

# IS THERE REALLY A *yaqtula* CONJUGATION PATTERN IN THE CANAANITE AMARNA TABLETS?

Anson F. Rainey  
Tel Aviv University

The ensuing study is based on two sections in a larger work dealing with the morphosyntax of the verbal system in the Amarna letters written by Canaanite scribes. One section of that work treats the many instances when what appear to be true Akkadian ventives are used by those scribes. There an attempt was made to play “the devil’s advocate” and to see just how many of the verb forms with *-a(m)* suffix could be explained as Akkadian ventives. The other section dealt with instances where the ventive might not be expected. It remains to see if one can really accept the arguments by W. L. Moran for the existence of a *yaqtula* injunctive pattern (functioning like the jussive) in the native dialect of the scribes who wrote the Amarna letters from Byblos.

## Terminology

The term “volitive” has been borrowed from Moran (1950: *passim*) who applied it to all injunctives (jussive, *yaqtula*). Moran, in turn, had adopted the term “volitive” from Joüon (1923: 307–12, §114). The *yaqtula* conjugation pattern was called “subjunctive” by Moran, following the convention of Arabic grammar (Moran 1950: 89–104). When Moran presented the evidence gathered in his dissertation to a wider audience, he called the conjugation pattern simply the

“Early Canaanite *yaqtula*” (Moran 1960). That article had considerable impact on Semitic linguistics (Moscati et al. 1964: 135; Fleisch 1968; Blau 1971). In the present study, “volitive” has been arbitrarily chosen as the title for *yaqtula* to distinguish it from the jussive and the imperative. The distinction is one of convenience only since volitive and injunctive would both be valid definitions for all conjugation patterns in this non-indicative mood (Rainey 1990).

## Morphology

The characteristic feature of this conjugation pattern is assumed to be the following (using Arabic as a model): the 3rd m.s., 3rd f.s., 2nd m.s., 1st c.s. and 1st c.pl. are marked by an *-a* suffix; the 3rd m.pl. and the 2nd m.pl. are identical with those of the preterite and the jussive, i.e., they lack the *-na* suffix of the imperfect. This means that all injunctive 2nd and 3rd plurals except energics, which are virtually unattested in EA, are the same. If the *yaqtula* conjugation pattern is to be identified in the EA texts from Canaan, then it is only on the singulars and the 1st c.pl. No injunctive glosses of purely Canaanite verbs are known with the volitive *-a* suffix, except for the apparent Canaanite imperative *ku-na* (EA 147:36).

The greatest obstacle to distinguishing volitive forms in these texts is the fact, as recognized

by Moran (1950: 91–92; 1960: 2) that they are written in Akkadian and Akkadian has the homophonous morpheme known as the ventive, i.e., the suffix (on singulars) *-a(m)*. For that reason, an intensive survey of all the texts in question was made in search of evidence for the Akkadian ventive. It was seen that ventives are prevalent throughout the corpus. Izre'el (1978: 80–82) had made a similar study, with special reference to the Gezer letters but against the background of the corpus as a whole, and had come to similar conclusions. Many verbs with *-a* suffix are those which naturally took the ventive in Akkadian. Rabiner (1981: 99–100) also noted that forms with *-a* in EA 234 (from Acco) appear on preterites; they seem to function like the forms with  $\emptyset$  both as preterites and injunctives. Therefore, the use of the ventive is evidently more widespread than one might deduce just from reading Moran's presentation. As the ventive occurs on truly preterite verb forms in this corpus, those which appear in injunctive contexts could just as well be ventives in the WS jussive mode. Moran did prove beyond all doubt that those forms were injunctive and not indicative. He provided numerous contrasts between verbs with *-u*, which are indicative (our imperfect), and those with *-a*, which are injunctive. But he also demonstrated that the jussives and the injunctives with *-a* all can serve in the same syntagmas! Who is to say that the *-a* forms are not simply jussives with Akkadian ventive? The ensuing discussion will be limited to those examples where an Akkadian ventive might not be required. It will be seen that in most cases, there is a possible ventive on some other verb in the immediate context, so that modus attraction could also have been at work.

The examples will be cited according to the same syntactic constructions as those described for the jussive.

### Akkadian Ventives

First it is necessary to note the examples of the true Akkadian ventive. It will be demonstrated below that the Canaanite scribes were well

aware of the function of that suffix. One finds both *-a* and *-am*, even in cases where there is no enclitic or personal suffix on the verb. The scribes are especially sensitive to the semantic nuances applied to verbs of motion and verbs of communication (speaking, writing) by the addition of the ventive, and they make good use of them. When the application of the *-a(m)* conflicted with the need for a WS verbal suffix, then the scribes had to make some kind of compromise or accommodation. Various solutions to that dilemma will be illustrated below.

### Stock Expressions

The Canaanite scribes were familiar, of course, with the use of the ventive in letters which they received from outside of Canaan (mainly from Egypt). Recognition of such forms would have been part of their training. The letters from pharaoh to local Canaanite rulers have the expression:

*tup-pa an-na-a uš-te-bi-la-ku* . . . LUGAL *um-te-eš-še-ra-ku* / <sup>1</sup>*Ḫa-an-ni* 'this tablet have I sent to you . . . the king has sent to you Ḫanni' (EA 367:3, 6–7); *tup-pa an-na<sup>1</sup>-am<sup>1</sup> / ul-te-bi-la-ak-ku* . . . *um-te-še-ra-ak-ku* <sup>1</sup>*Ḫa-an-ia* 'this tablet have I sent to you . . . I have sent to you Ḫanya' (EA 369:3, 5; Moran 1975: 151 n. 2).

Therefore, it is not surprising to find the following Akkadianism in a text which is obviously a reply to just such a pharaonic message:

*a-wa-at ul-te-bi-la* / LUGAL EN-*ia* DINGIR. MEŠ-*ia* / <sup>d</sup>UTU-*ia a[-n]a ia-ši* 'As for the word which the king, my lord, my sun-god, sent to me' (EA 267:9–11).

### With Accusative Suffix

The Jerusalem letters, which use mainly Akkadian prefix forms, also apply the ventive plus accusative suffix:

*zu-ru-uḫ ša-ri KALAG.GA* / <sup>1</sup>*ù<sup>1</sup>-še-ri-ba-an-ni a-na É<sup>LÚ</sup>a-bi-ia* 'The strong arm of the king installed me in my father's house' (EA 26:12–13; cf. EA 300:17–19).

