Dipartimento Scienze dell'Antichità
Sezione di Orientalistica

Sapienza
Università di Roma

QUADERNI DI VICINO ORIENTE

XII-2017

AFROASIATICA ROMANA

EDITED BY
Alessio Agostini
AND
Maria Giulia Amadasi Guzzo

ROMA 2017

QUADERNI DI VICINO ORIENTE

SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA

QUADERNI
DI VICINO ORIENTE
XII - 2017

AFROASIATICA ROMANA
"PROCEEDINGS
OF THE 15TH MEETING
OF AFROASIATIC LINGUISTICS"

17-19 September 2014, Rome

edited by
Alessio Agostini and Maria Giulia Amadasi Guzzo

ROMA 2017

QUADERNI DI VICINO ORIENTE

SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA

ISSN 1127-6037
e-ISSN 2532-5175

Frontcover: Maxim Kantor, *Babel Tower* (2008). Courtesy of the Artist.

QUADERNI DI VICINO ORIENTE

SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUADERNI DI VICINO ORIENTE

SAPIENZA UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA

INTRODUCTION

The 15th Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics was held in Rome on 17-19 September 2014 at the Museum of Classical Art, Sapienza University. These Italian Meetings were conceived in 1978 thanks to a group of distinguished Italian scholars, Fabrizio Angelo Pennacchietti and Frederick Mario Fales, along with Francesco Aspesi, Vermondo Brugnatelli, Felice Israel, Antonio Loprieno and Alessandro Roccati. Initially called the "Giornata Nazionale di Studi Camito-Semitici" (Hamito-Semitic), since 1995 the more neutral Afro-Asiatic has been preferred. Previous meetings have been held in Venice, Milan (Università Statale), Turin, Bergamo, Perugia, Sassari, Milan (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore), Naples (Istituto Universitario Orientale), Trieste, Florence, Bergamo, Ragusa, Udine and again Turin. Now, nearly approaching its 40th year, and after 14 irregular editions, the Meeting was held in Rome for the first time.

Rome has a long tradition in Afro-Asiatic - mainly Semitic - studies, once called "Oriental Studies", and it is worth recalling, briefly, their development, from the start of our knowledge of "oriental languages" to the work of our predecessors. The study of Hebrew began in Rome at the end of the 15th century when, in 1482, we know of a salary paid for teaching Hebrew to a certain "Guglielmo Raimondo", who can be identified with the converted Jew from near Agrigento, Wilhelmus Raimundus Monchates /Moncada = Šemuel ben Nissim Abu 'l-Farağ, alias Flavius Mithridates, about whom so much has been written (even novels).[1] In the same period the Vatican Library began its collection of oriental manuscripts, a collection studied particularly, in the 19th century, by Giorgio Levi Della Vida, specifically with regard to Islamic Arabic manuscripts.[2] The teaching in Rome of Hebrew, Arabic and Syriac continued in the 16th century, if not on a regular basis, at the University but also inside ecclesiastical institutions (Jesuit institutions especially).[3] However, it was only in 1903 that in the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy a School of Oriental Studies ("Scuola orientale") was founded that lasted until 1982 (the organisation has since changed, the School being divided into Departments/Institutes).[4] From its very start, the School of Oriental Studies covered Near Eastern and Far Eastern studies (with the teaching of Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic and South Arabic languages, Assyriology, Egyptology, Iranic languages, Chinese and Japanese). There was a shared library[5] and a periodical, the "Rivista di Studi Orientali" which was founded in 1907 and still exists, along with other more or less recent periodical publications.

The period from the end of the 19th century to the 1970's was one which witnessed the flourishing of Roman Oriental School, especially with regard to Semitics (comprising Arab

---

1 Cf. among the more recent studies Perani (ed.) 2008; as a novel, Camilleri 2014.
2 Levi Della Vida 1935; 1939; 1947; 1965.
3 Invaluable are the teaching and the library of the Pontifical Biblical Institute.
4 Gnoli 1996.
5 Now "Biblioteca di Studi Orientali" which, after a troubled period, has been based since 2016 at Circonvallazione Tiburtina 4.

