

The Distribution of the Temporal Sentences in the Old Babylonian Royal Inscriptions*

TIKVA ZADOK

Tel Aviv

A temporal sentence is a subordinate clause containing the grammatical subject, a subordinating particle, a verb in the subjunctive as well as, occasionally, objects. A complex temporal sentence includes a temporal clause and a main clause. The temporal clause is subordinated to the main clause by a subjunctive morpheme attached to the verb occurring at the end of the clause.

The function of the temporal clause is to describe the time related to the main clause. In every complex temporal sentence, there is a *consecutio temporum* determining the nature of the tense in the temporal clause, as well as in the main clause (see also von Soden, *GAG* §169a).

Most of the temporal sentences in these inscriptions are introduced by the subordinating particles *inūmi*¹/*inu*²/*inūma*,³ with the main clause in this case being sometimes introduced by the adverb *inūšu/inūmišu* (the common subordinating particle in Babylon is *inu*, and in the periphery—*inūma* and *inūmi*). In two additional instances, the temporal sentence is introduced by the subordinating particle *adi* (Ḥam.-Epil. LI 66; Iaḥ. A 74b) and in one case by the subordinating particle *ištu* (Sil. B 56), whereby the main clause in those instances is not introduced by the adverb *inūšu/inūmišu*.

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze the complex temporal sentence in the Old Babylonian royal inscriptions. No study has yet been dedicated to complex temporal sentences in Akkadian. Temporal sentences are discussed in some studies which deal with the temporal or aspectual system of Akkadian. Similarly, the standard grammars dedicate but a few small sections to the description of complex temporal sentences. Although these studies include separate chapters or sections discussing certain syntactical aspects of the Old Babylonian dialect, they do not usually deal with temporal sentences in the royal inscriptions dating from this period.

No proper linguistic analysis has been written for the corpus of the Akkadian inscriptions of that period. A few remarks in the fields of morphology and philology

* This article is excerpted from my doctoral dissertation, "Studies in the Syntax of the Language of the Royal Inscriptions from the Old Babylonian Period," written under the supervision of Professors J. Klein and P. Artzi (Samuel Noah Kramer Institute of Assyriology, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan 1993).

1. Lip. A 30 (var. *i-nu-ni*); Anmu. A 23; Ašd. A 6, 23; Ašd. B 4, 21.

2. Ḥam. A 15; Ḥam. B 24; Ḥam. C 10; Ḥam. D 11'; Ḥam. E 1; Ḥam.-Prol. I 1 (var. *inūma*); Sil. A 1; Sil. B 1; Sil. E 5; Aš. A 11'; Ip. A 5.

3. Kud. A 27; Ḥam.-Prol. I 1 (var. *inu*), V 14; Iaḥ. B 28; Šam. A 59, 88; Šam. B III 15; [Šam. C 11']; Šam. D 4; Šam. E 4; Ias. A 6; Ias. B 8'; Tak. A 5; Tak. B 5; Iar. A 1.

are embedded in the studies dealing with select inscriptions from that corpus, but syntax tends to be neglected. Our research is a first step forwards filling the gap in the above-mentioned field.

The updated edition by D. Frayne, *Old Babylonian Period 2002–1595 BC* (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods, 4; Toronto, 1990; henceforth *RIME* 4) includes inscriptions of the major dynasties in southern Mesopotamia (Isin, Larsa, Babylon and Uruk, see also the table below), as well as those of secondary and peripheral political centers. My research focuses on only eight geographical areas in southern Mesopotamia, viz., Babylon and its periphery (Kiš, Isin, Larsa, Dēr, Malgûm), as well as Mari and Alalâh. It deals with 28 royal inscriptions, which include temporal sentences, originating from the above-mentioned areas. Frayne (*RIME* 4) does not offer linguistic remarks regarding the royal inscriptions. Nor have reviewers⁴ of the volume referred to grammatical matters. The references to the research literature cited hereafter are in chronological order.

Since almost a third of the inscriptions discussed in this work is fragmentary, it is not possible to establish their statistical data (number of lines per inscription, the length of the temporal sentences, etc.) with exactitude. The lines which are not preserved are marked x (see the following table 1). The numbers in square brackets have been restored in accordance with the parallel Sumerian version. But in the linguistic analysis we have not, as a rule, used data from passages restored from the context or according to the Sumerian parallel. We have considered forms or words whose restoration or completion are certain.

