From typology to diachrony: synchronic and diachronic aspects of predicative possessive constructions in Akkadian

Elitzur A. Bar-Asher Siegal
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

This study uses typological surveys of predicative possessive constructions across languages and illustrates how a typological study may contribute to a historical discussion. More specifically it provides an account of such constructions in the history of Akkadian. The typological surveys reveal that various constructions in Akkadian not only connote possession accidently, but rather are tokens of predicative possessive constructions. Thus, this article provides a synchronic survey of different marginal predicative possessive constructions in Akkadian, of different dialects and from different periods, most of them unnoticed in the literature. Second, once these constructions are identified, assuming their existence in the history of a language may contribute to explaining other related phenomena, either as motivations for certain diachronic developments or as historical syntactic/semantic explanations for other phenomena. In the context of Akkadian, it will be first and foremost used to explain the origin of the Akkadian verb *išûm*, the equivalent of the English verb 'to have', as Akkadian is unique among the Semitic languages in having a finite verb for this function.

Keywords: predicative possessive construction, adnominal possession, existential predication, HAVE drift, linguistic typology, Semitic languages, Akkadian

> To John Huehnergard,
> on his Sixtieth Birthday

1. Introduction

1.1. Predicative possessive constructions from a typological perspective

The Predicative Possessive Construction (PPC) is a construction with two nominal phrases (NP) which asserts that one of them belongs to the other. Or in other words it determines the relationship between these NPs, that one is the possessor (PR) and the other is the possessed (PD). The grammatical relations in such constructions vary significantly between languages. In English for example, the PR is the subject of the transitive verb *have* and the PD is its object.

Akkadian is unique among the Semitic languages in having a finite verb (*išûm*), equivalent to the English verb *have*, for the expression of a possessive predication. For this reason (among other reasons that will be mentioned later) it is widely accepted that Akkadian is an example of a language that underwent in its pre-historic period the well known phenomenon of *transitivization*, sometimes called 'ʜᴀᴠᴇ drift'. This is a process in which a PPC without a verb that denotes possession grammaticalizes and becomes a transitive verb with such a meaning or that a different construction (usually verbless or existential) develops some syntactic features of a transitive construction especially in contexts that express possession.[1]

In the context of Akkadian, the similarity between the Akkadian verb and the existential particles in other Semitic languages suggests that this transitivization reflects a shift from an existential construction to a marked possessive one. The process of this grammaticalization in Akkadian, which resulted with the verb *išûm* and its function as a PPC, has never been set out in detail in the literature, and the final goal of the current article is to explain how it took place (section 3.1). For this purpose I begin with a synchronic survey of different marginal PPCs in Akkadian, of different dialects and from different periods, most of them unnoticed in the literature (section 2).

---

[1] Editions of Akkadian texts are quoted with abbreviations used in the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* (*CAD*). In general, when the examples in this article appear in the *CAD* I followed their translation, unless I either disagreed with their proposals or thought that a more literal translation was better for the purpose of the argument. For each example, if it is known to us, I will also indicate its time, and when necessary its location, as at times it will affect the discussion. The interlinear glosses are according to the Leipzig Glossing Rules http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php. In adopting this system I had to use a different terminology than what is customarily used in the context of Akkadian, here are the various terminological adjustments: Reference to Biblical verses and the transliteration of Hebrew and Aramaic are according to the *SBL Handbook of Style.*

The identification of these PPCs and consideration of their structures provides the foundation for an explanation of this diachronic development and of other phenomena related to various possessive constructions (section 3).

Comparative Semitic discussions in general and the grammatical analysis of Akkadian in particular do not dedicate any discussion to PPCs. Therefore, in the first part of this article, I also begin the task of filling this gap in the context of Akkadian (section 2). For this purpose I use both typological surveys from unrelated language families and parallel PPCs in other Semitic languages.[2] Thus, this study illustrates how a typological study may contribute to a historical discussion. First, exploring various types of PPC cross-linguistically reveals that various constructions in the Semitic languages in general and in Akkadian in particular not only connote possession accidently, but rather are tokens of PPCs, and as such are expected to have the possessive meaning. Second, once these constructions are identified, assuming their existence in the history of a language may contribute to explaining other related phenomena, either as motivations for certain diachronic developments or as historical syntactic/semantic explanations for other phenomena.

It is neither the purpose of this survey to provide a detailed theoretical analysis of the structure of the predication in each of the PPCs, nor to explain how these predications work compositionally to express the possessive relation between the possessor (PR) and the possessed (PD). For some preliminary ideas with regard to these questions see Bar-Asher (2009). These issues will be treated only where relevant to the basic synchronic description.

1.2. The corpus

Akkadian is the main language in the eastern branch of the Semitic languages. This extinct language was spoken in ancient Mesopotamia, and texts in this language are attested from the third millennium BCE until the first century CE. By the second millennium BCE, Akkadian was split into two variant forms, known as the Assyrian and Babylonian dialects. As is customary in scholarship Akkadian is divided to the following subphases and dialects based on geography and historical periods:

---

[2] Stassen (2009: 208–243). For such phenomena in the context of the Semitic languages see Brustad (2000: 154–157). I wish to thank Na'ama Pat-El for referring me to this book. For typological discussions concerning PPCs see Locker (1954), Clark (1978), Ultan (1978), Lizotte (1983), Heine (1997) and Stassen (2001, 2009).

Old Akkadian (OAkk), mid-3rd to end of 3rd millenium BCE
Old Babylonian (OB)/Old Assyrian (OA), 2000–1500 BCE
Middle Babylonian (MB)/Middle Assyrian (MA), 1500–1000 BCE
Neo-Babylonian (NB)/Neo-Assyrian (NA), 1000–600 BCE
Late Babylonian (LB), 600 BCE–100 CE

In addition, Old Babylonian was later regarded as the classical period of the Akkadian language, and consequently in later periods in both Babylonia and Assyria scribes attempted to imitate it, in a literary dialect that Assyriologists call Standard Babylonian (SB).

Searching for PPCs in a dead language poses a significant challenge, as the quantity of instances of these constructions per period or per dialect is small. Consequently the significance of any generalization on such a restricted corpus is very limited. Therefore I took the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* as the primary corpus for this study, and added examples from various primary and secondary sources, including data from several grammar books.

In light of this, I decided to treat all periods and all dialects of Akkadian together, distinguishing between them only when the corpus reflects significant distinctions between periods or dialects. Employing such a procedure it is of course possible that I do not cover all the PPCs, and hopefully future studies that will focus on a more restricted corpus will be able to refine the conclusions of the current study.

In addition, I will list examples from the peripheral dialects alongside the 'core dialects' as long as they behave similarly to all the dialects. I will note that an example is from a peripheral dialect only when it may be relevant to the discussion.

1.3. Restrictions on the domain of the inquiry

1.3.1. *Indefinite vs. definite PPCs*

In English it is common to distinguish between indefinite (1a) and definite PPCs (1b):[3]

---

[3] I am following this common terminology, despite the obvious problems with this distinction, as there are examples of definite NPs in the indefinite construction and *vice versa*. As noted, this distinction is mostly relevant at the level of information structure.

(1)   a.   Stuart has a piano
      b.   The piano is Stuart's/belongs to Stuart.

The distinction between the two constructions seems to be in terms of information structure. While in (1a) the topic is Stuart, in (1b) it is the piano. Following Stassen (2009), I will concentrate in this article only on clauses of the (a) type, thus sentences such as (2) and (3), with independent possessive pronouns, will be mostly excluded from the discussion:

(2)   *birīt   imitt-i   ya'umma šumēl-i ša nakr-ī*
      middle.of right-GEN POSS.1.SG left-GEN of enemy-GEN
      'The central area of the right side is mine, and of the left the left side
      belongs to the enemy.' (CT 20 44, 59, SB)

(3)   *Elamtu u   māt   Aššur   attūka*
      Elam   and land.of Assyria POSS.2.M.SG
      'Elam and Assyria are yours.' (ABL 961 r. 6, NB)

One should admit that this restriction is merely a superficial way of delimiting the discussion. It is especially difficult to justify such a restriction in the context of the Semitic languages, since the same PPC is often used regardless of the question whether the topic, in terms of the information structure, is the PR or the PD.

1.3.2. *Other transitive constructions*

I will also not discuss various roots and constructions that connote possession of the object. Thus while the following examples imply possession, they are not included in our discussion:

(4)   *eqel   bīt   ab-ī-ya   ša ištu ūm-ī   mādūt-im*
      field.of house.of father-GEN-POSS.1.SG REL since day-PL.OBL many.OBL
      ṣabt-ānu. . .
      hold.ST-1.PL
      'The field of my father's family we have had for a very long time.' (AbB 4,
      40: 7, OB)

(5)   *eql-am ašaršan ṣabit   u   kanik   šarr-im ul*
      field.ACC elsewhere hold.ST.3.M.SG and sealed.document.of king.GEN NEG
      naši
      carry.ST.3.M.SG
      'He has a field elsewhere but he has no sealed document from the king.'
      (AbB 10, 5: 13–15 OB)

The phenomenon of verbs with the meaning of 'holding, seizing', which in the *predicative construction*[4] implies possession has already been discussed in the context of Akkadian.[5] It is also a well known phenomenon cross-linguistically,[6] and therefore it will not be included in the current discussion.[7]

1.3.3. *The content of the discussion: structure and not semantics*

In the next section I survey various PPCs in Akkadian, standard and marginal ones. The focus of the discussion is only on the structure of the various constructions. I do not attempt to explain their distribution, and to explain the choice of one construction over another. The reasons for this are, first that this type of study deals with texts from different millenniums, written in different dialects, and therefore it would be irresponsible to assume an actual choice. Second, many of the texts are very short and it is almost impossible to propose a clear contrast between the uses of the various constructions.

Yet, the goal of the first part of this article is to show the structural similarity between the different constructions, and to illustrate how revealing the existence of such PPCs in the history of Akkadian enables the understanding of various processes in the history of this language, which is the focus of the current article.

1.4. The relevance of linguistic typology to the current study

Typological studies in linguistics aim at discovering and explaining the basic principles in the structure of human language, by revealing the prop-

---

[4] For the terminology of these verbal forms I am following Huehnergard (1987).

[5] For a very detailed discussion see Rowton (1962, esp. pp. 240–243), which is also the source for examples (4) and (5). Ungnad (1918) demonstrates how the predicative constructions can often be paraphrased in German by sentences containing the German verb "haben". However, as Rowton (1962) notes, Ungnad's proposal is based on very limited data, and in addition this may be more indicative of the German use of the possessive verb than of the function of this construction in Akkadian. I wish to thank Benjamin Foster for referring me to Rowton's article.

[6] Heine & Kuteva (2002: 298–299).

[7] Cross-linguistically many HAVE-PPCs developed from such verbs and constructions, and for this reason Testen (2000) proposes that the regular verb for possession in Akkadian, *išûm*, is derived from the verb *našûm*. However, see Rubin (2005: 61) and Kouwenberg (2010: 468, n. 76), for some problems with Testen's proposal.

erties which are common to the world's languages and those that distinguish between them. Thus, in the context of PPCs, a typological study first and foremost examines the various ways in which predicative possession is formally encoded.

Besides this qualitative aspect of the typological study, there is also a theoretical aspect which seeks for explanations for the distribution of structures among languages. Such a study asks the following questions: (1) why is the typology the way it is? (2) why are languages grouped the way they are with respect to the typology? (Sanders 1976).[8]

Most often these questions are dealt with by attempting to find correlations between the distribution of the various types in a typology at hand and the existence of other properties in the relevant languages.

As the title of this article indicates, this study is mostly relying on previous qualitative typological studies which explored the various types of PPCs cross-linguistically, and reveals the existence of various types of PPC in the Semitic languages in general and in Akkadian in particular. I will briefly note on some of the theoretical aspects of this typology, which are relevant for the discussion (sections 2.5–6).

2. Survey of marginal PPCs in Akkadian

2.1. The domain of our inquiry

This part of the article deals with indefinite strategies for encoding PPC in Akkadian (in the sense defined in section 1.3.1) without verbal roots that connotes possession. Instead various other strategies encode the possessive relation between the NPs.