and Assyriology) and Egyptology. Of course, this period of nearly a century was interrupted by years of war and dictatorship. Before - and after the first decade following the 2nd World War - we must remember the important scholarship of Ignazio Guidi, Carlo Conti Rossini (the only teacher of Ethiopic, and South Arabic, followed for some years after the war, by Francesco S. Pericoli Ridolfini), Michelangelo Guidi, Carlo Alfonso Nallino, David Santillana, Umberto Cassuto, Giorgio Levi Della Vida. Levi Della Vida in his collected essays "Aneddoti e svaghi arabi e non arabi"[6] traced in a perfect way (in content and style) the portraits and scientific profiles of his masters and colleagues mentioned here, all knowing the main Semitic languages and other languages at that time known as Chamitic; they were mainly philologists and historians (of literature, laws, religions), only the great Ignazio Guidi having written also an important contribution about Semitic origins from a comparative linguistic point of view.[7] Levi Della Vida's works have been masterly remembered by Francesco Gabrieli, professor of Arabic since 1938 and by Sabatino Moscati.[8] However, in the first decades of the 20th century, we must also recall the great personality of Leone Caetani,[9] who, although a private scholar, nonetheless contributed to the progress of the Arabic field of studies especially with his unfinished enormous work "Annali dell'Islam" (Milano 1907)[10] and who was undoubtedly, if indirectly, the master of Michelangelo Guidi and particularly of Levi Della Vida (at the University pupil and successor of Ignazio Guidi); indirectly, also of Francesco Gabrieli. After 1956, Sabatino Moscati, teaching from the chair which had been that held by Levi Della Vida ("Ebraico e Lingue semitiche comparate", later "Filologia semitica"),[11] continued and even enlarged in a comparative direction the philological work of his predecessors: he was the organiser of the only Congress on Semitic Languages held in Rome in 1960[12] and the author and editor, with E. Ullendorf, A. Spitaler and W. von Soden, of "An introduction to the comparative grammar of the Semitic languages"[13] still used today. Founder of new journals, such as "Oriens Antiquus" and "Rivista di Studi Fenici" and of Centres of Research ("Centro di studi per la Civiltà fenicia e punica", now "Istituto di Studi sul Mediterraneo Antico"), and new chairs ("History of the Ancient Orient", "Near Eastern Archaeology", "Phoenician and Punic Archaeology"), he soon turned to the study of archaeology, particularly of the Mediterranean regions. Moscati taught at "La Sapienza" from 1958 until 1982,[14] Semitic Philology being then taught from 1982 until his retirement in 2006 by Giovanni Garbini. We must also remember Assyriology, taught first by Giulio Cesare (Bruto) Teloni, then by Giuseppe Furlani, Giorgio R. Castellino and Giovanni Pettinato to cite only past holders of the chair, and, lastly Egyptology, taught in the past by Giuseppe Botti, then by Fabrizio Sergio Donadoni.

6 Levi Della Vida 1959.
7 Guidi 1878-1879 (reprint 2015, with an introduction by M. Liverani).
8 Gabrieli 1993, 33-38 (the book contains profiles of the main Orientalists of the last century, not only Italian); cf. already Moscati 1968 and Garbini (ed.) 1988.
9 Gabrieli 1973; cf. also Guidi 1937; Levi Della Vida 1966, 21-72.
10 Cf. also, among other works, Caetani 1911 (reprint 2012) and Caetani 1997.
11 Barbanera 2012; cf. also AA.VV. 2009.
12 Levi Della Vida (ed.) 1961.
13 Moscati (ed.) 1964.
14 When he taught from the chair of "Ebraico e Lingue semitiche comparate" at Tor Vergata University.

In the present far from easy period, knowledge of the history of our disciplines, which have suffered years of wars and restrictions, might give some confidence in the progress of research.

The Meeting here in Rome also represented an occasion to remember and share such a long and distinguished tradition with a wider audience. Since its beginnings, in fact, the Italian Afro-Asiatic Meeting has progressively enlarged its international vocation, having attracted a growing number of scholars from different parts of the world. During this edition in Rome we were honoured to host nearly 65 speakers. The range of topics was consequently very wide, just as Afro-Asiatic languages are spread over a large area, from the Semitic Near East through North Eastern Africa (Egyptian), the Horn of Africa (Cushitic, Omotic) to North-Western Africa (Berber, Chadic). The chronological span is also very ample, more so as it is thanks to two branches of Afro-Asiatic languages, the Semitic and the Egyptian, that the first written documents in human history have been preserved, allowing us to investigate ancient languages starting from the 3rd millennium BC - a privilege denied to the vast majority of the other linguistic families. It is also worth mentioning that, in its early days, the Meeting had an even wider scope since it also embraced topics linked to Indo-European languages, an extension that was later dropped. Now firmly concentrating on Afro-Asiatic languages, the Meeting is certainly one of the most important on this subject in Europe, especially if we consider the fact that the only other similar event is the North American Conference on Afro-Asiatic Linguistics.

