

## Unipartite clauses following the construct state in Semitic

In Semitic, a clause following an element in the construct state is considered subordinate. The clause itself is essentially identifiable as such, whether a verbal form or a bipartite non-verbal clause. However, in some cases, the attribute which follows the entity in construct state consists of what seems to be a nominal or adverbial phrase, and a question then arises, whether it should be analyzed as a phrase or as a clause:

<i>wa=y-anaššā'ā</i> CONN=3MSG-carry.NPST-ACC.3FSG	<i>ḥəzb</i> people	<i>za= 'əm-bābilon</i> PRON.CST= from=Babylon
---	-----------------------	--

'and the people that (is) from Babylon will carry her off' (Gə'əz, Kapeliuk 2009:147, ex. 4)

Throughout the history of research, in many cases no questions were raised and the prepositional phrase was often interpreted as a clause. However, in cases where the construct pronoun (e.g., Akkadian *ša*, Ethiopic *za*, Aramaic *dv-*, Arabic *dū*, etc., D-elements in short) equally precedes phrases and clauses, the nature of the attribute was more difficult to determine.

The talk re-examines, across older Semitic, the various combinations of construct nouns and D-elements as nuclei (i.e., syntactic heads) on the one hand, with prepositional (or adverbial), nominal and adjectival phrases as attributes, on the other. From an external point of view these combinations are all syntactic nominals (substantives or adjectives). The discussion focuses on the **internal analysis** of the attribute.

A. 

EXTERNAL SYNTAX: A NOMINAL(IZED) ENTITY			
NUCLEUS ↓	PP	ADJ	SUBST ←ATTRIBUTE
N.CST	INTERNAL SYNTAX: PHRASE OR CLAUSE		
D-			

I would like to discuss a few points that are instrumental in making the decision whether the entity in the attribute is a phrase or a unipartite clause.