It is worth noting that it is common that languages with a HAVE PPC, i.e. languages with transitive verbs appearing with the PR as the subject and the PD as the object, also use some marginal, non-transitive PPCs as well. Thus, similarly in Akkadian, while the verb *išûm* usually expresses this function,[9] there are still other secondary strategies for expressing posses-

---

[8] For a discussion concerning these questions in the context of PPCs, see Stassen (2009: 36–37, 251–255).

[9] The existence of a HAVE-PPC does not necessitate that the other constructions will be rare. For example, Ancient Greek used the dative-PPC (see section 2.3, below) very often despite the common use of the verb ἔχω "to hold" with a possessive meaning.

sive predication. Among these constructions, some remained productive and were used in certain contexts (sections 2.2–3, 2.6); others, however, were probably productive only in the pre-history of Akkadian. Synchronically, however, vestiges of these constructions remained either in some other possessive constructions (section 3), or fossilized in some individual expressions (section 2.5).

1.2. Locative PPCs

2.2.1. *The relationship between locative constructions and PPCs*

The connection between PPCs and locatives is widely known. Lyons (1967 and 1968), for example, argues that PPCs and locative constructions are related both synchronically and diachronically, and that the former derive from the latter (Lyons 1967: 390). This idea has been reinforced by others. Clark (1978), for example, demonstrates similarities between existentials, locatives, and possessives in word order and use of verbs. Taking a cognitive approach, Heine (1997: 93) claims that in this type of construction "the possessor is conceptualized as the place where the possessee is located" (see also Baron & Herslund 2001).[10] Consider, for example, the fact that in English, sentences (6a) and (6b) are equivalent semantically:

(6)   a.   There is a book on the table.
         b.   The table has a book on it.

Moreover, in many languages the PR is expressed as the location of the PD. Among the Semitic languages one can mention the use of the preposition *ba-* 'in' in Geʿez; or the Classical Arabic use of the preposition ʿ*inda* 'at, *chez*':

(7)   *inda-ka la-hā dawāʾ-un.*
         at-you   for-it remedy-NOM.INDF
         'You possess a remedy for this.' (Fischer 2002)

Similarly several locative constructions in Akkadian are structurally existential sentences, with the PD behaving as their subject (as it is in the nom-

---

[10] Some other scholars who argue that possession is in fact an existential sentence with a locative are Benveniste (1966), Freeze (1992), Harley (2003) and Stassen (2009: 11–15). Lizotte (1983), however, has shown that despite the connection between these constructions in many languages, this cannot be taken as universal, since in many languages PPCs and locative constructions are different.

inative and the verb, if there is one, agrees with it) and the PR encoded as their location, and these constructions in numerous contexts deliver semantically the same content of equivalent possessive predications. Although it is often hard to determine whether these are indeed PPCs or simply locative expressions, I include them in the current discussion for two reasons: first, as mentioned, some believe that PPCs are always in some deeper sense locatives and accordingly these types of predication should always be discussed together; second, and more importantly, I think that in some deeper sense the locative construction and the PPCs also in Akkadian share the same structure.

   All the locative clauses with a possessive implicature in Akkadian have either an overt or a covert existential predication. The overt verb *bašûm* agrees with the PD, and the PR always appears in locative prepositional phrases, among them: *ina qāti* 'in the hand of' (section 2.2.3), *maḥar* 'before/with' (section 2.2.4) and *itti* 'with' (section 2.2.5).

   In order to clarify the claim that the main predication of all these constructions is existential, a review of the overt and covert existential predication in Akkadian is in order.

2.2.2. *Existential predication in Akkadian*

Usually, in Akkadian, when existence is asserted it is indicated with the conjugated verb *bašûm*. However, similar to many Semitic languages, Akkadian allows existential predication without an overt indication of such a predication, or with what I shall call 'a zero-marked existential predication':[11]

> (8) *kīma teštenemme   nukurt-um=ma mamman bāb-am   ul*
>   as   hear-DUR-2.F.SG war-NOM=and person   gate-ACC NEG
>   *uṣṣi*
>   exit.DUR.3.M.SG
>   'As you keep hearing, there is a war and no one leaves the gate.' (AbB 6,
>   64: 15–17. [7] in Cohen 2005, OB)

Or with adverbial complements:

---

[11] For a survey of this phenomenon among the Semitic languages, see Bar-Asher (2009: 425–431). In the context of Akkadian this has been repeatedly noted in the literature, see Von Soden (1952 (henceforth: GAG) section 126e), Finet (1956: 207–208), Huehnergard (1986: 233–235) and Cohen (2005: 251–253).

(9) *ina imitt-i   ḫaš-îm   šēp-um.*
in   right-GEN lung-GEN foot-NOM
'There is a foot on the right of the lung.' (YOS 10 8: 32–33, [35] in
Huehnergard 1986, OB)

Huehnergard (1986) observes that the zero-marked existential clauses dif-
fer substantially from other verbless sentences in Akkadian. In existential
clauses, as in (9), the noun in the nominative case is in the final position
of the sentence, a position rigorously reserved in Akkadian for the predi-
cate. Accordingly, the prepositional phrase in such sentences is merely the
locative. When the prepositional phrase is the predicate it is in the expected
final position, as (10) demonstrates:

(10) *awāt   eql-ēti-šina   ul   ina qātī-ya.*
matter.of field-PL.F-POSS.3.F.PL NEG in   hand-POSS.1.SG
'The matter of their fields is not in my hands.' (AbB 2 158: 12, [82] in
Cohen 2005, OB)

This information is crucial for the understanding of some of the PPCs to be
discussed in the following sections.

2.2.3. ina qāti *'in the hand of'*

The first locative construction in Akkadian, namely, structurally existential
sentences, with the PD behaving as their subject to be discussed, is the one
in which the PR is introduced after the locative expression: *ina qāti* 'in the
hand of'. It seems that this construction was somewhat productive in Old
Babylonian, and very often with an overt existential predication:

(11) *šumma še'-um   ina qāti   nukaribb-im ibašši.*
COND barley-NOM in   hand.of gardener-GEN exist.DUR.3.SG
'If the gardener has the barley.' (AbB 9 20: 17, OB)

(12) *m[ī]nu paqād-u   ina qātī-šu   ul   ibašš[i].*
who   entrust.INF-NOM in   hand-POSS.3.M.SG NEG exist.DUR.3.SG
'He has nothing to entrust.' (AbB 1, 46: 37, OB)

(13) *ana mali   ša ina qātī-ka   ibašš-û   lū*
to   according REL in   hand-POSS.2.M.SG exist.DUR.3.SG-SBJV or
še'-am   lū kasp-am   šūbil-am=ma
barley-ACC or silver-ACC send.IMP.2.M-VEN=and
'According to what you have, send me either barley or silver.' (AbB 1 138:
36, OB)

(14)   *pitn-um   ina qātī-ša   ul   ibašši.*
        pitnum-NOM in   hand-POSS.3.F.SG NEG exist.DUR.3.SG
        'She does not have a P.' (Tell Rimah 116: 13 cf. ARMT 28 86: 22, OB, Mari)

(15)   [*ana*] *talbiš   napād-i   lū uš-ûm* [. . .] *ina qātī-ya*   [*ul*]
        [for] overlay.of *napādu*-GEN or ebony-NOM in   hand-POSS.1.SG [NEG]
        ibaššī=ma
        exist.DUR.3.SG=and
        'I have [no] ebony or [. . .] for the overlay of *napādu,* and . . .' (ARMT 13
        11: 20, OB, Mari)

(16)   *lā   tīdê   kīma kasp-um*   1 GÍN *ina qātī-ya   lā*
        NEG know.PST.2.M.SG how silver-NOM 1 *shekel* in   hand-POSS.1.SG NEG
        ibašši-u
        exist.DUR.3.SG-SBJV
        'Don't you know that I do not have one *shekel* of silver?' (Michel &
        Garelli Kültepe 1 No. 7: 28–30, OA)

(17)   *naḫram-u   [ša] ina qātī-ya   ibašš-û* . . .
        naḫramu-NOM [REL] in   hand-POSS.1.SG exist.DUR.3.SG-SBJV
        luddiš-šu
        give.PRC.1.SG-him
        'I will give him the n. which I have.' (AbB 8, 156: 17–19, OB)

As noted by Cohen (2005), there are a few *ina qāti-* verbless clauses, such as
(18), which seem to express a PPC as well. Cohen's discussion of this group
of sentences is relevant for various purposes of this article, and therefore
I shall summarize it first and add some more details.

(18)   *ṣibût-um   ina qātī-ya*
        need-NOM in   hand-POSS.1.SG
        'I had need.' (AbB 6 57: 20, OB)

Cohen raises the question of how to analyze this construction. He men-
tions two alternatives: 1. this is a zero-marked existential predication, with
an adverbial modification, similar to the ones encountered in (9); 2. this
is a nominal sentence in which the prepositional phrase is the predicate.[12]

As Cohen (2005) notes, it seems natural to analyze it as another example
of a locative PPC with a zero-marked existential predication. And in fact,

---

[12] Cohen considers this difference only from the point of view of information structure.
However, Francez (2007, 2009) demonstrates that in various environments there are also
some semantic differences between the two types of predication. Relevant to this discussion
is also the short note of Charpin (1989–1990: 102), concerning this construction.

sentences (11)–(17), which exhibit overt predication, strengthen this reading. However, according to Huehnergrad's observation (mentioned above in section 2.2.2) the location of the adverbial locative phrase at the end of the clause supports the reading of this construction as a bipartite verbless clause with the prepositinal phrase as the predicate.

I believe that some further discussion can support the first direction, and at the same time may explain the location of the adverbial phrase. For this purpose I should draw attention to another unsolved problem mentioned by Cohen (2005): in one OB letter *ina qāti* occurs with no further specification:

(19) *šīm-um*   *ina qāt-im*   [*š*]*adid=ma*   *adīni*   *ul*
      merchandise-NOM in   hand-GEN   delay.ST.3.SG=and until.now NEG
      ašām
      buy.PST.1.SG
      'There is merchandise. It is delayed. I didn't buy any until now.' (AbB 9
      130: 7, [92] in Cohen 2005)

Cohen rightly makes the following comments:

> In the edition it is translated 'the merchandise on hand is delayed . . .'.
> However, this example does not make much sense if we interpret it as part
> of a stative clause (how can it be both on hand and delayed?) it seems best
> to view *šimun ina qātim* as a full clause, expressing the existence of the
> merchandise.   (Cohen 2005: 276)

Furthermore, he notes that "this . . . is the only example found with no further attribution of *ina qāti*." He does not, however, propose an explanation for this. In order to explain this, first, I can add a few more examples of *ina qāti* without an object in other OB corpora, among them:[13]

(20) DUMU.MEŠ *bīt*   *ṭupp-i*   *ummên-ū*   *ina qāt-im*
      son.PL.of   house.of document-GEN expert-PL.NOM in   hand-GEN
      šutamṣ-û.
      sufficient.ST-3.M.PL
      'There are expert scribes in sufficient number.' (ARM 1 7: 37–38, OB,
      Mari)

In other places it appears with an overt existential predication:

---

[13] Cohen's study is restricted to the collection of the 400 examples in Kraus (1984) together with the addition of the letters in *AbB* 11–13.

(21) *siparr-um   ina qāt-im   ul   ibaš*[*ši*].
bronze-NOM in   hand-GEN NEG exist.DUR.3.SG
'There is no bronze.' (ARM 1 38: 7, OB, Mari)

(22) *paraḫšīt-um   ina qāt-im   ul   ibaššī=ma* . . .
paraḫšītum-nom in   hand-GEN NEG exist.DUR.3.SG=and
'There was no p. available . . .' (ARMT 27 7: 10f, OB Mari)

(23) *kasp-am   ša ina qāti   ibaš-šû   šūbil-am.*
silver-ACC REL in   hand-GEN exist.DUR.3.SG-SBJV send.IMP.2.M.SG-VEN
'Send me the silver that is on hand/there is.' (CT 29 38: 21, OB)

(24) *alp-ū   ina qāt-im   ul   ibaššû.*
ox-PL.NOM in   hand-GEN NEG exist.DUR.3.M.PL
'There are no oxen available.' (AbB 8, 84: 33–34, OB)

I would like to propose that there are signs of a grammaticalization process, probably operative at some point in the history of Akkadian (or in its pre-history) and effective in the Old-Babylonian period. In this process the expression *ina qāti* was reanalyzed not as part of the locative but as part of the existential predicate.

