

absolutus (GAG § 62 h)—cf. *ištu dār*, “up to this point (lit. ‘since forever’)” and *ana dār*, “forever” (CAD D: 107–108 s.v. *dār* 2’–3’); *ištu ūm šāt*, “from primordial days” (RIME 4 E4.6.8.2: 34); and *ana imen*, “to the right” (ARM 5 no. 65: 35). It would also be a formal parallel to Hebrew *lammohōrāt* (Jonah 4:7, 1 Chronicles 29:21) and *mimmohōrāt* (e.g., Exodus 18:13), both meaning “the day after”—for these employ a nominal, feminine -*t*-affixed form of the adverb *māhār* (“tomorrow”), and begin with the prepositions *la* (“to”) and *mi* (“from”) respectively.

Whichever of these two analyses is to be opted for, *Ludlul* II 39 may be read *ša ina amšat ibluṭu imūt uddiṣ*, and translated “He who was alive yesterday died today”—exactly as in the first aforementioned way to analyze the line—yet now with the understanding that *ina am-šat* is no scribal error giving rise to faulty Akkadian, but perfectly good Akkadian richly paralleled in the Semitic language family.

Notes

1. LAMBERT 1960: 40, CAD U/W: 19, and HÄTINEN 2022 all read *ud-de-eš*. Yet, following their analysis of *ud-de-eš* as derived from *uddu* (from Sum. *ud*, “day”) and affixed with a locative-terminative adverbial ending, there would be no reason not to utilize the standard form of that ending, namely *iš*, and then read *ud-di-iš*. And indeed, Hätinen reads the variant *ú-DI-IŠ* as *ú-di-iš* (for *ūdiš*) rather than *ú-de-eš*.

2. An adverb *uddiṣ/ūdiṣ*, “today” would be without known parallel, yet *uddam*, likewise derived from Sum. *ud* and meaning “today,” is attested in OB texts (CAD U/W: 19).

3. Jiménez translates “Her counsel—the abyss—who fathoms it” (2019: 81), yet the implied equivalence between *milikša* (*Ludlul* II 37) and both *tēm ilī*, “plan of the gods” in the line immediately previous (*Ludlul* II 36) and *alakti ilī*, “way(s) of the god” in that immediately following (*Ludlul* II 38) indicates that *milikša* refers not to the goddess’ “counsel” but her “intentions” (as in HÄTINEN 2022) or the like.

4. For a list of Neo-Assyrian adverbs beginning with *ina* or *in-*, along with attestations, HÄMEEN-ANTTILA 2000: 58–59; on Neo-Assyrian adverbs, LEONHARDT 2024: 299–311 and *passim*, with temporal adverbs discussed on pp. 300–303. On Akkadian adverbs beginning with *in-*, GAG § 113 m.

Bibliography

- FOSTER, B., 2005, *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature* (3rd edition), Bethesda, MD.
- HÄMEEN-ANTTILA, J., 2000, *A Sketch of Neo-Assyrian Grammar*, SAAS 13, Helsinki.
- HÄTINEN, A., 2022, “Righteous Sufferer (*Ludlul bēl nēmeqi*) Chapter II. With contributions by Z. J. Földi, A. C. Heinrich, E. Jiménez and T. D. N. Mitto. Translated by Benjamin R. Foster,” electronic Babylonian Library corpus/L/2/2 <<https://doi.org/10.5282/ebli/2/2>>.
- JIMÉNEZ, E., 2019, “The Distant Plans of the Gods (*Ludlul* II 36–38),” *Kaskal* 16, 79–81 <doi.org/10.1400/278197>.
- KOGAN, L. and KREBERNIK, M., 2021, “A History of the Akkadian Lexicon,” in J.-P. Vita (ed.), *History of the Akkadian Language Volume I: Linguistic Background and Early Periods*, Leiden / Boston, 366–476.
- LAMBERT, W.G., 1960, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, Oxford.
- LENZI, A., 2023, *Suffering in Babylon: Ludlul bēl nēmeqi and the Scholars, Ancient and Modern*, OBO 300, Leuven / Paris / Bristol, CT.
- LEONHARDT, H., 2024, *Neuassyrische Grammatik*, LAOS 16, Wiesbaden.
- OSHIMA, T., 2014, *Babylonian Poems of Pious Sufferers: Ludlul Bēl Nēmeqi and the Babylonian Theodicy*, ORA 14, Tübingen.
- RUBIN, A.D., 2024, “Yesterday and the Day Before in Semitic,” *JSS* 69/1, 671–686.
- VON SODEN, W., 1990, “‘Weisheitstexte’ in akkadischer Sprache,” *TUAT* 3/1, 110–188.
- STRECK, M., 2016, “Temporal adverbs in Akkadian,” in L. Edzard (ed.), *The Morpho-Syntactic and Lexical Encoding of Tense and Aspect in Semitic: Proceedings of the Erlangen Workshop on April 26, 2014*, Wiesbaden, 9–21.

