

## Akkadian Sentences about the Present Time (II/2)

Sergey Loesov

Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow

The present contribution is a continuation of my enquiry into the ways Akkadian verb expresses contemporaneity with a reference point.<sup>1</sup> In this part, I continue the analysis of the verb list started in Loesov 2006. The first draft of this verb list was compiled on the basis of the OB glossary in Huehnergard 1997 (see Loesov 2006:140f. for the selection criteria); it comprised some 130 verbs common in OB letters. Later, I decided to expand the list by including some verbs from the glossary of Streck 2006.<sup>2</sup> In the introductory note to the glossary, M. P. Streck explains: “Der folgende Grundwortschatz enthält alle häufigen altbabylonische Wörter. Aufgenommen sind alle Wörter, die im Akkadischen Handwörterbuch von W. von Soden einen Eintrag aufweisen, der mindestens eine Halbe Spalte lang ist” (p. 204). To complicate matters even more, I have added to the list a few common OA verbs that do not appear in either of the OB textbook glossaries. I believe that as far as the verbal morphosyntax (and perhaps grammar in general) goes, the Kültepe correspondence is the closest approximation to an Akkadian vernacular of the 2nd millennium one can ever get in our sources. Therefore, some frequent Old Assyrian verbs (mostly not technical terms of business) have to be included in the list (certain OA examples were crucial for the previous parts of this study). The OA corpus used in this study is largely limited to texts that K. Hecker made available online (<http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de>).

The numbering of entries in the verb list continues from Loesov 2006. For the entry organization and abbreviations, see Loesov 2006:140f.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The previous parts of this study were published in *B&B* 2:101–148 (= Loesov 2005) and *B&B* 3:133–148 (= Loesov 2006).

<sup>2</sup> I am grateful to Prof. M. P. Streck for allowing me to use the manuscript of his textbook *Altbabylonische Grammatik*.

<sup>3</sup> In the present contribution, there are gaps in the alphabetic listing of entries. E. g., (45) *mâtum* ‘to die’ is followed by (46) *qerēbum* ‘to approach,’ while some entries that are expected to be in between are now missing. The verbs that have been left out will be added in the last part of this study. An alphabetical index of all analysed verbs with their respective numbers will be supplied.

The rest of the entries and a discussion chapter will be published in the future issues of *B&B*. In the meantime, I am going to put forward a few interpretative observations. In Loesov 2005, I claim that the Pres. *iparras* has problems coding telic events, and this is because *iparras* is supposedly an “Old Present.” Yet an obvious question arises: How did this come about while no competing New Present was emerging, since Akkadian (unlike most other branches of Semitic) developed no New Present?<sup>4</sup> I suggest a speculative answer to this question. Akkadian, like most Semitic languages, felt a need to renew the methods of coding the Present Time sense. From the perspective of the Central Semitic, the easiest way to do so would have been to create a denominative Present using the base of the Active Participle. Yet, for Akkadian this path was unavailable, because what the traditional grammar of Akkadian calls “Participle” is an agent noun fully preserving its morphological (i. e., derivational) meaning when used predicatively, as e. g. in an OA sentence *rābiṣāti attā* ‘you are a representative.’ The predicative use of the Participle is very rare, and it is never used as an attributive adjective. Thus, in an Akkadian translation of English sentences like, “I saw a playing child/burning building,” we would be unable to use participles as attributive adjectives the way they are used in English. To quote Kouwenberg forthcoming 8.4.3, “Since the Akkadian present participle is primarily an agent noun, cannot express concomitant action, and is hardly ever used as a predicate, it is an unlikely source for the creation of new tense/aspect forms.” As a matter of fact, the Proto-Semitic nominal pattern  $*R_1\bar{a}R_2iR_3-$  itself was a garden variety agent noun and no “participle,”<sup>5</sup> so, in order to ultimately become the source of a New Present in various daughter languages of the Proto-Semitic,  $R_1\bar{a}R_2iR_3-$  had in the first place to get firmly entrenched in the nominal predicate slot (a step never taken by Ak-

---

<sup>4</sup> I thank Dr. Kouwenberg for posing such a question to me in a p. c., as well as for his critique formulated both in our correspondence and in his forthcoming book *The Akkadian Verb and Its Semitic Background* (= Kouwenberg forthcoming), which he sent me as a manuscript. Much of my thinking about Akkadian verb has been taking shape in an ongoing dialogue with Kouwenberg’s ideas, which, I believe, will profoundly impact our understanding of the Akkadian grammar in the years to come.

<sup>5</sup> This is born out by the way the reflexes of the PS  $*R_1\bar{a}R_2iR_3-$  are used in noun phrases of individual Semitic languages, in particular in Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic.

kadian), and hereafter to be adjectivized in this very slot, i. e., to undergo a shift from “X [is] a doer” to “X [is] doing.”<sup>6</sup>

Now then, the etymologically primary meaning of the SC is the resultative one, i. e. it is far away from depicting ongoing events. Cross-linguistically, the resultative forms of transitive verbs may have both passive and active readings (Nedjalkov ed. 1988), which is especially true of the Akkadian SC. Yet, the “active” resultative is unstable, it is not salient (“observable”) or relevant enough: the resultative sense is much easier oriented patient-wise than agent-wise, since it is the patient that is normally affected by a transitive action. This is why the “Active Statives” of the traditional grammar were easily shifting to dynamic (fientive, non-resultative) uses, which, as I claim in Loesov 2005, can be both perfective (Preterite-like) and progressive (Present-like). *Faute de mieux*, Akkadian pressed this inherent resource into the service of renewing the Present Time semantic domain. Another relevant feature is the *imperfective* nature of the Stative-Resultative: Imperfectivity is a semantic element that resultative verb forms share with genuine dynamic Present Tenses, and this commonality may also have played a part in the assumed shift.<sup>7</sup> Kouwen-

<sup>6</sup> Note that the denominative New Present of Aramaic had no chance to emerge through a shift from the noun phrase to the nominal sentence (\*a doing X > X [is] doing), since in Aramaic  $R_1\bar{a}R_2\bar{a}R_3$  is not a productive attributive adjective.

<sup>7</sup> This topic is fraught with theoretical questions about motives and mechanisms of grammatical change. The real problem is: Could *iparras* give up (and share with something else) part of its present-tense functions if no innovative form or construction **that was destined to win**, i. e., **to replace** *iparras* completely, was in view? The problem of a more or less stable grammatical competition was most recently treated (among other themes related to the notion of “linguistic complexity”) in Dahl 2004. Östen Dahl adduces some well-known instances of “pattern competition” in the contemporary European languages, e. g. *voy a trabajar* and *trabajaré* in Spanish, “the choice between the perfect and the simple past as ways of expressing past time reference in languages such as English or Scandinavian” (p. 129), variation of “short” and “long” inflectional forms of predicative adjectives in Russian. He believes that “[c]ompetitive situations like the ones mentioned here are difficult for the structuralist ideal, with a system of neat oppositions ‘où tout se tient’” (ibid.). As noted in the previous parts of this study, in written records of Akkadian there exists a kind of competition between the Pres. and the SC in the Present Time domain. This applies mostly (but not exclusively) to outspoken semantically low-transitivity verbs, both with and without a direct object. A list of such verbs found earlier includes *akālum* ‘to have usufruct of,’ *baqārum* ‘to claim,’ *hašālum* ‘to need, desire,’ *kalūm* ‘to hold, detain,’ *nazāqum* ‘to worry,’ *parādum* ‘to care, be afraid,’ *takālum* ‘to trust,’ *wašūm* ‘to have exit,’ *wašābum* ‘to live, be around.’

berg forthcoming 7.3 argues: “In 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.” Binnick 1991:187, to whom K. refers at this juncture, indeed says: “States are largely involitional, involuntary. Therefore they cannot be agentive, and consequently any structure presupposing agency, for example [...] the imperative (*be tall!*) is excluded.” Yet, in Akkadian the SC can have an agentive grammatical subject, e. g. it is used within the prohibitive construction (and with the directional ventive!): *ana eqlim šuāti mamman lā ʔe<sub>4</sub>-hi-a-am* ‘nobody has to approach this field!’ (AbB 4, 125:14).

An interim conclusion from this study, focused on the ways the SC and the Pres. of individual verbs are used in OB and OA, suggests that the SC is more unpredictable than GAG and subsequent grammatical research have it. According to GAG 126f., the only important restriction on the formation of the SC is the atelic semantics of a given verb, which is true in many cases (but not always, cf. the list of verbs in fn. 7). Kouwenberg forthcoming 7.3 claims (following GAG) that “the fientive verb itself must be telic in order to have a stative at all,” yet this claim is not sharp enough. Indeed, the criterion of (a)telicity may turn out to be not that crucial.<sup>8</sup> Now, let us recall the semantic taxonomies of verbs that are current in typological studies (as described in Loesov 2005): very roughly, these taxonomies are based on the four Vendlerian classes (states, atelic processes, telic processes, punctual events), combined with the criteria of agentivity and transitivity (the latter understood both syntactically and semantically). If we then examine a given cross-linguistically identifiable semantic group of Akkadian verbs, we will be unable to tell from their *prima facie* semantic and syntactic properties whether their SC is productive and whether it appears in our records at all, and if it does, what it means. By contrast, as regards the Pres. and Pret., we can safely assume their existence and predict their meanings for most dictionary items of the G-stem (the few conspicuous exceptions are well-known and entered in textbooks and reference grammars of Akkadian). The *t*-Perf. is much

---

<sup>8</sup> GAG 126f. does imply that telic verbs normally form the SC, but all three von Soden’s examples are infelicitous, which is hardly incidental. Thus, *tebi* ‘ist aufgestanden = ist auf’ is exceptional (i. e., *tebûm* is a basic motion verb, yet its SC is quite rare), *wa-šl-a-at* (CH VIII rev.:7) is doubtless a predicative “participle,” *erbet* ‘ist eingetreten = ist darin’ is also exceptional.

