

Sh. Izre'el & E. Cohen. *Literary Old Babylonian* (LW/M 81) München: LINCOM, 2004. X + 119 pp.

Literary Old Babylonian (henceforth *LOB*) is a new experiment in theoretical description of Akkadian, so in this respect *LOB* stands in the tradition of Reiner 1966 and Buccellati 1996. Sh. Izre'el (= Sh. I.) has written the chapters on the writing system, phonology and morphology, the chapter on the syntax is authored by E. Cohen (= E. C.).¹

The authors promise 'to share their perspectives on the structure of Akkadian with the widest possible audience [...] in order to suggest to general linguistic community that an ancient Semitic language has something to contribute to the general study of language no less than any other language, ancient or modern' (p. iii). To make the presentation available to general linguistic readership, the authors supplied quoted texts with either detailed morpheme-by-morpheme or easier-to-process 'syntactic' glosses. Semitists are invited to discover 'a rather unconventional look at Akkadian' (p. iii).

The corpus of *LOB* is restricted to OB texts containing mythological narratives; all (or almost all of) these texts are written in verse. Therefore for the benefit of the lay audience it would be better to term the language of this corpus in a straightforward way 'the language of OB epic narratives' rather than '*literary* OB'. According to the common linguistic usage, 'literary language' is *written* language as distinct from spoken one, most typically in lexicon and syntax. Now the OB literary standard is best represented by the Laws of Hammurapi (minus their non-legal frame) and Hammurapi correspondence, while the corpus of *LOB* is known to deviate from the written norm in a number of ways (see von Soden's HyEp).² Study of *poetic* language will usually build on descriptions of the standard form of a language. From the structuralist point of view, otherwise en-

¹ In this review, Kogan's primary responsibility is Phonology, while Loesov is mainly responsible for Morphology and Syntax.

² The language of OB law codices is called 'everyday OB' on p. 62. This is not quite so. The Laws of Hammurapi display not only 'artificial' syntax and verbal semantics, but also a very careful treatment of mimation on nouns, while in numerous OB documents older than the Laws of Hammurapi mimation is used inconsistently.

dorsed in *LOB*, poetic language has to display some systemic differences from the 'natural' code: usually, it is a question of additional restrictions superimposed on the spoken language; nonetheless *LOB* does not pay attention to this problem (see below comments on the word stress and metrics). One also wonders whether the corpus is rich enough to allow a coherent description of OB grammar, which is the actual ambition of *LOB*.

Writing system and phonology

Vowel quantity and stress

Pp. 5, 10–11, 31. In my opinion, Sh. I.'s interpretation of the plene spelling is erroneous in some of its basic assumptions.³ As a result, several important aspects of Akkadian phonology (such as the nature of vocalic length and stress) turn out to be understudied and/or misinterpreted.

'Plene spelling is optional' (p. 5). This is, perhaps, the most crucial mistake since in fact **plene spelling is not optional** in Akkadian orthography. Contracted triphthongs in an open word-final syllable are always written plene: it would be surprising to find a single example of *šamû* 'heaven' or *nadû* 'they are cast' written without an extra *û*-sign (accordingly, statements like '*Occasionally* [italics added] this difference is indicated in script' on p. 10 and 'Variation between plene and short spelling occurs with all types of vocalic length' *ibid.* are quite misleading). Already this well-defined and numerically important positional restriction would require, in a methodologically sound descriptive approach, a formulation like 'plene spelling is obligatory in some positions and optional elsewhere.' Indeed, other positions where plene spellings may (or tend to) appear are subject to irregularities and it is only a careful statistical investigation that will allow us to judge competently about whether there exists any orthographic (*ergo*, phonological) distinction between, e.g., *išām* 'he bought' and *išām* 'he will buy'. The *LOB* corpus would be a convenient starting point for such an investigation and it is lamentable that it was not carried out in the framework of the book under review.

³ A similar attitude towards plene writing can be found in Greenstein 1977 (notably, p. 85: 'because plene writings are inconsistently used, it is unlikely that they originated in order to indicate a phonetic feature such as vocalic length or stress'). Admittedly, this does not undermine the merits of Greenstein's extremely valuable study providing many important insights into the problems to be discussed below.

If plene spelling is used with full consistency in at least one position, it is highly unlikely that this phenomenon is due to random distribution. Accordingly, both 'phonemic distinction' and 'difference in pronunciation' between \bar{V} and \hat{V} are inevitable at least in this position (*contra* Sh. I., p. 11). Vague references to 'historical change in syllabic patterns' or 'established traditions in poetic versification' can alter nothing about this fundamental fact.⁴ That \bar{V} and \hat{V} vowels **could** on some occasions be spelled plene is completely irrelevant in this respect: \bar{V} and \hat{V} **could** on some occasions be pronounced similarly to \hat{V} , but the latter was always pronounced in its specific way, at least in certain positions. A systematic differentiation between various types of extra vowel signs (-u, -ú and -u₄) in some of the OB lexical lists from Nippur (as described in Westenholz 1991) lends further support to the assumption that the use of plene spelling was both intentional and meaningful.

As long as it is agreed that the contrast between defective and plene spellings is phonemic in some positions, phonetic realization of this phonological opposition (specific vocalic quality/quantity vs. stress) is by far less important for a dead language like Akkadian. What is important is that one of the two features was inevitably phonemic and it is impossible to reject both as Sh. I. (pp. 11, 31) seems to do. This means, *inter alia*, that the traditional circumflex notation cannot be abandoned as a useless archaism.

Sh. I. displays a strange attitude towards accentuation problems. The very point of departure ('prosodic differences is not a component of the written medium,' 'prosody is, of course, extra-systemic to a written language')⁵ is surprising. Elaborate systems of accentual notation were developed and transmitted through centuries for many 'written' languages (from Biblical Hebrew to Sanskrit). Why should we consider accentuation as 'extra-systemic' to such languages is unclear to me. Although the cuneiform writing produced no *gravis* and *circumflex*, I wonder why should we *a priori* reject the possibility that an extra vocalic sign was used as an

⁴ Are these statements meant to suggest that plene writings represent historical orthography (so Buccellati 1996:21)? In my opinion, everything we know about historical spellings in ancient Mesopotamia (irregularity, high degree of variation, geographic and chronological differences) militates against including spellings like *ša-mu-ú/ša-me-e* into this category. Moreover, the history behind such spellings is not long: vocalic contractions underlying most of the extra-long vowels do not antedate the OB period.

⁵ In the latter case, with a reasonable restriction ('especially when there is no punctuation').

accentual marker (especially if—as in *LOB*—no alternative function is ascribed to this practice).

‘Observed circumflexed vowels in verse-final position in place of trochees ... are scanty in our corpus and are outweighed by other, non-trochaic forms at verse end. Therefore, one cannot draw any solid conclusions that rely on alleged verse-final trochees.’ This statement is puzzling. As Sh. I. mentions just a few lines above (p. 30), ‘poetic lines (verses) have a strong tendency to end with a trochee.’ This is indeed a widely recognized fact and, as rightly emphasized in Greenstein 1977:46ff., one of the principal premises for the traditional understanding of the Akkadian stress patterns. Why then ‘alleged?’ And what exactly are the mysterious ‘other, non trochaic forms at verse end?’ Happily, verse-final trochees have been the subject of several studies by outstanding Assyriologists (Hecker 1974, von Soden 1981), whose results are well known: non-trochaic verse-endings are a rarity in Akkadian poetry. A relatively long list of such exceptional examples adduced in Hecker 1974:102ff. has been subject to a critical analysis by von Soden, who rightly observes that many of them are fully or partly unreliable (but even if all of Hecker’s examples are accepted, their numerical proportion never exceeds 11% for a given poetic text, von Soden 1981:172).⁶ Now it turns out that the most substantial group of true exceptions (Hecker 1974:104) consists of forms ending in an extra-long vowels. As pointed out in Greenstein 1977:48–9, this picture does not contradict but rather complements the

⁶ Von Soden’s criticism is generally justified although some of important issues raised by Hecker did not attract his attention. On the one hand, Hecker claims that ‘ergibt sich auch in der Prosa für die vorletzte Silbe des Satzes eine beträchtliche Häufung von Längen’ (p. 108). If this claim is correct, the trochaic ending could hardly be considered a hallmark of poetic speech. However, statistics adduced in fn. 3 on this page of Hecker’s study do not readily invite such a conclusion (thus, in AbB 1 100 Hecker finds 12 long and 10 short penultima, a proportion hardly conceivable for any poetic text). At the same time, Hecker believes that ‘jedenfalls sind Wortformen mit langer Pänultima gegenüber solchen mit kurzer keineswegs in einer entsprechenden statistischen Überzahl’ (*ibid.*). In view of the fact that there is at least one important factor—the vocalic syncope—that raises considerably the number of Akkadian words with trochaic endings, the validity of this claim is open to doubt. Before a comprehensive statistical investigation is carried out, it may be interesting to observe that in the first twenty paragraphs of the Laws of Hammurapi I was able to find 31 non-trochaic forms only (repetitions not counted). In nine of them extra-long final vowels are involved (*iddāk, nadû, iddû, iqbû, enêm, řahâm, rugummê, rugummâm, kussê, purussâm*) and in five cases the last syllable is also extra-heavy (*uktîn, idîn, iriâb, ařâm, iřtâm*).

trochee rule:⁷ it means that $-\hat{V}$ could be perceived as metrically identical to $-\sim$. The simplest explanation is that the extra-long vowel was synchronically interpreted as having the same metrical weight as the combination $-\sim$, namely three morae (Kogan 2004; a similar interpretation in morphophonemic terms can be found in Greenstein 1977:48–9). The main difficulty with this approach arises from the fact that also non-contracted triphthongs seem to be tolerated in the verse-final position (like *ša-di-a-am* in GilgSch2 5, *ra-bi-a* in AH I 35, *ni-qi-a-am* in AH III v 36). In von Soden 1981:173 such forms are stressed on the second syllable, which can be justified only if the respective vowels are thought to be long (*šadíam*, *niqíam* etc.). The next step is, inevitably, a reconstruction like **šadiy-am*, **niqiy-am* etc.

