Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
[ent7@pitt.edu]
[djbpitt@pitt.edu]

Case in Semitic: Roles, relations, and reconstruction. By Rebecca Hasselbach. (Oxford studies in diachronic and historical linguistics 3.) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. 353. ISBN 9780199671809. $150 (Hb).

Reviewed by Michael Waltisberg, *Philipps-Universität Marburg*

At first sight, case in Semitic may not seem a very promising topic for an entire monograph: the reconstruction of Proto-Semitic case morphemes is mostly uncontroversial (e.g. Weninger 2011:165), and the functions of the Semitic cases are well established, documented, and discussed in the available literature (see e.g. the bibliography of the book under review). Controversial topics such as the alleged ergativity of Proto-Semitic (see pp. 55ff.) have already been given exhaustive treatment (e.g. Zaborski 1999, Waltisberg 2002). Nevertheless, Rebecca Hasselbach resumes the discussion by combining basic notions of historical and typological linguistics (especially pp. 2ff., 14ff., 90ff.) with Semitic data and proposing some new views on the prehistoric case system (see especially pp. 322–32). On the whole, the book will be most beneficial to linguists unfamiliar with the Semitic case system and for Semiticists seeking to familiarize themselves with notions of typological linguistics.

After a brief 'Introduction' (1–15) including some methodological considerations, H presents the morphological evidence from various Semitic languages and discusses the available literature ('The Semitic case system: Basic evidence and traditional reconstruction', 16–89). Semitic basically possesses three case morphemes: nominative *-u*, genitive *-i*, and accusative *-a*. In some older languages, these endings may be expanded by the final consonants *-m* or *-n* (mimation/nunation) with language-specific functional scope (e.g. Akkadian *-um*, *-im*, *-am* or Arabic *-un*, *-in*, *-an*, the latter in indefinite function; on mimation/nunation in general see Diem 1975). Apart from this triptotic declension with three case markers, in Arabic and less prominently in Ugaritic there is another diptotic one with only two case morphemes, lacking mimation/nunation altogether and consisting of the endings nominative *-u* and genitive/accusative *-a* (44ff.). The distinction between triptotic and diptotic declensions will become crucial to H's reconstructions later on (see below). Whether Old South Arabian in its attested historical stages truly had a case system similar to that of Arabic as implied on pp. 26ff., following Stein 2003:95ff., is uncertain (Sima 2006:96).

Ch. 3, 'Linguistic typology' (90–124), introduces basic notions such as markedness, grammatical roles, and relations, as well as head vs. dependent marking and typological universals. Ch. 4, 'Grammatical roles and the alignment of Semitic' (125–81), is devoted to the discussion of grammatical roles in Semitic, including some conspicuous usages of the accusative, for example, after particles such as Arabic *ʾinna* 'verily' and some others, Hebrew *hinnẹ* 'behold' (142ff.), or the direct object marker *ʾẹt* with passive in Hebrew (150ff.). Some topics (e.g. syntactic pivot, pp. 145ff.) are discussed at length that have so far been only marginal to the discussion in Semitics. H can also show once again that there is no evidence for an ergative alignment in Semitic (passim). Ch. 5, 'Head- and dependent-marking in Semitic' (182–257), deals with these features in relation to the Semitic noun phrase, discussing, for example, prepositional phrases and various possessive constructions. The semantics of Semitic case markers is outlined in Ch. 6, 'The function of case markers in Semitic' (258–326), which provides a good overview of the many case functions attested.

'The "accusative" *-a*' (266–313) as well as 'The "absolute" ending *-Ø*' (313–22) are particularly highlighted since the functions of nominative and genitive are more restricted (see pp.

