



## Some Unrecognized Syrian Amarna Letters (EA 260, 317, 318)

Pinhas Artzi

*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 3 (Jul., 1968), 163-171.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2968%28196807%2927%3A3%3C163%3ASUSAL%28%3E2.0.CO%3B2-2>

*Journal of Near Eastern Studies* is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

For more information on JSTOR contact [jstor-info@umich.edu](mailto:jstor-info@umich.edu).

©2003 JSTOR

## SOME UNRECOGNIZED SYRIAN AMARNA LETTERS (EA 260, 317, 318)

PINHAS ARTZI, Bar Ilan University, Israel\*

### I

PROFESSOR I. J. GELB, in his article on the early history of the West Semitic peoples,<sup>1</sup> discussing the atypical occurrences of *ā* instead of *ō* in certain Amarna documents from Palestine, pointed out that, because of the completely arbitrary grouping of EA 317 and 318 with (Southern) Palestinian Amarna letters, there is nothing to be derived from the writing of the name of the sender as *Dagān-takala*, in place of \**Dagūn-takala*. Indeed, Knudtzon, contrary to his custom, gives no clear reason for this placement of the *Dagān-takala* letters in Southwest Palestine.<sup>2</sup> One may suppose that the reason was the high standing of *Dagōn* in Southwest Palestine as reflected in the Books of Judges and I Samuel and also the mention of the Suteans in EA 297:16 (Gezer), which apparently impressed Knudtzon as similar to their role in EA 318:13 (see Section II, *h*). Moreover, although Knudtzon stressed the paleographic identity of the *Dagān-takala* letters with EA 260<sup>3</sup> (the third document of the proposed group under discussion), he separated it from them and placed it with the *Ba<sup>c</sup>alu-miḥir* letters (EA 257–259; see Section II, *a*). It must be stressed here at once that, as to the statement on the paleographic identity, we lean almost entirely on the universally recognized and admired reputation of Knudtzon, because EA 260 has not yet been published in cuneiform.<sup>4</sup>

On the other hand, there are further data, to be presented in the following section, showing, convincingly I hope, that these three letters form one group to be placed in connection with the Syrian Amarna documents.

Coming back now to the statement of Professor Gelb, we are already on the move northward, even if the CV–VC writing of the divine name (DN) *Dagān* as *Da-ga-an* i.o. *Da-gan* does not prove definitely a possible Amurrite pronunciation, because it could be considered as one of the “standard” forms of this DN, and perhaps exclusively so.<sup>4</sup>

### II

I should like to present the above-mentioned further data, selected from the material of a Hebrew edition of the Amarna documents, now in preparation.

(*a*) *Personal names* (PN) (see re-transliterated texts of the proposed group, Appendix I, p. 170).

Both PN have focal Mesopotamian–Syrian area background.

\* Special abbreviations used in this article: AKL: “The Assyrian King List”; APNM: Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore, 1965); AS<sup>2</sup>: Von Soden–Röllig, *Das Akkadische Syllabar*<sup>2</sup> (Roma, 1967); WUS<sup>1</sup>: Aistleitner–Eissfeldt, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache*<sup>1</sup> (Berlin, 1963).

<sup>1</sup> JCS, XV (1961), 43.

<sup>2</sup> EA, pp. 1320–21, 1348–1349, 1609; BA, IV (1899), 321 (In EA, p. 1320, a “?” was appended to

EA 260); cf. also note 21 and Kupper, *Nomades*, p. 100.

<sup>3</sup> EA, p. 15 (“Oppert Tablet”); from this tablet only two signs were published; cf. Section II, *f*.

<sup>4</sup> First samples of the writings DN *Dagān*: MAD, 3<sup>1</sup>, 109 (CV–VC also attested); cf. *Recueil Dhorme* (Paris, 1951), p. 746 [1950]; on the “mysterious” *Dagūna*-seal see Nougayrol, *Syria*, 37 (1960), 209–14 (with lit.).

As to the name *Dagān-takala*: while this is the only instance of the occurrence of the DN *Dagān* in the Amarna letters, the position of *Dagān* in Mesopotamia and Syria (and, no doubt, to a smaller degree already in Palestine but without connection to our present case) is clear.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, the verbal element *takala* represents an originally old Akkadian name type.<sup>6</sup>

Still more significant is the other PN, *Balumer*, a unique northwest-Semitic PN containing the "appellative or theophorous element" *ba<sup>7</sup>lu*<sup>7</sup> and the DN of the ancient Mesopotamian god *Mer*,<sup>8</sup> known also in Amarna-age Ugarit,<sup>9</sup> and in the late middle-Assyrian inscription of King *Tukulti-Mer* of Mari and Ḫana.<sup>10</sup> This deity retained a central position in the pantheon of Aramean Ḫamat (early eighth century): its King Zakur was saved by *ḫur*<sup>8,11</sup>. Moreover, in these personal names we recognize a well-known "pair" of Mesopotamian deities: *Dagān*, worshiped in the upper and middle Euphrates area, and *Itūr-Mēr*, the protective deity of old-Babylonian Mari (and Ḫana).<sup>12</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Schmökel, *RLA*, II, 99; Dahood, *Studi Semitici* (Roma, 1958), 1, s.v. *Dagan*; *APNM*, pp. 180–81; Aistleitner, *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, VIII, 1 (1958), 62; *AT*, pp. 17, 130, 131, 142 (cf. *APNM*, p. 238); cf. Albright, *VTS*, III (1955), 2, note 6; cf. below, n. 12 and n. 4 above.

