

STUDIA ORIENTALIA
EDITED BY THE FINNISH ORIENTAL SOCIETY
55:6

***DAMQAM-ĪNIM* REVISITED**

BY
ERICA REINER

HELSINKI 1984

ERICA REINER (Chicago)

DAMQAM-ĪNIM REVISITED

The anomalous grammatical construction of an adjective with the ending $-a(m)$, instead of a substantive in the endingless construct state, preceding a substantive in the genitive has been the subject of a thoughtful article by W. von Soden, "Status-rectus Formen vor dem Genitiv im Akkadischen und die sogenannte uneigentliche Annexion im Arabischen", JNES 19 (1960) 163-171. In my *Linguistic Analysis of Akkadian* (1965), § 7.3.1, I gave a description in terms of transformational grammar, a two-page attempt expanded somewhat in two papers delivered in 1965 and 1966, both unpublished. The interpretations proposed in these two, on the surface radically different but basically similar, approaches never quite satisfied even the authors (e.g. von Soden, *Ergänzungsheft zum Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik* (= AnOr 47), § 64a [1969]). The additional material that has accumulated makes it desirable to describe more exactly the various subclasses of adjectives followed by a genitive. I offer this attempt to the memory of Jussi Aro, to whose insight in Akkadian and Semitic linguistics we shall long be indebted.

It will be necessary to discuss not only the examples listed in von Soden's article, but additional, related types as well.¹ In all, eight types will be considered:

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. <i>ellam qāti</i> | 'pure of hand' |
| 2. <i>atra hasīs</i> | 'exceedingly wise' |
| 3. <i>aklam išātīm</i> | 'consumed by fire' |
| 4. <i>rabūtam libbi</i> | 'great of heart' |
| 5. <i>ākīl karṣi</i> | 'calumniator' |
| 6. <i>rabi puhri</i> | 'chief of the assembly' |
| 7. <i>rapaš uzni</i> | 'broad of understanding' |
| 8. <i>palkāt uzni</i> | 'wide of understanding' |

Each of the eight types has an adjective or participle as first term, and a substantive in the genitive as second. In types 1-4, the first term is in the

status rectus, with an ending *-a(m)*. In types 5-8, the first term occurs in an endingless form. The compound itself is not inflected for case, notwithstanding its function as subject, object, or complement in the sentence.

Type 2, (*atra(m) hasīs*), is identical with type 1 (*ellam qāti*), the only difference being that the second term has no inflectional ending. The known examples, *Atram-hasīs*, *Namram-šarūr*, and *Namra-šīt* occur as proper names and may therefore follow a pattern of their own (compare *šēp-arik* 'long-legs', name of a wading bird). Only one of the representatives of this type, *atra hasīs*, has the late doublet *atar hasīsa* (with an unexplained *-a* at the end of the second term in the references Bab. 12 19:37 and KAR 38 r. 21). For the form of the first term, *atar*, an endingless form which is identical to the construct state, compare *rapaš uzni* (type 7), a doublet to *rapša uzni* (type 1, *ellam qāti*).

The first term of type 3 (*aklam išātīm*) differs from those of types 1 (*ellam qāti*), and 2 (*atra hasīs*) in that it is a passive participle of a transitive verb.

In the second group, type 5 (*ākil karšī*) — which has an active participle as first term — is the least restricted lexically; type 6 (*rabi puhri*) is the most restricted: it occurs only with one adjective, *rab(i)*, as first term. Type 7 has a masculine endingless adjective as first term (*rapaš uzni* ZA 43 18:66), and type 8 (*palkât uzni*) a feminine endingless adjective. For other examples of type 7, with an endingless masculine adjective as first term, cf. *hesir šinni* cited by von Soden p. 167, *halip namurrati* JAOS 88 125 i a 13, and *pēt uzni* 5R 43:43c, *pēt hasīsi* TCL 3 113, unless the two latter be interpreted as compounded with the substantive *pītu*, see AHW. 871a.

In type 8 (*palkât uzni*) the first term, the feminine adjective, ends in *-at*; the examples are *eddet qarnī* (Symb. Böhl 279:8, see AHW. 1552a), *šaqāt rēši* (TCL 3 18), *petât uzni* (KAR 109:20), *palkât uzni* (OECT 6 pl. 24 K.3031 r. 5 and parallel Sm. 1719:8 [courtesy R. Borger], the feminine correspondence to type 1 *palkâ uzni*, En. el. I 18) and *rapšat uzni* (K.232+3371:4). These compounds qualify a feminine substantive (*narkabtu* 'chariot', *ubān šadī* 'mountain peak', or the name of a goddess). Other examples with a feminine adjective in the construct state occur in a Boghazköy L u -list (MSL 12 216): *lú šā.ti.la* = *gamrat libba* (ii 6), *lú igi.bar.zalag.ga* = *zalaqti ēni* (ii 16) and *namrat ēni* (ii 17), all translating Sumerian compounds with *lú*, i.e. a masculine, as first element.

