

# John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Diachronica* 30:3  
© 2013. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com)).

Please contact [rights@benjamins.nl](mailto:rights@benjamins.nl) or consult our website: [www.benjamins.com](http://www.benjamins.com)

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at [www.benjamins.com](http://www.benjamins.com)

## REVIEWS / COMPTES RENDUS / BESPRECHUNGEN

*Indo-European syntax and pragmatics: Contrastive approaches*. Edited by Eirik Welo. (Oslo Studies in Language 3(3)). Oslo: University of Oslo, 2011. Pp. iv + 228; e-format at <https://www.journals.uio.no/public/journals/1/images/osla-3-3.pdf>.

Reviewed by Rosemarie Lühr (University of Jena)

This book presents selected papers from the workshop on Indo-European (IE) syntax organized by the PROIEL project (University of Oslo) at the University of Georgia in Athens, May 2009. In this project word order, discourse particles, pronominal reference, expressions of definiteness and the use of participles to refer to background events are categorized as ‘pragmatic resources’. PROIEL’s parallel corpus of the old IE translations of the New Testament (NT) provides an excellent comparative tool. Comparison is the first connecting element of the volume, and the second is the interaction between grammar and discourse structure.

In her comparison of the Greek and Classical Armenian NT, Angelika Müth (“Categories of definiteness in Classical Armenian”) approaches the question of which semantic and pragmatic types of nominal definiteness are attested in Classical Armenian, in the 5th-century NT translation. She fruitfully uses Löbner’s (1985) categorization system of nominal definiteness based on the distinction between the functional, relational and sortal concepts. Another step in her investigation is the assumption of a unidirectional ‘path’ of development from the emergence of definite articles towards a further expansion/gradual spread of usage as proposed by Greenberg (1978: 47–82). It is shown that the definite article in Classical Armenian in its earliest attested stage is much less developed than in NT Greek. Only one correspondence between Greek and Classical Armenian exists: both languages use the definite article in NPs determined by contrastive attributes (such as Greek *allos*, Arm. *miws*). In all other categories, the systems differ. Generally, Armenian avoids the definite article with proper nouns and nouns with unique reference, while definite articles with proper names in Greek are common (with the exception of sacred or especially respected persons such as prophets). If the definite article is present in Greek, it often appears to have pragmatic motivation (e.g. re-topicalization, etc.). There is also no evidence in Armenian of the definite article as a marker of generic reference, nor of its use in NPs determined by superlative, comparative or ordinal attributes. However, as the author notes,

further research is needed, for example, to establish whether use of the definite article increases in later stages of Armenian in line with Greenberg's step sequence.

Brian D. Joseph ("The puzzle of Albanian *po*") discusses the meaning and etymology of the Albanian particle *po*, an aspectual marker used to mark progressive (continuative) aspect. This element is unique among the Balkan languages. No other language shows a (more or less) free preverbal form that marks aspect and specifically a type of imperfectivity (in the sense of signaling an ongoing event). Besides its function as an aspectual marker, *po* is also used as an affirmative particle, "yes; indeed". To fully understand how *po* functions in Albanian, or more accurately, how it came to function as it does, Joseph examines this form from Balkan, Indo-European and cross-linguistic perspectives. This approach is promising for understanding the particle's etymology and development within Albanian and, in relation to other phenomena in neighboring languages, makes an Albanian origin for *po* very likely. A comparison of the structuring of the 'verbal complex', i.e. the string of elements that occur with the verb in the marking of negation, tense, mood, voice and argument structure in Albanian, dialectal Greek, Daco-Romanian and other Balkan languages, including Macedonian, Bulgarian and Romani, shows some kind of "convergence" (Joseph 28). However, how these modifying categories were realized in earlier stages of these languages differed greatly. Because Slavic elements in Albanian are lexical in nature, the starting point for Albanian *po* cannot be the Slavic prefix *po-*, although semantically related prefixed verbs like Serbian *po-plakati* "to weep for a while" and *po-plivati* "to swim for a while", or Bulgarian *po-vârvja* "go for a while" exist. Checking other explanations of the source of Albanian *po*, the author seizes on a suggestion by Eric Hamp (p.c.), who derived affirmative *po* from an original asseverative marker \*pĕst (via the regular loss of a word-final consonant cluster and the regular development of Indo-European \*ē into Albanian *o*), which itself derives from PIE \*pe (as in Latin *quipped* (< \*quid-pe) "why so?; of course") combined with \*est, an apparent third person injunctive mood form of BE, literally "it is thus". Subsequently, he convincingly demonstrates some possible ways in which an originally asseverative *po* could have developed into a grammatical element marking "a momentary action in progress" (p. 27). With regard to why such an aspectual marker should have developed at all in Albanian, language contact is the decisive factor. As Joseph persuasively argues, Balkan Slavic might be a suitable catalytic agent in this case, as the aforementioned perfective but (brief) durational preverb *po-* found in Serbian and elsewhere in South Slavic suggests. Under contact, this is promoted by homophony between Slavic *po-* and Albanian *po*. A further indication of the catalytic function of Slavic in spreading aspectual/progressive *po* can be found in its distribution. While it exists in both Tosk and Geg Albanian, it is missing

from peripheral Tosk dialects, in particular Arvanitika and Arbëresh, where Slavic influence was weakest.

