Maria A. Molina
Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow); maria.lakhuti@gmail.com

Carlotta Viti (ed.).
Perspectives on historical syntax.
Studies in Language Companion Series 169. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2015. 158 p.

The volume under review is dedicated to various issues of historical syntax and syntactic reconstruction. The book is a collection of contributions resulting from the workshop "Syntactic change and syntactic reconstruction: new perspectives" held at the University of Zurich in September 2012.

In terms of linguistic reconstruction syntax has always been less investigated than phonology, lexicon or grammar. In the second half of the 20th century research on diachronic syntax began to take its place in the field of historical linguistic studies, Indo-European as well as historical linguistics in general (*inter alia*, Lehmann 1974, 1976, 2000; Faarlund 1990; Bauer 1995, 2000; Crespo & García Ramón 1997; Devine & Stephens 1999; Barðdal 2001; Hewson & Bubenik 2006; Luraghi 2010; Barðdal & Eythórsson 2012; Ferraresi & Goldbach 2008; Ferraresi & Lühr 2010; Harris & Campbell 1995; Lightfoot 1979, 1991, 1999, 2002a, 2006; Longobardi 2003; Batllori et al. 2005; Roberts 2007; Jonas et al. 2012). Unfortunately, the usual trend in historical syntax is that the research is conducted under different frameworks, with almost no exchange of data or methods. This results in very little consensus in academic spheres on important theoretical and practical issues concerning syntactic reconstruction. Meanwhile, scholarly interest in syntactic change and reconstruction is growing, since this territory is largely uncharted and could provide researchers with a lot of additional information on language relationship and contacts, as well as historical migrations in the history of civilization. With syntax constituting one of the essential layers of language structure, linguistic reconstruction can hardly be complete without considering syntactic change.

The very feasibility of such a reconstruction, though, is still under discussion. The obvious reason is that basic syntactic units are freely generated and not memorized, and vary in many more ways than phonemes, morphemes or lexemes. Therefore, they are hard to compare in different languages; it seems impossible to determine with any certainty which construction is etymologically older, and to reconstruct the previous stages according to the principles of the comparative method, which imply regular correspondences between linguistic units.

The book under review contributes to the understanding of historical syntax as a discipline of comparative historical linguistics. Carlotta Viti (University of Zurich) opens the discussion with general notions on the nature of historical syntax in the article "Historical syntax: problems, materials, methods, hypotheses". Historical syntax is presented here as an emerging field of comparative linguistics; mechanisms of syntactic change and feasibility of syntactic reconstruction are discussed, as well as the general relevance of the volume for current studies in historical syntax. The author summarizes her introduction with a representative (but not exactly comprehensive!) list of references on previous research in historical syntax, about 8 pages in length. The bibliography, however, somehow lacks in fastidiousness: the names of A. Meillet, J. Wackernagel and K. Brugmann, M. Swadesh, C. Watkins and W. Lehmann, W. Labov, P. Kiparsky, J. Roberts and A. Garrett, whose influence on historical syntax and syntax theory cannot be overestimated, go along with dubious works on time depth in historical linguistics, such as Gray & Atkinson (2003), Renfrew et al. (2000), Longobardi & Guardiano (2009). The former two use phylogenetic methods to measure distances between cognate words, with ambitious, but not always reliable conclusions on prehistoric migrations; the latter focuses on building genealogical trees based on a list of syntactic parameters (see detailed discussion in Molina 2016). The aim of the introductory paper, though, is not to discuss the quality of the research, but to introduce the general problems of the field and present the most prominent perspectives of its development.

The chapter on syntactic change opens with a paper by Ekkehard König (Free University of Berlin & University of Freiburg), "Manner deixis as source of grammatical markers in Indo-European languages". The main part of this paper focuses on the quite neglected aspect of relative demonstratives and their role in the process of grammaticalization, resulting in the development of new grammatical categories. The author discusses the well-known change from exophoric to anaphoric and cataphoric meaning, and also gives examples for cases of propositional anaphors,

developed from deictic words, as well as comparative markers, adverbial connectives, quotative, exclamative and approximative markers. He specifically looks into the semantic categories of 'manner', 'quality' and 'degree' (< Proto-Germanic *swa). In particular, he shows that Germanic languages lack a clear differentiation between the three categories mentioned above (Germanic and Romance languages are the ones in focus here). König claims to be using the comparative method for his study, taking a theoretical approach rather than a descriptive one. The general syntactic processes are reconstructed "on the basis of comparative evidence, synchronic observations of possible forms, and patterns of polysemy" as well as on the basis of theoretical information known about grammaticalization of demonstratives — the macro-processes of grammaticalization, observable in a variety of languages. The deictic particles of 'manner', 'quality', 'degree' are taken as a starting point for all further processes concerning other demonstratives.

