
5 Akkadian

Giorgio Buccellati

Akkadian is the oldest attested Semitic language (with Eblaite, which several Assyriologists consider a branch of Akkadian, though it is treated separately in this volume). The earliest period, known as Old Akkadian, dates to between 2350 and 2200: the major textual evidence consists of royal inscriptions. After a Sumerian resurgence, from which fewer Akkadian texts are found, the documentation resumes shortly after 2000 BCE and continues unbroken until about the time of Christ, with all major types of texts attested for most periods. It is also from that date that begins the distinction between Babylonian in the South and Assyrian in the northeast. Four periods may be distinguished, corresponding roughly to cycles lasting about five centuries each: Old Babylonian and Old Assyrian in the first half, Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian in the second half of the second millennium; Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian in the first half and Late Babylonian in the second half of the first millennium. It is generally assumed that Akkadian came to be no longer spoken sometime in the first half of the first millennium, when it was effectively replaced by Aramaic. In addition, Assyriologists speak at times of Classic Babylonian, referring to the Old Babylonian dialect and its survivals. The most important such survival is also known as Standard Babylonian, which describes the language used in the literary texts copied and in some cases written in the first half of the first millennium.

The best-known literary texts, such as Gilgamesh or the Creation Epic, are preserved in their most complete textual versions in tablets from the late periods written precisely in Standard Babylonian, but there are significant literary texts from all periods, including especially political texts (royal inscriptions). The Code of Hammurapi is in part a legal text and in part a document of political literature, thus providing the best example of Classic Babylonian. We are also fortunate in having several thousand letters from all periods, which give us the best evidence for spoken language.

Phonemics

Akkadian phonemes show a considerable reduction of the inventory from an earlier/archaic stage. In particular, all pharyngeals and laryngeals came to be realized (at least by the beginning of the second millennium) as glottal stop, and all inter-

dentals as sibilants. The only innovative element is the introduction of a vowel *e*, which in part was conditioned by the loss of pharyngeals and laryngeals (e.g., 'abār- > 'ebēr- 'to cross'). The full inventory is as follows:

Consonants

p	t			k	'
b	d			g	
	ṭ			q	
		s	š	ḥ	
		z			
		ṣ			
m	n				
		l			
		r			
w			y		

Vowels

i	u
e	a

All vowels and consonants may occur either long or short; notation of length in cuneiform writing is for the most part irregular. Assyriological practice distinguishes two degrees of lengths, marked respectively by a macron and a circumflex, e.g., *bānū* 'builder'. There is however no indication that such a distinction obtained in actual phonemic reality, and it is generally applied according to historical criteria: contraction length is rendered by a circumflex, and morphological length by a macron. It seems best to avoid Assyriological use and retain a single length indicated by a macron.

Very little is known about stress, but it, too, appears to be non-phonemic.

Internal Inflection

The Root

Internal inflection is a system comprising two interdigitating sets of discontinuous morphemes, roots and patterns.

Structurally, a root can be isolated only when it interdigitates with at least two patterns. For example, the three nouns, *dunn-* 'power', 'umm- 'mother', and *tupp-* 'tablet', seem to be derived from the same pattern *purr-*. But while *dunn-* is part of a distributional array which includes *dann-* 'powerful', *dunnun-* 'to strengthen', there are no such forms as *'amm-, *'ummum-, *ṭapp-, *ṭuppup- — hence we cannot isolate any such root as *'mm or *ṭpp. •

Properly, the term "nominal root" should be used for such roots from which multiple noun formations (and no verb formations) may be derived. In Akkadian, this obtains only with numerals. Otherwise, all roots are verbal-nominal, in that both verbal and nominal patterns may be derived from them. This means that all verbs imply a root, while nouns may or may not imply it. There are no roots from which only verbs can be derived.

Also lexical in nature is the "root vowel." The term implies that this vowel is an element of the root, on the same level as the consonants and therefore a morphological element – but that is not so. The root vowel is a lexical determinant for appropriate patterns from finite verbal forms from any root, and will be treated below with patterns.

All Akkadian roots consist of three or four elements, called "radicals." Each radical can be either (1) a simple consonant, or (2) a set of possible realizations, including length and Ø next to regular consonants. Only one realization occurs for the radical at any given time, and it is conditioned morphophonemically. The roots of the first type are called "strong" roots, those of the second "weak" roots.

There are limits to the combinations of consonants which can occur together to form a root. For example, two emphatics do not cooccur in the same root, and when comparative considerations would require them, one of them is realized as voiceless (e.g., Akkadian *šbt* for Semitic *šbt*).

Patterns

Formal Aspects

There is a difference in pattern formation between nouns and verbs. They fall in different groups characterized by special sets of markers. While the nominal patterns may be arranged in a unilineal sequence, with each pattern becoming progressively more complex, the verbal patterns are bidimensional, defined by a system of two coordinates.

The system of verbal and nominal patterns overlap with regard to their internal inflection in three instances: the infinitive, verbal adjective and participle. From the point of view of external inflection, all three behave like nouns, receiving endings for number, gender, case, but not person, tense or mood. These three patterns however, are fully integrated from the viewpoint of internal inflection, into the coordinate system of verbal patterns. In addition, these three types of nouns, alone among all nouns, can govern both the genitive case (like other nouns) and the accusative case (like the verbs). Because of this special relationship with the verb, these nouns will be considered throughout as part of the system of verbal patterns and called "verbal nouns." The other nouns which are also derived from a verbal root, but do not fit into the coordinate system or govern the accusative, will be called "deverbal nouns." The verbal patterns proper (aside from verbal nouns) will be called the "finite forms."

The traditional paradigm is followed here (Table 5.1, p. 72), with some modification. Apart from minor points of nomenclature (e.g., *B* for the basic stem rath-

Table 5.1 Finite forms with affixes of external inflection

		Imperative	Preterite	Perfect	Present
B Sg.	3c.		¹ -iprus	¹ -iptaras	¹ -iparras
	2m.	purus	t-aprus	t-aptaras	t-aparras
	f.	pur[u]s-ī	t-aprus-ī	t-aptar[a]s-ī	t-aparras-ī
	1c.		¹ -aprus	¹ -aptaras	¹ -aparras
	Pl. 3m.		¹ -iprus-ū	¹ -iptar[a]s-ū	¹ -iparras-ū
	f.		¹ -iprus-ā	¹ -iptar[a]s-ā	¹ -iparras-ā
Pl.	2c.	pur[u]s-ā	t-aprus-ā	t-aptar[a]s-ā	t-aparras-ā
	1c.		n-iprus	n-iptaras	n-iparras
N Sg.	3c.		¹ -ipparis	¹ -ittapras	¹ -ipparras
	2m.	napris	t-apparis	t-attapras	t-apparras
	f.	napris-ī	t-appar[i]s-ī	t-attapras-ī	t-apparras-ī
	1c.		¹ -apparis	¹ -attapras	¹ -apparras
	Pl. 3m.		¹ -ippar[i]s-ū	¹ -ittapras-ū	¹ -ipparras-ū
	f.		¹ -ippar[i]s-ā	¹ -ittapras-ā	¹ -ipparras-ā
Pl.	2c.	napris-ā	t-appar[i]s-ā	t-attapras-ā	t-apparras-ā
	1c.		n-ipparis	n-ittapras	n-ipparras
D Sg.	3c.		¹ -uparris	¹ -uptarris	¹ -uparras
	2m.	purris	t-uparris	t-uptarris	t-uparras
	f.	purris-ī	t-uparris-ī	t-uptarris-ī	t-uparras-ī
	1c.		¹ -uparris	¹ -uptarris	¹ -uparras
	Pl. 3m.		¹ -uparris-ū	¹ -uptarris-ū	¹ -uparras-ū
	f.		¹ -uparris-ā	¹ -uptarris-ā	¹ -uparras-ā
Pl.	2c.	purris-ā	t-uparris-ā	t-uptarris-ā	t-uparras-ā
	1c.		n-uparris	n-uptarris	n-uparras
Š Sg.	3c.		¹ -ušapris	¹ -uštapis	¹ -ušapras
	2m.	šupris	t-ušapris	t-uštapis	t-ušapras
	f.	šupris-ī	t-ušapris-ī	t-uštapis-ī	t-ušapras-ī
	1c.		¹ -ušapris	¹ -uštapis	¹ -ušapras
	Pl. 3m.		¹ -ušapris-ū	¹ -uštapis-ū	¹ -ušapras-ū
	f.		¹ -ušapris-ā	¹ -uštapis-ā	¹ -ušapras-ā
Pl.	2c.	šupris-ā	t-ušapris-ā	t-uštapis-ā	t-ušapras-ā
	1c.		n-ušapris	n-uštapis	n-ušapras

er than *G* for the German “Grundstamm”), and of sequence (*BNDŠ* instead of *BDNŠ*), the main difference is that the permansive is not considered here a “tense” of the verb, but rather a special form of nominal sentence (see p. 81–82, 87).