<sup>6</sup> *MAD* 3<sup>1</sup>, 295; *MAD* 2<sup>2</sup>, 146–53, 216, Gelb, Kurylowicz *FS*, pp. 72 f.; *APNM*, pp. 87 f. (negative results in NWS PN's: pp. 89 f.)

<sup>7</sup> *APNM*, pp. 100, 174; meaning: "the lord (is) . . ."; note the orthographic variants! Cf. nn. 8 and 13.

<sup>8</sup> (I thank my colleague Professor H. Tadmor, who pointed out to me the possibility of the presence of the DN *Mer* in the PN *Balumer*). The wind-god *Wer/Mer* (*APNM*, p. 272, with lit.): Earliest samples of the phonetic writing of this DN: *MAD* 3<sup>1</sup>, 180; (-*Wer*; -*Mer*) cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 27–28; when written with *m*, the initial graphema is always *me-*, except in our PN *Balumer* (*mi-ir*) and Ug.-Akk. PN *ēr-mi-ir*, cf. n. 9). As its chief compound serves the theophorous appellative *īli/u-*, see already in *op. cit.* above; of special interest is the name of one of the "fathers" of Šamši-Adad I, DINGIR -*me-er*, AKL, I, 15, 16, (normalized *Ilu-Mer*), because of its setting in a NWS PN surrounding (Landsberger, *JCS*, VIII [1954], 33, note 16). DN of identical appearance (*Ilu/i-Mer*) is included as a (variant) equivalent of (d)IM(=Adad etc.; see below) in the Babylonian canonical lexical series *An-Num*, see the material collected by Ebeling in *RLA*, I, 23 and Deimel, *SL*, IV, 1 (1950), No. 721 (with KAV material). Identification with (original) *ḫur* (cf. n. 11) and thus the recognition of an univocalic sequence in this DN was noted already by Dhorme, *RA*, VIII (1911), 97.

The wind-god *Wer/Mer* is identified, like many other similar gods within the cuneiform-writing civilization and on its boundaries with (d)IM(=Adad, etc.; see lately: Klengel, *JCS*, XIX, [1965] 87–93). For our purpose it is to be especially noted that the now known relationship between *B<sup>1</sup>l* and *Hd* in Ugarit (cf.: Gordon *UT*, Glossary 749; *PRU* III Repertoire, p. 238 ff. *passim*; PN's with [-]d[IM(-)] is recorded in *CT* XXV, 17, 32:

(d) *Ba<sup>2</sup>u-ū-lu* MIN (=d[IM], cf. pl. 16, 1). This equation concludes the "syllogism" between the Mesopotamian and NWS area: A(Mer) = B(Adad) B(Adad) = C(Ba<sup>1</sup>) A(Mer) = \*C(Ba<sup>1</sup>). Thus the

position of the element *balu-* (cf. n. 7), uniquely compounded with DN *Mer* but well used with other DN's, would be more understandable; cf. also n. 13.

In this connection it might be recalled that on the basis of relationship between the DN's *Ili/u-Mer* and (d)*Mer*, J. Lewy postulates DN \**Tēr* (=d[Šēr[i]]) from DN *Il-terī* (personal god of Nabuna'id; see *HUCA*, XIX (1945–46), 428.

<sup>9</sup> *PRU* III, 16.249:14 (p. 97): *ēr-mi-ir* / *mé-er*; cf. orthography of PN *Balumer*; cf. nn 7, 8, 13.

<sup>10</sup> Pinches, *TSBA*, VIII (1885), 3; Thureau-Dangin and Dhorme, *Syria*, 5 (1924), 279–80; Weidner, *An. Or.*, 12 (1935), 336–38: (1) *Tukul-ti-me-er* / -(d)*Me-er*; cf. J. R. Kupper, *Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au temps de rois de Mari* (Paris, 1957), p. 40.

<sup>11</sup> Donner-Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*<sup>1</sup> (Wiesbaden, 1964), Text No. 202 A, 1; B, 20; cf. n. 8, above; (this is the last known instance of areal activity of this deity. He is not mentioned in the "active address list" of the *Tākkultu* ritual, see Frankena, *Tākkultu* [Leiden, 1954], pp. 77 ff.).

<sup>12</sup> (a) *Dagān* (cf. nn. 4 and 5 above) in Mari: G. Dossin, *Studia Mariana* (Leiden, 1950), p. 43, l. 5; pp. 45 ff.; A. Malamut, *VTS*, XV (1966), 208–27.