258ff., 264ff.). The absolute ending -Ø is explained as 'the original ACC that underwent the regular loss of final short vowels' (320), although this alleged regular loss of short vowels is basically a conjecture based on the absent case vowels in the Akkadian bound form ('constructus') before genitive (20). Such a vowel loss within a fixed syntagm like the constructus chain seems somewhat problematic. In addition, it is primarily limited to Akkadian and can be postulated as common Semitic only with difficulty. At the end of the chapter, H gives a reconstruction of the basic cases of Semitic (322ff.), distinguishing between Proto-Semitic and Archaic Proto-Semitic (cf. pp. 6ff., 14ff.) with different case systems: whereas Proto-Semitic resembles the attested languages with the three basic case markers and accusative alignment, Archaic Proto-Semitic has a marked nominative system (cf. already Sasse 1984:119) with only two case morphemes. The latter thus corresponds to the diptotic declension of Arabic (and Ugaritic), which, according to H, has to be reconstructed for the protolanguage (325).

The last chapter, 'Conclusions' (327–32), takes this reconstruction even further by proposing that the first stage of Archaic Proto-Semitic had no cases at all and later, though still before Proto-Semitic, developed into the marked nominative system mentioned above (330ff.). Should Sasse's (1984) reconstruction of a common Afro-Asiatic case morpheme *-a prove correct, a caseless protolanguage would be highly unlikely. A bibliography (333–46) and an index (347–53) conclude the thought-provoking and well-edited book.

The language data cited in the monograph, mostly taken from grammars, textbooks, and specialized studies, is generally reliable. Among the rare exceptions are Hebrew *yissārēp̄* 'shall be burnt' (for *yiśśārēp̄*, p. 159) or Gəʿəz *ʾəmmənē-ya* 'from me' (for *ʾəmannēya*, p. 206). A number of Syriac examples are imprecisely transcribed: *ʿam-eh* 'with it' (*ʿammeh*) and *hāḵanā* 'so' (*hāḵannā*, both on p. 229), *reglaw-hon* 'their feet' (*reḡlayhon*, p. 230), *ʾe-ḥawwê-ḵ* 'I will show you' (*ēḥāwwêḵ*, p. 233), as well as *nḇi haw d-hu ʾeštəʿi l-an* 'that prophet who has informed us' (*nḇiyā hāw d-hu eštaʿi lan*) and *b-ʿidteh d-allāhā* 'in the church of God' (*b-ʿēteh d-alāhā*, both on p. 236). A Sabaic quote from Stein (2003:211) is incomplete, yielding an ungrammatical construction: *bn mrḍ* 'from sickness' should read *bn mrḍ mrḍ* 'from the sickness that afflicted him' (constructus before asyndetic relative clause).

While discussing the suffix conjugation and its person markers, H observes that it is difficult to determine 'where the innovative 1CS marker -*ku* comes from', which 'still requires further study' (139). There is no reason given, however, for rejecting the solutions already proposed (see Diem 1997): the morpheme is the second half of the long first-person pronoun **ʾanāku* 'I', which appears as -*āku* in the suffix conjugation and also explains the Akkadian forms with long vowel -*ā*- before the endings of the stative in the first and second persons.

The starting point of H's deliberations seems to be the notion that there are 'unusual uses' of the accusative -*a* (45, similarly p. 328). We can ask, however, whether functions such as vocative and predicative marking or the use of -*a* after particles (Arabic *ʾinna*, etc.) are indeed so remarkable from a morphosyntactic viewpoint. Granted, explanations for some occurrences of the morpheme -*a* remain rather elusive, for example, the absolute negation as in Arabic *lā ʾilāha* 'there is no god' (cf. pp. 142, 278). H's assertion that such a structure stands 'outside grammatical constructions' (321), which is meant to explain both the use of the -*a* morpheme and the lack of nunation, is not quite convincing. Instead, in this case, the construction may be related to other clause-initial uses of the accusative (e.g. after particles) and thus to the focus structure and the scope of the negation (on the latter see for now Van Valin & LaPolla 1997:219ff.). Alternative explanations certainly require further study.