In contrast to the verbal patterns, the nominal patterns do not exhibit such a correlation of markers, and can only be listed in a unilinear fashion. When a pattern is closely correlated with a given stem, it is formally limited to just that particular stem, i.e., the characteristic marker is not carried over into other stems. For example, the pattern *tapris-* is characteristic of the *D* stem (it occurs frequently with roots which are attested only in the *D* stem, e.g., *teslūt-* ‘prayer’). But, the characteristic *t* in front of the first radical does not occur with this meaning for patterns connected with other stems.

Even though the system of nominal patterns is unilinear, it is nevertheless a true system because each pattern does have a specific meaning which is then integrated

with the semantic value of the root to form the word proper. In this the deverbal nouns are markedly different from non-interdigitating nouns (primary nouns and loanwords) which may be of the same shape but do not carry the meaning of the pattern. For example, all nouns of the pattern *mapras-* from verbal roots normally carry a meaning which can be placed under the category of noun of instrument (or place); but the word *mašmaš-* 'incantation priest', though outwardly of the same shape, does not have anything in common with that category, because it is a loanword from Sumerian.

Notional Categories

The formal system of coordinates outlined above has a close correlation with semantic categories and syntactic values. One set of forms include the infinite and finite forms, i.e., verbal nouns, moods and tenses. The two moods are the imperative to express positive command, and the indicative to express a statement. The indicative mood is divided into three tenses, i.e., forms which denote the temporal position of the action *vis-à-vis* the speaker: preterite for past action and present for present or future action. Traditional Akkadian grammar recognizes a third tense, the perfect, but a separate morphological status for this tense is doubtful, and it seems more likely that forms so understood should be treated as preterites of the *t*-stem. In this presentation, however, the perfect is retained as a separate tense.

The most important stems are the following:

<i>B</i> stem	for the basic meaning of the root
<i>D</i> stem	as factitive, intensive, pluralitive of <i>B</i> (lengthening of the middle radical)
<i>Š</i> stem	as causative or elative of <i>B</i> (prefix <i>Š</i>)
<i>N</i> stem	as passive or ingressive of <i>B</i> (prefix <i>N</i> or length)
<i>t</i>	as reciprocal or separative of <i>B</i> and passive of <i>D</i> and <i>Š</i>
<i>tn</i>	as iterative of <i>B</i> , <i>N</i> , <i>D</i> , <i>Š</i>

Here are some examples. For one set of forms, no relationship is involved: the infinitive (*'alākum* 'to go'), the stative participle (*damqum* 'good'), the active participle (*šābitum* 'the one who seizes'). Another set of forms does involve the relationship of time: the present-future refers to an action which is either contemporary or posterior (*iqabbī* 'he speaks' or 'he will speak'), the preterite refers to a past action (*iqbī* 'he spoke'), the imperative refers to an action contemporary with the speaker – command (*qibī* 'speak!'). If retained as a distinct verbal form, the perfect refers (in some periods of Akkadian) to an action which is following an earlier point in time, or which came before the speaker's utterance (*iqtabī* 'he then spoke', 'he will have spoken').

We have roots of condition (for which the term "stative" can be used), and of action ("fientive"). The infinitive is indifferent to aspect (*damāqum* is either stative 'to be good', or fientive 'to become good'), the first participle is stative (*dam[i]qum* 'good, endowed with the condition of goodness'), while the second

participle is fientive (*ṣābitum* 'the one who seizes at a given point in time'). However, all finite forms are punctual.

The attitude of the speaker refers to the stance taken *vis-à-vis* the process, depending on whether process is described in a statement, or solicited through a summons. The traditional terms used for this are 'indicative' in the first case, and 'imperative' in the second. Both are called moods. Note that this notional category is represented by two different types of formal categories, that is, the moods derived through internal inflection (described here) and those derived through external inflection (for which see below).

As indicated earlier, nominal patterns, or deverbal nouns, do not exhibit as complex a paradigm as the verbal patterns, because instead of a matrix, they have a more linear pattern. One major distinction obtains, on the notional level, depending on whether or not a reference is implied to the subject of the verbal process. In the first case we have subject nouns (*ṣabbātum* 'robber') and in the other description nouns (i.e., nouns which describe the process as such, without reference to a subject), for example, *ṣibtum* 'seizing'. In terms of the verbal nouns, the first category is parallel to the participles, and the second to the infinitive.

Patterns from Strong Triradical Roots

All verbal patterns (see Table 5.1, p. 72) include two to four vowels (except for the affixes which are elements of external, not internal, inflection). The vowels are always short except in two cases, the *B* infinitive and the *B* participle. Only the first and last vowels, however, are distinctive; the middle vowel(s), when present, is/are always, indistinctively, the same, namely *a* (which may have been realized as *ə*).

The function of the first vowel is to serve as auxiliary stem marker. It may be noted that a vocalic differentiation of the stems is often necessary, because consonantism by itself is not always distinctive – for example, in the *B* present (*pr:s*) and *D* present (also *pr:s*). The first vowel of the *B* and *N* stems is either *a* or *i*, with the exception of the *Bt(n)*, *N*, *Ntn* participle and the *B* imperative. The first vowel of the *D* and *Ṣ* stems is *u* throughout.

The last vowel serves as the main noun/tense marker. A differentiation of the nouns and tenses by vowel is generally necessary, because consonantism by itself is usually not distinctive, as in the *D* preterite (*pr:s*) and present (also *pr:s*). In the derived stems, the final vowel is as follows: *u* for infinitive and durative participle, *i* for punctual participle, imperative preterite and perfect and *a* for present.

The root vowel is determined lexically, and one will derive notations as to vocalism (*a*, *i*, *u*, and *u/a*) from the lexicon. The vocalism of the last syllable is, in the patterns of the *B* and *N* stems, dependent upon this lexical item for each finite form and most imperatives.

The root vowel is either a single phoneme (*a*, *i*, *u*) or a set of two alternating phonemes (*u/a*). When the root is single, the same vowel is found in all finite forms of *B(tn)* or *N(tn)*. When the root vowel is alternating, *a* is found in all the same finite forms except for the imperative and preterite *B*, where *u* is found. In

the case of some verbs, the imperative and preterite *N* (but not the perfect) show *i* as the last vowel, under partial influence of the vocalism of *D* and *Š*.

Patterns from Strong Quadriradical Roots

The patterns from quadriconsonantal roots are symbolized by *pršd* as equivalent of *prs*. The vocalism is identical to that of triconsonantal pattern, except that an extra vowel *a* is added whenever there would otherwise be three consonants in cluster.

No quadriradical occurs in the *B* stem, except for the verbal and deverbal nouns listed in the paradigm above. A few roots occur only in the *D* stem, while all others occur only in the *N*(*tn*) and *Š*(*tn*) stems. Some common roots are *šqll* 'to hang', *blkt* 'to cross, go over', *pršd* 'to flee'.

External Inflection

The Noun

General Concepts and Notional Categories

There are two basic types of nominal external inflection. The first consists of affirmatives which are added immediately to the core of an interdigitating noun, or to the base of any other noun (primary, loanword, or even proper name). These affirmatives serve to derive nouns from other nouns, hence they are here called denominal affirmatives. The second type consists of markers for number, gender and case of which there are four different sets, traditionally called "states." Each noun can occur in any one of these states.

Denominal affirmatives and markers for number and gender have a specific semantic value which is context free. Affirmatives are an aspect of lexical derivation, and have traditionally been associated with internal inflection; however, this correlation is valid on the notional level only, while on the formal level affirmative derivation and internal inflection are irreducible. Thus *Aššur-ī-um* 'Assyrian' on the one hand and *damq-um* 'good' on the other are identical in terms of derivational value (as adjectives), but presuppose completely different morphological processes.

There are cases where morphological marking does not correspond to the pertinent physical features, e.g., when a singular marker is used for items which are plural in count ("collective"), or when an item which is feminine in sex is not marked as feminine in gender. There are also cases where no sex differentiation is present in the pertinent items, e.g., with inanimates or abstracts, though they still have a grammatical gender.

The markers for state and case serve as overt signals of certain syntactical correlations, and as such they are intrinsically context bound. A syntactical description, however, will sort the data from the viewpoint of syntactical categories, which do not correspond on a one-to-one basis with morphological markers.

Hence it is useful here to index, as it were, the pertinent markers for their value, leaving for the syntax a structural explanation of what this value really is. The states of the noun serve as markers for predication and annexation (a special type of nominalization). The cases serve as markers for major and minor constituents within sentences or noun phrases.

The first or “normal” state (e.g., *sinništum* ‘a woman’) exhibits the fullest range of variations, with a basic distinction in three cases, two numbers and two genders.

The second or “construct” state (e.g., *sinništi* ‘the woman of’) differs from the normal state in the case inflection, in that the basic distinction is only between two cases, and also because of some difference in the case endings themselves.

The third or “absolute” state (e.g., *sinniš* ‘woman’) exhibits only a distinction for gender and number, and none for case.

The fourth or “predicative” state (e.g., *sinnišat* ‘she is a woman’) is completely undifferentiated, i.e., it exhibits no inflectional variation at all when bound with suffix. It differentiates for gender and number only when the suffix is zero.

Denominal Afformatives

The main denominal, or derivational, afformatives, are only three, but they are common in usage and structurally important. They all serve to form nouns out of other nouns. The first of these is used for description of condition, the others for the subject of action or condition.