(b) *Itūr-Mer* (cf. *APNM*, p. 271; n. 8), a local variant of *Mer*, receives equal rations with *Dagān*. Dossin, *op. cit.*, p. 44, l. 6; *idem*, *Syria*, 32 (1940), 153–59; cf. *Recueil Dhorme*, p. 750.

(c) *Dagān* and *Itūr-Mer* (in this order, the first one being the regional, the second the local god of the city of Mari) appear together as highest divine authorities in various affairs of the Kingdom of Mari: ARM II 13:27, the *asakkum* of *Dagān* and *Itūr-Mer* and that of the king and his son, the governor of Mari, are safeguarding the law of the state; cf. A. Malamut, "The Ban in Mari and in the Bible" ("Biblical Essays 1966"), Proceedings of the 9th Meeting, "Die Oü-Testam. Werkgenieskap in Süd-Afrika," pp. 40–49. ARM III, 19:20, *niš (il)Dagān, (il) Itūr-Mer u bēlija* introduces the "trusties" of the census to their task; see also ARM VIII, Chapitre II and in late OB contracts from Ḫana: "niš (il) Šamaš, (il) Dagān (il) I-tur-me-er u Kaštilašu šarrim in-pā," Thureau-Dangin, *JA* (1909/II), 15, ll. 26–28; the same: Th. Bauer, *MAOG*, IV (1928/9), 4, ll. 21–23 (see there: Obv. l. 2: PN *I-din-[d]Me-er*; also: Obv. l. 7: *a<sup>2</sup>ki-i<sup>1</sup>* [d]Me-er, cf. *CAD*, A-1, 270, 2', a').

Finally, it is to be stressed that PN Balumer is not a variant writing of PN *Ba'alu*- (= [d]IM)-*mi/ehir*,<sup>13</sup> to whose letters EA 260 was attached by Knudtzon (cf. Section 1). The bearers of these different names are quite different persons.<sup>14</sup>

(b) *Letterform and style (special characteristics).*

Our group of documents are the only EA vassal letters using the royal political title *lugal.gal, šarru rabû*,<sup>15</sup> except, significantly, a certain group of letters from Gubla and two Amurru letters.<sup>16</sup> Many of these use also address by the third pers. sing. as in our case: *iqbi*,<sup>17</sup> but, contrary to our letters using *imqut*, the following proskinesis is done in the correct first person: *amqut*; cf. Section II, e. It seems that the background of this special use of the royal political title *šarru rabû* (by "vassals") is based on the earliest North Syrian tradition of this title, meaning the "Great Kingship of Ḫalab"; even if in the "Amarna Age" this tradition becomes the normal political title of the kings of the equal empires, it is never used by other "vassals." Therefore the scribes of these letters have a special common tradition.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>13</sup> It is true that the common feature between the two PN's, the presence of the compound-base *b'l*, is a significant general WS-area indicator (the reading of [d] IM as *Ba'a[h]lu* was recognized already by Knudtzon, see EA, p. 815, note *g*, p. 820, note *b*; cf. n. 8 above), but otherwise their construction and meaning are entirely different. While the first PN, *Balumer* (EA 260), is, as was stated above, an appellative DN compound PN, the second PN, *Ba'alu-mihir* (written [d]IM-*mi/me-ḫi-ir* in EA 257:3, [d]IM-*me-ḫir* in EA 258:2 and in EA 245:44 [see n. 14]; in 259:2: [d]IM-*mi/me-ḫi-ir*) is a DN attributive compound name (cf. UT, 8.65; in the Akkadian adaptation: a DN "stative" PN). In case that the second element WS *mhr* (UT Glossary, 1441, *WUS*, No. 1532), which thus would give the meaning of the PN as: "*B'l* is a (certain kind of) skilled and swift warrior," then it is stressed that the other known examples of this name always shows presence or influence of the laryngeal /h/ (transliterated in Akkadian cuneiform by *ḫi- / ḫir*), as befits a purely Canaanite-writing area; see *APNM*, pp. 229-30; Rainey, *JNES*, 26 (1967), 59. Even if one believes (contrary to the present writer) that *Balumer* and *Ba'lumihir* are the same persons but that they employed two different scribes (one Canaanite and one non-Canaanite), it is very hard to see how (as with Knudtzon, but more explicitly Campbell, *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters* [Baltimore, 1964], p. 115, n. 15) could be the supposedly same PN containing the supposedly same divine attribute yet transcribed in the same time and in the same place in such a deeply different way. Such mixed use of scribes in the Canaanite area is unknown. Otherwise, the question is quite an academic one, because the evidence of the selected data gleaned from the *Ba'alu-mihir* letters and from our group show that *Ba'alu-mihir* and *Balumer* are both West-Semites, but otherwise they and their scribes are of quite different background, the geographical aspect included.

<sup>14</sup> *Ba'lumihir* (EA 257-259). According to EA 245:44 (Megiddo) he seems to be a close follower (or even a relative) of Lab'ayu of Shekhem or, at least, culpable with similar crimes. His quite innocent personal letters (coming from the post-Lab'ayu period) are of Canaanite type (cf. Section II, e).

