

Jean-Charles DUCÈNE	
Un nouveau manuscrit du <i>Šuwar al-aqālīm</i> d'al-Iṣṭahrī: le ms. 'Aref Ḥakamt <i>Ğuğrāfiya</i> 910/7 (Médine, Maktabat 'Abd al-'Azīz).....	279
Michel QUITOUT	
Situation linguistique en Libye.....	313
Aaron RUBIN	
Notes on the genitive exponents of some Modern Arabic dialects.....	327
Michael MALESSA	
Zur Semantik des Verbs <i>NTN G</i> 'geben' mit der Präposition <i>ʔel</i> statt <i>l-</i>	337
Aaron P. DUNNE	
Graphic and artistic political expression in contemporary Iran.....	345
Michael KNÜPPEL	
Zum Problem der Terminologie für uigurische Faltbücher.....	357

Review Article

Charles G. HÄBERL	
Mandaean studies since the millennium.....	361

Review

Bülent Fevzioğlu, Suna Atun; <i>Kıbrıs Türk Halk Edebiyatında Destanlar ve Ağutlar</i> <i>Üzerine Bilgiler – Belgeler – Araştırmalar</i> , (by G. Zajaç).....	369
--	-----

Bibliographical Notes

R. Bäcker, Shakir Kitab (Eds.), <i>Islam a Świat (Islam and the World)</i> , (by R. Kanarkowski).....	375
A.Š. Jusupova, <i>Samoučiteli tatarskogo jazyka XIX veka. Leksika</i> , (by S. Ćwikliński).....	376
W. Skalmowski, <i>Studies in Iranian Linguistics and Philology</i> , (by B. Mękarska).....	378

Short Note

Society, History and Culture in the Persianate World, Second Biennial Conference on Iranian Studies, 2-5 April, 2004, Yerevan, Armenia, (by A. Krasnowolska, R. Rusek)	381
--	-----

Olga Kapeliuk

Hebrew University, Jerusalem

SOME SPECIAL FUNCTIONS OF THE ADNOMINAL
PRONOUNS IN NEO-SEMITIC

1. Preliminary remarks:

In the present paper the term “adnominal” is applied to pronouns, both suffixed and independent, which are usually designated as “possessive” in grammars of the Semitic languages. The purely formal term “adnominal”, that carries no semantic connotations, seems more adequate for our purpose which is to demonstrate that the use of these pronouns goes far beyond simple rendering of possessivity. It had been suggested in the past that all the functions of nominal sentence components may be reduced to three basic cases, namely: nominative representing the subject, accusative as verb complement and genitive as the complement of nouns and prepositions¹. In the Semitic languages, ancient as well as new, all these functions may equally be rendered by means of the adnominal pronouns. Moreover, in the modern languages some new roles have further been devolved upon these grammatical elements.

The modern languages examined in the present paper belong to the peripheral branches of Semitic, i.e. to Eastern Neo-Aramaic and to Ethio-Semitic, but other languages are occasionally mentioned. Two specimens were chosen from Eastern Neo-Aramaic: Urmi Christian Neo-Aramaic from Iranian Azerbaidjan (henceforth UCNA²) which serves, since the middle of the 19th century, as a literary medium, and

¹ See Polotsky 1979: 208-209 and the bibliography on that theory since 1841 adduced there.

² Abbreviations: Am – Amharic; Ar – Arabic; Arg – Argobba; E – English; ES – Ethio-Semitic; F – French; G – Gəʿəz; Gr – Greek; H – Hebrew; IH – Israeli Hebrew; KK – Kurmandji Kurdish; M – Mandaic; NA – Neo-Aramaic; OS – Old Syriac; P – Polish; S – Semitic; Ta – Tigrinya; UCNA – Urmi Christian Neo-Aramaic; Y – Yiddish; ZJNA – Zaxo Jewish Neo-Aramaic.

the Jewish dialect of the town of Zaxo (ZJNA), an important Jewish center in northern Iraq until the middle of the 20th century. Amharic and Tigrinya represent the ES branch. Most examples quoted in what follows were extracted from works of contemporary literature or from texts recorded and published by linguists but the exact source is indicated only in verses quoted from the Holy Scriptures, so as to keep the list of references within reasonable dimensions.

1.1. The paradigm of the adnominal pronouns

In the following Table the adnominal pronouns of UCNA, ZJNA, Am and Ta are listed. For NA also the independent pronouns have been included because they are relevant to our discussion. Also Am and Ta use independent adnominal pronouns but much less frequently than the NA dialects. As may be seen from the Table, only Ta has preserved the distinction of gender in the plural of the 2nd and 3rd persons, which is a sign of a certain morphological conservatism in S in general (Kapeliuk 1989: 305-306).

ADNOMINAL PRONOUNS

	UCNA		ZJNA		Am	Ta
Sg. 1	-ij	dijij	-i	di:di	-e	-äy
Sg. 2m	-ux	dijux	ox	di:dox	-h	-ka
Sg. 2f	-əx ³	dijəx	-ax	di:dax	-š	-ki
Sg. 3m	-u	diju	-e	di:de	-u	-u
Sg. 3f	-o	dijo	-a	di:da	-wa	-a
Pl. 1	-ən/enij	dijən	-an/e:ni	de:ni	-aččən	-na
Pl. 2	-oxun	dijoxun	-o:xun	do:xun	-aččəhu	-katkum -katkən
Pl. 3	-e	dije	u/o:hun	do:hun	-aččäw	-atom -atän

³ In the Soviet Latin script, which was in use in the former USSR in the 1920's and 1930's, and which is retained here for UCNA, the sign ə serves for transcribing a front *a* and the sign ɐ for a central *i*. In the translation of examples literal translation is inserted between parentheses, whereas words which are added to the original text are put inside square brackets.

