

The Akkadian Inscription of Idrimi

EDWARD L. GREENSTEIN & DAVID MARCUS

Columbia University

Literature

By now the Akkadian inscription of King Idrimi of Alalah needs no introduction to students of the ancient Near East. It has become one of the principal sources for studying the history of Syro-Palestine in the middle of the second millennium B.C.E. Since the original publication, no full-length philological study of this important inscription has yet appeared. It has been our purpose here to fulfill this need. Philological contributions have been offered, though, in a variety of studies. Of these studies the following have been utilized by us considerably in our own study and will be cited by us only by the author's surname and the appropriate page reference: S. Smith, *The Statue of Idrimi*, Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara 1 (London, 1949); W. F. Albright, Review of Smith's *Idrimi*, *BASOR* 118 (April, 1950), 14–20; A. Goetze, Review of Smith's *Idrimi*, *JCS* 4 (1950), 226–31; J. Nougayrol, Review of Smith's *Idrimi*, *RA* 45 (1951), 151–54; B. Landsberger, "Assyrische Königliste und 'Dunkles Zeitalter'," *JCS* 8 (1954), 47–73; J. Aro, "Remarks on the Language of the Alalakh Texts," *AfO* 17 (1954–56), 361–65; M. Tsevat, "Alalakhiana," *HUCA* 29 (1958), 109–35; R. Borger, "Die Statueninschrift des Idrimi von Alalakh (um 1400 v. Chr.)," in K. Gallinger et al., eds., *Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels*² (Tübingen, 1968), 21–24; A. L. Oppenheim, in J. B. Pritchard, ed., *ANET*³, 557–58; G. Giacomakis Jr., *The Akkadian of Alalah*, *Janua Linguarum, Series Practica* 59 (The Hague, 1970); A. Kempinski & N. Ne'eman, "The Idrimi Inscription Reconsidered," in Y. Aharoni, ed., *Excavations and Studies. Essays in Honour of Professor Shmuel Yeivin* (Tel Aviv, 1973), 211–20 [in Hebrew with English summary].

Methodology

The inscription was written in cuneiform in an inconsistent and idiosyncratic manner. We are dealing with the work of a scribe whose knowledge of Akkadian grammar was weak and who was not careful in writing the cuneiform characters, and with the copy of a stone mason who betrays no understanding of cuneiform writing. We must therefore contend with a multitude of signs whose reading can only be guessed until the requisite interpretation is determined through philological analysis; cf. Smith, 10f.; Albright, 14–15. Our philological approach, then, begins with a decipherment of the cuneiform that readily yields meaningful Akkadian and then

proceeds to suggest appropriate readings for the more obscure passages. The correct decipherment of the more obscure cuneiform follows from philological determinations and not vice versa. Oppenheim (557a) has voiced the need for a fresh collation of the inscription. We have not had the opportunity of making such a collation from the original monument. However, to our mind, such a collation can only have value after a careful philological study of the inscription has been done, and we have tried to provide such a study here.

We do not mean to imply that preceding commentators, including Smith himself, have not based decipherments on philological probabilities. On the contrary, we have tried to accredit the notable contributions of preceding scholars in the commentary. However, our approach is characteristically more comparative than that of others. That is, we have found in the inscription several passages where comparative material from Akkadian (particularly Mari, Boghazkoi, Amarna, Ras Shamra, and Assyria) and Northwest Semitic (particularly biblical) sources helps elucidate the inscription of Idrimi significantly.

Following the Introduction, which includes some discussion of important linguistic and literary matters, we present a fresh reading of the cuneiform in transcription, a new translation, and a commentary concerning philological, linguistic, literary, and exegetical matters.

Orthography

It has long been noted that the orthography of the Level IV (fifteenth century) texts from Alalah follows so-called “Hurro-Akkadian” practice (cf. Wiseman, *Alalakh*, 18–19; Giacomakis, § 2.1). Many orthographic features of the Akkadian texts from Alalah, Nuzi, Boghazkoi, Amarna, and Ras Shamra are common to Hurrian writing. Some salient characteristics of this scribal tradition that bear upon the interpretation of the Idrimi inscription are the double writing of nasal consonants (see commentary on line 24, *imurūn(n)ima*), excessive use of the MEŠ determinative (cf. M. Berkooz, *The Nuzi Dialect of Akkadian* [Philadelphia, 1937], 19; see commentary on line 64), and interchanges of *s* and *š* (to which we return shortly). In addition, there are orthographic features in Idrimi that betray the influence of a scribal tradition which we know from the Old Assyrian documents from Kültepe, such as the writing of 𒄩 for *te* (cf. Oppenheim, *WZKM* 45 [1938], 40; see commentary on line 33, *ettešer*), the use of 𒄩 for *uš* (cf. Smith, 27), and the aforementioned interchange of *s* and *š*, to be discussed below. Another scribal practice, of less philological significance, is the lack of distinction between voiced and voiceless and “emphatic” and non-“emphatic” consonants, which appear to preserve characteristics of the Old Akkadian syllabary (cf. Goetze, *Language* 14 [1938], 135–37).

The orthographic confusion of *s* and *š* merits special attention. The phenomenon occurs in the Idrimi inscription in the writings of *ma-šī-ik-tú* (line 4) for *masiktu*; *aḫ-šU ŠU* and *iḫ-šU ŠU* (line 9) for *aḫsusu* and *iḫsus*; *ya-sī-im* (line 39) for *yāšī(m)*; and *bu-sī* (line 79) for *būšī*; cf. Smith, 28; Goetze, 227. The confusion of *s* and *š* is attested in other Alalah texts as well; e.g., SA *a-al* (Wiseman, *Alalakh*, #116:14) for *ša'al* (contrast *ibid.*: 17 *ši-ta-'il-šu-nu*); *me-šī* (*ibid.*, #126:38) for *mesi*; cf. Wiseman, *ibid.*, 19–20; Aro, 362a; and Giacomakis, § 2.27. This phenomenon, especially writings of *s* for *š*, is documented in Old Akkadian and throughout that area in which Hurrian may have been spoken and was written; cf. e.g., *tu-SA-bu* for *tūššabu* (OAKk.; *RA* 23, 25:16); *S1-be-lá-nim* for *šēbelānim* (OA; *BIN* 4, 3:14, etc.; see Hecker, *GKT* § 40); *IS-de* for *išdē* (OB Mari; *RA* 33, 52, ii:25; cf. *GAG* § 30e; Finet, *L'Accadien des lettres de Mari* [Brussels, 1956], § 11b); *SA-ṭi-ir* for *šaṭir* (Nuzi; see Gordon, *Or.* 7 [1938], 37; Goetze, *Language* 14 [1938], 136; cf. Speiser, *JAOS* 58 [1938], 184); *ri-ik-ša-am* for

riksam (Bo. St. 8, 90:4) and *ma-ši-ik-tam* for *masiktam* (ibid., 108:39; both Boghazkoi); *ka-ba-ši-ka* for *kabāšika* (Amarna; EA 366:6; cf. Bøhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe* [Leipzig, 1909], § 10b; *iš-ni-qu* for *isniqu* (Ras Shamra; PRU VI, #35: rev. 3; cf. Nougayrol, *Ug. V*, 78).

We are dealing here with an orthographic, and not phonetic, phenomenon. This is assured through a consideration of the related phenomenon of variant writings of the sequence of dental plus 3rd person pronominal suffix; cf. already Smith, 28. Contrary to standard Akkadian represented by Old Babylonian for example, in Idrimi the sequence dental (D) + pronominal *š/s* is written D + *š* instead of D + S. The examples in Idrimi are: *ap-ta-qi-id-šu-nu* (line 91), and LUGAL-*ut-šu* (line 95). Other examples in Alalah are *li-iš-bat-šu* (Wiseman, *Alalakh*, #2:27 and passim), SAG.DU (*qaqqad*)-*šu* (ibid.:52), *uk-ta-na-aš-ši-id-šu* (ibid., #92:7), *i-ša-ad-da-ad-ši* (ibid.:11), *a-wa-at-šu* (ibid., #116:13); etc. The phenomenon has been misrepresented by Aro (361–62) and Giacumakis (§ 3.14), but it has been appreciated by Smith.

Besides writings of D + *š* in texts from Alalah we find writings of -s + s- and -z + z-, cf. e.g., *ši-bu-uz-zu* (Wiseman, *Alalakh*, #7:17; cf. JCS 8 [1954], 2:33), *ri-ku-uz-za* (Wiseman, *Alalakh*, #8:10), *šu-ub-bi-is-su-nu-ma* (ibid., #110:7; correct Wiseman, ibid., 20). Clearly these writings represent phonetic spellings whereas the writings D + *š* represent morphophonemic spellings (for the concept of morphophonemic writing as applied to Akkadian see, e.g., Reiner, *Or.* 42 [1973], 35–38). However, as we have stated above, the practice of writing *š* rather than *s* in morphophonemic spellings is peculiar in comparison with Babylonian. But spellings of D + *š* are attested in Ras Shamra Akkadian; e.g., *aš-ša-bat-šu-mi* (PRU VI, #36:9), *É(bīt)-šu* (Fisher, *The Claremont Ras Shamra Tablets*, #1:8), DAM (*aššat*)-*šu* (*Ug. V*, 9, #6:3, 21), LÚ *mu-ut-ši* (ibid., 95:46), *a-kaš-ša-ad-šu-nu* (ibid., 71:14); cf. Nougayrol, ibid., 78. No clearer demonstration of the orthographic, non-phonological basis of this phenomenon could be found than the fact that in the very same text from Boghazkoi we encounter both *i-kà-aš-ša-az-zu* (= *ikkaššad* + *šu*; Bo. St. 8, 96:3) and *ni-pá-aš-ši-iš-šu* (ibid., 106:26). The confusion was at times so considerable that scribes wrote ZU for pronominal *šu* even when a phoneme other than a dental or sibilant preceded; cf. e.g., *šul-ma-an-ZU* for *šulmānšu* (EA 28:27; cf. ibid.:30; Tushratta of Mitanni); *šu-ku-un-ZU-nu-ti* for *šukunšunūti* (*Ug. V*, 92:22).

This scribal practice may have devolved from the Cappadocian scribes who wrote -š + pronominal *š as -šš-; e.g., *e-pá-šum* ‘I shall make for him’ (BIN 4, 9:8); cf. Hecker, *GKT* § 41b; there are even such exceptional forms in OB, for which see the literature and examples given by Veenhof, *Aspects of Old Assyrian Trade and Its Terminology* (Leiden, 1972), 90, n. 142. (The most probable reason for writing -šš- for -š + pronominal *š is that š + š was still pronounced šš, later becoming ss; for the entire problem see the forthcoming dissertation of Greenstein.) Later scribes in peripheral dialects may have extended the distribution of pronominal *š* in morphophonemic writings to apply when dentals precede. Since there are also phonetic writings of D + *š/s* in Alalah as *ss* (sometimes written *zz*), writings of D + *š* represent an orthographic tradition, not a phonological oddity; that is, they wrote *š* for what is *s* (or *z*) in most varieties of Akkadian. Similarly, interchanges of *š* and *s* elsewhere in Alalah should be explained on orthographic grounds.

It only remains to account for the scribal interchange of *š* and *s* in Alalah and other “Hurro-Akkadian” dialects. We may hold two chief factors responsible. First, there was a conflict of competing scribal traditions, that of Old Akkadian in which later Akkadian *š* was represented by either S (for *š/š) or Š (for *š), and that of Old Babylonian etc. in which *š* was represented by Š and *s* by S/Z; cf. Speiser, *AASOR* 20, § 14; *JAOS* 58 (1938), 187–89. Second, there was an inconsistency in representing the four sibilants of Hurrian with only three rows of cuneiform

signs (š, s, z). Sometimes, for example, cuneiform š and s would be employed to render the same Hurrian phoneme, leading to overlapping orthographies; cf. Speiser, *AASOR* 20, §§ 41–42; *JAOS* 58 (1938), 175–93. Hence, as heir to divergent and at times inconsistent traditions, the scribes at Alalakh and elsewhere occasionally represented š by s and s by š.

The Akkadian of Idrimi

In many respects our scribe followed standard Akkadian grammar and diction. However, the influences of non-Mesopotamian varieties of Akkadian, of West Semitic (see below), and of Hurrian manifest themselves. The excessive use of copula *u* and the occasional lack of number and gender agreement may be due to Hurrian influence; for the former cf. Speiser, *AASOR* 20, § 211; and for the latter see on line 50 (*māmīta danna*) and cf. Gordon, *Or.* 7 (1938), 231.

Other linguistic features point to (Old) Assyrian influence, such as the “subjunctive” *ūni* suffix (see on line 24), and attachment of a suffix to the preposition *qadu* (line 76), and perhaps the plural formation in *ebrūtu* (line 76). The use of *-šunu* (e.g., line 14) as an accusative suffix is Assyrian, in contrast to Babylonian *-šunūti* (cf. Aro, 362a), and note that our scribe writes *šubta(m) nēhta(m)* (line 85) as in, e.g., Mari (see commentary) and Assyria (e.g., *AKA*, 92:34–35), and not *šubat nēhtim* as in Hammurapi texts (cf. *LIH* 95:39–40; *PBS* 7, #133:19–20). The inscription of Idrimi shows no particular acquaintance with Middle Babylonian; in Idrimi *w* is never written with M, and *št* does not shift to *lt* (cf. line 53 *uštassūšu*, lines 80, 89 *uštēpiš*).

Our inscription also contains several idiosyncracies, some of them barbarisms. There is a prolixity to suffix “subjunctive” *u* or *ūni* to verbs when standard Akkadian does not call for it (see on line 30 *ittūru*). Sometimes the wrong case-ending is employed (see on line 79 *ina bašītu*), and in two instances case endings are not deleted before suffixes as they should be (line 73 *bašītu[šu]nu* and line 97 *šumašu*). In line 28 the verb *zukkū* is employed instead of *wuššuru* (see commentary). Rare lexical usages are *nāhu* ‘to become allied’ and *manāhtu* ‘treaty’ (see on line 41), and the demonstrative pronouns *anmū* ‘these’ (see on line 69), *ullū* ‘those’ (see there), and *annīnāti* ‘this’ (see on line 92). In syntax an anticipatory genitive construction is employed, which has occasional parallels only in Hurro-Akkadian (see on lines 60–63). Additional linguistic difficulties are discussed in the commentary.

West Semitic Influence

West Semitic influence, linguistic and idiomatic, has always been assumed for the Idrimi inscription, but few legitimate examples have been proffered in the literature. Of those proposed by Tsevat, for example, one is misconceived (see commentary on lines 5–6), one is based on a false parallel (see on line 95 *ebla limdudūšu*), and one depends on an unlikely reading in our inscription (see on line 4 *pān*; contrast Tsevat, 129). The use of copula *u* for asseverative force, suggested by Smith (33–34), is very speculative. While Aro (365b) speaks of considerable West Semitic influence in Idrimi, the only example he observes is that of the Akkadian stative corresponding to the WS perfect (364a), seen already by Smith (37–38).

We count eight instances in Idrimi where WS influence is more than likely; some have already been observed in whole or in part. For seven cases we refer to the commentary: *anāku Idrimi* (line 1); use of the stative as a WS perfect (see on line 4 *ḫalqānu* and line 26 *urtabbi’aku*); *ašābu ana* (line 6 et al.); *ašbu* ‘situated’ (lines 19–20); *inūma* ‘that’ (line 25); *kīma ištēn awēli*

(line 37); *ebla limdudušu* (line 95). The eighth case is more complex and merits attention here.

A notable feature of our inscription is that it departs from standard Akkadian syntax in frequently commencing clauses with a verb. Smith (38) observed these departures but minimized their significance, attributing them to a stylistic propensity toward verbal chiasmus; cf. Giacumakis, § 10.12. However, the positioning of the verb at the beginning of clauses appears to be another West Semitism, especially since it cannot be attributed to the Hurrian substratum. For in Hurrian, as in Akkadian, verbs rarely occur in clause-initial position; cf. Speiser, *AASOR* 20, 183 and § 244.

In Idrimi verbs occupy clause-initial position eight times: *u ḫalqānu* . . . (line 4), *u ašbānu* . . . (line 6) *imurūn(n)īma* . . . (line 24), *u ētepuš* . . . (line 30), *u adbub* . . . (line 46), *u uza''iz* . . . (line 74), *u ērub* (line 78), *u umaššil* . . . (line 87); contrast, e.g., *u mātīya išmūn(n)īma* (line 35). In six of these eight instances (lines 4, 30, 46, 74, 78, 87) a pattern obtains in which the clause-initial verb follows another verb in clause-final position plus connective *u*. In the other two instances (lines 6, 24), however, no other verb directly precedes.

