

THE CASE SYSTEM OF WEST-SEMITIZED AMARNA AKKADIAN

MAARTEN KOSSMANN (LEIDEN)

In describing Amarna Akkadian¹⁾, most authors have laid emphasis on the analysis of the verbal system. This is not at all surprising because the system is totally different from the one we find in standard Akkadian and clearly reflects the West-Semitic system. As short final vowels are preserved in Amarna Akkadian, and so the original tense-aspect distinctions, the language is of vital importance in the reconstruction of Proto-West-Semitic.

It is remarkable that hardly any work has been done on the case system. Apart from a few brief observations by Böhl and Dhorme²⁾ and a few loose remarks in articles primarily dealing with other subjects, philological or linguistic³⁾ or describing the entire grammar of one subcorpus⁴⁾, no endeavour has, as far as I am aware, been made to analyse the case system.

This is regrettable because from what we know of the verbal system we may assume that in Amarna Akkadian the case system too reflects West-Semitic usage to some extent. In Proto-West-Semitic, case was expressed mainly by short final vowels. Together with Ugaritic, Amarna Akkadian seems to show the most ancient West-Semitic case system attested. The Amarna Akkadian evidence is far more varied and philologically far less complicated than the Ugaritic evidence, where we must inevitably confine ourselves to III'-nouns.

¹⁾ I am indebted to Dr W H van Soldt and to Professor Dr F H H Kortlandt for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this article and to Dr G L van Driem for correcting the English. Of course, all responsibility for errors or flaws in the argument remain my own. The text editions used are J A Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln* (Leipzig 1915) and A F Rainey, "El Amarna Tablets 359-379" (*AOAT* 8, 2nd ed., Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978). The letters published in these two studies will be referred to simply by their numbers. Ample use was made of W L Moran, *Les lettres d'el Amarna* (*LAPPO* 13, Paris 1987).

²⁾ E.g. F M Th Bohl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe* (Leipzig 1909), § 22, E Dhorme, "La Langue de Canaan", in *Recueil Edouard Dhorme* (Paris 1951), 456ff. (reprint from *Revue Biblique* 1913/14).

³⁾ E.g. W F Albright and W L Moran, "A re-interpretation of an Amarna Letter from Byblos (EA 82)", *JCS* 2, 239-248.

⁴⁾ E.g. Sh Izre'el, "The Gezer letters of the El-Amarna Archive", *IOS* 8, 13-90, and Sh Izre'el, *The Akkadian Dialect of the Scribes of Amurru in the 14th-13th Centuries B C* (unpublished Ph D thesis, Tel Aviv 1985).

In this article I shall examine the following points⁵):

- 1) The morphology of the case system. Though it does not differ very much from the system of Akkadian, Ugaritic or Arabic, the Amarna Akkadian case system has its own interesting and problematical points and therefore deserves a thorough examination.
- 2) Confusion of cases. Attention will be drawn to the fact that in at least one town two cases are systematically confused, heralding the first stage of the disintegration of the case system.
- 3) The use of the different cases.

1. THE MORPHOLOGY OF THE CASE SYSTEM

In dealing with the nominal morphology, I have assumed a three-case system, in which the cases have the following functions:

- NOMINATIVE subject of a verbal sentence
subject or predicate of a non-verbal sentence
- ACCUSATIVE direct object
- GENITIVE element after a preposition
nomen rectum in a genitival phrase.

These are not the only functions these cases can assume, but they are the most obvious ones; since I intended to avoid circular argumentation, I have not taken into account adverbial use of cases (accusative of time, etc.) or special problems, such as the case after *janu* “there is not” and the pendent case. I will consider these points in the third section of the article.

Amarna Akkadian also used a locative case. As its morphology has already been examined by other authors⁶), I will leave this point out of consideration.

It is necessary to distinguish between three “states”: the *status rectus*, the *status constructus* and the *status pronominalis*. This last status is the status of a noun to

⁵) In order to keep the geographical distribution of the different grammatical features clear, I did not take into consideration every letter available. The corpora I studied are: Irqata (100), Byblos (68-95, 101-134, 139-140, 362), Beirut-1 (the letters sent by Rib-Addi of Byblos during his exile in Beirut 136-138), Beirut-2 (the Ammunira letters 141-143), Sidon (144-145), Tyre (146-155, 295), Amqi (174-177, 185-187, 363), Qadesh, Ruhiza and Lapana (189, 191-193 hence Qadesh), Kumidi (including the Birjawazi-letters, 194-198 and 201-206 cf. Moran 1987, 433, n. 2), Hasor (227-228), Acre (232-235, 327), Megiddo (242-248, 365), Shechem (252-254), Pihili (255-256), Gintu-Kirmil (the Tagi-letters, 264-266), Gezer (267-271, 292-294, 297-300, 378 and 278-280, cf. Moran 1987, 500, n. 1), Qiltu (the Shuwardata letters 281-294, 297-300, 378 and the Abdi-Ashtartu letters 63-65, 335), Jerusalem (285-290), Ashqalon (320-326), Lakhish (328-332).

The only large west-semitized corpus not included is Amurru. It was left out of consideration because of a number of philological problems. For example, at least one letter from Amurru is clearly influenced by Hurrian. Furthermore, there is great discrepancy between the grammar of the Abdi-Ashirta letters and that of the Aziru-letters. The corpus was already thoroughly examined by Sh. Izre'el (cf. note 4).

⁶) E.g. Dhorme 1951, 458, Izre'el, *IOS* 8, 48.

which a pronominal suffix is attached. In view of its marginal character I will devote no attention to the *status absolutus* (in the Assyriological sense of the word)

1.1 *Status rectus*

The system in the Status Rectus is, as one might expect from other Semitic languages, as follows

sg	NOM	-u	pl	-u ⁷⁾
	ACC	-a		-i ⁸⁾
	GEN	-i		-i

1.2 *Status constructus*

By *status constructus* I mean only those constructus forms which are without a pronominal suffix. In the singular, the difference between the cases is not expressed. In the nominative, accusative and genitive singular we find forms without any ending or with *-i*. Their distribution is partly predictable from the structure of the noun stem, partly arbitrary or lexically determined.

— Stems ending in a geminate have the ending *-i*. Only the word *mummu* often has forms without an ending (*mummu* 5 ×, *mim* 3 ×). Another exception is *gab* in 74/19 and 129/17.

— Monosyllabic stems of the structure CV()C- have *-i*. However, with the word *qatu* we usually find no ending. In letters from Byblos, Sidon, Qadesh, Gintu-Kirmil (the Tagi-letters) and Gezer we find *qat*, while the two instances of *qatu* come from Tyre and Jerusalem. The construct state of *šumu* is *šum* (2 ×). Other instances of *-ø* instead of *-i* are 119/45 *di-en* and 151/42 *IGI⁹⁾-an*.

— Stems ending in a consonant cluster containing the feminine desinence *-i* always have *-i*.

These rules are broadly the same as those for the occurrence of the epenthetic vowel *-i* found in Mesopotamian Akkadian⁹⁾.

