

# The Suffixing Conjugation of Akkadian: In Search of Its Meaning

Sergey Loesov

Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow

Were a language ever completely “grammatical,” it would be a perfect engine of conceptual expression. Unfortunately, or luckily, no language is tyrannically consistent. All grammars leak.

Sapir 1921:38

## 1. Introduction

This study is an inquiry into the functions of the Akkadian Stative.\* It starts from where BK left off: PARIS formed from telic roots is a finite verb form that *expresses a trivial state resulting from the action designated by the*

---

\* *Acknowledgements and conventions.* This research has benefited immensely from my ongoing conversations with Ilya Arkhipov (IA) and Bert Kouwenberg (BK), both of whom supported the initial insights behind this undertaking and have always done their best to answer my innumerable questions. They have also taken the time to read several drafts of this paper. IA commented on most of the OB Mari examples and so has spared me numerous mistakes. In August 2010, BK sent me his “List of Old Assyrian Verbs,” an alphabetic list of verbs with their attested forms, textual references, and philological notes. He composed this List (some 150 pages long) in the course of his preparatory work towards a new Grammar of OA. For the kind of study I am involved in, this reference tool means more than I can tell. I am grateful to Maria Bulakh who read various drafts of mine related to the present study and made important theoretical suggestions. Ilya Khait shared with me his readings and interpretations of YOS 10. Olga Borovaya discussed with me fine points of English morphosyntax important for this study and helped me improve my writing. I acknowledge the financial support of the Russian Foundation for Humanities within the project “Early stages of Akkadian: the synchrony and the diachrony,” 09-04-00235a, 2008–2010.

In this paper, SMALL CAPS stand for universal semantic notions (e. g. FUTURE, PERFECT, RES[ULTALTATIVE]). Terms for language specific morphological categories are written with first capitals: the (German or Akkadian) Preterite, the (English) Present Progressive, etc. The morphological shapes of Akkadian finite verb forms are written in ALL CAPS: IPARRAS, IPRUS, PARIS, etc., or are italicized: *paris*, etc.

*respective root*. However, a closer examination of PARIS of telic roots shows that *non-resultative* examples are perhaps no less frequent than the resultative ones and therefore they cannot be treated as “atypical” or “exceptional.” This evidence begs two questions: 1) what are the *conditions* that allow the resultative reading of PARIS? 2) What are then the functions of *non-resultative* PARIS forms? The article mainly answers the first question, whereas the second one is tackled only parenthetically. I have gathered the data for this study in the course of a lexicon-based analysis of PARIS, whereby PARIS forms of each root were studied separately. A few entries of this kind constitute the last section of the present contribution.

This enterprise is an offshoot of my research into “Akkadian Sentences about the Present Time” (= ASPT).<sup>1</sup> The ASPT venture aims at answering a semantic question: “How is the present-time domain encoded by the Akkadian verb?” The question may sound strange because most Assyriologists do not see here a problem and simply assume that for the G-stem both PRESENT and FUTURE are expressed by IPARRAS, for the D-stem they are expressed by UPARRAS, etc. I believe, by contrast, that for the G-stem verbs in the PRESENT there exists a division of labour among IPARRAS, PARIS, and IPTANARRAS. This division of labour is determined by the “Aktionsart” of a given verb, i. e. ultimately by its lexical meaning.<sup>2</sup>

Unlike ASPT, this study proceeds, in the conventional way, from a formal point of departure. It seeks to describe the semantic side (“the meaning,” “the usage,” or “the functions”) of just one member of the Akkadian finite paradigm—the Stative, called here “the Suffixing Conjugation” (= the SC), and sometimes PARIS/*paris*.

The corpus of the study consists of OA and OB. Since my goal is to learn whatever can be learned about the “genuine” verbal morphosyntax of the two vernacular dialects,<sup>3</sup> I am forced to treat the OB Mari with certain caution. In zero approximation, this corpus follows the OB literary variety based on the vernacular of Ešnunna (see most recently Durand 2004:113f.). For my purposes, the epistolary corpus of OB Mari can be best subdivided as follows:<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is reflected in three papers published so far: Loesov 2005, 2006, 2010.

<sup>2</sup> For a concise formulation of this hypothesis, see Loesov 2011.

<sup>3</sup> In other words, the aim is *reconstruction* of certain aspects of spoken Akkadian dialects.

<sup>4</sup> The classification was suggested to me by IA after I had shared with him the idea of the present study. He also indicated to me the relevant secondary litera-

1) Documents authored by writers whose native tongues were various dialects of Akkadian. Here belong the major part of the correspondence of Samsi-Addu epoch (cf. Charpin–Ziegler 2007), texts written by native speakers of Akkadian from Central or Southern Mesopotamia and found in the Mari archives, e. g. those authored by Ibal-pi-El of Ešnunna (Charpin 1991), by Hammurapi of Babylon (ARM 6, 51–54; 28, 1 and 3–11), and by Hammurapi’s representatives in Mari (FM 2, 120; 6, 10–17).<sup>5</sup>

2) “Amorite” letters, especially letters of local governors and administrators of Zimri-Lim, e. g. ARM 27. They constitute the bulk of the published OB Mari epistolary corpus. Mistakes against the OB norm can be found in almost each letter of this group, it is safe to assume the influence of non-Akkadian Semitic mother tongues of the authors. Here also belong letters from Amorite kingdoms of Western Syria and Upper Mesopotamia. In this “Amorite” corpus, the command of the OB norm varies considerably from writer to writer.

3) Letters of “Barbarians,” i. e. writers of Elamite and Hurrian extraction, etc.

This triple division may apply also to OB Tell Rimah and Shemshara.

Hence, if, within the OB corpus, a certain morphosyntactic fact happens to obtain only in the “Amorite” group, I treat it separately as a suspect of foreign influence. One understands that in practice the borderline between groups (1) and (2) is no iron curtain. E. g., we cannot exclude that among Zimri-Lim’s scribes or other palace folks there were native speakers of OB or genuine bilinguals. Yet the present study cannot do without some such distinction.

### 1.1. Research History

Unfortunately, there is not much to say in the way of a literature review as far as the semantics of the SC goes. I will start with the erstwhile influential essay of A. Goetze “The so-called Intensive of the Semitic Languages” (Goetze 1942). On p. 5, Goetze suggests the following tripartite semantic classification of the SC:

“(1) the *d u r a t i v e* stative. It denotes an inherent quality of a person or a thing.” Examples are *ṭāb* ‘is good,’ *šalim* ‘is well,’ *qerub* ‘is near,’ *rapaš* ‘is wide,’ etc. This kind of the SC “is identical with the predicative

---

ture. My reading experience in OB Mari makes me subscribe to IA’s subdivision of the corpus.

<sup>5</sup> Curiously, there are at least two letters written in OB by a writer who must have been a speaker of OA (Durand 2001).

form of the adjective.” In the ASPT papers, I call this variety “semantically deadjectival.”

“(2) The perfect stative. It denotes a condition which results from the subject’s own action with reference to a person or a thing.” It “constitutes an independent category of forms,” which means that for Goetze *ṣabit* ‘he possesses’ belongs to a category different from both the semantically deadjectival kind of the SC (*tāb*) and the forms like *iṣbat/iṣṣabat*. Goetze lists here *ṣabit* and other taking-hold-of transitive forms (with a reference to Ungnad 1918), as well as *ṣaṭer* ‘has by written deed,’ *ṣakin* ‘has placed,’<sup>6</sup> *walldat* ‘has born (children),’ and other transitive tokens of the SC. He also counts here some telic<sup>7</sup> intransitive verbs: *maḡit* ‘is on the ground,’ *ṭebi* ‘is sunk,’ etc. These SC tokens of intransitive verb “denote the rest after some movement.”

“(3) The passive stative. It denotes a state of affairs which results from another person’s action ... Any transitive verb may have such a form at its side.” “[T]he presence or absence of an object” makes possible the distinction between active (= **A**) and passive (= **P**) tokens of the SC formed from transitive verbs. The illustrative examples are part of those already cited for the previous category, now they receive **P** glosses, e. g. *aḡiz* ‘(is) held,’<sup>8</sup> *ṣabit* ‘(is) seized,’ *maḡer* ‘(is) received,’ *naši* ‘(is) lifted,’<sup>9</sup> *ṣakin* ‘(is) placed.’

The treatment of the SC in GAG is inferior to the earlier insights of Ungnad and Goetze. The SC is infelicitously called “Konjugiertes Nomen” (124a). The first half of von Soden’s two-page description is dedicated to the denominal forms of the SC, which are rare outside literary texts. The analysis of the deverbal SC is marred by its dialectic identification with the Verbal Adjective (= VA): the SC is the conjugated VA, while the VA is the declined SC, “beide Kategorien sind also identisch” (GAG

---

<sup>6</sup> It does not seem to be attested in OB, though Goetze refers to his forthcoming Grammar of OB as the source of his material.

<sup>7</sup> Goetze describes the telic meaning in the following words: “only if the intransitive by itself points to the termination of the action which it denotes”. He opposes such verbs to “cursive intransitives like ‘walk,’ ‘run,’ ‘shout,’” which do not form the SC.

<sup>8</sup> Goetze remarks that this type can be called “a passive participle in predicative use,” hence the bracketed ‘is.’

<sup>9</sup> We will see in due course that for some of this taking-hold-of verbs the SC **P** is not attested in OB, hence part of Goetze’s examples seem to be made-up.

125d). In spite of this dialectics, von Soden makes several valuable observations of both individual and general nature (GAG 126):<sup>10</sup>

- in OB, the SC of *kašādum* ‘to reach’ often has future time reference;<sup>11</sup>
- the SC of **telic** verbs is RES (‘bezeichnet der St. den sich aus der Verbalhandlung ergebenden Zustand’), the SC of telic transitive verbs is diathesis-neutral;<sup>12</sup>
- the SC of **atelic** verbs is rare (all three von Soden’s examples of atelic verbs with no SC in the first edition of GAG are intransitive);
- the availability of the VA also somehow depends on the meaning of the verb, i. e. there is a pattern of “the SC with no corresponding VA” (von Soden offers a few hints but no general rule for this).

Von Soden’s description reveals an unbridgeable gap between an inadequate theoretical frame and a number of far-reaching insights. GAG (1952) had appeared before the general linguistics elaborated such now commonplace notions as situation (or lexical) aspect,<sup>13</sup> the RES verb forms, or transitivity as a semantic rather than a purely syntactic concept.

Yet, von Soden made some important semantic distinctions in the spirit of these later theories.

The first attempt at describing the semantics of the SC in some detail is Rowton’s “The Use of the Permansive in Classic Babylonian” (1962). As Kouwenberg 2010:170, fn. 32 observes, “It is a well-documented study, exemplary as to how a grammatical problem should be addressed and pioneering in its inclusion of competing categories such as the *t*-perfect and the passive. However, his semantic interpretation of many statives is highly questionable ...”<sup>14</sup> With some 600 classified examples, Rowton 1962 is still the best documented semantic study of the SC. Unfortunately, his corpus is ill-chosen (“Classic Babylonian” = OB + SB), his semantic criteria are impressionistic, his terminology is partly coined by the author and not strictly defined.

K. Hecker’s description of the SC in GKT 118–121 (1968) is insightful and (unlike GAG) offers quite a few important examples of the SC **A**,

<sup>10</sup> Some of them may have been taken from the earlier scholarship, which is irrelevant when one discusses a reference grammar.

<sup>11</sup> A fact that I am dealing with in some detail on p. 116 below.

<sup>12</sup> This point was penetratingly formulated in Ugnad 1918:281, “müssen wir doch stets im Auge behalten, daß der Permansiv seiner Grundbedeutung nach denjenigen bezeichnet, an dem eine Handlung zum Abschluß gekommen ist.”

<sup>13</sup> In particular the notion of (a)telicity, which my Forschungsgeschichte uses anachronistically.

<sup>14</sup> I endorse completely BK’s evaluation of Rowton’s work.

building on Rowton's semantic classification. Unfortunately, it did not really influence our thinking about the SC, probably because this grammar of OA was meant as a non-ambitious practical addendum to GAG.

The year 1968 saw the publication of G. Buccellati's 12-pages essay "An Interpretation of the Stative as a Nominal Sentence," whose thrust is adequately rendered by its title. The most daring feature of this paper is that it brings no single example of the SC formed from a genuine verbal root, it hardly ever mentions their existence, while every reader of Akkadian knows that such forms are the only productive ones. Buccellati prefers to deal mostly with made-up examples, some of which may be grammatically wrong (see Kraus 1984).

Buccellati's thesis won the day for the next 30 years. The interpretation of the SC as a nominal clause (verbless clause, "predicative construction," etc.) was accepted by several generations of scholars in the field, see in particular Huehnergard 1986, 1987 and 1997, Reiner 1970, Streck 1995 (NB the literature review pp. 177–186), Tropper 1995.

At an early stage of my work on the problem, BK agreed, in a p. c., that "nobody published anything fundamental on the function of the stative since Rowton. At least one reason, I think, is Buccellati's 1968 article, which for some reason (incomprehensible to me) was so influential that it may have deterred people from sticking out their neck on this subject." One of the few dissenting voices was F. Kraus: "Ebenso wortreich wie ergebnisarm krankt der Artikel an schweren Fehlern verschiedener Art ... [E]ine detaillierte Auseinandersetzung mit einer so gearteten Arbeit unendlich, wo nicht unmöglich wäre ..." (Kraus 1984:39f.).<sup>15</sup>

It is probably not accidental that the protest was voiced by F. Kraus, the editor of numerous texts and publisher of *AbB*, who knew the language firsthand but whose interests were other than a "scientific" interpretation of Akkadian grammar. From the notes in the text editions by Kraus it is evident that his interest in grammar was primarily philological, related to the problems of literal understanding of text. Meanwhile, most students of the grammar of Akkadian in the 20th century were not particularly curious to learn what exactly "tenses" in general and the SC in particular do in text. As Kraus points out, it is some kind of (ill-equipped)

---

<sup>15</sup> D. Cohen in his important 1984 monograph on the emergence of new verb forms in Semitic from "la phrase nominal" also seems to follow the lead of Buccellati 1968, but this is not that vital for his study of grammaticalization. D. Cohen was the first one to compile a list of Akkadian "active statives," which is useful for the student of Akkadian grammar.

diachronic excitement that was “oft der eigentliche Anlaß zur Beschäftigung moderner Gelehrter mit dem Stativ” (p. 39).<sup>16</sup>

It stands to reason that the SC was grammaticalized in prehistoric times from the nominal clause consisting of the resultative VA + pronominal subject in the Nom. to its right.<sup>17</sup> In itself, this fact has nothing particular about it, since “today’s morphology is yesterday’s syntax” (Talmy Givón). As for the burning historical question, the relationship of the Akkadian SC to the WS “Perfect,” it remains as unsolved as it used to be a century ago. For what it is worth, I would bet that the two paradigms are genealogically unrelated, in particular the nominal base of the WS one is a predicative adjective other than *\*paris-*, i. e. most probably *\*paras-*. On this scenario, *\*paras-* would be soon lost by the WS as a productive attributive participle (or substantive). This is the fate of the PS agent noun *\*pāris-* in various Neo-Aramaic languages: *\*pāris-* became the base of the new present-future forms and was hereby discontinued as a nominal stem. Another possible analogy is the Proto-Slavic perfective participle with the suffix *-l* (Meillet 1934, § 281f., cf. Vaillant 1948, § 164). In historical times, it is used almost exclusively within analytical tenses that include various finite forms of the verb ‘to be,’ yet at some (pre-Slavic?) stage it must have been a productive noun or adjective that was used in nominal (non-predicative) slots, its appearance as a predicative adjective can hardly be explained in a different way.<sup>18</sup>

Kouwenberg’s article “Nouns as Verbs: The Verbal Nature of the Akkadian Stative” (2000) rehabilitated the SC as a finite form. As for the SC tokens formed directly from fientive verbal roots (or, as BK puts it, “from the verbal paradigm”),<sup>19</sup> BK assigned them an honourable slot within the

<sup>16</sup> I do not summarize here Rowton’s and Kraus’s theoretical considerations on the SC, and this is for two reasons: (1) both writers did not aspire to produce **the** theory; (2) their general ideas are now partly obsolete, while numerous insightful observations they offer are still a challenge and will be useful for any future description of the Akkadian verbal morphosyntax. On the contrary, the nominal sentence theory of the SC did not provide anything of use for our understanding of Akkadian.

<sup>17</sup> All the stages and details of the grammaticalization process will be probably never fully recovered.

<sup>18</sup> Among the recent opinions on the problem, see in particular Voigt 2002–2003 and Kouwenberg 2010 § 7.4.

<sup>19</sup> This variety, the only one productive in Akkadian, is the subject of the present research. Genuine conjugated nouns (both substantives and adjectives) are not considered here. I believe that this predicative *status* of nouns is an inner-Akkadian analogical development vis-à-vis the SC as a verbal “tense,” cf. Loesov 2005:142ff. and 2010:763f.

standard typological set of tense-aspect meanings: the SC is now **RESULTATIVE** in the sense of Nedjalkov (ed.) 1988 (= TRC).<sup>20</sup>

As everybody knows, the verb in ancient West Semitic languages had very limited possibilities to express tense-aspect meanings via inflectional morphology. It is usually assumed that the WS verb at the earliest stage of its life could only oppose PERFECTIVE to IMPERFECTIVE (or PAST to NON-PAST). Against this background, Akkadian looks conspicuously well-equipped: it had four tense-aspect conjugations plus productive derivational means for coding the aspectual meaning “iterativity,” i. e. *tan*-stems that could be formed from each of the four basic stems. Cross-linguistically, Akkadian verb is interesting due to the combination of two features: it has different inflectional forms for PERFECT (*iptaras*) and RES (*paris*), while RES of transitive verbs can get **P** or **A** readings though it does not inflect for diathesis.<sup>21</sup>

## 1.2. RES and the Akkadian SC. An overview and criticism of BK’s position

The previous paragraphs concluded the introductory story. I will now summarize BK’s views on the **functions** of the SC, as expressed in Kouwenberg 1997, 2000 and 2010, because this is the juncture where the present study starts.

---

<sup>20</sup> I do not produce here a summary of BK’s argumentation, among other things because he did this himself in Kouwenberg 2010, 7.3. To my knowledge, in the past ten years no attempt has been made to refute Kouwenberg 2000, in particular by the scholars who had bought into the Buccellati 1968 nominal sentence idea. It is therefore a pity that certain popularizing and/or typologically oriented descriptions of Akkadian keep misleading the linguistic readership about the place of the SC in the grammar of Akkadian and consequently about the very structure of Akkadian verb. Thus, Sh. Izre’el maintains that the SC is a “nominal predicative” that “can be substantival or adjectival” (Izre’el–Cohen 2004:49). Streck 2005:51 notes that “Die Analyse des Stativs als nominal oder verbal ist umstritten,” which does not mean anything for the outsider; the only important thing is that the SC was excluded from his morphosyntactic description of the Akkadian verb.

<sup>21</sup> According to TRC, **A** readings of RES formed from trans. verbs are cross-linguistically rare (this follows naturally from the semantic core of RES), while identical morphological marking of **P**, **A** and intransitive (= **S**) meanings is much more frequent than otherwise. Nedjalkov 2001 observes that ‘[i]dentical marking has a functional explanation: it is due to the fact that in all the three cases the derived subject is identical with that underlying constituent which is the most affected by the previous action. In the case of **S**-resultatives, it is the only constituent, and in **P**- and **A**-resultatives it is the most affected one’ (p. 932). This is exactly what Ungnad 1918 tells us.

BK's perspective on the **grammatical meaning** of the SC is consistent and uncompromising: since 1997 up to the present he has been insisting on the purity of the STATIVE meaning of the SC, against all kinds of "syntax-and-semantics" or "target-language-of-translation" oriented attempts to weaken or relativize this basic tenet.

Consider BK's criticism of Goetze's semantic classification:

"[T]he distinction which Goetze makes between three types of statives reflects a semantic distinction between different types of verbs which has no grammatical relevance for Akkadian. From the point of view of Akkadian, the stative has a completely uniform grammatical function, namely, to denote a state, i. e., the absence of any action or change. All differences between individual statives, such as whether a stative expresses a "pure" state (e. g., *šalmāku* "I am well"), or a state resulting from a previous event (e. g., *halqat* "**she** [has escaped and] **is** [now] **on the run**") ... are determined by the lexical meaning of the verb and by the context" (Kouwenberg 1997:14).

This thesis may have been influenced by our knowledge of the etymological (or primary) stative-resultative meaning of the SC. Let us narrow down the discussion to dynamic verbs as the most frequent ones and the natural representatives of the VERB as a part of speech. As I believe, the VA of telic transitive verbs in predicative use may have been the genuine historical kernel of the SC. After the verbalization of this predicative construction and its spread to intransitive telic verbs had taken place, the young SC must have been impeccably resultative, but **this was no longer the case in historical times**. To prove this, we first have to formulate restrictions on the manifestation of the resultative sense, i. e. we have to single out syntactic environments incompatible with RES. To be able to do so, we must put forward a strict working definition of RES.

According to TRC 6,

"The term resultative is applied to those verb forms that express a state implying a previous event. The difference between the stative and the resultative is as follows: the stative expresses a state of a thing without any implication of its origin, while the resultative expresses both a state and a preceding action it has resulted from."<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> According to Lyons 1977:483, "A static situation ... is one that is conceived of as existing, rather than happening, and as being homogeneous, continuous and unchanging throughout its duration. A dynamic situation, on the other hand, is something that happens ...".

This definition, as well as J. Lyons' definition of the static situation over against the dynamic one, is not sufficient for our purpose. In our case, the contrast between the categories SIMPLE PAST (or "narrative tense"), PERFECT, and RES can be best formulated in terms of relationship between Situation Time (= SitT), Speech Time (= SpT), and Reference Time (= RefT).<sup>23</sup>

SIMPLE PAST:	SitT is its own RefT, it precedes SpT. <sup>24</sup>
PERFECT:	SitT precedes RefT (which in case of PRESENT PERFECT coincides with SpT). <sup>25</sup>
RESULTATIVE:	RESULTATIVE: The event's resultant <i>state</i> exists at RefT, which in the default case coincides with SpT. <sup>26</sup>

One conclusion that follows from these definitions is the non-narrative nature of PERFECT and RES. Verb forms with these meanings do not belong in narrative chains. Unlike SIMPLE PAST, PERFECT views a past event from a temporal vantage point external to this event. In the natural setting of utterances, i. e. in oral dialogue, both RESULTATIVE and STATIVE can become what they are supposed to be if they are contemporaneous with SpT as the default RefT.

From the above there follow four commonsense syntactic restrictions on the appearance of RES encoded by a special linguistic shape,<sup>27</sup> and the list is most probably not exhaustive:<sup>28</sup>

<sup>23</sup> See Reichenbach 1947:287–298. Reichenbach's insights have long become part of the standard procedures in describing tense-aspect, see e. g. Smith 1997.

<sup>24</sup> Thus, SpT and therefore the speaker participate in the definition of SIMPLE PAST. In case of narrative verb forms (e. g. the Akkadian IPRUS), RefT "is determined by the point in time at which the last event related in the preceding context took place" (Dahl 1985:112).

<sup>25</sup> For Östen Dahl, PERFECT is characterized by "a point of reference (in Reichenbach's sense) which is different from the 'point of event'" (Dahl 1985:133). In Loesov 2004, I tried to show (following Goetze 1936) that the basic meaning of the Akkadian IPTARAS is PERFECT. I defined this basic meaning as "now extended past-wise" (p. 172), which is materially tantamount to the formal definition "SitT precedes RefT" and to Dahl's words. The famous "resultative component" of PERFECT, which I also embraced in Loesov 2004, now seems to me no less metaphorical than the "current relevance" approach. Therefore I accept the criticism of Kouwenberg 2010:141, fn. 8.

