

SYNTACTICAL AND STYLISTICAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE TEXT OF THE VIIIth CAMPAIGN OF SARGON II (TCL 3)

G.W. Vera Chamaza — Luzern

As is already well known in ancient Near Eastern Studies, the 430-lines text of Sargon's VIIIth campaign¹ was published by F. Thureau-Dangin in 1912². However, it was apparently not his intention to elaborate an investigation on the literary aspects of the language, so that only internal and external problems are touched upon. Five years later it was Albright³ who attempted to clarify some questions in the same domain. Unfortunately his investigation resulted in being of limited value, insofar as he did not take into account linguistic problems. By contrast, more attention should be given to the article by Oppenheim⁴ (1960), since he carried out a number of syntactical, historical and contextual observations on the text. The recent publication of the text with transcription and translation by Mayer (1983)⁵ did not add much new evidence in this respect. We will try here to clarify some problems in this field, which often made for complications in the contextual understanding.

The whole text may be divided in 15 sections, one introductory section and one final section, the delimitation of which is formal and clearly marked. Every section is introduced by the same stereotyped sentence⁶: TA URU/KUR.GN *at-ta-muš*, "from GN I

¹) A number of corrections to the new edition of the report of the VIIIth campaign by W. Mayer, *Sargons Feldzug gegen Urartu 714 v. Chr.. Eine militärhistorische Würdigung*, MDOG 115 (1983), pp. 68ff., will be listed in my article *Der VIII. Feldzug Sargons II.. Eine Untersuchung zu Politik und historischer Geographie des späten 8. Jht. v. Chr.*, forthcoming.

²) F. Thureau Dangin, *Une relation de la huitième Campagne de Sargon (714 av. J.-C.)* (TCL 3), Paris 1912.

³) W.F. Albright, *The Eighth Campaign of Sargon*, JAOS 191 (1917), pp. 226ff.

⁴) A.L. Oppenheim, *The City of Ashur in 714 B. C.*, JNES 19 (1960), pp. 133ff.

⁵) Cf. fn. 1, above.

⁶) The verbal forms are treated paradigmatically and according to their form and function. As a rule, the introductory sentence is formulated with *iptaras*.

departed”⁷; furthermore, the sections are separated from each other by dividing lines. Only in few cases (sections 1, 14, 15, introductory and final section) there is no introductory sentence, but this is caused by internal reasons. Section 15 forms a sort of recapitulation of the whole story; in section 14 the stereotyped sentence may be lacking because an attack is described. In section 1 the chronological information precedes the stereotyped sentence (l. 8).

EXCURSUS

Postposition of the nomen regens in construct state nexus

The simple structure of a construct state nexus consists of a *nomen regens* in the first position and a *nomen rectum* following immediately⁸. Nevertheless, there are some cases which diverge from this generally valid rule: thus, the *nomen regens* may appear in a postponed position (= inversion). These exceptions are the object of our discussion. A phenomenon which may be detected with a certain frequency, especially in poetical texts⁹, is the replacement of the genitive in the *nomen rectum* by *ša*, connected with its determined *nomen regens*, and the postposition of *nomen regens* to which is attached a determining enclitical personal pronoun.

This construction occurs in TCL 3 at times¹⁰. The postponed *nomen regens* may be also very far separated from its *nomen rectum*, in a hyperbaton structure¹¹: and this indicates that it is not tied to this position. The *nomen regens* may be separated from the *nomen rectum* by a prepositional nexus, as in *ša* ¹*ur-sa-a* KUR.ur-ar-*ta-a-a* ¹*me-ta-at-ti* KUR.zi-kir-*ta-a-a* *da-ab-de-e še-e-ri* ERIM.HI.A-*šú-nu ma-at-tu ú-šam-qit*, “to the numerous soldiers of Ursa, the Urartian, (and) Metatti, the Zikirtian, I inflicted a defeat on the battlefield” (l. 421). The parts of the construct state nexus may also be placed in different lines: *ša* ¹*ur-za-na* KUR.mu-*ša-šir-a-a* ... DAM-*šú* DUMU.MEŠ-*šú* DUMU.MÍ.MEŠ-*šú*, “the wife, the sons, the daughters of Urzanâ of Mušair” (ll. 423-424). In Gilgamesh X, Col. VI, 34, 39¹² the finite verb is placed, in both cases, in between: *ša*

⁷) The stereotyped sentence normally is followed by the sentence *a-na* KUR.GN *aq-te-reb*, which indicates the orientation of the subject. Five times it is enlarged by relative clauses which are parentheses explicative of place: in section 4 (ll. 74-77), in section 6 (l. 91), in section 8 (l. 188), in section 13 (ll. 297-298). For the general syntax of relative clause, cf. GAG, §§ 164-168; E. Reiner, *Une aspect de la proposition relative akkadienne*, RA 45 (1951), pp. 25f.

⁸) Cf. GAG § 135.

⁹) Cf. GAG § 136f; further, F.M.Th. Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe* (LSS V, 2), Leipzig 1909, p. 24.

¹⁰) E.g., in ll. 38, 78, 302. The same construction appears also in an inscription of Esarhaddon: *ša* EN *šarri belišunu* ... *maharšu* (R. Borger, *Zu den Asarhaddon-Texten aus Babel*, BiOr 21 [1964], pp. 43-148); in *Enuma eliš: ša tiamat karassa* (W.G. Lambert, *Enuma Eliš*, Oxford 1966, I, 36); for a prosa-text: *ša* LÚ *sa-a-ti ma-ša-rišu*, ARM I, 12, 19. Cf. also W.G. Lambert, *The Fifth Tablet of the Erra Epic*, Iraq 24 (1962), p. 125.

¹¹) This means the separation of two syntactically connected words by the interpolation of one or more words.

¹²) Cf. the edition by R.C. Thompson, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, Oxford 1930; see also Tablet XI, 91.

mu-ti ul uš-ši-ru ša-lam-šú, “the picture of death they do not draw”; *ša mu-ti ul ud-du-ú UD.MEŠ-šú*, “the days of death they did not declare”; to this group also belongs TCL 3, 142: *ša um-ma-na-at KUR.ur-ar-ti LÚ.KÚR lim-ni a-di kit-ri-šu šuh-hur-ta-šú*. The enclitical personal pronoun in *šuhhurtašu* might refer to the construct state nexus, but one would rather expect a feminine enclitical personal pronoun.

The postponed *nomen regens* can also omit the enclitical personal pronoun¹³, as in ll. 42-50: *ša 1ta-al-ta-a KUR.e-li-pa-a-a ...* (and the other names until l. 49) ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ *pi-tan bir-ki ANŠE.pa-re-e šar-hu-ti ANŠE.ud-re i-lit-ti KUR-šú-nu GUD.MEŠ ù še-e-né*, “from Daltâ, the Ellipian, ... I received horses, fast runners, fiery mules, camels (from) the breeding of their land, cattle and small livestock”. Furthermore, the confusing construction of line 14 belongs here: *ša 4UR1.GAL 4IM ú-ri-gal-li a-li-kut mah-ri-ia ú-šat-ri-ša ni-ir-šu-un*, “the yoke of Nerigal and Adad—whose standards are going in front of me— I lined up”¹⁴.

The preceding particle *ša* can be absent as well; in such cases the *nomen rectum* is found normally in genitive: *íd.hi-ri-tu íd tuk-la-te-šu a-ru-ur-šá* (l. 221), “the drain of the canal, the river of his supply”¹⁵; *ša*¹⁶ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ù GIŠ.GIGIR *a-mu-ra mi-na-a-šu-un*, “and I inspected the number of horses and chariots” (l. 12).

From the material investigated it results that the elements of a construct state nexus are not necessarily tied to a special position: they may be inverted for stylistic or rhetorical reasons. Likewise, the absence of the preceding *ša* in connection with the *nomen rectum* and of the enclitical personal pronoun connected with the postponed *nomen regens* is caused by stylistic reasons. On these bases it is not astonishing that such construct state nexus mostly appear in literary texts.

* * *

Introductory section: ll. 1-5.