We may now turn to the words not covered by these rules¹⁰⁾. In some Phoenician towns we find no ending (Byblos *-i* 4 ×, *-ø* 60 ×, Sidon *-i* 1 ×, *-ø* 5 ×). In other towns, the majority of forms have an epenthetic vowel (Tyre *-i* 19 ×, *-ø* 8 ×). In Syria, there is a slight preference for forms with *-i*, whereas in Palestine these forms appear only in one third of all cases.

⁷⁾ Generally vowel length is not represented in orthography.

⁸⁾ The use of *E* and *i*-signs is partly conditioned by grammar, partly a mere orthographical feature. As the corpora may be quite different from one another with respect to orthography and as an orthographical study falls outside the scope of the present investigation I have chosen not to distinguish between */e/* and */i/* in the grammatical sketch. However, in the transcriptions the two vowels will be distinguished from one another.

⁹⁾ Cf. W. von Soden, *Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik* (Rome 1952, henceforth *GAG*) § 64.

¹⁰⁾ As *ana mahar* is probably a compound preposition I left it out of the discussion.

Inside this group of nouns we do not find any formal difference between the cases so that we can safely regard *-i* as an epenthetic vowel¹¹⁾

It may be useful to consider in some detail the complementation of infinitives. Generally a construction like “the walking of Peter” or “the slapping of Peter” is formed by putting the infinitive in the construct state and the *nomen rectum* in the genitive. Yet sometimes we find a construction with the infinitive in the *status rectus* and the *nomen rectum* in the accusative, e.g.

151/18 *a-na da-ga-lī pa-ni-šu* sig₅-[t]a (from Tyre), “in order to see his good face”

287/58 *la-a a-la-ah-e mu-še-ra* KASKAL (Jerusalem), “I could not send a caravan”
Outside Jerusalem and Tyre this construction is very rare. In Byblos, for example, an accusative complement can only be used with an infinitive if the infinitive is the direct object of the verbs *le’û* or *bu’u*. In that case, we find either a construct state + genitive or a fronted complement of the infinitive, e.g.

81/10 *u 2 URU j[u-ba-]u [la-q]a-a*, “And he wants to take the two towns”

In these cases, the complement of the infinitive may have become a second object of the finite verb, cf.

129/19 *u ti-ba-u-na-ši la-q[a-a]*, “And they want to take them”

Here *-ši*, logically the complement of *leqû*, has been attached to *bu’u* as an object suffix.

Except for instances from Tyre and Jerusalem, I have in principle analysed every infinitive followed directly by its complement as a construct state. It is quite probable that this analysis is incorrect in a few individual cases. However, the general picture of the morphology of the construct state does not change if infinitives are left out.

There are a few singular forms of the *status constructus* where we find case-marking:

NOM *a-wa-tu* (136/22), *še-ḥu* (147/26), *ma-sar-tum* (289/36 from a sentence with *janu*)

ACC *[i-p]i-ša* (79/24, from an infinitive construction), *[ḥa-za-a]n-na* (131/19), *a-wa-tam* (94/5, 323/19, 324/10)¹²⁾

The ending *-a* is found three times where we should expect a genitive *ba-la-ta* (74/17 an infinitive construction), *a-wa-tam* (94/7)¹²⁾, *[i] i-[l]a-ta* (114/60) and once instead of a nominative *gab-ba* (378/21).

Against a total of 192 construct state forms these forms are negligible.

¹¹⁾ In Amqī there may be case marking in this group of nouns: ACC sg. *o* 3 × *i* 1 × and GEN sg. *o* 3 × *i* 7 ×.

¹²⁾ Perhaps these forms should be read as a broken spelling *a wa ut*.

In the plural of the construct state, the following case marking is found

NOM *-u* (also *-i*?)
 ACC *-i*
 GEN *-i*

Unfortunately, examples of the nominative plural are quite rare. I will give all available examples

-u *a-ia-bu* (114/47), *pa-nu* (117/12, *panu* is generally a plural noun), *na-ak-ru* (191/17, cf. the discussion below)

-i LU MEŠ *be-li* (102/22), *mar-ši-te* MEŠ (137/74) In the light of standard Akkadian, the last plural form is remarkable. One would expect *maršātu*

In the accusative and in the genitive, one always finds *-i*. The only exception is 192/10 *a-wa-at* MEŠ

The question now is: What was the situation in the substrate-language of Amarna Akkadian? Must we attribute the absence of case vowels in the singular to influence from Mesopotamian Akkadian, where we find approximately the same situation as in Amarna, or should we suppose that in contemporary Canaanite case distinctions had already disappeared in this position? The influence of Canaanite on the Amarna Akkadian verbal system is so overwhelming that it would be most unlikely that no influence was exerted on the case system. The case system of West-Semitic is much more similar to that of Akkadian than the verbal system. It must therefore have been much easier to put the two case systems on a par, which in Amarna automatically meant the use of the West-Semitic system. We can compare this situation with what happened in the Akkadian of Ugarit. Ugaritic had case vowels in the construct state¹³). Though the influence of Ugaritic on the Akkadian written in Ugarit was not as profound as the influence of Canaanite on Amarna Akkadian, half of the construct state forms follow the Ugaritic pattern¹⁴). If one assumes that in proto-Northwest-Semitic there was a case distinction in the singular of the construct state, as is suggested by the facts from Ugarit, the Amarna state of affairs would represent the first stage in the disintegration of the case system. Perhaps the use of *-i* in the nominative plural also corroborates this, though here the evidence is too meagre for definite conclusions. We might conclude that the construct state paradigm was developing into a system with only an opposition between singular (*-ø* or *-i*) and plural (always *-i*).

¹³) Cf. St. Segert, *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1984) § 52.7

¹⁴) W. H. van Soldt, *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Leiden 1986), 424

1.3 *Status pronominalis*

In the pronominal state, I shall mark the difference between the forms before a first person singular suffix and those before other suffixes

1.3.1 *The pronominal state before the 1 sg. suffix*

In Mesopotamian Akkadian, we find the following system

sg	NOM	- \emptyset + \bar{i}	pl	- \bar{u} + ja
	ACC	- \emptyset + \bar{i}		- \bar{i} + ja
	GEN	- i + ja		- \bar{i} + ja

The picture in Amarna is entirely different. In the nominative, the ending - \emptyset + \bar{i} is quite rare¹⁵⁾. In fact, the only word for which it is regularly attested is *bēlu*. Next to the form *bēlī* we also find forms of the type *bēlija*/EN-*ia*. The choice between these two possibilities depends on the writer. *bēlī* is found in six corpora

	<i>bēlī</i>	<i>bēlija</i>
Byblos	33 ×	10 ×
Beirut-1	12 ×	3 ×
Tyre	4 ×	15 ×
Kumidi	1 ×	3 ×
Gezer	12 ×	17 ×

In Gezer, the situation is very interesting. In the Milkili letters, we find a strong preference for *bēlī* (9 ×, only twice EN-*ia*). In the other letters, we only find EN-*ia* (14 ×). The same situation obtains in the letters of Shuwardata. Those letters which, according to Moran, are orthographically indistinguishable from the Milkili letters from Gezer and which Moran suggests were written by the same writer as the Milkili letters¹⁶⁾, give us three instances of *bēlī* and one of EN-*ia*. As I explained in note 5, I have in principle included the Shuwardata letters just mentioned in the Gezer corpus. In the other Shuwardata letters, we do not find *bēlī* at all, whereas EN-*ia* occurs 20 times.

