

Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikations- wissenschaft

Handbooks of Linguistics
and Communication Science

Manuels de linguistique et
des sciences de communication

Mitbegründet von Gerold Ungeheuer (†)
Mitherausgegeben 1985–2001 von Hugo Steger

Herausgegeben von / Edited by / Edités par
Herbert Ernst Wiegand

Band 36

De Gruyter Mouton

The Semitic Languages

An International Handbook

Edited by

Stefan Weninger

In collaboration with

Geoffrey Khan

Michael P. Streck

Janet C. E. Watson

De Gruyter Mouton

ISBN 978-3-11-018613-0
e-ISBN 978-3-11-025158-6
ISSN 1861-5090

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Semitic languages : an international handbook / edited by Stefan Weninger ; in collaboration with Geoffrey Khan, Michael P. Streck, Janet C. E. Watson.

p. cm. – (Handbooks of linguistics and communication science; 36)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-3-11-018613-0 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Semitic languages – History – Handbooks, manuals, etc.
 2. Semitic languages – Grammar – Handbooks, manuals, etc.
- I. Weninger, Stefan. II. Khan, Geoffrey. III. Streck, Michael P.
IV. Watson, Janet C. E.

PJ3014.S46 2012

492–dc23

2011042304

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2011 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/Boston

Typesetting: META Systems GmbH, Wustermark

Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

Cover design: Martin Zech, Bremen

∞ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Streck, M. P.

2011 Großes Fach Altorientalistik. Der Umfang des keilschriftlichen Textkorpus. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft* 142, 35–58.

Testen, D.

1993 The East Semitic Precative Paradigm. *Journal for Semitic Studies* 38, 1–13.

Tropper, J.

2000 *Ugaritische Grammatik* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 273) Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Tropper, J.

2003 Eblaitisch und die Klassifikation der semitischen Sprachen. In: G. J. Selz (ed.), *Festschrift für Burkhard Kienast* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 274. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag) 647–657.

Michael P. Streck, Leipzig (Germany)

14. Babylonian and Assyrian

1. Introduction
2. Old Babylonian
3. Old Assyrian
4. Middle Assyrian
5. Middle Babylonian
6. Akkadian in the periphery of Mesopotamia
7. Neo-Assyrian
8. Literary Akkadian
9. Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian
10. The Lexical Heritage of Akkadian
11. References

Abstract

A historically arranged sketch of Babylonian and Assyrian, two dialects of Akkadian, which were the dominant languages of Mesopotamia in the second and first millennia BC.

1. Introduction

Babylonian and Assyrian are the two main dialects of Akkadian (A.) attested from the beginning of the 2nd millennium onwards. Their connection to the attested dialects of 3rd millennium A. (ch. 13) is still disputed. Whereas the history of Assyrian cannot be traced back to the 3rd millennium, at least Ur III A. is a predecessor of classical Old Babylonian (cf. 2.1.), and this even seems to be true for Sargonic A. (Hasselbach 2005; differently Hilgert 2002 and Sommerfeld 2003).

Streck, M. P.

2011 Großes Fach Altorientalistik. Der Umfang des keilschriftlichen Textkorpus. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft* 142, 35–58.

Testen, D.

1993 The East Semitic Precative Paradigm. *Journal for Semitic Studies* 38, 1–13.

Tropper, J.

2000 *Ugaritische Grammatik* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 273) Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Tropper, J.

2003 Eblaitisch und die Klassifikation der semitischen Sprachen. In: G. J. Selz (ed.), *Festschrift für Burkhard Kienast* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 274. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag) 647–657.

Michael P. Streck, Leipzig (Germany)

14. Babylonian and Assyrian

1. Introduction
2. Old Babylonian
3. Old Assyrian
4. Middle Assyrian
5. Middle Babylonian
6. Akkadian in the periphery of Mesopotamia
7. Neo-Assyrian
8. Literary Akkadian
9. Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian
10. The Lexical Heritage of Akkadian
11. References

Abstract

A historically arranged sketch of Babylonian and Assyrian, two dialects of Akkadian, which were the dominant languages of Mesopotamia in the second and first millennia BC.

1. Introduction

Babylonian and Assyrian are the two main dialects of Akkadian (A.) attested from the beginning of the 2nd millennium onwards. Their connection to the attested dialects of 3rd millennium A. (ch. 13) is still disputed. Whereas the history of Assyrian cannot be traced back to the 3rd millennium, at least Ur III A. is a predecessor of classical Old Babylonian (cf. 2.1.), and this even seems to be true for Sargonic A. (Hasselbach 2005; differently Hilgert 2002 and Sommerfeld 2003).

General descriptions of A. grammar are mainly based on Old Babylonian (cf. 2.) and/or literary A. (cf. 8.) (Reiner 1966, von Soden 1995, Buccellati 1996, Streck 2007a). For the A. lexicon see AHW. and CAD. A textbook is Huehnergard 1997. There are only very few detailed studies in the historical grammar of A., the most noteworthy of them Deutscher 2000 on sentential complementation.

2. Old Babylonian

For a short grammar of Old Babylonian see Streck 2011a. For monographic studies on specific details of Old Babylonian grammar see Kraus 1984 (on nonverbal sentences) and 1987 (on *Koppelungen*).

2.1. Early Old Babylonian

“Early Old Babylonian” (ca. 2100–1800 BC) is a conventional label for A. in the Ur III period, of early Ešnunna in the Diyāla region east of the Tigris and of Mari in the middle Euphrates region during the so-called šakkanakku period.

The most extensive study is available for Ur III A. (Hilgert 2002). In the Ur III period, most of the documentation is written in Sumerian, a non-Semitic language (ch. 15). According to Hilgert 2002, 2–85, A. documentation is confined to: (a) 101 texts, among them 56 legal and administrative documents, 17 letters, 3 incantations and 25 royal inscriptions. (b) Personal names, e.g., *Šu-Suen-lilabbir-ḫaṭtam* “May Šu-Suen keep the scepter for a long time”. (c) Loan words in Sumerian texts, e.g.: *erubbatum* “entrance (name of a feast)”, *gerrānum* “wailing”, *ḫazannum* “mayor”, *manzaštum* “position”, *mašlūm* “(leather) bucket”, *muddulum* “salted meat”, *naptanum* “meal”, *nāb/piḫum* “a gold ornament”, *nēkepum* “a tool”, *sapalum* “juniper”.

According to Hilgert 2002, 168, Ur III A. is fundamentally different from Sargonic A. (see ch. 13) and closely connected to classical Old Babylonian (see, however, 1. for a partly different view). The Š-stem of verbs I-ʾ is of the type *ušaššab/uššāšib* against normal Sargonic *ušeššeb/uššūšib*. Umlaut *a > e* is regularly observed: *epēšum* against Sargonic *epāšum*. Verbs II-ʾ inflect analogous to verbs II-vocalis: D-stem *urīq* against Sargonic *uraʾiq*. Verbs III-ʾ inflect analogous to verbs III-vocalis, with ³_{–5} causing umlaut *a > e*: *išmē* against Sargonic *išmaʿ*. Verbs III-vocalis apparently do not have ablaut: *aqabbī/aqbī* against Sargonic *aqabbē/aqbī*.

For Ešnunna see Whiting 1987, for Mari Limet 1976 and Gelb 1992, 164–195.

2.2. Geographical distribution, chronology and text genres of classical Old Babylonian

Classical Old Babylonian (ca. 1800–1500 BC) is attested by 45 000 texts, which together contain ca. 2 560 000 words (Streck 2011b). Classical Old Babylonian is written in Babylonia, the middle Euphrates region (Mari) and northern Syria, in the Diyāla-region and in Elam in south-west Iran. The documentation contains many different

text genres (Lieberman 1977, 9–13): private and royal letters, administrative and legal documents, royal inscriptions, year names, edicts, omen texts, lexical texts, mathematical texts, epics, hymns, prayers, incantations etc. Classical Old Babylonian absorbed the Northwest Semitic language of the Amorites (ch. 19) that was mainly spoken in the Middle Euphrates area and the Syrian steppe (see Streck 2004a for the distribution of the Amorites in Mesopotamia based on a statistics of names); Amorite did not leave any visible imprint on Old Babylonian besides loanwords (cf. 2.7.).

2.3. Changes in the inventory of consonantal phonemes from Eblaite and Old Akkadian to Old Babylonian

From Old A. (including Eblaite) to classical Old Babylonian the phonemic inventory of A. is considerably reduced, most probably under the influence of Sumerian. See table 14.1.

Table 14.1: Reduction of phonemic inventory from Old Akkadian to Old Babylonian

Protosemitic	ḏ	ṭ	ś	š	h	ḥ	ʿ	ḡ	ḫ
Ebla	ḏ (Š)	ṭ (Š)	ś (S)	š (S)	h	ḥ	ʿ	ḡ	ḫ
Old A.	z (Z)	š (Š)	ś (S)	š (S)	h	ḥ	ʿ	ḡ	ḫ
Old Babylonian	z (Z)	š (Š)	š (S)	š (S)	(ʿ)	(ʿ), ḥ	(ʿ)	(ʿ), ḫ	ḫ

The interdentalals, which in Eblaite were still distinct phonemes (both written with Š-signs), become /z/ (written with Z-signs) and /š/ (written with Š-signs) in Old A. and Old Babylonian. Protosemitic /š/ which in Ebla and Old A. was merged with Protosemitic /ṣ/ into /š/ (written with S-signs) now merges with Protosemitic /ṭ/ into /š/ (written with Š-signs). /h/, /ḥ/, /ʿ/ and /ḡ/, which in Eblaite and Old A. were still distinct phonemes, get lost – probably under Sumerian influence, see ch. 15) and are either replaced by secondary /ʿ/ or merge with /ḥ/ (see Tropper 1995 for /h/ and Kogan 2001 for /ḡ/).

2.4. Personal pronouns

Table 14.2. presents the personal pronouns of Old Babylonian. Noteworthy is the existence of independent genitive and accusative pronouns (*jāʾum* “mine”, *jāti* “me” etc.) and of dative pronouns, independent as well as suffixed (*jāšim*, *-am* etc. “to me” etc.). For Sumerian influence on the pronominal system see ch. 15. The *s*-variants of the suffixed pronouns of the 3rd person appear after dentals (/d/, /t/, /ṭ/) and affricates (/s/, /z/, /š/): **bū-šu* “his house” > [*būsu*], traditional transcription *bīssu* (see Streck 2006, 228–233).

2.5. Nominal inflection

Table 14.3. presents the nominal inflection of Old Babylonian in the Status rectus (*šarrum* “king”, *šarratum* “queen”, *libbum* “heart”, *ilum* “god”, *šēpum* “foot”, *šittān* “two thirds”, *dannum* “strong”).

Table 14.2: Personal pronouns in Old Babylonian

	Nominative		Genitive		Dative		Genitive/ Accusative		Accusative
	independent	dependent	independent	suffixed	independent	suffixed	independent	suffixed	
1. singular commune	<i>anāku</i>	Singular masc. <i>ja'um/jām</i> , Singular fem. <i>jattum/n</i> Plural masc. <i>ja'ūtun</i> Plural fem. <i>jātun</i>	-ī, -ja, -a	<i>jāšim</i>	-am, -m, -nim	<i>jāti</i>			-ni
2. singular masculine	<i>atta</i>	Singular masc. <i>kām</i>	-ka	<i>kāšim</i>	-kum	<i>kāta</i>			-ka
2. singular feminine	<i>atti</i>	Singular fem. <i>kattun</i> Plural masc. <i>kuttun</i> Plural fem. <i>kātun</i>	-ki	<i>kāšim</i>	-kim	<i>kāti</i>			-ki
3. singular masculine	<i>šū</i>	Singular masc. <i>šām</i>	-šu/-su	<i>šū'āšim</i> ,	-šum, -sum	<i>šu'āti, šāti</i>			-šu, -su
3. singular feminine	<i>šī</i>	Singular fem. <i>šattun</i> Plural masc. <i>šuttun</i>	-ša/-sa	<i>šī'āšim</i>	-šim, -šim	<i>šī'āti, šāti</i>			-ši, -si
1. plural commune	<i>nīnu</i>	Singular masc. <i>nām</i> Singular fem. <i>nijattun/nuttun</i> Plural masc. <i>nuttun</i>	-ni	<i>nī'āšim</i> ,	-nī'āšim	<i>nī'āti</i>			-nī'āti
2. plural masculine	<i>attunu</i>	-	-kunu	<i>kunūšim</i>	-kunūšim	<i>kunūti</i>			-kunūti
2. plural feminine	<i>attina</i>	-	-kina	[<i>kināšim</i>]	-kināšim	<i>kināti</i>			-kināti
3. plural masculine	<i>šunu</i>	Plural masc. <i>šunām</i>	-š/sunu	<i>šunūšim</i>	-š/sunūšim	<i>šunūti</i>			-š/sunūti
3. plural feminine	<i>šina</i>		-š/sina	[<i>šināšim</i>]	-š/sināšim	<i>šināti</i>			-š/sināti

Table 14.3: Nominal inflection in Old Babylonian

	Substantive, masculine	Substantive, feminine	Adjective, masculine
Singular, nominative	<i>šarr-um</i>	<i>šarr-at-um</i>	<i>dann-um</i>
Singular, genitive	<i>šarr-im</i>	<i>šarr-at-im</i>	<i>dann-im</i>
Singular, accusative	<i>šarr-am</i>	<i>šarr-at-am</i>	<i>dann-am</i>
Singular, locative	<i>libb-ūm</i>	—	—
Singular, terminative	<i>il-iš</i>	—	—
Dual, nominative	<i>šēp-ān</i>	<i>šit-t-ān</i>	—
Dual, obliquus	<i>šēp-in</i>	<i>šit-t-in</i>	—
Plural, nominative	<i>šarr-ū</i>	<i>šarr-ātum</i>	<i>dann-ūtum</i>
Plural, obliquus	<i>šarr-ī</i>	<i>šarr-ātīm</i>	<i>dann-ūtīm</i>

Mimation is part of the case suffixes and has no function with respect to (in)determination (*šarrum* “a king” as well as “the king”; Diem 1975). The dual which in Old A. was productive is now mainly only used with body parts and certain numerals (*šēpān* “two feet”, *šittān* “two thirds”).