less frequent in text than the two basic tenses, yet so far no serious semantic restrictions on its formation have been reported.<sup>9</sup> I see at least two problems with the SC: (1) If a given frequent (non-atelic) verb does not have a productive SC, why is this so? (2) Why does the SC develop lexicalized meanings of its own the way the other “tenses” do not?<sup>10</sup> As a random example, consider a list of some frequent motion verbs, both transitive and intransitive, that include in their argument structure (always or in most contexts) the goal of movement, i. e., some of them are likely to be telic: *wabālu* ‘to bring, carry,’ *šūbulum* ‘to send, deliver,’ (*ana X*) *alāku* ‘to go/come to X,’ *elūm* ‘to go up (to a landmark),’ *erēbum* ‘to enter,’ *kašādum* ‘to reach,’ *qerēbum* ‘to draw near,’ *sanāqum* ‘to reach,’ *šapārum* ‘to send,’ *tārum* ‘to return,’ *tarādum* ‘to send,’ *tehūm* ‘to approach,’ *warādum* ‘to go/ come down (to a landmark),’ *wārum* ‘to go (up to),’ *zabālum* ‘to carry, transport.’ It turns out that for most of these motion verbs the SC is either unattested or very rare, for some of them it is frequent, and in certain contexts (or in lexicalized meanings) it may have been productive. And this unpredictability of the SC will probably be the case for almost any group of Akkadian verbs singled out on semantic grounds just outlined. One wonders what this massive lexicalization (and marginalization?) of the SC tells us about the history of the Akkadian and Semitic verb.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Kouwenberg forthcoming 6.3, fn. 8 notes that “the *t*-perfect is not, like the stative, restricted to telic verbs: prototypically atelic verbs, such as *to dance*, and *to walk around*, are also used in the *t*-perfect.”

<sup>10</sup> The problem receives attention in Kouwenberg forthcoming 7.3. K. explains lexicalization of the SC (he has mostly “active statives” in mind) by its cross-linguistic semantic properties of a resultative verb form: zero transitivity/agentivity, stativity (= zero dynamics), no morphologically encoded active vs. passive voice distinction. Yet, a question arises: Why then for resultative verb forms in other languages no massive lexical shifts have been reported, but rather restrictions on productivity (for these latter see Nedjalkov ed. 1988)?

<sup>11</sup> I still believe (see Loesov 2005:142ff. for argumentation) that the SC first made its appearance as the resultative inflectional form of dynamic transitive verbs. Later it expanded (perhaps not always equally successfully) to other semantic groups of verbs, and then, as the last stage in its inner-Akkadian development, the SC came to be used for optional morphological identification of nominal predicates, both adjectives and nouns. Kouwenberg (forthcoming 7.4.1) also maintains his earlier view that “the univerbation which created the stative started with primary adjectives and spread from there to past participles, which have the same form” (cf. Kouwenberg 2000). In the fn. 48 of that chapter K. argues that my etymology “seems to be contradicted by Berber, where the suffix conjugation is only open to primary adjectives.” Yet, given the current state of

(38) *kullumum* ‘to show; to assign’

To code the Experiencer, i. e., the one to whom something is shown, assigned, etc., the prefixing tenses use the acc.: 1D GN *li-ka-al-li-mu-ka* ‘let them show you the Gabûm canal’ (AbB 4, 74:10f.). In all the attested cases from OB letters, the SC is **P**, with the Experiencer as the syntactic subject: (1) *itâm ša kirîm ša ibaššû išariš ul ku-ul-lu-ma-nu* ‘We have not been properly shown the existing boundary of that garden’ (AbB 14, 91:28f.); (2) *ittî-kunu bā’erûtam e[pe]šam ku-ul-lu-mu-ma taprik-am-ma ana bā’erûtîm epēšîm [ul t]addin-aššunûti* ‘They have been 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, Stol’s translation); (3) *kîma šattišam ku-ul-lu-ma-ta* ‘As you experience each year’ (AbB 7, 169:9f.),<sup>12</sup> (4) *kîma ištu labîrtîm É-ti na-ap-ta-ri-ia šisâm u aḫîtam lā ku-ul-lu-mu ul tîde* ‘Do you not know that from of old my guest-house has never been “shown” summons and extraordinary duties?’ (AbB 2, 97:1–5, cf. CAD K 523a). The SC **P** appears a few more times in stereotyped adverbial *kîma*-clauses: ‘have votive gifts made *kîma ku-ul-lu-ma-ta* as you have been assigned’ (AbB 9, 182:22), ‘the rites of the seventh day, *kîma ku-ul-lu-ma-a-ta* as you have been instructed, perform!’ (AbB 14, 50:10’), ‘bring garlic and onions *kîma ku-ul-lu-mu* as it has been prescribed’ (AbB 2, 99:14).<sup>13</sup> These are all the examples in OB letters I am aware of. One token is known from an OB physiognomic text: *šumma awîlum pa-ga-ar šî-ru-šu pūšam ku-ul-lu-u[m]-ma u nu-uq-di itaddu* ‘if a man’s body/flesh<sup>14</sup> shows white spot(s) and is dotted with *nuqdu*-marks’ (A/O 18, 66:42).<sup>15</sup> A syntactic analogy with the letters allows one to interpret the first clause of the protasis as ‘if his flesh is shown/assigned white spots’

---

Afroasiatic grammatical reconstruction, there can be no saying whether the Berber evidence reflects the situation in a Berber-Semitic proto-language.

<sup>12</sup> Kraus translates ‘Wie du alljährlich hast erleben lassen,’ but without an (at least implicit) personal object this translation does not really make much sense. Note that in AbB 7, 177:10 Kraus restores *ki-ma ša-at-ti-ša-am ku-ul-l[u-ma-ta]* ‘Wie du alljährlich erlebst.’ This usage is passive, ‘you are shown.’

<sup>13</sup> The last example is exceptional. If I understand it correctly, it does not quite belong here. The clause seems to be “impersonal,” as against *kîma kullumâta* ‘you (ms) have been prescribed/told.’ In other words, the syntactic subject of this *kullumû* is no Experiencer, but rather an unnamed Agent.

<sup>14</sup> According to the Edition, *pa-ga-ar šî-ru-šu* ‘is a mistake of the scribe or a gloss showing a variant from a duplicate.’

<sup>15</sup> The translation “shows” appears both in the Edition (Köcher and Oppenheim) and CAD K 521.

(i. e., by a deity), but this is by no means certain.<sup>16</sup> In OA, the SC has not been found, while the prefixing tenses are well-known, especially in the meaning ‘to produce a tablet’ (CAD K 521f.).

↓ In (2), the SC appears with the sequencing conjunction *-ma* within the narrative part of the letter, which makes a genuinely resultative reading hardly possible. In (3) and (4), the time adverbials *šattišam* and *ištu labirtim* exclude the resultative interpretation of the SC. Thus, at least in these cases the SC is used instead of the regular past tenses of *kullumum*.

No VA.

(39) *labāšum* ‘to put on clothing’

The SC in the sense ‘to wear clothing, to have clothes, to be clothed, to be covered’ is common, cf. CAD L 17f. The following keen observation in the discussion section of CAD L 22 is especially valid for the OB and OA: *labāšum* G is used in the SC only (‘to wear’), while the prefixing tenses (‘to put on’) and the infinitive are usually supplied by the Gt forms of the same root. The SC of Gt is not in use in OB and OA letters.<sup>17</sup>

↓ This suppletion probably has to do with the fact that ‘to wear’ is a stative notion, while ‘to put on’ is a telic one.<sup>18</sup> That the G-stem of *labāšum* exists only in the guise of the SC is a retention: ‘to put on’ is usually expressed by *litbušum*, the causative sense ‘to clothe’ by *lubbušum* (CAD L 22). Thus, both indirect reflexive and causative for this root acquired explicit morphological markers, with the resulting ousting of the prefixing forms of *labāšum* G from Akkadian.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> CAD K 521b brings a similar example with the Pres. (SB Alu): ‘If the eyes of an ox ... *pūša ú-kal-lam* show the whites’ (CT 40, 32rev.:17).

<sup>17</sup> According to Kouwenberg forthcoming 14.3.4, in SB the SC forms *litbuš* and *labiš* interchange freely, since in this corpus “the number of lexicalized Gt-stems increases drastically.” The *t*-Perf. of *nalbušum* (*ittalbaš*) fills the slot of the non-existing *t*-Perf. of *litbušum* (CAD L 19, 22), because *t*-stems do not usually form the *t*-Perf.

<sup>18</sup> Cross-linguistically, these concepts are often expressed by different roots, as in English, cf. e. g. also Spanish *traer* ~ *ponerse*, Russian *nosit’* ~ *nadevat’*. In Syriac, they are expressed by different stems of the root *lbš*, in the way reminiscent of Akkadian: ‘he wears’ is usually *lbīš* (a conjugated resultative adjective), while ‘he (has) put on/will put on’ is often coded by the finite verb forms of *t*-stems (PS 1888, CSD 235).

<sup>19</sup> The meaning of *ilbaš*/\**ilabbaš* was ‘to put on,’ i. e. indirect reflexive (fully alive in BH *lābaš* (*lābēš*)/*yilbaš*). It was supplanted by the Gt stem because the latter is an overt exponent of the detransitive meaning (indirect reflexive is a particular

VA *labšu* ‘clad, arrayed,’ attested predominantly in SB lexical texts within a compound *labiš kitê* ‘linen-wearer’ (a temple official).