This edition of the Meeting was organized with some general transversal sessions, gathering papers focusing on common linguistic traits and methodology, but also exploring the latest research results in all of the numerous linguistic branches covered by the conference. In parallel, two specific sessions were organized, namely the "New Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics", which enjoyed a particularly numerous participation, and the "South Semitic Focus Session", which provided the opportunity not only to investigate some specific linguistic traits, both ancient and modern, but also to revive the more general topics of classification and subgrouping in an area, around the Red and the Arabian Seas, across the borders dividing the Semitic from the other African linguistic branches. Nor can we forget that the region we investigate unfortunately offers many reasons for concern, among others also because some of the living languages are here in danger (Modern South Arabic and Modern Aramaic in particular), a problem which is further worsened by the serious social and political instability that a large part of the region is now experiencing and which, at present, is both aggravating and sensibly limiting direct scientific investigation in the field.

We are glad that the articles collected in the present Proceedings offer a wide selection of the range of topics covered during the Meeting: Eblaite (Tonietti); Biblical Hebrew (Anthonioz, Aspesi, Marrazza); Phoenician and Punic (Schmitz); Aramaic (Faraj, Grassi); Ancient North Arabian (Ababneh); South Semitic (Castagna, Kapeliuk); Arabic (Avallone, Boucherit, Campanelli, Olivieri, Pepe, Puglielli); Egyptian (Calabro, Roccati, Satzinger); Cushitic (Banti-Vergari); Chadic (Baldi-Leger, Frajzyngier, Stolbova, Suzzi Valli); Berber (Taine Cheikh).

We wish to thank all the colleagues of the Faculty, especially those of the Department of Antiquity Sciences and the Institute of Oriental Studies for their encouragement, particularly Lorenzo Verderame for the organizational support, and all the members of the Scientific Committee for their advice: Maria Giovanna Biga, Alberto Camplani, Alessandro Catastini, Franco D'Agostino, Olivier Durand, Lucia Mori and Loredana Sist. To Lorenzo Nigro goes our deepest gratitude for having welcomed our Proceedings in the series of "Quaderni di Vicino Oriente" under his direction.

We finally wish to dedicate the present Proceedings to the memory of three scholars who made an enormous contribution to the field: Paolo Marrassini (1942-2013), Andrzej Zaborski (1942-2014), both having also occasionally participated in the previous editions of the Meeting, and Giovanni Garbini (1931-2017) who passed away while these Proceedings were in press.

Rome, January 2017

Alessio Agostini
Maria Giulia Amadasi Guzzo

REFERENCES

AA.VV.
2009 *Incontro di studio in ricordo di Sabatino Moscati* (Roma 7-8 novembre 2007) (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Atti dei Convegni lincei, 244), Roma 2009.
BARBANERA, M.
2012 Moscati, Sabatino: *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* 77 (2012).
CAETANI, L.
1911 *Studi di Storia Orientale*, Milano 1911 (reprint with articles by M. Liverani, V. Sagaria Rossi, B. Scarcia Amoretti, F. Tessitore, Roma 2012).
1997 *Altri studi di Storia Orientale*. Pagine inedite a cura di F. Tessitore, Roma 1997.
CAMILLERI, A.
2014 *Inseguendo un'ombra*, Palermo 2014.
GABRIELI, F.
1973 Caetani, Leone: *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* 16 (1973).
1993 *Orientalisti del Novecento*, Roma 1993.
GARBINI, G. (ed.)
1988 *Giorgio Levi Della Vida nel centenario della nascita (1886-1967)* (Studi Semitici, N.S. 4), Roma 1988.
GNOLI, R.
1996 *La scuola di Studi Orientali: Le grandi scuole della facoltà di Roma*, Roma (La Sapienza) 1996, pp. 382-389.