If we leave *bēlī* out of consideration, there are only three instances of - \bar{i} in the nominative singular: LU-*li* (138/81), e-*mu-qi* (154/7), šA-*bi* (362/6).

In the accusative singular, the ending - \bar{i} is even rarer than in the nominative, undoubtedly due to the fact that the word *bēlu* is more frequent in the nominative than in the accusative. Only in the corpora Beirut-1 and Shechem these forms are found. The following are all the relevant forms from these two corpora:

Beirut-1	NOM sg	= - \bar{i} <i>bēli</i> (12 ×), LU- <i>li</i> (1 ×)
	NOM sg	= - <i>ia</i> EN- <i>ia</i> (3 ×), ŠEŠ- <i>ia</i> (3 ×), DAM- <i>ia</i> (1 ×), E- <i>ia</i> (1 ×)
	ACC sg	= - \bar{i} <i>hutu</i> (1 ×), <i>bēli</i> (1 ×), <i>erēbi</i> (1 ×), <i>awati</i> (1 ×)
	ACC sg	= - <i>ia</i> DUMU- <i>ia</i> (1 ×)

¹⁵⁾ Cf. Bohl 1909 § 15a.

¹⁶⁾ Moran 1987, 500 n. 1.

Shechem	NOM sg	= -ī	not attested
	NOM sg	= -(i)ja	EN-ia (2 ×), arnuja (1 ×)
	NOM sg	= -uja	arnuja (1 ×), hituja (1 ×)
	ACC sg	= -ī	ili (2 ×)
	ACC sg	= -ja	karsija (2 ×), arnuja (1 ×), mimmija (1 ×)

Beirut-1 seems to be the only corpus where the suffix -ī is still regularly used. Looking at the rest of the Amarna letters, the following picture emerges:

NOM sg	= 52 × -ī, 139 × -ia
ACC sg	= 2 × -ī, 28 × -ia

The next question is: Which vowel was used between the stem and -ia? Though the suffix is very often found with ideograms which do not give any indication of the vowel between the stem and the suffix (e.g. É-ia, šA-ia), there are sufficient other examples to conclude that the vowel between the stem and the suffix was -i- for all cases. We find this vowel 35 × in the nominative and 18 × in the accusative. Only four times, a different vowel appears:

NOM sg	-uja	ar-nu-ia (253/18), hi-tu'-ia (253/19)
ACC sg	-aja	pa-ar-sa-ia (73/39), pa'-na-ia (281/20)

It is not entirely clear how we should analyse the accusative form *la-qa-ia*, which appears several times in Byblos. One might assume *laqa'-a + ia > laqaja* or *laqa'-i + ia > laqa'ya*, or some similar analysis.

As there is no parallel with standard Akkadian here, I think one can safely suppose that forms with -ja in the nominative and accusative singular reflect the situation in Canaanite. This would be more or less parallel to the situation in Ugarit, where in poetical texts we find no ending written in the nominative, the ending probably being -ī, while in prose texts one finds, -y, which must represent -(V)ja¹⁷⁾. In the Akkadian of Ugarit, which is primarily represented by prose texts, /ja/ is used¹⁸⁾. This is an indication that in Ugaritic and Canaanite the genitive suffix -ja was generalised to all cases in the singular. In later forms of Canaanite, such as Hebrew and Later Phoenician, this form -ja again became -ī because of the general dropping of final short vowels.

We are now left with the following problem. In Old Phoenician and in the older Phoenician inscriptions from Byblos, texts dating from centuries after the Amarna period, we find a distinction between -ī (not written) in the nom/acc sg and -ja (orthographically -y) in the genitive¹⁹⁾. Maybe this can be explained by assuming dialectal variation. If this is correct, all dialects would have replaced -ī by -ja,

¹⁷⁾ Van Soldt 1986: 409

¹⁸⁾ Cf. the discussion in van Soldt 1986, 407ff.

¹⁹⁾ J. Friedrich and W. Rollig, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik* (2nd ed., Rome 1970) 102

except some dialects in Northern Syria, whence all old Phoenician inscriptions come. However, the question remains what to do about the Phoenician forms from Byblos? Here we should keep in mind that in one Amarna corpus, Beirut-1, the opposition $-ī$ vs $-ya$ is still operative. Beirut-1 is the corpus of letters sent by Rib-Addi, prince of Byblos during his exile in Beirut. He had gone to Beirut to conclude a treaty with the local prince (cf. 138/51ff), but when he returned home, the gates of his own city remained closed to him, and he had to return to his ally. It is conceivable that Rib-Addi had taken a writer with him to write up the treaty. In that case, Beirut-1 would be a subcorpus of the Byblos-letters. Orthographically and linguistically, the Beirut-1 corpus is different from the other letters from Byblos, but even more so from the Ammunira-letters from Beirut (Beirut-2). If it indeed reflects the dialect of Byblos, we must assume that there were two subdialects in this city, one using only $-ya$, represented by the Amarna letters from Byblos, the other using $-ī$ as opposed to $-ya$, as found in Beirut-1 and the old Phoenician inscriptions from Byblos.

The dual of the nominative is found in a gloss from Sidon

144/17 // *hi-na-ia* “my two eyes”

In the plural, a vowel always appears between the stem and $-ia$. In the accusative and genitive this vowel is $-i-$, in the nominative usually $-u-$ (8 ×). In the nominative $-ya$ is attested five times. Three of these forms appear in the phrase LU MEŠ *hupšya*. Moran considers *hupšya* “an abstract standing in a genitival relation after LU MEŠ, which accordingly is not a determinative”²⁰). This analysis is corroborated by the two nominative *status rectus* forms LU MEŠ *hu-up-ši* (118/37, 125/27). In this light, IU MEŠ *hu'- <up> -šu-šu-nu* (125/34) is odd. The two other nominative plural forms with $-ya$ are *a-wa-te-ia* (117/32) and LU MEŠ *a-bu-ti-ia* (130/21).

1.3.2 *The status pronominalis before other suffixes*

Before other suffixes we find the following pattern in Amarna Akkadian

sg	NOM	$-\emptyset + \text{suffix} / -u + \text{suffix}$	pl	$-u + \text{suffix}$
	ACC	$-\emptyset + \text{suffix} / -a + \text{suffix}$		$-i + \text{suffix}$
	GEN	$-i + \text{suffix}$		$-i + \text{suffix}$

It is clear that this system is entirely different in the singular from the system before the 1 sg suffix, where case distinction is very unusual.

Before other suffixes we find either a diptotic declension (nom / acc vs gen) in the singular, or a triptotic declension. In the Akkadian from Mesopotamia triptotism is very rare in this position, but in Ugaritic it is the rule.

