

## Akkadian Sentences about the Present Time (II/1)\*

Sergey Loesov

Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow

### 0. Introduction

In the first part of this study (Loesov 2005) I have discussed sentences about the Present Time with finite predicates whose basic lexical meanings fall within the first three of the four traditional actionality classes, i. e. telic processes, atelic processes, and states. Logically, what remains to be considered is the fourth Vendlerian class, punctual verbs, i. e. the question is “What do verbs denoting punctual events contribute to coding the present-time semantic domain?”

I mentioned in Loesov 2005:109 that punctual events, by definition, ‘do not cross the SpT (= speech time), they always happen before it or after it,’ yet they ‘can bring about stative situations continuing into the SpT and beyond it.’ Now, the traditional grammar of Akkadian pays attention mostly to resultative states in the technical “assyriological” sense of the term, cf. the examples in GAG 126: *paris* “ist entschieden,” *tebi* “ist aufgestanden = ist auf,” with appropriate comments, e. g. ‘[b]ei den transitiv-fientischen Verben ... bezeichnet der St. den sich *aus den Verbalhandlung* ergebenden Zustand’ (ibid., italics added). These trivial resultatives are coded by the SC; the resultative states expressed by the SC of transitive verbs are believed to get typically (though not necessarily) a passive orientation (GAG ibid.).<sup>1</sup>

A closer look at the evidence shows that the genuinely resultative and passive meaning of the SC of punctual verbs is perhaps not that pervasive: the SC of a punctual verb does usually express a state, but not necessarily ‘den sich aus den Verbalhandlung ergebenden’ one, in case of

---

\* I thank N. J. C. Kouwenberg (Leiden University) for his stimulating discussion of the first part of this study. I am also grateful to I. Arkhipoff (Collège de France, Chaire d’Assyriologie), who has provided me with some research materials unavailable in Moscow. My thanks go to RFH for its financial support (project No. 06-04-00397).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. a very radical conclusion in Cohen 1984: 265: ‘C’est à cela que se réduit l’exercice de la diathèse dans le stativ: la valeur moyenne occasionnelle émanant d’un certain nombre de verbes par opposition à la valeur passive normale.’

transitive verbs probably not typically a “passive” (i. e. patient-oriented) state.

The ways in which the SC of different semantic types of verbs can contribute to the Present Time sense are not usually discussed in any detail, yet the translation practice makes it clear that in certain cases this semantic option is simply taken for granted.<sup>2</sup>

Sure enough, the SC does not have a morphologically inbuilt temporal meaning,<sup>3</sup> yet in the deictic discourse (i. e. especially in letters, legal documents, and divination texts) the SC often denotes situations contemporaneous with the speech time.

I do accept (perhaps with minor reservations) the scholarly opinion succinctly expressed by Kouwenberg (1997:14) in his criticism of Goetze 1942:

‘[T]he distinction which Goetze makes between three types of statives reflects a semantic distinction between different types of verbs which has no grammatical relevance for Akkadian. From the point of view of Akkadian, the stative has a completely uniform grammatical function, namely, to denote a state, i. e., the absence of any action or change. All differences between individual statives ... are determined by the lexical meaning of the verb and by the context.’<sup>4</sup>

A similar theoretical position is taken by D. Cohen, who claims that ‘[l]a voix dans le statif est un pur fait de context’ (Cohen 1984:257).

Thus, morphologically the SC bases express only the stative sense (as opposed to dynamic), while, as I will try to show, the values of voice, tense, and aspect *are expressed* via different kinds of interplay between the morphological meaning of the SC, lexical semantics of verbs, and their syntactic properties; so Kouwenberg’s claim about “no grammatical relevance” of semantic distinctions might be too strong.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also Cohen 1984:265: ‘Le statif en tant que tel implique la durée; il représente le procès dans l’état qui en résulte’. Metzler 2002 discusses in much detail the use of the SC to code the Present Time meaning in divination texts.

<sup>3</sup> It is a good question whether the other finite forms do, as the history of research shows.

<sup>4</sup> Goetze 1942:5 singles out ‘three sub-groups of Akkadian statives’: ‘(1) the durative stative. It denotes an inherent quality of a person or a thing’. A prototypical example is *tāb* “is good.” ‘(2) The perfect stative. It denotes a condition which results from the subject’s own action with reference to a person or a thing.’ A prototypical example is *šabit* “possesses,” i. e. a transitive active token of the SC. ‘(3) The passive stative. It denotes a state of affairs which results from another person’s action’. A prototypical example is *šabit* “(is) held.”

Consider the following two sets of paradigmatic relationships involving the selfsame verb *nadûm* (OB) / *nadâ'um* (OA), whose most basic meaning is a punctual one 'to throw (down)':

- (1) a. *aḥam ul addi*<sub>pret</sub> 'I did not get careless' / 'I was not careless'  
 b. *aḥam ul nadiāku*<sub>sc</sub> 'I am not careless'  
 c. *aḥam ul anaddi*<sub>pres</sub> 'I will not get careless' / 'I will not be careless.'<sup>5</sup>

The sentence *aḥam ul nadiāku* is semantically stative, but it is neither passive nor resultative, because its predicate is intransitive, although it has a surface direct object. Within the deictic discourse, the paradigm (1) codes pure temporal values of absolute past/present/future, while in (1a) and (1c) no information of aspectual nature is provided.

- (2) a. *kaspam addi*<sub>pret</sub> 'I deposited silver'  
 b. *kaspam attidi*<sub>pf</sub> 'I have deposited silver'  
 c. *kaspam nad'āku*<sub>sc</sub> 'I have the silver deposited'  
 d. *kaspam anaddi*<sub>pres</sub> 'I will deposit silver.'<sup>6</sup>

All four members of (2) are transitive and active, while (2c) is also perfect-resultative, i. e. in a sense definitely less transitive than (2a) and (2d). The important thing is that the morphological differences between predicates of (2a), (2b), and (2c) do not have much to do with the coding of temporal meanings—unlike in (1)—because all three sentences can refer to the same real-life fact lying in the speaker's past, although they interpret this fact differently. The choice of form in (2a–c) is most probably guided by pragmatic concerns of the respective speakers, although it may be difficult for us to grasp with certainty the exact message of this morphological variation.