- 1 -*ūt*- is used to form abstracts, e.g., from the core *šarr*- ‘king’ one derives *šarr-ūt*- ‘kingship’; the afformative can be added to loanwords (e.g., *ṭupšarr-ūt*- ‘scribal art’) and even proper names (e.g., *Ḫanigalbat-ūt*- ‘Ḫanigalbat citizenship’).
- 2 -*ān*- is used to form an adjective from another noun, e.g., *ḫurāš-ān*- ‘golden’, or to emphasize the subject aspect when it is derived from a subject noun, e.g., *šarrāq-ān*- ‘a particular thief’. In the latter usage the afformative -*ān*- is especially frequent before plural markers of the masculine, e.g., *il-ān-u* ‘particular gods’ (as different from *il-ū* ‘the gods, the pantheon’). (Note that traditionally -*ānu* is considered as a single plural marker next to -*ū*; the reasons why I prefer to split the ending in two are: the “plural” -*ānū* does have a particularizing meaning which fits well with value of the denominal afformative, and the “plural” -*ānu* on the one hand and the denominal afformative -*ān*- on the other are in complementary distribution – in other words, there is no plural -*ān-ānu*.)
- 3 -*ī*- (known as *nisbe*) is used to form an adjective from another noun or pronoun, or from a proper name, e.g., *maḥr-ī*- ‘first’ (from *maḥr*- ‘front’); *mimm-ī*- ‘all any’ (from *mimma* ‘whatever’); *Uruk-ī*- ‘Urukean’.

It should be noted that the afformatives are the only productive denominative devices in Akkadian when primary nouns, loanwords, or proper names are at stake. For, without the possibility of deriving verbs out of these nouns (as re-

marked already above), no adjective can be derived from them through internal inflection.

The Normal State

The normal state is characterized by the fullest range of inflectional variations. Gender and number on the one hand, and case and number on the other are closely intertwined, so that structurally it seems best to present the system as comprised of two subsystems, one for the singular and one for the plural.

Table 5.2 The normal state

Number	Gender		Feminine		Case
	Masculine Substantive	Adjective	After <i>pars-</i> , <i>parr-</i>	After other shapes	
Sg.	šarr-Ø-um	šeḥḥer-Ø-um	šarr-at-um	'il-t-um	nom.
	šarr-Ø-am	šeḥḥer-Ø-am	šarr-at-am	'il-t-am	acc.
	šarr-Ø-im	šeḥḥer-Ø-im	šarr-at-im	'il-t-im	gen.
Pl.	šarr-Ø-ū	šeḥḥer-ūt-um	šarr-āt-um	'il-āt-um	nom.
	šarr-Ø-ī	šeḥḥer-ūt-im	šarr-āt-im	'il-āt-im	acc./gen.

Glosses: *šarrum* 'king'; *šeḥḥerum* 'small'; *šarratum* 'queen'; *'iltum* 'goddess'

In the singular, the masculine is unmarked, the feminine is characterized by an infix *-at* after the pattern *pars-* and after patterns ending in a long consonant, and by an infix *-t-* in all other cases, e.g:

kalb-at- 'bitch'
šarr-at- 'queen'
damiq-t- 'good (f.)'

The set of case endings in the singular is triptotic, with *-um* for the nominative, *-am* for the accusative, and *-im* for the genitive.

In the plural, the masculine is marked only indirectly, by the fact that it has a special (diptotic) set of case markers, namely *-ū* for the nominative, and *-ī* for the oblique. Note the lack of mimation (final *m*) and the presence of length which is generally a marker of plural number. A masculine plural ending *-ānu* is generally recognized in Akkadian grammar, but it seems best to interpret forms of this type as a regular plural in *-ū* added to the affirmative *-ān-*, e.g., *šarr-ān-ū* 'the particular kings' (see above).

The feminine plural is marked by a single infix *-āt-*, followed by a diptotic set of case endings, *-um* for the nominative, and *-im* for the oblique. In addition, there is a special marker for the plural masculine of adjectives, namely *-ūt-*, which is also followed by a diptotic set *-um* for the nominative and *-am* for the oblique.

The basic system just outlined applies regularly only to Old Babylonian. Begin-

ning with Middle Babylonian and then especially in Neo-Babylonian and Standard Babylonian. mimation and case endings in the singular are not used regularly (perhaps because the final short vowel was dropped as a result of phonological change), while in the plural the ending *-ī* (often changed phonologically to *-ē*) is used for all cases. As a result, the basic case declension may be considered monoptotic in the later periods, with uniform endings \emptyset for the singular and *-ī/-ē* for the plural.

The *-m* found at the end of the singular and of the feminine plural is considered here an integral part of the case markers, but this requires some qualifications. This final *-m* is often dropped in Old Babylonian, and then regularly in later dialects: since no particular contrast is apparent between forms with and without final *-m*, this feature is generally considered a free variant, called "mimation."

A dual marker is used, already in Old Babylonian, only for words implying duality, e.g., *kilallān* 'both', and especially for parts of the body which occur in pairs, e.g., *šepān* 'the two feet', *ubān-ān* 'the fingers (of the two hands)', *šap-t-ān* 'the two lips', *šinn-ān* 'the two (rows) of teeth'. The dual case is not productive in the specific sense that it is not used to express dual number as such, but only a semantic category, i.e., parts of the body occurring in pairs. Thus "two kings" is not expressed by **šarr-ān*, but rather by a noun phrase with the numeral for "two": *šarrū šenā* 'two kings'.

Three additional postfixes belong in some respects to the same distributional class as the case markers, although they are different in other respects. They are:

locative	<i>-ūm</i>	<i>warḥ-ūm</i>	'on a given month'
modal	<i>-ī</i>	<i>šalš-ūm-ī</i>	'being the third day, the day before yesterday'
terminative	<i>-iš</i>	<i>il-iš</i>	'to god'

Traditionally, only the locative and terminative are recognized as being related to the case system, while the modal is considered separately under a variety of headings; it does, however, belong to the same distributional, and notional, class as the locative and terminative.

The main difference with respect to the other case markers is that *-iš* may also occur in conjunction with other case endings, specifically *-ūm* and *-am*, e.g., *ūm-iš-am* 'daily', *kir-iš-ūm* 'into the orchard'. Also, they are attested only in the singular, both in the masculine and the feminine, e.g., *šall-at-iš* 'as booty'. Another important difference is that the terminative can also be added to a proper name which is otherwise undeclinable (e.g., *Idiglat-iš* 'to the Tigris') – another indication that it is not fully aligned with the other case markers, and behaves more like a postposition. The terminative (and possibly also the locative, though this is disputed) serve also to express the comparative, e.g., *šall-āt-iš* just quoted; often the ending *iš* in this function is preceded by the affirmative *-ān-*, e.g., *rīm-ān-iš* 'like a bull'.

The Construct State

A noun in the construct state is bound with another element which can be either a noun or a pronominal suffix in the genitive, or a clause with the verb in the subjunctive. The term “construct” refers to the noun in the construct state, “construent” to the element bound with the construct, and “constructive” to the pair of both elements, e.g., *bēl bītim* ‘master of the house’ is a constructive in which *bēl* is the construct and *bītim* the construent.

Two types of constructs may be distinguished. Construct I occurs when the construent is a noun or a clause; Construct II when the construent is a pronominal suffix, e.g.:

Construct I:	<i>bēl bītim</i>	‘the master of the house’
	<i>bēl illiku</i>	‘the lord who went’
Construct II:	<i>bēl-šu</i>	‘his lord’

This inflection for gender and number is identical to that of the normal state.

The inflection for case is more reduced. We must distinguish different sets of case endings, and while all together three cases may be isolated, no single set is in fact triptotic. (There are a few exceptions such as *ab-* ‘father’ or *aḥ-* ‘brother’ which exhibit the set *-ū, -ā, -ī* in Construct II.) A first set shows zero for all three cases; a second, zero for nominative and accusative, and *-ī* for genitive; and a third, *-ū* for the nominative and *-ī* for accusative and genitive:

	Set 1	Set 2	Set 3
Nominative	Ø	Ø	<i>ū</i>
Accusative	Ø	Ø	<i>ī</i>
Genitive	Ø	<i>ī</i>	<i>ī</i>

Set 1 is used in the singular of Construct I and in the plural of Construct I with preceding infixes; set 2 is used in the singular of Construct II; set 3 is used in the plural of Construct I without infixes and in the plural of Construct II. See Table 5.3, p. 80.

The dual is identical to the normal state, without final *n*, e.g., *šēp-ā* ‘the two feet of’.

The postfixes *-ūm*, *-ī* and *-iš* are the same in the construct as in the normal state. The locative is attested for all genders and numbers, the modal is attested only in the singular masculine, and the terminative is not attested in the masculine plural.

A special ending *-am* or *-a* is used in poetry, proper names and lexical lists. It is attested only for the singular masculine of Construct I, almost exclusively for the nominative, though occasionally also for vocative and accusative. It is never attested for the dual or the plural, nor for the genitive, nor for Construct II. In most cases it is used with adjectives, e.g., *rapšam uzni* ‘broad of ear’, ‘broad of understanding’, instead of expected *rapāš-Ø uzni*.