It is in fact a well-known phenomenon, also among the Semitic languages, in which the existential particle originates from a locative expression. For example, Bravmann (1953: 139–150; 1977: 373) and others note that in Arabic existence is marked with *hunāka* ('there') and *ṯammata* ('there'), and similarly the expression *ʾikkā* from the eastern dialects of Late Aramaic derive from a combination of existential particle with a locative (<*ʾīt kā* 'there is here'). An example of the grammaticalization of a locative prepositional phrase is found in Yemeni Arabic and Geʿez with *bih* and *bo* respectively: both expressions originally meant 'in it'.[14]

Thus, I propose the following reanalysis in OB:

Stage 1: *alpū   ina qāti*+COMP [*ibašši*]
Subject Locative   Exist

Stage 2: *alpū   ina qātim* [*ibašši*]
Subject Exist

Accordingly sentences (21)–(24) in which *bašûm* and *ina qāti* appear together as part of the same predication, reflect a stage in which the

---

[14] Rubin (2005: 61–62). Since in our examples the pattern is without a pronoun, it is more likely to develop from something like "at hand".

appearance of *ina qāti* did not contribute to the semantics, but rather was perceived as part of the existential expression. It is therefore possible that synchronically in some places it was equivalent to what is found in Geʿez, where synchronically the *b*+pronoun in the PPC is not locative but what encodes existential predication:[15]

(25) *b-o   xeṣəwān-a.*
      in-it eunuchs-ACC
      'There are eunuchs.' (Matt. 19: 12)

(26) *wa-ʾal-b-omu   wəlud-a.*
      and-no-in-them child-ACC
      'But they had no child.' (Luke 1: 7)[16]

If this analysis is correct, it may also explain the location of *ina qāti-* expressions at the end of sentences, as seen in (18). Returning to Cohen's question, if *ina qāti-* were an adverbial expression, its location in final position would suggest reading this expression as the predicate (based on Huehnergard's 1986 observation), and as Cohen notes this is probably not the case in the example under discussion. But since, according to the proposed explanation, *ina qāti-* in these contexts does not contribute literally to the meaning of the sentence, as it has become part of what encodes the existential predication such an analysis is unnecessary. This is merely a grammatical form and as such does not express any location. The syntactic position is explained by the fact that it is part of the existential predicate.

Obviously, the weakness of this proposal is the lack of many examples of this phenomenon, and consequently the required assumption that it occurred in Old Babylonian at a level that did not reveal itself often in the written texts, that it was never systematically grammaticalized, and that it therefore disappeared in later periods.

To conclude, in OB there was a locative PPC with the PR as part of the prepositional phrase beginning with *ina qāti*. The main predication is existential either overtly (sentences 11–17) or covertly (18). This formula was probably productive, to the extent that the expression *ina qāti* itself was reanalyzed as part of the existential predication.

---

[15] This can be supported by the fact that when there is an explicit PR it appears without the locative preposition. This in turn indicates that in fact in Geʿez the PPC is a topic-PPC. This type of PPC will be discussed in section 2.4.
[16] These examples are taken from Rubin (2005: 58–62).

2.2.4. maḫar *'before/with'*

Another locative expression which seems to be productive as a PPC in Old Babylonian is the one with the existential predication, in which the PD is the object of the prepositional phrase: *maḫar* 'before/with':

(27) *naḫram-ū   maḫrī-ya   ul   ibaššû.*
      naḫramu-PL.NOM with-POSS.1.SG NEG exist.DUR.3.M.PL
      'I don't have any *naḫramu*-garments.' (AbB 11, 52: 20–21 OB)

(28) *ina   GUD.ḪI.A ša ina maḫar ab-ī-ya   kâta*
      from cattle   REL in   with   father-GEN-POSS.1.SG you
      ibaššû.
      exist.DUR.3.SG.SBJV
      'From the cattle which you, my father, have.' (CT 29 9: 24, OB)

(29) *kamūnu ana zēr-im   maḫrī-ya   ul   ibašši.*
      kamūnu for seed-GEN with-POSS.1.SG NEG exist.DUR.3.SG
      'I do not have *kamūnu* for seed.' (AbB 11, 98: 15–16, OB)

(30) *še'-um   maḫrī-ya   ul   ibašši.*
      barley-NOM with-POSS.1.SG NEG exist.DUR.3.SG
      'I have no barley.' (AbB 11, 61:rev.4', OB)

(31) *šumma kanīk-āt-im   maḫrī-ka   ibaššiā.*
      COND   sealed.document.F.PL-OBL with-POSS.2.M.SG exist.DUR.3.F.PL
      'If you have sealed documents.' (AbB 6, 129: 12–13, OB)
      Similar to *ina qāti*, in one example *maḫar* also appears without an explicit existential verb:

(32) *ma[ḫ]r[ī]-y[a] 1 alp-um ša muškēn-im   simm-am   naši.[17]*
      with-POSS.1.SG 1 ox-NOM of commoner-GEN wound-ACC hold.ST.3.SG
      'I have a commoner's bull, it has a wound.' (AbB 9, 71: 5–7, OB)

2.2.5. itti *'with'*

Similar to *maḫar*, which has a comitative sense, a possessive implication is also found with the regular preposition for this function in Akkadian: *itti*. In the context of PPCs, however, it is necessary to distinguish between two types of comitative constructions. In the first construction the PR is the grammatical subject and the PD is marked as a comitative complement, as found for example in Daga (Papuan, South-East, Murane 1974: 303):

---

[17] See section 1.2.2, above.

(33) *orup da   agoe den.*
      man one slave with
      'A man had a slave.'

As far as I have found in the literature, such a PPC does not occur in the Semitic languages and theoretically it is doubtful whether this is merely a grammaticalization of expressions such as 'I am with a car' in English (possible also with the equivalent in Modern Hebrew *ani im mexonit* which is applied in certain contexts where one can alternatively use the standard possessive construction), which convey the same meaning of 'I have a car;' or whether this PPC is a type of transitive clause.[18]

The second type of comitative construction is structurally similar to the previous locative constructions. The PD stands in the subject position and the PR that follows is a comitative complement, therefore I include this PPC among the locative PPCs because this is after all also an existential predication with the comitative complement providing the location. Among the Semitic languages Yemeni-Ṣanʿānī Arabic grammaticalized this PPC, and the preposition *maʿ* 'with' is used (Watson 1996: 60), and similarly *k-/š-* 'with' is used in Mehri (Johnstone 1987: 200, Rubin 2009: 223–224; 2010: 205, 276–276). Something of this sort appears in Biblical Hebrew with the preposition *ʾet* in the sense of 'with'.[19] Nevertheless it seems that *ʾet* can still be interpreted as the regular use of 'with', and so we should not speak about any form of grammaticalization yet.[20]

A similar situation is found with the Akkadian cognate of the Hebrew *ʾet, itti,* which occasionally can be interpreted as a PPC, with the overt existential verb *bašûm*:

(34) *palāh-u   u   kanāš-a   ul   ibašši   ittī-ša.*
      reverence-NOM and submission-ACC[21] neg exist.DUR.3.SG with-POSS.3.F.SG
      'She has neither reverence nor submission.' (Lambert BWL: 102: 77, SB)

---

[18] For some more discussion about this pattern see Stolz (2001).

[19] In Examples such as: *mâ ʾittānû* (lit. what with-us), 'What do we have?' (1 Sam 9: 7). See Waltke & O'Connor (1990: 195, section 11.2.4).

[20] It is possible, however, that in the Hebrew of Qumran such a process did occur to some extent, as can be seen in the following sentence (see Baasten 2006: 222):

(i) YŠ   ʾT-Y   DBR   L-RBYM.
     exist with-POSS.1.SG matter to.ART-multitude
     "I have something to say to the many [lit. there is something with me to say to the many]" 1QS 6.12

[21] Morphologically speaking this is accusative, although syntactically a nominative is expected here. In the later periods cases in Akkadian were not always systematic.

(35)   *bult-u   el   kala il-ī   ittī-šunu   ibašši.*
       dignity-NOM above all   god-PL.OBL with-POSS.3.M.PL exist.DUR.3.SG
       'They have more dignity than all other gods.' SEM 117 rev. iii 5–6 (MB)

(36)   *rēmēn-û   ša bulluṭ-u   baš-û   ittī-šu.*
       merciful-NOM REL give.life.INF-NOM exist.ST.3.M.SG-SBJV with-POSS.3.M.SG
       'The merciful one which has the power to grant life.' (En el. VII 30, SB)

(37)   *marṣ-a   [bulluṭ-u]   ittī-ka   ibaš[ši].*
       sick-ACC   heal.INF-NOM with-POSS.2.M.SG exist.DUR.3.SG
       'You have the power to heal the sick.' (4R 17: 37f, SB)

(38)   *bullus-sunu   ittī-ka   ibašši.*
       revive.INF-them with-POSS.2.M.SG exist.DUR.3.SG
       'You have the power to revive them.' (5R 50i 78f, SB)

(39)   *ibašši   ittī-ka   gillat-i pasās-u.*
       exist.DUR.3.SG with-POSS.2.M.SG sin-GEN annul.INF-NOM
       'You have the power to efface sin.' (KAR 58 r 21, SB)

It is interesting to note that all these clauses are from literary works and that they are semantically similar, in the sense that they all have an infinitive as a PD (in [35] an abstract noun). Thus, it is restricted to a specific semantic sense and to a single genre.

In sum, sections 2.3–5 demonstrate three locative constructions with a possessive implicature in Akkadian, and all of them have either an overt or a covert existential predication.

ina qāti 'in the hand of' *maḥar* 'before/with' *itti* 'with'	PR-GEN	PD-NOM [*bašûm*]
possessor as the location	possessed as the subject	overt or covert existential predication

Figure 1. Locative PPCs in Akkadian

2.3. Dative PPC

This type of PPC is very common cross-linguistically, where again the main predication is existential and the agreement is with the PD, and what distinguishes this PPC is that the PR is either in the dative or is the object of the datival preposition. Outside of the Semitic languages one can point to Ancient Greek, in which this construction appears both with and without

the existential verbs such as: εἶναι 'to be/exist' and γίγνεσθαι 'to become' (Smyth 1920, sections 1476–1480: 341–342).

(40) *Τῷ   ἀνδρ-ί   [ἐστι]   οἰκί-α.*
      ART.DAT man-DAT [be.PRS.3.SG] house-NOM
      'The man has a house.'

Among the Semitic languages this is the standard way to express PPC in Northwest Semitic, and especially in Hebrew and in Aramaic, where the PD is following the datival preposition *l-*. At times this PPC appears with the existential particle *yēš* in Hebrew and *'īt*[*ay*] in Aramaic. In these cases the PD has to be indefinite,[22] a restriction common cross-linguistically with overt existential predications, in the phenomenon known as the *definiteness effect,* which is the prevention of definite NPs from appearing in certain constructions, among them existential clauses, (inter alia Milsark 1974, 1977, Abbott 1993, Ward & Birner 1995, Keenan 2003):[23]

(41) *yēš lā-nû 'āb   zāqēn.*
      exist to-us father old
      'We have an old father.' (Gen 44: 20)

(42) *ḥǎlāq ba-'ǎbar   nahǎr-ā lā   'ītay l-āk.*
      portion in-across.of river.DEF NEG exist to-you
      'You will not have a portion on the other side of the river.' (Ez 4, 16)

And both languages have this construction without the existential particle as well:

---

[22] It should be emphasized that in Biblical Hebrew the use of the particle *yēš* is not mandatory with indefinite subjects, although it can appear only with such subjects. Already in Mishnaic Hebrew the majority of the possessive sentences have this particle (Azar 1995: 84–91). In Modern Hebrew this particle is mandatory, but it is also found with a definite subject: *yeš le-rina et hasefer* [there is for Rina the book (acc)=Rina has the book]. This is because in general the *definiteness effect* is not operative in Modern Hebrew.