By means of semantic analysis the author demonstrates on the examples of modern languages (English, German, Italian), as well as on ancient and proto-language material (Latin, Old German), the possible ways of semantic change from exophoric to anaphoric meaning, from anaphoric to connective, from cataphoric to quotative (the latter is typologically supported with data from African languages, via Güldemann 2008). One of the major construction types is the meaning change from an endophoric determiner to a comparative marker with further development into a relative marker (see also Haspelmath 2012; a detailed discussion of manner deictics in comparative constructions across languages is given in König 2013). The last change seems to have almost no support from linguistic material — still, König shows some Old Saxon / Old Low German examples (p. 54) that support this process, providing a perfect candidate for the reanalysis of comparative markers as relative markers:

(1) sulike gesidos so   he im selbo   gecos
    Such   companions as   he himself   chose
'Such companions as/that he chose for himself…'
(Heliand text, 9th century, cf. Brandner & Bräuning 2013:138)

The main result of the paper is that, as suggested by the material, "demonstratives of manner, of quality and of degree are a highly relevant source for processes of grammaticalization". However, the author stresses the preliminary character of this idea, and points out that it demands further research.

Frans Plank (University of Constance) begins his paper "Time for change" with a reference to physics, astronomy and geology, lamenting that historical linguistics cannot offer the same exact timing for its milestone events, as is given for the Big Bang or the time of Earth emerging, in order to model the evolution of typological diversity in languages. He puts forward the idea that the time needed for a change ('time-stability') should be a direct object of study. The basic measuring unit for such a study might be one generation, or one instance of acquisition of a language. Plank claims that the absolute dating of changes in syntax is possible quite deep in time, if relative chronologies of changes are traced (p. 66). He also suggests that for some items of lexicon the time for change goes slower than for others, being incredulous at the idea of glottochronology: "The glottochronological constant has been so decisively discredited, and the identification of cognates has proved so formidable or indeed impossible a task without an in-depth expertise in the histories of the languages concerned, that one can only marvel at the recent surge of neo-glottochronological enthusiasm and its gullible reception in high-profile science journals and the general press" (p. 70). It should be remarked that, as far as "neo"-glottochronology is concerned, Plank seems to only be acquainted with the well-publicized works of the Gray & Atkinson group (mentioned above with respect to the article of Carlotta Viti), whose methods were certainly let down by the poor quality of input lexicon material and, consequently, even poorer output results of dating. In fact, Plank confesses this in his own words: "Only one characteristic recent paper shall be mentioned, owing to its exceptional misproportion between rhetorical flourish and phylogenetic sophistication on the one hand and historical linguistic substance on the other: Greenhill, Atkinson, Meade & Gray 2010". Different modern approaches to glottochronology, such as represented, e.g., in the project "The Global Lexicostatistical Database" (G. Starostin 2011–2016), are not taken into account by Plank in his paper.

As for his own ideas on time change, Plank suggests that there is a theoretical minimum for an elementary syntactic change, which takes three generations:
   — individuals innovate;
   — variation appears in the speech community;
   — whole speech community follows the innovators.

According to the author, the loss of dual number in Attic Greek took precisely that minimum time, while in other languages this process took much longer: Old English is just one example, with over 600 years, or 25+ generations, for the change to take effect. Different changes, therefore, demand different spans of time. Plank advocates the idea that there is a list of possible

parameters for change, such as abruptness/gradualness, simple or complex innovation, social diffusion of the society, and so on (7 categories suggested in the paper): "Change should be rapid, reaching completion within the minimum span of three generations, if *all is easy*: simple actuation; abrupt transition; Neo-grammarian mode of implementation; elementary change; discernible, high-profile difference; decisive individuals; small, homogeneous, well-connected community".

One particular case is investigated, namely, the grammaticalization of the local adposition 'at' from the noun 'dwelling, home'. The aim of this case study is to determine the length of time for this change, and to compare its pace between several languages where it has occurred. Relevant instances are French *chez* 'at' from Late Latin *casa/chiés*; Swedish, Danish, Norwegian *hos* 'at' from Old Norse *hus*; Icelandic and Faroese *hjá* 'at, next to, by, with; of' from Old Norse *hión* 'family, household'; and late Pāli *gē* 'at; of' from Prakritic Indo-Aryan *geha*. The author shows that this change took approximately the same time (about 400 years = approximately 16 cycles of acquisition) to be completed.

The second part of the book, given over to issues of syntactic reconstruction, opens with a paper contributed by Thomas Smitherman (University of Bergen), called "Reconstructing non-canonical argument structure for Proto-Indo-European: methodological questions and progress". The paper discusses methodological issues that have arisen over the investigation into the likelihood that oblique subject constructions in Indo-European languages are inherited from Proto-Indo-European. A four-year project, Indo-European Case and Argument Structure in a Typological Perspective (IECASTP, led by Jóhanna Barðdal, University of Bergen, in 2008–2012), had attempted to apply the comparative method to syntax, which allows Smitherman to discuss the difficulties encountered by the researchers.