<sup>26</sup> Since the target of these considerations is the SC of Akkadian, this statement presupposes that the resultative form does not inflect for tense, unlike e. g. the German Zustandspassiv.

<sup>27</sup> The stipulation about a special linguistic shape ("non-combined," in the language of TRC) is essential because every perfective verb form can have re-

1. RES does not occur in non-subordinate narrative sentences.
2. RES is incompatible with past (and probably future) time adverbials but can be modified by temporal adjuncts that include the SpT: “Is rowan atkinson married? Yes, He **is married since** 1990 (to present) and has 2 children” (<http://www.trueknowledge.com>), “kevin **ya está** casado **desde** el sábado 19” (<http://jonasbrothers96.obolog.com>).
3. RES is incompatible with place adverbials, unless the verbal root itself denotes spatial relationships, e. g. a position in space.<sup>29</sup> The incompatibility of RES with place adverbials that do not point to the location of speech act plausibly follows from the above definition of RES. Yet in various European languages the *hic* adverbials are also incompatible with resultative constructions: \**I am married here*, \**Ich bin hier verheiratet*, \**Estoy casado aquí*, \**Я здесь женат* etc. are all hardly acceptable. Thus, I have to posit that deictic localization also possesses a semantic element incapable of coexisting with RES in some languages.<sup>30</sup>
4. Logically, genuine RES should not square with negations. Within the deictic register of speech (RefT = SpT), negation of the trivial resultant state may presuppose that the corresponding telic or punctual event has failed to take place, therefore there is a chance that {NEG + RES} will

---

sultative readings. As we will see below, the nearest example at hand is the Akkadian Pret.: some basic telic verbs (both transitive and intransitive) do not have the productive SC, therefore their Pret. and the *t*-Perf. appear in resultative contexts as well.

<sup>28</sup> I do not pretend to believe that all these restrictions are 100% universally valid. RES is by definition a complex and therefore unstable notion (it is its semantic depth and ambiguity that make it a worthy object of attention). Its grammatical shape in a given language lends itself synchronically to other uses (thus, the English ‘it is done’ has a resultative and a habitual reading). Besides, much depends on the etymology (or “inner form”) of the respective verb form in a given language. My arrangement of restrictions is meant to follow in the order of diminishing universality (or frequency), but this is also a guess. Needless to say, all four restrictions have been mentioned in typological literature.

<sup>29</sup> Examples are verbs with the meanings ‘to sit,’ ‘to lie,’ ‘to hang down,’ etc. In case of such verbs, a place adverbial may fill an obligatory valence. The deletion of place adverbials in resultative constructions of non-location verbs is explicitly mentioned in TRC 54, with a German example: Sie **sind** dort **gefesselt worden** → Sie **sind** (\*dort) **gefesselt**. There is a note *ibid.* to the effect that cross-language the compatibility with place adverbials helps tell dynamic verb forms from resultative ones.

<sup>30</sup> In typological literature, I have found no comprehensive discussion of the problem based on a representative sample from world’s languages. TRC has only occasional remarks *pro et contra* in the chapters on RES in individual languages.

be either impossible or will function as the negation of a dynamic past-time verb form, this {NEG + RES} may have the PERFECT reading.<sup>31</sup>

I am now going to adduce a selection of examples from OB and OA where the SC defies these restrictions and has **past-time dynamic** rather than resultative readings. I have already briefly discussed the problem in Loesov 2005:133f., with references to previous literature, to which I have to add Kraus 1984:31–32. Most recently, Kouwenberg 2010, 7.3.3 introduced the past-time use of the SC under the heading “Marginal and secondary uses of the stative” and provided a dozen OB and OA examples, some of which include the SC of *dâkum* ‘to kill’ and *mâtum* ‘to die.’<sup>32</sup> BK’s reason to consider these examples non-resultative is syntactic: “[T]he inclusion of a specification of the time and/or the place of death ... shifts the attention from the present state to the previous event since it (the specification.—*S. L.*) can only refer to the event itself.” BK explains this evidence simply by suggesting that Akkadian “was not completely immune” to the diachronic development RES → PERFECT, well-known in the world’s languages. In his opinion, “[t]he Akkadian stative did not become a productive perfect ... because Akkadian already had one in the *iptarVs* form.” To my mind, this explanation does not hold water, and this is for two reasons:

(1) As we will see in the course of this study, dynamic tokens of the SC in OB and OA (being of course diachronically secondary) are by no means “marginal,” they are frequent.

(2) The SC did not succeed in becoming a regular PERFECT in the rest of the lifespan of Akkadian, in spite of the fact that in the corpora of MB and MA *iptarVs* acquired the meaning of SIMPLE PAST/PERFECTIVE in the foreground sentences.<sup>33</sup>

This means that one will have to look for a different explanation of the evidence.

<sup>31</sup> See Kozinskij 1988:511f. for an analysis of data collected in TRC. The problem may be relevant for Akkadian, since in OB the *t*-Perfect is incompatible with negations in most syntactic contexts. The standard negative alloform of *iptaras* in main clauses is *ul iprus*, yet the literature reports cases of negated *paris* with allegedly dynamic force (e. g., Kraus 1984:11, Veenhof in a footnote to AbB 14, 150:11ff.).

<sup>32</sup> BK also introduces another secondary use of the SC, the inflected forms of *šakin* and *nadi* functioning as copular predicates. This fact is also relevant for my study.

<sup>33</sup> This last statement is based on current reference tools, including Kouwenberg 2010.

\* \* \*

Let us now preliminarily survey some evidence for the SC violating the four constraints on RESULTATIVE formulated above.<sup>34</sup>

**Non-subordinate sentences** that relate past events (“narrative” in the widest sense), the SC is often but not necessarily followed by the sequencing *-ma*:

- (1) GU<sub>4</sub>.HLA ša PN **ha-al-qū-ma** ina qāti PN<sub>1</sub> u PN<sub>2</sub> DÀM.GAR iṣbatū-šunu <ti>-ma umma šunu-ma nādinānū ša iddinūnāšī ibaššū

‘Oxen of PN **had been lost**, and (afterwards) they found them in possession of PN<sub>1</sub> and PN<sub>2</sub>, a merchant. This is what they said: There are certain sellers who sold us (the oxen). [Their names are ...]’ (Goetze 1958, No. 28:4–11, OB kingdom of Ešnunna).<sup>35</sup>

The SC *ḥalqū-ma* stands in the narrative chain and constitutes part of the crime description: *alpū ... ḥalqū-ma ina qāti ... iṣbatū-šunu*. BK tells me, “I doubt if *ḥalqū-ma* is part of the narrative chain; I rather think it is a circumstantial backgrounded clause, which is very common with stative + *-ma* at the beginning of a passage. One could also call it ‘virtually subordinate.’ I wonder if there is not some specific kind of rule why the stative is used here instead of the preterite: why not *iḥliqū-ma*, and what would be the difference if *iḥliqū-ma* had been used?” This is similar to the way M. B. Rowton understands these *paris-ma*-initial chains: “[T]he capacity the permansive has to speak of the background of other events. <...> In paratactic syntax it often speaks of the circumstance in which other action occurred, and in that sense it is ‘circumstantial’” (Rowton 1962:235, the examples are on pp. 271–278). Rowton tries to answer the question about the distribution of chain-initial *paris-ma* and *iprus-ma*: “In OB the enclitic particle (*-ma*.—S. L.) usually denotes no more than sequence of events when it is affixed to the preterite or the perfect. But when affixed to other tenses, it usually denotes a logical connection of some sort between the two sentences it joins” (p. 272). To escape circular reasoning, I prefer for the moment to keep here the term “narrative chain.” After all, even in the Pret<sub>1</sub>-*ma* ... Pret<sub>2</sub>-*ma* ... <...> Pret<sub>n</sub>-*ma* chain the conjunction *-ma* secures the effect of what BK calls “virtual subordination” (see Patterson 1970).<sup>36</sup> It may well be that the chain-initial SC-*ma* was used as a pluper-

<sup>34</sup> As we will learn little by little, this violation has a pattern.

<sup>35</sup> Goetze notes in the Edition: “This letter illustrates a law concerning lost animals which is analogous to § 9 CH: Lost animals have been found in somebody’s possession; the possessor must prove that he acquired the animals lawfully.”

<sup>36</sup> Building on the above observations of Rowton and BK and on the evidence collected in the course of my research, I will allow myself a near-at-hand guess: in narrative passages, the relationship between *paris-ma iprus* and *iprus-ma iprus*

fect of sorts (see below), but PLUPERFECT is by no means RES with a past-time reference point (= the RefT in the speaker's past): PLUPERFECT is dynamic (fientive), while the non-resultative nature of our *ḥalqū-ma* is the only thing that matters for us at this point.<sup>37</sup>

- (2) PN *ḥa-li-iq-ma* ina GN ... *wašib*  
 'PN **has left** (the ranks) and stays ... in GN' (AbB 6, 171:6–10).
- (3) PN MU 5.KAM *e-ri-iš-ma warkānum* PN<sub>1</sub> *ina emūqim ikim-šu*  
 'PN **cultivated** (the field) for five years, afterwards PN<sub>1</sub> took (it) from him by force' (AbB 4, 160:27'ff.).
- (4) *ittī-kunu bā'erūtam e[ḫē]šam ku-ul-lu-mu-ma taprik-am-ma ana bā'erūtīm epēšim [ul t]addin-aššunūti*  
 'They **were assigned** to do the fishing with you, but you were a hindrance and did not allow them to do the fishing. <Let them (now) do the fishing!>' (AbB 11, 112:18–22).

*Kullumū* is part of a narrative sequence and has an adjunct *ittī-kunu* 'with you.'

- (5) PN *bī-it ana šarrim iḥḥa-ma*  
 'PN spent the night and then had an audience with the king' (AS 22, No. 19:3ff., tr. Whiting; archaic OB).

The SC sentences in (1)–(5) can be interpreted as backgrounding/“virtually subordinate” (though formally paratactic) predications, yet the only formal correlate of this claim (however plausible) is the usage of the SC shape. Thus, the problem needs further research.

**Complement and relative clauses** where the SC has the reading of the pluperfect type (the situation coded by the SC is prior to a past-time reference point expressed by the predicate of the main clause):

- (6) *ḥišam ša ana šūtat kašpim ez-bu-ši ʾirišū-ši-ma*

---

chains is that of markedness. The chain *paris-ma iprus* may suggest explicitly that there is something “backgrounding” in its first link, while *iprus-ma iprus* is a default expression.

<sup>37</sup> Note that below (in connection with BK's perspective on the functions of the SC) I will try to cast doubt on the traditional formulation regarding “the lack of tense distinctions” in the SC. Simply put: in so far as the function of the SC is indeed RES, only the present-time domain is unproblematic. For past and future, we have to specify linguistic environments that allow (or forbid) the resultative meaning of the SC. All these niceties are due to the complex and fragile structure of RES.

‘They asked her (to produce) the binding agreement which **had been made** in her favor for the remainder of the money’ (TCL 1, 157:34, text and tr. CAD E 422b, OB leg.).

(7) *kīma ... ina sūnī-ki nīlu-ma aqtīp*

‘I have been led to believe that **he slept** with you’ (TCL 1, 10:23, text and tr. CAD Q 93a, OB letter).

(8) *tup-pá-am ša ku-nu-ki-a ša a-ni-ša-am wa-ba-la-am qá-bi-a-tí-ni u<sub>4</sub>-ma-am lá ta-ta-ab-lam*

‘Today you have not brought me the tablet with my seal that **you promised** to bring here’ (Michel 1991, No. 263:9ff.).

#### PARIS with **adverbials of time and place**:

(9) *a-šu-mì 25 TÚG ku-ta-ni ša (tù)-šé-bi<sub>4</sub>-lá-ni-ni i-na GN ša-áb-tù a-na É.GAL-lim né-li-ma*

‘As for the 25 *k.*-textiles that you (pl.) sent me, **they have been confiscated** in GN. We went up to the palace and ...’ (CCT 4, 19c:15–19, OA).

The SC *šabtū* has the reading of (present) PERFECT: confiscation of the textiles is the “hot news” and the rationale of the letter.

(10) *ištu* I TL.1.KAM *šerrum ina libbiya mi-it-ma*

‘The child in my womb **died** a month ago’ (ABIM 15:10).

(11) *ina panūtīm ana LUGAL.MEŠ šunūli awātam kīam ša-ab-ta-ak-šu-nu-ši-im*

‘Some time ago, I **addressed** these kings the following speech’ (A.1025:5ff. = MARI 6, 337ff.).

(12) *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 minas and 10 shekels tin **I have spent** between Zalpa and Kaniš. 23 minas and 10 shekels tin are the expenses of Asānum’ (BIN 4, 116, OA, and cf. the tr. of Ulshöfer 1995:272).

This is a travel expenses note, cited here in its entirety. The sentence whose predicate is *nad<sup>o</sup>āku* speaks about the author’s expenses during the travel rather than about his own resultative state.<sup>38</sup>

(13) *KÙ.BABBAR I MA.NA 4½ GÍN iš-tí DUMU sà-aḥ-ru-ta-na-im e-ri-iš-ma šé-bi-lam šál-ma-am i-na a-lim<sup>ki</sup> ša-qá-lam qá-bi*

<sup>38</sup> Contrast ŠU.NIGIN x KÙ.BABBAR *na-ad-a-tù-nu* ‘You have deposited, all in all, x silver’ (BIN 4, 33:15f., OA). Here the SC **A** of *nadārum*, in a different lexical meaning, does describe the resultative state of the addressees, see 2.1.2 below and the analysis of *nadūm* in the forthcoming part of this study.

‘Demand from the son of the Sahrutanean silver (in the amount of) 1 mina 4½ shekel and send (it) to me. In the City, **he has promised** to pay in full’ (Prag I 472:32–36, a letter from Assur to Kaniš).

**Negated forms of the SC:**<sup>39</sup>

(14) *ul ina pilši ka-aš-da-a-ku*

‘I have not been seized in burglary’ (AbB 2, 83:32).

Note also the place adverbial.

(15) *aššum pika 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 tr.).

In a fn. to his translation of *ul ma-ag-ra-ak-šu-nu-ti*, Veenhof suggests that here “the stative serves as perfect tense.” Veenhof may well be right, this is probably a negative alloform of the *t*-Perf.<sup>40</sup>

(16) *ištēn alpum ul na-d[i-i]š-šum*

‘Not a single ox **has been given** to him’ (Goetze 1958, No. 1:22).

(17) *šumma A.ŠÀ šaddagdam lā e-ri-iš-ma nadi*

‘Wenn das Feld im vorigen Jahre nicht **bestellt worden ist** und brachliegt’ (AbB 2, 92:15f.).

The SC is used here in the “natural” slot of the N-stem Pret. The time adverbial *šaddagdam* secures the past-time (non-resultative) interpretation perhaps more powerfully than the negation.

(18) *awīlū ul wa-šú-ú lā tušadda-šunūti*

‘The men are not (yet) gone. Do not prevent them (from leaving)’ (AbB 8, 87:10f.).

This example is important for our understanding of what the SC is all about. The verb *wašûm* belongs to the basic vocabulary, it is extremely common in the corpus. To my knowledge, *awīlū ul wašû* is the only OB example of *waši* for the literal telic meaning of the root ‘to go/come out’ (cf. Loesov 2006:139).<sup>41</sup> This evidence calls for explanation. The one that

<sup>39</sup> According to the above, {negation + the SC} may be forbidden to be resultative, but there is no reason why it should be past-time and nothing else, and actually it is not. I adduce here only past-time examples simply to make this point comparable with the other ones.

<sup>40</sup> Note that the form *lā šamāku* stands in a subordinate clause, and this environment may be in itself unfavorable for RES.

<sup>41</sup> To the material collected in Loesov 2006, add ARM 26/2, 449:42: *šumma-*

follows from the present study is two-fold: 1) as we will see below (2.2), intransitive telic motion verbs that are unergative (i. e. their subject is semantically AGENT-like)<sup>42</sup> usually do not form the resultative SC for the basic meanings of the respective roots;<sup>43</sup> 2) Akkadian can tolerate negated SC forms of unergative verbs with **past-time** readings. In other words, a past-time *ul waši* ‘he has not gone out’ might sometimes have been OK, while *waši* \*‘he is gone’ was unacceptable.

\* \* \*

I will now review BK’s perspective on the meaning of the SC as presented in Kouwenberg 2010. At the outset of his discussion (7.3, p. 163), BK restates his now classical thesis:

The grammatical function of the stative is the expression of a state. It is used indiscriminately for all kinds of states, whether permanent or transient, whether a “pure” state or a state resulting from a previous event. As such, it is opposed to the fientive members of the verbal paradigm, which express events.<sup>44</sup>

With Kantian integrity, BK deduces from this basic premise all the logically compelling semantic conclusions (all the quotations are from 7.3, boldface is added):

– “[T]he **lack of tense distinctions**: the stative may refer to the present, the past, and—much more rarely—the future.”

This statement, well-known from earlier (theoretically unambitious) literature, is nonetheless not self-evident within BK’s approach. For the SC with future reference, BK refers to the material collected in GAG § 77d\* and Leong 1994:244. In these sources, reliable OB examples are limited to the SC of *kašādum* in the motion sense ‘to come,’ and *wašābum*

---

*man ... bēli ina libbī-ka wa-ši.* The lexical meaning is figurative (lit. ‘were ... my lord to go out of your heart’ ~ ‘were you to forget my lord’), the grammatical reading of *waši* is dynamic (i. e., there is no question of the trivial resultant state of “the lord” as the one who has gone out). The form is suspect of adstratum influence.

<sup>42</sup> The notion contrary to “unergative” is “unaccusative”: an unaccusative verb is an intransitive verb whose subject is semantically PATIENT-like. The verb *wašūm* is unergative, while e. g. *mātum* ‘to die’ is unaccusative.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. also such basic verbs as *tebūm* ‘to get up,’ *tārum* ‘to return,’ *erēbum* ‘to enter’ (Loesov 2006:139f.).

<sup>44</sup> In a fn. to this paragraph, BK notes, “Only in very specific, exceptional circumstances are some statives capable of referring to events,” with reference to 7.3.3 (“Marginal and secondary uses of the stative”), with which we are already familiar.

‘to stay.’ Now inflected forms of *kašid* with this meaning happen to be an exceptional case, for some reason they **always** have future reference (Loesov 2006:147, No. 37). Besides, they invariably have specifications of goal, the coming time is also often indicated: *ana* U<sub>4</sub> 2.KAM *ka-aš-da-ka* ‘in two days, I will come to you’ (AbB 12, 42:14), so they seem to be **not resultative** by BK’s criteria (see also No. 39 below). The forms of *wašib* are not confined to future, but they have a virtually obligatory valency for place specifications; the two future-time examples reported in GAG and Leong 1994 (AbB 9, 117:11; OBTR 114:7) are 1st p. sg. (*wašbāku*) and have future-time temporal adjuncts (*ištu inanna* U<sub>4</sub> 5.KAM; U<sub>4</sub> 3.KAM). Since *wašābum* is a locative verb (see p. 85 above), the resultative sense of its SC may have survived in this environment, but this cannot be presumed and requires a special lexical study. Thus, in view of the above cross-linguistic constraints, the conditions under which the SC can get the meaning {PAST + RES} and {FUTURE + RES} have to be studied on their own and described in general terms.<sup>45</sup>

- “[I]n terms of semantic transitivity, statives have “**zero transitivity**,” since they do not indicate a change in the state of the world. Accordingly, **they cannot have an agentive subject**, since agentivity implies a conscious volitional act on the part of the subject and is therefore only applicable to actions.”
- “[S]ince statives do not envisage the termination of the state ... **they are by nature atelic**, whereas the fientive verb itself must be telic in order to have a stative at all.”
- “[S]tatives derived from verbs are **neutral for voice**: they can be “active” or “passive.” This is caused by the fact that they only refer to the result of an event and do not indicate how it came about; it is therefore immaterial whether its subject was the agent or the patient of the event.”

We are now passing to section 7.3.2 “Statives derived from verbs.” Let us adduce those of its theses that are especially relevant for us:<sup>46</sup>

- “Verbal statives ... are the most common and most complex type. ... [T]hey denote the state which results from the event expressed by the fientive forms of the verb (GAG § 77e). ... The occurrence of resultative

---

<sup>45</sup> I can add a future-time example of the SC from a divination apodosis: 𒀭 *i-ma-at-ma ina lā ālišu qebir* ‘he will die and will be buried not in his own city’ (TIM 9, 79:4; text and interpretation as in Metzler 2002:189). Once more, *qebērum* (at least in resultative readings) is a location verb. For two more allegedly future-time examples of the SC, see Loesov 2005:127, exx. No. 40 and 41.

<sup>46</sup> The book is meant to be a reference tool, so some of these statements seem trivial, yet for the purposes of the present study we have to keep in mind all of them.

- statives is therefore restricted to verbs denoting telic events, which culminate in a state. Atelic verbs for activities ... do not normally have a stative.”
- “[W]e can distinguish three kinds of verbal statives: intransitive statives, passive statives and active statives.”
  - “The most typical cases<sup>47</sup> are statives of intransitive verbs of telic movement, such as *ḫalāqu* ‘to get lost,’ *kamāsu* ‘to kneel down,’ *paḫāru* ‘to come together,’ *qerēbu* ‘to approach,’ *rabāšu* ‘to crouch, lie down,’ *tebū* ‘to stand up’ and *wašābu* ‘to sit down,’ and change of state verbs, such as *belū* ‘to go out (of fire),’ *mātu* ‘to die,’ *pašāḫu* ‘to become calm’ and *šebū* ‘to become satisfied.’”
  - “If the verb is transitive, either the subject or the direct object of the underlying fientive clause may become the subject of the stative, depending on the context and on semantic and pragmatic factors outside the stative itself, which ... is neutral with regard to voice.”
  - “If the subject of the underlying transitive clause retains its subject position in the stative, we have an “active stative,” which describes **the state of the subject** after the completion of the event.”
  - “Statives of **high-transitivity verbs** are almost always **passive**. This is due to the fact that it is the degree of affectedness of the participants which determines whether the resultant state is more likely to be predicated of the subject (the agent) or of the object (the patient).”
  - “Statives of **low-transitivity verbs**, on the other hand, **can be both active and passive**, because the direct object of low-transitivity verbs is not or not significantly affected by the action (see 3.4), so that their subject becomes proportionally more salient and therefore a more likely candidate to be described as having performed the action (Kozinskij 1988:517–521). Therefore, most active statives come from transitive verbs with a low degree of transitivity.”
  - “The fact that the stative describes an entity in terms of the result of a previous event makes the active stative eminently suitable for legal (con)texts to describe the legal status of a person (Rowton 1962:292–294).”
  - “[A]ctive statives have a particular tendency to develop a lexicalized meaning.”

\* \* \*

In BK’s semantic description of the SC, **each of the statements is in itself correct**. Yet the description is not gapless, because in fact so many tokens of the SC of dynamic verbs have readings other than RESULTATIVE (they are not necessarily past-time). If we sift the evidence, using among other things the above constraints on RES, we will see that the totality of non-re-

---

<sup>47</sup> I. e., of the SC of intransitive verbs.

sultative readings is so prominent that they cannot be simply lumped together and explained away as “marginal.” Therefore, students of the Akkadian verb have to deal with this material and to find out what were the tense-aspect functions of these non-resultative PARIS forms in text.

As we now know, Assyriologists have been since long ago aware that the SC of dynamic verbs is nontrivially sensitive to the lexical semantics of the root (i. e. more so than other “tenses”). Three elements of lexical meaning have been mentioned in the previous studies:

- (1) **Valency** (one- or two-place verbs, i. e. syntactic [in]transitivity).
- (2) “**Aktionsart**,” also known as “lexical aspect” or “actionality”: atelic verbs do not normally form the SC, and this stands to reason in view of the resultative meaning of the SC.
- (3) The degree of **semantic transitivity** ( $\approx$  dynamicity) of two-place verbs: high-transitivity verbs tend to have only the SC **P**, low-transitivity verbs can produce the SC with both **A** and **P** readings.<sup>48</sup> This difference also stands to reason: it is due to transparent pragmatic factors following from the essence of RES (as was explained in the above quotations from Kouwenberg 2010).