1.2. Pronouns after prepositions

It should be mentioned that in the ancient S languages the adnominal pronouns were regularly suffixed also to preposition, whereas in modern peripheral S some changes occurred. Thus in Am the prepositions are now followed by the independent nominative personal pronouns, e.g.: Am: *säläne* (=sälä+əne) 'About me' (about-I), whereas in NA the independent adnominal pronoun is often employed with prepositions instead of the suffixed one, e.g.: UCNA: *min bar-əj* or *min bar dijij* 'Behind me'.

2. Adnominal pronouns with possessive function

The usual possessive functions of the adnominal pronouns in the modern languages under discussion do not differ in most cases from what is known from ancient S and, consequently, there is no point in recapitulating them here. In a few domains, however, we witness certain new phenomena which are interesting both in terms of S and of general linguistics. One of these is the evolution in Am of the possessive pronoun of the 3rd person singular into the definite article. This development, somewhat unusual in terms of general linguistics⁴, and which has its roots in G, has been treated quite exhaustively in the extant literature on Ethiopic (Dillmann 1907: 424-428=§172; Kapeliuk 1994: 3-6, 28-40; Leslau 1995: 154-161 *et passim*; Correll 1991) and can easily be consulted. But there are some points that merit a special mention.

2.1. Exclusive 1st p. pl. pronouns

The 1st person plural in our Table has a double form, both in UCNA and in ZJNA. The first pronoun is usual in the majority of NA dialects and where two forms exist, they often are described as free variants (Maclean 1895: 18 for UCNA, Avineri 1988: 19 for ZJNA), or as variants conditioned by the form of the noun to which they are suffixed (Fox 1997: 44). One dialect (Bohtan in Fox 2002: 169) uses the second form only. But Polotsky (1961: 19-20) has established that, at least in UCNA, the second pronoun is exclusive i.e. the possessive pronoun 'our' refers to the speaker and those of his kind to the exclusion of the hearer, or in his words: "The possessors denoted by this suffix are the family or the village community to which the speaker belongs". To my knowledge, this phenomenon, encountered mainly in certain African and Amerindian languages (*cf.* Bloomfield 1933: 255 for Tagalog; Jespersen 1992: 192) has no parallel in the other branches of S.

⁴ But it is also mentioned in connection with Indonesian, certain Uralic and Turkic languages and, in diachronic perspective, with Armenian (Hagège 2003: 2. 85).

It is interesting to note, however, that in his two excellent grammars of UCNA, the native grammarian Qonstantin Marogulov mentions only *-ən* (Marogulov 1935: 12; *id.* 1936: 34), although he himself uses the second form in one exercise (1935: 12): UCNA: *qaṭunt-enuj raba sajduṭla* 'Our cat is much of a hunter' as well as in his translations of Russian literary works, e.g.: *av mubjinni go mət-enuj ... Tijvili go lodka u ... məqvuxili go pənçar-enuj* 'He showed up in our village.... He is seated in a boat and ... he is calling towards our windows'; UCNA: *xoravatb, cajdan-enuj!* 'Comrades, our bags!' In the last example the pronoun refers to two boys who try to sneak into a train guarded by Red Army soldiers. Here the bond between the two is their common fate vis-à-vis external circumstances. Also in Zaxo, despite the statement by Avineri (*loc. cit.*), certain cases such as: ZJNA: *go: ʔaraʔid babawas-e:ni ʔe: šixtu:sa la-ʔozittu:la* 'Don't make this dirt in the land of our fathers', found in a text in his book, conform to the UCNA usage⁵. It may be noted that, contrary to UCNA, the independent pronoun *de:ni* 'our' in ZJNA is constructed with the exclusive suffix pronoun, which might have caused the erosion of its specific meaning. It is not impossible that further investigation in other dialects, with special emphasis on the notion of exclusion of the hearer, rather than on the identity of the possessors, would lead to a more accurate description of the distribution of the *-enuj* form.

2.2. Inalienable Possessions

Another trait, considered as characteristic of certain "exotic tongues", but nevertheless attested in such "Kultursprachen" as the S family (Havers 1932: 11-112; Hetzron 1978: 124-125; Bravmann 1977⁶) concerns the special use of the adnominal pronouns with nouns denoting *inalienabilia*. In the S languages, classical and spoken, a noun designating inherent possessions, such as family members and body parts (henceforth "part") tends to be regularly accompanied by a possessive pronoun, even if the possessor is expressed at the same time by other means in the sentence. Suffice it to quote an example from Luke 8:54 to show the special behavior of S as opposed to some better known European languages: OS: *וּמִן־כַּף־יָדָהּ w-aḥd-āh b-īd-āh* 'And he took her by her hand' and similarly G: *wa-ʔḥaz-ā ba-ʔade-hā*, but E (King James authorized version): *And [He] took her by the hand*; F: *Il la saisit par la main*; P: *Ująwszy ją za rękę*.

From among the modern S languages only IH, especially in its colloquial variant, drops almost consistently the possessive pronoun in expressions of bodily

⁵ Avineri 1988, sentence no. 702; also in the same text: *brat-e:ni* 'our daughter' (no. 143) and *ka:s-e:ni* 'our belly' (no. 149).

⁶ I am indebted to Dr Rivka Halevy from the Department of Hebrew Language of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem for having drawn my attention to this source.

sensations, if the possessor is already mentioned in the sentence⁷. The person to whom the part belongs may act as the subject of the verb, e.g.: IH: *הוא שבר את הרגל hu šavar et ha-regel* 'He broke a leg', but, more frequently, he is designated by a dative independent pronoun which accompanies the verb with the part as its subject, e.g.: IH: *קואב לי הראש koev li ha-roš* 'I have a headache (the head hurts to-me)', or in an impersonal construction, e.g.: IH: *מגד לי ביד māgared li ba-yad* 'My hand itches (it.itches to-me in-the-hand)'. More literary or archaic variants would still contain the adnominal pronoun, e.g.: H: *הוא שבר את רגלו hu šavar et ragl-o* 'He broke his leg' and H: *ראשי קואב roši koev* 'My head hurts'. The colloquial variants with no adnominal pronoun are, of course, reminiscent of similar expressions in P or in Y and, considering the influence of these languages on IH phraseology, one might be inclined to attribute them to foreign impact. However, given the sweeping proportions of this phenomenon and the marked tendency of IH to replace, whenever possible, an adnominal possessive suffix by an independent dative pronoun⁸, it seems that we witness here another expression of the strong undercurrent in IH syntax to prefer analytic constructions to synthetic ones and to shift the emphasis to the verbal complement.

