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The Syntax and Pragmatics of Subject Pronouns in Phoenician

ROBERT D. HOLMSTEDT

1. Introduction

Grammatically speaking, pronouns are odd items. In traditional descriptions, pronouns are defined as words that “stand for nouns” (see, for example, Waltke and O’Connor 1990: §16.1 on pronouns in Biblical Hebrew). Syntactically, pronouns do appear in many similar (but not all the same) positions as nouns and noun phrases, but semantically and pragmatically, the “standing for nouns” definition is simply wrong. Consider for a moment the clause in example (1).

(1) k mlk ṣdq hʾ
    because king righteous PRON.3MS
    ‘because a righteous king is he’. (KAI 10.9)

Does the pronoun hʾ contain any descriptive content? Do we know to whom or what hʾ refers? No. The pronoun provides some morphological agreement features that limit the choices, in this case, to a single male who is not the speaker or addressee (at least, within the deictic bounds of the clause). Beyond this, the pronoun is semantically empty and illustrates how pronouns are unlike nouns by lacking descriptive content. And yet, the 3ms pronoun hʾ in (1) does identify an object within the discourse context: it clearly picks out yhwmlk, the king of Byblos, as its referent. This is the anaphoric function of third-person pronouns, which, interestingly, sets them apart from first- and second-person pronouns. Consider the statements in (2) and (3).

Author’s note: I am grateful to Aaron Schade, Philip Schmitz, and Holger Gzella for feedback on my argument. I alone am responsible for the analyses given in the essay as well as any errors.
Like the third-person pronoun in (1), the first-person pronoun in (2) and the second-person pronoun in (3) provide us some information via morphological agreement features, but beyond this we do not know the descriptive content of ṭnk or ṭt. Whereas the third-person pronoun is anaphoric and thus refers back to another expression (one with descriptive content) that occurred in the discourse, the first- and second-person pronouns are not anaphoric. The first- and second-person pronouns, rather, identify the two principal speech roles, the “speaker” and the “addressee.”

Note also how the first- and second-person pronouns cannot be replaced by a noun phrase in the same way that the third-person pronoun can and produce the same meaning for the clause. That is, in (1) the 3ms hʾ could be replaced by yḥwmlk, leaving the clause semantically identical.

1. Although the majority stance seems to be to take k as a noncausal particle here (see KAI 2.21–22; Faber 1986: 427 n. 12; Krahmalkov 2001: 286–87; Schade 2006: 171–72; compare with Cooke 1903; Gibson 1982; and Avishur 2000: 135). But in my opinion, Krahmalkov’s “presentative function” (as well as most others’ noncausal analyses) is a struggle to produce a good English rendering rather than to understand k in Phoenician. Whatever the motivation, these authors are constraining the semantics of the k subordinate clause too narrowly. Muraoka (2006: §170da) makes an insightful and relevant comment on kī in Biblical Hebrew:

In some cases, what follows כ is not a logical cause of an event or circumstance, but the evidence of, or an argument for, the preceding assertion: 1Kg 1.24f. “My lord, O king, you did say that Adonijah should reign after you and sit upon your throne. For (כ) he is gone down this day, and has slaughtered oxen . . .,” cf. also 1Sm 26.151.

So, too, in the 'Eshmunʿazor text (and also for the Karatepe example that Krahmalkov cites; 2001: 187), the k clause relates back to the larger argument of the text section or even the entire text and provides the reason or motivation for the action: “[do or do not do these things, or, these things have been done] because . . .”

2. Concerning qnmy, I follow Friedrich and Röllig 1999: §124 in taking it as a compound interrogative, rather than Krahmalkov (2000: 428; 2001: 109), who takes qnmy as two separate words, qn and my, and translates it “O acquirer <of this resting-place>, whoever you may be.”
In contrast, replacing the 1cs ʾnk with ʾšmnʾxr (the speaker in KAI 14) in (2) or the 2ms ʾl with kl mmlkt wkl ʾdm (the following appositional noun phrase) in (3) destroys the “speaker versus addressee” distinction provided by the pronouns. Another feature that divides the third-person from other personal pronouns is its demonstrative use, illustrated in example (4).

(4) \( w=y-q\text{sn} h=mmlk-t h' \)  
   and=3-cutt.off.ipfv.pasp.mp the=king=fs DEM.3MS  
   \( w=h=ʾdm-m hmt w=zd=ʾlm t=lʾlm \)  
   and=the=man=mp DEM-MP and=seed=their.3MS for=ever  
   ‘and that king or those men and their seed shall be cut off forever’. (KAI 14.22)

The third-person pronouns \( h' \) and \( hmt \) are not primarily anaphoric here but deictic: they point to particular instances of the nouns they modify. In Phoenician and related languages (for example, Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac), the third-person pronouns are often used specifically for distal deixis, ‘that, those’. Cross-linguistically, it is not unusual for third-person pronouns to overlap with demonstrative pronouns or to be derivationally related (see Bhat 2004: chap. 6).\(^3\) And it is not difficult to see how anaphora and deixis meet in the function of third-person pronouns: in both cases, the pronouns “are used for locating the participants of events . . . with reference to the speech context” (Bhat 2004: 9). A description and analysis of the Phoenician pronouns must take into account the full range of pronoun functions.

Another complicating factor is the use of personal subject pronouns with verbs that are highly inflected. It is standard among the Semitic languages for the finite verbs to carry morphological agreement features

---

3. The demonstrative use of the third-person pronouns is well attested outside Semitic (see Bhat 2004: chap. 6) and is the norm within Semitic, even though, for Phoenician, none of the commonly used grammars includes these pronouns in descriptions of demonstratives. For example, Segert (1976: §61.15) has one sentence indicating that the third-person pronouns are also demonstratives and Friedrich and Röllig (1999: §§111.3, 114) also mention it only in passing. Although Krahmalkov’s treatment (2001) is more substantive, it is given in the chapter on the “independent personal pronoun” instead of the “demonstrative” and introduced with the confusing (and inaccurate) subtitle “Expressing the Anaphoric Pronoun” (§3.5). The problem is that grammarians confuse etymology and syntax. It does not matter whether, for example, \( h' \) is also the anaphoric 3ms pronoun, if it serves in other contexts as a demonstrative, it should be included in the description of demonstrative pronouns.
matching the person, number, and gender of the subject. As such, the Semitic languages are among those that are “pro-drop” or ‘null subject” languages, in which a subject, whether a full NP or a pronoun, does not need to appear overtly in the syntax.\(^4\) The way that this is articulated in generative syntax is that subject NPs and overt subject pronouns are in complementary distribution with a “covert” or “null” pronoun referred to as “little pro.”\(^5\) The general pro-drop feature of Phoenician (as with all Semitic languages) explains why the epigraphic texts covered in this study exhibit numerous clauses that lack an overt subject. The representative Byblian (5), Tyro-Sidonian (6b), and Anatolian (7) examples below illustrate the generalization.