Semantically, there is considerable overlap between the marker -*a* and the Ø-ending in adverbial and fixed functions (especially in Akkadian). Taken together, this seems of rather little import syntactically and usually fits nicely with the use of both to mark peripheral constituents. In addition, it remains uncertain whether all instances of the ending -*a* indeed represent the same morpheme (including numbers, measures, personal names (sometimes even in genitive function, p. 325), etc.). The fact that there are no more than three vowels in Proto-Semitic, allowing for some overlap on the surface, might suggest that some -*a*s are of an entirely different origin. H explains several instances of the accusative as citation form (n. 146 on p. 48, pp. 300, 311; mea-

sures, Arabic ʾinna, early loanwords, etc.). The latter especially often have oblique forms, due to their more frequent occurrence (subjects tend to be pronominal; Croft 1990:59). For the accusative after Arabic ʾinna, etc. (311), this explanation likewise falls short, considering both the improbability of a citation form within a clause and typological parallels like French le voici 'here he is' (oblique form in presentative). For the ending -a as vocative marker or after numerals, H assumes 'the work of medieval [Arabic] grammarians' (299, 301) as if these rules were somehow artificial.

The problem of mimation/nunation is left untreated, though H states that they were absent from Archaic Proto-Semitic. If so, what are their origins? It thus seems problematic to identify the diptotic declension of Arabic (and Ugaritic) as Archaic Proto-Semitic simply because it lacks mimation/nunation (320). Diptotic declension may well originate with proper nouns in West Semitic. But it is unattested in Akkadian, and its transfer to various noun patterns in Arabic seems to be connected somehow to the introduction of the definite article and the development of a sharp contrast between definiteness and indefiniteness (diptotic declension is restricted to the latter). Both facts would continue to suggest that the pattern is secondary (pace 320). Evidence from Ugaritic in support of the argument needs to account for variants (45) as well as the language's lack of a definite article.

In the conclusion, H sketches a wide-reaching model of Semitic prehistory. A marked nominative system in the protolanguage as mentioned above is perfectly possible, but the more hypotheses H proposes, the fewer grammatical categories remain. The protolanguage thus has a decidedly primitive feel to it as compared to the historically attested tongues (329ff.). H even tracks the development from Archaic Proto-Semitic to Proto-Semitic (331–32), thus suggesting claims that are impossible to falsify. Schlerath (1981) has already shown conclusively the impossibility of diachronic and spatial reasoning in a reconstructed language, which render such endeavors necessarily speculative ('Es ist methodisch nicht zulässig, die abstrakte synchronische Linie, auf der die Ergebnisse einer Gesamtrekonstruktion aufgereiht werden, zu einer historischen Zeitlinie zu erklären' (Schlerath 1981:181); 'Gebiet der historischen Mutmaßungen mit geringem Beweiswert' (1981:187)). Notions such as Archaic Proto-Semitic vs. Proto-Semitic seem to be introduced primarily to provide an explanatory approach for allegedly 'irregular' case functions (see particularly p. 88). Such attempts may advance a possible scenario of linguistic prehistory, but they still remain open to further debate.

REFERENCES

CROFT, WILLIAM. 1990. Typology and universals. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
DIEM, WERNER. 1975. Gedanken zur Frage der Mimation und Nunation in den semitischen Sprachen. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 125.239–58.
DIEM, WERNER. 1997. Suffixkonjugation und Subjektspronomina: Ein Beitrag zur Rekonstruktion des Ursemitischen und zur Geschichte der Semitistik. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 147.10–76.
SASSE, HANS-JÜRGEN. 1984. Case in Cushitic, Semitic and Berber. Current progress in Afro-Asiatic linguistics, ed. by John Bynon, 111–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
SCHLERATH, BERNFRIED. 1981. Ist ein Raum/Zeit-Modell für eine rekonstruierte Sprache möglich? Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 95.175–202.
SIMA, ALEXANDER. 2006. Review of Stein 2003. Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik 45.90–97.
STEIN, PETER. 2003. Untersuchungen zur Phonologie und Morphologie des Sabäischen. Rahden: Leidorf.
VAN VALIN, ROBERT D., JR., and RANDY J. LAPOLLA. 1997. Syntax: Structure, meaning and function. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
WALTISBERG, MICHAEL. 2002. Zur Ergativitätshypothese im Semitischen. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 152.11–62.
WENINGER, STEFAN. 2011. Reconstructive morphology. The Semitic languages: An international handbook, ed. by Stefan Weninger, 151–78. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
ZABORSKI, ANDRZEJ. 1999. On the alleged ergativity in Hamitosemitic/Afroasiatic languages. Collectanea Linguistica: In honorem Casimiri Polański, ed. by Maria Brzezina and Halina Kurek, 309–17. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.

