

AKKADIAN SENTENCES ABOUT THE PRESENT TIME (II/3)

(Морфологические средства выражения семантики настоящего времени в аккадском языке (II/3))

Статья продолжает серию работ автора о грамматических свойствах суффиксального спряжения в аккадском языке (в традиционной грамматике эта форма называется *стативом*). Основная часть работы в целом и настоящей публикации в частности состоит из отдельных главок (или «словарных статей»), которые представляют собой морфосинтаксические портреты частотных аккадских глаголов: в каждой статье анализируется грамматическая семантика суффиксального спряжения данного глагола в соотношении с его другими финитными формами (или «временами»). Публикация включает также три теоретических экскурса, в которых предлагаются предварительные обобщения и гипотезы, вытекающие из уже проделанной работы.

Ключевые слова: семитские языки, глагольная система аккадского языка, суффиксальное спряжение

This contribution is a continuation of my inquiry into the meaning of the Akkadian Stative, termed here the Suffixing Conjugation (= the SC), and into the way Old Babylonian (= OB) and Old Assyrian (= OA) express the present-time sense.¹ I will summarise the problems I am trying to solve and then turn to the analysis of the list of verbs started in B&B 3.

Two interrelated observations provided the initial impulse to this undertaking.

1. The Akkadian verb uses more than one inflectional exponent in order to express the contemporaneity with a reference point (in simple terms, “present-time sense”). In particular, earlier research failed to notice that the Pres. *iparras* is hardly ever used to encode *telic* present-time

processes. This function was simply assumed to be one of the meanings of the Pres., with no proof whatsoever. The ways in which the SC contributes to the present-time domain were also barely recognized.

2. Unlike the three prefixing “tenses”, the SC is totally unpredictable. We have no reliable criteria allowing us to predict whether the SC of a given frequent verb at all exists. If it happens to exist, we have no way to foresee its meaning and frequency.

From our reference works and reading experience we know that the SC of transitive verbs can sometimes be both **A** (= active) and **P** (= passive), that the SC of some common atelic verbs is not attested, that the SC is sometimes lexicalized, i. e. it acquires lexical meanings different from those of other tenses of the same verb. Yet no hard-and-fast rules that are responsible for these facts and explain them have ever been formulated.

I know of two insightful studies² that mention some of the above riddles of the SC. Yet both studies work with diachronic theories that are not necessary for the understanding of the data I am speaking about. For my part, I prefer to do without working diachronic hypotheses about the Akkadian verb at all, and this is for two reasons. First, we have no plausible reconstruction of the Proto-East Semitic and Proto-Semitic verb, and will hardly get one in the near future.

Second, we have no idea about what happened to the Akkadian verb in the first millennium BC. It is generally believed that already in Middle Babylonian (= MB) the t-Perf. *iptaras* replaced the Pret. *iprus* as the main narrative form. Apart from this, no dramatic changes in the Akkadian verb over almost two millennia have been reported (e.g., no new analytical denominal verb forms are attested at the side of the old morphological repertoire). Needless to say, a spoken vernacular can hardly maintain its verbal system intact over such a long time span.

Therefore, I decided to exploit the rich corpora of OB and OA in order to describe the way in which both dialects code the present-time sense, with no possible diachronic implications of this endeavour in mind. This meaning-oriented Fragestellung is coupled with the form-oriented one, in the way of a descriptive grammar: I also analyse further functions of the SC, and, less rigorously, further functions of other morphological exponents of the present-time sense.

Given the nature of the posed questions, I chose the inductive procedure: each frequent verb has to be considered separately as to the way it codes the present-time sense. In the course of this analysis (started in

B&B 3), I have come to certain generalizations which I now submit to the readers' judgement.

In the table below, I formulate a prediction on the relative productivity of the SC for the eight semantic groups into which I subdivide the totality of Akkadian TELIC TRANSITIVE VERBS (= TTV). For the purposes of this calculus, I subsume punctual transitive verbs (such as *kašādum* “to reach”) under the category TELIC, because both punctual and telic events (such as *lawûm* “to surround”) imply resultative states as their natural output: *kašdāku* “I have reached”, *lawi* “it is surrounded”, “he has surrounded”. Conversely, atelic situations (such as *rânum* “to love”) presuppose no resultative states.

Yet, some atelic transitive verbs do have the productive SC, as e. g. *akâlum* “to receive victuals”, *epēšum* “to do”, *erēšum* “to cultivate (a field)”, *ḥašāḥum* “to need, desire”, *kalûm* “to hold, detain”, whose SC has been in some way or other treated in the previous parts of this study. An important question is why *erēšum* and *kalûm* have the SC both **A** and **P**, *epēšum* has the SC **P**, *akâlum* and *ḥašāḥum* have the SC **A**, while *rânum* “to love” and *kullum* “to hold” have none, though these two verbs seem to belong to the same semantic groups as *ḥašāḥum* and *kalûm*, respectively.

In the table, the productivity cline is as follows: “productive” > “not productive” > “rarely formed”. Among the eight classes of TTV, there are three with the productive SC: one of them **A**, the other two **P**. Both the classification and evaluations are based on the research done in the course of this study and are subject to refinements. “Productive” implies absence of further semantic constraints on the formation of the SC in a given class. “Not productive” means that the SC is attested infrequently and mostly with contextual readings deviating from the classic RESULTATIVE sense (e.g., PERFECT, SIMPLE PAST, or HABITUAL PRESENT). “Rarely formed” means that in this class the SC of a given verb is either marginally attested or not attested at all.

The word “rarely” reflects my speculation that under certain semantic and/or pragmatic requirements (i.e., with strong contextual support) speakers of early 2nd millennium Akkadian were able to produce the SC of these classes.

highly dynamic “unobservable” meanings	the SC active 1. rarely formed: <i>dīk</i> “he has killed”	the SC passive 2. not productive: <i>dīk</i> “he is/was killed”
highly dynamic “observable” meanings	3. not productive or rarely formed: <i>naksāku</i> “I have cut”	4. productive : <i>nakis</i> “it is cut”
low dynamic agent- oriented meanings	5. productive : <i>leqi</i> “he has received”	6. rarely formed: <i>leqi</i> “it is received”
low dynamic object-oriented meanings	7. not productive or rarely formed: <i>nadnāku</i> “I have given”	8. productive : <i>nadin</i> “it is/was given”

As the table shows, the eight groups are constituted by the interplay of three semantic features, each of them having two values. This gives us six basic parameters: high/low dynamicity, “(un)observability”, agent vs. object orientation. My calculus is based on the assumption that for high transitivity meanings, the important variable is “observability”; for low transitivity meanings, the relevant factor is “orientation” of the TTV event toward the agent or otherwise. The criterion of observability (“Anschaulichkeit”) makes more sense for **P** readings of the SC than for **A** ones, yet here I take this feature to be a general characteristic of the SC of a given highly dynamic TTV, irrespective of diathesis.

Consider a selection of illustrative examples:

1. *dīk* * “he has killed” is a hypothetic example, not actually attested.

2. In the core OB, *dīk* appears only in the past-time contexts (“he **was** killed”). The N-stem of this verb is frequent in the Pres., but its Pret. is not attested at all (CAD D 42), so *dīk* seems to have replaced **iddīk* in this N-stem paradigm³. *Mašāʾum* “to rob”: *mašʾāku-ma allik-am* “**I was robbed**, and then I came here” (Prag I 431:7). (Hecker translates “Ich wurde bestohlen, bevor ich herkam”). *Mašʾāku* is here a kind of perfective past rather than genuine Resultative. Consider another token of *mašʾāku* in OA: BAR *ma-na ša KÁ a-bu-lim ša ta-ak-bi-a-ni šé-bi₄-lam ma-áš-ḥa-ku-ú ù a-na-ku a-ga-mì-il₅-kà* “send me the half mina that you promised me at the gate. **I am robbed**, yet I am going to do you a favour (there follows the “favour”, i.e. a business proposal)” (TCL 4, 13:21–25, for a translation of ll. 26–29 see CAD M₂ 208a). I do not dare to decide whether *ma-áš-ḥa-ku-ú*

refers here literally to an act of robbing (as is likely the case in Prag I 431:7) or is a metaphor of the author's insolvency, i.e. whether it is a resultative or a descriptive predicate. From the examples accumulated in CAD M₁ 361b, it follows that prefixing forms of *mašārum* could be used in OA with a milder sense "to treat unfairly, to abuse (in business relationships)".⁴ The SC of such frequent verbs as *naqārum* "to tear down, destroy", *nērum* "to strike, kill", *šagāšum* "to kill, slaughter" is hardly ever attested for their basic meanings (B&B 3. P. 138).⁵ On the "unobservable" nature of these high-transitivity meanings, see TRC 29.

3. *anāku-ma kabsāk-šunūti* "It is **I** who **will trample** upon them" (ARMT 10, 53:16).

4. *inanna GIŠ.MA.NU nakis* "now the MA.NU-wood **is cut**" (AbB 12, 194:8ff.); *eleppum ... maḥṣat* "the boat ... is damaged" (AbB 12, 95:18f.); *ina nakkaptī-šu maḥiṣ* "he is smitten in his temple" (TLB 2, 21:9").

5. OB *leqi* "he has (got)", OB *maḥir* "he has (received)", OA *adim* "he has invested, he owns a share", OA *šapik* "he has invested", OB *aḥiz* "he has (wife) = he is married", "he knows". These SC forms are productive, some of them are represented by dozens of tokens, see the respective entries in my articles in B&B 3 and B&B 4, and below in this contribution. Here also belong the SC of *magārum* "to agree" (*magir* "he agrees/he has agreed", No 54 below, both OA and OB), OB *lamādum* "to learn" (*lamid* "he knows smth., he has an experience of smth., he is aware of smth.", see No 52 below), and *kašādum* "to reach" (*kašdāk-ka* "I will reach you", see B&B. P. 147). The shared semantic feature of this class is the "middle voice" sense (i.e., the agent of the verbal event is predictably affected by it).⁶

6. OB *leqi* and OA *laqi* "it is taken" are rare (Loesov forthcoming No 43). OB *maḥir* *"it is received" (B&B 4, No 44), OA *adim* and *šapik* *"it is invested" are all unattested (No 50 and 51 below). OB *aḥiz* *"it is taken" and *lamid* *"it is known" are not attested either (see No 52 below). The SC **P** *kašid* "he has been seized (in flagranti)" is rare: *ul ina pilši ka-aš-da-a-ku* "I have not been seized in burglary" (AbB 2, 83:32), see B&B 3. P. 147.

7. OB *nadnāku* and OA *tadnāku* "I have given" are attested a few times (No 58 below). OA *ṭaḥi*, OB *ṭeḥi* *"he has added", *būr*⁷ *"he has established the facts of the case, he has convicted" are not attested.

8. OA *ṭaḥi*, OB OA *ṭeḥi* "it is added" is productive in business correspondence (see CAD Ṭ 78). Other productive tokens within this class are e. g. *nadin* "it is given" (No 58 below), *šakin* "it is

placed/stored”, and OB *būr* “he is/was convicted (of a crime)”, “it is/was established” (CAD B 128f.).

It turns out that among low dynamic lexemes there are such whose SC can get agent- or object-orientation with about equal easiness. One such lexeme is OA *nadārum* in the meaning “to place, to deposit” (see No 59 below). Its SC is productive in both **A** and **P** sentences. OB examples are the SC of *lawūm* “to surround” (B&B 4, No 42) and *ḥabālum* “to harm, wrong” (B&B 3. P. 145). This kind of verbs is not particularly frequent.

Our inquiry shows that the grammatical behaviour of a given verb varies depending on its individual meanings. Thus, not all four tenses can be formed for every meaning of a given verb. Hence, the availability and meaning of the SC are often related not to the “dictionary verb” as a whole (e.g. *nadūm* or *šapākum*), but rather to its major “sub-entries”. Therefore I will sometimes call the dictionary shells of verbs “vocables” (such as *nadūm* or *šapākum*), while the “sub-entries” will become “lexemes”. This suggestion is inspired by the terminology of I. Mel’čuk and other Russian philologists who developed the model of “An Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary of Modern Russian”.⁸

Excursus I. *šumma awīlum kalbam našik*⁹

The two-argument sentences built according to the pattern «*šumma* S_{nom} S_{acc} V_{SC}»¹⁰ are ubiquitous in OB divination protases, and their syntax presents a problem which has not been paid sufficient attention in the grammatical literature on Akkadian. The problem is barely noticeable when the exponent of S_{nom} is (or appears to be) an agent-like entity, e.g. *šumma erūm iṣṣuram šabit* “if an eagle holds a bird”,¹¹ but this patently “active” (or “eventful”) variety is rare in omens. For OB extispicy, the usual kind of «*šumma* S_{nom} S_{acc} V_{SC}» pattern will be illustrated by the following sentence: *šumma AŠ* (= *šēpum* fem.) *qām_{acc} parkat* “if a ‘footmark’ is crossed by a filament_{acc}” (YOS 10, 44:48, tr. of CAD P 154b). Clearly, *šēpum* is not a patient nor is *qām* an agent (or even an instrument), if only because an anatomic picture implies no agency.¹² Besides, the sentence *šumma šēpum qām parkat* cannot be passive in any figurative or analogical sense either. Note that an active transitive sentence like *šumma awīlum awīlam ubbir_D* “if a man accused another man” (CH §1) cannot be transformed into a passive sentence **šumma awīlum_{nom} awīlam_{acc} ūtabbir_{Dt}* “if a man_{nom} was accused by another man_{acc}”, i.e. the Acc. does not encode the agent in passive constructions with verbs in prefixing tenses. The

«*šumma* S_{nom} S_{acc} V_{SC}» pattern is possible because in Akkadian the SC is “in principle” (or “virtually”, as a systemic possibility) diathesis-neutral, which is manifest in the fact that the SC of certain transitive (mostly G-stem) verbs is used both ways: *kaspum*_{nom} *nadi* “the silver **is deposited**” (by a depositor unmentioned within the clause) vs. *kaspam*_{acc} *nad^rāku* “**I have deposited** the silver” (for OA references, see the entry *nadûm* below). I suggest that in the artificial linguistic world of divination protases, this virtual feature is taken to the extreme: individual realizations of the «*šumma* S_{nom} S_{acc} V_{SC}» pattern are themselves “stripped of diathesis”, i.e. HAVE NO CONTEXTUAL VOICE VALUE, not even as a linguistic metaphor. Thus, the sentence *šumma martum išissa štram katim* (YOS 10, 31 IV 25ff.) does not say whether “the gallbladder base **covers** flesh” or “**is covered** with flesh”.¹³ The answer depends entirely on our knowledge of the world, and same is true of YOS 10, 44:48 quoted above.

I suggest that «*šumma* S_{nom} S_{acc} V_{SC}» construction in omen protases has to do with the communicative organization of the sentence rather than voice. In this kind of protases, the Nom. codes the topic of the sentence, while the Acc. codes the focus/rheme. This fact is trivial: it stands to reason that this coding principle follows the one dominant in the “natural” Akkadian. Generally speaking, the Nom. is the “zero” case (the least contextually bound), while the Acc. expresses some kind of dependency relation, therefore with the default syntax (an active voice transitive sentence with neutral word order) the Nom. is usually topical, while the Acc. belongs to the focal part of the utterance. Consider also the following well-known protasis of a medical prescription: *šumma awilum*_{nom} *kalbam*_{acc} *našik* ‘if a man has a dogbite’ (BAM 393rev.: 5, translation of B. Kouwenberg, p. c.), which on purely morphological grounds could be construed “if a man has bitten a dog”,¹⁴ with the **A** transitive SC form.

By way of illustrating this “actualized neutralization” hypothesis, I will adduce another syntactically pregnant example: *šumma 2 tallū pūšam*_{acc} *nadû* “if there are two diaphragms with white spots_{acc}” (YOS 10 42 ii 57). If we take out *pūšam*, we will get a sentence *šumma 2 tallū nadû* which makes perfect sense: “if there are two diaphragms” (see CAD N₁ 91a and the entry *nadûm* below). Now *pūšam* creates a new syntactic and communicative pattern, while the SC seems to retain its existential meaning (the existence of *two* diaphragms is no trivial fact, therefore this information is also focal). The data on whether the white substance (*pūšum*) had been discharged by the *tallū* (“active” reading) or added from

elsewhere (“passive” reading) is outside the scope of this sentence. In other words, the SC form *nadû* has here no diathetic reading at all.¹⁵

The main reason that makes me postulate this type of diathesis-neutrality for the omen protases is as follows: If what we have in *šumma awīlum_{nom} kalbam_{acc} našik* is a garden variety of something like the adverbial Acc.¹⁶ or the Akkusativ der Beziehung/*tamyīz*,¹⁷ why then the prefixing morphological passive of Akkadian is of the *mašūl* type, i.e. why doesn't it allow the regular expression of agent/instrument and similar participants via the Acc. as the arguably adjunct case?¹⁸

This Excursus is meant to serve merely as a preliminary grammatical note to the analysis of two-place tokens of the SC in omen protases. Numerous questions remain unsolved and even unasked, however. E.g., is this approach useful for the understanding of certain two-place SC forms outside of omen protases, e.g. *še'um girram parik* “the grain is blocking the road” (CT 52, 84rev.:10, tr. of CAD P 155b)? What about “passive” sentences with the SC outside of omens, such as *išissu KÛ.GI uḫḫuz* “its base is mounted in gold” (Syria 20 112:4, cf. CAD A₁ 179b), or TÛG.ḪI.A *sāsam_{acc} laptū* “the textiles are moth_{acc} infested” (CTMMA I, 77:7ff.), 12 UDU.NITA₂.ḪI.A *si-im-tam_{acc} maḫšū* “12 sheep have been branded with a mark_{acc}” (AbB 12, 95:15f.)? And what to do with the two-argument constructions of the verbs of “filling”, such as *malûm* and *šebûm*? For *malûm*, cf. an elegant example from divination, with a prefixing verb form: *šumma martum mē imtanalla* “if the gallbladder constantly fills with water” (YOS 10, 31 IV 29f.), and compare it with *pīya eperam_{acc} mali_{SC}* “my mouth is full_{SC} of dust_{acc}” (AbB 6, 174:11 f.).¹⁹ Since the semantics of the Akkadian case system is beyond the scope of this study, I hope to address these questions on a different occasion.

