . . . !" (EA 142:18-24).

Likewise the indirect object may be a clause introduced by *inūma*, as in the following:

ú-ul / ia-qú-ul LUGAL a-na i-^lpí^l-ši / an-nu-ú i-nu-ma di-ka / LÚMAŠKÍM "May the king not keep silent about this deed, that the commissioner has been slain!" (EA 132:43-46; similarly EA 196:38-43).

Inūma-clauses may function as the subject of non-verbal clauses with stative *damiq* "good" as the predicate (Moran 1950a:67-68):

SIG₅-mi i-nu-ma iṣ-bat URUGub-la "Is it good that he should take Byblos?" (EA 84:36); *da-mi-iq / [i-nu-]ma lum-da-ta* "It is well that you know" (EA 98:25); *ù SIG₅ / e-nu-ma i-de₄* "and it is well that he know" (EA 147:70-71).

In a similar construction, the "that"-clause stands in apposition to the subject of *damiq*:

da-mi-iq-mi / a-na pa-ni LUGAL BE-ia i-pf-iš / 𐎠𐎢𐎣-^dA-ši-ir-ti
 UR.GI₇ i-nu-ma / in₄-né-ep-ša-at KUR.ḪÁ LUGAL BE-i [a] / a-na
 ša-šu "Is it pleasing to the king, my lord, the deed of
 'Abdi-Ashirta, the dog, that the lands of the king are joining
 him?" (EA 84:6-10).

The stative, *damiq*, in all these rhetorical interrogative sentences is not only the grammatical predicate, but it is the logical predicate (corresponding to the comment of the assumed reply).

The stative *ibašši* (Rainey 1973c:249-250) is the copula in the following passage where the *inūma*-clause stands as the predicate nominative:

i₁₅-ba-aš-ši ar-ni-ia / i-nu-ma ir-ru-ba-ti / a-na URUGaz-ri / ù
 aq-ta-bi "My crime is that I entered into Gezer and I spoke"
 (EA 254:20-23);

and in the parallel passage (in another letter written at the same time) the *inūma*-clause is the nominal predicate of a non-verbal clause:

an-nu-ú ar-nu-ia / ù an-nu-ú / 𐎠𐎢𐎣-^{tú}-ia i-nu-ma ir-ru-ba-^{tí} i-na
 URUGaz-ri KI "Behold my crime and behold my sin, that I
 entered into Gezer" (EA 253:18-22).

In like manner, the "that"-clause stands in apposition to the pronoun *šūt* as subject (so-called copula):

šār KURMi-ta-na / ù šār KURKa-aš-še šu-ut i-nu-ma 𐎠𐎢𐎣-^{ba-ú} la-qa
 KUR LUGAL a-na ša-a-šu "Is he the king of Mitanni or the king
 of the Cassites that he seeks to take the land of the king for
 himself?" (EA 76:14-16; Moran 1950a:79; Ebeling 1915:1591;
 Youngblood 1961:172).

In the following passage, the two *inūma*-clauses serve respectively as subject of an interrogative and apposition to a subject:

a-ya-mi i-nu-ma ia-aš-pu-¹ru¹ / LUGAL be-èl-¹ka¹ [a-n]a MAḤ-ka / a-ya-mi ERÍN.MEŠ [i-]¹nu¹-ma uš-ši-ra-at / a-na ka-a-ta₅ 'Where (are they), if the king, your lord, is corresponding with you? Where are the troops, if they have been sent to you?' (EA 138:123-126).

Or the "that"-clause can serve as the subject of a rhetorical question, for example:

ú-ul i-nu-ma / uš-ši-ir-ti LÚ-ia a-na É.GAL "Is it not that I sent my man to the palace?" (EA 82:35-36).

Albright and Moran (1948:247) had assumed that this passage was elliptical for *ul tīde* "Don't you know" or the like. However, Moran (1950a:68) later compared

halô² kî ʔānôkî šiwvîṯî ʔetkem "Is it not that I have commanded you?" (2 Sam. 13:28),

Finally, there is a construction, unparalleled by any usage of *kî* in Hebrew, which has often defied definition. The numerous examples of it all reflect a particular semantic context. A communication had been received by a local city ruler and he is responding to it. The initial clause, describing the original communication, is introduced by *inūma* and the response is another, independent clause introduced asyndetically. Moran (1950a:68-69) weighed the possibility that the *inūma*-clauses were all elliptical, with an understood form of the verb "to be," or that they were analogous to the protases of conditional sentences, concessive clauses and clauses with the *kî* of affirmation. At times, *inūma* could be translated "when" or "if," but more often than not, a locution such as "In that" or "Inasmuch as" or even "Although" would be more appropriate. The examples all contain a verb of either speaking or writing. As responses to something previously communicated, the intention is to predicate the response on the message received. So the comparison by Moran with the protases in conditional sentences is highly suggestive. But unlike the

conditional sentence in the West Semitic Amarna letters, where the apodosis is introduced by the conjunction *u* (cf. *infra*, pp. 102-105, 187-192), the ensuing clause in the present construction is asyndetic. Still, the logical nexus between the *inūma*-clause and the response is obvious.

As demonstrated in the previous section, an *inūma*-clause may stand as the subject of a stative, which is itself the predicate of an interrogative sentence. Such clauses may also be the subject of an interrogative adverb, including the negative particle *ul* in a rhetorical question. In those constructions where the "that"-clause is in initial position followed by another clause, the new information being offered is the answer to the previous communication. The communication is mentioned in the *inūma*-clause, the response to it is in the following, asyndetic clause. It seems obvious that the two clauses are related to each other as Topic (logical subject) and Comment (logical predicate). Some typical examples of this most interesting construction illustrate the requests made by pharaoh for various items which local rulers in Canaan were expected to provide, especially rare or unusual products, but also some stable commodities:

i-nu-ma / ta-aš-pu-ra a-[na] URUDU.MEŠ ù a-na / ší-in₄-ni-m[i ti]-de ^dNIN / ša^{URU}Gub-^lla¹ šum-ma ^li¹-ba>-šu / URUDU.MEŠ ù š[i-i]n₄-ni [a-n]a / >a-na < ia-ši, "Since you have written for copper and ivory, the Lady of Byblos knows whether I have copper or ivory" (EA 77:6-11; Rainey 1973c:243; cf. Youngblood 1961:183-184; Moran 1987b:257 nn. 2-3; 1992:148 nn. 2-3; Rainey 1989-90:58b-59a).

As is the case here, the response to the communication is frequently negative: "You have written for . . . , but it is not available," etc., for example:

i-nu-ma ša-pár be-li a-na ^{GIŠ}TÚG¹ / iš-tu KUR.MEŠ Sà-al-^{hi} ù iš-^ltu¹ / URU.KI Ū-ga-ri-ti₇ tu-ul₁₁-qú-na , "Since my lord has written for boxwood, it has to be brought from the mountains

(or lands) of Salḫu and from the city of Ugarit" (EA 126:4-6; Moran 1987b:340-341 n. 2; 1992:205, 206 n. 2).

In the following example, the Comment is apparently indicated by the gloss sign!

i-nu-ma 'ša¹-pār-mi / LUGAL EN-ia a-na ŠE-IM.MEŠ [du-u]ḫ-ni / \ mu-ḫu-ṣu, "Since the king, my lord, has written for millet, it is spoiled" (EA 224:7-9; Na²aman 1975:78* n. 78; Moran 1987b:453 n. 1; 1992:287 n. 1; CAD M/1:53b).

However, the response may also be affirmative, as seen in this passage:

[i]-nu-ma qa-ba / LUGAL EN-ia a-na NA₄.MEŠ 'eḫ¹-lu¹-pa-'ak¹-ku / 'al¹-lu-ú uš-ši-ir-ti a-na L[UGAL E]N-ia / 30 NA₄.MEŠ 'eḫ¹-lu-pa-ak-ku, "[In]asmuch as the king, my lord, spoke for raw glass, behold, I have sent to the k[ing] my [lo]rd, thirty pieces of raw glass" (EA 323:13-16; also EA 331:15-23; Oppenheim 1973:259-266).

Other negative responses pertain to information that was not confirmed by actual events. The ensuing text contains a direct quote from the previous communication; due to the energetic verb in the quote, it could be taken as a question (Ebeling 1915:72-73; Moran 1950a:53-54; Zewi 1987:177-178), though it has not been so interpreted in the past (Ebeling 1910:70; Moran 1950:68). The most probable view is that we have here an affirmation or promise (Zewi 1987:181).

i-nu-ma yi-iš-tap-pa-ra / šār-ru a-na ia-ši a-nu-ma I¹-ri-ma-ia-aš-ša / ia-ak-šu-du-na a-na / mu-ḫi-ka ù-ul ka-ši-id / a-na mu-ḫi-ia, "Although the king has written to me, 'Now 'Irimayassa is surely coming to you,' he has not come to me" (EA 130:9-14).

The contrast between original statement and later response may be due to a third party, not just the speaker. The

next example shows how Rib-Haddi wanted to inform the king of his subjects' (Rib-Haddi's enemies') negative reply to a royal communiqué to the effect that the army was on its way:

*i-nu-ma ša-pár-mi LUGAL be-^lli¹ / a-nu-ma ERÍN.MEŠ a-ša-at u ti-i[*q*-bu-na] \ ka-ma-^rmi¹ / ^rka¹-az-bu-tu / i-nu-ma ERÍN.MEŠ pí-*tá*-ta₅ la-[a] / tu-šú u da-nu UGU-nu*, "That the king has written, 'Now the army has gone forth,' [they] s[ay] thus: 'It's a lie! There is no army; it is not coming forth so that it will overpower us!'" (EA 129:35-39; note *kâmami* as adverb continuing line 36; contrast CAD K:310a, and Artzi 1963:38-39; Moran 1987b:345, 347 nn. 18-19; 1992:209, 211 nn. 18-19).

More elaborate are the responses of Rib-Haddi to a royal command that he be on guard and protect himself. In the respective passages, one finds variations on the same theme, viz. that Rib-Haddi does not have the means to protect himself and his city. The frame of reference is basically the same: a command from pharaoh juxtaposed to a negative response, usually formed as a rhetorical question and/or a description of the circumstances which make fulfillment difficult, if not impossible.

i-nu-ma yi-iš-ta-pa-ru šâr-ru / EN-li ú-šur-mì ra-ma-an-ka / [m]i-nu yi-na-ša-ra-ni, "Inasmuch as the king, my lord, writes, 'Guard yourself,' who will guard me?" (EA 119:8-10; Rainey 1975b:416); *i-nu-ma / i-qa-bu šâr-ru EN-ia / ú-šur-mì ra-ma-an-ka / ù ú-šur URU šâr-ri / ša it-ti-ka iš-t[u] / ma-ni i-na-ša-ru-na / ra-ma-ni-ia ù URU [šâr-ri]*, "Inasmuch as the king, my lord, says, 'Guard yourself and the city of the king that is in your charge,' with what will I guard myself and the king's city?" (EA 125:7-13; Moran 1950a:68; cf. also EA 117:83 ff.; 122:9 ff.).

The above examples illustrate the fact that the response itself may also be framed as a rhetorical question; also the following:

[i]-nu-ma ša-pár ^rLUGAL¹ b[e-lí] / al!^r-ka-m[i] ^rù¹ [du-gu-ul pa-ni] / [LUGA]L be-l[í]-k[a a-na] / [m]a-an-[n]i e[-zi-bu URU LUGAL ù] /

da-[na-a]t-[m]i nu- KÚR [UGU-ia], "[In]asmuch as the king, [my] lo[rd] has written, 'Come and [look on the face of [the kin]g, your lord', [w]hy should I [abandon the city of the king while] hostility is st[ron]g [against me]?" (EA 306:12-16; Moran 1987b:534 n. 1-2; 1992:344 nn. 1-2).

Unlike pharaoh's repeated admonitions to protect himself, expressed by indicative imperfect, this particular "invitation" to visit the royal court was a single message, as expressed by the suffix conjugation. Similarly, Rib-Haddi has to make excuses for not fulfilling another specific order, this time from a senior official:

i-nu-ma ta-aš-tap-ra a-na ia-ši / a-lik-mi i-zi-iz a-na URUŠu-mu-ur / a-di ka-ša-di-ia / [t]i-de i-nu-ma nu-kúr-tu₄MEŠ / KAL.GA ma-gal UGU-ia / ù ú-ul i-le-ú'(!) a-la-[ká]m, "Inasmuch as you have written to me, 'Go, take up a position at Šumur until my arrival,' [be] apprised that there is very great hostility against me and I am unable to go!" (EA 102:14-19; Moran 1950a:68).

Such a "that"-clause appears in a letter from an important official to Rib-Haddi. The text in question has definite West Semitic features in its verbal morphology and syntax. Therefore, it is not possible to use this example as a case of West Semitic influence on Egyptian scribes, since the author of this epistle was most likely a Canaanite or at least of some related West Semitic origin. It should be noted, incidentally, that the response clause is interrogative, and unless it is meant to be satirical, it cannot be viewed like the rhetorical questions so often employed by Rib-Haddi.

i-[n]u!-ma! / táq-bu-ú la-a-mi / an-ti-in₄-nu e-re-eb / LÚ.MEŠ ša URUŠu-mu-ri KI / [a-n]a URU.KI-ia mu-ta-nu-mi / i-na URUŠu-mu-ri[KI] / mu-ta-nu-ú UG[U-ḫi] LÚ.MEŠú ù i-na [UGU-ḫ]i / ANŠÈ.MEŠ, "Inasmuch as you say, 'I am not permitting the entry of the men of Šumur into my city; there is a pestilence in Šumur,' is it a pestilence agai[nst] people or

agai[inst] donkeys?" (EA 96:6-14; Youngblood 1962:26; Rainey 1978a:10* n. 45).

It should be noted that the communication in these *inūma*-clauses need not always derive from the addressee of the response. The following example is a reply to the king about a statement by the commissioner:

*ša-ni-tam i-nu-ma yi-iq-bi 1Ia-an-ḥa-mu / [na-a]d-na-ti-mi ŠE.IM.ḪÁ
a-na 1Ri-ib- dIŠKUR . . . 1mi1-1na1 1na1-da-an 1šu1-1ut1 1a1-na ia-šši,*
"Furthermore, inasmuch as Yanḥamu has said, 'I have given
grain to Rib-Haddi . . . , ' what has he given to m(e)?" (EA
85:23-28).

In the spring of 1983, these examples were presented in a seminar of the Semitic Linguistics Department, Tel Aviv University. Naftali Kinberg responded with parallels from Classical Arabic in which the adverbial clause is introduced by *ʔammā* and its synonyms. Subsequently, Kinberg published a detailed study of sentences made up to two clauses (Kinberg 1985:353-416), the initial clause being the topic (logical predicate) and the following clause being the comment (logical predicate). He credits Bravmann (1953:18-19) with being the first scholar to observe that the relationship between adverbial clauses in front position and their main clauses was comparable to that of isolated topics (nouns, sentence adverbials, etc.) to their comments. Kinberg's essay provides extensive documentation of the phenomenon and of the many particles, besides *ʔammā*, that can introduce the initial adverbial clause. His research demonstrates that in Classical Arabic, such clause constructions were restricted to conditional and temporal clauses, while a wider range of usages has developed in Modern Standard Arabic. The comment clause is generally introduced by *fa-*, but it may also be introduced by *wa-* or *la-*.

In contrast to the many different Arabic particles and adverbs that can introduce the initial, topic clause, the Amarna texts from Canaan seem to employ only the Akkadian

subordinating temporal conjunction, *inūma*. The lack of examples with other particles might be due to the limited nature of the corpus, of course, but given the large number of examples that we were able to muster, it seems unlikely that our total sample is merely fortuitous.

Furthermore, unlike the Arabic construction, the Amarna sentences we have adduced all seem to introduce the comment clause without a conjunction. This is all the more remarkable since, contrary to classical Akkadian usage, the conditional sentences in the same corpus usually introduce the apodosis by the conjunction *u*. So in a formal sense one may say that the *inūma*-clauses are essentially temporal clauses. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that they are filling the syntactical position of the logical subject in a compound sentence. The pattern of such compound sentences may be viewed as an application of the Semitic non-verbal clause pattern, the so-called nominal clause, in which there are two main elements, a grammatical subject as topic and a grammatical predicate as comment. When viewed in this light, the *inūma*-clauses discussed in this section may be seen to fill the slot of the grammatical (and logical) subject. In other words, the *inūma*-clauses may be adverbial in essence (basically temporal clauses) but they are serving as substantive clauses.

As we have noted above, this exclusive use of *inūma* in all the types of clauses enumerated above is striking, since the native West Semitic tongue(s) of the scribes undoubtedly had *kî*. Evidently they were saving Akkadian *kî* for special usages only. In any event, a "that"-clause with *inūma* stands in juxtaposition to an interrogative *kî* in the response:

*i-nu-ma šap-ra-ta / a-na ia-a-ši ú!-šur!-mî / LÚ.MEŠ ša ša-ab-tu
URU / ki-i uš-šur-ru-na LÚ.MEŠ* "Since you have written to me,
'Guard the men who seized the city,' how shall I guard the
men?" (EA 252:5-8; Albright 1943b:30; Rainey 1974:306;
1975b:417; cf. *infra*, p. 137).

kî. As a conjunction, this particle is rare in the WS texts. The spellings vary from *ki* to *ki-i* to one example of *ke-e* or *ki-i*₁₅.

The following seem to be all we have (for prepositional *kî*, cf. *supra*, p. 38; for the interrogative modal adverb, cf. *supra*, pp. 137-138).

The basic function of conjunctive *kî* is temporal:

u ki yi-ša-ma "and when it (they) was (were) heard" (EA 227:10; Rainey 1975b:422).

The following is from a text showing northern features and has only a doubtful connection with the WS corpus (Artzi 1968):

a-na-ku ki-i₁₅ i-qa-bi / LUGAL GAL *be-li* / *a-na-ku* *iš-me a-wa-ti* / *ša* LUGAL GAL *be-li-ia* / ^dUTU *a(!)-na sa-me* "I, when the Great King, my lord, would speak, I heard the word(s) of the Great King, my lord, the Sun from heaven" (EA 260:6-10).

The most clearly Canaanite passage is in the famous proverb about the ants:

ki-i na-am-lu / *tu-um-ḥa-šú* "When ants are smitten" (EA 252:16-17; Campbell 1965:195; Albright 1943b:31).

One could also interpret the *kî* here as a conditional particle "If" (Brown, Driver and Briggs 1952:473). However, in the same epistle, there is a clear usage of *kî* in two circumstantial clauses:

i-na nu-kúr-ti₇ ṣa-ab-ta-at-mi URU / *ki it-mi ṣa-li-mi ù ki it-mi it-ta^l-mi* / I^{LUGAL} *it-ti-ia* "By hostile action the city was taken, even though I had sworn oaths of peace and even though, when I swore, an official swore with me" (EA 252:9-11; Albright 1943b:30; Campbell 1965:195).

Cases can be cited of *kî* in the meaning "because" (CAD K:319b):

ù t[i-]iq-bu / *a-na ṣa-a-šu al-lu-ú-mi* BA.BAD / *be-èl-nu ki-i ta-aq-bu mi-it* / ^lRi-ib-ad-di "And they said to him, 'Our lord is

dead,' because they said, 'Rib-Haddi is dead' (EA 138:63-66; cf. CAD A/1:358b).

Also, from Jerusalem:

ù la-a a-mur 2.IGI.MEŠ LUGAL / EN-ia *ki-i nu-kúr-tú* / *a-na muḥ-ḫi-ia* "I have not seen the two eyes of the king, my lord, because there is hostility against me" (EA 288:30-32; CAD K:319b).

Another possible instance:

ki-i a-na-ku i-ša-ḫa-tu "Because I am afraid (or: intimidated)" (EA 252:20; Albright 1943b:31 n. 20).

Ebeling (1915:1438) posited an adverbial usage, viz. "thus," but most of his examples can be explained as the subordinating conjunction, "according to, as" (CAD K:319b), e.g.

ki-i ni-pu-šu iš-tu¹ / *da-ri-ti₇* / *ki-i ka-li* LÚḫa-za-nu-ti₇ / *ki ép-pu-šu a-na* LUGAL / *bé-li-ia* "Just as we have always done, like all the city rulers, thus I (will) do for the king, my lord" (EA 212:6-10; Rainey 1978b:70).

Here the final clause, in line 9, would normally be introduced by *kīnanna* (cf. *infra*, pp. 141-142); perhaps the scribe was influenced here by the function of *kī* in affirmations and oaths (cf. *infra*, pp. 92-93), but he should have inserted the negative *lā* for a positive asseveration.

In two other passages (EA 182:6 and EA 202:11), Knudtzon (1915:695 n. e, 734 n. a) felt that *ki* was simply an error for *ù* and he may well have been right.

As one would expect, *kī* can also introduce "that"-clauses (cf. non-WS, EA 35:12, 35; 38:15, etc.):

ki-i qa-bi-mì / *i-na pa-ni-ka* "Inasmuch as it is said in your presence . . ." (EA 256:4-5; Albright 1943a:11 and Moran

1987b:483 = 1992:309 render "How?"); *ù ki-i i-qa-bu* LUGAL "And inasmuch as the king says . . ." (EA 106:30; Moran 1950a:165 and 1987b:302; 1992:179 reads "How?").

Although both passages admit of the rendering, "How?" for *kî* (cf. *infra*, pp. 137-138), the resemblance to similar clauses with verbs of speaking/writing introduced by *inūma* (cf. *supra*, pp. 83-89) is striking. Therefore, the suggestion seems appropriate here that "inasmuch as" may have been the scribe's original intention of *kî* in these two places.

One final usage deserves special attention though it is attested in only three WS texts. It is *kî* in oaths of asseveration, both negative and positive (*GAG*:240, §185j and 185k respectively). The *CAD* (K:321a) classifies these as interrogatives but *AHw* (469b), following *GAG* (*loc. cit.*), includes them under the subordinating conjunction. Thus, they will be treated here. The key passage was noted many years ago by Delitzsch (1909-10:164):

ša-ni-tam ki-i₁₅ šum-m[a / a-na DAM-ia ša-pár šār-rù / ki-i₁₅ a-kal-lu-ši ki-i₁₅ / šum-ma a-na ia-ši / ša-pár šār-ru / šu-ku-un GĪR ZABAR / i-na lib-bi-ka ù / BA.BAD ke-e la-a / ep-pu-šu ši-pf-ir-ti šār-ri "Furthermore, (god forbid) that, if the king had written for my wife, (god forbid) that I should withhold her! (god forbid) that, if he had written to me, 'Put a bronze knife into your heart and die,' (god forbid) that I should not carry out the king's bidding!" (EA 254:38-46; cf. Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:486b; Moran 1987b:481; 1992:307).

The second instance comes from a Taanach letter and was first noted by Holma (1914):

ù a-nu-ma a-na-¹din¹ / 50 KÙ.BABBAR.ḤÁ ki la e-[e]p?-pu-šu "And now, I will give 50 (shekels of) silver; (god forbid) that I should not do so!" (TT 1:10-11; Rainey 1977:36 n. 21).

And lastly, there is the following:

ù / aq-bi ki-i i-te₉-pu-šu a-na ša-šu / ù i-zi-bu LUGAL be-li "And I said, '(God forbid) that I should join him and abandon the king, my lord!' (EA 138:45-47; Rainey 1973c:254; 1977:36 n. 21).

The positive asseverations with *lā* and the negatives without it (cf. *infra*, pp. 225-226) seem to confirm the approach of von Soden as against *CAD* and others, who see here the *kī* as an interrogative. The use of *kī* in other oath formulae is documented by *CAD* K:318b, and classified as a function of the subordinating conjunction.

kīma. Although it is a widely used conjunction in Akkadian (*CAD* K:363 ff.), *kīma* hardly appears in this function in the EA letters. A popular form in peripheral areas is *kīmē*, but none of the EA examples is from a WS text (*CAD* K:366-367a). Six certain instances of *kīma* governing a subordinate clause are known. Two of them can be rendered by "as," viz.

a-nu-ma / ki-ma iš-[tap-]ru a-na ka-ta₅ UGU / URUŠu-mu-ra a-nu-ma i-ti-lik "Now, as I wrote about Šumur, now I went . . ." (EA 114:26-28; Moran emended to *ki-~~a~~-ma*, 1950a:19; 1987b:317 n. 4; 1992:189 n. 5); *ki-ma pa-na-nu-um i-te₉-lu* ḪR-Aš-[r]a-tu₄ / a-na šé-ri-ia "As formerly 'Abdi-Ashirta used to come up against me" (EA 127:31-32; Moran 1950a:124a n. 104; 1987b:343 n. 7; 1992:208 n. 7; Rainey 1971c:88; 1973c:257; 1989-90:61b).

The others introduce substantival "that"-clauses, as illustrated by the following examples:

[ti-]de₉ ki-i-ma / 'la¹-mi-in šum-ka / a-na pa-ni LUGAL "[Be] apprised that your name is vilified before the king!" (EA 97:4-6; *CAD* L:123).

There are three texts with *kīma* introducing a "that"-clause that share other stylistic features (Na³aman 1979:676-677); his use of *kīma* as the subordinating conjunction is an additional point to enhance their common regional origin:

ù *yi-il₅-ma-ad šàr-ri* EN-ia / *ki-ma da-na-at* KÚR.NU UGU-ia "And may my king, my lord, be apprised that hostility is strong against me!" (EA 64:8-9); *yi-il₅-ma-ad* ¹*šàr-ri* EN-ia / *ki-ma* 30 URU.DIDLI.MEŠ *ip-pu-uš* / KÚR.NU *a-na ia-ši* "May my king, my lord, be apprised that thirty towns made (are making) war against me!" (EA 283:18-20); *li-il₅-¹ma-¹ad* / ¹*šàr-ri* EN-ia *ki-ma* / ¹*na¹-ki-ra-at* ^{URU}*La-ki-ši* / ù *ša-¹ab¹-¹ta¹-at* ^{URU}*Mu-ú²-ra-aš-ti* "May my king, my lord, be apprised that Lachish has become hostile and Mu²rašti has been seized!" (EA 335:14-17).

šumma. There are a few instances when *šumma* can only be rendered "because, since," much in the manner as *inūma*. Knudtson had translated "denn" in such cases but Moran (1950a:11-12; 1953) rejected that and argued for taking *šumma* as, "behold." Although he was correct in insisting that "if" made no sense in any of these contexts, his own suggestion does not carry conviction. Even Moran was forced to admit that *šumma* appears in one of the passages in question in parallel with *aššum* and that at least two others have clear parallels with *inūma*, not *šumma* (Moran 1953:78 n. 2). The former is in an evidently non-WS letter from Alashia:

šum-ma i-na KUR-ia ŠU-ti ^dMAŠ.MAŠ EN-li-ia *gáb-ba* / LÚ.MEŠ *ša* KUR-ia *i-du-uk* ù *e-pf-iš* URUDU *ia-nu* "Since, in my land, the hand of Nergal, my lord, has slain all the men of my land, there is no copper worker" (EA 35:13-14).

Further on the same scribe writes:

aš-šum ŠU-ti ^dMAŠ.MAŠ *i-ba-aš-ši i-na* KUR-ia "Because the hand of Nergal is in my land" (EA 35:37).

Perhaps the Alashian scribe simply confused *šumma* with *aššum* so that the first instance is simply a mistake.

Now we must take up the parallels between *šumma* and *inūma*. First, a well known example of *šumma* which Moran did not cite:

ú-ul ta-qa-al-mi a-na ÌR-ka šum-ma / GA.KAL nu-kúr-tu₄ ša ERÍN.MEŠ GAZ UGU-⟨ia⟩ "Don't ignore your servant because the enmity of the *ʿapîrû* troops is strong against ⟨me⟩" (EA 74:13-14).

The function of *šumma* can be seen by comparison with this syntactically parallel reference:

ú-ul / ia-qú-ul LUGAL a-na i-¹pé¹-ši / an-nu-ú i-nu-ma di-ka / LÚMAŠKÍM "May the king not ignore this deed because the commissioner is slain!" (EA 132:43-46).

The first parallel discussed by Moran is:

AŠ É NIN.IB pu-ḥu-ru-nim-mi ù / ni-ma-qú-ut!(WA) UGU URUGub-la šum-ma ia-[nu] / LÚ-li ša ú-še₂₀-ze-bu-[š]e! iš-tu qa-ti-n[u] "Assemble ye at Bīt-NIN.IB and we will fall on the city of Byblos because there is n[o] man that can save it(!) from o[ur] hand" (EA 74:31-33; Mendenhall 1947a:123-124; Moran 1953:78 n. 4; 1987b:250, 251 n. 4, 252 n. 11; 1992:143, 144 n. 4),

which must be compared with

i-nu-ma / ›[i]-nu-ma⟨ ia-nu LÚ ša ú-še-ze-ba-an-ni / [iš]-tu qa-ti-šu-nu "because there is no man who can save me from their hand" (EA 74:43-45).

The next parallel pair quoted by Moran is:

ú-ul ia-qú-ìl-mi LUGAL be-li iš-tu / URU-li^{KI} šum-ma ma-gal ma-ad / KÛ.BABBAR GUŠKIN a-na lib-bi-ši "May the king, my lord, not ignore the city since very abundant is the silver and gold within it!" (EA 137:59-61); *i-nu-ma ma-id mi-mu-šu ki-ma / a-ia-ab* "because its wealth is as great as the ocean" (EA 89:46-47).

Such parallels indicate that *šumma* is functioning like *inūma*; since these are WS texts, there is no way to compare the

indicative-subjunctive modes as required for these respective particles in normative Akkadian. In the two examples where *šumma* carries enclitic *-mi*, from a Megiddo letter, the same meaning "because" is evident (again *contra* Moran *loc. cit.*):

*la-a-mi / yi-iš-bat-ši / ¹La-ab-a-yu / šum-ma-mi ga-am-ra-at-mi /
 URU.KI-ia BA.BAD / *i-na mu-ta-a-am* "May Lab²ayu not seize it
 because the city is being destroyed by pestilence!"
 (EA 244:24-32); *la-a-mi yi-iš-bat-ši / ¹La-ab-a-yu šum-ma-mi /
i-ia-nu pa-ni-ma / ša-nu-ta₅ i-na / ¹La-ab-a-yi "May Lab²ayu not
 capture it because Lab²ayu has no other intention!"
 (EA 244:37-41; Moran 1953:79;).**

Moran rendered *šummami* as "Behold" in the first passage and "Lo" in the second (1953:79); later he translated both of them "Vois" (Moran 1987b:468) and "Look" (Moran 1992:298). But Campbell (1965:193) translated both examples by "Truly," while Albright, Mendenhall and Moran (1955:485a) render them "Verily." "Because" or "since" would seem best to express the original intention of the scribe.

It remains to cite two other texts in which *šumma* has this same conjunctive function:

ù uš-ši-⟨ra⟩ LÚ.MEŠ ma-ša-ar-ta / a-na URUŠu-mu-ra ù / a-na
 URU¹Ir¹-qa-ta *šum-ma / in₄na-¹ab¹-tu ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ ma[-ša-]ar-ti*
iš-tu / URUŠu-mu-[r]a "So send garrison troops to Šumur and to
 ʿIrqata because all of the garrison troops have fled from
 Šumur!" (EA 103:34-39); *ša-ni-tam šum-ma LÚ.MEŠ / ḥa-za-nu-tu₄*
la-a na-a[d-nu] / pa-ni-šu-nu a-na mu-ḥi-šu-[nu] / ù ki-na-na
da-an-¹nu¹! "Furthermore, because the city rulers have not set
 their faces against them, so thus they are strong(!)"
 (EA 108:34-37; Moran 1953:79; 1950a:167).

With regard to the latter passage, Moran (1953:79; 1950a:167) had preferred to render *šumma* by "behold." However, he has changed his translation to "depuis que," "since," in his recent editions (Moran 1987b:306; 1992:182).

Two other passages usually brought into this discussion will be dealt with further on: EA 112:25 where *šumma* really seems to mean "if" (cf. *infra*, p. 189); and EA 109:50-55, where we have a case of "[either] . . . or" (cf. *infra*, p. 185-186).

Another conjunctive function parallel to *inūma* is the introduction of object clauses. In this usage, *šumma* has the meaning "whether (or not), if." Therefore, it will be treated in connection with *šumma* as a conditional particle (cf. *infra*, pp. 183-185).

For a brief summary of the problems concerning the obscure etymology of *šumma*, cf. *infra*, p. 183.

COORDINATING

The conjunction used for coordinating words, phrases and clauses is the Akkadian *u*. The roles of the enclitics, *-ma* and *-mi/-mì*, will be discussed *infra*, pp. 227-248. They do not function as conjunctions in the WS EA texts. Neither is there any evidence for the WS *wa*, which must be posited for Canaanite and other dialects on the basis of Ugaritic, Hebrew and Arabic, etc. Nor is there any trace of a **pa/fa* conjunction (cf. Ugaritic *p*, Arabic *fa*).

ORTHOGRAPHY. As would be expected, the conjunction is most often written with the cuneiform sign *ù*, but there are certain instances when the *u*-sign (Winkelhaken) is used, especially in learned pairs. Note, for example:

7-*šu u 7-ta-a-an* "seven times and seven times" (EA 328:13);
 KÁM.U₄ / *u mu-ša* "day and night" (EA 315:12); *ka-1bat¹-tum-ma*
u 1ši¹-ru-ma "on the belly and on the back" (EA 320:14-15); EN-*ia*
u dUTU-ia u DINGIR.MEŠ-ia "My lord and my Sun and my
 Deity" (EA 243:6).

Contrast the last passage with another from the same letter:

EN-*ia u dUTU-ia / ù a-nu-um-ma* "my lord and my Sun; and now
 . . ." (EA 243:9-10),

where the scribe reverts to *ù* when beginning a new sentence. However, EA 365, also from Megiddo, uses the Winkelhaken as the narrative conjunction.

Even more rare, of course, are the instances when some scribe uses *ú* for the conjunction (Knudtzon 1915:406 n. a., 418 n. f; Youngblood 1961:260). Thrice it occurs in the Byblos correspondence (EA 84:32; 87:18; 88:10). Some particularly N. Syrian letters (Artzi 1968), which may not be WS in grammar at all, also have it (EA 260:3; 317:7, 15, 19, 25). Finally, a letter from Ḥizīri uses it throughout (EA 337:15[?], 17, 18, 24). One should note, on the other hand, that in this entire corpus, *ù* is never used as a syllable within a word but only as the conjunction.

FUNCTIONS. Nowhere is the non-Akkadian flavor of the WS EA tablets more evident than in the use of the *u* conjunction. Whereas in classical Akkadian usage, the *u* expresses only simple coordination (GAG 170-171, §117b), in these letters it can reflect any number of logical relationships between the clauses.

When coordinating nouns, etc., the Akkadian often has the *u* conjunction between the last two if there are three or more. This practice is found in the N. Syrian, "Hurrianized" epistles, e.g.

GU₄.MEŠ UZ.MEŠ *ù* MUŠEN.MEŠ "oxen, goats, and fowl"
(EA 161:12; cf. Na²aman apud Rainey 1978b:70).

The same practice is found in the letters from Jerusalem (EA 287:16; 290:8-10). Longer lists may not employ the conjunction at all, for example, with commodities (EA 324:12-14), implements (KL 72:600:14-19), towns (EA 256:24-27), or people (EA 123:36-37).

The coordination of learned pairs in the WS EA corpus is by *u*, as seen in many examples (e.g. "day and night," *supra*, , p. 2). This reflects another difference between classical Akkadian and West Semitic, viz. the use in the former of the *status absolutus* for natural pairs (GAG:79, §62i). Since the West Semitic languages did not develop the *status absolutus*, the conjunction is employed to join the two members of such word pairs, as in biblical Hebrew.

zāqēn wānā^car "old and young" (Jer. 51:22).

A frequent logical pair in the EA letters is "infantry and chariotry (= army)," which takes the conjunction even though it is a sort of merism:

qa-du ERÍN.MEŠ-ia / ù^{Giš}GIGIR.MEŠ-ia "with my infantry and my chariotry" (EA 205:14-15).

Compare also,

a-bu ù be-lu at-ta-ma "You are a father and a master (to me)" (EA 73:36).

Two commodities may also be joined by the conjunction, especially in a direct quotation rather than in epistolary narrative, for example:

li-qé-ma GUŠKIN! ù GUŠKIN.SU₆ "to take gold and red gold" (EA 283:12; CAD B:322b).

Note the treatment of the "natural pair," viz. the "infantry and chariotry," in the following passage where the two members are joined together by *ù* and are dependent upon one preposition (as in EA 205:14-15 previously cited); with regard to the other groups that follow, each is introduced by *ù* and is dependent on its own preposition:

qa-du / ERÍN.MEŠ-ia ù^{Giš}GIGIR.MEŠ-ia / ù qa-du ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ia / ù qa-du LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ-ia / ù qa-du LÚ.MEŠ Su-ti7-ia "with my army (infantry and chariotry), and with my colleagues (brothers), and with my 'renegades' (*apîrû*), and with my bedouin (*Sutû*)" (EA 195:24-29;).

By contrast, one may note the following example, in which each of the two members of this "natural pair" is dependent on its own preposition:

qa-du / ERÍN.MEŠ-*ia* *ù qa-du* ^{GIŠ}GIGIR.MEŠ-*ia* / *ù qa-du gáb-bi*
 ŠEŠ.MEŠ-*ia* "with my infantry and with my chariotry and with
 all my colleagues" (EA 189:6-8).

Finally, there is an interesting repetition of the conjunction with another frequent pair, "forward (on the stomach) and backward (on the back),"

ù ka-ba-tu-ma / *ù šú-ú²-ru-ma* "both on the stomach and on the
 back" (EA 282:6-7; also EA 211:5-6).

This latter reminds one of Hebrew *gam . . . gam* (e.g. 1 Sam. 28:15).

As a clause conjunction, *u* fulfills a much wider range of functions than in standard Akkadian. Straight coordination of clauses, the usual Akkadian role, is naturally evident in these letters also, both for independent and relative clauses, as seen in the following example:

a-na-ku ÌR *ki-ti-ka* / *ù a-wa-ta ša-a i-de* / *ù ša eš-te-me aš-pu-^rru¹* "I
 am your loyal servant, and the word which I know and which I
 have heard, I write (to the king)" (EA 108:22-24).

Whereas Akkadian prefers the *-ma* enclitic with a string of logically connected clauses, the WS EA texts use *u* (Moran 1950a:16).

Scholars have long been aware that the *u* conjunction in the EA archive is used to link clauses which have some semantic connection (Müller 1906:3-7). This is true not only for series where classical Akkadian uses *-ma*, but also for some clause combinations where normative Akkadian would have joined them asyndetically. The syntax of the Canaanite EA letters is thoroughly paralleled in this respect by biblical Hebrew (Böhl 1909:75; Moran 1950a:15-16).

The ensuing discussion is based largely on Moran's analysis (1950a:15-16) with examples gleaned from various chapters in his work (Byblos texts) and from other texts in the WS EA tradition.

First of all, there are virtual relative clauses that can be introduced by *u* rather than *ša* or one of the other pronouns having relative function (GAG:220, §168). The best known examples are from the avowals of "canine servility" (cf. Rainey 1971c:98-99). One example actually employs a true Akkadian relative clause:

[*u*] *ma-an-¹nu¹-mi* LÚ¹*kal¹-bu* / *ša la-a yi-iš-¹mu¹* / *a-na a-wa-te*^{MEŠ}
LUGAL / EN-*šu* "[But] who is the do^g that would not give
heed to the words of the king, his lord?" (EA 319:19-22).

Nevertheless, it should not be assumed that the *-u* suffix on the verb is Akkadian subjunctive. The same suffix is employed in other texts where there is no formal subordination. That construction in EA 319:19-22 contrasts sharply with the strongly Canaanite syntax of the various parallel texts in which the relative clause is appended by the use of *u* conjunction, e.g.

mi-ia-mi / LÚ¹UR.GI₁₂ *u la-a* / *yi-iš-te-mu a-wa-ta₅* / LUGAL EN-*ia*
"Who is the dog that he would not heed the word of the king,
my lord?" (EA 323:17-20; Rainey 1978b:75; also EA 324:16-17;
similarly EA 315:16-17; 201:14-16; 232:12-15; 255:12-14; 378:18-
26; Müller 1906:3-7).

Many of Moran's "result clauses" with *u* (Moran 1950a:79) are actually derivations from this "canine servility" (EA 71:16-19; 76:11-14; 79:45-46; 85:63-65; 88:10; 104:17-24; 116:67-69; 125:40-44).

Secondly, substantival clauses as the object of verbs of hearing or knowing can be introduced by the *u* conjunction:

ù i-še₂₀-mé *ù ia-nu-um* ¹*mi¹-¹im¹-ma* / *ù i-nu-ma ia-nu-um* LÚ¹.MEŠ
ti-¹la¹-¹ta₅¹ "and he hears *that* there are no supplies and *that*
there are no support troops . . ." (EA 92:21-22; Rainey
1975b:421).

The parallel between *ù* and *ù i-nu-ma* in the two object clauses provides extra confirmation (Moran 1950a:67).

Another parallel with *inūma* is the introduction of causal clauses:

*mi-na / i-pu-šu-na ù a-na-ku / la-a i-le-ú a-la-¹ka₁₃ / a-na
 Šu-mu-ra* "What shall I do *since* I am unable to go to Šumur?"
 (EA 104:36-39; Moran 1950a:70).

The apodosis of a conditional sentence is nearly always introduced by *u* (for the exceptions, cf. Moran 1950a:71). Moran has observed that conditional sentences are essentially two independent clauses coordinated by the so-called *waw of apodosis* (Moran 1950a:75). But this conjunction can better be called the *waw of succession* and is comparable to Arabic *fa* (Joüon 1923:319; Moran 1950a:38-39, 121-122 n. 92, 135-136 n. 199). Although this syntagma is quite at home in the WS dialects, it must be noted that the use of *u* to introduce the apodosis of a conditional sentence was already in vogue in various older Akkadian dialects. Of course, such was not the usage in normative Akkadian, especially of OB where, e.g. the individual laws of *CH* are framed as conditional sentences, the apodosis being introduced asyndetically. This is generally the rule with conditional sentences in OA but there are a few instances when the apodosis is introduced by the conjunction *u* (Hecker 1968:235-236, §138a).

A most significant area where *u* also serves to introduce the apodosis is in OB Mari, as noted by Finet (1956:225-226 §§82c-f), who cites, e.g.

šum-ma wa-ši-ib-ma / ù li-il-qú-ši "If she is there, then let them take her" (ARM 5, 7:17-18; cited by Finet 1956:240 §85f).

In spite of the OA examples, Finet assumes that this feature represents WS influence in the Mari dialect of Akkadian. Whatever the case, it may be that the Hurrians who founded the Mitanni kingdom inherited this syntactical feature from the Amurrite cultural centers of N. Syria. The Mitanni EA letters display the use of *u* to introduce the apodosis of conditional sentences (Adler 1976:79):

a-ma-a-te^{MES} š[a at-t]-i-ma i-na pí-ki a-[na ia-ši] / ta-aq-ta-bi ù a-na pa-ni¹Na-ap-[hur-ri-ia] / am-mi-[ni la-]a ta-at-ru-uš šum-ma [at-ti-i] / a-na pa-[ni-š]u la ta-tar-ra-aš ù m[a-an-nu] / ša-[nu-ú] i-de₄ "The words whi[ch yo]u, yourself, spoke t[o me], wh[y did you no]t spell out before Nap[huria (Amenhotep IV)?] If [you] do not spell (them) out, then w[ho] el[se] knows (about them)?" (EA 26:49-53);

even in cases where *šumma* may better be rendered "since,"

ù šum-ma ap-pu-na a-na ši-ip-ri-im-ma ep-še-et / ù aš-šum an-ni-ti ah-tá-du dan-niš-ma "And if (since), moreover, it (the gold) is worked, then because of this I rejoiced greatly" (EA 19:51-52; AHw:1246b).

The next question that arises is how this use of *u* in the apodosis reached Nuzi. Was it by way of N. Syria? Or did it come to them from Assyrian? Although there are many Nuzi examples in which the protasis and the apodosis are asyndetic, use of the *u* of apodosis is not particularly uncommon (e.g. JEN 437:8-12; 441:12-14; 449:6-14; Gordon 1938:229). At the other end of the Mitannian/Hurrian spectrum of social and political influence, viz. at Alalakh, the usual means of introducing the apodosis is parataxis, but our *u* of apodosis does occur rarely in the texts from Stratum IV (e.g. AT 16:18; Giacomakis 1970:63). Furthermore, there is occasional use of the *u* of apodosis in the Akkadian correspondence from Carchemish (Huehnergard 1979:124-125, with examples).

It is not so surprising to find the *u* of the apodosis in EA letters from Egypt (Cochavi-Rainey 1988:232-233, §2.10.1). Conditional clauses may be found both with and without the connecting *u*, even in the same epistle:

šum-ma ÌR ša LUGAL at-ta ki-i ki-i-it-ti / am-mí-ni la-a tá-a-ku-ul kar!-ší-šu "If you are a servant of the king in truth, why did you not malign him?" (EA 162:15-16); ù šum-ma / te-te-pu-uš ki-i ki-it-ti ù tá-am-mar te₄-em-ka "But if you have behaved sincerely,

then you are looking after your proper relationship (with me)"
(EA 162:25-26).

The EA epistles from Amurru also have the *u* of apodosis (Izre'el 1985:334-335, §4.6.1; EA 58:36-38). And given the fact that the *wa* conjunction serves this purpose in Ugaritic, it is not surprising that the Akkadian texts from Ugarit often make use of it (Huehnergard 1979:330-331 and n. 580)

The Akkadian version of the treaty between Ramesses II and Ḫattusili III, which was written in Egypt (Spalinger 1981:355-358), also has examples of the apodosis introduced by *u* (One of the better preserved passages is *KBo* 1, 7+ 25 + *KUB* 3, 11, 121 + 120:27-30; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:232-233).

That the *u* of apodosis (or of succession, cf. the discussion above) happens to be used extensively in the WS EA texts should not be surprising. Even if this construction can be shown to exist in various other Akkadian dialects (not in classical Babylonian or in normative Assyrian), most of the areas where it is attested could have received it as a WS calque during the great period of Amurrite cultural flowering in N. Syria and N. Mesopotamia. It is clearly a feature of the WS dialects documented in a later age. Therefore, the preference for the *u* of apodosis by the Canaanite scribes is most probably because it was standard in their WS mother tongue.

Numerous examples of conditional clauses from the WS EA texts are cited further on in the discussion of *šumma* and *inūma* as conditional particles (*infra*, pp. 187-192).

Two illustrations will be given here, one with *šumma* and another with *inūma*. As for the first:

šum-ma la-a ti-le-ú la-qa-ṽia'(?) / *iš-tu qa-at na-ak-ri-ia ù / te-ra-ni*
a-wa-ta₅ ù i-de / *ip-ša ša i-pu-šu* "If you are unable to rescue
'me'(?), from the hand of my enemy, then send word back to
me and I will know the thing that I must do" (EA 114:23-26;
Moran 1950a:170).

And the second:

i-nu-ma I ḫa-za-nu / lib-bu-šu it-ti lib-bi-ia / ù ú-ba-bi-ra
 𒌦R-A-ši-ir-ta / iš-tu ^{KUR}A-mur-ri "If just one city-ruler were on
 my side, then I would expel 'Abdi-Ashirta from Amurru"
 (EA 85:66-69; Greenberg 1955:37; Youngblood 1961:271; CAD
 D:188a).

Further instances can be cited in which the conjunction is followed by the suffix conjugation with future meaning, the so-called *waw conversive*, which is really this *waw of succession*. Today it is well established, thanks mainly to Moran, that forms of the suffix conjugation may express future action or state, either at the head of a clause introduced by *u* that are dependent on a preceding injunctive clause, or else in the apodosis of a conditional sentence (Moran 1950a:31-34; 1961:64-65). Of the former, a striking example is:

du-ku-mi / 'eṭ¹-la-ku-nu ù i-ba-sa-tu-nu ki-ma ia-ti-nu / ù
pa-aš-ḫa-tu-nu "Kill your prince and you will become like us and
 you will be at peace" (EA 74:25-27; Moran 1950a:31; Greenberg
 1955:34).

For the latter, note this compound apodosis with a jussive verb in one clause and two statives in the last two clauses, each introduced by the *u* conjunction:

šum-ma / 2 ITU ia-nu ERÍN.MEŠ pī-tá-ti / ù i-te₉-zi-ib URU.KI /
ù pa-aṭ-ra-ti ù bal-tá-at ZI-ia "If (within) two months, there are no
 troops, then I will abandon the city and I will depart and my life
 will be safe" (EA 82:41-45; Moran 1950a:74, 76).

The *waw of succession* does not appear to be a distinct morpheme. It is the *syntagma* that determines the continuative function, in this case with a future or optative (Ginsberg 1936b:177) of the suffix conjugation. The *u* conjunction can introduce a form of the suffix conjugation with past meaning just as it can introduce a form of the prefix conjugation in either past or future, including optative and injunctive. The important thing

to note is that the WS scribes were using *u* in these syntactic frames where normative Akkadian would not.

Temporal clauses can also be introduced by the *u* conjunction, e.g.

ʿmi¹-ia i-ra-mu ù a-mu-ʿta¹ "Who will be loyal when I die?"
(EA 114:68; Moran 1950a:73, 77, 79; Moran's collation).

Of special interest is coordination with the meaning "as soon as," "no sooner than," viz.

ú-ul / te₉-eš-mu-na mi-im-ma / ù šap-ru a-na ša-a-šu "No sooner do they hear something, then they write to him" (EA 82:10-12);
ù la-a ka-ši-id / i-re-šu ù uš-ši-ir-ti-šu "As soon as the request arrives, then I will send him" (EA 82:16-17; cf. Albright and Moran 1948:245 n. 13; Moran 1950a:38).

Result clauses can be linked to the preceding clause by wither *u* or *inūma*. Note the following:

*a-ʿna¹ mi-*ni* qa-la-ta ù ʿtu¹-ʿul¹-qú¹ / ʿKUR¹-ka* "Wh(y) are you silent (negligent) so that your land is taken?" (EA 83:15-16; Moran 1950a:79; Greenberg 1955:36; Youngblood 1961:243; also EA 91:4-5; cf. *supra*, pp. 76-77).

There are specifically WS constructions for expressing purpose by means of logically dependent clauses joined syndetically. Moran has shown that the purpose clause may contain an imperfect indicative if it is predicated on a clause with an imperfect, a stative, or a nominal (including adjectival) predicate; or it may have an injunctive if it is logically dependent upon a clause with an injunctive (Moran 1950a:81-88). The purpose clause in either case may be introduced by *u*. With the imperfect:

a-na mi-ni₇ / qa-la-ta ù la-a / ti-iq-bu a-na šār-ri / ù yu-wa-ši-ru-na
/ ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ti ù ti-il-te₉-qú-na URUŠu-mu-ra "Why do you

keep silent and don't speak to the king *that* he should send the army *in order that* it should seize Šumur?" (EA 71:10-16);

and with the jussive:

ù *uš-ši-ra* ERÍN.MEŠ / *pí-tá-ti* ù *ti-il-qé-šu* / ù *ta-ap-šu-uh* KUR LUGAL "So send the army *that* it may capture him *in order that* the land of the king may be at peace" (EA 107:29-31).

Even in the instances when the injunctive is introduced by *lū*, the clause may be coordinated by *u* (EA 87:9-13; 127:35-39). The negative purpose clause may have *ul* without the conjunction (e.g. EA 77:36-37), or *u lā*, as in this example:

ia-aq-bi LUGAL . . . ù *la ti-la-ku* "May the king speak . . . *in order that* they not go!" (EA 101:32-34).

Among the nuances expressed in WS by the conjunction, Moran (1950a:15-16) notes the *waw of sentiment* (after Joüon 1923:535-536, §177*m*; Joüon and Muraoka 1991:652, §177*m*), for example:

ù / *uš-ši-ru-na-ni* "so send me" (EA 71:22-23; cf. also EA 73:33-35; 74:34).

Note also ù *i-na-an-na* "so now" (EA 102:27), which Moran (1950a:16) compares with Hebrew *w^cattā^h*.

On occasion, the *u* conjunction has adversative force, e.g. ù *an-nu-uš i-na-an-na* "but now" (EA 73:17; also EA 71:21; 74:8; 76:33-37; 104:26; Moran 1950a:16). Only by evaluating the context can this be made clear. Note this example of *u lū* "or" in a very dramatic context:

id-na-^fni¹ / DAM-ka ù / DUMU.MEŠ-ka ù *lu-ú* / *im-ḥa-ša* "Give me your wife and your children or else I will surely smite!" (EA 270:18-21; cf. Izre'el 1978b:62-63, 67-68, who sees a negative disjunction = Heb. *wālô²*).

Moran (1987b:505 n. 5; 1992:324 n. 8) has also noted an example of the *waw explicativum* (cf. GKC:484 n. 1 [b]).

a-nu-ma / ¹Ia-an-ḫa-mu ù ra-bi-ši / ¹šàr-ri EN-ia yi-iq-b[i] / ¹šàr-ri EN-ia it-ti-šu "Now, Yanḫamu is the commissioner of the king, my lord; may my king, my lord, speak with him!" (EA 283:27-30).

CHAPTER IV

LOCATIVE ADVERBS

Under the classification of locative adverbs are included the specifically adverbial vocables which stand independently (though some of them may also depend on prepositions). They are presented according to semantic categories (following GAG:171-176, §118).

INTERROGATIVE

ayya. Though this particle meaning "where?" is common Semitic, it is not used in normative Akkadian. The PN's cited in CAD A/1:220b can all be explained as WS (even those from Oakk). The usual Akkadian forms are *ali* or expanded forms of *ayya* with deictic *-k* (*ayyakam*, *ayyiki²am*, et al.; GAG:171, §118a). The few instances of *ayyami* (or *ayyāmi*; AHw:24b) and *ayyati* / *ayyāti* may represent the current Canaanite locative interrogative:

*i-nu-ma yi-qa-bu a-na [pa-ni] / LUGAL ia-nu-mi ŠE.MEŠ
NINDA.MEŠ / a-ka-al ERÍN.MEŠ pi-tá-ti a-ia-mi* "If they say
be[fore] the king, 'There is no grain for bread,' where is the
food for the army?" (EA 131:41-43; CAD A/1:220b, wrongly
transcribes *a-WA-mi* in this passage, but cf. 240a); *a-ia-[mi] /
i-zi-zu-na a-na-ku* "Where shall I take my stand?" (EA 124:15-16).

The remaining forms are in a letter from Beirut, EA 138. This scribe preferred a spelling with the WA/YA sign (i.e. PI):

ʿa¹-ya-mi ti-il-qú LÚ.MEŠ a-na a-ša-bi / i-na ʿURU¹.KI "Whence
will you take people to dwell in the city?" (EA 138:41-42); *ta-aš-
pu-ru-na LÚ.MEŠ URUGub-la / a-ya-mi i-nu-ma ia-aš-pu-ru /
LUGAL be-èl-ka [a]ʿna¹ MAḤ-ka / a-ya-mi ERÍN.MEŠ [i]-ʿnu¹-ma
uš-ši-ra-at / a-na ka-a-ta₅* "The men of Byblos write, 'Where (are

they), if the king, your lord, is corresponding with you? Where are the troops, if they have been sent to you?" (EA 138:122-126; cf. *supra*, pp. 54, 73, 100).

One example with an enclitic *-ti* (cf. Krahmalkov 1969:203-204) has been noted by Moran (1984:299). The context is as follows:

⟨*la*⟩*a ia-aš-ku-un* [L]UGAL ŠĀ-šu / *i-na mi-im-mi ša yi-iš-ši-ru* /
¹*A-zi-ru a-na ša-šu mi-im-mu* / *ša yi-iš-ši-ru a-ya-ti Šu-mu-\ru* / *ù*
mi-im ¹*ha-za-ni* LUGAL / *š[a d]a-ak yi-iš-ši-ru* / *a-na ka-ta a-mur*
¹*A-zi-ru* / *ar-⟨nu⟩* LUGAL EN-*ia* "May the king [no]t pay attention to the property that ^cAziru is sending to him! The property that he is sending, whence (does it come)? (It is from) Šumur! And it is the property of the king's city-ruler wh[om he has s]lain that he is sending! Look, ^cAziru is a reb[el] to the king, my lord!" (EA 139:33-40).

ayyakam. The one interrogative form with deictic *-k-* comes from Shechem. Its correspondence to the Assyrian form, *ayyakam*, has been correctly noted by *AHw*:24a, while *CAD* A/1:232a wrongly classifies it with Babylonian *ayyikâ*. However, this apparent Assyrianism may just be accidental, i.e. deictic *-k-* and adverbial accusative *-am* have been added to the adverb treated in the previous section, viz. *ayya*. The context in question is somewhat awkward (cf. *infra*, p. 279):

yi-il-te-qué šar-ru / *mim-mi-ia ù mim-me* / ¹*Mil-ki-li-lì a-ia-ka-am*
 "The king is always taking my property, but where is the property of Milkili?" (EA 254:25-27; contrast Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:486a; Campbell 1965:197).

INDEFINITE

ayyaka(m)mi. The one instance of an indefinite locative adverb has been wrongly classified as an interrogative by *AHw*:24a and *CAD* A/1:232a (it should be on p. 229). As with the

interrogatives, the form is closer to the Assyrian *ayyakamma* than the Babylonian *ayyikâma*, but the phenomenon may be purely WS, especially with enclitic *-mi*.

ù *ia-nu a-ia-ka₄-mi ni-iš-kán* / LÚ.BA.UG₇ "And there is nowhere we can bury the dead" (EA 149:52-53; CAD A/1:232a; M/2:140b).

DEMONSTRATIVE

annakam. This clearly Assyrian form for "here" appears three times in letters from Amurru which reflect the "Mitannian" rather than the Canaanite style of grammar (Izre'el 1985:275, §4.1.1.1; 1991a:282, §4.1.1): *a-na-kà-am* (EA 167:25), *an-na-kam* (EA 170:5, 42). This adverb also occurs once in a Rib-Haddi letter from Byblos:

ia-nu-um LÚ.MEŠ^{KUR}*Mi-iš-ri* / [ša] *i-ri-bu-ni₇ an-na-kam* "There are no Egyptians [who] can enter here" (EA 127:18-19; CAD A/2:126).

annânum. Another adverbial formation, common to both OA and OB, is *anna* + *ān* + *um* = *annânum* (AHw:52). The one possible instance in EA is probably just the result of a scribal error (Knudtzon 1915:594 n. b):

ù *a-na-nu-um-ma šu-ši-ra-ku* "And here I am ready" (EA 141:24; CAD A/2:132a).

The conventional replies to instructions (which the above passage really is) have as their normal idiom either *a-nu-um-ma* "now" (e.g. EA 193:19-21) or *a-nu-ma* (e.g. EA 213:12-13; cf. *infra*, pp. 151-153), that is "I have heard the royal instructions and *now* I am ready."

annikâ. One Byblos letter exhibits this Babylonian form for the adverb "here," but both of the relevant contexts are too badly broken for certainty:

'an¹-ni¹-ka¹ (EA 95:19); [an!]-ni-ka¹ (EA 95:23; as restored by Youngblood 1961:95).

annikê(m)ma. This form, typical of Mari (cf. *CAD* A/2:132b for references), also appears in a troublesome passage from Megiddo:

yi-la-ku iš-tu ŠU-[ti-ia] / an-ni-ke-ma "They come from [my] char[ge] here" (EA 365:27-28; Rainey 1978b:31; Rabiner 1981:15 n. 8; Na²aman 1981b:143-144 n. 13; Izre²el 1987:83-84; Moran 1987b:561 n. 1; 1992:363 n. 1).

annikānu. This rare form, meaning "here," is patterned after demonstrative *annānum*, interrogative *ayyānu*, and possibly also *ašrānu*. It appears only in one Jerusalem text:

mu-še-ra-an-ni ^{LÚ}*ma-šar-ta* / \ *an-ni-ka-nu* "Send me a garrison, hither!" (EA 287:51-52).

Moran (1975b:154) observed that this adverb is another of the northern characteristics of the Jerusalem letters. Its other attestations are from texts sent to Ugarit from some neighboring countries (cf. *CAD* A/2:132b). So, as Moran insisted (1975b:165 n. 73), there was no reason for *CAD* to list the Jerusalem example as questionable.

ašrānu. The noun, *ašru* "place" with adverbial *-ānu(m)* serves as a common Babylonian adverb with the meaning "there." There is no example with the meaning "here" (*contra CAD* A/2:454b). The *aš-ra-nu* in EA 230:6 is the specific plural of *ašru*:

aš-ra-nu ša i-ba-ša-ti "the places where I am" (Rainey 1971b:161 n.48).

The other text, RS 7.383:7, also requires "there," not "here," as demonstrated by the many Ugaritic renderings of the same stock expression (Rainey *loc. cit.*).

Just once in our corpus the adverb stands by itself, without a governing preposition:

ù / i-ru-ub aš-ra-nu "and I will enter there" (EA 102:30-31).

In another Rib-Haddi letter it is dependent upon *ana*:

la-a-mi i-le-ù uš-šar / G¹⁵MÁ.MEŠ-ia a-na aš-ra-nu "I am unable to send my ships thither" (EA 126:7-8; Moran 1950a:174).

Another instance may be understood as a direct quotation from a letter by a high official to the ruler of Tyre. Adverbial *ašrānum*, with mimation, is dependent on *ištu*:

ù i-nu-ma taq-bu / a-na KUR.ḪÁ A-mur-ri a-wa-at-mi / ti-iš-teḡ-mé iš-tu aš-ra-¹nu¹-¹um¹ / tú-te-ra-am a-na ia-a-ti "And when you say concerning the lands of Amurru, 'The word that you have been hearing from there, send to me!'" (EA 145:23-26; CAD A/2:454a; Mangano 1990:176-177; Moran 1987b:376 n. 6; 1992:232 n. 6; cf. *supra*, p. 36, *infra*, p. 236).

The actual quote begins with the word marked by enclitic *-mi* and it is evidently a stock formula used by scribes over a wide area. The earliest documented instance of this locution occurs in a Taanach letter:

ù a-wa-taḡ ¹mi¹-¹im¹-¹ma¹ / ša ti-iš-mé / iš-tu aš-ra-nu-um / šu-up!¹-ra-am it-<ti>-i[a] "and whatever word that you have heard from there, send (in writing) to me!" (TT 1:15-18; Rainey 1977:41, 43-44).

The widespread use of the stock expression under discussion is further confirmed by its appearance in Ugaritic garb as a literal translation from the Akkadian prototype:

w . mnm / rgm . d . tšm^c / tmt . w . št / b . spr . ^cmy "And whatever word that you hear there, then put (it) in a letter to me" (KTU 2.10:16-19; Rainey 1971:160-161)

The adverb, *tmt* "there" is a translation of *ištu ašrānum* and serves the same function in the Ugaritic example as the latter in the Akkadian texts.

In one passage, *ištu ašrānum* is replaced by *ištu Kina^ci* "from Canaan":

LUGAL *be-li-ia iš-ta-pár a-na ia[-š]i / ša ta-aš-me iš-tu* KUR *Ki-na-á²-na / ù šu-pur a-na ia-ši* "The king, my lord has written to me: 'That which you have heard from within Canaan, send to me'" (EA 151:49-51; Rainey 1964; Mangano 1990:176-177; Moran 1992:238-239 nn. 4-6; *contra* Astour 1965:348 n. 22).

Various usages of this adverb also occur in the correspondence from Egypt (EA 1:12, 54; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:209-210, §2.6.1) and Amurru (EA 158:10; 169:13; 170:12; Izre'el 1985:282-283, §4.1.2.3.2).

pô^h? Many years ago Böhl (1909:71w §34a) suggested that *'bu¹-ú* in EA 104:53 was an example of Hebrew *pô^h* "here." This interpretation was also accepted by Moran (1987b:300 n. 5; 1992:178 n. 5). But when the context is examined, it can be seen that the correct rendering of the vocable in question is evidently as a 3rd m.pl. form from the suffix conjugation of *bu²²ú* "to seek" (Rainey 1978b:67, 87; 1989-90:59b). As is frequently the case with this verb, here it governs an infinitive in the accusative, an *ad hoc* construction on the part of the scribe, *innepša* in place of *nenpuša*. The passage is as follows:

*a-na URU*_I-*birš-ta / al-ka-<ti> ù 'bu¹-ú in₄-né-ep-ša / a-na LÚ.MEŠ* GAZ.MEŠ "I went to 'Ibirta but they sought to go over to the *'apîrû* men" (EA 104:51-53; Rainey 1989-90:59b; Youngblood 1961:249; Moran 1987a:211).

CHAPTER V

TEMPORAL ADVERBS

As with the previous chapter, discussion is focused on specifically adverbial words. Although they may stand independently or depend on prepositions, most of them are not basic nouns in adverbial use, but vocables intended to fulfill an adverbial function.

INTERROGATIVE

mati. The widely used adverb for "when?" appears as an independent adverb only once in a WS text, and that one from Tyre (cf. *supra*, p. 275):

ma-ti-mi i-mur / pa-ni LUGAL be-li-ia "When will I see the face of the king, my lord?" (EA 147:59-60; CAD M/1:407b).

Two Rib-Haddi letters from Beirut use the adverb dependent upon a preposition, *a-di ma-ʿti*¹[. . .] (EA 137:89; cf. EA 138:37, 40, 133). The passages in the second of these texts are most interesting:

a-di ma-ti ni-ka-ši-šu DUMU ʾĪR-[A-ši-ir-ti] "How long must we be forced to pay the son of ʿAbdi-[Ashirta]?" (EA 138:37; Rainey 1978b:76; CAD K:286b); *a-di ma-ti ti₇-du- / ku-nu* "How long will you smite us?" (EA 138:40); *a-di ma-ti i-zi-ʿza¹-ti₇ it-ti-šu* "How long can I stay will him?" (EA 138:133).

mani ūmī/ ūmāti. This peculiarly WS expression, evidently based on a Canaanite interrogative pronoun (AHw:603a; CAD M/1:211b), was employed in the nuance "How long?" (Böhl 1909:30, §18e; Moran 1950a:21). From Byblos one finds the following:

ma-ni UD.KÁM.MEŠ-*ti la yi-na-mu-uš / iš-tu* KÁ.GAL "For how long has he not departed from the gate?" (EA 88:29-30; Moran 1950a:160; Youngblood 1961:314; cf. CAD N/1:221a); *ma¹-ni* UD.KÁM.MEŠ *ú-wa-ši-ru-šu* "How long have I been sending him?" (EA 114:35; Moran 1950a:45); *ma-ni* UD.KÁM.MEŠ / *yi-pu-šu du-um-qa / a-na ia-ši* "How long has he performed kindnesses for me?" (EA 119:39-40; Moran 1950a:46, 70); *ù ma-ni* UD.KÁM.MEŠ / *ti-ša-šu* URU UGU-*ia* "And how long has the city been angry with me?" (EA 122:38-39; CAD A/2:423b).

Two other examples from the southern coastal area, Gath-padalla and Gezer respectively, show that the expression was not confined to Byblos. However, in both of these latter instances, the interrogative force has given way to the rhetorical:

ù yi-de-mi šar-ru EN-*ia i-nu-ma / ma-ni* UD.KÁM.MEŠ *tu-¹bé¹-¹u⁵¹-na* UGU-*ia / 2 DUMU La-ab-a-ya* "And may the king, my lord, be apprised that so many days the two sons of Lab³ayu have been pressing me!" (EA 250:9-11; Campbell 1965:203); *ma-ni / UD.KÁM.MEŠ-ti yi-šal-la-¹lu¹-¹ši¹* "for so many days he has been plundering it" (EA 292:44; Izre'el 1978b:27).

CONCURRENT

Some of the most ubiquitous adverbs are those expressing a current situation, either contemporary with the interaction between the speaker and the hearer (sender and receiver of the epistle) or as the consummation of a series of events leading up to the present situation. The usual renderings are "now," "at this time," "still," "again," etc. For constructions employing the vocable *ūmu* "day" in such temporal functions, cf. *supra*, pp. 2, 64-66.

agāmi. Evidently a ghost word, *contra* AHw:15a and CD A/1:141b (Rainey 1978b:50 s.v. *māgammi*).

anumma. This most common adverb for "now" is widely used in the WS texts. Its special function to introduce the message

in a letter will be treated *infra*, pp. 151-053. The spellings are either *a-nu-ma* or *a-nu-um-ma* in the WS texts. Note the scribal errors, *a->na<-nu-um-ma* (EA 141:24; cf. *supra*, p. 111) and *a-nu-im-ma* (EA 136:37). Two Alashia letters use *e-nu-ma* in place of *a-nu-ma*, but the temporal function is identical (EA 35:10; 38:23); and another text from the same source even has *i-nu-ma* (EA 40:12; CAD I/J:158b). The substitution of *inūma/enūma* for *anumma* is evidently a trait of northern peripheral Akkadian.

Two examples in the Byblos correspondence must be read *a-nu-<ma>* (EA 89:34; 114:30). There is no justification for seeing either of these two spellings as 1st c.s. pronouns (*contra* Youngblood 1961:333-334; the same applies to *an-nu-ú*, EA 92:23).

There is a multitude of instances when *anumma* really means "now" with reference to a situation current at the time of the writing of the particular epistle:

u a-nu-um-ma it-ti / ¹Bi-ri-di-ya / i-ba-aš-ša₁₀-ku "and now I am with Biridiya" (EA 248:18-20).

Note especially,

ù a-nu-um-ma i-na-ša-¹ru¹ / URUMa-gi₅-da^{KI} / . . . UD.KÁM ù GI₆-ša "and now I am guarding Megiddo . . . day and night" (EA 243:10-13; Rainey 1975b:40; cf. Moran 1987b:467 n. 1; 1992:297 n. 1).

The examples are so numerous as to obviate extensive documentation. One should note the occasional combination of *anumma* with some other particle:

šá-ni-tam a-nu-um-ma "Furthermore, now" (EA 142:11, 25);
ša-ni-tam šum-ma / ap-pu-na-ma a-nu-ma pa-aṭ-ra / URU¹Šu¹-mu-ra
ù URUÉ-ar-¹ḥa¹ "Furthermore, even if Šumur and Bīt-Arḥa depart now" (EA 83:27-29; Moran 1950a:31).

Knudtson and Ebeling had assumed a meaning for *anumma* like Hebrew *hinnē^h* "Behold." Such particles do exist in

the WS EA texts, viz. the imperative *amur* and the demonstratives *annû* and *allû*, which will be discussed under introductory adverbs below (cf. *infra*, pp. 155-174). However, there is no justification for assuming that *anumma* acquired such a meaning even under strong influence from the Canaanite substratum. There are instances when both *amur* and *anumma* appear in the same epistle and the semantic difference in their respective nuances is obvious:

a-mur-mi a-na-ku ʾĪR¹-di / ša ki-it-ʾti¹ / ʾšār-ri EN-ia ù / a-nu-um-mi / i-na-ša-ru-um-mi / URU.Ĥa-šú-ra^{K1} / ʾqa¹-du URU.DIDLI.ĤÁ-ši "Look, I am the faithful servant of the king, my lord, and now I am protecting Hazor with its towns" (EA 228:10-15; cf. also EA 241:9-12).

By the same token, the frequent combinations of *a-nu-um-ma i-na-an-na* (EA 84:11; *et al.*) only confirm that *anumma* means "now" and not "behold."

inanna. Beyond question is the meaning of *inanna* "now." Its spellings are *i-na-an-na* and *i-na-na*. Once we find *a-na-an-na* where *a* has been written for *e* = *i*₁₅ (EA 179:22; Rainey 1978b:74).

In one instance *inanna* opens a letter in the manner of *anumma* (EA 317:7) and will be discussed under introductory adverbs (cf. *infra*, p. 154). To signify a new political or military development being reported, it can appear in a clause without other adverbs:

ù i-na-an-na iš-ši-ir / LÚ.MEŠ-šu "and now he has sent his men" (EA 140:28-29); *ù i-na-an-na / URU.DIDLI.ĤÁ šār-ri / ti-le-qé-ù LÚ.MEŠ ĥa-pí-ru* "and now the *ʿapîru* are taking the cities of the king" (EA 288:36-38).

Special emphasis on the contrast between some new development and the situation that had prevailed up to that time may be expressed by combination with another adverb that serves to underline the temporal progress:

i-na-an-na ap-pu-na-ma "Now, moreover" (EA 290:14).

Note particularly:

*ù a-nu-ma ù i-na-¹na¹ / ¹ša¹-[ak]-¹na¹-¹ti¹ ¹pa¹-¹na¹ / GIŠ¹ni-ri *
ḫu-ul-li LUGAL EN-ia a-na / UZUGÚ-ia "and now I have placed
 the front of the yoke of the king, my lord, on my neck"
 (EA 296:36-39; CAD N/2:263a).

Pleonastic repetition for emphasis is frequent:

ù a-nu-ma i-na-an-na la i-né-p[u-šu!] / ki-šu-ma i-na-an-na a-na ia-ši
 "But now, is not the same thing being done to me even now?"
 (EA 106:33-34; Rainey 1973c:253-254; contrast Moran 1950a:165;
 1987b:302; 1992:179; CAD K:465a; cf. *infra*, pp. 142-143).

And the same scribe writes:

[ù] *a-nu-ma a-na-ku i-na-an-na ¹mar¹-ṣ[a]-¹ku¹(?)* "[and] now I
 am ill" (EA 106:23).

Sometimes, *inanna* reinforces *anumma* (e.g. EA 84:11) or *annuš* (which is always accompanied by *inanna*, e.g. EA 73:17). One also finds *šum-ma i-na-an-na* (EA 130:39; 132:96). Only once is *inanna* found in a clause introduced by the deictic *a-nu-ú* "behold" (EA 92:24), the force of which will be discussed below. Likewise, it should also be mentioned that *inanna* once reinforces *amur* "see, behold!" in a letter from Tyre (EA 147:24).

adi. Neither of the standard dictionaries have given recognition to the function of *adi* as the equivalent of Heb. ^c*ôd*, though it was pointed out by Albright many years ago (Albright 1942b:35 n. 17). Therefore, it may be worthwhile to document this usage as fully as possible. Usually the adverb governs a whole clause but in at least one instance it is found governing another adverb (which is itself actually a noun that takes the adverbial accusative case):

a-di / *mu-ša šu-ri-ib ʾa-na* / *a-na* URUŠu-mu-ra "While it was still night, he sent (supplies/men) into Šumur" (EA 112:48-49; Moran 1950a:9 compares Heb. *bʾôd yômām*, Jer. 15:9).

It can also govern a stative present:

*a-^fdi*¹ [LÚ.M]EŠ-ia ra-[i-mu] / [I¹R-A]-^fšⁱ¹-ir-ta ù LÚ.MEŠ G[AZ.MEŠ] "My [me]n still fa[vor ʿAbdi-A]shirta and the men of the ʿa[pîru]" (EA 85:40; Youngblood 1961:277).

However, most of the clear examples govern a clause with WS indicative imperfect having present force:

a-di ni-na-ša-ru-š[u] "We are still guarding him" (EA 100:30; Rainey 1975b:408 n. 11); *a-di ú-šur-ru* / ¹*Ma-a-ia ma-gal* / *ma-gal* "I am still taking exceedingly good care of Māya" (EA 337:28-30; Rainey 1975b:408); *a-di aš-šur-^fru*¹ "I am still guarding" (EA 364:14); *a-di ú-ba-²a₄-šu-nu* / *be-lu-šu-nu* "their owner may still search for them" (EA 96:21-22; Youngblood 1961:401; 1962:25, 27); [*a-di ti-pu-šu[-na]*] / *ar-na* UGU-ia "they are still committing a crime against me" (EA 123:21-22); ù *a-di-mi ú-ti-ru-^fni*¹ "and still he replies to me" (EA 333:19; cf. Albright 1942b:35:35; collation 29.9.76).

Moran points to other passages where *adi* means "still" in the sense of "further," viz.

a-di yu-ú-ul-qu ¹*A-za-ru* "Aziru can still be taken" (EA 117:33; Moran 1950a:9); *šum-ma ki-a-ma qa-la-ta* / *a-di ti-ìl-qú-na* / URUŠu-mu-ra "If you are thus negligent, they will take Šumur besides" (EA 104:31-33; Moran *loc. cit.*).

To those examples may be added the following obscure and troublesome context:

a-di iš-tu / GÁN.BA ¹DI.AMAR.UTU / URU¹Aš-tar-ti in₄-né-ri-ir "Further, from the market place (?) of Shullum(?)—Marduk (of?)

Ashtartu, he came to help" (EA 256:19-21; Moran 1987b:484 n. 4; 1992:309-310 n. 3; *contra* Albright 1943a:35; for GÁN.BA = *mahīru*, cf. CAD M/1:93a).

That passage along with the following one was cited by CAD A/1:121a, sub *adi*, under the meaning "whether," which ignores the typical WS usage:

li-iš-al₇-mì LUGAL EN-*ia* / *ka₄-li* LÚ.MEŠMAŠKÍM-*šu* / *a-da a-na-ku* ÌR *ki-it-ti* / LUGAL EN-*ia* *li-iš-al₇-mì* / LUGAL EN-*ia* ¹*Ḫa-ma-aš-¹ša₁₀*¹ / *a-di a-¹na¹-ku* ÌR *ki-it-¹ti*¹ / LUGAL EN-*ia* "May the king, my lord, ask all of his commissioners (whether) I am a loyal servant of the king, my lord; may the king, my lord, ask Ḫamašša (whether) I am still a loyal servant of the king, my lord" (EA 198:11-17).

Note that these object clauses after injunctive forms of *ša²ālu* "to ask" are usually introduced by *inūma* or *šumma* (cf. *infra*, pp 80-81; *supra*, p. 184).

For the meaning "again," the following is a good example:

a-nu-ma i-te₉-li ERÍN.MEŠ *i-na* / URUGub-la ù *la-qa-ši* x(ŠE) / *i-na-na a-di yu-pa-ḫi-ru ka[-li]* / URU.MEŠ ù *yi-il-qú-ši* x(ŠE) "Now, the troops have come against Byblos and they will take it; even now he is again assembling all the towns in order that he may take it" (EA 124:12-15; Moran 1950a:9, 131 n. 163; Youngblood 1961:312-313; Moran 1987b:336 = 1992:203 takes the first sentence as conditional).

A hitherto unrecognized example of *a-di* with the meaning "again" was missed because Knudtzon erroneously corrected the reading of Winckler-Abel. Instead of Knudtzon's ù EGIR *šu-a-te!* (1915:802, line 28), personal collation has confirmed that the correct reading in this context is:

ù EGIR-*šu a-di ia-a[š-]p[u-r]a šūr-ru* EN-*ia* "and afterwards, may the king, my lord, write again!" (EA 250:28).

This usage of *adi* has been recognized in the treaty between Ramesses II and Hattusili III, written in Egypt in the 13th century B.C.E. (*KBo* 1, 17 + 25 + *KUB* 3, 11:obv. 32-33, 38-39; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:210, §2.6.2.2).

SUBSEQUENTIAL

*²*aḥrônhû*. A purely Canaanite gloss for Akkadian *arkīšu* (cf. below) is attested once in a Megiddo letter replete with such Canaanite syllabic glosses:

ù iz-zi-iz-mì / EGIR-šu \ aḥ-ru-un-ú "And I got up afterwards"
(EA 245:9-10).

The formation consists of the noun, *²*aḥrôn* (which is itself an expansion of the adverb *²*aḥar* [attested as ²*ḥr* in Ugaritic] by addition of the *-ôn* suffix), plus the 3rd m.s. possessive suffix, **hû*, here represented by *ù* (Rainey 1969a:108).

arkānu. Only once, in a broken context, do we find this widely used adverb (from *warkānum*) for "afterwards":

ù tu-ur / ù ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭá-[ti] / ar-¹ka¹-nu "then return and take the army afterwards!" (EA 95:36-38; Youngblood 1961:391).

arkīšu. This adverb for "afterward" (from *warkīšu*) appears only twice, in EA 250:28 (cited *supra*, p. 147) and in EA 245:10 (cited just above). In each instance, it is written ideographically EGIR-šu. The contexts reflect the expected meaning (*CAD* A/2:281a), and the normalization would be *arkīšu*, the adverb with *-ī* plus 3rd m.s. suffix.

maḥari. The only example of this noun used adverbially, evidently meaning "tomorrow," comes from one of the fifteenth century epistles found at Taanach. Though the basic meaning is fairly clear, the grammatical context is problematic, possibly due to some effaced signs at the end of the passage:

uš-še-ra-šu-^lnu¹ / u₄-mi ma-ḥa-ri / a-na^{URU}Ma-gi-da "Send them tomorrow to Megiddo" (TT 5:13-15; Rainey 1977:45).

Given the genitive suffix on *ūmi maḥari*, one would expect a governing preposition such as *ina*, which might have been lost from the end of line 13 (as suggested by Marcie Finkle in a classroom discussion). The word *maḥari* is not Akkadian; it must be Canaanite (*AHw*:580a; *CAD M*/1:50b; Albright 1944b:24 n. 80).