Further, a most peculiar alteration of Akkadian word order is found in the formulaic *šumašu [sic!] u zēršu liḫalliḳū ina mātīšu* "May they extirpate his progeny and his seed from his land" (lines 97–98). This formula is a widespread one, particularly in (Middle) Assyrian inscriptions, and in each case the verb is clause-final (e.g., *AOB* I, 66:52–53; 84, #7:12–13; 92:16–18; 98:20–23; 124:5f.; 128:23–24; 132:19–21; 138:23–24; 142:24–25; 156:rev. 12–13; etc.). Even in the peripheral dialects of Boghazkoi and Ugarit, variants of this formula are attested with the verb last; cf. e.g., *šumka u zērka . . . liḫalliḳā* (*Bo.St.* 8, 34: 65–66); *šumšu liḫalliḳ* (*PRU* III, 105:57).

Indeed, standard Akkadian word order is the norm both at Nuzi and Boghazkoi. But we do find examples of non-final verbs at Ras Shamra, where we must likewise suspect WS influences; cf. e.g., *RN mār RN₂ šar [āl Ugarit] ittaši 3 ikî e [ql] āti [š] a.PN u ittadinšu šarru ana PN₂ . . .* "RN, son of RN₂, king of [Ugarit] has appropriated three *iku*'s from the fields of PN, and the king has given them to PN₂" (*PRU* VI, #45:14–19); *[š] anītam šarru uzakki PN ina ardūti ša šarri [u] ittadinšu šarru ana PN₂ u ana mārēšu . . .* "Further, the king has freed PN from the servitude of the king [and] the king has given him to PN₂ and to his sons" (*ibid.*:28–30); etc. Non-final verbs are also attested regularly in the Amarna correspondence from Canaan, which surely reflects WS usage, cf. e.g., *ul yupahḫira kali awēlūt Ḫapiri u yilqa āl Šigata u āl Ambi* "So that he may not mobilize all the Hapiru and seize GN and GN₂" (*EA* 71:28–31); *ana minim qālāta u lā taqbu ana šarri bēlika u tūšana qadu šabē piḫāti u timaqqutu muḫḫi māt Amurri* "Why do you remain silent and not tell the king, your lord, that you may set out together with troops of archers and attack Amurru-land?" (*ibid.* 73:6–11); etc. It is therefore most reasonable to attribute the presence of so many non-final verbs in Idrimi to West Semitic influence.

It is perhaps of significance that most of the West Semitisms occur in the first part of the inscription, in which the scribe relates a narrative unlike the literature of Mesopotamia (see next section). Here the scribe had little dependence on classic Akkadian style and language and would be more apt to lapse into his own idiosyncratic usages.

The Literary Character of the Inscription and Biblical Parallels

The literary aspects of the Idrimi inscription have been neglected in most discussions but have been appreciated in the review by Oppenheim, *JNES* 14 (1955), 199–200. As Oppenheim

observed, the story of Idrimi is unlike Mesopotamian literature both in content and style. But there are clear biblical parallels. Oppenheim indicated similarities to the biblical narratives concerning the reunion of Joseph with his brothers and the story of David. We shall also indicate in our commentary the parallels with Jacob's stay with Laban, the story of Jephthah, and others. Oppenheim concluded that "All this seems to me to bespeak the existence of a specific literary tradition, totally different in temper and scope from that of the ancient Near East" (ibid., 200b). In fact, when we recognize this common literary tradition and compare Idrimi with biblical and other western texts, several problematic passages in Idrimi find reasonable interpretations (see especially on lines 24–28, 95, etc.). Beside the story of flight and spectacular return, other salient literary motifs are the typological use of the number seven (see on lines 28, 43, 65), and the attack against Idrimi by a coalition as soon as he established himself as King of Alalah. (lines 58f.). To this we may compare the biblical account of the rebellion of King Mesha of Moab upon the accession of a new king in Israel (2 Kgs. 1:1; 3:5).

TRANSCRIPTION

1. a-na-ku I¹d-ri-mi DUMU (*mār*) I¹DINGIR (*Ilīm*)-i-lim-ma
2. ÌR (*arad*) d¹IM (*Adad/Tešub*) d¹Ḫé-bat ù d¹Ištar NIN (*bēlet*) URU (*āl*)
A-la-la-aḫ NIN (*bēlti*)
3. i-na URU (*āl*) Ḫa-la-ab^{ki} É (*bīt*) a-bi-ya / NIN (*bēlti*)-ya
4. [awāt] ma-šī-ik-tú it-tab-ši u ḫal-qà-nu
5. LÚ ḫá (*awēlūt*) URU (*āl*) É-mar^{ki} a-ḫa-te ḫá / IGI (*pān*)
6. ša um-mi-ya ù aš-ba-nu a-na URU (*āl*) É-mar^{ki}
7. aḫ-ḫe ḫá-ya ša UGU (*eṭi*)-ya GAL-GAL ḫá (*rabû*)
8. it-ti-ya-ma aš-bu-ú ù ma-an-nu-um-ma
9. a-wa-te mešš ša aḫ-šu-šu ú-ul iḫ-šu-uš
10. um-ma a-na-ku-ma ma-an-nu-um É (*bīt*) a-bi-šu <uba"u>
11. lu-ú DUMU (*mār*) NISAG (*ašarēd*) GAL (*rabī*) ù ma-an-nu-um
12. [ašbu] a-na DUMU ḫá (*mārē*) URU (*āl*) É-mar lu-ú ÌR (*arad*)
13. ANŠE.KUR.RA (*sisī*)-ya GIŠ.GIGIR (*narkabī*)-ya ù LÚ.KUŠ_x (*kizī*)-ya
14. el-te-qé-šu-nu ù i-lam ma-at ḫu-ri-ib-te^{ki}
15. e-te-ti-iq ù li-bi ERÍN mešš (*šābē*) Su-tu-ú^{ki}
16. e-te-ru-ub it-ti-šu a-na li-bi
17. GIŠ.GIGIR (*narkabī*) ṣa-lⁱil-te-a bi-ta-ku i-na ša-ni u₄-mi
18. an-mu-uš-ma ù a-na ma-at Ki-in-a-nim^{ki}
19. al-li-ik i-na ma-at Ki-in-a-nim^{ki}
20. URU (*āl*) Am-mi-ya^{ki} aš-bu i-na URU (*āl*) Am-mi-ya^{ki}
21. DUMU mešš (*mārē*) URU (*āl*) Ḫa-la-ab^{ki} DUMU mešš (*mārē*) ma-at
Mu-ki-iš-ḫe^{ki}
22. DUMU mešš (*mārē*) ma-at Ni-iḫ^{ki} ù [DUMU (*mārē*)] mešš ma-at
23. A-ma-e^{ki} aš-bu
24. i-mu-ru-un-ni-ma
25. i-nu-ma DUMU (*mār*) be-li-šu-nu a-na-ku ù a-na UGU (*muḫḫī*)-ya
26. ip-ḫu-ru-nim-ma a-ka-a-na DUG₄ (*aqtabi*) ur-tab-bi-a-ku
27. ú-ra-ak ù a-na li-bi ERÍN mešš (*šābē*) LÚ.SA.GAZ (*Ḫapiri*)
28. a-na MU.7.KAM mešš (*sebe šanāti*) aš-ba-ku MUŠEN ḫá (*eššūrāti*) ú-za-ki

29. SILA₄ ḫá (puḫādi) ab-ri-ma ù še-ib-i ša-na-ti dIM (Adad/Tešub)
 30. a-na SAG.DU (qaqqadi)-ya it-tu-ru ù e-te-pu-uš GIŠ.MA ḫá (ellipāte)
 31. ERÍN mešš (šābē) NU.U.LÚ/SI.KU (tillati[?]) a-na-GIŠ.MÁ ḫá (ellipāte)
 ú-šar-ki-ib-šu-nu
 32. ù A.AB.BA (tāmta) a-na ma-at Mu-ki-iš-ḫe^{ki}
 33. et-te-šir ù pa-an ḪUR.SAG (ḫuršān) Ḫa-zi
 34. a-na ta-ba-lim ak-šu-ud e-li-ya-ku
 35. ù ma-ti-ya iš-mu-un-ni-ma GUD ḫá (alpē) u UDU ḫá (immerē)
 36. a-na pa-ni-ya ub-lu-ú-nim ù i-na U₄.1.KAM (išṭēn ūmi)
 37. ki-ma 1^{en} (išṭēn) LÚ (awēli) ma-at Ni-ḫi^{ki} ma-at A-ma-e^{ki}
 38. ma-at Mu-ki-iš-ḫe^{ki} ù URU (āl) A-la-la-aḫ^{ki} URU^{ki} (āl)-ya
 39. a-na ya-ši-im it-tu-ru-nim ŠEŠ mešš (aḫḫē)-ya
 40. iš-mu-ú-ma ù a-na maḫ-ri-ya il-li-ku-ú
 41. aḫ-ḫe ḫá-ya ki it-ti-ya-ma in-na-ḫu-ú
 42. aḫ-ḫe ḫá-ya lu ú-kin-am-šu-nu ap-pu-na
 43. MU.7.KAM ḫá (sebe šanāti) I Ba-ar-at-tar-na LUGAL (šarru) dan-nu
 44. LUGAL (šar) ERÍN mešš (šābē) Ḫur-ri^{ki} ú-na-kir-an-ni
 45. i-na se-eb-i ša-na-ti a-na I Ba-ra-at-ar-na LUGAL^{ri} (šarri)
 46. LUGAL (šar) ERÍN mešš (šābē) <Ḫur-ri^{ki}> I An-wa-an-da aš-ta-par
 ù ad-bu-ub
 47. ma-na-ḫa-[te] {te} ša a-bu-te ḫá-ya i-nu-ma
 48. a-bu-te ḫá-ya a-na UGU (muḫḫī)-šu-nu in-na-ḫu-ú
 49. ù [a-wa]-ti-ni a-na LUGAL ḫá (šarri) ša ERÍN mešš (šābē) Ḫur-ri^{ki}
 da-mi-iq
 50. ù a-na bi-ri-šu-nu NAM.ERIM (māmīta) da-na
 51. iš-ku-nu-nim-ma LUGAL (šarru) dan-nu ma-na-ḫa-te ḫá
 52. ša pa-nu-ti-ni ù NAM.ERIM (māmīta) ša bi-ri-šu-nu iš-me-ma
 53. ù it-ti ma-mi-ti uš-ta-su-šu AḪ.AḪ (aḫa-aḫa) a-wa-at
 54. ma-mi-ti ù aš-šum ma-na-ḫa-te mešš-ni šu-ul-mi-ya
 55. im-tá-ḫar ù ki-nu-ti ša kab-tu ú-ša <mbir(?)> SISKUR_x (niqē)
 56. ú-šar-bi ù É (būta) ḫal-qu ú-te-er-šu
 57. i-na LÚ^{ti} (awēlūtī)-ya i-na ki-nu-ti-ya da-an-na-am
 58. a-az-ku-ru-šu ù LUGAL^{ku} (šarrāku) a-na URU (āl) A-la-la-aḫ^{ki}
 59. LUGAL mešš (šarrāni) ša ZAG (imittī)-ya ù GÙB (šumēli)-ya il-lu-an-ni-ma
 60. ù ki-ma šu-nu-ti ku-um-ta el ku- {ku} -ma-ti-šu-nu
 61. ša ab-bu-te ḫá i-na qa-qa-ri tab-ku-ú
 62. ù a-na-ku i-na qa-qa-ri ú-ša-at-bu-ku
 63. ù a-na-an-ta ú-šak-lu-ú-šu-nu
 64. ERÍN mešš-bá (šāba) el-te-qé a-na ma-at Ḫa-at-te^{ki}
 65. e-te-li ù 7 URU.DIDLI ḫá (ālāni) ša-lul-šu-nu
 66. URU (āl) Pa-aš-ša-ḫe^{ki} URU (āl) Da-ma-ru-ut-SIPA (rē?)^{ki}
 67. URU (āl) Ḫu-laḫ-ḫa-an^{ki} URU (āl) Zi-se^{ki} I-e^{ki}
 68. URU (āl) Ú-lu-zi-na^{ki} ù URU (āl) Za-ru-na^{ki}
 69. an-mu-ú URU.DIDLI ḫá (ālāni) ša-lul-šu-nu ù ul-lu-ú
 70. aḫ-te-pì-šu-nu-ti ma-at Ḫa-at-te^{ki}
 71. ú-ul ip-ḫur ù a-na UGU (muḫḫī)-ya ú-ul il-li-ku

72. ša lib-bi-ya e-te-pu-uš šal-la-te ḫá-šu-nu
 73. aš-lu-ul-ma nam-ku-ri-šu-[nu] bu-še-šu-nu ba-ši-tu-[šu]-nu
 74. el-te-qé ù ú-za-iz a-na ERÍN^{meš} (šābē) til-la-ti-ya
 75. LÚ^{meš} aḫ-ḫe ḫá-ya
 76. ù LÚ^{meš} eb-ru-te ḫá-ya qà-du-šu-nu-ma
 77. a-na-ku el-te-qé ù a-na ma-at Mu-ki-iš-ḫe^{ki} at-tu-ur
 78. ù e-ru-ub a-na URU(āl) A-la-la-aḫ^{ki}-ya i-na šal-la-tim
 79. u i-na mar-ši-tim i-na nam-ku-ri i-na bu-ši ù i-na ba-ši-tú
 80. ša iš-tu ma-at Ḫa-at-te^{ki} ú-še-ri-du É(bīta) uš_x-te-pí-iš
 81. GU.ZA (kussī)-ya ki-ma GU.ZA^{meš} (kussī) ša LUGAL^{meš} (šarrāni)
 ú-ma-ši-il
 82. LÚ^{meš} ŠEŠ^{meš} (aḫḫē)-ya ki-ma ŠEŠ^{meš} (aḫḫē) ša LUGAL^{meš} (šarrāni)
 DUMU^{meš} (mārē)-ya
 83. ki-ma DUMU^{meš} (mārē)-šu-nu ù LÚ^{meš} qur₄-bu-te ḫá-ya ù
 qur₄-bu-te ḫá-šu-nu
 84. ú-ma-ši-lu-ú-šu-nu TUŠ^{meš} (āšibī) ša a-na lib-bi ma-ti-ya^{ki}
 85. KI.TUŠ(šubta) ṽnel-eḫ-tam ú-še-ši-ib-šu-nu ša KI.TUŠ(šubta)
 la ú-uš-ša-bu
 86. a-na-ku ú-še-ši-bu-šu-nu ù ma-ti^{ki}-ya ú-ki-in-nu-ma
 87. ù ú-ma-ši-il URU.DIDLĪ ḫá-ya ki-me-e pa-nu-ti-ni-ma ki-ma
 A.A. (abbūti)-ni-ma
 88. it-te^{meš} ša DINGIR^{meš} (ilāni) ša URU(āl) A-la-lā ḫ^{ki} ú-ki-in-nu-ú-ma
 89. ù SISKUR_x ḫá ni-iq-qí ḫá ša a-bi-bi-ni ša uš-te-pí-šu-ú-šu-nu
 90. a-na-ku e-te-ne-pu-uš_x-šu-nu an-mu-ú e-te-pu-uš_x-šu-nu
 91. ù a-na qa-ti^{Id} IM (Adad/Tešub)-ni-ra-ri DUMU (mār)-ya ap-ta-qi-id-šu-nu
 92. ma-an-nu-um-me-e ALAM (šalmī)-ya an-ni-na-ti IŠ-ZA-AR-RI-KU
 (ušamsaku/ušazzaqu[?])
 93. { ù pi-ri-iḫ-šu li-il-qú-ut } dŠa-mu li-iz-zu-ur-šu
 94. ša-ap-la-nu^l er-še-tu pi-ri-iḫ-šu li-il-qú-ut
 95. DINGIR^{meš} (ilānu) ša AN (šamē) ù KI(eršet) LUGAL^{ut} (šarrūt)-šu
 li^l-ma-aṭ-ṭu^l EŠ(ebla) lim-du-du-šu
 96. ma-an-nu-um-me-e ú-na-ak-kir-šu i-ip-pa-aš-ši-[ssū]
 97. dIM (Adad/Tešub) EN (bēl) AN (šamē) ù KI er-še-ti ù DINGIR^{meš} (ilānu)
 GAL.GAL.E.NE (rabūtu) šu-ma-šu
 98. ù NUMUN (zēr)-šu li-ḫal-li-qu ina ma-ti-šu IŠar-ru-wa DUB.SAR (tupšarru)
 ĜĪR.NITA (šakkanakku) X.XX.XXX (ištur isniq ibre) ù an-na
 99. IŠar-ru-wa LÚ.DUB.SAR (tupšarru) ša dALAM (šalma) an-ni-na-tim
 is-ṭu-ru-šu DINGIR^{meš} ša AN (šamē) u KI(eršet)
 100. li-bal-li-ṭu-ú-šu li-na-ša-ru-šu lu-ú KUG.LU (andullu/nūru[?])-šu
 dŠamaš EN (bēl) e-lu-ti
 101. ù šap-la-ti EN (bēl) { lu-ú } e-ṭem-mi lu-ú TI.RA (šillu/šulūlu[?])-šu
 102. MU.30.KÁM^{meš} (30 šanāti) LUGAL^{ku} (šarrāku)
 103. ma-na-aḫ-ti-ya a-na ALAM (šalmī)-ya aš-ṭu-ur li-[murā/šassā]
 104. ù a-na UGU (muḫḫī)-ya li-ik-ta-na-[rabā/ū]