The Byblos letters contain several examples of the ventive plus accusative 1st c.s. *-ni* in purely indicative contexts. The same tablet which has *mi-nu / yi-na-ši-ru-ni* ‘who will protect me?’ (EA 112:17) also has *mi-nu yi-na-ši-ra-an-ni* (EA 112:13). Other examples of the same phenomenon are: *[m]i-nu yi-na-ša-ra-ni* (EA 119:10); *mi-nu yi-n[a-ši-]ra[-an-ni]* (EA 121:10); *ma-an-nu / yi-na-ši-ra-ni* (EA 130:19).

*šapāru*. Another standard usage is the ventive with *šapāru* ‘to send in writing’, as in this Taanach letter:

*at-ta ta-<sup>r</sup>aš<sup>1</sup>-pu-<sup>r</sup>ra<sup>1</sup> / a-na ia-ši* ‘you have written to me’ (TT 1:9).

And there are numerous learned expressions with this verb used by the Canaanite scribes in reply to pharaoh:

*iš-te<sub>9</sub>-né-me / a-wa-at LUGAL EN-ia / ša iš-tap-pa-ra-ni* ‘I continually heed the word of the king, my lord, which he sent to me’ (EA 305: 15–17; also EA 145:11–13; 253:7–10; 254:7–; 304:15–17; 329:13–15); <sup>LÚ</sup>MAŠKÍM / *ra-bi-iš / ša LUGAL EN-ia / ša iš-tap-ra-am / LUGAL EN-ia ... a-na ia-a-ši* ‘As for the commissioner of the king, my lord, whom the king, my lord has sent to me’ (EA 321:15–20; 32:17–20).

Within a more West Semitized context, the same verb can also be in the preterite with ventive, even with the WS 3rd m.s. suffix *y-*. Note the following “that” clauses:

*i-nu-ma yi-iš-tap-pa-ra / šār-ru a-na ia-ši* ‘Inasmuch as the king has written to me’ (EA 130: 9–10, 14–16; also EA 77:6; 102:14).

*wuššuru / muššuru*. The most ubiquitous verb with the *-a* suffix in the corpus of Canaanite texts is *wuššuru / muššuru*. The unique western meaning for this verb, ‘to send’, may have developed from the original meaning, ‘to release’, plus the ventive. It may be impossible to prove that theory; in the texts one finds forms both with and without the ventive in the meaning ‘to send’. Nevertheless, it is notable how many of the examples of this verb do carry an *-a* suffix. Many of

these are in injunctive contexts and will be discussed below. Here it is important to note the few instances when the *-a* is present, but the meaning is not injunctive.

[ù] *aš-ta-pár / a-na É.GAL ù yu-w[a-ša-]ra / ù yu-wa-ša-ra* (‘šār<sup>1</sup>-ru ERÍN.MEŠ / *ra-ba* ‘[and] I wrote to the palace and he se[n]t and he sent( a large army’ (EA 117:24–27).

Moran (1960: 16–18; 1987: 323) translates the second clause as if it were a purpose clause but this is hardly suitable in the context. Rib-Haddi is simply recounting what happened in the past. In spite of the *-a* theme vowel, there can be no doubt here that the *-a* suffix is the Akkadian ventive, not the WS volitive. The same holds true for the following, which is an interrogative sentence and cannot possibly be injunctive:

*a-na mi-nim-mi la-a tu-wa-ši-ra / <sup>LÚ</sup>DUMU šī-īp-ri-ka a-na mah-ri-ia* ‘Why didn’t you send your emissary to me?’ (EA 34:9–10).

That Alashian text is paralleled by a similar question from Jerusalem:

*am-mi-ni<sub>7</sub> DUMU <sup>LÚ</sup>KIN k[i-ma ar-ḥi-ī]š / la-a ú-ma-še-ra* (‘šār<sup>1</sup> [-ru EN-ia] ‘Why did the king not send an emissary q[ui]ckly?’ (EA 285:7–10; Na<sup>w</sup>aman 1975: 97; Moran 1987: 507 n. 3).

Another preterite with the ventive ending is attested in a circumstantial clause employed in the strongly Canaanized epistle written by the leaders from <sup>c</sup>Irqata:

*i-nu-ma yu-wa-ši-<sup>r</sup>[a LU]GAL / EN-nu <sup>D</sup>[UMU]- Bi-ḥa-a [ù] / yi-iq-bi a-na ia[-ši-nu] ... ‘When the [ki]ng, our lord, sent <sup>D</sup>[UMU]-Biḥā [and] he said to u[s] ...’ (EA 100:11–13).*

These certain examples of the ventive raise the question of the *-a* suffix that appears with most of the imperative forms of *wuššuru*, viz. *uššira* (*passim*) and also on many examples of the precativ. It seems logical to assume that these were also *ventives* in spite of the temptation to see them as *modus attraction* from a

volitive *-a* used on regular prefix forms in injunctive contexts; cf. the similar phenomenon in Hebrew:

*qûmā<sup>h</sup> ʔelôhîm šoptā<sup>h</sup> hāʔāreš* ‘Arise oh God, judge the earth’ (Ps. 82:8).

Youngblood (1961: 94–95) surveyed all the *uššira* imperatives and found that while the simple *uššir* means simply “send” (elsewhere), *uššira* always means “send” (to me, the speaker). One does not find *uššira* . . . *ana yâši* but a circumlocution may be used, *uš-ši-ra-mi* . . . *it-ti-ia* (EA 82:15; Youngblood 1961: 230).

*leqû*. Besides the usual verbs of motion and of speaking, etc., it would appear that the Canaanite scribes had also learned some special nuances for particular verbs. One of these is *leqû* ‘to take’, for which the ventive can express “to bring along (with).” Note, for example, this passage from a Mitanni letter:

*ù tup-pa / ša il-qà-a al-ta-ta-as-sí-ma [ù a] -ma-ṭ[i] -šu el-te-me* ‘I have carefully read the tablet which he had brought along’ (EA 19:11; CAD L:133b).

A Jerusalem letter also has this nuance on a precative:

*lu-ma-še-er / šar-ru* <sup>LÚ</sup>MAŠKÍM *ù li-il-qé-a-ni / a-na ia-a-ši* (for *ka-ta<sub>5</sub>*) *a-di ŠEŠ.MEŠ ù BA.UG<sub>7</sub> / ni-mu-tu<sub>4</sub> it-ti šar-ru* (sic!) <sup>EN</sup>nu ‘May the king send the commissioner and may he take me away to you(!) with (my) colleagues that we may die with the king our lord’ (EA 288:58–61).

