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Abstract
...We note that this considerable outpouring of research in Amarna has not as yet resulted in a revised edition of the tablets themselves. It was primarily with this fact in mind that the present essay was originally undertaken. In addition, I have attempted to show that the Canaanite Vorlage of the Byblian Amarna dialect was all-pervasive, reaching not only into grammar and syntax (as Moran has already capably demonstrated) but also into phraseology and mode of expression.
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The excitement that followed the discovery of the Amarna tablets by a peasant woman in 1887 had scarcely diminished when popularizers and scholars alike began publishing transliterations and translations of the material at a feverish rate. These ranged from worthless (cf., e.g., C. R. Conder, The Tell Amarna Tablets [second edition; London, 1894]; typical of his approach is his statement that the language of Amarna is "Aramaic, resembling Assyrian" [p. 1]) to tolerably competent (e.g., Hugo Winckler, Die Thontafeln von Tell-el-Amarna [Berlin, 1896]). It remained for the great Norwegian Assyriologist, J. A. Knudtson, however, to produce a sober and carefully edited treatment of all the Amarna texts available to him. His monumental work, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln (Leipzig, 1915), published in collaboration with his associates, Otto Weber and Erich Ebeling, remains to this day the basic secondary source for serious students of Amarna and is the acknowledged classic in its field.

Since the labors of the excavators, however, effectively prevent the ossification of Semitic studies, it was inevitable that investigators should desire to update Knudtson's work on the basis of our ever-expanding knowledge of life in the Near East during the Late Bronze Age. Some twenty-four years after the publication of Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, therefore, Samuel A. B. Mercer attempted what he was pleased to call "the last word to date on the subject" (Mercer, The Tell el-Amarna Tablets [Toronto, 1939], p. vii), which unfortunately turned out to be little more than an English translation of Knudtson's edition. If, therefore, it is true that the classical period of Amarna studies to all intents and purposes closed with the efforts of
Knudtzon and his associates, it is equally true that Mercer did not accomplish his expressed desire of inaugurating the modern era of Amarna scholarship. Indeed, that era had already begun, having its origin in the fertile mind of William Foxwell Albright who, in 1937, published an epochal article entitled "The Egyptian Correspondence of Abimilki, Prince of Tyre," in JEA 23. Thereafter Albright and his students, notably William L. Moran, S.J., began to write journal articles and doctoral dissertations in profusion, most of which made important contributions, either directly or in an ancillary manner, to an advancement of our understanding of Canaanite Amarna. A fine example of the quality of their scholarly efforts is Moran's unpublished doctoral thesis, A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets (Baltimore, 1950).

When all is said and done, however, we note that this considerable outpouring of recent research in Amarna has not as yet resulted in a revised edition of the tablets themselves. It was primarily with this fact in mind that the present essay was originally undertaken. In addition, I have attempted to show that the Canaanite Vorlage of the Byblian Amarna dialect was all-pervasive, reaching not only into grammar and syntax (as Moran has already capably demonstrated) but also into phraseology and mode of expression so that, to give but one example, when Rib-Haddi wanted to verbalize the concept of "from time immemorial" he did not write, in standard Akkadian parlance, ıštu labora (or, as in later times, ultu ulla), but coined the phrase ıštu darīti, an Akkadian rendering of such Canaanite equivalents as Hebrew mel'olam. Examples of this type in the Rib-Haddi correspondence are legion, and the extensive references to Hebrew, Ugaritic and Phoenician literature on the following pages will therefore serve to focus attention on the Canaanite dialectal interplay that prevailed during the Amarna Age.
It is my fond hope, then, that the present modest attempt will be the first of a series that will, during the next several years, result in a truly up-to-date edition of the Amarna correspondence. That such an edition is long overdue none will gainsay; whether this writer's work may reasonably be expected to provide the impetus for that edition its readers must judge.
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Of no formal academic treatise of this scope can it be said that one man was its author. It is therefore with a great deal of gratitude that I here acknowledge my debt to those mentors and friends who have been sine qua non in the preparation of this dissertation.
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RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH
(VAT 1239 - WA 80 - W 88 - S 32 - EA 68)

Obverse

(1) [\textsuperscript{m}Ri]-ib-Ha-ad-d[i]
[iq]-bi a-na EN-Su
[LUGAL] KUR KI.HI.A LUGAL GAL
[d]NIN ya URU Gu-ub-la

(5) ti-id-di-in\textsubscript{4} du-na
a-na LUGAL be-li-ia
a-na GIR ME\textsubscript{4} EN-ia dUTU-ia
IMIN-Su IMIN-ta-a-an am-qut
lu-ú i-de LUGAL EN-ia

(10) i-nu-ma Mal-ma-at URU Gub-la
GEME ki-it-ti ya LUGAL
ù KALAG.GA MA.GAL nu-kúr-tum
Sa ERIN ME\textsubscript{4} SA.GAL ME\textsubscript{4}
[U]GU-ia ù la a-a-gul-me

Reverse

(15) LUGAL EN-ia i\textsubscript{5}-tu

[UR] Su-mu-ur KI
[1]a-a in\textsubscript{4}-né-pu-uṣ gá[b-b]u
a-[u]a ERIN ME\textsubscript{4} SA.GAZ ME\textsubscript{4}
i-na LÜ MASKIM LUGAL ri

(20) Sa i-Su-ú i-na URU Su-mu-ur
ba-al-tá-at URU Gub-la
a-nu-um-ma "Pa-ňa-ambil-na-ta
Lo. i-[n]a
URU i-de-me

(25) pu-š-qam \ ma-na-aš
Ma UGU Gub-la
Iš-tu Iš-ri-im-mu-ta
nu-bal-li-it
KALAG GA MA.GAL nu-k[úr]-tum

(30) [UG]U-nu ū ū-ul

(edge) [a-a-q]ul-me LUGAL Iš-[tu]
[UR]UDILLI.KI-Yu
(1) [R]ib-Hadd[i has spoken to his lord, [the king of] the two lands, the great king: May the Lady of Byblos (5) grant strength to the king, my lord! At the feet of my lord, my sun-god, seven times, seven times I have fallen. Surely the king, my lord, knows (10) that Byblos, the loyal handmaiden of the king, is safe; however, the hostility of the Apiru troops is exceedingly severe [again]st me. Therefore, let the king, my lord, (15) not remain silent with regard to Simyra, lest it all be turned over to the Apiru troops! Because of the royal commissioner (20) who is in Simyra, Byblos is alive. By now Paha[mna]ta, the royal commissioner who is in Simyra, knows of (25) the trouble that (hovers) over Byblos. From Yarimmuta we have maintained our existence; (however,) exceedingly severe is the hostility (30) [again]st us. Therefore, let not the king [remain silent] with respect [to] his [ci]ties!
L. 1. Rib-Haddi: The name of the mayor of Byblos occurs some 64 times in his correspondence and once in another letter (EA 142:21). Perhaps an examination of the ways in which his name is written will assist in an understanding of its meaning. Most often it appears as "Ri-ib-d" (a total of 48 times), completely preserved in 71:2; 83:40; 85:24; 95:2; 96:1; 102:3; 103:2; 104:3; 106:1,14,31; 108:1; 113:24; 118:3; 119:19; 123:1; 124:2; and 130:3 (18 times), and occurring in varying degrees of preservation in 76:1; 77:2; 78:1; 79:1; 83:1; 85:2; 86:2; 87:3; 88:1 (although the reading of "IM there is very uncertain); 89:1; 93:2; 105:1, 88; 107:1; 109:1; 110:2; 111:3; 112:1; 116:1; 117:1; 119:1,34; 121:1, 23; 122:1; 124:6,18; 125:2; 132:2; 136:2 (30 times). Included in this latter group are those renderings of the name in which the second element of the name is completely obliterated; it was deemed safest to include such occurrences in the largest category. In addition, 142:21 reads "Ri-[i]b-dIM."

A second group reads "Ri-ib-Ad-di in various degrees of preservation: 84:3; 92:1; 92:35 (notwithstanding Knudtzon's "d[a] and apparently also S 46, although the traces support "d[i] almost as well as "d[a]; cf. "d[i] in W 58, and note especially EA 92:1); 94:1 (probably); 129:1,45; 137:1 (probably, due to the otherwise close similarities between letters 137 and 138); 138:2,66,111—a total of ten times.

We find "Ri-ib-Ad-da twice (73:2; 74:1) and possibly a third time (75:1—but note that nothing is preserved after "i[b] in either W 79 or W 79). Once each appears "Ri-ib-Ad-di (126:1) and ["Ri]-ib-Ad-ad-[d[i] (68:1). In view of the preponderance of evidence favoring "di as the normal writing of the last syllable of Rib-Haddi's name, the reading "d[i] is preferable to Knudtzon's "[da] in 68:1. The traces in S 32:1 compare favorably with the third sign in line 5. W 88 likewise reads "[d[i]. Cf., finally and significantly, EA *362:1: ["Ri]-ib-dIM".
Invariably, the first element of this name is written 𒍒-ib-, although the masculine determinative is lacking four times (84:3; 87:3; 136:2; 138:2). It will be noted, however, that in each of these four cases the name is preceded by um-ma. In these tablets, the masculine determinative of the name is frequently written very close to the MA-sign in such cases. Where the determinative is lacking, therefore, we may assume its actual coalescence with the vertical stroke of the MA-sign, or we may surmise haplography on the part of the scribe. Since the Byblian scribes were usually quite careful to indicate determinatives before proper names (contrast the carelessness evident in the peripheral Akkadian materials of about the same period in PRU III), explanation for the phenomenon should not be sought in general scribal laxity.

My normalization, Rib-Haddi, arises from my interpretation of the name as meaning "The Compensation of Hadad." Rib-Haddi is obviously an Ersatzname (cf. Stamm, Namengebung, pp. 278 ff.), one of a class of names that indicates the previous loss of a brother or sister in the family. Perhaps the classic example of such a name is that of the famous Assyrian king, Sennacherib, the Akkadian normalization of whose name is Sin-ahḫē-erība (OIP 2, p. 23:1), "(The God) Sin Has Substituted the Brothers for Me." We learn from this that Sennacherib was at least the third child borne by his mother, a fact missing from most accounts of his life and times. By the same token, if our analysis of the name of Rib-Haddi is correct, he likewise was not the first member of his family. Indeed, his mention of a brother of his in EA 137:16 interestingly enough refers to him as Tur il-tu ia-ti, "younger than I."

Such Ersatznamen are well attested early in Mesopotamian history. For example, Sin-erībam was one of the rulers of Larsa in the eighteenth century B.C.E. (cf. Moortgat, Ägypten und Vorderasien im Altertum, 1949, p. 492). But what is perhaps more to the point is the fact that one of the important rulers of
Assyria during the Amarna Age was Išba-Adad I, who ruled c. 1390 to c. 1364 B.C.E. (Hoortgat, ibid., p. 497, reads "1490," but this is merely a typographical error). Thus a name like Rib-Haddi, constructed on the pattern of names like Rim-Sin (ibid., p. 492), Naram-Sin (ibid., p. 490), Mut-Ba'ili (EA 256:2; Gordon, UM, Text 322, v:11; cf. Hebrew '1š-bôšet in II Samuel 2:8, etc. [for *'1š-Ba'ali; cf. I Chronicles 8:33; 9:39]), Awil-Sin (Moortgat, ibid., p. 493), Awil-Marduk (ibid., p. 502; II Kings 25:27; Jeremiah 52:31), is normal for this general period from any standpoint. Consequently, in the broken text PRU III, 16.184:11' (mIr-ri-[b-]) and 14' (mIr-[r]-i-[b-]), we may confidently normalize IrI[bi-] and assume that a divine name is missing from the lacuna.

The scribe of EA 68 was the only one who gave the name Rib-Haddi its full spelling. The h represents the simple h-sound here, as also occasionally elsewhere (cf., e.g., sú-uh-ru-ma ['šhr], 64:7; 65:5; 232:11; 282:7; 284:5; 306:11; hi-ih-bó-e [Hebrew hebh'], 256:7; ha-ar-ri [Hebrew har'], 74:20). The divine name itself is that of the well-known storm-god, Hadad (Ugaritic Hd [Hdd] and Hebrew הָדָד), spelled simply Adad in standard Akkadian (which does not represent the h-sound). Gemination appears regularly when the name is written with case endings, as in Rib-Haddi where it carries the genitive ending. Cf. also names such as mLa-ram-Ad-di/du (PRU III, 16.254C / 255C:7,11---not mLa-aš-Ad-di/du, as proposed by Nougayrol, ibid., Part One, p. 157), wherein the case ending is determined by the grammatical position of the name within its sentence; mNa-qa-ma-du (ibid., 15.42 / 110:9), to be analyzed as Naqam(a)-A(d)du; and m[I]a-ab-na-du (ibid., 16.257 / 258 / 1268, B III, 1. 34), to be analyzed as Yabn(i)-A(d)du (with sandhi). In Ugaritic, Hd is frequently found parallel to B'C (cf., e.g., II AB, vii;35-37: Ib B'C tihd y'Crm Sand Hd gpt Ar).
Undoubtedly the West Semitic inhabitants of Byblos consistently pronounced the Ể in Rib-Haddi's name, even though it was almost never represented orthographically in syllabic cuneiform. The reason for the full spelling in EA 68 is patently clear, for its scribe was obviously enamored of plane writing. We find ti-id-di-in₄, l. 5; IMIN-ta-a-an, l. 8; lu-ù, l. 9; ki-it-ti, l. 11; i-Su-ù, l. 20; a-nu-um-ma, l. 22; Ia-ri-im-mu-ta, l. 27; nu-bal-li-ît, l. 28; û-ûl, l. 30. Of this group, these spellings of tiddin, Yarimmuta, and nuballit are hapax in EA.

It has long been recognized that in the Amarna correspondence in general, and in the Rib-Haddi letters in particular, many proper nouns end in an a-vowel, no matter what their syntactical position. In EA 68, for example, we find Gubla (nominative), l. l0, l1; Gubla (genitive), l. 4,26; Faha[mn]a[ta] (nominative), l. 22; Yarimmuta (genitive), l. 27. The reason for this a-vowel is not entirely perspicuous; perhaps it is to be analyzed as an indication of an accusative of specification with reference to the prefixed determinative (hence, URU Gubla, l. 4 = "the city, namely, Byblos"; Faha[mn]a[ta], l. 22 = "the man, namely, Faha[mn]atu"). At any rate, it does not seem that the few variant readings Rib-Adda, as distinguished from the more normal Rib-(H)addî, are to be explained on the basis of containing such an a-vowel. Rather, it would seem, we see here a case of simple vowel harmony, wherein *-di becomes -da under the influence of the preceding (H)ad-. Interesting in this connection is the anomalous Rib-Iddi, wherein *-(H)ad- becomes -Id- under the influence of the preceding Rib-.

The prevalence of the Ersatzname category in ancient Mesopotamia raises the question of whether such names are to be found in the Hebrew Bible. If our analysis of Rib-Haddi's name is correct, the meaning "Ba'el Substitutes" for Yrb-B' has at least as much to commend it as does the "popular etymology," "Let Ba'el Contend" (Judges 6:32). (Cf. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel, second
In any case, the original vocalization of the name must have been "Yarīb(u)-Ba'gal(u). Likewise, Yrb₇m (*Yarīb[u]-Amm[u]) probably meant originally "(The God) Amm Substitutes." There is no prima facie evidence for the meaning "to substitute, compensate" for the verb rib in Biblical Hebrew, but, since proper names tend to preserve archaic usages, it may well be that names like Yrb₂G and Yrb⁻m are Ersatz name survivals of an earlier era.

L. 3. LUGAL KURKI.HI.A (and its equivalents in other letters) is uniformly translated "the king of the lands" by previous interpreters (so, e.g., Knudtzon here; cf. also Albright and Mendenhall in ANET₂, p. 483). The rendering that we have adopted, however, may prove to be more exact. In the first place, it should be noted that the various devices employed by the Akkadian scribes to indicate plurality are often used incorrectly by the Canaanite scribes of Amarna. Cf., e.g., the barbaric KUR.KURKI.ME₇ of EA 76:2, a double plural, since either KUR.KUR (e.g., 74:2) or KURME₇ (e.g., 89:2) would suffice. A cogent example from Akkadian literature is an il₁ rabī'ūtim in Enuma eliš Vil, for the last word of which we find the variants [GAL].GAL (CT XIII, K.3567 ≠ K.3588:1) and GAL₂ME₇ (ibid., K.6526:1). This phenomenon is too well known to require further documentation. However, the misuse of such devices by the Canaanite scribes has as its corollary their use when a plural is not intended at all. Cf., e.g., EA 79:35-36: Kīma MUšEN Sa... Māknat with 74:45-47: kīma MUšEN₂ME₇ Sa... Māknat, wherein MUšEN must be singular because of the singular verb Māknat. Hence the meaning of the ME₇-sign was already uncertain to the Amarna scribes; e.g., it was frequently used as an indicator of the dual number (cf. GÎRME₇ in 68:7 and often elsewhere). Thus, since KURKI.HI.A in 68:3 is equivalent to KURME₇ elsewhere (e.g., 39:2), it may be that we have in LUGAL KURKI.HI.A a reference to the Egyptian pharaoh as
"the king of the two lands," namely Upper and Lower Egypt. In this connection, note the following paragraph by Wilson in Frankfort et al., The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man (Chicago, 1946), p. 74:

By his formal titles [the Egyptian ruler] was Lord of the Two Lands, that is, owner and master; he was King of Upper Egypt and King of Lower Egypt, the wearer of the double crown which symbolized the union of the two regions; and he was the 'Two Ladies', that is, the incorporation of the two tutelary goddesses who represented the north and the south. A parallel title, the 'Two Lords', expressed the dogma that the two competing gods of Lower and Upper Egypt, Horus and Seth, were also physically resident and reconciled within the person of the king. An important ritual activity of the king's coronation was the 'Uniting of the Two Lands', a ceremony somehow in relation to the throne of a dual kingship.

It is not at all unlikely that the Canaanite scribes were well aware of such a method of addressing the pharaoh; how pervasive it was may be seen by even a cursory glance at the Egyptian materials translated by Wilson in ANET.

4. Beltu ša Gubla: This goddess is equivalent to Belt of numerous Phoenician inscriptions in the Byblian dialect (cf., e.g., the Yhwhmlk inscription, 11. 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 15 [Cooke, A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions (Oxford, 1903), p. 18], and others). Albright indicates that the Egyptians equated this goddess with their Hathor (PSAC, p. 212; cf. also Wilson's comments in ANET, pp. 249-250); indeed, her name appears on the Barkal Stela (cf. ANET, p. 240). That she was an important Canaanite deity is further supported by the appearance of the formula lbšt in the proto-Sinaitic inscriptions found at Serabit el-Khadem by Flinders Petrie in the winter of 1904-1905 (notwithstanding the protestations of Friedrich against even a preliminary decipherment of the inscriptions; cf. his Extinct Languages, New York, 1957, pp. 159-162). Philo also mentions the tradition that Byblos was sacred to the worship of Beltis (cf.
ISBE, p. 1180; Albright, EB II [Jerusalem, 1954], p. 410.

L. 4. Gubla: Cf. Hebrew גָּבָל (Ezekiel 27:9; cf. also Joshua 13:5; I Kings 5:32). In the Amarna letters, the name of this city appears as Gubla and Gubli exclusively (never as Gublu). The reason for this must be sought in the scribal understanding of the function of the determinative preceding the name, a matter hinted at briefly in the note on Rib-Haddi above. Thus, URUGubla = "The city, namely, Byblos"; URUGubli = "The city of Byblos." The only other possibility, *URUGublu = "The city Byblos," was unthinkable to the scribe and, in fact, such a construction grates on modern ears also. A similar phenomenon occurs in the spelling of names of countries; e.g., KURHa-at-ti (EA 151:58) and KURHa-at-ta (140:31), but never*KURHattu. Indeed, the nominative ending on place-names appears only rarely in the whole Amarna corpus (e.g., 256:25: URUA-ra-ru; 256:24: URU(u-du-mu), with but two certain occurrences in the Rib-Haddi material: URUJas-apuKI (138:6) and KURMEI Ja-pu (138:85). In both of the last two cases, the -u is probably to be explained as due to the influence of the uaw which was the final consonant in the root of the word originally (cf. Akkadian iappu [OIP 2, p. 31:69] and Hebrew יָפֹא[ ]). The only exception to *ypw is Phoenician ꠉ convey [Greek Ἰόππα], 3man_hdr inscription, l. 19). It may well be that, at least in the case of the genitive constructions, the logogram was actually read separately; cf., e.g., ma-at Ha-at-teKI (Idri-ma, 1. 64; cf. il 14,18,21, etc.). There are very few examples of this practice involving ꠂ in Biblical Hebrew (e.g., II Kings 19:13 = Isaiah 37:13), although of course with 'eres such usages are legion. Interesting in this connection is the Latin rendering of "Byblos," Alcobile, which we are perhaps to understand as an attempt to represent ابل Gubli, "The city of Byblos."

The city itself, modern Jubail, is located some twenty miles north of Beirut in Lebanon. Its strategic location, coupled with the fact that it had a harbor adequate for small ships, made it a
convenient port for Egyptian seafarers engaged in trading with Phoenicia. Egyptian-Byblian commercial contacts began at the dawn of history; e.g., Albright remarks that "Gubla or Kupla (originally non-Semitic) ... was Egyptianized as Kpn (late Kbu) [= Kubi; cf. Albright, The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography, 1934, p. 60] not later than the First Dynasty" (JPOS VIII [1928], p. 231), indicating trade at a very early date. Such contacts were more or less continuous right down to the Amarna Age, since Byblos shipped the famous cedars of Lebanon that were used by ancient monarchs in the construction of their palaces. Thus during the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties Byblos became "virtually an Egyptian colony" (Albright, FSAC², p. 160); toward the end of the Twelfth Dynasty it was "comme une petite Égypte" (Montet, Syria VIII, p. 92); and during the Amarna Age itself Rib-Haddi was able to state unequivocally that "Byblos is just like Hikuptah [= Ugaritic H(q)kpt, whence Greek Αίγυπτος] to the pharaoh" (EA 84:37-38; cf. also 139:8-9). This seemingly unshakable alliance was soon to be sundered, however, for after the middle of the twelfth century Egyptian imperial control in Asia was a thing of the past (cf. Albright, ARI³, p. 111).

The Hebrew spelling of Gubla (i.e., הָבָל) is probably under the influence of such cuneiform renderings as Gu-bal in an inscription of Tiglath-Pileser I (Schroeder, KAH, II, 68:21).

The Greek form of the word was Gýblos (EB, II, p. 405 [in Hebrew]), whence the more common Búblos (for this phonetic change, cf. the posited proto-Indo-European *gWOU, whence Sanskrit GOU, Greek βόος, English "cow" [see Rosen, Leshonenu 17 (1951), pp. 173-174]). Byblos gave its name to the papyrus that it exported, and the numerous derivatives of bíblos ("book"), not the least of which is "Bible," attest to the enduring importance of this ancient city.

L. 5. tiddin: As is evident from our translation, we consider this form, which is found also in the salutations of
numerous other Rib-Haddi letters (except for EA 68:5, always written defectively; e.g., ti-di-in₆, 76:4; ti-di-in, 74:3; ti-din, 73:4), an Akkado-Canaanite feminine jussive of nadanu, "to give." The Akkadian equivalent would be liddin. As for the Canaanite equivalent, there are two possibilities: tattin, if the root is to be conceived of as *ytn (as in Phoenician and Ugaritic); tatitin, if the root is *ntn (as in Hebrew).

liddin is an excellent example of the "hybrid forms" (cf. Ebeling, BA VIII/2 [1912], pp. 47,52) with which the Canaanite Amarna letters teem. For the Canaanite scribes, the Akkadian language was merely a garment ("eine dünne Decke": Böhl, Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe [LSS V/2 (1909)], p. III) in which they clothed their words while nevertheless couching them in their native Canaanite idiom (cf. Albright, FSAC², p. 210). To the trained eye, however, that idiom is evident in almost every line of almost every tablet. In the case of liddin, not only is its formation non-Akkadian; even its syntactical position betrays its Canaanite author, for the verb normally stands as the last word in the Akkadian sentence.

The use of IN₄ (EN) for IN is exceedingly common in the Rib-Haddi letters; in fact, the sign IN is quite rare. It is perhaps going a little too far to state, with Ebeling, that "die i- und e-Zeichen werden promiscue gebraucht" (op. cit., p. 40), although many examples of an interchange between i and e do exist; cf., e.g., ɪs(eN)-tu and iN-tu in EA 103:31 and 38 respectively.

Careful study of the Rib-Haddi material seems to indicate the use of both *nt/dn and *yt/dn. Examples of the former are exceedingly numerous; cf., e.g., na-da-an, 85:28; na-ad-na-ti, 73:38; na-ad-ν, 79:10. Absolutely certain examples of the latter are rare (e.g., na-ad/t-na, 89:16, is probably first common plural imperfect from *yt/dn, since pa-ni-ν must be its object; cf. Albright and Moran, JCS 4 [1950], p. 166). However, it may well be that forms like ia-di-in₄ (EA 116:46) and ia-di-ν (105:85),
with which these letters abound, are likewise from the same root and not defectively written forms from *nt/dn, as is usually assumed. Interesting from this standpoint is ia-ti-na (83:31) which, unless the difference is merely orthographic, exhibits the Canaanite _-phoneme.

L. 5. du(n)na: The syllabic writing of this word appears again only in EA 109:54 (twice). More frequently it is written logographically, either as KALAG.GA (e.g., 76:4) or, less often, as GA.KALAG (e.g., 78:4).

The problem of such inversions is an intriguing one, since no self-respecting Babylonian scribe would ever reverse the order of syllables in a compound logogram. There is no easy solution; we cannot, for example, agree with Halévy, who suggests that "le scribe, habitué à l'écriture phénicienne qui se dirige de droite à gauche, a renversé par distraction l'ordre des caractères cunéiformes" (Lettres Babyloniennes Trouvées a El-Amarna, Paris, 1899, p. 295, n. 1). The number of occurrences of such inversions is far too great to attribute them merely to absentmindedness. Also, they appear only in connection with certain logograms and never with others; for example, we never find *GAL.É for É.GAL, or ZÍR.UR for UR.ZÍR. It would seem best, then, to discuss a few pertinent examples, one at a time and each on its own merits, to attempt to discover the principles involved. BB, p. xiv, lists three just such examples without further comment: GA.KALAG for KALAG.GA, *KÚR.NU for *NU.KÚR, SA.GAZ for GAZ.SA. We shall examine each of these in order.

GA.KALAG for KALAG.GA is the least problematical of the three examples. KALAG.GA is the correct way of writing the logogram (Labat, Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne, Paris, 1952, p. 147). However, the signs KALAG and GA are very much alike in appearance, and may easily be confused when written quickly or carelessly. Thus GA.KALAG may have arisen as a visual corruption of KALAG.GA, only to be perpetuated by scribes unfamiliar with or indifferent to the rigors involved in writing logograms properly.
*Kûr.Nû for *Nu.Kûr, on the other hand, is to be explained along other lines. Nu and Kûr are very much alike in appearance also, it is true; but in fact they do not constitute a logogram, no matter what their position with respect to each other. The only applicable logograms for *mkr (which root *Kûr.Nû and *Nu.Kûr invariably represent in Amarna) are Kûr and Kûr.Kûr. Now Kûr.Nû and *Nu.Kûr may both be considered as corruptions of Kûr.Kûr. On the other hand, perhaps we have here examples of a pseudo-logogram, with Nu functioning as a sort of phonetic complement to aid in the reading of the Kûr-sign. At any rate, forms such as Nu-kûr-tum in I. 12 of the present letter are best read syllabically; other combinations will be dealt with as they appear.

Sa.Gaz likewise appears to be a pseudo-logogram, since it is written at least once each as Sa.Ga.Az (EA 318:11) and as Sa.Ga.Gaz (PRU III, 11.790:7; 16.364 A:7'); true logograms do not behave in such a way. Cf. EA, pp. 49-50, for examples of other writings of the same sign-group. The inversion of Sa.Gaz, Ga.Za, may then be explained as analogous to other logograms of similar formation, such as Ha.Ra (hubullu), KaLa.Ga (dunnu), Du.Ga (tabu), etc.

L. 7. Hēpē: For this normalization of GiR He3 (which must obviously be taken as a dual), cf. the discussion of mātē in I. 3 above. That the Canaanite scribe intended Hēpu (a purely Akkadian word) for GiR is clear from such passages as 178:3: [an]a GiRpe bēliya amqut.

L. 7. Yamya: "From the Old Kingdom on, an effective title for the Egyptian pharaoh was the 'Son of Ṛē' " (Wilson in Frankfort et al., op. cit., p. 71). Because the son partakes of the essence of the father, to all intents and purposes the pharaoh was Ṛē himself; indeed, Egyptian texts are not lacking which describe him as such and which equate him with other gods in addition (ibid., p. 65). Since the Amarna Canaanites identified Ṛē with their own sun-god, Shamash (cf. Albright, FSAC2, p. 212), it is not surprising to find Rib-Haddi addressing the pharaoh as his sun-god. In fact,
it was a more or less common practice in the ancient Near East to address almost any monarch as the sun-god; cf., e.g., the use of the word *špš* as an appellation of the Hittite king, Shuppiluliuma, in an Ugaritic text (Gordon, *UIM II*, Text 118, l. 19, etc.). From such usages it was an easy step to the extravagantly flattering royal title, "my pantheon" (cf., e.g., *EA 147:1*: a-na LUGAL EN-li-ia DINIGIR Meh-ia d UTU-ia).

L. 3. *Sib*<sup>gitū</sup> *Sib*<sup>gitān</sup> anūn: The normalizations of the numeral expressions (cf. similarly Böhl, *op. cit.*, p. 39) are rendered virtually certain by such passages as *EA 84:5* and 315:6 (*MIN<sup>it</sup>-yu*); 211:4 (*Mi-ib-e-ta-an*); 215:6 (*Mi-ib-e-ta-an*); 221:6 (*Mi-bi-ta-an*); and 196:4 (*Mi-bi-ta-an*). The meaning is likewise not difficult to ascertain, for we have here a shortened form of a longer formula represented, e.g., in 232:8-11: *MIN-yu* *MIN-ta-a-an* uš₃-ḥē-ḥi-in i-na bā-an-te-c ba-at-nu-ma ḫe-ru-ma šu-uh-ru-ma, "Seven times, seven times I have bowed down, both prone and supine." It is clear, then, that the first "seven times" of our shortened formula refers to prostrating oneself in a prone position, while the second "seven times" has reference to lying supinely.

*Sib*<sup>gitū</sup> regularly precedes *Sib*<sup>gitān</sup> (or its equivalent), but the order is by no means absolutely fixed. We find, e.g., *MIN-yu* u *MIN-yu* (156:3); *MIN-ta-a-an* u *MIN-ta-a-an* (286:4); *MIN-tam* u *MIN* (138:4); or, simply, *MIN* *MIN* (140:4). These examples are but a sampling of the variations that occur in our texts, but they effectively disprove the suggestion that the endings -yu and -(t)ān are to be understood as the Akkadian demonstratives *Ti* and *annā* (so H. L. Ginsberg, *BASOR* 72, p. 19, n. 7) with the resulting translation of *MIN* "Ti (u) "MIN* "annā" then being "seven that (and) seven this." -yu and -tān are absolute equivalents, as can readily be seen from the above citations of *EA 156:3* and 286:4. Their exact meaning, however, is a very thorny problem, for which
I do not claim to have the definitive answer. It appears, though, that the solution lies in the following direction:

As to \texttt{IMIN-ta-(a)-an}, the sign-group \texttt{A-AN} cannot here be read as \texttt{AM}, nor can \texttt{AN} (by itself) be read as \texttt{A-M} (for which cf. Labat, op. cit., p. 277, n. 11), both of which are Sumerian determinatives which follow ordinal numbers and would therefore, in our case, result in the meaning "seventh," which in turn would make no sense in context. Nor can we read \texttt{TA-A-AN} as \texttt{TA-AM}, a Sumerian determinative following distributive numbers; such a rendering would again yield no sense, and furthermore we find the spelling \texttt{IMIN-da-a-an} in EA 273:7 and in several succeeding letters thereafter, which is difficult to reconcile with the supposition that \texttt{TA-A-AN} is intended as a true logogram. The best solution is to understand \texttt{Mib\textsuperscript{C}itan} as representing an adverbial formation and to equate it with Hebrew \texttt{Mib\textsuperscript{C}atayim}. Such an equation was suggested already by Böhl (op. cit., p. 38), and gains added support from the writing \texttt{IMIN-tam} (EA 138:4).

Incidentally, every occurrence of \texttt{Mib\textsuperscript{C}atayim} in the Bible (Genesis 4:15,24; Isaiah 30:26; Psalm 12:7; 79:12; Proverbs 6:31) means "sevenfold" with the obvious connotation of "many times." Of course, "seven" in the Bible often means simply "many" (cf., e.g., Deuteronomy 28:7,25; Judges 16:7,8,13,19; I Samuel 2:5; Isaiah 4:1; Jeremiah 15:9; Proverbs 24:16; 26:16,25; Ruth 4:15; also in Biblical Aramaic, Daniel 3:19; and frequently in the New Testament under Semitic influence, e.g., Matthew 12:45). It is not likely, however, that we are to translate \texttt{Mib\textsuperscript{C}it\textsuperscript{H}u} and \texttt{Mib\textsuperscript{C}it\textsuperscript{A}n} as "many times" in our texts. Having prostrated himself seven times prone and seven times supine, the underling would have clearly made his point, that of servile obedience.

\texttt{IMIN-Hu} is far more difficult of explanation, though an attempt, however fumbling, would seem to be worthwhile. It is instructive to compare here the data found elsewhere in the Canaanite dialects. Note the following striking parallels to
our passage: wayyištahû 'arsâh Nebaç pa-amîm cad-gištô cad-‘ahîw (Genesis 33:3); iy-n adty Ṣb’d wšb’id mrhtm qlt (Gordon, UM II, Text 89:6-11). The most common way of expressing the idea of "X number of times" in Hebrew is by using the phrase "X number of pa-amîm," literally "X number of feet" (cf. Phoenician pa’m, Ugaritic pa’n). Once yâdôt (literally, "hands") is used (Genesis 45:34; cf. Ugaritic Ṣb’ydt in I*AB, i:20-21); four times (Exodus 23:14; Numbers 22:28, 32, 33) we find ra’alim (literally, "feet"). Twice only we have monîn (Genesis 31:7, 41).

Thus overwhelmingly in Hebrew a part of the body is used to represent "time" in this sense. It is tempting, then, to see in the Ugaritic expression Ṣb’d wšb’id the word yd, "hand" (so already Gordon, UM III, Number 794). The y in Ugaritic yd regularly drops out when in an intervocalic position (cf. frequently bd, "in the hand[s] of," e.g. II AB, i:24-25, etc.; note also Phoenician bd = bôd [Friedrich, Phönikisch-punische Grammatik, 88 63a, 80a]); Ṣb’d would then stand for Ṣb’yd. Ṣb’id is somewhat more difficult, although it is clear that it is intended as only an orthographic variant of Ṣb’d. Perhaps we have to do here with the alternate phenomenon of intervocalic w/y occasionally becoming i (cf., e.g., šawînu becoming kâ’īnu in Akkadian and Arabic; for another example, cf. Albright, ARI 4, pp. 204-205, n. 42). On the other hand, it may be that id in Ṣb’id represents the influence of Akkadian idû, "arm"; cf. the remarkable gloss, zu-ru-û (Hebrew z’r’ac, "arm") for Ṣû (z’ Akkadian qâtu, "hand") in EA 287:27; 288:34. A major objection to the above scheme is the fact that both -d and -id appear to be in the singular, whereas in Hebrew the corresponding elements are cast in the plural. Numeral syntax is always problematic, however. Furthermore, these could be fossilized or status indeterminatus forms.

The standard explanation of sebînu, the Akkadian equivalent of Amarna Sib’ītû, is that it represents sebe (the construct of sebu, "seven") plus -î (originally -ay, an old adverbial ending.
found in words like timāli, "yesterday," and warki, "after[wards]"; cf. Hebrew and Aramaic *ahārē* plus -šu (the third person masculine singular suffix). The function of this -šu is difficult to understand, but Middle Babylonian phrases such as Manûtikka tašaparā, "Twice thou writest to me" (AF O X, 3:13), make it certain that it was indeed understood as a suffix.

How the Canaanite scribes of Amarna understood **IMIN-šu** is another matter, however. The easy solution would be to state that they, too, considered it a suffix. The normalization **Miib*itšu** cannot be used as an argument against such a contention, for a spelling **Miib*issu**, which would conform to Akkadian phonetic rules (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 30 f), would involve precision such as we cannot demand of the Amarna scribes. On the other hand, Canaanite usage, as we have seen, tends to employ a part of the body (usually the hand or foot) to express the idea of "(X number of) times."

It is at least possible, then, that -šu in such expressions was read **šu** (the logogram for "hand") by the Canaanite scribes. There is no doubt that the logogram was known to them in other connections; cf. EA 245:35: i-na šu₃ ba-di-ú (for *bayadihu; cf. Ugaritic bdh). Since it would be premature, however, to press the point on such scant evidence, I shall continue to normalize the šu-sign as a suffix. At any rate the meaning is clear, and nothing would be gained by insisting that it be taken as a logogram for "hand."

L 8. **amqu**: That this is to be understood as a simple Akkadian preterit form rather than as a Canaanite imperfect is clear from the parallel use of maqlētē, "I have fallen," in EA 138:4. maqlētē is the ordinary Akkadian verb for "to fall," and corresponds semantically to Hebrew napal and Ugaritic qil (*qal or *qal; cf. qilt, "I have fallen," in Gordon, UM II, Text 89:11; cf. III AB, B:9 with II K, 6:57-58, and 1*AB, 6:8 with III AB, A:23). Forms such as is-*ta-ha-hi-in (EA 298:12), is-*ti-hi-hi-in (302:10), uš-*hō-hi-in (221:7), etc., which replace **amqu** occasionally in
the formulae of submission, are to be translated "I have prostrated myself" and are surely related to Hebrew hîtâ_Sh and Ugaritic hîthu on the one hand and possibly to Akkadian Mukînu on the other hand. That the two sets of verbs represent different, howbeit complementary, actions is clear from such passages as I Samuel 20:41:

\[ \text{wayyippôl 'appayw 'arsa} \text{ wayyiståhû `alû p CAMIM.} \]

L. 9. lû ide Harru: The verb in initial position in such a sentence is characteristically Canaanite; cf. the note on tiddin in l. 5 above. ìde is here a Canaanite imperfect as to its usage; to understand it as an Akkadian preterite is less satisfactory syntactically, and under normal circumstances the Akkadian verb idû (Hebrew yâda\(^c\)) has no present tense (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 106 q).

The circumlocution evident in this phrase is characteristic of a subject's approach to the pharaoh of Egypt. "The divine person of the pharaoh was too holy for direct approach. An ordinary mortal did not speak 'to' the king; he spoke 'in the presence of' the king. Various circumlocutions were employed to avoid direct reference to the king: 'May thy majesty hear', instead of 'mayest thou hear', and 'one gave command', instead of 'he gave command'" (Wilson in Frankfort et al., op. cit., p. 75).

L. 9. EN-ia: The context demands that this be read as a nominative form. bêlî would be the normal Akkadian correspondent; only occasionally would Old Babylonian, for example, permit a form such as bêluya (in which the \(-y\) would become \(-i\)- intervocalically; cf. von Soden, GAG, § 65 c; cf. the note on \(\text{ibCišū miCišīn}\) in l. 8 above), and then most likely in poetically influenced contexts (cf., e.g., ëšau'a, "my helper," in CH XXVII:67), but rarely, if ever, in a letter. It is therefore highly unlikely that we are to read *bêluya in the present instance; in fact, EA 82:33, ha-ba-li-ia muhîka, "Any mistreatment of me is thy responsibility," makes the normalization bêluya imperative.

Strangely enough, the scribes of Amarna freely interchanged forms like bêlî with forms like bêliya; cf., e.g., [1]de Harru
bēlā, EA 75:7. Originally, as in standard Akkadian, the ending -ā was added to singular nouns in Canaanite to signify "my" in the nominative and accusative cases, whereas -iya signified "my" in the genitive case. In Phoenician, for example, cf. Kilamuwa, l. 3: ḫnn ḫb(b) Hāw ḫb l. 4, "There was my (nominative) father, Hayya, but he was ineffective"; ibid., ll. 5-6: ḫnn bt ḫb(i)y(a) ḫnn lmk n ḫb(r), "The dynasty of my (genitive) father was in the midst of mighty kings." In Ugaritic we find at ah, "Thou art my (nominative) brother" (III D, i:24); wtnh birit ṭp9, "My (nominative) soul shall repose in my (genitive) breast" (II D, ii:13-14).

Because of the early disappearance of final short vowels in Hebrew, the original picture is there obscured, but there is no reason to assume that the situation with regard to the first person singular pronominal suffix was essentially different.

It seems very likely, in view of the above evidence, that the development of -ā into -iya is to be explained as a leveling process under the influence of the genitive ending -iya. Z. Harris (GPI, p. 48) explains the parallel Phoenician development in a similar and essentially satisfactory way. In such a manner, perhaps, we are to understand a seemingly incorrect form like aby in the Ugaritic phrase ltkn ḫn lbr il aby (II D, i:24), "Wilt thou not surely favor him, 0 Bull El, my (vocative) father," wherein we expect ab (‘abi) instead of aby (‘abiya).

L. 10. inūma: inūma (spelled enūma in later periods) is an Akkadian conjunction meaning basically "when" (CAB, 7, pp. 159 ff.). Among the Amarna Canaanites, however, it was used as the equivalent of Hebrew kē, and as such shared nearly all of the values of the latter (cf. Albright, JEA XXIII, p. 202, n. 3). As the following partial listing demonstrates, inūma is a common word in the Rib-Haddi corpus. It means "when" in EA 73:26, 40; 85:82; 91:9; "that" in 73:41; 74:6; 75:7, 36; 76:7, 15; 79:8; 81:6; 83:1; 22:19, 41; "if/whether" in 84:18; 85:23, 66; 95:42; 96:15; "because/for" in 74:11; 77:6; 94:67. A particularly interesting
passage is 137:20-21: inūma yīmur ahiya inūma as¬ e mar Māp<ri>ya
reğami, "When my brother saw that my messenger went out empty-
handed . . . ."

L. 10. Salmat _ URU Gubla: The Akkadian equivalent of Sumerian
URU, "city," is ālu, which is of masculine gender; cf., e.g.,
Gilgamesh Xi:11-13: Šurippak ālu ša titušu atta [ša ina aš]
Puratti šaknu ālu šu labir(ma), "Šurippak---a city with which thou
art well acquainted, [which] is located [on the bank of] the
Euphrates---that city was old." In this quotation there are no
less than four indications of the masculinity of ālu: —šu,
šaknu, šu, labir. Since, then, _URU_ in the Rib-Haddi letters is
always construed with feminine verbs (such as Salmat here) and
modifiers, it is clear that the scribes did not have ālu in mind
when they wrote the _URU_-sign. Doubtless they were thinking of
a form such as Hebrew _šār_, which is always feminine (the word
appears also in Ugaritic _ša_), but the evidence is somewhat
inconclusive as to its gender there; note, however, Udm rtb
[wa]Udm tršt in 1 K:108-109, etc.).

Since it is unlikely that determinatives were commonly read
independently by the ancient cuneiformists (cf. the note on Gubla
in l. 4 supra), I shall not indicate them in my normalizations.
We can be sure, however, that, whether expressed or unexpressed,
the determinatives exerted their influence upon the grammatical
constructions in which they appeared.

Byblos is referred to as Salmat also in EA 74:6 and 75:8, an
indication that these letters were written early in the career of
Rib-Haddi, before his enemies became too powerful for him. For
this meaning of the root _šlm_ in Biblical Hebrew, cf., e.g., Job
5:24: _yadētā₃ ki-Salam _ohōlēkā_, "And thou shalt know that
thy tent is safe" (cf. 21:9). The idiom "safe and sound" best
expresses the idea in English. For Salāmu ana/itti meaning "to
be on friendly terms with," cf. the note on EA 30:28 infra, where
additional Biblical parallels are cited.
L. 11. amat kitti 'ya 'ameri: Byblos is called a "(loyal) handmaiden of the king" also in EA 74:6-7; 75:8, and note especially 116:44-47: yišme 'amaru awāte arad kī(t)tišu ū yādin balāṭa ana ardi[ḥu] ū anātišu Gubla, "May the king hear the words of his loyal servant and give provisions to [his] servant and his handmaiden, Byblos!"

Hebrew 'āmāh is likewise used figuratively in direct address in token of humility to God as well as to human superiors (I Samuel 1:11,16; 25:24,25,28,31,41; II Samuel 14:15,16; 20:17; I Kings 1:13,17; 3:20; Ruth 3:9). The subject is, of course, always feminine, even as is Gubla in l. 10 above. Mīpāh is used similarly, though only to human superiors (I Samuel 1:18; 25:27; 28:21-22; II Samuel 14:6,7,12,15,17,19; II Kings 4:2,16; Ruth 2:13). Cf. also the use of amatu in EA 83:55-55; 84:42-43; 85:84-86. While a city is never called a "maidservant" in the Hebrew Bible, similar metaphors are relatively frequent (cf., e.g., Isaiah 1:8; 47:1; II Samuel 20:19; and others).

kittu ("kīntu, from the verb kānu, "to be genuine/legitimate") means "truth, justice." Using the same verbal root, a great Babylonian poet described Marduk as follows in Enuma elīš IV:9:

lā kīnat šī tīka lā sarār searka, "Thy utterance is surely true; thy command is not false." Kittu and mī/ēMaru (for a similar Hebrew pair of Isaiah 1:4; Psalm 58:2; etc.), both having approximately the same meaning, were chief concerns of ancient Mesopotamian rulers. Sennacherib, for example, called himself nāṣir kitti ra'īm mīšari, "the guardian of truth, the lover of justice" (OIP 2, p. 23:4-5). Hammurabi began the epilogue to his famous law code with the words: dīnāt mīšarrim 'ya Hammurabi Harrum le'īm ukinnuma matam u(s)an kīnām ū ridam dāqua māṣbitu, "(These are) the equitable laws which Hammurabi, the able king, established; he thereby caused the land to take hold of true conduct and good direction" (CH, XXIV:1-8).
There do not appear to be any exact parallels to *amat/arád kitti* in the Hebrew Bible, either in a literal or figurative sense. In Zecharian 6:11, however, Jerusalem is called a "faithful city" (כָּרָה תּוֹחֵם; cf. further Isaiah 1:21, 26). We note also, in Genesis 42:11: הקִים אֲנַחֲנֵהוּ לַּוְיָהִי בֹּדֵהְוָוָוָוָו מִּרְגָּגְלִים, "Loyal men are we; thy servants are not spies." And finally, Numbers 12:7: לֶאָנָה מִשְׁפֶּהָו הֶבֵּהוּ בֶּקַלְּבֹדַו הָוָו מַשַּׂח מַעָו, "Not so is my servant Moses; in all my house, loyal is he."

L. 12. **MA·GAL**: In Or. XVI, p. 6, C. H. Gordon suggests that **MA·GAL** "may well be an Accadian word to judge from the spelling ma·ga·al* (see A. Ungnad, Babylonische Briefe, Leipzig, 1914, p. 329)." Of this there can be no doubt; cf. already CH, § 142: "עַ מַּעַּתָּרָו וַּאֲסַי מַעַּתָּרָו בֵּא-אָמ-תא-בָּו; cf. also la ma·ga·al da·ba·bu·um in an Old Babylonian love poem (1:2) studied by von Soden in ZA 49 (1950), pp. 151 ff., and by Professor Held in JCS 15 (1961) (in print). **Magal** is in Akkadian probably a loanword from Sumerian (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 120 d). In Amarna, however, it is highly unlikely that we are to read **MA·GAL** syllabically, as Gordon suggests (loc. cit.). **danniš** is almost certainly the correct reading; cf. EA 5:12: **MA·GAL** **MA·GAL** lu-ú Sul-mu with PRU III, 16.112:6: *danniš* *danniš* lu-ú *Sul-mu* (for the restoration, cf. *danniš* lu-ú *Sul-mu*, ibid., 10.046:5; 15.14:6; 15.33:19; 16.132:30; cf. Ugaritic mid *slm* in Gordon, UM II, Text 95:11-12; for **danniš** **danniš** cf. Hebrew מַהָּמּ מַהָּמּ in, e.g., Exodus 1:7). It is also noteworthy that **MA·GAL** never appears as "**MA·GA·AL** in the Amarna material, whereas in Old Babylonian such a spelling is common.

L. 12. **nu·kur·tu**: It would seem best to read nu·kúr·tu (so, substantially, Knudtzon) instead of a more unwieldy *nu·kúr·tu*, although it must be admitted that even to this day there is no solid agreement among ranking Assyriologists in such matters. At any rate, the normalization is certain. Mimmation always occurs
on nukur'tu in the Rib-Haddi letters when it appears in the nominative case (the separate citations are too numerous to require listing). When it appears in the genitive case, however, mimination is never evident (EA 103:16; 138:38). In general, the pattern of mimination elsewhere in Rib-Haddi is even less regular. We conclude, therefore, that such mimination as is found in these letters is to be considered orthographic rather than morphological.

nukur'tu ordinarily means "hostility," hence my translation. Albright's suggestion that in Amarna it often has the connotation of "warfare," however, is intriguing, to say the least (cf. JEA XXIII, p. 203, n. 3, p [5]). If Albright's proposal is valid, the idiom in 11. 12-14 of the present letter, dannat . . . nukur'tum . . . [U]GU, would thus find a striking Biblical parallel in I Samuel 14:52: watt<sup>eh</sup> hammilham<sup>−h</sup> hazaq<sup>−h</sup> c<sup>a</sup>. Cf. also II Kings 3:26: hazaq mimenn<sup>−h</sup> hammilham<sup>a</sup>. "The battle was too severe for him," which complicates the problem of just how to translate the Amarna idiom, since <i>eli</i>, the normal Akkadian equivalent of Sumerian <i>UGU</i>, frequently is used to express the comparative degree (as in Hebrew <i>min</i> above). I would advocate caution here, however, because in EA 106:21, for example, we find the sentence nukur'tum <i>Sumi(r),</i> wherein <i>UGU</i> cannot possibly have comparative force.

The Biblical phrase <i>casa</i><sup>−h</sup> milham<sup>a</sup> "et, "to make war against, to fight with" (Genesis 14:2; Joshua 11:18), is paralleled by EA 92:11: nukur'tum . . . [i]ttil[ya ]i[n]ne[pu]<sup>−</sup>. Cf. also 153:8; 105:39-40. Cf. further Professor Held, JAOS 79 (1959), p. 172 with n. 54.

13. <span style='font-size:12pt; color: #000099;'>ER<sup>MES</sup>IN</span>: The normalization of this logogram would be somewhat problematical were it not for EA 166:4, 18-tu ER<sup>MES</sup>IN sa-bi p<sup>−t</sup>á-t<sup>e</sup>, where sa-bi, though not preceded by the usual Glossenkeil in such cases, can only be a gloss, since we find ER<sup>MES</sup>IN p<sup>−t</sup>á-ti repeatedly in Amarna. sa-bi, "host, army," thus is to be preferred over ummanatu (the only other possibility) as the normalization for ER<sup>MES</sup>IN in our texts (cf. Labat, op. cit.,...
Number 393). The Biblical parallels between Amarna šabu and the Hebrew root "šb" (cf. also Ugaritic šbu; e.g., I X:88) will become increasingly evident infra.


L. 14. [U]GU: This logogram represents another problem in normalization. On the one hand, we find, in EA 33:10-11, aš-ba-ta UGU [G1GU]ZA E a-bi-ka(!), wherein UGU must be read eli because of the phonetic complement following it. In every other case where UGU is followed by a phonetic complement in Amarna, however, we find UGU, by which muhhi is intended. Cf., e.g., EA 96:30-33: ṭa-il-ta [a-n]a LUGAL UGU₄₃-ku-nu [A]i-te-[r]u-[a]-[a]n-ni i-na [DU]BEU h₄₃ g₄₃-b[i]. It is thus obvious that in the Rib-Haddi letters we are to read UGU as muhhi. The idiom ṭa-il-ta muhhi, "to write concerning," is also found elsewhere in Rib-Haddi (cf. 114:27-28; 118:47-49); the Hebrew equivalent would be katab "cal, but with the possible exception of Job 13:26 it does not have the meaning "to write concerning" in the Bible.

We find mu-hi (for *muhhi) frequently in Rib-Haddi (EA 71:35; 79:9; 91:19; 107:17; 108:56; 113:35; 116:36; 127:15; 130:13,14), but always preceded by either ana or ištu in accordance with standard Akkadian usage (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 115 h). muhhi used by itself as a preposition is surely strange, but perhaps it was derived by the Canaanite scribes from formations such as ištu muhhi, which they would naturally equate with combinations such as Hebrew me"al (hence for them muhhi alone would equal "cal).

L. 14. la a-a-qul-me: Assuming that the reading is correct (which can scarcely be disputed), my syllabic division is to be preferred to that of Knudtzon (who reads la-a a-kul-me). a-qul can only be interpreted as a first person singular form, which is
impossible in context here; we need yaqūl (third person masculine singular Canaanite imperfect; cf., e.g., EA 137:25), or at least iqūl (Akkadian preterit). Now a-a-qūl could have been intended by our Canaanite scribe to represent yaqūl, for in almost every other case he would have read the combination a-a as ya. For example, a form like ălānu'a (Akkadian for "my cities," the last syllable of which is often written a-a in this and similar expressions) would have been read ălānuya by the scribes of Amarna, and a form like da-a-a-nu (probably to be normalized in Akkadian as da'ānu and meaning "judge") they would have read as dayyanu (cf. Hebrew dayyān).

The verb gālu is common in Amarna, particularly in the Rib-Haddi material. Despite this fact, however, it seems that all interpreters of Amarna up to now have misunderstood it, not having taken into account the tendency of the Canaanite scribes to adapt Akkadian verbs to Canaanite idiomatic patterns. Scholars thus translate gālu uniformly as "to restrain, hold back," thereby revealing that they have confused it with Akkadian kalū (= Hebrew "kalūh"). (Akkadian *kalū is automatically excluded since it appears only in the II-conjugation in Akkadian, wherein kullu means "to hold" [cf. von Soden, GAG, § 104 o]. The Hebrew homonyma, *kalū, likewise occurs almost exclusively in the derived conjugations in the Hebrew Bible.) We note immediately, however, that gālu, always intransitive in Akkadian, is also always intransitive in Amarna (at least in the Rib-Haddi letters, whereas kalū and its Hebrew cognate are always used transitively. Albright and Mendenhall tacitly admit this difficulty when they mistranslate EA 137:25-26: ă-ūl ia-qū-ul-mi LUGAL be-li a-na in-šī UR an-nu-ū as follows (ANET², p. 483). "Let the king [sic] not restrain (himself) at the deed of this dog!" The translators here found it necessary to insert "himself" in parentheses, always a dangerous practice to be resorted to only when there is no other solution.
The most natural translation of EA 137:25-26 is: "May the king, my lord, not remain silent concerning the deed of this dog!" galu in Akkadian means just that—"to be silent." Wherever this verb is used in Rib-Haddi, such a meaning fits much better than "to restrain." The whole tenor of our corpus of letters is that although Rib-Haddi writes to Egypt continually for help against his enemies, the only response from the pharaoh is a disinterested silence. It would therefore be strange indeed if a verb meaning "to be silent" were not found in the Rib-Haddi letters.

But there is more to be said. In EA 73:6-8 we read: a-na mi-nim ga-la-ta 1 la-a tás-du a-na LU3AL, "Why hast thou kept silent and not spoken to the king...?" (Cf. also 71:10-12.) Similarly (though conversely), in Psalm 50:1-4, God is represented as speaking (the verb used is dibbor) and calling (qara') instead of remaining silent (harse). Cf. also Psalm 109:1-2, where harse (the semantic equivalent of galu) is again contrasted with dibbor (equivalent to galu). For a similar contrast with damn, "to be silent," cf. Psalm 30:13. Note also II AB, 7:38 ff.: ib hid lm thN . . . cN pcI, "O enemies of Hadad, why do you keep silent?... Answer Ba'cal!" (Cf. Hebrew haMa, "to be silent/inactive").

If it should be objected that the meaning of galu in Amarna is established by the gloss ha-ZI-ri for i-ka-al (EA 138:130), the answer to such an objection is found in the orthography of the Rib-Haddi letters, in which KA and QA are almost always kept strictly separate. We can scarcely, therefore, read 'i-qà-al; ha-ZI-ri is thus a gloss for an anomalous IV form of the verb kalû which, incidentally, is obviously transitive in 138:130. For additional comments, see the note in loc. cit.

For -me on yaqûlma, cf. the note on l. 24 below:

galu 1stu (EA 65:14-15), "to be silent with regard to," answers to harèg min in Psalm 28:1 (cf. further I Kings 22:3).

L. 16. Sumur: Albright wrote as far back as 1928 that "the exact site of [Sumur (Smyra)] is not known" (JPOS VIII, p. 236),
and we know no more about it today than we did then. Wilson (in ANET, p. 239, n. 7) confesses: "Its location ... [is] still to be established with precision." An equation with modern Sumra, a village on the Syrian seacoast between Tarabulus and Ruwād (Amarna Arwād, Biblical 'Arwād) about one and a half miles north of Nahr el-Kebīr (the Eleutherus of old), has been stoutly defended by many writers, such as Petrie (Syria and Egypt from the Tell el Amarna Letters, New York, 1898, p. 133), W. Ewing (in LSBE, p. 3143), H. S. Gehrman (in WDB, p. 654), and C. Weber (in EA, p. 1141). Albright, however, who is the recognized authority in Near Eastern geography, agrees only that Simyra "lay near the mouth of the Eleutherus" (loc. cit.). Although the exact site is thus unsure, the general area in which Simyra was located is fairly well circumscribed, and with that we must be content. In the Table of Nations, hāšar Mari, "the Sumurite," is mentioned in close connection with ha'arwādī, "the Arvadite" (Genesis 10:14; cf. 1 Chronicles 1:16), among the Canaanite tribes; this datum agrees with the occasional mention of Sumur(a) in close connection with Arwād in Amarna (EA 104:39, 42; 105:18, 24 and 86-87; 149:59, 67), and assures us that Simyra was not too far from modern Ruwād. For the generally recognized equations with the name of Amarna Sumur(a) in other ancient languages, cf. the convenient summary by Weber (loc. cit.).

Despite the fact that we do not know its precise location, the importance of Simyra is attested by its mention literally scores of times in the correspondence of Rib-Haddi, appearing in more than half of his preserved letters. It was a "garrison city" of the pharaoh (EA 76:36), his "resting place" (84:15). After the death of its commissioner, Rib-Haddi requested none other than Yanhamu, one of the most distinguished of the pharaoh's Canaanite aides, to replace him (EA 106). It would thus appear not rash to predict that when Simyra is finally located for certain and to the satisfaction of all scholars, rich archaeological treasures await its excavators.
L. 17. [l]a-a: The restoration is practically certain. As Knudtzon points out (loc. cit.), the only other possibility is **[N]la-a**, but the resulting word, **Na**, is not as acceptable contextually. **la**, on the other hand, makes good sense in context.

L. 17. in₄-`é-pu-ús: This use of **IN₄**(EH₄) for **IN** has already been commented upon with regard to **tiddin** in l. 5 above. **NÉ(NI)** is, similarly, exceedingly common as a substitute for **NE**; the latter is, to my knowledge, never used in the Rib-Haddi letters except to represent **BI** (cf., e.g., [g]í-bí-ma in MA 84:2).

**in₄-`é-pu-ús** is defective writing for **inneppus₄**, a IV₄ present form, required here by context. **inneppus₄** is a perfectly good Akkadian form; for a brief discussion of the thematic vocalization of **eped₄** in the various periods and dialects of Akkadian, cf. von Soden, GAG, § 97 t.

**népu₄su ana** (cf. CAD 4, p. 235) is a common Amarna idiom with the meaning "to go from one side to another"; it is found in no other body of ancient Near Eastern literature with such a meaning. My translation, "to be turned over to," brings out the passive idea inherent in the IV₄ conjugation as well as the submission involved in turning oneself over to a stronger power (an action usually motivated by expediency).

L. 17. ga[bb]u: In older periods of Akkadian, **kal₄(m)** and **napharu₄(m)** were the most common words used in the sense of "all, every," but by the time of the Middle Babylonian dialect (c. 1530 to 1000 B.C.E.) **gabbi** began to share the spotlight (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 49 a; CAD 5, pp. 4-5). **napharu** is found only rarely in Amarna, and never in the Canaanite material (not to mention the Rib-Haddi letters).

**kal₄** and **gabbi** are used interchangeably in Rib-Haddi. We find, for example, **gabbi matāti...**, **ti(n)neπ₄₄u** (MA 88:32-33) and also **ti(n)neπ₄₄u kal₄ matāti** (73:32; 76:42-43); **kal₄ al₄n₄i** (76:13; 104:12-13) and also **gabbi al₄n₄i** (137:76). Each of the two words may be used independently as well; cf. the common phrase **gāmir gabbi**, **gabbi**.
"Everything is gone" (e.g., 102:12), and note also kali ša ešmu, "Everything that I have heard" (116:15-16).

As with Hebrew kol (kol-), as well as in agreement with standard Akkadian usage, the gender and number of a predicate verb used in connection with a subject composed of gabbu or kalû in construct with a following genitive noun are usually determined by the gender and number of the genitive noun (cf. GKC², § 146 c). kalû and gabbu are merely attributes of such genitives. Examples from Rib-Haddi are: gabbî amilûti irda(h)amûšu (EA 106:40); kali hazanû te tuba'ûna (73:25-24). As a pertinent example from the Hebrew Bible, where such occurrences are legion, we may cite I Samuel 4:13: wattiṣaq kol-haṣîr.

L. 19. ina: Although amûšu(m) is most frequently used in Akkadian to express the idea of "because of, on account of," even Old Babylonian is not without examples of ina used in such a sense; cf., e.g., ina la mê še'um ina eglîm la ittabši, "Because of lack of water, grain has not been produced in the field" (CH, § 48). In Hebrew, the corresponding preposition, b-e, is also sometimes so used. In Isaiah 26:7, for example, b-e- and min are used interchangeably with the meaning "because of": 'Ellehe bayyayin sagû ubaṣṣèkar ta'un kohen wēnāṣī, sagû baṣṣèkar niblû min-hayyayin ta'un min-haṣṣèkar.

L. 19. Lû MAŠKÎM: The definitive delineation of MAŠKÎM and its Akkadian equivalent, rabisu, was made by Professor Benno Landsberger, the recognized dean of modern Assyriology, in ZA 38, p. 276. Labat (op. cit., p. 137) displays two very similar logograms that represent the rabisu concept in Akkadian literature; one he labels MAŠKÎM, the second MAŠKÎM (MAŠKÎM). The scribes of Rib-Haddi invariably used the latter, as far as can be determined from the standard autographs.

Unlike Akkadian the Amarna letters indicate that the rabisu, the "commissioner," was an important governmental official. In view of the frequent references to him as rabisu(u) (Ma) Harri (cf.,
in Rib-Haddi, EA 68:19,23; 85:82; 129:14—and often elsewhere in Canaanite Amarna), we may assume that he was directly responsible only to the pharaoh. The gloss ma-lik for Lu\textsuperscript{MES} (MA)SKIM (131:21) indicates that part of the task of the rabisu was to serve in an advisory capacity to the petty princes of Canaan. 256:8-9: išt\textsuperscript{p}ani Lu\textsuperscript{MES} ra-bis\textsuperscript{a} sú-ki\textsuperscript{ni} (cf. also *362:70-71) gives us further insight into the responsibilities of the rabisu, for the gloss describes him as a sūkinu, a Canaanite participle that means literally "caretaker"; the rabisu was thus, as the deputy of the pharaoh, the "one in charge" of royal affairs in the Canaanite provinces. sūkinu derives from the Amarna verb sakānu (ana), "to care (for)" (cf., e.g., 286:34: [1]i-[i]s-ki-in, šarru ana mātišu; 286:38: ū li-is-kīn šarru bēl(!) ana mātišu), which was clearly a synonym for malāku ana (cf., e.g., 149:8: li-im-li-ik šarru ana ardišu; cf. also the gloss ma-lik mentioned above). Needless to say, sūkinu is the sōkēn of Isaiah 22:15 and the sīn of the Phoenician inscriptions (cf., e.g., the Ahiram inscription, 1. 2: mlk bmlk wṣmn bṣ[k]nm).

It may be that rabisu itself was also a Canaanite word, since in EA 321:15 we find ra-bi-is as a gloss for Lu\textsuperscript{(MA)}SKIM. Bearing in mind the fact that MAS\textsuperscript{KIM} = rabisu also meant "demon" in Sumero-Akkadian, perhaps we are to translate the puzzling phrase in Genesis 4:7, lappetah hattāt rōbes, as "Guilt is a demon (watchman) at the door" (cf. the Akkadian idiom rabis lemūttim in, e.g., AF 12, p. 365:35). At any rate, rōbes must be a terminus technicus there, since otherwise we would expect *rōbeset. See Cassuto, Genesis, I (Jerusalem, 1944), pp. 118-120.

Albright suggests that the Egyptian equivalent of rabisu was p; mh-ib (JEA XXIII, p. 200, n. 4), in support of which he adduces EA 7:76: m\textsuperscript{pa}-ma-hu-[ ] and 162:74: Lu\textsuperscript{pa}-ma-ha-a. This may well be, although the evidence from Amarna itself is inconclusive. The suggestion is infinitely better than that of C. R. Conder, however, who suggested that MAS\textsuperscript{KIM} itself was to be
read pa-ka, understood as an Egyptian word, and translated "chief man" (The Tell Amarna Tablets, p. 17, n. 3). Conder's work has the dubious distinction of being perhaps the worst translation of the Amarna letters ever published. It is filled with such patent nonsense that the fact that a second edition of it was published is well nigh incredible.

L. 20. 𒂗: This subjunctive form has the appearance of a ᡳ preterit, whereas we expect a present or stative here. The verb 𒂗, however, together with a few other common verbs, has only one tense, the forms of which von Soden designates as "präfigierende Stative" (GAG, § 78 b). Such "stative" forms are used not only as statives, but as preterits and presents as well; cf., e.g., CH, § 142: 𒊃 << Ġilītu la 𒂗 ... sinnitum šī arnam ul 𒂗, "If ... she did not have a fault, ... that woman shall not have a penalty."

It can be seen from the above Old Babylonian example that 𒂗 in standard Akkadian means "to have." This meaning is found also in the Amarna letters; we note, for example, the phrase Na pēta la 𒂗, "which does not have a limit," three times in EA 27 (ll. 23, 28, 30). In the Canaanite Amarna letters, however, 𒂗 never means "to have," but rather "to be," as in the present case. For example, EA 145:21-22 reads: ana mahar ardūitu Na 𒂗 ina mētāt Zuhri, "before his servants who are in the land(s) of Zuhru."

Clearly, in this uniquely Canaanite use of 𒂗 we have contamination with forms like Hebrew yēš, "there is." Even more closely related is Ugaritic it as, for example, in II D, i:21: it bn lh k(!)m ahh, "Let there be a son for him like his brothers." Among the Semitic languages, apparently only Akkadian had a separate verb meaning "to have." The cognate languages uniformly employed circumlocutions, so that "he has" was expressed by "there is to him" (Hebrew yēš לֹּ, Ugaritic it lh, Phoenician ykn lh/y, Aramaic ʾitt lēh, Arabic yakūnu lahu, etc.), "there is found for him" (Arabic yūjadu lahu), and similar idioms.
L. 22. *anumma*: In almost any language, the most difficult lexicographical problems arise when one begins to discuss its particles; the Amarna letters are no exception to this well-known principle. In the case of *anumma*, the problem is complicated by the fact that Dhorme (RB, NS 11 [1914], p. 363) wanted to equate it with *annu*. Also, although Ebeling in the glossary of EA separates *annu* from *anumma* (p. 1377), he probably considered them to be for all intents and purposes identical, since he lists "siehe!" as the meaning for each (= Dhorme's "voici").

Now there can be no reasonable doubt that *annu* does indeed mean "behold!" In AHw (p. 53), von Soden indicates that this word is found only in the Canaanite Amarna letters, and that its cognates are Ugaritic *hin*, Hebrew *hinneh*, and Arabic *'inna*; he thus concisely sums up previous research with regard to *annu*. I feel, however, that he errs (with Ebeling, loc. cit.) in including *a-nu* (EA 89:38; 114:30) among the occurrences of *annu*. It is more likely that we are to understand *a-nu* as the personal pronoun "I" in both cases (for additional remarks, cf. the note on 89:38); *a-nu-ú* (92:23), likewise, means "I" (cf. the note in loc. cit.). Dhorme and von Soden concur in viewing *annu*, "behold!", as a logical semantic extension of the Akkadian demonstrative, *annu*. This is surely correct, and forms of *annu*, "this," that begin with *h* (for examples, cf. von Soden, loc. cit.) are to be pronounced with initial *h*, a fact ascertained by the cognate evidence for *annu*, "behold!", and scarcely warranting the "vielleicht" of von Soden in GAG (§ 24 a).

As to *anumma/anumma*, we note that it can hardly mean "behold!" because in Akkadian tablets from BOHMKÖL it is found juxtaposed to *amur*, "behold!" (KUB III, 42:5; 126:4), and it is unlikely that two such words would be found adjacent to one another in the same connected text. We note also that the inductive method has fixed the general meaning of *a(n)numma* in Akkadian literature as "now" (von Soden, AHw, p. 55), which meaning Ebeling (loc. cit.) admits
for anuma once only (in EA 83:28). Since, however, inanna is the common word for "now" in Amarna, and since we find a-nu-anum-ma inanna (e.g. in 84:11; 88:15-16) and a-nu-inanna (e.g. in 106:33), it must be admitted that anuma/anumma in Amarna has a somewhat differen nuance, however slight that difference may be. I propose "already, by this time, up till now." In every case in which the word appears in Rib-Haddi, such a meaning gives a good sense.

With this proposal in mind, it is surely safe to assume that the scribes of Rib-Haddi understood the form anuma as being related to anumma, inumma, inumma, inumma, etc. For the derivation of a(n)numma, von Soden (loc. cit.) proposes the locative-adverbial form of annu, "this," plus the enclitic ending -ma, an explanation that is only as certain as such things can be in the light of the available evidence. That the Rib-Haddi scribes, however wrongly, nevertheless understood their anuma/anumma as outlined above gains support when we note that they never doubled the n when they wrote the word. This fact also strengthens the contention that annu, "behold!", is to be kept separate from anuma/anumma, "already, by this time, up till now."

L. 22. Pahamantata: This governmental official, a royal commissioner who at the time of the writing of this letter was in Simyra, is praised by Rib-Haddi (ll. 19-21) for his assistance in fostering the continued well-being of Byblos. Rib-Haddi further adduces him (ll. 22-26) as a witness to the hostility of Byblos' enemies. Pahamnata is thus seen in an entirely favorable light in the present letter.

In EA 131, however, Pahamnata appears, to Rib-Haddi at least, to have undergone a change of heart. There (ll. 34-36) he is represented as failing to heed the pleas of Rib-Haddi and as committing rebellious acts. Since accusations and counter-accusations are the rule rather than the exception in Canaanite Amarna, it is at times impossible to determine who is telling the truth. But if
we may trust the testimony of Rib-Haddi in this instance, we may characterize Pahamnata as an opportunist whose allegiance shifted in the direction of those who were able to seize political power. In times of Egyptian strength, he would be loyal to the pharaoh and assist his petty underlings; on the other hand, when the peoples of Canaan were in the ascendency, he would not hesitate to offer his services to them.

Weber (EA, p. 1138) equates Pahamnata with the Pahanat(e) (the last vowel is uncertain because the name always appears in an oblique case) of EA 60 and 62, a judgment with which Albright concurs (JNES V, pp. 17-18) and which is borne out by a comparison of the contexts in which the names occur. According to Ranke apud Weber (loc. cit.), the name is Egyptian P;-hm-nt(r) and means "der Gottesdiener" (cf. Albright, op. cit., p. 17: "The Servant of [the] God," or, more simply, p. 24: "The Priest"). Ebeling's suggestion that we compare "ágýpt. hntj ... ,der an der Spitze steht" (BP VIII/2 [1912], p. 79) is practically excluded since it fails to take into account the -m- in Pahamnata. P;-hm-ntr was a very common personal name during the period of the New Kingdom; for details, cf. Albright, loc. cit.

L. 24. Ideme: The various usages of the so-called enclitic particles -me and -mi are no less complex in Amarna than they are in standard Akkadian. On Íde here and on yagül in 11. 14 and 31, the function of -me seems to be purely metrical. When used for such a purpose, -me is interchangeable with -mi; cf., e.g., yagülm!! in EA 137:25. In fact, the vocalization -mi is more common than -me in the Rib-Haddi letters; both are used to introduce direct quotations, but whereas -mi is employed dozens of times for that purpose, -me is so used only five times, always in the stock phrase, usurme (ramanka), "Protect (thyself)!" (EA 117:84; 119:9; 121:9; 125:9; 130:16-17).
L. 25. **pu-ūq-ām 𒈥 ma-na-aš**: pušqu is a well-known Akkadian noun meaning "trouble, difficulty, hardship." It is found only once again in the Amarna letters, however, this time also in Rib-Haddi (EA 74:52-53): ṣut yāde ʾū yātamar puš[qa(m)] 𒈤 muḫḫiya. In the present instance, the scribe felt obliged to explain what he meant by pušqu, fearing that the pharaoh's scribe might not understand it. He thus provides us with the first example of a Canaanite gloss in the letters of Rib-Haddi: ma-na-aš.

This intriguing scribal note has given rise to all sorts of fanciful explanations. Böhl (op. cit., p. 80, n. 2) remarks that one early interpreter of Amarna read the second sign as -MA-, and then went on to transliterate *ma-ma-rum*, which he explained as equivalent to *memer* in Proverbs 17:25. As an alternate possibility, he suggested reading *MA* and Aš/RUM together as *GAL*, whence *MA.GAL = *danniš*.

Both of these suggestions are impossible, however. Even if MA were the correct reading for the second sign, the earlier reflex of memer would be *mamru* or *mimru*, not *mamaru*. Furthermore, in Proverbs 17:25 memer is parallel to ka as and therefore must mean something like " vexation, irritation" rather than "trouble, hardship." It is usually considered as derived from the root *mrr* and translated "bitterness" (cf., e.g., BDB, p. 601).

As for the reading *MA.GAL = danniš*, which means "very, exceedingly," such a reading would make no sense whatever in the present context, since an adverb can never modify a noun. Also, the Glossenkeil preceding it would be left unexplained. Strangely enough, this reading (wrongly attributed to an unpublished emendation by Albright) was also Moran's choice (SSDB, p. 146).

But the most decisive objection against such readings is that the tablet itself has a clear NA-sign as the second syllable of the word under consideration, so that to read MA for it involves emendation, a process frequently dangerous and usually unnecessary (as will be demonstrated in this case).
The hesitant suggestion of Ebeling (EA, p. 1547) that *ma-na-rum is to be equated with Hebrew *minhar* fares no better. This word is found only once in the Bible (Judges 6:2: hamminharot) and means something like "hiding-places" to judge from its connection with hammarrarot and hammassadot.

I understand ma-na-a as a simple maqtal-formation from *'a*, which root in Hebrew ordinarily has the meaning "to be weak, sick." The corresponding verb in Akkadian is enenu, whose primary meaning is evident from such passages as CH, Prologue, i:37-39. There we read that Hammurabi has been appointed to destroy the wicked and evil, "so that the strong should not oppress the weak" (dannum enNam ana la sabalim). For other examples see CAD 4, pp. 166 ff.; pp. 170 ff.

At least two Biblical passages gain from our understanding of the gloss as mana. In Jeremiah 30:12 we may now translate *'anub* as "troublesome" in parallelism with nahla, "severe, sore." Far more interesting is Jeremiah 17:16: yom *'anub* l'hit'awwati. C.F. Keil (The Prophecies of Jeremiah, Volume I, p. 267) translated yom *'anub* instinctively as "the day of trouble" for contextual reasons. This rendering is substantiated by our Amarna gloss. In fact, it may well be that we are to assume haplography on the part of the Biblical scribe, and that the text originally read yom *m'anub*, that is, yom *ma'anaub* (cf. Akkadian menistu). At any rate, the wa' in *'anub* would not have appeared in the original text; cf. perhaps *'a'hu hw* in verse 9 (although the Masoretic text of that verse is very difficult and problematical).

L. 27. i$tu Yarimmuta nuballit: In sentences of this kind it is frequently difficult to determine whether the noun governed by the preposition is the source or the ground of the action of the verb. The result is approximately the same in either case, however. I have assumed Yarimmuta to be the source of the action, hence "from"; equally possible, however, would be the translation "because of" (for this meaning of $t$ = Hebrew min, cf. the note
L. 27. **KUR Yarimmuṭa.** This locality, which in Amarna is mentioned only in the Rib-Haddi letters, was extremely important in the economy of Byblos. It must have been a richly fertile area, for from it Byblos received its grain supplies (EA 85:35; 125:14-18). In times of strife, Byblos was obliged to exchange various commodities, including even its children (74:15-17; 75:11-14; 81:38-41; 85:12-15; 90:36-39)—yea, everything (112:27-30) for the provisions necessary to maintain the barest existence for its citizens. It is unclear whether the children thus sent to Yarimmuṭa went there to become slaves; 85:48-50 seems to leave open the possibility that they were only hostages who would be permitted to return to Byblos when the purchased items had been fully paid for. On two occasions, Rib-Haddi complains that although formerly the troops of Byblos (whether his own or those sent by the pharaoh to protect the garrison there) received provisions from Yarimmuṭa, such shipments have subsequently been curtailed by his enemies (114:54-60; 125:14-30).

Only in 68:27 is Yarimmuṭa spelled out fully; elsewhere it is always written **KUR la-ri-muṭa.** As to the location of this vital territory, we are even less certain of it than of that of Sīmyra. Even its general locality has been disputed; opinions on the matter range from the Syrian seacoast to the delta of the Nile. By mentioning boats in connection with the site, Rib-Haddi seems to indicate that Yarimmuṭa had a harbor (82:28-30; 105:35-36), although it may be that the provisions for Byblos were shipped overland for some distance before being placed aboard ship. Yarimmuṭa is always preceded by the **KUR-sign,** so that any attempt to identify it with a city must take into account the fact that such an identification is possible only if it can be shown that the city was located in a "land" or "territory" of the same name. Petrie (op. cit., p. 186) thus makes a methodological error in identifying Yarimmuṭa with Laodicea on the Syrian coast just south
of Ugarit. Weber’s suggestion (EA, p. 1153) that Yarimmuta is to be identified with Goshen and that the Biblical place-name Yarmût (Joshua 10:5) is its namesake, so called by the Israelites who fled from Egypt under Moses, is intriguing, but impossible to confirm. The other Biblical Yarmût, mentioned in Joshua 21:29, fares no better as the location of Yarimmuta, since it has been identified by Albright with modern Kokab el-Hawa, seven miles north of Beth-Shan (cf. ANET², p. 255, n. 3; WHAB¹, p. 111, under "Ramoth 3"). It would appear that Yarimmuta was in the general vicinity of Byblos, because in an Egyptian exorcism text of the nineteenth or eighteenth century two places named "Yarimuta" are mentioned in context with Byblos, Ullaza and Irgata, three cities that find their places also in the Rib-Haddi letters (cf. ANET², p. 329). Beyond this point the evidence does not permit us to go (cf. further Albright, BASOR 77, p. 36, n. 30).

L. 28. nuballit: For a similar use of bullutu cf. EA 114:55-57: ištû Yari(m)muta tu-ba-li-tu-na LûMEN huppîya. bullutu in such cases may also just as accurately be translated "to receive provisions"; it is but a step to such a meaning from "to preserve life, to maintain existence." Cf. CN, XXVII:11-12: ašnûn napišti nisî, "grain, the 'life' of the people (sustenance)."

It is interesting to note that the only occurrence of bullutu in Akkadian is found in Amarna (EA 236:31: attunu tušablitûnânu attunu timîtûnânû; cf. von Soden, A&W, p. 99). In the Biblical flood story, lûnahyût and lûnhayût are used interchangeably (Genesis 6:20; 7:3), but in the Akkadian flood story we find, as expected, napištibullit (Gilgamesh XI:26). Bullutu in Amarna is undoubtedly under Canaanite influence (cf., e.g., II Kings 5:7: lûmûnît ulînahyût). For the root "hîy in Amarna, cf. EA 245:6: baltûnumma kl had-ila-ma, "alive."

For additional Biblical evidence relating the concepts of "life" and "food" cf. particularly Proverbs 27:27, where hayyîm is parallel to lehem; cf. also mihiwa = "sustenance" (e.g., Genesis 45:5).
L. 31. [a-a-q]úl-me: The restoration depends for its validity upon the form a-a-qúl-me in l. 14; cf. the note on that line above.

L. 32. [ā]lānišu: That ālānu is the plural of ālu in Canaanite Amarna is certain from EA 209:7: URU a-la-nu-ka.
RIB-HADDI TO A HIGH EGYPTIAN OFFICIAL
(L 29856 - BB 73 - W 281 - EA 69)

Obverse

(1) [a-na

[âš-bî-[ma]]

[um-ma ᵐRî-ibᵈ-[IM]]

[a-na _AMD^ ka am-qu-ut]

(5) [a-A-[ma-na ū d-NIN]]

[a URU Gub-la ti-di-nu TÉŠ-ka]

[a-na p[a-a]-i [LUGAL be-li-ia]]

[d UTU-ia [am-mi-ni qa-la-ta]

ū aš-ba-š[a i-na]

(10) [a]-qa-bu īl-ti-qu-mi g[áb-bi a-wa-ti]

i-na bi-ri-Šu-nu UGU-[ia]

Šá-ni-tam a-nu-ma i-na-an-na

i-na-mu-Šu ur-ra m[u-Ša]

i-na nu-kür-ti ÊS gå UGU-[ia]

(15) [a(a-ni)-tam a-ta ti-de-ni]

URU KI ÊS-i a da-an-nu UGU-ia

[û ū]-u[l] i-le-[l] i-pi-Iš

[mí-lm-ni] a[t]-t[i]-š[u]-n[u śa-[ni]-tam

(edge) [ ]-nu-ut

Reverse

(20) [g]a URU Ma-āš-da-lim

û ERIN ÊS URU Ma-as-pât KI

nu-kür-tun UGU-ia ū a-nu-ma
ia-nu-um Lú lum Ma yi-ri-sú-ni
iš-tu qa-ti-Hu-nu Ma-ni-tam

(25) i-na ka-<Ma>-ad ḌAp-pí-ha a-na maḥ-ri-ia
Hi-si-tum UGū-ia ù gab-bi
KÁ.GAL 35 ia ti-îl-qé U[RUDU]
\nu-ḫu-u|M-tum Ma-a[1]
ḌAp-pí-ha Lú-ka ki g[ab-bi]

(30) a-wa-ti Ma-ni-tam ku-ru-u[ba-mi]
a-na LUGAL be-1[ia ȗ]
a-ṣ[?]

(33-37) [ ]

(left edge) [ gab-b[u ]
[ Ḍi-pí-l₁ S₁][a₃ ]

(11, 33-37 missing)

(38) [ gā]bb[u ipīš d[u]m[q]ī [ ]

(1) [To speak: Thus Rib-Haddi. At thy feet I have fallen down. (5) May Amon and the Lady of Byblos grant thee honor] befor[er]e [the king, my lord], my sun-god! [Why dost thou remain silent] and sitte[st in] ? (10) I] say: "They have taken up all (sorts of) matters among themselves against [me]!"

Further, already now they move about day (and) n[ight] with hostility which is against [me].

(15) F[urther, as for thee, thou knowest (that) my cities are powerful against me, [and] I am u[nable to do [anything] w[i]t[h] th[e]m].

[F]urther, [ ]

(20) O[f Magdal, and as for the troops of Maspat, there is hostility against me. Up till now there is no one who can rescue me from their power.

Further, (25) when Appīhā ar<ri>ved in my presence, there was an outcry against me. Copper has taken my whole city-gate!
Interroga[te] Appiha, thy man, concerning the whole affair!

Further, pay homage to the king, [my] lord, that there may go [out]

(11. 33-37 missing)


* * *
Bezold and Budge claim only that this letter was written "from the governor of a city to the King of Egypt" (BR, p. lxxxiii). They do not include it as a part of the Rib-Haddi correspondence. Knudtzon is certainly correct in considering it one of the letters of Rib-Haddi, however. Its tone and style are typical of Rib-Haddi; the verb rasu (l. 23) as well as its nominal derivative, resitu, are found elsewhere in Amarna only in the Rib-Haddi correspondence; and the phrase kurub(mi) ana Harri (cf. ll. 30-31) appears elsewhere in Amarna only in EA 87:25 (a Rib-Haddi letter).

Ll. 1-8: The addressee of this letter is unknown, but since the phrase kurub(mi) ana Harri, mentioned above, is in EA 67 directed to Aman-Appa it is likely that EA 69 was likewise written to an Egyptian official, possibly even Aman-Appa himself. Knudtzon's restoration of ll. 1-8 is obviously based on EA 102:1-8. Due to the many resemblances between EA 69 and EA 87, however, I have chosen to restore the lines on the basis of 87:1-7. At any rate, I shall withhold commentary on words and phrases included in the restored portion until they appear in clearly preserved passages.

L. 9. .tt aN-ba-t[a]: For this phrase, BR 73 reads tt ná-tam a(t-) (or t[a-]). However, whereas BR's autotype facsimiles of the British Museum tablets are often demonstrably incorrect, Knudtzon, to whose careful reading of the original documents Albright pays glowing tribute (ANET², p. 483), unhesitatingly reads tt aN-ba-a[t] and states that the signs A₈ and BA were superimposed over other signs that the scribe wanted thereby to obliterate (EA, p. 363, n. 6). But since the form aNbat would be unique in Amarna, I propose the reading aNbat[a], which the existing traces of the final sign permit. Ll. 8-9 may then be reasonably and almost completely restored on the basis of EA 91:3-4: [a]-na a[N-i-n] aN-ba-ta [u] qa-la-ta.
L. 10. [a]qa(b)bu: The restoration is virtually certain; cf. the energetic form in the phrase mi-na qa-bu-na (EA 85:11; 119:53). qa(b)bu is a hybrid form composed of the present Akkadian formation qa-abbu plus the Canaanite imperfect ending -u.