As pointed out above, the S_{nom} N_{acc} V_{SC} construction has not yet got a systematic treatment in the Akkadian philology. Kouwenberg²⁰ correctly observes that “the presence of an accusative does not automatically entail an active interpretation (sc. of the SC. — *S.L.*)”, the only piece of proof he produced being our *šumma awīlum kalbam našik*.

This very protasis is mentioned in N. Wasserman's study of OB poetics as the only instance, within his corpus, of the construction he christened “*kalbam našik*”:²¹ “Here, the collocation *ka-al-ba-am na-ši-ik* ‘bitten by a dog’ is a clear-cut case of a passive compound reminiscent of the type *aklam išātim*.²² It should be borne in mind, however, that the order of the components of this construction is reversed: the verbal component

follows the substantive in *-am*".²³ Wasserman's juxtaposition of the two "types" sounds both cavalier and forced: In Akkadian, the verb normally fills the right-most slot in the sentence, so our example has the trivial word order SOV (it is therefore a full-fledged sentence rather than a "passive compound"), while *aklam išātim* is syntactically a noun phrase with the dependent noun in the genitive.²⁴ For this reason *aklam* is no "verbal component". A nominalization of *awīlum kalbam našik* (in the spirit of unusual noun phrases collected by W. von Soden, E. Reiner, and N. Wasserman) would be something like **(awīlum) naškam kalab/kalvim* "the one with a dogbite".²⁵

(50) *adāmum* "to invest (funds)", "to own (a share)"²⁶

The verb is restricted to OA and used only as the SC A. It often has the present-time stative reading of "having a share", with an explicit direct object: *a-ša-me-ma mī-ma i-na ELLAT.tim lá ad-ma-ku* "I understand that **I own no share** in the caravan enterprise" (CCT 3, 7b–8a:6ff.); *i-na ša ELLAT.at A-šūr-ma-lik ša ú-ša-ru-ú-ni-ma i-lá-qé-ú-ni iš-tí A-šūr-ma-lik A-šūr-i-mī-ti ù I-dí-A-šūr 5 ½ ma-na ad-ma-ku* "An dem, was sie von der Karawane von A.-M. zu nehmen begannen, **habe ich** zusammen mit A.-M., A-I. und I.-A. **einen Anteil** von 5 ½ M." (Prag I, 600:1–8). In certain contexts, it gets the past-time dynamic reading of "investing", again with an explicit direct object denoting that which was invested: *4 me-at 20 ma-na URUDU ša i-na É kà-ri-im ad-ma-tí-ni URUDU uš-a-ma qá-at-kà al-qé* "(as to) 420 minas of copper that **you invested** at the office of the karum, (this) copper has reached me [*uš-am-ma*] and I have received your share" (CCT 4, 34c:3–6): it looks like here *admāti* refers not to the present-time situation of "owning" but rather to the past-time act of "investing" that took place within the appropriate institutional setting (*ina bēt kārīm*); *2 ma-na KÙ.GI a-bu-ni a-na PN a-dí-im* "Our father has paid 2 minas of gold (in)to (the account of) PN" (BIN 4, 16:3–6). Both kinds of readings are productive in OA, see the dictionaries and *NABU* 1991/91 for additional references.

As the examples show, there are no salient formal correlates of the semantic distinction between "investing (a share)" and "owning (a share)"; this is purely a matter of contextual interpretation. No **P** tokens of *adim* are attested. In this respect, *adim* goes with such "having" SC forms of OB as *leqi* and *maḥir*. I cannot explain why this verb has no prefixing tenses for the meaning "to invest". It looks like the lacking prefixing forms of

adāmum were supplied in OA business terminology by *šapākum* (both G and Gt) and perhaps *šakānum*. (See the entry on *šapākum* presently.) Yet this fact itself needs an explanation.

The rest of the data on *adāmum* gathered in the literature are ambiguous. According to *NABU* 1991/91, “le sens technique attribué au permansif d’*adāmum* est dérivé de son sens propre actif ‘s’occuper de’, également attesté en paléo-assyrien à l’impératif” (and cf. CAD A₁ 96b, discussion section). The two known tokens of the Imv. are quoted with their respective contexts in *NABU* 1991/91. The forms and translations are as follows: *um-ma a-ta-ma ša-ni-ú-tum É a-bi-ni i-ta-bu-lu ù i-a-tí ad-ma-ni* “Tu (m’as dit) ceci: ‘Des étrangers pillent la maison de notre père, alors occupe-toi de moi!’ [end of reported speech]” (POAT 16:19–22); TÚG.ĤI.A *ma-lá ta-le-e-a-ni ad-ma-šum*¹ “Quant aux étoffes, autant que vous le pourrez, occupez-vous en pour lui” (TCL 3, 95:21ff.).²⁷ The technical sense of *adim* is that of “investing” into a common enterprise, and therefore “owning” a share therein. This meaning is established beyond doubt from numerous transparent contexts.²⁸ Now the path of synchronic semantic derivation from the assumed more basic sense “occupy oneself with” to “invest” is not self-explanatory, and the cited contexts do not compel us to interpret the above sign strings as forms of a verb meaning “to occupy oneself with” either. Besides, the two contexts acknowledged in *NABU* 1991/91 are syntactically heterogeneous (while the second one is in addition paleographically uncertain): *yāti adm-anni* “take care of me”²⁷ vs. TÚG.ĤI.A ... *admā-šum* “take care of the cloths on his behalf”²⁷. Most importantly for the present study, it is not clear why the derived sense should be restricted to the SC, while the alleged basic meaning is so poorly attested and restricted to the Imv. On the whole, the Imv. forms discussed in this paragraph hardly belong to the same verb as the above SC forms.²⁹

No Verbal Adjective (=VA). Note that the only known derivate of this verb is *admūtum* “share in a common enterprize”, a *hapax* in BIN 6, 144:1 (CAD A₁ 128b).

(51) *šapākum* “to store, invest”

The SC A is attested only in OA and only for the exclusively OA meaning “to invest”:³⁰ “x minas of gold *ana naruq* PN PN₂ *ša-pi-ik* PN₂ **has invested** in PN’s *n*-venture” (ICK 1, 20b:2ff.); x KÙ.GI *ša ana* PN *ša-áp-kà-tí-ni-ma* “x gold which you have invested into (the account of) PN” (CCT 5, 11d:7), 2 *ma-na* KÙ.GI *ša* PN *a-na a-bi₄-kà ša-áp-ku-ni-ma* “2

mines d'or **que PN a versées à ton père**" (CCT 2, 47b:5ff., tr. of LAPO 19, 281),³¹ and see more references in CAD Š₁ 419b. This SC **A** looks like a synonym of another OA verb, *adim* "he (has) invested (a certain sum)", "he owns (a share)", except that the verb **adāmum* has no tense forms other than the SC **A** and no meanings other than the above one. Cf. the text already quoted under *adāmum*: 2 *ma-na* KÛ.GI *a-bu-ni a-na* PN **a-dí-im** "Our father has paid 2 minas of gold (in)to (the account of) PN" (BIN 4, 16:36). N.C.J. Kouwenberg informs me in a p.c. regarding this text that "the amount of gold shows that this is a *naruqqum* 'investment' ", which once more³² corroborates the impression that *šapik* and *adim* may have been interchangeable in OA business terminology. As is probably the case with *adim*, *šapik* can be both present-stative (or resultative), as in the above examples, and past-time dynamic (or "pluperfect"):³³ *šipkāt* PN *ni-a-im ša ana* PN₂ **ša-áp-ku** *išti li-mu-um* (sic!) *aš'am* "I bought from the eponym the deposits of our (partner) PN **which he had deposited** for PN₂" (TCL 14, 20:7f, tr. of CAD L 196a).³⁴ The OA *šapākum* "to invest" is attested a few times in the Pret., Pres. (with future reference), and the Inv. (CAD Š₁ 419b). Yet the SC **A** is the most frequent form of this OA lexeme, while its SC **P** is not attested. It is possible that in OA the prefixing tenses and the Inf. for the meaning "to invest" were usually supplied by the Gt-forms of the same root, see its numerous attestations in CAD Š₁ 419. The CAD gloss for *šitapku* is "to store or deposit silver or textiles at the office of the *kāru* in order to participate in a joint commercial activity".³⁵

For the meaning "to store", only the SC **P** is attested (along with prefixing forms). It is frequent both in OA and OB, e.g. 2 *il₅-lu ku-nu-ku-šu i-ba-ší-ú i-na iš-té-en* 40 *ma-na ša-pi-ik i-na iš-té-en ki-i* 2 GÚ **ša-pí-ik** "there were (there) two bags under his seals. In the one 40 minas (of copper) **were stored**, in the other about 2 talents (of copper) **were stored**" (AKT 3, 40:21–25, OA). Note also the following exceptional OA example: *i-na* 93 TÚG [*ku*]-*ta-nu* 18 TÚG *ku-ta-nu ša a-ma-kam-ma lá-be-ru-ni ú sá-sá-am ša-áp-ku-ma bu-lá-tí-šu-nu šú-ḥa-ri nu-lá-bi₄-iš* "From the 93 *kutānu*-textiles, with 18 *kutānu*-textiles, the ones that **got** shabby and **infested with moth** over there, we clothed servants [thus giving them] their 'working-capitals' " (TPAK 1, 58:3–7);³⁶ in this text, *šapik* is used as a synonym of *lapit* "is/has been affected with (S_{acc})", known in both OB and OA (see the entry on *lapātum* in my article B&B 4). In OB, *šapik* **P** usually refers to the storing of grain, note the precativ form: *šeum šū ... lū ša-pí-ik* "Let this grain be stored (in the granary)" (AbB 1, 135:18 ff.). The N-stem

precativative can be used with about the same import: *li-iš-ša-pí-ik* “it (= this grain) has to be stored” (1, 9:30), *li-iš-ša-ap-ku* (6, 190:24”, same meaning). Note also the prohibitive form: *šeum [ina k]ārim lā ša-pí-ik* “the barley should not be stored at the harbor” (9, 137:6). In CH § 120:14, the N-Pret. *iš-ša-ap-ku* “(barley which) was stored” has an OB variant *ša-ap-ku*.³⁷

The fact that with certain roots the SC **P** of the G-stem is synonymous to the Pret./t-Perf. of the N-stem requires an explanation. If (with the state-of-art) the SC were “resultative” while the Pret. were “fientive”, the synonymy of the *šapik/iššapik* kind would be impossible. In this study, the drift of the SC **A** towards the semantic sphere of “simple Past” has been shown to be a common feature of the Akkadian morphosyntax. This is partly because “*only the patient* can be characterized by means of the result of an action, because in general *only the patient* is affected by an action”³⁸, which entails that the **A** resultative tokens of the SC are semantically fragile, they tend to evolve into something else (“simple Past” or a kind of Present).³⁹ This approach does not work for the *šapik/iššapik* synonymy, since both forms are semantically **P**. In this case, a different drift is at work. During the last three decades, in the typological research on the passive voice “it goes as common sense” that passivization entails (among other things) “predicative stativization (under a perfective-resultative perspective and marked verbal morphology)”.⁴⁰ Simply put, in text semantically *passive* verb forms happen to be stative/resultative oftener than the *active* ones, although the **P** paradigm may possess both stative and dynamic members (Engl. “is done” and “is being done”): this is because the active diathesis produces an association with dynamicity, while the passive diathesis has a “natural” flavour of stativity. Therefore, in all probability *šapik/iššapik* (*lū šapik/lū liššapik*) are interchangeable not because the SC **P** acquires here a dynamic force,⁴¹ but rather because the N-stem Pret. could be processed by the speakers as a stative predicate.

VA *šapku* EA, SB “heaped up; cast (metal)”.

(52) *lamādum* “to learn, study”

All the tokens of the SC **I** have found in the corpus are mentioned in the entry. There is one instance wherein the SC seems to have a progressive reading: DUB.SAR-*tám wa-dí lá-am-da-ni e-pá-tá-am a-na um-mi-a-ni-a šu-bi-lam ú ma-tí-ma lá ta-aq-bi um-ma a-ta-ma* 1 GÍN KÛ.BABBAR *a-na me-er-i-a lu-šé-bi₄-il₅* “Assurément, **nous apprenons** l’art du scribe. Envoie-moi une (étouffe)-*eppatum* pour mon maître. Car jamais tu n’as dit

ceci: ‘Je vais envoyer un sicle d’argent à mon fils!’ (CCT IV, 6e:4–14).⁴² For this letter, the interpretation “we are learning the scribal craft” works better than “we are finally masters of the scribal craft”, so here the progressive reading of *lamdāni* looks more or less assured. This case is similar to the American “He is studying toward a PhD”, i.e. it is no ongoing real time telic event in the strict sense of the word.⁴³ The rest of the attested SC forms render the idea of “possessing an experience or skill” of the kind that does not require previous training: *ina amātīm ša lá-am-du-ni* “(one) of the slave girls with whom they have had intercourse” (TuM 1 22a:29, OA);⁴⁴ *aššum ša kīam tašpurī umma attī-ma* KU₆ TUR.TUR *ša PN i-ra-am-mu ušābil-akkum akkīma mutu-ki* PN *ina GN u GN₂ [KU₆] TUR.TUR la-am-du anāku ištu pana ina GN₃ GN₄ GN₅ u GN₆ KU₆ GAL a-ra-am* “Concerning what you wrote saying: ‘I have sent you small fishes which PN loves’ – just as your husband PN **knows** little fishes from Qaṭara and Karana, I myself **have** from of old **liked** the big fish from Šubat-Enlil, Ekallatum, Mari and Babylon (OBT Tell Rimah 42:6–20).⁴⁵ This contextual synonymy of *lamid* “knows” and *irām* “loves” deserves notice (the SC of *rāmum* is not attested, to the best of my knowledge). In OB Mari: “the officials *ša akālim la-am-du* are aware of (the problem related to) food” (ARM 26/2, 380:18”); [*š*]a *parāšam la-am-du* “the one who **knows** to flatter” (ARMT 5, 4:13, in a partly broken context). In literary OB texts: *isiqša la-am-da-at* “she (the goddess) **is well versed** in the exercise of her powers” (VAS 10, 215:14), *šarrum ša ... bīt ili sà-ḥa-<ra>-am la-am-du* “the king who **is accustomed** to circumambulate the temple” (JRAS Cent. Sup. pl. 9rev.vi 17, cf. CAD B 287b).

Note that “I learned (something)” is *almad*,⁴⁶ therefore the personal subject of *lamid* has to be the same as that of the prefixing forms.⁴⁷ It is for this reason that all the above examples belong to the “active transitive stative” of the traditional grammar. The absence of passive transforms like **epištum/lawātum lamdat* “the fact/word has come to be known” (or **amtum lamdat* “the slave girl has been known sexually”) is conspicuous. It turns out that Akkadian possesses a sizable number of frequent transitive verbs whose SC **A** forms are two-place only or predominantly.⁴⁸ The problem revolves around the question “What is for Akkadian a resultative verb form?” Generally speaking, the resultative finite verb form codes a *state* that the language represents as a result of *becoming*, “des Werdens”, in other words *it is a state that has a history*. Akkadian tends to demand that the resultative state be “observable”.⁴⁹ Now then, what kind of state

can be the one resulting from a previous transitive event and possessing some kind of observability? Typically, this will be the state of the patient “observably” or otherwise relevantly affected by the action (cf. the above semantic classification of TTV). Thus, passive transforms **epištum lamdat* or **amtum lamdat* are not attested because the respective syntactic subjects are not “relevant patients” enough. This means that both some outspoken high-transitivity verbs (e.g. *dākum* “to kill”) and the verbs like *lamādum* (two-place, lowly dynamic “natural middle” verbs) are unlikely to have productive SC with passive readings.⁵⁰ Further, this entails that agent-oriented tokens of the SC can hardly ever be “resultative” in the sense patient-oriented forms of the SC are; for this reason semantic restrictions on the formation of the “active transitive” tokens of the SC can be (and often are) obviated.

VA *lamdu* “experienced (person)”, attested twice in bilingual literary SB texts (CAD L 67b).

(53) *lummudum* “to inform somebody, to teach somebody”

The prefixing forms with the meaning “to inform” are well attested in OA and OB (CAD L 57f.), with the Addressee in the accusative, cf. the formula ubiquitous in the official OB correspondence *kīam ulammid-anni* “he informed **me** about this”. Only one token of the SC was found in the corpus, for the meaning “to teach”: *šikaram ana šatēm lā lum-mu-ud* “(Enkidu) had not been yet taught to drink beer” (Gilg. P. 92, OB). This token looks like the predicative form of the VA *lummudum* “taught, experienced”, though the latter is attested only three times: once in NA and twice in Hh (CAD L 246b).

(54) *magārum* “to agree”, “to be acceptable”

I do not find any significant discrepancies between OB and OA in the use of this verb, so both corpora are treated here together.

