A New Translation of the Amarna Letters*

Introduction

This long awaited volume was published to celebrate the first centennial anniversary of the discovery of the Amarna tablets. William Moran, the great master of Amarna studies, has supplied us with a new edition of these widely known texts. A hundred years of research and about 40 years of personal acquaintance with the Amarna material have yielded an impressive volume of thoroughly revised translations of the Amarna letters.

These translations should, and undoubtedly will, be used by new generations of students of the Ancient Near East as authoritative, up to date translations. They should also be used by Amarna specialists as an impetus for a further deepening of our knowledge of these texts.

The Amarna letters, as is well known, are thus named after the site Tell el-Amarna (in Egypt) in which they were discovered. These letters were sent to the Egyptian Pharaohs Amenophis III and his son Akhenaten around the middle of the 14th century B.C. The correspondents were other kings, namely kings of Babylonia, Assyria, Hatti and Mitanni, minor kings and rulers of the Near East at that time, and vassals of the Egyptian Empire.

The first Amarna tablets were discovered by local inhabitants in 1887. They still form the majority of the corpus, as subsequent excavations in the site, already in the last decade of the 19th century, and later in this century, have yielded less than 50 out of 382 tablets which form the Amarna corpus known to date.

Almost immediately following their discovery, the Amarna tablets were deciphered, studied and published, and their enormous importance has been acknowledged. This was not an easy task. The Amarna tablets, written in Akkadian cuneiform, presented many features which were strange to the other Akkadian dialects. This was especially manifest in the letters sent from Canaan, which were written in a mixed language (Canaanite-Akkadian).

In his chapter on the el-Amarna tablets for The Cambridge Ancient History, Albright wrote: "Because of the nature of this jargon, it is not enough for the would-be interpreter to know Akkadian; he must also be a specialist in Hebrew and Ugaritic, and above all he must be so familiar with all the letters that he knows what to expect from their writers" (Albright 1966 [=bibl. I/2]), p. 4).

This last demand, namely the need to be familiar with all the letters in order to be able to know what to expect from their writers, means, in effect, to be acquainted with the grammar of these letters' language. Indeed, one should acknowledge the utmost importance of sound linguistic analysis of any corpus of texts in order to achieve a sound interpretation and translation of its contents.

What has been done in this area in the past century?

The first decade of the 20th century witnessed Knudtzon's great achievement in the publication of his monumental edition of the texts, still the standard classic edition in use today (Knudtzon 1915 [=bibl. III/2]; the first volume, which includes the texts and their translations, was published in 1907). At that time the scholarly world also benefited from the studies of Böhl (1909 [=bibl. V/A/2]), Ebeling (1910 [=bibl. V/A/3]; also in Knudtzon 1915 [bibl. III/2], pp. 1358-1582) and Dhorme (1913-1914 [=bibl. V/A/4]), who gave us the first descriptions of the language of these texts. These scholars also took some notice of the mixed nature of the Canaan-Akkadian dialectal continuum in which the majority of letters were written. The third decade of this century has yielded some more discoveries in Tell el-Amarna itself, where new texts have been unearthed and published (later compiled, together with other Amarna tablets that were not published by Knudtzon, in Rainey 1970 [=first edition of Rainey 1978 [=bibl. III/3]]. The linguistic research continued, however, only in a series of papers by Albright (e.g., bibl. V/A/5-9).

Albright had paved the way for Moran, who, in his doctoral dissertation accomplished in 1950, was the first to see the systemic nature of the mixed language of the Amarna letters from Canaan (Moran 1950a [=bibl. V/B/19]). In this study Moran presented for the first time a thorough and detailed penetrating description of the syntax of the largest Canaanite subcorpus of the Amarna letters, namely that of Ribaddi of Byblos.

In a series of papers published in the 50's, 60's and in the 70's, Moran, followed by Rainey and his students, showed that the language of the Amarna letters from Canaan should be studied for its own sake, in order to yield a better understanding of the texts (e.g., Moran 1950b, 1951, 1953, 1960 [=bibl. V/B/20-23]; Rainey 1971, 1973, 1975, 1978 [=bibl. V/B/30-33]; Iz'ez'el 1978 [=bibl. V/B/9]). Other studies of various kinds have expanded our knowledge and understanding either of various non-Canaanite subcorpora


1) This notation refers to the introductory Amarna bibliography which is given at the end of this paper. Read: bibl(sophory) (section) l (item) 2.
of the entire Amarna corpus (as in Adler 1976 [= bibl. V/B/1]), or of the historical contents (as in Na‘aman 1975 [= bibl. IX/14]).

Between Knudtzon’s times and today, continued linguistic research has advanced our knowledge also of other Akkadian dialects, both of the core and of the periphery. We are now in a better position to evaluate the differences and variation among the standard Akkadian dialects of the core, between standard and Peripheral Akkadian, and among the Peripheral Akkadian dialects themselves.

This progress has proved very useful for the reevaluation and continued research of both the international and the vassal letters discovered in Tell el-Amarna, which were written in Middle Babylonian, Middle Assyrian, Peripheral Akkadian dialects and what I would call Amarnaic, i.e., the mixed dialects of the Canaanite Amarna letters.

Professor William Moran, highly esteemed as a master of both standard Akkadian and Amarnaic, took on himself the most difficult task of giving us new translations of the Amarna letters. It is indeed he who, more than anyone else, has the proper qualifications to do it. We thank him for presenting us with these translations, which will become the new authoritative renderings of the Amarna letters.

The contents and the format of the book

The book opens with an introduction to the corpus of the Amarna tablets. It gives a short survey of their discovery and publications, an account of the transactions of the tablets and their museum locations, an overview of the language and writing conventions, a discussion of the phraseology used in the international and vassal correspondences, and an account of the chronological aspects of the Amarna archive. This introduction is a good résumé of what has been hitherto achieved in Amarna studies, and offers very useful background information for the newcomer to this field. It also shows, especially when one carefully reads the last section of the introduction, namely, that on the chronological aspects, how much more can be done in the field (or, better: fields) of Amarna research.

After the texts follow maps, indices of proper names (personal, divine, geographical, and group names), and indices of all the Akkadian, Sumerian (logograms), West Semitic, Egyptian, Hittite and Hurrian vocabularies discussed within the notes. These indices are very useful for the serious student who seeks to study the texts in their original language.

The present review will not offer different readings or renderings for Moran’s translations. Differing views concerning this or that passage will always remain. This is, indeed, one of the great merits of a good scholarly work, that it inspires people to return to its subject matter and delve into it in enthusiasm. I am absolutely sure that the volume under review will spark renewed interest in these letters, and many scholars will raise new suggestions for the interpretation of many parts in them.

The point is, that an impressive piece of work like this can offer much more than availability of new translations of the Amarna letters. Being the product of long term research and decades of intimate knowledge with the material, this translated and annotated corpus of texts presents a new phase in the study of the Amarna material.

