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a) Introduction

This paper should be taken as a particular case of a more general subject, namely, ‘Post-positions vs. Pre-positions in Semitic’. The issue is framed within the agglutinative process peculiar to this linguistic family. Depending on the sort of agglutination at work, we can distinguish different kinds of functional postpositions: inflexional, suffixed (pronominal), enclitic proper, adverbial and free-syntagmatic (relational or conjunctional).

Inflexional postpositions (taken in the specific sense of nominal case ending and verbal modal and personal ending), form a clear cut category, possibly the most characteristic of the agglutinative linguistic family. Its lexical origin is sometimes difficult to ascertain, but its morpho-syntactical and semantic values are apparent.

Suffixation is a clear agglutinative morph made out mainly of pronominal bases more or less transformed. It goes along with the inflexional category as peculiar of the agglutinative linguistic family. It has two series, nominal and verbal.

The mimation markers should be considered as enclitic proper. Leaving aside its lexical origin, they offer two different phenotypes: sing. l-(v)m/ (Akk., ES/NA, and Ar. l-an/) and pl. l-ma/. This enclisis desappears in the status constructus. It indicates a semantic nuance of generic indefiniteness as against the definiteness implied by the construct syntagme. Later on this complementary opposition will be applied to the (mimation)/nunation vs. article, in languages which develop this morph, like Arabic, this time with the complementary opposition: indefinite /definite individuation.


4. Semitic languages, all but Ak., show this pl. morph. On its turn, the sing. mimation desapears in the developing Akkadian dialects.

5. Sometimes Arabic spakers do not drop the plural ending in construct chain, instead of stressing the final long vowel, in order to avoid confusion with the sing. syntagme: muslim(μ)-l-medīnāt(i) # muslimu-l-medīnāt(i) (private communication by Prof. F. Corriente).

6. We have to take also into account also the status absolutus (morpheme 0) in Ak. and NWS (Ug., Aram), which represents maybe the primary phenotyp.
We could sketch out the morpho-syntaxis of the nominal determination feature of CS in this way (but without taking into account the internal plural that implies a doubling of the sketch); the scheme should be distributed by languages, taking into account late developments like in Syriac.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Noun} & \text{Sing.} & \text{Pl.} \\
\text{indeter.} & \text{deter.} & \text{indeter.} & \text{determ.} \\
\text{mimat./nunat./0} & \text{art./nunat./constr.} & \text{non-mim./mimat.} & \text{art./nunat./constr} \\
\end{array}
\]

As adverbial can be taken certain invariable postpositions with a well defined semantic (adverbial) value and morpho-syntactic function, although the lexical origin remains obscure for some of those functions. Clear examples of this kind are Akk. /-iš/, NWS locative /-h/ [=/-ha/].

Finally, there is a category of postpositions or *encliseis* that have no clear semantic independent function, are free in use and are gathered many times under the heading ‘emphatic’, ‘paragogic’, ‘final’, ‘enhancing’, ‘focalising’, ‘focussing’. They can be attached to any morphological category (noun, verb, particles) without apparent modification in its meaning and function. Some of them show up a syntagmatic or relational function, namely, they relate the joined lexeme to the previous ones to shape a syntactic unit or ‘phrase’ along with them (conjunction) or to characterise the following phrase(s) as belonging to a particular category, for instance Akk. –m̄ of direct speech.

Here we are going to analyse a peculiar case of this last category and to assess the different morpho-syntactic functions assigned to it, searching to extend the analysis to the whole range of the Semitic family. Enclitic -m seems to be a typical Northwest Semitic morpheme, more exactly ‘Canaanite’, but in fact is matched by similar phenotyps in the whole Semitic family. In this regard, Amharic manifests an overwhelming use of the enclitic postposition –m, surpassing even the Akkadian prototype. Furthermore it must be dealt with within the more large frame of the mimation in general, with which it maintains close connexions.

Nevertheless, the aim of this paper is not to collect all or the majority of occurrences of this morph in NWS or in any other Semitic sub-family and to distribute them by morpho-syntactic categories, a task already carried out. We will pay attention to that, of course, but we will focus our interest into pinpointing the actual semantic and functional bearing of the morph and into tracing as far as possible its linguistic origin within a comparative perspective. In this regard the syntactic context would to be taken into account constantly.

In dealing with this issue, W.C.E. Watson states: “There is no doubt about the widespread use of a final –m … It is more difficult to assign a particular function to this particle (or particles) in every language.”

---

7. For such labelling see Blejer 1986:240.; also Izr’el 1998:41,72 … The designation ‘adverbial’, some time used for this morph, covers only partially its functions/uses.

8. Lipiński 1997:470, asserts on the conjunctive –ma: “is very likely its (postpositive) -wa/ f.i. in Bedja) phonetic nasalized variant –m̄< -wa”, what I find highly unlikely, given the coexistence of both elements in almost all the Semitic languages.

9. Cf. in this regard Aartun 1974:51 (“abwechselnde morpholigische Struktur”) and n. 2 (bibliography); Tropper 2000:825 (“… getrennt … zu behandeln”).

10. After the pioneering studies by Singer (1942-1943), Pope (1951), Hummel (1957) and Gordon (1940/1947/1955/1967), a thorough scrutiny of enclitic –m occurrences in the Ugaritic literature has been carried out by Aartun (1974), Watson (1992, 1994, 1996) and Tropper (2000); as for the Hebrew Bible, the studies of Dahood and his disciples (from 1952 onwards), as well as that of Emerton (1996) offer abundant though dispersed contributions; cf. infra n.103.

11. Tropper 2000:825ff, like many other authors suggests several functions for the same morph; Watson 1992 points out 9/11 functions supposedly attributable to the so called ‘enclitic –m’, which in his opinion could be reduced to 3/2, emphasis (Betonung, Hervorhebung) and different adverbial functions being the most generally accepted.
particular case” (Watson 1996:268). He goes on: “The question now remains whether there is a single enclitic particle –m with numerous functions or whether there are several distinct varieties” (Watson 1994:251). In principle I will lean towards the first supposition looking for an originally single morph (with two parallel allophones in complementary distribution) with a generalizing and many-sided morpho-syntactic bearing, but as a mere neutral, optional lexical expansion without a particular grammatical function by itself, this character coming out precisely from the postulated lexical origin. In this connexion Gordon’s characterization a ‘ballast variant’ is a good one, I think; also Seminara’s labelling - as ‘identificativo-anafórico’ seems fitting (Seminara 1998:521f), better in any case than the commonly endorsed ‘emphatic’.12 We will try to substantiate and nuance this suggestion in the following pages.

In this connexion, to posit the universals ‘emphatic’/’hervorhebendes’ value of the morph, as is generally accepted, on the one hand, does not have into account the originally indefinite lexical value of the morph and, on the other, sounds rather like an unfounded and topical answer. How and why do we know the kind of emphasis/’Hervorhebung’ involved in each case, supposing there is any at all, when in many cases there is the same wording with the same apparent meaning, but without the –m expansion?13 In my opinion this supposed emphatic character of the postpositional –m has to be rejected, as has been generally rejected, or at least questioned, its ‘adverbial’ function. This function is reached and yielded by the corresponding inflexional case ending, normally ac. –a, as Pope (1951) correctly posited in my opinion, with the enclisis serving as mere neutral and dispensable phonetic ‘sealing off’ such a grammatical function, whatever it is. This marker in itself has neither emphatic nor adverbial function; those functions lay with the noun according to its position and inflexion14.

b) Origin

As for the lexical origin of this morph, the evidence is ambiguous. In some cases at least (sing. nouns) one would see in the so called enclitic –m the persistence of mimation (/-m/, according to the Ak. and ESA pattern), with an indefinite semantic bias, in opposition to the determined status constructus, as was pointed out above. In fact, and despite their clear set apart function, it is a fairly common opinion that both morphs (mimation and the so called enclitic –m) have the same lexical origin, as we said15. But the appearance of the enclisis within constructed syntagmes in Ugaritic, and probably also in Hebrew and Phoenician, along with the general /-ma/ vocalisation in syllabic (Ak., AkEA and AkUg)16, to say nothing of its use with verbs and particles, seem to postulate a different origin or at least a different evolving

12. But even the authors who use this designation (Broekelman, Von Soden, Pope, Aartun, Tropper, etc.) are ready to accept the progressive weakenig (lexicalisation, ‘Erstarrung’) of such emphasis up to its complete disappearance (Aartun, Tropper). Emphasis is a psycholigical semantic overtone expressed by either suprasegmental functions (stress, tone, pitch …) or by specific lexical and grammatical morphs (interjection, vocative case, imperative mode, topicalising position …); cf. Van der Merwe 1989; Slonsky 1988.

13. Cf. in this regard Hummel’s sound considerations: “Many time one might theorize that the enclitic had emphatic force or the like, but it is practically impossible to demonstrate either this or the opposite view the enclitics were meaningless. We rather suppose, however, the the original emphatic force (if any) of the enclitic gradually diminished …” (Hummel 1957:06).

14. Tropper (2000:826) assumes also Pope’s (1951:128) opinion that the morpheme has mere emphatic function, no adverbial, that laying in the case ending, normally accusative. But if “there is no proof that the adverbial sense resides in the final –m” (Pope 1951:128), there not either any hint about its ‘emphatic’ function. What means ‘emphasis’ in this case? A priori it seems awkward to charge so much emphasis on the Ugaritic and Semitic in general discourse and poetry.

15. Cf. the authors quoted in n.3.

16. Also apparently in Hebrew (k’mô and similars, ESA lmv); but cf. yômam and similars. Also Ak.Ug šanam; cf. DUL 509. Cf. also the pattern in Amharic/South Ethiopic negative verbal use and assevertative answer [/m/].
stage. So the Ak. mimiation (nominal and adverbial: -Vm)\textsuperscript{17} would remain as the phenotyp of this kind in lack of lexical explanation. But on its turn, the loose of final /-al/ in the Ak. sing. could be another case of complementary distribution with the plural ending /-mal/ in CS, both with a generalised, indetermined, collective semantic bias and the same lexical origin (< /-ma/).\textsuperscript{18} In any case we had better setting apart (sing.) mimiation from the morph here in question (enclitic/final/postponed –m); they are supposed to represent two different patterns not easy to put together for the moment. But both coincide in one aspect: none of them has, in my opinion, ‘emphatic’ value. Nobody will postulate it certainly in case of mimiation. That could suggest maybe a common lexical origin for both morphs.

In the case of the enclitic -m, we are dealing with a postpositional morph\textsuperscript{19} of a supposed large functional and semantic range: it comes up in enclisis with nouns, verbs and particles as well, and can be labelled a CS issoglose\textsuperscript{20}. In this regard, its lexical connexion with the CS interrogative/indefinite pronoun /-ma:är/, ‘what’\textsuperscript{21}, recommends itself from the phonological as well as from the semantic point of view. Its function of tuning the plurivalent interrogative into indefinite pronouns is the best and maybe the more original and apparent pattern of this enclisis, the postpositional non-enclitic Arabic use of mā being another case of the same pattern or ‘function’.\textsuperscript{22} In this regard we could label this lexeme as a ‘(in)definising’ or ‘generalising/individualising’ marker (’-what, -whatever [it is]'). And once again we find this element in keeping with the role played by ‘mimation’. The so feeble and ‘generic’ semantic charge (indetermination) turns in the long run into a mere prosodic/phonetic expansion/reinforce and enables the element to function as a ‘lexicalised ballast variant’ in any kind of postpositions\textsuperscript{23}. Its original semantic bearing can even either disappear or assume other nuances in the interaction of complementary distributions.

This analysis is confirmed if attention is paid to the character of ‘Semantic Universal’ with general/indefinite bearing this Semitic element /ma/, ‘what(?)’ shows up\textsuperscript{24}. That means that whatever its lexical constituent may be, this Semantic Universal is bound to generate the same ‘semantic and morphosyntactic parallel chain’\textsuperscript{25} in other linguistic families. In fact, apart from the Semitic family, the same

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Tropper 2000:311.
\textsuperscript{18} The Ugaritic evidence could be distributed according to this double pattern, but there is no compelling evidence in this regard. The supposed original sing. mimiation in Ugaritic and its persistence in the vocalisation /-mma/ (Tropper 2000:826) lack textual support.
\textsuperscript{19} For the labelling ‘postpositional –m’ cf. supra n. 1.
\textsuperscript{22} On the complementary distribution ma/mi as probable apophonic allophones cf. infra n. 51.
\textsuperscript{23} Cf. Tropper 2000:825.