L. 10-11: Knudtzon undoubtedly restored these two lines, and quite probably correctly so, on the basis of EA 116:50-52: "A-si-ru  mà-pa-dIM laqû awāta [b]ēridūnu muḫḫiyya, "A. and Y. have taken up a matter [be]tween themselves against me." Thus le/aḫu awāta muḫḫi is an Amarna idiom meaning "to take up a matter against" in the sense of "to plot against"; cf. perhaps Jeremiah 23:51: ḫallû gâdim lâšānâm, "those who plot"?

L. 10. īl-ti-qū-mi: Standard Akkadian would have īlti-qūmi here; the TI-sign is another example of the confusion, with which Amarna abounds, between the i-vowel and the e-vowel (cf. the note on tiṭṭinn in EA 68:5 above). The -mi suffix is used correctly here as the sign of direct discourse (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 155 a for details).

L. 10. g[a]bbi awâṭi]: Literally, "every matter," answering to Hebrew kūl (kol-) dābār as, for example, in II Chronicles 19:11 (twice). Here, however, we must understand the phrase as meaning "all sorts of matters" (for this usage cf., e.g., Genesis 2:9: kol-bû, "all kinds of trees").

L. 11. ina bēridūnu: In prepositional phrases, bī/ēridū rarely stands alone; it is usually preceded by ina, ana, or some other preposition or particle (for details cf. von Soden, GAG, § 115 q; AHw, p. 128). In Rib-Haddi, however, the opposite is true. Beside the present passage, we find ana bēridūnu (EA 74:42), but elsewhere always bī/ēridū- alone (109:29; 113:10; 114:9; 116:33,51; 117:67; 118:53; 136:15,32). The reason for this inversion of frequency is not far to seek. Undoubtedly Rib-Haddi's Canaanite scribes, every time they wrote bī/ēridū-,
had in mind such forms as Hebrew ben, which is rarely preceded by another preposition in Hebrew. Whereas it may be going too far to claim that bī♭/ēreh- and ben are cognate to each other (though the interchange of n and r is common enough, particularly in the presence of a labial; cf., e.g., Hebrew ben = Aramaic bar), it may well be that ana bī♭/ēreh- is reflected in 'el-bēn (Ezekiel 31:10,14) and that ina bī♭/ēreh- is mirrored in bē♭ben (Isaiah 44:4). Indeed, bēn perhaps represents *bē♭ben in other cases as well; the preposition bē♭ need not appear orthographically when it precedes a word beginning with bēt (cf., e.g., Genesis 24:23), a phenomenon occurring also in Ugaritic (cf., e.g., II K, i:14-15: bhyk abn n(!)yah blntk [for *bblntk] ngln, "In thy life, O our father, we rejoiced; in thy deathlessness we exulted" [cf. ibid., ll. 98-99]; cf. further Ginsberg, BASOR 98 [1945], p. 16, n. 27; ibid., p. 20, n. 46; cf. Cassuto, Anath [1953], p. 39). The examples are too numerous to be explained on the basis of haplography.

L. 12. Sinītam: Knudtzon always transliterates this word as Ṣa/ā-nī-tū (cf. also BB, p. xii). It is doubtful, however, whether the sign UD ever represents *ṬU in the Rib-Haddi letters. Furthermore, the word itself can be understood only as an adverbial accusative (cf. Ebeling, EA, p. 1514), intended to introduce a new thought, and meaning "furthermore, moreover, next." The scribe of EA 136 has divided his tablet into sections by drawing three horizontal lines across it, after two of which he introduces a new idea with Sinītam.

Although Sinītam is based on the feminine form of the ordinal Sinū(m), "second," it is clear that we cannot translate "secondly," since even in the present letter Sinītam is used no less than three times (ll. 12, 24, 30). This is not to say, however, that Sinītam never means "secondly," for in certain legal texts from Ugarit we find istēn . . . ụ Sinītam (e.g., PRU III, 16,277:11-12), "firstly . . . and secondly," as an occasional variant of the more common istēn(Su) . . . (ụ) Sinām (e.g., ibid., 15,119:12'-13; 16,249:7-8;
15.109 ≠ 16.296:51-52; for a brief discussion of these phrases cf. Speiser, JAOS 75 [1955], p. 158, n. 34. We intend to emphasize only that in Rib-Haddi šanītam is an adverb meaning "further." Cf. further Mari šanītam (ARM XV, p. 263) and Ugaritic mtn (II AB, i:20).

The mistransliteration of Knudtzon is not nearly so serious as that of Conder (op. cit., p. 81), who succeeded in misreading all three of the signs that make up the word. He states: "The paragraphs are marked off in many of the letters by the word sacunu, 'pause.'" With his "sacunu" he would doubtless have compared Arabic sukūn, "rest," the orthographic indication of vowellessness in Arabic script. I cite Conder's ludicrous claim only as a reminder of the dangers involved in careless or arbitrary reading of cuneiform.

L. 13. ina(m)mumu: According to Ebeling (EA, p. 1481), namāšu means "to yield, withdraw, retreat; to leave off, desist, cease; to rise up, rebel." Since, however, every occurrence of this verb in Amarna can readily be explained on the basis of its usual meaning, viz. "to move (from one place to another)" (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 88 e; cf. already Delitzsch, HWE, p. 469), it is best not to invent new meanings for the verb. Knudtzon (EA, loc. cit.) posits a IV₁-stem of *amašu to explain many of the occurrences of namāšu in Amarna, but his suggestion is impossible because (1) there is no example on record of a IV₁-stem of a prima-'ālep verb with an u-theme (cf. von Soden, GAG, Paradigm 15); (2) none of the possible meanings of amašu, a rare verb at best, fit the Amarna examples (cf. von Soden, AHw, p. 42). In view of the fact that "moving beings" is in Akkadian namamāšu (cf. Landsberger, Fauna, p. 110) and in Hebrew remēš, it may well be that Akkadian namāšu and Hebrew rāmaš are cognate.

Elsewhere in Rib-Haddi, namāšu is found in EA 77:20; 87:23-24 (which Ebeling [loc. cit.] incorrectly quotes as "13,33"; 88:19-20; 109:5-8; 113:34-35; 138:39---always in its normal
connotation. In another Canaanite letter, the following intriguing example (EA 296:17-22) will aptly demonstrate the basic meaning of this verb: ti-na-mu-šu SIGA la-bi-tu štu [šupal tappāši] ū anākū la i-na-mu-šu štu šupal Šepē šarrī bēliya, "Though a brick dislodge itself from [u]nder its companions, I will not move from under the feet of the king, my lord" (cf. similarly 266:19-25; 292:14-17).

As to the subject of ina(m)mušu in EA 69:13 and of iltiqūmi in l. 10, we know only that the verbs refer to Hīb-Haddi's enemies. The suggestions of Weber (EA, p. 1154) are plausible but nevertheless conjectural.

L. 13. urra muša: The restoration is made certain by comparing EA 74:64-65; 82:48-49; 83:36; 86:8, 90:62; 105:13. Once each we find ur-ra [ū] mu-ša-am (73:20-21) and UD KĀM ša mu-ša (136:37). These expressions all reflect Canaanite idiom (cf. Hebrew yōmān wālayāḥ in Exodus 13:21 and often; layāḥ wēyōmān is rarer), since Akkadian ordinarily places the word for "night" first (cf., e.g., mušu urri; cf. von Soden, GAG, § 71 b for additional details; note also the unique muša urram in EA *362:33). We note, however, that Canaanite rarely excludes the copula in such phrases, so that the lack of a copula in urra muša must be explained as following the typical Akkadian practice with reference to stereotyped expressions (for additional details cf. GAG, § 62 i).

urra(m) ordinarily means "tomorrow" (cf. Landsberger, OLZ 26, p. 71, n. 1), but when it is used in opposition to muša(m), "by night," it is most naturally and correctly translated "by day."

The possibility that layāḥ (or rather layā) appears in Amarna is an intriguing one, but unfortunately the text of EA 243 is broken at the crucial point. 243:13 reads: [UD KĀM ša muša] 1[e-e]1 (or possibly 1[e-1]a). It appears that we have here the familiar urra (û) muša (written anomalously mša) followed by the gloss 1[ē]1(a). Unfortunately, however, this analysis is fraught with uncertainties due to the bad preservation of the text.
Nevertheless, it can scarcely be doubted that in 195:13: le-lá-ma we have a clear cognate of layil.

But more fruitful, perhaps, is the search for muMu (or its alternate form, mušitu) in other Canaanite dialects. Unless mbt in I K:30 means "at night" (*mušita), there is as yet no word for "night" attested in Ugaritic, since I AB, iv:43 is obscure. (With I K:30 cf. Psalm 6:7, which it resembles greatly, and note laylā'h there; cf. also Professor Held, JAOS 79 [1959], p. 173, n. 79.) As for Hebrew, it may be that we should vocalize *mušayim ("night") in Job 4:20 in view of the phrase mibboqer lā'ereb at the beginning of the verse; if we then admit the possibility that mibbēlā[T here means "before" (cf. BDB, pp. 115-116 for a comment about the rather free use of mibbēlā[T in Job), the sense of the verse would be: "From morning till evening they are crushed; before nightfall they perish forever" (see Ginsberg, Tur-Sinai Festschrift [Jerusalem, 1957], pp. 111-112).

L. 14. i-na nu-kur-ti ME$[a] UGU-[ia]: Although ina has a variety of uses in Akkadian (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 114 c), the meaning "with," connoting accompaniment, is rarely if ever attested. For this meaning Akkadian employs itti and qadu. It is likely, then, that we have here Canaanite influence, since bō in Biblical Hebrew is frequently utilized in such a sense (cf. BDB, p. 89 for examples). Ugaritic likewise is not without attestations of this usage; cf. II D, v:16-17: M$m c mtt Dnty c[d[u] imr bphd, "Hearken, O Lady Danatiya; slaughter a sheep with a lamb" (for details, cf. Professor Held's Ugaritic Lexicon [as yet unpublished]; cf. for the present JAOS 79, p. 174, n. 98). Cf. perhaps also V AB, A:15-16: alp kd yqh bhrm. nukurti here can only be understood as a collective (if, indeed, it is plural in any sense), since the plural casus obliquus of nukur tu is nukrati. This is a good example of the fact that the Canaanite scribes of Amarna often used determinatives incorrectly, either through carelessness or, more likely, through ignorance. Cf. the note on mātē in EA 68:3 above.
In Or. 16 (p. 11), C. H. Gordon offers the translation "with hostility against me" as an alternative explanation of this line, suggesting that "as in Nuzu . . . Sa may here be used instead of ina." The fact is, however, that in Amarna we find nukurtu(m) ina muhhi only once (EA 149:74-75), and that not in Rib-Haddi; elsewhere we note either simply nukurtu(m) muhhi (cf., e.g., 63:13; 64:9; 68:29-30; 69:22; 100:42; 106:17,21; 116:7-8) or nukurtu(m) Sa PN muhhi (e.g. 68:12-14; 74:14; 75:10-11; 76:8-9). ina muhhi is rather rare in Amarna altogether, and never appears in Rib-Haddi. It seems best, therefore, to state that while writing 69:14 the scribe accidentally inserted Sa, having in mind the phrase nukurtu(m) Sa PN muhhi, or else simply to translate, with Knudtzon, "with hostility which is against me."

Knudtzon feels that the scribe omitted -ya after muhhi here, which is of course possible (cf. EA 74:14). BB 73, however, indicates that the end of the line is broken away on the tablet, so that perhaps -ya was on the missing portion. muhhi by itself meaning "against me" can scarcely be due to Canaanite influence, however, since Hebrew and Phoenician clearly distinguish between  ch and  ly.

L. 15. §[anā]tam: BB 73 reads ina-an-na here, but questions each sign. Though the reading is obviously uncertain, that of Knudtzon is preferable in view of EA 102:8:  na-tam tidemī.

L. 15. attā tidemī: Cf. 'atta  yādā tā (e.g., Jeremiah 15:15; 17:16). In Hebrew, we would expect the independent personal pronoun to follow its verb under normal circumstances, but it frequently precedes the verb, sometimes on rhythmical grounds (cf. GKC 2, § 135 a). The situation in Akkadian is reversed for, since the verb is always the final element in an Akkadian sentence, the pronoun must precede it (for examples, cf. von Soden, GAG, §§ 41 a; 166 d). In the epic literature, however, poetic license and stylistic considerations intervene, often causing the pronoun
to appear after its verb. Examples are Enûma elīš 1:40: i
nislal nīnu(!), "Let us have rest"; Gilgamesh XI:11: ālu ma
tiḏušu attā, "the city with which thou art acquainted."

"To know that" is usually expressed in Hebrew by yādā c
xā, in Ugaritic by yū c k, and in Canaanite Amarna by idū inuma.
Occasionally, however, the conjunction is omitted both in Amarna
(as here in EA 69:15-16) and in Hebrew (cf., e.g., Psalm 9:21:
yēdē c a ʾqūyīm ʾe nos hemma h, "Let the nations know that they are
[merely] mortals"). In such cases, the object clause is added
"in the form of an independent noun-clause or verbal-clause"
(GKC 2, § 157 a).

L. 16. ʾālānuya: Knudtzon's normalization, ʾālāni-ia, is
impossible from any point of view. Such plural nominative forms
appear as ʾālānu'a in standard Akkadian (von Soden, OAG, Paradigm
3 b; for ʾālānuya, cf. ibid., n. 4), and even in Amarna we find
a-la-nu-ka (EA 209:7).

A study of ʾālānuya (casus obliquus ʾālāniya) in Rib-Haddi
gives us a thumbnail sketch of the progressive deterioration of
his domain. In EA 74:19-29, he tells us that "all of my cities"
have turned themselves over to the ēApiru, and that only Byblos
and two other cities are still under his control. He says in
81:6-13 that ēAbdī-ʾAṣhirta, his mortal enemy, has taken "all of
my cities"; only Byblos and one other city are still under him,
and ēAbdī-ʾAṣhirta wants those also. In 90:6-19, Rib-Haddi informs
us that "all of my cities" are gone, and that Byblos alone
remains; his pleas to the pharaoh have met with no response.
According to 116:37-38, "all of my cities" have been turned over
to the ēApiru, and in 124:7-15, 40-43 we learn that, in Rib-Haddi's
words, "āAziru [the son of ēAbdī-ʾAṣhirta] has taken all of my
cities"; Byblos alone remains under his control, but it is in
danger. The burden of EA 138 is that Byblos, due to rebellion in
its midst, threatens to become a divided city, so that Rib-Haddi,
by now an old man, is forced to dwell in Beirut.
L. 16. dannu: It was established in the note on Halmat in EA 68:10 that URU (ālu), though masculine in Akkadian, is feminine in Amarna. dannu must thus be understood as a Canaanite feminine plural perfect, since the corresponding Akkadian stative form would be danna. The form dannu indicates that the Canaanite third person common plural perfect had, by means of a leveling process favoring the masculine plural, become a reality already by the fourteenth century B.C.E.

L. 16. mūhīya: Although Hebrew כָּל occasionally means "in behalf cf" (cf. BDB, p. 754 for details), it is unlikely that Rib-Haddi's position was ever so secure as to enable him to claim that "my cities are strong in my behalf." mūhī must mean "against" here, as elsewhere with dannu/dannānu (cf. e.g., EA 102:18; 106:9; 134:32).


L. 17. ī-le-[d]: We find only l-LE/i in the text, and whereas īlā/i would be an acceptable form (cf. von Soden, GAG, Paradigm 34 c) it would be unique to Amarna, which consistently prefers the lengthened forms such as īle"i. I have therefore assumed haplography on the part of the scribe; for a similar scribal lapse, cf. ka-(ša)-ad in l. 25. Rib-Haddi prefers īle"u (with the Canaanite imperfect indicative ending; cf. EA 82:22; 102:24; 104:38,50; 105:29; 109:56; 113:29; 116:52; 126:7) for the first person singular imperfect form, but īle"i appears once elsewhere in Canaanite Amarna (144:52) and Rib-Haddi himself has once īle"e (61:21). The ī-prefix on such first person forms very frequently replaces the normal Akkadian ę-prefix (unlauted from *a- for verbs of this type), and is a characteristic Canaanite Amarna phenomenon
which can hardly be separated from the general failure of the Canaanite scribes to distinguish between the i- and e-phonemes; cf. ipp (for "epēš") in l. 18.

In Akkadian (and in Amarna as well), le'miş means "to be able"; in Ugaritic, the root "l'w/y means "to prevail" (cf., e.g., I K:33-34: šnt šluana [wy]ško, "Sleep prevails over him, [while he] lies down"; cf. further II K, vi:2,14). Although BDB (p. 521) lists "be weary, impatient" as the meaning of Hebrew 1ā'āh/nil'āh, it is clear from such passages as Genesis 19:11; Exodus 7:18,21; Jeremiah 20:9 that the verb means basically "to be unable" (for a possible example of this meaning for Ugaritic "l'w/y also, cf. 88:64: ŵlu 66.sn, "They could not be satisfied"; cf. Ginsberg, The Legend of King Keret [1946], p. 35).

L. 18. [mimmi]: Akkadian carefully distinguishes between the indeclinable indefinite pronoun mimma (*mān-ma), meaning "anything (at all), everything" (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 48 e), and its related noun, mimmi, meaning "property (of)," which is fully declinable (ibid., § 48 f). The scribes of Rib-Haddi, however, confused the two forms regularly. We find, for example, mir-mu ša ếmnepšu ana šatu mukik[a], "Everything that (is d)one to him is th[y] responsibility" (EA 83:41-42), in which mimma is treated as a declinable pronoun. Similarly, mir-mimi is frequently found as the genitive of mimma (cf. the examples given in the note on ll. 17-18 above).

The formation of Hebrew mir-ūma-h seems to be parallel to that of Akkadian mimma, but the Masoretic vocalization and accentuation of the word make uncertain any definite statements regarding it. At any rate, the present phrase finds striking parallels in such passages as: 'al-taš 1ō mir-ūma (ra), "Do not do anything (harmful) to him" (Genesis 22:12; Jeremiah 39:12). Cf. also Genesis 40:15; II Samuel 13:2. For the Amarna construction le'ụ epēš mimmi, cf. Numbers 22:38: ḫāyākōl ṭukal dabbēr mir-ūma-h, "Am I at all able to say anything?"
L. 18. "ittmahānū: Since the Hebrew expression is 
\[\text{c-h m-\text{u}h le} \], we expect ana \(\text{bēnina/bēnunu} \) instead of 
\(\text{ittīnunu} \). Further speculation is useless, however, since the 
restoration is highly tentative.

L. 19. Due to the bad state of preservation of this line, 
nothing can be made of it by way of restoration. (Henceforth 
when this is the case I shall not comment on the fact.)

L. 20. [\(\text{g} ja: \text{BB 73 reads [a]-na.}\]

L. 20. Ḍagglīm: Hebrew migdal, "tower," developed from 
\(\text{mīgda(l)}(u) \) through attenuation of the vowel of the first syllable 
after the shift of accent to the ultima. The Hebrew lexicons to 
the contrary notwithstanding, the word is not derived from the 
root \(\text{gdā} \), "to be great," but from \(\text{dgā} \), "to look (out), to look 
at," a tower being, in effect, a lookout station (cf. Hebrew 
\(\text{mispa}l \), "watchtower"), providing a vantage point from which to 
survey the surrounding territory (cf. Akkadian madgalu, madgaltu). 
The metathesis in Hebrew \(\text{migdal} \) is undoubtedly due to the 
influence of the liquid \(\text{l} \). The root \(\text{dgā} \) is not unattested in 
Biblical Hebrew (cf. EDB, p. 186; cf. especially dégal, "banner").

As a place-name, \(\text{Migdal}(u) \) is a hypocoristicon (cf. the 
Biblical localities \(\text{Migdal-El}, \text{Migdal-Gad, Migdal-Eder} \)). Since 
only the general locations of Migdal-El and Migdal-Gad are known 
(cf. Wright and Filson, WHAB\(^1\), p. 110), it is useless to try to 
locate our Migdal with any degree of certainty. Not only is it 
unqualified by a following genitive and found in a broken context; 
it also appears alongside Masspat, the location of which is likewise 
uncertain. The plethora of villages called "Mejdal" in the modern 
Middle East attests to the popularity of \(\text{Migdal}(u) \) as a place-name 
in ancient times.

L. 21. \(\text{Ma-as-pat}^\text{KI} \): This reading, ascertained by Albright 
after a recent careful examination of \(\text{BB 73} \) in the British Museum 
(cf. Moran, SSDB, p. 147), neatly disposes of the enigmatic
Ku-uz,-bat so puzzling to previous interpreters. With Maspat may surely be compared Hebrew Mispāʾ, although such an equation does not help in fixing the site of our Maspat since none of the localities called by that name in the Hebrew Bible have been fixed with any degree of certainty (cf., e.g., WHAD¹, p. 110; Burrows, What Mean These Stones?, p. 148; Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine, p. 42).

L. 23. ia-nu-um Lū-lum: yanu(m) in Middle and Late Babylonian (von Soden, GAG, § 22 d) replaces Old Babylonian ul ibaṭṭi and is the ultimate product of the contraction and eventual aphaeresis of the first syllable of the interrogative adverb a(y)yanu(m), "where? whence?", found in Old Babylonian, Old Assyrian, and Late Literary Babylonian (ibid., § 118 a; AHw, p. 24). The intermediate stage is apparent in iyanu(m) (written in Rib-Haddi i-ia-nu: EA 136:41; 137:10, 22, 71; 138:26, 30, 89), wherein the ʾ-vowel is the normal issue of the reduction of the ay-diphthong in Akkadian (von Soden, GAG, § 11 a).

The transition from the meaning "where? whence?" for a(y)yanu(m) to "there is/are not" for (i)yanu(m) is somewhat complex. It may most simply be described as having arisen from questions which expect a negative answer (cf. the use of Greek no and Latin num as interrogative particles expecting a negative answer). The hesitant or fearful question "where?" thus implicitly contains its own answer: "There is/are none."

yanu (with mimination) is not unique in Rib-Haddi in EA 69:23; cf. also 92:21, 22; 127:16, 21. Though yanu(m) took on verbal significance in the meaning "there is/are not," the earlier adverbial mimination had not yet quite disappeared.

In Rib-Haddi, (i)yanu(m) governs the accusative case (cf. 94:6: [ia]-a-nu-mi le-em-na; 117:9-10: ia-nu ha-za-na; *362:49-50: ia-nu-mi mu-ta-na). Cases such as ia-nu šim-III.A (85:10; cf. also 105:64-85; 125:25) and i[a]-nu A² (85:53-54) are not exceptions to this rule, since it is a well-known fact that
by the time of Middle Babylonian determinatives were still useful in indicating the general reading of a logogram but had become unreliable in denoting case and number. Crucial at this point is

119:42: \( \text{ia-nu } \text{SAG} \text{bi ya-na} \), which can only be normalized \( \text{yanu} \text{libba ya-nu} \) (cf. 136:41: \( \text{i-ia-nu } \text{SAG} \text{bi ya-na-am} \)). We are reminded also of the fact that determinatives in general are used very loosely by the Canaanite scribes of Amarna. Thus, after determining that \( \text{Lu} \) is to be read \( \text{am} \text{ulu} \) (although \( \text{am} \text{elu} \) is also possible [von Soden, AHw, p. 90]), and despite the fact that the word is never written syllabically in Rib-Haddi, other evidence favors \( \text{am} \text{elu} \); cf. \( \text{a-mi-lu-ú-tum} \), EA 20:76; \( \text{a-mi-lu-ú-ta} \), 21:30; \( \text{a-mi-lu-ta} \), 356:57; and for the i-vowel especially \( \text{i} \text{wil} \text{M} \text{rodak} \), ii Kings 25:27; Jeremiah 52:31), we are entirely justified in normalizing the present phrase as \( \text{yanu} \text{am} \text{ila} \).

(After writing the above paragraph I discovered that Albright and Moran had already shown that \( \text{yanu} \) governs the accusative case in Rib-Haddi, and had done so through similar reasoning; cf. JCS II, p. 248, n. 28. Cf. also, significantly, Haggai 2:17: \( \text{én-} \text{etkem} \text{el} \text{ay} \).)

Noting that in Late Literary Babylonian \( \text{ebtu} \text{yanu} \) means "whence?" (von Soden, SAG, § 118 a), we may confidently state that the relationship between Hebrew \( \text{mo} \text{sayin} \), "whence?", and \( \text{én} \), "there is/are not," is firmly established.

L. 23. \( \text{yi-ri-sú-ni} \): Knudtzon's reading of the first sign of this word as \( \text{yu} \)- can scarcely be correct (W 261 reads \( \text{yi} \)-, as does Ebeling in EA, p. 1498). On the other hand, Ebeling's suggestion (BA VIII/2 [1912], p. 64) that we are to understand the form as a Canaanite Hiph\textsuperscript{v} imperfect of the root \( \text{ws} \) and translate "(wer) holt mich heraus" is equally unlikely. If Ebeling were correct, we would expect \( \text{IA} \) as the first sign (the \( \text{Wa} \)-sign may be read \( \text{ye} \), \( \text{vi} \), or \( \text{yu} \), but never \( \text{YA} \), in Rib-Haddi). Furthermore, irrefutable examples of Hiph\textsuperscript{v} verbal forms in Amarna are exceedingly rare, the Saph\textsuperscript{v} being overwhelmingly
in use to express the causative idea under Akkadian influence. Also, the Akkadian verb rāsu, "to help," is found elsewhere in Rib-Haddi (EA 92:45; 127:16), as is the noun rēṣūtu, "help" (126:44). The prefix of the present verb is thus simply the Canaanized Akkadian preformative yi-. The preterit thematic vowel of rāsu is usually i, although i is also attested (as here and in 127:16).

Cazar is the Hebrew semantic equivalent of rāsu, and rāsu īṣtu finds its parallel in Cazar min (e.g., Ezra 8:22) and Ugaritic Cār b (III d, 1:14).

L. 25: We must read here ka-<Ma>-ad; the scribe inadvertently omitted the ṢA-sign, probably because such a sign closely resembles the initial KA.

L. 25. 'Appiḥā: An Egyptian functionary who appears also in l. 29 as well as in EA 100:12; 105:35. For details concerning the possible Egyptian equivalent of the name, cf. Albright, JNES 5, p. 23. Albright is incorrect, however, in asserting that the occurrence of the name in EA 100:12 was "not hitherto recognized" (cf. already BB, p. lxxii).

L. 26. Misiṭum: This word, derived from Ṣasu, "to cry, call," ordinarily means "call, summons"; cf., e.g., in CH 16: ana Misiṭ imṣārit la ʾuṭṣāšām, "... at the summons of the herald he has not brought (him) forth." Here, however, it must mean something like "outcry, uproar" (= rigmu, ikkillu [for which cf. CAD 7, pp. 57-58]), and represents the reaction of the Byblians upon the arrival in their city of a hated Egyptian (as Weber already noted; cf. EA, p. 1154). The word is found only here in Amarna.

W 281 suggests a comparison with Hebrew māṣāḥ, but since the latter means "to spoil, plunder" it is difficult to see how Misiṭum could fit in here with such a meaning. It is possible that māṣāḥ appears elsewhere in Amarna, however, namely in the difficult passage EA 252:29-30: LOMEM Ṣa šātu(m) āla ill
Su-sú-me abiya, "the men who seized the city (and) my god; the plunderers of my father" (Busú/Busim is an Egyptian loanword in Canaanite; cf. Albright, BASOR 69 [1943], p. 32, n. 27; cf. also Lambdin, JAOS 73, p. 155).

L. 27. abulliya: The MEŠ-sign here does not indicate a real plural; cf. EA 88:18. abulla is an essentially Akkadian word, Aramaic ḫbûlā'/irábhûlā being a loanword from Akkadian. The Canaanite scribe of EA 244 decided, therefore, to explain its meaning by means of a gloss. Il. 15-16 read as follows: läme nile'yu asē bab a-bu-ul-li² Ha-á'-ri, "We cannot go out through the opening of the city-gate." Ha'uru is, of course, Hebrew and Phoenician s̱r, Ugaritic ṯr, and confirms the original vocalization of all three.

Il. 27-28. U[RUDU]₆ nu-hu-um-tum: Despite the broken condition of the text, the restoration is virtually certain. The gloss nuhuštum thus provides valuable confirmation of the accuracy of the Masoretic vocalization with regard to ṉhôṣet: *nuhuštu > *nuhuš > *nuhuš > ṉhôṣet. Akkadian distinguishes between e'[aru], "copper" (Sumerian U[RU]DU), and siparru, "bronze" (Sumerian ZA[BA]R [UD.KA.BAR]), whereas Hebrew uses ṉhôṣet for both. Here, therefore, we must translate nuhuštun as "copper," since it is a gloss for U[RU]DU.

Nuhuštum is the subject of its sentence since it is in the nominative case and the verb tilqe, a Canaanized Akkadian form, is feminine singular. We must, therefore, normalize the last word in l. 27 as e'[aru] instead of Knudtzon's e'[ara], a fact which Knudtzon himself later realized (EA, p. 1590). The meaning of Il. 26-28 will then be that copper was used to bribe the guards of the city-gate to open it (cf. Weber, EA, p. 1154). Copper was a precious metal in ancient times (cf., e.g., Ezra 3:27).

L. 28. Ha-a[l]: Knudtzon's Ha-a[m]-mi] is possible but unnecessary. Such a reading would be unique in Amarna.
L. 29. **kī:** This is the only passage in all of Amarna where *Ma'alu kī* is used in the sense of "to ask/interrogate concerning," which makes the restoration of the following word somewhat suspect. The phrase makes good sense in context, however, and since I have nothing better to suggest I shall defer to Knudtzon at this point. "To ask concerning" is usually rendered by *Ma'alu ana* (cf., e.g., *EA* 89 *passim*), which is paralleled by Hebrew *Ma'al*.

L. 30. **Na-ni-tam:** Very often in the Rib-Haddi letters, the NI and TAM of this word are written together as a ligature (cf., e.g., l. 12 of the present text, equivalent to BB 73:6). In the present line, BB has misread the ligature as IZ (cf. Knudtzon, *EA*, p. 364, n. a).

Ll. 30-32. **ku-ru-u[b-mi] ana Sarri bel[iya u] a-s[i]:** These readings and restorations, many of which differ from those of Knudtzon, are based on *EA* 87:25-26 (q.v. for commentary).

Ll. 32-39: The remainder of the text is too fragmentary for restoration. Knudtzon's suggested readings for l. 39, which I have essentially followed for want of anything better (so also in l. 38), are obviously based on *EA* 119:40: *yi-pu-Mu du-um-qa*. Since **ipam** would be an infinitive, however, I have emended Knudtzon's restoration to d[u]m[q]i, which the traces support equally well.
**RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH**
(Golenischeff - WA 67 - W 112 - EA 70)

**Obverse**

(1) [\(^{m}\)Ri-ib-d\(^d\)IM iq-bi]  
[a-na EN-Yu LUGAL KÜR.KUR\(^{K.I.MES}\)]  
[LUGAL GAL d\(^d\)IN Ma URU Gub-la]  
[ti-di-in\(^q\) KALAG.GA a-na LUGAL\(^{R.i}\)]

(5) [EN-ia a-n]a G\(^{i.n.MES}\)]

[EN-ia] d\(^{dUTU-i}\) [a IMIN-Yu]  
[IMIN-ta-a\(^{n}\) a]n am-q\(^\text{û}\)u[\(^\text{t}\) ]

[ I ]  
[ ]\(^{H.I.A\, URU\, Gub-[\text{la}]\) ]  
[ ]\(^{tu-nu\, URU\, Ma-a[\text{d-da-lim}]\) ]

(10) [\(^{U\text{R}}\)U ki-t]i-ka i\(^{n\text{u-tu}}\)

[\(^{d\text{a}}\)a-ri\(^{\text{-t}}\)]-ti li-ma-ad  
[i-nu-ma] u\(^{w\text{Mi-\(\text{[i]}\)r-ti}}\]

[ ]\(^{\text{-}}\)u \(^{\text{u}}\) la-a(!)

[ ]\(^{\text{-}}\)ab/\(^{\text{p}}\)na-ti

(15)[ ] a-na DUMU-Yu

[ ]\(^{b\text{e}}\)e-ri-ku-n[i]

[\(^{\text{[a}}\)u\(^{u\text{N-gi-ra-ni}}\]

[\(^{L\text{U-MES}}\) KUR Mi-is-[\(^{r}\)i]

[\(^{\text{[u}}\)\(^{L\text{U-MES}}\) KUR Me-lu-ha [ ] ]

**Reverse**

(20) [ ]\(^{\text{-}}\)ma LUGAL\(^{\text{MES}}\)

[\(^{\text{[a}}\)a-a]d-na-ta G\(^{\text{I:\text{[I.GIGIR-MES}}}\)

[a-na \(^{\text{a}}\)a-s]u\(^{\text{u}}\) ti-[a-a\(^{\text{s}}\)]a-r[\(^{\text{[u}}\) URU]
([a-di a-s]e ERÍN Mes\[2\] pi-tá-ti
[ù y]i-de LUGAL EN-ia

(25) [i-nu-ma] KUR A-mur-ri ur-ra
[mu-ša] tu-ba a-sa <sa-bi> pi-tá-ti
[i-na U]J KÁM.MES\[2\] ka-[s[a-a]d
[ERÍN Mes\[2\] pi-tá-ti KUR A-m[ur-ri]
[lu-ú in₄]-né-ep-ša-[at]

(30) [gá-bu a-n]a LUGAL ri [EN-ia]
[ ]

(remainder broken away)

(1) [Rib-Haddi has spoken to his lord, the king of the two lands, the great king: May the Lady of Byblos grant power to the king, (5) my lord! At the feet of my lord, my sun-god, [seven times, seven times] I have fallen. Grant power to my sun-god, Byb[los ]


(remainder broken away)
This badly preserved tablet is one of three Amarna letters in the possession of a Mr. Golenischeff, who at the time of the publication of Knudtzon's edition was residing in St. Petersburg (presently Leningrad; cf. EA, p. 13). The other two letters in his collection are another by Rib-Haddi (EA 137) and one from the correspondence of ʿAziru, the mortal enemy of Rib-Haddi during the final phase of the latter's reign in Byblos (EA 160).

Although the first four lines of the present tablet are completely broken away, the reference to the land of Meluhha in 1. 19 makes it certain that it was written by Rib-Haddi, since Meluhha appears several times in Amarna but only in the Rib-Haddi material. Furthermore, the addressee can only be the pharaoh, as the traces of the salutation (ll. 5-7) clearly indicate.

My restoration of the first seven lines of the text differs only in one minor aspect from that of Knudtzon, who reads [a-na EN-ia dUTU-ia] in ll. 4-5. This would be highly irregular in a Rib-Haddi salutation, to say the least. My restoration, a-na LUGAL ri EN-ia, is based on the preserved portions of several similar salutations (cf. the pertinent sections of EA 68; 74; 76; 79; 83; 89; 105; 107; 109).

ll. 8-11: Due to the scarcity of comparative material in Amarna at this point, I have not been able to advance Knudtzon's suggested restorations in these lines. The city-name Magdāl is virtually certain in 1. 9 (cf. EA 69:20), since no other such name beginning with the syllable Ma- appears in Rib-Haddi. Knudtzon's restorations in ll. 10-11 are also very appealing, although in every other case where the phrase al kitti is used in Rib-Haddi it refers to Byblos (74:9, 56; 88:44-45; 106:4-5; 127:25; 132:8-9). There is one exception to this rule, however; 88:8: [URU K]+I.HI.A ki-it-ti LUGA[L] refers to several cities named in the previous lines. It may be, therefore, that Rib-Haddi wanted to emphasize Magdāl for reasons unknown to us (possibly originally hinted at in the portion of the text now broken away).
Ll. 10-11. **isti [darī]t**: darītu ("continuity, eternity"), a feminine substantive derived from the adjective dari'udarū ("enduring, eternal"), is rarely encountered in the singular; the phrase **isti/ultu darīti** ("from time immemorial") is found only in Amarna, Ras Shamra and Boğazköy Akkadian (cf. von Soden, AHw, p. 164 for details). In Rib-Haddi, **isti darīti** appears in EA 58:45; 116:56; 122:42-43; 123:11; 134:4. In Late Literary Babylonian, "from time immemorial" was expressed by ultu ulla (von Soden, GAG, § 124 a); **isti labirīd** denoted a similar idea ("from of old") in much earlier times (ibid., § 119 b).

When Rib-Haddi's Canaanite scribes used the phrase **isti darīti**, they undoubtedly had in mind such expressions as Hebrew *me-Colam*; cf., e.g., Genesis 6:4; Joshua 24:2; Isaiah 64:3; Jeremiah 2:20; 5:15. Note also *min-ha-Colam* in Jeremiah 28:8, and particularly the remarkable collocation of temporal phrases in Joel 2:2: kamānu lo' niha'yāh *min-ha-Colam* wēhārayw 13- yōsep cad-'ēnē dōr wa'ādā (cf. Ugaritic *lm//dr dr [e.g. III AB, A:10]).

Ll. 11-12. **limad [inūma]**: My restoration here is certain; cf., in Rib-Haddi itself, EA 79:7-8; in other correspondence, 34:3; 58:4; again in Rib-Haddi, **limad bēlī inūma** (75:35-36). Knudtzon restored i-nu-ma in the break after **limad** in 90:5, but inexplicably failed to do so here.

In standard Akkadian, **lamādu** means "to learn, experience; to understand, know (also in a sexual sense)." As such, it is virtually synonymous with **idū**, with which it is often found in parallelism (cf., e.g., CT 16, 44:106-107; cf. Hebrew *lāmad/*yādaš [e.g., Proverbs 30:3]); in Byblian Amarna the two verbs are thus interchangeable (cf., e.g., EA 68:9-10: lū īde bēlī inūma with the quotation from 75:35-36 given above). To distinguish them in translation, however, I have decided to translate **lamādu** everywhere in Rib-Haddi as "to be informed."

L. 12. **waširrit**: wašaru means basically "to be loosed, set free" (von Soden, GAG, § 103 b) in a variety of connotations.
wuṣṣuru, the II₁ infinitive, thus denotes "to release, liberate" (cf. Landsberger re aṣarīṣ wuṣṣuru in ZDMG LXIX, p. 523). Examples of this usage are common; cf. .dds-war, "he shall be set free" (II₂ present with passive force), CH, § 20 (and often); inšuḫu saṣīt arkaṭi pašuṣa um-diṣṣer, "The evil wind, which obstructed the rear, was released against her" (Enuma elīš IV:96).

In Amarna, however, as also occasionally elsewhere (e.g. in Mari; see ARM XV, p. 278), wuṣṣuru means "to send." For the same semantic development, cf. the usages of Hebrew ṣillah and Arabic 'arsala and 'atlaqa.

As to the formation of uṣṣirti, such guttul forms are clearly conflations of Akkadian II₁ statives (guttul) which have accepted the thematic i-vowel of the Canaanite Pišél perfect (gattil) and have been inflected according to the Canaanite perfect pattern, a fact already recognized by Böhl (op. cit., p. 45).

Ll. 13-15: It is well nigh impossible to restore these lines on the basis of existing parallels. L. 13 at the end reads ẖa-la-za, an obvious error for ẖa-la-a (as Knudtzon correctly notes).

L. 16: The restoration of Knudtzon, [al]ku-a ši-bat tal-ku-ni (for the first word of which he was influenced by ll. 20-21 of the previous letter), can hardly be correct. The verb ša/aqû never has an a-vowel in the preformative of the imperfect in Amarna, much less in Akkadian proper. It is best to read the four preserved signs in the line as be-ri-ku-n[i] (as Knudtzon himself had once been inclined to do; cf. EA, p. 365, n. c).

My translation of be-ri-kun[i] as "between u[z]" arises from a comparison of the following pertinent passages. EA 117:66-67 reads: y[u]-wa-[ṣ]-ra LUGAL ru Lu M|ASKIM-yu ẖu yu-p[α-r]i-i-[b]e-ri-nu (cf. also 118:50-53). In 113:17-18, on the other hand, we find: [yu-wa]-ṣi-ra LUGAL ru Lu M|ASKIM-yu ẖu yu-pa-ra-am be-ri-ku-[n[i], and 116:30-33 reads: Lu MES M|ASKIM LUGAL ri yu-wa-[ṣ]-ri-na [L]UGAL ru ẖu ia-aq-bi LUGAL ri a-na Ya-Mu-ṣu Ṿ tu-pa-ri-ṣu be-ri-ku-ni. From these three passages, all of
which refer to the same occasion, it is clear that bērikuni is a synonym for bērinu, "between/among us." It is a difficult form to analyze; possibly it is an anomalous conflation of bērikuni and bērinu, and as such is to be numbered among the "schlechte Neubildungen der Amarnabriefe" of which von Soden finds a few examples in the independent personal pronouns of Amarna (GAG, § 41 j, n. 16).

Ll. 18-19: The restorations are based on the fact that Melu(h)ha appears elsewhere in Amarna (only in Rib-Maddi) preceded, usually immediately, by LUGALNU (EA 95:39-40; 117:78-82, 91-93; 132:56-57), and where it occurs in connection with MISIRI, LUGALNU precedes the latter also (108:66-67; 112:18-20). Since a numeral precedes LUGALNU in several of the above citations, I have left space for such a restoration in my transliteration of the lines, though of course if such a restoration is required we have no way of knowing which numeral to insert. WA 67 shows traces after Me-lu-ha in l. 19, but again any proposal by way of restoration would be a mere guess.

"Meluhha ist seit der zweiten Hälfte des 2. Jahrtausends der Name für Nubien" (Moortgat, op. cit., p. 262). Other scholars equate Meluhha with Ethiopia at this period of history (cf., e.g., Albright, AR 4, p. 134), but since Nubia and Ethiopia are for all practical purposes equivalent terms (including portions of modern Sudan, Eritrea, Ethiopia and perhaps even Somaliland), the result is the same in either case. Indeed, as Oppenheim notes (ANET 2, p. 268, n. 4), "Meluhha" referred to different territories during different periods of history.

At a much later date, Sennacherib (704-681 BCE) boasts in his annals that he was able to defeat his enemies despite the fact that they had summoned Egyptian and Ethiopian mercenaries for help (LUGALMES KUR.MU-SU-RI LUGALNU MISIRI PAN GUGIR MES ANSE.KUR.RA LUGAL KUR ME-LUH-HA MU-QI LA NI-BI [OIP, 2, p. 31:78-80]). It thus appears that Egyptian and Ethiopian
soldiers were accustomed to fighting side by side not only in the Amarna Age but in other periods as well.

In the badly broken letter EA 133, Knudtzon (EA, p. 564) and Weber (ibid., p. 1155) restore 11. 16-17 as follows: 10 [amelut matu me-lu-]ka[-Hi]. From this phrase Weber draws the conclusion that in some places in Amarna KUR Me-lu-ha and KUR Ka-Mi are synonyms (cf. Weber, loc. cit.). This may well be true in some cases, for EA 131:12-13, for example, reads yu-<way>-Mi-ra be-li ES MEŠ ERIN ES GIGIR MES me LÛ MES KUR MES Ka-Mi, wherein KUR Ka-Mi must be located near Egypt and is thus possibly the equivalent of Meluhha. On the other hand it must be noted that in a phrase such as LUGAL KUR Mi-ta-na Su-nu u LUGAL [K]UR Ka-Mi ü LUGAL KUR Ha-ta (116:70-71) we must seek [K]UR Ka-Mi in Asia, either as a reference to the Kassite ruling house of Babylonia (for the possibility of this identification, cf. Albright, FSAC², p. 203) or possibly even to the territory of Kaššuwa in the Hittite Empire (for the location of Kaššuwa cf. Wright and Filson, WHAB¹, Plate III, C 2), though this latter suggestion is less likely. In support of my contention that Ka-Mi refers to at least two different areas in Rib-Haddi's correspondence, cf. Weber's similar conclusions in EA, pp. 1100-1102 (it should be noted that I arrived at my conclusion independently).

It seems that the equation Meluhha = Kaššu¹ gains support from a passage in the annals of Ashurbanipal (cf. Streck, Asb., p. 6:52-53). I quote Oppenheim's translation (ANET², p. 294): "In my first campaign I marched against Egypt (Magan) and Ethiopia (Meluhha). Tirhakah (Tarqû), king of Egypt (Musur) and Nubia (Kûsu), ... put his trust upon his own power." Needless to say, Kûsu is the Biblical Kûš.

L. 20. Marrâni: For Marrânu as the plural of Marru we have no direct evidence in Rib-Haddi, but cf. EA 7:37: i-na qâ-at Mar-ra-ni.
Ll. 21-23: The restoration of these lines is in a sense progressive, having as its starting point the certain restoration of l. 23 on the basis of EA 71:26-27; 79:31-32; 82:19; 127:38-39. Once this is done, tin[a(s)]jar[u 4ala] is practically the only possibility preceding l. 23 (it may be that URU should be restored at the beginning of l. 23 instead of at the end of l. 22; Knudtzon erroneously leaves it out altogether). Knudtzon's clever restorations at the beginnings of ll. 21 and 22 are probably correct; unfortunately, they are unverifiable by means of parallels. At the end of l. 21, however, WA 67 leaves ample room for another sign or two; I suggest the reading S[GI]I3M[GIGIR]ME[N], since chariots are often mentioned in connection with Egyptian and Ethiopian troops (cf. the references in the note on ll. 18-19 above). Another possibility is S[GI]I3M[TUKUL]ME[N], "weapons"; we note immediately, however, that this logogram never appears in Rib-Haddi.

L. 21. [na]dnatu: Such Akkadian stative forms are exceedingly common in Canaanite Amarna, where they take on an active perfect connotation instead of the passive timeless usage normal in standard Akkadian. It is tempting to compare the Amarna usage with the similar phenomenon in the hymnal-epic dialect of Akkadian, but whereas in the latter the stative was often used as an active preterit merely as a stylistic device, in Amarna such forms are true Canaanite perfects in Akkadian dress (the pure Canaanite form would be n/yatatta).

L. 21. [markabati]: My reading of this logogram assumes that it was read by the Canaanite scribes as an Akkadian word. This is, of course, by no means certain, since GI[GI]GR is never written out syllabically in Amarna. Indeed, in Ugaritic Akkadian we find (though unfortunately in a broken context) a-na mar-kab-te (PRU III, 16.249:28), which seems to mean "to/for the chariot." At any rate, a form markabte would never be tolerated in standard Akkadian, wherein the n- of a mdqta1-formation becomes n- in the presence of a labial (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 31 b; this
phenomenon is known as the Earth Law. Such a form, on the contrary, would be exactly parallel to Hebrew markaba $^h$ = Ugaritic mrikbt. To be noted in this connection also is the datum GAD $^M_B$ \text{ma-al-ba-Mi}, "linen garments" (RA 31 [1934], p. 127:9). This gloss is found in an Amarna letter that came to light too late to be included in EA but that was subsequently published by Dossin (loc. cit., pp. 125-136). The similarity to Hebrew malbûn is immediately obvious, but the Akkadian equivalent is nabalû ('again because of the labial).

In spite of this intriguing evidence supporting markabtu as the Canaanite Amarna reading for GIG $^H$GIGIR, however, I hesitate because of phrases like Ġštan tapal na-al-ba-Mi, "one suit of clothes" (EA 112:44), which clearly militates against such a reading. The Canaanite scribes tried to write in good Akkadian, even though they were frequently unsuccessful in their attempts. It seems best, therefore, to read GIG $^H$GIGIR as markabtu, at least until further evidence is forthcoming.

L. 22. tim[a(s)]sar[u]: If the restoration (substantially Knudtzon’s) is correct, we are here confronted with our first taqtulu(na) form in Rib-Haddi (though the present form is an Akkade-Canaanite conflation). The consensus of present scholarship is that taqtulu(na) is a Canaanite third person masculine plural imperfect, enjoying equal status with yaqtulu(na) (cf. the corresponding Ugaritic forms: y/taqtuluna). (The present example, if correctly restored, can be nothing else but that, since the subject is LUGAL $^M_B$ in 1. 20.) In JCS II, however, Albright and Moran adduced certain arguments against this position, arguments which at first seemed formidable. Moran has since published his volte-face, as he himself calls it (JCS V, pp. 33-35); nevertheless, it may be well to examine briefly Albright and Moran’s original statement. The quotations below are from JCS II, pp. 243-244.

"Frequently in the Byblos letters... a fem. sg. verb is construed with a masc. pl. subject taken as a collective..."
It can be seen that Albright and Moran originally regarded taqtulū(ḥa) as third person feminine singular (clearly under the influence of Arabic syntax). The forms that they listed as evidence supporting this contention are tímaḥ asā(a)nān[i] (EA 77:37); tíšāna (103:22); tūbalūna (117:18); and tāšā [82:50]. Moran has since realized that whereas each of these forms presents its own syntactical problems, none is insurmountable, nor do they as a whole warrant the supposition that the ubiquitous taqtulū(ḥa) is to be understood as a feminine singular form. As for my part, I shall discuss each of these problematical forms as they appear in context. The argument that taqtulū(ḥa) "appears constantly in the indicative without the ending -nā, whereas if the form were plural, the reverse should be true" does not take into account the conflation prevalent in these texts; taqtulū as a third person masculine plural indicative in Canaanite Amarna is under Akkadian influence.

Moran's article in JCS V, entitled "New Evidence on Canaanite taqtulū(ḥa)," deals primarily with mood sequence in purpose clauses and has as its thesis the following proposition: "Wherever the verb of the main clause is an indicative, the verb of the purpose clause is likewise an indicative; wherever the verb of the main clause is a volitive, the verb of the purpose clause is likewise a volitive" (p. 33). By "volitive" Moran means imperative, jussive, and yaqtulū forms (ibid., n. 3). He demonstrates conclusively that where a taqtulū(ḥa) form appears with a masculine plural substantive in a purpose clause preceded by a main indicative clause, it always ends in -nā; where, on the other hand, the main clause is volitive, such a following taqtulū(ḥa) form will be apocopated to taqtulū. The obvious conclusion that results from this evidence is that the -nā ending in such cases can only be the -n(a) familiar in Ugaritic, Phoenician, Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, etc., plural forms. Its primary function was to indicate the indicative mood (cf. Moran, ibid., p. 34, n. 11),
although by the time of the Masoretes its original purpose in Hebrew and Aramaic had in some cases been forgotten and in others been confused with the nun energetic. Indeed, in Amarna itself it is often difficult to distinguish between the genuine nun energetic and the -na ending of third person plural indicatives; each case must be judged on its own merits. It is highly unlikely that we are to consider every -na ending as energetic, as Dhorme apparently did (RB, NS Volume 10 [1913], p. 379).

Interest in the taqtuluna form has been renewed in the past three decades by its prevalence in Ugaritic, where it likewise shares with yaktulunona the duties of the third person masculine plural verb. Examples are legion; there is no need for extended citations here (cf. Gordon, UM I, p. 60). The form does not seem to be found in Phoenician (cf. Harris, GPL, p. 40); as for Hebrew, unambiguous examples are unknown to me. It may be, however, that both Phoenician and Hebrew employed such forms in their early stages, and that a leveling process removed them in their later development. But this is purely conjectural.

The origin of the third person masculine plural taqtuluna is a problem all its own. It may well be that "the explanation of the t-preformative with the masculine plural is to be found in the analogical change of the prefix y-t on the basis of the idiomatic use of the 3rd feminine singular indicative taqtulu with a plural subject" (Moran, JCS V, p. 35). On the other hand, it is entirely possible that even as Hebrew yaktulna (third person feminine plural) was leveled into taqtulna (tiqtolnah) by the influence of the second person feminine plural form, it may be that in Amarna and Ugaritic we are being permitted to observe an identical process being performed upon yaktuluna by the second person masculine plural form, taqtuluna. We will probably never know.

L. 23. ERINMES pi-tá-ti: Since the transcription of ERINMES in this phrase is crucial, it is here that we must discuss
it briefly. Albright and Moran noted in JCS II (p. 245, n. 14) Goette’s suggestion that ERIN^M^ME^S^ is "the ideogram of a singular in Amarna." Most of the examples there listed support that claim, to which Albright and Moran acquiesced (EA 76:38-40: umMira ERIN^M^ME^S^ pitatü raba' u tuda(b)bir a(y)tabi Marri; 117:26-27: yuwa[I]Mara Ma[r]ru ERIN^ME^S^ raba; 129:36: ERIN^ME^S^ asat; 137:42: ERIN^ME^S^ Ma-ra; 138:96: nadnat ERIN^ME^S^). It should be noted, however, that in the example taken from 76:38-40 ERIN^ME^S^ is modified by a masculine adjective (raba') and then construed with a Canaanized feminine verb (tuda(b)bir). While it is possible to argue that raba' may be accusative of specification here (so Knudtzon: "in grosser Menge"), the other examples listed make it clear that ERIN^ME^S^ habitually took masculine adjectives (raba'; Ma-ra; cf. also 138:61: [ERIN^ME^S^ Manu] but feminine verbs (tuda(b)bir; asat; nadnat). Although this apparently strict distribution of gender with regard to adjectival modifiers and verbal constructions in the case of ERIN^ME^S^ may strike us as curious, the fluctuation in gender itself is no problem, since sabu in Akkadian is feminine (von Soden, GAG, § 132 a) whereas in Hebrew and Ugaritic the same word (sb') is masculine. While, therefore, it appears that the Canaanite scribes of Rib-Haddi alternately considered ERIN^ME^S^ masculine or feminine, they were unswerving in using it as a logogram for a singular noun, sabu.

pitatü is Egyptian "pd.ty, "archer," to be vocalized approximately "pida'ta'y, a misbe-formation of "pd't (pîdît), "bow" (Coptic pîte) (cf. Lambdin, JCS VII, p. 77, n. 20; Albright and Moran, JCS II, p. 246, n. 16; Albright, JNES V, p. 14; Ebeling, BA VIII/2, p. 78; Böhl, op. cit., p. 35). The first two syllables of this word are always written PI-^TA^- (BI-^TA^-) in Rib-Haddi, whereas in the 'Abdi-Heba letters (EA 285-290) they are invariably written PI-^TA^-]. As to the length of the vowel in the second syllable, we note the spellings ERIN^ME^S^ pî-tä-a-te (EA 174:21; 176:16) and ERIN^ME^S^ pî-tä-a-ta (Louvre Museum Number AO 7097:17-18; cf. Thureau-Dangin, RA 19, p. 107).
The final example noted in the preceding paragraph brings us to the matter of the normalization of ERIN\textsuperscript{ME} pi-tá-ti, since the form there is clearly an accusative (the full quotation being li-di-na LUGAL EN-ia ERIN\textsuperscript{ME} pi-tá-a-ta). There are a few examples of this phenomenon also in Rib-Haddi; e.g., [i]a-na ERIN\textsuperscript{ME} pi-tá-[t]a (accusative) (EA 93:26) and mi-[na ti]-p[un]-u ERIN\textsuperscript{ME} pi-tá-tu (nominative) (129:33-34). On the other hand, in the great majority of cases in Rib-Haddi the phrase is ERIN\textsuperscript{ME} pi-tá-ti without regard for syntactical position; cf., e.g., yu-wa-ši-ru-na ERIN\textsuperscript{ME} pi-tá-ti (accusative) in 71:31-14. In such a case we can only read sabu pi-tátu, an Akkadian construct phrase bearing no external indication of case (the -i ending on sabu is normal for construct forms of final-weak roots; cf. Goetze, JCS II, pp. 269-270; von Soden, GAG, § 64 c) and a normalization substantiated by the gloss sa-bi pi-tá-te for ERIN\textsuperscript{ME} in EA 166:4. Where the nominative or accusative case ending appears on pi-tá(-a)-, we are obliged to read sa-bi pi-tá-tu and sa-bi pi-tá-ta respectively, and to consider pi-tá-tu/a in such cases either as adjectival or, what is more likely (in view of the probability that pi-tá-ti is a gloss for ERIN\textsuperscript{ME} in 216:9,16, indicating that pi-tá-tu was a noun in its own right), appositional; the genitive form would, of course, fall together with the ubiquitous construct phrase.

11. 24-25: The restorations are based on EA 94:5; 104:6-7; 116:10-11; 119:24; 137:52.

L. 25. KUR A-mur-ri: The boundaries of the land of Amurru fluctuated throughout the centuries, but the references in Rib-Haddi's letters are clearly to "a region to the east of Byblos and extending northward" (Campbell, Bib. Arch. 23/1 [1960], p. 13). In contemporary Hittite materials, Amurru similarly refers to "the coast of the Mediterranean between the sea and the upper Orontes" (Goetze, AMEM\textsuperscript{2}, p. 319, n. 1). For additional details
cf. the extended note by Weber (EA, pp. 1132-1138), which, however, must be used critically in the light of recent studies on the MAR.TU/Amurrum problem (cf. mainly Bauer, Die Cestkanaanzäer [1926], reviewed and criticized by Albright in AFO III [1926], pp. 124 ff.; Edzard, Die Zweite Zwischenzeit Babylonien [1957]).

According to the Hebrew Bible, in a somewhat later period ha'-emori was to be found (together with such peoples as ha(h)hitti and hakk na' na'a, also mentioned in Amarna) b'c'heber hayyarden bahar ubahe pelah ub'kol hoo hayyan haggadol 'el-mul halibaded (Joshua 9:1).

L. 26: For the restoration, cf. the note on urra m[u'ba] in EA 69:13 above.

L. 26. tu-ba: As in Akkadian proper (cf. von Soden, AHw, p. 145 for details), bu'tu in Amarna is always in the II conjugation. Etymological equivalents in other languages are Aramaic b'q'a-, Arabic baq'a, and Hebrew b'q'a- (though this latter verb is extremely rare; b'qeq, significantly also a Pi'-el, is the ordinary verb for "to seek" in Hebrew and Phoenician and is paralleled by Ugaritic but [= "baggita"; "to seek" in Arabic is generally talaba). The form tu'ba is unique in Ria-Haddi, however, since elsewhere the Canaanite -u ending always appears on this verb. We cannot plead the influence of the preceding inuma, since in EA 76:15-16 we read clearly inuma [yu]ba-ú.

Tu'ba may be due to scribal error here (for "tu-ba-ú"); on the other hand, final weak verbs were treated rather loosely by the Canaanite Amarna scribes (cf., e.g., the similar use of yilq and yilqu in 116:36 and 71:18 respectively; yilqu [71:30; 91:6] may also be noted here, although in both occurrences cited it may be reasonably interpreted as a ventive). Part of the difficulty is probably due to the occasional laxity on the part of the scribes in adding the -u ending to conflate verbal forms. I consider tu'ba, therefore, as an only slightly Canaanized third person feminine singular present form. Purely Akkadian forms
of this verb almost always preserve the glottal stop (cf. von Soden, GAK, §106 u).

As Campbell notes (op. cit., p. 13), Rib-Haddi was "embroiled in a continuous feud with the princes of Amurru." His troubles with Amurru are clarified in passages such as EA 114:6-15, and it may therefore seem strange to us to read, as in the present passage, that "Amurru day [(and) night] seeks the going out of the archer <host>," since those archers were intended to succor Rib-Haddi and not his enemies. EA 82:48-50, however, informs us as follows: KUR-mur-ri urra muša tuba 'una sabi pitati. We can only conclude that the people of Amurru (at least from the hopeful viewpoint of Rib-Haddi) sought the aid of the royal archers to free them from their despotic (again from Rib-Haddi's viewpoint) princes.

L. 26. a-sa (sa-bi) pi-ta-ti: Since piṭatu is always preceded by sābu in Rib-Haddi, we doubtless have before us a case of double haplography, both SA and BI having been accidentally omitted by the scribe.
L. 27. For the restorations, cf. ana ū-mi kašādīmī (EA 137:50) and ina ULM patar ERÎM (106:47-48).
L. 29. Knudtzon's restoration, although only a guess, is credible enough, since there is room for a sign or two before [in]nesNa[t]. The idiom elsewhere (although it cannot possibly apply here) seems to be ina/ana ūm(ī) plus genitive infinitive plus ū plus verb in past tense (cf. EA 137:50-51: ana ū-mi kašādīmī ū tarāt). The identical construction is found also in Hebrew (cf., e.g., Genesis 3:5); its appearance in Amarna demonstrates effectively the archaic nature of the so-called waw-conversive or waw-consecutive. inneNa[t] here is the Akkadian feminine third person singular IV, 1 preterit form with a Canaanite third person singular feminine ending.
In Bib. Arch. 23/1 (1960), p. 15, Campbell argues for the meaning "to be made, to become" for ṇępūšu ana, especially in connection with the ĆApiru. That this is highly improbably is clear from the present passage as well as, e.g., EA 76:42-43, where ti-ne-spšu kali matāti ana Sarri can hardly be translated "(that) all the lands may be made the king" or, by stretching a point, "royalists" (for Sarri). As stated earlier (cf. the note on 66:17), ṇępūšu ana is best translated "to be turned over to" in the sense of "to ally (oneself) with."

L. 30. [gabbu]: Having nothing better to suggest, I have here retained Knudtzon's restoration, which is plausible on the basis of EA 66:17-18.
RIB-HADDI TO HAYA
(VAT 1632 - WA 72 - W 54 - S 33 - EA 71)

Obverse

(1) [a-na m]Ha-ia pa-zi-t[e]
[um]-ma mRi-ib-dIM
[a]-na Gîr, MEG-ka am-qú-[ut]
\d\A-ma-na DINGIR \s\a LU[GAL be-li-k]a

(5) ti-di-nu TÉS-ka i-na
pa-ni LUGAL be-li-ka
a-mur at-ta LÚ em-qú
i-di LUGAL \u\ i-na em-qú-ti-ka
i\M-ta-pár-ka LUGAL \ru

(10) i-na LÚ MASKÍM a-na mi-nim
qa-la-ta \u\ la-a
ti-iq-bu a-na LUGAL \r\i
\u\ yu-wa-Si-ru-na
ERÍN, MEG- pí-tá-ti \u

(15) ti-il-ti-qú-na

(edge) \U\R, Su-mu-ra mi-nu
\m\n-Å-Si-ir-ta İR

Reverse

\U.R. ZÍR \u\ yi-il-qú
KUR LUGAL a-na Șa-a-Șu
(20) mi-nu ti-la-at-Șu
\u\ KALAG.GA i-na LÚ GAZ GA.KALAG
til-la-at-Šu ú
uš-si-ru-na-ni NINNU ta-pal
ANŠE.KUR.RA ú MIN me ERÎN.GûR.GûR
(25) ú i-zi-za i-na URUši-ga-
i-na pa-ni-Šu a-di \ ta
a-sî ERÎN.GûR pî-tâ-tî
ú-ul yu-pa-ḫi-ra ka-li
Lû.GAZ.GûR ū
(30) [y]i-il-qa URUši-ga-t[a]
ú URU Am-ši ú [y[i-is-ba[t]
[ ]SA(N)G \ ya y[i-za-za]
(edge) [ū] mi-na i-p[u-Šu-na]
[ū] ia-nu a-šar
(35) [ir]-ru-bu a-na mu-ḫi-[šu]
To Haya, the vizier: Thus Rib-Haddi. [At thy feet I have fallen. May Amon, the god of the king, thy lord, grant honor to thee in the presence of the king, thy lord! Behold, thou art a wise man in the entourage of the king, and because of thine abilities the king has appointed thee as a commissioner. (But) why hast thou kept silent and not spoken to the king, that he might send an archer host so that (15) it might capture Simyra? Who is Abdi-Ashirta, the slave, the dog, that he takes the land of the king for himself? (20) Who is his auxiliary host, that it is strong? (Only) because of the Apiru is his auxiliary host strong! Therefore send me fifty teams of horses and two hundred foot soldiers (25) so that I might withstand him in Shigata until the archer host goes out, lest he muster all the Apiru and (30) take Shigata[a] and Ambi and [seize] ... What [then] could I do? For there would be no place where [one could go] in because of [him]!
L. 1. [\textsuperscript{m}]Ha-ia pa-zi-t[e]: According to Albright (JNES 5 [1946], p. 12), the name Ha-ia is equivalent to Egyptian Ha-ya, the regular hypocoristicon of Amanhatpa (Amenophis) during the period of the New Kingdom in Egypt (for additional information concerning Haya, including an attempt to identify him with a personality mentioned in Egyptian texts, as well as for supplementary bibliographical information, cf. Albright, loc. cit., pp. 12-13). The spelling Ha-ia is found elsewhere in Amarna only in EA 112:42,48 (and possibly also in 109:62), but whether the same individual is meant must remain uncertain. Weber feels that our Haya is probably to be equated with \textsuperscript{m}Ha in 117:65 (cf. EA, p. 1155), but the gentleman there referred to is cast in a somewhat unfavorable light, a sharp contrast to the words of praise that Rib-Haddi bestows upon Haya in the present letter (cf. 11. 7-10). While it is true that there could have been a change of heart on Rib-Haddi's part, the equation is certainly suspect, with the difference in spelling making it all the less likely.

Haya is here characterized as pazit[e] (for the final syllable, which may be regarded as virtually certain, cf. WA 72; Knudtzon in EA, pp. 366-567, n. c; Ebeling in EA, p. 1492). Albright notes (loc. cit., p. 12) that "the word would lend itself perfectly to identification with N[ew] K[ingdom] pa-ti'ty, 'the vizier,' then perhaps pronounced approximately pe-'titi." This equation had already been suggested by Ebeling (loc. cit.).

L. 2. [um]ma: This particle (Old Akkadian emma; cf. von Soden, GAG, §121 b), "as follows, in the following manner, thus," is used in Akkadian to introduce the name of the addressee of a letter which is then followed immediately by the body of the letter itself (unless, of course, modifiers of the addressee's name intervene). In Old Babylonian, umma is followed by the name in the nominative case, but in Canaanite Amarna it is usually followed by the name in the genitive since it was apparently
considered by the scribes to be a noun in construct with the following name. Albright was perhaps the first to notice this phenomenon in an article in BASOR 87, pp. 32-37 (cf. n. 7). It is of course not apparent in compound names like that of Rib-Haddi, but a hypocoristicon such as °Aziru, which is spelled variously mA-zi-ru, mA-zi-ri, and mA-zi-ra in Amarna (the ending most often being determined by syntax), is spelled always mA-zi-ri after umma (where the full name is preserved; cf. EA 156-161, 164-168; where the final syllable is not preserved, it may thus safely be restored).

The few exceptions to this general rule listed by Marcus in JCS II (1948), p. 223, do not obviate the validity of the rule as a whole. As Goetze points out (ibid., p. 224), in Hittite texts, for example, umma is interchangeable with A-WA-AT, which necessarily requires a following genitive.

But it must be noted also that a parallel construction obtains in Ugaritic and in Hebrew. "hm, the Ugaritic semantic equivalent of umma, is always construed as a noun meaning "speech, message" ("wht, "word, speech") in the epic texts (e.g. I*AB, i:12-14: "hm on ilmMt hwt ydd on il ġdzr, "Message of the godly Môt, word of the god beloved ġdzr"), and so in the salutation of a letter (cf., e.g., Gordon, UM, II, Text 54, ll. 1-3; Text 89, ll. 1-5, and others) it must be considered as being followed by the name in the genitive case. As for Hebrew, the familiar phrase n°'um YHWH is surely another case in point; the Masoretes correctly understood n'm as a qal passive participle in the construct state and thereby governing the genitive. Note also n°'um /ā'dbar (construct) in, e.g., Proverbs 30:1.

L. 3: It is instructive to note that the salutation of a vassal prince to an Egyptian official was much less flowery and more direct than the salutation to the pharaoh himself. Doubtless the need for expressions of servile obedience was felt to be less urgent.
L. 4: The restoration is based on EA 86:3-4, which in turn may be restored by comparison with the present line, since the preserved portions complement each other.

L. 4. dA-ma-na: This divine name is found elsewhere three times in Rib-Haddi (EA 86:3; 87:5; 95:3), always spelled the same way by his scribes. In Egyptian mythology, Amon (Amûn) was the male member of the fourth pair of divinities that comprised the primeval Ogdoad. His name means "the hidden," and represents "the intangibility and imperceptibility of chaos" (Wilson in Frankfort et al., The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man, p. 52). For the gradual elevation of Amon to a position of supremacy in the Egyptian pantheon with headquarters at Thebes, cf., e.g., Scharff in Scharff and Moortgat, op. cit., p. 96. The god Montu had earlier been called "Lord of Thebes" (as, e.g., in the story of Si-nuhe; cf. Wilson's translation in ANET2, p. 21), but the encroachment of Amon is already apparent in the change in the royal dynastic name from Mentu-hotep to Amen-em-het in the early twentieth century B.C.E.

It is virtually certain that the Amarna letters were all written during the reigns of Amen-hotep III (1398-1361) and Amen-hotep IV (Akh-en-Aton) (1369-1353), and possibly also Smenkh-ka-Re (1355-1352) (for details, cf. the excellent summary article, "The Amarna Letters and The Amarna Period," by Edward F. Campbell, Jr., in Bib. Arch. 23/1 [1960], pp. 2-22). The dates given above for the pharaohs are necessarily tentative and differ slightly from those offered by Campbell (ibid., p. 10; cf. ANET2, p. xviii).

Since the name of Amon appears in the present letter as well as in EA 86, 87, and 95, we are justified in dating them within the reign of Amen-hotep III, for Akh-en-Aton "broke with the established religion of Egypt and instituted the worship of the Aton, the sun disc as the source of life" (Wilson, ANET2, p. 369; cf. further Wilson, The Culture of Ancient Egypt [Chicago, 1957], pp. 221 ff.). Indeed, "adherents of the cult of the Aten were commanded to erase
the name of Amun wherever it occurred" (Albright, *FSAC*², p. 221; cf. also Wilson, *ANET*², p. 375, n. 18). Amon was restored to favor during the Nineteenth Dynasty. For details cf. Wilson, *The Culture of Ancient Egypt*, pp. 206 ff.

L. 5. ti(d)dinu: Though the subject is 'Amāna, this verbal form cannot be third person masculine singular as indicated by Ebeling (BA VIII/2 [1912], p. 48) or by Dhorme (RB, NS Volume 10 [1913], p. 379). Nor can it be third person feminine singular (cf. Ebeling, *EA*, p. 1477), since in such a formula the feminine form would be written ti(d)din (cf. the comments on tiddin in the note on *EA* 68:5 above). Albright (*JNES* V, p. 12) and Moran (*JCS* V, p. 35, n. 14) are surely right in seeing in this form a pluralis majestatis; it is here correctly spelled as a jussive, minus the -na ending (cf. the note on *EA* 70:22 above). Moran (loc. cit.) rightly compares āl ma(s)artikunu (*EA* 76:36) as another example of this phenomenon in Rib-Haddi.

L. 5. baštaka: The syllabic spelling ba-aaš-ta-ka (*EA* 73:5) shows that the scribes of Rib-Haddi correctly understood the logogram 'EMMU. One of the meanings of baštu (later bāštu) is "shame," which it shares with its Hebrew cognate, bōset (cf. also Ugaritic btt). The Akkadian term, however, has a much wider semantic range than that of Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic; it means also "virility" (ē ddūtu; cf. Landsberger, *MACG* 4, p. 321); "vigor, vital energy" (cf. von Soden, *GAG*, § 54 k; *AHw*, p. 112); "pride, honor, respect" (cf. Bauer, *Akkadische Lesestücke*, Volume III, p. 5). It is this latter connotation which, I feel, best brings out the nuance of baštu in Rib-Haddi; "honor, respect" fits in well contextually, more so than do the other possibilities (so approximately Ebeling, *EA*, p. 1390). Albright's "repute" (*JNES* V, p. 12) is somewhat less exact, while Dhorme's "reverence" (RB, NS Volume II [1914], p. 348) seems to miss the point entirely. Clearly, the purpose of the baštu invoked upon the recipient is that he might wield influence with the pharaoh. Rib-Haddi is
consistent in his pleas for dannu for the pharaoh himself, but lesser Egyptian officials need baštlu. It should be noted that the much-maligned subāt bālti of Akkadian literature, usually interpreted as meaning "garment of shame," should be translated "garment of honor"; in many of the contexts in which it is found the idea of shame is either out of place entirely or at least awkward (cf., e.g., Ishtar's Descent, Obverse 60,61; Reverse 39), while in Gilgamesh XI:243,252 it seems to be equated with tēdiq, "formal/festive garment."

L. 7. amur: The masculine singular imperative of amāru, used here and elsewhere (very often) in Amarna as the equivalent of Hebrew נָהָ, "Behold!" (which itself is nearly equal to הִנָּ, Amarna anān; cf. BDB, p. 907). Such a usage (cf., e.g., Genesis 27:27) is found also in the plural (e.g., Genesis 39:14); that *amān is not to be so found in Amarna is merely accidental, since the addressee is in each case a single individual. Indeed, in Late Babylonian such plural forms do occur (cf. von Soden, AHw, p. 41 for details).

L. 7. amīlu emqu: This phrase is used once again in Rib-Haddi, this time of Yanhamu (EA 106:39).

L. 8. ḫ-idi LUGAL: Knudtzon's translation here ("zur Seite des Königs") remains the most plausible (so also approximately CAD 4, p. 152); cf. probably also id Marri in EA 149:82 (although the meaning there is not entirely clear because of the broken context). Albright's rendering, "who dost know the king" (JNES V, p. 12), is highly unlikely since it assumes that ḫ-idi is a construct participle of idū (ibid., n. 8), at least in this case. The Canaanite construct participle, however, would be *(y)ūdi, while the standard Akkadian equivalent is muḍu (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 106 q).

L. 8. em-ḫū-ty-ka: The suggestion of Albright (JNES V, p.12, n.8) that IM-TI-KA here is a scribal error for *em-ḫū-ty-ka
is very plausible. The lapse would be due to vertical haplography (the previous line ends with em-ū). Akkadian imtu (= Hebrew hēma), "venom" (cf., e.g., Enuma elīm IV:53,62), certainly does not fit here, and Knudtzon's "Zuverlässigkeit," by which it can be seen that he visualized a word imtu equivalent to Hebrew ēmēt (cf. also Ebeling's hesitant concurrence in EA, p. 1547), is phonologically impossible (for details cf. Albright, ibid.). A word *emqūtu (not attested in Akkadian) meaning "wisdom" would, on the other hand, fit in very well contextually. With the form itself Albright compares Aramaic *emqūta, "depth," but it is perhaps more to the point to note that Rib-Haddi's Canaanite scribe was probably influenced here by a form akin to Hebrew hokmōt (clearly singular in Proverbs 1:20; 9:1; see most recently Albright, H. H. Rowley Festschrift [1955], p. 8). The Akkadian equivalent, nēmequ, appears in the Amarna material only in the myth of Nergal and Ereshkigal (EA 357:84), a purely Akkadian context.

L. 9. ištappāka: In the Rib-Haddi correspondence, (w)uššūru is the verb used for the concept "to send." Sapāru is used for "to write," with the meaning "to send" being secondary and rare. We find, for example, the idiom mār/amēl Sipri Sapāru, "to send a messenger" (cf. EA 88:13; 92:16), but the predicate in this case is clearly in the nature of a cognate accusative; furthermore, examples of mār/amēl Sipri (w)uššūru in the same sense are not lacking (cf. 108:46-47; 137:8). In addition, tuppa Sapāru appears (cf. 92:12), meaning "to send a tablet," a phrase essentially equivalent to "to write." Except for such expressions, "to send" is denoted by (w)uššūru. In the present case, therefore, I have decided to translate Sapāru as "to appoint, commission" which, at any rate, is more exact contextually.

L. 10. ana mīnīm: The interrogative "why?" is expressed in Rib-Haddi mainly by ana mīnī(m) (EA 73:6; 77:18; 83:7; 91:7; 94:4; 102:10; 106:13,30; 108:51; 112:7; 113:28; 117:7-8,30; 124:37-38;
134:28; 138:60), which corresponds to Hebrew lmh (variously pointed and accented; cf. BDB, p. 554 for details) and Ugaritic lm (e.g. III AB, B:24-25). Only rarely is ana mini(m) found in its contracted form (am-mi-ni, EA 74:48; a-mi-ni, 86:14; am-mi-nim-mi, 96:25); the process of contraction, however, had been already well established in Old Babylonian (cf., e.g., von Soden, GAG, § 153 b). In addition to these well-known Akkadian forms, we find also mi-nu-mi (EA 126:49) and mi-nu-un (138:136,138) used in the sense of "why?" These are undoubtedly due to Canaanite influence; in Hebrew, for example, mh (variously pointed; cf. BDB, p. 553) is sometimes used adverbially in such a sense (cf., e.g., Psalm 42:6). Even more peculiar is EA 114:41-43: muhhi
Sa ma-an-ni yu-pa-Su ki-a-ma arad ki-ši-ka muhhi a-ra-di-ka,
"why (literally: For what reason) is thy loyal servant treated thus? For serving thee?" It is likely that Canaanite influence is also to be sought here, since the Hebrew Bible exhibits several examples of c-al-ma/1m with the meaning "why?" The problem in muhhi:Sa manni is not so much with manni as with Sa, which is unnecessary syntactically (at least from our viewpoint). Note, however, the Hebrew expressions Az'er lama, Hallama (wrongly rendered "lest" in BDB, p. 554).

11. 11-12. qalāta ʿa lā tiqbu: This phrase is an excellent example of the ease with which the scribes of Rib-Haddi fluctuated between pseudo-Akkadian and pseudo-Canaanite, and demonstrates forcibly the thorough conflation that such forms underwent. qalāta is a conflation of the Akkadian stative qalāta with the Canaanite perfect vocalization qalā; tiqbu has essentially the Canaanite imperfect vocalization (cf. tāq-bu in EA 73:7), but the scribe has here outdone himself by importing the preformative vowel of the Akkadian third person preterit (that the Akkadian preterit taqbi is intended is clear from the context).

1. 13. yuwa(M)Mirūna: To Dhorme we owe the astute observation that this form (cf. also EA 112:19; 116:31), a singular with nun
energetic, is clearly distinguished from its plural taqtulīna counterpart, tuwa(ג)Mirūna, found in 125:44 (cf. RS, NS Volume 11 [1914], p. 40). The form is a conflation, having the Canaanite y-preformative, PiC imperfect i-theme, and indicative -u-ending, while being formed from an Akkadian verbal root and retaining the Akkadian II I preformative vowel ū. This same form may be safely restored in EA 114:61.

The nun energetic is often best left untranslated, but wherever it can be reasonably represented in translation I shall indicate it.

L. 16. mīnu: In standard Akkadian, "who?" is represented by mannu and "what?" by mīnu/minū. In the dialect of Rib-Haddi, however, ma(n)nu and mīya share the spotlight with mīnu(m) in asking the question "who?", while "what?" is expressed by mīna(m).

ma(n)nu meaning "who?" is rare in Rib-Haddi in the nominative case, being found only in EA 82:24; 127:14; 130:19. It is somewhat more common in the genitive, attested as the object of ana (101:25; 125:39), īatu (112:10; 123:31; 125:11-12), and tā (101:11; 108:18). These phrases have their Biblical parallels in, respectively, 1סמ (e.g. Genesis 32:18), mimmî (Ezekiel 32:19; Psalm 27:1 [twice]), and construct formations such as bat-מ at(t) (Genesis 24:23).

mānu apparently means "what?" in EA 114:41-43, in which case the scribe was probably influenced by the vocalization of Hebrew-Ugaritic mh. Peculiar is the expression ma-nî umûtûmâti, meaning "how often/long?" in 88:19; 114:35; 119:39; 122:38. Possibly the scribe had in mind such Canaanite expressions as kammaו y e m e .false hayyay (II Samuel 19:35).

The form mīya is purely Canaanite and is particularly valuable in that it indicates the vocalization of Ugaritic-Pheenician my as well as the original vocalization of Hebrew ב. It is always written mī-ia in Amarna and in Rib-Haddi is found in EA 84:16; 85:63; 94:12; 104:17; 108:25; 116:67; 117:35; 129:7,81; *362:65, 69.
Knudtzon (in his translations) and Ebeling (EA, p. 1471) have failed to distinguish between \(\text{mēnu(m)}\), "who?", and \(\text{mina(m)}\), "what?" in Rib-Haddi. That such a distinction exists is clear from an inductive study of all the passages in which the words occur.

\(\text{mi-nu(-um)}\), "who?", appears in EA 71:16,20; 76:11; 82:41; 86:9; 101:1; 112:13,17; 119:10; 123:38; 125:40; 126:14. The only apparent exception to this scheme is 136:131-132 where, in spite of the somewhat broken context, \(\text{mēnum}\) probably means "what?" (for \(\text{mi-nu-mi}\), 126:49, and \(\text{mi-nu-um}\), 136:136,138, used in the sense of "why?" cf. the note on \(\text{ana mēnim}\) in 1. 10 above). On the other hand, \(\text{mi-na(-am)}\), "what?", appears in 71:33; 73:19; 74:41,63; 81:35,50; 85:11,28; 90:22; 91:25; 92:15,29,43; 104:36; 113:11; 117:92; 119:14,17,53; 122:48. \(\text{mina(m)}\) never means "who?" in Rib-Haddi, so that the restoration of Knudtzon in 92:41, \(\text{mi[-i]a-[a-m]}\ \text{Hu-tū}\), is impossible; the passage must be restored as \(\text{mi[-i]a-[m]}\ \text{Hu-at}\) (cf. 84:16-17; 108:25-26; 116:67; 117:35; 129:7,51), a restoration which the traces support.

As for the reason for the distinction between \(\text{mēnu(m)}\), "who?", and \(\text{mina(m)}\), "what?", the simplest answer is that "who?" was considered to be a nominative and "what?" an accusative by the Canaanite scribes (as indeed they are grammatically in all of the passages listed above). It may be, therefore, that the distinction between \(\text{mēnu(m)}\) and \(\text{mina(m)}\) is more apparent than real; it is also possible, however, that they became fossilized forms with the meanings "who?" and "what?" respectively. The \(\text{i}\)-vowel of \(\text{mēnu(m)}\), "who?", was doubtless influenced by that of \(\text{miya}\) and inserted into the consonantal skeleton of \(\text{ma(n)nu}\).

L. 17. \(\text{mēr-A-yi-i-r-ta}: \text{Abdi-'Amīrta\) (for this normalization of the name cf. the comments below) was the mortal enemy of Rib-Haddi during the latter part of the reign of Amen-hotep III. It is primarily with Rib-Haddi's frantic requests for assistance in his feud with \(\text{Abdi-Ashīrta}\) (and his alleged allies, the \(\text{Apīru}\) that the first half of the Rib-Haddi correspondence (EA 68-96)
deals. When Ābdi-Āshīrta died his sons (primarily ĀAzīru) continued to plague the embattled Rib-Haddī (EA 101-138). (For Ābdi-Āshīrta’s side of the story, cf. EA 60-64 [and possibly also 65]; for a lucid discussion of the power struggle between the two men cf. Weber, EA, pp. 1128-1132.)

\[\text{mIr-A-Si-ir-ta}\] is best normalized \(\text{Ābdi-Āśīrta}\) with the transparent meaning “The Servant of Asherah.” That the second half of the name refers to the well-known goddess is clear from the spellings \(\text{mIr-d-A-Si-ir-ti}\) (EA 84:8) and \(\text{mIr-d-Āš-ra-ti}\) (92:18). Admittedly the normalizations \(\text{Ābudu-Āśīrta}\) (cf., e.g., ANET, pp. 483,484) or \(\text{Ābd-Āśīrta}\) (cf., e.g., Moran, SSDB, passim) would be better, but the datum \(\text{Ab-di-Āš-ta-<ar>-ti}\) (EA 63:3) would seem to substantiate the correctness of my normalization (although it is possible that \(\text{Ab-di-Ā} \) is merely an attempt to render \(\text{Ābud-Ā} \). The final \(\text{a-}\)vowel, found on the majority of the occurrences of this name, is the same as that discussed in connection with the city-name Gubla (cf. the note on 68:4) and has nothing to do with case, since the name is found with this ending in the nominative (e.g., 71:17), genitive (e.g., 81:18), and accusative (e.g., 93:23) cases. The spellings with final-\(\text{i} \) will, of course, fit in well with any syntactic usage, since a construct chain has no external indication of case. As for the two instances of the spelling \(\text{mIr-Āš-ra-tum}\) (92:19; 127:31), we note that both occurrences are nominatives, a fact which may have subconsciously influenced the scribe.

Within the word \(\text{Ābdi-Āśīrta}\) and its variants, the alternate spellings of the divine name as \(\text{A-Si-ir-ta/i} \) and \(\text{Āš-ra-ta/i/u(m)} \) accurately reflect the original \(\text{‘Atirat(u)} \), a feminine intransitive participle of \(\text{‘tr.} \) ‘Āšīrta thus harks back to \(\text{‘Ašīrata, ‘Ašrata to ‘Aširata;} \) both effectively demonstrate the Ausstossvokal principle familiar to students of Akkadian. Were it not for the spelling \(\text{mIr-Āš-ra-ta}\) (102:23), it would be tempting to see in \(\text{‘Ašrati/u(m)} \) a plural in the
sense of "totality of manifestations of a deity" (the phrase is Albright's; for examples with other divine names cf. FSAC, p. 213). However, the above explanation of the divergence in the spelling of cAbdi-Ashira's name is doubtless correct.

In view of the spelling mTR-dINNIN (EA 64:3), we may confidently correct mAb-di-AS-ta-ti (63:3) to read ^mAb-di-AS-ta-<ar>ti and normalize 64:3 as cAbdi-cAstarti. Knudtzon reads 65:3 as [a]d[-r]a-aStarti; however, the traces in S 29 equally support [A]b-[d]a-INNIN, with the resulting normalization being [c]Ab[d]a-cAstarti (the connecting a-vowel would be due to sandhi). The name is equivalent to Phoenician cbd cAstart (cf. Harris, GPL, p. 150 for references). The equation (d)INNIN (Ištart) = cAstartu is no problem, since already in pre-Kassite cuneiform lists the Canaanite Ashtartu is identified with the Babylonian Ištart (cf. Albright, FSAC, p. 212).