Philipps-Universität Marburg
Centrum für Nah- und Mittelost-Studien
Deutschhausstr. 12
35032 Marburg, Germany
[waltisbe@staff.uni-marburg.de]

An annotated syntax reader: Lasting insights and questions. Ed. by RICHARD S. KAYNE, THOMAS LEU, and RAFFAELLA ZANUTTINI. (Linguistics: The essential readings.) Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013. Pp. xii, 596. ISBN 9780631235897. $64.95 (Hb).

Reviewed by TERJE LOHNDAL, *Norwegian University of Science and Technology*

This collection of papers constitutes another volume in Wiley-Blackwell's important series 'Linguistics: The essential readings'. The topic of the volume is syntax, and although not made explicit, more specifically, generative transformational approaches to syntax. It presents a collection of 'excerpted foundational articles in the field of syntax', as it says on the cover of the book. In this brief review, it is impossible to summarize and discuss each particular chapter. I therefore mostly focus on more general issues that arise in the context of a collection like the present.

The editors have included thirty-five papers in the volume, each consisting of about ten to twelve pages. These pages are excerpts from the original papers, which inevitably means that the chapters do not always read as well as the original papers. The book contains contributions from the following scholars: Stephen R. Anderson, Mark Baker, Filippo Beghelli, Joan W. Bresnan, Anna Cardinaletti, Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng, Noam Chomsky, Sandra Chung, Guglielmo Cinque, Liliane Haegeman, Kenneth Hale, Anders Holmberg, Norbert Hornstein, C. T. James Huang, K. A. Jayaseelan, Richard S. Kayne, Samuel Jay Keyser, Hilda Koopman, Jan Koster, Richard K. Larson, Julie Anne Legate, Giuseppe Longobardi, Diane Massam, Jean-Yves Pollock, Paul Postal, Luigi Rizzi, Dominique Sportiche, Michael Starke, Tim Stowell, Rint Sybesma, Anna Szabolcsi, Lisa Travis, and Raffaella Zanuttini. Each paper is prefaced with 'Lasting insights', which places the paper in its historical context and illustrates the impact the paper has had since it was first published. At the end of the excerpt, the editors have come up with fifteen to twenty-three questions per paper. In terms of year of publication, the papers range from 1966 (Ch. 1) to 2005 (Ch. 35). The editors state that they made an explicit decision to only include papers published before 2006. In addition to the thirty-five chapters, the volume contains a well-written introduction and a comprehensive index.

The introduction outlines some of the rationale behind the selection of chapters. In addition, it provides an overview of some of the core notions that have remained central throughout the history of generative transformational syntax. These are: (i) constituent structure, including phrase structure, (ii) transformations and locality conditions on transformations, (iii) mismatches between the surface position of a constituent and the position where the constituent originated, (iv) deletion of elements in the syntax, (v) silent elements in the syntax, (vi) the (universal) distinction between nouns and verbs, and (vii) parameters. These notions are covered in various chapters in the volume, and it is very helpful for the reader that they are so clearly outlined in the introduction. The editors also mention a few cases where the theory has changed so that what were movement operations in earlier versions of generative transformational grammar are now analyzed in other terms. They provide the following examples: agent-postposing in passives, downward movement from subject position in sentences like *There has arrived a letter for you*, and rightward heavy-NP shift. Some of these phenomena are also discussed in the book. I think the editors have written a very helpful and concise introduction that every reader will benefit from reading.