In fact many authors (De Langhe, Aartun, Segert, Blejer, Watson, Tropper) have hinted at ‘(in)definatisation’ as one of the functions of the enclitic –m. A systematic scrutiny of the occurrences of noun + enclitic –m seems to confirm this suggestion in many cases. It could be seen as a secondary supplency of lost of mimiation (as suggested long ago by De Moor), able to be set even into construct chains. Cf. in this connexion Buccellati 1996:351 (“The normal state followed by the enclitic –ma is used regularly for a determinative predicate”). Once lexicalised, the morph was attached to other lexemes (prepositions and verbs) where this grammatical function cannot be applied, unless under other considerations. Were things so, one cannot speak either of emphasis or adverbial function, but the morph has to be taken merely as a so to speak free ‘splicitor’ of an implicit morphosyntactic function still not developed in NWS and that very soon will give way to the pre-/post-positional system of articles. Cf. Watson 1994:102; 1992:239. On the indetermination value cf. also Blejer 1986:132; Segert 1984:112; and the contrary opinion of Rainey 1987:396, 399; cf. also Gelb 1969:146 (the Semitic languages did not express the category of definition/indefinition, determination/indetermination).

\textsuperscript{24} Cf. Wierwiczka 1995:434; also Wierwiczka 1996:114ff.
\textsuperscript{25} On this concept cf. Del Olmo Lete 2002:240f.
phenomenon can be seen, for instance, in postpositional non enclitic Greek particle /τε/ and in the postpositional enclitic Latin /que/ in its various lexical and syntactic uses. “It seems fairly certain that τε is related to Sanskrit ca, Latin que, Indogermanic q§e. Indogermanic q§e served to connect two parallel nouns or pronouns (perhaps also two parallel verbs) … Further, it possessed a universalising sense in Sanskrit kāś ca, Latin quisque …”

In fact the universalising (indefinitness) and connective (easily derived from the former: ‘what’ > ‘that’ > ‘the same’ > ‘also’) functions are the most representative of this morph. On its turn, Greek particle τε shows a very probable relationship to the indefinite pronoun τις, like Latin que to quis, which also becomes a generalising marker of indefinite pronoun (/quisque/) or even a copulative postpositional ‘conjunction’ after the second or final element of an enumeration (senatus [et] populusque), just in the same way as we find that -mal/ functions in Akk. The generalising-connective function, linked to its universal semantic value, spreads in Greek, and in Latin as well, in manifold syntactic (conjunction) and lexical (enclisis to pronouns and particles) postpositions as is the case in Semitic (Akkadian).

Leaving aside for the moment this last morph, the semantic charge of the postpositional –m in general can be defined accordingly as a lexicalisation (with 0 semantic charge, as mere prosodic/stylistic variant and as such used mainly in literary texts) of an original general indefinite reference to reality, maybe in complementary distribution with /mî/, as an apophonic alternance (/mâ/ # /mî/) applied to humna/non-human beings. This distribution, primary in CS and based on the same phonetic simple element (/m-/), is predictably bound to appear also in the postpositional use we are dealing with. In fact, so it is, as we will see later on.

The generic-indefinite semantic value (‘what’) and the original interrogative function of the morph, definite in character (‘what?’), enables it to play a very flexible role in the semantic field of definiteness/indefiniteness, maybe in languages which have not develop the ‘articulation’ (also on the base of indefinite pronouns) as a way of solving this problem, as it is the case with Akkadian, Ugaritic and Geœz. So it is possible to find this marker functioning both ways: as a indefinite and as a definite marker, according to the consideration given the item in question: as “one” category (definite, specific category) or as “a” category (indefinite, common to all its members)29. The same can be said to some extent also of the ‘article’ as a marker of definiteness/indefiniteness. For instance, the sentence: “the king has to accomplish that …”, can be viewed as defining a specific category of actants (kings), but without defining at the same time which individual of the category will act (this king). So, in translating nouns that bear attached an enclitic -m, the authors proceed in a free and uncompromised way, using indistinctively definite (‘the’) and indefinite (‘a, some’) articles.

In consequence I find the trend to analyse this element according to its ‘functions’ (locative, terminative, vocative… ) unsuitable. Such functions are defined in keeping with the apparent sense of the clause. The actual function of the morph has to be deduced from the whole syntactical complex of elements, whatever the morpho-syntactical pattern of the word to which is attached may be. On the other

27. The enclitic conjunction –ma is also present in Hittite with adverbial and syntactic functions of text distribution similar to those of Greek /μεν/ and /τε/ and Latin /que/; cf. Watson 1994: 103; Gitterbock-Höfner 1989: 91-99 (–ma enclitic conj. relates words or clauses to each other through pairing or apposition”, p. 91). For Lycian cf. Carruba 1969: 74ff. “Thomsen... unterscheidet drei me: me1, koordinierend (= gr. ἡδ) und leicht subordinierend (vgl arab. fa); m2, leit einen Satz, der einem Realitvsatz folg, oder in gleicher Weise nachgesellte, andere Sätze; wenn andere Wörter als das Subjekt den Satz einleiten, vertritt me3 das Subjekt selbst und steht nach diesen Wörter vor dem Verb” (p. 76).
hand, the Akkadian model is not the best one to uncover the specific uses of the NWS branch. We are faced with two contrasting as much as converging models.

c) Language distribution

1.- **Akkadian** is the language where the –m(a) enclisis seems to show up more systematic and defined syntactic functions. Starting from its original value as a Universal Semantic, I think we can explain their genesis easily, for instance, the conjunctive/connective value: ‘something’ > ‘what’ > ‘this’ > ‘the same’ > ‘also’ > ‘and’, implying originally always a certain ‘logical’, i.e., contents connexion, not mere juxtaposition or ‘copulative’ value (‘and’) 30. This concrete use however remains restricted to Ak. and South Ethiopian (Amh. and Har.). The intent to uncover it also in Ug. will be later rejected. In this case as in the following ones no emphasis whatever can be detected. That is also the case with the optional enclisis to the predicate of nominal clause, where it plays the role of a copula like the personal 3 p.p., a common Semitic isoglosses: ‘what’ > ‘this what (= is)’ > ‘namely’ 31. A similar derivation can be found in the quotation value, exclusive of Ak., again, not be be found in Ug.: enma/umma … -ma/-mi: ‘ecce … what (is/says)’, very similar to the former conjunctive function. The pretended ‘hervorhebendes’ value, when –ma is ‘enclitised’ to any word (pronoun, noun, verb, even particles!), better characterised as ‘identifizierendes’ (‘something’, ‘that’ > ‘just that’, cf. supra), if there is at all, comes from the syntaxis (f.i. position) or semantics of the clause, not from the enclisis, as we have pointed out repeatedly 32. Such a universal use excludes emphasis and plays better in favour of a lexicalised sentence organiser like was the function of similar element in Greek (cf. supra). It operates at syntactic not at lexical level. Above all, to speak of a ‘betonendes –ma’, when joined to different particles, is completely out of place, to my opinion 33. In the interrogative constructions the emphasis lies within the suprasegmental element (tone) and the interrogative lexis (interrogative either pronouns or adverbs), themselves variants of this primitive universal (mamu, mīnu …), the enclisis –ma serving only as an ‘adverbialiser’, namely, almost as a marker of classe or ‘determinative’ of function. To speak then of “Verstärkung der Frage” by –ma in this case seems rather unnecessary 34.

The transfer also from interrogative to indefinite pron./adv., through a sort of reduplication or addition represents a secondary construction that presupposes the primacy of the simple form 35. Such duplication of elements can be seen also in the enclisis of –man/min even to previous –ma (šumma-man > šumman) 36. In the case of the vocative enclisis –mē, lexically in this case a transformation of –mi, the emphatic value of the nominal inflexion or the use of well define prepositions makes useless to speak of such postposition as ‘Verstärkung des Vokatives’.

The function of enclitic –ma as sentence organiser is actually very much apparent in its manyfold usage in syntactic patterns of any kind: interrogative, conditional, coordinative, in conjunction with (or as


31. Cf. Von Soden 1995:221f., 224; Gelb 1969:145 (“Taking ma and mu to be the signals marking the absence of certain morphemes, it is tempting to assume that there two markers originally represented a word with the meaning ‘anyone’, ‘anybody’, or ‘anything’


an implicit alternative to) specific particles like /šu/ or /šumma/, usually in the protasis. This universal syntactic capability comes out from its originally semantic indefiniteness of which its neutral copula function is the best pattern. By itself such an enclisis cannot cover such a large syntactico-semantic field, were not for the presence of specific markers or syntagmes which it just seals off.

2.- Within this frame the Ak.Ug. shows some peculiarities that betray the Canaanite substratum, apart from the common Ak. elements; for instance, in the peculiar use of –ma and -mi in direct speech. Van Soldt singles out also the use of –mi “as a suffix with obscure connotations in other contexts”: attached to adverb/interjection anumma and to verbal forms (probable under Hurrian influence). Furthermore we have the indefinite pronouns mannu and minû expanded with –ma:e.

3.- As for the Ak.EA, the use of enclitic –ma covers all the possible positions recognised by the Ak grammar. It can so accompany the independent as well as the suffix pronoun; also it may be added to adverbs and adverbial expressions, to conjunctions, verbs and the direct object of the verbal clause; it shows up also the combined use of -mal-mi of direct discourse. Peculiar of this dialect is the


41. Cf. aššum, šumma, kīna; ayyakamma, annaka, anumma/äm, ammnīta(m), appūna(ma), assurri(m), kiam, kihamma, kīšama, unnaka(m), pīqamma, šaddaqdim; particularly šanam(ma), šanīlam, ‘furthermore’ (< ‘in the second place’); see Van Soldt 1991:463 for the distribution kīkiina. – The following references and quotations send back to Van Soldt’s grammar of the Akkadian of Ugarit (pp. 469f).


44. Cf. appunama, dannišma, ana daritīna, urra šeramma, assirīmna ...; see Van Soldt 1991:515. – For the respective use of the enclitic –m at Alalakh cf. Giaucumakis 1970:59ff.; Arnaud:1998 does not touch on this subject; he deals only with the demonstrative pronoun anumā (p. 185s.). PPNN may freely take enclitic –m (Ammītaqum-ma; cf. Zeeb 1992:452ff.) and adverbial forms like baltum-ma (ibid., p. 452) are also witnessed.


46. Cf. Rainey 1996 III:230ff. per. anaka-ma, atta-ma, miya-mi, panuia-ma, ḫimeni-ma; ind. minma; also with confusion between interrog. pronouns mi-and man.

47. Cf. Rainey 1996 III:232; Izre’el 1991:327: anum-mma, appūna-mma, ašrāna-mma, šurru-mma, kinanna-ma; kabatu-ma u šu’uma, ḫajia-ma, ūmīla-mma, ina umi u umi-ma, šata šata-ma, šalu pānūšu-mma, ina pānī pānī-mma, ina šattī šattī-mma. To figure out any emphatic value beyond the adverbialising function of the morph in those examples seems to me complete out of place.

48. Cf. šum-ma, šumna-ma, allu-ma, ki-ma, ena-ma, anā-ma ...

49. Cf. inf. paṭārī-ma, aši-ma, dagālī-ma ...; few cases with finite forms: ibašṣaku-mi, yūpašu-mi, yuṣṣašu-mi, nikkudummi, niḥṣirā-ma, dušuk-mi, lidē-mi ...

supplantation of –ma by –mi, “far more common”\textsuperscript{51}, and the absence or rarity of –ma as a conjunction, mainly copulative\textsuperscript{52}. The explanation of those uses as ‘emphatic’, as Rainey holds\textsuperscript{53}, are rather insatisfactory and he is obliged to nuance constantly this assessment. The enclitic element simply functions either as marker o ‘sealer’ of an emphasis already syntactically obtained\textsuperscript{54} or as an adverbialiser of modal accusative (kita-ma). Its role is rather more syntactical (clause organizer) than semantic. 

As for the enclitic –mi and its variant –me, beside its extensive use supersiding –ma, one must bear in mind its feasible dependence on the Ug. enclitic –m, of unknown pronunciation\textsuperscript{55}. In this regard its use in the middle of a construc chain (with nouns, prepositions, infinitives and clauses)\textsuperscript{56} is to be pointed out, a typically Ug. morph (cf. infra). It appears also as a quotation mark in letters, attached to different words\textsuperscript{57}. Finally Rainey records the possible uses of –mi to which also an emphatic value is accorded: with verbs, adverbs and particles and infinitive complements\textsuperscript{58}. In all those cases, not to speak of interjections, another element carries already the emphasis, as was pointed out formerly in regard to –am.