To what degree do the verse-final trochees bear on the accentuation problems? That the penultimate syllable of the verse-final word is heavy ($-\sim$) does not automatically mean that it is stressed ($\hat{\sim}$), although chances that the two features coincide are rather high (Greenstein 1977:50). Yet one wonders why disyllabic forms like *ilam*, *damiq* or *sukun* (obviously stressed on the first syllable and therefore ‘trochaic’ from the accentual point of view) are so rare in the verse-final position.⁸

The ‘sibilants’ of Old Babylonian

P. 10. Sh. I.’s exposition of the affricate hypothesis—a theory which has played a crucial role in recent phonological study of Akkadian and Semitic in general—is marred by several fundamental errors, possibly due to the author’s insufficient understanding of his (unnamed) sources, presumably Goetze 1937, Goetze 1958,⁹ GAG 35–6 (W. Sommerfeld).

⁷ Against von Soden 1981:174–5 who tries to get rid of such examples (exceptional within his approach) by introducing *ad hoc* accentual rules. His accentuation in such cases (*íddû*, *múššî* etc.) is both arbitrary (why a form accented as *šadíá* just one page above should become *šádâ* after the contraction took place?) and circular as it depends not so much on the (proven on other grounds) trochaic rule but on unproven assumptions concerning the number of unstressed syllables between the stressed ones (cf. Kuryłowicz 1972:185–6).

⁸ A few exceptional examples are listed in Hecker 1974:103.

⁹ Most surprisingly, these and other studies by Goetze (whose importance for our understanding of the OB orthography and phonology are hard to overestimate) are not even mentioned in the bibliography of *LOB*. A few other bibliographic lacunae are no less perplexing (Hecker 1974, von Soden 1981, Kouwenberg 1997), to mention only some of the studies most crucial for the topics discussed in *LOB*.

First and foremost, the ‘process of simplification ... thought to have changed the character of these three phones to fricative’ affects only *s* [c] and not *š* [ç] and *z* [ʒ]. Obviously enough, *za*, *zu*, *zi* (as well as *ša*) were written with ZV signs throughout the history of Akkadian (the situation with *ši* and *šu* is more complicated but at any rate totally different from that of *sa*, *su* and *si*). Accordingly, it is only for **one** of the three phones (*s* [c]) that positive evidence concerning loss of affrication can be obtained.

Second, conditions determining loss vs. preservation of affrication are reversed in *LOB*: it was the word-medial non-geminated [c] that first shifted to [ç] whereas word-initial and word-medial geminated [c] did preserve its affricate pronunciation (contrast Sh. I.’s ‘a process of simplification ... first as allophones in word-initial position and when doubled, then in all positions’).

Third, more caution would be in order when the positional distribution of [c] and [ç] is said to be ‘a feature of Southern Babylonia’ (probably following Westenholz J. 1997:60, 80, 191). This distribution was originally discovered by Goetze (1937) in Codex Hammurapi (a text with no transparent Southern background).¹⁰ CH, as Goetze explicitly points out, differs in this respect from both Northern (SV for *s* throughout) and Southern (ZV for *s* throughout) orthographies (for a consistent application of this principle v. George 2003:160,¹¹ 272 and cf. already Goetze 1958:144). ‘Andere Texte und Textgruppen müssen noch untersucht werden’ (W. Sommerfeld in GAG 36), and before massive investigations of this kind are carried out every conclusion about the areal background of the [c]/[ç] alternation will be inevitably premature.

Finally, in his discussion of this alternation Sh. I. introduces a chronological dimension, although in an inconsistent way. On the one hand, it is stated that ‘this allographic variation is attested in full only in the earliest texts’ (exemplified by *Narām-Sîn and the Lord of Apišal*). On the other hand, several exceptions are thought to be attested in the Gilgamesh tablets from Pennsylvania and Yale (‘written by the same scribe as early as the 18th century BCE,’ i. e. quite early). The rather strange conclusion is that ‘during most of the period covered by our corpus, the simplification of the respective phonemes was prevalent.’ Besides the fact that neither

¹⁰ It is treated as a subvariant of the Northern orthography in Goetze 1958:144. For the same peculiarity in certain groups of Mari letters v. *ibid.* 146.

¹¹ V. *ibid.* 225 and 267 for different examples of mixed orthography. In general, George’s study is an exceptional and stimulating example of keen attention to orthographic problems in a work whose main subject is rather far from orthography.

GilgPY nor Ns are convenient illustrations of the orthographic rule in question,¹² it may be observed that nowhere in the book criteria by which early or late date should be ascribed to this or that *LOB* text are discussed (or at all mentioned). This makes extremely subjective every orthographic hypothesis which depends on chronological factors (the same applies to other sections of *LOB* where 'the space-time continuum' of the *LOB* corpus is referred to).¹³

Ibid. For the shift *-šl-* > *-ll-* already in OB v. GAG 38.

Pp. 28–9. Sh. I.'s presentation of the Northern Babylonian orthographic norm is fully misleading. As demonstrated in Goetze 1958, the characteristic feature of this norm is the ZV spelling of pronominal enclitics attached to words ending in dentals and sibilants (*bi-ZU* 'his house', *e-re-ZU* 'his farmer'). Sh. I. states quite the opposite ('in texts from northern schools, both strings are spelled with VS-SV syllabograms', 'ss with fricative pronunciation').

Sh. I.'s contention that 'these distinct spellings at morphemic boundaries are identical to spellings of similar strings within stems' is not justified: as is well known, it is precisely the restriction to *š*-enclitics that is one of the hallmarks of the process under discussion. The spelling IŠ-SI for 'he called' is irrelevant in this respect since the verb *šasû* belongs to those few lexemes which use SV series also within the Southern norm (Goetze 1958:140–1), which becomes clear from *iš-ta-si* in l. 143 of the Pennsylvania tablet (as rightly emphasized in George 2003:160).

Segmental length

'In addition to consonantal and vocalic phonemes, Akkadian possesses a length segment : with a phonemic status. [...] Depending on the environment, this phoneme assumes either vocalic or consonantal behavior' (p. 11). This theoretical decision is relevant mostly from the morphologi-

¹² That Ns 'follows the method encountered in the Code of Hammurapi and letters of Šamši-Adad I and his son' has been suggested by J. Westenholz (1997: 175). However, the only example of SV for word-medial non-geminated *s* adduced by Westenholz (and reproduced by Sh. I.) is *i-si-ru* in II.1', translated as 'they will surround' (i. e. [*išširū*]!) in Westenholz J. 1997:179 and 'they surrounded' ([*iširū*]) by Sh. I. As for GilgPY, it strictly follows the Southern norm (i. e. ZV for *s* throughout), so to say that these texts 'already attest to a few exceptions to this rule' is misleading.

¹³ Even if both texts in question may indeed be early, v. Westenholz J. 1997:175 for Ns and George 2003:161 for the rather complex problem of dating GilgPY.

cal point of view, i. e. it is important mainly for *LOB*'s description of OB morphemics. *LOB* does not pay much attention to shapes of primary nouns, which may exhibit both long vowels (e.g. *bāb*- 'door') and geminated consonants (e.g. *abull*- 'city gate'), therefore the assumed 'length segment' { : } features mostly as a morphological operation, namely (in traditional terms) lengthening of a vowel or gemination of a consonant. Thus *ilū* 'gods' is segmented in *LOB* into a morphemic string *il+:+u* *god+PL+NOM* (ex. 287). So, if we disregard 'morphophonological' length (as in *ākul* 'I ate', *ukīn* 'I established', or *šamū* 'heavens'), the problem boils down to the way we describe those non-concatenative morphological operations that have (according to the naive view) no independent segmental exponents. Consider German *Garten* ~ *Gärten* 'garden(s)' or English *house* [*haus*] (noun) ~ *house* [*hauz*] (verb). One could of course describe non-concatenative fronting operation *a* → *ä* and non-concatenative voicing operation *s* → *z* as *segmental morphemes* 'fronting' (forming plural) and 'voicing' (expressing conversion) respectively, but this kind of description looks far-fetched. As we will see below, the introduction of the length *segment* as a morphemic entity adds rather than lifts difficulties for morphemic analysis of OB. On p. 29, Sh. I. observes: 'The morphemic function of the length segment lends further support to the view that it be regarded as a segmental phoneme.' Conversely, if OB has no { : } segmental morpheme, we can easily get along without { : } as a *segmental* phoneme.

Comments on morphophonology

P. 12. Glottal stop is treated as a phoneme with two realizations (∅ and ?) here and elsewhere in *LOB*. What is missing is to what degree ? and ∅ are at all opposed to each other and in what positions—a problem whose importance extends far beyond the description of Akkadian (cf. Streck 1998:317, Kouwenberg 2003–4:91ff.).

P. 13. Gemination of *w* in forms like *i-wa-li-id-ma* [*iwwalid-ma*] can be ascertained by later spellings with *m* (v. plentiful examples in AHW. 1458).