[23] While Milsark (1974, 1977) considers this phenomenon to be syntactic and hence the expectation is that this rule will have no exceptions, Ward & Birner (1995) demonstrate that this is not the case as there are possible exceptions where definite NPs are allowed in the relevant syntactic contexts. Consequently they argued that this is a pragmatic restriction, dependent on the information structure. Along these lines Francez (2007: 110–111) shows that in existential clauses with locatives, if the existence of the NP in the specific location is unknown to the hearer, in many languages even a proper name may appear in such contexts. These observations may explain the few places in Biblical Hebrew where an NP appears in an overt existential predication, for example in Gen 28, 16 and in Ex 17, 7 where the existence of God in certain places is in question (and not the existence of GOD himself).

(43) *hal-liškâ   ǎšer pānêy-hā   derek   had-dārōm l-ak-kōhǎn-îm . . .*
      DEF-room REL   face-POSS.3.F.SG   path.of DEF-south to-DEF-priest-PL
      'The room facing south is for the priests.'; or 'The priests (. . .) will have
      the room facing south.' (Ezek 40: 45)

(44) *qadm-āyt-ā kǎ-'aryē, wǎ-gapp-īn   dī nǎšar l-ah.*
      first-f-DEF   as-lion   and-wing-PL of eagle to-3.F.SG
      'The first was like a lion, and it had the wings of an eagle.' (Dn 7, 4)

A similar PPC is found in Classical Arabic, where the equivalent construc-
tion always appears without an overt indication of the existential predi-
cation, but with the tense indicated by the verb *kāna* (Wright 1862 vol 2:
95–96).

  This information is relevant to the analysis of the data from Akkadian,
as the dative PPC is definitely not common PPC. However, unsurprisingly
one can find it in texts of peripheral Akkadian, first and foremost in texts
suspected of being under the influence of some Northwest Semitic lan-
guages. Thus, several examples are found in El-Amarna texts:

(45) *šumma ibašši   māt-u   annī-t-u   ana šarr-i.*
      COND   exist.DUR.3.SG land-NOM DEM-F-NOM to king-GEN
      'If this land belongs to the king.' (EA 289: 15–16)[24]

(46) *ibašši   mat-āt-u   u ḫaziān-u ana šarr-i   bēlī-ya.*
      exist.DUR.3.SG land-PL-NOM and ruler-NOM to king-GEN lord-POSS.1.SG
      'The king will have lands and the ruler.' (EA 287 21–22)

In the corpus of El-Amarna the dative marker appears even in what seems
to be adnominal possession, as is the case in Hebrew and Aramaic:[25]

(47) *ana aḫ-ī-ya. . .   māt-u   ruq-t–u   ibašši   ū*
      to   brother-GEN-POSS.1.SG land-nom far-F-NOM exist.DUR.3.SG or
      qerub-t-u   ibašši.
      near-F-NOM exist.DUR.3.SG
      'Is the land of my brother . . . far away or near?' (EA 7: 27)

---

[24] According to the English translation this is a definite construction, excluded from our
discussion (section 1.3.1). However, there is nothing in the Akkadian construction that
marks it as such. As noted in (section 1.3.1) the Akkadian constructions not included in this
article are those with independent possessive pronouns.
[25] It is the common approach in the literature to consider this as an adnominal construc-
tion. Bar-Asher (2009: 398–400), argues that in fact this is a regular dative-PPC.

Again unsurprisingly, this PPC is found in an Akkadian text from Ras Shamra, another corpus heavily influenced by Northwest Semitic languages:

(48) *minummê ša ibašši   ana yâši.*
      whatever REL exist.DUR.3.SG to   me
      'Whatever I have.' (Syria 18 246 RS 8.145: 6)

Similarly there are examples of the dative PPC in Neo-Babylonian, and again in a dialect with a suspected Northwest Semitic substrate:

(49) *riḫīt   immer-ī   ana ramani-šu   ibaššû.*
      balance.of ram-PL.OBL to   self-POSS.3.M.SG exist.DUR.3.M.PL
      'He himself has the balance of the sheep.' (BIN 1 95: 11, NB)

But examples are also found in texts from the Old-Babylonian period:

(50) *ana yâšim še-um   ul ibašši.*
      to   me   barley-NOM NEG exist.DUR.3.SG
      'I have no barley.' (Sumer 14 no.1: 23–24)

(51) *sulupp-û   ana ekall-im   ul ibaššû.*
      date-PL.NOM to   palace-GEN NEG exist.DUR.3.M.PL
      'The administration has no dates.' (YOS 2 111: 5)

And in texts from other periods as well:

(52) *šum-u u zēr-u. . .   ana šarr-i   bēlī-ya*
      son-NOM and offspring-NOM. . . to   king-GEN lord-POSS.1.SG
      libšû.[26]
      exist.PRC.3.M.PL
      'May the king, my lord, have a son and an offspring.' (ABL 358: 13 NA)

2.4. Topic-PPC

In topic-PPC, the PR is the topic and the PD is the grammatical subject of an existential sentence. In some languages it is the standard PPC, as the following example from Tondano (Austronesian, Philippine, see Sneddon (1975: 172–175)), illustrates:

(53) *si   tuama si   wewean wale rua.*
      AN.SG man   TOP exist house two
      'The man has two houses.'

---

[26] There is, however, an alternative reading to this verb in SAA 10, 227: 13, suggesting the verb is *li-[qí]-šú*. Accordingly, the meaning of this line is "May the Gods grant a son and offspring to the king, my lord". I whish to thank Uri Gabbay for referring me to this edition.

The topic-PPC is rarely discussed in the literature on the Semitic languages. Even when noticed in the context of Biblical Hebrew (Kogut 1993), it has never been analyzed as a topic construction. At first glance, examples of this construction might seem to be tokens of bipartite nominal sentences, as for example the following example demonstrates:

(54) *wĕ-ʾattâ šālôm u-bêt-kā*   *šālôm wĕ-kōl ʾăšer lĕ-kā*
and-you health and-house-POSS.2.M.SG health and-all.of REL to-you
šālôm.
health
'Good health to you and your household! And good health to all that is yours.' (1 Sam 25: 6)

However, as rightly noted by Kogut, the relevant sentences are examples of two NPs with no adjectives, and clearly they are not instances of nominal sentences expressing identification between the two NPs. Considering (54), the expressions *ʾattâ šālôm u-bêt-kā šālôm* are equivalent to the clear example of the datival PPC, *šālôm lĕ-kā* ['health to-you'], which is found elsewhere in the Bible. Therefore, it is reasonable to accept Kogut's suggestion to read sentence (54) also as a PPC. Besides the many examples with *šālôm,* Kogut lists many Biblical expressions which can be reinterpeted in light of this. Among them is the following:

(55) *wa-ʾănî mĕtê   mispār.*
and-I   people.of number
'And I have a few people.' (Gen 34: 30)

Since this PPC is clearly not a regular nominal sentence, with one of the NPs as the subject and the other as the predicate, it is reasonable to equate this type of sentence with the phenomenon demonstrated in (54) of a PPC expressed by topicalization.[27] Although the Biblical Hebrew PPC has no explicit representation of the existential predication, in light of the discussion in section 2.2.2 of the possibility of zero-marked existential predica-

---

[27] Kogut (1993: 402) proposes that the two constructions are in fact the same construction, and are examples of a larger phenomenon of addition/deletion of prepositions: *ănî šālôm* à **l-ʾănî šālôm = lî šālôm* (following Rottenberg (1979: 61–65) and Kogut (1980: 20)). But this seems unlikely, and very different in nature from the phenomenon Rottenberg described. According to my proposal below, the role of the pronoun is indeed similar semantically. This is not a result of some arbitrary omission or addition, but is due to a similarity in their contribution to the truth value of the sentence.

tions, it is reasonable to assume that such a predication is found in such sentences covertly as well. Thus the underlying structure of (54) is (56):

(56) *'attâ   šālôm*
      Topic   Main sentence (zero-marker existential predication)

The main sentence is a verbless sentence with a single element. Semantically these sentences claim that the (only) NP in them exists.[28]

Accordingly, if the underlying structure of (54) is (56), it should be paraphrased as 'as for you, there is health,' and that semantically it is equivalent to 'you have health.' A good example of a parallel construction can be found in Biblical Hebrew in the following verse:

(57) *wĕ-ʿēmeq   haś-śiddîm beʾĕr-ōt beʾĕr-ōt ḥēmār.*
      and-valley.of ART-Siddim pit-PL.of pit-PL.of tar
      'The Valley of Siddim was full of tar pits/There were many tar pits in the Valley of Siddim.' (Gen 14: 10)

Once again the analysis of this sentence should be as follows:

(58) *wĕ-ʿēmeq haś-śiddîm   beʾĕr-ōt beʾĕr-ōt ḥēmār.*
      Topic   Main sentence   [existential predication]

---

[28] The fact that *šālôm* constitutes a predication by itself can be seen in the following context from 2 Kings 4: 23–26:

'Why go to him today?' he asked. 'It's not the New Moon or the Sabbath.' 'It's all right [**šālôm**], she said. She saddled the donkey and said to her servant, 'Lead on; don't slow down for me unless I tell you.' So she set out and came to the man of God at Mount Carmel. When he saw her in the distance, the man of God said to his servant Gehazi, 'Look! There's the Shunammite! Run to meet her and ask her:

hă-šālôm l-āk?   hă-šālôm lĕ-ʾîš-ēk?   hă-šālôm l-ay-yāled?
Q-health to-you Q-health to-man-POSS.2.F.SG Q-health to-ART-child
'Are you all right? Is your husband all right? Is your child all right?'"
'Everything is all right' [**šālôm**], she said.

šālôm in both 23 and 26 is translated as "Everything is all right," reflecting the fact that this is an independent sentence, which should be understood as "there is peace."
    Adina Moshavi has noted to me (p.c.) that the fact that we encounter in these verses only *šālōm* can be explained by the fact that this is an answer, and in such contexts there is a tendency to have only the first element of the sentence, as noted by Greenstein (1989). However, Greenstein explained this phenomenon as a deletion of the rest of the sentence. His proposal has to do with the fact that such shortened answers are a response to a yes–no question, and therefore he describes this as a strategy of saying *Yes* in Biblical Hebrew. As she noted, this is relevant to the second occurrence of *šālôm* in the passage (verse 26), but it is not the case when the woman in the biblical story first responded in this way. For more about unipartite answers, see Cohen (2005: 257–258).

Similar constructions of topic-PPC, without an overt representation of the existential predicate, are found in other languages too. For example, Evans (1995: 317–318) indicates that in Kayardild the so-called *nom:nom-having construction* (found in other Australian languages as well), for a variety of considerations, should be structurally analyzed with existential predication as well:[29]

(59) *ngumban-da   wakatha   maku   kiyarrng-k.*
     2.SG.POSS-NOM sister.NOM sister.in.law.NOM two-NOM
     'Your sister has two sisters in law.'

Following this introduction about the topic-PPC cross-linguistically and the evidence for its existence among the Semitic languages, I would argue that the topic-PPC is found in Akkadian, too. In fact, later I will even argue that this PPC represents the basis of various other constructions (sections 2.6, 3.1–3). But at this point I will simply suggest that a vestige of this construction is found in Akkadian, in the Neo-Assyrian expression *lā emūqu/mūqu* (lit. no ability/power/strength), in sentences such as:

(60) *aḫ-ē-ya*   *šēp-ē-ya*   *lā   mūqā   u   mā*
     arm-PL-POSS.1.M.SG legs-PL-POSS.1.M.SG NEG strength and FOC
     ēn-ē-ya   *lā   apatti.*
     eye-PL-POSS.1.M.SG NEG open.DUR.1.M.SG
     'My arms and legs are without strength and I do not open my eyes.'/'My arms and legs have no strength.' (SAA 10, 242: 6–8, NA)

Both *aḫēya šēpēya* and *emūqu* are substantives and since it does not seem to be the case that this is a nominal clause expressing identification between its members, it seems to be another example of a possessive construction with two NPs in the nominative. In light of the previous construction, it is reasonable to assume that this is a fossilized topic-PPC in a frozen expression. However, this reading is not decisive,[30] and as noted, below stronger evidence for the existence of the topic-PPC in Akkadian will be provided.

---

[29] For the lack of an overt existential predication in similar environments in this dialect, see Evans (1995: 138).
[30] The form in the text is *mu-qa-a–a*, which may be normalized as *mūqāyā* 'my strength'. Accordingly this line is better read as 'regarding my arms, my legs, my strength is absence'. There are two problems, however, with this reading. First, in this construction the possessive pronouns usually refer back to the 'topic' (see n. 37). Second, subjects of existential clauses, usually, do not appear with adnominal possession.