(40) *lapātum* ‘to touch; to affect; to write down’

The SC is frequent in **A** readings and common in **P** readings, which might be expected of certain low-transitivity more-than-one-place verbs. Cf. the following examples of the **A** usage in OB: *awilū ... la-a[p-t]u-ni-in-ni* ‘die Männer ... haben mich angegriffen’ (AbB 8, 22:3ff.), *ana alpim PN u PN<sub>2</sub> la-ap-tu-ni-a-ti* ‘PN and PN<sub>2</sub> keep bothering (?) us on account of the ox’ (TIM 2, 78:49 = CAD L 86a, tentatively accepted in AbB 8, 78:49 ‘greifen uns hart wegen (dieses) Rindes an’), *tamū qaqqad ilī-šunu la-ap-tu* ‘they have sworn, they have touched the head of their god’ (MDP 24, 337rev.:12 = CAD L 85a, OB Susa). In OB, the **P** reading is well attested for the meaning ‘to water,’ ‘to smear a surface with a liquid’: *ṭēm eqel GN mala mē la-ap-tu šupram ... u ṭēm eqel GN<sub>2</sub> mala eršu u mē la-ap-tu šupram* ‘schreibe mir einen Bericht über das Feld in GN, wieviel bewässert ist ... schreibe mir auch einen Bericht über das Feld in GN<sub>2</sub>, wieviel bestellt und wieviel bewässert ist’ (AbB 6, 114:19–25), *šumma martum damam la-ap-ta-at* ‘if the gall bladder is smeared with blood’ (YOS 10, 31 xii 11). Cf. also an OB example for the meaning ‘to affect,’ with the cause participant in the accusative: barley *kalmatam la-pi-it* ‘is infested by vermin’ (AbB 14, 56:21). This **P** usage is well-known in OA: *ni-ša-me-ma TÚG.ĤIA sā-sá-am lá-áp-tù* ‘we have heard that the textiles **are** moth **infested**’ (CTMMA I, 77:7ff.);<sup>20</sup> *kīma šimūm ša akkidīyē lá-áp-tù-ni* ‘since the trade in Akkadian textiles has been affected (I have not sent you any)’ (TCL 1, 2:11f., tr. of Veenhof 1972:377). In Kültepe, the **P** reading in the meaning ‘to be written down, recorded, entered into a document’ is ubiquitous, e. g. ‘x silver *ina ṭuppiṣ labīrim la-ap-tù* are recorded on the old tablet’ (TCL 21, 184:6), *šu-um-šu i-na É kà-ri-im lá-pi-it* ‘sein Name ist im Karum-Haus eingetragen’ (Prag I 482:6f.). In OB, the SC is also used in the meaning directly derived from the VA (‘to be bad, evil-portending, abnormal, anomalous’): *têrētum mādiš la-ap-ta* ‘the exta are very anomalous’ (ARM 2,

---

manifestation of the detransitive meaning, along with direct reflexive, reciprocal, passive, etc.). The SC *labiš* survived just because the SC is in itself detransitive, so in this case there was no need to renew the morphological shape. Kouwenberg forthcoming counts *labāšu* with “middle verbs” (3.5.2.4, 18.3.1, with references to earlier literature on this kind of verbs in Semitic).

<sup>20</sup> See Michel 1998 for more examples of this kind.

39:64), *šumma bamtum imittam la-ap-ta-at* ‘if the thorax is abnormal on the right side’ (YOS 10, 48:41), see more examples in CAD L 88b.<sup>21</sup>

↓ The above contrast in interpretations between ‘haben mich angegriffen’ and ‘greifen uns hart’ is required by the respective contexts, its grammatical justification presents no problem, since *lapātum* is a ‘taking-hold-of’ verb with an “active” trans. SC of the *eqlam šabtāku* type. This means that its temporal interpretation may be either PERFECT-RESULTATIVE or PRESENT-STATIVE, depending on the context. The last-mentioned meaning of the SC ‘to be abnormal’ does not belong with the rest of its meanings, here we come across a homonymy of sorts: *lapit* ‘is abnormal’ is a genuine conjugated verbal *adjective* (in the same sense as *lū awīlāta* ‘be a gentleman!’ is a conjugated *noun*), it has no prefixing finite forms at its side, while all the other tokens of the SC discussed in this entry are members of the finite paradigm of *lapātum*, their relationship to the rest of finite forms is transparent: *eqlum mē lapit* ‘the field has been irrigated’ vs. *eqlam mē luput* ‘irrigate the field!’ (see CAD L 86).

VA *laptum* ‘injured; affected (by disease); unfavourable (of omen).’

(41) *lupputum* ‘to touch, to smear, to write, to tarry’

The SC has much the same kind of readings as that of *lapātum*. In OB, the **P** reading is frequent in extispicy protases: DIŠ *šēlum ša imittim damam lu-pu-ut* ‘if the right rib is smeared with blood’ (YOS 10, 47:86). In Kül-tepe, both **A** and **P** readings for the meaning ‘to write’ are attested: *me-eḫ-**ra-at** ma-mi-tim ... a-na kà-ri-im lá-pu-ta-nim* ‘the copies of the oath have been written down for the *kārum*’ (CCT 4, 30a:8ff.), AN.NA *ša i-na tuḫ-pi-im lá-pu-ta-ku-ni* ‘(the amount of) tin for which I have been entered into the document’ (CCT 4, 1a:10f.), *na-āš-pè-er-tám [ša a-n]a šé-er I-li-a [Puzur<sub>4</sub>]-A-šur lá-pu-tù* ‘was das Schreiben betrifft, [das Puz]ur-Aššur [a]n Ilīja geschrieben hat ...’ (Prag I 661:18–20). The meaning ‘to tarry, to be delayed’ (CAD L 92) is attested only in OB (OA renders this sense with *saḫārum*), cf. an example of the SC with this meaning: *ištu inanna UD.5.KAM ... lu-up-pu-ta-a-ku* ‘I am going to stay (here) for another five days from now’ (LHarm 1:37ff.). Among the many individual senses of *lupputum*, this is the only intransitive one. Most probably, it first arose in the SC via a semantic shift of the ‘to be touched’ meaning, and later this

<sup>21</sup> Ilya Khait (RSUH, The Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts) suggests me in a p. c. that YOS 10, 48:41 and its likes might have to be interpreted as ‘smeared (with blood),’ i. e. they are a kind of shorthand for *damam lapit*.

new meaning developed its own prefixing tenses: *tuppi bēliya ú-la-ap-pí-tam* ‘the tablet of my lord was late (arriving) here’ (ARM 2, 106:14).

The VA *lupputu* (SB ‘damaged, soiled’) also developed its own SC ‘to be anomalous (said of ominous features)’ (CAD L 91): *bēli ı̄de kīma tēretum lu-up-pu-ta* ‘my lord knows that the extispicies are anomalous’ (ARM 10, 87:9).

(42) *lawûm* ‘to move in a circle, to surround’

In OB, the Pres. is hardly ever used to express contemporaneity with a reference point. Kouwenberg counts *lawûm* among verbs that “have an active stative with more or less lexicalized meanings”: *lawû* ‘to lay siege to,’ Stat. ‘to besiege’ (i. e., ‘to lie around (a city)’; Kouwenberg forthcoming 7.3.2). In OB letters, the SC seems to be productive in both **P** and **A** trans. readings: *alum* GN *la-wi* (ARM 6, 65:8), *dûrum šulhêm la-wi* ‘the wall is surrounded by an outer wall’ (ARM 6, 29:16), *inanna bēšû ištu 3 MU la-wi-ma* ‘and now his lord has been under siege for three years (and still he has not come)’ (ShT, p. 79:59f.), *alam* GN *ša* PN *la-wu-ú* PN *iššabat* ‘the town GN that Išme-Dagan was besieging Išme-Dagan has captured’ (ARM 1, 4:5–8). A similar usage is well attested in divination apodoses, e. g. *al la-wi-at ana libbi-šu terrub* ‘you will enter the city which you are besieging’ (RA 27, 142:2). In OB divination protases, the SC is attested in what appears to be an intrans. non-passive sense: *šumma qu[rinnum] alākšu ana [imittim] la-wi ... šumma qutrinnum alākšu ana šumēlim la-wi* ‘if the drifting smoke circles to the right ...’ (PBS 1/2, 99 ii 1–7, transl. as in CAD L 70). This token of the SC looks like a fientive one.<sup>22</sup> **P** tokens of the SC are frequent in OB divination protases, e. g. *DIŠ urudum šēram la-wi* ‘if the trachea is surrounded with flesh’ (YOS, 10 36 iv 21). In OA, I was able to find only the Imv. and the Proh. of this verb, with the transitive meaning ‘to wrap’ (CAD L 75b, Prag I 718:22).

VA *lawûm* ‘besieged; fenced.’

(43) *leqûm* ‘to take’

In OB letters, the SC **A** is common. It is routinely used to render the notion ‘X (has) received something’, often a specified amount of barley or silver: 97 ŠE.GUR *ana* 80 ŠE.GUR *ša eliya taršû le-qi-a-ti* ‘**You have received** 97 kor of barley for the 80 kor of barley that you held against me’ (AbB 9, 105:15ff.), *ištu annikām kalīāku 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR ana šamaššammī ana tātīm*

<sup>22</sup> Yet, cf. *šumma qutrinnum alākšu šalim* ‘if the smoke’s trail is black’ (PBS 1/2, 99 i 17).

*le-qi-a-ku* ‘while I stay here, **I have collected** 3 shekels of silver as “fee” for the linseed’ (LH 13:21–25). Additional tokens of this kind are e. g. AbB 8, 81:9–12; 9, 110:14; 12, 29:7; 14, 15:11; LH 23:6. This usage is formulaic in OB documents of private law from Susa (CAD L 135).<sup>23</sup> The SC **A** appears in non-technical contexts, too: PN *dīnam šuāti ul l[e-q]i* ‘PN does not accept that verdict’ (AbB 11, 7:22f.); *ammīnim būram [l]e-qi būram šūši* ‘Warum **hat man** das Kalb **weggenommen**? Gib das Kalb heraus’ (AbB 8, 9:8ff.), in Mari once with an inanimate subject: *mehir tuppi annīm kanīk LUGAL le-qi* ‘the copy of this tablet has (got) the king’s seal’ (ARM 22, 252:7f.),<sup>24</sup> so it may have been productive for different shades of meaning.<sup>25</sup> Importantly, I have found only two unambiguous **P** tokens of the SC in the core OB: *zikarum ša le-qū-ú* ‘a boy who is an adoptee (= who was “taken”)’ (AbB 14, 114:22, the main gloss is that of Veenhof), *našpakum ina nēreb KÁ i-[b]i-ru pateh-ma šeum le-qi* ‘Der Speicher am Eingang des Ibiru-Tores ist durchbohrt und Gerste **ist (heraus)genommen**’ (AbB 6, 219:14f., beginning of a quoted letter).<sup>26</sup> The resultative nature of both these examples is questionable. A Mari example comes from an administrative document: ‘a certain amount of silver *ša ka-ni-ik-šu i-na É.GÁL-lim la le-qi* whose receipt has not been accepted (or ‘received’) in the Palace’ (ARM 9, 254:14f.).