P. 14. For a recent comprehensive examination of the initial plene spellings like *i-īp-pu-uš* (with important remarks on examples like *i-in-ka* and *a-aḥ-ḥi-i-ka*) v. Kouwenberg 2003–4.

P. 16. A comprehensive treatment of the *a/e* variation (*tuḥteppišunūti* vs. *uḥtappiam*) is Kouwenberg 2001.

Ibid. It is somewhat misleading to state that 'in the environment of *r* or *ḥ*, the phoneme *i* is realized as *e*.' As rightly pointed out in GAG 14, this rule is systematically applied only to closed syllables whereas in open

syllables 'schwankte die Aussprache anscheinend.' At any rate, both examples adduced by Sh. I. which involve open syllables are doubtful: it is impossible to ascertain whether *e* in *mehû* 'storm' goes back to **a* or **i*¹⁴ whereas *e* in *nā'eru* 'raging' (besides the more common *nā'iru*, CAD N₁ 150–1) may be due to the preceding *r*¹⁵ rather than to the following *r* (which belongs to a different syllable).

P. 17. The rule according to which 'whenever two or more vowels appear in sequence, the vowels coalesce into a long vowel, with the timbre of the last one overriding' is inexact: as one can see from such examples as *īsim* 'he was fitting' (< **yi-usim*) other possibilities are at hand if diphthongs (rather than triphthongs) are involved (cf. p. 19 where *īpulam* is analyzed as < **iapulam*).

Pp. 17–18. The contrast between *naṭu* < **nṭX* 'it is appropriate' and *hadi* < **hdw* 'one who is happy' makes abundantly clear that the vowel after the second radical in stative forms *tertiaē infirmae* is the thematic one and does not depend on the nature of the third weak radical.¹⁶ Sh. I. is thus mistaken when he speaks about 'vocalic final radicals that override pattern vowels (and their timbre is therefore irretrievable).' The problem is recognized by the author on p. 18, but his recourse to "lexical constraint" is hardly a convincing explanation. Consequently, the 'vowel shortening rule' briefly introduced on p. 21 becomes less obvious (at any rate, the jussive forms *yarmi*, *yayzu* in Arabic clearly demonstrate that if this rule had ever been operative, it was on the deepest level of Proto-Semitic reconstruction and, consequently, it can hardly belong to the synchronic description of Akkadian). It may be observed, in general, that the concept of 'vocalic radicals' (mentioned already in the preface as one of the most important innovative features of *LOB*) is not expounded at any length anywhere in the book, although some of the problems related to it are far from insignificant. On the one hand, it would be important to establish the diagnostic positions from which the quality of the vocalic radical is to be ascertained. E. g., what is the vocalic radical in a verb like

¹⁴ If *mehû* is related to Arb. *maḥwat-* 'pluie; vent du nord' (BK 2 1071), the *e*-colouring may be conditioned by the original **h* (unexpectedly preserved as *h*, v. Huehnergard 2003 with references to earlier studies dealing with this peculiar phenomenon).

¹⁵ Most probably going back to **r* (AHw. 694).

¹⁶ Since the nature of the last radical in *naṭu* is unknown whereas in *hadi* it is—at least from the etymological point of view—clearly *w*, Sh. I.'s thesis becomes especially vulnerable.

tebû ‘to sink’? Is it *u* which is the thematic vowel of the prefix conjugations? Or is it *e* which triggers the *e*-coloring in the stative, the infinitive etc.? On the other hand, systematic rules of preservation viz. replacement of the vocalic radical are to be postulated, which is a rather difficult task (thus, as we have just seen, Sh. I.’s belief that the vocalic radical is preserved in the second syllable of the base of the suffix conjugation is scarcely correct).

P. 22. Diverse st. constr shapes of monosyllabic nouns with the fem. marker *-t-* (*biltum* ‘load’ > *bilat* vs. *qīptum* ‘belief, trust’ > *qīpti*) speak in favor of the quantitative vocalic opposition in closed syllables, at least on the morphophonemic level (v. Greenstein 1984:49–50; a comprehensive study of this interesting phenomenon is in preparation by the present reviewer (L. K.) in collaboration with A. Okhotina).

P. 25. *uṣur* < *naṣārum* is surprisingly missing in the section ‘Deletion of *n* in verbal forms.’ The deletion rule is to be reformulated accordingly.

Pp. 27–8. As pointed out in Streck 1998:317, *m*-spellings of an original *w* probably represent an orthographic rather than a phonological phenomenon (important observations supporting this conclusion v. in Greenstein 1977:148ff.).

P. 30. The rule of vowel deletion is a morphophonemic phenomenon which cannot be used for establishing the accentual rules of the synchronically attested Akkadian language (cf. Greenstein 1977:52–3). If **da-mi-qum* yields *damqum*, stress is of course unlikely to fall on the vowel subject to elision but no trisyllabic m.s. form of this adjective is synchronically attested. It is, therefore, only the disyllabic *damqum* which is subject to the prosodic analysis.

Morphology

3.1. *The word unit.* In this section, the difference between genuine clitics and bound morphemes is not sufficiently explored; they are all lumped together as ‘function words’ and ‘clitics.’ Consider the following example (ex. 227), quoted in the section under discussion:

ina:ma na:ri ‘in the river’.

In this text, the preposition *ina* is ‘separated from the content word by the enclitic focusing particle *-ma*’ (p. 33). In a previous example (ex. 225) Sh. I. demonstrates that the same preposition may be sometimes affixed: *i-ne₂-ep-ri inepri* ‘with dust’.

Ex. 227 above shows that both the preposition *ina* and focusing particle *-ma* enjoy a certain freedom of movement, i. e. they can be detached

from their hosts, in particular enclitic focusing particle *-ma* can be joined to another clitic rather than to the word it focuses. Moreover, prepositions can be detached from their hosts by the negation *lā*, as in *ina lā mē* 'because of lack of water' (CH XIV:7; AbB 3, 74:17, 30); further, a certain detachability of prepositions is manifest in their capacity to govern the genitive of several nouns in succession, as in *ina eqlim kirim u bitim* (GAG 204a), i. e. **ina eqlim ina kirim u ina bitim* is most probably unacceptable. On the contrary, the negation *lā* is not separable from the word it negates and has no syntactic outreach beyond its immediate host, so we have to consider *lā* a negative *prefix* rather than a clitic and a function word, as it is done in *LOB*.¹⁷

3.2. *Word types*. Within the word-type 'nouns', Sh. I. chooses not to oppose substantives to adjectives, both word classes are not mentioned in this section. This distinction is introduced on a lower level, in the section on nouns (3.3.2). I believe that this descriptive strategy mars the discussion of gender, as we will see below.

3.3. *Word structure*. 'Most of the content words in Akkadian consist of morphemic complexes, of which a stem, consisting of a root, optional augments, and a pattern, forms the kernel' (p. 34).

'Root' is root, 'augments' are other people's derivational prefixes and the *t(a)*-infix, and 'pattern' is discontinuous morpheme, inflectional in finite verb. Whether derivational suffixes belong to the stem in *LOB*, is not clear to the reader. Logically, they should. In 3.3.1.4, all of them are termed 'external (sc. relative to the 'stem'.—S. L.) derivational morphemes', but in 3.3.2, denominative adjectival suffix *ī* comes up as part of the stem. Following this cue and common linguistic usage, I consider all derivational affixes as part of the 'stem' in the sense of *LOB*.

Sh. I. arrives at the decision that 'patterns may be purely vocalic or they may consist of both vowels and consonants' (p. 37). The latter are exemplified by *maššar* 'guard' *ma••a•* and *taštakan* 'you have established' *•ta•a•* (ex. 260 and 261, bullets stand for consonantal segments that are not part of the pattern). To assign a meaning to both the prefixed and

¹⁷ *lā* is usually written with one sign in both OB and OA (*la/la₂*). The lack of contraction with the following [*i*]-vowel may be due to a morphophonological constraint, since the only context where the contraction $\bar{a} + i\bar{i} > \bar{e}$ occurs is the boundary of stem and case suffixes, otherwise the uncontracted sequence is preserved, as in *šā'imum* 'the one who establishes'. The only feature through which *lā* is different from well-established Akkadian prefixes is its broad compatibility: it can be used with all classes of content words.

infixes within the $ma\bullet\bullet a\bullet$ structure is indeed difficult, especially since in Akkadian $-R_1R_2aR_3-$ sequence is highly predictable in the context of the nominal prefix $ma-$, therefore it is best to regard (with *LOB*) both elements as parts of a single morpheme. As for the G Perfect *taštakan*, its stem vowel is determined lexically and is therefore no part of the pattern. Thus, $-(a)-$ is a genuine verbal infix, inflectional or derivational as the case may be.

The section on patterns (3.3.1.3) brings more cases of doubtful morphemic analysis. According to Sh. I., the vowel [u] in the verb form *išpur* 'he sent' (ex. 259) represents 'purely vocalic verbal pattern' ($\bullet\bullet u\bullet$). On p. 37 Sh. I. claims that 'verbal patterns are inflectional and carry aspectual meanings', as in *imliku*: 'they advised' ($\bullet\bullet i\bullet$) vs. *imalliku*: 'they were advising' ($\bullet a\bullet i\bullet$), exx. 262 and 263. The present reviewer (SL) would hesitate to consider the segments [u] in *išpur* and [i] in *imliku/imalliku*: (parts of) inflectional morphemes, because the quality of the vowel in this slot is vocabulary information, as is admitted on p. 57: 'In the unmarked class, and, with less rigidity, in the N class, the vowel that follows the second root radical is governed by the root,' i. e. (simply put) is its part.