Since the major part of the work is a syntactical analysis of the sources, the examples adduced are presented in transcription. This transcription follows *AHw.* and *GAG* and only in exceptional cases *CAD*.

We have made an extended use of statistics, trying to establish whether the use of a certain linguistic form was exclusive, whether it figured alongside other usages, or may be considered an isolated or exceptional phenomenon.

In the list of the following inscriptions, the identification of each inscription has been indicated by its full denotation in the editions of A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC to 1115 BC* (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods, 1; Toronto, 1987; henceforth *RIMA* 1) and Frayne (*RIME* 4) in order to help the reader find the original. In addition, an abbreviated denotation of the inscription is listed on the left-hand column. The inscriptions in this paper have been indicated by an identifying denotation (e.g., Ĥam. A, Ĥam. B, etc.), as well as by current numbering, independently of the standard editions.

The following is a list of the inscriptions on which our research draws. The numbers in brackets denote the respective pages in Frayne (*RIME* 4), except for No. 8, which refers to Borger (*BAL*) and numbers 16–19, which refer to Grayson (*RIMA* 1), in accordance with their full denotation in the following editions:

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Lip. A | = Lipit-Eštar E 4.1.5.3 (49–51) |
| 2. Kud. A | = Kudur-mabuk E 4.2.13.a (267–68) |

4. D. Charpin, *RA* 86 (1992), 88–91; A. R. George, *BSOAS* 55 (1993), 538–40; R. Borger, “Zum Korpus der altbabylonischen Königsinschriften. Nebst editionstechnischen Bemerkungen,” *OLZ* 89 (1994), 338–70; M. Stol, *Bi.Or.* 51 (1994), 109–13; J. S. Cooper, *JAOS* 115 (1995), 715–16.

3. Ȧam. A	= Ȧammu-rāpi E 4.3.6.3 (336–37)
4. Ȧam. B	= Ȧammu-rāpi E 4.3.6.17 (354–55)
5. Ȧam. C	= Ȧammu-rāpi E 4.3.6.7 (340–42)
6. Ȧam. D	= Ȧammu-rāpi E 4.3.6.14 (350–51)
7. Ȧam. E	= Ȧammu-rāpi E 4.3.6.2 (333–36)
8. Ȧam. Prol. & Epil.	= Ȧammu-rāpi Prologue & Epilogue (I, 2–10, 45–50)
9. Sil. A	= Samsu-iluna E 4.3.7.5 (380–83)
10. Sil. B	= Samsu-iluna E 4.3.7.3 (374–78)
11. Sil. E	= Samsu-iluna E 4.3.7.1 (373–74)
12. Aş. A	= Ammi-şaduqa E 4.3.10.1 (425–27)
13. Iaḥ. A	= Iaḥdun-Lim E 4.6.8.1 (602–4)
14. Iaḥ. B	= Iaḥdun-Lim E 4.6.8.2 (604–8)
15. Şam. A	= Şamši-Adad I A.0.39.1 (47–51)
16. Şam. B	= Şamši-Adad I A.0.39.2 (51–55)
17. Şam. C	= Şamši-Adad I A.0.39.3 (55–56)
18. Şam. D	= Şamši-Adad I A.0.39.4 (56)
19. Şam. E	= Şamši-Adad I A.0.39.5 (57)
20. Ias. A	= Iasmaḥ-Addu E 4.6.11.3 (617)
21. Ias. B	= Iasmaḥ-Addu E 4.6.11.4 (618)
22. Anmu. A	= Ilum/Anum-muttabbil E 4.12.2.2 (678–79)
23. Aşđ. A	= Aşđūni-iarīm E 4.8.1.1 (654–55)
24. Aşđ. B	= Aşđūni-iarīm E 4.8.1.2 (655–56)
25. Ip. A	= Ipiq-Eştar E 4.11.1.1 (669–70)
26. Tak. A	= Takil-ilissu E 4.11.2.1 (671–72)
27. Tak. B	= Takil-ilissu E 4.11.2.2 (672–74)
28. Iar. A	= Iarīm-Līm E 4.34.1.1 (799–800)

Temporal sentences are a widespread syntactical phenomenon, which is characteristic of most royal inscriptions of the Old Babylonian period, constituting the major part within the above-mentioned inscriptions. With respect to this phenomenon, it is possible to discern morphological and syntactical differences, characterizing diverse geographical areas in Mesopotamia in that period.