In the ES languages, G included, the semantic group of inherent possessions is not only regularly accompanied by an adnominal pronoun marking the possessor, but it also exhibits a very special syntactical behavior by increasing the transitivity of the accompanying verbs (Kapeliuk 1973)⁹. Thus, for instance in G, whenever a transitive verb has a part as its direct object, an additional pronoun referring to the possessor is suffixed to that verb, augmenting its valence to two objects, e.g.: G: *tasabbəru-ni ləbb-əya* (Acts 21:13) 'You are breaking (breaking-me) my heart (heart-ACC-my)'; with a reflexive-passive verb, when the possessor becomes the subject, the verb still keeps the part as its direct object in the accusative, e.g.: G: *kama ʔi-tət ʔaqaf ba-ʔəbn ʔəgər-a-kka* (Luke 4:11) 'That you won't stub (stub.yourself) your foot (foot-ACC-your) against a stone'. These two examples have their parallels in Am and Ta, but not the following one in which an intransitive verb, that normally does not accept an object, is provided with

⁷ Out of 90 expressions, quoted in a study on the metaphoric use of body parts in colloquial IH, in which an adnominal pronoun might have been expected (Netzer 2003), only 12 carried one.

⁸ Compare "literary" sentences such as: H *הרסו את ביתי harsu et beyt-i* 'They destroyed my house' with its colloquial equivalent: IH *הרסו לי את הבית harsu li et ha-bayit* 'They destroyed (to)-me the house (ACC)'.

⁹ I don't refer to this constructions as containing the accusative of relation (Diem 1986: 264-269) because my interpretation of increased transitivity allows me to include in the same definition also cases of intransitive verbs with the part in the nominative as their subject.

a suffix object pronoun because its subject is a part: G: *wa-rə ʿada-nni manfas-aya...wa-dangaša-nni ləbb-aya* (Daniel 7:15) 'And my soul trembled (trembled-me) ... and my heart panicked (panicked-me)'. In the modern languages the last construction has been replaced by impersonal expressions. In ES not only the body, dead or alive, and its members are considered as parts, but also clothes, the soul, the name, the voice, the speech, thoughts and intents, certain intellectual qualities, character and behavior and in Am even the house and the salary.

In ES, outside these constructions, other phenomena connected with the body and its activities also tend to attract the adnominal pronouns, e.g.: G: *wa-našša ʿem-lamš-u* (Mark 1:42) 'And he was healed from leprosy (leprosy-his)'; G: *wa-wahab-omu sənq-omu la-fənot-omu* (Genesis 45:21) 'And he gave them provisions (provision-their) for the trip (for road-their)', but in the original with no pronouns: H: *ויתן להם צדה לדרך*; Am: *māfūṭ-wa-n band tənfaš-wa... wada wəst asgäbbačč-əw* 'She absorbed her drink... in one breath (in-one breath-her)'; 11. Ta: *ab käbbid dəqqas-om fūḥalu* 'They sank in heavy sleep (sleep-their)'. Similar cases are also found in NA, but less frequently, e.g.: UCNA: *jimmə min kipn-o marra gərguṣilə* 'His mother, her illness drags on from hunger (hunger-her)'; UCNA: *min zdut-ij švirrij al pec* 'From fear (fear-my) I jumped on the stove'; UCNA: *kəlbə šinjivə min gixk-u* 'The dog had fainted from laughter (laughter-its)'.

3. Adnominal pronouns with relating function

Adnominal pronouns are sometimes used for relating¹⁰ a nominal sentence component to a person without there being any connotation of possessivity. Several such expressions were found both in ES and in NA. In a certain manner they seem to convey the notion of the dative and necessitate the presence of a preposition in the translation, e.g.: Am: *yəhəčč-əss mən-əh nat?* 'This one, what is she [to] you (what-your she.is)?', and already in G: *məntə-kka ʿəllu ʿəmuntu* (Genesis 48:8) 'What (what-your) [are] these [to] you?'; Ta: *ṭəna-y dəḥan ʿalloku* 'I am well ([as to] health-my well I am)'. Also with an adjectival participle (cf. Leslau 1995: 55), Am: *wāqt-u bāṭam asgi-yaččən nəbbār* 'The time was very frightening (frightening-our) [for] us'; Am: *asfällagi-yaččən aydälləm* 'It isn't necessary (necessary-our) [to] us'. And while relating an occurrence to the speaker, e.g.: Am: [A. says that

¹⁰ I use the term "relating" instead of "referring" because the verb "to refer" in present day linguistics is restricted mainly to discourse analysis and designates a different procedure. By "relating" I mean a process similar to the use of the adnominal pronouns with prepositions that simply relates the content of the preposition to the person or to the object to which the pronoun refers.

he stopped smoking. B. reacts disapprovingly] *ka-tägānānñän gāmməro sost-e arat-e aqqäṭaṭlähall* 'Since we met you lit three [times] (three-my) or four [times] (four-my)!'. Generally speaking, adnominal pronouns tend to accompany expressions of time in G and in modern ES, relating them either to an argument of the verb or to another expression of time (explicit or implicit)¹¹, e.g.: G: *nāhu šālās-omu yom ənza yəṣannəḥu-ni* (Mark 8:2) 'Behold, today is the third [day for] them (third-their) while they are waiting'; G: *wa-kona kälə ʿo əlat-a* (Genesis 1:8) 'And it was the second day' (other-ACC-its day-ACC, the pronoun resuming the first day and the accusative marking the predicative complement of *kona*); Am: *əndih aynūt səm səsāma yämägāmməriya-ye nāw* 'It is the first (of-beginning-my) [time] that I hear such a name' (for pronouns with expressions of time in Am cf. Leslau 1995: 55); Ta: *ʿab ʿətu tmali-ʿu ḥəšij zə-säfäru-llu nəssom kä ʿa ba-šəbbəḥit-u ʿab-ʿu säfäru* 'The next day (in-morning-its) He himself also camped where His Majesty camped the day before (yesterday-its)'.