What I wish to do here is to present some of the desiderata for the future study of the Amarna tablets, for which Moran has now eased the task and opened new ways. But first, I would like to discuss some points concerning the contents and the format of the book under review.

The series in which this volume has appeared prescribed both its contents and its format. As for the contents, one should note that this volume does not include all the cuneiform texts found at Tell el-Amarna. It contains only the letters (and related inventories). At this juncture, one should acknowledge the cooperation of V. Haas and G. Wilhelm, who translated the Hittite and the Hurrian letters of the Amarna corpus.

Besides letters (which, indeed, form the main and essential part of the corpus), the Amarna archives comprise also texts related to the education of scribes in Egypt, including syllabaries, glossaries, lists and literary texts. These texts have not been included in this volume, and are still awaiting renewed study in the context of the Amarna cuneiform corpus, as well as in the broader corpus of literary and scholarly Peripheral Akkadian texts.

Another issue which might be raised at this juncture is the existence of other texts, including letters, which are related to the Amarna corpus. These are the cuneiform texts discovered in Palestine, Lebanon and Southwest Syria, and dated roughly to the Amarna period. One might raise the question whether these texts, and especially the letters, should not have been included in this volume, at least as an appendix or a supplement (for a discussion of these finds in the Amarna context, see Edzard 1985 [= bibl. I/6]).

As far as the format is concerned, the main part of the volume contains the translated letters, annotated with many notes and comments. Moran has done a wonderful job in presenting his completely revised translations for each of the Amarna letters, be it royal letters, inventories, or letters from the northern and Canaanite vassals. All his revisions are based on new reading suggestions. Thus, many passages and letters have come up with a completely new interpretation and setting thanks to Moran’s work. In his notes Moran presents many new readings based on collations he has made in the various museums where the Amarna letters are located (with some additional collations by the late E.I. Gordon). He has skillfully combined them with many insights raised by scholars who dealt with some of the letters previously.

What is missing are transliterations. Since Knudtzon’s edition, which is the last authoritative work on the Amarna tablets, appeared, many changes in reading have become available. Even transliteration practices have changed. For the serious scholar and student who can read Akkadian, even if only in transliteration, it has now become almost an impossible task to overcome the difficulties in tracing Moran’s underlying transliterations of the texts (many times given in the notes, but definitely not always). Knudtzon’s transliteration can hardly be of help anymore. A volume of newly transliterated texts to comply with the new translations has thus become a necessity. In fact, a computerized compilation of all the Amarna and related material is now being undertaken at Tel Aviv university.

The translation

As has been already mentioned above, the series in which this volume has appeared preserved both its contents and its format. It also prescribed the language of translation, which is, of course, French.

Here lies the main disadvantage of this volume. Many scholars, and especially the younger generations of Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern scholars and students, are not sufficiently acquainted with French. English has become the major scholarly language of our times. Many scholars in these fields are American. Moran is also an American; English is his native tongue. Although his proficiency in French is excellent, his work on the Amarna tablets was done in English. Thus, the translated texts presented in this volume had to be translated from the English.

The translation from the English has been done most skillfully in close cooperation with Moran by Dominique Collon, who knows the source language. Nevertheless, a secondhand translation is always apt to come up with misunderstandings and mistakes.

It is interesting to compare two of Moran's English translations published most recently in a volume of texts at the Metropolitan Museum in New York3) with the French translations of the same texts offered in the volume under review. There are several differences between the two translations, and one cannot always tell where Moran directed a specific change between the two translations and where such a difference was indiscriminate and accidental.

Let us look at only one example. For alatprakkku (EA 15:7) the English translation has "I have sent (...) to you", while the French has "j'envoie". The difference in tense form may have been authorized by Moran himself. The tense form might be rendered both ways, according to one's concept of its function, and the French rendering seems indeed preferable4). However, the French lacks the translation for the pronominal suffix, and I suspect that this is a failure of the translation from the English, since for the second occurrence of this verb in this letter (I. 11) the French has, correctly, "je t'envoie".

Many people in the field would like to have an English translation for the Amarna letters, and we expect the publication of such an edition soon.

I have, though, another reservation concerning the translation which I should like to state here. This time it does not concern its language, but an essential concept. Sometimes found Moran to be too interpretative in his renderings of the Akkadian. Every translation is interpretative, there is no doubt about that. However, a translation should not be explainative. Should the receiving language need any additional phrase, or in case the translator feels that an explanatory phrase is essential for the understanding of a passage, this can be done by using special techniques, such as putting an additional phrase between parentheses, or adding a footnote with the exact literal translation.

The latter technique was indeed used by Moran. However, it was employed mainly where the cultural background would prove necessary for the understanding of a phrase or an idiom, or for understanding their accurate cultural meaning in a specific context (e.g., p. 82 n. 5; p. 108 n. 3; p. 228 n. 2; p. 239 n. 2; pp. 414-415 n. 2; p. 563 n. 1). Moran's reevaluation of these details calls for renewed large-scale research and reevaluation of the historical and cultural background of the Amarna archive. However, in many cases, his translations are too interpretative, and sometimes even too explanatory to my mind.

Compare, e.g., the original Akkadian text with the French translation of the following passage, taken from a letter of Burnaburiyas, King of Babylon, to Amenophis IV:

DUMU ši-p-ri-ka ša-a-šu-um-mi-ka a-hu-la la ša-mu-um-ma a-na šul-mi-ka la šu-pa-ru "Demande à ton propre messager si le pays est lointain et si, à cause de cela, ton frère n'aurait rien appris à ton sujet et n'aurait pas envoyé quelqu'un te sauver". (EA 7:28-30)5)

I would have enclosed the additional French phrases, here marked by boldface characters, between parentheses. This is not to say that I would not agree with Moran's understandings of this and other such translated texts. However, there may be passages to which Moran's interpretation will be objected by other scholars. Hence, this way of presenting a translation (in contrast with paraphrase, interpretative comments or a text analysis), may lead to misunderstandings on the part of the would-be scholar, who might take Moran's authoritative status as the leading Amarna scholar, and use his translations as if they were accurate renderings of the original texts. In some cases this may cause inaccuracies in historical interpretation.

Let us take another example. Abdiilstarti, a city ruler from Southern Canaan, writes to the Pharaoh as follows:

7 u a-na-ti qa-ba šar-ri [EN] a-[ma] 'a ś-e ši ú še-mu' a-[lab]-tu šar-ri [EN]-a-ta (5)[še]-mu "Le roi, [le seigneur, [m] a donné des ordres, et je fais attentions aux ordres du roi, mon seigneur". (EA 63:7-9)

There are two points that should be noticed here: (1) The scribe repeated the verb istemtu twice, and this is not expressed in the translation. (2) The word-string avâti qaba is translated interpretatively as "gave orders".

