

Digest of Discussions Concerning the Meaning and Function
of the Akkadian Verbal Forms with t-Infix

The present paper contains digests of all articles, passages (in books), etc. which deal with the problem of the t-form. In writing these digests special attention has been given to present clearly and succinctly the similarities and differences in the views, theories, suggestions, dicta, etc. put forth by the authors.

The arrangement is chronological, according to the dates indicated on the title pages of the books or periodicals.

B. LANDSBERGER in Islamica II (1926) p. 361 and note 2

The punctualis (i-ksud) is used to denote the beginning and the termination of a continued action; it is therefore to be termed respectively ingressive or terminative (with the verba movendi; ventive, characterized by the suffix -am referring to a movement towards the speaking person).

Subjective differences on the tense-level are not expressed in the dura-
tive (irappud) and have not been so originally with regard to the punctualis. Here,, three phases were secondarily differentiated by means of the introduction of a punctual present which is formed by means of the iterative-infix "t" (iktasad).

This iterative is stressed ittalak (like ikšud) "he now went away," while the not-punctual present is stressed ittállak (like ikáššad) "he goes, went (always)."

G. BERGSTRAESSER: Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen, 1928, p. 23

(with B. Landsberger as advisor on Akkadian)

The difference in meaning existing between the preterit iprus and the present iparas is basically one of aspect; the latter is fientic-durative, the former punctual.

The use of these forms on the tense-level is again objective inasmuch as they are used with regard to the fact whether the mentioned action is earlier or later in time. For that purpose the above-mentioned dichotomy has been enlarged by the introduction of the t-form: iptaras.

The punctual narration uses íprus to denote an earlier and íptaras to refer to a later stage.

Conditional sentence may use (in the first section, "Vordersatz") íprus or íptaras, or--if the event takes place in two phases--íprus followed by íptaras, the main clause (second section, "Nachsatz") always contains ipárras. Each of these sections may contain more than one verb in the same form.

The subjective indication of time is used only secondarily and with restrictions: íprus refers to the past, íptaras to the (punctual) present, and ipárras to the future (or durative present). This use of the t-form is characteristic for Akkadian only.

S. N. KRAMER: The Verb in the Kirkuk Tablets, AASOR XI (1931) (1929-31) pp. 63-119 on pp. 77-78 (cf. also p. 82)

Kramer notes that none of the t-forms in the Kirkuk tablets show either reflexive or passive meaning which holds true for all the conjugations, not only for I/2 where Delitzsch and Ungnad have already conceded this difficulty.

He also notes that such verbs as epěšu, nadānu, and liqū appear only with t-infixes, with other verbs t-less forms are abnormally frequent. Kramer offers the following explanation:

At an early time in the history of Akkadian, the t-element began to lose its reflexive significance so that for the preterit iksud and iktasud were used interchangeably, exactly as ikašad beside iktasad for the present. Because the preterit iksud lacked bulk (compared with the present ikašad) the pertinent t-form iktasud became more and more frequent. Through analogy (with ikašad) iktasud changed into iktasad.

L. OPPENHEIM: Die mittels T-Infixes gebildeten Aktionsarten des Altbabylonischen,

WZKM XLII (1935) pp. 1-30

Thesis (presented 1933)

T-infix belongs to a set of pre- and infixed deictic elements used to express "Aktionsarten" (aspects) in Akkadian as well as in other Semitic languages.

The function of the t-infix to be studied on the basis of the Old Babylonian evidence.

History of the problem (pp. 2-4). Schrader (ZDMG 26, 276) and Oppert (JA Ser. V, 15 (1860), 340) already connected these forms with the corresponding features of the other Semitic languages attributing to the Akkadian t-form reflexive, medial and/or passive meanings. Delitzsch and Ungnad concede, however, that little difference can be observed between forms with and without t-infix.