Quite surprisingly, some of the manifestly idiomatic Am expressions, quoted in the preceding paragraph, have their parallels in NA. Thus UCNA: *qə mudj-ən ijli kəlbə xinə* 'What do we need another dog for (for what-our is another dog)?', and with an adjective: UCNA: *ənij zi əhə lazəm-e-la* 'They too, this is necessary [for] them (necessary-their-is)'. In the following example even an independent pronoun has a relating function: ZJNA: *ḥəqq-u məstaḥəq di:de qəḥl-le* 'The fate worthy [of] him (worthy his) is killing'. The following two examples show the two different functions of the adnominal pronoun: first marking possession with an inalienable *possessum* (cf. § 2.2 *supra*) and then relating it to another person: UCNA: *ki hojə bixjə min xişş-o* 'She is crying from sorrow (sorrow-her)', versus: UCNA: *xə šitə šimtə b xişş-u pištivənvə* 'I was left a whole year in longing [for] him (in longing-his)'.

Another interesting construction with relating adnominal pronouns is encountered in compound verbs in NA (Kapeliuk 2002: 374-375). In the complex interplay between the incorporated object of the verb and its reflection in a resuming pronoun inside the verb itself, there is no room left for another adverbial pronoun for rendering a dative complement (Polotsky 1979). It may be expressed by a preposition, e.g.: UCNA: *cunki d goran əhə izin jiv-ə-li qəṭ-ən* 'Since our husband allowed it to us (this permission given-it-he.is to-us)', but not less frequently the dative object is rendered by an adnominal pronoun suffixed to the incorporated object, e.g.: UCNA: *çuvvab-e her levə maddur-u* 'He wasn't answering them at all (answer-their he.wasn't returning-it)'; *şqəltə d mint-ij* 'Thanking me (taking thanks-my)'. This usage seems to be an echo of the co-territorial Iranian languages (cf. Telegdi 1951; Tabaian 1979) with which NA forms an obvious *Sprachbund* as far

¹¹ In these constructions the difference between the possessive and relating function of the pronoun is not so easy to establish.

as compound verbs are concerned, e.g.: KK: *dikan-a Hejar nišan-i min bide* 'Show me Hejar's shop (shop-of Hejar sign-of my give)'; *ezê gazî we kim* 'I shall be asking for you (I-shall call your I.make)'.

4. Adnominal pronouns as subject and direct object

This paragraph deals with deverbal nouns such as the infinitive, noun of action and participle, and its title reflects the double nature, as nominative and accusative, of the pronouns attached to them. In the classical S languages these pronouns, always under their suffixed form, performed both functions, as they still do, to a certain extent, in the modern languages. Adnominal pronouns attached to an infinitive or to a noun of action, could designate either the subject or the direct object, e.g.: Ar: *حبب¹-hu* 'His love', meaning either the fact that he loves or that somebody loves him. Ditto for the infinitive in G: *qatilot-aya* 'My killing' means either the fact that I killed or that I was killed by somebody. But there are nuances; in H with an infinitive preceded by the preposition *b-* the adnominal pronoun serves as subject, e.g. H: *בקבלי² bə-qabb³l-i* 'As I receive', but with the preposition *l-* the government changes, the pronoun becomes adverbial and indicates the direct object: H: *לקבלי³ lə-qabb³l-enni* 'To receive me'. In OS, on the other hand, only the second possibility seems to have been retained, e.g.: OS: *l-meqtl-an(i)* (Nöldeke 1904: 234-235) 'To kill me'. The participle, apparently, did not attract a "possessive" suffix pronoun as its subject.

In the peripheral Neo-Semitic languages under discussion there occurred a significant development with the infinitive and the participle (but not with the noun of action). The function of the adnominal pronouns became crystallized, either as subject or as object, but not both. Moreover, the presence of adnominal pronouns attached to deverbal nouns, became much more conspicuous as a result of two novel morpho-syntactic phenomena: the emergence of the infinitive as a frequent transformation of a subordinate clause in Am and Ta on the one hand, and the introduction of intra-conjugational pronouns in NA, on the other hand. In modern ES an infinitive with its subject expressed by a suffix pronoun often replaces a subordinate clause with a finite verb, e.g.: Ta: *kəlattā sāmun qədmī wəggə³* 'Adwa məğəmmar-u' *Adwa ʾatāwu* 'Two weeks before the battle of Adwa started (before battle Adwa [to]start-its) He arrived at Adwa'; Am: *wānd ləğ əndā- wāllādhu-nna əğğəg mādāsūt-e-n əndə-ttasassəb-lləññ* 'Remind in my favor that a boy was born to me (that-I.engendered a boy) and that I rejoice (and [to]rejoice-my-ACC) very much'. In NA two nominal forms of the verb, the infinitive preceded by the preposition *b-* and the passive/perfect participle, acquired the properties of a present and past gerund respectively, and as such, followed by auxiliary verbs, they were fully incorporated in the tense system with the adnominal pronouns suffixed to them as the direct object, e.g.: UCNA: *o parsupa ... d bi vəd-u-li əməl* 'That person which makes (in-[to]make-

its-is) the predicate'; UCNA: *šbmj-e-vən ənni həqjətti* 'I have heard (heard-their-I.am) these stories'. In the Zaxo dialect this intra-conjugational pronoun may even be independent: ZJNA: *şqillu mbaqo:re di:de* 'They began asking him ([to]ask his)'; ZJNA: *mən zuna le:wax xizye do:xun* 'We haven't seen you (we.aren't seen your) for a long time'¹².