RETROSPECTIVE

pānānu(m). Formed from *pān* "face" plus *-ānum* (*GAG*:174, §119h), this vocable can usually be rendered "formerly, before" (note the semantic parallel with English "fore"). One may compare Heb. *lʔpānīm* "formerly," and Phoen. *hlpnym* "the former ones" (Friedrich and Röllig 1970:98, §204a). That the ubiquitous ending is truly adverbial *-u(m)* is demonstrated by the few instances of dependence on prepositions:

[ú]-ul *ki-ma pa-na-nu* "Things are not as they were before" (EA 93:24; Moran 1950a:161); *ki-ma pa-na-nu-um* "as formerly" (EA 127:31); *ša-lim iš-tu pa-na-^lnu-^lu¹* "It is healthier than before" (EA 362:50; *CAD M*/2:296a).

Contrast the dependent form constructed with the preposition *ina* from Alashia:

ša-ni-tam a-i-tu₄ a-ba-e-kà a-na / a-ba-e-ia i-na pá-na-ni e-pu-šu / a-^lma¹-^lta an-ni-ta "Furthermore, who among your forefathers did such a thing to my forefathers in the past?" (EA 38:27-29; *CAD A*/1:235a).

Nearly all of the examples of *pānānu(m)* come from the Byblos letters where they function mostly to describe a verbal state or action in the past. Only rarely does *pānānu(m)* appear with the preterite, in which case the stress is on a contrast between a former incident and the present:

pa-na-nu yi-zi-iz-mi / 𒀭R-A-ši-ir-ta UGU-ia / ù aš-ta-pa-ar . . .
 "Formerly, ʿAbdi-Ashirta opposed me and I wrote . . ."
 (EA 132:10); UGU *lu-um-ni ša pa-na-nu-um i!-né-!pu¹-[uš]*
 "concerning an evil that was done in the past" (EA 106:32;
 Moran 1950a:165; CAD L:250a).

Admittedly, in both cases one might argue that a protracted action is being described. The verb *yizziz*, here representing WS preterite, was originally an Akkadian timeless stative GAG:102, §78b), and *aštappar* is probably Gtn. The form of *innepu[š]* could just as well be *innepu[šu]* for WS imperfect (Rainey 1973c:253-254). So one must recognize that *pānānum* was hardly deemed a necessary complement to the WS preterite.

With the absolute infinitive denoting action in the past (Moran 1950b), *pānānu* is also found, and the parallel verb represents the WS suffix conjugation (though the form is Akkadian N preterite):

pa-na-nu / da-ga-li-ma / 𒀭LÚ¹ KURMi-iš-ri ù in₄-<na>-ab-tu /
 LU[GAL].MEŠ^{KUR}*Ki-na-aḥ-ni iš-tu pa-!ni¹-šu* "Previously, just
 seeing an Egyptian, the kings of Canaan would flee from him"
 (EA 109:44-46; Moran 1950b:170b; CAD D:21b).

The role of *pānānu(m)* as a time determinant is pivotal with the stative and the nominal clause, which are themselves tenseless. It is especially prevalent when the emphasis is on a protracted state of affairs in the past.

[a]-mur *pa-na-nu LÚ.MEŠ a-bu-ti-ia / 𒀭da¹-nu nu-KÚR a-na*
ša-šu-!nu¹ / [ù] ma-ša-ar-ti / [LUGAL] it-<ti>-šu-nu ba-l[a-at] /
 [LUGAL] UGU-šu-nu "Behold, formerly, as regards my fathers,
 hostilities were strong against them, [but] the [king's] garrison
 was with them, [the king's] pro[visions] were (provided) for
 them" (EA 130:21-25; Moran 1950a:124a n. 104); [pa]-na-nu
 URU^{URU}*šū-mu-ra ù LÚ.MEŠ[-ši] / [da]n-nu-!tu₄¹ !i¹-ba-aš-šu ù*
 LÚ.[MEŠ] / [ma-!ša¹-ar-!tu¹ it-ti-nu "Formerly, Šumur and [its]
 men were a fortress and garrison troops were with us"

(EA 81:48-50; CAD D:99b-100a; Moran 1950a:124a was still classifying the stative *ibašši* as a present; cf. also EA 112:50-53; 121:11-15).

Therefore, the same temporal nuance applies to the WS imperfect when it signifies continuous action in past time (Moran 1950a:43-46; 1961:63-64 = 1965:72-73; Rainey 1975b:399), as in the following passage where a stative expression is coupled with an imperfect verbal clause (cf. Moran 1950a:124a n. 104):

pa-na-nu / [LU]GAL ^{KUR}Mi-ta-na nu-KÚR a-na a-bu-tu-ka / 'ù'
la-a ti!(PI)-na-mu-šu-^lna¹ / [a]-bu-tu-ka iš-tu a-^lbu¹-t[i-ia]
 "Formerly, the king of Mitanni was hostile to your fathers but your [fa]thers never abandoned [my] fathers" (EA 109:5-8);

or, when a nominal (non-verbal) sentence is coupled with an imperfect verbal clause:

pa-na-nu LÚ.MEŠ ma-ša-ar-ti / šar-ri it-ti-ia ù / šar-ru ia-di-nu
 ŠE.IM.ĤÁ / iš-tu ^{KUR}Ia-ri-mu-ta / a-na a-ka-li-šu-nu "Formerly,
 the king's garrison troops were with me and the king was furnishing grain from Yarimuta for their sustenance"
 (EA 125:14-18; Moran 1950a:44, 96).

Thus, one finds many examples with the WS imperfect to express past continuous action (EA 104:24-26; 114:54-57; 117:43-44; 118:50-53; 126:18-23; 138:94-95). Normally, *pānānu(m)* comes at the head of such temporal clauses, but other factors, such as the subordination of the temporal clause, may require a change of the order (cf. Gianto 1990:143-153).

Note the following relativized clause introduced by the detirminative pronoun, *ša*, in which a former, past continuous situation is contrasted symmetrically with a volitive expressing a wish for a change in the present situation:

ša-a yu-da-¹nu¹ pa-na-nu i-na URUŠu-mu-ra / [y]u-da-na⁷ ¹i¹-na-na
URUGub-la "What used to be sold formerly in Şumur, let it be
sold now in Byblos!" (EA 85:36-37; cf. Moran 1950a:43, 95).

Two passages, not from Byblos, employ *pānānu(m)* as an adjective. The first is from Beirut but is a letter sent by Rib-Haddi:

a-mur URUGub-li URU-lu^{KI}-šu-nu / *ma-ad mi-im* LUGAL *a-na*
lib-bi-ši mar-ši-te MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ *ab-¹bu¹-ti-nu pa-na-nu* "Behold
Byblos, their city, great is the royal property within it, the
possessions of our fathers of old" (EA 137:73-75);

and the second is from Sidon:

ù i-le-i a-ra-ad / LUGAL EN-ia *ki-a-ma* LÚ.MEŠ *a-bu-ti-nu* /
pa-na-nu-um "and I may be able to serve the king, my lord, like
our fathers of old" (EA 144:32-34).

šaddiqdi(m). Albright (1937:203) noted that a letter from Tyre employs this adverb, meaning "last year." In both instances, it depends on *ištu*. The construction is known as early as OB in the form *šaddaqdim* (AHw:1127), developed from **šatta-qadim* (GAG:96, §72c). It appears in Mishnaic Hebrew (a loan from Aramaic) as ²*eštāqad*. The two relevant passages are as follows:

a-na-ku / [i^š-t]u *ša-an-dì-qá-dì-ma* / [lib-bi] *a-na i-re-bi* / [a-na
da-g]a-li pa-ni LUGAL *be-li-ia* "As for me, [sin]ce last year, [my
desire (heart) has been] to enter [in order to beh]old the face of
the king, my lord" (EA 149:26-29); ¹i^š¹-tu MU-qa-dì nu-kúr-¹tu⁴ /
i-na muḥ-ḥi-ia "since last year, there is hostility against me"
(EA 149:74-75).

From the first example, one may assume a normalized form such as *šandiqadimma*, but the second shows that the final *m*

has been lost, perhaps by analogy with the dropping of mimation. The apparent dissimilation of the first dental might, in fact, represent the original radical of *šant-* "year," with partial assimilation of the *-t* suffix. If that should be the case, then the adverb as used by the Tyrian scribe could even be a vestige from an older tradition than that documented in OB. More likely, however, is the assumption that *šandi-* represents an MB/Peripheral dissimilation of *-tt-* > *-nd-*.

šalšāmi. Twice a Byblos scribe uses the spelling *ša-al-ša-mi* (EA 362:14, 16) for Akkadian *šalšūmi* "day-before-yesterday." The latter represents *šal(a)š-ūm-ī* "third-day-hence," with adverbial *-ī* (GAG:163, §113k). In spite of Hebrew *šilšôm*, one cannot say that such an adverb existed in Byblian Canaanite. The Byblos forms do not necessarily represent a Canaanism. On the contrary, the *ā-* vowel of *šalšāmī* could very well be an analogy with the accompanying *tu-ma-al* (cf. below). If so, then the Byblos scribe evidently did not know the origin of *šalšūmi*. In his own tongue, the singular for *yawm* would be *yôm* and would require a spelling with *u-* signs in Akkadian script. On the other hand, one might risk the surmise that the Byblian form was based on the plural, *yāmîm*, developed by analogy with *šānîm*, with which it was often paired (Barth 1906:790-792). Such an explanation for the Byblos EA form seems forced. The analogy with *tumāl* is more probable.

tumāl. The same two passages having *šalšāmī* also have *tu-ma-al* (EA 362:14, 16). The surprising elements here are the use of *status absolutus* for this adverb and also the *u-* vowel in the first syllable instead of the usual Akkadian *timālī* "yesterday" (AHw:1359b-1360a). If there were a Canaanite form, it should have been **timôl*, but a frequent vowel harmony might have led to **tomôl* (cf. Rainey 1973a:40, 42); either **timôl* or **tomôl* would account for the Hebrew *ṭmôl* / *ʕṭmôl*. Given such a possibility for Byblian, the Byblos scribe might have begun to write his own

form, starting with the *tu-* sign, and then switched to the Akkadian *ā-* vowel. But it would be strange for that to happen twice in the same letter. The form *tu-ma-al* evidently represents an attempt to write the Akkadian adverb. At least one may suspect that for a Byblian scribe, a reduced *u/i* class vowel in just such an opening syllable could have led to his confusion. Compare, e.g. Byblian *ki-lu-bi* "gage" (EA 74:46 *et al.*), Heb. *kəlûḅ*.

DURATIVE

dārīš, *dārītu*. The feminine nisbe of *dāru* "ever, continuously" (CAD D:107-108) is preferred in the peripheral dialects (OB-Elam, Bogh., RS, EA; CAD D:111-112) and in the Mitanni correspondence (Adler 1976:269-270). Note also that the latter, *dārātu*, is consistently dependent upon *ana*, a combination which is confined to Tyre among the WS EA texts. For the one Jerusalem usage of *dār* + adv. *-iš*, cf. below.

With reference to duration beginning in the past and extending up to the present, the phrase *ištu dārīti* "from of old" (CAD D:114b) is standard. It may refer to a particular state of being, in which case the adverbial phrase may define a nominal (otherwise tenseless) clause:

URUGub-la URU ki-it-ti LUGAL 'EN¹-[ia] / iš-tu da-ri-ti "Byblos is the faithful city of the king, [my] lord, from of old" (EA 88:44-45; cf. also EA 106:4; 116:55-56; 134:6-7; 241:9-10).

On the other hand, it can define temporally a clause employing a stative verb form (equally tenseless in itself, of course). Note the combination where the adverbial is in construct with the plural of "days" (UD.KÁM.MEŠ = *ūmāti*, *ūmi*):

[lu-ú] / 'i¹-de LUGAL EN-li i-nu-[ma] / šal-ma-at URUGub-la 'GEMÉ¹ [ki-ti-šu] / iš-tu!(IŠ) da-ri-it UD.KAM.MEŠ "[May] the

king, my lord, be aware that Byblos, [his faithful] handmaiden, was at peace from olden times!" (EA 75:6-8; CAD D:114b; Youngblood 1961:161).

The negative, i.e. the assertion that some previous state or action had hitherto never come about, may also be so defined by this same adverbial construction:

ip-šu / ša la a-pf-iš iš-tu / da-ri-ti "a deed which had never been done from of old" (EA 122:41-43; 123:9-11; 196:32-33).

Of special interest is the function of *ištu dārīti* with WS imperfect verbs to denote an action that has been continuous for a long time up to the present:

a-mur ni-i-nu / ʾĪRʾ.MEŠʾ a-ra-du / ʾšār-ri iš-tu / ʾdaʾ-ri-ti7 ki-ma / ʾŠu-tar-na a-bi-ia "Behold, we are servants; I have been serving my king from of old like Shutarna, my father" (EA 194:5-9; cf. also EA 212:6-7; 295:8-11);

and also the negative:

la-a ya-qū-lu LUGAL EN-ia / i-na URUGub-la GEMÉ-šu / URU šār-ri iš-tu da-ri-ti "The king, my lord, has never neglected Byblos, his handmaiden, the city of the king, from of old" (EA 140:5-7).

Though Knudtzon and subsequent commentators have understood the adverbial here as defining the final epithet of Byblos, i.e. "a royal city from of old," the very presence of a verb in the WS imperfect suggests that *ištu dārīti* actually pertains to the verbal action; and *vice versa*, the use of the adverbial supports the interpretation of *yaqūlu* as an intentional WS imperfect to emphasize the continuous action. Thus, there is no need to posit an

indicative imperfect as a "virtual command," where an injunctive would be expected (Moran 1950a:50).

On the other hand, the verb in the following passage probably stands for the WS suffix conjugation (it lacks the *t-* prefix of the plural):

a-mur iš-tu da-ri-[-ti] / la-a i-teḡ-li-^lyu^l(?) / i-na URUGub-la
DINGIR.MEŠ "Behold, from of old, the gods have never gone
away from Byblos" (EA 134:4-6; cf. Moran 1950a:177; note the Gt
separative with a verb of motion, Rainey 1971c:87-89).

With respect to the future, the normal Babylonian usage is *ana* with the plural *dārāti* and this is also the case with the Mitanni letters (EA 19:15, 29, 74, 79; 20:75, 78; 21:23). Only the Tyrian correspondence, which often shows an independent scribal tradition from that reflected in the WS EA texts, provides an additional case:

šu-um-šu a-na da-ri-ti "his name lasts forever" (EA 147:51; CAD
D:114b);

which suggests that the following passage from the same epistle contains an erroneous *ina* for *ana* (CAD D:115a):

ia-nu šu-um-šu i-na gáb-bi / KUR-ti i-na da-ri-ti "his name is
forever missing from all the lands" (EA 147:47-48).

The second *i-na* is probably simply attracted from the previous *i-na* in line 47.

By the same token, one evidently must restore *ana* in the following broken context:

ù ba-li-iṭ / [a-na] da-ri-ti "and he will live forever" (EA 149:25-26;
Moran 1987b:382; 1992:236).

The other city with its own peculiar scribal tradition, Jerusalem, exhibits the lone example of *dārīš*, in a context similar to those from Tyre:

a-mur šār-ri ša-ka-an šum-šu / i-na KUR Ū-ru-sa-lim^{KI} a-na da-ri-iš
 "Behold, my king has placed his name in the land of Jerusalem forever" (EA 209:8-10; likewise EA 287:60-61; CAD D:113b).

Instead of *ana*, the WS EA texts generally prefer *adi*. e.g.

ù a-mur / a-na-ku ĪR-ka a-di / da-ri-ti; "Behold, I am your servant forever" (EA 209:8-10; likewise EA 189:26-27; also EA 93:27-28; 124:56).

Therefore, the following passage is probably not evidence for the assimilation of the *n* in *an(a)*. It is more likely that the text must be corrected as follows:

ù pa-aš-ḥu DUMU.MEŠ / ù MÍ.DUMU.MÍ.MEŠ a-di da-ri-ti
 UD.KÁM.MEŠ "and the sons and daughters will be at peace to the end of days" (EA 74:38-39).

Finally, *adi* governs the one plural example, which surprisingly carries what might be an adverbial *-a*, unless the final vowel is by attraction from the previous syllable:

ù lu-ú / ur-ra-da LUGAL EN-ia / UD.KÁM-ma ù mu-ša a-di / da-ri-ia-ta "and verily I would serve the king, my lord, day and night forever" (EA 294:32-35).

Or perhaps the *-a* was attracted from the ventive on the three verb forms in the context, *iz-zi-ba*, *il₅-la-ka*, and *ur-ra-da*. It appears that the ventive *-a* on the two verbs of motion was carried over by attraction (cf. GAG:107, §82c) to the third, *urrada*. The resultant

forms are Akkadian "positive affirmations" with asseverative *lū* (Edzard 1973:129; cf. *infra*, pp. 193-195). In any case, this is the only passage where *ūma u mūša* appears with *adi dāriʾāta*.

ūma/urra (u) mūša. The other durative adverbial in the WS texts is *urra(m) mūša(m)* and its local counterpart, *ūma u mūša = yômām wālaylā^h* (e.g. Num. 9:21). The former pair generally occurs without the conjunction in the Akkadian manner while the latter always occurs with it. Though this would suggest that the former pattern is East Semitic and the latter is WS (Youngblood 1961:49), one must note that *urra(m) u mūša(m)* usually has the conjunction in the contemporary dialects of Akkadian (*AHw*:687, 1433a). In any case, both elements are in the adverbial accusative with rare instances of mimation. The meaning is "day and night" = "all the time." The expression can give present tense, durative force to an otherwise tenseless nominal sentence as in the following military/political context:

ἸDUMU.MEŠ ἸR-A-ši-ir-ta iš-tu qa-qa-ri / ἰ LÚ.MEŠ URUAr-wa-da iš-tu / a-ia-ba ur-¹ra¹ mu-ša U[GU-ši] "The sons of ʿAbdi-Ashirta from the land and the men of Arvad from the sea are constantly ag[ainst it (the city)]" (EA 105:11-13).

As was to be expected, most of the other examples are with present-future verb forms, for example the 1st c.s. WS imperfect:

ʾšá¹-ni-tam a-nu-ma i-na-an-na / i-na-mu-šu ur-ra m[u-ša] / i-na nu-kūr-ti^{MEŠ} ša UGU-[ia] "Further, now I am pulling back day and night because of the hostilities that are against me" (EA 69:12-14; Rainey 1989-90:58b; Youngblood 1961:49-51; contrast CAD N/1:222; cf. *supra*, pp. 33-34);

or the 3rd m.pl.:

ša-ni-tam ú-ul ti-i-de / at-ta KUR A-mur-ri ur-ra / mu-ša tu-ba-ú-na / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-ti "Further, don't you know, the land of Amurru is constantly seeking for the (Egyptian) army?" (EA 82:47-50; also EA 70:24-26; 73:20-21; 74:64-65; 83:35-36; 362:31-33).

Once we have *mu-ša ur-ra-am* (EA 362:31-33) with the same connotation.

This is not to say that other verbal modes would not be compatible with this adverbial complement. It is quite appropriate with the Akkadian asseverative (EA 294:32-35, cited *supra*, p. 131). It can also modify the infinitive, or gerund, after *ana* serving to express purpose (note in this particular context the Tyrian scribe's unprecedented "infinitive," apparently a form born of confusion with the WS suffix conjugation 1st c.s. of this denominative verb unique to te EA texts):

ù id-din pa-ni-ia / a-na ur-da-ti-šu [ù!] / I.M¹Ma-ia-a-ti / BE-ti-¹ia¹ / mu-šu ù ur-ra "then I will set my face to serve him [and!] Mayati, my lady, day and night" (EA 155:27-30; *contra* Knudtzon's translation without the conjunction, 1915:635).

The form *mu-šu* employed here is most likely an error rather than the adverbial *-u(m)*.

The combination *urra(m) (u) mūša(m)* is documented for Byblos and Tyre. The parallel expression in comparable contexts from elsewhere is *ūma u mūša*, including EA 136:37, written for Rib-Haddi by a scribe from Beirut. This latter passage was taken by Knudtzon to be *urra u mūša* because he assumed that the ideographic UD.KAM also stood for *urra*, but there is no support for such a view. The proof that UD.KĀM stands for *ūma* "day (acc.);" derives from three contexts in similar epistles from the Gezer area, where a phonetic complement is added to the Sumerogram, e.g.

a-nu-ma / 'iṣ¹-ṣú-ru ù *a-nu-ma* / 'iṣ-te-¹mu¹ UD.KÁM-*ma* / ù *mu-ša a-wa-ti*^{MEŠ} *ša* / LUGAL EN-*ia* "Now I am guarding and now I am heeding day and night the words of the king, my lord" (EA 292:22-26; Rainey 1975b:406-407).

In the parallel passage, an aberrant use of the Sumerogram is also found:

a-nu-ma iṣ-ṣú-ru / UD.KÁM-*ma* ù >UD< *m[u-š]a* "Now I am guarding day and night" (EA 293:12-13; Izre'el 1978b:21 and n. 30; Rainey 1975b:407).

The third passage, EA 294:32-35, is cited *supra*, p. 131. The reading *ūma* is further strengthened by the plural spelling, UD.KÁM.MEŠ-*ti* (EA 292:45; Izre'el 1978b:30) for *ūmāti* in one of these letters. Two other passages also from the south, Yurza and Ashkelon respectively, are contexts similar to those of the Gezer letters, but with the spellings KÁM.UD / *u mu-ša* (EA 315:11-12), KÁM.UD / *u mu-ša!*(MA) (EA 326:22-23). There is no reason to doubt that UD.KÁM ù *mu-ša* in EA 136:37 is to be normalized *ūma u mūša*, not *urra u mūša*.

The same holds true for a Megiddo passage where we had formerly read *urra* (Rainey 1975b:404-405). This latter is of particular interest because of the spelling of the second element with a Sumerogram (Moran 1987b:467 n. 1; 1992:297 n. 1) followed by a Canaanite gloss:

ù *a-nu-ma i-na-ša-¹ru¹* / URUMa-gi₅-da^{KI} / URU.KI *šār-ri* EN-*ia* / UD.KÁM ù GI₆-*ša* \ 'le¹-¹la¹(?) / UD.KÁM *i-na-ša-ru* / 'iṣ¹-tu A.ŠÀ.MEŠ / *i-na* GIGIR.MEŠ ù G[I₆-*ša*] / *i-na-ša-ru* BÀD.¹URU!¹.K!¹[I]! / *šār-ri* EN-*ia* "And now I am guarding Megiddo, the city of the king, my lord, day and night; by day I am guarding from the open fields in chariots and by n[ight] I am guarding the wall of the city of the king, my lord"

(EA 243:10-18; contrast Rainey 1975b:404-405; also correct CAD M/2:294b-295a).

The assumed variant, *mīša*, is therefore removed. Note also the use of *ūma* "by day" and *mūša* "by night," each as an independent adverbial accusative in its own clause. The meaning is still present-continuous as confirmed by the WS imperfect verbs.

A kindred expression is found once in a letter from the official, Biryawaza, which exhibits a profusion of Sumerograms. It appears to be a unique example of temporal emphasis added to the customary obeisance formula:

a-na GÌR.MEŠ ḪLUGAL EN-*ia* / ^dUTU KIN.⟨NIM⟩ *še-ri*^{MEŠ} / *u le-lá-ma* / 7-*šu a-na pa-ni* / 7-*ta-an-ni am-qut* "At the feet of the king, my lord, the Sun-god, mornings and evening, seven times forward and seven times (backward), I have prostrated" (EA 195:11-15; Borger 1978:189 No. 538; CAD L:184a; AHw:121a).

ūmi, *ūmišamma*. The Tyrian scribe uses a unique expression, viz.

i-na u₄-mi-ma "day by day," "every day," "daily" (EA 147:7, 28, 67; possibly also EA 146:16).

These spellings, UD (= *u₄*) with phonetic complement, confirm the readings of UD.KAM discussed in the preceding section (*supra*, pp. 133-134). Albright (1937:198 n. 4) has assumed that this was an Egyptianism, since the proper Akkadian would be *ūmišamma*. In fact, the Tyrian scribe does use just that form, written *u₄-mi-ša-ma* (EA 148:24), in a context quite similar to EA 147:7, both being narrative, epistolary style. But because EA 147:7 is in one of the "poetic" passages of the Tyrian correspondence, Albright posits its Egyptian origin. However, a close Egyptian parallel is hard to

find. Contemporary Late Egyptian texts use expressions like the following:

r^c nb "every day," *m hrt hrw*, *m hrt hrw r^c nb*, or *m mnt* "daily" (Faulkner 1962:147, 203, 107 respectively).

On the other hand, there are close Hebrew parallels, e.g.:

yôm yôm (Gen. 39:10), *yôm wāyôm* (Est. 3:4), *b^akol-yôm wāyôm* (Est. 2:11); also Phoenician *ym md ym* (KAI 43:11).

Therefore, while the Tyrian scribe's choice of adverbial expression may represent a translation of a common Egyptian expression, he had local WS models from which he could gain his direct inspiration.

CHAPTER VI

MODAL ADVERBS

The category dealt with in this chapter covers a wide range of adverbial nuances, including "manner," "way," and "degree."

INTERROGATIVE

kî. Although interrogative *kî* "how?" was noted by Ebeling (1915:1438), there were other texts in which it was not discerned. One of these was first interpreted by Albright (1943a:9):

*ki-i in₄-né-bi-tu / šar URUPf-hi-li iš-tu / pa-ni LÚ.MEŠ ra-bi-šf *
sú-ki-ni / šar-ri EN-šu "How would the king of Piḫilu flee from
the presence of the commissioners of the king, his lord?"
(EA 256:7-10, for lines 4-5; cf. *supra*, pp. 91-92).

In another context, Albright understood the adverb correctly (1943b:30; CAD K:321a) but he failed to recognize the proper rendering of the verb:

ki-i uš-šur-ru-na LÚ.MEŠ "How can I maintain surveillance over
the men?" (EA 252:8; (Rainey 1974:306; 1975b:417; 1989-90:68b;
Moran 1987b:479 n. 1; 1992:306 n. 1).

Dhorme (1914:362 = 1951:476) thought that, in the next two passages, *kî* should be taken to mean "if," but Moran preferred to render them as interrogatives. In the first of the texts in question, Moran translates as a question, though another interpretation, closer to that of Dhorme, is possible and even more likely:

ù ki-i i-qa-bu LUGAL "But how can the king say . . . ?"
(EA 106:30; Moran 1950a:165; 1987b:302; 1992:179).

It has been shown above (cf. *supra*, pp. 91-92) that the nuance "inasmuch as" is more suitable in this instance. That comes closer to Dhorme's conditional "if," providing one understands that the king had actually spoken in the manner described.

The second of the two passages is surely interrogative:

ki a-na-ša-r[u ra-ma-ni-ia] "How can I guard myself?" (EA 126:33; Moran 1950a:169; 1987b:340, 341 n. 6; 1992:205, 206 n. 6).

For the *kî* in negative (EA 138:45-47) and positive (EA 254:38-46; TT 1:10-11) oaths, which CAD (K:321a) took as interrogatives, cf. the above discussion concerning the subordinating *kî* (*supra*, pp. 92-93).

ana mîni(m). The standard expression for "why?" is *ana mîni*, literally "for what?" The frequent spelling of the pronoun, viz. *mi-ni*, shows that those with the older mimation, *mi-nim*, should be read *mi-ni*₇. An exception is in one text from Alashia, *a-na mi-nim-mi* (EA 34:9; thus probably read also in line 47 of the same letter, even though the enclitic is absent there).

The general function of this adverbial in the WS EA texts follows the normal pattern, e.g.

*a-na mi-ni*₇ / *qa-la-ta* "Why are you silent?" (EA 71:10-11).

In contrast to such typical passages, there are three deviations from the norm in a Beirut text known for its unique phrases and expressions (EA 138). Instead of a prepositional phrase, *ana mîni*, the scribe used the adverbial suffix *-um*. Two of the sentences are broken and obscure (EA 138:131, 136), but the last can be compared with that cited in the previous paragraph:

mi-nu-[u]m qa-al be-li iš-^{<tu>} ia-a-ši-ia "Why is my lord silent concerning me?" (EA 138:137).

An awkward variant locution has been noted by Moran (1950a:112):

UGU/ ša 'ma¹-an-ni "for what reason?" (EA 114:41-42; cf. EA 280:16),

which has the Canaanite indefinite pronoun (CAD M/1:212b-213; Böhl 1909:29, §18b).

DEMONSTRATIVE

kī'am. The common Akkadian demonstrative adverb, *kī'am* "thus, how," is widely attested in the EA letters. The Byblos texts consistently write *ki-a-ma* except for *ka-a-ma* (EA 83:18; Youngblood 1961:243) and *ka-ma-mi* (EA 129:37). The key to the latter example is the *Glossenkeil*, which is not a gloss on the preceding word, but rather an indication that *ka-ma-mi* belongs with the preceding line (a not uncommon practice in these and other contemporary texts):

u ti-i[q-bu-na] \ ka-ma-mi / 'ka¹-az-bu-tu "but they 'say', thus, '(It's) a lie!" (EA 129:36-37; cf. *supra*, p. 91-92; contrast CAD K:310a).

Other WS texts write *ki-ia-am*, but once *ki-i-ia-am* is attested (EA 251:7). Once we also have *ki-a-ma-am* (EA 85:6), either due to metathesis of the signs *am* and *ma* (for *kīamma*), or as an attempt on the part of the scribe to put extra emphasis on the form's status as adverbial accusative.

Be that as it may, the role of *kī'am* / *kī'amma* / *kāmma* is not just deictic. The frequent use of enclitic *-ma*, in Byblos as against other centers, suggests a certain emphasis on the adverb in its own sentence. The overwhelming majority of clauses with this adverb are introducing a written report or a speech, or silence, i.e. the absence of speech (EA 83:45; 104:31). It is thus difficult to determine whether the emphasis is on the *fact* that someone spoke or wrote (or failed to do so), or on *what* they spoke or said. In the latter case, the message, direct or indirect as the case may be, may be the real point, i.e. the logical predicate (the comment). But since the message is often dealt with in previous lines or else

comes after the verb of speaking/writing, the demonstrative adverb *ki'amma* takes the place of the verb in the sentence and is itself the logical predicate. As will be seen from the examples, such usage is especially relevant to the protasis of conditional clauses:

šum-ma ki-a-ma qa-la-ta "If *thus* you remain indifferent"
(EA 104:31; Moran 1961:63);

or in emotionally charged accusations such as this frantic report from the worried ruler of Byblos:

al-[lu-ú] / ki-a-ma yi-qa-bu la-qé-[mi] / URU.MEŠ 'Ri-ib-[d]IŠKUR
"Be[hold], *thus* he is saying, '(to) take the cities of Rib-Haddi'"
(EA 124:16-18).

Even without the enclitic *-ma*, the adverb may be felt to be the logical predicate:

šum-ma ki-a-am yi-iq-bu / LUGAL EN-ia a-na ia-ši "If the king, my lord, should speak *thus* to me" (EA 294:27-28; cf. also EA 250:15, 40).

In a conditional clause with the stative *ibašši* as copula, the deictic adverb can hardly be anything else but the logical predicate, the comment, of the clause:

ù šum-ma ki-a-ma i-ba-šu / ù 'la¹-a ti-zi-za / URU.Šu-mu-ra "But if *thus* they (continue to) be, then Šumur will not hold out"
(EA 107:32-34).

A more difficult context to interpret is the following context with a stative verb:

da-mi-iq ki-a-ma <a-na> pa-^fni¹ LUGAL / i-na ša-pa-ri-ka a-na
'İR¹-[ka] "It has pleased the king *thus*, that you sent to [your] servant" (EA 112:40-41; *contra* CAD K:329a).

However, the demonstrative adverb may very well be the logical predicate in this passage since it serves to reemphasize Rib-Haddi's request in the previous lines to be transferred to Egypt:

a-nu-ma ki-a-ma ú-ba-ú ur-ra / mu-^lša¹ "Now thus I am longing day and night" (EA 74:64-65; *contra* CAD K:329a).

Finally, there is a double construction in which *ki'am* . . . *kī'am* "thus . . . thus" really seems to mean "hither and thither." Three examples of the same expression are documented:

da-ag-la-ti ki-ia-am / ù da-ag-la-ti / ki-ia-am "I looked hither and I looked thither" (EA 296:11-13; 292:8-9; 266:9-11; cf. CAD K:328b).

kīnanna. This adverb is strictly peripheral, being attested at Nuzi, Hattusas, Canaanite EA and twice in a text from Egypt (CAD K:380a-381a). CAD seems to suggest that it is derived from *kī* + *inanna* while AHw (479b) relates it to *kī'am*. Dhorme (1914:363 = 1951:476-477) made the unlikely suggestion that *kīnanna* contains the element *kīna* = Heb. *kēn*; he was supported by Youngblood (1961:118).

The spellings are *ki-na-an-na* and *ki-na-na*, both of which are attested in the WS texts. The EA letters have several instances of the meaning "for such reason," "on account of this," while Nuzi frequently employs this adverb before verbs of speaking in the meaning "as follows." Nuzi overlaps in the usage, "in this manner, in the same manner." The treatment of *kīnanna* in CAD is generally correct with the exception of one or two passages where the WS tenses were neglected:

ki-na-na ti-iq-bu-na / LÚ.MEŠ ḥa-za-nu-tu₄ ki-na-na yi-pu-šu a-na ia-ši-nu "For this reason, the city-rulers are saying: "Thus he is doing to us" (EA 73:29-31; Moran 1950a:150); *ù ki-na-an-na / ú-ša-à-ru i-na pa-ni LUGAL EN-ia* "Thus I am maligned before the king, my lord" (EA 286:20-21; Moran 1975b:161 n. 38).

As with *kī'am*, *kīnanna* may also be the logical predicate of its clause. Such a syntactical status may be highlighted by the stress required before an enclitic *-ma*, but this is seldom the case:

ki-na-na-am / ¹*pal*¹-*ḥa-ti* ù *ki-na-na la-a* / *al-ka-ti a-na*
URU¹Šu¹-*mu-¹ra¹* "that is why I'm afraid and that is why I have
not gone to Šumur" (EA 107:46-48; CAD K:380b).

However, in the following passage, *kīnannama* has to compete with an interrogative adverbial for pride of place as the logical predicate. Perhaps it was meant to be a secondary predicate:

a-na mi-ni 7 / *yi-iš-tap-ru* ¹*Ri-ib-* ^dİŠKUR *ki-na-an-na-ma* / *ṭup-pa*
a-na É.GAL "Why does Rib-Haddi continually send a tablet in
this manner to the palace?" (EA 106:13-15).

Finally, note the juxtaposition of *kīma* with *kīnanna*:

ki-ma ša *yu-uš-ší* / *iš-tu pī-i* / ^dUTU *iš-tu* / *sa-me-e ki-na-an-na* /
yu-up-pa-šu-mi "Just as it comes (has come) forth from the
mouth of the Sun in heaven, thus it will be (is being) done"
(EA 232:16-20; CAD K:380b).

kīšumma. Another demonstrative in this category, used like *kīnanna*, is formed from *kī* + *š* + *um* + *ma*. The construction with adverbial *-iš* and *-um* appears to be a variation from *kīšamma* (shortened to *kīšam* or *kīša*), which had the accusative *-am* used adverbially (CAD K:445b-446b; certainly not the imperative from *ki'āšu*, contra AHw:490b). The form *kīšamma* is widespread (OA, OB, MB, SB) while *kīšumma* is only attested on the Mediterranean seaboard, including one example from Ugarit. Few are the examples in which the vocable is preserved free of broken signs; one of the best is:

ù *a-nu-ma i-na-an-na la i-né-pu-[uš/šu]* / *ki-šu-ma i-na-an-na a-na*
ia-ši, "But now, has/is not the same thing been/being done to
me?" (EA 106:30-34; Rainey 1973c:253-254; 1989-90:60a; contra

CAD K:465a and also Moran 1987b:302; 1992:179; cf. *supra*, p. 119).

Another instance appears in a text from some Egyptian official addressed to Rib-Haddi, a letter which also shows some WS affinities:

am-mi-nim-mi / te-ep-pu-šu ki-šu-ma / a-na ÌR.MEŠ-*e* LUGAL
 "Why are you doing thus to the servants of the king?"
 (EA 96:25-27; Youngblood 1961:397; 1962:25; cf. *infra*, p. 245).

From Beirut we have the following, somewhat awkward passage:

ša-ni-tam a-¹i[a]-¹ši¹ yu-pa-šu ki-šu-ma ša-a yi-de-ni LUGAL *be-li*
 "Furthermore, will it be done to me thus? (To) one with whom
 the king, my lord, is acquainted?" (EA 138:135-136; note the 1st
 c.s. accusative suffix on the verb).

And finally, *kīšumma* occurs in tandem with *kīma* in an oft repeated proverbial analogue:

ki-ma MUŠEN.MEŠ *ša / i-na lib-bi hu-ḥa-ri \ ki-lu-bi / ša-ak-na-at*
ki-šu-ma a-na-ku i-na / ^{URU}Gub¹-¹la¹ "Like birds situated within a
 cage, thus I am in Byblos" (EA 74:45-48; 78:13-16; 79:35-38;
 81:34-36; 90:39-42).

QUALITATIVE

damqiš. Though it is known from neighboring areas (EA 16:32; 43:14), including Egypt (EA 367:10, 12, 13), the qualitative *damqiš* appears only twice in the WS EA letters (for the construction, cf. *supra*, pp. 7-8). The first is an earlier text from Taanach, viz.

bu-lu-uṭ dam-qi-[iš] "Live well!" (TT 1:4; Rainey 1977:43).

which has parallels in Alalakh (AHw:157a, *contra* CAD D:180a; cf. Rainey 1977:43 n. 51). The second occurs in a familiar context where the usual modifiers are *magal magal*. It is hard to determine whether *damqiš* is modifying *magal* or vice versa:

mi-im-ma ša qa-ba / LUGAL EN-ia a-na ia-ši / iš-te-mé-šu ma-gal /
 SIG₅-iš "Whatever the king, my lord, has said to me, I have
 heeded it very well" (EA 297:8-11).

QUANTITATIVE

appūnamma. To express the meaning "even, moreover, furthermore" in a clause relating to previous statements, the adverbial *appūnamma* could be used. It has something of a conjunctive force though it seldom begins the following clause but usually comes after some other introductory or linking word, or else it appears as a verbal complement. The spelling in the WS texts is always *ap-pu-na-ma* with enclitic *-ma* appended to the adverbial accusative. Beyond this, nothing of certainty is known about its derivation (GAG:162, §113c). There is undoubtedly a connection with Heb. 'ap "even," and the Ugaritic pair *apnk* and *aphn* (cf. Youngblood 1961:146). Outside the WS corpus, the long form, *appūnamma*, is frequently replaced by the shortened *appūna*. It is more often used there as a post-verbal complement, e.g. in a text from Egypt (EA 1:21, 24, *et al.*) and frequently in the Mitanni letters (e.g. EA 17:16, 25, 30, *et al.*; Adler 1976:262). The rare spelling *ap-pu-na-na* (EA 162:51) is typical of later Egyptian epistles (Cochavi-Rainey 1988:216, §2.3.6.2).

In all of the Byblos attestations except one, *appūnamma* appears after *šumma* and evidently is intended to express the nuance of "moreover," for example:

ù *šum-ma ap-pu-na-ma yu-ša-na šār-ru* / ù *ka-li KUR.KUR.KI nu-kūr-tu₄ a-na ša-šu* "And if, moreover, the king should come forth, then all the lands will be at enmity with him" (EA 74:39-40; CAD A/2:190; Youngblood 1961:145-146; cf. also EA 83:28; 116:35; 118:18).

In a Shechem letter it appears after *šumma* but has the force of "further, in addition," viz.

ša-ni-tam šum-ma ti-qa-bu / ap-pu-na-ma "Furthermore, if you should say further" (EA 252:23-24; closer to Albright 1943b:3l, than to Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:486; *contra* Youngblood 1961:146).

Once in a Jerusalem letter the adverb follows *inanna*, but its clause is still a supplement to previous information, viz.

ù i-na-an-na ap-pu-na-ma / URU KUR Ū-ru-ša₁₀-lim^{KI} šu-mu-ša / URUÉ.NIN.IB / URU šâr-ri pa-ṭa-ra-at "And now, moreover, a town of the land of Jerusalem, its name being Bit-NIN.IB, has deserted" (EA 290:14-15).

For *šumma appūnamma* "or else," cf. under *šumma* as conditional particle, *infra*, pp. 186-187).

The quantitative force is especially prominent in the one instance where the adverb stands as a complement after the verb, evidently as the logical predicate of the question (actually expanding the interrogative pronoun):

mi-na a-qa-bu-na / ap-pu-na-ma "What *more* can I say?" (EA 119:54).

danniš. Only two syllabic spellings of the adverbial *danniš* (*dann* "strong" + adv. *-iš*) occur in WS texts. One example from Tyre, *dan-niš* (EA 146:12), is in a broken context. It comes in a familiar refrain:

a-wa-ti / LUGAL GAL be-li-ia / iš-mé da-ni-iš "the words of the great king, my lord, I have heeded greatly" (EA 317:10-12).

Some scholars, beginning with Knudtzon, have thus been inclined to see the spellings with *ma-gal* as an ideograph for *danniš* (Youngblood 1961:23). As will be seen below, *magal* serves as a

modal adverb in many identical expressions where non-WS texts used *danniš*, but there is no evidence that *magal* was ever an ideogram. In fact, the lexical and bi-lingual evidence for *danniš* (CAD D:91b) and *magal* (CAD M/1:28b) do not suggest any connection between them. The Sumerian UL₄.GAL is the ideographic writing for *magal* and *magal* is the Akkadian rendering of ul₄.gal in a bi-lingual. For further discussion of *magal*, cf. below.

mādiš. A synonym for *danniš* is *mādiš*. It occurs but once in a WS epistle. The adverb modifies a promissory stative:

a-na-ku ub-ba-lu-ši / ki-ma ma-diš na-aš-ra-at "I will expedite it diligently protected" (EA 255:24-25; Ugnad 1916:186; Campbell 1965:205).

The text is evidently from Peḫel and the stative usage is somewhat unusual as is this rare reference for the adverb *mādiš*. The other peripheral dialects do have *mādiš* rather frequently (CAD M/1:18a, 19a).

magal. The origin of this adverb is obscure. It always appears in *status absolutus*. As noted above, there is no support for Knudtzon's taking *ma-gal* as a Sumerogram for *danniš*. In fact, *magal* itself has a Sumerian counterpart, ul₄.gal. It would seem that *magal* is a loanword from Sumerian. The meaning is "very" or "much" (CAD M/1:28 ff.). As such, it generally serves to add a relative nuance to other terms, usually verbs. Once it is found modifying an adjective:

yu-uš-ši-ra 1šār-ri / EN-ia ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ti / ma-ā-da ma-gal
 "May my king, my lord, send a very large army"
 (EA 282:10-12).

That *ma'ā-da* is a masculine singular adjective modifying ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ti* is confirmed by the unequivocal accusative adjective in the following:

uš-ši-ra ERÍN.MEŠ *pf-tá-ti / ra-ba* "Send a large army"
(EA 76:38-39).

Thus, we must reject the interpretation of *CAD* (M/1:4b), where *ma'da* in EA 282:12 is taken as an adverb.

There is a single instance, however, in which *magal* does modify another adverb (EA 297:8-11; for the citation cf. *supra*, p. 144).

The remaining examples are all with various forms of the verb. The majority modify a form such as *išteme* "I have heeded" and its variants (EA 141:23; 216:12; *et al.*). It is not surprising that with this verb and similar expressions of obedience on the part of the vassals, one frequently finds the double *ma-gal ma-gal* "very much." Other 1st c.s. verbs in comparable contexts with *magal magal* are *uššura* "I will guard" (EA 337:28-30) and *urrudu* "I am serving" (EA 257:18-19).

Seldom is the double form used with a stative verb, though a few instances are known, e.g.

ù ki-na-na pa-al-ḥa-ti ma-gal ma-gal "And thus I feared very much"
(EA 74:43); *ù ḥa-di lib ḪR-ka . . . ma-gal ma-gal* "And the heart of
your servant rejoiced . . . very much" (EA 141:11-14).

OF SWIFTNESS

arḫiš. The formation of this adverb with *-iš* was discussed in the introductory section (*infra*, pp. 7-8). The etymology of the vocable is obscured by the presence of a few examples with initial *w* (cf. *AHw*:63, 1463b, concerning the cognate verb). Though widely attested in the various Akkadian dialects, it only appears in the MB sphere among peripheral texts, Boghazköi and EA. The non-WS texts (Alashia, Amurru, Egypt, Hattusas) employ *arḫiš* alone in accordance with standard Akkadian usage (*CAD* A/2:257a; *AHw*:67a).

Only along the Phoenician coast (Byblos, Beirut) and in two WS-flavored texts from Alashia (EA 33:22, 26; 34:38) does one find the compound *kīma arḫiš* "with haste." All occurrences

modify a verb form "to come, arrive" or "to send, expedite." Of the former, note the following:

ku-uš-da ki-ma ar-ḫi-iš "Come with all haste" (EA 82:52; Albright and Moran 1948:242); *ḫu-mi-ṭa₅(UD) ki-ma / ar-ḫi-iš ka-aš-da* "Hasten (your) arrival as much as possible" (EA 137:97-99; *AHw*:943b).

ḫamutta(m), *ḫamuttiš*, *ḫamittu*. As the adverb formed from the accusative of the feminine singular adjective of the verb *ḫamāṭu* (for the *ṭt* > *tt* as indicated by OB spellings *et al.*, cf. von Soden 1969:11**, §60c), *ḫamutta(m)* is known from OB and widely used in MB, including peripheral dialects such as Mitannian (*CAD* ḫ:75; *AHw*:319b). It appears in two Alashian letters (EA 39:11, 15; 40:19-28), both of which show some WS influence. Otherwise, it is known in only a single WS epistle from Jerusalem:

ù lu-ma-še-ra DUMU ṽLÚ¹.[KIN] / ṽḫa¹-mu-tam "So may he (the king) send the ambas[sador] quickly" (EA 285:28-29).

Therefore its use is rightly seen by Moran (1975b:155) as another of the "northern" affinities of the Jerusalem texts.

The formation with adverbial *-iš* is unique to the EA corpus (*CAD* ḫ:75b; *AHw*:319a). The non-WS letters from Amurru employ *ina ḫamutiš* (EA 157:34; *et al.*) quite often. Only once, in a Rib-Haddi letter written from Beirut, do we find a compound with *kīma*:

[ù uš-ši-ra] / ERÍN.MEŠ ki-ma ḫa-ṽmu¹-ti-iš "[So send] the regular troops quickly!" (EA 137:92).

The same epistle also employs a hapax with adverbial *-u* and what may possibly be explained as dissimilation of the preceding vowel:

ù yu-ši-ra-šu ḫa-mi-ṽit¹-ṽtù¹ "So may he send him quickly!" (EA 137:79; *CAD* ḫ:67; *AHw*:319b).

SOCIAL, COMMUNAL

yaḥdôn-. The use of this vocable requires special attention. It was misunderstood by CAD I/J:321. This is the Canaanite equivalent of Akkadian *edēnu/idēnu* (discussed below); its meaning is "single, lone person," and with a genitive pronominal suffix, it means "by my-/himself," etc. The form is **yaḥdôn- < *yaḥdānu*, cf. Arabic *waḥdānī*. The single attestation is as follows:

a-na-ku-ma \ ya-ḥu-du-un-ni / ub-ba-lu LÚ.MEŠ *ma-as-sà* MEŠ
 "(Only) I, by myself, am bringing corvée workers"
 (EA 365:24-25; Rainey 1978b:73).

The spelling with an *u* vowel after the *ḥ* probably represents a short anaptyctic vowel close to vocal shewa, that is, **yaḥodôn-*. The suffix here is 1st c.s., *-ni*.

idēnu (for *edēnu*). The Canaanite **yaḥdôn-* evidently stands behind the prepositional combinations, plus pronominal suffixes, unique to the Byblos correspondence. The spelling of the Akkadian form with initial *i* is almost entirely unique as well (CAD E:27). It may be compared to the Byblian practice of spelling infinitives from 1st Alef verbs with *i* instead of *e*. The basic meaning of *edēnu/idēnu* is "single, lone person." One may compare the literary and NB forms *edāniš* and *edēnuššu* (with adverbial *-um* plus suffix).

Two examples will suffice for comparison with the Megiddo passage containing **yaḥdôn-* cited above:

a-na-ku / i-na i-de-ni-ia / ^li¹-na-ša-r[u ra-m]a-ni-ia "I, by myself, am guarding my[sel]f" (EA 122:19-20; Moran 1950a:174);
 URU *Gub-la i-na i-de-ni-ši_x(ŠE) / ir-ti-ḥa-at a-na ia-ši* "Byblos alone remains to me" (EA 124:9-10).

Note that EA 91:21, 26 have the same expression but with *ana* instead of *ina*, to which Moran (1950a:17) has compared Heb. *ləḥaddî*.

puḥriš. Only twice is the adverb *puḥriš* attested (AHw:876b). Its meaning must be "together, all together." Moran (1975a:150 and n. 3; 1987b:481; 1992:307) has demonstrated that, in the following passage, this adverb is part of Labʾayu's speech made at Gezer; it does not modify the verb of speaking ("publicly" as proposed by Albright 1942b:34 n. 9).

ù aq-ta-bu / pu-uḥ-ri-iš-mi / yi-il-te-qú šâr-ru / mim-mi-ia "And I was saying "The king is taking over my property completely" (EA 254:24-26).

The other context must thus be rendered:

lu-ú ti-i-de i-nu-ma / tu-ša-ṭú-na ¹DI.KUD. ^dIŠKUR / *ù* ¹Zi-im-re-¹da¹ / *pu-uḥ-ri-iš* "May you be apprised that Shipti-Ba^clu and Zimredda are being altogether insubordinate!" (EA 333:4-7; *contra* AHw:1205a and Albright 1942b:34 and n. 9).

It goes without saying, therefore, that *puḥriš* has nothing to do with a "civic forum" (Akkadian *puḥru*) at Gezer (cf. Reviv 1966:288-289).

CHAPTER VII

INTRODUCTORY ADVERBS

The following vocables serve to introduce a clause or a new paragraph. Some of them carry special semantic loads such as conditional or deictic, e.g. *šumma*, *umma*, while others are more for style or rhetorical division of thought units, e.g. *anumma*, *šanītam*. The wide variation in the selection and construction of such particles in the Semitic languages and the differences between Akkadian and West Semitic makes the EA group especially fascinating.

PRESENTATION PARTICLES — "NOW"

This category of presentation particles is useful for rhetorical division of components within the message of an epistle, particularly with reference to the time relationship between units. The logical relationship between paragraphs of information can also be established by the use of "now" presentation particles (Rainey 1988b:209-211).

anumma. The use of this temporal adverb (cf. *supra*, pp. 116-118) to introduce the topic of a letter after the introductory formulae (in particular to introduce a message and its bearer) is a widespread feature of the Babylonian dialects (*CAD* A/2:147-148), especially OB and Mari letters. It evidently stands behind the later Aramaic epistolary style (e.g. *k^oan*, Ezra 4:13 *et al.*), which probably influenced the use of ^c*t* = biblical ^c*attā^h* in the Lachish and Arad. letters. There can be no doubt that we have here the use of "now" as a simple introductory expression. One can not justify the meaning "siehe!" assigned to *anumma* by Ebeling (1915:1377), which led to the unfortunate confusion by Dhorme (1913:363 = 1951:477) of *anumma* with *annû* and with Arabic ²*innā* and Hebrew *hinnē^h*.

The introductory usage is evidenced by a N. Syrian (Mitannian) "passport" (EA 30; Artzi 1973), in which the body of the epistolary message begins:

a-nu-ma ¹A-ki-ia LÚDUMU.KIN-ia . . . *al-ta-pár-šu* "Now, (as for) Akyā, my ambassador, . . . I have sent him" (EA 30:3-6).

Likewise, a clear example is found in the Alashia texts:

a-nu-ma LÚDUMU.KIN-ia *it-ti* / LÚDUMU.KIN-ka *a-na* UGU-ka *al-ta-pár* "Now, my ambassador together with your ambassador have I sent to you" (EA 35:8-9).

So it is not surprising that the Egyptian scribes also make use of this formula at the beginning of an epistle:

a-nu-ma aš-te-me "Now I have heard" (EA 1:10); *a-nu-um-ma* LUGAL *um-te-eš-še-ra-ku* "Now the king has sent to you" (EA 367:6; also EA 369:2-3, 4-5).

Given the knowledge of Akkadian among WS scribes, it is not surprising that the introductory function of *anumma* appears among their letters. Note especially the allusions to previous correspondence as a springboard to the message of the epistle:

¹a¹-*nu-ma ta-aš-pu-¹ra¹* *a-na ia-ši* "Now, you have written to me" (EA 95:7; Youngblood 1961:388); *a-nu-ma ki-a-ma / aš-ta-pa-ru a-na É.GAL* "Now, I have been writing thus to the palace" (EA 118:8-9);

even with a strong WS flavor:

a-nu-ma / a-na ia-ši / ša-ap-ra-ta "Now, you wrote to me" (EA 201:9-11).

Once the message is introduced with reference to the whereabouts of the sender:

a-nu-ma i-na URU.KI / *i₁₅-ba-ša-ku-mi* "Now, I am in the city"
(EA 192:5-6).

In another instance, the essence of the message is that the sender and his entourage (companions?) have recently changed their venue:

ù a-nu-ma né-e-ta-lí i-na KUR.MEŠ "And now we have gone up
into the mountains(?) (EA 178:4).

Note that, in the latter example, *anumma* is preceded by the conjunction. It must also be noted that there is no consistent correlation between *anumma* and the so-called "perfect" (*iptaras*) of the Akkadian verbal system (as posited for OB by Heimpel and Guidi 1969); the scribes from Canaan use a variety of verb forms, depending on the particular situation they are reporting. In any event, the past tense forms with infix *-t-* do not play a significant role in these texts (Rainey 19771c).

Several letters seem to combine the temporal with the introductory function of *anumma*. They introduce an announcement that the sender is dutifully fulfilling a royal command and protecting his city. The verb employed is usually a form of *našāru* in the WS present/future to show current action, an expression often coupled with *anumma* in a subsequent paragraph after reporting the receipt of the message. So in these instances, the affirmation of obedience opens the text of the message after the preliminary obsequious phraseology; *anumma* both introduces the body of the letter, and carries its adverbial force in conjunction with the WS imperfect verb:

a-nu-ma a-na-ša-ru / URU.KI *ša* LUGAL / *ša it-ti-ia* "Now, I am
guarding the city of the king which is under my command"
(EA 307:3-5; also EA 315:8; 316:10; 323:9; 326:9).

In this introductory role, *anumma* is seldom found beyond the opening paragraph of the message within a letter. The only admissible meaning is a mild "Now."

inanna. Further support for the aforementioned view concerning *anumma* derives from the single instance in which *inanna* fulfills the identical function:

ù *i-na-na a-na* LUGAL GAL / *be-li-ia* / ¹Da-¹ga¹-¹an¹-¹ta¹-ka-¹la¹ /
 ÌR-ka a-[n]a *a-wa-ti* / LUGAL GAL *be-li-ia* / *iš-me* "And now, to
 the great king, my lord: Dagan-takala, your servant. To the
 words of the great king, my lord, I have listened" (EA 317:7-12;
 Moran 1987b:541; 1992:349).

annûš. One of the most mysterious adverbs in this category is *annuš*, perhaps to be read *annûš*. It appears in only a limited number of Byblos texts, EA 73-76, and always with *inanna*. Böhl (1909:73) assumed that it was formed by *annû* + 3rd m.s. -š(u). *AHw*:54a leans towards the connection with *annû*, with the meaning "behold." It will be seen below that *annû* generally has the meaning "behold," but that it, too, may drop into a slot usually intended for *anumma* "now." One might suggest that *annûš* is *annû* + adverbial -(i)š, but the logic behind such a unique formation on the part of perhaps only one Canaanite scribe is hard to grasp.

One feature does seem to be common to all passages with *annûš*. Their statements refer to past events which have consequences for the present:

ù ¹an¹-nu-uš *i-na-an-na* / *i-te-zi-ib šār-ru* URU *ki-it-ti-šu* / *iš-tu*
qa-ti-šu "But now the king has abandoned his faithful city"
 (EA 74:8-10); ù *an-nu-uš i-na-an-na il-te₉-qé* / ÌR-A-ši-ir-ta
 URU š_i-ga-ta *a-na ša-a-šu* "But now 'Abdi-Ashirta has taken
 Shigata for himself" (EA 74:23-24); ù *an-nu-uš i-na-an-na* /
iš-tap-pa-ar ÌR-A-ši-ir-ta *a-na ERÍN.MEŠ* "And even now
 'Abdi-Ashirta has written to the troops" (EA 74:29-30); ù
an-nu-uš [i]-na-an-na / LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*Am-mi-i-a* *ti-du-ku* /
 EN-šu[-nu] "And now the men of Ammia have slain the[ir]
 master" (EA 75:32-34; Youngblood 1961:164); ù *an-nu-uš* /
i-na-an-na in₄-né-ep-ša-at / KUR.KI LUGAL ù ^{URU}*š_u-mu-ra* /
 URU *ma-ša-ar-ti-ku-nu* / *a-na LÚ GAZ.MEŠ* "And now the land

of the king and Šumur, your garrison city, have gone over to the men of the "apîrû" (EA 76:33-36).

The additional passage below is only an apparent exception to the rule. The verb *ira*²*amû* here should most probably be construed as an Akkadian *iparras* (without consonantal prefix) standing for a WS stative which is meant to represent a present attitude on the part of the population of Amurru that had developed from their change of outlook in the fairly recent past:

ù an-nu-uš i-na-an-na / [ú]-ul i-ra-a-mu a-na ÌR-A-ši-ir-ta "But now they (the people of Amurru) are not sympathetic to "Abdi-Ashirta" (EA 73:17-18).

PRESENTATION PARTICLES — "BEHOLD"

The adverbs in this category are sometimes called interjections but they may also be referred to as demonstrative adverbs (Rainey 1988b:211-220). They do not just introduce; they call attention. The best rendering is "Behold," and in fact one of them is the imperative of the verb, "to see."

annû. In outward form this adverb cannot be distinguished from the m.s. demonstrative adjective. It may, in fact, be that adjective serving in a special adverbial function. However, because such usage is totally foreign to other Akkadian dialects, one must conclude that it is due to specific Canaanite influence. *CAD* (A/2:138b) simply puts the passages under the demonstrative pronoun *annû* with the notation that the usage of *annû* in these contexts is paralleled by *amur* "behold." It is certainly to be kept apart from *anumma* (Youngblood 1961:3-34).

The question remains open as to whether *annû* stands for some Canaanite particle of similar shape, something like **hannû* or **hannô*, or whether it is simply the Akkadian demonstrative pronoun standing for some entirely different Canaanite vocable.

The usual spellings of adverbial *annû*, which is confined to WS texts, is *an-nu-ú*; one instance of *an-nu* (EA 131:37) and

another of *an-na* (EA 117:19) probably are plain errors but also seem to preclude the possibility of taking the *-ú* sign as the 3rd m.s. pronominal suffix (cf. *hinnô*, *hinnéhû* in Hebrew). The spelling *a-nu* in EA 89:38 and EA 114:30 are to be completed *a-nu-⟨ma⟩* (*contra* Youngblood 1961:333-334).

First, the clearcut evidence will be given for the nuance "behold!" Then the instances of similarity in usage to *anumma* "now" will be treated.

The parallels with *amur* are striking, e.g.

an-nu-ú a-na-ku . . . "Behold, as for myself . . ." (EA 205:15; 122:15, 28),

in the well-known syntagma (cf. *infra*, pp. 172-173).

An emphasis such as "behold!" also seems mandatory in the following passages:

KASKAL-*na-ni* ^{HÁ} / ^{KUR}*Ha-na-galḡ-bat an-nu-ú / ú-wa-še-ru-na* *ù uš-še-ru-ši* "As for the Khanigalbat caravan, behold I am sending, so you(pl.) expedite it!" (EA 255:9-11); *an-nu-ú* 2 ITU.MEŠ *ia-[a-nu]-ma* "Behold, two months he hasn't been (here)" (EA 256:14); *ša-ni-tam an-nu-ú is-tu / ša-pa-ri-ka ṭup-pa a-na mu-ḫi-ia / ša-pár-ti a-na ša-šu / . . . ù an-nu-[ú] / ka-ši-id a-na URUP* *ḫi-li* "Furthermore, behold, since your sending a tablet to me, I have written to him, and behold, he has arrived in Piḫilu" (EA 256:29-33; Albright 1943a:15).

The strongest evidence for the meaning "Behold" comes from the parallels in the Shechem letters treated *supra*, p. 82, for example:

an-nu-ú ar-nu-ia / ù an-nu-ú ¹*ḫi-ṭú-ia*, "Behold my crime and my sin" (EA 253:18-20), paralleled by *i₁₅-ba-aš-ši ar-ni-ia* "My crime is" (EA 254:20).

The subject of each sentence is the misdeed of Lab²ayu, ruler of Shechem, and in apposition to that subject is a "that"-clause:

i-nu-ma / ir-ru-ba-ti i-na / URUGaz-ri "that I entered into Gezer"
(EA 253:20-21; 254:21-22).

The presence of the stative *ibašši* in the latter text shows that the *inūma* clause is in apposition; thus, *annû* in EA 253:18, 19 cannot be the demonstrative pronoun.

The following three examples of introductory *annû* in the Tyrian correspondence, which do not have the conjunction *u*, can best be rendered "Behold," viz.

an-nu-ú iš-pu-ur ÌR-du a-na be-li-šu "Behold, the servant has written to his lord" (EA 147:16); *an-nu-ú iq-bi / a-na* ^dUTU *a-bi LUGAL be-li-ia* "Behold, I have said to the Sun, the father of the king, my lord" (EA 147:57-58); *an-nu-ú a-na-an-šár* URU LUGAL "Behold, I am guarding the city of the king" (EA 151:6).

However, the last example cited above is paralleled in EA 147:61 by the same sentence but with *anumma*. Therefore, it may be helpful to cite the whole passage:

an-nu-ú iq-bi / a-na ^dUTU *a-bi LUGAL be-li-ia / ma-ti-ma i-mur / pa-ni LUGAL be-li-ia / ù a-nu-um-ma a-na-an-šár / URUŠur-ri URU ra-bi-tu / a-na LUGAL be-le-ia* "Behold, I have spoken to the Sun, the father of the king, my lord, 'When will I see the face of the king, my lord?' And now I am guarding Tyre, the great city, for the king, my lord" (EA 147:57-63).

The scribe used *annû* but reverted to *anumma* in the asseveration of loyal obedience. Can one deduce from this that he felt a contrast between *annû* and *anumma*? And if so, was there that same awareness of a difference in EA 151:16 where the obedience declaration is introduced by *annû*?

A definitive answer may be impossible to this question based on the available sources but one cannot dismiss the instances where *annû*, like *annûš*, clearly has the meaning "now." Note the following example where the temporal dimension is a crucial factor in the argument"

a->na-¹mur¹ pa-na-nu / LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM ša-a / URUŠu-mu-[ra] / [tu-]pa-ri-šu be-ri-nu ù an-nu-[ú/uš?] / ¹la¹-a yi-iš-[m]u ha-za-nu a-na ša-[šu] "Behold, formerly, the commissioners of Šumur decided between us, but now the city-rulers won't listen to hi[m]" (EA 118:50-54).

Since *annûš* is limited to a few of the earlier Byblos texts, it is more likely that the restoration here is *an-nu-[ú]*.

Thus, in spite of some instances in the letters from Byblos where "Behold" seems the more natural rendering, one cannot be certain of the scribe's real intention, e.g.

ù a-nu-ú i-na <qa-at> ¹Ia-pa- dIŠK[UR] / [a]d-di-<in> KÛ.BABBAR-šu-nu "And behold, into the <hand> of Yapa^c-Haddu I have giv<en> their money" (EA 85:29-30; Youngblood 1961:275; cf. also EA 81:44; 92:23, 25, (26?), 37; 114:57-58 with dittography).

There are also a number of cases where *annû* stands with *inanna*, like *annûš*. They all seem to indicate past events that have led to a certain situation in the present:

ù an-nu-ú i-na-na / nu- KÚR ¹Ia-pa- dIŠKUR it-ti ¹A-zi-ri / a-na ia-ši "And behold, now Yapa^c-Haddu along with Aziru is hostile towards me" (EA 114:15-17; cf. also the broken context in EA 112:54 with the existential negative *ia-[nu]*).

The stative can be paralleled by several past tense *qtl*'s which bear on a present condition:

ù / an-nu-ú i-na-na / iš-ta-ha-aṭ-ni ¹A-zi-ru / ù iš-ta-ni "And behold now, Aziru has repeatedly attacked me" (EA 125:18-21);
ù an-nu-ú i-na-na / pu-ḫi-ir ¹A-zi-ru k[a-li] / LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ "And behold now, Aziru has assembled all the men of the *apîrū*" (EA 132:19-21).

Byblos is not the only source for such usage:

ù *an-nu-ú* / *i-na-an-na bu-i-ti₇ uš-šir₄* / KASKAL.ḪÁ-ia "And behold now, I have sought to send my caravans" (EA 264:19-21).

There can be no doubt, therefore, that *annû* and its by-form *annûš*, have usurped some of the functions of *anumma*. On the other hand, it appears doubtful whether one might conclude that *anumma* also took on the meaning "Behold," since "now" is just as functional as an attention getter for the opening of a sentence. Therefore, there is still no justification for Ebeling's assumption that *anumma* could mean "Behold!"

allû. Alongside *annû* there is a by-form, *allû*. The situation is evidently parallel to the correspondence in Ugaritic between *hn* and *hl*, both of which are presentation particles to introduce clauses (cf. most recently Loewenstamm 1980:63, 451-454; Aartun 1974:68-70, 72-73, fails to grasp the relationship). The semantic range of *allû* will be analyzed below.

The spelling may be *al-lu* (EA 117:11; 118:36) often with enclitic *-mi*, namely *al-lu-mi* or *al-lu-mì*, but plene spellings predominate, *al-lu-ú*, *al-lu-ú-mi*, or *al-lu-ú-mì*. Once we find *al₇-lu-ú-mì* (EA 198:27). Of special interest are the secondary forms which seem to reflect some kind of declination, viz. *al-le* (EA 94:63), *al-le-mi* (EA 83:53) and *al-le-e* (EA 12:41) plus *al-la* (EA 101:14) and *al-la-mi* (EA 83:38).

From the very beginning, *allû* was equated with Hebrew *h'alô²*, the rhetorical particle meaning "Is it not that?" Böhl (1909:72-73) was the first to reject this equation; subsequently, Albright and Moran, followed by Youngblood (for references, cf. *infra*), continued to render it by "Behold" and the like. But recently, the CAD (A/1:358) went back to the view that *allû* is an interrogative particle. A review of the evidence will show that such an interpretation is wrong.

An etymological connection between *allû* and *h'alô²* is questionable indeed. How can one explain the gemination in the EA particle as against the lack of it in Hebrew, not to mention the *shewa* in the first syllable of the biblical form? Furthermore, the

EA variants *allê(mi)* and *allâ* are not conducive to a comparison with Hebrew *lôʿ*, the second component in *h^alôʿ*. Even so, one might argue that *allû* is some older, Canaanite form supplanted later by the biblical *h^alôʿ*. These etymological speculations do not solve the semantic problem, which in this, as in other such comparisons, must be the prime consideration. In the OT, *h^alôʿ* often functions as a substitute for *hinnēh*, and LXX frequently renders it by ἰδοὺ (Dt. 3:11; Josh. 1:9; 1 Sam 20:37; 2 Sam 15:35; 2 Ki. 15:21; Am. 5:20; Prov. 8:1; 14:22; 22:20). Note the verses where Kings has *h^alôʿ* while the parallels in Chronicles have *hinnēh* (2 Ki. 15:36; 20:20; 21:17; 2 Chron. 27:7; 32:32; 33:18; 35:27).

The EA form might be an adaptation from *allû* as a cognate of *ullû*, the demonstrative "that" (CAD A/1:358b). The analogy would be that of *annû*, the near demonstrative, serving as a presentation particle in EA (cf. *supra*, pp. 155-159). However, in both instances, there is no proof that the EA forms are simply borrowed demonstratives; the question remains open.

At first glance, there are many passages where the CAD's translations seem to make sense, even providing a poignant flavor. But in none of those instances is it mandatory to see a rhetorical question; the more bland "Behold" can also be read without affecting the meaning of the clause. Contrariwise, there are passages where "Is it not" just does not fit. A good case in point is this text:

al-lu / pa-tá-ri-ma LÚ.MEŠ *ḥu-up-ši ù / ša-ab-tu* LÚ.MEŠ
GAZ.MEŠ / URU "Behold, if the yeoman farmers desert, then
the *ʿapîrû* men will capture the city (EA 118:36-38; Moran
1950a:31; 1950c:169-170; 1987b:326; 1992:196).

But in CAD A/1:358b one finds: "Is it not on account of the deserting of the *ḥupšu*-people that the Ḥapiru took the town?" completely ignoring the historical context of this epistle. in question. Moran's translation (cited above), in which the initial clause is conditional, is the only acceptable interpretation since the city in question is Byblos and Byblos had not yet fallen as of

the writing of EA 118! The same kind of contradiction holds for the next passage:

al-lu-ú ḥa-za-na-šu da-ku / qa-du a-ḥa-ti-ia ù DUMU.MEŠ-ši_x(ŠE)
(EA 89:20-21),

as read by CAD (*loc. cit.*):

"Is their mayor not killed with my sister and her children?"

But correctly by Albright and Moran (1950:164):

"Behold, they have killed their governor along with my sister and her sons."

Rib-Haddi was reporting this news to Egypt, as is clear from lines 38-43 of the same text (pointed out by Albright and Moran 1950:167). Again, a rhetorical question would not be appropriate.

An even more striking contrast occurs, however, when a real rhetorical question is expressed—not with *allû* but with *ul!* The same passage does contain *allâ*, functioning as a true presentation particle with *inanna*.

ša-ni-tam GIŠMÁ.MEŠ *ša ma-ni / i-zi-zu* UGU-ia *ú-ul / LÚ.MEŠ*
URUAr-wa-da / ù al-la šu-nu i-na-na / it-ti-ka ša-bat GIŠMÁ.MEŠ /
LÚ.MEŠ URUAr-wa-da / ša-a i-ba-šu i-na / KURMi-iš-ri
"Furthermore, whose were the ships that attacked me? Were they not the men of Arvad? But, behold, they are now (there) with you! Seize the ships of the men of Arvad that are in Egypt!" (EA 101:11-18).

Neither can one take the following negative assertions as rhetorical questions:

al-lu-ú la-a ti-le-ú-na "Behold, they are not able" (EA 108:45);
[a]l-lu¹-mi¹ ¹Pu-ḥu-ur / *la-a [yi]-na-ša-ar-ni* "[Be]hold, Puḥur [di]d not protect me" (EA 207:17-18).

Given the rigid format of ancient epistolary style, it is hardly likely that the body of a letter, after the opening clauses of address and greeting, would open with a rhetorical question. And yet, *allûmi* does appear as the lead-off particle in two texts, from Byblos and Megiddo respectively:

a[l-lu-]mi / 'ia¹-a^q-bu šâr-ru EN-li "Behold, the king, my lord, says/has been saying" (EA 117:6-7); *al-lu-ú-mi na-ad-na-ku / 'ŠU¹.KAM-mi šâr-ri / [EN]-ia 30 GU₄.MEŠ* "Behold, I have supplied the king my [lord's] request, thirty head of cattle" (EA 242:9-10; Moran 1979).

In one of the instances when *annû* takes the place of *anumma*, in tandem with *inanna*, there starts a chain of three clauses, the second and third of which are introduced by *allû*. The first clause is furnishing new information, so the subsequent clauses must be understood as a continuation or rather expansion of the original theme:

ù an-nu-ú i-na-na / nu- KÚR I¹a-pa- dIŠKUR it-ti I¹A-zi-ri / a-na ia-ši ù al-lu-ú ša-bat GIŠMÁ-ia / ù al-lu-ú ki-na-na-ma yi-te₉-lu / i-na I¹ib¹-bi a-ia-ba aš-šum ša-ba-at / GIŠMÁ.MEŠ-ia "And behold now, Yapa^c-Haddi is hostile to me along with Aziru, and behold, he has seized my ship, and behold, he thus goes forth to the open sea in order to seize my ships!" (EA 114:15-20, cf. line 69; Rainey 1971c:88-89).

In another epistle, one finds an alternation between *allû* at the opening of the message (EA 117:7, cited *supra*), *amur* "Behold" (*loc. cit.*, cited *infra*, p. 172), and then again *allû*, with all of the clauses giving further elaboration on the opening theme:

ù al-lu / pa-nu gáb-bi a-na ia-ši "and behold, everyone's face is set against me!" (EA 117:11-12).

Another group of texts used by CAD (A/1:358) to support the "is it not?" connotation deals with the request that Pharaoh

question someone who is there at hand—either the bearer of the actual text itself, or else some official now in Egypt, but recently arrived from Canaan. Three of the passages in question could lend themselves to such a view. They each contain an adverbial phrase as predicate of a non-verbal sentence, indicating that the person suggested for interrogation is available there, in other words "with the king."

al-lu-mi / ¹P[u-ḥ]e-ya it-ṭi-ka ša-al-šu "Behold, B[uḥ]eya is with you, ask him!" (EA 85:30-31); [*a*]l-lu-mi ¹Ia-an-ḥ[a-mu] / it-ti-ka ù š[*a-al-šu*] "[B]ehold, Yanḥ[amu] is with you, so a[sk him]!" (EA 132:29-30; likewise EA 127:23-24).

That these are declarations, as translated here, and not rhetorical questions as rendered by *CAD*, is proved by the remaining examples in which the prepositional phrase is absent. There can be no doubt that *allû* here is a true presentation particle introducing the person named, e.g.

al-lu ¹A-ma-an-ma-ša ša-nu / ša-al-šu "Behold, another (or: the other) Amanmassa, ask him!" (EA 114:51-52; cf. Moran 1987b:316; 1992:189; for other examples cf. also EA 112:47-48; 208:10-12).

But the most detailed passage in this category also reflects a striking contrast with *annû*; the latter introduces a nominal clause while *allû* introduces a series of three personal names. Such a distinction cannot be posited for every context where both particles are used by the same author, but at least it did seem perfectly natural to one scribe. As with the passage just cited, this one also lacks any prepositional phrase:

an-nu-ú 2 'ITU'.ḤÁ ia-¹a-¹nu-¹ma / *al-lu-ú* ¹Bi-in₄-i₁₅-li-ma / ¹ša-¹al *al-lu-ú* / [I]Ta-du-a ša-al / *al-lu-ú* ¹Ya-šu-ia / ša-al "Behold, (for) two months he hasn't been (here); behold Bin-Ilîma, ask (him)!; behold Tadia, ask (him)!; behold Yashuya, ask (him)!" (EA 256:14-19; Albright 1943b:11-12; Rainey 1989-90:70a *contra*

Naʿaman 1988:181-182 accepted by Moran 1987b:484 n. 4; 1992:309-310 n. 3).

The presentational function is nowhere more obvious than in the allusions to commodities being sent with the epistle in hand. For example, the only Alashia letter to use *allû* has the following statement:

ù al-lu-ú ut-ta-šir₉-ka / i-na qa-ti LÚDUMU *ši-ip-ri-ia a-na ka-ta₅ / 1 ME GUN URUDU.MEŠ* "And behold, I have sent to you by the hand of my emissary, one hundred talents of copper" (EA 34:16-18); *ù ša / te-ri-šu at-ta a-[na-k]u id-di-nu / ù al-lu-ú ḫa-ba-na-at[-tu?] Ì DÜG.GA / ma-la-at a-na ta-bá-ki a-na [qa-qa]-di-ka / uš-ši-ir-ti* "And whatever you request, I (will) give; and behold, a jar full of perfumed oil to anoint your [he]ad have I sent" (EA 34:48-52; CAD H:7a; M/1:176b).

Similar expressions emanate from Canaan in response to royal requests for raw glass (Oppenheim 1973:259-260):

ʿal¹-lu-ú uš-ši-ir-ti a-na LUGAL EN-ia / 30(+x?) NA₄.MEŠ eḫ-lu-pa-ak-ʿku¹ "Behold, I have sent to the king, my lord, thirty (+x?) chunks of raw glass" (EA 323:15-16; cf. EA 331:19-21).

Besides commodities, the actual bearer of a letter may be introduced, using *allû* for the presentation:

ù al₇-lu-ú-mi / DUMU-ia uš-ši-ir-ti / a-na ma-ḫar LUGAL EN-ia "And behold, my son have I sent before the king, my lord" (EA 198:27-29); *al-lu-ú uš-ši-i[r-]t[i] / ÌR LUGAL ša-n[a-a]m* "Behold, I have sent another servant of the king" (EA 306:23-24).

In the following passage it is perfectly obvious that the particle *allêmi* is serving to introduce two people, and can under no circumstances be interpreted as a rhetorical question. It is simply introducing a pair of individuals from Byblos:

al-le-mi / ^MUm-ma-aḥ-nu ù ^Iš-ku-nu / *mu-ut-ši*_x(ŠE) GEMÉ ša
 ḏNIN / [šá] ^{URU}Gu[b-l]a "Behold Ummaḥnu and Ishkunu, her
 husband, the handmaiden of the Lady [of] By[bl]os"
 (EA 83:52-55).

It remains to examine certain well-known contexts where *allû* holds a prominent place. It hardly seems likely, in view of the foregoing evidence, that any of them could be rhetorical questions. Some of them have been so pivotal in historical and philological discussions that it seems advisable to cite them in full. The first pertains to delivering a person over to custody and thus may be compared with the preceding passages about sending someone. It is from Lab³ayu of Shechem:

ù-ul _{i15}-de *i-nu-ma* / ^IDUMU.MU-ia *it-ti* / LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ /
it-ta-na-la-ku / ù *al-lu-ú na-ad-na-ti*₇-šu / *i-na* ŠU ^IAd-da-[i]a "I did
 not know that my son was consorting with the ^c*apîrû* men; but
 behold, I have handed him over to Adda[y]a" (EA 254:32-37;
 Campbell 1965:167; Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:486).

The second is from a Megiddo letter concerning an important historical detail, viz. the loyalty of Yashdata, ruler of Taanach (Rainey 1968a:8, 14):

ù al-lu-ú-mi ^IYa-aš-da-ta / ^IR-ka ù *šu-ú-ut!*(TE) / *yi-ru-ub it-ti*-[i]a
 / *i-na* MÈ *ta-ḥa*-[zi] "And behold, Yashdata is your servant and
 he entered with me into the fray" (EA 245:15-18).

A third has to do with the crisis on the Phoenician coast:

[ù] *al-lu-m*[i p]a-^Itá¹-[ru] / [a-n]a *ma-ḥar* DUMU.MEŠ /
 [I]Ṛ-A-š*i-ir-ta* ù / [a-]na ^{URU}Ši-*du-na* ù / ^{URU}Be-ru-ta *al-lu-mi* /
 DUMU.MEŠ ṚA-š*i-ir-ra nu-* KÚR / *a-na* LUGAL ù ^{URU}Ši-*du-na*
 / ù!(ŠI) ^{URU}Be-ru-ta *ú-ul* / *a-na* LUGAL "And behold, [they]
 have departed [t]o the sons of ^cAbdi-Ashirta and [t]o Sidon and
 Beirut. Behold, the sons of ^cAbdi-Ashirta are hostile to the king,
 and Sidon and Beirut are not on the king's side" (EA 118:24-32).

The following passages might be taken as rhetorical questions if seen out of context. However, the mass of evidence discussed above assures us that even the ensuing texts are, in fact, declarations:

[ù] *al-lu-ú šap-ra-ti* / [a-n]a LUGAL UGU-*hi-ku-nu* "[And] behold, I have written [t]o the king concerning you" (EA 96:30-31); *al-lu-mi* / ¹Ia-pa-^dIŠKUR *i-t[e₉-p]u-[uš]* / *ar-na* "Behold, Yapa^c-Haddi has co[mmi]tt[ed] a crime" (EA 113:7-9); *al-lu-ú* ¹A-zi-ru ù / ¹Ia-pa-^dIŠKUR *la-qú a-wa-ta* ¹be¹-ri-šu-nu "Behold, Aziru and Yapa^c-Haddi have made an agreement among themselves" (EA 116:50-51; Moran 1950a:147); ù *al-l[u]-mi lem-né-ti₇ a-na pa-ni* / LUGAL EN-*ia* "And behold, I am vilified before the king, my lord" (EA 180:19-20; CAD L:123b); ù *al-lu-ú-mi LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM.MEŠ* / LUGAL EN-*ia* ù LÚ.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ-*šu* / *i-du-mi ki-it-ti₇-ia* "And behold, the commissioners of the king, my lord, and his officials know my loyalty" (EA 189:13-15); ù *al-lu-ú il₅-qé-ši* ¹Ma-a-*ia* / *iš-tu qa-te-ia* "And behold, Maya took it from my hands" (EA 292:33-34); ù *al-lu-ú il₅-qé-šu-nu* / ¹Pi-*ia* DUMU *Gu-la-ti* "And behold, Pi³eya, son of Gulati, took them" (EA 294:23-24).