In this connexion it is interesting the treatment Izre’el accords to the peculiar morph –mē as a ‘nominalising’ and ‘adverbialising’ particle, either generalising or least\textsuperscript{59}. It seems that there is a difference in the use of –ma and –mē as could be ascertained from the use of kīma and kīmē, before nouns and phrases respectively, some times in the same text. “The nominalising force of the enclitic–mē in these cases (when we have other nominalising elements) is redundant when attached to a pronoun”. The peculiar character of this variant morph is probable due to its Hurrian origin. “Similarity in usages and in form would indeed result in the replacement of a genuine Akkadian particle –ma by a Harrian one”\textsuperscript{60}.

4.- The Ak.Em. offers a series of functions similar to those of the Ak.EA according to the analysis carried out by Šeminar. Interesting is the recognised value of –ma as ‘anaphoric-identificative’ particle

51. Izr’eel 1998:42, 73 assess in this way the use of this morph in the Ak.EA: “The use of mi by some scribes seems to be more stylistic than grammatical ... The Akkadian cognate ma is used instead of mi by some scribe ...”. But he adds: “The particles ma and mi may be distinct for some scribes... The majority of the CanAkk scribes, however, maintain only one of these practices, in which case the particle utilized is to be regarded as an EMPH, although (underlining is mine) it may be added to focalized constituents all the same. This systematic reduction is the result of contamination between the two components of CanAkk: in Akkadian, ma is used only as FOC marker, mi being as DS (direct speech) marker. Canaanite, on the other hand, uses mi as an EMPH marker. Another use of Akkadian ma is as a conjunction, a use which was not assumed by CanAkk. Few CanAkk scribes mark direct speech by mī. Cf. also Garbini 1960:163f. (“non è possibile stabilire il valore esatto di –ma, -mi”)”.


53. Cf. Rainey 1996 III: 228, 240, Cf. also Izre’el 1991:325ff. (‘focussing’); cf. n. 50. The liberty shown by the Canaanite-Amorite scribe as for the place and element of the phrase to which this morph is added turns out to be a good case in favour of its merely syntactic function (clause distribution), without any ‘emphatic’ (semantic) bias.

54. In this regard a clause like amur anaku panu’ama, “behold, as for me, it is my face ...” (Rainey 1996 III:230), shows enough emphasis already by the redundant use of the pronoun to need any carcatisation as such because of the ‘emphasising’ –ma.

55. Cf. Rainey 1996 III:234ff. “The wide range of examples in which enclitic –mi is employed not as a marker of direct speech shows that at least some scribes from Canaan viewed this particle as the equivalent of the Akkadian –ma” (Rainey 1996 III:248).

56. Cf.: ana-mi LUGAL, šasu-mi abiia, ubili-mi KASKAL, Há šarri, abat-mi URUM. Magiddki, aṣe-mi ERÍN. MEŠ pītati, awat-mi tšteme ...".

57. On –mi as marker of direct speech in relation to its position in the clause cf. Izr’eel 1991:330ff. As pointed out above, this function is in perfect agreement with the basic value of the original /mal:/ as marker of specification of the clause, not of emphasis.


(“that cited”, “the same”) added to nouns in posterior position. The same usage can be found in adv. ašrîs-ma and the pron. šâšu-ma (cf. Ug. km-m). Variants of this identificative, non copulative, usage are the restrictive (“that only”), in anterior position this time, and the correlative (“I’uno … l’altro”). The indefinite value enters in the normal semantics of this morph (šanû-ma, “un altro”, matîma-ma, “mai”, ša-ma, “chiunque”). We would have also with possessive pron. an ‘emphatic’ value of -ma, but in all the examples adduced the emphasis is already shown by the position of the pron., the topicalisation of the nouns or their semantics (“all”). In any case Seminara’s uniform translation by “(lo) stesso” implies a very low emphasis, better characterised as ‘identification’ according to his previous labelling.

The suffixation of –ma to adverbs, adverbial locutions and formulae of direct speech is that of normal Ak., central and peripheric. In this connexion Seminara points out wisely: “Talvolta è difficile determinare l’essata connotazione semantica aggiunta da –ma …”, given its aleatory presence in similar phrases. “Preferisco sospendere il giudizio intorno al valore semantico di –ma, piuttosto che ricorrere ad un generico significato enfatico”. In some cases the usage of –mi seems aberrant, but even there “più che una funzione enfatica, mi pare di avervi riconosciuto un valore di coordinazione simile a quello dell’enclitica –ma”.

This coordinative function of –ma in the Ak.Em. shows up a profound influx of the West-Semitic substratum with its own coordinative conjunction /wa/, Ak. u. Both share and exchange syntactical functions in a type of language used to reproduce traditional formulae more than to follow grammatical correctness.

Endly, the seemingly fixed Ak. way of introduction of direct discourse by –ma and its determinat-
several scholars.\textsuperscript{70} We will below take into account with detail all the added cases of this morph in Hebrew. In any case it turns out to be a basically poetic/stylistic maker, whence its restricted use/survival in Biblical Hebrew prose, frequent in Psalms with some remains in wisdom and postbiblical Hebrew.

7.- Phoen., inspite its small textual literary corpus, exhibits examples of some of the uses of enclitic –\textit{m} typical of NWS: with prepositions/conjuctions, nouns, construc chain, adv. expressions, pronouns … \textsuperscript{73} These examples will be taken in and commented below. In the case suf. –\textit{m} of 3 p.s.m./f. Krahmalkov speaks of ‘excrecent consonant’: \textit{ndr-m}, ‘his vow’, \textit{bini-m}, ‘his son’\textsuperscript{72}.

8.- On the contrary Aram. retains, in all its dialects, but left-overs of this morph: with prepositions/conjuctions and some adv. expansions\textsuperscript{73}. Futhermore, some adverbs like \textit{twbn} and \textit{ywmn} may be transformations of original –\textit{m} endings (?).

9.- In the Ar. language the use of the postposition /\textit{ma}/ is attested also with prepositions, as an enclitic or independent particle, called by Arabic grammarians ‘the redundant \textit{mā}’ (\textit{mā ‘azzā ‘idat})\textsuperscript{74}, thus making clear the lexical origin of the \textit{enclisis} better than in any other Semitic language and certifying at the same time its opaque semantic function. Wright deals with it as the ‘indefinite pronoun’ simply, specifying all its prepositive and postpositive enclitic usages after adverbs, nouns, particles and certain verbs of time: “…if added to certain adverbial nouns, it gives them a conditional and general signification, as the Latin termination \textit{cumque …}; if appended to ‘\textit{inna, anna …} hinders their regimen (see later) …; in apposition to an indefinite noun, it has a vague intensifying force (as a reiteration of indefiniteness, already in the semantics of the noun and of the verb [\textit{mā ‘addaymūnat, ‘azzamāntyvat}, then ‘redundant’) …; added to the affirmative la it serves to strengthen the affirmation (the ‘strength’ goes with the particle) …; it is often inserted after the prepositions … without affecting their regimen …”. That last phenomenon, common to other Semitic languages, may well illustrate the mere phonetic nature of that \textit{enclisis} and its consequent compatibility within the construct chain, the prepositional syntagme functioning as a construct chain; while the ‘hiderning of the regimen’ when added to certain conjuctions reflects a different syntactic structure.

10.- Leaving aside the function of mimation for absolute (and even in some cases definite) state, the usage of enclitic –\textit{m} is in ESA/Sabaic limited to some common enlarged prepositions and to some personal and place names\textsuperscript{75}, along with some obscure examples attached to verbal forms. But regarding

\textsuperscript{70} Cf. the bibliography (also of Dahood’s pupils) and notes accompanying the different categories addeduced of enclitic –\textit{m} in Hebrew; also Emerton 1996:321-328; Ch. Cohen 2004:231-260.

\textsuperscript{71} Cf. \textit{km, lm, hl-m; bn-m …}; Krahmalkov 1991:259, 268, 285f., 289 (“The archaic accusative ending –\textit{am} is retained in the Punic adverb HNM, ‘gratis’” (?)”; Segert 1976:162 (\textit{km: “extended form”}).

\textsuperscript{72} Cf. Krahmalkov 2001:26f. The Phoenician grammar takes this ending as suffix, pronoun of 3.p.s.; cf. Friedrich-Röllig 1999:66 n. 1 (& 112), while KAI 5:2 (\textit{rb kham ‘lm ngl}) is taken as “eine vereinzelte falsche Genetivkonstruktion” (p. 216 [&308]). On his turn Driver, who in a first moment was favourable to the acceptance of this morph in Hebrew and Phoenician, later on manifested a clear reticence; cf. Dahood \textit{Biblica} 49,1968, 89f.; cf. n. 69.

\textsuperscript{73} Cf. \textit{fūnā, k’mā, b’nā; y’dām, syr. \textit{ tamā); Brockelmann 1961 I:474; Dalman 1960:215, 239; Segert 1990\textsuperscript{4}:234 (\textit{br-m}), 236 (\textit{ky-m, kn-m}), 357 (\textit{zq-m}), 538 (\textit{kmā, fūnā, ‘verstärktes \textit{il')); Muraoka-Porten 1998:337f. (\textit{p-m, ‘m}).

\textsuperscript{74} Cf. \textit{bfūdā mā, mimmān, kammā, bimmā; ammū: rubhānā, ‘indāmā, lāyutānā, ‘allāmā, la ‘allāmā; ‘aynāmā, lāyūtānā, wayyāmā, śāyru mā, ‘ayyānā, šāta mā, kull mā …} (Wright 1967 I:277f; II:178, 192f., 224, 276).

\textsuperscript{75} Cf. \textit{bn-m, bn-nw, kn-nw (?), -b-nw (?); Brockelmann 1908/1961 I:473f.; Beeston 1984:30f., 47-49, 54 (‘ …-\textit{m} or –\textit{nw} which is facultatively attached to the end of a word, without perceptibly modifying the sense of the word in the sentence … The arbitrary nature of this insertion can be seen from contrast between (forms with and without it) … But … one could assign some degree of emphasis to its use …’; Höfner 1943:56ff., 114ff. For this author too “die hervorhebende Funktion des \textit{nw ganz
Qabantanian Beeston points out: “Enclitic in the form –m, -mw and -’y are common to a particularly noteworthy degree, and attached to all parts of speech, including (which seems no to be the case in Sab) nouns and adjectives (Beeston 1984:67).

11.- As for the MSA: “In all the MSAL (except Soqotri for demonstratives), there are deictic forms with an –m or –n ending.”76. Nor even the simple prepositions (/b,l, k/) exhibit the common Semitic –m expansion.

12.- On the contrary, in classic Ethiopic/Ge’ez enclitic –m is omnipresent: with prepositions, adverbs, conjunctions, pronouns, pronominal suffixes …77. Interesting is the presence of a particle like mi-mma, with disjunctive nuance ‘or’ (< *mi, ‘what’ + -mma), y ’øsma, as introducer of the direct discourse. Both recall similar usages in Ak. –ma. On the contrary, the presumed ‘Hervorhebung’ function of this –mma must be understood as simple lexical expansion (indef. pronouns) or syntactical organisation (ka-mma)78.

13.- In the two other Northern Ethiopic dialects, closer to Ge’ez, namely, Tigre and Tigriña, the usage of enclitic –m is basically limited to the lexicalised formation of indef. pronouns and particles79. am(ama) is also used in Tigriña to form adjectives, while in Tig. ending –an of pl.m. of adj. represents rather a case of mimation. Interesting is in both languages the remains of coordinative functions of this morph: Tig. postpositive –ma, ‘also, even’ and ma, ‘or’ (in alternative)80; while coordinative –(ø)n, ‘and’, in Tigñ. may be a phonetic transformation of –m (cf. supra this function in Ak), like the verbal negation ’ay – øn would correspond to an original morph with –m, like in Amh. (cf. infra)81.