As a starting point, he assumes that a syntactic reconstruction may be less reliable compared to a lexical one, but the reason for that is an extra layer of complexity — it should be based on a thorough reconstruction of phonetics, phonology, morphology (with complete understanding of allomorphy), formal and semantic aspects of lexicon. There are certain formal approaches to description of syntactic constructions, and a syntactic reconstruction of a language might look like an inventory of its possible constructions. IECASTP attempted to provide an example of how formal representations might work for PIE syntactic reconstructions (see Barðdal & Smitherman 2013). These representations include reconstruction of predi-

cates (as heads), all separate word forms, cases, semantic roles of arguments and argument structure of the predicate, which constitute a kind of construction grammar. This grammar can, indeed, be used as formal means to compare syntactic units. As described in the paper, the approach is rather close to dependency grammar, which has been actively used in treebanks, including ones for ancient languages (see below on Dag Haug and the PROIEL project). It certainly helps to enforce uniformity and provide an instrument to make comparisons on syntactic level; still, this does not necessarily mean that a certain syntactic construction in Latin has the exact same meaning as, say, in Hittite, which marks the weak point of this approach. The author does not, however, insist on generalizations on the current level of historical syntactic studies: theoretically-determined interpretations, according to Smitherman, should only be attempted "after the empirical data have been examined, after comparisons between languages have been conducted".

The project has succeeded in gathering lists for predicates with argument structures, in which oblique subjects appear, from the oldest languages of Indo-European branches: Old Icelandic, Old High German, Middle High German, Gothic, and Old Russian; Latin, Ancient Greek (Homeric to Early Koiné), Old Church Slavonic, Old English, and Old Swedish, Sanskrit and Hittite (partially). For each predicate a PIE etymology was drawn where possible (phonetic reconstruction is based on laryngeal theory, under the assumption of three laryngeals and no vowel-initial morphemes). If a predicate is supposed to be an early borrowing into one IE branch from another (like some German borrowings into Common Slavic), it is not counted on the level of Indo-European etymological comparison.

Study of argument roles for the predicate involves analysis of the semantics of affixes and preverbs. Some verbal affixes are assumed to have aspectual values (like *-ske-* in Hittite); preverbs in some IE languages might evolve from postpositions or deictic adverbs, which could determine the case of arguments. Semantic transfers in verbs are also checked. IECASTP guidelines identify common semantic correlations as being linked to a single PIE predicate: e.g., burn — be angry or suffer an uncontrollable sensation; bend/twist — be confused/be in pain; eat/consume — be overcome; be light/heavy — have it easy/difficult, etc.

The preliminary results are as follows. Roughly 200 cognate sets in 2+ branches, and 90 sets in 3+ branches (Baltic and Slavic are not counted separately) have been analysed for the etymology of verbs and their polysemy, case frames and distribution of oblique subjects. The working hypothesis is that "late PIE had

a contained, probably unproductive or barely productive realm of semantic alignment within a generally Nominative-Accusative language". According to the author, this ensues from patterns of use of the argument structure to accommodate polysemy, recurrent throughout many branches.

Basic methodological problems concern early borrowings between branches; areal contacts, with similar argument structures on some cognate predicates; comparison of non-cognate like word classes, e.g. comparing Latin deponent forms (with *-r), Græco-Aryan (*-oi), Slavic or Old Norse neo-formations involving the reflexive pronoun. Another important problem is whether to reconstruct sememes or forms — if several forms have the same or almost the same meaning, should they be considered separately or not? Smitherman does not give any clear answer in his article. He suggests that focused diachronic frequency studies should be conducted in the case of specific sememes for oblique subject construction in Indo-European. A controlled test should be invented that could play the role of a Swadesh-type wordlist for syntactic constructions, before we could claim with any certainty what semantic alignment there was in PIE. Summing up, he argues that a reconstruction of oblique subject constructions for PIE is possible, though the use of the Comparative Method for syntax certainly needs further review and refinement.

The next paper of the book under review is "An approach to syntactic reconstruction" by Ilja A. Seržant. It is primarily devoted to the methodological discussion of how to reconstruct syntactic patterns. The author distinguishes between two types of inquiries into diachronic syntax: stage reconstruction and etymological reconstruction (p. 117). He focuses on the second one and argues for a methodology based on the principles of the Comparative Method, where all factors other than inheritance should be excluded by the reconstruction process: "Typologically quirky, idiosyncratic features are better reconstructable than typologically ordinary ones". Seržant applies his method to the development of the independent partitive genitive (IPG) from Proto-Indo-European into Baltic and Russian, and finally into North Russian dialects, to show that this feature was indeed inherited from PIE and how it changed from PIE.

The method crucially relies on typologically idiosyncratic properties of every pattern to be reconstructed. For example, morphological properties, as regards their phonetic/phonological realization, are typologically idiosyncratic. The more idiosyncratic properties are found to correlate across comparanda, the higher is the probability of the reconstruction.