Landsberger (Islamica II, cf. also Bergstraesser and Eilers, AO 31/3-4) brings new moments into the discussion (note on p. 361: t in Nord-African Hamitic languages as iterative element). Against Landsberger's explanation of the use of verbs with t-infix to express a consecutio temporum in a narration, Oppenheim argues that the function of the particle -ma yields the same effect.

Mention is also made of Kramer's article in AASOR XI "The Verb in the Kerkuk-Texts." His conclusions are not considered acceptable because these texts use verbs with and without t-infixes promiscuously.

The t-form in Akkadian (pp. 4-5) has clearly different functions than the corresponding infixes in the other Semitic languages although the existence of functional connections cannot be doubted. The role of the t-infix in the Hamitic languages seems to offer the missing link between Akkadian and the other Semitic languages. The infix "t" is used to form habitatives, intensives, and reflexives, as well as duratives in various Hamitic dialects. This is taken as explaining how the very same formans can be used in Akkadian for the expression of perfective-intensive nuances, and, in the other Semitic languages, passive-medial-

reflexive nuances. Finally, Oppenheim expresses the opinion that an investigation of the "tan-" formation should have been included in the present study.

The basis of the entire investigation is to be formed by the Old Babylonian letters (pp. 5-6) which alone in the text-material of that period offer the opportunity to study verbal forms in varied contexts.

Before the evidence derived from these letters can be studied, a well defined group of t-forms have to be set aside (pp. 6-12). These are the t-forms of the verbs *ṭarādu*, *alāku*, *šapāru*, *šûbulu* and *šûrû* appearing in a specific context which Oppenheim calls "Einführungsformel." It is characterized by the use of *anumma* and *inanna* (in corresponding Neo Babylonian letters: *âmur*, *enna âmur*), the mentioning of the name of the person which is being sent, etc.

Then follows a series of passages taken from Old Babylonian (with occasional references to Neo Babylonian) letters to illustrate the use of the "Einführungsformel" used with *ṭarādu* for persons, with *šûbulu* for objects, etc. This section is clearly too long and out of proportion with regard to the next.

The following discussion (pp. 12-16) points out (with examples) the appearance of groups of verbs with t-infixes in certain letters, a fact which Oppenheim connects with the "Gefühlsbetontheit" of the contexts. Oppenheim shows, however, that there are letters written obviously under similar emotional stress where t-forms are conspicuously absent.

This observation is interpreted as demonstrating the subjective nature of the intensity of feeling expressed by means of the t-infixes. This subjectivity alone explains--so Oppenheim asserts--why it is impossible to use objective categories for the explanation of all occurrences of t-forms. The subjective intensification of the t-infix is then contrasted with the objective intensification expressed by the so-called Pi'el.

Oppenheim then (p. 15 note 1) refers to the few Old Babylonian instances in which two t-infixes appear in one word quoting some instances (one from the CH

§ 146). No explanation is attempted, but reference is made to a similar phenomenon in the language of the Harper letters (noted already by Klauber in AJSL 30, 233).

Then follows (pp. 15-18) a series of examples showing the use of t-forms in connection with certain words, phrases, and formulae which demonstrate what is termed the "Gefühlsbetontheit" of the context.

Finally (p. 18 note 1) reference is made to the fact that Akkadian t-forms are often used to render Sumerian verbal forms with reduplications (cf. Poebel, GSG § 443a).

Somewhat abruptly, Oppenheim then draws attention to the fact (pp. 18-19) that many of the quoted references demonstrate a perfectivating (beside the intensifying) function of the t-infix. Again a reference to parallel phenomena in Hamitic languages is given as an explanation of the situation in Akkadian (Feichtner, "Die T-Praefix- und T-Suffixverben im Aegyptischen" WZKM 39, 313 ff.).

The references to demonstrate the perfectivating function of the t-infix on pp. 19-21 are organized according to syntactic principles (end of quoted letters or reports, before such reports, end of sections of letters, etc.). Oppenheim observes (p. 20 note 1) that negated verba do not as a rule have t-infixes, which he explains by assuming that the stress tends to shift towards negation-particle.