The whole introductory section consists of asyndetic nominal clauses which may be stereotyped as greeting-formula: they are constructed as a *parallelismus membrorum*. The greeted persons are introduced according to their rank: first the god Aššur (l. 1), then the other gods (ll. 2-3), lastly the city of Aššur and its inhabitants (l. 4); the people greeted are introduced by the preposition *ana*: *a-na NN / a-na DINGIR.MEŠ / a-na URU ù UN.MEŠ*. But they are not dependent (as an indirect object) from the verb in l. 7 (*išturušu*) as one might conclude from the fact that the addressee of the letter is the god Aššur. The enclitical personal pronoun of the verb refers neither to Aššur nor to the other gods nor to the remaining greeted persons.

¹³) GAG § 138 l only points out the cases of postponed *nomen rectum* with enclitical personal pronoun.

¹⁴) Cf. *ša ša-di-i ... du-u[r-gi la il-lak]*, “the inner part of the mountain (nobody) has crossed”, Thompson, *Gilgamish*, Tablet IX, Col. III, 9.

¹⁵) But the construction in l. 81 is also suitable.

¹⁶) The particle *ša* probably serves here to initialize the genitive connection.

Section 1: ll. 6-50.

In section 1 the report begins with a chronological indication which marks the time of the departure of the campaign (l. 6): it is the argument of the following stereotyped sentence, which serves as introduction for every section. The chronological indication is constructed by a number of appositional construct state nexus, whose clauses are interrupted by a relative clause, exactly in l. 7. The relative in l. 7 refers to the month Tammuz (l. 6), to which also refers in an enhanced manner the enclitical personal pronoun placed at the end of the verb (*ištaru-ša/u*)¹⁷. The main clause follows in l. 8.

In l. 9 no difficulties arise from the presence in a final clause of the construct infinitive emphasized by *aššu*. The relative stative clause *ša né-ber-ta-šú pa-aš-qa-at*, “the crossing point of which is arduous”, in l. 10 has only an explicative function. It is the same case as in l. 11: *ša KUR.za-mu-a i-qab-bu-šu-ni* (verb + enclitical personal pronoun + *modus relativus*). In l. 14 the particle *ša* has not the function of a relative¹⁸: it replaces the genitive of the inverted construct state nexus¹⁹. This nexus is followed immediately by a participle clause²⁰, which at the same time interrupts the main clause. Lines 15-16 have a periodic structure²¹: their main clause opens with *i-na bi-rit KUR.ni-ki-pa KUR.ú-pa-a KUR.MEŠ AN.TA.MEŠ*, “between GN₁ and GN₂, high mountains” (l.15), and ends with *e-tiq-ma*, “I climbed” (l.16). The parallel clauses meanwhile introduced by *ša* and formulated by stative²² are connected paratactically. Line 16 consists of a stative-comparative clause, which continues with a paratactic syntactical *iparras*.

The next periodic chain contains ll. 18 through 28+29. Its main clause, beginning with *KUR.si-mir-ri-a ŠU.SI KUR-i GAL-tu*, the first mountain, is interrupted, and continues only in ll. 28+29, where the other six mountains are listed; the total of seven mountains is given only in l. 29: (“mount Simirria, the big peak”, l. 18; “mounts Sinahulzi, Biruati”, l. 28; “mounts Turtani, Sinabisa, Išuru and Suja: these seven mountains I crossed with difficulty”, l. 29)²³. The attributive relative clause and the parataxis, whose formulation is dominated exclusively by stative (as in ll. 18-22), are a characteristic of the poetic syntactical expression; the sentences appear in parallelism. One should take into

¹⁷) Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 69, recognized the sense and function of this relative clause very well.

¹⁸) As the translation by Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 69, assumes.

¹⁹) Cf. Excursus, above.

²⁰) *Contra* Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 69: it is an active construct participle plural, and not a passive one as he translated. For the use of participle, cf. B. Groneberg, *Syntax, Morphologie und Stil der jungbabylonischen “hymnischen Literatur”* (FAOS 14, 1), Stuttgart 1987, pp. 40ff.

²¹) For periodic structure and its function, cf. GAG § 181 and H. Ehelolf, *Ein Wortfolgeprinzip im Assyrisch-Babylonischen* (LSS 6/3), Leipzig 1913, pp. 19ff. From the syntactical point of view, the period is only an extension of the main clause, prolonged by a relative clause and by parataxe.

²²) The active function of stative should not cause any difficulty: see GAG § 77e; W. von Soden, *Tempus und Modus in semitischen Sprachen*, BZAW 162 (1985), p. 33.

²³) For an opposite opinion, cf. Mayer, MDOG 115, pp. 69-71.

account especially the infinitive construction in l. 21 (*a-na i-tap-lu-us ni-til* IGI.2): a final, or a nominal, function of the infinitive is hardly possible: more likely, it seems to be used in conditional sense²⁴ (“and if one is looking (there) with a glimpse of the eye ...”). Line 23 inserts into the periodic chain a new part, which is characterized by the use of an *iprus*-form for the punctual past tense and is joined to the preceding paragraph²⁵ by an anacoluthon²⁶. The enclitical personal pronoun or the anonymous word *KUR-i* appear very often in this paragraph, which ends in l. 27: they have the function of a reference to the name of mount Simirria²⁷ in l. 18. A stative clause in l. 28 interrupts the main clause: its poetic expression qualifies the names of the mountains in l. 28, and not Mt. Simirria. To avoid any misunderstanding, the poet recapitulates the seven mountains mentioned before in the last line of the period: this is a way for indicating the delimitation of this period.

Section 1 continues in ll. 30-31 with no further complications²⁸. In l. 32 a causal clause is introduced, which gives reasons for Sargon's actions: an infinitive as a final clause with dependent adverb²⁹ follows immediately after³⁰. Section 1 ends with a long clause (ll. 42-50), where a series of city-rulers—who pay tribute to the Assyrian king—together with their names and origin³¹ is introduced.

Section 1 is opened by an *iprus* for punctual past tense³². The following action is described with this verbal form; whenever a new paragraph begins, the *iprus*-chain is interrupted and replaced by an *iptaras*-form (ll. 11, 31, 37), but this does not happen within a period. The stative³³ is, however, predominant in the poetic formulations which appear exclusively inside the periods (ll. 15-16, 18-21): their function is to specify the landscape (mountains).

²⁴) According to GAG §§ 114c, 150g, the infinitive construction are built only with the preposition *ina*. For the syntax of the infinitive see K. Deller, *Zur Syntax des Infinitivs im Neuassyrischen*, OrNs 31 (1962), pp. 225ff; Groneberg, *cit.*, pp. 53ff., 173.

²⁵) That is why the correct translation of this period is very difficult.

²⁶) Cf. GAG § 183.

²⁷) Participle clause in l. 25: *a-li-kut i-di-ia* should not be problematic because the relative is replaced by a participle.

²⁸) In l. 31 the locative nominal clause *ša pat-ti KUR. kar-al-li ù KUR. al-lab-ri-a* appears as an apposition to the GN, and has explicative function. For the nominal clause in general, see J. Nougayrol, *La phrase dite nominale en Akkadien*, GLE 5 (1949), p. 22; Groneberg, *cit.*, pp. 40 ff.

²⁹) For examples of this kind of infinitive construction see J. Aro, *Die akkadischen Infinitivkonstruktionen* (*Studia Orientalia* 26), Helsinki 1961, pp. 192-194.

³⁰) The *iparras* of the causal clause seems to represent durative of past tense rather than simple present tense as Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 71 suggests in his translation. For the function of this verbal form mentioned above, see GAG § 78e.

³¹) For an inverted construct state nexus with preceding *ša* initializing a genitive see Excursus; see also O.E. Ravn, *The So-called Relative Clauses in Accadian or the Accadian Particle ša*, København 1941, pp. 64ff.

³²) Cf. l. 8. In l. 16 there is a chronological indication, and the main clause is interrupted by l. 9 (attributive relative clause). For *iprus* for punctual past tense, see GAG § 79.

Section 2: ll. 51-73.

A characteristic of section 2 is the frequent use of the infinitive construction: the infinitive has nominal function³⁴ in l. 52 (*i-na tag-mer-ti lib-bi ša e-piš ar-du-ti*, “in loyalty to the vassalage”); on the other hand, it is used for the formulation of the final clause in ll. 54-57³⁵ and 61³⁶.