In Kültepe, only two tokens of the SC **A** have been found, both non-resultative: 2 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *a-na TÚG ša-mi-šu lá-qi* ‘2 S. Silber **hat er** für den Kauf eines Stoffes **genommen**’ (Prag I 429:31), *ma-nu-um [k]i-ma i-a-ti i-na KÙ.BABBAR da-nu-tim e-na-ni-ki-i lá-qé-e ša a-wi-lim a-bu-šu ú um-mu-šu lá e-pu-šu* ‘Wer ist da, der wie ich mit hartem Silber deine Bitten **erhört**? Des Herrn Vater und Mutter tuen (es) nicht!’ (Prag I 662:26’–29’).<sup>27</sup> The

<sup>23</sup> Kouwenberg forthcoming 7.3.2 notes that the SC of *leqūm* is often used in legal contexts referring to “ownership of commodities that someone is entitled to and has received.”

<sup>24</sup> I am grateful to Dr. Ilya Arkhipoff for kindly alerting me about this example.

<sup>25</sup> In the case of ARM 22, 252:7f., the real-life situation could be more easily expressed by an explicitly passive construction, because “in reality” the tablet *was sealed* with the king’s seal.

<sup>26</sup> AbB 7, 33:17f. *a-šar le-qū-ú li-iš-tú-ra-am* ‘wo *er* weggenommen ist, soll er *mir* aufschreiben!’ is poorly understood, and AbB 14, 114:22 is not quite transparent.

<sup>27</sup> The clearly habitual sense of *lá-qé-e* reminds one Yahdunlim’s *šēmi ikribī le-qi unnēnim* ‘the one who listens to vows, accepts prayers’ (Syria 32, 12 i 12, and see CAD L 136b for more examples of this noun phrase), yet the syntax of Prag I 662:26’–29’ leaves no doubt that here we deal with a “real” SC verb form rather than predicative form of a Participle (cf. Kouwenberg forthcoming 8.4.1 for a

SC **P** has been found in the following OA texts: 6 TÚG *ku-ta-ni i-na sà-e-tim a-šu-mì* PN<sub>1</sub> ù PN<sub>2</sub> *lá-qí-ú* ‘6 *kutānu*-textiles **have been taken** from the *saʾutum* in the name of PN<sub>1</sub> and PN<sub>2</sub>’ (OAA 1, 111:13 ff. = CCT 4, 13a), 7 ½ TÚG *ku-ta-nu a-na ša-du-e-tim lá-qí-ú* ‘7 ½ *kutānu*-textiles **have been taken** for the transport tariff’ (ibid. 16 f.); 1 ½ GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *ša A-bu-ša-lim iš-tí Da-da-a ú-lá lá-qí* ‘1 ½ Sekel Silber des Abu-šallim sind von Dadā’a nicht genommen’ (KUG 22:16–19); KÙ.BABBAR *ša lá-qí-ú* ‘silver that has been taken’ (CCT 5, 25b:16). Thus, the *lá-qé-e* of Prag I 662 is the only “non-technical” example found in OA, but this of course may be due to the nature of the extant Kültepe archives and incompleteness of my search results.

*Leqûm* is the head of a well-known idiomatic verb phrase whose direct object is *šēlūtu* ‘contempt, disdain,’<sup>28</sup> the whole being ‘to hold somebody in contempt.’ From the examples quoted in the dictionaries (AHw. 1222a, CAD L 145b, Š<sub>2</sub> 345a), it follows that, with *leqûm* used in the prefixing tenses, *šēlūtu* takes possessive pronouns pointing to the patient, e. g. *šī-tù-us-sà la te-le-qé* ‘do not despise her’ (AbB 3, 90:9). When the head is used in the SC, it can agree either with the patient, *ma-ma-an ša tup-pì-a ú* KÙ.BABBAR-pì *a-na a-wa-tim lá i-de<sub>8</sub>-ú šē-tù-tí lá-qé* ‘Whoever has not deposited my tablets or my silver for (my) cause, is contemptible (lit. ‘takes my contempt’) (BIN 6, 99:12–16 = Michel 1991, No. 99), or with the noun *šēlūtu*: *šēlūt-ī le-qí-a-at* ‘ich bin verachtet’ (lit. \*‘my contempt is being taken’ = ‘I am a target of contempt’) (AbB 5, 160:10’).

In the vernacular dialects outside of the corpus, the SC **P** is exploited mostly by the Assyrian legalese: it occurs in set expressions *uppu laqi* ‘it is acquired and taken (into possession)’ (MA legal documents, cf. CAD A<sub>2</sub> 202b; L 140b), *šarip laqi* ‘it is sold and taken over’ (NA legal documents, cf. CAD Š 105b), once in Middle Assyrian Laws (§ 44: *ana šīm gamer la-qí-u-ni* ‘(the one who) is taken for the full value’), and more times in MA and NA legal documents (CAD L 140a, see also AHw. 545a under “St. Pass.”).

↓ The fact that in OB letters the SC of *leqûm*, a transitive verb, is attested almost exclusively in **A** readings requires explanation. The evidence can be accounted for by the suggestion in Loesov 2006:138: **P** resultative readings of the SC usually describe those **P** states that are “ob-

---

thoroughgoing syntactic description of the “Participle” as a habitual agent noun). The *e*-vocalism of this word is enigmatic anyway. The plene-writing may render a prosodic feature, though this orthographic reflection of the “question intonation” has so far been described for OB only. The string *e-pu-šu* is a Pres. *eppušū*.

<sup>28</sup> Curiously, the noun does not seem to be attested outside of this expression.

servable” at the reference time.<sup>29</sup> If this is true, the number of verbs with productive and semantically predictable (non-lexicalized) SC **P** reduces drastically. In Loesov 2006:136–140, I put forward (with the above explanation) a list of some frequent and semantically basic high-transitivity verbs whose SC **P** is very rare or not attested at all in predictable meanings. One of the verbs from this list was *dâkum* ‘to kill.’ Now, Kouwenberg forthcoming 7.3.3 discusses “Marginal and secondary uses of the stative” (i. e., essentially, its dynamic use as a perfect/preterite), and one of his prime examples is *dîk*, which

“means ‘he has been killed (and therefore is now dead)’ <...> and simply describes the condition of the subject. However, the inclusion of a specification of the time and/or the place of death <...> shifts the attention from the present state to the previous event <...>. Therefore, the stative is used as a perfect here.”

One of the instances K. produced is AbB 13, 181:31f. (*ina mithuri 1 mâr GN di-i-ik* ‘one man from GN was killed in the clash’), the very text I mentioned (Loesov 2006:136) as about the only token of *dîk* in the core OB, i. e. outside of Mari. The only other known instance from AbB 1–14 is 8, 24:19; this token of *dîk* is also dynamic and past-time, as pointed out in Kouwenberg forthcoming 7.3.3. This leaves us with no genuinely resultative use of *dîk* in the whole of the core OB corpus. The two **P** tokens of the SC of *dâkum* in OB just mentioned *are not resultative* by the criteria of Kouwenberg, and therefore the requirement of “being observable” (I would say, of *Anschaulichkeit*) *does not apply* to this use of the SC. This *Anschaulichkeit*-criterion makes the availability of the resultative SC **P** heavily depend on the lexical semantics of a given trans. verb. The “past-tense” interpretation of the SC<sup>30</sup> is valid also for a part of the attested SC forms of *leqûm*, including some of the above examples.<sup>31</sup> Obviously, the state of

<sup>29</sup> Cross-linguistically, resultative (i. e., roughly, past-tense passive) participles are more often than not employed when they stand for “observable” properties. I could illustrate this with the following made-up English examples: “a broken hand/my hand is broken” is OK, while “a kissed hand/my hand is kissed” is bizarre.

<sup>30</sup> About this use of the SC, both **A** and **P**, see also Loesov 2005:133f. and the literature referred to there. The “past-tense” SC can correspond functionally to the English Present Perfect, Simple Past and Past Perfect.

<sup>31</sup> Simply put, adverbials of past time and locative expressions dependent on a verb form are incompatible with a purely resultative sense, and this situation is somewhat analogous to the way words like ‘yesterday’ are incompatible with the English Present Perfect. For a detailed discussion, see Kouwenberg forthcoming

“being-taken” is hardly ever observable, therefore the SC **P** of *leqûm* is not particularly frequent, the passive of *leqûm* being coded by the N-stem, which looks productive in both OB and OA (see CAD L 147). Note that the MA and NA **P** usages mentioned above are all technical and (in this sense) idiomatic.

No proper VA, except for a noun *leqû* ‘adoptee’ in SB lexical texts (CAD L 130f.). Again, this fact is explained by my *Anschaulichkeit*-criterion, as applied to resultative adjectives.

(44) *maḥārum* ‘to accept, receive, meet’

In OB, the SC **A** is common in legal passages of letters, it means ‘somebody has (got) something’ (cf. Kouwenberg forthcoming 7.3.2 with a reference to Rowton 1962, see examples in these studies and CAD M<sub>1</sub> 53). Otherwise, semantically more or less predictable tokens of the SC **A** are rare, they appear in literary texts. Cf. an example from the Etana epic: *erû ma-ḥi-ir ukultam kīma ni-ši-im na-e-ri emūqam īšu* ‘the eagle **took** food, he gained strength like a raging lion’ (*Bab.* 12, pl. 12 vi 3f. = CAD N<sub>1</sub> 151a).<sup>32</sup> In the rest of **A** tokens, the subject is inanimate: *dummuqtum ma-aḥ-ra-su* ‘happiness is waiting for him’ (Kraus Texte 62rev.:9, an OB physiognomic text), *šumma ši-pu-um ti-bu-um ma-ḥi-ir*<sup>33</sup> ‘if the “footmark” is equal to the t.’ (YOS 10, 50:13 = CAD T 390b, a technical usage in extispicy). Note an idiomatic verb phrase X *īnam* (+ POSSESSOR) *maḥir*, lit. ‘X meets somebody’s eye,’ i. e., ‘X pleases, is acceptable to somebody,’ which is attested mostly in OB (CAD M<sub>1</sub> 64). Within this phrase, the Pres. can also appear: *ina kīm inanna šēnū nasqātum īnam ul i-ma-aḥ-ḥa-ra* ‘right now (even) the choice sheep look terrible’ (AbB 14, 77:7ff., Veenhof’s translation). The SC **P** has not been found in OB letters, the only example known to me comes from divination:  $\lceil ni-qí LÚ it \lceil -ti DINGIR \lceil ma \lceil -ḥi-ir$  ‘the sacrifice of the man has been received by the god’ (YOS 10, 17:1 = Jeyes 1984:43).