Another syntactical innovation in ES and NA, inexistent, to my knowledge, in the ancient languages, consists in exploiting the opposition between the presence of an adnominal pronoun beside a deverbal noun or its absence for distinguishing between two different syntactical categories. Thus in Am the presence of a pronoun suffixed to an infinitive or its absence allow the creation of different equivalents of subordinate clauses (Kapeliuk 1988: 29-58). An infinitive preceded by the preposition *bä-* 'in/by' with no suffix pronoun corresponds to a gerundial clause, but with a pronoun it indicates the cause, e.g.: Am: *wädä-fit alä...mäträyyäs-u-n bā-mäqäbbäl bədəgg blo* 'Forward he said... receiving (in-[to]receive) the machine gun [and] getting up', against: *andü bā-māhon-əh ya-k^wāraññall* 'It makes me proud because you are (in-[to]be-your) part of it', and with *kä-* 'from/at': Am: *gize kä-mabakän sərə fälləg* 'Instead of wasting (from-[to]waste) time look for work'; but with a pronoun: Am: *nəgəggər-wa-n kä-mäfäşşäm-wa mälk-wa ləwəwwəft alä* 'As soon as she finished (from-[to]finish-her) speaking her expression changed'.

In NA the presence or the absence of the adnominal pronoun with the infinitive and the participle allows to differentiate between an intransitive and transitive use of certain verbs. Following the disappearance of passive and reflexive stems in NA there emerged a category of verbs that serve both with transitive and intransitive function (not unlike in E or F) and, when there is no explicit object, it is only the pronoun that makes the difference between the two, e.g. in the gerund: UCNA: *pumm-u ptijə* 'His mouth open', but: *pumm-u ptijə-u* 'Having opened (open-his) his mouth', and: *pumm-u bi ptəx-u* 'Opening (in [to]open-his) his mouth'. As for the noun of action, whereas in ES it isn't much employed as a verb nominalization, in NA its use is quite frequent and the pronoun may carry both functions, as subject and object, e.g. as subject: UCNA: *əhə nəşə xtbjəb min lə det-u* 'This man made a mistake because he didn't know (from not knowing-his)', and as object: UCNA: *ənə bit salən dlə maxbart-oxun* 'I shall go down without informing you (informing-your)' (Kapeliuk 1992: 69-72).

¹² In at least one NA Aramaic dialect the adnominal "possessive" pronouns have been replaced by the accusative marker of a direct object *illi*: *qṭilille le (=qṭila+ille+ile)* 'He has killed him (killed-him-he.is)' (Borghero 2003).

5. Adnominal pronouns in circumstantial constructions

At this stage we may leave the simple sentence with adnominal pronouns performing the basic functions of attribute, subject and object, and turn to the domain of subordination because, here too, the peripheral languages produced some interesting innovations. Among the various kinds of subordinate clauses in S in general, the circumstantial clauses, which specify the state of the subject or of the object during the performance of the action of the main verb, are special in that sense, that they can be rendered either by a finite verb accompanied by a subordinating conjunction or by a nominal form, mostly deverbal, used in an appropriate syntactical setting (حال in the terminology of the Arab grammarians). In classical S the usual means of this kind of subordination include the preposition *b-* before the infinitive or the accusative case both with the infinitive and with active and passive participle and adjectives. Juxtaposition, i.e. a zero governing factor, is also common especially in languages which have no accusative case.

Normally, in rendering subordinate predication the infinitive tends to be accompanied by an adnominal pronoun marking its subject, contrary to the participle or adjective which are predicative by themselves, e.g.: H: בשוּבִי בְשָׁלוֹם אֶתְּ אֵת בְּשׁוּבִי בְשָׁלוֹם *bə-šub-ī bə-šālom* ²ettoš ²et ham-migdāl haz-ze (Judges 8:9) 'Upon my safe return (in-[to]return-my) I shall break this tower'; H: וִירָאוּ אֶת הַנִּבְלָה מִשְׁלַכְתָּ וִירָאוּ אֶת הַנִּבְלָה מִשְׁלַכְתָּ *vay-yir-ʿu* ²et han-nəbelāh mušleket bad-derek (I Kings 13:25) 'They saw the corpse lying on the road'. In Ar the infinitive and the participle or adjective are employed in the accusative, but usually they carry no suffix pronoun, only an explicit subject, e.g.: Ar: جاء طلوع الشمس *ǧāʾa ḥulū* ^{ci} š-šams ⁱ 'He came at sun rising ([to]rise-ACC-of sun)'; Ar: مررت بزید راكبا *marartu bi-Zayd* ⁱⁿ rākib ^{am} 'I passed Zayd riding (ACC)'. But the infinitive may also be used with a zero subordinating element as in the following example from M adduced by Nöldeke (1975: 388) *ماتوياني بيت* [Upon] my arrival ([to]arrive-my) at the house of the good I worshipped' or with no indication of its subject as in the NA gerundial forms *bi ptaxə* and *ptiixə* in which an adnominal pronoun may only correspond to the object (cf. § 4 *supra*). NA makes little use of the adnominal pronouns in the circumstantial construction, except perhaps in expressions such as: UCNA *svat-uj bit axlən* 'I shall eat my fill (satiation-my I shall eat), or *tili lingə-ling-u* 'He came hobbling (lame-?-lame-his)' which was described by Polotsky (1961: 18-19; id. 1962: 282) and in which Nöldeke (1868: 285) saw an affinity to G (cf. § 5.1 *infra*).