The distribution of the two declensional patterns can largely be predicted on the base of the phonological structure of the stem.

²⁰) Cf. W. L. Moran, *The Use of the Canaanite Infinitive Absolute*, *JCS* 4, 169–172, esp. 169 n. 8.

— If a stem ends in a geminate, there is a case vowel in the nominative and accusative (9 ×, only exception *gab-ša* in 286/36)

— Monosyllabic stems of the structure CVC often lack a case vowel in the nom / acc sg 5 × against 2

— Stems ending in -VC generally lack a case vowel in the nom / acc sg This situation obtains 17 × The exceptions are [*b*]*e*²¹-*la-ku-nu* (74/26), URU-*lu-ki-ši-na* (137/73), //ru-*šu-nu* (264/18 a gloss)

— Other stems often have a case vowel (10 × against 5)

Instead of the expected -*u*-, which occurs 11 ×, or -*a*-, which occurs 13 ×, we sometimes find the vowel -*i*- in the nominative or in the accusative

NOM sg *a-wa^l-ti-šu-nu* (89/14), *gab-bi-šu-nu* (362/68), *ir-pi-šu* (289/38 this is the Egyptian word *iry p^t*²¹) As in this period final /*t*/ often disappears in Egyptian²²), the vowel -*i*- might be explained as deriving from the Egyptian stem)

ACC sg *qa-ti-ḥu* (284/19)

In conclusion, we find the following case system in Amarna Akkadian

St	Rectus	St Constr	St Pron 1 sg	St Pron other suff
sg	NOM - <i>u</i>	- <i>ø</i> / <i>-i</i> *	- <i>i-ja</i> / <i>-ø-i</i>	- <i>ø</i> / <i>-u</i> *
	ACC - <i>a</i>	- <i>ø</i> / <i>-i</i> *	- <i>i-ja</i> / <i>-ø-i</i>	- <i>ø</i> / <i>-a</i> *
	GEN - <i>i</i>	- <i>ø</i> / <i>-i</i> *	- <i>i-ja</i>	- <i>i</i> -
pl	NOM - <i>u</i>	- <i>u</i> / <i>-i</i> ?	- <i>u-ja</i>	- <i>u</i> -
	ACC - <i>i</i>	- <i>i</i>	- <i>i-ja</i>	- <i>i</i> -
	GEN - <i>i</i>	- <i>i</i>	- <i>i-ja</i>	- <i>i</i> -

* in part phonologically determined distribution

1.4 Some special cases

It is necessary to deal with a number of words and groups of words separately I shall discuss the following cases

1.4.1 toponyms and proper names

1.4.2 plurals with ending in -*ūtu*

1.4.3 the word *panu* “face”

1.4.4 the word *annu* “this”

1.4.5 the word *pitatu* “archer host”

1.4.6 the words *ajab* “sea” and *tamhar* “battle” in Byblos

1.4.1 Toponyms and proper names

In Amarna Akkadian, there is no indication that toponyms are declined There are place names in -*u* (e.g. *Usu*), -*a* (e.g. *Irqata*), -*i* (e.g. *Ambi*) and place names without any ending (e.g. *Urusalum*) The endings -*a* and -*i* constitute the vast

²¹) Cf Knudtzon 1915, 1427

²²) Cf J Černý and S I Groll *A Late Egyptian Grammar* (3d ed., Rome 1984) 6

majority For certain toponyms more than one ending is attested (often *-a* alongside *-ø*, or *-a* alongside *-i*), but these endings are never related to case differences, as is shown quite clearly by the toponym Symira

	<i>Sumur</i>	<i>Sumura</i>	<i>Sumuri</i>
NOM	4 ×	8 ×	1 ×
ACC	1 × ?	10 ×	3 ×
GEN	4 ×	34 ×	2 ×

Unlike the situation in Ugarit²³), there is no indication that proper names were declined diptotically in Amarna Of course, one finds toponyms which are only attested in genitive and accusative contexts, but it would be a totally *ad hoc* analysis to consider these as cases of diptotic declension²⁴)

For personal names, as opposed to toponyms, the picture is slightly more complicated Foreign names are treated like toponyms, viz there is no case marking, although variation in the final vowel is possible (e.g. *Amanappa* alongside *Amanappi*) The name *Šuwardata* might prove to be an exception Here we find two genitive forms with *-a* and a single instance of *Šuwardatu* in the nominative

Personal names consisting of a genitive construction (like “the servant of Ashirta”) are generally not susceptible to case differentiation Consider for example the prince of Amurru

	<i>Abdi-Aširta</i>	<i>A -Aširti</i>	<i>A -Ašratu</i>	<i>A -Ašrata</i>	<i>A -Ašrati</i>
NOM	9 ×	—	4 ×	—	3 ×
ACC	6 ×	1 × ?	—	1 ×	—
GEN	30 ×	9 ×	1 × ?	1 ×	5 ×

We sometimes find case marking in this class of names This seems to be limited to an opposition of *-u*, used only in the nominative, as opposed to *-i/-a*, used in all cases including the nominative Instances of this nominative in *-u* are the forms *Abdi-Ašratu* and *Milkilu*, the last of which occurs once in the nominative alongside the usual *Milkilū* in all cases However, these are exceptions

In other names, that is, West-Semitic names not consisting of a genitive construction, we usually find case inflection For example, in the letters from Byblos and Beirut-1, the form *Aziru* occurs 16 × in the nominative and the form *Aziri* 12 × in the genitive without any overlap between the two Yet in Tyre we find the form *Azira* twice in the nominative and three times in the genitive *Aziri* occurs but once, in an accusative context Even inside this group there is apparently variation between case-marked and undeclined forms With those few declined names for

²³) Cf M Liverani, “Antecedenti del diptotismo arabo nei testi accadici di Ugarit”, *RSO* 38, 131-160

²⁴) Differently D Sivan, *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary (AOAT 214, Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984)* 115

which we have sufficient information to reconstruct a complete paradigm triptotical declension appears, e.g.

	<i>Janḫamu</i>	<i>Janḫama</i>	<i>Janḫamī</i>
NOM	7 ×	1 ×	—
ACC	1 × ?	4 ×	—
GEN	—	—	8 ×

1.4.2 Plurals ending in *-ūtu*

In Mesopotamia, plurals ending in *-ūtu*, a desinence used there with adjectives and a few substantives, are diptotes, just like the other plurals²⁵⁾ In Amarna Akkadian, these plurals are triptotically declined, as is shown by forms like *ša-ru-ta* (103/31) and LU MEŠ *ḫa-za-nu-ta* MEŠ (365/16) As against 15 accusatives with *-ūta* we find only one instance of *-ūti*, [*ḫa-zi*]-*a-nu-ti* (285/19)

Quite interesting is the behaviour of these plurals in the construct and pronominal states If we leave out of consideration the word *abbūtu*, “fathers”, which always maintains the element *-ūt-*, one regularly finds that *-ūt-* is dropped in the construct state and that the remainder of the word is declined diptotically In the pronominal state, the same rule applies without any exception whatsoever I give all examples and counter examples