The 28 above-mentioned royal inscriptions include temporal sentences where their predicate is only a verb. Temporal sentences occupy a central place in both kinds of inscriptions: building inscriptions for the most part (19),⁵ the rest being votive ones (six).⁶ Three inscriptions constitute an exception: the Prologue and Epilogue of Codex Ȧammu-rāpi, which are designed to eternally commemorate a literary and legal enterprise; and two fragmentary inscriptions, whose genre cannot be determined, viz., Ias. A and Anmu. A.

The Prologue and the Epilogue of Codex Ȧammu-rāpi are to be included in this corpus, because of the overlap with and resemblance to the rest of the royal inscriptions from the following vantage points (see the thorough discussion in V. A. Hurowitz, *Inu Anum şirum: Literary Structures in the Non-Juridical Sections of Codex Hammurabi* (Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund, 15; Philadelphia, 1994), 14–19 and passim):

1. The Prologue and the Epilogue are, as it were, an expanded votive inscription, which includes a summary of all of Ȧammu-rāpi's enterprises, mentioned in his remaining inscriptions. They

5. Kud. A; Ȧam. A–E; Sil. A, B, E; Iaḥ. A, B; Şam. A–C; Aşđ. A, B; Ip. A; Tak. A, B.

6. Lip. A; Şam. D–E; Ias. B; Iar. A; and maybe Aş. A, since it is mostly broken.

extol Ḥammu-rāpi's undertakings, and make an extended use of participles and adjectives.⁷ At the end of the Epilogue, Ḥammu-rāpi specifies the curses intended against violators of the Laws.⁸ These curse formulae are characteristic of the rest of the Old Babylonian royal inscriptions.⁹

2. The language in both sections (I 27–49 and V 14–24) is not archaic. However, archaic features stand out at the beginning of the Prologue, informing on the establishment of world kingship in Babylon (I 1–26), as well as in the list detailing Ḥammu-rāpi's achievements (I 50–V 13), which parts are not directly related to the Laws.¹⁰ The language of the Prologue and the Epilogue is poetic (trying to constitute rhyming artificially, IV 15–16), which is similar to the language of the old hymns and the epic literature.¹¹ The Prologue is characterized by ancient grammatical forms, which give way to the normal forms, as well as to an irregular word order, in the Epilogue.¹²
3. Indeed, the Prologue and the Epilogue include addresses to the citizens with respect to the establishment of law and order in the land (a phenomenon not shared by the rest of the inscriptions). However, both are separate from the Laws of the king.

Likewise, we have included in the corpus the inscriptions of Šamši-Adad I (incorporated into *RIMA* 1), in spite of the fact that he was an Assyrian king and that his inscriptions exhibit some peculiarities of the Old Assyrian dialect. This is mainly because he ruled over Mari, and most of his inscriptions were found in this city. Some of his inscriptions reflect an Old Babylonian influence on their structure, contents, and dialect.¹³ Indeed, we have found some syntactical and grammatical features, which are common to those inscriptions and the rest of the inscriptions from Mari.¹⁴

As mentioned above, these 28 inscriptions, which include temporal sentences, originate from eight geographical areas. Temporal sentences are more widespread in Babylon than in the rest of the cities. In the inscriptions of the thirteen kings of Babylon and other cities (Lipit-Eštar, Kudur-mabuk, Ḥammu-rāpi, Samsu-iluna, Ammī-šaduqa, Iaḥdun-Līm, Šamši-Adad I, Iasmaḥ-Addu, Anum-muttabbil, Ašdūni-iarīm, Ipiq-Eštar, Takil-ilissu and Iarīm-Līm), a total of 34 temporal sentences have been found (see table 1 below).

Most of the inscriptions include only one temporal sentence. Out of 28 pertinent inscriptions only five have more than one temporal clause.¹⁵ For instance, in Ašd. B, two temporal sentences appear one after the other:

7. Such an extended use is also found in the following inscriptions: Lip. A; Ḥam. A–C, E; Sil. A; Aš. A; Iaḥ. A, B; Šam. A; Ias. B; Ip. A; Tak. A, B.