(5) \(\text{km}=^\text{š} \ qr^\text{2t} \ ____ \ ^\text{ʃt} \ rb-t=y \ b^\text{lt}\)

like=REL call.PFV-1CS ACC mistress-FS=my.1CS Baʿalat.of

Byblos and=heard.PFV.3FS voice.my.1CS and=did.PFV.3FS

l=y n^\text{m} goodness

‘at (the time) that pro (I) called on my mistress, Baʿalat of

Byblos, pro (she) heard my voice and pro (she) did
goodness for me’. (KAI 10.7–8)

(6) \(w=y^\text{š}b-n=y \ ____ \ ^\text{šm} \ ^\text{dr} \ ^\text{m}\)

and=settle.PFV-1CP=him.3MS heaven-MP mighty-MP

‘and pro (we) settled him [ʾEshmun] (in) the mighty heav

e ns’. (KAI 14.16)

---

4. The pro-drop parameter was formulated within the early Government-and-Binding framework of generative linguistics, although it is now recognized more broadly. The theoretical context of the pro-drop parameter is critical since, contrary to some nongenerative linguistic approaches (particularly the early twentieth-century approach of Jespersen, which is sometimes still used in Biblical Hebrew studies), the generative view of inflectional affixes on verbs, such as those in Hebrew, is that they differ syntactically and semantically from independent pronouns. That is, inflectional affixes on verbs are taken not as cliticized pronouns, which is sometimes the view in Hebrew studies but, rather, as morphologically realized agreement features. The subject pronouns, in contrast, are full syntactic constituents. On pro-drop in Hebrew, see Holmstedt forthcoming.

5. The null subject pro is present when an overt (pronominal or full NP) sub-
ject is absent in order to fulfill the “extended projection principle” (EPP) require-
ment (that is, every clause must have a syntactic subject) and to check both person,
gender, and number agreement and nominative case features (see, e.g., Haegeman
As we see in (5)–(7), it is most common for an overt subject NP or pronoun to be dropped when the agent/patient subject of the verb is the most recently used verbal subject. Moreover, the data suggest that the identification of the covert pronoun is related to the discourse: pro is used with an inflected finite verb when its ability to access its antecedent within the discourse is high, whereas the referring NP subject is used when the discourse accessibility is low, and an overt pronoun is used when the antecedent is marked for Topic or Focus (see Gutman 1999, 2004 for a similar analysis of modern Israeli Hebrew).

In the following sections (§§2–6), I describe my findings for the use of subject pronouns in Phoenician epigraphic texts, divided chronologically and geographically. The final section, §7, is a brief summary of resumptive pronouns and object pronouns. For all their linguistic oddities, pronouns are central to both the linguistic system of Phoenician languages and the organization of information within stretches of discourse. And yet, the syntax and pragmatics of pronouns are just a sample of linguistic phenomena for which the description in our Phoenician grammars must now move beyond the strong philological tradition to linguistic analyses grounded in both modern theory and the insights and generalizations gained from cross-linguistic studies.

---

6. Although all recent treatments have taken the verbs in this section of the Karatepe text to relate to a future time (see, among others, Younger 1998; Röllig 1999; Avishur 2000; Schade 2006), I have taken the verbs in (7) as imperfectives used for past conditions. In my opinion, past events or conditions continue to be related until the 'm conditional clause in A III.12 marks the transition to the curse that ends the text.

2. Early Byblian: Ittobaal b. Aḥirom (KAI 1) and Yaḥimilk (KAI 4)

We have little relevant data from the earliest Phoenician inscriptions, the tenth-century Byblian texts. The genre of these texts is dedicatory, and the narratorial voice does not use first-person presentation in the same way that memorial inscriptions, such as the Byblian inscription of Yaḥawmilk (KAI 10) or the Anatolian inscriptions of Kulamuwa (KAI 24), ʿAzatiwada (KAI 26), and Warika (Çineköl; see Tekoğlu and Lemaire 2002) do. Moreover, there is often no need in the early Byblian texts for Topic or Focus, since these texts are not long and often lack multiple agents who take differing stances or actions. Thus, there are only two overt pronouns from these early texts, given in (8) and (9):

(8) \[ w=hʾy-mḥspr=h \]
and=PRON.3MS 3-efface.IPfv.PASS.MS inscription=his.3MS
l=pp ʾbl
to=edge.of path
‘and as for him—may his inscription be effaced by the edge (?) of the road’. (KAI 1.2)

Example (8), from the tenth-century sarcophagus of Aḥirom, exhibits an anaphoric 3ms pronoun, which points back to the previously mentioned person who dares to uncover the sarcophagus. Although the pronoun could be the subject of the following verb, I take it as a left-dislocated element that is resumed by the genitive clitic pronoun in the noun phrase sprh ‘his inscription’. However, for the pragmatic analysis of this overt pronoun, it matters little whether the pronoun is part of the clause proper or is a left-dislocated constituent; in both cases, it serves as a Topic and thus marks a shift from one agent to another—from what the transgressor’s scepter and rule will suffer to what the dastardly fellow himself will suffer. Presumably, to have one’s burial inscription erased is a severe and very personal punishment.

(9) \[ hʾtḥwyklmpl-t h=bt-mʾl \]
PRON.3MS restore.IPfv.3MS all ruin-FP the=house-MP DEM.P
‘he (alone) has restored all the ruins of the these houses’. (KAI 4.2–3)
In (9), the sole overt pronoun in the tenth-century Yahimilk inscription is also a 3ms anaphoric pronoun and is inserted into the clause to carry Focus. It is not a Topic pronoun because there is no agent shift at this point; rather, the Focus helps the narrator assert that it was Yahimilk and no other possible candidate who rebuilt the houses.  