By the same token, since Goetze 1942 atelicity has been the only known **lexical restriction** on the formation of **the SC shape *paris*** (with whatever meaning). Relative frequency of the SC of basic telic (and punctual) verbs has been never discussed, although every reader of Akkadian will tell you that the SC of *šakānum* ‘to place’ is very popular, while off the top of his head he will probably confess that he has never come across the SC of *wabālum* ‘to bring,’ although the two words seem to belong in the same semantic class “verbs of telic transitive motion.” Same is true of verbs of telic intransitive motion. E. g., the SC of *maqātum* ‘to fall’ is frequent, the SC of *tebūm* ‘to get up’ is rare, while that of *erēbum* ‘to enter’ is hardly attested at all. There must be a reason that is responsible for this state of affairs.

\* \* \*

So far, we have put forward two observations, to be supported by further evidence:

---

<sup>48</sup> To my knowledge, this last criterion was first explicitly suggested by D. Cohen (1984, with different terminology) and elaborated by BK. Its kernel probably goes back to A. Ungnad.

- (1) The application of commonsense constraints on RESULTATIVE allows us to detect a **sizable number** of the SC forms **with dynamic readings**.<sup>49</sup>
- (2) The SC **morphological shapes** (with whatever grammatical readings, resultative or otherwise) **of basic telic verbs** display very uneven **token frequencies**,<sup>50</sup> **from very common to zero**.

At first sight, the two observations seem to be unrelated, yet we will see that they touch different sides of the same reality “où tout se tient.”

If one stayed with the syntactic limitations only [= observation (1)], the matter would appear quite simple: PARIS of dynamic roots is resultative *unless the environment blocks its resultative force*.<sup>51</sup> One would then have to ask why Akkadian needs PARIS in these kinds of environment at all, and one would probably surmise something like this: since syntactic constraints secure complementary distribution between resultative and dynamic tokens of PARIS, the latter were reemployed as pluperfect/background forms, which was a sensible thing to do, given that Akkadian verb cannot render this meaning morphologically, i. e. without syntactic support.

Yet the lexicon-based description of the SC forces on us observation (2), i. e. it poses the question about basic telic verbs with no (or almost no) SC, hence one has to look for the reasons. As we will see, this search leads to a **third** observation: for telic and punctual verbs, both the availability of the SC and whether it is resultative or not further depends on certain fine-tuned parameters of meaning of the given lexeme, to be described below. A **fourth** lexicon-based observation starts from inflection-morphology evidence: the rarer is PARIS of a given frequent telic lexeme, the more is the chance it will be used in non-resultative senses.

Consequently, we may chance to come across PARIS forms of telic verbs that *cannot* have resultative readings.

---

<sup>49</sup> As I mentioned above, some such constraints have been hinted upon time and again in the literature (at least since Rowton 1962 and Kraus 1984), but they have been never applied systematically.

<sup>50</sup> **Token frequency** is the number of times a given form of a given word is used, in this study it is always *the sum total of the SC examples for a given Akkadian verb*. It is opposed to **type frequency**, i. e. the number of existing lexemes with a given property (e. g., the totality of frequent high-transitivity verbs with no SC).

<sup>51</sup> This is how I understand BK's position, although he underestimates the amount of non-resultative examples.

## 2. Conditions for the RES reading of the SC of telic/punctual verbs

In an attempt to supplement BK's semantic description, I will now try to formulate additional rules that are responsible for relative token frequencies of the SC and for its grammatical readings (i. e. resultative or otherwise). The assumed rules will be supported by illustrative examples.

### 2.1. Transitive verbs

Conditions for the resultative reading of the SC are different for **P** and **A** tokens.

#### 2.1.1. The SC **P** RESULTATIVE

For the SC **P** to be resultative, it has to denote a resultant state of the former patient physically **observable** at the reference time.

#### *A note on the observability concept*

Loesov 2006 produces some Akkadian evidence that first prompted the present writer to advance this criterion. Since then I learned that in TRC observability is considered a frequent cross-linguistic condition that favours the formation of RES (to the exclusion of non-observable situations), see especially Kozinskij 1988, where this very catchword "observable" is used consistently, while in the body of TRC the main term for the feature is "specific resultative meaning," as opposed to "general resultative meaning." According to TRC, the criterion of **reversibility** is cross-linguistically no less relevant than that of observability (see especially the diagram on p. 505). Certain languages of the sample build "non-combined" resultative forms (i. e. those having no other tense-aspect meanings) only to code observable and reversible states resulting from telic events. Note how S. Jaxontov describes constraints on the formation of the resultative form in Chinese: "The resultative is formed from a limited number of verbs. These have to satisfy certain general semantic requirements. First of all, these verbs have to be either static or telic. These latter have to code a physical action with an easily observable result. The resultant state has to be reversible. For this reason, the resultative is not formed from verbs that express creation or destruction of an object" (Jaxontov 1983: 69, my translation from Russian). To illustrate, Jaxontov adduces a few common telic (or punctual) verbs that do not form the resultative, in particular those meaning 'to melt (intr.),' 'to go out (about fire),' 'to sell,' 'to build,' 'to kill,' 'to come.' Consider also my pre-theoretical reflections

on the SC of *maḥāṣum* ‘to hit, to wound, to kill, to strike’: “In OB and OA, the SC of this verb is not used for those of its senses that imply destruction of the object, loss of its identity” (Loesov 2006:137), which is tantamount to saying the resultant state is reversible. Yet a preliminary analysis of the Akkadian evidence allows one to hope that we probably do not need reversibility **in addition to** observability. For an adequate description, it seems sufficient to pose that Akkadian considered the (irreversible) state of destructed objects to be unobservable.

Vladimir Nedjalkov, the editor of TRC, authored an encyclopedic description of RES in a recent handbook of language typology, where he offered a good working definition of **observability**: “A **specific-resultative** meaning implies that an **observable** state of an entity allows us to deduce a particular action or process that has brought it about. For instance, if something is ‘cooked’ or ‘tied’ we can deduce that someone has cooked or tied it first” (Nedjalkov 2001:934). He distinguishes this type from the “**general-resultative** meaning”: “[T]he speaker describes the state of an entity through an action which he has witnessed or deduced. Thus, we can assert that a person is killed only if we know that someone has killed him, while the body may bear no signs of inflicted death. This meaning is characteristic of resultatives derived from verbs of “non-physical” actions and those that result in destruction or disappearance of the patient. <...> Thus, *Das Geld ist gestohlen*, means “The money is not where it should be, and I know (or at least suppose) that someone has stolen it” (ibid).

Note that in TRC and Nedjalkov (2001), “reversible” and “locational” are practically speaking varieties of “observable.”<sup>52</sup> Consequently, within

---

<sup>52</sup> According to Nedjalkov 2001:935, “If a language has resultatives of **unobservable** states, it also has resultatives of **observable** states. Within **the latter type**, the implicational hierarchy corresponds to the order of considerations (in the description of Nedjalkov 2001.—S. L.): 1) observable states → 2) reversible states → 3) position in space.”

If we reformulate the “implicational hierarchy” in terms of relative frequencies, then the above passage claims that in the world’s languages the **observable** RES is **more frequent** than the **unobservable** RES (+ if in a given language there is the latter kind, this language is supposed to have the former kind as well). Further, as for **observable** resultatives, the “**position in space**” RES is better attested cross-language than the “**reversible states**” RES (+ if in a given language there is the “reversible states” RES, this language has the “position in space” RES as well). By way of illustration, cf. a more intuitively appealing language universal: “If the verb in the language X has the inflectional dual, it also has the inflectional plural, however the opposite is not true.” This universal also says that in the world’s lan-

the distinction “specific vs. general” the former term is roughly equivalent to “observable.” Like so many other distinctions in language, this one does not look terribly “entweder–oder,” yet its application to Akkadian will help us explain the evidence on non-resultative forms of the SC **P** and that on its uneven token frequency.

\* \* \*

As we have seen, RES has to be contemporaneous with the reference time (by default, with the speech time). This means that RES is comparable to deictic tense. Deictic grammatical categories (those pointing to the *hic et nunc* of an oral utterance and to its speaker) are often re-interpreted in written communication,<sup>53</sup> which means that *more or less drastic semantic shift of a given deictic category* takes place. Therefore it is safer to start the argumentation about the relevance of **observability** with the negative evidence supporting (indeed, prompting) this criterion: the evidence is statistically significant and its unfolding does not involve a hair-splitting semantic analysis to which we have to recur in some parts of this study.

According to BK’s commonsense view expounded above, the higher is the degree of the patient’s affectedness, the higher is the chance for the SC **P** to be formed. This would entail that semantically basic (and demonstrably frequent) verbs with the highest degree of transitivity (in the sense of Hopper–Thompson 1980) will have the highest token frequencies of the SC **P**. To test this thesis, one has to compile a list of Akkadian representatives for prototypically transitive verbal notions, i. e. verbs encoding events in which volitional agents do killing, destroying, smashing, etc. of concrete, referential, definite, preferably animate patients. Then one will have to look at the SC of these verbs.<sup>54</sup>

Since ‘to kill’ is perhaps the best representative of the prototypically transitive verbs, we can have a look at the ‘kill’ verbs in Akkadian: *dākum* ‘to kill’; *nērum* ‘to strike, kill’; *šagāšum* ‘to kill, slaughter’; *šumūtum* ‘put (s. o.) to death’ (the glosses follow CDA).

The basic Akkadian verb for ‘to kill’ is *dākum*. For its SC, three tokens were found in the core OB (all of them in AbB), and about ten in Mari.

---

guages plural is believed to be more frequent than dual. The “implicational hierarchy” formalism is then *dual* → *plural*.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. my suggestion that the ventive pointing to the location of the addressee is a secondary feature that arose in the milieu of written communication (Loesov 2006a), and the interpretation of the Akkadian “epistolary perfect” as the temporal projection to the addressee’s “now” (Loesov 2004).

<sup>54</sup> A first attempt to do this is reflected in Loesov 2006:136–138.

In OA, *dēk* was found in two documents, VAS 26, 26:9 and Kay. 1830<sup>55</sup> (in the latter one, there are four stereotyped occurrences referring to the same real-life event). The other three killing verbs have no SC for this meaning whatsoever.

Now, **all the tokens** of *dīk/dēk* in its basic meaning found in the corpus are not resultative, they occur in narrative parts of letters, most of them are modified by place adverbials. Consider the illustrative examples:

- (19) [*ah*]*ī* *i-na* GN *dī-[i]k-[m]a*  
 ‘My brother was killed in GN (and I informed PN about this)’ (AbB 10, 19:7f.).<sup>56</sup>
- (20) 6 ANŠE.HI.A <...> *ù šú-ḥa-ru-a i-na* GN *de<sub>g</sub>-ku*  
 ‘six donkeys <...> and my servants have been killed in GN’ (VAS 26, 26:4–9, OA).

Kouwenberg 2010, 7.3.3 highlights among his “marginal and secondary uses of the stative” the cases of *dīk/dēk*<sup>57</sup> and *mīt/mēt* ‘he is dead.’ On p. 175 (fn. 46), he notes that

“*dāku* does not seem to have an N-stem perfective (= the Pret.—*S. L.*) or *t*-perfect; there is only an N Impfv *iddāk* (earlier *iddūak*), familiar from the Old Babylonian law codes. So it is conceivable that the stative *dīk* serves to fill an awkward gap, since a passive perfective of the verb ‘to kill’ seems hard to dispense with.”

In other words, the **P** paradigm of *dākum* is suppletive: *dīk* for PAST, *iddāk* for FUTURE. Now we can add to the picture the fact that *dīk* did not function as the G-stem resultative in OB and OA,<sup>58</sup> yet this morphological shape is represented in the corpus by some fifteen tokens (very unevenly

<sup>55</sup> It was published in Hecker 1995:150f.

<sup>56</sup> The relevant words are badly damaged, but *da-i-ka-an a-ḥi-ia* ‘the murderer of my brother’ in line 10 fully justifies the restoration.

<sup>57</sup> BK was at the time not yet aware that they are not attested with the “mainstream” resultative reading at all: in 7.3.2, he explains the basic resultative meaning of the SC **P** with the help of the following made-up example: *šarru nēša idūk* ‘the king killed the lion’ ⇒ *nēšu dīk* ‘the lion is dead as a result of having been killed.’

<sup>58</sup> The reason has to be a semantic one. As I have just suggested, for Akkadian, the state of destructed objects was probably unobservable. Be it as it may, in typological literature ‘is killed’ is a stock example of a problematic and difficultly formed resultative form. Nedjalkov (2001:934) hints that ‘is killed’ is usually implicational knowledge, i. e. it has to do with evidentiality: “We can *assert* that a person is killed only if we *know* that someone has killed him, while the body may bear no signs of inflicted death” (italics added). In other words, for Nedjalkov ‘is killed’ belongs to the “general-resultative” class.

distributed). It is therefore likely that the prohibition to use *dik* as RES was not pristine in Akkadian,<sup>59</sup> it is not pre- or proto-Akkadian but rather appeared in the course of the history of this language. After the prohibition had arisen, *dik* was reemployed as the past passive form, and it probably ousted the N-stem Pret. *\*iddik* from this slot.<sup>60</sup>

I will now reformulate my thesis as follows:

The availability and the productiveness of the **resultative SC P** do not depend on the prototypical transitivity, but rather on the **observability** of the trivial resultant state of the former patient.

To introduce more negative evidence corroborative of this thesis, we will look at the SC of frequent “High transitivity verbs with a D-stem” listed in Kouwenberg 1997:104.<sup>61</sup> The first part of the list is headed “Verbs which entail a partial or total **destruction** of the object.” In what follows, I will briefly discuss the most frequent items of this list.

*abātum* ‘to destroy, ruin.’

Among the inflectional forms of the G-stem, CAD A<sub>1</sub> 41a mentions the SC shape *abit* but I have found no examples of it in the entry. It does not seem to be attested in the whole of the corpus.<sup>62</sup>

*batāqum* ‘to cut off, pierce, break.’

In the core OB, I have found one example of the SC. The context is damaged, but the meaning of this **P** token is clearly figurative rather than literally destructive:

- (21) *ul a-na-ku-ú-ma ba-at-qá-ku ina ahlīya ša warki šarrim illikū-nim naziq mannum kīma yāti*  
 ‘Bin ich nicht “abgeschnitten”? Wer von meinen Kameraden, die mit dem Könige hergekommen sind, ist betrübt wie ich?’ (AbB 5, 273:2’–7’).<sup>63</sup>

<sup>59</sup> Otherwise *dik* would have been attested more marginally or not attested at all, as is the case with the SC of so many frequent telic verbs.

<sup>60</sup> But notice that the available evidence (Kouwenberg 2010, 16.5.3.5) suggests that the N-stem Pret. of hollow roots may have never existed in Akkadian, for some yet unknown reason. So in case of *dākum* the morphological slot for PAST PASSIVE may have been empty before *dik* filled it, though this of course sounds strange.

<sup>61</sup> The verb *dākum* is not part of this list because for some reason it does not have the D-stem.

<sup>62</sup> IA informs me that Durand’s translation of *a-bi-it* in ARM 26/1, 18:40 as ‘elle (= la troupe.—S. L.) était anéantie’ is wrong, the form says ‘I stayed overnight.’

In OA, *batiq* is common in secondary business-related senses, cf. glosses and examples in AHw. 114. Part of the examples may be semantically deadjectival: rather than being derived from BK's verbal paradigm, they are predicative-state forms of the VA *batqum*, cf. CAD B 166b–167, Veenhof 1972:404ff. and the references for *batāqum* and *batiq* in Veenhof's Index (p. 468). Note in particular the following considerations of Veenhof: “[W]e cannot fully understand the meaning of the verb (*batāqum*.—S. L.) without taking into account the permansive *batiq* and the accompanying verbal adjective *batqum*, which have acquired a meaning of their own. <...> The permansive is used in connection with calculations, counts and checks, and signifies that something **is missing**” (p. 404f., bold type added).

In OA, *batiq* is also known in more or less non-technical readings, which are also not destructive, as in the following example:

- (22) *iš-tù a-wu-tum ba-at-qá-at-[nù]* KÙ.BABBAR PN *né-ri-iš um-[ma]* *šu-ut-ma*  
 ‘After the matter **had been settled**, we demanded the silver from  
 PN. This is what he said ...’ (TCL 4, 20:14ff.).

*ḥepûm* ‘to break, demolish.’<sup>64</sup>

I know of only one “destructive” example in OB, it obtains in a court record:

- (23) PN *šāpir* GN *u dayyān* GN *ikšudū awātī-šunu imurū-ma ermun ša tuppi*  
*ḥi-pi-ma tuḫpa-ša išrumū-ma ana pī tuḫpī-ša labiri* X *é ukinnū-ši*  
 ‘They (= the parties to the conflict)<sup>65</sup> approached PN the governor  
 of Sippar and the city judge; (the latter two) investigated the facts  
 of their case. The envelope of the (plaintiff’s) tablet **happened to be**  
**broken**, so they (= the judiciary) broke open her (the sued party’s)  
 tablet, and confirmed her X house lot according to her older tablet’  
 (RA 9, 22:19–25).

In Loesov (2006:136, fn. 9), I suggested that in this exceptional example “the broken envelope is physically present at the moment of observation,” and this still seems to be true: the officials **see** that the envelope is broken, and this is legally relevant; most probably this means that the evidence of the respective document cannot be accepted, therefore they prefer to base

<sup>63</sup> Kraus comments on *batqāku*: ‘Mangels Kontext konkrete Bedeutung unerschindlich.’ The sign string *ba-ti-iq* in ARM 5, 67:35 is unclear (cf. LAPO 17, 672; AHw. 114b; CAD B 167a). This token is not destructive on any of the available interpretations.

<sup>64</sup> This verb was also on the list of destructive verbs in Loesov 2006:136 (No. 5).

<sup>65</sup> The plaintiff is male, the sued party is female.

their decision on the sued party's document, which is properly sealed. Thus, the syntactic relationships of *ermum ša tuppi hepi-ma tuppa-ša išrumū* only superficially resemble those of *alpū PN<sub>1</sub> halqū-ma ina qāti PN<sub>2</sub> iṣbatū-šunūti* (ex.1).<sup>66</sup> The *hepi* is a rare example of the genuinely resultative SC of a destructive verb. This reading arose due to a strong contextual pressure that overrode the general rule according to which Akkadian counts the SC of destructive verbs to those unobservable.

As to the rest of the SC tokens found in OB, they are all<sup>67</sup> related to documents and say that a tablet 'is invalid,' i. e. the meaning of the SC is always figurative.<sup>68</sup> It is no chance that the picture is essentially similar to that of *batāqum*: (1) both verbs normally use the SC in derived (non-destructive) senses; (2) the SC of both verbs tends to appear in purely stative (i. e. non-resultative, descriptive, qualitative) readings. The only serious difference is as follows: *batāqum* has a productive VA *batqum* at its side (especially for the meaning 'deficient, missing, in short supply,' CAD B 166f.), while *hepūm* 'broken' is rare and, according to CAD H 170b, not attested in the corpus.<sup>69</sup>

*nakāsum* 'to cut off, fell.'

In OB, I have found three examples of the SC **P** in letters, and three more in divination protases (YOS 10, 52 ii 34, dupl. 51 ii 35; 42 i 35; and YOS 10, 31 to be cited presently).<sup>70</sup> The divination examples ultimately presuppose real-time observations of animal entrails, therefore the described states of morphological features are by definition **observable**, e. g.:

(24) *šumma martum ina qablīša na-ak-sà-at*

'If the gall bladder **is cut** in the middle' (YOS 10, 31 v 33; xii 16).

<sup>66</sup> The "virtual subordination" is of course also palpable ('since the envelope happened to be broken'), but observability remains a necessary feature of the situation with whatever translation.

<sup>67</sup> Save one example in an epic text, OB Atra-Hasis: [*h*]i-*pí-i-ma libbašu* 'his heart was broken' (Lambert-Millard 1999:92, 47). The complete list of examples will be presented and analysed in a sequel to this paper.

<sup>68</sup> In OA, this idea is rendered by another destructive verb, *duākum* 'to kill,' see CAD D 41a for prefixing forms and TCL 21, 264:11 for the SC *dī-i-ik* 'it (the tablet) has been "killed".'

<sup>69</sup> The only possible example comes from a literary text, I found it in BK's OA verb list. Here is the entry: VA sf. gen. (*kīma karpitīm*) *ha-<ap>-e-tīm* (RIMA 1, 21:42).

<sup>70</sup> A relevant dictionary entry has been found: **lú.šà**.PA.TAG = *ša li-ib-ba-šu na-ak-su* (OB Lu B V 54, text CAD N<sub>1</sub> 172a). The meaning is probably figurative, 'the one with broken heart.'

Technically, *nakis* tokens in still life protases are “derived statives,”<sup>71</sup> and this perfectly accords with the throughout metaphorical morphosyntax of the genre: observable “primitive” (= not created) states are depicted in terms of dynamic Becoming (*iprus*, *iptaras*, and *iparras*) or resultative Having-Become (*paris*). In other words, if the gall bladder is said to be *naksat*, this does not imply it was supposed to have been cut in the first place.

All three occurrences of the SC in letters are **observable**:

- (25) *ana* GIŠ.TIR.ĪI.A-ku-nu lā tēgiā ... *urram ina amārī-ya ana* I GIŠ *sikiltim* ša **na-ak-sa-at** *awīlam bēl pīhatim ul uballaṭ*  
 ‘Do not be careless about your forests! <...> Tomorrow, during my inspection (of the woods), for every tree that **is** illegally **felled**, I will not let the responsible person stay alive!’ (AbB 4, 111:12ff., Hammurapi’s words addressed to foresters).

Clearly, Hammurapi refers to something (like a felled trunk) he may happen to observe during his inspection (= *amārum*, lit. ‘seeing’).

- (26) *inanna* GIŠ.MA.NU **na-ki-is-ma** šakin  
 ‘Now the MA.NU-wood **is felled** and put together (get me boats so that I take it along)’ (AbB 12, 194:8f.).

In real life, the wood was first felled and then piled up, but the writer’s words are no narrative, in spite of the sequencing *-ma*. I. e., *nakis* is not used here **instead of** *innakis*.<sup>72</sup> This is proven by the sentence-initial *inanna* ‘now’ which qualifies each of the two predicates. The writer’s message is that a fresh supply of wood is now ready for transportation, and he renders this message by depicting both facts (being-felled and being-piled) as resultative states. In Akkadian, this is easily done because the states in question are observable, i. e. the respective SC **P** tokens can be freely formed.

- (27) [mā]r irtim ša šaddaqdim waldu [ina] meḫret sakkanim labirim [ša] elēnu pīatim šapiltim[ina] [e<sub>4</sub>-e<sub>5</sub>] nārim nadi-ma šeḫrum šū [ina q]ablī-šu **na-ki-**

<sup>71</sup> Since at least Nedjalkov (1988), DERIVED STATIVE is a verb form that denotes a state that needs not to result from some event, though in a given language the same morphological shape can have the **resultative** sense. This is how DERIVED STATIVE is used in the present paper, although of course the term has other senses in linguistic literature.

<sup>72</sup> The Pret. N of this root is attested in OB with the very meaning ‘to be felled’ that would be needed here were this sequence a narrative, see CAD N<sub>1</sub> 179.