8. See also G. R. Driver and J. C. Miles, *The Babylonian Laws* (Oxford, 1952; henceforth: *BL* 1), 1:41.

9. See E. Szlechter, *Codex Hammurapi* (Rome, 1977), 182.

10. See also Driver and Miles, *BL* 1:40.

11. See W. von Soden, "Der hymnisch-epische Dialekt des Akkadischen," *ZA* 40 (1931), 174, 197.

12. See Driver and Miles, *BL* 1:39–40.

13. See B. Landsberger and K. Balkan, "Die Inschrift des assyrischen Königs Īrišum, gefunden in Kültepe 1948," *Belleten* 14 (1950), 220; Borger, *Einleitung*, 14, f; Grayson, *ARI* 1:10 and n. 56; Grayson, *RIMA* 1, 47; cf. Frayne, *RIME* 4, 614.

14. Indeed, Brigitte Groneberg ("Untersuchungen zum hymnisch-epischen Dialekt der altbabylonischen literarischen Texte," Ph.D. diss., Münster, 1971 [henceforth *UHED*], 24–25) includes within the list of Old Babylonian royal inscriptions, Ḥam.-Prol. and Epil. (see also von Soden, "Hymnisch-epische Dialekt," 174, 197), as well as the inscriptions of Šam. On the other hand, Grayson (*RIMA* 1, 47–57) subsumes the inscriptions of Šam. under the Assyrian royal inscriptions.

15. See also Ḥam.-Prol. and Epil. (three instances): I 1–49, V 14–24, LI 66–69; Sil. B (two instances): 1–38, 55–62; Šam. A (two instances): 59–72, 88–98; Ašd. A (two instances): 6–22, 23–37; Ašd. B (two instances): 4–40, 21–36.

- (1) *inūmi*¹⁶ *kibrātum erbēm*¹⁷ *ikkirāninnīma samāne šanātīm tāhāzam ēpušma ina samuntīm šattīm*¹⁸ *māḥiri ana bā!*¹⁹ *lū itūr ummāni ana šalāš me'ātīm lū itūr*

When the four quarters rebelled against me, I made battle for eight years and²⁰ in the eighth year (the power of) my adversary was indeed reduced to half (and)²¹ my army was reduced to three hundred (men) (lines 4–20).

- (2) *inūmi Zababa bēli idinanna*¹⁶ *u Ištar bēlti tappūti illikūna*¹⁶ *akal patānija elqēma ana ḥarrān ūmakkal*²² *allikma 40 ūmi mātam nakirtam lū ukanniš*

When Zabala, my lord, gave me a (favorable) decision and Ištar, my lady, came to my help, I took some food for me to eat and went a day's march and within (only) forty days I indeed subdued the enemy land (lines 21–36).

Most of the inscriptions in which temporal sentences are included are monolingual (23 inscriptions with 28 temporal sentences) with only a small percentage being bilingual (five inscriptions with six temporal sentences), whereby in the bilingual inscriptions temporal clauses tend to be longer. This is possibly because the temporal sentence appears in most of the bilingual inscriptions (three out of five, viz., Ham. E; Sil. A, B) at the beginning of the inscription. Another reason is that the

16. This inscription exhibits some phenomena characteristic of the Old Akkadian dialect, which survived in isolated cases in early Old Babylonian inscriptions:

- The subordinating particle *inūmi*, “when” (lines 4, 21); compare Lip. A 30; Anmu. A 23; Ašd. A 6, 23.
- The subjunctive endings *-na* (line 23) and *-ūna* (line 26); see Ašd. A 25, 28 and compare the subjunctive endings *-ūni* in Lip. A 35 and *-ūna* in Anmu. A 30, which also follow the subordinating particle *inūmi*. On the above-mentioned irregular subjunctive endings, see von Soden, *GAG* §83c; A. Westenholz, “Some Notes on the Orthography and Grammar of the Recently Published Texts from Mari,” *Bi.Or.* 35 (1978), 163, n. 24.

17. For the case of *er-bé-em* (line 6), which is an irregular nominative form, see von Soden, “Der hymnisch-epische Dialekt des Akkadischen,” *ZA* 41 (1933), 133; cf. Ašd. A, line 8.

18. We have in lines 12–13 a case in point where the adjective (ordinal number) precedes the modified noun: *ina samuntīm šattīm*, “in the eighth year.” Cf. Ašd. A 14–15 and CAD S, 120a, s.v. *samnu* a. This is due to the poetic style and may express an emphasis (cf. Driver and Miles, *BL* 2:133; von Soden, *GAG* §§134h, 139 l).