3. North Syrian: Kulamuwa (KAI 24)

The next text in chronological sequence that exhibits adequate pronoun evidence is the late ninth-century Kulamuwa text, from Zinjirli (ancient Samʾal) in northern Syria. In (10a–b), the 1cs pronouns are required for the self-identification of the speaker and as subjects for the two null-copula clauses.

(10a) $\text{3}^{\text{pron.1cs}} 
\text{kłm} \quad \text{br} \quad hy[?]

\text{Kulamuwa son.of Hayya’

‘I am Kulamuwa, son of Hayya’}. (KAI 24.1)

(10b) $\text{w=} \text{3}^{\text{pron.1cs}} 
\text{kłm} \quad \text{br} \quad tm

\text{Kulamuwa son.of TM

‘but I am Kulamuwa, son of TM’}. (KAI 24.4)

Similarly obligatory is the 1cs pronoun following the uninflected narrative verb (NARR)\(^9\) in (10c):

8. In the Nora Stele (ca. 820 b.c.; KAI 46), there is a possible 3ms pronoun $h’$ in lines 2 and 3–4. If this is the correct interpretation of the text (see Schmitz in this volume for an alternate reading), the pronouns follow a perfective verb ($grš h’ garriš=ô drive.out.3ms=him he.3ms ‘he drove out’) and an adjective ($šlm hʾ save.3ms he.3ms ‘he is safe/well’; see Zuckerman 1991). In the second clause, the pronoun is syntactically obligatory to represent the subject of the null-copula clause; its position after the predicate adjective presumably represents Focus-marking on the adjective, thereby indicating that the status of the subject of the inscription was what was being “emphasized.” It is much more difficult to explain the postverbal placement of the pronoun in the first clause, since the subject pronoun is optional and, when present with a finite verb, almost always precedes the verb to signal a focused subject. Thus, if the pronoun readings in the Nora Stele are correct, I suggest that $grš$ might be our earliest example of the uninflected narrative verb that appears so prominently a century later in the Karatepe text. Notably, with the uninflected narrative verb, the pronoun is obligatory to provide the grammatical information concerning the verbal subject and overwhelmingly follows the verb.

9. On the issue of the “uninflected narrative verb,” see below, examples (11e,f), and the subsequent discussion.
Subject Pronouns in Phoenician

(10c) \( w=\overline{\text{dr}} \quad q=l=y \quad \text{mlk} \)

and=be.powerful.\text{PFV.3MS} upon=me.\text{1CS} king.of

\( dnn-ym \quad w=\overline{\text{škr}} \quad ʾnk \quad q=l=y \)

Danunian-\text{MP} and=\text{hire.NARR} \text{PRON.1CS} over=me.\text{1CS}

\( \text{mlk} \quad ʾ\overline{šr} \)

king.of ʾAshur

‘and the king of the Danunians was more powerful than me so I hired against him the king of ʾAshur’. (\text{KAI} 24.7–8)

Note that, with the uninflected narrative verb, the pronoun always follows the verb (see the numerous examples in the Anatolian texts, below; Krahmalkov 2001: 46), the common use of the pronoun to signal Topic or Focus and the association of Topic and Focus with the left-periphery of the clause (that is, the fronted position), I suggest that the postverbal order in the uninflected narrative verb clauses is intentional in order to signal that the pronouns are pragmatically unmarked.

In (10d–e) fully inflected finite verbs are used, indicating that the pronoun is syntactically unnecessary.\(^{10}\) Thus, in both cases, the presence of the pronoun signals a pragmatic function.

(10d) \( l=pn \quad h=\text{mlk-m} \quad h=l=pn-ym \quad y-\text{tlwn} \)

to=face.of the=\text{king-MP} \text{REL=to=face-MP} \text{3-writhe.MP}

\( mškb-m \quad km \quad klb-m \quad w=\overline{\text{šnk}} \quad l=my \)

lower.class-MP like dog-MP and=\text{PRON.1CS} to=who

\( k-t \quad ʾb \quad w=l=my \quad k-t \quad ʾm \)

be.\text{PFV-1CS} father and=to=who be.\text{PFV-1CS} mother

\( w=l=my \quad k-t \quad ʾh \)

and=to=who be.\text{PFV-1CS} brother

---

10. In line 9, there is another occurrence of the \text{1CS} pronoun: ʾnk klmw br ḫyb yšbt ʿl ks\(^3\) ʾb=y. The syntax is ambiguous, however: it is possible to take the \text{1CS} pronoun as the subject of a null copula clause (‘I am Kulamuwa; \text{pro} (I) sat upon my father’s throne’; see, e.g., O’Connor 1977a; de Moor 1988; Avishur 2000; \text{COS} 2.147–48; Schade 2006) or as the subject of the inflected verb (‘I, Kulamuwa, sat upon my father’s throne’; see, e.g., Collins 1971; Gibson 1982; Sperling 1988; Parker 1996). Whatever option was intended by the author, the choice likely related to whether this first statement in the second half of the text was meant as an opening identification, parallel to the opening statement of the entire text, ‘I am Kilumuwa’, or as a statement of accomplishment (since the speaker’s identity has been well established by this point).

before the kings who were beforehand the lower class
writhed like dogs, but I was father to whomever, a
mother to whomever, and a brother to whomever’.
(KAI 24.9–11)

In (10d), the Focus signaled by the presence of the 1cs pronoun is
strengthened by its fronted position: it has been raised above the prepo-
sitional phrase with the interrogative lmy ‘to whomever’. The intended
contrast is clear: Kulamuwa sets his compassion and magnanimity over
against the fear induced in the “lower class” by his predecessors (on the
identity of the mškbm, see Schmitz’s essay in this volume).

(10e) w=ʾnk tmk-t mškb-m l=ŷd
and=PRON.1CS hold.PFV-1CS lower.class-MP to=hand
w=hmt št nbš km nbs ytm
and=PRON.3MP set.PFV.3CP life like life.of orphan
b=ʾm
in=mother
‘and I held the lower class by the hand and they set (for
me) affection like the affection of an orphan for a
mother’. (KAI 24.13)

In (10e), the two pronouns, the 1cs ʾnk and the 3mp hmt, work together
but are not contrastive with each other. Rather, the 1cs pronoun pres-
ents Focus on Kulamuwa, the speaker, and again contrasts him with his
predecessors. The 3mp pronoun in the following clause is a Topic in that
it marks a shift in the agent from the speaker to “they,” which is clearly
anaphorically linked to “the lower class” in the first clause.