Since (syntactic) categories never remain the same through time, syntactic reconstruction deals rather with clusters of properties that mutate through time: certain properties may persist while others may drastically change or get lost and new ones can be acquired. The author emphasizes that "superficially similar constructions may in fact have quite divergent underlying syntactic structures at different developmental stages".

A grammatical category, therefore, is treated as a list or as a cluster of properties, with each subgroup analyzed separately. There are four types of profiles for the analysis — lexical, semantic, morphological and syntactic ones: "Profiles of the category can be established in the course of synchronic analyses at every particular stage where data are available". The reconstruction of the morphological and lexical profiles on a proto-stage can be carried out by means of the Comparative Method. However, "the degree of probability" depends on "the number of idiosyncratic properties" inherited from the respective proto-language on the basis of the Comparative Method (Ivanov 1965: 185). It is only the Comparative Method, applied correctly, that helps to get rid of borrowings in the morphological profile, excluding typologically dominant correlations or correlations that are due to language contact. The syntactic and semantic profiles have to be explored for typologically quirky properties in order to individualize the reconstructed pattern against the typological background and thus claim sufficient probability. The following ranking of profiles represents their relevance for determining etymologically cognate categories across related languages (ranked from most to least crucial):

morphological profile > lexical profile > syntactic profile > semantic profile

Speaking about the IPG and the changes it underwent from PIE to Baltic and East Slavic, Ilja Seržant discusses first the morphological and lexical profiles of the construction. The inheritance of morphology and lexicon from PIE to Baltic/Slavic languages was thoroughly proven in previous studies. The difference between the genitive in Baltic/Slavic and in PIE is seen by Seržant, particularly, as loss of all morphological difference between ablative and genitive throughout the singular in the former, "while the latter still distinguishes these cases for one specific NP type, namely, the o-stems". On the lexical level, it is important that there are reconstructible lexemes that occurred in the construction. Derivational means that are part of the lexeme should not be glossed over,

"because different morphological derivations, especially with verbs, may be linked to distinct syntactic patterns, e.g. causatives vs. simplices or denominal vs. deverbal predicates are known to trigger distinct syntactic patterns".

The semantic profile is described on p. 134 as a list of possibly inherited functional properties for which values are drawn for PIE and Baltic/Slavic. The comparison exhibits a number of particular changes in the partitive genitive though its development:

— ability to quantify over the host constituent or over the whole clause,
— sensitiveness to adverbs quantifying the situation (VP),
— sensitiveness to verb-prefixal quantifiers,
— invoking the meaning of a temporality ('for some period of time') with transfer verbs,
— 'one' as a possible value of the implicit (head) quantifier,
— combination with verb negation,
— interaction with aspectuality,
— decreased referentiality,
— discursive backgroundedness,
— gradual loss of the partitive function; prevalence of the pseudo-partitive function,
— partitivity constraint,
— partial loss of the differential object marking.

The syntactic profile consists of five properties: selection restrictions on NPs marked by the IPG (e.g. mass vs. count nouns), selection restrictions on verbs with subject IPG (e.g. existential vs. unergative), verbal agreement with subject IPG, coordination with otherwise case-marked NPs, positional restrictions.

Thus, morphological and lexical profiles provide a relatively high probability for the assumption of etymological relationship between the IPG of Baltic and Slavic languages and the same structure in PIE, reconstructed on the basis of ancient IE languages such as Sanskrit, Avestan and Ancient Greek. After the analysis of syntactic properties, the author argues that the IPG in Baltic and Slavic (Russian) languages may be analyzed as a *syntactically independent partitive genitive*, governed by an *implicit pronoun*, for which the term *pro* is used, thus assuming the existence of an implicit head for this construction. The author reminds us that there is no restriction on syntactic position for the IPG in ancient IE languages, which is another reason why he argues for the implicit pronoun assuming case and position in the clause. The same concerns singular/plural of verbs in the partitive constructions — it is the *pro* which assumes number and person and becomes visible due to its ability to be the controller in

the subject position triggering verbal agreement. He argues that this implicit pronoun (zero head) in Baltic and Russian became even less visible in the morphosyntax and, comparing with PIE, retained only a weak ability to coordinate with accusatives and, partly, nominatives (triggering the default third singular neuter/non-agreeing form). Finally, in those instances where some North Russian varieties allow for the agreement *ad formam* with the IPG subject, the implicit pronoun may be considered to be lost entirely and the former dependent genitive NP acquires direct access to verbal agreement. The general development of the IPG, thus, can be summarized as: *explicit head* (dependent partitive genitive) —> "*pro*" (PIE/ ancient IE languages) —> "*PRO*" (Baltic/Russian) —> *null* (some North Russian subdialects).