In secondary clauses (pp. 21-22) t-forms appear more rarely and with a characteristic change: from a perfectivating formans, the t-infix turns into a "perfektisch" (against "perfektive"), the meaning changes from the aspect level to the tense level. The examples given are badly chosen because Oppenheim avoided those where such a change occurs after temporal subordinations (such as: kima, istu (ūm), ūm, inuma, etc.) (cf. p. 21 note 1).

Oppenheim then discusses the relative frequencies of occurrences of the t-infix in non-finite verbal forms (pp. 22-24). He observes that I/2 participia are restricted to historical texts and to the poetic sections of the code (where they

seem often to correspond to reduplicated Sumerian forms). As to the imperative, he observes that I/2 imperativa seem to be restricted to verbs with one weak consonant (one isolated II/2 imperative of burru, p. 23) and that III/2 imperativa are by far the most frequent.

In this connection Oppenheim points out that an objective change of meaning can be observed when the t-infix is inserted in "weak verbs"; he quotes elū and le'ū as well as šutawū. He furthermore draws attention to the fact that secondary verbs originate from such forms (with a reference to parallel developments in Arabic) to wit: tabālu, tamū, tarū without discussing the nature of the semantic change. The possibility that verba mediae and tertiae t have developed for similar reasons (nālu, natālu, liqū, laqātu, etc.) is also mentioned.

Finally--at the end of this section--the rarity of genuine passive-reflexive t-forms in Akkadian is briefly discussed (p. 24). Sumerian influence is made responsible for that, and several clearly passive and reflexive t-forms are quoted.

The next section (pp. 25-26) deals with the relationship existing between t- and tan-infixes. The lack of a differentiation between present and preterit forms in Qal and Nif'al is explained by the perfectivizing nature of the t-infix which does not permit a form for the "fiens" to develop beside that for the "factum."

The formation tan is explained as containing the durative element: "n" which, in the present-forms of the Qal and Nif'al, is assimilated to the second radical (ikāssad, ikkāssad) together with the intensifying "t". T-intensification plus N-durification yields "habitudō." Oppenheim therefore differentiates within the t-forms two sets: one with t-infix and one with t plus assimilated n attested in imperative kitsud - kitāssud, inf. kitsudu - kitāssudu, permansive kitsud - kitāssud. The same (assimilated) n-infix appears in Nif'al infinitive nakāssudu as against the normal naksudu.

The relationship between the finite forms with tan infix and the non-finite forms with t plus assimilated n is not clarified.

The rarity of tan-formations in Pi'el and Shaf'el is stressed.

Section V (pp. 26-29) attempts to offer a solution for the problem with which we are faced in the CH. Oppenheim proposed in WZKM XL (1933) pp. 181 ff. the solution of a division of the code into two sources (with the use of t-forms as the main criterium). On the basis of insufficient evidence (VAB V and VI) an attempt is then made to link the two usages to geographical complexes, the t-form as preferred means of expression in the North, contrasted with the South where such forms are said to be less frequently used.

A final section (pp. 29-30) offers a restatement of the results of the entire investigation. 1) The t-infix of Akkadian is only formally (as to its form) related to the same infix used in the verbal setup of other Semitic languages but shows formal and functional relations to the corresponding phenomenon in the Hamitic languages.

2) Its basic effect on the verb is to characterize the action as perfectivated and endowed with a specific intensity.

3) Under the influence of temporal subjunctions, the perfectivating force of the t-infix shifted from the aspect-sphere into the tense-sphere and was consequently used to characterize a temporal relation.

4) The subjective nature of the intensity which is characteristic for the use of t-forms accounts for the typical inconsistencies easily to be observed (influence of Sumerian?).