Hence in the G stem of sound roots, the opposition of the Preterite and Present stems is coded by two alternations: (1) $\emptyset\sim a$ after R_1 , (2) short vs. geminated second root consonant. This means that in the G stem the Preterite 'pattern'¹⁸ consists of two zeroes (vocalic and consonantal), the Present pattern consists of [a] inserted after R_1 and gemination of R_2 , while the cases of alternation in the R_2VR_3 vowel slot represent apophony of the root vowel, e. g. *-prus-* vs. *-parras-*. If we follow the insight of *LOB* and take the R_2VR_3 vowel as part of a transfix, the description will be much more cumbersome. E. g., we will have to posit here three allomorphs of the Preterite transfix: $\emptyset\bullet u$, $\emptyset\bullet a$, $\emptyset\bullet i$ and still allow for lexical distribution. Incidentally, the vowel classes of G finite verbs are not discussed in *LOB*.

The patterns of the Present and the Preterite do not by themselves carry aspectual meanings (*pace* Sh. I.), because in independent clauses as well as in most types of embedded clauses the Preterite is confined to the past time sphere, so an aspectual opposition of both conjugations would be possible only within the domain of the past. In OB letters, the Present never has the meaning 'past time *imperfective* aspect,' though it is sometimes used with the force of 'past time *habitual*,' which has to be supported by past time adverbials (e.g. *panānum* 'previously'). The Present

¹⁸ I. e., inflectional morpheme that expresses the meaning(s) of the Preterite, whatever defined.

seems to have the meaning 'past time imperfective aspect' only in literary narratives (including Ich-Erzählung).¹⁹ It is a commonplace that the narrative use of finite verb forms tends to differ considerably from their use in everyday language. Incidentally, the structural opposition between narrative and dialogue is the premise of inquiry into the meaning of finite verb forms in *LOB*'s chapter on Syntax (see below).

As far as the morphemic analysis of D and Š tense forms goes, it is natural to oppose the invariable *base* (it consists of slots for radicals and derivational affixes) and slots for variable vocalic transfix that codes tenses ('pattern' in the narrower sense of the word, or 'melody'). The Present transfix is {*a-a*}, the Preterite transfix is {*a-i*}.²⁰ Interdigitation of base and transfixes produces the Present and the Preterite stems. The Perfect stem is formed by *t*-infixation to the right of the first stem slot of the Preterite. Thus the Present stem of D and Š is •*a*••*a*•, the Preterite stem is •*a*••*i*•, the Perfect stem is •*t-a*••*i*•, i. e. the latter consists of three morphemes.

3.3.1.5. *Inflectional morphemes.*

'[A]spect is marked by patterns. Other types of inflectional morphemes are external' (p. 39).

It is interesting to note that *semantic* inflectional categories of OB verb are expressed either by a transfix within the stem (tense/aspect and imperative mood) or (marginally) via prefixes that in their origin are modal particles, i. e. on an earlier stage the respective mood values used to be expressed analytically, cf. the Precative *liprus/luḫrus/i-niprus/lū-ḫarsāta*, the Vetitive *ayy-iprus/ē-taprus*, the Prohibitive *lā-iparras*. On the other hand, all *syntactic* inflectional values (person, gender, number, and subordination) are expressed by 'real' affixes outside the stem; verbal person, gender and number are of syntactic nature because the finite verb is the target of agreement for these categories. This distribution generally agrees with the prediction according to which *the more relevant inflectional morphemes are to the root's meaning the closer to the root they occur* (Greenberg 1963, Bybee 1985).

¹⁹ Neat examples of past time imperfective will be the Russian 'Ivan čital kogda ya vošol' and the Spanish 'cuando entré Juan leía', both meaning 'John was reading when I entered.' As far as I can see, in OB letters it is not *iparras* but rather *paris* that is used to code ongoing situations in the past, cf. *adi anāku ana IN.NU.DA ḫullusā[k]u ḫuḫāru ... ana KIRI₆ ūrid-am-ma ešir tuḫallātim ilqe-am-ma ū-ti-alkam* (Edition: 'als *ittalkam* aufzufassen') 'While I was busy with the straw, the servant ... came down to the garden, took ten baskets and got away' (AbB 6, 146:18–24).

²⁰ I do not introduce the N conjugation into the picture because its vocalization is partly determined lexically.

Discussing the repertoire of external **inflectional** morphemes (i. e. prefixes and suffixes), Sh. I. counts among suffixes ‘personal non-predicative pronouns’ (p. 39),²¹ as in *hubu:ri:-šina* ‘their (3 PLF_{ATT}) noise’ (ex. 284) and *tuhṭeppi:-šunu:ti* ‘you have broken them (3 PLM_{CMP})’ (ex. 286). Yet bound pronouns have nothing to do with inflectional morphology. If bound pronouns are inflectional morphemes, then *anāku* ‘I’ and *atta* ‘thou’ (m.) are also inflectional markers with a zero base, nonetheless on p. 46 they are counted to free morphemes, i. e. to lexical words.

‘Bound pronoun’ is a good label for this kind of personal pronouns.²² Still this term is not explicit as to their place along the continuum leading from free words via clitics to affixes, which are by definition ‘bound’ into a word form, and cf. the above observations on 3.1. In the following lines I suggest a few considerations regarding this morphological issue of OB.

(1) Syntactically, personal bound pronouns either modify heads of noun phrases and prepositional phrases or fill the slots of direct and indirect objects of finite verbs, i. e. they are aligned with lexical words.

(2) Morphosyntactically, they are inflected for *gender* (with the exception of the first person) and *case*; their case repertoire is peculiar: adnominal genitive,²³ adverbial accusative and dative, but no nominative (unless one considers the suffixes of the Stative to be bound pronouns rather than real affixes). In certain instances, their forms are suppletive depending on the environment and morphologically unanalysable, cf. 1 c.s.: gen. *-ī/-ya*, acc. *-anni/-nmi/-ninni*,²⁴ dat. *-am/-m/-nim*, in other instances they have a root that denotes person and number plus cumulative suffixes that code gender and case, cf. 3 f.s.: gen. *-š-a*, acc. *-š-ī*, dat. *-š-im*,

²¹ For Sh. I., ‘personal predicative pronouns’ are probably suffixes of the Stative.

²² It is used in *LOB* and elsewhere along with another widespread label, ‘pronominal suffix’.

²³ I dub this case *genitive* (with GAG and GKT) rather than possessive (as many writers do) or *attributive* (as in *LOB*), because like the genitive of nouns it can code any adnominal argument, e. g. possessor: *ana bēti-ya* ‘to my lord’, agent: *digilšu* ‘his glance’, patient: *ḫiblātī-šunu ša ibaššīā* ‘the damages they suffered’ (TCL 7, 60:16). Yet the label ‘genitive’ does not cover the collocation of this set of pronouns with prepositions to code the oblique object, as in *eli-ša* ‘upon her.’

²⁴ This view of 1 c.s. acc. in OB was put forward already in Huehnergard 1997 and enthusiastically supported in Kouwenberg 1998. Yet *LOB* p. 47 keeps splitting this morpheme into DIR + *ni*, which has no textual justification in OB (Kouwenberg 1998).

as against 3 m.s.: gen. and acc. *-š-u*, dat. *-š-um*.²⁵ So morphosyntactic criterion also aligns bound pronouns (at least partly) with full-fledged words.

(3) Morphophonologically, they take a position somewhere between clitics and affixes.

In OB, strings consisting of pronouns bound to their noun hosts through helping vowel [a]²⁶ block the vowel syncope, creating a word boundary signal. Thus, typical OB strings are *tuppa-kunu* 'your (m. pl.) tablet' \approx *ina qātim* 'in the hand', while typical OA strings are *tuppaknu* \approx *iqqātim*, which means that in OA the respective elements are *already* nearer to genuine affixes than their OB counterparts, because they comply with a phonological rule that operates within the word-form.²⁷

Another diagnostic context is the contact of the stem-final dental obstruents with the third person bound pronouns, which contain *š-* as the first radical. This contact results in the long affricate [cc], i. e. it produces fusion at the morphemic boundary. In the inlaut, the contact *dental obstruent* + *š* leads to assimilation of the respective dental to *š*: *eššum* 'new' (< **edšum*), *šeššet* (abs.) vs. *šedištum* (nom.) 'six', *qaššum* 'dedicated' m. vs. f. *qadištum*, *piššušum* (< **pi-t-šušum*) inf. Gt 'anoint oneself'.²⁸ Thus the very

²⁵ In the singular, the three case forms are distinguished only for 1 c. and 3 f., while most bound pronouns exhibit syncretism of gen. and acc., as all independent personal pronouns do.

²⁶ Synchronically speaking, [a] in this environment marks nom. sing. and acc. sing. of respective nouns.

²⁷ Greenstein 1984:33 suggests that 'VOWEL DELETION operates across strings of words as well as within morphs,' yet it is clear that the environment in which the vowel syncope *has to be* operative cannot be defined in purely phonological terms, i. e. without recourse to non-phonological context. This is self-evident for OB. As for OA, cf. e. g. the prepositional phrase *qā-dī ša li-wi-tim* [*qadi ša li-wi-tim*] 'together with the packaging' (AKT 1, 18:13). To explain the behaviour of the above strings, Greenstein 1984 proposes several rules. For the OB *libbašunu* he suggests that the blocking of the vowel deletion rule 'is morphologically conditioned ..., perhaps to preserve the clarity of the suffix morpheme' (p. 32), which agrees with my boundary signal approach. To explain the OA *libbašnu*, he hypothesizes two rules: 'VOWEL DELETION must precede VOWEL HARMONY' and 'a-EPENTHESIS precedes VOWEL DELETION' (p. 33). As for *iqqātim*, it is explained by the vowel deletion operating across word boundary (p. 33 f.). If my proposal (clitics underway to real affixes) is otherwise tenable, it will perhaps yield a more economic description.