*Magārum*₁ “to agree”. Prefixing forms of this lexeme are usually transitive, both the person with whom the referent of the syntactic subject is in agreement and the matter of agreement can be rendered by a direct object (“X AGREE with somebody_{acc}/something_{acc}”): *ana PN apnu-ma im-ta-ag-ra-ni* “I turned to PN and **he agreed with me**” (KT Hahn 17:4, OA); *[a-w]i-lum im-ta-ag-ra-ni-a-[t]i* “der Herr hat uns zugestimmt” (AbB 6, 116:19); *aššumīya maškattam ištēt lā ta-ma-ga-ar* “**you should not agree** to even one single payment on my account” (TCL 4, 18:15f., OA);⁵¹

šumma awatam annītam lā ta-ma-gār šuḥārī-ka lā tušbīat ṭurd-aš-šunu “if **you do not agree** on this matter, do not keep your servants overnight, send them to me” (CCT 2, 50:26–29). Consider also the sentences where all three core semantic participants get surface expressions (“X AGREE with somebody_{acc} upon something_{ana}”): *ana lā erēb šābim am-gu-ur-šu-nu-ti* “I agreed with them not to have the soldiers enter (the town)” (Bagh. Mitt. 2, 57 ii 12, OB); *ana awitim annītim mu-ug-ra-ni-ma* “agree_{m sg} with me in this matter” (VAT 9301:44, OA, text as in CAD M₁ 35b).⁵²

For *magārum*₁, the SC **P** ([the matter] **is agreed upon**) is not attested, while the SC **A** is frequent. I have found one instance of the SC **A** with a direct object, the bound pronoun pointing to the person with whom the subject agrees: *aššum pīka lā ša-ma-ku ul ma-ag-ra-ak-šu-nu-ti u anāku ul appal* “because I have not yet learned your decision, **I have not granted their request**, since (lit. ‘and’) I myself cannot answer them” (AbB 14, 150:11ff., Veenhof’s translation).⁵³ In yet another example, the matter of agreement is expressed by a prepositional phrase headed by *ana*: *an-ni-tam e-pu-ūš DINGIR-lum a-na an-ni-tim ma-gi-ir* “This is what I did. The god is (or ‘has been’?) favourable **to this**”⁵⁴ (ARMT 26/1, 115:10’f.). Otherwise, the clauses with the SC have only one syntactic argument, i.e. the subject (= the one who agrees), the other two semantic participants have to be supplied from the context: PN 5 *ša-na-at U₄-me iq-bi-a-am_{pret} ù a-tū-nu ma-ag-ra-tū-nu_{SC} a-na-ku lá am-gu₅-ur-šu_{pret}*⁵⁵ “PN proposed_{pret} me a term of five full years. And as for you, **you have agreed_{SC}**, yet I have not given_{pret} **him** my consent” (BIN 4, 32:9–12);⁵⁶ *šu-ma m[a]-ag-ra-tū-nu ṭup-pì lu-up-ta šu-ma lá ta-mu-a lu-šì* “if **you are willing**, write out a document for me, if you do not want to, I am going to leave” (BIN 6, 201:17ff.);⁵⁷ *k[īm]a tappā’ē-ni-ma ma-ag-ra-ni* “**we are in agreement**, just as our colleagues are” (TCL 14, 10:8”, OA, text and tr. of CAD M₁ 35b); *aššum qaqqad awātim ša lā riksī qall[u] ul ma-ag-ra-a-[ku]* “since business without contracts is of little value, **I do not agree** [therefore I am going to make the following decision]” (AbB 5, 171:9-12).⁵⁸

*Magārum*₂ “to be acceptable”

Unlike *magārum*₁, it has only two obligatory semantic participants, the one for whom something is acceptable and the matter of acceptance. The only example of a prefixing form with this meaning I have found is transitive: the subject stands for the accepted **matter**, the direct object codes **the one who accepts** (“It BE acceptable to someone_{acc}”): *šumma*

awātum lā im-ta-ag-ra-ka “**should** the proposal not **be acceptable** to you” (AbB 14, 27: 15f.). As in the case of *magārum*₁, the SC of *magārum*₂ keeps the diathetic value of the prefixing form(s), yet the exponents of “the-one-who-accepts” are either demoted to a prepositional phrase or deleted, to be supplied from the context. Examples with prepositions: *qibūt ina mahri-šin ma-ag-ra-at dubub* “say a word that **would be acceptable** for them” (AbB 2, 83:35f.);⁵⁹ RN ... *šarru ša qibīssu itti DN₁ u DN₂ ma-ag-ra-at anāku* “I am Samsuiluna, the king whose word **is pleasing** to DN₁ and DN₂” (CT 37 3 ii70f.). Examples with deletion: *u 5 ERIM.MEŠ eḫlūtīm ša [Ø] ma-ag-rū ki-la-ma /kill-am_{vent}-mal* “and (any) five young men that **are pleasing** [Ø = to you] keep **for yourself_{vent}**” (AbB 3, 51:12f.); *iqabbû-kim ma-gi-ir* “everybody says to you_{fem sg} ‘(it is) agreed!’”⁶⁰ (AbB 6, 55:7f.). Thus, the SC of *magārum*₂ is not attested with direct object (**awātum magrat-ka* “**the matter** is acceptable for you”), unlike *magrāk-šunūti* “I agree with them”; the production of such a transitive clause was probably blocked altogether by a semantic restriction, i.e. by the non-personal nature of the subject.

I will analyze the above data in terms of diathesis and tense-aspect-Aktionsart, starting with the sentence with *magārum*₁ wherein all three core participants have surface expressions: *ana lā erēb šābim amgur-šunūti* “I agreed with them on not-entering of the army”. One can transform it into at least two grammatical sentences with the SC: *magrāk-šunūti* “I (have) agree(d) with them”, *ana lā erēb šābim magrāku* “I (have) agree(d) on not-entering of the army”. The third one, **ana lā erēb šābim magrāk-šunūti* “I (have) agree(d) with them on not-entering of the army” does not seem impossible,⁶¹ but this pattern is not attested. The SC **P** **lā erēb šābim (ina mahriya) magir* “Not-entering of the army is/has been agreed upon (by me)” is not attested. Yet the above evidence suggests that it would be a grammatical Akkadian sentence if it meant something like “Not-entering of the army is pleasant/pleasing/acceptable (for me)”, i.e. if the SC form were related to *magārum*₂ “to be acceptable”. In the language of TRC, it is a “derived stative”: this form, unlike the resultative proper, codes “the state as such with no reference to its origin” (TRC 498, I. Š. Kozinsky).⁶² This proves that the SC forms gathered here under the label *magārum*₂ are no **P** of *magārum*₁. They belong to the semantically stative lexeme *magārum*₂ “to be acceptable” (with an inanimate subject), otherwise attested at least once as the future-time t-Perf. in a conditional clause: *šumma awātum lā imtagr-akka* “if the matter happens to be unacceptable to you”.

The fact that this verb has a direct object at all looks peculiar, because its degree of semantic transitivity is of course very low.⁶³ In terms of Aktionsart, I would label *magārum*₁ “to agree” a “change-of-state achievement” and assign *šapākum* “to invest” to the same class, although the argument structures of the two verbs are not identical. Yet, both of them represent punctual events that affect the agent (they are “agent-oriented”, in terms of the above taxonomy), i.e. these events produce relevant *s t a t e s* of the respective *a g e n t s*. The SC A of this lexeme is RESULTATIVE, less often PERFECT, as the above examples and commentaries show.

*Magārum*₂ “to be acceptable” is a semantic stative, comparable to *naʿādum* “to be attentive” (No 56 below). Its SC is, as I have just noted, a non-resultative STATIVE.

VA *magru* “favourable, obedient, in agreement”, from MB, MA on (CAD M₁ 47b).

(55) *maqātum* “to fall down”, “to arrive”

There are no important differences in the use of the SC between OB and OA letters, except it is more frequent in the latter corpus. I already adduced some data on the SC of *maqātum* in a recent article.⁶⁴ The point there was to show that *maqit* is very rarely formed for the basic meaning of the root, “to fall down, collapse”. The only example was “the rear of the house *maqit* has collapsed” (Prag I 577:4f.). I have now found another example of this kind, in the parable the king Hammurapi told an envoy of Zimri-Lim: *š[u]m-[m]a É-tum e-le-nu-úš-šu im-qú-ut-ma úš-šu-šu da-an-nu x [o o o] É {x x x x} da-an š[um-ma uš-šu]-šu ma-aq-tu-ma e-le-nu-úš-šu ša-lim m[im-ma e]-pí-is-sú ú-ul i-le-i i-ma-aq-qú-ut* “Soit une maison dont le haut **s’est effondré** mais dont les fondations **sont solides**: le [...] de la maison **est solide**. Mais si ses fondations **s’effondrent** alors que son haut **est en bon état**, son maçon ne pourra rien faire et elle **s’effondrera**” (ARM 26/2, 392:45–48). The morphological difference between *šumma bītum elēnuššu imqut* and *šumma uššūšu maqtū* looks like free variation, with no meaningful opposition involved. If we disregard a possible influence of the poetic structure, we have to admit that *maqtū* is used here as a “simple past” (rather than as a resultative form), the way it often happens with the SC of different verbs, especially highly dynamic ones.

The second-dynamic sense of *maqātum* for which both prefixing tenses and the SC are attested, refers to the loss of cattle: *ÁB.ĪI.A ekallim i-ma-qú-ta* “the cattle of the palace are perishing” (ARM 1, 118:21), and

see CAD M₁ 243b; ANŠE.HI.A-[i]a *ma-[a]q-tu* <wa->*ar-ka-s[ú]* *ap-ru-ús-ma* ANŠE.[HI.A-šú] *m[a]-aq-[tu]* “‘Mes ânes ont subi des pertes’. J’ai fait une enquête. Ses ânes ont bien subi des pertes” (ARM 26/1, 63:12ff.).⁶⁵

A number of other metaphorical senses of the SC are also attested in OB Mari only, which may be due to chance in all cases: *mu-ut-ta-at ma-a-tim a-na* NP ù *mu-ut-ta-at ma-a-tim a-na a-|hi-šu ma-aq-[t]a-at* “La moitié du pays **a fait soumission** à NP, et l’autre moitié à son frère” (ARM 26/2, 359:6f.). The Edition’s interpretation looks very plausible, though no other tokens of the SC with this meaning are attested, while the semantically similar construction of prefixing tenses usually includes *ana šēp* PN (cf. CAD M₁ 242b).⁶⁶ Thus, *mātum ana* PN *maqta* “the country **is obedient** to PN” is a lexicalized stative reading. Yet another meaning of the SC seems to be a lexicalized one, i.e. without exact matches in the suffixing tenses: LÚ.MEŠ *šunu* DUMU *si-im-a-al ana šīr bēlī-ya ma-aq-t[u]* “Ces hommes sont des Benê Sim’alites, **tout dévoués à mon Seigneur**” (ARM 26/1, 5:48). In a note to this translation (ARM 26/1, p. 85), J.-M. Durand observed that “l’expression *ana šīr* NP *maqātum* (permansif) signifie dans plusieurs contextes clairs de Mari: “être tout dévoué à”, and adduced more examples from unpublished texts, one of them is *ana šīr bēlī-ya ma-aq-ta-ku* “je suis tout dévoué à mon Seigneur” (A.2049:7ff.). In this note, J.-M. Durand suggests that the very same phrase is attested in Mari with “un sens légèrement différent d’**être profitable à**”: Je leur ai tenu ces propos et bien d’autres qui pouvaient être profitable pour mon Seigneur Zimri Lim = [*ša a-na ši-ri ša be-[lī]-ia zi-im-ri-li-im [m]a-aq-ta* (A.4530-bis)].⁶⁷ J.-M. Durand proposes to derive the meaning of the SC in this phrase from the sense “tomber au combat”, “faire le sacrifice de sa vie pour...” (ARM 26, p. 86), yet, as we have seen above, the resultative reading of *maqit* ≈ “he is/has fallen” does not appear in OB letters. Besides, the senses “he is devoted to someone” and “it is profitable to someone” would have hardly developed from the “he has perished” notion. I suggest that this Mari usage is derived from the meaning “to fall down” = “to do homage”. Alternatively, it could be akin to the one known from omina: in smoke omina protases *šumma qutrēnum maqta* probably means “if the smoke is going down” (see below). On both suggestions, behind the “devotion/profit” there stands the notion of “inclining”.

The SC is best known for the motion meaning “to arrive”.⁶⁸ In OB letters, two examples were found: “persons *ša ana šīrī-ka ma-aq-tu lillikū* that **arrived** to you have to leave” (AbB 6, 109:9ff.); *anāku ina šapilti ša-*

bi-im BÀD^{KI} *ša ma-aq-tu ša ana be-lí ašpur epeš* “et moi, avec le reste de l’armée de la citadelle, qui **est arrivée**, je ferai ce que j’ai écrit à mon Seigneur” (ARM 26/1, 147:9–13).⁶⁹ Both these tokens look like past-tense dynamic rather than stative-resultative. Yet, for a genuine dynamic form of a motion verb one would expect the allative ventive in both cases (**maq-tam* or **maq-tū-nim*). In reality, the allative ventive is used with the SC of motion verbs rather sparingly.

In OA, the “arrive” meaning of the SC is better documented. Consider the following examples, wherein the SC is used with negation: *a-dí wa-ar-ḫi-im iš-té-en₆* DAM.QAR-*ru-um* 10 *ma-na* URUDU *i-ša-qá-lam lá* KÙ.BABBAR 1 GÍN *a-qá-tí-a ma-qí-it lá* URUDU 10 *ma-na a-qá-tí-a ma-qí-it* “The trade agent is supposed to pay me 10 mines of copper within one month. (Yet, in the meantime) **I have got** neither one shekel of silver nor ten mines of copper” (VAS 26, 26:16–20),⁷⁰ *um-ma šu-ut-ma* KÙ.BABBAR *a-na qá-tí-a lá ma-qí-it* KÙ.BABBAR *a-na qá-tí-a i-ma-qú-ut-ma* KÙ.BABBAR-*áp-šu ú-šé-ba-al-šum um-ma a-na-ku-ma iš-tù-ma* KÙ.BABBAR *a-na qá-tí-kà lá ma-aq-tá-ni a-ma-lá na-áš-pé-er¹-tí wa¹-ar-ki-tim* 20 *ma-na* KÙ.BABBAR *ù ší-ba-tí-šu ma-lá a-na ší-ib-tim il₅-qé-aku-ni* [*ilqe-akkun-ni*] *lu-bi-il₅-šu*[*m*]-*ma* *ù ší-tám wa-ar-kà šé-bi-¹il₅* “He told (me): ‘The silver **has not** (yet) **come** into my hand. If the silver **comes** into my hand, I will send him his silver’. I answered (him): ‘If the silver **has not** indeed **come**_{vent} into your hand, then according to (his) last message 20 mines of silver and their interest as much as he borrowed at interest on your behalf — I shall bring_{Juss} it to him, and you bring_{Imv} the rest afterwards’ ” (CCT 4, 30b:8–22). Examples without negation are as follows: *šu-ma šu-ḫa-ru-um a-na li-bi₄-kà ma-qí-it* “if the (above-mentioned) servant has arrived/arrives to you, (let us know)” (AKT 3, 114:16ff.); TÙG.ḪI-*tí-šu a-šar ma-aq-tù-ni ú-šu-ru-šu-_{<um>}* “<...> sollen sie seine Stoffe, wohin **sie** auch **gelangt sind**, ihm loslassen” (Prag I 681:30f.).

At least the negated tokens look more like negative counterparts of the t-Perf. rather than genuine resultative (i.e., semantically stative) forms, though this cannot be proven definitely. The dynamic element in their meaning is also corroborated by the allative addressee ventive on one of them, *ištūma kaspum ana qātī-ka_i lā maqt-an_j-ni* (CCT 4, 30b:15). This is the only (+vent.) example of the SC of *maqātum* I have found. Note that prefixing tenses of *maqātum* “to arrive” are almost regularly (+vent.) when the arriving entities are humans, messages and vehicles, yet with

merchandise as “moving” syntactic subject the prefixing verb is either (+ vent.) or has a dependent prepositional phrase (*ana qātī-* and its likes), see examples in CAD M₁ 245ff.⁷¹ In the case of merchandise as subject, the ventive points to the speaker only, e.g. *šūmum imqut-am/imtaqt-am/imaqqut-am* “the merchandise came/has come/will come my way” (cf. AbB 12, 52:10; 53:29), as against the prepositional phrase that can refer both to the speaker and addressee: *kaspum ana qātī-kal qātī-ya imaqqut*. This evidence makes one conclude that sentences like *kaspum imqut-am* and *kaspum ana qātī-kalqātī-ya imqut* were not processed by the language as motion events but rather as periphrases for “to receive, to get”. I would dare to suggest that *ištūma kaspum ana qātī-ka; lā maqt-an;ni* “if the silver has not indeed come into your hand” was reinterpreted as a motion event, i.e. the etymological sense of this verb phrase was foregrounded, hence the ventive.