- st c NOM LU MEŠ *be-li* (102/22), *na-ak-ru* (191/17, in view of the context I prefer a translation “enemies” above Moran’s “war”²⁶⁾)
- st c ACC LU *ša-ri* MEŠ (185/56)
- st c GEN [LU]MEŠ *ḫa-za-ni* (129/11)
LU MEŠ *ḫa-za-na* in 138/26 is probably a singular form If this is correct, MEŠ is a “logogram marker” here rather than a plural marker²⁷⁾ LU MLŠ *ḫa-za-nu-ti* is found twice in the genitive of the construct state (107/24, 117/37)
- st pr NOM LU MEŠ *ḫa-za-nu-šu'* (114/48), LU MEŠ *ra-i-mu-ia* (137/47 if this is a plural ending in *-ūtu* in the *status rectus*)
- st pr ACC *ḫa-za-ni-su* (116/63)
- st pr GEN LU MEŠ *ḫa-za-ni-ku-nu* (117/62), LU MEŠ *ḫa-za-ni-ka* (132/50)

Van Soldt explains similar phenomena in the Akkadian of Ugarit as a reinterpretation of the opposition *-ūtu* vs *-ū* in Akkadian²⁸⁾ In Mesopotamia, this opposition is used to distinguish adjectives from substantives Yet, in the periphery, writers used the opposition to match the opposition *status rectus* vs *status constructus*, *-ūma* vs *-ū*, in their own language

²⁵⁾ Cf *GAG* § 63i

²⁶⁾ Moran 1987 430

²⁷⁾ Van Soldt 1986 428vv

²⁸⁾ Cf van Soldt 1986 427 428

1.4.3. *The word panu “face”*

In principle, *panu* is used in Amarna as a *plurale tantum*, comparable to the Hebrew *panîm*. The behaviour of *panu* in the pronominal state gives good evidence for this. Before the 1 sg. suffix we always find *-u* in the nominative, which would be surprising if *panu* were a singular. In the accusative before other suffixes we always find *-i* (15 ×). If *panu* is modified by an adjective, this adjective is always plural, e.g.:

244/39 *pa-ni-ma ša-nu-tam*, 253/27 *pa-ni ša-nu¹-tam*.

Panu is used twice as a singular:

151/42 *IGI²-an* (st. c. GEN), 281/20 *p[a²]-na-ia* (ACC).

1.4.4. *The word annu “this”*

As other authors have observed²⁹⁾, *annu* is used for all cases in Byblos, e.g.:

117/52 *LÚ an-nu-ú* (ACC), 76/46 *ši-ip-ri an-nu-ú* (GEN).

In most other towns, *annu* is inflected as a regular noun, e.g.:

196/32 *ep- <ša> an-na* (ACC), 196/40 *ep-ši an-ni* (GEN).

The feminine form *annitu* and the plural *annutu* are declined in the normal way.

1.4.5. *The word ERÍN.MEŠ piṭatu, “archers”*

The Egyptian word *pḏty* has been treated differently by the different writers:

1) *piṭatu* is indeclinable

a) By analogy with foreign proper names *piṭatu* cannot be declined. This situation is found in the Ammunira letters from Beirut:

st. r. GEN ERÍN.ḪI.A *pi-ṭá-at* (141/22; 141/30)

st. c. GEN ERÍN.MEŠ *pi-ṭá-at* (142/30)

st. c. GEN ERÍN.MEŠ *pi-ṭá-ti* (142/14).

b) *Piṭatu* is the nomen rectum of ERÍN.MEŠ, and therefore always appears in the genitive case. This pattern is found in most letters from Byblos. This analysis is corroborated by the fact that the gender of an adjective modifying ERÍN.MEŠ *piṭati* is always masculine in these letters. This means it agrees with the masculine word ERÍN.MEŠ (*šābu*) rather than with the feminine word *piṭatu*, e.g.:

ACC ERÍN.MEŠ *pi-ṭá-ti ra-ba* (76/38).

2) *piṭatu* is declinable

a) *Piṭatu* is interpreted as a feminine singular and is therefore a triptote. This pattern can be found in some Byblos letters (93; 127-132 and 362), e.g.:

ACC ERÍN.MEŠ *pi-ṭá-tam* (EA 131/33).

²⁹⁾ Cf. Böhl 1909 § 22e.

If there is a modifying adjective, this agrees with *pitatu* and is therefore feminine, e.g.

GEN [ERIN] MEŠ *pi-ta-ti ra-bi-ti* (127/39)

Triptotic declension is also found in Beirut-1, Amqi, Gezer and the Shuwardata letters

b) *Pitatu* is regarded as a plural and is therefore a diptote. The clearest examples of this are found in Jerusalem

NOM ERIN MEŠ *pi-ta-tum* (287/21)
 ACC ERIN MEŠ *pi-ta-ti* (287/18, 290/20)
 GEN ERIN MEŠ *pi-ta-ti* (287/17)

There is some evidence that *pitatu* was analysed similarly in Amqi, Kumidi and in the Shuwardata letters

There is evidently a lot of variation, not only between the different corpora but also within some single corpora (Byblos, Amqi)

1 4 6 *The words ajab, "sea", and tamḥar, "battle", in Byblos*

The words *ajab* and *tamḥar* appear in Byblos in two forms

GEN = *tamḥara* or *tamḥar*
 GEN = *ajaba* or *ajab*

As these words are attested several times, and as they never have the expected case ending, these forms require an explanation other than dismissing them as mere slips of the pen

Ajab- was derived from the ideogram A A BA. In Amarna, certain ideograms were pronounced according to their Sumerian phonetic value, as is shown by the pronunciation gloss *tu-ka* for DUG GA in 136/28. Apparently A A BA was pronounced [*ajaba*], which led to a spelling in which [j] became written. The invariable ending *-a* reminded the writers of the toponyms which had this ending in all cases. As there existed a variant without any ending for many of these toponyms, *ajaba* was also written *ajab*.

The case of *tamḥar-* is more difficult to explain. Youngblood explains *tamḥara* as an accusative of specification and *tamḥar* as a *status indeterminatus*, which, as the author himself remarks, is "a rare phenomenon in Rib-Haddi"³⁰). This explanation of *tamḥara* is entirely *ad hoc*. In a construction like *šar tamḥara* one expects a genitive, and as far as I know, there are no other examples of a specifying accusative in this kind of context. Furthermore, since it is not very attractive to analyse *šar tamḥar* and *šar tamḥara* as two different constructions, I would like to

³⁰) R F Youngblood, *The Amarna Correspondence of Rib Haddi Prince of Byblos* (unpublished Ph D thesis, Philadelphia 1961), 129

propose an explanation which is no less *ad hoc* than Youngblood's, but has no syntactic consequences. Like *ajab*, *tamḥar* follows the toponymical pattern. In the case of *ajab* this was explained by its ideographical origin. For *tamḥar* it is impossible to give a similar explanation. Perhaps the expression *šar tamḥari*, "king of the battle", the title of an Akkadian epic well known in Amarna, was reinterpreted by the writer as "king of Tamḥar". This would have made him adapt *tamḥar* to the declensional pattern of other toponyms.