<sup>15</sup> See Seux, *Epithetes Royales akkadiennes et sumériennes* (Paris, 1967), pp. 298-300 and esp. n. 183.

<sup>16</sup> Gubla: EA 68; 74; 76; 78; 79; 81; 83; 89; (91); 92; 105; 106; 107; Amurru: 160; 161.

<sup>17</sup> This form seems to be inevitable when the *šarru rabû* is addressed by a vassal; while in the other Amarna-letters cited, there is a (more common) combination: *ana šarri rabi umma* (cf. also e.g. EA 103, Gubla), the whole unit of *proskinesis* is typical of the Syrian Amarna letters, see EA II, 1461; also: Ugarit-Boghazköi-Akkadian, see *AHW*, p. 606 a. As to *imqut* (1. pers. sing.), which occurs only in this group, see Section I, e.

<sup>18</sup> On the use of the RPT *lugal.gal* in Ḫalab see Seux, *op. cit.*, p. 298 and Landsberger, *JCS*, 8 (1954), 53, n. 89 (The Hittite declaration on the continuity of the Great Kingship inherited by them from Ḫalab); n. 90 (the use of this RPT in the Alalah-texts; only by the vassal!); Draffkorn, *JCS*, 13 (1959), 97, n. 16; J. R. Kupper, *CAH I and II* (1963), Vol. II, Chap. I, pp. 32-38, cf. Klengel, *Geschichte Syriens*, I (Berlin, 1965).

This use would therefore indicate that these scribes, the one of Gubla and the other of our group, transfer this special use by vassals of the RPT *šarru rabû* on Pharaoh. This is not "surprising" if one remembers that other Mesopotamian royal epithets and titles were also transferred (not to speak here of the style-bound but significant variations of *EN-ja* and *bēlīja*): *šar tamḫāri*, (in letters from Gubla, many times together with *šarru rabû*, EA II, 1528; Seux, *op. cit.*, p. 319); *šar mātāti* (Gubla, before *šarru rabû*) cf. Seux, *op. cit.*, p. 315, n. 262.

Altogether these titles show that the scribes of the North Syrian vassals of Pharaoh sometimes succeeded in "classifying" the present status of the King of Egypt quite connectedly by their own sources of tradition and learning: in the case of *šarru rabû* by connecting the tradition of North Syrian vassals with the self-styling royal political titles of their time; in the case of *šar tamḫāri* by concluding the achievements of the Egyptian Empire with the use of the literary title (or epitheton) of the Great Akkadian King Sargon, an "international" hero, whose feats were known even in Egypt, as the presence of his epic in the Amarna Archive shows (EA 359, *VAS*, XII, 193); in the case of *šar mātāti* they perhaps paraphrase one of the

A further sign of this Syrian tradition is the use of the pleading expression *šēzibanni* (318:8, 14), "save me!" The use of this expression in the Amarna letters (and of *šūzubu*/*šēzubu*) in general is restricted to two instances: the Amurru letter No. 62 and the Rib-Addi letter No. 74 (an "iqbi" letter; cf. our note 16).<sup>19</sup>

(c) *From the grammatical features* (special features):

Pers. pron. sing. 3. pers. *šu-ut* (317:25) (instead of *šu-tú* as Knudtzon): in the Amarna Archive occurs first of all in Gubla, then in Tyre and at least once in an Amurru letter.<sup>20</sup>

(d) *Selected features of orthography*:

*samē* (260:5) *šamē* (318:2); south to the line Akka (EA 232)–Mt. Carmel area (EA 264)–Damaseq Upi (EA 195) *samē* only occurs. North to this line *samē* occurs in Tyre only: EA 147:13; 149:7. Our group must be placed therefore along this line northeastwards.

The writing *s a - g a - a z / a s* (318:11) represents an extreme phonetic solution which seems to be typical to this scribe, who prefers *plene* writing also in DN Dagān (cf. Section I).

As to *LÚ.MEŠ ḥabbāti* following immediately after *LÚ.MEŠ SA.GA.AZ* EA 318:12: this is the only clear EA occurrence of this term, apart from certain problematic places: EA 299:26 (Gezer. Cf. Section I) *SA.GAZ.MEŠ<sup>tum</sup>* which is proposed to be read *ḥabbatūtum* or *ḥabirūtum*, see Bottero, *op. cit.*, p. 110 (already Knudtzon EA I, 50); the former reading, accepted by Von Soden in *AHW*, p. 304, is unacceptable to Landsberger, see *apud* Bottero, p. 159, who prefers to read in every context *ḥapiru* except in the case of Bottero, *op. cit.*, No. 168; of *CAD*, H, 13 (b). (Perhaps read here *ma'dūtum/u<sub>4</sub>?*). EA 207:21 (Canaanite letter) is also inconclusive, see EA I, 50, Bottero, *op. cit.*, p. 105, No 134, not to speak of EA 131:16. The only "clear" appearance of this term in EA is *LÚ ha-ba-du* (EA 162:77) in the letter of Pharaoh to Amurru(!), written by a "Hurrian-type" scribe; cf. EA II, 1268,

Egyptian royal titles, "King of the Two Lands"; for this latter observation cf. R. F. Youngblood, *The Amarna Correspondence of Rib Haddi, Prince of Byblos* [EA 68–98]; MS of unpub. doctoral thesis, the Dropsie College [Philadelphia, 1961], used by the kind permission of the author).