But the clearest example of this particular usage is found in a letter from Biryawaza:

*ù yi-la-ak* <sup>I</sup>Ar-za-wu-ya / *a-na* <sup>URU</sup>-Qì-ṭ[s-sà] *ù yi-il<sub>5</sub>-qa* / <sup>ERÍN</sup>.MEŠ <sup>I</sup>A-zi-[ri u yi]-iš-ba-at / <sup>URU</sup>Ša-ad-du *u yi-di-in<sub>4</sub>-ši a-na* / <sup>LÚ</sup>.MEŠ <sup>SA.GAZ</sup> *u la-a yi-di-in<sub>4</sub>-ši / a-na* <sup>LUGAL</sup> <sup>EN</sup>ia ‘and Arzawuya went to Ke[desh] and he took along the troops of Azi[ru and he] seized the town of Shaddu and he gave it to the ʕapîru men and did not give it to the king, his lord’ (EA 197:26–31).

*izuzzu*. Another verb which sometimes takes the ventive to express a particular nuance is the irregular *izuzzu* ‘to stand’. With the ventive, it may signify something like ‘to take a stand’, ‘to present oneself’, much like Hebrew *hityaššēb*. In OB we have:

P.A.PA ù DUMU.É *tup-pa-a-ti / iz-zi-zu-ni-ma* ‘The P.A.PA officer and the archivist have been present’ (VAS 7, 198:14–15 = VAB 6, 254:14–15 = AbB 6, 215).

and OA:

*A-šur be-li / i-zi-za-ʔmaʔ iš-tù a-bu-ul šē-n[i]-im / a-dí a-bu-ul ni-ši-im qà-ʔqíʔ-re-e / a-na A-šur be-[l]i-a e-zi-ib* ‘Asshur, my lord, stood by me, so I reserved the ground between the sheep gate and the people’s gate for Asshur, my lord’ (Landsberger and Balkan 1950: 224, 8–11, 225 CAD E:420b).

and also in MB:

*ù pa-ʔanʔ be-li-šu ú-zu-uz-zu / i-na-an-na a-na pa-ni be-lí-ia-ma / ú-zu-uz-za* ‘And before his lord they stand; now it is before my lord that I present myself’ (PBS 13, 6:16–18).

and in literary texts from Amarna itself:

*i-lu iš-te-en i-na pí-i ba-a-bi iz-za-ʔzaʔ* ‘A god is standing at the gate’ (EA 357:55); *ša ša iz-za-za qáb-la-šu li-pu-la* <sup>LUGAL</sup> ‘those (expenses) of the ones who help him in battle, let the king pay’ (EA 359:19; Rainey 1978b: 12–13).

There are some examples of *izuzzu* in the Canaanite letters where the *-a* suffix has to be ventive since the context requires an indicative, not an injunctive, e.g.

*ša-ma-ma šu-nu / ʔšu-nu( i-nu-ma i-te<sub>9</sub>-ru-bu / i-na* <sup>URU</sup>Šu-mu-ra / <sup>URU</sup>.MEŠ *an-nu-tu* <sup>GIŠ</sup> <sup>I</sup>MÁ <sup>I</sup>.MEŠ <sup>I</sup> / ù <sup>DUMU</sup>.MEŠ <sup>I</sup>İR-A-ši-ṭ[r-] / *ta / i-na sé-ri ù / [i]z-ʔziʔ-za* <sup>UGU</sup> (-šū-nu) ù / *la-a i-le-ú / a-ša ù ep-ša-at* <sup>URU</sup> *Gub-la / [a]-na* <sup>LÚ</sup>.MEŠ <sup>GAZ</sup>.MEŠ ‘If they hear that I am entering into Šumur, these cities (will be in) ships and the sons of ʕAbdi-Ashirta (will be) on land and I will be up against (them) and I

will be unable to go forth lest Byblos go over to the ‘*apîru* men’ (EA 104:43–52).

The entire string of clauses comprise the protasis of a conditional sentence of which the protasis is a clause beginning with an absolute infinitive (Rainey forthcoming; *contra* Moran 1960; 1987: 300 n. 3). The first clauses of the apodosis are non-verbal and the subsequent clause is indicative, viz. *la-a i-le-ú*. Therefore, [*i*]z-’zi’-za can hardly have any other WS modal stance than indicative. The scribe felt that he needed the lexical nuance of the ventive, ‘to take a stand’, with UGU, ‘to stand up against’. Therefore, he used *izzizza* as 1st c.s. indicative imperfect without any WS indicator of mood or tense!

The same conclusion seems unavoidable with regard to *yizziza* in the next passage:

*šum-ma i-na-na / qa-la-ta ù<sup>1</sup> Pi-ḥu-ra / la-a yi-zi-za i-na / URU Ku-mi-di u ka-li LÚ.MEŠ / [h]a-za-ni-ka tû-da-ku[-n]a* ‘If now you keep silent and Paḥura does not take up position in Kômidi, then all of your [ci]ty rulers will be sla[i]n!’ (EA 132:46–50; Rainey 1989–90:62).

Moran (1950: 98; 1960: 14; 1987: 352) takes the clause *ù<sup>1</sup> Pi-ḥu-ra / la-a yi-zi-za i-na / URU Ku-mi-di* as the apodosis. But this leaves the next clause, *u ka-li LÚ.MEŠ / [h]a-za-ni-ka tû-da-ku[-n]a*, dangling by itself. The latter is, in fact, the apodosis, the dreaded result of possible pharaonic negligence. So even if Piḥurra’s failure to take/hold his position in Kômidi is part of the apodosis, then it must agree in mood with the verb in the next clause, *tû-da-ku[-n]a*. However, it seems more likely that Piḥurra’s being posted in Kômidi is viewed here as a necessary condition to prevent the slaying of the city rulers. Therefore, his clause must be part of the protasis, which happens to have a suffix conjugation verb (the modal equivalent of a prefix conjugation indicative). Therefore, whether in the protasis or in the apodosis, *yi-zi-za* must be indicative; it follows then, that the *-a* suffix is Akkadian ventive and not WS volative.

(*w*)*ašû*. Definite lexical force attaches to the ventive used with (*w*)*ašû* ‘to go out’, viz. ‘to come

forth’. Some of the contexts where this construction is employed require an indicative, not a volitive:

[*i-d*]<sub>e9</sub> *ki-i-ma / [l]a-mi-in šum-ka / a-na pa-ni LUGAL ù / [l]a-a ti-ta-ša-am / [i]š-tu<sup>KUR</sup> Mi-iš-ri* ‘[I kn]ow that your name is [vi]lified before the king so that you [can]not come forth [f]rom Egypt’ (EA 97:4–8; CAD L:123b; Moran 1987: 289).