The masculine substantive in the singular, besides the three common Semitic cases nominative, genitive and accusative, has two further cases, a locative (*libbūm* “in the heart”) and a terminative (*iliš* “to god”), mainly used in literary texts (Groneberg 1978/1979) or frozen in various particles (e.g., *elēnūm* “above”). For the length of the locative suffix see Buccellati 1996, 152 and Neo-Babylonian plene spellings like *lib-bu-ū* etc. (AHw. 550). Both locative and terminative are also sparsely attested in other Semitic languages (Tropper 2000, 320 and 326); their higher productivity in A. might have been developed under Sumerian influence (see the Sumerian locative *é-a* “in the house” and the terminative *é-šè* “into the house”).

In the masculine plural, the suffixes of adjectives differ from those of substantives (*šarrū dannūtum* “strong kings”).

2.6. Verbal inflection: general remarks

The inflection of the A. verb distinguishes: 3 tenses (present, preterite, perfect); 7 moods (imperative, prohibitive, precative, cohortative, vetitive, affirmative, irrealis); 4 verbal nouns (stative, participle, infinitive, verbal adjective); 1 form of syntactic subordination (subordinative); 1 form of marking the direction of a situation (ventive).

2.7. Verbal stems

Table 14.4. presents the verbal stems (root consonants in capitals (*PRS*)).

Old Babylonian and A. in general have 11 current verbal stems (Edzard 1965). G is the unmarked stem. D is characterized by length of the second root consonant and has factitive or plural meaning (“he decides many cases”) (Kouwenberg 1997; Streck 1998a). Š is characterized by a prefix *š* and has causative meaning (“he has (him) decide”). N is characterized by a prefix *n* and has passive/reciproce/reflexive meaning (“he is decided”) (Lieberman 1986, 596; Testen 1998, 137f.; 141 Anm. 21). Gt/Dt/Št are characterized by

Table 14.4: Verbal stems in Old Babylonian

Verbal stem	Infinitive	Present	Preterite	Perfect	Stative
G	<i>PaRāSum</i>	<i>iPaRRaS</i>	<i>iPRuS</i>	<i>iPtaRaS</i>	<i>PaRiS</i>
D	<i>PuRRuSum</i>	<i>uPaRRaS</i>	<i>uPaRRiS</i>	<i>uPtaRRiS</i>	<i>PuRRuS</i>
Š	<i>šuPRuSum</i>	<i>ušaPRaS</i>	<i>ušaPRiS</i>	<i>uštaPRiS</i>	<i>šuPRuS</i>
N	<i>naPRuSum</i>	<i>ipPaRRaS</i>	<i>ipPaRiS</i>	<i>ittaPRaS</i>	<i>naPRuS</i>
Gt	<i>PitRuSum</i>	<i>iPtaRRaS</i>	<i>iPtaRaS</i>	–	<i>PitRuS</i>
Dt	<i>PutARRuSum</i>	<i>uPtaRRaS</i>	<i>uPtaRRiS</i>	<i>uPtataRRiS</i>	–
Št	<i>šutaPRuSum</i>	<i>uštaP(aR)RaS</i>	<i>uštaPRiS</i>	<i>uštataPRiS</i>	<i>šutaPRuS</i>
Gtn	<i>PitaRRuSum</i>	<i>iPtanaRRaS</i>	<i>iPtanaRRiS</i>	<i>iPtataRRaS</i>	<i>PitaRRuS</i>
Dtn	<i>PutARRuSum</i>	<i>uPtanaRRaS</i>	<i>uPtanaRRiS</i>	–	<i>PutARRuS</i>
Štn	<i>šutaPRuSum</i>	<i>uštanaPRaS</i>	<i>uštaPRiS</i>	–	<i>šutaPRuS</i>
Ntn	<i>itaPRuSum</i>	<i>ittanaPRaS</i>	<i>ittaPRaS</i>	–	<i>itaPRuS</i>

an infix *t* and combine reciprocal/reflexive/passive meaning and the meaning of the main stems (Streck 2003a). Gtn/Dtn/Štn/Ntn (Edzard 1996) are characterized by an infix *tan* in the present tenses. The other forms of Gtn are characterized by an infix *t* + length of the second root consonant (Renger 1972, 230; Steiner 1981, 17; Kouwenberg 1997, 69–79; Streck 1998a, 527–529 2.2); the other forms of Dtn/Štn/Ntn are characterized by an infix *t* and thus are identical with the corresponding forms of Dt and Št (Renger 1972, 230, Edzard 1996, 17; Kouwenberg 1997, 78). Gtn/Dtn/Štn/Ntn combine plural meaning and the meaning of the main stems (e.g., „he always decides“).

2.8. Personal affixes

See table 14.5. for the Old Babylonian affixes that distinguish person, gender and number in the tenses and in the imperative:

Table 14.5: Verbal affixes in Old Babylonian

Verbal stems	Tenses			Imperative (all verbal stems)
	G, Gt, Gtn, N, Nt, Ntn	D, Dt, Dtn, Š, Št, Štn		
1. Singular commune	<i>a-</i>	<i>u-</i>		
2. Singular masculine	<i>ta-</i>	<i>tu-</i>		<i>-0</i>
2. Singular feminine	<i>ta- ... -ī</i>	<i>tu- ... -ī</i>		<i>-ī</i>
3. Singular commune	<i>i-</i>	<i>u-</i>		
1. Plural commune	<i>ni-</i>	<i>nu-</i>		
2. Plural commune	<i>ta-... -ā</i>	<i>tu- ... -ā</i>		<i>-ā</i>
3. Plural masculine	<i>i-... -ū</i>	<i>u- ... -ū</i>		
3. Plural feminine	<i>i-... -ā</i>	<i>u- ... -ā</i>		

2.9. The tenses

The present tense designates non-anteriority, the preterite anteriority. The perfect tense is morphologically identical with the preterite of the *t*-stems; it is never a perfect

in the sense of the English present perfect but designates anteriority + posteriority with two different reference points. The difference between preterite and perfect is one of markedness: whereas the preterite is only marked for anteriority the perfect is marked both for anteriority and posteriority. Therefore, only the preterite can be used for anteriority in the past in conditional and subordinate clauses. For temporal progress or for anteriority in the future, the perfect in Old Babylonian is the normal form, but the unmarked preterite is sometimes also used. In short, the uses of the three tenses can be summarized as in table 14.6:

Table 14.6: Tenses in Old Babylonian

	Main clause	Conditional clause	Subordinated clause
Present	Present (“he is doing”) Future (“he will do”) Plurality in the past (“he used to do”)	Plurality (“if he constantly does”) Modality (“if he wants to do”)	Simultaneity (“when he is/was doing”) Posteriority (“that he will do”)
Preterite	Past (“he did”) Past, (English) Perfect (“he has done”) Anteriority in the past (“he had done”) Temporal progress (“(he did) and he did”)	Anteriority in the past (“if he did (yesterday”) Anteriority in the future (“if he does”)	Anteriority in the past (“after he had done”) Anteriority to the main clause in the future (“when he has done”)
Perfect	Temporal progress (“(he did) and then he did”)	Anteriority in the future (“if he will have done”)	Anteriority in the future (“when he will have done”)

For the tenses in A. see Streck 1995a and b; Streck 1998b; 1999b; 2007a, 59–63; also, with some minor differences, Metzler 2002; with very different conclusions Kaplan 2002, Cohen 2006. Cf. 5.5. for the use of the perfect tense from Middle Babylonian onwards, 8.6. for the use of the present tense in literary texts and 9.10. for the use of the preterite tense in Neo- and Late Babylonian. For the tense system of Sumerian which might have influenced the A. tense system (or vice versa) see ch. 15.2.9. For similar tense systems of other non-Semitic Ancient Near Eastern languages and the question whether we deal with an areal phenomenon see Streck 1998b, 192–195.

2.10. The stative

The stative, which is conjugated by suffixes, designates states regardless of tense (“he is/was/will be good”); its nature as (more) verbal or nominal is debatable (Kouwenberg 2000). It seems best to analyse it as a verbal noun. The paradigm is presented in table 14.7. (the root consonants are presented in capitals, *DMQ*).

For possible Sumerian influence on the morphology and use of the stative see ch. 15.

2.11. The subordinative

The subordinative suffix *-u* marks the verbal predicate of subordinate sentences: *warka abum ana šimtim ittalku* Kodex Hammurapi § 167 “after the father has died”. No other

Table 14.7: The stative in Old Babylonian

	Singular	Plural
3. masculine	<i>DaMiQ</i> „he is/was good“	<i>DaMQū</i> „they are/were good“
3. feminine	<i>DaMQat</i> „she is/was good“	<i>DaMQā</i> „they are/were good“
2. masculine	<i>DaMQāta</i> „you are/were good“	<i>DaMQātunu</i> „you are/were good“
2. feminine	<i>DaMQāti</i> „you are/were good“	<i>DaMQātina</i> „you are/were good“
1. commune	<i>DaMQāku</i> „I am/was good“	<i>DaMQānu</i> „we are/were good“

Semitic language has such a subordinative (for the Assyrian subordinative in *-ni*, used together with *-u*, cf. 3.4.); on the other hand, several Ancient Near Eastern languages of different families show forms with similar functions (Sumerian: *-a*, Elamite *-a*, Hurrian *-šše*, which most likely represents an areal phenomenon (Streck 1998b, 193; for Sumerian see ch. 15).

2.12. Amorite loanwords

In Old Babylonian some 90 loanwords from Amorite (ch. 19) can be found (Streck 2000, 82–128). Most of these loanwords are attested in the core area of the Amorites in the middle Euphrates area and northern Syria (Mari, Tuttul, Qaṭna, Rimāḥ). Some loanwords are attested in Babylonia; among the latter, a group of literary words is remarkable (cf. 8.6.). Most Amorite loanwords are confined to the Old Babylonian period and are represented with less than five instances. The loans belong to the following semantic fields:

- (a) Tribal units: *gayyu* “clan”, *gayyišam* “clan for clan”, *ḥibru* “migrating tribal unit”, *limu* “tribe”, *ra’su* “unit”.
- (b) Tribal institutions: *sugāgu* “sheikh”, *sugāgūtu* “office of sheikh”, *zubūltu* “princess”, *abū kahli* “fathers of might” (a designation of the elders), *ta’tāmu* “assembly”.
- (c) Kinship: *ḥammu* “people; older male relative”, *yabamu* “brother-in-law”, *iššu* “woman”, *dāru* “generation”.
- (d) Animal husbandry: *ḥayyātu* “animals”, *šamru/šammuratu/šummuratu* “sheep”, *ti-šānu* “an ovine”, *ḥazzatu* “goat”. Qualifications of ovines: *ḥālu* “to give milk”, *yabisu* “dry (i.e. without milk)”. *buqāru* “cow”, *ḥašāru* “pen”, *merḥū* “overseer over the royal flocks”, *merḥūtu* “office of the overseer over the royal flocks”.
- (e) Nomadic camp: *maskanu* “dwelling”, *maskanū* “inhabitant”, *sakānu* “to settle”, *maškabu* “camp”.
- (f) Topography: *āḥarātu* “far bank of a river, west”, *aqdamātu* “near bank of a river, east”, *bataru* “gorge”, *gab’u* “summit”, *ḥadqu* “steppe”, *ḥamqu* “valley”, *k/qasū* “steppe”, *madbaru* “desert, steppe”, *sawū* “environs” or “desert”, *šūru* “rock”.
- (g) Agriculture: *ḥiršu* “ploughed field”, *maḥappu* “part of a dam”, *yābiltu* “a canal”.
- (h) Hunt: In connection with hunting lions: *ḥalū* “to be sick”, *nissatu* “sickness, weakness”, *saḥātu* “pit for snaring animals”.
- (i) Weaving: *nasāku* “to weave”.
- (j) Messenger service: *mālaku* “messenger”.

- (k) Razzia, military: *sadādu* “to make a razzia”, *saddu* “razzia”, *marādu* “to rebel”, *qatālu* “to kill” (but mostly used in connection with a symbolic act accompanying the conclusion of treaties), *ṭaḥānu* “to wound”.
- (l) Law: In connection with concluding treaties: *ḥāru* “donkey”, *qatālu* “to kill”, *ḥazzu* “goat”. *yālūtu* “alliance”, *madīnatu* “judicial district”, *naḥālu* “to hand over property”, *niḥlatu* “heritage”, *niqmu* “revenge”, *šapātu* “to judge”, *šāpiṭu* “judge”, *šāpiṭūtu* “office of judge”, *šiptu* “court”.
- (m) Religion: *ḥulūtu* “rejoicing(?)”, *qilāsātu* “a festival”.
- (n) Objects: *ḥabalu* “strap”, *ḥimru* “a fermented drink”, *ḥūgu* “bread”, *kinnāru* “lyre”, *marbiqatu* “an ornament”.
- (o) Miscellanea: *abiyānu* “poor”, *aqdamu* “earlier time”, *biqlu* “sprout”, *ḥakū* “to wait”, *ḥarāšu* “to keep silent”, *ḥarāšu* “to keep quiet”, *ḥāziru* “helper”, *ḥikītu* “expectation”, *ḥinnu* “mercy”, *ḥippu* “obstacle”, *māpalū* “speaker”, *-na* (affirmative particle), *naḥāmu* “to be available in abundance”, *naḥmu* “prosperity”, *paḥātu* “fear”, *qaḥālu* “to gather”, *rabbatu* “ten thousand”, *šaḥādu* “to make a present”, *tarsīātu* “joy”, *yagātu* “complaints”.

