



## (5) Inana E 49 (ETCSL 4.07.5)

lugal<sup>d</sup> ama-ušumgal-an-na šag<sub>4</sub>-za  
 s[lugal amaušumgalanak] PC's POSS[šag=zu=ak]  
 s[king DN=ABS] PC's POSS[heart=2.SG.POSS=GEN]

ki aḡ<sub>2</sub>-bi-im  
 PC[ki=∅ aḡ=bi=∅]=am-∅  
 PC[place=ABS measure=3.SG.NH.POSS=ABS]=COP-3.SG.S  
 “King Ama-ushumgal-ana is your heart’s beloved.”

## (6) Enmerkar and En-suhgir-ana 15 (ETCSL 1.8.2.4)

sukkal en aratta<sup>ki</sup>-ka sukkal an-sig<sub>7</sub>-ga-ri-a  
 PC's POSS[sukkal en aratta=ak=ak] s[sukkal ansigari'a]  
 PC's POSS[minister lord GN=GEN=GEN] s[minister PN]

mu-ni he<sub>2</sub>-en-na-nam  
 PC[mu=ani=∅] S<sub>1</sub>ha-S<sub>12</sub>i-S<sub>12</sub>nanam=S<sub>14</sub>∅  
 PC[name=3.SG.H.POSS=ABS] MOD-FIN-COP-3.SG.S  
 “Now the name of the lord of Aratta’s minister was minister Ansigaria.”

## (7) Ur-Namma 19 2:7-8 (RIME 3/2.1.1.19) (Ur, i.e. 21. sz.)

eg<sub>2</sub>-ba a-ba<sup>d</sup>nanna-gin<sub>7</sub>,  
 PC's POSS[eg=bi=ak] s[aba=∅ nanna=gin=∅]  
 PC's POSS[levee=DEM=GEN] s[who=ABS DN=EQU=ABS]

mu-bi  
 PC[mu=bi=∅]=am-∅  
 PC[name=3.SG.NH.POSS=ABS]=COP-3.SG.S  
 “As for this levee ‘Who-is-like-the-god-Nanna?’ is its name.”

## (8) BIN 8 345 obv. 7: 6 (ED IIIb) (P221476)

<sup>d</sup> ba-u <sub>2</sub> -na-nam	passim
PC[bau=ak]=nanam=∅	{d}ba-u <sub>2</sub> -kam
PC[DN=GEN]=COP=3.SG.S	PC[bau=ak]=am=∅
“She/he belongs to Bau”	PC[DN=GEN]=COP=3.SG.S
	“She/he belongs to Bau”

## II.

The form **na-nam** is usually explained as a by-form of the copula in the Sumerological literature. Its exact analysis, however, has remained open to question. The forms occur in literary texts and personal names, but not in administrative texts and royal inscriptions.

Adam Falkenstein derives it from the independent form of the copula prefixed with the non-negative modal prefix /na/- and followed by a 3rd. ps. sg. enclitic copula: “\*na-i-me-àm > \*na-mam > \*na-nam” (Falkenstein 1941: 185)

Edzard considers the form a “pleonastic formation” and assumes that “\*na-àm [na-am] turned into [na-na-(a)m] and could be extended still further to (ur<sub>5</sub>) hé-na-nam-ma(-àm)” (2010: 120).<sup>2</sup>

## (9) Iri-kagina 1 7:26-28 (RIME 1.9.9.1) (Lagash, 24th. c) (P222607-9)

bi<sub>3</sub>-lu<sub>5</sub>-da ud-bi-ta e-me-am<sub>6</sub>  
 PC[biluda ud=bi=ta=ak=∅] S<sub>2</sub>i-S<sub>12</sub>me-S<sub>14</sub>∅=S<sub>15</sub>∅=am-∅  
 PC[rule day=DEM=ABL=ABS] FIN-COP-3.SG.S=ABS=COP-3.SG.S  
 “These were indeed the customs of the former days.”

<sup>2</sup> Jagersma (2010: 580–581) appears to have accepted Edzard’s explanation.

(10) Gudea Statue B 7:49-50 (Lagash, 22nd. c.) (P232275)

alan-e,	u <sub>3</sub>	kug	nu
<sub>s</sub> [alan=e=∅]	u	<sub>pc</sub> [kug=∅]	nu
<sub>s</sub> [statue=DEM=ABS]	and	<sub>pc</sub> [silver=ABS]	NEG

za-gin <sub>3</sub>	nu-ga-am <sub>3</sub>
<sub>pc</sub> [zagin=∅]	<sub>s1</sub> nu- <sub>s2</sub> i- <sub>s3</sub> nga- <sub>s12</sub> me= <sub>s14</sub> ∅
<sub>pc</sub> [lapis.lazuli=ABS]	NEG-FIN-COOR-COP=3.SG.S

“This statue is of neither silver nor lapis lazuli.”