19. For the expression *a-na ba!-a*, “to half” (line 15), see I. J. Gelb, Review of Edzard, *Zwischenzeit*, *JNES* 20 (1961), 270. CAD (B, 297b, s.v. *bū* b; M/1, 100a, s.v. *māḥiru* 1c; Z, 152a, s.v. *zū* B) suggests that we have here a loanword from Sumerian BA₃/BA₇ (“half”) in *status absolutus* (see von Soden, *GAG* §62 e–f). For this Sumerian word, see recently A. W. Sjöberg et al., eds., *The Sumerian Dictionary of the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1984), B, 23. Since the sign *BA* is not clear (its form resembles the sign *ZU*), many scholars reject the above-mentioned reading. Compare also Edzard, *Zwischenzeit*, 130, n. 690, who transliterates *ZU.A* without a translation. For a reading *a-na ba!-a* with a different interpretation, see Frayne, *RIME* 4, 659 (*a-na SÚ.A*, ‘was reduced’). Cf. Ašd. A 17.

20. In line 11 *ēpušma* is rendered “I made and . . .” as the enclitic *-ma* connects the preceding units of the sentence (lines 8–11) with the following ones (lines 12–16; 17–20); differently Frayne, *RIME* 4, 656. Cf. Ašd. A 13.

21. According to the context, the enclitic *-ma* is missing at the end of line 16 and there is an asyndeton. Lines 12–20 are a unit of a coordinate sentence without a coordinating particle of the sentence unit of lines 17–20. Therefore we translate here “(and)” at the beginning of line 17 (with CAD B, 297b, s.v. **bū* b); differently Frayne, *RIME* 4, 656. Cf. Ašd. A 19.

22. The phrase *ana ḥarrān ūmakkal*, “for a day's march” (lines 30–31) denotes a measure of distance, and for this reason *ūmakkal* appears in *status absolutus* (see von Soden, *GAG* §62h; *AHw.*, 1412a, s.v. *ūmakkal* 2). Compare *ana bā* in line 15 and in n. 19 above, as well as Ašd. A 17, 31–32.

temporal clause of these bilingual inscriptions is never embedded in the main clause in sharp contrast to the monolingual inscriptions where the temporal clause is usually embedded and therefore tend to be shorter (cf. von Soden, *GAG* §169b).

a. In bilingual inscriptions:

- (1) *inu*²³ *Šamaš bēlum rabium ša šamā²³ i u eršetim šarrum ša ili Hammu-rāpi rubām migiršu jāti*²⁴ *in*²³ *pānišu namrūtīm ḥadīš*²³ *ippalsanni šarrūtām dārītām palā ūmī arkūtīm išrukam išid mātīm ša ana bēlim iddinam ukkinam niši Sippar u Bābīlim šubat nēhtīm šūšubam in*²³ *pīšu ellim ša lā nakār iqbiu*²³ *dūr Sippar epēšam rēšišu ullām rabīš*²³ *lūwa²³eranni*

When Šamaš, great lord of heaven and earth, king of gods, with his shining face joyfully looked at me, Hammu-rāpi, the prince, his favorite, granted to me everlasting kingship (and) a reign of long days, made firm for me the foundation of the land which he had given me to rule, spoke to me by his pure word, which cannot be changed, to settle the people of Sippar and Babylon in peaceful abodes, (and) laid a great commission on me to build the wall of Sippar (and) to raise its head (Ham. E 1–27).

- (2) *inu*²³ *Anum Enlil šarrū ša šamē u eršetim ana Marduk [mā]rim rēštīm ša Ea ḥadīš*²³ *ipalsūšum bēlūt kibrāt arba'im iddinūšum in*²³ *Anunnaki šumam širam ibbiūšu*²³ *Bābīlam išdīšu kima [šamē] u eršetim [u]kinnūšum inūšu*²³ *Marduk Enlil mātīšu [ilu]m bāni nēm-eqim ana Samsu-iluna šar lališu jāti*²⁴ *[n]aphar mātātīm [a]na rējīm iddinam [m]āssu aburri šurbušam nišīš[u]ra*²³ *pšātīm in*²³ *šulmim ana dār itarrām rabīš*²³ *lū uwa²³eranni*²⁵

When Anum (and) Enlil, the kings of heaven and earth, joyously looked at Marduk, Ea's eldest son, gave him rule over the four quarters, in (the assembly of) the Anunnaki gave him an exalted name (and) established for him the foundations of Babylon like (that of) [heaven] and earth, at that time Marduk, the highest-ranking god of his land, the god who creates wisdom, gave me, Samsu-iluna, the king desired by him, all the lands to shepherd; indeed he ordered me greatly to settle his land in meadows (and) to conduct his wide-spread people in peace forever (Sil. A 1–24).