TRANSLATION

- 1–14 In Aleppo, my ancestral home, a hostile [incident] occurred so that we had to flee to the people of Emar, my mother's relatives, and stay there. My older brothers also stayed with me, but none of them had the plans I had. So I, Idrimi, the son of Ilim-ilimma, devotee of IM, Ḫebat, and my lady Ištar, lady of Alalah, thinking to myself, "Whoever <seeks> his patrimony is a great nobleman, but whoever [remains] among the citizens of Emar is a vassal," took my horse, chariot, and groom and went away.
- 14–20 I crossed over the desert and came among the Sutu warriors. I spent the night with them in my covered chariot. The next day I set forth and went to Canaan. The town of Ammiya is located in Canaan.
- 20–26 People from Aleppo, Mukišḫe, Ni'i, and Nuḫašše were living in Ammiya, and when they realized that I was their lord's son, they gathered to me. I said the following: "I have become chief, I have been appointed." Then I stayed among the Ḫapiru warriors seven years. I released birds and practiced extispicy.
- 26–29
- 29–34 In the seventh year IM became favorably inclined toward me, so I made ships and had *auxiliary* troops board them and proceeded via the sea to Mukišḫe. I reached land at Mount Casius and went ashore.
- 35–42 Now, when my country heard of me they brought me large cattle and small cattle, and in one day, in unison, the countries of Ni'i, Nuḫašše, Mukišḫe, and my own city Alalah became reconciled to me. When my allies heard, they came to me. And when they concluded a treaty with me, I established them truly as my allies.
- 42–51 Now for seven years Barattarna, the mighty king, the king of the Hurrian warriors, was hostile to me. In the seventh year I sent Anwanda to Barattarna, the mighty king, the king of the Hurrian warriors, and told him of the treaties of my ancestors when they were allied with them, and that our actions were pleasing to the (former) kings of the Hurrian warriors for they had made a binding agreement between them.
- 51–58 The mighty king heard of the treaties of our predecessors and the agreement made between them, and with the treaty they read to him the words of the treaty in detail. So on account of our treaty terms he received my tribute. Then I *pr*<esented> the (*gestures of*) loyalty, which were considerable, I made great sacrifices, and restored to him a lost estate. I swore to him a binding oath as a loyal vassal.
- 58–63 Then I became king. Kings from all around attacked me in Alalah. Just as they had heaped up on the ground the *corpses* of (my) ancestors, *corpse* upon *corpse*, so I, too, caused (their *corpses*) to be heaped up on the ground thus putting an end to their warfare.
- 64–77 Then I took troops and attacked Hatti-land. As for the seven cities under their protection, namely, Paššaḫe, Damarut-re'i, Ḫulaḫḫan, Zise, Ie, Uluzina, and Zaruna, these I destroyed. Hatti-land did not assemble and did not march against me, so I did what I wanted. I took captives from them and took their property, valuables, and possessions and distributed them to my auxiliaries, kinsmen, and friends. Together with them I took (booty).
- 77–86 Then I returned to Mukišḫe and entered my capital Alalah. With the captives, goods, property, and possessions which I brought down from Hatti I had a palace built. I made my regime like the regime of kings. I made my brothers like royal brothers, my sons like their sons, and my relatives like their relatives. The inhabitants who were in my land I made to

dwelt securely, and even those who did not have a dwelling I settled.

- 86–91 Then I organized my land, and made my cities like they were before. Just as our ancestors had established regular *rites* for the gods of Alalah, and just as our forefathers had performed sacrifices, I constantly performed them. These things I did, and I entrusted them to my son IM-nirari.
- 92–98 Whoever *effaces* this statue of mine, may the Heaven god curse him, may the Earth below destroy his progeny, may the gods of heaven and earth *diminish* his kingship. Let them have him executed (lit., measure him by a rope). Whoever changes or erases it, may IM, the lord of heaven and earth, and the great gods extirpate his progeny and seed from his land.
- 98–101 Šarruwa is the official scribe. He has written, copied and reviewed (the text). And now may the gods of heaven and earth keep Šarruwa, the scribe, who has written (the text of) this statue for him, in good health; may they protect him and be his *guardian*. May Šamaš, lord of the upper and nether worlds, lord of the spirits, be his *protector*.
- 102–4 I reigned for 30 years. I inscribed my achievements upon my statue. Let [the people read it] and continually bless me.

COMMENTARY

Line 1

anāku Idrimi. “I, Idrimi” (Goetze, Borger), not “I am Idrimi” (Smith, Oppenheim, Kempinski & Ne’eman). The case for taking the first person pronoun heading royal inscriptions as appositional has been made by Poebel (*AS* 3 [Chicago, 1932]), who also observed that the standard Akkadian formula, following Sumerian models, has the king’s name heading the inscription and the pronoun following, such as *Ḫammurapi . . . anāku* (e.g., *CH* prolog 1:50–53; *LIH* 57:1–10, 25–30, 36–39; 95:1–9, 42–44). Akkadian texts with a formula *anāku RN* are from Neo-Assyrian or later times; e.g., *anāku Šîn-aḫḫē-erība* (*OIP* 2, 150, x:1), *anāku Aššur-bāni-apli* (Streck, *Asb.*, 2, i:1). That this is not the norm is clear from the inscriptions of Sennacherib, where, apart from the above reference, only the formula *Šîn-aḫḫē-erība . . . anāku* is found (e.g., *OIP* 2, 147:1–9; 148, iii:1–3; 150, vii:1–3; viii:1–2; etc.). Since the irregular form only occurs from Neo-Assyrian times, Poebel has suggested that it may have been influenced by Aramaic (*AS* 3, 86).

In fact, in West Semitic inscriptions the pattern pronoun + RN is standard; cf. e.g., *’nk Yḫwmlk* (*KAI*, #10:1), *’nk Tbn̄t* (*KAI*, #13:1), *’nk Klmw* (*KAI*, #24:1), *’nk ’z̄twd* (*KAI*, #26, Ai:1), *’nk Mš’* (*KAI*, #181:1), *’nk Pnmw* (*KAI*, #214:1), *’nb B[r]rkb* (*KAI*, #216:1), etc. We are therefore obliged to consider the opening formula of the Idrimi inscription a West Semitism, the first of several to be encountered in this inscription (see Introduction).

The resumption of the apposition with the first person pronoun in line 10 is paralleled in West Semitic inscriptions such as that of Kilamuwa in which, after a brief genealogical survey, the second *’nk* introduces Kilamuwa’s achievements (*KAI*, #24:1, 4); cf. *KAI*, #216:1, 19–20 (Old Aramaic). The same type of resumption is now attested in a Jewish Aramaic inscription from Giv’at Ha-mivtar in Jerusalem: *’nb ’bb br kbhb l’z br ’brm rbb ’nb ’bb . . . wqbrtb* “I, Abba, son of the priest Eleaz(ar) son of Aaron the Great, I, Abba, . . . buried him”; E. S. Rosenthal, *IEJ* 23 (1973), 72–81. Likewise in Idrimi there is a brief history narrated in the first person plural (*ḫalqānu*, *ašbānu*, etc.) until the resumption of *anāku* in line 10, when,

following a parenthetic interjection, Idrimi describes his accomplishments in the first person singular (*elteqe, ētetiḳ, ēterub*, etc.). Clearly in each case the resumptive *anāku* introduces the main clause, the preceding giving merely background information. The story of Idrimi's flight (lines 3–8) serves as the prelude to his well-planned comeback which begins on line 13.

Idrimi. The name occurs several times in the Alalakh texts (for references see Wiseman, *Alalakh*, 137) and perhaps at Ugarit in *bn idrm* (*UT* 400, ii:2; *PRU* V, 113:8). While Speiser (*JAOS* 71 [1951], 152) believes the name is Hurrian, his argument is entirely indirect in reasoning that since one ruler of Alalakh had an indisputably Hurrian name, the other rulers, including Idrimi, may be presumed to have had Hurrian names. Idrimi was not even a native of Alalakh.

We follow most commentators in deriving the name from the West Semitic root **ḏr* 'help' plus enclitic *-mi*. The name is then a hypocoristicon analogous to the biblical Aramaean *Hadad ʿezer*, which is transliterated ^dIM-*idri* in Shalmaneser's annals, e.g., *WO* 1/2 (1947), 57:25; *WO* 1/6 (1952), 464:27; for *ʿzēr* [= *idri*] in Hebrew PNN see Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen*, 154. Enclitic *-mi* is an emphatic particle in Amorite names (Huffman, *Amorite Personal Names*, 228), and enclitic *-m(i)* is commonly suffixed to hypocoristic names in Ugaritic (Gröndahl, *Die Personennamen*, 25, 53).

Line 2

^dIM. It is difficult to determine whether we are to normalize *Adad*, the Syrian Semitic storm-god, or *Tešub*, his Hurrian counterpart (so e.g., Speiser, *JAOS* 71 [1951], 152, and Borger). In favor of *Tešub* is its juxtaposition here with the Hurrian goddess *Ḫebat*, written syllabically. On the other hand, at Nuzi, where *Tešub* is attested in PNN by syllabic spellings, ^dIM also has the reading *Adad*, as in the equation of ^dIM-*rēšī* and *Ad-rēšī* (MacRae, *Nuzi Personal Names*, *OIP* 77 [Chicago, 1943], 289). Similarly the reading of ^dIM in the name of Idrimi's son ^dIM-*nirāri* (line 91), may be *Tešub-nirāri* (as at Nuzi, see Gelb, *Nuzi Personal Names*, 155) or *Adad-nirāri*.

^dIŠTAR. Likewise it is possible that ^dIŠTAR could have been read as the Hurrian DN *Išḫara* (cf. Wiseman, *Alalakh*, 9, n. 2) as well as the Semitic DN *Ištar*.

āl Alalakh. Smith (103) has already indicated that the determinative *māt* is to be read in this text, as it is written throughout *ma-at*, not *KUR*. Analogously, even though *āl* is always written logographically in Idrimi, *āl* should be read, as it appears to have been in the Canaanite letters from Amarna; cf. Albright and Moran, *JCS* 4 (1950), 165. Likewise, it seems that the determinatives *māt* and *āl* were read at Nuzi, for which see Oppenheim, *WZKM* 45 (1938), 42. For a different view concerning *āl*, see Giacomakis, §§ 2.19–2.20.

Line 3

bīt abīya. "My ancestral home, patrimony." The *CAD* (*A*¹, 75b) has already observed that *bīt abi* in this meaning appears only in texts from the West and from Assyria. Such meanings are clearly attested for Heb. *bēt 'āb*, e.g. in Gen. 12:1 'ancestral home'; Gen. 31:14, Jud.

11:2, 7 'patrimony' (correct the misinterpretation of R. G. Boling, *Judges*, AB #6A [Garden City, N.Y., 1975], 198, and see below on lines 26–27); 1 Sam. 17:25 'paternal estate'; etc.

bēltiya. Written NIN at the end of line 2 but repeated in a run-over into the next line (NIN-ya at the end of line 3), because "the mason wished to avoid writing -ia on an inconvenient surface" (Smith, 15); cf. on *pān* (line 4) below.

Line 4

masiktu. For the writing of *si* by *ši*, see Introduction. The form *masiktu* is adjectival, but it can serve alone as a substantive; cf. e.g., *šumma ana Bentešina lū ana mārišu mār mārišu mamma ma-ši-ik-ta uba* "If anyone plots evil against Bentešina, or his son (or) grandson" (*Bo.St.* 9, 130:32). Hence in Idrimi Oppenheim and Lambert (*BWL*, 290) translate "evil deed" and "bad reputation" respectively, without restoration. The substantive occurs in another Alalah text in the phrase *bēl masikti* (written with *š*) 'criminal': *Abra ana bēl masikti ittūr u kīma arnišu iddāk u bīssu ana ēkalli irub* "Abra became a criminal, and, as his punishment, he was executed, and his estate was forfeited to the palace" (Wiseman, *Alalakh*, #17:7–11).

However, because of the large break preceding *masiktu* in our text, most scholars would restore a substantive to go with *masiktu*. Nougayrol (151, n. 2) has proposed to restore [*tērtu*] *masiktu* 'a fatal oracle', presumably because it was on the basis of favorable omens that Idrimi initiated his comeback (lines 28–30). However, it seems unlikely that Idrimi would have forfeited his patrimony out of anxiety concerning an unfavorable omen. Even in making his comeback, Idrimi was not instigated by an omen. He employed divination merely to determine when Adad had become reconciled with him (lines 29–30), i.e., when the time was propitious for his return (see below on these lines).

Goetze suggested [*nukkurtu*] on the basis of *EA* 92:10–11: *inanna nukkurtum masiktum ittiya ennīpuš* "Now wicked hostility has been waged against me." Such a restoration is possible for Idrimi, but it should be noted that the phrase *nukkurtum masiktum* is unique in Amarna while the expected modifier of *nukkurtu* is *dannatu* (*EA* 68:12, 29; 72:2; 74:14; 76:8; 78:8; 81:7; and passim). More importantly, our context implies an internal conflict (a revolt or usurpation) at Aleppo and not enemy action.

Landsberger (60b) restored [*awatu*] *masiktu* which Borger has translated "criminal [event (?)]". This is quite plausible considering that *masiktu* is synonymous with *lemuttu* and that the phrase *awat lemutti* occurs frequently in contexts of rebellion, sometimes with other words for revolt and insurrection like *bartu* and *sīhu*. For example, *sīhu bartu awat lemutti ušabšīma māta ušbalkit* "(When PN) created sedition, rebellion, and insurrection, and caused the country to revolt" (*KB* 1, 176; 40–41 [Šamši-Adad V]). The employment of the verb *bašū* in this passage with *awat lemutti* corresponds to its usage in Idrimi (*ittabši*) with [*awatu*] *masiktu* or better [*awat*] *masiktu* (for *masikti*). Finally, the phrase *awat masikti* is actually found in a passage from Ras Shamra: *inanna 7 iṣelippātu ša awīl¹ nakri [š] a illaka[n] ni u a-ma-at maš-ik-ta* (for *mašikti*) *itepšūnāši* "Now the seven enemy boats that have come against me have harassed us" (*Ug. V*, no. 24 [pp. 87–88]: 27–31).