<sup>5</sup> For textual references in OB, see CAD N<sub>1</sub> 92.

<sup>6</sup> This paradigm is based primarily on the OA evidence: see CAD N<sub>1</sub> 84f., AHw. 707a. An additional token of the Pres. is in Hecker 1966 No. 29:21: *qātam ša abika a-na-dī* 'I will deposit your father's share'; the examples of the Pf. (which I miss in the entry *nadû* of the dictionaries) are 2 TUG *šu-ri-in ša a-ni-kà-sí té-zi-ba-ni lá a-ti-dī-i* 'I have not deposited the two *šūru*-textiles which you left me for the accounting' (BIN 4, 51:26f.) and *i-na na x x a-na-ku-ma i-na ra-mi-ni-a a-ti-dī* 'Au ..., j'ai déposé de mon (proper) compte' (ATHE 61:24f., translation according to Ichisar 1981:264). A very similar expression (but without an overt semantic object) is attested in OB: *kīma ana nikkassim lā na-dī-a-ak-kum ina ṭuppika-ma annim amur* 'Look in this tablet of yourself to see that I have charged nothing to your account' (AbB 14, 139:6ff., Veenhof's translation); another possible OB example is (with CAD N<sub>1</sub> 85b) *x kaspam it-ta-dī-i* (AbB 6, 200:9).

Thus, *aḥam ul nadiāku*<sub>SC</sub> has a present-time reading in the way *kašpam nad'āku*<sub>sc</sub> does not.

Against what the essentially resultative definition of the SC of transitive verbs would predict, the SC of high transitivity verbs is not the most common variety of the SC in text. Therefore, for the purposes of the present study, it is important to get an overview of (both *resultative* and *non-resultative*) states contemporaneous with the speech time, whatever the semantic type of the verb and its morphological form, i. e. the Pres. or SC as the case may be.<sup>7</sup>

I will first present data on the SC of a few frequent high transitivity verbs in OB and OA. The data are drawn from the dictionaries and searchable corpora of OB and OA texts.<sup>8</sup> It turns out that the higher is the transitivity degree of a verb (or, more precisely, of an individual meaning of a verb), the rarer is this verb's SC. Consider the following examples, arranged alphabetically:

- (3) *dākum* 'to kill; beat': the SC is attested once in OB letters outside of Mari, AbB 13, 181:31f. *ina miṭḥuri* 1 DUMU *nu-kār*<sup>ki</sup> *dī-i-ik* 'one man from Nukar has been killed in the clash'; CAD D 36b (1959) has a few examples from early ARM volumes.
- (4) *ekēmum* 'to take away (by force)'. Within the corpus, the SC was found only as a technical term of OB extispicy 'is stunted' (see CAD E 67–68).
- (5) *ḥepām* 'to smash, destroy (an object),' 'to break (a tablet),' 'to invalidate (a document)'. I have found only one OB token of the SC with a clear-cut "physical" sense: *ermum ša tuppi ḥi-pi-ma tuppaša išrumū* 'the case of the tablet was (already) broken/had broken down, so they pulled her tablet off' (RA 9 22:22f.).<sup>9</sup> All the remaining OB examples have the legal sense 'is invalid,' as the following texts illustrate: *umma šū-ma ištu-ma šibtū i-ša-ās-su-ú tuppa-šu ḥi-pi* 'Und dann hat er folgendermaßen gesagt "Da

<sup>7</sup>The traditional grammar of Akkadian uses the clumsy notion of "prefixing statives," e. g. *izzaz* 'stands' and *ukāl* 'holds.' The very existence of this notion betrays a not thought-through awareness that lexical semantics may override morphology. By the same token, the "prefixing statives" show that the Pres. can be (or sometimes looks) no less "stative" than the SC.

<sup>8</sup> I do not discuss the evidence of later dialects available in the dictionaries. They would have to be studied on their own. One has especially to beware of using SB data along with OB ones, since SB is an artificial literary language not immediately based on a contemporary vernacular.

<sup>9</sup> Note that in this example the broken envelope is physically present at the moment of observation.

man doch «Zinsen» liest, ist seine Urkunde ungültig” (AbB 2, 173:10–13); *aššum šarrum mās[aram] ana mātīm iškunu tuppašu hi-pi* ‘Since the king has promulgated the redress for the land, his<sup>10</sup> tablet is void’ (Kraus 1958 § 2’:13’ff.).

(6) *mahāšum* ‘to hit, to wound, to kill, to strike’:

In OB and OA the SC of this verb is not used for those of its senses that imply destruction of the object, loss of its identity. The following ones are the most “destructive” contexts for the SC of this verb found in OB: *atānu u imēru ša ešemšēršu ma-aḥ-šú uštazziqū-ninni* ‘Die Eselin und der Esel, dessen Rückgrat verletzt ist, verursachen mir Sorgen’ (AbB 2, 177:8f.); *u eleppum ša bēlum kīma m[a-a]ḥ-ša-at-ma immerī ul ušarkib* ‘Since my lord’s boat is damaged, I did not load the sheep aboard’ (AbB 12, 96:18f.).<sup>11</sup>

On the contrary, the SC of *mahāšum* is quite frequent in a number of specialized “milder” meanings. Thus, it is attested within the legal expression *sikkatam mahāšum* ‘to drive in a (marking) peg’;<sup>12</sup> e. g. *bitum annām ibbaqqar-ma ina ālišu u šērišu sikkatum* (GIŠ.KAK) *mah-ša-at* ‘should this house be claimed, there is a peg (which serves as guarantee) driven (into his property) in his town and country’ (MDP 23, 236:12, text according to CAD S 250b, cf. M<sub>1</sub> 76b and Salonen 1962:56).