GUIDI, I.
1878-1879 Della sede primitiva dei popoli semitici: *Memoria della Reale Accademia dei Lincei*, ser. III, vol. 3 (1878-1879), pp. 566-615 (reprint Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Fondazione Leone Caetani, Roma 2015).
GUIDI, M.
1937 Commemorazione di Leone Caetani: *Rendiconti Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, classe di scienze morali storiche e filologiche*, ser. 6, 12 (1937), pp. 99-104.
LEVI DELLA VIDA, G.
1935 *Elenco dei manoscritti arabi islamici della Biblioteca Vaticana* (Studi e testi, 61), Città del Vaticano 1935.
1939 *Ricerche sulla formazione del più antico fondo dei manoscritti orientali della Biblioteca Vaticana* (Studi e testi, 92), Città del Vaticano 1939.
1947 *Frammenti coranici in carattere cufico della Biblioteca Vaticana* (Codici vaticani arabi 1605, 1606), (Studi e testi 132), Città del Vaticano 1947.
1959 *Aneddoti e svaghi arabi e non arabi*, Milano - Napoli 1959.
1965 *Secondo elenco dei manoscritti arabi islamici della Biblioteca Vaticana* (Studi e testi, 245), Città del Vaticano 1965.
1966 *Fantasmi ritrovati*, Venezia 1966.
LEVI DELLA VIDA, G. (ed.)
1961 *Linguistica semitica presente e futuro* (Studi Semitici, 4), Roma 1961.
MOSCATI, S.
1968 *Ricordo di G. Levi Della Vida* (Orientis antiqui collectio, VII), Roma 1968.
MOSCATI, S. (ed.)
1964 *An Introduction to the comparative grammar of the Semitic languages. Phonology and morphology*, Wiesbaden 1964.
PERANI, M. (ed.)
2008 Guglielmo Raimondo Moncada alias Flavio Mitridate. Un ebreo converso siciliano: *Atti del Convegno internazionale, Caltabellotta (Agrigento), 23-24 ottobre 2004*, Palermo 2008.

[Quaderni di Vicino Oriente XII (2017), pp. 147-154]

DIRECT OBJECT IN OLD AND IMPERIAL ARAMAIC

Giulia Francesca Grassi - Georg-August Universität zu Göttingen

The collapse of the case system in Aramaic is less fatal than is commonly assumed: syntactic functions remain clear, both because the number of structurally ambiguous clauses is relatively low, and because non-morphological parameters (particularly animacy) play a major role.

Keywords: Aramaic; syntax; direct object; structural ambiguity; animacy

A group of scholars of various linguistic departments of the University of Marburg were (and partially still are) involved in a project entitled *Exploring fundamental linguistic categories (Fundierung linguistischer Basiskategorien).*[1] Within the project is included a subproject on case syncretism (*Kasussynkretistische Prozesse in der Langzeitdiachronie* / *Case-syncretistic Processes in long-term Diachrony*), the main research question of which is how the roles of actor and undergoer are assigned when all morphological means of distinguishing them (mainly, case marking) are lost.

The working hypothesis is that, after the collapse of the case system, the identification of the roles must still be possible, and based on fundamental, non-morphological parameters. The collapse of the case system may generate structurally ambiguous clauses, in which the verbal form may potentially agree not only with the subject, but with the direct object as well.[2] In other words, structurally ambiguous clauses are clauses in which there are no formal means to determine the syntactic functions and the semantic roles, while unambiguous clauses are clauses in which the form of the subject and/or of the direct object and/or of the verb clarifies the syntactic functions and the semantic roles. The main questions which this fact prompts are: how high the percentage of the ambiguous clauses is, and what strategies are employed in order to distinguish the different semantic roles and syntactic functions in ambiguous clauses.

The languages involved in this subproject are German dialects, Modern Irish, Hittite, and Old and Imperial Aramaic (hence OA and IA respectively).

The group of scholars working on the subproject has developed a theoretical concept (Kasper 2012-), which is the basis for an online database facilitating the collection of the

[1] The project is carried out with the financial support of the Hessian Ministry for Science and Arts through the LOEWE (*Landes-Offensive zur Entwicklung Wissenschaftlich-ökonomischer Exzellenz*) programme. Many thanks are due to all the people involved in the conception, implementation and improvement of the database, particularly to Magnus Breder Birkenes, Felix Esser, Sara Hayden, Axel Harlos, Mícheál Hoyne, Simon Kasper, Frank Nagel, Julia Schüler, and Paul Widmer. I am also grateful to Irene Pasqualini for correcting the English of this article.