The causal clause in ll. 60f. (*áš-šu da-na-ni šu-tu-re ... aq-bi-šu-nu-ti-ma*) has a more complicated construction. This sentence is interrupted by two relative clauses (l. 60)³⁷ and two infinitive constructions (l. 61); the predicate appears only afterwards. *UGU ša 'ir-an-zi a-bi a-lid-di-šú ú-šaq-qi* GIŠ.GU.ZA-šú (l. 62) is probably an ellipse³⁸: here the word GIŠ.GU.ZA-šú is introduced virtually and in anticipation by *UGU-ša*; the latter is contemporaneously in construct state with the following PN: “his throne I raised over the one of Iranzu, the father who had generated him”³⁹.

Lines 64-69 revert to a periodic construction: the main clause starts in l. 64 with PNs and ends in l. 69⁴⁰ (*[me-te-e]q ger-ri-ia iš-mu-ma*, “he heard of the advance of my expedition”). As in section 1 the inserted clauses are formulated as relative-attributive ones (ll. 65, 67) and paratactically (ll. 65, 66, 67). The conjunction indicates that *ù* UN.MEŠ *a-<ši->bu-ut* URU.MEŠ-*ni šu-a-tu-nu* (l. 66) and *a-na e-mu-qi ra-ma-ni-šú-nu tak-lu-ma lq i-du-ú be-lu-tu* (l. 66) are paratactically connected⁴¹ (“and (where) the people, inhabitants of those towns, trust in their own strength and do not know lordship”). On the contrary, l. 68 forms a kind of an anacoluthon because it differs from the preceding lines syntactically and semantically.

Section 2 starts with an *iptaras*; the action is brought forth by an *iptarus*-chain, which is interrupted only at the periods where the relative clause and parataxes are inserted⁴²; like in section 1 the stative is used predominantly in the latter (l. 65). Both verbal forms have identical function and might express different types of action because the *iptaras* of

³³) For the function of the stative, see GAG § 77.

³⁴) For the semantic meaning of this combination. see AHW., p. 1300b, *s.v. tagmertu*.

³⁵) *maše mal libbi* is a characteristic sentence (AHW. p. 612a translates “Wunsch erfüllen, erreichen”), as well as *ana ašri-šu turri*, “to return to order” (l. 57; cf. AHW., p. 1334).

³⁶) In l. 58 *ušallu-ni-ma* does not form a subjunctive ending, but the enclitical personal pronoun of the 1st person sg. acc.: “they ... implored me”.

³⁷) The second relative clause is a parataxis.

³⁸) For the different structure of such constructions, see GAG § 184.

³⁹) Cf. also Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 73.

⁴⁰) This period has two interpolations in l. 65 and in l. 66.

⁴¹) R. Borger, rev. of B. Landsberger, *The series HAR-ra (Materialien zum sumerischen Lexicon, VI)*, BiOr 17 (1960), proposes the reading “Querholz sperren” for GIŠ.RI *parku* = GIŠ.talli *parku*. However, AHW., p. 293, prefers *gisru* (“Sperrbaum sperren”). There is hardly a functional semantic difference between these words.

⁴²) The main clause of this period is formulated with *iptarus*: cf. l. 69.

the introductory sentence represents an ingressive action. The use of the *iprus*-form of the D-stem of *našāqu* (*a-na la na-qar* BĀD.MEŠ-šú-nu ú-na-áš-ši-qu GİR.2-ia, l. 72) is rather peculiar, since here a factitive action is not expressed; instead of it, one would expect the construct infinitive of the Š-stem. Perhaps it has the same function as the G-stem, as is the case with some verbal roots⁴³. The large number of infinitives of verbal roots should be considered relevant, since they are usually used in formulaic expressions (ll. 56-57).

Section 3: ll. 74-78.

In section 3 there are no problems, apart from ll. 76-77. Here two relative clauses⁴⁴ are subordinated to a main clause. The relative is separated from its predicate by two final clauses expressed by infinitives, which depend not on the relative clause but on the main clause, and this causes some problems for the translation of this passage.

Section 4: ll. 79-90.

The first period consists of ll. 80-81. In the same way as before, a number of paratactical attributive clauses⁴⁵ is subordinated to the main clause; the main clause is interrupted by these clauses twice, and the result is a fragmentary sentence: ¹*me-ta-at-ti* KUR.zi-kir-ta-a-a ... (relative clause + parataxis) *a-na* ¹*ur-sa-a* ... KUR.ur-ar-ta-a-a ... (relative clause + parataxis) *it-ta-kil-ma*, “Metatti of Zikirtu ... trusted in ... Rusa of Urartu”.

The nominative independent personal pronoun in l. 84 cannot belong to the immediately following permansive clause⁴⁶; neither it cannot appear in a non-functional way: it seems rather that in *ù šu-ú* URU.pa-ar-da URU.LUGAL-ti-šú pa-nu-uš-šu la i-ger-ma bu-še-e É.GAL-šú e-zib-ma ú-ši ka-ma-ti-iš, “and he —Parda, his royal city, did not have value for him any more— left the possessions of his palace and went out”, a parenthesis starting just after the mentioned personal pronoun is included. This means that *šu-ú* is subject of the interrupted verbal clause and is taken up again in the parenthesis by the enclitical personal pronoun. The verbal clause in ll. 87-89 is built with a number of direct objects.

⁴³) Cf. GAG § 88d.

⁴⁴) The first clause is constructed with stative; the second clause is constructed nominally. *raksatu* might have the function of a verbal adjective.

⁴⁵) But here the *iprus*-form is used.

⁴⁶) For the permansive clause in Akkadian see F. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, Berlin 1889 (with *iparras* and stative); W.G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, Oxford 1960, pp. 305, 309 (with stative); M.B. Rowton, *The Use of Permansive in Classic Babylonian*, JNES 21 (1962), pp. 233 ff.

At the beginning of this section (l. 79) three *iptaras* appear, which have a syntactically similar paratactic behaviour⁴⁷. Then, the action is taken over by the same verbal form of the main clause of this period (ll. 80 f.), and it represents a virtual substantiation of Sargon's preceding action, but only as regards content, not formally. The *iprus* of l. 80 expresses anteriority in the past; in l. 81 *i-du-ú* rather indicates the durative of present tense, and the participle *e-tir* in the relative clause shows a modal nuance⁴⁸. The *iprus*-form continues the action until the end of section. There is a change of subject in l. 86, which is marked by the lack of enclitic *-ma*; this verbal form expresses exclusively punctual past tense.

Section 5: ll. 91-166.

The first period starts immediately after the introductory clause; if I am right, it lasts from l. 92 to l. 103, and shows the same structure as the preceding ones do, *i.e.* a main clause with four interpolations: *el-la-mu-u'-a* ¹*ur-sa-a* KUR.ur-ar-*ta-a-a* (l. 92), followed by interpolation 1; LÚ.*šad-du-u'-a* NUMUN *né-er-ti* (l. 93), followed by interpolation 2; *i-na* KUR.ú-a-uš KUR-i GAL-i (l. 96), followed by interpolation 3; KUR-ú *zaq-ru* (l. 98), followed by interpolation 4; *um-ma-an-šu ma-a'-du a-di re-še-e-šú id-kam-ma* is the last part of the main clause.

Interpolation 1 consists of an appositional participle clause; interpolation 2 differs from interpolation 1 in the formulation of the sentence (relative clause) and in the use of the verbal form: in l. 95 the temporal clause introduced by EGIR is not subordinated syntactically to the preceding relative clause (l. 94), but to the main clause⁴⁹. Its *iprus* expresses anteriority in the past tense⁵⁰. Two infinitives introduced by *ša* and replacing the relative clause depend on this sentence⁵¹. In interpolation 3, stative (l. 96; this stative has active sense) and *iprus* (ll. 97-98) alternate; the alternation of the verbal form is accompanied by a change of subjects. A number of relative clauses in ll. 97f. is connected paratactically; the last relative clause (l. 98) is followed by an infinitive as a final clause. The stative⁵² is predominant in the subordinate clauses⁵³.

⁴⁷) They represent actions of the past: see GAG § 80.

⁴⁸) For construct state nexus and preceding *ša* see Excursus, above.