---

7.3.3. Sure enough, this use of the SC is etymologically secondary, yet whether it is marginal in the corpus, is not obvious.

<sup>32</sup> CAD E 158b has ‘the eagle, having been fed ...’, N<sub>2</sub> 196a has ‘the eagle, receiving food ...’, both interpretations are inferior to the above one. Speiser’s translation (ANET 114) ‘the eagle, having received the food ... gained strength’ is to my mind the most precise of the four, since Speiser singles out this non-trivial use of *maḥir* by means of the English Perfect Participle.

<sup>33</sup> Sic, no accusative in this sentence!

In OA, the SC is rare. The only semantically unbound (non-idiomatic) token I have found is an instance of legal (or “business”) **A** use so typical of OB: *mì-ma a-nim ša Lu-lu i-na ša 12 ma-na ta-da-num-ma?* [Ú-sà]-nim ma-*hi-ir* ‘tout cela (appartient) à Lulu. [Usā]num (l’)a **reçu** sur ce qui est des 12 mines (d’argent) à remettre’ (TPAK I, 147a:11–14).<sup>34</sup>

↓ Semantic shifts of the kind *šimam amhur* ‘I received the purchase price’ > *šimam mahraku* ‘I have the purchase price’ are described in Kouwenberg forthcoming 7.3.2 as development of lexicalized meanings.<sup>35</sup> I fully agree with K. that the SC tends to lexicalize, yet *mahir*, *leqi* and their likes are not the most interesting instantiations of this tendency. First of all, certain Akkadian verbs show more unpredictable semantic shifts from the prefixing tenses to the SC; these shifts are especially characteristic of the technical language of divination, e. g. *ekim* ‘is stunted, atrophied’ (*ekemum* ‘to take away’), *mahiš* ‘is flattened’ (*mahāšum* ‘to hit’), *šakin* ‘there is’ (*šakanum* ‘to set’); cf. also the rare instances of *amer* and *alik* ‘he is familiar’ in OB epic texts (*amārum* ‘to see,’ *alākum* ‘to walk’). Second, the fact that *resultative* forms of “taking” verbs may denote “Haben” (Ungnad 1918, to whom K. refers in this connection)<sup>36</sup> looks as a rather expected one, though it probably still remains within the compass of lexicalization concept. This particular meaning shift has a reliable typological parallel in Aramaic. Kutscher 1973:269, within an outline of early Medieval Aramaic, notes that “in all dialects the passive participle ܬܘܩܝܘܢ seems to be employed with certain verbs in the active voice <...>, e. g., ܬܘܩܝܢ (‘carrying’).” In ancient Aramaic, *qūl-* is the base of the G-stem resultative participle, used mostly as a passive predicate. What Kutscher has in mind are in particular some verbs of “taking,” as his example shows. Thus the Syriac *tšim* (lit. ‘[he is] loaded’) and *šqil* (lit. ‘[he is] lifted up’) often appear in text

<sup>34</sup> My search results are by no means definitive, yet they do reflect the situation in OA relative to OB. Note that for the idiom X *inam mahir* CAD M<sub>1</sub> 64 books only one OA example, while the instances from the core OB and Mari are numerous, and their list in CAD was hardly meant to be exhaustive.

<sup>35</sup> K. points out similar semantic shifts also for the SC **A** of *lequm*, *šabatum*, and *našum*.

<sup>36</sup> In this five-pages note, A. Ungnad described the basic meaning of the SC as follows: “... müssen wir doch stets im Auge behalten, daß der Permansiv seiner Grundbedeutung nach denjenigen bezeichnet, an dem eine Handlung zum Abschluß gekommen ist ...” (p. 281), i. e., Ungnad believes the SC is a diathesis-neutral resultative verb form and shows this in his note. It is amazing how far ahead of his time Ungnad was, in fact, ahead of some contemporary writers on the SC.

in the sense ‘he holds, he is carrying/bringing, he has.’<sup>37</sup> As all predicative adjectives, these participles take phonologically reduced post-positive subject pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons: *b-īday ṭṣm-nā* ‘I hold (it) in my hands.’<sup>38</sup> It is also worth notice that *leqûm* and *maḥārum* display their famous productive “Haben” A readings of the SC in OB, but not in OA. A natural explanation will be that these are technical usages of law and business that developed within OB. In business OA, the corresponding senses must have been expressed by different exponents.

VA *maḥrum* ‘received.’

(45) *mâtum* ‘to die’

The SC is common in both OB and OA; it is better attested in OA, and often appears in the syntactic slots of the Perf. or Pret.,<sup>39</sup> while a purely resultative usage of *mēt* is also well known in OA (unlike that of the SC P of *dākum* in the whole of our corpus): ANŠE.ḪI.ru-kà *me-tù* ‘Deine Esel sind tot’ (Prag I 426:11), 1 ANŠE *me-et* (ibid. 22), and *passim* in the accounts of gains and losses. Death of humans is often reported in the same way, e. g. PN *me-et šī-im-tù-šu ú-lá i-šī-im* ‘PN has died without having left his last will’ (BIN 6, 2:3ff.), *lā libbi ilim-ma aššitī me-ta-at* ‘alas, my wife has died’ (TCL 4, 30:4); cf. same kind of usage in a conditional clause: *šummamin me-ta-ku* ‘if I had died/if I were dead’ (TCL 19, 32:30). An instance of the SC in a typically preterital slot: 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>* ‘½ Stoff habe ich, nachdem seine Tochter gestorben war, zu PN geschickt’ (BIN 4, 141 = Ulshöfer 1995, No. 397:143), and see also e. g. KUG 35:8, Prag I 648:7. Actually, the Pret. of *muātum* seems to be underrepresented in OA “in favour” of the SC. The Perf. has not been found in main clauses.

In OB, unlike in OA, the *t*-Perf. is well attested in main clauses, it is used oftener than the Pret., and this unusual evidence might be explained by a “middle” (or, better, “unaccusative”) lexical meaning of this verb coupled with the etymologically “middle voice” nature of the *t*-Perf.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. also a very telling example from Mandaic, quoted in Nöldeke 1875:381, *w-nydy-lh trysar malakia* ‘und 12 Engel ziehen es’ (NGD ‘to draw, to lead forth’).

<sup>38</sup> See Goldenberg 1998:610 for references to the grammars of Syriac that illustrate this feature, and for parallels with Hebrew.

<sup>39</sup> *Mātum* is another prime example of a verb with “improperly” used SC apud Kouwenberg (forthcoming 7.3.3). His evidence comes from OA, MA, and SB.

(Loesov 2004:162–172),<sup>40</sup> cf. a curious sentence from an OB letter where in the grammatical subject gets the accusative case, and the *t*-Perf. appears in an unexpected syntactic position within a narrative: *am-tam ša ana šūbulim ana šerika im-tu-ta-an-ni* ‘the slave-girl who was supposed to be sent to you **died on me**’ (AbB 2, 87:10f.).<sup>41</sup> In the core OB letters, the SC seems to be rarer than in OA, yet it is also attested in preterital slots: *ištu ITI.1.KAM šerrum ina libbiya mi-it-ma* ‘the child in my womb died a month ago’ (ABIM 15:10).

In OA and OB, there are a few tokens of the Pres. that can be construed as depictions of ongoing telic events (“somebody is dying”), yet for my study they are a moot point both for typological reasons (Loesov 2005:112, with an OA example) and because a prospective interpretation cannot be excluded for all of them on contextual grounds. CAD M<sub>1</sub> 422b offers a new reading (coll. F. Köcher) of the OB letter VAS 16, 88:17: *u anāku ina hé-ep libbi mi-ta-a-ku* ‘and I am dying from a broken heart’ (cf. AbB 6, 88), but it does not look secured, since *hí* is almost unattested as a syllabic value in AbB 1–14, and the context does not really help to establish the meaning of this sentence.

↓ Kouwenberg forthcoming 7.3.2 counts *mātum* among change of state intransitive verbs whose SC may resemble what K. calls “adjectival statives” (ibid.). This is perhaps the reason why *mīt-/mēt-* is productive in purely resultative usage, although it does not meet the criterion of *An-schaulichkeit*.

VA *mātum* ‘dead.’

(46) *qerēbum* ‘to be near; to approach’

The stem vowel of this verb is unstable: OB *iqrab—iqarrab* and *iqrib—iqerrib*,<sup>42</sup> OA *iqrub—iqarrub* (CAD Q 228, Kouwenberg forthcoming 3.3.3, 3.5.3, 17.3.3.2), the SC is *qerub* (OB), *qurub* (OA).

<sup>40</sup> And cf. Kouwenberg forthcoming 6.4 on the etymology of the *t*-Perf.: “For the time being, we can say little more than that the rise of the *t*-perfect is likely to be related to the autobenefactive meaning of the *t*-infix, but further details remain completely obscure.”

<sup>41</sup> This text was also commented upon in Loesov 2004:118f. and Kouwenberg forthcoming 6.3.1.

<sup>42</sup> According to CAD Q 228a, *a/a* is “OB lit.,” according to Kouwenberg forthcoming, it is “early OB.”