In the protases of OB omens, we come across either *maqit* or *imtanaqqut*, while *imaqqut* is not attested.⁷² In the perspective of the present study, with its underlying assumption that in the early 2nd millennium Akkadian to code the Present Progressive sense was an “emergency procedure”, this fact deserves special attention. I will produce examples wherein the stative interpretation of *maqit* and “verbal plurality”,⁷³ interpretation of *imtanaqqut* are not very plausible: *šumma qutrēnum ana imittī-šu ikšur-ma šumēl-šu ma-aq-ta-at* “if the smoke concentrated to the right and (then) its left starts going down⁷³” (UCP 9, 377rev.:44, see *ibid.* 48, and cf. CAD M₁ 244b, B 122b.⁷⁴ In the case of smoke omens there is little doubt that the real-life facts were of truly “fientive” (i. e., in no way stative) nature. Therefore, the SC *maqat* most probably depicts a dynamic event. Consider also the following example: *šumma awīlum inūma šallu ālum im-ta-na-qū-ta-šum u i-ḥa-az-zu-ma išemmu-šu* “if a man, when he sleeps, (dreams that) the city is falling⁷ upon him, and he groans and someone hears him” (*AfO* 18, p. 67 iii 31ff.). The Edition translates “the town falls **again and again** upon him”, which implies a recurrent nightmare, but the protasis contains no indications to this effect except the Gtn-stem itself, whose derivational meaning is not that straightforward. CAD N₁ 241a translates “**the entire** city is falling upon him”, but this is pure guesswork.

My guess is that in spoken Akkadian certain semantic groups of verbs used the Pres. of Gtn-stem as a more expressive exponent of Progressive sense than the Pres. of G-stem. Note that for the verb *rabāšum*, “to lie

down”, we find in smoke omens what looks like synonymy of the SC G and the Pres. Gtn,⁷⁵ cf. the texts and translations as they appear in CAD R 12a: *šumma qutrinnum ana ereb šamši maḥrātušu ra-ab-ša arkassu šaqât* “if the front parts of the (smoke of the) incense **are settling down** toward the west but its rear part is ascending⁷⁵” (*Or NS* 32, 383:11); *šumma qutrinnum ir-ta-n[a]-b[i]-iṣ* “if the (smoke of the) incense **keeps settling down**” (UCP 9, 369:37). Most probably, both *rabṣā* and *irtanabbiṣ* refer to the same real-life situation, so the translation “keeps settling down” might be artificial.⁷⁶ One has to keep in mind that both *maqit* and *imtanaqqut* can also be used to describe a *condition* of still exta rather than dynamic events of *movement* (cf. the above examples), and this fact requires explanation. Cf. the following examples: *ú-ba-nu ša-al-ma-at MÁŠ [= šibtum] ma-aq-ta-at* (*JCS* 21, p. 231:27, an extispicy report = ARM 26/1, 100–bis:50)⁷⁷ vs. [*erištum*] *nadiat-ma im-ta-na-qú-ut* (CT 44, 37:21 = CAD M₁ 244b). The last protasis says “there is an *e*-mark in the horizontal⁷ position”,⁷⁸ cf. *šumma ... šitta KÁM.MEŠ nadû ritkubû* “if there are two *e*-marks riding one upon the other” (TCL 6, 4rev.:3, cf. CAD E 300b, SB), *kakkum nadi-ma martam iṭṭul* “there is a ‘weapon-mark’ facing the gall bladder” (RA 44, 24:8, cf. CAD N₁ 91a); with a different existential auxiliary and the same *imtanaqqut* as the main verb: *šumma <ina> rēš [ubānim] qûm pešûm šakim-ma u im-ta-[na]-aq-qú-ut* “if on top of the ‘finger’ there is a white ‘filament’ in the horizontal⁷ position” (YOS 10, 33 r.iv:35ff.).⁷⁹ In descriptions of still exta, *imtanaqqut* (rather than *maqit*) appears in the non-initial slot, preceded by the SC, whether existential (as above) or descriptive, as in the examples that follow: “if the ‘weapon’ ... *saliḥ-ma im-ta-na-qú-ut* is covered with drops and lies horizontally⁷” (YOS 10, 46 v 16), *šumma ina maškan lu-mu-[un li-ib-bi-i]m erištum ḥa-al-la-at ta-⁷ar-ka⁷-at ⁷ ù ⁷ [im⁷-t]a⁷-na-qú-ut⁸⁰* “if on the *maškan lumun libbim* (a feature of liver) there is an *e*-mark which ...” [the sequence *ḥallat tarkat u imtanaqqut* is difficult for a cogent interpretation] (YOS 10, 26 iii 40–41).

My attempt to explain this evidence runs as follows. In spoken OB, both *maqit* and *imtanaqqut* could be used for coding the ongoing telic event of “falling”, and this usage is reflected in omen protases that depict real-life motion. In “still life” protases, second-slot *imtanaqqut* (*erištum nadiat-ma imtanaqqut*) is a feature of literary consecutio temporum, idiosyncratic for this genre. This usage of *imtanaqqut* for stative situations is a metaphor built on analogy with *maqit*: in spoken language, *maqit* could be both stative and dynamic (= *imtanaqqut*), hence the derived (and “artificial”)

stative use of *imtanaqqut* (= *maqit*) in “still life” protases, with a purely syntactic distribution of the two forms: *maqit* is the first or the only protasis predicate, while *imtanaqqut* follows the chain-initial SC form and copies its stative meaning. In the above examples, the morphological difference between *imtanaqqut* (Pres.) and *ritkubū* (SC) as the second-slot predicates has to do with lexically determined aspectual properties of respective verbs (≈ “Aktionsart”).⁸¹ This analogical shift whereby *imtanaqqut* acquired stative reading within a literary genre can be explicated by comparison with the Optative Perfect of the Classical Arabic (*rahīma-hu llāhu* “may God have compassion on him”): most probably, the Arabic Perfect developed this meaning by analogy with the short form of the Prefix Conjugation, which is essentially a modal form (optative/jussive), but in a few syntactic surroundings the Prefix Conjugation has the same meaning as the Perfect, i.e. past tense.⁸²

Finally, let us consider an omen from YOS 10, 47. The protases of this tablet relate the behaviour or condition of sheep that are being sacrificed, which means that some of these texts describe dynamic events. The protasis that interests us is as follows: *šumma immerum uznašū im-ta-ḡna-qú-ta*⁸³ “if the sheep is twitching its ears” (YOS 10, 47:4). In this case, I believe, we have a clear-cut case of verbal plurality (“sheep’s ears fall again and again”), an atelic process.

VA *maqtum* “(wind)fallen, collapsed, dilapidated”, from OB on.

(56) *naʿādum* “to be attentive”

The root *naʿādum* is a stative intransitive: it does not express activities, but rather agentive states.⁸⁴ Its G-stem is used as follows:⁸⁵

(1) “to be attentive, careful, anxious”, with no surface argument encoding the matter of attention. Imv. is frequent in both OA and OB: [*aḥī*] *atta i-ḥi-id* “you are my brother, **take care**” (BIN 6, 256:21, end of letter), *ana awātim annītim lā tuštaḥḥa mādiš i-ḥi-id* “do not act improperly in this affair, **be very careful**” (UCP 9, 345 No 20:13), see also CAD N₁ 1 and 3b. Indicative forms with this meaning are attested mostly in OB, the SC is one of them: *ana pagrī-ya našārim aḥī ul anaddi mādiš n[a-a]ḥ-da-ku* “I do not neglect taking care of myself, **I am very careful**” (ARM 10, 142:11), see more examples of the SC in CAD N₁ 3b. Note a semantically stative Pret. as read by von Soden: *be-[e]l-tu[m ša t]a-ḥi-du* “the Lady who **was watchful**” (ZA 44, 32:14 [VAS 10, 215], von S. translates “die Herrin, die aufmerkte”). Phrases of the kind *libbaka lā inaʿid* “not to worry!”, *libbī*

na'id “I am anxious” are well attested mostly in OB Mari (CAD N₁ 4a).

(2) In OA, volitive forms and prefixing tenses of *na'ādum* precede the main verbs “in hendiadys” (CAD N₁ 1a–2) to render the writers’ insistence, resolve, etc., cf. the ubiquitous *i'id-ma kaspam šēbil-am* “**take care** to send me some silver”. The Imv. of *na'ādum* looks here as a near-synonym of *apputtum* “please”: *apputtum ē lā tušēbil-am* “please send (it) to me” (CCT 4, 19b:20f.).⁸⁶ An example of this usage of the Pres. is as follows: *a-na-ḥi-id-ma akaššad-am* “**I will take care** to arrive at where you are” (BIN 4, 7:25).

(3) In OB and OA, the verb is used with *ana* or dative personal pronouns to introduce the contents of care/concern. Both the Pres. and the SC code non-future situations of this kind (at least in OB): [š]u[ḥar]û *kīma ša ana awâtī-[k]a [la i]-na-aḥ-ḥi-du* “Daß die Burschen sich nicht um deine Worte **kümmern** (hat ... mir geschrieben)” (AbB 8, 19:4”f.); LÚ.TÚG *ša i-na-aḥ-ḥi-da-kum ula ibašši* “there is no (other) fuller who **pays attention to you**” (UET 6, 414:39),⁸⁷ GU₄.ḪIA *ša tēzibū-šunūti na-a-du-um-ma i-na-aḥ-i-du-šu-nu-ši-im-ma ḥīlam ul iraššû* “**they take** very good **care** of the cattle you have left, they will suffer no losses” (AbB 3, 94:11ff., tr. of CAD N₁ 3b),⁸⁸ *ana šuḥārī-ka na-aḥ-da-ni* “**we take care** of your employees” (CCT 3, 36a:18). Cf. additional examples of the present-time SC (all OA, where the present-time Pres. has not been found): *anāku annakam ana tērtī-kunu na-aḥ-da-ku* “here **I am attentive** to your instructions” (CCT 3, 11:3ff.); *ki-ma a-na-ku a-na té-er-tí-kà na-aḥ-da-kuni ú a-ta i-ḥi-id-ma* KÛ.BABBAR *ša li-bi₄-kà šé-bi₄-lam* “Since **I am attentive** to your instructions, **be so kind** to send me your silver” (AKT 2, 29:11–15); *a-ma-kam ša ki-ma <ku-a-tí > a-na a-wa-tí-kà na-aḥ-du* “over there <your representatives> **take care** of your problems” (TTC 10:9ff., text as in RA 80:113).⁸⁹

(4) In OB, the SC is used in the sense defined in CAD N₁ 4a as “to be a cause for worry”, in AHw. 693a as “ist besorgniserregend”. Both this meaning and the fact it is attested only for the SC require explanation. Consider the following examples from OB letters: *eqlum ša tattanallaku na-ḥi-id ramanka ušur* “The region you use to travel in **gives cause for concern**. Take care of yourself!” (AbB 14, 148:6f., Veenhof’s translation); *aššum ḥarrānum na-aḥ-da-a-at kasapka ula uterrū-nikkum* “they will not bring your silver back to you because the road is not safe” (UET 5, 17:8 = CAD N₁ 4), *šumma martum na-aḥ-sà-at na-aḥ-da-at* “if the gall bladder is held down[?], **this is a reason to worry**” (YOS 10, 31 i 11).⁹⁰ Apodoses of YOS 10 often say *ana šarrim na'id* “one has to worry about the king”

(CAD N₁ 4). We have to keep apart *ana šarrim naʔid*, where the worrier about the king is “generic”, i.e. coded by the 3 ms. form of the SC within the generic (or “impersonal”) construction, while in the rest of the examples accumulated in CAD and AHW the subject codes the contents of concern, and the worrier (“Experiencer” in the technical language of semantic roles) is not mentioned.⁹¹ Let us compare the following sentences:

(a) *ana ḥarrānim naʔdāku* “**I am anxious** about the road” [Subj. = Experiencer, Obliq. obj. = Contents]

(b) *ḥarrānum naʔdat* “the road **provokes anxiety**” [Subj. = Contents, Experiencer is not mentioned]

Obviously, (a) is the source sentence and (b) is syntactically derived from it, since the basic meaning of *naʔādum* is “to be attentive/concerned”. Thus, we come across a diathetic shift with no morphological marking on the verb. This particular shift (and therefore the meaning “to cause worry”) is possible for the SC of *naʔādum* (and only for the SC of this verb) due to the very neutralization of voice oppositions that conditions the “active transitive” use of the SC of certain transitive verbs. In the same way *naʔādum*, a stative intransitive verb, developed a quasi-**causative** reading (with implied direct object) that is limited to the SC.

Semantically, *naʔādum* (at least in my sub-entries 1 and 2) looks like a “middle situation” verb as defined by S. Kemmer.⁹² Like in some other verbs of emotion, its subject is in a matter-of-fact way both the Initiator of the situation and its Endpoint, i.e. the affected entity.

VA *naʔdum* (1) “pious, attentive”; (2) “careful, trustworthy”, in Babylonian from OB on (CAD N₁ 65b). Meaning (1) is attested in literary texts, referring to kings and gods, meaning (2) is mainly known from OB letters.

(57) *nuʔudum* “to alert, to instruct”. The Pret., Pres. and Imv. are common in OB and OA letters, the addressee of instructions is in the Akk.: *ana ša tù-na-ḥi-di-ni* [*tunaʔidī-ni*] *a-na-ḥi-id* “I shall pay attention to the things which you_{fs} have enjoined me to pay attention to” (TCL 20, 107:45, OA, tr. of CAD N₁ 5a). The SC **P** has been found once in OB: *aššum suluppī ša PN PN₂ nu-uh-ḥu-ud* “concerning the dates of PN, PN₂ **has been alerted**” (AbB 6, 145:13ff.)

No VA.

(58) *nadānum* “to give”. The SC base in OA is *tadin*, in OB it is mostly *nadin*, see CAD N₁ 43–44 for shapes of the prefixing tenses in various corpora.

In OB, the SC **P** is attested dozens of times, often in a purely resultative present-time sense. The following examples (official correspondence of Hammurapi’s time) illustrate: (1) A.ŠÀ-*am*_{acc}⁹³ *ša ... innadnu kīma na-ad-nu-ma na-di-in ina eqlim šuāti 1 SAR eqlum lā illappat* “Das Feld_{acc}, welches [an die Vertrauensleute und die Seefischer] ausgegeben worden ist, **bleibt** genau, wie es **ausgegeben ist, ausgegeben**. Von besagtem Felde soll (auch) nicht eine Fläche (von) eine(r) Quadratrute angetastet werden!” (AbB 4, 6:4–10); (2) *eqlšu ša taššuru ašar tattadnu lū na-di-in* “Sein Feld, das du abgeteilt hast, soll (auch weiterhin dort) **ausgegeben bleiben**, wohin du es ausgegeben hast!” (AbB 4, 55:9ff.). In (1), the event of giving is coded by the N-stem Pret. *innadin* (“ist ausgegeben worden”) in a relative clause, while the resultative state is coded by the G-stem SC *nadin* (“ist ausgegeben”).⁹⁴ In (2), the same kind of event is expressed by the t-Perf. *tattadin* in a locative clause,⁹⁵ while its present-time result *nadin* is implied in the volitive *lū nadin*.⁹⁶ The SC with the indicative negation is different: *ištēn alpum ul na-d[i-i]š-šum* “Not a single ox **has been given** to him.” (LH 1:22). This negated token of the SC looks like a negative alloform of the t-Perf.;⁹⁷ *attadin* “Ich habe gegeben” or *ittaddin*⁹⁸ “es ist gegeben worden” vs. *ul nadin* “es ist nicht gegeben worden”,⁹⁹ although the question is delicate and probably can never be solved definitely in the absence of native-speaking informants (see also TRC: 552f. on the meaning of negated resultative forms). The positive form of the SC **P** can also be used as “simple past”: *atta ana mārūti na-ad-na-ta-ma ana ilik bīti abī-ka il-te-qū-ka* “du **bist** als (Adoptiv)sohn **weggegeben** und man hat dich zum Lehndienst deiner (Adoptiv)familie angenommen” (AbB 7, 125:13ff.). F. Kraus translated *nadnāta* with the German Resultative,¹⁰⁰ yet the chain “SC-*ma* t-Perf.” with the sequencing conjunction *-ma* demands the preterital interpretation of this form.

The SC **A** is rare, most of the examples I have found are 1 cs, a fact I cannot explain:¹⁰¹ *šeam ana UGULA MAR.TU x na-ad-na-ku* “Ich habe die Gerste dem Obersten **überhändigt**” (AbB 7, 60:7f.); *kaspam gamram lū na-ad-na-ku* “**I have paid** all the silver” (YOS 8, 150:21f., a legal document);¹⁰² 2 GÍN *kaspam na-ad-na-ak-šum* “Ich habe ihm zwei Sekel Silber gegeben” (AbB 4, 149:10);¹⁰³ *ina libbi 3 TÚG.ĪI.A-ka ištēn na-ad-na-a-ti u šaniam anāku annikām attadin* “(as regards the three garments,

your impost,) of these three garments of yours **you have given** one, a second one **I myself have now given** here” (AbB 14, 119:6–9, Veenhof’s translation). It looks like at least the last **A** token is dynamic (i.e., past-time rather than stative-resultative), which is corroborated by the parallelism of *nadnāti* and *anāku attadin*: in this case both verb forms likely have the same tense-aspect reading.¹⁰⁴

Another possible example of non-**P** reading is as follows: *ana pūḫātī-ki na-ad-na-[ku]* “I would give myself as your substitute” (OBT Tell Rimah 162:32, the Edition’s translation). CAD P 494b translates “I am handed over as your substitute”. The contextual sense is better rendered by the Edition. In the note to this line (p. 133), the Edition aptly compares the message of these concluding words of the letter to the well-known greeting formula *ana dinān bēlīya lullik* “may I be a substitute for my lord” (i.e., “give my life for my lord”), attested in MB letters and other post-classical corpora, and sporadically in OB (VAS 16, 55:9f.; ARM 5, 57:4f.). Since the prospective doer of *nadnāku* is the writer, this is contextually conditioned reflexive sense that doubtless emerged from the **P** one (~ “I am given”).