⁴⁹) Cf., on the contrary, the translation of Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 77.

⁵⁰) For the temporal clause see GAG § 174f and M. Dietrich, *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik des Neubabylonischen. I: Die neubabylonischen Subjunktionen* (AOAT 1), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969, pp. 72-86.

⁵¹) For the use of *ša* + infinitive + object in the sense of a relative clause, see GAG § 150b, and Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*, p. 60. Exemplars are listed there.

⁵²) But the stative in ll. 100-101 is active, and is used for the durative of present tense. For the action of the Gt-stem cf. A.L Oppenheim, *Die mittels t-Infix gebildeten Aktionsarten des Altbabylonischen*, WZKM 42 (1935), pp. 1ff.

⁵³) But in l. 102 occurs *iptaras*.

The paratactical clause in l. 100 (interpolation 4) bears some difficulties. In this sentence *ša* is placed after *i-na um-še* GAL.MEŠ ù *dan-na-at* EN.TE.NA⁵⁴. This particle can hardly be assumed to cause the genitive⁵⁵ at this point⁵⁶; it seems much more probable that it introduces a new relative clause in an already existing one⁵⁷. An interrupted paratactical clause follows in l. 101: *šal-gu ur-ru ù mu-šu še-ru-uš-šú kit-mu-ru-ma ...*, “on which the snow accumulates in a long summer and a strong winter (relative clause) day and night, continuously”⁵⁸. The change of subject (here: “people travelling by”) and the use of *iparras* make us perceive that l. 102 forms a short section depending virtually on *ša* in l. 99. One would expect the action of *iparras* + *-ma* being continued by a syntactically paratactic verbal form. The poet, however, formulated the second sentence in a completely different way, as he used Dt-*iparras* (i.e., passive) and UZU.MEŠ-šú as subject⁵⁹. The isolated word *pu-hur* (l. 103) might be not a stative⁶⁰, but a subject in a construct state form derived from *pahāru* (*puhru*); this subject forms⁶¹ a construct state nexus together with LÚ.*mun-dah-ši-šu*, “the totality of his fighters”⁶².

Lines 105-109 are partially destroyed; this prevents us from any syntactical observation⁶³. In l. 110, after the verbal clause, one would expect a cause justifying the “wishes of his heart”; alternatively, the following verbal clause might represent a kind of cause⁶⁴ as regards content⁶⁵. The following sentence, to which an infinitive construction is connected (*ša i-aq-ru-ub-ti ú šu-te-lu-up a-na-an-ti iš-pu-ra* LÚ.A-šip-ri, “He sent a messenger for the attack and the involvement in the battle”⁶⁶) causes some problems: the infinitive does not have a final sense⁶⁷, but is used as a subject of an inverted

⁵⁴) According to B. Landsberger, *Jahreszeiten im Sumerisch-Akkadischen*, JNES 8 (1949), p. 287, this means the greatest heat and the strongest freeze.

⁵⁵) The text is partially destroyed where stative was probably placed.

⁵⁶) As translated by Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 77.

⁵⁷) The relative might refer to the seasons.

⁵⁸) This picture has no comparison. The observation of the natural phenomenon is described by a kind of parallelism: the stars shine both in the evening and in the morning, and the snow accumulates during the long summer and the strong winter: this means eternal snow.

⁵⁹) The subject is partially identical to *zu-mu-ur-šú*, the direct object of the preceding clause.

⁶⁰) As translated by Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 79.

⁶¹) This thesis is strengthened by the fact that the same semantic function of the verb *šakānu* occurs in KAH 2, 66, 25; 71, 32f.

⁶²) Cf. AHW., p. 877, s.v. *puhru* C.1.b.

⁶³) Lines 106-110 could be constructed periodically: “Metatti, the Zikirtian, ... his heart wished to have a fight against me in the battle(field)”. A new asyndetic sentence could also begin in l. 110.

⁶⁴) Concerning *la ta-a-ar* it might be a subordinate, here in *status absolutus* like *la šanan*; cf. GAG § 62i.

⁶⁵) “To fight together with me in a battle was the wish of his heart (because) he had planned mercilessly to drive back the troops of Illil of the city of Aššur” (cf. ll. 80 f.).

⁶⁶) Cf. Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*, p. 52. Albright, JAOS 36 (1916), p. 228, understands *šu-te-lu-up a-na-an-ti* as “joining battle”, whereas Thureau-Dangin, TCL 3, p. 21, translates “multiplication des préparatifs guerriers”.

⁶⁷) Cf. AHW., p. 200, and Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 79.

construct state nexus⁶⁸.

Lines 112-114 are again constructed in periods; their main clause begins with a subject enlarged by apposition in l. 112. One should pay attention to *mu-pi-iq*^d*ša-maš* (l. 112): this participle clause interrupts the sequence of nominal appositions which continues in l. 113, probably as an apposition to the PN; a real interpolation of a main clause may be found in l. 113. Line 114 is built like l. 112⁶⁹: two verbal clauses (l. 115) are subordinated to the apposition, which is enlarged by a construct state nexus. The sequence of nominal and verbal appositions is basically represented only by predicates of the PN (Sargon)⁷⁰.

In l. 116 the indirect object (*a-na*^d*aš-šur*) of the main clause appears to be formulated⁷¹ with the same principle of enlargement as before⁷². Special attention should be paid to l. 118, where the relative clause appears together with a dependent participle construction: *ša i-na giš-par-ri-šú e-piš le-mut-ti la ip-par-šid-du-ma la pa-lih ma-mit-šu in-na-sa-hu šur-su-su*. To avoid complications within the relative clause, the first participle may be regarded as the subject construct state to *le-mut-ti*, which at the same time is the subject of the sentence: “from his trap the evildoer cannot escape”; the implicit subject refers to the god Aššur, and the N-stem *iparras* has a modal nuance. On the other hand, the second part shows an inversion, since *šur-su-su* is a postponed *nomen regens* of the participle (*la pa-lih ma-mit-šu*). Together they form the passive subject of the sentence and of the N-stem: “... and the root of him who is not afraid of his oath is pulled out”. Line 119 still deals with the “contemptuous” in a participle construction: he occurs in the following stative clause as an unmentioned subject⁷³. By the pun *aš-ga-gi ag-gi-iš* the poet underscores the action of Aššur (l. 120)⁷⁴.

Only at this point (ll. 121-122) the “god-fearing one” is brought forth with strong rhetorical accent. This section is introduced by an adversative verbal clause; its structure is almost antithetic to the preceding section⁷⁵. The speech about the person who fears the gods does not depend anonymously on the divine predicate; it represents an

⁶⁸) So one can understand why the infinitive construction is linked with a conjunction to the preceding subject.

⁶⁹) From the syntactical point of view l. 114 consists of appositional participle clause, relative nominal clause, verbal clause (with *iparras*) and final clause.

⁷⁰) For such predications enlarged by nominal and verbal apposition, see Ehelolf, *Wortfolgeprinzip*, pp. 20 f.

⁷¹) Similar formulations of such predicates of the god Aššur occur in the building inscriptions of Esarhaddon: cf. R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien* (AfO Beiheft 9), Graz 1956, § 7. For their formal structure cf. W. Mayer, *Untersuchungen zur Formensprache der babylonischen “Gebetsbeschwörungen”* (Studia Pohl Series Maior 5), Roma 1976, pp. 41ff.

⁷²) The meaning of *iparras* in this line might be a resultive one, at least the first one; the second one is not so sure.

⁷³) The stative, however, is used in active sense here.

⁷⁴) The relative clauses of l. 120 are constructed with *iparras* for durative present tense.

⁷⁵) Cf. ll. 119/121 and ll. 120/122: participle clause and relative clause. The activity of the god is expressed by

intended justification as regards content of Sargon's action, which is introduced in l. 123 by a causal clause: in this way, the king is silently identified as a person who fears his god. The *iprus* of the two causal clauses might represent anteriority in relation to the main clause, since they give a reason for the king's action in the main clause of the period⁷⁶.