The form *ti-ta-ša-am* (for Akkadian *tattaš[s]âm*) is either Gt present or preterite (less likely Gtn preterite), the infix *-t-* expressing the separative nuance. The context expresses no injunctive nuance. The second clause is a result clause, not a purpose clause, and even if it were the latter, it would be dependent on a nominal clause (= indicative) which would require an indicative in the clause expressing purpose. Therefore, the only possible definition of *ti-ta-ša-am* is as an Akkadian ventive in an indicative syntagma.

The same holds true for the next example:

[*ša-ni-tam a-na-k*]u *la uš-ša-am* ‘[Further, as for m]e, I cannot come out’ (EA 88:51; Youngblood 1961: 321).

Moran (1987: 275, 276 n. 12) took the verb *uš-ša-am* to be 3rd m.s. as a parallel to EA 87:17, but Youngblood (1961: 321) compares EA 87:29 and adopts the reading above. The resulting 1st c.s. verb must be in an indicative context (even Moran’s 3rd m.s. could hardly be injunctive here).

It is not possible to construe the following example as volitive; it is clearly parallel to a preceding preterite:

*ù aš-pu-ur / ù tu-ša ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-tu / ù ti-íl-qé<sup>1</sup> a-ba-šu-nu* ‘so I wrote and the army came forth and it captured their father’ (EA 362:18–20; Moran 1960: 4; 1987: 556; *contra* Moran 1950: 178); *ù aš-pu-ur / a-na LUGAL be-li-ia. ‘ú<sup>1</sup> tu-ša ERÍN.MEŠ / [ù] ti-íl-qé<sup>URU</sup> Šu[-m]u-ri ù / [ÍR-A-ši-ir]-ti* ‘and I wrote to the king, my lord, and the army came forth [and] it took Šu[m]ur and [‘Abdi-Ash]irta’ (EA 138:31–34).

The form *tu-ša* is obviously preterite in both passages.

A few passages reveal a special solution to the conflict between the need for an Akkadian ventive and for a WS indicative on the same form. The scribe simply adds the energetic *-na* to the ventive! This could presumably stand for an energetic volitive, but the latter was so rare in the Canaanite Amarna texts as to cast doubt on its existence there at all. So the scribe(s) in question seem to have felt that ventive plus *-na* would solve their dilemma. The first text is a purpose clause dependent on an indicative:

*a-na mi-ni<sub>7</sub> / qa-la-ta ù la-a taq-bu / a-na šàr-ri EN-li-ka / ù tu-ša-na qa-du ERÍN.MEŠ / pí-tá-ti ù ti-ma-qú-tu / UGU<sup>KUR</sup>A-mur-ri* ‘Why do you keep silent and not speak to the king, your lord, so that you come forth with the army and so that you fall on Amurru’ (EA 73:6–11).

The other two passages are in the protasis of conditional sentences with *šumma*. In all of Moran’s examples, he never found a volitive in a *šumma* clause.

*šum-ma ap-pu-na-ma yu-ša-na šàr-ru / ù ka-li KUR.KUR.KI nu-kúr-tu<sub>4</sub> a-na ša-šu / ù mi-na yi-pu-šu a-na ia-ši-nu* ‘If the king comes forth and all the countries are against him, then what can he do to us?’ (EA 74:39–41); *šum-ma MU.MEŠ a[n]-ni<sup>1</sup>-ta ú-ul / yu-ša-na ERÍN.MEŠ [pí-tá-ta / ù in-ni[-ip-ša-a]t ka-li / KUR.KUR.KI.MEŠ a[-na LÚ.MEŠ GA]Z* ‘If this year, the army does not come forth, then all the countries will go [over] t[o the ‘*apîru* me]n’ (EA 77:26–29).

Finally, the same interpretation, ventive plus indicative energetic *-na*, must apply to the following:

*ša-ni-tam ú-ul aš-ta-pár a-na šàr-ri / a-nu-ma 2 LÚ<sup>KUR</sup>Mi-iš-ri šu-nu / tu-ša-na ša-ri a-na ia-ši / ù la-a a-ša* ‘Furthermore, did I not write to the king: ‘Now, as for those two Egyptians, my breath will come forth to me?’ But it did not come’ (EA 117:53–56; contrast Moran 1987: 323, 325 n. 11).

*turru*. It remains to note that in one instance (EA 145:10), Moran (1987: 375) renders a ventive

of *turru* as a preterite although it is really an injunctive.

[*lu-ú ti-i-de i-nu-ma / šal-[m]a-ku ù at-ta iš-tu / šul-mi-k[a i]š-tu / ma-ḥar šàr-ri [E]N-ia / ša-a-ri<sup>UZU</sup>KA / pí-ka / tù-ti-ra-an-ni* ‘[May] you be apprised that I am well, and may you send back to me concerning your welfare from the presence of the king, my [lo]rd, the breath of your mouth’ (EA 145:5–10).

### Conclusion

The foregoing illustrations provide ample proof that the Akkadian ventive was used extensively in the EA letters from Canaan. Most of the examples cited are preterite, i.e., Akkadian verb formations plus the  $\emptyset$  suffix of the past tense (applicable to both Akkadian and WS). One more passage is well worth citing for its clear context as a chain of events in the past; note the many verbs with ventive suffix:

[*Zi-ir-dam-ia[-a]š-da / p[a-]tá-ar iš-tu*] / [*B-ir<sub>5</sub>-ia-wa-za i[-ba-ši] / it-ti<sup>1</sup>Šu-ta Ì[R] / šàr-ri i-na URU<sup>1</sup>UN<sup>1</sup>[-ti] / [l]a-a yi-qa-bi mi-im[-m]i / [a-n]a ša-šu tu-uš-ša / [E]RÍN.MEŠ LUGAL EN -ia i-ba[-ši] / it-ti-ši i-na<sup>URU</sup>Ma-gíd-da<sup>KI</sup>] / la-a qa-bi mi-mu a-na ša-š[u] / ù yi-ip-tú-ra a-na mu-ḥi-ia / ù a-nu-ma / ia-aš-pu-ra<sup>1</sup>Šu-ta. a-na ia-ši i-din-mì / <sup>1</sup>Zi-ir-dam-ia-aš-da / a-na<sup>1</sup>Bir<sub>5</sub>-ia-wa-za* ‘[Zir]damyashda departed from [B]iryawaza; he wa[s] with Shuta, the servant of the king in the garrison town; he said nothing to him; the king’s army came forth; he was with it in Megiddo; nothing was said to him; then he departed to me and now Shuta has written to me: “Give Zirdamyashda to Biryawaza” (EA 234: 11–26; Rabiner 1981: 99–100; §5.2.2.3; Moran 1987b: 460, 461 n. 4).