*is-ma [išt]u irtī-šu adi qaqqadī-šu šakin [bal]u qaqqadī-šu adi šepī-šu [laššu] lū zīkar [lū s]inniš mannu[um] [lū id]e ištu qablīti-šu [adi ša]plīš ul ibašši<sup>73</sup>*  
 ‘(Immediately after the letter-head) A baby that was born last year was [found] lying in front of the Old Palace (which [is situated] above the lower city-limit), near the river. The kid **was cut across** at its middle: the body from the breast up to the head was there, but it had neither the head nor (the lower part including) the feet. Whether it used to be male or female, there is no knowing. There is nothing preserved below the middle part [of the body]’ (ARM 6, 43:5–15).

This is a letter of Bahdi-Lim, the governor of the Mari district during the reign of Zimri-Lim, so it belongs to the “Amorite group” in the sense of IA. Certain turns of phrase in this text may indeed sound clumsy, but our *nakis* is in perfect accord with the core OB usage: Bahdi-Lim describes the remains of the baby from the vantage point of a synchronic observer who stands on the river bank and examines the mutilated body.

Thus, all the available examples of *nakis* in the corpus can be considered both **resultative** (given the artificial nature of still-life omens protases) and **observable**.

*nasāḫum* ‘to tear out, remove.’

Akkadian counted the meaning ‘it is torn’ with the observable ones, because it implies literal seeing.<sup>74</sup> The following three examples for the basic meaning, the only ones I have found, are not without blemish (the first is marred by negation, the second is probably a derived stative, and the third one comes from a lexical list), yet I believe that taken together they prove the point:

(28) *šumma ... bītum lā palīš sippu lā ḫališ aptum lā na-as-ḫa-at*

‘If ... the house has not been broken into, the threshold has not been scraped off, the window **has not been torn out**’ (LE § 36).

Goetze 1956:96, Yaron 1988:65, and Roth 1995:64 interpret these clauses as semantically circumstantial: ‘the house not having been broken into,’ ‘even without evidence that the house has been broken into.’ It is understood that the meaning of these SC forms depends on the literal

<sup>73</sup> The text reproduces all the collations and restorations of LAPO 18, 236f. See this edition for philological details. The interpretation partly follows the Russian translation of IA.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. “The last time **we saw you you looked** so much older // Your famous blue raincoat **was torn** at the shoulder” (Leonard Cohen).

“moment of observation” at which the competent authority visually establishes that the house is intact, while the deposit is missing.

(29) *šumma izbum ullānum-ma imittašu ša imitti na-as-ḥa-at*

‘If the malformed animal’s right shoulder **is torn off** “from the start” [= from the moment of its premature birth?’] (YOS 10, 56 i 10f.).

(30) *ša inā-šu nashā* ‘whose eyes have been torn out’ (OB Lu B IV 48, text and tr. CAD H 60a).

Note a metaphoric example in OA, still close to the basic meaning:

(31) *mīnum annitum ša tuḫpam 2 ubān šulum-kunu lā tušebbalā-nin-ni aššēr ana ešrī-šu ḥalqāku-ni-ma u libbī na-as-ḥu u attunu šulum-kunu lā tušebbalā-nin-ni*

‘What is this that you (pl.) never send me a letter of (at least) two inches (length) about how you are doing? Besides that I am ten times at a loss and my heart **is torn**, and (why is this that) you never write me about how you are doing?’ (ICK 1, 17b:4–12).

In the corpus (mostly in OB), there are dozens of **P** *nasiḫ* tokens with non-literal meanings. All of them are **technical terms** of divination (*nasiḫ* vs. *kīn* to express a morphological peculiarity of animal entrails, CAD N<sub>2</sub> 6a), of law and administration (‘has been deported’; ‘has been removed [from a list]’; ‘[the claim] has been rejected’; [a certain amount of something] ‘has been drawn/deducted’ [as payment]); [a person] ‘has been/has to be disinherited’ (e. g. ICK 1, 12b:36, OA).<sup>75</sup> According to my prediction, such **P** forms have to be non-resultative, which will be (at least sometimes) corroborated by the above syntactic criteria.

*šebērum* ‘to break.’

For the basic sense of the root, the SC **P** has been found only in ARM 13, 40:29f., represented by two tokens in contiguous lines. Though the exponents of subjects are damaged in both of them, the meaning of [š]e-bi-ir (l. 29) and še-eb-ru (l. 30) is doubtless observable and resultative: ‘[a beam<sup>2</sup>] is broken, [several beams<sup>2</sup>] are broken.’<sup>76</sup>

Note also the following example that plays with the literal meaning:

<sup>75</sup> Most of these SC forms have at their side prefixing forms with the same lexical meanings.

<sup>76</sup> The observable meaning of these verb forms follows from the contents of the passage as well. The letter was written shortly after Zimri-Lim’s takeover of power (p. c. of IA, and see Arkhipov forthcoming = ARMT 32, s. v. *nūbalum*), its author is Yasim-Sumu (at the time, a high official of ZL), who has inspected the royal palace and is now reporting to the king what is to be done for its restoration.

- (32) *eqlētīm u kirām ša i-[di-nu] ekīm-šu-ma ana sanāqim appašu lu-ú še-bi-ir*  
 ‘Take from him the fields and the garden that he has [given out],  
 may his nose be broken should he transfer (them again)’ (AbB 14,  
 31:28ff.).

Veenhof explains on p. 205 of the Edition, “I take *appašu lū šebir* (31:30), ‘may his nose be broken,’ not literally <...>, but, also in view of the stative, as an idiom expressing a threat which has to prevent an action.”<sup>77</sup>

In OB letters *šebir* **P** is productive in an agricultural meaning ‘(the field) has been broken up’ (and/or ‘harrowed for the second time?’—cf. CAD Š<sub>2</sub> 248), see examples and glosses in CAD Š<sub>1</sub> 114; Š<sub>2</sub> 249, in particular AbB 8, 130:4’; 9, 151:17). This “less destructive” meaning may be observable as well, in spite of its technical nature.

Summing up: **resultative** tokens of the SC **P** are not attested (or only exceptionally attested) for the **basic meanings** of the following frequent high-transitivity verbs, selected more or less randomly for the above overview: *dākum* ‘to kill,’ *nērum* ‘to strike, kill,’ *šagāšum* ‘to kill, slaughter,’ *abātum* ‘to destroy, ruin,’ *batāqum* ‘to cut off, pierce,’ *hepūm* ‘to break, demolish,’ *ekēmum* ‘to take away (by force),’ *naqārum* ‘to tear down, destroy,’ *maḥāšum* ‘to hit, smash’ (for evidence on some of these verbs, cf. Loesov 2006:136f.). This fact has been explained by two suggestions: (1) in Akkadian, the SC **P** has to be observable in order to be resultative; (2) Akkadian counted the state of destructed entities to those unobservable. Note that there is one thing that has not been explained: why then Akkadian possesses the SC shape of certain destructive verbs at all? So far,<sup>78</sup> it has been only vaguely surmised that some of these SC tokens may have served as pluperfect/background forms or fillers of paradigm gaps.

My analysis of individual verbs shows that **observability** cross-cuts the distinction “low” vs. “high” semantic transitivity of two-place verbs: observability represents a different semantic parameter. This follows from two types of evidence:

<sup>77</sup> BK tentatively suggests me in a p. c. that *lu-ú-še-bi-ir* could also be rendered as “I shall break.” He adduces EA 356:5 (“Adapa and the South Wind”), where an identically spelled form is traditionally understood as ‘I want to break.’ “Or is this also a stative?” he asks. The OB spelling leaves of course little chance for the former verb form to be a D-stem precativ. Yet, frankly, I do not know what Veenhof means by his “also in view of the stative.”

<sup>78</sup> See the above discussion of syntactic constraints on RES, especially exx. (1), (6)–(8).

(1) On the one hand, as we have just seen, the resultative SC **P** of verbs with the highest transitivity is not productive, because it tends to be non-observable.

(2) On the other hand, the observability criterion explains why e. g. the SC **P** tokens of *leqûm* ‘to take’ and *maḥārum* ‘to accept, receive’ are very rare (as we will see, the **P** *maḥir* is virtually unattested).<sup>79</sup> The only reliable example of the **P** *leqi* in the whole of OB<sup>80</sup> happens to be resultative, and this is due to the extraordinary pressure of the context:

- (33) É.1.DUB *ina nēreb* KÁ *i-[b]i-ru pateḥ-ma še-um le-qi amtam uššir-ma umma amtum-ma* 0.1 ŠE TA.ĀM *šimšu* 0.2 ŠE *il-qi*

‘The granary at the entrance of the Ibiru-gate is broken open and the barley **is taken** (out). I interrogated<sup>81</sup> a slave-girl. She told me: He (= the one who broke into the granary) took out twice 60 *qa* barley, (i. e.) 120 *qa* barley’ (AbB 6, 219:14–19).

Within the letter, this is a piece of reported speech, cited here from the beginning (the slave-girl’s words are embedded into it). In a description of a forced storehouse, *pateḥ* looks appropriate as an observable resultative **P** form. In the clause *našpakum ina nēreb* GN *pateḥ*, the prepositional phrase ‘*ina nēreb* GN’ is an analytical attribute of *našpakum* rather than a place adverbial modifying the verb form, so ‘*ina nēreb* GN’ does not disqualify *pateḥ* as RES. At the moment of observation, vividly reproduced by the writer of the reported message, the granary is demonstrably *broken open* and *empty*, i. e. *šerum leqi*.

We have to put the argumentation the other way round, as a prediction:

If a telic transitive verb happens to build a **P** token of the SC with an **unobservable** meaning, this verb form will not have the **resultative** reading.<sup>82</sup>

Indeed, the rest of the **P** tokens of *leqi* in the corpus (‘is taken,’ etc., about five examples) live up to the prediction: 1) the verb form’s meaning is unobservable (usually, the “having-been-taken” leaves no physical

<sup>79</sup> This goes against the well-known assumption that the SC **P** of “taking-hold-of” verbs is freely formed (e. g. Huehnergard 1997:395). Due to the wrong premises, the near-absence of the **P** *leqi* and *maḥir* has not been noticed. The assumption about their existence can lead to mistakes in text interpretation.

<sup>80</sup> See Loesov 2010:769.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. AHw. 1439b, CAD Š<sub>3</sub> 39a.

<sup>82</sup> The inescapable questions are then why the language builds such verb forms at all and what they are needed for. It is possible to address both of them only after all the evidence has been passed in review. I suspect that part of the “Why” will be diachronic.

impression); 2) syntactic constraints exclude the resultative interpretation. The following sentence illustrates:<sup>83</sup>

- (34) 6 TÚG *ku-ta-ni i-na sa-e-tim a-šu-mi* PN ù PN<sub>1</sub> *lá-qi-ú*  
 ‘6 *kutānu*-textiles **have been taken** from the *sa’utum* in the name of  
 PN and PN<sub>1</sub>’ (OAA I, 111:13ff., tr. Larsen).

In the meantime, discussing the negative evidence *pro* the observability criterion, we have seen quite a few good examples of the SC **P** RES formed from relatively highly transitive verbs which however are not in the highest position on the “transitivity cline,”<sup>84</sup> such as *nakis* ‘is cut/felled,’ *hepi* ‘is broken open/damaged,’ *nasih* ‘is torn off,’ *šebir* ‘is broken.’ I hope these examples make it clear what is meant here by “observability” of the SC **P**.

In addition, consider SC **P** tokens of two locative verbs, *šakānum* (the basic meaning ‘to place’), and *nadūm* (the basic meaning ‘to throw, to lay down’). Such verbs have the obligatory valency for the participant LOCATION. As noted above, place adverbials do not stand in the way of the resultative reading for the SC of locative verbs:<sup>85</sup>

- (35) (a) 17 *ma-na* AN.NA *i-mu-ta-ti-im ša-ki-in*  
 ‘(PN told me:) 17 minas of tin **have been placed** in the half-pack  
 (take this for yourself)’ (OAA I, 102:15f.).<sup>86</sup>
- (b) *a-ma-lá té-er-ti-kà* ANŠE-*ru-kà a-na-ab-ri-tim na-du ša-am-kà-kà ša-lim*  
 ‘According to your order, your donkeys are put out to pasture; your  
 personnel are doing well’ (BIN 4, 31:43–46).<sup>87</sup>
- (c) KÙ.BABBAR *iš-tù u<sub>4</sub>-mì-im a-mì-im kà-ni-ik-ma i-na Kà-ni-iš na-dí*  
 ‘Since that day, the silver **has been sealed** and **deposited** in Kaniš’  
 (CCT 4, 14a:22ff.).

In (35c), *kanik* and *nadi* are **P** resultative forms,<sup>88</sup> both are observable. Note that *kanākum* ‘to seal’ is a low-transitivity event eagerly terminating in an observable state of the object.

<sup>83</sup> See also an analysis of *leqi/laqi* in Loesov 2010:768–772.

<sup>84</sup> The term goes back to Hopper–Thompson 1980.

<sup>85</sup> I would like to draw the reader’s attention once more to the relative cross-linguistic frequency of RES depending on lexical semantics. An attempt to calculate “the universals of resultative formation” was made by I. Kozinskij who worked with the data collected in TRC (see Kozinskij 1988:505). According to his calculus, reversible “bivalent locational” resultatives are the most common subtype within the “observable” group. See also fn. 51 above.

<sup>86</sup> Compare a very similar verb phrase with the head in the Imv.: *kaspaṃ ... ina muttātim ištēt šuknā* ‘Put (Imv. pl.) the silver into one half-load’ (TCL 4, 16:28).

<sup>87</sup> See also CAD N<sub>1</sub> 79b; N<sub>2</sub> 148a (discussion section).

## 2.1.2. The SC A RESULTATIVE

Logically, the next point of the agenda is “What is the prerequisite for the SC A of transitive verbs to be resultative?” We do not expect the lexical feature “observability” to play a role here, since an **observable resultative state** is usually the fate of the former patient.<sup>89</sup> From the descriptions of the “*transitive* resultatives”<sup>90</sup> in TRC it follows that in this variety

“[T]he result of the action is relevant for the agent rather than <...> for the patient” (TRC 516, I. Kozinskij).<sup>91</sup>

This is actually **the commonsense lexical constraint** on the formation of the SC A RES in Akkadian: the telic event should be able to lead to a resultant state affecting the former agent. Consonantly with the “to marry” example in the last footnote, the SC A RES in the corpus typically (but not exclusively) codes what can be loosely called “a socially relevant status.” As we already know, this is exactly the opinion of BK, most recently confirmed in Kouwenberg 2010 and cited above: the SC A is formed mainly from “transitive verbs with a low degree of transitivity” and is “eminently suitable <...> to describe the legal status of a person.” Here as elsewhere, I disagree with BK on a different ground: for BK, all PARIS forms of telic verbs (including two-place ones) are by default resultative, while I believe that this should be (dis)proven piece by piece, or better still: the grammatical meaning of PARIS is an open question. At this turn of our study, we can only assert that the SC has several grammatical readings

---

<sup>88</sup> Note that according to TRC 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.

<sup>89</sup> M. Haspelmath (1990:40) says that “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,” and this stands to reason.

<sup>90</sup> I. e., morphological resultatives that have both a subject (coreferential with the agent of the previous action) and a direct object (the former patient). In grammatical studies, finite verb forms with both subject and direct object are sometimes called “two-place predicates,” to avoid the semantically more pregnant term “transitive.” E. g., since RES codes a kind of state, both Kozinskij and BK are not quite happy with the dynamic term “transitive” as applied to two-place resultative sentences, and use it with an explicit caveat.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. a very similar formulation in Nedjalkov (2001:928): “The previous action affects the agent rather than the object.” A good example is ‘to marry,’ adduced by I. Kozinskij, “If John marries he not only makes some lucky girl his wife but also makes himself her husband” (TRC 520).

(i. e., more than just **A RES** and **P RES**), they are to a certain degree predictable and depend on lexical semantics and syntactic environment.

The criterion “relevance for the former agent” is a rigid one, to the extent that in a living language two-place **A RES** complying with this criterion may exist as a closed-list class. TRC does mention languages in which RES is in fact formed for relatively few verbs, due to lexical semantics restrictions. Yet, if in a given language the morphological category in question is not completely “frozen” (e. g., in the way of certain conjugation types of French or Italian), it will be able to produce time and again new and semantically non-trivial tokens, provided there is a strong pragmatic need. My very tentative Akkadian examples of the non-trivial SC **A RES** are as follows:

(36) (a) [a]nāku-ma *kabsāk-šunūti*

‘It is **I** who **is going to trample** upon them’ (ARM 26/1, 195:16).

This is a prophesy uttered on behalf of a certain goddess Hišamitum. The trivial results of trampling can affect only the patient, yet in this prophesy the goddess asserts herself as one who is stronger than Zimri-Lim’s enemies ([LÚ.MEŠ b]e-el a-wa-ti-ka), therefore this SC token is probably meant as something like the assumed BH Perfectum Propheticum and the **property** of the agent emanating from its divine status. Or is this very unusual sentence somehow due to the “Amorite” influence (as IA suggests to me)?

(b) [m]imū awātum-ma PN<sub>nom.</sub> [a]rdī<sub>acc.</sub> bītīya ... *rakis*

‘How is it that PN keeps the slaves of my household **bound** (by contract)?’ (AbB 12, 72:13–16, late OB).

The writer focuses on the **condition** of PN, not on that of household servants, hence the unusual semantic configuration of the SC **A**.

Did the two-place SC **A RES** constitute a closed list in the spoken Akkadian vernaculars of ca. 2000–1700?<sup>92</sup> Though the SC **A** has been felt as something “special” (sometimes even disturbing) since at least Ungnad 1918, grammatical literature has not provided us with anything like a syntactic and semantic analysis of two-place **A** forms of the SC.<sup>93</sup> Today, the only well-known facts about the SC **A** are the following ones:

<sup>92</sup> Note that the logical stress in this question is placed on RES, I am not asking just about any kind of the SC **A**.

<sup>93</sup> D. Cohen (1984:257f.) offers a list of roughly one hundred verbs for which the SC **A** is attested (as it seems, in the whole of the recorded Akkadian, but unfortunately he never defines his corpus explicitly), including verbs that do not

1. It is rare relative to the SC **P** (Rowton 1962:235; Cohen 1984:257).
2. It is usually formed for low-transitivity verbs (Cohen 1984:260; Kouwenberg 2010 7.3.2.).
3. It “describes the state of the subject after the completion of the event” (Kouwenberg 2010, 7.3.2, following Kouwenberg 2000). Sure enough, in this case for BK “subject” ≈ “agent,” i. e. a personal, willing being. It can hardly be anything else, e. g. an instrument or an inanimate cause, as in ‘The cyclone has damaged sugarcane crops in the Mackay and Proserpine region.’
4. The SC **A** is common (Rowton 1962:235; Cohen 1984:258) only for three nearly-synonymous taking verbs *šabātum* ‘to seize,’ *leqūm* ‘to take,’ *maḥārum* ‘to receive’;<sup>94</sup> the fourth one in this set of frequent tokens is *našūm* ‘to lift, carry’ (Rowton 1962:235) that renders a nuance of taking as well.

I will now produce a few pieces of lexically consistent (and therefore not fortuitous) evidence showing that (*contra* BK) the SC **A** cannot be considered resultative **by default**. In other words, it does not **necessarily** describe “the state of the subject after the completion of the event,” it can render this service only under certain (and very demanding) conditions.

First, let us have a look at a syntactic minimal pair:

(37) (a) PN *annikām sà-ni-iq-ni-a-ti-ma alākam ana šēri-ka ulā nile<sup>95</sup>*

‘PN is checking<sup>2</sup> us here, so we cannot come to you’ (AbB 9, 88:6–11, tr. of the Ed.).

(b) *anāku annikām sa-an-qa-ku-ma ul allī[kam]* (Goetze 1958, No. 46: 4ff).<sup>95</sup>

In (37a) *saniq* is **A**, in (37b) it is **P**. Given the rest of the relevant data,<sup>96</sup> one has to acknowledge that (37b) is a passive counterpart of (37a), the

take direct object in the prefixing tenses for their basic meanings, e. g. *alākum* ‘to go.’ Kouwenberg 2010:172, fn. 36 notes that this list “could be augmented substantially.” The list, if sifted through, will constitute a good starting point for a synchronic syntactic study of the SC **A**.

<sup>94</sup> In the literature, the value of this piece of evidence has been overestimated out of any proportion. In particular, to my knowledge no attention has been paid to the fact that the SC **A** of these three verbs is only marginally represented or completely unknown in the OA corpus. This most probably means that *šabātu* ‘I have the usufruct (of a piece of real estate)’ and similar usages of the SC **A** of the other two taking verbs are OB “bureaucratic” expressions, probably alien to the contemporary spoken OB.

<sup>95</sup> See Loesov 2010:779ff. for a detailed analysis of *saniq*, and already Loesov 2005:124f. for some claims regarding this form. In my previous discussions of the lexical meaning of *saniq* in the letters from Ešnunna I overlooked the remarks in Kraus 1987:43.

facts of life behind both sentences being more or less the same. In spite of the SC **A** form in the sentence ‘PN *annikīam saniq-niāti*,’ it is unlikely that (37a) describes **the state of PN** after he had completed the *sanāqum*. Hence, logical reasoning and the adjunct *annikīam* exclude the resultative reading for both sentences.

In Loesov 2005:124–133, this example was used as a piece of proof to show that the SC **A** of telic verbs can code ongoing present-time events. BK rejected this idea in personal communications and in Kouwenberg 2010:91, fn. 8, where he says my examples “are all in some respect problematic and are certainly insufficient to prove such a far-going claim.” I agree wholeheartedly with the latter statement, and I partly agree with the former one. In particular, an important shortcoming of (37) is that the lexical meaning of *sanākum* is opaque (see Loesov 2010:780 for a discussion). Yet what are we to make out of (37) morphosyntactically (= in terms of the grammatical meaning of *saniq*), with whatever root meaning in this context? It is clear that (37a) is not resultative because it is relevant to the patient rather than to the agent, and because of *annikīam*. The example (37b) is not resultative either if it a passive transform of (37a), which is likely. Now, the *t*-Perf. of *sanāqum* is represented in AbB 1–14 with some 35 tokens, almost always as a stereotyped *futurum exactum* for the lexical meaning ‘to arrive, to reach’ in the temporal clauses of the *kīma/inūma issanq-akkum* kind, lit. ‘as soon as **he will have reached you**’ (the verb phrase is inflected for subject and personal goal).<sup>97</sup> If *saniq-niāti* in (37a) is semantically PERFECT, why then not *\*issaniq-niāti*? Since we do not really understand how the Akkadian verb functions, to exclude the present-time meaning of this sentence would seem a bit dogmatic.

Consider another relevant set of examples, syntactically similar to the above one:

(38) (a) É.GAL *is-ra-an-ni-ma ana mahṛī-ka alākam ul ele<sup>ri</sup>*

‘The Palace **is exacting** (payment from) me [or ‘keeps me under pressure’?], so I am not able to come to you’ (AbB 10, 73:10f.).

(b) *ilkum is-ra-an-ni-ma naparkām ul ele<sup>ri</sup>*

‘The service keeps me busy, so I cannot stop (working)’ (AbB 14, 43:8f.).

<sup>96</sup> For stereotyped **P** sentences of (37b) kind in OB letters from the kingdom of Ešnunna, see Loesov 2010:780f.

<sup>97</sup> The data are from <http://www.klinopis.cz> and <http://klinopis.cz/nobtc>.

(c) *kīma tūdū ana amtīm hi-ša-a-am ēzīb<sub>pret.</sub>-ma adān hašpīm šaqālim iktāšd<sub>perf.</sub>-anni-ma tamkārūm is-ra-an-ni*

‘As you know, I drew up<sub>pret.</sub> a debt-note (obliging me to pay) for the slave-girl, and (now) my term to pay the silver has come<sub>perf.</sub> and the creditor **is exacting**<sub>SC</sub> (payment from) me’ (AbB 2, 94:9).

(d) *kīma is-ri-ku ul tīde*

‘Don’t you know that **I am being pressed** (for payment?)’ (AbB 2, 96:36).