The majority of loans fill a semantic gap (cf. 9.11.): words for tribal units and institutions, husbandry, nomadic camp. The topographical terms are also closely connected to nomadic movement in the country. Some loans belong to the semantic fields of typically nomadic activities: hunt and messenger service, weaving and razzia. Terms in the semantic fields of law and religion attest to typical nomadic institutions and traditions. The limited importance of realia is remarkable; it reflects the low significance of the material culture of the nomads for the sedentary people.

Though most of the loans are substantives, verbs are attested as well. Only one particle (*-na*) is borrowed from Amorite. Amorite substantives and verbs are normally fully integrated in the A. inflection system; Amorite morphology is only rarely maintained in loans (ch. 19).

Amorite loans are sometimes also phonologically integrated in A. They thus exhibit Geers' law (**qtl > qtl*). However, more often Amorite phonology is retained. Thus /ʿ/ is preserved (written ḥ): see *ḥālu*, *ḥamqu*, *ḥāru*, *ḥazzatu*, *ḥibbu*, *ḥūgu*, *merḥū*, *naḥāmu*, *naḥmu*, *ṭaḥānu*. /h/ is preserved in *ḥinnu*. /h/ is preserved (written ḥ or with plene vowel): *ḥulūtu(?)*, *kahlu*, *qaḥālu*. Post-consonantal /ʿ/ is preserved: *gabʿu* (but see *māl-aku*). Syllable final /ʿ/ is preserved: *taʿtāmu*. Etymological */š/ and */s/ are written s, i.e. Amorite /š/: *saḥātu*, *sadādu*, *saddu*, *saḥātu*, *sakānu*, *sawū*, *sugāgu*. Short vowels in open syllables are preserved: *yabamu*, *marbiqatu*, *rab(a)bātu*. */w/ develops into /y/ with verbs I w/y: *yābiltu*, *yagātu*, *yālūtu*. The diphthong /ay/ is preserved: see the spellings *ḥa-a-ri-im*, *ḥa-a-ra-am* and *a-ia-ra-am* for /ʿayra/im/. The noun pattern *maQTaL/maQ-aLL* is preserved when the root contains a labial: *madbaru*, *maškabu*, *maḥappu*, *māpalū*, *marbiqatu*. Geers' law is not applied in rare cases, such as *qašū* instead of *kašū*.

2.13. Akkadian and Sumerian

Possible or certain Sumerian influences on A. have been noticed in 2.3.–5. and 2.9.–11. See also ch. 15.

3. Old Assyrian

3.1. Geographical distribution, chronology and textual genres

Old Assyrian is only sparsely attested in Assyria (northern Mesopotamia) itself (Assur). Most of the texts have been excavated in various places in Asia Minor where Assyrian merchants lived in colonies (Kaneš/Kültepe, Hattuša/Boghazköy, Alişar Höyük). Some texts have also been found in Nuzi east of the Tigris. The number of texts in total is about 22 300, which contain ca. 1 311 000 words (Michel 2003, v; Streck 2011b). They date to ca. 1900–1700 BC.

Old Assyrian is confined to fewer textual genres than Old Babylonian: administrative and judicial documents, letters (Michel 2001), royal inscriptions (Grayson 1987), and very few literary texts.

For Old Assyrian grammar in general see Hecker 1968.

3.2. Vowel harmony

The most prominent phonological feature of Old Assyrian and of Assyrian in general is the so-called Assyrian vowel harmony (a term borrowed from Turkish): short /a/ in an open unaccented syllable following an accented syllable assimilates to the vowel in the following syllable; thus, e.g., in the declension of nouns: *áššatam* “wife” (accusative), *áššutum* (nominative), *áššitim* (genitive); in the conjugation of verbs: *íddan* “he gives” (present tense of *nadānum*), *íddunū* “they (m.) give”, *táddinī* “you (f.) give”; *íttaksū* “they (m.) cut” (perfect tense of *nakāsum*), *táttaksī* “you (f.) cut”, both forms without vowel harmony since /a/ is in a closed syllable, but *íttikis* “he cut”.

3.3. Gutturals

According to Kouwenberg 2006, the Proto-Semitic gutturals show the reflexes in Old Assyrian presented in table 14.8.

Note, however, that the evidence presented by Kouwenberg is questionable on several points. Thus, *beārum* can well be interpreted as *be’ārum* (no difference from *be’ālum*), and a spelling *i-li-qí-ú* can well stand for *illiqī(?)ū* with *ī* as a long vowel taken over in analogy from word final *ī* (*illiqī* “he was taken”).

3.4. Subordinative

Old Assyrian and Assyrian in general have a subordinative suffix *-ni* used alone or in addition to the subordinative suffix *-u* (for the latter cf. 2.11.). *-ni* sometimes also marks subordinate nonverbal sentences. Table 14.9. contrasts Old Assyrian and Old Babylonian forms (subordinative suffixes are marked bold).

Table 14.8: Reflexes of the Proto-Semitic gutturals in Old Assyrian

Proto-sem.	Word initial	Intervocalic	Post-consonantal	Syllable final
*ʔ	(ʔ): (ʔ) <i>aklam</i> “bread”	ʔ: <i>šaʔalum</i> “to ask”	ʔ: <i>išʔal</i> “he asked”	long vowel: <i>wašissu</i> “his departure” < * <i>wašit-t-šu</i>
*ʕ	(ʕ) + e-coloring: (ʕ) <i>emmudū</i> “they will impose”	ʔ + e-coloring: <i>beʔalum</i> “to rule” < * <i>baʕalum</i>	ʔ + e-coloring: <i>ibʕel</i> “he ruled” < * <i>ibʕel</i>	long vowel (+ e-coloring): <i>tašbūt</i> (Status constructus) “satisfaction” < * <i>tašbit</i>
*ħ	(ħ): (ħ) <i>awātam</i> “word”	0/glide: <i>bāš</i> “be (singular) ashamed” < * <i>bahaš</i>	0: <i>ibāš</i> “he was ashamed” < * <i>ibhaš</i>	long vowel: <i>bāšā</i> “be (plural) ashamed” < * <i>bahšā</i>
*ħ	(ħ) + e-coloring: (ħ) <i>ešādum</i> “to harvest”	0 + e-coloring/glide: <i>beārum</i> (- <i>bé-a</i>) “to choose” < * <i>bahārum</i>	glide y: <i>illiqjū</i> (- <i>qí-ú</i>) “they were taken” < * <i>illiqhū</i>	long vowel (+ e-coloring): <i>luqūt</i> (Status constructus) “goods” < * <i>luquht</i>
*ğ	ħ: <i>hadārum</i> “to fear”	ħ: <i>taħarrim</i> “you write on the envelope”	ħ: <i>lišħir</i> “he becomes small”	ħ: <i>ušaħdar</i> “he frightens”

Table 14.9: The subordinative in Old Assyrian and Old Babylonian

Old Assyrian	Old Babylonian	Translation
<i>ša iPRus-u, ša iPRus-u-ni</i>	<i>ša iPRus-u</i>	“who (singular) decided”
<i>ša iPRusū-ni</i>	<i>ša iPRusū</i>	“who (plural) decided”
<i>ša iPRus-u-šu-ni</i>	<i>ša iPRus-u-šu</i>	“who decided it”
<i>ša ina ālim wašbat-ni</i>	<i>ša ina ālim WašBat</i>	“who (fem.) sits in the city”
<i>kīma PN aħūka(-ni)</i>	<i>kīma PN aħūka</i>	“as PN is your brother”

3.5. Verbal forms

Table 14.10. contrasts characteristic (Old) Assyrian and (Old) Babylonian verbal forms. Whereas in (Old) Babylonian the personal prefix *i-* for the 3. person singular is used for both genders, (Old) Assyrian has *i-* only for the masculine and *ta-* for the feminine. In (Old) Assyrian, infinitive, imperative, verbal adjective and stative of the D- and Š-

Table 14.10: Characteristic differences in the verbal inflection between (Old) Assyrian and (Old) Babylonian

	(Old) Assyrian	(Old) Babylonian
Personal prefix 3. singular feminine	<i>taPRRuS</i>	<i>iPRuS</i>
Infinitive etc. D	<i>PaRRuSum</i>	<i>PuRRuSum</i>
Infinitive etc. Š	<i>šaPRuSum</i>	<i>šuPRuSum</i>
Precative G 1. singular	<i>laPRuS</i>	<i>luPRuS</i>
Precative D 3. singular	<i>luPaRRiS</i>	<i>liPaRRiS</i>

stems have *a* in the first syllable, where (Old) Babylonian has *u*. The (Old) Assyrian precativ forms *laprus* and *luparris* are older than the corresponding (Old) Babylonian ones: they are formed by prefixing *l-* to the indicative forms *aprus* and *uparris*, whereas the (Old) Babylonian forms developed by analogy: *luprus* is analogous to *luparris* (precativ D 1. person singular) and *liparris* analogous to *liprus* (precativ G 3. person singular).

3.6. Lexicon

Table 14.11. presents examples for lexical differences between Old Assyrian and Old Babylonian. For a full description see Kogan 2006.

Table 14.11: Examples for lexical differences between Old Assyrian and Old Babylonian

Old Assyrian	Old Babylonian
Words attested exclusively or predominantly in Assyrian	
<i>ammīum</i> “that”	<i>ullūm</i> “that”
<i>huzīrum</i> “pig”	<i>šahūm</i> “pig”
<i>adrum</i> “threshing floor”	<i>maškanum</i> “threshing floor”
<i>kēna</i> “yes”	<i>annali</i> “yes”
<i>pūrum</i> “lot”	<i>isqum</i> “lot”
<i>aršātum</i> “wheat”	<i>kibtum</i> “wheat”
<i>šumkū</i> “onions”	<i>šamaškillū</i> “onions”
Common A. words with special prominence in Assyrian	
<i>abākum</i>	(<i>abākum</i>)
<i>awīltum</i>	(<i>awīltum</i>)
Common A. words with specific meaning in Assyrian	
<i>lapātum</i> “to write”	<i>lapātum</i> “to touch”
<i>naṭālum</i> “to witness”	<i>naṭālum</i> “to look”
Derived verbal stems unattested in Babylonian	
<i>pazārum</i> D “to smuggle”	–
<i>šapākum</i> Gt “to store”	–
Minor lexical differences	
<i>kirānum</i> “wine”	<i>karānum</i> “wine”
<i>širqum</i> “stolen goods”	<i>šurqum</i> “stolen goods”
Idioms typically Assyrian	
<i>libbam nadānum</i> “to encourage”	–
<i>puzram šabātum</i> “to hide”	–

In Old Assyrian texts at least two Hittite loanwords are found, *išḫiuli* “treaty” and *išpatalu* “hostel at night” (derived from Hittite *išpant-* “night”) (Kammenhuber 1972–1975 § 2). Some 5–10 words are borrowed from unknown Anatolian languages, e.g., *iknusi* “a container”.

4. Middle Assyrian

4.1. Geographical distribution, chronology and text genres

In contrast to Middle Babylonian (cf. 5.1.), Middle Assyrian (ca. 1500–1000 BC) did not spread to neighbouring cultures and was confined to the Middle Assyrian kingdom. Middle Assyrian is attested in Assyria itself (Assur, Kalah, Ninive, Kār-Tukultī-Ninurta, Šibaniba, Rimāh) and in Syria (Dūr-Katlimmu, Ḥarbe, Tall Šabīy Abyaḍ). The Old Assyrian archives in Asia Minor have no Middle Assyrian successor. The number of texts total about 2 700, which contain ca. 220 000 words (Pedersén 1998; Streck 2011b).

Attested textual genres include administrative and judicial documents, letters, laws and harem edicts. Royal inscriptions and literary texts produced in Assyria in this period are written in Middle Babylonian but contain Assyrianisms (see Streck 2007b, 152–155 for the longest inscription of Tukultī-Ninurta I).

For a general description of Middle Assyrian grammar see Mayer 1971.

4.2. Orthography and phonology

Word initial /w/ becomes /u/: *warkūum* > *urkūu* “later”, *wašābum* > *ušābu* “to sit”, *waššurum* > *uššuru* “to release”. Intervocalic /w/ is written B or rarely ʾ, which probably is only an orthographic phenomenon: *awātum* > *abutu* “word”, *awīlum* > *aʾīlu* “man”.

/št/ becomes /lt/ and /št/ becomes /lʃ/, a development understandable only if /š/ has a lateral pronunciation (Streck 2006, 233–251, especially 238): *iktašdam* > *iktalda* “he arrived”, *išṣur* > *iṣṣur* “he wrote”.

/qt/ becomes /qʃ/, i.e. /t/ acquires an “emphatic” (velarized?) pronunciation under the influence of “emphatic” /q/: *uqtanarrubū* > *uqʃanarrubū* “they bring near repeatedly”.

/šb/ becomes /sb/: *uššab* “he sits” (present), but *usbū* “they sit” (stative).

Perfect and stative forms of the verb *našāʾu* “to carry, to lift” show a peculiar orthography (Parpola 1974): the phoneme cluster /šʾ/ is written Š (which proves that the phoneme /š/ was post-glottalized [(t)sʾ]): *inašši* (present), *išši* (preterite), *ittasi* (perfect 3. person singular), *ittaššū* (written *i-ta-šu*) < *ittasʾū* (perfect 3. person plural), *našša* (written *na-aš-ša*) < *našʾa* (stative 3. person singular masculine + ventive), *našsat* (written *na-ša-at*) < *našʾat* (stative 3. person singular feminine).