J. LEWY: MVAeG XXXV/3 (1935) p. 169 note 1

The forms containing a t-infix of the genera verbi I/2, II/2, III/2, and IV/2 have very often--as the Old Assyrian texts show--the meaning of an "Effectiv."

Against Bergstraesser, not "Spaeter der ausgesagten Handlung" but actual occurrence of a possible or expected action. This can be proved, Lewy asserts, from Kültepe texts, Old Babylonian letters, and the Middle Assyrian code.

T-forms should be translated by adding "actually," "really," "indeed" (German: nunmehr, jetzt wirklich).

A. GOETZE: The t-Form of the Old Babylonian Verb, JAOS 56 (1936) pp. 297-334

The introduction (pp. 297-300) deals first with the Akkadian system of verb classes (conjugations) and presents the parallel sets without and with the infix ta.

History of the research concerning the function of the ta infix: Delitzsch's and Ungnad's views are quoted (reflexive-reciprocal, middle or passive force). Delitzsch admits that no clearcut differences can be observed between I/1-III/1 and I/2-III/2, but mentions that II/2 and III/2 forms have clearly passive meaning, while Ungnad favors the assumption that a primary middle force disappeared in the course of time.

Landsberger's interpretation is shortly mentioned ("punctual present") with references to Islamica II, Bergstraesser, Einf. and Eilers AO 31/3-4. No critical discussion is given because it has not been "comprehensively set forth."

Oppenheim's interpretation is dismissed ("right track," "first serious attempt") with a characterization which shows that it was basically misunderstood ("first to express emotion (gefühlbetont), afterwards it assumed perfective force and finally became a perfect proper").

General Observations (pp. 300-302). Scope of investigation: main basis: Codex Hammurabi, to be supplemented by additional evidence from letters and contracts. One illustrative example is quoted showing forms with and without t-infix which do not express "modification of the action itself" but seem to be used according to their position in given context.

A The t-Form in the function of a tense in coordinated clauses, pp. 302-319

Goetze joins Landsberger and Oppenheim in stating that the verb with t-infix regularly concludes a series of successive verbal clauses in the preterit commonly connected by -ma.

On the basis of the CH evidence Goetze contends (and shows with examples) that a "protasis" consisting of a single clause shows verbs without t-infix, while longer clauses and added additional elements cause the verb to be transferred ("in consequence") to the t-form. Where two or more verbs appear in the "protasis" the t-infix appears in the last verb; where more than two links appear, the infix may be introduced in one of the middle links.

Numerous examples all from the CH are given in order to support the correctness of this observation.

"The use or non-use of the t-form seems to affect the sense of the whole sentence only to a very slight degree."

Reference is made to §§ 30, 136 and 141 where the t-form with -ma is followed by present-forms. No conclusions are drawn.

In letters: Goetze says: "the t-form is frequently preceded by the adverbs anumma or inanna." Sentences with anumma regularly contain a t-form (announcement, not narration). t-forms appear in "abbreviated statements (they) may convey the idea of urgent, surprising, or even alarming news."

Goetze then states again that t-forms terminate series of simple preterits (and may be followed by present-future) (references to CH §§ 141, 30, 136).

"Some affinity with the permansive" (pp. 312-313).

"One of the functions of the t-form is to link the past to the present. It denotes the action which has just been performed and still affects the situation."

While the preterit contains simply a statement concerning a past action and the permansive denotes a state or condition without indicating any connection with previous actions, the t-form may be translated "has been done, has happened, has done": the action has just been performed and still affects the situation.

Additional observations (pp. 313-317): 1) Negation and t-form seem to be mutually exclusive (examples taken from the CH show few exceptions). Goetze differentiates: negations which express non-performance (negative facts): not

with verbs in t-form; and: negative effect of an action, performance without success: with t-form. Also letters: "main announcement is given in t-form" (cf. p. 310 n. 61) but not when negated.

Explanation: A negative action cannot have any extension in time, since the t-form refers to such a "link between the past and the present," negation is incompatible with t-form.