- (3) *inu*²³ *Enlil šarrum ša ili bēlum rabium ša mātātīm ana Šamaš in*²³ *būnišu damqūtīm ipalsūma Sippar āl šiatīm māḥassu dūršu epēšam Ebabbar ana ašrišu turram ziqqurratam gīgundāšu širam rēšiša kima šamē ullām Šamaš u Aja ana šubtišunu elletim in*²³ *rišātīm u ḥidiātīm erēba in*²³ *pīšu ša lā uttakkaru iqbiu*²³ *inūšu*²³ *qarrādum eḫlum Šamaš ana šī-*

23. Also in Ham. E, Sil. A, B are several Old Akkadian forms, which are typical of the hymnic-epic dialect (HED):

- The subordinating particle *inu*, “when” (Ham. E 1; Sil. A 1; Sil. B 1) and the adverb *inūšu*, “at that time” (Sil. A 13; Sil. B 25) in the temporal sentence (for *inu* see von Soden, “Hymnisch-epische Dialekt (1933),” 98–99, n. 2; 147–48; *CAD I/J*, 152b–53a, s.v. *inu*; *AHW.*, 382b–83a, s.v. *inu* I B; von Soden, *GAG* §116b. For *inūšu* see von Soden, “Hymnisch-epische Dialekt (1933),” 98–99 and n. 2; *CAD I/J*, 152b–53a, s.v. *inu* a; *AHW.*, 384a, s.v. *inūmisu* 1; 162b–63a, s.v. *inūšu*; von Soden, *GAG* §119h).
- The form *in* instead of *ina*, “in” (Ham. E 7, 21; Sil. A 8, 22; Sil. B 5, 20, 22; cf. Driver and Miles, *BL* 2:116) and *iqbiu* (for *iqbū*; Ham. E 22; Sil. B 24), *ibbiūšu* (for *ibbūšu*, Sil. A 9) along with contracted forms.
- The adverbial suffix *-iš*, e.g., *ḥadīš*, “joyously” (Ham. E 26; Sil. A 5; Sil. B 36) and *rabīš*, “greatly” (Ham. E 26; Sil. A 24). For this adverbial suffix see von Soden, “Hymnisch-epische Dialekt (1933),” 113, 134; Groneberg, *UHED*, 175–76; idem, “Terminativ- und lokativadverbialis in altbabylonischen literarischen Texte,” *AfO* 26 (1978/79), 15–29; W. R. Mayer, *Or.* 64 (1995), 161–86.
- For *jāti* (Ham. E 6; Sil. A 17; Sil. B 35) instead of *jāši(m)* see Borger, *BAL*, 125.
- Here is a syndetic sentence without a coordinating particle, both in the temporal clause (lines 1–7, 8–9, 10–12) and the main clause (lines 13–19 + 24, 20, 21–23) of the temporal sentence.

*mātim rabiātim ša Enlil ana Sippar u Ebabbar išīmu kīma ḥidūtīm ittaškanšum*²⁶ Samsu-iluna šarram lipit qātīšu jāti²⁴ ḥadīs²³ issiannima tērtam šuāti uwa²⁷eranni

When Enlil, king of the gods, great lord of the foreign lands, looked at Šamaš with his gracious face, (and) decreed to him, by his utterance that cannot be altered, to build the wall of Sippar, the ancient city, his cult city, to restore Ebabbar, to raise high as heaven the top of the ziqqurat, his lofty gīgūna temple, and to bring Šamaš and Aia into their shining dwelling amidst joy and rejoicing, at that time there was established joyfully for champion, youth Šamaš, the great destinies which Enlil had determined for Sippar and Ebabbar; he joyfully called me, Samsu-iluna, the king created by his hand, (and) gave to me that (afore-alluded) commission (Sil. B 1–38).

b. *In monolingual inscriptions:*

- (1) *šarrāssu adi baḷu ūmišam ḥidirtum*²⁷ *limtaḥḥar*

As long as he lives may misfortune daily confront his royal rule (Iaḥ. A 74–76).²⁸

- (2) *inūma*²⁹ *bitum innahūma*³⁰ *mamman ina šarrāni mārija ša bitam uddašu temmēnija u narēja šamnam lipšuš niqiam liqqīma ana ašrišunu litēršunūti*

When the temple becomes dilapidated, may whoever among the kings, my sons, renovates the temple anoint my clay inscriptions and my monumental inscriptions with oil, make a sacrifice, and return them to their places (Šam. A 88–98).