4.3. Independent personal pronouns

Table 14.12. shows the complicated development of the independent personal pronouns from Old to Middle Assyrian, contrasting it with Old and Middle Babylonian.

In the nominative 3. person singular, Old and Middle Assyrian have forms with final /t/ in contrast to Old and Middle Babylonian. However, in the genitive/accusative 3. person singular Old Assyrian and Old Babylonian show identical forms. In Middle Assyrian final /u/, restricted to the masculine in Old Assyrian, spreads to the feminine. Middle Babylonian, after contracting both /uʾā/ of the masculine and /iʾā/ of the femi-

Table 14.12: Independent personal pronouns in Old/Middle Assyrian and Old/Middle Babylonian

	Middle Assyrian	Old Assyrian	Middle Babylonian	Old Babylonian
Nominative 3. singular masculine	<i>šūt</i>	<i>šūt</i>	<i>šū</i>	<i>šū</i>
Nominative 3. singular feminine	<i>šīt</i>	<i>šīt</i>	<i>šī</i>	<i>šī</i>
Genitive/Accusative 3. singular masculine	<i>šū'ātilu</i>	<i>šū'ātilu</i>	<i>šātu</i>	<i>šū'ātilu</i>
Genitive/Accusative 3. singular feminine	<i>šī'ātilu</i>	<i>šī'āti</i>	<i>šāti</i>	<i>šī'āti</i>
Dative 3. singular masculine	<i>šū'āšu</i>	<i>šū'ātilu</i>	<i>šāšu</i>	<i>šū'āšim</i>
Dative 3. singular feminine	<i>šū'āša</i>	<i>šī'āti</i>	<i>šāšī/a</i>	<i>šī'āšim</i>
Dative 2. plural masculine	<i>kunāšunu</i>	<i>kunūti</i>	<i>kāšunu</i>	<i>kunūšim</i>
Genitive/Accusative 3. plural masculine	<i>šunātunu</i>	<i>šunūti</i>	<i>šātunu</i>	<i>šunūti</i>
Genitive/Accusative 3. plural f.	<i>šinātina</i>	<i>šināti</i>	<i>šātina</i>	<i>šināti</i>

nine to /â/, offers a new gender distinction with final /u/ for masculine and final /i/ for feminine. The dative pronouns 3. person singular of Old Assyrian are identical with the corresponding accusative pronouns. Middle Assyrian as well as Old and Middle Babylonian have dative forms with /š/ in contrast to genitive/accusative forms with /t/. Whereas the gender distinction is marked by an internal vowel opposition /u/ : /i/ in Old Babylonian, Middle Assyrian and Middle Babylonian distinguish gender by different word final vowels. In the plural, Old Assyrian has /t/ for both dative and genitive/accusative. The three other dialects mark the dative by /š/ and the genitive/accusative by /t/. Gender distinction is marked in Old Assyrian and Old Babylonian by internal vowel oppositions only; in Middle Assyrian and Middle Babylonian gender is distinguished by a combination of internal and final vowel oppositions.

4.4. Declension

Table 14.13. shows the development in the declension from Old to Middle Assyrian. Mimation gets lost and /i/ of the genitive singular and obliquus plural suffixes shifts to /e/. For the vowel harmony cf. 3.2.

Table 14.13: Declension in Middle and Old Assyrian

	Middle Assyrian		Old Assyrian	
	Masculine	Feminine	Masculine	Feminine
Singular nominative	<i>šarru</i>	<i>šarrutu</i>	<i>šarrum</i>	<i>šarrutum</i>
Singular genitive	<i>šarre</i>	<i>šarrete</i>	<i>šarrim</i>	<i>šarritim</i>
Singular acccusative	<i>šarra</i>	<i>šarrata</i>	<i>šarram</i>	<i>šarratam</i>
Plural nominative	<i>šarrū</i>	<i>šarrātu</i>	<i>šarrū</i>	<i>šarrātum</i>
Plural oblique	<i>šarrē</i>	<i>šarrāte</i>	<i>šarrē</i>	<i>šarrātim</i>

4.5. Ordinal numbers

Middle Assyrian has a new noun pattern, *PaRāSī*, for ordinal numbers. Old Assyrian has *PaRiS* and Old Babylonian *PaRuS*. Cf. table 14.14:

Table 14.14: Ordinal numbers in Middle/Old Assyrian and Old Babylonian

	Middle Assyrian	Old Assyrian	Old Babylonian
(2)	<i>šanāṣṣu</i>	<i>šanûm, šanîtum</i>	<i>šanûm/šanîtum</i>
(3)	<i>šalāšṣu</i>	<i>šalšum, šalištum</i>	<i>šalšum, šaluštum</i>
(4)	<i>rabāṣṣu</i>	<i>rabûm, rabîtum</i>	<i>rebûm, rebûtum</i>

4.6. Lexicon

In AHw. 58 new Middle Assyrian lemmata are booked, among them: *akannî* “now” (< *akî* “as” + *annî* “this”), *ammar* “as much as” (replacing *malā*), *battubattēn* “all round” (*battu* “side”), *dariṣu* “sacrificial sheep” (< Sumerian (*máš*) *da-rí-a*), *ḥaramma* “later” (< **aḥar* “after” + *amma* “there”), *jamattu* “each” (< *ajju* “which” + ?), *karāru* “to put, to place” (replacing *šakānu*), *mā* (particle of quoted direct speech, replacing *umma*), *matāḥu* “to lift”, *mummertu* “procuress” (participle *amāru* N), *pirša-duḥḥu* (an aromatic, attested in the Middle Assyrian recipes for perfumes, a word of unknown origin), *talmu* “big” (< Hurrian).

5. Middle Babylonian

5.1. Geographical distribution, chronology and text genres

Middle Babylonian (ca. 1500–1000) is attested by ca. 12 200 texts with together ca. 660 000 words (Pedersén 1998; Streck 2011b). In Babylonia itself, most texts come from Nippur. The isolated language of the Kassites who ruled Babylonia during the Middle Babylonian period, did not leave any visible imprint on the Middle Babylonian language besides some loanwords (cf. 5.6.). For Middle Babylonian in the periphery of Mesopotamia cf. 6.

Text genres comprise administrative and legal documents (including the *kudurrus*, stelae documenting the donation of real estates), letters, treaties, omen texts and literary texts (e. g., a fragmentary version of the epic of Gilgamesh).

For Middle Babylonian grammar in general see Aro 1955 and for the lexicon Aro 1957.

5.2. Orthography and phonology

/a/ sometimes undergoes partial assimilation to the /i/ of the following syllable, appearing as /e/: *liballiṣu* > *libelliṣu* “let them keep alive”, *lišalbiš* > *lišelbiš* “let him clothe”.

As in Middle Assyrian (cf. 4.2.), /št/ develops to /lt/, /št/ to /lt/: *ištēn* > *iltēn* “one”.

/s/, which in Old Babylonian was an affricate pronounced [ʃs], written Z, becomes deaffricated [s], written S: **bī-šu* “his house”, pronounced [bī ʃs(s)u], written É-ZU > [bīs(s)u], written É-SU. This leads to the widespread use of the cuneiform signs SA, SI and SU for /sV/ whereas the signs ZA, ZI and ZU are confined to /šV/ and /zV/.

Word initial /w/ drops: *wašābum* > *ašābu* “to sit” (cf. Middle Assyrian *ušābu*). Intervocalic /w/, which was written with the PI sign in Old Babylonian, is preserved but now written with M signs: *awīlum* > (conventional transcription) *amīlu* but pronounced [awīlu] (cf. Middle Assyrian *a’īlu*, probably pronounced [awīlu] as well). From now on, M is the normal notation for /w/ in A. as can still be seen in the latest cuneiform texts, the Graeco-Babyloniaca, where cuneiform *na-ma-ri* “to shine” is rendered in Greek as ναυαϞ.

The long voiced consonants /dd/ and /gg/ are nasalized and develop into /nd/ and /ng/, respectively, and /bb/ into /mb/: *inaddin* > *inandin* “he gives”, *imaggur* > *imangur* “he agrees”, *šubbum* > *šumbu* “wheel”.

5.3. Personal pronouns

For new formations in the personal pronouns see 4.3.

5.4. Loss of mimation

As in Middle Assyrian (cf. 4.4.), mimation is regularly lost, e.g. in the declension of nouns: *šarrum* > *šarru* “king” (nominative), *šarrim* > *šarri* (genitive), *šarrātu/im* > *šar-rātu/i* “queens”

5.5. Use of the perfect

The most interesting syntactic innovation of Middle Babylonian is the extension of the functions of the perfect and the restriction of the preterite. Table 14.15. contrasts the functions of both tenses in Old and Middle Babylonian:

Table 14.15: The use of the perfect in Old and Middle Babylonian

	Old Babylonian Letters and documents	Middle Babylonian Letters	Documents
(a) Past, main declarative sentence, positive: “decided, has/had decided”	<i>iprus</i>	<i>iptaras</i>	<i>iprus</i>
(b) Past, temporal progress: “decided and then did”	<i>iprus-ma ītepuš</i>	<i>iptaras-ma ītepuš</i>	<i>iprus-ma ītepuš</i>
(c) Past, main declarative sentence, negative: “did not decide, has not decided”	<i>ul iprus</i>	<i>ul iprus</i>	<i>ul iprus</i>
(d) Past, question with interrogative: “why did he decide?”	<i>ammīnim iprus</i>	<i>ammīni iprus</i>	<i>ammīni iprus</i>
(e) Past, subordinate clause: “after he had decided”	<i>ištū iprus-u</i>	<i>ištū iprus-u</i>	<i>ištū iprus-u</i>
(f) Future, subordinate clauses: “as soon as he will have decided”	<i>ištū iptars-u (iprus-u)</i>	<i>ultū iptars-u (iprus-u)</i>	<i>ultū iptars-u (iprus-u)</i>

In Old Babylonian, the preterite *iprus* designates relative past, whereas the perfect *iptaras* combines the designation of relative non-past + posteriority: in b past relative to the present moment + posteriority relative to the previous situation, in f past relative to the situation of the main clause + posteriority relative to the present moment. In Middle Babylonian, *iptaras* replaces the preterite in positive main declarative sentences, which is the result of a semantic demarking (Streck 1995a, 203–207): *iptaras* loses the function “posteriority” and assumes the same function as *iprus*; the distribution of both tenses in main clauses follows syntactic rules (*iptaras* positive, *iprus* negative, see a and c; *iptaras* declarative and *iprus* interrogative, see a and d). Only in subordinate clauses the old distribution of *iprus* and *iptaras* still works: *iptaras* is restricted to the future whereas *iprus* is semantically unmarked and can be used for the past as well as the future. Characteristically, the new distribution of preterite and perfect is observable mainly in letters, that show a language relatively near to the spoken language; in documents, however, that normally have a more formulaic and archaic language, the old distribution of both tenses still works in Middle Babylonian.

5.6. Lexicon

New Middle Babylonian words are for example: *aḫāmiš* “each other” (< *aḫā* + *iš*, i.e. [*aḫāwiš*], cf. 5.2. for *m* = [w]), *akanna* “so” (< *ak(i)* “as” + *anna* “this”), *banû* “good” (replaces *damqum*), *dullu* “work” (Old Babylonian “trouble”, replaces *šiprum*), *gabbu* “totality” (replaces *kalûm*), *kudurru* “boundary, boundary stone”, *ma'da* “very”, *šul-mānu* “greeting gift”, *zaratu* “tent” (replaces *kuštarum*). The preposition *ana* is often replaced by the following prepositional phrases: *ana muḫḫi*, literally “to the skull of”, *ana lēt* “to the cheek of”, *ana pūt* “to the forehead of”.

The Kassites, who ruled Babylonia during the Middle Babylonian period, spoke an isolated language that is known only through some names and loanwords in A. texts (Balkan 1954). Besides loanwords, the language did not leave any visible imprint on Middle Babylonian. The loanwords belong to the following semantic fields:

- (a) Horse breeding (perhaps partly also other animals) and war chariots (see also Weszeli 2004, 470 §§ 2.1, 2.2). Most loanwords belong to this semantic field since both were introduced to Babylonia during the Middle Babylonian period (Weszeli 2004, 472 § 3.2): *akkandaš/anakandaš* “spoke”, *allak* “hub (of a wheel)”, *alzibadar* “a colour of horses”, *baziḫarzi* “a part of the yoke-team”, *išpardu* “horse-bit”, *kamusaš* “a bronze component of harness”, *lagaštakkaš* “piebald”, *massiš* “horse trappings”, *sir(i)pi* “brown”, *sumaktar* “half-bred”, *taḫarbatu/taḫabbatu* “standing platform”. Terms for horses whose exact meaning is unclear: *burzaraš*, *ḫulalam*, *kilidar*, *minzir*, *minzahar*, *pi/urmaḫ*, *pir(zu)muḫ*, *sambiharuk*, *šimriš*. Parts of the chariot: *karagaldu/karimgaldu*, *kimek*.
- (b) Plants: *aralaš(?)*, *ḫašimbur*, *kabittigalzu*, *kadišeru*, *kuruš*, *piriduḫ*, *pirimaḫ*, *pirizaḫ*, *šagabigalzu*, *tarizaḫ*.
- (c) A bird: *ḫašmar* “a falcon”.
- (d) Titles: *andaš* “king” (in a lexical text equated with A. *rubû* “great one”), *bukāšu* “duke”, *sakrumaš* “a chariot officer(?)”.
- (e) Objects: *dardaraḫ* “buckle (?)”, *ganandu* “an ornament”, *sernaḫ* “a garment”.