In OA, the SC **P** is frequent in the semi-technical meaning “is sold”, e.g. TPAK 3:9, Prag 1, 520:6, and see AOATT 369. It is also attested for the idiom *ana arnim tadānum* “to subject someone to punishment”: *ša-bu-um ma-[d]u-um a-na ar-nim ta-dī-in* “many people **have been fined**” (VAS 26, 9:8f.). The SC **A** is rare, I have found no examples of it in the CAD entry. The only available **A** tokens come from two documents. KTS 1, 4088 *šī-tí KÙ.BABBAR ... a-na-ku ta-ad-na-ku i-na x ma-na KÙ.BABBAR ša a-ta ta-ad-na-tī-ni šī-im y TÚG y ma-na KÙ.BABBAR PN i-na-pá-lá-ku-um* “den Rest des Silbers **habe ich gegeben**. Von den x Mine Silber, **die du gegeben hast**, wird dir den Preis von y Stoffen, y Mine Silber, PN als Ausgleich zahlen” (7–11, text and translation as in GKT 121d). Prag 1, 653:5’–8’: 2 GÍN.TA É *kà-ri-im ni-<iš>-ta¹-qal-ma a-na ba-at-qí-im ta-ad-nu* “... zahlten wir im Kārum-Haus je 2 S., und dann **hat man billig verkauft**”.¹⁰⁵

An important question is why *leqi* and *maḫir* display almost only **A** readings, “has” or “has got”, while *nadin* is mostly though not exclusively **P**: “it has been given”/“it is given” rather than “he has given”. The observability criterion does not help: all three productive SC forms in question — *leqi*, *maḫir* and *nadin* — are not “observable”. My calculus of the relative productivity of the SC for the TTV predicts that for low transitivity verbs such as ours the crucial semantic factor is not the

observability but rather orientation of the action toward the agent vs. “theme”, i.e. the moving participant in verbal events of “giving” and “taking”.¹⁰⁶ In legal and quasi-legal contexts of OB letters and documents, the event depicted as “taking” affects the status of the taker more than that of the theme.¹⁰⁷ On the contrary, in the situations of “giving” (*nadānum*) the most salient entity is usually the theme (e.g. the land *given* to a tenant), less often the giver (e.g. the one who *pays back* his debt). This “middle” element in the meaning of *nadānum* is responsible for the appearance of the SC A (“**he has** something **given**”). No examples with the receiver as the subject of the SC (“**he is given** the silver”) have been found.

No proper VA in the corpus. A noun *nadintu/nadittu* “gift” is attested in OB and MB (CAD N₁ 62a); *nadnu* “given” “occ. only in personal names” in NA and NB (CAD N₁ 65a).

(59) *nadûm* “to throw (down); lay down”

Nadi is one of the most frequent SC forms in the corpus. It is formed mostly for the derived lexical meanings of *nadûm*, i.e., not for its most basic sense of literal “throwing”. *Nadi* also appears in important lexicalized usages.

In OA letters and documents, the SC has the following kinds of readings:

(1) For the low transitivity meanings “to put”, “to place”, “to deposit”, both **P** and **A** readings are well attested. Consider an example of the SC **P**: KÙ.BABBAR *iš-tù u₄-mù-im a-mù-im kà-ni-ik-ma i-na Kà-ni-iš na-dí* “since that day, the silver **is** sealed and **deposited** in Kaniš” (CCT 4, 14a:22ff.).¹⁰⁸ Both *kanik* and *nadi* are clear-cut **P** resultative forms (“objective resultatives” in the language of TRC).¹⁰⁹ This **P** usage of *nadi* is common in OA (see more examples in CAD N₁ 84f.). In the available corpus, the meaning “let it be deposited” is always expressed with the N-stem precative rather than *lu nadi*, see CAD N₁ 99bf. As expected, the **A** tokens are often semantically identical to the Pret. or *t*-Perf.: 20 *ma-na AN.NA áš-a-ma-kum-ma 5 ma-na.TA AN.NA a-na pá-ni šu-uq-lá-tim na-du-ú-ma na-áš-ú-ni-kum* “(with 1 mina of silver) kaufte_{pret} ich dir 20 M. Zinn. **Sie legten_{SC} dann** je 5 M. Zinn auf die Vorderseite der Packungen **und tragen_{SC} es zu dir**” (Prag 1, 706:32–35). *Nadû-ma našû-nikkum* is a sequencing chain of clauses with SC predicates: “they packed the tin and (now) are carrying it to you”, neither of the SC forms is resultative. Consider also the travel expenses note BIN 4, 116, cited here in its entirety:

5 *ma-na* 10 GÍN AN.NA *iš-tù Za-al-pá a-dí Kà-ni-is na-dá-ku* 23 *ma-na* 10 GÍN AN.NA *gám-ru-um ša A-sà-nim* “5 Minen 10 Šekel Zinn **habe ich** von Zalpa bis Kaniš **eingetragen**. 23 Minen 10 Šekel Zinn waren die Auslagen des Asānum” (translation of Ulshöfer, FAOSB 4, 272).¹¹⁰ The communicative focus of the sentence is the amount of tin the writer disposed of during his journey from Zalpa to Kaniš, therefore *nad'āku* is not **A** resultative. An interesting though perhaps hopeless question is whether there is any synchronic difference between **A** past-time *nad'āku* and *addilattidi*.¹¹¹ Cf. also a negated **A** token: *mamman ib-barī-kunu KÙ.BABBAR mimma lā na-di* “no one of you has deposited silver” (ICK 1, 1:11f.).¹¹² For numerous additional **A** examples of the SC in the above meanings, see AHw. 707 17d), CAD N₁ 85a. As expected, *nadi P* is often resultative, while *nad'āku A* is mostly past-time verb form.

Otherwise, the SC **P** is known in OA for two more meanings.

(1) “to put (animals out to pasture)”: *a-ma-lá té-er-ti-kà ANŠE.ru-kà a-na-áb-ri-tim na-du ša-am-kà-kà ša-lim* “according to your order, your donkeys are put out to pasture; your personnel is doing well” (BIN 4, 31:43–46).¹¹³ In this case, the verb’s meaning is close to the basic one, the SC form is resultative and can be considered “observable”.

(2) *taḥsistam nadûm* “to draw up a note”: 1 *ma-na KÙ.BABBAR ša ana šibtim taddin-an-ni-ma taḥsistum na-ad-at-ni* “one mina of silver which you have lent me at interest and concerning which a note **is drawn up** (TCL 14, 49:6ff.); (certain amount of silver) *ša PN iṣ-ṣērī-ya išû u i-GN taḥsistī na-dá-at-ni* “welches Šū-Ištar auf mich (gut) hat und worüber in Kaniš meine Notiz **aufgezeichnet worden ist**” (KT Blanckertz 10:3–6). The last form has a clear-cut past-tense meaning, as correctly rendered in the translation of J. Lewy. Within the verb phrase *taḥsistam nadûm*, the verb’s meaning is low-dynamic and metaphorical, therefore the SC is outside the scope of the Anschaulichkeit criterion and can be most naturally employed as a past tense form (class 7).

(2) The SC appears as an existential predicate:¹¹⁴ *a-na-kam AN.NA^{ku-ú} i-da-ni-nu KÙ.BABBAR ma-[d]u-um ša ḥu-du-ra-i na-dí-i* “Hier werden die Zinnpreise fest, **es ist** viel Silber der Leute aus Ḥudurut **vorhanden**” (Prag 1, 574:17ff.). Since the prefixing forms of *nadûm* are not employed this way, this is a lexicalized sense. The Pres. *ibašši* is also used in OA as an existential predicate: *šu-ma a-mu-tum ša iš-tí DUMU PN tal-qé-ú ta-ba-šī* “if the ‘meteoritic iron’ that you took from the son of PN is available” (BIN 4, 45:2ff.), *šu-ma a-šī-um a-a-kam-ma i-ba-šī* “if somewhere there is

ašium-iron” (ibid., 11f.). Whether *nadi* and *ibašši* are synonyms in this slot is hard to say.¹¹⁵ Thus, in the sentences *kaspum ina bēt kārim nadi* “the (above mentioned) silver is deposited at the office of the settlement” and *kaspum mādum nadi* “there is much silver (in general or in somebody’s hands)” two contextual readings of the SC *nadi* are manifested: they are distinct grammatically (P resultative vs. existential auxiliary) and therefore lexically. The following text also belongs here: *um-ma a-tù-nu-ma KÙ.BABBAR Be-lá-num iš-qul-ni-a-tí-ma na-dí KÙ.BABBAR la na-dí šu-ma I-dí-a-bu-um i-ḥa-ša-aḥ li-il₅-qé šu-ma lá ki-a-am a-na ší-ib-tim dí-na* “You wrote me: “B. has paid us silver and it lies idle here.” The silver must not lie idle! If I. needs it, let him take it, but if not, lend it out at interest!” (BIN 6, 25:15–22, tr. of Veenhof in MOSt I, 64). I have come across one token of Gtn Pres. with existential meaning: *mì-šu-um ik-ri-bu-um i-na pí-kà i-ta-na-dí-am* “Warum liegt für mich immer wieder ein Fluch in deinem Mund?” (AKT 3, 63:12ff.). The “immer wieder” of the translation is an Assyriological convention, the sense is “why is there *ikribum* in your mouth?” The Gtn-stem is often said to have “habitual” meaning,¹¹⁶ while this term is sometimes simply another word for “stative”, because “habitual” presupposes that nothing particular is happening or being done at the reference time. What really surprises is the **intransitive** sense (“lying” rather than “laying”) of the verb that is usually transitive in its prefixing tenses. My guess is that stative uses of transitive verbs in the Pres. can trigger diathetic shifts the way this regularly happens to the SC, i.e. the stative semantics works as the tertium comparationis between *nadi* and *ittanaddi*. Consider a G-stem Pres. with a stative **intransitive** reading: *ke-num a-na-ku lá a-na-dí* “ich bin zuverlässig, nicht nachlässig” (Prag 1, 466:5). This is hardly shorthand for *aḥī lā anaddi* “I am not negligent”, because this expression, common in OB (CAD N₁ 92), is not attested in OA.¹¹⁷ I will add an OB example that seems to belong here semantically: *šumma ZI ištu imittim ana šumēlim it-ta-na-ad-di* “if the ZI is always displaced from right to left” (YOS 10 45:9, translation as in CAD N₁ 81a).¹¹⁸ I. Khait translates: “If the tail is twitching right to left”. The text is obscure, but there is no doubt that the Gtn-stem Pres. *ittanaddi* has here an intransitive meaning. This peculiar usage can be once more explained by my suggestion that within the discipline of divination the situation in question (tail-twitching) was categorized as a stative one, which made possible the ensuing diathetic shift.¹¹⁹ Note also that the CAD sub-entry of *nadûm* “to put something into a container” (N₁ 81b, OA) is populated by

the SC only, and its tokens are numerous. One suspects that in this case the actual putting was expressed by a different verb (*tadānum?*). If this is true, a text like *riksum ṣaḥrum il-libbi nēpišim nadi* (TCL 20, 171:11) is perhaps better rendered as “**there is** a small bundle in the pack” rather than “a small bundle **is placed** in the pack” (CAD *ibid.*).

In O B l e t t e r s , there are reasons to consider together the forms of *nadi* that appear as predicates of such concrete and abstract entities as *eqlum* “field” (AbB 9, 193:12, see CAD N₁ 77b for more examples), *mātum* “country” (14, 131:5), *dūrum* “city-wall” (*ibid.* 6), *šiprum* “work, mission, agenda” (9, 211:10; 220:16), *pīḫatum* “responsibility” (13, 119:5’, and cf. CAD N₁ 78a), *ilkum* “service” (14, 38:6). Thus, *eqlum nadi* is “the field is abandoned, uncultivated, (left) fallow”, *ilkum nadi* “the service obligation is neglected”, *šiprum nadi* “the task is not fulfilled, the work is left undone”, and cf. an example from the OB literature: *na-du-ú paršū* “the divine decrees were disregarded” (RA 46, 88:1 = CAD N₁ 88b). Since the basic meaning of *nadūm* is literal “throwing/casting/putting”: *nadi* functions here as a property predicate and can be best understood as the predicative form of the VA *nadūm*, which displays just the range of meanings necessary for building the above SC forms, “abandoned, uninhabited”, “uncultivated, fallow” (CAD N₁ 66f.).¹²⁰ In terms of their tense value, these tokens of the SC are never Perf./Pret.-like, and this stands to reason if in the above contexts they are indeed used as pure property predicates. In other words, a speaker of OB could say *ina miḥuri ištēn awīlu dīk* “one man from GN **was killed**_{SC} in the clash” (“simple past” reading, cf. AbB 13, 181:31f.), but a sentence **amšāli šiprum nadi* “yesterday the work was left undone” was most probably unacceptable.

In OB, both *lā nadi* and the N-stem Pres. *lā innaddi* can render the idea “it should not be abandoned”, etc. (cf. No 51 above, discussion section).¹²¹ In the following examples both predicates appear in the same syntactic slot of “dependent prohibitive”, i.e. are joined to preceding volitive forms by the “virtual subordinator” *-ma*: *šeam ša taqbū arḫiš idinma eqlum lā in-na-ad-di* “give the barley that you promised promptly so that the field **be not left uncultivated**” (AbB 11, 136:11ff.); *u ERIM eḫlūtīm ša niḫrud-am arḫiš liḫrudū-niš-šunūti-ma pīḫātū-šunū lā na-di-a* “let them promptly send (back) to me the soldiers that we sent to you so that their posts **be not abandoned**”¹²² (AbB 6, 186:6’–8’). In these examples, the temporal and Aktionsart meanings of the two prohibitives seem to be identical (i.e., the modal value is applied to the same kind of future time

dynamic events). More examples of the two **P** forms as dependent prohibitives: *mānaḥātū-šu lā nadiā* “lest his expenses be lost” (AbB 3, 82:25), *eqlum lā innaddi* “lest the field be left fallow” (AbB 7, 132:22). The only syntactically free-standing example I have come across is as follows: *ḥaṣum lā in-na-ad-di* “the district should not be neglected” (AbB 9, 140:22f.).¹²³

The rest of **P** readings I have found also stem from figurative (low dynamic) senses of *nadûm*, while – unlike the preceding group – they cannot be represented as derived from the VA: *šurqum ina muḥḥi-ka na-a-di* “you have been accused of theft” (AbB 1, 95:13f.) [“to accuse, to charge with a crime”], *diliḥ ramanī-šu na-di-i-šu* “confusion of mind will be inflicted upon him” (AfO 18 65 ii 19) [“to inflict”], and cf. YOS 10 46 iv 40, quoted in CAD N₁ 88b.

The only **A** example I have found in OB is as follows: *kīma ana nikkassim lā na-di-a-ak-kum ina ṭuppika-ma annîm amur* “Look in this tablet of yours to see that **I have charged nothing** to your account” (AbB 14, 139: 6 ff., Veenhof’s translation, note the negation!). This metaphorical sense is similar to those frequent in OA (see Veenhof’s lexical commentary on p. 213).

The SC as an existential auxiliary and copula is well-known in various genres of the OB corpus. Cf. some examples from letters: *kīma tešmû mātum dallḥat u nakrum ina mātîm na-di-i* “As you have heard, the country is in confusion and the enemy **is** in the country [or perhaps ‘**there is** enemy in the country’]” (AbB 14, 81:5f.);¹²⁴ *ištu ITU 1 KAM maṣāku-ma na-di-a-ku* “I have been ill for a month (now) [so I failed to show up]” (AbB 1, 18:11);¹²⁵ *eqlum ... ana panī-ka na-di* “the field ... is ready for you (to harvest)” (AbB 14, 33:5ff., and see more examples with *ana pan-* in CAD N₁ 91b).¹²⁶ Cf. also an example from the OB Gilgamesh: *ina sūqim ša Uruk ribītim ḥaššinnu na-di-i-ma* “in the street of Uruk-The-Main-Street an ax was lying...” (Gilg. P. i 27f.). The use of *nadi* as an existential predicate and copula, in both cases in agreement with the syntactic subject, is best known from the OB divination (AHw 707b, CAD N₁ 91a).¹²⁷ In omens, along with the “being” readings just referred to, *nadi* displays “having” readings, with the exponents of the possessed features in the Acc.: *šumma awilum šārassu pūšam na-di-a-at* “if a man’s hair **has** a white streak” (AfO 18 66 ii 39).

(3) In the popular idiom *aḥam nadûm*, the present-time sense “is negligent” is rendered by the SC and (more rarely) by the Pres. Consider

the following examples, all of them with indicative negations: [*kī*]ma ana awātim annītim [*aḥī*] lā na-du-ú u ina libbīya [*an*]akkudu atta t[īde] “you know that in this matter I am not negligent, but (rather) preoccupied in my heart” (AbB 6, 125:8ff.), ana hašī-ya ... aḥam ul na-de-e-ku “I am not negligent regarding my district” (ARM 3, 12:8f.)¹²⁸, ana pagrī-ya našārim aḥī ul a-na-ad-di “I do not neglect taking care of myself” (ARM 10, 142:11). There is a peculiar instance wherein the SC has past-time dynamic rather than present-time stative temporal reference: UDU.NÍTA.ḪI.A 2.TA.ÀM MU.3.KAM nabalkutūtu ša ina pani UDU.NÍTA-šu-nu illaku ul tāmur-ma aḥ-ka na-di “**you have been careless** in not selecting a pair of wethers which have passed the age of three years and serve as bellwethers of their sheep” (AbB 14, 166:15–21). The sequence *ul tāmur-ma aḥ-ka na-di* syntactically requires a past-time sense “you have not selected **and** (this means) you have shown carelessness”.