The next paper, "Anatolian syntax: inheritance and innovation", was contributed to the volume by Annette Teffeteller. It is dedicated to three interrelated topics in the syntax of Anatolian languages: the issue of argument structure, the putative split-ergativity, and the development of subject clitic pronouns. Actually, Annette Teffeteller is reproducing here her own talk at the VIIIth International Congress of Hittitology in Warsaw in 2008, where it was received with relatively little enthusiasm; the problems encountered there remain largely unsolved in the paper, which seriously restricts its usefulness for future discussion on historical syntax.

In two areas concerned with subject reference, Anatolian languages display unique syntactic features. First, there is a third-person enclitic 'subject' pronoun, marked for gender, common and neuter, restricted to a particular class of verbs (intransitives only, predominantly statives). Second, there is a suffix used with neuter nouns when they occur in correlation with the subject of a transitive verb. Both are topics with a long history of discussion, and for both there is still no consensus as to their origins. Unfortunately, the author adds no new information to the discussion. Her analysis of Anatolian data in the paper is largely restricted to Hittite material, and the examples are mostly not Teffeteller's own, but have been taken from other works, such as Melchert 2011. She laments that the most prominent syntacticians working in the field of Anatolian languages tend to use generative syntactic theory (see, for example, Hoffner & Melchert 2008:406; Sideltsev 2011), where subject pronouns are treated as *null subject.* Teffeteller suggests using another framework for Hittite, borrowed from the research on North American languages, according to which personal endings of verbs might be considered as verbal subject markers, i.e. incorporated pronomi-

nal elements (Jelinek 1984). Nouns, NPs, and independent pronouns in this case are considered as adjuncts, regardless of whether they are found outside or inside the clause. The verb thus constitutes a complete minimal clause in itself. However, the author gives no clear reasons why this concept should be used instead of the more widespread concept of null subject. Teffeteller argues that "the absence of grammatical agreement markers (*null subject*) is a typologically rare phenomenon", with reference to Siewierska 1999, and that the generative framework only works for modern European languages. This sounds rather strange, since generative syntax has been tested many times on languages outside of the Indo-European family, and, actually, is now widely used in typological research on the world's languages.

As for the problem of 'ergativity' in Hittite, this is an old discussion, in which the specific Hittite 'ergative' suffix *-ant-* (added to neuter nouns if they are subjects) is sometimes viewed as derivational, and sometimes as inflectional, with a special 'ergative' case in the Hittite noun declension paradigm (see recently, *inter alia*, Melchert 2011, Yakubovich 2011, Goedegebuure 2013). Annette Teffeteller traces this discussion in detail, listing all the arguments *pro and contra*, and may be safely referred to as a source for the most recent references on the question.

In the chapter "Historical syntax and corpus linguistics" the most prominent projects of annotated corpora for historical languages are represented. The opening paper is by Dag Haug from the University of Oslo, the leader of PROIEL, a unique public on-line resource for syntactically annotated corpora of ancient languages, built in the framework of universal dependencies (UD). He argues in the paper for the advantages of using parsed corpora (treebanks) for research in historical linguistics.

One important example is basic word order. Raw statistical data on word order in Ancient Greek differs between researchers (see p. 189 for figures on word order in Luke/Acts, according to various authors). The author points out an important question of historical syntax: if we cannot agree even on the raw facts, how can we settle such questions as what (if any) basic word order there was in Ancient Greek, or to what extent it was influenced by Semitic? Another thing is that the results of the research should also be replicable by other scholars, and it is only the corpus approach that could help us achieve this.

Initially, PROIEL had developed a parsed corpus of the Greek New Testament as well as several of its early translations into other languages (Haug & Jøhndal 2008; Haug et al. 2009). The paper in question

focuses on the description of the oldest part of the project. However, it should be mentioned here that, as of now, the project not only contains data from Ancient Greek (New Testament, Historia Lausiaca, Herodotus: Histories, Sphrantzes: Chronicles), but also from Church Slavonic (Codex Marianus, Codex Suprasliensis, Codex Zographensis), Classical Armenian (New Testament, Koriwn), Gothic (The Gothic Bible), and includes a list of sources in Latin, Old English, Old French, Old Norse, Old Russian, Portuguese and Spanish.

The author argues that "a treebank does not in itself define the *actual* assumptions of research based on it, but it defines the set of *possible* assumptions that a researcher can make using it". There are several ways to avoid pre-assumption. Phrase structure based corpora, such as the Penn Treebank (actually, the family of corpora from the Linguistic Data Consorium at the University of Penn), use a much flatter phrase structure than any practitioners of theoretical phrase structure grammars assume, thereby avoiding many contentious decisions. The other option, which was chosen in the PROIEL corpus, is to use a dependency-based analysis, where grammatical relations, such as subject, object, and adverbial, are taken as primitive. Being on the team of linguists and programmers that work on the standards of Universal Dependencies, Dag Haug could have hardly made a different choice. Unfortunately, syntactic annotation in the UD scheme treats the syntax of the world's languages as if no language-specific features existed in the first place (annotation of language-specific relations as subtags of existing universal tags does not help much). For example, one problematic issue with UD is clitics, with their specific syntax.[1] Another problem is the very absence of any assumption in treebanks — in fact, this framework gives the researcher no proper explanation of syntax. However, in terms of pure data PROIEL, with its standards of merely building an improved instrument for search, so far remains the best, if not the only, means of applying statistical methods to the material of early IE languages.