4. Anatolian:

Karatepe (KAI 26), Çineköy,
and Çebel Ires Daği (KAI 287)

The artifacts from the Anatolian sites of Karatepe, Çineköy, and
Çebel Ires Daği (modern Çebelireis Daği) have provided us with the
largest extant Phoenician texts to date. At first glance, the numerous
pronouns, especially in the Karatepe texts, suggest great potential for
exhibiting innovative pronominal syntax or pragmatics. However, the
pattern remains the same as we have seen so far. Consider the represen-
tative examples from mid-eighth-century Karatepe texts:
In these first two examples, the pronoun is required by discourse to specify the speaker role and by the syntax to serve as a subject for both null-copula clauses (11a) and clauses with the uninflected narrative verb (11b). The vast majority of subject pronouns are used this way in Karatepe. Only a few instances reflect the pragmatics of Topic or Focus (11c–g).

There is an ambiguity to the syntax of both (11c) and (11d), just as there was with the example in line 9 of Kulamuwa (KAI 24.9, see above, n. 6). There are three possibilities: (1) the 1cs pronoun is the subject as a null-copula clause, followed by a separate finite verbal clause, ‘I am ṾAzatiwada; pro (I) did x’; (2) the pronoun and proper name are left-dislocated, ‘As for me, ṾAzatiwada—pro (I) have oppressed them’ (see 12. On hbrk as ‘steward’, see Pardee 1983: 64–65; Röllig 1999: 58; Lipiński 2004: 123–27; Schade 2006: 21–22; on hbrk as ‘blessed of’, see O’Connor 1977b.

Dunand 1944; 1946; Dupont-Sommer 1948; the problem with this analysis is that there is no resumptive constituent in the core clause, which is required in structures of this sort); (3) the pronoun is the syntactic subject of the verbal clause, with the proper noun in apposition: ‘I, ’Azatiwada, did x’ (see, e.g., Marcus and Gelb 1948; 1949; Gordon 1948; 1949; Alt 1949; Honeyman 1949; O’Callaghan 1949a, b; Younger 1998; COS 2.148–50; Avishur 2000; Schade 2005; 2006). The clear weight of scholarship is on the side of the third option (with no one who takes the first, and only Dunand and Dupont-Sommer who opt for the second).

I also take the third analysis to be the most felicitous within the context; the speaker is not reidentifying himself but, rather, making an assertion about his achievements. If this is correct, then the pronoun is not syntactically required as a subject for the two inflected finite verbs in (11c) and (11d). Rather, it serves two purposes, one strictly pragmatic and one related to the discourse function of first-person pronouns. In pragmatic terms, the insertion of the 1cs pronoun serves to mark the speaker with Focus, thereby aiding ’Azatiwada in asserting how he, unlike previous rulers, accomplished these things (for example, subduing brigands). In its nonpragmatic role, the 1cs pronoun also provides a suitable position to host the appositional proper noun, ’Azatiwada, thereby allowing the speaker (for good rhetorical measure) to assert himself as the speaker of the narrative (the “I”) and remind the audience who he is (“’Azatiwada”). This latter function is not related to Topic or Focus but is an inherent feature of the pronominal system.

The next two pronoun examples in Karatepe are hardly less troublesome (11e–f), since the verbs have been analyzed as participles or infinitives absolute with object suffixes:

(11e) \(\text{yrd}=m\) \(\text{šnk}=\text{narr} \implies \text{them.3mp} \text{pron.1cs}\)

‘I brought them down’. (AI.20//BI.11, CII.11–12)

(11f) \(\text{yšb}=m\) \(\text{šnk}=\text{b=qst} \implies \text{gbl}=\text{y}\text{mp}\implies \text{my.1cs}\)

‘I settled them in the ends of my borders’. (AI.20//BI.11, CII.12)
It is often recognized (often implicitly) that, if the verb in both (11e) and (11f) is the “infinitive absolute” with object suffixes, then the Phoenician grammar represented in Karatepe differs in this regard from Hebrew, in which the adverbiaal infinitive does not allow affixation (see, e.g., Obermann 1950: 96; O’Callaghan 1949b: 239; Gordon 1949: 114; Bron 1979: 74; Garr 1985: 183–84; Friedrich and Röllig 1999: 103, 126, 130; Krahmalkov 2001: 72). Yet, if these are to be analyzed as the “infinitive absolute,” or better, an “uninflected narrative verb” (see, e.g., Marcus 1969: 60 n. 23; Ginsberg 1973: 144 n. 56; Gibson 1982: 37), then the presence and position of the subject pronoun is uncontroversial. In contrast, if these forms are participles (see, e.g., Obermann 1950), the affixation of object pronouns is normal, but the placement of the pronoun following the participle is problematic: while pronouns are obligatory with participles in main clauses (they may be dropped in relative clauses and small clauses), they are typically placed before the participle. The placement after a participle suggests that the participles would be raised for Focus, which makes no sense in the context. I tentatively suggest that the two verbs in (11e, f) are not participles but rare cases of the uninflected verb with object suffixes.  

The final example of the subject pronoun in Karatepe, given in (11g), lies within an interpretive crux (see Bron 1979: 78–85).

(11g) w=b=ym-t=yʾnkʾš-ttk
and=in=day-fp=my.1csPRON.1cswomans-walk.ipfv.fs
l=ḥd=ydlplkm
to=alone=her.3fswithspindle-mp
‘but in my days, mine!, a woman walked by herself with spindles’ (AII.5//BI.13, CIII.3)

Whatever the correct interpretation of tk lhdy dl plkm (see, among others, Bron 1979: 78–85; Swiggers 1980; Younger 1998: 32–33), the role of the 1cs pronoun seems clear: it is inserted for Focus. The initial prepositional phrase wbynty ‘and in my days’ is a scene-setting Topic constituent, and yet the speaker, ʾAzatiwada, wants to draw attention to

14. Note that I eschew the label “infinitive absolute” for this verb in Phoenician (as well as in Amarna Canaanite and Biblical Hebrew). The form functions as a finite, narrative verb that simply lacks full agreement and, regardless of any homophony with the adverbiaal “infinitive absolute;’ should be recognized as part of the finite verbal system.
the fact that this positive situation (whatever it was) happened only on his watch (for a similar construction, see KAI 10.12–13, given below in [16f]).