It may be noted *en passant* that in IH some kind of stative present seems to be emerging from the combination of a deverbal or an abstract noun with the preposition *b-*, but with no suffix pronoun, e.g. (the examples have been collected from the media, written or electronic): IH: העוזרת בחפש והאומנת בהצטננות *ha-ozeret bə-xofeš və-ha-omenet bə-hištannut* 'The maid [is] on (in) vacation and the nanny has a cold

(the nanny in-cold)'; [to the question whether W. Clinton would admit a certain detail in their relationship Monica Levinsky answers]: IH: הוא לא, הוא לא, הוא לא *lo, hu lo, hu bə-hakxaša* 'No, he [would] not, he denies (he in-denial)'; [on the map of a highway]: IH: כביש איילון דרום – עבודות ההרחבה הושלמו. כביש איילון צפון *kviš Ayalon darom – avodot ha-harxava hušlomu. kviš Ayalon šafon – avodot ha-harxava bə-biṣua* 'Ayalon highway North – the broadening works have been completed. Ayalon highway South – the broadening works are being performed (works in-performance)'; [in a local clinic]: IH: ד"ר בלאו במחלה עד *dr. Blau bə-maxala ad lə-hodaa xadaša* 'Dr Blau is sick (B. in-sickness) until further notice'.

5.1 The special case of ES

As indicated in the preceding paragraph, subordinate circumstantial constructions are obtained by the combination of the following elements: a deverbal noun – mostly an infinitive, or a participle, and a few adjectives often indicating bodily conditions – forming the base, and a few grammatical elements that provide the syntactical frame of adverbial subordination and of predicalization. These are: the preposition *b-* 'in/by', the accusative, juxtaposition with zero subordinating factor and the adnominal pronoun. We shall find all these elements in ES but in combinations much richer and more complex than in the languages which have been mentioned above. First it should be emphasized that some of the ES languages (G, Am, Ta and Arg) developed a special subordinate morphological form, inflected for its subject – the gerund (Kapeliuk 1997), which has no parallel in the other S groups. The G gerund is composed of an infinitive in the circumstantial accusative case followed by an inseparable adnominal pronoun which indicates its subject: G: *nāgir-a-ka* 'You having spoken ([to]speak-ACC-your)'. In Am (and Arg) the ancient accusative marker *-a* is preserved even though it doesn't serve any more as such on the synchronic level: Am: *nāgr-ä-h*, but in Ta there is no sign of the accusative: Ta: *nāgir-ka* and the subordinate predicalization is the result of the simple combination of the specific base *qatil* with an adnominal ('possessive') pronoun.

But beside the gerund, ES has several other ways of describing the state of the subject or of the object during the performance of the action of the main verb. Contrary to the gerund, which may be derived from any verbal root and used in any semantic context, the constructions which follow are limited to the rendering of bodily and intellectual sensations, mostly of human beings, and remain within the semantic domain of *inalienabilia*. There are several possible ways of combining the elements (Kapeliuk 1998) which may best be exemplified by the following verse from Mark 8:3: Gr: καὶ ἔὰν ἀπολύσω αὐτοὺς νήστευεις εἰς οἶκον αὐτῶν 'And if I send them hungry to their home' and its various translations. Thus, whereas H, for instance, has an adjective: H: רעבים *rævim* 'Hungry' in plain juxtapositions and Ar

a participle in the accusative, Ar: صائمين *ṣā'imīna* 'Fasting (ACC)', the G form is a complex one, with its own nexus explicited, composed of a passive participle of the pattern *qətul*¹³ and of a suffixed adnominal pronoun for its subject: G: *rəḥubān-ihomu* 'Hungry (hungered.PL-their)'. By the way, on the basis of this peculiar construction and of the G gerund, novel and inspiring interpretations were suggested for the West Semitic perfect (Zaborski 2003) and for the Egyptian pseudo-participle (Satzinger 1967) in the larger frame of the Afroasiatic phylum. In Am different editions of the New Testament have at least three variants for the verse quoted: 1. a regular subordinate clause with a finite verb and a subordinating conjunction: Am: *əndä tärabu*¹⁴ 'While they are hungry (whilē they.hungered)', 2. in the gerund: Am: *tärəbaw*¹⁵ 'Being hungry (they.having.hungered)', and 3. a very interesting case, with an abstract noun derived from the verb 'to fast', in the adverbial accusative (Leslau 1995: 862-863), together with the adnominal suffix pronoun resuming the direct object of the main verb and forming a predicative link with the noun to which it is appended: Am: *tom-aččaw-n b-assänabbət-aččaw*¹⁶ 'If I send them away in fast (fast-their-ACC)'.

In Ta the combinations are somewhat different, being obtained by a different interplay between the bases and the governing elements. Ta uses in this verse: 1. in a recent translation, a deverbal abstract noun plus a suffix pronoun like Am, but with a zero subordination marker instead of the Am accusative: Ta: *šom-om ... əntä ʿassänabätkə-wom* 'If I send them away [in] fast (fast-their)', and 2. in an older version cited by Praetorius (1871: 313), a passive participle of the form *qətul* with a suffix pronoun, like G, but, unlike G further preceded by the preposition *b-*: Ta: *bə-ṭmuy-om* literally 'in-hungered-their'. Until now we have encountered the preposition *b-* only with the infinitive (and occasionally with a noun of action¹⁷)

¹³ The G participle *qətul*, *qəṭalt*, *qəṭulān*, *qəṭulāt* is passive only when derived from transitive verbs, but not less frequently it is derived from intransitive verbs and in that case its meaning is active.

¹⁴ In an almost identical verse in Matthew 15:32 from a local edition of the 4 Gospels in G with an Am commentary (*andəm*).

¹⁵ Mark 8:3 from the 4 Gospels just mentioned.

¹⁶ Mark 8:3 in the official translation of the Old and New Testament printed by the Ethiopian Bible Society.