The paper of Prof. Dr. Rosemarie Lühr from Humboldt-University of Berlin ("Traces of discourse configurationality in older Indo-European languages?") concerns the relationship between information structure and syntax on the material of Old Indian, Ancient

---

[1] Joakim Nivre, University of Uppsala, another member of the UD team, informed me in a pers. comm. during his lecture on Universal Dependencies in Moscow, Yandex campus, 20 April 2016, that he had no proper guidelines for annotating, for instance, Hittite subject enclitics.

Greek and Hittite, languages with the documented discourse-configurational word order *topic — focus — verb*. There are many deviations from this word order in the early IE languages. As in the case of a preceding predicate noun in Old Indian, the sequence *topic — focus* can be inverted. Similarly, a *shifting* topic may appear at the end of a clause if the first/initial position is taken by a *contrastive* focus. The positions of contrastive focus are shown in the paper on examples from Ancient Greek and Hittite.

Regrettably, Prof. Lühr does not take into account the works of Petra Goedegebuure (2013, 2014), who specifically discussed the types of foci in Hittite and their positions in the clause. This shortcoming of the article under review might be partially explained by its being presented for the first time in September 2012. Still, at the time when the reviewed volume was edited, the abovementioned papers of Goedegebuure, specifically the one concerning focused noun phrases (2013), had already been published and should have been known to Prof. Lühr. Actually, she presents here the preliminary results of her own project in Humboldt-University on word order corpus research in early IE languages. The project took around eight years, was finished in 2015 and has been discussed in several workshops of 2015 and 2016. One presented result is that the marked word order OSV, closely connected with the position of focus, in Hittite appears in 50% of all involved material.[2] Unfortunately, the corpus itself is not in the public domain, and there is no way for an independent check. Our own Hittite material (letters and instructions), when subjected to corpus-based analysis of the distribution of OSV, demonstrates rather low values — around 15% (Molina 2015). The author summarizes the paper with the notion that the position of information-structural entities in the old IE languages is inherited from PIE, and that only Greek has demonstrated in the study an innovation specified as "the postverbal *new-information* focus position", triggered by the verb moving into the middle position. As has already been said, all the details leading to this assertion should be independently double-checked on corpus material, which strongly demands historical corpora made for the research to be opened for the public.

The chapter concerning corpus research for historical languages is continued with the paper "Studying word order changes in Latin: some methodological remarks", contributed by Lieven Danckaert (Ghent

University). He argues that "a linear string of Latin words can correspond to more than one syntactic structure", and offers a detailed case study on the often discussed OV/VO alternation in the history of Latin (from 1st c. BC to 6th c. AD). The author postulates multiple positions for the object in the Latin clause and demonstrates that "the objects in three different positions are all to be interpreted in a different way". Two hypotheses are formulated for languages that display variable OV and VO ordering: one, that the choice between possible word orders is influenced by the variety of different usage-based factors, such as information structure, weight and complexity of the object, but the factor itself should not have much influence on the syntactic position of direct objects. Second, quantitative results that emerge from a study that only takes into account *syntactically non-ambiguous* environments provide a more accurate characterization of the syntactic changes that took place during the evolution from Latin towards the (early) Romance languages. The case study presented in the paper took into account at least 20 clauses with an auxiliary, with a transitive non-finite verb and an overt direct object for each period and source, "in order to be sure that the calculation of the average values of VO and OV is based on sufficient amount of tokens and thus provides a reliable estimate". Surprisingly, the statistical data demonstrated that no statistically significant rise of VO could be spotted, in strong contrast with what is commonly assumed.

Anna Bonifazi's article is titled "Problematizing syndetic coordination: Ancient Greek 'and' from Homer to Aristophanes". It discusses the interpretation of three particles, *te*, *kaí* and *dé*, which function as coordinators with the general meaning 'and' in Archaic and Classical Greek. Bonifazi focuses on discourse phenomena that cause syntactic distinctions between these particles. She demonstrates that multiple words with the meaning 'and' reflect a specific communicative need: for example, *te* may pragmatically imply shared knowledge, or may indicate a certain genre, while *kaí* between two conjuncts may be used to indicate a conceptual unity. Overall, summarizes Bonifazi, the range of usage for *te*, *kaí*, and *dé* encompasses a continuum between connective and adverbial functions.