- (f) Miscellaneous and unclear words: *epapu*, *kutkim*, *mašhu* “god” (in a lexical text equated with A. *ilu* “god”), *talgab* “part of irrigation equipment”, *tanzilam* “a connecting canal”, *zibinalzina*.

6. Akkadian in the periphery of Mesopotamia

6.1. Introduction

Middle Babylonian was also used outside Babylonia in the entire Ancient Near East as a lingua franca in the diplomatic communication between the states of Babylonia, Assyria, Mittani, Ḫatti, Syria-Palestine and Egypt (see ch. 16). Moreover, in different regions of the Ancient Near East Middle Babylonian also served as an administrative language. A. in the periphery of Mesopotamia was in part strongly influenced by the spoken local, Semitic or Non-Semitic, languages. A. in the periphery of Mesopotamia is known from ca. 5300 texts with together ca. 340000 words (Pedersén 1998; Streck 2011b).

In the following paragraphs, the A. of Nuzi in Hurrian milieu (cf. 6.2.) and the A. of Ugarit (cf. 6.3.) and Amarna (cf. 6.4.), both in Northwest Semitic milieu, are described in more detail. For the A. of Emar see Seminara 1998 (grammar) and Pentiuć 2001 (West Semitic loan words in Emar texts). The few texts from Amurru are described by Izre’el 1991. For word order in the A. of Byblos see Gianto 1990.

6.2. Nuzi

In Nuzi, east of the Tigris near modern Kirkūk, texts dated between ca. 1500–1350 BC were found. The Middle Babylonian language of Nuzi is influenced by the local Hurrian language. For the A. of Nuzi see Wilhelm 1970.

Grammatical interference from Hurrian appears in the following points:

- (a) Voiced, voiceless and emphatic consonants are not distinguished: e.g., the sign QA is used to write /qa/, /ga/ (transliterated *ga₅*) and /ka/ (transliterated *ka₄*).
- (b) Due to the ergative structure and the missing grammatical gender of Hurrian, subject and object as well as grammatical genders are often confused in the verb: *u adī PNī balṭu PN u PN₂... ipallaḥšunūti* “And as long as PNf is alive, PN and PN₂ will behave respectfully towards her”. But the A. text has “he is alive”; correct would be **balṭatu*. Moreover, the A. text reads “she will behave respectfully towards them”; correct would be *ipallaḥūši*. 5 UDU^{meš} PN *ana jāši iddinū* “PN gave me 5 sheep”. However, the A. text has “they gave”, i.e. the verb is congruent with the object “sheep”; correct would be *iddin. anāku tuppa šanā lā išaṭṭar* “I will not write another tablet”. The A. text has “he will write”, again the verb is congruent with the object; correct would be *ašaṭṭar*.
- (c) The stative conjugation is replaced by a frozen stative 3. person singular masculine. The plural of the subject is marked by a pronominal suffix plural accusative: *nīnu apilšunūti* “We are satisfied”. Correct would be *aplānu* (1. person plural).

Besides grammatical interferences, A. borrowed some 400–500 loanwords from Hurrian (Edzard 1995, 302 n. 1). These are mainly attested in Nuzi, but some also in Middle Assyrian (cf. 4.6., e.g. *šiluhli* “a class of dependent workers”). Noteworthy is the combination of a Hurrian infinitive and the A. word *epēšu* “to do” in the infinitive: *širumma epēšu* “to confirm” (literally “to do confirm”, *šašumma epēšu* “to loose” (literally “to do loose”). Through Hurrian transmission, about ten loanwords are also borrowed from Indo-Iranian such as terms for horses (*babrunnu* “brown”) or *magannu* “gift” (Mayrhofer 1966, 18–24; 1982, 76; Kammenhuber 1968, 181–232).

6.3. Ugarit

In Ugarit some 700–800 A. texts dated ca. 1400–1200 BC were found. For the A. of Ugarit see Huehnergard 1989 and Van Soldt 1991.

The A. texts from Ugarit show various interferences from Ugaritic (ch. 16):

- (a) Triptotic inflection of the Status constructus before genitive: *kalbuli/a* “dog” in analogy to Ugaritic *kussī'u* (spelled *ksu*), *kussī'i* (spelled *ksi*), *kussī'a* (spelled) *ksa* “throne”. Normal A. would have *kalab* for all three cases.
- (b) The verb has a prefix *ta-* for the 3. person singular feminine: *taPaRRaS* in analogy to Ugaritic *taQTuLu*.
- (c) The verb has a prefix 1. person plural *na-*: *naPaRRaS* in analogy to Ugaritic *naQTuLu*.
- (d) Subordinate clauses do not have a subordinativ marker, unknown in Ugaritic.
- (e) *jānu* “is not” is construed with a predicate noun in the accusative: *pilka jānu* “There is no service” in analogy to Ugaritic *'ēna bêta li Ba'li* “There is no house for Ba'al”.
- (f) For Ugaritic loanwords in A. see Huehnergard 1987.

6.4. Amarna

In Amarna (Aḫetaten) in Egypt more than 380 texts dated ca. 1400–1200 BC were found. Most of the texts are letters to the Egyptian king (Moran 1992). The letters from Syria and Palestine show various Canaanite interferences (see Rainey 1996):

- (a) A. verbs are inflected according to the Canaanite verbal system: *ka-ša-at-ti-šu* “I reached him” EA 138: 80: A. verb *kašādu*, Canaanite perfect 1. person singular *QaTaLti*. *ti-iq-bu* URU^{ki} “The city said” EA 138: 90: A. verb *qabū*, Canaanite short imperfect 3. person plural *TiQTuLū*. *ti₇-pa-ṭi₄-ru-na* “They will desert” EA 362: 31: A. verb *paṭāru*, Canaanite long imperfect 3. person plural *tiQTuLūna*.
- (b) Canaanite verbs with Canaanite inflection are also interspersed in the A. text: *a-ba-da-at* “She is lost” EA 288: 52; Canaanite Verb 'BD, Canaanite perfect 3. person singular feminine *QaTaLat*.
- (c) Sometimes A. words are accompanied by a Canaanite gloss: SAG.DU-*nu* (A.) : *ru-šu-nu* (Canaanite) EA 264: 18 = *qaqqadnu* : *rōšunu* “our head”. *ina ŠU-ti-šu* (A.) : *ba-di-ú* (Canaanite) EA 245: 35 = *ina qātišu* : *bādi-hu* < **bi-yadi-hu* “in his

hand". For Northwest Semitic, especially Canaanite loanwords in the Amarna texts see Sivan 1987.

Besides Canaanite loanwords, also 30–40 Egyptian loanwords are found in the A. texts from Amarna, more than half of them in a single text, EA 14, in which imported objects from Egypt are mentioned; see Lambdin 1953.

7. Neo-Assyrian

7.1. Geographical distribution, chronology and text genres

Neo-Assyrian is attested from ca. 1000 until 600 BC when the Assyrian empire was destroyed and the (written) language vanished completely. The last Neo-Assyrian texts date from 603–600 BC and have been excavated in Dūr-Katlimmu at the Ḫābūr river in Syria (see *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 7 (1993)).

Neo-Assyrian is known from ca. 7100 texts with together 500 000 words (Streck 2011b) mainly from Assyria itself (state archives from Nineve, Kalḫu). Textual genres are mainly documents and letters. Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions and literary texts are normally written in literary A. (cf. 8) which is basically Babylonian, sometimes with more or fewer Assyrianisms. For a few literary texts in Assyrian language see Livingstone 1989.

In the Neo-Assyrian period, the Aramaic language and script gained more and more importance at the expense of the A. language and cuneiform (cf. ch. 17). This is illustrated by the following passage from a Neo-Babylonian letter to the Assyrian king Sargon II: *k[i-i IGI LUGA]L maḥ-ru ina ŠÀ si-ip-ri [KUR?] Ár-m[a-a lu-u]s-pi-ir-ma a-na LUGAL [l]u-še-bi-la mi-nam-ma ina ši-pir-ti Ak-ka-da-at-tu la ta-šaṭ-ṭar-ma la tu-šeb-bé-la SAA 17, 2: 15–19* „[f it is acceptable to the [kin]g, let me [wr]ite on an Arama[ic] parchment sheet and send (my message) to the king.’ Why don’t you write on an A. document and send me (your message)?” It is, however, difficult to say to which degree A. and cuneiform were replaced by the Aramaic language and script. In any case, the A. influence on written Neo-Assyrian is weak and mainly confined to loanwords (cf. 7.8.).

For Neo-Assyrian grammar in general see Hämeen-Anttila 2000 and Luukko 2004.

7.2. Phonology

/lt/ (either developed from /št/ or original) becomes /ss/: *aštapar* > *altapar* > *assapar* „I sent“. *ilteqe* > *isseqe* „He took“.

7.3. Declension

Table 14.16. illustrates the development of declension from Middle to Neo-Assyrian.

In the singular, the old accusative in *-a* is lost and replaced by the nominative. In the plural, the old nominative in *-ū* disappears and is replaced by the obliquus.

Table 14.16: Declension in Middle and Neo-Assyrian

	Singular nominative	Singular genitive	Singular accusative	Plural nominative	Plural obliquus
Middle Assyrian	<i>šarru</i>	<i>šarre</i>	<i>šarra</i>	<i>šarrū</i>	<i>šarrē</i>
Neo-Assyrian	<i>šarru</i>	<i>šarre</i>	<i>šarru</i>	<i>šarrē</i>	<i>šarrē</i>

7.4. Stative

In the stative, new forms with *k*-suffixes for the 2. person singular and plural emerge in analogy to the 1. person singular. See table 14.17:

Table 14.17: The stative in Middle and Neo-Assyrian

	1. singular	2. singular masculine	2. singular feminine	1. plural	2. plural masculine	2. plural feminine
Middle Assyrian	<i>parsāku</i>	<i>parsāta</i>	<i>parsāti</i>	<i>parsāni</i>	<i>parsātunu</i>	<i>parsātina</i>
Neo-Assyrian	<i>parsāk(u)</i>	<i>parsāka</i>	<i>parsāki</i>	<i>parsāni</i>	<i>parsākunu</i>	* <i>parsākina</i>

7.5. Gt-, Gtt- and Dtt-stems

The synthetic reciprocal/reflexive Gt-stem with single *-ta*-infix had almost disappeared and was replaced by analytic paraphrases with *aḥāmiš* etc. “each other” and *ramanu* “self”: *ina muḥḥi taḥūmi ša šarre issaḥēiṣ maḥṣāni* SAA 1, 250: 7f. “We fought with each other at the king’s border” (*issaḥēiṣ* replaces older *maḥāṣum* Gt). *ramanka ta-paššaš* KAR 31 r. 22 “You anoint yourself” (*ramanka* replaces older *pašāsum* Gt).

The separative Gt of *alāku* “to go” is replaced by a new Gtt-stem with the forms *ittatlak* (singular) and *ittatakkū* (plural); cf. 7.6.

The perfect Dt with double *-ta*-infix gave rise to a new Dtt-stem with two *-ta*-infixes in all forms: *ugdadammir* “he was completed” (perfect Dt) -> *ugdadammar* “he is completed” (present Dtt).

7.6. *alāku* “to go”

The verb *alāku* “to go” develops various new forms: (*a*)*likalkā* < *alīk alkā* “go!” (imperative 2. person plural without ventive); *ittatlak* “he went away” (Gtt preterite 3. person singular, cf. 7.5.); *ittatakkū*, *ittatkū* “they went away” (Gtt preterite or Gt perfect 3. person singular); *littatlak* “let him go away” (precativ Gtt 3. person singular).

7.7. Personal pronouns used as a copula

Personal pronouns can be used as a copula which includes the subject: *mār PN bēl hītu šū parrīšu šū* SAA 5, 210: 15–17 “The son of PN is a criminal and a traitor” (literally “The son of PN – he is criminal, he is a traitor”).

7.8. Lexicon

In AHW. 307 new Neo-Assyrian lemmata are booked. They belong to the following semantic fields:

- (a) Realia, among them 21 words for animals, e.g. *anāqātu* “she-camels” (< Arabic); 18 words for food, e.g. *hīlpu* “milk” (probably < Aramaic *halab*); 13 words for plants, e.g. *šušūnu* “a tree”.
- (b) 18 *-ūt-* (abstract nouns) or *-ān-* (concrete nouns) derivations, e.g. *šakrānū* “drunkard” (derived from *šakru* “drunk”), *šagalātu* “deportation” (derived from *galū* “to take into exile”).
- (c) 24 verbs, e.g.: *harādu* “to be on guard”, *passuku* “to clear away” (a D-stem), *rammū* “to leave” (a D-stem, replaces older *ezēbu*), *sarruru* “to pray” (a D-stem), *zarāpu* “to buy” (replaces older *šāmu*).
- (d) Particles, e.g. *atā* “why”, *bis* “then”, *dāt* “behind”, *m/nuk* (introduces direct speech after 1. person), *nēmel* “because”.

Aramaic loanwords also appear in the Neo-Assyrian lexicon, e.g. *šārītu* “beam” < Aramaic *šārīā*), *ziqqu* “wineskin” (< Aramaic *ziqqā*).

8. Literary Akkadian

8.1. Name and text corpus

In all periods A. literary texts show a language different from everyday texts (documents and letters). For certain groups of these texts various terms are in use: “hymnic-epic dialect” for some literary texts of the Old Babylonian period (von Soden 1931, 1933), “Jungbabylonisch” or “Standard Babylonian” for most of the literary texts after the Old Babylonian period. In fact, these labels simplify a complicated situation: different textual genres show different degrees of literacy, literary texts of different periods and regions are influenced by the everyday language in current use, and individual texts can combine literary features in an unique way. Nevertheless it is possible to describe some common traits of literary A.