The argumentation about (37) applies here as well, except that according to the dictionaries the root meaning in this case is more transparent.<sup>98</sup> My claim in Loesov 2005 about the progressive meaning of *esr-anni* in (38 a–c) may be not 100% proven, but one has to insist that *esr-anni* is not RES, if RES A (with typological literature and BK) implies a change in the state of the (former) agent.<sup>99</sup> On the other hand, the evidence collected for this study makes it necessary to suggest (see already some of the above examples and analyses) that the non-RES SC hardly ever appears randomly (i. e., with no reason at all) in the legitimate slots of the Pret. or the *t*-Perf.<sup>100</sup> Faute de mieux, for (37a) and (38a, b) the progressive reading is a tolerable way out. Needless to say, it fits the respective contexts even better than a past-time interpretation.

BK informs me regarding my interpretation of exx. (37) and (38):

“I would translate 37b ‘I am kept busy/tied down/detained here’ and 37a as ‘PN has tied down me here.’ For *esērum*, I doubt very much whether ‘press for payment’ is correct, it rather seems to be more or less synonymous to *sanāqum*, cf. also *ussurum* ‘to imprison, to take captive,’ so in 38a and 38c ‘the palace/the creditor has detained me’ (like *sikkam karṛulum* in OA?), 38b ‘the work has kept me busy/tied down’ (in the CAD, these instances should have been placed under *esērum* B). In terms of their stative, these verbs behave like *katāmum*, etc.: ‘to have covered’ > ‘to keep covered,’ especially 37a. The editions and the dictionaries are unreliable in this respect, and the whole semantics of these verbs has to be reviewed. <...> Is

<sup>98</sup> The gloss for the CAD entry *esēru* A is ‘to press for payment due, to collect, to put a person under pressure.’ This set of examples was mentioned in Loesov 2005:125f.

<sup>99</sup> Cross-language, there seems to be nothing unusual about resultative-progressive polysemy of the same marker and even about a diachronic shift from RES to PROGRESSIVE, see e. g. Nedjalkov 2001:938, with references to Chinese, Japanese, Uzbek, Balkar, Mongolian, and Iroquoian.

<sup>100</sup> I am extremely grateful to IA who was the first one to come up with the idea that one has to look for rules in the non-resultative use of the SC.

it possible to extend the definition of the active status so that it may also picture the state of the **patient** (rather than agent) after the event if the meaning of the verb favours this? This is what comes to my mind for several of these examples.”

BK is most probably right that the lexical semantics of these verbs needs revision. In this study of grammatical meanings, it is best to avoid examples that are lexically (or otherwise philologically) problematic. Yet, by way of exception, I decided to keep this important material and to leave my above interpretations unchanged, in spite of BK’s critical observations. This is because in my opinion BK’s remarks do confirm the only claim that is vital at this point: none of the examples in (37)–(38) is RES.

My argumentation runs as follows. We have got four two-place **A** sentences with *paris* predicates (37a, 38a–c). It is agreed that these four **cannot** picture RES states of the respective grammatical **subjects**. BK’s question also implies that the informational focus in each of the four utterances is the respective **direct object**.<sup>101</sup> In **dynamic** transitive sentences with the default word order, the direct object naturally belongs to the focal part. For the genuine SC **A** RES, this universal rule cannot work, because such resultative sentences picture the **resultant state** of the former **agent**; in anticipation of more examples below, consider my interpretation of (36a), *anāku-ma kabsāk-šunūti*, where *anāku-ma* secures the focal role of the subject. In an attempt to save the resultative meaning of (37a) and (38a–c), BK wonders if these **A** sentences may be allowed to picture the state of the direct object. Yet such a strong claim is not needed: since BK grants that in numerous other cases the SC **A** is in fact dynamic (= non-RES), we can safely admit this for *tamkārūm esr-anni* etc. as well. What we get in exchange is the trivial information structure of the dynamic transitive sentence, and this is preferable to the typologically exotic scenario of a syntactically **A** resultative sentence depicting the state of the patient. Summing up: the four above **A** sentences are not resultative, their tense value can be either past or present, depending on our judgment about the lexical semantics and the contexts.

Let us now follow BK’s comparison of ‘PN *annikīam saniq-niāti*’ and ‘*ekallum esr-anni*’ to the OA ‘X *sikkam ša Y ukāl*’ (‘X is detaining Y,’ CAD K 509; S 255)<sup>102</sup> and to the SC of *katāmum*-like verbs, e. g. *šeʾum girram parik*

<sup>101</sup> It is the speaker (‘me’) in three cases, and *-niāti* ‘us’ in 37a. Note that it is also the speaker that is the subject in the two **P** instances (37b, 38d).

<sup>102</sup> The verb *kullum/kaʾulūm* ‘to hold’ has no SC and consequently is one of the best known “prefixing statives” of the traditional grammar (GAG 127b).

‘the grain is blocking the road’ (CT 52, 84rev.:10, OB letter, tr. CAD P 155b). For the sake of argument, we can render the former two sentences as ‘PN keeps me detained here’ and ‘the palace does not let me go,’ i. e. more or less with BK. All four situations are present-time and stative; the only major difference between them is that the former three are agentive, unlike the latter one.<sup>103</sup> Now, a verb phrase *irâm* ‘(s)he loves (something)’ is equally stative (typically, nothing happens to the participants of this situation), and the verb *râmmum* has no SC, as well as *kullum/ka<sup>r</sup>rulum*.<sup>104</sup> The choice of *paris* or *iparras* in these stative sentences about the Present Time is determined lexically,<sup>105</sup> while none of them is RES, simply because none of them describes the post-factum state of the subject.

The last two paragraphs call for a reminder: for the purposes of this study, we have to distinguish two senses of the word “stative.” The first one is morphological: STATIVE (and RESULTATIVE as its variety) is the etymologically primary function of an Akkadian “tense,” the SC *paris*. In other words, STATIVE as a possible inflectional meaning of the verb is the *raison d’être* of the SC *paris*, and this is also true of various morphological and analytical verb “tenses” in the world’s languages (see TRC). The second sense of “stative” has to do with lexical semantics and syntax rather than with morphology. Roughly, it is an Aktionsart, i. e. one of the four Vendlerian semantic types of predicates (Loesov 2005:107). Thus, “In God We Trust” is a stative predication (both the subject and object of trusting remain as they are) independently of its morphological shell in individual languages, e. g. the Simple Present in English or the SC *taklānu* in OB (Loesov 2005:141f.).

At this point, what is important for us is that there are common verbs whose SC **A** is both frequent and usually (or always) non-resultative. In addition to exx. (37)–(38) which may be somewhat problematic, I can ad-

<sup>103</sup> This difference may turn out to be grammatically relevant. Thus, we do not know whether a sentence \**Enkidu bābam parik ina šēpī-šu* ‘E. is blocking the doorway with his feet’ was acceptable in OB (cf. Gilg. P. vi 12). It may well be that *katim* ‘it covers’ (+ Acc.) and *parik* ‘it blocks’ (+ Acc.) can only denote a spatial position of the inanimate subject relative to a landmark coded by the Acc.

<sup>104</sup> Consider a curious example: *aššum ša kīam tašpurī umma allī-ma* KU<sub>6</sub> TUR.TUR *ša PN i-ra-am-mu ušābil-akkum akkīma mutu-ki* PN *ina* GN *u* GN<sub>2</sub> ‘<sup>7</sup>KU<sub>6</sub> TUR.TUR **la-am-du** *anāku ištu pana ina* GN<sub>3</sub> GN<sub>4</sub> GN<sub>5</sub> *u* GN<sub>6</sub> KU<sub>6</sub> 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 **loved** the big fish from Šubat-Enlil, Ekallatum, Mari and Babylon (OBT Tell Rimah 42:6–20).’ In this text, *lamid* and *irâm* are synonymous.

<sup>105</sup> See Loesov 2005 and Loesov 2011.

duce the SC of *kašādum* ‘to reach, to come, to arrive’ in OB. Among the meanings of *kašid* (Loesov 2006:147), the one derived immediately from the literal motion meaning of the root (‘to reach, to come’) is always used as future with an additional reference point (“after a certain event,” “in two days,” etc.). Consider three of the six examples from AbB listed in Loesov 2006:147:

- (39) (a) *šeam amah̄har-ma ka-aš-da-ak-ki*  
 ‘I will receive the barley and (then) come to you’ (13, 87:8’f.).
- (b) *ana U<sub>4</sub> 2.KAM ka-aš-da-ka*  
 ‘within two days I will reach you’ (12, 42:14).
- (c) *awātum É.GAL ka-aš-da*  
 ‘(By the time you meet the lord) the news will have reached the palace’ (3, 48:32f.).

Sentence (39c) is not resultative (the reaching of the palace does not affect the news), and so probably are the former two, since they are not really different from the latter one. The Pres. *ikaššad* is used in the same future environment in OA, core OB, and OB Mari (CAD K 273–274), consider an example:

- (40) *adi ištu inanna UD.2.KAM a-ka-ša-ad-ka*  
 ‘I will meet you in two days from now’ (TCL 17, 22:9; OB, text and tr. CAD K 272b).

This evidence reminds one the *pluperfect* function of certain SC forms as discussed above, exx. (6)–(8): in both cases there is a reference point not identical to the speech time.

Another instance is the SC **A** of the OA *qabārum* ‘to say, speak.’ This SC token is common in OA. Consider the examples:

- (41) (a) *šim 4 GÚ AN.NA kīma i-Šalatuar u Wahšušana ša ELLAT<sup>at</sup> I-dī-Ku-bi<sub>4</sub>-im innaddin-u ša ana DAM.QAR šaqālam qā-bi<sub>4</sub>-a-ku-ni 3 GÚ AN.NA kunukkī-ya ana Wahšušana ana šēr ša kīma yāti ušēbil*  
 ‘(Immediately after the letter-head) The price of four talents tin as it is being sold from the Iddin-Kubum’s caravan in Šalatuar and Wahšušana: what **I had promised** to weigh out to the merchant, i. e. three talents tin, I sent to Wahšušana under my seals care of my representative’ (Prag I 442:2–9).

The relative clause *ša ana tamkārīm šaqālam qabiāku-ni* does not describe the resultative state of the speaker as the one who is under the self-imposed duty to pay, semantically this is a dynamic PLUPERFECT, but the stereotyped OA usage of the SC verbal phrase *šaqālam qabi* (inflected for subject) is derived from RES: *šaqālam qabiāku* = ‘I have promised to pay,

and I am now obliged to pay,’ the event of promising affects the one who has promised.

- (b) *tuppam ša kunukkīya ša annišam wabālam qá-bi-a-tí-ni ūmam lā tattabl-am*  
 ‘Today you have not brought me the tablet with my seal that **you promised** to bring hither’ (Michel 1991, No. 263:9ff.).

Same comment applies here, except that this is not the ubiquitous *šaqlam qabi* phrase and the meaning is probably more like SIMPLE PAST than PLUPERFECT.

What then about examples of the genuine SC **A RES**? Since this study aims at reconstructing certain features of the tense-aspect in spoken Akkadian, we are not going to abuse the best-known candidates, to wit OB *laqi* ‘he has got,’ OB *maḥir* ‘he has (received),’ OB *ṣabit* ‘he has (a piece of real estate in usufruct),’ OA *adim* ‘he has invested, he owns a share,’ OA *ṣapik* ‘he has invested,’ because they are stock phrases of administration or business, not necessarily reflecting the natural usage. As I have mentioned above, *ṣabit A* is absent from OA, *laqi* and *maḥir A* are very rare in OA.<sup>106</sup> On the other hand, \**adāmum* is reliably attested only in OA and only in the guise of the SC **A**.

The following examples, taken preferably from letters, look as appropriate illustrations of what it means to be the SC **A RES**, though their token frequency is in most cases low:

- (42) 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-ti-ma lá ta-aq-bi um-ma a-ta-ma I GÍN KÙ.BABBAR a-na me-er-i-a*  
*lu-še-bi<sub>4</sub>-il<sub>5</sub>*

‘Sure enough, **we have mastered** the scribal art. Send an *eppatum*-textile to my teacher. And (why then) have you never decided, “Let me send a shekel silver to my son?”’ (CCT IV, 6e:4–14).<sup>107</sup>

- (43) (a) I GEME<sub>2</sub> *ša ... ištiššu šinīšu-ma waldat ana utlī-ya leqe-am*  
 ‘Bring me for sex a slave girl who **has given birth** once or twice’  
 (ABIM 20:82).

<sup>106</sup> In response to my question, BK tentatively suggests that “OA uses the pret-erite instead, cf. especially lists of expenses where the writer writes down what he received or paid, and I think they always use *ilqe*, *alqe*, *išqul*, *ašqul*, etc., never a stative or a perfect. This makes it even more interesting to learn when the Old Assyrians do use the corresponding stative forms.” BK agrees that the very high frequency of the three “taking-hold-of” forms of the SC **A** in OB is probably due to their being “legal jargon.”

<sup>107</sup> CAD L 55b translates, ‘as you know, **we are learning** to write.’ Michel 1998: 250 has ‘Assurément, **nous apprenons** l’art du scribe.’ Why? By contrast, CAD T 163 translates ‘as you know, **we know** the scribal craft,’ which seems nearer to the mark.

In this sentence, the direct object is implicit in the adverbials. It surfaces in a protasis from CH (§ 158:28), once more in a relative clause:

- (b) 'If a man, after his father's death, has been caught in the lap of his (= the defunct father's) wife *ša mārī wa-al-da-at* who has born children (= **is mother**).'<sup>108</sup>

In both examples (the only ones I have found), the relative clause '(a woman) *ša ... waldat*' is a way of saying 'a woman having given birth,' 'a parous woman.' As in the case of *lamdāni*, the resultative state *waldat* is an acquired quality that possesses social relevance.<sup>109</sup> The case of *lamdāni* (No. 43) is not really different. Note also my contextual interpretation of *anāku-ma kabsāk-šunūti* in (36) above as a property of the goddess.

- (44) (a) *awīlum abi* <sup>d</sup>MAR.TU *ša aḥ-zu-ki*  
 'The honourable Father of the Amorites who **is married to you**'  
 (AbB 9, 15:21, tr. Stol).

Note that *aḥiz* stands in a relative clause, as in (43 a–b).

- (b) *ina bulluṭ ummi-ki-ma lāma ana sikkātīm nuṣṣu* PN *ina kišaršim innidi*  
*ištu i-šu qātī-šu igmurru u nu-a-um ša ummi-ki aḥuzu* (PN *mer'assu a-ḥi-*  
*iz*) *nu-a-um gamram ša kišaršim igmur-ma*

'While your mother was still alive, before we left for the *expedition*, Iliya had been thrown into prison. After he had spent all his cash, the indigenous man who had married your mother (Iliya **is married** to his daughter), (this) indigenous paid the expenses of the jail' (OA, Kt 91/k 423:24–32, tr. adapted from Veenhof 2008:107).

The other two tokens that have been found are negated, one of them obtains in a relative clause:

- (c) *aḥū-ni šeḥrum aššatam ul a-ḥi-iz*  
 'Our youngest brother has not taken a wife' (i. e., is still unmarried)' (AbB 3, 2:11, tr. BK).

<sup>108</sup> The lawgiver's point here is that the widow is a woman having given birth, but not the culprit's mother (the latter situation is taken care of in the preceding norm, with a different sanction).

<sup>109</sup> One is almost tempted to suspect that *wālitum* of our dictionaries is probably in part of the cases rather *walittum*, especially since no SC **P** *walid* 'is born' in the resultative reading has been found in the corpus, and the VA *waldum* '(the one) born' does not really exist (AHw. 1458a). Note that the contexts of AbB 14, 93:11 (*wa-al-du*) and ARM 10, 106:10 (*wa-al-da-at*) are illegibly broken, while ARM 6, 43:5 [*mā*]r *irīm ša šaddaqdīm wa-al-du* cited above as (27) is of course not RES, it is used with the force of the N Pret. (*ša šaddaqdīm*) *irwaldu*, which is attested in OB (AHw. 1458a).

(d) *ana aḫī-šunu šeḫrīm ša aššatam lā aḫ-zu*

‘To their young **unmarried** brother (they shall apportion the silver equivalent of the bridewealth)’ (CH § 166:67, tr. Roth 1995).

In the above examples, the relation of negated tokens (44 c–d) to the non-negated ones (44 a–b) looks like the binding of a variable in the static sentence: *aššatam ul aḫiz* ‘he is **unmarried**’ vs. *mer<sup>o</sup>assu aḫiz* ‘he is **married** to his daughter,’ *aḫiz-ki* ‘he is **married to you**.’ This leads one to think that in Akkadian the natural way to say ‘he is married’ was *\*aššatam aḫiz*, this is once more a resultative state interpreted as an acquired feature (or “quality”) that possesses social relevance. This would mean that *aššatam ul aḫiz* (45c–d) is what Kozinskij (1988:522) calls “anti-resultative,”<sup>110</sup> a state that in real life does not result from an action but nonetheless is not considered by the language to be a primitive, non-created, “natural” property.<sup>111</sup>

The case of the SC of *nadānum/tadānum* ‘to give’ is instructive. Although the state of having-been-given is unobservable, the SC **P** is attested by dozens of stereotyped 3rd person tokens: they are “bureaucratic” in the official correspondence of the first Babylonian dynasty (‘is

<sup>110</sup> By way of illustration, I would compare this evidence to Spanish constructions with the auxiliary verbs *ser* ‘be’ and *estar* ‘≈ come to be’: *este hombre (no) es guapo* vs. *este hombre (no) está casado*, while *\*este hombre no es casado* is unacceptable. A bit simplifying, one can say that *ser* + adjectives forms purely stative sentences, while *estar* + past participle forms resultative sentences. The tertium comparationis between Spanish and Akkadian is that on the surface both *no está casado* and *aššatam ul aḫiz* look like resultative sentences (because of *estar* and the direct object *aššatam*, respectively), though actually they are “derived statives.”

<sup>111</sup> The present writer is doing his best to take BK’s **RES** seriously, and this attitude leads to questions at every turn. By definition, negated tokens of the SC cannot be resultative, while in text they are quite common. What to do with them? Theoretically, we can assign them to either pure (“anti-resultative”?) states or to negations of past-time events (negative [plu]perfects?), and for the moment I do not see a third possibility. In certain cases, the past-time option is inescapable: *ištūma KÙ.BABBAR ana qāti-ka lā ma-aq-tá-ni* [*maq-an-ni*] ‘If the silver **has not** indeed **come**<sub>vent.</sub> into your hand’ (CCT 4, 30b:14f., the syntax excludes the RES interpretation: note the ventive coterferential with the Endpoint/Recipient *ana qāti-ka*). Contrast a vivid example of a purely descriptive usage: *ul ina pilši ka-aš-da-a-ku* ‘I have not been seized in burglary’ (AbB 2, 83:32). The letter is the author’s cry for help from prison, the burglary language is here nothing more than *façon de parler*, the message of this sentence being simply “I am no criminal, I have done nothing bad.” IA suggests that at this point I am being oversubtle and too “notional,” while Akkadian is not that sensitive here, it sees no problem at all about producing negated *paris* forms.

given,’ about the state property),<sup>112</sup> and technical (‘is sold’) in OA (e. g. TPAK 3:9; Prag 1, 520:6). These **P** tokens belong to professional jargon, therefore they do not need to comply with the observability criterion. By contrast, the SC **A** is relatively rare, it appears mostly in the 1st p. sg. (and sometimes 2nd p. sg.). These examples are often (and perhaps always) RES, because they refer to a socially relevant state of the agent:

(45) (a) 2 GÍN *kašpam na-ad-na-ak-šum*

‘**I will have** two shekels silver **given** to him’ (AbB 4, 149:10).

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 (p. 99 of the Edition) that the contextual reading is ‘ich habe ihm zwei Sekel Silber zuerkannt/versprochen.’

(b) *kašpam gamram lū na-ad-na-ku*

‘**I have paid** all the silver’ (YOS 8, 150:21f., a legal document).

The author is now free from an obligation.

(c) *ina libbi 3 šubātī-ka ištēn na-ad-na-a-ti u šanīam anāku annikīam attadin ištēn-ma šubātī-ka ušhur*

‘(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, (so that) only one garment is (still) due from you’ (AbB 14, 119:6–9).

Kouwenberg (2010:171, fn. 34) claims that *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.” This looks theory-dependent, since the payment of the three-garments *nēmettum* by joint efforts of the writer and the addressee is the only concern of the letter. Yet in the corpus there is no such thing as a non-motivated alternation of the SC **A** and the *t*-Perf.<sup>113</sup> My explanation is as follows. The form *nadnāti* is (with BK) RES ‘you have (one piece) given.’ Had the writer simply wanted to say ‘I have another one given,’ he would have said *nadnaku*, yet he needed to specify to his business partner that he had made the payment *annikīam*, where he was penning his letter. As we know, the place adverbial *annikīam* is incompatible with the RES read-

<sup>112</sup> E. g., AbB 4, 6:4–10; 55:9ff., both times about land tenure: the land is or should “be given” to somebody.

<sup>113</sup> This follows from my observations in the course of this study and is in agreement with the tenor of Kouwenberg 2010.

ing of the SC, so the writer selected the second-best option, the *t*-Perf. **at-tadin**. By contrast, *annikīam* squares with the lexically-determined non-RES readings of the SC, as we have seen in (37a–b): PN *annikīam saniq-niāti* and *anāku annikīam sanqāku*.

The SC of the OB verb *habālum* ‘to harm, wrong’ is perhaps even more telling. The SC is formed mostly for the specialized legal meaning ‘to deprive,’ i. e. ‘to take something from somebody illegitimately’ (with two accusatives). The SC **P** appears in AbB in “bureaucratic” contexts, e. g. *šumma eqel-šu ... ha-bi-il* ‘if he **is** (indeed) **deprived** of his field (give it back to him!)’ (13, 43:20, a letter of Hammurapi). The **P** form is unobservable (though it is meant to be RES), and this is small wonder, since we already know that the chancellery of the Amorite dynasty was fond of abusing the SC. The important thing is that the SC **A** ‘**he is the one who has deprived** (somebody of something)’ is also attested, although the trivial result of harming/depriving is supposed to affect the patient rather than the agent. Yet *habil* could be used as a charge, an accusation, i. e. to describe the former agent. Consider the following examples:

(46) (a) É *ha-ab-la-an-ni* ‘he has deprived me of my house’ (AbB 2, 111:13).

(b) *eqlam ša ha-<ab>-lu-ni-in-ni* ‘the field of which they have deprived me’ (AbB 2, 111:29).

(c) PN ... *ha-ab-la-an-ni-a-ti* ‘(PN) has wronged us’ (AbB 2, 74:12, beginning of a suit).

To recapitulate: semantically, the “acquired-quality” meaning of the SC **A** RES resembles the grammatical meaning of predicative adjectives, in spite of its verbal two-place syntax, and in this respect it is radically different from the non-RES **A** tokens, which are by definition dynamic (or “fientive”). Thus, what is described by the sentences ‘(a woman) *ša marī waldat*’ and ‘PN *merʾassu aḥīz*’ are **properties of the syntactic subjects**, while for ‘PN *annikīam saniq-niāti*’ or *šeam amaḥḥar-ma kašdāk-ki* this interpretation hardly makes a lot of sense. If we ask, “What does it mean for the SC **A** to be RES?”—The answer will be, “To code an acquired quality of the former agent.” As we have seen, this answer implies a lexical restriction on the formation of the SC **A** RES. It is understood that the “social relevance/legal status” mentioned above is a variety of the “acquired quality” concept. For obvious reasons, the former is especially well represented in our records of Akkadian.

The negative evidence *pro* this thesis is the fact that e. g. the SC **A** of basic verbs of telic transitive motion is rare and probably never RES. In

particular, this is true of the verbs *wabālum* ‘to bring,’ *šūbulum* ‘to make bring, to send,’ *tabālum* ‘to take along, to carry off,’ *šapārum* ‘to send (a message),’ *ṭarādum* ‘to send off, dispatch,’ while for the other finite forms most of these verbs are represented by thousands of examples. This is because Akkadian does not consider “having sent”/“being-sender” etc. to be an acquired quality. In part 3 of this paper, we will look at the respective evidence.