¹⁷ See, for instance, the following example: G: *wa-ba-gəb ʿat-omu ba-nagh rakabə-wwā la-yə ʿəti balas yəbəst* (Mark 11:2) 'And upon their return at dawn they found this fig tree dry'. Also in UCNA, where the gerundial form is obtained from the combination of the same preposition and of the infinitive of the pattern *qṭala*, there are at least two verbs which create the same gerund from the noun of action of the pattern *qṭila*: UCNA: *bī rixṣə* 'Going' and (*bī*) *bixjə* 'Crying'.

whereas its use in front of a passive participle is an exclusive feature of Ta. The presence of *b-* is not limited to relatively ancient sources and it may occasionally be found in the recent translation of the Bible, e.g.: Ta: *bə-ʿasur-u sädäid-o* (John 18:24) 'He sent Him bound (in-bound-His)', and in the feminine: Ta: *Tamar bə-g ʾəḥəyt-a ... täqämmäṭit* (II Samuel 13:20) 'Tamar remained ...dejected (in-dejected-her)', and with an adjective: Ta: *bə-ʿəwur-u ʿət-täwäldä säb ʿay rä ʿayä* (John 9:1, 9:19, 9:32) 'He saw a man who was born blind (in-blind-his)'. However, there is a tendency in the contemporary language to introduce a subordinate form of the verb 'to be' or of the copula that renders explicit the predicalizing function of the more ancient combination, e.g.: *bə-dəqqus-u k-ällo tāla ʿlä-lla*¹⁸ 'He let himself be lifted by her being asleep (in-asleep-his while-he.is)', or simply to replace the *b-*+base+pronoun combination by a gerundial construction, thus for what Praetorius (*loc. cit.*) cites as: *bə-ʿəkkub-atom färisawyan ʾäyyäq-om* (Matthew 22:41) 'The Pharisees [being] gathered (in-gathered-their) He interrogated them' the recent version has a gerund: *tä ʿakkibom k-ällawu* 'While they were there having gathered' and beside John 9:1 quoted above, verse 9:2 has: *ʿəwur koynu z-iwəlläid* 'That he should be born being blind'¹⁹. Such variants perfectly exemplify the predicalizing and subordinating function of the adnominal pronouns in ES. Without these pronouns these constructions would be ungrammatical but thanks to them they were transformed into adverbial qualification of the arguments of the main verb.

In this connection we may mention the non infrequent use in G, modern ES and in S in general, of the suffix pronouns under discussion, inflected or under a frozen form in the 3rd p. s. masculine or feminine and semantically empty, in forming adverbs, especially adverbs of time (*cf.* Correll 1991: 260-263 and the bibliography adduced there), e.g.: IH: *לכּם בּזמנּו הודענּו* *bi-zman-o hodanu laxem* 'We informed you in the past (in-time its)'. In G this procedure allowed the creation of adverbs from prepositions and adjectives, e.g.: G: *lā ʿəl-u* 'Above (on-its)'; *gəmur-ā* 'At all (accomplished-her)' etc. and this usage is perpetuated in the modern languages and is still alive in creating some adverbs from other speech parts, e.g.: Am: *yä-mərr-e-n alku-t* 'I said it seriously (of-certain-my-ACC)'; Am: *bä-*

¹⁸ In the novel *Əmbafraš* by Muse Aron, Asmara 1959 E. C.: 7:4.

¹⁹ In this connection it is interesting to mention a few expressions in which common nouns designating various ages of man, when used in an identical construction, provide an adverbial specification of time, e.g. Ta: *bə-gobäz-om k-ällawu* 'When He was young (in-young.man-His when-he.was)'; Ta: *bə ʿəšäl-u k-ällo* 'While he was a baby (in-baby-his when-he.was)'; Ta: *b-äwald-än k-älläwa ʿamänzära* (Ezekiel 23:3) H: *בנעוריהן זנו* 'They prostituted themselves in their youth (in-girls-their when-they.were)'; Ta: *bə-säwit-om motu* 'He died in his prime (Kane 2000: *säwit*: 'ear of corn, grain, pod (of peas, beans, etc) still green but ripe enough to eat')'.

säffi-w²⁰ 'broadly, in extenso (in-broad-its)'; Ta: bə-säffi-l-u 'id'. It is not impossible that this capacity of the adnominal pronouns to transform certain syntactically bound speech parts such as prepositions or adjectives into adverbs that are more independent but still governed by verbs, was equally made use of in creating adverbial constructions provided with their inherent nexus (حال).

We may conclude that the peripheral Neo-Semitic languages present certain special semantic and syntactical characteristics in their use of the adnominal pronouns, as opposed to the mainstream S languages, both ancient and new. These features show some signs of parallel evolution at the North-Eastern and South-Western extremes of the S area (for other common features cf. Kapeliuk 1989).