2) Certain verbs--such as bašūm, išum, le'ūm, idūm, erēsum, hiātum, ezēbum(?)--do not appear with t-infixes.

Explanation: Imperfective aspect referring to conditions which remain unchanged without recognizable beginning or end. They cannot therefore express an action which has occurred and which influences the present.

3) t-forms are (as a rule) irreconcilable with dative suffixes (-šum/sim). CH § 49 and Rm 277 § 1 have iqbišu where other paragraphs have iqtabi. Exception: uttersum in § 163 and 164.

Explanation: The action expressed by the t-form refers to the acting person itself; therefore a tendency arises to avoid combining t-forms with dative (and partly accusative) suffixes of the personal pronoun.

The use of t-form in the imperative (prohibitive and precative) (p. 319) seems to lay added stress on request or prohibition. This is to be accounted for by the aorist-like character of the t-preterit: the request is already as good as fulfilled.

B The t-form in the function of a relative tense in subordinated clauses, pp. 319-321. Generally following the rules which dictate the use of t-forms in main clauses, still the use of t-forms in subordinate clauses seems to follow two rules: 1) indicating consecutio temporum when main clause specifies future event, request or prohibition ("future perfect").

References quoted from CH § 30, 137 (after istu) and many others (all

warka ... ana šīmtim ittalku).

References from letters: t-forms after kima, istu, etc.

- 2) indicating consecutio temporum in subordinate clauses which precede main clauses in the preterit; meaning: past perfect.

Reference to CH § 58.

References to letters: t-form after inuma and istu.

In these cases the t-form refers to action just performed and still of actual interest.

C The t-form as an aspect, pp. 322-332. 1) As an aorist-like preterit, the t-form is a tense and does not modify the action denoted by the verb.

2) t-forms with "present"-meaning and those with (lexically) specialized meanings indicate an "objective" value of the t-infix.

ad 1) In the apodosis of the CH occur	elūm I/2	"to forfeit"
	alāku I/2	"to go away"
	wabālu I/2	"to carry off"
	wasāru II/2	
	maḥāru III/2	"to be of equal rank"

ad 2) The list of verbs presented on pp. 323-324 refers to reflexive-reciprocal meanings and contains: labāsum, šumḥurum, magārum, maḥārum, malākum, ša'ālum.

Follows a list of taqtil(t)um and taqtal(t)um formations such as: tahāzum, tamḥarum, tarbašum, tadmiqtum, and talittum.

Another group is titled "Separative" and contains such verbs as are listed pp. 324-332.

The terminative (alias: ventive, alias: energicus) is here opposed to separative; both are aspects (not moods).

Two types of t-forms: aorists and separatives are coexisting.

List: alākum
 elûm
 ḥalāqum
 wabālum
 waṣûm
 warûm
 wussurum
 sûsurum
 leqûm
 nadānum
 naṣûm
 redûm

Historical Interpretation (pp. 332-334: Genetical relationship.

t has primarily reciprocal-reflexive force (action refers to acting person itself). Difficult relation to separative (radiating from a fixed point with definitive goal) which, however, refers basically only to moving person or object. Here, Goetze resorts to the assumption that Sumerian influences facilitated the connection between the aorist-meaning and the separative.

The Sumerian differentiates movement from agent to object by m and i/e prefixes, against ba-prefixes (separation between person/thing and place). The latter are rendered in bilingual texts by t-forms (cf. Poebel GSG § 598). This Sumerian separative favored the specific Akkadian shift from aorist to separative. Originating from the verba movendi (ittalak "he went away" becomes "he is gone") and the use of t to express this tense spread to other verbs.

Finally Goetze states that the use of t-forms is largely syntactic--in the Old Babylonian period--and that only lexically relevant changes of the basic verbal idea should be mentioned in dictionaries.