²⁸ An alternative way of resolving this cluster in inlaut is metathesis, as in *qašdu* 'holy' (AHw. 906, CAD Q 147). To be sure, in Semitic the chance for a *dental obstruent* + *sibilant* encounter within the stem is infrequent due to the well-known tendency to constrain the compatibility of root consonants.

affricate that bridges over the morphemic boundary serves as a boundary signal, because at this boundary the interaction is not (morphologically speaking) close enough to produce assimilation.²⁹

(4) The last criterion is the possibility to detach bound pronouns from their hosts and move them along the text. Pronouns bound to nouns and prepositions always fill the outermost slot in the respective syntagms; therefore according to this criterion they are (*already*) suffixes. Adverbial pronouns also occupy the outermost slot, i. e. to the right of the 'outer' suffixes (ventive or *u*-subjunctive). Accusative bound pronouns can be detached from the finite verb only by the dative ones, as in *taddin-aš-su* 'you (ms) gave me it.'

In OB free plural (gen.-)acc. and dat. forms are identical to bound acc. and dat. forms, respectively. Since they code the same syntactic roles of direct (acc.), indirect and oblique objects (dat.) and differ only in their linear position vis-à-vis the finite verb,³⁰ they should be taken synchronically as free and cliticized varieties of the same words. This means that in OB plural cliticized pronouns are still no suffixes.

In OA the oblique free form of 2 m.p. is *kunūti*, the bound gen.-acc. is *-kunu*, the bound dative is *-kunūti*, same relationship obtains for 3 m.p. forms: *šunūti* vs. *-šunu/-šunūti*. This fragment of the OA pronominal system shows considerable reduction as against the OB picture. Thus, *-kunu* as an acc. form looks like the genitive form put to express the direct object. Morphologically, it is a genuine suffix.

Substantives vs. adjectives

'The noun-class comprises both substantives and adjectives. Apart from a small class of adjectives with external marking [...] *adjectives are not usually distinguished from substantives in their stem structure* [...]. Furthermore, adjectives are always marked for gender, while gender may be implicit in substantives and realized only by morphosyntactic agreement' (p. 39, italics added).

As rightly pointed out in a recent study (Fox 2003:43, 54, 107, 123), structural opposition between substantival and adjectival stem patterns is an inherent characteristic of the Proto-Semitic language, which was

²⁹ Across the word boundary within the genitive construction, there are no alternations, cf. e. g. *ina qí-bi-it šar-ri* 'on the king's order' (AbB 11, 83:5').

³⁰ This difference in word order (as well as anticipation of the bound pronoun by a free one) expresses pragmatic meanings related to the sentence functional perspective.

largely preserved by its daughter languages. This opposition is especially pronounced in Akkadian (Fox 2003:292). Thus an immense majority of Akkadian adjectives display the pattern *CaCC-* (with underlying **CaCaC-*, **CaCiC-* and **CaCuC-*), while derived substantives built on this pattern are all virtually unattested; this is an interesting correlate of the distinction between primary and derived substantives.

Gender of nouns (3.3.2, 3.3.2.2)

It is nowhere said explicitly in *LOB* that gender is an intrinsic property of substantives that is copied onto the targets that are sensitive to it (primarily adjectives and the Stative), being 'revealed' in them via special inflectional morphemes.³¹ The whole discussion is conducted in terms of 'markers' only, which are ultimately not vital for substantive gender classes in Akkadian: OB evidence shows that gender as a noun-classifying parameter does not need morphological expression on the source of agreement. By the same token, part of the reason why adjectives are different from substantives in their stem structure is that in adjectives *-(a)t* is an inflectional suffix, i. e. no stem morpheme.

In the section on the gender of nouns, Sh. I. claims in general terms that F 'is either marked morphologically or via agreement', and M 'is unmarked' (p. 41).³² On the same page he writes: '*Adjectives are always marked for gender. Substantives can be morphologically unmarked for gender, mostly in the SG, but also in the DU or, in rare cases, in the PL*' (italics added). All three examples of substantives unmarked for gender are F substantives that lack *-(a)t* in the SG, DU, and PL respectively, i. e. what Sh. I. really means is simply that F substantives may lack the *-(a)t* suffix in any of the three numbers, while F adjectives have to have it in all number forms.

Sh. I. does not quite understand what '(un)marked' is and what the gender as substantive agreement class is all about. The above formulation

³¹ As we have seen, 'morphosyntactic agreement' is there, but the treatment of this theme is tortuous for the reader. On p. 38, 'the feminine gender marker can be regarded as a derivational marker when attached to substantives'; on p. 39, nominal gender markers *tutti quanti* are listed among inflectional morphemes, but on p. 42 again 'the gender marker (without qualification.—S. L.) is basically of a derivational nature'. On the same page, 'gender is in the majority of cases obligatory' (?) for inanimate substantives.

³² This statement refers to all M nouns, substantives and adjectives alike. Since in adjectives gender value belongs to inflectional paradigm, there is no way about its being 'unmarked.'

'M is unmarked' is erroneous. From Trubetzkoy's 'marked' vs. 'unmarked' distinction³³ it follows that what can be morphologically unmarked in our case is the gender *value* of a **given noun** (*LOB*'s 'substantive') rather than a *member* of the gender category (M or F). E. g. the morphemic composition of *šuhrum* 'young age, young ones' and *šuqlum* 'load' does not predict the behaviour of these nouns as controllers of gender agreement, i. e. their gender value. Actually *šuhrum* is M: *šuhrum šalim* 'the young population is well' (BIN 6, 17:24; CCT 4, 28b:28), while *šuqlum* is F: *šuqlum zakūtum* 'genaues Gewicht' (TC 2, 7:9–11, cf. GKT 90a).³⁴

Sh. I.'s observation about the substantive being 'marked' for gender 'via agreement' is tautological, since to claim that in a language the noun has 'gender' amounts to saying that the noun in this language has the property 'to be the source of agreement in its non-inflectional category.' To say that only F substantives are marked for gender 'via agreement' (as Sh. I. does) is just nonsense, because the target gender markers are inflectional, i. e. constitute a morphological paradigm.

Informally, the drawbacks of this analysis of gender might be due to Sh. I.'s underlying value judgement: the gender of SG adjectives (*-at-* for F; 'unmarked', i. e. \emptyset for M) is regarded as the prototypical or normal case of gender coding in Akkadian, while the gender of SG substantives (F may be outwardly indistinguishable from M) is somehow marginal, i. e. a 'worse' example of this category. It is clear that these differences in coding technique (substantives are 'undermarked' for gender) reveal an obvious semantic asymmetry between the gender assignment to substantives and adjectives, which is totally overlooked in *LOB*.

Sh. I. posits *-at-* as the deep level F marker, which under certain conditions 'surfaces as *t'*' (p. 41). On the surface level, a simple distribution pattern is visible: consonant-cluster base auslaut + *-at-*, and *-t-* elsewhere. Since Sh. I. embraces *-at-* as the deep level allomorph, he does not introduce this rule, but rather stipulates the following conditions for the sur-

³³ As applied to morphology by R. Jakobson and J. Greenberg.

³⁴ The material gathered in GAG and GKT makes one wonder whether (as far as derived nouns go) the *kittum* 'truth'/*dannatum* 'fortress' (SGF) type is the only surface configuration wherein gender information can be worked out from the outward form with 100% certainty. Unfortunately the inflection classes (i. e. the interface of inflectional morphology and gender) of both classical dialects have not yet been studied. An interesting fact that may be relevant for the history of gender and number of Semitic nouns is that in the SG a great number of Akk. F primary nouns reconstructable to PS have no stem-final *-(a)t-* (and cf. a list of 'isolated' PS nouns in Fox 2003).

face representation *-t-*: 1) operation of the vowel deletion rule; 2) the final radical is a vowel; 3) the F marker follows a vocalic derivational suffix (practically, it is *ī* of denominative adjectives); 4) 'lexically determined', as in *tukulti* (Er:62) vs. *tuklat* (AnzB:14) 'trust', ex. 305.³⁵ It is difficult to explain (*pace* Sh. I.) the surface form *nawirtum* 'light' (ex. 302) by application of vowel deletion rule to the deep level representation *nawiratum*, because this rule would yield the surface form *nawratum* for OB and *nawirtum* for OA, while productive word forms with this morphemic structure (i. e. F SG verbal adjectives) are identical in both dialects (and cf. Greenstein 1984: 32 f.). So it is easier to grant that Akkadian *paris-t-um* has always been this way. Consider also nouns with (at least historically) long stem vowel, such as *qīštum* 'gift', *bābtum* 'district', etc., where the surface realization of the F morpheme as *t* is not explainable by the above rules. Moreover, in many cases surface stems *pirist-*, *parast-*, *purust-* and surface *pūr̄sat-* stems can be traced down to the common underlying prosodic template CṼCC- (and cf. Edzard 1982). Thus I see no compelling reasons to choose *-at-* as the synchronic deep level representation for this morpheme.³⁶ A possible rationale of Sh. I.'s decision shows up in the *LOB*'s section on the number of nouns.