Eli TADMOR <eli@tadmor.us>

Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg (GERMANY)

115) A Bibliographical Corrigendum to a Recent Discussion of *Emar* 256 (E6 256) — In a recent paper (TADMOR 2026), I discussed the adoption text *Emar* 256 (copy ARNAUD 1985: 69; no photo available; edition ARNAUD 1986: 251–253). In the text, a man named Addu reports that his son, Ḫulāyu, is no longer his son; that Ḫulāyu died; and that Ḫulāyu’s three children were cast out into the square, and then lifted therefrom by a man by the name of Abī-kapī. As part of my discussion (TADMOR 2026: 209–212), I wrote as follows (TADMOR 2026: 210, with citations adapted to house style):

What events, concrete and symbolic, underlie this text, and in what order did they occur? Carlo Zaccagnini [1995: 102–103], Nicoletta Bellotto [2009: 147–148], and Maurizio Viano [2023: 210], agree in proposing the following sequence: Addu (here, the grandfather) disowned his son, Ḫulāyu. Ḫulāyu then died, and his children were cast into the street. A man named Abī-kapī rescued the children from the street, and took them into his household. He then adopted them, with *Emar* 256 being produced to ratify the adoption and outline its stipulations [...]. Yet an

anonymous peer reviewer, in bringing this text to my attention, outlined a different sequence: “A grandfather declares that his deceased son is no longer his son and his grandchildren have been abandoned in the square.” According to the reviewer’s interpretation, the grandfather’s disavowal of his son’s paternity did not occur in the past, but is rather proclaimed as part of the drafting of *Emar* 256, and the text’s talk of the grandchildren’s abandonment is likewise not an account of former occurrences but [...] symbolic language denoting the grandparent’s giving up of his rights to them before handing them over for adoption by Abī-kapī.

Diverging both from the position of Zaccagnini, Bellotto, and Viano and from that of the anonymous reviewer, I then argued that in *Emar* 256 Addu renounces his paternity over the already deceased Ḫulāyu, thereby shoring up Abī-kapī’s adoption of the three children—who were, *contra* the anonymous reviewer, actually cast out upon their father’s death and subsequently taken in by Abī-kapī (TADMOR 2026: 210–211).

However, as I found out after the article’s publication, the interpretation advanced by the anonymous reviewer—namely that, contrary to *communis opinio*, the text’s talk of the children’s abandonment in the street and subsequent rescue reflects not actual events but purely symbolic actions signifying Addu’s renouncing of his grandchildren and their transferal to Abī-kapī—had already been put forward by D. Justel in his discussion of *Emar* 256 (2018: 35–37). Justel’s position is followed, with proper citation, by Jacobsen in her recent discussion of maternal infant abandonment in the ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible (2026: 23 n. 14).

As a refinement of TADMOR 2026, it may be proposed that Addu’s renouncing his paternity over Ḫulāyu occurred after the latter’s death, and that Addu’s talk of the children being “cast out” into the street and “lifted” therefrom by Abī-kapī may, as Justel puts forward, have been symbolic rather than actual—yet that this “casting out” and “lifting” did not occur simultaneously with the composition of *Emar* 256, but rather in the past (as in Zaccagnini, Bellotto, and Viano), and were only legitimized by Addu post hoc.

Bibliography

- ARNAUD, D., 1985, *Recherches au pays d’Aštata: Emar VI, vol. 1: Textes sumériens et accadiens: Planches*, Paris.
 ——— 1986, *Recherches au pays d’Aštata: Emar VI, vol. 3: Textes sumériens et accadiens: Texte*, Paris.
 BELLOTTO, N., 2009, *Le adozioni a Emar*, HANE 9, Padova.
 JACOBSEN, L., 2026, “Maternal Child Abandonment in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible,” *JANES* 38, 19–42.
 JUSTEL, D., 2018, *Infancia y legalidad en el Próximo Oriente antiguo durante el Bronce Reciente (ca. 1500–1100 a. C.)*, Ancient Near East Monographs 20, Atlanta.
 TADMOR, E., 2026, “How Išum Got His Name,” *JCS* 78, 199–214.
 VIANO, M., 2023, *Debt and Indebtedness at Emar*, SANER 28, Berlin.
 ZACCAGNINI, C., 1995, “War and Famine at Emar,” *OrNS* 64/2, 92–109.

Eli TADMOR <eli@tadmor.us>

116) Kassites or Kushites? — The toponym or ethnonym *Ka(š)ši/u* in the Amarna correspondence has been a source of confusion.¹⁾ Does it refer to the (land of the) Kassites or Kushites? The latter interpretation is clearly valid at this point in time. As noted by D.O. Edzard (1970, 58–59) with regard to the Amarna correspondence, “die Gleichung Kaši = Kuš (=Nubien) ist heute *communis opinio*”. He also notes that “das nichtbabylonische *ka-ši/ka-a-ša* wird nie mit /šš/ geschrieben”. Attestations with only one sibilant must be identified (in terms of Kassites or Kushites) by the textual context.

Proceeding from the conclusion by Edzard, the attestations with double sibilants should be understood as referring to the (land of the) Kassites. These are EA 76:15 (^{kur}*Ka-aš-še*) and EA 104:20 (^{kur}*Ka-aš-ši*). Other attestations can be understood as referring to the (land of the) Kassites based on textual context. In EA 116:71, the king of ^{kur}*Ka-ši* are spoken of along with the kings of Mitanni and Hatti. Although A.F. Rainey (2015, 617) suggests that “Cush” is referred to, this is unlikely due to the textual context, as recognized already by W.L. Moran (1992, 192, 390), who identifies “Kaššu”. The same textual context probably (there are lacunae) appears in EA 129:75. This time Rainey (2015, 671) speaks of “the king of the land of the Cassites”, while Moran (1992, 211, n. 26) reiterates his identification.

The rest of the attestations of *Ka(š)ši/u* in the Amarna correspondence should point to Kush and Kushites. EA 49(:20) is a letter from Ugarit to Egypt. The palace personnel from ^{kur}*Ka-ši* likely refer to Kushites, especially since an Egyptian is mentioned and the letter comes from Egyptian-influenced Ugarit, a context in which reference to Kush – rather than the more distant Kassite sphere – is to be expected (MORAN 1992, 120, 390; RAINEY 2015, 381).²⁾ EA 127(:[22], 36) is a letter from Byblos to Egypt. Troops