2. ERRORS IN CASE ENDINGS

Up till now I have described the general morphology of the Amarna Akkadian case system. Nevertheless we are left with a residue of "errors", i.e. errors in the framework of the grammar of Amarna Akkadian. These errors may originate from different sources:

1. *Orthography*. A substantive may have been adopted from Mesopotamian Akkadian in a petrified, indeclinable form. We can compare this phenomenon with ideograms, which are indeclinable, but function as normal substantives. The same principle can be applied to Akkadian nouns, which may become indeclinable even if they show a petrified case ending. Such words, which are comparable to the so-called pseudo-ideograms, will be called "akkadograms". Actually, these are not errors at all.
2. *Grammar*. It is conceivable that in the substrate language case endings were confused or even dropped. In written texts such a development may result in a great number of errors.
3. *Real scribal errors*. There are a number of instances where the writer simply made a mistake. In view of the great number of verified scribal errors (omission of signs, digraphs, etc.), this category must not be underestimated.

In view of points 1 and 2, it is important to keep the corpora separated.

2.1. Akkadograms

The following words should be considered akkadograms.

- In Byblos, the word *ŠE.im.ḪI.A* is indeclinable. It can be compared with Middle Assyrian, where *še'um* is also found as an akkadogram³¹).
- In Tyre, the word *a-ma-tam* is only found in this form, e.g. 147/69 *a-ma-tam* GEN. st. r., 155/46 *a-ma-tam* NOM. st.c.³²).
- The forms *LUGAL-ri* and *DINGIR.MEŠ-nu-ia* in the letters from Qiltu should be regarded as akkadograms. In these letters, *LUGAL-ri* appears 28 × as a nominative, while the expected nominative form *LUGAL-ru* appears only once. In all other

³¹) W. Mayer, *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik des Mittel-assyrischen* (AOATS 2, Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1971) 11.

³²) O. Loretz, "ENri = iwri in EA 286", *UF* 6, 485.

words, *-u* is the nominative ending (7 ×) DINGIR MEŠ-*nu-ia* is found three times as a genitive, whereas *-i* is the genitive desinence (5 ×) in all other words. It is therefore plausible to treat LUGAL-*ri* and DINGIR MEŠ-*nu-ia* as akkadograms. This is corroborated by evidence from other corpora from Southern Palestine.

Lakhish	LUGAL- <i>ri</i> (NOM) 1 ×	LUGAL- <i>ru</i> (NOM) 2 ×
	DINGIR MEŠ- <i>nu-ia</i> (GEN) 1 ×, DINGIR-MEŠ- <i>ni-ia</i> (GEN) 2 ×	
Jerusalem	LUGAL <i>ri</i> (NOM) 18 ×, LUGAL- <i>ru</i> (NOM) 5 ×	

It is not attractive to treat LUGAL-*ri* in Jerusalem as the Hurrian word /*ewri*/ in a way analogous to Loretz' proposal for the Jerusalem form EN-*ri*³²). This would mean that Hurrian words were also used in Qiltu and Lakhish, which would appear rather odd. Secondly, whether or not the writer of the Jerusalem letters originated from Syria³³), there is absolutely no indication for a Hurrian substrate or superstrate in these letters.

— In Jerusalem, *nu-kur-tam* is only found as a constituent in a non-verbal sentence. If we look at other words in a non-verbal sentence, we find *-u* 4 × and *-a* only once (*ḥa-an-pa* in 288/7). It seems simplest to regard the five instances of *nu-kur-tam* as akkadograms.

2.2 Errors resulting from developments in the substrate language

It is impossible to draw a clear line between a simple scribal error and an error resulting from developments in the substrate language. There are two principles that can be of help.

1) Simple scribal errors are infrequent. If there were a sizeable corpus in which half of the case endings were used incorrectly, this could not be explained in terms of simple scribal errors alone. Yet, with small corpora it may be hard to decide if we should blame the substrate language.

2) Simple scribal errors occur in an arbitrary way. If we only find errors of the type NOM sg = *-i* in a large corpus, this cannot be due to chance.

Keeping these two principles in mind, I found two corpora where the substrate language could probably be blamed. Apart from these corpora we find the wrong case ending approximately 40 times. In view of the large number of properly used case endings, we should treat these 40 instances as simple scribal errors. In § 2.3 I shall enumerate all examples I regard as simple scribal errors, but first I shall consider Hasor and Tyre.

2.2.1 Hasor

The analysis of the situation in Hasor is hampered by the extreme shortage of

³³) Cf. W. L. Moran, 'The Syrian Scribe of the Jerusalem Amarna Letters', in H. Goedicke and J. J. M. Roberts (eds.), *Unity and Diversity* (Baltimore and London 1975) 146-166.

available material Yet, within this tiny corpus we quite often find a genitive in the place of a nominative

st r	NOM	1 × -u DINGIR MEŠ-nu (227/12)
		2 × -i i[R-d]i (228/10), LUGAL-ri (228/20)
st r	GEN	4 × -i LUGAL-ri (228/1, 6, 12, 17)
		1 × -u LUGAL-rum (228/8 probably a scribal error ³⁴)
st pr		1 × -i ši- <i>ip-ri-ka</i> (227/16)

In the accusative there are no errors

2.2.2 Tyre

The situation in Tyre is interesting In about half of the instances where one would expect an accusative, the ending -u occurs, while -a never appears in the nominative I shall give all accusatives

ACC sg	-a	13 ×	ir-da (147/49), ma-mi-ta (148/37, 149/60), tup-pa (149/11, 71, 77), u-mu-da (149/11), li-im-na (149/16), sig ₅ -ta (151/19), a-ra-da (154/15), LUGAL-ra (295/9), ri-ig-ma-šu (147/13), tu[p-p]a-šu (151/29)
	-u	9 ×	še- <i>h</i> u (147/19, 34, 155/9), ra-bi-tu (147/62), nu-kur-tum (148/35, 151/14), //qi-na-zu (151/48 a gloss), Giš ma-<qi>-bu-ma (151/48), mi-nu-um-mi (149/56)

The last word, *minummi*, deserves special attention It is the only example of *minummi* in all corpora I have examined Though maybe *minummi* was indeclinable in Mesopotamia, as the examples in the *CAD* suggest³⁵), this cannot be proved for the Amarna letters Since there are enough examples in Tyre of accusatives in -u, I think it is appropriate to consider *minummi* as one of these In fact, in the Aziru-letters from Amurru, which I have left out of consideration in this article, we find a nominative *minummi* (e.g. 158/11), as opposed to an accusative *minammi* (157/37)

More evidence for the use of -u in the accusative can be found in the expression “day and night” In the rest of Amarna Akkadian this expression is always used in the accusative *mu-ša ur-ra* Yet in 155/30 we find PN BE-ti-ia *mu-šu ù ur-ra*, “PN is my mistress day and night”

In the genitive, -i is regularly used, but there are three instances of -u instead of -i NA *me-ku* (148/5)³⁶), *ti-ib-nu* (148/33), *a-bu-šu* (147/8)