Number of nouns (3.3.2, 3.3.2.1)

'In the masculine plural, adjectives assume a special morpheme, *ut*, that is annexed to the nominal base when affixed by the plural morpheme *{:}*' (p. 39).

The splitting of the adjectival masculine plural suffix *-ūt* into plural marker *{:}* and adjective marker *ut*, as in *ilu: rabu:tu* 'the great gods' (ex. 287),³⁷ is due to the author's decision to have all nominal plurals coded by the PL *{:}* morpheme, in keeping as it were with the agglutinative ideal of one-to-one correspondence between form and meaning.

Provided that length(ening) can be interpreted as a segmental entity (see above on *Segmental length*), this decision is plausible at least for the plural markers *-ū/ī*, cf. *ilū* analyzed as *il+:+u* god + PL+NOM 'gods' (ex. 287).

³⁵ Frankly, the present reviewer (S. L.) does not understand what 'lexically' means here, and cf. HyEp I 222 ff. for a discussion of this feature of OB poetic texts.

³⁶ For related problems, see Testen 2003 and earlier literature referred to in this study.

³⁷ *rabu:tu* is glossed as 'great+PL+ADJ+NOM', i. e. the plural morpheme precedes the adjective marker (*:+ut*).

LOB's dual looks less appealing. Sh. I. has it marked by two morphemes, PL $\{:\}$ and DU $[a]$, the latter 'overt only in the NOM case' (p. 40). Thus, in *LOB* dual nom. is $\{:\}+a+\emptyset$, zero being the case marker (3.3.2.3, p. 42), dual oblique is $\{:\}+a+i$, the dual marker $[a]$ having being 'deleted during the morphophonological operation' (p. 43). Consider the following gloss (ex. 312):

i:ni:šu ← *iš*³⁸ +: +*a+i+šu* eye+PL+DU+OBL+3SGM_{ATT} 'his eyes'.

This gloss says that on the deep level three segmental inflectional morphemes build a linear sequence $\{:\}+a+i = \text{PL+DU+OBL}$. I fail to see how it is possible to assign here a meaning to each of the morphemes $\{:\} + [a]$, if both of them have to do with the dual number only, i. e. with the same inflectional value. It is not clear why DU should be morphologically more complex than PL and as it were derived from the latter. This decision is not only just awkward. A dual based on the plural is hardly ever attested in the languages of the world, and for a good reason: this derivation would be so to speak "cognitively misleading". So the traditional view seems more cogent: NOM DU is coded cumulatively by $[\bar{a}]$, and OBL DU is coded by $[\bar{i}]$.³⁹

Let us do some detective work that would explain this part of *LOB*'s nominal morphology. I believe that, paradoxically, the reason why DU has to be coded by *two* morphemes is once again the author's decision to keep the elegant *one-to-one* correspondence between form and function. This decision does not allow positing portmanteau morphemes \bar{a} DUAL NOM and \bar{i} DUAL OBL. What can be done then? If in the dual the nominative is a short $[a]$ while the oblique is a short $[i]$, where is the dual marker? Only $\{:\}$ is left, and it is already busy as *LOB*'s one-to-one PL marker. Here comes in the ingenious solution to assign the dual value to $\{:\}+[a]$ and then to delete the $[a]$ where it is in the way by means of a morphophonological operation (this latter is of course at variance with OB rules of vowels coalescence).⁴⁰

³⁸ Correct to *i:n*.

³⁹ While *LOB*'s DU is over-coded, 'SG is unmarked' (p. 39). Again, Sh. I. mistakes inflectional zero markings for unmarked categories. A table on p. 42 suggests that the case markers of all *LOB*'s nouns are *u/a/i* in the singular and *u/i* in the plural. Thus, if the nominal PL morpheme is $\{:\}$, the SG morpheme within this approach (wrong as it is) has to be \emptyset .

⁴⁰ By the way, Sh. I. fails to notice that dual's nunation (unlike mimation in the singular) has a morphological load of marking the free (or 'normal') state.

In *LOB*, F PL in *-āt* is as follows: *dima:ti* ← *dim* +: +*at* + *i* tear + PL + F + OBL 'tears' (ex. 291). Hence the author's option to code PL in *-āt* via { : } stands and falls with the deep level feminine marker *-at-*; to maintain a uniform expression of PL as { : } one has to split *āt* into { : } + *-at-*. An alternative analysis in this particular case is to view *dimt-* as a root/stem belonging to F noun class,⁴¹ and *-ā-* as an infix coding PL. So let us take a morphologically more transparent F PL noun, say *mārātum* 'daughters'. *LOB* would analyze it as *mār* +: +*at* daughter + PL + F. On my analysis, it consists of the stem *mārt-* 'daughter' (root + F suffix) plus once more the PL infix *-ā-*, which is morphotactically required by noun stems comprising this F suffix (i. e., *ā* = PL, *t* = F). As for *kalb-at-* 'bitch' ~ *kalb-ā-t-* 'bitches', the fact that the *-t-* allomorph of F complies with the 'elsewhere condition' (as described above)⁴² demands that *-t-* rather than *-at-* be *synchronically* the basic shape of this morpheme (*pace LOB*), because *-t-* is less context-bound.⁴³ Consequently, in primary F noun stems comprising a morpheme-like *t*

⁴¹ Actually, *dīmtum* 'tear', *amtum* 'female slave', *ammatum* 'cubit', *šaptum* 'lip', *qaštum* 'bow', *ešetum* 'bone', *ešetum* 'earth' and their likes prepare more difficulties for the synchronic morphemic parsing than is envisaged in *LOB*. Thus, the above gloss creates with all nonchalance a nominal root *dim-*, which however does not exist in Akkadian except in this word and therefore has no meaning (to be sure, the denominative derivative *dīmātiš* 'in tears' does not alter the picture). This is a 'cranberry morpheme', i. e. a bound root attested in only one word that looks morphologically non-elementary but has lost its derivational structure due to simplification. In such cases, a valid segmentation in the *plan du contenu* is impossible. Even more puzzling is *šuttum* 'dream'. *LOB*'s ex. 230 looks as follows: *ina šma:ti* in ≠ dream + PL + F + OBL 'in the dreams' (GlgN:10).

This gloss suggests that *šn-* is a root, *-u-* is a derivational 'pattern', while *-at* is a derivational F marker. Now in Akkadian there are only two relevant words with the assumed consonantal root *šn*: *šittum* 'sleep' and *šuttum* 'dream', both are F nouns. If we analyze *šitt-* into three morphemes: *šn* root, *i* 'pattern', *t* derivational suffix, and *šutt-* accordingly into *šn*, *u*, and *-t*, we will be unable to ascribe a meaning to any of these segments. In Akkadian there is no consonantal nominal root *šn* whose semantics is related to sleeping or dreaming and to which affixes could be attached, as well as there are neither vocalic infixes *i* and *u* that derive nouns from nominal roots nor vowel replacement *i* ~ *u* as a means of deriving denominative nouns. We can introduce two nominal roots, *šn* and *šun*, only to get two cranberry morphemes. Again, these difficulties in morphemic analysis, overlooked in *LOB*, result from simplification whereby the respective stems had lost their morphological structure.

⁴² The notion of 'elsewhere condition' originates with Kiparsky 1973. Its kernel is the idea that particular rules block general rules.

⁴³ I introduce morphotactic conditioning since I would like to stress that for derived nouns of *mārtum/kalbatum* type the [*ā*] infix is chosen to code PL not because the respective nouns are F, but rather because these F nouns have the feminine suffix (*a*).

(*dimt-*) and in derived F nouns with the (*a*)*t* suffix, PL is expressed by the infix *ā*.⁴⁴

In another inflection class, represented e.g. by F nouns *elepp-* ~ *eleppāt-* ‘ship(s)’, *abull-* ~ *abullāt-* ‘city gate(s)’, the element *āt* in the PL is morphologically unanalysable, therefore it is the exponent of PL rather than of PL F. If one splits it into *ā* = PL and *t* = F, one gets a nominal inflection class with stem suppletion *abull* (SG) ~ *abull-t* (PL). This looks more like derivational morphology and is hardly appealing as a description of nominal inflection.

Summing up, *LOB*’s theory about the PL nominal morpheme having in OB only *one morph* { : } might look descriptively elegant but it is hardly viable. A sounder procedure would be to establish its allomorphs + distribution rules. In particular, if we compare the free inflectional forms of e. g. *mārum* ‘son’ and *mārtum* ‘daughter’, it will be difficult to escape a most obvious conclusion: unlike in FPL *mārātum* and *mārātīm*, in MPL *mār-ū* and *mār-ī* suffixes code cumulatively case and number (the respective bases are in bold type). This will of course ruin the gender-independent uniform coding of cases in the plural as *u/i* (cf. fn. 39 above).

Personal pronouns (3.3.4.1)

P. 47. ‘The ATT (= genitive.—S. L.) allomorphs of the 1 SG are dependent on the environment: *-i*: occurs after consonants, *-ya* after vowels.’ Actually the environment is morphological: *-ī* on SG nouns in the nom. and acc., elsewhere *-ya*, cf. *ša-ma-al-le-e* (< *šamallā* + *ī*) ANŠE.ĪLA *ilqe-ma iḫtaliq* AbB 2, 87:7 ‘my assistant took the donkeys and fled away.’