On one occasion we find *allû* introducing a direct quotation:

ù *al-le-e* / *ta-aq-bu* URU *ip-šu* / *ša la a-pí-iš* / *iš-tu* / *da-ri-ti a-pí-iš* / *a-na ia-ši-nu* "And behold, the city is saying, 'A deed which has never been done before has been committed against us'" (EA 122:40-41).

In another epistle, *allûmi*, with the Akkadian marker of direct speech, appears as the opening particle within two direct quotations:

ù *t[i]-iq-bu* / *a-na ša-a-šu* ¹al¹-*lu-ú-mi* BA.BAD / *be-èl-nu* "And they said to him, 'Behold, our master is dead'" (EA 138:63-65); *ti-iq-bu* URU.KI *al-lu-mi* ¹[*Ri-ib-ad-di*] / *a-ši-ib a-na* ^{URU}A.PÚ "and

the city said, 'Behold,[Rib-haddi] is sitting in Beirut'"
(EA 138:90-91).

And finally, there is one place where *allû* is preceded by nouns in extraposition:

2 LÚ I-bir₅-ta al-la-mi i-na / É I¹la-an-h[a]-mi "As for the two men
of 'Ibirta, behold they are in the palace of Yanḥ[a]mu"
(EA 83:37-39; Youngblood 1961:241).

One is even tempted to see *allâ* here as a nom. du. demonstrative: "Those two men of Beirut." However, there is no other precedent for such a usage.

amur. The most striking expression for "Behold!" or "Look!" in the peripheral Akkadian used by Canaanite scribes is the imperative singular of the verb *amāru* "to see" (Rainey 1989a). It does not function as a presentation particle in classical Babylonian but its distribution in the peripheral dialects is of the utmost interest. One finds it numerous times in the texts from Canaan and it also appears in the Egyptian correspondence (EA 1:28; 162:30, 67) including texts from the 13th century B.C.E. which were sent from Egypt to Hattusas (Cochavi-Rainey 1988:228). The example recorded from Ugarit (*CAD* A/2:19) is actually in a letter sent from Amurru (RS 17.116:9', 21'; Nougayrol 1956:132, 133; Izre'el 1985:247; 1991a:248-249, §3.6.4). The native scribes of Ugarit do not seem to have used it (Huehnergard 1979:354-355; 1989:156). Some examples are cited for Hattusas, but with the exception of a letter from Hattusili III to Kadashman-Ellil II (*KBo* 1, 10:50), all the texts using *amur* as a presentation particle were written by Egyptian scribes (Cochavi-Rainey 1988:228), including the treaty between Ramesses II and Hattusili III (*KBo* 1, 7:passim). In fact, the latter text, an Akkadian translation from an Egyptian original (Spalinger 1981:355), has a parallel in the Egyptian version on a wall at Karnak (which was itself a translation made from an Akkadian original written in Hattusas and sent to Egypt, Spalinger 1981:355).

One Egyptian parallel to Akkadian *amur* is the Egyptian imperative *ptr* "see!" The original text of the Akkadian passage was approximately as follows (with some additions based on the Egyptian parallel passage):

a-mur ¹*Re-a-ma-še-ša ma-a-i* ^d*A-ma-na* LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR
Mi-iš-ri-i <*i-na ri-ki-il-ti ša na-da-ni*> *a-na e-pé-ši te₄-ma*, "Behold,
 Ramesses, beloved of Amon, the great king, the king of the
 land Egypt, <is in a treaty of causing> the relationship to come
 into being" (KBo 1, 7:11),

while the parallel Egyptian passage is:

ptr *Ḫ-t-s-l p₃ wr ^c3 n Ḫ-t [m] nt-^c n dī.t mn p₃ šḫr*, "Behold,
 Hattusili, the great ruler of Ḫatti is [in] a treaty of making the
 relationship firm" (Treaty line 8; Kitchen 1971:227, lines 4-5).

Other particles paralleling *amur* in the Egyptian version of the Hattusilis-Ramesses II treaty will be referred to as the occasion arises.

That the texts from Canaan employ the imperative of the verb "to see" is not surprising in the light of the similar use of *r^aʔēh* in biblical Hebrew. Its status as an independent introductory particle is especially prominent in the following passage, where a plural audience is addressed while the imperative remains in the singular:

r^aʔēh nātattī līpnēkem ^ʔeṭ hāʔāreš "Behold, I have placed before
 you the land" (Dt. 1:8; Jouön 1923:287 §105d).

The same construction is found in Dt. 11:26:

r^aʔēh ^ʔānōkī nōtēn līpnēkem hayyôm b^arākāh uqlālāh "Behold, I am
 placing before you today a blessing and a curse."

But normally the audience is addressed in the singular in conformity with the singular imperative (Dt. 1:21; 4:5; 30:15).

On the other hand, the contemporary analogous usage of Egyptian *ptr*, the imperative of the verb "to see," is highly suggestive. It would appear that this is a calque within the sphere of Egyptian control over the Canaanite population (with sporadic influence on the scribes at Hattusas following the extensive correspondence with Ramesses II). For convenient reference, the Boghazköi attestations to introductory *amur* are listed herewith (correcting Labat 1932:95-96):

KBo 1, 7:7, 9, 11, 18, 19, 24, 26, 27, 40; 15:12, rev. 10, 12, 23; 19:16, rev. 6, 11; 24:12, rev. 5, 8, 13; *KUB* 3, 27:16; 33:8; 34:4, 8; 42:5; 48:8; 54:rev. 3; 57:rev. 1; 69:14, rev. 10; 126:1, 4.

The original nature of *amur* as an imperative was not really lost. The earliest documented example of its function as an introductory particle, from the 15th century B.C.E., carries the 1st c.sg. acc. pronominal suffix:

¹*i*¹-¹*na*¹-*an-na a-mur-ni i-nu-ma* / *i-pu-¹šu*¹ ¹*DÜG*¹.¹*GA*¹ *it-ti-ka*
 "Now, behold me, that I will do good for you" (TT 2:17-18;
 cf. Rainey 1977:46).

On occasion, one finds that the imperative *amur* governs a nominal direct object:

a-mur i-pí-iš / ¹*URU*¹ *Šur-ri* "Behold the deed of Tyre" (EA 89:10-11; Youngblood 1961:329); *a-mur ip-ša an-ni-ú ip-ši*
¹*Mil-ki- DINGIR* / *ù ip-ši DUMU.MEŠ La-ab-a-ya* "Behold this deed, the deeds of Milkilu and the deeds of the sons of Lab²ayu" (EA 287:29-30; also apparently EA 288:7-8 where <*a-mur*> must be supplied); *ša-ni-¹tam*¹ *a-mur ar-na ¹ša*¹ / *[yi]-pu-iš ¹A-zi-ru* "Furthermore, behold the crime which(!) Aziru has [co]mmitted" (EA 140:20-21; Rainey 1989-90:64; also EA 106:4; 140:18-19);

even when the direct object is in extraposition to the clause that follows:

a-mur / ÌR-da ša iš-me a-na >a-na < be-li-šu / šul-mu URU-šu
 šul-mu É-šu / šum-šu a-na da-ri-ti "Behold, the servant who has
 obeyed his lord: his city is at peace, his house is at peace, his
 name endures forever" (EA 147:48-51).

In the following Jerusalem passage, the awkward context seems to require that the particle *amur* or something comparable should probably be supplied:

<*a-mur*> ḥa-an-pa / ša iḥ-nu-pu a-na mu-ḥi-ia "Behold, the
 audacity that they have exercised against me" (EA 288:7-8).

An optional addition to *amur* is the enclitic *-mi*. Whether this is to mark the ensuing clause as direct speech or whether it is the Canaanite enclitic for emphasis is open to question. Enclitic *-ma* is never used with *amur*. The optional nature of the enclitic with *amur* may be seen from the two passages in the same epistle, one with an enclitic and one without it:

a-mur-mi a-na-ku ÌR ša lšār-ri "Behold, I am a servant of the king"
 (EA 264:5); *ša-ni-tam a-mur ni-nu a-na mu-ḥi-ka* / 2 IGI-ia
 "Furthermore, behold (as for) us, my(sic!) eyes are towards
 you" (EA 264:14-15; for the extraposition see *infra*).

Numerous other examples could be cited, e.g.

a-mur-mi ni-i₁₅-nu i₁₅-ba-ša-nu / a-na KURAm-qí "Behold, we
 belong to the land of 'Amqi" (EA 174:8-9; also EA 175:7-8;
 176:7-8; 363:7-8).

The affinity between expressions for "now" and for "behold" can be seen in the one place where a Tyrian scribe used *amur* in a position usually occupied by *anumma*, viz. *a-mur i-na-an-na* "Behold, now" (EA 147:24).

Certain particles may stand before *amur* at the head of a clause. Now and then, *amur* appears after *šanitam* (EA 140:18, 20; 264:14; 296:9; 330:13; possibly EA 84:42), or after the simple *u*

conjunction (EA 179:14; 28; 209:8, 10). And *amur* at the head of a sentence may be followed by another adverb, e.g. *panānu* (EA 122:11; 130:21).

The kind of sentences introduced by *amur* vary somewhat. There are a few places where *amur* serves to introduce a verbal clause:

ù a-mur-mi ¹*Bir₅-ia-ıwa-za* / *uš-ši-ir gáb-bi* URU.DIDLI.ĤÁ LUGAL / EN-ia a-na LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ "And behold, Biryawaza has handed over all the cities of the king, my lord, to the men of the 'apîrû" (EA 189:rev. 9-11); *a-mur-mi a-na-ku na-aš-ra-ti* [URU] / DIDLI.ĤÁ LUGAL EN-ia "Behold, I have protected the [cit]ies of the king, my lord" (EA 227:5-6); *ù a-mur-mi* / LÚ.MEŠ *ha-za-nu-ta* ^{MEŠ} / *ša it-ti-ia* / *la-a ti-pu-šu-na* / *ki-ma ia-ti-ia* "Behold, the city-rulers who are with me are not doing as I (do)" (EA 365:15-18); *a-mur šâr-ri* EN-ia *ša-ka-an* / *šum-su a-na mu-ši* ^dUTU-ši / *ù er-bi* ^dUTU-ši "Behold, my king, my lord, has placed his name at the sunrise and at the sunset" (EA 288:5-7); *a-mur-mi* / ¹*ša¹-bat-mi šu-nu* URU.⟨MEŠ⟩.KI *Gub-li* "Behold, they have seized the towns of Byblos" (EA 362:27-28).

Only once is a really complex sentence led off by the particle *amur*:

¹*a¹-mur¹-mi a-na ú-mi tu-šú* / *ù i-né-pu-ša-at gáb-bi* / KUR.MEŠ *a-na* LUGAL *be-li-ia* "Behold, on the day you come forth, all the lands will return to the king, my lord" (EA 362:62-64).

However, by far the largest number of clauses introduced by *amur* are non-verbal, e.g.

a-[mur] GU₄.ME[Š] *it-ti-šu* "Be[hold], there are oxen with him" (EA 92:42); *ù a-mur-mi* ^{URU}Ṭú-[*bi-ḫi*] URU É-ti *a-bi-ia* "And behold, Ṭó[biḫi] is the city of my paternal family" (EA 179:28); *a-mur ni-i-nu* / İR.MEŠ *šâr-ri* "Behold, we are the servants of the king" (EA 239:18-19); *a-mur at-ta* LÚ *em-qú* "Behold, you are a wise man" (EA 71:7); *a-mur at-⟨ta⟩* ŠEŠ-ia "Behold, yo⟨u⟩ are my brother" (EA 34:7, from Alashia);

and especially from Jerusalem:

a-mur a-na-ku la-a LÚ_ha-zi-a-nu / LÚú-e-ú <a-na-ku> a-na šār-ri EN-ia "Behold, I am not just a city-ruler; a soldier am <I> of the king, my lord" (EA 288:9-10 = EA 285:5-6; cf. Liverani 1967:15 n. 4; and also Moran 1987b:516 n. 1; 1992:331 n. 1; *contra* Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:488b); *a-mur* KUR URUGin₈-ti-ki-ir-mi-il^{KI} / a-na ¹Ta-gi "Behold, the land of Gath-carmel belongs to Tagi" (EA 289:18-19).

Many more could be cited (EA 60:6-7; 84:38; 106:18-20; 107:8-9; 117:34; 211:15-17; 254:10; 257:7-8; 264:5). These are also reminiscent of the use of the Egyptian imperative of *ptr* "to see."

ptr wi ¹m¹ p₃ wr ^č3 [n] Ḫ-t irm [R^c-mss mry Ḳmn] p₃ ḫk₃ ^č3 n Kmt m ḫtpw nfr m ssn nfr, "Behold I, as the great chief [of] Hatti with [Ramesses beloved of Amon], the great ruler of Egypt, am in genuine peace and genuine brotherhood" (Treaty, lines 11-12; Kitchen 1971:227 lines 11-12).

A particularly striking usage of *amur* is to introduce a sentence component, most often the 1st c.sg. independent pronoun, standing in extraposition to its clause. A good case in point is EA 264:14-15 cited *supra*. The Byblos letters frequently make use of this construction:

a-mur a-na-ku / nu-kúr-tu₄ UGU-ia 5 MU.MEŠ "Behold, (as for) myself, there has been hostility against me five years" (EA 106:16-17); *a-mur a-na-ku ia-nu* / ḫa-za-na i-na ar-ki-ti-ia, "Behold, (as for) myself, there is no city-ruler behind me" (EA 117:9-10); *a-mur a-¹na¹-ku pa-nu-ia-ma* / a-¹na¹ a-ra-ad LUGAL "Behold, (as for) myself, it is *my* face that is set to serve the king" (EA 118:39-40).

These contexts remind us of a similar usage of the introductory particle *ir* to introduce an element in extraposition in Late Egyptian:

dā.f ṛr ṛnk wn.ī ḥmsi.k(wi) m p3-pr n A, "He said, 'As for me, I was staying in the house of A'" (BM 10052, 3; example 14 in Černý and Groll 1975:14 §2.1.3), *ṛr ṛnk gr ṛnk ṛn ṛnk p3y.k b3k*, "As for me, even me, am I your servant?" (LES 68,7; example 15 in Černý and Groll: *loc. cit.*).

And in fact, *amur* does serve as the translation for *ṛr* in the treaty between Ramesses II and Hattusilis III. The Egyptian reads:

ṛr r-ḥ3t n-dr nḥḥ ṛr p3 šḥr n p3 ḥk3 ʿ3 n Kmt ṛrm p3 wr ʿ3 n Ḥt3, "As for from the beginning forever, as for the relationship of the great ruler of Egypt together with the great prince of Ḥatti, . . . (Treaty, line 7; Kitchen 1971:227, lines 2-3; cf. Spalinger 1981:307 n. 19),"

while the parallel passage in the Akkadian version is:

a-mur ṭe4-ma ša LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR Mi-iš-ri-i / [qa-du LUGAL GAL(!)] LUGAL KUR Ḥa-at-ti ul-tù 'dā'-ri-ti, "As for the relationship of the great king, the king of the land of Egypt [with(!) the great king], the king of Ḥatti since the beginning . . ." (KBo 1, 7:9-10; cf. Cochavi-Rainey in press:n.8).

The element in extraposition need not be a pronoun:

a-mur É URUŠur-ri / ia-nu É-ti ḥa-za-ni / 'ki'-ma šu-a-ta "Behold, as for the house (= palace) of Tyre, there is no house (= palace) of a city-ruler like it" (EA 89:48-50).

One must also read:

a-mur!(NA) LÚ.MEŠ ḥa-za-nu-tu URU.MEŠ a-na ša-šu-nu "Behold, (as for) the city-rulers, they have their cities" (EA 118:45-46).

In one unique passage, the extraposition is only made by the repetition of the independent pronoun in the following clause:

[a]-mur a-na-ku GIŠ.GÌR.GUB ša GÌR-pe / LUGAL BE-ia a-na-ku ù
 ÌR ki-it-ti-šu "[Be]hold, as for myself, the footstool of the king,
 my lord, am I, and his loyal servant" (EA 106:6-7).

Perhaps the most famous use of this construction is in a Jerusalem letter:

a-mur a-na-ku la-a ^{LÚ}a-bi-ia \ ša-ak-na-ni / ù la-a ^{MÍ}ú-mi-ia / i-na
 aš-ri an-ni-e "Behold, as for myself, it was not my father that
 placed me, and not my mother, in this place" (EA 286:9-11).

The use of *amur* as a presentation particle disappeared with the collapse of the Levantine culture of the Late Bronze Age. Its Egyptian calque, developed in the same time frame, also did not outlast the New Kingdom period. Thus, it stands as a remarkable, though scarcely noticed, witness to West Semitic/Egyptian symbiosis at that time.

UNIT MARKERS

umma. The ubiquitous particle for introducing the sender of an epistle and his message is *umma* (< OAk *en + ma*; GAG:176, §121b). The use of this particle in the Amarna letters from Canaan was subject to certain specific limitations and even a degree of misunderstanding. One finds it only in the introduction to the epistle, and, with one exception (EA 100:14), never in the body of the letter. Four seeming exceptions to this rule are post-scripts added as a final section set apart from the body of the letter (EA 286:61-64; 287:65-68; 288:63-66; 289:48-50; cf. also Nitzán 1973:78, §5.5).

Beyond the single instance of *um-ma* LUGAL (EA 100:14) in the body of a letter, one does not find a Canaanite scribe using the sort of "dialogue" format typical of epistles from the OB period. In those texts from the classical period the sender would quote himself, *umma anākūma*, or his correspondent, *umma attāma*, or third parties, *umma PN/šu/šunuma*, etc. Instead, the scribes from Canaan preferred other locutions, e.g.

ki-na-na ti-iq-bu-na / LÚ.MEŠ *ḫa-za-nu-tu₄* "Thus say the city-rulers" (EA 73:29-30).

All this is in sharp contrast to the practice of the Egyptian scribes, who use *um-ma-a(mi)* to introduce citations within the body of the letter (EA 1:11, 26, 31, 37, 51, 66, 77, 78, 88; 162:17 *et passim*; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:230-231 §2.9).

Though the Canaanite scribes acquired their use of *umma* from OB tradition, in contrast to other particles and combinations of Assyrian, they were not always consistent in preserving the complete OB syntagma, viz. *umma* + nominative subject + *-ma*. There are, of course, numerous instances of the correct use:

um-ma ¹*Ri-ib-ad-da* DUMU-*ka-ma* "Thus (says) Rib-Haddi, your son" (EA 73:2); *um-ma* / ¹*Ri-ib-* ^dIŠKUR ÌR-*ka-ma* "Thus (says) Rib-Haddi, your servant" (EA 130:2-3).

But there is also a plethora of instances in which the enclitic *-ma* is omitted:

um-ma ÌR.^dINNIN ÌR *šar-ri* "Thus (says) ^cAbdi-Ashtart, the servant of the king" (EA 64:3; Na³aman 1979:676-677); *um-ma* *Ri-ib-*^dIŠKUR ÌR-*ka* "Thus (says) Rib-Haddi, your servant" (EA 136:2).

And, as a matter of fact, the Byblos texts stand apart from the rest of the letters from Canaan (and elsewhere in peripheral Akkadian) in that they often employ an entirely different formula:

¹*Ri-ib-ad-da iq-bi a-na* EN-[*i-šu*] / *šar* KUR.KUR LUGAL GAL *šar ta-am-ḫa-ar* "Rib-Haddi said to [his] lo[rd], the king of the lands, the great king, the king of battle" (EA 74:1-2; and also EA 68:1-2; 75:1-2; 76:1-2; 79:1-2; 81:1; 83:1-2; 88:1; 89:1-2; 92:1-2; 105:1; 106:1; 107:1-2; 109:1).

Some of the Byblos scribes prefer a form of the verb *šapāru*:

¹*Ri-ib-* ^dIŠKUR *iš-ta-pár* / *a-na* ¹EN-šu šār KUR.KUR.MEŠ.KI / LUGAL GAL šār *ta-am-ḫa-ra* "Rib-Haddi has written to his lord, the king of the lands, the great king, the king of battle" (EA 108:1-3; also EA 112:1-2; 116:1-2; 119:1-2; 121:1-2; 122:1-2; 123:1-2; Salonen 1967:62-63).

The most striking feature about the use of *umma* in the Canaanite texts is the choice of case for the speaker denoted in this syntagma. Standard OB practice is for the PN or the independent pronoun and its appellatives to stand in the nominative. It was Albright (1942b:33 n. 7) who first pointed out that *umma* is generally followed by the genitive (or more correctly the dependent) case in the WS texts from the Amarna corpus. Marcus (1948:223) followed suit with a statistical study in which he claimed that only about ten percent of the EA texts use the nominative, while the rest have the dependent. Marcus had to limit his study to those passages where an epithet was spelled syllabically or where the PN showed declension. He evidently did not try to distinguish WS texts from those written in other dialects, e.g. the Mitanni letters. In fact, the latter also show the variation between nominative and dependent case after *umma* (Rainey 1980:195b-196a), a point that was missed by Adler (1976:38). The clearest examples of this contrast (for the dependent and the nominative cases respectively) are the following introductory formulae from two of Tushratta's letters:

um-ma ¹Tu-uš-rat-ta LUGAL GAL *e-mi-i[-ka]* / *ša i-ra-²a-a-mu-ú-ka* šār ^{KUR}Mi-i-it-ta-an-ni ŠEŠ-ka-ma "Thus (says) Tushratta, the great king, [your] father-in-law, who loves you, the king of Mitanni, your colleague" (EA 19:3-4);

um-ma ¹Tù-uš-rat-ta šār ^{KUR}Mi-it-ta-a-an-¹ni¹ / *e-mu-ú-ka* *ša i-ra-²a-a-mu-ú-ka* ŠEŠ-ka-ma "Thus (says) Tushratta, king of Mitanni, your father-in-law, who loves you, your colleague" (EA 28:4-5).

Goetze (1948) added a note to Marcus' study in which he pointed out that the same view of *umma* as governing the

dependent case applies to Hittite texts. He even cited a text (*KBo* 5, 2) where the initial *umma* was paralleled by the construct form *awāt* in the colophon (4, 63), thus proving the equation in the understanding of the Hittite scribes.

On the other hand, Albright had observed that the epistles in the Ugaritic language, whose style was based on Akkadian models, used a WS vocable, *ṯm*, in the syntagma corresponding to that governed by *umma* in Akkadian (Albright 1942b:33 n. 7). Now *ṯm* is a substantive that also appears in Ugaritic literary texts as a synonym for *hwt* (*KTU* 1.6:IV, 10-11; 1.5:I, 12-13), which is itself a cognate of Akkadian *awātu* "word." In Ugaritic epistolary style, the syntagma was, therefore, *ṯm* PN, "the word of PN," a construct formation with the second element in the dependent case (on the literary and epistolary formulae, cf. Loewenstamm 1980:256-261). It follows from the use of the genitive after *umma* in the Canaanite epistles that *umma* was no longer understood as a particle but rather as a substantive with the meaning "word, message, saying" (cf. Moran 1950a:12; Youngblood 1961:82).

The clearest examples of *umma* + nominative have a chain of epithets, some of which were spelled syllabically. The best of these are:

um-ma ¹Zi-im-re-ed-di / LÚ_ha-za-nu ša URUŠi-du-na^{KI} "Thus (says) Zimreddu, city-ruler of Sidon" (EA 144:3-4); *um-ma* ¹Sú-ra-ta / LÚ^{URU}Ak-ka ÌR ša šàr-ri / ep-ru ša GÌR>MEŠ-šu ù qa-qa-ru ša ka-bá-ši-šu "Thus (says) Surata, ruler of Acco, servant of the king, the dust of his feet and the ground of his treading" (EA 232:3-5); *um-ma* La-ab-a-yu ÌR-ka / ù ep-ru ša ka-bá-ši-ka "Thus (says) Lab²ayu, your servant and the dust of your treading" (EA 254:2-3); *um-ma* ¹Mu-ut-Ba-á²-l[u₄] / ÌR-ka SAḤAR ša 2 GÌR.MEŠ-[ka] / ṯi-ṯù ša ka-bá-ši-ka "Thus (says) Mut-Ba¹[u], your servant, the dust of your feet, the clay of your treading" (EA 255:3-5).

A good selection of examples in which the epithets with syllabic spelling have the dependent case are given herewith,

arranged in numerical order (which also represents the geographical distribution to some degree). First, from Alashia:

um-ma šar-ri ^{KUR}A-la-ši-ia ŠEŠ-ka-ma "Message of the king of Alashia, your colleague" (EA 38:2).

An official writes to Rib-Haddi:

um-ma ^{LÚ}ráb ERÍN.ʾMEŠʾ ʾAD¹-ka-ma / a-bi-ka "Message of the army commander, your father (= superior)" (EA 96:3-4).

The location of this next ruler's home is unknown:

um-ma ¹Zi-it-ri-ya-ra / ʾİR-di-ka "Message of Zitriyara, your servant" (EA 212:2-3).

The shorter passages given above can be supplemented by a group of very long chains, sometimes with only one or two epithets spelled syllabically. Frequently, the dependent case is made evident by the use of a gloss explaining an ideogram.

um-ma ¹Bir₅-ia-wa-za / ʾİR-ka SAḪAR.MEŠ \ ep-ri / ša GÌR.MEŠ-ka
ù / KI.MEŠ ša ka-bá-sí-ka / GÌŠGU.ZA ša a-ša-bi-ka / ù
GÌŠ.GIR.GUB \ gi-iš-tab-bi / ša GÌR.MEŠ-ka "Message of Biryawaza, your servant, the dust of your feet and the ground of your treading, the chair of your sitting and the footstool of your feet" (EA 195:4-10).

That lengthy example from the northeastern district of Upe resembles another from nearby Kumidi:

um-ma ¹A-ra-ʾaḫ¹(?)-[a]t-ta₅ / LÚ ^{URU}Ku-mi-di ^{KI} / ep-ri ša
ʾGÌR¹.ʾMEŠ¹-[ka₄] / qa-qa-ri ka₄-bá-ši_x(ŠE)-ka₄ "Message of Arahatta, ruler of Kumidi, the dust of [your] feet, the ground of your treading" (EA 198:4-7).

And there is an additional text from from the northwest:

um-ma ¹Ru-uš-ma-an-ia / LÚ URUŠa-ru-na ^{KI} ÌR-ka / SAḪAR.MEŠ
ša GÌR.MEŠ-ka / ʔe₄-ʔi ša ka-ba-ši-ka / GIŠ.GÌR.<GUB> ša GÌR.MEŠ
EN-ia "Message of Rušmanya, ruler of Sharuna, your servant,
the dust of your feet, the clay of your treading, the foot-stool
of the feet of my lord" (EA 241:3-7).

At the southern end of the country, for example at Ashkelon, one finds the same use of *umma* as a substantive:

um-ma / ¹Yi-id-ia LÚ / ša URUAš-qa-lu-na ^{KI} / ÌR-ka₄ ep-ri ša /
UZU GÌR.MEŠ-ka₄ LÚ / kàr-tap-ʔi ša ANŠE.KUR.RA-ka₄ "Message
of Yidya, ruler of Ashkelon, your servant, the dust of your feet,
the groom of your horses" (EA 320:4-9; also EA 321:4-9; 322:4-8;
323:3-5; 324:4-6; 325:3-5; 326:3-5).

Two letters from Beirut reflect what might be taken as a breakdown of the rule or an attempt to revert to the OB pattern. They certainly show that the scribe was confused.

um-ma Am-mu-ni-ra / LÚ URUPÚ.ḪÁ ÌR-ka u SAḪAR-ra \
a-pa-ru / ša GÌR.MEŠ-ka "Message of ʕAmmunira, the ruler of
Beirut, your servant and the dust of your feet" (EA 141:3-5;
likewise EA 143:3-4).

To clarify the thinking of this scribe, one must also look at EA 143:11-12 where ʕAmmunira again describes himself by the same epithet, this time dependent upon a preposition in apposition to the PN also dependent on *ana*:

a-na SAḪAR-ra \ ḫa-pa-ru / ša GÌR.MEŠ-šu "to the dust of his
feet" (EA 143:11-12).

From this entry it should be clear that the *-ra* may just as well be an error by the scribe who thought that it was part of the ideogram, i.e. SAḪAR.RA, and that a gloss should be entered in the nominative. In both the headings of the epistles and in this passage he knew that SAḪAR stood in a dependent position.

The peripheral understanding of *umma* as a substantive governing a genitive in construct has direct bearing on the problem of declination among PN's. There are some instances when a PN after *umma* ends in what appears to be a dependent case, e.g. *um-ma* ¹*Šu-ba-an-di* with the following epithets

ep-ri ša 2 ^{UZU}GÌR.MEŠ-*ka* / ^{LÚ}*ku-sí ša* ANŠE.KUR.RA-*ka* "the dust of your two feet and the groom of your horse" (EA 303:3-6; cf. also EA 301:3-5; 302:4-6; 34:4-7).

One other text has *um-ma* ¹*Šu-ba-an-du*, though the epithets are still in the dependent case (EA 305:4-7). The problem is complex, given the wide dialectical range of the PN's in these letters, but the genitive construction with *umma* is a factor that must be taken into consideration.

šanītam. The adverbial accusative particle, *šanītam* "furthermore" (AHw:1164a), is widely used to introduce new subjects in the text of a letter. Thus, it is a structural marker. The reasons for adopting the reading with mimation have been discussed *supra*, p. 2, with reference to other adverbial accusatives in the WS EA texts. The particle is simply a specialized usage of the feminine accusative of the adjective *šanû* "other, another" (Ebeling 1915:1514; Youngblood 1961:47-48; Finley 1979:184-185; Huehnergard 1989:200). The spelling is nearly always *ša-ni-tam* (the latter sign mistakenly rendered *tú* by Knudtson), though there are over two dozen instances of *šá-ni-tam* spread throughout six Byblos letters and three epistles from Beirut.

The particle *šanītam* is used to introduce some new subject and may even appear three times or more in the same text. Therefore, one must render it "furthermore," and not "secondly" (Youngblood 1961:47). The latter meaning is not used in the EA corpus, though it does occur in certain legal formulae from the Akkadian texts of Ugarit (Speiser 1955b:158 n. 34; Youngblood *loc. cit.*; Huehnergard 1989:200). The ensuing matter may be introduced by a further particle. A few cases even have *šanītam u* (EA 34:11; 141:36; 297:11; possibly EA 3:8) — *šanītam u anumma*

(EA 34:18) and *šanītam u šumma* (EA 93:18 discussed at length below).

Its function as a unit or structural marker requires that *šanītam* come in initial position (Finley 1979:185, §8.2.1.2). Only once is *šanītam* preceded by the coordinating conjunction *u*, viz. in the following passage from Gezer:

ʿú¹ ʿša¹-ʿni¹-ʿtam¹ / ʿyi¹-ša-al / ʿLUGAL¹ be-li / ʿ[ʿI]a-ʿan¹-ḥa-ma
 ʿR-šu / a-na ša yu-ʿpa¹-šu / i-na ʿKUR¹-šu "And furthermore,
 may the king, my lord, ask [Y]anḥamu, his servant, concerning
 what is being done in his land" (EA 271:22-27).

A wide range of other introductory particles (all of which are dealt with in previous sections above) can follow *šanītam*, namely:

anumma (EA 90:10; 142:11, 15), *inūma* (EA 84:18; 85:23; 117:83;
 141:18), *indum* (EA 136:24), *kīʿam* (EA 35:30), *šumma* (EA 83:47;
 88:21; 108:34) and *šumma appunamma* (EA 83:27), *amur* (EA 84:38,
 42; 140:18, 20; 264:1; 269:1; 330:13), *annū* (EA 256:28).

One unusual passage introduces a conditional sentence by *šanītam* at the head of the protasis and then repeats the adverb at the head of the apodosis, where the normal WS usage called for the conjunction *u* (Moran 1950a:71).

ša-ni-tam / ū šum-ma ni-le-ū / [ša-]ba-at URUBaṭ-ru-ʿna¹ / [a-n]a
 ka-ta₅ ša-ni-tam / i-te₉-zi-bu LÚ.MEŠ / ʿR-A-ši-ir!(NI)-ta
 "Furthermore, but if we are able to [se]ize Baṭruna [fo]r you,
 then ʿAbdi-Ashirta's men will withdraw" (EA 93:18-23; cf.
 discussion by Youngblood 1961:376).

There can be no doubt that this passage represents a scribal aberration.

Basically, then, *šanītam* can be said to stand outside the normal sentence structure of the text. It forms a sort of heading for any new paragraph or subject. The particles which can precede

or follow it can introduce sentences or sections with the same syntax but without the use of *šanītam*.

From the standpoint of epistolary style, one is reminded of the Egyptian expression *ky swd³-ib* "another communication," used to introduce a new subject in the body of a letter (e.g. Pap. Anastasi VI, 53; Gardiner 1937:6, line 12).

CHAPTER VIII

CONDITIONAL PARTICLES

The three particles dealt with in this chapter are capable of introducing the protasis of a conditional sentence. Only in the case of *šumma* is that the main function, and *šumma* has some other roles as well.

CONDITIONAL ŠUMMA

The standard Akkadian particle for "if," viz. *šumma*, is used with very high frequency in the Canaanized letters. Its usage as a conjunction meaning "since, because" has already been treated (cf. *supra*, pp. 94-97). All its functions which usually require the translation "if, whether," will be discussed here.

The spellings are invariably *šum-ma* with two exceptions: *šu-u[m]-ma* (EA 149:47) and *šu-ma* (EA 209:3).

As one might expect, parallels in function between EA *šumma* and biblical Hebrew *ʔim* have frequently been cited. They are usually most illuminating. On the other hand, the search for the etymology of *šumma* is not advanced by the study of *šumma* in these letters (for the principal views, cf. Speiser 1947; Haldar 1950; Schoneveld 1951; Moran 1953).

QUESTIONS. Only in one instance does *šumma* serve to introduce a simple question:

šum-ma a-na ḥa-za-ni URUŠur-ri / *la-a yi-ša-i-lu šār-ru* "Will the king not inquire concerning the city-ruler of Tyre?" (EA 89:44-45; Albright and Moran 1950:164,167; Youngblood 1961:334).

OBJECT CLAUSES. Another salient feature is the widespread use of *šumma* to introduce object clauses. This

function is known from OA (Hecker 1968:236-237, §137c) and OB (Finet 1956:247, §86h) but there object clauses generally precede main clause verbs.

Three EA examples are known in which the clause is governed by the verb *idû* "to know," viz.

i-de be-li šum-ma ta-ru "My lord knows whether they have returned" (EA 106:47; Moran 1950a:165-166); LUGAL *i-de₄ šu-u[m]-ma ša-ak-na-ta-ni / i-na* LÚMAŠKÍM *i-na* URUŠur-ri "The king knows whether he appointed me as commissioner in Tyre" (EA 149:47-48); [*ti-*]^r*i¹-de* dNIN / *ša* URUGub-^r*la¹ šum-ma* ^r*i¹-ba*-šu / URUDU.MEŠ *ù* ^r*ši¹-in₄¹-ni* [*a*]-^r*na¹ / >a-na* *ia-ši* "The lady of Byblos knows whether I have copper or ivory" (EA 77:8-10; Rainey 1989-90:58b-59a *contra* Moran 1950a:154; 1987b:257 n. 3; 1992:148 n. 3; Rainey 1973c:243).

Of higher frequency are the instances of such object clauses after the verb *ša²ālu* "to ask," viz.

yi-iš-al-šu LUGAL d[UTU] / *šum-ma la a-na-ša-ar / URUŠu-mu-ri* URUUl-*la-sà* "May the king, the [su]n, ask him whether I am guarding Şumur (and) Ullasa!" (EA 60:21-23); *ia-aš-al-mi / LUGAL EN-ia / LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM-šu / šum-ma / ^rtu¹-ub-^rba¹-lu-na / LÚ.MEŠ a-bu-tu-nu / aš-šum* UD.KAM.MEŠ / ^r*Ku-sú-na / LÚa-bi-nu* "May the king, my lord, ask his commissioners whether our fathers have been bringing (tribute) since the days of Kôsûna, our father!" (EA 224:10-16; CAD A/2:471a); *li-iš-al-šu-^rnu¹ / šar-ru šum-ma la-qí-ti / mi-im-ma aš-šum* LÚĥa-*za-ni* "May the king ask them if I have taken anything from the city-ruler!" (EA 251:1-3; CAD A/2:471a); *ù ša-al* LÚ.MEŠ MAŠKÍM-*ka / šum-ma la ú-ba-an la-a me-ĥi-iš / ŠEŠ-ia* "So ask your commissioners whether my brother was not almost smitten!" (EA 264:11-13; also EA 132:30-32; for EA 114:52, cf. *supra*, p. 163).

These examples can be compared with the normal Akkadian usage of contemporary dialects, which use *kî*, e.g.

DUMU *ši-ip-ri-ka ša-al / ki-i ma-tu₄ ru-qá-tu-ma* "Ask your emissary whether the land is not far away!" (EA 7:28-29; CAD K:318b).

OATHS. There are two examples of oaths involving a clause introduced by *šumma*. Like the standard Akkadian usage (GAG:240, §185g), the positive oath has *šumma lā*, the negative simply *šumma*. The passages are:

ù 'šu¹-ma / [l]a 'na¹!-uṣ-*ra-ti*₇ URU.MEŠ-k[a] / ù 'DINGIR¹.MEŠ¹-nu¹ ša it-*ti*-ka / 'SAG¹-qà¹-di li-mu-*ḥu*¹-ṣ[ú](?) "And if I have not protected your cities, then may the gods who are with you smite(?) my pate!" (EA 209:13-16); *li-ib-lu-uṭ / šār-ru EN-ia li-ib-lu-uṭ / šār-ru EN-ia šum-ma i₁₅-ba-ši / 'A-ia-ab i-na URUP¹-ḥi-li* "May the king, my lord live! May the king, my lord, live! If Ayyab is to be found in Piḥil!" (EA 256:10-13; Ebeling 1915:10-13; Albright 1943a:11).

Ebeling (*loc. cit.*) also listed EA 77:9 as an oath, but it is not.

DISJUNCTIVES. The one clear WS passage where *šumma* serves as a disjunctive conjunction is a series of questions after a form of the verb, *ša²ālu*:

yi-iš-ta-al LUGAL be-li / šum-ma el-teḡ-qé LÚ / ù šum-ma I-en GU₄ / ù šum-ma ANŠE iš-tu / mu-ḥi-šu "May the king my lord, investigate as to whether I have taken a man of (even) one ox or an ass from him!" (EA 280:25-29).

Another passage has hitherto gone unnoticed because of a break just where *šumma* has to be supplied:

da-mi-iq mu-tu a[-na ia]-ši / [ù] iš-mu lum-<na>* a-na EN-ia ù / [TIL.A] 'ZI¹-ia¹ ka-li DINGIR.MEŠ-nu / 'ù¹ [dNIN š]a URUGub-la^{KI} TIL.A š[um!-ma] LÚ ša-a yu-ba-ú / lum-na a-na [EN-š]u šum-ma du-na du-na-ma / 'ú¹-ba-'ú¹ a-na-ku a-na EN-ia* "Better death for me (than) [that] I should hear ev<i>l

concerning my lord. But as my soul [lives], as all the gods and [the lady o]f Byblos live, i[f] (I am) a man who seeks evil for h[is lord] or if only strength do I seek for my lord" (EA 109:49-55).

A unique negative disjunction is found in one of the Taanach letters:

ša-ni-tam la-a-mi / 'i¹-na ma-an-ša-ar-^fti¹ i-^fba¹-^fšu¹ / 'ha¹-na-ku-u-ka ù la-a-mi / ti-il₅-la-ku-un!(EN)-na at-t[a] / a-na maḥ-ri-ia ù šum-ma-mi / tu-wa-še-ru-na ŠEŠ-ka "Furthermore, your troops are not among the garrison troops and you do not come before me yourself, nor do you send your brother (colleague?)" (TT 6:6-11; Albright 1944b:25 n. 89, citing Gordon 1930:394).

The passage may be profitably compared with Prov. 27:24 (cf. Gordon *loc. cit.*) where *lô² . . . w²im* is rendered in the LXX by οὐ . . . οὐδέ.

Unless the obscure EA 62:16-18 is another instance, there do not seem to be any other cases of *šumma . . . šumma* with disjunctive meaning. However, there are two texts in which *šumma appūnamma* seems to have a disjunctive nuance. The alternatives being expressed have to do with a legal dispute in which Pharaoh must decide what to do with certain property allegedly belonging to Rib-Haddi; the property has been confiscated by Yapa^c-Haddi, ruler of Beirut. If he so chooses, the king may award it to Rib-Haddi's adversaries or he may confiscate it for himself:

šum-ma ia-di-nu šar-ru a-na ša-šu-nu / ù id-di-in₄ ù šum-ma ap-pu-^fna¹-ma / yi-ìl-qe LUGAL gáb-ba a-na ša-^fšu¹ "If the king would award (it) to them, then give! Or else, let him take (it) all for himself!" (EA 116:34-36).

The second context deals with the same dispute and in conclusion, Rib-Haddi says:

ù / *šum-ma ap-pu-na-ma yi-il-qé* / LUGAL *mi-im-mi-ia iš-tu* /
 LÚ.MEŠ *ḫa-za-nu-ti a-na ša-šu* "Or else, let the king take my
 property from the city-rulers for himself!" (EA 118:17-20).

CONDITIONAL PROTASES. The most widely attested usage is in the protasis of conditional sentences. These have been treated in detail for the Byblos texts by Moran (1950a:71-75). The ensuing analysis departs from Moran's in a few respects, but generally the picture for Canaan as a whole is the same as that for Byblos. The majority of examples have either an imperfect (i.e. *yaqtulu*) or its temporal equivalents, the nominal and the stative predicates. Both negative and affirmative clauses with *yaqtulu* will be cited first. A representative example is the following:

šum-ma šār-ru yi-ša-i-lu / *ù na-lad¹-na pa-ni-nu a-na* / *a-ra-di-ka* "If
 the king will investigate, then we will set our faces to serve
 you" (EA 89:15-17; also EA 89:32 ff., 39-43; Albright and Moran
 1950:164, 165b, 166a).

Numerous others can be cited (EA 73:11-14; 74 39-41; 93:19-21; 112:14-15; 117:32-36; 245:3-7). Even the Akkadian present may substitute for WS *yaqtulu*, notably in a passage having strong Canaanite flavor (including two important glosses):

šum-ma ni-tel-li / *a-na AN \ ša-me-ma šum-ma* / *nu-ra-ad i-na*
er-še-ti₇ / *ù SAG.DU-nu \ ru-šu-nu* / *i-na qa-te-ka* "Whether we
 ascend to heaven or whether we descend to Sheol, our head is
 in your hands" (EA 264:15-19; Winckler 1895:123; Jirku
 1933:116).

In EA 123:23, the verb is *i-ra-am*, probably also intended as an Akkadian present though the preterite could be spelled the same way. But the nature of this verb "to love" may permit the conjecture that the Canaanite scribe is using an Akkadianism to represent a WS stative (which, nevertheless, governs a direct object). If not, then the passage is just another case of Akkadian present for WS *yaqtulu*.

On the other hand, protases with negative *yaqtulu* are also widely used. Typical of this ubiquitous construction is the following example from Byblos:

šum-ma la-a ti-le-ú la-qé ÌR-^lka¹ / *ù uš-ši-ra* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti / ti-il-qé-ni* "If you are unable to take your servant away, then send the regular army, let it take me!" (EA 114:44-46).

Other passages abound (EA 77:26-29; 83:45(?), 47-48; 89:44-46; 90:50 ff.; 93:25-28; 112:16-18; 114:23-24; 117:56-58; 131:15-18, 59-60).

The circumstantial nature of the protasis as it is expressed by *yaqtulu* is also suitable to the non-verbal clause:

šum-ma / šār-ru EN-lì ANŠE.MEŠ / *bu-a-mi* ANŠE.MEŠ / LUGAL "If the king is the owner of the asses, (then) search for the king's asses!" (EA 96:22-25; Youngblood 1961:401).

The following, relatively frequent syntagma is really a non-verbal clause, even though it resembles closely the prepositional use of *šumma* in OA, including the expression *šumma libbi* (Hecker 1968:181, §103j; GAG:165, §114i):

šum-ma lib-bi LUGAL *ba-li uš-ša-[ar]* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti ia-aš-pu-ur a-na / ^lIa-an-ḥa-mi ù a-na ^lPí-ḥu!-ra!* "If the king prefers not to send regular troops, (then) let him write to Yanḥamu and to Piḥura!" (EA 117:59-61; also EA 108:56-58; 112:30-34; 130:44-48; 131:10-14).

The negative non-verbal clause is also widely used in the conditional protasis. Note the contrast between affirmative and negative existential protases (stative *ibašši* as affirmative copula versus *yānu* as negative copula) in this pair of conditional sentences from a Jerusalem epistle:

šum-ma i-ba-aš-ši LÚ.ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-ṭa-ti / i-na* MU *an-ni-ti i-ba-aš-ši* KUR.ḤÁ LUGAL EN<-ia> *ù šum-ma ia-a-nu-mi* LÚ.ERÍN

pi-ta-ti / ^h*hal*¹-*qa-at* KUR.ḪÁ LUGAL EN-*ia* "If there are regular troops this year, (then) the lands of the king, <my> lord, will still be; but if there are no regular troops, (then) the lands of the king, my lord, are lost" (EA 286:57-60).

In fact, it is the negative non-verbal protasis that is most widely attested in the corpus of Canaanized EA texts (EA 79:18-20; 93:25-28; 112:25-30; 117:56-58; 130:39-42; 136:41-42; 271:17-20; 283:15-16; 288:51-53, 57-61; 290:22-24).

The same temporal nuance is also compatible with the stative. The ensuing passage is illustrative of the stative with verbs of feeling, that can also govern a direct object. Moran (1950a:74) had taken the verbal form as a participle with its object in the genitive position, but it seems more likely that the Canaanite scribe had the *qatil* stative formation in mind (CAD Z:97-98):

šumma LUGAL / *za-ir* URU.¹KI¹-*šu* *ù* *i-zi-ba-ši* / *ù* *šum-ma ia-ti-ia* ^u*ù*! / *i-pa-tá-ra-ni-mi* "If the king hates his city, then I will leave it; but if (he hates) me, then I will hie me away" (EA 126:44-47; partly based on Moran 1950a:175; Rainey 1989-90:61a; but also contrast the translation and comments by Moran 1987b:340, 341 n. 7; 1992:206-207 n. 7); *šum-ma mi-ta-ti mi-na* / *i-pu-šu-na* "If I am dead, what can I do?" (EA 119:17-18; Moran 1950a:31, 71).

As noted in EA 286:57-60, cited above, the stative function of *ibašši* (GAG:102, §78b; cf. Youngblood 1961:343; Rainey 1973c:249-250) is not neglected in the conditional protasis (also EA 289:15-16). The impersonal stative *damiq* also occurs (EA 107:20). It is an open question as to how one should take *i-le-e* in EA 79:39-44 and EA 92:51-52. It is meant either as an Akkadian present in lieu of the WS *yaqtulu*, or else it reflects the acknowledged stative role of this verb (GAG:102, §78b). A similar problem has been noted above with reference to *i-ra-am* in EA 123:23-28 (cf. *supra*, p. 187).

In conditional protases, *šumma* does, on occasion, govern a *qatal* form, i.e. a transitive of the suffix conjugation. Examples

include *pa-aṭ-ra* "apostatized, fallen away" (EA 83:27-32), *qa-la-ta* "You keep silent" (EA 132:46-50) and the transitive *ša-pár*, e.g.

šum[-ma] / a-na DAM-ia ša-pár / ki-i₁₅ a-kal-lu-ši ki-i₁₅ / šum-ma a-na ia-ši / ša-pár šàr-ru . . . "If for my wife the king had written, how could I withhold her? Because if the king had written to me . . ." (EA 254:38-42).

The classical Akkadian dialects often have the preterite in the protasis (GAG:212-213 §161d). One example of a *yaqtul* verb governed by *šumma* is not easy to interpret. It could be a simple preterite, viz.

šum-ma la-a / iš-me a-na LÚ^hha-za-ni / ù šu-ut i-de₄-ma "If I have not heeded the city-ruler, then it is he (the commissioner) who knows" (EA 317:23-25; following Moran 1978b:541).

One is led to wonder, nevertheless, if the protasis is not an asseveration, perhaps with jussive *yaqtul*.

CONDITIONAL LŪ

There is one lone example of *lū* as the conditional particle in place of *šumma*. Unfortunately, the isolated nature of this evidence precludes drawing any far reaching conclusions about a possible calque from a WS conditional particle like Hebrew *lû*. Nevertheless, *AHw*:560a classes this vocable as a true Canaanite loan word.

lu-ú¹ Ia-an-ḥa-ma / i-ia-a-nu i-na / [MU]-ti an-ni-ti₇ / [ù ḥa-]al-qa-at-ma / [gá]b-bi KUR.ḤÁ / i-na LÚ.MEŠ SA.GA[Z.K]I "If Yanḥamu is not (does not come) in this [yea]r, [then a]ll the territories [are l]ost to(sic!) the men of the ʿapî[rû la]nd" (EA 215:9-15; Greenberg 1955:44).

The formulation of this passage is so close to others such as EA 286:57-60 (cf. *supra*, p. 188-189) *et al.* that there can be no doubt

that *lū* in EA 215:9 is functioning in the same manner as the Akkadian conditional particle *šumma*.

A broken context that may contain a second example of conditional *lū* is the following:

ù lu-ú-mi 2 ÌR.MEŠ / [ša LU]GAL la-a / [. . .]-mi iḫ-x[a . . . "But if two servants [of the ki]ng do not . . . " (EA 313:17-19).

It is quite possible that this use of *lū* derives from the concessive function of this particle in standard Akkadian (GAG:210-211, §158c; CAD L:225b).

CONDITIONAL *INŪMA*

The protasis of a conditional sentence can also be introduced by *inūma* instead of *šumma* (Moran 1950a:71, 134 n. 183; for *inūma* as subordinating conjunction, cf. *supra*, pp. 74-89). Note the following:

i-nu-ma 1Ḫa-za-nu / lib-bu-šu it-ti lib-bi-ia / ù ú-da-bi-ra 1ḪR-A-ši-ir-ta / iš-tu KUR A-mur-ri "If there were one city-ruler whose heart was with my heart, then I would drive 'Abdi-Ashirta from Amurru" (EA 85:66-69; Moran 1950a:71; Greenberg 1955:37); i-nu-m[a] / i-ka-ša-da-am KUR.KUR.MEŠ.KI "If I should (attempt to) conquer the lands" (EA 362:33-34; Moran 1950a:178-179; 1960:14; contrast Moran 1987b:556; 1992:360; Rainey 1989-90:72b).

In some of these instances, one may translate either "when" or "if," e.g.

[i]-na-ṣí-ru i-na / [b]a-la-tì-ia i-nu-ma / [i]-mu-ta mi-nu / [y]i-na-ša-ru-ši_x(ŠE) "While I am alive, I will guard (it); if (when) [I] should die, who will guard it?" (EA 130:50-52; Moran 1950a:73; 1987b:348-349; 1992:212).

For a similar passage, with *šumma*, EA 119:16-18, cf. *supra*, p. 189).

However, the next example has a clear parallel between *enūma* and *šumma*, viz.

ma-an-nu ba-la-aṭ LÚ.GÌR / e-nu-ma la-a it-ta-ší / ša-a-ru iš-tu
UZU pí LUGAL be-li-šu / ù ba-li-iṭ šum-ma LUGAL iš-ta-pár /
[a]-na ÌR-šu ù ba-li-iṭ "What is the life of a foot soldier, if (when)
 the breath from the mouth of the king, his lord, does not come
 forth that he should live? If the king sends to his servant, then
 he lives" (EA 149:21-26; CAD A/2:366a; B:55b).

Even here, nevertheless, Moran (1987b:382; 1992:236) prefers to render *enūma* by "when."

CHAPTER IX

THE OPTATIVE PARTICLE

The particle *lū* (von Soden's "Wunschpartikel," GAG:176, §121c) actually has more than one function in Akkadian, leading some scholars to assume that originally there was more than one particle (most recently Edzard 1973:131; Huehnergard 1983). The conditional *lū* (EA 215:9-15; AHw:560a) has been treated in the previous chapter (*supra*, pp. 190-191). The conjunctive usage (EA 270:18-21) was also discussed earlier (*supra*, p. 107). It remains to deal with the two most important functions of *lū* in the Canaanized letters, viz. the asseverative and the injunctive.

ASSEVERATIVE

The use of *lū* in affirmations is quite rare in the Canaanite texts. All the known examples but two pertain to the past tense. The most frequent syntagma is the introductory declaration of obeisance. Only once in all the peripheral dialects do we find it with the standard verb form, *amqut*:

lu-ú am-qut-ma "Verily have I prostrated (myself)" (EA 299:10).

That Gezer reference is matched by another from Gezer having a different verb:

lu-ú iš-ta-ḥa-ḥi-in "Verily have I prostrated myself" (EA 298:12).

This latter expression is common to several other towns in southern Canaan, viz. Yurza (EA 314:7-8; 315:5-6), Ginti-ašna (EA 319:13), Ashkelon (EA 320:12-13; 321:14; 322:12; 323:6-7; 324:8; 325:8; 328:7), and Lachish (EA 328:14).

Asseverative *lū* has long been recognized in one text from Jerusalem:

lu-ú ir-pí-šu ¹*Pu-ú-ru* / *pa-ta-ar i-na ma-aḥ-ri-ia* / *i-na* ^{URU}*Ḫa-za-ti*
i-ba-aš-ši "Truly, the commissioner, Puwure, has taken leave of
 me; he is in Gaza" (EA 289:38-40; Albright, Mendenhall and
 Moran 1955:489a).

Note a passage in which the asseverative *lū* serves to reinforce some 1st c.s. verb forms in a promissory oath:

šum-ma ki-a-am yi-iq-bu / LUGAL EN-*ia a-na ia-ši* / *iz-zi-ib-mi*
 URU.KI-*ka* / *iš-tu pa-ni* ¹*Pí-i-ia* / *ù lu-ú iz-zi-ba ù* / *il₅-la-ka ù lu-ú*
 / *ur-ra-da* LUGAL EN-*ia* / UD.KAM-*ma ù mu-ša a-di* / *da-ri-ia-ta*
 "If thus the king, my lord, should say to me, 'Leave your city in
 favor of Piya,' then verily would I leave and I would come and
 verily would I serve the king, my lord, day and night forever!"
 (EA 294:27-35).

The *-a* suffix on these verbs is evidently a ventive on the verbs of motion, carried over by modus attraction (GAG:107, §82c) to the third. Thus, we have here a true Akkadian affirmation using *lū* with the *iparras* present tense (GAG:239, §185d; Edzard 1973:129). It is not difficult to see how the asseverative *lū* could be adopted to reinforce the old jussive **yaprus* to form the precative (cf. the next section, *infra*, pp. 195-199, for discussion).

Furthermore, there is a passage from Taanach in which a chain of injunctives is concluded by a WS imperfect verb reinforced by *lū*. It would seem that we have here a strong promise rather than a mere cohortative:

ù lu-ú i-pu-šu ḥa-at-nu-ta₅ "And truly will I make a marriage
 alliance" (TT 2:24; Rainey 1977:36-37,52).

A strong affirmation with the stative is actually a response to the formula adopted in letters from Egypt urging a vassal to be diligent in protecting the city entrusted to him. The vassal writes:

lu-ú na-aš-ra-ku ma-gal "I am verily on guard diligently"
 (EA 193:7).

The command from Pharaoh had been formulated:

uṣ-ṣur lu-ú na-aṣ-ra-ta "Guard! May you be on guard!" (EA 367:4; also EA 99:7-8 and EA 117:83; Thureau-Dangin 1922b:380-381).

The striking fact about the use of asseverative *lū* in the passages cited above is that nearly all of them have true Akkadian verb forms. EA 289:38-40 does have WS *qatal* and the Taanach text may have WS imperfect, but these seem to be exceptions. The strong impression is, then, that the asseverative *lū* is an Akkadianism in the WS texts. It does not seem to reflect a Canaanite particle. If there is such a particle in the mother tongue of the Canaanite scribes, it evidently is supplanted here by the Akkadian *lū*.

INJUNCTIVE

The other, more widely used nuance of *lū* is with the injunctive expressions (for the term, cf. Huehnergard 1983:569 n. 1). It would appear that the precative came into being in Akkadian by the combining of the jussive **yaprus* with the optative *lū* (perhaps originally a marker for conditional, primarily unreal, conditions; Huehnergard 1983:573b). It has been argued that Akkadian *liprus*(*ū/ā*) and *laprus* (in Assyrian) cannot have developed from *lū* + **yaprus* or *lū* + **aprus* respectively (Huehnergard 1983:574-575; Edzard 1973:131). But the arguments are not convincing; though the resultant precatives are inexplicable by normal Akkadian sound shifts, the factor at work here is differentiation of person that can override the usual phonetics. Third person *liprus* preserved an echo of the original *y-* which was needed as a person marker; in Babylonian the vowel class of the *lū* was admissible in first person *luprus* because there was no danger of confusion with the third person. In Assyrian, on the other hand, *laprus* kept an echo of the original ²- by analogy with the third person's echoing its *y-*. That the precative constructions of the stative and the forms with preformative *t-* all have *lū* is sufficient proof that the original particle at play in the

third and first persons was also *lū* (*contra* Huehnergard 1983:574b-575a).

So the Akkadian verbal system used *lū* as its injunctive particle (with cohortative *i* for Babylonian 1st c.pl.). This is also the situation in the WS EA letters. There are no hints as to the existence of **la* as an optative/injunctive particle in Canaanite. The scribes consistently use *lū*.

Due to some peculiar features of verbal inflection in the texts from Canaan, especially the addition of *y-* prefixes to third person forms, there was more occasion to use the *lū*. One of the earliest Amurru letters provides a clear example of *lū* governing not one, but two 3rd m.s. jussives:

ù LUGAL EN-[i]a lu-ú yi-da-an-ni / ù yi-ip[-q]i-[n]i i-na ŠU /
 ʾPa-ḥa-na-ti-ṛ LÚ.MAŠKÍM-ia "And may the king, my lord,
 recognize me and may he assign me to the authority of
 Paḥanati, my commissioner" (EA 60:30-32; Campbell 1976:50;
 Izre'el 1985:251 §3.4.1.7; compare Moran 1987b:234-235 n. 8;
 1992:132-133 n. 8).

To be sure, the Canaanite syntax that permeates the WS EA texts permits the use of jussive *yaqtul* + \emptyset and volitive *yaqtul* + *a* (with their corresponding *taqtulū* plural) to express injunction without any additional particle (Moran 1950a:49-51, 89-104; 1951; 1960; Rainey 1975b:403-404, 411-4125; 1977:52-57). Nevertheless, many scribes do make use of the Akkadian precativ, e.g.

li-il-ma-ad / šār-ru EN-ia "May the king, my lord, be apprised!"
 (EA 237:9-10),

and others couple the injunctive *lū* with Canaanized forms:

[l]u-ú yi-il-ma-ad šār-ru / EN-ia "May the king, my lord, verily
 be apprised!" (EA 366:17).

One should not use this situation to draw conclusions about an original Canaanite injunctive particle. Whether it really was *lū* or

there existed some other form, such as **la*, remains an open question.

One of the most interesting results of the WS scribal practices pertains to the verb *idû* "to know." The OB precative was *lū īde*, which is somewhat anomalous. It probably derived from the function of the preterite, *īde*, *tīde*, etc., as a syntactic stative (GAG:102, §78b). The WS EA texts often use *lū īde* (EA 68:9; *et al.*), but some scribes created a more "conventional" precative, *li-de-(mi)* (EA 174:18; *et al.*); others combined injunctive *lū* with a Canaanized jussive:

ù lu-ú yi-de / šār-ru EN-ia a-na KUR.KI-šu "So may the king, my lord, take cognizance of his territory!" (EA 243:21-22; also EA 60:30; 245:46; 307:6).

Other 3rd m.s. jussives with the injunctive *lū* are the following:

lu-ú yi-iš-me "May he heed!" (EA 136:6-7); *u lu-ú / yi-it-ra-ni!* "So may he deliver me!" (EA 299:21-22; Izre²el apud Na²aman 1979:679 n. 29; cf. Izre²el 1977:165); *u lu-ú yu-uš-ši-ra* "So may he dispatch!" (EA 270:24); *ù lu-ú / yi-il-te-qé-ni* "and may he take me!" (EA 270:26-27); *ù lu-ú yi-na-[di-nū a-na ša-šu]* "So let there be gi[ven to him]!" (EA 245:19).

It should be no surprise that injunctive *lū* sometimes appears with the Canaanite 3rd m.pl. jussive/volitive, which has a consonantal *t*-prefix; note the following:

ù lu-ú / ti-na-ša-ru URU.KI "And may they protect the city!" (EA 136:19; Moran 1951:34 n. 11; 1950a:84); *ù lu-ú ti-mu-ru 2 IGI.MEŠ ÌR-ka* "And may your servant's two eyes behold . . . !" (EA 141:34).

No Canaanite scribe uses the cohortative particle *i* with 1st c.pl. The one supposed instance of this particle (with an imperative) is obviously to be read DUMU!·MEŠ (EA 138:137). Although the cohortative constructions with *i* are known in the

non-WS texts (EA 9:21, 22; 20:79; 23:30; 41:22), the Canaanite scribes employ *lū*, viz.

ù ^llu^l-ú ni-zi-^liz^l / UGU-š^u-nu ù lu-[ú] ni-du-bu-ur / LÚ.MEŠ ša-ru-ta "And let us take a stand against them and let us drive out the miscreants!" (EA 279:18-21); ù lu-ú ni-pa-aš gáb-bu-ma / nu-kúr-ti "and let us all make war" (EA 366:31-32); ù lu-ú ni-ip-ťú-ur ^{URU}Ū-ru-sa-lim^{KI} "And let us desert Jerusalem!" (EA 289:29; Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:489a).

The latter example, from the Jerusalem letters, could have legitimately been classified by Moran (1975b:153) as an Assyrianism in view of the close adherence by the Jerusalem scribe to the Assyrian pattern in the precativē.

There are even instances in which a scribe from Megiddo reinforced the Akkadian precativē by an additional *lū* (+ enclitic *mi*). The entire passage deserves citation in order to illustrate the peculiar juxtaposition of *lūmi* to introduce the entreaties with *lāmi* beginning the vetitives:

ù lu-ú-mi / li-ik-ki-im-mi / šar-ru ^{URU.KI}š^u la-a-mi / yi-iš-bat-ši / ^lLa-ab-a-yu / . . . ù lu-ú / li-di-nam-mi šar-ru / 1 ME LÚ.MEŠ ma-an-ša-ar-ta₅ / a-na na-ša-ri ^{URU.KI}š^u / la-a-mi yi-iš-bat-ši / ^lLa-ab-a-yu "May the king deliver his city lest Lab^aayu seize it . . . so may the king provide one hundred guardsmen to protect the city lest Lab^aayu seize it" (EA 244:25-38; Campbell 1965:193; Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:485a; Rabiner 1981:99, 110; Moran 1987b:468; 1992:298; cf. *infra*, pp. 241, 244).

There are a few instances when a Canaanite scribe seems not to have known the proper Akkadian vocalization for the precativē, especially in the D stem. The Jerusalem scribe was strongly influenced by the Assyrian dialect in his choice of verbal forms, so it is not surprising that 3rd m.s. forms such as *lu-ši-mi* (EA 286:54), *lu-ti-ra* (EA 290:21), *lu-ma-še-er* (EA 286:45; 288:42), *lu-ma-še-ra* (EA 285:28; 287:18) and *lu-ma-šir*₉ (EA 290:20) should occur (Moran 1975b:153). But when Byblos letters produce

examples like *lu-wa-ši-ra* (EA 84:31; 92:47; 106:26, 36, 42) and also *lu-wa-ši-ra-am* (EA 84:26), they are not likely to have been from Assyrian influence. The same must be said for *lu-wa-ši-ra-mi* (EA 263:23) and *lu-wa-aš-ši-ra-an-ni-mi* (EA 238:9) from other WS scribes. Confusion between D and G in addition to a misunderstanding about the prefix vowel resulted in *lu-ḥa-mu-uṭ* (EA 88:40, also to be supplied in line 24). Finally, there is the G form *lu-uk-šu-da-am-mi* (EA 191:11).

The WS letters almost never make use of the optative function of the suffix conjugation (Ginsberg 1936b:177), though future tense syntagma with *qatal* are widespread (Moran 1950a:30-34; 1961:64-65). So it is not surprising that, apart from *lū īde* discussed above, there are few examples of precatives with the stative. A precative permansive injunctive, much disputed among scholars, is the following:

lu-ú 2 šil-la-tu-nu "May you two be protection!" (EA 289:26; Moran 1987b:518 and n. 3; 1992:333 and n. 3; 1975b:162 n. 42), or *lu-ú a!-mi-la-tu-nu* "Be ye men!" (AHw:90b; CAD A/2:54b), or *lu É!-mi at!-tu-nu* "You are (members of) of my house" (Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:489a; Campbell 1965:200).

Albright (1975:116 n. 6) later arrived at another solution. He read *lu-ú ša!-mi at!-tu-nu* "As for you, go forth!" but *lū* is hardly likely with the imperative. The best interpretation is still that of AHw:90b; CAD A/2:54b, viz. *lu-ú a!-mi-la-tu-nu* "Be ye men!" Note that it is a well known idiom, recorded in OA texts and elsewhere (CAD A/2:54b). It does no damage to the context and makes perfect sense (Rainey 1989-90:71b).

Passages such as *lu-ú na-šir-ta* (EA 112:9; 117:84) are citations of letters from Egypt with just that formula, i.e. *lu-ú na-ša-ra-ta* (EA 99:7-8; 367:4; 370:5; Thureau-Dangin 1922b:380; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:166, §2.4.5.1; cf. *supra*, p. 194-195). On the other hand, *lu-ú na-aš-ra-ku* (EA 193:7) is the Canaanite reply to the Egyptian exhortation and it is actually an asseveration, not an optative.

OATHS

There are a number of places where the precative is used in oaths. These are not strictly asseverations, which in Akkadian usually do not contract the *lū* particle with the following word. They may be classed as assertions (cf. GAG:239, §185a). The examples are all precatives of *balātu* "to live." The strongest is:

li-ib-lu-uṭ / šār-ru EN-ia li-ib-lu-uṭ / šār-ru EN-ia šum-ma i₁₅-ba-ši
/ ¹A-ia-ab i-na URUPī-ḫi-li "As the king, my lord, lives, as the king,
 my lord, lives, if Ayyābu is in Peḫel" (EA 256:10-13).

Another good example is followed by the *lū* of asseveration (cited *supra*, pp. 193-194):

li-ib-lu-uṭ šār-ru / lu-ú ir-pí-šu ¹Pu-ú-ru / pa-ṭa-ar i-na maḫ-ri-ia /
i-na URUH_a-za-ti i-ba-aš-ši "As the king lives, his commissioner,
 Puwure, has departed from me, he is in Gaza" (EA 289:37-40;
 Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:489a).

Two broken passages from Byblos apparently contain the identical idiom (EA 85:39, 86). Another Byblos context has

ù / DINGIR.MEŠ KUR-k[a T]I "As the god(s) of yo[ur] land
 [li]ve" (EA 74:14-15; Youngblood 1961:132).

A second presumed occurrence of the ideographic writing has been recently discounted by Moran in favor of another reading (EA 75:29; Moran 1987b:253, 254 n. 6; 1992:145. 146 n. 6; *contra* Moran 1950a:152 and Youngblood 1961:163-164).

CHAPTER X

NEGATIVE PARTICLES

As the mirror image of the affirmative statement or expression of volition, the negative counterparts are a most revealing testimony to many syntactical facets of any language. This is no less true of the Canaanized EA texts.

NON-VERBAL

yānu(m), *iyyānu(m)*. A notable feature of the WS texts is the adoption of a negative existential particle totally unknown in OB. Only in MB and the contemporary peripheral dialects do we find *yānu(m)*/*iyyānu(m)* for the negation of non-verbal expressions (CAD I/J:323a-324a; AHw:411b-412a). It would appear, however, that this late usage is derived from the OA and OB epistolary use of the interrogative *ayyānu(m)* "where?" as a rhetorical question with negative implications (cf. CAD A/1:227b; GAG:161, §111b). The proper long form of the negative should thus be *iyyānu(m)* (with Moran 1975b:165 n. 69).

The EA texts show a wide variety of orthography for this particle but the most common spelling is the simple *ia-nu*, used in over 40 texts. Rare instances of *ia-a-nu-mi* (favored by the Jerusalem scribe, 9 times; also EA 94:6), also *i-ia-nu-mi* (EA 195:21), are inconclusive with regard to the mimation. The latter two do reveal other morphological features, viz. the long *a*-vowel and the consonantal *y*, respectively. Both appear together only once, i.e. *i-ia-a-nu* (EA 215:11; perhaps also EA 10:44?). The form *i-ia-nu* is shared by scribes from Egypt (EA 1:20, 79, 81; 369:17), Alashia (EA 34:26, 29), and Beirut (EA 136:41; 137:10, 22, 71; 138:26, 30, 89). Mimation is indeed rare: *ia-nu-um* (EA 69:23; 92:21, 22; 127:18, 21; also EA 59:42), *i-ia-nu-um* (EA 250:57). Scribal error must account for *ia-nu-AM* (EA 362:37) and *ia-nu-AM-mi* (EA 362:29).

None of the WS letters have examples of *iyyānumma* "if not" (EA 162:27, 45, 52, 54; also EA 16:50; 29:141; CAD I/J:329b).

The usage of the existential negative particle in the WS corpus is distinguished from MB and the other peripheral dialects in two respects: word order and case. The Akkadian position for *yānu(m)/iyyānu(m)* is at the end of its clause (CAD I/J:230b). The opposite is true of the EA texts from Canaan. This will be seen throughout the examples treated below. An exception is (from Tyre):

*mi-ši-il-šu / i-kúl ù mi-ši-il-šu ia-nu / ù LÚ.MEŠ^{KUR}Ḫa-at-ti
ia-nu* "It (the fire) has consumed half of it, but not the other half
nor the Hittite troops" (EA 151:56-58; CAD I/J:230b).

A partial exception was also cited with regard to *lū* as a conditional particle (EA 215:9-15; *supra*, p. 191) where the negative follows its subject but is followed by the adverbial complement.

In keeping with standard Akkadian grammar, the subject of a normal clause with *yānu(m)* as the predicate is in the nominative (GAG:180, §126c), cf. the following MB passage:

it-qu ba-ni-tu₄ ia-nu "there is no good fleece" (Radau 1908:No. 44:11; cited Aro 1957:42; CAD I/J:299b);

also from Ḫattusas:

ù re-eḫ-tu₄ mim-ma ia-nu "and there was nothing else" (KBo 1, 3:32; cited AHw:968b).

Only the Jerusalem scribe consistently maintains the standard case usage among the Canaanite correspondents, e.g.

ù šum-ma ia-nu ERÍN.MEŠ *pi-ṭa-tu₄* "But if there are no regular troops" (EA 290:22; also EA 285:15-16; 287:23; 288:51, 57); *ia-a-nu-mi* LÚḪa-zi-a-nu a-na LUGAL "the king has no city-ruler" (EA 286:52; also EA 288:39).

But as in many other respects, the Tyrian scribe sometimes follows the same pattern as his Jerusalem counterpart:

*e-nu-ma ia-nu / GIŠ.MEŠ ia-nu A.MEŠ ia-nu IN₄.NU / ia-nu
 'ip¹-ru ia-nu ša-mu / a-na ba[-la-ti]-'š^u(!) "there is no wood, no
 water, no straw, no food, no fodder for its(!) sus[tenance]"
 (EA 155:18-21; CAD I/J:168a).*

However, the remarkable feature of the Canaanized EA texts is that *yānu(m)* takes its subject in the accusative (Böhl 1909:72 §34f; Moran 1950a:14-15, 110 n. 23; Albright and Moran 1948:248 n. 28). Moran assembled a number of decisive examples showing that the same word appears in the nominative as subject of a finite verb but in the accusative as the subject of *yānu(m)*. From two passages within the same epistle he found:

*ù mi[-na] / ti-'pu¹-šu ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-tu "And wh[at] will the
 army do?" (EA 129:33-34); šum-ma ia-nu ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-ta₅ "If
 there is no army" (EA 129:49, also 30).*

And from another:

*ti₇-iq-bu-ni ia-nu-mi / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-ta₅ ù aš-pu-ur / ù tu-ša
 ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-tu "They said to me, 'There is no army,' but I
 wrote so that the army came forth" (EA 362:17-19); cf. also
 i-nu-ma / tu-šú ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ťá-tu "that the army came forth"
 (EA 362:55-56).*

The latter epistle also has:

*BA.UG₅ \ mu-tu-mi a-na KUR.MEŠ "'Death is in the territories"
 (EA 362:47); ia-nu-mi / mu-ta-na a-na KUR.MEŠ "There is no
 epidemic in the territories" (EA 362:49-50).*

One may also contrast the different cases used in negative existential statements with *ul* (plus nominative) and *yānu(m)* (plus accusative):

ú-ul / ma-ša-ar-tu ú-ul / ba-la-aṭ LUGAL a-na / ia-ši "I have no garrison and no royal provisions" (EA 122:28-31); *ia-[nu] / [ba]-¹la¹-aṭ LUGAL [ù ia-nu] / [ma-ša-a]r-ta [UGU-ia]* "There are n[o] royal [pro]visions [and there is no garri]son [assigned to me]" (EA 112:54-56).

Moran also collected a number of other clear examples from the Byblos letters:

ù ia-nu-um ¹mi¹-¹im¹-ma / ù i-nu-ma ia-nu-um LÚ.MEŠ ti-¹la¹-¹ta₅¹ "that there are no supplies and that there is no support troop" (EA 92:21-22); *ia-a-nu-mi le-em-na i-n[a a]-¹wa¹te ÌR-šu* "There's no evil in the words of his servant" (EA 94:6); *ia-nu / ḥa-za-na i-na ar-ki-ti-ia* "There is no city-ruler behind me" (EA 117:9-10); *ia-nu mi-im-ma a-na ia-ši* "I have no supplies" (EA 117:74; also EA 85:74; 112:25; 116:42-43).

In all the above cases, the subject was in apposition to some determinative, for example LÚ.MEŠ or ERÍN.MEŠ, that preceded it. Thus, it carried the inflection demanded by its clause. On occasion, the key word may be construed as a genitive that is dependent on the preceding logogram. In cases such as these latter, the dependent substantive will be inflected accordingly which explains why so many examples are in the dependent case:

ia-nu LÚ.MEŠ ma-ša-ar-ti "There are no garrison men" (EA 122:18); *ia-nu / ERÍN.MEŠ pī-tá-ti* "There are no regular troops" (EA 283:15-16).

Moran had also faced up to some apparent discrepancies in the Byblos texts (Moran 1950a:110 n. 23), all of which have to do with Sumerograms. The solution seems to be that many logograms from Sumerian were learned by the scribes with a set of fixed phonetic complements. They considered those phonetic compliments to be part of the logogram. In other words, the word sign consisted of a fixed combination of signs. The principal examples found in the texts with *yānu(m)* are:

ia-nu-um LÚ-LUM (EA 69:23); *ia-[nu]* / LÚ-LIM (EA 74:32-33);
i[a-n]u / A-U (EA 85:53-54); *ia-nu É-ti ḥa-za-ni* (EA 89:49); *ia-nu* /
 [ŠĚ-I]M (EA 105:84-85).

Youngblood (1961:1950a:70).

ia-nu ŠÀ-BI ša-na a-[n]a ia-ši "I have no other intention"
 (EA 119:42).

The accusative case is properly expressed in the adjective, while the ideogram has its most common phonetic complement, representing the dependent case ending and/or the anaptyctic vowel of the construct form. There can be no doubt, then, that the accusative is the correct case and phonetic complements that violate the rule are to be disregarded. By contrast, the following example follows the rule since the subject is plural (*casus obliquus*):

ù ia-nu-um!(AM) / LÚ.MEŠ-*li* "and there would be no men"
 (EA 362:37-38; Rainey 1978b:21).

Apart from Jerusalem and Tyre, the accusative rule was probably in force elsewhere among the Canaanite scribes of the EA corpus. At least the few clear examples point in that direction:

lu-ú¹Ia-an-ḥa-ma / *i-ia-nu* "If Yanḥamu is not (here)"
 (EA 215:9-10; cf. also *supra*, p. 190); *ù i-ia-nu-um pa-¹nu¹-ta₅*
ša-n[u-]ta₅ / *a-na ia-ši* "But I have no other intention"
 (EA 250:57-58); *[i]-ia-nu mi-im-ma* / *i-na É¹(?)-ia* "There are no
 supplies in my house(?)" (EA 316:18-19).

To these we may possibly add one entry from Tyre in spite of the passage cited above with the nominative. The question in this second example is whether the key *a-* vowel is purely anaptyctic or an indicator of case as well:

ia-nu É-šu ia-nu / *bal-ta-šu* "His house is not, his honor is not"
 (EA 153:13-14; cf. GAG:85, §65f.).

As its subject, *yānum* can also take a noun clause. Note, for example,

ia-nu / ša iq!(AQ)-bi mi-im-ma a-na / 𒀭R-A-ši-ir-ta "There was no one who said anything to 'Abdi-Ashirta" (EA 75:27-28; also EA 91:10-11; Youngblood 1961:163; cf. Moran 1950a:47).

Finally, there is one use of *yānu(m)* in the abstract. The reference is naturally to some concrete situation understood by the writer, if not stated explicitly in the text.

šum-ma i-ia-nu "If not" (EA 271:17; Izre'el 1978b:68, 72); *da-na-at-mi KÚR^{NU} / UGU Išu-wa-ar-da-ta / ù i-ia-nu* "Is the hostility against Shuwardata strong or not?" (EA 283:30-33).

lā. There are a few non-verbal main clauses negated by *lā*. Details of orthography, etc., are discussed *infra*, p. 209, under verbal negation. Here the question arises as to how one should interpret the broader use of *lā* in functions reserved for Babylonian *ul* (GAG:177, §122). A most tempting solution is the assumption of interference from the cognate WS particle (Heb. *lô*²), which idea receives some support from the verbal negation pattern (Anderson 1977:2). This is attractive for Byblos passages:

URUGub-la la ki-[m]a URU.KI.ḪÁ "Byblos is not like the (other) cities" (EA 88:43); *ù ta-aq-bu / URU an-nu-ú la-a ḫa-za-nu* "Then the city will say, 'This is not the city-ruler'" (EA 89:40-41; Moran 1950a:71).

Perhaps also for Jerusalem, though Assyrian influence has been noted there in other spheres of grammar (Moran 1975b:152-154):

a-mur a-na-ku la-a LÚḫa-zi-a-nu "Behold, I am not (just) a city-ruler" (EA 288:9).

The most troublesome expression is the proverbial analogy used by Rib-Haddi:

A.ŠĀ-*ia aš-ša-ta* / *ša la* ¹*mu*¹-*ta ma-ši-ìl* "My field resembles a wife without a husband" (EA 74:17-18; 75:15-17; 81:37-38; 90:42; Marcus 1973:284).

Now *ša lā* "without" should take the dependent case (AHw:521a), so the presence of the accusative *mu-ta* is puzzling (Youngblood 1961:136; Marcus 1973:284). One is reminded of the predilection for the accusative with *yānu(m)* (cf. *supra*, pp. 202-205), but that hardly seems plausible here. It would appear that the phrase as a whole, being in apposition to *aš-ša-ta*, itself the object of *ma-ši-ìl*, was given the case ending corresponding to its status within the clause.

The oft quoted mixture of functions between *lā* and *ul* (Moran 1950a:13) is underscored by the following non-verbal clause where the two particles are used together in tandem; each one negates a nominal subject as part of the same syntagma:

ú-ul / GU₄.MEŠ *ù la-a* UZ(!).[MEŠ] / *a-na ia-ši* "I have no oxen and no goats" (EA 125:21-23; for the correction cf. Na'aman apud Rainey 1974:303; 1978b:70).

ul. MB continues the OB usage of *ul* to negate the declarative-sentence, e.g.

ma-an-nu i-qa-ab-bi um-ma-a ul DUMU.MÍ LUGAL *ši-i* "Who speaks thus, 'She is not a king's daughter?'" (EA 4:13-15).

Therefore, it is not surprising to find at Byblos:

[*ú*]-*ul ki-ma pa-na-nu* "Things are not as they were before" (EA 93:24; Moran 1950a:161); *a-mur a-na-ku ú-u[l]* / ¹*ki*¹-¹*ma*¹ ¹*la-pa-aḥ*-¹*IŠKUR* *ù ú-ul ki[-ma]* / ¹*[Zi-i]m-re-da* "Behold, I am no[t] like Yapa^c-Haddu and not li[ke] [Zi]mredda" (EA 106:18-20).