Excursus II: Gtn to render the “simple” Present Time

The stems of the Akkadian verb remain to be described,¹²⁹ so we do not know for certain if the Pres. of the *tan*-stems invariably expresses “verbal plurality” as opposed to a “non-plurality” of the Pres. of the respective simple stems for the same roots (i.e., for the same verbal concepts).

According to Kouwenberg,¹³⁰ in the whole Akkadian corpus there are 1316 G-verbs vs. 312 Gtn-verbs, and 395 N-verbs vs. 98 Ntn-verbs, i.e., in both cases the ratio is about 4:1.¹³¹ How is it possible that the language needs so many “pluractional” verbs? Kouwenberg¹³² suggests that *all* G-verbs “can have a pluractional Gtn-stem, although it is attested only for a minority of them”. Yet I observe that all common verbs that show the regular “competition” of the Pres. and SC in the present-time domain¹³³ have no productive Gtn in the corpus. Consider the data:

– *akālum* “to eat”, “to receive victuals/fodder”. No Gtn in OA; in OB it is attested twice within the idiom *karšī akālum* “to slander” (ARM 2, 115:11; YOS 10, 41:56), once — with another metaphorical meaning, “to hurt (of ailing body parts)” — in TLB 2, 21:23 (an OB diagnostic manual). Thus, the “pluractional” (or habitual) eating is expressed by the Pres. and SC of the G-stem of *akālum* rather than by its Gtn-stem (see examples in my article in *B&B* 3. P. 142). Note that *ikkal* and *ūtanakkal* “it hurts” were

likely used synonymously in medical texts: *šumma maršu qātā-šu u šēpā-šu ikkalā-šu šitassâm mimma lā paṭer* “if the patient’s hands and feet **ache** and he never stops screaming” (TLB 2, 21:19, tr. CAD Š₂ 164);¹³⁴ *šumma maršu [...] libbīšu ūnanakkalā-šu [i-ta-na-ka-la-a-šu]* “if a patient’s [somethings = fem. pl. substantive] inside him **hurt** him **all the time**” (TLB 2, 21:23). No D-stem.

– *baqārum* “to claim” has no Gtn in the whole of Akkadian. Its D-stem, glossed in CAD P 133b “to raise a claim, to lay claim to”, is used “passim on NB sales contracts and kudurrus” (CAD *ibid*); besides, CAD P 134a enters two MB tokens with the same meaning. It further lists three OB tokens of the D-stem meaning “to contest, challenge” (a leg. doc. TCL 1, 157:49; AbB 12, 166:13; 1, 58:16); this meaning is also attested in later periods. Thus, *baqārum*, a verb common in both OB and OA, has neither D- nor Gtn-stem for its basic meaning “to claim (a property title)”.

– *ḥašāḥum* “to need”, “to desire” (AHw “brauchen”, “begehren”)¹³⁵ has no Gtn in the whole of Akkadian. Its D-stem is represented in AHw 333a and CAD H 136a by two SC **P** tokens (OB and SB), glossed “to deprive, take away” (AHw “in Bedürftigkeit bringen”).

– *kalûm* “to hold, detain”.¹³⁶ This verb is common in both OB and OA, its Gtn is registered in the dictionaries with two identical SB tokens from the same medical text, there is also one instance from NA. The CAD (K 102b) gloss for Gtn is “to stop repeatedly, to hold up”. For the D-stem **kullû* “to hold back”, CAD K 102–103 has four tokens (from OA, OB, MB and SB), all of them are the Pres. forms. The OB example *tu-ka-la-šu* stands in a difficult context,¹³⁷ so the case (dat. or acc.) and antecedent of the *-šu* pronoun are problematic. Goetze translates “[But (as to) getting water on my time -] you will prevent **it**”, CAD K 102b has “[but at the moment it is irrigated,] you_{m sg} will block up (the water) **for him**” (*Sumer* 14, 73, No 48:8). On any interpretation, this sign string is plausibly construed as the Pres. of *kullum*, the near-synonymous D-verb, common in both OA and OB: *tukall-aššu*, *-aššu* can be analysed as a OB allomorph of the bound dative pronoun 3ms. “to/for him”, or as the ventive + acc. *-šu* (“you will prevent **it** for your own sake_{vent}”).¹³⁸ The OA example, PN *lā tû-kâ-lâ* “do_{sg} not hold PN back” (CCT 4, 186:15), can be interpreted as the Pres. of *kullum* (“do not withhold PN **for yourself**_{vent}”) if we accept, with GKT 54c, the orthographic rendering of the ventive without *-m* as a possibility for OA: *lā tukall-a_{vent}*. Thus, depending on one’s judgement, the D-stem of *kalûm* is represented in the corpus marginally or not attested at

all. Ockham's razor favours the latter solution, since for **kullûm* no Pret. has been found, i.e. the form where the orthographic opposition between the D-stems of verbs II-weak and III-weak cannot be neutralized in **both** OB and OA.

– *nazāqum* “to worry”.¹³⁹ No Gtn in the corpus, it is attested a few times (“to have constant worries, to squeak constantly”) in SB omens (AHw 772a, CAD N₂ 138a).

– *parādum* “to be afraid, to care”.¹⁴⁰ No Gtn in the corpus, it is attested a few times in SB medical texts (AHw 827b, CAD P 143a: “is constantly fussing”).

– *takālum* “to trust”.¹⁴¹ No Gtn in the whole of Akkadian.

– *wašābum* “to sit”, “to dwell”.¹⁴² No Gtn in my core OB and OA corpora. An exception is “the chamber [š]a *qerbuššu ni-it-ta-aš-ša-bu-nim* in which we used to sit” (MIO 12, 54rev.:17, “OB love lyric” according to CAD R 377b). Note that the compatibility of the subjunctive and the ventive (-*nim* = *qerbuššu*?) in this form is also most unusual. Another exception (the Part.) also comes from an OB literary text: *mu-ta-aš-ši-ba-at askuppāt awīlê* “(she is) **the one constantly sitting** on the thresholds of men”.¹⁴³ According to the dictionaries (AHw. 1483a, CAD A₂ 386a), Gtn appears a few more times in SB.

Thus, all eight common verbs (found so far) that use both the Pres. and SC for coding the present-time sense do not really have pluractional stem forms in the corpus. I will now quote one of the conclusions that B. Kouwenberg reached in his study of the Akkadian derived stems:

“In all second millennium dialects, the Gtn-stem is fully productive. It is especially frequent in two kinds of verbs: intransitive action verbs, in particular motion verbs such as *alāku* ‘to go/come’, *elû* ‘to go/come up’, *erēbu* ‘to enter’, *ebēru* ‘to cross’, *etēqu* ‘to pass’, *maqātu* ‘to fall’, and *wašû* ‘to go/come out’, and transitive verbs with a low degree of transitivity, e. g., *amāru* ‘to see’, *akālu* ‘to eat’, *apālu* ‘to answer’, *leqû* ‘to receive’, *nadû* ‘to drop, leave behind, lay down’, *našû* ‘to lift, carry’, *šakānu* ‘to place’, *šemû* ‘to hear’, *wabālu* ‘to bring, carry’, and *warû* ‘to bring, lead’. These are exactly the same types of verbs that do not normally have a D-stem (see 11.5). So *there is a complementary distribution between Gtn and D in its function of underlining verbal plurality*: Gtn takes the area of intransitive and low-transitivity verbs, D that of high-transitivity verbs”.¹⁴⁴

Thus, according to Kouwenberg, **lowly dynamic transitive agentive**¹⁴⁵ verbs are supposed to have the pluractional Gtn-stem. In my

list there are three verbs that meet these criteria: *akālum* “to eat”, *baqārum* “to claim”, *kalūm* “to hold”,¹⁴⁶ and all three verbs have neither Gtn- nor D-stem at their side. Further, such notions as “to worry” (*nazāqum*), “to be fearful (about smth./smb.)” (*parādum*), “to desire” (*ḥašāḥum*) are quite susceptible to a pluralic interpretation. Only “trusting” (*takālum*) and “sitting, dwelling” (*wašābum*) are concepts whose pluralic use is less needed, due to their pronounced stative character.

My explanation of this evidence runs as follows: the Pres. Gtn can code not only “plurality” in the narrow sense, but it is also involved in the coding of the “basic” present-time sense (probably in its different nuances) *within* (or *for*) the G-stem paradigm, along with the G-stem Pres. and SC. This suppletive participation in the G-stem would explain the unusually high frequency of Gtn.¹⁴⁷ My analysis of the evidence suggests that, e.g., in the paradigm of *šakānum*, “to place, to store” *išakkan* codes the future, while the Gtn *ištanakkan* expresses the present (and probably “pluralic” situations in the future). The key fact is the absence of the present-time *išakkan*. I believe that the distribution of the G Pres., SC, and Gtn Pres. in the present-time domain was lexically determined (= semantically sensitive). Consider an example:

miššu ša ina bē[tīya] tibnam u eṣṣi taštanakkun-u bētātī-kunu lā tadaggalā (BIN 6, 119:17ff.) – “Why do you **store** straw and wood in [my] house? Don’t you **own** houses of yourselves?”

The morphological contrast of *taštanakkan* and *tadaggalā* reveals the fact the two verbs belong to different Aktionsart classes, i. e. *šakānum* in the meaning “to store” is probably considered by OA as more dynamic than *dagālum* in the meaning “to own”. Yet, OA *idaggal* “he owns” is more dynamic than those “having” verbs that employ the SC **A** for the Present Time, e.g. the OB *leqi*, *maḥir*, and *ṣabit* (they are not used this way in OA).¹⁴⁸ If this suggestion is grounded, we get three exponents for the present-time meaning of the G-stem verbs: *iptanarras*, *iparras*, and *paris*, distributed according to semantic criteria related to transitivity (or dynamicity). Now the above eight G-stem verbs that show both the SC and Pres. in the present-time domain are lowly dynamic, this is why they do not employ Gtn to render this sense and, consequently, have little or no use of Gtn.

Addendum on *ḥabātum* “to rob” (B&B 3. P. 145, No 25)

In OB, the SC form *ḥabtāku*, lit. “I am robbed”, was lexicalized as an interjection: it is used as a call for help, or with similar forces. In this function, *ḥabtāku* is followed by an appropriate form of the verb *šasūm* “to cry”; after the latter we often find an articulated utterance of the one crying, introduced by *umma*: *ḥa-ab-ta-ku issi umma šī[ma] amtum ša Bēlšunu anāku bēlī iqīš-anni* “‘Help!’ she cried. She yelled (*umma šī-ma*): ‘I am a slave-girl of Bēlšunu. My mistress gave me (to him)’” (AbB 1, 27:17ff.); cf. *u ḥa-ab-ta-ku ištānassi umma šū-ma ...* (AbB 10, 81:6’f.), *ḥa-ab-ta-ku ašši-ma umma anāku-ma ...* (AbB 10, 184:2f.), and slightly different syntactically: *umma šunu-ma wardum ša^dAMAR.UTU-na-šir umma ḥa-ab-ta-ku issi-ma* (AUCT 4, 89:6f.). For OB Mari, numerous tokens of this kind of *ḥabtāku* (mostly from unpublished manuscripts) were gathered by Fr. Joannès in ARM 26/2, p. 299¹⁴⁹ The syntax is essentially the same as in the above core OB examples, the suggested stereotyped rendering is “Quel scandale!” Fr. Joannès points out the lexicalized nature of this usage, not yet described in the dictionaries: “L’emploi constant de la première personne du permansif traduit l’aspect figé qu’a pris cette expression en akkadien”.

The lexicalization is perhaps more prominent in the Mari examples than in the AbB ones: *sugāgū ... itbū-ma ištēniš ḥa-ab-ta-ku issū-ma umma šunu-ma* “les cheikhs se sont levés, et ensemble ont crié ‘Quel scandale!’, en disant...” (M.5437⁺, cited by Joannès *ibid*). And cf. an even more eloquent example: *awâtim šināti eštemme-ma ḥa-ab-ta-ku assi-ma* “(when I arrived at Saggartum) I kept hearing about these things and saying ‘What a shame!’” (ARM 26/1, 5:18).¹⁵⁰

Abbreviations

AbB	Altbabylonische Briefe in Umschrift und Übersetzung
AHw.	W. von Soden. <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> . 3 Bde. Wiesbaden, 1965–1981
AKT	Ankara Kültepe Tabletleri (Ankaraner Kültepe-Tafeln)
AOATT	K. Veenhof. <i>Aspects of Old Assyrian Trade and its Terminology</i>
ARM	Archives royales de Mari
AS	Assyriological Studies
BAM	F. Köcher. <i>Die babylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen</i>
B&B	Babel und Bibel

- BIN Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies. New Haven
- CAD *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute*, the University of Chicago. Chicago, 1956ff.
- CCT Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets in the British Museum
- CH Codex Hammurapi
- CTMMA Cuneiform Texts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art
- FAOSB Freiburger Altorientalische Studien Beihefte: Altassyrische Texte und Untersuchungen
- GAG W. von Soden. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. Roma, ³1995
- GKT K. Hecker. *Grammatik der Kültepe-Texte*. Roma, 1969
- HALAT L. Koehler und W. Baumgartner. *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*. 3. Aufl. bearb. v. W. Baumgartner, J.J. Stamm u. B. Hartmann. Leiden 1991.
- ICK Inscriptions cuneiforms de Kultépé
- JRAS *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
- KT Hahn J. Lewy. *Die Kültepe-Texte aus der Sammlung Frida Hahn*. Leipzig, 1930.
- KTS Keilschrifttexte in den Antiken-Museen zu Stambul
- LAPO Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient
- LH A. Goetze. *Fifty OB Letters from Harmal*. Reprinted from "Sumer" Vol.XIV. Baghdad, 1958.
- MOSSt Middle Eastern Studies Program. Leiden–Istanbul, 1999ff.
- NABU *Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires*
- OBT Tell Rimah St. Dalley, C. B. F. Walker, J. D. Hawkins. *The Old Babylonian Tablets from Tell al Rimah*. Hertford, 1976
- POAT The Pennsylvania Old Assyrian Tablets. HUCA Sup. 3, Cincinnati, 1983
- Prag I Hecker K.; Kryszat G.; Matouš L. Kappadokische Keilschrifttafeln aus der Sammlung Karlsuniversität Prag. Praha, 1998
- TCL Textes cunéiformes du Louvre
- TDOT *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Ed. by G. Botterweck und H.Ringgren. Grand Rapids, 1974ff.
- TLB Tabulae Cuneiformes a F. M. Th. de Liagre Böhl Collectae
- TPAK I Garelli P., Michel C. *Tablettes Paléo-assyriennes du Kültepe I (kt 90/k)*. Paris, 1997
- TRC *Typology of Resultative Constructions* (V. P. Nedjalkov ed.). Amsterdam, 1988
- TTC G. Contenau. *Trente tablettes cappado-ciennes*. Paris, 1919
- TuM Texte und Materialien der Frau Professor Hilprecht Collection
- UCP University of California Publications

UET	Ur Excavations. Texts
VAS	Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmaler
VAT	Museum siglum of the Vorderasiatisches Museum. Berlin (Vorderasiatische Abteilung, Tontafeln)
YOS	Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts

Notes

1. The first two parts of this study were published in *B&B 2* (*Loesov S.* Akkadian Sentences about the Present Time (I) // *B&B 2* (2005). P. 101–148) and *B&B 3* (*Loesov S.* Akkadian Sentences about the Present Time (II/1) // *B&B 3* (2006). P. 133–148), the third one in *B&B 4* (*Loesov S.* Akkadian Sentences about the Present Time (II/2) // *B&B 4/1* (2010). Pp. 759–786).
2. *Cohen D.* La phrase nominale et l'évolution du système verbal en sémitique. Etudes de syntaxe historique. Leuven–Paris; *Kouwenberg N.J.C.* The Akkadian Verb and its Semitic Background. Winona Lake (LANE), 1984.
3. *Kouwenberg N.J.C.* Op. cit. 7.3.3.
4. Cf. the milder technical sense of the SC of another high-transitivity verb in OA: *maḥṣāku* “I have suffered a financial loss” (see CAD M₁ 78b, 3 d “to cut prices, give a discount”), the basic meaning of *maḥāšum* being “to hit, to strike”. Here also belongs the only instance of the SC of *šagāšum* “to kill, slaughter” available in OA: *ina qātišu ša-ag-ša-ku* “I am (financially) ruined by his action” (CAD Š₁ 68a, unpubl. OA letter).
5. For a derived meaning of the SC of *šagāšum* in OA, see the previous fn. Another possible example is ʿša¹(?)-ki-iš “he is being badly mistreated” (AS 22, 24:25, cf. ibid. the commentary to 17:8–11). If Whiting’s interpretation is correct, note the “milder” meaning of the verb, not listed as the CAD gloss (but cf. AHW. 1126b “mißhandeln”).
6. E.g., the sentence *aššatam aḥiz* lit. “he has a wife taken” can express the legal status of the verbal event’s agent (cf. CH § 166:67).
7. The SC of *burrum* “to establish, to prove, to convict”, a frequent OB verb (cf. *B&B 3*. P. 142).
8. For which see *Mel’čuk I., Zholkovsky A.* The Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary // Relational Models of the Lexicon: Representing Knowledge in Semantic Networks / Evens M. (ed.). Cambridge, 1988. P. 41–74.
9. I am grateful to Eran Cohen and Bert Kouwenberg for discussing the problem with me. My very special thanks go to Maria Bulakh, who has read all the installments of this work and spent a lot of time analysing with me various facets of the whole enterprise.