P. 47. ‘The 1 SG bound CMP (= accusative.—S. L.) and DAT morphemes both require a preceding DIR allomorph. All other markers may or (more commonly) may not follow a DIR allomorph. The 1 SG DAT {Ø} can only be indicated in the text by an obligatory DIR morpheme’. Hence *-nim* in *libbuku:nim* ‘let them bring to me’ (ex. 343) is analyzed in *LOB* into *nim+Ø* ~ DIR+1 SG_{DAT}.

Logically, if OB 1 SG bound CMP *-ni* is obligatorily used with the preceding ‘ventive,’ this latter morpheme-like segment has no meaning of its own in the context of *-ni*, so *-anni/-nni/-ninni* is morphologically elementary (i. e., as far as the meaning goes, and cf. fn. 24 above). As is well known (see most recently Kouwenberg 2002), in OB there is at least one

⁴⁴ In adj. *damqāt-* ‘good’ (F PL), the linear order of morphemes is different from that of the noun *kalbāt-* ‘bitches’. In *kalbāt-*, the PL morpheme is infixated into the stem *kalb+t*, while *damqāt* is STEM (*damiq-*)+PL+F, i. e. all inflectional morphemes follow the stem.

common context in which the directional morpheme is *required* by a bound pronoun: the verbs of movement with a second person goal. Thus, *ašpuram* means 'I sent (s. th.) to where you are' unless a third person goal is explicitly indicated;⁴⁵ *ašpur-ak-kum* = 'I sent you (s. th.) to where you are', while **ašpur-kum* is ungrammatical.⁴⁶ The analysis of the ventive morpheme on the verbs of movement with the first person goal into DIR+1 SG_{DAT} (=Ø) follows *LOB*'s policy of 'agglutinative' segmentation discussed above. Synchronically, I believe that the ventive on *libbuku:nim* 'let them bring to me' is a cumulative exponent of DIR and 1 SG_{DAT}.⁴⁷

Primary stem augments (3.3.5.4.1)

Semantics of the verbal stems gets a very poor treatment in this section.

Thus, the discussion of the N stem is almost completely reduced to a single sentence whose italicized part is incomprehensible to the present reviewer: '*n* tends to indicate non-active voice, usually the passive counterpart of a root derived in the unmarked class' (p. 52, italics added).

An observation on p. 53 'š can also be used as a derivational marker, altering the basic meaning of a root' presupposes that the common causative meaning of the Š stem is not derivational or at least is 'located far from the derivational extreme on a derivational-inflectional continuum' (p. 36). The controversial theoretical notion 'derivational-inflectional continuum' is not otherwise explicitly used in *LOB*.

This observation on the Š stem is supported by one example (No. 369), *šubriq anzam* 'strike Anzu!'. Semantically, this Š stem token is a rather trivial causative 'strike (by lightning)' of G *barāqum* 'flash (said of lightning).'

'There are cases in which the morph š has no value' (p. 53).—In these cases it would be no morph.

The D stem 'is usually said to mark the factitive' (p. 53). This is no longer so, since Kouwenberg 1997 has shown convincingly that the Akkadian evidence does not support Goetze's theory about the factitive as the primary sense of the D stem in Semitic.

⁴⁵ E. g., *ana* PN *ašpur-am*.

⁴⁶ The availability of both *ašpuram* and *ašpur-ak-kum* ensures that in this case *-ak-kum* consists of two morphemes.

⁴⁷ Note that in the verbal inflectional paradigm Sh. I. (p. 50) allows 'a combined number and gender marker for the 3 PL (-u: for M; -a: for F),' although of course it would be feasible to split these suffixes into gender markers and 'length segment' to code the plural, similarly to what Sh. I. does to the nominal inflection.

'Forms in the D class may carry *meanings* different from their corresponding *forms* in the unmarked class' (p. 53, italics added). With the required corrections of the English wording, this is how things are expected to be in language, yet the nature of the difference remains to be expounded.

'Furthermore, forms in either the unmarked class or the D class do occur in similar contexts with no difference in meaning' (p. 54). This insight is illustrated by the following pair of examples in (374):

unaššiqū šēpīša 'they kissed her feet'
 as against
iššiqū šēpīšu 'they kissed his feet.'⁴⁸

Since the end of the 19th century, examples of this kind serve to illustrate the assumed original **intensive** function of the D stem, not mentioned in *LOB*. As shown by N. J. C. Kouwenberg, there is every reason to believe that this traditional view 'is basically correct' (Kouwenberg 1997:443).

Syntax

The chapter on Syntax, written by Eran Cohen (henceforth E. C.), occupies more than one third of the book (p. 62–114) and makes for interesting and refreshing reading. I believe that this chapter, unlike the rest of the book, indeed contributes to our understanding of Akkadian.

While studying these pages, one has to keep in mind that neither the morphological semantics nor the syntax of OB has so far received satisfactory treatment. We know a great deal more about Akkadian phonology than we do about syntax. This means that a student of Akkadian syntax has to develop an idea of what syntax is, how it is different from morphology and how one is supposed to study it.

E. C. seems to understand the subject-matter of syntax more or less in the spirit of functional linguistics, hence his interest in pragmatics, especially in functional sentence perspective, in text types and various manifestations of modality. He professes European structuralism (i. e. 'oppositions alone' and even 'minimal pairs alone' approach) as his method of research into syntactic semantics (p. 62 and *passim*), and he is indeed consistent in its application.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ Translations follow those of *LOB*.

⁴⁹ See also Cohen 2005:1–6 for a concise statement on the linguistic structuralism as understood by E. C.

On the whole, the syntactic description is well-organized and easy-to-read. One could wish that one day E. C. apply the same scholarly rigour to an inquiry into the syntax of more voluminous OB corpora.

In the rest of this review I will dwell on the semantics of indicative verb forms as described by E. C., since it is the only part of his contribution in which I hope to be capable of independent judgement.

At a first step, E. C. breaks down his description into 'microsyntax' (syntactic values that can be analyzed at the clause level) and 'macrosyntax' (values analyzable at the text level).

In the microsyntax part (4.1–4.3), E. C. discusses, among other things, the predicative relationship in both nominal and verbal clauses. His perspective on the deverbal Stative *paris* is so to speak 'intermediate': unlike G. Buccellati and the scholars who followed his lead, E. C. does not reckon *paris* a non-verbal predication but rather terms it 'the participial predicative' (p. 63) and 'the nominal predicative conjugation' (p. 67). E. C. denies *paris* full membership in the verbal predication club because 'it participates only partially in the aspectual-temporal system' (p. 67), although 'its syntactic behavior is exactly that of a finite verbal form regarding connection, compatibility with an object, etc.' (ibid.).

Granted all this is true, i. e. if a morphological entity is derived from a verbal root, has a subject index rather than a cliticized subject pronoun⁵⁰ and behaves syntactically like a verb, this entity must be verbal. It is only partly true that the deverbal Stative 'is very much like a non-verbal clause in its aspectual-temporal values' (p. 67 fn. 31). In my view, what happens is that the morphological shape of the Akkadian Stative codes meanings different from those of other verb forms. Still I drop here the problem of semantics of the Stative as it would lead us too far afield.

E. C. discusses the verbal semantics in the macrosyntax part, since he believes that it can be grasped only at the text level. He divides the corpus into two 'textemes', i. e. narrative and dialogue, following the text-linguistic approach to the research into verbal morphosyntax inaugurated by Harald Weinrich's 'Tempus.'

E. C. observes correctly that both repertoire and meanings of verb forms in the corpus depend on the speech type: 'What seems to be the same verbal form may turn out to have an altogether different functional value in each texteme' (p. 100). Applying his sober 'minimal pairs alone'

⁵⁰ With E. C. ibid.: the Stative constitutes a 'built-in sentence', like 100% verb forms.

method, E. C. arrives at the conclusions on the semantics of indicative verb forms that I list and discussed below:

(1) 'There are no temporal oppositions in the narrative texteme, which means tense plays no part in the system' (p. 101). This claim is supported by the author's observation that the corpus has no grammatical means of expressing the pluperfect or future-in-the-past.

(2) In the narrative, the Preterite⁵¹ chains form the foreground, i. e. the backbone of the story. In other words, the Preterite is the main narrative form, whereas the Present (*LOB*'s 'imperfective form') functions as '(dynamic) background' (p. 102, 105). The Stative also depicts the 'background to a series of narrative events' (p. 103). E. C. observes that here the difference between the Preterite and the Present 'is basically analogous to the difference between the French narrative form, the *passé simple*, as opposed to the *imparfait*, both within the narrative' (p. 102).

This opposition of foreground (*iptarus*) vs. background (*iptarras*) and the analogy with the evidence of the French narrative is strongly reminiscent of Weinrich's ways: 'Wir vermerken hier zunächst methodisch, daß es bei diesen Überlegungen nicht mehr um "Aspekt", "Aktionsart" oder dergleichen geht. Diese Begriffe – was immer sie bei den einzelnen Autoren bedeuten mögen – beziehen sich auf Sätze. Hier wird stattdessen gefragt, was diese Tempora in Texten leisten. Und da in der französischen Sprache *Imparfait* und *Passé simple* erzählende Tempora sind, wird gefragt, was sie in Erzählungen leisten. Sie geben nämlich einer Erzählung *Relief* und gliedern sie rekurrent nach Vordergrund und Hintergrund. Das *Imparfait* ist in der Erzählung das *Tempus des Hintergrunds*, das *Passé simple* ist das *Tempus des Vordergrunds*' (Weinrich 1985:93, italics by H. W.).

All this would mean that the opposition 'foreground vs. background' established by E. C. for the epic narratives is a self-sufficient grammatical category that need not be reduced to an aspectual contrast (perfective vs. imperfective), at least *within narrative*.