As for the first point, it seems that Moran did not translate the second occurrence of the verb because he treated it as a scribal mistake. However, one may hold a different view, and suggest that this repetition is intentional. In that case, it has a meaning which has now been omitted from the translation. Usually repetition underlines emphasis. Moreover, one might also think of a different way of parsing syntactically this passage, and translate (from the middle of line 8):

"So I heed. It is the words of the king, my lord, that I heed".

This certainly gives a different interpretation and meaning to the passage.

As for the verb qaba, I would rather translate it by the English "said", to be differentiated also in translation from other Akkadian (or Canaano-Akkadian) verbs which may be used in similar contexts. We still do not know whether there was a difference in meaning or nuance between such

---


4) The Amarna Texts (Nos. 102, 103) by William Moran, pp. 149-151; hand copies by Ira Spar (plates 112-115).

verbs like *qaba* and *šapar* in similar contexts (for the latter cf. EA 64:15, of the same sender; cf. also *šapara*, in another letter of Abdišarti, EA 65:7). Translations like “gave orders”, which are too general, might miss the point if there is one. One might think of *qaba* as referring to the oral delivery of the Pharaoh’s orders, as against *šapar*, indicating orders transmitted by a letter.

Note further, that at least in one case, there is a real confusion in the translation of these two verbs. In EA 117:7 Moran translates “a écrit” for *yjagbu*; whereas *tisšaparu* on the next line is translated, accurately, “à (m’)écrire”.

The last example for an excessively interpretative translation is taken from one of the letters of Ribhaddi, the famous ruler of Byblos. In EA 138:8 Moran translates “un [de mes] mess[agers]” for mār š[iptiya]. This rendering (instead of the simpler “mon messager”, as has been correctly translated for an identical phrase occurring in l. 21) indicates that Ribhaddi had more than one messenger, an implication which cannot be deduced from the original Akkadian phrase.

I hope that these examples give an idea of what I meant in suggesting that translations of texts might be less interpretative, less explicative.

One other point, though much less important, that I should comment upon here is the technique used by Moran to mark gaps in translation. Whenever there is such a gap, caused either by a fragmentary text or by an actual missing part in the tablet, Moran marks it by three points: [...]. These three points are used for large as well as for small gaps. This technique is sometimes quite misleading, as one tends to ignore these gap markings even if they mark large portions of text missing. I would recommend to add a verbal note within, telling the reader how many words or lines are missing.

**Linguistic analysis**

Some notice has been paid above to the history of research into the peculiar language of the Amarna letters sent from Canaan. I have insisted on the fact that only a scholar who has devoted much time for the study of that language is capable of performing the task of translating the Amarna letters into a modern language. I have also stressed the correlation between knowledge of the texts, familiarity with their scribes, and appreciation of the grammatical structure of the language in which these texts were written.

As Albright put it, the knowledge of Akkadian is not enough for this task. Anyone who wishes to study the Amarna letters in the original must also know West Semitic tongues, as well as be acquainted with the history of these languages. Let it be known, that the language in which these letters were written was Akkadian only in the eyes of the scribes who wrote them. Structurally, the language of most of the texts should be regarded as a mixture of Akkadian and the local Northwest Semitic dialects (by and large Canaanite). Akkadian predominated in its lexical-semantic skeleton almost entirely, while the Canaanite language (whatever this might have been), the mother-tongue of the scribes, the writers of these letters, predominated in the sphere of grammar. It influenced its syntax and its morphology heavily, and affected the phonology and semantics.

A mixed language of this type, i.e., a second language practiced by local scribes in remote peripheral areas, where geographical and educational diversity is prominent, is usually characterized with strong internal variation. This is also the case with the Amarna letters, where variation is indeed an inherent characteristic of their language, and structural traits may be very different between the language used in letters of two scribes, even if from the same city.

Research into the essence of this complicated linguistic continuum has still a long way to go. Allow me to demonstrate how much more can be done in this area of linguistic inquiry, and how such an investigation can effect our ability to reach a better understanding of these texts and their historical setting.

In EA 88 Ribhaddi of Byblos is telling about sending his messenger. He uses a verbal form which prima facie looks like a Gtn form: 13) *ša-ni-šam as-tap-pār* LÚ.ĐUMU.KIN-ia i-nu-ma 14) *li-gi-ḫe U.R.U.KI.ḪA-ia*

“Furthermore, I (have/continually?) sent my messenger after he took my cities.” (EA 88:13-14)

Moran (p. 274 with n. 2 on p. 275) follows Rainey in interpreting this verb as indicating iterative action. However, a thorough investigation of all the occurrences of the -t- forms of *šapāru* in the letters of Ribhaddi may suggest that the scribes of Byblos were either unaware of the differences between Gtn, Gt and the perfect -t- forms of this specific verb, or at least confused between the usages of these forms (Izze’el, forthcoming a [ibid. bbl. V/B/15]). The situation is further complicated by the fact that EA 88 is written in a different dialect (or, better: lect) than the majority of the Ribhaddi letters. The language of EA 88 is closer in some respect to northern Peripheral Akkadian, and hence also to standard Akkadian. Further research is, obviously, needed in order to be able to have a definite idea as for the correct rendering and interpretation of this very form.

The second example to be discussed demonstrates that history may sometimes depend on a single letter. In this case, it is the letter t, and we are still within the domain of the verbal system and the -t- forms of the verb.

Let us examine a passage from a letter of Aziru, the reputed Amurrite king. In this passage, as in many other of his letters to the Pharaoh, Aziru makes an effort to convince the Egyptian king of his loyalty. Immediately following the opening address, Aziru claims:

*En-ta a-na-kū LÚ.T.R-ka ụ i-nu kā-ša-di-ia 5 a-na pa-ni LUGAL EN-ia ụ ag-ta-bi *gāb-bi a-na-te.MES-ia a*-nā pa-ni EN-ia (EA 161:4-6).

The correct understanding of this passage is dependent on our interpretation of the -t- form of the verb *agīb*. The so-called perfect tense of Akkadian was unknown to the scholarly world until 1926, when Landsberger published his famous note on the existence of an inflectional (rather than derivational) category marked by an infixed **it**.

---

1) A lect can be defined for our needs here as a single linguistic system, which is the language of a single scribe reflected in some or all of his texts. A lect can also be correlated with a single text reflecting a unique linguistic system of its own, even from among a choice of texts written by one and the same scribe (Izze’el, forthcoming a [ibid. V/B/15]; forthcoming b [ibid. V/B/16], section 0.1).

Thus, the many forms with infixed -t- which occurred in the Amarna tablets, including those occurring in letters from Babylon proper, could not have been interpreted grammatically by previous scholars. The rendering of each of these forms was dependent solely on the translator's interpretation of the general context.

Attestations of many passages in Aziru letters in which Aziru promised the Pharaoh and his officials that he would come to Egypt (e.g., EA 164:43-44), have led scholars to interpret this passage in EA 161 to concur with all other texts, and to interpret the form aquabi as it were denoting the future.