2.5. Summary

In order to be able to discuss another PPC, I would like to pause and summarize what is common to all the PPCs encountered so far, and to comment briefly on their semantics.

Sections 2.2–4 established that in the history of Akkadian, one can find marginal PPCs in which the possessive is not encoded by a verb (the verb *bašûm* expresses only existence). As has been demonstrated, these PPCs are common cross-linguistically and are found among the other Semitic languages. Some of them are even the standard ones in these Semitic languages. They all share two features: the main predication is existential, and if there is an overt predication with the verb *bašûm* the agreement is with the PD. The PR appears either in a locative expression, or after a datival marker, or as the topic of the sentence.

Bar-Asher (2009) demonstrates how, in fact, all of the PPCs discussed in this section are **allosentences** of the same construction. Allosentences in this context are different constructions that do not necessarily share the same components, but have the same truth conditions and also use the same conceptual strategies for achieving equivalent meanings.[31] Thus, in all the PPCs discussed, the main predication is existential with the PD as the sole participant.

Bar-Asher (2009) argues that the various expression of the PR in these PPC contributes similarly to the existential predication, in the following way: existential sentences in general are true in their contexts, thus their truth conditions are always evaluated in a restricted 'domain' within the actual world (or possible worlds). In a longer discussion it can be demonstrated that the PRs in all these PPCs provide the domain in which the existential predication should be evaluated. To put it in simple words: the role of the PR in all these PPCs is either to function as the indicator of the location in which the existential predication should be evaluated, or to reinterpret the meaning of the existence – that to exist from the perspective of some NP means to be possessed by it. This domain is given either by

---

[31] The notion of allosentences was coined by Daneš (1964: 233), but I am using it in a different sense from the way he used it. For Daneš, allosentences are similar on the "grammatical level" but different in terms of their informational level ("level of the organization of utterance" in Daneš' terminology). I would argue that my use of the term is more preferable on the grounds that allo-Xs [such as allophones and allomorphs] usually describe different manifestations that have the same value at the X-level, rather than ones that have a similar manifestation but function differently.

ina qāti "in the hand of" *maḫar* "before/with" +PR-GEN *itti* "with"	PD-NOM	[*bašûm*]
Datival expression+PR-GEN or PR as a dative pronoun		
PR-NOM [⇐TOPIC]		
The domain in which the existential predication should be evaluated	Possessed as the subject	Overt or covert existential predication

Figure 2. PPCs in Akkadian as allosentences

the PR in the topic position, or when it is the object of the datival preposition, or when it is expressed obliquely as a locative; Bar-Asher (2009) is an attempt to demonstrate how this is the function of these syntactic positions in other grammatical contexts as well.

As it becomes clear that Akkadian has all these constructions next to its main HAVE PPC (the verb *išûm*), a note concerning the typological discussion on PPCs is due. Stassen (2009) aims at finding a correlation between the type of a PPC a language has and the way temporal sequencing is encoded in that language.[32] However, as one may realize from the above discussion, it is somewhat problematic to associate a language with a specific type of PPC as languages have more than one PPC (Akkadian has almost all of the types enlisted in the typological literature). Therefore, if three out of the four main types are available in one language one may ask: to which of them a correlation should be made? And what does it tell us about the nature of such universals?

Methodologically speaking, such typological surveys rely on grammars of the world's languages. The current study illustrates how careful one

---

[32] Without entering too much into the details, it should be noted that, according to Stassen's universal (p. 274), there is a correlation between a Have-PPC and a balanced encoding in structuring of a simultaneous different subject sequence, i.e. that there is a coordination of the two main clauses. Akkadian, however, has a Have-PPC, and the standard way to express such a sequence is with a deranked encoding, i.e. that one of the clauses is reduced in rank. As usually one of the clauses in such a sequence is encoded with an infinitive, and its subject is marked either with a genitive or with a nominative, depending on its location (Aro 1961).

should be in using these sources, as they tend to not cover all the marginal PPCs.

2.6. Genitive PPC[33]

2.6.1. *The data*

Various languages have a productive genitive PPC, in which the PD stands in an existential predication and the PR is part of a genitive relation with the PD as, for example, is the case in Turkish:

(61) *Mehmeďʾ-in   para-sı   var.*
Mehmed–GEN money-POSS.3.SG exist
'Mehmed has money.'

This observation may explain various constructions among the Semitic languages. Already Brockelmann (1913: 40) noticed that at times in Biblical Hebrew there are examples of a possessive predication with only one word: a PD suffixed with a genitive pronoun referring to the PR. A good example of this PPC is the following:

(62) *pê   lā-hem w-lō   yĕdabbērû   ʿēn-ayim lā-hem w-lō*
mouth to-them and-NEG speak.IMPV.3.M.PL eye-DU   to-them and-NEG
yirʾû   ʾozn-ayim lā-hem w-lō   yišmāʿû   ʾap
see.IMPV.3.M.PL ear-DU   to-them and-NEG hear.IMPV.3.M.PL nose
*lā-hem w-lō   yĕrīḥûn   **yĕd-ê-hem**   w-lō*
to-them and-NEG smell.IMPV.3.M.PL hand-PL-POSS.3.M.PL and-NEG
*yĕmīšûn   **ragl-ê-hem**   w-lō   yĕhallekû.*
touch.IMPV.3.M.PL feet-DU-POSS.3.M.PL and-NEG walk.IMPV.3.M.PL
'They have mouths, but cannot speak; they have eyes, but cannot see;
they have ears, but cannot hear; they have noses, but they cannot smell;
they have hands, but cannot feel, they have feet, but they cannot walk.'
(Ps 115: 5–7)

From the parallels between the lines, it is clear that *yĕdēhem* 'their hands' and *raglēhem* 'their feet' mean 'they have hands' and 'they have legs.' Kogut (1993) demonstrates that this PPC is not as rare in the Bible as it seems to be, and similarly Loewenstamm (1974) shows parallels to this construction

---

[33] This construction is also known in the typological literature as the "adnominal-PPC" (for example, Stassen 2009). However, in the case of the Semitic languages, as will be discussed later, it is not clear that we can speak about adnominal-PPC at all, but only about a genitive-PPC, as it appears only with the genitive pronouns.

in Ugaritic. Again, this construction is better understood in light of languages like Turkish (61) in which the genitive PPC is regular.

While, once again, a zero-marked existential predication should be assumed in the above example from Biblical Hebrew, Akkadian has examples with an overt existential predication:[34]

(63) *šumma alp-ū-šu*   *ibaššû.*
      COND   OX-PL.NOM-POSS.3.M.SG exist.DUR.3.M.PL
      'If he has oxen.' (AbB 13, 58, OB)

(64) *mār-āt-u-ya*   *ibaššâ*   *ul*
      daughter-F.PL-NOM-POSS.1.SG exist.DUR.3.F.PL NEG
      akallâ-kku.
      withhold.from.DUR.1.SG-you
      'I have daughters whom I do not withhold from you.' (EA 4: 22)

(65) *awīl-ū*   *šībūtī-ka*   *ibbašši-mi.*
      men.PL-NOM functioning.as.witness-POSS.2.M.SG exist.DUR.3.SG=AND
      'Do you have witnesses?' (RA 23 148 29: 32, probably MA)

(66) *mār-šu mār   aḫ-ī-šu*   *ibašši.*
      son-his son.of brother-GEN-POSS.3.M.SG exist.DUR.3.SG
      'He has a son and a nephew.' (SAA 1,75: 10–11, NA)

(67) *šumma mār-ē-ša*   *ibašši*   *innaggurū*   *u*
      COND   son-PL-POSS.3.F.SG exist.DUR.3.SG hire.DUR.PASS.3.M.PL and
      ekkulū.
      eat.DUR.3.M.PL
      'If she has sons they can be hired to support themselves.' (lit. and have something to eat) (KAV 1 iv 94, Ass. Code section 36)

(68) *šumma abat-ka*   *ibašši*   . . . *šupr-a.*
      COND   news-POSS.2.M.SG exist.DUR.3.SG . . . send.IMP.2.M.SG-VEN
      'If you have any news send it to me.' (SAA 10, 68: 11–13, NA)

2.6.2. *The classification of the genitive PPC*

Before proceeding with this discussion, I would like to mention some of Stassen's (2009) observations concerning this particular PPC cross-linguistically, and the conclusions he drew from them. I will review his

---

[34] Bravmann (1977: 368) documents some examples of this construction with an overt existential particle in the Baghdadian Jewish dialect as well.

remarks, along with some indication about whether the evidence from the Semitic languages fits his observations:

(a) Compared to other major types of PPC the genitive PPC is relatively rare.
(b) In languages with a genitive PPC, while in regular adnominal possessive construction the PR and the PD form a syntactic constituent, this is not the case in the genitive PPC, since only the PD is part of the existential predication.
(c) A common characteristic of the genitive PPC is that the PR occupies sentence-initial position. This is not the case in the examples from the Semitic languages, as all the examples are with the genitive as a pronominal suffix. However, below there will be examples with a similar phenomenon in Akkadian.
(d) In many of these languages the PR can be analyzed synchronically as a dative or a locative (i.e. there is a syncretism between the forms), or at least it can be concluded that diachronically the encoding of the PR derived from these grammatical categories. This cannot be the case in the Semitic languages, since the genitive is clearly distinct from the other grammatical categories.
(e) Languages with a genitive PPC also have one of the other constructions in which the PR is marked as either the topic (Austronesian) or in the dative (Hungarian) or in the locative (Turkish). Akkadian is an example which does not follow this generalization. While it has some examples of 'existential PPC' its regular PPC is with a transitive verb.

In light of his observations, Stassen argues that many of the languages with the genitive PPC, especially those in which the PR occupies sentence-initial position, should be analyzed synchronically as topic- or locative PPCs. Therefore, from a typological perspective, he concludes that the genitive PPC does not deserve its own category in the classification of PPCs.

Stassen, however, does not propose a synchronic explanation for the languages with this construction. Moreover, as has been argued, the evidence from the Semitic languages does not always correspond with his general observations. Before trying to provide some semantic or pragmatic explanation for the genitive PPC in the Semitic languages, two general observations concerning the Semitic languages are in order:

(a) Among the Semitic languages the examples of this PPC are encountered sporadically. It seems that only in Akkadian was it used with some regularity, especially in descriptions of omens.

(b) In all of the examples from the Semitic languages, the genitive PR is a pronoun. So far there are no examples of a genitive PPC with a non-pronoun PR standing in the genitival relation.[35]

2.6.3. *A new analysis*

In order to propose an explanation for the Semitic examples, taking into consideration Stassen's observations, I would like to cite additional evidence from Akkadian, where an explicit PR occasionally appears:[36]

(69) [*šumma*] *izbu*   ME.ZE-*šu*   *lā*   *ibaššû.*
      COND   new-born.lamb.NOM jaw-POSS.3.M.SG NEG exist.DUR.3.SG
      'If a newborn lamb has no jaws.' (Leichty Izbu VII 51, SB)

izbu ('newborn') in this sentence is not the subject of the sentence, but is in the nominative absolute (a nominative on a preposed noun), which functions as the topic of the sentence. The subject of the sentence is ME.ZE ('jaws'), and the main predication is an overt existential one. The pronominal suffix attached to the subject merely anchors it to the topic. This analy-

---

[35] It is possible to find an exception to this generalization in a letter from the early Neo-Babylonian period, where we encounter the following clause:

(1) AN.BAR *ša ah-ī-ya*   *ibaššû.*
     iron   of brother-GEN-POSS.1.SG exist.DUR.3.M.PL (Cole Nippur 96: 11)

The editor's translation of this line is the following: "My brother's iron is available". However, it is hard to determine from the context whether "the iron" is known and the question is whether it is available, or that in fact the message that is quoted was "my brother has iron". If the latter is the case then this is an example of a genitive-PPC in which the governed element in the genitive relation which is not pronominal. As mentioned above, such a phenomenon is known from other languages, but not among the Semitic ones.