## 2.2. The SC RES of intransitive telic/punctual verbs

Now, what does it mean for the SC of intransitive verbs to be RES? If we start with the above list in Kouwenberg 2010 (7.3.2) which comprises eleven admittedly frequent tokens of the SC formed from “intransitive verbs of telic movement <...> and change of state verbs,” we will see that not all these verbs yield resultative SC forms. An example is *tebûm* ‘to stand up’: *tebi* is well attested, yet it hardly ever means literally ‘he is [now] standing (= having stood up).’ For the basic meaning ‘to stand up,’ no single example of the SC has been found in OB and OA letters.<sup>114</sup> On the other hand, *tebi* is attested for several derived meanings in OB literary texts, and especially in SB; see AHW. 1342f.; CAD T 317b.<sup>115</sup> All the OB tokens seem to be non-RES. Consider an example from an OB extispicy report:

(47) *ašar mukīl rēši kakku šumēla te-bi*

‘At the “support of the head,” a “weapon-mark” **protruded** to the left’ (JCS 11, 99, No. 8:20, text and tr. CAD T 317b).

The token is stative and by definition observable, but it is clearly not resultative. Both its lexical and grammatical meanings are metaphorical, the latter feature constituting the norm in still life divination texts.

By contrast, the SC of another “intransitive verb of telic movement” in BK’s list, *ḫalāqum* ‘to get lost,’ behaves differently. For the basic sense of

<sup>114</sup> For that matter, *tebi* with whatever meaning has not been found in OA and core OB letters. In my corpus, the closest approximation to the basic sense of the root would be Enkidu *te-bi-i-ma š. irḫi* ‘[For six days and seven nights] E. was sexually aroused and mated with Šamhat’ (Gilg. P. ii 7, if interpreted correctly), and see CAD T 317f. for more examples of *tebi* with this meaning in later literary texts. Anyway, this one looks like a technical (and probably euphemistic) usage, since the grammatical subject is never the penis.

<sup>115</sup> I am grateful to Rim Nurullin for discussing with me the usage of *tebi* in literary texts.

the root, it is attested in OB and OA letters (and OB laws) by dozens of tokens, often in RES readings.<sup>116</sup> Consider some RES examples:

- (48) (a) PN *ḥa-li-iq* *šumma illak-ak-kināšim pādā-šu*  
 ‘Dan-ilišu **has disappeared**. If he shows up at your place (2 f. pl.), detain him!’ (AbB 7, 29:11ff.; the message is quoted in its entirety, save for the letter-head and the seal legend).
- (b) ‘I found and detained in Isin PN *ša ištu* ... MU.3.KAM *ḥa-al-quí* who **has been missing** for three years’ (AbB 14, 186:9).
- (c) *ṭuppam ērišū-ma umma* PN *ḥa-lá-aq*  
 ‘They demanded (from PN) the debt-note, but PN said **it is lost**’ (JCS 14, 1:7, OA).

Why then ‘PN *ḥaliq*’ is a good Akkadian sentence while ‘PN *tebi*’ is not? We cannot explain the contrast in the behaviour of *ḥaliq* and *tebi* using notions applied above to transitive verbs. To claim that ‘having-been-lost’ or ‘having-disappeared’ is an **observable** resultative state (on a par with ‘having-been-broken’) is to overload the concept “observability” by using it as a metaphor too far removed from its literal meaning. As we have already seen, **observability** as a heuristically useful notion has to be applied literally. Hence, to explain the above evidence we need to look for something else. As already mentioned above, the SC of telic intransitives can be productive and RES if the respective verb is **unaccusative**, i. e. if its subject is patient-like. According to this prediction, the SC of **unergative** intransitives (i. e. those whose subjects are agent-like) *will be non-RES and not productive for the basic root meanings*.

Keeping to verbs of movement, we can now account for the virtual non-existence of the SC of agentive motion verbs, e. g. *tebûm* ‘to stand up,’ *erēbum* ‘to enter,’ *wašûm* ‘to go out,’ *warādum* ‘to go/come down,’ *elûm* ‘to go/come up.’<sup>117</sup> By contrast, the SC of *maqātum* ‘to fall down’ is repre-

<sup>116</sup> In OB, it is also well-known in *ḥaliq-ma* chains, as in No. 1 above, and see additionally e. g. AbB 6, 171:8; 9, 62:12.

<sup>117</sup> Kouwenberg (1998:183) and BK’s *OA Verb List* gloss this verb as ‘to go/come up; to be high,’ and cf. Loesov 2006:147, No. 15. Von Soden divides the AHw. entry *elûm* in two parts: “**A**. St. (hoch sein) selten; **B** sonst” (AHw. 206b), and suggests that the rare SC forms (OB and SB) in his **A** part of the entry are deadjectival from *elûm* I ‘hoch’ (ibid. 205b). This decision of von Soden looks reasonable, if we agree that it makes sense at all to speak time and again about the SC tokens derived not directly from a verbal root (or BK’s “paradigm”) but rather from a *deverbal* adjective. Sometimes, I do make such claims when I describe a certain SC token as “semantically deadjectival” (cf. e. g. the above story about *batiq*, ex. No. 21).

sented by dozens of tokens in various lexical meanings. In particular, for the basic unaccusative sense of the root ‘to fall down, to collapse’ it is attested by the following RES examples (they are the only tokens of *maqit* for the basic sense of the root I have found so far):

- (49) (a) *ašamme-ma urkat bētim ma-qí-it*  
 ‘As I know, the rear part of the house has collapsed’ (Prag I 577: 4f., OA).
- (b)  $\text{š}[u]m\text{-}[m]a \text{É-tum } e\text{-le-nu-úš-šu } \mathbf{im-qú-ut-ma} \text{ úš-šu-šu } \mathbf{da-an-nu} \times [o \ o \ o]$   
 $\text{É } \{x \ x \ x \ x\} \mathbf{da-an} \text{ š}[um\text{-}ma \text{ uš-šu}] \text{-šú } \mathbf{ma-aq-tu-ma} \text{ e-le-nu-úš-šu } \mathbf{ša-lim}$   
 $m[im\text{-}ma \ e]\text{-pí-is-sú} \text{ ú-ul } i\text{-le-i } \mathbf{i-ma-aq-qú-ut}$   
 ‘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, text and tr. of the Edition).<sup>118</sup>

The morphological difference between *šumma bītum elēnuššu imqut* (‘if the roof of the house has fallen down’) and *šumma uššūšu maqtū* (‘if its foundation [pl.] has collapsed’) seems to be a free variation. In Akkadian, *maqtū* in this context is RES (and therefore the marked form), while the Pret. *imqut* is an unmarked form: being essentially PERFECTIVE PAST/AORIST, it can appear in the semantic slots of PERFECT and RES as well.<sup>119</sup>

A derived meaning of *maqātum* refers to the loss of cattle, maintaining the unaccusative sense of the root. In (50b), the SC used in this meaning is clearly RES.

- (50) (a)  $\text{ÁB.ĪIA } \mathbf{ekallim} \text{ } i\text{-ma-qú-ta}$   
 ‘The livestock of the palace keeps falling’ (ARM 1, 118:21).<sup>120</sup>
- (b)  $\text{ANŠE.ĪIA-[i]a } \mathbf{ma-[a]q-tu} \text{ } \langle wa \text{-} \rangle \text{ ar-ka-s[ú] } \mathbf{ap-ru-ús-ma}$  ANŠE.[ĪIA-šú]  
 $m[a]\text{-aq-[tu]}$   
 ‘“Mes ânes ont subi des pertes.” J’ai fait une enquête. Ses ânes ont bien subi des pertes’ (ARM 26/1, 63:12ff., text and tr. of the Edition).

<sup>118</sup> This is a parable the king Hammurapi of Babylon told an envoy of Zimri-Lim.

<sup>119</sup> When I dub *maqtū* “the **marked** form,” I want to say that its RES reading is encoded morphologically. In this text, *imqut* is “an unmarked form” because it is synonymous with *maqit* and therefore has the RES **reading** as well, but its morphological shape does not **encode** RES, it is non-committal as to whether the contextual meaning is RES or otherwise. Cf. also the above observation of BK (p. 117, fn. 106) according to which OA can use *ilqe* where OB uses the **A** *leqi*.

<sup>120</sup> See CAD M<sub>1</sub> 243b for more examples of prefixing forms with this meaning.

This is once more the only example with this meaning that I have found. In Mari, *maqit* is attested in yet another metaphorical meaning, clearly derivable from the unaccusative notion of physical “falling-down”:

- (51) *mu-ut-ta-at ma-a-tim a-na NP ù mu-ut-ta-at ma-a-tim a-na a-ḫi-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 token, as interpreted in the Edition, is RES, and so probably are a few similar usages of *maqit* in Mari, see ARM 26/1, 5:48 and the note (s) on p. 85 of that volume.

In OA, *maqit* is frequent in the motion meaning ‘to reach (a landmark), to arrive,’ said about humans and merchandise. This derived meaning of *maqātum* is quite common in the prefixing tenses as well, and I believe it keeps the initial semantic element of non-agentive (= “unaccusative”) movement. Consider some examples:

- (52) (a) *šu-ma šú-ḫa-ru-um a-na li-bi<sub>4</sub>-kà ma-qí-it* ‘If the (above-mentioned) servant has arrived at your place, (let us know)’ (AKT 3, 114:16ff.).  
 (b) TUG.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., text and tr. of the Edition).  
 (c) *umma šūt-ma KÙ.BABBAR ana qātī-ya lā maqīt KÙ.BABBAR ana qātī-ya imaqqut-ma kasap-šu ušebbal-šum umma anāku-ma ištūma KÙ.BABBAR ana qātī-ka lā ma-aq-tá-ni [= maqtanni] ammala našperti warkitim 20 ma-na KÙ.BABBAR u šibāti-šu mala ana šibtim ilqe-ak-kun-ni lubil-šum-ma u šittam warka šēbīl*

‘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): “Since the silver **has not come**<sub>vent.</sub> into your hand, then according to (his) last message 20 mines of silver and their interest, as much as he took at interest on your behalf,—I shall bring<sub>juss.</sub> (it) to him, and you bring<sub>inv.</sub> the rest afterwards”’ (CCT 4, 30b:8–22).

All the *maqit* tokens in (52a–c) are RES (some of them are “anti-RES,” if we insist on taking negations in earnest), i. e. none of them occurs in syntactic contexts that cancel the RES force of the SC.<sup>121</sup> Note the (+ vent.) clause *ištūma KÙ.BABBAR ana qātī-ka lā maqtan-ni* that appears in free alternation with the (– vent.) clause *KÙ.BABBAR ana qātī-ya lā maqīt*. To my

<sup>121</sup> As we already know, ENDPOINT is the admissible (or even necessary) participant of the RES clauses with verbs of telic motion.

knowledge, the directional ventive is used with the SC of motion verbs very sparingly.<sup>122</sup> In this case (*ištūma kaspum ana qātī-ka lā maqt-am*), the ventive probably foregrounds the endpoint.

We are now passing to BK's intransitive "change of state" verbs that form the SC. The sample includes four items, *belū* 'to go out (of fire),' *mātu* 'to die,' *pašāḫu* 'to become calm,' and *šebū* 'to become satisfied.' Of these four, the SC is attested in the corpus with any noticeable frequency only for *mātum* 'to die.'<sup>123</sup> This is not because the writers in our corpus used *mātum* a lot more frequently than any of the other three verbs: the numbers that can be gleaned from our dictionaries do not support this hypothesis. I suggest that the SC of *mātum* 'to die' is productive and often RES not because of "change of state," and not just because of the importance of the concept 'to die,' but due to the patient role of the subject.

There is a non-trivial syntactic isogloss between *ḫaliq* 'he is lost' and *mīt* 'he is dead': the two forms are productive in both RES and non-RES slots.<sup>124</sup> Consider a few examples taken from my more detailed description of *mīt* (Loesov 2010:774f.):

(53) (a) *lā libbi ilim-ma aššūti me-ta-at* 'alas, my wife has died' (TCL 4, 30:4, OA).

(b) *šummamin me-ta-ku* 'if I were dead' (TCL 19, 32:30, OA).

(c) ½ TÚG *i-nu-mì DUMU.MUNUS-sú me-ta-at-ni a-na PN ú-šé-bi<sub>4</sub>-il<sub>5</sub>*  
'I sent half a textile to PN after his daughter had died' (BIN 4, 141:1-3, OA).

(d) *ištu ITI.1.KAM šerrum ina libbīya mi-it-ma*  
'The child in my womb died a month ago' (ABIM 15:10).

<sup>122</sup> Besides the *naš<sup>9</sup>-am* clause in OA ('he carries [smth.] to where you are'), I am aware of only two additional examples: *ana eqlim šuāti mamman lā ṭe<sub>4</sub>-ḫi-a-am* 'nobody has to approach this field!' (AbB 4, 125:14); *kaspum ... šé-bu-lam* 'Has the silver been sent to you?' (VAS 26, 69:6f.).

<sup>123</sup> In AbB 1-14, the SC of *šebūm* is attested once: 'except for them, there is no civil servant *ša eqlam lā šabtu u lā še-bu-ú* that has not got a field and **is not satisfied** (= provided with livelihood)' (AbB 3, 74:25). It has not been found in OA. The SC of *belūm* is known from OB oil omens in the meaning 'to burst (said of bubbles),' see CAD B 73b. The SC of *pašāḫum* has not been found in the corpus, it is attested in later periods, see CAD P s. v. As for *mīt/mēt*, we will now see that in OB and OA letters it is productive for the basic sense of the root.

<sup>124</sup> See also Kouwenberg 2010 (7.3.3) on the non-RES use of *mīt*.

Examples (53a–b) are RES, ex. 53c is PLUPERFECT, while ex. 53d is PRET/SIMPLE PAST.<sup>125</sup> Note that the RES tokens of *mēt* can hardly be considered observable. According to suggestions in Loesov 2010:774f., *mēt* in OA tends to be used in most past-time slots (i. e., instead of the *t*-Perf. and the Pret.), while in OB letters the *t*-Perf. *imūt* is often used instead of the Pret. *imūt* (and possibly instead of *mūt*, though this is difficult to prove). If this is true, both facts represent unusual developments and require further study.

### 2.3. What is the tertium comparationis between the three diathetic varieties of the SC RES?

Now, we have concluded that the SC **P** is RES if it is observable; the SC **A** is RES if the action is believed to affect the agent (= personal and volitional subject) and culminate in a quality of the latter, and the SC **Intr** is RES if its subject is patient-like. The shared feature of the three varieties is obvious: it is the communicative importance of the resultant state. One can christen this feature “(high) cognitive relevance.” Our **cognitive relevance** (or “salience”) is, so to speak, an umbrella notion that can be neither induced directly from the linguistic evidence nor applied to it directly. For this reason it is appropriate to dub this feature “cognitive” rather than “linguistic” relevance/salience. Indeed, there is no *a priori* (= prior to a detailed examination) criterion that would tell us what is more “relevant”: *nakis* ‘it has been felled/cut across’ or *māhir* \*‘it has been received’; *māri waldat* ‘she has children’ or *nadi* \*‘he has thrown down (a thing)’; *haliq* ‘he has disappeared’ or *waši* \*‘he has gone out.’ At this abstract level, the very question about “relevance” may sound bizarre. Yet, in the course of a piece-by-piece study of certain basic verbal concepts, we have come to learn that for Akkadian the trivial RES state of the former patient is worth mentioning (= coding with a special “tense”) if it is observable; the RES state of the former agent is encoded morphologically if it is an acquired feature of the agent (i. e., signals the agent’s “change of state”); the RES state of the **Intr** subject is expressed if the subject looks like a patient, though the respective state does not have to be observable.

---

<sup>125</sup> In anticipation of the research on non-RES functions of the SC of telic roots, we can observe that so far we have seen PLUPERFECT/BACKGROUND as such a function much oftener than PRETERIT. The latter seems to be exceptional. The most prominent example I am aware of is *dīk* \*‘he is killed’ used instead of the non-existent N-stem Pret., but this fact was explained in terms of morphonology rather than lexical semantics.

The shared feature of “observability” (patient), “acquired property” (agent) and “patient-likeness” (intr. subject) is the maximum change in the world’s state of affairs. This is another man’s word for “cognitive relevance.”

### 3. Retrospect and Prospect: The lexicon-based description of Akkadian morphosyntax

In this paper, I have attempted to describe conditions that are essential for the SC of telic verbs to be RES. I hope I have made some progress, yet certain vital questions remain unanswered, and others even unasked. When I started writing this article, IA urged me not just to hunt for non-RES tokens, but to ask what they are doing in the language, i. e. to look for patterns of their use.<sup>126</sup> This challenge has not been taken up here and remains part of the agenda for future research.

Furthermore, so far we have dealt in some detail mostly with verbs whose SC **can** have RES meanings, because the respective SC forms do follow the stipulations I have suggested. Now, one may ask: what then about the SC of telic transitives which, due to their lexical meanings, can be neither “observable” nor “acquired property”? And what about the SC of unergative (= agentive) intransitive verbs? Are there common examples of these types? What are their functions?

Moreover, *contra* our reference works, from GAG to Kouwenberg 2010, we do come across the SC of certain **atelic** verbs, and some tokens seem to be productive and intrusive into the present-time domain as habitual predicates. Consider an example:

- (54) (a) [*in*]a mimma annîm [a]k-la-ku ‘I am entitled to the use of (lit. “**I eat**/I may eat”) all this’ (AS 22, 26:5, early OB).
- (b) *annakam emârû ak-lu-ú*  
‘The donkeys “**eat**” (= receive fodder, are being fed) here’ (ATHE 46:18, OA).
- (c) ANŠE-ku-nu lu ak-lu ‘let your donkeys get fodder’ (Prag I 718:25).
- (d) [*u*]šbat **ak-lá-at** u paššat ‘she is entitled to stay, **eat** and get ointment’ (Albayrak 2004, 12:14f.).

---

<sup>126</sup> BK also writes me, “You show clearly that describing the stative as resultative and nothing else is not the whole picture. What I still miss ... is the rest of the picture, in other words, what is the overall function of the non-resultative active statives? Are they secondary developments based on the resultative (like OA *qabi*)? Or instantiations of the verbal adjective used predicatively?”

To complicate things even more, the SC tends to be lexicalized the way other tenses are definitely not. In other words, the SC sometimes appears with the meanings which do not really have matches in the prefixing tenses. An extreme example is the OB *ḥabtāku* (lit. ‘I have been robbed’) that ended up becoming an interjection: it is used as a call for help, or with similar forces. In this function, *ḥabtāku* combines with appropriate forms of *šašûm* ‘to cry,’ followed by an articulated utterance of the one crying, introduced by *umma*:

- (55) (a) *ḥa-ab-ta-ku issi umma š[īma] amtum ša Bēlšunu anāku bēltī 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.).<sup>127</sup>

For OB Mari, numerous tokens of *ḥabtāku* (mostly from unpublished manuscripts) were gathered by Fr. Joannès in ARM 26/2, p. 299.<sup>128</sup> The syntax is essentially the same as in the core OB examples, the stereotyped rendering is “Quel scandale!” Fr. Joannès points out the idiomatic nature of this verb phrase, not quite 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:

- (b) *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<sup>+</sup>, cited by Joannès *ibid.*).

And cf. an even more eloquent example:

- (c) *awātīm 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).

I have set out to elucidate these complexities by describing the SC from its “grassroots,” i. e. from the syntactic behaviour of the SC of a given frequent verb, comparing its SC (wherever appropriate) with other members of its morphological paradigm. This procedure is adequate for a synchronic tense-aspect study of a living language, while for an ancient literary language its validity is restricted at best and sometimes even du-

<sup>127</sup> See also *u ḥa-ab-ta-ku ištānassi umma šū-ma ...* (10, 81:6’f.), *ḥa-ab-ta-ku ašši-ma umma anāku-ma ...* (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.).

<sup>128</sup> The reference, along with the explanation that this usage is idiomatic, is courtesy IA.

bious.<sup>129</sup> The truth is my morphosyntactic “shots” presented below depend on the corpus of published texts which is contingent on what can be ultimately called “chance discoveries” in the soil of today’s Iraq, Turkey, and Syria. This means that we will never learn everything we want about the Akkadian verb. On the other hand, the bulk of the available OA and OB corpora consists of a huge amount of non-literary texts (some 31,000 texts in OB, see [www.archibab.fr](http://www.archibab.fr)),<sup>130</sup> while the verbal roots under investigation are very frequent, many of them are attested in our corpus by thousands of inflectional tokens. All in all, this makes 2000–1700 B. C. Akkadian a rewarding field for a fine-tuned study in verb’s grammatical semantics, perhaps more so than any other ancient textual corpus.

I made a first attempt of this kind in Loesov 2010.<sup>131</sup> The analyses reflected in that paper had been carried out before my views on the meaning of the SC took the exact shape expounded above. Therefore certain decisions may have become obsolete, yet the evidence collected and commented upon can be useful for future research anyway. In what follows I go on with the lexicon-based investigation of the SC. The aim is to test the value of the above criteria, to try to falsify some of them, and, more generally, to advance the discussion by bringing to the reader’s attention certain facts and observations.

The availability and meaning of the SC are related not to the “dictionary verb” as a whole (e. g. *nadûm* or *šapākum*), but rather to its individual senses. For this reason, wherever appropriate, I start with the SC for the basic root meaning and then pass to its other meanings, analyzing them

<sup>129</sup> With mixed feelings, I am now reading in the Introduction to J. Blau’s new grammar of BH, “Synchronic investigation is not congenial to Biblical Hebrew, since the corpus does not reflect a closely knit linguistic system but is profoundly multilayered. It is not useful to analyze such a language with the tools of synchronic linguistics” (Blau 2010:5; it is understood that here “such a language” = “such a corpus”). Blau’s judgment may sound “unscientific” and blunt, especially given the high number of doctoral dissertations on the synchronic (morpho)syntax of BH and other, much smaller, Semitic corpora. Yet Blau is essentially right.

<sup>130</sup> It stands to reason that their value as linguistic evidence is uneven depending on the genre.

<sup>131</sup> In Loesov 2010, the following verbs were discussed: *kullumum* ‘to show, assign’; *labāšum* ‘to put on clothing’; *lapātum* ‘to touch, affect, write down’; *lupputum* ‘to touch, smear, write’; *lawûm* ‘to move in a circle, surround’; *leqûm* ‘to take’; *maḥārum* ‘to accept, receive’; *mātum* ‘to die’; *qerēbum* ‘to be near, approach’; *sanāqum* ‘to arrive, reach, check, put pressure on’; *teḥûm* ‘to come near, approach’; *tuhûm* ‘to conduct, bring near, hand over, add to.’

one by one. Among other things, this will hopefully permit us a fresh look at lexicalized readings of the SC, i. e. those that have no matches in the prefixing tenses. It goes without saying that by default the data of OB and OA are being treated separately.

In the rest of this contribution, I will study three basic verbs of transitive motion whose SC is only marginally attested. In the forthcoming part of this work, we will have a look at frequent transitive verbs whose SC is productive and reveals considerable polysemy.

*wabālum* ‘to bring.’

The SC is rare, given the enormous frequency of prefixing tenses. The VA is not attested at all. In OB, I have found five examples for the basic meaning (both **P** and **A**), two of them obtain in literary texts.