Table 5.3 The construct state in syntactical context with morphophonemic resolution of forms with Ø

Pattern with gender infixes	Word	Construct I	Construct II
Ends in simple consonant	bēl-um	<i>bēl</i> bitim t̃āb <i>bēl</i> bitim āmur ana <i>bēl</i> bitim the master of the house	<i>bēl</i> -šu t̃āb <i>bēl</i> -šu āmur (ana <i>bēl</i> -šu) his master
Ends in vowel	kala-um	<i>kala</i> ilī t̃ābū <i>kala</i> ilī āmur ana <i>kala</i> ilī all of the gods	<i>kalū</i> -šunū t̃ābū <i>kalā</i> -šunū āmur (ana <i>kalī</i> -šunū) all of them
Polysyllabic, ends in long consonant	kunukk-um	<i>kunuk</i> šarrim t̃āb <i>kunuk</i> šarrim āmur ana <i>kunuk</i> šarrim the seal of the king	<i>kunukka</i> -šu t̃āb <i>kunukka</i> -šu āmur (ana <i>kunukkī</i> -šu) his seal
Monosyllabic, ends in long consonant	libb-um	<i>libbi</i> ālim t̃āb <i>libbi</i> ālim āmur ana <i>libbi</i> ālim the heart of the city	<i>libba</i> -šu t̃āb <i>libba</i> -šu āmur (ana <i>libbī</i> -šu) his heart
Polysyllabic, ends in cluster	nidint-um	<i>nidinti</i> šarrim t̃āb <i>nidinti</i> šarrim āmur ana <i>nidinti</i> šarrim the gift of the king	<i>nidinta</i> -šu t̃āb <i>nidinta</i> -šu āmur (ana <i>nidintī</i> -šu) his gift
Monosyllabic, ends in cluster	kalb-um	<i>kalab</i> awīlim t̃āb <i>kalab</i> awīlim āmur ana <i>kalab</i> awīlim the dog of the man	<i>kalab</i> -šu t̃āb <i>kalab</i> -šu āmur (ana <i>kalbī</i> -šu) his dog

Glosses: *t̃āb* 'is good'; *āmur* 'I saw'; *ana* 'to'

Note: Forms in parentheses do not have a case ending in Ø.

The Absolute State

The noun in the absolute state (used rarely, and mostly in an adverbial sense) inflects only for number and gender. In the singular, the masculine is unmarked, the feminine has a marker *-at*; in the plural, only the feminine marker *-ā* is attested. The feminine singular is unmarked with nouns which have no feminine singular marker in the normal state, whether they are feminine by agreement or have a feminine plural marker (e.g., *ubān-Ø-um/ubān-āt-um* 'finger' – absolute state *ubān-Ø/ubān-ā*). Primary nouns with a feminine singular marker in the normal state, and with no masculine counterpart may occur in the absolute state either unmarked (e.g., *sinnīš-t-um* 'woman' – *sinnīš-Ø*) or with *-at* (e.g., *bām-t-um* 'half' – *bām-at*; *kall-at-um* 'daughter-in-law' – *kall-at*). There is no inflection for case. The complete inflectional scheme therefore is quite simple:

		Masculine	Feminine		
Normal state		(<i>mār-Ø-um</i>)	(<i>mār-t-um</i>	<i>sinniš-t-um</i>	<i>ubān-Ø-um</i>)
Absolute state	Sing.	<i>mār-Ø</i>	<i>mār-at</i>	<i>sinniš-Ø</i>	<i>ubān-Ø</i>
	Pl.	?	<i>mār-ā</i>	<i>sinniš-ā</i>	<i>ubān-ā</i>

The Predicative State

A noun in the predicative state is bound with pronominal suffixes in the nominative. The pronominal suffixes of the third person are marked (suffix \emptyset , and in this case the predicative state inflects for number and gender); with the other suffixes instead the predicative state is completely undifferentiated. It must be stressed that the predicative state of the feminine is unmarked even with primary nouns which are only feminine and which have the feminine marker (*a*)*t*- in all other states, e.g., *kall-at-um* 'daughter-in-law' occurs in the predicative state as *kall+(āku)* 'I am the daughter-in-law'. A complete inflectional differentiation may thus be noted among all states of the noun:

Normal	<i>nidin-t-um</i>
Construct I	<i>nidin-t-i</i>
Construct II	<i>nidin-t-a+(šu)</i>
Absolute	<i>nid[i]n-at-Ø</i>
Predicative + \emptyset	<i>nid[i]n-at-Ø+(Ø)</i>
Predicative + suffix	<i>nid[i]n-Ø+(āku)</i>

The distinction of two sets of postfixes, one marked before unmarked suffix, the other unmarked before marked suffix may seem arbitrary because the two sets are obviously in complementary distribution. This situation may best be illustrated by listing all possible combinations with pronominal suffixes:

<i>šarr-Ø + āku</i>	'I am a/the king/queen'
<i>šarr-Ø + āta</i>	'you are a/the king'
<i>šarr-Ø + āti</i>	'you are a/the queen'
<i>šarr-Ø + ānū</i>	'we are (the) kings/queens'
<i>šarr-Ø + ātunū</i>	'you are (the) kings'
<i>šarr-Ø + ātinā</i>	'you are (the) queens'
<i>šarr-Ø + Ø</i>	'he is (the) king'
<i>šarr-at + Ø</i>	'she is (the) queen'
<i>šarr-ū + Ø</i>	'they are (the) kings'
<i>šarr-ā + Ø</i>	'they are (the) queens'

Traditionally, the predicative state of the verbal adjective, in its bound form with the pronominal suffixes in the subject case, is considered a tense of the verb, and included in the verbal paradigms. This interpretation is uneconomical (because it accounts twice for the same phenomenon), and it is erroneous (because the predicative state is not restricted to the verbal adjective). The predicative state

must be considered uniformly as a special morphological realization of the predicate of a nominal sentence. Hence the terms “permansive” or “stative” may be retained to refer to a special type of nominal sentence, i.e., the bound form resulting from the combination of (any) noun in the predicative state plus the pronominal suffix of the subject.

Any noun may be inflected for the predicative state, e.g.:

Unmotivated	primary	<i>šarr-āku</i>	‘I am a king/queen’
	loanword	<i>ṭupsarr-āku</i>	‘I am a scribe’
Deverbal		<i>šarrāq-āku</i>	‘I am a thief’
Verbal		<i>dam(i)q-āku</i>	‘I am good’

In the vast majority of cases, when a verbal noun is inflected for the predicative state, it is the verbal adjective; in fact, this is so prevalent that grammars and dictionaries consider traditionally a form like *dam(i)q-āku* to be the “permansive” of the verb *damāqum*. In point of fact, the form *dam(i)q-āku* is specifically the “permansive” of the verbal adjective *dam(i)q-um*, and not generically of the verb as such.

The Verb

Person, Number and Gender

In the indicative, a set of prefixes serves as person markers, and a set of postfixes as gender and number markers (for the first person, the prefix already includes an indication of number). Traditionally, the prefixes include the first vowel of the verbal form; it seems best, however, to consider the prefix as being exclusively consonantal, because the vowel serves a stem determinant function. The imperative occurs only in the second person, hence the marker for person (prefixes) are omitted; the gender and number markers are the same postfixes as in the indicative. See Table 5.1, p. 72.

Mood

Traditionally, the term is used to refer to two quite distinct types. The first pertains to context-free categories, not conditioned by the presence or absence of other syntactic constituents in the sentence. This includes the imperative and indicative (see above), and the desiderative (see below).

Two other moods are instead context bound inasmuch as they must cooccur with, i.e., are conditioned by, other constituents. The subjunctive (as it is generally called) is the correlative of subordination, i.e., it occurs whenever a verb is introduced by a conjunction or a relative pronoun: it thus corresponds to the state and case of the noun. The allative (or ventive) is the correlative of an adjunct of motion toward a given point: it thus corresponds semantically to the separative.

The subjunctive is marked by a postfix *-u* after forms of the indicative which end in a consonant. It is the regular mood of subordinate (except conditional) and

relative clauses, e.g., *ša iprusu* 'who divided'.

The ventive or allative is characterized by a set of postfixes added to the indicative or the imperative, namely: *-am* after a radical, *-m* after *+ī*, *-nim* after *+ū* or *+ā*. The meaning is often that of direction toward the speaker, but in many cases it seems undistinguishable from the indicative. Examples: *taprus-am* 'you went toward me = you came', *taprusī-m*, *iprusū-nim*.

The desiderative expresses positive or negative wish on the part of the speaker, and is normally rendered in English simply by the auxiliary "may" or "let" in front of the main verb, e.g., "I wish that he may (not) go" = "may he (not) go," "let him (not) go." When the subject of the main action is of the third person, and the action is positive, the desiderative is traditionally called precative (or optative or jussive); with a first person subject and positive action, the traditional term is cohortative; with negative action and any person as subject, the traditional term is vetitive. Since precative, cohortative and vetitive are in complementary distribution, they should all be subsumed under the same category, which is here called "desiderative."