A. SCHOTT: OLZ XL (1937) Sp. 360-361

(Book review of Pfeiffer, State Letters of Assyria)

Schott refers to the above-quoted interpretation of the t-form by J. Lewy and accepts it, adding that it is valid too for the language of the Harper letters. He adds to the nomenclature by calling the preterit "Mitteilungspraeterit" or narrative, and the t-form "Behauptungspraeterit" or effective. In negated and subordinated clauses only the former is used. Schott also remarks (Sp. 361 note 3) that this rule does not apply to verbal forms with two infix t's, where the t-infix might have another function.

A. UNGNAD: Die t-Form des akkadischen Verbs, Orientalia NS VI (1937) pp. 252-255

Rejection of the interpretations of Goetze and Oppenheim as "complicated and hard to understand." Based upon a glossary of Neo Babylonian texts (against Oppenheim's remark that the Neo Babylonian contains only traces of the differentiations observed in the Old Babylonian texts), the explanation of Ungnad is given in very succinct form: "Forms without t characterize an action as happening 'durch aeusseren Anstoss' (outside cause, instigation), those with t as happening due to an inner impulse (innerer Trieb)."

iddin "he gave" because certain external circumstances caused him to do so; ittadin "he gave" because he felt compelled to do so by himself.

Examples given are not very convincing (mostly kî with t-form).

t-forms can therefore be translated "intentionally, on purpose, with evil intentions" which holds true also for the CH. Wherever several actions are reported, it suffices to use the t-form once.

Paragraphs 136 and 141 of the CH are quoted to prove the contention that the t-form there expresses intention.

Investigation of Babylonian psychology made possible by this interpretation, cf. e.g. ana simti ittalak "he died because he was sated with life (death as 'Erloesung')." "

In legal documents always iddin, ušadgil, though an intention can hardly be denied. Ungnad, however, proposes that such factors as the handing over of the price (purchase price), etc. are responsible. He also asserts that the form without t was used when there was no special reason to stress the "intention" of the action.

M. SAN NICOLO: Juristische Bemerkungen zur Bedeutung der t-Formen des akkadischen Zeitwortes, Orientalia NS VII (1938) pp. 309-318. Cf. also Glossar to NRV I (1937) p. IX

Reports on the interpretation of Goetze, Oppenheim and Ungnad. He characterizes Goetze as interpreting the t-form largely as "a matter of syntax", Oppenheim ("in Mittelstellung") as admitting beside grammatical and functional differences between forms with and without t, also as assuming "fühlbare" differences, Ungnad as making a clear-cut separation in the field of semasiology (in NRV I "hinsetzen" for šakānu I/2) and Orientalia NS VI 252ff: intention expressed by t-infix.

San Nicolo shows in a series of examples that the use of the t-form in the protasis of the CH does not bear out the contention of Ungnad. The interchange of išriq and istariq in paragraphs 259 and 260 is quoted as a typical example for the unexplainable shifts between forms with and without t-infix.

Oppenheim's theory that such differences are due to the use of two sources is considered acceptable but criticized because of the attempt to link linguistic differences to differences in legal concepts.

San Nicolo then criticizes Ungnad's examples taken from the Neo-Babyl. material because a consistent interpretation of the verbal forms with and without t leads to results which are not acceptable either from the point of view of the historian of law or from that of simple common sense (example: alādu I/1 and II/2).

He observes that most if not all of the examples quoted by Ungnad for t-forms come from subordinated clauses introduced by *kî*, *ina ūmi*, (also *ša*) and asserts from a study of the contents of Ungnad's glossary that 90 per cent of all t-forms mentioned therein come from such phrases. He furthermore says that t-forms in main clauses are very rare and mostly restricted to the language of administrative documents where the verb usually appears at the end of the entire text (examples are given).

San Nicolo noted (p. 317 note 3) the existence of lexicographical t-forms, quoting as characteristic examples *elū I/2* in the meaning "to forfeit" and *apālu I/3*.