- (1) ‘18 shekels of silver *ša ana ubārūtīm* **ba-ab-lu** that **were brought** for an *i.*-partnership’ (UCP 10, 167, No. 98:24f. text CAD I/J 295a).
- (2) ‘Has [the silver] that you took *ul* **ba-bi-il-ma-a** not been brought?’ (AbB 9, 279:2).
- (3) [*k*]u-up-ru **ba-bi-il** *i-pé-eh-ḫi* *ba-ab-šu*  
‘Pitch **was brought** that he might close up his door’ (OB Atra-Ḫasis, Lambert–Millard 1999, 92 iii 2:51).
- (4) [*kīma bēl*]ī idū 1 LÚ *parzillam* **ba-bi-il** *aṭṭaras-su*  
‘As my lord knows, a certain man **used to bring** iron; I have (now) dispatched him’ (AbB 9, 82:25ff.).

Rowton 1962:276 translates the last sentence ‘He **has always been** the only one **to bring in** the iron.’ Stol rejects Rowton’s translation and proposes in the Edition, ‘As my lord knows, one man **carries** (the) iron.’ BK suggested me a non-habitual solution in a p. c., ‘*I don’t think anything is wrong with “the man has brought iron” (the context is fairly obscure).*<sup>132</sup> *This is supported by the Sargonic instances, which clearly refer to a specific delivery (if we take these as statives, which I find attractive).*’<sup>133</sup> Thus, we have PAST HABITUAL (‘used to bring/has been bringing’), ‘has brought’ (PERFECT or RES), and ‘carries’ (PRESENT HABITUAL) as suggested solutions. The decision is difficult; see the discussion presently.

- (5) <sup>d</sup>UTU *na-ši-ku-um me-e* ÍD.IDIGLAT ù ÍD.BURANUN *ša iš-tu ša-di-im*  
GIŠ.EREN ù GIŠ.ŠU.ÚR.MĪN *a-na ka-ši-im* **ba-ab-lu-ú**

<sup>132</sup> Indeed, Stol admits in the Edition that he does not understand how the paragraph in question relates to the rest of the letter in terms of contents.

<sup>133</sup> See these examples below in this entry.

‘O Šamaš! (Here) I have for you water from the Tigris and the Euphrates which **brings**<sup>134</sup> you cedar and cypress from the mountains’ (OB diviner’s prayer; *JCS* 22, 26:18ff., the collated text as in Steinkeller 2005:31).<sup>135</sup>

The tense-aspect reading of both *našêk-kum* and *bablû* is difficult to pinpoint on non-linguistic grounds because “the conceptual and mythological setup of Babylonian extispicy” (cf. Steinkeller 2005) is not fully understood. My rendering is meant to suggest that *našêk-kum* is a stative predication, while *bablû* has habitual force; i. e. the two tokens of the SC display different nuances of the present-time stative reading. Yet a past-time rendering ‘water ... which (has) brought to you’ is difficult to exclude.

Given the above uncertainties, I decided to present here some of the few examples I had found outside the corpus. Two tokens with the shape *wabil* are probably attested in Sargonic Akkadian (OAIC 36, an economic text)<sup>136</sup>:

(6) 18. 30 [SIKI] MA.NA	‘30 minas of [wool]
19. <i>in</i> NA <sub>4</sub> KU <sub>3</sub> .BABBAR	(measured by) the “stone of silver,”
20. <i>Bi<sub>2</sub>-za-num</i>	Bizanum
21. <i>wa-bil<sub>2</sub>-ši-in</i>	<b>is their porter.</b>
22. 5 <i>Bi<sub>2</sub>-za-num</i>	5 (GUR of barley), Bizanum
23. [ <i>w</i> ] <i>a-bil<sub>2</sub>-šu</i>	<b>is its porter.’</b>

As we will now see, Gelb’s interpretation of *wa-bil<sub>2</sub>* as a participle (i. e., agent noun *wābil-*) may be wrong. This noun is amply attested in OB Mari,<sup>137</sup> Tell Rimah,<sup>138</sup> and in OA,<sup>139</sup> it is used almost exclusively as the

<sup>134</sup> The **P** translations of CAD Š<sub>1</sub> 54a (‘water from the Tigris and Euphrates, **brought** for you from the cedar and cypress mountain’) and Š<sub>3</sub> 350a (‘water ... **is carried** to you’) are a shame, since *ša-di-im* GIŠ.EREN is not ‘the cedar mountain,’ while Goetze in the Edition (1968) had correctly put forward an **A** rendering, ‘water ... which has carried.’

<sup>135</sup> Steinkeller translates: ‘O Šamaš! I bring you water from the Tigris and the Euphrates which **has carried** for you cedar and cypress from the mountains.’

<sup>136</sup> The text is that of [http://web.uni-marburg.de/altorientalistik/sommerfeld\\_oaic.htm](http://web.uni-marburg.de/altorientalistik/sommerfeld_oaic.htm). It is not materially different from Gelb’s reading. The translation facing the corresponding lines is that of Gelb.

<sup>137</sup> E. g. ARM 2, 141:4; 28, 136:12, 173:5. The form in Mari and Tell Rimah is always *wābil-*. Curiously, this word has not been found in the core OB, with whatever phonological shape.

<sup>138</sup> OBTR 85:9’; 165:1’.

<sup>139</sup> See GKT 156e, Veenhof 1972:440f. For the analysis of our alleged nominal clause in Sargonic, it is worth noting that in OA *wābil-* is used as subject/topic in particular in the identifying nominal clause *wābil tuḫpim šūt tamkārūm* ‘the bearer

head of noun phrases *wābil tuḫpim*, *wābil tuḫpīya annîm*, *wābil kaspim* (e. g. VAS 26, 70:10), and the like.<sup>140</sup> This noun phrase is always topical: it is never the predicate of a nominal clause, as is supposed to be the case in OAIC 36. The overall syntax of OAIC 36 (verbal preterite-final clauses) and the shape of object bound pronouns in Sargonic Akkadian (Hasselbach 2005: 150) favour the interpretation ‘Bizanum **has brought** them/it.’ The transitive sentence structure will be similar to 1 LÚ *parzillam ba-bi-il* ‘a certain man **used to bring/has brought** iron’ (AbB 9, 82:25ff.), as cited above.

In the 1st millennium, the SC does not seem to be frequent either. The few tokens I have found come mostly from the SB literary texts. **P** readings are attested in omina apodoses, consider an example:

- (7) *kakkū ša ana libbi lā bablū ana rubē iṭehhū-ni*  
 ‘Weapons that **were not brought** inside will attack the prince’ (Koch-Westenholz 2000:187, the critical edition of the SB *padānu*, a similar example from *šumma izbu* is cited *ibid.* fn. 537).

I have found one **A** present-stative (~ habitual) example in a SB prayer to Marduk:

- (8) [*dumm*]uḡa *ba-ab-la-ta* ‘you bring welfare’ (CT 44, 21 i 11, cf. 13, the restoration of AHW. 1451a).<sup>141</sup>

Thus, for the basic sense of *wabālum*, the SC is only marginally attested. We can explain this by the fact that, according to the above criteria of RES readings, *wābil* cannot be RES in either **A** or **P** diathesis. Why then does it appear in the corpus at all? I believe *wābil* did sometimes show up in the

of (this) letter is **the** creditor (in question)’ (e. g., *UF* 7, 1:22–25; CCT 1, 1a:35f., and see Veenhof 2008a:218, fn. 69 for the explanation that in this stereotyped clause *wābil tuḫpim* refers to “a person who had acquired a debt-note from the original creditor” [ref. BK]).

<sup>140</sup> CAD A<sub>1</sub> 53a and AHW. 1454b cite only two examples of this noun, both happen to be OA ones, *ni-a-um wa-bi-lu* (BIN 4, 79:2’, in a partly broken context), and *wa-bi<sub>4</sub>-lā-ni* (TC 3, 38:20). Regarding the latter one, BK informs me that it has to be read *wa-bi<sub>4</sub>-la-né* ‘porters,’ acc. pl. of (*w*)*ābilānum* ‘porter/bringer.’ As additional evidence for this new OA noun, BK adduces ‘PN *ābilān ḫusārīki* ‘PN, the bringer of your (fs) lapis lazuli’ (Kt n/k 10:26, see Veenhof 2008a:218, fn. 69), and [*a-n*]a *a-bi-la-an a-wa-ti-a* ‘to the bringer of my case’ (OIP 27, 15:5; reading of Dercksen 2001:53, fn. 75).

<sup>141</sup> T. Oshima (*NABU* 2001/15:16) offers the following text: *ina ar-ni gi<sub>l</sub>-la-ti n[a-ās-ḫur-k]a ba-ab-la-ta* ‘Even in the most sinful crimes, **you bring** [your benevolent attent]ion.’ It is based, as the author explains in fn. 9, on *AJO* 19, pl. 12:13–20; CT 44, 21, i 6’–13’; LTBA 1, 68:2–4.

spoken Akkadian dialects, and this was due to the interplay of three factors: 1) the RES *paris* was productive for numerous telic roots; 2) *wabālum* ‘to bring’ was a common transitive verb of telic motion; 3) in spoken Akkadian, *paris* was often used in non-RES readings, whether past-time (for numerous telic verbs) or as a habitual predicate for some atelic verbs (see ex. 54 above). These conditions gave rise to a **morphological analogy**, a sporadic use of *wabil* for the basic motion sense. Its **P** readings would be normally past-time, because of the natural association of PASSIVE with PAST PERFECTIVE. By contrast, its **A** readings would be predominantly present habitual. This alleged state of affairs was also reflected in our written records, as discussed above. Mutatis mutandis, a comparable fact is the sporadic appearance of the SC of *bašûm* ‘to be’ and *edûm* ‘to know,’ which are semantically superfluous (see GAG 127b + \*b).

My suggestion regarding the present-habitual nature of certain **A** readings is supported by the only other usage of *wabil* known in Akkadian. This is the idiom *pan- X wabālum* ‘to show favour,’ the beneficiary of favour (= X) being coded by the noun phrase headed by *pan-* in the accusative case. Below are all three (or four) examples I know:

- (9) *awilum an-[nu-um] panī-ya ma-di-[iš] ba-bi-il ša arhiš nadān[im] epuš*  
 ‘This man is very nice to me,<sup>142</sup> arrange to deliver (the barley) as soon as possible’ (Goetze 1958, No. 11:12–16).

In the OB Mari, M. Birot restores a unique **A** shape *\*wabil* within the idiom *panam wabālum*:

- (10) *ù PN LÚ GAL.MAR.TU ša RN ... pa-an<sup>143</sup> LÚ Èš-nun-na<sup>K1</sup> wa-[bi-il]*  
 ‘And Silillum, the *rab Amurrim* of Bina-Eštar, ... **is in favour** of the king of Ešnunna’ (~ ‘he is likely to defect from Bina-Eštar and join the king of Ešnunna’) (ARM 14, 106:20’ff.).<sup>144</sup>

<sup>142</sup> Cf. CAD A<sub>1</sub> 18b: *panu* + *abālu* ‘to show preference, to favor.’ Goetze translates in the Edition, ‘The man in question very much deserves indulgence on my part’, which now does not seem a likely solution. CAD A<sub>1</sub> 19a translates ‘this man **has shown** me great favor.’ In view of the other examples, a present-time stative interpretation is the most likely one, and it does not contradict the context.

<sup>143</sup> In my sample, this is the only example of the idiom where *pan-* doubtless has the sg. shape.

<sup>144</sup> Be the restoration correct, this SC token (*wabil* rather than *babil*) will be an isogloss with the OA (see presently). Since ll. 22’ and l. 23’ are broken at the end, it is thinkable that *wa-* represents the Inf. acc. *wabālam* + a modal/phasal verb to its right (‘is going to become a follower of the king of Ešnunna’ or something like this).

BK's *OA Verb List* brings two examples of *wabil*, both happen to be used within our idiom *pan-* X *wabālum*, and my search has brought no additional results:

- (11) *pá-ni* PN *wa-áb-lá-tí-ma* KÙ.BABBAR *ša-áš-qú-lá-am lá ta-mu-a-šu*  
 'You favour PN (over me), therefore you do not want him to pay me (back) the silver' (VAS 26, 3:14–17).
- (12) *ù šu-nu pá-ni-a wa-ab-lu-ma ú-lá i-ša-pu-ru-ni-kum*  
 'They are being nice to me, yet they do not want to write to you' (AKT 3, 67:28f.).

This is an **A** present-time usage.<sup>145</sup> The *pan-*<sub>Acc.</sub> *wabālum* verbal phrase uses the Pret. for past time references, and the Pres. for future and in-junctions (v. CAD A<sub>1</sub> 18f.). Consider an example:

- (13) *kīma* <...> *pa-ni la tu-ub-lu tašpur-am* <...> *ina ubbubī-ka pa-ni-šu-nu la tu-ub-ba-al*  
 'You wrote me that you had treated them fairly <during the census> ... Treat them fairly (= "show them no preference") <during a future census>' (ARM 1, 82:6–16f.).

This idiom goes back to a weakened, atelic sense of *wabālum*: 'to carry' rather than 'to bring.' Etymologically, this verb phrase means 'to carry (somebody's) face.' "Face" is here a *pars pro toto* designation of a person. An interesting typological parallel is a nearly identical verb phrase in BH, *nāšā' pānīm* 'to receive someone in a friendly manner, be favourably disposed towards someone' (HALOT 725). It is attested for all three temporal domains (cf. Mal 2:9 for PRESENT, where the **A** predicative participle is used). The only difference with *pan-* X *wabālum* is that the basic meaning of the BH *nāšā'* is atelic. According to HALOT 724, it is 'to carry,' though I would not rule out the possibility of its being 'to hold (something) up-lifted,' i. e. nearer to the primary stative meaning of this root in Akkadian, which is probably 'bei sich haben.'<sup>146</sup>

<sup>145</sup> One could label it "semantically stative," but this is of course true of the idiom in general.

<sup>146</sup> Anticipating the forthcoming part of this study, I would like to mention an important suggestion of BK in a number of p. c.: with much caution, he grants that *wabil* may have had present-habitual force (the SB, No. 8 above being for him the most cogent example). BK then compares this evidence to grammatically similar usages of *naši*, e. g. *bilassunu na-šu-ni-iš-šum* 'they bring their tribute to him' (RIME 4.6.8.2:66, Yahdun-Lim of Mari). He concludes, "The instances of *naši* and *babil* I mentioned still seem to be a special class of their own of which I do not know any other examples."

I will now compare the shapes of the SC and the verbal nouns of *wabālum* in various Akkadian corpora, in order to complement the data of GAG 175i–j and Veenhof 1972:440.

SC	<i>wābil</i>	OA, Mari (?), Sarg.
	<i>babīl</i>	OB (SB)
Part.	<i>wābil-</i>	Ur III, OA, Mari, Tell-R.
	<i>bābil-</i>	not attested (in particular, not in the core OB)
Inf.	<i>wabāl-</i>	OA, <sup>147</sup> Mari
	<i>babāl-</i>	OB

No example of the Part. has been found in the core OB. According to Hilgert 2002:322, 529, the predicative form of *wābil-* is attested at least once in Ur III Akkadian, within the proper name DINGIR-*wa-bil*<sub>2</sub>.

The Inf. *wabāl-* may be attested in Mari at least twice, in broken contexts: *i-na wa-ba-[li-im]* (ARM 10, 14:10), *a-na wa-[ba-lim]* (ARM 26/2, 306:27). In Mari, I know of no inf. *babāl-*, while this shape is represented by some 13 tokens in AbB, where the *wabāl-* shape is unknown (the AbB data are from <http://www.klinopis.cz/nobtc>). Thus, the table shows an isogloss between OA and Mari as against OB: *wabāl-* vs. *babāl-*.

CAD T 11a claims, “note that in OA *tabālu* and *tabīl* serve as inf. and stative of *wabālu*,” yet I have found no corroboration of this idea either in the CAD entry on *tabālu* or in the searchable corpus of OA (see also the entry on *tabālum*).

*tabālum* ‘to take along,’<sup>148</sup> ‘to carry off.’

<sup>147</sup> Cf. e. g. Michel 1991, No. 263:10, cited above as No. 41b (the examples of Inf. were still missing in Veenhof 1972:440).

<sup>148</sup> See Kouwenberg 2005:89–93. Using the results achieved in Kouwenberg 2005, BK comments on the drafts of this entry and the preceding one: “CAD starts from the idea that *tabālum* basically means ‘to take away’ and grudgingly admits that sometimes ‘to take along’ is inescapable. The order is the reverse one: ‘to take away’ is a secondary development arising from ‘to take along.’ As to *wabālum/ tabālum*, the two partly overlap (cf. the imperatives *bilam* and *tablam*), but *tabālum* is more specific: it is more or less exclusively used with concrete objects and does not have any of the numerous figurative meanings of *wabālum*. The typical use of *tabālum* without Vent. is when people acquire things and then ‘take them along’ (to their home or whatever); of course, they also take them away, but I think the focus is not on the separation from their initial locus but on the

The SC of *tabālum* is rare, the VA is not attested in the corpus.<sup>149</sup> All four tokens of *tabil* I have found are **P**, three of them come from OA:

- (1) *i-tū-wa-ar* KÙ.BABBAR-*pu-šu-nu ta-ab-lu té-er-tum wa-ar-kà-num i-lī-kam* *um-ma šu-nu-ma*

‘[the left-hand context of the letter is broken] ... it will return. The amounts of silver belonging to them **were carried off**. Afterwards their message **arrived here**, as follows ...’ (Prag I 738:5’f.).

The SC form *tablū* appears in a clear-cut preterital slot.

- (2) ŠĀ-*ba* 5 TÚG *ur-du-nim* 12 TÚG *ta-áb-lu*

‘[Out of my seventeen garments that had reached the Palace, only] five garments arrived here, twelve garments were taken’ (TMH, I 19b:12f., a legal decision).

The asyndetic coordination of *urdū-nim* and *tablū* favours the same grammatical reading for both verb forms.

- (3) <sup>6</sup>*ša-ru-qū a-na É-tí* <sup>d</sup>*A-šur e-ru-bu-ma ša-am-ša-am ša* GUŠKIN *ša i-ir-tí* <sup>d</sup>*A-šur ú pá-aṭ-ra-am ša* <sup>d</sup>*A-šur* <sup>12</sup>[x (x)] *a ú mī-šu-ru-um ká-lu-bu-ú sà-am-ru-a-tum ú ká-ta-pu ta-ab-lu É-tum lá-qū-ut mī-ma lá e-zī-[bu]*<sup>150</sup> *ša-ri-qī ni-šé-ma lá ni-mar*

<sup>6</sup>Thieves entered Aššur’s temple and <sup>12</sup>[stole?] the golden sun on Aššur’s breast and Aššur’s dagger. The Justice-emblem, the *kalubu*, the *samruūtum*, and the *katappu*—(all these) **were taken away**. The temple has been picked clean, they have left nothing. We keep searching for the thieves but cannot find them’ (*Bab* 6, 186f., No. 7: 6–19; text of Larsen 1976:261f.).

It is likely that the author of this vivid complaint meant *tablū* to be RES and observable: the belongings of the god are conspicuously not where they have to be. Consider my discussion of an exceptional case in No. 33 above, *našpakum ... pateh-ma še’um leqi* ‘the granary ... is broken open and the barley is taken’ (AbB 6, 219:14ff.).

- (4) 0,2,3 ŠE ù 0,0,1 I SILA<sub>3</sub> Ì.GIŠ *ta-bi-il’*

‘(The writer inspected the condition of his master’s household and found out:) 150 *qa* barley and 11 *qa* oil have been taken away’ (MHET I, 89:13; late OB).

---

connection with their new owner, which is juridically the more relevant one, and this accords with its original indirect reflexive meaning.”

<sup>149</sup> In SB, NA and NB, *tablu* is a substantive ‘stolen goods’ (CAD T 29b).

<sup>150</sup> The reading *mī-ma lá e-zī-[ib]* (with the Ed. pr.) ‘nothing has been left’ can be also defended on morphosyntactic grounds: there are a few **P** tokens of *ezīb* in OB (Loesov 2006:144) and in OA.

The evidence on *tabil* is compatible with that on *wabil* in its **P** readings, except that (as BK notes in fn. 148) *tabil* demonstrates no polysemy. The marginal existence of *tabil* is due to the “morphological analogy,” as explained in the previous entry. The dictionaries (AHw. 1297b, CAD T 20b) have no example of the N-stem of *tabālum* for either the core OB or OA. BK’s *Verb List* has one token of the N pret. 3ms. *i-ti-bi<sub>4</sub>-il<sub>5</sub>* (TC 1, 15:29 = OAA 1, 48), analysed differently in CAD N<sub>1</sub> 277a. All in all, OA *tabil* appears in the semantic slot of the SIMPLE PAST **P** for *tabālum*. Filling a paradigmatic gap once more?

*šūbulum* (OB)/*šēbulum* (OA) ‘to send.’

*Šūbulum* is a common causative verb of motion. It has four participants: the Causer (in this case, the sender), the Theme (that which is sent), the Recipient,<sup>151</sup> and the Causee (in this case, the one who does the bearing/bringing). All four of them can be expressed in the same sentence whose predicate is a prefixing form of *šūbulum*. Consider the examples from OA and OB:

- (1) I GÚ 25 MA.NA URUDU *ša ište* PN *algeu ana* PN<sub>1</sub> *ú-šé-bi-il<sub>5</sub>-ku-nu*  
 ‘One talent and 25 minas of copper which I received from PN, I made **you**<sub>pl. acc.</sub> bring **to** PN<sub>1</sub>’ (OAA 1, 71:9–12, ref. and tr. BK).
- (2) (after a list of goods) *mimma annim ana* PN *nu-šé-bi-il<sub>5</sub>-kà*  
 ‘We have made **you**<sub>sg. acc.</sub> bring all this to PN’ (AKT 3, 78:6–11, ref. and tr. BK).
- (3) *tuppam šāti ulū-ma* PN *ulū-ma* PN<sub>1</sub> *ana GN šu-bi-il*  
 ‘Send this letter to Ešnunna with PN<sub>acc.</sub> or PN<sub>1 acc.</sub>’ (ARM 1, 27:12ff., ref. IA, cf. 18, 8:17ff.).
- (4) *luqūtam išti panim wāšim ana šēr-<sub>ni</sub> šé-bi<sub>4</sub>-lá-nim*  
 ‘Send<sub>pl.</sub> **us** (ana šēr- + vent.) the merchandize **with** the first (transport/messenger) to depart’ (TCL 19, 69e.:2ff.).
- (5) *anumma* 2 MA.NA URUDU *uš-ta-bi-la-ak-kum*  
 ‘Look, I am sending **you** two minas of copper’ (AbB 6, 89:4f.).

The Theme is encoded by the Acc., and this is often true of the Causee, if it is expressed at all: in (1)–(3) the Causee is represented by the Acc. of pronouns and nouns, in (4) it is expressed by a prepositional phrase, in (5) it is left unmentioned. Speculatively, it would be possible to form three varieties of the SC of *šūbulum*, one **A** (partly preserving the

<sup>151</sup> It is understood that the Recipient can be metonymically substituted by the Endpoint of sending (to send to GN = to send to PN), if this is required by context.

argument configuration of the prefixing tenses) and two **P** ones, with the Theme (**something** has been sent) or the Causee (**somebody** has been made to carry/bring) as the subject.

In fact, I have not found satisfactory examples of the SC **A** in the whole of the corpus. In AbB, the only promising token is not fully reliable because the text is damaged:

- (6) *bukāšum ... itti zikir šumi ša LÚ GN [a-na] GN<sub>2</sub> šu-bu-l[u x] [... māri] šipri tarādam ukīn*

‘The prince decided to dispatch messengers with the gift that the ruler of Aleppo **had sent** to Babylon’ (AbB 6, 24:9’–14’).

These are the restoration and interpretation offered in the Edition and accepted in CAD T 52a. Yet, as IA suggests to me, a text *itti zikir šumi ša LÚ GN [ša a-na] GN<sub>2</sub> šu-bu-l[u ...]* ‘with the gift of the ruler of Aleppo that **was sent** to Babylon’ would be no worse.