The main clause of this period ends in l. 124 wit *qa-ti áš-ši-šu*. Its subject, Sargon, and its indirect object, the god Aššur, are accented by deictic enclitical personal pronouns. Two infinitives as final clauses depend on this sentence without difficulties. The extensions inserted six times within the main clause and the appositional relative clause complicate particularly the structure of this period. But we are not dealing with a mosaic of single unconnected parts: the passage is constructed with literary care, and it keeps its logical context in spite of its length and complexity. The king's activity is asyndetically separated from the one of his god⁷⁷, who appears as a subject in the following part. The infinitive (l. 126) inserted within the relative clause might have a conditional sense⁷⁸: *ša i-na a-ši-šu-nu iš-tu ši-it* ^dUTU-ši *a-di e-reb* ^dUTU-ši *la ma-gi-ri i-miš-šu*, "who —coming out— from dawn until sunset disregard the rebels"⁷⁹. The *iprus* in ll. 130-139⁸⁰ has a modal nuance; *ša 15 u 150 a-na,i-di-ia*, "who on the right and on the left, at my side" (l. 130) should be an object clause, since it is ruled by *la te-ram*⁸¹.

Lines 130-139 do not cause big difficulties: their verbal form (*iprus*) progressively describes Sargon's activity⁸². *i-na qé-reb tu-ša-ri* GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ-šú-nu *ú-šab-bir-ma* ... (l. 137), is a typical example of a parenthesis⁸³.

The activity of the Urartian king is mentioned only casually (l. 140). In ll. 141-142⁸⁴ Sargon becomes again subject of the action. The frequency of the change of subject in these lines⁸⁵, by contrast with the preceding lines, is functional to the dynamic structure of this section. From l. 144 the action of the Assyrian king is described progressively; the clauses are without complications apart from the nominal parenthesis at l. 145.

Lines 146-147 require further explanation. In l. 146 Sargon announces that he

iparras in both cases.

⁷⁶) This gives a reason for the pious actions of Sargon; he is allowed to raise his hands to the god, to the contrary of the evildoer.

⁷⁷) Cf. the verbal form in ll. 124 and 125.

⁷⁸) *ina* + infinitive can be used as a conditional clause without difficulties: cf. GAG § 150g. Concerning the subject of this sentence, it is the nominal-subjective suffix *-šunu* implicating the GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ-šú *ez-zu-ti*.

⁷⁹) Albright, JAOS 36, p. 229, assumes that *imiššu* "is extremely hard to explain", and reads *ilaqat*. I consider this change as not indispensable.

⁸⁰) The short period in ll. 127-129 is rather simple: any syntactical analysis is omitted.

⁸¹) The active sense and the dependence of the object clause from the stative is clearly shown by the ventive at the end.

⁸²) H. Winckler, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons*, Leipzig 1889, p. 231, translates GIŠ.GIGIR GIR.2-*ia* as "Leibstretwagen"; cf. further p. 119, l. 114.

⁸³) *šap-lu-uš-šú* probably means the "lower part" of the horse: cf. AHW., p. 1174.

⁸⁴) For the inverted construct state nexus see Excursus.

⁸⁵) The verbal form for the punctual past tense is exclusively *iprus*.

allowed survivors to escape in order to praise his god. One might consider this statement as pure piety for the praise of the deity; this, however, is not meant here. The stress on divine action has priority, as is underscored nicely in l. 147; Sargon praises him to a special degree introducing the personal intervention of his god, which implies the inactivity of the king at the scene⁸⁶.

The style of comparison in ll. 149-151⁸⁷ and the personification of “the power” and “the weapons” in ll. 153-154 are worth noting: the weapons are interposed⁸⁸ as a parenthesis⁸⁹ within the main clause.

Section 6: ll. 167-187.

Highly interesting is the fact that the relative clause (l. 168) does not follow immediately the word it refers to (URU.*uš-qa-a-a*, l. 167), but it is only used indirectly⁹⁰. In this way, a clear and differentiated formulation is obtained: it is only a simple amplification by means of appositional relative clause⁹¹. The latter formulation differs from the period and the parenthesis.

The strange term *re-eš mi-iš-ri* for the city of Ušqaia is explained in l. 298 by the corresponding antithetical expression *še-pit mi-iš-ri* referred to the city of Uaias: in this way the merismic geographic comparison of both cities is emphasized. The subject of the two *iparras* at l. 171 might be *mu-re-e mur-ni-is-qi še-eh-he-ru-ti*⁹². In l. 173 one can consider *a-di KUR.su-ú-bi na-gi-i* (l. 172) as a preposed virtual complement of the clauses. This would be a reason to believe that there is an elliptic construction⁹³. The expression LÚ.ERIM.MEŠ-šu-nu-ti refers to the people of Ušqaia (l. 170), as is suggested by the relative nominal clause *ša bir-ti ú na-gi-i*. This means that the connecting line of the story is resumed only in l. 174⁹⁴. In l. 175 there is no parataxis⁹⁵, but a main clause interrupted by a relative clause⁹⁶. *da-lil^d a-šur be-lí-ia* at l. 176 might be the real object of

⁸⁶ A similar example of this combination of words (D *qatû* + (acc.) *rēha*) occurs in the Erra-Epic, I, 146 (cf. L. Cagni, *Das Erra-Epos* [Studia Pohl 5], Roma 1970, Tablet 9). Incidentally, this expression may be found also in Hebrew: *w^a hikratî še'ar* (Js. 14, 24).

⁸⁷ The *iprus* is predominant in these clauses; the last one might have resultive meaning.

⁸⁸ For the extension of subject by nominal and verbal apposition, see above.

⁸⁹ The *iparras* of the parenthesis is durative of present tense.

⁹⁰ The relative clause constructed in this way reminds the “Afterthought-Construction” in Hebrew language.

⁹¹ The stative is predominant in the relative clause and contains ll. 168-169.

⁹² In l. 170 occurs an object clause formulated with the particle *mal*.

⁹³ Cf. GAG § 184.

⁹⁴ Probably with change of subject and *iprus*.

⁹⁵ As the translation of Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 87 assumes.

⁹⁶ The semantic function of *iqrubu* (“to arrive/to come near”) in this context is not very convincing.

ušannū-šunūtima: its main clause is extended⁹⁷ by an object clause⁹⁸. The remaining lines (177-186) describe the action of the Assyrian king without complicated formulations⁹⁹.

Section 7: ll. 188-198.

A long period occurs in ll. 189-195: URU.tar-ú-i URU.tar-ma-ki-sa É.BÀD.MEŠ-ni dan-nu-ti (ll. 189-194), BÀD.MEŠ-ni-šu-[nu dan-nu]-ti ul-[tu gabadibbišunu a-d]i tim-mìn-ni-šu-nu ak-šud (l. 195)¹⁰⁰. The first group of relative clauses¹⁰¹ (ll. 189-191) is connected paratactically¹⁰²; the second group (ll. 192-194) has the structure of an anacoluthon which is related to the first group and differs from it since it uses¹⁰³ the *iprus*-form¹⁰⁴. Sargon's action continues then asyndetically with *iprus* until the end of the section¹⁰⁵.

*Section 8: ll. 199-232*¹⁰⁶.

I think that the *tertium comparationis* of the "fruits and grapevine" in the expression GURUN ù GĚŠTIN *ki-ma zu-un-ni ú-ša-az-nin* (l. 205) is represented by the abundance of the "rain"¹⁰⁷. At l. 208, 3-me ANŠE ŠE.NUMUN.MEŠ might refer to an usual measure of

⁹⁷) But it is not clear why *akšuddu* should have a passive nuance here, as stated in AHw., p. 663 (cf. also *ibid.*, p. 460). Albright, JAOS 36, p. 231, speaks about a "stereotyped motive" in this connection. But such a characterization does not help in solving syntactical problems. One should also take notice of the doubled third radical of the verb.

⁹⁸) The semantic function of the verb *isituma* and the subject (*multahtu*) of the object clause can be explained in this way.

⁹⁹) In l. 179 two relative stative clauses appear. In l. 183 there is a comparative clause whose verbal form (*ú-ab-bi-tu*) represents the *irrealis* of past tense. In l. 184 the nominal clause *i-na mi-šir* KUR.sa-an-gi-bu-te *bi-rit* URU.uš-qa-a-a ù URU.tar-ma-ki-sa *ep-šu* forms a parenthesis. In l. 178 "the cattle" is the subject of the action (after the comparative clause).