How can we account for the case errors treated above? Evidently, something happened to the accusative in the substrate language It seems improbable that the accusative would have been reduced to zero, for then we would expect not only confusion of the accusative with the nominative case, but also confusion of the

³⁴) Cf Knudtzon 1915 769

³⁵) Cf *CAD* M/2, 97ff (sub *minumme*)

³⁶) This word may be indeclinable like NA₄ *ch_lupakku* (323/14, 16, 331/17)

accusative with the genitive. The accusative singular was apparently in the process of merging, or may already have merged, with the nominative sg.³⁷⁾ In the latter case, the *-a*-forms would be archaisms or akkadianisms, which would not be improbable in Tyre. Morphological interference of West-Semitic is much less pronounced here than in the other corpora. If the accusative sg. was still in the process of merging with the nominative when the Amarna letters were written, we should regard the use of cases in the Akkadian texts as an exact representation of the situation in the substrate language. In this connection, it is important to realize that an accusative form is never found in the place of a nominative. If nominative and accusative were to have merged completely, such confusion would be expected. The genitive is also of some interest in this context. Maybe what we find here are the first beginnings of a development of GEN = *-u*.

On the basis of the data from Tyre, we may conclude that the merging of the cases started before short final vowels were dropped. This might have syntactic reasons such as regression of the case system, or phonological reasons such as the loss of opposition between /a/ and /u/ in word final position. If one chooses the phonological option, one must assume that all accusatives in *-a* are due to Akkadian influence. The forms *ma- <qi> -bu-ma* and *a-bu-šu* (GEN) seem to indicate that a syntactic explanation is in order. Whether we choose a phonological explanation or a syntactic explanation, the data from Tyre do not favour the opinion Moscati expresses for Northwest-Semitic in general, that "in the later languages the endings disappear and with them the formal distinction between the cases"³⁸⁾.

2.3. Scribal errors in other corpora

In the following paragraph I shall enumerate those case errors I regard as simple scribal errors. As construct state forms were already discussed above, they will not be included.

- 1) NOM = *i*: Byblos: LÚ-*lim* (74/12); *ši-en-ni* (77/10); *a-wa-te* (94/9)³⁹⁾; *ú-nu-te* (120/1); Irqata: *ṭup-pí* (100/1); Gezer: *ep-ri* (298/19).
- 2) NOM = *a*: Byblos: *mu-ú-ša* (86/33); *mur-ša-ma* (116/58); *mi-na* (81/33)⁴⁰⁾; Jerusalem: *ḥa-an-pa* (288/7)
- 3) ACC sg. = *i*: Byblos: LÚ-*lim* (108/48); ERÍN.MEŠ *til¹-la-ti* (104/35); *ṭup-pí* (112/46; 117/18); *ka-li* (116/15); *ša-ri* (117/55); URU-*lim* (118/34); Kumidi: LUGAL-*ri* (194/

³⁷⁾ A few centuries after the Amarna period a similar development took place in Mesopotamia, cf. GAG § 63c.

³⁸⁾ S. Moscati ed., *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Wiesbaden 1964) 95.

³⁹⁾ W.L. Moran, *A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as reflected in the Amarna Tablets* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Baltimore 1950) 161, interprets *a-wa-te* as *awat+i*, "my word". If this is correct, we have here one of the very few instances of the 1 sg. suffix *-i*.

⁴⁰⁾ Moran 1950, 156, interprets this sentence as *mi-na <a-qa-bu-na> a-na...* If this is correct, the accusative in *mina* is correct.

- 7); Acre: *gab-bi* (233/19); *mi-im-mi* (234/16); Megiddo: *ba-ga-ni* (244/14); Gezer: *ep-ši* (270/10); *ša-ri* (297/18); Jerusalem: *e-za-bi* (287/62); Lakhish: *ep-ri* (330/15); Qiltu: *nu-kúr-ti* (366/32).
- 4) AKK = *u*: Byblos: *a-wa-tu-ia* (74/50); *ka-az-bu-tu* (129/37, explained by a gloss showing the correct case ending); Jerusalem: *a-si-ru* (287/54)
- 5) GEN = *u*: Byblos: LUGAL-*ru(m)* (76/13; 131/19); *an-nu-tum* (73/25); *ḥa-za-nu-tu(m)* (118/45; 126/10); *ú-nu-tu-ia* (119/56); Jerusalem: LUGAL-*ru* (288/61); Ashqalon: AN-*ú* (326/2).
- 6) GEN = *a*: Gezer: *da-ri-ia-ta* (294/35)

Total: NOM = <i>i</i> : 6 ×	ACC sg. = <i>i</i> : 16 ×	GEN = <i>a</i> : 1 ×
NOM = <i>a</i> : 5 ×	ACC = <i>u</i> : 3 ×	GEN = <i>u</i> : 7 ×

The forms listed above constitute only a small percentage of the total number of attested forms. For example, in the whole Amarna corpus outside of Tyre, 19 case errors can be found in the accusative singular. Yet, even if we confine ourselves to the Byblos corpus, we find no less than 123 instances of the regular ending *-a*.

2.4. *Status rectus* forms without an ending

If we leave out of consideration the words *tamḥar* and *ajab*, which have been dealt with above, forms without an ending used in a position where a *status rectus* is required can be explained in two ways:

- a construct state was used erroneously,
- the case ending was erroneously dropped.

Examples of the erroneous use of a construct state can be found in constructions with *ša*. A genitival relationship can be expressed by means of a constructus-linking or by the word *ša*, which leaves the *nomen regens* in the *status rectus*. There are cases where both a construct state and *ša* are used:

//*ra-bi-iš ša* LUGAL (321/15)
 LÚ[*ra*]-*bi-iš* [*ša*] LUGAL (328/17)
 LÚ *qar-tab ša* ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ-*ka* (331/6)

A relative clause is generally formed with the relative pronoun *ša*. There is an alternative to this relative clause construction, which is probably taken from Mesopotamian Akkadian, in which the antecedent of the relative clause is put into the construct state and the pronoun *ša* is not used, e.g. *a-wa-at ul-te-bi-la* LUGAL (267/9).

Yet in Gezer we may also find a construct state before a relative clause introduced by *ša*:

[*a*]-*wa-at ša iš-tap-par* [LUGAL] (278/9)
a-wa-at ša iš-pu-ur LUGAL (293/8)
a-wa-at ša qa-ba LUGAL (294/12).

3.1.3. *Indication of situation*

Although it is much more usual to indicate a situation by means of a prepositional phrase, there are a few examples of a situational accusative, e.g.

87/17 *u uššam riqūtam*, “and he went away empty-handed”.

There is one very interesting passage in a letter from Megiddo where a word in the locative case is explained by a gloss in the accusative.