Ashtartu (Hebrew-Phoenician cAstart, Ugaritic cAstart, Greek 'Astarte) was a goddess of the evening star, while Asherah (Hebrew 'Ahsh'rah, Ugaritic aršt) was originally a goddess of the sea (cf. her Ugaritic appellation, aršt ym [e.g. II AB, i:22-23]; cf. also the abode of her husband, El: mkn nhrm grb apq thtmtm [e.g. II AB, iv:21-22]); for a recent summary of the problem of the exact connotation of 'Ahsh'rah in the Hebrew Bible, see Burrows, What Mean These Stones?, p. 231 (cf. further Cassuto, Anath, pp. 45-46). Both goddesses, together with Anath, were "principally concerned with sex and war" (Albright, ARI, p. 75). This fact, coupled with the superficial similarity between the names of the two goddesses, makes very plausible the conclusion that the names cAbdi-Ashira and cAbdi-cAshtarti are to be considered as referring to the same individual in the Amarna letters. Indeed, in PRU III (16.155, A:5) we find the proper name mTR-A-Mar-t[l] (cf. also l. 3), which seems to be a conflation of the two names (although perhaps we should read mTR for lAR, since these two signs were sometimes confused). At any rate, as Albright has
noted (ARI, pp. 74, 78), the names Ashtar and Acher in the Hebrew Bible seem at times to refer to the same goddess. It is clear that the distinction that obtained originally between them was not always kept; we should therefore not be too harsh on our Amarna scribes for furthering the syncretism (cf. Weber, EA, p. 1129).

1. 17. ardu: If it is clear that IR in the proper name discussed in the preceding note represents the West Semitic noun Cabdu, it is equally clear that IR by itself stands for Akkadian (w)ardu in the Amarna letters. We shall not, of course, receive any help from such spellings as IR di-šu (EA 137:32; 138:25), which could just as easily represent Cabdišu as ardišu. A far more cogent argument is found in the observation that the Amarna scribes of Canaanite extraction made frequent use of a verb (w)aradu in the sense of "to serve." Such a verb does not exist in standard Akkadian with this meaning; we can thus only conclude that it was abstracted from (w)ardu, "slave," by the Canaanite scribes, who doubtless compared it to their verb Cabada (for the possibility that Hebrew Cabad is also denominative, cf. Gerber, Verba Denominativa, p. 14 ff.; Nödeke, ZDMG XL [1886], p. 741). The verb (w)aradu, "to serve," is in place only if IR equals (w)ardu, since the latter is nowhere written syllabically in Amarna. For ardu used in context with ardu, cf. EA 114:41-43.

11. 17-18. ardu kalbu: CAbdi-Ashirta is referred to as ardu kalbu (or more simply kalbu) also in EA 75:41-42; 76:12; 84:8; 85:64; 88:10; 104:18-19; 117:36. When the phrase appears thus on the lips of Rib-Haddi, it cannot be denied that scorn is involved. However, in 60:6-7 CAbdi-Ashirta says of himself: anaku arad ūrri š kalbu ša bātišu, "I am the slave of the king and (only) a dog in his house" (cf. also 61:2-4). This servile self-deprecation was common parlance in ancient Syro-Palestine when a petty prince addressed his overlord. The phrase Cbīk klīb, "thy slave, the dog," is found frequently in the Lachish ostraca.
(e.g. 2:3-4; 5:3-4; 6:2-3); cf. Albright in ANET², pp. 321-322, for translations of several of the letters together with additional pertinent bibliographical information. In view of the frequent attestation of this phrase as noted above, it is clear that in I Chronicles 17:19 we must read bašābur ʾabaḏ ʾka ʾwaḵalb ʾka (not ʾuk ʾlibb ʾka!), "for the sake of thy servant and thy dog" (similarly, in II Samuel 7:21 we must read ʾabaḏ ʾka ʾwaḵalb ʾka, not ʾdba ʾba ʾʾka ʾuk ʾlibb ʾka!). On the basis of such passages as I Samuel 24:15; I Samuel 9:8; 16:9, and II Kings 8:13 this minor emendation was already required; the Amarna and Lachish material simply serve to make it a virtual certainty (for details see Torecznyer, The Lachish Ostraca [Jerusalem, 1940], pp. 31-32).

11. 20, 22. ti(l)latātū: Since Ti(l),LA is the logogram for bašātu, "to live," Knudtzon was inclined to read ti(l)-la-ta(m)/ti(m)/tu as Ti(l),LA plus phonetic complement. "Ti,LA is not equivalent to bašātu, but since the Canaanite scribes were not schooled in the proper use of logograms this of itself is not an entirely valid objection. Ebeling, however, immediately saw in the various spellings the word tillātū, "auxiliary" (cf. EA, p. 1590—although his translation, "Aufgebot," is not accurate; better is, e.g., Bezold, BG, p. 293: "Unterstützung," or Labat, Manuel d'Épigraphie Akkadienne, p. 325: "aide, auxiliaire, allié"), which is, of course, what is intended in all the passages where the word occurs (cf. ʾašu tillātim in Mari [e.g. ARM II, 68:3]). As here, tillātū most often stands alone (EA 73:4; 91:29, 34; 92:36; 103:25, 44; 104:15), but we find also ERIN MES tillati(m) (60:12; 82:18; 104:35; cf. the Mari equivalent mentioned above) and once LÚ MES ti-la-tam (92:22). It is clear from this latter reference that the word was considered a feminine singular noun even when combined with ERIN MES or LÚ MES (cf. the similar treatment of ʾašu pītātu). I have therefore decided to translate "auxiliary host" in all of the above citations.
Il. 20-22: Failing to understand that the construction of il. 20-21a is the same as that of lines 16-19, Knudtzon completely misinterpreted il. 20-22 (cf. EA, p. 367). Ebeling more nearly gave the correct meaning but nevertheless did not recognize the syntactic construction involved; moreover he included "machtig" three times in his translation, although KALAG,GA and its inverted equivalent occur only twice in the passage (cf. EA, p. 1590). We must render: "Who is his auxiliary host, that it is strong? (Only) because of the "Apiru is his auxiliary host strong!"

The treatment of the logograms in il. 21 well illustrates the carelessness (or perhaps ignorance) of the Canaanite scribes in this regard. damnat is once written KALAG,GA (correctly) and once GA,KALAG (incorrectly, probably because KALAG and GA greatly resemble one another). Also, although a plural is clearly intended, "Apiru is written simply LU,GAZ.

Il. 23. ušširūnani: Knudtzon (EA, p. 367) and Ebeling (ibid., p. 1383) understand this form as a plural, a judgment with which I readily concur (it can be parsed only as an energetic plural imperative with first person singular pronominal suffix); it must therefore be considered a plural of majesty (cf. tid[d]inū in il. 5 above) since it is addressed to the pharaoh. The form consists of an Akkadian imperative stem, ušširi-, to which have been added the Canaanite accoutrements -ū and -na and the common Semitic -ni. Strangely enough, Knudtzon (ibid., pp. 429,567) and Ebeling (loc.cit.) have both misconstrued ušširū in EA 90:45 and 134:23 as singular imperatives, an analysis which is, of course, impossible. They are again clearly plurals of majesty.

-ū is the Akkadian correspondent to Canaanite -u as the plural masculine imperative morpheme. Shall we, then, interpret the ubiquitous ušši-ra (which occurs at least twenty times in Rib-Haddi) as an Akkadian plural of majesty? Such an analysis is highly unlikely. It is far more preferable to see in uššira a singular imperative with the Akkadian ventive ending and to
translate "send to me!" An examination of all the passages in which ḫāṣīra appears bears out this interpretation without a single exception. On the other hand, ḫāṣir, as expected, always means "send (elsewhere)!" (except, perhaps, in EA 121:42 where, however, the context is somewhat broken). It is perhaps significant to note that, since ḫāṣīra of itself means "send to me!", we never find ḫāṣīra ana yâhî (contrast ḫāṣir ... ana Māâ in 120:36-37). Whenever the scribe wanted to emphasize the ventive ending, he resorted to a circumlocution; cf. 82:15: ḫāṣīra(m)mi ... ittiya (for itti meaning "to," cf. the note on 82:15; cf. also Ugaritic Mt bepr c-my in Gordon, UM II, Text 54:18-19); cf. also 136:17-19: ḫāṣīra ... ana ardika.

L. 23. tapal: Knudtzon's educated guess as to the meaning of this word ("Paar") turned out to be completely correct (cf. Landsberger in Or., NS 12, p. 153). My translation of tapal as "team" throughout should be understood as meaning a team of two - ˓sim/ndu in Akkadian, ˓md in Ugaritic and Hebrew (cf. Professor Held, JAOS 79, p. 170, n. 28).

L. 24. ERÎN MEŠ GÎR MEŠ: Cf. ERÎN MEŠ GÎR MEŠ - Mu-nu (EA 149:62) and ERÎN MEŠ GÎR (170:22). A comparison of the contexts of these three passages with those in which LÚ GÎR occurs (148:14, 26, 44; 151:69) leads to the conclusion that in Canaanite Amarna ERÎN MEŠ GÎR = LÚ GÎR (a fact not surprising in view of the easily demonstrable truth that LÚ often means "soldier" in Amarna; cf. the similar use of ˓mî and ˓mhîm in Biblical Hebrew). LÚ GÎR is, in turn, clearly equivalent to ˓în rashî, (Judges 20:2; II Samuel 3:4 = I Chronicles 13:4; I Chronicles 19:18), "foot soldier." Indeed, rashî alone may have the same meaning (I Samuel 4:10; 15:4; II Samuel 10:6; I Kings 20:29; II Kings 13:7; Jeremiah 12:5), although it may also denote simply a person on foot (Exodus 12:37; Numbers 11:21).
It should be noted that ANSE.KUR.RA at the beginning of this line refers to horses **fully equipped and including their riders**, the underlined phrase being necessarily implied in Rib-Haddi's request (likewise, when he asks for chariots, he intends for them to be manned and in full battle regalia). Thus in Jeremiah 12:5, for example, we must translate: "If with infantrymen thou hast run and they have wearied thee, then how canst thou contend with cavalrymen (hassûsim)?" Cf. also Hebrew paraš, which means both "horse" and "horseman."

11. 25-26. *i(z)siza* ... ina paniyu: *i/uzuzu i/ana pani*, "to withstand, resist," is found elsewhere in Rib-Haddi in EA 94:12; 105:26-27; "362:65. It is clearly the equivalent of Cámad b/lipsê in such passages as Joshua 10:8; 21:42; 25:9; Judges 2:14; II Kings 10:4; Esther 9:2; of hityasêb lipsê in, e.g., Joshua 1:5; and of qûm lipsê in, e.g., Joshua 7:12. Note also *'(y)b/qum* in Biblical Hebrew and in Ugaritic (cf. Cassuto, Tarbiz 14 [1943], p. 3).

*i(z)siza* is a good example of Moran's "volitive" (cf. the note on EA 70:22 above); it is first person singular here, exhibiting the characteristic ('i)-preformative already noted (cf. the note on *ile*<i> in 69:17). Moran's extensive researches in Amarna Byblian syntax have led him to "view yaqtil and yaqtila as essentially the same with the accidental difference of emphasis, the latter probably the more emphatic form" (SSDB, p. 105). In view of Moran's cautious statement I shall not attempt to represent the difference in my translations.

Additional examples of volitivs in the present letter are yupa(h)ira (1. 26) and *[y]ilqa (1. 30) which, with i(z)siza, are dependent upon uṣûrûnani (1. 23).

1. 25. Ûigata: This town is almost always mentioned together with Ambi/Ammi(ya) (as here; cf. ll. 29-30), whether in the Rib-Haddi correspondence (EA 74:24-25; 76:16-19; 95:44-45; 104:11-12, 40-41) or outside it (98:11-12, 15-16). Since in 104:10-12
both towns are mentioned along with Ardata which is located about 28 miles northeast of Byblos, it seems proper to seek the location of Shigata in the neighborhood of Ardata (for an attempt to locate Ambi/Ammi[ya], cf. the note on l. 31 below). The suggestion of Clausen apud Weber (EA, p. 1156) that modern Zegharta (five miles southeast of Tripoli and about 23 miles northeast of Byblos) is the site is intriguing, but the linguistic equation appears highly unlikely. It is, however, the best attempt thus far made to locate the site and I have nothing better to suggest.

It is clear from the present context that Rib-Haddi had journeyed to Shigata, probably with the purpose in mind of strengthening its defenses. In EA 90:9-10 he reminds the king that he had been there, although we cannot be sure that the same visit is meant.

L. 28. yupa(h)hira: Although this form, i(z)ziza (l. 25) and [y]'lq(1 (l. 30) are all built on the skeletons of Akkadian preterit forms, it is clear that the Canaanite scribes understood them as imperfect forms. Dİ in the present line is the equivalent of Hebrew (w)al (cf., e.g., I Samuel 12:19) or peh (cf., Genesis 24:6); for the syntax of i(z)ziza and [y]'lq(1, cf., e.g., I Kings 11:21. All of these Biblical examples contain imperfects that are dependent on imperatives (as in the present Amarna passage).

L. 31. Ambi: That Ambi and Ammi[ya] probably refer to the same village is clear from a comparison of all the passages in which the names occur (EA 71:31; 72:8,29; 73:27; 74:25; 75:33; 76:19; 81:13; 83:7; 95:45; 98:12,15; 102:20; 104:11,40). Petrie (op. cit., pp. 161-162,164) is thus unjustified in separating them. KURAm-m1-is (EA 139:14; 140:11) merely refers to the area immediately surrounding the village; cf. KUR-ga-ri-itKI (l:59) and [UR]U'ga-ri-ta (39:51).

As to the location of Ambi/Ammi[ya], my choice is modern Amyun (about eight miles southwest of Zegharta), but we cannot of course be sure. For another suggestion, cf. Weber et al., EA, p. 1156.
L. 31. [yi-is-bat]: Knudtzon's restoration is based on the parallel passage, EA 76:17-23; he has supported it by means of cogent arguments (EA, p. 368, n. b). The only improvement that I might suggest would be to restore instead [yi-is-ba-ta] in view of the preceding volitive forms. However, there does not appear to be enough space at the end of the line for so many signs, and thus Knudtzon's restoration is probably better.

L. 32: For the restoration, cf. EA 76:23: 

Sa ji-[z]-a-za (cf. already Moran, SSDB, p. 149, where, however, correct to y[i-za(!)]-za). Knudtzon's ji(!)-bar-za in 76:23 is not borne out by § 35:23, nor is such a form possible. Due to our inability to restore the sign(s) before SA(N)G the passage is obscure.

L. 33: Knudtzon's restoration is virtually certain (cf. EA 74:63; 81:50-51; 90:22; 91:25-26; 104:36-37; 117:92; 119:14; 122:48-49; 130:30-31,36; 134:15), but his translation ("[Dean] was w'dt er t[un?]"), however tentative, is impossible (so also in 119:17-18). Had the subject been third person singular masculine, Rib-Haddi's scribe would have written yi-pu-bu (cf. mīna yi-pu-bu in 73:19; 74:41). My normalization, i(p)p[ušna], assumes an Akkadian present skeleton with Canaanite pre- and sufformatives. (Henceforth in such cases I shall let my normalizations speak for themselves.)

L. 34-35: In view of EA 76:21-22, Knudtzon's restoration may again be pronounced correct. The phrase ašar [ir]rubu, in which ašar governs the subjunctive, is perfect Akkadian (cf., e.g., CH, § 123: ašar išdinu, "the place where he made the deposit"), although of course it must be admitted that the Canaanite scribe may have known nothing of the Akkadian construction and simply ended the verb with his own indicative morpheme.

Ana mu(h)ni[Nu] in l. 35 is equivalent to ana S[Nu] in EA 76:22. Since Hebrew ל occasionally means "because of" (cf.
I am inclined to render ana ạmụ "because of him" in this case as the only translation that makes sense in context. Where l^c^- means "because of," it is equivalent to min with that meaning; note that in Ugaritic (wherein "min is unattested) l(a)- and b(a)- are the only words for "from" (cf. Gordon, UM I, pp. 75-76). Noting that ana muhhi may at times have the force of ištú muhhi (cf., e.g., EA 118:35-36 with 91:18-19), we are surely to translate ana muhhi in 71:35 in the sense of ištú pani (cf. Hebrew mippînè!) in 108:56, namely, "because of." min and ạl both may mean "because of" in Hebrew (cf. BDB, pp. 580 and 754, for details); the fact that ạl (ištú/ana muhhi) is apparently unattested with such a meaning may perhaps be considered accidental.
RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH
(VAT 1712 - S 34 - EA 72)

Obverse
(five or six lines missing)
(1) [ ]
    lu-ú] i-de LUGALru
    [ENli i-nu-ma KALAG] GA nu-kúr-tum
    [ša-a mIr-A-bi-ir-ta] UGU-ia
    [ ] ki-ma URU Ir-q[a-ta]
(5) [ ]
    ]ù URU Ar-[da-ta]
    [ ] a-na ša-a-šu
    [ ]-ú URU Gub-la
    URU Am-bi û
    [uš-Mi-ra] qa-du ERINMES pi-[tä-ti]
(10) [û mi-na i-pu-šu-na] a-na-ku i-na
    [i-de-ni-ia] ni en [ ]
    [š]a-ni-tam [ ]
    [ ] ti eš [ ]
    [ ] ka [ ]
(15-16) [ ]
(edge) [ ]

Reverse
(18-24) [ ]
(25) [ ]
    JMES [ ]
    [uš-Mi-[ra]]
ra ki [ ]

URU Am-bi

(30) [ ERINMEY pí-tá-ti ]

URU Su-mu]-ri KI

LOMEMEY [G]AZMEY

(33-34) [ ]

(remainder broken away)
(five or six lines missing)

(1) [lū] ide Yarru [beli inûma dann]at nukurtum

[Ma 'Abdi-'Aḥiyrta]a muhhiya [ ] kîma 'Irq[ata] (5)
[ ] 'Ar[data] [ ] ana ḫāṣu [ ]

]u Gubla [ ] Ambi [u 'uṣṣira ]

qadu sabi pi[tâti (10) û mîna i(p)puṣûna] anaku ina [îdîniya

] ni en [ ] anîtam [ ] ti eṣ [ ]

] ka [ ] (15)

(20)

(25) ] uṣṣira ra Yarru Malûsê

tapâl sî]sî [gadu] narkabâti [ ] ra ki [ ]

] Ambi (30) [ ] sabi pi[tâti [ ]

Sumu]ri [ ] 'Al[p[i]rî [ ]

] (35) (remainder broken away)

(five or six lines missing)

(1) [May] the king, [my lord,] know [that severe] is the hostility [of 'Abdi-Ashtar]a against me! [ ]

like 'Irq[ata (5)] and Ar[data ] for

himself [ ] Byblos [ ] Ambi. So

[send me ] together with an ar[cher] host. (10) [For

what can] I [do] by [myself?

Further, [ ]

(15)

(20)

(25)

Send me, O king, thirty teams of horses, [together with]
chariots! [ ] Ambi (30)
[ an arçher [host Simy]ra [ ] (35)
(remainder broken away)

* * *
LL. 1-3: My restoration, though highly tentative, is based on EA 76:7-9; 78:7-9; 81:6-7. It is, therefore, at least better than that of Knudtzon, for which there are no parallels. It appears that Knudtzon was led astray by his hesitant reading of the first sign in l. 3 as the end of a KAL-sign (cf. EA, p. 369, n. e), whereas the traces, considering the very bad state of preservation of the tablet together with the fact that the sign appears on its broken edge, leave room for the possibility that we are to read [T]A. The citations listed above indicate that perhaps five or six lines are missing from the beginning of this badly damaged text, only the right half of which remains at all. Since EA 76, 78, and 81 were addressed by Rib-Haddi to the pharaoh, it follows that EA 72 was similarly addressed (a fact demonstrably certain from other considerations within the preserved portion). For possible restorations of the initial five or six lines, cf. the salutations of the abovementioned three letters. I have decided to retain Knudtzon's line count in order to facilitate comparison with his edition as well as with Schroeder's autograph.

L. 4: Due to the lack of suitable parallels it is virtually impossible to restore the first half of this line. The presence of URU Ir-q[a-ta] (or perhaps URU Ir-q[at]---cf. EA 88:6) makes it plausible to assume that a reference to Simyra is nearby (cf. 62:13-14, 22-23; 103:11-13, 34-36; 140:10-15; and note especially Genesis 10:17-18 and I Chronicles 1:15-16 for cArqā in context with Sēmārā), but there is no way of ascertaining its exact position on the tablet as it was originally. At any rate, the restoration of the city-name cIrqata is certain at the end of the line; only its spelling is debatable.

The village itself, modern Tell cArqah, was "an important and very ancient Phoenician city just north of Tripoli" (Albright, JPOS VIII [1928], p. 245; cf. also Petrie, op. cit., p. 171; Wilson in ANET², p. 241 and especially n. 41). EA 100 is a
letter written from Irqata to the pharaoh. The town is so well known from both cuneiform and Egyptian sources that it is unnecessary to multiply citations. There are also Latin, Greek, and Talmudic references to the site (cf. Weber, EA, p. 1143). For the relative position of Irqata and Ardata (for which cf. the note below) with reference to Byblos, cf. WHAB¹, Plate III.

L. 5: Every certain reference to Ardata in Amarna (EA 75:30-34; 88:5-8; 104:10-13; 139:14-15; 140:10-14) finds also Ambi/Ammi(ya) in the immediate context, as here. The restoration of this city-name is thus far more likely than AR-WA-DA; as in the case of Irqata in the preceding line, however, the spelling is uncertain (cf. Ar-da-at in 88:5). For the location of Ardata (known also from Egyptian inscriptions; cf., e.g., Wilson in ANET², p. 239), cf. the preceding note.

L. 6. ana Ṣasu: This phrase increases the probability that my restoration of ll. 1-3 is correct, since it refers in all likelihood to Abdı-Ashırta.

L. 9. gadu: C. H. Gordon (UM I, p. 83) states that Ugaritic "yd 'hand' can be used prepositionally to mean 'with' (like Acc. qa-du)." While it is true that yd meaning "together with" is found in certain non-poetic Ugaritic texts (cf., e.g., Gordon's Text 170:8-9: C Br ksdm yd lmdhm lqh C Br mhm yd lmdhm), there is no evidence connecting gadu with Akkadian gatu, "hand," which is apparently what Gordon has in mind.

Ll. 10-11. [u mina i(p)pušuna] anāku ina [Idēniya]: Knudtzon's restoration here is quite plausible; cf. EA 74:63-64; 81:50-51; 90:22-23; 134:15-16. ana is substituted for ina in this phrase in 91:25-26; with ana Idēniya Moran suggestively compares Hebrew lēbaddā (SSDB, p. 17).

i/ana Idēniya is dialectal in Amarna for (w)ediśemya (later 𒌢ashire; cf. von Soden, GAG, §§ 67 f, 71 c; cf. further CAD 4, p. 27), the root being *whd. In EA 90 we find both ina Idēniya

---

¹ WHAB: World History of the Ancient Orient
² ANET: Ancient Near East Texts
(l. 23) and ina _EXPRESSION_ (l. 8), attesting once more the ease with which the _i_- and _e_-vowels interchange in Canaanite Amarna. The _e_-prefix on this word is, of course, more original (von Soden, GAG, § 9 a).

L. 27: The restorations (made by Knudtzon), though mere guesses, are partially supported by EA 107:40-41, as he himself notes (EA, p. 370, n. a). Rib-Haddi elsewhere requests the same number of horses from the pharaoh (85:19-20; 90:45-46).

Ll. 28-29: A possible restoration here is [u3-si]-ra \_ki-\-[ma ar-hi-im] (cf. probably EA 78:37-38), but the uncertainties are so numerous and the context so broken that the passage is perhaps best left unrestored.

Ll. 30-31: These plausible restorations are Knudtzon's. That Simyra should appear in this letter is to be expected (cf. the note on l. 4 above).
Obverse

(1) a-na \(^{m}A\)-ma-an-Ap-pa a-bi-ia
um-ma \(^{m}ni-ib-Ad-da\) DUMU-ka-ma
a-na G\(\text{IR}^{MES}\) a-bi-ia am-qú-ut
\(d\text{NIN}^{sa}\) URU Gub-la ti-din

(5) ba-aš-ta-[k[a]] i-na pa-ni
LUGAL\(^{ri}\) EN-ka a-na mi-nim
qa-la-ta ū la-a táq-bu
a-na LUGAL\(^{ri}\) EN\(^{li}\)-ka
ū tu-sa-na qa-du ERÍN\(^{MES}\)

(10) pí-tá-ti ū ti-ma-qú-tu
UGU KUR\(^{Amur-ri}\) Šum-ma
ti-ib-mu-na a-sé-mi ERÍN\(^{MES}\)
pí-tá-ti ū i-zi-bu URU\(^{MES}\)-šu-nu
ū pa-at-ru at-ta ū-ul

(15) ti-i-de KUR\(^{Amur-ri}\) i-nu-ma
a-Sar da-an-ni ti-la-ku-na
ū an-nu-uš i-na-an-nu
[ū]-ul i-ra-a-mu a-na \(^{m}Ir-A-yi-ir-ta\)
[m]i-na [y]i-pu-šu(!) a-na ša-[š]u-nu

Reverse

[ū] mu-ša-am a-sé ERÍN\(^{MES}\)
pí-tá-ti ū ni-ti-pu-uš
a-na qa-a-ge u ka-li
LÜMEH ha-za-nu-te tu-ba-ú-na

(25) i-pi-iš an-nu-tum a-na mR-A-Mi-ir-ta
i-nu-ma yi-iš-ta-pár a-na LÜMEH
URU Am-mi-ia du-ku-mi EN-ku-nu
ù in-né-ep-Šu a-na
LÜMEH GAZ ki-na-na ti-iq-bu-na

(30) LÜMEH ha-za-nu-tum k-na-na
yi-pu-Šu a-na ia-Ši-nu
ù ti-né-pu-Šu ka-li KURMEH
a-na LÜMEH GAZ ù qí-ba-mi
a-wa-tam an-ni-ta a-na pa-ni

(35) LUGAL ri ENlI-ka i-nu-ma
a-bu ù be-lu at-ta-ma
a-na ia-ši ù a-na ka-tam
pa-ni-ia na-ad-na-ti
ti-i-de pa-ar-sa-ia

(40) i-nu-ma i-ba-ša-ta i-na
(edge) [U]RU [S]u-mu-ra i-nu-ma
[IR][k]i-it-ti-ka a-na-ku

(45) ia-ši ki-ma ar-ši-š
(1) ana 'Aman-'Appa abiya umma Rîb-(H)adda mārikama ana Șepe
abiya amqut Bēltu șa Gubla ti(d)in (5) bāṣṭak[a] ina pani șarri
bēlika ana mânim qālāta û lā taqbu ana șarri bēlika û tūṣa(n)na
qadu sabi (10) piṭāti û tima(q)qutu muḥhi 'Amurri șumma tiasmūna
aṣemi sabi piṭāti û i(z)zibū ăláníşunu û paṭrū attā ul (15) tīde
'Amurri inūma aṣar danni ti(1)lakūna û annuš inanna ul ira' 'amū
ana ĞAbdi- 'Aṣırtta [m]īna [y]ıpušu(!) ana yâm[û]unu (20) [u]
tuba'una urra [u] mūsam aṣe sabi piṭāti û nīt(p)puš ana șase
û kali amīlûte ḥazānūte tuba'una (25) ipīš annūtum ana ĞAbdi-
'Aṣırtta inūma yiṣṭapar ana amīlūt Ammiya dūkūmi bēlkunu û
tiqbuna ḥazānūtum kīna(n)na
innepšû ana amīlûti ĞApirī kīna(n)na yıpušu ana șašinu û
ti(n)ne(p)pušû kali māṭāti ana amīlûti ĞApirī û qiba(m)mi awatam
annīta ana pani (35) șarri bēlika inūma abu û bēlu attāma ana
yâši û ana kāṭam paniya nadnāṭi tīdeضارغ (40) inūma
iba(û)šata ina [5]umura inūma [ar]ad [k]ittika anāku û qibi ana
șarri bēli[ka] û [t]ıwu(û)ša Ğar [ra] tillatu [ana] (45) yâši kīma
ărhiš
(1) To Aman-Appa, my "father": Thus Rib-Haddi, thy "son."
At the feet of my "father" I have fallen. May the Lady of Byblos
grant (5) th[es] honor in the presence of the king, thy lord!
Why hast thou kept silent and not spoken to the king, thy lord,
so that thou mightest come out together with an archer (10) host
and attack Amurru? If they hear of the coming out of the archer
host, then they will leave their cities and defect; (for) as for
thee, dost thou not (15) know Amurru, that they follow the
strong(er) party? Moreover, behold now, they are not devoted
to ḡAbdi-Ashtira; (now) [w]hat [wil]l he do to th[e]m? (20)
[And so] they seek day and night the coming out of the archer
host, so that we might turn ourselves over to it. Moreover, all
the mayors seek (25) to do these things to ḡAbdi-Ashtira! Since
he has written to the people of Ammiya, "Kill your lord and turn
yourselves over to the ḡApiru!", thus say (30) the mayors: "Thus
he will do (also) to us, and all the lands will be turned over
to the ḡApiru!" Therefore be sure to mention this matter before
(35) the king, thy lord, for "father" and lord art thou to me
and to thee I have directed my hope. Thou didst become
acquainted with my conduct (40) when thou wast in [S]imiya, that
thy [l]oyal [ser]vant am I. Therefore speak to the king, [thy]
lord, that an auxiliary host be [dis]patch[ed] [to] (45) me
without delay!

* * *
L. 1. 'Aman-'Appa: To the Egyptologist, this name is perspicuous. It represents Egyptian 'mn-(m-)'pīt which means "Amon Is in Luxor" (cf. Weber, EA, p. 1158; Friedrich, Or., NS 11 [1942], p. 113; and especially Albright, JNES 5, p. 9 for additional bibliographical references). He was a high Egyptian official (residing for a time in Simyra; cf. EA 73:39-42) during the latter part of the reign of Amen-hotep III (cf. 117:21-26), as Albright has noted (loc. cit.). His name (Greek 'Amenōphis; cf. Weber, loc. cit.) is identical to that of his royal overlord (cf. Campbell, Bib. Arch. 23/1 [1960], p. 13).

Judging from the contents of the letters that Rib-Haddi wrote to him (EA 73, 77, 82, 86, 87, and 93---and possibly also 69, q.v.), Aman-'Appa's responsibilities were politico-military. Rib-Haddi held him in high esteem (74:51-53), as the salutation of the present letter clearly shows. For the possibility that Aman-'Appa was the author of EA 96 (addressed to Rib-Haddi), cf. Weber, EA, p. 1190.

Il. 1-3: In this salutation Rib-Haddi refers to Aman-'Appa as his "father" and to himself as the latter's "son" (cf. also EA 82:1-4), whereas in 87:1-4 the terms are "lord" and "servant" respectively. Although Weber (EA, p. 1158) correctly noted that "father" and "son" are here used only as terms of respect and are not to be understood literally, he apparently failed to realize that when so used "father" is equivalent to "lord" and "son" to "servant." This becomes immediately clear upon examination of EA 158, a letter written from ʿAziru to Tūtu (cf. also EA 164). Note particularly the following passages: an[a] Tūtu bēliya abī[ya] umma ʿAziru mārika arīka, "T[o] Tūtu, my lord, [my] 'father': Thus ʿAziru, thy 'son,' thy servant" (158:1-2); [a]mur attā abīya ʿū bēliya [ū] a[a]aku mārika, "[Be]hold, thou art my 'father' and my lord [and] I am thy 'son!'" (Il. 14-15).

Now the real father of ʿAziru was, of course, ʿAbdi-Ashirta (cf., e.g., 107:26-27), so that "thy 'son,' thy servant" can only be
understood as a handiadys meaning "thy servant." Likewise, "my 'father' and my lord" means simply "my lord." Indeed, even in the present letter the matter is reasonably clear, for in ll. 36-37 we read: *abu ā bēlu attāma ana yābī, "'Father' and lord thou art to me."

Examples of this phenomenon elsewhere in Semitics are legion. In Akkadian, for example, we note *Kudur-Mabuk abu Emuthala (EA 11, p. 92, 1:1-2); cf. also, in Mari, *abu bītim = bēl bitim, and abbū Hana, "the rulers (Arabic /quyu/) of Hana"; in Hebrew, cf., e.g., II Kings 5:13; in Ugaritic, note that El is called ab adm in Korét and ab šnm (= nšm?) in Bācal and *Aqhat; and in Phoenician cf. especially *Azitawadda i:12-13; Kilamuwa 10-11.

If in Amarna "father" is used as a term of respect when an underlying addresses his superior, it is logical to assume that "brother" would be used as a term of respect between equals, and such is indeed the case. *Cāziru, for example, refers to himself and Hā'ay as mutual "brothers" (EA 166:1-2). Rib-Haddi likewise made metaphorical use of ahu (cf., e.g., 106:13-16), a use which of course is not at all foreign to Hebrew 'āh (cf. especially Amos 1:9) or Phoenician 'h (cf. the Kilamuwa reference already noted).

L. 9. *tusa(n)na: Second person masculine singular imperfect indicative (*tahṣiu) plus the energetic ending (-anna). The form is Canaanite, exhibiting the original waw as the initial consonant of the root.

L. 10. *tima(q)gutu: Knudtzon expressed uncertainty regarding this form: "herfiest (od. sic herfielen)" (EA, p. 371), an uncertainty shared by Ebeling (ibid., p. 1461). The form must be second person masculine singular imperfect indicative (a hybrid form), however, since third person plural in the present context would be *timaggutūna on the basis of Moran's researches.
mãqatũ muhhi here answers to Hebrew nāpāl ụl/bē-, "to attack" (cf., e.g., Jeremiah 48:32).

Ll. 11-14: Because of his failure to recognize the Canaanite construction involved here, Knudtzon misunderstood this passage. tiṣmūna and pātrū are Canaanite forms, while i(z)ṣībū is Akkadian; all are plurals and refer to Amurru (here conceived as a sort of plurale tantum). The translation can only be: "If they hear of the going out of the archer host, then they will leave their cities and depart." The context immediately following indicates the meaning to be that the people of Amurru, though now under the oppressive control of cAbdi-Ashirta, will leave him and join forces with the royal archers as soon as they arrive, since their loyalty always resides with whomever they deem to be stronger at the moment. ū pātrū is a clear example of waw-conversive with the perfect (cf. Albright and Moran, JCS II, p. 245, n. 12).

Ll. 12-13. ašēmī sābi pītātī: This is a striking example of the Canaanite practice of attaching an enclitic mem to a nomen regens. The Masoretic vocalization has obscured the same phenomenon in Biblical Hebrew, although once alerted to its presence the investigator has no trouble finding many certain attestations of it. Examples are likewise not lacking in Ugaritic. H. L. Ginsberg was the first to note this phenomenon in Hebrew and Ugaritic (cf. Tarbiz 4 [1932], p. 386; The Ugarit Texts, Jerusalem [1936], p. 130). See now the summary by H. D. Hummel, JBL 76 (1957), pp. 85 ff. (though not all of his examples are convincing). Examples hitherto not noted are found in II Kings 3:4 and Ezekiel 22:18 (these were pointed out to me by Professor Held). In Ugaritic cf., e.g., II AB, 1:28-29; II K, i-ii:10 (contrast ibid., l. 20). For enclitic -m in Phoenician see Friedrich, Phönizisch-punische Grammatik (Rome, 1950), p. 141.

L. 14. pātrū: In standard Akkadian, pātāru means "to loosen, untie" (opposite of rakāsu), and hence by extension "to ransom,
to forgive (sins, debts, etc.)" (see now CAD 7, pp. 171 ff.).
Already in the Mari dialect of Old Babylonian, however, *patarum*
had come to mean "to depart, desert" (ARM XV, pp. 243 ff.),
probably in the sense of "to dismantle (one's tent/dwelling)"
(cf. von Soden, GAG, § 184 d). As is clear from the present
passage, Rib-Haddi employed the verb in the same elliptic sense.
The Hebrew Bible has at least one example of *pater* meaning "to
depart" (I Samuel 19:10), which connotation the root also has
frequently in Late Hebrew and Aramaic. What is perhaps more
significant, however, is that Biblical Hebrew exhibits a similar
ellipsis in the case of the verb *nasaʾ* which, though literally
meaning "to pull up/out," is commonly used in the sense of "to
depart" (literally, "to pull up [tent-pegs]"). This resemblance
to the elliptic usage of *pataru* is even more striking when it is
noted that *nasahu*, the Akkadian semantic equivalent of Hebrew and
Phoenician *neʾ*, is frequently found in parallelism with *patahu*
(cf., e.g., IV R, 17:57-58: *ennessu lippatir arasāšu linnasāšu*,
"May his transgression be forgiven, his sin eradicated!"). Note
also *nasahu/nesu* (cf. Hebrew-Phoenician *neʾ*) (e.g., *Surpu*, IV:14)
and *patahu/nesu* (e.g., *KAR*, 31, r. 3-4).

II. 15-16. *inūma ašar danni ti(l)akūna*: Moran translates
this phrase "... that it follows the stronger party" (SSDB, p.
53). Such a rendering is quite adequate, for although "to follow,"
when utilizing the verb *alāku*, is expressed in Akkadian by *alāku*
warzī or *alāku ana pī* (cf. von Soden, AHw, p. 32), it must be
noted that since in Hebrew *hālak* 'āhār/ahārē means "to follow"
and since *atr* and *ahr* are equivalent particles in Ugaritic meaning
"after," *alāku ašar* may well be a Canaanism in the sense of "to
follow" (cf., significantly, Ugaritic *hīk* ≠ *atr* in I K:94-95;
182-183). Another possibility (though less likely) is that *ašar*
here means "to" (as often at Nuzi; cf. von Soden, AHw, p. 83).
This is Ebeling's choice (EM, p. 1381).
My sole quarrel with Moran's translation is that ti(l) lakūna can only be plural here. It may be, however, that since the publication of his fine article, "New Evidence on Canaanite taqthu(ka)" (JCS V [1951], pp. 33-35), he would agree fully with my analysis of the form.

L. 17. annu ana inanna: This phrase, found only in Amarna and then only in Rib-Haddi's dialect (EA 74:8, 23, 29; 75:32; 76:33-34), apparently means "behold now!" (so von Soden, AHw, p. 54). annu must then be related to annu, "behold!", but the exact significance of the -(u) ending escapes me.

L. 18. It is not necessary to translate this line as a question, as does Knaudtzen (EA, p. 371). In fact, to do so misses the point. That the people of Amurru "are not devoted to 'Abdi-Ashirta" is clear from the fact that "they follow the stronger party" (l. 16).

ira'āmū is from the verb rāmu/ra'āmu, which is unrelated to the common Semitic root *rhm (contra Ebeling, BA VIII/2 [1912], p. 43, and others). The latter root, meaning "to have/show compassion," occurs as rāmu in Akkadian (see Mullo Weir, A Lexicon of Accadian Prayers [1934], p. 283), whereas rāmu/ra'āmu means "to love" (ibid., p. 278). Partly responsible for the confusion is the fact that in Aramaic rāhem means "to love." A spelling such as i-ra-ha-mu-yu (EA 106:40) is merely an orthographic attempt to represent the glottal stop. The semantic equivalent of ra'āmu in Biblical Hebrew is of course 'āhāb (note Ugaritic rāmt/aht in V AB, C:1-4). ra'āmu/ra'āmu ordinarily takes a direct object in standard Akkadian; ra'āmu ana, then, as in the present passage, seems to be a Canaanism (cf. 'āhāb i6 in Leviticus 19:18, 34; II Chronicles 19:2).

L. 19. BB 15 here reads [i]-na-[n]a aš-bu-na a-na a-[u]-nu, which makes very little sense contextually and for which the anomalous "ašbuna has no parallel support (the energetic -na is


Both bu'û, "to seek," and qu'û, "to await," belong to a group of verbs (mostly weak) denoting an attitude of expectation. They occur only in the II-stem (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 88 h). The Hebrew cognate of qu'û is qîwā (for Akkadian forms containing waw as the middle radical, cf. von Soden, GAG, § 106 u) which, except for a few qal participial forms, is always found in the Pikkû conjugation in the Bible.

L. 21. asē: The Old Babylonian construct of final weak infinitives exhibits a final -e (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 64 i); there is nothing in Canaanite Amarna which might cause us to alter this vocalization. A form like asē, however (accusative construct infinitive in EA 70:26), is under Canaanite influence.

L. 22. nîti(p)puw: A slightly Canaanized I2 present Akkadian form. Knudtzon's translation of nîti(p)puw ana ṣaše (ll. 22-23) as a direct quotation is forced and unnecessary.

L. 23. ṣaše: This third person singular feminine dative pronoun is Rib-Haddi dialectal for ṣaši (cf. further ṣaši-še in EA 120:37). Referring to ṣaši, it strengthens our understanding of the latter as a feminine singular noun in Canaanite Amarna.
The claim of W 57 that it refers to גAziru is impossible; גAziru was a male personality and moreover is nowhere in view in the present letter.

1. 24. LU\₁ME\₂\₁\₂ hazanūte: This phrase could be rendered "men of mayorality" (i.e., "mayors"), understanding hazanūte as an abstract noun in the genitive case. In 1. 30, however, we find LU\₁ME\₂ hazanūtum, and it becomes immediately clear that case in such instances is determined not by LU\₁ME\₂ but by syntactic position. LU\₁ME\₂, then, is to be regarded either as a simple determinative, or, perhaps what is more likely, as a noun in apposition to what follows (cf. standard Hebrew practice in such phrases as 'אִשׁ סֵאֶר, Exodus 2:14; 'אִשׁ קֹהֶן, Leviticus 21:9; 'אִשׁ סֵאֶרֶס, Jeremiah 38:7; 'אִשׁ נָבִי, Judges 6:8). Of course in phrases like LU\₁ME\₂ Ammīya (11. 26-27) LU\₁ME\₂ is clearly a nomen regens. In the present case, however, it is best left untranslated. hazanūte, then, is casus obliquus plural, and although hazanūtum is ordinarily preceded by LU\₁ME\₂ it occasionally stands alone (cf., e.g., EA 89:57). An alternate plural hazanū is also attested (cf., e.g., 114:47-48; 137:13); this phenomenon is paralleled by the two possible normalizations of LU\₁ME\₂ itself, viz. amīlūtu and amīlū (cf. *362:35: LU\₁ME\₂-tu with iīd., 1. 38: LU\₁ME\₂-ii). Since in Akkadian proper -ūtu is a plural ending only on adjectives and pronouns, we are perhaps justified in assuming that in Canaanite Amarna the indiscriminate use of -ūtu on both nouns and adjectives is due to the fact that no distinction in plural endings existed among the Canaanite peoples.

According to Albright and Moran (JCS II, p. 243, n. 5), hazanū (which they incorrectly normalize as "hazanu") is "derived from old hazi'ānu, a form like Old Babylonian da'ākānu, 'murderer,' etc., where -unu is added to the participle to indicate professional status." Now that the available evidence has been conveniently summarized in CAD 6 (pp. 163-165), however, we know that such an analysis proceeded on the basis of false assumptions. In terms of
the history of Akkadian, ḥazī'ānu is not "old"; its earliest attestations are Middle Assyrian, while its correspondent from the Ur III period, ḥazā(n)nu, precedes it by several hundred years. As CAD cogently states (loc. cit., p. 165), ḥazī'ānu can only be understood as an artificial back formation of *ḥzy by way of popular etymology. ḥazanu/hazānu is thus not even participial, nor is the nun an adjunct but rather one of the radical consonants. Cf. particularly the spelling ḥazānu in PRU III, 16.346:10: Lū ha-a(z)-z[a]-nu a-na ū-šu ul [irrub], "The m[a]ly[c]r must not [enter] his house" (for other attestations of ḥazānu in PRU III, cf. 15.137:15; 15.157:22; 16.250:18). Note also Late Hebrew ḥazān, Aramaic ḥazzanā', "synagogue servant, cantor," which must be a loanword from Akkadian (cf. Zimmern, Fremdwörter, pp. 6-7).

ḥazanu/hazānu appears only rarely in Old Babylonian, where it seems mostly to be replaced by rabi'ānum (cf., e.g., Ch, §§ 23, 24). That Rib-Haddi was himself a ḥazānu is clear from passages such as EA 157:13 wherein he refers to the other mayors in the pharaoh's domain as his "brother(s)." Cf. also particularly 125:31-32: a(m)šini yišṭakanūni šarru kīma anšēlūti ḥazānu, "Why has the king appointed me as a mayor?"

L. 25. annātum: If our interpretation of ll. 23-25 is correct, we expect annāti(m) here (for *awāti/o annāti, "these things"). We note, however, ūlu annātu in EA 101:26 and 104:46 instead of the expected ūlu annātu (since ūlu is feminine in Canaanite Amarna; cf. the note on Malmat Gubla in 68:10 supra). It seems, therefore, that adjectives were not always carefully distinguished by the Byblian scribes as to gender. That in the present instance dēgarīm was in the mind of the scribe when he wrote annūtum is far less likely (cf. awātam annīta in l. 34). -tum for -tim here, though not unique, is unusual; except in the matter of phonetic complements on logograms, Rib-Haddi's scribes were quite scrupulous in their representation of case endings.
The meaning of the present passage, as determined by context, seems to be that all of Rib-Haddi's fellow mayors were seeking to betray 'Abd-Ashirta by joining forces with Egyptian troops.

L. 27. ḫūḥū: The verb is Akkadian, but this plural imperative form is Canaanite (the Akkadian equivalent is ḫūkhā, contra Dhorme, RB, Volume XI [1914], p. 56).

L. 28. innepēnū: Moran (SSDB, p. 150) interprets this verb as another imperative and includes its clause within the scope of the direct quotation beginning in l. 27. By so doing he reverts to the original interpretation of BB (p. xlii), which is certainly correct (contra Knudtzon). As an imperative, the form is Canaanite; cf., e.g., ẖēmēnū for 'hināmēnū. IVa imperatives of prime weak unlauted verbs in standard Akkadian are lacking, but the Akkadian equivalent of innepēnū would probably be *nea(n)pehā (cf. von Soden, GAG, Paradigms 15, 17).

L. 29. kīnā(n)na: The suggestion of Dhorme (RB, NS Volume 11 [1914], p. 363) that this word, meaning "thus," contains the element represented by Hebrew ḵēn is probably correct (note Hebrew ḵēs-h / ḵēn [ḵēs-h being equivalent to Akkadian/Amarna epēnū] in, e.g., Deuteronomy 7:19). Besides its abundant attestation in Biblical Hebrew, ḵēn apparently occurs also in Ugaritic (BH, ii:54-55) and appears in Phoenician in the combination lkn (Harris, GPL, p. 111). kīnanna, then, is perhaps composed of *kīnā, "thus, so," plus the energetic element -anna. Less plausible is the claim of BG that kīnanna is to be connected with Akkadian kī (p. 154).

L. 31. yābēnu: Together with yātnu (EA 74:26) this form is an example of what von Soden has termed "schlechte Neubildungen" (GAG, § 41 j, n. 16). The process of development, however, is by no means unparalleled. The Canaanite first common plural suffix -nu was simply attached to the oblique Akkadian first person singular pronouns yāni and yāti; in much the same way, the secondarily formed pronoun ẖnn, "we," was probably fashioned
originally from ח, "I," and פָּה, "we." This latter phenomenon, though appearing in Hebrew and Phoenician, is not specifically Canaanite, since it is attested also in Aramaic (whence also in Akkadian as an/šnu, etc.; cf. von Soden, CAG, § 41 j, n. 15; AHW, p. 51) and Syriac.

Ll. 32-33: Again I must agree with BB (p. xlix) that this clause is a part of the direct quotation beginning at the end of l. 30 (contra Knudtzon; cf. the note on innepšù in l. 28).

L. 33. qiba(m)mi: While it may be stretching a point to insist on ventive force here ("speak for me"), one may reasonably seek for examples of ventive imperatives in Biblical Hebrew (cf., e.g., Jeremiah 49:11; Psalm 26:2; 141:3).

L. 34. a-wa-tam: Not a-wa-tú (Knudtzon). The UD-sign rarely if ever has the value *TÚ in Rib-Haddi.

Ll. 35-38: To read imma ... nadtāti as a direct quotation (as does Knudtzon) makes very little sense. It can scarcely be denied that Rib-Haddi intends to refer to Amun-Appa, not the pharaoh, as "father and lord" (cf. the note on ll. 1-3 supra).

L. 37. ana ka-tam: Again, not ka-tú (Knudtzon; cf. EA 90:26: ana ka-ta; cf. also the note on l. 34 supra; cf. Ebeling, EA, p. 1437). As Albright and Moran have noted, kəta(m) is "the regular form of the second sg. independent pronoun in the oblique cases" in Rib-Haddi (JCS II, pp. 242-243). This is contrary to standard Akkadian practice, wherein in the later dialects kəta is genitive-accusative and kəša is dative (cf., e.g., ana kəša in *370:4 published by C. H. Gordon in Or. 16, p. 5). The Rib-Haddi usage undoubtedly reflects Canaanite idiom, which cannot be expected to make such fine distinctions.

L. 38. paniya nadtāti: The expression is genuinely Canaanite. "To set one's face, to direct one's attention," with various nuances, is expressed in Ugaritic by ytn pnm, and whereas in Hebrew we find usually šām pānim, cf. II Chronicles 20:3 for
nātan pāna (cf. Cassuto, Anath, p. 33). The same concept in Akkadian is expressed by uzna Ṣākānu (cf., e.g., Ishtar's Descent, ll. 2-3) or pānī/a Ṣākānu (cf., e.g., CH. §§ 148, 168).

L. 39. parsāya: In standard Akkadian this accusative suffixial form would be more simply parsī. The form in our text reflects the extended use made of the -ya suffix in Canaanite Amarna (cf. the note on ṣēliya in EA 68:9). We normally expect such a suffix only on genitive nouns when employed in the singular.

The various nuances of parsu were first clearly delineated by Landsberger in AK I, pp. 73, 75; ibid., II, pp. 64-65; Symb. Kosch., p. 222, n. 16; ibid., p. 223. "Religious obligation, divine power, ritual/secular custom, rite" are all attested as legitimate connotations of the word. parsu appears to have an Arabic isogloss in fard/farīda, "religious duty" (see Delitzsch, HWE, p. 544). In Rib-Haddi's correspondence the word has the idea of "custom, habit, manner," especially clear in the phrase kī(m)ā parsu ʾa a(b)būtī-[y]a/ka, "according to the custom of [m]y/thy fathers" (EA 117:82; 116:40-41). It is this phrase that draws me irresistibly to the conclusion that the semantic equivalent of parsu in Hebrew is miṣpāt, which, beside referring to an authoritative ordinance or regulation, whether divine or human, which must be obeyed, has also the meaning "custom, manner." When preceded by kā- (as often; cf. BDB, p. 1049, for references) it provides a perfect parallel to kī(m)ā parsu. II Kings 17:34 (wherein kammiṣpatīm harāḏsonīm = Akkadian kīma parsī labirūti!) conveniently employs miṣpāt both in the sense of "custom" and of "ordinance." Note particularly I Samuel 8:9: miṣpāt hammeleḵ = Akkadian parsu ḫa marri; Jeremiah 8:7: miṣpāt YHWH = parsu ḫa ili; Exodus 26:30: mūpt (hammiṣkān) = parsu ekurri; and others.

L. 40. iba(#)ṣata: The Amarna letters provide eloquent confirmation of von Soden's observation (GAG, § 78 b) that in Akkadian baṣu, "to be, exist," regularly employs the present
tense when the stative is intended. Every occurrence of the verb in Amarna faithfully complies with this rule (cf. EA, p. 1390), frequently conjugating the forms as though they were statives in fact as well as in function. In the present case ḫab(),$aṭa,
reflecting such Canaanite equivalents as Hebrew ʾaḥata and Phoenician ḫt (*knt, attested as a first person singular perfect in Kilamuwa, 11. 6,10,11), represents Akkadian taba$m$i.

L. 44. [t]umu(♀)Na$ra: The scribal lapse here is somewhat difficult to restore since there are no exact parallels, but $ra is the most likely possibility on the basis of qiba(m)mi . . . ù yudana (EA 86:31-32) and [q]iba(m)mi . . . ù yi(d)ina (93:10-11) which exhibit the same type of clause sequence as in the present instance.

My normalization (contra Knudtzon's transliteration [t]u-wa-ṣa (!)), is the result of my conviction that we have before us a Canaanite II, passive imperfect form, the morphological equivalent of the Hebrew Pu$al imperfect (cf., e.g., y$u$bullah). Any other analysis does violence to the context. That the verb must be passive was correctly perceived by Knudtzon (cf. EA, p. 373: "gesan(dt) w[e]rd(en)"). As a Pu$al, the form under consideration is not unique; cf. yu-ṣa-ru (either contracted from *yuwa$laru or the result of haplography of the first syllable, whence yu-$wa$-ṣa-ru) in EA 126:19, which again can only be passive.

L. 45. kīma arhīṣ: Such a redundant phrase is possible only for one who has no clear understanding of the terminative-adverbial function of the -$w ending. For the Babylonian scribe, arhīṣ (= hantūṣ) was a self-sufficient word; to have preceded it with kīma would have seemed to him unnecessary and ludicrous. Perhaps we should not judge the Amarna scribes too "arhīṣ," however, since the Biblical writers likewise occasionally prefixed their adverbial ṣekher$ with prepositions; cf. $bim ṣekher$ yinnateq (Ecclesiastes 4:12) and ṣad-ṣekher$ (Psalm 147:15).
RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH
(1 29795 - BB 12 - W 55 - EA 74)

Obverse

(1) \textsuperscript{m}Ri-ib-Ad-da iq-ti a-na EN\textsuperscript{i}-Yu

LU\textit{GA}L KUR.KUR LUG\textit{AL} GAL LUG\textit{AL} ta-am-\textit{ha}-ar \textsuperscript{d}[NIN]

S\text{a} UR\text{U} Gub-la ti-di-in GA.KALAG a-na [LUG\textit{AL}]

EN-ia a-na GIR\textsuperscript{ME}\textsuperscript{G} EN\textsuperscript{li}-ia \textsuperscript{d}[TU]-ia

(5) IMIN-Su IMIN-a-an am-qú-ut lu-ú i-de LUGAL\textsuperscript{ru}

EN i-nu-ma Sal-ma-at UR\text{U} Gub-la GEME

ki-it-ti \text{S}a LUGAL\textsuperscript{ri} iš-tu \text{UD}

KÁM.ME\textsuperscript{S}

\text{S}a ab-bu-ti-Su ulla an-nu-uš i-na-an-na

i-te-zii-ib LUGAL\textsuperscript{ru} UR\text{U} ki-it-ti-Su

(10) iš-tu qa-ti-Su li-d[a]-gal LUGAL DUB(\textsuperscript{P})\textsuperscript{i}-ME\textsuperscript{S}

\text{S}a ˛ a-bi-Šu i-nu-ma ú-ul IR ki-ti

LU\textsuperscript{li}m \text{S}a i-ba-aš-Yi i-na UR\text{U} Gub-la

ú-ul ta-qa-al-mi a-na IR-ka Sum-ma

GA.KALAG nu-kúr-tum \text{S}a ER\textsuperscript{IN}ME\textsuperscript{G} GAZ UGU ulla

(15) DINGIR\textsuperscript{ME}\textsuperscript{S} KUR-[a T]I ga-am-ru DUMU\textsuperscript{ME}\textsuperscript{S}-nu \textsuperscript{h}DUMU,MI\textsuperscript{ME}\textsuperscript{S}

G\textsuperscript{Z}S(!) ˇ(!)-nu i-[n]a na-da-nim i-na \text{KUR}La-ri-nu-ta

i-na ba-[a]l-té ZI-nu A\textsuperscript{N}A-ia aš-Ma-ta

\text{S}a la m[u-t]a ma(!)-ši-il aš-šum ba-li

i-re-ši-[i]ma gáb UR\text{U} ME\textsuperscript{S}-ia \text{S}a i-na

(20) HUR.\textsuperscript{S}A(N)G \lowercase{ha}-ar-ri ú i-na a-hí a-ia-šu

i-ba-aš-šu in-mé-ep-šu a-na ER\textsuperscript{IN}ME\textsuperscript{G} GAZ

UR\text{U} Gub-(\text{la}) qa-du MIN UR\text{U} ME\textsuperscript{S} ir-ti-šu a-na ia-yi

ulla an-nu-uš i-na-an-na il-ti-qé
m^IR-A-^Si-ir(!)-ta URU^i-ga-ta a-na Ya-a-Yu
(25) `u iq-bi a-na LU^ME^H URU Am-mi-ia du-ku-mi
[e]t-la-ku-nu `u i-ba-^a-tu-nu ki-ma ia-ti-nu
[ù] pa-a^š-ha-tu-nu `u ti-né-ep-yu ki-ma
[a-w]a-te^ME^H -yu `u i-ba-a^š-yu ki-ma
(Edge) LU^ME^H GAZ `u an-nu-u8 i-na-an-na
(30) i5-tap-pa-ar m^IR-A-^Si-ir-ta a-na ERÍN^ME^H
A§ É NIN.URTA pu-hu-ru-nim-mi `u

Reverse
ni-ma-qú-ut(!) UGU URU Gub-la Šum-ma i[a-nu]
LU^*lim Ya ú-ši-zi-bu-[E]i is-tu qa-ti-n[u]
`u nu-da-bir5 LU^ME^H ha-za-nu-ta is-tu
(35) S^AG^ 4 bi KUR,KUR^KI `u ti-né-pu-u8 ka-li KUR,KUR^ME^H,KI
a-na LU^ME^H G[A]2 `u [k]i-tu ti-in-<ná-pu-u8>-ma
a-na ka-li KUR,KUR^KI `u pa-a^š-hu DUMU^ME^H
ú MÍ DUMU,MÍ^ME^H a-da-ri-tí UD KÁM,ME^H
ú Šum-ma ap-pu-na-ma yu-ša-na LUGAL^ru
(40) `u ka-li KUR,KUR^KI nu-kúr-tum a-na Ya-Yu
ú mi-na yipu-yu a-na ia-ši-nu
ki-na-na ti-iš-ku-nu NAM,<ER>ÍM a-na be-ri-šu-nu
ú ki-na-na pa-al-ha-ti MA,GAL MA,GAL i-nu-ma
{(i]-nu-ma) iu-nu Lu`a ú-še-zi-ba-an-ni
(45) [i8]-tu qa-ti-šu-nu ki-ma MUSEN^ME^H Yu
i-na S^AG^ 4 bi hu-ša-ri< ki-lu-bi
Yu-ak-na-at ki-šu-ma a-na-ku i-na
URU 5u[b]-la am-mi-ni ta qa-al-mi a-na KUR-ka
a-nu-ma ki-a-ma aš-ta-pa-ar a-na E.GAL
(50) ū ū-ul ti-š-mu-na a-wa-tu-ia
a-nu-ma aš Ma-an-Ap-pa it-ti-ka Ma-al-Šu
Šu-ut yi-de ū ia-ta-mar pu-š-[ga]
ša UGU-ia li-š-š-mé LUGAL Šu a-wa-te IR-Šu
ū ia-di-na ba-la-tá IR-Šu
(55) ū yu-ba-li-šš IR-Šu ū
a-na-sa-ra [a URU ki]-it-ti-šu a-di N[N]-nu
DINGIR MEG nu a- [ ] ū yi-da-ga[1 LUGAL]
(edge) [KUR]-šu ū [LUGAL Šu yi-im]-lik a-na K[UR-šu]
ū šu-[p-ši-iš KUR-k]a-ma li-it-ri-[š]
(60) i-na pa-nil LUGAL E[N-šu yu-wa-ši-ra
(left edge) [LU]-šu ū yizi-iz i-na-an-na ū ak-šu-[ud]
a-na-ku a-na ma-šar LUGAL ri EN da-mi-š ši-ti-ka
a-na ia-ši mi-na i-pu-šu-na a-na-ku i-na
[i]-de-ni-ia a-nu-ma ki-a-ma ū-ba-ú ur-ra
(65) mu-[ša]
ki'ama issūri ga ina libbi ḥuḥārı' kilūbi yaknat ki'uma anāku ina
Gu[b]la ammiini taqla'mi ana mātika anūma ki'ama aṣtapar ana ṣkalli
(50) u'ul tişimuna awatuya anūma 'Amān-'Appa ittika Bālū bi yūt
yīde u yatamar puš[qa] sa muḥhiya lišme Sharru awate ardiṣu u
yādina balāta ardiṣu (55) u yuba(l)iṣ aradṣu u anā(s) sar[a ʾal
k]ittiṣu adi Bē[le]tnu ilānunu a[ ] u yida(g)ga[l
Sharru māt]ṣu u [Sharru yim]lik ana m[ātiṣu] u Su[pṣih mātk]ama
litri[s] (60) ina pani Su[rra bē]liyya yuwa(s)Mira [amīl]ṣu u
yī(z)ṣiz inanna u akṣu[d] anāku ana māḥar Sharr bēli damiq
ittika ana yāṣi mīna i(p)pušūna anāku ina [Ī]dēniyya anūma
ki'ama uba' u urra (65) mu[g]a.
Rib-Haddī has spoken to [his] lord, the king of the two lands, the great king, the king of battle: May [the Lady] of Byblos grant power to [the king], my lord! At the feet of my lord, my sun-god, (5) seven times, seven times I have fallen.

The king, (my) lord, should know that Byblos, the loyal maidservant of the king, has been secure since the days of his fathers; but behold, now the king has abandoned his loyal city (10) from (being in) his power. Let the king examine the documents in the house of his father, for is not the man who is in Byblos (always) a loyal servant? Do not remain silent with respect to thy servant! Behold, severe is the hostility of the cApiru host against (me), and (15) as the gods of th[y] land [li]ve, gone are our sons, (our) daughters, our household furnishing(s), b[y] being sold into Yarimmuta in exchange for the prov[is]ions of our live(s). My field resembles a woman without a hu[sba]nd, because of (its) being without a plowman. All of my cities, which are (situated) in (20) the mountain(s) and on the shore of the sea, have turned themselves over to the cApiru host. (Only) Byblos, together with two (other) cities, remain to me. Moreover, behold, now cAbdi-Ashtīrta has taken Shigata for himself, (25) and he has said to the people of Ammiya, "Kill your [l]ord so that you may be like us and be at peace!" So they turned themselves over according to his [wo]rds, and they became like the cApiru.

And behold, now (30)cAbdi-Ashtīrta has written to the host in the temple of Ninurta, "Muster yourselves, and let us attack Byblos ---behold, th[ere is no] man who can rescue [i]t from ou[r] power ---and let us drive the mayors from (35) the midst of the lands, and let all the lands turn themselves over to the cAp[i]ru, and let an [al]liance <be formed> for all the lands so that the sons and daughters may have peace forever. And even if the king comes out, (40) as for all the lands there will be hostility toward him, so what can he do to us?" Thus they took an oα<τ>h among themselves, and thus I am very much afraid, for there is no one
who can rescue me (45) fr]om their power. Like a bird that lies
in a snare, so am I in By[b]los. Why dost thou keep silent
concerning thy land? Already thus I have written to the palace,
(50) but my words have not been heard. By now Aman-Appa is with
thee; interrogate him! He knows and has experienced the trouble
that (hovers) over me. The king should hearken to the words of
his servant and give his servant's provisions (55) and preserve
his servant's life, so that I may protect his [l]oyal [city]
until our [l]and (and) our gods [ ] . So let [the
king] sur[v]ey his [l]and, and [let the king ca]re for [his]
[land]! Furthermore, pa[cify th]y [land]! May it be agreeable
(60) to the king, my [lo]rd, (that) he send me his [man], that
he might stay (here) now so that I might com[e] into the presence
of the king, (my) lord. Does it seem pleasing to thee with
regard to me? What can I do by [m]yself? Up till now, thus I
have asked day (and) (65) ni[g]ht!

* * *

-128-
L. 1. BB 12 erroneously restores the end of this line as 
EN KUR[.MES]. The mistake is understandable, since the Egyptian 
scribes frequently applied such a title to their pharaoh (cf. 
the note on [Mar] matē in EA 68:3). Rib-Haddi, however, never 
dresses the pharaoh as the "lord" of the two lands. Knudtzon 
is therefore entirely correct in seeing in *KUR the first part of 
a LI-sign and restoring the passage on the basis of such similar 

L. 2. Mar tamār: Rib-Haddi addresses the pharaoh thus 
also in EA 114:2; 116:2-3; 122:3 and as LUGAL tamhāra in 76:3; 
79:3; 107:3; 108:3. The restoration of 105:2 and the scribal 
lapse in 119:3 may thus be supplied by adding either AR or RA in 
each case; it is impossible to tell which, although the meaning 
is of course unchanged. Mar tamār is status indeterminatus, a 
rare phenomenon in Rib-Haddi, attesting to the scribal 
familiarity which surrounded the phrase. In LUGAL tamhāra, the 
latter word can only be an accusative of specification; the case 
of LUGAL is therefore determined independently of it and is seen 
in each case to be the genitive Marri (contra Knudtzon) as object 
of the preposition ana. The spelling LUGALri ta-am-ha-[a]r 
(123:3-4) carries no more weight for purposes of normalization 
than the LUGALri KUR.KURKI which immediately precedes it, which 
no doubt influenced it, and which just as clearly was influenced 
by LUGALri GAL in l. 2, where the RI-sign is justified.

Weber correctly notes (EA, p. 1159) that Mar tamār does 
not have "a corresponding Egyptian expression." To this negative 
judgment we may now add the positive evidence that was subsequently 
recognized concerning the unearthing, at Amarna, of fragments of 
the now famous Sar tamhāri epic. Written to extol the storied 
Sargon the Great, who exercised sway over Mesopotamia during the 
initial 56 years of the First Dynasty of Akkad (c. 2350 to c. 
2150 B.C.E.), the epic tells the story of how Akkadian merchants 
trading in Asia Minor persuaded Sargon to invade it (cf. Albright,
FSAC\(^2\), p. 150; JSOR VII [1923], pp. 12-20; Güterbock, ZA XLII [1934], pp. 86 ff.). So well known and popular was this saga that it had been translated into Hittite by the time of the Amarna Age (cf. Albright, FSAC\(^2\), p. 211). It is certain, then, that Rib-Haddi knew of the epic and that by addressing his Egyptian overlord as "the king of battle" he was bestowing upon him one of the finest compliments of which he was capable. Men had celebrated the deeds of Sargon for one thousand years by the time Rib-Haddi began his local rule in Byblos, and they would continue to praise his exploits and those of his grandson, Maram-Sin, for another eight hundred years, down to the time of Nabonidus (555-538 B.C.E.—whereby correct the typographical error ["338"] in Moortgat, op. cit., p. 502).

L. 7-8. \textit{ṣtu umi ša abbūtānu}: For similar expressions, cf. EA 121:11 (elliptic); 122:11-12. Note also Malachi 3:7: \textit{lēmīī\footnote{\textit{šapṭēkem}, and cf. further Ezra 9:7.} ḫabbūtu} (literally, "fatherhood") is the plural of \textit{abu} only in Amarna (cf. von Soden, AḤw, p. 7), the normal plural being \textit{abbū}. For \textit{-ūtu} as a plural ending, cf. the note on EA 73:24 supra.

Ll. 9-10. Ḥezib Ṣarrū ḫal kitiṣšu \textit{ṣtu qātīšu}: A parallel to this peculiar phrase is found in EA 151:35-36. It must be elliptic for "The king has neglected/abandoned his loyal city from (being in) his hand (= power)" (i.e., so that it is no longer completely under his control). A possible Biblical parallel is Genesis 24:27: \textit{lē'-ṣazab hasādō waʾāmītō meʾṣīm ṣā́mīn}, "He has not left his kindness and his faithfulness from (being) with my master" (= has not withheld his steadfast kindness from my master).

L. 10. \textit{līd[a](g)gal}: As Ebeling has noted (BA VIII/2 [1912], p. 69), the form under consideration is a \textit{lī} present with a prefixed precative \textit{lu}. Such a monstrosity is impossible in standard Akkadian, which combines \textit{lu} only with preterit forms (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 81 c); the particle, however, may also precede stative forms, in which cases it stands independently (\textit{ibid.}, §
31 b). The other example of \( \text{lu} \) plus present quoted by Ebeling (loc. cit.) is one that he and Knudtzon read \([\text{l}]i-[\text{m}]\text{a-li�} \) (EA 94:72); this reading is suspect, however (cf. my note in loc. cit. infra). Cf., however, \( \text{inisur} \) in 169:15 (though spelled with the thematic vowel of the preterit!).

\( \text{dagalū} \), rather than \( \text{amaru} \), is the normal correspondent of Hebrew \( \text{ra'ah} \) in the Rib-Haddi letters, occurring some 14 times. That Hebrew knew of the root \( \text{dgl} \) is clear from its use of \( \text{dagul} \) (Canticles 5:10) meaning "visible" (so von Soden, \( \text{AHw} \), p. 149), migdal, "lookout tower" (cf. the note on EA 69:20), and possibly also degel, "banner." \( \text{amaru} \), with the exception of the ubiquitous and fossilized \( \text{amar} \), "behold!", appears only six times in Rib-Haddi, five of which are in EA 137 and 138 (which, it should be noted, were written from Beirut where the scribes undoubtedly employed their own dialectal peculiarities). The sixth occurrence is \( \text{yatamar} \) in l. 52 of the present letter to which Moran (SSDB, p. 152) attaches the meaning "to say, tell," thereby equating it with the Hebrew, Phoenician and Aramaic verb \( \text{mr} \). Whereas, however, in EA 138:36 it certainly has such a meaning, cf. the note on \( \text{yatamar} \) in loc. cit. infra.

L. 10. \( \text{DUB(1)[p]}\text{ME}^\text{M} \); BB 12 reads instead \( \text{EN KUR} \text{ME}^\text{M} \), but such a reading is as impossible here as in line 1 (q.v., with note). Far more acceptable is Knudtzon's reading, which I follow; moreover, the photograph of the tablet (BB, Plate 20) by no means excludes it.

\( \text{tuppu} \) (not \( \text{tuppu} \); cf. Landsberger, \( \text{ZA} \) 41, pp. 225-226; \( \text{tu-up-pa} \), EA 357:83; \( \text{tu-up-pa-ti-ma} \), 358:7) is masculine in the singular in Amarna, both in the Rib-Haddi material (119:55) and elsewhere (99:5; 237:20). In the plural, however, the evidence is ambiguous, since in Rib-Haddi it is masculine, as here (cf. also 129:28), while elsewhere it is feminine (cf. 51, r. 5; 52:5; 358:7). The plural in Rib-Haddi in this instance is paralleled by that in Old Assyrian (cf. von Soden, \( \text{GAQ} \), s. 61 g), but is perhaps rather to be explained as under the influence of
such forms as the Hebrew masculine plural אֵּרֵי, its semantic equivalent.


L. 11. **inûma**: It seems better to translate this word "for" here than "whether," as does Knudtzon ("ob").

L. 12. **amûlu**: In such cases this word is a synonym for hazaû (cf., e.g., EA 299:1-5, and often).

L. 12. **ââ rebû**: For standard Akkadian ââ rebû.

L. 13. **ûumma**: To give to ûumma its usual translation, "if," would make no sense at all in this passage. Knudtzon himself recognized that here, as well as in five other Amarna passages (EA 35:13; 103:36; 109:54; 112:25; 137:60), **ûumma** appears in a main clause (cf. Ebeling, EA, p. 1526). To this number, Moran in 1950 added two more examples, viz. 74:32 and 108:34 (SSDB, p. 11), and in 1953 he again augmented the number by two (244:30, 38), bringing the total to ten. In his detailed article concerning this subject ("Amarna ûumma in MainClauses," JCS VII, pp. 78-80), Moran correctly proposed the translation "behold, lo" for ûumma in all these cases, noting that hinne/în in Hebrew and în (cf. also înn) in Ugaritic mean both "if" and "behold, lo," depending on context.

Ll. 14-15. **û ilûnu mütik[a lib]lut**: This phrase can only be understood as an oath: "... and as the gods of th[y] land [li]ve..." ilûnu is the most likely normalization of DINGIRMEŠ in Rib-Haddi (cf. EA 96:4), but its construct form is highly tentative; von Soden leaves the pertinent space blank in GAG, Paradigm 3 b. The KA-sign at the beginning of the break may be regarded as certain (cf. BB, Plate 20). For [lib]lut as the normalization of [TÎ] here cf. EA 85:39-40, 86; 256:10-12; 289:37. Since ilûnu was apparently considered a collective by the Canaanite scribes of this period (cf. ilûnu... lib'al in 96:4-6; 97:3),
I have decided in favor of liblūt over liblūtū (cf. also Hebrew practice with regard to "loha" as noted in GKC², § 145 h). The order of subject and predicate in the present instance is Akkadian (cf. also EA 96:4-6; 97:3), whereas in the other abovementioned examples the order is Canaanite; cf. also 75:29, Δ̂ TDINGIR-k[a], together with its note. For oath formulae in Hebrew, cf. GKC², § 149; in Akkadian, GAG, § 185. Cf. further Ungnad, VAB VI, 207:21 ff.: mar-ra-an at-na, "I have sworn by the king," on the basis of which Professor Held correctly translates iv:6 of an Old Babylonian love poem (published by von Soden in ZA 49 [1950], pp. 151 ff.), reading at-na-ki-im nanā Hammurabi BUGAL, as follows: "I swear to thee by Nanā and Hammurabi the king" (BUGAL = Harran, contra von Soden, loc. cit., pp. 170-171). For details see Held in JCS 15 (1961) [in print].

Ll. 15-17: gamaru means "to finish, annihilate, use up, spend," and boasts Hebrew and Aramaic cognates. More significant, however, is its Hebrew and Ugaritic semantic parallels, klh/kly, for in the present passage the stative form gamru can only be understood in the sense that klh/kly frequently bear, viz. "to come to an end, to be spent, to vanish" (cf. BDB, p. 477, for details). For an approximate Biblical parallel to this passage, cf. Nehemiah 5:1-5.

L. 15. MiDUMU,MiMESH: For the more correct DUMU,MiMESH.

L. 16. GIS(!) E(!)-nu: QA-A[=]-NU, the reading of BB 12 here, is impossible to translate. Knudtzon's reading, qa-d[u]-nu, is not much better, for though he claims to make sense of it ("neb[s]t uns selbst") several factors militate against his transliteration and translation. *qad[u]nu here would be the only instance in Amarna of qadu plus pronominal suffix (cf. KA, p. 1446); indeed, with but rare exceptions qadu is never found with pronominal suffixes attached to it (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 114 j), although it could be argued that the Canaanite scribe had in mind such prepositions as Hebrew ̄im and ̄et, to which
suffixes are regularly appended. In addition, "together with ourselves" would make very little sense in the present context.

But the most decisive argument against former readings of these signs is to be found in the parallel passages, of which there are four, in other Rib-Haddi letters: EA 75:11-14; 81:38-41; 85:12-15; 90:36-39. In each case, "household furnishings" are listed together with the children who had to be sold into the land of Yarimmuta so that the remaining inhabitants might receive the food and other provisions necessary to maintain life. As can be seen from BB, Plate 20, the readings that I have proposed are by no means impossible and are the only ones that meet the requirements of the passage. For issue denoting wooden implements, see now CAD 7, p. 218.

L. 16. naddānu: Although naddānu means basically "to give," it denotes also "to sell" in Akkadian and in the latter sense is semantically equivalent to Hebrew mākar. For nātan/mākar, as well as for additional points of contact with the present passage, cf. Joel 4:3.

L. 17. ina bal[ā]ta napišinu: ina here is precisely equivalent to the Hebrew bēt pret, as found for example in Joel 4:3 (cf. the preceding note).

bal[ā]ta is simply a scribal error here; cf. ba-la-at in three of the parallel passages (EA 75:14; 81:41; 90:39) and bā(PA)-la-at in the fourth (85:15), wherein the scribe may well have been influenced by the verbal root *plt, "to escape" (in the derived conjugations, "to deliver"), attested in Hebrew and Ugaritic as well as in Aramaic. For balātu (literally, "life") meaning "provisions, sustenance," cf. hayyim/lehem in Proverbs 27:27, and note also mihyāh, "sustenance" (e.g., Judges 17:10).

Weber is entirely correct (EA, p. 1159) in assuming that the statement in 11. 15-17 implies that slavery would be the lot of the children who were sold into Yarimmuta. The use of the verb gamāru indicates the seriousness of the situation. For

Ll. 17-19: "My field resembles a woman without a hu[sba]nd, because of (its) being without a plowman." This translation differs from most previous renderings mainly in understanding the final word, i(r)raššim, as a professional noun rather than as an infinitive. Only by so doing does the underlying proverb exhibit true parallelism, viz.: "A woman without a husband is like a field without a plowman" (contrast Weber, EA, p. 1159; H. H. Pfeiffer, ANET², p. 426). The present passage is correctly rendered in CAD 4, p. 305.

As Weber correctly notes (EA, p. 1160), the comparison of a woman to a field is a common motif in Near Eastern literature. As far back as the days of the Old Kingdom in Egypt, "the husband was urged by the books of wisdom to take kindly care of the wife, because 'she is a field advantageous to her lord'" (Wilson in Frankfort et al., op. cit., p. 72; cf. also ibid., pp. 99,113; Weber, EA, p. 1160). The Koran makes a similar comparison (Sura 2:223; cf. Weber, loc. cit.), while the Palestinian Talmud likewise refers to the plowing of a woman (cf., e.g., Ye'udim 1:2: hmš hryššat hmr, "He copulated (literally, plowed) five times").

Because of his failure to see in i(r)raššim the word "plowman," Weber (loc. cit.) noted only a general connection between our proverb and Rib-Haddi's complaint immediately preceding it, namely that children and household goods had to be sold in exchange for necessary provisions. This is explained proverbially by Rib-Haddi as due to the shortage of labor in Byblos. The uneasy situation there had undoubtedly resulted in every able-bodied man's being ordered to be prepared at all times to defend the city from its attackers, with the result that its fields had been neglected and were therefore, at the moment at least, unproductive. The same modified proverb is found again in EA 75:15-17; 81:37-38; 90:42-44, each time in context with a parallel to ll. 15-17 of
the present letter. It is thus evident that Rib-Haddi does not employ the proverb in a stylistic vacuum but rather that it is a quotation clearly pertinent to his urgent requests for help from Egypt.

L. 17. Ašš-ia: In his zeal to demonstrate the use of the genitive suffixial form for the nominative (cf. my note on bōliya in EA 68:9), Moran here read ekli-ia (JCS 4, p. 169, n. 7), although this may well be a typographical error for *ekli-ia.

L. 18. Ǧa la m[ut]a . . . aššum bali: In GAG, § 115 s, von Soden incorrectly asserts that Ǧa laa, "without," is only Late Babylonian. The present passage, falling well within the range of Middle Babylonian, effectively disproves his statement. The nearest Hebrew equivalent is *bōlā, so that we cannot claim Canaanite influence. We expect, of course, m[ut]a here, since Ǧa, when so used, is always followed by the genitive case (cf., e.g., the Akkadian proverb Ašš Ǧa laa ikkari, "a field without a farmer," in RA 17, p. 123, r. i:19). The troublesome m[ut]a, found also consistently in the parallels, may be a fossilized adverbial accusative form, so written because of the proverbial context.

Moran (SSDB, p. 14) has astutely observed that aššum bali is equivalent to Hebrew mibōlā. In favor of this equation is the fact that in Hebrew min often means "because of, on account of" (cf. BD, p. 580, for details), which is precisely the meaning of aššum. Furthermore, balu(m), "without," exhibits the final i-vowel only in much later periods (von Soden, GAG, § 114 r), and bali here may thus be an attempt to represent a form resembling Hebrew bōlā (cf. also Ugaritic bl). Dhorme's comparison of aššum bali to Hebrew bībōlā (RB, NS Volume 10 [1913], p. 393) is less exact and therefore less acceptable.

That balu(m) and Ǧa laa are virtually equivalent is shown, for example, in W. G. Lambert, Babylonian Wisdom Literature (Oxford, 1960), wherein the Akkadian commentary to ba-al/lu (70:11) has Ǧa laa (noted by von Soden, AHw, p. 101).
L. 18. ma(!)-mi-il: BB 12 and its photograph (Plate 20) both indicate a G1̄-sign as the first syllable of this word, but that this is merely a scribal error for MA is clear from the parallel passages. maMiIl has here the normal form of the Akkadian I1 stative with its connotation of timelessness, although because it is used in the sense of a preterit (or Canaanite perfect) and takes a direct object (ášMata, 1.17) it reminds us of the parallel hymnal-epic dialect use of the stative. For mašalu, "to be like," mûšulu, "to compare, make equal," see already Delitzsch, HWR, pp. 431 ff.; note the Commentary to Ludlul, I:71: eman = māšālu (= Hebrew māšal, Aramaic āštal; cf. particularly Late Hebrew māšul, "equal to, like").

L. 19. i-re-Mi-[i]: This is the Byblian representation of e(r)ēšim, a genitive nomen agentis formation meaning "plowman" and derived from the verb ēšû, "to plow." Ebeling (EA, p. 1406) enigmatically fails to separate this verb from its homonym meaning "to request." The mistake was serious enough 45 years ago; Ugaritic, however, clearly demonstrates that the only radical that the two verbs have in common is the middle one, since the root of the former is *hrt while that of the latter is *rēš.

L. 19. gabbāniya: In Amarna, the construct of gabbu is usually gabbī (cf. Ebeling, EA, p. 1408), but gabbāniya here is not unique (cf. EA 129:17; cf. also 14, ii:17: gabb unûšunu, "all of their vessels").

Ll. 19-20: Cf. Hebrew bāhār . . . َُٰٓ َُٰٓ hayyām (e.g., Deuteronomy 1:7).

L. 20. ṣadī harri: This transparent gloss is recognized on all sides to be equivalent to Hebrew-Phoenician hr. The Masoretic vocalization (har) implies the doubling of the rēš, and several Biblical verses make it explicit (cf., e.g., Genesis 14:6; Deuteronomy 8:9; 33:15; Jeremiah 17:5; Psalm 30:8). As to the h being represented in cuneiform by ḫ, this phenomenon is regular in Canaanite Amarna (cf. the note on Ṣāb-Haddî in EA 68:1).
Rib-Haddi's reference here can only be to the foothills of the Lebanon range.

L. 20. a-ia-ab: The logogram for ṭāmtu, "sea," is A.AB.BA. It appears, therefore, that a-ia-ab/ba (cf. also EA 105:13; 114:19) is to be understood as a pseudo-logogram arising from a misunderstanding of A.AB.BA, then becoming a word in its own right (so approximately von Soden, AHw, p. 23, where he notes further that all of the occurrences of a(y)abba have a Syrian origin—albeit, because of the sparsity and ambiguity of the examples that he lists, all of them may not be pertinent).

In JCS 4 (1950), p. 167, Albright and Moran reported another previously unnoticed occurrence of a-ia-ab, "sea," in the Byblian letters (ignored, strangely enough, by von Soden in AHw). EA 89:46-47 reads: ma'id mi(m)muṣu ki̞ma a(y)ab, "Plenteous is his wealth, like the sea." Another possible occurrence, though somewhat uncertain because of the broken context, is found in the same letter, l. 64: [Abdi]-'Ashirta laqā a(y)ab, "[Abdi]-Ashirta has captured the sea" (cf. Albright and Moran, loc. cit.). ahi ayyab in the present passage is equivalent to Akkadian ah(i) ṭāmti.

L. 21. ḫaṣṣû, ḫinnepû: It will be noticed that these verbal forms confirm the statement made in the note on dannu in EA 69:16 above to the effect that the third person feminine plural perfect Canaanite verb had already leveled out to the corresponding masculine form by the time of the Amarna Age.

L. 22. MIN URU\ME3: Standard Akkadian orthography would have most likely written simply MIN URU. It may be that the scribe inserted the \ME3-sign to reflect his Canaanite proclivities (cf., e.g., ṣarīm ṣayim in Joshua 15:60). For my normalization, Sīna ālānī, cf. EA 79:31: MIN URU\ni-su; for the various possibilities in standard Akkadian, cf. GAG, § 139 d.
L. 22. irti(h)hu: râhu, "to remain, be left," is attested in Amarna apparently only in the Rib-Haddi correspondence, and then only in the I₂ conjugation (cf. Ebeling, EA, p. 1496, for details). Because of context, I understand the form under consideration to be defectively written present. The Hebrew equivalent of Byblian šritūnu is hôtar/niš'ar.

As to the identity of the "two cities" mentioned in this line that at the writing of the present letter were still under the control of Rib-Haddi, cf. EA 79:21-26 together with its commentary (cf. Weber, EA, p. 1160).

L. 26. [e]t-la-ku-nu: At first glance, a comparison of EA 74:25 ff. with 73:27 ff. and 81:12 ff seems to indicate that etlu, rather than belu, is the Byblian equivalent of Sumerian EN. That such an equation is impossible, however, is clear not so much from any single passage as from the cumulative evidence of the Rib-Haddi material; cf., e.g., EA 68:4-6 with the present letter, 11. 2-4; cf. also 106:41: ana be EN-ia, which can only be normalized ana beliya. It appears that in the present case the scribe, for stylistic or other reasons, decided to use a synonym for belu. His choice of etlu, "mature/grown man," was somewhat unfortunate (note, however, the possibility that etlu here = "man" with a connotation of disrespect; cf. particularly the letters of Šamši-Adad to his son, Yašmah-Adad---e.g., ARM I, 73:43-44; 108:6-7); possibly he intended the similar-sounding etellu, "potentate, lord" (cf. Landsberger, ZA 41, p. 226, and see now CAD 4, pp. 381 ff.).

[e]tlakunu is, furthermore, vulgar Akkadian (or good Canaanite!) for *[e]telkunu unless, of course, it is a syncope for *[e]tellakunu, a perfectly correct form. At any rate, because of the ambiguities involved we can learn nothing from the form as regards the Canaanite accusative construct state which, however, is sufficiently clear from other evidence (cf., e.g., EA 70:26: tubâ asâ (<sâbî> pîtâti).
L. 26. kīna yātimu: Though an ill-conceived secondary formation (cf. the note on yātimu in EA 73:31), the genitive pronoun yātimu (hapax here) is carefully distinguished from its dative counterpart, which is always preceded by anā (73:31; 74:41; 85:11; 100:13, 41; 122:44; 149:51; 151:44). For ibia(š)matunu kīna cf. Hebrew hāyaḥ ke(mō) (e.g., Genesis 34:15; 1 Samuel 8:20).

L. 27. [u] paṣḥatunu: Another clear example of waw-consecutive with the perfect tense.

paṣḥatu means literally "to be calm, composed" (cf. EA 116:50), and then by extension "to be at peace, to be secure (politically)" (74:37, 59; 89:65; 107:31; 112:39; 113:32, 33; 118:44, 46; 121:50; 127:41; 132:59). The former meaning is generally represented in Hebrew by nūḥ/šaqat, the latter by Malam/ḥatet; apparently no single Hebrew verb has the semantic range of both (note Isaiah 30:15; 32:17; Judges 18:7, and others).