ḥalqānu. Morphologically an Akkadian stative, but it corresponds syntactically to the West Semitic perfect; cf. Smith, 37–38; Aro, 364a; Tsevat, 130; Giacumakis, § 8.17. The correspondence is facilitated by the fact that both the Akkadian stative and the West Semitic per-

fect are inflected through suffixation. This feature is found throughout the inscription; e.g., *ašbānu* (line 6), *bītāku* (line 17), *ašbū* (line 23), etc. For the positioning of *ḥalqānu* at the beginning of the clause as representing another West Semitism, see Introduction.

pān. Written IGI at the end of line 5 for the same reason that *NIN-ya* in line 2 was run over to line 3 (so already Smith); cf. above. Elsewhere in Idrimi *pān* is written syllabically: *u pa-an ḥuršāni Ḥazi* (line 33), *ana pa-mi-ya* (line 36). The omission of the preposition *ana/ina* preceding *pān* here and in line 33 is generally confined to later texts in Akkadian (see *AHw.*, 822a). One can only guess at the source of the scribe's error. Perhaps the scribe was used to writing IGI alone as he would on all documents, preceding the names of witnesses; or perhaps he was thinking of another reading of IGI, viz., *maḥar*, which can occur without a preceding preposition; cf. e.g., IGI *Niqmēpuḥ* (Wiseman, *Alalakh*, #8:11) with *maḥar Niqmēpuḥ* (ibid., #9:6). Thus, he may have made the analogy *ana/ina maḥar*: *maḥar* = *ana/ina pān*: **pān*.

Lines 5–6

aḥāte ša ummiya. “My mother's relatives,” lit., “my mother's sisters.” That *aḥāte* is not an abnormal plural for ‘brothers’ is clear from the correct employ of *aḥḥēya* in line 7. It does not reflect West Semitic morphology (so *CAD A¹*, 195b), since in WS ‘brothers’ is expressed *’aḥīm*; ‘sisters’ is expressed by Ugaritic *aḥt*, Heb. *’aḥyōt*. Tsevat (111, n. 4) is probably correct that the text intends to denote the male population. But in order to explain fem. *aḥāte* Tsevat invokes an occasional feature of West Semitic style in which masculine nouns are paired with masculine nouns and feminine nouns with feminine nouns, e.g., *bn Krt kmbm tdr ap bnt Ḥry* “Keret's sons vow like them, even Hurriya's daughters” (IIK, iii:23–24). Unfortunately this feature does not apply in Idrimi since here we do not have a pairing of nouns according to gender, but a feminine noun (*aḥāte*) in place of an expected masculine form. Note, for example, that when Abimelech, son of the biblical “judge” Gideon, approaches his maternal relatives in Shechem the text speaks of “his mother's brothers” (*’aḥē ’immō*; Jud. 9:1), not sisters! For the motif of seeking asylum from a hostile brother with a maternal uncle, compare Jacob's sojourn and service with Laban (Gen. 28f.).

ašbānu ana. The normal Akkadian idiom is (*w*)*ašābu ina*, as in lines 20–23 *ina āl Ammiya mārē Ḥalab . . . ašbū* “In Ammiya the people of Aleppo . . . were living.” However, as Tsevat has shown (131f.), *wašābu ana* is common elsewhere in Alalah and in Amarna; e.g., *ul ašbāti ana āl Berūta* (*EA* 138:21). There can be little doubt that the peculiar usage of *wašābu ana* reflects West Semitic *yṯb l*. For the sequence “flee to”–“remain among” cf. Gen. 27:43–44 (Rebecca to Jacob); “Flee (*b^eraḥ*) at once to my brother Laban in Haran and stay (*w^eyāšabtā*) with him a little while.”

Line 8

ittiyāma. Frequently in this inscription enclitic *-ma* is otiose, serving no apparent grammatical function, especially since it is often followed by the conjunction *u* (cf. Aro, 365a). In such cases *-ma* may be interpreted as emphatic; so Smith, 34. For the same phenomenon at Nuzi, see Wilhelm, *Untersuchungen zum Hurro-Akkadischen AOAT 9* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1970),

50–52. The sequence of enclitic *-ma* followed by *u* is found in standard Akkadian too; cf. *AHw.*, 570b.

mannumma. Contra Giacomakis, § 4.41, we should distinguish between the indefinite independent pronoun *mannumma* ‘someone’ and the indefinite relative pronoun *mannummē* ‘whoever’. The enclitic *-mē* stands instead of the relative marker *ša*, whereas *mannumma* does not introduce a relative clause; see below on lines 10–12.

Lines 10–12

Owing to the fact that these lines are partly broken, the readings of some signs are uncertain, and several phrases are philologically obscure, one cannot offer a completely convincing restoration and rendering. Many have been the readings and interpretations proposed for this passage, and many are the difficulties they entail. The most recent proposal is that by Kempinski & Ne’eman who read *ma-an-nu-um É a-bi-šu lu-ú DUMU NISAG.GAL ù ma-an-nu-um [la i-šu] a-na DUMU^{hi.a} uruE-mar^{ki} lu-ú ÌR* and render “Whoever (will have) a patrimony will be foremost; and whoever [will not (have)] will be a slave to the people of Emar.” Their contribution is to adopt the DUMU of Landsberger’s reading (cf. 55, n. 98) and read NISAG.GAL for Smith’s *i-šu li-kal*, comprising an apt opposition to ÌR. However, their rendering glosses over linguistic problems that preceding commentators also overlooked and is beset by difficulties of its own. Of the latter the most serious is that their rendering of the first clause assumes a verb of possession (*išû*), which they do not read in line 11; their restoration of [*lā išû*] in line 12 presupposes the same missing verb in line 11. Earlier commentators who restored [*lā išû*] in line 12 did so on the basis of a reading *i-šu* in line 11; e.g. Smith and Albright.

In terms of meaning, the general thought of Idrimi’s declaration seems clear: One who seeks to reclaim his patrimony is great, while one who remains as an alien in Emar is base. Since Idrimi takes up action immediately following this declaration, the pronouncement must have advocated some initiative. A verb stronger than *išû* is thus desiderated.

However, even fully restored these lines present linguistic difficulties. First, as Goetze, perceived, *mannum* cannot be rendered ‘whoever’ but only ‘who’ (interrogative). In the Hurro-Akkadian dialects ‘whoever’ must be expressed by either *mannum ša* or *mannummē*; see Goetze, *Language* 14 (1938), 139; Gordon, *Or.* 7 (1938), 42; cf. *AHw.*, 603b, where only here is *mannum* taken as an indefinite relative pronoun; cf. also Heb. *mî ’āšer . . . mî ’āšer* in 2 Sam. 20:11. For *mannummē*, see lines 92 and 96 below. Second, the *lū* in line 11 must directly precede a noun that stands in opposition to *lū (w)arad* in line 12. Hence, what follows *lū* in line 11 must be either a noun or a misplaced verb. Scholars who read a verb at the end of the clause (Smith, Albright, Goetze) must account for the absence of a direct object. Third, if we adopt the reading DUMU NISAG GAL of Kempinski & Ne’eman we must face the conclusion that a verb has been omitted preceding *lū*.

Taking all this into account we offer the following suggestion which we believe is grammatically sound and contextually suitable: *mannum <mē> bīt abišū <uba”û> lū mār ašarēd rabî (DUMU NISAG GAL), u mannum[mē] [ašbu] ana mārē āl Emar lū (w)arad* “Whoever <seeks> his patrimony is a great nobleman, but whoever [remains] among the citizens of Emar is a vassal.”

The selection of *bu''û* is occasioned by the following consideration. In Hebrew the verb used of seeking a territorial inheritance is *baqqēš* (Jud. 18:1 with *naḥālā*), and the Akkadian equivalent of *baqqēš* is *bu''û*. Compare, for example, *baqqēš 'et hā'ātōnōt* "seek the she-assess" (1 Sam. 9:3; cf. 10:2, 14) with *bu''ā(mi) imērē* "seek the asses" in Amarna (EA 96:24); cf. further, Held in *Kramer Anniversary Volume, AOAT 25* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1976), 233, n. 23.

To express an antithesis to *ir* in line 12 we prefer the reading DUMU NISAG GAL 'a great nobleman' of Kempinski & Ne'eman (see above) to Landsberger's apparent DUMU SU-BIR₄ GAL = *mār Subarti rabūti* "subject of the great (land) Subartu" (55, n. 99; cf. Goetze, *BASOR* 147 [1957], 22, n. 6).

Since it is remaining among the Emarites that is anathema to Idrimi, we restore in line 12 [*ašbu*] (with subjunctive in the relative clause) in the idiom *ašbu ana* 'to remain in/among', which is attested above in line 6 (see commentary).

An advantage to reading GAL as a logogram instead of the final syllable of a verb (so Smith, Albright, Goetze) is that Idrimi may be referring back to this declaration in assuming leadership of his fellow exiles from Aleppo in line 26: *urtabbi'aku* "I have become chief (*rabū*)" (see below).

Line 15

libbi šābē Sutû. The so-called defective writing *li-bi* is unusual; cf. the same spelling below, lines 16 and 27. Even in the older texts from Alalah one finds *lib-bi* (Wiseman, *Alalakh*, #2:17; etc.). Note the absence of the preposition *ana* preceding *libbi*; contrast *ana libbi narkabti* (lines 16–17), *ana libbi šābē Ḥapirī* (line 27), *ašibī ša ana libbi mātīya* (line 84). Cf. the likewise peculiar omission of a preposition preceding *pān* (see above on line 4).

Line 16

ittīšu. Literally 'with him', but the context requires a plural; perhaps a *-nu* was omitted by mistake. Borger suggests a singular is intended, referring to Idrimi's groom; but this is improbable, especially since the groom is mentioned a few clauses before and only together with the horses and chariot.

Line 17

narkabti šaliltīya. 'My covered chariot'. The substantive *šaliltu* is generally understood as a feminine derived from *šillu* 'shade'. The sign preceding *lil* is a phonetic complement *li*. The phenomenon of a CV-sign preceding a CVC-sign as a phonetic complement is rare, but is also found at Boghazkoi (cf. Labat, *L'akkadien de Boghaz-Köi*, 19), Nuzi (cf. Berkooz, *The Nuzi Dialect of Akkadian*, 21), and Amarna (e.g. EA 359:11 *nu-uš-ša'ab* 'we shall dwell'); cf. RA 66 (1972), 167:47+X *līl-mu-ma* (MB *Kudurru*, courtesy of H. Wohl); and Labat, *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne*⁵, 23.

Line 18

māt Kin'anīm. The writing *Ki-in-a-nim* here and in line 19 with the *a* sign beginning a syllable probably serves to indicate a still articulated laryngeal, as in Amarna *Ki-na-aḫ-ni* etc. (cf. Ebeling in Knudtzon, *EA*, 2:1577); cf. Smith, 29; Speiser, *JAOS* 71 (1951), 152, n. 16; Aro, 361b. The same phenomenon is evident in *še-ib-i* (line 29; cf. line 45). The scribal practice of indicating a laryngeal through employing a V-sign to commence a syllable is widespread in standard Akkadian; see e.g., Ungnad-Matouš, *Grammatik* § 14b; cf. Reiner, in *Studies . . . Oppenheim*, 170, and *JCS* 25 (1973), 28.

Lines 19–20

ina māt Kin'anīm āl Ammiya ašbu. Oppenheim translates “I stayed in Ammia in the land of Canaan,” but to express ‘I stayed’ our scribe employs *ašbāku* (line 28), not *ašbu*; at the least we would expect *ūšib*. We must therefore follow Albright and recognize that *ašbu* refers to Ammiya’s being ‘situated’ in Canaan, and that the form is stative + “subjunctive” *u*. The final *u* is a peculiar feature of this text (cf. *ittūru* in line 30, etc.) in which a reckless suffixation of subjunctive *u* abounds. It is possible that our form has been contaminated by the correct usage of *ašbu* in line 23.

Albright exaggerates, however, when he asserts that “The verb *ašābu* means ‘to be situated’ as well as ‘to dwell.’” Akkadian, to our knowledge, never employs *ašābu* to express ‘be situated’, but rather *šakānu*, as in the opening line of the *Šumma ālu* omen series, *šumma ālu ina mēlē šakin* “If a city is situated on high terrain” (for references, see *AHW.*, 644a); in the well-known verse from Gilgāmeš, *āl Šuruppak ālu ša tīdūšu attā [ša ina aḫi] Puratti šaknu* “The town of Šuruppak, a town with which you are familiar, that is situated on the bank of the Euphrates” (Gilg. XI:11–12); and in Boghazkoi, *ālāni . . . ša ina aḫ Puratti šaknū* “towns . . . that are situated on the bank of the Euphrates” (*Bo.St.* 8, 26:33); cf. Poebel, *AS* 9 (Chicago, 1939), 48, n. 1.

In fact, it appears that the employ of *ašābu* in this meaning represents another West Semitism, as in Hebrew the cognate verb *yāšab* may have just this sense; cf. Ezek. 16:46 “Your (said of Jerusalem) elder sister Samaria—she and her daughter-towns—who is situated (*bayyôšebet*) to the North of you, and your younger sister who is situated (*bayyôšebet*) to the South of you—Sodom and her daughter-towns”; Nah. 3:8 “Are you (Nineveh) better than Thebes which is situated (*bayyôšēbā*) on the Nile?”

Line 21

Mukišḫe. The suffix *ḫe*, which also appears in lines 32, 38, and 77, is a Hurrian gentilic (Speiser, *AASOR* 20, § 56, and *JAOS* 71 [1951], 152).

Line 22

Niḫ. Written here *Ni-iḫ* but in line 37 *Ni-ḫi*. For the various writings of this kingdom, see Astour, *Or.* 38 (1969), 385, n. 2.

Lines 22–23

[*mārē*] *māt Ama'e*. This restoration is consistent with other members of the series (lines 20–23); cf. Albright, and Greenberg, *The Hab/piru*, AOS 39 (New Haven, 1955), 20. Others (e.g. Smith, Oppenheim) inexplicably restore [*šābē*]. *Ama'e* is another designation for Nuḫašše, which is never mentioned in the Alalah texts; Astour, *Or.* 38 (1969), 385. Nuḫašše formed a confederacy with Mukišše and Ni'i with its capital at Aleppo, then Alalah; see *ibid.*, 382–414.

Line 24

imurūn(n)īma. The suffix is strange but of a piece with *išmūn(n)īma* in line 35. It is neither the standard accusative suffix *-ninni* nor the dative suffix *-nim*, as in *ipḫurūnimma* 'they gathered to me' (line 26). Most probably, the suffix is a misused subjunctive *-ūni* inherited from Old Assyrian (for which see Hecker, *GKT* #79d). The double *n* in the orthography conforms to the frequent Hurrian practice of writing intervocalic nasals (and somewhat less so liquids) double; cf. Speiser, *AASOR* 20, #39. The alternative of taking the suffix as an unusual first person suffix is unsuitable in both contexts. In such a case we would have to translate "When they saw me that I was the son of their lord" and "When my land heard (about) me," the former of which is awkward and the latter of which assumes more than the text says. Contrast Giacumakis, § 4.22. Observe that later on in our text the standard accusative suffix is employed: *unakkiranni* (line 44), *illū'annīma* (line 59).

The enclitic *-ma* here has temporal force, 'when they realized'. Although this function of *-ma* is noted by von Soden neither in *GAG* § 123 nor in *AHw.*, 569–70, it is well attested in Akkadian. Compare for example, *immaršīma iteḫḫa ana šāši* "when he sees her he will approach her" (*Gilg.* I, iii:44); *naṭlātāma niši miḫāriš apātum* "when you look upon all of mankind" (*BWL* 70:18 [Theodicy]); and see *išmūn(n)īma* below (line 35) 'when they heard'.

Line 25

inūma. 'That', corresponding to Amarna and Boghazkoī usage, equivalent to Hebrew *kî*. For example, *lū īdī šarru bēliya inūma šalmat āl Gubla amat kitti ša šarri* "May the king, my lord, know that Byblos, the loyal handmaid of the king, is well" (*EA* 68:9–11); *šumma awēl Hurri išammi inūmāmi Šunaššura ištū maḫar ša[r H] urri iptur u ana Šam[ši i] šḫur* "If the Hurrian hears that Šunaššura has seceded from the king of Hurri and has returned to the Sun" (*Bo.St.* 8, 104:50–52).

The *inūma* that occurs in line 47 is not the relative corresponding to West Semitic idiom (contra *CAD* I/J, 161a) but the regular Akkadian conjunction (see below).