The desiderative is formed by prefixes added to the pattern of the preterite. Note that the first vowel of the pattern is omitted when the prefix ends in a vowel. This causes some differences between the desiderative and the indicative preterite, which it may be well to point out:

	B stem		D stem	
Singular	3rd	1st	3rd	1st
Indicative	<i>'iprus</i>	<i>'aprus</i>	<i>'uparris</i>	<i>'uparris</i>
Desiderative	<i>liprus</i>	<i>luprus</i>	<i>līparris</i>	<i>lūparris</i>

Positive wish for the 2nd person is not normally expressed by the desiderative. In its place one finds (with different nuances in meaning) either (1) the imperative, or (2) the independent particle *lū* followed by the present or the noun in the predicative state, e.g., *lū taḥassas* 'you should think', *lū baḥ-āta* 'may you be in good health'.

The Pronoun

While inflection proper occurs only for gender, number and case (see Tables 5.4 and 5.5, p. 84), the alternation of forms for the different persons is not inflectional; rather different word bases are used to refer to the different subjects.

The two sets of pronouns (for subject and oblique case respectively) are characterized by the following consonants:

	Set I		Set II	
Sg. 1	<i>k</i>	'I'	<i>y, n, '</i>	'me'
Pl. 1	<i>n</i>	'we'	<i>n</i>	'us'
Sg./Pl. 2	<i>t</i>	'you'	<i>k</i>	'you'
Sg./Pl. 3	Ø	'he, she, they'	<i>š</i>	'him, her, them'

Table 5.4 The personal pronoun, set 1

<i>Nominative Independent</i>			<i>Suffix</i>
Sg.	1c.	anāku	-āku
	2m.	ʾatta	-āta
	f.	ʾatti	-āti
	3m.	šū	Ø
	f.	ši	Ø
Pl.	1c.	nīnū	-ānū
	2m.	ʾattunū	-ātunū
	f.	ʾattinā	-ātinā
	3m.	šunū	Ø
	f.	šinā	Ø

Table 5.5 The personal pronoun, set 2

		<i>Possessive and genitive</i>		<i>Accusative and after preposition</i>	
		<i>Independent</i>	<i>Suffix</i>	<i>Independent</i>	<i>Suffix</i>
Sg.	1c.	yūm	-ma/-ya/-ī	yāti	-ni
	2m.	kūm	-ka	k(u)āti	-ka
	f.		-ki	kāti	-ki
	3m.	šūm	-šu	š(u)āti	-šu
	f.		-ša	š(i)āti	-ši
Pl.	1c.	nūm	-ni	niāti	-niāti
	2m.	?	-kunū	kunūti	-kunūti
	f.		-kinā	kināti	-kināti
	3m.	šunūm	-šunū	šunūti	-šunūti
	f.		-šinā	šināti	-šināti

Other pronouns include the following:

Interrogative	<i>mannum</i> 'who'; <i>mīnum</i> 'what'
Relative	<i>ša</i> 'who, which'; <i>mala</i> 'which'
Determinative	<i>ša</i> 'the one of'
Demonstrative	<i>ann-ī-um</i> 'this'; <i>ull-ī-um</i> 'that'
Possessive	<i>yūm</i> 'mine'; <i>kūm</i> 'yours'; <i>šūm</i> 'his'; <i>nūm</i> 'ours'

The latter two types of pronouns show occasionally /n/ as final consonant (nutation) instead of *m*.

Morphophonemics

Alternations Conditioned by Internal Inflection

Alternations Affecting Patterns

Only two alternations, particularly characteristic of Akkadian, are described here.

1 The conditioning factor is a root with *r* as one radical and *i* as root vowel, e.g., *qrib* as in *qerēbum* 'to approach', or *ṣḥir* as in *ṣeḥērum* 'to be small'. The alternation affects all patterns containing one or more vowels *a*, which are realized with vowel *e* instead:

{ qarāb }	= <i>qerēb</i>	'approaching of'
{ ṣaḥir }	= <i>ṣeḥir</i>	'he is small'
{ ṣaḥir+am }	= <i>ṣeḥram</i>	'small'

Note that the morphophonemic alternation is limited to the pattern (resulting from internal inflection) and does not extend to the accusative postfix *-am* (resulting from external inflection), though exceptions are known, e.g.,

{ ṣaḥir+āta }	= <i>ṣeḥrēta</i>	'you are small'
---------------	------------------	-----------------

The existence of words such as *maḥārum* 'to receive' and *gamir* 'it is complete' (both with root vowel *u/a*) clearly shows that the alternation { *a* } = /*e*/ is truly morphophonemic; the simple presence of *r* as a radical, and even *i* as a vowel other than root vowel (i.e. as a pattern vowel), are not sufficient to cause the alternation automatically.

2 The conditioning factor is a root with a labial as a radical (in any position), e.g., *pḥr* (labial in first position) as *paḥārum* 'to gather', *ṣpr* (labial second) as in *ṣapārum* 'to send', *rkb* (labial third) as in *rakābum* 'to ride'. The alternation affects the pattern *mapras*, which, when derived from these roots, is realized as *npras*, with alternation of the first consonant:

{ mapḥar+um }	= <i>napḥarum</i>	'gathering'
{ maṣpar+t+um }	= <i>naṣpartum</i>	'letter'
{ markab+t+um }	= <i>narkabtum</i>	'chariot'

The purely morphophonemic nature of the alternation is substantiated by the existence of words with initial *ma* which retain a labial in the remainder of the base because they are not subject to the terms of the morphophonemic alternation as stated, e.g., *mamītum* 'oath' (labial as first consonant after *ma*), or *madbarum* 'desert' (labial as second consonant after *ma*).

Alternations Affecting Roots and Patterns: Weak Roots

What are traditionally treated as weak roots (generally one speaks of weak verbs,

but the alternations affect nominal derivation as well) can be analyzed as morphophonemic alternations conditioned by internal inflection and affecting the realization of both the root and the pattern.

Weak roots may be described as having unstable radicals. Such instability affects the quality and occasionally the quantity, though never the order. For example, the first radical of the root meaning 'to bring' may occur as *w*, *'* or length (variation as to quality) or it may not appear at all (variation as to quantity – only two radicals are left). The complete notation of the weak radical would be *w/:/'/Ø*, and the notation of the root (*w/:/'/Ø*)*bl*, with the pertinent variations exemplified in the infinitive B *wabālum*, the perfect B *it:abal*, the infinitive Bt *'itbulu*, and the imperative B (Ø)*bil*.

From the fact that the first radical may be realized as length or zero it is clear that this root may not be considered as purely triconsonantal, precisely because the first radical is not consistently consonantal in nature. It is for this reason that such roots are traditionally known as "weak": they are conceived as having one radical which does not succeed, as it were, in maintaining its consonantal integrity, in contrast with the strong roots which remain triconsonantal throughout. The specific meaning which is given here to the notion of "weak radical" may be stated as "a set of alternating realizations." To indicate such sets capital letters will be used, e.g., *W* for *w/:/'/Ø* (hence *Wbl*).

The possible realizations of the weak radical are only six: length, *'*, *n*, *w*, *y*, and zero. Starting from the notion of weak radical as a set of alternating realizations, statements will be necessary to predict the manner of alternation for any given set. These statements are based on the morphophonemic environment, which may be reduced to two main types, with two subtypes each, as follows:

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 1 cluster | (a) radical as first element of cluster |
| | (b) radical as second element of cluster |
| 2 non-cluster | (a) radical intervocalic |
| | (b) radical initial or final |

Occasionally it will be necessary to differentiate between verbal and nominal patterns, though normally the same statements apply to both categories.

We cannot review here the details of conjugation of each class of weak verb. Suffice it to say that there is a high degree of regularity in such conjugations: even so-called "irregular" verbs such as *'izuzzu* and *'itūlu* can be considered as regular, since they can be analyzed as weak quadriradicals.

Alternations Conditioned by External Inflection

Various types of assimilation occur only at the morphemic boundary between elements of external inflection, for instance {*īpuš+am+šum*} = *īpušaššum* 'he did to him' but *šamš+um* 'sun' (no morphemic boundary between *m* and *š*, hence no assimilation).

A distinctive Akkadian phonotactic rule states that when, through the addition of inflectional postfixes, a sequence of three syllables results, of which the first two are short, the sequence is realized as bisyllabic without the middle vowel (alternatively, the middle vowel is syncopated). See, e.g., {damiq+um} = *damqum* 'good'; {iktašad+ūm} = *iktašdūm* 'they reached'. The rule does not apply with suffixes and enclitics, in which case the morpheme boundary is obviously of a different nature than the boundary occurring before postfixes, e.g., *šarra+kunū* 'your king' (not **šarkunū*).

Alternations affecting syllabic structure at morphemic boundary with zero occur only in the construct state. Problems arise only when a long consonant or a consonantal cluster result in word-final position. In such cases, a vowel is generally added, the quality of which is governed by rules which consider the phonological structure of the base, for instance {tupp + Ø šarrim} = *tuppi šarrim* 'the tablet of the king'. In other cases, a long consonant is shortened, e.g., {kunukk + Ø šarrim} = *kunuk šarrim* 'the seal of the king'. See Table 5.3, p. 80.