The same faculty of the North Syrian Scribes reveals itself in the translation of some (Mesopotamian) RPT's into NWS language, Ugaritic, as *mlk rb* = *šarru rabū* (UT 118:13, 26; 1018:2, 17), cf. the semantic borrowing in biblical Hebrew *Melek raš* (Ps. 48:3; otherwise the Hebrew equivalent is *Melek gadol*, as the *rāb šaqē* himself translates it in his speech before the King of Judah and the people of Jerusalem, II Kings, chaps. 18, 19, 28); also UT 200:9 (= PRU V, No. 8): *mlk 'lm*, "King of the Universe" (?); the political equivalent of this title is not clear to me; perhaps (as semantic equivalent) = \**šar kiššati*? (cf. Seux, *op. cit.*, p. 308, n. 233). (On the applicative and adaptive faculties of the "Western" scribes see Labat, *Syria*, 39 [1962], 11–27; P. Artzi, "The System of 'Glosses' in the Amarna Documents [and in the Akkadian Documents of Ugarit], *Bar-Ilan*, I [1963], 24–57 [Hebrew]; English Summary, pp. xiv–xvii; *idem*, "Evidence of Lexical Knowledge in the Amarna Documents," *Bar-Ilan*, VI [= Decennary Volume, Part II, *Humanities*], 1968, pp. 105–108 [in press]).

<sup>19</sup> The pleading expression *šēzibanni* connects Letter 318 with a certain specific political usage (MB) of the (separate) verb *šūzubu*/*šēzubu* (cf. *CAD*, E s.v. *ezēbu*, semantic Section 6, p. 424, discussion p. 426); referring to the activating of the military aid promised to the vassals in certain pressing situations or at least expected by them in their position (it is quite interesting to note that this usage "develops" from OB Mari). Now this expression, used only in (North) Syria toward northern (Great) Kings, is addressed to Pharaoh (see also Section II, e). This applicative "change over" is also a typical stylistic indicator of the political situation in Syria in the "Amarna Age," see Artzi, "Vox populi" in the Amarna Tablets, *RA*, 58 (1964), 159–66; this factor was unfortunately overlooked in Buccellati, *Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria* (Roma, 1967)—(for semantically borrowed *šēzib* in Aramaic see LVT, 1129).

<sup>20</sup> For *šū*, see EA II 1527; Albright–Moran, *JCS*, IV (1950), 167–68 (to EA 89:38, 50, Gubla); Labat, *L'Akkadien de Boghaz-kēi* (Bordeaux, 1932), pp. 56, 217; apart from the Gubla occurrences, see for Tyre: 154:9 (= 155:45); Amurru: 67:16 (*šu-u-ut*; = 164:20); also, Qatna: 55:4, 7, 52, 59. Our case belongs to those represented by the Old-Assyrian and Hittite–Akkadian examples.

Helck, *Beziehungen*, pp. 467–68. The only Palestinian occurrence of the verb *ḥabātu* is in EA 286:56, one of the Jerusalem letters whose special position is well known. On the other hand this term (and verb) is well known in original Akkadian texts, (Boghazköi–Akkadian included). Thus the appearance of *ḥabbāti* with its synchronically factual “pair” LÚ SA.GA.AZ shows the roots of the scribe of our group in good Mesopotamian tradition: this is a canonized “pair” in lexical texts, cf. *CAD*, H, 13. In our actual case, however, it is not difficult to decide that LÚ.MEŠ *ḥabbāti* does not translate LÚ.MEŠ SA.GA.AZ because (a) *ḥabbāti* is placed by the determinative; cf. also the dictum of Landsberger cited above; (b) because a further quality of our group: the disuse of the so-called “Glossenkeil”; thus we have in 317:21: LÚ MAŠKIM<sub>x</sub> *ḥa-za-ni-ka*. This (unique) pairing shows the system of equation of our scribe, omitting the second LÚ. (The omitting of the “Glossenkeil” in itself is not a characteristic quality, cf. Böhl, *Sprache*, p. 13, g.).<sup>20</sup>

Therefore EA 318:11 and 12 are to be kept apart (cf. Section II, *h*); for the disuse of the “Glossenkeil” see also 318:7: ŠU *qa-ti*).<sup>21</sup>

(e) For the evaluation of the data presented in Section II, *a*, *b*, *c*, and *d* as the “profile” of our group, it is important to note that there are only a few signs of Canaanite or Hurrian influence in it. The “confused” forms *imqut*, etc. (cf. Section II, *b*) as 1. pers. sing. praet. are to be treated as analogous formations generally typical of peripheric-Akkadian.<sup>22</sup>

Canaanite influence can be detected in *šemû ana* PN (EA 317:17, 24) and in the uses of the copula *u*; see W. L. Moran, *A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos* (Baltimore, 1950), pp. 15 ff.; 17 (A, 5).