### III.

Hypercharacterization or “[a]ffix pleonasm consists in the semantically vacuous addition of a transparent affix to a word that is already characterized for the morphosyntactic property expressed by this affix” (Haspelmath 1993: 297).

“One reason why a morphological operation may be reapplied with no semantic effect (resulting in some kind of affix pleonasm) is that integrative phonological processes have severely reduced the syntagmatic recognizability of its first occurrence. ... phonologically motivated opacity is one of the main factors allowing reapplication of morphology.” (Haspelmath 1993: 301).

(21) Some cases of affix pleonasm

- a. The Latin infinitive *esse* ‘to be’ (root *es-*, infinitive suffix *-se*) was augmented by the more common infinitive suffix *-re* in Vulgar Latin (cf. Italian *essere*).
- b. The older English plural suffix *-er* was augmented by the more common plural suffix *-en* in the word *childer*, yielding forms like *children*.
- c. English plural forms lacking a final *-s* are augmented by the more common plural suffix *-s*, yielding forms like *feets*, *childrens*, etc., in some varieties of English (e.g. African-American Vernacular English, according to Hock 1986: 190).

(Hasplemath 1993: 297)

### IV.

The attested forms

A) the stem /**nam**/ (<sub>s1</sub>na-<sub>s2</sub>i-<sub>s12</sub>me-<sub>s14</sub>∅ = MOD-FIN-COP-3.SG.S) is attested:

i) alone

a) in a 1st ps. sg. form: nam-men<sub>3</sub> (<sub>s1</sub>na-<sub>s2</sub>i-<sub>s12</sub>me-<sub>s14</sub>en = MOD-FIN-COP-1.SG.S / **nam**-en COP-1.SG.S) (example is late)

b) in a 3rd ps. sg. form: nam

ii) preceded by the /**ha**/-prefix:

a) in a 3rd ps. sg. form: he<sub>2</sub>-nam (<sub>s1</sub>ha-<sub>s2</sub>i-<sub>s12</sub>**nam**-<sub>s14</sub>∅ / MOD-FIN-COP-3.SG.S)

b) in a 3rd ps pl. form: he<sub>2</sub>-nam-me-eš (<sub>s1</sub>ha-<sub>s2</sub>i-<sub>s12</sub>**nam**-<sub>s14</sub>eš / MOD-FIN-COP-3.PL.S)

B) the stem /**nanam**/ is attested:

i) alone fairly common

a) in a 3rd ps. sg. form: na-nam (<sub>s1</sub>na-<sub>s12</sub>nam=<sub>s14</sub>∅ = MOD-COP-3.SG.S / **nanam**=∅ COP-3.SG.S)

ii) preceded by the /**ha**/-prefix:

a) in a 3rd ps. sg. form:  $he_2(-en)-nam$  ( $_{s_1}ha-_{s_2}i-_{s_{12}}**nam**-_{s_{14}}\emptyset$  / MOD-FIN-COP-3.SG.S)

iii) preceded by the /**ha**/-prefix, followed by the 3rd ps. sg. enclitic copula:

a)  $he_2(-en)na-nam-am_3$  ( $_{s_1}ha-_{s_2}i-_{s_{12}}**nanam**-_{s_{14}}\emptyset=am-\emptyset$  / MOD-FIN-COP-3.SG.S=COP-3.SG.S)

b)  $he_2-na-nam-ma$  ( $_{s_1}ha-_{s_2}i-_{s_{12}}**nanam**-_{s_{14}}\emptyset=am-\emptyset$ ) mimation disappears

c)  $he_2-na-nam-me$  ( $_{s_1}ha-_{s_2}i-_{s_{12}}**nanam**-_{s_{14}}\emptyset=am-\emptyset$ ) a>e

STEM	ALONE	WITH /HA/-	WITH /HA/- AND -/AM/
/ <b>nam</b> /	X	X	—
/ <b>nanam</b> /	X	X	X

Table 2

$na-i-me-\emptyset$	$nam$
↓	
$nam-\emptyset$	$nam$
↓	↓
$na-i-nam-\emptyset$	$na-nam$
↓	
$ha-i-nanam-\emptyset$	$na-nam$
↓	
$ha-i-nanam-\emptyset=am-\emptyset$	$na-nam$