L. 28. [a-w]a-te-MEŠ-Su: For reasons unknown to us, the Amarna scribes added the plural postdeterminative MEŠ to the word aw/mātu very frequently (cf. Ebeling, EA, p. 1570, for details). Perhaps they did so because there is no orthographic difference between the singular and plural forms of the word. The phenomenon is attested also in Ugaritic Akkadian (cf., e.g., PRU III, 16.238:19).

L. 30. İŞṭappar: As this form stands, it is to be parsed as either a I₂ present, which makes no sense in the present context, or as a I₃ preterit. This latter analysis is likewise problematical, however, because the scribe does not seem to be indicating that AŞdi-Ăshtar wrote continuously to the troops. Furthermore, the habitative or iterative concept in Rib-Haddi is normally expressed by utilizing the verb šanu (cf., e.g., EA 136:16-17; 114:34). It seems best, therefore, to view forms like IŞṭappar as super-plene writings for iptaras (I₂ preterit) forms; cf., e.g., 122:1-2 with 123:1-2.
L. 31. ina: This seems to be the only place where ina is written with the sign \(\text{AS}\) in the whole Rib-Haddi corpus; elsewhere we find always i-na. Likewise, ana is always written a-na (except where abbreviated, for which cf., e.g., l. 3b of the present letter). ina is surely intended here, however; no other reading makes sense.

L. 31. \(\text{E NIN.URTA}\): Knudtzon's hesitancy in reading nin-ib for \(\text{MIN.URTA}\) and his concession that the name is to be read otherwise is entirely justified (EA, p. 374, n. g). Ninurta is the now well-known son of Enlil; he occupied his place in the Mesopotamian pantheon as a youthful god of battle. He is primarily god of the thundershowers and floods of spring, identical with Ningîrsu (for details cf. Deimel, Pantheon Bab., pp. 209 ff.; Bottéro, La Religion Bab., pp. 44 ff.).

Since no URU-sign precedes it, it is perhaps best to translate \(\text{E NIN.URTA}\) as "the temple of Ninurta." At any rate, because of the difference in geographical locale it cannot be the same as \(\text{URU.E NIN.URTA}\) mentioned in EA 290:16 (so Weber, EA, p. 1160). The temple in question doubtless played a prominent role in the lives of \(^c\)Abdi-Ashirta and his cohorts, although its strictly local importance discourages us from attempting to locate it at present. We can be sure only that it was reasonably close to Byblos.

By excluding ina bit NIN.URTA from the quotation which follows I express my admiration for the Sprachgefühl of the earliest interpreters of this letter (BB, p. xlv; W 55; Petrie, op. cit., p. 105). Knudtzon and those who followed him here (cf., e.g., Mendenhall in JNES 6, p. 124; Moran in JCS 7, p. 78) failed to take into account the fact that "\(^c\)Abdi-Ashirta has written to the troops" is a far too general statement to be readily understood by the addressee, whereas the addition of the phrase "in the temple of Ninurta" makes it much more specific and intelligible. A more serious objection to the later translations, however, is the anomaly of preceding an imperative with a prepositional phrase
at the beginning of a direct quotation. The normal order is to start with imperative form (cf. l. 25); *ina bit MIN.URTA* puḫurūnimmi would be very strange indeed, and would substantially lessen the force of the imperative. Finally, it should be noted that -mi, the particle introducing direct quotations, is ordinarily appended to the *first* word of such quotations in Rib-Ḫaddi.

**Ll. 31-41. puḫurūnimmi . . . yāʾiminu:** This challenging passage has spawned a great deal of controversy, from a lengthy note by Weber (EA, pp. 1160-1161) to a journal article by George Mendenhall ("The Message of Abdi-Ashtita to the Warriors, EA 74" [JNES 7 (1947), pp. 123-124]). The basic problem concerns the length of the direct quotation, which Knudtzon, for example, feels is only two lines long, while BB (p. xlv) carries it through to the middle of l. 35. Mendenhall, however, has shown conclusively that the entire passage is one long statement by Abdi-Ashtita (loc. cit.). My translation follows that of Mendenhall as corrected by Moran (JCS 7, p. 78). Improved readings have clarified the passage, and these will be discussed as they arise.

puḫurūnim would read puḫrānim in standard Akkadian. It is a Canaanite plural imperative with the Akkadian ventive suffix. The retention of the vowel of the second syllable is unusual; cf., e.g., alu(i)mi (EA 117:62); idūmi (289:27); kušda (82:52; 86:16; 95:34). On the other hand, cf. dugula (283:9), although there is some doubt as to the reading there (cf. Knudtzon, EA, p. 852, n. c; but note SS 160:9—the sign is certainly not UG, and appears to be clearly GU).

**L. 32. ni-ma-qua-ut(!):** The final sign is WA, and although it could be resolved into UT plus AŠ (ina; cf. the suggestion of Knudtzon, EA, p. 375, n. h), the Amarna idiom for "to attack," required here, is maqatu muḫḫi, never maqatu ina muḫḫi (cf. the note on EA 75:10-11 above).

**Ll. 32-33. Šûmmu . . . qātin[u]:** The elucidation of this phrase we owe primarily to the labors of Moran, who translates:
"Behold! there is no one who will save it from out hand" (JCS 7, p. 78). For Ṣumma meaning "behold!", cf. l. 13 together with the commentary.

L. 33. Ṣu[i(z)zib[i]: This reading is at least as plausible as Knudtzon's Ṣi-[zi-bu-[n]i; BB 12 is uncertain about the NI-sign, and the photograph is noncommittal. Furthermore, had the scribe intended the first person singular suffix he probably would have written Ṣu[i(z)zibání (cf. l. 44).

To this day, Ṣuzubu, "to rescue, save," is considered on all sides to be the III infitive of Ṣe[bi, "to abandon, leave, forsake, disregard" (cf., e.g., CAD 4, pp. 424 ff.). However, according to Professor Held (unpublished), this derivation is doubtless an example of popular etymology, the resemblance between Ṣe[bi and Ṣuzubu being purely coincidental; note Aramaic Mežib, "to free, rescue," a clear loan from Akkadian Suzubu but failing to exhibit the c of Ṣe[bi. In addition, to conceive of the idea "to rescue" as being equivalent to "to cause to leave" is not without its semantic problems. Finally, by way of negative evidence, Hebrew, in which the verb Ṣe[azab is very common, knows no verb Ṣe[azab meaning "to rescue."

L. 33. īṣtu qātin[u]: Moran's cogent objections to Knudtzon's īṣ-tu ka-ti ʾ [n]iq [n]ukurti (JCS 7, p. 76, n. 4) are entirely convincing; the basic argument being that the construct of qāti in Rib-Haddi is always qāt, never *qāti (cf. EA, p. 1448, for details).

L. 34. nu-da-bir[]: After it had been established that Bi-ri-ia-ma-za (EA 7:75) and BIR,NAM-ia-wa-za (cf. EA, p. 1565, for citations) represented the same personal name (cf. Albright and Mendenhall in ANET 2, p. 484, n. 4), it was then clear that the Amarna scribes knew of the reading BIR,NAM for the NAM-sign. Mendenhall (JNES 6, pp. 123-124) then recognized that nuda(b)biri makes much better sense in the present context than "nudanam,
which had been read previously and had given trouble to earlier interpreters (cf. Weber, EA, p. 1161; Knudtzon, ibid., p. 1590).

The present spelling indicates that "to drive out, to expel" in Rib-Haddi was expressed by a verb dubburu (BIR cannot be read *PIRx in any period [cf. Labat, op. cit., Number 79]). dubburu (Old Babylonian duppurum; cf., e.g., ARM 2, 53:23-25: ulu nedâkšu ulu ūuma ina kussîšu nudapparšu, "We shall either kill him [Zimrilim] or expel him from his throne") may be explained as a dialectal variant of duppuru under the influence of the II stem of the West Semitic verb *dbr, "to speak" (cf. Hebrew and Phoenician). It is attested elsewhere in Rib-Haddi in EA 76:39; 85:68,81; 104:27; 138:69,106.

L. 34. hazanuta: The accusative -a ending here substantiates the idea that the -atu frequently used as a masculine plural noun ending in Amarna is somehow related to the same ending of abstract nouns (cf. the note on hazanute in EA 73:24 above), since such an accusative ending is normal for abstract nouns whereas plural nouns would be expected to append the casus obliquus ending -i/e in the accusative.

L. 36. [k]i-tu ti-in-<né-pu-uš>-ma: "Let an [al]liance <be formed>" (so Mendenhall, JNES 6, p. 124). The text as it stands makes no sense whatsoever; Mendenhall's emendation, however, has the support of the idiom kitta espâšu in such passages as EA 83:24-25 (as he himself points out, loc. cit., nn. 5-6); 125:39; 132:32-33; 138:53. The scribal error is due to vertical haplography (cf. ti-né-pu-š in the previous line). The Hebrew correspondent to kitta espâšu is mainly kârat bērit (cf. especially Isaiah 28:15, where kârat // cē̂̂̂̂asa); several other phrases also occur (cf. BDB, p. 137, for details).

L. 38. a(d)dârīti ʾuml: Since "forever" is ordinarily expressed in the Byblos dialect by adârīti (EA 93:27-28; 124:56; cf. also Hebrew-Phoenician c·d g·l·m), a(d)dârīti in the

For examples of the contraction of ana in Rib-Haddi (duly noted by Ebeling, loc. cit.), cf. EA 103:10; 125:31. Cf. also 138:135: a(y)y[ā]nā (possibly for *ana yānā--we cannot be absolutely certain because of the broken context).

a(d)dārītī umā seems to be an orthographic expression of *a(d)dārīt (construct) umā; cf. EA 75:9: [i]t-tu(ißa) da-ri-it umā (for an approximate Biblical parallel, cf. Isaiah 45:17: cād-'olmē cād; note also yēnōt cōlām/yēnōt dōr wādōr in Deuteronomy 32:7). Such expressions, together with ana dārī dūri (PHU III, passim; cf. Hebrew lōdōr dōr) and similar numerous expanded Hebrew and Ugaritic phrases (cf. Cassuto, Tarbiz 14 [1942], pp. 2-3), gave impetus to such Greek equivalents as eis tous aiónas ton aiónon (cf., e.g., Galatians 1:5) as well as the English idiom "forever and ever."

The umā on the present expression was possibly suggested to the Canaanite scribe by such phrases as Hebrew 'ōrek yānīm (cf., e.g., Psalm 21:5; 23:6), although arāk umā is also common in Akkadian proper (von Soden, AHw, p. 63).

L. 39. Summa appunama: According to von Soden, the particle appūna means "in addition, besides, moreover" (AHw, p. 60; OAG, § 120 d). Such a meaning fits in well in the present phrase (Mendenhall's "even if" is entirely adequate) as also in the other contexts where appūna(ma) is found in Rib-Haddi (EA 83:28; 116:35; 118:18; 119:54). Albright's rendering of 252:23-24: Summa tiqa(b)bu appunama . . . as "(even) if thou wilt say, 'Come . . . '" (BASOR 89 [1943], p. 31) mars an otherwise brilliant article ("An Archaic Hebrew Proverb in an Amarna Letter from Central Palestine," ibid., pp. 29-32) and was later duly corrected by the author to "even if thou shouldst say" (ANET², p. 486).
The ultimate origin of ṣurnarna remains unclear (von Soden, GAG, § 113 c), but it is clearly akin to the frequently attested Ugaritic parallel particles, ṣpnnk . . . ṣphn, "Furthermore . . . moreover" (cf., e.g., II P, vi:4–5,13–14,33–34). Related also is Hebrew-Ugaritic ṣp meaning "also, moreover," and note especially ṣp kn, "furthermore," in Ezekiel 23:40; Habakkuk 2:5.

L. 39. ṣwa(n)na: Mendenhall (JNES 6, p. 124, n. 9) suggests that we read yi-sa-na here "because forms such as ti-sa-na (see Glossary) support the evidence from Hebrew that the West Semitic preformative of this verb was yi-." I am not sure that I completely understand his statement, for the Hebrew evidence of which he speaks points rather to ya- as the West Semitic preformative (waṣṣa' is derived ultimately from *waṣṣi'u*). But one thing is certain: There is no ti-sa-na in Ebeling's glossary, at least. On the contrary, the spelling tu-sa-na is found four times in Rib-Haddi (EA 73:9; 76:31; 81:45; 117:55). Possibly Mendenhall had te-i-sa (*362:30*) in mind; but ṭayṣa, though a valuable datum in that it reveals an underlying Canaanite form, is abnormal and should not be used as the criterion for vocalizing every ambiguous form of (w)asā that makes its appearance. For the old reading *ti-i* in 88:19 cf. the commentary below in loc. cit.

For the development of ṣwa(n)na, cf. the note on ṭūsa(n)na in EA 73:9 above.

L. 42. ṭūṣa(n)ta: The suggestion of Ebeling (BA VIII/2 [1912], pp. 49,76) that we read here nam-ru and compare Arabic namira, "plot, conspiracy," should be discarded from the start, since such a meaning for namira is rarely attested. Moreover, that we should derive help for Amarna from a literature two thousand years younger is improbable; furthermore, if Ebeling were correct, we would expect namra (accusative) in context, since in Rib-Haddi case endings were ordinarily very strictly kept. For
a long time, therefore, I read **MAM.UB = Mipta**, "oath," and translated the line as follows: "Thus they took an oath among themselves."

It is now certain, however, that we must read **MAM.ERIM = m$m<mi>ta**, although the new reading does not necessitate changing our translation. Moran has convincingly pointed out (in **JCS 7**, p. 79, n. 5) that the idiom, **mamita Yakanu**, "to take an oath," is attested in the Idri-mi inscription (cf. Sidney Smith, The Statue of Idri-mi [London, 1949]), ll. 50-51: ana berisunu **MAM.ERIM danna imkunumim**. The RU-sign in our passage is thus a scribal error, omitting the first half of the ERIM-sign. Cf. also, significantly, **EA 149:60**: imtani ma-mi-ta ina berisunu, and note further **mamita epēšu** in 67:13.


L. 44. $a uše(z)zišanni: Such an expression is possible only in Assyrian; Middle Babylonian would indicate the same idea with **Sa ušezzišűni** (cf. von Soden, GAG, Paradigm 8). The scribal lapse here and in many other similar instances (cf., e.g., **EA 75:28**; 91:10) seems to be due to the lack of a subjunctive mood in the Canaanite of the period.

L. 45. **MUSEN** MEŠ: The parallel passages (**EA 78:13-16**; 79:55-56; 81:34-36; 90:39-42; 105:8-10; 116:18-20) make it clear that the MEŠ-sign here is not intended to indicate a plural. It is simply another substantiation of the fact that the Canaanite scribes were frequently confused as to the proper use of logograms.

L. 46. huhari kilubi: huhāru is an Akkadian word (probably of Sumerian origin) meaning "(bird-)trap, snare." Symbolically, it was an emblem of Shamash, clamping down (saḫuru) upon the unrighteous when he least expected it (for details, cf. **CAD 6**, pp. 224 ff.). In Amarna it is found only in the Rib-Haddi letters in the passages cited in the preceding note.
kilūbi was readily recognized by all previous interpreters as a Canaanite gloss inserted by the scribe to explain the difficult hūhāru and as clearly equivalent to Hebrew kēlāb which means "trap, snare" in Jeremiah 5:27 (cf. verse 26). The expression kēlāb qāyis in Amos 8:1,2 is problematic; had the prophet intended "basket" (as the first word is usually translated), it would seem that he would have used a word like tene' or sah.

L. 47. kīsuma: Beside its being used here and in the first four parallel passages cited in the note on l. 45 above, this particle is found again in Amarna only twice, both times in Rib-Haddi (EA 96:26; 138:135). The origin of this particle is unclear, but the meaning is established with certainty both by context and by the fact that it is replaced by kīna(n)na in 105:10; 116:19. It is very likely that kīsuma is a rare and dialectal form; von Soden does not list it in 'GAG.

As noted by Weber (EA, p. 1161), the comparison of a caged or ensnared bird with a besieged or imprisoned ruler is found also in the annals of Sennacherib with reference to King Hezekiah of Judah. The passage (OIP 2, p. 33, iii.27-29) runs as follows: ḫālu kīma issūr quppi qereb Ursalimmu ėl Harrūti ū ėsirMū, "As for him, like a bird in a cage I confined him in Jerusalem, his capital." Cf. also Rost, Tigl. III, Plate 22:9: kīma issūr quppi ėsirMū. For similar expressions in Hebrew cf. Amos 3:5; Proverbs 7:23; Lamentations 3:52; Ecclesiastes 9:12.

L. 48: ḫālu ana, "to be silent with respect to," answers to ūreš el in Psalm 39:13 (cf. also l. 13 supra).

L. 49: kī'ma, found some 17 times in Amarna but only in Rib-Haddi (cf. Ebeling, EA, pp. 1438-1439 for details), is not listed in GAG and, like kīsuma (cf. the note on l. 47 supra), must therefore be dialectal. It is derived from Akkadian kī'am, "so, thus," which, being unfamiliar to the Canaanite scribes, was
vocalized analogously to Akkadian ki₂₃₅₆, "like, as," which has Canaanite cognates (Ugaritic-Phoenician km, Hebrew kᵣ₅₆₇₈₉₉­t₀).

L. 50. tišmûna awâtya: We expect here either tišmûna awâteya, "Thou hast heard my words" (cf. EA 85:7), or tušmûna awâtya, "My words have been heard" (cf. 91:29-30), the latter being preferable because of its more indirect and less intimate manner of addressing the pharaoh. In defense of our scribe, however, it should be noted that this is not the only lapse where the words ₑₑ₅₅₆₇₈₉₉ and awâtu are concerned; cf., e.g., awâteya tušmû[na] in 117:32. Both words were so common in the parlance of Rib-Haddi that the fact that they should, on occasion, be used contrary to correct grammatical procedure was a practical inevitability (cf. Ebeling, EA, p. 1370, n. 1).

*tušmûna* is a Qal passive imperfect form, a syncope for *tušmûna*.

L. 52. Sût: Knudtzon's uniform translation of this word as ₑₑ₅₅₆₇₈₉₉ does not take into consideration the fact that the UD-sign rarely, if ever, has the value Tû in Rib-Haddi. Sût is status indeterminatus in form, exhibiting the same final -t as that found in Akkadian ₑₑ₅₇₈₉₉, Ugaritic hw₄, and Ethiopian we₉₇₈₉₉, and is equivalent to the Assyrian personal pronoun Sût (as already recognized by Albright and Moran in JCS 4, p. 167; cf. von Soden, CAG, §§ 41 f,i), to be carefully distinguished from the Akkadian masculine plural relative pronoun which is its orthographic equal.

Moran is surely right in translating EA 83:37: u₉₅₇₈₉₉(u)Su Sût as "Send him back, even him" (SSDE, p. 156; JCS 6, p. 78, n. 22). He is incorrect, however, in reading Su-tam (SSDE, p. 156) in such a case, since Canaanite syntax in such instances demands the nominative pronoun (cf., e.g., in Phoenician, Azitawadda, l. 26: bymt₃₅₆₇₈₉₉ₐ nk, "In my days, even mine"; in Hebrew, Numbers 14:32: upigrot₄₅₆₇₈₉₉ 'attem, "but your carcasses, even yours"; Zechariah 7:5: h₉₅₇₈₉₉sam₅₆₇₈₉₉₉₉₉₉ 'ân₉₅₇₈₉₉₉, "Did you fast at all to me, even [to] me?).
In the present case, šut may be connected either with the preceding šalša or the following yāde. My choice is the latter, since the construction discussed above is relatively rare. The meaning remains unaffected in either case.

L. 52. yatamar pus[qa]: "He has been an eyewitness to my trouble"; cf. Hebrew expressions as are found in Lamentations 1:1; Genesis 31:42; Exodus 4:31; II Kings 14:26, etc. Note also yāda c/ra'āh as, e.g., Ecclesiastes 6:5; Isaiah 58:3; cf. further I Samuel 23:22; Deuteronomy 4:35, etc.

The form of the verb here represents an attempt to Canaanize the normal Akkadian I₂ preterit, yatamar (cf. von Soden, AHw, p. 40).

L. 53. awâte: The Akkadian correspondent to this plural construct form is awât. It is tempting to suppose that the final -e represents the Canaanite masculine plural construct ending on a form such as dibrē, the semantic equivalent of awâte. Our knowledge of Ugaritic and Phoenician phonology is still too meagre, however, to insist on the validity of such a suggestion. The -e is probably merely the casus obliquus case ending -i.

Ll. 54-56. yādina . . . yuba(l)lit . . . ana(s)ar[a]: This sequence of verbs is a fine example of the way in which jussives (yiqtol forms) and volitives (yiqtula forms) alternate freely in the Rib-Haddi letters. It also demonstrates the fact that there is no discernible difference between them regarding syntactic force.

L. 54. yādina balāta IP-Su: Knudtzon is entirely correct in normalizing ardi-Su here. We translate: "May he grant the provisions of his servant," understanding the -a ending on balāta as the Canaanite accusative construct ending.

L. 55. yuba(l)lit: The prefix vowel of the II₁ conjugation of this verb is assured in Rib-Haddi by such spellings as nu-ba/bal-li-it (EA 66:28; 85:38) and tu-ba-li-tû-na (114:56). I cannot agree, however, with Dhorme's unfounded conclusion that yu-ba-li-it here is an attempt to represent the pronunciation
yeballit whence, he claims, directly proceeded Hebrew יבּלֵל (RB, NS Volume 11 [1914], p. 39). It is true that יבּלֵל is a strongly Canaanized representation of Akkadian uballat, but there is no evidence whatever that it was at any time pronounced as Dhorme would have us believe. Furthermore, even BDB, probably the most inclusive etymologist of all time, does not equate Akkadian bullatu with Hebrew pillet (p. 812), noting that where the Akkadian root does indeed appear in the Hebrew Bible (as in the proper name, Sanballat, found in Nehemiah passim) it is written correctly with a ב (von Soden, unaccountably, is less cautious; cf. AHw, p. 99).

Due to the hybrid character of the average Canaanite Amarna verb, the problem of the nature of the imperfect preformative vowel of the II₃ conjugation of the Canaanite verb in Rib-Haddi is difficult to solve; the following remarks merely present the evidence, without attempting a definitive solution. יבּלֵל in EA 85:38, a clear present (imperfect), exhibits an "u", but this may be due to the influence of Akkadian. On the other hand, cf. 130:48: תי-נָּסִי-רֻ, versus the only slightly Canaanized תי-נָּסִי-רֻ in 85:22. It seems that in such cases the Canaanite scribes sometimes revocalized Akkadian II₃ a-theme present forms as Canaanite פֶּלֶל, since they had no present forms in their own Canaanite dialect (cf. the startling, seemingly arbitrary alternation of forms in EA 112: י-נָּסִי-רֻ-ו-נַ, 1. 10; יִ-נָּסִי-רֻ-אֶנֶּ, 1. 13; יִ-נָּסִי-רֻ-ו-נַ, 1. 14; יִ-נָּסִי-רֻ-ו-נַ, 1. 17; יִ-נָּסִי-רֻ-ו-נַ, 1. 18.---Subsequent to my own research on this matter it was gratifying for me to learn that Albright and Moran, in JCS 4, pp. 165-166, had come to the same conclusion on the basis of the same evidence.). It will readily be noted that forms such as תי-נָּסִי-רֻ (EA 130:48) exhibit an -י- preformative vowel; again, however, such evidence is inconclusive for the vocalization of the Canaanite פֶּלֶל prefix since the scribe may have been intending, however incorrectly, to represent the ordinary Akkadian prefix vowel as he understood it (cf. the
note on tiddin in EA 68:5). Thus, however much the evidence of the tigattilu forms seems to favor -i- over -u-, we cannot at present be absolutely certain. At any rate, -a- is excluded, Ugaritic vocalization to the contrary notwithstanding.

Ll. 56-58: Due to the bad state of preservation of the tablet at this point and the lack of adequate parallels, very little can be extracted from this passage. Despite the lack of the DINGIR-sign, Knudtzon's reading at the end of l. 56 is probably correct, although b[ēle]tānu is the proper normalization if the form is indeed nominative (likewise ilānu as the first word in l. 57 as corrected by Ebeling, EA, p. 1422). His a]-sa-ū-nim-mi], however, in the middle of l. 57 is pure guesswork and makes very little sense; the parallel which he cites, EA 134:11 (cf. EA, p. 376, n. c), is not applicable here because the circumstances involved are entirely different. As for his yi-da-ga[l-]lu at the end of l. 57, such a form is impossible both grammatically and from the standpoint of meaning. Much better is the reading that Knudtzon rejects, yi-da-ga[1 LUGAL] (cf. EA, p. 376, n. d), descriptive of a function properly ascribed to the pharaoh (EA 116:61-63) or to his archers (76:31-33), but hardly to images of gods as Knudtzon would have us believe. The use of dagālu in the sense of "to survey, reconnoitre, inspect" is identical to that of Biblical rā'ā in such passages as Joshua 2:1; I Kings 9:12.

L. 58. [LUGAL:]yi-im]-lik:ana: My restoration differs from that of Knudtzon only in that [yi-im]-lik represents the Byblian idiom more exactly than does [li-im]-lik (cf. EA, p. 1590, for this minor correction, which Knudtzon made himself); cf. EA 105:6-7: yi-am-lik (for "vimlik; cf. mi-am for "mim in l. 19) bārru ana Sumura; 114:20-21: d-am-lik bārru ana ālīšu; 136:35-36, 39-40: ū bārru beliya yi-im-lu-uk ana arḏāšu. Cf. also yi-da-ga[1] in l. 57 above. The example from EA 136 authenticates the inverted word order of Knudtzon's restoration,
and also demonstrates a closer approximation to the original Canaanite vocalization of the verb (*yamluku) than do the other examples.

malakû ordinarily means "to advise, counsel" in Akkadian, which connotation it retains a few times in the Rib-Haddî letters (EA 94:12; 116:14; 136:26). More frequently, however, it enters into the idiom malakû ana, "to care for" (not "to pay attention to" as per C. H. Gordon in Or. 16, p. 9), a synonym of the sakanû ana of the Jerusalem Amarna letters (cf. EA 285-290 passim). It is significant that malîk(u) and sükîn(u), both meaning "caretaker," are both Canaanite glosses of LûMAŠKîM (EA 131:21; *362:70-71) and are thus equal to each other and to râbisû (256:9).

L. 59: The reasonably certain restorations in the middle of this line are those of Knudtzon (contra BB 12; cf. EA, p. 376, n. e). If he has restored correctly here, we should probably read KUR-ka in EA 113:33 and 132:59 as well. The meaning of the phrase is clarified by the expanded formula in 121:50-51: "u š[u-up]-ši-ih hazâni [Marri] ina KUR.KUR MEŠ (for the revised reading of the final sign-group, cf. Thureau-Dangin in RA 19, p. 93, n. 1).

L. 59. li-it-ri-[s]: Knudtzon's li-it-ri-[š] would be unique; BB 12 reveals the beginning of a horizontal stroke that could well be the first part of an IS-sign.

In Akkadian tarasû means basically "to stretch out, spread out," and is thus the semantic equivalent of Hebrew nâtaḥ. That the Canaanite scribes themselves made this equation is clear from a comparison of EA 137:54-55 with Proverbs 21:1 from which it can be seen that tarasû libba muhhi is intended to correspond to nâtaḥ leb al, "to incline (one's) heart toward." The idiom tarasû i/ana (pani) is best translated "to be agreeable to" (cf. EA 92:46-47; 103:40-41; 106:35,41; 286:44), and to my knowledge has no exact Canaanite parallel.
The preterit theme of Akkadian tarāṣu is normally in -u-, but in Rib-Haddi, and apparently exclusively so, -i- (the only exception being EA 103:40: yītrus). The reason for this phenomenon is unknown to me.

L. 62. damiq ittika: The idiom damagu itti, "to be/seem good/pleasing to" (cf. also EA 114:46), finds its Hebrew parallel in tōb ġim (I Samuel 2:26). Likewise, tōb lipnē (Ecclesiastes 2:26; 7:26) answers to Amarna damagū i/ana pani with the same meaning (cf. EA 84:6-7; 85:33; 107:20-21; 108:8). A slightly different nuance, it would seem, is preserved in the expression damagū ana, "to be good for, well with" (EA 116:46; 117:71), paralleled by Hebrew tōb lā- (cf., e.g., Numbers 11:18; Deuteronomy 5:30; I Samuel 16:16).

L. 64. uba’u: Although bu’u ordinarily means "to seek" in all dialects of Akkadian, it must mean "to ask" here (as already noted by Ebeling; cf. EA, pp. 1162,1590).
RBHADDI TO THE PHARAOH
(C 4757 - WA 79 - W 79 - EA 79)

Obverse

(1) [^R]i-i[b]-A[d-d]a [iq-bi]
[a]-na EN-[u] L[UGAL KUR KUR LUGAL GAL]
d[N]IN Ya U[RU] Gub-la

(5) [a]-na G[IR] EN-ia d[UTU-ia]
[IMIN]-[u] IMIN-a-an am-q[u-t lu-u]
[i]-de LUGAL EN[i] i-nu-[ma]
Sal-ma-at URU Gub-la G[EME ki-ti-du]
[i]-[u]tu(!) da-ri-it UD[K] AM ME$[h]

(10) Ya-[n]i-tam GA KALAG nu KUR Ya ERIN GAL ME$[h]
[U]GU-ia ga-am-ru DUMU ME$[h] [DU]MU MI ME$[h]
GI$[h] E ME$[h] i-na na-da-ni
[i-na] KUR la-ri-mu-ta i-na
[i-na] ba-la-at ZI-ti-[nu]

(15) [A.G]A-ia DAM Ya la mu-[@a
ma-[S]-I $ a-y-Sum ba-li
[i]-re-[y]-im a-y-ta-p[a]-ar [u
[a]-ta-ni a-na L.GA[L] a-y-Sum mur-si(!) UGU-nu
[Ya] i-da-gal a-wa-[t]e [Y]a-a

(20) [LUGAL URU SI]-du-na li-iM-me
[LUGAL ru a]-wa-te ME$[h] [R-Yu]

[ ]
[ ]
[ù uš-ši]-ra LÚ a-na UR[Ugub-la û]

(50) [a-ka-Š]a-da(!) a-na-ku a-na [ma-ḫar LUGAL]


t[a ] a tē eš [ ʿu uṣṣi]ra amīla ana [Gubla u (50) aka(M)āda(ū) anāku ana [maḥar Sarri]
(1) B[a]l-[h]a-[d]a [has spoken] to his lord, the king of the two lands, the great king: May the Lady of Byblos grant power to the king, my lord! (5) At the feet of my lord, my sun-god, seven times, seven times I have fallen. The king, my lord, should now the [at] Byblos, [his loyal] maid[ervant] from time immemorial, is in good estate.

(1) Fur[ther, severe is the hostility of the Apiru host against me. Gone are (our) sons, (our) [daughters], (our) household furnishing[s], by being sold [into] Yarimmuta in exchange for the provisions of [our] live(s). (15) My [field] resembles a woman without a husband, because of (its) being without [a p]low[man]. I have written [repeatedly to the] palace because of the trouble (hovering) over us; [ ] examine the statement[s] of (20) the "king" of Sidon. May [the king] hearken to [the w]ords of [his] servant!

(25) the lands of] the king, my lord. The Apiru have killed Aduna, "king" of] Irqa[t], [but] there is no one who say[s an]yt[hing to Abdi-Ashirta. Moreover, as thy god lives, (30) Miyu, the man of Arasni, has seized Ardat[a, and, behold, [n]ow the people of Ammin have killed th[eir] lord, [and so] I am [f]earful. (35) The king, my lord, who should be in[formed that the king of Hatti has seized all of the trustworthy lands of the king of Mitanni, (namely) the king of Nahriya. [But (40) the land of the great kings shall Abdi-Ashir[t, the slave,] the dog, take for himself]? Send me an [archer] host! S[e]vere is [the hostility] a[gainst me. (45)

Therefore send me a man for [Byblos, that] (50) I [might come into [the presence of the king].

* * *
This tablet is one of seven Rib-Haddi letters in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo, the other six being EA 94, 104, 113, 116, 124, and 134. The autograph (WA 79) leaves much to be desired (e.g., it omits ll. 30 and 33 entirely, as does also WA 79). It is therefore exceedingly difficult to establish the reading at many points, and the following commentary must be read with this fact constantly in mind.

ll. 1-4: The curt salutation represented by Knudtzon's restoration has no parallels elsewhere; we may safely fill in this passage only on the basis of the opening lines of EA 68, 83, 89, 109, 112, and 121.

Because WA 79 shows no traces after the [B]-sign in l. 1, it seems best to transcribe the [D]-A-sign as uncertain in view of the preponderance of evidence supporting -di as the final syllable of the name elsewhere.

KUR.KUR is the most likely logogram group to represent nū in l. 2; cf. KUR.KUR in l. 37 and LUGAL.LUGAL in l. 40.

L. 6. [MIN]-M[u]: Despite Knudtzon's note (EA, p. 377, n. h), -M[u] is more plausible than his -ta[m]; cf. the equivalent phrase in each of the letters cited in the preceding note. The traces in WA 79 are noncommittal and could be used to support either reading.

ll. 6-7. [lu-ú i]-de: The restoration of [lu] is required by the formulaic character of this expression following the salutation in Rib-Haddi (cf. EA 68:9; 74:5; 76:7; 78:7; 81:6; 114:6; 116:6). Whereas lu always precedes ide in this idiom, however, it never precedes yi de in the same idiom (EA 94:5; 104:6), a fact which justifies our assumption that yi de is a jussive form in its own right.

L. 8. G[EME ki-ti-šu]: Knudtzon's restoration, a[m]t[u-ka], should have been at least a[m]a[t-šu] (cf. EA 116:47). Again, however, my attempt to arrive at the Rib-Haddi idiom leads me to restore [kiti-šu] on the basis of amat kitti ša zarri in 68:11 and 74:6-7.
L. 9. [\text{[i]N-I}]\text{UH}: As Knudtzon has noted (EA, p. 377, n. i), this is clearly a scribal error for *[\text{[i]N-u}] (cf. 1H-(tu) in EA 138:138 and TU-tu-HU-nu for *[\text{[i]N-u-HU-nu}] in 126:57).

Ll. 17-18. aṣṭapar ʿut [aSH]tanī: In standard Akkadian, Ṣanu is frequently used in a sort of hendiadys with another verb to indicate a second execution of the action that the verb describes. Hebrew occasionally employs Šana similarly; cf., e.g., I Samuel 26:8; II Samuel 20:10 (although, of course, the real parallel construction in Hebrew is Šu plus wš- plus the verb; cf., e.g., Genesis 26:18; Numbers 11:4; Judges 19:7; II Kings 1:11; 19:9). In the Rib-Haddi correspondence, however, the use of Ṣanu is extended to include actions repeated more than twice, thus encompassing the range normally occupied by the 13 conjugation (of which, to my knowledge, there are no clear examples in Rib-Haddi; cf. the note on aṣṭapar in EA 74:30). Other examples in Rib-Haddi are 82:5; 114:34; 125:20-21; 126:53; 136:16-17; 137:5.

L. 18. mur-ši(!): WA 79 reads clearly mur-GI, the second sign of which is a scribal error for ZI (ジー), which quite closely resembles it. Knudtzon's reading, mur(!)-ši(!)-i, though not changing the sense of the passage in any way, represents highly questionable orthography for the Rib-Haddi dialect, and since he expressed certain doubts about the final sign (EA, p. 378, n. e) I have decided to follow the autograph.

mursu commonly means "illness, sickness" in Akkadian, which connotation it seems to bear also in EA 137:29,32 (so Albright and Mendenhall in ANET, p. 483). In 116:58, however, it clearly means "hardship, trouble" where, as in the present passage, it is equivalent to puṃsu (cf. 66:25; 74:52). The verbal adjective, marsu, means "grievous" in 137:95. It must be noted also that whereas in standard Akkadian the verb marasu means primarily "to be sick," in Rib-Haddi it means nearly always "to be in trouble, hardship" (cf. 84:24; 103:7,15,49; 106:23, 114:50; 116:54). Conforming to this Canaanite connotation is the Hebrew Bible,
wherein the root */mrz* (found only in the derived conjugations) never means literally "to be sick" but denotes rather "to be grievous, troublesome; to disturb, trouble" (cf. DBB, p. 599, for details).

L. 18. **muhhi-nu**: The reading is that of WA 79. It is impossible to tell from Knudtzon's *muhhi-ia(*! ) just what he saw on the tablet. The **NU**-sign is perfectly plausible here, however; cf. the easy alternation between the singular and plural forms of the first person pronominal suffix in such passages as EA 68:14,30.

L. 19: Although not without its own difficulties, EA 94:7-9 sheds some light on this line: *u*[1][ł] i[q]-b[u] a-[w]a-te(!) *M* a-r[u]-[t]e [mi]-in-ma a-na LUGAL b[ê]-lî]-ia a-wa-te i-d[a-ga]l *u a-wa-te da-mi-ia LUGAL be-lî, "I [ne]ver [s]pe[ak] fals[e] w[o]rds to the king, my l[ord]. I co[n]sider my (every) word, and my word is good, O king, my lord!" From this passage we learn that in Rib-Haddi awâta dagâlu means "to consider, examine a word" (cf. Hebrew *ra’*h, "to consider," in, e.g., I Samuel 24:16; Ecclesiastes 7:14). Far less defensible in the present context is the idiom *ana aw/mâta dagâlu, "to pay attention to a thing/matter" (cf. EA 162:27), since in 75:21 [a]wâte clearly means "[w]ords of." The slight improvement in translation, however, does not serve to advance the restoration of our line.

L. 20: For the plausibility of the restoration of [Si]dûna, cf. Knudtzon, EA, p. 379, n. f. Needless to say, Si'dûna in Amarna is equivalent to Biblical *Sidon*, modern Saida, located on the coast of Lebanon almost due west of Damascus. The restoration of LUGAL (however grandiloquent its use may seem in such cases) rather than *Lû* (so Knudtzon) before the city-name is more likely on the basis of EA 92:33; *Lû* URU *(S)* du-na does not appear in Rib-Haddi. The reference here is probably to Zimridda (cf. 147:66-67; 83:26; 103:18; 106:20).

Ll. 25-27. 'Adūn[a] Har] Ār[t]a iðûkûna Āp[ir]û: Despite Knudtzon's note (EA, p. 379, n. h), the restoration of these lines is virtually certain. iðûkûna (ibid., n. g) is preferable to "iðûkûnû (EA, p. 1591) since the casus pendens construction is not at all typical of the Rib-Haddi dialect except for the fossilized construction involving nukurtum found, for example, in EA 74:40.

In the present letter, the murder of 'Adūna (probably equivalent to Hebrew [and Ugaritic] 'dn, "master"; cf. Weber, EA, p. 1163, for details), "king" of Ār[t]a, is probably charged to the Āpiru, whereas in EA 140:10-11 we read that "Aziru has killed Aduna, 'king' of Ār[t]a." This merely apparent discrepancy serves to emphasize the fact that if Ābdî-Ashtirâ and his son, Āziru, were not themselves Āpiru they nevertheless worked hand in glove with them. For the bearing of EA 139-140 on EA 75, cf. Weber, EA, p. 1163.

Ll. 27-29. yānu H[a] aq[b][i m]i[m]a ana Ābdi-'Amhirta: The translation of Knudtzon is doubtless correct; cf. EA 91:10-11 (duly noted by Weber, loc. cit.): yānu H[a] yiqbi mimma [ana H[a]lû] (cf. Job 2:13 [for the expression] and, e.g., I Samuel 14:39; Job 32:12 [for the content]). aq[b][i] in the present context is thus a third person form distorted from *aq[b][i] due to sandhi with the preceding H[a], and not a first person form as assumed by Ebeling (EA, p. 1444).

L. 29. ẖ TI DINGIR-k[a]: This reading, suggested by Moran (SSDB, p. 152), is undoubtedly correct; for the idiom, together with pertinent commentary, cf. the note on īlān(u) màtik[a lib]lūt in EA 74:15. Knudtzon's reading, ẖ ti-il(i.e., AN)-m[a-t]û, the verbal portion of which he understood as a form of lammâdû, is impossible orthographically, since it is highly doubtful whether the UD-sign ever represents the value *Tû in Rib-Haddi,
not to mention the fact that it never has the value "DU" in any period. Rather the last two signs in Knudtzon's reading are in reality the beginning and end of a KA-sign, as Moran has demonstrated (loc. cit.).

L. 30. Mi-yu Lū [U]A-ra-aS-ši: WA 79 and W 79 omit this line altogether. Miyu (scarcely Knudtzon's "Mija," which would be written *Mi-ia in the Rib-Haddi orthography) and Arashni are not mentioned elsewhere, and the location of the city is unknown. Lū here probably is a terminus technicus (cf. the note on amšu in EA 74:12).

Ll. 33-34. L[U] MES URU Am-mi-u<š> ti-du-ku EN-š[u-nu]: WA 79 and W 79 omit l. 33 altogether. Knudtzon's alu am-mi-i would be unique; I therefore assume a slight scribal error. EN-š[u-nu] is entirely possible on the basis of WA 79, which I follow here. Knudtzon reads the suffix as -š[u], but he should have indicated the problem involved in such a reading; cf. the plural form of the suffix in the related passages (EA 73:27; 74:26; 81:12). Had the scribe intended "its (i.e., the city's) lord," he would have written *EN-ši/e.

L. 37. **TUKUL** ti-ti: Before Moran provided the clue to the most likely interpretation of this sign-group (cf. **SSDB, p. 153**), they were read *ku-ti-ti and translated variously as "possession, property" (so Knudtzon, though uncertainly) or as a place-name (cf. **W 79: "kutäischen[?]""). Moran's solution, however, is far more satisfactory than either of these. He states that **KU** is the logogram for tukultu and that the TI-sign is written twice (serving here as phonetic complements) to indicate the plural number. Since the scribe of this letter does tend to double a logogram to denote its plural (cf. **KUR,KUR** in the present line and **LUGAL,LUGAL** in l. 40), Moran's argument is plausible. I would prefer to read **KU** as **TUKUL**; however (cf. the familiar **GIL.TUKUL = kakkku, "weapon"**), and to understand **TUKUL** ti-ti as a sort of rebus writing. In any case the normalization of the present line is quite probably kali mat-ti tuklati, to be translated "all of the trustworthy lands."

II. 38-39. **LUGAL KUR** Mi-it-ta-ni-ma **LUGAL KUR** Na-ah-<?]>-ma:
Knudtzon reads matu-mi-it-ta ṣum(!)-ma, but WA 79 (followed by **W 79**) has a clear **NI**-sign instead of ṣum(!). In addition, ṣumma makes no sense here; Knudtzon's tentative "oder" has no parallel elsewhere in Rib-Haddi. Despite the fact, therefore, that we find Mi-ta-ni only once elsewhere in the Rib-Haddi letters (**EA 104:21**; otherwise always **Mi-ta-na**: 76:14; 85:51[!]; 86:12; 90:20; 101:10; 109:6; 116:70), I am inclined to read **Mi-ir-ta-ni-ma**. For the doubled **t** cf. 17:3; 19:4; 24, III:104; 25, IV:66; 28:4; 54:40; 56:39.

The Mitannian king mentioned here is of course Tushratta (for his correspondence found at Amarna cf. **EA 17-29**) who was replaced by Mattiwa; a vassal of Shuppiluliuma(s), just before Mitanni disappeared from the historical scene forever (cf. **Moortgat, op. cit., p. 497**).

From the evidence available to him at the time, Weber (**EA**, pp. 1071-1072) deduced the fact that Mitanni and Nahrima are
merely two different names for the same territory. Wilson elaborates somewhat on this deduction in his statement that Mitanni was "a political equivalent of the geographical term Naharin" (ANET: p. 374, n. 10). For the relative locations of Mitanni and the land of the Hittites during the period immediately preceding the Amarna Age, cf. WHAB, Plate III.

Nahrīma is mentioned again in Amarna only in EA 140:32; 194:23; 238:35. It is identical to the Biblical ('âram) nah'rayim and offers yet another example of the tendency of the Amarna scribes to employ cuneiform h to represent their h-phoneme. The name means "two rivers" (referring probably to the Euphrates and the Khabur), the Greek equivalent of which has become familiar to us as "Mesopotamia."

L. 39 is thus seen to be in apposition with L. 38: "the king of Mitanni, (namely) the king of Nah'riyma."

Ll. 39-42. [ū māt Harrāni rabû[t] ˚Abdi-'Ašir[ta ardu] kalbu yil[qu ana ṣāšu]: "[But the land]d of the great[kings] shall ˚Abdi-Ašir[ta, the slave,] the dog, ta[ke for himself]?"

It would seem that this (or a very similar) restoration and translation is the only possible way to make sense of this badly broken passage. Rib-Haddi appears to be contrasting the exploits of Shuppiluliuma(s), which he feels are justified because of the latter's greatness as the ruler of the Hittite empire, with the plundering confiscations of the despicable ˚Abdi-Aširta (for similar contrasts, cf. EA 76:11-16; 104:17-24; 116:67-71). The passage is best understood as a question, as is the case with the parallel passages cited. "The great kings" (si vera lectio) will then refer to the pharaoh and his predecessors, while "the land of the great kings" will denote that portion of the pharaoh's patrimony delegated to the control of Rib-Haddi.

L. 44. d[a]nnat m[uḫhiya nukurtum]: We expect dannat nukurtum muḫhiya (cf., e.g., ll. 10-11; cf. also the references
listed under the form dannat in EA, p. 1396), although a somewhat inverted word order appears in EA 106:8-9: Sumur nukurtum dannis dannat muhisi u muhisiya dannat.

li. 49-50. [ussi]ra amila ana [Gubla u aka(?)]ada anaku ana [mahar Barri]: My highly tentative restoration differs radically from that of Knudtzon. The RA-sign, the first clear sign in l. 50 and due perhaps to vertical dittography, I take to be a mistake for DA(!), which it greatly resembles in these texts. Knudtzon's WA as the last clear sign in the line, however, I read as NA with WA 79. The passage may then be restored, with due misgivings, on the basis of EA 74:59-62 (q.v.).
RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH

(VAT 324 - WA 74 - W 56 - S 35 - EA 76)

Obverse

(1) [m]Ri-ir-di-im iq-bi a-n[a] (EN-šu)

LUGAL KUR KI.MES LUGAL ri GAL

LUGAL ta-am-ha-ra d NIN ša

URU Gub-la ti-di-in KALAG.GA

(5) a-na LUGAL ri be-li-ia a-na GIN MES

EN-ia dUTU-ia IMIN-šu IMIN-a-an am-šú-ut

lu-ú i-de LUGAL ru EN li i-nu-ma

KALAG.GA nu-kúr-tum ša-a mšIR-A-ši-ir-ta

UGU-ia a-nu-[m]a MIN URU ša ir-ti-hu

(10) a-[n]a ia-ši [y]u-ba-ú la-qa

[a-na ša-a-šu ša]-ni-tam mi-nu šu-ut

mšIR-A-ši-[ir]-ta UR.ZIR ū yu-ba-ú

[la]-qa ka-li URU MES LUGAL ru dUTU

[a-n]a ša-a-šu LUGAL KUR ti-ta-na

(15) [ù] LUGAL KUR ka-aš-me šu-ut i-nu-ma

[y]u-ba-ú la-qa KUR LUGAL a-na ša-a-šu

[a-n]u-[m]a ÿ-na-an-na pu-ši-ir

[k]-la-li LU MES GAZ UGU URU ši-ga-ta

[ù] URU Am-bi ū la-qa-ma

(20) [š]u-ut MIN URU an-ni-ta ū

[a-q]a-[b]i ia-nu a-Ma šar ir-ru-bu

[ ] tum a-na ša-a-šu ša-bat

[S]JA(N)G ša yí-[z]a-za
[ù u]Ma-ra-ni LIMMU me

(25) [LÚ MEŠ ma-sa-a]r-ta [ù]  
[ES ta-pal AN]ŠE.KUR.RA ṬE-MEŠ

Reverse  
[a-n]u-ma [ki-a-ma]  
[aš-ta-pár a-na Ê.G]AL ū la-a  
[tu-te-ru-n]a [a-w]a-[t]am a-na ia-ši

(30) [ù-ul ki-pa]-na-nu ka-{li} KUR.KUR MEŠ  
[LUGAL]ri [M]U KĂM.MEŠ tu-sa-na  
[ERIN MEŠ] pī-tá-ti a-na da-gal  
[KUR]XI MEŠ ū an-nu-us  
[i]-na-an-na in₄-nē-op-da-at

(35) KUR XI LUGAL ū URU Su-mu-ra  
URU ma-sa-ar-ti-ku-nu  
a-na LÚ GAZ MEŠ ū qa-la-ta  
uš-Mi-ra ERIN MEŠ pī-tá-ti  
ra-ba ū tu-da-bi-ir

(40) a-ia-bi LUGAL iš-tu  
[HAG bi KUR-Yu ū  
ti-nē-op-Yu ka-li  
KUR.KUR MEŠ a-na LUGAL ri Ha-ni-tam  
]at-ta EN GAL ū-ul

(45) ta-qal-mi iš-tu  
[IM]i-š-p-ri an-nu-ù
(1) Rib-Haddi iqbı an[a] "beliṣu" [U]ar mātē Sarri rabī
Sarri tamhāra Bēltu Ya Gubla ti(d)īn dunna (5) ana Sarri bēliya
ana ūepē bēliya Ṣamāiya Mib'itṣu Mib'itān amqut lū ḫīlể Sarru bēli
inūma dannat nukurtum ya Gaddi-'Amīrtta muḫhiya anū[m]a Sīna ālānī
Ya irti(h)ū (10) a[n]a yāṣi [y]ūba'ū laqū [ana 'āṣu b]anītam
mīnu ūtū Gaddi-'Āmīrtta kalbu _verify_box ṣu yūba'ū [la]qā kali ālān(i)
Sarri Samā [a] 'āṣu Sar Mītn(a)nna (15) [u] Sar Kańskē ūt
inūma [y]ūba'ū laqū mät Sarri ana 'āṣu [an]ū[m]a inanna
pu(h)ēhir [k]ali ḡApirī muḫhiṣiṣīgata [u] Ambi 📺 laqāma (20) [mūt
Sīna ālānī annīta u [a[q]a(b)]u[y]ūnu aṣan irrubu [ ]
tum
ana 'āṣu sabat [ ]SAN[M] 9a y[ī(z)z]a(z)za [u
u]ṣūra(n)ni erba me('at) (25) [amīlūtī ma(s)ə]rta [u] yalāṣa
tapūl siṣ[ī] anūma [kī'ama aṣtapar ana āk]allī u lā
[tute(r)run]a [awjāt[am] ana yāṣi (30) [ul kī pa]nānu ka[li]
mātāt [Sar]ri [k]anātī tūsa(n)na [sāb]i piṭāti ana dagāl [mā]tāti
u annūs [i]nnāna innepēt [35] māt Sarri ū Sumura ʿal ma(s)əartikunu
ana ḡApirī ū qālāta uṣūra sābī piṭāti rabū ū tūda(b)bir (40)
a(y)yāṣi Sarri iṣtu libbi mētiṣu ū ti(n)neṣū kali mātāti ana
Sarri Sanītam attā bēlu rabū ul (45) taqālmi iṣtu [k]ipri annū
(1) Rib-Haddi has said to his lord, [the king] of the two lands, the great king, the king of battle: May the Lady of Byblos grant power (5) to the king, my lord! At the feet of my lord, my sun-god, seven times, seven times I have fallen. The king, my lord, should know that the hostility of Ḫabdi-Ashtiya is severe against me. Alre[ady] the two cities that remain (10) t[o] me [h]e seeks to take [for himself].

Further, who is he, Ḫabdi-Ashtiy, the dog, that he seeks [to take] all the cities of the king, the sun-god, [for] himself? The king of Mitanni (15) [or] the king of (the land of) the Kassites is he, that [h]e seeks to take the land of the king for himself? [Alre]ady now he has mustered [all the] Apiaru against Shigata [and] Ambi and he has taken (20) these two cities. And so [I s]end me four hundred (25) [garrison] troops and thirty teams of [h]orse[s] . Alre[ady] I have written to the pa[lace], but [thou hast] not [return]ed [w]ord to me. (30)

Al[of] the lands of [the king] are not as they were before. For [years] [an] archer [host] used to come out to inspect [the lands], but behold, [now] the land of (35) the king, as well as Simyra, your garrison city, have been turned over to the Apiaru, and thou remains silent! Send me a large archer host so that it may drive out (40) the enemies of the king from the midst of his land, that all the lands might turn themselves over to the king!

Further, thou art the great lord; do not (45) remain silent with reference to this [mess]age!

***
L. 1. a-n[al] < EN-Šu>: For the necessity of assuming a scribal lapse here (or possibly an inadequately hatched autograph) cf. the note on EA 81:4 infra.

L. 6. dUTU-ia: The revised autograph, § 35, displays a SAB-sign instead of the usual UD-sign for UTU. According to Labat (op. cit., p. 179), however, SAB is merely an orthographic variant of UD in such cases.

L. 9: As Weber has noted (EA, p. 1164), the "two cities" mentioned in the present passage are probably Byblos and Batrun (EA 79:23-29; 81:9-11).

Ll. 10-11. [y]uba’t’u laqâ [ana Šāšu]: Despite Knudtzon's objections (EA, p. 381, n. h), the traces in § 35 are not inimical to the restoration [a-na Ya-a-Šu]. In addition, the phrase yuba’t’u laqâ ana šāšu appears in ll. 12-14 and again in l. 16 of the present letter, strengthening the likelihood of the proposed restoration.

laqâ is a Canaanite accusative form, the Akkadian equivalent of which would be legê.

L. 13: Context forces us to normalize Ṣarrî (genitive) here (contra Knudtzon).

Ll. 14-16. Ṣar Mītā(n)na ... ana Šāšu: This sentence makes sense only if understood as a question, as Ebeling correctly suggested (EA, p. 1591). In such a way also we are to interpret EA 104:19-24 and 116:70-71.

L. 15: "The king of (the land of) the Kassites" (cf. the note on Meluhha in EA 70:19 for details).

L. 17. pu-hi-dir: Dhorme's contention (RB, NS Volume II [1914], p. 41) that this form (cf. also EA 91:23; 132:20) and nu-ki-dir (132:41), among others, correspond to the Arabic third conjugation and are the Canaanite prototypes of Sōrēb (Isaiah 40:24) needs no refutation. It is clear that such forms are
defectively written representations of *puhhir, *nukkir, and so forth, which are Canaanized II₁ forms of intransitive verbal stems (for the morphological structure of the qattil form, cf. the note on uSIMN in EA 70:12). du-bi-ru (104:27) is another such defectively written form, this time of the verb dubbûrû which is attested only in the II₁ conjugation in Amarna (cf. EA, pp. 1384-1395 for details), as is standard Akkadian dûppûrû. Hebrew forms such as ṣôrêh, however, are examples of the so-called Pô-Cêl conjugation which is the morphological equivalent of the Arabic third conjugation (cf. GKC², § 55 b).


L. 20. ʹāna ʾālānī ʾānītā: We expect ṣannātî here (instead of annîtâ) to conform with standard Akkadian syntax; note also the uniform witness of the Hebrew Bible with regard to the use of plural demonstrative adjectives to modify objects occurring in two's (Exodus 4:9; Deuteronomy 3:21; Joshua 21:16; Isaiah 47:9; 51:19; Zechariah 4:11). To the note made regarding EA 73:25 above, therefore, we must add the observation that the Byblian scribes were careless also in the matter of number (and, it would seem, case as well; cf., e.g., ʾattu ʾÂḫpri annû in ll. 45-46 of the present letter) in their treatment of adjectives. There appears to be a clearly dual form of the demonstrative annû in 117:19.

L. 21. [aq]a(b)[b]î: Knudtzon's restoration (which I have followed here), though not entirely satisfactory, best conforms to the traces in § 35. Since ll. 21-23 here are roughly reminiscent of EA 71:31-35 (q.v. for commentary), we expect Rib-Haddî to write "I have said" (i.e., either aq-bî or aq-ṭa-bî). It may be, however, that a direct quotation was not intended, but rather that Rib-Haddî was simply reiterating a favorite argument for the pharaoh's benefit.
L. 22: sabat here is clearly intended as a Canaanite perfect of the gatal(a) type.

L. 24. me: The word for "hundred" in Akkadian is usually written in this abbreviated form (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 69 g).

L. 25. [AMILI[TI MA(S)SA]-RTA: The latter noun is probably accusative of specification here (cf. the note on Bar tamhar in EA 74:2 above). Garrison troops formed an important part of Rib-Haddi's requests for aid from the pharaoh (cf. EA, p. 1465, for citations).


L. 27-29. [a-n]u-ma [ki-a-ma aš-ta-pár a-na
È.G]AL ü qa-a [tu-te-ru-n]a [a-w]a-t[am] a-na ia-si: Knudtzon made no attempt to restore this passage, since by the time he made his edition of the Amarna letters the signs qa-a at the end of l. 28 and most of a-na ia-si at the end of l. 29 had been broken away (although in WA 74 they are all clearly visible). The suggestive attempt of Moran (SSDB, p. 153), however, based on such passages as EA 74:49-50; 85:6-7; 89:7-10; 91:27-30; 103:20-22; 118:8-9; 119:10-11; 122:53-55; 132:51-53, provided the impetus for the reading which I have offered above and which I believe to be the only one possible in view of all the evidence. Moran reads: [a]nu-ma [ki-a-ma aš-pu-ru a-na īkallili ü [la-a yi-iš-mi LUGAL a-w]a-tam. If, however, an active form of aš(pa)-am is to be restored in l. 29, we expect as its object either a-wa-te-ia (cf., e.g., EA 85:?) or a-wa-te LR ki-ti-šu (cf., e.g., 103:25-24) or the like, and not simply a-wa-tam. Indeed, the failure of Moran to seriously consider the WA 74 readings led him astray as far as defensibly detailed restoration is concerned.

The key passage for the restoration of the present sentence is EA 81:22-24: [a-nu-ma ki-a-ma aš-ta-pár a-na È.GAL [ù qa-a tu]-te-ru-na a-wa-tu [a-na ia-si]. It is clear from 83:7-8,
47-48 that a-wa-tu here is a scribal error for a-wa-tam.

[ute(r)rûna] is a Canaanized II preterit with the nun energy ending. The Akkadianized Canaanite idiom, awatsi turrû, "to answer," is reflected in the Hebrew phrase hûlib dâbâr (cf., e.g., I Samuel 17:30; II Samuel 3:11; I Kings 12:6 = II Chronicles 10:6) as well as in Ugaritic rgm tâb (e.g., Gordon, UM II, Text 89:14-15).

Ll. 30-31. [û-ul ki pa]-na-nu ka-‘i KUR.KUR MB ˘ [LUGAL] ri: "All cf> the lands [of the kin]g [are not as they were b]efore." This highly tentative restoration is based on EA 93:24: [û]-ul ki-‘ma pa-na-nu, "Things are not as they were before" (so rendered by Moran, SSDEB, p. 161). It fits in well with the subsequent context, however. Cf. further EA 95:23-24.

pananu(m), "formerly" (cf. Hebrew lôpanîq), is used frequently by Rib-Haddî in pointing out to the pharaoh the stark contrast between the "good old days" and his present desperate situation (cf. EA, p. 1488, for citations). It utilizes the fossilized adverbial ending anu(m) so common to Akkadian (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 113 g).

For the scribal lapse in kâlí, cf. EA 130:43 where, incidentally, it also precedes matâtî (written KUR MB ˘). The reason for the mistake is obvious; it is due to haplography caused by the fact that the initial wedges of the Ll-sign are identical to the KUR-sign (cf., e.g., the Ll-sign in § 35:7).

Ll. 32-33. ana dagâl [mu]tâtî: This type of infinitive construction, attested frequently in Rib-Haddî, is purely Canaanite. The corresponding Akkadian expression would be ana matâtî(m) dagâli(m) (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 150 h).

Ll. 34-36. innepât mat Harri ˘ ... āl ma(a)sartikunu: We have here an example of a feminine singular verb appearing as the predicate before two feminine singular subjects. This type of construction, also Canaanite (cf. GKC², § 146 g), is foreign to Akkadian (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 132), due no doubt to the
fact that the verb in Akkadian appears normally at the end of the clause and is thereby influenced by the already completely written subject. In Canaanite, on the other hand, the verb in the standard verbal prose sentence occurs in primary position and is thus normally influenced only by the first noun of a compound subject.

L. 36. al ma(s)artikunu: Weber (in EA, p. 1164) has expressed puzzlement at the plural suffix -kunu here in reference to the pharaoh. As we have already noted, however (cf. the commentary on ti-di-nu in EA 71:5 above), the suffix is a so-called plural of majesty. It would appear that this phenomenon is more widespread in Canaanite Amarna than was formerly supposed (cf., e.g., the Canaanized form ušširu in 90:45; 134:23).

Ll. 38-39: uššira ṣabi pitāti rabā ù tuda(b)bir: Because rabā is masculine here it has caused trouble for many previous interpreters. Knudtzon, for example, translates "in great abundance" ("in grosser Menge"), understanding it as a nominal accusative of specification. If he were correct, however, we would expect something like narba since rabā, an adjective, rarely if ever means "abundance" in Akkadian. W 56, to take another example, renders "(and) a grandee" ("[und] einen Grossen"). But this is likewise highly improbable: (1) The particle ù is lacking; (2) there is no Lû-sign preceding ra-ba, and such an omission would be unique in Rib-Haddi (cf. EA, p. 1496, for details).

I understand rabā simply as an adjective modifying ṣabi pitāti. For the careless employment of adjectives by Rib-Haddi's scribes, cf. the notes on EA 73:25 and on l. 20 of the present letter.

The jussive form tuda(b)bir is perfectly normal in a purpose clause following the imperative uššira (cf. Moran, JCS 5, p. 33). It is, of course, a feminine singular and not a plural form (contra Ebeling, BA VIII/2 [1912], p. 42). As for the form ti-[de]b-bi-ru
(EA 138:69), the problem of its preformative vowel is inextricably interwoven with the hybrid character of the Byblian verb (cf. the note on yuba[1]lit in 74:55). It must be admitted, however, that the form strengthens the supposition that the Piel prefix vowel in Byblian was i, since dubburu appears only in the II₁ conjugation in Amarna. At any rate, the suggestion of Ebeling (loc. cit.) that the prefix vowel in ti-[da]b-bi-ru represents the $^6wā$ in the Hebrew Piel imperfect (cf. also Dhorme, RB, NS Volume 11 [1914], p. 39) is a totally unfounded assumption, since such a $^6wā$ could conceivably be reduced from any short vowel (a or u as well as i; cf. the note on EA 74:55 mentioned above).

L. 42. ti(mepēšū): Canaanite IV₁ third person feminine plural jussive.

L. 44. attā būlu rabū: "Thou art the great lord." Knudtzon's rendering of EN GAL as a vocative here, though not impossible, is awkward.

LL. 44-45. ul taqālmi: Standard Akkadian forms its prohibitive with the negative particle lā plus the present tense of the verb (cf. von Soden, § 31 h). ul taqāl is thus under Canaanite influence here; ul corresponds to Hebrew-Ugaritic 'al, and taqāl is a pseudo-jussive (the truly Canaanite form would be *taqūl). For the usage of Biblical Hebrew cf. GKC², § 109 c.

LL. 45-46. iṣṭu [ṣ]ipri annū: We expect, of course, *annī, but cf. the note on l. 20 above.
RIB-HADDI TO AMAN-APPA

(VAT 1635 / 1700 - WA 81 - W 111 - S 36 - EA 77)

Obverse

(1) a-na m[A-m]a-[an-Ap-pa]
    um-ma m[Rom][b]-dIM a-na G[ir]MEŠ-ka]
    am-ų-ut d[A-ma-na DINGIR] [a LUGAL]
    EN-ka u d[NIN] [a URU] Gub-[1]a

(5) ti-di-nu(!) T[Es-ka] i-na
    pa-ni LUGAL EN-[ka] i-nu-ma
    ta-َاṣ-pu-ra a-[na] URUDU MEŠ u a-na
    sį-in₄-ni-m[i i]-de d[NIN]
    ša URU Gub-[1a] šum-ma [i]-)][

(10) URUDU MEŠ u š[i-i]₄-ni [a-n]a
    [a-na] ia-ši ?[k]a [l]iše
d[aš] ka wa diš [u]₄ t]i-ma-[h]a-as
    u na-ad-n[a-t]i sį-[i]₄-n-a-[ų]
    [i-n]a ba-la-ti-[i]a a-na

(15) [LUGAL UR]SUR-r[1 a]t-ta
    (edge) [u-ul] ti-i-de [ ]-ia
    [ ]-ta a-[ ]-yi

Reverse

[ ] a-na mi-[nim qa]-la-ta
[ ] ub/p-ri [ ] ša

(20) [t]\-na-mu-[ša] [k]a<di> KUR KT, MEŠ
    [u]₄-ul ta-aq-[bu a-n]a EN-ka u
    yu-wa-ši-ru-[n[a-k]a] i-na
pa-ni ERÍNMEH $\text{pi-}[t]\text{á-ti} \ u$
tu-ya-am-ri-ru LU$\text{MEH}$ GAZ

(25) iy-tu LU$\text{MEH}$ [h]a-za-nu-ti
\text{yú-sa-na ERÍNMEH [pí-]}t\text{á-ti}
ù in-né-[ep-ya-a]t ka-li
KUR.KUR$\text{KI.} \text{MEH}$ [a-na LU$\text{MEH}$ GAZ]

(30) \text{yú-sa-na ERÍNMEH [pi-]}t\text{á-ti}
ù ia-nu [KUR$\text{KI.} \text{MEH}$ a-na Ya-Mu]
GI$\text{MEH}$ a-di mu-

(35) [ ] U[R]U [ ]

(35) [p]al-$\text{ha-ti} LU$MEH $\text{hu(!)-u[p-ya-ia]$
ul ti-ma-$\text{ha-sa-na-n[i]}$
(1) ana [ 'Amanj[a[n-'Appa] umma Rā[b-Haddi ana Ǧepeka] amqut
['Amāna ilu Ǧa Ǧarri] bēlika u B[ețlu Ǧa] Gub[l]a (5) ti(d)dinū(!)
bā[}'atka] ina pani Ǧarri bēli[ka] inūma taṣpura a[na] erī u ana
ṣinnim[i Ǧde Bēțlu Ǧa Gub[l]a] Summa [i]yū (10) erī u Ǧ[į]nni
[anja] {anja} Ǧāṣi u [k]a [l]i ye iš ka wa diš u[1 t]ima(h)[h]as
u nadn[ăt]i Ǧinnaṣu {in}a balāṭi[y]a ana (15) [Mar] Sur[i a]tt[a
[ul] tīde [ y]a [ t]a a[ ]yi[ ]
ana Ǧi[įnim qā]lāta [ ] ub/prī [ ] Ǧa (20)
iştu [h]azānūti Summa ṭatta a[n]nīta ul yūṣa(n)na sābi [pī]tāti
u inne[pṣat] kali māṭāti {ana ǦApīrī} (30) Summa qā[l Ǧarru
bēl]i u Ǧānu [māṭāti ana Ǧaṣṣu] elippāt amīlū[t
amīl]ūtka i[1] ] adī mu[
(35) ] ā[1
p]ahlāṭi hu[pṣiya] ul tima(h)ḥas(a)n[į]
To [Am]a[n-Appa]: Thus Ri[b-Haddi. At thy feet] I have fallen. May [Amon, the god of the king], thy lord, and the Lady of Byblos grant [thee] honor in the presence of the king, [thy] lord! Because thou hast written to me for copper and for ivory, (I tell thee that) the Lady of Byblos is witness if I have (any) copper or ivory! Moreover, .....

[Do] not smite (me), for I sold his ivory, [in exchange] for my provisions, to (the "king" of) Tyr[e. As for thee, dost thou know my [ ]? [ ] Wh[y] dost thou remain silent? [ ] (Al) the lands [are in ferment. Hast thou not spok[en to] thy lord, that he might send [th]ee at the head of an army her host that thou mightest drive the Apiru away from the mayors? If in this year an army her host does not come out, then all the lands will be turned over to the Apiru; (30) if [the king], my lord, maintains (his) silence, then no lands will be his. The boats of the people of [ ] thy [men] will [ ] until [ ] the city [of ] I [fear my] tenant [farmers]. Please do not smite me!
Ll. 1-3. ana ['AmJa(n-'Appa) umma Hī[b-Haddi ana Hēpēka] amgut: That this badly damaged letter was written to Aman-Appa is virtually certain (cf. Knudtzon, EA, p. 383, n. k). Ll. 26-27 are echoed in ll. 25-26 of EA 93, another letter of Rib-Haddi to Aman-Appa. It is perhaps best, however, to omit [qī-bī-ma] at the end of l. 1 both in the present tablet and in 86:1 (contra Knudtzon; cf. 93:1-3, which forms the basis for the restoration of the lines under discussion; cf. further 71:1-3).

Ll. 3-6. ['Amāna ilu Ya Harri] bēlika u B[ēltu Ya] Gub[l]a ti(d)dinū(!) bā[ēltka] ina pani Harri bēli[k]a: This restoration is based primarily on EA 71:4-6; 86:3-5; 87:5-7; 95:3-6, from which sources I combined the elements that best commended themselves to fit the lacunae in the revised autograph (§ 36) Knudtzon's rejection of a similar restoration is, I feel, based on a false assumption that in turn rests on an incorrect reading (cf. EA, p. 384, nn. a, b). Just before the break in l. 4 Knudtzon saw a ŠI-sign, which he assumed was the beginning of an Ū-sign. Whatever the traces may represent, however, they are certainly not those of a ŠI-sign. We see, rather, a single oblique wedge (Ū) followed immediately by a clear DINGIR-sign (cf., for the scribal orthography of DINGIR here, the penultimate sign in l. 8). I have decided, therefore, to read u d[NIN] before the break in l. 4, although it is of course quite possible that the scribe intended to write an Ū-sign and by mistake proceeded no farther than the first wedge (for a similar error cf. the use of a ŠI-sign as an incomplete Ū-sign in EA 118:31; 137:54). When the scribal intention is thus understood, Knudtzon's objection that there is no room for the remainder of the Ū-sign as well as d[NIN] Ṣa URU in the break becomes superfluous, for we then need to supply only the final three signs (for which there is ample space). Needless to say, ti-di-mi at the beginning of l. 5 is an error for *ti-di-nu (cf. the passages cited at the beginning of this note; EA 102:5-7, referred to by Knudtzon, is not nearly so pertinent).
6-11. inūma taṣpura a[na] er ū ana ši-in₇-ni-m[i i]-de
Beltu ṣa Gubl[a] Summa [i]yu erī ū š[i-in₇-ni a-n]a [â-na] yaši:
ši-in₇-ni, according to Ebeling (EA, p. 1591), should be normalized as senni with the meaning "axe." We note, however, that in ll.
10 and 13 the word is written with the ŠI-sign which has the value ŠI₁₇ only in neo-Assyrian (according to Labat, op. cit., p. 201).
ši-in₇-ni, on the other hand, is not the only word in Rib-Haddi that displays a ŠI-sign with the value ŠI (cf., e.g., lu-wa-ši-ra-am in EA 84:26). The word in view is, therefore, Šinnu, "ivory" (for occurrences elsewhere in Amarna cf. EA, pp. 1522-1523). Akkadian Šinnu, "tooth, ivory," has approximately the same semantic range as does Hebrew Šen.

The crux interpretum of the entire passage occurs at the break in l. 8. Knudtzon readsLit[-ti-j]-di and hesitantly interprets the result as a I₂ form of nādu, "to praise, extol" (this verb, incidentally, should be carefully distinguished from na'ādu, "to obey; pay attention"; cf. Landsberger, ZDMG 69, p. 492; OLZ 28, pp. 231-232; ibid., p. 232, n. 1), while Moran (SSDB, p. 154) reads more plausibly lit[-i]-di, understanding his normalization as a I₂ form of iā, "to know." The fact remains, however, that nādu does not appear elsewhere in Rib-Haddi; and, as for iā, although the verb occurs very often in Rib-Haddi, there is not one attestation of it in the I₂ conjugation anywhere in Amarna, and indeed it is a moot point whether such forms appear in Akkadian literature altogether (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 106 q; see now also CAD 7, p. 20). It will not do to adduce Hebrew hiyyaddā and plead Canaanite influence since the Hebrew form denotes "to reveal oneself," a meaning not pertinent in the present case. In addition, the LIIT-sign does not, to my knowledge, occur elsewhere in Rib-Haddi, even in words where it might reasonably be expected (cf., e.g., EA 68:25; 74:55; 85:18, 58).

The above arguments have led me to assume that the LIIT-sign is the first part of a MI-sign which is to be appended to the preceding word as the enclitic -mi, the possible function of which
might here be to indicate the presence of a direct quotation (a fact which I have tried to represent in my translation). The following two signs are then best read [i]-de and understood as a purely Akkadian form of the verb idū. For the Canaanite idiom involved in my rendering cf., e.g., Joshua 22:22.

[il]du ... ana yāši is under clear Northwest Semitic influence (cf. Hebrew yēš 1î; Ugaritic it ly; Aramaic İtay lî; cf. further the note on išu in EA 68:20, and see now also CAD 7, p. 292, §3). The forms erî and _MI]nî in 1. 10 are thus to be understood as genitives in accordance with Hebrew usage as reflected in suffixial forms such as yēšoša and yēš0šem.

At the end of 1. 10, Knudtzon restores [es]rî (i.e., [URU]DU) which, however, makes no sense when the preceding M[i]nî, left untranslated by Knudtzon, is properly understood. Furthermore, in 1. 7 and at the beginning of 1. 10 URUDU carries the MEH-sign. The restoration of Moran, [a-n]a (SSDB, p. 154) is therefore much to be preferred (with the resulting dittography Moran rightly compares EA 107:45-46; 108:16-17 [cited incorrectly by him as 108:15-16]; 112:49-50).

I1. 11-12. [k]a [l]i yē is ka wa diš: Although nearly all the signs are reasonably clear, this passage remains an enigma. Knudtzon reads the first sign as KIL but, since the appearance of the KIL-sign elsewhere in Kib-Haddi is unknown to me and because of the reasonably certain [l]i that follows, the possibility of reading [k]a-[l]i immediately presented itself. The ME-sign that ends the line might then be understood as a ligature for KUR.KUR as occasionally elsewhere in these texts, a phenomenon first noted by Thureau-Dangin (in RA 19, p. 93, n. 1). [k]a[l]i matati, "[a]ll[l] of the lands," would be the result, but because the first four signs in 1. 12 present a seemingly insurmountable obstacle even this partial decipherment must remain highly uncertain.
L. 12. u[1 t]ima(h)[h]as: "[Do] n[ct] smi[t]e (me)." The elimination (or, perhaps better, omission) of the pronominal suffix, the nature of which is clear from the context, is paralleled in Canaanite syntax (cf., e.g., GKO², § 117 f).


In connection with EA 77:6-15 Campbell (Bib. Arch. 23/1 [1960], p. 13) makes the following suggestive comment: "Amanappa may have been the officer by whom Rib-Adda sent in his tribute, for he writes at one point that he has had to give ivory and copper to the 'king' of Tyre in exchange for his life (or for the necessities of life) and therefore cannot fill Amanappa's request for these articles." For the plausibility of the reading [LUGAL U]SUR-r[i] in l. 15, cf. EA 92:32-34. Surr[i] is, of course, Tyre (Hebrew Sör), the storied island port located just off the Mediterranean coast 13 miles north of the modern Lebanese-Israeli border.

L. 15-16. [a]t-ta [ú-ul] ti-i-de [ ]-ia: For the restoration of [ú-ul] (contra Knudtzon's [lu-ú]), cf. EA 75:14-15 which is, significantly, a passage from a letter to Aman-Appa. The lacuna before the IA-sign cannot at present be filled in due to the lack of parallels. We expect something like [ki-t]i-ia (cf. 119:38-39) or [pár-ša-ia] (cf. 73:39) but the traces do not support either reading.

L. 17: It is tempting to restore here [ga-l]a-ta a-n[a ia]-ši, but since gálata appears in the following line such a
restoration is highly unlikely (cf. also the comment by Knudtzon in EA, p. 385, n. i).

L. 18. a-na mi-[nim qa]-la-ta: For this restoration (so approximately also Knudtzon), cf. EA 71:10-11; 73:6-7.

L. 19. [     ] ub/p-ri [     ]: In certain of the Amarna letters upru is clearly attested as a dialectal form meaning "dust" (cf. EA, pp. 1539-1540, for details). It does not, however, appear in Rib-Haddi, where the word for "dust" is the more common ep(e)ru (EA 116:60; 136:3), and it is therefore unlikely that we are to see upru in the present line. The signs may well form part of a longer word.

L. 20. [ti]-na-mu-ša [k]a-[li] marati: The form of namasšu as I have restored it corresponds more closely to the Canaanite ideal of the third person plural feminine verb than does Knudtzon's [yi]-na-mu-ša. For the plausibility of [k]a-[li], cf. the note on EA 76:30-31 above.


Ll. 22-23: ina pani in the sense of "at the head of" is paralleled in Hebrew by a similar use of līpm (cf., e.g., Deuteronomy 10:11; Judges 9:39; I Samuel 8:20; Micah 2:13) and in Ugaritic by a similar use of līpm in II AB, iv-v:16-17: 𒈗 𒈂𒈏 𒈔 𒈒 𒋼 𒈏 𒈐 𒈔 𒈐 𒈏, "Qadesh proceeds to lead, Amur is like a star in front" (the translation is that of Ginsberg in ANET2, p. 133).

L. 24. tu Amurru: A comparison of such passages as EA 76:38-41 and 85:80-82 with the passage under consideration (77:21-25) makes it quite clear that duburu and Amurru (cf. also 103:30) are virtual synonyms in Rib-Haddi and that therefore Amurru means "to drive out." In view of the researches of Albright (cf. especially BASOR 78, p. 24, n. 5, and 89, p. 12,
n. 34, together with references there cited) and von Soden (in
Or., NS 20 [1951], pp. 257 ff.) it is now certain that Rib-Haddi's
Sumuraru must be kept separate from such forms as innamir (EA
256:21) which are derived from an entirely different root (as yet
undetermined with complete certainty, but equivalent to Mari
naharum [ARM 15, pp. 230 ff.]) meaning "to come to help" (contra
Ebeling, EA, p. 1463). I suspect, therefore, that it is a
Canaanite verb and assert that we are entirely justified in
assuming a connection between Sumuraru and the imperative form mr
(hence murra?) in the well-known Ugaritic passage found in III AB,
A:19-20: ḫmr at Aymr Aymr mr Ym mr Ym lksīn Nhr lkht drkth,
"Thy name, thine, is 'Aymr; 'Aymr, drive out Yamm! Drive Yamm
from his throne, Nahar from the seat of his dominion!" (note
ibid., 11-13: ḫmr at Ygrh Ygrh qrō Ym, etc.). In view of the
fact that mr/grō in Ugaritic, it may not be amiss to suggest a
slight emendation in Deuteronomy 33:27: wygrō ṁnyk 'wyb
wayyāmar(!) ḫṣmd, "and he will chase the enemy from before thee,
and he will drive out destruction."

L. 26. Matta (n)nitā: For this normalization (despite
MES
here) cf. EA 93:25; 117:56.

L. 27. ĕṣu(n)na sabi [pit]āti: In view of EA 76:31-32 and
81:45-46, and because sabi pitāti is a feminine singular noun,
ĕṣu(n)na must be a mistake for Canaanite *tēṣa(n)na; it may be
that we are to see in it an Akkadianizing tendency (since standard
Akkadian does not distinguish between third person singular
masculine and feminine forms in the preterit or present tenses).
It is far less likely that we are to understand the form as a
Canaanite ḫīphū̂l and render "he (i.e., the pharaoh, who is
referred to in l. 21) does (not) send out."

154) reads in-nē-[ep-M]a here, claiming lack of room for the
restoration proposed by Knudtzon. It should be noted, however,
that by the same token there is scarcely room for Knudtzon's restoration in either l. 27 or l. 29, both of which may nevertheless be considered certain due to the numerous parallels available. It is clear that Schroeder's revised autograph does not in this instance accurately represent the lacunae of the original tablet. innepāa would, of course, fit in well with matsi, but the fact remains that Byblian idiom prefers innepmat in this phrase (cf. EA 79:42-43; 84:9; 85:72-73). For the common Canaanite practice of using a third person singular feminine verb as the predicate of a plural subject cf. GKC², §145 k.

11. 30-31. Summa qa-a[l LUGAL EM]i ū yānu [KUR.KI.MEH a-na Ma-šu]: The restoration (so approximately Knudtzon for l. 30, although he made no attempt in l. 31) is based on EA 137:75-76 (cf. also 88:12). We see in gāl a Canaanite perfect form (cf., e.g., Hebrew qām) since in Akkadian the morphological equivalent (in this case a stative) would be qū with forms such as qāl making their appearance only in neo-Assyrian (cf. von Soden, GAG, §104 i; Paradigm 28, n. 26).

L. 32. GIą MA LÚ[EM]: GIą MA is probably a plural here (cf. EA 101:33).

L. 34. adi mu-[ ]: Knudtzon's restoration, adi mu[-ḥ]i, is highly improbable in view of the fact that adi mu-hi is exclusively Middle Assyrian, neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian (cf. von Soden, GAG, §§115 h, 119 c). Possibly the MU-sign is here a logogram for šatu (cf. l. 26), or perhaps we are to read adi mu-[ša], "... while it was still ni[ght]..." (cf. EA 112:48-49 with commentary).

L. 36. hu(!)-u[p-M]-ia: §36 displays RI as the first sign of this word, but the following sign can only be read U[B/P] and assures the correctness of the reading Hu( ) in initial position, verifying also the accuracy of at least the crucial portion of the restoration. Cf. Knudtzon, EA, p. 386, n. f,
where he compares ti-pa-li-hu(!)-na (EA 105:22) for the same scribal error, and note further 125:35: hu(!)-<up>-Su-Su-nu (for the accidental omission of the second syllable in this word, cf. 114:22: hu-<up>-Bi-ia).

In Amarna, the class of people known as hupšu is mentioned only in the Rib-Haddi letters (cf. for citations EA, p. 1417, sub hupšu). Studies by a number of scholars, notably L. Mendelssohn (in BASOR 83, pp. 36-39; 139, pp. 9-11), have shown that hupšu means something like "tenant farmer" and refers to an individual who was roughly equivalent to the musšēnu(m) familiar to students of the Code of Hammurabi. The hupšu was subject to military service (note especially the use of the equivalent Ugaritic term, hpt, in IK:90) and to the corvée, and was an important factor in the economies of Nuzi (for which cf. especially E. R. Iachman in BASOR 86, pp. 36-37) and Alalakh (cf. Wiseman, Alalakh [1953], p. 10). The Hurrian plural form hupšena attested in the Alalakh tablets (Numbers 129,131,136), as well as the fact that in Ugaritic the word is written with the t-phoneme, suggests the possibility that hupšu is a Hurrian loanword in the Semitic languages. Though Hebrew hupši has a somewhat different meaning, it cannot be doubted that it is etymologically related to the word under consideration. For representative attestations of hupšu in the various dialects of Akkadian wherein it occurs cf. CAD 6, pp. 241-242.

L. 37. ul tīma(h)basa(n)man[i]: Though stating correctly that this verbal form contains an example of -a- used as the connecting vowel for the nun energicum, Ebeling (in BA VIII/2 [1912], p. 73) errs both in claiming it to be a plural and in comparing it with the form tīśmāna (EA 103:22), which he also considers a plural. Since the latter is obviously to be connected with two personal names occurring earlier in the letter (103:18-19) it can only be analyzed as a Canaanite dual (= third person feminine plural) with the energetic ending (so approximately also Moran, JCS 5, p. 35).
As for tima(h)hana(n)na itself, I believe that all existing translations err in failing to understand it in its proper context. In the first place, no amount of explanation can succeed in making of it a third person masculine plural form, since it is inconceivable that the ū-ending of such a form could possibly be sublimated into the -a- connecting vowel of the energicum. Furthermore, I feel that to consider it a third person feminine singular and to evoke the usage noted in ll. 28-29 above, though possible, is highly unlikely and presents too easy a solution. It seems to me, rather, that we are to understand our form as a second person masculine singular and to translate the phrase in l. 37 as an emphatic reiteration of the plea ending l. 12: "Please do not smite [e]!" Lest the change of thought from line 36 seem too abrupt, it is highly significant to note the similarly unqualified parallel to that line in Ea 117:90: ḫu-ṣa-ṣi-ia a-[pa-l]a-ah a-na-ku.
RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH
(VAT 1282 – WA 84 – W 62 – S 37 – EA 78)

Obverse

(1) [\([\text{MRi-i}]\)b-\(d\)IM iq-b\(i\)]

[a-na] E\(N\)-\(yu\) LUGAL KUR.KUR\(H\).A.K.I\(i\)]

[LUGAL GA]L \(d\)NIN \(\#\)a UR\(U\) [Gub-la]

[tir-d]i-in\(4\) GA.KALAG a-na [LUGAL]

(5) [be-1]i-\(na\) a-na G\(I\)R\(n\) MEN\(y\) EN-[\(ia\)]

[^d]\(UTU\)-\(ia\) IMIN-\(yu\) IMIN-a-an am-[\(qut\)]

[i\(u\)-\(u\)] i-de LUGAL \(ru\) EN\(li\) [\(i\)-nu-\(ma\)]

[KALAG, GA] nu-\(kur\)-tum \(\#\)a-a

[^MR]-\(d\)-\(A\)-\(ir\)-ta UGU-i\(a\) \(\dot{u}\)

(10) [il-t]i-q\(e\) ka-li URU\(K\)I.\(H\).A.-\(ia\)]

[a-na] -ma MIN URU\(K\)I ir-ti-hu

[a-na] ia-\(si\) \(\dot{u}\) \(\#u\)-nu \(\dot{y}\)[u-ba-\(u\)]

[\(la\)] qa-a a-na-ma ki-ma MUS\(E\)N

[\(\#\)a] i-na \(\#A\)\(4\) bi hu-ha-r\(i\)]

(15) [\(\#\)a]-ak-na-at ki-\(\#u\)-m[a]

[a-na] ku i-na \(\#A\)\(4\) bi URU G\(ub\)-\(l\)[a]

[\(\dot{u}\)] yi-\(i\)S-ma EN\(li\) a-wa-te

[\(\#R\)] \(\#u\) a-na-ma i-\(na\)

[U\(R\)] BAT-ru-na i-ba-\(S\)[a]-\(ti\)

(20-24) [ ]
(25-27)

i-na pa-ni [ ]

(30)

KUR, KU][KI, HI, A [ ]

KUR ]la-ri-[mu-ta]

ma ha [ ]

u [ ]

$[A] t[i] [ ]

(35) [i]-na pa-n[i

a [ ]

HI, A [ ]-i[a] uš-ar[a

[ki-ma] ar-ši-is ū [uš-ši-ra]

[Lo, MEH] ma-sa-ar-ta [ ]

(40) [ ] ra[a i]-na qa-[ti

(remainder effaced or broken away)
(1) [Rī]b-Haddi iqbi[i ana bel]išu yar māte [Yarri rab]ī
Bēltu ša [Gubla ti(d)d]in dunna ana [Yarri (5) bēl]iya ana ṣepe
bēl[i(ya)] Šammiya Ṣib'ītšu Ṣib'ītān am[qut lū] Ḭđe Yarru bēlī
[iniヌma dann]at nukurtum ša ["Abdi]-'Ādira muhhiy[a ʿā (10)
ilt]iqe kali āl[āniya anū]ma ṣina alāni irti(h)bū [ana] yāyi ṭ
Yunu y[uba'lu la]qā anūma kīma īṣṣuri [Ma] ina libbi ḥuhār[i
(15) š]aknāt kīnum[a anā]ku ina libbi Gubl[a ʿā] yiḥme bēlī
awāte [ardi]šu anūma ina Batrūna iba(š)[ā]ti (20) [  

(25)

] ini [  
  5 1 [  
  (30)  
  5 ājītā(t)i [  
  [  
  i[n]a pan[i  
  ] [  
  5 j[  
  [  
  (35)  
  5[t]i [  
  a [  
  5[y[a] uṣṣir[a  
  5[kīma] arhiš ʿū [uṣṣira  
  5[amīlūti] ma(š)sartä [  
  (40)  
  5[a  
  i]na
  5[qā[ti  

(remainder effaced or broken away)
(1) [Ri]b-Haddi has said to his [lord], the king of the two lands, [the great] king: [May] the Lady of [Byblos gra]nt power to [the king], (5) my [lord]! At the feet of [my] lord, my sun-god, seven times, seven times I have fallen. The king, my lord, [should] know [that] the hostility of [Abdi]-Ashirta against m[e is sev]ere, [and (that)] (10) he has taken all [my] citi[es. Up till] now (only) two cities remain [to] me, and (even) those he [seeks to ta]ke! By now, like a bird [that l]ies in a snar[e], (15) so [am] I in Bybl[os. Therefore], let my lord hearken to the words of his [servant]! I have already bee[n] in Batrun; (20) [  

(25) in the presence of [  

(30) the land[ds (of)] [  

(35) in the presence of [  

(40) (remainder effaced or broken away)
L. 2. **KUR.KUR**[I] ** serious**: Instances of the **KI**-sign following the plural indicator in Rib-Haddi are relatively rare (cf., e.g., EA 74:35; 102:6; 108:2), but the traces in Schroeder's autograph point to such a reading in the present case (cf. also Knudtzon, EA, p. 387, n. g).