[2] Many verbal forms in Old and Imperial Aramaic are homographic, because the writing system rarely marks the vowels. For example, *ktbt* could be the first person singular, the second person masculine singular and the third person feminine singular of the perfect of *ktb*, "to write"; however, the vowels in these words, if they were written, would be different. Thus, a form like *ktbt* is not considered ambiguous, if it is a first/second person singular of the perfect and the direct object is a third person singular, but only when both the subject and the direct object are third person feminine singular.

linguistic data, from the largest to the smallest unit (text; sentences; clauses; phrases; words[3]).

As regards the percentage of the ambiguous clauses within each *corpus*, the results are given in the following table.

Language / Dialect	**Clauses considered**	**Percentage of structurally ambiguous clauses**
Old Aramaic	173	**40 (23%)**
Imperial Aramaic	243	37 (15%)
Old Hittite	125	**0 (0%)**
Middle Hittite	365	38 (10%)
Old High German	588	17 (3%)
Middle High German	406	27 (7%)
Early New High German	400	22 (6%)
New High German	380	42 (11%)
New Irish	558	281 (50%)

Apart from New Irish, which is a particular case, the percentage of the structurally ambiguous clauses ranges between 0% (Old Hittite) and 23% (Old Aramaic). That means that the percentage of the structurally ambiguous clauses is generally low and that case syncretism is less fatal than is commonly assumed.

Moreover, in all the languages taken into consideration in our research, two important data emerge: first of all, the means of distinguishing the subject from the object is essentially animacy; secondly, rigidity of word order - which may be seen, for example, in English - does not play an important role.

As regards Aramaic, it may be noted that the relatively low percentage of ambiguous clauses is quite remarkable, since this language had already lost its cases in the most ancient phases of its attestation, substituting a system based on cases with a system based on prepositions. Thus, with the exception of the direct object marking (which will be dealt with later), nominal subject and nominal direct object are formally indistinguishable (a formal distinction is still visible in personal pronouns).

As regards ambiguous clauses, the first step is to examine their percentage both in the entire Aramaic *corpus* considered, and in the three subgroups related to the word order, namely S < O (subject before direct object), O < S (direct object before subject), and S and/or O = Ø (where S and/or O are/is dropped). The *corpus* consists of the main Old Aramaic inscriptions (including Samalian) - with the exception, because of its very bad state of preservation, of Deir ʿAlla - and of 21 texts from Elephantine.[4] Some parts of the

[3] For further details about the database and its parameters, see Grassi forthcoming.

[4] For OA, KAI 202; 214-216; 222-224; 309; 310; 311; 320; inscription of Kuttumuwa (see Pardee 2009); for IA, TADAE A 1.1; 2.1- 2.5; 3.3; 3.5; 3.8; 4.3; 4.4; 4.7; 6.15; TADAE B 2.6; 2.7; 2.11; 3.6-3.8; 7.2; C 1.1 (excerpts).

texts are not taken into consideration because of difficulties with reading or interpretation. Note that the direct object marked with the so called *nota objecti* (*ʾyt*) in OA is included in the table, while the differential object marking *l-* of IA is not; this will be dealt with later.

Clauses	All	S < O	O < S	S and/or O = Ø	Percentage O < S	Percentage S/O = Ø
All	416	75	25	316	6%	76%
Structurally unambiguous	339	52	20	267	6%	79%
Structurally ambiguous	77	23	5	49	6%	64%
Percentage structurally ambiguous	19%	31%	20%	16%		

The percentages which are significantly different in the two dialects (see below) are related to the word order O < S, since the clauses with O < S are almost always unambiguous in OA, while the 36% of them are ambiguous in IA. Ambiguous clauses are slightly less common in IA,[5] while pro-drop sentences increase from the 69% of OA to the 81% of IA. The great majority of the clauses are, in both cases, pro-drop. Quite remarkably, the percentage of the clauses with a dropped subject or direct object is not drastically different in structurally ambiguous and structurally unambiguous clauses (64% versus 79%). Thus, the omission of the overt subject does not seem to correlate with the ambiguity of the verbal form: the subject can be dropped both in structurally ambiguous and unambiguous clauses.