- (3) *inūma*²⁹ *aḥḥūšu Abba-II bēlšunu ibbalkitū Abba-II šarr[u in]a tukulti Adad Hepat u šu-kurrim [ša Eštar] ana Irride illikma Irride iṣbat [u š]ābšu ikšud*

When his allies rebelled against Abba-II, their lord, Abba-II, the ki[ng], with the help of Adad, Hepat, and the spear [of Eštar], went to Irridu, captured Irridu, and defeated its troops (Iar. A 1–4).

The main clause is introduced by the adverb *inūšu/inūmišu*, especially in the royal inscriptions of Babylon, as can be seen in table 1 below, column 10.³¹

26. Prof. J. Klein (private communication) points out that *kīma ḥidūtīm ittaškanšum* is a literal translation of Sum. *im-ma-(na-)ni-tb-/in-ar*, “was done to him like joy,” i.e., “was filled with joy.”

27. *ḥidirtum* (line 75) is a dialectal form for *idirtum* (see CAD A 1, 126b, s.v. *adirtu* A 2a). Von Soden transliterates *’i-di-ir-tum* (AHw., 364b, s.v. *i/edirtu(m)*). The special spelling *ḥi/’i-di-ir-tum* may prove that we have here a local pronunciation, peculiar to the Mari dialect.

28. For further instances of temporal sentences in monolingual and bilingual inscriptions, see table 1 below, col. 3.

29. *Inu* is recorded in Babylon especially in bilingual inscriptions, except for one case where only *inūma* appears (Ham.-Prol. V 14) and another case in which *inūma* is a variant of *inu* (Ham.-Prol. I 1). *Inūma* is frequent in inscriptions from the periphery (Larsa, Mari and Alalah). *Inu*, which is typical of inscriptions from Babylon, is extant only once in the periphery (Malgûm, Ip. A 5). For the subordinating particle *inūmi*, which is typical of the Old Akkadian period (six instances), see n. 16, a. above.

30. The attachment of an enclitic *-ma* to verbs appearing at the end of the temporal clause with or without the subjunctive morpheme is a marginal and exceptional phenomenon. In such positions the *-ma* does not designate coordination, but a certain emphasis. Also in this corpus there exists the exceptional phenomenon of the appearance of the subordinate verb at the end of the clause with an enclitic *-ma* in five cases out of 34 (Sil. E 5–11; Šam. A 88; Ašd. A 6–9; Ašd. B 4–7; Tak. A 5–11). It is noteworthy that in all these cases, except for one (Šam. A 88), the subjunctive morpheme is absent due to either the presence of a ventive morpheme or a scribal error.

31. In table 1, col. 3, the language of the inscription is specified only when it is bilingual. When there is no special indication, the language of the inscription is only Akkadian. In columns 6–8, the numbers in brackets indicate the lines including the temporal sentence, the temporal clause or the main clause.

To sum up, the analysis of 34 temporal clauses (in 28 inscriptions) reveals that the verb occurs in the subjunctive, that the temporal clause is connected with the main clause by means of one of the subordinating particles (*inūmī/inu/inūma* and less frequently *adi, ištu*). The temporal clause occupies the lion's share of each inscription and tends to be longer in bilingual than in monolingual inscriptions. Temporal clauses are more frequent in Babylon than in the periphery, but with respect to other syntactic aspects we found no significant differences between the two groups of inscriptions. The meticulous analysis and comparison of the temporal clauses in a particular corpus such as that of the Old Babylonian royal inscriptions enhances the proper understanding of the inscriptions.