Since the feminine examples all qualify a feminine singular, it is tempting to assume that the similar example previously adduced (von Soden p. 167), *ṣal-*

māt qaqqadīm 'black-headed', which is customarily taken as having a feminine plural in the construct state as first term, with the antecedent *nišū* 'people' (feminine pl.) understood, is also to be interpreted as *ṣalmat* (fem. sg.) *qaqqadīm*. This interpretation may find some support in the syntagm *ṣalam SAG.MEŠ* — presumably to be read *ṣalam qaqqadī* — in the awkwardly written Middle-Assyrian version of the Fable of the Tamarisk and Date Palm (Lambert BWL 162: 10).

Turning to the semantic aspect, we note that all known constructions with an adjective as first term express an inherent quality; this does not hold true for constructions with participles, whether active or passive. If we look at the attested examples with an adjective as first term, which for type 1 are *balša īni(m)*, *barma(m) īni*, **eddam² qamīn*, *ellam mē*, *ellam qāti*, *emqam bir-kīn*, *erīam mūri*, *namra īni*, *palham riḡmī*, *rabša elūtīm*, *rapšam irtīm*, *rapša uzni*, *šadla karši*, *palham zīmī* (all cited by von Soden, pp. 164f.), as well as *našiam rēši*, *patia īnim*, *petā uzni*, *ulluham šārātīm* (cited by von Soden, p. 165 as having a passive participle as first term), we note that their second term, as well as the second term of types 2 (*atra hasīs*), 4 (*rabītam lib-bi*), and 7 (*rapaš uzni*), namely those with an adjective as first term, are non-random. Most of the substantives in the genitive denote a part of the body (e.g., *uznu* 'ear', *qātu* 'hand'), or some other inalienable possession (*riḡmu* 'voice'). This is not the case with the substantives occurring in the examples of types 3 and 5, i.e., after a passive or active participle. As in the attested examples of type 3, *aklam išātīm*, *sakpa(m) ilīm*, *maḥšam bēl ūrīm³*, *maḥšam ilīm*, *lapta *šuhnim⁴*, *malia mē* (also written *ma-le-e Izi II RS Recension Ab 207f.*, and note *ma-le-e saḥaršubbē* BBR No. 24:32), substantives occurring after a passive participle denote the agent, substantives occurring after an active participle denote the patient; when the construction is paraphrased, the first is the subject and the second the object of the verb. Of course, the compound itself behaves like, and may be expected to enter the same collocations as, a simple noun in the sentence.

If the passive participle of type 3 (e.g. *aklam*) were in the construct state instead of in an apparent accusative, e.g., *akil* and not *aklam*, *palih* and not *palham*, the graphemes ⟨a-ki-il⟩, ⟨pa-li-ih⟩ could be interpreted as writings of the active participles *ākil*, *pālih*. However, *aklam išātīm* 'consumed by fire' contrasts with *ākil karši* 'calumniator' (lit. 'who eats calumny', OB Lu A 355 and D 142) and *palham zīmī* 'frightful of features' with *pālih abīm* 'who fears (i.e., respects) the father' (OB Lu B iii 39). For this type my argument in

LAA that the status rectus forms *aklam*, *palham*, etc., and not the construct state *akil*, *paliḥ*, etc., was chosen as first term in order to avoid the ambiguity (at least in writing) between the passive and the active participle, may still be valid.

A paraphrase of the two constructions with participles can serve another purpose. The paraphrase of *ākil karṣi* is, say, in the preterite, *karṣī īkul* 'he ate calumny', while that of *aklam išātīm* is *išātum īkulšu* 'fire ate him'; thus, the verbal predicate of the latter has an obligatory accusative suffix (which refers to the person characterized as *aklam išātīm*) while that of the participial construction does not.

A paraphrase of the examples of types 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8, i.e., those which contain an inalienable possession as genitive, also contains an accusative. This paraphrase was already made by the ancient lexical compilers: *rapšam irtīm* is followed by *ša irtam malū* (OB Lu B iii 37 and 38). The paraphrase is not necessarily a relative clause; compare the clauses *kišāda kabar* 'he is thick of neck', *kuzbam za'nat* 'she is laden with charm', *ru'aman labšat* 'she is clothed in loveliness', etc. This accusative — a relational accusative, German *Akkusativ der Beziehung* — is attached to the body part, i.e., the substantive, and not to the verbal predicate. Still both types of constructions, when paraphrased, contain a syntactic accusative.

Thus, the "anomalous" constructions indeed are based on an accusative, morphologically realized as an *-a(m)* ending on one of the terms, which has to be the first, since the ending of the second is pre-empted by the genitive ending.

There is one example, *ṭābat rigma* (Gilg. XI 117), where the accusative ending appears on the second term and not on the first. This construction can be interpreted either as a nominal clause, with an inverted word order (for *rigma ṭābat* 'she is sweet of voice') or as the here discussed anomalous construction, that is, standing for *ṭābat rigma* (compare the *-a* ending of *atar hasīsa*), comparable to *petât uzni*, *palkât uzni*, *eddet qarnī* of type 8.