An examination of the word order - when it can be seen - shows the following results:

All (100)		**OA (54)**		**IA (46)**	
S < O < V:	8	S < O < V:	3	S < O < V:	5
S < V < O:	43	S < V < O:	21	S < V < O:	22
V < S < O:	24	**V < S < O:**	**16**	**V < S < O:**	**8**
V < O < S:	17	**V < O < S:**	**11**	**V < O < S:**	**6**
O < V < S:	5	O < V < S:	3	O < V < S:	2
O < S < V:	3	O < S < V:	ø	O < S < V:	3

As may be seen, the main difference lays in the fact that OA has a stronger preference for the verb in the first position, and a stronger dislike for the object in the first position. In both cases the most common order is SVO. It is quite obvious that there is no rigid word order and that the object may precede the subject, even if in this case the object is usually a suffix pronoun and there is thus a morphological mean to distinguish it from the subject.

[5] This unexpected tendency (ambiguous clauses tend to increase: cp. *e.g.* their increasing percentages in High German) is possibly due to the nature of the *corpus*: many texts are letters and contracts, with the use of the unambiguous first and second person.

Actually, in *structurally unambiguous clauses* the form of the object is an important means of distinguishing the subject from the object, particularly in O < S clauses, and sometimes in S dropped clauses, while the verb is the most important mean both in S < O and in S dropped clauses.

What disambiguates S < O (52 clauses)

Form Subject	Form Object	Form Verb
15	7	50

What disambiguates O < S (20 clauses)

Form Subject	Form Object	Form Verb
1	17	15

What disambiguates S/O dropped (267 clauses)

Form Subject	Form Object	Form Verb
0	61	231

If this was quite easy to predict, the situation of the *structurally ambiguous clauses* is much more interesting. The parameters that may be relevant are animacy,[6] specificity,[7] and accessibility,[8] while discourse scale pragmatics, taken into consideration in the database, is in Old and Imperial Aramaic irrelevant, because ambiguous clauses may contain only the 3rd person.[9]

What disambiguates S < O? **Rest? No**

Animacy S ≥ O	Specificity S ≥ O	Accessibility S ≥ O
23/23	21/23	13/23

6 "Animacy hierarchy": self > kin/name > human > animate > inanimate > location > abstract > mass; based on Silverstein 1976.

7 Scale specificity: individuate > not individuate and countable > not individuate and not countable.

8 Structural information scale ("Accessibility hierarchy"): indefinite description > full name + modifier > full name > long definite description > short definite description > last name > first name > distal demonstrative pronoun + modifier > proximate demonstrative pronoun + modifier > distal demonstrative pronoun > proximate demonstrative pronoun > stressed pronoun > unstressed pronoun > clitic pronoun > verbal person > zero. This scale is based on Ariel 1988, 1991 and 2008 (esp. p. 44): "Each referring expression on the marking scale indicates a relative degree of memory activation for the addressee to retrieve. Top expressions are ones used to indicate lower degrees of activation (where the representations are deemed harder for the addressee to retrieve), whereas bottom forms are used when relatively high degrees of activations are involved (where the representations are deemed easier for the addressee to retrieve"). In contrast to Ariel, "indefinite description" is included in our scale, and it is, of course, the least accessible referring expression.

9 Discourse pragmatic scale, based on De Lancey 1981, is actually a person hierarchy, in which first and second person outrank third person. For more details on the database, see Grassi forthcoming.

Animacy O ≥ S	Specificity O ≥ S	Accessibility O ≥ S
0/24	15/24	12/24

What disambiguates O < S? **Rest? 1 (Context)**

Animacy S ≥ O	Specificity S ≥ O	Accessibility S ≥ O
4 or 5/5	5/5	1/5

Animacy O ≥ S	Specificity O ≥ S	Accessibility O ≥ S
0 or 1/5	3/5	4/5

What disambiguates S/O dropped? **Rest? 2 (Context)**

Animacy S ≥ O	Specificity S ≥ O	Accessibility S ≥ O
45/49	44/46	46/49

Animacy O ≥ S	Specificity O ≥ S	Accessibility O ≥ S
11/49	26/46	9/49

There are 77 structurally ambiguous clauses (23 S < O; 5 O < S; 49 S or O Ø). If we examine these clauses, it is immediately clear that the most useful means to distinguish semantic and syntactic roles in the majority of them is animacy. In the 23 S < O clauses, the animacy of the subject is *always* higher than the animacy of the direct object, so that animacy alone can disambiguate the sentence. This is most significant, because in structurally unambiguous clauses this is not always the case: the animacy of the object may be higher than the animacy of the subject, or just the same.