### Wish, Request, Command

The plethora of texts in which a request and a chain of further injunctive clauses begins with a form of *wuššuru* will not be adduced here since there is too strong a possibility that the *-a* suffix really is the ventive (cf. above). On the other

hand, there are other verbs with similar meanings, such as *ḥummuṭu* ‘to hasten’:

*ki-[a-na] / yu-ḥa-mi-tá uš-šar* ERÍN.MEŠ *p[í-tá]-ṭi* / LUGAL *ù yi-ìl-qé-šu-nu ù / ti-né-p[u-uš* KUR.MEŠ *a-na* LUGAL ‘BE<sup>1</sup>-ṭi[a] ‘The[re]fore] may he hasten to send the army in order that it may capture them and that the lands may si[de] with the king, my lord’ (EA 129:77–80);

and from the same scribe:

*ù yu-ḥa-mi-tá be-li* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá-ta<sub>5</sub> ù ni-UG<sub>7</sub>.BA* ‘So may my lord send the army or we will die’ (EA 362:40–41).

The D stem of this verb is rare in any case, but it must be noted that the use of the ventive with the G stem *ḥamāṭu* is widespread (CAD H:62b–63a). A unique construction is the verb form derived from the adverb *arḥiš* (personal observation by S. Izre’el; *contra* AHw:943b). In light of the two passages with *ḥummuṭu*, it is logical to assume that this *hapax* also has the ventive:

*ù ya-ar-ḥi-ša* LUGAL *be-li-[ia]* / ERÍN.MEŠ *pí-tá[ṭ]-ta<sub>5</sub> ù ti-iš-ba-tu* / URU *ki-ma ar-ḥi-iš* ‘So may the king, [my] lord, hasten the troops that they may seize the city quickly’ (EA 137:97–99).

Another verb appearing in a negative wish is *puḥḥuru* ‘to assemble’, which is also used generally with the ventive (AHw:810b–811b):

*ú-ul yu-pa-ḥi-ra ka-li* / LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ *ù / yi-ìl-qa* <sup>URU</sup>Ši-ga-ṭi[a] / *ù* <sup>URU</sup>Am-pí ‘Let him not assemble the <sup>c</sup>*apîru* men that he may take Shigata and Ampî’ (EA 71:28–31; also EA 85:77–79).

### Purpose Clauses

The following negative result clause employs *šemû* ‘to hear’, which does not characteristically take the ventive (AHw: 1211a–1213b):

*aq-bi a-na ka-ta<sub>5</sub> la-a / i-le-ù uš-šar-[šu]* / *ù-ul yi-iš-ma* <sup>1</sup>İR-A-ši-i[r-ta] / *ù ma-an-nu ìl-te<sub>9</sub>-qa-n[i]* / *ì[š]-tu qa-ti-šu* ‘I said to you, “I am unable to send [him] lest <sup>c</sup>Abdi-Ashirta hear, and

who will deliver me from his hand?” (EA 82:21–25; Moran 1960: 4; Albright and Moran 1948: 246 n. 17).

Another verb which does not normally take the ventive is *našāru* ‘to protect, guard’. However, in the following passage, the purpose clause is dependent upon an injunctive of *wuššuru*, which, as we have seen, probably developed extensive use of the ventive. Therefore, one could argue that the ventive on the second verb is due to modus attraction from the first:

*ša-ni-tam / yu-wa-ši-ra šār-ru* ANŠE.KUR.RA. (MEŠ) *a-na / )a-<sup>r</sup>na<sup>1</sup>* (İR-šu *u a-na-ša-ra* URU.KI ‘Furthermore, may the king send horse(s) to his servant so that I may protect the city’ (EA 117:71–73; Rainey 1975: 414).

Modus attraction is a bit more difficult to maintain for the next passage though one might argue that the scribe wished to alternate between verbs with  $-\emptyset$  and verbs with  $-a$ , for whatever reasons.

*li-iš-mé šār-ru a-wa-te* İR-šu / *ù ia-di-na ba-la-tá* İR-šu *ù / a-na-ša-<sup>r</sup>ra<sup>1</sup>* [URU ‘*ki*’-it-ti-šu *a-di* <sup>1</sup>NIN<sup>1</sup>-nu / DINGIR.MEŠ-nu *a[na ka-ta<sub>5</sub>]* *ù yi-da-ga*] LUGAL] / [KUR]-šu *ù* [URU-šu] ‘May the king heed the words of his servant and may he provide his servant’s sustenance that his servant may live and so that I may protect his loyal [city] with our Lady, our deity, fo[r you] and so that [the king] may see his [land] and [his city]’ (EA 74:53–58; Youngblood 1961: 152; Rainey 1975: 414; Moran 1987: 253 n. 15).

Another verb which does not usually take the ventive is *epēšu* (but note that in the idiom *alākam epēšum*, this verb usually does have the ventive! CAD E:20 1b). But again, the preceding imperative certainly has the ventive and modus attraction could have been at play:

*šu-te-ra a-wa-ta<sub>5</sub> / a-na ia-ši ù i-pu-ša a-na-ku / ki-ta it-ti* <sup>1</sup>İR-A-ši-ir-ta / *ki-ma* <sup>1</sup>Ia-pa-<sup>d</sup>İŠKUR *ù* <sup>1</sup>Zi-im-re-[d]a / *ù bal-tá-ti* ‘Send word back to me or I will make an alliance with <sup>c</sup>Abdi-Ashirta like Yapa<sup>c</sup>-Haddi and

Zimredda that I may live' (EA 83:23-25; Moran 1950: 100; 1987: 264).

Perhaps a better case might be made for this passage. The verb in question, *maḥāṣu* 'to smite', does not customarily take the ventive. Still, it occurs in a negative result clause (*contrast* Izre<sup>2</sup>el 1978:63) after an imperative with the ventive:

ù *yi-iq-bu / a-na ia-ši id-na-'ni* / DAM-ka ù / DUMU. MEŠ -ka ù ù *lu-ú / i-ma-ḥa-ša* 'And he is saying to me. "Give me your wife and your children or else I will attack!"' (EA 270:17-21; Moran 1987: 495).