Literary texts comprise the following textual genres with tendentially rising degree of literacy: scientific literature (e.g., omen texts, medical texts); personal names; royal inscriptions; literary texts in the narrowest sense (epics, hymns, prayers, incantations, wisdom literature and some other text genres). Scientific literature and literary texts in the narrowest sense (together also labeled canonical text) form a corpus of ca.

600 000 words whereas royal inscriptions (also labeled monumental texts) represent a corpus of ca. 220 000 words (Streck 2011b).

In principal, literary features can be divided into three groups (Hess 2010): archaisms, artificial forms and foreign elements. It is, however, sometimes difficult to disentangle the different origins of literary features. The most prominent foreign element in A. literary language is the Babylonian dialect in literary texts from Assyria, e.g., in Assyrian royal inscriptions (Madvig 1967).

For monographic descriptions of the literary language of certain textual genres see von Soden 1931/1933 (on literary texts of the Old Babylonian period), Hecker 1974, Streck 1999a (both on epics), Groneberg 1987 (on hymns), Stein 2000 (on Middle and Neo Babylonian royal inscriptions) and Wasserman 2003 (on Old Babylonian literary texts). For the locative and terminative cases see Groneberg 1978/1979. For the ventive in the epics of Gilgameš and Erra see the monograph of Hirsch 2002.

8.2. Archaisms and innovations in Akkadian personal names

A. personal names offer a good opportunity to investigate the mixture of archaisms and innovations in the literary language (Streck 2002a). A. personal names of all periods show archaisms. At the same time they also adopt, sometimes with delay, innovations of the everyday language. Phonology is always innovative. Morphology and lexicon are more innovative than archaic whereas syntax is more archaic than innovative. Syntactic archaisms live longer than morphological and lexical archaisms. Table 14.18. offers examples:

Table 14.18: Archaisms and innovations in Akkadian personal names

	Archaisms	Innovations
Lexicon	<i>Andi-Sutūti</i> (Neo-Babylonian) “Slave-girl of Sutūtu”	<i>Ninurta-gabbi-ilāni</i> (Middle Babylonian) “Ninurta is all gods”
Syntax	<i>Iddin-DN</i> “DN has given” (Middle Babylonian)	<i>Nabû-tultabšī-līšir</i> (Neo-Babylonian) “Nabû, you have made come into existence, let him prosper”
Morphology	<i>Šu-Mama</i> (Old Babylonian) “He of Mama”	<i>Ninurta-lukīn</i> (Neo-Babylonian) “Let Ninurta make firm”
Phonology	–	<i>Alsīš-abluṭ</i> (Middle Babylonian) “Ich cried to him (and) recovered”

Andi-Sutūti: the normal Neo-Babylonian word for “slave-girl” is *qallatu*; *andu* < *amtu* is an archaism. *Ninurta-gabbi-ilāni*: the word *gabbu* “everything” is a Middle Babylonian innovation. *Iddin-DN*: the normal word order, already in Old Babylonian, is subject–predicate; in personal names, however, the old Semitic word order is preserved. *Nabû-tultabšī-līšir*: the use of the perfect for single past situations in main clauses is an innovation that can be observed in certain contexts already in Old Babylonian; in Middle Babylonian this use is normal in everyday texts. *Šu-Mama*: the inflected determinative

pronoun *šu* is an archaism; normally in Old Babylonian is uninflected *ša*. *Ninurta-lukīn*: the *lu*-prefix for the precativ D 3. person singular is a Neo-Babylonian innovation; older Babylonian has *li*-prefix. *Alsīš-abluṭ*: /šs/ > /ls/ is a Middle Babylonian innovation.

8.3. Shortened pronouns

Shortened pronouns (suffixes as well as independent) are artificial forms of A. literary texts. Before shortened suffixes, case vowels are distinguished: *rigmuš(a)* “her cry” (nominative) von Soden 1931, 179. *narbīʾaš(a)* “her greatness” (accusative) ib. *alak-tak(i)* “your way” (accusative) ib. *šâš(im)* “him” ib. 184.

8.4. Construct state

Apparently artificial are also the following construct states in literary texts: *bēlu* “lord” von Soden 1931, 212 (instead of *bēl*, not only used for nominative but also for other cases). *rigmašu* “his cry” ib. 214 (instead of *rigimšu*). *epšetašun* “their deed” ib. 214 (instead of *epištašunu*). *pulḫatka* “your fear” ib. 223 (instead of *puluḫtaka*).

8.5. ŠD-stem

Certainly artificial is the ŠD-stem of the type *ušPaRRaS* which combines the features of the Š-stem *ušaPRaS* and the D-stem *uPaRRaS*: *ušmallī* “he filled” von Soden 1933, 152. *lušḫalliq* “let me destroy” ib. 153f. *mušnammer* “who enlithens” ib. 153.

8.6. ittašab ibakki

Typical for narrative literary texts is the use of the present tense to express past situations simultaneous or posterior to another past situation designated by a preterite, perfect or stative (Streck 1995b; with in part different conclusions Mayer 2007). Thus in circumstantial clauses: *uktammisma attāšab abakki eli dūr appija illakā dīmāja* Gilg. SB XI 138 f. “I fell to my knees and sat there, weeping, the tears streaming down the side of my nose”. In clauses expressing purpose: *īmurma būra Gilgameš ša kašū mûša ūrid ana libbimma mē irammuk* Gilg. SB IX 303 f. “Gilgameš found a pool whose water was cool, and he went down into it to bathe in the water”.

8.7. Lexicon

Literary texts often use words not found in everyday texts. E.g., instead of the normal word *nišū* for “people”, Old Babylonian literary texts use: *abrātum* (literally “the

strong ones”), *ep̄r̄ātum* (literally “the cloudy ones”?), *ba’ulātum* (literally “subjects”), *tenēšētum* and *ammū* (a loan word from Amorite ‘*ammu* and an example of a foreign literary element).

9. Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian

9.1. Geographical distribution, chronology and text genres

The use of the termini Neo- and Late Babylonian in this article follows the division introduced by von Soden 1952: Neo-Babylonian designates the language of all Babylonian everyday texts beginning with ca. 1000 BC and ending with 627 BC. Late Babylonian means all later texts, starting with 626 BC when king Nabopolassar climbed the Babylonian throne until the end of the cuneiform documentation. Since the division between the two periods is very sharp, compared with the transition from Old to Middle Babylonian and from Middle to Neo-Babylonian where longer gaps in the documentation facilitate the division, the periodization has only limited linguistic reality. Therefore, some authors (among them the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary in some of its volumes) use the term “Neo-Babylonian” for the entire period and sometimes distinguish further under this title between “Early Neo-Babylonian” and “Neo-Babylonian” or similarly.

In contrast to Neo-Assyrian (7.1.), the final period of Babylonian has no clear-cut end. The cuneiform documentation disappears in different Babylonian cities from the end of the 4th century BC (Ur) until the 1st century AD (Babylon) (see Streck 2004b, 344f.). The last (astronomically) dated text was written in Babylon in 74/75 AD. The latest texts at all may be the Graeco-Babyloniaca, A. and Sumerian texts in Greek transcription, sometimes accompanied by cuneiform, on clay tablets; the latest dates suggested for these texts by paleography are 1./2. century AD (Geller 1997 and Westenholtz 2007).

Neo- and Late Babylonian are almost entirely confined to Babylonia itself. Textual genres attested are documents and letters (for an overview of the textual record see Jursa 2005) whereas royal inscriptions and literary texts are written in literary Babylonian (cf. 8.) with a greater or lesser degree of Neo-Babylonisms (see for the inscription of Nabonidus and Cyrus Schaudig 2001, 81–317 and for the Behistun inscription Malbran-Labat 1994 with the review of Streck 1996). The number of texts in total is ca. 47.500 with together ca. 3.460.000 words of text (Streck 2011b).

A grammar of the Neo-Babylonian letters written to the Assyrian court is presented by Woodington 1982. For numerals and the tense system of Neo- and Late Babylonian see Streck 1995a, for subordinate clauses Hackl 2007.

9.2. Orthography

The interpretation of cuneiform orthography is crucial for the reconstruction of Neo- and Late Babylonian morphology. Cuneiform orthography in this period was influenced by the orthography of the Aramaic alphabet (Streck 2002b; 2003b § 4) that must

have gained more and more ground at that time. Some of the features typical for Neo- and Late Babylonian orthography serve to express consonants more exactly; others are the result of the neglect to note vowels:

- (a) The combination of two signs of the type CV-CV is used to express a closed syllable /CVC/: *a-d(i)-gu-ul* OECT 12, A 135: 12 *adgul* “I looked”.
- (b) The combination of two signs of the type (C)VC-CV is used to express a closed syllable /CVC/: *taq^{qa}-ba-²* CT 22, 189: 9 *taqbâ* “You told me”.
- (c) CVC-signs and (sometimes) CV-signs are used with arbitrary vowels: *a-nam-dan* ABL 795 r. 14 for *anandin* “I shall give.” *pa-qa-ra-nu* YOS 3, 148: 23 for *pāqirān* “who vindicates”.
- (d) CVC -signs are complemented by CV-signs: ^{lu}*lil-lik* YOS 3, 69: 30 for *lullik* “Let me go”.
- (e) Vowels are sometimes not written: *uš-ri-du* CT 22, 53: 11 for *ušēridū* “They brought down”.
- (f) Morphographemic spellings (for the term see Gelb 1970): Singular + plural determinative ^{meš}: *MA-ĤIR^{meš}* TCL 12/13, 244: 12 for *maḥrū* “They have received”. Stem + suffix: *A-MUR-am-ma* OECT 12, A 175: 10 for *amramma* “Look and...!” Mixed morphographemic-phonemic spellings: *I-TA-PAL-lu-²* TCL 9, 131: 10 for *ītaplū* “They answered”. Suffix rendered only partly: *KA-LAK-KU-na* Dar. 74: 10 for *kalakkān* “granaries”.
- (g) The aleph sign is used to express long or short word final vowels: *i-šak-nu-²* YOS 3, 45: 39 for *iššaknū* “They were put”. *ta-at-tu-ru-²* Behistun-inscription § 9 for *tattūru* “(who) will have returned”.

9.3. Dropping of short word final vowels

Short word final vowels are often dropped:

- (a) In the declension: *ana e-peš šá un-qu* Dar. 11: 7f. for *epēš* “for making a ring”.
- (b) With pronominal suffixes: *UGU-ḥi-in* OECT 9, 2: 5 for *muḥḥin* “on us”. Compare *UGU-ḥi-nu* ib. 6.
- (c) With verbs *tertiaefirmae*: *i-ba-áš* OECT 9, 2: 4 *ibaš* “exists”.
- (d) The subordinative *-u* is correctly written in the majority of cases (Hackl 2007, 145f.). The missing subordinative often seems to be orthographically motivated, as in the use of a CVC-sign: *šá* EN *iš-pur* YOS 3, 28: 8 for *ša bēl išpuru* “that the lord had sent”. As Hackl 2007, 146 points out, a small portion of missing subordinatives might hint at the fact that in the spoken language the subordinative had already been dropped although it was still historically written.
- (e) Perhaps with the ventive suffix *li-ik-šu-du-nu* YOS 3, 71: 18 for *likšudūn(u?)* “Let them reach”.

9.4. Declension

Table 14.19. presents the development of declension in Neo- and Late Babylonian (Strech in press):

Table 14.19: Development of declension in Neo- and Late Babylonian

		1. stage	2. stage	Final stage
Singular, short vowels	Nominative	-u	-u	-0
	Genitive	-i	-i	(?-u >) -0
	Accusative	-a	-u	-0
Singular, contracted vowels	Nominative	-û	-û	-û
	Genitive	-î	-î	?-û/-î
	Accusative	-â	-û	-û
Plural masculine	Nominativ	-û	-ê	-ê
	Oblique	-î	-ê	-ê
<i>ân</i> -plural	Nominative	-ânû	-ânê	-ân
	Obliquus	-ânî	-ânê	-ân
<i>ût</i> -plural	Nominative	-ûtu	-ûti	-ût
	Oblique	-ûti	-ûti	-ût
Feminine plural	Nominative	-ātu	-āti	-ât
	Oblique	-āti	-āti	-ât

In the singular, first the accusative merges with the nominative and later, after dropping the final vowels (cf. 9.3.), all three cases merge in one case with zero morpheme. With contracted vowels, -û dominates all three cases in the final stage, but -î might sometimes be preserved for the genitive case. In the plural, in the 2. stage the two cases merge in the original oblique case; in the final stage, the oblique case is preserved in the masculine plural only, whereas all other plurals drop the final vowel.

Table 14.20. shows the shape of the stems in the singular after dropping the final vowels:

Table 14.20: Shape of the stems in the singular after dropping the final vowels in Neo- and Late Babylonian

Stem with final single consonant	<i>tēmu</i>	<i>tēm</i>
Stem with final long consonant	<i>dullu</i>	<i>dul(l^e)</i>
Stem with final consonant + feminine suffix	<i>šipirtu</i>	<i>šipirt</i>
Stem with final two consonants	<i>baṭlu</i>	<i>baṭal</i>
	<i>širku</i>	<i>širik</i>
	<i>šulmu</i>	<i>šulum</i>

Stems with final single consonant and stems with final consonant + feminine suffix remain unchanged. Stems with originally final long consonant probably shorten this consonant (alternatively add a reduced vowel). Stems with final two consonants insert a vowel identical with the vowel in the first syllable.