The Akkadian "perfect" category was misunderstood not only by modern scholars in pre-Landsberger times. It was also misunderstood by Canaanite scribes, since their West Semitic substrata did not possess any similar inflectional category. The Akkadian language attests many confusions in the usage of inflectional -t- verbal forms. In many cases the Canaanite scribes used the -t- formation either as a derivational category or in agreement with their own usages of infixed -t- verbs (Rainey 1971 [= bibl. V/B[30]).

One example of a similar tendency has already been discussed above. It has been mentioned that scribes of Ribhaddi from Byblos tended to use -t- forms of the verb šapāru (including Gtn forms) indiscriminately. We also know from Rainey's paper about other usages of -t- forms in other Canaan-Akkadian dialects. However, this tendency is not necessarily a feature of all dialects and subdialects attested in the Amarna corpus. Some dialects do make use of inflectional forms of the verb which have a -t- infixed patterning as a marker. One of these is the Akkadian dialect of Amurrus.

In Amurrus Akkadian (in all its attested periods and lects), the formal category which may be conveniently termed iptaras is relatively rare. Its usage expands — at the expense of iprus forms — the more we advance in time. This expansion in usage goes hand in hand with a transition in meaning. While in the earlier lects, i.e., in texts from the Amarna period, this form marks the semantic category of proximity (see below), its usage in later subcorpora conforms, in general, to its usage in the middle Akkadian dialects. This trend conforms to a more general trend of Amurrus texts, i.e., to draw nearer to the core standard dialects of Akkadian the later the text is. This trend can be paralleled with a similar trend in the transition between the Old Babylonian and the Middle Babylonian periods of standard Akkadian.

The semantic notion of proximity can be established as the semantic category of the iptaras inflection in early Amurrus lects†). The Aziru letters form part of this corpus. By using the notion "proximity" I wish to stress that the inflectional category iptaras marks nearness in time, possibly nearness in space, and also proximity of relation, i.e., showing a certain degree of involvement on the side of the speaker. For our needs suffice it so say that iptaras forms in some lects of Amurrus Akkadian mark proximity in time, so that they would not be used to mark neither the past perfect, or the regular future. Rather, when a sequence of situations was to be expressed, the iptaras category would be used to mark the less remote situation, namely either a present-perfect, an after-past, or a future-in-the-past situation on one hand, or a future-perfect, a before-future, or a past-in-the-future situation on the other hand.

One should note that Amurrus Akkadian (as against Canaan-Akkadian in many of its dialects) is closer to standard Akkadian in that they both have an inflectional category using an infixed -t- as a marker.

Only after a thorough linguistic analysis of the verbal system of Amurrus Akkadian — including the differences between Amurrus Akkadian and Amarnaic — could one reach any solid conclusions concerning the meaning of the verbal categories covered by iptaras formations in any of the Amurrus Amarna letters. This was unavailable to Moran at the time he translated EA 161, so that his own translation rested on data he had at that time. The commonly accepted historical setting of the Aziru letters, as well as Rainey’s analysis of the -t- form in Amarnaic, had led Moran to adhere to Knudtzon’s (and Knudtzon’s predecessors’) interpretation of this passage. Thus, he translated this passage as if Aziru were speaking about a future visit to Egypt.

However, the grammatical analysis presented above prevents us from translating the form aquabi in the future. My own translation of the passage under consideration is as follows:

"My lord, I am your servant. When I arrived in the presence of the king, my lord, I said all my words in the presence of my lord.""

Just after the publication of Moran’s book, I had the privilege to discuss with him my own translations of the Amurrus letters. I presented to him my translation for this passage, and asked for his opinion. I, a dedicated linguist, had not asked myself the historical implications of the change I suggested in my treatment of the verb aquabi. Moran, however, immediately noticed that if my rendering was correct, then the immediate implication should be that Aziru had visited Egypt twice: once before EA 161, the other time after he had exhausted his endeavors to postpone or refrain from coming. This putative second visit to Egypt was the one attested to in EA 169 and EA 170, two letters sent from Amurrus to Egypt at the time Aziru was there.

Convinced of my linguistic approach, and being a strong advocation grammaticae for the study of the Ancient Near East, I had insisted on my own translation. When I later asked my colleague Itamar Singer to write a chapter on the history of Amurrus for my forthcoming book on Amurrus Akkadian (Izre’el, forthcoming b [= bibl. V/B[16]), I drew his attention to this debate.

Many discussion and a true interdisciplinary team work between a historian and a linguist have eventually yielded some interesting results. The outcome of these discussions has been that Aziru did not pay two visits to the Pharaoh, but only one, and that that single visit took place before he wrote EA 161. Further investigations have come up with the surprising fact that there was an absolutely new evidence (in contrast to a very well rooted view) for a visit of Aziru to Egypt subsequent to his frequent assurance and reassurance.

†) To the best of my knowledge, only Finley (1979 [= bibl. V/B[5], p. 152) has interpreted this passage as occurring in a past time (see there for his interesting syntactical analysis of the sentence). It is not at all surprising that only a scholar whose interest was focused solely on the linguistic side, has “dared” to translate the verb aquabi in the past tense.
to the Pharaoh that he would come (EA 164-168). These and other important historical implications of EA 161 will be discussed in detail in a forthcoming book by Singer and myself9), as well as in his above-mentioned chapter of the history of Amurru.

We have thus seen that further grammatical investigations can indeed yield advances in interpretation.

More research is also needed in other domains of linguistics and related subjects, such as lexicography, stylistics, phraseology, and so forth. One of these topics has been briefly discussed earlier (in my discussion of aspects of the present translation), namely, the study of the differences between qaba and lapar in similar contexts.

As I have already said above, Moran’s translations, based on the latest word of the Amarna linguistic research, can now serve as a new authoritative interpretation of the contents and linguistic setting of the letters. It is from this higher level that the scholarly world can now prepare itself for renewed linguistic study.

**Glosses**

A well known feature of the Amarna letters is its glosses. The glosses are words, usually marked as foreign, inserted within the sequence of the text either to clarify or to replace an Akkadian word or a Sumerian logogram which might be wrongly interpreted when read in Egypt.

The study of these glosses, especially the West Semitic ones, has been undertaken several times in the past century. The interest in investigating these words has been by and large linguistic, as these are taken to be the oldest vocalized Canaanite words hitherto attested (Böhl 1909 [= bibl. V/A, 2], pp. 89-90; Sivan 1984: passim [= bibl. V/B/34])

Moran has paid notice to glosses too. All the discussed glosses and foreign words have been conveniently listed as the last indices (pp. 617-618), which contain references to discussions of these words within the textual notes.