TABLE 1. The Distribution of Complex Temporal Sentences in the Inscriptions

City	King	Inscription	Inscription's lines	Number of temporal sentences	Lines of temporal sentence	Lines of temporal clause	Lines of main clause	Subordinating particle	The introducing of the main clause
Isin	Lipit-Eštar	Lip. A	36	1	17 (20-36)	6 (30-35)	11 (20-29+36)	<i>ināmi</i>	
Larsa	Kudur-mabuk	Kud. A	51	1	19 (24-42)	1 (27)	18 (24-26+28-42)	<i>ināma</i>	
Babylon	Ḫammu-rāpi	Ḫam. A	23	1	9 (15-23)	5 (15-19)	4 (20-23)	<i>[in]u</i>	<i>ināšu</i>
		Ḫam. B	37	1	14 (24-37)	7 (24-30)	7 (31-37)	<i>inu</i>	
		Ḫam. C	57	1	28 (10-37)	7 (10-16)	21 (17-37)	<i>inu</i>	
		Ḫam. D (bilingual)	x+16+x	1	6+[10?] (11'-23')	9 (11'-16'+[3?])	7? (17'-23')	<i>inu</i>	
		Ḫam. E (bilingual)	81	1	27 (1-27)	22 (1-22)	5 (23-27)	<i>inu</i>	
	Ḫam. Prol.	Ḫam. Prol.	303	2	49 (11-49)	26 (1-26)	23 (1 27-49)	<i>inu/ināma</i>	<i>ināmīšu</i>
					11 (V 14-24)	6 (V 14-19)	5 (V 20-24)	<i>ināma</i>	
					4 (LI 66-69)	2 (LI 66-67)	2 (LI 68-69)	<i>adi</i>	
					24 (1-24)	12 (1-12)	12 (13-24)	<i>inu</i>	
					38 (1-38)	24 (1-24)	14 (25-38)	<i>inu</i>	
Mari	Samsu-iluna	Sil. A (bilingual)	83	1	8 (55-62)	3 (55-57)	5 (58-62)	<i>ištu</i>	<i>ināšu</i> <i>ināšu</i>
		Sil. B (bilingual)	123	2	46 (5-50)	7 (5-11)	39 (12-50)	<i>inu</i>	
		Sil. E	50	1	21+x (11'-31'+x)	9 (11'-19')	12+x (20'-31'+x)	<i>inu</i>	
		Aš. A (bilingual)	x+31+x	1					
	Ammit-šaduqa	Iaḫ. A	78	1	3 (74-76)	½ line (74b)	2½ lines (74a+75-76)	<i>adi</i>	
		Iaḫ. B	157	1	6 (28-33)	3 (28-30)	3 (31-33)	<i>ināma</i>	
		Šam. A	135	2	14 (59-72)	3 (59-61)	11 (62-72)	<i>ināma</i>	
					11 (88-98)	1 (88)	10 (89-98)	<i>ināma</i>	
Dēr	Anum-muttabbil	Šam. B	33+x+77	1	17 (III 11-IV 1)	4 (III 15-18)	13 (III 11-14+19-IV 1)	<i>ināma</i>	
		Šam. C	10+x+15	1	5 (11'-15')	2½ lines (11'-13'a)	2½ lines (13'b-15')	<i>[ināma?]</i>	
		Šam. D	14+x	1	11+x (4-14+x)	6 (4-9)	5+x (10-14+x)	<i>ināma</i>	
		Šam. E	17	1	14 (4-17)	8 (4-11)	6 (12-17)	<i>inā[ma]</i>	
		Ias. A	7+x	1	2+x(6-7+x)	line 6ff.	(broken)	<i>[in]āma</i>	
	Ias. B	Ias. B	18+x	1	7+x (8'-14'+x)	5 (8'-12')	2+x (13'-14'+x)	<i>[inām]a</i>	(broken)
Kiš	Ašdūni-iarim	Ammu. A	37+x	1	15 (23-37+x)	8 (23-30)	7+x (31-37+x)	<i>[inām]i</i>	
		Ašd. A	51	2	17 (6-22)	4 (6-9)	13 (10-22)	<i>[in]āmi</i>	
Malgūm	Takīl-ilissu	Ašd. B	40	2	15 (23-37)	6 (23-28)	9 (29-37)	<i>ināmī</i>	
					17 (4-20)	4 (4-7)	13 (8-20)	<i>ināmī</i>	
					10 (21-36)	6 (21-26)	10 (27-36)	<i>ināmī</i>	
Alalah	Iarim-Lim	Ip. A	41	1	13 (5-17)	3 (5-7)	10 (8-17)	<i>inu</i>	<i>ināmīšu</i>
		Tak. A	37	1	17 (5-21)	7 (5-11)	10 (12-21)	<i>ināma</i>	
		Tak. B	97	1	53 (5-57)	3 (5-7)	50 (8-57)	<i>[ināma]</i>	
Alalah	Iarim-Lim	Iar. A	20	1	4 (1-4)	1 (1)	3 (2-4)	<i>ināma</i>	