As to the possibility of Hurrian influence (aside, perhaps, from the place-name, see note 29 and Section III), we have: *i-te*, 260:16; 317:25. This writing, with the normal value of *de*<sub>4</sub>, occurs first in old-Babylonian Mari (by “Hurrian” scribes) and spreading everywhere in (“Hurrian”-influenced) peripheric-Akkadian becomes a normal feature here, used sometimes also in (bordering) Canaanite letters, see e.g. in Tyre, cf. EA II 1420–21. Without doubt, this writing is especially typical of the Syrian Amarna letters.<sup>23</sup>

The same situation prevails in the uses of the preposition in: *idû ana* PN, (*w*)*ašābu ana* PN Pl. N: for the diffusion of the latter see EA II 1374, showing clearly a mixed area background in Syria.<sup>24</sup> As for *idû ana* PN see EA II 1420–21; this usage seems to be also an areal one.

A most instructive indicator for areal delineation comes from the comparison of the uses of the verbal expressions synonymous to *šēzibanni* (see Section II, *b*). In Palestine we have *ekēmu* and in one instance *eṭēru*.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup> See in general Bottero (ed.), *Le problème des Habiru* (RAI IV; Paris, 1954); with added “?” after the Palestinian setting of *Dagān-takala*, p. 111, No. 152; Greenberg, *The Hab/piru*, “AOS,” Vol. 39, (New Haven, 1955), pp. 50, 88–89.

<sup>22</sup> Labat, *L'Akkadien de Boghaz-köi* (Bordeaux, 1932), pp. 66–67; other prefix-confusions, equally typical to Canaanite and non-Canaanite peripheric-Akkadian, are those appearing in the prefix of “e”-containing verbs and in the final vowels, as in our group *iš-mi/e* (etc.), EA 260:8; 317:12 (etc.); see material in Böhl, *Sprache*, pp. 54–55. (The original, “non-confused” basis of the first phenomenon occurs as a norm in MB; see Aro, *Studien zur MB Grammatik*

[Helsinki, 1955], p. 72.) Similarly, for “confusions” in verbs belonging to the II group of Verbs Prim. Aleph as *i-pu-uš*, EA 317:18, see Labat, Böhl, *loc. cit.* (For a much earlier view, no more acceptable in its original definition, see *Recueil Dhorme* [1913–1914], p. 417).

<sup>23</sup> AS<sup>2</sup>, 218; *CAD*, I–J, 24; Finet, *L'Accadien des lettres de Mari* (Bruxelles, 1956), p. 20 (13 *d-e*); Labat, *L'Akkadien de Boghaz-köi*, p. 29; Berkooz, *The Nuzi Dialect of Akkadian*, p. 39.

<sup>24</sup> See also Labat, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

<sup>25</sup> See EA II 1400; *CAD*, E, *eṭēru*, lex. sect. p. 416; for *eṭēru* in Amarna documents see EA II 1407 (?; EA 121:40 Gubla); Landsberger *apud* Bottero, *Habiru*, p. 110, No. 148 (= EA 299:22, Gezer).

(f) *Paleography.*

The Chart (Appendix II) is intended to convey a general impression on the placement of our group.

Not shown here are the two signs copied by Knudtzon from EA 260:13 (cf. Section I and note 3): É (KI[?]). The form of É is identical with the forms of É in EA 148:42 and EA 151:55 (Tyre). See Knudtzon, *Autographs*, EA, pp. 1001 ff.: Aut. 108 (=148:42); 110 (=151:55); 145 (=260:13). At first, Knudtzon read these signs as *kar* (cf. also BA 4 [1899], 321), but it is to be pointed out that he already proposed to improve it to É, *būt(u)*, see EA 1321 (É[di] = *bi-ti<sub>4</sub>*?); this is the independent reading of Albright also, see JEA, 23 (1937), 203 concerning EA 151:55. This reading was confirmed by the collation of Gadd, see Liverani, *Storia di Ugarit* (Roma, 1962), p. 29.

(g) *Geographical placement.*

In 1916 A. Alt proposed the identification of our only place-name TI-en-ni (260:14; collation at present impossible: cf. Section I) with Egyptian Ti-àn-ni (Helck's transliteration), one of the place-names mentioned in Papyrus Petersburg, 1116 A, Recto.<sup>26</sup> This pre-Amarna list of rations for *marjannū* from *Sa-hi*, stationed in Memphis as envoys mentions, according to the observation of Aharoni, important centers situated in the valleys of Palestine, along the pharaonic strategic highway, the northernmost clearly identifiable being *Hašōr*.<sup>27</sup> But because *Sa-hi* includes, already in the inscriptions of Thutmose III,<sup>28</sup> also Phoenicia and the Lebanon area (and later on even further far-northern territories) in Syria, the observation of Aharoni is good for the Lebanon Valley also ("*Amqa/i*"). This general placement of TI-en-ni<sup>29</sup> in that area is a minimum demand, enforced now by the philological observations presented in this paper, showing the logical placement of the whole group in the Syrian area along the line "Gubla"—"Amurru"—"Dameseq" (Section III).