As yet, no systematic evaluation of the gloss phenomenon has been undertaken (for a preliminary treatment cf. Arzì 1963 [= bibl. VII/1]). The study of this phenomenon in its broad context may yield some very interesting results. Such a study may also benefit from the study of comparative material.11)

Some of the questions to be asked with regard to the glosses are: What is their raison d’être? I.e., what does it mean when we say that glosses were added to vocabularies “which might be wrongly interpreted in Egypt”? Who was supposed to read these letters in Egypt? Were these Canaanite scribes in the service of the Pharaoh’s court, or Egyptian scribes who could understand Canaanite (cf. the questions raised by Edzard, after E. Reiner, Edzard 1985 [= bibl. II 6], p. 255 with note 79 on p. 259)? Or, perhaps, were they messengers bringing letters from Canaan to Egypt and vice versa, thus reading the tablets themselves at the Egyptian “foreign office”? I have some suspicion that this was indeed the case with one scribe of Gezer, who may himself have written in Egypt EA 369, a letter from the Pharaoh to Milku of Gezer.12)

What can we learn from Hurrian and Egyptian glosses? Who could have read Hurrian glosses in Egypt? At this juncture, one may also ask who were the officials in Egypt who had been asked by the scribe of EA 32 to respond “always in Hittite” (ll. 24-25)? What can we learn from the fact that Hurrian glosses are attested only in letters from the north, and not from Canaan, and with this, what can be suggested concerning the spoken language of the rulers who bore non-Semitic names and that of the local inhabitants within their territories?

These and many more questions can be asked, and we are now in a better position to get to the study of these issues. The study of the gloss system should be combined later with the study of scribal education and the messenger system in that area during the Amarna period. All this integrative research should certainly yield many new insights and better understanding of the political powers of that time.

**Proper names**

I have raised above the question of southern Canaanite rulers with non-Semitic names. An onomastical and prosopographic study of the Amarna correspondence has been wanting for a long time. Questions pertaining to the ethnographic meaning of non-Semitic names and their geographical settings, or the prosopography of the Syro-Palestinian continuum have remained a matter of debate, and practically open to date. Moreover, there are still names of which the reading remains uncertain, even obscure, such as that of the notorious ruler of Jerusalem, spelled IR-he-ba (cf. p. 574 s.v. ‘Abdi-Heba). While we are awaiting a forthcoming study on the Amarna proper names by Richard Hess (based on his dissertation, Hess 1984 [= bibl. VIII/2]), the list given by Moran is helpful, at least for reference while reading the texts.

Moran sometimes endeavors to give an accurate normalization of a name (e.g., Keliya for gl-li-ja, p. 581 s.v.), but in most cases he renders names as in their primary transliterated form. I wonder why Moran did not make the effort to render all the names according to their phonemic supposed representations and in agreement with recent achievements of onomastical investigations?

Perfection is by no means possible, of course. Moreover, there are various legitimate ways for transcribing and rendering proper names. The procedure followed by Moran is readily and admittedly acceptable for some unrecognized and barely studied non-Semitic personal or geographic names. Several ancient names, especially geographical ones,


12) I hope to bring some support to this claim in another study.

13) Some of the questions raised here have been provoked by the audience during a lecture I gave at the University of Michigan in March 1987. These, and many other problems, were later discussed in a seminar I gave at the University of Tel Aviv last year. I thank all the participants of both these occasions for inspiring questions and comments.
have already received an accepted conventional form in modern scientific literature, as is the case with the transcription Nuhaššē rather than a possible transcription Nuhaššē or the like, Aziru rather than 'Aziru, and so forth. In such cases the conventional or common transcription is to be preferred, especially for the general reader. Therefore, I would not have transcribed well-known geographical names like Ta'nanak or Gaza as Taňaka and Hazzatu respectively (e.g., in the map, p. 569).

There are also some inconsistencies in the way in which proper names are transcribed. Thus, e.g., PI-mi-ú-ta (EA 177:2) is rendered Yamiuta on p. 175, but Yamiuta in the index on p. 588; il-da-a-PI (EA 175:3) is normalized with a final i ('Hdayyi), but hi-bi-PI (EA 178) and other similar names are normalized with a final a (Hihiya). The reasonings for these differences are not given.

A more important matter is the treatment of variant spellings of proper name which occur in the original texts. Here Moran has endeavored to represent fully each of the variants occurring in the individual letters. Correlations and identifications of the individual names have been given in the indices. Their identifications might better have already been given in the notes which follow each text. Another possibility, which might be preferred also by non-specialists, is to have only one form of each name in all its attestations, and to give the exact spelling variation in a textual note which follows. This problem would perhaps be less acute had we had transcriptions of the texts.

For instance, the city of Qedes (or, rather, Qedeš) is rendered, according to its variant spellings, Qidsâ, Qissa, Qinna (p. 601), but there are no references to this equation in the letters or in the notes. Likewise, there are many spellings of the name of its ruler: Aitukama, Atak(k)ama, Etak(k)ama, Itatkama (p. 575).

While the identifications of all the variant spellings of these specific names, both of Qedeš and of its ruler, are quite solid and commonly accepted, there are other names where doubts can be raised as to their identification or correlation. In such cases, variational spellings cannot and must not be ignored. Hence I agree with Moran in his conceptual framework concerning this issue, but as for me, I would still let the reader, especially the newcomer and non-specialist, have a more convenient way to overcome these difficulties.

Geographical setting and scribal traditions

Historical-geographical research about Canaan during the Amarna period has not been neglected, and it has indeed yielded important results (see the respective section [IX] in the bibliography presented below). The publication of Moran's volume should also stimulate more research of the geographical setting of the Amarna letters.

This required study of both the geographical and the historical setting of 14th century Canaan must be preceded by a preparatory investigation aiming to determine the provenance of each of the Amarna letters.

The first serious attempt to get an overall integrative geographical and historical (i.e., chronological) view of the Amarna correspondence was made by Knudtzon. He did that in an admirable way by rearranging all the Amarna texts and renumbering them according to their provenance and chronological order. Knudtzon studied carefully the physical features of all the tablets, examined their script and language, observed the names occurring in them, and took notice of their contents. His views have been faithfully represented in the detailed discussion of these issues by Weber in the second volume of Knudtzon's Amarna edition (= bibl. IX/21). On the whole, Knudtzon's order followed the principle of giving a letter a higher number as we advance southwards. The international correspondence was given the lowest series of numbers; non-letters were given the highest numeric values.

Knudtzon's order can still hold as a rough skeleton. However, much has been done in this area since the publication of Knudtzon's edition. First of all, more Amarna letters have been unearthed and given subsequent numbers (Rainey 1978 (= bibl. III/3), p. 1). Furthermore, research has discovered that Knudtzon's grouping could not always be followed.

Let us discuss one example. Knudtzon grouped EA 60-65 together, relying primarily on the identity (or similarity) of the names of their senders. He has attributed all six letters to Abdi-Asîru of Amurrû, and hence gave them low numbers. However, differences between EA 60-62 and EA 63-5, mainly in language, has favored the dissociation of these two groups. It has been suggested that the latter group, i.e., EA 63-65, are to be associated with EA 335, and all four letters with the group of letters sent by Súwardata (EA 278-284, 366), a ruler in southern Palestine (Gath)?