According to E. C., the shared feature of all Perfect *iptaras* forms in the narrative is that 'the perfect form comes at the end of the chain' (p. 103), i. e. the Perfect also has some kind of macrosyntactic function.

(3) In the dialogue texteme, the opposition between the Present and the Preterite is temporal (p. 105), i. e. non-past vs. past. 'Aspectual distinctions do occur in dialogue, but only in the **dialogue narrative** subtexteme' (p. 105, bold by E. C.), where they are virtually identical to the

⁵¹ *LOB*'s 'perfective form'.

foreground vs. background distinction of the third-person narration discussed above.

According to E. C., the Perfect in dialogue is used as 'perfect of recent past' (p. 106), implying 'relevant result' (ibid.). Thus its semantics is comparable to that of the English Present Perfect.

This means that E. C. establishes a robust *aspectual* opposition in neither of his textemes. I believe that one can epitomize E. C.'s treatment of finite forms in dialogue by ascribing them the values of absolute (deictic) *tenses*. Thus Sh. I.'s claim that 'verbal patterns ... carry aspectual meanings' (p. 37) hardly finds support in E. C.'s description of verbal semantics.

A vexing problem is to my mind that of underlying semantic unity of Akkadian finite verb forms, i. e. of 'basic' morphological meanings inherent to 'verbal patterns' *parras*, *prus* and *ptaras* themselves, quite independently of their syntactic settings. This question cannot be definitely answered (and perhaps even asked) within the methodology chosen by E. C. Still his analysis of literary dialogue makes it plausible that in historical times these inherent meanings were temporal rather than aspectual.

Miscellaneous comments and corrections

P. 3. The table representing what the authors believe to be 'the accepted contemporary reading' of Akkadian phonemes exhibits a number of mistakes (presumably misprints): *š* is listed as voiced, *l* and *y* as ejective, *a* as 'other consonants' (together with *m*, *n* and *w*, all obviously voiced, at least in 'the accepted contemporary reading').

P. 24, ex. 162. *šakiššum* 'he is set' (GlgP:195)—correct to 'is set for him', and cf. same text in the chapter on Syntax as ex. 453, correctly translated 'he has (an opponent = *mehrum*).'

P. 30, ex. 209. *ušaši:m* 3+decree $\sqrt{šim} \sim \check{š} \sim PV$ 'he established' (AgB6: 22).—The $\sqrt{šim}$ is not attested in the $\check{š}$ stem. The Edition has *na¹-ar-bi-aš u₂-ša-si₂-im* 'Ihre großen Taten ließ er angemessen sein', i. e. the $\check{š}$ stem of \sqrt{wsm} .

P. 37, ex. 257. *narbi:ša* 'her great deeds' is analyzed as $\sqrt{rbi} \sim na \bullet \bullet i \bullet + : i + ša$. Correct the stem pattern to *ma \bullet \bullet a \bullet*, i. e. *mapras-*.

P. 38, ex. 270. It is nonsensical to compare *šarrāqu* 'thief' with *šappāru* 'wild sheep' in order to illustrate the diversity of meanings proper to a nominal pattern. Sh. I. seems to understand (cf. an explicit statement to this effect on the preceding page) that nominal patterns are derivational (*šarrāqu* < *šrq* 'to steal'), whereas *šappāru* is not derived from a Semitic

verbal root (for its uncertain origin v. SED II No. 208). Incidentally, *LOB* does not discuss the phenomenon of primary (or isolated) nouns.

P. 40. 'In the construct state, either governing another noun or an affixed pronoun, the adjective marker (sc. *-ūt* of M PL participles.—*S. L.*) does not surface.' The examples are *pāqidū šīmāti* 'those who charge decrees' (ex. 294) and *mušēbirūya* 'the ones who make me cross' (ex. 295). This rule is doubtful, since participles, when used as agent nouns (as is mostly the case in OB), often display substantive inflection, and the context of construct state usually favours the substantive syntactic roles.

P. 45. 'Most of the numbers in the first ten are construed⁵² on either the pattern *•a•a•* (e. g., *šala:š* 'three') or the pattern *•a•i•* (e. g., *hamiš* 'five').' This is wrong: PS cardinal numbers of the first ten had a rich variety of patterns (**CiC-*, **CaCāC-*, **ʔa-CCaC-*, **CaCiC-*, **CiCC-*, **CaCC-*, **CaCāCiC-*, **CaCaC-*), all of which were faithfully preserved by most Semitic languages including Akkadian. *Contra* Sh. I., *sebe* 'seven' is no result of 'morphophonemic changes' of the *•a•i•* pattern.

P. 48. Unless the possibility of attaching dative suffixes to unambiguously substantival bases is proved by a considerable number of examples, the interpretation of *šimassum* as 'it is the destiny for him' looks suspicious (contrast 'she was destined for him' in George 2003:179, where the bride is obviously meant; a more neutral translation 'it was destined for him' should not be excluded either). The same is true of p. 68 where great deal of attention is paid to this (apparently unique) example.

P. 51 fn. 14. Correct *Doppelsstamm* to *Doppelungsstamm*.

P. 52. *√pls* is not limited to the N stem, *pace* *LOB*, and cf. CAD P 53f.

P. 78, ex. 518. *narām* in *narām libbiša* 'the beloved of her heart' is no stative participle but rather a deverbal noun.

P. 83, ex. 541. Correct 'the dark walls' to 'the dark fields' (*uga:aru:*).

P. 102, ex. 620. *ipte:q blink*. PV.3SG—correct to PC.3SG.

In morphological glosses throughout the book, PTC_A 'active participle' stands in most cases (due to an erroneous global replacement?) for PTC_{ST} 'stative participle.'

References

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| Buccellati 1996 | Buccellati, G. <i>A Structural Grammar of Babylonian</i> . Wiesbaden. |
| Bybee 1985 | Bybee, J. L. <i>Morphology. A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form</i> . Amsterdam–Philadelphia. |

⁵² Read 'constructed'?

- Cohen 2005 Cohen, E. *The Modal System of Old Babylonian*. (HSS 56). Winona Lake.
- Edzard 1982 Edzard, D. O. Zu den akkadischen Nominalformen *par-sat-*, *pirsat-*, und *pursat-*. *ZA* 72, 68–88.
- Fox 2003 Fox, J. *Semitic Noun Patterns*. Winona Lake.
- George 2003 George, A. *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*. Oxford.
- Goetze 1937 Goetze, A. The Sibilant in Old Babylonian *nazārum*. *Or* 6, 12–18.
- Goetze 1958 Goetze, A. The Sibilants of Old Babylonian. *RA* 52, 137–49.
- Greenberg 1963 Greenberg, J. H. Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements. *Universals of Language*. Cambridge (Mass.). Pp. 73–113.
- Greenstein 1977 Greenstein, E. *Studies in Akkadian Phonology*. Ph. D. (Columbia University).
- Greenstein 1984 Greenstein, E. The Phonology of Akkadian Syllable Structure. *AAL* 9/1.
- Hecker 1974 Hecker, K. *Untersuchungen zur akkadischen Epik*. Neukirchen.
- Huehnergard 1997 Huehnergard, J. *A Grammar of Akkadian* (HSS 45). Atlanta.
- Huehnergard 2003 Huehnergard, J. Akkadian *ḥ* and West Semitic *ḥ*. *Studia Semitica (FS A. Militarev)*. Moscow. Pp. 102–19.
- Kiparsky 1973 Kiparsky, P. 'Elsewhere' in phonology. *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*. New York (NY). Pp. 93–106.
- Kogan 2004 Kogan, L. Review of Buccellati 1996. *B&B* 1, 379–91.
- Kouwenberg 1997 Kouwenberg, N. J. C. *Gemination in the Akkadian Verb*. Assen.
- Kouwenberg 1998 Kouwenberg, N. J. C. Review of Huehnergard 1997. *BiOr* 55, 814–816.
- Kouwenberg 2001 Kouwenberg, N. J. C. The Interchange of *e* and *a* in Old Babylonian. *Veenhof Anniversary Volume*. Leiden. Pp. 225–49.
- Kouwenberg 2002 Kouwenberg, N. J. C. Ventive, Dative and Allative in Old Babylonian. *ZA* 92, 200–40.
- Kouwenberg 2003–4 Kouwenberg, N. J. C. Initial Plene Writing and the Conjugation of the First Weak Verbs in Akkadian. *JEOL* 38, 83–103.
- Kuryłowicz 1972 Kuryłowicz, J. *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics*. Wrocław etc.
- Lambert–Millard 1969 Lambert, W. G.; Millard, A. R. *Atra-Hasis. The Babylonian Story of the Flood*. Oxford.
- Reiner 1966 Reiner, E. *A Linguistic Analysis of Akkadian*. London etc.
- von Soden 1981 von Soden, W. Untersuchungen zur Babylonische Metrik I. *ZA* 71, 161–204.
- Streck 1998 Streck, M. P. Review of Buccellati 1996. *AfO* 44/45, 314–325.

- Testen 2003 Testen, D. Evidence of an Early Metathesis among Akkadian *piristum*-Stem Nouns. *JAOs* 123, 577–94.
- Weinrich 1985 Weinrich, H. *Tempus: Besprochene und erzählte Welt*. Stuttgart.
- Westenholz A. 1991 Westenholz, A. The Phoneme /o/ in Akkadian. *ZA* 81, 10–19.
- Westenholz J. 1997 Westenholz, J. G. *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*. Winona Lake.

L. Kogan and S. Loesov