In spite of what one might expect, *dubburu/duppuru* does not take the ventive in classic Akkadian. Like the examples above, this one has an imperative with the ventive:

ù *i-na* UD.MEŠ / [*an-nu-ti uš-še-ra* ERÍN. MEŠ [GAL] / [*ù tu-du-bi-ra-šu i[š-tu]* / [<sup>KUR</sup>A-mur-ri 'So in [the]se days, send a [large] army [that it may] expel him f[rom Amur]ru' (EA 85:79-82; Youngblood 1961: 281; Moran 1950: 158; 1987: 271 n. 10; cf. EA 76:38-41 without -a).

The verb *arādu/urrudu* "to serve," a denominative from (*w*)*ardu* "slave," is exclusive to the EA texts from Canaan (CAD A/2:220). It seldom takes the -a, and its semantic range is hardly commensurate with the ventive. Nevertheless, it does happen to be more-or-less homophonous with MB (*w*)*arādu* "to go down," a verb of motion that would naturally take the ventive on many occasions. Furthermore, the contexts where *urrudu* does have an -a suffix are in tandem with another form having -a which is most likely a ventive. Note the following:

[*u*]lu[-*ú*] 'yu<sup>1</sup>-<sup>r</sup>wa<sup>1</sup>-<sup>r</sup>ša<sup>1</sup>-a[r] / 'ERÍN<sup>1</sup>.MEŠ<sup>r</sup> 'pí<sup>1</sup>-<sup>r</sup>tá<sup>1</sup>-<sup>r</sup>ta<sup>1</sup>-š[*u*] / *šu-nu / [t]u-šu-<sup>r</sup>[u]-ba-ni / a-na* URU. DIDLLKI-ni-ia / u l[*u*]-*ú i-ru-da-am* / LUGAL EN-ia 'So] may he send h[is] troops; it is they who can install me in my towns that I may truly serve the king, my lord' (EA 300:15-21; Izre<sup>2</sup>el 1978: 14; Moran 1987: 530).

The syntagma is difficult to define because of the possible lacuna in the latter part of line 17,

but there may not be anything missing there. Assuming the interpretation given above, the clause *šu-nu / [t]u-šu-<sup>r</sup>[u]-ba-ni*, is not necessarily injunctive; in fact, it is more likely indicative. So the status of the clause with *i-ru-da-am* may not be injunctive either. It would appear, then, that the suffix -am on the latter verb is truly a ventive, the result of modus attraction from the preceding Š form from *šurubu*, which would by nature be appropriate for the ventive.

The final passage to be discussed here has several special features. The imperative on which the subsequent purpose clause depends is in the plural, apparently with the energetic -na; the verb in the purpose clause, *izuzzu*, is used frequently with the ventive in good Akkadian (cf. the examples cited above; also Rainey 1989-90:59b).

ù / *uš-ši-ru-na-ni 50 ta-pal* / ANŠE.KUR.RA ù 2 *me* ERÍN.MEŠ GÌR.MEŠ / ù *i-zi-za i-na* URUŠi-ga-ta / *i-na pa-ni-šu a-di / a-ši* ERÍN. MEŠ pí-tá-ti 'So send to me fifty spans of horses and two hundred foot troops so that I may take up a position in Shigata facing him until the coming forth of the army' (EA 71:22-27).

#### After a Verb of Fearing

Moran (1950: 100; 1960: 14) noted that in Arabic, the subjunctive *yaqtula* follows verbs of fearing (Wright 1898: 25). It so happens that in this regard, there is one lone example in the EA texts from Canaan. Furthermore, the verb, a G passive of *dâku*, is one which does not take the ventive in Akkadian. There is no contextual reason to suppose modus attraction to explain the -a suffix on the verb in question. Although the final sign is somewhat defaced on the tablet, it is most probably k[a] (Moran 1987: 351 n. 7).

pa[l-ḥ]a-ti a-n[a-k]u / *la-a-mi ú-da-a-k[a]* 'I am afraid lest I be killed' (EA 131:27-28).

#### Conditional Sentences

Note the following example in the protasis of a conditional sentence:



*i-nu-ma* / [a]-*mu-ta mi-nu* / <sup>1</sup>*yi-na-ša-ru-ši*<sub>x</sub>(ŠE) ‘If I die, who will protect it?’ (EA 130:50–52; Moran 1960: 14; 1950: 73).

Now the verb *mātu* ‘to die’, does sometimes take the ventive in literary Akkadian (CAD M/1:424a):

*mūt bubāti u šummi limūta* ‘let him die the death of hunger and thirst’ (Langdon 1931: Pl. 5:9; cited CAD B:302a); [*i*]na *šuttati amātama* ‘Shall I die in the pit?’ (ibid., Pl. 3:26); *qar-rādān šina imuttānim* ‘two heroes will die’ (YOS 10, 31:ix, 27).

It should be remembered that the Semitic root \**mwt/mūt* belongs to a class that defines the transition from one state to another (Landsberger 1926: 362; 1976: 9). Therefore, the ventive was not felt by the ancient Mesopotamians to be out of place on this verb.

The ensuing cases of the *-a* suffix come in a chain of injunctives which comprise the apodosis of a conditional sentence. The first verb in the injunctive chain is an imperative (Moran 1950: 74) with the ventive suffix:

[šum-]ma *i-ra-am* <sup>1</sup>*šar*<sup>1</sup>-[ru] / [E]N-li ÌR *ki-ti-i-šu* / [ù] *uš-ši-ra* / [3] LÚ ù *ib-lu-tá* / ù *i-na-ši-ra* / URU *a-na šar-ri* ‘[I]f the ki[ng], my [lo]rd, cares for [his] faithf[ul] servant, [then] send the [three] men that I may survive and that I may protect the city for the king’ (EA 123:23–28; Rainey 1975: 414).

It was observed above that *dubburu/duppuru* does not seem to normally take the ventive. So in the apodosis of this conditional sentence there is no reason to assume modus attraction:

*i-nu-ma* l *ha-za-nu* / *lib-bu-šu it-ti lib-bi-ia* / ù *ú-da-bi-ra* ÌR-A-*ši-irta* / *iš-tu* <sup>KUR</sup>A-*mur-ri* ‘If there were one governor of the same mind as I, then I would drive out ‘Abdi-Ashirta from Amurru’ (EA 85:66–69; Moran 1960: 15).

### Complex Sentences

The ensuing passage is very complex indeed. It begins with an *inūma* clause as topic and continues with an oath as comment. The oath itself

is in the form of a conditional sentence introduced by *inūma*, the apodosis is what appears to be an injunctive clause the verb of which has the *-a* suffix. Although this latter verb is a verb of speaking, it is not one that generally appears with the ventive suffix (CAD D:186b–188b).