Syntax

Government

Verbal and Nominal Predicate: The "Permansive"

The predicate of a sentence may consist of either a verb phrase or a noun phrase. The difference between the two is primarily that the verbal predicate refers to an action, and is temporally determined according to tense inflection, whereas the nominal predicate refers to a state or condition, and can be determined temporally only by means of adverbs.

Traditionally, the predicative state of the noun is considered separately from the other nominal predicates. In fact, most Akkadian grammars today do not even recognize the existence of a predicative state as part of nominal inflection; rather they consider predicative state and subject pronominal suffixes as one unit, which is called "permansive" (also "stative") and subsumed under the forms of the verb. As a result, *šarrāta* 'you are king' is completely separated from *atta šarrum dannum* 'you are a powerful king'. Syntactically, however, they serve the same function and should be considered together.

Predicate and Complements

Complements are all adverbial, i.e., they occur regularly in a verb phrase, in that they serve to "complete" the process described by the verb. In the terminology adopted here, a complement differs from an adjunct in that it is an essential, or nuclear, part of phrase, in contradistinction from an adjunct, which is non-essential. Complements consist of either noun phrases or subordinate clauses.

The direct object occurs regularly in the accusative, unless it is invariable. Of the transitive verbal nouns, participle and infinitive do not as a rule occur as pred-

icates; hence their occurrence is treated below in connection with the nominalizing transformation.

The verbal adjective of transitive roots, on the other hand, occurs regularly as the predicate, and in that case it often governs the direct object, although it occurs even more frequently without direct object and then normally with a passive function. The direct object is always in the accusative, e.g., *tertam šabit* 'he holds office'.

When the context does not allow the use of a substantive or a pronoun as single complement, the latter is expressed by means of a noun of description derived from the same root of the verb. This is normally expressed in English by an indefinite pronoun, which serves the same purpose of what has been called a "dummy object." See for example *hubtam aḥbut* 'I stole something' (lit. 'a stealing'). Since the same root of the predicate is used for the object, this is traditionally called the paronomastic, cognate or internal accusative.

The complement of a transitive verb may be expressed twice, the second time in the form of a personal pronominal suffix appended to the verb. The use of the resumptive pronoun seems to be a matter of free variation, conditioned at most by stylistic emphasis or the need for better clarification of the relationships among the constituents. See, for example, *dayyānam šuāti ina dīn idīnu enēm ukannūšu* 'that judge they will convict him for having changed the verdict he had given'.

The place of the direct object may be taken by a clause, called the "objective clause." Such clauses are introduced by the conjunction *kīma* 'that' in Old Babylonian, and *kī* 'that' in Middle and Neo-Babylonian. Negation is regularly *lā* and the verb in the subjunctive. See for example *Nidnat-Sīn ... kīma puḥādi nēmettaka ana ekallim lā tublam iqbām* 'Nidnat-Sīn ... said to me that you have not yet brought to the palace the lambs which represent your tax'.

Predicate and Adjuncts

From a formal point of view, or in terms of surface structure, three categories may be distinguished. The first two may be called analytic, and consist of either prepositional phrases (i.e., a preposition plus a noun in the genitive) or subordinate clauses (i.e., a conjunction plus a sentence). The third category may be called synthetic, in that the adverbial nature of the construction is expressed purely by inflectional means, without prepositions. The relevant markers of the synthetic adjuncts are:

- 1 the accusative singular (-*am*), as in *ūmam* 'today';
- 2 the locative (-*ūm*) as in *warkānūm* 'afterwards' or in the "absolute infinitive";
- 3 the terminative (-*iš*), occasionally combined with the accusative (-*iš-am*), as in *šapliš* 'below' or *šattišam* 'yearly';
- 4 the modal (-*ī*), as in *amšalī* 'yesterday';
- 5 the absolute state, as in *kayyān* 'constantly'.

More than one adjunct may occur in any sentence, and an adjunct in the accusative may occur in the same sentence next to the direct object complement, also in the accusative. This gives rise to the so-called double accusative, where it must be noted, however, that similarity in the inflection is only one of surface, and does not reflect identity of structure at a deeper level. Thus in the sentence *šubāta qaqqad-ka kuttim* 'cover your head by means of a cloth' only the second accusative (*qaqqad* 'head') is a complement, while the first one (*šubāta* 'cloth') is a non-essential adjunct.

While it seems possible that adjuncts of all notional categories could have been expressed both analytically (prepositional phrases) and synthetically (noun phrases), in fact the first type is the most common, and the only one of the two attested for all notional categories.

The place of an adjunct may also be taken by a subordinate clause, which is regularly introduced by a conjunction, and is further characterized by the predicate in the subjunctive and the negative particle *lā* (rather than *ul*). The notional content of the clause is partly determined by the conjunction, though some of them are ambiguous as to their meaning.

Word Order

Absolute Positions

The only instances where contact sequences between constituents may clearly be established are when either the subject or the complement or, more rarely, the adjunct consist of suffixes: then they always follow the predicate, and are in close juncture with it. Examples:

Subject	<i>šarr-āku</i>	'I am king'
Direct object	<i>āmur-šu</i>	'I saw him'
Indirect object	<i>addin-šum</i>	'I gave to him'
Adjunct	<i>ēkim-šu</i>	'I took away from him'

Two complements may both occur together as suffixes, in which case the indirect object precedes the direct object, e.g.

addin-šuš-šu 'I gave it to him'

The only other instance, outside of suffixation, in which a contact sequence seems to obtain is between subject and predicate when the subject is an interrogative pronoun and the predicate a nominal predicate. See for instance:

Ina Bābilim ana dummuqikunū mīnu ḥištakunū?

'What is your reward in Babylon for your good behavior?'

In discontinuous sequences, i.e., sequences in which no contact is required

between constituents, rules can be established only for sentence- and clause-final and initial position. These position rules apply whether the sequence is a sentence or a clause.

Two elements only are normally found in sentence- or clause-final position.

1 The subject is sentence final when it is an independent personal pronoun and the predicate is nominal. (Note the close parallelism with the contact sequence found in the stative.) Examples are:

Ina Bābilim warad ekallim anāku

'In Babylon I was a servant of the palace.'

kī yatīma atta

'You are like me.'

Note that *-ma* in the latter example indicates clearly that *kī yati* is the predicate. Clear exceptions (identifiable because of the *-ma* after the predicate) are not frequent, e.g.

anāku wēdišyāma 'I am all alone.'

2 In all other cases, and that means in the vast majority of the cases, sentence-final position is normally occupied by the predicate, be it verbal, be it nominal, e.g.:

Verbal predicate *šarrum illik*

'The king went.'

Nominal predicate *bītum annūm bīt-ka*

'This house is your house.'

Exceptions are not infrequent, especially in poetry and political literature (royal inscriptions). They seem to occur mostly for euphonic and stylistic reasons, and may be divided in two groups accordingly:

(a) The predicate occurs in penultimate rather than final position in order for the sentence to end with a syllabic sequence consisting of long and short syllables ("trochaic clause"), which is a preferred prosodic feature for sentence-final position, e.g.: *išpura rakkūšu* 'he sent his messengers'.

With the predicate in final position, the sentence would end with a dactyl rather than a trochee: *rakkūšu išpura*.

Often, however, the inversion occurs even without any effect on prosody, and one may perhaps conclude that, especially in political literature, a new sentence-final position had become acceptable, namely the sequence predicate-direct object, at least when the direct object consists of a single word ending in a trochee, e.g. *uṣaḥḥir massu* 'I reduced his country.'

(b) Another common exception to the rule which places the predicate in sentence-final position is to emphasize the predicate by inverting the order of constituents, especially by placing the predicate in initial position. This occurs in initial position, e.g.:

ana nawēm ša Ḫana ... šulmum

'There is peace in the encampment of the Ḫaneans,'

'As for the encampment of the Ḫaneans, it's at peace.'

Two elements can occur only in clause-initial position, namely conjunctions and relative pronouns; they are also mutually exclusive, as they can never occur together in the same clause.

Similarly, the subject, object or adjunct of a non-pronominal attributive clause can only occur in clause-initial position when they are the same as the head from which the attributive clause depends (see p. 93).

Exceptions are rare, e.g.:

PN *išti* PN₂ *šumma ittāmar*

'If PN is seen with PN₂'

Relative Positions

No clear role may be formulated for relative sequence of constituents, i.e., no rank may be assigned the constituents of a sentence (unlike the case with the constituents of a phrase resulting from the nominalizing transformation, see p. 93). Certain trends, however, may be pointed out, the validity of which still needs to be tested statistically on a representative body of texts. The trends may be stated as follows:

- 1 the subject tends to occur before the direct object, e.g.:
šumma dayyānum dīnam idīn 'if the judge has issued a verdict';
- 2 the direct object tends to occur before the indirect object:
ūmam ana mūšim lītēr 'may he turn day into night';
- 3 the major emphasis tends to fall on the element which is farther away from the predicate toward the beginning of the clause, e.g.:

ana warkat ūmī, ana matīma (adjuncts of time)

šarrum, ša ina mātīm ibbaššū (subject + attributive clause)

awāt mišarim, ša ina nāriya ašṭuru (object + attributive clause)

lišsur (predicate)

'In the future, forever,

the king who will be in the land

the words of justice, which I wrote on my stela,

let him keep.'