A. POEBEL: Unrecognized Forms of I/3 Formation (= Studies in Akkadian Grammar no. I)
AS 9 (Chicago, 1939)

Observations concerning the t-form can be found on pp. 1-3 in the discussion of the paradigm of Delitzch for I/2 and I/3, where Poebel disentangles the confused state of affairs according to which the finite forms of the verb with t-infix consisted of two sets differentiated by the position of the stress, while the verb with tan-infix lacked forms for the infinitive imperative and permansive.

pp. 11-15 where it is shown that while reduplicated Sumerian roots are rendered in vocabularies by Akk. infinitives in respectively I/3 or II/1 (the latter, when formed of transitive verbs, expresses the idea of repeated performance of the action, p. 5) the cases in which a I/2 infinitive renders a Sumerian reduplicated form can all be explained by the fact that there the t-infix expresses reciprocity.

pp. 17ff. An unpubl. Crozer grammatical text shows clearly that Akk. t-form never corresponds to Sumerian verbal forms with reduplicated base; this because I/2 forms (in contradistinction to I/3 form) never are used to express a plurality (repetition) of the verbal action.

pp. 29ff. and especially p. 30 note. The function of the t-infix is discussed in a cursory way (promising an article on t-tn and t-t forms). Starting out from a passage in an Amarna letter of Tushratta (VAB II 19) which shows the forms ir-ta-ta-'a-am and ta-ar-ta-ta-'a-am (lines 10, 11) opposed to ni-ir-ta-na-'a-mu (line 12) and which Poebel interprets as tn-forms with added t-infix, he defines the function of this infix as used to "express the idea of temporal precedence". In the quoted note he rejects Landsberger's interpretation of the t-form as found in Bergstraesser which - as he states - attributes to the t-infix an almost opposite meaning. The interpretation of Oppenheim is characterized as explaining the t-form as having a "perfect meaning in the CH" which, as Poebel remarks, is actually correct when the t-form is contrasted with a present.

He also asserts that in the inscription of ^{Assur-naṣir-apli}, e.g., the t-form is used in the sense of a pluperfect ("after he had done this or that - he did this or that"). Furthermore that in such context the t indicates that the verb (or group of verbs) is logically subordinate to the I/1 verb (or group of verbs) that follow (no examples given).

p. 35 n. 1 a statement is given concerning the last vowel of the preterits I/2, I/3, IV/2 and IV/3 which agrees with that of the last vowel of the present.

p. 28 n. 1 Poebel remarks that the t imparts to certain verba movendi the nuance "away" for which assertion he quotes *yabālu* and *tabālu*, *alāku* and *atluḳu* and *itmuṣu* (in Ass. inscriptions), the latter is interpreted as *itpuṣu* from a root *naḳāsu*.

In following up this interpretation, Poebel refers in note 1 of p. 49 to the meaning of the permansive I/2 *šitkun* against *šakin*: "lying off the road, out of the way" in contradistinction to "be situated".

J.J. STAMM; Die akkadische Namengebung (1939) p. 94 (and note 1) states:

In personal names, t-forms refer to what has been immediately experienced. The action referred to by a verb with t-infix is terminated in the very moment it is pronounced. Consequently, t-forms appear exclusively in names containing exclamations, complaints (Ātanah-ili), expressions of joy (Ātamar-Sin, "I just have seen the moon"), etc. The syntax of these names indicates likewise that they are basically exclamations (Ittabšī-dīn-Āššur). Names of the type Ittabšī-līšir render a specific "Gefuehlsbetontheit".

"Danknamen" contain t-forms only exceptionally (cf: Imtagar-^dNN, Irtība-^dNN).

p. 93. Some verbal forms in personal names show the preterit, others the t-form, changes which may be due to dialectal differences. (Cf. ānaḥ as against ātanāḥ). Retrospective "Vertrauensnamen" always have the simple preterit.