*i-nu-ma qa-bi a-na* / *pa-ni šar-ri* <sup>1</sup>*Ri-ib-<sup>d</sup>IŠKUR* / *šu-mi-it ERÍN.MEŠ pí-tá-at šar-ri* *i-nu-ma ba-al-tú* / LÚ.MEŠ MĀŠKÍM.MEŠ ù / *a-da-bu-ba ka-li ip-ši-š*u-nu ‘Inasmuch as it is said in the king’s presence, “Rib-Haddi has caused the death of the king’s army,” as the commissioners live, I shall report all their deeds’ (EA 119:18–23; Moran 1960: 15; 1950: 100; 1987: 329 n. 2; CAD D:7a).

### Evaluation

It is abundantly clear that the EA texts have not given us any conclusive evidence for the existence of a Canaanite *yaqtula* pattern. In spite of Moran’s brilliant mustering of the evidence, it is still possible to argue that the *-a* suffix is merely the Akkadian ventive. Moran was not unaware of the problem. His main argument was the injunctive nature of all the various contexts in which he found this *-a* suffix in the Byblos letters. However, the *-a* suffix almost always was attached to verbs which tend to be employed with the ventive and in many of the examples cited, especially the purpose clauses, there were other, parallel verbs with the same syntactic function but with the  $\emptyset$  suffix of the jussive. There are no glosses or strictly Canaanite verbal forms with the *-a* suffix (unlike the evidence for the WS imperfect and jussive). Furthermore, even in the Byblos corpus, there were some instances where the *-a* suffix appeared in past narrative and in some *inūma* clauses (topic clauses in complex sentences); those contexts were completely unsuitable for an injunctive and leave little doubt that the *-a(m)* suffix is the Akkadian ventive (Moran 1960: 16–17). Outside of the Byblos corpus, there are many more preterites and other contexts where the ventive was employed.

The synchronic and diachronic evidence was also adduced by Moran but he refused to base his case on it (Moran 1960: 11–13). He did point out the more than theoretical possibility that *yaqtula* had survived in the Hebrew cohortative (Moran 1961: 64 = 1965: 73–74). And he stressed the similarity in function between the Arabic subjunctive and *yaqtula* in the Byblos texts (Moran 1950: 102–4). In fact, *yaqtula* finds an unequivocal witness in Ugaritic, in spite of the limited nature of the orthography. The following cohortative context is indisputable:

*iqra . ilm n[<sup>c</sup>mm] = \*<sup>2</sup>iqra<sup>2</sup>a <sup>2</sup>ilî.a na[<sup>c</sup>îmîma]*  
 ‘I will invoke the g[oodly] deities’ (KTU 1.23:1;  
 Gordon 1965: 72; Rainey 1985; 1987: 398–99).

The diachronic witness of the Hebrew cohortative and the Arabic subjunctive also strengthens the case for an early NWS *yaqtula* pattern. The contrast between *yaqtulu* and *yaqtula*, the latter being employed in a syntactically subordinate manner, was not lost on Arab grammarians, who observed that *yaqtula* bears the accusative, or subordinate, suffix, while *yaqtulu* has the nominative, or independent ending.

As far as the EA evidence goes, Moran was probably on the right track when he suggested that the Canaanite scribes seem to have employed Akkadian ventives in injunctive contexts because it was homophonous with a *yaqtula* in their native tongue. The present review of the EA examples seems to suggest that such was the case. However, the almost complete parallelism between the use of the jussives and the forms with *-a(m)* suffix indicates that, if there was a *yaqtula* in Amarna Age Canaanite, it was hardly distinguishable in its nuances from the jussive. It might be assumed that the original, full blown *yaqtula* was a more emphatic injunctive than the simple jussive. That is certainly not true in the EA letters.

Are these injunctive forms with *-a(m)* suffix Akkadian ventives recruited to serve as Canaanite *yaqtulas*? Or were they simply true Akkadian ventives standing in as Canaanite jussives having an additional semantic (not modal) indicator of direction (ventive)? The answer to these

questions cannot be given on the basis of the materials at hand. The comparative evidence from Ugaritic, Hebrew and Arabic suggests that the Canaanite scribes had a *yaqtula* in their native repertoire which made them partial to Akkadian ventives (cf. the remarks of Izre<sup>2</sup>el 1978: 82).

### *Energic*

Finally, there is one Byblos occurrence of an injunctive energic. It is in a negative purpose clause after a verb of fearing. Moran (1950: 60, 100–101) construed the form as 3rd f.s. with a collective 3rd m.pl subject.

*pal-ḥa-ti LÚ.MEŠ ḥul-<sup>1</sup>up<sup>1</sup>[-šî-ia] / ul ti-ma-ḥa-ša-na-n[i]* ‘I am afraid of [my] tenant [farmers] lest they smite m[e]’ (EA 77:36–37).

The injunctive nature of the verb form seems assured by its role in a negative purpose clause. Moran had noted that injunctives can appear after verbs of fearing (cf. EA 131:27–28 discussed above). Other explanations could be suggested, however. The *-a* suffix could be the Akkadian ventive even though *maḥāšu* does not normally take the ventive (cf. *supra*, regarding EA 270: 17–21). A less likely possibility is that the suffix is the missing 3rd f.pl., i.e., *-āna*, but the subject is a plural masculine noun; such a masculine plural can take a 3rd f.s. verb (Moran 1950: 60, 131–32 n. 163). Therefore, the best solution at present seems to be that we do have here a true injunctive energic.

The injunctive energic is also documented in Ugaritic, in the same text from which was cited the 1st c.s. volitive above.

*iqran . ilm n<sup>c</sup>mm = \*<sup>2</sup>iqra<sup>2</sup>an(n)a <sup>2</sup>ilîma na<sup>c</sup>îmîma* ‘I will invoke the goodly deities’ (KTU 1.23:23; Gordon 1965: 72; Rainey 1985; 1987: 398–99).

Of course, the strongest motivation for positing an ancient *yaqtulan(n)a* is the presence of just such an energic in Arabic. While the Canaanite EA texts reveal an abundance of indicative energics in *-un(n)a*, this one, lone example (EA 77:36–37) cited above, is all we have

from the injunctive energetic. Forms like *yi-na-ší-ra-an-ni* (EA 112:13), *yi-na-ší-ra-ni* (EA 130:20), and *yi-na-ša-ra-ni* (EA 119:10) are all in questions and simply represent the accusative suffix attached by means of the ventive; they are paralleled by *yi-na-ší-ru-ni* (EA 112:18) in the same syntagma.