The last paper in this chapter concerns epigraphic corpora: "What role for inscriptions in the study of syntax and syntactic change in the old Indo-European languages?", by Francesca Dell'Oro. She regrets that scholars who deal with syntactic problems, especially of a theoretical nature "tend to dismiss inscriptional records of early IE languages as being 'not useful' or 'too difficult to investigate'", — although this assertion would seem unfair if one takes into account cer-

---

[2] This information was made public at the Workshop "The precursors of Indo-European: The Indo-Hittite and Indo-Uralic hypotheses", Leiden University, June 2015, and was later discussed personally with Prof. Lühr.

tain cases of thorough investigation of epigraphic sources by Indo-Europeanists, it is indeed true that syntactic research rarely looks into inscriptions for input data. The paper provides a lot of examples from Greek epigraphics, including ones containing syntactic errors that help to reconstruct certain syntactic patterns, but also contains a series of rather commonplace assertions, such as "it is not easy to investigate problems of syntactic change or syntactic reconstruction on the basis of epigraphic material".

The final chapter, concerning questions of historical syntax and linguistic contact, contains two papers based on non-Indo-European material. One of them is a case study of Guinea creole languages ("The Gulf of Guinea creoles: a case-study of syntactic reconstruction") by Tjerk Hagemeijer; the other is "Syntactic diversity and change in Austroasiatic languages" by Mathias Jenny. Upon first sight, both seem to concern issues that are only tangentially related to the main focus of the volume, but in fact they offer a wider understanding of the problems of syntactic reconstruction, discussing material that usually remains untouched by mainstream researchers in the respective fields. The first article shows that creoles may constitute fertile ground with respect to the reconstruction of syntax, given a high degree of structural identity between sister languages and the fact that many shared syntactic properties, such as discontinuous sentence negation, must have been inherited and diffused from the protolanguage. The second one looks into the syntactic diversity of Austroasiatic languages, where historical data are available only for a small number of units, and seeks possible explanations for the development of this diversity. Two main factors seem to trigger syntactic change, namely, reanalysis and contact influence from neighboring languages, and insights drawn from languages with lengthy recorded histories could help to understand the development of languages with no historical data.

References

Barðdal, Jóhanna. 2001. *Case in Icelandic: A Synchronic, Diachronic and Comparative Approach*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Lund.

Barðdal, Jóhanna, Thórhallur Eythórsson. 2012. Reconstructing syntax: Construction grammar and the comparative method. In: H. C. Boas, I. Sag (eds.). *Sign-Based Construction Grammar*. Stanford CA: CSLI: 257–308.

Barðdal, Jóhanna, Thomas Smitherman. 2013. The quest for cognates: A reconstruction of oblique subject constructions in Proto-Indo-European. *Language Dynamics and Change* 3(1): 28–67.

Batllori, Montserrat, Maria-Lluïsa Hernanz, Carmen Picallo, Francesc Roca. 2005. *Grammaticalization and Parametric Variation*. Oxford: OUP.

Bauer, Brigitte. 1995. *The Emergence and Development of SVO Patterning in Latin and French: Diachronic and Psycholinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford: OUP.

Bauer, Brigitte. 2000. *Archaic Syntax in Indo-European: The Spread of Transitivity in Latin and French*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brandner, Ellen, Iris Bräuning. 2013. Relative *wo* in Alemannic: Only a complementizer? *Linguistische Berichte* 234: 131–169.

Crespo, Emilio, José Luis García Ramón (eds.). 1997. *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy. Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft*. Madrid, 21–24 de septiembre de 1994. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Crisma, Paola, Giuseppe Longobardi (eds.). 2009. *Historical Syntax and Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: OUP.

Devine, Andrew, Laurence Stephens. 1999. *Discontinuous Syntax. Hyperbaton in Greek*. Oxford: OUP.

Goedegebuure, Petra. 2013. Hittite Noun Phrases in Focus. In: S. W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert, B. Vine (eds.). *Proceedings of the 24th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Bremen: Hempen: 27–45.

Goedegebuure, Petra. 2014. *The Hittite Demonstratives. Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Gray, Russell, Quentin Atkinson. 2003. Language-tree divergence times support the Anatolian theory of Indo-European origin. *Nature* 426: 435–439.

Greenhill, Simon J., Quentin D. Atkinson, Andrew Meade, Russell D. Gray. 2010. The shape and tempo of language evolution. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 277: 2443–2450.

Güldemann, Tom. 2008. *Quotative Indexes in African Languages: A Synchronic and Diachronic Survey*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Faarlund, Jan. 1990. *Syntactic Change: Towards a Theory of Historical Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ferraresi, Gisella, Maria Goldbach (eds.). 2008. *Principles of Syntactic Reconstruction* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 302). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ferraresi, Gisella, Rosemarie Lühr (eds.). 2010. *Diachronic Studies on Information Structure. Language Acquisition and Change*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Harris, Alice, Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: CUP.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2012. Equative constructions in a worldwide perspective. Paper given at the conference "Expressions of Similarity from an Africanist and Typological Perspective", Villejuif, July 2012.