Feature Analysis

Of particular interest are two lexical features pertaining to the verb. They are:

<action>	{ +	<i>alāku</i> 'to go', <i>šabātu</i> 'to seize'
	{ - <condition>	<i>damāqu</i> 'to be good' = <intransitivity>
<transitivity>	{ +	<i>šabātu</i> = <action>
	{ - <intransitivity>	<i>damāqu, alāku</i>

The adjective which is commonly used in Akkadian grammar to refer to (<+action) is "fientive," while the adjective referring to (<-action) is "stative" (not to be confused with the "stative" or "permansive" as a special type of nominal sentence).

The distinction between verbs of action and verbs of condition, which is essential for Akkadian, is borne out especially by the following considerations:

- 1 Verbs of condition do not occur as imperatives. See for example the following contrasting pair:
 (<+action) : *ilik* 'go'
 (<-action) : **dimiq*.
- 2 Verbs of condition occur in finite forms with an ingressive aspect only:
 (<+action) : *illak* 'he goes'
 (<-action) : *idammīq* 'he becomes good' vs. *damiq* 'he is good'.
- 3 The causative transformation operates differently with verbs of action and verbs of condition.

Nominalization

Relative Clauses

Relativization is the more common type of nominalization with finite verb. A relative clause is introduced by the pronoun *ša*, which may be resumed by a personal pronoun when the relative pronoun corresponds to the object, and must be so resumed when it corresponds to a genitive or dative:

<i>ša</i> (nom.)	<i>ṭuppam išpuru</i> '(the man) who sent a tablet'
<i>ša</i> (acc.)	<i>šarrum išpuru-(šu)</i> 'whom the king sent'
<i>ša</i> (dat.)	<i>šarrum bītam iddinuṣum</i> 'to whom the king gave a house'
<i>ša</i> (gen.)	<i>mārūšu ṭuppam išpurū</i> 'whose sons sent the tablet'
<i>ša</i> (gen.)	<i>ina bītišu uššabu</i> 'in whose house I dwell'

In all cases the predicate is placed in the subjunctive. With the desiderative, which morphologically does not allow a subjunctive, a construction with *ša* and the genitive of the infinitive is used instead:

<i>lišpur</i>	'he ought to send'
<i>ša šapārim</i>	'which he ought to send' (* <i>lišpuru</i> is impossible)

When the relative clause is restrictive, the relative pronoun is normally deleted and the noun to which the relative pronoun refers is placed in the construct state. Deletion of the pronoun is only possible when the predicate is verbal, but (unlike English) it may occur with all cases:

<i>awīl ṭuppam išpuru</i>	'the man who sent the tablet'
<i>awīl šarrum išpuru</i>	'the man the king sent'
<i>awīl šarrum bītam iddinušum</i>	'the man to whom the king gave a house'

Subjective and Objective Genitive

Any verbal predicate (whether stative, transitive or intransitive) and its relative subject may be nominalized by transforming the predicate or the complement into a corresponding noun of description, in the construct state, and the subject into a dependent genitive.

Stative verb	<i>šū dan</i> 'he is powerful' ~ <i>dunnašu</i> 'his strength'
Intransitive verb	<i>šū illik</i> 'he went' ~ <i>alakšu</i> 'his going'
Transitive verb	<i>šū inaššar</i> 'he watches' ~ <i>maššartašu</i> 'his watch'
Complement	<i>šarrum qištam (iddin)</i> 'the king (gave) a gift' ~ <i>qišti šarrim</i> 'the gift of the king'

A transitive predicate may occur nominalized in the construct state followed by the genitive of the complement:

<i>qištam iddin</i>	'he gave a gift'	~ <i>nādin qištim</i> 'the giver of the gift' or ~ <i>nidinti qištim</i> 'the giving of the gift'
---------------------	------------------	--

Attribute and "Attributive" Genitive

A predicate consisting of a verb of condition is nominalized by transforming the finite predicate into a verbal adjective, which is then in concord with the subject of the kernel sentence and functions as an attribute proper:

šarrum dan 'the king is powerful' ~ *šarrum dannum* 'the powerful king'

A very frequent expression in Akkadian, as in other Semitic languages, is the so-called "attributive genitive", e.g.: *āl dannūti* 'city of strength' or 'strong city'. The attributive value, however, is inferred intuitively from the translation into modern languages and cannot properly be derived from linguistic analysis. In the specific example quoted, the verb *danānu* cannot be predicated of the subject *ālu*, since the correlative lexical feature for the subject is (+animate). In such constructions, then, the noun in the construct does not correspond to the subject of an underlying sentence such as "the city is strong," but rather to the adjunct of a sentence with a deleted subject, such as "in the city (people) are strong."

The so-called "attributive" genitive is especially frequent with abstracts derived from primary nouns, e.g.: *šubat ilūti* 'the dwelling of divinity', i.e., 'divine dwelling'. Here too the construct is not equated with the quality of the genitive (it is not that 'the dwelling is god' or even 'godlike'), but rather it is the adjunct of a sentence of which one may understand "gods" to be the subject: 'dwelling in which

the gods (may dwell)'. This construction appears at first to be especially suited for a qualification as "attributive" because adjectives from primary nouns are not productive (for example, there is no adjective **il-ī-u*, and *il-ān-ī-u* has the special meaning 'blessed by god, prosperous'); in fact, however, it has a potential value: 'the city in which one may feel secure', 'dwelling where the gods may reside'.

Limitative, Partitive, Superlative

A transformational analysis of the nominalized construction *šalmāt qaqqadim* 'the black (ones) of head' presupposes an underlying sentence such as "the people are black as to the head." This is generally called a "genitive of relation," but it seems more appropriate to call it a genitive of limitation, since it limits the range of effectiveness of the predicate. Other examples are:

damqam inim 'good of eyes' (with the unusual construct state in *-am*)
kabit kaspim 'heavy in silver'

A special type corresponds to the use of a paronomastic infinitive in the kernel sentence, e.g., *le'ū le'ūti* 'strong of strength' (corresponding to *le'ūm le'ī* 'in being strong he is strong').

Conjunction

Reversible Sequences

Only two types of conjoined sentences may be recognized as reversible in terms of surface structure, i.e., by means of specific markers. The first type includes the disjunctive sentences, i.e., sentences which are notionally mutually exclusive. They are characterized formally either by the particle *ū* 'or' occurring between the two sentences, or by the particles *lū ... lū*, *šumma ... šumma* 'whether ... or', either ... or', with one particle occurring in front of either sentence. Sentences of this type, namely *īkul ū išti* 'he ate or drank' = *išti ū īkul* 'he drank or ate' are always reversible. Examples are:

ū *šumma sābitum ana šīm šikarim še'am lā imtaḥar,*
 ina abnim rabītim kaspam imtaḥar,
 ū maḥīr šikarim ana maḥīr še'im umtaḥī ...
 'If an innkeeper has not received barley in payment for beer and has received instead silver by the heavy weight, or if she has reduced the value of beer in relation to the value of barley ...'.

ū lū *šumma ... eqlam Adad irtaḥiṣ*
 ū lū bibbulum itbal
 'If either Adad has flooded the field or a flood has carried it away ...'.

*šumma šumma kišām ilqī-ma ittalak,
šumma maḥrikum ...*

'Whether he took the purse and went away, or whether he is still with you ...'.

Direct speech and the sentence introducing it may be considered as conjoined sentences. They are normally reversible, and characterized by special markers which occur with the first sentence. The markers vary depending on whether the sentence introducing direct speech or the direct speech itself comes first. If direct speech is first, then the suffix *-mi* is added, optionally, to one of the constituents of direct speech (occasionally more than once if direct speech includes in turn several sentences):

nādinānum-mi iddinam, maḥar šībī-mi ašām iqtabī

'“A seller gave to me, I bought (it) in front of a witness” he has said.'

If the introductory sentence comes first, then the particle *umma* begins the sentence, and the suffix *-ma* is added to the subject of the introductory sentence:

umma Ḥammurapī-ma rabiān Medēm aššum ḥibiltišu ulammidanni

'Thus (said) Ḥammurapi: the mayor of Medūm has informed me about his loss.'

This is the standard form in letters (as in the previous example), in which case the entire letter may be considered as a single direct speech.

Irreversible Sequences

Of the two sentences constituting an irreversible sequence, only one may be introduced by a conjunctive particle. The two possible subtypes are thus characterized according to whether the particle precedes the first or the second sentence.

1 A sentence introduced by *šumma* 'if' occurs regularly first in a conjoined transform. This first sentence is known as protasis, while the second is known as apodosis, e.g.:

protasis: *šumma awīlum šinni awīlim meḥrišu ittadī*

apodosis: *šinnašu inaddū*

'If a man knocks out the tooth of a man who is his peer,
they will knock out his tooth.'