L. 4-5. **[LUGAL be-1]i-ia**: This restoration is the only possibility in view of my note on EA 75:1-4 supra which, in turn, effectively discredits Knudtzon's [[Marri bêli-ia ilu's]amê-i-ia].

L. 6. **am-[qut]**: Due to the restricted space at the end of this line, the frequently attested reading **am**-**qut** is perhaps to be preferred to Knudtzon's **am**[-**ku**-ut].

L. 7. **Idea . . . [i-nu-ma]**: With the possible exception of EA 108:45, "to know that" in Rib-Haddi is expressed by **idû** inûma. I have therefore decided to follow Knudtzon's restoration here.

L. 9. **[NIR]-dA-si-ir-ta**: According to the traces in S 37, this restoration is more probable than Knudtzon's **[labd]i-a-si-ir-ta**.


Instead of **Sûnu** here we expect **Matina** or, at the very least, **Sinâti**. We note, however, that such forms never appear in Amarna at all, much less in Rib-Haddi. The resultant leveling of accusative plural independent personal pronouns is carried over into the corresponding pronominal suffixes (cf., e.g., EA 90:25: [til]tigûSûnu, where standard Akkadian would write *ilteqûsinâti; 96:21: ûba-ûâ-Sûnu, and 116:24: [Mû]-ri-ib-ti-Sûnu, wherein in each instance we expect *-Mûnu-ti). One aspect of this phenomenon has already been touched upon by C. H. Gordon, who noted that the accusative suffix -Sûnu replaces -Sûnûti also in the Nuzi documents (cf. Or. 16, p. 9).
L. 14. hu-ha-r[i]: For the omission of the expected gloss, ki-lu-bi, cf. EA 90:40.


L. 19. Batruna: For several years after the discovery of the Amarna letters, the name of this city was read Be-ru-na and equated with Amarna Be-ru-ta, modern Beirut (cf., e.g., Knudtzon, passim; Petrie, op. cit., p. 165). As Weber has pointed out (EA, p. 1165), however, Dhorme recognized as early as 1908 that we must read Bat-ru-na and understand the sign-group as referring to modern Batrun, located about ten miles up the coast from Byblos. The village is mentioned in Amarna only in the Rib-Haddi correspondence (EA 79:25; 81:9; 87:20; 88:16; 90:14; 93:20; 124:34); with the exception of Byblos itself it was the last city in Rib-Haddi's domain to be captured by Abd-Ashtira (cf. 81:9-10; 88:16).

L. 30. [KUR.KU]R KI.HI.A: Before the HI.A sign-group WA 84 exhibits a clear KI-sign; Knudtzon and S 37, which read $^{55}$ A$^{56}$, can scarcely be correct.

L. 32: Knudtzon reads [i-m]a-h[a-]a[r], but maharu is extremely rare in Amarna and never appears elsewhere in Rib-Haddi.

L. 37: Knudtzon's restoration at the end of this line, u[N]u-ir[a-an-ni], is unlikely because of the fact that the object of wa-muru always immediately follows it and immediately precedes kina arhi wherever the latter occurs (EA 103:25-26; 103:44-45; 117:77-78; 133:12-14).
Obverse

(1) [m]Ri-i]b-dIM iq-bi
[a-na EN]-Yu LUGAL KUR.KUR[KL LUGAL GAL]L
[LUGAL ta]-am-ḫa-ra Hôtel
[Ma] URU Gub-la ti-di-in
(5) [KALAG.G]A a-na LUGALri EN-ia
[a-na] G[IR] MES EN-ia dUTU-ia
[IM]IN-Yu IMIN-a-an am-qū-ut li-ma-ad
i-nu-ma iš-tu ka-Ma-ad
mA-ma-an-AP-pa a-na mu-ḫi-ia
(10) ka-li LÜ MES GAL MES na-[d]-nu
pa-ni-Yu-nu a-na ia-ši a-n[a]
KA \ pī-i mIR-A-ši-ir-[ta]
ù yi-š-m-e EN li
a-wa-te MES IR-Yu û [yu-wa-ši-r]a-ni
(15) LÜ MES ma-sa-ar-ṭa a-n[a]
[n]a-sa-ar URU LUGAL a-d[i]
a-sa ERIN MES pī-ṭa-ti
šum-ma ia-nu ERIN MES pī-[p]i-[tā-ti]
ù in4-né-ep-Yu ka(!)-[li]
(Edge)(20) KUR MES a-na LÜ[EL G]A MES ši-me [ia-ši]
Reverse

iš-tu sa-ba-at ŪRUM-a[r-ha]
a-na pi-i mIr-A-gir-ta
ù ki-na-na tu-ba-ú-na
e-pé-ša ŪRUGub-la ु

(25) ŪRUBat-ru-na KI ु in₄-[nÉ-ep-Su] ka-li KUR.KUMES a-na LÜMES GAZ[MES]
MI N ŪRUKI.MES Iša ir-ti-ḫu a-na [ia-Ši]
ù tu-ba-ú-na la-qa-šu-[nu]
iš-tu qa-at LUGAL₂¹ yu-wa-[i-ra]

(30) EN li LÜMES ma-sa-ar-ta
a-na MIN ŪRU₄-Su a-di a-šé ER[ÍNMES]
pí-tá-ti ु mi-im-ma
yu-da-na-ni a-na a-ka-li-
ia-nu mi-im-ma a-na ia-Ši Mu-nu

(35) ki-ma MUŠEN Iša i-na SAG₄ bi
ḫu-ḫa-ri ु ki-lu-bi Iša-ak-na-
[ki]-Mu-ma a-na-ku i-na at
[URU]Gub-la KI Iša(!)-ni-tam
[Sum-m]a la-a i-le-e

(40) [LUGAL₂²] la-qa-ia iš-tu
[qa-at] na-ak-ri-šu

(edge) [ù i]₄[nÉ-ep-Sa-at
[ka-š]i KURKI.MES
[a-na mIr]-A-gir-ta
(45) [mi-nu š]u-ut UR.USR.ù
[yi-ì]-qú KUR.KUR[MEŠ] LUGAL[r] a-n[a]
[ya-a]-šu

(1) [Rī]-b-Haddi iqbi [ana bēli]šu šar mātē ša[rrī ra]lī
[šarri t]amhāra Beltu [ša] Gubla ti(d)in (5) [dun]na ana šarri
bēliya [ana] šepē bēliya Šamšiša [šib]citišu šibcitan amqut limad
inūma īstu kašād 'Amān-Appa ana mu(h)hiya (10) kali cApirī
na[d]nu panišunu ana yāši an[a] pī cAbdi-'Ašir[ta] u yišme
bēli awâte ardišu u [yuwa(š)šir)a(n)ni (15) amīlūti ma(s)arša
an[a] n]asār āl šarri ad[i] asā sābi pitāti Summa yānu sābi
pi[pī][tāti] u inneπū ka(!)[li] (20) mātāti ana [cApirī šime
[yāši] īstu šabāt Bit-a[rha] ana pī cAbdi-'Aširta u kīna(n)na
tuba'una epešša Gubla u (25) Baṭrūna u inneπū kali mātāti
ana cApirī šina ālāni ša irti(h)hu ana [yāši] u tuba'una
laqāš[u]nu īstu qāt šarri yuwa(š)šir[a] (30) bēli amīlūti
ma(s)arša ana šina ālānīšu adi asē sā[bi] pitāti u mimma
yūdana(n)ni ana akalīšunu yānu mimma ana yāši (35) kīma issūrī
ša ina libbi huḥāri \ kilūbi šaknat [kī]šuma anāku ina Gubla
ša(!)nātam [šimmu] la ile' e (40) [šarru] laqāša īstu [qāt]
nakrīšu [u i]nneπušat [kal]i mātāti [ana cAbdi]-'Aširta (45)
[mīnu š]ūt kalbu u [yil]qu mātāt šarri an[a ša]šu
(1) [Rigion] Haddi has said [to] his [lord], the king of the two lands, the [great] king of battle: May the Lady of Byblos grant (5) power to the king, my lord! [At] the feet of my lord, my sun-god, seven times, seven times I have fallen. Be informed that since the arrival of Aman-Appa into my presence (10) all the C[piru have set their faces against me at] the command of CAbdi-Ashir[ta]. Therefore let my lord hearken to the words of his servant, and [let him sen]d me (15) garrison troops to guard the city of the king until the coming out of an archer host. If there is no archer host, then all of the lands will be turned over to the [C]Apiru.

Hearken [to me]: Since the seizure of Bit-ar[a] at the command of CAbdi-Ashir[ta], thus also they seek to capture Byblos and (20) Batrun, and so all the lands will be turned over to the C[piru. (There are only) two cities that remain to [me], and they seek to take th[em] from the control of the king. Let my lord (30) send me garrison troops for his two cities until the coming out of the archer host, and let something be given to me for their sustenance. I have nothing! (35) Like a bird that lies in a snare, [s]o am I in Byblos.

Further, [if] the king is (40) unable to rescue me from [the power of] his enemies, then all of the lands will be turned over [to CAbdi]-Ashir[ta]. (45) [Who is he], the dog, that [he should]ake the royal lands for[him]self?
Ll. 8-9. istu kāšad 'Aman-'Appa ana mu(h)īhya: Clearly, Aman-Appa responded favorably to the pleas of Rib-Haddi in EA 73 and 77 (q.v.) that he (Aman-Appa) request the pharaoh to send him to Rib-Haddi's aid.

Ll. 10-11. mā[n]u panīṣunu ana yāṣī: "... (they) have set their faces against me..." nādānu pānī ana is a Canaanite expression meaning "to oppose"; cf. Hebrew nātan pānīm bē' with the same connotation in Leviticus 17:10; 20:6; Ezekiel 14:8; 15:7 (in this latter reference cf. also the equivalent expression šām pānīm bē', for which cf. further Leviticus 20:5; Jeremiah 21:10; 44:11); šām pānīm šēl (cf., e.g., Ezekiel 6:2; 21:2); šām pānīm šāl (cf. Ezekiel 29:2; 35:2).

Ll. 11-12. an[a] pī: In standard Akkadian this phrase generally means "according to, corresponding to" (cf., e.g., CH, § 51: ana pī simdat šarrīm, "corresponding to the price fixed by the king"). The same meaning is attested for the Hebrew expressions šēl pī, šēpī, kēpī, and šāl pī (cf. BDB, p. 805, for details). In the present context, however, ana pī means more exactly "at the command of," a meaning likewise demanded by kēpī and šāl pī in certain instances (cf. ibid.). šēl, "according to," is also found in Phoenician (cf. Harris, GPL, p. 136).

Ll. 13-14. višme ... ū [yu-wa-ši-ra]a-ni: Because of the fact that yu-wa-š[i-ra] appears in l. 29, clearly reflecting the polite, impersonal style of our scribe, I have decided to restore as above (cf. also EA 85:16-17; 121:45-47; 122:44-46). Knudtzon's restoration, [u8]-ši-ra]-a-ni, though less plausible, does not contradict Byblian idiom (103:32-34; 108:65-66; cf. also GKC², § 112 q; cf. further my note on EA 90:44-45 infra).

L. 17. a-sa: The left edge of ll. 17-24 was still intact when WA 75 was drawn, so that we can be certain of the readings on that area of the tablet.
asa appears in the present context in the phrase ad[i] asa sabi pitati, "unt[il] the coming out of an archer host." We expect asa instead of asa (cf. EA 71:26-27; 82:19; 127:38-39, and especially 11. 31-32 of the present letter), but we are probably to explain asa here as the uncontracted construct of *(w)asa'u(m) (so used in Old Akkadian as well as in Old and Middle Assyrian; cf. von Soden, GAG, § 64 i). Cf. EA 70:26 for an additional example.

L. 19. ka(!)[li]: Our scribe has written a clear ología-sign instead of the expected KA-sign here; he was somewhat careless in distinguishing between the two signs, which are very similar in appearance (cf. KA for ología in 1. 38 below).

L. 20. Si-me [ia-Śi]: For the plausibility of my restoration cf. EA 83:14; 85:47; 93:9; 95:21-22; 102:29; 122:53. The use of the dative after *Hm is not uncommon in Canaanite; in Hebrew, for example, ñama is frequently followed by el plus object (cf., e.g., Genesis 49:2), less often by e- plus object (cf., e.g., Joshua 24:10; cf. BDB, pp. 1033-1034, for additional details).

L. 21. URU E-a[r-ha]: The restoration is scarcely to be doubted (cf. EA 83:29; 91:9). Beth-yerah immediately presented itself as a possible etymological equivalent for Bit-arha, but its location at the southern end of the Sea of Galilee militates against such an identification. Furthermore, we should also expect the Byblian scribes to have written URU E-la-ar-ha if the two sites are to be equated. The location of Bit-arha must therefore remain uncertain.

Ll. 23-24. tuba'una epesHa Gubla: "... they seek to seize Byblos ..." The construction here is Canaanite throughout; the corresponding Akkadian expression (assuming for the moment identity of vocabulary) would be either epes Gubla uba'ū or, better, a/ina Gubla epesHi(m) uba'ū.
The idiom **āla epēšu** means "to capture a city" only in Mari and Amarna (cf. CAD 4, p. 202, for details). For a somewhat similar use of **casa** in Biblical Hebrew, cf. Genesis 31:1 (where it is parallel to **lqah**; cf. 1. 23 of the present letter with the passage under discussion, a comparison which shows clearly that epēšu, "to take," is equivalent to Amarna **laqū**); Ezekiel 22:13.

**Ll. 25-26.** **ina-[né-es-Šu]** kali matati:** For the restoration cf. **l. 19-20.** **ina-[né-es-Ša-at]** is also possible (cf. **l. 42-43**), but is less likely in view of the amount of space available at the end of **l. 25.**

**Ll. 27-28.** **Yina ālāni Na irti(h)hū ana [yāši] ʿū tubaʿānā laqāšu[nu]:** "(There are only) two cities that remain to [me], and they seek to take th[em] . . . ." The expression is unusual; we expect the omission of either ʿū (cf. EA 76:9-10) or Na (cf. 78:11-13), but not the inclusion of both.

For **laqāšu[nu]** instead of the expected "laqāšina" cf. the note on ʿunu in EA 78:12 supra.

**Ll. 32-33.** **mimma yu-da-na-ni ana akālišunu:** The verbal form (as noted already by W, p. 410) is a clear Qal passive jussive, to be normalized **yudana(n)ni** (for other examples of such forms of the verb *y/ndn* in Amarna, all of which are in Rib-Haddi, cf. EA 83:23; 85:34,36,37; 86:32,47; 126:28,49; 137:6; 138:43). Knudtzon's ji-da-na-ni (oddly enough accepted by Ebeling; cf. EA, p. 1477), which he considered an active form, is impossible. The active equivalent in Byblian would be written *ia-di-na-ni* or, Akkadianized slightly, *yi-di-na-ni*, the i-theme being all-important in such a case.

**L. 38.** Ma(!)-ni-tam:** The scribe has written a clear KA-sign as the first syllable of this word; cf., however, the note on ka(!)-[li] in l. 19 above.
Ll. 39-41. [Ḫum-m]a lā ile‘ē [LUGAL] u laqāia Ṃtu [gāt]
nakrišu: For the plausibility of this restoration (so Knudtzon) cf. EA 114:23-24,44.

In standard Akkadian the conditional particle Summa is almost always followed by the preterit tense (cf., e.g., CH, passim), but in the case of the Canaanite dialects the conditional particles are under no such restriction (cf. GKC^2, §§ 159 l, bb for Hebrew usage; in Phoenician cf., e.g., Azitawadda, III:14: 'm 'p yhmd; l. 17: 'm ... ys^C [twice]). Thus Summa lā ile‘ē (with which cf., significantly, Hebrew 'im lō yūkal in, e.g., Judges 14:13) may be under Canaanite influence (cf. further, e.g., EA 93:19: Summa nila‘ī').


Perhaps more than any other, this letter demonstrates the close co-operation that existed between the marauding ĔApīru and ĔAbdi-Ashīrta, the Canaanite outlaw. ĔApīru hostility was on occasion instigated by ĔAbdi-Ashīrta (ll. 10-12, 19-26), and a comparison of ll. 42-44 with 19-20 and 25-26 indicates that for all practical purposes Rib-Haddi equated ĔAbdi-Ashīrta with the ĔApīru forces.
RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH
(VAT 1711 - S 39 - EA 80)

Obverse

(1-11)

[ ] ka ia ši [ ]
MÉS
[ ] nu ù [ ]
[ ] ma i-na [ ]

(15)

[ ] ka ta [ ]

[ ] yi(!)-iš-[me LUGALʃu]

[ENli a-wa-te] IR ki-ti-[M]u [ ]

[ ]-ti ū ti-[ ]

[mir-à-Mī-i]r-ta ū [ ]

(20)

[ ] uM]-Si-ra [ ]

[ ] a-[a]li-tam [ ]

(22-23)

Reverse

(24-28)

[ ] ma [ ]

(30)

[ ]-ni a-na [ ]

[at-t]a LUGALru ĺUTU(!) EM[li]

[ù] at-ta tu-ba-l[i-tú]

[IR k]i-ti-ka ū E[RINMÉS]

[pī]-tá-ti
(1) [  

(5) [  

(10) [ ka ina Yi [  

(15) nu ù [  

(20) ka ta [  

(25) ]ti ù ti [  

(30) ma [  

nu ù [  

] ma ina [  

] yim[me ɐrru bəḻi aawate] arad  

ki(t)ti[y]u [  

] u[ Abdi-']Aṣi]rta ù  

] y]a[n]i̱tam [  

] ni ana [  

] atta ɐrru ɐmSu(!) bəl[ɪ  

u] atta tuba(1)[itu arad k]i(t)ika ù ɐbî pi]ṯti  

] u[N]Mira [  

] u[Abdi-']Aṣi]rta ù  

] ṯi ú ṯi [  

] ṯi ú ṯi [  

]}
Moreover], let [the king, my lord], hear[ken to the words of his loyal servant. [ ] and [ eAbdi-Ashi]rta and [ (20) se]nd me [ F]u[r]ther, [ (25) (30) ] to [ Thou] art the king, the sun-god, [my] lord, [and] thou preservest the li[fe of] thy [lo]yal [servant] and the [ar]cher h[ost]: ...
EA 80 consists of a mere fragment of a tablet with scarcely more than forty complete signs preserved. Very little can be learned from a document so severely damaged. Its general tenor, however, makes it fairly certain that it was indeed addressed by Rib-Haddi to the pharaoh (e.g., with the characteristic phrase, ır ki-ti-[š]u, in l. 17 cf. EA 85:17,63; 103:6-7,24; 107:13,36).

L. 12. [ ] ka ia šš [ ]: With the exception of the phrases šeše šasi (for the citations of which cf. the note on EA 79:20 supra) and yūpašu šasi (138:75), the pronoun šasi is always preceded by ana in Rib-Haddi. It is therefore unlikely that we are to read [ ]ka šasi (with Knudtzon) here.

Ll. 14-15: Knudtzon’s fanciful restoration, i-na tu[ppiš]
Mš-ra-ti a-n]a ka-t[a], has no parallels elsewhere.

Ll. 16-17: yi(!)-iš-[me LUGAL]šu ENli a-wa-te] ır ki-ti-[š]u:
Cf. EA 85:16-17; 103:5-7,23-24; 107:11-13,35-36. A hatched DINGIR-sign appears in § 39 just before the EN-sign in l. 16 and is probably a scribal error for YI. At any rate, Knudtzon’s attempt to restore l. 16 as [ ]šu An šš-[ta-par] leads us nowhere.

Ll. 17-19: A possible restoration here would be [uš-šš-ra
ERINšš til-1]a-ti aš-[il-qé šš-[šš]}šš-i-ta], but due to the lack of acceptable parallels any such restoration is necessarily highly tentative. The only reasonably certain restored word in this passage is Ābdī-Ashirta’s name.

Ll. 19-21: Knudtzon’s restoration, š[ap-ra-ti a-na ka-šš uš-šš šš-ra ]šš [me amēši{tu a-na ia-šš šš[-n]}i-tu . . .], is unparalleled elsewhere (cf. the note above on ll. 14-15). The fragmentary nature of the passage relegated it to the category of mere guesswork.
L. 30: The restoration suggested here by Knudtzon, [leg]ēni ana p[anîka], has no parallels elsewhere and ought therefore to be rejected.

Ll. 31-34. [at-t]a LUGAL ru dUTU(!) EN[li ū] at-ta tu-ba-l[i-tú IR k]i-ti-ka û E[NÍN] p[í]-tâ-ti: This attempt at restoration (so approximately Knudtzon), though plausible on the basis of such passages as EA 76:44; 74:53-55, must remain highly tentative in the absence of more exact parallels. A small wedge precedes the UTU-sign in l. 31, but the reading dUTU may nevertheless be regarded as certain. After the word [pí]-tâ-ti there is considerable space left on the tablet which was not utilized by the scribe.
RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH

(VAT 1318 - WA 89 - W 64 - S 40 - EA 31)

Obverse

1] [Mr [i-b-dI M q-bi] a-na EN-[Yu]
   [LUGAL KUR[KI,MES] LUGAL GAL LU]GAL ta-am-ha-[ra]
   [dMIN Sa URU, Gub-la] t[i]-di-in4 KAL[AG,G]A
   [a-na LUGALr]i [EN-ia a-na gIN]MES E]N-ia

5] [dUTU]-ia [I]MIN-[u] IMIN-a-an a[m-q]ù-ut
   [lu-ú i]-de LUGALru EN[li [i]-nu-ma
   [KALAG].GA nu-kúr-tum Sa IR-A-[i]-ir-ta
   [ù] il-ti-qé ka-li URU[I,MES]-[i]a
   [a-na #]a-a-#u URU, Gub-la ù UR[R]U, Ba-t-ru-[na]

10] [ir-t]i-ña a-na ia-ši ù MIN UR[U]U y[u-ba]-ú
    [la-q]a-a ù iq-bi a-na LÜ[MES] URU, Ba-t-ru-[na]a
    [du]-ku-mi EN-ku-nu ù in4-né-[ep-Yu]
    [a-na] LÜ[MES] GAZ ki-ma URU, Am-m[i-ia]
    [ù] in4-né-ep-Yu ar-<nu> a-na [ia-ši]

15] [iz-z]i-i[z] LÜ ZABAR(!) GİR(!) p[at-r]a UGU-i[a]
    [ù] d[a]-k[a]-ti-[Yu ù [LÜ]Si-ir-da-nu
    [ ]a i-de-[ a-n]a ma-har
    [m]IR-A-ši-ir-ta i-na pi-[Yu a-pî-i]
    [ip]-Yu an-nu-ú a-na ia-ši a-nu-ma

20] [ki-a-m]a aš-ba-ti ù qa-la-ti i-na
    [LÜAg bi URU]-i[a la-a i-le-e a-ša
    [a-nu-ma ki-a-m]a aš-ta-pár a-na Ê.GAL
[ù la-a tu]-te-ru-na a-wa-tu
[a-na ia-ši ILIMMU-t]a-an am-ma-ša-as

(25) [ù kù-na-an-n]a ZU-ia pa[ša-ti]
[ ] ù aš-[ ]
(edge) [ ] ú-ul t[a-
[a-na mi-nim qa]-la-ta aš-[ ]

Reverse

[Su]m-ma MIN ITU an-[ni-ta]

(30) [ia-nu ERIN^2 ES pí-tá-ti [ù ušša-ra]
[ ] ù-ul yi-ma-qú-ta [a-na]
[mu-ši]-ia ù yi-šš-a-ši I I [a-na]
(È) GAL ù mi-na a-〈qa-bu-na a〉-na LU^10 MES^8 [u-upaš-šìa]
[a-n]u-ma ki-ma MUSEN ša i-na šAG^4 [ai]

(35) [bi]u-ha-ri \ ki-lu-bi ša-a[k-na-at]
[k]i]-šu-ma šu-nu i-na šAG^4 bi U RU ^10 šub-ši]a
[A.ŠA]-šu-nu DAM ša la mu-ta [m]a-ši-il
[aš-sum] b[a-š]i i-re-ši ga-am-ru
[DUMU^7 MES^8 Šu-nu M]D[UMU].M[IMES GIL]ES^10 MES^10 -Šu-nu

(40) [i-na n]a-[d]a-[n]i [i-n]a [K]^UR [I]a-ri-mu-ta
[i-na] ba-la-at ZI-šu-nu a-nu-m[a]
[k]i-[a-m]a aq-bi a-na ša-a-šu-nu DINGIR-[i]a
[ ] ERIN^10 pí-tá-ti i-nu-ma ti-d[u-ku]
[ù] ia-nu ù an-nu-ú na-ad-nu p[a-ni-šu-nu]

(45) [a-na] ia-ši(!) Šum-ma MIN ITU^8 la-a tu-[sa-na]
[ERIN^2 ES pí-tá-ti ù i-ti-la
\[ [\text{M}}R-A-\text{Si-ir-ta} \; \text{ù} \; \text{i}-\text{ti-qú} \; \text{MIN} \; U[RU]\]
\[ [\text{pa}]\text{-na-nu} \; [U]RU \; \text{Su-mu-ra} \; \text{ù} \; \text{LÚ}^{\text{MEB}}-[\text{Si}]\]
\[ [\text{da}]\text{n-nu-tu[m i]}-\text{ba-aš-yu} \; \text{ù} \; \text{LÚ}^{\text{MEB}}\]

(50) \[ [\text{ma-s}]\text{a-ar-t[u]} \; \text{it-ti-nu} \; \text{mi-[n]a}\]
\[ [\text{i-p}]\text{u-Šu-[n]a} \; \text{[a-na]-ku} \; \text{i-na-i-[e-ni]-ia}\]
\[ [\text{-d}]\text{a-ga-lu} \; [i]t-ta-sí\]
\[ ] \text{an} [ ]

(55) \[ [\text{GAL}G].G[A\]

(edge) \[ [\text{ù} [ ]\]
\[ [\text{ù} \; \text{ki-na-[n]a}\]
\[ [\text{i}-\text{ti-qú}\]
\[ ]-\text{ti-ia}\]

(left edge broken away)
(1) [Hīb-Haddī iqbi] ana bēli[šu ṣar mātē ḍarrī ražī ṣa]rri
tamḥā[ra Bēltu ṣa Gubla] t[1](d)din du[aa]n a [ana ṣaarṛi] [bēliya
ana ṣōpe b]eliya (5) [šamshinya] [u] šib'itū[u] šib'itān a[mq̣ut
[lū ī]de ṣarṛu bēli [i]nūma [dan]nat nukurtum ṣa ʿAbdi-'Aṣirta
[u] ilitating kali ālāni[y]a [ana b]u Gubla ṣu Bāṭrū[na (10)
irt]i(h)hā ana yāṣī ʿu šina ā[lāni] y[uba]ʾ][u] [laq]ā ʿu iqbi ana
amīlūt [Bāṭrūn]a [dū]jūmī bēlkunu ʿu inne[pšū ana] ʿApirī kīma
Anm[iya ulist] innepšu ar[qun] ana [yāṣī (15) ʾizz]i[s] amīlu
siparra(!) patra(!) \ p[atr]a muhhiy[a ʿu] d[a]k[a]tišu ʿu ʾśirdanu
[ ] ide[ an]a māhār ʿAbdi-'Aṣirta ina pšu apiš [ip]šu
annū ana yāṣī anūma (20) [kī'am]a ašbātī ʿu qālātī ina [libbi
āliyya]a lā ilāʾe ašā [anūma kī'am]a aštapar ana ēkallī [u lā
tu]te(r)runa awātu [ana yāṣī tiš'ittan ammahās (25) [u kīnann]a
napišṭaya pa[la]'ti ʿu aš[ ] ul
t[a an]a mínim qā]lāta aš[ ] ŝu:mmma
yina arhī an[nīta (30) yānu sāb]i pitātī [ʿu uṃṣira ʿ] ul
yima(q)uta [ana mu(h)hiy[a ʿu yilqa(n)]ni b[alṭa an]a ē]kallī ʿu
mīna a[qa(b)]būnā a]na ḫ[upšiya an]ūmā kīma issūrī ṣa ina lib[bī
(35) b]uḥārī \ kīlūbi ṣa[knut kī]šuma ṣunu ina libbi [Gubl]a
[eqel]šunu aṣṣata ṣa lā muta [m]aṣṣil [aṣṣum] b[alṭi i(r)reši
gamrū [marūšunu] m[ār]ā[tu is]sū bitātisunu (40) [ina n]a[d]ā[n]i
[in]a [Y]ari(m)šuta [ina] balāt napišṭisunu anūm[a kī'am]a aqbi
ana šagūnu ili[y]a [ ] sābi pitātī inūma tīd[ūkū ʿu]
yānu ʿu annū nadnū p[anišunu (45) ana] yāṣī(!) šumma yina arhī
lā tū[sa(n)na sāb]i pitātī ʿu ʾśīl(1)lā ʿA]bdi-'Aṣirta ʿu ilitating(q)qe
(1) [Rib-Haddi has said] to [his] lord, [the king of the two lands, the great king, the king of battle]: May [the Lady of Byblos] grant power [to the king], [my lord! At the feet of] my lord, (5) my sun-god, seven times, seven times I have fallen. The king, my lord, [should know] that the hostility of Abdī-Ashtiri [is severe] [that] he has taken all [my] cities [for himself]. (Only) Byblos and Batrun [remain] to me, and (even these) two cities he sees [to take]. Moreover, he has said to the people of [Batrun], "[Kill] your lord and turn yourself [over to] the Apiru as Ammiya (did)!" Furthermore, a misdeed has been committed against [me]: (15) A man [attacked] me with a bronze dagger, [but] I killed him, and a Sherden-man [in the presence of Abdī-Ashtiri. At his command was this crime]me perpetrated against me. Up till now (20) I sit and remain silent in my city; I cannot go out. [Already thou]s I have written to the palace, [but thou hast not] returned word [to me. Nine times] I was wounded, (25) [and under such conditions] I am afraid for] my life. [ ] and [ not [ Why dost] thou [remain] silent? [ If within these two months (30) [there
is no] archer [host], [then send me], (that) he may not attack me and (that) he may take me alive to the palace.

Moreover, what am I to say to [my] tenant farmers? Up till now, like a bird that lies (55) in a snare, [so are they in Bybl]oes. Their field resembles a woman without a husband, [because of (its) being] without a plowman. Gone are [their sons, (their)] daughters, their household furnishings, (40) [by being sold] to [Y]arimmata [in exchange for] the provisions of their live(s). Already I have said to them,

"[My] god [has] an archer host so that it might kill, but] there is none." Therefore, behold, they have set [their] face(s) against me. If within two months an archer [host] does not come out, then [A]bdi-Ashirta will come up and take the two (remaining) cities. Formerly Simyra and [its] people were strong; moreover, [gar]riso(n) (50) troop[s] were with us. (But) what can I do by myself? [survey [ ]]. There has gone out [ ]

(55) strong

] and [ ]

thu[s] taken [ ] my [ ]

(left edge broken away)
L. 2. [KUR\textsuperscript{KI,MES}] : For my restoration cf. URU\textsuperscript{K-I,MES-[i]a} in l. 8.

L. 4. [a-na LUGAL\textsuperscript{r,i} [EN-ia a-na GIR\textsuperscript{MES} EJN-ia : The restoration is Knudtzons, although he subsequently disavowed it in part, claiming lack of space between [LUGAL\textsuperscript{r,i}] and [EJN-ia for the six signs involved (cf. EA, p. 998). § 40, however, displays ample room for the restoration, and it should be noted further that ll. 1-5 of the present letter are formulaic in character, a fact which makes intolerable the omission of one or more syllables as proposed by Knudtzon (cf. EA 74:1-5; 76:1-6; 79:1-7; 105:1-5; 107:1-7; 108:1-7; 114:1-6; 116:1-6; 117:1-6; 119:1-7; 122:1-8; 123:1-9).

L. 10. [irt]i(h)\dagger : The dual (i.e., third person feminine plural) form of the verb "ritūhu in Rib-Haddi always occurs elsewhere with the Canaanite ending -ū (EA 76:9; 78:11; 79:27; 103:12), for a discussion of which cf. the note on dannū in 69:16 supra. The form before us, however, resembles more closely its Akkadian prototype (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 75 d).


L. 14. innee\dagger ar\dagger : For the idiom arna epe\dagger u, "to commit an injustice, to perpetrate a misdeed," cf. EA 122:47-48; 123:21-22; 137:24 (cf. further CAD 4, pp. 203-204). Coincidentally, the final syllable of the word arnu was mistakenly omitted by the scribe also in EA 138:21.

L. 15. [iz-z]i-i[z] LÚ ZABAR(!) GİR(!) \\
by noting that the peculiar orthography employed in the GIR-sign of 81:15 was the same as that in 82:38 (cf. EA, p. 394, n. b), but he inexplicably failed to see in the present line's UD(!).KA.BAR (the UD-sign is erroneously written MAŠ) the same ZABAR compound logogram found in 82:38 (for a final occurrence of GIR ZABAR in Amarna, cf. 254:43). Weber likewise connected the two passages (EA, p. 1166; his citation of EA 109:49 as well is incorrect, being based on an old misunderstanding of that line), although the ZABAR(!) of 81:15 apparently eluded him also. It should be noted in all fairness, however, that Knudtzon from the start had expressed misgivings concerning the reading of the first MAŠ-sign in 81:15 (EA, p. 394, n. a). At any rate, his Bar.Ka(1),Bar.Gir is infinitely better than Winckler's inexcessably grotesque bar-ra-bar-na (W 64:15; cf. also WA 89).

uzuzzu muhhi, literally "to stand against," clearly has the more specialized meaning of "to attack" in Hib-Haddi (EA 85:8; 101:12; 104:49; 132:10-11) and is the semantic equivalent of Hebrew camad cāl (to the Albright-Moran citations of Daniel 3:25; 11:14 should be added II Chronicles 20:23; the phrase in I Chronicles 21:1 has a related, though slightly different, connotation; cf. further qa'm cāl in Hebrew). In the present passage, patra is then surely an accusative of instrument and is paralleled in Hebrew by such usages as that of 'eben in Joshua 7:25, as suggested by Albright and Moran (loc. cit.), whose caution here, however, though perhaps commendable, seems to me somewhat exaggerated.

ZABAR(!) GIR(!) is to be normalized siparra patra (contrast GIR ZABAR = patar siparri, literally "dagger of bronze"), wherein siparra is to be considered a sort of adjective preceding the noun and agreeing with it in case. Although the usual function of such an arrangement is to emphasize the adjective (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 133 f; GKC², § 132 b), nothing of that kind is intended here.
L. 16. d[â]k[a]ti\th\tu: This form is more plausible than Knudtzon's d[a-]a[k-]ti-\th\tu which, si vera lectio, would be the only occurrence of such a thoroughly Canaanized first person singular preterit form in Rib-Haddi. Such forms do appear, although very infrequently, elsewhere in Amarna (cf., e.g., EA 147:56: nūhti, "I am tranquil"; 252:14:  și\th\tii, "I am slandered"), but my restoration, showing decided Akkadian influence, is more typically Byblian for hollow verbs (cf., e.g., qālāti in l. 20 of the present letter).

L. 16. [Lû\th\t]Si\th\tir-da-nu: Cf. Lû\th\tSe-a\th\t-er-da-ni in EA 122:35; 123:15. The Sherden, mentioned in Egyptian sources particularly during the thirteenth and twelfth centuries B.C.E., were one of the Sea Peoples who served as Egyptian captive or mercenary troops (cf. Wilson in ANET², p. 255, n. 2; p. 260, n. 3).

According to Scharff (in Ägypten und Vorderasien im Altertum [Munich, 1959], pp. 157,164-165), the etymological connection between the word "Sherden" and the name of the island of Sardinia may be regarded as certain, although he declines to attempt an explanation of the historical relationship (cf. further Weber in EA, pp. 1166-1167, where additional bibliographical material is also cited). Wilson, however, is more cautious, suggesting the possibility that the Sherden may have been Sardians (cf. ANET², p. 262, n. 18).

Ll. 16-18: It is tempting to restore here Sîrdanu [S]a-a i-de a[r-na an]a mahar "Abdi- 'Ashīrta, "... a Sherden-man [w]ho has knowledge of the crime (is now) in the presence of "Abdi- Ashīrta" (the Rib-Haddi dialect rarely takes notice of the Akkadian subjunctive mood; cf., e.g., EA 108:23-24: Na-a i-de ū Na-a is-te-me), but we cannot be certain because of the lack of parallels. Knudtzon's restoration of the first part of l. 17, [la]-a i-di-[p]a ... , is for the most part not even remotely plausible.
Ll. 18-19. ina pûnu apim [ip]nu annû ana yâšî; For the validity of the restoration cf. EA 103:19; 122:41-44; 123:9-12. apim is a Canaanized stative form (its Akkadian equivalent would be epîšu) and is found elsewhere in Rib-Haddi in the passages cited in the preceding paragraph. It is always correctly used with passive force and as such is carefully distinguished from its active and highly Canaanized counterpart, apaû (cf. EA 113:10; 122:31-33).

The word ipûšu, like Hebrew maše, means basically "act, deed" (cf. EA 82:46; 92:30-31), and it is doubtless only because of the nature of Rib-Haddi's difficult situation that in his correspondence it has, in an overwhelming number of cases, the connotation "misdeed" (cf. EA, p. 1405, for citations; for a similar use of the Hebrew semantic equivalent cf., e.g., Genesis 44:15; Exodus 23:24; Nehemiah 6:14). Only in peripheral Akkadian (mainly Amarna and Ras Shamra) does ipûšu mean "act, deed"; Akkadian proper utilizes instead the feminine form epîštu.

In Rib-Haddi, then, the idiom ipûšu epēšu is almost always equivalent to arna epēšu (for which cf. the note on l. 14 above). A similar cognate accusative construction, c-ša mašaše, "to perform a work," is frequently encountered in the Hebrew Bible (cf. BDB, p. 793, for details); cf. also in Ugaritic gdbg gdbt (II AB, vi:35-40).

That ana here is equivalent to munhi, "against," is clear from a comparison with EA 123:21-22. For ana meaning "against" elsewhere in Rib-Haddi in the phrase ipûšu ana, cf. EA 122:33,44; 123:12. Hebrew le- is occasionally used similarly (cf., e.g., Genesis 42:28).

Ll. 19-20. annû [ki-a-m]a ašbāti û qalāti: Cf. EA 104:31:
šumma ki'ama qaltaa.

Ll. 21-24. la-a i-še-a sa [a-nu-ma ki-a-m]a aš-ta-pár a-na š.GAL [ù la-a tu]-te-ru-na a-wa-tu [a-na ia-ši]: The restoration proposed by Knudtzon for the beginning of l. 22, [a-na
am-ru u] (doubtless on the basis of EA 88:20-21), was corrected by Moran to the certain [a-nu-ma ki-a-m]a (SSDB, p. 156). Knudtzon is probably correct, however, in restoring the beginning of l. 23 as [u la-a tu]-te-ru-na; Moran's [ta]-te-ru-na, which he normalizes as tatteru-na and considers to be a IV₁ form, would be unique in Amarna. For commentary on this passage, cf. the note on EA 76:27-29 supra.

L. 24. [tiš'it]ān ammahas: As Knudtzon correctly observed (in EA, p. 394, n. e), this passage is to be restored on the basis of EA 82:38-39: am-ma-ha-as-ni ILIMMU-ta-an, "I was wounded many times." I see no need, however, to perpetuate the incorrect form ammahasni (as Knudtzon is inclined to do in his restoration), since there is no trace of a Ni-sign at the end of 81:24. Albright and Moran (in JCS 2, p. 248, n. 25) have analyzed ammahasni, no doubt correctly, as a conflation of ammahas, "I was wounded," and imhasni, "he wounded me" (cf. the note on EA 83:27-31 for a discussion of the pronominal suffix, -ni, added directly to the consonantal ending of the verbal form).

I have based my normalization of [ILIMMU-t]a-an on the same principles that influenced my normalization of IMIN-ta(-a)-an as šib'itān (for discussion, cf. the note on EA 68:8 above). As "seven times" may mean "many times" (cf. ibid.), so also "nine times" frequently denotes "many times" (as undoubtedly here; cf. Weber, EA, p. 1167, and Albright and Moran, JCS 2, p. 248, n. 26, for bibliographical references attesting to this phenomenon elsewhere).

suffix in the Rib-Haddi dialect, cf., e.g., the idiom laqayq le'á, "to be able to take me" (EA 79:39-40; 82:6-7).


L. 29. [Yu]mma ūna arhí an-[ni-ta]: That the plural casus oblique of arhu, "month," in Rib-Haddi was arhí is clear from EA 138:23: I[T]U-hi-MAŠ5. We expect anâtí in the present phrase, but cf. the note on EA 76:20 above. At any rate, Knudtzon's an[-na-a] is impossible; if a true dual adjective were in view here we should expect an[âe].


Ll. 31-32. ul yima(q)quta [a-na mu-hi]-ia: Knudtzon's restoration here suffers from the fact that "to attack" is never *maqatu ana muhhi in Rib-Haddi but rather simply maqatu muh (EA 73:10-11; 74:32; 83:43-44; 91:25). Nevertheless, ana muhhi does mean "against" in several passages (108:36; 118:36; 127:15), and since I have nothing better to suggest Knudtzon's restoration must suffice, the one proviso being that, since ana muhhi is always written a-na mu-hi in Rib-Haddi, his logographic indication of muhhi is highly improbable. The subject of yima(q)quta is most logically <Abdi-Ashirta.

Ll. 32-33. vilqa(n)ni T[I ana e]=kalli: My restoration follows that of Knudtzon except that the traces after the verb seem to favor the beginnings of a TI-sign rather than those of TII (contra Knudtzon, EA, p. 395, n. i). Knudtzon apparently based his restoration on EA 129:49-51, with which cf. ll. 29-34 of the present letter. The subject of vilqa(n)ni is doubtless the individual whose name or status appeared originally in the lacuna at the beginning of l. 31.
L. 33. ni-na a-qa-bu-na a-na L[eahun] h[u-up-Mi-ia]: We owe this recognition of scribal error, doubtless correct and substantially in its present form, to Moran (SSDE, p. 156), who saw its relationship to EA 85:11-12 (already hinted at by Knudtzon in EA, p. 395, n. k, where he failed, however, to see the full implications of his suggestion). We have before us a clear case of haplography; the scribe intended to write a-qa-bu-na a-na, began by writing the first syllable of the first word, and through a momentary mental lapse thought that he was actually writing the first syllable of a-na which he then proceeded to finish.

L. 39. [ ]DI[UNU].M[i{EH]]: This seems to best fit the space requirements (contra Knudtzon, EA, p. 395, n. m); for the lack of the pronominal suffix, cf. the pertinent portions of EA 74:15-17; 75:11-14; 90:36-39.

L. 41. [i-na] ba-la-at: Knudtzon's [a-na] is impossible (cf. EA 74:17; 75:14; 85:15).

Ll. 41-42. a-nu-m[a ki-a-m]a aqqi: Knudtzon's restoration of [a-na-k]u instead of [ki-a-m]a here is possible (cf. EA 109:15: a-na-ku aq-bu; 138:82: a-na-ku aq-bu-na), but since anūma ki'ama is formulaic (74:49, 64; 91:27; 103:20; 118:8; 119:10-11; 122:53-54; 132:51; cf. also ll. 19-20 of the present letter) I have decided in favor of the latter. Since ki-a-ma and a-na-ku require almost exactly the same amount of space on a tablet Knudtzon's objection against ki-a-ma (in EA, p. 395, n. n) is invalid.

Ll. 42-44. ili(y)a [ ] sābi pitāti inūma ti-d[u-ku u] yānu: Due to the lack of parallels the verb after ili[y]a cannot be filled in, and in fact the portion that I have restored at the end of l. 43 must remain highly tentative. EA 131:18 seems to bear on the present passage, but it likewise is too badly damaged to provide significant help.
LL. 44-45. _madnu p[an[i]nu ana] ia-Wi(!): The restored portion, probably correct despite apparent lack of space at the end of l. 44, is Knudtzon’s (cf. the note on _EA_ 79:10-11 for a discussion of the idiom). The translation proposed by Knudtzon, [anf] u[n], for the first two words in l. 45 indicates that he would have us read [a-na] ia-(Wi)-nu. I understand the subject of _madnu_, however, to be the tenant farmers referred to in ll. 33-42 and consider ia-NU to be a scribal error for ia-”Wi (a case of vertical dittoography). The thrust of the passage seems to be that Rib-Haddi’s tenant farmers blamed him for the pharaoh’s laxity in sending an archer host to come to their assistance.

L. 45. tu-[ga-na]: For a corroboration of Knudtzon’s brilliant restoration here cf. _EA_ 76:31-32.

LL. 46-47. _itti(1)lā _[gA]bdī-’Amīra_: _itti(1)lā_ is an only slightly garbled I2 present form of _el₂_, “to go up” (cf. the correctly written _i-te-la-am_ in _EA_ 88:17). The ventive ending is lexical; cf. _GilgamesH_ XI:97: _illāma iṣṭu iṣid Samā urpatum sallatu_, “A black cloud came up from the horizon”; _ibid._, 139: _ittēlā nagā_, “A region came up” (having been formerly submerged in the waters of the flood).


L. 52. [t]a-ga-lu: This form is probably not an infinitive (cf. _y+d dun_ in _EA_ 85:62, _tia-da-ga-lu_ in 120:34).

L. 52. _ملابس_: If correctly restored, this form is the only example of the _2_ conjugation of _wasū_ in Rib-Haddi, although such forms are plentiful elsewhere in Amarna (cf. _EA_, p. 1381, for details).
(1) a-na m[A-ma]-an-Ap-pa a-bi-ia
  qí-
  bí-
  ma
um-ma mRí-ib-dIM DUMU-ka-ma
a-na GIN a-bi-ia am-qu-ut

(5) aq-ta-bi ū aš-ta-mi
a-na ka-tam ú-ul ti-le-ú-na
la qa-ia iš-tu qa-at
mRÀAši-ir-ta ka-li
LÜ[MEG GAZ ME[ ME[ it-ti-šu

(10) ū LÜ[ME[ ha-za-nu-tu ú-ul
ti-iš-mu-na mi-im-ma
ū šap-ru a-na ša-a-šu
ū ki-na-na KALAG.GA ū
ta-aš-ta-na a-wa-tam a-na ia-ši

(15) uš-bi-ra-mi LÜ-ka it-ti-ia
a-na É.GAL ū la-a ka-bi-id
i-re-šu ū uš-bi-ir-ti-Šu
qa-du ERIN[ME[ til-la-ti a-na ka-tam
a-di a-sé ERIN[ME[ pí-tá-ti

(20) a-na na-sa-ar ZI-ka ū
aq-bi a-na ka-tam la-a
i(!)-le-ú uš-ša-ar-[u(!!)]
ū-ul yi-iš-ma mRÀAši-ir-[ta]
ū(!) ma(!!)-an-nu il-ti-qa-[ni]
(1) ana 'l-Jumāl, Appa abii qīma uma nīk-raddī narta kāma

(2) ana šeṣā abīa amuṣ (5) ḍaṭābī a wātān anā kātām ul tli, 'āmmā

(3) Lāqay idhu qut aḥād, 'Adīrāt kāli āqīli līlīmu (5) wātān

(4) kānā bi'idā muṣamāt (1) kā-ri-rīfā (1) kā-ri-rīfā

(5) kāna bi'idā muṣamāt (1) kā-ri-rīfā (1) kā-ri-rīfā
(1) To [Am]an-Appa, my "father," speak: Thus Rib-Haddi, thy "son." At the feet of my "father" I have fallen down. (5) I have said repeatedly to thee: "Art thou unable to rescue me from the power of ConfigurationException? All the ConfigurationException are on his side. (10) Moreover, the mayors do not hear anything but that they write to him, and thus he is powerful." Furthermore, thou hast said to me: (15) "Send thy man to me to the palace, and the request will no sooner be granted than I will send (him), together with an auxiliary host, to thee—until the going out of an archer host—(20) to protect thy life." But I have said to thee: "I am unable to send him. Let not ConfigurationException hear (of it), for then who will rescue [me (25) fr]om his power?" And (yet) thou [sayest] to me: "Do not fear!" Also thou hast said to me: "Send a boat to Yarimmuta that I may send out to thee (30) silver (and) garments from the(m)." Already the men whom thou didst give to me have fled, all (of them). (Any) mistreatment of [m]e is thy responsibility if thou [art si]ent toward me. Up till now (35) I have hearkened! Is it not (true) that I sent my man to the palace, and (then) he (ConfigurationException) gave an order to a man and he attacked [m]e with a bronze dagger and I was wounded nine times? Already he has been encouraged by (40) this misdeed; from another misdeed who will rescue me? If within two months there is no archer host, then I will leave the city and depart, and (45) my life will be preserved while I do what I want to do.

Further, dost thou not know Amuru, (that) day and night they seek (50) an archer host? They have not (yet) become embittered (, however). Therefore, say to the king: "Come quickly!"
The present tablet is one of four Amarna letters (the other three being EA 28, 230, and 292) that at the time of their publication by Vincent Scheil, O.P., were in the possession of a gentleman named Rostowicz residing in Cairo. Scheil's autographs of the Rostowicz tablets, together with that of a fragment of another letter (EA 26) belonging to a Reverend C. Murch, appeared in Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire, Volume VI, Part 1 (Paris, 1892), pp. 297-312, while the autograph of EA 82 itself, together with transcription, translation, and a few notes, encompasses pp. 306-308.

Although the letter is practically intact, very little progress was made in producing a connected rendering of its contents until the publication of a penetrating article, "A Re-interpretation of an Amarna Letter from Byblos (EA 82)," in JCS 2 (1948), pp. 239-243, by Albright and Moran. Indeed, so thorough was their work that my commentary below will be found to differ with it only in minor particulars and to supplement rather than to supersede it. The reader is advised by all means to refer to the Albright-Moran analysis, which antiquates every previous discussion, as the starting point for a proper understanding of EA 82.

Ll. 1-4. a-na ... am-qui-ut: Cf. EA 73:1-3 together with its commentary. Scheil reads simply DUMU-ka at the end of l. 3 in his autograph, but he doubtless accidentally omitted the MA-sign there since in his transcription he reads abal-ka-ma. Knudtzon, whose footnotes make it clear that he had access to the original tablet, reads mar-ka-ma. In W 59 Winckler reads mar-kua (typographical error for mar-ka), but in his preface admits that he had never seen the Rostowicz tablets. EA 73:2 makes it abundantly clear that we must read DUMU-ka-ma despite Scheil's error in succumbing to vertical haplography.

Ll. 8-9. kali "Apirî ittiṣû: "All the "Apiru are on his side" (so also Albright and Moran, loc. cit., p. 241). For Hebrew
'ēt in the sense of "on the side of" cf., e.g., Numbers 14:9; Joshua 14:12; Judges 1:19; II Kings 6:16; 9:32; Isaiah 43:5; Jeremiah 1:8,19; 20:11.

ll. 10-12. amîlûtu hazănûtu ul tîšûna mimma ʿû Yaprû ana
Mašû: "The mayors do not hear anything but that they write to him." The negative particle ul is here used pleonastically; without it, the sense would be the same: "When(ever) the mayors hear anything, they write to him" (for full discussion together with citations of representative Biblical and Akkadian hymnal-epic parallels, cf. Albright and Moran, loc. cit., pp. 240-241). ʿû Yaprû is, of course, another instance of the perfect tense used with waw conversive (cf. ll. 17 and 44 of the present letter for additional examples).


L. 14. ta-ṣî-ṭa-na a-wa-tam a-na ḫa-ṣi: The final syllable in the first word here may well be due to vertical dittography from the preceding line (cf. ta-ṣî-ṭa-ni in the same phrase in l. 27 below), but it is perhaps best to understand the form either as an anticipatory ventive subsequently emphasized by the prepositional phrase (cf. similarly l. 15) or, still more simply, as due to sandhi with the following word.

Although the verb ṣanû is frequently used in Rib-Haddi to express repeated action (cf. the note on EA 75:17-18 for details), the idiom awāta ṣanû can hardly denote repetition here (contra Albright and Moran, loc. cit., pp. 241-242) but rather seems to mean simply "to speak, declare, relate." In so doing it conforms closely to Ugaritic usage, wherein we find often tny/_rgm (the latter being the ordinary verb for "to speak" in Ugaritic). Note particularly V AB, C:17-19: _rgm it ly w argmk hw t w tnyk (cf. especially hw t, which is identical to Akkadian awatu): "A matter I have and I tell (it) thee, a word and I relate (it) to thee" (cf. further II AB, vii:29-30: ytn ql//ytny).
L. 15. uššira(m)mi amīlka ittiya: "Send hither thy man to me." itti can only mean "to" here, and as such is equivalent to Ugaritic 𒎂 with that meaning (so already Albright and Moran, loc. cit.; p. 245, n. 9); note particularly l'k 𒎂, "to send to," in NK:16-17. Knudtzon's "mit mir" is all the more inexcusable in that Scheil (loc. cit.; p. 308) had already divided the correct meaning; Winckler vacillated between "zu" (пп. 135) and "mit" (ibid., p. 409). Had Ebeling been in possession of the Ugaritic evidence, he would not have questioned "to" as the sense of itti in EA 35:54,55; 283:11; 286:40; 299:21 (cf. EA, pp. 1430-1431), to which must now be added 87:10 (as per Albright and Moran, loc. cit.).

11. 16-17. lā kašid irešu uitka uššittišu: "The request will no sooner be granted than I will send <him>" (the lā is pleonastic; cf. the note on 11. 10-12 above). The brilliant elucidation of kašid irešu by Albright and Moran, which phrase they rightly compare to the similar Hebrew phrases in Proverbs 13:12 and Job 6:8 (cf. loc. cit., p. 245, n. 15; cf. also nn. 10,11), is a fine example of the values to be derived from paying attention to semantic relationships. To their equation of kašādu with bō', however, should be added the footnote that where the concept "to enter" is required in Amarna, a concept rendered in Hebrew by bō', erēšu is used (cf. EA, pp. 1405-1406, for details).

i-rešu is best analyzed as an infinitive. The root *rš, "to request," is found frequently in Ugaritic and twice in a nominal formation in Hebrew (Psalm 21:3; 61:6[1]). The verb erēšu is common also in Akkadian (cf. CAD 4, pp. 261 ff.), however, so that the implication of Albright and Moran (loc. cit., n. 11) that *rš is only Canaanite is misleading. The noun form, which we expect here, is erēšu (cf. probably i-ri-ʾš-ti in EA 85:56,59).
Scheil's autograph ends l. 17 with a TI-sign. Knudtzon is certainly correct, however, in appending a SUMER sign to uššârâ (cf. EA 114:34, 53).

Ll. 21-22. la-a i(!)-le-ī uš-MA-ar-M[u(!)]: The autograph reads KA at the beginning of l. 22, but Knudtzon confidently transcribes an I-sign and states that it was written over something else (cf. EA, p. 393, n. b). At the end of the same line the autograph indicates, after the clear AR-sign, the beginning of a ME- or MESS-sign which, however (si vera lectio), must be a scribal error for the beginning of a SUMER-sign since in each of six other occurrences of uššâr in Rib-Haddi (EA 105:36; 113:29; 117:44, 59; 126:7; 129:73) mentioned by Albright and Moran (loc. cit., p. 246, n. 17) the object is expressed. To these occurrences must now be added also EA *362:3 where the object is likewise indicated.

The II₁ infinitive construct form uššâr, attested only in Rib-Haddi, remains an enigma; all previous attempts to explain the ū-vowel are untenable. Dörme considered it to be a Babylonian formation constructed on the analogy of the II₁ present form (RB, NS Volume XI [1914], pp. 38-39). An Akkadian infinitive "waššârurum, however, is unattested elsewhere; the Babylonian II₁ infinitive is waššârurum, the Old Assyrian waššûrum (cf. von Soden, GAG, Paradigm 25). Ebeling asserted the possibility that we are to vocalize uššâr and understand the form as having arisen under the influence of a passive nomen actionis of the type found in infinitival form in Hebrew, as for example gûnâmîb in Genesis 40:15 (BA, VIII/2 [1912], p. 62). But there is no reason why uš-šâr/šâr should have been formed on the analogy of a passive substantive. Furthermore, Amarna Canaanite phonology rules out Ebeling's hypothesis entirely, for since the " > ū shift had already taken place in Byblian (cf., e.g., EA *362:71: ūš-ki-na for *šâkina) as, indeed, in the rest of Amarna Canaanite, "uššâr would have to be written "uš-šu-ur."
In EA 264:9,20 we find the \( \mathrm{II}_1 \) infinitive construct form written \( \text{u} \text{n} \text{m} \text{r} \), an obvious partial accommodation to the Canaanite "qatt il" pattern. It is tempting, therefore, to see in \( \text{u} \text{m} \text{r} \) a Canaanite development and to ascribe the a-vowel to the influence of the final r (cf. the Pí ele imperative katter in Job 36:2). The form \( \text{urradi} \) (\( \text{EA} \ 294:20 \)), however, effectively dismisses such a theory. Moreover, for \( (\text{w}) \text{u} \text{m} \text{r} \) to become \( \text{u} \text{m} \text{r} \) under the influence of the a-vowel in the first syllable of Canaanite "qatt il" is a possibility that scarcely deserves serious consideration.

L. 23. \( \text{ul yi} \text{m} \text{a} \): Albright and Moran are undoubtedly right in claiming Canaanite influence here and in comparing such phrases as Hebrew \( \text{al yi} \text{m} \text{a} \) (loc. cit., p. 246, n. 18). Cf. further Ugaritic \( \text{al yi} \text{m} \text{a} \) (I AEB, vi:26-27).

Ll. 24-25. \( \text{m}(!) \text{a}(!)-\text{an}-\text{nu} \text{ilt} \text{qa}(\text{n})[\text{n} \text{i} \text{m}] \text{tu gat} \text{bi} \\
\text{tu}: \) As the first sign in l. 24 the autograph reads \( \text{U} \text{G} \text{U} \); cf., however, Knudtzon's comment (\( \text{EA} \), p. 396, n. e). The second sign in the same line of the autograph is \( \text{U} \text{D} \) (actually an incomplete MA-sign; cf. similarly \( \text{LU} \) for MA in \( \text{EA} \) 74:15).

For a brief discussion of the syntax of this passage cf. Albright and Moran, loc. cit., p. 246, n. 19.

Ll. 25-26. \( \text{ta-a}[	ext{g} \text{-} \text{bi}] \text{ ana yasi ul ta-pa-la-[a]h} \): The first scholar to suggest essentially this restoration was Winckler (cf. \( \text{W} \), p. 410).

L. 29. \( \text{usa(k)xa} \): As Albright and Moran have noted (loc. cit., p. 247, n. 21), Ebeling correctly analyzed this form as a Canaanite \( \text{Hiph} \text{G} \text{I} \) imperfect (\( \text{EA VIII/2} \ [1912] \), p. 64). The former scholars' explanation of the a-vowel preceding the suffix, however, is less than satisfactory. While it is true that "verbs tertiae infirmae receive very irregular treatment from the Can. scribes" (loc. cit.), the irregularity is best explained not as a result of scribal whim but rather on the basis
of the conflate nature of the Canaanite Amarna verb; hence a
final weak verb with an i/e-theme in Akkadian would be expected
to end in -i/e under ordinary circumstances, in -u if Canaanized,
and in -a if ventive. The citation by Albright and Moran of EA
91:4,6, "where the scribe shifts from yilku to yilka with no
apparent syntactical reason" (loc. cit.), is incredible (EA
91:4: yilq[â] has a plural subject, while the subject of 91:6:
yilqâ is singular), but even if it were germane to the problem
under consideration the explanation that I have ventured would
suffice. ú-sa-ka, then, stands for $\text{hu}(k)ka < \text{us}-\text{am}-\text{ka} <$
**\text{a}wsi'(u)-\text{am}-\text{ka}.

L. 30. KÜ.BABBARMEU lu-bu-â: As frequently in these
letters, it is best to disregard the MEU-sign here and to
normalize kaska (the addition of the MEU-sign to a word like
kaspâ, indicating perhaps that it was to be treated as a plurale
tantum, was primarily a neo-assyrian practice; cf. von Soden, GAG,
§ 61 h). lu-bu-â, on the other hand, is best read lubûsî
(casus obliquus plural), "garments."

L. 30. Sa-Šu-(nin): Knudtzon's addition of MU here is quite

Ll. 31-33. ana maamilâtu na maduâta ana yâši in, na-ab(!)-tu
gâ-bu(!) habâli[y]â muhika: According to the autograph, the
third sign in innâmî was erroneously written in the form of a
NA[u]-sign by the scribe. As for the last sign in l. 32, Scheil
read tentatively BT; Knudtzon, however, saw a clear BU-sign in
that position, and I have decided to trust to his usually sharp
eye in this case.

According to von Soden, năbutu, "to flee," is not related
to abâtu, "to annihilate," even though the root of each is **'bt
(cf. GAG, § 97 1, for details; cf. also Goetze, The Laws of
Eshunna [1956], pp. 85-86).

CAD 6, p. 3, understands gâ-â-bu(!) here as a singular construct
form, connects it with what follows, and translates: "All (this)
violence (directed against) me is your fault." Such a rendering is impossible, however, since gabbu is never a construct form in the Rib-Haddi dialect, the construct function being carried invariably by gabbī or, less often, gab (cf. EA, p. 1408, for details). We may best normalize gabbū (plural) and understand it as being in apposition to amīlūtu (for the same construction in Hebrew, cf., e.g., Psalm 67:4,6; cf. similarly in Ugaritic Y AB, F:12-14; I AB, i:65).

L. 33. **Sum(1)-ma(!):** The autograph reads MA-IZ. MA and **SUM** both begin with three similarly placed horizontal strokes, however, and as for IZ being mistakenly written for MA, cf. EA 74:18. The scribe of the present letter was inordinately careless.

L. 34. ta-[q]ú-ú-ul: Such orthographic indication of vocalic length or quality within a closed syllable is unusual, but by no means unique, in Rib-Haddi; cf., e.g., yu-ú-ul-qū(-na) in EA 117:33,68.

LL. 35-36. ul inmūn umūrītī amīlāya ana ēkālī: "Is it not (true) that I sent my man to the palace?" For an explanation of the syntax here, cf. Albright and Moran, loc. cit., p. 247, n. 23.

LL. 37-39. iizziz patar siparri muhhi[y]a ˚ammahāsni ti̯īgītān: Cf. EA 81:15,24 together with commentary. The -ni ending on ammāhāsni is not nūn energicum as intimated by Ebeling (BA VIII/2 [1912], p. 73).

L. 39. GA(!).KALAG: The scribe erroneously added a vertical stroke to the GA-sign, giving it the form of TA.

L. 41. minu iltiq(a)nu: "Who will rescue me?" Cf. manu iltiqa(n)[a] in l. 24 above, which effectively eliminates the Albright-Moran translation of minu as "what?" here (cf. further the note on minu in EA 71:16 supra). For lāqāh meaning "to rescue" (= hīsāl), cf., e.g., Psalm 18:17; 49:16.
L. 45. baltat napistiya: Cf. e-hay_e-ta-napuy (Genesis 12:13).

L. 45. a-di(?): The emendation is Knudtzon's; the autograph reads e-na. Si vera lectio, a-di(!) here then reflects HebrewCad, as Albright and Moran have noted (loc. cit., p. 248, n. 30), in such passages as 1 Samuel 14:19 (for further citations, cf. BDB, p. 725).

L. 46. i-pé-šu i-pé-es libbiya: šešu is "probably a scribal error for i-pu-šu, because of following i-pé-es" (Albright and Moran, loc. cit., p. 248, n. 31).

Ll. 47-50. ul ti-i-de(!) atta KUR A-mu-ri urra ù mûša tu-ba-u-na(!) ERIN(!) pitati: For DE, the autograph reads IA; for NA, UD; and for ERIN, DINGIR. The first scribal error was recognized and corrected by Knudtzon, the last two already by Scheil. Knudtzon's attempt at a corrected reading, matu a-mur(!)-ri, KUR A-mu-ri (for this spelling in another letter by Rib-Addu to Aman-Appa, cf. EA 86:8). The autograph displays also a clear š-sign before mûša in l. 49 (contra Knudtzon, who saw nothing there). With this entire passage cf. EA 73:14-22.

Ll. 51-52. ul taššā Eq(!) na-ag-sa(!)-pu: For both the glossenkelil and Sa, the autograph reads A; Knudtzon's corrections of the errors are doubtless in order (cf. especially EA 93:4-5). The Akkadian verb aššānu means primarily "to be afflicted, troubled, distressed," but is attested also with the meaning "to be irritated, embittered, incensed." The gloss našša(!)pu, therefore, is entirely plausible (cf. Hebrew qāšā, "to be wrathful").

taššā has been analyzed by Albright and Moran as a third person feminine singular Akkadian preterit form (loc. cit., p. 244). This analysis we must modify slightly, since such a form would be spelled taššu (cf. von Soden, AHw, p. 79). taššā has been influenced by the Canaanite yigatlu stative vocalization (cf. the completely Canaanized equivalent, tīššu, in EA 122:39).
We have in ta₃₃a₃ another example of a feminine singular verb used with a noun to be understood as a collective ('Amur₃₃ri), while the gloss nag₃₃a(₃)p₃, a masculine plural, refers to the people living in Amurru. ta₃₃a₃ cannot be used, however, as an argument in favor of the theory that all ta₃₃ul₃₃ forms are to be understood as feminine singulars (as Albright and Moran once attempted to demonstrate; cf. loc. cit.; for Moran's retraction, cf. JCS 5, pp. 33-35; cf. further the note on EA 70:22 above).

As Dhorme has pointed out (RB, NS Volume 11 [1914], p. 45), the vocalization of nag₃₃a(₃)p₃ here and of [n]ag₃₃apti in EA 93:5 prove that the attenuation of the prefix a-vowel in the Canaanite Niph₃₃al had not yet taken place in the Amarna Age. Ebeling (BA VIII/2 [1912], p. 65) had already recognized the fact that we are here dealing with a Niph₃₃al (cf. also EA, p. 1448), as doubtless Knudtzon had also. The original Niph₃₃al vocalization survives in Hebrew in initial-waw verbs (cf. n₃₃₃₃ab < *n₃₃₃₃₃ab) and middle-weak verbs (cf. n₃₃₃₃₃₃ < *n₃₃₃₃₃₃ < *n₃₃₃₃₃₃₃a).

L. 52. ku-u₃₃-da(₁): For DA the autograph reads AL; for the validity of Knudtzon's correction, cf. EA 95:34-35. Dhorme erroneously explains the a-vowel in this and similar cases as being energetic (RB, NS Volume 10 [1915], p. 373). It is, however, simply ventive, as Albright and Moran already recognized (loc. cit., p. 242); Aman-Appa is to speak to the pharaoh from Rib-Haddi's standpoint.
RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH
(L 29797 - BB 14 - W 61 - EA 83)

Obverse

(1) [\text{\textsuperscript{m}RM}i-ib-\text{\textsuperscript{d}IM i}]q-bi a-[na]
[\text{\textsuperscript{d}EN-\text{\textsuperscript{d}N}I}u LUGAL KUR.KUR\text{\textsuperscript{K1.ME\textsuperscript{5}}} LUGAL GAL
[dN]IN \text{\textsuperscript{N}U} Gub-la ti-di-in
[KALAG.GJA a-na LUGAL ri EN-ia
(5) a-na G\text{\textsuperscript{r}}.ME\text{\textsuperscript{8}} EN-ia dUTU-ia
IMIN-Yu IMIN-ta-an am-qu-ut
a-na mi-ni la-a tu-te-ru-[n]a
a-wa-tam a-na ia-a-Si ū
i-de ip-ya Ya i-pu-\text{\textsuperscript{N}}[u]
(10) Lū-ia ut-ta-Si-ir a-na ma-[ha]r
EN-ia ū la-qū MIN AN\text{\textsuperscript{5}}.KUR.RA-Yu
ū Lū Ya-nu la-qē Lū-Yu
[ū] DUB\text{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{d}F}} LUGAL la-a na-di-in
[i-n]a qa-at Lū-ia Si-m[é ia]-Sī
(15) a-n[\text{\textsuperscript{a}}] mi-\langle\text{\textsuperscript{n}}i\rangle qa-la-ta ū t[u-u]l-[q]ū
KU[R]-ka ū-ul yu-uq-ba i-na
UD\text{\textsuperscript{KÁM.ME\textsuperscript{5}}} LŪ\text{\textsuperscript{ME\textsuperscript{5}}} GAZ.ME\text{\textsuperscript{5}}
ka-li KUR.KUR\text{\textsuperscript{HI}.A ū-ul ka-a-ma
yu-uq-bu \{[i-na UD\text{\textsuperscript{KÁM.ME\textsuperscript{5}}} \}
(20) ū la-a ti-le-ū la-qa-Sī
sa-ni-tam aš-ta-pār a-na LŪ\text{\textsuperscript{ME\textsuperscript{5}}} ma-sa-ar-ti
ū a-na AN\text{\textsuperscript{5}}.KUR.RA ME\text{\textsuperscript{5}} ū la-a
tu-da-nu-na Šu-te-ra a-wa-tam
a-na ia-ši ú i-pu-ša a-na-ku

(25) ki-ta it-ti ทำความสะอาด și-ir-ta
ki-ma șI-pa șIM ú și-im-ri-[d]a
ú bal-ta-ti șa-ni-tam șum-[a]

Reverse

(30) [t]a-din-ni i-na qa-at
șI-an-șa-mi ú ia-ti-na
șE-im-HA a-na a-ka-li-ia ú(!)
a-na-sa-ra URU LUGAL a-na șa-șa-șu
ú ia-aq-bi LUGAL ú șu-șa-și-ra

(35) Lû-ia LÛMES șu ti-șa-șu-na UGU-ia
ur-ra mu-șa at-ta-mi na-ad-[n]a-ta
DUMU-nu a-na LUGAL ú uș-și-ra-ṣu șu-șu-ut
MIN Lû URU șI-bir-ta al-la-mi i-na
șI-șa-an-[a]-mi șa-ni-tam qi-ba-mi

(40) a-na șI-<an>-șa-mi al-lu-mi șRI-ib-șIM
i-na qa-ti-ka ú mi-im-mu
șa <an>-nê-ep-șu a-na șa-șu UGU-k[a]
ú-ul yi-ma-qû-ta ERÎN MES ka-ra-[ș]i
UGU-ia ú aș-pu-du a-na ka(!)-tam(!)

(45) Sum-ma ki-a-ma la-a ti-iq-bi
ú i-ti-zî-ib UR[U] ú
pa-at-ra-ti șa-ni-tam șum-ma la-a
tu-te-ru-na a-wa-tam a-na ia-ši
ù i-ti-zib URU ù

(50) pa-at-ra-ti qa-du LUMES
Sa i-ra-a-mu-ni ù
li-ma-ad al-le-mi
f Um-ma-ah-nu ù MIŠ-ku-ru
mu-ut-še GEME Sa dNIN

(55) [Sa UR] UG[ub-l]a [ù] KALAG.GA

(edge) [ ] ra [ ]

[a]-n[a] dNIN
(1) [H]ib-[Haddi i]qbi a[na bēliṣ]uMAR māte MARRI rabā
[Bē][ltu Ṣa Gubla ti(d) din [dunn]a ana MARRI bēliṣ (5) ana ṣepē
bēliṣa Ṣammiya Mibcitṣu Mibcitān amqut ana mi ni lā tute(r)rū[n]a
awātam ana yāṣi ʿī ḥide ipṣa ṣa i(p)puṣ[u] (10) amiliya utta([s]mīr
ana ma[ḥa]r bēliṣa ʿū laqū sinā sīsīṣu ʿū amīlu sanū laqe amīlsu
mī(nī) qālāta ʿū t[u]ll[q]u ma[t]ka ul yuqba i na ṣūmī ṣābisūti laqū
ʿApīrū kali māṭāti ul kāma yuqbu {ina ṣūmī} (20) ʿū lā tileʿʿu
laqāṣī Ṣanītam aṣtapar ana amīlūṭ ma(s)ṣartī ʿū ana sīsī ʿū lā
tūdana ṣute(r)ra awātam ana yāṣi ʿū i(p)puṣā anāku (25) kī(t)ta
itti ʿAbdi-ʿAmīra Ḵīm Yaḥaʿ Haddu ʿū Zīmīr(d)[d]a ʿū baltātī
Ṣanītam Ṣumμ[a] ṣappūnāma anūma ṣatārā Ṣ[u]mrūa ʿū Bīt-ʿar[ḥ]a (30)
[t]a(d) dinī ina qāt Ṣanīḥami ʿū yāṭīna šeʿa ana ṣakāliya ʿū(!)
ana(s) sarā ʿal MARRI ana Ṣāṣu ʿū yaqbi Ṣarru ʿū ṣuwa(Ṣ)mirā (35)
amīlaya amīlūṭṣu tīṣaṣīna muḥḥiya urra muša attāmī nad[n]āta
mārnu ana MARRI ʿū Ṣṣūmīr(ṣ)u ṣyūt sinā amīlūṭ ʿibīrta allāmī ina
bīt Ṣanīḥ[a]mi Ṣanītam qība(m)mi (40) ana Yaḍnḥami allūmī
Rīb-Haddī ina qāṭika ʿū mimmu ṣa ḳ[n]yepṣu ana Ṣāṣu muḥḥik[a] ʿul
yīma(q) quta sāṭi karā[n]i muḥḥiya ʿū aṣpuru ana kā(!)tam(!) (45)
Ṣummā kīʿama lā tiqbi ʿū Ṣtī(ṣ)zib ʿal[a] ʿū pāṭrātī Ṣanītam Ṣumma
lā tute(r) ruṇa awātam ana yāṣi ʿū Ṣtī(ṣ)zib ālā ʿū (50) pāṭrātī
qadu amīlūṭī sinā iraʾʾamūnī ʿū limad allāmī Ummāṣnu ʿū lĪṣkuru
(1) [R]i-[Haddi has] said to his lord, the king of the two lands, the great king: May the Lady of Byblos grant power to the king, my lord! (5) At the feet of my lord, my sun-god, seven times, seven times I have fallen. Why dost thou not return word to me so that I may know what I am to do? (10) My man was sent into the presence of my lord, and his two horses were taken, and another man was taken, (namely) his man, and the king's tablet was not given into his possession.

Hea[r m]e! (15) Wh<art thou silent, with the result that thy land is taken? May it not be said, "In the days of the commissioners, the Capiru took all the lands"! Such a thing shall not be said, (20) for they are unable to take it.

Further, I have written for garrison troops and for horses, but they have not been given. Return word to me, or I will form (25) an alliance with Abdi-Ashirta, as (did) Yapa-Haddu and Zimri(d)[d]a, and so I will live.

Further, even if S[i]myra and Bit-ar[h]a have already deserted, (30) mayest thou put me under the charge of Yanhamu so that he may give me grain for my sustenance in order that I might guard the city of the king for him! Therefore let the king speak, and let him send me (35) my man. His relatives have become embittered against me day and night: "Thou hast given our son to the king!" So send him back, even him. As for the two men of Ibita, lo, (they are) in the house of Yanh[u]mu.

Further, please tell (40) Yaḥ[u]mu: "Lo, Rib-Haddi is under thy charge, and everything that is done to him is thy responsibility." May the bivou[ck]ing force not attack me! Moreover, I have written to thee(!), (45) "If thou dost not speak thus, then I will abandon the city and depart."

Further, if thou dost not reply to me, then I will abandon the city and (50) depart together with the people who are devoted to me. Moreover, be informed: Lo, Ummahnu, Ishkuru being her husband, is a maidservant of the Lady (55) [of] B[lyblos].

[Furthermore], strong is [  

f]o[r] the  

L[ady]  

* * *
Ll. 8-9.  "... so that I may know what I am to do," Moran (SSDB, p. 49) correctly realized (contra Knudtzon) that i-pu-su is always a first person singular form in Rib-Haddi (cf. EA 85:60; 114:26; 125:39).

L. 10. utta(u)šir: This form is an erroneously constructed II₂ preterit of wuššuru, "to send." Since *wu becomes ū in Akkadian, we expect ūššer (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 103 o; ibid., Paradigm 25). It is, of course, possible to read ušš-laššiš in the present passage, but such orthography would be unique in Rib-Haddi.

Ebeling (BA VII/2 [1912], p. 68) and Knudtzon both translate utta(u)šir in an active sense here. We note, however, that ll. 11-19 contain a plethora of passive verbs. Furthermore, if an active meaning were intended by the scribe, we would expect him to employ ušširti as is so often done elsewhere (no II₂ forms of wuššuru appear with certainty elsewhere in Rib-Haddi). Since, therefore, the II₂ conjugation often carries a passive connotation in Akkadian (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 93), I have decided to so translate utta(u)šir here.

L. 11. laqû šina šiššu: "His two horses were taken." Since the subject is in effect dual in number, the verb laqû is in fact a Canaanite third person feminine plural form (cf. the note on dannû in EA 69:16 supra), though it is to be translated passively since it is morphologically also an Akkadian stative form. This phrase provides a fine example of conflated morphology and syntax in Canaanite Amarna.

L. 12. amīlu šanû laqû amīšu: "Another man was taken, (namely) his man." Apparently Rib-Haddi's messenger was accompanied on his journey to the pharaoh's court by an aide, who was taken from him (the identity of the captors is not clear from the context).
L1. 13-14. [û] tuppi Harri la nadin [i-n]a qat amilinya: BB 14 (the autograph) reads [i-n]a before tuppi, but such a reading makes no sense whatever. Likewise, the autograph's [a-n]a before qat fails to reckon with the Byblian idiom ina qat X nadānu, "to give into the possession/power of X" (cf. 1. 30 of the present letter; cf. also EA 118:16-17). The restorations which I have followed were both made by Knudtzon.

L1. 15-16. [u-uJl-[q]ü KUR-ka: For the plausibility of Knudtzon's restorations, cf. EA 132:15-16. Forms such as t[u]l[q]u effectively demonstrate the truth of the theory that so-called Hophal imperfects of the root 'iqh in Hebrew are really Qal passive forms (cf., e.g., GKC2, § 53 u), a fact already comprehended by Knudtzon (cf. EA IV, pp. 410-411).

L1. 16-20. ul yuqba ina ūmī rābisūti laqū 'Apirū kali mātāti ul kāma yuqbu {ina ūmī} ĕ la lā tile'ī'u laqāmī: "May it not be said, 'In the days of the commissioners, the 'Apiru took all the lands!' Such a thing shall not be said, for they are unable to take it." A proper understanding of this passage hinges on the suggestion of Moran that the second ina ūmī is a dittograph (SSDB, p. 142, n. 252). Knudtzon's failure to recognize this fact led him astray.

Our scribe carefully distinguished between the Qal passive jussive form yuqba and the imperfect form yuqbu here. The above translation seeks to bring out the difference.

That rābisūtu is the Byblian plural of rābisu seems clear from EA 129:14: LUMES MAŠKIM ut LUGAL be-1[i-ia].

kāma, though unique in Rib-Haddi, could be explained as a contraction of *kī'āma influenced by the tone. On the other hand it may well be simply a scribal error for ki-a-ma, which appears together with the verb qabū in l. 45 below (cf. also EA 124:17).

The antecedent of the suffix in laqāmī is most naturally mā[t]ka (l. 16).

II. 23-24. ḫutēr(ṛ)ra āwatām ana ɣāḥi: "Return word to me." II forms of the verb ṭaru are ordinarily used in this expression in Rib-Haddi (cf. ll. 7-8 and 48 of the present letter), but the phrase under discussion has a parallel in EA 108:49-50. āwatām ṣutērū is in all probability influenced by Canaanite equivalents (cf. Hebrew ḫēṣib ḏābor; Ugaritic ṣmū).

II. 24-25. ʾi(p)pušā ḫanakūtšī(t)ta: The final vowel of the form ʾi(p)pušā, unique in Amarna, is probably due to sandhi with the following word. For the idiom kitta ṣpēšu, "to form an alliance," cf. the note on [k]i-tu ti-in-(ʾa-pu-um)-ma in EA 74:36 above.

L. 26. Yapaac-Haddu: Cf. particularly the Ugaritic proper name ṣp-a-Bac (Syria 28 [1951], p. 36). In addition to its occurrence in the present passage, the name Yapaac-Haddu is written Ṣa-pa-dIM also in EA 85:29, 42; 103:19; 105:31, 75, 85; 113:8, 12, 47; 114:16, 59, 69; 116:25, 51; 117:65; 119:57, and, significantly, Ṣa-pa-ah-dIM in 98:2; 106:19. The name also appears in the Mari letters (ARM 15, p. 146).

Albright long ago (in JPOS 8 [1928], p. 244) recognized the root of this name to be *wpac, comparing Hebrew ḫōpacc, "to (cause) to shine," and Akkadian ᵐupu, "to make visible." To this data must now be added Ugaritic ṣpacc, "to appear." Yapaac(a)-Haddu thus means approximately "Hadad Has Appeared, Revealed Himself."

The root *wpac is attested frequently in ancient West Semitic nomenclature. Albright (loc. cit.) has noted Hebrew ḫōpacc, and refers also to a certain Yapahu, the author of EA 297-299 (cf. for the same name Ṣa-pa-ū in PRU III, 15.42 / 110:18' 11.839:14). From the time of the late Middle Kingsom there
appear several references to one Yapa-EMU-abī, a prince of Byblos (cf. Albright, loc. cit., p. 226; idem, Vocalization, p. 8). To these citations we may now add MIA-pa-MILKU (PRU III, 16.246:7,8,16,19,21—hardly YAPA-narru with NOUGAYROL) and DUMU-la-pa-i (ibid., 15.42 / 110:12; cf. Ugaritic (H)n-YP in Syria 18 [1937], p. 172).

The numerous references to Yapa-c-Haddu in the writings of Rib-Haddi lead to the conclusion that the two men were not on the best of terms. The former is mentioned frequently in connection with Simyra (cf. EA 98:1-9; 105:29-32; 106:10-21; 116:21-28); he was for a time its mayor, it seems, and such a fact would alone tend to make him a natural rival of Rib-Haddi, since Simyra was within the latter's sphere of influence. For a summary of Yapa-c-Haddu's activities cf. Weber, EA, pp. 1168-1169.

L. 26. ZIMRI(d)[d]a: The original form of this name was undoubtedly ZIMRI-Haddu, "Hadad Is My Protection" (cf. the name of the famous king of Mari, ZIMRI-LIM: "Lim Is My Protection/Strength"). Due to the juxtaposition of the two accented syllables, the syncopation of the h-phoneme permitted the contraction to take place in two directions: ZIRIDDU (cf. Mzi-im-ri-id-di, genitive after UMMA, in EA 144:4) and ZIMRADDU (cf. PRU III, 12.34 / 43:33: Mzi-im-rad-du). The standardization of the name into the accusative form, ZIMRI(d)da, regardless of syntax is not surprising in these texts (cf. the note on GUBLA in EA 68:4).

With *ZIMRI-Haddu must now be compared the Ugaritic proper names SMR-Hd and SMR-BČ (cf. vi:7 and ii:5 of the text published in RA 37 [1940-1941], pp. 130-131), each of which displays the troublesome Ugaritic consonant variously transcribed d, j, and r. In view of the possibility (though still vigorously debated by Arabists) that the root *DMR in North and South Arabic is attested in the sense of "to protect," it would seem that we may be justified in claiming the value d for the ̀ sign at least here.
At any rate, it can scarcely be denied that the Biblical name Zimri is a hypocoristicon of *Zimri-DN; furthermore, whatever the status of the Arabic root *dār, the root "zar" in Hebrew is certainly attested with the meaning "to protect" (cf., e.g., Isaiah 12:2).