[36] The language of Mehri has an interesting related phenomenon. When the PD is a member of the close family (father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, wife, brother-in-law), the PR is indicated twice: once with the regular comitative expression (see section 2.2.5, above), and another time as a pronominal genitive suffix (Rubin 2009: 223–224; 2010: 276):

(i) *šay*   *ḥəbrayt-i.*
     with-POSS.1.SG daughter-POSS.1.SG
     'I have a daughter.'

As noted, this is a very similar situation to other languages with genitive-PPC, in which the PR is extraposed and encoded as the PR in another strategy common in that language.

sis of the function of the pronominal suffix can be seen in other sentences with a *šumma*-construction in similar contexts:

(70)   *šumma immer-um eṣemt-um ša isī-šu   ša imitt-im   palš-at.*
       COND   ram-NOM bone-NOM of jaw-his of right-GEN perforate.ST-3.F.SG
       'If the right jawbone of a sheep is perforated.' (YOS 10 47: 1, OB)

I would like to argue that the genitive pronoun in both (70) [*isīšu*] and (69) [ME.ZE-*šu*] has the same function: to indicate a relation between the subject of the sentence ('jaws' in [69] and 'jawbone' in [70]) and the topic of the clause ('newborn' in [69] and 'sheep' in [70]). Thus, in the same way that in (70) the pronominal suffix is not a PR in a PPC, it is also not what encodes it as a PR in (69). It is not the genitive element in (69) that makes it a PPC. Instead, (69) is another example of the topic-PPC.[37] Accordingly, the genitive pronouns simply refer back to the NP which provides the domain in which this existential PPC is evaluated. In sentences without explicit topics, I would argue that the pronoun acts as determiner of the topic. In order to clarify this, let us begin with a simpler example:[38]

(71)   *šumma sinništ-u   ulid=ma   ušar-šu   u*
       COND   woman-NOM give.birth.PST.3.SG=and penis-POSS.3.M.SG and
       ŠIR-MEŠ-šu   lā   ibaššû.
       testicles-POSS.3.M.SG NEG exist.DUR.3.SG
       'If a woman gives birth and [the child] has neither a penis nor testicles.'
       (Leichty Izbu III 69, SB)

---

[37] This might also explain an unexplained formula in Neo-Assyrian expressing incapacity, in the formula *lā emūqu/mūqu*+pronominal suffix [lit. not X's ability], for example: *elipātte lā emūqašina lā intuha* [lit. the ships no their-ability no carry] "the ships could not carry" (ABL 420: 9). Following what we saw in (52) about the expression *X lā emūqu* [lit. X no power, "X has no power"], it is natural to see the formula with the pronominal suffixes as another example of the topic-PPC with a genitival resumptive pronoun, and to propose the origin of this formula as the following development 'X has no power to do Y' → 'X could not do Y'. Similarly the OB expression from Mari *lā buštu* "shameless" (lit. no dignity) appears with a pronominal suffix:

(i) *ina lā   buštī-šu   itbêma   ana GN illikamma.*
    in   NEG dignity-POSS.3.M.SG got.up.PST.3.SG to   GN go.PST.3.SG
    "He left immediately for GN" (ARM 4 26: 22)

In section 3.2 I will discuss two *without*-expressions and argue that their underlying structure is "not having a. . ." in a topic-PPC. Similarly, the expression *lā buštīšu* can be understood only if we take it as another PPC of "not having a dignity" and interpret the function of the genitive pronoun as similar to its function in the genitive-PPC.

[38] For a description of the "regular" phenomenon see GAG section 128, p. 226 and section 161k, p. 263.

Without an explicit antecedent, the genitive pronoun establishes a domain and 'reconstructs' the licensed antecedent in the same way that it does so in the following example:

(72) *šumma sinništ-u   ulid=ma   uzun imittī-šu   ina*
COND   woman-NOM give.birth.PST.3.SG=and ear.of right-POSS.3.M.SG on
isī-šu   KI-TA-ma šakn-at.
jaw-POSS.3.M.SG lower   place.ST-3.F.SG
'If a woman gives birth and [the child's] right ear is located on his lower jaw.' (Leichty Izbu III 16, SB)

As topics are necessary for the establishment of the domain (see section 2.5, above), it seems that the genitive pronouns function here deictically/anaphorically to relate the main predication to the domain in which the proposition should be evaluated.

In summary, in light of all these facts it seems that eventually the genitive PPC is structurally a token of the topic-PPC with an anaphoric pronoun. Since occasionally the genitive PPC appears with an explicit topic, it can be considered as a subgroup of the topic-PPC, with the genitive pronoun anchoring the main predication to the topic-PR which provides the domain, as is the case in the following examples as well:

(73) *šumma sinništ-u   ulid=ma   ÚR   imittī-šu*
COND   woman-NOM give.birth.PST.3.SG=and thigh right-POSS.3.M.SG
(šumēlišu)   lā   ibašši.
(left-POSS.3.M.SG) NEG exist.DUR.3.SG
'If a woman gives birth and (the child) has no right (left) thigh.' (Leichty Izbu III 77–78, SB)

(74) *šumma izb-u   muttat lišāni-šu   ša imitt-i*
COND   malformed.creature.NOM half.of tongue-POSS.M.SG of right-GEN
ul   ibašši.
NEG exist.DUR.3.SG
'If the malformed creature lacks [=does not have] the right half of its tongue.' (Leichty Izbu XII 76, SB)

The following example illustrates an interesting phenomenon, and thus strengthens our analysis:

(75) LÚ.ARAD.MEŠ-*ya ibašši   ina māt   *LÚ.GAL.*šaq-ê*
slaves-POSS.1.SG   exist.DUR.3.SG in   territory.of chief.cupbearer-GEN
eql-ū   kir-û   ibašši.
field-PL.NOM orchard-PL.NOM exist.DUR.3.SG
'I have slaves in the territory of the chief cupbearer, and I (also) have fields and orchards (SAA 10, 58: rev 8–10, NA)

The genitive pronoun appears only with the first PD, 'slave'. In fact the second clause is merely an existential sentence, and the topic (location) is restored from the previous line. This is of course not surprising according to our explanation of the phenomenon. Since the role of the genitive pronouns is not to express the possessive relation but merely to determine the topic, once the possessive relation is established, its repetition is not required and therefore it can 'pass on' from one clause to another, (as is the case with other anaphoric pronouns).

2.7. Intermediate conclusions

Section 2 revealed that next to the verb *išûm* Akkadian has three more marginal PPCs: 1) the locative PPC (section 2.2), 2) the dative PPC (section 2.3), and 3) the topic PPC. While at first the last one seemed to occur only in one frozen expression (section 2.4), the discussion on the genitive PPC (section 2.6) revealed that in fact it was a somewhat productive construction in Akkadian, since the genitive PPC should be analyzed as a subgroup of the topic-PPC. This conclusion is significant for the next discussion concerning the origin of the Akkadian standard transitive PPC with the verb *išûm*.

3. Ramifications of the typological survey for various historical issues

3.1. The Akkadian verb *išûm*

This article opened with the note concerning the fact that Akkadian is unique among the ancient Semitic languages in that it has a transitive PPC, the designated verb *išûm,* where the PR is the subject and the PD is the object. There is an overall consensus in the historical discussions that this verb is related to the existential particles in the Northwestern Semitic languages: *yēš* in Hebrew, *ʾītāy* in Aramaic and *ʾiṯ* in Ugaritic; and to the negative forms *laysa* in Arabic and *laššu* in Akkadian with the meaning of 'there is no.' In fact it is hard to reconstruct one form from which all these particles and verbs can be derived since the Aramaic and the Ugaritic forms (and the form *ʾīš* appearing several times in the Bible) suggest that the proto-form was **ʾīθay*; and the Hebrew, Arabic and Akkadian forms

suggest *yiš as the proto-form. In fact, Blau (1972) proposes to reconstruct a proto-doublet of both forms.[39]

The fact that Akkadian has *laššu*, presumably resulting from *lā+išû* in negative existential clauses, reinforces the connection between *išûm* and the existential meaning. The question remains, however, in which direction was the development? Was it Possessive > Existential or Existential > Possessive?

A strong reason for preferring the latter option is the fact that this verb has some unexplained peculiarities. Most notable is the fact that it is declined only in the preterite[40] (Huehnergard 2000: 282, section 26.1). If this verb is genetically related to an existential particle,[41] it would be understood in light of its appearance in other languages as a particle and not a verb. Therefore, it is clear why it does not indicate tenses.[42]

In addition, in Eblaite, the only other language in the eastern branch of the Semitic languages besides Akkadian, the cognate verb *yiθāwum* has the existential meaning. Thus, since both Eblaite and languages throughout the West Semitic languages have the existential sense with this form, the Akkadian meaning is probably secondary.[43]

Finally, taking into account the discussion above about the other PPCs in Akkadian and in other Semitic languages, the direction of Existential > Possessive is more likely for a variety of reasons:

---

[39] Inter alia Cull (1872), Christian (1924), Hetzron (1969), Gensler (2000) and Măcelaru (2003). Earlier in n. 7, we mentioned Testen's 2000 alternative proposal for the etymology of the verb *išûm*. See also GAG section 106 r, who suggests a connection between *išûm* and *rašûm* 'to get' arguing that the latter is the ingressive form of the former. For a criticism of this proposal see Kouwenberg (2010: 468, n. 79).

[40] Another verb that conjugates only in the preterite tense is *edûm* 'to know', but this verb also has participial forms. As John Huehnergard noted (p.c.), it is possible that in this verb there is a different semantic phenomenon, since verbs of knowing in Indo-European languages also occasionally occur only in past tense forms. See also Gelv (1955: 108), Streck (1995: 144) and Testen (2000).

[41] In Neo-Babylonian *išû* is used as an existential verb (Hueter 1996: 31). This is probably not a vestige of Proto-Akkadian, but rather an influence of another West Semitic language. I wish to thank Mary Frazer for drawing my attention to this information.

[42] Throughout the discussion in this article, I have not referred to the ways in which tenses and aspects are added to these constructions. Most languages developed some ways in which to indicate tenses, aspects, and moods with existential sentences through the addition of some finite verb (*HYY* in Hebrew, *HWY* in Aramaic, *KWN* in Arabic etc). It is important to note that such finite verbs only add the tense to these categories but do not contain the existential meaning itself.

[43] Krebernik (1996: 241, n. 35) shows that according to the Sumerogram it is clear that this verb in Eblaite has an existential meaning. See also Gensler (2000: 235).

1. In Semitic languages in general – and to some extent this is still the case in Akkadian as well – PPCs are based on existential predication. Therefore, it may be assumed that this was the case also in Proto-Semitic, i.e. that possession was expressed only in intransitive PPCs.
2. Based on the discussion above it is possible to propose the factors that are responsible for the development of the Akkadian verb. In the rest of this section I will present a possible path for such a development.

Sections 2.4 and 2.6 provided some evidence that Akkadian also had a topic-PPC; therefore, if *iš* was also an existential particle at an earlier prehistoric stage, then such a construction with an explicit existential particle would be the following:[44]

(76)   PR-NOM   PD-NOM   *iš*
       Topic   Subject   Existential particle

Since both the topic and the subject are marked with a nominative, it is reasonable to assume that at some point (prior to the documented period) the first nominative NP, the PR, was reanalyzed as the subject.[45] Consequently, this sentence was analyzed as a two-element sentence, with the result that *iš* was analyzed as a transitive verb and the PD as its object. If a structure similar to the genitive PPC also occurred at this stage, it might even have contributed to this:

(77)   PR-NOM   PD-NOM+pronom. suffix   *iš*

       First stage: Topic   Subject   Existential particle
                      'PR, his PD exist.'

       Second stage: Subject   Object   Verb
                      'PR has his PD.'

It is not necessary to include the genitive PPC in this development, but it is possible that already at this hypothetical stage the case was often not indicated in proto-Akkadian before pronominal suffixes. Given this possibility,

---

[44] One should not confuse this topic-PPC with the regular verbless construction NP-NOM NP-NOM IS which developed in other languages into a copula, see Pat-El 2006, 342 who argued that the path of existential>copula was motivated by an inflection that was developed independently.
[45] See Bar-Asher Siegal (forthcoming-c), for another example in the history of Akkadian of a topic-construction with two nouns in the nominative, in which the first noun, the topic, was reanalyzed as the subject of the sentence, and the second noun went through a development of losing the nominative case.

it is even easier to understand how the PD was conceived of as the object of the sentence.