The protasis and apodosis are properly two conjoined sentences rather than a subordinate and main sentence: the protasis, in fact, does not correspond to any other constituent of the sentence, such as complement and adjunct, or of the phrase, such as attribute. It is rather an irreducible sentence which may only be analyzed as the result of a conjoining transformation, which combines two separate sentences.

Negation in the protasis occurs with the particle *lā* as with subordinate clauses, rather than *ul* as with main sentences:

šumma nukaribbum eqlam ina zāqāpim lā igmur
 'If a gardener has not finished planting a field'

Only seldom is the negation *ul* employed, and then in a potential sense, apparently to reduce the strength of negation when the speaker hopes that the negative hypothesis may not come true:

šumma GN ul ikšudū tuppam lišakšidū-šu
 'Should they not (be able to) reach GN (as I hope they will) one should have (at least) the letter reach him.'

2 A typical Akkadian construction (generally called "virtual subordination") uses the particle *-ma* suffixed to the predicate of the first sentence. Many notional ranges may be expressed by this construction.

Deletion

Subject

The subject is often deleted when it can easily be resupplied on the basis of the context. It must be noted, however, that the subject is always implicitly present in a verbal predicate, since indication of the subject is included in the inflection markers for person (historically connected with pronominal subject markers). With a nominal predicate the subject may only be deleted if it is of the third person (and then again, the subject must be known from the context). See for instance:

nukurtum-ma '(it) is a case of hostility'
ana bēlīšu-ma '(the loss) is of its owner'

The subject is normally deleted with the imperative, since a command is as a rule addressed to a person immediately present to the speaker; if the subject is retained for emphasis, it may be considered in the vocative:

attunū ... ana Bābilim alkā 'You, leave for Babylon!'

For examples of subject deletion with the indicative one may quote instances in which the topic of discussion is known from previous sentences within the same discourse and is not repeated, not even in pronominal form (square brackets indicate deletion):

Anumma Sîn-ayyabāš, ištēn guzalām u šatammī ... uwa''eram ...
Inūma [Sîn-ayyabāš, guzalām u šatammū] issanqūnikkum,
ittišunū alik.

'Now I have sent S., one servant and the managers.
 When [S., one servant and the managers] come to you,
 go with them.'

Similarly the subject may be deleted when an adjunct clause has the same subject as the main clause in which it is embedded, in which case deletion affects normally the subject not of the first, but of the subsequent sentence:

deletion:	<i>inūma aḥḥū izuzzū</i> <i>ina makkūr bīt abim ana aḥiṣunū šeḥrim ...</i> <i>kasap terḥatim [aḥḥū] išakkanūšum</i> 'When the brothers divide (the inheritance), they will set aside the bride price from the family estate for their younger brother.'
no deletion:	<i>ištu bēlī ... lā iddinam</i> <i>bēlī ... liddinam</i> 'Since my lord did not give (before), let my lord give (now).'

A special case of subject deletion is found with the "impersonal" predicate, i.e., a predicate in the third plural with generic subject, normally translated in English with "one" and the third singular, e.g.

iqabbū ... 'on says (that) ...'

Complement

Deletion of single complement is less frequent than subject deletion, but is similarly conditioned by contextual environment; if not repeated literally, the object is normally present at least in the form of a pronominal suffix. (Object deletion is more frequent on the level of the nominalizing and conjoining transforms, for which see p. 98.)

A special case of object deletion is what is known as "lexical" deletion, i.e., a deletion which occurs regardless of context and only with reference to a specific object which is assumed to be generally known. Thus for example *šaḳālum* 'to weigh' has become lexicalized with meaning 'to pay' whether or not it governs an object such as *kaspam* 'silver'.

Predicate

Deletion of predicate is very rare, and is always conditioned by a clear contextual situation. See for instance how in the following sentence the predicate is to be supplied from the previous sentence:

... *mimmāšu ḥalqam irīabbū-šum.*
Šumma napištum [ḥalqar]
ālum u rabiānum l mana kaspam ... išaqqalū
 'Whatever was lost they will return to him.
 If a life (was lost),
 the city and the mayor will pay one mina of silver.'

Only in one instance is the deletion of the predicate regular, namely in the introductory sentence in front of direct speech, where the standard formula calls only for the name of the speaker, with regular deletion of a verb for saying or speaking:

umma Ḥammurapī-ma [iqbī]
 'Thus Ḥammurapī spoke, said.'

Noun Phrase

One of the three major constituents is always deleted as the result of nominalization, since only two constituents may appear in any given transform.

In some cases more than one constituent may be deleted, sometimes as the result of a lexical deletion, e.g., *nādinānum* 'seller' (without specific reference to what is being sold).

While all other deletions do not entail any other transformation in the sentence besides deletion itself, pronoun deletion with attributive clauses also transforms the head of the attributive clause from the normal into the construct state, e.g.:

awātum ša iqbū ul uktīn
 'The word which he spoke he did not confirm.'
awāt iqbū ul uktīn
 'The word he spoke he did not confirm.'

Further Reading

- Aro, Jussi. 1957. *Studien zur mittelbabylonischen Grammatik* (Studia Orientalia 22). Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica.
- Buccellati, Giorgio. 1988. "The State of the 'Stative'." In *Fucus: A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 58). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 153-189.
- . 1996. *A Structural Grammar of Babylonian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- De Meyer, Léon. 1962. *L'Accadien des contrats de Suse* (Suppléments Iranica Antiqua 1). Leiden: Brill.
- Finet, André. 1956. *L'accadien des lettres de Mari* (Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques, Mémoires 51, 1). Brussels: Palais des Académies.
- Gelb, I. J. 1961. *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*, 2nd edn. (Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary 2). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1969. *Sequential Reconstruction of Proto-Akkadian* (Assyriological Studies 18). Chi-

- cago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hecker, Karl. 1968. *Grammatik der Kültepe-Texte* (Analecta Orientalia 44). Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Huehnergard, John. 1987. "'Stative,' Predicative Form, Pseudo-Verb." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 47: 215–232.
- . 1988. *The Akkadian of Ugarit* (Harvard Semitic Studies 34). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- Kraus, F. R. 1987. *Sonderformen Akkadischer Parataxe: Die Koppelungen* (Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde 50, 1). Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandische Uitgevers Maatschappij.
- Mayer, Werner. 1971. *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik des Mittelassyrischen* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament – Sonderreihe 2). Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Reiner, Erica. 1964. "The Phonological Interpretation of a Subsystem in the Akkadian Syllabary." In *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. 167–180.
- . 1966. *A Linguistic Analysis of Akkadian* (Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 21). The Hague: Mouton.
- Salonen, Erkki. 1962. *Untersuchungen zur Schrift und Sprache des altbabylonischen von Susa, mit Berücksichtigung der Mālamir-Texte* (Studia Orientalia 27, 1). Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica.
- Soden, Wolfram von. 1932–1933. "Der hymnisch-epische Dialekt des Akkadischen." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 40: 163–227; 41: 90–183, 236.
- . 1952. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (Analecta Orientalia 33). 2nd edn. 1969, *Analecta Orientalia* 47. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Ungnad, Arthur. 1903–1904. "Zur Syntax der Gesetze Hammurabis." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 17: 353–378; 18: 1–67.
- . 1964. *Grammatik des Akkadischen*, 4th edn., revised L. Matouš. (1906¹, 1926², 1949³.) Munich: C. H. Beck.
- . 1992. *Akkadian Grammar*, revised by Lubor Matouš, translated by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.

Contents

List of Maps	viii		
List of Tables	ix		
List of Contributors	xiii		
Preface	xv		
List of Abbreviations	xviii		
Part I: Generalities			
1 Genetic Subgrouping of the Semitic Languages Alice Faber	3		
2 Scripts of Semitic Languages Peter T. Daniels	16		
3 The Arabic Grammatical Tradition Jonathan Owens	46		
4 The Hebrew Grammatical Tradition Arie Schippers	59		
Part II: Old Semitic			
5 Akkadian Giorgio Buccellati	69		
6 Amorite and Eblaite Cyrus H. Gordon	100		
7 Aramaic Stephen A. Kaufman	114		
8 Ugaritic Dennis Pardee	131		
9 Ancient Hebrew Richard C. Steiner	145		
10 Phoenician and the Eastern Canaanite Languages Stanislav Segert	174		
11 Classical Arabic Wolfdietrich Fischer	187		
12 Sayhadic (Epigraphic South Arabian) Leonid E. Kogan and Andrey V. Korotayev	220		
13 Ge'ez (Ethiopic) Gene Gragg	242		
Part III: Modern Semitic			
14 Arabic Dialects and Maltese Alan S. Kaye and Judith Rosenhouse	263		
15 Modern Hebrew Ruth A. Berman	312		
16 The Neo-Aramaic Languages Otto Jastrow	334		
17 The Modern South Arabian Languages Marie-Claude Simeone-Senelle	378		
18 Tigrinya Leonid E. Kogan	424		
19 Tigré Shlomo Raz	446		
20 Amharic and Argobba Grover Hudson	457		
21 Harari Ewald Wagner	486		
22 The Silte Group (East Gurage) Ernst-August Gutt	509		
23 Outer South Ethiopic Robert Hetzron	535		
Index	550		