Moran's notes at the end of each letter, and especially his indices of proper names at the end of his book, summarize the present state of research with regard to the provenance of each of the Amarna letters and the identity of their senders. This is done by giving the basis for the latest view concerning the individual senders in the textual notes, by specifying the status or identity of each of the personal names, or by stating the suggested location of each of the geographical names in the respective indices.

Moran has made a noticeable effort to delve into the origin of each letter, including its sender. He has collected all the relevant data from previous research, and advanced our understanding even more from his own investigations. He has combined the accumulated knowledge of the historical geography of Canaan with his own intimate familiarity with the language of the Amarna letters and scribal traditions, in order to present many new insights.

Apart from explanatory notes and annotated indices, Moran discusses the scribal traditions in his introduction (section 3), and — which is more relevant to our discussion here — within textual notes on the link between letters. Also, some joins of separate fragments have been suggested (EA 235 + 327; also 180 + 183, p. 419 n. 1 for EA 180). This is done by means of searching for scribal features which may give us clues for a single hand theory.

Such notes are useful also for suggesting links between letters forming a subgroup inside a larger corpus of letters sent by a single ruler. For instance, Moran suggests that EA 126, 129, 137(?) and 362, all letters of Ribbaddi of Byblos, yet only a small part of the large Ribbaddi corpus, were written by one and the same scribe.

There are also comments on the differences in scribal hand within some smaller groups of letters than the Ribbaddi

corpus. For instance, Moran notes that the scribe of EA 278-280 is to be distinguished from that (or those) of EA 281 and EA 282-284 (p. 500 n. 1). Another example is EA 215-216. Moran states that these two letters, both sent by a ruler named Bayawa, could not have been inscribed by a single scribe.

These and similar observations open another area for research, and a new array of questions to be raised. For example: We can ascertain that it is indeed Ribhaddi of Byblos who sent EA 126 and the related letters, and that Suwardata is the sender of EA 278-284. What, then, can we learn from the differences in script and language that have been discerned among their letters?

As for EA 215-216, Moran suggests that between the time of Yanhamu, mentioned in EA 215, and the time of Maya, mentioned in EA 216 (both were commissioners who served in that area), there was a change of scribe (p. 448 n. 1 for EA 216). But is this the only possible explanation for the difference in script between these two letters? Can we be sure that these two letters were indeed sent by one and the same ruler, judging only from the identical names of their respective senders? The reason for my doubts is simple: there is not enough data to enable us to reach at any solid conclusion for this scanty group of letters. However, large-scale research into scribal traditions and other related matters might serve to achieve a better understanding of the problems involved, and draw a clearer picture of the general historical and geographical setting.

Other questions that can be asked within this type of investigation are, e.g., whether the sender of EA 292 is identical to that of EA 294 (cf. Moran’s n. 1 on p. 522); whether Abditiriri, king of Hazor, is the same (or what is his relationship to) the sender entitled “the man of Hazor” in 228; and if it is the same person, what can we learn from the change in his title between these two letters. A detailed investigation of scribal traditions may yield interesting results also in this domain.

Scribal traditions and linguistic analyses are of extreme importance for the investigation of the place of origin of these letters. Moreover, geographical linguistics provides an indispensable tool for achieving this goal. However, this study should be combined with both a preparatory and a coordinated historical-geographical inquiry. While research of the latter subject has already been undertaken, large-scale combined investigation on both geographical linguistics and historical geography is still wanting for the Amarna Period in Canaan.

As mentioned above, Moran’s indices of proper names give some idea of suggested relationships between different spellings of names, and relationships between names of rulers and their respective city states. They also give some indication of the location of geographical names. The index of geographical names also gives frequent references to the maps on pp. 569-571. Unfortunately, the editorial work done here is very unsatisfactory. First of all, there are no numbers on the maps to correspond to the reference numbers in the index. Secondly, the map on p. 569 should have been given the number 2; the map on p. 570-1 should have been given the number 1.

For any future study which will be specifically related to the history and geography of Canaan during the Amarna period, as well as for any casual reading of these letters in their historical and geographical context, these indices are too complicated to be of instant help, especially for the newcomer. Hence, I thought it would be worthwhile to offer the interested students of Amarna two provenance lists: one is arranged according to the EA number; the other groups the letters according to their provenance. These lists try to be conclusive of what has already been achieved by research done in this field. Moreover, they can serve as a starting point for a newly undertaken combined research into the area of geographical linguistics of the Amarna period in Canaan. Note, however, that these lists are not based on any newly made historical-geographical research or linguistic-geographical research of my own, and depends solely on previous research done in these fields.

The lists comprise only the texts included in Moran’s edition, and exclude the literary and other scholarly texts. Previous lists of similar kinds are, unfortunately, either too old or not comprehensive (see Knudtzon [= bibl. III/2], vol. I, pp. V-VIII; Weber in Knudtzon, vol. II, pp. 1555-1582; Jacquier 196613), pp. 32-36, 52-54; Edzard 1985 [= bibl. I/6], p. 252 with notes 36-61 on p. 258; for previous research into the historical geography of Canaan in the Amarna period, see the respective section in the bibliography [IX]).

Note: An ancient name, whenever different from the respective conventional name, is specified in the lists only when it actually appears so in the tablet (or in one of the listed tablets for that specific reference).

With regard to letters from an unknown provenance, wherever one can ascertain their approximate region, this region is specified. Otherwise, some general idea of a letter’s provenance is rendered by its number, as has been explained above.

### Provenance list (according to number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Amunephi III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Misiri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Kadashmanenil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Burnaburyas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Amenophis III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Babylonia</td>
<td>Amenophis III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>Babylonia</td>
<td>A princess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burnaburyas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amenophis IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assyrus (Aššur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aššuraballit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arslaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Egypt (Miṣṣari)</td>
<td>Amenophis III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Arslaw</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-5</td>
<td>Alasîya</td>
<td>King of Alasiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>Hatti</td>
<td>Supphihulma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-40</td>
<td>Hatti? Syria?</td>
<td>Zita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-3</td>
<td>Ugari</td>
<td>Ammištammaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Ugari</td>
<td>Ammištammaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ugari?</td>
<td>Puduheba, Queen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ugari</td>
<td>of Ugari?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ugari</td>
<td>Nāqaddu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Daughter of ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Nuḫaše</td>
<td>Addunirari</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