14.- As pointed out above, Amh. is the Semitic language, along with Ak, in which this enclisis is used in the most general way. It enters not only in the shaping of indef. pronouns, starting from the interrogative, “the enclitic –(ø)m … may be suffixed to any word” as well: verbs, nouns, pronouns, adverbs… Sporadically some adj. may be formed with suf. –(ø)mma. In addition to the pref. al- marks, enclitic –m rounds up the negation in the perfect and imperfect verbal forms82. It also a marker of coordination in enumerations (‘and, as well as …’) and alternative answer (‘me, too…’); reinforces, or better said, precises, calls the attention to (‘that’) the suffixed word; serves as proleptic value (‘as for’), as a transformation of its consecutive function83. In the same way and as a phonetic variant, “the particle –mma may be attached to any part of speech”, namely, verbs, nouns, pronouns and adverbs, with similar values: ‘as for, well indeed …’ as a marker of identification or contrast. In this way it serves to organise the discourse.

78. Cf. Tropper 2002:151f., accordingly brought under the heading “Logische Satzpartikeln”.
81. Cf. infra n.; But –m is not by itself a negative particle; Bejer, W 92:251; 96:267f.
82. Cf. infra n.; But –m is not by itself a negative particle: Bejer, W 92:251; 96:267f.
15.- Southern Ethiopic Semitic, Gur, and OSE (Outer South Ethiopic), reflects a situation similar
to that of Amh., though not so well witnessed. So we have enclitic –(ómo/m(ó/a)) affixed to
pronouns ( indef.), adverbs, nouns (enumerations) and verbs in any pattern, specially to the so
called ‘converbs’ (not to simple prepositions), with indefinite value in some cases (‘any…’) and
the usual coordinative in others (‘again, also, and …’); with negative verb it assumes also this sense (cf. supra Amh.), at noun and
clause level ( –m … –m, mi … –mi, ‘neither … nor’). “With the discourse suffix –m (underlining is
mine) the meaning of the conditional functor ba- … –m) is ‘even if/though’, asserts Gutt, while
Hetzron, talking about enclitic particles in Gunnín-Gurage languages (“preceding all other suffix”) says:
“the most important one is –m(-), a multifunctional particle (converb, past tense, conjoining) which, after
the first phrasal element may stand for a constrastive topic ‘as for’, and some other kind of emphasis”.
As can easily be ascertained, ‘emphasis’ bears here a rather detracted value. I find Gutt’s assertion more
felicitous in order to define the function of the enclitic –m.

Development

Given the bearing of this morph in NWS and its prevalence in Ugaritic, the texts of this language
will be the starting point for our analysis, but we will pay heed to occurrences in other Semitic languages,
with special attention paid to the Akkadian of Ugarit as well as to that of the Amarna letters. In this
connexion Van Sold asserts: “Although the problem of –ma in Ugaritic needs further clarification, at
least the phenomenon appears to be attested in this language (Ak.Ug.) as well”.

To begin with we will deal with lexemes in which the lexicalised nature of the enclitic –m is more
apparent (with prepositions, suffixed pronouns, verbal forms) to pass afterwards to consider the
occurrences of postpositional l–m(a)/ with nominal independent and constructed lexemes to which either
functional/adverbial or emphatic functions are applied. For us, the mentioned morph merely shows a
redundant generic duty in all cases, as stated above.

1) Indecomposable Particles

It is impossible to ascertain any either emphatic (or adverbial, of course!) bearing in the post-
position phonetic expansions of prepositions: Ug. /b-m/, /l-m/, /k-m/ and their parallels in almost all
Semitic Languages.

84. Cf. ammat-ám, ammant-me, attr-em, atto-máá, and with desimilation man-m, man-en (<-en); Leslau 1979:53, 105, 385,
407. Interesting is the use in those languages of balá in direct speech quotations (cf. Ak -mal-mi).
87. In the 12th Italian Meeting of Afroasiatic Linguistics held at Ragusa (Sicily) on June 6-9, 2005, where he called attention
to the function of –ma as the ‘true’ state/movement postposition, adversative and clause modifier in Cushitic Gawwada.
unexplained instances of enclitic –my reflect the still obscure Ugar. Enclitic –m”.
830, 832; DUL I 2004:443-45. Questionable instances: b–m ī nār (KTU 2.13:14-15); k–mbm (KTU 1.15: III 22-25); km mrm
(KTU 1.12 I 11); k–m(–) (KTU 2.19:2-4; cf Aartun 59-60; DLU 447); k–mb (KTU 1.16 VI 50s) (cf. Watson 1996:263). Cf. in
NWS: Heb. kíná, b’má, l’má, Heb.Mish kíná, k’mót; Phoen. k–m; Aram. k–má; Syr. a’ykh–má; - Contrast l’má < l’má (Amor.,
Ug., Heb., Aram.; cf. Hetzron 1974:59), where l’má maintains its pronominal original
bearing.
90. Cf. Ak. kí-ma, kí-máá, kí-mu, ká-m, as phonetic variants; cf. Von Soden 1952:165), lá-m(a); also é-m(a), šú-mma, šitu-m,
elu-m, balu-m, aššu-m (see Von Soden 1995:204ff., 212; /l ki ; Ak.Ug. kí-ma, kí-máá, kí-mu (Van Soldt 1991:460); also Ak.EA
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All those forms, go back to common primitive /ba-mā/, /la-mā/, /ka-mā/. The definitive confirmation of the lack of semantic bearing is offered by the frequent parallelism of those morphs with the simple ones in Ug. and Heb. (//b-, l-, k-/)91. The entire semantic charge lies in the prepositional marker, the postposition serving only to release it as a lexeme. The sometimes presumed emphatic value of those forms as second variant in poetry, in parallel with the simpler morph, is pure speculation: the 'emphasis' or 'focussing' lays in the parallelism itself not in this 'ballast variant'92.

The mentioned original semantic value of this postposition (definiteness/indefiniteness) maybe originated in this lexical system, as a sort of mimation of mono-consonantal nouns/prepositions. In this case we would have to presume that the system of Semitic prepositions made up a primary monosyllabic nominal category, a presupposition that nevertheless cannot be proved93. It could be also probable, on the contrary, that this enclitic postposition came in here as a later development, starting from its widespread use with nouns and verbs. The non-expanded phonotyp seems primary. On the nominal pattern of the prepositional 'construct'chain and its possible phonetic 'raison d’être' cf. infra p. 41f.

Lest frequent is this ‘ballast variant’ with other prepositions, but in principle any of them could have it. The frequency hangs basically on the large semantic range covered by the three added prepositions that displaced the rest. See, for instance, Ug. /f-m-, /bn-m/, /bd-m/94.

The same can be said of subjunctions/conjunctions: Ug. /hl-m/95, /k-m/; /d-m/96; adverbs: Ug. /ahr-m/(!), /hk-m(y)/, /'l-m/, /'b-k-m/ (< */b-k-n-m/), /h-m/, /ht-m/, /km-ml/, /bd-k-ml/, /mid-m/97 and existence and deictic particles: Ug. /d-m/, /fn-m/, /inn-ml/, /inn-ml/, /d-ml/, /h-m/98.

a-na-mi, qa-da-mi (cf. Rainey 1996 III:11ff); Ar. bi-mā, ka-mā; also ’am-mā < *'an-ma, mim-mā < *min-mā (for the vocalic variant /bi/- cf. Ak. /ki/-: conditioned apophonies; ESΑ /bn-m/, /bn-k-m/; Ge ka-ma, ko-mma; Tig. ka-m; ‘Amh. kānu; Ga. (ū;/) kām-; (ū;/) ko-m. For Ebla. cf. Pagan 1998:81f: (at;i:u)šša-ma); on Ak. ‘prepositional expressions’. cf. Von Soden 1995:207f.; “Substantive, die mit adverbialem Endungen oder im Adv. Akk. oder in Verbindung mit eigenlッチchen Prp. Im präpositionalen Sinn gebrauchen werden”.

91. For new readings of this morph in Heb. cf. b-m(yy) mdnh (Is 25:10), k-m 'klt (Is 9, 18), wyn l-m-w zhb (Ps 72:15), 'yn b-m-w tm (Is 1:6); bnvk-m ym (Ez 26:12); mbly-m šm (Job 4:20), k-m nshn (Is 61:7). The particle /gam/ is left out, given its obscure etymological parsing. To avoid overloading this paper, we omit the reference of the authors who proposed each example supposedly found in the Ug. texts and in the Hebrew Bible, unless in special disputed cases. The quotations will lead easily the reader to the adequate bibliographical item.

92. In this regard Tropper (2002:825ff) is right when he speaks of enclitic –m as “Erweiterung von Nomina”, “Stilmittel der Poesie”, “Variation im Parallelismus”, “längere Ausgestaltung”, namely, as more phonetic/prosodic variant, semantically neutral. On the contrary, its ‘emphatic functions (’Hervorhebung’, ’Betontung’, ‘Steigerung’), in any position of the clause, I do not find proved. On the other assigned functions (distributive, copulative) we will talk later on; they must be assessed from the syntactic construction itself (cf. Tropper 2002: 830-31).


95. As a deictic particle (bl, ‘look’), this morph has correspondences in other Semitic languages: Ak.EA allā-mi (EApasim); Heb. halā-m, Phoen. , Pun. hl-m, alu-m, Ar. halu-nma; cf. Tropper 2002:322. Cf. also following n. Ak. an(n)u-nma (" Ug. hn, Heb. hinneh).

96. Cf. Tropper 2000:747, 797, 800ff, 832; Aartun 1974:58-59 (although hl-m/ non as a conjunction), 61; Watson 1992:244, 246.1996:263. Dietrich-Loretz’ analysis of /km-m/ as an adverb in 2.10:12 (‘und das (is) so!’) I take as very unlikely (Cf. Watson 1992:230). For other languages see Heb., /y-m/ /y'z (Jer 48:32), /d-m hrh (Ps 147:15) and for seeming cases of w-m (cf. Michel 1987:172), Ak. k-m, akki-ma, allama-m, an(n)u-nma, šum-nu(n), en-nu, um-nu, šum-nu ... x-nu, um-nu-mi, um-nu, am-ma, lā-man, ra't-mu, qiš-ma, qšš-man, idl-m, apiti-nna, mindē-ma, ana šarrī-ma, tut-ta-ma, ulta-man, annā-mi, lā-mā, lā_mu, lā-man (Von Soden 1995:207ff., 219f); AkUg, supra nn. 40-44 (Van
In all those morphs the semantic bearing lays in the simple element and its original, maybe non-inflectional, ending, the *enclisis* –m functioning only as a general marker of a verbal/lexical, mostly adverbal function, but not of a specific semantic-functional category by itself.

1) Pronouns

Another case where the neutral semantic bearing of this postposition comes out clearly is the *enclisis* to pronouns, either personal or indefinitely, independent or suffixed. This grammatical use is common in almost all the Semitic languages. Any precise semantic bearing remains uncertain and the presumed emphasis is also here merely hypothetical. Its generalised use plays rather in favour of a lexicalised morph. In case of the indefinite pronouns indefiniteness is apparently underlined, as a primitive and homorganic semantic result: Ug. */at-m/, */d-m/, */dt-m/, */mnk-m/, */mn-m/, */asr-k-m/, */n-k-m/ (?), */ah-y-m/, */npš-h-m/, */bhl-t-h-m/, */b-h-m/, */y-l-k-m/, */hbrš-k-m/.}


97. Cf. Tropper 2000: 331, 743, 754, 745 (< b-km/), 832, (sobre /b-km/ p. 745, 749); Aartun 1974:57-58 (para *šbcd-m*, p. 58), but in my opinion *al-m* (KTU 1.82:8) does not exist in Ug. as an expanded negative adverb; Watson 1992:264; 1994:97-98, 101; 1996:264 (*km-m* (…) (latif/ *communque*, ac. … ar.). Cf. in Ak. adv. endings *l-am*, *l-um*, *l-al* < *l-am* … *ān-um*, *-ūn-um*, *-iš-am*, *-al-am*, *āyišk-i-a-m*, *āyiša-m*, *aayakam-ma*, *aayišam-ma*, *alum-ma*, *aanišk-i-a-m*, *aanišk-i-ma*, *aanna-m*, *a(nn)mānum-ma*, *aannī-ma*, *ullīšk-i-a-m*, *ullīša-m*, *ašrānu-m*, *aanna-ma*, *fallānu-m*, *aamānu-m*, *ašrāk-i-a-m*, *ašrāk-i-ma*, *elēnu-m*, *imittā-m*, *šumēlu-m*, *ašišk-ma*, *ašišanna-ma*, *ašulanna-ma;  ṯīšu-ma*, *mati-ma*, *mutē-ma*, *inniššu-ma, inniššu-ma*; and variants and compositions: *piqām lā piqām, enn-u-ma, pāniša-ma, lā-ma, an(n)um-ma, ullī-ma, ṭabarru-ma, ḫaram-ma, ḫaram-me, warkānu-m, urkānu-m, warkata-m, ṭarka-m, pānānu-m(ma), pānā-ma, pānīšan-ma, uullimma-ma, annī(m)-m, ammini-m(m)-m, ašūnī-m(m)-m, inninī-m-ma, mim-ma, kī-a-m, kē-m, kā-m, kī-am-ma, apputtu-ma, uullān-ma, uullānum-ma, elēnu-m, ellānum-ma, itti-im-ma, qātu-m, qātam-ma, rēdu-m, šaḫātu-m, kāyyānta-m, kāyyāna-ma, kāyyānam-ma, purqāda-ma, *[ba-mā]*? (Von Soden 1952:202ff, 215-221); also AkEÀ. Rainey III 1ff. (suffixes: *-am, *-um(ma), *-im*); 109ff, 115ff137ff, 151ff; Ar., the negation *la-m* (< *lā + m(V))*; *la-mmā* (< *lā + m(V) + mār*) (Wright 1976 I:287; for Heb. *Aram., Ar., Eth. cf. nn. supra about those languages. – For Heb., apart from the well known ‘adversb’ *šīšôm, ḫinnām, yōmān, rēqām* (cf. EA *re-qa-m*) cf. infra nn. 18f. the nominal adverbialisation.