9.5. Pronominal suffix genitive 1. person

The pronominal suffix genitive 1. person singular -î is replaced by -āja or -aja: EN-a ABL 281 Rs. 3, *be-la-a* SAA 10, 179: 3 for *bēlāja* “my lord”. *qal-la-ta-a-a* CT 22, 185: 5 for *qallatāja* “my slave girl”.

The pronominal suffix genitive 1. person plural *-ni* is replaced by *-āni* or *-ani*: EN-*a-ni* CT 54, 554 r. 5 for *bēlāni* “our lord”.

Instead of *abī* “my father” and *aḥī* “my brother” the forms *abūja* and *aḥūja* are used (von Soden 1952 § 65i).

9.6. Numbers

Whereas in older A. the gender of the numbers higher than two is the opposite of that of the item counted in Neo- and Late Babylonian the genders of numbers and items counted agree (Streck 1995a, 26–39): 4-*ta qa-ap-pa-tu₄* 4 *za-bi-la-nu* 4 *da-ri-ka-nu* Strassmaier, Liverpool 12: 9f. *erbēt qappāt erbe zabbilān erbe darikān* “4 palm-leaf baskets, 4 baskets, 4 containers”.

9.7. Personal prefix 3. person singular feminine

Whereas older Babylonian used the prefix *i-* for both genders of the 3. person singular Neo- and Late Babylonian have *i-* for masculine and *ta-* for feminine as in Assyrian (cf. 3.5.): ^f*Lu-ri-in-du ... ta-ad-din* L 1652 (Joannès, Ea-ilūta-bāni p. 246): 6–8 *Lurindu taddin* “Lurindu has given”. ŠU^{II}-*su ul ta-kaš-šad* UET 4, 192: 3f. *qāssu ul takaššad* “His hand will not reach”.

9.8. Precative

The precative D and Š 3. person singular has *lu-*prefix against older *li-*: *lu-bal-li-ṭu-ka* SAA 10, 168: 5 *luballiṭūka* “Let them keep you alive”. *lu-šak-šid-du* CT 54, 62 vs. 11 *lušakišidū* “Let them cause to arrive”.

9.9. Paraphrase of the genitive construction

Instead of the older construction X *mār* Y “X son of Y” Neo- and Late Babylonian have X *mārušu ša* Y, literally “X, his son, that of Y”. Since the same construction is found in Aramaic (X *brēh dī* Y) it is probably an Aramaism in A.

9.10. Tense system

The present tense has the same functions as in A. everywhere and the perfect tense the same functions as in Middle Babylonian (cf. 5.5.). In letters, the preterite tense gains a new function in positive main sentences, namely designating wishes (Streck 1995a, 127–135): *ina* UGU-*ḥi* ^{lú}GAL *ka-a-ri ina* ON *ka-la-a-ni ši-pir-tu₄* *šá* EN-*ia a-na pa-ni* PN ^{lú}GAL *ka-a-ri tal-li-kam-ma ka-a-ri lu-še-ti-qa-a[n-n]a-šú...* *kap-du ši-pir-tu₄* *šá* EN-*ia a-na* UGU-*ḥi tal-li-ka* YOS 3, 71: 9–14 ... 18–20 *ina muḥ rab kār ina* GN

kalân šipirt ša bēlija ana pānī PN rab kār tallikamma kār lušētiqa[nn]āš ... kapd(u) šipirt ša bēlija ana muḥ tallik(a) “We are detained by the overseer of the harbour in GN. Let a letter of my lord come to PN, the overseer of the harbour that he makes us pass on ... Therefore, let a letter of my lord come quickly.”

9.11. Lexicon

Several innovations and changes can be observed in the lexicon of Neo- and Late Babylonian. A systematic survey (Streck 2010) considers the following parameters:

- (a) Attestation: An innovation can be found in Neo- and Late Babylonian only (*eṭēru* “to pay”) or also shared by Neo-Assyrian (*unqu* “signet ring”).
- (b) Form: An innovation can be a loan from Aramaic (ch. 17), Old Persian or Greek (*lamūtānu* “slave” < Aramaic; *aspastū’a* “horse feeder” < Old Persian; *istatirru* “stater” < Greek). Rarely, a new word can be shaped by a Sumerian base (*giṭtu* long tablet, receipt, Sumerian base *gíd* “long”). Frequently, a new word or phrase is derived from an older A. root or roots (*ana madakti alāku* “to go on a military campaign” with *madaktu* derived from *dāku* “to kill”). Some lexical innovations are restricted to new meanings imposed on older words (*qallu* “slave”, older “small”).
- (c) Semantic change: Semantic narrowing, i.e. restriction of the semantic scope or context in which the word may be used (*mukinnu* “witness”, older unrestricted participle D “who makes firm”). Semantic widening (*našpartu* “instruction”, older “written order, message”). Metonymy (*nikkassu* “property, assets”, older “account”). Metaphor (*nasāku* “to impose”, older “to throw”). Semantic degeneration (*babbanû* “good”, older *“very good” (not attested)).
- (d) Position in the lexicon of Neo- and Late Babylonian: The innovation fills a semantic gap which means that it designates something for which before there was no designation at all (*rasānu* “to perform the service connected with a prebend”). A lexical innovation replaces an older word which in turn becomes obsolete (*te’iqtu* “worry, trouble”, replaces older *niziqtu*). A lexical innovation coexists with an earlier word. In this case we are dealing with “synonyms”, i.e. with words that at least have more or less the same range of meaning (*gildu* “hide”, “synonym” of *mašku*).

10. The Lexical Heritage of Akkadian

Many languages borrowed words from A. during its long history. In general, it is often impossible to distinguish between direct and indirect loans or between loans and words inherited from Proto-Semitic or cultural words (*Wanderwörter*). In the following, some examples for direct loans into the most important contact languages are given, based on Streck 2007a, 71f.; the older study of Zimmern 1917 is largely outdated. For A. loans in Aramaic see ch. 17.

10.1. Sumerian

For A. loanwords in Sumerian in general see Falkenstein 1960, 312f., and Oberhuber 1981. The oldest loans are attested in Fāra and Tall Abū Šalābīḥ (Krebernik 1998, 265 and 269f.): either they end in the old Status absolutus in *-a* such as *na-gada* “herdsman” (< A. *nāqīdum*), or they don’t have any ending such as *pa-šeš* (< A. *pašīšum*). Loans from the Sargonic and Neo-Sumerian periods are more often borrowed with the A. nominative suffix *-um* and some, e.g. *mun-du* (< A. *mundū* “emmer groats”), are probably A. plurals ending in *-ū* (Powell 1986, 15f.). Gelb 1957 noted 249 A. loanwords in Sumerian texts from the third millennium BC, above all names for professions, e.g., *ḫa-za-núm* “mayor” (< A. *ḫazannum*), and objects, e.g., *mi-rí-tum* “Musical instrument from Mera” (< A. *melirūtum*).

10.2. Hurrian

See Laroche 1976–1978, 315f., and Neu 1997. According to Neu 1997, 262, remarkable semantic fields are architecture and administration including measures and names for cereals. Cf., e.g., *šarri* “king” (< A. *šarru*) and *izūzi* “emmer” (< A. *zīzum*).

10.3. Hittite

See Sommer 1947, 85 and 89–92; Kammenhuber 1972–1975 § 7. Apparently the number of direct loans is low, of loans transmitted through Hurrian somewhat higher. A direct loan is *tuppi-* “writing tablet” (< A. *tuppum*). It seems that there are also some loan translations such as *šallanu-* “to bring up” (literally “to make big”) analogous to A. *rubbûm* and calques such as *araš aran* “each other” corresponding to A. *tappûm* *tappâm* (Kronasser 1966, 123–125).

10.4. Elamite

For A. loans in Elamite see Stolper 1984, 21f., and Krebernik 2006, 93f. Examples are: *li-ti-bí* “hostages” (< A. *līṭum*), *za-al-mu* “statue” (< A. *šalmum*), *zag-ra-tu-me* “ziqurrat” (< A. *ziqurratum*), *tup-pi* “writing tablet” (< A. *tuppum*) and the composite noun *a-lu-me-lu* “acropolis” (< A. *ālum elûm*).

10.5. Hebrew

Mankowski 2000 presents a detailed analysis of the ca. 70 A. loans in Hebrew. Most of them belong to the semantic fields of law, administration and technical terms (ib. 175). Several loans were transmitted through Aramaic into Hebrew (ib. 168–170).

List of Abbreviations

AHw.: Von Soden, W. 1958–1981: *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 CAD: Oppenheim, A. L., E. Reiner et alii (edd.): *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (1956–). Chicago: The Oriental Institute.

11. References

- Aro, J.
 1955 *Studien zur mittelbabylonischen Grammatik* (Studia Orientalia 20) Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica.
- Aro, J.
 1957 *Glossar der mittelbabylonischen Briefen* (Studia Orientalia 22) Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica.
- Balkan, K.
 1954 *Kassitenstudien I* (American Oriental Series 37) New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Buccellati, G.
 1996 *A Structural Grammar of Babylonian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Cohen, E.
 2006 The Tense-Aspect-System of the Old Babylonian Epic. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 96, 31–68.
- Deutscher, G.
 2000 *Syntactic Change in Akkadian. The Evolution of Sentential Complementation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Diem, W.
 1975 Gedanken zur Frage der Mimation und Nunation in den semitischen Sprachen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 125, 239–258.
- Edzard, D. O.
 1965 Die Stämme des altbabylonischen Verbums in ihrem Oppositionssystem. *Assyriological Studies* 16, 111–120.
- Edzard, D. O.
 1995 Review of CAD Š. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 85, 302–306.
- Edzard, D. O.
 1996 *Die Iterativstämme beim akkadischen Verbum. Die Frage ihrer Entstehung; ihre Funktion; ihre Verbreitung*. München: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Falkenstein, A.
 1960 Kontakte zwischen Sumerern und Akkadern auf sprachlichem Gebiet. *Genava* 8, 301–314.
- Gelb, I. J.
 1957 *Glossary of Old Akkadian*. Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary 3. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Gelb, I. J.
 1970 A Note on Morphographemics. In: D. Cohen (ed.). *Mélanges Marcel Cohen* (The Hague: Mouton) 73–77.
- Gelb, I. J.
 1992 Mari and the Kish Civilization. In: G. D. Young (ed.). *Mari In Retrospect* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns) 121–202.
- Geller, M.
 1997 The Last Wedge. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 87, 1–95.

- Gianto, A.
1990 *Word Order Variation in the Akkadian of Byblos*. (Studia Pohl 15) Roma: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana.
- Grayson, A. K.
1987 *Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC (to 1115 BC)*. The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods. Volume 1. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Groneberg, B.
1978–1979 Terminativ- und Lokativadverbialis in altbabylonischen literarischen Texten. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 26, 15–29.
- Groneberg, B.
1987 *Syntax, Morphologie und Stil der jungbabylonischen „hymnischen“ Literatur* (Freiburger Altorientalische Studien 14) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Hackl, J.
2007 *Der subordinierte Satz in den spätbabylonischen Briefen* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 341) Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Hämeen-Anttila, J.
2000 *A Sketch of Neo-Assyrian Grammar* (State Archives of Assyria Studies 13) Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.
- Hasselbach, R.
2005 *Sargonic Akkadian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hecker, K.
1968 *Grammatik der Kültepe-Texte* (Analecta Orientalia 44) Roma: Pontificium Istitutum Biblicum.
- Hecker, K.
1974 *Untersuchungen zur akkadischen Epik* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament Sonderband 8) Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker.
- Hess, C.
2010 Towards the Origins of the Hymnic Epic Dialect *Kaskal* 7, 101–122.
- Hilgert, M.
2002 *Akkadisch in der Ur III-Zeit* (Imgula 5) Münster: Rhema.
- Hirsch, H.
2002 Gilgamesch-Epos und Erra-Lied. Zu einem Aspekt des Verbalsystems. *Archiv für Orientforschung, Beiheft* 29. Wien: Institut für Orientalistik.
- Huehnergard, J.
1987 *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription* (Harvard Semitic Series 32) Atlanta-Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Huehnergard, J.
1989 *The Akkadian of Ugarit* (Harvard Semitic Series 34) Atlanta-Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Huehnergard, J.
1997 *A Grammar of Akkadian* (Harvard Semitic Series 45) Atlanta-Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Izréel, S.
1991 *Amurru Akkadian: A Linguistic Study* (Harvard Semitic Series 40/41) Atlanta-Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Jursa, M.
2005 *Neo-Babylonian Legal and Administrative Documents. Typology, Contents and Archives*. Guides to the Mesopotamian Textual Record. Volume 1. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Kammenhuber, A.
1968 *Die Arier im Vorderen Orient*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Kammenhuber, A.
1972–1975 Hethiter, Sprache. In: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* (Berlin-New York: de Gruyter) Bd. 4, 384–389.