Haug, Dag, Marius L. Jøhndal. 2008. Creating a parallel treebank of the old Indo-European bible translations. In: Caroline Sporleder, Kiril Ribarov (eds.). *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Language Technology for Cultural Heritage Data (LaTeCH 2008)*: 27–34.

Haug, Dag, Marius L. Jøhndal, Hanne Eckhoff, Eirik Welo, Mari Hertzenberg, Angelika Müth. 2009. Computational and linguistic issues in designing a syntactically annotated parallel corpus of Indo-European languages. *Traitement Automatique des Langues* 50: 17–45.

Hewson, John, Vit Bubenik. 2006. *From Case to Adposition: The Development of Configurational Syntax in Indo-European Languages* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 280). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hoffner, Harry, Craig Melchert. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Winona Lake IN: Eisenbrauns.

Jelinek, Eloise. 1984. Empty categories, case, and configurationality. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2: 39–76.

Jonas, Diane, John Whitman, Andrew Garrett (eds.). 2012. *Grammatical Change. Origins, Natures, Outcomes*. Oxford: OUP.

König, Ekkehard. 2013. The deictic identification of similarity. In: Y. Treis, M. Vanhove (eds.). *Similative and Equative Constructions: A Cross-linguistic Perspective.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ivanov, Vjacheslav V. 1965. *Obshcheindoevropejskaja, praslavjanskaja i anatolijskaja jazykovye sistemy (sravnitel'no-tipologicheskie ocherki)*. Moscow: Nauka.

Lehmann, Winfred. 1974. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin TX: University of Texas Press.

Lehmann, Winfred. 1976. From topic to subject in Indo-European. In: Charles N. Li (ed.). *Subject and Topic*. New York NY: Academic Press: 447–456.

Lehmann, Winfred. 2000. *Pre-Indo-European* (Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series 41). Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man.

Lightfoot, David. 1979. *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. Cambridge: CUP.

Lightfoot, David. 1991. *How to Set Parameters: Arguments from Language Change*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Lightfoot, David. 1999. *The development of language: acquisition, change, and evolution*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lightfoot, David (ed.). 2002a. *Syntactic effects of morphological change*. Oxford: OUP.

Lightfoot, David. 2006. *How new languages emerge*. Cambridge: CUP.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 2003. On parameters and parameter theory. In: E. Stark, U. Wandrusza (eds.). *Syntaxtheorien: Modelle, Methoden, Motive*. Tübingen: Narr: 273–290.

Longobardi, Giuseppe, Cristina Guardiano. 2009. Evidence for syntax as a signal of historical relatedness. *Lingua* 119: 1679–1706.

Luraghi, Silvia. 2010. The rise (and possible downfall) of configurationality. In: Silvia Luraghi & Vit Bubnik (eds). *A Companion to Historical Linguistics*. London: Continuum: 212–229.

Melchert, Craig. 2011. The problem of the ergative case in Hittite. In: M. Fruyt, M. Mazoyer, D. Pardee (eds.). *Grammatical Case in the Languages of the Middle East and Europe: Actes du colloque international "Variations, concurrence et évolution des cas dans divers domaines linguistiques". Paris 2–4 April 2007*. Chicago IL: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago: 161–167.

Molina M.A. 2015. Markirovannyy poryadok slov OSV v khettskom yazyke, ego funkcii i regulyarnost' [Marked word order OSV in Hittite, its functions and regularity]. *Indoevropeyskoye yazykoznanie i klassicheskaya filologiya* 19. Saint-Petersburg: Nauka: 655–663.

Molina M.A. 2016. Review of: L. Kulikov, N. Lavidas (eds.). Proto-Indo-European syntax and its development (2015). *Voprosy yazykoznaniya* 5: 141–146.

Renfrew, Colin, April McMahon, Robert Trask (eds.). 2000. *Time Depth in Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Roberts, Ian. 2007. *Diachronic Syntax*. Oxford: OUP.

Sideltsev, Andrey V. 2011. Clitic doubling: A new syntactic category in Hittite. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 38(1): 81–91.

Siewierska, Anna. 1999. From anaphoric pronoun to grammatical agreement marker: Why objects don't make it. *Folia Linguistica* 33(2): 225–251. Greville G. Corbett (ed.). Special issue "Agreement".

Starostin G.S. (ed.). 2011–2015. *The Global Lexicostatistical Database*. Moscow/Santa Fe: Center for Comparative Studies at the Russian State University for the Humanities; Santa Fe Institute. Available: http://starling.rinet.ru/new100

Yakubovich, Ilya. 2011. Privative ergativity in Hittite. Handout for the presentation at the conference "Historical-Comparative Linguistics in the 21st Century", Pavia, Italy, 22–25 September 2011.