| EA 52-55; 56? | Qatna | unknown | unknown | unknown | unknown | Aḫḫ... |
| EA 57 | Syria | Akizzá | unknown | unknown | EA 217 | unknown |
| EA 58 | Syria | Teljutešub | unknown | EA 218-9 | unknown |
| EA 59 | Tunip | Citizens of Tunip | EA 220 | unknown | Nukurtuya |
| EA 60-2 | Amurrú | Abdiaširta | EA 221-2 | unknown | (Kurtuya?) |
| EA 63-65 | Gath? | Abdiašarti | EA 223 | unknown | Yiktasu |
| EA 66 | unknown | unknown | EA 224 | unknown | Endaruta |
| EA 67 | unknown | unknown | EA 225 | unknown | Şumhadda |
| EA 68-95 | Philomenian Coast | Ribhaddi | EA 226 | unknown | Samùhadda |
| EA 96 | Byblis (Guba/i) | A Commander | EA 227 | unknown | (Šaḫunu) |
| EA 9777; 98 | Beyrouth? | Yapa’hadda | EA 228 | unknown | Šipturu[iša ’] |
| EA 99 | Egypt | Amenophis III? IV? | EA 229 | unknown | King of Hazor |
| EA 100 | Ḫaqat | Iqara and its elders | EA 230 | unknown | Abdiširi |
| EA 101-138 | Byblis (Guba/i) | Ribhaddi | EA 231 | unknown | Abdina ... |
| EA 139-140 | Byblis (Guba) | Iliqari and Byblis | EA 232 | unknown | (northern)? |
| EA 141-3 | Beyrouth (Beruta, written PŪḪÁ) | Ammuniṟa | EA 233-4; 235(+ 327) | unknown | Yama |
| EA 144-145 | Sidon (Siduna) | Zimreddi | EA 236 | unknown | unknown |
| EA 146-155 | Tyre (Surri) | Abimilkí | EA 237-8 | unknown | Acre (Akka) |
| EA 156-161 | Amurrú | Aziru | EA 239 | unknown | Acre (Akka) |
| EA 162-3 | Egypt | Amenophis IV | EA 240 | unknown | Surata |
| EA 164-168 | Amurrú | Aziru | EA 241 | unknown | Satatna |
| EA 170 | Amurrú | Ba’luya and Beti’ilu | EA 248 | unknown | unknown |
| EA 171 | unknown | Aziru | EA 249-50 | unknown | unknown |
| EA 172 | unknown | unknown | EA 251 | unknown | unknown |
| EA 173 | unknown | Beri | EA 252-254 | unknown | Shechem |
| EA 174 | Lebanon Valley? | unknown | EA 255-6 | unknown | Lab’ayu |
| EA 175 | Ḥasi (Hazi) | Ildaya | EA 257-9 | unknown | Pella (Philu) |
| EA 176 | Lebanon Valley | Yamniyata | EA 260 | unknown | ...].[Gnate] |
| EA 177 | Guddāšuna | Hibiya | EA 261-2 | unknown | Ba’limhir |
| EA 178 | Lebanon Valley | A former ruler of Tubijí | EA 262 | unknown | Bit-Tinni |
| EA 179 | Lebanon Valley | Šutarna? | EA 263 | unknown | Ba’limir |
| EA 180(+ 1837); 181 | Mušnuna? | Šutarna | EA 264-6 | unknown | Dašru |
| EA 181 | unknown | unknown | EA 267-271 | unknown | Palestine (Central) |
| EA 182; 183 | Mušnuna? | Šutarna | EA 272 | unknown | Rash-met |
| (+ 1807?); 184 | unknown | unknown | EA 273-4 | unknown | Tagi |
| EA 185-6 | Ḥasi (Hazi) | Mayarzana | EA 275-6 | unknown | Gezer |
| EA 187 | Enišasi | Śatiya | EA 276 | unknown | Milkilu |
| EA 188 | unknown | unknown | EA 277 | unknown | Šum... |
| EA 189 | Qedesh (Qidši) | Etakkama | EA 278-284 | unknown | Šābuna |
| EA 190 | Egypt | Amenophis IV | EA 285-291 | unknown | NIN.UR.MAḪ. MEŠ |
| EA 191-192 | Ruljizza | Araswiyah | EA 292-3 | unknown | Palestine (Central/South) |
| EA 193 | Labana (= Lapana) | Tiwaté | EA 294 | unknown | unknown |
| EA 194-197 | Kumidí | Pinyawaza | EA 295 | unknown | Gath |
| EA 198 | Bashan Region | (Birýawaza) | EA 296 | unknown | Jerusalem |
| EA 199 | Syria? | Arašša | EA 297-300 | unknown | (Urusalim) |
| EA 200 | Ziribašani (Siribašani?) | "[Your] servants" | EA 301-6 | unknown | Gezer (Gazri) |
| EA 201 | Bashan Region | Artamanyá | EA 307-8 | unknown | Ba’luššiti |
| EA 202 | Bashan Region | Amayašé | EA 295 | unknown | (Addadani?) |
| EA 203 | Śašjimi | Abdimilkí | EA 296 | unknown | Ši...Ni |
| EA 204 | Qanu | Ruler of Qanu | EA 297-300 | unknown | (or Addadani of Gezer?) |
| EA 205 | Tubu | Ruler of Tubu | EA 301-6 | Tyre | ...šipti/dani |
| EA 206 | Nazib’a | Ruler of Nazib’a | EA 307-8 | Palestine | Ya’iru |
| EA 207 | unknown | Irpē ... | EA 309-10 | Palestine | (Central/South) |
| EA 208 | unknown | unknown | EA 311 | unknown | |
**Provenance list (according to place of origin)**

This list is arranged in alphabetical order of place of origin, and then of senders; the latter without reference to chronological order. The international correspondence and Egyptian letters are listed first; then the correspondence from the vassals. Letters from an unknown provenance are listed at the end in two groups: first according to the approximate region whenever that could be ascertained, arranged from north southwards and from east westwards; then according to the sender’s name, in alphabetical order. As has been said above, some general idea of the provenance of each of the latter texts is rendered by its number.

**Letters from independent countries:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>City/Location</th>
<th>EA No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alašiya</td>
<td>King of Alašiya</td>
<td>33-5; 367; 37-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsawa</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyria (Aṣšur)</td>
<td>Aṣšuruballit</td>
<td>15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon (Karaduniyaš)</td>
<td>Burnaburiyaš</td>
<td>4; 6-11; 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt (Miṣri, Miṣṣari)</td>
<td>Amenophis III</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatti</td>
<td>Šuppiluliuma</td>
<td>41-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatti? Syria?</td>
<td>Žita</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatti? Mitanni</td>
<td>Tušaratta</td>
<td>17; 18; 19-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vassal Letters:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Location</th>
<th>EA No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acre (Akka)</td>
<td>233-4; 235-327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satatna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akšap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amurru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba’luya and Beti’išu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beti’išu? Iriteššu?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yidya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayyāb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammûnira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yapa’hadda</td>
<td>977; 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba’lumir</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilirapī’ and Byblos</td>
<td>139-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribhaddi</td>
<td>68-95; 101-138; 362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdirēša</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šətiya</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdiāštari</td>
<td>63-65; 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šuwardata</td>
<td>278-284; 366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagi</td>
<td>264-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba’lu – U.R.S.A.G.</td>
<td>249-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba’lụṣīpti</td>
<td>292-3; 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Addadānī)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mülkītu</td>
<td>267-271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yapa’u</td>
<td>297-300; 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zurašar (Šurašar?)</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamiyuta</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beri</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ildaya</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayarzāna</td>
<td>185-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdooršī</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King of Hazor</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqara and its elders</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR-heba</td>
<td>285-291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araška</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piryawaza (Biryawaza)</td>
<td>194-197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiwāite</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šṭëtišša’la</td>
<td>330-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahni’išu</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zirmredi</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biridiya</td>
<td>242-247; 365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Masōdīta** (of Ta’anākāh?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Location</th>
<th>EA No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šūtarānā</td>
<td>180(?+1)183; 182; 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šum...</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruler of Nazib’a</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addūnirīrī</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutu’a’lu</td>
<td>255-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etākkama</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruler of Qanu</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akizzi</td>
<td>52-55; 567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsawīya</td>
<td>191-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIN.UR.MAH. MES</td>
<td>273-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zirmredi</td>
<td>144-145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamuhadda</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bibliography