The SC of *mahāšum* is used as a technical term in OB extispicy reports: *šumēl ubānim šuqqu-ma ma-ḥi-iš* ‘the left of the finger is high but flat’ (YOS 10 7:15 and 27, text and translation according to CAD M<sub>1</sub> 77b). In OA *šmum mahiṣ* means ‘the price is reduced (lit. ‘cut’),’ while *mahšāku* is ‘I have suffered a financial loss’ (cf. CAD M<sub>1</sub> 78b, 3 d ‘to cut prices, give a discount’). The SC is attested within the expression (*eqlam*) *māy-yārī/māy-yāram mahāšum* ‘to plough (a field),’ e. g. (a field) *māy-yārī ma-ḥi-iš* ‘has been ploughed’ (AbB 3, 50:28), cf. AbB 9, 243:8; 10, 93:7’.

(7) *mašā’um* ‘to take away by force, to rob a person.’ The SC is to the best of my knowledge not attested in OB; I have found three tokens of *mašā’aku* ‘I am/was robbed’ in OA (TCL 4, 13:24; Oxf. 1933, 1050:31, for which see CAD M<sub>1</sub> 361b; Prag I 431:7). Prag I 431:7 is quoted as (54b) in Loesov 2005: *mašā’aku<sub>SC</sub>-ma allik-am* ‘I was robbed<sub>SC</sub>, and then I came here.’ This usage of the SC in the syntactic slot of a Pret. is rather exceptional (Loesov 2005:133) and requires a special study.

<sup>10</sup> I. e. the owner’s.

<sup>11</sup> Van Soldt translates ‘was smashed,’ but in view of my observations on the SC of *mahāšum* this interpretation is perhaps too “strong.”

<sup>12</sup> Cf. CAD M<sub>1</sub> 76b: the phrase is well known in OB, the SC is amply attested in OB Susa.

- (8) *naqārūm* ‘to tear down, destroy’: the SC is not attested.
- (9) *nêrum* ‘to strike, kill’: the SC is not attested.
- (10) *šagāšum* ‘to kill, slaughter’: only one token of the SC is recorded in CAD (Š<sub>1</sub> 68a): *ina ‘la’ šazzuztīm ina qātīšu ša-ak-ša-ku* ‘for lack of a representative I am (financially) ruined by his action’ (unpubl. OA letter). Note that the verb is used here in a non-literal sense.

The SC of certain frequent one-place verbs with highly dynamic meanings is also underrepresented, as the following example illustrates:

- (11) *maqātum* ‘to fall down, collapse.’ The prefixed tenses of this verb are amply attested in OB in OA letters, as well as in OB laws, omnia, and epic texts, yet the patient-oriented SC is not eagerly built for its admittedly basic meaning used above as a gloss. The only example I was able to find comes from OA: *ašamme-ma wrkat bētim ma-qī-it* ‘Ich höre, daß die Rückseite des Hauses eingestürzt ist’ (Prag I 577:4f.). Yet the SC (along with the prefixed forms) is productive for the derived meanings ‘to fall into somebody’s hands,’ ‘to fall to one’s share,’ ‘to arrive’ (CAD M<sub>1</sub> 245ff.), with the “moving” participant as the syntactic subject. This usage is well known in Kültepe (cf. the references in CAD M<sub>1</sub> 247a, and see additionally Prag I 739:9; 843:2<sup>n</sup>; AKT 3, 114:18; CCT 3, 16b:16). I have found only one token of the SC of *maqātum* in OB letters, again in a derived meaning: *ša ... ma-aq-tu* ‘those who ... have arrived’ (AbB 6, 109:9f.). The SC of *maqātum* is attested in OB extispicy texts in the meaning ‘hangs down, descends’ (see CAD M<sub>1</sub> 244).

Trying to make sense of this kind of evidence, I suggest that patient-oriented tokens of the SC are really common only if the referent of the patient is somehow available (or “observable”) at the reference time, which in letters usually coincides with the speech time. It is for this reason that e. g. the SC of *šakākum* ‘to harrow’ is much more frequent in text than that of *dākum* ‘to kill,’ not because in real life harrowing is more common or salient than killing. This hypothesis would explain why the SC of the verbs which are highest on the ‘cline’ of Transitivity (in the sense of Hopper–Thompson 1980) is relatively rare.

In OB and OA there is a group of intransitive telic and punctual motion verbs<sup>13</sup> whose SC is not well attested or not attested at all. This group

---

<sup>13</sup> The distinction between the telic and punctual may of course be a matter of a language-specific conceptualization, cf. the discussion of OA *muātum* ‘to die’ in Loesov 2005.

includes inter alia such common verbs as *tebûm* ‘to get up,’ *wašûm* ‘to go out,’ *târum* ‘to return,’ *erēbum* ‘to enter.’ This fact also requires explanation. In what follows I will briefly review the evidence:

- (12) In OB the SC of *tebûm* seems to appear only once, in an epic narrative: U<sub>4</sub> ‘7’ u 7 *mušiatim* <sup>den</sup>-[*ki-du*<sub>10</sub> *t*]e-bi-i-ma ša-[*am-ka-ta*]m *irhi* ‘For seven days and seven nights Enkidu was erect<sub>sc</sub> and coupled with Šamkatum’ (Gilg. P 48ff., George 2003: 174f.).
- (13) The SC of *wašûm* is attested twice in AbB 1–14: *tuppât šimâtim* ša A.ŠA É u GIŠ.SAR *išmû-ma* ša *ina mīšari wa-ši-a uḥēppû* ‘(The judges) ließen sich die Kaufurkunden betreffend Felder, Häuser und Gärten vorlesen und zerbrachen diejenigen, welche infolge der “gerechten Ordnung” annulliert waren<sub>sc</sub>’ (AbB 7, 153:8f.);<sup>14</sup> *awilû ul wa-šû-û lā tušadda-šunûti* ‘The men are not (yet) gone. Do not prevent them (from leaving)!’ (AbB 8, 87:10f.).