(h) *The Suteans.*

While the concrete geographical data are meager (see Section III), the position of the Suteans<sup>30</sup> in 318:13 could serve as a general directional indicator for the positioning of our group. The sender of this letter, stationed also in TI-en-ni or at least very near to it, has the rare opportunity of distinguishing correctly all the disturbing social and demographic factors of the Syrian (–Palestinian) area: the (urbanized) *s a g a z* "rebels", the prowling *ḥabbātu* worker-gangs and the desert nomads, the *sutū*. Such a situation is conceivable only along the eastern borderland of Syria (see *Idrimi*, 13–15; PRU III pp. 7–8; EA 169:25), meaning the "desert" areas in the general direction of the Euphrates. Here we have a direct continuation of information on the Sutean activity described by Aššuruballit I, (EA 16) adding information about the necessary counter-measures (cf. *Chronicle P*, I 6 ff.).

<sup>26</sup> A. Alt, "Tenni", *ZDPV*, 39 (1916), 264–65; Helck, *Beziehungen*, p. 164 (cf. Section III).

<sup>27</sup> Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible. A Historical Geography* (Philadelphia, 1967), p. 153.

<sup>28</sup> Helck, *Beziehungen*, p. 274.

<sup>29</sup> So far no suitable location can be offered. Cf. e.g. material treated lately by Astour, *JNES*, 22 (1963), 220–41. While Boree offered a quite unacceptable solution (relation with *danānu*) in *Die alten Ortsnamen Palästinas* (Leipzig, 1930), p. 31, it seems

that this is not a Semitic Pl. N. but a *Hurrian* one, to be "normalized" as *Teg-en-ni*? (Cf. Landsberger, *JCS*, 8 [1954], 60, n. 111 and "OIP," 57, 210); perhaps we should understand that *Balumer* sits in the ancestral "house" of *T*. (originally) a *marjannu*; thus, *T*. would be a PN used as Pl. N. as "*būt T*," the House of *T*.? Cf. Section III.

<sup>30</sup> Kupper, *Nomades*, pp. 84–145, esp. pp. 96–104; *idem*, *RA.*, 55 (1961), 197–200; Helck, *Beziehungen*, p. 279; Albright, *ANET*, 490, n. 23.

Thus, by putting our group in its proper place we are rewarded now with a continuous and consistent picture of a border-situation (with wild Suteans), contrasting the continuing picture which emerges from some further data from inland (with pacified, serving Suteans): EA 122:34 (Suteans in Egyptian service, cf. EA II, 1222) and especially EA 195:29, where the able, popular, and *semper fidelis* Governor, Birjawaza, reports to Pharaoh his readiness at the head of his army, which includes s a g a z and Suteans (cf. also in the pre-Amarna Ta<sup>c</sup>anak letters, No. 3, rev. 4).

The Gezer Letter 297 (l. 16; cf. Section I) is the only Palestinian Amarna document mentioning (perhaps!) the Suteans. The meaning of the passage in itself is still obscure but it seems, taking the presence of the Suteans for granted, that the local prince simply (or to be more correct, metaphorically) complains about expenses or damages caused by the presence of the Sutean troops.

### III. CONCLUSIONS

While the exact geographical location of the "send-off" pointed for our group of EA Documents 260, 317, and 318 remains for the time being unidentified it seems clear that we have rediscovered the correspondence fragment of a border station of the Egyptian Empire in Syria. This station must be situated on the highway leading northeastwards, parallel to the Canaanite-Phoenician coastal area, in the general direction of North-Syria-Euphrates, and on the fringe of the desert. The "pair" *Balumer-Dagantakala* (relationship unknown) demands nearness to ancient Mesopotamian-Amorite (Syrian) cultic centers.

The type of the peripheric-Akkadian of the letters and their script ("andere Formen") stresses also that this geographical point must be found as north-northeastwards (in the neighborhood of the Orontes(!)-Euphrates area) as the geopolitical situation makes it possible.

Finally, the comparison of the conclusions presented here with those of C. Epstein in *JEA*, 49 (1963), 53, on the identification and location of Place Name TI-en-ni, shows convincingly their converging accuracy.

(On the eve of the eightieth anniversary of the discovery of the Amarna Archive, may these observations be received as a festal contribution.)