In the recently published text from Çineköy (mid- to late eighth century B.C.) there are three examples of a subject pronoun, all in the first-person singular (12a–c):

(12a) $ʾnk\ w[\text{rk} \ bn ------ ]$

PRON.1CS Warika son.of

‘I am Wa[rika, son of . . .]’. (line 1)

(12b) $w=\text{narr}\ ᵀnk ᵀp \ ss \ [q \ ss]$

and=do.NARR PRON.1CS also horse on horse

‘[and] I [added] also horse [upon horse]’. (lines 5–6)

(12c) $w=\text{build.Narr}\ ᵀnk ᵀmy-[t]$

and=build.NARR PRON.1CS wall=fp

‘and I built fortifications’. (line 10)

In the first example, in (12a), the pronoun is the subject of a null-copula clause and, like the two similar examples in Kulamuwa in (10a–b), is required both for the self-identification of the speaker and as the syntactic subject. In the second and third examples, in (12b–c), the pronouns are similarly obligatory; the only difference is that, instead of the null-copula in (12a), the predicate in (12b–c) is the uninflected narrative verb. As in the lone occurrence in Kulamuwa (10c) and the numerous examples in Karatepe (see [11b] and n. 5), the pronoun follows the uninflected narrative verb and does not signal Topic or Focus.

The final Anatolian pronoun example comes from the mid- to late seventh-century text from Çebel Ires Dağı (KAI 287):

(13) $nᵀ\ h' \ mᵀ-m \ b=\text{bd} \ bkr$

plant.pfv.3ms PRON.3ms plantation-mp in=field.of BKR

$b=\text{ym-t} \ Šlpn$

in=day-fp.of Šlpn

‘He planted plantations in the field of BKR in the days of Šlpn’. (KAI 287 AB.1–2)

The nature of (13) is not entirely clear. On the one hand, it looks like a simple case of the uninflected narrative verb with the pronoun required
for the syntactic subject. If the verb were the 3ms perfective (so Mosca and Russell 1987; Friedrich and Röllig 1999: 77), the postverbal position of the pronoun would be extremely unusual since it would only be inserted for Topic or Focus and both positions are preverbal. On the other hand, nowhere else in the text is the uninflected narrative verb used (that is, the inflected perfective verb is preferred); moreover, this would constitute the only example of the uninflected verb with anything other than a first-person pronoun. If it is the inflected 3ms perfective verb, it is possible that the pronoun is used for Focus to contrast the activities of one of the protagonists, MSNZMŠ, with the activities of the others.

5. Sidonian:

Tabnit (KAI 13) and ʾEshmunʿazor (KAI 14)

After the Anatolian texts, we need to move to later texts from Sidon for additional examples of pronoun usage. First is the early fifth-century Sidonian inscription of Tabnit (KAI 13). In this short text, there are three overt pronouns, given in (14a–c):

(14a) ʾnk tbnt khn ṣtrt mlk ṣdn-m

Tabnit priest.of ṬAshtart king.of Sidonian
bn ʾšmnʿzr khn ṣtrt mlk
son.of ʾEshmunʿazor priest.of ṬAshtart king.of
ṣdn-m ṣkb bʾrn z
Sidonian lie.ṭcp.ms in=sarcophagus DEM.S
‘I, Tabnit, priest of ṬAshtart, king of the Sidonians, son of
ʾEshmunʿazor, priest, am lying in this sarcophagus’.
(KAI 13.1–3)

(14b) my ʾt kl ṣdm ṣ t-pq ʾyt
who any man REL 2-find.ipfv.ms ACC
hʾrn z ʾl ʾl t-pth
the=sarcophagus DEM.S NEG NEG 2-open.ipfv.ms
ʾltʾy over=me.1cs
‘Whoever you are—any man—who find this sarcophagus—
do not, do not open (what is) over me!’ (KAI 13.3–4)

The 1cs pronoun ʾnk in (14a) is necessary not only to specify the subject of the participle ṣkb, which does not exhibit the same full agreement
features of the finite verbs, but also so that the ostensible speaker of the text can assert himself—in this case to identify who he is. Placing a referential noun phrase, such as a proper name, in apposition to a first- or second-person pronoun is the only way to specify the speaker or addressee (Bhat 2004: §2.2.3), since these two pronouns are tied to the two speech roles of a discourse and have no anaphoric feature. In (14a), the 1cs pronoun ʾnk is followed by the appositional proper name tbnt and later in (14b) the 2ms pronoun ʿt, representing the addressee, is followed by the appositional noun phrase klʾdmʾstpqʾhʾrn zʾany man who finds this sarcophagus’ in order to specify the type of addressee with which Tabnit is concerned. There is no Topic or Focus function associated with either pronoun in (14a) or (14b). However, the use of the 2ms pronoun in (14b) to address the reader directly has great rhetorical effect, as does the redundancy of the appositional noun phrase, since anyone reading the text would logically need to have found the sarcophagus. The effect, in my opinion, is to put the reader on the spot, so to speak, and give the following entreaty and threat all the more shock value.

The third example of a subject pronoun in the Tabnit text is (14c):

(14c) \[w=\text{kl} \quad \text{mn}m \quad mšr^{15} \quad \text{blt} \quad ʾnk \quad škb\]
\[b=zʾrn \quad z\]
\[\text{in=sarcophagus} \quad \text{Dem.s}\]

‘and no riches at all, but me, are lying in this sarcophagus’.

(KAI 13.5)\(^{16}\)

The 1cs subject pronoun in (14c) is in what is structurally a non-nominative position, since it follows what appears to be the bound blt ‘except’. In Hebrew, the parallel expression is bilti ‘besides me’, with the 1cs enclitic pronoun (as in Hos 13:4, ʾumōšiāʾ layin bilti ‘there is no savior besides me’, //wēlōhîm zūlāti lōʾ tēdaʾ ‘and no god but me do you know’). Since it is likely that the exceptive particle blt is a bound form and requires a clitic host, then the 1cs pronoun in this case fulfills a syntactic requirement and thus has no pragmatic function by itself (although the

\(^{15}\) See Lipiński 1974: 55–56; DNWSI 705–6 (s.v. mšr).

entire exceptive phrase, which as a parenthetical statement disrupts the syntax, may be associated with some sort of Focus).