98. Cf. Aartun 1974: 58f, but *aph-m* (KTU 1.2 I 13) is very dubious, also *it-m* (KTU 1-5 III 24); Tropper 2000: 793ff, 798 [*himm(ma)/, two functions], 809, 822, 832. Neither does a postposition /hw-m/ seems to exist in Ug. [cf. KTU 3.9.6, and n. 96 for Heb.]; Tropper 832; Watson 1992:230; Moran 1961:61 [*hm(h)* ‘deictic particle’]. The same may be said of *al-m*, ‘nay!’ (cf. Gordon 1998:357, 359; Dahood 1965:50). Cf. also Ak. *en-ma, allitā-mv* (Von Soden 1995:219); Heb. *lhm-h* (2Sam 16:5); Ar. *innā(-mā)* (Wright 1976 I:284). Cathcart 1973:68 reads *hw-y mnm in Sir 41:1 (with the manuscript B and the Masada Scroll), namely, interj. *hw+y* enclitic –m.


102. Tropper 2000:228 (“Selbständige Personalpronomina und Pronominal suffixed sind bisweilen zur besonderen Betonung durch enklitische Partikeln erweitert, im eizelnen durch –n, –m und (wahrsch. Auch) –y. Häufig steht das betreffende Wort betont am Satzanfang”). The emphasis, if there is any, comes from the redundant use of the pronoun with the, mainly imperative, verbal form and from the topicalised position in the clause (cf. Tropper 2000:228, 832; cf. above Buccellati 1996:215, 383ff, the only author, to my knowledge, who pays enough attention to this fact, enumerating all the grammatical and lexical ways of expressing emphasis, among them ‘enclitic particle’). In this case the ‘Betonung’ comes from the redundant use of the pronoun also. For other languages: Ak. *ayya-m, manu-m, and other indef. + –ma* (Von Soden 1995:61ff.: “etstatte Kombinationen”); AkEÀ *a-ku-m-a*, *a-su-ma*,-, *bu-ni-ma*,-, *ni-su-ma*, *iš-mi-ma* (Rainey 1996 I:103-124; sometimes niya, ‘who’, mannu, ‘what’ < WS); InDP + –m(ı) also in Heb (burnmaḥ, m(ı)‘umāḥ), Ar.; EShA: *sah, meh. (dā-ma < dān/m, dī-me < dī-mv), Eth. (manu(ı)-ma), Tig., Tig., Amh.; cf. Aartun 1974:51 n. 2, 56, 58 for the bibliography. For Ebl. pronouns cf. Pagan 1998:75ff. A few cases of suff. pronoun with enclitic –m can be found also in *Pun. (Freidrich-Röllig*
A number of suffixed pronouns with enclitic –m have been suggested in the Hebrew Bible:

w’tw–m rbbt qdš (Dt 33:2)  
wpḥḥ mw–m (Dt 33:3)  
wd’g lk–m (Is 10:2)  
ngšyw–m *wll (Is 3:12)  
‘md ldy–m (Is 3:13)  
wtn lk–m *dny (Is 3:20)  
kbdw–m š’h (Is 30:27)  
my mdd bš lw–m ym (Is 40:12)  
k’yngdv–m ’ps … (Is 40:16-17)  
’s’y *nk–m wr’y (Jr 13:20)  
wd’g lk–m ywšbt (Mic 1:11)  
nnth šmkḥ bby–m ’t … (Ps 4:8)  
byšw’tk–m ygył (Ps 21:2)  
hytny–m yrdy br (Ps 30:4)  
lkpy–m / ngdy (Ps 31:12)  
hyy–m ’šnw (Ps 38:20)  
pgdywn npsw–m (Ps 49:9)  
byšw’tk–m ygył (Ps 21:2)  
lw’s mk lngdy–m (Ps 68:14)  
šl hkkb–m (Ps 68:24)  
p’lt lw–m hykkł … (Ps 68:29)  
bydw–m hrq(y)’–rš (Ps 95:4)  
tpl h’r’r / plt(w)–m (Ps 102:18)  
wykr t m’ry zkwr–m (Ps 109:15)  
šywr lw–m šyr (Ps 137:3)  
lmlky–m (Ps 144:10)  
’šmrym lbqr (Ps 130:6)  
šyrw lw–m šyr (Ps 137:3)  
lmlky–m (Ps 144:10)  
’sh’lwb–m ynp (Ps 48:12)  
’šmrym lbqr (Ps 130:6)  
šyw lnw–m šyr (Ps 137:3)  
šyrw lnw–m šyr (Ps 137:3)  
’sh’lwb–m ynp (Ps 48:12)  
šyw lnw–m šyr (Ps 137:3)  
šyw lnw–m šyr (Ps 137:3)

The Ugaritic grammars limit themselves in this case to register the morph, unable to suggest any convincing semantic function attributable to the *enclisis*, above all in case of suffixed pronoun. At the most the currently adduced ‘emphatic’ nuance, if actually there is any, lays in the redundant use and position of the same pronoun.

2) Personal names

The third case in which the *enclisis* of this postposition becomes semantically neutral is that of PNN, including also DNN. Neither determination nor emphasis can be called in cause, both aspects being already bound to them. Only starting from the syntactical structure of such lexemes and from their position in the clause can this problem be put in some cases. But the alternation of names with and

1999:30, 66, 154 (* /u/ (?)); with relative pronouns enclitic –m is found in ESA: Qatab. (Beeston 1984:67) and Amh., which also uses –m as an article (cf. Kaye 1990:1:134).  
103. Most of those texts will be find in Singer 1942-1943; 1948; De Langhe 1946; Pope 1951; Hummel 1957; McDaniel 1968 (Lam); Dahood 1965 (UHPH), 1974 (Psalms); Van Dijk 1968 (Ez 26-28); Tromp 1969; Blommende 1969 (Job); van der Weiden 1970 (Prov.); Del Olmo Lote 1971 (Jer 14-17), Sabotka 1972 (Zeph.); Cathcart 1973 (Nah.); Kuhnick 1974 (Hos); Aartun 1974:51-61; Penar 1975 (Sir); Viganò 1976; Irwin 1977 (Is 28-33); Ceresco 1980 (Job 29-31); Boadt 1980 (Ez 29-32); Althann 1983 (Job 4-6); Michel 1987 (Job 1-14); Zarro 1987; Cohen 1990; Watson 1992/1994/1996; Emerton 1996; Tropper 2002.
without this postposition points to consolidated phenotypes, independently from their grammatical inner construction. The *enclisis* functions as a merely discreational phonetic expanded phenotyp.

To my knowledge, Watson is, for the moment, the only author who has paid attention to this question in Ugaritic and has listed the most complete series of such expanded PNN. The names witnessed in Ak.Ug. are also offered by him. This list will be implemented with PNN from the onomastic elenchus of other Semitic languages.

To visualise the situation in Ugaritic the instances with and without enclitic –*m* are set out by Watson himself; to which, as pointed out above, the DNN must be added, quoted by Watson also when they come out in the texts:

```
| arš / arš-m | b’l / b’l-m | ḥty / ḥty-m | pt/d / pt/d-m |
| ill / ill-m  | brš / brš-m | zry / zry-m | ḥry / ḥry-m |
| ilt / ilt-m  | gny / gny-m | ydn / ydn-m | ẓpš / ẓpš-m |
| ulluri / ulr-m(?) | hr / hr-m | ytr / ytr-m | td/tgl / td/tgl-m |
| bly / bly-m  | blyb / blyb-m | pgu / pgu-m | ḥty / t-t-m, ḥty-n |
| ktr/ ktr-m107 | il/il-m108 | mt / mt-m109 | bbt/bbt-m110 |
| ḥss/ḥss-m   | ḫbn-m MN111 |
```

This impressive list rules out any attempt of attributing to the morph –*m* any specific semantic bearing; the lexicalised variants appear simply optional and semantically neutral. On the other hand, the syllabic transcription confirms the state of the art, only the vocalisation of the morph is ambiguous: –*m*-

---


106. In *ym * l mt // *b’l-m yml[k] (KTU 1.2 IV 32) (Tropper 2002:827) we have double duty *l* with –*m* as balance variant, with a certain stylistic nuance; the real emphasis lies in the particle *l*; cf. Gr. ἰεῦ / ἰε. Cf. Watson 1992:236; 1996:267 – The six *b’l-m* in KTU 1.118:5-10 (and par. are interpreted in the Ak. version as a simple numerical series; the reading *b cl-m*, ‘am folgenden Tag’, has no verisimilitude whatever, in my opinion, pace Tropper 2002 332, 832.


111. KTU 4.269:30; cf. Watson 1994:100 (?).

112. Cf. Watson 1992:251. It is difficult to ascertain whether we have two different particle -*ma* // -*mi* or just two variants of the same, according to the central Ak. and Ak.EA (Tropper 2002:825). On the other hand cf. loc. Ak. /-t(m)/ and the ending EA /-t(m)/ (Tropper 2002:326). In the Ak.EA the usual variant –*mi* with PNN may have been induced by the NWS personal pronominal /m/, ‘who’, as could also be the case with its variant l-mū (i.e. with PNN; cf. Aartun 1974:39; Watson 96:267). On the vocalisation mal-mū Humme 1957:95, n. 83.

A peculiar instance present the names in vocative case, where the postpositional –m seems to have an emphatic value. But anew this value is inherent to the case ending, emphatic by itself, and when there is a will of more emphasis a real emphatic prepositional particle is used (/y-l/, /l-/). Cf. y ym-m, y b‘l-m (4), y bʾl-m (4), y bʾl-m, [nhr]-m.

At Ebla we find some examples of the use of postpositional –ma, already at variance with –mi, with PNN, which Pagan understands, according to the current trend, as ‘asseverative in function’, that is to say, ‘emphatic’ (‘truly, indeed …’)


115. Cf. Layton 1992:249; also Layton 1990:165: bin-ili-ma- rakab, bulu-ma-šeri, iatar-mu; is the second one a case of enclisis within the construct chain?

116. Cf. Tropper 2002:317; Watson 92:234-236 - In lʾþm bʾl (KTU 1.24:15f (Watson 1992:234-36; Aartun 1974:52; Tropper 2000:826), we do not have a vocative: Yarḥu does not get married to any of Baal’s daughters, he even refuses it, so he cannot be called lʾþm bʾl; also the parallelism rules out this version. Translate then: “make yourself a son-in-law of Baal”


121. Cf. Watson 1992:234-36, for the ‘Amorite’ PNN including or ending in –ma, left aside the ending –um.

Also a small group of PNN with enclitic –ma/-mi are found in Ak.EA, of either WS (addu-mi, baalu-ma, balum-me, bin-azi-mi, bin-eli-ma, bahlu-m-me, mut-bahlu-m-me, rahmanu-ma) or Egyptian extraction (jaya-ma, manie-ma, maiati-ma, nap¿urria-ma, nibmuaria-ma, tieie-ma)\footnote{Cf. Hess 1993:202, 217; Layton 1990:160ff.}. No example of *enclisis* within a contract chain is quoted.