The Zimridda in the present passage was, at least during the latter part of Rib-Haddi's tenure in Byblos, the mayor of Sidon (cf. EA 144:5). Where he is mentioned elsewhere in Rib-Haddi his name always appears in connection with that of Yapa(a)-Haddu, as here (103:18-19; 106:19-20), giving credence to the idea that he, too, was a political rival of the former. He is found elsewhere in Amarna in 145:3; 146:15; 147:66; 149:49, 57, 68; 151:11, 65; 152:7 (cf. Weber in EA, p. 1244, for a brief review of his role in Palestinian affairs). Another Zimridda, connected this time with Lachish, appears in EA 288:43; 329:5; 333:6, 9.

L. 27. û baltāṭi: As Albright and Moran have already noted (JCS 2, p. 245, n. 12), we have here, as well as in ll. 46-47 and 49-50, additional examples of the Canaanite perfect used with nāw-consecutive.

Ll. 27-31. Humb[a] appūnāma anūma patā S[u]muṣā ā
Bit-ar[h]a [t]a(d)inni ina qat Yānhami: Rib-Haddi seems to be saying that the defection of Simyra and Bit-arha has not adversely influenced the determination of Byblos to remain loyal to the pharaoh. Possibly "Simyra" and "Bit-arha" here refer to Yapa(a)-Haddu and Zimridda respectively; if so Zimridda, at the time of the writing of this letter, may have been the mayor of Bit-arha (for which cf. the note on EA 79:21 above).

For the ending on the verb patā, cf. the note on irtiṭ[i]h|hā in 81:10 above.

To Moran (SSDB, p. 93) we owe the reading [t]a-din-ni at the beginning of 1. 30, a reading which resulted in the elucidation of the entire passage from ll. 27-33. BB's [n]a(?)- and Knudtzon's [t]ū- may both easily be accommodated to the end of a TA-sign.
[t]a(d)din is more accurately translated as a jussive, however, than as Moran's rendering of it as an imperative (although, of course, such a rendering need not be entirely wrong, depending on context; cf., e.g., GKC², § 109 b). The form [t]a(d)dinn makes it clear that in Amarna, as occasionally also in Hebrew (cf. forms like q3talatn), the first common singular accusative suffix -ni may be affixed directly to a verb ending in a consonant without the necessity of an intervening vowel. For additional examples of this phenomenon in Rib-Haddi, noted already by Albright and Moran (JCS 2, p. 248, n. 25), cf. EA 87:8; 125:20; 137:24.

The root of the name Yanhamu was erroneously identified as "Hm" by Weber (EA, p. 1171); Ugaritic Ynhm, however, makes it certain that the root is, rather, "nham (cf. Gordon, WA, p. 295, for citations; to Gordon's brief list of cuneiform representations of the name should be added the following from PRU III: 11.839:5; 15.09A:19; 16.163:3; 16.257.16.258:16.126B, III:5,41,46; 16.348:4; 16.353:4,14,21; 16.359A:6). Yanhamu is a clear hypocoristic meaning "DN Consoles." It is probably "Amorite" since its nham remains unassimilated (cf. Albrignt, JAOS 60 [1940], p. 417) and the Barth-Ginsberg Law is inoperative in it. The name is also attested in Egyptian (cf. Weber, loc. cit.).

"Nham was a common element in the ancient West Semitic onomasticon. The most notable Hebrew examples are Nahum, Nehemya, and Meleahm (with the latter name cf. Ugaritic Mnkm in Gordon, loc. cit.; Phoenician Mnhm in Harris, GL, p. 123; for cuneiform representations cf., e.g., Gordon, loc. cit., and PRU III, p. 251). According to Acts 4:36 the idea of consolation appears in the Aramaic name Barnabas which is there explained as meaning huioς paraklēsōs, "Son of Consolation" (although just how this rendering is derived is still a matter of some dispute; cf., e.g., Arndt and Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament [Chicago, 1957], p. 133).

The distinguished official named Yanhamu who appears in the Canaanite Amarna letters "was a high Egyptian official of Canaanite
(possibly of Hebrew) origin, who seems to have been the Egyptian governor of Palestine at the beginning of the reign of Akh-en-Aton" (Albright and Mendenhall, ANET², p. 486, n. 11). The references to him in the Rib-Haddi corpus are invariably favorable (cf. EA, p. 1562, for details). For brief summaries of his role in Palestine and Syria during this period, cf. Weber, EA, pp. 1169-1172; Campbell, BA 23/1 (1960), pp. 16-18.

Ll. 31-33. نب wi-ti-na ṣem-HI.A aana a-ka-li-ia ū(!)
a(s)ara al Harri: ia-ti-na is the only clear instance in Rib-Haddi in which the verb "n/ytn is represented with its Canaanite t-phoneme (although of course there are numerous forms, such as na-AD-T-[n]a-ṭa in l. 36 of the present letter, in which it is virtually impossible to be sure how the crucial phoneme was pronounced).

.sem-HI.A (together with similar orthographic representations) is probably best normalized simply as še'w/i/a (cf. the note on kasa in EA 82:30 supra, and note especially iba(š)šši sem-HI.A in 125:29).

With the exception of EA 85:11, ana akālī is always qualified by means of a pronominal suffix (cf. 79:33; 105:85; 109:41; 125:18,26,30); moreover, even in 85:11 the phrase is followed immediately by ana yāsinu, the practical equivalent of a modifying suffix. It is clear, therefore, that we are to read in the present passage ana a-ka-li-ia and to understand the following š1-sign, which was so puzzling to Knudtzon, as the beginning of an unfinished ū (for which scribal error cf. further 118:31; 137:54).


L. 37. ū usṣira(š)šši ūṭ: "Therefore send him back, even him." This phrase must be divorced from the direct quotation which precedes it, and its verb is best understood as an imperative (contra Knudtzon; cf. the note on šši in EA 74:52 above).
L. 38. **URU**-**bir-ta**? The location of this city, which is mentioned again in EA 104:52, is unknown; at any rate, my reading is more plausible than Knudtzon's **alu-i-nam-ta** (cf. the note on **nu-da-bir-ta** in 74:34).

L. 38. **allā**: This particle, which together with **allā** (EA 94:63; 122:40; cf. also l. 52 of the present letter) is a secondary formation of **allā** (cf., e.g., l. 40), can hardly be separated from Ugaritic **hl** (so von Soden, **AHw**, p. 37), Hebrew **hālō**', Biblical Aramaic **a/ra** with the resultant meaning of "Behold! Lo!" Such a rendering fits the contexts in which the word appears better than does a comparison with Hebrew **'alāy**, "Woel!" which is often connected with **Gilgamesh** VI:159 (so von Soden, loc. cit. — not VI:176 as per Döhl apud Ebeling, **EA**, p. 1368): **al-lu-u**.

Ll. 41-42. **mimmu ša** (n.)-**né-ep-su** ana **ṣašu : mubhik[a]:** "Everything that (is.d) one to him is th[y] responsibility" (for the idiom cf. **EA** 82:33). **mimmu** is incorrectly treated as a declinable noun in Canaanite Amarna, probably through contamination with the declinable **mimmu**, "property," on the part of the Canaanite scribes (cf. **EA**, pp. 1470-1471, for details). Knudtzon's **ni-ip-su** as the second word in l. 42 is an impossible form; we must assume a scribal error, as Ebeling already noted (cf. **EA**, p. 1404). **EA** 81:14 supplies us with our restoration.

L. 43. **ṣabī kara[M]i**: One of the meanings of **karašu** in Akkadian is "camp, encampment," so that our phrase is best rendered "bivoua[ck]ing force." We may safely compare with it the Phoenician equivalent, **m mhnt** (cf. Harris, **GPL**, p. 133), together with Hebrew **man nef** which is frequently so used also (cf. especially Judges 8:10; I Kings 22:34 = II Chronicles 18:33; cf. **BDB**, p. 334, for additional citations).

As Moran has pointed out (SSDB, p. 157), **ERIN** **ka-ra-[M]i** must be connected with **ERIN** **kal, ba[D]**, **KIL** (EA 92:48) and
ERUN.MES\(h\) KI.KAL.KIB (106:48; cf. further 58:6; ERUN.MES\(h\) KAL.KIB[ ]),
since GARA\(h\) (KI.KAL.BAD) is equivalent to kara\(\mathfrak{a}\) in the Akkadian
materials from Bogasköy (cf. Labat, L'akkadien de Boghaz-\(\mathfrak{k}\)oi
[Bordeaux, 1932], p. 135). It is also attested in the Assyrian
royal inscriptions (cf., e.g., Borger, Ash., p. 103:9: mu\(\mathfrak{s}\)allim
KI.KAL.BAD-\(\mathfrak{u}\), "he who assures the welfare of his camp"). As in
so many other cases, the Canaanite scribes of Amarna have
incorrectly written the compound logogram; their reason for
including the KIB-sign is still unknown.

L. 44. a\(\mathfrak{n}\)puru ana ka(!)-tan(!): The text reads a\(\mathfrak{n}\)puru ana
\(\mathfrak{m}\)-\(\mathfrak{u}\), but this makes no sense whatever in context (cf. Weber,
EA, p. 172). The nature of the scribal error in this case is
difficult to determine; perhaps he forgot momentarily whether the
addressee was the pharaoh or Yanhamu.

L. 51. ira'asumi: For standard Akkadian *ira'asuminni;
the present form is clearly under Canaanite influence.

Ll. 53-55. *\(\mathfrak{u}\)-mas-\(\mathfrak{a}\)-\(\mathfrak{n}\)-nu \(\mathfrak{m}\)-\(\mathfrak{I}\)-ku-ru mut\(\mathfrak{s}\)e amtu \(\mathfrak{m}\)-\(\mathfrak{B}\)-\(\mathfrak{l}\)-ti
[\(\mathfrak{m}\)-\(\mathfrak{a}\)] G[\(\mathfrak{u}\)-\(\mathfrak{b}\)-\(\mathfrak{l}\)]: BB 14 records a hesitant \(\mathfrak{N}\)-sign (instead of the
determinative \(\mathfrak{M}\)) at the beginning of l. 53; cf., however, EA
84:42; 85:84. \(\mathfrak{M}\)-\(\mathfrak{I}\)-ku-ru is scarcely to be read \(\mathfrak{M}\)il-ku-ru as
suggested in BB (p. xlviii); the \(\mathfrak{B}\)-sign rarely if ever has the
reading \(\mathfrak{M}\)IL in Rib-Haddi (although elsewhere in Amarna it is
attested; cf., e.g., the references to the personal name Milkili
listed by Weber in EA, p. 1565).

The standard Akkadian equivalent of mut\(\mathfrak{s}\)e would be mussa
(cf., e.g., CH, § 131). Canaanite, however, does not display the
*-\(\mathfrak{t}\)-\(\mathfrak{a}\)- > -\(\mathfrak{s}\) - shift, nor does it distinguish between verbal and
nominal forms of the third person feminine singular suffixial
endings (as does Akkadian).

The facts mentioned in this passage reappear in EA 84:43-43
and 85:84-85 (and possibly also 86:24-26), but in no case is the
context preserved sufficiently to enable us to determine the
reason for Rib-Haddi's overweening interest in Ummahnu and her husband. For some suggestive comments concerning the matter cf. Weber, EA, pp. 1172-1173.

L. 56: BB 14 hesitantly reads URU תחילת as the last two signs in this line, but Knudtzon saw a clear RA-sign as the first of the two signs. His reading ra-b[u] on the basis of EA 85:87, however (cf. EA, p. 403, n. k), suffers from the facts that (1) the Egyptian official entitled in Akkadian rabû is always written LUGAL in Rib-Haddi, and (2) in 85:87 the word is in the genitive case. rabû (LUGAL) probably represents Egyptian wr, "great one" (cf. Albright, BASOR 87, p. 33, n. 5).
RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH

(VAT 1633 - WA 73 - W 53 - S 41 - EA 84)

Obverse

(1) [a-na] LUGAL BE-ia dUTU KUR^\text{KI.DIDLI.HI.A}

[q]i- bi- ma

[u]m-ma Ri-ib-Ad-di IR-ka-m[a]

[G][]^\text{\textgreek{g}}\text{GIR(I).GUB GIR}^\text{ME\textgreek{g}}\text{-ka a-na GIR}^\text{ME\textgreek{g}}\text{dUTU}

(5) BE-ia IMIN(!)it-Su ù IMIN-ta-a-an

am-qú-ut Sá-ni-tam da-mi-iq-mi

a-na pa-ni LUGAL BE-ia(!) i-pí-iš

mÍR-d'A-gi-ir-ti UR.ZÍR i-nu-ma

in₄-né-ep-Sa-at KUR^\text{KI.HI.A} LUGAL BE-ia[a]

(10) a-na Sa-Su ù qa-al a-na KUR/KUR\text{KI-Su(!)}

ù a-nu-um-ma i-na-an-na

in₄-né-ep-Sa-at URUŠu-mu-ur

tar-ba-as BE-ia ù [ur]-Si-[Š]u a-[n]a Š[a-Su]

ù i-sa-lu-ul a-na Š u[r-Ši BE]-ia

(15) ù i-pé-ti a-mur ni-si-[ir-ti Ša]

[B]E-ia ù qa-al mi-i[a-mi]

[Šu-]t LÚKIRI ù UR.ZÍR [ù]

[\text{\textgreek{j}}] a-an Sá-ni-tam i-nu-m[a]

(edge) [\text{\textgreek{i-ga}}]-bu-nim LÚ^\text{ME}\text{\textgreek{j}} a-na pa-n[i BE-ia]

(20) [li-ma-a]d-mi URU Gub-ia

[la-a KALAG.G]A i-de be-lí-ia [i-nu-ma]
(1) [To] the king, my lord, the sun-god of the two lands, [speak: [Thus Rib-Haddi, thy servant, the footstool of thy feet. At the feet of the sun-god, (5) my lord, seven times and seven times I have fallen.

Further, is the deed of Abdi-Ashirta, the dog, pleasing to the king, my(!) lord, that the lands of the king, m[y] lord, have turned themselves over (10) to him? For he is silent concerning his(!) lands! Moreover, already now Simyra, the resting place of my lord as well as [his] bedchamber, has been turned over to him, so that he (now) sleeps in the bedchamber of my lord (15) and opens the treasury of my lord. And yet he is silent! Wh[i]c is he, the pig and the dog, [that he should be (so) strong?]

Further, if[th] people [should s]ay in the presence of my lord: (20) "[Be informed: Byblos is not strong!", my lord knows [that] they have [not taken] Byblos! [Nevertheless, there is no] wheat [in] midst of, with the result that (the situation) is very difficult (25) [with respect to the land of my lord.

Further, let the king, [my] lord, send me his commissioner, who is strong, together with troops, that he may protect the city of my lord and I may live (30) and serve my lord, the sun-god of the two lands. Moreover, let my lord send me men, that they may take the property of my Tammuz to my lord and that he may not take the property (35) belonging to thy gods. A dog is he; [therefore] would it be good if he should seize Byblos? [Behold], Byblos is just like Memphis to the king!

Further, [behold Abdi-Minurta, the man whom I sent (40) with Puhewa, (thy) man: Let him be informed], and then send him back to thy servant.

[Further], behold, U[m]ma[hu] is a maidservant of the [Lady of Byblos], her husband (being) Ishkur(u) [ ]

... Send to m[e]
L. 4. [GI sigu] GIR(I).GUB Mepeka: According to Labat (Manuel d’Épigraphie Akkadienne, p. 199), the Akkadian equivalent of GIS GIR(I).GUB is kirsappu. In EA 195:9-10, however, we find GIS GIR(I).GUB gi-il-tap-pî Ma Mepeka, indicating that we are probably to read gimtappu for this logogram in Canaanite Amarna.

It is tempting to consider gimtappu as having developed from an original kirsappu(m); the difficulties of such a phonetic development are not entirely insurmountable. Indeed, Bezold (BG, p. 248a) lists no fewer than eight dialectal variants of this word. His inclusion of gerigubu (better girigubbu; cf. CAD 5, p. 88), however, is out of place, since the Sumerian logograms from which Akkadian girigubbu was borrowed are GIS GIRI.GUB, GIRI.GID, GIRI.GUB.MAR, GIRI.GID, DA (cf. MSL VI, pp. 6, 13). Inexplicably, CAD fails to list the Amarna form gimtappu.

An interesting phenomenon to be noted in connection with the occurrences of GIS GIR(I).GUB in Amarna is the fact that where it stands alone it denotes a literal footstool (EA 5:25, 30) while in its metaphorical application it is always modified by (Ma) Mepe, as in the present passage (cf. further 106:6; 141:40, 195:9-10; 241:7[1]). Strikingly, the same usage obtains in the Hebrew Old Testament on the one hand, where haddîm (1s) ragalayim is a metaphorical footstool (Isaiah 66:1; Psalm 99:5; 110:1; 132:7; Lamentations 2:1; 1 Chronicles 22:2) while an entirely different word, kebeš, is used for a literal footstool (II Chronicles 9:18), and in the Greek New Testament on the other hand, where, under clear Semitic influence, hypopódon tôn podôn is metaphorical (Matthew 5:35; 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:43; Acts 2:35; 7:49; Hebrews 1:13; 10:13) and hypopódon used alone is literal (James 2:3). In Ugaritic, hêm (unmodified) is thus far attested only in the sense of a literal footstool, howbeit in a mythical context (as the footstool of El; cf., e.g., IV AB, vi:12-14).
L. 5. IMIN(1)IT-šu: The tablet displays the logogram for "eight" (USSU) here, but the ubiquitous parallels throughout Canaanite Amarna, as well as the phonetic complement, make it certain that we are here dealing with a scribal error.

Ll. 7,10. BE-ia(!), KUR[KI]-šu(!): According to § 41, the scribe has added extra wedges to each of these suffixes in a sort of orthographic flourish. The additional wedge of the KUR-sign, however, giving it the appearance of $E$, serves to make of that sign a ligature (cf. especially EA *362:34 and Thureau-Dangin in RA 19, p. 95, n. 1) for "KUR.KUR. That this explanation is correct is clear from the fact that KUR[KI]-šu(!) in l. 10 refers back to KUR[KI]-šU.A (an obvious plural) in l. 9.

Ll. 12-16. innegšat Sumur tarbas šéliya ü bit [ur]-ši-[š]u a[n]a šaššu ü isa(l)lul ana bit u[r-ši] BB-ia ü ipes(t)ti ašar ni-ši-[ir-ti ša be]šéliya: With but the few exceptions indicated, the restorations may be regarded as certain; they represent only a slight advance over the brilliant work of Knudtzon.

For bit urši, "bedchamber," cf. the related bit erši (cf. von Soden, Anw. p. 133, for details); cf. further uššeribma šalal ina urši hammūtišu, "He brought (them) in and hung (them) up in the bedroom where he sleeps as master" (Gilgamesh VI:175); šarpašumu šalal bit hammūti šesuttalu šettiškar (Streck, Ass., p. 302:23). The phrase bit uršši šéliya at the end of l. 14 in our passage displays Canaanite influence (standard Akkadian would express the same construction as bit uršši šéliya).

The scribe, in writing i-sa-lu-ul, was apparently ignorant of the fact that salalū exhibits an a-theme in both its preterit and present forms (cf. von Soden, GAC, § 101 c). Furthermore, we expect isallal ina (instead of ana); cf., e.g., Hebrew šakab/yəšen b°- (note, however, Job 7:21: le apar 'ēškab).

According to my understanding of our passage, ipes(t)ti cannot be translated "I opened" with Moran (SSDB, p. 157).
For ἀμαρ nisi[rti], "trea[sury]," cf. the similar Akkadian phrase, bit nisiirti (cf. von Soden, AHw, p. 134; for details) in Hebrew bet ḫāʾēšār (earlier bet nēḵōt).

L. 17. :pointer

L. 17. ḫāʾēšār: Moran (ASDE, p. 157) was the first to read this logogram (which in turn closely resembles the Middle Babylonian ḫāʾēš-sign; cf. Labat, op. cit., p. 59) correctly and to compare the figurative use of šahû here to that of Hebrew ḫāʾēš in Proverbs 11:22. The ḫāʾēš determinative merely stresses the figurative emphasis intended by the scribe (cf. ḫāʾēš in l. 35).

Ll. 17-18. .UR.ZĪR [u tā]a: Knudtzon is doubtless correct in his contention that one or more signs must have followed UR.ZĪR at the end of l. 17 on the original tablet (cf. EA, p. 405, n. k). For the plausibility of my restoration cf. EA 85:64-65; 125:42, where the same dittography appears in similar contexts.

L. 18. [d]a-an: "He is strong" (cf. also l. 27). The verb in question here is ḫāʾēš, not ḫāʾēš, "to judge" (contrast Knudtzon; Ebeling, EA, p. 1397; Weber, though hesitantly, ibid., p. 1173). The spelling [d]a-an likewise solves the problem posed by Albright and Moran as to the proper normalization of ḫāʾēš in EA 82:13 (cf. JCS 2, p. 244, n. 8).

L. 19. [i-qa]-bu-nim: WA 73 reproduces clearly the last two signs of this word, and the form is attested elsewhere in Rib-Haddi (EA 127:10).

Ll. 20-21. Gubla [i-a XALAG.G]A: For the plausibility of my restoration here, as well as of Knudtzon's restorations (which I have followed) in ll. 19-20, cf. particularly EA 137:100-103.

L. 21. ūde be-lī-ia [i-nu-ma]: S 41 clearly supports the reading be-lī-ia (contra Knudtzon and as noted already by Moran in JCS 4, p. 159, n. 7). The simplified writing of the LI/MI-sign is characteristic of the scribe who wrote this letter, though
only in the combination ḫa-ni-tam (cf. ll. 6, 26, 38). For bēlīya as a nominative elsewhere in this letter, cf. l. 31.

Knudtzon's translation of ḫide here ("wisse") betrays his failure to understand the subtleties of the Rib-Haddi dialect. Only yīde and lū ḫide may be so rendered (cf. EA 68:9 and passim; cf. further the note on [šu-ʾi]-de in 75:6-7); ḫide when standing alone can only be expressed in German by "weiss," as in EA 137:30 (where, however, Knudtzon again erred; cf. correctly Albright and Mendenhall, ANET², p. 463).

For my restoration of [i-nu-ma] cf. the note on EA 78:7 above.

LL. 23-25. [u la-a] ki-ib-tum [i-na ša]G₄-〈hi〉 ḫ maris MA.G(IL a-nša K[UR]KI.ḪI.A bēlīya: My restorations in the first clause are highly tentative for a number of reasons. We would expect yānu before kibtum to express "there is no"; in such a case, however, kibtum would have to be accusative (cf. the note on yānum in EA 69:23 supra). On the other hand, lā kibtum is at least conceivable in the Rib-Haddi dialect; cf., e.g., the somewhat similar expression annū lā hazānu in EA 89:41.

kibtum itself is somewhat problematical, since grain in Rib-Haddi is always denoted by the more general term ṣe'u (cf. EA, p. 1521, for details). However, kibtum meaning "wheat" is well attested in Akkadian; cf., e.g., the famous pun in Gilgamesh XI:46-47, 87, 90 (Heidel, GE², p. 82, n. 170; Speiser, ANET², p. 93, n. 190; Schott and von Soden, Das Gilgamesch-Epos [Stuttgart, 1958], p. 88, n. 5). Of course, the reading qī-ip-tum is also possible, but qīptum, "credit" (cf. CH, § 111), "money or merchandise entrusted to a commissioner" (Landsberger, MSL I, p. 115), is less likely in the present context (assuming the remainder of my restoration to be correct). Finally, ki-lib/p-tum could be the last three syllables of a longer word; nothing, however, comes to mind that would make more sense in our passage than our present choice.
[i-na 𒊢𒈼]-𒀀, the last syllable of which assumes haplography in relation to the following i-sign, fits well the requirements of space and context. For *libbiхи instead of *libbiḫa, cf. the note on mutḫa in EA 33:54 above (and note especially 102:39: [a]štu 𒊢, where the antecedent of ḫa is URU and where 𒊢 is written without the usual phonetic complement, both as in the present passage).

By failing to see the traces following the MA-sign at the end of 1. 24 (cf. § 41), Knudtzon erroneously transliterated ma-ri-is-ša. He could have avoided that particular mistake, as well as his hesitancy in transliterating the beginning of 1. 25, by noting the relatively frequent phrase ma-ri-is MA.GAL ana ṣabu (EA 103:7-8; 114:50; 116:54-55; cf. also 95:41). With my translation cf. the note on 75:18 above.

L. 26. liwa[(s)]Mila: We expect liwa[(s)]Mila (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 61 c); obviously our Canaanite scribe was not familiar with the Akkadian method of forming the II1 protractive mood (cf. 1. 31; cf. also EA 106:42).


L. 29. in-lut anāku: This reading, first tentatively suggested by Winckler (W, p. 124), remains the most plausible; cf. EA 123:25-28, 33-35, and especially 112:18-24. The LUT-sign is written with several additional flourishes; cf., however, the note on 11. 7 and 10 of the present letter.

L. 30. u[rr]ad: The verb (w)arādu never means "to serve" in standard Akkadian, but is a denominative invention of the Canaanite scribes on the analogy of their verb *q condominium (for additional details cf. the note on arādu in EA 71:17 supra).

L. 32. Ṣ: This writing for the conjunction is unusual for Rib-Haddū but by no means unique, being found also in EA 87:16 and 88:10 (as already noted by Knudtzon in EA, p. 406, n. a, and Ebeling, ibid., p. 1534).
L. 33. \( d_{DA.MU-ia} \): For \( DA.MU = Tammuz(u) \), cf. Schroeder in OLZ, 1915, Columns 291-293 (referred to by Albright, AMI\(^4\), p. 222, n. 128; Moran, JCS 5, p. 34, n. 8). Since Tammuz\((u)\) is more often represented logographically by \( DUMU.31 \), the present writing bears eloquent testimony to the sophistication of our scribe.

Tammuz, son of Ea, was the Babylonian vegetation god and was called Adonis by the Phoenicians, a fact that did not escape the attention of early Christian scholars (cf., e.g., Jerome's comment in a letter to Paulinus, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church [Schaff and Wace, Editors], Second Series, VI, p. 120). In the Hebrew Bible, Tammuz is mentioned at least once (Ezekiel 8:14, with which cf. the striking parallel in Gilgamesh VI:46-47; for a discussion of the "Syro-Mesopotamian syncretism in the priestly and noble circles of Jerusalem" as outlined in Ezekiel 8 cf. Albright, AMI\(^4\), pp. 165-168) and probably also a second time (hemdat nāṣim in Daniel 11:37; cf. BDB, p. 326). For a brief general account of the minor role played by Tammuz in the Babylonian pantheon cf. Bottero, La Religion Babylonienne, p. 45.

Ll. 35-36. kalbu šut [u] SIG-\(mi\) inūma isbat Gula: "A dog is he; [therefore] would it be good if he should seize Byblos?" Knudtzon renders kalbu šut as "jener Hund" and considers it the subject of īlīqā in l. 34. He errs on both counts, however, since šut is never a demonstrative adjective in Rib-Haddā and since kalbu is too far removed from īlīqā to be its subject.

SIG\(^2\) is to be normalized dāniq here (so correctly Knudtzon; cf. l. 6).

Ll. 37-38. [a-mu]r-\(mi\) Gula kīma URU-\(Hi-ku-up-ta-ah(\)?) (i)ba\(n\)a[!]Estimated as: "Behold, Byblos is just like Memphis to the king!" Knudtzon's restoration of amur is practically certain due to the parallel passage, BA 139:7-9; cf. further the similar comparison made between Tyre and Ugarit in 89:48-51 which is also introduced by amur. Our scribe has erroneously written what
appears to be a גיר-sign (cf. 1. 4) instead of AH at the end of 1. 37.

As is recognized by all scholars, Hikuptah is Egyptian Ḥa(t)-ku'-Ptah (the vocalization is Albright's; cf. BASOR 70, p. 22), "The House of the Soul of Ptah," the Egyptian name of the city of Memphis (Hebrew Mop in Hosea 9:6, Ṣop in Isaiah 19:13; Jeremiah 2:16; 44:1; 46:14,19; Ezekiel 30:13). Memphis was the abode of Ptah, the Egyptian craftsman god; Ugaritic Ḥ(g)kpt ii in V AB, F:13-14; II D, v:21,31), the abode of Ḳtr-wāss, the Canaanite craftsman god, is thus equivalent to Amarna Hikuptah (so Albright, loc. cit.; for additional bibliography reflecting this viewpoint cf. Albright, AR 4, p. 197, n. 34; contrast Gordon, WM, p. 263; Driver, CML, p. 169). The expanded epithet given to Ḥ(g)kpt ii in V AB, F:14-16: Ḳpt kṣu bāh Ḥkpt ars nlth, "Kaphtor, the throne of his sitting, Hikupta, the land of his portion," can therefore hardly be understood as proving that Kaphtor and Hikupta were names for one and the same place; the scribe was simply playing on the graphic similarity between Ḳpt and Ḥkpt, both of which contain the sequence kpt. For the loss of the feminine t from Hikuptah (cf. its Egyptian forebear), cf. Weber, EA, pp. 1173-1174; Ebeling, EA VIII/2 (1912), p. 76; for the loss of the final h in Ugaritic Ḥ(g)kpt (whence Greek Ἀγυπτος, English "Egypt"), cf. Albright, BASOR 70, p. 22. For the historical significance of the present passage and its parallel (EA 139:7-9), cf. the note on Ḡubla in EA 66:4 supra.

III. 39-41. Ḡmun ʿAbdi-Ninurta amīla Ṣa uṣ-hir'-ti ḫtti Ṣu-he-wa amīli līl-[ma-ad] Ṣu uṣṣira(ṣ)ṣu ana ardik[a]: My restoration at the end of 1. 40, līl-[ma-ad], represents a radical departure from Knudtzon's reading and necessitates a revised translation. He conceived of the ליל-sign as the first element of a compound logogram, of which the preceding ל was the supposed determinative. No such logogram has as yet been attested, however; it therefore seems best to read līl[ad] (cf.)
e.g., li-[a]_3[ma]-ad in EA 75:35) and to regard the LIL-sign as further evidence of the proficiency, so unusual in these letters, of our scribe (cf. the note on l. 33 above; note also the unique spellings 1š-lut in l. 29 and uš-Mir.-ti in l. 39). Lš, used twice in this passage, thus simply means "messenger" here, as often in Rib-Haddi.

With the name ᵐAbdi-Ninurta cf. ʃ MIN,URT in EA 74:31; with ʰPu-he-wa (not -ja with Knudtzon; the PI-sign can never be so transliterated in Rib-Haddi) cf. the name ʰPu-u-he in EA 18, r.5 (described by Weber, EA, p. 1566, without sufficient justification due to the broken state of the text, as a messenger of Tushratta; he might just as well have been a messenger of the pharaoh). Weber is probably correct in his assumption that ᵐAbdi-Ninurta was a servant of Rib-Haddi (EA, p. 1174), but Puhewa is better described as an Egyptian messenger or servant than as a "Beamter."

Il. 42-43: Cf. the note on EA 53:53-55 supra. For the writing .URS-kur (lacking the case ending), cf. .URS-su-su-ur in l. 12.

L. 44: Knudtzon and §§ 41 agree on the readings. If they are correct, however, the text is hardly in order; possibly Schroeder was unduly influenced by Knudtzon's transliteration.
RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH

(VAT 1626 - WA 48 - W 69 - S 42 - EA 85)

Obverse

(1) [a-na LUGAL\textsuperscript{ri}] EN-ia \textsuperscript{d}UTU q[i]-b[i]-ma

[um-ma \textsuperscript{m}Ri-i)b-\textsuperscript{d}IM ìR-ka-ma a-na G[\textsuperscript{Ir}MES]

[EN-ia] \textsuperscript{d}UTU IMIN-\textsuperscript{yu} IMIN-ta-an am-[qut]

[\textsuperscript{d}NIN] \textsuperscript{g}a URU Gub-la ti-di-in₄

(5) [KALAG.G]A a-na LUGAL\textsuperscript{ri} EN-ia

[a-nu]-ma ki-a-ma-am iš-tap-ru a-na LUGAL\textsuperscript{ri} EN-ia

[û] la-a yi-īš-mu-na a-wa-te-ia

a-nu-ma ES₅-ta-an i-zi-iz UGU-\textsuperscript{i}a MU\textsuperscript{K}(A)M.MES

an-ni-ta ù MIN MU am-ma-Ya-hu

(10) \textsuperscript{S}lim-HI.A ia-nu \textsuperscript{S}\textsuperscript{S}lim-HI.A a-na

a-ka-li a-na ia-\textsuperscript{mi}nu mi-na a-qa(!)-bu-na

a-na LU\textsuperscript{MES} hu-up-\textsuperscript{Si}-ia ga-am-ru

DUMU\textsuperscript{MES}-\textsuperscript{yu}-nu M₁\textsuperscript{DUMU.MI} Yu-nu GIS\textsuperscript{MES} \textsuperscript{8} E-\textsuperscript{yu}-nu

i-na na-da-ni i-na KUR\textsuperscript{ia} -ri-mu-ta

(15) i-na bā-la-at [2]I-nu \textsuperscript{g}a-ni-tam

yi-īš-mé LUGAL\textsuperscript{ru} EN\textsuperscript{li} a-wa-te

Ir ki-ti-\textsuperscript{yu} ù yu-wa-\textsuperscript{Hi}-ra

\textsuperscript{S}lim-HI.A i-na \textsuperscript{S}\textsuperscript{S}AG BI GIS\textsuperscript{MES} \textsuperscript{MA} ù yu-\textsuperscript{ba}-li-it

Ir-\textsuperscript{yu} ù(!) URU(!)-\textsuperscript{yu} ù ia-di-na

(20) LIMMU me LU\textsuperscript{MES} ES₅ ta-pa[l \textsuperscript{ANSE.KU}]R.RA\textsuperscript{MES}

ki-ma na-da-ni a-na \textsuperscript{m}Zu-r[a]-ta

ù ti-na-sa-ru URU a-na ka-tam

[\textsuperscript{5}]a-ni-tam i-nu-ma yi-[i]q-bi \textsuperscript{m}\textsuperscript{1}a-an-\textsuperscript{ha}-mu
[na-a]d-na-ti-mi ḪE|m-HI.A a-na m[Ri-ib]-dIM

(25) [ù n]a-di-in₄ a-na ṣa-a-ṣu
[ ] -z]u Ḥu-ta-ri-ma
[ù na-di-in₄ ḪE[m-HI.A] ḪANABI LÛME₈

m[i-n]a na-da-an [u-u]t [a]-na ia-a-[ṣi]
ù an-nu-ù i-na m[IA-pa]-dI[M]

(30) [a]d-di KÛ.BABBARME₈-ṣu-nu al-[lu]-mi

^P[u]-hé-wa it-ka [ṣ]a-al-ṣu
ù yi-iq-bi gâb-ba i-na pa-ni-ka
Ṣa-ni-tam li-id-mi-iq i-na pa-ni
LUGAL ri EN-ia ù yu-da-[n]am

(35) ḪE|m-HI.A mu-ù-[ṣ]a KÛR[a]ri-mu-ta
[ṣ]a-a yu-da-[n]u pa-na-nu i-na URU[S]u-mu-ra
[y]u-da-nam i-na-na i-na URU Gub-la
[ù] n[u]-ba-li-it a-di ti-[ṣ[a-a-l]u
[a-n]a URUli-ka Ṣa-ni-tam li-[b-lu-ut]

(40) [LUGAL]ru EN a-di [LÛME₈-en] ia ra-[i-mu]

(edge) [M[IR-A]-ṣ[i]-ir-ta û LÛME₈ G[AZME₈]
[ ] m[IA-pa]-dIM i-na [ ]
[ ]-ta û tu-pa-ṣu [ ]

Reverse
[ ] EN ia-nu LÛ i-na UR. LÛ. Gub-la

(45) [uṣ]-ṣi-ra L[U]ME₈ ma-ṣa-ar-ta [a-na]
[na-s]a-ar KÛ[R-k]a ú-ul tu-ṣa-bat
[KUR]-ka Ṣa-ni-tam Și-mé ia-a-ṣi
[q[i]-ba-mi a-na mTa-an-ha-mi ?
[y]i-[?]qé Kû.BABBAR? [EŠ lu-bu]-û a-na LûMEŠ

(50) [U]RU Gub-la i-na KUR[I]a-ri-mu-ta
ša-ni-tam LUGAL KUR<MI>ta-na a-sî
a-di UR[U]Su-mu-[r]a yu-ba-û
a-la-k[ám a]-di URU Gub-la û i[a]-nu
Aû a-na š[a]-te-Yu û ta-[r]a

(55) a-na KUR-šu a-nu-ma k[i]-a-ma šš-tap-ru
[a]-n[a]š]-GAL a-na i-ri-îš-ti-ia
[a-na mi]-ni l[a-a t]u-te-ru-[n]a
[a-wa-tam a-na] i[a]-a(!)-mi-mi û DUMU-ia
[i-r]i-îš-ti îR-ia û i-de

(60) [il]p-ša š[a] i-pu-šu
a-[d]i yi-[ik-t]a-aš-du-na LUGALru
[u] yi-[d]a-ga-lu LUGALru
[IL]R ki-ti-šu mi-ia-mi
mîR-A-[ś[i-ir]-t[a] î[R UR.[ZI]R [û]

(65) [u] yi]-qa-bu šum-šu i-na
[pa]-ni LUGAL dUTU i-nu-ma DIŠ ha-za-nu
šAGbu-šu it-ti šAGbi-ia
û ú-da-bi-ra mîR-A-ši-ir-ta
îš-tu KUR_A-mur-ri ša-ni-tam îš-tu

(70) ta-ri a-bi-ka îš-tu
URU Si-du-na îš-tu UD*KÁM.MES
šu-wa-at šu_né-ep-ša-at
(75) yi-š-mé LUGALRu a-wa-te īR-šu
  [i]a-di-na LūMSRu a-na na-sa-ar
  [UR]U-šu ú-ul yu-pa-hi-ra ka-li
  [Lū]MEŠ GAZMEŠ ʾū DI.AB[u]
  [URU] ʾū i-na UDKAM.MESu

(80) [an-nu]-ti uš-mi-ra ERĪNMEŠ [pí-tá-ti]
(edge) [〈tu〉-da-bi-ra-šu i[y-tu]
  [KUR]-um]-ri i-nu-ma LūMASHIM L[UGAL]
  [it-t]i-nu ʾū a-na ṣa-š[u]
(left edge) [ ],[ru ʾu-ul nu-uš-pu-ru a-n[a ] fUm-m[a-ah-nu]

(85) [u mu]-ut-ši ḫIS-ku-[R[u] GEME d[N[I a] URUGub-[la ṣ]
  [li-ib-l]u-ṭ LUGALRu a-di GEME d[N[I i-na [ ]
  [ ],][na i-na qa-at LūGAL ] d[N[I [N ]
ardikama ana s[ēpe bēliya] RARY bēliya ARY bēliya [u] lā yiṣmūna awāteya anūma Ḥalūtān

i(z)iz muḥhiya подобна annīta u ʿṣina Ṣanāṭī ammaṣaḥu (10) Ṣeʿaya
yānu Ṣeʿa ana akāli ana yāṣinu mīna aqa(!)(b)būna ana ḥupḥiyā

gamū māruṣunu mārātuṣunu iss[u] bītātišunu ina nadānī ina

(Ya)ri(=)mūta (15) ina balāt na[piš]tinu Ṣanītām yīšme Ṣarrū
bēli awāte arād ki(t)tišu u yuwa(Ṣ)ṣīra Ṣeʿa ina libbi elippāti
u yuba(l)lit arādšu u(!) āl(!)ṣu u yādīna (20) erba meʿ(āt)
amīlūtī Ṣalābē tapā[1 s][s][i] kīma nadānī ina Zur[ā]ta u
tīna(s) sarū āla ina kātām [ṣ]sanītām inūma yiqbi Yanḥamu

[na]dnātimi Ṣeʿa ana Ṣīb-Haddi (25) [u n]adin ana Ṣāṣu [...

\ hutarīma [u nadn] Ṣeʿ erbe amīlūtī m[īn]a nadan s[u]t [a]na
yāṣīnu u annu ina Yapa Ḥa[ddu (30) a]dīi kasapṣunu allūmī
P[u]hewa itka [ṣ]alšu u yiqbi gabba ina panīka Ṣanītām lidmiq
ina pani Ṣarrī bēliya u yūda[n]am (35) Ṣeʿu mū[s]a(′) Yari(m)mūta
[ṣ]a yūda[n]u panānu ina [ṣ]umura [y]ūdanam ina(n)na ina Ğubla
[ū] n[u]ba(l)lit adi tiṣ[a′al]u [an][a] liška Ṣanītām li[blut (40)
]

YPa Ḥaddi ina [ ]ta u tūṣaṣu [ ]

EN yanū amīla ina [Guba (45) u]ṣīra amī[1]u[t]i
ma(s) sarta [ana nasār mā[tik]a ul tusabat [mat]ka Ṣanītām yīše
yāṣi [qi]ba(m)mi ana Yanḥamī u [y]i[1]qe kaspa [lubū]ṣī ana
amīlūt (50) Ğubla ina [Y]ari(m)mūta Ṣanītām Yar (Mi) tana asi
adi Sumu[r]a u yuba’u alak[am a]di Gubla u y[â]nu me ana
š[a]tēšu u tā[ra] (55) ana mātišu anūma k[ī]’ama īstapru [a]n[a
š]kalli ana īrītiya [ana mī]ni l[ā t]ute(r)rū[n]a [awātam ana]
yâ(¡)simi u DUMU-ia [ir]īti ardiya u ūde (60) [i]pša š[a]
i(p)pušu a[d]i yi[kt]ašdûna Sarru [û] yi[d]a(g)galu Sarru a[r]ad
ki(t)tišu mîyami ĔAbdi-’A[ir]t[a] a[rd]u k[ja]l[b]u [û (65) {û}
yi]qa(b)bû Sumšu ina [pa]ni Sarri Šamši inūma īstēn ḥāzanu
libbasu itti īlibbiya u uda(b)bira ĔAbdi-’Amīrta īstu ’Amurri
Šanītam īstu (70) târī ābīka īstu Šidûna īstu ūmî Šuwât
innēpšat mātâtu ana ĔApirī kīna(n)na yânû mimma ana yâmî (75)
yîšme Sarru awâte ardišu [y]âdina amlandî ana nassâ [āl]îshu
ul yupa(h)bira kali ĔApirī u yisbatû [ša] u ina ūmî (80)
[annû]ti uṣyira sâbi [pi]tāti {û} tu]da(b)bira(š)šu i[stu
’Amur]ri inūma râbis Š[arri itt]išnu u ana Šaš[u]
ru
ul nušpuru an[a ] Uma[aḥnu (85) ȗ m]utši Iškur[u]
[ na ina qāt rab[t] ] Bē[l]ti
(1) [To the king], my lord, the sun-god, s[p]e[ak: Thus Rib-Haddi, thy servant. At the f[ee]t of my lord, the sun-god, seven times, seven times I have f[allen]. May [the lady] of Byblos grant (5) [powe]r to the king, my lord! [Alre]ady thus I have written to the king, my lord, [bu]t he has not heeded my words. Already he has attacked me three times this year, and for two years I have been plundered (10) as far as my grain is concerned. There is no grain for our sustenance; what am I to say to my tenant farmers? Gone are their sons, their daughters, their household furnishing[s], by being sold into <Ya>rimmuta (15) in exchange for the provisions of our l[iv]e(s).

Further, let the king heed the words of his loyal servant and let him send me grain in boats so that he might preserve the life of his servant and(!) his city(!). Moreover, let him give me (20) four hundred men (and) thirty tea[m of h]or[se]s, such as were given to Zur[a]ta, so that they might guard the city for thee.

[F]urther, if Yanhamu says: "I [have gi]ven grain to Rib-Haddi, (25) [and there has been g]iven to him [ ] . . . , [and there has been given] grain for forty men"--w[h]at has he given [t]o m<e]? Moreover, behold, in (the charge of) Yapa^-Ha[ddu (30) I de]posited the money for them. Lo, P[u]hewa is with thee; [int]errogate him, and he will tell thee everything.

Further, may it seem good before the king, my lord, that there be gi[v]en to me (35) grain, the expo[r]t of Yarimmuta. [Let that] which was gi[v]en formerly in [S]iymra [be gi]ven to me now in Byblos [so th]at w[e] may preserve life until thou canst in[v]estigate [concer]ning thy city.

Further, hearken to me: [Tell]11 Yanhamu to [t]a[k]e silver [(and) garments] to the people of (50) Byblos (who are) in [Y]arimmuta.

Further, the king of (Mi)tanni went out to Simy[r]a and he sought to g[o as f]ar as Byblos, but the[re] was no water for him to d[ri]nk and so he retu[rned]ed (55) to his (own) land. Already t[h]us I have written [t]o [the p]alace for my need(s); [wh]y [hast thou] n[ot] return[e]d [word to] me—- . . . ---so that I may know (60) [w]ha[t] I am to do un[t]il the king c[o]mes [and] the king s[ees] his loyal s[er]vant? Who is cAbdi-Ash[ir]t[a], the s[la]ve, the d[o]g, t[ha]t (65) t[h]a[t] they [should (even)] speak his name in the [pres]ence of the king, the sun-god? If (only) one mayor would ally himself with me, then I would drive cAbdi-Ashirta from Amurru.

Further, since (70) the return of thy father from Sidon—-since his days—-the lands have been turned over to the cApiru, (and) so I have nothing. (75) Let the king heed the words of his servant; [let hi]m give men to guard his [ci]ty, lest he muster all the cApiru and they seize [the city]. Moreover, in [the]se (80) days send me an [archer] host [(so that) it] might drive him [from Amur]ru. When the commission[er of the k[ing (was) wi]th] us, then to hi[m ] . We shall not be sent t[o +]. Umm[a]nu, (85) her [hus]band [being] Ishkur[u], is a maidservant of the La[dy of] Byb[los, and, as] the king [liv]es, the maidservant of (the la)dy is still in [ ] in the charge of the (Egyptian) offici[al +] the La[dy ] .

* * *
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L. 3: Because of the limited space available at the end of this line, my restoration (am-[qut]) is more plausible than that of Knudtzon (am[ku-ut]); cf. EA 68:8; 94:3, and note also am-[qut] in 126:3.

L. 6. ki'aman: If my explanation of Byblian ki'ama is correct (cf. the note on EA 74:49 supra), the mimination on this form (unique in Amarna) is perhaps best understood as an attempt to archaize what was considered to be an adverbial ending (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 113 b). Note that ki'aman is doubly adverbial.


L. 8. halmitan: For this normalization of ES-ta-an cf. the notes on Hibhitan in EA 68:8 and timitan in 81:24. As has already been noted (cf. the commentary on 68:8), these forms are clearly related to the frequently attested Hibcatam in the Hebrew Bible (cf. also 'arba'tayim, "fourfold," in II Samuel 12:6).

L. 8. i-zi-iz: As Weber correctly notes (EA, p. 1174), the subject of this verb is 'Adhi-Ashira (cf. ll. 41, 64, 68).

Ll. 8-9. MU Kramer, MEB annita: The singular adjective, as well as context, indicates that the MEB-sign is to be disregarded here (contra Knudtzon).

Ll. 9-10. Sina Sanati am-ma-Sa-hu Ye'aya: "For two years I have been plundered as far as my grain is concerned." Many attempts have been made to understand am-ma-Sa-hu/ah in this passage and its parallels (cf. EA 86:38-39; 91:16 and quite likely also 90:63). Winckler went astray by assuming that the syllables am-ma are part of what precedes and then by connecting the resulting *Sa-hu with Hebrew Muh and comparing Saha in Psalm 44:26 (cf. W, p. 410). A comparison of the present passage with EA 91:16, however, makes it absolutely certain that we must read am-ma-Sa-hu here. It is clear, then, that we are dealing with a verb masahu. In Akkadian, there is such a verb,
frequently attested, with the meaning "to measure," which Knudtzon unhesitatingly seized upon as describing what Rib-Haddi would logically do with his grain (cf. also Weber, EA, p. 1174).

Knudtzon failed to note, however, that the forms in question are all in the IV1 conjugation and so must be translated as passives. The verb mma'nu/maṣahu, "to take away (by force), to plunder" (for which cf. Landsberger, ZDMG 69, p. 525), not to be confused with mma'nu/maṣū, "to forget," is the only one that meets the requirements of our passage (so also Moran, S3DB, p. 46). Ebeling seems to have been the first to discern mmaṣahu, "to plunder," in this case, although he erred in connecting it with an Arabic root masaha, "to spoil" (BA VIII/2 [1912], p. 65), since the form mmaṣu shows that the h is not original in our root but is merely orthographic (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 23 e; to the examples adduced there we may add, e.g., the present verb; 'alālu/halālu, "to hang [transitive]," for which cf. Landsberger, AA 43, p. 262, n. 2; ba'ulatu/bahulatu, "vassals" [cf. von Soden, AHw, pp. 96,117; etc.).

Ll. 11-12. mīna a-qā(!)-bu-na ana hupšiya: Cf. the note on EA 81:33 supra. Schroeder's revised autograph reads clearly a-NA-bu-na at the end of l. 11, but the NA-sign is perhaps best explained as being due to vertical dittoigraphy since l. 10 ends in a-na.

L. 19. ṣ(!) URU(!)-hū: The uncertain signs in this phrase straddle a break in the tablet. WA 48 reads ṣ RA hū, while § 42 displays A NA IA hū. Neither of these readings makes sense, whereas that of ṣ 69 and Knudtzon, which I have decided to follow, has the support of numerous parallel passages (EA 112:30-36; 114:20-21; 116:44-47; 117:75-81; 130:44-46; 133:2-4).

L. 21. Zur[a]ta: This figure, while the mayor of Accho (Biblical ḥakkū, located about ten miles up the Mediterranean coast from modern Haifa), was for a time the contemporary of Rib-Haddi, who here complains of the preferential treatment
accorded to the former (for a similar complaint against him, noted already by Weber in EA, p. 1175, cf. EA 88:46-48). Zurata was the author of EA 232; he is mentioned, in addition, in EA 245 as well as in an Amarna letter published by Thureau-Dangin in RA 19, p. 106 (cf. especially 11. 20 ff.).

Weber is doubtless correct in assuming that Ṣa-ra-a-tum (EA 8:19) and Zurata are one and the same (cf. EA, p. 1027), but his implication that the initial phoneme was originally Ṣ (ibid., p. 1568) is untenable; that the Canaanite scribes would have more accurately represented the sibilant in the name of one of their own princes than a Babylonian scribe could be expected to do is, in my opinion, far more defensible (so also Ṣa/i-ta-at-na, the Canaanite spellings of the name of Zurata's son, are preferable to Ṣu-ta-at-na in EA 8:19, contra Weber, EA, p. 1568). Indeed, the exact nature of the sibilant, though certainly not Ṣ, is still problematical in view of the Ugaritic proper names Ṣrt (cf. the text published in RA 37, pp. 130-131, vi:7) and Bn-Srt (ibid., p. 25, l. 2); perhaps we should transliterate "Ṣu-ra-ta."

L. 25. [ụ a]di-i**: Knudtzon's [ụ a]d-di-en here would be unique in Rib-Haddi whereas nadin occurs several times (EA 83:13; 137:12; 138:128), each time to be translated in the passive voice as here (its subject, unfortunately broken away at the beginning of l. 26, almost certainly has the nominative case ending) and to be carefully distinguished from nadan, the Canaanized perfect form which must always be translated in the active voice (cf. l. 26 infra; 132:42; 134:37). [ụ na-di-i**] is plausible likewise at the beginning of l. 27.

L. 26. hu-ta-ri-ma: Moran (SSBE, p. 158) suggests that we compare with this gloss Ugaritic ūtrrm, which is parallel to ḫtt (Hebrew hettm), "wheat," and ksmm (Hebrew kussēmim), "spelt." The passage involved, however (II K, iii:9-11), is badly preserved in l. 11 where ūtrrm occurs (note that Ginsberg
declines to translate the line in ANET. Moreover, the Amarna gloss does not exhibit the reduplication of the Ugaritic form. Although Moran's proposal remains the most plausible thus far, it seems best to leave the matter in abeyance at present (as does CAD 6, p. 263).

L. 28. m[i-n]a na-da-an 9[u-u]t [a]-na ia-<<<<: Schroeder's revised autograph fully confirms Knudtzon's hesitant restoration. The error at the end of the line was probably caused when the scribe temporarily lapsed into his native Canaanite idiom, wherein -ya is the genitive/dative first person singular pronominal suffix added directly to prepositions (cf. Hebrew-Ugaritic-Phoenician ly, "to me").

Ll. 29-30. ina YapaC-Haddu a]ddi kasapMu: ina is probably elliptic here for ina qät (cf. EA 83:30-31; Genesis 27:17). The suffix -Mu most likely refers to whatever foodstuffs and other supplies Rib-Haddi had requested from Yanhamu. It appears that YapaC-Haddi was the middleman in the transaction, and that although he had turned over Rib-Haddi's money to Yanhamu he had not delivered the purchased items to Rib-Haddi, a fact that Weber plausibly adduces as at least one of the reasons behind the lawsuit between Rib-Haddi and YapaC-Haddi (cf. EA, pp. 1175-1176, for details).

Ll. 31-32. mP[u]-hō-wa it-ka [8jālu ụ yiqbi gabba ina panīka: Puhewa, an Egyptian messenger, had been accompanied on his return trip to the pharaoh by CAbdi-Ninurta, Rib-Haddi's courier (cf. EA 84:39-41).

It is tempting to see in it-ka a scribal error for "it-ti-ka", but cf. it-ia (EA 114:7, 47) and it-yyu-nu (130:24). We should perhaps understand these forms as precursors of such compressed Hebrew forms as 'itt'ka and 'itt'kem. The Rib-Haddi letters exhibit also it-ta-ka (114:46; cf. the pausal Hebrew form 'ittak) and it-ta-yyu (105:33, 39; 120:31; 122:26; cf. Hebrew 'ittō which
developed from *ittahu); it-ti (138:31), where we expect *it-ti-ia, foreshadows Hebrew 'itti. The relatively large number of such secondary formations in Canaanite Amarna removes them from the category of Akkadian "variants" (contra CAD 7, p. 303) and demands that we understand them as specifically Canaanite developments.

For yisbi... ina panika cf. the note on lu ûde Harrau in EA 68:9 supra. Such expressions are very frequent with reference to the pharaoh; cf., in the present letter, ll. 33-34, 65-66.

Ll. 34-35. û yu-da-[n]am Ya'u mu-û-[s]a Yari(m)mûta: For the Qal passive form yuda[n]am cf. ll. 36-37 below and the note on EA 83:23 above (cf. further GKC², § 53 u).

In standard Akkadian, mûsû means "exit" and the like, while in the present passage it clearly denotes "produce, export," leading us to suspect Canaanite influence (cf. mûsû in the sense of "export" in I Kings 10:23 = II Chronicles 1:16). mu-û-[s]a above cannot be analyzed as a Canaanite accusative construct form since the verb, yuda[n]am, demands a nominative; it can only be normalized as mû[s]a(') and understood as the Akkadianized nominative construct of mawṣa'u.

Ll. 38-39. adî ti-û[a-a-l]u [a-n]a: Knudtzon's restoration after adî, ti-û[a-la-k]u [a-n]a, is impossible, since malâku is unattested with an a-theme in the present tense either in Akkadian or in Bybliam. Knudtzon later corrected his restoration to ti-û[a-li-k]u (EA, p. 1591) but, although such a restoration is tempting (cf. especially EA 104:16-17; for malâku ana, "to care for," cf. the note on 74:58 supra), there is not enough room for the Li-sign in the lacuna. This latter objection, however, applies also to the restoration suggested by Moran (SSDB, p. 158), viz. ti-û[a-î-1]u (for which cf. EA 89:40). Moran is probably correct in assuming that the verb in view in our passage is ba'âlu, but if so the better restoration is
doubtless $\text{ti-[a-a]-lu}$ (cf. 89:12: yi-Ma-a-lu), for which § 42 provides ample space. For the Canaanite Amarna tendency to vocalize Akkadian $\text{I} \_\_ \_ \text{a}-\text{theme}$ present forms as though they were actually $\text{i}-\text{theme}$ forms cf. the note on EA 74:55 above. Ma'al $\text{u an}$, "to investigate concerning" (cf. EA 89 passim), renders Hebrew $\text{Ma'al}$ $\text{I}^\text{e}$ (cf. BDB, pp. 981-982, for details).

Ll. 39-40. $\text{li-[u-lu-ut LUGAL]} \text{ru} \text{ EN}$: With Knudtzon's brilliant restoration here cf. EA 256:10-12; 289:37, and especially l. 36 of the present letter.

L. 40: Here, in l. 36 below, and elsewhere in Rib-Haddi (notably EA 104:32; 112:48; 117:33; 124:14) $\text{adi}$ is best understood as reflecting Hebrew $\text{C} \text{Od}$ (cf. already Moran, SSDB, p. 9) in the mind of the Canaanite scribe and should be carefully distinguished from $\text{adi}$, "while," which occurs at least once in these texts and represents Hebrew $\text{C} \text{ad}$ (cf. the note on EA 82:45 supra for details). In the passages cited here, Knudtzon was joined by Ebeling (EA, p. 1362) in translating $\text{adi}$ variously as "so wahr"; "wahrhaftig" (Ebeling: "f"urwahr"); "ob"; von Soden uncritically acquiesced in their judgment (AbW, p. 13) which, if correct, would grant to $\text{adi}$ a semantic range so broad as to render it meaningless. Our interpretation of it as denoting "still, yet, again" in these passages makes them perfectly intelligible.

Ll. 40-41. $\text{[anilu]tuya rA-im-m Abdi-'A]birta}$: The word at the end of l. 40 must be a form of the verb $\text{ra-amu}$, "to love" (for a discussion of which cf. the note on EA 73:18 above), but Knudtzon's $\text{ra[-i-mu-ut}$ is scarcely possible for the Rib-Haddi dialect. The key parallel passages are EA 137:46-47: $\text{ma-ah-du anilutu ra-i-mu-ia ana libbi il}$, and 362:54-56: $\text{gabbi hazanute la ra-i-mu inuma tusu sabu pitatu}$. The present passage, when read in connection with other passages (notably 73:14-18; 83:49-51; 137:46-48; 138:71-73), describes the Canaanite inhabitants of Amarna Age Syro-Palestine as only too willing to
join forces with any individual or faction whom they considered
politically and militarily strong, sometimes in utter disregard
of moral principles.

L. 43: tupašu here can only be analyzed as a Canaanite Qal
passive imperfect of the Akkadian verb ėpēšu. This particular
form is unique, however, so that the context cannot be restored
at present. WA 48 displays a clear EN before the IA in l. 44,
but this fact does not simplify the restoration problem.

Ll. 46-47. ū-ul tu-sa-bat [KUR]-ka: "... lest thy
[land] be seized." As Ebeling has already recognized (BA VIII/2
[1912], p. 60), tu-sa-bat is a scribal error for "tusbat, a Qal
passive required here by context. It seems that the scribe
started to write the third person feminine singular passive
imperfect form and, momentarily forgetting his intention, ended
with the syllables of the corresponding active form (for a somewhat
similar lapse of memory cf. am-ma-ha-as-ni in EA 52:38).

In view of KU[R-k]a in l. 46, [KUR]-ka in l. 47 is more
plausible a restoration than Knudtzon's [alu]-ka.

L. 48: After ū, WA 48 displays traces of what appears to
be either a second ū-sign (for the frequent ditto graphy of ū in
Rib-Haddi cf., e.g., the note on EA 34:17-18 above) or a WA-sign
(cf. the beginning of l. 49 of the present letter) which the
scribe may have tried to obliterate. Schroeder's revised
autograph, however, shows nothing whatever after ū, which it
displays as being close to the edge of the tablet (cf. further
Knudtzon, EA, p. 409, n. m).

L. 49: Weber (EA, p. 1176) is probably correct in restoring
[lu-bu]-ši here on the basis of EA 82:28-30 (contra Knudtzon,
EA, p. 1591).

Ll. 51-55: With this highly interesting passage (cf., e.g.,
Campbell, Bib. Arch. 23/1, pp. 5-6) cf. especially EA 109:5-8.
The reading KUR t-NA-ta-na may be regarded as certain (cf. the note on EA 75:38-39 supra).

*ta-[n]a (for *tawara) in l. 54 is a striking example of the West Semitic qatala formation as imposed upon a purely Akkadian verb.

L. 56. a-na i-ri-

5-ti-ia: So WA 48 (contra Knudtzon, EA, p. 410, n. c; the IA-sign had been broken away by the time that Schroeder made his revised autograph). Knudtzon failed to translate ištatu here and in l. 59, although it is obviously to be rendered "requirement, need(s)" and derived from erētu, "to request" (for examples of erētu with this meaning elsewhere in Akkadian cf. CAD 4, p. 299, 2b).

Ll. 57-58. [a-na m]i]-ni [a-a]l\u-ru-[n]a [a-wa-tam a-na] i[a]-a(1)-Bi-mi: Knudtzon made no attempt to restore this passage; for the plausibility of my restoration cf. especially EA 83:7-8 (cf. further 83:23-24, 47-48; 108:49-50; 114:25). Despite Knudtzon's note (EA, p. 410, n. d), i[a] is quite plausible in l. 56, and WA 48 shows traces of a Na-sign at the end of the line. § 42 appears to read [i]-ba-Bi-mi (cf. Knudtzon) after the break at the beginning of l. 57, but there is no room for the subject of the resulting *[i]ba(B)imi before the latter. My emendation seems required by the parallels.

Ll. 58-59. ő DUMU-ia [ir]ištī ariya: Although each of these words is perfectly clear in itself, when taken together they are baffling in the present context. It may well be that the text is in error here. At any rate, the phrase forms a sort of parenthesis between what precedes and what follows (cf. EA 83:7-9; 114:25-26).

The DUMU-sign is clear in both WA 48 and § 42 (contra Knudtzon, EA, p. 410, n. f); there is no MUS after DUMU, however (§ 42 and Knudtzon, loc. cit., contra WA 48).
ll. 59-60. ū̱ īde [̱i]p̱a ̱[̱a] i(p)ušu: Cf. the note on EA 83:7-9 supra (cf. further Moran, SSDB, p. 125, n. 111).

ll. 61. yi-[ik-t]a-as-du-na: Although this is the only example of kasādu in the I₂ conjugation in Rib-Haddi, Knudtzon's restoration can scarcely be doubted; cf., for the same idea as that expressed here, EA 82:51-52; 83:24-28; 102:14-19; 103:25-32.

ll. 61-62. LUGALru . . . LUGALru: The repetition of the subject is highly unusual; perhaps the second LUGALru is due to vertical ditto graphy.

ll. 64-65. [û {û}]: Traces of both U-signs are clearly visible in Schroeder's revised autograph. For this ditto graphy cf. the note on EA 84:17-18 supra.

ll. 65. [yi]-qa-bu: Although Knudtzon's restoration ([i]-ka-bu) is possible, the Canaanized preformative is far more likely; cf. ll. 61 and 62 of the present letter and note especially EA 116:8-9; 131:41-42. The form could, of course, be read as a singular here (cf. 117:83; 122:9), but a comparison with 84:13-19 leads me to favor understanding it as a plural (for the comparable Hebrew construction cf. GKC², §§ 134 f, g).

ll. 66-67. SAG₄ Lu: In spite of the phonetic complement, we should perhaps normalize libbāšu, since UZU₄ SAG₄ bā-ku-nu (EA 166:15) shows that the Canaanite scribes were not unaware of Akkadian morphology with regard to nominative suffixal forms of nouns ending in a doubled consonant (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 65 d).

ll. 69-70. Ǝtu ta-ri abīka: Standard Akkadian would read Ǝtu tāri abīka; the form tāri exhibits the Canaanite genitive construct vowel.

ll. 71-72: Ǝtu umi buah-wa-at means literally "since the days of him"; cf. [k]īma buah-a-ta in EA 89:50 (for discussion cf. Albright and Moran in JCS 4, p. 168).
L. 74. ni-am-ma: The use of the AM-sign to represent the phonemes -im- and -um- is rather common in Rib-Haddi, especially in minnu (cf. EA 91:16; 105:19; 132:16; cf. further, e.g., yi-am-lik/li-ik in 105:6; 114:20; ia-nu-am in *362:29,37).

L. 77. ul yupa(h)ira: For ul, "lest," cf. the note on EA 71:28 supra. The subject of the verb here is undoubtedly Abdi-Ashtira.

Ll. 78-79. Dl. AB \textsuperscript{bu} URU: Knudtzon's suggestion (EA, p. 411, n. 1) that Dl. AB stands here for DIB (sabatu) remains the most plausible, although yisbatu (cf. EA 137:62) is a more likely Assyrian equivalent than Knudtzon's isabbatu (at any rate, a plural is required here). It is true that the verb following paharu and puḫuru in Rib-Haddi is always either maqatu muḫḫi (EA 74:31-32; 91:23-25) or le/aḫ (71:28-30; 76:17-20; 124:13-15), but note that 71:31 and 76:22 (cf. 71:28 and 76:17 respectively) give some support, however weak, to the proposed restoration.

Ll. 79-80: ina îmu [an-nu]-ti, not [an-ni]-ti as per Knudtzon.

Ll. 80-81. uṣṣiru sabi [piṭāti ⟨̑⟩ tu]-da-bi-ra-šu: There is not room for the 𒍋-sign either at the end of 1. 80 or the beginning of 1. 81; cf., however, EA 76:33-40: uṣṣiru sabi piṭāti raba ū tu-da-bi-ir a(y)yābī Marri. It was on the basis of this latter passage that Moran (ASDB, p. 158) corrected Knudtzon's [ū]-da-bi-ra-šu in the phrase under discussion.

Ll. 83-84. ana ša-[u] ]-ru ū-ul nu-um-pu-ru a-n[a ]: In view of the lack of parallels for this passage, any attempt at connected restoration is likely to prove unsuccessful. Knudtzon's a-na [][u] na-um-pu-ru appears plausible at first, but when translated in connection with what precedes is found to be meaningless. Likewise, Knudtzon's proposed [umu]tú after a-n[a] in 1. 84 is impossible; in Rib-Haddi
But is never the object of a preposition. Nor does a-n[a ăn-a-ši]a (as suggested in EA, p. 412, n. a) fare any better; the traces do not support the second ṢA-sign, and at any rate we would expect a-n[a ăn-a-ši]. a-n[a ău-a-ši] is possible (cf. [k]īna ău-a-ta in EA 89:50) but, of course, incapable of anything approaching proof.

The form nușparu is itself not without problems. It is probably best analyzed as a Qal passive imperfect (*nușparu) which has undergone vowel harmony. It is clearly indicative, however, and should not be translated as a jussive (contra Knudtzon).

L. 87: Knudtzon's restoration at the beginning of this line, [du-un-]šna, on the basis of EA 83:55 (cf. EA, p. 412, n. b), is highly improbable, since the gemination in the word dunnu never appears in the Rib-Ḫaddi orthography; furthermore, [dun]šna would make very little sense here. Likewise, Knudtzon's hesitant [a-na] after rab[a] on the basis of 83:57 must remain quite uncertain in view of the fact that the same word order at the end of EA 83 has by no means been proved (cf. the note on EA 83:56 supra).
RIB-HADDI TO AMAN-APPA
(1 29805 - BB 21 - W66 / 90 - E0 86)

Obverse

(1) [a-na m]A-ma-a[na-Appa]

um-ma m[Ri-ib-][IM a-na G]R M6 [ka]
am-qú-[ut d]A-ma-n[sa DIN]GIR ša LUGAL
EN-ka ti-di-nu TÉš-k[a i-na pa-ni]

(5) LUGAL ri EN-ka ši-mé i[a-MI nu KUR]

KALAG.GA 𝐮 ku-uš-da q[a-du]

ERÍN M6 pi-tá-ti 𝐮 [ti-il-gé]
KUR A-mu-ri ur-ra m[u-Sa]
[  ] -ši a-na ka-tam [ù]

(10) [ti-il]q-ta-bu ma-ad MA.[GAL]

[mi-im]-nu ša yu-ul-qu ú[iš-tu]
[ša]-yu-nu a-na KUR Mi-ta-na [ù]
[a-nu-š]a i-na-na la a ta-[ ]
[ù] a-mi-ši tu-sa(-)na [ ]

(15) [ki-a] ma taq-bi m[še-an-ha-[mu-mi]]

[ù]š-yi-[ir B(!)im(!)]H[IA a-na k[a-tam]
[1]a-a ti-iš-mé IR na-[ ]
[a-n]a ša-a-yu ū d[a-
[ ] KU M6 \ ma-aš-ka a-na [ ]

(20) [ ] -šu la ra-[ ]
[ ] a ū la [ ]
[ ] K]š.BABBAR M6 šš-š[u KUR La-ri-mu-ta]
[ù l]i-ma-[ad al-še-mi]

(edge) [š][U]m-ma-ša-[nu ū mu-ut-ši]
Reverse

(25) [m]I]u-ka |r- [GEME dNIN]
[Ma-a] URU Gub-[la a-mi-ni la]
[táq-b]i a-na ia-[bi ë-mé ia-bi]
[ù] qí-bi a-na LUGAL [ù]
[t]u-da-na a-na dN(IN ù)

(30) [ú]-ul ti-ka-li [ ]
[§]a-ni-tam qí-da-mi a-na [LUGAL]
ù yu-da-na a-n[a URU Gub-la]
mu-ú-sa ša KUR Ia-[r(i(!)-mu-ta]
ki-ma na-da-ni-šu [pa-na-nu]

(35) a-na URU Su-mu-ra [ù]
ni-ub-lu(!)-ut a-di y[ša-a-lu]
LUGAL ru a-na URU-šu [ù]
[a]-nu-ma ES MUKA [MEŠ] a[m-ma-ša-hu]
yš-IM-HI.A-nu ia-nu m[i-im-ma]

(40) a-na na-da-ni a-na A[NHÉ.KUR.RA] MEŠ
ù a-na mi-ni ia-d[i-na]
LUGAL ru ES ta-pal [ANŠ.E.KUR.RA] MEŠ
ù ti-šl-qa at-[ta]
U ta-pal Ṣum-ma t[i-le-ù]

(45) ù le-qa gab-[bi ANŠ.E.KUR.RA] MEŠ
ù iš-tu KUR I[a-ri-mu-ta]
yu-da-na š[š-IM-HI.A]
[a-n]a a-ka-l[i-ia]

(edge) [ù] uš-ši-[ra ŁU] MEŠ

(50) [ma]-s[a]- [ar-ta]
(1) [To] Aman-Appa: Thus Rib-[Haddi. At thy feet] I have fallen. May Amon, [the god of the king], thy lord, grant thee [26] honor [before] rthe king, thy lord! Hearken to me: The hostility is severe; therefore come [27] together with] an archer host, that [it may take] Amurru. Day (and) night ...

... to thee. [Moreover, (10) they have said (that) very] great in quantity is [the property] that has been taken [from] them to Mitanni. [Moreover, already now ... not [28]. Also], why does there come out [29] ? (15) Thus thou sayest: "Yamma[nu has s]ent grain to t[hees]." Hast thou [30] not heard (that) a slave [31] to him? Moreover, [32] leather to [33] (20) not [34] and [35] s[ilver from Yarimmuta. Moreover, beam informed: Lo, Ummah[nu, her husband being (25) Ishk]uru, is a ma[i]servant of the Lady of] Byb[los. Why dost thou not speak to me? Hearken to me, and] speak to the king, [that she] may be given (back) to the Lady and (30) not withheld [36].

[Further, speak in my behalf to the king], so that there might be given t[o Byblos] the export of Yar[i(1)mmuta] as he gave [formerly] (35) to Simyra [so that] we might survive until the king can make inquiry concerning his city. [Moreover, already for three years I ha]ve been plundered] as far as our grain is concerned. There is not[thing] (40) to give for horses. Moreover, why has the king gi[ven me] thirty teams of [horses] and thou hast accepted for me (only) ten teams? If thou a[rt able], (45) then accept for me all [the] horses! Moreover, from Y[arimmuta] let there be given me g[rain for] my sustenance. Also, send me ga[rison (50) troops].

** **
L. 1-5. [a-na m]A-ama-a[n-Ap-pa] um-ma ... EM-ka: My restorations differ only slightly from those of BB 21 and Knudtzon; for details, cf. the notes on EA 77:1-6 supra.

L. 5. 3ime i[a-3i]: Knudtzon's ši-mi-i[-nu-ma] is impossible; cf. the note on EA 79:20 supra.

L. 5-6. [nu]KUR KALAG.GA: Knudtzon's restoration is essentially correct, although nu KUR (which spelling is very common in Rib-Haddi; cf. EA, p. 1486 for details) fits the restricted available space better than his [nu-kur-tum]. The shortened, unqualified phrase is unusual but not unique (cf. dannat nukur tum in EA 103:8).

L. 6-8. ku3da q[a-du] sābi pitāti ū [ti-il-qe] Amu(r)ri:
The restorations are Knudtzon's, and comparable passages, insofar as they are parallel, support them. For qadu sābi pitāti or its equivalent, cf. EA 73:9-10; 82:18; 137:80. For a volitive followed by sābi (pitāti) (ū) tilqê, cf. 91:37-38 (quoted by Knudtzon in EA, p. 412, n. h; the other passage he adduces, however, viz. 95:33, has no bearing on the form of tilqê): 107:29-30; 114:45-46; 138:32-33. It follows, therefore, that in 94:11 we must read ti-il-[qe] (the last syllable is completely lacking in WA 78) and not ti-il-ku with Knudtzon.

L. 8-9. urra m[u-3a] -3i ana katam: Knudtzon restored [ta-M]a-3i at the beginning of l. 9, apparently on the basis of EA 83:35-36. Such a form is impossible, however, even for Canaanite Amarna; -3i can be the final syllable of a third person feminine singular verbal form only if the verb involved has a weak third radical. In addition, the sign before -3i is in doubt; BB 21, e.g., reads [ta]. Finally, the preposition following asābu in Rib-Haddi is always muhī, never ana (cf. EA 83:35; 122:39; cf. also 93:6, at the beginning of which we must restore [UJ] instead of Knudtzon's [i-3a]). Knudtzon's ta[-3a-3i] at the end of l. 13 of the present letter must likewise be discounted. Lacking suitable parallels, we must leave these passages unrestored.


Ll. 12-13. [a-nu-m]a i-na-na: Knudtzon is probably again correct; cf. EA 126:58; 138:95. The first word in l. 13 could also be [an-nu-û] (cf. 104:27; 112:53-54; 114:15; 121:18; 125:18-19; 132:19), but the traces of the final sign favor Knudtzon's restoration.


Since [mi-an-ha-[nu]] here is the first word in a direct quotation, it is quite likely that -mi was appended to it on the original tablet.

L. 16. [SS(!)im(!)-H.I.A]: The text here reads literally SÁR [SE-H.I.A], “3600 (measures) of grain,” but such a reading is probably accidental since the word Sâr (for which cf. von Soden, GAG, § 69 f) does not appear elsewhere in Amarna. Furthermore, it is unlikely that such a phrase would be used by an artless Canaanite scribe. On the other hand, we note that with the exception of EA 131, where we find [SB Mes] three times (l. 15, 42,45), SB’u is always written [SS-im-H.I.A] in Rib-Haddi (cf. l. 39 of the present letter; cf. also EA 83:32; 85:10,18,24,27,35; 91:16; 105:85(!); 125:16,25,29). It seems best, therefore, to
assume a scribal error in the present line; our reading involves only minor orthographic emendations and is supported by the fact that 86:15-16 and 85:23-27 refer to the same or similar events (cf. Weber, EA, p. 1177).

L. 17. ardu na-[ ]: For the NA-sign (contra BB’s SU) cf. Knudtzon, EA, p. 413, n. o. Knudtzon’s restoration, na-a[d-nu], and translation, "der Diener gegeb[en hat]," are impossible, since na-ad-nu is never singular in Rib-Haddi (for [n]a-ad-nu in EA 88:43 cf. my note in loc. cit.). The reading arda na-a[d-na-ti], "[I have] gi[ven] a slave," is possible, but the word order would be highly unusual. It seems best to leave the passage unrestored.


L. 19. [KU]3 \ ma-aš-ka: If this reading is correct (which can scarcely be doubted), we have here the unusual circumstance (for Canaanite Amarna) wherein a Sumerian logogram is glossed with its Akkadian equivalent. This phenomenon, though rare, is by no means unique, however (cf., e.g., EA 195:5: SAHAR \ ep-ri, and especially 81:15: GÎR(!) \ pl[t-ri]; it occurs also quite frequently in Ugaritic Akkadian (cf., e.g., PRU III, 15.90:6: HA.LA \ MEŠ si-te; 16.111:12: IZI \ i-ba-ti; 16.150:15: KIRI \ ki-ru-U; 16.166:11: ZAG \ pa-ti).

L. 20: Knudtzon restores [Ya-a-]šu at the beginning of this line on the assumption that a-na ends l. 19. BB 21, however, seems to indicate that a sign or two followed a-na on the original tablet (cf. also Knudtzon, EA, p. 413, n. q). Furthermore, it seems that there is room for more than two signs before -šu at the beginning of l. 20.

L. 22. [K]U.BABBAR MEŠ i-šu KUR Ia-ri-mu-ta]: Knudtzon’s restorations here are plausible; cf. EA 82:28-30 (also in a letter to Aman-Appa); 85:48-50.
mIM-k]u-ra a[mat dNIN Hā-a] _URU_Gub-[la]: BB 21 erroneously reads
[Na]-ni-tam instead of [1]i- at the beginning of l. 23. For the
above restorations, which are Knudtzon's, cf. EA 83:51-55 together
with the note on ll. 53-55. If our understanding of this passage
is correct, the a-vowel on the end of Ishkuru's name in l. 25 may
be explained as due to sandhi with the following word.

The bad state of preservation of this passage makes the
restoration highly suspect. We note also that in each of its
three other occurrences the passage appears at the end of a letter
to the pharaoh, while here it is found in the middle of a letter
to Aman-Appa. Despite these facts, however, Knudtzon's restoration
remains the most likely.

IL. 26-27. [a-mi-ni la tāq-b]i ann ia-3[i]: Cf. ll. 14 and
15 of the present letter, and cf. also EA 73:6-7; 77:21 (both
citations are from letters to Aman-Appa). In view of what follows,
Knudtzon's restoration at the beginning of l. 27 ([ki-bi] is
clearly impossible and arises from his erroneous assumption that
qibī is a preterit form.

ia-3[i] would seem to be the only plausible restoration in
l. 27 despite the fact that the traces in both BB 21 and EA, p.
1003, Number 80 appear to militate against the 3i-sign. No
other possibility suggests itself.

IL. 27-28. [bi-mē ia-bi ū] qibī a-na LUGAL: Cf. l. 5
above, and note especially EA 85:47-48; 93:9-10 (the latter
reference is from a letter to Aman-Appa). For ū before qibī in
letters to Aman-Appa cf. 73:43; 82:51 (cf. further 73:53). This
latter restoration is made despite Knudtzon's note (EA, p. 414,
n. b); his [l]a is impossible and originates in the same
erroneous assumption mentioned immediately above (since qibī is
an imperative, *lā qibī is clearly intolerable).

the exception of [ū] at the end of l. 29, the restorations are
Knudtzon's.
Although Knudtzon did not venture to translate *ti-ka-li*, it seems best to understand it as a IV, preterit of *kalū* under Canaanite influence. This explanation renders superfluous Knudtzon’s restoration of *m[i-im-ma]* at the end of l. 30; perhaps the oblique stroke at the beginning of the break is a gloss (cf. EA 138:130: *i-ka-al* li ha-si-ri, together with note), but we cannot be sure. For the validity of our rendering cf. EA 254:38-40: kē *Sum[ma]* anā *AHātiya* Ṣapar Ṣarru kē akallūdi, “Even if the king should write for my wife, how could I withhold her?”

For a verb used with the negative of its antonyms for the purpose of emphasis cf., e.g., EA 71:10-12; 73:6-8.

L. 31. *giba(m)mi* ana [LUGAL]: This restoration is preferable to Knudtzon’s [bēlī-ka]; cf. EA 73:43; 82:51; 93:10 (all of which are taken from letters to Aman-Appa).

Ll. 32-37. *yu-da-na a-n[a URU]Gub-la* *mu-ū-sa* Ṣa
*KUR* *La-[i(!)-mu-ta]* ki-*ma* na-*da-ni-*ṣu [pa-*na-nu*] a-na *Su-mu-ra* [u] ni-*ub-lu(!)-ut a-di *y[i-Ša-a-lu]* LUGAL *a-na* *URU-Šu*: It is clear that Knudtzon made use of EA 85:34-39 in attempting to restore the present passage (cf. EA, pp. 414-415, un. e,f), but it would seem that he did not adhere to it closely enough, for [URU]Gub-la] at the end of l. 32 is far better than [ardī-šu] (cf. 85:37).

Since *yūdana* is passive, we expect either *mūsa* (i) (constr; cf. EA 85:35) or *mūša* Ṣa; the scribe apparently wrote *mūša* by mistake, having forgotten that its verb was passive. For a similar error cf. *awāteya tu״mū[na]* in 117:32; cf. also *tīsšūna awāteya* (74:50) together with its commentary.

*mātu* in-*a[r-mu-ta]* represents Knudtzon’s attempt to read the traces at the end of l. 33. Such a reading would be unique, however; we find elsewhere always *KUR La-ri-(im-)mu-ta* (cf. EA, p. 1576, for details).
At the beginning of l. 36, BB 21 reads ni-mu-ku-na, which makes no sense. According to EA, p. 1003, Number 81, the second sign is most plausibly UB; moreover, BB apparently misread the final sign in the word. At any rate, Knudtzon's revised reading, ni-ub-lu(1)-ut, is doubtless correct; cf. n[u]-ba-li-it in the parallel passage (EA 85:38). ni-ub-, of course, stands for ni-"ib"; cf. ba-lu-at (112:51) for ba-"la-at, and for several other examples of a similar phenomenon cf. the note on ni-am-ma in 85:74 supra. The Canaanite scribes, who were accustomed to writing with alphabetic scripts, seem to have experienced occasional difficulty in adjusting to the vocalic value of the cuneiform syllable.

For y[i-ša-a-lu] in preference to Knudtzon's impossible y[i-na-la-ku] cf. the note on EA 85:38-39 supra.

L. 39. yānu m[i-am-ma]: Knudtzon's restoration here is confirmed by EA 79:34; 92:21; 94:76; 112:25; 116:42; 117:74.

Ll. 39-40. yānu m[amma] ana nadāni ana A[M]E.KUR.RA [ME]: Knudtzon reads b[alāti] (thus probably T[I]) at the end of l. 40, but if he were correct this would be the only instance of the infinitive balatu written logographically in all of Rib-Haddi (cf. EA, p. 1388, for details; the examples with Til.ša cited there are incorrect—cf. the note on EA 71:20, 22 supra). Far better it is, it seems to me, to restore our passage on the basis of 107:37-38: yānu kaspā ana nadāni ana A[M]E.KUR.RA, particularly in view of what follows. Cf. also 112:25-27.

Ll. 41-44. ana mīnī in-d[i-na] Harru Milāšē tapāl [sīsi] u tilqā at-[ta] ešēret tapāl: For the validity of Knudtzon's restoration at the end of l. 41, cf. especially EA 85:19-20 (cf. also 105:42-43; 107:40-41). His addition of the enclitic to at-[ta] at the end of l. 43 is hardly justified, however.

We expect ešēret *tapāl, but Semitic numeral syntax frequently leaves much to be desired.
If our understanding of this passage is correct, then the implications of Rib-Naddi's question to Aman-Appa are rather serious: "Why has the king gi[ven me] thirty teams of [horses] and thou hast accepted for me (only) ten teams?"


DHorne (RR, NS Volume 11 [1914], p. 57) considers lecā here to be a Canaanite form, but it is far more plausible to give to the -ā ending a ventive rendering.

Ll. 46-48. īṣtu [ari(m)muṭa] yūdana 8[eš an]a a-ka-l[i-ša]: For the restorations in ll. 46 and 47 (so also Knudtzon) cf. ll. 32-33 of the present letter as well as EA 85:34-37; 125:16-18. For contextual reasons [iš] seems better at the end of 1. 48 than Knudtzon's [-nu] (cf. also 83:32; 125:26). RR 21 displays an incomplete š-sign at the beginning of 1. 48, but Knudtzon is entirely correct in reading [a-n]a (which always precedes akāš in Rib-Naddi; cf. EA, p. 1365, for citations).

Ll. 49-50. [uš-mi]-ra Lu[meš ma]-s[a-ar-ta]: Knudtzon's tentative restoration, [uš-mi]-[iv elippe ʿu]-s[a a-na-ku], though plausible enough (cf. EA 129:50-51,98; 132:53-55), suffers from the fact that ušma remains unattested in Rib-Naddi as a 1st person singular form. With my restoration, on the other hand, cf. EA 78:38-39; 85:45; 90:58; 103:34; 112:33-34; 124:58-59; 130:46-47; 136:17-18.
RIB-HADDI TO AMAN-APPA
(L 29804 - BB 22 - W 67 - EA 87)

Obverse

(1) [a-na m]A-ma-an-Appi B[E-ia]
qí- bi- ma
um-ma Ri-ib d IM Ir-ka-ma
a-na GIN MEŠ EN-ia am-qú-ut

(5) dA-ma-na ù d NIN
Ma URU Gub-la ti-di-nu
TÉS-ka a-na pa-ni LUGAL BE-ia
Gá-ni-tam a-na mi-nim-mi tu-úš-ti-te-eq-ni
uš-Si-ra-am-mi LÚ DUMU KIN-ka

(10) it-tí-ia a-na ma-ḫar
LUGAL BE-ka ù lu-ú
li-di-na-ku ERÍN MEŠ ù GÍ Š GIGIR MEŠ
i-zi-ir-tam a-na ka-tam

(edge) ù ti-sú-ru URU

Reverse

(15) ù an-nu-ú i-Si-me a-na
a-wa-te MEŠ-ka ù ú-wa-š [ir-Šu]
ù us-sa-am re-qú-tám
ù i-Si-me e-nu-ú ia-nu-um [ER] IN MEŠ
it-tí-šu ù te-né-pu-[u]Š

(20) URU Bat-ru-na a-na Ša-šu
ù ERÍN MEŠ SA GAZ MEŠ ù GÍ Š GIGIR MEŠ
Ma-ki-in₄ i-na ᵃ₋ᵃ⁻ᵇⁱ⁻⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁽⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎⁎ ⁿ
(1) [To] Aman-Appa, [my] lord, speak: Thus Rib-Haddi, thy servant. At the feet of my lord I have fallen. (5) May Amon and the Lady of Byblos grant thee honor before the king, my lord.