¹⁰⁰) As there were no fortified cities mentioned in the text, beside of l. 188, one might assume that BÀD.MEŠ-šu-[nu dan-nu]-ti (l. 189) refers to the mentioned fortresses. This would mean that we should expect another inverted construct state nexus, without preceding *ša*.

¹⁰¹) Beside *iprus* in l. 191, the stative is used in the relative clause.

¹⁰²) In l. 191 the paratactical chain is interpolated by a relative clause introduced by *ša*.

¹⁰³) There is also a subject change in l. 192: UN.MEŠ *a-ši-bu-tu na-gi-i* at l. 192, Sargon at l. 194.

¹⁰⁴) *e-tep-pu-šu* in l. 192 represents durative in past tense.

¹⁰⁵) One should take into account the two comparative clauses whose subject is still Sargon.

¹⁰⁶) The gap between ll. 199-206 disturbs the syntactical and semantic interconnection, so that the text cannot be syntactically understood here. For sure, it may be stated that Rusa becomes subject only after l. 202.

¹⁰⁷) Unlike Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 89, who translates "und Obstbäume und Weinstöcke ließ er wie mit regen beregnen".

capacity¹⁰⁸ for grain¹⁰⁹.

Up to l. 212 the Urartian king leads the action¹¹⁰, which is characterized by simple formulations¹¹¹. The change of subject in ll. 213-214 does not cause any complication¹¹². In l. 215 Sargon goes back to action¹¹³. His activity reaches the end of the section without important interpolations¹¹⁴. Only in ll. 223-224 and 229-230 the main clause is completed by a relative stative clause. Some difficulties are caused by the relative clause *ša ki-i za-gin-du-re-e šer-pa šak-nu-ma* at l. 229; one would rather expect the word *šerpa* as a second genitive depending on *ki*¹¹⁵: in this way there would be no problem in this clause, since its implicit subject is A.GAR-*šu aš-mu*¹¹⁶.

*Section 9: ll. 233-268*¹¹⁷.

It is quite difficult to pinpoint which is the semantical relation between l. 247 and the preceding lines. Perhaps it would be better to explain ll. 247-248 as a complete sentence further enlarged by a relative clause.

In l. 248 the relative clause *ša a-na 1 DANNA ru-qi-iš iš-tú UGU KUR.ur-ar-ti* is not completely certain. I suspect that here might be an *iprus*-form (*ištu* from *šētū*, “to spread out, to extend”), whose subject is the expression *a-ka-am ger-ri-ia* taken up by *ša*: “which (= the cloud of dust) stretched over the distance of a double hour the land of Urartu”¹¹⁸. As for *šit-ku-n[a]t* (in the same line), it might be a stative fem. 3rd Pers. sg.,

¹⁰⁸) Thureau-Dangin, TCL 3, p. 35, understands it as an unit of square measure.

¹⁰⁹) Cf. AHw., p. 376, s.v. *imeru* 3a. Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 89, translates “300 Eselslasten”.

¹¹⁰) For the seasons (in l. 209), cf. Landsberger, JNES 8, pp. 273 ff.

¹¹¹) A relative clause can be found only in l. 209.

¹¹²) The *iprus* in l. 213 represents the anteriority in past tense. Beside of this case, such a verbal form is exclusively used in progressive past action.

¹¹³) For the causative meaning of *akšura* in l. 215, see AHw., p. 456a.

¹¹⁴) An isolated relative clause appears in l. 217. *ša ni-šir-te* might be connected attributively with the preceding word by *ša*. The relative clause in ll. 225, 228, and the object clause in l. 227, introduced by *mal*, whose *iprus* represents anteriority of past tense, also belong to this simple interpolation of section 8.

¹¹⁵) Perhaps the word *šerpa* is used adverbially: cf. GAG § 120a, g, j.

¹¹⁶) In any case I consider Mayer’s translation “das wie mit Lapislazuli und Rot eingelegt war” (MDOG 115, p. 93) correct.

¹¹⁷) It is impossible to draw a sure syntactical conclusion within the fragmentary lines 236-247. In l. 234 an infinitive construction as final clause appears; in ll. 235-238 occur only GNs which are introduced by the relative in l. 239; the syntactical connection of l. 241 is hard to explain: an anacoluthon or a parenthesis should be suspected. Lines 243-244 are in very fragmentary conditions: one can only state that in the first (and in the second) line, which is an object clause (*mal bašū*) depending on the following nominal clause *rit-pu-šu si-kil-tu*, rivers are mentioned.

¹¹⁸) *Contra* Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 93, who translates “... die auf die (Entfernung von) einer Doppelstunde (... und) über Urartu ausgebreitet”. *a-na pat gim-ri-šū* belongs to the following stative clause and does not belong to the relative clause.

with *ešitu* as its subject. It is conceivable that in l. 249 *ša* has the function of a relative particle referring to UN.MEŠ (l. 247).

The gap in l. 250 hinders any attempt to understand these sentences¹¹⁹, not even the type of clause is identifiable. From l. 251 on the meaning of the context becomes a bit clearer: the “people” of l. 247 enter the action, in l. 253 Sargon takes up the action by the two verbal clauses and leads it until the end of the section¹²⁰. Here the clauses are built similarly¹²¹ to section 8: they are short and have no interpolations¹²². The delimitation of the comparative clause in l. 266 might be the following one: *ša ki-ma a-pi ed-lu-ti hi-it-lu-pu iṣ-ṣu-ši-in*, “his large forests whose trees are clothed like a locked thicket of reed”, because the *tertium comparationis* between the “bolted thicket of reed” and the “trees” are probably the “forests”.

Section 10: ll. 269-279.

The difficult sentence *pi-i di-im-ti tu-bal-e ma-hi-re ru-uk-ku-šu* which is placed in l. 270 without any syntactical connection points to an anacoluthon: “at (their) entrances towers were built with corresponding *tubale*”. The remaining lines do not cause big problems, with the exception of two paratactically connected relative clauses¹²³ in l. 278¹²⁴; both lines form a short period. One should take into account the fact that here appears the rare taking over of a part of the clause by an apposition: URU.MEŠ-*ni šu-a-tu-nu* (l. 279) is apposition of 7 URU.MEŠ-*ni ša li-mé-ti-šu-nu* (l. 278).

Section 11: ll. 280-296.

The clause in ll. 281-286 begins with a number of GNs whose number is recapitulated as an apposition in l. 286, where the main clause interrupts contemporaneously to make room for the paratactical chain¹²⁵. Together with some new GNs it reappears in l. 287, being again interrupted by a parenthesis¹²⁶. In my opinion, the main clause takes

¹¹⁹) The addition of a D-stem participle of *alāku* by B. Landsberger, *Einige unerkant gebiebene oder verkannte Nomina des Akkadischen*, WdO 3 (1964-66), p. 75, referring to *šep imitti alikat* of CT 30, 19, II, 9 and 11 (with duplicate CT 28, 49) is not convincing because no D-stem of this verbal root is attested.

¹²⁰) The independent main clause have an *iṣrus*-form.

¹²¹) In l. 257 there is a kind of “personal description”.

¹²²) A relative clause appears in ll. 260-262.

¹²³) The relative clauses in ll. 272 and 274 (nominal clauses) bear no problem.

¹²⁴) *mašartu* (better *mašartu*) might be a substantive derived from *našāru*: cf. AHW., p. 620.

¹²⁵) The clauses are constructed with stative and define the position of the GN.

¹²⁶) The parenthesis partially contains ll. 287 and 288. Lines 289-292 can be explained as a second parenthesis, either connected with the GN by *qereb-šun* or forming a part of the first parenthesis. It is very

up the narration only in l. 293, with BÀD.MEŠ-*ni-šu-nu dun-nu-ti* 87 URU.MEŠ-*ni ša li-mé-ti-šu-nu ap-pul-ma*; otherwise, from the syntactical point of view, the GNs from ll. 281-286 and 288 would appear in an isolated position, since we are not only dealing with the description of the cities but also with the attitude of Sargon against the enemy villages¹²⁷, a fact which becomes apparent later in l. 293.

Section 12: ll. 297-305.