10. S = Substantive, V = Verb.
11. Metzler K. Tempora in altbabylonischen literarischen Texten. Münster, 2002. S. 153.
12. B. Kouwenberg informs me in a p.c. that he would prefer *parkat* as an A token of the SC, “if the footmark crosses (lies crosswise on) the filament”. He explains this as follows: “It seems more likely to me that a fortuitous irregularity such as the *šēpum* is visible on top of the tissue of the liver rather than vice versa”. The very fact that students of Akkadian interpret certain tokens of this pattern in different ways renders additional plausibility to the claim of this Excursus.
13. Both possibilities are mentioned in E. Cohen (forthcoming).
14. TDOT. Vol. 10. P. 62 (Kapelrud) has this protasis as “when a man holds a dog with his teeth (medicinal text)”. Kapelrud’s translation is doubtless meant to amuse the theological readership with an Oriental curiosity.
15. The prefixing tenses of *nadûm – iddi* and *ittadi* – are used in oil omens to describe features produced by oil (CAD N₁ 90a), but this is hardly reason enough to read the dynamic metaphor of “producing a white substance” into the above protasis.
16. See Jacobsen T. Ittallak niāti // JNES 19 (1960). Pp. 101–116; *Ibid.* The Akkadian Ablative Accusative // JNES 22 (1963). Pp. 18–29.
17. von Soden W. Zum Akkusativ der Beziehung im Akkadischen // Or 30 (1961). Pp. 156–162; GAG 247f.; Wasserman N. Style and Form in Old Babylonian Literary Texts. Leiden–Boston, 2003.
18. Maria Bulakh suggests me in a p. c. the possibility of another interpretation for the evidence referred to in this Excursus. I believe it is worth considering by the reader, especially since S_{nom} N_{acc} V_{SC} seems to occur frequently outside of divinational *šumma*-conditionals. Bulakh’s insight, if I understand it correctly, runs as follows. The sentence *šubātū sāsam_{acc} lapṭū* “the textiles **are** moth_{acc} **infested**_{SC} represents good Akkadian, while **šubātū sāsam_{acc} illapṭū*_{N-Pret} seems to be ungrammatical. This evidence makes one suspect that the SC in passive readings was no *ma hūl*, unlike the prefixing tenses of N- and T-verbs in their passive readings. In other words, the SC of the basic stem did admit the regular encoding of the agent-like participants (i.e., instrument, cause, etc.) in the passive sentences via the accusative case. This suggestion, no less typologically unusual than the “actual diathesis-freedom” hypothesis offered above, will have to await further research.
19. For the relevant analysis of the argument structure of *malûm*, see Kouwenberg N.J.C. Gemination in the Akkadian Verb. Assen, 1997. P. 252ff.
20. Kouwenberg N.J.C. Op. cit. 7.3.2.
21. “A single example for this type...” (Wasserman N. Op. cit. P. 54). Why did not he use examples from divination? They are (or are not) “literature” to the same degree as medical texts.

22. “Vom Feuer gefressen”. See *von Soden. W. Status Rectus-Formen vor den Genitiv im Akkadischen und die sogenannte uneigentliche Annexion im Arabischen // JNES* 19 (1960). P. 165 (the fn. is mine.— *S.L.*).
23. *Wasserman N. Op. cit.* P. 54.
24. For various attempts to explain the *-am* of the head noun (the *regens*) see *von Soden W. Status Rectus-Formen* (1960) and *Reiner E. Damqam-īnim Revisited // StOr* 55 (1984). Pp. 177–182.
25. Note the correct critical remark of M. P. Streck: “*kalbam našik ... is keine Genitivverbindung, sondern ein Stativ mit einem den Agens bezeichnenden Akkusativ*” (*ZA* 95, 148, review of *Wasserman. Op. cit.*).
26. The glosses are English translations of “investir” and “posséder une part”: these are the meanings of *adāmum* suggested by C. Michel in *NABU* 1991/91 and *LAPO* 19, 306, and corroborated by my research.
27. The reading was suggested in *GKT* 120, fn.2: “Vielleicht lässt sich eine Lesung *ad-ma-šum*¹ (Imp., sonst unbelegt) erwägen”.
28. Cf. also “to own a share in a common fund” as the main gloss in *CAD* A₁ 95b.
29. The etymology of *adāmum* is obscure, hence the identities of the historical guttural and obstruent (*d*, *t* or *t*) in the root are unknown. L. Kogan compares Arb. *ʔadama-hu* “he mixed him, associated him, united him in a company” (*Kogan L. Old Assyrian vs. Old Babylonian: The Lexical Dimension // The Akkadian Language in its Semitic Context / Deutscher G., Kouwenberg N. J. C. (eds). Leiden, 2006. P. 187, fn.17*), which seems to fit the OA *adim* both phonologically and semantically (the shared element would be “introducing”), but this exclusive OA – Arb. isogloss would need further explanation. In *ARMT* 10, 120:6ff., there occurs the SC verb phrase *ina bārūtīm ... IT-MI-KU*, in the continuation of the letter carried on twice in the 2 f. s.: *IT-MI-E-TI, IT-MI-T[I]*. J.M. Durand (*NABU* 1991/91, *LAPO* 18, No 1147) believes that these SC tokens (and *IT-MI-KU* in *ARMT* 27, 70:10, in a damaged context) belong to the same verb as the OA *adim* and manifest its assumed basic meaning “s’occuper de”. His translation in *LAPO* 18, No 1147 is “je me suis occupée de la divination”. These data, if proven, would be relevant for the present study. Yet, obviously, the OB *edmēku* is no regular counterpart of the OA *admāku* in terms of vocalism, while the prepositional phrase (*ina bārūtīm*) as the expression of the semantic object contradicts the above OA data. All in all, Durand’s point remains to be proven. Whether the verb form *ud-da-am* cited by Durand in *NABU* 1991/91 has to do with the material discussed in this entry of my contribution, is very doubtful.
30. The basic meaning of *šapākum* is most probably “to pour out”, as follows from the Akkadian evidence and the comparison with the sister languages (for which see

- HALAT 1504a). This fact accords with my suggestion: verbs of physical actions (those that change the face of the observable world) form the SC A mostly for their derived, non-literal senses.
31. According to M.T. Larsen, in this text “the verb *šapākum* must denote the act of investing in a *naruqqum*; otherwise, the verb *adāmum* is used with this meaning” (*Larsen M.T. Partnerships in the Old Assyrian trade // Iraq* 39 (1977). P. 137, fn. 59.) (In OA trade terminology, *naruqqum*, lit. “leather bag”, stands for a long-term contract about business partnership and the partnership’s common fund.)
 32. *Larsen M.T.* Op. cit.
 33. At this point, I will not go into the delicate aspectual distinctions that can exist between the Simple Past and the Pluperfect in the world’s languages.
 34. The **P** translation of the relevant clause in CAD Š₁ 419b is wrong, if only because the verb form *ša-áp-ku* does not agree with its assumed subject *šipkāt*.
 35. Within the list of verbs already studied, a similar suppletion has been described for *labāšum* (the SC only) and *litbušum* (the rest of forms, including the Inf.), see my article in B&B 4, No 39.
 36. My translation presupposes that in the text the second subjunctive morpheme is erroneously missing, the correct OA would be *kuṭānū ša ammakam-ma laberū-ni u sāsam šapkū-ni*.
 37. Cf. *Borger R.* Babylonisch-assyrische Lesestücke. Bd. II. Roma, 1963. P. 23.
 38. See *Haspelmath M.* The Grammaticization of Passive Morphology // *Studies in Language* 14 (1990). P. 40 (italics added).
 39. According to the above prediction, the SC A is productive only for “middle voice” verbs, i.e. the verbs whose agent is indeed “affected by the action” (see class 5 of my calculus). These verbs are not numerous, and their SC often loses the resultative force, as the present study shows.
 40. *Abraham W.* Introduction: Passivization and Typology // *Abraham W., Leisiö L.* (eds.). *Passivization and Typology. Form and Function.* Amsterdam–Philadelphia, 2006. P. 1–27.
 41. This of course happens to SC **P** tokens of certain verbs, depending on their lexical semantics and context, cf. e. g. *dīk* “he was killed” analysed in my new article (B&B 4. Pp. 759–786).
 42. Tr. of C. Michel (*Michel C.* Les suites de la mort d’un tamkāru en Anatolie // *CRRAI* 34 (1998). P. 250. Cf. CAD L 55b: “**as you know, we are learning to write**”).
 43. There is an interesting semantic parallel in a letter of Yasmah-Addu, known to be a native speaker of Akkadian (see *Ziegler N.* and *Charpin D.* Amurritisch lernen. *WZKM* 97, 55–77.): [aš-šum na]-ru-tam dam-qī-iš **ah-zu** “Étant donné que PN ... a

- bellement **appriš** l'art musical" (ARMT 5, 73:4", tr. of LAPO 17, 553; CAD A₁ 177b suggests a restoration [*tup-ša*]r-ru-tam). I.e., as far as professional training in X is concerned, X *lamid* = "he is studying X" vs. X *ahiz* = "he knows X".
44. My translation follows GKT 120d and CAD L 56a. CAD I–J 278b has "one of the slave girls that have been trained", CAD Š 12a has "<slave girls> who are skilled"; the latter two translations are wrong because *lamdū* is no feminine form of the SC. Besides, the evidence of the present entry shows that the passive/intransitive usage of *lamid* (without direct object, i.e. "he is known" or "he is [in general] knowledgeable/experienced/wise") is not attested in OB and OA.
45. Translation follows the Edition, which notes (p. 53): "*rāmum* and *lamādum* are both unexpected verbs to use of preferences for types of fish", and continues in another note: "The meaning of the letter ... is not clear". – In both cases the question is why.
46. E. g., *ina ahūtī-ya kīam al-ma-ad* "I learned this from my environment" (ARM 26/2, 361:26).
47. In other words, since *lamādum* does not have the causative meaning "to teach", *lamid* can hardly mean "he has been taught" (> "he knows"), but rather "he has learned/experienced" (> "he knows"). A passive transform with a personal subject **lamdat* "she has been (carnally) known" in theory is possible but not very likely to be formed, see presently.
48. This goes against the traditional view that by default the SC of transitive verbs has to have **P** readings. D. Cohen notes that certain transitive verbs have only **A** tokens of the SC (Op. cit. P. 257). His examples, taken from the glossary in ARM 15, are *amārum*, *parākum*, *parāsum*, *šaḫātum*, *šemūm*. (The very frequent *leqi* and *maḫir* [my article in *B&B* 4] are perhaps more interesting in this respect.) D. Cohen mentions *lamādum* among his "verbes déponents internes" (i. e., natural middle verbs) of Akkadian (Op. cit. P. 261), which, being formally transitive, have the SC that refers to the subject of prefixing tenses. See also the prediction on the relative frequency of the SC of TTV at the beginning of this contribution.
49. Cf. the *Anschaulichkeit* criterion (my articles in *B&B* 3 and *B&B* 4). Since then I have learned that TRC discusses the very same limitation on the formation of resultatives, valid in certain languages: "Resultatives describing visually perceivable states ... This type is most prominent in Nivkh, where all the resultatives, it seems, are of this type... Resultatives cannot be formed from verbs meaning "to kill", "to kiss"..." (p. 29, Nedjalkov and Jaxontov). Note that this is also basically true of the Akkadian verb *dākum* "to kill", whose SC is not attested with resultative readings in the core OB (my article in *B&B* 4), as well as other Akkadian verbs of killing, and of *našāqum* "to kiss" (no SC, to my knowledge). TRC labels this type of resultatives "specific", as opposed to resultatives with "general" meaning. According to

Jaxontov's summary, in the languages of the former group usually there are no "resultatives denoting non-physical states or states of entities that are absent, e.g. 'forgotten', 'lost', 'eaten'" (TRC 102). TRC counts to this group four languages analysed in the volume: Chinese, Nivkh, Chukchee, and Archi. I.Š. Kozinsky in his reassessment of the data gathered in the body of TRC (TRC 497–525) suggested that observable resultatives are more widespread in the world's languages than unobservable ones (in his own words, there exists "the unobservable → observable hierarchy" (p. 506). He confesses his inability to explain this evidence, yet I believe the matter is quite simple: unobservable resultative states are less relevant *in their quality of states* than the observable ones, therefore speakers prefer to code respective real-life facts with dynamic past-tense verb forms. To exploit once more the verb "to kiss", both in Akkadian and English we tend to avoid sentences like *našqat* and "she is kissed", in this case we prefer wherever possible dynamic active-voice sentences with both agent and recipient overtly mentioned: "he has kissed her", *ittašiq-ši* (cf. Ass. Code § 9), and cf. Loesov in B&B 4, fn. 29.

50. By the same token, the former group is unlikely to form productive and purely resultative (= not preterite-like) SC at all, see my article in B&B 3. P. 136ff. and B&B 4, and the above table (semantic classes 1 and 2).
51. Cf. CAD M₁ 35b. CAD M₁ 375b renders the same passage as "do not agree to let any deposit be made on my behalf". The meaning of *maškattum* in OA is indeed elusive, see *Dercksen J. G. On the Financing of Old Assyrian Merchants // Trade and Finance in Ancient Mesopotamia / Dercksen J.G. (ed.). Leiden, 1999. Pp. 90ff.*
52. There are more variants in the syntactic coding of the two "object" participants (CAD M₁ 35b f.) At least once both of them were rendered by prepositional phrases: *a-na URUDU ša PN iš-tí ma-ma-an lá [t]a-ma-ga-ar* "do not make an agreement with anybody concerning the copper of PN" (BIN 4, 232:4ff.).
53. In a footnote to his translation of *ul ma-ag-ra-ak-šu-nu-ti*, Veenhof suggests that here "the stative serves as perfect tense", and he may well be right. CAD M₁ 36b translates our clause as "I am not in agreement with them", but in this case the present-time stative reading hardly suits the context.
54. I. e. the author received a positive oracular answer to his request.
55. Cf. CAD M₁ 35a. Hecker's transliteration on the website is *am-hu-ur-šu*, yet the handcopy displays a clear-cut KU sign. Cf. also C. Michel's translation in LAPO 10, 210.
56. In the cited piece, *magrānunu* is surrounded by the Pret. forms, therefore it can hardly have a present-time stative reading "you **are** in agreement (with him)". Thus, the SC is here functionally similar to the t-Pf., while *lá am-gu₅-ur-šu* looks like the standard negative alloform of the t-Pf.

57. In this example, *lā tamuʾā* (“you do not want”), a “prefixing stative” (Veenhof *K.R. Two Akkadian Auxiliary Verbs // Scripta Signa Vocis* (Fs. J. H. Hospers). Groningen, 1986. Pp. 235–250), is the negative counterpart of *magrātunu* (“you are willing”), therefore both verb forms probably possess the same values of tense/aspect, dynamicity, and agentivity. This means that *magrātunu* is here present-time and agentive. Whether the situation of “not-wanting” is dynamic or stative, is a matter of definition.
58. The same reduction of syntactic arguments of the SC vis-à-vis Pres. shows up in the MA Laws: *šumma mussa ma-gi-ir ... šumma mussa ana paṭārīša lā i-ma-ag-gu-ur* “if her husband agrees [he shall hand over the stolen goods], if her husband does not agree to ransom her [she shall have her nose cut]” (KAV 1 i 57–69, §5). For the SC *magir*, the matter of agreement (or “willingness”) is supplied from the context of the legal norm.
59. Cf. also CT 2, 19:36 (cited in CAD M₁ 40a), an almost identical clause.
60. This is probably a lexicalized usage where the SC signals obedience to an order.
61. Cf. the SC *šapik* “he has invested” with all three participants expressed: x KÙ.GI *ša ana PN ša-áp-kà-tí-ni-ma* “x gold which you have invested into (the account of) PN” (CCT 5, 11d:7).
62. The term “derived stative” is probably meant to suggest that these forms are derived from verbal notions.
63. In the languages of Europe, the most common AGREE-verbs often do not have a direct object. E. g., Russian: согласиться (с кем-либо/о чем-либо); Ukrainian: погодитися (з ким-небудь/про що-небудь), Polish: przychylić się (do prośby); English: agree (with smth/smb); Spanish: ponerse de acuerdo (con alguien/en algo); Italian: mettersi d’accordo (con qualcuno/su qualcosa); German: zustimmen (dat.), übereinstimmen (mit). Note also the reflexive markers on these verbs in Slavic and Romance languages.
64. Loesov *S. Akkadian Sentences about the Present Time* (II/1). *B&B* 3, P. 138.
65. Interestingly, to describe the loss of cattle in the SC, OA uses *mēt* rather than *maqit* (Loesov in *B&B* 4).
66. “To throw oneself down, as a gesture of greeting and homage”.
67. A.4530-bis is quoted in extenso in ARM 26/1, P. 182.
68. It is amply attested in prefixing tenses (CAD M₁ 245ff.)
69. There are three morphological errors in this text: it should have been *šāb BÀD^{KI}* and *ša ana bēlī-ya ašpur-am*. Most probably, the author was no master of the OB norm.
70. Prag I 843:2” restores a similar context for the negated SC: [*a-na q*]á-tí-a *lá ma-qí-it* [KÙ.BABBAR].