In Hebrew some twenty six occurrences can be ascertained, more or less sures, but without no possibility to distinguish whether they carry ‘mimation’ or enclitic –m, what as we have already pointed out does not make much difference. Those belong to he most ancient layer of the language, here normalised: ‘Ulam, ‘Onam, ‘Ahuzzam, Bil’am, Ga’tam, Horam, Zetam, Hupnam, Husham, Kimham, Malkam, Mish’am, Iram, Pir’am, Shuham, Shephupham, Gershom, Hoham, Hemam, Ya’ilam, Miryam, Amram, Shim’am; also with internal *enclisis* ‘abi-ma-‘el, le-mo-‘el, ‘al-mo-dad\footnote{Cf. Layton 1990:1167ff., 236f).}

Also in Phoenician we met this enclisis in PNN, but those are sometimes difficult to analyse: ‘d-m, ‘rš-m, bd-m, bšr-m, grpš-m, drdš-m, ytn-m, knš-m, mgn-m, mtr-m, ‘z-m, ‘kbr-m, ‘rš-m, srb-m, qnz-m, šp-m. Neo-punic PNN of Semitic origin involving an enclitic –m are extremely rare; some of them are among the Phoenician just quoted\footnote{Cf. Benz 1972:242ff.; Jongeling 1984:17ff.; Hoftijzer-Jongeling 1995.}

Ancient Aramaic PNN (including Hatra, Palmyre, Nabatea and Egip) that carry a –m ending are almost non extant and the few ones could be easily be parsed as pl. or as foreign names\footnote{Cf. Maraqten 1988; Abadi 1983; Stark 1971; Korfeld 1978 (p. 133, ‘Reversindex’. Names like šlwmm, šlmm could be parsed as /šlm-m/). Cf. also Al-Khraysheh 1986.}

Epigraphic (Thamudean) Nord-Arabic offer a certain amount of PNN ending in –n which could be seen in some cases as an allomorph of the *enclisis* –m. This is practically non extant\footnote{Cf. Shatnawi 2002:635. For the whole *corpus* of Epigraphical North- and South-Arabic PNN cf. Harding 1971.}

The examples of PNN with enclitic –m in the ESA Sabaic inscriptions have been gathered by Tairan ‘mnmm, bglm, tymm, ‘glmm, ḫkm, ḫlfn and many other of the mf’l(m) and mlf’l(m) noun patterns\footnote{Cf.  Tairan 1992:9f. Cf. also Al-Said 1995; Hayajneh 1998; Avanzini 1989; and the classical work of Ryckmans 1934-1935.}

3) Verbs

The new set of lexemes to which –m is postponed is that of the verbal forms, not very frequent in Ugaritic: some three dozens with /yqtl/ and only a couple of examples with /qtl/\footnote{Cf. Tropper 2000: 829-30, Aartun 1974:57; Watson 1996: 226-229; Gordon 1998:104. Participles and infinitive are considered as nominal forms. For enclitic –ma with verbal forms cf. above on particular languages, mainly Ak.}, in contrast with the common usage in Ak., central and peripheric. Tropper comments in this connexion: “Es ist damit zu rechnen, dass die EP –m dabei keine einheitliche Funktion besitzt”\footnote{Cf. Tropper 2000:829.}. In fact, it appears attached to verbal forms either in indicative or volitive mode, namely, semantically undifferentiated. Both modes have in the inflexional verbal system their own markers. As pointed out above, also here the expanded form comes out some times in parallel (second position) with forms without such expansion (as it is
rightly pointed out by Aartun), underlining in this way its semantic neutrality and its function of mere stylistic variant \(^{131}\). Some times the interpretation is disputed as far as the verbal form is concerned.

\[ /\text{qtl} / \]
\[ k\text{tm}-m (K\text{TU 1.6 I 53) } q\text{ry}-m \ ab \ d\text{db}h \ (K\text{TU 1.19 IV 29)}^{132} \]

verbal nominals

\[ b \ yrd-m \ ar\vars (K\text{TU 1.4 VIII 8f} \ldots )^{133} \]
\[ n\text{ht}-m \ lyk/mmn-m \ m\text{t} \ ydk \ (K\text{U 1.23:40} \ldots )^{134} \]
\[ l \ b1 \ yrd-m \ b\text{\'mq} \ (K\text{TU 1.151:13} )^{136} \]

\[ /\text{qtl} /: \text{indicative mode}^{138} \]
\[ t\text{lk}-m \ r\text{hm}y \ (K\text{TU 1.23:16) } t\text{rk}-m \ yd \ il \ (K\text{TU 1.23:33) } \]
\[ b \ sh \ t\text{g}r-m \ t\text{ttr}t \ (K\text{TU 1.2 IV 28) } y\text{s}q-m \ l \ r\text{bb}t \ (K\text{TU 1.4 I 26-28) } \]
\[ q\text{dist} \ yu\text{d}-m \ sb\text{r} \ (K\text{TU 1.4 IV 16) } [y\text{m}]r-m \ n\text{m}[\text{rn}] \ (K\text{TU 1.15 II 19f.) } \]
\[ w \ t\text{\'mn} t\{t\}\text{mn}-m \ (K\text{TU 1.15 II 23-25) } b1\text{l} \ h\text{md}-m \ y\text{hmd}-m^{39} \]
\[ t\text{\'sp}-m \ (K\text{TU 1.17 VI 15f.) } l \ t\text{brk}n \ a\text{l}k \ b\text{rkt}-m \ (K\text{TU1.19 IV 32) } \]
\[ w/t\text{\'tlld}-m \ d\text{t} \ y\text{mnt}-m \ (K\text{TU 1.25 :2-4) } h\text{m} \ t\text{\'gr}-m \ l \ m\text{t} \ (K\text{TU 1.82:5) } \]
\[ y\text{\'sh}-m \ (K\text{TU 1.175:7) } b\text{k}-m \ y\text{\'n}-y \ (K\text{TU 1.177:12) } \]
\[ w \ lh \ y\text{\'l}-m \ (K\text{TU 2.14:14)(?)^{140} } t\text{\'shm}-m \ a\text{b} \ (K\text{TU 2.16:10f) } \]
\[ u\text{\'sh}-m \ n[\text{t}]\text{bt} \ (K\text{TU 2.36:15f.) } t\text{\'ad}-m \ a\text{t}\text{r} \ i\text{t} \ (K\text{TU 2.39 :33-34) }^{141} \]
\[ t\text{\'sh}-m \ (K\text{TU 2.71:9) } k\text{d} \ t\text{t}-m \ (K\text{TU 4.710:9) }^{142} \]

\[ y\text{\'qtl} : \text{volitive mode} \]
\[ a\text{rt}-m \ p\text{\'dn} \ (K\text{TU 1.2 I 18s) } a\text{t-m} \ w \ a\text{k} \ ib\text{gyh} \ (K\text{TU1.3 III 28) }^{143} \]
\[ l\text{hm} \ h\text{m} \ s\text{ty}-m \ (1.4 IV 35) \ a\text{t}-m \ k\text{tr} \ (K\text{TU 1.4 VII 15s.) } \]
\[ w \ l\text{hm}-m \ a\text{hy} \ l\text{hm} \ [w \ \text{w} \ \text{st} \text{-m} \ a\text{f[hy]} \ y\text{n} \ (K\text{TU 1.5 I 24-25) } \]
\[ y\text{tn}-m \ q\text{rt} \ (K\text{TU 1.23:3) } i\text{b} \ t\text{\'r} \text{-m} \ b \ b\text{ht} \ (K\text{TU1.24:18-19) } \]
\[ l \ h\text{m}-m \ b\text{cl} \ (K\text{TU 1.24:25f) } (W 92:236)^{144} \]

\(^{131}\) As pointed out, it recalls the function of the Greek particles /\muεν-δε/ as an ‘ordering’ devise without semantic bearing. Cf. Watson 1992:226 n. 25, who quotes Margalit’s felicitous labelling of \(bn-m \ il\) as “a metrically elongated version of \(bn \ il\)" (Margalit 1980:64).


\(^{136}\) Cf. Tropper 2002:830 (?).

\(^{137}\) Cf. Watson 1996:264 (?)


\(^{139}\) Here the possible emphasis comes from the rhetoric figure ‘Semitic infinitive’; cf. infra.

\(^{140}\) The case is dubious; cf. Watson 1992:228 (Verret); but DUL 158 (< /clm/) \(\text{KTU w l yt\text{m}}\).

\(^{141}\) Cf. Watson 1992:228; but DUL 18. (< /adm/ II)

\(^{142}\) Dubious text: KTU 1.169:10; 2.16:10f; 3.8:9; Watson 1996:262ff.

Many examples of this kind have also been found, or rather presumed, in Hebrew:

\[\text{qtl} \]

\[w'klt-m \, 'my (1 Sm 9:19) \]
\[wns-m \, mryhq (Is 17:13 and similar) \]
\[ky \, šmt-m \, 'yr lgl (Is 25:2) \]
\[wktw[w]-m \, nws nsw (Jr 46:5) \]
\[kyś-mt-m \, cyr lgl (Is 25:2) \]
\[rš-cy-m \, 'lhy (Ps 18:22 // 2 Sm 22:22) \]
\[w'klt-m \, 'my (1 Sm 9:19) \]
\[wns-m \, mryhq (Is 17:13 and similar) \]
\[kyś-mt-m \, cyr lgl (Is 25:2) \]
\[rš-cy-m \, 'lhy (Ps 18:22 // 2 Sm 22:22) \]

\[\text{yqtl} \]

\[tml'-m \ldots \, twyš-m (Ex 15:9) \]
\[yd-m(w) \, k'bn (Ex 15:16) \]
\[ys'ı-wm \, dbytyk (Dl 33:3) \]
\[yśś-wm \, mdbr wyšh (Is 35:1) \]
\[bmqbw \, yḥzw-m (Jr 10:4) \]
\[wykšlw \, bdrkyhm (Job 18:15) \]
\[yqtl \]

\[yśś-w-m \, mdbr wyšh (Is 35:1) \]
\[yqs\ldots-m \, dbytyk (Dl 33:3) \]
\[yśś-w-m \, mdbr wyšh (Is 35:1) \]
\[bmqbw \, yḥzw-m (Jr 10:4) \]
\[wykšlw \, bdrkyhm (Job 18:15) \]
\[yš-hm \, 'pk (Ps 85:4) \]

\[\text{hpk-m} \, šš hrym (Job 28:9) \]
\[\text{ypk-m} \, šš hrym (Job 28:9) \]

\[\text{Paronomastic inf.} \]

\[rgm- \, argm(a/k) (KTU 1.3 IV 31f) \]
\[ḥmd-m \, yḥmdm (KTU 1.12:1:38, II 9) \]
\[w \, an mt-m \, amt (KTU 1.17 VI 38) \]
\[yd'-m \, lyd't (KTU 2.39 :13f) \]
\[ywpt-m \, [ywptn] (KTU 1.4 VI 13f) \]
\[rk-m \, ybrk (KTU 1.15 II 18f) \]
\[lak-m \, ilak (KTU 2.30 :19f) \]
\[pk-m \, alhpk lbš (RS 92.2016:36') \]

144. Cf. supra n. 116. In yšl (KTU 1.100:6 and par.) no enclitic –m is to be accounted for (< /l yan/); Watson 1996:261).
THE POSTPOSITIONS IN SEMITIC: THE CASE OF ENCLITIC –M

hrp’ymhülw-m (Job 26:5)  h “śhky-yqw-m (Job 31:14) (?)
wyšyb-mínšḥ (Job 36:7)  ‘ymtht-m (Job 40:12)
ytgp‘-mhrp (Pr 20:3-4)  znḥ-mšalwmnpšy (Lam 3:17)
yr’ ‘lyysygm (Sir 6:15)

Verbal nominals and imp.
lḥwml-dynalym (Is 10:2)  c(h)-mrwḥw (Is 11:15)
khdwṣ-mtnbn (Is 25:10)  p(y)-mwbdknwrt (Is 30:32) (?)
’t-mw‘lsprḥḥ (Is 30:8)  wnḥr(y)-m(bw)(Is 33:21) (?)
sqlm-mbn (Is 62:10)  mṭṭwbdkmḥṭk(Jer 17:4)
k’yšndhm(Jer 14:9) (?)  nṣlmkpr (Hab 2:9)
rtq-mṣv’ty (Ps 22:2)  hymṣpt-m(Ps58:12) (?)
wrw-mpt’lwv(Ps 66:5)  yr-mbwmdbsm(Ps 83:12)
wgw‘-mr’(Ps88:16)  mkh-mṣwrt(Pr3:18)
lṣgtw-mmr’dr’t(Pr19:27)  ll-mmkh(Lam2:2)
wṣyldwzm-m(Lam3:26)

In no other case the attribution of emphatic value to the postpositive /–m/ turns out to be more redundant than in case of paraphrastic infinitive (alias Semitic infinitive!), itself an emphatic morph by nature 146.