Three interrogative sentences with *ul* can be cited from one Byblian (Moran 1969:1 n. 1; Altman 1977a:4-5) text:

mi-nu nu-kúr-tu₄ / [UGU!] LUGAL *ú-ul* ^I*Ḫa-ya-a* "Who is hostile [to] the king? Is it not Ḫaya?" (EA 101:1-2); ^{GIŠ}MÁ.MEŠ *ša ma-ni* / *i-zi-zu* UGU-*ia* *ú-ul* / LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}*Ar-wa-da* "Whose ships were arrayed against us? Were they not the men of Arvad?" (EA 101:11-13); *a-na ma-an-ni* / URU.MEŠ *an-nu-tu* *ú-ul* *a-na* LUGAL "Whose cities are these? Are they not the king's?" (EA 101:25-26).

Likewise, the presence of *ul* in the following passage from Byblos may be accounted for by the interrogative nuance of the subordinated clause:

li-^Ida¹-gal LUGAL *tup-^Ipt¹MEŠ¹* / *ša É a-bi-šu i-nu-ma* *ú-ul* ^{IR}*ki-ti* / LÚ-*lu* *ša i-ba-aš-ši i-na* ^{URU}*Gub-la* "May the king look at the records of his father's house as to whether the ruler who is in Byblos is not a true servant!" (EA 74:10-12; Moran 1950a:151; cf. *supra*, p. 81).

One other text should more properly be classed as an elliptic verbal clause:

LUGAL *iš-ta-kán-šu* / UGU-*šu-nu* *ú-ul* *šu-nu* "The king appointed him over them, not they (themselves)" (EA 101:30-31).

Albright and Moran (1948:247) made the observation that the following passage may also reflect an ellipsis for a verb such as *tīde* or the like:

ú-ul i-nu-ma / *uš-ši-ir-ti* LÚ-*ia a-na* É.GAL "is it not that I sent my man to the palace?" (EA 82:35-36).

Note the following non-verbal rhetorical question with *ul* from a text that was sent to Rib-Haddi by an Egyptian official (the text has some WS features):

ANŠE.MEŠ *šār-ri* / *ù* *ú-ul la-a* *ḫal-qu mi-im-mé* / LUGAL "Do the asses belong to the king or not? The king's property may not

be lost" (EA 96:19-21; Moran 1987b:288; 1992:170; *contra* Youngblood 1961:401; 1962:26;).

Finally, there is the existential sentence which has already cited (*supra*, p. 204) for its comparison with similar clauses containing the regular negative existential particle, *yānu(m)*:

ù / *an-nu-ú a-na-ku ú-ul / ma-ša-ar-tu ù ú-ul / ba-la-aṭ LUGAL a-na / ia-ši* "But behold, as for me, I have no garrison and no royal provisions" (EA 122:27-31).

VERBAL NEGATION

Since the Canaanite epistles reveal a considerable inconsistency in the use of *ul* and *lā*, the verbal negation will be treated topically with parallel examples of similar clause types having each of the negative particles.

The negative particles are generally written plene in the EA texts from Canaanite sources. Thus, they preserve the OB practice of spelling *ú-ul* and only rarely do they write simply *ul* (EA 39:18; 77:12, 37). The normal spelling in MB is *ul*, which is also the standard in other peripheral dialects. Interestingly enough, there is a tendency among the Egyptian scribes to use *ú-ul* (EA 1:*passim*). Likewise, the WS scribes prefer the plene *la-a* for *lā*, though there are at least a dozen or so examples of the short form, *la* (EA 35:50; 60:21-23; 74:18; 90:13; 92:15, 51; 106:13, 28; 193:17; 286:42, 50) even in the same line with the longer spelling (EA 264:12). Once in a while, the negative *lā* also receives an enclitic *-mi* either as sign of direct speech or for special emphasis, viz. *la-a-mi* (EA 90:49; 96:7; 126:7, 17, 27, 62; 131:28, 58; 244:13; 273:22) or in two texts, *la-a-mi* (EA 244:15, 19, 27, 37; 264:8, 12).

It has been noted (Moran 1950a:13; Anderson 1977) that there is a considerable interchange between the two negative particles, *ul* and *lā*. Therefore, in line with the approach mentioned at the beginning of this section, the various types of verbal clauses will be treated and examples cited to illustrate the use or avoidance of each of the respective particles. The objective

will be to assess the degree of divergence from the Babylonian norm for each class of sentences. In this way, the interchange of *ul* and *lā* may be evaluated and perhaps its causal factors can be defined. As usual, examples from the Alashia letters are taken into consideration even though they are not uniformly WS in their syntax.

DECLARATIVE MAIN CLAUSES. OB and MB employed *ul* in declarative main clauses (GAG:177, §122b; Finet 1956:213-214, §77; Aro 1957:113). Use of an Akkadian present is quite rare for such clauses in the WS texts, and the best example may actually have been a calque for the stative in the mind of the WS scribe (it lacks the *t*-prefix and the *-ūna* suffix expected on Canaanized verbal hybrids):

ù an-nu-uš i-na-na / [ú]-ul i-ra-a-mu a-na 𐎠𐎢𐎣-*A-ši-ir-ta* "But now they don't favor 'Abdi-Ashirta" (EA 73:17-18).

On the other hand, three examples from Jerusalem have the Akkadian present (they generally avoid the WS prefix tenses) plus *lā*. The Assyrian usage of *lā* should be no surprise here, since the verb forms themselves are, in fact, purely Assyrian (Moran 1975b:153-154), and all Assyrian dialects have only *lā*, never *ul* (GAG:177, §122a; Mayer 1971:101, §88)!

ù la a-la-á²-e / e-ra-ba iš-tu LUGAL EN-*ia* "so I am unable to come before the king, my lord" (EA 286:42-43); *la ta-ša-mé-ú a-na ia-ši* "They would not listen to me" (EA 286:50; note WS 3rd m.pl. with *t*-!); *ù la-a a-mar 2!* IGI.MEŠ LUGAL / EN-*ia* "and I will not see the two eyes of the king, my lord" (EA 288:30-31).

The ensuing passage from Tyre displays a typical similarity with Jerusalem practices:

la-am kà-ša-ad LÚ<DUMU> KIN-*ri*: LUGAL EN-*ia* / *la-a i-sà-ḥur še-ḥu* "Before the king's ambassador arrived, the breath (of life) was not returning" (EA 147:22-23).

As would be expected, many main clauses have the WS imperfect (*yaqtulu*). Instances can be cited in which the same verb takes either *ul* or *lā*, but it is the latter which seems to predominate. They may be due to the fact that *lā* is quite common in the neighboring peripheral dialects, e.g. in Mitanni (Adler 1976:80-81) and Hattusas (Labat 1932:75). So one must also take into consideration the possibility that the extensive use of *lā* at the expense of *ul* was due to Assyrian influence throughout the region (cf. Adler 1976:81).

The matching pairs cited below will illustrate the situation:

ú-ul ni-le-ú / i-pé-eš mi-im-mi "We are unable to do anything" (EA 89:42-43); *la-a i-le-ú uš-šar / ḠIŠMÁ.MEŠ-ia a-na aš-ra-nu* "I am unable to send my ships there" (EA 126:7-8; also EA 244:13-17; 98:19-20; 211:18-20; 264:9-10; and pl. EA 108:45).

And,

ù ú-ul tu-uš-mu-¹na¹ / a-wa-tu-ia "But my words are not heeded" (EA 91:29-30; also EA 74:50; 89:8-10; 90:16-18); [*ù*] / *la-a tu-uš-mu-na a-¹wa¹-tu-¹šu¹* "[but] his words are not heeded" (EA 89:36-37; cf. also EA 118:53-54; 131:34-35; 132:39, 52-53).

Again,

ú-ul yi-te-r[u-bu] / LUGAL a-na URU.MEŠ-šu-nu "The king cannot even en[ter] their towns" (EA 117:39-40; also EA 85:84; Youngblood 1961:282; EA 92:39); *la-a-mi / an-ti-in₄-nu e-re-eb / LÚ.¹MEŠ¹ ša URUŠu-mu-ri^{KI} / [a-n]a URU.KI-ia* "I am not permitting the men of Šumur to enter [in]to my city" (EA 96:7-10; cf. Youngblood 1961:395; 1962:26).

The *lā* passages far outnumber those with *ul*:

i-na-na la-a ¹yi¹-ša-a-lu šàr-ru / a-na ḥa-za-¹ni¹-šu a-na ŠEŠ-ia "Now the king doesn't investigate concerning his city-ruler,

concerning my brother" (EA 89:12-13; Albright and Moran 1950:164; also from Byblos, EA 83:21-23; 97:6-8; 114:57-59; 118:47-48; 126:25-28; 126:40-42; 131:27-28; 131:58;);

but also in those from various other towns throughout the territory of Canaan:

ù la-a / yu-sà-an-ni-qú šār-ru EN-ia / ar-ni-ia "But the king, my lord, does not investigate my crimes" (EA 254:17-19; Rabiner 1981:20; CAD S:143b-144a; also EA 266:22-25; 365:16-21).

Finally, there is an unusual instance of the Akkadian present to express an event in the past (either as an Akkadianism expressing repeated action in the past or as a simple past tense with WS -Ø; cf. Rainey 1975b:420):

L[UGAL] / *a-wa-te* ^{MES}*tup-pí-ia* *ù* L[ÚDUMU.KIN-*ia*] / *la yi-še*₂₀*-mé* "The k[ing] did not heed the words of my tablet or of [my ambassador]" (EA 92:13-15; Moran 1950a:124;).

The *yaqtul*+Ø preterite is very much in evidence as a Canaanite tense (Rainey 1971b:96-102; 1975b:401, 410-411; 1977:40-43). The attested negative clauses with preterite in declarative sentences all have *lā* in contrast to Babylonian, which would have *ul*.

a-na-ku / la-a iš-me a-na ša-šu-nu "I did not listen to them" (EA 136:14-15; also EA 34:11-12; 38:9; 62:38; 83:20 [pl.]).

Even in a context where the preterite is paralleled by the Akkadian stative, all the clauses have *lā*, viz.

ù la-a ar-na-ku / ù la-a ḥa-ṭá-ku ù / la-a a-kal-li GÚ.UN.ḤÁ-*ia* / *ù la-a a-kal-li / e-ri-iš-ti*₇ LÚ-*ra-bi-ší-ia* "But I have not rebelled and I have not sinned and I have not withheld my tribute nor have I withheld the request of my commissioner" (EA 254:11-15).

On the other hand, the preformative stative shows instances of negation by both particles. Even the same text cited above for *lā* with the stative and the preterite has *ul* with the preformative stative:

ú-ul i₁₅-de i-nu-ma / 1DUMU.MU-ia it-ti / LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ / it-ta-na-la-ku "I didn't know that my son has been associating with the ʿapîrû" (EA 254:32-35; for the tense, cf. Rabiner 1981:20, 21 n. 13; Moran 1975a:149).

One may even compare the following:

ù a-na-ku ŠEŠ-ia la-a i-de₄-mi ki-i it-ti-šu-nu / i-ba-aš-ši "But I, my brother, did not know that they(sic!) were with them" (EA 38:15-16);

and also:

ù la-a i-lé-e iš-tu / qa-ti 1Zi-im-re-da URUŠí-du-na^{KI} "But I am unable because of Zimredda (of) Sidon" (EA 151:10-11).

Likewise, forms of the regular stative, which may be Akkadian in shape but usually follow Canaanite word order, may also be negated by either particle, though there is a preponderance of clauses with *lā*. Compare the parallel passages showing interchange of *ul* and *lā*:

ù-ul ka-ši-id / a-na mu-ḫi-ia "He has not come to me" (EA 130:13-14; also EA 89:14; Albright and Moran 1950:164);

and:

ù la-a / ka-ši-id a-wa-tu / LUGAL EN-ia a-na ÌR-šu "But the word of the king, my lord, has not come to his servant" (EA 136:21-23); *ù an-nu la-a la-qí* "But this (suggestion) was not accepted" (EA 119:52; also EA 83:13-14; 92:10; 96:19; 108:40-41; 264:8; 266:9-12; 273:22-24; 362:54-56).

Not only are active *qatal* forms negated by either particle, but this may even occur with respect to the same verb in a single text, as in the following:

ù 2 LÚ / ^{KUR}Mi-iš-ri ša-a ša-ap-ra-ti / a-na É.GAL ú-ul a-ša "But the two men of Egypt whom I sent to the palace have not come forth" (EA 117:12-14); ù an-na ú-ul a-ša "But behold, they have not come forth" (EA 117:19; Moran 1950a:62); ù la-a a-ša "But it did not come forth" (EA 117:56; also EA 117:91-92).

Compare also:

ú-ul / ša-ap-^lra^l-ti a-na šār-ri "I did not send to the king" (EA 117:14-15); ù ki-na-na la-a / al-ka-ti a-na ^{URU}Šu^l-mu-^lra^l "And thus, I did not go to Šumur" (EA 107:47-48).

INTERROGATIVE CLAUSES. In the category of questions, the general rules of negation noted for Mari (Finet 1956:219-221, §79e-h) seem to have been followed by the scribes of Canaan. Clauses having an interrogative pronoun or an interrogative adverb(ial) are negated by *lā*; clauses without such elements, which are simply interrogative by nature, are negated by *ul*. There are practically no exceptions to this rule.

First, a selection of examples of interrogative clauses which do not have an interrogative pronoun or an interrogative adverb(ial):

at-ta ú-ul / ti-i-de ^{KUR}A-mur-ri "Don't you know Amurru?" (EA 73:14-15; Knudtzon 1915:371; Youngblood 1960:109); ú-ul ta-qa-al-mi a-na.ĪR-ka "Have you not ignored your servant?" (EA 74:13; Knudtzon 1915:373; Youngblood 1960:127); [ú]-ul ta-aq[-bu! a-n]a EN-ka "Won't you speak to your lord?" (EA 77:21; Knudtzon 1915:385; cf. Youngblood 1961:178, 181, 183; Greenberg 1955:35).

The same principle applies not only to the tenses in these passages, i.e. the imperfect (also EA 83:18-19; 93:14-17) and the

preterite (also EA 83:16-17; 117:53), but also to the repeated past action and the stative:

ú-ul la-qi / ʾĪR-A-ši-ir-ta "Was not 'Abdi-Ashirta captured?"
(EA 117:27; 108:32-33; 132:16-17; cf. Moran 1950a:167, 171).

Turning to questions negated by *lā*, a passage without an interrogative phrase must be treated first. It is not generally recognized as a question (Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:489a), but makes more sense when read that way (Nitzan 1973:68, 70). This use of *lā* is readily understood in light of the Assyrian verb form (Moran 1975b:154), and the negation by *lā* is thus another Assyrianism in the Jerusalem corpus:

*la-a i-qa-bi-ú a-na pa-ni LUGAL EN-ia / e-nu-ma ḫal-qa-at KUR
LUGAL EN-ia / ú ḫal-qu gáb-bi LÚ.MEŠ ḫa-zi-a-nu-ti* "Will they
not declare before the king, my lord, that the land of the king,
my lord, is lost and that the city-rulers are lost?" (EA 288:54-56).

The presence of extraposition may explain the choice of negative particle in the following passage from Alashia:

šu-ú ŠEŠ-ia / la-a i-de₄-šu "That very thing, did my brother not
know it?" (EA 38:8-9).

Two more texts, with *lā*, are generally assumed to be declarative, but if so, it is hard to explain the energetic verb forms. They make good sense as questions and perhaps the *lā* is for special emphasis as it is used here in conjunction with the energetic mode of the verbs:

*[a-n]u-ma ki-a-ma-am iš-tap-ru a-na šâr-ri EN-ia / [ú] la-a
yi-iš-mu-na a-wa-te-ia* "[N]ow, thus I have been writing to the
king, my lord, [but] won't he heed my words?" (EA 85:6-7);
aš-tap-pár aš-ta-ni la-a / ia-tu-ru-na a-wa-tu / a-na ia-a-ši "I kept
writing repeatedly; will not word come back to me?"
(EA 126:53-55).

There is a fair spectrum of instances with some interrogative element, negated by *lā*. From Alashia there is an example of the Akkadian preterite:

a-na mi-nim-mi la-a tu-wa-ši-ra / LÚDUMU ši-ip-ri-ka a-na maḥ-ri-ia
 "Why did you not send your ambassador unto me?"
 (EA 34:9-10; also EA 34:46-48).

But the Canaanized clauses are also plentiful; note e.g.

a-na mi-ni7 / qa-la-ta ù la-a / ti-iq-bu a-na šār-ri "Why are you silent and do not speak to the king?" (EA 71:10-12; 73:6-8; cf. also EA 83:7-8; 114:35-37; 126:14-18, 49-50; 289:10).

The interrogative force of *šumma* in the next passage is also reinforced by the negation with *lā*:

šum-ma a-na ḥa-za-ni URUŠur-ri / la-a yi-ša-i-lu šār-ru "Will not the king make an inquiry concerning the city-ruler of Tyre?" (EA 89:44-45; Albright and Moran 1950:164, 167; Youngblood 1961:334).

A special group of clause questions consists of some variations on the theme of "canine servility" in which the writer infers that he is like a lowly dog, obedient to the commands of Pharaoh. The most Akkadian of these examples has the negative in a relative clause, which naturally calls for *lā* (Edzard 1973:125, 126; GAG:177, §122):

[*u*] *ma-an-ṽnuṽ-mi LÚṽkalṽ-bu* / *ša la-a yi-iš-ṽmuṽ / a-na a-wa-teMEŠ*
 LUGAL / EN-šu "[But] who is the doṽg that would not give
 heed to the words of the king, his lord?" (EA 319:19-22).

However, the thoroughly Canaanized version (with WS interrogative pronoun) appends the relative clause by means of the coordinating conjunction *u* (cf. *supra*, pp. 101-102), thus converting it to the status of a main clause:

mi-ia-mi / ^{LÚ}UR.GI₁₂ *u la-a* / *yi-iš-te-mu a-wa-ta₅* / LUGAL EN-*ia*
 "Who is the dog that he would not heed the word of the king,
 my lord?" (EA 323:17-20; Rainey 1971b:98-99; 1978b:75; also
 EA 324:16-17; similarly EA 315:16-17; 201:14-16; 232:12-15;
 255:12-14).

Only once does a scribe, from Gezer, take the negative as a truly independent clause, probably because it was separated from the initial proverbial clause:

[*u m*]a-an-nu-mi a-na-ku UR.GI₇ . . . *u a-wa-te*^{MEŠ} / LUGAL EN-*ia*
 . . . ú-^lul^l / *él-te₉-né-em-me* "Who am I, a dog, . . . that I would
 not continually heed the words of the king, my lord . . . ?"
 (EA 378:18-26).

This exceptional use of *ul*, with a purely Akkadian Gtn form, only serves to emphasize the role of *lā* in all the other clauses with this formula. Whether the scribes were simply using a calque from their native tongue or were influenced by the logical subordination of the negative clause (in spite of the *u*) is impossible to determine; but in view of the WS origin of the entire context, Canaanite influence seems quite likely.

CONDITIONAL CLAUSES. The Babylonian rules for the negation of conditional clauses are not always observed by the Canaanite scribes, but one gets the impression that they were familiar with them.

One should expect *ul* in a conditional clause without *šumma* (GAG:212, §161a). Only at Mari does one find *ul* and then in just those cases where there is hope that the stated condition will not be realized (GAG:212, §161b; Finet 1956:242, §85j). The Canaanite examples do seem to reflect such an intention. Rib-Haddi hoped Pharaoh would send his army, but he also warns:

šum-ma MU.MEŠ a[n-n]i-ta ú-ul / *yu-ša-na* ERÍN.MEŠ [pí-t]á-ti "If
 this year the army does not come forth . . ." (EA 77:26-27).

Likewise, ^cAbdi-Ashirta hoped that he could maintain his present location where he could prevent the seizure and destruction of Šumur:

ʿšum¹-ma ú-ul aš-bá-ku / a-na-ʿku¹ [i-n]a U[RU]Ir-qat¹KI ʿšum¹-ʿma¹
i-na ašar né-eḫ / aš-[bá-k]u ù [i-]ʿšar¹-ra-pu-ni⁷ / [IZI]-te^{MEŠ}
ʿURU¹Šu¹-mu-ri^{KI} / ù É.GAL-ʿši¹ ERÍN.MEŠ URUŠe-eḫ-la-li^{KI} "If I
don't stay in [ʿIrqat], (but rather) if I stay in a safe place, then
the troops of Shehlali will burn Šumur and its palace by [fir]e"
(EA 62:16-20).

Otherwise, one finds *lā* in the conditional protasis with *šumma*. Since clauses in this position usually deal with a future situation, the verbs are WS imperfect (*yaqtulu*) or stative *qatal*, for example:

šum-ma la-a ti-le-ú la-qa-ʿia¹ / iš-tu qa-at na-ak-ri-ia "If you are
unable to rescue me from the hand of my enemy"
(EA 114:23-26, cf. 44-45; Moran 1950a:170; 1987b:316, 317 n. 3;
1992:188, 189 n. 4); šum-ma LUGAL be-li / la-a yu-ša-ru
ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-ta⁵ "If the king, my lord, does not send troops"
(EA 131:15-16 and evidently also EA 90:50-52; 92:51-53;
123:18-20; 131:59; and EA 83:45; 112:16-18).

The next example, which is comparable semantically with EA 114:23-26, 44-45, cited above, employs the Akkadian present, which, in the case of *le'û*, is a "preformative stative" (GAG:102, §78b; Rainey 1973c:247-248):

ša-ni-tam / [šum-m]a la-a i-le-e / [šār-r]u la-qa-ia is-tu / [qa-at]
na-ak-ri-šu "Furthermore, [i]f [the kin]g is not able to rescue me
from [the hand] of his enemies" (EA 79:38-41).

The following is a *qatal* stative followed by a WS imperfect (but with Akkadian ventive for lexical nuance; *contra* Moran 1950a:98; 1960:14, who takes this clause as part of a compound apodosis and the verb as *yaqtula* volitive):

šum-ma i-na-na / qa-la-ta ù¹Pí-ḫu-ra / la-a yi-zi-za i-na / URUKu-mi-di "If, now, you keep silent and Piḫura does not stand fast in Kumidi" (EA 132:46-49).

The negated preterite in a conditional protasis is more of a rhetorical question or a positive affirmation (GAG:240, §185g):

ù šum-ma la-a / iš-mé a-na LÚḫa-za-ni / ù šu-ut i-de₄-ma "But if I did not obey the official, then he would surely be aware of it" (EA 317:22-24).

For a true positive oath with *šumma lā*, cf. *supra*, p. 185.

Relative clauses. Although the Akkadian subjunctive is never employed in relative clauses by the WS scribes, the Akkadian rule of negation by *lā* in such clauses (GAG:117, §122a; 217, §165e; 218, §165g/h, j) is strictly followed. This applies equally to clauses dependent upon *ša*, e.g. with the stative:

epšu / ša la a-pí-iš "An act which has not been committed" (EA 122:41-42);

or with the WS imperfect:

'LÚ¹.MEŠ ša la-a ti-iš-teg-mu-na / a-na LUGAL LUGAL EN-ia / yi-im-lu-ku a-na ša-šu-nu "As for people who do not obey the king, the king, my lord, will tend to them" (EA 216:18-20);

as well as to clauses in the dependent (genitive) position after a noun in construct (GAG:219, §166):

ù amēl(LÚ) la yu-ra-du / LUGAL yi-ra-ru-šu "But as for the man who does not obey, the king will curse him" (EA 193:17-18; cf. CAD A/1:235b).

Finally, there is a substantivized relative clause without the relative pronoun (in parallel with a similar but positive, rather

than negative, clause having *ša*) in a passage that must reflect an Egyptian prototype (Albright 1937:199):

ù la-a iš-te-mé a-ma-ta₅ LUGAL be-li-šu / ḫal-qa-at URU-[š]u ḫa-li-iq É-šu / ia-nu šu-um-šu i-na gáb-bi / KUR-ti i-na da-ri-ti "But as for him who has not hearkened to the word of the king, his lord, his city shall perish, his house shall perish, his name shall not exist in the whole land forever" (EA 147:45-48).

CIRCUMSTANTIAL CLAUSES. Again, in the circumstantial clauses, the Akkadian rule of negation by *lā* (GAG:177, §122a; Aro 1957:49) is followed.

First, a clause from Alashia introduced by *kî* (note the absence of Akkadian subjunctive):

e-nu-ma ŠEŠ-ia ki-i LÚDUMU KIN-ri-ia / la-a ta-aš-pur "Now, my brother, since you have not sent my ambassador" (EA 38:23-24).

From Canaan, one finds negated circumstantial clauses with *inūma*:

[i]-nu-^fma¹ / la-a ta-la-ku / ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ "[S]ince the horses have not wandered away" (EA 96:15-17; cf. Youngblood 1961:401; 1962:25, 27).

OBJECT CLAUSES. There are no exceptions to the rule that object clauses are negated by *lā* (GAG:177, §122a; 233, §177). Again, the Akkadian rule is maintained although the clauses in question are introduced in ways typical mainly of the WS dialect of EA, viz. with *inūma* (cf. *supra*, pp. 78-81):

i-nu-ma la-a / yi-la-ú na-ša-ar KUR-ti₇ LUGAL EN-ia "that he is not able to protect the land of the king, my lord" (EA 326:14-15); *i-nu-ma / la-a aš-pu-ru a-wa-at / ka-az-bu-ti₇ a-na be-li-ia* "that I do not write a word of falsehood to my lord" (EA 362:51-53; 1992:360; contrast the rendering of CAD K:310a).

Of special interest are the object clauses introduced by *šumma* (cf. *supra*, pp. 94-97):

šum-ma la a-na-ša-ar / URUŠu-mu-ri URUUl-la-sà "whether I do not protect Šumur (and) Ullasa" (EA 60:21-23); *šum-ma la-a KUR A-la-ši-ia* / uš-ši-ir-ti-šu¹ a-na mu-ḫi-ka "whether I sent him to you via Alashia" (EA 114:52-53); *šum-ma la-a qa-bi-ti* / a-na ša-a-šu "whether I did not speak to him" (EA 132:30-32); *šum-ma la ú-ba-an la-a me-ḫi-iš* / ŠEŠ-ia "whether my brother didn't come within an inch of being smitten" (EA 264:12-13).

Note that the negative here with *šumma* served to express an affirmative idea in a negated rhetorical question.

Finally, an object clause in these texts may even be introduced by the conjunction *u* (cf. *supra*, p. 101), e.g.

ù 'la¹-a-mi ti-id-[da-n]u(?)-na / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭá-tu₄ "that the troops are not being fur[nish]ed(sic!)" (EA 244:19-20; Rabiner 1981:10 n. 9; *contra* Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:485a).

NEGATED INJUNCTIVES. Under this category are treated both the prohibitions and the negative wishes (vetitives). It is here that the most serious confusion or interference between *lā* and *ul* occurs (Anderson 1977:2). The Babylonian *ul* was never meant to be employed in either the prohibitive or the vetitive (GAG:177, §122b) and its intrusion into the sphere of negated injunctives among the EA letters from Canaan has suggested a comparison with Hebrew *al* (cf. e.g. Youngblood 1960:67; Anderson 1977:2).

In Akkadian there is a sharp morphological and syntactical distinction between the prohibitive, with *lā* plus the present (GAG:106, §81h; Edzard 1973:131), and the vetitive, built on the negative particle *ay/ē* plus the short prefix form, *iprus*, *taprus*, *aprus*, etc., used also in the precative (GAG:106, §81i; Edzard 1973:132), which is homophonous with the preterite (the form homophonous with the preterite in the derived stems is also used in this syntagma). The vetitive paradigm with *ay/ē* is never

used in any of the Canaanized epistles and is virtually absent from peripheral Akkadian in general; the Mitanni and the Hattusas texts favor the combination *lū lā* (Adler 1976:60, 295-296; Labat 1932:75). The negative *ē* "not" (EA 1:85; KBo 1, 3:39) must not be confused with the precative negative (CAD E:1a).

There are a few examples of the Akkadian prohibitive, *lū* plus the present; most of the examples come from the Alashia correspondence, e.g.

ù i-na-an-na ŠEŠ-ia / la-a ta-ša-kà-an i-na lib-bi-ka "And now, my brother, don't take (it) to heart!" (EA 38:29-30; 34:12-13); *a-ḫi ki-i ṣe¹-ḫe-er URUDU i-na lib-bi-ka la-a i-ša-ki-in* "My brother, that the copper is of small quantity, let it not be taken to your heart!" (EA 35:12); *ŠEŠ-ú-a DUMU ši-ip-ri-ia / la-a i-ka-al-la li-iš-¹pur¹* "May my brother not detain my ambassador; may he send (him)!" (EA 37:19-20).

With the N-stem example cited above (EA 35:12) can be compared parallel passages from the same epistle in which the stative serves to express the passive nuance:

ù ŠEŠ-ia i-na lib-bi-ka la-a ša-ki-in "And my brother, may it not be taken to your heart!" (EA 35:15, 35).

But in a very West Semitized letter, a verb with WS *y-* prefix is negated by *ul!*

¹LÚ¹*pa-qá-ri-ka ul / ia-qá-ar-ri-ib / it-ti-šu-nu* "May your customs inspector not come near them!" (EA 39:18-20).

A few other Akkadian prohibitives are known, such as this clause from Ḫasi in the Beqa^c Valley:

ù la-a i-qa-al ṣār-ru / EN-ia "And may the king not keep silent!" (EA 185:67-68);

or from Tyre:

[û] / *la-a i-te-zi-ib* [LUGAL *be-li*] / ÌR-šu *iš-tu qa-t[i-šu]* / *li-it-ta-din pa-n[i-šu]* / LUGAL *be-li-ia* "[but] may [the king, my lord,] not abandon his servant! May the king, my lord, turn [his] face (towards him)!" (EA 151:34-38);

where the verb *i-te-zi-ib* is evidently Gt present with separative nuance (AHw:268b).

On the whole, it is difficult to distinguish between prohibitives and vetitives in the WS texts. The pattern is identical for both of them, viz. negative particle plus injunctive (either jussive or volitive). Particularly illustrative are the following examples from southern Canaan, which can be rendered, "lest . . .," or "may . . . not . . .":

la-a / *iḫ-la-aq* "lest I perish" or "(that) I may not perish" (EA 270:28; cf. Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:486b; Rainey 1978a:11*; *la-a ti7-iḫ-la-ʿaq1* / *la-qf-ta* / URUṢa-pu-ma^{KI} "may the city of Ṣapuma not be lost!" or "let not the city of Ṣapuma perish, be conquered!" (EA 274:14-16; Naʿaman 1979:680 and n. 33; Rainey 1978a:11*; collated by Moran, 1974, and Rainey, 1980; *contra* Albright 1943a:17 and n. 61).

There follow a series of citations illustrating the degree to which *ul* has penetrated this negated injunctive syntagma. Since this phenomenon is not attested in other peripheral areas or dialects, it may very well be due to WS influence. Pairs of examples with the same verb negated by *lā* and *ul* and other cases of parallel semantics, but with different verbs, provide ample documentation:

la-a yi-iš-mé LUGAL *be-li* / *a-wa-te*^{MES} LÚ.MEŠ *ša-niu-ti* "May the king, my lord, not listen to the words of other men!" (EA 362:48-49; 126:62-63); [ú]-*ul yi-iš-me* LUGAL *kar5-ší* / ʿÌR¹ *ki-ti-šu* "May the king not listen to the slander of his loyal servant!" (EA 119:26-27).

[ú]-*ul yi-iš-me* LUGAL *kar5-ší* / ʿÌR¹ *ki-ti-šu* "May the king not listen to the slander of his loyal servant!" (EA 119:26-27).

Note the use of *lā* and *ul* in the same letter:

ù la-a i-a-¹qúl¹-mì / LUGAL EN-*ia iš-tu* / ¹URU¹Šu-mu-ur^{KI} "So may the king, my lord, not keep silent concerning Šumur!" (EA 68:14-16; 139:5-6, 10); *ù ú-ul* / [*ia*]-*qúl¹-mì* LUGAL *iš-[tu]* / [UR]U.DIDLI.KI.-*š^u* "So may the king not keep silent concer[ning] his [ci]ties!" (EA 68:30-32; 132:43-45; 76:44-46; 90:57).

An exceptional clause with the same verb employs the WS imperfect instead of the jussive, unless this is meant to be a declarative statement(?):

la-a ya-qú-lu LUGAL EN-*ia* / *i-na* ^{URU}Gub-*la* GEMÉ-*š^u* "May the king, my lord, not keep silent concerning Byblos, his handmaiden!" or "The king, my lord, would not keep silent concerning Byblos, his handmaiden" (EA 140:56).

Here are some further verbal clause parallels with *lā* and with *ul*:

¹*la¹-a* / *ti⁷-ma-ḥa-šú-nu* ÌR.MEŠ-*nu* "Lest our servants smite us" (EA 271:20-21; cf. EA 299:24-26); LÚ.MEŠ *ḥu!-u[p-šⁱ-ia]* / *ul ti-ma-ḥa-ša*(sic!)-*na-¹ni¹* "May [my] fa[r]mers, not smite me!" (EA 77:36-37; *contra* Youngblood 1961:190; cf. also EA 77:12);

la-a-mì / *yi-iš-ba-at-ši* / ¹*La-ab-a-yu* "Let not Lab³ayu seize it!" (EA 244:27-29; also EA 244:37-38); *ú-ul* / *yi-ìl-qé-š^u* LÚ *ša-nu a-na ša-š^u* "Let not another man seize it for himself!" (EA 117:69-70; also EA 84:34-35; 90:11-13; and EA 85:45-47 with passive verb).

Since the use of *ul* to negate the volitive is unique in all of cuneiform literature, a thorough sampling of passages is clearly in order:

ú-ul yu-pa-ḥi-ra ka-li / LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ "Let him not assemble all of the *‘apîrû* men!" (EA 71:28-29 = 85:77-79; cf. Moran 1950a:94; 1960:3); *ú-ul yi-ma-qú-ta* ERÍN.MEŠ *ka-ra-[šⁱ]* /

UGU-*ia* "let not the expeditionary force attack me!" (EA 83:43-44 = 81:31; Moran 1950a:100, 131, 157; 1960:2; CAD K:211b; M/9:247b); *ša-ri / šār-ri ú-ul ti-na-mu-uš / iš-tu mu-ḫi-nu* "May the breath of the king not depart from us!" (EA 100:36-38); *ša-ni-tam [ú]-¹ul¹ ¹i¹a-aš-ku-un / lum-ni[-šu(?) i]-na lib-bi-ka>-ka* "Furthermore, let not [his(?) misdeed trouble your heart!" (EA 108:59-60); *ú-ul ti-né-pu-¹uš¹* URU *a-na* GAZ.MEŠ "May the city not go over to the *‘apîrû!*" (EA 117:94); *ú-ul ti-pu-uš / URU ar-na* "lest the city commit a crime" or "lest the city revolt" (EA 122:47-48; cf. line 51; Moran 1950a:83; 1987b:334; 1992:201).

Another function of the injunctive in the WS texts is to express a strong assertion in the apodosis of a conditional sentence (Moran 1950a:103; 1960:14-15). The following negative apodosis is illustrative:

ù šum-ma ki-a-ma i-ba-šu / ù ¹la¹-a ti-zi-za / URUŠu-mu-ra "If things remain like that, then Šumur cannot stand" (EA 107:32-34; CAD K:328a; Moran 1950a:93; 1960:14; possibly also EA 132:46-49, but cf. *supra*, p. 218-219).

POSITIVE OATHS. Not be overlooked is the function of *lā* in positive oaths or assertions (GAG:240, §185j; cf. *supra*, pp. 92-93). Two examples are known from WS texts, one of them from the Taanach letters:

ù a-nu-ma a-na-¹din¹ / 50 KÛ.BABBAR.ḪÁ ki la e-[e]p(?)>-pu-šu "So now, I will pay the 50 (shekels) of silver; how could I not do so?" (TT 1:10-11; Holma 1914:102-103; Rainey 1977:36);

and the other from Shechem:

ki-i₁₅ la-a / ep-pu-šu ši-pf-ir-ti šār-ri "How could I refuse to carry out the instruction of the king?" (EA 254:44-46; Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:486a; Delitzsch 1909-10:164; Rainey 1977:36 n. 21; Moran 1987b:481; 1992:307; Campbell 1965:197).

Although one might prefer to see the verb forms in these two texts as WS imperfects (*yaqtulu*), it would seem more likely that the entire syntagma was a learned unit and that the verb form is actually the Akkadian present in the subjunctive mode (*contra* Rainey 1977:36). This assumption is reinforced by the parallel in the Taanach text with positive *anaddin*, a true Akkadian present indicative. Nevertheless, the negative oath in EA 138:44-47 certainly is in a strongly WS context and its verb after *kî* is surely WS imperfect:

*ù ti-iq-bi URU.KI i-¹zi¹-bu-šu / ni-te-pu-uš-mi a-na ¹A-zi-ri ù /
aq-bi ki-i i-te₉-pu-šu a-na ša-šu / ù i-zi-bu LUGAL be-li* "Then the city said, 'Abandon him! Let us be allied with 'Aziru!' But I said, 'I will not be allied with him and abandon the king, my lord!'" (EA 138:44-47; Rainey 1977:36 n. 46; cf. *supra*, pp. 112-113).

As mentioned previously (*supra*, p. 92-93), these positive asseverations with *lā*, and the negatives without it, seem to confirm the approach of von Soden (*GAG*:240, §185j and 185k respectively; *AHw*:469b) as against *CAD* (K:318b) and others, who see here the *kî* as an interrogative. The use of *kî* in other oath formulae is documented by *CAD* (K:318b), and classified as a function of the subordinating conjunction.

SUMMARY. The WS EA texts reveal that *lā* was used extensively in declarative main clauses at the expense of Babylonian *ul*, while *ul* served to negate many of the injunctives, a task strictly fulfilled by *lā* in Akkadian. The expanded use of *lā* can be explained by the influence of Assyrian on the peripheral dialects, or simply by the abandonment by peripheral scribes of *ul*. But the injunctive use of *ul* is wholly without precedent. Thus, it would appear that the influence of Canaanite on the use of the negatives was truly at work. Nevertheless, in the various classes of dependent clauses and in the protasis of conditionals, the WS scribes seem to have been fairly knowledgeable of the original Babylonian practices for negation.

CHAPTER XI

ENCLITIC PARTICLES

In the early stages of Amarna studies, the functions of the enclitic particles were recognized but not given too much attention (cf. e.g. Böhl 1909:74, §34n). The expanded use of the enclitics by the Mitannian scribes has now been duly treated (Adler 1976:82-91, §60). Of special note is the use of *-mē* by the Mitannian and North Syrian scribes (Adler 1976:82-86, nn. 1-3 on p. 83), an usage foreign to the Canaanite EA texts (except perhaps EA 137:14).

Basically, there are only two real enclitics in the epistles from Canaan, viz. *-ma* and *-mi/mi*. Böhl's *-u* and *-na* (Böhl 1909:74, §34o-p) were already analyzed correctly as the energetic *-una* by Ebeling (1910:69-73, §21). Although there would appear to be considerable semantic overlap between the *-mi/mi* and the *-ma*, the ensuing discussion will treat them separately, as morphological entities, rather than grouping the material according to functional categories.

ENCLITIC *-MA*

The enclitic *-ma* is not nearly as widely used as it is in normal Akkadian. The *-mi/mi* is far more common. A point of sharp contrast with older dialects is the entire absence of *-ma* as a conjunction between clauses (OB, GAG:177-178, §123a; OA, Hecker 1968:225-230, §135). On the other hand, *-ma* as a component in other adverbs is common and practically never supplanted by *-mi/mi* (the few exceptions are treated *infra*, pp. 243-244). Thus, one encounters the commonplace adverbs reinforced by *-ma*, such as *umma*, *anumma*, *inūma*, *šumma*, and such like. Sometimes the *-ma* closes the introductory syntagma that opens with *umma*, but such is not always the case (for examples with and without *-ma*, cf. *supra*, p. 175). It may also conclude the instructions for the address to the recipient, e.g.

a-na LUGAL EN-*ia* DINGIR-*ia* ^dUTU-*ia* / *qí-bí-ma* "To the king, my lord, my god, my Sun, speak!" (EA 363:1-2).

However, the enclitic was frequently omitted:

a-na LUGAL BE-*ia* *qí-bi* "To the king, my lord, speak!" (EA 230:1).

The *-ma* may, on rare occasions, conclude the standard obeisance formula:

lu-ú am-qut-ma "Verily I have prostrated" (EA 299:10).

The real function of enclitic *-ma* in the text of the letters is for emphasis. That is to say, it marks the logical predicate of the clause (cf. Rainey 1976a). In verbal clauses, it may be that the verb is not only the grammatical predicate, but also the logical predicate, i.e. the main point (comment) of the clause. In such cases, it was sometimes given extra stress by the Canaanite scribes with the addition of *-ma*. Other components in the clause may have been the main point; if so, then they carry the enclitic *-ma*. The examples have been grouped accordingly in the ensuing discussion.

ON VERBS. Apart from the introductory phrase cited above, *lū amqutma* (EA 299:10), there are very few instances of enclitic *-ma* on the finite verbs. It is never a case of *-ma* as conjunction; the verbal state or action is deemed the central focus of the clause and thus gets special emphasis. Such emphasis is more frequent with imperatives. The relationship between a command and its fulfillment is stressed in the following excerpts from the same text. First the imperative:

ù LUGAL GAL *be-li-ia* / *iq-bi a-na ia-ši* / *ši-mé-ma a-na*
LÚMAŠKIM_x(M)AŠKIM) *ḥa-za-ni-ka* "But the great king, my
lord, said to me, 'Give heed to your commissioner!'"
(EA 317:19-21; Moran 1987b:541 n. 2; 1992:349 n. 2);

followed by the strong affirmation that the king's word has been obeyed:

a-na-^fku¹ iš-mé-ma da-ni-iš "I have obeyed explicitly" (EA 317:22);

and the writer further emphasizes his point:

ù šum-ma la-a / iš-mé a-na LU¹ha-za-ni / ù šu-ut i-de₄-ma "And if I have not obeyed my commissioner, then we will surely know" (EA 317:23-25).

The *-ma* on *ide* cannot be the conjunction because it ends the text of the letter. It could have the effect of making the verb a jussive. Another example will reinforce this view:

ù šar-ru i-de-^fma¹ / [a-]^fna¹ KUR.KI.MEŠ "And the king should know [a]bout the lands" (EA 304:22-23).

A multitude of parallels from other letters use one form or another of the injunctive or the Akkadian precative (e.g. EA 76:7-9; 243:21-22; 248:21-22; *et al.*).

A jussive may also be emphasized by enclitic *-ma*, if the proposed correction be accepted in the following clause:

ù [k]i-t[u] ti-in<-né-pu-uš>-ma / a-na ka-li KUR.KUR.KI "And let an alliance be m[ade] for all the states" (EA 74:36-37; Mendenhall 1947a:124; but cf. Gianto 1990:70 n. 2).

One scribe sought to emphasize the threat to all the king's lands — unless the commissioner, Yanḥamu, comes to take action within the year:

[ù ha-]al-qa-at-ma / [gá]b-bi KUR.ḪÁ "[then l]ost are [al]l the lands" (EA 215:13-14; for the passage, cf. *supra*, pp. 190-191).

Special emphasis is placed on the infinitive serving as finite verb in a conditional protasis:

*al-lu / pa-ṭá-ri-ma LÚ.MEŠ ḥu-up-ši ù / ṣa-ab-tu LÚ.MEŠ
GAZ.MEŠ / URU* "Behold, if the serfs desert, then the *ṣapîrû*
men will capture the city" (EA 118:36-39; Moran 1950a:31, 57).

Likewise, the infinitive as direct object is stressed by the addition of the enclitic *-ma*:

LÚ.MEŠ / *ḥu-⟨up⟩-ši-ia pa-ṭá-ra-ma tu-ba-ú-na* "My serfs are seeking to desert!" EA 114:21-22; perhaps also EA 283:12).

Its position as direct object standing before its verb adds further emphasis and perhaps was the reason for adding the enclitic. Usually, an infinitive as direct object in these texts comes after its governing verb.

ON PRONOUNS. Now and then, the logical predicate (comment) of a clause is represented by a pronoun. In such cases, some scribes added the enclitic *-ma* to the pronoun in question. One example from Tyre seems to place stress on the pronominal suffix:

iš-mé-ni-ma e-nu-ma / i-ra-bu "He heard from me that I would enter in (to Egypt)" (EA 151:12-13).

And likewise in a passage from Byblos:

a-mur a-^fna¹-ku pa-nu-ia-ma / a-^fna¹ a-ra-ad LUGAL "Behold, as for me, it is my face that is set to serve the king" (EA 118:39-40).

It is not surprising that the pronominal predicate in a nominal clause should have the enclitic *-ma*; without the added particle, one would construe the pronoun as the subject, not the predicate:

i-nu-ma / a-bu ù be-lu at-ta-ma / a-na ia-ši "Because it is you who are father and master to me" (EA 73:35-37; cf. Gianto 1990:25, 155; Rainey 1992b:334).

The emphasized subject of an interrogative clause stands in contrast to the usual syntax of questions by which the interrogative phrase is the logical predicate:

a-^fna¹ / mi-ni at-ta-ma ti-iš-tap-ru-na / a-na ia-ši "Why is it you who constantly write to me?" (EA 117:7-9).

The subject of a declarative verbal sentence may also be marked as the logical predicate by the addition of *-ma*:

a-nu-ma a-na-ku-ma / er-ri-šu \ aḫ-ri-šu "Now, it is I who am cultivating" (EA 365:10-11); *u a-na-ku-ma / ub-ba-lu* LÚ.MEŠ *ma-as-sà^{M[EŠ]}* "And it is I who am bringing corvée workers" (EA 365:13-14); *a-na-ku-ma \ ya-ḫu-du-un-ni / ub-ba-lu* LÚ.MEŠ *ma-as-sà^{MEŠ}* "It is I, by myself, who am bringing corvée workers" (EA 365:24-25); *ù / a-na-ku-ma ù ʾR-ḫe-ba / nu-kúr-tu₄ i-na* LÚ.^fSA¹.GAZ "But it is I and ʿAbdi-Ḫeba who are fighting the ʿapīrū" (EA 366:19-21); *šu-ni-ma in₄-né-ri-ru* "It was they (two) who hastened to help" (EA 366:24; Moran 1973:51); *ù lu-ú ni-pa-aš gāb-bu-ma / nu-kúr-ti* "And that we, viz. all (of us), may make war" (EA 366:31-32).

ON ADVERBS. Inasmuch as adverbs can be said to be responses to questions, and in a question the interrogative element is normally the logical predicate, the adverb in the (hypothetical) question that stands behind every sentence and its response in the sentence itself will usually be the logical predicate. So it is not surprising that sometimes an adverb receives special emphasis by means of the enclitic particle *-ma*.

What is surprising in the Canaanite EA texts is that *-ma* is so rare in this function, while *mi/mi* is so very common (cf. *infra*, pp. 243-244).

Apart from the conventional adverbs on which the *-ma* has become a standard component without special emphasis, there are very few simple adverbs emphasized by *-ma*. In the case of *ki-šu-ma* (cf. *supra*, pp. 142-143), it is hard to determine whether the *-ma* is a component or a sign of special stress (cf. EA 74:47;

78:10; 79:37; 90:41; 96:26). On the other hand, *kinanna* is complete without *-ma* so the enclitic must be for special emphasis, e.g.

a-na mi-ni₇ / yi-iš-tap-ru ¹Ri-ib-^dIŠKUR *ki-na-an-na-ma / tu₉-pa a-na* É.GAL "Why does Rib-Haddi continually send a tablet *in this manner* to the palace?" (EA 106:13-15).

In two other passages, from the same text, *kinanna* is emphasized by the addition of *-ma*, in declarative statements, not questions:

ù al-lu-ú ki-na-na-ma yi-te₉-lu / i-na ¹lib¹-bi *a-ia-ba aš-šum ša-ba-at / GIŠMÁ.MEŠ-ia* "But, behold, this is why he goes out to sea, in order to seize my ships!" (EA 114:18-20); *ki-na-na-ma / ma-ri-iš ma-gal a-na ia-ši* "That's why it's so very miserable for me!" (EA 114:49-50).

Some temporal adverbial expressions have the *-ma*, but not necessarily to denote the logical predicate. Note the two following examples from Tyre and Alashia respectively:

i-na u₄-mi ù u₄-mi-ma "every day" (EA 147:7, 28, 67); *ša-at-ta ša-ta-ma* "year by year" (EA 38:11; cf. *supra*, p. 4).

The same may be said for locative *-um* reinforced by *-ma*, viz.

ù ka-ba-tu-ma / ù šú-ú²-ru-ma "On the stomach and on the back" (EA 282:6-7; also EA 64:7; 65:5; 213:9; 215:4-5; 232:10-11; 233:13-14; 282:6; 298:13-14; 299:11; 315:7; 316:9; 319:14; 323:8-9; 324:9; 325:9; 326:7-8; 366:10; 378:9-10).

However, an adjective with adverbial *-umma* may very well be the logical predicate:

ù TIL.LA-nu-ma \ ha-ia-ma / nu-ub-ba-lu-uš-šu a-na šār-ri EN-nu "But *alive* we must send him to the king, our lord" (EA 245:6-7; cf. *supra*, pp. 4, 6-7).

Note that the gloss, an adverbial accusative, is also reinforced by *-ma*. It was because of so many instances of enclitic *-ma* on WS words such as *ṣuhrumma*, *baṣnumma* and *ḥayyama* that Dhorme (1914:345-347 = 1951:457-460) and De Langhe (1948) thought it must be the true Canaanite particle. But it seems equally probable that the Akkadian *-ma* was at play here just as it serves to emphasize the adverbial accusative, which is a perfectly good Akkadian word in the next example; here the adverbial accusative is evidently the logical predicate:

ù pu-ia a-wa-te^{MEŠ} aq-bu / a-na šâr-ri ki-ta-ma "It is truthfully that I speak words to the king from my mouth" (EA 107:10-11; cf. *supra*, p. 3).

An adverbial complement containing the infinitive may also have similar stress:

ù gâb-bi KUR[.MEŠ-k]a / ú-ša-aḥ-li-iq¹Bir₅-ia-wa-za [. . .] / a-na ḥa-ba-li-ma "But with violence Biryawaza has destroyed [. . .] all [your] land[s]" (EA 189:24-26; cf. CAD H:3b).

ON THE DIRECT OBJECT. It would seem that the author of the following passage wished to stress the seriousness of a certain political act by emphasizing the kinds of fighting men turned over to the rival power:

ù / na-ad-nu LÚ.MEŠ ŠÌR \ ši-ir-ma / ù LÚ.MEŠ wi-i-ma a-na / >a-na< KUR Su-<ba>-ri i-na lu-qi "And they have even given *maryannū* and *wi^cū* troops as hostages(?) to Su<ba>ru" (EA 108:14-17; Moran 1950a:166; 1987b:306-307 n. 2; 1992:182 n. 2; CAD L:253a; AHw:564b; cf. also EA 85:26 and Moran 1950a:158).

A contrast on the rhetorical level may be realized by using the enclitic. In the following text, there is no doubt that the direct object is being stressed in contrast to the direct object in the previous clause:

š[um!-ma] LÚ ša-a yu-ba-ú / lum-na a-na [EN-š]u šum-ma du-na du-na-ma / ʾú¹-baʾú¹ a-na-ku a-[n]a EN-ia "w[hether] (I am) a man who seeks evil for h[is lord] or whether it is *only strength* that I seek for my lord" (EA 109:53-55; cf. *supra*, p. 185-186).

ON THE SUBJECT. The following passage is a questionable example of *-ma* on the subject because the form might be a WS masculine plural in *-ūma* rather than the simple enclitic:

[i]-ba-šu LÚ.MEŠ ŠĪR / mar-ia-nu-ma a-na ia-ši / ù ia-nu ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ / a-ʾna¹ ia-ši "I have *maryannū(ma)* but I do not have horses" (EA 107:42-45; Schroeder 1918).

Stress should be on the fact that he had qualified chariot warriors but no horses for them.

SUMMARY. The evidence does not necessarily favor the assumption that *-ma* was also the WS enclitic. The arguments by Dhorme (1914:345-347 = 1951:457-460) and De Langhe (1948) were based on the use of *-ma* with obviously Canaanite adverbials (cf. *supra*, pp. 231-233). However, it is still not impossible that the original particle was *-ma*; however, the fact that *-mi* has replaced *-ma* (cf. the ensuing discussion below) need not be an indication that the original WS enclitic was *-mi*. One possibility, which cannot be proven from the material at hand, is that the vowel of the unaccented WS enclitic might have varied between *ǎ* and *ĭ*.

ENCLITIC -MI

In contrast to the somewhat limited use of enclitic *-ma*, the EA texts from Canaan make extensive use of enclitic *-mi*. It has been suggested that the enclitic *-m* of Ugaritic may be identical with the *-mi* of the EA letters (Albright 1934:121 n. 188; 1943:32 n. 27; 1944a:219 n. 83; 1944d:30 n. 5; 1950:387). The problem, of course, is that Akkadian has an enclitic *-mi* used exclusively as a marker for direct speech (GAG:178, §123c), and, as will be amply demonstrated below, the *-mi* in the Canaanized EA letters does

frequently have just this function. The approach to a possible solution may be found by grouping the various examples according to function and scrutinizing those which seem to be clearly unrelated to direct speech (Moran 1950a:9-10).

But first, the problem of orthography must be dealt with. The particle in question is written by both the *mi* and the *me* signs, the latter of which is transcribed herein as *mì* when it appears in the enclitic position. The reasons for this are as follows: (1) the values of *mé* for MI and *mì* for ME in the EA texts are indisputable and need no documentation; (2) the *me* sign is also used as a marker for direct speech where it must represent Akkadian *-mi*; (3) a group of texts use the *me* sign profusely for the enclitic (EA 244, 245, also EA 131, 132, 185), and in one of them, it alternates with the *mi* sign (cf. *la-a-mi*, EA 244:13, and *la-a-mì*, EA 244:15); (4) the *mi* and the *me* signs partake of all the syntactic positions but *me* signs are definitely in the minority. Of all the occurrences treated herein, only ca. 26% have the *-mì*, and of the total, 23% are on direct quotations with 3% of these being *-mì*; of the 44% attached to verbal forms, 16% are *-mì*; of the remaining 33% used to emphasize adverbs and other parts of speech, only 7% are *-mì*. So everything is solidly in favor of taking the *me* sign in enclitic position as a graphic variant for *-mi* to be transcribed *-mì*.

As to the question of WS enclitic *-mi* with semantic functions wider than the Akkadian *-mi* (i.e. more parallel to Akkadian *-ma*), one may note at the beginning that in the Ugaritic language there is an enclitic *-m*, though its vocalization is unknown (Ginsberg 1932-33:388; 1935:46-47; Albright 1934:121 n. 88; Singer 1942; 1948; Pope 1951; Hummel 1957:69). Furthermore, there are some striking instances of *-mi* in the EA texts where Akkadian *-ma* is expected. Note, e.g., introductory *qí-bi-mi* (EA 362:1; Moran 1950b:153 n. 4), also the imperative *qí-ba-mi* (EA 73:33; 83:39; 85:48; 93:10) and *am-qú-ut-mi* (EA 228:9), *am-qut-mi* (EA 239:7; 286:4; 288:4, 64), *am-qú-ut-mì* (EA 224:5; 244:8). These latter can be compared with *am-qut-ma* (EA 299:10).

Particular note must also be taken of a syntactic peculiarity typical of the enclitic *-mi* in the Canaanized texts, but

foreign to normative Akkadian, viz. the ability to separate a construct from its dependent genitive, a feature shared by *-m* in Ugaritic (cf. Gordon 1965:104, §11.8) and apparently also in very ancient Hebrew (Moran 1950:54). This practice is not limited to the *nomen regens* and the *nomen rectum* of a construct chain; it also occurs on some prepositions, which also govern a word in the dependent case. Here are two examples:

a-na-mi LUGAL *gáb-bu* "(It is) to the king (that) everything belongs" (EA 197:6; cf. *supra*, p.12, *infra*, p. 245); *ba-li-mi / ur-ru-ud* LUGAL EN-*ia* "Not to serve the king, my lord?" (EA 191:9-10; cf. *supra*, p. 24; *infra*, p. 245).

Construct nouns, including infinitives, in the nominative and the accusative with enclitic *-mi* have been noted, e.g.

šu-sú-mi a-bi-ia "The plunderers of my father" (EA 252:30; Albright 1943b:32 n. 27; cf. *infra*, p. 247); LÚ.MEŠ *ú-bi-li-mi* KASKAL.ĤÁ *šà[r-ri]* "The porters for the kin[g's] caravans" (EA 287:55; Albright 1944a:219 n. 83); *a-ba-at-mi* URUMa-gid₆-*da*[KI] "to destroy Megiddo" (EA 244:42; Albright 1944a:219 n. 83; cf. *infra*, p. 247); *a-šé-mi* ERÍN.MEŠ *pt-tá-ti* "the going forth of the army" (EA 73:12-13; Moran 1950b:154 n. 7; but cf. *infra*, pp. 238-239).

For this intrusive *-mi* on a construct followed by a clause, cf. EA 145:23-26, *supra*, p. 113,

ù i-nu-ma taq-bu / a-na KUR.ĤÁ *A-mur-ri a-wa-at-mi / ti-iš-te*9-mé *iš-tu aš-ra-^lnu^l-^lum^l / tú-te-ra-am a-na ia-a-ti* "And when you say concerning the lands of Amurru, 'The word that you have been hearing from there, send to me!'" (EA 145:23-26; Moran 1987b:376 n. 6; 1992:232 n. 6).

Even though the *-mi* in this text indicates direct speech (Moran 1987b:376 n. 6; 1992:232 n. 6), it intervenes in the the construct chain.

DIRECT QUOTATIONS.

The widespread use of *-mi* in the EA letters from Canaan might be explained by the assumption that the scribes considered every epistle to consist of direct speech. After all, does not the standard opening contain the instruction to "speak" to the recipient and the declaration that the sender has "spoken"? Be that as it may, there are still numerous passages within the text of a letter which are themselves direct quotes on the part of the sender himself, and they are denoted by enclitic *-mi* as in other Akkadian dialects. Perhaps the most noteworthy are the quotations taken from a letter previously received from Pharaoh:

a-na mi-ni yi-iš-ta-pa-ru / 'šār¹-ru EN-li a-na ia-ši / ú-šur-mi lu-ú na-šir-ta "Why does the king, my lord, write continually to me, 'Guard! May you be on guard!'" (EA 112:7-9; cf. 1987b:312; 1992:186; also EA 117:84; Thureau-Dangin 1922b:380-381; Moran 1950a:172).

Even the original statement is documented in Pharaoh's own messages (EA 99:8; 367:4; 370:5). A variation on the king's command is:

ú-šur-mi ra-ma-an-ka "Protect yourself!" (EA 119:9; also EA 122:10; 123:30-31; 125:9; 130:16-17; 337:25); also the plural [ú]-ša-ru-¹mi¹ / ^{URU}Ir-qa-ta "Guard ye the city of 'Irqata!" (EA 100:14-15).

The enclitic is attached in all these quotes to the first word in the direct speech. It may be deferred to a later word when the latter is part of the first semantic phrase as in the following example:

i-nu-ma ta-aš-tap-ra a-na ia-a-ši / a-na mi-nim-mi la-a tu-wa-ši-ra / LÚDUMU ši-ip-ri-ka a-na maḥ-ri-ia "Since you wrote to me, 'Why didn't you send your ambassador to me?'" (EA 34:8-10); *a-qa-bi a-na* ^{LÚ}MAŠKÍM LUGAL EN-[ia] / *am-mi-nim-mi ta-ra-ia-¹mu¹ / LÚ*ḥa-pí-ri ù LÚ.MEŠ ḥa-zi[-ia-nu-ti] / *ta-za-ia-ru* "I say to the

commissioner of the king, my lord, 'Why do you love the *‘apîrû* and hate the city[-rulers]?' (EA 286:17-20).

It may also be attached to the first word of each of the clauses within the quote:

a-na-ku a-qa-bi e-ru-ub-mi / it-ti šâr-ri EN-ia ù la-mur-mi / 2
 IGI.MEŠ LUGAL EN-ia "I say, 'I will enter in to the king, my lord, and may I see the two eyes of the king, my lord!'" (EA 286:39-41).

As with this last example, the quotes may be articulated thoughts or reflections of the author himself, e.g.

ù im-lu-uk iš-tu / ŠÀ-ia a-li-ik-mi a-na-ku / i-pu-ša!(MA)-am
 DU₁₀.GA \ tu.ka / it-ti-šu ša ¹*Am-mu-ni-ra* "So I took counsel in my heart, 'Go! I will make an alliance with him, namely *‘Ammunira*'" (EA 136:26-29).

The presence of the enclitic *-mi* on the adverb in the next passage assures that it is the first word of the quote and not a complement to the preceding verb:

ù aq-ta-bu / pu-uḫ-ri-iš-mi / yi-il-te-qú šâr-ru / mim-mi-ia "And I have been saying, 'Altogether, the king has been taking my property'" (EA 254:24-27; cf. Moran 1975a:150 and n. 3).

Again, the *-mi* suggests that the following is also a quote, in which case the first word will be an infinitive serving as a finite past tense, rather than a construct with its subject as dependent genitive:

šum-ma / ti-iš-mu-na a-šé-mi ERÍN.MEŠ / *pí-tá-ti ù i-zi-bu*
 URU.MEŠ-š_u-nu / *ù pa-aṭ-ru* "If they hear, 'The army has gone forth,' then they will abandon their towns and depart" (EA 73:11-14; contrast Moran 1950a:10; 1987b:248; 1992:141; Youngblood 1961:112).

And if the *-mi* is the sign of a direct quote in the passage cited next, then a different tone is given to the text as a whole:

a-nu-ma ki-i-ia-am / qa-la-ta a-di-mi / yi-ìl-ma-du šàr-ru / be-lí-ia a-wa-ta₅ an-ni-ta₅ "Now, thus you are keeping silent, (saying) 'Until the king, my lord, looks into this matter'" (EA 251:7-11; cf. *supra*, p. 70; Rainey 1989-90:68b; *contra* CAD A/1:112b and A/2:33a; also contrast the translation by Moran 1987b:478; 1992:305).

There is some room for variation in the placing of the enclitic. It may appear not only on the opening particle but also on the first and subsequent verbs:

šum-ma-mi yi-pu-uš-mi / DINGIR.MEŠ-nu ša šàr-ri EN-nu / ù ni-ik-šu-du-um-mi / ¹La-ab-a-ia "If the god(s) of the king, our lord, will act so that we catch Lab³ayu" (EA 245:3-6; cf. EA 364:24-25).

Or it may come on the second word in the quote, e.g. on the verb preceded by its subject:

i-ka-lu ka-ar-ši-ya \ ú-ša-a-ru / i-na pa-ni LUGAL EN-ri(sic!) ¹IR-Ĥé-ba / pa-ta-ar-mi a-na šàr-ri EN-šu "I am being slandered before the king <my> lord, 'Abdi-Ĥeba has deserted the king, his lord'" (EA 286:6-8).

Likewise, it may be appended to the subject, which is itself preceded by its verb:

ù yu-qa-bu / a-na ia-ši / ma-a-¹di¹(sic!) ¹ŠE¹.MEŠ-mi / a-na [KUR^A-mu]r-ri "and it is said to me, '[Amu]rru has lots of grain'" (EA 178:21-24).

It may even appear only on the verb of the second clause within the quotation, in this case at the end of a result clause. Note that the verb seems to have a lexical ventive:

ti7-iq-bu-na / la yi-iš-pu-ra-am ù / nu-ul₁₁-qa-am-mi "They are saying, 'Let him not write that we be taken!'" (EA 362:21-23; contrast EA 362:17, 25, 47).

EMPHASIZING PARTICLE

Such is the evidence for direct speech. It remains to review the extensive number of cases where the context does not appear to be a quotation. The weight of that evidence and its parallels with functions of the enclitic *-ma* should substantiate the claim that Canaanite did have its own enclitic and that its pronunciation was *-mi*.

ON VERBS. The attachment of an enclitic *-mi* to the verb has its parallel in the similar function of *-ma* which has been treated in the previous section (cf. *supra*, pp. 228-230). The purpose is to drive home the significance of the verbal action or state; in such clauses, the verb is both the grammatical and the logical predicate. One must admit, however, that certain texts appear to attach the *-mi* (or *-mi*) to every verb, almost as a kind of punctuation, especially EA 185 and EA 245, e.g.

ù i-ša-la-lu-mi ù uš-šu¹ru¹-ši-mi / i-na IZI \ i-ša-ti "And they plundered *it* and sent it up in flames" (EA 185:18-19 *et al.*);
ša-ni-tam du-ub-bu-ba-ku-mi "Furthermore, I (verily?) said . . ."
 (EA 245:1 *et passim*).

Sometimes the stress on the verb gives a strong, dramatic flavor to the clause:

ù a-na-ku ŠEŠ-ia la-a i-de₄-mi "But I did not know, my brother!"
 (EA 38:15); *ʿša¹-bat-mi šu-nu URU.⟨MEŠ?⟩.KI Gub-li* "They really have seized town⟨s⟩(?) of Byblos" (EA 362:28).

This often implies the notion of asseveration, especially on forms of the WS imperfect, and perhaps also on those the Akkadian present:

a-nu-ma / ¹*a¹-na-ša-ru-mí a-šar* LUGAL EN-*ia* "Now I *am* guarding the place of the king, my lord" (EA 378:10-11); *ù ur-ru-du-mì* / LUGAL EN-*ia* "And I *am* serving the king, my lord" (EA 189:r. 21-22); *a-na-ku it-ti₇-š[i]* / *il₅-la-ku-mì* "With 'it' (the army) I will go" (EA 193:15-16); *ù a-šar nu-kùr-tu₄ a-na* LUGAL EN-*ia* / *a-na-ku al-la-ak-mì* "And wherever there is hostility to the king, my lord, I will go" (EA 189:rev. 4-6).

In the next example, the emphasis is on the apodosis of a second conditional clause expressing an alternative course:

ù šum-ma ia-ti-ia¹ 'ù¹ / *i-pa-tá-ra-ni-mi* "But if it is me (that he hates), then I will get me away" (EA 126:46-47; cf. Moran 1950a:175; Rainey 1989-90: 61a; contrast Moran 1987b:341 n. 7; 1992:206-207 n. 7).

A large number of injunctives are reinforced by the enclitic, both affirmative and negative. In the same text one finds the enclitic on a precative in the first clause and on the negative particle (to heighten the contrast on the rhetorical level) in the second clause:

ù lu-ú-mi / *li-ik-ki-im-mi* / *šàr-ru* URU.KI-*šu la-a-mi* / *yi-iš-bat-ši* / *¹La-ab-a-yu* "May the king deliver his city; let not Lab²ayu seize it!" (EA 244:26-29; cf. *subra*, 198, *infra*, p. 244).

The negative jussives so emphasized all seem to have a sense of urgency; they also tend to emphasize the particular type of action which the writer wants to avoid, e.g.

ša-ni-tam / *at-ta* EN GAL *ú-ul* / *ta-qa-al-mi iš-tu* / *ši-ip-ri an-nu-ú* "Furthermore, you are the great lord; please don't ignore this message!" (EA 76:43-46; also EA 68:14-15, 30-31).

Most of the affirmative examples are some injunctive form of *idû* "to know," such as the precative (a form typical of these texts but not of classical Akkadian):

li-de-mi / šār-ru EN-ia "May the king, my lord, be apprised!"
(EA 244:7-8; also EA 174:18; 175:14; 176:14; 182:6; 248:9, 21;
363:15; 364:24-28; 365:8, 30);

and also the jussive, usually with *lū*:

ù lu-ú yi-de-mi / šār-ru EN-ia "And may the king, my lord, be
apprised!" (EA 245:46-47; also EA 226:6; 307:6-7, 10; 330:9, 17).

That this may well be a Canaanite practice is seen in the double entry where the Akkadian precativ and its Canaanite gloss in the jussive both take the *-mi* enclitic:

[ù] *li-iḫ-šu-uš-mi / \ ia-az-ku-ur-mi / ¹šār-ri EN-ia* "[So] may the
king take thought for . . . !" (EA 288:18-19; CAD E:234b; H:123b;
Z:22b).

The precativ in the following example was given special stress commensurate with its optative function in the protasis of a conditional sentence:

*lu-uk-šu-da-am-mi / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-a LUGAL / ù MAŠKÍM.
MEŠ-šu ù a-na-¹ku¹ / šu-ši-ra-ku gāb-ba* "Should the king's army
and his commissioners arrive, then I have prepared
everything" (EA 191:11-14).

Of particular interest is the role of enclitic *-mi* on the verbal predicates of questions, e.g.

ki-i qa-bi-mi / i-na pa-ni-ka "How is it said in your presence . . ."
(EA 256:4-5; cf. Albright 1943a:11; Albright, Mendenhall and
Moran 1955:486b; and *supra*, pp. 91-92, 137-138).

Note the next two examples, from the same text, in which the second passage confirms that the first is also a question, as already suggested *supra*, p. 214, because of the use of the negative particle *ul*:

ú-ul ta-qa-al-mi a-na ÌR-ka "Have you not ignored your servant?" (EA 74:13); *am-mi-ni ta-qa-al-mi a-na KUR-ka* "Why have you ignored your land?" (EA 74:48-49).

The predicate of the question may also be a stative augmented by the enclitic *-mi*:

ša-ni-tam da-mi-iq-mi / a-na pa-ni LUGAL BE-ia i-pí-iš /
ÌR-^dA-ši-ir-ti UR.GI₇ "Furthermore, is it good in the sight of the king, my lord, the deed of 'Abdi-Ashirta?" (EA 84:6-8, also 36; EA 92:30).

Finally, there is an emphasized verb in a relative clause, but the reason seems to be the desire to stress the antecedent, which is the direct object of the clause. The passage is the continuation of the double injunctives in EA 228:18-19, cited *supra*, p. 242. Pharaoh is urged to take thought for:

mi-im-ma ša / in₄-né-pu-uš-mi / UGU^{URU}Ha-šú-ra^{KI} / URU.KI-ka
ù / UGU ÌR-ka "everything that has been done against Hazor, your city, and against your servant" (EA 228:20-24).

Therefore, one may usually expect some special nuance in clauses where the verb is strengthened by enclitic *-mi*.

ON ADVERBS AND PARTICLES. Especially frequent are presentation particles with enclitic *-mi*. Since this is a typical function of enclitic *-ma* (cf. *supra*, pp. 232-233), it represents a significant parallel in function between the Akkadian particle and its presumed Canaanite counterpart. Note *a-nu-um-ma-mi* (EA 228:13; E. Gordon cited by Moran 1987b:456 n. 2; 1992:290 n. 2); also *al-lu-mi* (EA 85:30; 112:47; 118:24, 28; 132:29), *al₇-lu-ú-mi* (EA 198:27; 242:9, 14; 245:15), as well as *al-la-mi* (EA 83:38) and *al-le-mi* (EA 83:53). The ubiquitous imperative serving as a presentation particle is often augmented by the enclitic, i.e. *a-mur-mi* (EA 84:37; 174:8; 175:7; 176:7; 179:14, 28; 185:42, 64; 187:9; 189:r. 9; 198:10; 211:7; 228:10; 241:9; 264:5; 330:13).

Although the conditional particle *šumma* contains enclitic *-ma* (Speiser 1947), there are three instances when a Canaanite scribe augmented it with *-mi*, viz. *šum-ma-mi* (TT 6:10; EA 245:3) and *šum-ma-mì* (EA 244:30).

Once the optative particle has enclitic *-mi*, *lu-ú-mi* (EA 244:25) in the lone instance where it precedes a precativ (cf. *supra*, pp. 198, 241)!

In the same passage, the following clause, which is a negative jussive, the negative particle also bears the enclitic *-mi*, *la-a-mì* (EA 244:27). There are several other examples but only two from injunctive contexts (EA 126:62; 244:37), the rest being indicative (TT 6:6, 8, 13; EA 126:17, 27; 131:28; 244:13, 15, 19).

The addition of the enclitic to the subordinating conjunction suggests that it may, in fact, be meant for an adverb, especially since it precedes a precativ verb form (cf. *supra*, p. 70, 119-122):

a-di-mi li-de-mi / LUGAL EN-*ia* / *ù* LUGAL EN-*ia* / *li-im-lu-uk-mi*
 / *a-na* ÌR-*šu* "Yet may the king, my lord, be apprised and may
 the king, my lord, take counsel concerning his servant!"
 (EA 364:24-28).

The enclitic *-mi* may also emphasize the adverbial accusative. The following example is particularly striking in that the emphasized adverbial idea is further elaborated upon by the addition of an asyndetic circumstantial clause:

i-nu-ma yi-mur LÚŠEŠ-*ia* *i-nu-ma* / *a-ší* LÚDUMU *šip-ri-ia ri-qa-mi*
 / *i-ia-nu* ERÍN.MEŠ *ma-ša-ar-ta₅ it-ti-šu* / *ù ia-an-aš-ni* "When my
 brother saw that empty-handed my ambassador came forth
 (from Egypt), no garrison troops being with him, then he
 scorned me" (EA 137:20-23; cf. *supra*, p. 75; Albright 1950:387).

Finally, the existential negative particle, which is often augmented by *-ma*, appears from time to time with *-mi*, *i-ia-nu-mì* (EA 198:21) and *ia-a-nu-mi* (EA 286:33, 52, 58; 288:13, 51, 57; 289:36; all of them from Jerusalem).

ON PREPOSITIONS. In a few rare cases, the enclitic *-mi* is attached to a preposition. One unique passage where it is clearly for emphasis is:

a-na ia-ši-ia a-na-mi LUGAL gáb-bu "(As for what is) mine, it is to the king that it all belongs" (EA 197:6; cf. *supra*, pp. 12, 236).

Two other examples of emphasis have *qadu* plus *-mi*; they stress the contrast between being alone and being accompanied by important support troops:

ù uš-ši-ra-šu qa-du¹-mi / ERÍN.MEŠ *ri-šú-ti* "So send him (not alone but) with support troops" (EA 126:43-44); *ur-ru-da a-na-ku qa-du¹-mi¹* / *gáb-bi ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ia* "I am serving you (not alone but) with all of my colleagues" (EA 189:r. 3'-4').

And the lone instance of the negative preposition plus *-mi* is a rhetorical question:

ù i-ma-la-ku ba-li-mi / *ur-ru-ud LUGAL EN-ia* "But would I consider not serving the king, my lord?" (EA 191:9-10; *contra* CAD B:71b; M/1:155b; cf. *supra*, pp. 24, 236).

ON INTERROGATIVES. Since the interrogative particle or phrase in a question is usually the logical predicate of its clause, the addition of an enclitic for emphasis is only by way of reinforcement for the natural syntactic logic. Perhaps the stress was felt to be necessary when another adverb was present, as in the following:

am-mi-nim-mi / *te-ep-pu-šu ki-šu-ma* "Why is it that you behave thus?" (EA 96:25-26; Youngblood 1961:397; 1962:25; cf. *supra*, p. 143)

Otherwise, it is evidently just to strengthen the impact of the question. It seems a logical procedure to place an emphasizing particle on the interrogative expression:

am-mi-ni-mi qa-la-ta / iš-tu URUŠu-mu-ra "Why is it that you ignore Šumur?" (EA 98:3-4); *am-mi-nim-mi a-na-ku e-pu-uš / \ ar-na a-na LUGAL EN-ri*(sic!) "For what reason would I commit a crime against the king, my lord?" (EA 286:14-15; cf. line 18, where the same form is in a direct quote).

The same effect is achieved when the interrogative is in the adverbial case. In the following example, the orthography does not permit us to determine whether the enclitic was preceded by mimation of the adverbial:

mi-nu-mi la-a yu-da-¹nu¹ / iš-tu ¹É¹.GAL mi-im-¹mu¹ / a-na ia-ši
 "Why is it that provision is not given to me from the palace?"
 (EA 126:49-51; contrast CAD M/2:79a, 94a).

The interrogative may also be the direct object, like the pronoun in the following:

ša-ni-tam mi-na-am-mi ep-ša-ku-mi / a-na šār-ri EN-ia
 "Furthermore, what is it that I've done to the king, my lord?"
 (EA 245:36-37).

Likewise, the Canaanite interrogative personal pronoun, *miya* (Loewenstamm 1959:72-73 = 1980:56-57) almost always has enclitic *-mi*; note e.g.

mi-ia-mi / a-na-ku UR.GI₇ I-en / ù la-a il-la-ku "Who am I, a dog, that I should not go?" (EA 202:12-14; also EA 85:63-66; 323:17-18; 324:16; 325:12); *mi-ia-mi yi-ma-ge-er / ur-ru-ba it-ti ¹šār-ri EN-ia*
 "Who would agree to go in to the king, my lord?"
 (EA 283:10-11).

ON GRAMMATICAL SUBJECT. The traditional grammatical subject may also be the main point of a clause, i.e. its comment. This applies alike to both verbal and non-verbal clauses and is perhaps more crucial to the former. The stress on the subject as logical predicate of the next passage is obvious:

a-na-ku-mi ep-ša-ti / i-mu!-I^{ta} a-na URUŠur-ri "It was I who made connubium with Tyre" (EA 89:17-18; following Albright and Moran 1950:164:166).

Compare also the identical use of *-ma* in EA 365 and EA 366, cited *supra*, p. 231.

In the following passage, there is a contrast between the actions of Rib-Haddi and his younger brother. The particle affixed to the personal pronoun, *a-na-ku-mi-e*, can either be read *a-na-ku-mé-e* or *a-na-ku-mi-i₁₅* (with Gianto 1990:84, §5.3). Note in the same text *a-na* KUR.MEŠ *Mi-iš-ri-i₁₅* (EA 137:28). If the former, then this would have to be the only example of the N. Syrian particle *-mē*. However, that seems rather unlikely.

ša-ni-tam a-na-ku-mi-i₁₅ / al-ka-ti a-na ma-ḥar-ri ¹Ḫa-mu-ni-ri / *ù* ŠEŠ-ia TUR *iš-tu ia-ti / i-na-kar₅-mi* URUGub-la^{K1} / *a-na na-da-ni* URU.KI-li / *a-na* DUMU.MEŠ *İR-¹A-ši-ir-ti* "Furthermore, when I myself had gone to ^cAmmunira, my brother, who is younger than I, alienated Byblos in order to give my city to the sons of ^cAbdi-Ashirta" (EA 137:14-19; Rainey 1992b:340-341).

The personal pronoun does not seem to be the logical predicate. In this instance it may be helpful to apply a suggestion of Huehnergard (1986:228-229) that, when a personal pronoun is employed with an Akkadian stative (in the present case, a WS-style suffix form of a verb of motion) that contains a person marker, the pronoun is actually a kind of "suspended subject," i.e. it is in extraposition. Thus, "Furthermore, as for me, I having gone to ^cAmmunira"

In the following passage, the logical predicate of a nominal clause is marked directly by the enclitic even though it is itself a participle in construct with its own direct object:

šu-sú-mi a-bi-ia / ù ú-šur-ru-šu-nu "(They are) the plunderers of my father and I will surely keep watch on them" (EA 252:30-31; cf. Albright 1943b:32 n. 27; Rainey 1974:306; 1975b:417; cf. *supra*, p. 236).

This last example may be especially relevant since the word being emphasized by the enclitic is itself a true Canaanite word.

ON INFINITIVE COMPLEMENTS. The infinitive as object or adverbial cognate accusative (paronomastic) may also take the enclitic. An example of the latter is:

ù la-ḡéḡ-ḡmi¹ ti-il-qú-na-ši "Then surely they will capture it"
(EA 131:17).

The following infinitive is direct object of the verb and is in construct with its own direct object, yet the *-mi* is attached to it and not to the dependent object. The intention is to stress the action of the infinitive as a potential danger to Megiddo:

a-ba-at-mi^{URU}Ma-gid₆-ga^{IKI} / yu-ba-á-ú. "It is the absolute destruction of Megiddo that he is seeking" (EA 244:42-43).

SUMMARY. The wide range of examples in which enclitic *-mi* is employed *not* as a marker of direct speech shows that at least some scribes from Canaan viewed this particle as the equivalent of the Akkadian *-ma*. Does it also mean that the WS enclitic was closer in form to *-mi* than to *-ma*? The question is impossible to answer. There are enough passages with enclitic *-ma* in convincing contexts to indicate the many of the scribes understood its function. That they sometimes chose to employ *-mi* in such emphasizing functions is, by any interpretation, an important feature of the peculiar dialect employed in the EA texts from Canaan. The phenomenon of "confusion" between enclitic *-ma* and *-mi* is not paralleled elsewhere in the contemporary peripheral dialects.

CHAPTER XII

THE INTERJECTION

Only one real interjection is known from the WS EA letters. The negative interjection \bar{e} "No, no!" appears once in a letter from Egypt (EA 1:85; CAD E:1a; Cochavi-Rainey 1988:227, §2.8). An alleged *i* "Let us" in EA 138:137 does not exist; it is to be read DUMU!.·MEŠ (cf. *supra*, pp. 197-198).

