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This chapter examines antecedent accessibility and salience in reference by focusing on the interpretation of pronouns and demonstratives in Finnish. It compares two third-person anaphoric forms referring to humans in Finnish, the gender-neutral pronoun hän (s/he) and the demonstrative tämä (this), and argues that the salience notion typically used in the accessibility/salience hierarchy for referential forms is oversimplified. It shows that pronominal and demonstrative forms are located at different points in the accessibility hierarchy, and that pronominals hypothesized to refer to entities are more salient than demonstratives. However, the results of three experiments, two which focused on off-line sentence-completion tasks and one which monitored on-line eye movements, revealed that hän and tämä depend differently on factors that affect saliency—specifically, word order and grammatical role.
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Chapter 4 (Grammatical roles and the alignment of Semitic) investigates grammatical roles and their alignment in Semitic by looking at the three core roles, S (subject of intransitive verb), A (agent of transitive verb), and P (patient of transitive verb), and their alignment in morphological
structures such as verbal indexation and nominal marking, and syntactic environments such as syntactic pivots, passivization, and word order. The chapter concludes that the basic alignment in all these structures is nominative/accusative with no traces of any other alignment type. It further provides an attempt to reconstruct basic word order in nominal and verbal clauses for Proto Semitic.

Case in Semitic
Rebecca Hasselbach

This book investigates the case system and the marking of grammatical roles and relations in Semitic languages. It further attempts to provide an explanation for “unusual” usages of cases, especially the accusative, that seem to violate the traditional interpretation of Semitic as exhibiting nominative/accusative alignment from a diachronic perspective. The basic methodologies applied for the diachronic reconstruction are those of historical and comparative linguistics. These methodologies, however, face severe limitations based on the lack of sufficient data for the earliest historically attested periods of Semitic (~ 2500-1800 BC). It is argued that these limitations can be mitigated by employing linguistic typology, which is a linguistic discipline that has not found wide reception among scholars working on Semitic languages so far. Based on both the comparative method and typological principles, the book investigates the alignment and marking of grammatical roles, basic word order patterns connected to the marking of roles, head- and dependent-marking patterns, and the function of the individual cases across Semitic. It concludes that although the alignment of historically attested Semitic languages is nominative/accusative, both morphologically and syntactically, they exhibit vestiges of a more archaic system that reflects a marked-nominative system. In this archaic system, the accusative functioned as the unmarked and default form of the noun that was used as citation form, for nominal predicates, the vocative, and for direct objects of transitive verbs. The nominative on the other hand, was the morphologically and syntactically marked form that solely functioned to mark nominal subjects.