For the rest this morph is to be found in all the Semitic languages 147. But in this connexion the peculiar situation in Amharic has to be taken into account. There is in the morpho-syntaxis of this language the negative ‘existence’ morpheme aldollăm …-m, and the more general negative verbal pattern, al-…-m, with perfect and imperfect as well 148. Here the original semantic bearing of –ma, ‘what, whatever’ (cf. Latin res) is maybe preserved and its function as mere lexicalised sealing of the negative particle (/al-/) is apparent 149. It could be a good sample of the origin of this enclitic morph. In any case its presence in the periphery of the Semitic family could represent another confirmation of the ‘edges law’. We may conclude that taking into account its general regularity, the enclisis l-m(a)/ does not have any peculiar semantic bearing (nor ‘prolative’ either) in case of being postponed to verbal forms. It appears as a lexicalised morph, the semantic nuance depending on the verbal modal system.

This verbal use of enclitic –m could be considered either as a secondary generalisation of enclisis starting from a peculiar grammatical function or as a primitive morph which has been lost or weakened in other languages (like ‘mimation’). It could be so a linguistic phenomenon preserved in the linguistic edge (enclitic /-ma/ in general) and introduced into the verbal system by the generic/universal bearing of negation (‘no… whatever may be’). In Ugaritic, and other later Semitic languages in general, it may imply hypercorrection, therefore used almost exclusively in poetry and ‘solemn’ texts.

4) Nouns

149. Cf. Cat. ‘no res’ > ‘res’, ‘nothing’. From this enclitic use would probably derive the value of /ma/ as a proclitic/prepositive negative particle in Ar. and other languages?, supra n. 82.
But the real difficulty comes out in the apparently **multiform** uses of this postposition with nouns. We are going to consider the different functions attributed to this morph by the various authors, taking into account only the **status absolutus** and the **status constructus** of the nouns, independently from their case ending determined by the syntactical function.

In case of nouns with adverbial function, this is indicated by the inflexional –*a* accusative morph, the postpositional –*m* functioning just as a dispensable and neutral phonetic variant (‘Erweiterung’). The kind of adverbial function is irrelevant for us, as far as the use of **enclitic** –*m* goes. Precisely, the multiplicity of such functions is the clearest argument against the attribution of any specific adverbial value to this postposition. Its function is merely lexically expansive and syntactically organising suffixed to adverbial accusatives or prepositional syntagmes:

a) Adverbial sealing

**Modal, ‘material’, etc.:**

\[
\begin{align*}
[ašhlk] & \quad šbt h m \quad // \quad šbt dqnh [mn' m] \quad (1.3 V 10-11, 32f.)^{152} \\
g & \quad (KTU 1.6 I 10f) \quad dq an-m \quad (KTU 1.6 I 22) \\
nlmln & \quad tlk nbt-m \quad (KTU 1.6 IV 13) \quad špš-m \quad (KTU 1.14 III 3, 14 and par.) \\
kšt-m & \quad (1.14 I 16f.) \quad zbln-m \quad (KTU 1.14 I 16s) \\
kšp-m / šrś-m & \quad (1.14 IV 42f.) \quad 'ry-m \quad (KTU 1.16 II 29) \\
uzr-m & \quad (KTU 1.17 I 21s) \quad ṭn-m \quad (KTU 1.18 IV 22) \\
krä-m / ḫrq-m (KTU 1.24 :22f.) & \quad ur-m \quad (KTU 1.39:8 and par.) (?) \\
pś-m (KTU 1.43 :24-25) & \quad šlm-m \quad (KTU 1.46 :15 and par.) \\
mihrṭt prīt-m (1.92:25) & \quad 'l-m \quad (KTU 1.105:25f) \\
šrp-m (KTU 1.111 :6) & \quad iyn-m \quad (KTU 1.112 :12) (?)^{154}
\end{align*}
\]

Similar, although no so numerous examples can be found in other languages:

**Ak**: urra(m) u mūša(m), an(n)umma; more abundant in the **Ak.EA**: ḫa-ia-ma (EA 245:6), ki-ta-ma (EA 107:11), ur-ra / [ǔ] mu-ša-am (EA 73 :20f.), mu-ša ur-ra-am (EA 362 :33), l[ēl]a / le-lā-ma (EA 243 :13 / 195 :13)^{155}.

Also in this case Hebrew provides some clear and repeated examples: pit’om, ʾerom, ’umnā-m, ḥinnā-m, rēqā-m^{136}; some new examples have been provided: ṭḥyw t ’mnwt ʾšl-m (Is 10:2); ṭḥym ḥṭynym ly mr-m (Ps 56:3).

150. Cf. in this regard Tropper’s distribution; already Ginsberg (1945:6, n. 13) accepts Singer’s observation that ending ‘*m*’ is many times adverbial, maybe in keeping with Heb. /–ā/ (ḥinnām, rēqām, yōmām). But he does assert also that such ending, when is not a plural or dual ending, is always an adverbial or vocative ending.


152. This couple of examples and some others could be taken as objective accusatives.

153. This couple of examples and some others could be taken as objective accusatives.


156. Cf. Tropper 2002:326
A particular set of examples in Hebrew with this ‘adverbial’ sealing pressures the presence of enclitic –m instead of the classical intensive plural:

- wdhl 'yš-m (Is 53:3; cf. maybe Ps 141:4)  
- ḥqlt šlmn-m (Jr 13:19)  
- ḫ’yn tmrw(y)-m (Hos 12:15; cf. Jr 6:26; 31:15)  
- 'gr b’hlk 'wlm-m (Ps 61:5, and many others)  
- yṣyrm tšpw (Ps 58:2; cf. Ps 75:3)

Locative

- bargs // b’pr-m (KTU 1.3 III 14f)  
- ʾlk pht ġł b šd-m (KTU 1.6 V 17f) (?)  
- kqr urbt-m (KTU 1.169:3)  
- mrhqt-m qlny (KTU 2.11:6 and par.)

The use of this morph is present in central Ak. (–m, -m-ma) and also manifestly in the Ak.EA.: kba-tu-ma â šuí-â’-ru-ma (EA 282 :6-7), ba-āq-nu-ma (EA 232:11), šh-ul-ru-ma (EA 232 :11).

Instrumental

- mṯ-m tgrš (KTU 1.3 II 15 and par.)  
- kltan-m (KTU 1.14 II 15 and par.)  
- ʾnt šrz-m (KTU 1.82:11) ?  
- lšn-m šlh (KTU 1.83:5) (?)  
- ʾr-r-m ynr-rnh (KTU 1.100:65)  
- clt-m yš dynh (KTU 1.100:66)

temporal

- ʾl-m (KTU 1.41:8 and similar)  
- ahr šapš-m (KTU 1.14 IV 37)

b) No adverbial bearing

With absolute/attributive forms

159. Cf. GAG 87f; Tropper 2002:326. In other Semitic languages this adverbial meaning is taken up by the corresponding preposition.
161. Cf. Tropper 2002:328, 322, 332. In other NWS languages: Heb. yōmā-m (leḥem yōmām wālāylāh [Ps 42:5]); JAr. yēmā-m; Syr. ānā-m (Brockellmann GVG I, 474). See also ḫṣr-y in Meša’ ṣ inscription (Blau 1980:143-145).
In Hebrew many examples have been put forward of this particular morph, independent, in balance with suffixed pronouns or in their place:

- yqww hmym … 'l-mqw(h)-m (Gn 1:9)
- ygd' qbm (Gn 49:19-20)
- wlnš' rym bkm … blbb-m (Lv 26:36)
- 'l msy' (w)-m (Nm 23:22, cf. 24:8)
- mšn'yw-(m) yqwmwn (Dt 33:11) (?)
- l'dyr-m … k gbwr-m (Judg 5:13) (?)
- 'm-shyw hť'ykm knšy-m (Is 1:18; 1QIs: kšny)
- wns' ns lgwy-m mrhq (Is 5:26)
- mšgr-(w)m rb ynmyn (Is 24:22)
- mqw(h)-m-nhrkm (Is 33:21) (?)
- k'yn ndgw-m 'ps (Is 40:17; 1QIs: ndgw)
- w'l yhsr lh-m (Is 51:14)
- znq' 'm-ml' ymy-m (Jer 6:11)
- 'yr-m l' nšbhh (Jr 22:6)
- bs't' zbnym mym-m (Ez 27:33)
- 'l gylk ħy-m (?) (Hos 9:1)
- bywn 'd-m (Ob 13)
- wksb'-m sbw' ym (Nah 1:10)
- wygdlw 'l-gbw-l-m (Zeph 2:8)
- ln' hbyt al-m rhy-m (Hab 2:15)
- tkyn lb-m / 'znk (Ps 10:17)
- bny 'l-m (Ps 29:1; cf. Ps 82:1)
- pdwn npšw-m (Ps 49:9)
- l' šmw'lyhm lngd-m (Ps 54:5)
- tkyn dgn-m / tkynh (Ps 65:10)
- 'š'y rd-m (Ps 68:28)
- h'kl-m / wšqm (Ps 80:6) (?)
- lw / mšlwt blbb-m (Ps 84:6)

In Hebrew many examples have been put forward of this particular morph, independent, in balance with suffixed pronouns or in their place:
A peculiar case of enclitic –m in Ugarit is offered by the enclisis of this morph between the nomen regens and the nomen rectum of the construct chain. The morpheme seems to be restricted to the NWS area. So besides in Ugaritic we find it in the Canaanite of EA in different kinds of morpho-syntactic structures (nouns, infinitives and clauses): šusu-mi abiia, “the plunders of my father”, LÚ.MEŠ ubili-mi KASKAL.ŠAR, “the porters of the king’s caravans”, abat-mi URU Magidda kī, “the destroying of Megiddo”, ase-mi ERÍN.MEŠ pi Anat, “the going forth of the army”, awat-mi tištemi ištu ašranu-um, “the word that you have been hearing from there”; even with preposition: ana-mi LUGAL gabbu, “(it is) to the king (that) everything belongs”165. In contrast, it is not present in the Ak. from Mari, Alalah and Emar outside PNN, to my knowledge. For Northwest Semitic languages this construction can be traced from Ebla to the Aramaic dialects. The same can be said of the expanded prepositions /bm, lm, km/ (cf. supra). Ugaritic in turn provides a fairly large amount of occurrences, all of them in literary texts:

b mry-m špn (KTU 1.3 IV 1)  
thr-m iqmim (KTU 1.4 V 19, 34f)  
abi-m thw (KTU 1.5 I 14f)  
il-m arš (KTU 1.5 V 5f ;1.19 III 35)  
’nt šd-m il (KTU 1.6 IV 2)  
tkm-m šm (KTU 1.14 II 22)  
bn-m il (KTU 1.16 I 9f.)  
qš-m arš / ks-m mhyt (KTU 1.16 III 3f)  

164. For those texts cf. n. 103. In the Yabne inscription yônê-m is read (Vogt 1960:183-84: < yânâ, ‘opress’).- For other languages cf. supra Language distribution.  
Following in the footsteps of Ugaritic, certain Hebrewists have found hundreds of examples in the Hebrew Bible, many of which can be explained in other ways. Here is a selection:

- bhry-m š’yr (Gn 14:5)
- hnhly-m ’rnwn (Nm 21:14)
- gwy-m šryw (Nm 24:8; *gewē)
- kwwb-m y’qb // šḥt-m yš’r’l (Nm 24:17)
- gwy-m ’m (Dt 32:43)
- mtny-m qnyyw (Dt 33:11)
- mn-hrntc-m šwpym (1 Sm 1:1)
- yd-m ngn (1 Sm 16:16, cf. vs.18)
- my-m lhṣ (1 Re 22:27; Is 30:20; 2 Cro 18:26)
- byd-m š’my (Is 10:5)
- ’ry-m ’zw (Is 17:9)
- wḥrb-y’r-y-m šôr (Is 19:6)
- ’rgy-m ḥwry (Is 19:9)
- mbw’-m ’r’s (Is 23:1)
- ’rbwt-m mrvwm (Is 24:18)
- šmny-m ḥlwmy yyn (Is 28:1)
- gmwly-m ḥlb-tyqy-šdym (Is 28:9)
- ’lḥ’y-m ’mt hw’ ’lḥ’y-h yyym (Jr 10:10)
- k’wb-m ’r’s (Is 29:4)
- nwšbt-m ym(y)-m (Ez 26:17)
- btwk-m ym (Ez 26:12) (cf. supra n. 91)
- my-m lhṣ (Is 30:20; 1QIsa my lhṣ)
- kl y’ry-m šôr (Is 37:25b)
- bš’lw-m ym (Is 40:12; 1QIsa bš’lw my ym)
- wm’my-m ’yn yś ’ry (Is 63:3; 1QIsa; ’m’my)
- ’lh’y-m ’mt hw’ ’lh’y-h yyym (Jr 10:10)
- btwk-m ym (Ez 26:12)
- nwšbt-m ym(y)-m (Ez 26:17)
- ḥrbwt-m ’lm (Ez 26:20)
- bn’mqy-m ym (Ez 27:34; cf. Is 51:10; Ps 69:3, 15) šmnty-m yyn (Hos 7:5)
- kbrm(y)-m ’ll yyyh(h)-m (Hos 11:4)
- ktn-m š’hm (Hos 13:2)
- lhm lm ’mr’y-m zbḥ (Hos 13:2)
- wnšlmh pry-m šptw (Hos 14:3)
- bty-m rbym (Am 3:15)
- lmny šwr w’ry-m šôr (Mi 7:12)
- wlmny-m šwr w’d nhr (Mic 7:12)
- mšnry-m ḥbl š’w’ (Jon 2:9)
- ’pyqy-m ym (Ps 18:16; cf. 2 Sm 22:16; ’pyqy-ym) ’yny-m rmnym (Ps 18:28)
- mḥr(y)-m š’r (Ps 42:7)
- ’lh’y-m šb’w (Ps 59:6)
- ’yr-m šwr (Ps 60:11=2 Chr 11:5; Ps 31:22)
- hry-m gbmrnym (Ps 68:17)

167. A reverse paraphrastic construction, itself emphatic.
168. For those texts cf. Watson 1992:225, 226 n. 25, 240, 242; 1994:96; 1996:264; Tropper 2002:828. I leave aside a long list of dubious or even improbable cases quoted by Watson in his three articles: lhmnt-m (KTU 1.19 I 45), ḥlq-m (KTU 1.3 II 14, 28), ydy ḥḥḥb-m (KTU 1.169:1), mizr-t (KTU 1.5 VI 16f.), lr-m (KTU 1.169:10f), tr-m (KTU 1.16 II 25f.), ṭ-m (KTU 1.16 II 52), hm ṭ-m (KTU 1.46 IV 48), yrm-m (KTU 1.9 I 9), šr-fyṛ-m (KTU 1.16 VI 43f.), ḥṣ-m (KTU 1.16 VI 47f.), š-m b’l (KTU 1.16 VI 56), yḥn-m (KTU 1.8a:4), š-m (KTU 4.323:2), ḥḥḥ-m (KTU 1.100:73), (b) š-m (KTU 1.148:3 ...), w grnn ’r-m šrn prdm (KTU 1.14 III 6f...), l m ṭ-m (KTU 1.15 V 16), ḥłu-m (KTU 1.2 II 20), ’d m (KTU 1.117:7’), ’š-m (KTU 1.119:20f), mṭ mlk-m (KTU 1.119:25), ḥḥḥm šlḥh hatt (KTU 2.3:9:12), ṭṭ-t ḥṣr (KTU 4.41:7), ḥṭ-m b’lm (KTU 3.60:6f), ʾḥl-m (KTU 1.14 IV 49), šś-h ym-m (KTU 1.17 V 3; but cf. 1.17 I 15: b šš-h ym-m), ḥknt my-m (KTU 1.19 IV 28, 37), dt ṭḥ-m (KTU 1.4 I 10), ʾḥl-t (KTU 1.169:20), ṭṣ-t-m (KTU 1.5 I 18 and par.), [š]-m thkm (KTU 1.15 V 14f.), ḥḥḥ-m ṭbqrn (KTU 1.78:5f), ḥḥḥ t-m (KTU 1.1 IV 8), mlḥ-m (4.77b:7; cf. Tropper 2002 832).
A couple of examples can be found in Phoenician-Punic as well: the Pirgi text *hkkm hlm* seems too transgressive (article and –*m* ending) and liable to another interpretation (cf. *hbmn hlm*, "those houses"); but *lkwbkj-l* is 14:15); nevertheless a text like *rb khnm 'lm nrgl*, “Chief Priest of the god Nergal” (KAI 59:2) leaves no doubt on the use of the *enclisis*.

So as for the nominal construct chain the morph seems limited to NWS. Leaving aside its assessment as an ‘emphatic’ particle, which has no support whatever in the texts, the explanation of this construction has to be sought outside the syntactical and semantic field, maybe as a phonetically bound phenomenon. In this connexion the large proportion (approaching 75%) of Ugaritic and Hebrew *nomina recta* beginning with a glottal /'/ or glottalised stops (‘emphatic’) and preceded by *nomina regentia* ending in vowel is interesting. Maybe the *enclisis –m(a)* serves in this position to ease the correct delivery of the construct chain (glottal phonemes). Being a free and dispensable morph it could be extended to other phonemes and at the same time, be omitted in many others. Maybe too this was the reason for the genesis of the expanded prepositions (morphologically also a ‘construct chain’) from which the pattern extended to other syntagms.

d) Special syntactic patterns

Another point linking the Akkadian with the Ugaritic syntax, although this time in the opposite direction to my way of thinking, has also attracted the attention of Semitists in relation to the morph –*m*a.

This is its well attested value as a coordinative particle or marker in Ak. Van Soldt notes, as a specific feature of Ak.Ug that “the enclitic –*m* appears … after a word is used for a second or third time in the
same clause or context". And he provides examples of *enclisis* with verbs, nouns and names. Till now authors were rather reluctant to accept such a function in Ugaritic (Pope, Aartun, Hummel, Watson in principle), even though it may not be alien to its original meaning as a Universal Semantic, as we said above. But given its sporadic appearance in accordance with the examples put forward and the well attested conjunctive-coordinative particle /w/ in Ug. it seems sensible to reject it.

Now, the examples adduced from Ugaritic do not fit this pattern. The two put forward by Van Soldt reproduce a prosodic parallelism. The first (ṣq ... ṣq-m, KTU 1.4 I 26-28) is preceded by two other ṣq... ṣq... and followed by another, in different verses certainly. This kind of parallelism is normally paratactic or asyndetic, so the –m in this structure has the usual function of ballast variant. It would be strange if this construction appeared only once in the whole of Ugaritic poetry. The second example does not fit the pattern since the word are not the same (barš / bʿprm, KTU 1.3 III 14f.) nor is it even sure that this is an enclitic –m.

Similar examples are proposed by Tropper also with the meaning “ebenfalls, noch(mals), noch ein...” basically from the administrative and cultic sphere in this case. The one taken from the mythological realm (KTU 1.23:14f) already presents the copulative conjunction /wl/, so that the –m is redundant in this sense (šb’d ... w ... šb’d-m). The other three cultic texts are controversial in their interpretation: yrḥ-y ḫby (KTU 1.123:7) probably has a gloss or copula character ([“ksa, who] is the yrḥ kassite”177; for ‘ḥty, “the two Anats”, dubious to the author himself (?), cf. my own explanation178. In the case of ilḥ/lḥm/lḥm (KTU 1.41:13f.; cf. 1.39:5), the repetition “for ... and also for ... and also for... (the same deity)” makes little sense in an administrative cultic record179. Once more we are dealing with an isolated case which must correspond to specific cultic reasons180. In the administrative lists dealing with nḥl (nḥl/w nḥlm/w nḥlm ... ) (KTU 4:66:4ff and par.) again the presence of the copulative conjunction makes the enclitic –m (?) a simple redundant marker, unless we are dealing with a specific legal formula implying for instance successive generations of heirs (?). The other examples which imply the postpositional ballast variant are not relevant.

The case of sequentially repeated words belongs to the well known distributive pattern in Semitic (cf. Sp. ‘día a día’), so the –m just seals here off this function through a sort of adverbialisation:

ym ym-m (KTU 1.1 V 2f ...) išt išt-m (KTU 1.2 I 32f) (?)
skn-md ḫtn ‘dn-m (KTU 1.12 II 52f) kmr kmr-m (KTU 1.19 I 12) (?)
mnk mnk-m (KTU 3.2 :12f) bnš bnš-m (KTU 3.516f)181

On the other hand npš-m npš (KTU 1.133:2-3) is a scholarly exercise, amended by the canonical text 1.5 I 14f and going counter to the postulated pattern (in first position) To presume here a case of ‘topicalisation’ would be to go too far away. To atmost it could be a case of 1. p. suffixed pronoun (/-i/) with enclitic –m.

175. The asyndetic use is also well attested in Ugaritic: l asṭ ḫty nʾry (KTU 2.33:28f.) and in lists (cf. KTU 4.147 and similar).
177. Cf. in this sense the ‘anaphoric/identificative’ function of Seminara, supra p. 7.
180. According to the Akk. use the –m is set after the last item.
Finally they appear to be some Ak. loans in peripheral Ak.EA and Ak.Ug.:

ša-at-ta ša-ta-ma (EA 38:11)  i-na MU.KAM MU.KAM-ti-ma (RS 20.33:26')
u₄-mi u₄-mi-ma (EA 147:7.28.67)  du-na du-na-ma (EA 109:54)\(^{182}\)
lum-na lum-na-ma (EA113:13;116:41)

In these frozen wordings the –ma also seals off the distributive meaning meant by the repetition, implying a sequential unity more than a coordination of items (‘one after another’, more than ‘one and the other’).

In case of b) distant repetition, the examples adduced do not fit Van Soldt’s pattern either, but some runs counter to it; in any case they are to be viewed from the same parallelistic pattern mentioned:

dt / dt-m (KTU 1.4 VI 33ff)  b / b-m (KTU 1.10 III 29f; 1.19 II 18, 25)
hl-m gdš / hl-m adr / hl ṭkb (KTU 1.16 I 7-9)  pr’-m / pr’-m / pr’-m (KTU 1.17 V 3ff)
ib-m / ib (KTU 2.33:27f)  [y]l-m / yd’-m (KTU 2.39:10, 14)
bd / bd-m (KTU 4.132:1f.)  / / l-m (KTU 4.223:6-9\(^{183}\))

Summing up, we support the common opinion that rejects the conjunctive function of the enclitic –m in Ugaritic, a typically Akkadian morph that did not have clear reflections in Ugaritic texts.

Conclusions

Enclitic/postpositional –m must be considered as a prosodic enlargement/expansion with an original generalising semantic value (‘whatever [it may be]’). As such it had an indefinite nuance at the semantic level but definite at the syntagmatic/syntactic level. Attached to verbs that could take a certain reassumptive/prolative bias (depending on the place of the verbal predicate in the phrase), mostly related to the object complement; attached to nouns its indefinite/generalising value could suppose a sort of ‘explicitation’ (or ‘focussing’ or call of attention not of intention) of either the individuum (definite value) or the category/species (indefinite), leaving aside its function as a mere stylistic ‘ballast variant’ without any semantic value whatever. This can be ascertained particularly in the so called ‘adverbial’ function of this morph. Its original indefinite semantic value as a ‘Universal Semantic’ enabled it to ‘explicit’ the nominal adverbial function, signified already by the inflexional ending, whatever it may be. And so we cannot speak of ‘modal, locative, instrumental, vocative, etc. enclitic –m’, because the morph has not any of those values, nor any general emphasising force. For this function the language has its either own pre- and postpositional morphs or suprasegmental pitch. On the contrary, its value is rather ‘generalising’, that being the reason why it can function as a general postpositive enclisis.

Very soon however the original value was lost and the postpositional –m became lexicalised, a phenomenon that appear clearly in its attachment to particles and PNN. At the present level of grammatical reading of our texts this morph does not have a semantic relevance, only a prosodic /phonetic redundancy. The morph has more a phonetic value (rounding off of the word sound and clause rhythm) than a semantic one. It appears as optional and dispensable as a mere lexicalised postposition, of euphonic-stylistic expansive nature without a semantic value of its own, almost as a deictic particle of


second degree that ‘points out’ semantic and syntactic functions already embebed in the morpho-syntax of the discourse.
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