The SC forms *wa-ši* and *wa-ši-a-at* in CH (§ 142 30:70; § 143 31:7) are doubtless denominative from the *pāris*- base: *u mussa wāši-ma* ‘and (if) her husband is a wayward person,’ *šumma ... wāšiat* ‘if she is a wayward (wife)’.<sup>15</sup>

More interesting for our study are the relatively numerous SC tokens of *wašûm* in OB omina. Consider the following example:

*ištu libbi pišu qaqqassu šanûm wa-ši* ‘a second head protrudes from its (the anomaly’s) mouth’ (YOS 10, 56 I 36, translation according to CAD A<sub>2</sub> 367b).<sup>16</sup> The meaning of *waši* in extispicy texts is more stative or “descriptive” than strictly speaking resultative. This follows from the fact that a very similar sense can be expressed by the Pres. of the same verb: É.DÛ.A ... *ana ribû* DN *uš-ši* ‘a house with an exit to the DN street’ (TCL I 196:3, translation according to CAD R 318a); *bû sēbim u bû maḥīrātīm ša ina ribitīm ša Sippar uš-ša* ‘an inn and market-stalls which exit on the main street of Sippar’ (Scheil 1902, 10:20, text and translation according to CAD R 318a, and see more examples of the same usage of the Pres. *ibid.*). In extispicy

<sup>14</sup> According to the Edition’s commentary to this non-literal rendering, *wašiā* actually has to refer to the realty items mentioned in the quoted text: they ‘were gone out,’ i. e. returned to their former owners as a result of *mīšarum*.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. AHW. 1475a s. v. (*w*)*āšitum* 6) aB Bez. einer (aushäusigen?) Frau: **mlú-tilla** = *wa-ši-i-tum* MSL 12, 158, 26 || 177, 29 nach *wāšûm* 1c.; AHW. 1480b s. v. (*w*)*āšûm* 1c) aushäusig? aB LL: **lú-tilla** = *wa-šû-û/um* MSL 12, 158, 25 || 177, 28 vor *wāšitum* 6. CAD A<sub>2</sub> 360a considers the possibility of the *pāris*- base, but this is orthographically less likely.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. also YOS 10, 56 I:34; III:25. See CAD A<sub>2</sub> 367–368 and AHW. 1477b for examples in other OB omina compendia.

omina, the last predicate of the protases written *ú-ši/ZI* may stand for the Pres. or the Pret.: *šumma sippi šumēl bāb [ekallum šilum iplušma ana ....] ú-ši* ‘If [a rent pierces] the wing on the left side of the [palace] gate and comes out (it is an omen of Būr-Sin)’ (YOS 10, 26 II:52, text and translation according to Goetze 1947:261, where the restoration is justified); *šumma martum (EŠ) šrum appam im-ši-ma rēssa ipluš-ma ú-ši* ‘Wenn Gewebe die Spitze der Gallenblase verbirgt (?), ihr “Kopf” sich aber hindurchbohrt und heraustritt (Leberomen Šarrukīn’s)’ (Riemschneider 1965, 130:16).<sup>17</sup>

- (14) *erēbum* ‘to enter, to return, to arrive’: the SC does not seem to be attested in the corpus, though the verb is definitely telic and perhaps punctual in some of its readings. It is well known that *tārum* ‘to return’ has no SC.<sup>18</sup>

The reason why these motion verbs make no or little use of the SC may be that the respective situations of movement (even *tārum* ‘to return’ with its inbuilt endpoint) form no pragmatically salient (or “visible”) resultative phases. Inspection of the liver of sacrificial animals and similar still objects is an exceptional case in which a visually observed “picture” is all that matters; therefore a present-time *waši* is used in these texts to code situations simultaneous with the moment of observation.

### 1. An analysis of an OB verbs list

In view of these facts, it is important to get exact data on what kinds of verbs build the SC most and least often and to look at the grammatical sensitivity of the SC tokens belonging to different semantic fields. It was difficult to take care at once of all the verbs attested in OB and OA, therefore I decided to limit the study lexically to some 130 common OB verbs which I selected from the glossary of Huehnergard 1997 according to the criterion of their frequency; I chose AbB 1–14, minor published OB collections (e. g. AS 22, ABIM and Goetze 1958), and part of the OB Mari letters (mostly ARM 1–6 and 10) as the main corpus, using other data (both OB and OA) only if they look important in one way or other. The rationale of this choice is an attempt to concentrate (as much as our sources allow) on everyday verbs and meanings, excluding (or singling

<sup>17</sup> Metzler 2002 provides examples of extispicy protases wherein both the Pret. and the Pres. appear as the last predicates preceded by Preterites (cf. p. 66ff., 162).

<sup>18</sup> The motion verb *wārum* does not build the SC either, yet its basic meaning may be an atelic one ‘to advance.’ This question will be discussed in due course below. Note that according to GAG 126f. *alākum* is also basically atelic.

out as such) technical usages of law, administration, commerce, divination, and other practices that are associated with special lexical and in certain cases grammatical features.

This decision led to the exclusion of certain well-known verbs that are hardly quotidian in OB letters, as e. g. *banûm* ‘to form,’ *rehûm* ‘to copulate’ and *sapâhûm* ‘to scatter.’

Verbs that are suspected to picture the respective situations as atelic processes (cf. GAG 126 f and Loesov 2005:136–142) are included in the list mostly if they do build the SC, i. e. deviate from the assumed rule of thumb. Thus, *amârum* ‘to see,’ *alâkum* ‘to go, move along, walk,’ *kullum* ‘to hold’ are not considered, since it is well known that their SC is either unattested or shows up very rarely and in non-trivial senses. “Prefixing statives,” among which there are basic lexical items *ibašši*, *izzaz*, *išu*, and *īde*, are of course not included.