Lines 26–27

akanna aqtabi urtabbi'āku urrāk. The reading of this passage has been subject to nearly as many versions as commentators. Any proposal will inevitably involve philologic difficulties, and Albright and Borger have not even ventured to suggest a reading. The main exegetical problem is to determine what the text is trying to say. We believe that an avenue of investigation becomes accessible once we realize that the story of Idrimi is not an entirely unique

one. Oppenheim (*JNES* 14 [1955], 200) and Wiseman (*Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume* [Nashville, 1976], 17) have recognized a general similarity in Idrimi to the stories of Genesis (presumably Jacob's flight to Haran) and David. However, the resemblances run deeper. In fact, the narrative structure in Idrimi has clear parallels in the stories of Jephthah and David in the Hebrew Bible. On the basis of these parallels it is possible to determine the meaning of this obscure passage in the inscription of Idrimi.¹

The narrative structure may be schematized as follows:

	IDRIMI	JEPHTHAH (Jud.11)	DAVID (1 Sam. 21–22)
<i>The flight</i>	In Aleppo, my ancestral home, a hostile [incident] occurred so that we had to flee . . . (3–4).	They expelled Jephthah telling him: "You shall not inherit our father's estate" (v. 2).	—
	I set forth and went to Canaan (18–19).	Jephthah fled from his brothers and settled in the land of Tob (v. 3).	David set out and fled . . . and he came to Achish King of Gath (21:11); David went out from (Gath) and fled to the cave of Adullam (22:1).
<i>Recognition by kinsmen</i>	When they realized that I was their lord's son (24–25).	—	His kinsmen and his paternal household heard (22:1).
<i>Joining the exiled hero</i>	They gathered to me (25–26).	There gathered to Jephthah social outcasts (lit., "empty men") (v. 3).	They went down to him there. There assembled to him every man in trouble, every man who had a creditor, every bitter man (22:2).

1 A somewhat similar narrative structure in the Egyptian story of Sinuhe—including flight, recognition, and elevation to leadership—has been pointed out to us by M. Lichtenstein; cf. now Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature* (Berkeley, 1975), 1:224–27.

Making the fugitive/exile leader

They said to Jephthah: "Come be our leader² . . . for now we have returned to you . . . and so that you will be our leader . . ." Jephthah replied to the elders of Gilead . . . "I will be your leader" (vv. 6, 8, 9; cf. 10:18). And he (David) became ruler over them (v. 2).

In Idrimi too we expect some statement indicating that the people who joined with Idrimi in exile proclaimed him their leader or a pronouncement by Idrimi that he would be their leader. In our text we must have some pronouncement since *akanna* introduces direct discourse (cf. Goetze). The next sign is best read DUG₄ = a form of *qabû* 'to speak' (with Speiser, *JAOS* 74 [1954], 18, n. 4) since *akanna* is frequently followed by *qabû*; cf. e.g., *akanna aqtabaššu* "I said the following to him" (*EA* 7:26); *akanna iqtabâ* "He said the following to me" (ibid.:28); *akanna iqabbi* "He said the following" (*PRU VI*, #7B:9); *akanna lâ taqabbi* "Do not say as follows" (ibid., 14:27–28); etc.

The question of who is speaking rests on the interpretation of the difficult forms *urtabbi'aku* and *urrāk*. While some corruption in our text is likely, from what is written we seem to have a mixed form of a II/1 preterite of *rabû* plus a stative (corresponding to a WS perfect) suffix, "I have become chief (the *rabû*)," and a II/1 stative of (*w*)*u'uru* 'to rule, to govern' with apocopation of the final *u*, "I have been appointed" (for (*w*)*u'uru* 'to appoint, to install' at Boghazkoi, see *CAD A*², 322a); such apocopation is regular at Nuzi (cf. Goetze, *Language* 14 [1938], 141). But even this interpretation must remain speculative.

In any case, the narrative structure calls for Idrimi to declare his assumption of leadership, and in fact he does become chief of the exiles and leads them in an amphibious campaign to *Mukišhe* (lines 30f.).

Line 28

ana sebe šanāti ašbāku. "I stayed (among the Ḫapiru warriors) seven years." The number seven is to be taken as a typological round number and not as precise (cf. Dietrich & Loretz, *OLZ* 61 [1966], 558). Similarly, Barattarna is said to have been hostile to Idrimi for seven years

² *qāšim* 'captain' here is equivalent to 'leader', as it is replaced in the following verse by *rōš* 'leader'; for the poetic parallelism of *rōš/qāšim*, cf. Mic. 3:1, 9.

(lines 42–44), and Idrimi claims to have destroyed seven Hatti towns (lines 65–70). The use of the number seven is too widespread in the ancient Near East to merit extensive discussion here, but one cannot but compare such Western parallels as *sebet šarri abbū Ḫana ša uqtabbilūnim akmīšunūti* “As for the seven sheiks, fathers of Hana, who waged battle against me, I defeated them” (RA 33, 51:15–18 [Yaḥdunlim]). Note also that Jacob stays with Laban in intervals of seven years, and that his surreptitious departure occurs after a third interval of only six years, that is, prematurely, one year before another interval had been completed (Gen. 31:38–41). Furthermore, David rules seven and a half years in Hebron before he reigns over a united kingdom in Jerusalem (2 Sam. 2:11; cf. 5:5). By contrast, in Assyrian inscriptions the number five seems to predominate; cf., e.g., AKA, 35:63; 36:75; 41:30; 68:96; (60 kings = 5 x 12); OIP 2, 74:75–76 (five days cooped up on board ship during a storm); etc.

eššūrāti uzakki. The release of birds in order to observe their flight and thereby divine the mind of the gods is a Western, not Mesopotamian, means of augury; cf. Oppenheim, JNES 14 (1955), 200, n. 1; idem, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago, 1964), 209–10; idem, ANET³, 557, n. 2. It should be noted that the employment of *zukkû* for the release of birds is a barbarism; cf. Oppenheim, JNES 14 (1955), 200, n. 1. In standard Akkadian the verb *wuššuru(m)* is utilized, as in the passage in which Utnapishtim releases the birds to determine if the flood has subsided (Gilg. XI:149f.); for other references, see CAD I/J, 211a. Although CAD Z, 29, lists a heading “*zukkû* to free, release—a) referring to persons and birds,” the only passage within nearly two columns of material in which *zukkû* is used of birds is this from Idrimi! But while this usage of *zukkû* is not proper Akkadian, neither is it West Semitic, for WS *zky cannot be so employed. The verb used for the release of birds in Hebrew is *šallē^{ah}* (Gen. 8:7 and passim; Deut. 22:7), the semantic equivalent of Akk. *wuššuru(m)*. Most likely the misuse of *zukkû* in Idrimi for the release of birds is a transfer from its proper usage for the manumission of persons (cf. Oppenheim, loc. cit.), release from claims or obligations, or the like.

Lines 29–30

u sebe šanāti^{d1M} ana qaqqadiya ittūru. For the writing of *sebe* with *š* here and in line 45, see Introduction. The phrase *sebe šanāti*, despite its proper grammatical designation of ‘seven years’ (cf. e.g., Goetze), must mean ‘in the seventh year’; cf. Kempinski & Ne’eman and Dietrich & Loretz, OLZ 61 [1966], 557. Two arguments can be adduced from the Idrimi inscription itself. First, in line 45 *ina sebe šanāti* must mean “in the seventh year,” not “in seven years”; cf. Albright; Aro. AfO 17, 362b; Giacomakis, § 7.13. The fact that in our line the preposition *ina* is wanting presents no special difficulty as our scribe is not meticulous in his utilization of prepositions (cf. above on *libbi* in line 15). Second, *ina sebe šanāti* in line 45 follows the same number of years written with the logogram MU 7 KAM in line 43. The logographic writing must be rendered “For seven years (Barattarna was hostile to me)” but the syllabic writing must be rendered “In the seventh year” (see above). Likewise here in line 28 the logographic writing MU 7 KAM.MEŠ “(for) seven years (I stayed among the Hapiru warriors)” is followed by syllabic *sebe šanāti*. This suggests a characteristic feature of our inscription: when cardinal and ordinal numbers follow in consecutive phrases, the cardinal is written as a logogram and the ordinal is written syllabically. Hence, we should render *sebe šanāti* in line 29 “In the seventh year.”

With Oppenheim we take the phrase *ana qaqqadiya ittūru* to be an idiom meaning “he be-

came favorably inclined toward me.” Since in a parallel phrase in line 39, *ana yāši ittūrūnim* “(the countries) became reconciled toward me,” the sense ‘toward me’ is expressed clearly by the pronoun *yāši*, it is evident that *qaqqadu* is used here to indicate ‘self’, i.e., used as an independent pronoun; cf. *AHw.*, 900 (4).

The final *-u* on *ittūru* is another example of an inappropriately applied subjunctive suffix; cf. above on *ašbu* (line 20) and below: *māt Ḫatti ul ipḫur u ana muḫḫīya ul illiku* “Hatti-land did not assemble and did not march against me” (lines 70–71); *ša šubta lā uššabū anāku ušēšibušunu* “Those who did not have a dwelling I settled” (lines 85–86); *u mātiya ukinnu* “I organized my land” (line 86).

Idrimi did not spend seven years as a professional diviner (so implied by Albright, and Giacomakis, § 1.6). Rather, it was through divination that Idrimi discovered that the storm-god had become favorable and that the time was propitious to make his comeback; cf. Smith, 74, Oppenheim, *JNES* 14 (1955), 200a; idem, *ANET*³, 557b; Borger, 22, n. 9. Albright’s comparison of Idrimi’s divination with that of Joseph in Egypt is superficial and unrelated since Joseph did not employ divination in order to predict the moment of his rise to power. One would do better to compare the career of David, who employed divination in order to determine whether or not he should go to battle (1 Sam. 30:7–8; 2 Sam. 5:23; that *šā’al baYHWH* denotes divination is particularly clear from 1 Sam. 28:6, said of Saul).

Line 31

šābē tillati(?). The interpretation of what is usually read as ERÍN.MEŠ NU UL Ú/SI KU is so problematic that some scholars have suspected that the text is in disarray; cf. Goetze, 228, and Aro, 363. Some scholars have taken the sign NU following ERÍN.MEŠ to be a phonetic complement (reading *ummānu*, so Albright, Giacomakis, 110; and Kempinski & Ne’eman). But this is unlikely because of the fact that the suffix on the verb *ušarkibšunu* indicates that the preceding noun is in a *casus pendens* (“as for the ERÍN.MEŠ X, I had them board”) and so should be in the oblique case (e.g., requiring a phonetic complement *nī*). So, for example, the nouns in lines 13–14 *sīšīya narkabtīya u kizīya elteqēšunu* “As for my horse, chariot, and groom, I took them.” Moreover, a reading of *šābu* here for ERÍN is strengthened by the fact that *šābu* primarily denotes soldiers in western texts (from Mari, Ugarit, and Alalah; see *CAD* Š, 54b), and by the fact that nowhere else in our inscription is *ummānu* employed (contra Giacomakis, 110). Thus the NU sign must be part of the modifier to ERÍN.MEŠ and not a phonetic complement.

Albright, reading *ummānu ul ūqū*, took *ūqū* as a preterite of *waqū*, a form of *quwwū* ‘to await’ (cf. *AHw.*, 931), and translates “my troops did not tarry.” However, not only does this rendering seem out of place in context, but the proposed verb does not mean ‘to tarry’.

Akkadian expresses ‘tarry’ by *uḫḫuru* or *lupputu*. It should also be noted that elsewhere in Idrimi (lines 9 and 71) and at Alalah (see Giacomakis, 109), the word *ul* is written *ú-ul* (cf. Aro, 363).

Kempinski & Ne’eman, 212, read *ul- <te- > šī-ma* “I gathered (soldiers).” Their suggestion is attractive but phonologically most difficult. It assumes that the shift of *št* to *lt*, which is a well-known characteristic of Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian, has occurred in this form. However, this shift is extremely rare at Alalah (cf. Aro, 361b; Giacomakis, § 3.11) and does not occur in the inscription of Idrimi; cf. *uštēpišušunu* (line 89). Nor does *uštēsi* become

ultēši at Nuzi or Ras Shamra (see examples in *CAD A*², 380a).

Although we cannot offer any improved reading of the signs we can make a suggestion as to what the original modifier of ERÍN.MEŠ ought to have been. We believe that the expected modifier was probably *tillati*, based on the following considerations. First, elsewhere in the inscription Idrimi terms his soldiers either simply by the collective ERÍN.MEŠ^{bā} = *šāba* in line 64 (cf. Nougayrol, 153, n. 5; and for ERÍN.MEŠ as a collective with singular modifiers, see Albright & Moran, *JCS* 2 [1948], 245–46) or by the phrase *šābē tillati* (ERÍN.MEŠ *til-la-ti-ya*) ‘auxiliaries’ in line 74. We would thus a priori expect *tillati* as a modifier for Idrimi’s troops here. Second, the phrase *šābē tillati* occurs frequently in texts from the West. Thus at Mari, *šābāšunu u ša-bi ti-la-ti-šu-nu idūk* ‘He killed their troops and auxiliaries’ (*Syria* 32, 15:22 [Yaḥdunlim]); *aššum ša-ab ti-il-la-tim ša taštanapparam* ‘Concerning the auxiliaries for which you are constantly writing me’ (*ARM* 2, 68:3); or in the Amarna letters, *ušširtišu qadu ERÍN.MEŠ til-la-ti ana kâtam* ‘I will send him along with the auxiliaries to you’ (*EA* 82:17–18); *u tidūkūna awēl rābiša u ERÍN.MEŠ til-la-ti ša ina āl Šumura* ‘(the sons of Abdi-Aširta) will kill the commissioner and the auxiliaries that are in Simyra’ (*EA* 104: 34–36 [both letters of Rib-Haddi]). Thus it is quite conceivable that the original phrase in our Idrimi line was *šābē tillati*. However, because of the problematic nature of the signs this suggestion must remain uncertain.

Line 33

ettešer. The reading of the signs is uncertain, but the context clearly requires a verb denoting amphibious travel. Both Albright and Goetze read a form of the verb (*w*)*âru* ‘lead’, the former reading *et-ḫé-ḫir*, ‘a strange spelling of *ette’er* or an iterative form like Amarna *ištaḫḫin . . .*,” and the latter *et-ḫé-ḫer*, assuming an unattested by-form **te’erum*. Neither proposal is acceptable, however. As for Albright’s, no I/2 or I/3 or the verb (*w*)*âru* is attested, and we would expect a direct object (“I led them”). As for Goetze’s, even if such a verb were real, it would not have the meaning “I took to (the sea) . . .” We find it best to read *et-te-šir* (= *ētešer*) “I proceeded,” as the verb *ešēru* may be used of a boat travelling; e.g., *lišlima išelippu / / lištēšera išmakurru* “May the boat arrive here safely / / may the barge proceed here directly” (*KAR* 196, ii:47–48); cf. *CAD E*, 358b.

Line 35

išmūn(n)īma. For the form, see on *imurūn(n)īma* (line 24).

Line 36

ina ištēn ūmi. Idrimi claims to have received instant acceptance by the towns of his power-base. Kings typically boast of achieving military victory in the space of one day, evidently telescoping protracted conflicts into flash triumphs; for references and discussion, see Stuart, *BASOR* 221 (1976), 159–64.

Line 37

kīma ištēn awēli. Idrimi is obviously describing the towns’ support of him in unison. But to

express 'in unison' Akkadian employs *ištēniš* (from Oakk. on; see *CAD I/J*, 279f.) or *ana/ina pī ištēn* (see *AHw.*, 872–73a; cf. Heb. *pe'eḥād*, e.g., Josh. 9:2; 1 Kgs. 22:13; 2 Chr. 18:12). Cf. e.g., *ana tillūtīšunu šāb PN ša māt GN illikamma ina ālim GN ummat GN(?) ištēniš ipḥurūšum* "As their reinforcements the people of PN from the land of GN came, and in the city GN, the center(?) of GN(?), they assembled in unison against him" (*Syria* 32, 14:12–18 [Yaḥdunlim]); *mātam šāti ša kišād Ayabba ukanniš ana pīm <ištēn> ušēšibši* "That country on the seacoast he subdued and he made it of one mind" (*ibid.*:22–24; for the insertion of *ištēn*, cf. *ARM* 1, 5:31–35).

To our knowledge there is no parallel in Akkadian to Idrimi's *kīma ištēn awēli*. However, our expression finds an exact equivalent in Hebrew, where we read for example, *wayyāqom kol-bā'ām kē šš 'eḥād lēmōr* "The entire people arose in unison (lit., as one man) saying . . ." (Jud. 20:8; cf. 20:1, 11); *wayyipōl paḥad-YHWH 'al bā'ām wayyēš'ē 'u kē šš 'eḥād* "Fear of the Lord overcame the people and they went forth in unison (lit., as one man)" (1 Sam. 11:7); cf. Num. 14:15; 2 Sam. 19:15; Ezra 3:1; Neh. 8:1. We are therefore compelled to regard Idrimi's expression as a calque from West Semitic.