Table 3

## V.

“Belege für  $na-nam$  sind hier nicht gesammelt, da der affirmative Sinn nicht zweifelhaft sein kann.” Falkenstein (1941: 181, fn. 1)

“It serves to draw attention to the importance of something that was there or happened, but is still meaningful for what is to come. ... It is often found at the beginning of tales.” Edzard (2003: 119)

“There is a related form **na-nam** (and variations) used to introduce something ‘as everybody knows’, ‘as we have been told’.” (Civil 2000: 38)

“It is often found in contexts where traditional or mythological lore is reported, or in formulaic introductions to narratives and speeches.” (Michalowski 2004: 43)

“One **could** speculate that originally  $na-$  had a narrative foregrounding function that was lost in later Sumerian.” (Michalowski 2004: 43)

“It is assumed here that it is a marker for *reported speech* marking a statement as either belonging to traditional orally-transmitted knowledge or simply being a report of someone else’s words. It is used: (1) in the opening passages of mythical and epic tales, and in crucial points of the text, (2) in the introduction to certain types of direct speech such as **silim-še<sub>3</sub> na-e** (before self-congratulatory

speeches), and (3) in the formulaic opening lines of a letter, introducing the verbatim report of what the sender has told the messenger.” (Civil 2000: 37)

## (11) Shulgi C 124 (ETCSL 2.4.2.03)

eme <sup>1</sup>	elam	niĝ <sub>2</sub>	eme-gi-ra-gin <sub>7</sub>
eme	elam	niĝ	emegir=ak=gin
tongue	GN	thing	Sumerian=GEN=EQU

he<sub>2</sub>-en<sub>3</sub>-ga-zu-am<sub>3</sub>

<sub>S1</sub>ha-<sub>S2</sub>i-<sub>S3</sub>nga-<sub>S11</sub>n-<sub>S12</sub>zu-<sub>S14</sub>ø(-<sub>S15</sub>'a)=ø-am-ø

MOD-FIN-COOR-3.SG.A-know-3.SG.P(-SUB)-ABS-COP-3.SG.S

“I also do know the Elamite language as well as I do Sumerian.”

## (12) Nanshe A 1–11 (ETCSL 4.14.1) (at the beginning of a narrative)

iri<sup>ki</sup> na-nam iri<sup>ki</sup> na-nam me-bi **na**-pad<sub>3</sub>-de<sub>3</sub>  
 nin<sup>ki</sup> iri<sup>ki</sup> na-nam me-bi **na**-pad<sub>3</sub>-de<sub>3</sub>  
 iri<sup>ki</sup> kug-ga iri<sup>ki</sup> na-nam me-bi **na**-pad<sub>3</sub>-de<sub>3</sub>  
 kur a-ta il<sub>2</sub>-la iri<sup>ki</sup> na-nam me-bi **na**-pad<sub>3</sub>-de<sub>3</sub>  
 e<sub>2</sub> zid-da ud-bi na-ed<sub>2</sub>-e nam-bi **na**-tar-re  
 iri<sup>ki</sup>-a ni<sub>2</sub>-du<sub>7</sub>-e pa **na**-mu-un-ed<sub>2</sub>-e  
 ŋarza ama <sup>d</sup>nanše-ke<sub>4</sub> si **na**-an-sa<sub>2</sub>-sa<sub>2</sub>-e  
 nin-bi dumu eridug<sup>ki</sup>-ga tud-da  
<sup>d</sup>nanše nin me kal-kal-la ki **na**-mu-un-gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>  
 agarin<sub>4</sub> **na-nam** ama sa-<sup>hi</sup>-in **na-nam**  
<sup>d</sup>nanše ama ni<sub>2</sub> gal-gal-la **na-nam**

“There is a city, there is a city whose powers are apparent. Ninin is the city whose powers are apparent. The holy city is the city whose powers are apparent. The mountain rising from the water is the city whose powers are apparent. Its light rises over the secure temple; its fate is determined. There is perfection in the city; the rites of Mother Nanše are performed accordingly. Its lady, the child born in Eridug, Nanše, the lady of the precious divine powers, is now to return. She is beer mash (?), the mother is yeast (?), Nanše is the cause of great things.”

## (13) Inana and Bilulu 111 (ETCSL 1.4.4)

i<sub>3</sub>-ne-eš<sub>2</sub> <sup>d</sup>utu ud ne ur<sub>5</sub> **hez-en-na-<sup>r</sup>nam<sup>1</sup>**

“And immediately, under the sun of that day, it truly became so.”