The imperative of *alāku* "to go" serves as a cohortatory exclamation in the personal musings of Rib-Haddi:

*ù im-lu-uk iš-tu / ŠÀ-ia a-li-ik-mi a-na-ku / i-pu-ša!(MA)-am
DU₁₀.GA \ tu.ka / it-ti-šu ša¹A-mu-ni-ra* "So I took counsel in
my heart, 'Go! I will make an alliance with him, namely
‘Ammunira’" (EA 136:26-29; cf. *supra*, p. 238).

That letter was written for Rib-Haddi in Beirut. Another text from the same geographical source has a plural imperative in the same function:

ù ti-iq-bi URU.KI i-¹zi¹-bu-šu / ni-te-pu-uš-mi a-na¹A-zi-ri "Then
the city said, '(Let us) abandon him! Let us be allied with
‘Aziru!’" (EA 138:44-45; cf. *supra*, p. 226).

The interjectional particle that is documented is, remarkably enough, an Egyptian expression. Once in a letter from Tyre, where Egyptian influence is pronounced, one finds an interesting combination of West Semitic and Egyptian idioms, both of them marked by double gloss signs:

*e-nu-ma / iq-bi LUGAL be-li-ia \ : ku-na / a-na pa-ni ERÍN.MEŠ
GAL ù iqbi / ÌR-du a-na be-li-šu \ \ ia-a-ia-ia* "When the king, my
lord, said, 'Be ready for the arrival of the great army!' then the
servant said to his lord, "Yea, yea, yea!" (EA 147:35-38).

It was Albright (1937:197 nn. 4-5; cf. *CAD* I/J:321) who first recognized that this interjection was actually the Egyptian *y3* repeated for emphasis (as often in Egyptian). So the passage above juxtaposes the Canaanite imperative, *kuna* "be ready" with the Egyptian response *y3 y3 y3* "Yea, yea, yea!"

Perhaps this text, with its combination of Canaanite and Egyptian in an Akkadian context, provides a fitting conclusion to the review of particles and adverbs.

CHAPTER XIII

TOPIC AND COMMENT

One of the cardinal features of the EA texts from Canaan that impressed scholars very early on is the marked difference in word order as compared to more standard Akkadian (Böhl 1909:78, §36c; Müller 1903:pp. 245-246, 262-264). However, apart from noting the marked differences, subsequent studies practically ignored the semantic implications of *WS* word order in the texts from Canaan. In recent times, Finley (1979) made an important statistical study of the Levantine EA texts and a selection of documents from Ugarit. Though his emphasis was on verbal clauses, he did not distinguish between various types of clauses, e.g. indicative, injunctive, interrogative. Word order in the native texts from Ugarit were studied by Huehnergard (1979:93-98, 288-303) in comparison with those sent to Ugarit from Carchemish. He later updated his work on the native texts in somewhat more detail (Huehnergard 1989:211-224). Meanwhile, van Soldt (1986:476-528; 1991:476-518) had also made a detailed study of the Akkadian texts from Ugarit.

Word order variation in the Byblos EA texts was taken up by A. Gianto (1990) in an exemplary study that dealt with the main types of clauses employed (fixed introductory formulae, etc., are part of the Western Peripheral repertoire and therefore not useful in determining the local Byblos dialectical syntax). Although the analysis is restricted to the Byblos texts plus a few others sent by the ruler of Byblos while he was in exile at Beirut, Gianto also realized that the entire collection of letters written from other places in Canaan share the peculiar dialectical features of the Byblos texts (with a few regional peculiarities). In a detailed review of Gianto's monograph (Rainey 1992b), it was suggested that Gianto's study be expanded to cover all those other letters. Furthermore, it was shown that there are some categories of sentences/clauses which Gianto failed to include.

The present chapter was written as a modest condensation of Gianto's book. It has been appended to the study of the adverbs and particles because so many of the morphosyntactic chapters on those components deal with problems of word order. Selected material therefrom will be repeated here for convenience. Naturally, the scope of the examples covers the entire corpus of EA texts from Canaan. The order of treatment follows that of Gianto in most respects and many of the illustrative passages are also his.

TERMINOLOGY AND RATIONALE

Throughout his book, Gianto is searching for the rationale behind the various word orders for different types of clause. One should note in passing that the present discussion will adopt the usage proposed in the above mentioned review, viz. that the term "sentence" be applied to a complete, independent syntagma. For dependent or subordinate syntagmas, the term used herein will be "clause." A sentence, then, may be comprised of one or more clauses. Two or more independent clauses may be joined syndetically to form a compound sentence. A main clause may have subordinate clauses as components. What Gianto (1990:1, 174) sometimes refers to as the "predicative structure" can thus simply be called a clause.

Within the clause, Gianto defines the subject (S), the verb (V), the object (O) and the complement (C). These symbols will be adopted here as well. In verbal clauses, Gianto generally considers the verb form to be the "predicate." In non-verbal clauses, the predicate is recognized as the component being stated, i.e. predicated, concerning the subject. It is obvious that Gianto speaks only of the grammatical subject and the grammatical predicate. A more useful approach, which would pertain to every category of clause discussed, will be to speak in terms of the "logical subject" and the "logical predicate." The former is the known datum, recognized already by the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader. The latter is the new information being provided about the "logical subject." In the

following discussion, the "logical subject" will be called the "topic," while the "logical predicate" will be referred to as the "comment." The application of this distinction will be seen to facilitate the proper understanding of all the syntagmas dealt with.

Gianto's success in highlighting the various syntagmas in which a particular component in the clause/sentence is fronted shows that he has a feel for the approach to which we are alluding. Often enough, he talks about some component or other as being "emphasized." Frequently, an emphasized component is such because it is fronted, and sometimes it is accompanied by specific modifiers or particles. The need to express "emphasis" often requires a departure from the normal VSO word order in verbal clauses (Gianto 1990:4, citing Finley 1979:64-69). This "emphasis" is in fact the raising of a particular component in the clause to the status of the "comment." While the grammatical subject normally corresponds to the logical subject and the grammatical predicate equals the logical predicate in non-verbal clauses, there are some exceptions. But the situation is especially complex with regard to verbal clauses. The verb, the grammatical predicate, is often not the logical predicate! Many syntagmas in which some other element in a verbal clause is fronted or otherwise emphasized will be discussed below (for biblical Hebrew, cf. Muraoka 1985, cited as 1986 by Gianto 1990: 5, n. 8).

It remains to point out that one means in Akkadian by which the comment, or logical predicate, may be indicated is by the addition of the enclitic *-ma*. It was surprising to find that, although Gianto does take cognizance of enclitic *-ma* as an emphasizing particle, he seems unaware of earlier study of that particular function (Rainey 1976a) as it is missing from his bibliography. Recourse will be had to sections dealing with enclitic *-ma* (cf. *supra*, pp. 227-234) and enclitic *-mi* (cf. *supra*, pp. 240-248) as markers of the logical predicate or comment in various types of clauses.

Gianto mentions some words which have a fixed position regardless of the following syntagma. These "Function Words" (Gianto 1990:16) include presentation particles, conditional particles, conjunctions and other adverbials. He observes that the

function words are often followed by clauses which normally have V-S-O-C word order. However, the function words do not actually seem to determine the word order of the following clause in most cases.

Alongside the function words, Gianto (1990:16-17) ranks the interrogatives as words which must come at the head of their clause, whether the clause be verbal or non-verbal. Here Gianto has evidently missed the point. In a question, the interrogative component is normally the logical predicate, that is the comment. The interrogative may be a pronoun, "who?" "which?" "what?" or an adverbial, "when?" "where?" "why?" "how?" etc. As the comment, the interrogative component is fronted. In verbal clauses of this nature, the verb may be the grammatical predicate, but it is not the logical predicate (comment), unless, of course, the sentence is a reply to a question such as "What did he do?" In non-verbal clauses, the interrogative may be S or P but it is most often the comment. By the same token, in clauses which are responses to a question, the component which corresponds to the interrogative element in the original question is now the comment whether it is S, V, O or C. Understanding this simple principle will help to analyze other syntagmas. Furthermore, it should be noted that every clause is, in a sense, the response to a question whether the question is articulated or merely implicit between the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader. The component in the clause which answers that question is thus the comment of the clause; the comment is not always the P/V component. In fact, adverbs, which are natural responses to interrogatives, are frequently the comment of their clause contexts.

NON-VERBAL CLAUSES

EQUATIONAL CLAUSES

Gianto (1990:20-36) describes the tendencies governing the position of S and P in non-verbal clauses where the predicate is a modified noun phrase in the nominative case. Huehnergard's definition of the personal pronoun in such constructions as the

grammatical subject (Huehnergard 1986:246-247) will generally be seen to apply here.

Two word orders are known for clauses of this type, viz. SP and PS. Gianto (1990:22) gives contrasting examples of each. For SP note:

a-na-ku ÌR *ki-ti-ka* "I am your loyal servant" (EA 108:22; 116:56);
a-mur / *a-na-ku* ÌR *ki-ti a-na šàr-ri* [ù] / *ia-nu ki-ma ia-ti-ia* ÌR *a-na* /
šàr-ri "Look, I am the loyal servant of the king [and] there is none like me, a servant of the king" (EA 109:41-44; Gianto 1990:29).

For PS examples:

ti-i-de pa-ar-ša-ia . . . *i-nu-ma* / ÌR [*k*]i-it-ti-ka *a-na-ku* "You know my conduct . . . that I am your loyal servant" (EA 73:39-42); ù *yi-de šàr-ru i-nu-ma* / ÌR¹ *ki-ti a-na-ku a-na ša-šu* "that the king may know that a loyal servant am I to him" (EA 119:24-25; Gianto 1990:25).

One may also note similar contexts from elsewhere in Canaan, e.g. the following selection of independent clauses with SP order:

a-mur-mi a-na-ku ÌR¹-¹DÌ¹ / *ša ki-it-[t]i* / Ì¹šàr-ri EN-ia "Behold, I am the loyal servant of the king, my lord" (EA 228:10-12; also EA 295:8; 296:9-10; 298:18; Izre'el 1978b:47, §6.1.2); *a-mur a-na-ku* ÌR LUGAL ù / UR.GI₇ *ša É-šu* "Behold, I am the servant of the king and the (watch)dog of his house" (EA 60:6-7); *a-nu-um-ma a-na-ku* ÌR *ša* LUGAL EN-ia / ù GIŠ.GIR.GUB *ša* GÌR.MEŠ-šu "Now, I am the servant of the king, my lord, and the footstool of his feet" (EA 141:39-40; Moran 1987b:370-371; 1992:227; cf. EA 147:4; 151:4; 185:74; 187:9; 198:10, 13, 16; 209:9; 211:8-9, 14; 212:11; 228:10; 241:9, 19; 254:10-11; 257:7; 264:5; 288:66; 296:9).

And subordinate clauses with PS word order providing the ideogram stands for an adjective and not a stative:

i-nu-ma TUR *a-na-ku ù* / *šû-ri-ba-ni a-na* KUR *Mi-iš-ri* "When I was young, then he brought me to Egypt" (EA 296:25-26);
li-iš-al-mi / *šâr-ri* LÚ.MAŠKÍM.MEŠ *e-nu-ma* KAL.GA É *ma-gal*
 "May my king ask the commissioners whether the house is very strong!" (EA 287:33-34; Nitzán 1973:68).

There are clear indications that, even in independent equational clauses, the order may be PS, probably to stress the comment:

ÌR LUGAL *a-na-ku* / *u [e]p-ri ša 2* ĠIR.MEŠ-*ka* "A servant of the king am I, and the dirt under your two feet" (EA 298:18-19);
 ÌR-*ka a-na-ku* "your servant am I" (EA 289:51).

In the following Jerusalem passages, independent equational clauses with SP are paralleled by others with PS:

a-mur a-na-ku la-a LÚ^h*ha-zi-a-nu* / LÚ^ú*ú-e-ú* <*a-na-ku*> *a-na šâr-ri*
 EN-*ia* "Behold, I am not just a city-ruler; a soldier am I of the king, my lord" (EA 288:9-10 = 285:5-6; Liverani 1967:15 n. 4; Moran 1987b:516 n. 1; 1992:331 n. 1; *contra* Albright, Mendenhall and Moran 1955:488b); *a-mur a-na-ku* LÚ^{ru}*ru-ì šâr-ri* / *ù ú-bi-il*
 GUN *šâr-ri a-na-ku* "Look, I am a companion of the king and a bringer of the king's tribute am I" (EA 288:9-12).

Gianto (1990:20-21) has taken cognizance of Huehnergard's demonstration that, in peripheral Akkadian, when a personal pronoun occurs in such non-verbal clauses, it sometimes comes in second position but still must be reckoned as the subject and not as the predicate (Huehnergard 1986:235-249).

With regard to EA 109:41-44, Gianto (1990:31) recognized that the subject, i.e. the personal pronoun, is in contrastive emphasis. A contrast situation is precisely where a logical predicate might be expected. That is to say, *anāku* and *kīma yâtiya* could be the logical predicates as indicated not only by the context but also by the fronting. So one might render the clause in question: "Look, it is I who am the loyal servant of the king [and]

like me the king has no other servant." However, the contrast expressed here is actually on the rhetorical and not on the syntactic level. Of his rivals, the sons of ^cAbdi-Ashirta, he says:

[š]u-nu ša-ra-qú-ma "They are thieves" (EA 109:36; Rainey 1978b:93; Moran 1987b:309 n. 10; 1992:184 n. 10).

The pronoun *šunu* has to be the topic (S) since the sons of ^cAbdi-Ashirta are already a known entity in the context. Between lines 36 and lines 41-44 there is a rhetorical contrast between topics, *šunu* "they" and *anāku* "I." But each personal pronoun is in fact the topic, not the predicate of its respective clause. Still, the other examples cited above show that the order in independent clauses may be either SP (the majority) or PS.

Gianto (1990:34) seems confused with regard to interrogative non-verbal clauses. He says ". . . the order, which is expected to be PS, is inverted." Further on he says "Thus the fronting of P [in interrogative passages EA 76:11-16 and EA 116:67-71] is not conditioned by emphasis, but by the question." Here are the relevant contexts:

[. . . š]a-ni-tam mi-nu šu-ut / 1[R-]A-ši[-ir-]ta UR.GI7 ù yu-ba-ú / [la]-qa ka-li URU.MEŠ šàr-ru(sic!) dUTU / [a-n]a ša-a-šu šàr KUR Mi-ta-na / ù šàr KUR Ka-aš-ši_x(ŠE) šu-ut i-nu-ma / 'yu¹-ba-ú la-qa KUR LUGAL a-na ša-a-šu "[Fur]thermore, who is he? (this) ^cAbdi-Ashirta, the dog, that he seeks [to ta]ke all the cities of the king, the sungod, for himself? Is he the king of Mitanni land or the king of Cassite land, that he seeks to take the land of the king for himself?" (EA 76:11-16; cf. also EA 71:16-22; 88:9-11; 123:38-40; 125:40-43); mi-ia-mi šu-n[u] / DUMU.MEŠ 1[R-A-ši-ir-ta ù 'la¹-qú KUR LUGAL a-na ša-šu-nu / šàr KUR Mi-ta-na šu-nu ù šàr / [K]UR Ka-ši ù šàr KUR Ḫa-ta "Who are they? (these) sons of ^cAbdi-Ashirta, that they have taken the land of the king for themselves? Are they the king of Mitanni land or the king of Cassite land or the king of Ḫatti land?" (EA 84:16-17; 85:63-64; 108:25-26; 116:67-71; cf. EA 104:17-21; 117:35-36; 138:21).

The order, as those two passages show, is PS. The reason for this is that, as stated above, the interrogative component in a question is always the logical predicate because it is asking for the new information.

The following example shows fronting of a numeral, or rather of a substantive modified by a numeral:

ù 4(?) ŠEŠ *ni-nu-u*₁₆ ù *aš-t[ap-p]ár* / *a-na ša-šu-nu a-na re-ší-ia*
 "And four(?) colleagues are we, so I wrote to them for help"
 (EA 92:44-45; Gianto 1990:34; Youngblood 1961:371).

It has been observed that, in OB, numerals are often fronted in non-verbal clauses (Huehnergard 1986:221-222 n. 13, 234 n. 62). Such a format was probably determined by the function of bookkeeping entries in inventory texts. This might be the explanation in the present passage as well. However, it is more likely that here the predicate is fronted for emphasis. Note that the numeral, normally read "three," has traces in Schroeder's copy of another wedge, albeit horizontal; the context requires "four" to make proper sense (three rival kings and Rib-Haddi himself; Youngblood 1961:371)

By contrast, the PS order in dependent clauses seems more firmly fixed. There is one example of a dependent clause where Gianto (1990:25, 27, 155) seems not to have grasped the key element. The context contains a non-verbal, subordinate clause followed by a parallel verbal clause (also subordinate)

ù *qí-ba-mi* / *a-wa-ta*₅ *an-ni-ta a-na pa-ni* / *šâr-ri EN-ka i-nu-ma* / *a-bu*
 ù *be-lu at-ta-ma* / *a-na ia-ši* ù *a-na ka-ta*₅ / *pa-ni-ia na-ad-na-ti* "So
 speak this message before the king, your lord, because you are
 father and master to me and it is to you that I have turned my
 face" (EA 73:33-38).

The verbal clause, with fronting of *ana kâta*, makes it clear, as Gianto recognizes, that the emphasis in both clauses is on Amanappa's being the official responsible for the welfare of Rib-Haddi. He is "father and master" to him. But in the

subordinate non-verbal clause, the consistent order is PS. So the P should be *abu u bēlu*. Gianto does observe that the enclitic attached to the personal pronoun, *attāma*, is for emphasis. What needs to be recognized here is that enclitic *-ma* in verbal and non-verbal clauses can raise a component to the status of comment (logical predicate) even though it is not the grammatical predicate of the syntagma. This is what has happened here. The scribe felt constrained to follow the order PS in which S is an independent pronoun even though he intended that the pronoun should be the comment. He overcomes his constraint by affixing the enclitic and thus drawing the intonation to the pronoun. The fronting of *ana kâta* was felt to be sufficient to make that complement the comment, without recourse to another enclitic (Rainey 1992b:333).

The choice of SP or PS is not "entirely dictated by the status" (Gianto 1990:36) of the clause. On occasion, there are logical predicates which receive fronting or other syntactic means of emphasis contrary to the word order customary for the type of clause (independent or dependent).

CLAUSES WITH ADVERBIAL COMPONENT

This section deals with some verbless clauses consisting of a nominal expression and a prepositional phrase. The two categories into which Gianto (1990:37-39, §3.1) has divided them, locative and existential, are useful and instructive. In the former, the prepositional phrase is the predicate (P), explaining something about the nominal (S). Since the prepositional phrase may express something other than location (e.g. the clauses of comparison with *kīma* phrases, Gianto 1990:41), they can more appropriately be called clauses with adverbial predicate. In the existential clause, it is the nominal component that is the predicate, the prepositional phrase being a secondary modifier. Gianto points out that the subject of the clause with adverbial predicate is "determinate, given, or recoverable from the preceding context" (Gianto 1990:39). This is exactly what is expected from the topic (logical subject). The topic is something already known. The new information is the whereabouts, etc. of the topic. Thus the

prepositional phrase is the comment, the logical predicate. These naturally correspond in a verbless clause to the grammatical subject and predicate respectively. Subordinate clauses with prepositional phrases as predicate do not seem to switch to PS word order as do the equational clauses treated above. Note, for example, the following:

i-nu-ma a-na-ku a-na URU-li^{KI} a-na-ša-ar-ši / a-na be-li-ia "When I was in (sic!) the city, I guarded it for my lord" (EA 137:53-54; Gianto 1990:41; cf. *supra*, p. 21); *ù / ti-mu-ru URU.¹KI¹ 'i¹-nu-¹ma¹ 'ERÍN¹.MEŠ ša-nu \ a-ša-bu / a-na URU.KI ù 'ti¹-¹ma¹-ga-¹ru¹ / i-re-bi a-na 'URU¹.KI* "but the city saw that other troops were located in (sic!) the city, and they were agreeable to my entering the city" (EA 138:60-63; Gianto 1990:43-44; Rainey 1989-90:63a); *i-nu-ma LÚMAŠKÍM L[U GAL] / [it-t]i-nu ù a-na [š]a-[š]u / [nu-uš-pu-]ru 'ú¹-ul nu-¹uš¹-pu-ru a-na [ka-]taš* "Inasmuch as the k[ing's] commissioner was with us and to 'him¹ [we are writ]ing, we do not write to [yo]u" (EA 85:82-84; Gianto 1990:44; Rainey 1989-90:59a).

One may note that the verbless clause in the following example (Gianto 1990:42, No. 16) is in fact the comment of a clause with extraposition, which is itself the protasis of a conditional sentence:

i-nu-ma 1 ḫa-za-nu / lib-bu-šu it-ti lib-bi-ia / ù ú-da-bi-ra 1ḫR-A-ši-ir-ta / iš-tu KUR A-mur-ri "If there were one city-ruler whose heart is with my heart, then I would expel 'Abdi-Ashirta from the land of Amurru" (EA 85:66-69; Gianto 1990:42).

The next passage is not simply a determinate subject with an adverbial phrase as predicate. The enclitic *-ma* converts the ostensible subject into the predicate, i.e. the comment:

yi-du LUGAL ma-ni UD.KAM.MEŠ / yi-pu-šu du-um-qa / a-na ia-ši i-nu-ma / ia-nu lib-bi ša-na a-¹na¹ ia-ši / pa-nu-ia-ma a-na a-ra-ad / šar-ri EN-ia "The king knows how many days he has treated

me well because I have no other mind; it is my intention to serve the king, my lord" (EA 119:39-44; Gianto 1990:42; Rainey 1992b:335; also EA 118:39-40).

The emphasized noun, *pānūyama*, is evidently meant to begin an independent clause. The application of the *-ma* makes it the comment of its clause, even if it might be construed as the grammatical subject.

The following example is typical of the "possessive" force of the preposition *ana* (Rainey 1990a; cf. *supra*, 15-20):

a-na ša-šu / ^{URU}Šu-mu-ra *a-na ša-šu* / URU.MEŠ *šār-ri 1-en*
^{URU}Gub-la / *is-sí-la-at šār-ri* "To him belongs Šumur, to him belong the towns of the king; alone, Byblos remains(?) to the king" (EA 140:14-17; Gianto 1990:48, No. 7; Rainey 1989-90:64a; 1992b:336).

Geography may help to understand the locative prepositional phrase in the following passage. The town in question, probably to be read *Ya^cliya*, was evidently somewhere north of Byblos but south of Šumur, probably south of Nahr el-Kebîr. In EA 104:6-13 it is associated with Ullasa, Ardata, Ampî and Shigata, all of them towns in the vicinity of modern Tripoli. In EA 114, Rib-Haddi is stressing the fact that he is virtually isolated from the sea lanes. He had to send an Egyptian messenger to Egypt via Alashia (EA 114:51-53). The phrase *ina Ya^cliya* most certainly belongs at the end of the sentence about the capture of Rib-Haddi's men (lines 9-12), the point being that the men sent to Šumur were apprehended by Aziru at a place along the way northward. Furthermore, the ships of the neighboring rulers are all in Amurru. They are at peace (or: safe) while Rib-Haddi is at war. Thus read:

ù / LÚ.MEŠ *ša-a* ¹uš¹-ši-ir-ti *a-na* / ^{URU}Šu-mu-ra *ša-ab<-bat i-na* /
¹URU¹Ya-á²-li-ia GIŠ.MÁ.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ / ^{URU}Šur-ri ^{URU}Be-ru-ta
^{URU}Ší-du-na / *gáb-bu i-na* ^{KUR}A-mur-ri *šal-mu šu-nu* / *a-na-ku-mi*
¹NU¹.KÚR "And the men whom I sent to Šumur he (Aziru)

captured in Yaḥliya; as for the ships of the rulers of Tyre, Beirut and Sidon, all are in Amurru; they are safe but as for me, I am at war" (EA 114:9-15; *contra* Gianto 1990:49, No. 8; cf. Rainey 1992b:336-337).

The scribe resorts to two sentences with extraposition (Huehnergard's "suspended subject," 1986:237; Andersen 1970:36, 42, 45). He wants to contrast the situation of the ships of the neighboring towns with his own situation. The locative, non-verbal clause is *gāb-bu i-na* ^{KUR}*A-mur-ri* "all are in Amurru."

There are instances when the prepositional phrase is fronted for further emphasis upon it as the comment (Gianto 1990:46-50, §3.4). Compare the following:

^{URU}*Šu-mu-ra a-na ša-šu* "Šumur belongs to him" (EA 140:15);
a-na ša-šu-nu ^{URU}*Ar-da-ta* / ^{URU}*Ya-aḥ-li-ia* ^{URU}*Am-bi* /
^{URU}*Ši-ga-ta ka-li* / ^{URU}*M.EŠ a-na ša-šu-nu* "They have Ardata, Yaḥliya, Ambi, Shigata, all the cities are theirs" (EA 104:10-13).

The latter example is an interesting contrast between two clauses, the first with the fronted adverbial comment to stress to whom the cities now belong and the second with fronted noun phrase containing the quantifier as comment to emphasize that it is all those towns that have fallen into the adversary's hands.

EXTRAPOSITION

A frequent syntactic and rhetorical device in these texts is extraposition. This is a special means of predication concerning a particular topic. The extraposed noun or pronoun is truly the "suspended subject" (Huehnergard 1986:237; Andersen 1970:36, 42, 45). That it is the topic of the sentence is obvious by the fact that it is always the known datum. The ensuing clause, whether verbal or non-verbal, is the comment, the new information predicated on the extraposed topic. Since the extraposed item is the subject of the sentence, there is no way that the suspended subject could be identical with the predicate of the clause that is

being predicated about it. The resumptive pronoun or other similar component can, of course, be in the genitive as in the following example:

a-mur a-^lna¹-ku pa-nu-ia-ma / a-^lna¹ a-ra-ad LUGAL "Behold, (as for) myself, it is *my* face that is set to serve the king" (EA 118:39-40);

accusative:

a-mur a-na-ku la-a LÚ*a-bi-ia \ ša-ak-na-ni / ù la-a* MÍ*ú-mi-ia / i-na aš-ri an-ni-e* "Behold, as for myself, it was not my father that placed *me*, and not my mother, in this place" (EA 286:9-11; Nitzán 1973:68, §5.22);

dative:

an-nu-ú a-na-ku ú-ul / ma-ša-ar-tu ù ú-ul / ba-la-aṭ LUGAL *a-na / ia-ši* "Behold, as for me, *I have* no garrison and no royal sustenance" (EA 122:28-31);

or other oblique position:

a-mur a-na-ku / nu-kúr-tu₄ UGU-ia 5 MU.MEŠ "Behold, (as for) myself, there has been hostility against *me* five years" (EA 106:16-17); *a-nu-ma* URU*Šu-mu-ur nu-kùr-tu₄MEŠ ma-gal / KAL.GA UGU-ši* "Now, as for Šumur, hostilities are very strong against *her*" (EA 106:8-9); *a-mur a-na-ku ia-nu / ḥa-za-na i-na ar-ki-ti-ia*, "Behold, (as for) myself, there is no city-ruler behind *me*" (EA 117:9-10).

It can also be the topic of the clause:

[*a*]-*mur a-na-ku* GIŠ.GÌR.GUB *ša GÌR-pe / LUGAL BE-ia a-na-ku ù ÌR ki-it-ti-šu* "[Be]hold, as for myself, the footstool of the king, my lord, am I, and his loyal servant" (EA 106:6-7).

On the rhetorical level, a contrast may be made between the respective situations of two topics. But within each sentence the extraposed element is the topic, not the comment. Note Rib-Haddi's familiar complaint:

LÚ.MEŠ *ḥa-za-nu-tu* URU.MEŠ-*šu-nu* / *a-na ša-šu-nu* LÚ.MEŠ /
ḥu!-<up>-šu-šu-nu i-na / *šap-li-šu-nu ù* / *a-na-ku* URU.MEŠ-*ia a-na*
 1*A-zi-ri* "As for the city-rulers, they have their towns, their
 yeo<man far>mers are subservient to them; but as for me, my
 towns belong to Aziru" (EA 125:33-37; also EA 121:11-16;
 122:26-31).

VERBAL CLAUSES

Readers of classical Akkadian are familiar with the standard word order of most epistolary and legal documents in which the verb comes at the end of the clause (GAG:183, §130c). The fact that this is not always so in the EA texts from Canaan became clearer after the discovery and analysis of the Codex Hammurapi and other related literature (Ungnad 1903, 1904; Müller 1903:pp. 245-246, 262-264). In the Canaanite EA letters there are various syntagmas for verbal clauses, the word order of which is determined by the relative importance of the components, viz. subject (S), verb (V) and complement(s) (C). As mentioned above, Finley (1979) made statistical studies of the clauses in the EA letters from Canaan with regard to word order, especially VSO versus SVO, but he did not attempt to sort out the clauses according to mode, i.e. indicative versus injunctive. Gianto (1990:93-158) has given special attention to the word orders prevailing in the Byblos texts. The ensuing discussion will borrow considerable information from his work but the organization of the material may deviate from his in some respects. In particular, the distinction between different kinds of discourse and their respective modal expression will be emphasized. There is considerable similarity to biblical Hebrew. For the contrast between narrative discourse and injunctive discourse in biblical Hebrew, cf. Longacre 1992.

NARRATIVE DISCOURSE (INDICATIVE)

VERB-SUBJECT. On occasion, the writer of an epistle recounts some event or series of events. Some typical examples of this category of narration will show that while SV may be used when some specific subject is being introduced, VS characterizes the progress of the action. The ruler of Acco reported on the movements of a certain Zirdamyashda (numbers denote sentences, not lines):

- (1) [Zi-ir]-dam-ia[-a]š-da / p[a-]tá-ar iš-t[u] / [B]ir₅-ia-wa-za SVC
 "[Zir]damyashda des[er]ted from [B]iryawaza."
- (2) i[-ba-ši] / it-ti ¹Su-ta Ì[R] / šàr-ri i-na URU ¹UN¹[-ti] VC₁C₂
 "He w[as] with Shuta, the ser[vant] of the king
 in the garrison town."
- (3) ¹la¹-a yi-qa-bi mi-im-¹mi¹ / [a-n]a ša-šu Neg.+VOC
 "He didn't say anything [t]o him."
- (4) tu-uš-ša / ERÍN.MEŠ LUGAL EN-ia VS
 "The army of the king, my lord, came forth."
- (5) i-ba[-ši] / it-ti-ši i-na URU Ma-gíd-d[a^{KI}] VC
 "He wa[s] with it in Megiddo."
- (6) la-a qa-bi mi-mu a-na ša-š[u] Neg.+VSC
 "Nothing was said to hi[m]."
- (7) ù yi-ip-tú-ra a-na mu-hi-ia Conj.+VC
 "Then he deserted to me."
- (8) ù a-nu-ma / ia-aš-pu-ra ¹Su-ta / a-na ia-ši . . . VSC[O]
 "And now Shuta has written to me . . ."
- (9) ù la-a i-ma-gur na-da-an-šu Neg.+VO
 "But I did not agree to hand him over" (EA 234:11-27).

At the beginning, Satatna introduced the person under discussion (1) so Zirdamyashda comes first in the clause, followed by the verb. Next (2) the subject is understood as still being Zirdamyashda, so he is not mentioned; the predication (stative *ibašši*) heads the clause; a new person is introduced, Shuta, who will be the subject of the next clause. Since the negative always precedes its verb, it begins (3) but Shuta is not mentioned by name. It is the fact of the army's coming forth (arrival from Egypt) that is important to the next clause (4) so the ventive verb, *tuššâ*, heads the clause followed by the subject. Even though there is a change of subject back to Zirdamyashda (5), the stative (harking back to [2]) is sufficient to carry forward the story. (6) corresponds to (3) but the verb is passive and the subject expressed. Since (6) ends in "to him (= Zirdamyashda)," it was logical to begin (7) without naming the clearly understood subject. The new stage in the narrative (8) starts with the function word, *anumma*, and since the actor, Shuta, is already identified in (2), he does not come at the head of the clause. It is the act of his writing to Satatna that is important. The direct quote with its imperative is the direct object of the verb *yašpura*, and is omitted here. The final clause in the story (9) begins with a negated verb; its 1st c.s. form is sufficient to identify the subject. An independent pronoun is not needed because the emphasis is on the action of refusing. It is clear that the explicit subject is only fronted in (1) because it is important to introduce him. One is inclined to see here an extraposition à la Huehnergard (1986), i.e. "As for Zirdamyashda, he deserted from Biryawaza." This suggests that Zirdamyashda had been the subject of a letter sent to Satatna who was obliged to explain what had happened to him.

In passages like the above, portrayal of the progression of actions is the main intention. Except for the first clause, the verb precedes any explicit subject even when a new one is introduced, e.g. "the army" in (4). The verbal predicate is therefore the comment.

When the infinitive is used as a finite verb (cf. Ebeling 1915:1491; Moran 1950a:57-59; 1950c; 1952; 1961:61-62 = 1965:69-70) it invariably comes at the head of its clause and is

usually marked by an enclitic, *-ma* or *-mi*. Obviously, the emphasis is on the action, and it is the comment of the clause.

a-šé-mi ERÍN.MEŠ / *pí-tá-ti* "The army has come forth" (EA 73:12-13; Rainey 1989-90:58); *ù [a]-la-ak-mi a-na-ku a-na URU.A.PÚ[KI] / a-na da[-ba-b]i a-na ma-ḥar Ḥa-mu-ni[-ri]* "So 'I' [w]ent to Beirut in order to plead before 'Ammuni[ra]" (EA 138:51-52); *a-šé-mi* ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-tu ù ša-mu / a-na ú-mi ka-ša-di-ši ù ta-ra-at URU.KI a-na LUGAL be-li-ia* "As soon as the army comes forth and they hear about the day of its arrival, then the city will return to the king, my lord" (EA 137:49-51; cf. Moran 1950c:170a; 1987b:358 and 360 n. 9; 1992:218 and 220 n. 9); *al-lu / pa-tá-ri-ma LÚ.MEŠ ḥu-up-ši ù / ša-ab-tu LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ / URU* "Behold, if the yeomen farmers desert, then the 'apīru men will seize the city" (EA 118:37-39; Moran 1950a:57; 1950c:169-170; *contra* CAD A/1:358b); *ù tiṭ-iq-bu-ni ša-bat-mi / ni-nu-u₁₆ URU.MEŠ Gub^{ub}-li / ù da-na-nu-u₁₆* "And they are saying, 'If we capture the town(s) of Byblos, then we will be strong'" (EA 362:25-27).

SUBJECT-VERB. It was seen in (1) above that the subject may precede the verb when the context requires it. Although the PN is not the comment of that clause, it is fronted and may very well be in a sort of extraposition. Thus, it is the topic. On the other hand, there are instances when the grammatical subject is the comment of the clause. Fronting is the usual device for achieving this emphasis but the addition of an augment such as enclitic *-ma* (*supra*, pp. 230-231; also *-mi* in these texts, *supra*, pp. 246-247) or a modifier, e.g. "by myself" (*supra*, p. 149) is a frequent practice.

a-nu-ma a-na-ku-ma / er-ri-šu \ aḥ-ri-šu "Now, it is I who am cultivating" (EA 365:10-11); *u a-na-ku-ma / ub-ba-lu LÚ.MEŠ ma-as-sà^M[EŠ]* "And it is I who am bringing corvéé workers" (EA 365:13-14); *a-na-ku-ma \ ya-ḥu-du-un-ni / ub-ba-lu LÚ.MEŠ ma-as-sà^{MEŠ}* "It is I, by myself, who am bringing corvéé workers" (EA 365:24-25); *ù / a-na-ku-ma ù ḪR-ḥe-ba / nu-kúr-tu₄ i-na LÚ.ŠA¹.GAZ* "But it is I and 'Abdi-Ḥeba who are fighting

the *‘apîrû’* (EA 366:19-21); *šu-ni-ma in₄-né-ri-ru* "It was they (two) who hastened to help" (EA 366:24; Moran 1973:51).

On the other hand, note that the following example has an independent 1st c.s. pronoun emphasized by enclitic *-mî* (it is hardly a marker of direct speech here).

a-na-ku-mî ep-ša-ti / i-mu-t[a] a-n[a] ^{URU}*Šur-ri / i-ba-šu i-na pa-ni-ia*
 "It was I who made a marriage contract with Tyre; they were on good terms with me" (EA 89:17-19; Albright and Moran 1950:164-166; Gianto 1990:83, No. 10; cf. *supra*, 246-247).

Contrary to Gianto's interpretation (1990:84, No. 12) the contrast in the following is not between Rib-Haddi and his host, *‘Ammunira*, but between Rib-Haddi and his own younger brother.

šá-ni-tam a-na-ku-mi-i₁₅ / al-ka-ti a-na ma-ḥar-ri ¹*Ḫa-mu-ni-ri / ù*
^{ŠEŠ-ia} *TUR iš-tu ia-ti / i-na-kar₅-mi* ^{URU}*Gub-la* ^{KI} */ a-na na-da-ni*
^{URU.KI-li / a-na} *DUMU.MEŠ* ^{İR-IA-ši-ir-ti} "Furthermore, when I myself had gone to *‘Ammunira*, my brother who is younger than I, alienated Byblos in order to give my city to the sons of *‘Abdi-Ashirta*" (EA 137:14-19).

OBJECT-VERB. Gianto demonstrates that OV is a means of emphasizing the object. There are very few instances of the use of other components of emphasis. One can only concur with Gianto (1990:136) when he says, "object fronting itself is a strong emphatic device." It is not certain that every fronted object can be taken as the comment of its clause, but this analysis seems to fit many or most of the contexts that Gianto has cited. Although the following example may be construed as argumentative, i.e. dialogue, it is still a sample of narration:

ù a-wa-ta ša-a i-de / ù ša-a eš-te-me aš-pu-^fru¹ / a-na šar-ri *EN-ia*
 "And it is the word that I know and that I have heard, that I write to the king, my lord" (EA 108:23-25; also EA 116:15-16).

Rib-Haddi is stressing that his reports to the king are based on factual knowledge, not on lies or figments of his imagination.

ù ERÍN.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ ù GIS.GIGIR.MEŠ / *ša-ki-in₄ i-na lib-bi-šib(?)* "And it is both *apîrû* troops and chariots that he (cAbdi-Ashirta) has stationed within it" (EA 87:21-22).

Here Rib-Haddi wants to emphasize the strength of the enemy's forces posted so close to his own city, both foot troops *and* chariots.

For emphasis, the infinitive standing in the accusative as the object of a governing verb may be placed at the head of the clause:

ša-ḥa-at-ši i-le-ú ù ṣa-bat-ši / la i-le-ú "To besiege it they are able but to capture it they are not able" (EA 106:12-13); ¹ù¹ *uš-šar-šu-nu a-na URUŠu-mu-ra / [l]a-a i-le-[ú aš-š]um* ¹GIŠ¹MÁ.[MEŠ] ¹URU¹*Ar-wa-da* "But to send them to Šumur I am unab[le bec]ause of the ships of Arvad" (EA 105:86-87).

For further emphasis, the object of the governed infinitive may precede the finite verb:

šá-ni-tam šum-[ma] / ¹URU¹Gub-la ú-ba-ú ṣa-ba-ta "Furthermore, if it is Byblos that he seeks to take" (EA 88:21-22).

This must be compared with a unique instance in which the object begins the clause but the governed infinitive of which it is the object is expressed by an adverbial complement of purpose which itself appears at the end of the clause:

URUŠur-ri / la-a i-lé-ú-ni₇ a-na ṣa-bat "Tyre they are unable to capture" (EA 149:65-66).

One must note, nevertheless, that other means were sometimes employed to emphasize the object in addition to fronting. In the following passage, the enclitic *-ma* is attached to

the direct object, which is also fronted and repeated. The passage must be interpreted as follows:

ù / [TI.LA] 'ZI'-¹ia¹ ka-li DINGIR.MEŠ-nu / 'ù¹ [dNIN š]a
 URUGub-la^{KI} / 'TI'.LA 'ù¹?[šu-u]t LÚ ša-a yu-ba-ú / 'lum¹-na
 a-n[a EN-š]u šum-ma du-na du-na-ma / [ú]-ba-ú a-na-ku [a-n]a
 EN-ia "And [as] my soul [lives], as all the gods 'and' [the lady
 o]f Byblos live, 'then' [h]e is the man who seeks evil for [hi]s
 [lord], while it is only power, power that I seek [fo]r my lord"
 (EA 109:53-55; cf. Moran 1987b:310 n. 14; 1992:184:14; Gianto
 1990:89, §5.4, 133, §7.5).

The contrast is between the evil which the other person (Aziru) seeks for pharaoh and the effective power and influence that Rib-Haddi wants him to have. In the first clause the subject is fronted, "He is the man . . . ," and the object follows the verb, but in the second, the order is reversed, viz. OVS. This may be a kind of *chiasmus*; in any case, the comment of the latter clause is the object. Gianto (1990:133, No. 2) recognizes this in a subsequent chapter.

POSITION OF THE COMPLEMENT. The most useful chapter in Gianto's book is his study of the adverbial complements to verbal clauses (Gianto 1990:137-158). We would propose a slightly different nomenclature for his six categories of complements (Gianto 1990:137-138): (a) Dative, (b) Locative, (c) Committative, (d) Modal, (e) Causal, (f) Temporal. By complements, Gianto means prepositional phrases with the exception of temporal expressions which are often noun phrases in the adverbial accusative (but note also *ina ūm[i]*). It turns out that there is usually a sequential preference for the various categories, viz. a + b + c + d + e + f (Gianto 1990:139). There are, of course, many other adverbs which can be fronted if they are the comment of the clause. Temporal complements are usually fronted; if that is not possible, then they take the last position on the right.

Temporal adverbs have been dealt with in a previous chapter of this present work (cf. *supra*, pp. 115-136). The

complement of time is usually fronted in narration or in non-injunctive dialogue.

a-mur iš-tu da-^rri¹-[ti] / la-a i-te₉-li-^ryu¹(?) / i-na URUGub-la
DINGIR.MEŠ "Behold, from of old, the gods have never gone
away from Byblos" (EA 134:4-6; cf. Moran 1950a:177; note the
Gt separative with a verb of motion, Rainey 1971c:87-89).

In cases where two temporal complements are employed, the second comes at the end of the clause:

ù a-nu-um-ma i-na-ša-^rru¹ / URUMa-gi₅-da^{KI} / . . . UD.KÁM ù
GI₆-ša "and now I am guarding Megiddo . . . day and night"
(EA 243:10-13; Rainey 1975b:40; cf. Moran 1987b:467 n. 1;
1992:297 n. 1).

Especially worthy of note is the syntax of the following example :

a-mur-mi a-na ú-mi tu-šú / ù i-né-pu-ša-at gáb-bi / KUR.MEŠ a-na
LUGAL be-li-ia "Behold, on the day you come forth, then all the
territories will go over to the king, my lord" (EA 362:62-64;
Gianto 1990:146, No. 20; Rainey 1992b:346).

This is a verbal clause with *tūšû* dependent upon a construct noun (cf. *awāt iqbû*). The entire syntagma thus constitutes the temporal complement. Nevertheless, the main clause is introduced by the conjunction; this is a variation of the "as soon as" formula (cf. *supra*, p. 106 regarding EA 82:16-17). Though the passage is a departure from narration, it does describe a situation prevailing in the region.

Gianto (1990:141-143) gives seven apparent examples of variation from the normal sequence of complements (EA 105:29-31; 139:11-12, also EA 88:10-11; EA 82:17-20; 103:25-29; 103:44-47; 105:20-21; 107:21-24) and in each case there is some special explanation or mitigating factor. This serves to illustrate the fact that the "normal sequence" is not a hard and fast rule.

Inasmuch as complements are adverbials, and adverbs basically are answers to questions (how? when? where? why?), it should not be surprising that they are often the comment, the new information, supplied by the clause. Thus, the following example can be rendered in English by a cleft sentence:

is-tu ^{KUR}*Ia-ri-im-mu-ta / nu-bal-li-iṭ* "It was from Yarimuta that we had to get supplies" (EA 68:27-28; Gianto 1990:151, No. 1; Rainey 1992b:346).

INJUNCTIVE DISCOURSE

Gianto (1990:18-19) notes that injunctives, viz. imperatives, jussives and volitives (for this terminology, cf. Rainey 1990b) come at the head of their clauses. This, of course, is diametrically contrary to classic Akkadian practice where a whole series of injunctives in a letter may come at the end of their respective clauses. Among his examples, Gianto includes (rightly) the secondary injunctives which come in purpose or result clauses.

An important corollary observed by Gianto (1990:143) is that injunctives do not normally tolerate fronting of some other component to their left. The reason for this is that the injunctive is usually the comment of its clause. Nevertheless, note must be taken of some exceptional cases such as this clause with an imperative preceded by a temporal adverbial expression:

ù i-na UD.KÁM.MEŠ / [*an-nu*]-*ti uš-ši-ra* ERÍN.MEŠ [GAL] "So at [thi]s very time send a [large] army!" (EA 85:79-80; Youngblood 1961:281; Moran 1987b:271 n. 10; 1992:158 n. 12; Gianto 1990:149, No. 30).

Gianto (1990:156-157, Nos. 1-3) cites three problematic constructions in which an injunctive appears to be preceded by a complement. The first one (EA 74:31) is perhaps best explained with Youngblood (1961:141-142); i.e. that ^cAbdi-Ashirta wrote to the troops which were in Bīt-NINURTA; he did not say "assemble

in Bīt-NINURTA." On the other hand, Gianto is right to note that a command to assemble without designating the place of assembly is awkward. Therefore, one could still render:

AŠ É NIN.IB *pu-ḫu-ru-nim-mi* ù / *ni-ma-qú-ut!*(WA) UGU
URU*Gub-la* "In Bīt Ḫoron(?) assemble so that we may fall on
Byblos!" (EA 74:31-32; cf. *supra*, p. 31).

In the second example, (EA 95:31-32) the *ana yâši* preceding the volitive verb most probably belongs with the previous clause. In the third passage, the passive volitive *yu-da-na* is preceded by the locative complement,

iš-tu KUR I[*a-ri-mu-ta*] / *yu-da-na* [Š]E-[IM.ḪÁ] / [a-n]a
a-ka-li[-nu] "From the land of Y[arimuta] may gr[ain] be given
for [us] to eat!" (EA 86:46-47).

With regard to Gianto's examples of VS clauses having an independent pronoun as subject (Gianto 1990:89-90, Nos. 23-25), he has correctly discerned that all the clauses are in modal congruence (Moran 1960:9-11). That is required by the relationship between the verbs of result clauses and that of the clause upon which they are dependent. Such modal chains can be indicative or injunctive. However, all of the verbs in the passages that Gianto cites here happen to be injunctives (volitive or jussive), which are normally the logical as well as the grammatical predicate of their clauses, hence they are fronted. The use of an independent pronoun in such clauses is not to serve as the comment but rather to signal a change in subject. Someone does something in the first clause and as a result something has to be done by someone else in the following clause. One illustration will suffice:

li-it-ri-[-iṣ] / *i-na pa-ni* LU[GAL E]N-*ia yu-wa-ši-ra* / [L]Ú-*šū*
ù *yi-zi-iz i-na-an-na* ù *ak-šū-¹ud¹* / *a-na[-k]u a-na ma-ḫar šār-ri*
EN-*ia* "May it seem rig[ht] in the sight of the king, my lord,
that he send his [m]an that he may take up the post now, and

that I may reach the presence of the king, <my> lord!"
(EA 74:59-62).

INTERROGATIVE CLAUSES

There are many interrogative clauses in the EA texts from Canaan. Some of the most common types will be touched on here along with some rarer examples of special interest. The interrogative component in questions is normally the comment. This holds true for both verbal and non-verbal clauses.

VERBAL CLAUSES. As mentioned earlier, the parallelism between a declarative clause and an interrogative clause may serve to identify the comment in the former. Note the following conditional sentence:

[ù šum-m]a ʿšār¹-ru la-a / [yi-n]a-ša-ru-ni mi-nu / yi-na-šá-ru-ni
"[But i]f the king does not protect me, who [wil]l protect me?"
(EA 112:16-18).

The fronted subject in the protasis is the comment because it corresponds to the interrogative in the apodosis, "If it isn't the king who will protect me"

In verbal clauses the interrogative pronoun, adverb or particle is usually fronted. Note these examples with the nominative personal pronoun; the word order is naturally SV or SVC and the subject is the comment:

ù ma-an-nu il-teḡ-qa-ʿni¹ / i[š-]tu qa-ti-šu "Then who will rescue m[e] from his hand?" (EA 82:24-25; Moran 1992:152; Albright and Moran 1948:246 n. 19; Youngblood 1961:232); ma-an-nu / yi-na-ší-ra-ni "Who will protect me?" (EA 130:19-20); mi-ia-mi yi-malik i-zi-za [i]-na pa-ni / ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭá-at LUGAL be-lí-ia "Who would advise to resist the regular troops of the king, my lord?" (EA 94:12-13; *contra* Moran 1987b:285; 1992:169).

The interrogative pronoun may also be in the accusative:

ù mi-n[a-a]m / a-qa-bi a[-na-k]u "And what could I say?" (EA 92:29-30); mi-na-¹am¹ id-¹din¹ a-na ša[-š]u-nu "What has he given to t[he]m?" (EA 92:43); ša-ni-tam mi-na-am-mi ep-ša-ku-mi / a-na šār-ri EN-ia "Furthermore, what have I done to the king, my lord?" (EA 245:36-37); mi-na ip-ša-ti a-[na] / ¹Ia-pa-^dIŠKUR "What have I done to Yapa^c-Haddi?" (EA 113:11-12); mi-na ip-ša-ti₇ a-na ¹Mi-il-ki-lī "What have I done to Milkilu?" (EA 249:6); ù mi-na yi-pu-šu a-na ia-ši-nu "And what will he do to us?" (EA 74:41).

Adverbial interrogative nuances may be expressed by the interrogative impersonal pronoun with adverbial suffix *-u(m)* instead of a prepositional phrase (*ana mīni[m]*):

ša-ni-tam mi-nu-um ia-di-nu / mi-im-ma ù ba-la-ta₅ / LUGAL a-na LÚ.MEŠ ḥa-za-nu-ti ib-ri-ia / ù a-na ia-ši la-a-mi / ia-di-nu mi-im-ma "Furthermore, why does the king give goods and sustenance to the city rulers, my colleagues, but to me he does not give anything?" (EA 126:14-18); mi-nu-mi la-a yu-da-n[u] / iš-tu É.¹GAL¹ mi-im[-m]u / a-na ia-ši "Why are goods not issued to me from the palace?" (EA 126:49-51).

The adverbial *-ī* (cf. *supra*, p. 8) is also a sufficient marker of adverbial function, especially for some adverbial interrogatives such as the following:

a-di ni-na-ša-ru-š[u!] "We are still guarding him" (EA 100:30; Rainey 1975b:408 n. 11); ki-i in₄-né-bi-tu / šār UR^UPī-ḥi-li iš-tu / pa-ni LÚ.MEŠ ra-bi-šī \ sú-ki-ni / šār-ri EN-šu "How would the king of Piḥilu flee from the presence of the commissioners of the king, his lord?" (EA 256:7-10, for lines 4-5; cf. *supra*, pp. 91-92, 137); ma-ti-mi i-mur / pa-ni LUGAL be-li-ia "When will I see the face of the king, my lord?" (EA 147:59-60; CAD M/1:407b).

An adverbial particle may also be in the accusative (cf. *supra*, pp. 1-4):

ʿa¹-ya-mi ti-il-qú LÚ.MEŠ a-na a-ša-bi / i-na ʿURU¹.KI
 "Wherefrom will you take people to dwell in the city?"
 (EA 138:41-42).

The most commonplace syntagma for adverbial interrogatives is the prepositional phrase. Such phrases in verbal clauses are normally fronted. Sometimes they are also augmented by an enclitic particle (*-ma* or *-mi*).

a-di ma-ti ti₇-du- / ku-nu "How long will you smite us?" (EA 138:40); *a-na mi-ni₇ / qa-la-ta ù la-a / ti-iq-bu a-na šār-ri* "Why are you silent and do not speak to the king?" (EA 71:10-12; 73:6-8; cf. also EA 83:7-8; 114:35-37; 126:14-18, 49-50; 289:10); *am-mi-ni-mi qa-la-ta / iš-tu URUŠu-mu-ra* "Why is it that you ignore Šumur?" (EA 98:3-4); *am-mi-nim-mi a-na-ku e-pu-uš / ar-na a-na LUGAL EN-ri(sic!)* "For what reason would I commit a crime against the king, my lord?" (EA 286:14-15); *iš-tu ma-an-ni i-na-ša-ru-na* "By what means shall I protect myself?" (EA 112:10; Moran 1950a:169; 1987b:313 n. 1; 1992:186-187 n. 1; cf. also EA 119:10).

The following passage, dealt with by Gianto (1990:90, No. 26), is not a case of modal congruence in the EA sense because the sentence is interrogative. The verb in the first clause is broken. An injunctive is not expected in a question; it may very well have been a ventive. Neither is an injunctive called for in the ensuing clause, which in this case is not a result but a parallel circumstance. The verb evidently has a lexical ventive, not a *yaqtula* volitive ending (Rainey 1991-93:108-112). The independent pronoun in this second clause is also mainly restored but the restoration seems certain and there is not only room on the tablet but also logic in restoring the enclitic *-ma*:

ù a-na mi-ni ia-[di-na?] / šār-ru 30 ta-pal [ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ] / ù ti-il-qa at[-ta-ma] / 10 ta-pal "And why should the king give thirty pairs of [horses] while you, yourself, have taken ten pairs?" (EA 86:41-44; Rainey 1992b:342-343).

The contrast in this compound sentence is between giving (by the king) and taking away (by the official). Thus the sequence within the verbal clauses, both of which are made interrogative by the adverbial *ana mīni*, is VS, i.e. CVS followed by (C)VS.

Rhetorical questions also tend to have the comment fronted:

ú-ul ta-qa-al-mi a-na ÌR-ka "Have you not ignored your servant?"
(EA 74:13; Knudtzon 1915:373; Youngblood 1961:127); *ú-ul la-qi*
/ *ÌR-A-ši-ir-ta* "Was not 'Abdi-Ashirta captured?" (EA 117:27;
108:32-33; 132:16-17; cf. Moran 1950a:167, 171).

The answer to each of these questions is "Yes." The fronted negative particle emphasizes the rhetorical nature of the question: "It is not that you have ignored your servant?" or "It is not that 'Abdi-Ashirta was captured?" In other words, the negative particle is the comment.

In the following rhetorical question, the independent pronoun is practically in extraposition. This is an especially pertinent observation since the verb, *tīde*, is one of the prefix statives:

at-ta ú-ul / ti-de KUR *A-mur-ri i-nu-ma / a-šar da-an-ni ti-la-ku-na*
"As for you, don't you know Amurru, that they follow the
stronger party?" (EA 73:14-16; cf. Gianto 1990:82-83; Rainey
1992b:340).

The negative particle *ul* in this rhetorical question is certainly the logical predicate since it is the interrogative component. Rib-Haddi is writing to an official who had served in Amurru and who knew very well the nature of the leadership there: "As for you (of all people), it is not that you are well acquainted with Amurru?"

The following Alashia passage has a nominative independent pronoun in extraposition. That may explain the choice of negative particle (*lā* instead of *ul*). Not only is the object in extraposition (taken up by the subsequent accusative

pronominal suffix), but the explicit subject of the verb is also fronted within the predicate clause:

šu-ú ŠEŠ-ia / la-a i-de₄-šu "That very thing, did my brother not know it?" (EA 38:8-9).

The verb is the prefix stative, *īde*. It is not surprising, therefore, that the nominal subject precedes it. It is as if the *šū* is in extraposition and *aḫūya* is in extraposition within the predicate clause.

NON-VERBAL CLAUSES. There are interrogative non-verbal clauses with PS and SP order. The interrogative element is naturally the predicate, i.e. it corresponds to the comment. The subject (S) is some known element about which some unknown fact is being requested.

When the interrogative is a pronoun, whether personal or impersonal, the normal order is PS. The subject may either be a noun:

ma-an-nu LÚ-lu₄ / ù ša-pár LUGAL / EN-šu a-na ša-[šu] / ù la-a yi-iš-¹mu¹-mi "Who is the man to whom the king has written that would not listen?" (EA 232:12-15); *u ma-an-nu LÚ kal-bu / ša la-a yi-¹iš¹-mu / a-na LÚMAŠKÍM LUGAL* "but who is the man, the dog, who would not listen to the commissioner of the king?" (EA 322:17-19; also EA 319:19-21); *ma-an-nu mu[-ta]-nu / UGU-ḫi ANŠE.MEŠ [i]-nu-m[a] / la-a ta-la-ku-[na] / ANŠE.MEŠ* "What pes[tile]nce affects the asses 'so that' the asses cannot wa[lk]?" (EA 96:14-17; Moran 1987b:289 n.2; 1992:170 n. 2).

or an independent personal pronoun:

[mi]-ia šu-nu UR.GI₇.[MEŠ] k[a-al-bu] (EA 129:7), *mi-ia šu-nu UR.GI₇.MEŠ* "Who are they, the dogs?" (EA 129:81); *mi-ia šu-nu / i-nu-ma i-pu-šu ar-na ù da-a-ku LÚMAŠKÍM sū-ki-na ¹Pt-wu-¹ri¹* "Who are they that they should commit a crime and kill the commissioner Piwuru?" (EA 362:68-69).

In the following passage, there is a reply to the second interrogative in which the answer is fronted since it is the comment:

mi-nu / 1IR-A-ši-ir-ta 1IR / UR.GI₇ ù 1yi¹-il-qú / KUR LUGAL a-na ša-a-šu / mi-nu ta-la-at-šu / ù KAL.GA i-na LUGAZ GA.KAL / til-la-at-šu "Who is ʿAbdi-Ashirta, the slave, the dog, that he takes the land of the king for himself? Who are his support troops that he is strong? It is because of the ʿapīru that his support troops are strong " (EA 71:16-22; also EA 76:11-16; 88:9-11; 123:38-40; 125:40-43).

Conversely, the interrogative locative adverb (cf. *supra*, pp. 109-111) generally comes after its subject, thus SP (topic-comment) is the resultant word order:

i-nu-ma yi-qa-bu a-na [pa-ni] / LUGAL ia-nu-mi ŠE.MEŠ NINDA.MEŠ / a-ka-al ERÍN.MEŠ pí-ṭá-ti a-ia-mi "If they say be[fore] the king, 'There is no grain for bread,' where is the food for the army?" (EA 131:41-43; cf. *supra*, p. 109); *mi-im-mu / ša yi-iš-ši-ru a-ya-ti Šu-mu-\ru / ù mi-im 1ḫa-za-ni LUGAL / š[a d]a-ak yi-iš-ši-ru / a-na ka-ta* "The property that he is sending, whence (does it come)? (It is from) Šumur! And it is the property of the king's city-ruler wh[om he has s]lain that he is sending!" (EA 139:35-39; cf. *supra*, p. 110); *yi-il-te-qú šār-ru / mim-mi-ia ù mim-me / 1Mil-ki-li-li a-ia-ka-am* "The king is always taking my property, but where is the property of Milkili?" (EA 254:25-27; cf. *supra*, p. 110).

One exception is the usage in a passage from Beirut where the interrogative is repeated:

a-ya-mi i-nu-ma ia-aš-pu-ru / LUGAL be-èl-ka [a]1na¹ MAḤ-ka / a-ya-mi ERÍN.MEŠ [i]-1nu¹-ma uš-ši-ra-at / a-na ka-a-ta₅ "Where (are they), if the king, your lord, is corresponding with you? Where are the troops, if they have been sent to you?" (EA 138:122-126; cf. *supra*, pp. 54, 73, 100).

COMPOUND SENTENCES

It remains to mention that there are some combinations of clauses in which one clause is the topic and the other(s) is/are the comment. One such combination is the conditional sentence (cf. Polotsky 1983:302-306). A broad sampling of conditional sentences in the EA texts from Cañaan is given in Chapter VIII (*supra*, pp. 183-192). The point to be made here is that the protasis acts as the topic, the particular condition which is assumed to be potentially possible of realization. The apodosis is the comment, the suggested result of the realization of the condition posed in the protasis.

*šum-ma i-ba-aš-ši LÚ.ERÍN.MEŠ pi-ṭa-ti / i-na MU an-ni-ti
i-ba-aš-ši KUR.ḪÁ LUGAL EN<-ia> ù šum-ma ia-a-nu-mi LÚ.ERÍN
pi-ṭa-ti / 'ḫal'-qa-at KUR.ḪÁ LUGAL EN-ia* "If there are regular
troops this year, (then) the lands of the king, <my> lord, will still
be; but if there are no regular troops, (then) the lands of the
king, my lord, are lost" (EA 286:57-60).

The topic under discussion is whether troops will be sent. The comments, positive and negative are the maintenance of royal control over the king's territory.

The second clause combination contains a "that"-clause as topic with the main clause as comment (cf. *supra*, pp. 83-89).

*i-nu-ma yi-iš-tap-pa-ra / šar-ru a-na ia-ši a-nu-ma ḪI-ri-ma-ia-aš-ša /
ia-ak-šu-du-na a-na / mu-ḫi-ka ù-ul ka-ši-id / a-na mu-ḫi-ia,*
"Although the king has written to me, 'Now Ḫrimayassa is
surely coming to you,' he has not come to me" (EA 130:9-14).

The "that"-clause usually refers to a known communication and the comment is a response to it.

CANAANITE IN THE AMARNA TABLETS
A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE MIXED DIALECT
USED BY THE SCRIBES FROM CANAAN

Volume IV

References and
Index of Texts Cited

HANDBUCH DER ORIENTALISTIK
HANDBOOK OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

ERSTE ABTEILUNG
DER NAHE UND MITTLERE OSTEN
THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

CONSULTING EDITOR FOR THIS VOLUME

T. MURAOKA

FÜNFUNDZWANZIGSTER BAND
CANAANITE IN THE AMARNA TABLETS
A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE MIXED DIALECT
USED BY THE SCRIBES FROM CANAAN

Volume IV



CANAANITE IN THE AMARNA TABLETS

A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE MIXED DIALECT
USED BY THE SCRIBES FROM CANAAN

VOLUME IV

REFERENCES AND
INDEX OF TEXTS CITED

BY

ANSON F. RAINEY



E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1996

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

The CIP-data has been applied for.

ISSN 0169-9423
ISBN 90 04 10521 2 (*Vol. 1*)
ISBN 90 04 10522 0 (*Vol. 2*)
ISBN 90 04 10523 9 (*Vol. 3*)
ISBN 90 04 10524 7 (*Vol. 4*)
ISBN 90 04 10503 4 (*Set*)

© Copyright 1996 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Abbreviations	1
References.....	7
Index of Passages Cited.....	77

PREFACE

The present volume contains the reference tools needed by the users of volumes I-III. It seemed more profitable to bind these materials separately so that one can peruse the grammatical discussions and at the same time turn to particular reference works or to the other places where some specific texts are dealt with in other portions of the work. Thus, the user will not have to keep one finger in the index while thumbing through the grammatical discussions.

There are no footnotes in those three volumes. Frequently, when citations are made from the EA texts and other ancient sources, some bibliographical references are made to works which explain or justify certain points in the citation and/or its translation. The citations thus may often represent something of a philological commentary of the contexts being treated. As much as humanly possible, an effort has been made to give proper credit to scholars who in the past have solved problems or at least proposed solutions to specific renderings in the transcriptions and/or translations to the texts. If, when treating such a mass of material containing a myriad of details, we have overlooked some significant contribution to the understanding of any text, apology is hereby offered in advance to the scholars concerned (or to their memory).

References to scholarly works in volumes I-III are cited by the system used in the social sciences: author's last name, date of the publication and relevant page numbers, all in parentheses at the appropriate place. No apology need be made for the inclusion in the reference list of more than just the specific works cited. Some of the latter are in other fields (Hebrew studies, linguistics, etc.) while important works on the EA texts may not happen to be cited in this present work. The user will doubtless find occasion to seek out works of interest from the reference list. On the other

hand, the list does not pretend to be a comprehensive bibliography of EA studies.

The index chapter is intended as a cross reference tool to all three volumes of the grammatical study. The writing of volumes I-III stretched over a decade or more and the most that could be done under those circumstances was to make cross references to related discussions within a particular volume. When the user is reading a particular discussion in one volume and wants to see how the same passage(s) is/are treated elsewhere, he may turn to the general index and seek out the places where the same EA texts are treated in the other volumes. Such a need may be especially frequent when dealing with volumes II and III because the nuances of the verbal system are often enhanced or even determined by the associated adverbial complements in the clause. Conversely, the occurrences of a specific adverbial or other particle are often sorted out in relation to the various verbal constructions which they accompany.

The reference tools in this volume were prepared with the able assistance of Linda Meiberg with financial support from the Irene Young Endowment Fund for Scientific Publications, Tel Aviv University. This subvention was granted by the Faculty of Humanities of Tel Aviv University. Linda made the index and typed it in the present format. She also typed the bibliographical references from a card file which was begun in 1977 and continued down to the present.

The past century of Amarna studies has engaged the efforts of many scholars. We owe a great deal to all those whose imaginations were stirred by this collection of texts and who used their own mental powers to clarify and elucidate the world of human experience from the mid-fourteenth century B.C.E. which they invoke. It is my hope that the present work on *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets* will inspire and assist a new generation of scholars to carry on this work.

Anson F. Rainey
Sha^carei Tikva
1995

ABBREVIATIONS

AASOR	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research.
<i>AbB</i>	<i>Altbabylonische Briefe.</i>
<i>AHw</i>	von Soden 1959-81.
<i>AJBI</i>	<i>Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute.</i>
<i>AJSL</i>	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages.</i>
<i>ANET</i>	Pritchard 1955.
An.Or.	Analecta Orientalia.
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament.
AOS	American Oriental Series.
<i>ARM</i>	<i>Archives royales d'Mari.</i>
AS	Assyriological Studies.
<i>ASAE</i>	<i>Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte.</i>
<i>ASSF</i>	<i>Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae.</i>
AT	Alalakh Text.
ATAT ²	Gressman 1926.
<i>AUSS</i>	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies.</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.</i>
BASS	<i>Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.</i>
BE	The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania.
<i>Bi. Or.</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Orientalis.</i>

- BIFAO *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire.*
- BIES *Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society.*
- BIN Babylonian Inscriptions in the collection of J. B. Nies.
- BJPES *Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society.*
- Bogh. Boghaz-köi.
- BSAW Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philologisch-historische Klasse.
- BSOAS *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies.*
- CAD *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.*
- CAH *Cambridge Ancient History.*
- CCT *Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets in the British Museum.*
- CBQ. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly.*
- CH *Codex Hammurapi.*
- CT *Cuneiform Texts from Tablets in the British Museum.*
- DLZ *Deutsche Literaturzeitung.*
- EA El Amarna.
- EI *Eretz Israel.*
- EL Eisser, G. and Lewy, J., *Die altassyrischen Rechtsurkunden vom Kültepe.*
- GAG von Soden 1952a.
- GKC Cowley 1910.
- GM *Göttinger Miszellen.*
- HUCA *Hebrew Union College Annual.*

IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal.</i>
IOS	<i>Israel Oriental Studies.</i>
JA	<i>Journal asiatique.</i>
JANES	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University.</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society.</i>
JARCE	<i>Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt.</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature.</i>
JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies.</i>
JEA	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology.</i>
JEN	<i>Joint Expedition to Nuzi.</i>
JESHO	<i>Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient.</i>
JKF	<i>Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatische Forschung.</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies.</i>
JPOS	<i>Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society.</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review.</i>
JRAS	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.</i>
JSOR	<i>Journal of the Society of Oriental Research.</i>
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies.</i>
KAI	Donner, H. and Röllig, W. 1966-69.
KAV	Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts.
KB	Keilschriftliche Bibliothek.
KBo	<i>Keilschrifttexte aus Bohgazköi.</i>
KL	Kamed el-Lôz.
KTH	Lewy 1930.
KUB	<i>Keilschrifturkunden aus Bohgazköi.</i>
KTU	Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit.
LSS	Leipziger semitische Studien.

MA	Middle Assyrian.
MAD	Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary.
MANE	<i>Monographs on the Ancient Near East.</i>
MAOG	Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft.
MB	Middle Babylonian.
MDAI	Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut.
MIO	<i>Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung.</i>
MVÄG	Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft.
NA	New Assyrian.
NB	New Babylonian.
NBC	Nies Babylonian Collection.
OA	Old Assyrian.
OB	Old Babylonian.
OLZ	<i>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.</i>
<i>Or. Ant.</i>	<i>Oriens Antiquus.</i>
PBS	University of Pennsylvania, the Museum, publications of the Babylonian section.
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly.</i>
PJb	<i>Palästina Jahrbuch.</i>
PRU	<i>Le Palais royale d'Ugarit.</i>
RA	<i>Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale.</i>
RB	<i>Revue biblique.</i>
RÉJ	<i>Revue des études juives.</i>
RÉS	<i>Revue des études sémitiques.</i>
RHA	<i>Revue hittite et asianique.</i>
RS	Ras Shamra.

RSO	<i>Rivista degli studi orientali.</i>
SAK	<i>Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur.</i>
St. Or.	<i>Studia Orientalia.</i>
Th.LZ.	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung.</i>
TT	Taanach Text.
TuM	Texte und Materialien der Frau Professor Hilprecht Collection of Babyonian Antiquities im Eigentum der Universität Jena.
Ug.	<i>Ugaritica.</i>
UF	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen.</i>
VAB	Vorderasiatische Bibliothek.
VAS	= VS.
VAT	Vorderasiatische Abteilung Tontafeln.
VS	<i>Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin.</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum.</i>
VTS	Vetus Testamentum Supplements.
WO	<i>Die Welt des Orients.</i>
WVDOG	Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft.
WS	West Semitic.
WZKM	<i>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Morganlandes.</i>
YOS	Yale Oriental Series.
ZA	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete / Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie.</i>
ZÄS	<i>Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde.</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.</i>

- ZDMG *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.*
ZDPV *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*

REFERENCES

The ensuing list of references includes all the works cited in *CAT* plus many others. The main scope of the subjects covered is the EA texts themselves, especially studies on individual letters and essays on the grammar, syntax and rhetoric of the dialects represented in the archive. Abbreviations are those of *CAD* and *AHw* as well as those used in the *Keilschriftbibliographie* published annually in *Orientalia*. Egyptological abbreviations generally follow the *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*.

Entries follow the format adopted by the social sciences, as represented, e.g. by the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* and *Tel Aviv*.

Aartun, K.

- 1974 *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen. 1. Teil.* AOAT 21/1.
Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- 1978 *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen. 2. Teil.* AOAT 21/2.
Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.

Abel, L. A.

- 1892 Stück einer Tafel aus dem Fund von El-Amarna. *ZA*
7:117-119.

Adamthwaite, M. R.

- 1992 Lab'aya's Connection with Shechem Reassessed.
Abr-Nahrain 30:1-19.

Adler, H.P.

- 1976 *Das Akkadische des Königs Tušratta von Mittanni.*
AOAT 201. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.

Aharoni, Y.

- 1953 The Land of ʿAmqi. *IEJ* 3:153-161.
- 1969 Rubute and Ginti-kirmil. *VT* 19:137-145.

Ahl, S. W.

- 1973 *Epistolary Texts from Ugarit: Structural and Lexical Correspondences in Epistle in Akkadian and Ugaritic*.
Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University.

Aistleitner, J.

- 1954 *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik des Ugaritischen*.
BSAW, Band 100, Heft 6. Berlin.
- 1957 Studien zur Frage der Sprachverwandschaft des
Ugaritischen I. *Acta Orientalia* 7:251-307.

Albright, W. F.

- 1923 The Epic of the King of Battle: Sargon of Akkad in
Cappadocia. *JSOR* 7:1-20.
- 1924 The Town of Selle (Zaru) in the 'Amarnah Tablets.
JEA 10:6-8.
- 1926 The New Cuneiform Vocabulary of Egyptian
Words. *JEA* 12:186-190.
- 1927a Aman-ḥatpe, governor of Palestine. *ZÄS* 62:63-64.
- 1927b Another case of Egyptian *û* = Coptic *ê*. *ZÄS* 62:64.
- 1931 Mitannian *maryannu*, "chariot-warrior," and the
Canaanite and Egyptian Equivalents. *AfO*
6:217-221.
- 1932 The North Canaanite Epic of 'Al'êyân Ba'al and Môt.
JPOS 12:185-208.
- 1934 The North Canaanite Poems of Aleyân Baal and "the
Gracious Gods." *JPOS* 14:101-140.

- 1937 The Egyptian Correspondence of Abimilki, Prince of Tyre. *JEA* 23:190-203.
- 1941 Two Letters from Ugarit. *BASOR* 82:43-49.
- 1942a A Teacher to a Man of Shechem about 1400 B. C. *BASOR* 86:28-31.
- 1942b A Case of Lèse-Magesté in Pre-Israelite Lachish, with Some Remarks on the Israelite Conquest. *BASOR* 87:32-38.
- 1943a Two Little Understood Amarna Letters from the Middle Jordan Valley. *BASOR* 89:7-17.
- 1943b An Archaic Hebrew Proverb in an Amarna Letter from Central Palestine. *BASOR* 89:29-32.
- 1943c A Tablet of the Amarna Age from Gezer. *BASOR* 92:28-30.
- 1944a The Oracles of Balaam. *JBL* 63:207-233.
- 1944b A Prince of Taanach in the Fifteenth Century B.C. *BASOR* 94:12-27.
- 1944c An Unrecognized Amarna Letter from Ugarit. *BASOR* 95:30-33.
- 1944d A Vow to Asherah in the Keret Epic. *BASOR* 94:30-31.
- 1946 Cuneiform Material for Egyptian Prosopography. *JNES* 5:7-25.
- 1947 Review of de Konig 1940. *JNES* 6:58-59.
- 1950 Review of Gordon, C. H., *Ugaritic Handbook*. *JBL* 69:385-393.

- 1975 The Amarna Letters from Palestine. Ch. 20, pp. 99-116 of *CAH³ II*. Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney.
- Albright, W. F. and Lambdin, T. O.
- 1957 New Material for the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography. *JSS*:2:113-127.
- Albright, W. F., Mendenhall, G. E. and Moran, W. L.
- 1955 The Amarna Letters. Apud *ANET²*:483-490.
- Albright, W. F. and Moran, W. L.
- 1948 A Re-interpretation of an Amarna Letter from Byblos (EA 82). *JCS* 2:239-248.
- 1950 Rib-Adda of Byblos and the Affairs of Tyre (EA 89). *JCS* 4:163-168.
- Alt, A.
- 1924 Neues über Palästina aus dem Archiv Amenophis' IV. *PJb* 20:22-41. Reprinted 1959 in *Kleine Schriften* III:158-175.
- 1933 Hic murus aheneus esto. *ZDMG* 86 N.F. 11:33-48.
- 1936 Neues aus der Pharaonenzeit Palästinas. *PJB* 32:19-25.
- 1953-59 *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. München. 3 vols.
- Altman, A.
- 1976 Was Ugarit ever Subject to the Eighteenth-Dynasty Pharaohs? *Bar Ilan* 13:1-16 (Hebrew).
- 1977a The Fate of Abdi-Ashirta. *UF* 9:1-11.
- 1977b The Struggle for Control of Highways in the Amarna Period. *Bar Ilan* 14-15:1-29 (Hebrew).

- 1978a The Revolutions in Byblos and Amurru during the Amarna Period and their Social Background. *Bar Ilan Departmental Researches. Bar Ilan Studies in History*. Ramat Gan:1-24.
- 1978b Some Controversial Toponyms from the Amurru Region in the Amarna Archive. *ZDPV* 94:99-107.
- Anbar, M. and Na'aman, N.
 1986-87 An Account Tablet of Sheep from Ancient Hebron. *Tel Aviv* 13-14:3-12.
- Andersen, F. I.
 1970 *The Verbless Clause in the Pentateuch*. JBL. Monograph Series, 14. Nashville and New York.
- Anderson, E.M.
 1977 *Lâ and ul in the El-Amarna Byblos Correspondence*. Seminar Paper, Dept. of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, Harvard Univ. Cambridge, MA.
- Arnaud, D.
 1982 Une lettre du roi de Tyr au roi d'Ougarit: milieux d'affaires et de culture in Syrie à la fin de l'âge du Bronze Recent. *Syria* 59:101-107.
 1986 *Recherches au pays d'Aštata, Emar VI/3*. Paris.
 1991 Une lettre de Kamid-el-Loz. *Semitica* 40:7-16.
- Aro, J.
 1954-56 Remarks on the Language of the Alalakh Texts. *Afo* 17:301-365.
 1955 *Studien zur mittelbabylonischen Grammatik*. St. Or. 20. Helsinki.

1957 *Glossar zu den mittelbabylonischen Briefen*. St. Or. 22. Helsinki.

1961 *Die akkadischen Infinitivkonstruktionen*. St. Or. 26. Helsinki.

Artzi, P.

1963 The "Glosses" in the el-Amarna Tablets. *Bar Ilan* 1:24-57 (Hebrew); English Summary XIV-XVII.

1964 "Vox Populi" in the el-Amarna Tablets. *R A* 58:159-166.

1967 The Exact Number of the Published Amarna Documents. *Or.* n.s. 36:432.

1968 Some unrecognized Syrian Amarna Letters (EA 260, 317, 318). *JNES* 27:163-171.

1969 The First Stage in the Rise of the Middle-Assyrian Empire: EA 15. *EI* 9:22-28 (Hebrew).

1969-70 *Selected Documents from the el-Amarna Archive*. Tel Aviv (Hebrew).

1973 El Amarna Document No. 30. *Actes du 29^e congrés international des orientalistes*. Paris:1-7.

1978 The Rise of the Middle-Assyrian Kingdom, according to El-Amarna Letters 15 & 16. A Contribution to the Diplomatic History of the Ancient Near East in the Mid-Second Millennium B.C.E. *Bar Ilan Departmental Researches. Bar Ilan Studies in History*. Ramat Gan:25-41.

1984 Review of Hellbing 1979. *Bi. Or.* 41, N^o 1/2:208-213.

1991 Aššur-uballiṭ and the Sutiāns. Pp. 254-257 in: Cogan, M. and Eph'al, I., eds. *Ah, Assyria, Studies in Assyrian*

History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor. Scripta Hierosolymitana 33.
Jerusalem.

Artzy, M., Perlman, I. and Asaro, F.

1976 Alašiya of the Amarna Letters. *JNES* 35:171-182.

Astour, M. C.

1963 Place Names from the Kingdom of Alalah in the North Syrian List of Thutmose III: A Study in Historical Topography. *JNES* 22:220-241.

1964 The Amarna Age Forerunners of Biblical Anti-Royalism. Pp. 6-17 in *For Max Weinreich on his Seventieth Birthday*. The Hague.

1965 The Origin of the Terms "Canaan," "Phoenician," and "Purple." *JNES* 24: 346-350.

1968 Mesopotamian and Transtigridian Place Names in the Medinet Habu Lists of Ramses III. *JAOS* 88:733-752.

1972 The Merchant Class of Ugarit. *Gesellschaftsklassen im Alten Zweistromland und in den angrenzenden Gebieten--XVIII. Rencontre assyriologique internationale, München, 29. Juni bis 3. Juli 1970*. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Abhandlungen. N. F. 75:11-26.

Barker, K. L.

1969 *The Comparative Lexical and Grammatical Study of the Amarna Canaanisms and Canaanite Vocabulary*. Doctoral Dissertation, Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning. Philadelphia.

Barré, M. L.

- 1982 A Cuneiform Parallel to Ps. 86:16-17 and Mic. 7:16-17. *JBL* 101:271-275.

Barth, J.

- 1889 Vergleichende Studien. III. Das \dot{y} -Imperfect im Nordsemitischen. *ZDMG* 43:177-191.
- 1894 Zur vergleichenden semitischen Grammatik. *ZDMG* 48:1-7.
- 1906 Formangleichung bei begrifflichen Korrespondenzen. Bezold, C., ed., *Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag (2. März 1906) gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*. Giessen: vol. 2, 787-796.

Bauer, H.

- 1920 Die "Löwenherrin" der Amarnabriefe Nrr. 273 und 274. *ZDMG* 74:210-211.
- 1930 *Entzifferung der Keilschrifttafeln von Ras Shamra*. Halle.

Bauer, H. and Leander, P.

- 1922 *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testamente*. Halle.

Benz, F. L.

- 1972 *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions*. *Studia Pohl* 8. Rome.

Bergsträsser, G.

- 1918 *Hebräische Grammatik*. Leipzig.
- 1929 *Hebräische Grammatik II*. Leipzig.

Berkooz, M.

- 1937 *The Nuzi Dialect of Akkadian Orthography and Phonology*. Language Dissertations (Supplement to *Language*) No. 23. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, University of Pennsylvania.

Bezold, C.