## APPENDIX I

## TEXTS

EA 260, uncopied! ("Oppert-tablet")

- O1. *a-na* LUGAL.GAL *be-li-ia*  
 2. (1) *Ba-lu-mi-ir/mé-er\** *iq-bi*  
 3. *7-šu ú(!) 7-šu-ma*  
 4. *a-na* 2 GÌR(!)LUGAL.GAL  
 5. (d)UTU *a(!)-na sa-me im(!)-qú-ut*  
 6. *a-na-ku ke-e/ki-i<sub>15</sub>\** *i-qa-bi*  
 7. LUGAL.GAL *be-li*  
 8. *a-na(!)<-ku\*> iš-me a-wa-ti*  
 9. *ša* LUGAL.GAL *be-li-ia*  
 10. (d) UTU *a-na sa-me*  
 11. LUGAL.GAL *i-te/de<sub>4</sub>\**  
 12. *a-na ÈR-šu*  
 R13. *ù a-na-ku a-na É(!) (KI[?])*  
 14. *TI-en-ni u-ša-ab*  
 15. *ù* LUGAL.GAL *be-li-ia*  
 16. *li-i-te/de<sub>4</sub>\** *a-na ÈR-šu*

EA 318 BB 74; Collated

- O1. *a-na* LUGAL.GAL *be-li-i[a]*  
 2. (d)UTU *a-na ša-mi/mé*  
 3. (1)(d) *Da-ga-an-ta-ka-[la]*  
 4. ÈR-ka *iq-bi*  
 5. *7-šu ù 7-šu-ma*  
 6. *a-na* 2 GÌR LUGAL.GAL  
 7. *be-li-ia im-qú-ut*  
 8. *še-zi-ba-an-ni*  
 9. *iš-tu KÚR.MEŠ da-<sup>1</sup>an-nu<sup>1</sup>-[ti]*  
 10. *iš-tu ŠU qa-ti*  
 11. LÚ.MEŠ SA.GA.A [Z.MES(?)]  
 12. LÚ.MEŠ *ha-ba-ti*  
 13. *ù* LÚ.MEŠ *šu-ti-i*  
 14. *ù še-zi-ba-<sup>1</sup>an<sup>1</sup>-ni*  
 15. LUGAL.GAL *be-<sup>1</sup>li-ia<sup>1</sup>*  
 R16. <sup>31</sup>  
 17. <sup>31</sup>  
 18. *ù at-t<sup>1</sup>a<sup>1</sup>* LUGAL.GAL  
 19. *be-li-ia*  
 20. *tu-še-zi-ba-an-ni*  
 21. *ù i-na-ba-a- a<sup>1</sup>t(??)\*<sup>1</sup>*  
 22. *a-na* LUGAL.GAL *be-li-[ia]*

<sup>31</sup> 318:16, 17; see EA I, Autogr. 168 (p. 1007).

EA 317 VAS XI, 177









- O1. *a-na* LUGAL.GAL *be-li-ia*  
 2. (1) (d) *Da-ga-an-ta-ka-la*  
 3. ÈR-ka *iq-bi*  
 4. *7-šu ù 7-šu-ma*  
 5. *a-na* 2 GÌR LUGAL.GAL *be-li-ia*  
 6. *im-qú-ut*  
 7. *ù i-na-na a-na* LUGAL.GAL  
 8. *be-li-ia*  
 9. <sup>1</sup>(d) *Da-ga-an-<sup>1</sup>ta-ka-la*  
 10. ÈR-ka *a-[na-k]u a-wa-ti*  
 11. LUGAL.GAL *be-li-ia*  
 12. *iš-mi da-ni-iš*  
 13. (1) *Da-ga-an-ta-ka <-la>\**  
 14. [*i*]*q-bi ki-ma a-bi-ia*  
 15. [*ú*(?) *a-b*]*i a-bi-ia-ma*  
 R16. [*i-*] *pu-šu a-na* LUGAL.GAL  
 17. *a-na-ku a-na* LUGAL.GAL  
 18. *be-li-ia i-pu-uš*  
 19. *ù* LUGAL.GAL *be-li-ia*  
 20. *iq-bi a-na ia-ši*  
 21. *ši-mi-ma a-na LÚ MAŠKIM<sub>x</sub> ha-za-ni-ka*  
 22. *a-na-<sub>1</sub>ku iš<sub>1</sub>-mi-ma dan-ni-iš*  
 23. *ù šum-ma la-a*  
 24. *iš-mi a-na LÚ ha-za-ni*  
 25. *ù šu-ut\* i-te/de<sub>4</sub>\*-ma*

! Collations of Knudtzon

\* Improvements by P.A.

## APPENDIX II

## CHART

	(EA 318) BB 74, collated	(EA 317) VAS XI, 177	NOTES
LUGAL			Zeichenliste* nr. 81: "Andere Formen"; cf. VAS XI, 79:5 (= EA 146, Tyre); VAS XI 81:1 (= EA 156, Amurru); but see also BB 81, EA 277:9, unplaced.
li			Zeichenliste nr. 23: Gubla, Sidon.
ka			Zeichenliste nr. 11: Gebal, Amurru, Phoenicia (Alasia); cf. Landsberger-Tadmor, <u>IEJ</u> , 14 (1964), 208 (post-OB).
iq			Zeichenliste nr. 38: "Andere Formen"; cf. VAS XI, 51:25 (= EA 98).

\* Zeichenliste = VAS XII, p. 75 ff.