In OB letters, the SC has dozens of attestations (cf. CAD Q 228–230 for a selection), in Kültepe I have found only one token in addition to those four booked in AHW. 915a and CAD Q 229b.<sup>43</sup>

↓ Both dictionaries stick to the uniform rendering of the SC as a stative predicate. AHW. 915a has ‘St. ist nahe, in der Nähe’ as the gloss for the first sub-entry of *qerēbum*, the same tactics (‘is close’ and similar translations) is accepted in CAD Q 228–230. In both dictionaries, SC tokens populate, just on their own, entire sub-entries for individual meanings. All this may be understandable in view of the assumed semantically deadjectival nature of *qerub/qurub*, revealed formally by its “adjectival” vocalism. But a closer look shows that in both dictionaries an oversimplification in the arrangement of the evidence might have occurred. An alarming fact is that no reliable token of the Pres. has been found in either OB<sup>44</sup> or OA letters, though the Pres. of *qerēbum* is expected to code the progressive sense ‘is/was approaching.’ Indeed, the nature of our sources does not impede expressing this nuance of meaning: in letters, one mentions approaching/proximity of seasons, troops and other entities moving in space or time. Therefore I suggest that the SC of *qerēbum* has both stative and dynamic readings, depending on the context and lexical meanings of the respective grammatical subjects. Thus, *šadūm qē-ru-ub* ‘das Gebirge lag nahe’ (AbB 8, 92:27) is stative.<sup>45</sup> Yet, in <sup>d</sup>UTU-<sup>š</sup>i-<sup>d</sup>IM *u ummānātū-šu qē-ru-ub iēmum annūm liḫmuṭ* (AbB 8, 15:40–45), the SC codes a situation that “in real life” is dynamic, ‘Šamši-Adad with his troops is approaching, (therefore) this message is to be delivered rapidly.’<sup>46</sup> Additional instances of this kind can be easily found in the dictionaries. If

<sup>43</sup> KÜ.BABBAR.áp-kà qū-ru-ub ‘Dein Silber ist nahe’ (Prag I 483:25). This passage is similar to ŠE ù KÜ.BABBAR ú-ul qē-er-ba-am-ma ‘wenn Silber oder Gerste mir nicht zur Verfügung steht’ (AbB 1, 118:13); this may have been a lexicalized usage of *qerub/qurub* in the business Akkadian (‘to be available’), and cf. CAD Q 230b e.

<sup>44</sup> My search result agrees with Kouwenberg forthcoming 3.3.3, fn. 57: OB *iqarrab* “is inferred from sporadic OB *iqrab*” (cf. *ana ḫiāriš iq-ra-ab* in CT 15, 5 ii 8 = CAD Q 234b).

<sup>45</sup> It is likely that CH 8:15 *šumma ... šībū-šu lā qer-bu* also belongs here, because, as I will try to show below, the SC of *qerēbum* encodes either a “pure” state or an atelic process, while its capacity to denote a *resultative* state is questionable due to the atelic nature of the root. Thus, I understand this clause as ‘if his witnesses are not around,’ in spite of the parallelism with *šumma ... šībū-šu lā irdi-am* in the same § 13. One has to bear in mind that the SC of certain verbs can be used in the slots of the Perf. and the Pret., yet this is not the case with *qerēbum*.

<sup>46</sup> See Charpin–Durand 1997:379–381 for a new historical interpretation of this letter.

the ongoing event of approaching is regularly encoded by the SC, essentially a non-fientive verb form, this is because the Pres. of *qerēbum* is unable to express the idea (for an attempt to explain this, see the forthcoming discussion chapter). Looking at the compatibility of “moving” subjects of *qerub* with prefixing tenses of verbs expressing motion towards a landmark, one notices that these are invariably verbs other than *qerēbum*. For example, consider *ebūrum* ‘harvest time’ as subject: *kīma tūdū ebūrum qé-ru-ub* ‘as you know, harvest time is near/approaching’ (AbB 11, 151:4f., cf. an almost identical text in 12, 34:13) vs. *ebūrum wuddi it-tà-ḥi-a-am* ‘harvest time has definitely arrived’ (ShA 1, 59:24), *ebūrum iktašd-am* ‘harvest time has come’ (ARMT 13, 35:6), *ebūrum lā ikaššad-am* ‘die Erntezeit soll nicht anbrechen!’ (AbB 1, 117:15), and a similar verb phrase with the SC: *ebūru kašid-nāti* ‘die Erntezeit ist für uns angebrochen’ (AbB 3, 49:12). An instance from OA is *sikkātum* (pl.), a noun with poorly understood meaning:<sup>47</sup> *tuwār sikkātīm qú-ru-ub* ‘the return of the s. is imminent’ (TCL 14, 37:15 = CAD S 252a)<sup>48</sup> vs. *sí-kà-tum da-na a-dí-ni lá i-tù-ra-nim* ‘die s. sind heftig; bis jetzt sind sie noch nicht zurückkehrt’ (Prag I 565:5ff.), *adi 2 [ūmi] sí-kà-tum iturrā-nim* ‘the s. will return within two days’ (Ka 259:2, quoted in CAD S 252), and cf. *a-dí 2 U<sub>4</sub>-me sí-kà-tum i-pá-tá-ra-nim* ‘bis in 2 Tagen werden die s. aufbrechen’ (Prag I 598:9f.).<sup>49</sup> What then about prefixing forms (other than the Pres.) of *qerēbum* in letters? — The Pret. has been found only in MHET 1, 88:12 (*kīma e-eq-ri-bu kīam iqbi* ‘this is what he said when I approached’) and ARMT 27, 162:7 (*qāssu ana pīšu iq-ri-ib* ‘sa main s’est approchée de sa bouche’). The *t*-Perf. has been located only within one phrase used twice by the same writer from Mari: (*inanna*) *ebūrum iq-te-er-ba-am* ‘(now) the harvest time has arrived’ (ARMT 27, 30:21’; 37:28). The only prefixing forms found in Kültepe are the two tokens of the Prec. *liqrub-am* ‘let (the principal/my caravan) arrive’ booked in CAD Q 232b 2’.

Short supply of prefixing forms for future and past-time references requires an explanation. My suggestion is as follows. Lexically, *qerēbum* is

<sup>47</sup> CAD S 252b follows the opinion that *sikkātum* “possibly refers to a military expedition or the army,” yet K. Hecker (KUG, p. 105, cf. Prag I, p. 158) has shown that this interpretation is not plausible, he believes “daß es sich um ein Fest handelt.”

<sup>48</sup> Syntactically, *sikkātum* is here a dependent in a subject noun phrase, but this fact does not affect the gist of the present discussion.

<sup>49</sup> Note that the SC of *qerēbum* in its motion readings assumed here does not take the ventive (unlike the SC of some other motion verbs), while all the prefixing verb forms in the above examples do have the ventive.

an atelic motion verb, it is more in the way of ‘to get nearer/closer’ to a goal, ‘to approach’ it than ‘to arrive’ (= ‘to reach a goal’), and therefore it is more at home when the event of motion towards a goal is considered from an imperfective viewpoint.<sup>50</sup> Now, the above-mentioned prefixing forms of Akkadian, including the future-time Pres., always have perfective readings (Loesov 2005). For this reason, the Pret./Prec., *t*-Perf., and future-time (perfective) Pres. of *qerēbum* are rare.<sup>51</sup> For the letter-writers of our corpus to use the prefixing tenses of *qerēbum* was to overstrain the atelic meaning of the root, there emerged a conflict between the lexical root meaning and the aspectual meaning of the respective inflectional bases. As for the ongoing atelic approaching, it is encoded by the SC, by far the most frequent finite form of *qerēbum* in the epistolary corpus.<sup>52</sup> For this verb, the contrast between the present-time SC and (rarely used) perfective future-time Pres. can be visualized by the following pair of examples from the OB divination apodoses: U<sub>4</sub>-*ma-tu-šu qé-er-ba*: ‘(If a man is distinguished by beautiful hair the end of) his days is near/approaching’ (*AfO* 18, p. 63:18) vs. *šumma naplaštum ana padānim iq-te-er-ba-am tu-ru-ku-tum ana šarrim i-qé-er-ri-bu-nim-ma a-PI-EL-šu ekallam ibêl* ‘If the spy-hole **has approached** the path, the Turukkeans **will approach** the king, and then their man/his heir will take over the palace’ (YOS 10, 11 ii 14–17).

The suggestion that the SC of a motion verb should code an ongoing event of movement at all might look bizarre, yet it is to a certain extent corroborated by the OA verb phrase *naš<sup>9</sup>-am* ‘he is carrying (something) to where you are’ (Loesov 2005:128ff.) and the observations on the SC of *teḥûm* ‘to approach’ below. Cross-linguistically, this situation has a non-trivial parallel in the Modern Western Aramaic (MWA).<sup>53</sup> This language has a resultative (etymologically denominative) verb form with the base

<sup>50</sup> For previous research on the semantics of *qerēbum*, see Kouwenberg 1997: 234, 399.

<sup>51</sup> AbB 11, 39:9’ (*a-qè-er-r[u-ba-ak-ki-im]* ‘I will travel to you’) would be the only token of the future-time Pres. I have found in letters, yet the restoration of the Edition is not 100% reliable, and the GI sign (= *qè*) is an unusual means of rendering [qe] in this verb.

<sup>52</sup> The lack of the ventive on the SC of *qerēbum* in its (as I believe) motion readings is probably also related to the basic atelicity of this verb. The (in)compatibility of the ventive with inflectional forms of motion verbs depending on their aspectual and lexical properties requires a special study.

<sup>53</sup> The most recent description of its phonology and morphology is Arnold 1990.

\**qaṭīl*<sup>54</sup> for two-place verbs, and \**qaṭṭīl*<sup>55</sup> for one-place and certain low-transitivity two-place verbs (e. g., *šmṣ* ‘to hear’ and *ḥmy* ‘to see’). The \**qaṭīl*-based resultative forms may get, as in Akkadian, both active and passive readings, e. g., *ḥu ʿzīmīl-laḥ* ‘they have not invited us’ vs. *ḥu neʿzem* ‘I am not invited.’ The Present-Future base of the MWA verb is \**qāṭīl*. Yet, some frequent intransitive motion verbs of the MWA use the resultative base \**qaṭṭīl* for ongoing events contemporaneous with a reference point, and \**qāṭīl* for future references only: *nnaṣṣīq ana l-elbar* ‘I am going outside (now)’ vs. *ḥu nmoṣīq* ‘I will not go out’ (*nṣq* ‘to go out’; for additional examples and a list of these verbs, see Correll 1978:65). D. Cohen (1984: 502) observes that in these motion verbs \**qāṭīl* functions ‘comme un futur et d’autre part pour le passé et le présent comme un habituatif,’ and this constitutes an isogloss with the functions of the Akkadian *iparras* as described in Loesov 2005. Both Ch. Correll and D. Cohen believe that this shift has to do with the imperfective connotations of the resultative verb forms, and I share this opinion. In this respect, the most serious difference between Akkadian and the MWA is that the latter possesses two allomorphs of the resultative base, depending on the lexical meaning of the given verb.