- 1893 *Oriental Diplomacy: being the transliterated text of the cuneiform despatches between the Kings of Egypt and Western Asia in the XVth Century before Christ, discovered at Tell el-Amarna, and now preserved in the British Museum, with full vocabulary, grammatical notes, etc.* London. Luzac.

- 1922 Zum babylonisch-assyrischen Wörterbuch. *ZA* 34: 105-112.

Bezold, C., and Budge, E. A. W.

- 1892 *The Tell el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum*. London.

Bienkowski, P.

- 1987 The Role of Hazor in the Late Bronze Age. *PEQ* 119:50-61.

Biot, M., Kupper, J-R., Rouault, O.

- 1979 *Répertoire analytique, Première partie, noms propres*. ARM XVI/1. Paris.

Blau, J.

- 1971 Studies in Hebrew Verb Formation. *HUCA* 42:133-158.

- 1978 Pronominal Third Person Singular Suffixes with and without *N* in Biblical Hebrew. *EI* 14:125-131 (Hebrew).
- Bloch, A.
- 1963 Zur Nachweisbarkeit einer hebräischen Entsprechung der akkadischen Verbalform *iparras*. *ZDMG* 113:41-50.
- 1967 The Vowels of the Imperfect Performatives in the Old Dialects of Arabic. *ZDMG* 117:22-29.
- Bloch, S. J.
- 1940 Beiträge zur Grammatik des Mittlebabylonischen. *Or. n.s.* 9:305-347.
- Böhl, F. M. Th. de Liagre.
- 1909 *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Kanaanismen*. LSS 5/2. Leipzig. Reprinted 1968.
- 1914 Hymnisches und rhythmisches in den Amarnabriefen aus Kanaan. *Th.LZ.* 35:337-340.
- 1929 Die bei den Ausgrabungen von Sichern gefundenen Keilschrifttafeln. *ZDPV* 49:321-327.
- 1953 Hymnisches und rhythmisches in den Amarnabriefen aus Kanaan. Pp. 375-379, 516-517 in *Opera Minora*. Groningen.
- 1974 Der Keilschriftbrief aus Sichern (Tell Balâṭa). *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 7:21-30.
- Bonkamp, B.
- 1939 *Die Bibel im Lichte der Keilschriftforschung*. Recklinghausen.

Borger, R.

- 1958 Das Problem der 'apīru ('Ḫabiru')," *ZDPV* 74:121-132.
- 1967 *Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur*. Band 1. Berlin.
- 1971 *Akkadische Zeichenliste*. AOATS 6. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- 1978 *Assyrisch-babylonische Zeichenliste*. AOAT 33. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.

Bork, F.

- 1932 Mitani-Glossen und anderes. *OLZ* 35:377-381.

Bottéro, J.

- 1954 *Le problème des Ḫabiru à la 4^e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, (Paris, 29 juin- 1^{er} juillet 1953)*. Cahiers de la société asiatique XII. Paris.

Boyd, J. L.

- 1975 *A Collection and Examination of the Ugaritic Vocabulary Contained in the Akkadian Texts from Ras Shamra*. Doctoral dissertation, Univ. of Chicago.

Bravmann, M. M.

- 1953 *Studies in Arabic and General Syntax*. Publications de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire, Textes arabes et études islamiques. Tome XI. Cairo.

Brown, F., Driver, S. R. and Briggs, C. A.

- 1952 *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament...based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius as translated by Edward Robinson*. Oxford: corrected impression.

Buccellati, G.

- 1966 *The Amorites of the Ur III Period*. Naples.
 1968 An Interpretation of the Akkadian Stative as a Nominal Sentence. *JNES* 27:1-12.

Buhl, F.

- 1915 *Wilhelm Gesenius' hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. In verbindung mit Zimmern, H., Müller, W. M., und Weber, O. Berlin. Reprinted 1962.

Bull, L. S.

- 1926 Two Letters to Akhnaton, King of Egypt. *BMMA* 21:169-176.

Bush, F. M.

- 1964 *A Grammar of the Hurrian Language*. Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis Univ. Ann Arbor.

Callendar, J. B.

- 1975 *Middle Egyptian*. Afroasiatic Dialects, Ancient Egyptian, vol. 2. Malibu.

Campbell, E. F.

- 1960 Amarna Letters and the Amarna Period. *BA* 23:2-22.
 1964 *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters*. Baltimore.
 1965 Shechem in the Amarna Archive. Apud Wright, G. E. *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical city*. New York:191-213.
 1976 Two Amarna Notes: The Shechem City State and Amarna Administrative Terminology. Pp. 34-54 in: Cross, F. M., Lemke, W. F. and Miller, P. D., etc. *Magnalia Dei, The Mighty Acts of God. Essays on the*

Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernst Wright.
Garden City, NY; Doubleday and Company, Ind.

Cavaignac, E.

1933 Synchronismes assyriens, égyptiens et hittites (XVI^e et XIII^e siècles). *RHA* 2, Fasc. 13:180-189.

1955 La lettre 101 de Tell el-Amarna. *JA* 243:135-138.

Cazelles, H.

1973 De l'idéologie royale. *JANES* 5:59-73.

Černý, J. and Groll, S. I.

1975 *A Late Egyptian Grammar*. Studia Pohl: Series Maior, 4. Rome.

Civil, M.

1984 Notes on the "Instructions of Šuruppak". *JNES* 43:281-298.

Clauss, H.

1907 Die Städte der El-Amarnabriefe und die Bibel. *ZDPV* 30:1-78.

Cochavi-Rainey, Z.

1982 *The Egyptian Letters of the el-Amarna Archive*. M. A. thesis, Tel Aviv Univ. (Hebrew).

1988 *The Akkadian Dialect of the Egyptian Scribes in the 14th-13th Centuries B.C.E.* Doctoral dissertation, Tel Aviv University, 2 Vols. (Hebrew with English summary).

1989 Canaanite Influence in the Akkadian Texts written by Egyptian Scribes in the 14th and 13th Centuries, B.C.E. *UF* 21:39-46.

- 1990a Egyptian Influence in the Akkadian Texts written by Egyptian Scribes in the 14th and 13th Centuries, B.C.E. *JNES* 49:57-65.
- 1990b Tenses and Modes in Cuneiform Texts Written by Egyptian Scribes in the Late Bronze Age. *UF* 22:5-23.
- 1993 The Style and Syntax of EA 1. *UF* 25:75-84
- Cowley, A. E., ed. and trans.
- 1910 *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Ed. by Kautzsch, E. 2nd Eng. ed. rev. in accordance with the 28th German ed. Oxford.
- Cross, F. M.
- 1962 Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs. *Harvard Theological Review* 55:225-259.
- 1973 Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. *Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA.
- Dahood, M.
- 1965 *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology*. Rome.
- Degen, R.
- 1969 *Altaramäische Grammatik der Inschriften des 10.-8. Jh. v. Chr.* Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes herausgegeben von der Deutschen Morganländischen Gesellschaft. Band XXXVIII, 3. Wiesbaden.
- de Konig, J.
- 1940 *Studiën over de El-Amarnabrieven en het Oude-Testament inzonderheid uit historisch oogpunt*. Delft.

De Langhe, R.

1948 L'enclitique cananéenne *-m(a)*. *Le Muséon* 59:89-111.

Delitzsch, [F.]

1909-10 Review of Knudtzon 1915. *Memnon* 3:163-165.

Dhorme, P. [E.]

1908-09 Les Pays bibliques au temps d'el-Amarna. *RB* n.s. 5:500-519; 6:50-73, 368-385.

1913 La langue de Canaan. *RB* n.s. 10:369-393 (Reprinted 1951. *Recueil Édouard Dhorme*. Paris:405-432).

1914 La langue de Canaan (suite). *RB* n.s. 11:37-59, 344-372 (Reprinted 1951. *Recueil Édouard Dhorme*. Paris:432-487).

1924 Les nouvelles tablettes d'el-Amarna. *RB* 33:5-32. (Reprinted 1951. *Recueil Édouard Dhorme*. Paris: 489-519).

1928 Amarna (Lettres d'el-Amarna). *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Suppl.* Paris:207-225.

1931 Le déchiffrement des tablettes de Ras Schamra. *JPOS* 11:1-6.

1951 *Recueil Édouard Dhorme*. Paris.

Diakonoff, I. M.

1972 Die Arier im Vorderen Orient: Ende eines Mythos (Zur Methodik der Erforschung verschollener Sprachen) *Or.* n.s. 41:91-120.

Dietrich, M.

1969 Untersuchungen zur Grammatik des Neubabylonischen. I. Die Neubabylonischen Subjunktionen. Pp. 65-99 apud Röllig, W., and Dietrich, M.,

eds. *lišān mithūrti*. AOAT 1. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.

Dietrich, M. and Loretz, O.

1969 Der Amarna-Brief VAB 2, 170. Apud Stiehl, R. and Stier, H. E., eds. *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte und deren Nachleben*. Festschrift für Franz Altheim zum 6.10.1968. Berlin. I:14-23.

1970 Die soziale Struktur von Alalah und Ugarit (IV): Die È=bītu-Listen aus Alalah IV als Quelle für die Erforschung der gesellschaftlichen Schichtung von Alalah im 15. Jh. v. Chr. ZANF. 60:88-123.

Dietrich, M., Loretz, O., and Sanmartín, J.

1976 *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit*. AOAT 24/1. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.

Dietrich, M. and Mayer, W.

1993 Die Deklination des Hurritischen im Mitanni-Brief. Beiträge zum Hurritischen (III): Einzelfragen zu Grammatik und Lexicon des Mitanni-Briefs. UF 25:143-156.

Diringer, D.

1934 *Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi*. Florence.

Donner, H.

1961 Der "Freund des Königs." ZAW 73:269-277.

Donner, H. and Röllig, W.

1966-69 *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. Wiesbaden. 3 vols.

Dossin, G.

1933 Glanes assyriologique. RA 30:83-92.

- 1934a Une lettre d'Amenphis III. *Académie Royale de Belgique, Bulletins de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques* V/20:83 ff.
- 1934b Une nouvelle lettre d'el-Amarna. *RA* 31:125-136.
- 1956 Une lettre de Iarîm-Lim, roi d'Alep, à Iašûb-Iaḥad, roi de Dîr. *Syria* 33:63-69.
- Driver, S. R.
- 1892 *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*³. Oxford.
- Durand, J.-M.
- 1982 Sumérien et akkadien en pays amorite. *MARI* 1:79-89.
- Durham, J. W.
- 1976 *Studies in Bogazköy Akkadian*. Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard Univ. Cambridge MA.
- Ebeling, E.
- 1910 Das Verbum der El-Amarna Briefe. *BASS* 8:39-79.
- 1915 Glossar. Pp. 1358-1583 apud Knutdzon, J. A. *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*. VAB 2. Leipzig. Reprinted, Aalen, 1964.
- 1926 Babylonisch-assyrische Texte. Apud *ATAT*². Berlin: 108-439.
- 1927 *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur juristischen Inhalts*. *WVDOG* 50, Leipzig.
- 1933 *Urkunden des Archivs von Assur aus Mittelassyrischer Zeit*. *MAOG* 7/I-II.
- Edel, E.
- 1948 Neue keilschriftliche Umschreibungen ägyptischer Namen aus den Bogazköytexten. *JNES* 7:11-24.

- 1950 Neues Material zur Beurteilung der syllabischen Orthographie des Ägyptischen. *JNES* 8:44-47.
- 1953 Die Stelen Amenophis' II. aus Karnak und Memphis. *ZDPV* 69:97-176.
- 1966 *Die Ortsnamenlisten aus dem Totentempel Amenophis III.* Bonn.
- 1975 Zur Deutung des Keilschriftvokabulars EA 368 mit ägyptischen Wörtern. *GM* 15:11-16.
- 1989 Ägyptische Glossen in den Geschenklisten des Amarnabriefes Nr. 14. *SAK* 16:27-33.
- 1994 Neues zum ägyptisch-akkadischen Keilschriftvokabular Ashmolean Museum 1921.1145. *Biblische Notizen* 71:53-64.

Edzard, D. O.

- 1970 Die Tontafeln von Kāmid el-Loz. Pp. 55-62, Pls. 10-14 apud Edzard, D. O. *et al.*, *Kamid el-Loz—Kumidi.* Bonn.
- 1972 Review of Rainey 1970. *ZA* 62:123-125.
- 1973 Die Modi beim älteren akkadischen Verbum. *Or.* N.S. 42:121-141.
- 1976 Ein Brief an den "Grossen" von Kumidi aus Kāmid el-Lōz. *ZA* 66:62-67.
- 1980 Ein neues Tontafelfragment (Nr. 7) aus Kāmid al-Lōz. *ZA* 70:52-54.
- 1982 Ein Brief an den "Grossen" von Kumidi aus Kāmid el-Lōz. Pp. 131-135 apud Hachmann, R., ed. *Bericht über die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in Kāmid el-Lōz in*

- den Jahren 1971 bis 1974*. Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 32.
- 1985 Die 3. Person m. Pl. *TIPRUSŪ* im Altakkadischen von Mari. Pp. 85-86 apud J.-M. Durand and J.R. Kupper, eds. *Miscellanea Babylonica, Mélanges offerts à Maurice Birot*. Paris.
- 1986 Ein neues Tontafelfragment (Nr. 7) aus Kamed el-Loz. Pp. 145-147 in Hachmann, R., ed. *Bericht über die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in Kāmid el-Lōz in den Jahren 1977 bis 1981*. Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 36. Bonn.
- Ehelolf, H.
- 1939 Zu Amarna KNUDTZON Nr. 29,184 und 41,39 ff. ZA 45 N.F. 11:70-75.
- Erman, A.
- 1889 [Note within Winckler 1889]:62-64.
- Ewald, G. H. A.
- 1831-33 *Grammatica critica linguae arabicae cum brevi metrorum doctrina*. Leipzig
- Eyre, C.
- 1976 An Egyptianism in the Amarna Letters? *JEA* 62:183-184.
- Faulkner, R. O.
- 1962 *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*. Oxford.
- Fecht, G.
- 1960 Amarna-Probleme (1-2). *ZÄS* 85:83-118.
- Federn, W.
- 1960 Daḥamunzu (KBo V 6 iii 8). *JCS* 14:33.

Feigin, S. I.

1943-44 Abd-Ḥeba and the Kashi. *JQR* N.S. 34:441-458.

Fenton, T. L.

1970 The Absence of a Verbal Formation *yaqattal* from Ugaritic and North-West Semitic. *JSS* 15:31-41.

Finet, A.

1956 *L'Accadien des lettres de Mari*. Brussels.

Finkel, M.

1977 The Tyre Letters of the el-Amarna Archives — A Study of Selected Linguistic Aspects. M.A. Thesis. Tel Aviv University.

Finkelstein, J. J.

1953 Cuneiform Tablets from Tell Billa. *JCS* 7:111-176.

1969 Three Amarna Notes. *EI* 9:33-34.

Finley, T. J.

1979 *Word Order in the Clause Structure of Syrian Akkadian*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Fleisch, H.

1968 *Yaqtula* cananéen et subjonctif arabe. *Studia Orientalia in memoriam Caroli Brockelmann = Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg* 17:65-76.

Fischer, W.

1972 *Grammatik des Klassischen Arabisch*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Forrer, E.

1929 *Forschungen*. Berlin.

- Fossey, C.
1937 Sur le mot *šaditum*. *RÉS*:87-88.
- Frankena, R.
1966 *Briefe aus dem British Museum*. AbB 2. Leiden.
1968 *Briefe aus der Leidener Sammlung*. (TLB IV). AbB 3. Leiden.
1974 *Briefe aus dem Berliner Museum*. AbB 6. Leiden.
- Freydank, H.
1960 Eine hethitische Fassung des Vertrages zwischen dem Hethiterkönig Šuppiliuma und Aziru von Amurru. *MIO* 7:356-381.
- Friedrich, J.
1926 *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*. 1. Teil. *MVÄG* 31:I.
1930 *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*. 2. Teil. *MVÄG* 34:I.
1932 *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*. Berlin.
1940 Zur Sprache von Qatna. *WZKM* 47: 202-214.
1941-44 Churritisch-Ugaritisches und Churritisch-Luwisches. *AfO* 14:329-333.
- Friedrich, J., and Röllig, W.
1970 *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik*. An. Or. 46. Rome.
- Gadd, C. J.
1940 The Tell el-Amarna Tablets. *PEQ* 72:116-123.
- Galán, J. M.
1993 What is he, the dog? *UF* 25:173-180.
- Garbini, G.
1960 *Il semitico di nord-ovest*. Naples.

Gardiner, A. H.

- 1937 *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*. Bibliotheca aegyptiaca VII. Brussels.

Gelb, I. J.

- 1961 *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*. MAD 2. 2nd ed. Chicago.
- 1965 The Origin of the West Semitic *Qatala* Morpheme. Pp. 72-80 apud *Symbolae linguisticae in honorem Georgii Kurylowicz*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków.
- 1968 An Old Babylonian List of Amorites. *JAOS* 88:39-46.
- 1970 Comments on the Akkadian Syllabary. *Or. N. S.* 39:516-546.
- 1980 *Computer-Aided Analysis of Amorite*. AS 21.
- 1981 Ebla and the Kish Civilization. Pp. 9-73 apud Cagni, L., ed. *La lingua di Ebla. Atti del Convegno internazionale (Napoli, 21-21 aprile 1980)*. Istituto Universitario Orientale, Seminario di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor XIV. Napoli.

Gevirtz, S.

- 1973a Evidence of Conjugational Variation in the Parallelization of Selfsame Verbs in the Amarna Letters. *JNES* 32:99-104.
- 1973b On Canaanite Rhetoric, The Evidence of the Amarna Letters from Tyre. *Or. N.S.* 42:162-177. (= Buccellati, G., ed. *Approaches to the Study of the Ancient Near East*, Gelb Volume. Rome).

Giacumakis, G.

- 1970 *The Akkadian of Alalah*. The Hague.

Gianto, A.

1990 *Word Order Variation in the Akkadian of Byblos*. *Studia Pohl* 15. Rome.

1994 Subject Fronting in the Jerusalem Letters. *Orientalia* n.s. 63:209-225

Ginsberg, H. L.

1932-33 To the Epic of ʿAlʿêyân Baʿl. *Tarbiz* 4:106-109, 380-390 (Hebrew).

1935 Notes on The Birth of the Gracious and Beautiful Gods. *JRAS*:45-72.

1936a *Kitve Ugarit*. Jerusalem (Hebrew).

1936b The Rebellion and Death of Baʿlu. *Or.* n.s. 5:161-198.

1939 Two Religious Borrowings in Ugaritic Literature. *Or.n.s.* 8:317-327.

Gittlen, B. M.

1985 The Murder of the Merchants Near Akko. Pp. 63-72, apud Kort, A. and Morschauser, S., eds. *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Ewry*. Winona Lake.

Giveon, R.

1974 Determinatives on Canaanite Personal Names and Toponyms in Egyptian. Pp. 55-59 apud Caquot, A. and Cohen, D., eds. *Actes du premier congrès de linguistique sémitique et chamito-sémitique. Paris 16-19 juillet 1969*. The Hague/Paris.

Glock, A. E.

1971 A New Ta'anek Tablet. *BASOR* 204:17-30.

- 1983 Texts and Archaeology at Tell Ta'anek. *Berytus* 31:57-66.
- Görg, M.
- 1975a Anmerkungen zu EA 368. *UF* 7:566-567.
- 1975b *qr.t* ("Türriegel") Keilschriftlich. *GM* 15:19-20.
- 1988 Zum Namen der Fürsten von Taanach. *Biblische Notizen* 41:15-18.
- Goetze (Götze), A.
- 1924 Zum Briefwechsel zwischen Šuppiluliuma und der Witwe des Bihururijaš. *OLZ* 27:581-582.
- 1925 Šuppiluliumas syrische Feldzüge. *Klio* 19:347-350.
- 1930 *Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte*. Marburg.
- 1931 *ištēnūtu* und *tapalu*. *ZA* 40 N.F. 6:79-80.
- 1946a Number Idioms in Old Babylonian. *JNES* 5:185-202.
- 1946b The Akkadian Masculine Plural in *ānū/ī* and its Semitic Background. *Language* 22:121-130.
- 1947 A New Letter from Ramesses to Ḫattušiliš. *JCS* 1:241-251.
- 1948 Apud Marcus. 1948:224.
- 1956 *The Laws of Eshnunna*. AASOR 31. New Haven.
- Goetze, A. and Levi, S.
- 1959 Fragment of the Gilgamesh Epic from Megiddo. *'Atiqot* 2:121-128.
- Gordon, C. H.
- 1930 Rabbinic Exegesis in the Vulgate of Proverbs. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 49:384-416.
- 1934 Eight New Cuneiform Fragments from Tell el-Amarna. *JEA* 20:137-138.

- 1938 The Dialect of the Nuzu Tablets. *Or. N.S.* 7:32-63, 215-232.
- 1947 The New Amarna Tablets. *Or. N.S.* 16:1-14.
- 1965 *Ugaritic Textbook*. An. Or. 38. Rome.
- Grave, C.
- 1980a The Etymology of Northwest Semitic *šapānu*. *UF* 12:221-229.
- 1980b On the Use of an Egyptian Idiom in an Amarna Letter from Tyre and in a Hymn to the Aten. *Oriens Antiquus* 19:205-218.
- 1982 Northwest Semitic *šapānu* in a Break-up of an Egyptian Stereotype Phrase in EA 147. *Or. N.S.* 51:161-182.
- Grayson, A. K.
- 1972 *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions* Vol. I. From the Beginning to Ashur-rêsh-ishi I. Wiesbaden.
- Greenberg, M.
- 1955 *The Ḥab/piru*. New Haven.
- Greenstein, E. L.
- 1979 Trans-semitic Idiomatic Equivalency and the Derivation of Hebrew *ml^ʾkh*. *UF* 11:329-336.
- Greenstein, E. and Marcus, D.
- 1976 The Akkadian Inscription of Idrimi. *JANES* 8:59-96.
- Gröndahl, F.
- 1967 *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*. Rome.
- Gross, W.
- 1976 *Verbformen und Funktion. wayyiqtol für die Gegenwart?* St. Ottilien.

Gustavs, A.

- 1927-28 Die Personennamen in den Tontafeln von Tell Ta'annek. *ZDPV* 50:1-18; 51:169-217.

Hachmann, R.

- 1970 Kāmid el-Lōz--Kumidi. Pp. 63-64 apud Edzard, D. O. et al. *Kamid el-Loz Kumidi*. Bonn.
- 1982 Arahattu—Biriawaza—Puhuru. Pp. 137-177 apud Hachmann, R., ed. *Bericht über die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in Kāmid el-Lōz in den Jahren 1971 bis 1974*. Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 32.

Halligan, J. M.

- 1983 The Role of the Peasant in the Amarna Period. Pp. 15-103 apud Freedman, D. N. and Graf, D. F., eds. *Palestine in Transition: The Emergence of Ancient Israel*. The Social World of Biblical Antiquity Series, 2. Sheffield.

Haldar, A.

- 1950 On the Problem of Akkadian *šumma*. *JCS* 4:63-64.

Hallo, W. W. and Moran, W. L.

- 1979 The First Tablet of the SB Recension of the Anzu-Myth. *JCS* 31:65-77.

Hallo, W. W. and Tadmor, H.

- 1977 A Lawsuit from Hazor. *IEJ* 27:1-11.

Halpern, B. and Huehnergard, J.

- 1982 El-Amarna Letter 252. *Or.* N.S. 51:227-230.

Harrelson, W.

- 1957 Shechem in Extra-Biblical References. *Biblical Archaeologist* 20:2-10. Reprinted 1964 as pp. 258-265

- in Campbell, E. F. and Freedman, D. N., eds. *Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, vol. 2. New York: Doubleday.
- Harris, R.
 1955 The Archive of the Sin Temple in Khafajah (Tutub). *JCS* 9:31-58, 59-88, 91-120.
- Harris, Z. S.
 1936 *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*. AOS 8. New Haven.
 1939 *Development of the Canaanite Dialects*. AOS 16. New Haven.
- Hayes, J. L.
 1984 *Dialectical Variation in the Syntax of Coordination and Subordination in Western Akkadian of the el-Amarna Period*. Doctoral dissertation, UCLA. Univ. Microfilms International.
- Hecker, K.
 1968 *Grammatik der Kültepe-Texte*. An. Or. 44. Rome.
- Heimle, W. and Guidi, G.
 1969 Der Koinzidenzfall im Akkadischen. Pp. 148-152 in Voigt, W., ed. *XVII Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 21. bis 27. Juli 1968 in Würzburg, Vorträge*. ZDMG Supplementa I. Wiesbaden.
- Heintz, J. G.
 1982 *Index Documentaire d'El-Amarna - I.D.E.A., 1*. With the collaboration of Bauer, D., Marx, A., and Millot, L. Programming by Françon. Wiesbaden.

Held, M.

- 1961 A Faithful Lover in an Old Babylonian Dialogue. *JCS* 15:1-26.
- 1965 Studies in Comparative Semitic Lexicography. Pp. 395-406. *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. AS 16. Chicago.
- 1976 Two Philological Notes on Enūma Eliš. Pp. 231-239 in: Eichler, B. L., ed. *Kramer Anniversary Volume. Cuneiform Studies in Honor of Samuel Noah Kramer*. AOAT 25. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn

Hellbing, L.

- 1979 *Alashia Problems*. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 57. Göteborg.

Herdner, A.

- 1938 Une particularité grammaticale commune aux textes d'el-Amarna et de Ras-Shamra. *RÈS*: 76-83.

Hess, R. S.

- 1984 *Amarna Proper Names*. Doctoral dissertation, The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion. Cincinnati. Reprinted Univ. Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
- 1989a Cultural Aspects of Onomastic Distribution in the Amarna Texts. *UF* 21:209-216.
- 1989b Hebrew Psalms and Amarna Correspondence from Jerusalem: Some Comparisons and Implications. *ZAW* 101:249-265.
- 1990 Rhetorical Forms in EA 162. *UF* 22:137-148.
- 1991 The Operation of Case Vowels in the Personal Names of the Amarna Texts. Pp. 201-210 apud *Actes*

de la XXXvième Rencontre assyriologique internationale. Gand, 10-14 juillet 1989. *Mesopotamian History and Environment*. Occasional Publications.

1993a *Amarna Personal Names*. American Schools of Oriental Research Dissertation Series, vol. 9. Winona Lake.

1993b Smitten Ant bites Back: Rhetorical Forms in the Amarna Correspondence from Shechem. Pp. 95-111 apud de Moor, J. C. and Watson, W. G. E., *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose*. AOAT 42. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.

Hetzron, R.

1969 The Evidence for Perfect *y'aqtul* and Jussive *yaqt'ul* in Proto-Semitic. *JSS* 14:1-21.

Hilprecht, H. V.

1896 *Old Babylonian Inscriptions chiefly from Nippur*. The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A: Cuneiform Texts. Vol. I, Part II. Philadelphia.

Holma, H.

1914 Zum ersten Ta'annek-Brief. *ZA* 28:102-103.

Holmes, Y. L.

1973 Egypt and Cyprus: Late Bronze Age Trade and Diplomacy. Pp. 91-98 apud Hoffner, H. A., Jr., ed. *Orient and Occident*. AOAT 22. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.

- 1975 The Messengers of the Amarna Letters. *JAOS* 95:376-381.

Horowitz, W. and Shaffer, A.

- 1992a An Administrative Tablet from Hazor: A Preliminary Edition. *IEJ* 42:21-33.
 1992b A Fragment of a Letter from Hazor. *IEJ* 42:165-167.

Huehnergard, J.

- 1979 *The Akkadian Dialects of Carchemish and Ugarit*. Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, MA. University Microfilms.
 1981 Akkadian Evidence for Case-Vowels on Ugaritic Bound Forms. *JCS* 33:199-205.
 1983 Asservative *la and Hypothetical *lu/law in Semitic. *JAOS* 103:569-593.
 1986 On Verbless Clauses in Akkadian. *ZA* 76:218-249.
 1987a Northwest Semitic Vocabulary in Akkadian Texts. *JAOS* 107:713-725.
 1987b Stative, Predicative, Pseudo-verb. *JNES* 46:215-232.
 1987c Three Notes on Akkadian Morphology. Pp. 181-193 apud Golomb, D. M., ed. "Working With No Date," *Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*. Winona Lake.
 1987d *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*. Harvard Semitic Series 32. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
 1988 The Early Hebrew Prefix-Conjugations. *Hebrew Studies* 29:19-23.
 1989 *The Akkadian of Ugarit*. Harvard Semitic Studies 34. Atlanta.

Huffmon, H. B.

- 1965 *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study*. Baltimore.

Hummel, H. D.

- 1957 Enclitic *mem* in Early Northwest Semitic, especially Hebrew. *JBL* 76:85-107.

Ikeda, J.

- 1995 *A Linguistic Analysis of the Akkadian Texts from Emar: Administrative Texts*. Doctoral Dissertation, Tel Aviv University

Izre'el, Sh.

- 1976 The Gezer Letters of the el-Amarna Archive — Linguistic Analysis. M. A. thesis, Tel Aviv Univ. (Hebrew).
- 1977 Two Notes on the Gezer-Amarna Tablets. *Tel Aviv* 4:159-167.
- 1978a $\text{'}et=\text{'el be}^{\text{'ivrit hammiqra}^{\text{'it}}$ ($\text{'et}=\text{'el}$.in biblical Hebrew). *šnaton lammiqra' uleḥeqer hammizraḥ haqqadum*. 3:204-212 (Hebrew).
- 1978b The Gezer Letters of the el-Amarna Archive — Linguistic Analysis, *IOS* 8:13-90.
- 1984 On the Use of the So-called Ventive Morpheme in the Akkadian Texts of Amurru. *UF* 16:83-92.
- 1985 The Akkadian Dialect of the Scribes of Amurru in the 14th-13th Centuries B.C. -- Linguistic Analysis. Doctoral dissertation, Tel Aviv Univ. (Hebrew).
- 1987 Early Northwest Semitic 3rd Pl. M. Prefix: The Evidence of the Amarna Letters. *UF* 119:79-90.

- 1991a *Amurru Akkadian: A Linguistic Study*. 2 vols. Harvard Semitic Studies 41, Atlanta, GA.
- 1991b A God *Rib(b)ān* in Ugarit? *UF* 23:217-218.
- 1991c See Red: Reflections on the Amarna Recension of Adapa. Pp. 746-771 apud Kaye, A. S., ed. *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslaw on the occasion of his eighty-fifth birthday, November 14th, 1991*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- 1992a Review of Huehnergard, J. *The Akkadian of Ugarit*. *Bi. Or.* 49, No. 1/2:168-180.
- 1992b The Study of Oral Poetry: Reflections of a Neophyte. Can We Learn Anything on Orality from the Study of Akkadian Poetry, Especially in Akhetaton? Pp.155-225 apud Vogelsang, M. E. and Vanstiphout, H. L. J., eds *Mesopotamian Epic Literature: Oral or Aural?* Lewiston.
- 1995 *The Amarna Scholarly Tablets*. Groningen.
- Izre'el, Sh. and Singer, I.
- 1990 *The General's Letter from Ugarit. A Linguistic and Historical Reevaluation of RS 20.33 (Ugaritica V, No. 20)*. Tel Aviv.
- Jean, Ch. F. and Hoftijzer, J.
- 1965 *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest*. Leiden.
- Jestin, R.
- 1952 Textes économiques de Mari (III^e Dynastie d'Ur). *RA* 46:185 ff.

- Jirku, A.
 1933 Kana'anäische Psalmenfragmente in der vorisraelitischen Zeit Palästinas und Syriens. *JBL* 52:108-120.
- Joüon, P.
 1923 *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*. Rome.
- Joüon, P. and Muraoka, T.
 1991 *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. *Subsidia biblica* 14, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2 Vols. Rome.
- Jucquois, G.
 1966 *Phonétique comparée des dialectes moyen-babyloniens du nord et de l'ouest*. Louvain.
- Kienast, B.
 1981 Die Sprache von Ebla und das Altsemitische, Pp. 83-98 apud Cagni, L., ed. *La lingua di Ebla*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Napoli, 21-23 aprile, 1980). Napoli.
- Kinberg, N.
 1985 Adverbial Clauses as Topics in Arabic: Adverbial Clauses in Frontal Position Separated from their Main Clauses. *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 6:353-416.
- Kitchen, K. A.
 1962 *Suppiluliuma and the Amarna Pharaohs: A Study in Relative Chronology*. Liverpool Monographs in Archaeology and Oriental Studies, No. 5. Liverpool.
 1965 Theban Topographical Lists, Old and New. *Or. N.S.* 34:1-9.

- 1967 Review of Campbell 1964 *JEA* 53:178-182.
- 1969 Review of Edel 1966. *Bi. Or.* 26:197-202.
- 1971 *Ramesside Inscriptions, Historical and Biographical*. Vol. II, Fascicle 5. Oxford.
- Klein, J.
- 1977 Appendix: *ū dākū* -- The Linguistic Issue. *UF* 9:10-11.
- Klengel, H.
- 1964a Aziru von Amurru und seine Rolle in der Geschichte der Amārnazeit. *MIO* 10:57-83.
- 1964b Neue Fragmente zur akkadischen Fassung des Aziru-Vertrages. *OLZ* 59:437-445.
- 1974 Review of Rainey 1970. *OLZ* 69:261-262.2
- 1984 Şumur/Simyra und die Eleutheros-Ebene in der Geschichte Syriens. *Klio* 66:5-18.
- Knudtzon, J. A.
- 1891 Zur assyrischen und allgemein semitischen Grammatik. *ZA* 6:405-431.
- 1892 Zur assyrischen und allgemein semitischen Grammatik. *ZA* 7:33-63.
- 1893 *Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnengott für Staat und königliches Haus aus der Zeit Asarhaddons und Asurbanipals*. Leipzig, 2 vols.
- 1899a Ergebnisse einer Kollation der El-Amarna-Tafeln. *BASS* 4:101-154.
- 1899b Weitere Studien zu den El-Amarna-Tafeln. *BASS* 4:279-337.
- 1899c Nachträge und Berichtigungen zu "Weitere Studien zu den El-Amarna-Tafeln." *BASS* 4:410-417.

- 1913 Ueber *qibima* in Eingängen babylonisch-assyrischer Briefe. *OLZ* 16:298-303.
- 1914 Zu den El-Amarna-Tafeln. *OLZ* 17:483-494.
- 1915 *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*. VAB 2. Leipzig. 2 Vols. Reprinted 1964, Aalen.
- 1916 Zum sog. 2. Arzawa-Brief. *OLZ* 19:135-137.
- Korošec, V.
- 1960 Les Hittites et leurs vassaux syriens à la lumière des nouveaux textes d'Ugarit (PRU IV). *RHA* 18, Fasc. 66:65-79.
- Krahmalkov, C.
- 1969 The Amorite Enclitic Particle TA /I. *JSS* 14:201-204.
- 1971 Northwest Semitic Glosses in Amarna Letter No. 64: 22-23. *JNES* 30:40-143.
- Kramer, S. N.
- 1929-30 The Verb in the Kirkuk Tablets. *AASOR* 11:62-119.
- Kraus, F. R.
- 1984 *Nominalsätze in altbabylonischen Briefen und der Stativ*. Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, 47/2. Amsterdam.
- Krauss, R.
- 1983 *Das Ende der Amarnazeit. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Chronologie des Neuen Reiche*. Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beiträge 7. Hildesheim.

Kufeldt, G.

- 1974 *Labaya of Shechem and the Politics of the Amarna Age*.
 Doctoral dissertation, Dropsie College of Hebrew
 and Cognate Learning. Philadelphia.

Kühne, C.

- 1963 Zum Status der syro-palästinensischen Vasallen des
 Neuen Reiches. *AUSS* 1:71-71.
- 1971 Zum Text RS 19.68. *UF* 3:369-371.
- 1973 *Die Chronologie der internationalen Korrespondenz von
 El-Amarna*. AOAT 17. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- 1993 Review of Moran 1987b. *Orientalia* N. S. 62:410-422.

Labat, R.

- 1932 *L'Akkadien de Boghaz-köi*. Bordeaux.

Labat, R. and Malbran-Labat, F.

- 1976 *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne*. 5th ed. Paris.

Lambdin, Th. O.

- 1953a Another Cuneiform Transcription of Egyptian *msh*
 "Crocodile." *JNES* 12:284-285.
- 1953b Egyptian Loan Words in the Old Testament. *JAOS*
 73:145-155.
- 1953c Egyptian Words in Tell El Amarna Letter No. 14.
Or. n.s. 22:362-369.
- 1953d The *Miši* People of the Byblian Amarna Letters. *JCS*
 7:75-77.

Lambert, M.

- 1903 De l'emploi des suffixes pronominaux avec *Noun* et
 sans *Noun* au futur et à l'impératif. *RÉJ* 46:178-183.

Landsberger, B.

- 1924 Der 'Ventiv' des Akkadischen. *ZA* 35:113-123.
- 1926 Die Eigenbegrifflichkeit der babylonischen Welt. *Islamica* 2:355-372.
- 1954 Assyrische Königsliste und 'dunkles Zeitalter.' *JCS* 8:31-45, 47-73, 106-133.
- 1967 Über Farben im Sumerisch-Akkadischen. *JCS* 21:139-173.
- 1976 The Conceptual Autonomy of the Babylonian World. Translation by Jacobsen, T., Foster, B. and von Siebenthal, H. *Sources and Monographs. Monographs on the Ancient Near East*. 1:57-71.

Landsberger, B. and Balkan, K.

- 1950 Die Inschrift des assyrischen Königs Irišum—gefunden in Kültepe 1948. *Türk Tarih Kurumu, Belletin* 14:219-288.

Landsberger, B. and Tadmor, H.

- 1964 Fragments of Clay Liver Models from Hazor. *IEJ* 14:201-218.

Langdon, S. H.

- 1931 The Legend of Etana and the Eagle, or the Epical Poem "the City that they hated." *Babyloniaca* 12:1-56, Pls. I-XIV.

Laroche, E.

- 1958 Études sur les hiéroglyphes hittites. *Syria* 35:252-283.
- 1976 *Glossaire de la Langue Hourrite*. Première Partie (A-L). *RHA* 34.

- 1977 *Glossaire de la Langue Hourrite. Deuxième Partie (M-Z, Index). RHA 35.*
- Legrain, L.
- 1922 *Historical Fragments. Univ. Museum Publications of the Babylonian Section. Vol. XIII. Philadelphia: The University Museum.*
- Lesko, L. H.
- 1982 *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian. Berkeley. Vol. I*
- 1984 *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian. Berkeley. Vol. II*
- 1987 *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian. Berkeley. Vol. III*
- 1989 *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian. Berkeley. Vol. IV*
- Lettinga, J. P.
- 1948 Review of De Lange, R., *Les Textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et leurs rapports avec la milieu biblique de l'Ancient Testament*, Louvain, 1945, in *Bi. Or.* 5:107-113.
- Lewy, J.
- 1929 Review of Gustavs 1927-1928. *OLZ* 32:172-174.
- 1930 *Die Kültepetexte der Sammlung Frida Hahn. Berlin.*
- Limet, H.
- 1975 Observations sur la grammaire des anciennes tablettes de Mari. *Syria* 52:37-52.
- 1976 *Textes administratifs de l'époque des šakkanakku. Paris.*
- Liverani, M.
- 1965 Implicazioni sociali nella politica di Abdi-Aširta di Amurru. *RSO* 40:267-277.
- 1967 Contraste e confluenze di concezioni politiche nell'età di El-Amarna. *RA* 61:1-18.

- 1971 Le lettere del faraone a Rib-Adda. *Or. Ant.* 10:253-268.
- 1972 Elementi irrazionali nel commercio amarniano. *Or. Ant.* 11:297-317.
- 1974 Rib-Adda, giusto sofferente. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 1:175-205.
- 1979a Farsi *ḥabiru*. *Vicino Oriente* 2:65-77.
- 1979b Three Amarna Essays. *MANE* 1:73-106.
- 1983 Political Lexicon and Political Ideologies in the Amarna Letters. *Berytus* 31:41-56.
- Loewenstamm, S. E.
- 1959 Notes on the Pronouns in Ugaritic in the Light of Canaanite. *Lšonénu* 23: 72-81 (Hebrew).
- 1967 Prostration from afar in Ugaritic and Hebrew. *BASOR* 188:41-43.
- 1968 On Stylistic Patterns in Biblical and Ugaritic Literatures. *Lšonénu* 32:27-35 (Hebrew).
- 1980 *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures*. AOAT 204. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Longacre, R. E.
- 1992 Discourse Perspective on the Hebrew Verb: Affirmation and Restatement. Pp. 177-189 in Bodine, W. R., ed., *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake.
- Loretz, O. and Mayer, W.
- 1974 Die Glossen *mi-ke-tu* und *ia-pa-aq-ti* in EA 64:22-23. *UF* 6:493-494.

Luckenbill, D. D.

1918-19 A Difficult Passage in an Amarna Letter. *AJSL* 35:158-159.

Luckenbill, D. D. and Allen, T. G.

1916 The Murch Fragment of an el-Amarna Letter. *AJSL* 33:1-6.

Lutz, H. F.

1919 *Selected Sumerian and Babylonian Texts*. University of Pennsylvania, the University Museum Publications of the Babylonian Section. Vol. I, No. 2, Philadelphia: the University Museum.

Maisler, (Mazar) B.

1929 Die Landschaft Bašan im 2. vorchristlichen Jahrtausend. *JPOS* 9:80-87.

1930 *Untersuchungen zur alten Geschichte und Ethnographie Syriens und Palästinas*. 1 Teil. Arbeiten aus dem Orientalischen Seminar der Universität Giessen. Giessen.

1934 A New Document from El-Amarna. *BJPES* 2:38-40 (Hebrew). Reprinted 1965, *BIES Reader B*. Jerusalem:264-266.

1936 The Taanach Tablets. *Sefer Klausner*. Tel Aviv:44-64 (Hebrew).

Malamat, A.

1961 Campaigns of Amenhotep II and Thutmose IV to Canaan. *Scripta hierosolymitana* 8:218-231.

Mangano, M. J.

- 1990 *Rhetorical Content in the Amarna Correspondence from the Levant*. Doctoral dissertation, Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion. Cincinnati.

Marcus, D.

- 1969 Studies in Ugaritic Grammar 1. *JANES* 1:55-61.
 1970 *Aspects of the Ugaritic Verb in the Light of Comparative Semitic Grammar*. Phd. Thesis, Columbia University. Ann Arbor.
 1973 A Famous Analogy of Rib-Haddi. *JANES* 5:281-286.

Marcus, R.

- 1948 On the Genitive after *umma* in the Amarna Tablets. *JCS* 2:223-224.

Matouš, L.

- 1964 *Grammatik des Akkadischen*. Vierte Auflage der Babylonisch-Assyrischen Grammatik Arthur Ungnads. München.
 1992 *Akkadian Grammar*. Fifth corrected edition (1969) translated by Hoffner, H. A. Atlanta.

Mayer, W.

- 1971 *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik des Mittelassyrischen*. AOATS 2. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
 1976 Beiträge zum hurro-akkadischen Lexicon I. *UF* 8:209-214.

Mayerhofer, M.

- 1982 Welches Material aus dem Indo-Arischen von Mitanni verbleibt für eine selektive Darstellung? Pp. 72-90 apud Neu, E., ed. *Investigationes Philologicae et*

Comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser.
Wiesbaden.

Maynard, J. A.

1925 Textual Notes on the Amarna Letters. *JSOR* 9:129-130.

Mazar, (Maisler) B.

1961 Geshur and Maacah. *JBL* 80:16-28.

1974 *Canaan and Israel*. Jerusalem (Hebrew).

1975 *Cities and Districts in Eretz-Israel*. Jerusalem (Hebrew).

McCarter, P. K.

1973 Rib-Adda's Appeal to Aziru (EA 162, 1-21). *Or. Ant.* 12:15-18.

Meer, P. van der.

1957-58 The Chronological Determination of the Mesopotamian Letters in the El-Amarna Archives. *JEOL* 15:74-96.

Meissner, B.

1916 Review of Knudtzon 1915. *DLZ* 35:1514-1517.

1928-29 Amarna, Nr. 244,14. *AfO* 5:184.

1932 *Beiträge zum assyrischen Wörterbuch II*. AS 4. Chicago.

1937 *Studien zur assyrischen Lexikographie III*. MAOG 11/I-II.

Mendenhall, G. E.

1947a The Message of Abdi-Ashirta to the Warriors, EA 74. *JNES* 6:123-124.

1947b *The Verb in Early Northwest Semitic Dialects*. Doctoral dissertation, Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore.

Mercer, S. A. B.

1939 *The Tell El-Amarna Tablets*. Toronto, 2 vols.

Meyer, R.

1964 Aspekt und Tempus im althebräischen Verbal-system. *OLZ* 59:117-126.

1966 Zur Geschichte des hebräischen Verbums. *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 40:241-243.

Millard, A. R.

1965 A Letter from the Ruler of Gezer. *PEQ* 97:140-143, Pl. XXV.

1971 Review of Rainey 1970. *BSOAS* 34:594.

1972 Review of Rainey 1970. *Biblica* 53:125-127.

Mohammad, M. A.

1959 The Administration of Syro-Palestine during the New Kingdom. *ASAE* 56:105-137.

Moran, W. L.

1949 An Unexplained Passage in an Amarna Letter from Byblos. *JNES* 8:124-125.

1950a *A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets*. Doctoral dissertation, Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore. Reprinted, Univ. Microfilms, Ann Arbor.

1950b The Putative Root ^ctm in Is. 9:18. *CBQ* 12:153-154.

1950c The Use of Canaanite Infinitives Absolute as a Finite Verb in the Amarna Letters from Byblos. *JCS* 4:169-172.

1951 New Evidence on Canaanite *taqtulū(na)*. *JCS* 5:33-35.

- 1952 "Does Amarna bear on Karatepe?"—An Answer. *JCS* 6:76-80.
- 1953 Amarna *šumma* in Main Clauses. *JCS* 7:78-80.
- 1960 Early Canaanite *yaqtula*. *Or. N.S.* 29:1-19.
- 1961 The Hebrew Language in its Northwest Semitic Background. Pp. 54-72 apud Wright, G. E., ed., *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*. New York.
- 1963 A Note on the Treaty Terminology of the Sefire Stelas. *JNES* 22:173-176.
- 1964 *taqtul* -- Third Masculine Singular? *Biblica* 45:80-82.
- 1965 The Hebrew Language in its Northwest Semitic Background. Pp. 59-84 apud Wright, G. E., ed., *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*. New York. Reprinted 1965, Anchor Book Edition.
- 1969 The Death of 'Abdi-Aširta. *EI* 9:94-99.
- 1972 Tell el-Amarna Letters. Cols. 933-935 of *Encyclopedia Judaica* 15. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House.
- 1973 The Dual Personal Pronouns in Western Peripheral Akkadian. *BASOR* 211:50-53.
- 1974 *Collations of the el-Amarna Tablets*. Unpublished notes.
- 1975a Amarna Glosses. *RA* 69:147-158.
- 1975b The Syrian Scribe of the Jerusalem Amarna Letters. Pp. 146-166 apud Goedicke, H. and Roberts, J.J.M., eds. *Unity and Diversity*. Baltimore.
- 1979 Putative Akkadian *šukammu*. *JCS* 31:247-248.
- 1981 *duppuru* (*dubburu*) — *ṭuppuru*, too? *JCS* 33:44-47.
- 1984 Additions to the Amarna Lexicon. *Or. N.S.* 53:297-302.

- 1985 Rib-Hadda: Job at Byblos? Pp. 173-181 apud Kurt, A. and Morschauser, S., eds. *Biblical and Related Studies presented to Samuel Iwry*. Winona Lake.
- 1987a Join the ‘Apiru or Become One? Pp. 209-212 apud Golomb, D.M. ed. "Working With No Data" *Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*. Winona Lake.
- 1987b *Les lettres d’el Amarna. Correspondance diplomatique du pharaon*. With collaboration by V. Haas and G. Wilhelm. Trans. by Collon, D. and Cazelles, H. Paris.
- 1988 Amarna Texts (Nos. 102,103). Pp. 149-151, Pl. 112-114 apud Spar, I., ed. *Tablets, Cones, and Bricks of the Third and Second Millennia B.C. Cuneiform Texts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1*. New York.
- 1992 *The Amarna Letters*. Baltimore and London.
- Moscatti, S., ed.
- 1964 *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, Phonology and Morphology*. Wiesbaden.
- Müller, D. H.
- 1903 *Die Gesetze Hammurabis und die Mosaische Gesetzgebung. Text in Umschrift, deutsche und hebräische Übersetzung. Erläuterung und vergleichende Analyse*. Vienna.
- 1906 *Semitica. Sprach- und rechtsvergleichende Studien. Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 153:1-48.

- Müller, W. M.
- 1899a Semitische Eigennamen in ägyptischer Umschrift. *OLZ* 2:107-111.
 - 1899b Zu den ägyptischen Wörtern von Amarna 294 *OLZ* 2:104-107.
- Muhammad, M. A.
- 1966 The Hittite Provincial Administration of Conquered Territories. *ASAE* 59:109-142.
- Muraoka, T.
- 1975 The *Nun Energicum* and the Prefix Conjugation in Biblical Hebrew. *AJBI* 1:63-71.
 - 1985 *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem, Leiden.
- Muraoka, T. and Bosworth, C. E.
- 1973 Review of *IOS* 1 (1971). *JSS* 18:169-174.
- Murnane, W. J.
- 1983 Review of Krauss. *Das Ende der Amarnazeit*. Or. N.S. 52: 274-284.
- Muntingh, L. M.
- 1991 Syro-Palestinian Problems in the Light of the Amarna Letters. Pp. 155-194 apud *Essays on Ancient Anatolian and Syrian Studies in the 2nd and 1st Millennium B.C.* Wiesbaden.
- Na'aman, N.
- 1975 *The Political Disposition and Historical Development of Eretz-Israel according to the Amarna Letters*. Ph. D. Thesis. Tel Aviv University. Tel Aviv (Hebrew).
 - 1977 *Yeno⁵am*. *Tel Aviv* 4:168-177.

- 1979 The Origin and Historical Background of Several Amarna Letters. *UF* 11:673-684.
- 1981a Economic Aspects of the Egyptian Occupation of Canaan. *IEJ* 31:172-185.
- 1981b Royal Estates in the Jezreel Valley in the Late Bronze Age and under the Israelite Monarchy. *EI* 15:140-144 (Hebrew). English summary, 81*.
- 1982 The Town of Ibirta and the Relations of the ^cApiru and the Shusu. *GM* 57:27-33.
- 1988a Biryawaza of Damascus and the Date of the Kāmid el-Lōz ^cApiru Letters. *UF* 20:179-193.
- 1988b Historical-Geographical Aspects of the Amarna Tablets. Pp. 17-26 in *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies. Panel Sessions, Biblical Studies and Ancient Near East*. Jerusalem.
- 1990a On Gods and Scribal Traditions in the Amarna Letters. *UF* 22:247-256.
- 1990b Praises to the Pharoah in Response to his Plans for a Campaign to Canaan. Pp. 397-405 apud Abush, T., Huehnergard, J. and Steinkeller, P., eds. *Lingering over words, Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran*. Atlanta.
- 1992 Canaanite Jerusalem and its Central Hill Country Neighbors in the Second Millennium B.C.E. *UF* 24:275-291.
- 1994 The Hurrians and the End of the Middle Bronze Age in Palestine. *Levant* 26:175-187.

Nakata, I.

- 1969 Scribal Peculiarities in EA 285-290. *JANES* 2:19-20.

Nitzan, Sh.

- 1973 The Jerusalem Letters from the el-^cAmarna Archive, Linguistic Aspects. M. A. thesis, Tel Aviv Univ. Tel Aviv (Hebrew).

Noth, M.

- 1941 Review of de Konig 1940. *ZDPV* 64:115-117.

Nougayrol, J.

- 1955 *Le Palais royal d'Ugarit*. Vol. III, Textes accadiens et hourrites des archives est, ouest et centrales. Vol. VI of Mission de Ras Shamra, ed. by C. F. A Schaeffer. Paris.
- 1956 *Le Palais royal d'Ugarit*. Vol. IV, Textes accadiens des archives sud. Vol. IX of Mission de Ras Shamra, ed. by C. F. A Schaeffer. Paris.
- 1968 Textes suméro-accadiens des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit. Pp. 1-446 in Nougayrol, J., Laroche, E., Virolleaud, Ch. and Schaeffer, *Ugaritica V*. Vol. XVI of Mission de Ras Shamra, ed. by C. F. A Schaeffer. Paris.

Oberman, J.

- 1951 Does Amarna bear on Karatepe? *JCS* 5:58-61.

Oppenheim, A. L.

- 1967 *Letters from Mesopotamia*. Chicago.
- 1968 The Eyes of the Lord. *JAOS* 88:173-180.
- 1973 Towards a History of Glass in the Ancient Near East. *JAOS* 93:259-266.

- Oppert, J.
 1888 Les tablettes de Tell-Amarna. *Comptes rendues de séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*.
- Parpola, S.
 1970 *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings. Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal Part I: Texts*. AOAT 5/1.
- Peet, T. E.
 1925 Additional Note. *JEA* 11:239-240.
- Pflüger, K.
 1994 Beiträge zur Amarnazeit. *ZÄS* 121:123-132.
- Philippi, F. W. M.
 1878 Das Zahlwort *zwei* im Semitischen. *ZDMG* 32:21-98.
- Pintore, F.
 1972a *Kamiru o kabtu* in EA 1? *Or. Ant.* 11:37-38.
 1972b Transiti di truppe e schemi epistolari nella Siria Egiziana dell'età di el-Amarna. *Or. Ant.* 11:101-131.
 1973 La prassi della marcia armate nella Siria Egiziana dell'età di el-Amarna. *Or. An.* 12:299-318.
- Pitard, W. T.
 1982 Amarna *ekēmu* and Hebrew *nāqam*. *Maarav* 3:5-25.
 1987 *Ancient Damascus: A Historical Study of the Syrian City-State from Earliest Times until its Fall to the Assyrians in 732 B.C.E.* Winona Lake, Indiana.
- Polotsky, H. J.
 1976 Les Transpositions du verbe en Egyptien Classique. *IOS* 6:2-50.
 1983 Amharic Minutiae. Pp. 296-306 apud Segert, S. and Bodrogligeti, A. J. E., eds., *Ethiopian Studies*

Dedicated to Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of his Seventy-fifth Birthday. Wiesbaden.

Pope, M.

1951 Ugaritic Enclitic *-m*. *JCS* 5:123-128.

Pritchard, J. B.

1955 *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Second edition. Princeton.

Rabiner, S.

1981 *Linguistic Features of the El-Amarna Tablets from Akko, Megiddo and Shechem*. M. A. Thesis, Tel Aviv University. Tel Aviv. (Hebrew).

Radau, H.

1908 *Letters to Cassite Kings from the Temple Archives of Nippur*. The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A: Cuneiform Texts, 17/I. Philadelphia.

Rainey, A. F.

1962 *The Social Stratification of Ugarit*. Doctoral Dissertation, Brandeis University. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms.

1964 Ugarit and the Canaanites Again. *IEJ* 14:101.

1965 The Military Personnel of Ugarit. *JNES* 24:17-27.

1966a Gath of the Philistines. *Christian News from Israel* 17/2-3:30-38, 17/4:23-34.

1966b Private Seal-Impressions, A Note on Semantics. *IEJ* 16:187-190.

1967a The Soldier Scribe in *Papyrus Anastasi I*. *JNES* 26:58-60.

- 1967b *Āširu* and *asīru* in Ugarit and the Land of Canaan. *JNES* 26:296-301.
- 1967c *The Social Structure of Ugarit*. Jerusalem Biblical Institute. 1967 (Hebrew).
- 1968a Gath-Padalla. *IEJ* 18:1-14.
- 1968b The Scribe at Ugarit. His Position and Influence. *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Science and Humanities*. 3, No. 4:126-147.
- 1969a Notes on the Syllabic Ugaritic Vocabularies. *IEJ* 19:107-109.
- 1969b Some Prepositional Nuances in Ugaritic Administrative Texts. Pp. 205-211 of *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies held in Jerusalem, 19-23 July, 1965*. Jerusalem.
- 1969c Verbal Forms with Infixed *-t-* in the West Semitic El-Amarna Letters. Paper read at the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, 4-12 August, 1969.
- 1970 *El-Amarna Tablets 359-379*. AOAT 8 Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- 1971a A Front Line Report from Amurru. *UF* 3:131-149.
- 1971b Observations on Ugaritic Grammar. *UF* 3:151-172.
- 1971c Verbal Forms with Infixed *-t-* in the West Semitic el-Amarna Letters. *IOS* 1:86-102.
- 1973a Gleanings from Ugarit. *IOS* 3:34-62.
- 1973b Reflections on the Battle of Qadesh. *UF* 5:280-282.

- 1973c Reflections on the Suffix Conjugation in West Semitized Amarna Tablets. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 5:236-262.
- 1974 El-^cAmarna Notes. *UF* 6:295-312.
- 1975a More Gleanings from Ugarit. *IOS* 5:18-31.
- 1975b Morphology and the Prefix-Tenses of West Semitized El-^cAmarna Tablets. *UF* 7:395-426.
- 1975c The Prince and the Pauper. *UF* 7:427-432.
- 1975d Review of Wevers, J. W. and Redford, D. B., eds., *Studies on the Ancient Palestinian World*, Toronto Semitic Texts and Studies, 2., in *IEJ* 25:184-187.
- 1975e Toponymic Problems, ^c*Ain-shasu*. *Tel Aviv* 2:13-16.
- 1976a Enclitic *-ma* and the Logical Predicate in Old Babylonian. *IOS* 6:51-58.
- 1976b KL 72:600 and the D-Passive in West Semitic. *UF* 8:337-341.
- 1976c Tell el-Amarna. *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Vol.*:869.
- 1976d Toponymic Problems (cont.). *Tel Aviv* 3:57-69, Pl. 1.
- 1977 Verbal Usages in the Taanach Texts. *IOS* 7:33-64.
- 1978a The Barth-Ginsberg Law in the Amarna Tablets. *EI* 14:8*-13*.
- 1978b *El Amarna Tablets* 359-379. Supplement to J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*. 2nd edition, revised. AOAT 8 Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- 1978c The Scatterbrained Scribe. Pp. 141-150 apud Avishur, Y and Blau, J., eds. *Studies in Bible and the*

- Ancient Near East presented to Samuel E. Loewenstamm on his Seventieth Birthday.* Jerusalem.
- 1979 Toponymic Problems (cont.), *Rāḥiṣum=Rôḡiṣu?*, Canaan and Canaanites. *Tel Aviv* 6:158-162.
- 1980 Review of Adler 1976. *Bi. Or.* 37:194-197.
- 1981 The Military Camp Ground at Taanach on the Waters of Megiddo. *EI* 15:61*-60*.
- 1982 Linguistic Notes on Thutmose III's Topographical List. Pp. 335-359 in S. Israelit-Groll, ed., *Egyptological Studies, Scripta Hierosolymitana*, vol. XXVIII, Jerusalem.
- 1983 Toponymic Problems (cont.), Harosheth-Hagoiim. *Tel Aviv* 10:46-48.
- 1985 The Early West Semitic Prefix Conjugations. Paper presented to the Joint Session of the American Oriental Society and the North American Conference on Afro-Asiatic Linguistics, 16 April, 1985.
- 1986 The Ancient Hebrew Prefix Conjugation in the Light of ^cAmārnah Canaanite. *Hebrew Studies* 27:4-19.
- 1987a A New Grammar of Ugaritic, Review of Segert, S., *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language*, Berkeley, 1984, *Or.* N.S. 56:391-402.
- 1987b Review of Gottwald, N. *The Tribes of Yahweh*. *JAOS* 107:541-543.
- 1987c In Search of the Canaanite Verb: The Progress of Discovery in the West Semitized el-Amarnah Letters. Paper presented at the International

- Symposium to Commemorate the Centennial Anniversary of the Discovery of Tell El Amarna, Chicago, 1-3 February, 1987.
- 1988a Further Remarks on the Hebrew Verbal System. *Hebrew Studies* 29:35-42.
- 1988b Some Presentation Particles in the Amarna Letters from Canaan. *UF* 20:209-219.
- 1988c The Ancient Hebrew Prefix Conjugation in Light of the Canaanite of the Amarna Letters. *Beer-sheva* 3:149-162. (Hebrew).
- 1989a The Imperative "see" as an Introductory Particle, an Egyptian-West Semitic Calque. Paper presented at the American Academy of Religion, Society of Biblical Literature, Annual Meeting, Anaheim, 18-21 November, 1989.
- 1989b *Ināma* Clauses in the Amarna Letters from Canaan Paper presented at the American Academy of Religion, Society of Biblical Literature, Annual Meeting, Anaheim, 18-21 November, 1989.
- 1989c Review of Moran1987b in *Biblica* 70:566-572.
- 1989-90 Review of Moran 1987b in *AfO* 36/37:56-75.
- 1990a Genitive *ana* in the Canaanite El-Amarna Tablets. Pp. 171-176 apud Klein, J. and Skaist, A. *Bar-Ilan Studies in Assyriology dedicated to Pinḥas Artzi*. Ramat Gan, Bar-Ilan University Press.
- 1990b The Prefix Conjugation Patterns of Early Northwest Semitic. Pp. 407-420 apud Abush, T., Huehnergard, J. and Steinkeller, P., eds. *Lingering Over Words, Studies*

in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran. Atlanta.

- 1991-93 Is there Really a *yaqtula* Conjugation Pattern in the Canaanite Amarna Tablets? *JCS* 43-45:107-118 (appeared 1994).
- 1992a *Inūma* Clauses in the Amarna Letters from Canaan. *IOS* 12:177-191.
- 1992b Topic and Comment in Byblos Akkadian. *Bi. Or.* 49, Nos. 3/4:329-358.
- 1993 The Use of the Precative by Canaanite Scribes in the Amarna Letters, Pp. 331-341 apud Dietrich, M. and Loretz, O., eds. *Mesopotamica — Ugaritica biblica. Festschrift für Kurt Bergerhof zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres am 7. Mai 1992.* AOAT 232. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Rainey, A. F. and Cochavi-Rainey, Z.
- 1990 Comparative Grammatical Notes on the Treaty between Ramses II and Hattusili III. Pp. 796-823 apud Israelit-Groll, S., ed. *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim.* Jerusalem. 2 vols.
- Ranke, H.
- 1910 *Keilschriftliches Material zur altägyptischen Vokalisation.* Berlin.
- 1937 Keilschriftliches. *ZÄS* 73:90-93.
- 1935-52 *Die ägyptischen Personenamen.* Glückstad/Hamburg. 2 vols.

Redford, D. B.

1967. *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt: Seven Studies*. Tronto.

1984 *Akhenaten: The Heretic King*. Princeton.

Reiner, E.

1966 *A Linguistic Analysis of Akkadian*. The Hague.

1970 Akkadian. Pp. 274-303 in Sebeok, T. A., ed. *Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol. 6, Linguistics in South West Asia and North Africa*. Paris.

Reviv, H.

1963 Concerning the History of Shechem in the el-^cAmarna Period. *Tarbiz* 33:1-7. (Hebrew)

1966a The Government of Shechem in the El-Amarna Period and in the Days of Abimelech. *IEJ* 16:252-257.

1966b The Planning of an Egyptian Campaign to Canaan in the Reign of Amenhotep IV. *Yediot* 30:45-51. (Hebrew)

1969 On Urban Representative Institutions and Self-government in Syria-Palestine in the Second Half of the Second Millennium B.C. *JESHO* 12:283-297.

Riedel, W.

1920 *Untersuchungen zu den Tell-el-Amarna-Briefen*. Tübingen.

1939 Das Archiv Amenophis IV. *OLZ* 42:145-148.

Robertson, A. F.

1993 Word Dividers, Spot Markers and Clause Markers in Old Assyrian, Ugaritic, and Egyptian Texts: Sources for Understanding the Use of the Red Ink

- Points in the Two Akkadian Literary Texts, *Adapa* and *Ereshkigal*, found in Egypt. Doctoral Dissertation, New York University.
- Röllig, W.
 1971 Review of Rainey 1970. *WO* 6:122-123.
- Rössler, O.
 1961 Eine bisher unbekannte Tempus form im Althebräischen. *ZDMG* 111:445-451.
 1962 Die Präfixkonjugation Qal der Verba Iae Nun im Althebräischen und das Problem der sogenannten Tempora. *ZAW* 74:125-141.
- Rosén, H. B.
 1969 The Comparative Assignment of Certain Hebrew Tense Forms. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies held in Jerusalem, 19-23 July, 1965*. Jerusalem:212-34.
- Rosenthal, F.
 1963 *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. 2nd Revised Printing. Wiesbaden.
- Ross, J. F.
 1966 Gezer in the Tell el-Amarna Letters. *Museum Haaretz Bulletin* 8:45-54.
 1967 Gezer in the Tell el-Amarna Letters. *BA* 30:62-70.
- Rowton, M. B.
 1962 The Use of the Permansive in Classical Babylonian. *JNES* 21:233-303.

- Sachs, A.
 1939 Two Notes on the Taanach and Amarna Letters. *AfO* 12:371-373.
- Salonen, A.
 1959-60 Review of *AHw* 1-2. *AfO* 19:156-159.
- Salonen, E.
 1967 *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen*. Helsinki.
- Sasson, J.
 1972 Notes on some Personal Names from Mari. *RA* 66:179-180.
- Säve-Söderbergh, T.
 1946 *The Navy of the Eighteenth Egyptian Dynasty*. Uppsala Universities Årsskrift 6. Uppsala/Leipzig.
- Sayce, A. H.
 1894 Pp. 34ff., Tab. XXXI-XXXIII apud Petrie, W. M. F. *Tell el Amarna*. London.
 1917 The Discovery of the Tel el-Amarna Tablets. *AJSL* 33:89-90.
- Scheil, V.
 1892 Tablettes d'El-Amarna de la collection Rostovicz. *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire* 6/II:298-309.
 1893 Une tablette palestinienne cunéiforme. *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 15:137-138.
 1902 Deux nouvelles lettres d'El Amarna. *BIFAO* 2:113 ff.

Schoneveld, J.

1951 Akkadian *Šumma. Bi. Or.* 8:112.

Schorr, M.

1913 *Urkunden des altbabylonischen Zivil- und Prozessrechts.*
VAB 5. Leipzig.

Schroeder, O.

1914 Die beiden neuen Tontafeln. *MDOG* 55:39-45.

1915a *iluA=iluA-ma-na.* *OLZ* 18:326-327.

1915b Kanaanäisch *malania* = "Quartier, Lager." *OLZ*
18:105-106.

1915c *Ku A = pû* "Mund". *OLZ* 18:325-326.

1915d Ueber den Namen des Tamūz von Byblos in der
Amarnazeit. *OLZ* 18:291-293.

1915e Zu Berliner Amarnatexten. *OLZ* 18:292-296.

1915f Zum sog. 2. Arzawabrief (VAT 342). *OLZ*
18:231-232.

1915g Zur Amarnatafel VAT 1704. *OLZ* 18:174-176.

1915h Zur kanaanäischen Glosse *maḫzirāmu.* *OLZ* 18:38-39.

1915i *Die Tontafeln von El-Amarna in akkadischer Sprache.*
Texte Nr. 1-189. VS 11. Leipzig.

1915j *Die Tontafeln von El-Amarna. Texte Nr. 190-202.*
Nebst Zeichenliste. VS 12. Leipzig.

1916 Zum sog. 2. Arzawa-Brief (VAT 342). *OLZ* 19:138.

1917 Zu Berliner Amarnatexten. *OLZ* 20:105-106.

1918 Ueber die Glossen *ši-ir(-ma)* und *mar-ia-nu(-ma)* in
den Briefen Rib-Addi's. *OLZ* 2:125-127.

Schulman, A. R.

1964 Some Observations on the Military Background of the Amarna Period. *JARCE* 3:51-69.

1964 *Military Rank, Title and Organization in the Egyptian New Kingdom*. Berlin.

Segert, S.

1961 Die Sprache der moabitischen Königsinschrift. *Ar. Or.* 29:197-267.

1976 *A Grammar of Phoenician and Punic*. München.

Sever, M. W.

1972 Reconsidering the Egyptian Empire in Palestine during the Amarna Period. *PEQ* 104:123-133.

Shehadeh, L. R.

1968 The Sibilants in the West Semitic Languages of the Second Millennium B.C. Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University.

1987 Some Observations on the Sibilants in the Second Millennium B.C. Pp. 229-246 in: Golomb, D. M., ed. *Working with No Data. Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Siegfried, C.

1884 Die Aussprache des Hebräischen bei Hieronymus. *ZAW* 4:34-83.

Singer, A. D.

1942 The final *-m* (=ma?) in the Ugarit Tablets. *BJPES* 10:54-62 (Hebrew).

1948 The Vocative in Ugaritic. *JCS* 2:1-10.

Singer, I.

- 1991 A Concise History of Amurru. Pp. 135-195 apud Vol. II of Izre'el, Sh., *Amurru Akkadian: A Linguistic Study*. Atlanta.

Sivan, D.

- 1978 *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian Texts of the 15th-13th Centuries [B. C. E] from Canaan and Syria*. Doctoral dissertation, Tel Aviv Univ. Tel Aviv (Hebrew).
- 1984 *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian Texts of the 15th-13th C.B.C. from Canaan and Syria*. AOAT 214. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- 1988 On the Appending of Case Ending to Ugaritic Construct Forms. *Beer-Sheva* 3:113-120 (Hebrew).

Sivan, D. and Cochavi-Rainey, Z.

- 1992 *West-Semitic Vocabulary in Egyptian Script of the 14th to the 10th Centuries BCE*. Vol. VI of *Beer-Sheva, Studies by the Department of Bible and Ancient Near East*. Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. Beer-Sheva.

Smith, S.

- 1932 Notes on the Gutian Period. *JRAS* 1932, 295-308 Pp 304/5.

Smith, S. and Gadd, C. J.

- 1925 A Cuneiform Vocabulary of Egyptian Words. *JEA* 11:230-239.

Soden, W. von.

- 1931-32 Der hymnisch-epische Dialekt des Akkadischen. *ZA* N.F. 6 (40):163-227; N.F. 7 (41):90-183.
- 1952a *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. An.Or. 33. Rome.
- 1952b Zu den Amarnabriefen aus Babylon und Assur. *Or.* n.s. 21:426-434.
- 1959-81 *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Wiesbaden.
- 1965 Das akkadische T-Perfekt in Haupt- und Nebensätzen und sumerischen Verbalformen mit den Präfixen *ba-*, *imma*, und *u-*. *AS* 16:103-110.
- 1967 Kleine Beiträge zum Ugaritischen und Hebräischen. Pp. 291-300 apud *Hebräische Wortforschung. Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner*. VTS 16.
- 1969 *Ergänzungsheft zum Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik*. An. Or. 47. Rome.
- 1973 Der akkadische Subordinativ-Subjunktiv. *ZA* 63: 56-58.
- 1979 Assyrianismen im Akkadischen von Ugarit und das Problem der Verwaltungssprache im Mitannireich. *UF* 11:745-751.
- 1981 Review of CAD 10 M1 + 2. *OLZ* 76:245-248.

Soden, W. von and Röllig, W.

- 1976 *Das akkadische Syllabar*. An. Or. 42. 3rd ed. Rome.

Soldt, W. H. van

- 1986 *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit: Dating and Grammar*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Leiden.

- 1991 *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit, Dating and Grammar*. AOAT 40, Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Spalinger, A.
- 1981 Considerations on the Hittite Treaty between Egypt and Hatti. *SAK* 9:299-358.
- Spiegelberg, W.
- 1916 Der Rabiš Maia der El-Amarna-Tafeln in einer ägyptischen Inschrift. *ZA* 30:299-300.
- Speiser, E. A.
- 1947 A Note on the Derivation of *šumma*. *JCS* 1:321-328.
- 1955a The Durative Hithpa^cel: A *tan*-Form. *JAOS* 75: 118-121.
- 1955b Akkadian Documents from Ras Shamra. *JAOS* 75:157-161.
- Stamm, J. J.
- 1939 *Die akkadische Namengebung*. MVÄG 44. Leipzig. Reprinted Darmstadt 1968.
- Stiebing, W. H.
- 1983 The Amarna Period. Pp. 1-14 apud Freedman, D. N. and Graf, D. F., eds. *Palestine in Transition: The Emergence of Ancient Israel*. The Social World of Biblical Antiquity Series, 2. Sheffield.
- Stol, M.
- 1975 Review of Rainey, 1970. *Bi. Or.* 32:72.
- Sturm, J.
- 1933 Wer ist Piphururiaš? *RHA* 2, Fasc. 13:161-176.
- 1933 Zur Datierung der El-Amarna-Briefe. *Klio* 26:1-28.

- 1934 Zur Vokalverflüchtung in der ägyptischen Sprache des Neuen Reiches. *WZKM* 41:43-68, 161-179.
- Tallqvist, K. L.
- 1914 *Assyrian Personal Names*. ASSF 43/I. Helsingfors.
- Thureau-Dangin, F.
- 1922a Nouvelles lettres d'el-Amarna. *RA* 19:91-108.
- 1922b Une lettre d'Aménophis (III ou IV). Pp. 377-382 apud *Recueil d'études égyptologiques dédiées à la mémoire de Jean-François Champolion*. Paris.
- 1926 *Le syllabaire accadien*. Paris.
- 1940-41 Bir-ia-wa-za. *RA* 37:171.
- Toy, C. H.
- 1899 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Proverbs*. The International Critical Commentary. New York.
- Ungnad, A.
- 1903 Zur Syntax der Gesetze Hammurabis. *Z A* 17:353-378.
- 1904 Zur Syntax der Gesetze Hammurabis. *ZA* 18:1-67.
- 1908 Zur Chronologie der Kassitendynastie. *OLZ* 11:cols. 11-12.
- 1909 *Altbabylonische Urkunden*. VS 7. Leipzig.
- 1914 *Babylonische Briefe aus der Zeit der Ḫammurapi-Dynastie*. VAB 6. Leipzig.
- 1916 Review of Knudtzon 1915. *OLZ* 19:180-188.
- Vincentelli, I.
- 1973 Alleanze o paragmi? *RSO* 46:143-148.

Virolleaud, Ch.

- 1931 Le déchiffrement des tablettes alphabétiques de Ras-Shamra. *Syria* 12:15-22.
- 1936 *La légende phénicienne de Danel*. Paris.
- 1942-45 Sur ^{sal}*Maiâti* (Lettres d'El-Amarna, n° 155). *RÉS*: 101-104.
- 1951 Les nouvelles tablettes de Ras Shamra (1948-1949). *Syria* 28:22-56.
- 1957 *Le palais royal d'Ugarit II, Textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques des archives est, ouest et centrales*. Vol. VII of Mission de Ras Shamra, ed. by C. F. A Schaeffer. Paris.

Walker, C. B. F.

- 1979 Another Fragment from el-Amarna (EA 380). *JCS* 31:249.

Waschow, H.

- 1936 *Babylonische Briefe aus der Kassitenzeit*. Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft, Band 10/ Heft 1. Leipzig.

Weber, O.

- 1915 Anmerkungen. Pp. 1009-1357 apud Knudtzon, J. A. *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*. VAB 2. Leipzig. Vol. 2.

Weidner, E. F.

- 1923 *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien*. Boghazköi-Studien 8 und 9. Leipzig.

Weinfeld, M.

- 1983 The Counsel of the "Elders" to Rehoboam and its Implications. *Maarav* 3/1:27-53.

Weippert, M.

- 1970 Die Nomadenquelle. Pp. 259-272 apud Kuschke, A. and Kutsch, E., eds. *Archäologie und Altes Testament, Festschrift für Kurt Galling*. Tübingen.
- 1974 lúAD.DA.A.NI in den Briefen des Abduheba von Jerusalem. *UF* 6:415-419.

Westenholz, A.

- 1978 Some Notes on the Orthography and Grammar of the Recently Published Texts from Mari. *Bi. Or.* 35:160a-169a.

Whiting, R. M.

- 1972 The Dual Personal Pronouns in Akkadian. *JNES* 31:331-337.
- 1987 *Old Babylonian Letters From Tell Asmar*. AS 22, Chicago.

Wilhelm, G.

- 1970 *Untersuchungen zum Hurro-Akkadischen von Nuzi*. AOAT 9 Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- 1973 Ein Brief der Amarna-Zeit aus Kāmid el-Lōz. *ZA* 63:69-75.
- 1982 Die Fortsetzungstafel eines Briefes aus Kāmid el-Lōz. Pp. 123-129 apud Hachmann, R., ed. *Bericht über die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in Kāmid el-Lōz in den Jahren 1971 bis 1974*. Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 32.24

Williams, R. J.

- 1970 The Passive *Qal* Theme in Hebrew. Pp. 43-50 apud Wevers, J. W. and Redford, D. B., eds. *Essays on the Ancient Semitic World*. Toronto.
- 1972 Energetic Verbal Forms in Hebrew. Pp. 75-85 in: Wevers, J. W. and Redford, D. B., eds. *Studies on the Ancient Palestinian World*. Toronto.

Winckler, H.

- 1889 Verzeichniss der aus dem Funde von el-Amarna herrührenden Thontafeln. *ZÄS* 27:42-64.
- 1889-90 *Der Thontafelfund von El Amarna*. Mittheilungen aus den orientalischen Sammlungen der königlichen Museen zu Berlin, I-III. Berlin.
- 1895 *Geschichte Israels in Einzeldarstellungen*. Leipzig.
- 1896a *Die Thontafeln von Tell-el-Amarna*. KB 5. Berlin.
- 1896b *The Tell-el-Amarna Letters*. New York.

Wiseman, D. J.

- 1953 *The Alalakh Tablets*. London

Wright, W.

- 1896 *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. Third edition. Vol. I Cambridge.
- 1898 *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. Third edition. Vol. I Cambridge.

Ylvisaker, S. C.

- 1912 *Zur babylonischen und assyrischen Grammatik*. LSS V/6. Leipzig. Reprinted 1968.

Young, G. D.

1952-53 The Present Status of Ugaritic Studies. *JKF* 2: 225-245.

Youngblood, R. F.

1961 *The Amarna Correspondence of Rib-Haddi, Prince of Byblos (EA 68-96)*. Doctoral Dissertation, Dropsie College. Philadelphia.

1962 Amorite Influence in a Canaanite Amarna Letter (EA 96). *BASOR* 168:24-27.

Yoyotte, J.

1954 Trois généraux de la XIX^e dynastie (Apropo de l'Égyptien *Suta*, KUB III, 57). *Or.* n.s. 23:223-231.

Zewi, T.

1987 *-n(n)* Endings of Verbal Formations in Arabic, Biblical Hebrew, the Accadian Language of El-Amarna Tablets and Ugaritic. M. A. thesis, Tel Aviv University. Tel Aviv (Hebrew).

Zimmern, H.

1890a Das Verhältnis des assyrischen Permansivs zum semititischen Perfekt und zum ägyptischen *Pseudopartizip* untersucht unter Benutzung der El-Amarna-Texte. *ZA* 5:1-22.

1890b Briefe aus dem Funde in El-Amarna in Transscription und Übersetzung. *ZA* 5:137-165.

1891a Kanaanäische Glossen. *ZA* 6:151-158.

1891b Die Keilschriftbriefe aus Jerusalem. *ZA* 6:245-263.

1891c Palästina um das Jahr 1400 v. Chr. nach neuen Quellen. *ZDPV* 13:133-147.

Zorn, J.

- 1991 *LÚ.PA-MA-ḪA-A* in EA 162:74 and the Role of the *MHR* in Egypt and Ugarit. *JNES* 50:129-138.

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

The following index includes all text references in the three volumes of *CAT*. In this manner, it serves as a complete cross reference tool for all passages cited in the entire work. Although there are some cross references between sections and chapters within each volume, there are no cross references within the respective volumes to either of the other volumes. The main entries give the text number and the lines followed by the volume and page number(s). The Amarna and closely related references are given first (EA, KL, TT), followed by other Akkadian and Hittite sources, then Ugaritic, other West Semitic, biblical and finally Egyptian. For explanation of the sigla, cf. the ABBREVIATIONS on pp. 1-6.

EA	
1—I 80, 185.	21—III 144.
1:passim—III 209.	24—II 37; III 144.
2—I 12.	25—I 17, 80.
9—III 43.	26—III 175.
10—I 17; III 25, 27, 152.	28—II 274; III 167.
11—III 175.	30—III 38.
12—III 114.	31—III 175.
15-16—II 323.	34—III 2.
16—I 17, 80.	35—I 17.
17—I 17(2x), 40, 80; II 21.	36—I 17, 80.
20—III 43, 201.	37—III 175.
	41—I 17, 80; II 37.