References

- Avineri, Iddo, 1988. *The Aramaic Dialect of the Jews of Zākhō* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.
- Bloomfield, Leonard, 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt.
- Borghero, Roberta, 2003. The Neo-Aramaic dialect of Ashitha – Paper presented at the 11th Meeting of Hamito-Semitic Linguistics in Bergamo on 5-7.06.03.
- Bravmann, M. M., 1977. The idea of 'possession' in linguistic expressions. In: *Studies in Semitic Philology*, 357-373. Leiden: Brill.
- Correll, Christoph, 1991. Gedanken zur nichtpossessiven Determination mit Hilfe von Possessivsuffixen im Altäthiopischen und Amharischen. In: Kaye, A. S. (ed.) *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau* 1. 252-299. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Diem, Werner, 1986. Alienable und inalienable Possession im Semitischen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 136/2. 229-291.
- Dillmann, August, 1907. *Ethiopic Grammar* translated by J. A. Crichton. London: Williams & Norgate.
- Fox, Samuel Ethan, 1997. *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Jilu*. (Semitica Viva 16) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Fox, Samuel Ethan, 2002. A Neo-Aramaic dialect of Bohtan. In: Arnold W. & Bobzin, H. (eds): 'Sprichdoch mit deinen Knechten aramäisch wir verstehen es!' – *Festschrift für Otto Jastrow zum 60. Geburtstag*, 165-180 Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hagège, Claude, 2003. Review of Haspelmath, M. et alii: *Language Typology and Language Universals*, Berlin 2001. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique*: 98/2.72-112.
- Havers, Wilhelm, 1931. *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universität.
- Hetzron, Robert, 1978. The nominal system of Awngi (Southern Agaw). *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 41. 121-141.
- Jespersen, Otto, 1992. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Kane, Thomas Leiper, 2000. *Tigrinya-English Dictionary*. Springfield, Va: Dunwoody Press.
- Kapeliuk, Olga, 1973. Traitement spécial du corps et de l'âme dans la syntaxe éthiopienne. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies*: 1.143-160.
- Kapeliuk, Olga, 1979. Quelques remarques sur l'emploi de l'accusatif en sémitique éthiopien et en arabe classique. *Studia Orientalia Memoriae D. H. Baneth Dedicata*, 225-238. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- Kapeliuk, Olga, 1988. *Nominalization in Amharic* (Äthiopistische Forschungen 23). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kapeliuk, Olga, 1989. Some common traits in the evolution of Neo-Syriac and of Neo-Ethiopian. *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*: 12. 294-320.
- Kapeliuk, Olga, 1992. "Miscellanea Neo-Syriaca". *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*: 15.60-73.
- Kapeliuk, Olga, 1994. *The Syntax of the Noun in Amharic*. (Äthiopistische Forschungen 37). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kapeliuk, Olga, 1997. Reflections on the Ethio-Semitic gerund. In: *Ethiopia in Broader Perspective: Proceedings of the 13th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies – Kyoto 12-17 December 1997*: 1.492-498.
- Kapeliuk, Olga, 1998. The Ethio-Semitic possessive pronouns as predicalizers in historical perspective. *Aethiopica*: 1.148-163.
- Kapeliuk, Olga, 2002. Compound verbs in Neo-Aramaic, in: Arnold W. & Bobzin, H. (eds): 'Sprichdoch mit deinen Knechten aramäisch wir verstehen es!' – *Festschrift für Otto Jastrow zum 60. Geburtstag*, 361-377. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Leslau, Wolf, 1995. *Reference Grammar of Amharic*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Maclean, John Arthur, 1895 *Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marogulov, Qonstantin I., 1935. *Grammatikij qə mǝdrəsi d gurb* (A Grammar for Adult Education). Moscow: Government Press.
- Marogulov, Qonstantin I., 1936. *Grammatikij d liṣənə surəṣə – morfologia*. Moscow: Government Press.
- Netzer, Nissan, 2003. Use of terms of body parts in 'popular' Hebrew. In: Shlesinger, Y., Muchnik, M. (eds.), *Studies in Modern Hebrew*, 192-206. Jerusalem: Tsivonim.
- Nöldeke, Theodor, 1868. *Grammatik der neusyrischen Sprache*. Leipzig: Weigel.
- Nöldeke, Theodor, 1875. *Mandaische Grammatik*. Halle: Waisenhaus.
- Nöldeke, Theodor, 1904. *Syriac Grammar*, translated by J. A. Crichton. London: Williams & Norgate (reprinted in 1974).
- Polotsky, Hans Jacob, 1961. Studies in Modern Syriac. *Journal of Semitic Studies*: 1-32.
- Polotsky, Hans Jacob, 1962. Review of Friedrich, Johannes: *Zwei russische Novellen in neusyrischer Übersetzung und Lateinschrift*. *Orientalia*: 31.273-283.
- Polotsky, Hans Jacob, 1979. Verbs with two objects in Modern Syriac. *Israel Oriental Studies*: 11.204-227.
- Praetorius, Franz (1871): *Grammatik der Tigrīnasprache in Abessinien*. Halle (reprinted in 1974).

²⁰ The suffix -w in Am could be interpreted as the definite article (Leslau 1995: 861), but judging by its Ta equivalent, it is an adnominal pronoun.

- Satzinger, Helmut, 1967. Äthiopische Parallelen zum ägyptischen *šdm-f*. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut-Abteilung Kairo*: 22.163-166.
- Tabaian, Hessian, 1979. Persian compound verbs. *Lingua*: 47.189-208.
- Telegdi, S., 1951. Nature et fonction des périphrases verbales dites 'verbes composés' en persan. *Acta Orientalia*: 1.315-334.
- Zaborski, Andrzej, 2003. The origin of the suffix 'conjugations' in Afroasiatic languages. *Polska Akademia Nauk (Oddział w Krakowie) – Sprawozdania z Posiedzeń Komisji Naukowych*: 45.59-61.

Tali Bar

Kochav Ya'ir

EXTRAPOSITION IN MODERN HEBREW

1. Introduction

Extrapolation can mainly be regarded a result of a transformation of a simple sentence by moving one of its elements from its original place and turning it into an isolated subject, usually in front of the sentence. The new structure maintains traces of the former one: primarily a resumptive pronoun in the adjacent sentence (and sometimes even a preposition that has been moved from its former location to the head of the changed sentence). The essence of turning a sentence into an extrapositional sentence is emphasis of the transformed element by making it an expressive subject. An extrapositional sentence is basically a nominal structure; its subject is isolated from its adjacent sentence of which one element relates to it, points at it or even repeats it. This structure is one of the phenomena of apposition in a language (Jespersen 1909-1949:357), as the isolated extraposed part of the sentence corresponds to one of the elements of the adjacent sentence. In a language with nominal sentences the identification of the extrapositional element is more transparent than in languages which lack non-verbal predication, since the extrapositional sentence with a basic nominal structure easily fills the pattern of a nominal sentence with no need for any modification. In languages in which predication calls for a verb not always does its appearance maintain the transparency of the structure¹.

The question of the formation and structure of the extrapositional sentence has been discussed in both general and Hebrew linguistic literature (see Bussmann the entry *Extrapolation*), and the terminology used to define it characterizes its structure, the special status of the new subject and the syntactic transformation that

* This article is based on a paper written in Hebrew "Extrapositional Sentences in Contemporary Hebrew", *Lěšonenu* 60 (1997) 297-328.

¹ Prof. Gideon Goldenberg, in private communication.