The entries are arranged alphabetically by roots, the glosses serve only for orientation. **P** stands for “contextually passive meaning,” **A** stands for “contextually active meaning,” trans. = “transitive use.” Frequency evaluations are common-sense and somewhat impressionistic: “rare” usually means ‘one to five tokens’ if the verb in question is very common in OB,<sup>19</sup> “frequent” means ‘ten tokens or more,’ “common” stands for a higher frequency than “frequent.” Wherever textual references are easily supplied from the dictionaries, they may be adduced very selectively. I record the availability and basic meanings of deverbal nomina that display the morphological pattern of the “verbal adjective” (VA). The symbol ↓ introduces occasional comments that anticipate the analysis of the entire evidence in the discussion chapter.

(1) *agârum* ‘to hire.’

No SC; VA subst. *agrûm* ‘hireling.’

(2) *aḥâzum* ‘to seize.’

SC **A** trans. is rare, only within the phrase ‘to have wife’  
AbB 3, 2:11; 9, 15:21; CH § 166:67. No VA.

(3) *šūhuzum* ‘to make hold.’

SC is attested only within two idiomatic expressions: **P** PN  
*šūhuz* ‘PN is liable’ OB Susa s. CAD A<sub>1</sub> 182 f; **A** ‘PN has a claim’  
*anaḥina* AbB 1, 74: 12, 16; s. CAD A<sub>1</sub> 182 g; with acc. AS 22  
No. 26:10.<sup>20</sup> No VA.

<sup>19</sup> Informally, “common” usually means that CAD has a sub-entry (or sub-entries) for OB letters and documents with dozens of attestations.

<sup>20</sup> Whiting offers a different interpretation, which is perhaps less cogent.

(4) *akālum* ‘to eat; to have usufruct of.’

SC **A** ‘receives victuals’ is rare in OB: [*in*]a *mimma annīm* [*a*]k-la-ku ‘I am entitled to the use of all this’ (AS 22 No. 26:5); frequent in OA: [*u*]šbat ak-lā-at u paššat ‘she shall live, eat and be anointed’ (Albayrak 2004, 12:14f.);<sup>21</sup> emārū (lū) ak-lu ‘(let) the donkeys get fodder’ Prag I 718:25; BIN 6, 71:13’; 121:17; ATHE 46:18, 23. VA *aklum* ‘eaten, consumed.’

↓ In OB letters and legal documents, the common vehicle of this sense is the Pres., e. g. *eqlam* ... *i-ik-ka-al* ‘he supports himself with this field’ (AbB 4, 79:19, and *passim* in Hammurapi-letters).

(5) *apālum* ‘to answer; to pay.’

SC is rare. **P** *kašbam a-pi-il* ‘he was paid the money’ (JCS 11 106 No. 1:12); *a-pil* he has been paid (Wiseman 1953 No. 8:17); **A** *šumma 2 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR lā a-pi-il* ‘if ... 2 shekels silver do not constitute a satisfactory payment’ (AbB 10, 122:18f.); *ina mimma ša išū* ... PN *a-pi-il* ‘he is liable to PN (the creditor) with everything he owns’ (MDP 24, 345:6–10, OB Susa); s. CAD A<sub>2</sub> 157b. VA *aplum* ‘late.’

(6) *b/wabālu* ‘to bring, to carry.’

No SC, no VA.

(7) *balātum* ‘to live.’

SC ‘is/will be alive,’ frequent and productive for all three persons. VA *baltum* ‘living, alive.’

↓ SC is probably semantically deadjectival.

(8) *baqārum* ‘to claim.’

SC is rare. **P** *kunukkātunu ba-aq-ra kunuk mannim-mi immalḫar* ‘(if) your seals are contested, whose seals can be acceptable?’ (AbB 11, 90:28f.); *ba-aq-ra-ku* ‘je suis l’objet d’accusations’ (ARM 28, 63:33). **A** *ba-aq-ra-ta* ‘You claim (a garden)’ (ABIM 8:4); *ša* PN *ba-aq-ru-šu* ‘(a field) that PN claims’ (AbB 8, 3:6), cf. AbB 4, 60:6; VA *baqrum* subst. ‘claim.’

↓ Note A.ŠÀ PN *la ba-aq-ra-ku-ma* ‘I do not claim the field of PN!’ (cited from a manuscript in CAD P 131a, no translation): this sentence looks like a legally binding “performative” statement.

(9) *burrum* ‘to prove.’

SC **P** ‘has been convicted/established’ is frequent in OB, cf. e. g. YOS 8, 159:6; TCL 11, 245:34; PBS 5, 100 IV:11; AbB 2, 172:4; 14, 34:3’; 74:22.

(10) *batāqum* ‘to cut off.’

SC **P** is rare in OB, cf. AbB 5, 273:3’. VA *batqum* ‘poor’; ‘low’ (said of price).

<sup>21</sup> I thank Dr. Kouwenberg for alerting me about this example.

↓ VA is often used “in the Stative” in OA, e. g. *šumma šimūm ammakam ba-ti-iq* ‘if prices are low there’ (BIN 4, 12: 23), cf. also the adverbial use of the VA in the “absolute form” within the OA idiom *batīq wattur* ‘at any price’ (CAD B 166b)

(11) *damāqum* ‘to be good.’

SC is semantically deadjectival; a quasi-adverbial *damiq* ‘is good/OK’ is attested in AbB some 15 times, cf. e. g. *da-mi-iq ša ana PN tašpurī* ‘What you wrote to PN is just fine!’ (AbB 12, 87: 6f.). Other 3<sup>rd</sup> person forms, agreeing with their nominal subjects in number and gender, are very rare; cf. *šunātūya madiš da-am-qá<sub>SC 3fp</sub>* ‘my dreams are very good’ (AbB 11, 17:24 f.). The forms of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> persons are not attested.