- 46—III 38.
 49?—III 25, 45.
 51—III 175.
 54—III 114.
 56—III 38.
 58—I 17.
 60—II 37.
 63—I 85.
 65—III 45.
 66—III 25, 175.
 68—I 21, 40; II 21; III 25,
 45.
 69—III 25, 43, 45.
 69-70—I 83, 185.
 76—I 40, 43; II 21, 24; III
 25, 45.
 77—III 175.
 78—III 175.
 79—III 201.
 81—III 201.
 85—III 222, 249.
 85-86—I 83, 185.
 88—III 175.
 90—II 37.
 91—III 38.
 92—III 2.
 2:6—III 72.
- 11—I 43; II, 24.
 3:2—I 12.
 8—III 180.
 11—I 78.
 34—I 75.
 4:10—I 23.
 13-15—III 207.
 15—I 39; II 20, 141.
 32—I 23.
 34—I 80.
 5:4—I 12.
 23-24—II 201.
 7:20—I 11.
 22—I 78.
 26—I 78.
 28-29—III 185.
 33—I 23.
 37-38—II 296.
 51—I 11.
 53—I 23.
 63—II 296.
 71—II 296.
 75—I 25.
 76—I 168; III 2.
 8:16—I 13.
 21—I 75.
 29—I 89.

- 33—II 334.
 36—I 19, 39; II 20.
 9:16—I 171.
 20-22—II 129.
 21—II 219; III 198.
 22—II 120, 219; III 198.
 35—I 13, 89.
 36-39—II 409.
 10:1—I 12.
 19—II 296.
 37—I 41; II 22.
 44—III 22.
 44?—III 201.
 47—I 80.
 11:obv. 17—I 89.
 22—II 296.
 32'—I 12.
 12:1—I 14.
 17—I 27.
 25—III 20.
 29—III 33.
 36—II 231; III 70.
 41—III 159.
 13:45—II 77.
 14—I 3.
 15—I 3, 58.
 16:10—I 15.
 14—I 15, 62.
 15—I 137.
 16—I 78.
 32—III 143.
 38—I 30.
 40—I 30.
 46-49—III 16.
 50—III 202.
 17—I 73.
 17:2—I 12.
 10—I 8.
 11—III 13.
 15—II 196.
 16—III 144.
 25—III 144.
 30—III 144.
 33—III 55.
 48—I 40; II 20.
 19:3—I 12.
 3-4—III 176.
 11—II 206.
 15—III 130.
 16-17—II 201.
 29—III 130.
 32—I 85.
 36—I 78; II 136.
 37—I 78.

- 38—II 136.
 45—II 19.
 51-52—III 103.
 57—II 19.
 69—I 12.
 70—I 20(2x), 95.
 74—III 130.
 79—III 130.
 20—II 374.
 20:9—I 12; II 371.
 10—I 41; II 22.
 20—III 160.
 24—I 19.
 25—II 19.
 28—II 19.
 34—III 55.
 47—I 40; II 20.
 68-69—I 89.
 75—III 130.
 78—III 130.
 79—II 219; III 198.
 21:14—I 78.
 15—I 80.
 17—III 160.
 23—III 30.
 22:I, 9—II 185.
 II, 70—III 62.
 III, 3—III 62.
 IV, 11—III, 62.
 23:4-5—II 199.
 21—I 40; II 20.
 22—I 12.
 23—I 12.
 26-27—I 54.
 30—II 219; III 198.
 24—I 15.
 25:IV, 48—III 62.
 26—I 2.
 26:7—I 56.
 14—I 56.
 15—I 56.
 19—I 56.
 42—I 62.
 45—I 62.
 49—I 56.
 49-53—III 103.
 27:2—II 136.
 4—II 136.
 12—III 25.
 17—I 75.
 18—I 75.
 20—III 21.
 21—I 43; II 24.
 22—I 13.

- 23—I 13.
 24—I 137.
 26—I 137.
 27—I 12, 137.
 28—II 318.
 30—I 137.
 31—I 137.
 32—I 10.
 33—II 136.
 34—I 10.
 36—I 19.
 41—I 13.
 57—I 12.
 89—I 15.
 93—I 15.
 94—I 70.
 108—III 25.
 28—I 2.
 28:4-5—III 176.
 12—I 15.
 27—I 20.
 44—I 91.
 45—I 91; III 21.
 29:13—I 39; II 20.
 17—I 43; II 23.
 23—I 43; II 24, 176.
 28—I 43; II 24.
 46—II 92.
 47—I 39; II 20.
 50—III 21.
 66—III 72.
 69—I 40; II 20.
 76—III 25.
 126—II 135.
 140—III 21.
 141—III 21, 202.
 144—III 21.
 147—I 43; II 23.
 150—I 39; II 19.
 152—I 43; II 23.
 153—I 39; II 20.
 154—II 176.
 30—III 152.
 30:3-6—III 152.
 31—I 4.
 32—I 4.
 32:17-20—II 203.
 33:9-11—I 81.
 10-11—III 26.
 15—I 190.
 22—III 147.
 23-26—II 159.
 26—III 147.
 27—I 169; III 3.

- 31—I 169; III 3.
 34:3—II 267, 283.
 4—I 21.
 4-7—III 180.
 7—I 56; III 171.
 8—II 39, 102.
 8-10—III 237.
 9—I 23; II 40; III 138.
 9-10—II 160, 204; III 216.
 11—II 42; III 180.
 11-12—III 212.
 12—II 39(2x).
 12-13—I 117; III 222.
 13—III 22.
 13-15—III 72.
 14-17—II 178.
 16-17—III 55.
 16-18—I 62; III 164.
 18—I 190; III 181.
 18-19—I 161.
 20—I 183.
 22—I 184.
 22-23—I 184.
 25—I 186.
 26—I 160; III 201.
 29—III 201.
 30-31—II 178.
 33—III 42.
 35—II 137.
 38—III 147.
 42-43—I 82.
 46-48—II 159, 163.
 47—I 23; III 138.
 48—II 40.
 48-49—I 59, 100; III 216.
 48-52—III 164.
 49—II 39.
 50-53—I 81.
 51—I 13.
 51-53—III 75.
 52—II 40, 311; III 13.
 52-53—II 197.
 35:3, et passim—III 25.
 8-9—III 152.
 10—I 189; III 117.
 12—II 120; III 91, 222(2x).
 13-14—III 94.
 15—II 120; III 222.
 17—II 39, 137.
 20—II 182.
 22—II 39.
 23—II 39.
 25—II 273.
 26—II 273.

- 30—III 181.
 34—I 43; II 24; III 55.
 35—III 91, 222.
 37—III 72; III 94.
 41—II 137.
 45—II 157.
 49-50—II 120.
 50—I 89; II 39; III 209.
 36:15[?]-I 15.
 23—I 65.
 37:6—I 146.
 13-15—II 187.
 17—I 15.
 19—I 72.
 19-20—III 222.
 38:2—III 178.
 7—I 129.
 7-8—I 129.
 8—II 39.
 8-9—III 215, 278.
 9—II 41; III 212.
 11—I 169; III 3, 232.
 13—II 39.
 15—III 91, 240.
 15-16—III 213.
 17—II 266.
 19—I 10.
 22—II 267.
 23—III 117.
 23-24—III 220.
 24—II 39.
 26—I 23.
 27-29—III 123.
 29-30—III 222.
 30—I 11; II 39.
 39:5—III 25.
 11—III 148.
 12—II 42.
 15—III 148.
 18—I 11, 30; III 209.
 18-20—III 222.
 19—I 40; II 20, 35, 59.
 40:12—III 117.
 15—II 182.
 19-28—III 148.
 41:22—II 219; III 198.
 42:16—III 25.
 19—III 22.
 21—I 23.
 43—I 3.
 43:14—III 143.
 45:13—I 95.
 15—I 23.
 23—I 23.

- 51:6—I 78..
 13'—I 21.
 r. 3—I 178
 r. 5—I 151, 178.
 r. 13—I 40; II 21.
 52:5—I 151.
 53:59—III 78.
 69—II 157.
 55:12—I 34.
 13—II 19.
 23—III 22.
 65—III 22.
 56:36—I 21.
 58:4—II 267.
 36-38—III 104.
 59:5—I 178.
 11-12—III 80.
 16—I 43; II 23.
 17—I 43; II 24.
 18—I 178.
 20—II 135.
 29—III 13.
 30—III 13.
 35—I 43; II 23.
 37-38—III 13.
 42—III 201.
 60—II 33.
- 60:5—I 193.
 6-7—I 48; III 172, 255.
 7—I 35.
 10-13—II 91.
 11—II 268.
 12—I 10.
 12-13—I 175; II 403.
 13-17—I 200.
 13-18—II 145.
 15—II 45.
 19-25—II 71.
 21—I 78; II 36, 59.
 21-23—III 184, 209, 221.
 22—II 41.
 23—I 17, 19.
 25—I 25.
 30—II 249; III 197.
 30-32—I 73; III 57, 196.
 61—I 3.
 62—II 33.
 62:9—I 19; III 43.
 9-10—I 126.
 10—I 79.
 12—I 79(2x), 126; III 43.
 13—II 128.
 16—II 283.
 16-18—III 186.

- 16-20—III 218.
 18—II 283.
 18-20—I 127, 135.
 21-24—II 128.
 23—I 79.
 24—I 23, 79.
 27—I 21, 23.
 27-29—I 70.
 28—I 23.
 29-32—II 189; III 58.
 30—II 26, 188; II 269, 272.
 31—II 42.
 33—I 11.
 33-34—I 135.
 38—II 176; III 212.
 39-40—I 154; III 50.
 39-45—II 114.
 41—I 23; II 39.
 43-44—III 50.
 44—I 23; II 39.
 50—I 95.
 51—I 79.
 63—II 31.
 63:3—I 163.
 6—I 194; II 285, 349.
 7—II 301.
 8—I 54.
 9—I 149.
 11—II 214.
 13—I 32; II 289.
 15—I 22.
 64—II 31.
 64:2—I 12.
 3—III 175.
 4-7—I 193
 5—II 350.
 6—I 94.
 7—I 20; III 232.
 8—I 22, 163; II 36, 55, 71.
 8-9—III 94.
 9—I 32.
 10-13—II 159, 167.
 11—III 50.
 12-13—II 402.
 14-15—I 163.
 17-18—I 149.
 20-21—I 186.
 23—II 286, 296.
 65:4-5—I 193.
 5—I 20; II 349; III 232.
 7—II 288.
 7-8—I 163.
 8—I 149.
 9—I 28.

- 10—II 41, 57.
 11-13—III 49.
 67:1—I 12.
 10—II 83.
 12—I 23.
 14—I 99.
 15—I 30, 153, 199.
 16—I 9, 63.
 17—I 35.
 23—III 34.
 68-96—II 8.
 68:1-2—II 103; III 175.
 2—II 58.
 3—I 28.
 4-6—II 246.
 5—I 12, 22; II 38, 57.
 8—I 193.
 9—II 213, 324; III 197.
 9-10—III 78.
 10—II 353.
 10-11—I 126.
 12—I 26, 31, 34.
 14—III 12.
 14-15—III 241.
 14-16—II 248; III 224.
 16-18—I 197.
 17—I 23.
 19—I 26.
 19-21—I 128; II 318; III 33.
 19-28—II 139.
 22-24—II 318.
 22-26—II 327.
 25-26—III 30.
 27—I 28.
 27-28—III 272.
 28—II 47, 137.
 29—I 31.
 30-31—III 241.
 30-32—II 248; III 224.
 31—III 12.
 32—I 27.
 69:5—II 40.
 5-8—II 246.
 9—II 289.
 10—II 99.
 11—III 42.
 12-14—III 33, 132.
 14—I 139.
 17—I 24, 37; II 375.
 17-18—II 395.
 23—I 32, 171; III 201, 205.
 24-26—II 410.
 25—III 44.
 26—I 25.

- 29—I 25; III 38.
 38—II 266.
 70—I 2.
 70:3-5—II 246.
 11—II 267.
 12—II 287.
 16—II 44.
 17—II 273.
 20—II 391.
 23—I 14, 38; II 19, 371,
 411.
 24—II 53.
 24-26—II 145; III 133.
 25-30—II 411.
 26—II 38, 370.
 28—I 14.
 71:4-6—I 148; II 246(2x).
 5—I 75; II 57.
 5-6—III 51.
 7—I 57; III 171.
 9—II 102.
 9-10—I 75; III 32.
 10—I 23, 110.
 10-11—III 138.
 10-12—III 216, 276.
 10-16—II 165, 232, 239; III
 107.
 11—II 287.
 12—II 40, 58.
 13—I 17.
 13-14—I 132; II 159.
 15—II 54.
 16—I 19.
 16-19—II 230; III 101.
 16-22—I 105; III 257, 279.
 18—I 35; II 36, 54.
 19—I 65.
 20—I 77.
 20-22—III 33.
 21—III 107.
 21-23—II 159.
 22-23—III 107.
 22-27—II 260, 272.
 24—I 190.
 25—II 53, 321.
 26—I 38; II 19; III 51.
 26-27—II 371, 411.
 28-29—I 201; III 224.
 28-30—II 153.
 28-31—II 257.
 30—II 36.
 33—I 109.
 34—II 231; III 72.
 72:2—I 33.

- 3—I 188.
 73—II 105.
 73-76—III 154.
 73:1-13—II 392.
 2—III 175.
 4—II 38, 57, 215.
 4-5—I 75.
 4-6—I 174; II 246; III 51.
 6'—I 23.
 6—I 110.
 6-8—III 216, 276.
 6-11—II 170, 210, 239.
 7—II 39, 58.
 9—II 40, 52.
 10'—I 13.
 10—II 40, 56.
 10-11—III 30.
 11-14—II 343, 360, 370,
 384; III 187, 238.
 12'—I 20.
 12—II 383.
 12-13—I 132; II 372; III
 236, 267.
 13—II 28, 52, 292.
 14-15—I 58; III 214.
 14-16—II 327; III 277.
 14-18—II 344.
 15'—I 28.
 15—II 40.
 16—II 45, 51; III 21.
 17—III 107, 119.
 17-18—III 155, 210.
 19—I 109.
 20—II 317.
 20-21—I 168; III 2, 133.
 20-22—II 370, 391.
 20-33—II 112.
 21—I 132.
 22—II 47.
 23—I 65.
 23-25—II 144, 392.
 24—I 155; II 45.
 25'—I 20.
 25—I 10, 24, 37, 95, 152; II
 375.
 26—II 36, 102.
 26-27—II 105, 201.
 27—II 271, 363.
 28'—I 22.
 28—II 334.
 29—II 45.
 29-30—I 154; III 175.
 29-31—III 141.
 29-33—II 125.

- 31—I 68.
 32'—I 22.
 32—II 334.
 33—I 12; II 268; III 235.
 33-34—I 129.
 33-35—III 50, 107.
 33-38—I 57, 62; III 258.
 34'—I 9, 162.
 34—I 95.
 35-36—III 20.
 35-37—III 230.
 36—I 181; III 99.
 36-37—I 180.
 38—II 285.
 39'—I 72.
 39—I 9, 175.
 39-41—II 350; III 75.
 39-42—II 327; III 255.
 40—II 320.
 42'—I 48.
 43—II 268.
 45'—I 20.
 74:1—I 15; II 103.
 1-2—II 273; III 175.
 2—I 27.
 2-4—II 246.
 3—II 38, 57, 215.
 5—I 163.
 5-10—II 324.
 6—I 126.
 8—III 107.
 8-10—III 59, 154.
 9—II 87(2x).
 10—I 151; II 213.
 10-12—III 81, 208.
 11—I 21.
 12—II 198.
 13—II 59; III 12, 214, 243,
 277.
 13-14—III 95.
 14-15—III 200.
 14-17—II 216.
 15-16—I 86.
 15-17—II 382.
 16—I 23; II 409.
 16-17—III 24.
 17—I 9, 86; III 33.
 17-18—I 101; III 61, 207.
 18—I 22; III 209.
 18-19—III 24(2x).
 19—I 24, 37, 162; II 18,
 375.
 19-21—II 333.
 21—I 22; II 320, 334.

- 22—II 339; III 18, 39.
23—I 32; II 99.
23-24—III 154.
25—II 271.
25-27—II 363; III 105.
25-29—II 126.
26—I 68; II 290, 320.
27—I 22; II 290, 334.
28—II 320.
29-30—III 154.
29-38—II 125, 362(2x).
30—II 101.
30-31—I 135; II 188.
31—II 270, 271; III 31, 272.
31-32—II 170; III 273.
31-33—III 95.
32—II 47, 56; III 30.
32-33—I 81; III 58, 205.
32-38—II 253.
33—I 17, 21, 171.
34—I 23; II 47; III 107.
34-35—I 155; III 44.
35—I 22, 27(2x); II 38.
36-37—III 229.
37—I 27.
38-39—III 131.
39—II 52.
39-40—III 144.
39-41—II 210, 230, 240; III 187.
40—I 202.
41—I 68(2x), 109; III 275.
42—I 20, 89; III 42.
43—III 147.
43-45—II 188; III 95.
44—I 17(2x).
45-48—III 143.
46—III 43, 128.
46-49—II 305.
47—III 231.
48—I 23; II 59; III 12.
48-49—III 243.
49—II 102, 107.
49-50—II 106.
50—I 20, 130, 148, 157; II 39, 79; III 211.
51—II 272; III 39.
51-53—I 64; II 93.
52—I 9; II 35.
52-53—III 30.
53-55—II 139.
53-57—II 217.
53-58—II 258.

- 54—I 9, 24; II 35, 57, 68,
 382.
 55—II 137.
 55-57—III 11.
 57—II 47.
 59—II 184.
 59-61—II 159, 166.
 59-62—I 53; III 274.
 61—II 53, 321.
 62—III 44.
 62-63—II 301; III 39.
 63—II 41, 52.
 63-64—I 52, 109, 195; II
 236.
 64—I 72; II 42.
 64-65—II 146; III 133, 141.
 75:1-2—II 103, 175.
 6-8—III 129.
 7—I 164.
 7-9—II 352.
 9—III 35.
 10—I 31.
 11-14—II 409.
 14—III 33.
 15-16—III 61.
 15-17—III 207.
 17-18—II 91, 107.
 18—III 30.
 19—II 52.
 26—I 29; II 28.
 27-28—III 206.
 27-29—I 117; II 200.
 28—II 58.
 29—III 200.
 29-31—II 216.
 32-34—III 154.
 33—II 52.
 35—I 164; II 212.
 38—I 28.
 43—II 268.
 76:1-2—II 103; III 175.
 2—I 27.
 4—I 22; II 38, 57.
 7—II 324.
 7-9—III 229.
 9-10—II 339.
 9-11—II 372, 393.
 10—II 144.
 11-14—III 101.
 11-15—I 63.
 11-16—I 105; III 257(2x),
 279.
 12—I 35.
 12-13—I 170; II 144.

- 12-16—II 372, 393.
 14—I 28.
 14-16—III 77, 82.
 15—I 18, 28.
 15-16—II 144, 198.
 17—II 311.
 17-19—III 30.
 19-20—I 64.
 20—I 95.
 21—II 231; III 72.
 24—I 190; II 273.
 26—I 188.
 31—II 52.
 31-32—I 132, 135.
 33-36—III 155.
 33-37—III 107.
 35—I 19.
 38—I 133.
 38-39—I 133; III 147.
 38-41—II 147, 259.
 38-42—II 126.
 38-43—II 250, 278.
 39—II 38.
 40-41—III 44.
 42—I 22, 334.
 43-46—III 241.
 44-46—I 57; II 248; III 224.
 45—I 20; II 59; III 35.
 77:1—I 12.
 3-6—II 246.
 5-6—III 51.
 6-8—II 204.
 6-11—III 84.
 7—II 39, 60.
 7-8—I 18.
 8—II 182.
 8-10—III 184.
 8-11—II 318.
 9—III 185.
 10—I 18, 22.
 11—I 80.
 12—II 40; III 209, 224.
 13—I 22.
 14—III 33.
 18—I 23, 110.
 18-25—II 239.
 21—II 39; III 214.
 21-23—I 75; II 159.
 21-25—II 165.
 22—II 235.
 24—I 30.
 25—I 155.
 26-27—I 132; III 217.

- 26-29—I 134; II 210, 241,
 359; III 188.
 27—I 31; II 52.
 28—II 334(2x).
 36—I 30, 143.
 36-37—II 8, 263, 264; III
 107, 224.
 37—II 43, 235; III 209.
 39—II 55.
 78:1-2—II 103.
 2—I 27.
 7—I 164; II 324.
 10—III 231.
 12'—I 20.
 12—II 44.
 13-16—II 305; III 143.
 14—III 43.
 16—III 43.
 17—I 20, 164; II 36, 60.
 19—I 14; II 320.
 39—I 150.
 79:1-2—II 103; III 175.
 7-12—II 413.
 10-11—I 142.
 11-12—III 53.
 12—I 36; III 14.
 13—I 20,164; II 245.
 15-16—III 43.
 16-17—II 411.
 18-20—III 189.
 18-26—II 337(2x).
 19—II 334.
 20—II 268.
 21—I 20.
 21-25—II 413.
 22—I 36; III 14, 53.
 23-25—II 144, 392.
 24—I 24, 37; II 337, 375,
 390.
 27-29—II 144.
 28—II 373, 392.
 29—I 20, 89, 174; III 35.
 30—I 203.
 31—II 371, 411.
 32-34—I 118.
 32-33—II 403.
 34—I 89; III 17.
 35-38—II 305; III 143.
 37—III 231.
 38-41—III 218.
 38-44—II 337(2x).
 39—II 55.
 39-41—II 395.

- 39-44—II 330, 356, 359; III
 189.
 40—II 373.
 41—I 20.
 45—I 63.
 45-46—III 101.
 81:1—II 103; III 175.
 6—I 164; II 324.
 7-8—I 201.
 8—II 99.
 9-11—II 339.
 10—II 144.
 10-11—II 372.
 11'—I 190.
 11-14—II 336.
 12—II 268, 271(2x), 334,
 363.
 16—II 286.
 18—I 14; III 32, 53.
 19-22—II 331.
 20—II 285(2x).
 21—II 42, 55.
 21-22—I 166; II 369, 394.
 22—II 102, 107.
 23—I 39; II 20.
 24—I 194; II 119.
 31—II 56; III 225.
 31-32—II 169.
 32—II 36.
 33—I 110.
 34-36—I 69; II 305; III 143.
 36—III 43.
 37—III 61.
 37-38—III 207.
 38—I 24, 37; II 375; III 24.
 38-41—II 409.
 41—II 334.
 42—I 70.
 44—III 158.
 45-46—I 132.
 45-47—II 341.
 46—II 86.
 47—II 99.
 48-49—I 153.
 48-50—II 351; III 125.
 49—II 320.
 50—I 150.
 50-51—I 109, 195; II 236.
 82—I 2; II 90.
 82:3—III 28.
 5-6—I 60; II 90(2x).
 5-8—II 238, 330.
 6—II 55.
 6-8—II 395; III 58.

- 7—II 373.
 8-9—I 202.
 8-12—II 352.
 10—II 89.
 10-12—I 117, 154; III 106.
 11—II 61.
 12-18—I 61.
 13-14—II 90(2x).
 14—II 39.
 15—II 205, 268, 269.
 15-16—III 38.
 16-17—II 302; III 106, 271.
 16-20—II 411.
 17—II 287.
 17-20—III 271.
 19—II 371.
 21—I 60.
 21-22—II 379.
 21-25—II 99, 257.
 22—I 38; II 12, 19, 42, 55,
 310, 330, 396.
 23—II 36.
 24-25—I 104, 106; III 58,
 274.
 25—II 90.
 26—II 39.
 27—II 39, 90(2x).
 27-30—II 193.
 28—II 137, 268.
 31-32—I 198.
 32—II 122.
 35—II 42, 96.
 35-36—III 83, 208.
 37-38—II 322.
 37-39—II 119.
 38—II 118.
 39—I 194.
 39-41—I 106, 192.
 41-45—III 105.
 41-46—II 88, 362.
 43—II 42.
 44—II 285.
 46—II 13.
 47-49—II 142.
 47-50—III 133.
 47-51—II 307, 377.
 49-50—I 132.
 50—I 41; II 22, 37.
 52—I 41; II 22, 266, 270;
 III 148.
 83:1-2—II 103; III 175.
 6—I 194.
 7—I 110.
 7-8—II 238; III 216, 276.

- 7-9—II 326(2x).
 8—I 23, 53.
 9—II 28, 42, 328.
 10—II 178.
 10-12—I 192.
 13-14—III 213.
 14—I 17, 54; II 268; III 55.
 15—II 38, 78.
 15-16—III 106.
 16—II 36.
 16-17—III 215.
 16-20—II 78; III 65.
 17—I 13, 30.
 18—I 27; III 139.
 18-19—III 214.
 19—I 24; II 36; III.65.
 20—II 40, 55, 373, 395; III
 212.
 21—I 79.
 21-23—II 107; III 212.
 23—I 171; II 45, 182, 269.
 23-25—II 258.
 23-27—II 364.
 24—II 41.
 27—I 9; II 285; III 181.
 27-29—II 293, 294; III 117.
 27-32—II 357; III 190.
 28—III 144.
 28-29—I 128.
 30—I 9; II 39.
 30-31—III 57.
 31—I 24; II 57, 68.
 32-33—I 33.
 34—II 35, 167, 245.
 34-35—II 159.
 34-37—I 65.
 35—III 30.
 35-36—III 133.
 36-37—I 58.
 37-39—III 167.
 38—I 25; III 159, 243.
 39—I 12; III 235.
 40-41—III 57.
 40-42—I 115; II 335.
 41-42—III 28.
 43—II 56.
 43-44—I 134; II 170; III
 225.
 44—II 60; III 30.
 45—II 40, 58; III 139, 218.
 45(?)—III 188.
 45-51—II 88, 360, 362.
 46—II 42.
 47—III 181.

- 47-48—III 188.
 47-51—II 240.
 49—II 42.
 49-51—II 345.
 52-55—III 165.
 53—III 159, 243.
 54—I 18, 80.
 77-78—I 201.
 81—II 72.
 84—II 58.
 84:1—I 28.
 2—I 12.
 5—I 193, 194.
 6—I 15.
 6-8—I 172; III 243.
 6-10—III 82.
 7—I 25, 37; II 376; III 50.
 8—I 35.
 9—I 23.
 11—III 118, 119.
 12—I 23.
 12-13—I 128.
 16-17—I 63, 107; III 257.
 17—I 35.
 18—III 181.
 19—III 50.
 24-25—II 354.
 26—I 18; II 182, 213; III 199.
 27—II 288.
 28—II 212.
 30—II 43, 148.
 30-35—I 121.
 31—III 199.
 32—I 119; II 45, 54; III 98.
 34—I 10, 119.
 34-35—I 96, II 99; III 224.
 35—I 35.
 36—II 200; III 81, 243.
 37—III 243.
 37-38—I 128; III 18.
 38—II 320; III 172, 181.
 41—II 272.
 42—III 170, 181.
 43—I 30.
 85:5—I 186
 6—II 41, 102; III 2, 139.
 6-7—II 107, 238, 244; III 215.
 7—II 36.
 8—III 30.
 8-9—II 322.
 9-10—II 118.
 9-11—I 33.

- 10—I 161.
 10-11—II 403.
 10-12—II 237.
 11—I 68; II 41, 58.
 11-12—I 110.
 12-15—II 409.
 15—I 13; III 33.
 16—II 36, 60.
 16-19—II 139.
 17—II 167.
 17-18—II 159.
 18—I 33, 171; II 137; III
 43.
 19—II 35.
 19-21—II 414.
 19-22—I 188
 20—I 190.
 21—I 20.
 22—I 61; II 45, 57.
 23—II 58, 72; III 181.
 23-28—III 88.
 24—I 33, 171.
 26—III 233.
 27—I 33, 188.
 28—I 64, 110.
 29-30—III 158.
 30—III 243.
 30-31—III 163.
 31—III 37.
 32—I 198; II 245; III 50.
 33—II 212; III 50.
 33-39—II 139.
 34-35—I 33.
 35—I 171.
 36-37—I 101; II 233; III
 126.
 38—II 47, 137.
 39—II 138, 212; III 200.
 39-40—II 216.
 40—III 120.
 45-47—III 224.
 46—II 75.
 48—I 54; III 235.
 51—I 18; II 295.
 51-55—II 234.
 52—III 12.
 52-53—II 144, 391.
 53—III 12.
 53-54—II 375, 403; III 205.
 54—II 288.
 55—II 41, 102.
 56—I 20.
 59-60—II 326.
 61—I 41; II 22.

- 61-62—II 88.
 62—II 52.
 63-64—I 107; III 257.
 63-65—III 101.
 63-66—III 246.
 64—I 35.
 65—II 78.
 65-66—III 50.
 66-69—II 147, 261; III 105,
 191, 260.
 67—I 54.
 68—I 14; II 42.
 69-73—I 98; II 413.
 70—II 369; III 35.
 71—I 18, 20.
 73—I 23, 115.
 73-74—I 118.
 74—III 17, 204..
 75—II 36.
 76—II 35.
 77-78—I 201.
 77-79—II 153, 257; III 224.
 79-80—III 272.
 79-82—II 259.
 79-83—II 146.
 80—I 133.
 81—I 14.
 82-84—III 260.
 84—II 47, 78; III 211.
 86—II 138, 212, 216; III
 200.
 86:3-5—I 148; II 246.
 4—II 57.
 6—II 266.
 8-9—I 60.
 10—II 89.
 10-12—I 120.
 11—II 78.
 14—II 38.
 15—II 39, 58.
 16—I 33(2x); II 157, 311.
 17—I 22; II 39, 61.
 31-37—II 40.
 41-44—III 276.
 46-47—III 273.
 90—I 17.
 87:6—II 57.
 7—I 169; III 3.
 9-10—III 38.
 9-13—III 107.
 9-14—II 217.
 12—II 18.
 15—II 60; III 74.
 15-19—II 225.

- 17—II 209.
 18—II 60; III 98.
 18-19—III 74.
 18-24—II 303.
 19—II 38.
 21-22—III 269.
 25—II 266.
 29—II 209.
 30—II 287.
 30-31—II 356.
 31—II 56.
 88:1—II 103; III 175.
 3—I 193.
 4-5—II 91.
 6—I 29.
 9—I 15.
 9-11—I 105; III 257, 279.
 10—III 98, 101.
 10-11—III 271.
 13—II 101.
 13-19—II 340.
 14-17—III 60.
 17—II 86.
 19-21—I 113.
 20—II 42, 47, 55.
 20-21—I 166; II 369, 394.
 21—III 181.
 21-22—I 166; II 393; III 269.
 22—II 140.
 23—II 212.
 24—II 134, 150; III 199.
 25—II 58.
 29—II 52.
 29-30—III 116.
 29-34—II 124.
 29-39—II 360.
 32-34—I 200.
 34-35—I 164.
 34-39—II 183.
 39—II 364.
 40—II 133, 150, 213; III 199.
 41—II 58.
 43—III 206.
 44-45—III 128.
 47—III 35, 62.
 51—II 19, 52, 209.
 89—II 174.
 89:1—I 15.
 1-2—II 103; III 175.
 7—II 102, 107.
 8—I 72.
 8-10—I 130, 148; III 211.

- 9-10—II 374, 389.
 10—II 45, 79.
 10-11—II 275; III 169.
 11—I 20.
 12—II 59.
 12-13—III 212.
 12-17—II 174.
 13—II 59.
 14—II 293, 295; III 213.
 15—II 59, 134.
 15-17—III 187.
 16—II 46, 57.
 16-17—II 295, 405.
 17—I 38; II 148, 285.
 17-18—III 247.
 17-19—III 268.
 19—II 320; III 51.
 20-21—III 161.
 21—I 89.
 22—I 80.
 23—III 53.
 32—I 29.
 32 ff—III 187.
 33-34—II 175.
 34—II 59, 134; III 117.
 35—II 135.
 36—II 35, 60, 67.
 36-37—III 211.
 37—I 130(2x), 148; II 79.
 38—I 48, 77; II 383; III 156.
 38-39—I 47; II 386.
 38-43—III 161.
 39-42—II 175.
 39-43—III 187.
 40—II 40, 58, 59, 135.
 40-41—I 129; III 206.
 41—II 175, 267.
 42-43—I 116; II 395; III 27, 211.
 43—I 20, 24, 37; II 375.
 43-44—I 120.
 44-45—II 175; III 183, 216.
 44-46—III 188.
 45—II 59, 134, 135.
 46—I 77.
 46-47—III 95.
 47—I 47.
 48-50—I 97; III 173.
 49—I 32; III 205.
 49-50—I 171, 173.
 52-53—I 120.
 53—III 43.
 54—II 167.

- 54-55—II 159.
 55—II 321.
 57—I 155.
 57-59—I 120.
 60—I 30.
 63—II 345.
 66-67—I 86.
 90:6—I 13.
 7-8—I 195.
 8—I 80, 195.
 10—III 181.
 10-11—I 60.
 11—II 267.
 11-12—I 127.
 11-13—III 224.
 12—II 36.
 13—I 20, 22; II 39, 61; III
 209.
 14—II 41.
 15-16—I 61.
 16—I 9, 72.
 16-17—I 130, 148.
 16-18—III 211.
 17—II 79.
 18—II 78.
 19-21—I 97.
 22-23—I 195; II 236.
 22-25—I 58.
 23-25—III 77.
 26—I 60.
 27-28—I 203.
 39—I 86; III 33.
 39-42—II 305; III 143.
 40—III 43.
 41—III 232.
 42—III 207.
 42-43—I 101.
 43—I 22.
 43-44—III 24.
 44—I 24(x2), 37; II 375.
 45—II 271.
 46—I 188.
 46(?)—I 190.
 47—I 61.
 49—III 209.
 50—II 40.
 50ff.—III 188.
 50-52—III 218.
 55—I 69.
 57—II 59, 248; III 224.
 60—I 133.
 63—II 118.
 91:3—II 287.
 4-5—III 106.

- 5—I 35.
 6—II 36, 77.
 7—I 60, 110; II 106.
 8—II 38, 77.
 10-11—I 102, 115, 117; III
 27, 206.
 12—I 77.
 13—II 144, 372, 390, 392.
 14—III 30.
 15—I 22, 44.
 16—I 161.
 17—II 39.
 17-19—I 190.
 18—I 161, 190.
 18-19—III 47.
 19—I 12.
 19-20—I 201.
 19-23—I 203; II 338.
 20-22—I 195.
 21—III 14, 149.
 22—I 79.
 22-23—II 144, 392.
 23—I 22; II 61, 373.
 23-24—I 201.
 23-25—III 30.
 25—III 30.
 25-26—I 195; II 236.
 26—II 42; III 14, 149.
 29-30—I 130, 148; II 79; III
 211.
 31—I 72.
 42—I 164.
 48—I 133.
 61—II 118.
 92—II 106.
 92:1-2—II 103; III 175.
 7—I 15, 35.
 10—I 91; II 374, 389; III
 213.
 10-11—I 131.
 11—I 23, 31, 45, 139; II
 335.
 13-15—III 212.
 15—I 17; II 42, 60; III 209.
 15-16—I 109; II 237.
 17—III 27.
 17-18—II 199.
 20—III 44.
 21—I 17, 162; II 60; III
 201.
 21-22—I 167; III 101, 204.
 21-23—I 121.
 22—I 162; II 289; III 201.

- 23—I 48; II 85, 340; III
 117, 158.
 23-24—III 60.
 24—II 269; III 119.
 25—III 27, 158.
 (26?)—III 158.
 29—I 87.
 29-30—I 109; III 275.
 30—I 15; II 41, 58; III 243.
 30-33—III 74.
 32—I 26.
 33—I 19.
 35—II 102.
 35-36—I 69; II 108.
 37—II 268, 271; III 158.
 39—I 41; II 22, 51; III 211.
 40—II 368.
 41—I 15, 63.
 41-42—I 107, 201; III 11.
 42—III 171.
 42-43—III 61.
 43—I 109; III 275.
 44—I 25, 66, 67.
 44-45—III 258.
 45—I 18; II 369.
 46—II 212.
 47—III 199.
 47-48—III 50.
 51—II 330, 356; III 209.
 51-52—III 189.
 51-53—III 218.
 57—I 155.
 93:4-5—I 53.
 4-6—II 308.
 4-9—II 365.
 5—II 286.
 6-7—I 61.
 7—II 285.
 8—II 60.
 9—I 54.
 10—I 12; III 235.
 11—I 61; II 35, 57.
 12—I 190; II 52.
 14-17—III 214.
 18—III 30, 181.
 18-23—III 181.
 19-21—I 61; III 187.
 20—II 396.
 22—II 28, 87.
 24—III 123, 207.
 25—I 95.
 25-28—I 169; II 359; III 4,
 188, 189.
 26—I 133.

- 26-27—I 62.
 27—III 12.
 27-28—III 131.
 94:1—II 78, 102.
 4—I 110; II 36, 60.
 6—III 201, 204.
 7—I 46.
 7-8—I 159.
 10—II 286.
 10-11—I 133; II 250.
 12—I 40; II 20, 55, 68.
 12-13—I 107, 166; II 376,
 397; III 51, 274.
 14(?)—I 46.
 14—II 45, 58.
 14-15—I 159.
 63—III 159.
 64-69—II 118.
 66—I 32; II 139.
 66-67—III 76.
 69—II 139.
 71—II 213.
 72—II 55, 68, 213.
 76—I 118.
 95:3-6—II 246(2x).
 5—I 75; II 57.
 5-6—III 51.
 7—II 39, 60; III 152.
 15—II 266.
 17-18—III 34.
 19—III 112.
 20—I 63.
 23—III 112.
 24—III 38.
 30—I 95.
 31—II 167.
 31-32—III 273.
 32-33—II 159.
 33—II 36.
 34—II 266.
 34-35—I 59.
 35—I 20; II 268.
 36-38—III 122.
 37—I 132.
 37-39—II 268.
 38—III 6.
 39—I 190.
 96:2—I 12.
 3—I 29.
 3-4—I 36; III 178.
 4-6—II 215.
 5-6—I 147; III 50.
 6—II 212.
 6-14—III 88.

- 7—II 39, 58; III 209.
 7-10—II 368, 398; III 211.
 12-13—I 171.
 12-15—III 30.
 12-17—III 45.
 13 (et passim)—III 25.
 14-17—I 111; III 278.
 15-17—III 220.
 19—III 213.
 19-21—I 121; III 209.
 19-22—II 141.
 21—I 88; II 140.
 21-22—III 120.
 22—I 90.
 22-25—II 277; III 188.
 23—I 21.
 25-26—III 245.
 25-27—III 143.
 26—II 39; III 232.
 27—I 146.
 28—II 268.
 30—II 285.
 30-31—III 27, 166.
 32—II 213.
 97:3—II 212, 215.
 4-6—III 93.
 4-8—II 82, 208.
- 6-8—III 212.
 7—II 40.
 9—II 40.
 9-12—II 150.
 98:3—I 23.
 3-4—III 246, 276.
 4-7—I 200.
 5—I 181.
 6—III 40.
 6-7—I 165.
 9—III 12.
 10—I 181.
 10-12—I 128.
 13—II 299.
 17-18—III 24.
 19-20—II 394; III 211.
 20—II 13.
 21-22—I 67, 109; II 237.
 22—II 267.
 22-24—I 95, 129.
 24—I 95, 96, 129.
 25—III 81.
 26—II 287.
 99:5—I 94.
 7-8—III 195, 199.
 8—II 287; III 237.
 8-9—I 143.

- 18—I 8.
24—I 145.
100:2—I 29.
3—I 79.
5—I 86.
6—II 47, 56.
7—I 86.
8-10—II 325.
9—II 47, 57.
11-12—II 159.
11-13—II 160, 205.
13—I 68.
14—II 270, 271; III 174.
14-15—III 237.
15-17—II 141.
15-19—I 87.
16—I 46.
17—II 45.
18—II 38.
18-19—II 142.
21—I 20.
21-22—I 188.
22—I 27.
23—II 53.
26—I 46.
29-30—III 28.
30—I 86; II 47, 57; III 120,
275.
31—I 86.
31-36—II 247.
33—II 35.
34-36—I 86, 140.
35—I 30.
36—II 51.
36-38—I 86, 173; III 47,
225.
37—II 38.
39—II 47.
39-41—II 411.
41—I 68.
101:1-2—I 105; III 208.
6-10—II 403.
11-13—I 104; III 208.
11-18—III 161.
14—III 159.
14-15—I 69.
17—II 320.
19—II 35, 58.
22—II 45.
25-26—I 104; III 17, 208.
26—I 95, 152.
30-31—III 208.
32—II 35.

- 32-34—III 107.
 32-35—II 252.
 34—II 45, 51, 52.
 36-37—I 61.
 102:5-8—II 215, 247.
 6—II 212.
 7—I 32, 139.
 8—I 15.
 9—II 55, 287, 310.
 9-10—I 166, II 369, 399.
 10—I 110; II 60, 338, 345.
 11-12—II 338.
 11-13—II 354.
 12—I 197.
 13—I 198.
 13-16—II 411.
 13-19—II 331.
 14—II 39, 102, 204.
 14-19—II 106, III 87.
 15—II 51, 267, 268.
 17-19—I 166, II 394.
 19—II 42.
 20—I 31.
 21—II 40.
 21-23—II 353.
 22—I 143.
 24—II 330.
 24-25—I 166; II 331, 394.
 25-26—I 197.
 26—I 16, 46.
 27—III 107.
 28—II 283.
 28-30—II 150.
 29—II 150, 268.
 29-31—I 166; II 397.
 30—I 38.
 30-31—III 113.
 31—II 42; III 6.
 31-32—I 159.
 32—I 46.
 32-33—II 399.
 36—II 172.
 37—II 287.
 38—II 60; III 44.
 103:5-6—I 164.
 7-8—II 354.
 8—I 32.
 10—I 70; III 12.
 10-11—I 202.
 11-13—II 339.
 13-15—III 76.
 13-19—II 88.
 14-15—II 321.
 16—II 42.

- 20—II 36, 102, 107.
 22—II 43.
 25-29—II 411; III 271.
 30-32—I 159.
 31—I 46; III 35.
 32-36—II 279.
 34-39—II 122; III 96.
 37-38—I 203.
 39-47—II 247.
 40—II 36, 61, 62.
 40-47—II 279.
 42—II 272.
 44-47—III 271.
 47—I 18.
 47-49—I 203; II 339.
 49—II 288.
 51-55—II 101.
 51-57—II 240.
 53—II 40.
 53-55—I 101.
 54—II 38.
 54-55—I 61.
 55-56—I 31, 134.
 55-57—II 355.
 56-57—I 201.
 57—II 47.
 104:5'—II 289.
- 6-9—II 325, 342.
 6-13—III 261.
 10—I 29.
 10-13—III 19, 262.
 12-13—I 202.
 14—I 39; II 20, 157.
 14-15—II 167.
 16—II 55, 68.
 17-21—I 107; III 257.
 17-24—III 101.
 17-36—II 233.
 19-24—II 232.
 22—II 54.
 24—II 22.
 24-26—III 125.
 25—II 54.
 26—III 107.
 27—II 12, 310, 311.
 31—III 139, 140.
 31-33—III 120.
 31-36—II 356.
 32—II 54.
 34—II 52.
 36-39—I 109, 166; II 237,
 330, 394; III 102.
 43—II 374.
 43-52—II 207, 330; III 79.

- 43-53—II 387.
 44—II 42, 86.
 46—I 95, 152; III 60.
 48—III 60.
 49—II 321.
 49-51—I 166; II 369, 394.
 51-53—III 114.
 52—II 25.
 52-54—II 377, 392.
 53—II 311, 334; III 114.
 105:1—II 103; III 175.
 6—II 35, 55.
 6-7—II 68.
 8-9—III 43.
 8-10—II 305.
 11-13—III 132.
 14—II 287.
 17—II 292.
 18-19—II 371, 411.
 18-22—II 173.
 19-20—I 202.
 20-21—II 294; III 271.
 22—II 45, 135.
 23—II 371.
 23-24—II 144, 392.
 25-28—I 122.
 29—II 330.
 29-31—I 166; II 394; III 271.
 32—I 122.
 33—II 47, 52; III 37.
 36—II 53.
 38—I 122.
 39—III 37.
 39-40—II 111.
 40—I 22; II 42, 61.
 77(?)—II 25.
 81—I 122.
 82—II 77.
 83—II 138.
 83-84—II 294.
 84-85—I 171, III 205.
 85—II 35, 57, 68.
 86-87—II 379, 396; III 269.
 87—II 330.
 88—II 35.
 106:1—II 103; III 175.
 4—II 275; III 128, 169.
 5—I 14, 27.
 6-7—I 138; III 174, 263.
 8—I 139.
 8-9—III 263.
 9—I 79.
 10-11—I 128; II 354.

- 10-13—II 332.
 11-12—I 79.
 12—I 43, 79; II 23, 55.
 12-13—II 396; III 269.
 13—I 15, 23, 110; II 55; III
 209.
 13-15—II 108; III 142, 232.
 14—II 36, 102.
 15—I 11, 40; III 35.
 16—III 30.
 16-17—I 50, 186; III 172,
 263.
 18—II 41.
 18-20—III 172, 207.
 20-21—I 200.
 23—II 283; III 119.
 26—II 213; III 199.
 28—III 209.
 30—I 23, 110; II 58, 102;
 III 92, 137.
 30-31—II 108.
 30-32—III 27.
 30-34—II 124, 335; III 142.
 32—I 162; III 124.
 33-34—III 119.
 35—II 212; III 50.
 36—II 72; III 199.
 36-37—III 32.
 38—I 17.
 38-39—I 63.
 39—I 10, 153; II 60; III 53.
 40—I 200; II 345.
 41—I 31.
 41-45—II 407.
 42—II 213; III 199.
 42-44—I 187.
 44—III 22.
 45—I 139.
 45-49—II 225.
 46—II 41, 58; III 50.
 47—II 325; III 184.
 47-48—III 65.
 49—I 197.
 107:1-2—II 103; III 175.
 5—I 22.
 8-9—III 172.
 10—II 58; III 6.
 10-11—I 169; III 3, 233.
 16—II 268.
 18—II 270, 272.
 19-24—III 32.
 20—III 189.
 20-22—II 279.
 20-24—II 355.

- 21—III 50, 51.
 21-24—III 271.
 23-24—I 155.
 25—I 20.
 26-34—II 320.
 29-30—I 133.
 29-31—II 250, 363; III 107.
 31—II 37.
 32-34—III 140, 225.
 33—II 38, 321.
 33-34—I 129.
 37-38—II 403.
 38—I 86.
 38-39—I 197.
 39—III 33.
 39-40—I 188
 42—I 34; II 320.
 42-43—I 34.
 42-45—III 234.
 43—I 34, 142; III 17.
 44—I 23.
 45 et al.—III 17.
 46-48—III 142.
 47-48—III 214.
 48—II 285.
 108:1—II 102(2x).
 1-3—III 176.
- 2—I 27.
 8—III 50.
 8-9—I 131.
 8-13—II 354.
 12-13—I 89.
 13—I 11.
 14-17—III 233.
 15—I 34(2x).
 16—I 142.
 17—I 12, III 32.
 18-19—I 104.
 19—I 14.
 20—II 78.
 20-21—I 159.
 20-23—I 130.
 21—I 16, 46; III 50.
 22—I 180; III 255.
 22-24—III 100.
 22-25—II 327.
 23-24—II 201.
 23-25—III 268.
 24—I 41; II 42, 96.
 25-26—I 107; III 257.
 25-28—III 51.
 26—I 35.
 28—II 106.
 29—I 20.

- 30-32—I 132.
 32-33—III 215, 277.
 34—III 181.
 34-37—III 96.
 39—II 45, 51.
 40-41—III 213.
 42—III 52.
 43—II 47, 53.
 43-44—II 327; III 50.
 45—III 161, 211
 46-50—II 168; III 75.
 47—I 21.
 48—I 32; II 42.
 48-50—II 380.
 49—I 95; II 182(2x).
 49-50—II 156.
 50—I 20.
 50-52—I 157.
 51—I 110; II 61.
 51-52—II 238.
 52—I 191.
 52-55—II 157.
 53—I 35; II 45.
 56—III 53.
 56-57—III 65.
 56-58—III 188.
 58—II 45, 78.
 59—II 35, 59.
 59-60—II 66; III 225.
 62—I 77.
 64—I 28.
 65—II 285.
 65-69—II 280.
 66—II 273.
 66-67—I 74.
 66-68—I 187.
 71—I 19.
 109:1—II 103; III 175.
 5-8—II 232; III 125.
 7—II 44.
 7-8—II 44.
 8—I 182.
 13-15—II 201.
 14—I 22; II 61.
 15—II 58.
 15-19—II 100.
 16—II 36, 61.
 17—II 54.
 18—II 36, 61.
 19—II 54.
 20-21—I 140.
 22—I 142.
 24-25—II 142.
 29—I 45; III 42.

- 30—II 286.
 35—II 45.
 36—III 257(2x).
 40—I 12; III 32.
 41-44—III 255, 256, 257.
 43—I 54.
 43-44—I 56.
 44-46—II 123, 384, 388; III
 53, 124.
 49-55—III 186.
 50-55—III 97.
 53-55—I 166; II 143; III
 234, 270.
 55—II 42.
 56—II 330.
 58—I 202.
 60-61—II 293, 294.
 63—II 295.
 110:3—II 345.
 50—II 35.
 111:18—I 132.
 24—I 171, 173.
 112—II 134.
 112:1-2—III 176.
 7—I 110, II 36, 102.
 7-9—II 109, 277; III 237.
 9—II 267, 287; III 199.
 10—II 41; III 36, 276.
 10-13—I 112; II 237.
 10-18—I 105; II 172.
 13—II 57, 134, 172, 203,
 235, 264; III 36.
 14—I 73; II 57, 134, 171.
 14-15—III 187.
 15—I 18.
 16-18—II 358; III 188, 218,
 274.
 17—II 57, 134, 203.
 18—I 73; II 57, 134, 172,
 264.
 18-22—III 57.
 18-24—II 240, 359.
 20—I 28; II 134.
 24—I 38; II 148.
 25—III 97, 204.
 25-27—I 118.
 25-30—III 189.
 26-27—II 373.
 28—II 409.
 30-34—III 188.
 30-39—II 279, 358.
 34—I 203.
 34-39—II 185.
 36-39—II 163, 323.

- 37—II 137(2x).
 37-38—I 132.
 40-41—III 140.
 40-43—II 409.
 46—II 315.
 47—III 243.
 47-48—III 163.
 48-49—III 120.
 49—II 315.
 50-53—II 351; III 125.
 51—III 29.
 52—II 47, 57.
 53—II 47, 60.
 54—III 158.
 54-56—III 204.
 113:4—II 267.
 4-5—I 191.
 5-6—II 66.
 6—II 35, 59.
 7-9—II 111; III 166.
 11-12—I 110; III 275.
 11-13—III 77.
 12-13—I 166.
 14—II 288.
 15—I 34, 122.
 17-18—II 251.
 17-21—I 82.
 18—III 43.
 26-28—I 121.
 28—I 110.
 28-30—II 379.
 29—I 38; II 19, 330, 396.
 32—II 57.
 32-35—II 44.
 33—II 184.
 34-35—III 47.
 37—II 321.
 40—III 8.
 40-42—II 386.
 41—II 51.
 44—II 321.
 114—III 261.
 114:4-6—I 100.
 5—I 99.
 6-12—II 299.
 8-9—I 188.
 8-10—I 86.
 9—I 9; III 42.
 9-12—III 261.
 9-15—I 51; III 262.
 12—II 55.
 12-14—I 197.
 13—I 14.
 15-17—III 158.

- 15-20—II 85, 349; III 162.
 17—II 299.
 18-19—II 406.
 18-20—III 232.
 19—III 43.
 20—I 24; II 35, 55.
 20-21—II 68.
 21—II 41, 374.
 21-22—I 166; II 144, 391;
 III 230.
 23-24—III 58, 188.
 23-25—II 330.
 23-26—III 104, 218(2x).
 24-26—II 326(2x).
 25—II 269, 272.
 26—II 41.
 26-28—III 93.
 26-32—II 86, 234.
 27—I 60; II 340; III 27.
 29?—I 79.
 30—I 47; III 117, 156.
 30-31—I 80.
 31—I 35.
 32-37—II 91.
 32-41—II 352.
 34—I 78; II 287.
 35—I 78; II 287; III 116.
 35-37—I 113; II 159, 163,
 329; III 216, 276.
 36—II 55.
 36-37—II 394.
 37—II 13.
 37-38—I 201.
 40-41—I 64.
 41-42—III 139.
 41-43—I 112; III 27.
 42—II 77.
 43—I 38, 75; II 148; III 27.
 44—I 12; II 372, 395.
 44-45—III 218(2x).
 44-46—II 279; III 188.
 45—I 133.
 47—III 37.
 47-48—I 140.
 48—I 77, 140; II 68.
 49-50—III 232.
 50—II 306, 354.
 51-52—I 191; III 163.
 51-53—III 261.
 52—I 28; III 184.
 52-53—III 221.
 53—I 78.
 54—II 267.
 54-57—II 140, 232; III 125.

- 56—I 10; II 137.
 57-58—III 158.
 57-59—III 212.
 58—I 90; II 35.
 59-62—II 165.
 61-63—II 239.
 62—I 133.
 66—I 75; II 148.
 67—II 267.
 68—I 106; II 56; III 106.
 69—III 162.
 115:10—II 237.
 15-16—I 202.
 116:1—II 102.
 1-2—III 176.
 6—II 324.
 8—II 58.
 8-9—III 50.
 10-12—II 384, 385.
 11—I 35; II 285.
 14—III 80.
 15-16—III 268.
 16—II 42.
 18-20—II 305.
 24—II 287.
 27-28—II 386.
 28—I 45.
 29-36—I 82.
 30-31—II 244.
 30-33—II 159, 164, 247,
 248.
 32—II 35.
 33—III 43.
 34—II 35.
 34-35—II 279.
 34-36—III 186.
 35—II 267; III 144.
 35-36—I 198.
 36—II 36, 54.
 37-40—I 203.
 41-42—I 166.
 42-43—I 118; III 204.
 42-44—II 303.
 43—I 100.
 46—II 35, 57, 68.
 48—II 306.
 50—II 285.
 50-51—III 166.
 51—III 43.
 52—II 330.
 52-53—I 116; II 395.
 54-55—II 354.
 55-56—I 67; III 128.
 56—III 255.

- 58-59—I 129.
 59—I 129.
 60—I 139.
 61—II 295.
 65—II 287.
 66—III 13.
 67-69—III 101.
 67-71—I 107; III 257(2x).
 72—II 167.
 72-73—I 132.
 117—II 295.
 117:4-7—I 59.
 6-7—III 162.
 6-9—II 108, 238.
 7—II 35; III 162.
 7-9—III 231.
 8—I 20, 110; II 102.
 9-10—I 167; III 42, 172,
 204, 263.
 9-11—I 50.
 10—I 38.
 11—I 20; III 35, 37, 159.
 11-12—III 162.
 12-14—II 294; III 214.
 13—II 285.
 14—I 118.
 14-15—III 214.
 15—II 285.
 17—I 95, 152.
 17-19—II 294.
 18—II 45.
 19—I 94, 179; III 10, 156,
 214.
 21—II 285.
 22—I 75.
 23-27—I 133.
 24—II 106.
 24-27—II 160, 204.
 27—III 215, 277.
 27-28—I 124; II 414.
 28—II 375.
 29—I 46.
 29-31—I 159; II 109.
 30—I 110; II 40, 58.
 31—I 46; II 102.
 32—II 79.
 32-33—II 230.
 32-36—III 187.
 33—II 36, 78; III 120.
 34—III 172.
 35-36—I 107; III 257.
 36—I 35.
 39—II 86.
 39-40—III 211.

- 41—III 12.
 42—I 17; II 35.
 43-44—II 232, 379, 393; III
 125.
 44—I 38; II 19.
 50—II 311.
 50-51—III 56.
 52—I 95.
 53—III 215.
 53-56—II 210, 294.
 56—I 169; III 4, 214.
 56-58—III 19, 188, 189.
 59—I 38; II 19.
 59-60—III 24.
 59-61—III 188.
 59-63—II 253, 271.
 60—II 35, 60, 67.
 61—II 72.
 62—I 140; II 271.
 63—II 106.
 63-64—III 65.
 64—I 17, 81.
 66—II 159, 167.
 66-67—II 251.
 66-70—II 244.
 67—I 86; III 42.
 67-69—I 122, 202, 204.
 68—II 36, 78.
 69—I 20.
 69-70—I 191; III 224.
 71-73—II 257.
 74—III 204.
 74-76—II 301.
 75—II 409.
 75-76—I 197.
 76—III 33.
 76-77—II 159.
 76-80—II 167.
 77—I 78, 95.
 78—I 20; II 35.
 79-81—I 203.
 83—II 58; III 181, 195.
 83ff.—III 86.
 84—II 267(2x), 269, 287;
 III 199, 237.
 91-92—III 214.
 92—I 109; II 167, 237.
 94—I 22, 129; II 38; III
 225.
 118—III 161.
 118:2—I 14.
 8-9—III 152.
 11—II 35.
 15—I 20.

- 16—II 35.
 16-17—III 56.
 17-20—I 124; III 187.
 18—I 22; III 144.
 24—III 243.
 24-32—III 166.
 28—I 14; III 243.
 28-30—I 181.
 30-32—III 17.
 32-33—I 90.
 32-36—II 88.
 33—II 36.
 34—I 21.
 36—III 159.
 36-38—III 160.
 36-39—II 361; III 230.
 37—I 9; II 383.
 37-39—II 386; III 267.
 39-40—I 50, 141; III 172,
 230, 261, 263.
 39-41—II 405.
 40—I 38; II 148; III 38.
 41-43—I 132.
 41-44—II 185.
 42—II 167.
 45-46—I 154; III 19, 173.
 47—I 20; II 60.
 47-48—III 212.
 47-49—III 27.
 50-53—II 232; III 125.
 50-54—III 158.
 51-52—I 99.
 53—I 86; III 42.
 53-54—III 211.
 54—II 36.
 55-56—III 17.
 119:1—II 102.
 1-2—III 176.
 8—II 36, 198.
 8-9—II 109.
 8-10—III 86.
 9—I 93; III 237.
 10—I 105; II 57, 203, 264;
 III 36, 276.
 14—I 53, 109; II 237.
 15—I 9, 19, 40; II 20, 41,
 58, 134, 172.
 15-18—II 408.
 16-18—III 191.
 17—II 285.
 17-18—I 109; II 237, 241,
 356; III 189.
 18-19—III 50.
 18-23—II 261.

- 19-21—I 133.
 20—I 144.
 21—I 11.
 21-23—I 144; II 216, 291;
 III 76.
 23—I 89; II 52.
 24-25—III 19, 255.
 25—I 18.
 26—II 25, 36, 60.
 26-27—II 248; III 223(2x).
 36—I 14; II 35.
 36-37—III 50.
 36-44—II 324.
 39-40—III 116.
 39-41—I 113.
 39-44—III 261.
 41-42—I 191.
 42—III 205.
 43—I 38; II 148.
 43-44—I 141; II 405.
 44-45_I 172.
 45—I 22.
 45-46—I 100.
 46—II 286.
 46-51—I 122.
 47—II 36.
 51—II 35.
 52—III 213.
 53—II 41, 58, 237.
 53-54—I 110.
 54—III 145.
 55—I 160.
 55-57—I 160, 202.
 55-59—I 64, 96, 192; II
 120, 249.
 56—I 72.
 58—II 66.
 58-59—III 51.
 120—I 160; II 120.
 120:1-2—I 160.
 23—I 156.
 25—II 268.
 31—III 37.
 33—II 374.
 34—II 52.
 36—I 18; II 137, 268.
 36-37—I 161.
 37—I 65.
 38—II 374, 409.
 39—I 18.
 40-42—I 160.
 42—III 43.
 44—I 40; II 20.
 121:1—II 101.

- 1-2—II 103; III 176.
 7—II 36, 102.
 7-8—II 109.
 7-10—II 235, 239.
 10—II 58, 172, 203, 235.
 11-15—II 351; III 125.
 11-16—I 51; III 264.
 14—III 29.
 19-22—II 112.
 25—II 58.
 41—II 106.
 42—II 137, 268.
 47—II 167.
 47-48—I 132.
 50—II 184.
 50-51—I 141.
 61—II 345.
 122:1—II 103.
 1-2—III 176.
 9ff.—III 86.
 10—I 93; III 237.
 11—III 36, 171.
 11-15—I 123.
 11-19—III 29.
 15—III 29, 156.
 17—I 38; III 25, 29.
 18—III 204.
 19-20—III 149.
 19-21—I 52, 195.
 26—III 37.
 26-31—I 51; III 29, 264.
 27—III 29.
 27-31—III 209.
 28—III 156.
 28-31—I 50; III 204, 263.
 30-31—I 54; III 17.
 31-33—II 300.
 34—I 19, 29.
 35—I 30.
 37—II 315.
 38-39—III 116.
 39—I 129; II 38; III 30.
 40-41—III 166.
 40-44—II 301, 304.
 41—I 129; II 58.
 41-42—III 219.
 41-43—I 100; III 129.
 42—I 14.
 43—I 14.
 44—I 68.
 47—II 38.
 47-48—III 225.
 48—I 129.
 48-49—I 53, 109; II 237.

- 53—I 54.
55—II 79.
123—II 158.
123:1—II 102.
1-2—III 176.
9-11—I 100; III 129.
10—I 14.
12—I 14.
13-34—II 159
14—I 19, 29.
15—I 30.
17—II 315(2x).
18-20—III 218.
18-22—II 163.
21—III 30.
21-22—III 120.
22-28—II 345.
23—III 187.
23-26—II 279.
23-28—II 261, 356; III 189.
26—II 138.
27—II 41, 58, 134, 172.
29—II 60.
29-32—II 235, 238.
30-31—I 93; III 237.
31-32—I 112; III 36.
32—II 41, 58, 134, 172.
33—II 315.
33-35—II 363.
36-37—III 98.
38-I 13.
38-40—I 105; III 257, 279.
40—I 133.
41—II 167.
41-42—I 132.
50-52—II 163.
124:6-7—II 102.
9-10—I 195, 203; II 338; III
18, 149.
12—II 86.
12-13—I 134; III 35, 60.
12-15—II 153, 341; III 121.
14-15—II 232.
15—II 36.
15-16—II 237 III 109.
16—II 53, 321.
16-18—III 140.
17—II 58.
23—II 59.
31—II 340.
35—I 56; II 40, 58.
35-40—II 109.
36—II 102.
37—I 155.

- 37-39—I 60.
 38—I 110; II 102.
 39—I 146.
 40—I 146.
 47-48—I 159.
 48—I 46.
 50-52—I 132.
 51'—I 34.
 52—II 373.
 53—II 55, 288, 373, 395.
 54-56—II 373, 390.
 56—III 131.
 125:6—I 22.
 7-13—III 86.
 9—I 93; III 237.
 10-11—I 154, 170.
 11-12—III 36.
 11-13—I 93; II 238.
 12—II 41.
 12-14—I 112.
 14—I 203.
 14-18—II 232; III 125.
 16—I 33; II 35.
 16-18—II 403.
 18-21—III 158.
 19-21—II 90.
 21—I 41; II 22.
 21-23—III 207.
 23—II 288.
 23-24—I 198.
 25—I 33.
 25-26—II 403.
 29—I 133; III 71.
 31—I 41; II 22; III 12.
 31-38—II 92.
 32—I 155.
 33-34—I 154; III 19.
 33-36—III 63.
 33-37—I 51; III 264.
 36—I 89.
 36-37—III 19.
 36-38—II 141.
 38—I 54, 55.
 38-39—I 113.
 39—I 35; II 41.
 39-40—I 112.
 40-43—I 105; III 257, 279.
 40-44—III 101.
 40-45—II 159, 162.
 42—I 89.
 44—II 45.
 126—I 119; II 179.
 126:2-3—II 349; III 63.
 3—I 32, 194.

- 4—II 3.
 4-6—III 85.
 5—I 17.
 6—I 22; II 78.
 7—II 330; III 209.
 7-8—II 379, 382, 396; III
 113, 211.
 8—III 6, 38.
 9-10—I 181.
 10-11—I 200.
 12—II 45.
 13—I 89; II 45.
 14—I 162; II 35; III 5.
 14-18—I 111; III 216, 275,
 276.
 14-21—I 119.
 15—I 11, 119, 179.
 16—I 143(2x), 155.
 17—III 209, 244.
 17-18—I 118.
 18—I 119; II 35.
 18-23—II 163, 179, 232; III
 125.
 22—I 17, 39; II 20, 157.
 23-24—I 53.
 25—I 150.
 25-28—III 212.
 26-28—I 119.
 27—III 209, 244.
 31—I 93.
 32—II 267.
 33—III 138.
 34—II 3, 286.
 38-42—II 183.
 40—I 134.
 40-42—III 212.
 40-43—II 244.
 43—II 272.
 43-44—III 245.
 44-45—II 357.
 44-47—I 56; III 189.
 44-48—I 75.
 45—II 42, 52.
 46-47—III 241.
 49—III 5.
 49-50—III 216, 276.
 49-51—I 111, 119; III 246,
 275.
 53-54—I 130.
 53-55—II 91, 107, 244; III
 215.
 54—II 35, 61.
 58-59—II 45.
 62—III 209, 244.

- 62-63—II 248; III 223.
 63-66—I 97.
 64—II 44.
 66—II 44.
 127—II 33.
 127:10—II 58.
 14-16—I 104.
 15—I 196; III 47.
 18—III 201.
 18-19—III 111
 19—II 29.
 21—III 201.
 23-24—III 163.
 25—II 284.
 26-27—II 405.
 26-29—II 362.
 27—II 57.
 30—II 41.
 30-32—II 85.
 31—III 123.
 31-32—III 60, 93.
 33—II 306.
 34—II 283, 286, 353.
 35-39—III 107.
 37—II 41.
 38-39—I 134(2x); II 371,
 411.
 41—II 289.
 129—I 106; II 141.
 129:7—I 107; III 278.
 8—I 151.
 9—I 114.
 12—I 143.
 13-14—I 156.
 15-16—II 312.
 17-19—II 393.
 17-21—I 98.
 18-19—II 144.
 19—II 45, 135.
 20—I 65.
 20-21—II 384, 388.
 26-27—II 398.
 27—I 24, 37; II 375.
 29—I 24, 37; II 45, 135,
 144, 375, 392.
 30—I 133, 167; III 203.
 31—I 141; II 405.
 32—II 45, 383.
 32-34—II 387.
 33—I 32.
 33-34—I 30, 134; III 203.
 35-39—III 86.
 36-37—III 139.
 37—III 139.

- 40-41—II 371; III 24.
 40-42—II 388.
 40-43—II 179.
 41—I 95.
 43—I 32.
 48—II 40, 52.
 49—I 94, 167, 169; III 4,
 203.
 49-50—II 279.
 54—II 317.
 77-79—II 379, 397.
 77-80—II 256.
 78-79—II 150.
 78-80—II 251.
 79—II 36.
 80—II 38.
 81—I 107; III 278.
 82—I 25; II 285.
 83—II 303.
 84—II 58, 245.
 88—II 45.
 91—II 311.
 130:2—I 12; II 35.
 2-3—III 175.
 4—I 99.
 9—II 36, 101, 102.
 9-10—II 204.
 9-14—II 243; III 85, 280.
 9-20—II 105.
 12—I 24; II 54.
 13-14—III 213.
 14-16—II 204.
 15—II 36, 102(2x).
 16-17—I 93; III 237.
 17-19—I 101.
 19—II 203.
 19-20—I 104; III 274.
 20—II 58, 172, 264.
 21—III 171.
 21-25—II 351; III 124.
 24—III 37.
 25—III 29.
 30-31—II 237.
 31-33—I 154.
 33—I 146.
 33-35—II 142; III 41.
 33-39—II 159, 164.
 34—I 35.
 34-35—I 102.
 35—I 38, 89.
 36-37—I 53.
 36-38—I 101.
 37—I 203.
 37-38—III 44.

- 39—III 119.
 39-41—III 17(2x), 29.
 39-42—III 189.
 41—I 41; II 22.
 43—I 181, 201, 202.
 44-45—II 405.
 44-48—II 279; III 188.
 48—II 58, 134, 172.
 49—II 41, 58, 134, 172.
 49-52—II 408.
 50-52—II 260; III 191.
 51—II 56.
 52—I 17.
 131—II 77; III 235.
 131:6—I 164; II 161.
 7-8—I 128.
 9—I 25, 32, 135; II 77.
 10-14—II 168; III 188.
 11-13—I 188.
 12—I 39, 190; II 20, 157,
 161.
 13—I 190.
 14—I 32.
 15—I 18, 39; II 20, 157,
 161.
 15-16—III 218.
 15-17—II 163; III 3.
 15-18—II 240; III 188.
 17—I 80; II 373, 390; III
 247.
 20—II 77.
 21—I 28, 36.
 22—II 46, 77; III 9.
 25—I 67.
 26—I 86, 137; II 354.
 27-28—II 76, 260, 264; III
 212.
 28—III 209, 244.
 31—II 161.
 31-34—II 160.
 32—II 138.
 33-34—I 198; III 211.
 36—I 46, 150, 159.
 37—I 36; III 155.
 39—I 173.
 41—II 58; III 50.
 41-43—III 109, 279.
 42—I 161.
 43—I 168; III 1.
 43-46—I 199.
 44—I 28, 146.
 45—I 161.
 58—III 209, 212.
 59—III 218.

- 59-60—II 161; III 188.
 60—I 80.
 132—III 235.
 132:8—II 267.
 8-9—II 278.
 10—II 321; III 124.
 10-11—III 30.
 12-13—I 75.
 12-16—II 106.
 13-14—I 133.
 15—II 78.
 16—III 65.
 16-17—III 215, 277.
 16-18—I 124.
 18—I 119.
 19-21—III 158.
 20—II 311.
 24—I 63.
 29—III 243.
 29-30—III 163.
 30-32—III 184, 221.
 30-35—II 387.
 31—II 286.
 32-35—I 59; II 361(2x).
 35—I 13.
 37—II 286.
 39—III 211.
 42—II 288.
 43-45—II 248; III 224.
 43-46—II 305; III 81, 95.
 44—I 24, 37; II 59, 375.
 46-49—III 219, 225.
 46-50—II 77, 208, 356; III
 190.
 48—II 53, 321.
 48-49—I 133.
 49-50—I 140, 203.
 50—II 45.
 51—I 24.
 51-52—II 79.
 52-53—III 211.
 53-55—I 55, 121.
 56-57—I 188.
 57-58—I 61.
 59—II 184.
 96—III 119.
 133:10-14—II 280.
 15—II 102.
 134:4-6—III 130, 271.
 6-7—III 128.
 10—I 147.
 12—II 369.
 14—II 61.
 15-16—I 195; II 236, 237.

- 17—II 320.
 26—II 271.
 27—I 95.
 28—I 110.
 31—II 41, 101.
 34—II 288.
 35-36—II 301.
 135—I 3.
 136:2—III 175.
 3—I 14, 36.
 6—I 24.
 6-7—II 249; III 197.
 10—I 10, 54; II 45.
 11—II 51, 267, 277.
 11-12—III 40.
 13—I 86; III 42.
 14-15—III 212.
 15—II 42, 61.
 16—I 15.
 17—II 91.
 18—I 35, 36.
 19—II 219; III 197.
 21-23—I 175; III 213.
 24—III 181.
 24-26—II 154.
 24-27—III 73.
 26—II 56, 68.
 26-27—III 44.
 26-29—II 276; III 238, 249.
 27—II 51, 267.
 28—II 41.
 30-32—II 406; III 73.
 30-33—II 350.
 31-32—II 368.
 33—II 61.
 33-34—III 52.
 33-35—II 307.
 34—III 41.
 36—I 24; II 68.
 37—III 117, 133, 134.
 38—II 317.
 38-39—I 132.
 40—II 56, 68.
 41—I 162, 191; III 201.
 41-42—III 29, 189.
 42—III 28.
 43—I 32.
 45—I 29.
 137—I 2; III 21.
 137:3-4—II 350; III 63.
 5-11—II 108.
 6—II 45.
 8—II 42, 135.
 8-9—II 159, 162.

- 10—I 169; II 58; III 3, 201.
 11—II 51.
 11-13—II 305.
 11-14—II 170.
 12—III 80.
 13—I 140.
 14-19—III 268.
 15—III 44.
 16—III 35.
 16-17—I 55.
 16-19—II 402.
 20-23—III 80, 244.
 20-25—II 176.
 20-30—III 75.
 21—I 169; II 295; III 3.
 22—III 201.
 23—II 72, 170.
 25—II 35.
 25-26—I 144.
 27—II 42, 55.
 27-30—II 354.
 29-30—I 93.
 30-31—II 325.
 30-35—II 291.
 34—II 29, 42.
 39—II 35.
 40—II 45, 59.
 42—I 46; II 29.
 44—II 35; III 43.
 44-45—I 132.
 46—II 373.
 46-48—I 127, 159; II 344.
 47—I 142; III 43.
 48—III 43.
 49—I 133.
 49-51—II 361, 370, 385,
 410; III 267.
 50—III 65.
 51—II 289.
 52—II 56; III 28.
 53-54—III 260.
 55—I 40; II 21, 56.
 59—II 35.
 59-61—III 95.
 60-62—I 120.
 62—II 59, 292.
 64—I 29.
 64-65—I 166.
 65—III 44.
 67—I 181; II 288.
 68—II 285.
 69—III 44.
 71—III 201.
 72—I 36; II 286.

- 73-74—I 185.
 73-75—III 126.
 74—I 119, 139.
 75-76—II 297.
 76—I 28.
 77—I 94, 95.
 79—III 6, 148.
 79-80—II 159, 167.
 80—I 165.
 81-82—II 70.
 81-83—II 155.
 83—I 169; III 3.
 89—III 115.
 92—III 7, 148.
 94—II 35.
 96—II 77.
 97—I 24; II 35, 69.
 97-99—II 256; III 148.
 98—II 59.
 100-103—I 181.
 102—II 289.
 138—III 21, 109, 138.
 138:3-4—II 350; III 63.
 4—I 194; II 285.
 8—I 15.
 9-11—II 131.
 11—II 40, 58, 135.
 12—II 47; III 22.
 13—I 46, 158.
 15?—I 46; II 38.
 21—I 107; III 257.
 23—I 143; II 60.
 26—III 201.
 26-27—I 141; II 66; III 28.
 27—II 35, 56.
 28—II 36, 59.
 29—II 41, 52.
 30—III 201.
 30-31—I 150.
 31—II 41, 60, 106.
 31-34—II 209.
 33—III 22.
 34-37—II 118.
 36—II 51.
 37—III 115(2x).
 40—II 52, 58; III 115(2x),
 276.
 40 f.—II 40.
 41—I 38; II 19, 52, 54.
 41-42—III 109, 276.
 42—II 41, 60.
 43—II 45.
 44—II 37, 38, 58, 271, 272.
 44-45—III 249.

- 44-47—III 226(2x).
 44-50—II 112.
 45—II 47.
 45-47—III 93, 138.
 46—II 41.
 47—II 42, 52.
 49—II 45, 52.
 51-52—II 385; III 267.
 58—I 166; II 398.
 60—II 299.
 60-63—I 192; III 260.
 60-70—II 147.
 61—II 38, 51(2x); III 80.
 62—II 45, 55, 382.
 63-65—III 167.
 63-66—III 91.
 65-69—III 39.
 66—III 38.
 67—I 36; II 35.
 68—II 36.
 69—II 45, 135.
 71-73—I 185, 191; II 343.
 73-75—I 176.
 74—II 77.
 75—II 77.
 75-77—I 187; II 412.
 78—I 186.
 80—I 110; II 285, 286; III
 9.
 82—II 58.
 83—II 334.
 89—III 61, 201.
 90—II 58.
 90-91—III 167.
 90-93—II 126.
 91-92—II 301; III 61.
 92—III 45.
 93—II 45, 337.
 94-95—II 232; III 125.
 96—I 35; II 38; III 38.
 96-97—I 129(2x); II 79.
 98—II 289.
 100-103—II 129.
 101—II 47, 59.
 103-106—II 146.
 111—II 37.
 115—I 46, 159.
 116-117—I 97.
 120—II 285.
 122—II 44, 60.
 122-126—III 110, 279.
 123—I 168; II 35, 67; III 1.
 123-124—III 61.
 123-126—III 83.

- 124—III 45.
 125—II 311.
 126—I 60.
 129-130—II 151.
 130—II 135; III 9.
 131—III 5, 138.
 131-133—I 111.
 133—II 322; III 115(2x).
 134—II 29.
 135—II 77; III 12.
 135-136—III 143.
 136—I 111, 191; III 5, 138.
 137—II 45, 60, 219, 285;
 III 5, 138, 197, 249.
 138—II 269.
 139—III 34.
 139:5—II 59.
 5-6—II 248; III 224.
 10—II 248; III 34, 224.
 11—I 20.
 11-12—III 271.
 12-13—II 300.
 15—I 29(2x).
 16—II 285.
 29-33—II 167.
 30-31—I 20, 39; II 20, 135,
 157.
 30-33—III 34.
 33—II 35.
 33-35—II 66.
 33-40—I 120; III 110.
 34—I 39; II 20, 135, 157.
 35-39—III 279.
 36—I 39; II 20, 135, 157.
 37—I 119.
 38—I 39; II 20, 135, 157.
 39—I 60.
 67—II 67.
 140—III 34.
 140:4—I 194.
 5—II 35, 59.
 5-6—III 34.
 5-7—III 129.
 7—I 126.
 8—I 20, 110; II 157.
 9—III 34.
 10—I 29.
 10-14—II 300.
 12—I 29.
 14-17—III 261.
 15—I 19; III 19, 262.
 17—II 288.
 18—I 19; III 170, 181.
 18-19—II 275; III 169.

- 19—I 17.
 20—III 170, 181.
 20-21—II 275; III 169.
 24—I 20; II 157.
 26-27—I 201.
 27—I 29.
 28—I 20; II 157.
 28-29—III 118.
 28-30—II 407.
 29-30—I 29.
 31—I 28.
 56—III 224.
 141:3-5—III 179.
 8—I 15; II 226.
 8-9—II 348.
 8-11—II 351.
 11—II 301.
 11-14—III 147.
 18—III 181.
 18-30—II 314.
 21-22—III 49.
 22—I 99, 133.
 23—II 226; III 147.
 24—II 284, 353; III 111,
 117.
 24-30—I 123.
 25—I 28.
 27—I 119.
 28—II 288.
 30—I 99, 133.
 31—I 133; II 38.
 31-33—I 135; II 174.
 33—I 30, 143.
 34—I 137; II 51, 219; III
 70, 197.
 36—III 180.
 36-38—II 157.
 39—I 162.
 39-40—I 48; III 255.
 41—I 19; II 41, 58.
 44—I 79(2x).
 45—II 51; III 70.
 45-46—I 132, 137.
 46—I 99, 133.
 142:5—I 15.
 [6]—II 226.
 6-7—II 188.
 7-9—III 73.
 7-10—II 129, 351.
 8—II 226.
 9—II 36, 53.
 10—I 22, 137.
 11—II 283; III 117, 181.
 12—II 41, 58.

- 12-14—II 411; III 69.
 15—II 288; III 181.
 15-16—I 101.
 16—I 78; II 42.
 16-17—II 231; III 69.
 17—II 56, 68.
 18—I 22; II 36.
 18-24—II 321, 350; III 81.
 19—I 14; II 288.
 23—I 152.
 25—II 284, 353; III 117.
 25-31—I 123; II 314.
 26—I 28.
 28—I 119.
 29—II 288.
 33—I 13.
 143:3-4—III 179.
 10-17—II 242.
 11-12—III 179(2x).
 13-15—III 71.
 13-17—II 141.
 13-21—II 164.
 15—II 42, 235.
 16—II 235.
 18—I 24, 38; II 376.
 18-21—II 159.
 18-22—II 408.
 20—II 292.
 29—II 284, 320.
 144:3-4—III 177.
 10—II 324.
 10-12—II 199.
 11—II 353.
 12—I 126.
 13—II 226.
 13-14—I 173; II 200.
 13-17—II 130.
 14-20—III 50.
 15—II 53, 351.
 15-18—II 409.
 16—II 36, 132.
 16-17—I 136.
 17—I 22; II 374.
 17-18—I 173.
 18—I 72, 92.
 18-21—II 314, 353.
 19—II 284, 325.
 21—I 198; II 284, 414.
 22—II 325.
 24-25—III 56.
 25—I 28.
 26—I 23.
 26-27—III 57.
 26-32—I 91; II 155.

- 26-34—II 332.
 27—I 73; II 51.
 28—I 21.
 29—II 368.
 29-30—III 72.
 30—I 23, 28.
 31-32—III 56.
 32—I 38; II 42, 55, 148.
 32-34—II 395; III 126.
 34—I 30.
 145:5-10—II 156.
 6—II 283; III 6.
 8—III 44.
 9—I 36.
 10—II 136, 210.
 11—II 226.
 11-12—III 54.
 11-13—II 104, 203.
 14—II 289.
 19-22—II 319.
 23—II 39.
 23-26—III 113, 236(2x).
 24-26—I 55, 177; II 156.
 25—II 39; III 6.
 26—I 53; II 136, 211.
 27—I 197.
 27(?)—II 226.
 28—II 66.
 29—I 137.
 39—I 40; II 20.
 146:12—III 70, 145.
 13—III 7.
 16—III 135.
 20—I 145.
 147—III 26.
 147:3—I 21.
 4—I 48; III 255.
 4-5—III 63.
 5—I 14, 21.
 6—II 83; III 25.
 7—I 36, 151; III 135(3x),
 232.
 8—I 77.
 9—II 135, 137, 140.
 10—I 16, 77.
 11-12—II 408.
 12—II 95.
 12-13—II 95.
 13—I 77.
 13-14—II 199.
 14-15—I 200.
 16—III 157.
 17—II 25, 42.
 18—I 11.