What I would like to have in a volume of text translations like this is an introductory bibliographical list. I am not sure if this is a book, as he found Heintz's I.D.E.A. volumes (volume 1: Heintz 1982 [= bibl. I/7]) sufficient for this purpose (p. 10). I disagree. Heintz's bibliography is not only far from complete, but also its purpose, and hence its format, is total unsuitable for the average, not to mention the beginning unprofessional student of the Amarna tablets.

This volume will be an indispensable tool both for the specialist and the general Bible and Ancient Near Eastern student. I certainly hope that the merits of Moran's book will attract many young students to study the Amarna letters more seriously and for their own sake, rather than as an aid for other disciplines. Therefore, I offer here an introductory bibliographical list which may serve for a start-up study of the Amarna letters.

El-Amarna Basic Bibliography

Note: Some of the references listed below are of limited importance, and are given here only as specimens of studies. On the other hand, this bibliographical list is a basic bibliography rather than an extensive one, and further bibliographical work is needed for the study of both individual texts and general notions. It should also be noted that, being intended to serve as an introductory bibliography, this list is more linguistically oriented.

(I) General background, research background and bibliographies:


(II) Main editions of cuneiform texts:

For a complete list of available cuneiform copies, photographs, transliterations and previous translations, see
Moran's introduction, pp. 14-17, as well as the many bibliographical references under each text heading.


(III) Texts editions (with glossaries):


(IV) Latest translation:


(V) Linguistic and philological studies (some include text editions or glossaries):

A. Earlier linguistic studies:

1. Bezold, Charles. 1893. *Oriental Diplomacy*: Being the transliterated text of the Cuneiform Despatches between the Kings of Egypt and Western Asia in the XVth century before Christ, discovered at Tell el-Amarna, and now preserved in the British Museum. With full Vocabulary, Grammatical Notes, etc. London: Luzac & Co.

B. Modern Studies (since 1950, the time of the completion of Moran’s dissertation, below no. 18):

13. Irze’el, Shlomo. 1986. The Complementary Distribution of the Vowels e and i in the Peripheral Akkadian...


(VI) Theoretical grounds and comparative material for linguistic research:


(VII) Scribes' education and epistemology:


form Archives and Libraries. Papers read at the 30e
Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Leiden, 4-8 July
Learning at Hattusha. Journal of Cuneiform Studies
6. Oppenheim, A. Leo. 1965. A Note on the Scribes in
Mesopotamia. In: Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger
On His Seventy Fifth Birthday, April 21, 1965. (As-
syriological Studies, 16). Chicago: The University of
7. Salonen, Erkki. 1967. Die Gruss- und Hilsflechtformen
in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen. (Studia Orientalia,
38). Helsinki.

(VIII) Proper names:
1. Albright, W.F. 1946. Cuneiform Material for Egyptian
Prosopography. Journal of Near Eastern Studies 5. Pp. 7-
25.
3. Hess, Richard S. 1985. Personal Names from Amarna:
Alternative Readings and Interpretations. Ugarit-Fors-

(IX) History and chronology; historical geography:
1. Aharoni, Yohanan. 1967. The Land of the Bible. A
Historical Geography. Translated by A.F. Rainey. Lon-
2. Albright 1966 (= bibl. 1/2).
3. Alt, Albrecht. 1959. Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des
Kingdom, According to Amarna Letters 15 & 16. A
Contribution to the Diplomatic History of Ancient Near
East in the Mid-Second Millennium B.C.E. In: Bar-Ilan
Studies in History. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University
Press.
5. Campbell, Edward Fay, Jr. 1964. The Chronology of the
Amarna Letters. With Special Reference to the Hypo-
thetical Coregency of Amenophis III and Akhenaten. Bal-
timore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. (Ägyptolo-
Harrassowitz.
und Geschichte des neuen Reiches. (Ägyptologische
8. Kitchen, K.A. 1962. Suppiluliamu and the Amarna Pha-
rass. A Study in Relative Chronology. (Liverpool Mon-
graphs in Archaeology and Oriental Studies). Liverpool.
Jahrtausend v.u.Z. I-III. (Deutsche Akademie der Wis-
senschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung,
Veröffentlichung Nr. 40). Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Korrespondenz von El-Amarna. (Alter Orient und Altes
12. Liverani, Mario. 1979. Three Amarna Essays. In-
trduction and Translation by Matthew L. Jaffe. (Source
13. Murman, William J. 1985. The Road to Kadesh. (Stu-
14. Na'aman, Nadav. 1975. The Historical Disposition and
Historical Development of Eretz-Israel According to the
Amarna Letters. PhD Dissertation, Tel Aviv University.
15. Redford, Donald B. 1967. History and Chronology of
the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt. Seven Studies. (Near
and Middle East Studies, 3). Toronto: University of
Toronto Press.
16. Redford, Donald B. 1985. The Relations Between
Egypt and Israel from El-Amarna to the Babylonian
Jerusalem, April 1984. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration
17. Sapin, Jean. 1981. La géographie humaine de la Syrie-
Palestine au deuxième millénaire avant J.C. comme
voie de recherche historique. Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient vol. 24, pp. 1-62; vol. 25,
pp. 1-49; 113-186.
Military Background of the Amarna Period. Journal of
Translated by David Smith. London: Darton, Long-
man & Todd.
Amarna Age. A Borderline Between Conflicting Empires.
PhD Dissertation, The University of Michigan, Ann
Arbor.
1009-1356.
22. Wente, E.F. and Ch.C. van Siclen III. 1977. A
Chronology of the New Kingdom. In: Johnson, J.H.
and E.F. Wente (eds.). Studies in Honor of George R.
Hughes. (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations, 39).
und die hehittische Geschichte des 15. und 14. Jahr-
hunderts v. Chr. In: Äström, Paul (ed.). High, Middle or
Low? Acts of an International Colloquium Held at the
(Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology and Literature,
Pocket Book 56). Gothenburg: Paul Åström. Pp. 74-
117.
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