Line 39

ana yāšim ittūrūnim. See above on *ana qaqqadiya ittūru* (line 30).

Line 41

in(n)ahḥū. "They allied themselves, made a treaty with me," from an idiom *itti X nāḥu* 'to ally, make a treaty with X'; cf. Smith, 103, who however, parses our form as a IV/1. Since the IV/1 of *nāḥu* is not well developed (see *AHw.*, 717a), we prefer to take it as a I/1 present with orthographic doubling of the *n* (see above on line 24, *imurūn(n)ima*). Eissfeldt, *Kleine Schriften* (Tübingen, 1966), 3:124–28, has made the interesting comparison of our *nāḥu* with Hebrew *nū^aḥ* in such passages as Isa. 7:2 *wayyugad l'ēbēt Dāwīd lēmōr nāḥā 'Arām 'al 'Eprāyim* "Now, when it was reported to the House of David that Aram had allied itself with Ephraim" (trans. *The Book of Isaiah*, JPS [Philadelphia, 1973], 34). Such a rendering is supported by the Versions (cf. LXX *sunefōnēsen*, Peshitta *štwy*, Targum *ṭḥbr*) and makes perfect contextual sense.

Our verb occurs again in lines 46–48, where Idrimi informs the Hurrian king, Barattarna, of the previous relations between their respective kingdoms: *u adbub manāḥāte ša abbūtēya inūma abbūtēya ana muḥḥišunu in(n)ahḥū* "and I told (him) of the treaties of my ancestors when my ancestors were allied with them (the Hurrians)" (see commentary there). Because of its association with *nāḥu* in this passage, we may infer that *manāḥātu* is derived from the same root and denotes 'treaties, terms of alliance'; so already Smith, 104. This interpretation is bolstered by the appearance of *manāḥātu* again in lines 51–52 in parallelism with *māmītu* 'fealty oath, covenant' and in line 54, where Barattarna accepts Idrimi's tribute as per their *manāḥātu*, clearly 'terms of treaty, alliance'. In fact, the combination of *manāḥātu* and *māmītu* in lines 51–52 appears to be equivalent to the combination of *riksu* 'treaty' and *māmītu* 'fealty oath' in Hittite treaties (cf. *AHw.*, 985a, C2b), as noted by Goetze, 228b.

Hence, the *manāḥātu* of these lines is to be distinguished completely from the *mānaḥtu* 'achievement' of line 103, *mānaḥtiya ana šalmiya aštur* "I inscribed my achievements upon my statue." This last passage betrays the influence of Gilg. 1:8 [*iḥru*] *š ina narī kalu mānaḥti*

“He [engra] ved all (his) achievements upon a stela.” The noun *mānaḥtu* in the sense of ‘achievement’ is derived from *anāḥu* ‘to toil, exert oneself’ and occurs in these two passages in singular form only. There are those who interpret plural *manāḥātu* in lines 51–52 and 54 as *mānaḥātu* ‘toils, vicissitudes’ and derive *innaḥū* from *anāḥu* (so *CAD A²*, 102a; *ibid.*, *I/J*, 161a; Oppenheim, 557b; Kempinski & Ne’eman, 213). Such an interpretation is not objectionable on morphological grounds, as *innaḥū* can be a 1/1 of *anāḥu* and may be construed with the preposition *itti* (line 41) or with *ana muḥḥi* (line 48). However, in addition to our counterarguments above, the concepts of Idrimi’s allies having ‘toiled’ with him (line 41) and of Idrimi’s ancestors having ‘toiled’ for their Hurrian overlord (line 48) are inapposite in their contexts. In the first place, there is no mention in the text that Idrimi’s allies had been with him in exile. On the contrary, it was only upon his return that they became reunited with him. Secondly, it would be odd for Idrimi in his own inscription to recount his ancestors’ labor for the Hurrians. Such an acknowledgement of servitude, reminiscent of the biblical account of Israelite servitude in Egypt, would be atypical of both Mesopotamian and Western historiography. On the other hand, since we are obviously dealing with treaty terminology, interpreting *nāḥu* as ‘to become allied’ suits both contexts completely.

Line 42

ukīnamšunu. Smith’s reading, accepted by Albright, Oppenheim, and *CAD* (*K*, 166a), has been regarded by Goetze (228a) as problematic. He observed that the phonetic string *kin* is elsewhere expressed in Idrimi by *ki-in* (line 86 *ú-ki-in-nu*, line 88 *ú-ki-in-nu-ú-ma*). He therefore emended and read *u-sa-al-<la>-am-šu-nu* “I made peace with them.” It should be observed, however, that there are other examples of the interchange of CVC and CV-VC in this inscription, e.g. *dan* (line 50), *da-an* (line 57); *lul* (line 69), *lu-ul* (line 73); *šap* (line 101); *ša-ap* (line 94). As regards Goetze’s suggested reading (accepted by Kempinski & Ne’eman), apart from the obvious drawback of the need to emend, it suffers from two further objections: (1) the fact that *usallam* in form is a present while the context and Goetze’s translation require a preterite (*usallim*); (2) his rendering “I made peace with them” does not suit the context. Idrimi had already been reconciled with the people of his homeland (above lines 35–41). The point here is that he now forms an alliance with them, hence “I established them truly as my allies.”

The unassimilated *m* of the ventive with the pronominal suffix, which occurs again at Alalah in *il-qú-nim-šu-nu* (Wiseman, *Alalakh*, #354:7), is a morphophonemic writing analogous to *D + Š* (see Introduction).

Line 45

ina sebe šanāti. See above on lines 28–29.

Line 47

manābā[te] {te}. The *ḥÉ* following the gap is problematic. Albright, 18, n. 29, ignores it, and Nougayrol (152, n. 9) interprets *ḥÉ* as another form of *ḥÁ*, the pluralizing determinative. Kempinski & Ne’eman, 213, read *mānabā[te] [ga] bbi ša abbūtēya* “all the labors of my an-

cestors.” However, this reading is ruled out by the fact that *gabbi* must either precede the noun it modifies or be followed itself by a possessive suffix (*-šina*). We prefer, therefore, to read 𒄩É as *te*, written dittographically. For *manāḫātu* ‘treaties’, see above on line 41.

inūma. The regular Akkadian conjunction ‘when’, not the West Semitic usage as in line 25 (so *CAD I/J*, 161a; Kempinski & Ne’eman, 213).

Line 48

in(n)abḫū. See above on line 41.

Line 49

damiq. Note the lack of gender and number agreement with [*awā*] *tīmi* ‘our actions’.

Line 50

māmīta danna. ‘Binding oath, agreement’; *māmītu* is written here and in line 52 with the logogram NAM.ERIM, but syllabically in line 53. Note the lack of gender agreement between the substantive (fem.) and adjective (masc.); also *šalmīya annīnāti* (line 92; cf. line 99); cf. the skimpy note in Giacomakis, § 6.5. For the phenomenon at Nuzi, cf. Gordon, *Or.* 7 (1938), 48, 231; and for Boghazkoi, cf. e.g., *kittam šarram* (for *šarram kīnam*; *Bo.St.* 8, 92:39), *nukurtu dannu* (*ibid.*, 100:2, 63). For *dannu* ‘binding’, see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford, 1972), 87, n. 2. For the pairing of *māmītu* with *ana berīšunu šakānu*, cf. [*ana*] *berīšunu māmīta(m) iškunū* “They have made a sworn agreement between themselves” (Wiseman, *Alalakh*, #122:4–5); *kīnanna tiškunū NAM.ERIM ana berīšunu* “In this manner they have made a sworn agreement between themselves” (*EA* 74:42); cf. Moran, *Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, 1950), 152.

Idrimi reminds Barattama of the former good relations that obtained between their ancestors in order to secure from the Hurrian overlord a new vassal treaty and the protection for Idrimi and his dynasty that the treaty would entail. It is common knowledge that Hittite treaties of the second millennium introduce the stipulations of the treaty with a historical prologue that describes earlier relations between the parties; for discussion and bibliography, see Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire* (Rome, 1967), 121–25, esp. 122. In the case of Idrimi, old relations had been broken and are now being restored. Such a history of (repeatedly) broken and restored relations followed by the vassal’s request for renewed protection is described in the historical prologue of Hittite treaties, such as that between Mursilis and Duppi-Tešub of Amurru (translated by Goetze, *ANET*³, 203–5). We may surmise that the account Idrimi inscribed on his statue is but a synopsis of sections of a written treaty between himself and Barattama.

Line 51

manāḫāte. See above on line 41.

Line 53

Aḫ.Aḫ. At this point the text seems to refer to the manner in which the treaty was read to Barattarna. We therefore read Aḫ.Aḫ as a pseudo-logogram for *aḫa-aḫa* (*CAD A¹*, 163b), *aḫē* (*ibid.*, 183–84), or *aḫennā* (*ibid.*, 184) ‘one-by-one, distinctly’, hence, ‘in detail’.

Line 54

šulmīya. Landsberger (55) translated ‘gifts’, which is the expected sense. But because *šulmu* generally means ‘welfare, health’, etc., Smith read the preceding NI as LÚ, i.e., *awēl šulmīya* ‘my messenger’; cf. Oppenheim, 557b. Goetze saw the need to find some form of tribute here and so read NI (= *šaman* ‘oil’) *šulmīya* without translation (228b with n. 20). However, it is more probable that *šulmu* here is employed in place of standard *šulmānu* ‘tribute’, especially as the verb *maḫāru(m)* is regularly employed of receiving tribute (cf. *AHw.*, 578b). The substitution is not difficult to appreciate when one considers that *šulmānu* is used at Ras Shamra in place of *šulmu* ‘well-being’; e.g., *ilānu ana šulmāni liššurūka* ‘May the gods keep you in health’ (*PRUVI*, #4:5–6; cf. 6:4; etc., and see Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln*, *St.Or.* 38 [Helsinki, 1967], 74).

Line 55

imtaḫar. As the form is written *im-DA-ḫar* it is possible that our text follows the phonological rule of MB in which *t* becomes *d* (voiced) following *m*. However, since *aštapar* (line 46) is likewise written with DA = *tá*, we are most likely dealing with a matter of orthography; cf. Aro, 361b; contrast Smith, 27–28. Smith’s phonological explanation is farfetched since it is difficult to conceive how in *aštapar* *t* would become voiced following (most probably voiceless) *š*.

Lines 55–56

u kīnūti ša kabtū uša < > niqê ušarbi. ‘Then I pre[sented] the (gestures of) loyalty which were considerable (lit., heavy); I made great sacrifices.’ We would, ideally, wish to read *bilāti* ‘tribute’ (written syllabically, or GÚ.UN), which is frequently modified by *kabtu* (cf. *CAD K*, 26a), but the signs clearly read *ki-nu-ti*; so Landsberger, 55, n. 100; contra Smith; *AHw.*, 482a; *CAD K*, 395a, who read *kinūnu* ‘brazier’ but offer no satisfactory rendering of the passage. The word *kinūtu* is attested below in line 57 denoting ‘loyalty’, and we may assume a similar sense for our line. We think it best to follow the lead of Oppenheim (557b) who translates ‘‘I increased the gifts indicating my loyalty, which were heavy.’’

Unfortunately Oppenheim glosses over the signs following *kabtu* and includes the verb *ušarbi* with the preceding phrase. It is preferable, however, to find a verb for the first clause in the signs *u-ša*, which appear to be the beginning of a verb, perhaps *uša <kbit>* ‘I made heavy’, *uš <ābil>* ‘I brought’, or *uš <amḫir>* ‘I presented’, the latter signs of which were omitted by the mason.

The signs following *u-ša* we read *SISKUR_x = niqê* ‘sacrifices’; see Borger, *Zeichenliste*, #438, cf. *CAD K*, 395a; *AHw.*, 939b. We are dealing here with the ratification of a vassal treaty, and it is well known that treaties of the third and second millennia were ratified by sacrifices;

for a convenient discussion, see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford, 1972), 102f.

Line 56

u bīta ḥalqu utêršu. “And I restored to him a lost estate”; so Landsberger, 55, n. 100; cf. Kempinski & Ne’eman, 216. For the idiom, cf. Wiseman, *Alalakh*, #7:30–33 *bītam šapli’am . . . iddin . . . ul itâr(ma)* “The lower house he gave (to PN) . . . it shall not revert.” This was another item in the treaty beneficial to Barattarna.

Line 57

ina awêlûtiya ina kînûtiya. Literally, “in my status as a retainer, in my loyalty” = “as a loyal vassal”. The translation of Kempinski & Ne’eman, 212, “on account of my loyalty and my humanitarian qualities” is not borne out by the attested meanings of these words.

Lines 57–58

dannam azkuršu. For *dannu* referring to ‘binding’ oath, see above on line 50. Note the ellipsis of some word for ‘oath’ like *nīšu*, *māmītu*, *zikru*, etc.

Note the augmented prefix written on *a-az-kur-šu*. This orthographic practice is not employed consistently in Idrimi but is found also in *ú-uš-ša-bu* (line 85) and *i-ip-pa-aš-ši[it-šu]* (line 96). Though characteristic of earlier Akkadian dialects too, it is frequently encountered in Alalakh (e.g., Wiseman, *Alalakh*, #126:8 *i-il-la-ak*, *ibid.* 19 *i-ik-kà-al*; etc.), Nuzi (see Gordon, *Or.* 7 [1938], 216, for examples), Amarna (e.g., *EA* 19:45 *e-ep-pu-uš*, *ibid.*:57 *i-il-la-ak*; etc.), Boghazkoi (e.g., *Bo.St.* 8, 96:20 *i-ip-pu-uš*, 98:47 *ú-ub-bal-šu*; etc.), and Ras Shamra (e.g., *PRU VI*, 2:26 *e-ep-pa-aš*, 30:11 *ú-ub-bal*; etc.). The practice is likewise characteristic of Hurrian script; cf. Speiser, *AASOR* 20, § 20.

Line 58

u šarrāku. “Then I became king.” As a result of the protection assured him by Barattarna, Idrimi could begin to reign securely. In line 102 *šarrāku* means “I reigned (for thirty years).”

ana āl Alalakh. In contrast to Smith and Nougayrol (153), most translators read this phrase with the preceding, i.e., “I became king/ruled over Alalakh”; so Albright, 18; Oppenheim, 557b; Borger, 23; Kempinski & Ne’eman, 213. However, the idiom ‘to attack GN’ is *ana GN elû*, as in lines 64–65, *ana māt Hatti eteli* “I attacked Hatti-land”. Hence, in line 58 *ana* (GN) is construed with *elû* in line 59, “(They attacked me in Alalakh)” (lit., “They came up against me, against Alalakh”). See below on *illû’annima*.

Line 59

imittīya u šumēliya. The reading, now universally accepted, was proposed by Albright (18, n. 30). However, there is no necessity to render “South and North” as Albright (*loc. cit.*),

Nougayrol (153), Borger (23, with question-mark), Giacomakis (§ 1.7), and Kempinski & Ne'eman (213). It is simply a merism to indicate 'all over, all around' like the more familiar *eliš u šapliš*, lit., 'above and below'. For the use of 'right and left' as a merism in Semitic languages, see Cohen, *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 14:179; cf. *CAD I/J*, 122–23 for Akkadian examples; for Hebrew cf. e.g., Exod. 14:22, 29; 2 Sam. 16:6; etc.

illū'annīma. The form is irregular with the accusative suffix *-anni* instead of dative *-nim*, and without contraction of the contiguous vowels, *u-a*. For this reason Goetze (228–29) has cast suspicion on the decipherment. He was particularly perplexed because the vowels appear to be contracted in *imurunnīma* (line 24) and *išmunnīma* (line 35). This seeming contraction is resolved, however, when these latter verbs are analyzed as preterites with subjunctive *-ūni*, not the first person suffix; see above on line 24.

Lines 60–63

u kīma šunūti . . . The reading and rendering of these lines have been more problematic than those of any other lines in the inscription. Widely divergent decipherments and translations have been suggested; cf., Smith, 18–19; Albright, 18; Goetze, 229a; Nougayrol, 153, n. 4; Oppenheim, 557b; Kempinski & Ne'eman, 213; and Leichty (apud *CAD K*, 535a). Borger would not venture to translate the passage altogether. However, there is general agreement on the reading of most signs, and we believe that once the syntactic pattern is grasped, a meaningful and philologically founded statement emerges. When dealing with this poorly executed inscription in particular, it is necessary to determine from clear segments the overall content of a passage and on that basis discern the requisite readings of the signs.