The SC **P** is rare, its subject is always the Theme (an exception is No. 18 at the end of this entry). Below are all five examples found in OA.<sup>152</sup>

- (7) *ku-sí-tám a-ta tal-qé um-ma a-ta-ma a-na a-bi-a šé-bu-lá-at*

‘You took the *kusitum*-textile (yourself), saying: “**it has been sent** to my father”’ (POAT 7:12ff., tr. BK).

- (8) 36 TÚG ... *šé-bu-lu-ni-kum* ‘thirty-six garments ... have been sent to you’ (AMMY 2000, pl. IV, No. 4 = kt e/k 68:2–7, CDLI No. P361204).

- (9) TÚG *ša aššēr* PN *u DUMU* PN<sub>1</sub> *šé-bu-lu-ni piqis-sunūti*

‘The textile **that has been sent** to PN and the son of PN<sub>1</sub>—hand (it) over to them!’ (TCL 4, 13:8ff.).

- (10) 2 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR ... *ša* PN *ana* PN<sub>1</sub> ... *iddin-u-ma ana Ālim ana šī’amātīm šé-bu-lu-ma* DAM.GĀR *wa-du-ú*

‘Two minas of silver ... that PN gave to PN<sub>1</sub> and (that) **have been sent** to the City to make purchases—the owner (of the silver) has been indicated (on the parcel?) [I am the owner, I have a case-enclosed tablet with PN’s seal, the tablet says that the silver is my silver]’ (TCL 4, 22:3–9).<sup>153</sup>

- (11) *i-na té-er-tí-a* KÙ.BABBAR *a-na na-an-du-im šé-bu-lam*

<sup>152</sup> I am grateful to BK and J. G. Dercksen who did their best to help me understand these texts.

<sup>153</sup> On the agreement rule, see GKT 197e. An **A** interpretation ‘silver ... that PN gave to PN<sub>1</sub> and **sent** [= **made** (him = PN<sub>1</sub>) **bring** (it)] to the City’ cannot be excluded. In the light of the data collected in this entry, it is rather unlikely, however.

‘**Has** the silver **been sent** to you (vent.) on my instruction in order to let it lie idle?’ (VAS 26, 69:6f., tr. BK).<sup>154</sup>

In this case, we can explain the evidence by something more tangible than my speculative idea about the “morphological analogy”: the **P** *šēbul* is used instead of the Št<sup>1</sup> Pret. of *wabālum* which is not attested in OA (GKT 158; AHW. 1453b; BK’s *List*) and perhaps in the whole of Akkadian. Moreover, BK points me out in a p. c. that all the alleged instances of Št<sup>1</sup> Pres. of *wabālum* listed in AHW. 1453b have to be relegated to Št<sup>2</sup> ‘to do business with, to trade with.’<sup>155</sup> This means that *šēbul* does a good job: it fills an important paradigmatic gap as best it can, coding the idea of “being sent” for the PAST. This fact is a formal correlate of the semantic claims in the theoretical part of this study which make us predict that the **P** *šēbul* will not be RES. The situations depicted by the above five tokens of *šēbul* are hardly **observable**; these SC forms govern prepositional phrases that code Recipient/Endpoint, which is ill compatible with the idea of RES. The fact they occur in past-time slots that need to be filled anyway squares well with these two non-RES features.<sup>156</sup>

In the core OB, I found an indisputable token of the SC **P** only in § 112 of the CH:

(12) *mimma ša šu-bu-lu ašar šu-bu-lu lā iddin*

‘(if) he (= the person entrusted with delivery) did not dispatch (lit. ‘did not give’) what **had been sent** to where it **had been sent,**’ the

---

<sup>154</sup> BK informs me, “The sentence is a (rhetorical and indignant) question: the sender wants the silver to be used to make a profit. Veenhof has translated this passage in *MOS Studies* 1, p. 64f. as ‘Was it my instruction to have the silver sent in order to let it lie idle?’ which looks as if he took it as an infinitive while at the same time realizing that this is difficult syntactically (he gives no comment).” Hecker (<http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/altass/>) emends the text in order to interpret *šē-bu-lam* as an infinitive: KÙ.BABBAR *a-na na-an-du-im / šē-bu-lam <qá-bi-a-ti>*. The emendation is unnecessary. Note that *šēbul-am* is a rare token of the SC with the directional ventive.

<sup>155</sup> BK also informs me that in the OA corpus there is no single token of Št with a **P** meaning. Does this mean that the stems of the Akkadian verb are no longer a “system” at the beginning of the 2nd millennium B. C.? Note that according to BK’s *List*, Št lexical is attested in OA for more than ten roots and has a high token frequency.

<sup>156</sup> In other words, the writers of OA letters **had** to render the idea “X was sent to PN,” and they found a way to do so. In agreement with this line of reasoning, the subject of *šēbul* is invariably the Theme, while the classical passive-of-causative has the Causee for subject. Indeed, it stands to reason that “he was made to bring” is less needed by the language than “it was brought.”

owner of the sent goods *ina mimma ša šu-bu-lu-ma lā iddin-u ukân-šu* ‘shall prove that he did not dispatch whatever **had been sent**’ (CH 25:60–69).

The **P** *šūbul* is well-known in OB Mari (all the ref. IA), in stereotyped contexts of subordinate (mostly relative) clauses:

- (13) *tuppi PN ša ana šēr bēliya šu-bu-ul ištu GN ikšud-am*  
 ‘A letter of PN that **has been sent** to my lord arrived here from Kurda’ (ARMT 27, 73:6ff.).<sup>157</sup>
- (14) *aššum tuppi LÚ.ME[š pā]terī adi inanna ana šēr bēliya la š[u-b]u-lu*  
 ‘As to the fact that the list of the absentees **has not** up to now **been sent** to my lord ...’ (ARMT 151:23f.).
- (15) *umma anāku-ma aššum mīnim tuppa-ka ša ana šēr bēli-ya šu-bu-lu a-ka-al-la*  
 ‘I answered him, “Why should I keep your tablet that **was sent** to my lord?”’ (ARM 14, 48:44f.).
- (16) *tuppi bēli-ya ša ana GN ... šu-[bu]-lu*  
 ‘The tablet of my lord that had to be sent to GN’ (ARM 3, 59:5f., and cf. a very similar text 9, 124:10).

Thus, the Mari usage of *šūbul* is similar to the OA one. Note also the following Mari text (ref. IA):

- (17) *ša adīni šu-ba-al-ta u GEŠTIN.ḪI.A sí-mi-im ša tušābil-am ša ina kunuk PN kank-u tāb*  
 ‘What **you have sent**<sup>2</sup> up to now and the wine of Simum that you sent me, sealed with the seal of PN, is good’ (A.4723:12ff., published as No. 19 in FM 7).

J.-M. Durand thinks (FM 7:50) that “*šu-ba-al-ta* tient la place d’un *šūbulāta* attendu,” his translation being **A** (‘tu m’as fait porter’). In the light of the data of this entry, I do not expect the SC **A** \**šūbulāta* ‘you have sent’ to show up in a good OB letter. Hence, *šu-ba-al-ta* does not represent a phonetic distortion of \**šūbulāta*<sup>158</sup> and, therefore, is no Akkadian verb form at all.<sup>159</sup>

<sup>157</sup> The sporadic lack of subjunctive marker (*šūbul* rather than *šūbul-u*) is a feature current in Mari archives (Finet 1955:261). This is doubtless a grammatical error.

<sup>158</sup> J.-M. Durand tentatively suggests *šubol(a)ta*.

<sup>159</sup> One solution would be to consider *šu-ba-al-ta* an active Š-causative (2 m. s. sg. suffixing preterite) formed from the PS root *wbl* in a language with Š-causative (like e. g. Ugaritic). Since in this case the *u*-vocalism of the causative prefix (\**šūqtala*) is

Finally, we will have a look at a non-trivial OB example:

- (18) *ullānum inūma bēlni uwa<sup>er</sup>-anniāti abbū ERIN<sub>2</sub>.H1.A-ma ana šērī-ka erēbam-ma lēm šitūli-ka lamādam uwa<sup>er</sup>-anniāti. ERIN<sub>2</sub>.H1.A [= šābam<sub>acc</sub>] ana libbi ālim šurubum ul qabi. Ina warkat dūrīm ina sa<sup>2</sup>-we-e ERIN<sub>2</sub>.H1.A ibiāt-ma ina šērtim ERIN<sub>2</sub>.H1.A ēma alākīm iššer. Birātīm ša i-te-né-ru-bu<sup>160</sup> u mimma zikir šumim ša **šu-bu-la-a-nu** ina āl dūrāni nizzibam-ma ištu annām u annām nūtaḫl-am tayyartani ana šērīka-ma*

‘At that time, when our lord instructed us, he instructed us that the army commanders had to approach you and to learn your considerations.<sup>161</sup> It was not ordered to bring the troops into the city. The troops shall spend the night on the other side of the city wall in the desert, and in the morning they will head to wherever they have to. All the fortresses that they will enter and whatever gifts **we have been sent with** we will leave in the stronghold,<sup>162</sup> and, after we have discussed among ourselves this and that, our return to you (will take place)’ (*BaM* 2, 56:12–22; within the letter, this is a piece of reported speech quoted here in its entirety).

difficult to account for (I would expect *a-*), one could alternatively envisage a borrowing of the Akkadian inf./SC stem *šūbul-* into a WS language: the newly “back-formed” root is *šbl*, the foreign first-syllable [*u*] being preserved. The G-preterite receives the dynamic stem-vowel [*a*], in the way of *qatal*, *qatalta*. A partial parallel would be *šeši* < *ušēši* and *šezib* < *ušēzib* in Aramaic (HALOT 1993). IA proposes me a third solution: *šūbalta* < *\*šawbalta*, in the hope that convincing examples of monophthongization will show up.

<sup>160</sup> This is K. Veenhof’s reading, as BK informs me. A. Falkenstein in the Edition has *x-bu-ni-a-bu<sup>2</sup>*, ‘Die Festungen des ... *buni<sup>2</sup>abu<sup>2</sup>*.’

<sup>161</sup> BK suggests me the following translation of *erēbam-ma ... lamādam uwa<sup>er</sup>-anniāti* ‘... he instructed us **to let** the *abbū šābim* enter in order to learn ...’ In terms of overall meaning, this suggestion suits the immediate context pretty well, yet it yields an even more complex syntactic arrangement than the above translation: *-anniāti* becomes the subject of an implied causative verb, which latter in its turn governs a very complex infinitive clause. As for the inf. complement clause itself, ‘he instructed us that [*abbū ERIN<sub>2</sub>.H1.A-ma ana šērī-ka erēbam-ma lēm šitūli-ka lamādam*],’ it seems to have no parallel in OB. Structurally, this inf. clause is more complex than its OB second-best *dannum enšam ana lā ḫabālim ... awātīya ... aštur* ‘I wrote ... my words ... in order that the mighty one not oppress the weak one’ (CH 47:59ff.), which latter inf. clause is no obligatory complement of *aštur*. Since the former inf. clause is unique, one can only wonder if it is “correct” that its subject is in the Nom. (*abbū*), while the two infinitival predicates are in the Acc.

<sup>162</sup> To save the literal text, BK (p. c.) assumes a zeugma, ‘we will leave all the fortresses they (= *šābum*) will enter, and (we will leave) in the stronghold whatever gifts we have been ordered to bring.’ This then will be a zeugma complicated by a pun based on different senses of *ezēbum*. My translation presupposes an anacoluthon: the writer inadvertently switched from one grammatical subject to another.

The SC form *šu-bu-la-a-nu* was interpreted as **A** by A. Falkenstein in the Edition (‘und allen guten Ruf, den **wir tragen**’) and in CAD M<sub>2</sub> 76a ‘everything which **we are transporting**’. This is wrong first of all because *šūbulum* means ‘to send’ rather than ‘to carry, to bring,’ and because the SC **A** of *šūbulum* does not exist. Thus, *šu-bu-la-a-nu* will be the only known **P** token with Causee as the subject. I believe that *BaM* 2, 56ff. is a fictitious letter, a purely literary composition. Note that the cohesion of this very long letter is weak, its pragmatic purport is not obvious, which is typical of literary letters.<sup>163</sup> This guess would help us digest the syntactic features of *BaM* 2, 56 that are absent from everyday Akkadian letters, including *šūbulānu* ‘we have been sent.’

In the forthcoming part of this study, I will analyse, by way of contrast, certain common verbs whose *paris* shape is very frequent in text, in particular *našūm* ‘to carry,’ *nadūm* ‘to throw,’ *šakānum* ‘to place.’ The burning questions here are the polysemy of respective *paris* forms and explanations of their lexicalized meanings. I will compare OB and OA data on the SC of the three famous “having” verbs (*šabātum*, *leqūm*, and *maḥārum*). I will also address **non-resultative** tokens of the SC of **telic** verbs and will elaborate a theory about their functions. We will then have a look at the SC of **atelic** verbs (cf. the data on *akil*, No. 54 above) and ask what they are doing in Akkadian.

## References

- Albayrak 2004                      Albayrak, I. ‘She Will Live, Eat and Be Anointed together with Them’ *ušbat aklat u paššat ištīšumu*. Dercksen, J. G. (ed.). *Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen*. Leiden. Pp. 9–20.
- Arkipov forthcoming              Arkhipov, I. *Le vocabulaire de la métallurgie et la nomenclature des objets en métal* (MDBP 3 = ARM 32).
- Blau 2010                              Blau, J. *Phonology and Morphology of Biblical Hebrew. An Introduction*. Winona Lake.
- Buccellati 1968                      Buccellati, G. An Interpretation of the Akkadian Stative as a Nominal Sentence. *JNES* 27:1–12.
- Buccellati 1996                      Buccellati, G. *A Structural Grammar of Babylonian*. Wiesbaden.
- Charpin 1991                        Charpin, D. Un traité entre Zimri-Lim de Mari et Ibâl-pî-El II d’Ešnunna. Charpin, D.; Joannès, F. (eds.). *Marchands, diplomates et empereurs. Études sur la civilisation mésopotamienne offertes à Paul Garelli*. Paris. Pp. 139–166.

<sup>163</sup> On OB fictitious letters see Sasson 1985:250f. (ref. IA).

- Charpin–Ziegler 2007 Charpin, D.; Ziegler, N. Amurritisch lernen. *WZKM* 97: 55–77.
- Cohen 1984 Cohen, D. *La phrase nominale et l'évolution du système verbal en sémitique. Etudes de syntaxe historique*. Leuven–Paris.
- Dahl 1985 Dahl, Ö. *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford.
- Dercksen 2001 Dercksen, J. G. “When We Met in Ḫattuš.” Trade according to Old Assyrian texts from Alishar and Boğazköy. Van Soldt, W. H. et al. (eds.). *Veenhof Anniversary Volume*. Leiden. Pp. 39–66.
- Durand 2001 Durand, J.-M. Une alliance matrimoniale entre un marchand assyrien de Kanesh et un marchand Mariote. Van Soldt, W. H. et al. (eds.). *Veenhof Anniversary Volume*. Leiden. Pp. 119–132.
- Durand 2004 Durand, J.-M. Peuplement et sociétés à l'époque amorrite (I). Les clans bensim'alites. Nicolle, Chr. (ed.). *Nomades et sédentaires dans le Proche-Orient ancien* (CRRAI 46). Paris. Pp. 111–197.
- Finet 1955 Finet, A. *L'accadien des lettres de Mari*. Gembloux.
- Goetze 1936 Goetze, A. The *t*-Form of the Old Babylonian Verb. *JAOs* 56:297–334.
- Goetze 1942 Goetze, A. The So-called Intensive of the Semitic Languages. *JAOs* 62:1–8.
- Goetze 1956 Goetze, A. *The Laws of Eshnunna* (AASOR 31). New Haven.
- Goetze 1958 Goetze, A. *Fifty Old Babylonian Letters from Harmal* (reprinted from *Sumer*, vol. 14). Baghdad.
- Haspelmath 1990 Haspelmath, M. The Grammaticization of Passive Morphology. *Studies in Language* 14:25–72.
- Hasselbach 2005 Hasselbach, R. *Sargonic Akkadian*. Wiesbaden.
- Hecker 1995 Hecker, K. Rechtlos in der Fremde? *AMMK* 1995:145–159. Ankara.
- Hilgert 2002 Hilgert, M. *Akkadisch in der Ur III-Zeit*. Münster.
- Hopper–Thompson 1980 Hopper, P. J.; Thompson, S. A. Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language* 56:251–99.
- Huehnergard 1986 Huehnergard, J. On Verbless Clauses in Akkadian. *ZA* 76:218–249.
- Huehnergard 1987 Huehnergard, J. Stative, Predicative, Pseudo-Verb. *JNES* 46:215–232.
- Huehnergard 1997 Huehnergard, J. *A Grammar of Akkadian*. Atlanta.
- Izre'el–Cohen 2004 Izre'el, Sh.; Cohen, E. *Literary Old Babylonian*. München.
- Jaxontov 1983 Yaxontov, S. Y. Resultative in Chinese. Nedjalkov, V. P. (ed.). *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Moscow. Pp. 67–60 (Yahontov, S. J. Rezul'tativ v kitajskom jazyke. Nedjalkov, V. P. (red.). *Tipologija rezul'tativnyh konstrukcij*).

- Koch-Westenholz 2000 Koch-Westenholz, U. *Babylonian Liver Omens: The Chapters manzāzu, padānu and pān tākalti of the Babylonian Extispicy Series Mainly from Assurbanipal's Library*. Copenhagen.
- Kouwenberg 1997 Kouwenberg, N. J. C. *Gemination in the Akkadian Verb*. Assen.
- Kouwenberg 1998 Kouwenberg, N. J. C. Review of Buccellati 1996. *BiOr* 55: 172–185.
- Kouwenberg 2000 Kouwenberg, N. J. C. Nouns as Verbs: The Verbal Nature of the Akkadian Stative. *Or* 69:21–71.
- Kouwenberg 2005 Kouwenberg, N. J. C. Reflections on the Gt-stem in Akkadian. *ZA* 95:77–103.
- Kouwenberg 2010 Kouwenberg, N. J. C. *The Akkadian Verb and Its Semitic Background*. Winona Lake.
- Kozinskij 1988 Kozinskij, I. Š. Resultatives: Results and Discussion. Nedjalkov, V. P. (ed.). *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Moscow. Pp. 497–525.
- Kraus 1984 Kraus, F. R. *Nominalsätze in Altbabylonischen Briefen und der Stativ*. Amsterdam.
- Kraus 1987 Kraus, F. R. *Sonderformen akkadischer Parataxe: die Koppe-lungen*. Amsterdam.
- Lambert–Millard 1999 Lambert, W. G.; Millard, A. R. *Atra-ḫasīs. The Babylonian Story of the Flood*. Oxford.
- Larsen 1976 Larsen, M. *The Old Assyrian City-State and Its Colonies*. Copenhagen.
- Leong 1994 Leong, T. F. *Tense, Mood and Aspect in Old Babylonian*. PhD. Diss. UCLA.
- Loesov 2004 Loesov, S. T-Perfect in Old Babylonian: The Debate and a Thesis. *B&B* 1:83–181.
- Loesov 2005 Loesov, S. Akkadian Sentences about the Present Time (I). *B&B* 2:101–148.
- Loesov 2006 Loesov, S. Akkadian Sentences about the Present Time (II/1). *B&B* 3:133–148.
- Loesov 2006a Loesov, S. Marginalia on the Akkadian Ventive. *B&B* 3: 101–132.
- Loesov 2010 Loesov, S. Akkadian Sentences about the Present Time (II/2). *B&B* 4:759–785.
- Loesov 2011 Loesov, S. IPTANARRAS Can Render the “Basic” Present (Akkadian Sentences about the Present Time III/1) *B&B* 6:149–168.
- Lyons 1977 Lyons, J. *Semantics*. Cambridge.
- Meillet 1934 Meillet, A. *Le Slave commun*. Paris.
- Metzler 2002 Metzler, K. *Tempora in altbabylonischen literarischen Texten*. Münster.
- Michel 1991 Michel, C. *Innāya dans les tablettes paléo-assyriennes*. Paris.
- Michel 1998 Michel, C. Les marchands et les nombres: l'exemple des Assyriens a Kaniš. Prosecky, J. (ed.). *Intellectual Life of the Ancient Near East* (CRRAI 43). Prague. Pp. 249–267.

- Nedjalkov 1988 Nedjalkov, V. P. (ed.). *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Amsterdam.
- Nedjalkov 2001 Nedjalkov, V. P. Resultative Constructions. Haspelmath, M. (ed.). *Language Typology and Universals. An International Handbook*. Vol. 2. Berlin–New York. Pp. 928–940.
- Oshima 2001 Oshima, T. Two Notes on Expressions with *ina pī* ... “in the mouth of ...” in “Prayer to Marduk 1.” *NABU* 2001/15:15–18.
- Patterson 1970 Patterson, R. D. *Old Babylonian Parataxis as Exhibited in the Royal Letters of the Middle Old Babylonian Period and in the Code of Hammurabi*. PhD. Diss. UCLA.
- Reichenbach 1947 Reichenbach, H. *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. New York.
- Reiner 1970 Reiner, E. Akkadian. Sebeok, T. A. (ed.). *Linguistics in South West Asia and North Africa*. The Hague. Pp. 274–303.
- Roth 1995 Roth, M. *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor*. Atlanta.
- Rowton 1962 Rowton, M. B. The Use of the Permissive in Classic Babylonian. *JNES* 21:233–303.
- Sapir 1921 Sapir, E. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York.
- Sasson 1985 Sasson, J. M. Yarim-Lim’s War Declaration. Durand, J.-M.; Kupper, J.-R. (eds.). *Miscellanea Babylonica (FS Maurice Birot)*. Paris. Pp. 237–255.
- Smith 1997 Smith, C. *The Parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht.
- Steinkeller 2005 Steinkeller, P. Of Stars and Men: The Conceptual and Mythological Setup of Babylonian Extispicy. Gianto, A. (ed.). *Biblical and Oriental Essays in Memory of William L. Moran*. Roma. Pp. 11–48.
- Streck 1995 Streck, M. *Zahl und Zeit. Grammatik der Numeralia und des Verbalsystems im Spätbabylonischen*. Groningen.
- Streck 2005 Streck, M. P. Akkadisch. Streck, M. P. (ed.). *Sprachen des Alten Orients*. Darmstadt. Pp. 44–79.
- Tropper 1995 Tropper, J. Die semitische “Suffixkonjugation” im Wandel. Dietrich, M.; Loretz, O. (eds.). *Vom Alten Orient zum Alten Testament. Festschrift für Wolfram Freiherrn von Soden*. Neukirchen-Vluyn. Pp. 491–516.
- Ulshöfer 1995 Ulshöfer, A. M. Die altassyrischen Privaturkunden (FAOS. Bh. 4). Stuttgart.
- Ungnad 1918 Ungnad, A. “Haben” im Babylonisch-Assyrischen. *ZA* 31:277–281.
- Vaillant 1948 Vaillant, A. *Manuel du vieux slave*. Vol. 1. *Grammaire*. Paris.
- Veenhof 1972 Veenhof, K. R. *Aspects of Old Assyrian Trade and Its Terminology*. Leiden.
- Veenhof 2008 Veenhof, K. R. The Death and Burial of Ishtar-lamassi in Karum Kanish. Van der Spek, R. J. (ed.). *Studies in the Ancient Near Eastern World View and Society (FS M. Stol)*. Bethesda. Pp. 97–119.

- 
- Veenhof 2008a            Veenhof, K. R. Communication in the Old Assyrian Trading Society by Caravans, Travelers and Messengers. Michel, C. (ed.). *Old Assyrian Studies in Memory of Paul Garelli*. Leiden. Pp. 199–246.
- Voigt 2002–2003        Voigt, R. Die beiden Suffixkonjugation des Semitischen (und Ägyptischen). *ZAH* 15/16:138–165.
- Yaron 1988             Yaron, R. *The Laws of Eshmunna*. Jerusalem–Leiden.