VA *qerbum* ‘near.’

(47) *sanāqum* ‘to arrive, to reach, to check, to put pressure on’

The SC is frequent in OB and rare in OA. To explain its grammatical properties, it would be important to understand how the rather disparate lexical meanings of this verb evolved. One solution is to posit the motion sense ‘to arrive, reach, approach’ as the primary one (probably with CAD, which lists motion readings first).<sup>56</sup> For this sense, the SC was not found in OB, one token (with an inanimate subject and metaphorical sense of motion) is known in OA: *ú U<sub>4</sub>-ma-am sí-ki lá tù-kà-al U<sub>4</sub>-mu-ú sà-an<sup>2</sup>-qú-ni-a-ti ba-a-am iš-tí-a a-dí a-lim<sup>ki</sup> a-ku-ul* ‘And today do not detain me. It is high time for us (lit. ‘the days **have reached us**)! Come, eat with me (on the way) to the City’ (CCT 4, 39a:9’ff.). Otherwise, *sanāqum* is often used as a verb of telic motion in OB, e. g. *kīma is-sà-an-qú-ni-ik-kum* ‘when they reach you’ (AbB 14, 4:16). CAD S 139b **5a**) singles out the following meaning: ‘(in the stative) to be adjacent to, next to,’ with OB examples from mathemati-

<sup>54</sup> Historically, *qaṭīl* is a proto-Aramaic passive participle of the G-stem.

<sup>55</sup> Etymologically, *qaṭṭīl* is a productive adjective formed from intransitive verbs in Middle Aramaic languages.

<sup>56</sup> In SB incantations, the verbs *sanāqum*, *kašādum*, *qerēbum*, *ṭeḥūm* could be used together to enhance the ‘let the evil not come’ idea (cf. CAD S 136b).

cal and divination texts. The examples cited in CAD look like resultative tokens of the SC in its motion sense: 1 (BÜR)<sup>iku</sup> *lū sà-ni-iq* ‘one bur has to border (on one side of the dividing line),’ i. e. ‘let one bur reach ...’ (AOS 29, p. 45 B 5, cf. CAD S 140a for more examples of the same kind in problem-texts), *il-šu u ištar-šu ul sà-an-qú-šu* ‘his god and his goddess are not near him,’ i. e., lit. ‘have not reached him’ (A/O 18, p. 64 i 38).

The meanings ‘to check’, ‘to put pressure on’ may have been derived from the telic motion meaning of *sanāqum*. Here belong four stereotyped **P** tokens of the SC from LH and one **A** token from AbB. I will start with the latter, already mentioned in Loesov 2005:124f.: PN *annikām sà-ni-iq-ni-a-ti-ma alākam ana šēri-ka ulā nile<sup>re</sup>* ‘PN is checking on us here and we cannot come to you’ (AbB 9, 88:6–11, translation follows the Edition). In Loesov 2005, I opted in this case for “checking” rather than “pressing”<sup>57</sup> for a somewhat dogmatic reason: I believed that Present-Time activities (= agentive atelic processes) are coded by the Pres., while Present-Time telic events are coded by the SC. In the meantime, my case-studies of frequent verbs show that the relationship between the lexical meaning of verbs and the inflectional base they choose to code the Present-Time sense is more complex. Yet, the trouble with *saniq-niāti* in AbB 9, 88 is that neither this short letter nor lexicographical data really help to establish the meaning of the passage. But a comparison with OB *anāku annikām sanqāku* usages from Ešnunna (see below) and the above motion contexts allow one to suggest that we are dealing here with a technical term of law or administration. Although its exact import escapes us, I propose that this term is indeed related more to “checking” than to “pressing” and that it is derived from the motion meaning, i. e., “PN *has reached* PN<sub>2</sub> and *is now doing something* to him.” Note that *annikām* ‘here’ makes resultative interpretation of ‘PN *annikām saniq-niāti*’ unlikely,<sup>58</sup> while a purely past-time reading of this sentence is also not very plausible in the context. Thus, there are reasons to assume a present-time dynamic (and most probably telic) sense for this *saniq-niāti*, in accord with my initial suggestion in Loesov 2005. Now I will look at the corresponding **P**

<sup>57</sup> Pace CAD S 140b: ‘PN is pressing us here so that we cannot go to you.’

<sup>58</sup> Cross-linguistically, genuine resultative verb forms are (due to their semantics) hardly compatible with deictic spatial adverbials. Consider the German intransitive resultative form of the verb (*sich*) *betrunken* ‘get drunk’ *Ich bin betrunken*. *Ich bin hier betrunken* is hardly ever used (except perhaps for emphasis), anyway this sentence cannot render a message similar to that of *Ich habe mich hier betrunken*. (I thank Dr. Maria Bulakh for discussing with me certain subtleties of the German usage.)

tokens from LH that occur in letters penned by different writers and addressed to (as it seems) their peers: *anāku annikīam sa-an-qa-ku* (7:20f.), *annikīam sa-an-qa-nu-ma ni-ib-te-e-ri*<sup>59</sup> (20:10ff.), *anāku sa-an-qa-ku-ma alākam ul ele<sup>ri</sup>* (42:8f.), *anāku annikīam sa-an-qa-ku-ma ul alli[kam]* (46:4ff.). Most likely they are passive transforms of active constructions represented in the corpus by the above “PN *annikīam saniq-niāti(-ma alākam ana šērika ulā nile<sup>re</sup>)*.” Again, the regularly appearing *annikīam* is hardly compatible with resultative reading of the respective SC tokens (‘I am/have been SNQ-ed’), while the stereotyped nature of these verb phrases and almost complete lack of further details (e. g., reasons of being ‘hard pressed’<sup>60</sup> etc.) make plausible my suggestion that this SC form developed a dynamic technical reading, i. e., ‘I/we undergo SNQ-ing,’ probably a well-known bureaucratic procedure.<sup>61</sup> Finally, for the assumed meaning ‘to check’ one **P** token with an inanimate subject is available in OA: *hurāšam addiššum-ma lā sà-ni-iq* ‘I gave him the gold but it was not checked’ (BIN 6, 189:24 = CAD S 138b).

VA *sanqum* ‘checked, verified.’

(48) *teḥûm* ‘to come near, approach’; ‘to add to’ (trans.)

The SC is frequent in both trans. and intrans. meanings. The intrans. variety of the SC has both stative and dynamic readings. The only example of the latter from OB letters is as follows: *ana eqlim šuāti mamman lā te<sub>4</sub>-ḥi-a-am<sub>vent.</sub>* ‘(daß) mit besagtem Felde niemand zu schaffen haben soll’ (AbB 4, 125:14). Lu-Ninurta represents the situation he prohibits as a telic (or a punctual) event of motion: ‘nobody has to approach this field!’ The “third-party” goal ventive probably serves to enhance the dynamic nature of this verb form. Within the same archive, the very same concept is usually expressed by a stereotyped Pres.-based prohibitive, without the ventive: PN *a-na eqlim šu[āti] lā i-te<sub>4</sub>-eḥ-ḥi-i* ‘PN soll sich mit besagtem Felde nicht zu schaffen machen!’ (AbB 4, 87:2’), and see also e. g. 4, 159:6’ (*la i-te<sub>4</sub>-eḥ-ḥi*); 9, 189:12 (*la i-te<sub>4</sub>-eḥ-ḥi*); 11, 165:21 (*la t[e]-te<sub>4</sub>-e[ḥ]-ḥi-a* ‘you<sub>pl.</sub>

<sup>59</sup> The signs sequence *ni-ib-te-e-ri* is taken (with CAD B 119) to mean ‘we are constantly hungry,’ i. e. with an emendation and against the Edition.

<sup>60</sup> So CAD S 140b.

<sup>61</sup> N. J. C. Kouwenberg informs me in a p. c. that in his view the original meaning of *sanāqum* is ‘to pinch, to squeeze.’ In this case the motion sense of *sanāqum* (‘to arrive, reach’) would be derived from ‘pressing’; it seems that W. von Soden held a similar opinion, cf. the arrangement of the *sanāqum* entry in AHw. 1021 and the assumed etymological Semitic parallels suggested there.

should not touch [the field]); with a different goal/semantic object: *mam-man lā i-te-eh-ḫi-šu-nu-ši-im* ‘niemand soll ihnen nahetreten’ (8, 115:7’). The “indicative” Pres. appears in OB letters only with future reference: *bēli ana GN qadum gamarat ummānātīšu iṭ-te-ḫi-a-am<sub>vent.</sub> ... ištu inanna ana UD.20.KAM i-te<sub>4</sub>-eh-ḫi-a-am<sub>vent.</sub>* ‘my lord has approached<sub>pf</sub> GN with all his troops ... within twenty days he will approach<sub>pres</sub> here’ (TIM 2, 15:13–19 [AbB 8, 15] = CAD T 74b),<sup>62</sup> *ištu inanna ana ITI UD.30.KAM e-te-ḫi-a-kum* ‘within a full month from now I will come to you (UET 5, 82rev.:12’ = CAD T 72b), see also ShT, p. 34:37; ARM 10, 4:19 (in a figurative sense).