Several parallel phrases and syntactic constructions are contained within these lines. First, *u kīma šunūti* . . . "And just as they (did so and so)" is paralleled in line 62 by *u anāku* "So I (did so and so)." Idrimi is evidently evoking a vengeance motif. He boasts of requiting his attackers for whatever they had done to his ancestors (*abbūte*, line 61). Second, it is reasonable to assume that the verb *tabāku*, which most commentators read at the end of line 61, recurs in *ušatbuku* at the end of line 62 (though *ušatbik* is expected; for the inappropriate *-u* suffix, see above on *ittūru*, line 30). Third, the prepositional phrase in both sections is *ina qa-qa-ri* 'on the ground' = 'on the battlefield'; cf. *ina šēri* (*CAD Š*, 146). Fourth, the enigmatic *ku?-um?-ta* in line 60 appears to be the singular of *ku?-ku?-ma-ti-šu-nu* 'their *kumtu*'s', with the first *ku* being a dittograph (so Albright, 18, n. 32). The intervening *el* is a form of the preposition *eli* (*CAD E*, 73; *AHw.*, 200a) forming a distributive phrase of the type *X eli X* (cf., e.g., *qīptu eli qīptu ippuš* "He makes loan upon loan," *BWL*, 146:57; and see *AHw.*, 201a, 3b). Finally, the phrase *kumātīšunu ša abbūte*, lit. "their *kumtu*'s of the ancestors" = "the ancestor's *kumtu*'s," is an anticipatory genitive construction which is common in peripheral texts in the second millennium. So at Boghazköi, *aḫāšu ša PN, dīnšu ša PN* and other examples listed in Labat, *L'akkadien de Boghaz-koi*, 198; at Nuzi, *abūšu ša PN, dīnšu ša PN* and other examples listed in Wilhelm, *Untersuchungen zum Hurro-Akkadischen von Nuzi*, 29–31; at Ras Shamra, *aḫḫēšu ša PN (PRU III, 102:14), mār mārīši ša PN (PRU IV, 208:6)*; etc.

Thus the context has to do with *kumtu*'s being poured out or heaped up (*tabāku*) on the ground (*ina qaqqari*). The sense is that just as they (his enemies who had come up against him in Alalah) had previously piled up his ancestors' *kumtu*'s, so now Idrimi heaps up their

kumtu's (so basically Albright, 18). Since the context follows by stating "I put an end to their warfare" the preceding obviously describes Idrimi's military victory over his enemies. The question now is to ascertain a meaning for *kumtu*. We believe this can best be done by examining contexts expressing military victories in which something is described as being poured out or heaped up.

A perusal of Akkadian inscriptions and annals shows that a common motif after battle descriptions is for the king to boast of pouring out, spreading out, or heaping up corpses of defeated enemies. For example, *ištu birīt GN adi GN₂ pagrišunu atbuk* "From GN to GN₂ I heaped up their corpses" (AKA 324:83 [Aššurnasirpal II]); *itāt abullišunu šalmassunu [kīma karê] lušeppek* "I piled up their corpses [like heaps of grain] around their city gates" (Weidner, *Tukulti-Ninurtas*, 2:34–36 [Tukulti-Ninurta I]); *gurun šalmātīšunu iškun* "He made a heap of their corpses" (*Syria* 32, 15:24 [Yaḥdunlim]); *šalmāt qurādīšunu ina gisallāt šadê kīma šūbe lumīšše* "I spread out like emmer the corpses of their warriors in the mountain ledges" (AKA 77:92–94; cf. *ibid.* 37:81–82; 39:13–14; 56:78–80; 67–68:91–94 [all Tiglath-Pileser I]); *pagar muqtablišunu ana gurrunāte ina gisallāt šadê lugerrin* "I heaped up the corpses of their warriors in heaps on the mountain ledges" (AKA 40:21–22; cf. *ibid.* 36:77–78; 51:23–25; 54:53–54; 61:18–19 [all Tiglath-Pileser I]). On this same theme note the curse in the Epilogue of the Code of Hammurapi: *gurun šalmāt ummanātīšu ina šerim littadi* "May she (Ishtar) pile up a heap of his warriors' corpses on the battlefield" (*CH* xxviii: 12–16); for many other examples of this motif, see the *CAD* sub *garānu*, *gurrunu*, *ašitu*, and *kamāru*.

Our suggestion then is that *kumtu* represents a word for corpse like *pagru* or *šalamtu*, and Idrimi's enemies would have heaped up *kumtu* upon *kumtu* "corpse upon corpse" of his ancestors. The concept of piling corpse upon corpse is found in a remarkable parallel to our text in one of the curses from the Aramaic inscriptions of Sefire. As a possible consequence of Matî'el of Arpad refusing to go to the aid of Bir-Ga'yah of KTK when he would be attacked (*wbn y'th ḥd mlkn wysbn <y>* "If one of (the) kings comes and surrounds <me>" [*KAI* #222B:28]; cf. Idrimi line 59 "Then kings from all over came up against me"), Bir-Ga'yah threatens: *wpgr 'rb' m'l pgr b'r[p]d* "I will pile up (lit. multiply) corpse upon corpse in Arpad" (*ibid.*:30); cf. Fitzmyer, *Sefire*, 68. This same threat (albeit in a different context) is also found in Hebrew: *w^enātattî 'et pigrêkem 'al pigrê gillûlêkem* "I will set your corpses upon the corpses of your fetishes" (Lev. 26:30; contra Neiman, *JBL* 67 [1948], 55–60; Gordon, *UT* § 19.2005; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 125, n. 4; Heb. *peger* cannot denote a statue on the basis of Ugaritic because Ugar. *pgr* denotes 'mortuary sacrifice', for which see the article by Greenstein in this issue).

Thus in the light of both the Mesopotamian and West Semitic parallels we believe that this difficult text is dealing with an idiom for heaping up corpses. Idrimi describes his victory in terms of heaping up the corpses of his enemies, and consequently "makes an end to their war." Upon defeating this local coalition Idrimi eliminated any immediate military threat to his regime in Alalah and enabled himself to engage in a strike against more distant Hatti (lines 64f.).

Line 64

šāba. Written ERÍN.MEŠ^{bá}; cf. Nougayrol, 153, n. 5. For ERÍN.MEŠ as a collective with singular modifiers, see Albright and Moran, *JCS* 2 (1948), 245–46.

Line 65

7 *ālāni šalūšunu*. The writing of *ālānu* by URU.DIDLI.ĜÁ, which recurs in lines 69 and 87, is common at Alalakh; cf., e.g., URU.DIDLI.ĜÁ ša šarri (*JCS* 8 [1954], 12, #186:1). Owing to the ubiquity of the number seven in this inscription (see on line 28 above), we must suspect that here too the number seven is typological, despite the specification of the towns' names.

Line 69

anmû . . . ullû. 'These . . . those'. The redundant accusative suffix on the verb *aḫtepišunūti* 'I destroyed them' shows that *ullû* is plural. The same phenomenon occurs with *anmû* in line 90 *anmû ētepusunu* "These (things) I did" indicating that it too is a plural in our inscription (cf. Giacomakis §§ 4.35–36; contrast *CAD A*², 125a; *AHw.*, 52a). This statement constitutes a summation following the enumeration of the cities: lit. "These are the towns under their (the Hittites) protection, and those I destroyed them."

Line 70

aḫtepišunūti. Smith and others (cf. e.g., Borger, 23; Giacomakis, § 4.36) read *aḫ-te-bat-šu-nu-ti* 'I looted them'. However, while contextually suitable, this reading is morphologically unsound. The 1/2 preterite of *ḫabātu* is *aḫtabat*, with *ta* not *te*; see the dictionaries. We should therefore read *aḫ-te-pi* 'I destroyed', as the form is correct and *ḫepû* is employed of destroying towns; see *AHw.*, 340b; *CAD ḫ*, 173a. So read by Oppenheim, 557b; Kempinski & Ne'eman, 214.

Line 71

illiku. The final *u* is evidently another instance of the phenomenon discussed on line 30 (*ittūru*) above.

Lines 72–73

šallātešunu ašlul. "I took captives of them," i.e., "I took some of them captive" (lit. "I took their captives"). Contra, most recently, Borger (23), and Kempinski & Ne'eman (214), plural *šallātu* here refers to 'captives, prisoners', not 'spoil', which would have to be expressed in the singular; cf. Oppenheim, 558a; *AHw.*, 1148b. Note that both here and in lines 78–79, *šallātu* is set off from the terms denoting material booty by a connective, *-ma* and *u*, respectively.

Line 73

bašītu[šu]nu. On the restored *[šu]*, see Smith, 21. As the word occurs only as a singular (cf. *ina bašītu [sic!]* in line 79), the morphology of this form is erroneous as *bašissunu* would be expected.

Line 74

šābē tillatīya. See above on line 31.

Lines 75–76

aḥḥēya u ebrūtēya. The kinsmen and allies likewise receive shares of the spoil and are likewise the objects of *uza* 'I distributed' (line 74); so Smith, 20–21; Albright, 18; Borger, 23; Oppenheim, 558a. Contrast Kempinski & Ne'eman (214), and the *CAD* (*I/J*, 6a; *L*, 134a), who take these as the objects of *elteqe* in line 77. Note, however, that when *elteqe* is employed of Idrimi taking along his horse, chariot, and groom (lines 13–14), a redundant pronominal suffix is attached; here the expected suffix is not attached.

The plural *ebrūtu* is analogous to *abbūtu* 'ancestors' but, unlike *abbūtu* (lines 47, 48, 61), is not widespread in peripheral dialects of this period. The form may well be conserved from Old Assyrian; cf. *CAD I/J*, 7a, and *ebarūtu* 'collegium' (OA; *ibid.*, 7–8).

Lines 76–77

qadūšunūma anāku elteqe. We, as most translators, follow Smith (21) and render "Together with them I took (booty)." A serious challenge to this interpretation was raised by Goetze (229a), who observed that "Old Bab. *qādum* can hardly take a pronominal suffix. However, *qā-tù-šu-nu* 'their share' (i.e. a share like theirs) is possible." One could add that elsewhere in Alalah *qadu* does not take suffixes (cf., Giacomakis, 95–96). However, Old Assyrian *qadu* does take pronominal suffixes (see *AHW.*, 892a), and we have seen a few instances above in which our inscription betrays OA affinities: cf. already Smith, 27–28, for matters of orthography. Moreover, Goetze's own proposal is problematic. In the first place, to express /tu/ our inscription uses either *tu* or *tú* (only in word-final position) but never *tù* (= DU). In the second place, the case of *bašītu[šu] nu* (line 73) notwithstanding, 'their share' should be formed *qassunu*, plural *qātātēšunu*.

Line 78

ālīya. 'My capital'; so already Smith, 25.

šallāti(m). 'Captives'; see above on lines 72–73. Idrimi exploited his foreign captives for building his palaces, according to common practice.

Line 79

maršītu(m). 'Goods, property, possessions', as *AHW.*, 613b; not 'flocks', as *CAD* A², 218. For *maršītu* in sequence with *šallatu* 'spoil' and *bušû* 'property', see e.g., *AKA*, 73:51–53; 74:61–63.

ina bašītu. For *ina bašīti*; other erroneous case-endings are found in *ḫalqu* for *ḫalqa* (line 56), and, if our suggestion be correct, *masiktu* for *masikti* (line 4).

Line 80.

uštēpiš. It is obvious (so already Smith, 27) that ÚĜ here and in line 90 *e-te-ne-pu-ÚĜ-šu-nu* and *e-te-pu-ÚĜ-šu-nu* must be read *uš_x*; cf. Nougayrol, 153, n. 7.

Line 81

kussīya . . . umaššil. From what follows it seems that Idrimi is organizing his 'regime' like that of other kings. For *kussû* 'throne' in the metonymic sense of 'dominion' cf. *CAD K*, 592. In Wiseman, *Alalakh*, #7:26, *kussû* refers to the king. Even in such a passage as the following, *kussû* connotes more than a physical throne: *eli ša RN abi āhidišu ušaqqi kussâšu* "I made his throne (i.e., dominion) higher than that of RN, his natural father" (*TCL* 3:62, [Sargon II]). For the same use of Hebrew *kissē* in a similar context, see, e.g., 1 Kgs. 1:37, 47.

Line 82

aḫḫēya. We read ŠEŠ (so Oppenheim, 558a; Kempinski & Ne'eman, 214) for Smith's ʾR (so Borger, 23).

Line 83

qurbūtēya. 'My relatives'. Smith and von Soden (*AHw.*, 929a) translate 'my courtiers', but in a series that includes kinsmen (lit. brothers) and sons we would expect another family member. We therefore take *qurbu* as another form of *qerbu* 'relative' (*AHw.*, 914a). Note the parallelism of *qerbu* and *aḫu* in the following passage: *kīma aḫam u qerbam [lā] išū epšēku* "I am treated like one who has no kin or relative" (*TCL* 17, 21:31–32). It is even possible that we should read *qur₄* as *qer_x* and read *qerbūtēya*, as some CVC-signs at Nuzi (cf. Berkooz, *The Nuzi Dialect of Akkadian*, 13–14; Oppenheim, *WZKM* 45 [1938], 41; Gordon, *Or.* 7 [1938], 34) and at Ras Shamra (cf. some examples in *PRU VI*, p. 164) can represent more than one vocalic value.

Goetze (loc. cit.), followed by Borger, Oppenheim, and Kempinski & Ne'eman, read *tap-pu-te* 'companions'.

Line 84

umaššilušunu. For the *-u* affixed to the verb, see above on line 30 (*ittūru*).

āšibi. 'The inhabitants', reading TUŠ.MEŠ with Dietrich & Loretz (*OLZ* 61 [1966], 556) for Smith's SU.MEŠ. This latter can hardly refer to the Sutu folk (so Smith, Oppenheim; cf. Kempinski & Ne'eman), which are written ERÍN/LÚ.MEŠ *Su-ú-ti* at Alalakh (cf. above, line 15; Wiseman, *Alalakh*, ##2:5; 228:4).

Line 85

šubtam nēḫtam. As Goetze (229) realized, this is no doubt the requisite reading. What appears

as ŠU in our ŠU-*eh-tam* is obviously the first part of a partly broken NE. For the phrase and the writing, cf., e.g., . . . *mātī šubtam ne-eh-tam ušēšib* “I made my land dwell securely” (RA 33, 51:24–25). For additional examples of this classic idiom, see CAD A², 403, 408. The Akkadian phrase has a close parallel in the Phoenician inscription of Azitawadda, *lšbntm dnnym bnht lbnm* “so that the Danonians might dwell securely” (KAI #26, AI:17–18). See the forthcoming monograph on Azitawadda by Held.

Line 86

ušēšibušunu . . . ukinnu(ma). For the “subjunctive” *u* suffix, see above on line 30 (*ittūru*).

Line 87

ālānīya. For the reading, see above on line 65.

kīmē. Mainly peripheral Akkadian for *kīma*; cf. CAD K, 367a.

pānūtīni. Lit., ‘our ancestors, predecessors’; cf. *manāḫāte ša pānūtīni* ‘the treaties of our predecessors’ (lines 51–52). For a similar term in Phoenician, cf. *blpny}{b}{m* ‘the predecessors’ (KAI #24:5).

Line 88

IT.TE.MEŠ. The interpretation of these signs is difficult. From the context the word must represent something pertinent to the gods and suitable as an object of the verb *kunnu* ‘establish’. Smith (99) took the word as *ittē*, plural of *ittu*, which he equated with Hebrew *‘et* ‘fixed time’. He has been followed by Goetze (229b) and Kempinski & Ne’eman (214), but the equation is at best speculative, as Akkadian *ittu* would then be a *hapax*. The CAD (IJ, 313a), followed by Giacomakis (80), derives *ittē* from *itū* ‘border’ and translates “and I also reestablished the border lines as the gods of Alalah had (previously) established them.” However, though *kunnu* may be used of fixing boundaries, the CAD’s interpretation is doubtful. For one thing, the standard plural of *itū* is *itātu*. For another, the subject of *ukinnu* is almost certainly *abbūtīnī(ma)* ‘our forefathers’ (line 87), and not *ilānu ša āl Alalah* ‘the gods of Alalah’; so Goetze and Borger; contrast Smith, Oppenheim, and Kempinski & Ne’eman. The conjunction *kīma* in line 87 introduces a clause subordinate to the clause *anāku ētenēpussunu* in line 90: “Just as (our ancestors had . . .) . . . so I constantly performed them.” Cf. above on lines 60–63. Note that the rendering of Kempinski & Ne’eman is syntactically impossible as it ignores the *ša* preceding *uštēpišūšunu* in line 89.

