One of the cardinal features of the EA texts from Canaan that impressed scholars very early on is the marked difference in word order as compared to more standard Akkadian (Böhl 1909:78, §36c; Müller 1903:pp. 245-246, 262-264). However, apart from noting the marked differences, subsequent studies practically ignored the semantic implications of WS word order in the texts from Canaan. In recent times, Finley (1979) made an important statistical study of the Levantine EA texts and a selection of documents from Ugarit. Though his emphasis was on verbal clauses, he did not distinguish between various types of clauses, e.g. indicative, injunctive, interrogative. Word order in the native texts from Ugarit were studied by Huehnergard (1979:93-98, 288-303) in comparison with those sent to Ugarit from Carchemish. He later updated his work on the native texts in somewhat more detail (Huehnergard 1989:211-224). Meanwhile, van Soldt (1986:476-528; 1991:476-518) had also made a detailed study of the Akkadian texts from Ugarit.

Word order variation in the Byblos EA texts was taken up by A. Gianto (1990) in an exemplary study that dealt with the main types of clauses employed (fixed introductory formulae, etc., are part of the Western Peripheral repertoire and therefore not useful in determining the local Byblos dialectical syntax). Although the analysis is restricted to the Byblos texts plus a few others sent by the ruler of Byblos while he was in exile at Beirut, Gianto also realized that the entire collection of letters written from other places in Canaan share the peculiar dialectical features of the Byblos texts (with a few regional peculiarities). In a detailed review of Gianto's monograph (Rainey 1992b), it was suggested that Gianto's study be expanded to cover all those other letters. Furthermore, it was shown that there are some categories of sentences/clauses which Gianto failed to include.
The present chapter was written as a modest condensation of Giano's book. It has been appended to the study of the adverbs and particles because so many of the morphosyntactic chapters on those components deal with problems of word order. Selected material therefrom will be repeated here for convenience. Naturally, the scope of the examples covers the entire corpus of EA texts from Canaan. The order of treatment follows that of Giano in most respects and many of the illustrative passages are also his.

TERMINOLOGY AND RATIONALE

Throughout his book, Giano is searching for the rationale behind the various word orders for different types of clause. One should note in passing that the present discussion will adopt the usage proposed in the above mentioned review, viz. that the term "sentence" be applied to a complete, independent syntagma. For dependent or subordinate syntagmas, the term used herein will be "clause." A sentence, then, may be comprised of one or more clauses. Two or more independent clauses may be joined syndetically to form a compound sentence. A main clause may have subordinate clauses as components. What Giano (1990:1, 174) sometimes refers to as the "predicative structure" can thus simply be called a clause.

Within the clause, Giano defines the subject (S), the verb (V), the object (O) and the complement (C). These symbols will be adopted here as well. In verbal clauses, Giano generally considers the verb form to be the "predicate." In non-verbal clauses, the predicate is recognized as the component being stated, i.e. predicated, concerning the subject. It is obvious that Giano speaks only of the grammatical subject and the grammatical predicate. A more useful approach, which would pertain to every category of clause discussed, will be to speak in terms of the "logical subject" and the "logical predicate." The former is the known datum, recognized already by the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader. The latter is the new information being provided about the "logical subject." In the