John Huehnergard (p.c.), in line with this thinking, has offered a different solution. In various Semitic languages (inter alia Ethiopic [Lambdin 1978: 122]; Standard Arabic;[46] Jewish Babylonian Aramaic [Bar-Asher Siegal, forthcoming-b] and Modern Hebrew[47]) the argument of the existential sentences occasionally is either in the accusative or has an accusative marker. If this is the case, the development is almost natural and certainly more elegant, with the possible following construction:

(78)   PR-NOM   PD-ACC   *iš*

    First stage: Topic   Subject   Existential particle
                    'PR, his PD exist.'

    Second stage: Subject   Object   Verb
                    'PR has his PD.'

The problems with this solution are that we do not have any evidence for accusative subjects in existential clauses in the history of Akkadian. Furthermore, the reasons behind the accusative in this environment are unclear, thus it is difficult to rely on this phenomenon, as long as its nature is not completely clear. Therefore I leave both options, as both solutions account for the same results.

It is also worth noting that a declined existential particle is found also in Late Eastern Aramaic dialects (although as a nominal declension and not as a verbal conjugation as in Akkadian).

Both hypotheses rely on the fact that Akkadian has in its historic period a topic-PPC overtly with the existential verb *bašûm*, and covertly without it. Accordingly, it is not the case that Akkadian completely lost the topic-PPC, but only its appearances with the particle *iš* went through a process of reanalysis and this particle was conceived of as the predicate that encodes possession. This, of course, did not happen with the zero-marked existential predication. Thus, once the verb *bašûm* evolved as the existential verb in Akkadian (and the assumption is that this is a new verb, since Akkadian

---

[46] For negative existential sentences, see Ryding (2005: 179).
[47] For a different approach to the phenomenon in Modern Hebrew see Ziv (1976), who sees it as a sign of a HAVE-*drift*. Hankin (1994), argues that in Modern Hebrew the reason for the accusative marker has to do with definiteness, and not with case assignment. See also in pp. 48–49 for some parallel phenomena in Biblical Hebrew.

is the only Semitic language with this verb for existence), it inherited the place of the existential predicate in the topic-PPC.

It should be noted that in general, as Stassen (2009: 219–230) remarks, Have-*drift* from a topic-PPC involves a transfer of subject properties from one NP (PD) to another NP (PR), and therefore it is difficult to detect such a process. According to the current hypotheses Akkadian presents a unique case cross-linguistically in which the development is transparent. Since originally the existential predication was not indicated with a finite verb, and the topic has the same formal representation as the subject, it is not necessary to assume a 'transfer' of properties. Instead it is possible to suggest a reanalysis of the grammatical relations of the elements of the construction.

3.2. *Without*-expressions

3.2.1. ša lā

The final phenomena to be discussed in light of the survey of the marginal PPCs are various expressions for 'without'. I shall begin with the equivalent expressions for 'without' in Akkadian and Syriac: the combination of the subordinating marker (*ša* in Akkadian and *d-* in Syriac) followed by the negator *lā*. It seems that this combination, at least in Syriac, is grammaticalized almost to the extent of becoming a preposition, as is the case in English and other languages:[48]

(79) *bīt-u   ša lā bēl-i   sinništ-u   ša lā mut-i.*
house-NOM REL NEG master-GEN woman-NOM REL NEG husband-GEN
'A house without a master is like a woman without a husband.' (Akkadian; Lambert BWL 229 iv 20f.)

(80) *ʾar-ʿā   d-lā   nāš.*
land-DEF REL-NEG man
'A land without a man.' (Syriac; Job 38: 26[49])

A few observations are needed for the next discussion:

---

[48] For a possible connection between the Akkadian and the Eastern Aramaic form, see Kaufman (1974: 98).

[49] See Nöldeke (2001: 155, section 202 F). A similar phenomenon is in fact reflected also in the Hebrew: *lĕhamṭîr ʿal ʾereṣ lô ʾîš midbār lô ʾādām bô* (Job 38, 26) "to water a land without a man, a desert with no one in it" [lit. to water a land - no man, a desert no man in it].

(a) The use of the subordinating particle in this context suggests that, at least historically, these *without*-expressions had underlying embedded clauses.[50]

(b) 'X without Y' is semantically equivalent to 'X which does not have Y', it is reasonable to examine whether in some languages this semantic resemblance indicates that in the past it was in fact the underlying structure, and may explain also a syntactic reanalysis.

(c) Following the previous observation, it should be noted that while at first it might seem that the negation in this construction negates the following NP, this is obviously not the case. Regardless of the syntactic structure, semantically it always negates the possession of the NP by the previous expression. Thus 'NP$_1$ without NP$_2$' by no means negates NP$_2$, it simply indicates that NP$_1$ does not possess NP$_2$.

Given our previous discussion I would like to propose, that *at least* historically, the origin of some *without*-expressions was an embedded clause with the meaning of 'which does not have'.

Consequently I would like to propose that the *ša lā* construction has an underlying topic-PPC (with a covert existential predication, see section 2.2.2). According to our explanation, this is the structure of these sentences:

(81) *bīt-u   ša lā ∅   bēl-i.*
      house.NOM REL NEG (EXIST) master.GEN[51]

Thus, the origin of these expressions can be understood as 'a house (for) which a master does not exist.'[52] The absence of the expression 'for it' or of some absolute case (in respect of it) is not surprising, since, as mentioned in Bar-Asher Siegal (forthcoming-a), in the Semitic languages a reference to the antecedent is often not included in dependent clauses with existential predication. This then is the reconstructed process that led to this construction:

(82) a house (for) which a master does not exist → a house that doesn't have a master → a house without a master

---

[50] This term indicates that it is not a pronoun. For a justification for this term see Bar-Asher Siegal (forthcoming-a). For an alternative approach see inter alia Pat-El & Treiger (2008).

[51] A discussion of the genitive case in this context requires a long discussion on the functions of the cases in Semitic in general and in Akkadian in particular. A preliminary discussion of this can be found in Bar-Asher (2009: 54–77).

[52] Rimalt (1932) proposes that the origin of this in Akkadian is in the construction with the infinitive: *ša lā ragāmim* "of not-claiming" where the negative functions as a negation prefix.

Two variations of the *ša lā* expressions in Akkadian support this proposal. The first appears in some OB texts where the existential predication is overt:

(83)   X *ša parakt-um   lā ibaš-šû.*
X REL *paraktum*-NOM NEG exist.DUR.3.SG-SBJV
'X that does not have a *paraktum/* without a *paraktum*.' (BA 5 515f No. 52: 9, 15, 21 24, OB)

The second occurs in a text from Nuzi where we find an analogous construction that illustrates that indeed the underlying construction is possessive:

(84)   *x paššūr-ēt-u   tarṣ-ūt-um   ša kibr-a   lā*
x tables-PL.F-NOM straight-PL.F-NOM REL border-ACC NEG
īšû.
have.PST.3.M.SG.SBJV
'X straight tables <u>that do not have border</u>/<u>without a border</u>.' (RA 36: 136 line 14)

In these two examples NEG comes either before the existential verb or before the possessive verb, thus it negates the main predicate. According to our analysis in (81) originally this was the case also in the 'without expression' as the negation is of the covert existential predicate. However, it should be noted that in Akkadian we expect to have the predicate in the final position. If our analysis is indeed correct, it can be extended to Proto-Akkadian when the word order was VSO, similar to the other Semitic languages.[53] Accordingly when the word order was changed (as a result of Sumerian influence) it did not affect this expression as it had already been reanalyzed and became a lexical *without*-expression. In fact, this assumption is not necessary if we assume a zero marked existential predication (section 2.2.2), and accordingly the negative formula of such constructions begins with the negator.

This analysis of the Syriac and Akkadian expressions may explain another phenomenon in Syriac. Together with the other Eastern Late Aramaic dialects, Syriac lost the morphological distinction between definite and indefinite nouns, and the 'long form', previously used only for determined nouns, became the unmarked form and expressed also semantically indefinite nouns. However, in a few syntactic environments there is still a *tendency*[54] to have the 'short form'. Among these environments is one in

---

[53] Inter alia Deutscher (2004: 162).
[54] This is by no means a rule. Therefore one may still try to explain historically why the 'short form' appears in this syntactic environment.

which the noun appears after *d-lā*, where it has the meaning 'without' (as in [80] where we find *nāš* and not *nāšā*).[55] This phenomenon can be explained in light of the proposed hypothesis regarding the etymology of *d-lā*: accordingly, the *d-* was the subordinating marker with an existential predication in the dependent clause. In view of this, the indefinite form is expected in existential sentences with the 'definiteness effect' (see section 2.3 on the definiteness effect in Aramaic when the morphological distinction between definite and indefinite forms was still operative). This is especially compelling since one of the environments where 'short forms' still occur in Syriac is the negative existential sentence (Nöldeke 2001: 155, section 202 F).[56]

3.2.2. balu

It is worth noting that many scholars have proposed that the existential verb *bašûm* derives from a combination of the preposition *ba* 'in' and the pronominal suffix *šu*, similar to the existential construction in Geʿez (examples (25) and (26), above).[57] Rebecca Hasselbach has informed me (p.c.) that this etymology is impossible because of Old Akkadian spelling of *bašûm* as the sibilant is almost consistently written with the SH-series, which stands for an interdental. This spelling is too consistent to be an error or mix up of merging phonemes.

Regardless of the etymology of *bašûm*, it is worth considering whether the variants of *bal*V found in different Semitic languages, including the Akkadian form *balu*, with the meaning of 'without', do not derive from *ba* 'in' and the negator *lā*. Thus, as in Geʿez (see (24) and (25), above) the preposition *ba* constituted the existential predication (and we may assume that this phenomenon was not restricted to the Ethiopian languages).[58] Accordingly one may assume an asyndetic embedded clause with an underlying construction similar to the one proposed for *ša lā*. Synchronically, however, these prepositions function in expressions beyond what

---

[55] For some discussion about the difference between the short and the long form in predicative position, see Goldenberg (1991).

[56] One should remember that in the *d-lā* we are speaking about covert existential clauses, otherwise we would have expected the existential negation *layt*.

[57] For a survey of the literature, see Rubin (2005: 45, n. 161).

[58] It should be noted that a similar phenomenon is found in the Arabic dialects of the Jews of North Yemen where *bih/buh* and *fih* 'in it' function as the existential predicate, see Shachmon (2007: 212, 218), as is found in other Arabic dialects, for a survey of this phenomenon see Rubin (2005: 61–62).

can be 'translated' by a negative PPC. In order to accept this proposal one should explain the relation between *balu* and the Assyrian form *balātu* with the same meaning. It is worth noting the *balat-* most often appears as a preposition before pronominal suffixes. Accordingly, one may propose that this morphological environment may explain a historical insertion of a /t/ (either resulting from a phonological reason, or as a result of morphological analogy to other prepositions).

Admittedly it is difficult to propose strong evidence for this proposal, but this is merely an example of how better understanding of PPCs may contribute to better understanding of other related constructions.

4. Summary

While the standard expression in Akkadian to express the possessive predication is with the finite verb *išûm*, equivalent to the English verb *have*, this article has demonstrated that next to this construction Akkadian in its history or pre-history had other marginal PPCs as well. This demonstration relied on typological surveys from unrelated language families and parallel PPCs in other Semitic languages. Thus one may find in the history of Akkadian also the locative PPC (section 2.2) with various expressions, the dative PPC (section 2.3), the topic-PPC (section 2.4) and the alleged genitive PPC (section 2.6). The data in Akkadian prove that the genitive PPC (at least in Akkadian) is a sub-group of the topic-PPC.

These observations allowed us to explain various syntactic developments in Akkadian, among them the use of *ina qatim* as the existential predicate (section 2.2.3) and the details of the process of the HAVE-*drift* in which *išûm* 'to have' derived from the existential predicate *iš* (section 3.1), and finally to trace the etymology of the *without*-expressions *ša lā* and *balu* (section 3.2).