The expected sense, “cultic regulations,” was felt by Oppenheim. Now appropriate Akkadian words for ‘cultic norms’ that are well-attested with the verb *kunnu* are *paršu* and *tērtu*; cf. e.g., *kunnā tēvēti* “The norms had been fixed” (En.el. VI:78; trans. Speiser, ANET³, 69a); *ša kunni paršišūnu* (VAB 4, 66, no. 4:6; cf. 256:33, reading according to CAD K, 166a). We wonder, therefore, whether the TE of IT.TE does not stand for a phonetic complement to an original logogram for *tērtu*, namely UR₅-ÚŠ, and the signs be read UR.ÚŠ^{te}-MEŠ = *tēvēte*. However, because of the nature of the copy this suggestion must remain tentative.

Line 89

niqqī. Written with logogram followed by syllabic spelling. For the reading SISKUR_x, see Borger, *Zeichenliste* #438, and compare the writing above in line 55 (but without 𒊕). Logographic writings followed by complete syllabic spellings of the same word are uncommon but are attested particularly in peripheral Akkadian texts; cf. already Smith, 24. For Alalah see KI *er-še-ti* (below, line 97), and cf. Giacomakis, § 2.15. For Amarna see Böhl, *Die Sprache*, § 5g; for Boghazkoi see, e.g., EGIR *ar-ká* (*Bo.St.* 8, 90:16), and Labat, *L'akkadien de Boghaz-Köi*, 19d; and for Ras Shamra see, e.g., SISKUR-*ya ni-qa-te-ya* (*Ug.V*, 121:8); etc.

abībīni. 'Our forefathers'. Most probably the spelling represents *abi abi* (see CAD A¹, 70b) with contraction of contiguous vowels or omission of an *a*-sign. Contrast CAD E, 214b, and Giacomakis, 64 who read *abīni* 'our father'.

Line 90

ētenēpussunu. For ÚḪ = *uš*, see above on line 80. Note von Soden (*AHw.*, 227b) reads *e-te(-ne)-pu-úḫ¹-šū-nu*.

anmû. See above on line 69.

Line 91

ana qāti . . . aptaqissunu. It is unclear to what extent Idrimi abdicated power in favor of his son. Smith (86–88) believed that Idrimi turned complete authority over to his son. As he himself observed, such complete abdication would be unique in the ancient Near East. Goetze (229b), however, contended that Idrimi was only placing his "presumptive heir to the throne in charge of the state cult much in the same way as Hittite kings did"; cf. Kempinski & Ne'eman (217b). Against Goetze's view is the apparent fact that *anmû* in line 90 refers not only to the cult but to the administration of the realm that Idrimi had organized (line 86). Another explanation comes to mind. It seems that Idrimi had this inscription composed toward the end of his reign, when he had ruled for "thirty" years (line 102). Such seems to have been the common practice. Compare, for example, the explicit statement in the Foundation Inscription of Yaḥdunlim of Mari that he had already ruled a long time when he commissioned the inscription: (*Šamaš . . .*) *nādin balāṭ ṭūb libbim ša ūmī arkūtīm ana pāliḫīšu* "(Shamash . . .) who gives a satisfying and long life to his worshipper" (*Syria* 32, 12:13–15). Perhaps, as Idrimi neared the end of his life, he placed ^dIM-*nirāri* in control in order to avert a struggle for the throne, analogous to the appointment of Solomon by David and the well-known Egyptian practice of co-regency. Idrimi, himself, may have been the victim of such a struggle in the event that caused him to flee from Aleppo (lines 3f.).

^dIM-*nirāri*. The DN ^dIM could be normalized either *Adad* or *Tešub*; see above on line 2.

Lines 92–98

The curse formula presented here includes several clichés. These clichés are most affinitive to those of Assyrian inscriptions, but several are common to Babylonian texts, the *kudurru*'s in particular. Where readings in our text are problematic, it seems best to us not to concoct peculiar forms and constructions to accommodate the difficult cuneiform but to assume that a suitable cliché had been miswritten by the scribe and/or miscopied by the mason.

Line 92

annīnāti. For the lack of agreement of this pronoun with its noun (*šalmīya*), see above on line 50. The word is discussed by Smith, 32–33.

IŠ-ZA-AR-RI-KU. Smith, followed by Oppenheim (558b), Giacomakis (§ 1.10), Kempinski & Ne'eman (215), reads this as a form of the verb *šarāqu* 'steal'. As far as we can tell, such a derivation is untenable. Smith analyzes *išzarriqu* as a I/2 <*ištarriqu, assuming a "normal phonetic change" of *št* to *ss*. However, this phonological development occurs only in Neo-Assyrian texts; cf. Ungnad-Matouš, *Grammatik*⁵ § 37g; see further Deller, *Lautlebre des Neuassyrischen* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation; Vienna, 1959), 224–27. Moreover, as Goetze (229b) has indicated, the expected form would be *ištarqu*. On the other hand, neither is our form a I/1 present, as this form would be *išarraqu* (cf. Wiseman, *Alalakh*, #2:48; 4:11).

Blind adherence to the script cannot lead to a satisfactory solution. Goetze (229b), followed by Nougayrol (153), wanted to read a form of *surruru* 'falsify', but his argumentation depends on a dubious translation of *nukkuru* (which he renders 'to remove' rather than 'to alter') and a tortuous reading of line 94. On the other hand, an examination of (especially Assyrian) curse formulae indicates that parallel to *nukkuru* 'to alter' (line 96) and *pāšātu* 'to erase' (as line 96 is doubtless to be restored) and often interchanging with them are *šumsuku* or (the generally earlier) *šuzzuqu* 'to efface'; as the following examples show: *mamman . . . narēya unakkarūma šumī ušazzaquūma šumšu išaṭṭaru . . .* "Who . . . alters my stele and effaces my name and writes his (own) name . . ." (AOB I, 24, iv:20–v:18) [Šamši-Adad I]; *ša šumī šaṭra ipāšīṭūma šumšu išaṭṭaru u lū narēya ušamsaku* "Whoever erases my inscribed name and writes his (own) name or if he effaces my stele" (ibid., 64:36–38; cf. 100, no. 13:7–8 [both Adad-Nirari I]); *ša . . . šumī šaṭra ušamsaku* "Whoever . . . effaces my inscribed name" (ibid., 84, #7:10–11 [Adad-Nirari I]); *ša narēya unakkaru šumī šaṭra ušamsaku* "Whoever alters my stele (or) effaces my inscribed name" (ibid., 124:4–5 [Shalmaneser I]); etc. In all probability then we should read *mannummē šalmīya annīnāti ušamsaku/ušazzaqu* "Whoever effaces this statue of mine."

Line 93

u piriḫšu lilqut. This phrase cannot stand here, as it has no grammatical subject. Out of apparent desperation Oppenheim (558a) translates as though ^d*šamū* were the subject, and Kempinski & Ne'eman (215) translate *lilqut* 'May he extirpate' as a passive 'May (his progeny)

be uprooted'. These renderings ignore both grammar and style. It should be obvious that this phrase is an anticipatory dittograph of *pirihšu lilqut* in the following line.

Line 94

ša-ap-la-nu(?) ersetu. 'The earth below'. Smith's reading of *ša ab-du-ut-sa *kap-tu = ša abtūt-sa kapdu*, lit. "He who has its destruction planned out," has been followed fully by von Soden (*AHw.*, 7b), with reservations by Goetze (229b), and partially (*x-ud/tam*) by *CAD* (*A*¹, 67b) and Kempinski & Ne'eman (215). However, this reading cannot be accepted for many reasons, primarily because the subject of the following phrase *pirihšu lilqut* must precede that phrase. We thus read the signs *ša-*kap-tu* as *er-se-tu* (cf. Goetze, 229b), 'Earth' (*eršetu*) thus being the subject of *pirihšu lilqut* i.e. "May Earth destroy his progeny." This constitutes a perfect opposition to ^d*šamû* 'Heaven' in the curse formula. Compare *bēl šamê u eršeti* "Lord of heaven and earth" (line 97) with *bēl elûti u šaplāti* "Lord of above and below" (lines 100–1). With the noun *eršetu* we would expect an adverb like *šaplis* or *šaplānu* (see *AHw.*, 1173–74), and we thus suggest a reading *ša-ap-la-nu¹ eršetu* 'the earth below'.

Line 95

šarrussu limatṭū(?). Following 'his kingship' a verb is necessary. The verb *limdudū* 'let them measure' can hardly refer to kingship and must belong to the following phrase (see next comment); contrast Kempinski & Ne'eman (215). The verb used most commonly of overturning kingship is *sakāpu* (e.g., *CH* epil. xxvii:20; *AKA*, 3:9; *AOB* I, 84, #7:12; *ibid.*, 98:22; etc.). Hence, it is possible that the scribe omitted *liskipū*. On the other hand, in the light of the following curse in the Foundation Inscription of Yaḥdunlim, we should perhaps read—instead of *ù ma-at-šu—li¹-ma-at-ṭu¹* 'let them diminish (his kingship)': *šarrussu limatṭi ina kal šarrī* "let him diminish his kingship among all kings" (*Syria* 32, 17:14–15). Note that the *ṭu* sign, employed at Boghazkoi and Ras Shamra (cf. von Soden-Röllig, *Die Akkadische Syllabar*², #322), has the *ŠU*-sign as its second element; the careless mason may have simply omitted the first half of the sign. The phrase *u massu* is problematic in any case; see next comment.

ebla limdudūšu. "Let them have him executed (lit., measure him by a rope)." Tsevat (124), followed by Kempinski & Ne'eman (215), takes *māssu* (see previous comment) as the direct object of *madādu* and compares Amos 7:17 "Your land shall be divided by line [*baḥebel*]." This verse provides no parallel, however, as the idiom *ḥillēq baḥebel* does not mean 'to measure by rope' (= Akkadian *ebla madādu*) but 'to divide (i.e., apportion) by lot' (= Akkadian *isqa zāzu*)! See Held, *JANES* 6 (1974), 114 with n. 78. Moreover, the suffix *-šu* on *limdudū* appears to be the direct object of the verb, not the dative 'for him', which would be very awkward in context. We therefore prefer to read *limatṭū* in place of *ù ma-at-šu*; see previous comment.

We interpret the phrase *ebla limdudūšu* to refer to the martial practice of assigning captured soldiers to execution by measuring them off in rope-lengths. The practice is described in the Bible with an expression semantically and etymologically equivalent to *ebla madādu* in 2 Sam. 8:2: *wayyak 'et Mō'āb way^emadd^edēm baḥebel baškēb 'ôtām 'aršā way^emaddēd š^enē ḥābālīm lēhāmît ūm^elō' baḥebel lēbaḥāyôt* "He (David) defeated Moab. He measured them with a rope,

lying them down on the ground. He measured two rope-lengths to be executed and one full rope-length to be spared.” Compare the commentary of Hertzberg: “What we have here is not a means of measuring the land . . . , but a gruesome exercise of the rights of war, according to which two out of every three men must be put to death”; *I & II Samuel*, The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia, 1964), 290; cf. Ehrlich, *Mikrâ ki-Pbeschutô* (Berlin, 1900; reprint: Jerusalem, 1969), 2:203; Noth, *The History of Israel*², (New York, 1960), 194. Therefore, the practice may well be western and the idiom West Semitic.

Line 96

ipašši[ssu]. “(Whoever) erases it (the inscription).” The reading becomes self-evident to anyone familiar with Akkadian curse formulae (see above on line 92, IŠ-ZA-AR-RI-KU); e.g., *ušūrātīya uttakir šumī šaṭram ipšit* “He has altered my carved figures (and) erased my inscribed name” (*CH* epil. xxvi:31–34). So Oppenheim (558a), Borger (24); contrast Goetze (229b), Kempinski & Ne’eman (216). For the augmented prefix, see above on line 58 *a-az-kur-šu*.

Line 97

KI eršeti. See above on SISKUR_x.HÁ *niqqī* (line 89).

ilānu. Written DINGIR.MEŠ. We should normalize *ilānu* in the nominative, not *ilāni*; cf., e.g., DINGIR.MEŠ^{nu} (= *ilānu*) at Ras Shamra (*Ug. V*, 85, #23:6).

šumašu. Incorrect morphology for *šumšu*; for a similar error see *bašitu[šu] nu* (line 73).

Line 98

liḫalliḫū. This verb should occur in clause-final position and is best explained as a reflex of West Semitic word order; see Introduction.

X XX XXX. A cryptogram probably standing for the regular scribal formula for collation: *ištur isniq ibre* “He has written, copied, and reviewed”; see *CAD B*, 117. Such a reading has been suggested by Nougayrol (153, n. 12). Dietrich & Loretz (*OLZ* 61, 557) and Kempinski & Ne’eman (215) take these numbers as logograms for the gods Addu, Šamaš, and Sîn-Kušah, and the last read the preceding sign as ʾIR = (*w*)*arad*. For the use of numbers as a cryptogram, see Leichty, “The Colophon,” *Studies Oppenheim*, 152.

u anna. ‘And now’; cf. *CAD A*², 125. Kempinski & Ne’eman (215 with n. 23) read AN.ŠUR = ^dAŠšur as part of the preceding cryptogram.

Line 99

^d*šalma annināti(m)*. The demonstrative pronoun fails to agree in number and gender as in

line 92.

linaššarūšu. The expected II conjugation precative form is *linaššir*, but a similar form occurs in Amarna, cf., e.g., *linaššar* (EA 169:15), and see Rainey's comments in *UF* 7 (1975), 418.

lū KUG.LU-šu. 'May (they) be his protection(?)'. The signs which follow the precative *lū* here and in line 101 (*lū* TI.RA-šu) must indicate a noun and not a verb (contra Smith, 22; Goetze, 230a; Kempinski & Ne'eman, 215; but see Nougayrol 153, n. 13; Oppenheim, 558a). Elsewhere in the inscription the precative *lū* plus verb is written according to standard Akkadian practice as *lizzuršu* (line 93), *lilqut* (line 94), *limdudūšu* (line 95), *liḫalliqū* (line 98), *liballiṭūšu*, *linaššarūšu* (line 100). Unfortunately, the readings for both nouns are difficult. However, something like *andullu* 'protection' (cf. Nougayrol, 153, n. 13) or *nūru* 'light' (cf. *lū nūršu nawirum attūnu* "may you [Zababa and Ištar] be his shining light," YOS 9, 35:38–39) in the first case and *šillu* or *šulūlu* 'protection' (said of Šamaš, see CAD Š, 190 & 243) is expected.

Line 101

EN-*lu-ú eṭemmī*. We are no doubt dealing here with the epithet of Šamaš as *bēl eṭemmī* 'lord of the spirits'. For example, *^dŠamaš . . . bēl elāti u šaplāti bēl ^dAnunnaki bēl eṭemmī* "Šamaš . . . lord of the upper and nether worlds, lord of the Anunnaki, lord of the spirits" (*An.St.* 5, 98:25–26). However, the *lu-ú* following EN is a problem. It can hardly be a 'pausal' form to indicate unusual emphasis (Smith, 23). Most probably it is best to take the *lu-ú* as an anticipatory dittograph of the *lu-ú* following *eṭemmī*.

lū TI.RA-šu. "May (he) be his protection(?)", see on *lū* KUG.LU-šu in line 100 above.

Line 102

30 *šanāti*. For the reading of KÁM for Smith's ŠE, cf. Nougayrol, 154, n. 2.

šarrāku. Here, 'I reigned'; see above on line 58.

Line 103

mānaḫṭiya. 'My achievement(s)'; see above on line 41.

li[]. A verb such as *līmurā* 'let them see' or *līšassā* 'let them read' is called for.

Line 104

līktana[rabū/ā]. It is uncertain whether the subjects of *karābu* are the gods (so Goetze, 230a; Kempinski & Ne'eman, 215) or the citizens of Alalaḫ (so Oppenheim, 558a).