71. As a matter of course, I consider only the environments wherein the allative ventive is supposed to be an obligatory element (as in *Kouwenberg N.J.C. Ventive, Dative and Allative in Old Babylonian // ZA 92 (2002). P. 200–240*).
72. *Imaqut* is used in the apodoses in the sense “(the city wall) will fall” (CAD M₁ 241a), “(the army) will suffer defeat” (ibid., 243b).
73. This is the most abstract meaning of the *tan*-stems as defined by Kouwenberg.
74. *Pettinato G. Libanomanzia presso i babilonesi // RSO 41 (1966). P. 319:29*.
75. I speculate that this kind of grammatical synonymy was valid for certain telic verbs in spoken Akkadian.
76. Cf. also the following pair of examples: *šumma šamnum ana šār erbettī-šu ip-ta-na-at-ta-ar* “if the oil splits to the four directions” (CT 3, 2:28) vs. *šumma qutrinnum ana ḥalli bārim iḫsur-ma ana šī šamšim pa-ḫe₄-er* “if the incense smoke gathers toward the diviner's crotch, then splits off toward the east” (UCP 9, 377:51). The Gtn form can be justified by the “four directions”, but its non-pluralic counterpart is here the SC (*paḫer*) rather than Pres. of the G-stem.
77. *JCS 21*, p. 231 translates “le Doigt était en bon état. L’Excroissance **tombait**” (J. Nougayrol); *ARM 26/1*, 100-bis translates “le Doigt était sain; l’Excroissance **était abattue**”. Cf. also *š[um-ma uš-šu]-šu ma-aq-tu-ma e-le-nu-úš-šu ša-lim* in *ARM 26/2*, 392 (the proverb quoted above), where the meaning of *maqṭū* is perhaps as transparent as we can get for a dead language.
78. The gloss for this CAD sub-entry (M₁ 244a) is “to hang down, to descend (said of parts of the exta)”. I do not find this gloss 100 percent convincing, yet I am unable to prove that “horizontal” is the only viable option.
79. I am grateful to I. Khait, who shared with me his transliteration of YOS 10, 33 and discussed with me numerous problems of the omens interpretation.
80. I. Khait’s reading.
81. The Gt-stem verb *ritkubum* “to ride one on top of the other, to copulate” (CAD R 88f.) does not really display forms other than the SC, and this is for a reason.
82. *Fischer W. Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch. Wiesbaden, 1987. §194*.
83. I. Khait’s reading.
84. I assume, for the sake of argument, that the latter label is not self-contradictory, with part of the current typological thinking.
85. My entry arrangement is conditioned both semantically and syntactically, and therefore it is different from that of the dictionaries.
86. And cf. *apputtum i-ḥi-id-ma alk-am* “please take care to come” (KTS 34a:10)
87. The Pres. rather than the SC because of non-referential status of the noun?
88. The Edition interprets the text in the same way: “kümmert man sich sehr”, yet I believe nothing stands in the way of the future-time reading.

89. C. Michel translates “Là-bas, <tes> représentantes **ont veillé** à tes affaires”, but the present-time translation does not contradict the context and is preferable in view of the examples adduced in this entry.
90. For more examples of this kind, see CAD N₁ 4.
91. This means that *ana šarrim na'id* does not really belong with the rest of the examples of the SC collected in CAD N₁ 4a–b and AHw. 693a. It is similar to **ana šarrim na'dāku* “I worry about the king”, i.e. it has to go to (3) above.
92. Kemmer S. *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia, 1993.
93. Cases of ergative alignment crop up in OB and OA letters time and again, cf. *am-tam*_{acc} ... *imtūt-anni* “the slave-girl ... died on me (AbB 2, 87:10), *šu-ma a-mu-tām šé-bu-lam*_{acc} *i-li-bi-kà i-ba-šī* “if **sending**_{inf acc} the meteorite iron **is** in your heart (= if you want to send it)” (BIN 4, 45:17f.), *šī-ip-kà-tī-a*_{acc} ... *ša-ak-na* “my deposits ... are placed” (CCT 4, 31b:6f.). These are semantically conditioned “errors”.
94. M. Rowton remarks that “in (the semantic domain of. — S. L.) the passive *ipparis* is fairly often used instead of *paris* within the sphere of the present perfect” (Rowton M. *The Use of the Permansive in Classic Babylonian* // *JNES* 21 (1962). P. 236b), yet the opposite is usually the case (Kouwenberg Op. cit. 7.3.3, Loesov in *B&B* 4), i.e. under certain conditions the SC can appear in past-time slots instead of the t-Perf. or Pret.
95. One can only speculate why the author used here the t-Perf., the form which is very rare in this type of subordinate clauses.
96. *Lū paris* can of course have a purely future-time reference, too: *ana dinānī-ka lu na-ad-nu* “let them be given instead of you!” (AbB 3, 18:19).
97. Along with the more frequent *ul iprus*.
98. Cf. TCL 21, 216A:18 = CAD N₁ 59a.
99. I.e., *not* “ist (nicht) gegeben”. Here, to make my point clear, I have to use German glosses because German has the Resultative formally different from the Passive (“a non-combined objective resultative form” in the language of TRC). The English form “is given” is ambiguous, since it can also code the habitual (i.e., stative) Present: “life is given to you by the Creator” (Resultative) vs. “this vitamin is given by mouth” (Present).
100. The German sentence sounds awkward, and this is because the translation of Kraus was meant as a morphological gloss as well.
101. The **P** reading of this form is also attested: *aššumī-ka ana kaspim na-ad-na-ku* “ich bin deinewegen verkauft worden” (AbB 8, 100:15).
102. Note that in this case, as in many others, the translation of the kind “I have all the silver paid” is attractive, because it alerts us to the fact that the English Present Perfect is not an adequate counterpart of the Akkadian SC transitive **A**. Yet this

- English periphrasis is noncommittal as to whether its subject is coreferential with the agent of the preceding verbal event.
103. The context of AbB 4, 149 makes it clear that it is the addressee who has to pay the silver on behalf of the author (i. e., in the author's future), therefore F. Kraus notes (fn. on p. 99) that the contextual reading is "ich habe ihm zwei Sekel Silber zuerkannt/versprochen". In other words, an English translation grammatically faithful to the context has to use the Future of the analytical transitive Resultative: "**I will have** two shekels silver **given** to him".
 104. Kouwenberg (Op. cit. 7.3.2, fn. 34) claims that in this text *nadnāti* "implies that the addressee is now free of his legal obligation", whereas *anāku attadin* "indicates the news value of the message for the addressee and/or its recentness and relevance". It is clear that this particular claim is theory-dependent, however.
 105. The Edition (p. 236) observes that the **A** translation of the SC *tadnū* "erklärt sich daraus, das kein Mask. Pl. als Subjekt erkennbar ist", but the semantic object (the merchandise) does not seem to be mentioned either.
 106. See, e.g., *Haspelmath M. Understanding Morphology*. London, 2002. P. 209.
 107. Think e.g. about the OB land tenure and the *ilkum* service.
 108. The place adverbial *ina Kaniš* is compatible with the resultative reading of *nadi* because the verbs meaning "to put, place" as a matter of course include the participant PLACE in their semantics (i. e., in their situation structure). Contrast the sentence PN *annikām saniq-niāti* "PN is checking us **here**" discussed in Loesov forthcoming (*B&B* 4, No 47 with the fn. 57), wherein (as argued *ibid*) the place adverbial excludes the resultative sense for *saniq*.
 109. Note that according to TRC (p. 56), "reversible resultatives" (unlike irreversible ones) are easily compatible with SINCE-prepositional phrases indicating the time span between the coming about of the state and the reference time.
 110. In a note to her translation (p. 245), A. Ulshöfer observes: "AHw 708 sub *nadû* 29) führt für *nadû* im Stativ eine Bedeutung "ist verwendet" an. Diese Übersetzung würde sich dem Kontext nach anbieten, allerdings scheint diese Bedeutung bisher auf Texte aus Amarna beschränkt zu sein." CAD N₁ 85a lists our SC form (without translation) under the gloss "to place in storage, to deposit in an account". Yet, Ulshöfer is doubtless right, here *nad'āku* says "I have spent". On *nadā'um* as a technical term in OA commerce, see AOATT 272; *Dercksen J.G. Old Assyrian Institutions*. Leiden, 2004. P. 135.
 111. This problem looks rather hopeless because S. Loesov (*Loesov S. T-Perfect in Old Babylonian: The Debate and a Thesi // B&B* 1 (2004). Pp. 83–181) and *B. Kouwenberg* (Op. cit.) claim that *iptaras*, being a real deictic PERFECT, is optional in most (Loesov) or all (Kouwenberg) of its surroundings, i.e. it can be

replaced by *iprus*. For a dead language, it is difficult to estimate properly the competition/synonymy of the three “tenses” in the same PRESENT PERFECT slot. It is always a possibility to suppose (in the wake of D. Cohen, op. cit. 1984) that the SC A in such cases has a middle voice value, but this can hardly be (dis)proven. Consider an example: *i-na na x x a-na-ku-ma i-na ra-mi-ni-a a-ti-di* “As for me, **I have contributed**_{Perf} from my own (textiles) in ...” (ATHE 61:24f.). The t-Perf. *attidi* looks here more focal than the above token of *nad’aku*.

112. The translation of CAD T 119a “no silver was deposited by any of you” is wrong, the correct A translation is provided in: *Michel C. Innāya dans les textes paléo-assyriennes*. Paris, 1991, No 125.
113. See also CAD N₁79b, N₂148a (discussion section).
114. Kouwenberg (Op. cit. 7.3.3) discusses “the frequent locational statives of *šakānu* “to place” and *nadū* “to put down”, which have developed more or less into a copula” in certain contexts. E. Cohen (2.1.2.2.4) describes *šakin* as an “existential or locative expression”, as e. g. *anumma 2 mana kaspum šakin* “there are two minas silver” (AbB 12, 42:8). He notes that in Akkadian existential and locative expressions “are not always easy to tell apart” (Cohen E. Conditional Structures in Mesopotamian Old Babylonian, forthcoming).
115. Note that *amūtum* could be “deposited as a pledge” (N-stem of *nadūm*), see CAD A₂ 98b, as well as silver.
116. Thus, for Kouwenberg (Op. cit 14.7.1), the invariant meaning of the *tan*-stems is verbal plurality, manifested mainly in iterative, frequentative, habitual, continuous, and distributive readings.
117. Hecker’s translation (“ich bin nicht nachlässig”) may have been influenced by this idiom, yet the general stative purport of *lā anaddi* is secured by the parallelism with *kēnum* in the nominal clause.
118. Following Nougayrol (RA 44, 21), CAD S 247a interprets ZI as *sikkat šēli* “rib”. According to p. c. of I. Khait, ZI in YOS 10 45 is an abbreviation for *zibbatum* “tail”. YOS 10 45 is supposed to describe the behaviour of sheep while they are being slaughtered, though neither sheep nor slaughtering are mentioned in the text.
119. C. A. Smith calls habitual predicates “derived statives” (Smith C.A The Parameter of Aspect. Dordrecht etc., 1997). See S. Loesov (B&B 2. P.111 with the fn. 16) for an application of this insight to the analysis of the Akkadian Pres.
120. Rowton (Op. cit. P. 236b) notes that in CAD “it was found best to put the permansive of adjectival verbs with the corresponding noun rather than with the verb”. This was doubtless done because the founding fathers of CAD felt such forms of the SC to be derived directly from the corresponding VA rather than from the “verb paradigm”, to use the word of N. J. C. Kouwenberg. Yet, as mentioned in

Kouwenberg (*Kouwenberg N.J.C. Nouns as Verbs: The Verbal Nature of the Akkadian Stative. Or* 69 (2000). Pp. 21–71: *takil* “he/it is reliable, trustworthy” vs. *taklāku* “I trust”) and Loesov (*B&B* 4), de-VA tokens of the SC are not restricted to “adjectival” roots. I have already suggested that it makes sense to ask why certain common verbs **do not** have the VA with more or less straightforward meanings (e.g. *nadūm* “laid, placed” vs. **nadnum* “given”). It would also be important to study the set of those Akkadian verbs that do have the semantically regular VA in order to find out why some of these VA can build predicative forms, while other (and this is presumably the majority) cannot.

121. E. Cohen observes: “The formation *lā paris* is quite rare and instead *lā iparras* serves for both stative and fientive precative forms, even when it is clearly about stative verbal lexemes” (*Cohen E. The Modal System of Old Babylonian*. Winona Lake. 2005. P. 94). Some of his examples are “let the door *lā iqattin u lā ikabber* be not (too) thin or (too) thick” (*AbB* 3, 34:28f.), “let these cows and sheep *lā iṣeḫherā* not be few” (*AbB* 2, 58:17f.). — On the other hand, *lā paris* can be formed from dynamic roots and employed for dynamic situations, as we have already seen in the course of this study, cf. e.g. *ana eqlim šuāti mamman lā ʔe₄-ḫi-a-am* “let nobody approach this field!” (*AbB* 4, 125:14).
122. In the context of the letter, the *pīḫātu* may be something like the city-wall bulwarks.
123. Note that the syntactic heads of these synonymous *lā nadillā innaddi* are mostly the very substantives that appear in the above sentences with the admittedly de-adjective SC.
124. Both *dalāḫum* “to disturb” and *nadūm* are transitive verbs; now in this text *mātum* is patient-like, while *nakrum* is not, therefore *nadi* is best understood as an auxiliary.
125. CAD N₁ 90a has this token under the gloss “to become downcast, dejected”, but the sentence is hardly about the author’s mood. The translation of F. Kraus is more appropriate: “(Wie mein Chef weiß,) liege ich seit einem Monate krank”. *AHw.* 707b lists this context under the gloss “27) St. liegt (da)”, which is to my mind correct.
126. This copular/auxiliary usage of the SC is a semantic development of the **P** one, like the one manifested in the following text: *inūma ištu GN issuḫū-ma ina dimātīm ša meḫret GN₁ É.ḪI.A-šu-nu na-dī-a* “when they decamped from GN, their tents **were set up** in the district that faces GN₁” (*BE* 6/2 136:4, text as in CAD N₁ 84a).
127. Provisionally and for the purposes of the present study, *šlū mādūtum nadū* “there are numerous holes” (*RA* 44, 13:14) is an existential clause; *šumma martum ina abullim nadiat* “if the gallbladder is/lies in the gate” (*YOS* 10, 31 xi 45) is a copular

locational clause with *nadiat* overtly expressing the predicative relation. Thus, in Akkadian the distinction between certain types of existential and copular clauses consists primarily in the number of participants, not in the agreement behaviour of the predicative element (unlike e.g. in the case of the Old Aramaic and Syriac *ʔit[ay]*).

128. The two syntactic arrangements, “passive” *aḫī lā nadi* and “active” *aḫī lā nadiāku*, seem to be semantically identical.
129. The best semantic analysis of the verbal stems in Akkadian is now Kouwenberg (Op. cit.), yet the purpose of Kouwenberg’s work is encyclopedic, the book is meant to be a balanced description of the Akkadian verb, it includes both formal and semantic, synchronic (wherever possible, separately for OB and OA), diachronic inner-Akkadian (roughly 2500–700 BC), and comparative analyses (against the Semitic and Afrasian background), with the aim of a Proto-Semitic reconstruction. The comprehensive semantic description of the stems for OB and OA with methods of the corpus linguistics has not yet been undertaken. This kind of research would certainly deepen our understanding of the language.
130. Kouwenberg *N.J.C.* Op. cit. 10.3.
131. Kouwenberg’s count is based on the data of AHW.
132. Kouwenberg *N.J.C.* Op. cit. 10.6.
133. For the provisional list of such verbs analyzed in my earlier contributions see Loesov (*B&B* 4, fn. 7). I thank Bert Kouwenberg, who suggested me (in his p. c. back in 2006) the elegant word “competition” as a label of this phenomenon.
134. Note also the periphrasis *šitassām_{inf} Gtn mimma lā paṭer_{SC}* “he never stops screaming” rather than a straightforward *ištanassi_{Pres} Gtn*. In the context, *lā paṭer* has a “pluractional” reading.
135. For the examples of both the Pres. and SC in the present-time domain, see Loesov (*B&B* 2. P. 137f., *B&B* 3. P. 145).
136. For the competition between the Pres. and SC of this verb in the present-time domain, see Loesov (*B&B* 3. P. 141).
137. Ll. 7ff: *ù a-na it-ti-i ša-tu-ú tu-ka-la-šū me-e [t]a-ta-ba-la-šum*. The last two words probably mean “you_{m sg} will take the water away from him”.
138. I. e., in the spirit of “the reflexive benefactive ventive on transitive taking hold-of verbs” (Loesov *S. Marginalia on the Akkadian Ventive // B&B* 3 (2006). 101-13).
139. For the competition between the Pres. and SC of this verb in the present-time domain (see S. Loesov in *B&B* 2. P. 137).
140. For the competition between the Pres. and SC of this verb in the present-time domain, see *ibid.* P. 137.
141. For the competition between the Pres. and SC of this verb in the present-time domain, see *ibid.* P. 141f.

142. For the competition between the Pres. and SC of this verb in the present-time domain, see *ibid.* P. 140f.
143. *van Dijk J.* La sagèsse sumero-accadienne. Recherches sur les genres littéraires des textes sapientiaux, avec choix de texts. Leyden, 1953. P. 92:2.
144. *Kouwenberg N.J.C.* Op. cit. 14.7.2 (italics added).
145. Agentive verbs are “action verbs” in Kouwenberg’s terminology.
146. The verb *ḥašāḥum* is most likely not agentive, i.e., its subject has no free will.
147. Kouwenberg (Op. cit.) shows that the Pres. is by far the most frequent form of the Gtn-stem.
148. From the evidence collected in CAD D 22a for *dagālu* “to own” it follows that in OA “I own” is always *adaggal*, while in NB it is usually *daglāku*. This reminds one of the shift *atakkal* > *taklāku* “I trust” in the early 2nd millennium Akkadian (see *Loesov S.* in *B&B* 2).
149. I thank Ilya Arkhipov for alerting me about the note of Fr. Joannès.
150. To the examples collected by Joannès, add A.1968:9’ (Mari 7, p. 45).