Tabnit’s son, ʾEshmunʿazor II, also left an early fifth-century Sidonian inscription (KAI 14), and the use of pronouns in this text is syntactically similar to the Tabnit text. The relevant clauses are given in (15).

(15a) \( w=škb \ ʾnk \ b=ḥl-t \ z \ w=b=qbr \)
\( \text{and}=\text{lie} \).PTCP.MS PRON.1CS in=box-\text{fs} DEM.S and=\text{in}=\text{grave} z
\( \text{DEM.S} \)

‘and I am lying in this box and in this grave’. (KAI 14.3)

(15b) \( qn\text{my} \ ʾt \ kl \ mmlk-t \ w=kl \ ʾdm \ ʾl \)
\( \text{whoever} \).PRON.2MS any king-\text{fs} and=\text{any man} NEG y-\text{pth} \ ʾyt \ mškb \ z
\( \text{3-open.} \).IPFV.MS ACC resting-place DEM.S

‘whoever you are, any king or any man—let pro (him) not open this resting-place!’ (KAI 14.4; see also line 20)\(^{17}\)

(15c) \( k \ ʾnk \ nḥn \)
\( \text{because} \).PRON.1CS pity.PASS.PTCP.MS

‘because I am pitied’. (KAI 14.12)

(15d) \( bn \ ʾlm-t \ ʾnk \)
\( \text{son.of} \).widow-\text{fs} PRON.1CS

‘a son of a widow am I’. (KAI 14.13)

(15e) \( k \ ʾnk \ ʾšmnʾzr \ mIk \ šdn-\text{m} \ . . . \)
\( \text{indeed} \).PRON.1CS ʾEshmunʿazor king.\text{of} \text{Sidonian-mp} w=ʾmy \ ʾmʾstrt \ . . . \ ʾ≮ ≯ \ bn-n \)
\( \text{and}=\text{mother-my.} \).1CS ʾImmi-ʾAshtart REL build.PFV-1CP

\(^{17}\) Friedrich and Röllig 1999: §326 classifies the shift in person in (15b) as anacoluthon, but this is not strictly correct since the deictic shift does not formally disrupt the syntax. Comparing this example to the similar one in (14b) suggests that, while the expected antecedent is in the second person, as in (14b), the third-person appositional phrase provides a closer antecedent for the following verb, and this is the likely explanation for (15b). Moreover, it is also likely the text has both an implied addressee (second person) and witness (third person), thus making the deictic shifts here and elsewhere in KAI 14 a matter of whether the speaker is addressing the addressee directly or talking about the addressee to the witness.
In the 'Eshmunʿazor text, covert pronouns predominate, but the overt pronoun is used as the subject with participles (15a, c) and in null-copula clauses (15d, e). The 1cs ʾnk is used for the ostensible speaker and the 2ms ʾt in (15b), in a similar construction to the example we saw in Tabnit (above, in [14b]). The predicate-pronoun order of the participial clause škb ʾnk ‘I am lying’ (15a) and the null-copula clause bn ʾlmt ʾnk ‘a son of a widow am I’ (15d) may both reflect Focus-raising of the predicate. I propose this for two reasons: (1) the dominant order with finite verbs, participles, and in null-copula clauses is pronoun-predicate; (2) the participle in (15a) is separated from its oblique (locative) PP complement bḥlt z wbqbr z ‘in this box and in this grave’ (and since a verb and its complement constitute a single constituent, the fact that they are separated in [15a] suggests that the participle has been raised out to a higher position). With the phrase bn ʾlmt ʾnk in (15d), the Focus-fronting of the predicate serves to contrast his status as a fatherless boy to any other status.18

One final feature of the pronouns in 'Eshmunʿazor to note is the use of the 1cp pronoun ʾnhn in (15f). Note that it is the subject of a null-copula clause in which the predicate is a relative clause. Since a simple

18. In Biblical Hebrew studies, Andersen’s (1970) word-order-based distinction between “classifying” (= predicate-subject order) and “identifying” (subject-predicate order) null-copula clauses has become the generally accepted analysis. However, not only do the numerous exceptions doom this distinction, there is a much simpler analysis: null-copula clauses are subject-predicate order unless the predicate has been fronted for Topic or Focus; any correlation with the discourse-semantic notions of “classifying” and “identifying” are by-products and not directly involved in the syntactic and pragmatic operations acting upon the word order (see Buth 1999 for both an extended critique of Andersen’s distinction and a Topic and Focus analysis of Biblical Hebrew null-copula clauses).
verbal clause could have sufficed (as it does in line 16 with \( wy\langle b\rangle n \) 'štrt
‘and we settled Ashtart’), the use of the pronoun and the relative clause
here suggests that the pronoun not only functions as the subject of the
null-copula clause but also carries Focus. And in the context, this makes
sense, particularly if the latter part of the inscription was added by
ʾEshmunʿazor’s mother and regent upon his death in a last-gasp attempt
to immortalize herself (so Parker 1999).

6. Late Byblian: Yaḥawmilk (KAI 10)

Contemporary with the Sidonian texts, the Late Byblian Yaḥawmilk
text (early fifth century B.C.) presents the final set of subject pronouns
that I will discuss in this study. As with the other texts discussed above,
the Yaḥawmilk “drops” the pronoun (that is, uses covert pron) widely;
overt pronouns are often used to fulfill the requirement for a syntactic
subject in null-copula clauses, illustrated in (16a, b):

\[(16a) \text{ \( 'nk\ yhwmlk\ mlk\ gbl\) }\]
\[
\text{PRON.1.CS Yaḥawmilk king.of Byblos}
\]
\[
'I\ am\ Yaḥawmilk,\ king\ of\ Byblos'.\ (KAI\ 10.1)
\]

\[(16b) k\ mlk\ sdq\ h^2\]
\[
\text{PRON.3.MS}
\]
\[
'because\ a\ righteous\ king\ is\ he'.\ (KAI\ 10.9)
\]

In (16a) the 1cs pronoun 'nk is used as the subject of a null-copula
clause in the first clause, and in (16b) the 3ms pronoun is used anaphori-
cally to link with the speaker, who refers to himself in the third person.
The Focus-fronting of the predicate in the null-copula clause serves to
assert that he was nothing if not a righteous king.