## (14) Gudea Statue B 6:77–7:4 (Lagash, 22nd. c.) (P232275)

e <sub>2</sub>	ur <sub>5</sub> -gin <sub>7</sub>	dim <sub>2</sub> -ma,	ensi <sub>2</sub>	dili-e
e	ur=gin	dim-'a=ø	ensi	dili=e
house	this=EQU	make-PT=ABS	ruler	single=ERG

<sup>d</sup>nin-<sup>ŋ</sup>ir<sub>2</sub>-su-ra, nu-na-du<sub>3</sub>,

na-mu-du<sub>3</sub>

nin<sup>ŋ</sup>irsuk=ra <sub>S1</sub>nu-<sub>S6</sub>nn-<sub>S7</sub>a-<sub>S11</sub>n-<sub>S12</sub>du-<sub>S14</sub>ø

<sub>S1</sub>na-<sub>S4</sub>mu-<sub>S11</sub>n-<sub>S12</sub>du-<sub>S14</sub>ø

DN=DAT.H

NEG-3.SG.H-DAT-3.SG.H.A-build-3.SG.P

MOD-VEN-3.SG.H.A-build-3.SG.P

“No ruler but he (= Gudea) has ever built a temple fashioned like this for the god Ningirsu.” = lit. “No ruler has ever built a temple fashioned like this for the god Ningirsu, but he (= Gudea) did built it.”

Polarity focus is used to emphasize the speaker’s belief in the truth or factualness of the proposition expressed by the clause, contrasting it with its implicit negation.

“Evidentiality is defined as the functional category that refers to the perceptual

and/or epistemological basis for making a speech act. In traditional classifications, evidentiality is divided into direct and indirect evidentiality. Direct evidentials are used when the speaker has witnessed the action while indirect evidentials are used when the speaker has not witnessed the action personally but has either deduced the action or has heard about it from others. When the action is deduced, we are talking about inferentials; when information about the event is conveyed through others, they are called hearsay markers, report(at)ives or quotatives.” (Cornillie 2009: 45)

Epistemic modality refers to the “evaluation of the chances that a certain hypothetical state of affairs under consideration (or some aspect of it) will occur, is occurring or has occurred in a possible world.” (Nuyts 2001: 21)

“The definitions of evidentiality and epistemic modality presented in this section indicate that the two notions are conceptually different. Evidentiality refers to the reasoning processes that lead to a proposition and epistemic modality evaluates the likelihood that this proposition is true.” (Cornillie 2009: 46–47)

## References

- Civil, Miguel (2000), ‘Modal Prefixes’, *Acta Sumerologica* 22, 29–42.
- Cornillie, Bert (2009), “Evidentiality and epistemic modality. On the close relationship between two different categories”, *Functions of Language* 16, 44–62.
- Edzard, D. O. (2003), *Sumerian grammar* (Handbook of Oriental Studies, I, 71). Leiden: Brill.
- Ecklin, Sabine (2005), *Das Präfix {na} in der sumerischen Verbalkette*. Lizenziatsarbeit, Universität Bern, Philosophisch-historische Fakultät, Institut für Vorderasiatische Archäologie und Altorientalische Sprachen.
- Falkeinstein, Adam (1941), ‘Untersuchungen zur sumerischen Grammatik (Fortsetzung)’, *ZA* 47, 181–223.
- Haspelmath, Martin (1993), ‘The diachronic externalization of inflection’, *Linguistics* 31, 279–309.
- Jagersma, A. H. (2010), *A descriptive grammar of Sumerian* (PhD Dissertation, Universiteit Leiden, 2010). Retrieved from <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/16107>.
- Michalowski, Piotr (2004), ‘Sumerian’, in Roger D. Woodward, ed., *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World’s Ancient Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 19–59.
- Lehmann, C. (2005). ‘Pleonasm and hypercharacterization’, in G. E. Booij and J. van Marled, eds., *Yearbook of Morphology 2005*. Heidelberg: Springer, 119–154.
- Marsal, Erika (2012), ‘La evidencialidad en lengua sumeria’, in A. Agud et al., eds. *Séptimo centenario de los estudios orientales en Salamanca* (Estudios filológicos, 337). Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 127–134.
- Nuyts, Jan. 2001. *Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Zólyomi, Gábor (2014), *Copular clauses and focus marking in Sumerian*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open.