Further, why hast thou forced me to wait (saying): "Send hither thy messenger (10) to me into the presence of the king, thy lord, and let him give thee an army and chariots as help for thee so that they might guard the city"? (15) Nevertheless, behold, I shall hearken to thy words and I shall send him; but should he return empty-handed and he hear that there is no army with him, then Batrun (20) will be turned over to him. Moreover, he has placed an Apiru host, as well as chariots, in midst. Furthermore, they do not move from here, from the opening of the city-gate of Byblos.

(25) Further, pay homage to the king, my lord! [Let there come out]t with thee an army that is well trained, together with chariots, or [all the land]s will be turn[ed over] to him(!). [I cannot come] out; therefore, guard the city. Moreover, (30) if thou shouldest die, then I (too) will die.

* * *
L. 1. B[E-ia]: Although Rib-Haddi in no other letter refers to Aman-Appa as his "lord," he likewise nowhere else refers to himself as Aman-Appa's "servant," as he does in the present letter (l. 3); moreover, he specifically calls Aman-Appa his lord in l. 4 below. It thus appears that Knudtzon's tentative restoration is correct (cf. EA, p. 415, n. 1). For BE = bēlu in the present letter cf. ll. 7,11,25.

L. 8. ana mēnimī tustītegni: "Why hast thou forced me to wait?" Cf. similarly CAD 4, p. 392 (where, although our passage is misquoted slightly, additional examples of yūtuq with this meaning are cited); Moran, SSDB, p. 159. We cannot translate with Ebeling "[Warum hast du] zu mir gelangen lassen" (BA VIII/2 [1912], p. 68; so approximately also Knudtzon), a rendering that completely misses the point. yūtuq, "to cause to pass by, to cause (time) to elapse, to cause delay," is but a normal development of etēqu, "to pass by" (cf. Hebrew-Ugaritic çtq), "to elapse." Cf. the note on EA 83:27-31 for a discussion of the pronominal suffix -ni added directly to the consonantal ending of the verbal form.

Ll. 9-14. uṣṣirammī mar ṣiprika ittiya ana mahār ṣarri bēlika ū lū li(d)ina(k)ku saba ū narkabātī izīrtam ana kātam ū tī(s)surū āla: "Send hither thy messenger to me into the presence of the king, thy lord, and let him (the king) give thee an army and chariots as help for thee so that they might guard the city" (so approximately also Moran, JCS 5, p. 34).

For itti meaning "to," cf. the note on EA 82:15 supra.

Moran (loc. cit.) translates a-na ma-har here as "to present himself before" and apparently would thus normalize maḥar (construct infinitive). We note, however, that the verb maḥāru is unattested in Rib-Haddi, whereas ana maḥar, the preposition, is ubiquitous (cf. EA, p. 1460, for details). Perhaps Moran is merely paraphrasing.
lu li(d)ina(k)ku, displaying the repetition of the precative particle, is highly unusual; such duplication occurs nowhere else in Rib-Haddi. Perhaps the scribe of this particular letter was not aware of the purpose of lu when prefixed to a verbal form.

iziru, "help," is hapax here, and is, as CAD 7, p. 319, duly noted, related to Hebrew ēzrāh (cf. also particularly the archaic form ēzrāt in Psalm 60:13 = 108:13). CAD (loc. cit.) errs, however, in finding iziru in EA 89:13 (so also Ebeling, EA, p. 1431, as well as Knudtzon), where we must read i-mu-t[a] (cf. Albright and Moran in JCS 4, p. 166, for details).

11. 15-20. Ṽ anān i-wi-me ana awateka Ṽ u-wa-[ir-yu] Ṽ uussām regutam Ṽ i-wi-me e-nu-ǔ yānum [e]bagai ittīgu Ṽ te-ne-pu-[u]Batrūna ana Ṽašu: "Nevertheless, behold, I shall hearken to thy words and I shall se[nd him]; but should he return empty-handed and he (CAbdi-Ashtira) hear that there is no [h]ost with him, then Batrūn will be turned over to him" (so approximately also Moran, SSDB, p. 159; cf. also ibid., p. 101).

At the end of 1. 16, BB 22 reads û-PI-t[i] and Knudtzon reads û-ju-ru[m]. Neither of these proposals, however, makes any sense whatever. The only restoration thus far suggested that fits well into the present context is Winckler's hesitant û-wa-Šīr (cf. W 67:16), which I have expanded into û-wa-[ir-yu] since a direct object is required (cf. û-wa-Ši-ru-[u] in EA 114:35).

It is true that the sign ŠIR is unattested elsewhere in Rib-Haddi, but when we compare 11. 16 and 17 of the present letter with EA 137:8-10 no other restoration seems plausible (cf. also the writing uš-Šir,-ti in 84:39). If it should be objected that uwaŠīr is a preterit form, our reply would be that we have here yet another example of the Canaanite syntactical phenomenon wherein a "perfect" form is preceded by waw converive.

The conditional construction involved in uussām... Ṽ iši(m)me... Ṽ te(n)nepuš is purely Canaanite; for the equivalent Hebrew construction cf. GKC², § 159 c.


requtum is literally "emptiness"; requtam in l. 17 of the present letter means "in emptiness" (adverbial accusative), hence "empty-handed." In Old Babylonian requtum is generally found with a pronominal suffix attached to it when it bears the latter meaning; cf., e.g., in CH, § 191: marum ūq requ(s)su ul ittallak, "That son shall not depart empty-handed" (cf. further von Soden, GAG, § 147 b). Middle Babylonian likewise exhibits such suffixial forms (cf., e.g., EA 9:35: requtimunu; for an explanation of this form cf. GAG, § 113 k, where von Soden cites the same phenomenon for Middle and neo-Assyrian). The form requtam would therefore seem to be under Canaanite influence; note that in EA 137:8-21 requtam and reqami have exactly the same meaning. This latter form is, of course, identical to Hebrew reqam (cf. especially Genesis 31:42; Exodus 3:21; Deuteronomy 15:13; 1 Samuel 6:3; Job 22:9; Ruth 1:21; 3:17); for -am as an archaic adverbial ending in Ugaritic, cf. for the present Gordon, UM, §§ 114,5, together with the bibliographical references there noted; in Hebrew, cf. GKC2, § 100 g.

Knudtzon reads i-si-me-e in l. 18; the final sign, however, belongs to the following word (cf. below). The spelling i-si-me can represent either an Akkadianized third person form, as here (cf. also EA 92:21: i-si-mê, and note its Canaanized equivalent, yi-si-mê, in l. 15 of the same letter), or a Canaanized first person form, as in l. 15 above (cf. also i-si-mê in 106:38). Although Knudtzon tentatively rendered as indefinite the subject of i(i)mê in the present line, Moran (SSDB, pp. 101,159) correctly identified the subject as Abdi-Ashirta, a fact that we may ascertain by comparing EA 92:16-24 with the present passage.

With regard to the reading e-nu-ú in l. 18, Moran (SSDB, p. 159) states: "I am indebted to Dr. Albright for this reading which is completely confirmed by e-nu-ú in 92.31. Cf. BB, pl. 6, where the NU is quite clear." Concerning this statement, I would add only the following two comments: (1) The NU-sign had already
been noted, however hesitantly, by BB 22; (2) the reading in EA 92:31 is i-nu-ú (so also CAD 7, p. 153), not e-nu-ú (though of course Moran’s comparison is still appropriate). Be/amû ūnu is equivalent to Be/amû inûma (cf. EA 92:18-19,21-22) even as damaq īnu (92:30-31) is equivalent to damaq inûma (cf. 84:6-8). īnu (si vera lectio) appears also in 230:21.

For the reading te-né-pu-[u]M (1. 19; so essentially Knudtzon), cf. ti-né-pu-u[N] in EA 117:94 (subject: ēlu); for the te-preformative cf. te-né-pu-šu-na in 138:93. The TE-sign is made rather peculiarly on this tablet; cf. ll. 16 and 19 of BB, Plate 6.

Ll. 21-22. u sabi ǦApirī u narkabāti Makīn ina ǦAG, bi-(mill) : “Moreover, he (ʿAbdi-Ashirta) has placed an ǦApiru host, as well as chariots, in its midst” (so approximately also Moran, JNES 8, p. 125). Knudtzon’s rendering of Makīn as “sind . . . gelegt,” while theoretically possible, involves tortuous exegesis to support it.

For the plausibility of adding -<mill> to ina libbi here, cf. the note on EA 84:23-25 supra. Note that l. 23 of the present letter begins with 簋. The phrase here most naturally refers to Batūna in l. 20 (so Weber, EA, p. 1177); cf. ana ǦAG, bi-Mi used in reference to Byblos in EA 137:44,46,61,74.

Ll. 23-24. 1a(!) inammušērim [i] Mtu pī abul ǦURU Gub-(la) KI: The AD-sign that begins this phrase is clearly an error for LA, which it greatly resembles (cf. Knudtzon, EA, p. 416, n. 6).

In view of the present passage it is perhaps unnecessary to emend ʿpī-qaret (Proverbs 8:3) to lipsē-qaret as per Toy, Proverbs (ICC), p. 165 (cf. also ina pī-i bābi in EA 357:55).

Ll. 25-26. [ša-ni-ta]m ku-ru-ub-mi ana šarrī bēliya [tu-sa-a]m ittika ENIN MES: “[Further]r, pay homage to the king, my lord! [Let] an army [come out]t with thee!” These two lines were the subject of an article by Moran in JNES 8, pp. 124-125.
(unintentionally misquoted by him as "125-126" in SSDB, p. 159), entitled "An Unexplained Passage in an Amarna Letter from Byblos." Moran there transliterates as follows: [a-mu]r ku-ru-ub-mi a-na Murri šēli-ia [a-sa-a]m it-ti-ka sūbē; his translation reads: "Come, make entreaty to the king, my lord, for the coming forth with you of the warriors."

The essential correctness of Moran's treatment is beyond question, and his readings and resulting interpretation are far better than those of Knudtzon (the reader is referred to the abovementioned article for Moran's cogent arguments). Furthermore, his study must be considered the basis for any subsequent attempts to interpret this passage. Having said this, however, I shall proceed to defend the few changes which I find that I must make with respect to my own analysis.

At the beginning of 1. 25 Moran reads [a-mu]r (following Knudtzon). The parallel passage (EA 69:30), however, has Ma-ni-tam, and the reading [šā-ni-ta]m is just as plausible in context here. Assuming a final ligature such as that appearing in šā-ni-tam in 1. 8 above (cf. further the note on Manītam in 69:30 supra), the space available in the present line is admirably suited to our proposed restoration; moreover, Knudtzon's note (EA, p. 416, n. f) is not inimical to it.

We cannot gainsay Moran's ku-ru-ub-mi (imperative of karābu) in preference to Knudtzon's ku-ru-ud-mi (imperative of a proposed "qarādu"). His rendering, "make entreaty, beseech," however, is open to doubt; there would seem to be nothing inadequate in the more normal translation "pay homage" (cf., e.g., the famous passage in Enūma eliš IV:28: ihdū ikrubū Mardukma Šarru). Moran found it necessary to invent his translation for kurub here because, in my judgment, he failed to restore properly the first word in the following line (cf. comments below). Needless to say, the Hebrew cognate of karābu is beraʾēk (the Akkadian equivalent displays metathesis of a common type); for a parallel to our passage cf. II Samuel 14:22.
Moran has probably chosen the correct verb (\textit{was\textsubscript{a}}\textsuperscript{a}) for his restoration at the beginning of 1. 26, but in my opinion is guilty of a rather fundamental error in selecting [\textit{a-sa-a}m] as the most suitable form of that verb in our context. I fail to see how he would justify his translation, "the coming forth with you of the warriors," for his reading, [\textit{a-sa-a}m \textit{it-ti-ka} s\textit{ab\textsubscript{e}}. If [\textit{a-sa-a}m] is correct, what is its syntactical relationship to \textit{\textsuperscript{a}s\textsubscript{ab\textsubscript{e}}}? It seems to me that Moran errs in assuming that \textit{a-sa} in passages such as \textit{EA} 70:26 and 79:16-17 is "accusative of the infinitive," since if he were correct in his assumption he would be hard put to explain how \textit{a-sa} could be preceded by a[\textit{di}] in 79:16-17. It is perhaps best to understand \textit{asa} in such cases as an uncontracted construct form (cf. my note on \textit{a-sa} in 79:17 \textsuperscript{supra}), in which case it dovetails nicely with the occurrences of the normal construct form, \textit{a-s\textsuperscript{e}}, quoted by Moran and eliminates the necessity of finding, as he does, a "fluctuation . . . between the infinitive construct . . . and the accusative of the infinitive." The above remarks should by no means be construed as a denial of the fact that \textit{asa(m)} (accusative of the infinitive) is found in R\textsuperscript{2}-Haddi; Moran cites several clear occurrences of it following \textit{le\textsuperscript{u}}. We only assert that \textit{asa(m)} and \textit{asa} are two different grammatical forms of the infinitive and must be scrupulously separated from each other. Similarly, \textit{a-s[\textit{J}]} in \textit{EA} 69:32 is a stative form (\textit{as[\textit{J}]}), used as a perfect, and must be separated from the other citations of \textit{a-se} (\textit{a-se} = infinitive construct) adduced by Moran. For additional examples of the Canaanite perfect form \textit{asi} cf. 85:51; 116:61; 137:21; in 69:32 it is probably best to conceive of it as following \textit{waw} converive. For [\textit{tu-sa-a}m], my tentative restoration in 87:26, cf. 76:31-32; 81:45-46; 138:32; ventive mimination is common in this letter, both singular (11. 9, 17, 29) and plural (1. 23). Note also that my [\textit{tu-sa-a}m] fills the available space much more adequately than does Moran's [\textit{a-sa-a}m].
Ll. 26-27. $\text{sabu Ša SIG}_2 \text{ qa-du}$

an army that is well trained, together with ... chariots."

As Knudtzon has noted (EA, p. 417, n. h), this passage is related to EA 106:42-43 which, in its present state, reads as follows: $\text{eһrē tapāl ša SIG}_3 \text{ qū ANŠE.KUR.RA}$. This latter phrase, a grammatical monstrosity (notwithstanding the fact that CAD 3, p. 71, reproduces it without comment and translates "twenty teams of fine horses"), is best understood as the result of scribal transposition of $\text{eһrē tapāl sisā ša SIG}_3 \text{ qū}$, i.e. "twenty teams of horses that are well trained (damāqū)." In EA 87:26, then, we must read $\text{sabu Ša dam[a[at]}$, "an army that is well trained." Assuming that Knudtzon's [ka-du] at the beginning of l. 27 is correct (which can scarcely be doubted), this explanation fits in well with the syntactic parallel resulting from my restoration of EA 84:27: $\text{Lū MAŠ-im-Šu ša da-an qa-d[u ERĪN}_7 \text{ } \text{ }}$, "... his commissioner, who is strong, together with troops." For narkabati preceded by qa-du cf. 107:41; 141:26; 142:27; 204:16-17.

In the present passage, however, there is clearly room for an additional sign (probably a numeral) before narkabāti, a fact that Knudtzon failed to take into account in his restoration. For narkabāti qualified by a numeral in Rib-Haddi cf. 127:37; 131:12; 132:57; 135:16; for qa-du preceding a numeral cf. 74:22; 100:21-22.

For additional examples of damāqū, "well-trained," in other Akkadian texts cf. CAD 3, p. 71. Beside its occurrence in EA 106:42-43, this root is used to describe horses elsewhere in Amarna also (2:3; 99:15).

Ll. 27-28. $\text{ti(i)-ē-p[u-šu ka-li KUR}_7 \text{ } \text{ }}$ it-ti-šu(!): All previous interpreters of Amarna have read ū as the first sign in this phrase, notwithstanding the fact that the excellent photograph on BB, Plate 6, by no means displays a clear ū-sign in the space in question. At any rate, Knudtzon's ū-$\text{ni-p[u-}$ is impossible. My highly tentative emendation and restoration are based on passages such as EA 73:32-33. The idiom is, of
course, very common in Rib-Haddi (note ll. 19-20 of the present letter). Instead of itti-mu(!) (for the reading of the final sign cf. Knudtzon, EA, p. 417, n. i) we expect ana liamu, but itti clearly means "to" in l. 10 above (q.v.).

L. 29. [la us]-sa-am û ú-sú-[ur URU]: "[I cannot come out; therefore, guard the city]." E. F. Campbell, Jr., has pointed out the fact that many of Rib-Haddi's letters to Aman-Appa "parallel closely letters sent to the king (e.g., 73 and 74, 81 and 82, 85 and 86)" (Bib. Arch. 23/1, p. 13). He might have added EA 87 and 88 to the list, since they likewise demonstrably parallel each other in several places. It is justifiable, then, to restore [la us]-sa-am on the basis of 88:51 (despite Knudtzon's note, for which cf. EA, p. 417, n. k). Likewise, û-sú-[ur (for this reading cf. ibid., n. 1) URU] would seem to be the only plausible restoration at the end of our line in view of EA 88:41-42 (cf. also l. 14 of the present letter, and note especially 125:10; 130:18). The sense of this line would then be: "Because Byblos is encircled by the enemy, I cannot come out, nor can I defend it. In fact, the situation is so desperate that only you personally can save the city." Such an explanation also fits in well with what follows.

Ll. 30-31. [û Summa] atta mît[a û a-ma-ku] amât: It would be difficult to improve upon Knudtzon's restoration here. My attempt deviates from his only in that the former locates the first û-sign at the beginning of l. 30 (where there is plenty of space available) rather than at the end of l. 29. For û Summa preceding a stative form of matu cf. EA 119:16-17; for various forms of matu either preceded or followed by an independent personal pronoun cf. 136:42; 138:136-137; *362:11.
RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH
(L 29800 - BB 17 - W 65 - EA 88)

Obverse

(1) [mRi-i)b-[d]I[I] iq-b[i a-na BE-Yu]

[LUGAL KU, R] Mis-ri LUGAL KUR[KI, HI, A] LUGAL GAL

[IM] IN-it-{Yu} IMIN-ta-an a-[na GIR MES] BE-ia

dUTU-ia am-qû-ut a[m-tap-bar]

(5) 0 aš-ta-ni a-na [ka-tam UGU URU] Ar-da-at

UGU URU Ir-qat û U[GU URU Su-mu-ur]

[ù] UGU URU Am-{mi}-i[a ù UGU URU Si-gat]

[URU] KI, HI, A ki-it-ti LUGAL[BE-ia ù qa-al]

[LUGAL] BE-ia Sá-ni-tam ni-nu-um-mi [Yu-ut]

(10) [m]i]Aš-ra-ti [R UR.ZÍR ù i[p-pu-u]s

[k-i-a]a [MAG ] bi-su i-na KUR KI, HI, A BE-ia

[ù] qa-al LUGAL BE-ia a-na [R [Yu]

[Sá-ni-t]am aš-tap-pár LÚ DUMU KIN-ia i-nu-ma

[i-l-q]é URU KI, HI, A-ia ù i-ti-la-[a[m]

(15) [a-n]a se-ri-ia ù a-nu-um-ma

[i-n]a-an-na il-qé URU baš-ru-na

[ù] i-te-la-am a-na se-ri-ia

[a-m]ur URU tam-ši [gá]b-bi KÁ,GAL

URU Gub-la ma(!)-ni(!) UD KÁM, MES-ti la(!) yi-na-mu-uš

(20) iš-tu KÁ,GAL ù ú-ul ni-le-û

a-sa-am a-na am-ru-me(!) Sá-ni-tam Sum-[ma]

[URU] Gub-la ú-ba-ú sa-ba-ta ú[

[ù] li-š-me LUGAL BE-ia a-[wa-te ã]R-Mu
[306-]

(lu ha-mu-tam GIGIR.MES \( E \) \[ERIN.MES \( yu-yi-ra \])

(25) [ki-ma] ar-hi-is \( a \) ti-\( [su-ru] \)

[URU.KI LUGAL BE-i]a \( [IR-Su] \)

(edge) [a-di] ka-sa-[a]d LUGAL [BE-ia]

Reverse

[\( u \)] a-na-ku a-wa-at BE-i[a]

[\( u-u \)] ez-zi-ib \( u \) [um-ma la yi-is-me]

(30) [L]UGAL BE-ia a-na a-wa-te [\( IR-Su \)]

\( \text{a} \) in\( _h \)-né-ep-\( y \)a-\( \delta \) \( \text{URU} \) Gub-[la]

a-na \( s \)a-\( s \)u \( u \) gâb-bi \( KUR \) A \( L \)UGAL BE-ia]

a-di \( KUR \) Mi-is-ri ti-né-ep-\( y \)u

a-na \( LF \) MES Sâ.GAZ MES \( S \)â-ni-tam a-wa-[tam]

(35) la \( yu-\)ô-bi-la be-li a-na \( IR(!)-y[u]

ki-ma ar-hi-is \( a \) na \( DUB \) \( u \) na-ri-[ ]

\( \text{URU} \) [\( KI \) a-na \( S \)a-\( s \)u \( u \) er-r[i-ia]
\( \text{URU} \) [\( KI \) i-[\( S \)]-tu \( S \)a-\( s \)u

a-na a-sa-bi-ia \( u \) bal-\( t \)a-ti

(40) [\( S \)â-n]i-tam lu ha-mu-tam LUGAL BE-ia \( y[u-\)Mi-ra]

\( \text{ERIN.MES} \) GIGIR.MES \( u \) ti-sú-ru

\( \text{URU.KI LUGAL BE-ia a-mur}
\( \text{URU.Gub-la la ki-[ma] URU.KI.HI.A} 
\( \text{URU.Gub-la URU ki-it-ti LUGAL BE-ia]

(45) i-[\( S \)]-tu da-ri-ti \( S \)â-ni-tam

\( L_4 \) DUMU Ki[H] LUGAL \( \text{URU.Ak-ka}

\( k_4 \)-bi-id i-[\( S \)]-tu \( L_4 \) DUMU \( Mi-ip-r[i-ia] \)
307-

[u n]a-ad-nu ANŠE.KUR,RA Yap-li-[y]u
[u Lü-la] MIN ANŠE.KUR,RA
(50) [ti-til-ti-q]u iyy-tu Yap-li-y[u]
[Há-ni-tam a-na-k]u la us-se-am

[a|stappar|] (5) à aṣtani ana [Kātam muhhi] 'Ardat muhhi ġIrqat
u muhhi Sumur u] muhhi Âm[miy[a u muhhi Sīgat ġl]ān(i) ktti
Sarr[i beliya u qal Sarru] beliya Sumītam minnum [īlī (10)
[ ġA]bdī-'Aṣrati ardū kalbu u [ppu]ū [kīm]a lībbīšu ina màtāt
beliya [u] qal Sarru beliya ana ardi[šu] Sumītam aṣtappar mār
Mipriya inūma [ilq]e ālāniya u īti(1)lā[m (15) an]a šēriya
[am]ur āla tamū [ga]bbi abul Gub[la ma(n)]i(!) ūmāti lā(!)
yina(m)muš (20) īstu abulli u īl nīle'āu asām ana amrū(m)me(ā)
Sumītam Sum[a|ma] Gubla ubā'ūu sabāta u[ u] liīme Sarrū
beliya a[waṭe ardišu [l]ū ḥamu[t]am narkabāti u [ṣaba yu(h)]birā
(25) kīma] arhīš u ti[(s)surū ġl Sarri beliya]a u [aradūn adī]
kašād Sarri [beliya u] anāku awâṭ beliya[a u]l ezziū u ū[umma lā
anā šāšu u gabbi màtāt ūS[arri beliya] adī Misri ti(n)nep̄u ana
[ ġA]pīrī Sumītam awa[ta[m] (35) lā yuṣēbīla bōlī ana arādū[u](ā)
kīma arhīš ana tuppi u nari[ ] āla ana šāšu u err[i]s āla īstu
šāšu ana amābīya u bal(š)tāti (40) [San]ītam ū ḥamu[t]am Sarru
beliya y[u(h)]birā] šāba narkabāti u ti[(s)surū ġl Sarri beliya
amur Gubla lā ki[m]a ālāni [ ] Gubla āl kitti bē[liya]

(45) ištu dārīti ṣanītam mār šī[ir] mār ʾAkkā kabīd ištu mār ṣip[ir] yā n]adnū sīsā ṣap-li[u ] [u amālīya] bīna sīsī (50)
[tīltiq]u ištu ṣap-li[u ṣanītam anāk]u lā uṣṣām

(1) [Ri]b-[Ha]d[i] has sa[id to his lord, the king of] Egypt, the king of the [two] land[s, the great king: Se]ven
<times>, seven times a[t the feet of my lord], my sun-god, I
have fallen. I [have written] (5) repeatedly to [thee concerning]
Ardata (and) concerning ṢIrqata and con[cerning Sīmyra and]
concerning Am(m)y[a and concerning Shigata], loyal [cities of]
the kin[g, my lord, but the king], my lord, [has remained silent].

Further, [who is (10) ʾA]bdī-Ashtita, the slave, the dog,
that he [act]s [according to] (the desire of) his heart in the
lands of my lord, [and (yet)] the king, my lord, remains silent
with respect to [his] servant?

[Further, I sent my messenger: "If he will ta[ke my cities
and come u[p (15) ag]ainst me"—and already [n]ow he has (indeed)
taken Batrun [and] is coming up against me! [Echo]ld the city!
Hast thou forgotten [the enti]re city-gate of Byblos? How long
will he not(!) move (20) from the city-gate, and we not be able
to go out to the aqueduct? Beh[old], he seeks to seize Byblos
[ . Moreover], let the king, my lord, heed the w[ords of]
his [ser]vant! [May he send me] quickly chariots and [troops
(25) without] delay, that th[ey might guard the city of the king,
my lord], as well as [his servant, until] the arrival of the
king, [my lord! Moreover], as for me, the words of m[y] lord I
do [no]t ignore; but i[f the k[ing, my lord, (30) does not
hearken] to the words of [his servant], then Byb[los] will be
turned over to him and all the lands of the k[ing, my lord], as
far as Egypt, will be turned over to the ʾApiru.
Further, my lord (35) has not had word brought to his servant(1) quickly on a tablet. Moreover, [ ] city to/for him, and I will request from him a city for my dwelling place so that I might live.

(40) [Further, may the king, my lord, send me] quickly chariots (and) troops, that they might guard the city of the king, my lord! Behold, Byblos is not like (other) cities; Byblos has been a loyal city of the king; [my] lord, (45) from time immemorial.

Further, is the messenger of the "king" of Acco more important than [my] messenger, that they should place a horse under [him]? [But as for my man], two horses (50) [they have taken away] from beneath him.

Further, as for me, I cannot come out.

* * *
LL. 1-4: By any standards this salutation does not follow any of the more normal patterns that we are accustomed to seeing at the beginning of a Rib-Haddi letter. The poor state of preservation of the tablet makes it impossible to restore the passage with absolute certainty, but the following comments may not be out of place.

BB 17 (cf. also W 65) reads [ ]-ra-ri at the beginning of l. 2, which BB, p. 1, n. 1, explains as being "probably part of a Babylonian form of the prenomen of Amenophis IV." The prenomen of Akh-en-Aton, however, never ends in such a way, nor does that of Amen-hotep III (cf. EA, pp. 1565-1566). Moreover, nowhere else in Rib-Haddi are the names of the pharaohs ever spelled out.

Knudtzon's restoration of l. 2, [a-na] mah-ri Bar mat[āti lu-u Sul-mu], fares no better, however. The lu Sulmu salutation, though quite common elsewhere in Amarna, never appears in Rib-Haddi with the exception of the highly modified expression in EA 96:4-6 (23v.). A more serious objection, however, is the fact that "ana mahri LUGAL is impossible in Rib-Haddi; the form of the preposition before any independent substantive is always ana mahar (for the examples before LUGAL cf. EA 74:62; 120:41; 137:35,37,79).

My proposal, [LUGAL KU]R mis-ri LUGAL KUR[ ki-hi A LUGAL GAL], is offered in the most tentative way. Although my readings of the second and third signs are more plausible than any yet suggested (cf. EA, p. 1003, Number 83), the sign MIS is apparently unattested in Middle Babylonian (cf. Labat, Manuel d'Épigraphie Akkadienne, p. 143). The phrase as I have restored it is, however, much more idiomatic of Rib-Haddi than are the previous proposals. Note also that the Canaanite scribes did occasionally refer to the pharaoh as LUGAL Mīšē (cf., e.g., EA 52:1-2; 197:25; for an example in Rib-Haddi, cf. probably 95:32), and that KUR Mī-šē-ri appears in l. 33 of the present letter.

For my emendation in l. 3, [IM]IGIG (Mā?), cf. EA 84:5.
Ll. 4-9. a[b-tap-pá]r u aštáni ana [kâtam muhhi URU] ar-da-at

muhhi URU ir-qat u m[uhhi URU su-mu-ur u] muhhi URU Am-<mi>-i[a u

muhhi URU si-gat URU XI.HI.A kitti Harr[u BE-la u qa-al Yarru]

BE-ia: My restorations are essentially those of Knudtzon, the
differences being only in matters of detail.

Knudtzon's a[b-tap-par] at the end of l. 4 is uncertain
because of the fact that BB 17 shows two parallel horizontal
strokes at the beginning of the break (cf. also W 65:4: i[b-ta-par],
a[b]-tap-pár is found in l. 13 of the present letter, however (cf.
also a[b]-tap-pár a[b]-ta-ri in EA 126:53: 137:5); perhaps one of
the parallel strokes shown by BB 17 is merely a crack in the
tablet.

There does not seem to be enough room for Knudtzon's
[nu-nukurtu] in l. 5; moreover, nukurtu is almost always followed
or preceded by KALAG.GA or GA.KALAG in Rib-Haddi, a fact which
further complicates the space problem. For my restoration cf.

For Knudtzon's readings ar-da-at and ir-kat in ll. 5 and 6,
cf. EA, p. 418, nn. b and c. These status indeterminatus
readings have led me to restore [su-mu-ur] in l. 6 and [hi-gat]
in l. 7 (both contra Knudtzon); the latter reading making
possible my insertion of [UGU] after the second [u] in l. 7 for
greater uniformity of expression. For my emendation of
Am-<mi>-i[a] in l. 7 cf. the citations in EA, p. 1571.

My restoration of [BE-ia] after LUGA[IL] in l. 8 is justified
on the basis of ll. 9,23,26,27,30,32,40,42,44.

Knudtzon's restoration of [u qa-al] at the end of l. 8 is
highly plausible; cf. EA 74:48-50 and especially l. 12 of the
present letter.

Ll. 10-11. i[p-pu-u][ki-m]a libbiSu: "... he [act]s
[accordin]g to (the desire of) his heart (i.e., he acts as he
pleases)." For other examples of this idiom in Rib-Haddi, cf.
EA 108:11-13; 125:42-43; for examples of this and similar phrases elsewhere in Akkadian literature, cf. CAD 4, pp. 194-195. The phrase kallōb(ā)ī, "according to the (desire of one's) heart," is found fairly frequently in the Hebrew Bible; cf., e.g., I Samuel 13:14; 14:17; Jeremiah 3:15; Psalm 20:5 (II Samuel 7:21 = I Chronicles 17:19 is to be explained differently; cf. my note on EA 71:17-18 supra). The true Biblical equivalent to the phrase under discussion, however, is ḫāṣ ẖākēnō (cf. Esther 1:8; 9:5; Daniel 8:4; 11:3,16,36; Nehemiah 9:24; cf., for a similar expression, Esther 3:11) = ḫāṣ ẖā ḫattōb bēqēnayw (e.g., Genesis 16:6; Judges 19:4; I Samuel 3:18).

II. 13-17. astappar mar šipriya inūma [il-g]ē ālāniya ā i-tī-la-a[m an]a šeriya ā anūma [in]anna il-gē Barūna [l] i-te-la-an ana šeriya: Knudtzon's treatment of this passage, it seems to me, is rather weak; he translates the second ilge clause as though it were the message relayed via Nīq-Haddi's courier. Such an understanding of the passage, however, needlessly complicates its syntax. The translation reads much more smoothly if we understand inūma as being equivalent to Hebrew kî in its function of introducing a direct quotation (thus analogous to the Greek ἥτις recitativum); cf. ΓΚ 2, § 157 b, for examples from the Hebrew Bible; cf. further BDB, pp. 471-472.

Unaccountably, Knudtzon reads [la-k]u at the beginning of l. 14, even though such a form is nowhere attested in Amarna as third person masculine singular. The only possible restoration is [il-g]ē (cf. l. 16). Knudtzon's lapse is all the more remarkable since he correctly read i-tī-[la-a[m]a] in l. 14 on the basis of the almost identical form in l. 17 (cf. EA, p. 419, n. 1).

ēṭū ana šēr, "to go up against (with hostile intent)," is, as already recognized by CAD 4, p. 116, a Canaanism; cf. Hebrew ḫāṣ ẖā ḫal/'ēl (for Biblical citations cf. BDB, p. 748). ēṭū ina (cf. EA 124:12-13) has the same meaning and corresponds to Hebrew

Ll. 18-21. [a-mur ʾālā tam-ši [ga]b-bi ʾabul Gubla ma(!)-ni(!) UD KĀM.MEŠ-ti la(1) yina(m)muš ʾētu abullu ʾu ul nilētīʾu ʾasām ana ʾam-ru-me(!): "[Behold] the city! Hast thou forgotten [the enti]re city-gate of Ṭyāblos? How long will he (ʿAbdi-ʾAshirta) not(!) move from the city-gate, and we not be able to go out to the aqueduct?" This passage fairly teems with difficulties, due to the poor state of preservation of l. 18, the carelessness of the scribe, and the lack of parallels.

Knudtzon’s original reading at the beginning of l. 18, [a-mur ʾālā, seems to me to be the correct one (cf., e.g., EA 105:7-8, 17-18). The following two signs, however, have puzzled all students of Amarna. At first Knudtzon read them together with the preceding sign as ʾal-ud-šī, a proper name (cf. EA, p. 419, n. 1). Realizing the inadequacy of this proposal, he then read ud-lim and translated "verschlossen ist," understanding his reading as a form of edēlu (a plausible assumption in view of EA 100:39; 197:9). "udlim, however, is an impossible construction; we would expect something like uddulat if a form of edēlu were intended here. Ebeling then suggested the reading er-(better ir,-)tam-ši, assuming the resulting form to be a L2 preterit of a possed *rāmāšu which he compared to Hebrew ʾāmāš (BA VIII/2, p. 77). Knudtzon (EA, p. 1591) and Weber (ibid., p. 1178) both accepted Ebeling’s proposal. The following objections must be raised, however: (1) *rāmāšu is, to my knowledge, nowhere else attested; (2) Hebrew ʾāmāš is used only of animals, whereas the subject of *irtamši in our passage could only be ʿĀbdi-ʾAshirta; (3) the -i ending on *irtamši remains unexplained.
My reading, tam-Yi, is offered only in the most tentative way. It has the advantages, however, of being a legitimate form of the well-known Akkadian verb maṣu (\*Hebrew maṣa'h), "to forget," and of fitting in reasonably well with the context. For respectable Biblical parallels to the present passage cf. Psalm 13:2; 42:10; 44:25; Lamentations 5:20.

As Knudtzon has already noted (EA, p. 419, n. n), the mark at the end of l. 18 that looks like a single wedge was probably not placed there by the scribe.

Immediately after \textit{URU}Gub-la in l. 19, \textit{BB} 17 and \textit{H} 65 both read lu-ú, but Knudtzon, doubtless correctly, emends to ma(!)-ni(!) (cf. \textit{EA} 114:35; 119:39; 122:38; 250:10). His reading ti-si after \textit{UDKAM,NEŠ} however, forced him to mistranslate ma(n)ni(!) \textit{UDKAM,NEŠ} as "zu welcher zeit . . . immer" instead of as an interrogative (as in all its other occurrences). The form ti-si itself should have given him pause, since with the exception of te-i-sa in *362:30 (of which Knudtzon of course had no knowledge when he published his edition) the verb (w)asú is not found with an i-preformative vowel in Rib-Naddi (cf. the note on yusa(n)na in 74:39 supra).

Seeing the inherent difficulty in Knudtzon's understanding of our passage, Moran (\textit{SSDB}, p. 160) reads, doubtless correctly, ma-ni \textit{umati ti} la(!) yi-na-nu-uš. Our scribe wrote \textit{SI} and \textit{LA} in such a way as to encourage confusion in their reading (cf. already Knudtzon, \textit{EA}, p. 419, n. i); note further la(!) \textit{inammušûnim} \textit{[I]štu pī abul Gub(1a)} in \textit{EA} 87:23-24. In support of his reading \textit{umati} (feminine plural), Moran cited Deuteronomy 32:7 (he might also have mentioned Psalm 90:15) and referred to Harris, \textit{GPL}, p. 106. This latter reference quotes the famous Yhalk inscription, 11. 3-5: ʾyʾrk bō1 Šmm wbō1(7) Gbl wnhpt ʾ1 Gbl qdMm ymt Yhalk, "May Baʾal Shanem and the Lady of Byblos and the assembly of the holy gods of Byblos prolong the days of Yehimilk." This citation is significant in that its source is Byblos; scarcely less
impressive, however, are the frequent attestations of the feminine plural of the word for "day" in the Phoenician Azitawadd inscription (ll. 5, 22, 26, 28, 36, 38). Nevertheless, there is one passage, from Amarna itself, that definitely assures the correctness of Moran's reading: ma-ni UD KAM. MES-ti (EA 292:44-45).

For a tentative explanation of ma(n)i um/i/umati from the viewpoint of Canaanite syntax cf. the note on minu in EA 71:16 supra.

am-ru-me(!) in l. 21 was misunderstood by Knudtzon and Ebeling because (1) they also misunderstood CT 18, 3:v:4 and (2) the scribe erroneously wrote am-ru-MES. The CT lexical datum reads AM-RU-UM-MA = da-al-tum, from which Knudtzon and Ebeling (cf. EA, p. 1372) derived either an ideogram, *AM.RU, or alternatively a noun, "amru(m), meaning "door." It is now known from numerous other occurrences, however, that the first portion of the CT datum is most plausibly read amrumma, and that an amrumma may itself have a daltu (cf. MSL 6, p. 23:220). Von Soden's emendation of am-ru-MES in our passage to am-ru-me(!) is therefore entirely in order (AHw, p. 45). His tentative translation, "postern," however, is rather questionable; the amrumma in this case seems to have been entirely outside the city, so that its usual reference to a water conduit of some sort would appear to apply here.

ll. 21-22. Sum[ma] Gubla uba’u šabata: It makes no sense to translate Sum[ma] here as "i[f]" (cf. Knudtzon's "we[na]"), since Abdi-Ashirta's intentions are not a matter of doubt.

"Beh[old], he seeks to seize Byblos" is much more to the point. Cf. EA 93:19-21 for a similar use of Summa. For Summa in the sense of "behold, lo" cf. the note on 74:13 supra.


ha-mu-UD in both of these passages has been dealt with in a bewildering variety of ways. Knudtzon and, at times, Dhorme (RB, NS Volume 10 [1913], pp. 386, 387), as well as (also at times) Ebeling (BA VIII/2 [1912], p. 58), have been inclined to read *ha-mu-tū and to consider the resulting form a plural stative. Against such a reading we may object that (1) the fact that it is preceded by 1ū sharply reduces the possibility of its being a stative in a context such as this; (2) UD is never read *TU in any period of Akkadian. CAD 6, therefore, reads ha-mu-ut (p. 75) and considers the form an adverb (although then proceeding to translate it as a predicate adjective!). While such an endless form could be adverbial (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 133 n, for many examples of similar forms), the reading ha-mu-ut is purely artificial since the word hamutta(m) is well attested from the Old Babylonian period onward (as CAD, loc. cit., itself admits). We, therefore, read ha-mu-tam, "quickly," with (on occasion) Dhorme (RB, NS Volume 11 [1914], p. 371) and (sometimes) Ebeling (EA, p. 1413).

We note further, however, that hamutta(m), in all of its other occurrences in Amarna (cf. ibid. for citations), always appears in the vicinity of a verb which it modifies (hence my restoration of yu(ś)Mira in both of our passages). This should cause no surprise, since the Hebrew semantic equivalents, maḥer and mēhērāh, are also always similarly used (cf. BDB, p. 555, for citations).

The redundancy of [kīma] arhiš in l. 25 above is more apparent than real (cf. EA 102:29-30).

Ll. 25-26. ū ti-[sū-rU URUKI LUGAL BE-ī]a: Quite properly, in my judgment, Knudtzon restored this passage on the basis of the identical phrase in ll. 41-42 below. Syntax requires the
jussive form of the verb, however, rather than Knudtzon's ti-[su-ru-na] (indicative). Though there appears to be a trace of a sign after ti-su-ru in BB 17:41, Knudtzon himself expressed doubts concerning it (EA, p. 421, n. c).


Ll. 28-29. anāku awat beliy[a u]l ezzib: For the idiom awat X eṣebu, "to ignore/disregard the words of X," elsewhere in Amarna cf. EA 1:62-63. Note especially also the hitherto unrecognized occurrence in 211:18-20: lā nila'tu e-ze-sb a-ma-at šarrī beliya, "We cannot ignore the words of the king, my lord" (Knudtzon's reading, a-ba(!)-at(!), is meaningless and requires the invention of a new word, *abatu, which Ebeling carelessly relates to Hebrew 'bh [cf. EA, p. 1360]; S 121:19 substantiates my reading to a considerable degree, and the context makes it certain). For additional Akkadian citations containing this and similar phrases cf. CAD 4, pp. 418-419; AHw, p. 268; for the closest approximation in Biblical Hebrew cf. 1 Kings 12:8,13 (= II Chronicles 10:8,13).

L. 31. in, né-ep-sa-(at): For my emendation here cf. the citations of this form listed by Ebeling in EA, p. 1404 (note especially EA 84:12).

L. 32. L[UGAL BE-ia]: For my restoration here cf. the note on 11. 4-9 supra.

Ll. 34-36. a-wa-[tam] lā yu-šē-ši-la belī a-na IR(!)-u kīma arhiš ana tuppi: "My lord has not had wor[d] brought to h[is] servant quickly on a tablet." Though preserved almost intact, this passage remains somewhat enigmatic and my restorations and translation must be considered highly tentative. Nevertheless, a-wa-[tam] (contrast Knudtzon's a-wa[-te]) seems virtually certain
(cf. EA 116:13). Moreover, Ebeling's citation of yu-ŠI-bi-la as a III₂ form (BA VIII/2 [1912], p. 68) is demonstrably incorrect, since *ŠI- never contracts at all in Rib-Haddi, much less to -as Ebeling proposes (ibid., p. 43); since ŠI is occasionally read ŠI in these texts (cf., e.g., EA 77:8; 84:26), my reading, yu-ŠI-bi-la, is perfectly in order. In fact, even ana IR(!)-Š[u] receives strong support from context, despite Knudtzon's serious doubts against such a reading (cf. EA, p. 420, n. b).

The main problems here surround the position of kīma arhiš ana tuppī and the meaning of ana. The phrase doubtless goes with what precedes it, but in so doing makes its syntax rather awkward. Furthermore, if we are to translate "on/in a tablet" here we expect either muḫḫi or ina (libbi) (cf. EA 120:42) rather than ana. I have nothing more plausible to suggest, however.

Ll. 36-37. ʔ na-ri-[ ] URUKI ana Hāšu: Knudtzon restores na-r[i]-i[k] which he considers the stative of a verb *narāku to which he assigns the meaning "to long/yearn (ana for)." To my knowledge, however, there is no such verb in Akkadian, nor does a cognate of it exist in the other Semitic languages. Furthermore, Knudtzon's proposed nār[i]k] is a masculine stative while ṣlu is always feminine in Rib-Haddi. For the present it seems best to leave the word unrestored and untranslated; perhaps the text itself is not in order.

Ll. 37-39. er-r[i-i]š ʾala inštu Hāšu ana aššiyya ʾila bal-(tā)-ti: "I will requ[es]t from him a city for my dwelling place so that I might li(v)e." To Moran (SSDB, p. 160) we owe our understanding of this passage. His reading results from his brilliant emendation of ʾBAL TI to ʾbal-(tā)-ti at the end of 1. 39, an emendation that receives support from EA 83:27; 112:23; 123:35. Dhorme's interpretation of *ʾ-bal-ti as a Hiph of wābālu and therefore equivalent to Hebrew ḫōbaltī (RB, NS Volume 11 [1914], p. 54; so also apparently Knudtzon) is open to
serious question since (1) it results in a form which makes very little sense in context; (2) it suffers from the fact that a III form of wabalu appears in 1. 35 above; and (3) if a Hiph form were intended we would expect the scribe to have written "hu-bal-ti" (cf. EA 256:7: hi-h-b-e-e = Hebrew hehhê'). Ebeling's reading, ubal balâta (EA, p. 1591), is also difficult contextually. Needless to say, ú balâtâ'ti here represents another example of the use of a Canaanite perfect form with waw converse.

Ll. 40-42: Cf. the commentary on ll. 24-26 supra. BB 17 shows a small wedge at the beginning of the break at the end of l. 40, making y[u-ši-ra] not at all implausible.

Ll. 42-45. amur Gubla la ki[m]a álání [ ] Gubla ál ktti Marri bê[liyâ] ithu dârîti: For similar expressions cf. EA 106:4-5; 116:55-56. A smoother translation would result here if *Ma-na-ti were added at the end of l. 43. Knudtzon notes (EA, p. 421, n. d) that part of a sign is visible at the beginning of the break, but there appears to be room for a maximum of two small signs there.


kabîd ithu is under oppressive Canaanite influence; cf. the use of Hebrew min in expressions of comparison. elî is the particle of comparison in standard Akkadian (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 68 a), while ithu is never so used (cf. CAD 7, pp. 286-288). Rib-Haddi's Canaanite scribes, however, employed the ithu of comparison at least two more times (EA 106:15; 137:16).

Since *"ḵbd is the root meaning "to be heavy, important, honored" in Canaanite generally (cf. Hebrew, Ugaritic, Phoenician), my transcription ka₃-bi-id (so approximately also W 65) is preferable to Knudtzon's ka-bi-it.
Knudtzon's restoration at the beginning of l. 48, k[i-i], is highly suspect, since k[i] never has the meaning "since, because" (Knudtzon: "[i]n[de]m") in Rib-Haddi. BB 17 (hesitantly) and W 69 both read  in here, a reading which is highly plausible in our context.

[na-ad-nu cannot be a singular form as Knudtzon is inclined to understand it (cf. my note on EA 86:17 supra). Wherever na-ad-nu appears in Amarna we must normalize nadu and read it as a plural (cf. EA, p. 1478, for details). In the present passage the subject (to be supplied by the reader) is probably the servants of the pharaoh.

Napli[H]u (l. 48) and ištu Napli[u] (l. 50; cf. also EA 266:19-25) are clear Canaanisms (cf. Hebrew tahat and mittahat respectively); standard Akkadian knows only šapal for "under, beneath" in the early periods, ina šapal (suffixial ina šapli-; cf., e.g., EA 125:35-36) and similar constructions in the later periods (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 115 g). Note further the Canaanisms ana/ištu (Na) šapal(i) (for citations cf. EA, pp. 1526-1527), wherein ana šapal(i) recalls Hebrew el-tahat. For the root *tht (well known also in Ugaritic and Phoenician as well as in Aramaic and Arabic) in Amarna, cf. EA 252:25-27: nupulme ta-aš-ta-na  itima(h)hasuka, "Fall beneath them and let them smite thee" (cf. Albright, BASOR 89, p. 32, n. 24, who had already been anticipated in this rendering by Knudtzon, EA, p. 1601).

As Weber notes (EA, p. 1178), the "king" of Accho mentioned in this passage is one Zurata (cf. the note on EA 85:21 supra).

Ll. 49-50: Rib-Haddi appears, in this passage, to be attempting to heighten the contrast between the treatment accorded his servant and that granted by the pharaoh to the servant from Accho; we thus expect something like [ū LÚ-ia] Nina sis[i]
[ti-il-ti-q]ū ištu Napli[u]. While the second part of my restoration remains quite plausible, the first part seems to be ruled out by Knudtzon's [  ] (cf. also EA, p. 421, n.
e). Beside the fact that it fits in well contextually, however, I feel somewhat justified in retaining it on the basis of EA 83:10-11: Lú-ia utta(M)ir ana ma[ha]r bēliya ù la-qú MIN ANšE.KUR.RA-Mu, which clearly refers to the same event.


My [Šá-ni-tam] provides a better transition to the brief reminder with which Rib-Haddi closes his letter than does Knudtzon's [ù]. As for Knudtzon's addition of -[m]a at the very end of the line, we can only observe that none of Rib-Haddi's other letters ends with an enclitic.
Rib-Haddi to the Pharaoh
(VAT 1627 - WA 49 - W 70 - S 43 - EA 89)

Obverse

1. ["Ri-ib"]^\text{IM} iq-b[i a-na]
[EN-\text{u} LU]GAL KUR^\text{MES} LUGAL G(AL)
[d\text{NIN} \text{a}]a URU\text{Sub-l}[a ti-din]
[KALAG.GA a]-na LUGAL^r\text{EN-[ia]}

5. [a-na G\text{IR}^M]^\text{EN}-ia \text{dU[TU-i]a}
[IMIN-\text{u} IMI]N-ta-an am-q[\text{u}]ut
[a-nu-ma] k[i]-a-ma a\text{N-ta-pa-ru}
[a-na \text{E}].GAL a-wa-tu-ia ú-ul
[tu-ul]\text{l-qú]-na ü \text{Sa}-ma ú-ul

(10) [tu-u]\text{S-mu-na a-mur i-pí-i\text{H}}
\text{Ur-ru} \text{Sur-ri kí-na-na pál-\text{ha-ti}}
i-na-na la-a yi-\text{Sa}-a-lu LUGAL^\text{ru}
a-na ha-za-ni-\text{Yu} a-na a-\text{hi-ia} yi-\text{<i\	ext{H}-me} LUGAL
ú-ul k[i-n]a a-wa(!)-ti-\text{Yu-nu} \text{a-wa-te-ia}

(15) Sum-ma LUGAL^\text{ru} yi-\text{Sa}-a-lu
ù na-ad-na pa-ni-nu a-na
a-ra-di-ka a-na-ku-me ep-\text{Sa-ti}
i-mu-t[a] a-n[a] \text{UrU} \text{Sur-ri}
i-ba-\text{Yu} i-na pa-ni-ia

(20) al\text{-lu-ú ha-za-na-\text{Yu}-nu da-ku}
qa-du a-\text{ha-ti-ia} ù DUMU^\text{MES} -\text{še}
M\text{f}DUMU.MI^\text{MES} a-\text{ha-<ti}-ia u8-\text{Hi-ir-ti}
a-na URU [§Jur-[ri] i[§]-tu pa-ni m:\R-A[-§i-ir-ta ]-§u

(25) qa-[ -a\d]

(26-29) [

(edge)(30) [
mum-ma qa-al]

Reverse

[LUGAL]ru [\b ti-né-ep-§u]
ka-li KUR ME [-§ a-na LUMES GAZ ME]-

mum-ma a-na a-li-[ia la-a]
yi-§a-i-lu LUGAL\ru [\u ]

(35) GUR i-na ba-li [\d-

ia-§a-pu-ru a-na LUGAL\ri [-\u]
la-a tu-§a-mu-na a-w[a]-tu-[§]u u ma-ti-ma §u-ut a-nu
i-de-§u u mum-ma a-na a-li-ia

(40) ti-§a-i-lu u ta-aq-bu
URU an-nu-\u la-a ha-za-nu §a-al LUGAL\ru UGU-§u \b-ul ni-le-\u
i-pé-\b§ mi-im-mi u pal-hu-ni mum-ma a-na ha-za-ni URU §ur-ri

(45) la-a yi-§a-i-lu LUGAL\ru
i-nu-ma ma-\d§ mi-mu-§u ki-ma a-ia-ab a-na-ku i-de-§u a-mur § URU §ur-ri
ia-nu § ti ha-za-ni
(50) [k]i-ma Šu-a-ta ki-ma š

[ UR ] U[ga-ri-ta i-ba-š]i

[ma]-id MA.GAL mi-mu

[i-na] SAG₄ bi-šu yi-is-me LUGALru

[a-wa-t]e IR-{šu} yu-wa-ši-ra

(55) [ ]-da ū yi-zi-iz

[e]r-šé-ti ū

[ ] a-na ha-za-nu-ti ū [a-na]

[ia-ši la-a y]u-da-an mi-[i-n]u

(edge) [ ]-šu-nu ū [ ]

(60) [ ] L↑MA]ŠKIM LUGALri i-[ ]

[ ] qa-ši LUGALri [ ]

[ ] KURMES [ ]

(left edge) [ ] i-de i-ra-am LUGALru [IR-šu ū]

["kIR]-A-ši-ir-ta la-qa a-ia-ab [ ]

(65) [i-n]a pa-ni-šu-nu ū pa-aš-hu

[ ] Šu-nu LUGALru ū-ul aš-pu-[u]

ar-na-nu a-na LUGAL
(1) [Rāb]-Haddi iqāb[i ana bēlišu ḡa]'r mātē ṣarrī ra[bī]
Bēltu ḡa]a Gubl[a ti(d)din dunna a]na ṣarrī bēliš(ya (5) ana ṣep{jē)
bēliya ṣa[miy]a [sib'citšu sib'citān amqut [anūma] k[i]'ama
aštapar( ḡa] [ana e]kalli awāṭuyā ul [tulqū]na ʿū ṣamā ul (10)
[tu]šmu-na amur ʿiṣṣ Surri kīna(n)na palhāṭi ina(n)na lā
yiša'al u ṣarrī ana ḡazānīšu ana ʿaḥiša yīḥṣ(ṣma) ṣarrī awāṭeyā ul
k[īn]ā awā(!)tišunu (15) Summa ṣarrī yiša'ilu ʿū Ṽādna panīnu
ana arādka anakume ṣepūti imūt[a] an[a] Surri iša(ṣ)uṁ ina
panīya (20) allu ḡazānašunu ḍāku qadu ahātiya ʿu māriše mārāt
ahā(t)iya waṭārti ana [ṣ]ur[ri i(ṣ)tu pani ḡabdī'-ʿA[ḥūrta
]ṣu (25) qa[ a]ld [ ]

(30) Summa qāl
ṣārru [u ti(n)nepšu] kali mātāt[i ana ḡapīrī] Summa ana ʿaḥī[ya
lā] yiša'ilu ṣarrū [u ] (35) GUR ina bali i[d ]
yadpuru ana ṣarrī [u] lā tušmüna aw[a]tu[y]u ʿū mātīma šūt anū
īdēšu ʿu Summa ana ʿaḥīya (40) tiša'ilu ʿu taqbu ālu annū lā
ḡazānu ʿāl ṣarrū muḥḥīšu ul nil'eṭ'u ipeṣ mimmi ʿu palhūni Summa
ana ḡazānī Surri (45) lā yiša'ilu ṣarrū inūma ma'id mi(m)mūšu
kmā a(y)yab anāku īdēšu amur ʿiṣ Surri yānu ʿiṣ ḡazānī (50) [k]īma
ṣuʿātā kmā ʿiṣ 'Ugarīta iša(ṣ)u [ma]id ḡanniṣ mi(m)mū [ina]
libbīšu yišme ṣarrū [awāt]e ardi(yu) yuwa(ṣ)ṣira (55) [ ]
da ʿu yi(z)zi[z [ e]rṣetī u [ ] ana ḡazānūti u [ana yāni
lā yJudān m[i(m)m]u [ ]ṣunu u [ ] (60)
rā]bis ṣarrī i[ ] qāti ṣarrī [ ]
mātāti ] ̱ Ide ʿirāʿam ʿArru
[aradḥu ʿAbdī]-ʿAṣṭīra lāqāʾ a(y)yāb [ (65) in]a
panīḥunu ʿṣaḥhū [ ] -Ḥunu ʿArru ʿal aṣpur[u] arānān
ana ʿArrī

(1) [Rīb]-Haddī has sai[d to his lord, the k]ing of the two lands, the gre[at] king: [May the Lady o]f Byōl[os grant power t]o the king, [mi]y lord! (5) [At the feet] of my lord, [m]y s[un]-god, [seven times, sev]en times, I have fallen. [Already] th[u]s I have written [to the p]alace, (but) my words [have] not [been ac]cepted and [have] not at all (10) [been hee]ded. Behold the deed of Tyre; therefore am I afraid! Now the king does not investigate concerning his mayor, concerning my brother(-in-law). The king should (heed) my words! Their words(!) are not t[ru]e:
(15) "If the king investigates, then we will direct our attention toward thy service." As for me, I had established marriage relations with[ty] Tyre while they were favorably disposed toward me. (20) Lo, they have killed their mayor together with my sister and her sons. I had sent my sis[ter]'s daughters to [T]yr[e] aw[ay] from the presence of ʿAbdī-ʿAshīrta.

(25)  

(30) If the k[i]ng [remains silent, then] all the land[s will turn themselves over to the Ḫṣir]. If concerning [my] brother(-in-law) the king does [not] investigate, [then ] (35) . . . without [. He wrote to the king, [but h]is wo[r]ds were not heeded. Moreover, when he died, I knew of it, and if concerning my brother(-in-law) (40) thou dost investigate, then the city will say, "This one is not the mayor! Investigate, O king, concerning him! We cannot do anything!" And so they are afraid. Concerning the mayor of Tyre will (45) the king not investigate?
For plenteous is his wealth, like the sea; I know it! Behold, as for the dynasty of Tyre, no mayoral dynasty is (50) [like that! It is like the dynasty of Ugarit, very [plenteous is the wealth [in] it. Let the king heed [the word]s of <his> servant! Let him send me (55) []da, that he may stay [the land]. Moreover, [ ] to the mayors, but [to me there has not been given anything. [ ] their [ ] and [ (60) ] the royal commissioner [ ] the power of the king [ ] I know (that) the king loves [his servant. Nevertheless, "Abdi]-Ashirta has captured the sea [ (65) in their presence, and they are at peace. [Let] the king [ ] them. Have I not report[ed] our "crime" to the king?

* * *

---

For plenteous is his wealth, like the sea; I know it! Behold, as for the dynasty of Tyre, no mayoral dynasty is (50) [like that! It is like the dynasty of Ugarit, very [plenteous is the wealth [in] it. Let the king heed [the word]s of <his> servant! Let him send me (55) []da, that he may stay [the land]. Moreover, [ ] to the mayors, but [to me there has not been given anything. [ ] their [ ] and [ (60) ] the royal commissioner [ ] the power of the king [ ] I know (that) the king loves [his servant. Nevertheless, "Abdi]-Ashirta has captured the sea [ (65) in their presence, and they are at peace. [Let] the king [ ] them. Have I not report[ed] our "crime" to the king?

* * *

---
As is true in the case of EA 82 (q.v.), the present letter and its interpretation form the subject of a penetrating article written by Albright and Moran. The title in this case is "Rib-Adda of Byblos and the Affairs of Tyre (EA 89)"; it was published in JCS 4 (1950), pp. 163-166. Because of the excellence of their study and since it antiquates every previous discussion of EA 89, it must serve as the starting point for any future analysis of the latter. The following comments are therefore offered merely by way of supplementary information and will be found to differ with the Albright-Moran article only in minor particulars.

L. 2. [â]âr KURMEŠ: "... [the k]ing of the two lands," not "king of the universe" (Albright and Moran); cf. my note on [LUGAL] KURILI.M.A in EA 68:3 supra.


L. 7. [a-nu-ma]: "[Already]," not "[See]" (Albright and Moran); cf. my note on anumma in EA 68:22 supra.

Ll. 9-10. b4mâ-ul [tupmûna]: This phrase illustrates the phenomenon, well known particularly from Akkadian, Ugaritic, Hebrew, and Phoenician, of emphasizing the action of a finite verb by juxtaposing its infinitive absolute (usually in primary position, as here). In standard Akkadian, the infinitive when employed thus is normally cast in the nominative case (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 150 a). Ugaritic likewise (possibly under Akkadian influence) uses the nominative form of the infinitive in such cases (cf. II AB, iv-v:34: Mau ḫmat, "Hast thou [f.] verily become thirsty?"; II K, vi:3: bt Krt bu ṭbu, "Into Keret's house verily she goes").

The correspondence of Rib-Haddi, then, is vital in this regard in that it gives examples of our infinitival construction which demonstrate that normal Canaanite usage called for the
infinitive to be cast in the accusative case (hence Hamā); cf. also EA 92:10: .Num a la[aš] (in 131:17: laq[aš]m[aš]
ti-il-gu-na-ši, the genitive ending on laq[aš] is probably due to
attraction to the following syllable). It seems better, however,
to conceive of such infinitives as adverbial accusatives rather
than as objects of the finite verb, as does Gesenius (GKC², §113 m); indeed, in the present passage the infinitive cannot be
an object, since [tu]Hamā is a clear Gāl passive. To take an
example from Hebrew, nît tamût (Genesis 2:17) would then mean
literally: "As far as dying is concerned (*mâta), thou shalt
die." It can readily be seen that the Māb-Haddi evidence is
sine qua non for the vocalization of the infinitive absolute in
the construction under discussion both in proto-Hebrew and in
Phoenician (the best Phoenician example is to be found in the
Tabnit inscription, 11. 6-7: 'm pth [ *patôna] tptth City wrgz
[*wa-ragôza] trgzn).

As in the present example, Gāl infinitives are juxtaposed
to passive finite verbs elsewhere in Canaanite literature as well;
for examples in Biblical Hebrew cf. GKC², §113 w, and note
possibly also 1 K:97-98: almôt ñkr ñkr (tuškaru? tiºšakiru?),
"The destitute woman verily hires herself out." Likewise, the
negative particle is in normal position here (cf. possibly EA
92:10; for examples in Akkadian, cf. von Soden, GAG, §150 a;
for examples in Biblical Hebrew, cf. GKC², §113 v; and, although
the evidence in Ugaritic is meagre, cf. possibly VI AB, v:21:
yâ d lyê d [in broken context]).

L. 10. i-pî-î: Albright and Moran read i-pê-aš here and
consider the form an infinitive, probably on the basis of 11.
42-43 where the latter form occurs and where it can be nothing
else. ipšu, "deed, act," however, is exceedingly common in these
letters, and ipš is its normal construct form (cf. CAD 7, p.
168-171; Ebeling, though hesitantly, EA, p. 1405). Cf. with our
passage, significantly, EA 287:29 ff.: armû ip-ša an-ni-ú
ip-ši Mil-ki-li, "Behold this deed, the deed of Milkilu."
L. 11. *URURISUR-RI*: The proposal of Albright and Moran that we are to read ḫ[U] sur-ri here (understanding the determinative to have been pronounced as a construct noun) rests on weak foundations indeed. They cite EA 256 as a "classic illustration" of a letter in which "the names of towns are nearly always in the genitive." The word "nearly," however, is significant, since we find URURUDU-MA in 256:24 and URURARA-RI in l. 25. Furthermore, even a cursory glance at EA, pp. 1571-1582, demonstrates that while EA 256 may be "classic" as proof of an a priori assumption it can scarcely be said to represent average Amarna orthography with respect to place names. Nor is Albright and Moran's reference to the Idri-mi inscription convincing, since ma-at Hu-ri-ihte (Idri-mi:14), for example, can scarcely be considered as providing a datum for the reading of KUR in such spellings as [KUR]URAMUR-RA (EA 115:17) or KURHAT-TA (116:71) or KURMU-LU-RA (108:67). In this connection, a note by Albright and Moran on the spelling *URUGUB-1[a]* in l. 3 of the present letter would seem to have been in order!

In short, I fail to see any compelling objection to treating determinatives in Canaanite Amarna according to classic scribal tradition. As children are to be seen but not heard, so determinatives are to be seen but not read aloud. For my present understanding of the function of the determinative in Rib-Haddi cf. my note on Gublu in EA 68:4 supra.


L. 14. ý-ul k[i-n]a a-wa(!)-ti-SU-nu: Albright and Moran appropriately quote EA 162:19-20: ý-ul k[i-n]a gās-bi a-wa-te to confirm the reading k[i-n]a, but they are incorrect in assuming that "Ebeling also reads K1"; cf. EA, p. 1397. WA 49 clearly reads K1, however (cf. also W 70). For further parallels to our passage cf. EA 1:33; 29:47.
The reading a-wa(!)-ti-Šu-nu is tentative. Although the autographs read A NA TI šu NU, these signs together make no sense in context and so we assume the NA-sign to be due to vertical ditography (so also Albright and Moran). Ebeling reads 11. 14b and 15 together: a-na Ti-Šu-nu Mumma Harru yiMa’ilu (cf. EA, p. 1591). Beside making very little sense, however, the syntax is awkward since we expect Mumma to occupy the initial position in the sentence (cf. 11. 39-40) as always elsewhere in Rib-Haddi. On the other hand, there is nothing to be gained from positing a noun *annatu, "offense, transgression" (cf. EA, p. 1376); nor is it likely that we have here a noun *añatu related to Hebrew-Ugaritic *my, "to speak, respond." In any event we expect, of course, a-n/wa-tu-Šu-nu (nominative; cf., e.g., a-wa-tu-ia in 1. 8 and a-w[a]-tu-[E]u in 1. 37).

L. 16. nādna panīnu: Albright and Moran are undoubtedly correct in assuming na-ad-na to be a Canaanite first person plural imperfect form (contra Ebeling, EA VIII/2 [1912], p. 55); perhaps we should read *nātna (cf. the note on tiādin in EA 66:5 supra).

L. 19. iba[g]šu ina panīya: "... while they were favorably disposed toward me." The idiom seems to be Canaanite; cf. especially I Samuel 29:8. The clause is of the type called in Arabic hāl, i.e. circumstantial (von Soden, GAG, § 159; cf. also GKC², §§ 142 d, 156 d-g).

L. 20. hazanašunu: The word for "mayor" is always written defectively (i.e., as hazanu) in Rib-Haddi; this suffixial form, however, reflects the more archaic spelling (i.e., "hazannu"). It may be that such a spelling was always intended by Rib-Haddi's scribes; cf., e.g., 1. 44 of the present letter: ana ha-za-nî (not "ha-za-an") URU Sur-ri.

L. 20. dēkū: dēkū is the Assyrian morphological equivalent of this Canaanite perfect formation, but is not normative for
Akkadian generally (contra Albright and Moran); the Babylonian plural stative, in all periods, would usually be spelled di-ku (cf., e.g., ARM 4, 33:16 ff.; cf. also di-ku in Nbk. 365:5) unless, of course, under Assyrian influence (cf. von Soden, GAG, Paradigm 28).

Ll. 24-25: Albright and Moran restore [da(?)-ku(?)-mu ka-[du(?)] here, comparing ll. 20-21. The connection with what immediately precedes would then be somewhat abrupt, however; moreover, the antecedent of the suffix on "[dāk][ūmu (the mayor of Tyre? Ābdi-Ashirta?) could prove puzzling to the reader. It seems best to leave the passage unrestored.

L. 26: Knudtzon's m[a] at the beginning of this line was wisely omitted by Albright and Moran; the traces support equally EA, L, SUM, BA, etc.

Ll. 30-32: To the parallels adduced by Albright and Moran add EA 74:35-36. For my highly tentative restoration of [sum-ma qa-al] at the end of l. 30 cf. 68:14-18; 137:75-76. [LUMES] GAZ is normal for Rib-Haddi; the spelling SA.GAZ (Albright and Moran, following Knudtzon) is relatively infrequent in his correspondence (cf. EA 68; 87; 88; 127; 128).

L. 35: If Albright and Moran are correct in isolating i-na ba-li here and in translating it "without," we hasten to observe that i-na bāli would then be, as an independent preposition, unique not only in Amarna but in all of Akkadian literature as well (cf. von Soden, AHw, pp. 100-101). Only suffixial occurrences are attested (e.g., i-na bāli•u), and these in late texts; otherwise, where i-na is involved, we find i-na balu(m) (von Soden, GAG, § 114 r). i-na bāli could easily be understood as a Canaanism, however (cf. Hebrew bēli). Cf. further my note on as-sum bāli in EA 74:18 supra.

The restoration of i[D/T/T] at the beginning of the break is assured by comparing WA 49.
Il. 38-39. u mātimu ūtu anū īdešu: "Moreover, when he died I knew of it." The discovery and elucidation of the infinitive absolute construction involved here was made the subject of a paper by Moran entitled "The Use of the Canaanite Infinitive Absolute as a Finite Verb in the Amarna Letters from Byblos" (JCS 4 [1950], pp. 169-172). Moran's contention that in the construction qatalima plus pronominal subject "the -i is probably adverbial---hence qatali anāku, 'I am (engaged) in killing'" (ibid., p. 172) is probably correct (cf. his article for additional details as well as for a complete listing of other citations in Rib-Addi where this phenomenon is attested). His assertion that the same construction is found also in the Phoenician Asitawadd inscription, however, set off a brief running battle in JCS between Julian Obermann and himself (cf. Obermann, "Does Amarna Bear on Karatepe?", JCS 5, pp. 58-61; Moran, "Does Amarna Bear on Karatepe?---An Answer," JCS 6, pp. 76-80). Moran and Obermann (who considers the forms in question to be participles) have done a reasonably effective job of neutralizing one another's arguments (and therefore also those of C. H. Gordon, whose position on the matter is essentially that of Moran; cf. JNES 8, pp. 112-113), leaving only the view of Friedrich, namely that the Karatepe forms (and similar forms noted in other Phoenician passages by Gordon, loc. cit.) are simply third person masculine singular perfects (cf. Phönizisch-punische Grammatik [Rome, 1951], p. 82). While this latter view admittedly poses difficulties with regard to syntax, it has the advantage of removing the morphological problems involved in the infinitive and participle theories. Any further discussion of the matter at this time would take us too far afield.

All previous interpreters have connected a-nu in our passage either with anā, "behold," or with anū(m)ma, "by this time, up till now, already" (for a discussion of the difference between
annû and annû(m)ma cf. my note on anumma in EA 68:22 supra). Note, however, that annû is never written defectively in Amarna, nor does annû(m)ma ever appear without its -ma ending. Moshe Held has suggested (in a class in Amarna) that a-nu here is probably the first person singular independent pronoun which, though not appearing in this simplified form in standard Akkadian, is well known in a shortened form in Canaanite (cf. Hebrew 'a₃n and Ugaritic an) as well as in Aramaic-Syriac, Arabic and Ethiopian. Held's proposal receives strong support from l. 47 below: anakû 'ādešû. In our passage a-nu, "I," serves not only to balance the foregoing but also to clarify the person of the ambiguous verbal form īde. It performs the latter function also in EA 114:30: a-nu i-ti-zi-ib-û (cf. my note in loe. cit. for further details). Cf. also a-nu-û in 92:23.

'ādešû, "I knew of it," is unusual; we expect the feminine suffix in reference to the verbal idea contained in the preceding clause (cf., for Biblical Hebrew, GKC 2, § 135 p; cf., for a similar construction in Akkadian, Enûma elîm IV:8: Mušû û Šušpulu âû ānatka). Perhaps īdešû here (cf. also l. 47 infra) is best understood as approximating the sort of construction noted by von Soden in GAG, § 42 d.

Ll. 44-45: An excellent Hebrew example of a disjunctive question to add to those adduced by Albright and Moran is Job 6:12. ūnumma... lâ here is equivalent to Hebrew 'im lâ; for an example of a disjunctive question cast in the negative cf. Isaiah 10:9.

L. 46. ma'id: Cf. l. 52 below; EA 105:38; 113:16; 116:29. The Akkadian equivalent of this Canaanized stative form would be maš (cf. 86:10; 137:60-62,74). The root 'm'd appears as a verb in Ugaritic apparently only once (I K:58: 'ama'idû; the II₁ form is required by context, so that we cannot vocalize 'am'idû with Albright and Moran. Moreover, since the verb is stative in the I₁ conjugation, the first person singular imperfect
vocalization would normally be *'im'adu, a spelling ruled out by the Ugaritic orthography in loc. cit."

L. 47. a(y)yb: For a discussion of this pseudo-logogram cf. the note on a-īm-ab in EA 74:20 supra. As another example of a pseudo-logogram in Rib-Naddi Albright and Moran adduce UR.KI (138:96), which they claim to have arisen as the genitive of *UR.KI (kalbu) which was mistakenly pronounced as though it were an Akkadian word in its own right. There is no reason to assume, however, that the scribes of Amarna were ignorant of the fact that the logogram for kalbu was read UR.ZIR (not "UR.KI) in Sumerian. UR.KI in 138:96 is best read simply as kalab ursi, "badger(?)" (cf. Landsberger, Fauna, p. 86) or, perhaps even better, "worm" (ibid., p. 129).

L. 48. bit Surri: To Albright-Moran's excellent summary of the use of *baytu in the sense of "family, clan, dynasty" in Semitic in general and in West Semitic in particular we add the observation that bt with the same meaning appears also in Ugaritic (cf., e.g., I K:?).

L. 49: After hazani appear traces of *ki-ma, which the scribe decided to obliterate (cf. Knudtzon, EA, p. 424, n. c) and to use instead as the first two signs of the next line.

L. 54. IR-ṣ[u]: The scribal lapse is due to vertical haplography.

L. 55: A proper name was doubtless on the original tablet at the beginning of this line (cf. EA 74:60-61: yuwa-hi-ra [LÛ]-ṣ[u Ṽ y]-ṣi-iz), but the traces before the DA-sign give us no clue as to his identity.

Ll. 57-58. Ṽ [a-na in-ṣi la-a y]u-da-an m[i-m]u: For my restoration cf. EA 126:17-18, 26-28, 49-51. The clue to the restoration of the first part of l. 57 above seems to be found in 126:15-18, but we cannot fill in the former with the same
words used in the latter because of a scribal lapse in the text of the latter (cf. my note in loc. cit. infra).


L. 63. i-de ʾaʾāʾam Mārr[u] [ʾIR-Šu]: "I know (that) the king loves [his servant]." My restoration is based on EA 123:23-24: ʾaʾāʾam Mār[u] b[ēš] ḫIR ki-t[i-[].

L. 66: Knudtzon's restoration at the beginning of this line, [1]i-[h]-Šu-nu, is merely a guess and leads nowhere. The only certain signs are -Šu-nu (so also Albright and Moran).

L. 67. arnanu: This suffixial form exhibits the accusative case ending under Canaanite influence.
RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH
(VAT 1661 - WA 53 - W 93 - S 44 - EA 90)

Obverse

(1) [a-na] LUGAL EN-ia [dUTU-ia]
[q]-í-        [ma]
[u]m-ra-[dIM][R-ka] a-na G!R_EU-'EM-ia dUTU-[ia IMIN u IMIN]

(5) am-qú-ut li-ma-ad [i-nu-ma]
KALAG GA nu-kúr-tum UGU-ia ū-qó]
ka-"li URU_EU-ia u[Gub-la]
i-na e-de-ni-še ir-"ti-[a-šat]
a-na in-ši in-na URU_EU[ga-ta]

(10) i-ba-ba-ti ū aš-ta-[pár]
[a-n]a [ka]-tam mi-lik-mi a-na UR[U-ka]
[ū-u]l yi-il-qé-ši [A-ši-ir-ta]
[ū l]a ti-š-me a-na ia-š(i ū]
[iš-t]u [UR]Bat-ru-na in-t[a-pár]

(15) [uš]-ši-ra-mi L[U]E] ti-[š]-qú]
[URU a-[n]a ka-tam a-wa-t[u-ia]
[ū]-u[l] tu-š-mu-na ū
[u]-u[l]t]u-ul-qú-na a-nu-[m]
[yi-il-q]ē URU_EU-ia ya-ni-tam a-nu-[m]

(20) [i-n]a KUR Mi-ta-ša i-ba-aš-ši
[UR.ZlJR ū-ut ū pa-nu-su i-[n]a]
[URGU]-la ū mi-na i-pu-su-⟨na⟩
[a-na-k]u i-na i-de-ni-ia at-ta
[qa]-la-ta a-na UR[U]Mg\textsuperscript{š} ka i-nu-ma

(25) [ti-il]-ti-qú-Su-nu LÚ GAZ\textsuperscript{š}
[ ] ù a-na ka-ta na-ad-[a]-t[ī]
[pa-ni-i]a Sa-ni-tam ka-li Lú\textsuperscript{š}
[ha-sa-nu-ti] Mal-nu a-na mR-A-[Mi-ir-ta]

(edge)

(30)

Reverse

[ ŪR\textsuperscript{š}] Su-mu-ra [ ]

[ ] -k[a] V(Q)\textsuperscript{hi} [ ]

[ ] -t]a-Su [i]\textsuperscript{š}-t[u] [ ]

(35) [ ] a-na [i]a-š[i ]

[ g]a-am-r[u DUMU Ms\textsuperscript{š} nu M\textsuperscript{š} DUMU Mi\textsuperscript{š}] nu

[GIS\textsuperscript{š}] E\textsuperscript{š} EMB\textsuperscript{š} i-na na-[d]a-[ni]
[i-na] KUR\textsuperscript{š}a-ri-mu-t[a] i-[n]a

{[i-n]a} ba-la-[a]t Z[I-nu] k[i-m]a

(40) [MUŠEN S]a i-na SAG\textsuperscript{ši} [u] h[u]-h[a-r]i

[Sa-a]k-[u]a-[a]t k[i-S]u-[m]a [a-na-ku i-na]

[mu-t]a ma-ši-il aš-[S]um ba-li

[1]-re-S[i] Sa-ni-tam yi-[i]\textsuperscript{š}(!)-mē

(45) [LUGAL a-w]a-t[e] î[R]-\textsuperscript{š}û ù uš-ši-ru
ù [a-n]a-s[a-r]a URU [a-n]a ka-[t]am
[u]Y-Sî-ra la-a-[m]i i-ri-ê[i]

(50) ù Sum-[m]a la-a tu-wa-Sî-[ru]
pal-ê-a-ti ZI-ia [ü]

(55) [h]ar-Su Bu-nu ut-ta-[Sî-ru]
[h]a-[mi-tam at]-ta EN GAL ü
[u]-ul ta-qa-[l a-na ÊR-ka]
[u]Y-Sî-ra [m]a-sa-[r-ta ü]

(60) [u]Y-Sî-ra ERÎN[MES] D[i-tá-ti]
ù ti-[i]-qê KU[R][A-mur-ri]

(left edge) [u]r-ra mu-[a
ù] am-ma-[N]a-ê[im-HI.A-ia ü a-na ka-tam]
[a]-ad-na-ti [pa-ni-ia]
(1) [ana] Ṣaḥbi bēliya [Ṣammiya qa]b[ma u]mmma Ḳīb-Baddi
a[rdikama] ana ṣepē bēliya Ṣammi[ya Ṣib Rita(y) u Ṣib Rit(a)]n] (5)
amqut limad [inūma] dannat nukurtum muḥhi[ya ilq]e kali ālāniya
[Gubla] ina ṣēdēniṣe irtih[hat] ana yāṣi ina Ṣi[gata] (10)
iba(y)ṣati ū aṣṭa[par an]a [kā]tam milikmi ana al[ika u]l
yilqēṣi ʾAbdi-[ʾAyirta ū l]ā tiṣme ana yāṣi[ ū ist]u ʿAbtūna
ist[apar (15)] u]yīrā(m)mi amilūtī ti[laqū ā]la a[n]a kātam
Yannītam anū[m]a (20) [in]a Mita(n)na iba[ṣi] [kalb]u ʿūt ū panūṣu
i[n]a [Gu]bla ū mīna i[p]puṣū[na] [anāk]u ina ṣidēniya attā
[qā]lāta ina āl[a]nika inūma (25) [til]tiqūṣunu ʾApīrū [ ]
ū ana kāta nad[n]āt[1] panīja ʿYannītam kali amilūt[i ḥazānūṭi]
Yalmū ana ʾAbdi-ʾA[ṣirta ] rā[bisā
(30) ] Sumura [ ]

[ ]k[a] mu[k]hi [ ]

(t)ṣayu [i]ṣt[u

(35) ] ana [y]āṣ[i

g]amr[ū mārūnu mārātu]nu [iss]ū bītāṭi ina na[d]ā[ni
[i(r)]rēṣ[i] ʿYannītam yi[Y]me (45) [Marru aw]ṣat[e] a[rd]i[yu] ū
ussirū [ṣrba me(ʿat) amilūṭi] ū ṣalāṣ̱e t[ap]āl [s][s][i ū
[an]a(s)[sar]a ala [an]a kā[t]am ū [mārū Ṣipr[i] Ṣ[a u]yīrā
lā[m]i i(r)riṣ[i] (50) ū Sum[m]a lā tuwa(y)ṣ[i ru amī]lūtī
(1) [To] the king, my lord, [my sun-god, s]pea[k: T]hus Rib-Haddi, [thy] se[rvant]. At the feet of my lord, [my] sun-god, [seven (times) and seven (times)] (5) I have fallen. Be informed [that] the hostility against [me] is severe; [he has taken] all my cities. [Byblos] alone rem[ains] mine. When I was (10) in Shi[gata], I wr[o]te to [th]ee, "Take care of [thy] cit[y, le]st "Abdi-[Ashirta] take it"; [but] thou didst [no]t hearken to [m.e. Moreover, fro]m Batrun I wr[ote, (15) "S]end me troops; let them [take the c]ity f[or thee]; (but) [my] word[s] were [n]o[t] heeded [n]o[r ac]cepted. Alrea[d]y [he has tak]en my cities.

Further, alrea[d]y (20) he is [i]n Mitanni. [A do]g is he, that his face should be (set) ag[a]in]st [By]blos! Moreover, what can I do by myself? As for thee, thou [art s]i[l]ent with reference to thy ci[t]ies, so that (25) the "Apiru [have ta]ken them [. Nevertheless, to thee do [I] se[t m]y [face]!

Further, all the [mayors] are on friendly terms with "Abdi-[A]shirta. [the com[m]issioner

(30]

] Simyra [ ] thy

] ag[a]in]st [ ] him

[f]ro[m

(35) ] to m[e

. Gone a[re our sons], our [daughters], (our) household [furnishing]s, by being s[o]l[d into] Yarimmut[a]
in [exchange] for the provisions of [our] li[ve(s)]. L[ike]
(40) [a bird th]at [li]es in a s[n]a[r]e, s[o am I in Byb]los.
of [its] being without [a p]lowm[an].

Further, let [the king] (45) he[e]d [the wo]rd[s of] [his]
se[rva]nt and send [four hundred troo]ps and thirty t[ea]ms of
[h]o[rs]es so that [I may g]ua[r]d the city [fo]r th[e]e.
 Moreover, the [me]s[enger]s th[at he s]ent me I do not
desir[e]; (50) but i[f] thou dost not sen[d] garrison [tr]oops,
then will [the ci]ty [not] be [a]fra[i]d and will I [not] fear
for my life? [Yea], as for the me[ss]engers, n[one (55) were]
re[quested]; let them be sen[t back].

[Further, th]ou art [the great] l[ord; therefore] do not
remain sile[nt toward thy serva]nt! S]end me a [g]arri[son, or
the CApi]ru will se[i]ze the city. (60) S]end me an a[archer]
host, [that it may ta]ke [Amurr]u. D]ay (and) nigh[t

. Moreover], I ha[ve been plun]der[ed as far
as my grain is concerned; therefore to thee] do I [s]et [my face]!

* * *
Ll. 1-3: Knudtzon's restorations here are all but certain; cf. EA 104:1-3; 132:1-3 (cf. also 85:1-2; 118:1-3).

L. 4. [IMIN u IMIN]: There is scarcely room for Knudtzon's [7-Mu 7-a-an]; for my restoration cf. especially EA 126:3 (note also 94:3; 129:3).

L. 5. limad [i-nu-ma]: For Knudtzon's restoration cf. my note on EA 70:11-12 supra.

L. 6: [il-qé] is to be preferred to Knudtzon's [la-ku] in view of EA 91:19-22 (Moran had already come to the same conclusion; cf. SSDP, p. 160). il-ti-qé (cf. EA 78:8-12; 81:7-10) is somewhat too long for the available space, while la-qa (cf. 124:7-10), the Canaanized third person masculine singular perfect form, was used (with the single exception of 89:64) only in Rib-Haddi's later correspondence (cf. EA, p. 1452, for details). The subject here is Abdi-Ashirta (cf. 1. 12).

L. 8. ir-ti-[ha-at]: For Knudtzon's restoration cf. EA 91:20-22; 124:9-10. Despite the -at sufformative (as though a Canaanite perfect were intended), context demands that we understand this form as a defectively written present (cf. the note on irti(h)hu in 74:22 supra). Such conflate preterit-present forms are not uncommon in Rib-Haddi; cf. i-ba-Ma-ti in 1. 10 of the present letter, and note especially 102:10: ta-Ma-pár-ta. In stating that the Hebrew transcription of ir-ti-ha-at would be hryht, Dhorme (RB, NS Volume 11 [1914], p. 47) seems to understand the form as a Hiph{t}i perfect with an infixed t-morpheme, since he agrees that the root is *ryh. Such a form would, of course, be unique and therefore scarcely deserves further consideration.

Ll. 9-11. ina ši[gata] iba(š[)bati u ašta[par an]a [kâ]tam: "When I was in Shi[gata], I wrote to [th]ee." For the type of construction involved here as well as for similar constructions cf. GKC 2, SS 141 e; 142 d; 156.
L. 11. milikmi ana UR[U-ka]: Knudtzon’s restoration is quite plausible; cf. EA 126:61.

L. 14. is-t[a-pár]: Knudtzon adds [a-na ka-t]ú, but Schroeder’s autograph seems to exclude the possibility of such an extensive addition. The omission of ana plus the addressee after šaparu is relatively common in Rib-Haddi, however (cf. EA 83:21-22; 91:27-29; 119:8-9; 123:29-30; 126:53; 129:35; 138:122).

Ll. 15-16. [u]šira(m)mi amīlūti ti-[il-qú a]la a[n]a katam: Following a jussive (precative) or imperative we expect the jussive form tilqû (cf. EA 84:31-32; 132:53-54; 137:79-80, 91-93), not the indicative form tilqûna (contra Knudtzon).

L. 17: As Albright and Moran have already noted (cf. JCS 4, p. 165), there is no room for Knudtzon’s conjectured [la-k]a at the end of the line.

L. 19: In view of the available space as well as of yi-[il-qé-ši] (l. 12), [yi-il-qé]š is far more plausible at the beginning of our line than is Knudtzon’s [la]-k[u].