↓ Note a syntactically unusual OA token *da-am-qá-ni-ku-um* ‘les choses vont bien pour toi!’ (CCT 3, 8b:26; translation after LAPO 19, 260).

(12) *danānum* ‘to be strong.’

The semantically deadjectival SC is attested no less than ten times in AbB, it is also frequent in Mari. Only 3<sup>rd</sup> person forms are used, they mostly have a lexicalized meaning ‘is/are hard,’ cf. e. g. *awātum da-an-na* ‘the situation is serious’ (AbB 9, 83:26).

(13) *egūm* ‘to be careless.’

No SC. VA subst. *egū* ‘negligent person’ in SB lex.

(14) *ekēmum* ‘to take away.’

SC is used as a technical term ‘is stunted, atrophied’ in OB extispicy (see No. 4 in the Introduction); VA SB *eqmu* ‘taken away,’ rare.

(15) *elūm* ‘to go up.’

No SC. VA *elūm* ‘high’; from OAKK on.

↓ In OB ext. protases the prefixing tenses rather than the SC are used in the descriptive sense (s. CAD E 120 2<sup>o</sup>), same in math. texts (s. CAD E 120 6<sup>o</sup>). Kouwenberg 1998:183 suggests that *elūm* ‘is both a stative verb with the meaning “to be/become high” ..., and a fientive verb “to go up”.’ Why then no SC?

(16) *emēdum* ‘to lean against; impose.’

SC **P** is rare: DUMU.MEŠ PN *ša elišu išū anāku-ma e-em-de-e-ku* ‘I have been charged with the debt which he owes to the sons of PN’ (AbB 6, 70:19 ff.). VA *emdu* ‘auferlegt’ jB (AHw. 221a).

(17) *epēšum* ‘to do.’

Resultative SC **P** is rare in OB letters: *awātum šī kī ep-še-et* ‘(send a word) on how it has been done’ (AbB 13, 122:2<sup>o</sup>), cf. AbB 8, 112:22; 3, 65:3; VA *epšum* ‘made, built.’

- ↓ For OB *lemniš epšēku* / OA *lamniš epšāku* ‘I am treated badly’ as denoting a present-time habitual situation s. Loesov 2005:138.
- (18) *erēbum* ‘enter.’  
SC is not attested. VA subst. *erbum* ‘income.’
- (19) *erēšum* ‘to cultivate (a field).’  
SC **P**: *šumma* A.ŠÀ *šaddagdam lā e-ri-iš-ma nadi* ‘Wenn das Feld im vorigen Jahre nicht bestellt worden ist und brachliegt’ (AbB 2, 92:15f.); A.ŠÀ *ša rabîm e-ri-iš ū nadi* ‘(send me word, whether) the field of the noble is cultivated or lies fallow’ (Goetze 1958 No. 10:6f.); cf. also AbB 13, 64:24; 6: 114:24. SC **A**: PN MU 5.KAM *e-ri-iš* ‘PN had cultivated (the field) for five years (and then PN<sub>2</sub> took it by force)’ (AbB 4, 160:27’); [išt]u MU 10.KAM PN *eqlam šuāti e-ri-iš* ‘PN has cultivated this field for ten years’ (AbB 3, 93:11’–14’); VA *eršum* ‘drilled’; subst. ‘drilled field.’  
↓ **P** tokens are frequent, unlike the **A** ones.
- (20) *esēlum* ‘to assign.’  
SC **P**: ERÍN.ḪIA *ša es-ḫa-am* ‘the workers that have been assigned to me’ (AbB 14, 167:7); cf. also AbB 4, 11:17; 35:7, 13; 5, 136:6; 6, 6:10; 7, 110: 17; ARM 2, 39:48. All the attestations known to the present author are referred to. VA<sup>2</sup> subst. *išlu* ‘allocation’ post-OB.
- (21) *etēqum* ‘to pass along.’  
No SC in OB letters. OB ext. texts use the prefixing tenses (s. CAD E 289 **d**); an exception is perhaps *kunukkum imittam e-te-eq* ‘processus<sup>2</sup> extends to the right’ (YOS 10, 8:20, s. CAD *ibid.*). No VA.
- (22) *ezēbum* ‘to leave.’  
SC **P** is rare: *ša ana šipRūtîm iz-bu-ni-ki-im* ‘(as to the bronze utensils) which have been left to you as a pledge’ (AbB 2, 93:7); *ḫišam ša ana šitat kašpîm iz-bu-ši irišūšîma* ‘they asked her (to produce) the binding agreement which had been made in her favor for the remainder of the money’ (TCL 1, 157:34, a legal doc. quoted according to CAD E 422b); cf. also MHET 2/6, 882:17. No VA in OB, unless *izbum* ‘misbirth’ is counted as a subst. VA.
- (23) *gamārum* ‘to bring/come to an end.’  
SC **P** (or anticausative) is frequent in letters, e. g. *lēm eqlîm ša awâtūšu lā ga-am-ra* ‘news concerning the field over which the negotiations have not been concluded’ (AbB 12, 18:13); and often with *awātum* as subject, e. g. *awātum ga-am-ra* ‘der Prozeß ist beendet’ (AbB 5, 213: 29). SC **A** is frequent within the legal phrase *zîzū gamrū* ‘they have divided everything,’ e. g.

TCL 1, 196:7, and *passim* in MHET 2, parts 2 and 3, often with a direct object whose referent is a piece of real estate (e. g. MHET 2/2, 226:1–5).

(24) *ḥabālum* ‘to harm, wrong.’