In divination protases, at least one token of the Pres. is attested, in “competition” with the SC: *šumma ṭulimum ... ina bamat G[ÜB(?)] i(?)-te<sub>4</sub>-ḫi-i* ‘if the spleen comes close to the left side of the chest’ (RA 67, 42:41’ = CAD T 74b). In the six stereotyped protases of YOS 10, 46 i 11–35, *teḫûm* appears in the SC form with the ventive, e. g. *šumma TUKUL imittim ina reš martim ubān lā te<sub>4</sub>-ḫi-a-am šakim-ma šumēlam inaṭṭal* ‘if the right weapon is not approaching the top of the gall bladder, lying one finger distant from it’ (YOS 10, 46 i 11ff.).<sup>63</sup>

In OA, the Pres.-based prohibitive is well-attested: *a-na ba-āp<sup>1</sup>-pí-ni<sup>64</sup> É Šu-Ištar ma-ma-[an] lá i-tá-ḫi* ‘let nobody approach the “beer breads” of the Šu-Ištar household’ (CCT 3, 14:27ff.), see also e. g. Prag I 437:6 (*lá i-tá-ḫi*). In one instance, the negated Pres. codes a habitual situation within the ‘negative asseverative form’ marked by the subjunctive morpheme (E. Cohen 2005:19, cf. GKT 233d): <sup>d</sup>*A-šur ù DINGIR.ĪA-ú-ni li-ṭù-lu ma-ma-an a-na KÙ.pí-kà I GÍN la i-tá-ḫi-ú* ‘let Aššur and our gods witness: **nobody does ever touch** even a shekel of your silver’ (KTS 2, 45:28–31); in another instance this very form refers to the future: *adi kaspam ša DN uštabbû mamman lā i-tá-ḫi-ú* ‘until he has been paid the silver of DN in full, no (other claimant) will approach (it)’ (CCT 4, 37b:14).<sup>65</sup> The Pres. is also

<sup>62</sup> “He will approach here” is no idiomatic English. The sense is doubtless “he will arrive here,” “he will come.” See above on the complementary distribution of the SC *qerub* and the prefixing forms of other motion verbs, in particular *teḫûm*.

<sup>63</sup> I thank Ilya Khait for sharing with me his transliteration and translation of YOS 10, 46 i 11–35. The above translation is essentially in agreement with that of I. Khait. Winitzer 2006:414 interprets this text quite differently: ‘If the weapon of the right—not reaching a finger (in length)—is situated in the head of the gall bladder it faces the left ...’ I do not quite understand this rendering.

<sup>64</sup> The reading is with Michel 2001:462, note d to No. 339.

<sup>65</sup> Hirsch 1961:50b, CAD Š<sub>2</sub> 255a and Schwemer 2001:15 translate this verb form as if it were a prohibition (‘nobody may approach’ and the like), which is

used with future reference: KÙ.BABBAR *a-qá-tim ša a-bi<sub>4</sub>-ni i-tá-ḫi* ‘the silver will go to our father’s account’ (CCT 3, 9:14f.), *a-na síG.ḪI.A ú-lá a-tá-ḫi* ‘I am not going to occupy myself with the wool’ (BIN 6, 76:5f., cf. Dercksen 1996:125–127, fn. 399), *wa-dí a-lí-tí-a ú-lá i-tá-ḫi-i* ‘sure he will not approach me!’ (CCT 3, 7a:26f.).<sup>66</sup> The SC is used in a stative sense, it is probably lexicalized as a technical term: ŠĀ.BA <sup>5</sup>/<sub>6</sub> *ma-na LÁ 1* <GÍN> KÙ.BABBAR *ší-im* KÙ.GI *tá-ḫi* ‘davon **ist** <sup>5</sup>/<sub>6</sub> Mine minus 1 <Shekel> Silber, der Kaufpreis für das Gold, **verfügbar**’ (BIN 4, 148:34f. = Ulshöfer 1995, No. 67).

Thus, neither the Pres. nor the SC of this verb are attested in letters in the sense of the ongoing Present. Tentatively, I suggest that this evidence may have to do with the “achievement” (punctual event) sense of the root.

The SC of *ṭeḫûm* in its trans. sense ‘to add to’ has the expected passive meaning ‘is added’ in both OB and OA (see CAD Ṭ 78).

No VA.

(49) *ṭuḫḫûm* ‘to conduct, to bring near, to hand over; to add to’

Neither the Pres. nor the SC are used for the ongoing present-time events. The only SC token that CAD Ṭ has under the motion glosses (‘to conduct’ etc.) is from an OB divination: *šumma ina išid martim piṭrum šakimma ana zumriša ṭu-úḫ-ḫu* ‘if there is a fissure at the base of the gall bladder and it is close to its (the gall bladder’s) body’ (YOS 10, 31 xii 31 = CAD Ṭ 80b). For the meaning ‘to add to’ the passive SC form ‘is added’ is well attested in both OB and OA (see CAD Ṭ 80b–81a).

In OA, the SC is common in a lexicalized meaning ‘to have something to do (with),’ ‘to have a claim,’<sup>67</sup> which is unknown for the prefixing verb forms and appears only in the context of negations or a question word

---

fully justified by the context, yet the author represents the prohibition as an affirmative statement.

<sup>66</sup> Why is there no ventive?

<sup>67</sup> CAD Ṭ 81 ‘to involve (someone), to make (someone) concerned’; the gloss is not felicitous, since the sub-entry does not bring a single causative context and has no verb forms other than the SC. EL II 192–193, fn. 2 is nearer to the mark: *ṭuḫḫûm* can be used (along with other possibilities) “6) im passivisch wiederzugebenden Permansiv ... mit dem Subjekt der Person und dem—meistens zu subintelligierenden—Objekt der Sache mit der Bedeutung ‘einer Sache nahegebracht sein’, ‘mit einer Sache befaßt sein’, ‘an einer Sache teilhaben’, ‘an einer Sache Anrecht haben.’” It is a pity that the authors of the last volumes of CAD more or less discontinued discussion sections and references to lexical observations in earlier literature.

*mīnam* ‘what<sub>acc.</sub>’: PN *lá tá-ḫu* ‘PN has no claim (on the goods mentioned above)’ (BIN 4, 194:21), *ú šu-ut lá tá-ḫu* ‘while he has no claim’ (KTS 2, 37:17’), *mīnam tá-ḫu-a-ku* ‘what is it to me?’ (CCT 4, 5b:10), *lá tá-ḫu-a-ku* ‘it is none of my business!’ (CCT 3, 46b:9), and cf. *a-na-ku ú-lá lá tá-ḫu-a-ku* (ibid. l. 17), *a-ta lá tá-ḫu-a-ti* (BIN 6, 92:24).

For the rare instances of the VA in NB and SB, see CAD Ṭ 123f., *ṭuḫḫû* A (if it belongs here) and *ṭuḫḫû* B.

## References

- Arnold 1990 Arnold, W. *Das Neuwestaramäische*. V. Grammatik. Wiesbaden.
- Binnick 1991 Binnick, R. *Time and the Verb. A Guide to Tense and Aspect*. New York–Oxford.
- Charpin–Durand 1997 Charpin, D.; Durand, J.-M. Aššur avant l’Assyrie. *MARI* 8:367–391.
- Cohen, D. 1984 Cohen, D. *La phrase nominale et l’évolution du système verbal en sémitique. Etudes de syntaxe historique*. Leuven–Paris.
- Cohen, E. 2005 Cohen, E. *The Modal System of Old Babylonian* (HSS 56). Winona Lake.
- Correll 1978 Correll, Ch. *Untersuchungen zur Syntax der neuwestaramäischen Dialekte der Antilibanon*. Wiesbaden.
- Dahl 2004 Dahl, Ö. *The Growth and Maintenance of Linguistic Complexity*. Amsterdam.
- Dercksen 1996 Dercksen, J. G. *The Old Assyrian Copper Trade in Anatolia*. Leiden.
- Goldenberg 1998 Goldenberg, G. *Studies in Semitic Linguistics. Selected Writings*. Jerusalem.
- Hirsch 1961 Hirsch, H. *Untersuchungen zur altassyrischen Religion* (AfO Bh 13/14). Graz.
- Huehnergard 1997 Huehnergard, J. *A Grammar of Akkadian* (HSS 45). Atlanta.
- Jeyes 1989 Jeyes, U. *Old Babylonian Extispicy. Omen Texts in the British Museum*. Leiden.
- Kouwenberg 1997 Kouwenberg, N. J. C. *Gemination in the Akkadian Verb* (SSN 32). Assen.
- Kouwenberg 2000 Kouwenberg, N. J. C. Nouns as Verbs: The Verbal Nature of the Akkadian Stative. *Or* 69:21–71.
- Kouwenberg forthcoming Kouwenberg, N. J. C. *The Akkadian Verb and Its Semitic Background*. Winona Lake.
- Kutscher 1973 Kutscher, E. Aramaic. *Encyclopedia Judaica* 3:257–287.
- 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.
- Michel 1991            Michel, C. *Inmāya dans les tablettes paléo-assyriennes*. II. Édition des textes. Paris.
- Michel 1998            Michel, C. Les Mites d'Assyrie. Moths in the Assyrian Texts of the Second Millennium B. C. *JAOS* 118:325–331.
- Michel 2001            Michel, C. *Correspondence des marchands de Kaniš au début du II<sup>e</sup> millénaire avant J.-C.* Paris.
- Nedjalkov ed. 1988    Nedjalkov, V. (ed.). *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia.
- Nöldeke 1875           Nöldeke, Th. *Mandäische Grammatik*. Halle.
- Rowton 1962           Rowton, M. The Use of the Permissive in Classic Babylonian. *JNES* 21:233–303.
- Schwemer 2001        Schwemer, D. *Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen*. Wiesbaden.
- Streck 2006            Streck, M. *Altbabylonische Grammatik mit Grundwortschatz, Übungen und Chrestomathie*. Leipzig (a manuscript).
- Ulshöfer 1995        Ulshöfer, A. *Die altassyrischen Privaturkunden*. Stuttgart.
- Ungnad 1918            Ungnad, A. “Haben” im Babylonisch-Assyrischen. *ZA* 31:277–281.
- Veenhof 1972        Veenhof, K. *Aspects of Old Assyrian Trade and Its Terminology*. Leiden.
- Winitzer 2006        Winitzer, A. *The Generative Paradigm in Old Babylonian Divination*. PhD. Diss. Harvard University. Cambridge (MA).