Section 12 is very complicated. Already in l. 298 the object of direction is enlarged by a nominal apposition; in ll. 299-302 the period is formulated in a completely different way: the main clause begins with some nominal appositions which are followed¹²⁸ immediately by a number of paratactical attributive clauses¹²⁹. The connection to the preceding lines is established by the prepositional expression *ina libbi* (l. 301); in this way the paratactic chain is continued, however, though only with the *iprus*-form¹³⁰. The main clause is resumed by an apposition¹³¹ and a deictic demonstrative pronoun¹³², and closes in l. 302¹³³.

Section 13: ll. 306-308.

We will omit section 13 because it does not show specific syntactic figures which make the contextual understanding difficult.

Section 14: ll. 309-414.

I already pointed out that section 14 has no introducing stereotyped sentence; instead, it starts immediately with a period (ll. 309-311) whose main clause is interpo-

important to take into account that these lines do not refer to the position of the state of the cities anymore, but to the fear of the warriors: cf. ll. 289-290.

¹²⁷⁾ Cf. the preceding sections.

¹²⁸⁾ Instead of *qerbuššu* (l. 300) one would rather expect *qerbušša* because the locative + enclitical personal pronoun goes back to the city of Ušqaia.

¹²⁹⁾ Such appositions are often constructed with stative serving as an attribute of a GN or PN.

¹³⁰⁾ Somewhat confusing is the appearance of the masculine singular and plural enclitical personal pronoun (l. 301). It is understandable that the first one implicates Rusa; but who is meant by the second one? Perhaps the governor?

¹³¹⁾ The apposition describes an inverted construct state nexus.

¹³²⁾ In this respect the formulation of this period differs from the others, where the component parts of the interrupted main clause are resumed by a deictic enclitical personal pronoun.

¹³³⁾ For the last lines of this section, see section 11.

lated twice¹³⁴: *i-na ta-a-a-ar-ti-ia¹ur-za-na mu-ša-šir-a-a* (l. 309) ... (interpolation 1) ... *ik-šu LÚ.šad-da-a-'u-ú* (l. 310) ... (interpolation 2) ... *a-lak mah-ri-ia ša ta-a-a-ar-ti ger-ri ú-šab-til-ma* (l. 311). This period is the contextual basis for the action of Sargon in l. 313¹³⁵.

The Mušasirian king is introduced by a syndetic verbal clause¹³⁶. The Assyrian king reenters the action in l. 314, and his action is continued asyndetically through a long clause (ll. 314-321). The main clause is enlarged by the usual apposition four times; this sentence begins in l. 314 with divine appositional predications¹³⁷ and continues with *ina qí-bi-ti ša^dAG^dAMAR.UTU* in l. 317; after that, it skips to l. 318, where the complement-part is connected to the preceding part of the clause by a conjunction: *ù i-da-at dum-qí ša le-qe-e kiš-šu-ti*; then it is resumed in l. 319 by *i-na an-ni šu-qu-re ša^dUTU qu-ra-di*; the whole l. 321 belongs to it. The sentence ends in l. 321 with *aš-bit-ma*.

The first interpolation (ll. 315-316) refers exclusively to the god Aššur. It contains some infinitive clauses¹³⁸ whose infinitive¹³⁹ has a final sense. Line 316 (*it-ti i-šit-ti-šu-nu kit-mur-ti a-na šu-ru-ub É.HUR.SAG.GAL.KUR.KUR.RA iš-ru-ku-uš^dEN.LÍL.LA DINGIR.MEŠ^dAMAR.UTU*) causes considerable difficulties. A syndetic resp. asyndetic clause¹⁴⁰ is hardly conceivable; this infinitive rather seems to have the same function as the preceding ones: the subject of the sentence might be *^dEN.LÍL.LA DINGIR.MEŠ^dAMAR.UTU*. The translation of ll. 315-316 would thus be "To whom, since far-off times, Marduk, the highest of the gods, gave as a present the gods of the land and of the mountains and of the four regions of the world, so that they could pay respect to him again and again; so that he lets them enter the Ehursaggalkurkurra with their accumulated treasures". The relation of the enclitical personal pronoun pl. *-šunu* remains controversial. The second and third interpolation¹⁴¹ do not cause any difficulty. The fourth interpolation (*ša*

¹³⁴) The first interpolation is constructed with a participle clause (l. 309), the second one with *iprus* (l. 310).

¹³⁵) In opposition to Mayer, MDOG 115, pp. 99, 101, who suggests anteriority, the *iprus* of the main clause might express punctual past tense, because the action of Urzanâ (interruption of the campaign) is not situated in the anteriority, but in the past crime of l. 309, which is the reason for the Assyrian king to stop his march. The evil deeds of the Mušasirian are expressed finely, in a progressive construction; the verbal form (*iprus*) is used for anteriority (l. 305) and past (l. 312). Such a progressive construction expressed by a verbal form is, incidentally, also to be found in Hebrew poetry (see G.W. Vera Chamaza, *Hizkijahu Rey de Judá* [*Institución San Jerónimo*, 20], Valencia 1988, p. 214). Also the *iprus* in l. 311 (whose clause is connected syndetically) should have the same syntactically ordered function as in the following lines: this is indicated by the encliticon *-ma*, and by the fact that the refusal of the contribution cannot have taken place before the arrival of Sargon.

¹³⁶) With coordinate verbal form.

¹³⁷) For the enlarged divine predications, cf. section 5.

¹³⁸) With the exception of the last sentence, which is constructed with *iprus* + enclitical personal pronoun.

¹³⁹) It is hardly possible that the infinitives of l. 315 express past action: they might rather represent durative of present tense because the gods pay respect to him (Aššur) again and again.

¹⁴⁰) As suggested by the translation of Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 101.

¹⁴¹) The third interpolation represents an anacoluthon clause; it has no syntactical and semantic connection to the context.

UZU.MEŠ ... (object clause) ... *ú-ša-áš-ti-ra a-mu-ti*, l. 319¹⁴²) is rather complicated because an object clause (*ša a-lak i-di-ia*) is interpolated; the translation is “who (= Šamaš) let write down for me reliable results of extispicy, (meaning) that he was advancing at my side”.

The action of Sargon continues by the same syntactical function of verbal form up to l. 320, where a new period starts, which reaches l. 329. The interpolation (l. 325-329) of the latter period is not without problems: from the relative clause *ša <la> ni-ba id-ku-ma* the implicit subject might go back to *sim-mil-at* KUR.MEŠ-*e pa-áš-qa-te* (in the same l. 235): “difficult mountain heights rising without number”¹⁴³. This introductory relative clause is followed by a paratactical chain¹⁴⁴. The infinitive construction in l. 327 (*a-na sa-naq né-re-bi-šu-nu*) forms a conditional clause here (as in l. 21): “and if one reaches their entrance, (they) are full of fear (*ma-lu-ú pul-ha-a-te*)”. In l. 328 the mountains mentioned before (in l. 324) are referred to by relative pronouns¹⁴⁵. The last sentence depends virtually on this relative. The structure of the main clause is formed as follows: the mountains of l. 324 + *hur-ša-a-ni ša-qu-ti sim-mil-at* KUR.MEŠ-*e pa-áš-qa-te* of l. 325 ... (interpolation 1: ll. 325-328) ... + *GIŠ.gup-ni-šu-nu* GAL.MEŠ *ú-kap-pi-ir-ma* of l. 329¹⁴⁶.

“The people of Urartu and their prince” (l. 239) appear in ll. 334-342¹⁴⁷; their cultic activity is the object of the above mentioned lines¹⁴⁸. In l. 344 the lament of the elders is expressed by a merismic *pars pro toto*, and in l. 346¹⁴⁹ Sargon gives a reason for his action using three causal clauses¹⁵⁰ in ll. 347 ff.¹⁵¹

The section continues with two long syndetic verbal clauses (ll. 352-367 and 368-405) to which a series of direct objects is appended¹⁵². The looting of the palace is

¹⁴²) For the construction, see Excursus.

¹⁴³) For the meaning of the verb *idkuma* cf. AHW. p. 166.

¹⁴⁴) Mostly formulated with statives. An exception to this is the *iparras* in l. 326. One should take notice of the use of *iprus* in l. 325 for an ingressive action of present tense.

¹⁴⁵) One can exclude that they are “so daß-Sätze” as Mayer, MDOG 115, p. 101, translated.