Diachronically, it would appear that the indicative energetic survived in Hebrew in the accusative suffixes *-enhû*, *-ennû*, *-enhā*, and perhaps also *-ekkā* (Rainey 1975: 186b; Blau 1978; Rainey 1986: 10–12). By the same token, it is possible that

the injunctive energetic survived in the same accusative suffixes when they appear on the cohortative (Huehnergard 1988: 23; Rainey 1988: 36).

As for the Arabic energetic, T. Zewi has demonstrated that it functions in many injunctive syntagmas but also in some indicative constructions, such as the interrogative sentence (Zewi 1987: 6–74). In other words, the *-an(n)a* energetic fulfills many of the functions of Canaanite *-un(n)a* as well as serving in injunctive syntagmas like the oath, the warning and the prohibition.

## References

- Albright, W. F. and Moran, W. L.  
1948 A Re-interpretation of an Amarna Letter from Byblos (EA 82). *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 2:239–48.
- Blau, J.  
1971 Studies in Hebrew Verb Formation. *Hebrew Union College Annual* 42:133–58.  
1978 Pronominal Third Person Singular Suffixes with and without *N* in Biblical Hebrew. *Eretz-Israel* 14:125–31 (Hebrew).
- Fleisch, H.  
1968 *Yaqtula* cananéen et subjonctif arabe. *Studia Orientalia in memoriam Caroli Brockelmann = Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg* 17:65–76.
- Gordon, C. H.  
1965 *Ugaritic Textbook. Analecta Orientalia* 38. Rome: The Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Huehnergard  
1988 The Early Hebrew Prefix-Conjugations. *Hebrew Studies* 29:19–23.
- Izre'el, Sh.  
1978 The Gezer Letters of the El-Amarna Archive—Linguistic Analysis. *Israel Oriental Studies* 8:13–90.
- Jouion, P.  
1923 *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical.
- Langdon  
1931 The Legend of Etana and the Eagle, or the Epical Poem "The City they Hated." *Babylonica* 12:1–56, Pls. I–XIV.
- Landsberger, B.  
1926 The Eigenbergifflichkeit der babylonischen Welt. *Islamica* 2:355–72.  
1976 The Conceptual Autonomy of the Babylonian World. Translated by Jacobsen, T., Foster, B., Siebenthal, H. von. Introduction by Jacobsen, T. *Sources and Monographs on the Ancient Near East* 1:57–71.
- Moran, W. L.  
1950 *A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets*. Doc-
- Albright, W. F. and Moran, W. L.  
1948 A Re-interpretation of an Amarna Letter from Byblos (EA 82). *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 2:239–48.
- Blau, J.  
1971 Studies in Hebrew Verb Formation. *Hebrew Union College Annual* 42:133–58.  
1978 Pronominal Third Person Singular Suffixes with and without *N* in Biblical Hebrew. *Eretz-Israel* 14:125–31 (Hebrew).
- Fleisch, H.  
1968 *Yaqtula* cananéen et subjonctif arabe. *Studia Orientalia in memoriam Caroli Brockelmann = Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg* 17:65–76.
- Gordon, C. H.  
1965 *Ugaritic Textbook. Analecta Orientalia* 38. Rome: The Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Huehnergard  
1988 The Early Hebrew Prefix-Conjugations. *Hebrew Studies* 29:19–23.

Izre'el, Sh.

- 1978 The Gezer Letters of the El-Amarna Archive—Linguistic Analysis. *Israel Oriental Studies* 8:13–90.

Jouion, P.

- 1923 *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical.

Langdon

- 1931 The Legend of Etana and the Eagle, or the Epical Poem "The City they Hated." *Babylonica* 12:1–56, Pls. I–XIV.

Landsberger, B.

- 1926 The Eigenbergifflichkeit der babylonischen Welt. *Islamica* 2:355–72.
- 1976 The Conceptual Autonomy of the Babylonian World. Translated by Jacobsen, T., Foster, B., Siebenthal, H. von. Introduction by Jacobsen, T. *Sources and Monographs on the Ancient Near East* 1:57–71.

Moran, W. L.

- 1950 *A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets*. Doctoral dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. Reprinted, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.
- 1960 Early Canaanite *yaqtula*. *Or.* n.s. 29:1–19.
- 1961 The Hebrew Language in Its Northwest Semitic Background. Pp. 54–72 of Wright, G. E., ed., *The Bible and the Ancient Near East, Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company.
- 1965 The Hebrew Language in Its Northwest Semitic Background. Pp. 59–84 of Wright, G. E., ed., *The Bible and the Ancient Near East, Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- 1975 Amarna Glosses. *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 69:147–58.
- 1987 *Les Lettres d'el-Amarna. Correspondence diplomatique du pharaon*. With collaboration of Haas, V. and Wilhelm, G. Translated by Collon, D. and Cazelles, H. Paris: Les Editions du Serf.

Moscatti, S., ed.

- 1964 *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, Phonology and Morphology*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Rabiner, S.

- 1981 *Linguistic Features of the El-Amarna Tablets from Akko, Megiddo, and Shechem*. M.A. Thesis, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv (Hebrew).

Rainey, A. F.

- 1975 Morphology of the Prefix-Tenses of West Semitized El-Amarna Tablets. *UF* 7:395–426.
- 1985 The Early West Semitic Prefix Conjugations. One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Meeting of the American Oriental Society in a Joint Session with the North American Conference on Afro-Asiatic Linguistics, Ann Arbor, 14–17 April 1985.
- 1986 The Ancient Hebrew Prefix Conjugation in the Light of Amarnah Canaanite. *Hebrew Studies* 27:4–19.
- 1987 A New Grammar of Ugaritic, Review of Segert, S., *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language*, Berkeley, 1984, *Orientalia* n.s. 56:391–402.
- 1988 Further Remarks on the Hebrew Verbal System. *Hebrew Studies* 29:35–42.
- 1989–90 A New Translation of the Amarna Letters—after 100 years. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 36–37:56–75
- 1990 The Prefix Conjugation Patterns of Early Northwest Semitic. Pp. 407–20 in Abusch, T., Huehnergard, J. and Steinkeller, P., eds., *Lingering over Words, Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Wright, W.

- 1898 *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. 3rd ed. Vol. II. Cambridge: The University Press.

Youngblood, R. F.

- 1961 *The Amarna Correspondence of Rib-Haddi, Prince of Byblos (EA 68–96)*. Doctoral dissertation, Dropsie College, Philadelphia.

Zewi, T.

- 1987 -n(n) Endings of Verbal Formations in Arabic, Biblical Hebrew, the Accadian Language of El-Amarna Tablets and Ugaritic. M.A. thesis, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv (Hebrew).