SC **P** is frequent in letters, e. g. A.ŠĀ-šū ù <sup>GIŠ</sup>KIRI<sub>6</sub>-šū *ḥa-bi-il* ‘he has been unjustly deprived of his field and orchard’ (AbB 13, 43:20); *ḥa-ab-la-a-ku* AbB 10, 181:14f. SC **A**: *ḥa-ab-la-an-ni-a-ti* ‘(PN) has wronged us’ (AbB 2,74:12); É *ḥa-ab-la-an-ni* ‘he has unlawfully deprived me of my house’ (AbB 2, 111:13). **A** is also frequent. VA adj. and subst. ‘wronged (person).’

(25) *ḥabātum* ‘to rob.’

SC **P** is frequent in letters, e. g. *ḥa-ab-ta-a-ku* ‘I have been robbed’ (AbB 10, 81:6’), *ḥa-ab-ta-ku issi* ‘She cried: “I am being stolen!”’ AbB 1, 27:17;<sup>22</sup> *ana mīnim ḥa-bi-it* ‘Why is he being robbed?’ (AS 22, 24:12f.).

(26) *ḥalāqum* ‘to disappear.’

SC intrans. ‘has disappeared’ is well attested in letters, Laws of Ešnunna and CH. There are no less than ten tokens in AbB 1–14, e. g. PN *ḥa-li-iq-ma ina* GN ... *wašīb* ‘PN has left (the ranks) and stays ... in GN’ (AbB 6, 171:6–10). VA *ḥalqum* ‘lost; fugitive.’

(27) *ḥašāḥum* ‘to desire, need.’

SC **A** trans. ‘X<sub>pers</sub> needs Y<sub>acc</sub>’ is common in letters; there are no less than 15 tokens in AbB 1–14, e. g. *ḥa-aš-ḥa-ku* ‘I need (baked bricks)’ (AbB 12, 23:5). VA *ḥašḥum* ‘one who needs, needy.’

↓ See further Loesov 2005:137f. for some examples and discussion of the relationship between the present-time SC and the Pres. of this verb. Note that no **P** token ‘is needed’ seems to be attested.

(28) *ḥepūm* ‘to smash, destroy.’

SC **P** is rare, *ḥepi* usually appears with a technical legal meaning ‘(a document) is invalid,’ see discussion under No. 5 in the Introduction. VA *ḥepūm* ‘broken.’

(29) *ḥerūm* ‘to dig.’

SC **P** is rare: *itteḥri ... ul ḥi-ri-a-at* ‘(one canal) has been dug, (the other canal) has not been dug’ (AbB 2, 5:4f). VA *ḥerūm* ‘excavated.’

<sup>22</sup> The comparison of the ways the direct speech is introduced in these two passages shows that the “active-voice” translation of Kraus in AbB 1, 27 ‘(die Sklavin) habe ich mit Gewalt *bemeistert*’ is wrong. It is the slave-girl who speaks. There is some chance that here the SC *ḥabtāku* renders the ongoing present: in Loesov 2005 I tried to show that in certain cases the SC may express this meaning.

- (30)
- kabātum*
- ‘to be heavy, important.’

SC is semantically deadjectival; in OB letters it appears mostly within the phrase *qaqqad-ī-ka kabit* ‘I am honoured / you are honoured’ (e. g. AbB 3, 22:31; 7, 138:19); cf. also *še’um ina bitim ka-bi-it* ‘there is enough barley in the house’ (AbB 8: 148, 10); *maruṣ ka-bi-it* ‘he is seriously ill’ (Goetze 1958 No. 43:16). VA *kabtum* ‘heavy; important.’

- (31)
- kalûm*
- ‘to hold, detain.’

SC with **P**, **A** and intr. readings is common in letters, e. g. *tuppam ana PN šūbilam-ma anāku annikīam lā ka-li-a-[ku]* ‘send a letter to PN so that I am not detained here (anymore)!’ (AbB 7, 4:18); *ana šūtātim nīpūssu ka-li-a-at* ‘there is a person kept as his pledge for the rest (of the barley)’ (AbB 6, 208:7f.); *ištu U<sub>4</sub> 5.KAM LÚ.MEŠ ka-li-ku* ‘I have been detaining (these) men for five days (here)’ (ARM 2, 133:9f.); *inūma anāku ina dannatim ša bēliya ka-li-a-ku redū bīti imašša’ū* ‘While I stay (or ‘am detained’) in the fortress of my lord, soldiers pillage my household’ (AbB 8, 18:7); *ištu annikīam ka-li-a-ku 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR ... leqeāku* ‘since I stay here, I have received ... three shekels silver’ (Goetze 1958 No. 13:21–25; the context of the letter and the archive unambiguously suggests the intr. reading). VA *kalû* ‘held back, detained’ M/NB.

↓ The Pres. is used along with the SC to render the **A** sense, see Loesov 2005:141.

- (32)
- kamāsum*
- ‘to gather, bring in, complete.gather, collect, assemble, bring in, complete gather, collect, assemble, bring in, complete.’

SC **P** is attested some ten times in AbB, mostly in agricultural contexts, e. g. *ina erēšim ka-mi-is* ‘(das Feld ist) fertig bestellt’ (AbB 5, 212:9); *ina zarēm ka-mi-is* ‘the winnowing (of the barley of PN) is finished’ (AbB 12, 31:4). Note also a descriptive usage in ext.: *šumma izbum qaqqassu ana ḥallišu ka-mi-is* (YOS 10, 56 II:31). No VA.

- (33)
- kanākum*
- ‘to seal.’

SC **P** is attested some ten times in AbB and well represented in other OB epistolary corpora. Its meaning is either literal ‘is/was sealed’ (e. g. AbB 7, 161:4) or bureaucratic ‘(a field) is/was assigned (to s. o.)’ (e. g. AbB 4, 79:17). VA *kankum* ‘sealed.’

- (34)
- kunnukum*
- ≈
- kanākum*
- .

SC **P** found once: *ša ku-un-nu-ku* ‘(das Haus), das versiegelt ist’ (AbB 4, 146:7). No VA.

- (35)
- kānum*
- ‘to be firm, true.’