In addition to the null-copula clauses, the Yahawmilk text also ex-
hibits the subject pronoun following the uninflected narrative verb
(which we have not seen since the much earlier Anatolian texts):

\[(16c) w=qr\ 'nk\ t\ rb-t=y\]
\[
\text{and=call.} NARR\ PRON.1.CS ACC mistress-fs=my.1.CS
\]
\[
b^4lt\ gbl\]
\[
\text{Baʿalat.of Byblos}
\]
\[
'and\ I\ called\ my\ mistress,\ Baʿalat\ of\ Byblos'.\ (KAI\ 10.2–3)\]
(16d) \( w=p^l \) \( \text{prn.1cs for=mistress-fs=my.1cs} \) \( l=rb-t=y \) and=make.narr \( b^l t \text{gbl h=mzbh nhš-t zn} \) Baʿalat.of Byblos the=altar bronze-fs dem.s ‘and I made for my mistress, Baʿalat of Byblos, this bronze altar’. (KAI 10.3–4)

(16e) . . . \( p^l \) \( \text{prn.1cs Yaḥawmilk king.of Byblos} \) \( l=rb-t=y \) \( b^l t \text{gbl} \) for=mistress-fs=my.1cs Baʿalat.of Byblos ‘[this doorway, etc.] I, Yaḥawmilk, king of Byblos, made for my mistress, Baʿalat of Byblos’. (KAI 10.6–7)

A final example presents an unusual use of the pronoun:¹⁹

(16f) \( šm \) \( \text{name.my.1cs prn.1cs Yaḥawmilk king.of Byblos} \) \( [t-št \text{ipfvs.ms with=you.2ms on work-fs dem.s}] \) ‘my name, mine!—Yaḥawmilk, king of Byblos—should set with you on that work’. (KAI 10.12–13)

In (16f), the 1cs pronoun \( ʾnk \) is used appositionally to \( šm \) ‘my name’ (Segert 1976: §61.16; Friedrich and Röllig 1999: §286; Krahmalkov 2001: 47). Like the similar example from Karatepe (see above, [11g]), the pronoun in this example serves no syntactic role within the clause, which is unusual; even so, its pragmatic role appears to be as a Focus constituent, strengthening the 1cs suffix on ‘my name’ by asserting that the one whose name is in question is none other than the speaker, the king. Note that the 1cs pronoun, because it is not anaphoric, is followed by its own appositional phrases, the personal name \( yhwmlk \) and the NP

---

¹⁹. There are also two 1cs pronouns in the Yaḥawmilk funerary inscription (KAI 280, “Byblos 13”), both in the first line. Since the beginning of the first line is broken, the context of the first pronoun is lacking. But the context for the second case of the pronoun is clear—and it is an obligatory pronoun both for a subject for the participle and for the identification of the first-person speaker: \( w=kn hn ʾnk škb b=ʾrn zn \) ‘and so, here I am lying in this coffin’. Similar to this example is the single pronoun in the fourth-century Batnoʿam text (KAI 11.1–2): \( bʾrn zn ʾnk bnʾm ʾm mlk šbʾl mlk gbl bn pštʾl khn bʾlt škb \) ‘In this ark I, Batnoʿam, mother of King ʿAzbaʿal, king of Byblos, son of Paltūbāal, priest of Baʿalat, am lying’ (KAI 11.1–2).
mlk gbl, both of which identify the speaker, just in case the addressee forgot.20

7. Resumptive and Object Pronouns

Among the epigraphic Canaanite texts of the first millennium, only Phoenician has left us with unambiguous cases of RC resumption, but even in the Phoenician texts the examples are limited, though they appear to increase over time. Two Byblian examples exist, presented in (17) and (18):21

(17) B. Shiptibaal III, ca. 500 B.C.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b}=m\text{škB} & \quad \text{zn} \quad \text{šš} \quad \text{škb} \quad \text{b}n \quad \text{šš} \\
\text{in}=\text{resting.place} & \quad \text{DEM.S} \quad \text{REL} \quad \text{PRON.1CS} \quad \text{lie.PTCP.MS} \quad \text{in.it.3MS} \\
\text{‘in this resting-place that I lie in it’. (KAI 9 A.3)}
\end{align*}
\]

(18) Yeḥawmilk, ca. 450 B.C.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{šnk} \quad \text{yhwm}l\text{k} & \quad \text{mlk} \quad \text{gbl} \quad \text{bn} \quad \text{yhrbš} \\
\text{PRON.1CS} \quad \text{Yeḥawmilk} & \quad \text{king.of Byblos son.of YḤRBA’al} \\
\text{bn} & \quad \text{bn} \quad \text{šrm}l\text{k} \quad \text{mlk} \quad \text{gbl} \quad \text{šš} \\
\text{son.of} & \quad \text{son.of} \quad \text{šUrimilk king.of Byblos REL} \\
\text{šš} & \quad \text{h}=\text{rb}-t & \quad \text{b’lt} & \quad \text{gbl} \\
\text{make.PFV-3FS}=\text{me.1CS} \quad \text{the=mistress-FS} & \quad \text{Ba’alat.of Byblos}
\end{align*}
\]

20. Isolated occurrences of pronouns also appear in the following nonexhaustive list of texts: Chytroi (Cyprus, ca. 650 B.C.), line 2; CIT 113 (ca. 550 B.C.), line 2; KAI 50 (ca. 550 B.C.), obv. line 2; KAI 49.4–6, 7 (2x), 8, 9, 11 (2x), 12, 13, 19, 22, 25–28, 34 (2x), 35–41, 45–49; the silver amulet (ca. 500 B.C.), lines 6–8; RES 1513 (5th–4th c. B.C.); Ostracon A from Dor (33608/1, 5th–4th c. B.C.), line 5; the Milkya-ton trophy inscription (Cyprus, early 4th c. B.C.), line 4; RES 1213, line 6; the Byblian altar inscription of ʾbdšmn (3rd c. B.C.), lines 1–2; KAI 35.1 (3rd c. B.C.); KAI 43.1, 5 (ca. 275 B.C.); KAI 17.2 (2nd c. B.C.); KAI 48.1 (1st c. B.C.), KAI 54.1, 2 (1st c. B.C.); KAI 59.1 The syntax and pragmatics of the pronouns in these texts appear to follow the same pattern that we have seen in the larger texts.