- 19-20—III 53.
 20—I 21.
 21—I 77.
 22—I 11; III 39.
 22-23—III 210.
 24—III 119, 170.
 25-27—II 351.
 26—III 25.
 27—II 285.
 28—III 135, 232.
 29—II 285.
 30—I 18; II 25, 42.
 32—II 289.
 32-33—I 200; III 52.
 33-34—II 200.
 34—II 25, 42.
 35—I 11.
 35-36—II 200.
 35-37—III 49.
 35-38—II 266, III 249.
 36—II 46, 255, 270.
 39—I 11, 20; III 25(2x),
 45.
 40—I 175.
 41—II 25.
 41-42—II 199.
 41-44—II 96.
 42—I 146; II 148.
 43—III 25.
 43-44—III 53.
 44—I 77.
 45—I 175; II 25, 51.
 45-48—II 96; III 220.
 46—I 11, 127; II 301.
 47-48—III 130.
 48-51—II 97, 275; III 170.
 51—I 77; III 130.
 52—III 25.
 56—II 286(2x), 301.
 57-58—III 157.
 57-63—III 157.
 59-60—III 115, 275.
 61—I 40; II 21; III 157.
 61-63—I 126, 170.
 61-66—II 403.
 63-64—III 69.
 64—III 25.
 65—II 379.
 66—II 378.
 67—III 135, 232.
 68—I 29.
 70—II 41, 328.
 70-71—II 198; III 81.
 148:1—I 71.

- 4—II 103.
5-6—II 198.
6—II 57.
9—II 214.
9-17—II 218.
11—I 20.
11-13—II 403.
13—II 214, 376.
15-16—II 403.
16—II 213.
17—II 213.
18-22—I 141.
20—III 39.
20-22—II 402.
23—II 106.
23-26—III 76.
24—III 8, 135.
26—II 214.
28—II 212.
30—I 20.
31—I 36, 145.
32-33—II 373.
33—I 36.
38—II 135.
39-40—I 101.
41-43—II 94.
42—II 87(2x).
43-44—I 158.
43-45—I 98.
44—I 70.
45—II 337.
46—II 212, 328.
46-47—II 198.11
149:1—I 71.
2—I 24.
4-5—III 63.
8—II 68, 212.
11—II 106.
12—II 135.
13—II 135.
15-17—I 130.
17—II 138, 213.
19—II 25.
20—II 25.
21-26—II 363; III 192.
24—II 130.
25-26—III 130.
26-29—III 126.
27—I 10, 11, 179; III 9.
28—II 25.
28-29—II 405.
31—II 135.
33—II 181.
39—II 57.

- 40-41—I 97.
 41—II 59.
 42—II 25.
 42-45—III 76.
 44-45—I 200.
 45-46—III 41.
 47—II 287; III 183.
 47-48—II 328; III 184.
 48—III 32.
 49—I 20.
 49-51—II 87.
 50—II 25, 87.
 51—I 68.
 52—I 12; II 59.
 52-53—I 168; III 1, 111.
 54—II 68, 212.
 55—II 103.
 56—II 25, 39, 267.
 57-63—II 91.
 60—III 42.
 61—II 28.
 61-63—II 402.
 64—II 289.
 65—II 289.
 65-66—II 396; III 269.
 70—II 106.
 74—I 10, 11, 179; III 9.
 74-75—III 126.
 76—II 138, 213.
 78—II 25(2x), 212.
 81-82—II 328.
 82—I 16, 46, 102.
 84—II 214.
 150:6-7—II 403.
 9—I 40; II 21.
 11—II 25, 42.
 18—I 20.
 35—II 39.
 151:2—II 25.
 4—I 48; III 255.
 4-5—III 63.
 5—I 21.
 6—I 40; II 21; III 157.
 6-7—II 199.
 7—III 56.
 8-9—I 141; II 405.
 8-11—II 332; III 59.
 10—I 21; II 42, 55.
 10-11—III 213.
 12-13—III 230.
 13—II 25, 42.
 14-15—I 74.
 14-16—I 187.
 15—I 21.

- 15-16—II 403.
 16—III 157.
 17—II 213.
 21—I 21; II 212.
 22-25—I 72.
 26—II 287, 311.
 31—I 21.
 34-38—III 223.
 35-36—III 59.
 36—II 25.
 37—II 214.
 37-40—II 403.
 39—II 376.
 41-44—II 94.
 42—III 45.
 44—I 68.
 44-46—II 159, 162.
 45—II 158.
 47—I 186.
 49—I 72; II 103.
 49-50—III 114.
 50-51—I 102; III 36.
 51—II 267.
 53—II 288.
 53-54—III 41.
 55-57—I 191.
 56—I 77; II 51.
 56-58—III 202.
 57—II 51.
 59-63—I 181.
 67—I 28.
 69—I 29, 197.
 70—I 16; II 213.
 152:53—II 135, 137, 140.
 53-55—I 102; II 328.
 153—I 3.
 153:5—II 41.
 6-8—I 200.
 9—II 287.
 12—II 25, 199.
 13-14—III 205.
 14—I 42.
 15—I 40; II 21.
 154:4-5—III 63.
 5—II 25.
 6—II 103.
 9—II 41.
 10—II 283.
 11-17—II 413.
 13—I 40; II 21.
 16-17—II 373.
 19—II 288.
 19-20—I 184.
 155:4-5—III 63.

- 7-10—II 403.
 7-13—II 415.
 9-10—I 145.
 10—II 376.
 12—II 374.
 13—I 40; II 21.
 14—II 212.
 18-21—III 203.
 24—II 57.
 24-26—II 376, 403.
 27—II 57.
 27-29—II 378.
 27-30—III 133.
 31—II 42, 86.
 33—II 283.
 35—II 51.
 39—II 415.
 43-45—I 130.
 46—I 168, 175; III 1.
 49-50—II 402.
 58-59—II 328.
 66-67—III 80.
 67-69—II 302.
 69—II 41, 51.
 70—II 212.
 157:9-12—II 158.
 34—III 148.
- 158:10—III 114.
 11-13—II 273.
 22—I 158.
 159:41—I 158.
 160—I 2.
 160:28—I 19.
 30—I 158.
 161:3—I 193.
 7—I 16, 158.
 10—I 8.
 12—III 98.
 13—III 78, 79.
 14—III 78.
 20—I 14.
 30-32—I 178.
 32-33—I 147.
 35-36—I 127.
 40—I 17, 81.
 41—III 79.
 43—I 12.
 45—I 12.
 162:2—I 25.
 5—I 75.
 6—I 75.
 7—I 56.
 14—I 10.
 15-16—III 103.

- 16—I 144.
 17 et passim—III 175.
 18—I 11.
 19-20—II 293.
 20—III 25, 27.
 22—I 8.
 24—I 8.
 25-26—III 104.
 27—III 202.
 28—I 75.
 30—II 151, 274; III 167.
 36—I 11.
 39—II 267.
 40—I 10.
 41—I 80.
 43—I 8.
 45—III 202.
 46—I 75.
 51—I 8; III 144.
 52—III 202.
 53—II 137.
 54—III 202.
 56—I 146.
 57—I 194.
 58—I 30.
 59—I 75.
 61—I 41; II 22.
 67—II 274; III 167.
 74—I 30; II 199.
 77—I 62.
 78—III 78.
 78-79—III 78.
 79—I 15.
 80—I 19; III 62.
 163:9—I 19.
 164:9—I 30.
 10—I 30.
 12-14—III 29.
 20—I 9, 63.
 44—III 79.
 51—I 164.
 165:16—III 79.
 24—I 7.
 36—II 157.
 166:4—I 132.
 4-5—I 30.
 10—I 30.
 16—I 11; III 79.
 28—III 28.
 28-29—I 129.30—II 19.
 45—I 31.
 167:25—III 111.
 169:7—II 136.
 12-15—II 134, 171.

- 13—III 114.
 170—II 46.
 170:3—I 14.
 5—III 111.
 7-8—I 117.
 8—I 10.
 12—III 114.
 16—I 29.
 25—I 16.
 28—I 14.
 32—I 16.
 40-41—II 46.
 42—III 111.
 80—II 136.
 171:5—II 157.
 13—II 157.
 17—II 214.
 29—II 157.
 173—II 127.
 173:1-2—II 170.
 2—II 56.
 3—II 127.
 14—II 178.
 174:5-6—III 63.
 7—I 194.
 8—I 25, 66; II 320; III 243.
 8-9—I 67; III 170.
 8-10—III 18.
 11-14—III 48.
 12—I 12, 17.
 15—II 299.
 17—I 25.
 18—II 213, 324; III 197,
 242.
 20-21—I 132.
 22—I 28; II 337.
 175:4-5—III 63.
 5—I 138.
 7—I 25, 66, 67; III 243.
 7-8—III 18, 170.
 9-11—III 48.
 10—I 12, 17.
 12—II 299.
 13—I 25.
 14—III 242.
 176:4-5—III 63.
 5—I 138.
 7—I 25, 66, 67; III 243.
 7-8—III 18, 170.
 9-11—III 48.
 10—I 12, 17.
 12—II 299.
 13—I 25.
 14—III 242.

- 17—II 337.
 31—I 31.
 177:4—I 138.
 178:3—I 138.
 4—I 21, 25; II 47; III 153
 4-8—II 83.
 5—I 21.
 6—I 25.
 6-8—II 411.
 13—II 226.
 21—II 83.
 21-24—III 239.
 179—I 25, 37; II 376.
 179:14—III 171, 243.
 15—I 18; II 319.
 16—II 51.
 17—I 25, 37; II 13, 337.
 17(?)—II 376.
 19—I 25, 181.
 22—III 118.
 24—II 289.
 26—I 25; II 41.
 28—III 171(2x), 243.
 180:4—II 287.
 6—I 39; II 20, 157.
 6-9—II 167.
 8—II 45, 57.
 12-13—III 46.
 14—II 42.
 16—II 41, 58.
 19—II 285; III 50.
 19-20—III 166.
 22—II 45.
 181:9—II 47, 57.
 182:3—I 138.
 6—III 91, 242.
 6-13—II 166.
 8—I 39; II 20, 36, 157.
 14—II 231; III 70.
 14-15—II 323.
 183:5-8—III 64.
 184—I 3, 32.
 184:7—I 32.
 185—II 34; III 235, 240.
 185:4—I 138.
 4-5—III 62.
 6—I 13, 44; II 399.
 7—I 193.
 9-12—I 176.
 10-12—III 30.
 13-15—I 135.
 18—II 159, 162.
 18-19—III 240.
 19—I 36.

- 20—II 29.
 23—I 11; II 159, 162.
 31—II 159, 162.
 32—I 11, 36.
 36—II 29.
 39—II 159, 162.
 40—II 29.
 42—II 267; III 243.
 45—I 90.
 46-47—I 188.
 49—I 13.
 50—II 61, 320.
 52-54—I 151.
 55—II 58.
 56—I 46, 90, 139, 158.
 56-57—I 86.
 61—I 90.
 61-62—II 397.
 61-63—II 121.
 64—I 46; II 267, 397; III
 243.
 67—II 59.
 67-68—II 398; III 24, 222.
 68—II 369.
 69-71—I 191.
 70—I 46, 158.
 73—I 46.
 74—I 48; III 255.
 75—II 61.
 186—II 34.
 186:7—II 43, 135, 149.
 10-11—III 63.
 27—I 161.
 50—II 29.
 52—II 61.
 54—I 158.
 58—II 58.
 59—I 46, 139.
 66—II 53.
 68—II 53.
 77—II 192.
 187:4—I 138.
 4-5—III 62.
 7—I 193.
 9—I 48; III 243, 255.
 11—I 94, 162.
 12—I 19.
 14—I 25.
 20—II 41.
 189—II 156.
 189:4—III 48.
 6-7—III 6.
 6-8—III 100.
 6-9—III 51.

- 11—I 12.
 12—I 25, 36, 139.
 13-15—III 166.
 13-17—II 156.
 15-17—II 378.
 19-20—II 212.
 24—II 149.
 24-25—II 184.
 24-26—III 233.
 26-27—III 131.
 27—III 12.
 r. 2-8—I 53.
 r. 3—I 75.
 r. 3-4—III 245.
 r.4—III 71.
 r. 4-6—III 241.
 r. 6—II 41, 51.
 r. 9—III 243.
 r. 9-11—III 171.
 r. 13—I 21, II 285.
 r. 13-15—I 147; III 48.
 r. 15—II 137.
 r. 15-17—II 406.
 r. 17—I 38, 77; II 149.
 r. 21—II 149.
 r. 21-22—III 241.
 r. 24—II 43.
 190—I 3.
 191:4-6—II 380.
 6-8—III 49.
 9—II 41.
 9-10—II 127, 378, 397; III
 24, 236, 245.
 10—I 38; II 149.
 11—III 199.
 11-13—I 132; II 212.
 11-14—III 242.
 11-15—II 314.
 14—I 13; II 284, 353.
 15—I 38.
 16—II 41, 51.
 17—III 71.
 19—I 21, 90.
 20—II 57.
 20-21—I 86.
 192:5-6—III 153.
 10—I 139; II 226.
 20-21—III 55.
 193:3—III 48.
 6—I 25; II 284, 320.
 7—II 148; III 194, 199.
 15-16—III 241.
 16—II 41, 51.
 17—II 137; III 209.

- 17-18—I 176; III 219.
 19-21—III 111
 21—II 285, 314(2x).
 21-24—II 414.
 22—II 375.
 23—III 43.
 194:5—I 66.
 5-8—I 67.
 5-9—III 129.
 22—I 139; II 287, 311.
 195:4-10—II 399; III 178.
 5—I 36, 143.
 7—I 13, 19, 44.
 9—I 36.
 11-15—III 135.
 12-13—I 167, 168; III 1, 2.
 13—I 142.
 14-15—III 48.
 17—I 145.
 17-23—II 369.
 19—I 145(2x).
 19-23—II 398.
 20—II 317.
 21—III 201.
 22—I 36.
 23—III 53.
 24-29—III 99.
 24-32—III 49.
 31—II 231; III 72.
 196—II 26.
 196:3-4—I 194; III 48.
 4—I 46, 186.
 5—II 226.
 32—I 94, 132; II 26.
 32-33—II 300; III 129.
 33-36—I 189(2x).
 35-36—II 403.
 38-41—II 300.
 38-43—III 81.
 40—I 94.
 41—II 26.
 42—II 57.
 197:5-6—I 108.
 6—I 54, 196; III 12, 236,
 245.
 7—I 94.
 7-16—II 223.
 8—II 225.
 9—III 41.
 10—II 36.
 10-12—I 85.
 11—I 43; II 24.
 12—I 43; II 24.
 14—II 45.

- 16—II 45, 58.
 16-19—II 158.
 17—II 47, 52, 267.
 18—II 47, 135, 157.
 20—II 53, 321.
 22—II 149.
 24—I 67.
 26—II 51, 225.
 26-31—II 206.
 26-32—II 223.
 27—II 36.
 29—I 43; II 24.
 30—I 43; II 24.
 31-34—II 150, 348.
 32—II 310, 311.
 35—II 214.
 35-39—I 156.
 37—I 54.
 40—II 52.
 41—II 45.
 43—II 94.
 lo. ed.—I 132.
 198:4-7—III 178.
 7—I 12, 13, 16, 18, 44,
 75(2x); II 400.
 10—I 12, 48, 75(2x); III
 243, 255.
- 11—I 22.
 11-17—III 121.
 12—I 12, 201.
 13—I 48; III 255.
 14—I 22.
 16—I 48; III 255.
 19-20—III 50.
 20—I 73; II 133.
 21—III 244.
 21-23—I 54; III 17.
 24—I 20.
 27—I 22; III 159, 243.
 27-29—III 164.
 30-31—I 73.
 200:5—II 47, 56.
 7—II 47.
 201:7-8—III 48.
 9-10—III 152.
 11—II 287.
 12-13—II 380.
 14—I 35.
 14-16—I 50, 108, 184; III
 101, 217.
 16—II 41, 51.
 17-18—I 49.
 17-21—III 49.
 21—II 231; III 72.

- 202:6—I 193
7—I 54.
9-11—III 49.
11—III 91.
12-14—I 108, 184; III 246.
13—I 35.
13 ff.—I 49.
14—II 41, 51.
15-19—III 49.
- 203:7-8—III 48.
9-10—I 58.
11—II 380.
11-12—III 49.
13 ff.—I 49.
13-16—III 49.
19—I 10; II 45, 198, 231;
III 72.
- 204:7-8—III 48.
9—I 58.
12—II 380.
12-14—III 49.
15 ff.—I 49.
15-18—III 49.
19—II 198, 231; III 72.
20—I 10.
- 205:1—II 198.
6—I 142.
- 7-8—III 48.
9—I 58.
10—II 380.
10-12—III 49.
13-17—III 49.
14 ff.—I 49.
14-15—III 99(2x).
15—III 156.
18—I 10; II 231; III 72.
- 206:5—II 41.
10—II 287.
11—II 380.
11-12—III 49.
13-17—III 49.
- 207:7—II 148.
17-18—III 161.
19-20—I 199.
- 208:9—II 287.
10-12—III 163.
10-14—III 80.
14—I 146.
- 209—I 1, 4.
209:1—I 14.
3—III 183.
5—I 194.
6—I 14.
7—I 36, 146; II 351.

- 7-8—III 48.
 8—III 171.
 8-10—III 131(2x).
 9—I 48; III 12, 255.
 10—II 213; III 171.
 13-16—III 185.
 14—I 14.
 15—III 37.
 16—I 11, 31.
 211—I 46, 186, 194.
 211:5-6—III 100.
 7—III 243.
 8-9—I 48; III 255.
 9-11—I 100.
 10—I 39; II 20.
 10-11—II 345.
 13—II 36.
 14—I 48; II 61; III 255.
 15-17—III 172.
 16—I 11; III 35.
 17-20—II 368.
 17-23—II 395.
 18—II 47, 55.
 18-20—III 211.
 19—I 13, 39; II 20.
 21-23—III 27.
 22—II 287.
 212:2-3—III 178.
 5—I 194.
 6-7—III 129.
 6-10—III 91.
 8—I 10, 155.
 9—I 15.
 10—I 14.
 11—I 14, 48; III 255
 12-14—I 171, 202(2x).
 13—I 14.
 14—I 41; II 22.
 213:4—I 13.
 5—I 10, 44, 75, 99; II 399.
 6-9—I 193.
 9—I 19; III 232.
 10—II 226.
 12-13—III 111.
 13—II 287, 314.
 214:6—II 43, 185.
 215:4-5—III 232.
 4-9—I 193.
 6—I 46, 186, 194.
 9—III 191.
 9-10—III 205.
 9-15—III 190, 193, 202.
 11—III 201.
 12—I 95.

- 13-14—III 229.
 16—II 268.
 216:6—II 226.
 8—II 380.
 8-9—III 50.
 10—II 187.
 10-11—II 414.
 11—II 374.
 12—III 147.
 13—I 149.
 15—I 39; II 20, 157.
 15-17—II 167.
 18—II 45.
 18-20—III 219.
 20—II 56, 68.
 217:7—II 226.
 8—I 149.
 13-16—I 108.
 218:8—I 149.
 220:6—I 13, 44; II 399.
 9—II 226.
 10—I 149.
 11-12—I 108; II 230.
 11-14—II 414.
 13-14—II 374.
 15—II 41, 58.
 15-19—II 229, 411.
 20—I 36, 145.
 24—II 306.
 25—II 41.
 25-30—II 229; III 69.
 27—II 229.
 30-31—II 403.
 221:7—II 43, 110, 185.
 8—II 226.
 11-16—II 231; III 69.
 12—II 41, 57.
 14—II 38.
 222:6—II 43.
 223:6—II 43, 110, 185.
 7-10—I 123; II 186.
 224:5—III 235.
 6—I 194.
 7-9—III 85.
 8—I 161, 171.
 9—I 24.
 10—II 35, 59, 72.
 10-16—III 184.
 13-18—III 22.
 14—I 30; II 45, 51.
 225:3—I 21, 32.
 6—I 21.
 10—II 35, 57.
 10-12—III 27.

- 13—I 77.
 226:6—III 242.
 7—I 128.
 10-11—II 67.
 15—II 187.
 16—I 161.
 67—II 353.
 227:5—II 285.
 5-6—III 171.
 5-7—II 411.
 7—II 226; III 12.
 8-9—II 201.
 8-13—II 120.
 9—I 95, 152; II 286; III 12.
 10—II 60; III 90.
 11—II 288.
 13—II 314(2x); III 12.
 13-14—I 198.
 14—I 175.
 15—II 54, 62.
 22—I 68.
 228—II 31.
 228:4—I 20.
 5—I 138.
 9—III 235.
 10—I 48; III 243, 255.
 10-12—III 255.
- 10-15—III 118.
 13—III 243.
 13-16—I 127.
 14—II 235.
 15—I 20.
 16—I 146.
 18—I 44; II 212, 220.
 18-19—III 243.
 18-24—II 65.
 18-25—I 116; II 245, 335.
 19—II 35, 222.
 20-24—III 243.
 21—I 23.
 21-23—III 30.
 22—I 20.
 35—II 38.
 230—I 2.
 230:1—III 228.
 1-2—II 274.
 3—II 320.
 4-7—III 71.
 6—I 146; II 320; III 112.
 6-7—I 196.
 9—I 155.
 12—II 19.
 13—II 41, 58.
 14-15—I 198.

- 14-16—I 61.
 17—I 155.
 18—II 272.
 20—II 40.
 30-32—I 198.
 231:7-8—I 44.
 8—I 13; II 399.
 10—I 145.
 13—I 145.
 16—II 41.
 232:3—I 20.
 3-5—III 177.
 5—I 13, 44; II 399.
 6-11—I 193.
 7—I 145.
 9—II 185.
 10—I 13.
 10-11—III 5, 232.
 11—I 20.
 12-15—I 104; II 358; III
 101, 217, 278.
 16—I 18, 24, 51.
 16-20—I 100; II 77; III
 142.
 17-18—III 53.
 20—II 36.
 233:3-11—II 186.
- 7—I 139.
 8—I 13, 44; II 400.
 9-15—I 192.
 11—I 145.
 13—II 185.
 13-14—III 232.
 15—I 21.
 16—I 24, 26; II 35, 101.
 16-18—II 105, 200, 201.
 18—II 36.
 18-20—II 186.
 234—II 255.
 234:2—I 145.
 5—I 139
 5-6—I 44.
 6—I 13; II 400.
 7—II 38.
 8—I 145; II 348.
 9—II 185.
 11—I 173.
 11-26—II 211.
 11-27—III 265.
 16—II 58.
 16-17—I 116.
 17—II 51.
 20—I 115, 116.
 21—II 36, 62.

- 22-26—II 277.
 23—II 35, 60.
 24—II 267.
 26-27—II 397.
 27—I 40, 77; II 21, 55.
 30-33—II 124.
 32—II 334.
 235—II 31.
 235:3—I 145.
 8—I 193.
 9—II 185.
 236—I 3.
 237:1-14—III 68.
 2—II 99, 322.
 2-6—II 323.
 5—II 99, 322.
 9-10—III 196.
 11—II 99.
 13—II 35, 322.
 13-16—II 94.
 14-17—III 68.
 15—II 285.
 16-17—I 137; III 70.
 18-22—II 323.
 19-20—I 176; III 66.
 30—I 95.
 238:6—II 99.
- 7-9—II 331.
 8—II 42, 55.
 9—II 213, 396; III 199.
 25—II 99.
 25-28—II 323.
 27—II 99, 322.
 29—II 212.
 31-33—I 68; II 46, 184,
 190.
 239:7—III 235.
 8-17—II 100.
 11—I 19; II 83.
 11-17—III 68.
 12-17—I 117.
 13—I 21; II 54.
 18—I 66.
 18-19—I 67; III 171.
 20—I 19.
 23-24—I 86.
 26-27—III 50.
 240:4-7—III 49.
 241:3-7—III 179.
 6—I 10, 13, 44.
 9—I 48; III 243, 255.
 9-10—III 128.
 9-12—III 118.
 11—II 149.

- 17—I 191.
 19—I 48; III 255.
 242:5—I 173.
 7-8—I 194.
 8—II 43, 110, 185.
 9—III 243.
 9-10—II 284; III 162.
 14—III 243.
 14-17—I 53.
 17—I 11.
 243:6—III 97.
 8—II 226.
 9-10—III 97.
 10-13—III 117, 271.
 10-18—II 229; III 135.
 11—I 12.
 13—I 167; III 1.
 19—II 289.
 19-21—I 173.
 19-22—II 325.
 20—I 171.
 21—II 213.
 21-22—II 249; III 197,
 229.
 244—III 235.
 244:4—I 86.
 7—I 86.
 7-8—III 242.
 8—I 17; III 235.
 8-12—II 325, 413.
 9-12—II 111.
 11-12—III 47.
 12—III 46.
 13—I 22; III 12, 209, 235,
 244.
 13-14—II 394.
 13-17—III 211.
 14—I 11, 19.
 15—I 22; III 209, 235, 244.
 15-17—II 370, 394; III 53.
 16—I 21; II 390.
 18-20—II 82.
 19—II 40; III 209, 244.
 19-20—I 133; III 221.
 20—I 9.
 21-24—II 405.
 23—I 12.
 23-24—II 373.
 24—I 20.
 24-32—III 96.
 25—III 244.
 25-28—I 127.
 25-29—II 252.
 25-38—II 217; III 198.

- 26-29—III 241.
 27—III 209, 244.
 27-29—III 224.
 28—I 43, 80; II 23, 36; III
 43.
 30—III 244.
 30-31—I 128.
 31-32—I 36.
 33-38—II 252.
 34—II 18.
 34-36—I 189; II 402.
 35—I 190.
 37—I 43, 80; II 23; III 209,
 244.
 37-38—III 224.
 37-41—III 96.
 38—I 22; II 36.
 38-41—I 142, 158, 191.
 38-43—II 145.
 40—I 191.
 42—III 236.
 42-43—II 390, 391; III
 247.
 43—II 141.
 245—I 76; III 235, 240.
 245:1—II 309; III 240.
 1-2—II 284; III 28.
 3—III 244.
 3-6—III 239.
 3-7—II 241; III 187.
 5—II 235.
 6—I 167; III 4.
 6-7—III 232.
 7—I 78; II 47, 235.
 8—II 38(2x).
 8-9—II 76, 78.
 9—II 53, 321.
 9-10—III 122.
 10—I 76, 92; III 1, 8, 122.
 11-12—II 71.
 11-14—II 292.
 13-14—II 412.
 14—I 77(2x), 92.
 15—III 243.
 15-18—I 64; III 165.
 18—I 36.
 19—III 197.
 24-30—II 243.
 25—II 36.
 27-30—II 177, 178.
 28—III 31.
 28-30—II 159.
 29—II 235.
 30—I 78; II 36.

- 30-33—II 177.
 31—I 78.
 33-35—II 303.
 34—I 77.
 35—I 76, 92; III 23, 31, 54,
 56.
 36—II 284.
 36-37—I 109, 110; III 246,
 275.
 36-38—III 77.
 36-40—II 151, 191.
 38—I 73; II 35.
 39-40—I 157.
 41-45—I 83; II 177.
 46—II 249; III 197.
 46-47—III 242.
 246:8—II 226.
 r.3—II 320.
 r.5-10—I 84.
 247:9—II 35, 60.
 11—II 226.
 14-16—I 184.
 19—II 186.
 248:9—III 242.
 10-12—II 200.
 10-16—I 123.
 11—II 36.
 15—I 45.
 15-17—II 309.
 16—I 73.
 18-20—III 117.
 20—II 284, 320.
 21—III 242.
 21-22—III 229.
 249:3—II 45.
 5—II 45.
 6—I 110; II 285; III 275.
 6-7—III 77.
 10—II 42, 52.
 10-11—II 237.
 12-14—II 394; III 46.
 13—II 55.
 250—I 84(2x).
 250:4-7—II 379, 405.
 5—II 311.
 5-8—I 84.
 8—I 174; II 12, 310, 311;
 III 41.
 9-11—I 113; II 142; III
 116.
 10—I 39; II 20, 45, 141.
 11—I 23.
 14—I 174.
 15—I 169; II 45; III 2, 140.

- 15-17—II 278.
 16—II 267.
 16-18—I 165; III 73.
 18—I 174; II 40.
 18-19—I 67.
 19—I 25, 66, 84.
 20-21—II 407.
 21—I 24, 37; II 375.
 22—II 36, 61, 62.
 23—II 35, 60, 67.
 26—II 40, 26, 235; III 46,
 47.
 28—II 35; III 8, 121, 122.
 32-38—I 84.
 33—II 36, 334.
 33-34—II 117; III 44.
 35—II 289.
 37-38—III 42.
 38—III 41.
 39—II 12, 310, 311.
 40—II 45; III 140.
 41—I 174; II 267.
 42—II 36, 53, 321.
 42-44—II 201.
 46—II 36.
 48—I 84.
 51—II 43, 135, 149.
 52—II 45.
 53—II 57.
 55—I 94, 95.
 55-56—II 145, 379, 402.
 56—II 141.
 57—I 191; III 201.
 57-58—I 156, 158, 167; III
 205.
 58-59—I 165.
 59—II 43, 135, 149.
 60—I 177.
 251:1—II 286.
 1-2—I 90.
 1-3—I 118; III 184.
 2-3—III 22.
 5—III 50.
 7—I 169; III 2, 139.
 7-11—II 231; III 70, 239.
 9—II 55, 71.
 10—I 21.
 11—I 21, 95.
 11-12—II 235.
 11-15—I 177; II 155, 241.
 13—II 244.
 15—II 42, 61.
 252:5—II 287.
 5-8—II 238; III 89.

- 6-7—II 298.
 8—II 41, 58; III 137.
 9—II 289.
 9-11—III 90.
 12—II 289, 298.
 13-15—II 304.
 14—II 286.
 "14—II 353.
 16-17—III 90.
 16-19—I 131; II 5, 43, 54,
 65.
 17—II 38, 78.
 18—II 148.
 18-19—I 174.
 19—I 43; II 24, 55, 169.
 20—II 119(2x); III 91.
 21—III 2.
 21-22—II 298.
 22—II 289.
 23—II 40.
 23-24—III 145.
 23-30—II 242.
 25-26—II 265; III 40.
 25-27—I 88.
 26—I 92, 168, 174; III 1.
 27—II 45, 55.
 28—II 41, 58.
 29-30—II 298.
 29-31—II 242.
 30—III 236.
 30-31—III 247.
 31—II 41, 58.
 253:3-4—II 400.
 5—I 13, 44.
 7—II 226.
 7-10—II 104, 203.
 9—III 43.
 10—II 102.
 16—I 144.
 18—III 157.
 18-20—I 175; III 156.
 18-22—II 341; III 82.
 19—III 157.
 20-21—III 157.
 21—II 14.
 23—II 58.
 25-27—III 110.
 25-28—I 143, 158.
 26-28—II 378, 407.
 27—I 191.
 28—I 38; II 149.
 29-31—I 116.
 32—II 212.
 35—II 403.

- 254:2-3—III 177.
 6—II 226, 348.
 6-7—II 104, 203.
 8-10—I 50, 108.
 9—II 53.
 9-10—III 27.
 10—III 172.
 10-11—I 48; III 255.
 11-15—III 212.
 13—II 53.
 14—II 53.
 14-15—I 173.
 15—I 30.
 16—II 51.
 16-17—III 6.
 17-19—III 212.
 18—I 16.
 18-19—I 150.
 19-22—II 341.
 20—III 156.
 20-23—III 82.
 21-22—III 157.
 24—III 7.
 24-26—II 100; III 150.
 24-27—III 238.
 25—II 54.
 25-27—I 124; III 110, 279.
- 27—I 21, 24, 168; III 1.
 28—II 42.
 28-29—II 328; III 30.
 30-35—II 327, 328.
 30-37—II 114..
 32—II 42.
 32-35—III 213.
 32-37—III 165.
 34—I 30.
 36—I 78; II 285.
 36-37—III 55.
 38-39—I 163.
 38-42—III 190.
 38-46—II 357; III 138.
 40—I 80; II 53.
 44-46—III 225.
 45-46—I 173.
 46—II 19, 42.
 61—I 18.
- 255:3-5—III 177.
 4—I 139.
 5—I 9, 10, 13, 75, 99; II
 399.
 8—II 299.
 8-11—II 159, 164, 242,
 375.
 9—I 28, 31, 139.

- 9-11—III 156.
 11—I 80; II 271, 272.
 12-14—I 50, 108; II 159,
 162; III 101, 217.
 13—I 28, 39(2x), 139; II
 19, 42, 158.
 14-20—II 159, 164.
 17—I 17, 63; II 137, 158.
 18—I 28, 139.
 20-23—III 82.
 22—II 158, 213.
 23—I 28, 139.
 24—I 80.
 24-25—III 146.
 25—II 289.
 38-46—III 92.
 256—II 127.
 256:4-5—III 91, 242, 275.
 4-10—II 315.
 4-13—II 122.
 5—III 50.
 6—I 22(2x).
 7—I 22(2x), II 12, 122.
 7-9—III 53.
 7-10—III 137, 275.
 8—I 21.
 9—I 20(2x).
 10—II 138, 212.
 10-13—II 216; III 185,
 200.
 11—II 138, 212.
 14—I 21, 23; III 156.
 14-19—III 163.
 16—II 267.
 17—II 267.
 19—II 267.
 19-21—III 35, 121.
 19-23—II 128.
 20—I 22(2x).
 22—I 181.
 22-23—I 201.
 24-27—III 98.
 25—I 21.
 27—I 21, 128.
 28—III 181.
 29-30—I 167.
 29-33—II 412; III 156.
 31—I 75; II 286.
 31-33—II 412.
 33-35—II 241.
 257:7—I 48; III 255.
 10—II 353.
 13—II 285.
 18—II 43, 148.

- 18-19—III 147.
 20—II 38, 148.
 258:6-9—I 115, 199; II 111.
 7—II 52.
 9—I 11; II 288.
 259:6-8—I 115.
 7—II 284.
 260—I 1.
 260:3—III 98.
 6-10—III 90.
 8—II 42.
 12-13—II 325.
 14—II 42.
 261—I 42; II 22.
 261:7-10—I 115; II 115, 198.
 10—I 23, 41; II 22.
 262:7-11—I 115, 199; II 198.
 10—I 11; II 288.
 263:2—II 268.
 8—II 286.
 8-17—II 305.
 9-13—II 290.
 11—I 12.
 12—I 12, 20.
 13—I 19.
 13-16—I 120.
 14-17—I 64, 96.
 18—II 212.
 20—II 286.
 20-21—III 55.
 22—I 95, 129.
 23—II 213; III 199.
 26—II 301.
 264:1—III 181.
 5—I 48; II 276; III 170,
 172, 243, 255.
 6—II 287, 311.
 6-7—II 380, 393.
 7—III 56.
 8—I 178; II 306; III 9, 209,
 213.
 9—II 330.
 9-10—II 159, 380, 396; III
 211.
 11—II 267.
 11-13—III 184.
 12—I 178; II 306; III 9,
 209(2x).
 12-13—III 221.
 14—III 170.
 14-15—I 67, 137; II 276;
 III 46, 170, 172.
 14-19—II 84.
 15—II 47.

- 15-16—I 145.
 15-19—III 187.
 18—I 86, 92, 174.
 18-19—I 85, 138, 164; III
 57.
 19-21—III 159.
 20—I 10; II 287, 311.
 20-22—II 380, 393.
 22—I 30.
 22-23—III 56.
 23—I 22; II 36, 55, 71.
 24—II 149.
 265:4—II 287, 311.
 7-10—III 54.
 10-13—I 184.
 13—I 184.
 14-15—II 405.
 266:8—I 8, 194.
 9—II 285.
 9-11—III 141.
 9-12—III 213.
 10—II 285.
 12—II 130.
 13—II 285.
 14—II 285.
 15—II 130.
 16—II 285.
 19—II 38, 57.
 19-21—III 72.
 19-25—I 53; III 64.
 20-28—II 342.
 22-25—III 212.
 267:7-11—I 197.
 8—I 8.
 9-11—II 202.
 9-12—I 130.
 9-13—II 182.
 9-14—I 177.
 12—II 187.
 15—I 10; II 36.
 17—I 18.
 18—I 21.
 20—I 10.
 268:7—I 8.
 8-11—III 56.
 9—I 128; II 353.
 17—I 30.
 18-19—I 186.
 19—I 142.
 269:1—III 181.
 4—II 69.
 8—I 8; II 226.
 11—I 39; II 20, 157.
 11-12—I 133.

- 11-13—II 167.
 14—I 39; II 20, 157.
 14-17—II 167.
 270:4—II 35.
 8—I 8.
 9-13—I 144; II 413.
 9-16—II 142.
 11—I 24.
 12—II 371.
 12-13—III 46, 47.
 14-16—I 190; III 57.
 17-21—II 258, 264, 278.
 18—II 272.
 18-21—III 107, 193.
 21—I 22.
 21-28—II 167.
 24—I 39; II 20, 157; III 197.
 24-29—II 70, 101, 252.
 26-27—III 197.
 26-28—III 46.
 27—II 54.
 28—I 77; III 223.
 29—II 53.
 33—I 162.
 271:8—I 8.
 9—I 14.
 11-12—III 30.
 17—III 206.
 17-20—III 189.
 17-21—II 168
 18—I 39; II 20, 137, 157.
 18-21—I 87.
 20-21—III 224.
 21—I 10, 19, 20; II 45, 55.
 22-27—III 181.
 26—II 77; III 21.
 272:11-17—II 409.
 14—II 288.
 21—II 77.
 23—I 40; II 20.
 23-25—II 152.
 273:7—I 8.
 10—II 288.
 11—II 289.
 11-14—II 409.
 22—I 178; III 9, 209.
 22-24—III 213.
 23—II 306.
 26—I 94.
 274:9—I 8.
 10-13—III 58.
 10-14—II 69.
 10-16—II 252.

- 14—II 38, 53.
 14-16—III 223.
 15—I 12.
 17-18—II 405.
 275:4—II 69.
 8—I 8.
 9—II 89.
 9-14—II 187.
 276:4—II 69.
 8—I 8.
 9-11—II 200.
 9-13—II 103.
 12—II 187.
 277:7—I 8.
 8-12—II 187.
 15—II 36.
 278:8—I 8.
 9-10—I 100.
 9-15—I 177.
 12—II 187.
 279:8—I 8.
 9—I 14.
 11—II 83.
 14—I 39; II 20, 157.
 14-15—II 167.
 18—II 47, 53, 321.
 18-19—III 30.
 18-21—II 219, 251; III
 198.
 18-23—II 148.
 19-21—I 159.
 20—II 47, 135.
 31—I 46.
 280:9—I 39; II 20, 157.
 9-10—II 159, 162.
 10—II 368.
 12—II 14, 288.
 12-15—II 315, 342.
 13—II 289.
 13-15—I 55, 128.
 14—II 182.
 16—III 139.
 16-17—III 27.
 16-18—I 112.
 16-20—II 278.
 18-20—II 271.
 19—II 46.
 20—I 38; II 271; III 41.
 21-24—II 200.
 22—II 99.
 24-29—II 92.
 25—I 41; II 22.
 25-29—III 185.
 26—II 99.

- 26-29—I 183; III 47.
 27—I 178.
 30-35—II 100.
 31—II 54.
 32—I 146.
 33-34—I 192.
 36-37—III 27.
 37—I 94.
 37-39—II 182.
 37-40—I 117.
 38—II 42.
 38-39—II 231; III 70.
 281:1-3—I 147.
 11—I 39; II 20, 157.
 11-12—I 133; II 167.
 13—II 38, 77.
 14—II 36.
 27—I 39; II 20, 157.
 27-28—I 133; II 167.
 29—II 36.
 282:4—II 349.
 4-11—I 193.
 6—III 232.
 6-7—III 100, 232.
 7—I 20.
 8—I 22; II 212.
 9—I 53, 178, 184.
 10-11—I 132.
 10-12—III 146.
 10-14—II 192.
 12—III 147.
 283:4-6—II 349.
 5—I 94.
 7—II 288.
 7-9—II 277.
 8—II 269, 270.
 9—I 12, 21; II 266, 270; III
 37.
 10—II 55.
 10-11—I 107, 166; II 152;
 III 246.
 10-13—II 372, 397; III 37.
 11—II 372.
 12—III 99, 230.
 14—III 37.
 15—I 94.
 15-16—III 189, 204.
 16—I 73; II 155.
 18—I 22.
 18-20—III 94.
 19—I 28.
 20—I 32, 79.
 21—I 53, 178, 184.
 23—II 311.

- 23-24—III 59.
 25-26—I 132.
 26—I 73.
 27-30—III 108.
 30-33—III 206.
 284:4—II 350.
 5—II 350.
 6—II 267.
 8—I 53; II 320.
 8-9—I 184.
 9—I 178.
 12—II 36.
 13—II 285.
 14—I 111.
 18-20—I 76.
 18—I 94.
 19—I 92.
 22—II 350.
 25—I 45.
 285:1-2—II 274.
 5-6—III 18, 256.
 7-10—II 152, 205.
 10—II 73.
 15-16—I 133; III 202.
 16—I 9.
 18—II 212.
 19—I 155.
 23—320.
 26—II 212.
 28—II 24, 213; III 198.
 28-29—III 148.
 29—I 169; III 3.
 30—II 56.
 286:1—I 15; II 268.
 1-2—II 274.
 4—III 235.
 5—I 111.
 6—I 19, 24, 144; II 51, 304.
 6-8—II 298; III 239.
 7—III 51.
 9-11—I 50; III 174, 263.
 10—I 73.
 11—I 94.
 12—I 34.
 12-13—II 181, 203.
 13—I 73.
 14-15—III 246, 276.
 16—III 68, 76.
 17—II 41, 58.
 17-20—III 238.
 17-21—II 11.
 18—I 23; II 59; III 246.
 19—I 155.
 20—II 39.

- 20-21—III 141.
 20-23—III 77.
 21—I 24; III 51.
 22—I 24; II 41, 200.
 24—I 24.
 26—II 299.
 27—I 80.
 28—II 73.
 33—III 244.
 35—I 9; II 288.
 35-36—I 80, 200.
 36—II 73.
 36-37—II 149.
 37—I 40; II 20, 53.
 39—II 41, 42, 58.
 39-40—III 38.
 39-41—II 218; III 238.
 40—II 24, 213.
 41—I 9.
 41-42—III 46.
 41-43—II 329.
 42—I 34; II 42, 55; III 209.
 42-43—II 394; III 210.
 43—II 25, 368; III 35.
 44—III 50.
 44-47—II 218.
 45—III 198.
 46—II 24(2x), 213(2x).
 47-50—II 217.
 48—II 83.
 49—II 41, 58.
 49-50—II 11.
 50—II 25, 44; III 209, 210.
 51—I 13; II 213.
 52—III 202, 244.
 53—II 212.
 53-55—II 218.
 54—I 19, 30; III 198.
 54-55—I 134.
 56—I 14; II 24, 213, 300.
 57—I 31.
 57-59—I 134; II 355.
 57-60—II 358; III 189(2x),
 190, 280.
 58—I 95; III 244.
 59—I 31.
 61-64—III 174.
 62—II 25.
 62-63—I 149.
 287—I 164.
 287:1-2—II 274.
 11—II 25, 181; III 7.
 11-12—II 291.
 13—I 163.

- 14-16—I 88.
15-16—I 18.
16—I 92, 161 ; III 98.
17—I 163.
17-19—II 218.
18—II 24, 213; III 198.
19—II 24.
20—I 95; II 25.
20-21—I 133; III 4.
23—I 133; III 202.
24—I 155.
25-28—I 74.
27-29—II 380, 395.
28—I 53.
29—I 94, 95.
29-30—I 172; II 275; III
169.
32-33—II 306.
33-34—I 163; III 80, 256.
35—II 141, 142.
36—I 161; II 290, 296, 298,
304.
37—II 135.
43—I 163.
43-46—II 84.
45—II 25, 100; III 69.
46—II 384.
46-48—II 384.
47—III 11.
48—I 164.
50—II 40, 52, 270.
51-52—III 112.
52—II 268; III 3, 6.
53—II 287, 311.
53-57—II 290.
54—I 142, 190.
55—III 236.
56—I 10, 16.
56-57—II 304.
57—I 164.
57-59—II 329.
58—II 42, 55.
59—II 406.
60—II 299.
60-61—III 131.
62—II 368.
62-63—II 329, 395.
64-65—II 274.
65—I 15; II 268.
65-68—III 174.
66—I 48.
67—II 25.
67-68—I 149.
69—I 48.

- 69-70—II 364.
 70—I 60, 62; II 286; III 21.
 71—II 24.
 72—I 18.
 73—I 169, 178; II 25, 285;
 III 4, 9.
 74—I 18.
 288—III 26.
 288:1-2—II 274.
 4—III 235.
 5—II 299.
 5-7—III 171.
 6—I 19.
 7-8—II 275, 276; III 47,
 169, 170.
 9—III 206.
 9-10—III 18, 256.
 9-11—III 172.
 9-12—I 49; III 256.
 10—I 30.
 11—I 30.
 13—III 244.
 14—I 34.
 15—I 73.
 16-22—II 298, 302.
 18—I 29; III 55.
 18-19—III 242.
 21—I 18, 143.
 22—III 55.
 24—I 80; II 289.
 25—I 73.
 25-26—III 12.
 25-28—I 9.
 29—III 31.
 30-31—I 137; III 210.
 30-32—III 91.
 32—II 285; III 25.
 32-33—III 31.
 33—III 43.
 34—I 34.
 35—I 28; II 54.
 36—I 18.
 36-38—III 118.
 38—II 25, 54.
 39—III 202.
 39-40—III 17.
 40—I 13, 197.
 40-41—I 137.
 41—II 25, 288.
 42—III 198.
 43—I 18.
 44—II 25.
 45—II 25, 69, 288.
 47—I 90.

- 49—II 212.
 51—I 15, 73; III 202, 244.
 51-52—I 133.
 51-53—II 358; III 4, 189.
 52—I 95; II 288, 289.
 54—II 28.
 54-56—III 80, 215.
 56—I 13, 155.
 57—I 15; III 202, 244.
 57-58—I 133.
 57-61—III 189.
 58—I 40, 95; II 20, 24, 213.
 58-61—II 206.
 59—II 25.
 60—I 36; III 11.
 60-61—II 56.
 61—I 86; II 18.
 62—I 29.
 63-66—III 174.
 64—II 25; III 235.
 64-65—I 149.
 66—I 48; III 255.
 289:1-2—II 274.
 5—II 73.
 7—II 368.
 9—I 24, 94; II 24.
 10—I 23; III 216, 276.
 11—I 21.
 12—II 24.
 14—I 16, 21.
 15—I 95.
 15-16—III 189.
 15-17—II 355.
 15-19—III 19.
 16—I 23.
 16-17—III 31.
 18—I 29.
 18-19—III 172.
 20—I 16.
 21-22—III 31.
 23—I 29.
 25—I 21.
 26—I 180; III 199.
 29—I 11, 16, 21; II 219,
 251; III 198.
 30—I 139, 150.
 30-31—III 56.
 30-35—I 187; II 153.
 32—II 299.
 35—I 39, 40; II 19, 20.
 36—I 150; III 244.
 37—II 138, 212.
 37-40—II 216, 298; III
 200.

- 38-40—III 194, 195.
 41—II 212; III 52.
 42—I 40, 188; II 20, 24,
 213.
 44—I 9; II 288.
 45—II 73, 268.
 46—I 10.
 47—I 29.
 48-50—III 174.
 50—II 286; III 21.
 50-51—I 62; II 364.
 51—I 49; III 256.
 290:1-2—II 274.
 2—I 15; II 268.
 5—II 25.
 8—II 311.
 8-10—III 98.
 11—I 29.
 12—I 9; II 288.
 14—III 119.
 14-15—III 145.
 15—I 16, 21, 29, 80.
 15-17—I 127.
 16-18—III 21.
 17—I 9; II 288.
 19—II 212.
 19-21—II 218.
 20—II 24, 213; III 198.
 21—II 24, 213; III 198.
 22—I 15, 133; III 202.
 22-24—II 358; III 189.
 23—I 9; II 288.
 25—I 94.
 29—II 212.
 292—I 2.
 292:4—I 139.
 8—II 285.
 8-9—III 141.
 9—II 285.
 10—II 130.
 11—II 285.
 12—II 130.
 13—II 38.
 13-17—III 64.
 17-19—II 224, 348.
 17-26—II 96, 98, 115, 226.
 18-19—II 345.
 22-26—III 134.
 23—II 41, 58.
 24—I 168; II 226; III 2.
 29—II 285, 286, 302.
 29-30—I 184.
 31-32—II 380.
 33-34—III 166.

- 34—II 299.
 35—III 43.
 36-40—II 182.
 37—II 137.
 38-40—III 49.
 39—II 186.
 41-49—II 336.
 44—III 116.
 44-45—I 113.
 45—I 151; III 134.
 46—II 119.
 50—II 28, 119.
 50-51—III 32.
 51-52—I 130, 149.
 52—I 95, 152.
 293:8-10—I 177; II 224.
 10-11—I 143.
 12—II 41, 58.
 12-13—III 134.
 13—I 168; III 2.
 19—II 169.
 22—II 168.
 294:5—I 193.
 6—II 226.
 6-8—II 224.
 8—II 268.
 11-12—I 99.
 11-13—II 224.
 12—II 41, 58.
 13—II 301.
 14—I 22.
 16-18—I 144.
 16-24—II 378.
 20—II 149.
 23—I 12, 21.
 23-24—III 166.
 24—I 12.
 25—I 22.
 26—I 95, 152.
 27-28—III 140.
 27-35—III 194.
 29—II 52, 269.
 29-30—III 53.
 31—II 42, 52, 269.
 32—I 21; II 41, 51.
 32-35—III 131, 133, 134.
 33—II 43, 148.
 34—III 12.
 35—I 149, 170; III 4.
 295:4-5—III 62.
 8—III 255.
 8-11—III 129.
 9—II 149.
 r. 9-10—I 141; II 405.

- 17—II 36, 56, 62.
 21—II 311.
 296:4—II 231.
 4'—II 198.
 5—II 69.
 9—I 48; III 170, 255.
 9-10—III 255.
 11—II 285.
 11-13—III 141.
 12—II 285.
 14—II 130.
 14-15—III 46(2x).
 14-17—II 159.
 15—III 46.
 16—II 130.
 16-22—I 53; III 64.
 17—II 38.
 19—I 79.
 21(?)—I 79.
 25-26—I 49; III 75, 256.
 25-29—II 312, 315, 322.
 27—II 287.
 30—III 80.
 33-35—I 49.
 35—III 72.
 36-39—III 119.
 39—II 19.
 297:4—I 139.
 8—II 301.
 8-11—I 116; II 224; III
 144, 147.
 10—II 226.
 11—III 7, 180.
 11-16—III 59.
 12—I 10; II 285, 334.
 12-16—II 335.
 14—I 23.
 16—I 19.
 16-21—II 339.
 17—II 226.
 19—II 83.
 20—II 354.
 298:3—I 145.
 3-4—I 99.
 7—I 30, 139.
 9-14—I 193.
 12—I 41; II 22, 43, 110; III
 193.
 13-14—III 232.
 14-17—I 116.
 18—III 255.
 18-19—I 49; III 256.
 19—I 139.
 20-27—II 297, 342.

- 23—I 181.
 23-24—I 55(2x).
 26—I 137.
 29—I 25.
 31-33—III 27.
 32—I 30.
 41-42—II 218.
 299:4—I 99.
 6—I 12.
 7-11—I 193.
 10—III 193, 228(2x), 235.
 11—III 232.
 12—II 226.
 19—III 30.
 19-21—I 174; III 38.
 20—II 159.
 21-22—II 249; III 197.
 21-23—III 58.
 21-26—I 88.
 24-26—III 224.
 25—I 40(2x); II 20(2x).
 300—I 42; II 22.
 300:15-16—II 161, 165.
 15-21—II 259.
 17—II 259.
 17-19—II 203.
 18—II 40.
 18-19—II 181.
 20—II 43, 135, 149.
 20-22—I 100.
 23—I 42; II 13, 22.
 23-28—II 115, 226.
 25—I 42; II 13, 22.
 301:2—I 145.
 3-5—III 180.
 8—I 145.
 10—II 110, 43.
 12-14—II 299.
 15—II 226.
 16—I 173.
 21-23—II 406.
 302—I 3.
 302:4-6—III 180.
 11-15—II 104.
 11-18—II 187.
 14—II 226, 348.
 16-18—II 415.
 18—II 375.
 303:3-6—III 180.
 5—I 139.
 6—I 12.
 7—I 139.
 13—II 226.
 19—II 226.

- 304:6—I 139.
 7—I 12.
 15—II 226.
 15-17—II 203.
 22-23—II 325; III 229.
- 305:4-7—III 180.
 6—I 139.
 7—I 12.
 8-9—i 139.
 11-14—II 110.
 15—II 110.
 15-17—II 104, 203.
 15-20—II 113, 115.
 17—II 101, 104.
 23-24—II 325.
- 306:5—I 12.
 12-16—III 87.
 19-22—III 77.
 22—II 283.
 22-23—I 192; II 381.
 22-27—II 381.
 23-24—III 164.
 28-32—III 78.
- 307:3-5—III 153.
 6—II 249; III 197.
 6-7—III 242.
 7—I 72.
- 8-10—I 86.
 10—III 30, 242.
- 308:r. 2-8—II 406.
 309:25—III 22.
 25-28—II 406.
- 311:8—I 12.
- 313:4—II 292, 306.
 5-6—II 409.
 7-8—III 26.
 7-11—I 191.
 10-11—III 27.
 13—I 95.
 17-19—III 191.
- 314:7-8—III 193.
 13—I 36, 145.
 14—I 35.
 14-16—I 108.
 19—I 142.
- 315:3—I 99.
 5-6—III 193.
 5-7—I 193.
 6—I 193, 194.
 7—III 232.
 8—III 153.
 10—II 301.
 10-12—I 117; II 224.
 11—III 2.

- 11-12—III 134.
 12—III 97.
 14—II 301.
 15—I 15; II 288.
 16—I 35.
 16-17—III 101, 217.
 17—I 149.
 316:4—I 36.
 5—I 12.
 6-9—I 193.
 7—I 145.
 9—III 232.
 10—III 153.
 11-12—I 108.
 12—I 35.
 18-19—I 118, 167; III 205.
 18-20—II 410.
 21-25—I 61.
 23—II 187.
 317:4—I 193.
 6—II 41.
 7—III 98, 118.
 7-12—III 154.
 10—I 149.
 10-12—III 145.
 12—II 42, 61.
 15—III 98.
 17-18—I 53.
 18—II 41.
 19—III 98.
 19-20—I 72.
 19-21—III 228.
 19-25—I 64.
 21—II 268.
 22—II 42, 61; III 229.
 22-24—III 219.
 23-25—II 359; III 190,
 229.
 24—II 42.
 25—I 10; III 98.
 318:5—I 193.
 7—II 41.
 8—I 18; II 188, 269.
 10—I 36.
 13—I 19, 30.
 14—I 18; II 188, 269, 272.
 16-22—I 57.
 17—I 12, 75, 76.
 18-22—II 123, 189.
 20—I 18; II 40.
 21—II 121.
 319:5—I 99.
 7—I 139.
 9-14—I 193.

- 13—III 193.
 14—III 232.
 15—II 226.
 16—I 10.
 19-21—I 104; III 278.
 19-22—III 101, 216.
 21—I 10.
 320:4—I 145.
 4-9—III 179.
 10-15—I 193.
 12-13—III 193.
 14-15—III 97.
 18-19—II 345.
 18-21—I 116; II 224.
 22-24—II 97, 116, 230.
 22-25—I 108.
 23—II 245.
 23-24—III 14.
 321:4-9—III 179.
 7-8—I 139.
 10—I 139.
 14—III 193.
 15—I 36, 99.
 15-20—II 203.
 15-23—II 104.
 17—II 102.
 21—II 226.
 24-26—I 143.
 322:4-8—III 179.
 12—III 193.
 15-16—I 143.
 17-19—I 104; II 97, 116,
 230; III 14, 278.
 323:3-5—III 179.
 6-7—III 193.
 6-9—I 193.
 7—I 193, 194.
 8-9—III 232.
 9—III 153.
 9-13—II 414.
 11-12—II 374.
 13—II 301.
 13-16—III 85.
 14—I 142.
 15-16—I 188; III 164.
 16—I 142.
 17-18—III 246.
 17-20—I 108; II 3, 97, 166,
 230; III 101, 217.
 18—I 35.
 18-20—III 14.
 19—II 36.
 19-20—I 175.
 22—II 38.

- 22-23—II 199.
 23—II 344.
 324:4-6—III 179.
 7-9—I 193.
 8—III 193.
 9—III 232.
 12—I 161; II 287.
 12-14—II 314; III 49, 98.
 13—I 161.
 15—I 198.
 16—I 35; III 246.
 16-17—III 101, 217.
 16-18—I 108; II 97, 116,
 230; III 14.
 24—I 145.
 325:2—I 145.
 3-5—III 179.
 7-9—I 193.
 8—II 43; III 193.
 9—III 232.
 12—III 246.
 12-14—I 108; II 97, 116,
 230; III 14.
 14—I 145.
 15—I 35; II 287, 314.
 15-19—I 122.
 16—I 161(2x).
 17—I 161.
 18—II 301.
 19—I 78; II 287, 314.
 20—II 187.
 20-22—II 414.
 21-22—II 374.
 22—I 15.
 326:2—I 145.
 3-5—III 179.
 5-8—I 193.
 6—I 194.
 7-8—III 232.
 9—III 153.
 11—I 137.
 12—I 19; II 212.
 13—II 226.
 14-15—III 220.
 15—II 55.
 16—II 299.
 18—I 11; II 288; III 50.
 19—II 42.
 20—II 83.
 20-23—I 117.
 21—III 53.
 22—III 2.
 22-23—III 134.
 327:1—I 149; II 226.

- 1-5—II 171.
 5—II 58.
 9—II 51, 225.
 328:4—II 69.
 6-7—I 139.
 7—III 193.
 10—I 139.
 13—III 97.
 14—III 193.
 17-26—II 115, 224.
 21—II 226, 348.
 25-26—I 198.
 26—II 41.
 329:13-15—II 203.
 13-20—II 187.
 15—II 104.
 16—II 226.
 18-20—I 100; II 415.
 20—I 77; II 375.
 330:8—I 32.
 9—III 242.
 11—II 226.
 12—I 173.
 13—III 170, 181, 243.
 17—III 242.
 19-21—I 128.
 331:9—I 145.
 10-11—II 43, 110.
 15-23—III 85.
 16—II 301.
 19-21—III 164.
 333—I 2; II 175.
 333:4-7—II 175; III 150.
 7—III 7.
 12—II 272.
 15-17—III 30.
 15-18—II 239, 336, 361.
 16—II 42, 52.
 18—II 334.
 19—III 120.
 19-22—II 154.
 21-23—II 175.
 22—II 272.
 23-24—II 162.
 24—II 42, 137.
 26—I 95.
 334:8—II 371, 411.
 335:8—II 306.
 9—I 24; II 69.
 14—II 212.
 14-17—II 297; III 94.
 16—I 181; II 288.
 336:5—II 349.
 337:8-12—III 49.

- 13-17—II 82.
 15(?)—III 98.
 17—II 36, 55; III 98.
 18—III 98.
 19—II 287, 314.
 19-23—III 49.
 24—III 98.
 25—III 237.
 28—II 41.
 28-30—III 120, 147.
 340:7—III 35.
 343—I 3.
 344—I 3.
 345—I 3.
 346—I 3.
 347—I 3.
 348—I 3.
 349—I 3.
 350—I 3.
 351—I 3.
 352—I 3.
 353—I 3.
 354—I 3.
 355—I 3
 356:22—I 112.
 37—I 42; II 23.
 41-42—I 112.
 60—I 42; II 23.
 357:5—I 56.
 55—II 207.
 86—I 42; II 23.
 359—I 4.
 359:19—II 207.
 r. 22—I 56.
 359-361—I 5.
 360—I 4.
 361—I 4.
 362—I 10, 106, 164; II 141.
 362:1—II 268; III 235.
 1-2—II 273.
 3—III 63.
 5—I 149; II 286, 302.
 5-6—II 348.
 7—I 164.
 7-8—I 71; II 150.
 7-9—II 247.
 8—I 30.
 9-10—I 133, 164.
 9-11—I 68(2x).
 9-13—II 161, 252.
 10—I 30, 39, 132; II 20,
 157.
 10-12—II 67.
 11—I 36, 66; II 56.

- 13—I 22.
 14—I 179; III 8, 10,
 127(2x).
 15—I 40.
 15-20—II 227.
 16—I 179; III 8, 10,
 127(2x).
 17—II 58; III 240.
 17-18—I 133.
 17-19—III 203.
 18—II 41, 60.
 18-20—II 106, 209.
 19—I 30, 133.
 20—I 10, 89; II 54.
 21—II 45, 58.
 21-23—III 240.
 22—II 36, 60, 62, 78.
 23—II 77.
 23-24—II 144.
 23-29—II 289.
 24—I 10; II 45.
 25—I 23; II 58, 383; III
 240.
 25-27—II 361, 387; III
 267.
 26—I 25, 32, 66; II 25.
 27—I 25.
 27-28—III 171.
 28—III 240.
 28-29—I 70.
 29—III 201.
 30—I 10.
 31-33—III 133(2x).
 32—I 25, 32.
 33—I 168; III 2.
 33-34—III 191.
 33-37—II 132.
 34—I 26; II 18, 54.
 35—I 153; II 45.
 36—I 27, 151; II 373.
 37—I 70; III 201.
 37-38—I 33, 143; III 205.
 40—I 164.
 40-41—I 71, 133; II 150,
 256.
 42—I 164.
 42-43—I 71.
 42-44—II 328.
 44—II 56, 66.
 45—I 24, 37; II 135, 375,
 392.
 46—III 50.
 46-50—II 254.
 47—I 36; III 203, 240.

- 48—I 71, 164.
 48-49—I 157; II 248; III 223.
 49—I 149, 191.
 49-50—I 167; III 203.
 50—III 35, 123.
 51-53—II 109, 227; III 220.
 52—II 41.
 52-53—I 173.
 54—I 155.
 54-56—II 344, 353; III 213.
 54-59—II 145.
 55-56—III 203.
 57—I 70; II 354.
 58—I 79; II 135, 370, 391.
 59—I 54; II 354.
 60—I 72; II 18.
 60-61—I 164.
 62—II 52.
 62-64—I 176; II 337; III 66, 171, 271.
 63—II 334(2x).
 65—I 106; II 53, 321; III 51.
 66—I 95, 164.
 66-68—II 161, 165, 254.
 68-69—I 69, 107; III 77, 278.
 363:1-2—III 228.
 1-3—II 273.
 4—I 19.
 4-5—III 63.
 4-6—I 138.
 7—I 66, 67; II 320.
 7-8—III 170.
 8—I 29.
 9-11—III 48.
 11—I 28.
 15—III 242.
 15-18—I 72.
 17-18—I 133.
 17-23—II 251.
 19—II 337.
 364:9—I 139.
 10—II 226, 348.
 10-13—III 54.
 11-19—III 79.
 12-13—I 174.
 14—II 58; III 120.
 17-20—I 185.
 20—I 55.
 21—I 176; II 51; III 66.

- 21-23—II 396.
 22—I 24, 37; II 375.
 24-25—III 239.
 24-28—I 72; III 70, 242,
 244.
 365—III 98, 247.
 365:1-3—II 273.
 2—II 268.
 8—I 72; III 242.
 10-11—I 52; III 231, 267.
 10-12—II 228.
 13-14—I 52; III 231, 267.
 14—I 17; II 51.
 15-17—I 155.
 15-18—III 171.
 16-21—III 212.
 18-19—I 56.
 19—I 54; II 42.
 22—II 51.
 23—I 17.
 23-25—I 196.
 24—I 72; III 1.
 24-25—I 52; III 149, 231,
 267.
 25—I 17; II 42, 51.
 27—II 51.
 27-28—III 112.
 28—III 3.
 30—III 242.
 30-31—I 72.
 366—II 127; III 247.
 366:1-2—I 147.
 1-3—II 273.
 2—II 268.
 5—I 139.
 6—II 399.
 7-10—I 193.
 8—I 145.
 9—II 185.
 10—III 232.
 11—I 72, 163.
 11-16—II 130, 308.
 14—I 26.
 17—II 36, 55; III 196.
 17-18—I 163.
 17-19—II 249, 343.
 18—II 28, 52, 129, 292.
 19-21—I 52; III 231, 268.
 22-26—I 66; II 128, 308.
 24—III 231, 268.
 27—II 320.
 28-29—III 50.
 28-34—II 166, 252.
 30—I 39; II 20, 157.

- 31-32—I 198; II 219, 251;
 III 198, 231.
 33—I 26.
 34—I 78, 79, 92.
 367—II 313.
 367:2—II 268.
 3—I 41, 94; II 22, 182, 202.
 4—II 267, 269; III 195,
 199, 237.
 4-5—I 143.
 6—II 152; III 152.
 6-7—II 202.
 10—III 143.
 12—III 143.
 13—II 267; III 143.
 14—II 267, 269.
 15—II 287.
 15-16—III 49.
 15-17—II 313.
 20—I 44.
 21—I 146.
 22-24—III 78.
 368—I 4.
 368:1—I 15.
 4—I 15.
 5—I 15.
 r. 5—I 15.
 14—I 15.
 369—I 4.
 369:2—I 95.
 2-3—III 152.
 3—I 41; II 22, 182, 202.
 4-5—III 152.
 5—II 152, 202.
 9—I 161(2x).
 17—III 201.
 22—I 25.
 24-25—III 78.
 28—II 57.
 28-32—III 62.
 30—III 62.
 370:2—II 268.
 3—I 94; II 182.
 4—II 267, 269.
 5—III 199, 237.
 7—II 152.
 371—II 33.
 371:18—I 191.
 25—II 127.
 32—I 161.
 378—I 5, 42; II 22.
 378:1—I 147.
 2-3—I 145.
 5-10—I 193.

- 6-7—I 145.
 9-10—III 232.
 10-11—III 241.
 14-17—I 123.
 17—II 42.
 18-26—III 101, 217.
 19-26—II 116.
 21-23—I 124.
 23-24—I 149.
 24-25—I 145.
 26—I 42; II 13, 22.
- 379—I 4, 5.
 380—I 5.
 381—I 5.
 381:14—II 26.
 382—I 6.
 386:18—II 344.
- KL
- 69:277:8—I 40; II 21.
 72:600:1—II 285.
 1-4—I 160.
 1-5—II 89.
 4-8—II 178, 242.
 8—I 90; II 235(2x).
 9-13—I 160; II 180.
 10—I 140.
- 11-13—II 12.
 13—I 140.
 14-19—III 98.
 17—I 186.
 19-21—II 180.
 20-21—II 12.
 21—II 45.
 22-23—I 160.
 23—I 140.
 74:300:15—II, 182, 269.
 20—I 12, 75.
- TT
- 1—II 31.
 1:4—II 266, 274; III 143.
 5-6—I 147.
 5-7—II 215.
 8—II 39, 60.
 8-9—I 54; II 18, 203.
 10—I 40; II 21, 56.
 10-11—III 92, 138, 225.
 11—I 161.
 12-14—II 165, 238.
 15-18—I 102; II 267; III
 113.
 16—II 39.
 18—III 37, 38.

- 2—II 31.
 2:2-3—I 147; II 214.
 3-4—I 98, 178.
 6—II 283.
 9-12—II 279.
 11—I 24, 37, 80; II 272,
 376.
 13—II 267.
 14—I 24, 38, 89; II 376.
 15-16—III 28, 54.
 17-18—II 275; III 169.
 19-20—II 76, 180.
 20—II 45.
 21-24—I 167.
 23—II 157.
 24—III 194.
 26—II 333.
 5—II 31.
 5:3—II 214.
 10—I 143.
 13—II 158.
 13-15—III 123.
 14—III 8.
 6—II 31.
 6:3—II 214.
 4-6—II 163.
 5—II 40, 158, 243.
- 5-6—I 54.
 6—I 140; III 244.
 6-11—III 186.
 6-14—II 243.
 7—I 40.
 8—III 244.
 9—II 40, 235.
 10—III 244.
 11—I 39; II 19, 40, 158.
 13—III 244.
 14—II 40.
 17—II 320.
 29—III 8.
- AKKADIAN AND HITTITE
- AbB*
 2, 126:6—II 268.
 6, 215—II 206.
- Anbar and Na'aman 1986-87:
 3-12—II 30.
- Anbar and Na'aman 1986-87:
 6—II 30.
- ARM
 1, 69: rev. 5'-6'—I 28.

- 69:7—I 28.
 2, 25:15—I 28.
 4, 59:6-8—II 214.
 5, 7:17-18—III 102.
 35:27—II 63
 37:9—II 309.
 47:5—II 63.
 87:23—II 70.
 6, 22:16—II 63.
 7, 169:12—II 63
 10, 84:2I 28—I 28..
 19, 41:3—II 26.
 19, 42:1-3—II 26.
 19, 42:3—II 26.
 19, 43:3—II 26.
 19, 44:3—II 26.
 19, 45:3—II 26.
 19, 46:1-3—II 26.
 19, 382:10—II 26, 27.
 A.1314:16—I 29.
 M.10556—II, 26, 27.
- AT
- 3:1—I 45.
 4—I 45.
 *8:8—I 75.
 12:7—II 29.
- 16:18—III 103.
 *35:8-12—II 196.
 108:8-10—II 196.
 109:3—II 274.
 110:8—III 7.
 11—III 7.
 116:15—II 274.
 *126:27—I 75.
 189:2—II 72.
 *409:45—II 196.
 Idrimi 4—I 45.
 8-9—I 44.
 29—I 46.
 45—I 46.
 99-100—II 134, 171.
- BE
- 17/I, 23:30—II 141.
 17/I, 33:11—I 42; II 23.
 17/I 42:15—II 389.
- BIN
- 4, 106:17-18—II 250.
- CCT
- 1 37a:22—I 29.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>CT</p> <p>29, Pl. 4c:6—II 268</p> | <p>449:6-14—III 103.</p> |
| KAV | |
| <p>EL</p> <p>244:17-18—II 250.</p> | <p>99:14—II 389.</p> <p>109:12—II 389.</p> |
| KBo | |
| <p>Finkelstein 1953:13X, No.</p> <p>62:4—II 110.</p> <p>Finkelstein 1953:13X, No.</p> <p>63:3-4—II 110, 127.</p> <p>Hallo and Tadmor 1977:4—II</p> <p>29.</p> <p>Hallo and Tadmor 1977:6—II</p> <p>29.</p> <p>Hallo and Tadmor 1977:7—II</p> <p>29.</p> <p>Hallo and Tadmor 1977:9—II</p> <p>29.</p> <p>Hazor M/5142/31050—II 30.</p> <p>Hazor A2/3423/17-23086—II</p> <p>31.</p> | <p>1, 1:30-31—II 143.</p> <p>1:56—III 13.</p> <p>1:r.58—I 45.</p> <p>2:r.34—I 45.</p> <p>2:r.35—I 45.</p> <p>3:32—III 202.</p> <p>3:39—III 222.</p> <p>5:I 4—I 45.</p> <p>5:IV 39—I 45.</p> <p>7:7—III 169.</p> <p>7:9—III 169.</p> <p>7:9-10—III 173.</p> <p>7:11—III 168, 169.</p> <p>7:18—III 169.</p> <p>7:19—III 169.</p> <p>7:24—III 169.</p> <p>7:26—III 169.</p> <p>7:27—III 169.</p> <p>7:40—III 169.</p> <p>7:passim—II 274; III 167.</p> |
| JEN | |
| <p>437:8-12—III 103.</p> <p>441:12-14—III 103.</p> | |

- 7+25+*KUB* 3, 11,
 121+120:27-30—III
 104.
- 8:8—III 13.
 8:15—I 45.
 8:16—III 13.
 8:32-33—II, 143.
 10:50—II 274; III 167.
 15:r.10—III 169.
 15:12—III 169(2x).
 15:23—III 169.
 15+19:r.5—I 44.
 15+19:r.15—I 40; II 21.
 15+19:r.17—I 40; II 21.
 17+25+*KUB* 3, 11:obv. 32-
 33, 38-39—III 122.
 19:11—III 169.
 19:16—III 169.
 19:r.6—III 169.
 24:r.5—III 169.
 24:8—III 169.
 24:12—III 169.
 24:13—III 169.
 31:r.13'—II 376.
 31:r.14'—II 376.
 31:r.13'—I 38.
 31:r.14'—I 38.
- 4, 63—III 177.
 5, 2—III 177.
- KTH*
- 16 A:9-11—II 371.
- KUB*
- 3, 11:obv.32-33, 38-39—III
 122.
 3, 11+121+120:27-30—III
 104.
 3, 14:2—III 16.
 3, 14:12—III 13.
 3, 27:obv.14—I 44.
 3, 27:16—III 169.
 3, 27:r.8—I 40, II, 21.
 3, 27:r.19—II 389.
 3, 33:8—III 169.
 3, 34:4—III 169.
 3, 34:8—III 169.
 3, 42:5—III 169.
 3, 48:8—III 169.
 3, 54:r.3—III 169.
 3, 57:r.1—III 169.
 3, 67:11'—II 21.
 3, 67:11'—I 40.
 3, 69:14—III 169.

- 3, 69:r.10—III 169. PBS
- 3, 82:11—I 38. 1/II, 24:9—I 41; II 22.
- 3, 82:11—II 376. 13, 6:16-18—II 207.
- 3, 126:1—III 169.
- 3, 126:4—III 169. Radau 1908:No. 5:6-11—II
214.
- Landsberger and Balkan
- 1950:224, 8-11—II RS
207. 4.449—III 57.
- Landsberger and Tadmor 4.449:12—II 135.
- 1964:Frag. A, text a— 7.383:7—III 112.
II 30. 8.279:8'—II 46.
- Landsberger and Tadmor 12.33:r.1'-9'—II 99.
- 1964:Frag. A, text e— 15.89:7—I 43; II 24.
II 30. 15.89:13—I 43; II 24.
- Landsberger and Tadmor 15.89:15—I 43; II 24.
- 1964:Frag. B, text 15.89:16—I 43; II 24, 287.
f:2—II 30. 16.144:4-13—II 173.
- Landsberger and Tadmor 16.144:8—I 43; II 23.
- 1964: Frag. B, text g— 16.144:9—I 43; II 23.
II 30. 16.144:13—I 43; II 23.
16.147:12-15—II 292.
- Lutz 1919:No. 30:4-5—II 214. 16.153:10-11—I 99.
16.153:10-16—III 16.
- NBC 17.116:9'—II 274; III 167.
- 3934:3.1—I 40; II 21. 17.116:21'—II 274; III 167.
- 3934:r.5'—II 143. 17.159:6-7—II 143.

17.230:3—I 45.
 17.338:3—III 13.
 17.340:11—III 58.
 17.353:2—III 13.
 17.383:33—I 178; III 9.
 17.383:85—III 13.
 20.33:30-32'—II 174.

Shechem

1378:5—II 29(2x).
 6-7—II 30.
 7—II 29.
 9—II 29, 30.
 11—II 29.
 15—II 29.
 20—II 29.

TuM

1, 19b:5-6—I 29.

Ug. 5

2:5—I 43; II 23.
 28:13—I 75.
 28:r.20'—I 75.
 29:r.3'—I 75.
 54:21—I 81.

54:30—I 81.
 130:II, 12'—I 48.
 137:II, 17'—II 12, 310, 378.
 137:II, 20'—II 12, 310, 378.

VAB

6, 66:29—I 29.
 6, 254:14-15—II 206.

VAS

7, 198:14-15—II 206.
 16, 20:12—I 29.

YOS

2, 70:8—II 309.
 9, 80:27—II 154.
 10, 31:ix, 27—II 260.

UGARITIC

KTU

1.2:I, 32—II 93.
 1.3:I, 22-23—II 93.
 1.4:33-34—II 389.
 1.4:r.V, 42-43—II 76.
 1.5:I, 12-13—III 177.

1.6:I, 58—III 13.
 1.6:IV, 10-11—III 177.
 1.14:II, 5—II 135.
 1.16:VI, 3—II 389.
 1.16:VI, 23-24—III 13.
 1.16:VI,29-30—II 95.
 1.16:VI,42—II 95.
 1.17:I, 18—III 20.
 1.17:I,20—III 20.
 1.23:1—II 262.
 1.23:23—II 264.
 2.10:16-19—III 114.
 2.11:7—II 350.
 2.12:11—II 350.
 2.34:up.ed.2—II 389.
 2.39:34—II 391.
 2.39:34-35—III 71.
 3.5:17, 19—III 23.
 4.180:1—III 20.
 4.422:1—III 20.
 5.14:6—I 76.

NORTHWEST SEMITIC

KAI

14:9—III 41.
 43:11—III 136.

181:19—II 113.
 269:2—II 304.

BIBLICAL

Gen.

3:11—III 24.
 4:15—III 24.
 11:30—III 20.
 18:18—II 113.
 19:21—III 24.
 22:18—II 113.
 24:27—III 59.
 25:20—II 287.
 30:42—II 64.
 31:43—III 20.
 32:11—III 57.
 16—III 55.
 33:11—III 20.
 38:20—III 55.
 39:10—III 136.
 45:3—III 52.

Ex.

9:35—III 55.
 19:5—III 20.
 21:19—II 64.

- 22:13—II 72.
 33:19—II 70.
 34:5—II 94.
- Num.
 9:21—III 132.
 13:31—III 60.
 33—III 52.
 21:34—III 55.
 30:5—III 13.
 8—III 13.
 12—III 13.
 15—III 13.
 34:1-12—II 2.
 35:25—III 57.
- Dt.
 1:8—III 168.
 21—III 168.
 2:24—III 55.
 30—III 55.
 3:2—III 55.
 11—III 160.
 4:5—III 168.
 7:19—III 52.
 11:26—III 168.
 17:19—II 71.
 19:12—III 55.
- 28:50—II 70.
 30:8—III 14.
 15—III 168.
 33:29—III 33.
- Josh.
 1:9—III 160.
 2:19—III 28.
 15:20—II 95.
 28—II 73.
 21:14—II 95.
 22:12—III 60.
- Judg.
 2:16—III 57.
 15:17—III 59.
 16:24—III 55.
- 1 Sam.
 5:6—III 60.
 7:8—III 13.
 11:7—III 55.
 12:4—III 47.
 19:8—III 53.
 20:37—III 160.
 24:4—III 55.
 28:15—III 100.

29:8—III 51.

30:28—II 95.

2 Sam.

1:16—III 28.

12:3—III 20.

13:28—III 83.

15:35—III 160.

18:2—III 56.

19:27—II 71.

1 Ki.

1:5—II 131.

7:15—II 64.

15:29—III 55.

16:12—III 55.

34—III 55.

18:9—III 55.

20:20—III 160.

21:17—III 160.

2 Ki.

1:15—III 52.

8:29—II 113.

9:15—II 113.

10:19—III 20.

14:8—II 277.

15:21—III 160.

36—III 160.

Isa.

1:12—III 57.

7:4—II 64.

6—III 34.

28:24—II 67.

29:22—II 64.

31:5—II 64.

45:17—III 33.

Jer.

15:9—III 120.

23:13—III 61.

48:18—III 34.

51:22—III 99.

Ezk.

34:10—III 57.

47:13-48:29—II 2.

Am.

5:15—II 70.

20—III 160.

Micha

7:9—II 192.

Ps.

17:13—II 166.

28:1—III 13.

39:13—III 13.

59:6—II 70.

74:22—II 166.

81:12—III 14.

82:8—II 166, 205, 266.

109:14—III 52.

Prov.

8:1—III 160.

14:22—III 160.

15:5—II 72.

19:20—II 148.

22:20—II 160.

23:7—III 24.

27:24—III 186.

Est.

2:11—III 136.

3:4—III 136.

Dan.

2:32—I 96.

44—I 96.

Ezra

4:13—III 151.

1 Chron.

4:17—II 95.

19—II 95.

6:42—II 95.

12:20—III 28.

2 Chron.

22:6—II 113.

23:18—III 56.

24:11—III 56.

27:7—III 160.

28:22—II 154.

30:16—III 59.

32:32—III 160.

33:18—III 160.

35:11—III 59.

35:27—III 160.

EGYPTIAN

Anastasi VI, Line 53—III 182.

BM 10052—III, 173.

LES, 68, 7—III 173.

Treaty:7—III, 173.