Deadjectival SC is rare in OB letters: *awātūšunu ki-na ū sarrā mannum lū īde* ‘who knows whether their words are true

or false?’ (Eidem–Læssøe 2001, No. 920:16), cf. also AS 22, 31:11; ARM 10, 156:25; it is well attested in OB literary texts and most probably belongs to the elevated style, as can be felt also in the epistolary passages referred to in this entry. VA *kīnum* ‘true; reliable.’

(36) *kunnum* ‘to establish as true, confirm, convict.’

SC **P** is rare in OB letters, cf. *i-ppīšu ku-un* ‘it is confirmed with his own words’ (AbB 5, 156:14). No VA.

(37) *kašādum* ‘to reach; suffice.’

SC **P** is rare: *ul ina pilši ka-aš-da-a-ku* ‘Ich bin nicht bei einem Einbruch gefaßt worden’ (AbB 2, 83, 32), and possibly AbB 8, 155:16’. **A** is common in letters and has two well attested lexical meanings:

(a) A non-motion meaning ‘to be sufficient’ (cf. CAD K 275), e. g. *ana mīnim ka-ši-id* ‘what (this amount of barley) is sufficient for?’ (AbB 1, 72:17); *awīlum ...ul ka-ši-id* ‘this man is not adequate (for the task)’ (3, 73:9ff.); *eqlum ... ul ka-ši-id* ‘the field ... is not ready (or ‘large enough’)’ (12, 16:7f.); same kind of meaning is attested also in 14, 179:19; 3, 22:11; 10, 17:16; 12, 91:23. This is a present-time stative (or “descriptive”) usage.

(b) A motion meaning ‘to come’ (usually to the addressee), the addressee as the goal of motion being always referred to by the acc. bound pronouns *-ka/-ki*.<sup>23</sup> This one is a future-time usage: coming is anterior (in the way of a *futurum exactum*) to some reference point in the speaker’s future, as in the following example: *ana U<sub>4</sub> 2.KAM ka-aš-da-ka* ‘within two days I will reach you’ (AbB 12, 42:14), cf. also *ana U<sub>4</sub> 10.KAM ka-aš-da-ki* (2, 135:4), and see 8, 90:12; 13, 87:9; 12, 129:20; in AbB 3, 48:33 *awātum É.GAL ka-aš-da* ‘the news will have reached the palace’ the endpoint (presumably, the location of the writer) is expressed by a noun in the acc.

The SC of this verb has also a third (relatively rarer) meaning in OB letters, ‘to arrive’ (of a moment in time), as in *ebūru ka-ši-id-na-ti* ‘die Ernte(zeit) ist für uns angebrochen’ (AbB 3, 49:12), and note *šumma ... ka-ši-id* ‘if ... it has happened’ (AbB 3, 2:20f.).

VA *kašdum* ‘successful; sufficient.’

<sup>23</sup> Note that Kouwenberg 2002: 225 f. correctly observes that *kašādum* as a motion verb with a 2<sup>nd</sup> person goal usually takes accusative bound pronouns in AbB, while in ARM it takes the ventive (or the ventive + a 2<sup>nd</sup> person dative pronoun).

## References

- Albayrak 2004      Albayrak, I. "She Will Live, Eat and Be Anointed Together with Them *ušbat aklat u paššat ištišunu*". // Dercksen, J. G. (ed.). *Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen*. Leiden, Pp. 9–20.
- Cohen 1984      Cohen, D. *La phrase nominale et l'évolution du système verbal en sémitique. Etudes de syntaxe historique*. Leuven–Paris.
- Eidem–Læssøe 2001      Eidem, J.; Læssøe, J. *The Shemshara Archives I*. Copenhagen.
- George 2003      George, A. R. *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*. Oxford.
- Goetze 1942      Goetze A. "The So-called Intensive of the Semitic Languages". *JAOS* 62:1–8.
- Goetze 1947      Goetze, A. "Historical Allusions in Old Babylonian Omen Texts". *JCS* 1:253–265.
- Goetze 1958      Goetze, A. *Fifty OB Letters from Harmal*. Reprinted from *Sumer*. Vol. XIV. Baghdad.
- Hecker 1966      Hecker, K. *Die Keilschrifttexte der Universitätsbibliothek Giessen*. Giessen.
- Hopper–Thompson 1980      Hopper, P. J.; Thompson, S. A. "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse". *Language* 56:251–299.
- Huehnergard 1997      Huehnergard, J. *A Grammar of Akkadian* (HSS 45). Atlanta.
- Ichisar 1981      Ichisar, M. *Les archives cappadociennes du marchand Indilum*. Paris.
- Kouwenberg 1997      Kouwenberg, N. J. C. *Gemination in the Akkadian Verb* (SSN 32). Assen.
- Kouwenberg 1998      Kouwenberg, N. J. C. Review of Buccellati 1996. *BiOr* 55:172–185.
- Kouwenberg 2002      Kouwenberg, N. J. C. Ventive, Dative and Allative in Old Babylonian. *ZA* 92:200–240.
- Kraus 1958      Kraus, F. R. *Ein Edikt des Königs Ammi-Šaduqa von Babylon*. Leiden.
- Loesov 2005      Loesov, S. Akkadian Sentences about the Present Time (I). *B&B* 2:101–148.
- Metzler 2002      Metzler, K. A. *Tempora in altbabylonischen literarischen Texten*. (AOAT 279). Münster.
- Riemschneider 1965      Riemschneider, K. K. Ein altbabylonischer Gallenomen-text. *ZA* 52:125–145.
- Salonen 1962      Salonen, E. *Untersuchungen zur Schrift und Sprache des Altbabylonischen von Susa* (StOr 27/1). Helsinki.
- Scheil 1902      Scheil, V. *Une saison de fouilles à Sippar (Abou Habba), janvier–avril 1894*. Cairo.
- Wiseman 1953      Wiseman, D. J. *The Alalakh Tablets*. London.