- Kaplan, G. H.
2002 *Use of aspect-tense verbal forms in Akkadian texts of the Hammurapi period (1792–1750 B.C.)*. (LINCOM Studies in Afroasiatic Linguistics 09). München: LINCOM.
- Kogan, L.
2001 *ġ in Akkadian. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 33, 263–298.
- Kogan, L.
2006 Old Assyrian vs. Old Babylonian: The Lexical Dimension. In: G. Deutscher and N. J. C. Kouwenberg (eds.). *The Akkadian Language in its Semitic Context. Studies in the Akkadian of the Third and Second Millenium BC*. (Publications de l'Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 106. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten) 177–214.
- Kouwenberg, N. J. C.
1997 *Gemination in the Akkadian Verb* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 33) Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Kouwenberg, N. J. C.
2000 Nouns as Verbs: the Verbal Nature of the Akkadian Stative. *Orientalia* 69, 21–71.
- Kouwenberg, N. J. C.
2006 The Reflexes of the Proto-Semitic Gutturals in Assyrian. In: G. Deutscher and N. J. C. Kouwenberg (eds.). *The Akkadian Language in its Semitic Context. Studies in the Akkadian of the Third and Second Millenium BC* (Publications de l'Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 106. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten) 150–176.
- Kraus, F. R.
1984 *Nominalsätze in altbabylonischen Briefen und der Stativ*. Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie Van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks. Deel 47 No. 2. Amsterdam: Noord-hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.
- Kraus, F. R.
1987 *Sonderformen akkadischer Parataxe: Die Koppelungen*. Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie Van Wetenschappen. Afd. Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks. Deel 50 No. 1. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Krebernik, M.
1998 Die Texte aus Fāra und Tell Abū Ṣalābiḥ. In: *Annäherungen 1* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 160/1. Fribourg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht) 237–427.
- Krebernik, M.
2006 Aspekte elamisch-mesopotamischer Beziehungen. *Babel und Bibel* 3, 59–99.
- Kronasser, H.
1966 *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Lambdin, T. O.
1953 Egyptian Words in Tell El Amarna Letter No. 14. *Orientalia* 22, 362–369.
- Laroche, E.
1976–1978 *Glossaire de la langue hourrite* (Revue Hittite et Asiatique 34–35) Paris: Klincksieck.
- Lieberman, S. J.
1977 *The Sumerian Loanwords in Old-Babylonian Akkadian. Volume One: Prolegomena and Evidence* (Harvard Semitic Series 22) Missoula-Montana: Scholars Press.
- Liebermann, S. J.
1986 The Afro-Asiatic Background of the Semitic N-Stem: Towards the Origins of the Stem-Affirmatives of the Semitic and Afro-Asiatic Verb. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 43, 577–628.
- Limet, H.
1976 *Textes Administratifs de l'époque des šakkanakku*. Archives Royales de Mari 19.

- Livingstone, A.
1989 *Court Poetry and Literary Miscellanea* (State Archives of Assyria 3) Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Luukko, M.
2004 *Grammatical Variation in Neo-Assyrian* (State Archives of Assyria Studies 16) Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.
- Madvig, D. H.
1967 *A Grammar of the Royal Assyrian Annals of the Sargonid Dynasty*. Dissertation Ann Arbor.
- Malbran-Labat, F.
1994 *La version akkadienne de l'inscription trilingue de Darius à Behistun*. Rom: Gruppo editoriale internazionale.
- Mankowski, P. V.
2000 *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew* (Harvard Semitic Studies 47) Missoula-Montana: Scholars Press.
- Mayrhofer, M.
1966 *Die Indo-Arier im Alten Vorderasien*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Mayrhofer, M.
1982 Welches Material aus dem Indo-arischen von Mitanni verbleibt für eine selektive Darstellung? In: E. Neu (ed.). *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz) 72–90.
- Mayer, W.
1971 *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik des Mittelassyrischen* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 2) Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker.
- Mayer, W. R.
2007 Das akkadische Präsens zum Ausdruck der Nachzeitigkeit in der Vergangenheit. *Orientalia* 76, 117–144.
- Metzler, K. A.
2002 *Tempora in altbabylonischen literarischen Texten* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 279) Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Michel, C.
2001 *Correspondance des marchands de Kaniš au début du II^e millénaire avant J.-C.* (Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient 19) Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Michel, C.
2003 *Old Assyrian Bibliography*. (Publications de l'Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 97) Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Moran, W. L.
1992 *The Amarna Letters*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Neu, E.
1997 Akkadisches Lehnwortgut im Hurritischen. *Archivum Anatolicum* 3, 255–263.
- Oberhuber, K.
1981 Kontaktwirkungen der Symbiose Sumerisch-Akkadisch: Bemerkungen zum akkadischen Lehngut im Sumerischen. In: R. G. Stiegner (ed.). *Al-Hudhud. Festschrift Maria Höfner zum 80. Geburtstag*. (Graz: Karl-Franzens-Universität) 257–261.
- Oppenheim, A. L. and E. Reiner et al. (eds.)
1956– *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- Parpola, S.
1974 The Alleged MA/NA Irregular Verb *našš and the Assyrian Sound Change š > s. *Assur* 1/1, 1–10.
- Pedersén, O.
1998 *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500–300 BC*. Bethesda: CDL Press.

- Pentiuc, E. J.
2001 *West Semitic Vocabulary in the Akkadian Texts from Emar* (Harvard Semitic Series 49) Winona Lake-Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Powell, M. A.
1986 *mun-du* as an Akkadian Plural Loan Word in Sumerian. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 76, 12–16.
- Rainey, A. F.
1996 Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets. A Linguistic Analysis of the Mixed Dialect Used by the Scribes from Canaan. *Handbuch der Orientalistik* 25, 1–4.
- Reiner, E.
1966 *A Linguistic Analysis of Akkadian*. *Janua Linguarum* (Series Practica 21) London: Mouton.
- Renger, J.
1972 Review of ²GAG. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 31, 228–232.
- Schaudig, H.
2001 *Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros' des Großen samt den in ihrem Umfeld entstandenen Tendenzschriften. Textausgabe und Grammatik* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 256) Münster: Ugarit Verlag.
- Seminara, S.
1998 *L'Accadico di Emar*. (Materiali per il vocabolario Sumerico 6) Rom: Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”.
- Sivan, D.
1987 *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian Texts of the 15th-13th C. B. C. from Canaan and Syria* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 214) Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker.
- Sommer, F.
1947 *Hethiter und Hethitisch*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Sommerfeld, W.
2003 Bemerkungen zur Dialektgliederung Altakkadisch, Assyrisch und Babylonisch. In: G. J. Seltz (ed.). *Festschrift für Burkhard Kienast : zu seinem 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen Festschrift B. Kienast* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 274. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag) 569–586.
- Stein, P.
2000 *Die mittel- und neubabylonischen Königsinschriften bis zum Ende der Assyrerzeit. Grammatische Untersuchungen* (Jenaer Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 3) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Steiner, G.
1981 Die sog. *tan*-Stämme des akkadischen Verbums und ihre semitischen Grundlagen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 131, 9–27.
- Stolper, M. W.
1984 *Texts from Tall-i Malyan I. Elamite Administrative Texts (1972–1974)*. (Occasional Publications of the Babylonian Fund 6). Philadelphia: University Museum.
- Streck, M. P.
1995a *Zahl und Zeit. Grammatik der Numeralia und des Verbalsystems im Spätbabylonischen*. Cuneiform Monographs 5. Groningen: Styx Publications.
- Streck, M. P.
1995b *ittašab ibakki* “weinend setzte er sich”: *iparras* für die Vergangenheit in der akkadischen Epik. *Orientalia* 64, 33–91.
- Streck, M. P.
1996 Review of Malbran-Labat 1994. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 86, 275–284.

- Streck, M. P.
1998a Zur Gemination beim akkadischen Verbum. *Orientalia* 67, 523–531.
- Streck, M. P.
1998b The Tense Systems in the Sumerian-Akkadian Linguistic Area. *Acta Sumerologica* 20, 181–199.
- Streck, M. P.
1999a *Die Bildersprache der akkadischen Epik* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 264) Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Streck, M. P.
1999b Das “Perfekt” iptaras im Altbabylonischen der Hammurapi-Briefe, in: N. Nebes (ed.). *Tempus und Aspekt in den semitischen Sprachen. Jenaer Kolloquium zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Jenaer Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz) 101–126.
- Streck, M. P.
2000 *Das amurritische Onomastikon der altbabylonischen Zeit. Band I: Die Amurriter. Die onomastische Forschung. Orthographie und Phonologie. Nominalmorphologie* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 271/1) Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Streck, M. P.
2002a Sprachliche Innovationen und Archaismen in den akkadischen Personennamen. In: M. P. Streck/S. Weninger (eds.). *Altorientalische und semitische Onomastik* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 296) 109–122.
- Streck, M. P.
2002b Keilschrift und Alphabet. In: D. Borchers, F. Kammerzell and S. Weninger (eds.). *Hieroglyphen, Alphabete, Schriftreformen* (Lingua Aegyptia-Studia monographica 3) 77–97.
- Streck, M. P.
2003a *Die akkadischen Verbalstämme mit ta-Infix* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 303) Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Streck, M. P.
2003b Orthographie. B. Akkadisch im II. und I. Jt.. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* (Berlin-New York: de Gruyter) Bd. 10, 137–140.
- Streck, M. P.
2004a Die Amurriter der altbabylonischen Zeit im Spiegel des Onomastikons. Eine ethnische Evaluierung. In: J.-W. Meyer and W. Sommerfeld (eds.). *2000 v. Chr. Politische, wirtschaftliche und kulturelle Entwicklung im Zeichen einer Jahrtausendwende*. 3. Internationales Kolloquium der Deutschen Orient Gesellschaft 4.-7. April 2000 in Frankfurt/Main und Marburg/Lahn (2004) (Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag) 313–355.
- Streck, M. P.
2004b Parther A. In der schriftlichen Überlieferung. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* (Berlin-New York: de Gruyter) Bd. 10/5–6, 343–346.
- Streck, M. P.
2006 Sibilants in the Old Babylonian Texts of Hammurapi and of the Governors in Qaṭṭunān. In: G. Deutscher and N. J. C. Kouwenberg (eds.). *The Akkadian Language in its Semitic Context. Studies in the Akkadian of the Third and Second Millenium BC* (Publications de l’Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 106) 215–251.
- Streck, M. P.
³2007a Akkadisch. In: M. P. Streck (ed.). *Sprachen des Alten Orients* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft) 44–79.
- Streck, M. P.
2007b Die große Inschrift Tukultī-Ninurtas I. Philologische und historische Studien. *Welt des Orients* 37, 145–165.

- Streck, M. P.
 2010 Innovations in the Neo-Babylonian Lexicon. In: L. Kogan et al. (eds.). *Languages in the Ancient Near East* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns) 647–660.
- Streck, M. P.
 2011a *Altbabylonisches Lehrbuch* (Porta Linguarum Orientalium, Neue Serie 23) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz
- Streck, M. P.
 2011b Großes Fach Altorientalistik. Der Umfang des keilschriftlichen Textkorpus. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft* 142, 35–58.
- Streck, M. P.
 in press *Die Kasusflexion im Status rectus des Neu- und Spätbabylonischen*.
- Testen, D.
 1998 The Derivational Role of the Semitic N-Stem. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 88, 127–145.
- Tropper, J.
 1995 Akkadisch *nuhutu* und die Repräsentation des Phonems /h/ im Akkadischen. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 85, 58–66.
- Tropper, J.
 2000 *Ugaritische Grammatik*. (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 273) Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Van Soldt, W. H.
 1991 *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit: Dating and Grammar* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 40) Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker.
- Von Soden, W.
 1931 Der hymnisch-epische Dialekt des Akkadischen, Teil I. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 40, 163–227.
- Von Soden, W.
 1933 Der hymnisch-epische Dialekt des Akkadischen, Teil II. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 41, 90–183, 236.
- Von Soden, W.
 1952 *Grundriß der akkadischen Grammatik*. (Analecta Orientalia 33. ³1995). Roma: Pontificium Istitutum Biblicum.
- Von Soden, W.
 1958–1981 *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Von Soden, W.
 1995 s. von Soden 1952.
- Wasserman, N.
 2003 *Style and Form in Old Babylonian Literary Texts* (Cuneiform Monographs 27) Leiden-Boston: Brill-Styx.
- Westenholz, A.
 2007 The Graeco-Babyloniaca Once Again. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 97, 262–313.
- Weszele, M.
 2004 Pferd A. I. In Mesopotamien. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* (Berlin-New York: de Gruyter) 469–481.
- Whiting, R.
 1987 *Old Babylonian Letters from Tell Asmar*. (Assyriological Studies 22) Chicago: Oriental Institute.
- Wilhelm, G.
 1970 *Untersuchungen zum Hurro-Akkadischen von Nuzi* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 9) Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker.

Woodington, N. R.

1982 *A Grammar of the Neo-Babylonian Letters of the Kuyunjik Collection*. Dissertation
Ann Arbor.

Zimmern, H.

1917 *Akkadische Fremdwörter als Beweis für babylonischen Kultureinfluß*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'schen Buchhandlung.

Michael P. Streck, Leipzig (Germany)

15. Akkadian and Sumerian Language Contact

1. Introduction
2. Linguistic influence of Sumerian on Akkadian
3. References

Abstract

The mutual influence of East-Semitic Akkadian and isolate Sumerian on each other is the first known and documented example of contact-induced language change. Speakers of East-Semitic and Sumerian may have been in contact for over a thousand years, and the contact resulted in similarities on the level of phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon. This chapter describes the linguistic traits of Akkadian that may have developed under the influence of Sumerian. Except for a considerable number of loanwords from Sumerian, this influence manifests itself in shared patterns, categories, constructions, and meanings but not in loaned forms.

1. Introduction

Sumerian was a linguistic isolate spoken in the southern part of ancient Mesopotamia; an area that roughly corresponds to today's Iraq. A generally accepted reference grammar of Sumerian has not yet been written. Recent descriptions varying in length, scope, and details are Thomsen 1984, Edzard 2003, Michalowski 2004 and Zólyomi 2007b. An introduction to the problems involved in the linguistic study of Sumerian is found in Black/Zólyomi 2007.

Contact between Sumerian and dialects of East Semitic is thought to have begun at least as early as the turn of the 4th to the 3rd millennium B.C.E. The history of the relationship between Sumerian and Akkadian can be surmised only on the basis of indirect evidence, such as the temporal and geographical distribution of personal names, texts, and text types, aided by our knowledge of the history of ancient Mesopotamia (cf. Sallaberger 2004; Woods 2006). Many of the alleged shared features are