21. Segert (1976) suggests that the Nora Stele (9th c. B.C., Sardinian; KAI 46) contains an instance of subject-resumption in a relative clause. His reading of lines 2–3, which follows KAI, is at odds with the readings of, for example, Peckham 1972 and Cross 1972. Based on my own reading of Peckham’s original 1972 photograph, I concur with the readings of Peckham 1972; Cross 1972; and Zuckerman 1991; against that of Segert 1976; and KAI: there is no relative clause and therefore no subject-resumption in this inscription. It is also worth noting that three later Phoenician instances of resumption, one oblique and two subject, are from Cyprus and date to the 3rd c. B.C. (KAI 40.2; 43.4–5, 12–3).

Both Byblian examples are from the second half of the first millennium. The example in (17) is obligatory, since the whole PP (which itself requires a complement) is an oblique (locative) complement of the verb. The resumption at the accusative position in (18) is not syntactically obligatory, but it is nonetheless required for semantic interpretation, since without the resumption the entity to which the object of the verb refers would be ambiguous—did Ba’alat of Gubl make the speaker, Yehawmilk, king or one of the closer potential antecedents, his father or grandfather? With the insertion of “me” as the resumptive pronoun, the antecedent is specified, and the clause is rescued from fatal ambiguity.

There are no clear cases of resumption in Early Tyro-Sidonian or Anatolian texts; the earliest examples are from later in the first millennium (19)–(20):

(19) Oblique Resumption:
Cyprus-Lapethos ii (c. 274 B.C.)

The resumptive element in (i) is the clitic (possessive) pronoun on the subject noun in the relative clause, $py$ ‘her command’. In Phoenician, as in all NWS languages, this genitive type of resumption is obligatory (see Holmstedt 2008), since without the resumptive possessive suffix coreferential with the relative head, $’t$ hawran ‘wife of Hawran’, the noun in the relative clause would have no syntactic or semantic connection to the matrix clause. This kind of resumption illustrates the most common function of resumptive pronouns in NWS—as a “last resort” strategy to save a construction that would otherwise fail grammatically. In contrast, in languages with true relative pronouns the possessive or genitive relationship is manifested by agreement features on the relative pronoun itself; the remnants of a system of this sort are still visible in English whose, as in “Hawran, whose command is bound.”
The relative clause in (19) exhibits resumption in the oblique (object of preposition) position inside the relative clause. The preposition and thus the resumptive pronoun as its complement fill the syntactic role of the copular predicate and are thus syntactically licensed. The two cases of subject resumption in (20a, b)—the only two Phoenician examples of subject resumption I have yet to find—are not syntactically necessary; moreover, I see no pragmatic explanation and can only conjecture that the late date and language contact are involved.

The use of resumptive pronouns in Phoenician is, on the one hand, similar to the use of subject pronouns (they are almost always required for the grammaticality or felicitousness of the clause in context) and, on the other hand, more constrained. That is, there are no clear cases (among the admittedly rather small selection) of resumptive pronouns inserted for Topic or Focus.
As best we can tell, object pronouns operate similarly to resumptive pronouns. Representative examples are provided in (21)–(23) (examples [23a] and [23b] repeat [11c] and [11f], respectively).

(21) ʾrn z pʿl [ʾ]lthʾl bn ḥrm
sarcophagus REL make.PFV.3MS ʾIttobaʾl son.of ʾAḥirom
mlk gbl l=ḥrm b=h k
king.of Byblos for=ʾAḥirom father=his.3MS when
št=h b=ṯm
set.PFV.3MS=him.3MS in=eternity

‘The sarcophagus that ʾIttobaʾl, son of ʾAḥirom, king of Byblos, made for ʾAḥirom, his father, when he set him in eternity’. (KAI 1.1)

(22) w=my bl ḥz pn š
and=who NEG see.PFV.3MS face.of sheep
št=y bʿl ʿdr
make.PFV.1CS=him.3MS owner.of flock

‘and one who had not seen the face of a sheep—I made him the owner of a flock’. (KAI 24.11)

(23a) w=ʾnk ṣṭwʾd št=nm tht
and=PRON.1CS ʾAzatiwada set.PFV.1CS=them.3MP under
pʿm=y feet.MP=my.1CS

‘but I, ʾAzatiwada, set them under my feet’. (KAI 26 AI.16–17//BI.9, CII.5)

(23b) yšb=m ʾnk b=qš t
settle.NARR=them.3MS PRON.1CS in=end-FP.of
gbl=y border.MP=my.1CS

‘I settled them in the ends of my borders’. (KAI 26 AI.20// BI.11, CII.12)

In all four examples, the enclitic object pronoun provides a syntactic complement for each of the transitive verbs. Even in the case of left-dislocation in (22), since the initial noun phrase sits at the edge of the clause and has no formal syntactic role within it, the resumptive pronoun is obligatory to fulfill the accusative case role of the verb št ‘I
made’. It is also true, however, that the choice of left-dislocation often sets up the resumptive pronoun as a Focus constituent, so that the dislocated element functions as a Topic (for example, “as for this fellow”) and the resumptive pronoun provides the focal contrast (for example, “I made him [and no other person] the owner”).

There remain many questions about Phoenician object pronouns, many of which, unfortunately, will remain unanswered due to the lack of orthographic representation for many third-person enclitic pronouns. That is, since Phoenician does not exhibit the same use of matres lectionis as ancient Hebrew, enclitic pronouns that are manifested as word-final syllables are simply not represented by the writing convention (for a convenient list followed by discussion, see Krahmalkov 2001: 68–74). Moreover, unlike the prolific use of the nota accusativi ʾt with an enclitic pronoun in ancient Hebrew, such usage in Phoenician is arguably nonexistent (although it does occur in Punic; see Mosca, this volume, for a discussion). Thus, it is quite possible that Phoenician uses zero anaphora much more widely than Hebrew (on zero anaphora in Biblical Hebrew, see Creason 1991). Even with the orthographic obstacles, a thorough study of the limited available evidence on the syntax and pragmatics of object reference in Phoenician is needed.
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