Abbreviations

ACC	accusative	DAT	dative
AN	animate	DEF	definite
CAD	*Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*	DEM	demonstrative
COND	conditional	DUR	durative

DU	dual	POSS	possessive
FOC	focus	PPC	Predicative Possessive
F	feminine		Construction
GEN	genitive	PRC	precative
IMPV	imperfective	PRS	present
IMP	imperative	PR	possessor
INDF	indefinite	PST	preterite
INF	infinitive	REL	relative
M	masculine	SBJV	subordination marker
NEG	negative	SG	singular
NOM	nominative	ST	stative
OBL	oblique	TOP	topic
PD	possessed	VEN	ventive
PL	plural		

References

Abbott, Barbara. 1993. A pragamatic account of the definiteness effect in existential sentences. *Journal of Pragmatics* 19: 39–55.

Aro Jussi. 1961. Die akkadischen Infinitivkonstruktionen. *Studia Orientalia edidit Societas Orientalis Fennica* 26. Helsinki .

Azar, Moshe. 1995. *The syntax of Mishnaic Hebrew.* Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language.

Baasten, Martin F. J. 2006. *The non-verbal clause in Qumran Hebrew*. PhD dissertation, University of Leiden.

Bar-Asher, Elitzur. 2009. *A theory of argument realization and its application to features of the Semitic languages*. PhD dissertation, Harvard University.

Bar-Asher Siegal, Elitzur A. forthcoming-a, Adnominal possessive and subordinating particles in Semitic languages. In C. Bodelot, H. Gruet-Skrabalova, F. Trouilleux, eds*., Morphologie, syntaxe et sémantique des subordonnants. Cahiers du LRL,* vol. 5. Clermont-Ferrand: Presses universitaires Blaise-Pascal.

Bar-Asher Siegal, Elitzur A. Forthcoming-b. *An introduction to Jewish Babylonian Aramaic: A grammar book,* to be published in *Lehrbücher orientalischer Sprachen (LOS)/Textbooks of Near-Eastern languages*, edited by Josef Tropper, in Collaboration with John Huehnergard, Leonid Kogan, Daniel Nicolae, and Juan-Pablo Vita. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Bar-Asher Siegal, Elitzur A. Forthcoming-c. Diachronic syntactic studies in the Hebrew pronominal reciprocal constructions. In Cynthia Miller & Ziony Zevit, eds. *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns (expected 2012).

Baron, Irène & Michael Herslund. 2001. Semantics of the verb HAVE. In Baron Irène, Michael Herslund & Finn Sørensen, eds. *Dimensions of possession*, 85–98. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Benveniste, Emile. 1966. *Être* et *avoir* dans leur function linguistique. In E. Benveniste, ed. *Problèmes de linguistique générale.* Paris: Gallimard.

Blau, Joshua. 1972. Marginalia Semitica II. *Israel Oriental Studies* 2: 57–82.

Bravmann, M. M. 1953. *Studies in Arabic and general syntax*, Cairo: Institut Français d'Archeologie Orientale du Caire.

Bravmann, M. M. 1977. *Studies in Semitic philology*. Leiden: Brill.

Brockelmann, Carl. 1913 *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, vol. II: S*yntax.* Berlin: Reuther & Reichard.

Brustad, Kristen. 2000. *The syntax of Spoken Arabic.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Charpin, Dominique. 1989–1990. Compte rendue du CAD volume Q (1982). *Archiv für Orientforschung* 36: 92–106.

Christian, Viktor. 1924. Die deiktischen Elemente in den semitischen Sprachen. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 31: 137–192.

Clark, Eve. 1978. Locationals: existential, locative, and possessive constructions. In Joseph Greenberg, ed. *Universals of human language*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 85–126.

Cohen, Eran. 2005. Addenda to non-verbal clauses in Old-Babylonian. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 50: 247–279.

Cull, Richard. 1872. The Assyrian verbs *basu*, 'to be', *qabah*, 'to say', and *isu*, 'to have', identified as variant forms of verbs having the same significance in the Hebrew language. *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archeology* 1: 28–93.

Daneš, Frantisek. 1964. A three-level approach to syntax. *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague* 1: 225–240.

Deutscher, Guy, 2000. *Syntactic change in Akkadian: The evolution of sentential complementation*. Oxford, New York : Oxford University Press

Evans, Nicholas. 1995. *A grammar of Kayardild: With historical-comparative notes on Tangkic*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Finet, Andre. 1956. *L'accadien des lettres de Mari*. Brussels: Palais des Academies.

Fischer, Wolfdietrich. 2002. *A grammar of Classical Arabic.* 3rd ed. (Transl. Jonathan Rodgers.) New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Francez, Itamar. 2007. *Existential propositions*. PhD dissertation, Stanford University.

Francez, Itamar. 2009. Existentials, predication, and modification, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 32: 1–50.

Freeze, Ray. 1992. Existentials and other locatives. *Language* 68: 553–595.

Gelb, Ignace J. 1955. Notes on von Soden' s *Grammar of Akkadian. Bibliotheca Orientalis* 12: 93–110.

Gensler, Orin D. 2000. Why Semitic adverbializers (Akkadian -*iš*, Syriac -*ʾāīt*) should not be derived from existential **īt*. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 45: 233–265.

Goldenberg, Gideon. 1991. On predicative adjectives and Syriac syntax. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 48: 716–726.

Greenstein, Edward L. 1989. The syntax of saying "Yes" in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 19: 51–59.

Hankin, Rony. 1994. 'Yeš gam ʾet ze': Do existence and possession 'subjects' really take the accusative in Hebrew? *Hebrew Linguistics* 38: 41–54. (In Hebrew)

Harley, Heidi. 2003. Possession and the double object construction. In Pica Pierre & Johan Rooryck, eds. *Linguistic variation yearbook* 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 31–70.

Heine, Bernd. 1997, *Cognitive foundations of grammar.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hetzron, Robert. 1969. Third person singular pronoun suffixes in Proto Semitic. *Orientalia Suecana* 18: 101–127.

Huehnergard, John. 1986. On verbless clauses in Akkadian. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 76: 218–249.

Huehnergard, John. 1987. 'Stative,' predicative, pseudo-verb. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 46: 215–232.

Huehnergard, John. 2000. *A grammar of Akkadian. Harvard Semitic Studies* 45.3rd edn. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Hueter, Gwyneth. 1996. *Grammatical studies in the Akkadian dialects of Babylon and Uruk 556–500 BC*, D.Phil. dissertation, University of Oxford.

Johnstone, Thomas M. 1987. *Mehri lexicon and English-Mehri word list*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

Kaufman, Stephen A. 1974. *The Akkadian influence on Aramaic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Keenan, Edward. L. 2003. The definiteness effect: Semantics or pragmatics? *Natural Language Semantics* 11: 187–216.

Kogut, Simcha. 1993. Alternative usage of independent and suffixed personal pronouns to express possession in Biblical Hebrew. *Studies in Bible and Exegesis* 3: 401–411 (in Hebrew).

Kogut, Simcha. 1980. Ledarke hakhasifa, hahagada vehateur shel klalim takhbiriyim shel leshon hamikra. *Leshonenu* 44: 12–23 (in Hebrew)

Kouwenberg, N. J. C. 2010. *The Akkadian verb and its Semitic background*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Kraus, F. R. 1984. Nominalsätze in altbabylonische Briefen und der Stativ. *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* 47. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen.

Krebernik, Manfred. 1996. The linguistic classification of Eblite: Methods, problems, and results. In Jerrold S. Cooper & Glenn M. Schwatrz, eds. *The study of the Ancient Near East in the twenty-first century*. Winona Lake Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 233–249.

Lambdin, Thomas O. 1978. Introduction to Classical Ethiopic (Geʿez). *Harvard Semitic Studies* 24. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press.

Lizotte Richard J. 1983. *Universals concerning existence, possession, and location sentences*. PhD dissertation, Brown University.

Locker, Ernst. 1954. 'Etre' et 'avoir': Leurs expressions dans les langues. *Anthropos* 49: 481–510.

Loewenstamm, Samuel E. 1974. Ha-kinuy ha-dabuq šel ha-šem be-ʿibrit u–b-ugaritit. *Leshonenu* 23: 149–150.

Lyons, John. 1967. A note on possessive, existential, and locative sentences. *Foundations of Language* 3: 390–396.

Lyons, John. 1968. Existence, location, possession and transitivity. In Bob van Rootselaar & T. Frits Staal, eds. *Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science*, vol. III, 495–509. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Co.

Măcelaru, Adrian. 2003. Proto-Semitic *YŠ: Problems and possible solutions. In Bender M. Lionel, Davis Appleyard and Gábor Takács, eds. *Afrasian: Selected comparative-historical linguistics studies in memory of Igor M. Diakonoff*, 233–240. Munic: Lincom Europa.

Milsark, Gary. 1974. *Existential sentences in English*. PhD dissertation, MIT.

Milsark, Gary 1977. Toward an explanation of certain peculiarities of the existential construction in English. *Linguistic Analysis* 3: 1–29.

Murane, Elizabeth. 1974. Daga grammar: From morpheme to discourse. *Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields* 43. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma.

Nöldeke, Thodore. 2001. *Compendious Syriac grammar*. (Transl. by Peter T. Daniels). Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Pat-El, Naʿama. 2006. Syntactical aspects of negation in Syriac. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 60: 329–348.

Pat-El, Naʿama & Alexander Treiger. 2008. On adnominalization of prepositional phrases and adverbs in Semitic. *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 158: 265–282.

Rimalt, E. S. 1932. Wechselbeziehungen zwischen dem Aram, und dem Neubab. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 39: 100–122.

Rottenberg, Meir. 1979. *Unknown syntax rules of the Bible language*. Tel Aviv: Hotsaʾat sefarim Reshafim (in Hebrew).

Rowton. M. B. 1962. The use of the permansive in Classic Babylonian. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 21: 233–320.

Rubin, Aaron D. 2005. *Studies in Semitic grammaticalization. Harvard Semitic Studies* 57. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Rubin, Aaron D. 2009. The functions of the preposition *k-* in Mehri. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 65: 221–226.

Rubin, Aaron D. 2010. *The Mehri language of Oman*. Leiden: Brill.

Ryding, Karin C. 2005. *A reference grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sanders, Gerald A. 1976. *A functional typology of elliptical coordinations.* Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Schachmon, Ori. 2007. *Arabic dialects of the Jews of North Yemen*. PhD dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Smyth, Herbert W. 1920. *Greek grammar for colleges*. New York: American Book Company.

Sneddon, James N. 1975. *Tondano phonology and grammar*. Canberra: Australian National University.

Stassen, Leon. 2001. Predicative possession. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible, eds. *Language typology and language universals*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 954–960.

Stassen, Leon. 2009. *Predicative possession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stolz, Thomas. 2001. To be with X is to have X: Comitatives, instrumentals, locative and predicative possession. *Linguistics* 39: 321–350.

Streck, Michael P. 1995. Zahl und Zeit: Grammatik der Numeralia und des Verbalsystems im Spätbabylonischen. (Cuneiform Monographs 5.) Groningen: STYX Publications.

Testen, David. 2000. Conjugating the 'prefixed stative' verbs of Akkadian. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 59: 81–92.

Ultan, Russel. 1978. Toward a typology of substantival possession. In Josepgh Greenberg, ed. *Universals of human language*. Vol. 4: *Syntax*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 11–49.

Ungnad, Arthur. 1918. 'Haben' im Babylonisch-Assyrischen, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 31: 277–283.

Von Soden, Wolfram. 1952. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

Waltke, Bruce M. and Michael Patrick O'Connor. 1990. *An introduction to Biblical Hebrew syntax*. Winona Lake.

Ward, Gregory & Betty Birner. 1995. Definiteness and the English existential. *Language* 17: 722–742.

Watson, Janet C. E. 1996. *Sbahtu! A course in San'ani Arabic*. Semitica Viva: Series Didactica, 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Wright, William. 1862. *A grammar of the Arabic language, translated from the German of Caspari*. London: Williams and Norgate.

Ziv, Yael. 1976. On The reanalysis of grammatical terms in Hebrew possessive constructions. In Peter Cole, ed. *Studies in Modern Hebrew syntax and semantics*. North Holland Linguistic Series 32. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 129–152.

Author's address:
School of Language Science
Department of the Hebrew Language
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Mt. Scopus, Jerusalem 91095
Israel

ebas@mscc.huji.ac.il