Counterexamples can be found that do not fit the patterns here established. In type 1, the ending is sometimes *-u(m)* and not *-a(m)*, e.g., *rapšu uzni* (JAOS 88 125 i a 11), *šadlu ṣurra*. The nominative ending replaces the accusative ending as it often does in late texts where the distinction between these two cases was neutralized.

The nominative ending of the Old Babylonian name *Nawrum-šarūr* (CT 47 11:12, as

against *Nawram-šarūr*) cannot be explained in this fashion, but since it is a proper name, it may follow its own pattern, as also the similar *Dannu(m)-tāhaz* cited by von Soden p. 166; for references see ARMT XVI/1 p. 86f.

Two examples of type 1 (*ellam qāti*) do not have an inalienable possession as second term: *rabša elūtīm* which remains obscure, and *ellam mē* 'pure of rites' (see CAD sub *ella-mē*), which occurs only as an epithet of Sin, and may replace a proper name.

Two examples of type 3, *aklam asakkīm* 'who committed sacrilege' and *aklam anzillīm* 'who infringed on a taboo' (OB Lu A 235-6, B iv 36 and 35) stand for expected *ākil asakkīm* and *ākil anzillīm*, both on semantic grounds — their paraphrase is *asakkam/anzillam īkul* 'he ate sacrilege/taboo' — and as the equivalents of Sumerian *lú.azag.kú.kú* and *lú.an.zil.kú.kú* (and not *-kú.a*, cf. *izi.kú.a* = *aklam išātīm*).

In the example *massūtam šukām* the first term may be either a feminine adjective, with *-am* ending as *rabītam libbi* (type 4), or the abstract noun *massūtu* in the relational accusative; however, the second term is in the endingless (absolute?) state, as also in the other obscure example, *apkallam šipir* (Or. 23 338:13).

Other languages also have constructions which express inherent or permanent qualities with a combination of an adjective and a noun in a possessive relationship. For example, English *swift of foot*, *keen of sight*, *slow of speech*, etc., a stylistically more marked alternative to the less marked compound adjectives *swift-footed*, *keen-sighted*, *slow-spoken* (a pattern that moreover is not restricted to inherent qualities), and *light of step*, *hard of hearing*, idioms that lack such alternatives.

In Hungarian, compound adjectives expressing an inherent quality are formed with the suffix *ú/ű*, e.g., *éleseszű* 'sharp-witted', *bőbeszédű* 'loquacious, ready-tongued', *feketefejú* 'black-headed' while those expressing passing attributes with the suffix *-os/ös*, e.g., *bőszoknyás* 'with a full skirt', *fekete-kalapos* 'with a black hat', a distinction that is not made in English.

Just as in the adduced languages, in Akkadian too compounds with an adjective in first position are not freely formed, but restricted to certain locutions. These occur in literary texts and in lexical lists, either Old Babylonian or presumably going back to Old Babylonian sources. Among the hundreds of entries in OB Lu, only a few exhibit this pattern: *aklam asakkīm* (A 235, B iv 36), *aklam anzillīm* (A 236, B iv 35), *sakpa(m) ilīm* (A 379, C₅:8), *rapšam irtim*

(B iii 37), *laptam šuhnim* (text *šuhṭim*) (B iv 37), *erīam mūri* (B v 53), *mahṣam ilim* (C₄:11), *mahṣam bēl ūrim* (Fragm. I 4, p. 201). If the Sumerian compound is not translatable by a single Akkadian word or by a regular compound of two substantives, with *bēl*, *awīl*, or *ša* as first term (e.g., *bēl emūqim*, *awīl zīqim*, *ša kittim*), or of a participle and a genitive, the most common translation is with a relative clause.

Texts later than Old Babylonian, moreover, resort to various devices to normalize these anomalous syntagms, such as replacing the *-a(m)* ending of the adjective by a nominative ending (see above), or replacing the adjective by a noun (*petā uznī* by *pēt uznī*, see above), or by treating the compound as a declinable single word, e.g., *damqamīnam ūlid* (see CAD sub *damqam-īnim* and von Soden, p. 163f.).

The last point I would like to make is that the two tentative explanations put forward by von Soden in his original study in JNES 19 address the construction on two different linguistic levels. The first considers the *-a(m)* ending as the accusative ending, with the function of "ein erstarrter Zustandsakkusativ". This interpretation is a syntactic one, and is on the same level as the interpretations given as "transformations" in LAA. von Soden's second tentative explanation, which assumed that the ending of the adjective is a fossilized status constructus ending *-a*, to which the *-m* of the mimation was later added, is on the morphological level, the same as my interpretation in LAA based on the need to distinguish passive participles from active participles. Since von Soden's first interpretation, the syntactic one, addresses itself to a higher level of linguistic structure, it is regrettable that in the *Ergänzungsheft* to GAG (§ 64a), it has been abandoned in favor of the second explanation.

NOTES

- 1 I give references only for examples not cited in AHW. or CAD.
- 2 Emended from e-da-ta-am by von Soden, JNES 19 p. 164.
- 3 Thus after collation (and not *mahṣam *igārim*), see Civil, MSL 12 203.
- 4 See MSL 12 189.