L. 21. [kalb]u šu-ut: Moran’s brilliant restoration (cf. SSDB, p. 160) is doubtless correct; cf. EA 84:35 (to which Moran refers) and my note on 84:35-36 supra.


Ll. 22-23. mina i-pu-šu-[na] [anak]u ina İđiniya: WA 53, W 93, and S 44 all read simply i-pu-šu at the end of l. 22. Knudtzon reads correctly i-pu-šu-na (cf. the note on EA 72:10-11 supra), although he failed to indicate that the NA-sign is an
emendation and was probably omitted as a result of vertical haplography.

L. 25. [ti-il]-ti-qu-su-nu: In view of ti-[il-qi] (l. 15), the ti-preformative is more plausible here than Knudtzon's [ji-]. As to the suffix, we expect -Minati instead of -Hunu since UR[U]MEŠ in l. 24 is feminine; cf., however, my note on EA 78:11-13 supra, and observe further the not uncommon use of masculine plural suffixes in reference to feminine plural substantives in Hebrew (cf. GKC², § 135 o, for details).

L. 26-27. [u ana ka-ta nad[n]at[i pa-ni-i]a: Knudtzon's restoration of [a-mur] before results in a reading that is unparalleled in Rib-Haddi and therefore unjustified.

The spelling ka-ta validates our reading ka-tam elsewhere (contra Knudtzon's ka-tū; cf. further my note on ana ka-tam in EA 73:37 supra).

Knudtzon himself corrected his impossible reading [pa-nu-ia] at the beginning of l. 27 (cf. EA, p. 1592, and the parallels there cited).

L. 27-28. kali LŪME₃ ha-za-nu-ti] Halmū ana cAbdi-
'A[Birta]: Knudtzon restores [bēl alāni] at the beginning of l. 28, obviously on the basis of EA 102:22-23. Note, however, that the term bēl ālī is extremely rare in Amarna, being found again only in 138:49. haza-nu, on the other hand, is the normal word for "mayor" in Rib-Haddi; moreover, an excellent parallel to the phrase under discussion is to be found in 126:10-11: gabbi LŪME₃ ha-za-nu-tum Sal-mu-šu. At any rate, haza-nu and bēl ālī are virtual synonyms (cf. further von Soden, AHw, p. 119).

That hala-nu ana/itti means "to be on friendly terms with" is apparent from the fact that in EA 102:20-23; 114:14-15; 126:9-11 it is contrasted with the idea of hostility. (The suffixes appended to Halmū in 114:14 and 126:11 are dative [Halmūnu(nu) = Halmū ana] Halmūnu(nu)].) The root *šlm is often used in Biblical
Hebrew, in connection with ʼe/l/lט or ʼim/ʼet, in exactly the same sense (cf. BDB, pp. 1023-1024, for details). Cf. also the Phoenician Azitawadd inscription, ll. 11-12: wšt ʼnk ḫlm ʼt kl mlk.

In view of the above evidence, and since ʼAlamu ana/itti apparently is not attested in standard Akkadian, it would seem safe to pronounce the phrase a Canaanism.

L. 40. ḫ[u]-h[a-r]i: For the omission of the expected gloss, ki-lu-bi, cf. EA 78:14.

Ll. 44-45. vi-i[ irrig](-mē [LUGAL a-w]a-[t[e] 1[R]-[Bu] ʼu wš-Mi-ru: My restorations here are virtually certain; cf. EA 78:17-18; 79:13-15; 85:75; 89:53-54; 103:32-34; 108:65-67; 122:44-47; 136:6-7; 137:38, and note also the traces in Schroeder's revised autograph. Knudtzon misread the 1R-sign in the middle of l. 45 as lā. As for his reading j[a-]a[y-]m at the end of l. 44, we observe that (1) the WA-sign is rarely (if ever) read YA in Rib-Haddi, and (2) a ya-preformative on the third person masculine singular perfect form of ʼe/amu never appears in Canaanite in general nor in Amarna in particular. In cuneiform literature a form such as ya[sm(u) may be expected only in Amorite as, e.g., in the proper name Yasma-Hadad (for which cf. Albright, BASOR 78, p. 25, n. 13).

With the scribal omission of the suffix -Bu after 1[R] in l. 45 cf. EA 89:54.

EA 122:44-47, when compared with 103:32-34; 108:65-67 and with the passage under discussion, shows that yišme . . . awate ardīšu ʼu may be followed either by yuwa(N)Mi¬r- or by uššir-. In the latter case the verb is best understood as a perfect following waw converative (cf. the note on EA 79:13-14 supra), although it should be emphasized that an analysis of it as an imperative is not implausible from a grammatical standpoint (for parallels in Biblical Hebrew cf. GKC², § 110 i). The spelling uš-Mi-ru in
the present passage is best normalized as ummirū and considered to be a pluralis majestatis (for which cf. the note on ti(d)dinū in EA 71:5 supra).

L. 47. [a-n]a-s[a-r]a: Knudtzon reads the final sign of this word as -ru; such a reading, however, results in a form which is impossible syntactically, since we expect here a jussive/volitive. Realizing this, Moran (SSDB, p. 160) decided in favor of [ti]-na-sa-ru on the basis of EA 85:19-22; 131:12-14. Plausible though this suggestion might be, Schroeder's autograph shows clearly [RJA as the final syllable of the form in question, and the top of the A-sign is likewise clearly visible at the beginning of the word, making my reading certain. For a good parallel cf. EA 117:71-74.

LL. 48-49. [L]U[k]-[M]U [Mip[i] #a u]Mira la[m]i i-ri-S[i]: "The [me]s[s]enge[r]s th[at he s]ent me I do not desir[e]." The general sense of this passage was perceived already by Knudtzon, although he erred somewhat in the details (EA, p. 1592). The stem ummir- is never clearly passive in Rib-Haddi, and [u]s-si-ra cannot be read as a plural here; it therefore seems best to understand the subject of the latter as being the pharaoh, the scribe having employed the courteous form of expression so common in these letters.

We expect e/irriš as the first person singular present form of erešu at the end of l. 49; the spelling i-ri-[S[i] was doubtless influenced by [i]-re-[S[i] at the beginning of l. 44 (even though the verbs involved are, of course, in no way related to one another).

cf. EA 103:51-53. His [ub]-ti-[i]k-[k]i in l. 52 of the present passage, however, is an impossible makeshift. bakû is not attested in the II conjugation in Akkadian (cf. von Soden, AHw, p. 97); moreover, the II₂ preterit form would be "ubtakkî rather than "ubtikkî. My reading of the same four signs, [u]l ti-[p]al-[i]h, represents a radical departure from that of Knudtzon (Schroeder's autograph displays traces which support either reading) but has the advantage of making good sense in context. Whereas the LH-sign can also be read LAH (a reading that would correctly represent the present thematic vowel of palâhu), ti[p]all[i]h, a conflate Akkado-Canaanite form, displays a vocalic pattern that is paralleled elsewhere in Rib-Haddi (cf. EA 105:22: ti-pa-li-hu-na). Following ti[p]all[i]h we note traces of what appears to be an URU-sign, then a reasonably clear ū (neither of which were seen by Knudtzon). In the lacuna at the end of the line there is room for at least one additional sign; [ul] is the most likely possibility if the remainder of my restoration is correct. ti[p]all[i]h receives added support from the phrase in l. 53: palâti napištaya (for which cf. EA 81:25).

ll. 53-55. [û L]ûMEŠ D[UM]U Sìpri g[âb-bu la-a h]ar-û Mu Nunu ut-ta-[Mi-ru]: "[Yea], as for the me[ss]engers, n[one were re]quested; let them be sen[t back]." Knudtzon's transliteration does not include an attempt to interpret these lines, though it does make a commendable start in restoring the signs in them. Instead of his [g]âb[-bi] at the end of l. 54, however, my reading, g[âb-bu la-a], is more plausible in context; moreover, I have been able to complete Knudtzon's ut[-t]a(-) at the end of l. 55 (see commentary below).

The stimulus to my restoration and interpretation of our passage was derived from ll. 48-49 above; I consider it to be a repetition of the thought contained in the latter, hence my translation of [û] as "[Yea]" (for wอะ- meaning "yea" occasionally in Biblical Hebrew cf. GKC², § 154 a, n. 1).
A form of the Canaanite verb "harāšu, "to plow," is used twice in Amarna to gloss a form of the well-known Akkadian equivalent, erešu (*hṛt), "to till, cultivate" (cf. CAD 6, p. 96, for citations). In view of the fact that the scribe of the present letter had already confused the latter verb with its homonym (*'rš) meaning "to desire, request" (cf. the note on ll. 48-49 supra), the writing [h]ar-šu is not too surprising here. It is not entirely outside the realm of possibility, of course, that the scribe intended his reader to pronounce *'[j]aršu (cf., e.g., EA 106:40: i-ra-ha-mu-šu for *ira'amušu; 102:27: Lū-šu-ia-bi-[a] for *'(y)yabi[a]); note that the HAM-sign is occasionally read AR (though only logographically).

For the plausibility of my reading utta(š)[Sirū] cf. the note on utta(š)šir in EA 83:10 supra.

ll. 56-57. [š]a-[ni-tam at]-ta E[N GAL u ú]-ul taqā[l a-na īR-ka]: For my restorations cf. especially EA 74:13; 76:43-46. Knudtzon's TA-sign at the beginning of l. 57 is by no means as clear as he indicates it to be, whereas [š]a-[ni-tam] is to be expected here as the particle most often used to introduce a new thought. Moreover, his tentative IS in the middle of the same line is almost certainly the second half of a TA (cf. Schroeder's autograph). As for his addition of [-mi] to taqā[l] in l. 58, he himself later expressed doubts concerning the wisdom of it (cf. EA, p. 1592).

ll. 58-59. [u]šira [m]a-sa-a[r-ta ù L[ID] ME μ [GA] z MEŠ DI.A[B tu URU]: In view of ma-sa-ar-ta in l. 51, Knudtzon's [m]a-sa-[ra-ta] in the present passage is not convincing; the spelling ma-sa-ra-tam in EA 136:31 is unique in Amarna and should therefore not be adduced in support of a similar reading here.

For my restorations in l. 61 cf. EA 94:10-11; 107:29-30; 114:45-46, and especially 36:6-8; 91:37-38. These passages strongly support Knudtzon's restoration at the end of l. 60 although, since t[il-la-ti] is also possible (cf. Schroeder's autograph), I have decided to permit p[í-tä-ti] to remain uncertain.

L. 62. [u]rra muš[a]: The clue to the further restoration of this line is doubtless to be found in EA 86:9, but since the beginning of that line is still illegible we must be content to leave the present passage unrestored.


Ll. 63-64. [u] a-na ka-tam n]a-ad-na-ti [pa-ni-ia]: For my restorations cf. ll. 26-27 above.
RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH
(VAT 931 - WA 56 - W 102 - S 45 - EA 91)

Obverse

(1) [\textsuperscript{m}Ri-it-d IM iq-bi a-na] EN-\textsuperscript{u} a-na GIR\textsuperscript{M.EG}

[\textsuperscript{EN-ia IMIN-\textsuperscript{u} IMIN-a}]a[n a]m-q[ú]-ut [aš-ta-pár a-na]

[ka-tam a]-na m[i-n]\textsuperscript{i} aš-ba-ta

[ú] qa-la-ta ù yi-il-q[ú]

(5) \textsuperscript{[URU}\textsuperscript{M.EG}}-\textsuperscript{1]}a LÚ\textsuperscript{GAZ-M.EG}.\textsuperscript{1} UR.ZÍR

[i-nu-ma]\a URU Su-mu-ra yi-il-qá

[ú aš-t]a-pár a-na ka-tam a-na mi-ní

[qa-la-t]\a ù t[u]-ul-qé

[\textsuperscript{URU-M.EG}] ar-ha() i-nu-ma yi-d[a]-gal

(10) [ú] ia-nu Ș[a] yi-iq-bi mi-am-ma

[a-na Ma-a]-Su UGU \textsuperscript{URU} Su-mu-ra

[ú] yi-d[a]-ni-in\textsuperscript{4} SAG\textsuperscript{bu} -Su

[ú] yu-ba-ú la-qá UGU Gub-la

[ú a]m-ma-qú-ut UGU-ia KIRI\textsuperscript{M.EG}-ia

(15) [ú A.ŞÅ]\textsuperscript{M.EG} ia in\textsuperscript{4}-na-ka-\textsuperscript{a}

[ú Ș̃\textsuperscript{im}]-HI.A ia am-ma-Ma-a' ù

[ú-ul t]a-di-in\textsuperscript{4} li-im KU.BABBAR\textsuperscript{M.EG}

[ú] DI\textsuperscript{4} me GUSKIN\textsuperscript{M.EG} ù ip-ta-tú-ur

[iṣ-t]u mu-ḥi-ia ù il-qé

(20) [ka]-li \textsuperscript{URU-M.EG}-ia URU Gub-la

[i]-na i-de-ni-ṣi ir-ti-ḥa-a[t]

[a]-na ia-ṣi ù yu-ba-ú
la-qa-ti a-ka-um i-š-mé pu-ḫi-ir-mi
[k]-a-li LUGAL.GAZ

(edge)(25) [a]-na ma-qa-ti UGU-[i]a mi-[n]a
[i]-pu-šu-na a-na-ku a-na i-d[e]-ni-[i]a

Reverse
a-nu-um k[i]-a-[m]a aš-pu-ru a-na
ERÍN.ME₄ pí-tá-ti ǔ
a-na til-la-ti ǔ ú-ul t[u]-

(30) a-wa-tu-ia

[u]-nu-[n]a
[a]-n[i]-tam mi-[nu yi]-n[a-sa-r]U KUR.ME₄-ka
[i-nu-um] i-[mu-ta a-n]a-ku Ma-ni-tam
[Num-m]a ia-nu
[ERÍN.ME₄ pí-tá-ta] ǔ til-la-ta

(35) [a]-na URU.Gub-la
[i]-[p]-šu [ ]
[u]-ši-[r]a ERÍN.ME₄-[�]
[pí-tá-ti ǔ t]i-il-qé KUR.MU-[r-r]i
[Pa-nu ka-[l]i

(40) [a-na ia-MI] ja
[ERÍN.ME₄ pí-tá-ti
[LuGAL ru ENI
[ ] ǔ
[ERÍN.ME₄ pí-t[i]-ti

(45) [ti]-il-qé
[ ] ǔ
-353-

[ ] a-di
[ ] ME5

(remainder broken away)

(1) [Rib-Haddi has said to] his lord: [At the feet of my lord seven times, seven times I have] fallen. [I have written to thee: "Why dost thou sit and remain silent so that the Apiru, the dog, take[s] my cities?" [When] he took Simyra, [then I wrote to thee: "Why dost thou remain silent so that Bit-arha is taken?" When he saw that there was nobody who said anything to him concerning Simyra, [then] he became encouraged [and] sought to take Byblos. [Moreover], with respect to my orchards I have been attacked, [and with respect to] my fields I have been cut down, [and] with respect to] my grain I have been plundered. Therefore [wilt thou not] give a thousand pieces of silver [and] one hundred pieces of gold so that he might depart from me? Moreover, he has taken my cities; Byblos alone remain[s] mine and he seeks to take it. [Already I have heard] that he has mustered all the Apiru [to attack me. Wh[a]t am I to do by myself? Already t[h]at I have written for an archer host and for an auxiliary (host), but my words have not been heed[ed].

Further, [if there is no [archer host] or auxiliary, (35) [for Byblos [the ded] [S]en[d] me an [archer host] may take Amu[rr]u [The face of every one (40) [is against me. archer host] the king, my lord [and [archer host] may take [ [m]y [until [ ]

(remainder broken away)

* * *
LL. 1-2: While due to the lack of parallels it is impossible to restore this passage with absolute certainty, Knudtzon's attempt is not at all implausible. Instead of his [7-ta-an] in l. 2, however, I have decided to read [IMIN-a]-a[u]; the former seems somewhat too long for the space available, whereas the latter has the added advantage of conforming more closely to the traces in Schroeder's autograph. The abbreviated form of salutation to the pharaoh, of which these lines are an example, is relatively rare in Rib-Haddi (cf. EA 88:1-4; 92:1-4; 106:1-3; 129:1-3; 137:1-4).

LL. 2-4. [a-ta-pár a-na ka-tam a]-[i-a]i aḫbāta [u] qalāta: Knudtzon's restorations here can scarcely be improved upon, especially in view of ll. 7-3 below (cf. also EA, p. 429, n. 1; EA 71:10-11; 73:6-7; 77:18; 81:20-21; 83:15).

LL. 4-5. u vi-il-q[u] URU⁹ ME⁸ -i]a LŪ⁶ GAZ⁸ ME⁸ kalbu: "... so that the Apiru, the dog, takes[m]y [cities]." The readings and restorations are essentially those of Knudtzon, the only change being that the traces in Schroeder's autograph support [-i]a as the suffix on [URU⁹ ME⁸] (contrast Knudtzon's [-k]a and cf. ll. 19-20).

Bybloan usage dictates that we must understand vi-il-q[u] as a singular form; cf. EA 124:15 (in context), and note especially 71:16-19 (and probably also 75:40-42). LŪ⁶ GAZ⁸ ME⁸ we must therefore consider a singular form, in spite of the ME⁹-sign; indeed, the plural of GAZ is most often written LŪ⁹ GAZ⁹ ME⁹ in Rib-Haddi (cf., e.g., l. 24 of the present letter). Apiru is thus here in apposition to kalbu, both of which are terms of opprobrium referring to Abdi-Ashirta (so already Weber, EA, p. 1181). For a brief and generally satisfactory treatment of the Apiru problem with special reference to Abdi-Ashirta cf. Campbell, Bib. Arch. 23/1, pp. 13-15.
L. 8. [qa-la-t]a: Knudtzon's restoration here is highly plausible; cf. ll. 3-4 above and note also EA 76:33-37; 84:11-16.

Ll. 8-9. 'u tūge [Bit]-ar-ha(!): "... so that [Bit]-arha is taken." The construction is the same as that involved in ll. 3-5 above, a fact unrecognized by Knudtzon. His understanding of the syntax of ll. 7-13 is very poor indeed, for while recognizing the common inūma ... 'u ... construction in ll. 6-7 he fails to see it in ll. 9-12. inūma ... 'u ... "When ... then ..." (cf., e.g., EA 85:62-84; 105:40-41; 117:23-27; 137:20-23; 138:28-30) corresponds to Hebrew k=t ... w=. ... (cf., e.g., Genesis 6:1-2; 12:12; Deuteronomy 31:21; Judges 1:28; 16:16-17; I Samuel 1:12).

After the break at the beginning of l. 9 Schroeder reads -ar-š&t and indicates that the second sign was partially erased. The scribe probably intended to write *-ar-ha; cf. EA 83:29. Knudtzon's k[a] for the second sign does not acknowledge the additional wedges that complete it.

L. 10. mi-am-ma: For this peculiar orthography cf. the note on EA 85:74 supra.

L. 11. [a-na Ma-a]-Mu: My restoration fills the available space more adequately than does Knudtzon's [a-na Ma-§ju. With ll. 10 and 11 we must compare EA 75:27-29 (cf. my note in loc. cit. supra, and cf. already Weber, EA, p. 1182).

L. 12. yi-[d[a]-ni-in, libbaMu: "He became en[co]uraged" (literally, "His heart became str[en]gthened"). Knudtzon's ju-[8]ab-ni-en is clearly a makeshift; no verb *b/panānu is known in Akkadian. My reading (the traces favor -d[a]- over -d[an]-) understands the phrase as a Canaanism paralleled in Biblical Hebrew by hāṣaq lāb (cf. Exodus 7:13, 22; 8:15; 9:35).

Ll. 14-16. [û a]m-ma-q[ut muhhiya KI]RIL ∨-ia [û A,Na] ∨-ia in, na-ka-aš [û Hā]-HIA-ia am-ma-§a-a': "[Moreover], with respect to my orchards [I h]ave been attacked, [and with
respect to] my [field]s I have been cut down, [and with respect to] my [grain] I have been plundered." Previous interpreters have had little success with this passage because they have failed to see the parallelism involved (for a somewhat similar construction cf. I Samuel 8:11 ff.) and have furthermore been hampered in their attempts by Knudtzon's misreading of the second verb.

Since maqātu muhhi occurs frequently in Rib-Haddi with the meaning "to attack" (cf. my note on EA 73:10 supra), Knudtzon's hesitancy to attempt a translation of [am]maqut muhhiya here is hard to understand. Admittedly, the phrase is a grammatical monstrosity, but the scribe deserves our admiration for his ingenuity in getting his point across. Indeed, how else could he have constructed the IV₁ first person singular form of maqātu muhhi? We are inevitably reminded of the equally clever (if also equally barbarous) ammahasni in EA 82:38 (cf. the note on 81:24 for commentary).

That KIRI₆ was read kīru by the Canaanite scribes of the Amarna Age is clear from PRU III, 16:150:15: KIRI₆ kī-ru-ū. Knudtzon's reading, en-na(!)-ka-rum, in l. 15 of our text has led to untold mischief, not the least of which is the perpetuation of "[LU]₂₅₄-is at the beginning of the line. To translate with Knudtzon "meine Le[ut]e sind feindlich geworden" makes very little sense in context, disregards entirely the fact that the verb is a IV₁-form, and fails to note that the An₄-sing is seldom read Rum or Ru in Rib-Haddi. It seems much more plausible to read in₄-na-ka-aš from a verb nakašu, "to cut off/down"; if it be objected that proper Akkadian knows only nakašu (with sameh), we need only observe the following passage from an Amarna letter published by Thureau-Dangin in RA 19, p. 105 (AO 7095:20-21): i-na-ak-ki-la(Š)A(M)DU a-iš-bić-eša LUGAL (cf. also the Late Hebrew root nkš used as a technical term with reference to weeding [wild plants; see Ben Ishuda, Thesaurus,
Volume 7, pp. 3673 f.). Whereas we expect "innakim" instead of
innakam (cf. von Soden, GAG, Paradigm 22), we would also expect
"innaki(m)" if Knudtzon's reading were correct, since nakaru and
nakas/yu exhibit the same thematic pattern in the I₁ conjugation;
inna kam is probably best explained as an attempt at vowel harmony.
Having thus disposed of "en-na(!)-ka-rum, we proceed to dispose
also of *[L][H]i-ma by suggesting that eglu (or the like) forms a
far more suitable parallel to kiru and Be'u (note that Schroeder
displays only an illegible trace or two before the MB-sigat the
beginning of l. 15).

am-ma-Hasa' in l. 16 could also be read "am-ma-Hasa'u (cf.
am-ma-Hasahu in EA 85:9); I have apocopated the case ending in
deference to the two preceding verbs. There appears to be room
for an =u-sign before [H][M] at the beginning of the line.

L. 17. [u-ul t]a-di-in: Knudtzon's restoration of [lu-û]
before [t]a(d)in is contrary to Byblian idiom, which rarely if
ever places the particle lu before a second person form. For my
restoration and interpretation cf. the note on EA 77:15-16 supra.

Ll. 18-19. 'iptatur [išt]u mu(h)hiya: "... so that he
might depart [fr]om me." Unless we employ a cumbersome
circumlocution it is difficult to express Rib-Haddi's phrase in
English translation. išt[u muhi (which answers to Hebrew me'al;
cf. BDB, pp. 753-759, § b., for citations roughly paralleling
the passage under discussion) means literally "from upon, from
over," and is used here to dramatize Rib-Haddi's desire to be
entirely free from the oppressive influence of 'Abd-Ashtira's
presence near Byblos (so also similarly EA 113:34-35).

The I₁ paradigm of pasaru follows the same pattern as that
of parasu; we therefore expect "iptatar instead of iptatur (cf.
von Soden, GAG, §§ 87 c, h). It seems that the Canaanite scribe,
being unsure of the manner of constructing the I₂ of pasaru,
simply inserted the -(ta-) infix into the I₁ preterit form.
L. 22: After yu-ba-ú at the end of this line the scribe partially obliterated a sign or two, apparently ba-ú (cf. Knudtzon, EA, p. 430, n. d.).

Ll. 31-32. mi-[nu yi]-n[a-sa-r]u mātāka [i-nu-aa] i-[mu-ta a-n]a-ku: My highly tentative restoration is based on EA 130:50-52.

Ll. 33-34. [Sam-n]a yānu [EMIN.MES pī-tā-ta] û til-la-ta: Knudtzon's restorations here are quite plausible, though pītātu is better cast in the accusative than in the genitive after yānu; cf. û tillata immediately following the lacuna and note my comments on yānum in EA 69:23 supra. Cf. further especially 93:26; 129:30,38,49,94-95.

Ll. 35-48: With the exception of ll. 37-38 (with which cf. my note on EA 90:60-61 supra), Knudtzon's restorations in the remainder of this tablet are sheer guesswork and therefore virtually worthless; the section from l. 35 and following is too broken for anything approaching plausible restoration. I would suggest only that we read yānu ka[ll]i [ana yāšī] in ll. 39-40 on the basis of EA 117:12: pa-nu gāb-bi a-na ia-šī; the latter has been interpreted by Moran (SSDB, p. 171) as meaning "... the face of everyone is against me."
RIB-HADDI TO THE PHARAOH
(VAT 868 - WA 50 - W 58 - S 46 - EA 92)

Obverse

(1) [r^m]R[i-i]d-[A]d-di iq-bi
   a-na G[i[R^m]E] LUGAL BE-ia d_U[TU-ia
   [IM]IN-Su IMIN-ta-a-an am-qu-ut
(5) d_NIN S[a] URU^_gub^b-[la t]i-d[ia]
   [S[a]-ni]-tam d_[R^m]-A[R^m]-ra-ti L[U]^R.Z[IR]
   [ ] a [ ] LUGAL URU-[S]u [a-na]
   S[a]-[S]u Sum-ma S[a]-al U[G]U
(10) a-na [S^a]G^b-bi-Si-na a-Sa-ba [l]a a-Si-i[b] u i-na-an-na
    K^U^k-it-tum-MES^a ma-Si-ik-tum [i]t-ti-[ia i]n^4-ne-pu-uM
    u a-S-tap-pár D[U]^b^i-[ia u L[Ú KIN-ia]
    a-na ma-har LUGAL BE-ia u L[U]GAL
    a-wa-te MES^a DUB^b^i-[ia u L[Ú KIN-ia]
(15) la yi-Si-me u mi-na ip-p[u-S]u-[na]
    u a-S-tap-pár LÚ KIN-ia a-na L[U]GAL BE-[ia]
    m_d[A]S-r-ti u iS-[m_e]
    m_[R^R-S]-ra-tum i-nu-ma ka-Si-id
(20) LÚ-[ia iS-tu ma-har LUGAL BE-[ia]
    u i-Si-me u ia-nu-um m[i-i]m-ma
    u i-nu-ma ia-nu-u[m] LÚ^MES^a ti-la-tam S[a] a-[a][a]-[a][t]
a-na ia-a-ši  dù a-nu-ú i-ti-[l-l]u
[i]-na-an-na a-na se-ri-ia
(25) [ù] a[n]-nu-ú UGU-ia i[š-a]l-mi

(edge) [ ]-na  dù an-[nu-ú
[ ]

Reverse

[ ]
[ ] in₄-na [ ù m]i-na-[a]m
(30) a-qa-bi a[n]-k[u] Š[a]-n]i-[t]am SIG₅-mi
i-pí-ib LUGAL BE-ia i-nu-ú
Š[a]-páš L[UGA]L a-[n]a LUGAL URU₆-HI.[A]-K[I]
ù a-na LUGAL URU₆-Si-[d]u-na
ù a-na LUGAL URU₆[u-r]i
(35) [al-l]u-m[i] š[š-t]ap-ru Ṣ[i]-ib-Ad-d[i]
[a]-na ka-tu-nu a-[n]a ti-la-ti
ù l[a al]-ku gāb-bu-[š]u-nu ù an-nu-ú [ ]
ù [ù-u]l í[l]-la-ku ù la [ ]-ru
(40) l[û] DUMU [KI]N-šu-nu a-na Ša-[a]l [ ] nu [ ]
ša-ni-tam mi-[i]a-[m]i šu-ut i-nu-[m]a īl-[š-e]
ka-li LÛMEŠ a-[mur] GUD₅-ES₂ it-ti-[š-u]
mi-na-[a]m id-di[n] a-na Š[a-š]u-nu
ù ES₂ ṢES₂ ni-nu-um ù aš-ta[p-pá]r
(45) a-na Ša-šu-nu a-na [r]e-sî-ia
ù li-[i]t-ri-îš
a-na pa-ni LUGAL BE-ia ù [lu-wa]-yi-[ra]
ERÍN MEŠ KAL.BA[D].KIB MAH[t]a [ù ]
[ù] īR-šu ù ip-[p]u-[ ]
(50) [i]u-[t]u KUR KI LUGAL BE-ia [ ]
[LUGAL B]E-ia i-de Šum-ma la i-le-[ù]
[ ]-uk-š[u Š]um-ma 1[a] ū-w[a-ši-ru]
[LUGAL] BE-ia ERÍN MEŠ [ ]
[ ] ù a-na-ku
(55) [ ] URU BE-ia
(left edge) [ ] MEŠ [ ] ia [ ]
[ ] MEŠ h[a]-za-nu-t[i ]
arad[uù i[p]u[ (50) ḫ[t]u māt Harri bāliya]
[ barru bēl]iya ḫe Summa lā ile' [u
]ukū[u ù]umma l[a] uw[a(§)]Siru barru bēliya sābi []
] u anāku (55) [ uāti
] al bēliya [ ] iā [
] amīlūti h[a]zanūtī ]

(1) R[i]b-[Ha]ddi has said to the k[i]ng, his lord, the
sun-god of the [two] lan[ds]: At the feet of the king, my lord,
my sun-god, [seven]en times, seven times I have fallen. (5) [May]
the Lady o[f] Byb[los] grant p]owe[r] to the k[i]n[g], m[y lor]d,
[m]y s[un-go]d!

[Furt]her, ĈAbdi-[A]shīrta, the d[o],[g,
]. The king [should h]is city [for]
hims[el]f. Behold, investigate co[ncerni]ng [whether] (10) indeed he does [no]t dwel[l] in them! Moreover,
now a disgraceful war [has] been made [ag]ainst [me], and I sent
my t[a]blet and [m]y me[ssenger] into the presence of the king,
my lord, but the k[i]ng does not heed the words of my tablet or
(15) [my] me[ssenger]. Therefore, what am I t[o d]o? Yea, I
sent my messenger to the k[i]ng, [my] lord, [because] of my
cities which ĈAbdi-Ashīrta took; and should ĈAbdi-Ashīrta h[ear]
that my man (20) has arrived from the presence of the king, [m]y
lord, and should he hear that n[ot]hing has happened and that
there is no auxiliary host that has come for[th] to me, then, as
for me, he will com[e u]p [n]ow against me. (25) [Moreover],
b[e]hold, he h[as inqui]red concerning me [ ]; and,
b[e]hold,

. Moreover, w]hat (30) am I to say?
F[ur]ten, the act of the king, my lord, is good, in that the "king" has written to the "king" of Beiru[t] and to the "king" of Sid[on] and to the "king" of T[yr]: (35) "[L]o, Rib-Hadd[i] has written to you for auxiliaries, but none of them [have gone]." Moreover, behold, [ ] against [me], [and] I have sent my [mess]enger, but they do [not] come and they do not send their messenger to invest[igate].

Further, who is he that he should take all the troops? Behold, he has oxen; what has he given to them? Moreover, we are three brothers, and so I wrote to them to help me; nevertheless, may it be agreeable to the king, my lord, that [he send me] a large bivouac force [so that and] his servant. Moreover, [ ]

(50) [f]rom the land of the king, my lord [ ]

- The king], my [lord], should know whether he is unable to [ ]

If [the king], my lord, does not send a(n) [host [ ]

]. Moreover, as for me, (55) [ ]

] the city of my lord [ ]

m[ay]or[s ]

Ll. 3-4: When \textit{WA} 50 was published the signs at the ends of these lines were still clearly visible.

L. 5. \textit{URU} \textit{Gub}[^b-1a]: For the spelling \textit{Gub}[^b-1a/i in Rib-Haddi cf. \textit{EA} 129:33, 42, 43; 131:9, 11, 14; 137:41; 138:10, 36; \*362:12, 26, 32. Knudtzon's \textit{al} \textit{Gub}[^a-]l[u] here is impossible.

L. 7. \textit{dI} \textit{RA}[^y-ra-ti]: The first two signs are clear in Schroeder's revised autograph. If the remainder of the restoration is correct (cf. already Knudtzon), the scribe has accidentally transposed the first two signs of the name (cf. l. 18: \textit{mu-ra-ti}. Knudtzon's \textit{Gub}[^b-b]a at the end of the line does not appear in Schroeder's copy; Schroeder makes no attempt to reproduce whatever traces might have appeared there.

Ll. 8-9. \textit{LUGAL URU-[S]} \textit{Ma-[a-na]} \textit{Ma-[S]}: The \textit{SU} sign following \textit{URU} here doubtless represents the third person masculine singular suffix rather than the first syllable of a place-name as all previous interpreters have understood it. Lack of clear parallels makes my restoration of \textit{ana} \textit{Ma[Su]} highly tentative.


Since the form \textit{Ma-al} is always an imperative elsewhere in Rib-Haddi (cf. \textit{EA}, p. 1507, for details), it seems best to understand it as such here (contra Knudtzon who, however, later expressed doubts with respect to his rendering "gefragt hat"; cf. \textit{EA}, p. 1592); the Canaanite perfect form, \textit{Ma-al}, probably appears in \textit{EA} 113:4, although the broken context there forces us to be cautious. In the present passage, then, \textit{Summa} can only be rendered as "Behold" (for which cf. the note on \textit{EA} 74:13 supra). For my restoration of \textit{m[uhh]i} after \textit{Ma-al} cf. \textit{EA} 59:41-42.
Due to the poor state of preservation of our text the antecedent of -Mina in l. 10 is unknown; possibly we should restore *URU.KI.HI.A.ka after m[uuh]i.

L. 10. a-Si-i[b] a: This reading, doubtless correct, is that of Moran (SSDB, p. 161).


nukurta ṭepēṣu, "to wage war," is relatively common in Amarna Canaanite and in Hittite Akkadian (cf. CAD 4, p. 215, for representative citations); with the present passage cf. especially EA 100:26-28. With nukurta itti X ṭepēṣu, "to make war against X," we must compare Hebrew casāh milhāna ṭēt/cim (cf. BDB, p. 536, for details; see further Feld, JAOS 79 [1959], p. 172 with n. 54).

Moran's comparison of Idri-mi:4 is certainly apropos. It reads: i-na Ha-la-ap [ ] maṣṣi-ik-tu it-tap-ṣi; in view of the present passage it may be that we should understand the verbal form as an incorrectly constructed IV₂ preterit of ṭepēṣu (rather than from bāhū, as it is usually considered). The adjective *maṣṣiku is derived from *masāku (var. *maṣāku), attested almost exclusively as mussku and sumsku, "to treat badly" (cf. Landsberger, ZDMG 69, pp. 515-516; JCS 8, p. 32, n. 10); cf. especially Feld's commentary on la masku (a phrase found in iv:17 of an Old Babylonian love poem) in JCS 15 (in print).

L. 12. L[ū] KIN-i[a]: This restoration fits the available space better than Knudtzon's am elu mar Yipri-i[a]; cf. also l. 16.

L. 18. *im-[me]: although this form is unattested for the third person masculine singular in Rib-Haddi, Knudtzon is probably right in so restoring here; the context favors his restoration, as does also *il-qi in the preceding line.

L. 21. y≠num m[i]mma: While it might be somewhat rash to suggest that mimma is cognate to Hebrew *em*°\textsuperscript{u}ma", it can scarcely be doubted that *∞n m"\textsuperscript{u}ma* (1 Kings 18:43) is the Hebrew semantic equivalent of yanu(m) mimma.

L. 22. The verb (asā[t]) shows that *ib\textsuperscript{EN}Esp* is the virtual equivalent of *ER\textsuperscript{EN}Esp* here.

L. 23. a-na yāši: Schroeder reads u instead of a-na here. Since, however, all other major sources, both primary and secondary, display a-na, and since yāši in our context can be preceded only by a preposition, we must consider Schroeder's u as vertical dittography on his part.

L. 23-24. ū a-nu-u i-ti-[l-l]u [i]nanna ana šeriya: "... then, as for me, he will come up [now] against me." Since the spelling a-nu-u is unique in Amarna, it seems best to divorce it from an-nu-u ("behold") and a-nu-(um-)ma ("already"), and to equate it with a-nu, "I" (for which cf. the note on EA 89:38-39 supra); cf. anaku in a similar casus pendens in l. 54 of the present letter.

For my reading i-ti-[l-l]u (contra Knudtzon’s i-ti-[l-l]u) cf. the note on EA 88:13-17 supra.

L. 25. muhhiya i[š-a]l-mi: Cf. l. 9: Mal m[u[h]hi], together with its note; for the form of the verb cf. EA 96:6: li-iš-al. Knudtzon’s restoration, i[p-iša]l-mi, is ruled out on the basis of the fact that the TUM-sign never has the reading *FB/P in Rib-Haddi; Schroeder’s traces support my reading equally well.

L. 26: The traces in Schroeder’s autograph do not corroborate Knudtzon’s restoration of [i-na-a]n-na at the beginning of the line.
L. 29: Knudtzon reads [e]n-n[a]-tu at the beginning of this line; the traces of the third sign are spread apart too far to justify reading them as UD, however.

L. 31. i-nu-ú: Cf. the note on EA 87:15-20 supra.

Ll. 32-34. URU[PÖ]-HI,[A]-K[1] . . . URU[Si-d[u]-na] . . . URU[ur-rj]: Knudtzon's readings and restorations are scarcely to be disputed; cf. especially EA 114:13. The first sign-group is, of course, Beirut, the capital of modern Lebanon; Sumerian \( \text{PŪ} \) = Akkadian \( \text{būrū} \) (Hebrew \( \text{bôr} \)), "cistern" (cf., e.g., AHw, p. 141), and the close similarity of the latter with \( \text{bēšūru} \) (Hebrew \( \text{bēšūr} \)), "well," accounts for the use of \( \text{PŪ} \) (cf. EA, p. 1572, for details) as the Amarna logogram of \( \text{Bērūta} \). It is probably going too far to assert, with von Soden (AHw, p. 141), that \( \text{bōr} \) and \( \text{bēšūr} \) have a direct etymological relationship; the former is mediae \( \text{yōd/waw} \) and denotes primarily a cistern for collecting rain water, while the latter is clearly mediae \( \text{'ālep} \) and refers to a well for tapping subterranean water. For other Amarna attestations of Beirut in context with Sidon and Tyre (or with Sidon alone) cf. EA 101:23-25; 118:27-28, 30-31; 155:67-68; for an Egyptian citation cf. Wilson in ANET\(^2\), p. 477.

Clau ss apud Weber to the contrary notwithstanding (cf. EA, p. 1183), the possibility that Beirut is to be found in the Hebrew Bible is remote indeed (cf., e.g., ISBE, pp. 440-441; WHAB\(^1\), p. 108).

L. 35. [al-l]u-m[i]: This reading, first proposed by Moran (SSDB, p. 161) on the basis of Schroeder's autograph, may be regarded as certain; cf. especially EA 83:40-41; 138:64-65, 90-91.

L. 35. \[h\]ri-ib-Ad-d[i]: If Schroeder has faithfully reproduced the traces of the final syllable here, Knudtzon's \( \text{ri-ib-ad-d[a]} \) is more plausible than my reading; on the other
hand,  \( \overline{w} \) 58 unhesitatingly reads the last syllable as -d[i] (following the traces in \( \overline{w} \)A 50), and l. 1 of the present letter spells the name with final -di.

L. 36. \( [a]na \) kātunu: We expect \( [a]na \) kāšunu, but cf. the note on ana kātan in \( \overline{w} \)A 73:37 supra.

L. 37. \( [a \text{ al}]-ku \) gabbū[\( \overline{M} \)nu]: "\( M[\text{ o}]ne \) of [t]hem [have gone]." For my highly tentative restoration of \( [a \text{ al}]\)\( \overline{K} \)u cf. \( \overline{i}[1]-la-ku \) in l. 39. I include l. 37 of our letter in the direct quotation that begins with l. 35. Knudtzon translates ll. 30-36 as though they constituted a question in which Rib-Haddi doubts the wisdom of the action taken by the pharaoh. That Rib-Haddi at times had such doubts is certain, but that he would express them to the pharaoh in so direct a manner is virtually unthinkable. I therefore translate the whole passage as an affirmation of fact.

L. 39: Knudtzon's restoration, \( \overline{i}[1]-t[a-\text{q}a-ru, \) at the end of this line is impossible; the -\( \overline{\text{t}} \)- > -\( \overline{\text{t}} \)- shift is nowhere attested in Rib-Haddi (contra also Böhl, Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe, p. 23). A form of \( \overline{\text{h}}\overline{\text{a}}\overline{\text{p}}\overline{\text{aru}} \) would fit in well contextually, but since Schroeder displays no traces whatsoever after \( \overline{\text{l}}\overline{\text{a}} \) and since there are no exact parallels to our passage any attempt at restoring the form would be sheer guesswork. The \( \overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{u}} \)-sign at the extreme end of the line was seen also by \( \overline{w} \)A 50 and \( \overline{w} \) 58.

L. 40. ana \( \overline{W} \)-[\( \overline{a} \)]t: For Knudtzon's restoration cf. \( \overline{w} \)A 144:26-30; the traces in Schroeder's autograph support it.

L. 41. \( \overline{m}[i-\text{q}a-\text{m}]i: \) Knudtzon's \( m[i-n]a-[a-m]\)i is impossible here; cf. my note on \( \overline{\text{m}}\overline{\text{in}} \) in \( \overline{w} \)A 71:16 supra.

L. 41. \( \overline{\text{q}e} \): Although Knudtzon declines to restore this word, some form of the verb le/\( \overline{\text{ag}}\overline{\text{u}} \) seems to be indicated; for my choice cf. l. 17.
L. 44. *mašša aḥhā manu*: As Weber has already noted (EA, p. 1184), we expect Rib-Haddi to write "four brothers," since he is referring to the three previously mentioned "kings" plus himself. The reading of the [uh] sign is not absolutely certain, however (cf. Knudtzon, EA, p. 434, n. c).

*ni-ni-um* is a misguided attempt at erudition on the part of the scribe. Even in the earliest stages of Akkadian, the independent personal pronouns are not attested with mimination in the nominative case (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 41 f).

L. 47. [lwa]-ṣi-[ra]: My restoration is to be preferred to Knudtzon’s [lu-wa]-ṣi-r[u]; cf. EA 106:35-36, 41-42. [yu-wa]-ṣi-[ra] is also possible (cf. 74:59-60), but the traces in Schroeder’s autograph offer more support to lu as the first sign.


L. 49. *ra[ti]*: The MAH-sign is clear enough, but its reading is somewhat in doubt. Knudtzon reads the sign immediately following it as [u]; [t] is equally possible, however, in which case it seems best to understand it as a phonetic complement. For my interpretation cf. especially EA 127:39; 131:40 (cf. also 76:35-39; 117:26-27).

L. 51. *summa la i-le-[ú]*: Knudtzon’s restoration at the end of this line is quite plausible; cf. EA 79:39; 114:23, 44.

L. 52. *u-[a]-mi-ru*: Knudtzon restores quite plausibly here, but since *uwa(M)iru* is used elsewhere in Rib-Haddi only as a first person singular form (EA 114:35) I have decided to transcribe it as uncertain in our line (cf. the note on *uwa* in l. 18 supra).

L. 53: *pi-t[a]-ti* is possible after *ER[N]M[HE]U* here on the basis of Schroeder; cf., however, Knudtzon, EA, p. 435, n. e.

L. 57: Knudtzon’s restorations here are merely conjectural.
RIB-HADDI TO AMAN-APPA

( VAT 1663 - WA 55 - W 68 - S 47 - EA 93 )

Obverse

(1) [a-na mA-m]a-an-Ap-pa
[um-ma mR]i-ib-d IM
[a-na G]IR[MEH]ka am-qui-ut
[a-mur a]ta-8a-a8 a-na-ku
(5) [\q\ na]\aq\sa\sa\ap\ti
[UG]\U a-wa-te-ka a-nu-m[a]
[ka]a8-da-ti a-na k[a]-tam
[ki]a-ma ti-8a-ru
[a]-na ia-Hi Hi-me ia-[q]i
(10) qí-ba-mi a-na LUGAL\ri
ù yi-di-na a-na ka-tam
ES\5 me L[RU]ù ni-[d]a-gal
[U]\RUù ni-pu-u\8
(edge) [ ] ú-ul
(15) [t]\i-ib[y-mu-na L]\ú[MEH]
Reverse

[Manka] KIMME a-sa ERINME
pi-ta-ti KALAG.GA
[UGU] IUGAI Ma-ni-tam
u Sum-ma ni-le-ú

(20) [sa]-ba-at URU Bat-ru-n[a]
[a]-na ka-tam Ya-ni-tam
i-ti-zu-bu LÜME
[m]IN-A-ä-ir(!)-ta
[u]ul ki-ma pa-na-nu

(25) [M]um-ma MU KAM an-ni-ta
[i]a-ru ERINME pi-ta-[t]a
[u] GA.KALAG a-di
[da-r]i-ti
(1) [To Amzan-Appa: Thus R]ib-Haddi. [At] thy feet I have fallen. [Behold], I have become embittered (5) [because] of thy words. "By no[w] I shall have [c]ome to t[h]ee\-

(10) Speak to the king, that he may give to thee three hundred troops so that we might [re]connoitre the [c]ity and do [

(15) the co[m]issioners [hear of] the going out of an archer host? He is powerful [ag]ainst the king!

Furthermore, if we can (20) [se]ize Batrun [f]or thee, than the people will desert Abdi-Ashirta. Things are not as before; (25) [i]f in this year [th]ere is no arch[te]r host, [then] he will be powerful for[ever]!
Ll. 4-5. [a-mur a]-ta-ha-am anāku [āna]aqṣapti: Knudtzon's reading, [at]-ta-ha-am, as the first word in l. 4 of this letter has remained unquestioned up till the present time (cf., e.g., Albright and Moran, JCS 2 [1948], p. 246). It is impossible for at least two reasons, however: (1) Unless inordinately huge, an AT-sign could not fill the space available on the tablet; (2) even in Amarna (much less in standard Akkadian) the t-infinitive does not double in 1₂ forms of primae-weak verbs, and a 4₂/₃ form would be out of place here (cf. the simple 1₁ form, taṣṣat, in the parallel passage [EA 82:51-52]). In any event, [ā]taṣṣat is certainly better than [at]taṣṣat (we expect 'ataṣṣat, but cf. my note on 82:51-52 supra for an attempt to explain the a-theme here). [a-mur] nicely fills out the space before the restored [a]-ta-ha-am; any one of a number of other particles may have been on the original tablet, of course.


Ll. 12-13. ū ni[6]a(g)al [ā]la: Moran (SSDB, p. 161) translates: "... that we may care for the city," comparing Hebrew ra'ah with that meaning. While it is true that ra'ah can mean "to care for/about" (cf., e.g., Exodus 4:31; Psalm 80:15, where it is parallel to pāqad), āla/mata dagalu is a well-attested idiom in Amarna meaning "to survey/reconnoitre/inspect a city/land" (cf. my note on EA 74:56-58 supra), and to introduce an additional nuance to the verb here is unnecessary. Moreover, "to care for" in Rib-Haddi is mašāku ana (cf. the note on [Marru lim]lik ana in EA 74:58 supra).

Ll. 14-17. ū-ul [t]i-i-[s-mu-na] r[āblisatu asā sabi pitāti: Knudtzon restores the traces at the beginning of l. 15 as [i]l-b[i ... ]; such a restoration leads nowhere, however. With my proposal cf. EA 73:11-13.
Ll. 18-23.  \[\text{Manītam} \text{ \& \text{Summa}} \text{nīle'} \text{u [sa]}\text{bāt Batrūn[a a]}\\text{na} \kātām \text{\text{Manītam} \text{\& \text{Summa}}} \\text{īti(z)ziū} \text{\& \text{amīlūtu} \text{\& Abdi-'Asir(1)īta}: \text{"Furthermore, if we can [se]ize Batrun [f]or thee, then the people will desert \text{\& \text{Abdi-'Asirta."}}\]
The construction of this sentence would seem to be unique in at least two ways: (1) \text{Manītam} \text{ \& \text{Summa} are both relatively frequent in Rib-Haddi, but \text{Manītam} \text{ \& \text{Summa} (apparently a conflation of the two) is unattested elsewhere; (2) \text{\&} is often used to introduce the apodosis of a conditional sentence in Rib-Haddi, while \text{Manītam is never so used outside the present passage and is probably best explained here as an extension of the scribal confusion apparent in \text{Manītam} \text{ \& \text{Summa (to explain it as due to vertical dittography is less acceptable because of the distance involved). Despite these difficulties, our passage scarcely admits of any other interpretation.}}\]

L. 24. \text{\&lū kīma panānu: Moran (SSDB, p. 161) translates, "Things are not as they were before," doubtless correctly; cf. further EA 76:30-31; 95:23-24. This rendering effectively undermines Weber's tortuous commentary on the line (cf. EA, p. 1184).}
RIB-HADDI (?) TO THE PHARAOH
(C 4756 - WA 76 - W 115 - EA 94)

Verse

(1) [REC][ib]-Ad-[d][i] [i]N(!)-[t][a](!)-pá[r] a-na [LUGAL][L²][i]
[ ] L[R] LUG[AL] be-[1][i][a][a]-ki(!)
a-[n][a] GIR be-[l]-[i]-a IMIN u IMIN a[m]-qut
a-[n][a] mi-ni la-a yi-iš-me be-[l][i]

(5) a-w[a]-te(!) IR-Yu yi-de be-li i-nu-ma
[i][a]-a-nu-mi le-em-na i-n[a a]-w[a]-te [R]-M[u]
[u][l] i[q]-b[u] a-[w][a]-te(!) Ha-ru-[t]e [mi]-im-ma
a-na LUGAL b[e-li]-ia a-wa-te i-d[a-ga]l
ù a-wa-te da-mi-iq LUGAL be-li

(10) qa-be-te a-na LUGAL be-li-ia [u]š-[š]-ra-mi
ERI[N][e][b] pi-ta- ti ù ti-il-[qé mi]R-AS-ra-ta
mi-ia-mi yi-ma-lik i-zi-[za i]-na pa(!)-ni
ERI[N][e][b] pi-ta-at LUGAL be-li-ia
[i][i][q]-bi[i] te-eq-bu-[n][a] L[R][e][b][b] Ha-ru-t[u]

(15) [a-wa-te Ha]-r[u-t]e a-[na LUGAL] be-li-ia
[ ] ERI[N][e][b] pi-ta-ti
[ ]

(18-38) [ ]
Reverse

(39-58) [ ]
[§] a-n[i-tam]

(60) Lū na-a-ru [ ]
Sa-ki-in U[GU]

(65) u al-lu-ú [ ]
Lū, na-a-ri

Su-ut yi-de L[U]GAL u ia-nu L]U Sa-na(!)

(65) u a-mé-e i-[a] H[a-§] u-nu-ma
Su-ut YU TIL, LA.t: -Su-nu

i-nu-ma i-ka-§i-iM a-na-ku
Lū[ME] GAZ(!) nu KUR i-na ia-§i

(70) u li-im-lik L[U]GAL ÍR-§u

li-§i-ra L[U]GAL Lū ra-bi-sa-§u

[1]i-[i]m-lik i-na a§-ri Su-ut

[1]a-[a]-mi y[i]-i§-ta-§i-it

[pa-na-n]u-ma [i-na] ANSE[ME]S yi-§-bi

(75) L[U]GAL [a-na na-d] a-ni a-na ÍR

(left edge) [ki-it-ti-§u i] ia-nu mi-ma a-na [ ]
[ ]}

[ ] Śi i na na §[u] ni a-na [ ]
[ ] lu [ ]
The servant of the king, my lord, has fallen. Why does my lord not heed (5) the words of his servant? My lord should know that there is no evil in the words of his servant. I obey (6) my lord. I consider every word, and my word is good, O king, my lord! (10) I have said to the king, my lord, "Send me an archer host, that it may take Abdi-Ashurta!"

Who would recommend (that) he resist the archer host of the king, my lord? Let him speak! Let the king say (15) to the king, my lord, [ ] an archer host [ ]

(Further, has (been?) placed against). Moreover, lo, [ ]; and lo, the city: my ... is he. The king should know (that there is no one else. (65)

Yea, shall I become like them? As for him, he supplies them with provisions, for he is mighty; as for me, the Capiru are hostile toward me. Yea, he supplies them with provisions! (70)

Therefore, let the king care for his servant! Let him send me his commissioner; let him care for (this) place! Let him not hesitate! The king spoke (concerning) (75)
donkeys [to be given] to [his loyal] servant, [but]

... for [ ] there is nothing for [ ]

...
W 115 (following WA 78) reverses the order of obverse and reverse in this letter; cf., however, Knudtzon, EA, p. 436, n. f; p. 998. I have retained Knudtzon's line count. The poor state of preservation of this tablet makes restoration and interpretation extremely difficult; much of the resulting commentary must therefore remain highly tentative pending a new collation of the tablet.

L. 1. [m]i-[ib]-[d]: The reading of the Ad-sign here is certain (cf. WA 78; Knudtzon, EA, p. 437, n. g), that of the other signs virtually so (cf. Knudtzon, EA, p. 437, nn. g-h). Though this letter is unique in many respects, such factors as the use of ka₄w₃ in l. 67 (the verb is attested elsewhere in Amarna only in EA 138:37) indicate that it was indeed written by Rib-Haddi (so also Weber, EA, pp. 1184-1185).

L. 1. [i]š(!)-[t]a(!)-pe[r]: Knudtzon's [j]u[-u]š-p[a]r is unprecedented and senseless; we must read "in-ta-par" or the like (cf. EA 108:1; 116:1; 119:1; 121:1; 122:1; 123:1). This letter was written by a very careless scribe, as was EA 82 (g.v.).

L. 2. ara[d] ša[rri] be-[li]-[ia a-na]-ku(!): My restorations at the end of this line assume a scribal error, since the last sign of the line is clearly šu. While there is no exact parallel to this phrase in Amarna, similar expressions are common there both in Rib-Haddi (cf., e.g., EA 107:8-9; 109:69) and elsewhere (e.g., 55:4-5; 60:6-7; 147:4-5; 149:4-5); cf. also the frequent warad bēliya anšku in Mari (e.g., ARM 5, 66:21-22) and the Ugaritic expression ḫdbk an wd ḫmk, "I am thy slave, thy eternal (bondman)" (I*AB, 11:12).

L. 5. a-w[a]-te(!) ardimu: Knudtzon, reading a-w[a]-tú ardišu, perpetuates the obvious scribal error here; the correctness of my emendation is manifest, and the frequent attestation of the resulting phrase (cf. l. 6 of the present letter) is too well known to require documentation. In l. 7 the
same mistake was made; we must read a-[w]a-te(!) Na-ru-[t]e. Note that UD is rarely, if ever, read "Tû in Rib-Haddi.

1. We expect lemattu or lemnetu here, since the context requires a substantive. Our Canaanite scribe, however, was doubtless influenced by such considerations as the fact that in Hebrew the semantic equivalent of lemnu, viz. ra°, can be a substantive as well as a masculine adjective. It is interesting to note that ra°, when a substantive, never forms a plural, whereas its feminine counterpart, ra°-c-h, does (cf. lemattu and lemnetu).

11. 7-9. u[1] i[q]b[u] a-[w]a-te(!) Na[r]ü[t]e  t[n]immer ana  Sarri b[e-lî]-ia a-wa-te id[a(a)]g[a]l u a-wa-te da-mi-ig  bar beli: "I [never]er [e]pe[ak] fals[e] w[o]rds to the king, my lord. I co[nsid]er my (every) word, and my word is good, O king, my lord!" With the exception of the first clause (which he renders: "I do not speak any treacherous word . . .") the above translation is essentially that of Moran (SSDB, p. 161). His basic contributions are that (1) he recognized the fact that the passage is cast in the first person singular (the only possibility here contextually), and (2) he reinstated the reading da-mi-ig (following MA 78 and W 115), rejecting Knudtzon's impossible im(!)-mi-ig.

For 1qbu as a first person form cf. EA 197:25.

In my opinion, Na-ru-[t]e here is to be connected with Akkadian sarru, "false, deceptive." The use of N for s (and vice versa) is relatively common in Canaanite Amarna (cf., e.g., innaka± in EA 91:15 together with its note; cf. further Albright, BASOR 89, p. 30, n. 11). The key passage in Rib-Haddi is EA 106:20-25, where "false words" (a-wa-tu Na-ru-tu; cf. the Hebrew expressions dêbar-kazâb [Proverbs 30:8]—with which cf., significantly, EA *362:52-53: a-wa-at ka-az-bu-te—-and dêbar-Sequer [Proverbs 13:5]; note also especially dîbar sær [Deuteronomy 13:6; Isaiah 59:13; Jeremiah 18:16]) on the part of
Rib-Haddi's enemies are contrasted with his portrayal of himself as the "trustworthy/truthful servant" (arad kirti) of the king. awâtu ša(r)âtu is expressed in a slightly different but closely related way in EA 39:14: ul k[â]nâ awâ(!)tišunu (q.v. together with commentary). That the opposite of ãnu is sarru is clear from such Akkadian passages as Enuma eliš IV:9: lu kînat sit pâka lâ sarâr segarka; KB 6/2, p. 130:57: ina sarrâtû u lâ kînâtî. The common Lû ša-ru (cf. EA, p. 1518, for citations), then, will mean "liar, deceiver" and should be connected with Hebrew 'îš kâzâb (Proverbs 19:22). Needless to say, the word under discussion is totally unrelated to the Canaanite verb šarû, "to slander," also attested in Amarna (cf. for a brief discussion Albright, loc. cit., p. 30, n. 13). However, since sarru and šarû (together with šaru, "wind, breath") fall together orthographically in these letters, each occurrence of ša-ru or the like must be carefully analyzed to determine its meaning.

Although both WA 78 and W 115 read ŠE-ia in l. 8, Knudtzon reads b[â-â]-ia, doubtless correctly (cf. ll. 2,3,10,13,15). The normalization awâře, "my word," for a-wa-ta in ll. 8 and 9 is unique in Amarna. Note, however, that TE is used for TI in ll. 10 and 14, while in l. 69 we even find TE.LA written for *TI.LA (halâtu).

With dagâlu in the sense of "to consider" cf. Hebrew ūâ'â with the same meaning (cf. BDB, p. 907, for details).

Knudtzon's reading, ili(!)-mi-ig, in l. 9 led to some ludicrous results. Ebeling saw in iliš-mig a preterit form of ša/samu (EA VIII/2, pp. 42,77) and compared it with iliš-mu-hum in EA 109:50 (ibid., p. 75). That a g would be used to represent ū was, however, highly unlikely; moreover, the explanation of iliš-mu-hum lies in an entirely different direction (cf. my comments loc. cit. infra). The correct reading in our passage, as already noted above, is da-mi-ig. Whereas we expect dagâlu here, the scribe may have had in mind a Canaanite masculine equivalent to
awātu (such as Hebrew dabār) as the subject of the verb; cf. also a-[w]a-te(!) Ba-ru-[t]ē in l. 7 above.

L. 10. qa-be-te: This spelling is our scribe's way of writing qa-bi-tī (for which cf. EA 119:46; 132:31,37; cf. my note on awātē in ll. 8 and 9 of the present letter). The form qabēte/qabêtē is a purely Canaanite adaptation of the Akkadian verb qabû; such forms developed as analogues of the intransitive paradigm form qātīlī (cf. OKC 2, § 75 f) and are too well known in Canaanite generally to require further documentation.

L. 11. ti-il-[nē]: Since both WA 78 and W 115 were uncertain about the reading of the third sign in this word, it would seem that Knudtzon's confident ti-el-ku was somewhat premature. For my reading cf. EA 91:37-38; 107:29-30; 114:45-46; 138:32-33.

Ll. 12-13. mīyami yima(l)lik i(z)zi[(z)za i]na pa(1)-ni sābi pitāt harri bēliya: "Who would recommend (that) he res[ist] the archer host of the king, my lord?" Moran renders similarly (SSDB, p. 99); Ebeling's analysis of i-zi-[za] as an imperative (EA, p. 1592), while possible, results in an awkward translation. WA 78 displays *qa-ni at the end of l. 12, an obvious scribal error for pa(1)-ni. For i/uzuzu i/ana pani meaning "to resist, withstand" cf. my note on EA 71:25-26 supra.

Ll. 14-15. teqū[u] na am[i]lūtu ba(r)rūt[u] awātē ba(r)rūt[e a[n]a harri] bēliya: Knudtzon's restorations here are highly plausible; my rendering of the sentence is in accord with the interpretations of Lū ba(r)rū and awātē ba(r)rūt discussed in my note on ll. 7-9 supra, and makes good sense in context.

L. 60. Lūn-[a-ru]: Knudtzon's rendering here and at the end of l. 63, "Heuler," indicates that he read nāru, "singer" (a Sumerian loanword in Akkadian). Such an interpretation is hardly suitable in our context, however. Two other possibilities present
themselves: (1) Perhaps we have here a Canaanized active
participle of the verb *nāšeru*, "to kill" (*nhr*), hence "assassin,
murderer"; or (2) *nā-a-rū* may be an orthographic attempt to
represent Hebrew-Ugaritic-Phoenician *nas̱ru*, either in the sense
of "servant" or simply a belittling appellation, "boy, child."
The reference seems to be to ṢAbdi-Ashirta; since, however, the
context is badly broken, we prefer to leave the word untranslated.

L. 64.  i̇dē L[Uqal] ̱ī ia-nu L][U] ̱a-na(!): "The king should
know [that there is no one else." My restorations here conform
to the traces in WA 78. Knudtzon reads ρ before Ṣanāš, but the
end of a LU-sign is equally possible; he is doubtless correct,
however, in seeing in Ṣa-Mu a slight scribal error for *ṣa-na.*

L. 65.  i̇ a-mē-e ̱in[na] ̱a *usumma:* "Yea, shall I becom[e]
(like) Qōm?" My interpretation of this difficult line assumes
it to be a rather sarcastic question, born of desperation on the
part of the beleaguered Ḳib-Haddi who comes to the conclusion
that alliance with his enemies is the only way out of his
troubles. I understand ̱in[na]a here to be a scribal lapse for *a-nah,*
as in l. 68 (Winckler had already come to a similar conclusion;
cf. W, p. 225, fn.); *e/nu* *a-nah* is then semantically equivalent
to Hebrew *haya* ̱e-. To read *Dan* as the fourth sign in this line
(with WA 78 and W 115) leads nowhere; Knudtzon's ̱a-mē-e is
doubtless correct (cf. EA, p. 459, n. f).

Ll. 66, 69.  u̱ TIL,LA̱̱̱-S̱u-nu, TE,LA̱̱̱-S̱u-nu: In both cases
the scribe meant to write "(yu) TIL,LA̱̱̱-S̱u-nu" but, having no
knowledge of the rigid requirements of logographic spelling, he
merely approximated the logogram for balatu. For a similar
error cf. EA 136:43.

Ll. 67-68.  anāku L[Uqal] ̱edes GAZ(!) nu ̱KUR tu ina Ṣadī: "As for
me, the ṢApiru are hostile toward me." The sign after L[Uqal] in
l. 68, which gave previous interpreters such great difficulty,
is most appropriately read as a badly written GAZ-sign; cf.
Labat, Manuel d'Épigraphie Akkadienne, p. 114, the last sign in Column iv of his Number 192, for a close approximation. Even if GAZ did not appear in our passage, we would expect it in this context; there is no reason, therefore, to raise objections to its occurrence here.

Frequently in Rib-Haddi "nu-kur-tu or the like is used predicatively, as in the present passage. To avoid awkward syntax in such cases, it seems best to assume that the Canaanites of this period had a word "nukru (cf. Hebrew nokri, "foreigner, alien") meaning "enemy, aggressor." I have therefore decided to read nu KUR in our passage, understanding KUR as an error for *KUR. The normalization will then be nukru. The only other alternative is to normalize nukru and render "enemy" (so Knudtzon and Ebeling, EA, p. 1486), a makeshift solution at best since nukru would then mean both "hostility, warfare" and "enemy" with the latter meaning being strange indeed for a noun of feminine formation.

For ina yâmi here meaning "toward me," cf. the note on l. 65 above.

L. 71. Lû ra-bi-sa-Mu: This form exhibits the Canaanite accusative suffixial formation; the Akkadian equivalent would be *râbissu (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 34 b).

L. 72. [l]i-[l]m-lik ina aâri: "[Let] him care for (this) place." Knudtzon reads [l]i-[m]a-lik, but such a form is highly unlikely even for our Canaanite scribe. Very little of the second sign remains in WA 76, and the traces there are not iminimal to my restoration; cf. further li-im-lik in l. 70.

"To care for" in Rib-Haddi is generally malâku ana; in l. 70, however, the preposition is omitted entirely, and for ina = ana here cf. the note on l. 65 above.

LL. 72-73. Šūt [l]âmi yištânit: "Let him [n]ot hesitate!"

The verb here is bahatu, "to be fearful, timid, modest; to
hesitate," not "Maatu, "to leap, attack" (for which cf. EA 106:10,12; 125:20). Failure to keep these two verbs separated can lead to endless confusion, a fact already noted by Albright (BASOR 89, p. 31, n. 20). The subject of yinshahit here is neither the commissioner nor Abdi-Ashirta, between the two of whom Weber vacillates (EA, p. 1157); it is the pharaoh. Another example of Maatu is found in EA 252:20: ki-i a-na-ku i-Ma-ha-tu, "How could I be fearful . . .?" Cf. further, e.g., Gilgameš I, iv:10,17; ARM XV, p. 259.

L. 76: Knudtzon suggests [a-nu-ma i-na-an-na] after his [ki-it-ti-su ū] at the beginning of the line, but whereas the latter is quite plausible the former is sheer guesswork. His [šu-t[u] at the end of the line is impossible; after ana we expect *šânu.
RIB-HADDI TO AN EGYPTIAN OFFICIAL
(VAT 1668 - WA 70 - W 110 - S 48 - EA 95)

Obverse

(1) [mena LÚ]GAL qî-bî-ma
[u]m-[m]a mRa-ib-IM a-na G[IRMES-ka]
[a]m-q[u]-ut dA-ma-na û
{û} dNIN NYa URUGUUB-la

(5) ti-di-nu TÉH-ka i-na pa-ni
LUGAL ri ENli-ka-ma
[a]-nu-ma t[a]-aš-[p]u-[r]a a-na ia-ši
[ -n]-i-ka
[ ]

(10) [ ] nu [ ]
[ ] i1 [ ]-qa
[ ]-na a-na [ ]MEȘ
[a]-na [ ] ma-a[r-s]i
[û] [ ]-ra

(15) [û] i)a-ši k[u]-uš-di
[û] ERINMES pî-[t]á-ti
[û] k[u-u]š-da i-[n]a [ERINMES]
p[i-t]á-ti-šu û t[i]-i[l]-qé URU
an-ši-k[a ] yi-de

(20) šu-ut [ ]-r[u-b]u-ka
[a-n]a KUR A-m[u]r-[r]i ši-m[é]
[i]a-ši û [ ]
(edg) [an]-ni-k[a] š[a]-ni-[i]-ta[m] ú-ul  
[k][i] p-a-na-n[u] mR-A-[ši-ir-ta]

Reverse

(25) [m][i]-[n][u] i-ru-u[b] 
[ a-n][a] [m][a]-ni-[i]-la-[ak]  
[ ] LUGA[L] KUR[M]-i-[s-ri]
KUR-A-m[u]r-[r[i-m][a] [i]-da-[g][al]
ú y[i-i]q-b[i] m-i-n[u] [ ]

(30) KUR an-ni-t[u] ma-[ ]-da-a[t]
KUR-k[a] a-na ia-[ši yu-wa-[ši-r][a]  
[LUGA[L] KUR[M]-i-[š-ri] [L]Š MÅšKIM-[š][u]
ú y-[i-š]-q-[š] a-na ša-a-[š][u]
[š][a]-ni-[tam k[u]-uš-da at-[t][a]

(35) ki-ma ar-[ši-iš] ú [e-ga]
gáb-ba ú tu-[ur]
ú le-[q]a ERÍN[NÈB] pí-[t]-[ti]
ar-k[a]-nu š[a]-ni-[tam [l][e-q[a]
[ l][e-q[a][a] M][I]N me [L][N][ÈB]

(40) [K]UR M[š]-I[u]-ha ú [ ]
[m][R]-A-[š][i]-ir-[ta ma-ri-iš [M][A].[G]AL
[m][i]-nu [i]-de i-nu-ma BA.UG 7
[ ] nu [ ] ia [ ]

(45) [ù] UR[U][A]-m-m[š]-i[a]
[û] U̲ R̲ U̲ Bat-r[u-na
[ ak [ ]
]

(remainder broken away)

(1) [ana r]abi qibīma [u]m[m]a Rīb-Haddi ana y[ēpēka a]m[qû
'Amāna u {u} Bēltu Ša Gubla (5) ti(d)inū bāštaka ina pani Sarri
bēlikama [a]nūma taš[p]u[r]a ana yāsī [ n]ika [ ]
[ ] il [ ] ga [ ] na ana
[ a]n[a ] ra (15) [u] yjāmī kūsdi [u]
i(r)r[u]b[ ] an[ ]a [m]a[n][i i(1)]la[ ]
] š[a][r] Mi[srī] 'Am[u]rr[im][a [i]da(g)g[al] u y[i]qbi mīnu [ ]
] (30) māt[ ]u annit[u] ma[ ]da[t] mātk[a] ana yāmī
[š][an]īt[a]m kuśda at[t]ā (35) kīma arhīm u l[eqā] gabba u tūr u
leqā sāb[ ]i p[x]ā[t]i ark[a]nu š[a]nīt[a] l[eq][a
l][eq][ā][m]a šitta me( 'at) [amīlūṭi] (40) M[e]l[u]h)a u [ cAb[di]-'A[širta maris [da][n][i]y [m]nu [ī]de
] inūma imūt [ ] nu [ ] ia [ ] šigata
[û ] (45) Šu A[mm][i]y[a Šu] Bat[r][ūna
] ak [ ]
]

(remainder broken away)
(1) [To the com]mander speak: [T]h[u]s Rib-Haddi. At [thy] feet I have] fallen. May Amon and the Lady of Byblos (5) grant thee honor before the king, thy lord! Thou hast w[r]it[te]n to me [ ]

(10) to [ ] gri[evo]us [ ] , and (15) and m]e. Come, [and ] ar[c]her host. [Moreover], c[o]me w[i]th his a[rc]her [host], that it might [take the city] her[e. ]

(20) He (20) should know [ ] t]o Am[u]r[r]u. Hearn[en to m]e, and [ ] h]er[e.

F[u]r[t]he[r], cAbdi-A[shirta] is not [a]s (he was) befor[e.


(F)urther, come th[o]u (35) quickly, and t[ake] everything, and then take back the arch[er] host again aft[er]ward.

F[u]rth[er], [t]ak[e ; t]ak[e] two hundred [men of] (40) M[e]l[u]hha and [ ] . cAb[di]-Ashirta is [v]e[r]y sick; [pe]rh[a]ps he has died. [ ] Shigata [and (45) ] and A]mm[i]y[a and] Batr[un]

(remainder broken away)

* * *
L. 8: From this point on our text is badly mutilated. My readings and restorations will be based on Schroeder's revised autograph and will therefore often differ from those of Knudtzon. Only where such differences result in changes of translation will specific attention be called to them.

L. 15. k[u]-uM-di: Moran adduces dīkī (EA 131:22) as a form containing the only instance of an overhanging final vowel in the Byblian letters (JCS 4, p. 170). kuṭīdi here, however (si vera lectoris), is another clear example. For similar phenomena in standard Akkadian cf. von Soden, GAG, §§ 18 φ; 82 e.


L. 18. ̀u t[i]-i[l]-qé]: For my restoration cf. my note on EA 86:6-8 supra.

L. 19. an-ni-k[a]: For annikā, "here" (not "just as" with Knudtzon and Ebeling, EA, p. 1376), cf. Landsberger, OLZ 26, p. 72; von Soden, GAG, § 118 c; AHw, p. 52.

Ll. 21-22. ̀i-m[é i]a-àyi: Not ̀i-[ma a-na i]a-àyi with Knudtzon (cf. my note on EA 79:20 supra).

L. 23. [an]-ni-k[a]: This restoration is more plausible than Knudtzon's [pa-]n[i-]ka; cf. l. 19.

Ll. 23-24. ̀i[a]-n[i]-ta[m] ̀u-ul [k]i pa-na-a[u] m̄IR-A-[́i-ir-ta]: "F[u]r[t]he[r], ČAbdi-A[shirta] is not [a]s (he was) befor[e]" (for the Hebrew semantic equivalent of kī(ma) panānu cf. kitmāl ʾilmām in, e.g., Genesis 31:2; Exodus 5:7). For my restorations here cf. my note on EA 76:30-31 supra. The reference in our letter is doubtless to the fact that ČAbdi-Ashirta is sick (cf. ll. 41-42).
L. 26. [a-n]a [m]a-n[i i]-la-[ak]: For my restoration of i-la-ak as a first person singular form cf. EA 155:69.

L. 27. LUGA[L] KUR Mi-i[s-ri]: Not Mar m[ ]tu m[i-]t[a-na] with Knudtzon; cf. l. 32.

LL. 29-31. minu [ ] mātu annīt[u] ma-[ ]-da-a[t] mātk[a] ana yāmī: "Who [ ] (that) thi[s] land is [ ]? Th[y] land is mine!" My rendering differs from that of Knudtzon in several respects: (1) Since minu always means "Who?" in Rib-Haddi, its verb must have followed it on the original tablet; (2) ma'ādu never means "to be large" but rather denotes "to be much, many"; Knudtzon's restoration is therefore highly unlikely, and indeed the MA-sign is perhaps to be considered as an enclitic affixed to annīt[u]; at any rate, the verb after the latter is at present unknown; (3) ana yāmī, being a prepositional phrase, never begins a sentence in the Byblian idiom.

L. 31. yu-wa--muted[r]a: Knudtzon's ju-wa-M[i-r]u is impossible here; the context requires a "volitive" (for numerous other citations cf. EA, p. 1362).


LL. 35-40: If Knudtzon's readings and restorations are correct, these lines can only mean that Rib-Haddi wishes the Egyptian official to come and set his domain in order, after which Rib-Haddi will be able to maintain the status quo with the support of his own forces and the official will thus be able to return to Egypt together with all the pharaoh's troops. Ll. 41-42, then, may be reasonably interpreted as stating the reason for this unusual lessening of tension: Rib-Haddi's archenemy, Ābdi-Ashirta, has been removed from the scene of action by sickness or perhaps even death.

L. 43: Knudtzon's restorations in this line are for the most part guesses that fail to produce solid results.
AN EGYPTIAN OFFICIAL TO RIB-HADDI
(VAT 1238 - WA 82 - W 89 - S 49 - EA 96)

Obverse

(1) [a]-na m^{-R}-ib^{-d}IM
[DU]MU-ia qí-bí-ma
um-ma m^{-L}{GAL \textit{ER}-\textit{ME}}^{-S} A\textit{D}-ka-ma
a-bi-ka DINGIR^{-S}^{-}^{-}nu
(5) Šu-lum-ka Šu-[u]m Š-ka
li-iš-al i-[u]n-\textit{ma}(?)
táq-bu-ú la-\textit{a}-mi
an-ti-in_{4}^{-}nu e-re-eb
LU^{-E}_{S}^{-} Na URU Su-mu-ri \textit{KI}
(10) [a-n]a URU^{\textit{KI}}^{-}ia mu-ta-nu-mi
i-na URU Su-mu-ri^{\textit{KI}}^{-}
mu-ta-nu-ú UG[\textit{u}^{-}\textit{h}]^{-}
LU^{-MES}^{-}ú ù i-na [UG\textit{u}^{-}\textit{h}^{-}]
AN\textit{SE}^{-MES}^{-}^{-}ma an-nu m[u-ta]-nu
(15) UGU^{-hi} AN\textit{SE}^{-MES}^{-}^{-}^{-}[i]-nu-m[a]
(edge) la-a ta-la-ku
Reverse

[ANEM]E§ u ú-ba-[ú]

[ANEM]E§ LUGAL ri

ù ú-ul la-a

(20) ḫal-ku mi-im-mé

LUGAL a-di(!) ú-ba-'a₄-Su-nu

be-lu-Su-nu Súm-ma

LUGAL ru EN₃ ANEM

bu-'a₄-mi ANEM

(25) LUGAL am-mi-nim-mi

te-ep-pu-Su ki-Su-ma

a-na 1R MES-e LUGAL

u₄-Si-ra-am-mi LU MES

[a-n]a na-sa-ar URU^[I]

(30) [û] al-lu-úhap-ra-ti

(edge) [a-n]a LUGAL UGU₄-ku-nu

[1]i-te-[r]a-[a]n-ni i-na

(left edge) [DU]BU₄ pé UGU₄ gāb-b[i]

(1) [T]o Rāb-Haddi, my "[so]n," speak: Thus the commander of the army, thy "father." May the gods (5) be concerned for thy welfare (and) the welfare (and) the welfare of thy dynasty! B[ec]ause thou hast said, "I will not allow the entrance of the people of Simyra (10) [into] my city; there is a pestilence in Simyra"—is it a "pestilence" with [respect to] people or with [respect t]o donkeys? Behold, it is a "pestilence" (15) with respect to donkeys! If the d]onkeys have not gone away (completely), then one should s[earch] for the d]onkeys of the king. Again, nay! the possessions of (20) the king have not gone away (completely); their owner may yet(!) search for them. (But) behold, the king is the owner of the donkeys; (therefore) search for the donkeys of (25) the king! Why dost thou act in such a manner toward the servants of the king? Send troops [to] guard the city! (30) [Moreover], lo, I have written [to] the king concerning you, [that h]e may rep[ly] to me on [a tab]let concerning everyth[ing].

* * *

-397-
Strictly speaking, the present letter is alien to the Rib-Haddi corpus since it was composed by an Egyptian official and therefore represents a strain of pseudo-Akkadian that differs appreciably from that employed by the prince of Byblos. I include it here only because it forms a part of the correspondence of the latter.

Weber calls his own commentary (EA, pp. 1190-1192) on the letter "gekünstelt" (ibid., p. 1191). However artificial it may have seemed to him, it nevertheless must be placed among his finest attempts in Amarna exegesis. At best, EA 96 is a difficult letter; Weber, following closely Knudtzon's translation, advanced its interpretation immeasurably. My understanding of the main thrust of the letter is identical to his; only in a few minor details do I differ with him.

Ll. 3-4. umma rašē sābi [A]D-ka-ma a-bi-ka: The case ending of the gloss abīka is correct regardless of which of two possible explanations we may accept: (1) The genitive case after umma is characteristic of Canaanite (cf. Albright, BASOR 87, p. 33, n. 7); (2) nouns in apposition regularly appear in the genitive case in Akkadian (cf. von Soden, GAG, § 134).

For the likelihood that the rašē sābi here is none other than Aman-Appā cf. Weber, EA, p. 1190.

Ll. 4-6. īlānu .mulūmka mul[u]m biṭika liš'al: "May the gods be concerned for thy welfare (and) the welf[a]re of thy dynasty!" For īlānu construed with a singular verb (duly noted by Dhomme, EB, NS Volume 11 [1914], p. 356) cf. the similar treatment of šālim in Hebrew (noted already by Weber, EA, p. 1190; cf. GKC², § 145 h).

Mulūm X ša'ālu here is equivalent to Hebrew šā'al lišlôm X (cf., e.g., II Samuel 11:7).

For biṭu in the sense of "dynasty" cf. my note on biṭi̇ surri in EA 89:48 supra.
Ll. 6-7. i-[n]u-ma(!) taqbu: Knudtzon reads i-[d]i as the first word here, but such a reading has no parallels in this type of context and makes very little sense. inuma before gabu, however, is very common (cf. EA 85:23; 101:13-19; 116:8; 117:83; 122:9; 125:7-8; 131:41; 137:100; 138:5). The orthographic representation of length on the final syllable of taqbu (hence my circumflex in this case) indicates the likelihood that our scribe intended a subjunctive following inuma, even though the meaning of the latter is here under the influence of Canaanite rather than Akkadian idiom. Incidentally, the spelling taq-bu-ú is further evidence against Knudtzon's i-[d]i, which fails to reckon with it.

Ll. 7-10. lami an-ti-in(q)-nu eréb LUBAG Sa Sumuri [an]a áliya: "I will not allow the entrance of the people of Simyra [int]o my city." My rendering follows that of Knudtzon closely, although the latter translated from purely intuitive considerations since he read the second word as ál-ti-en-nu, thereby demonstrating his failure to understand the form. Ebeling's analysis of "iltinnu vacillated between a I₂ present of le'ê (EA, p. 1454) and a I₂ form of banu (RA VIII/2 [1912], p. 44). Forgetting momentarily the fact that neither verb makes sense in context, the former analysis fails to account for the fact that I₂ forms never appear in Rib-Haddi's correspondence while the latter would result in the only *-št- > -lt- shift in these letters. If it be objected that Rib-Haddi was not in fact the author of the present letter, we would nevertheless insist that the real author would surely do his utmost to make himself understood and would sedulously avoid the use of rare or unusual forms that might needlessly confuse his correspondent. At any rate, my reading, antinu, should effectively silence all defenders of the earlier reading; it is a perfectly vocalized formation (on the Canaanite pattern) of nat/dánu, and it is well known that natan often means "to permit, allow" in Biblical Hebrew (for a striking parallel to
our passage cf. Joshua 10:19: 'al-tittänām lābē 'el-Cārēhem, "Do not permit them to enter into their cities"). antinnu illustrates the "Amorite" tendency to avoid the assimilation of the consonant n to a following dental or sibilant (cf. Albright, BASOR 73, p. 10; 86, p. 30, n. 17; 89, p. 31, n. 17). The peculiar doubling of the final consonant may conceivably also be of "Amorite" provenience (cf. the "Amorite" proper name Yannamnu in FRU III, 16.123.1; 16.257/258/126, III:5,41,46; 16.348.4; 16.359A:6); the phenomenon, while rare, is not unique in Amarna (cf., e.g., us/ū-sûr-ru in EA 252:8,28,31).

LUM E[H] is best normalized āmilī here (rather than āmilūti); cf. LUM[ES]-u in 1.13 and ĪM[ES]-e in 1.27. For the alternation of āmilūtu and āmilū in a single letter cf. EA *362, where we find LUM[ES]-tu in 1.35 and LUM[ES]-li in 1.38.

L. 12. mu-ta-nu-ū: The word mūtānu, "plague, pestilence," appears also in 11.10 and 14 of this letter, elsewhere in Rib-Haddi only in EA *362:50. In the present line the final syllable is lengthened because the word appears here in a question (cf. von Soden, CAG, § 153 d).

L. 12. UG[U-hi]: Knudtzon does not restore the HI-sign here; cf., however, ll. 13,15,31,33.

Ll. 14-15. an-nu mūta[n]nu mūhi imērī: "Behold, it is a 'pe[stilence] with respect to donkeys.'" It makes no sense to read ma-an-nu in 1.14 and to translate, with Knudtzon, "What sort of?" The MA-sign is best understood as an enclitic appended to the previous word, while an-nu is best read annu, "Behold." The latter is usually spelled an-nu-ū in Amarna; cf., however, EA 119:52; 131:37.

Ll. 15-18. [i]num[a] lā ta-la-ku [i]mērū ū ba-[ū i]mērī Sarru: "[f the d]onkeys have not gone away (completely), then one should se[arch for the d]onkeys of the king." I understand ta-la-ku here and hal-ku in 1.20 as forms of *halāku, "to go,"
rather than as forms of \underline{halāqū}, "to perish, be lost." ll. 19-22, in my judgment, repeat the basic idea of the passage under discussion, and whereas it would not be surprising should the pharaoh's donkeys have died it would certainly be unforgivable had they been permitted to run away. The spelling \underline{ta-la-ku}, moreover, does not exhibit the laryngal phoneme of \underline{halāqū}. The vocalization of \underline{ta(l)laku}, in which the Barth-Ginsberg Law is inoperative, is again "Amorite" (cf. my note on \underline{EA 83:27-31 supra}).

If my observation regarding ll. 19-22 is correct, then my restoration of \underline{ú-ba-[ú]} in 1. 17 (cf. \underline{ú-ba-\textsuperscript{'}a}-\underline{Su-nu} in 1. 21) is more plausible than Knudtzon's \underline{ú-\textsuperscript{'}zu-[ú]}.

ll. 19-25. \underline{ú ul la hal-ku mimmē Sarri a-di(\textsuperscript{'}) uba'\textsuperscript{'}ašunu belušunu Šuma Šarru bel imērī bu'\textsuperscript{'}āmi imērī Sarri: "again, nay! the possessions of the king have not gone away (completely); their owner may yet(!) search for them. (But) behold, the king is the owner of the donkeys; (therefore) search for the donkeys of the king!" While my rendering here differs radically from that of Knudtzon, it does not necessitate any basic changes in Weber's commentary. The passage is shot through and through with Canaanisms: (1) \underline{ul} is here equivalent to Hebrew \textsuperscript{'}al when the latter is used as an interjection (cf. \underline{BDB}, p. 39, for details); (2) \textsuperscript{'}adi(!) here corresponds to Hebrew \textsuperscript{'}ad (for other examples in Rib-Haddi cf. Moran, \underline{SSDB}, p. 9); (3) \underline{Summa} is here semantically identical to Hebrew hinne\textsuperscript{'}h (cf. my note on \underline{EA 74:13 supra}). The verbal form uba'\textsuperscript{'}ašunu also displays Canaanite influence (cf. my note on \underline{78:11-13 supra}), as does the appearance of the nominative case ending in belušunu.

For the spelling \underline{halkū} for "halkū cf. my note on \underline{EA 68:1 supra}.

l. 32. \underline{[1\textsuperscript{'}]tē(r)[r]anni}: "To reply, answer" in Rib-Haddi is normally \underline{awata turru = héšib dābār} in Hebrew (cf. my note
on EA 76:27-29 for details). The noun may be omitted, however, in both dialects (cf., e.g., Job 13:22; 20:2; 33:5,32; Nehemiah 6:4; II Chronicles 10:16).
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