¹⁴⁶) The characteristic of these clauses is the simple formulation. Exceptions are l. 330, the participle clause in l. 332 and the final clause in l. 333.

¹⁴⁷) Ll. 334-339 are partially in fragmentary condition: a structural analysis is hard to elaborate.

¹⁴⁸) Cf. Oppenheim, JNES 19 (1960), pp. 140ff.

¹⁴⁹) Besides the alternating subject change there is no exceptional syntactical phenomenon.

¹⁵⁰) The *iprus* of the causal clauses expresses anteriority of past tense.

¹⁵¹) The particle *ša* (l. 347) might have a coordinating “conditional function”.

¹⁵²) The direct object is often enlarged by an explicative relative clause: cf. ll. 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 364. In l. 368 occurs an object clause, in l. 370 two relative clauses with Gt-stem-*iprus* (of *e'ēlu* und *helú*). The second relative clause in l. 371 (5 GUN 12 MA.NA *sa-a-mu ru-uš-šu-ú ti-iš-bu-tu* KL.LÁ) is somewhat difficult: the word *ru-uš-šu-ú* should be the adjective of the preceding word, otherwise the syntactic relation of these words makes no sense: “red gold”; cf. AHW., p. 1020, 7b. As for *ti-iš-bu-tu*, it is a Gt-stem-stative with metathesis of *šabātu* (cf. GAG §§ 36, 96e and AHW., p. 1069); the sense of the sentence may be understood “... which contain 5 talents, 12 mines of red gold in weight”. Other explicative relative clauses may be found in l. 372, where *šapku* can hardly have the function of an absolutely attributive adjective because of its

described in the same way (ll. 406-409¹⁵³). In l. 411 Rusa acts as the subject; here the *iprus + mā*¹⁵⁴ appears as the sign for the introducing temporal clause¹⁵⁵. In l. 414 Sargon becomes subject of the action and continues until the end of the section¹⁵⁶.

Section 15: ll. 415-425.

As I mentioned at the beginning, section 15 represents a recapitulation of the whole report. It starts with a number of enlarged prepositional objects which contain ll. 415-418 and which are interrupted in ll. 416 by a relative clause, 417 by a participle clause and 418 by a parenthesis. In this section the activity of Sargon is concisely summarized by contrasting asyndetic and syndetic clauses whose subject is always the king¹⁵⁷.

Final section: ll. 426-430.

The report on the loss of warriors is brought to our cognizance by a simple stative clause in l. 425. The number is not truthful, but is fictitious and schematic¹⁵⁸. The handing over of the report to the god Aššur is solemnly introduced by an *iptaras* of coincidental value¹⁵⁹. This is followed by the mention of the author whose PN is adorned by appositional nominal predicates¹⁶⁰. The whole report ends with a chronological information (l. 430), which is also formulated through a stative.

distance from the possibly accompanying word (*sageru*). Rather, it seems that it was used as a stative. Further relative clauses: in ll. 373, 374 (participle clause), 375 (participle-relative clause), 376, 377 (actively used stative), 378, 379, 380, 381, 384 (the second stative with active sense), 385 (the construct infinitive should have a nominal function), 386, 387 (probably with a relative nominal clause in between), 389, 390, 396, 397, 398 (with a depending final clause), 399, 401 (twice with *iprus* for anteriority of past tense), 402 (*Šu.2 15-šú ka-ri-bat* might form an inverted construct state nexus with participle), 404 (where the relative clause is enlarged by an interpolated quote; for the direct speech introduced by the particle *-mā* cf. B. Kienast, *Satzeinleitendes mā im älteren Akkadischen*, ZA 20 [1961], pp. 90 ff.), 405.

¹⁵³) In ll. 407 and 408 this sentence is enlarged by relative clauses. Here an *iprus* represents anteriority (not punctual past tense) because the action of looting precedes the carrying and transporting.

¹⁵⁴) The temporal clause constructed in this way might be the reason for the verb being in the first position.

¹⁵⁵) The semantic meaning of the verb *izziz-ma* is not clear. A meaning "to stop" is not sure: cf. J. Lewy, *Old Assyrian izēzum and its Implications*, OrNS 28 (1959), pp. 351ff.

¹⁵⁶) The sentence in l. 414 (GN + *a-na paṭ gim-ri-šú si-pit-tu ú-šá-aš-rih-ma*) finds its correspondent in Hebrew *ki hiqīpāh ha-z 'aqah 'at gbu-l MW'B* (Js. 15, 8). For an example in Akkadian language cf. Borger, *Ash.*, § 27, 57. The reading of the verbal root *SLH III.1* ("fluten lassen") suggested by C. Bezold, *Babylonisch-assyrisches Glossar*, Heidelberg 1926, p. 213b, can be deleted.

¹⁵⁷) It is very interesting to state that the *iprus*-form has a summarizing function, as it is the case in Hebrew.

¹⁵⁸) Cf. Borger, *Ash.*, § 68, IV, 25.

¹⁵⁹) For this function of *iptaras* see GAG § 80c, and Mayer, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 183ff, with examples.

¹⁶⁰) For the term *lišān rēšēti*, see B. Landsberger, *Das gute Wort*, MAOG 4 (1928/9), p. 318, and T. Bauer, *Ein Erstbericht Asarhaddons*, ZA 40 (1931), p. 250 fn. 1.

Synthesis

The report shows a quite complicated structure, in respect both to syntax and to content. This is caused by the various constructions starting from simple asyndetic clauses to long difficult periods, especially when the poet lets his poetic vein come to fore. The main clause of such periods is often enlarged by relative clauses, parataxes, parentheses, anacoluthons or nominal appositions. This causes difficulties especially in the delimitation of the periods. Such periods are characterized by the use of all kinds of stylistic devices in form and content, like parallelisms¹⁶¹, personifications, hyperboles or hyperbaton. Infinitive and participle constructions appear often too; their use goes from a nominal to a verbal function.

As for the nominal clause, it is not predominant, as for example the verbal clause or the stative construction. Its function is mostly explicative, especially in the form of an appositional relative clause. An exception is the introductory section, where it is built asyndetically as a *parallelismus membrorum*.

The verbal forms appear with various functions: the *iprus* for example is not only used for simple punctual past tense, in which it normally has a progressive nuance; it also represents modal function or anteriority in the past tense. The less frequently used *iptaras-form* has always an ingressive function from the point of view of the type of actions. The chain of actions, as concerns the *iprus*, is very often interrupted by change of subject, parenthetical elements or periods. All these give a dynamic structure to the text and prevent it from being monotonous.

Semantic synonymy characterizes the text. The personification appears as a rule as nominal apposition: this is a characteristic of the text. Similarly, the predicatives of gods and men are used literally. The predominant use of adjectives and adverbs is also to be emphasized.

The poet describes the action of section 5 and 14 with special care and defines the geographical informations. These sections are the longest and have a particularly complicated structure. Such phenomena might be explained by the notion that the subjection of Urartu and Muşasir and the defeat of their kings Rusa¹⁶² and Urzanâ, who were the most important opponents of Sargon besides Metatti, are underscored in particular.

Without overevaluation, one can conclusively state that the report on the eighth campaign of Sargon is a literary masterpiece of Neo-Assyrian cuneiform literature.

¹⁶¹) Cf. ll. 1-51, 57, 77, 92, 93, 98, 117, 131, 150, 151, 189, 190, 193, 299, etc. Because of that C.F. Lehmann-Haupt, *Musasir und der achte Feldzug Sargons II. (714 v. Chr.)*, MVAG 21 (1917), p. 140, thinks that the report is written in parallelistic language and by using the poetic form of the *parallelismus membrorum*. Cf. further J. Renger, *Neuassyrische Königsinschriften als Genre der Keilschriftliteratur – Zum Stil und zur Kompositionstechnik der Inschriften Sargons II. von Assyrien*, BBVO 6 (1986), pp. 124ff.

¹⁶²) The report reads always “Ursa”. This writing is a parallel form with prosthetic *u*-vowel: see M. Streck, *Das Gebiet der heutigen Landschaft Armenien, Kurdistan und West-Persien nach den babylonisch-assyrischen Keilschriften*, ZA 14 (1899), p. 124.