Similarly, in the 5 O < S and in the 49 S or O Ø structurally ambiguous clauses animacy plays an important role. However, one case in the O < S clauses is problematic, and only the context makes the sentence clear. Also in the 49 S or O dropped there are cases in which animacy alone is not sufficient to distinguish the agent from the undergoer.

However, in all these cases, the use of a second parameter, accessibility, is of major relevance, since the subject, being not expressed ("zero" in the accessibility scale), is almost always more accessible than the object, because it requires a higher degree of activation in the memory of the addressee. In other words, animacy is the most relevant means to distinguish the agent from the undergoer in structurally ambiguous clauses with subject dropped, but, when animacy alone is not enough, animacy combined with accessibility disambiguates almost the totality of the sentences.[10] On the other hand, scale specificity does not seem to play an important role in the strategies for distinguishing semantic roles. That means that there are only 3 clauses out of 416 (0,72%) in which only an external factor - the context - may clarify the syntactic roles.

[10] With two exceptions, in which the syntactic role is made clear by the context.

We may now wonder which role is played by the differential object marking (DOM) *l-* in IA (the phrases with DOM are not included in the table above). Limits of space do not allow a full treatment of this topic, which has aroused great interest in the last few years. [11]

The main and commonly accepted conclusion is that *l-* behaves in IA as a "classic" DOM, [12] since it marks mostly animate, definite objects [13] (that are marked in order to distinguish them from the subject, which in transitive clauses is usually animate and definite [14]). In these cases the DOM may surely be helpful, but, as already seen, the DOM is not the only strategy used in order to distinguish syntactic roles. Actually, the DOM might be considered a parallel strategy, the use of which is frequently redundant. Among the 10 certain occurrences of *l-* as marker of direct object in my sample, [15] there is just a single case in which the clause is ambiguous: *kzy [yḥ]zh gbr ṭb lgbr lḥ[h ... lʾ] ylwh ʿmh*, "When a good person will see a bad person, he shall not join with him" (TADAE C 1.1, col. 7, lines 99-100). The DOM may be useful in this case, but the unmarked word order VSO would possibly have been enough to disambiguate the syntactic roles.

To sum up, the collapse of case system is less fatal than is commonly assumed: the percentage of structurally ambiguous clauses in Old and Imperial Aramaic is relatively low, whereas animacy, and, to a lesser degree, accessibility, may be helpful in distinguishing syntactic roles. In this context, the DOM used in IA may be seen as just one of the possible strategies elaborated to clarify the syntactic functions, and its use is often redundant.

---

[11] For differential object marking in Semitic languages, see *e.g.* Khan 1984 and Rubin 2005, 91-127; for North-West Semitic inscriptions, see *e.g.* Garr 1985, 191-194; Gzella 2013 and Bekins forthcoming; for the Mesha inscription, see Bekins 2014; for Biblical Hebrew, see Malessa 2000; for Aramaic, see Folmer 1995, 340-371 (with previous literature at pp. 369-371), Folmer 2008 (with further literature at pp. 132-133), Rubin 2005, 94-105, Kalinin - Loesov 2013 and 2014 (with further references on this topic), and Grassi forthcoming.

[12] The term "differential object marking" was created by Georg Bossong to indicate the presence in a language of a marked direct object together with an unmarked direct object. The features that underlie the differentiation of the objects may be inherent or referential. Among the former, the most prominent feature is animacy; among the latter, definiteness (cp. *e.g.* Comrie 1979; Bossong 1983-1984). Note that the *nota objecti* *ʾyt* in Old Aramaic does not behave like a DOM: cp. Kalinin - Loesov 2013; Grassi forthcoming.

[13] Cp. Folmer 1995, pp. 340-371; Kalinin - Loesov 2014.

[14] Cp. For example Comrie 1979, 19.

[15] The verbs which are surely complemented by a direct object (with or without evidence for the use of the *nota objecti*) are listed in Folmer 1995, 343-348; the ambiguous ones are listed at pp. 349-351. In the first group, 13 of the 23 verbs are attested with the *nota objecti*, and 6 of them occur with the *nota objecti* in my *corpus* (*ḥzy*; *yhb*; *ktš*; *ntn*; *šʾl*; *šbq*).

ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGLA

KAI Donner - Röllig 2002[5]
TADAE Porten - Yardeni 1989-1999 (A: *Letters* [1989]; B: *Contracts* [1989]; C: *Literature*, *Accounts*, *Lists* [1993]).

REFERENCES

ARIEL, M.
1988 Referring and Accessibility: *Journal of Linguistics* 24 (1988), pp. 65-87.
1991 The Function of Accessibility in a Theory of Grammar: *Journal of Pragmatics* 16 (1991), pp. 443-463.
2008 *Pragmatics and Grammar*, Cambridge 2008.
BEKINS, P.
2014 Object Marking on the Mesha Inscription: *KUSATU* 17 (2014), pp. 37-63.
forthcoming The Use of Differential Object Marking in Northwest Semitic: *KUSATU*.
BOSSONG, G.
1983-1984 Animacy and Markedness in Universal Grammar: *Glossologia* 2-3 (1983-1984), pp. 7-20.
COMRIE, B.
1979 Definite and Animate Direct Objects: A Natural Class: *Linguistica Silesiana* 3 (1979), pp. 13-21.
DE LANCEY, S.
1981 An Interpretation of Split Ergativity and Related Patterns: *Language* 67 (1981), pp. 626-657.
DONNER, H. - RÖLLIG, W.
2002 *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, I, Wiesbaden 2002[5].
FOLMER, M.L.
1995 *The Aramaic Language in the Achaemenid Period. A Study in Linguistic Variation*, Leuven 1995.
2008 The Use and Form of the *nota objecti* in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic Inscriptions: H. GZELLA - M.L. FOLMER (eds.), *Aramaic in its Historical and Linguistic Setting*, Wiesbaden 2008, pp. 131-158.
GARR, W.R.
1985 *Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine 1000-586 B.C.E.*, Philadelphia 1985 (reprint Winona Lake 2004).
GRASSI, G.F.
forthcoming Direct Object in Old Aramaic (10th-8th century BC): *KUSATU*.
GZELLA, H.
2013 Differentielle Objektmarkierung im Nordwestsemitischen als Konvergenzerscheinung: R. KUTY - H. SEEGER - S. TALAY (Hrsg.), *Nicht nur mit Engelszungen. Beiträge zur semitischen Dialektologie. Festschrift für Werner Arnold zum 60. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden 2013, pp. 113-124.
KALININ, M. - LOESOV, S.
2013 Encoding of the Direct Object throughout the History of Aramaic (Part 1): J.P. MONFERRER-SALA - W.G.E. WATSON (eds.), *Archaism and Innovation in the Semitic Languages. Selected Papers*, Córdoba - Durham 2013, pp. 45-57.

2014 Encoding of the Direct Object throughout the History of the Aramaic Language: *Babel und Bibel* 7 (2014), pp. 477-526.

KASPER, S.

2012- *ReffMech. Die Relation von formalen und funktionalen Mechanismen der Form/Inhalts-Zuordnung. Leitfaden zur Datenbank der LOEWE Syntax/Semantik-Schnittstelle*. Konzeption unter Mitarbeit von Magnus Breder Birkenes, Felix Esser, Giulia Francesca Grassi, Sara Hayden, Axel Harlos, Julia Schüler, Paul Widmer. Technisch implementiert durch Frank Nagel unter Mitarbeit von Slawomir Messner und Raphael Stroh, Marburg 2012-.

KHAN, G.

1984 Object Markers and Agreement Pronouns in Semitic Languages: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 47 (1984), pp. 468-500.

MALESSA, M.

2000 Differentielle Objektmarkierung im klassischen Hebräisch: *KUSATU* 1 (2000), pp. 133-156.

PARDEE, D.

2009 A New Aramaic Inscription from Zincirli: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 356 (2009), pp. 51-71.

PORTEN, B. - YARDENI, A.

1989-1999 *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt* (4 volumes), Jerusalem 1989-1999.

RUBIN, A.D.

2005 *Studies in Semitic Grammaticalization*, Winona Lake 2005.

SILVERSTEIN, M.

1976 Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity: R.M.W. DIXON (ed.), *Grammatical Relations in Australian Languages*, Canberra 1976, pp. 112-171.