245/6 *u TIL.LA-nu-um-ma | ḥa-ia-ma nubbaluššu ana LUGAL-ri*, “and then we can send him alive / alive to the king”

The form of words only used in order to specify the verb is a lexical matter. This obtains in adverbs, including those which have the Akkadian terminative ending *-iš*, e.g. *puḥriš-mi* (254/24), which Moran translates as “continuellement”⁴¹). Forms with the terminative desinence may also appear after prepositions, e.g. *kima arḥiš* “as fast as possible” (73/45 a.o.). As opposed to the locative case, the terminative most probably was not productive in Amarna.

3.2. *The case after janu, “there is not”*

Unlike Middle Babylonian, where the nominative is used in a construction with *janu*, Amarna Akkadian uses the accusative with this word⁴²), e.g.

117/9 *janu ḥazana*, 244/39 *janu panima šanutam*

A nominative or a genitive occur only rarely:

69/23 *janum LÚ-lum*, 85/53 *janu A-u*, 74/32 *ḥ[anu] LÚ-lim*, 119/42 *janu šà-bi šana*.

These examples are from Byblos, where the accusative is found 21 × .

In Tyre and Jerusalem the nominative is used.

148/38 *janu LÚ.[Gi]R sanu*, 155/20 *janu epru janu šamu*.

The accusative appears once: *janu baltašu* (153/14). As I mentioned before, in Tyre the nominative and the accusative are often confused.

In Jerusalem the nominative appears 8 × . Only in the two following examples a different case is used:

286/33 *[jan]umi LÚ.MEŠ mašarta*, 287/23 *janumi [KUR.Ḫ]I.A u LÚ.MEŠ hazianuti*.

3.3. *The case after umma, “thus”*

The case after *umma* has already been discussed by R. Marcus and other authors⁴³). However, they did not take into account that a majority of the proper names are indeclinable. As proper names very often occur after *umma*, their analysis is not fully reliable. Furthermore, they neglected the variation between the different corpora. If we exclude proper names from our data it becomes clear that *umma* was used in two different ways.

⁴¹) Moran 1987, 481.

⁴²) Moran 1950, 14-15.

⁴³) E.g. R. Marcus, “On the Genitive after *umma* in the Amarna Tablets” (with an additional note by A. Goetze), *JCS* 2, 223-224; Moran 1950, 12.

— *umma* is used as an introductory particle. The word following it is in the nominative case. In Mesopotamia, this use of *umma* constitutes the regular pattern⁴⁴). In Amarna it appears in Sidon, Acre, Piḫili, Shechem and in the Shuwardata-letters, e.g. 232/5 (Acre) *ep-ru*.

— *umma* is used as a preposition or as a substantive. The word following it has genitive case. This construction appears in Irqata, Amqi, Ginti-Kirmil (the Tagi letters), Ashqalon, Lakhish, Kumidi and Beirut-1, e.g. 320/7 (Ashqalon) *ep-ri*. *Ep-ra* in 321/7 (Ashqalon) is a scribal error.

3.4. *The pendent case*

For the purpose of this article I shall define a noun in the pendent case as a noun at the beginning of the sentence which is referred to by a pronominal element in the second part of the sentence. As pronominal reference to the subject is obligatory, I shall not take into consideration subject forms at the beginning of the sentence. We may distinguish two types of pendent case, one in which the noun in the pendent case is referred to by an object suffix, and one in which it is referred to by a genitive suffix.

3.4.1 *Pronominal reference by an object suffix*

Pronominal reference to the object is not obligatory. When the object stands before the verb, two sentence types are possible.

a) There is no pronominal reference to the object in the second part of the sentence, e.g. 298/14 (Gezer) *u mema (= mimma) ša iqabbi LUGAL EN-ia ana jaši išteme magal magal*, “and to everything the king my lord said to me I listened very very well”.

b) There is pronominal reference to the object in the second part of the sentence. This is a *casus pendens* construction, e.g. 297/8 (Gezer) *mimma ša qaba LUGAL EN-ia ana jaši ištemišu magal SIG₅-iš*, “everything the king my lord said to me I listened to it very well”

For most towns it is impossible to establish which case was used when a noun in the pendent case was referred to by an object pronoun in the second part of the sentence. Only for Jerusalem can we find clear evidence. Here the nominative is used:

286/9 *amur' anaku la LÚ abija u la MÍ ummija šaknani ina ašri annē*, “Look! Me, neither my father nor my mother put me in this place”.

289/9 *LÚ ḫazianu ša epaš epša anniju amminim LUGAL-ri la ša'alšu*, “The prince who performed this deed, why does the king not ask him?”.

However, we cannot be sure this was the situation in every town. Two sentences from Gezer and Ashqalon (297/8 and 320/18) might imply that an accusative was

⁴⁴) Cf. GAG § 121/10b

used in these two towns. Unfortunately, in both sentences the noun in the pendent case is *mimma*, “everything”, which is often indeclinable. Although forms like *gabbi m[i]mmi'* (325/15, Ashqalon) and *gabba' mimme* (378/21, Gezer) suggest that *mimma*, “everything”, was declinable in these two corpora, one cannot be sure.

3.4.2. *Pronominal reference by a genitive suffix*

In the other type of pendent case, the preposed constituent is referred to by a genitive suffix. Here the nominative case always occurs, both in verbal and in non-verbal sentences.

83/12 *u LÚ šanu laqe LÚ-šu*, “And another man, his servant was taken away”.

118/39 *amur anaku panuja-ma ana arad LUGAL*, “Look, I, my face is set to serve the king”.

This type of pendent case is attested in Byblos, Tyre and the Shuwardata letters.

It should be noted that in one sentence a preposed constituent has nominative case, while there is no pronominal reference to it in the second part of the sentence:

107/10 *u puja awate. MEŠ aqbu ana LUGAL-ri kitama*, “as for my mouth, I said words to the king in truth”.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The morphology of the Amarna Akkadian case system is quite similar to its counterparts in other Semitic Languages. However, the system has several interesting peculiarities.

- 1) In the singular of the construct state no case marking appears. Instead, there is a partly phonologically determined variation between the epenthetical vowel *-i* and the absence of an ending.
- 2) In the nom./acc. singular before the pronominal suffix of the first person singular, *-ija* usually occurs. *-Aja* and *-uja* are quite rare in the singular. The pronominal suffix *-ī* is practically only attested with the word *bēlu*. Only in Beirut-1, the letters sent by Rib-Addi of Byblos during his stay in Beirut, the opposition *-ī* vs. *-ija* remains.
- 3) Before other pronominal suffixes triptotic declension regularly appears.
- 4) Toponyms are indeclinable. There is no reason to suppose a diptotic declensional pattern for toponyms or for proper names, comparable to the one found in Ugarit.
- 5) In general, case ending are used correctly. Yet in Tyre a nominative case ending is often used where we would expect an accusative.

The four productive cases in Amarna Akkadian are used in the following contexts:

- NOM with — constituents of a non-verbal sentence,
— subjects of a verbal sentence,
— nouns in the pendent case.
- ACC with — direct objects,
— words after *janu*,
— adverbial phrases as far as they are not expressed by a locative or by a prepositional phrase.
- GEN with — the *nomen rectum* in a genitive construction,
— after a preposition.

The locative case, finally, is used in locative phrases. This case is rather rare.