As Bridget Drinka (“The sacral stamp of Greek: Periphrastic constructions in New Testament translations of Latin, Gothic and Old Church Slavonic”) persuasively argues that, like the progressive in the Greek NT, the use of periphrastic perfects and participle constructions is an example of the so-called “sacral stamp”. This represents a linguistic emblem of membership in the Christian community which arises from the imitation of the koiné Greek by early translators of Latin, Gothic, Old Church Slavonic (OCS) and other languages (p.41). On the whole, the semantic range of the periphrastic constructions was broader than that found in Classical Greek, since they could refer not only to progressivity and durativity, but also to ingressiveness and imperfectivity, a function previously reserved for the synthetic imperfect alone. On the other side, in the NT the HAVE perfect retains its possessive value with an object-oriented participle. Another important point concerns highlighting the role of Luke in transmitting the holy text from Hebrew to NT Greek. Here, Luke does not rely on Hebrew directly, but on the Semiticized Greek of the *Septuagint* (LXX). So in his translation there are forms which do not come from the contemporary Koiné but from the time of the translation of the LXX between the third and first centuries BC. In using the periphrastic BE + present participle construction for aspectual purposes far more frequently than the other evangelists, Luke wanted to return to the construction’s Semitic roots. It specifically comes from the progressive in the LXX, which consists of the *waw*-conversive plus the perfective form of the verb *hyy* “be”. In making perfective verbs imperfective and imperfective verbs perfective by the conjunction *waw*, the aspectual reference is reversed. This usage appears frequently in biblical prose narratives, where the first verb is perfective and the following verbs are imperfective but are to be construed as perfective through the operation of the conversive. While Luke’s frequent use of periphrasis with the verb BE is an attempt to bring a stylistic feature of the LXX into his Greek, the periphrastic perfect does not find its predecessor in the Semiticized Greek of the LXX. However, the series of verb-initial clauses again reflects a Semitic linguistic feature, the normal Verb-Subject-Object order of Hebrew.

Chiara Gianollo’s comparison of the syntax of adnominal arguments in the Greek original and in the Latin Vulgate translation of the Gospels (“Native syntax and translation effects: Adnominal arguments in the Greek and Latin New Testament”) yields the following picture: The strikingly parallel distribution of genitives expressing adnominal arguments in the late variety of Latin used in the Vulgate translation from Greek and NT Greek is not a result of leveling Latin to the Greek model, but is due to significant parametric settings in a diachronic stage of Latin and Greek. While Classical Latin is characterized by a mixed GN/NG system,

the variety used in the Vulgate presents NG ordering like in the Greek original. The author considers this consistent with a more general tendency of the non-conservative colloquial register transmitted to the Romance languages. Another feature of Vulgate Latin is the loss of the possibility of expressing two arguments of the same head noun simultaneously (in Classical Latin a genitive of the subject and a genitive of the object could co-exist within the same DP). Only one Greek construction is perceived by the Latin translator as alien to his native competence and therefore is not straightforwardly reproduced in the Latin word order: a construction consisting of clitic ethical genitives. In the case of Jerome's translation of the Vulgate Gospels, the author assumes a situation of *diglossia*, where two distinct varieties of the same language co-exist as structurally and functionally separate systems within the competence of this individual speaker. As Jerome included in his translation only constructions which he considered grammatical (if far from the stylistic register of his classicist rhetorical training), his language in the Vulgate is considered as an I-language, i.e. as a system of principles and parameter settings. Also in the Greek Koiné, represented e.g. by the NT, a shift from a mixed NG/GN system to a uniformly NG one (transmitted to Modern Greek) can be observed. The author does not answer the question whether the parallel development towards postposed genitive modifiers, seen in both Late Latin and koiné Greek, should be attributed to language contact and bilingualism or should be seen as independent.

Dan Collins ("The pragmatics of 'unruly' dative absolutes in early Slavic") discusses absolute constructions in OCS and old East Slavic texts. The traditional notion that Slavic dative absolutes are subordinate clauses is influenced by the fact that typical absolutes can be translated into modern languages by explicitly hypotactic clauses. However, there are also datives in syntactically independent clauses. Their subjects are coreferential with the subjects of their putative main clauses either because they seem not to have main clauses to which they can be subordinated or in general because they occur where standard descriptions of Old Church Slavonic syntax would predict finite verbs (e.g., in coordination with finite clauses, or after explicitly subordinating conjunctions or subjunctives like *egda* "when"). It is shown that these constructions are not mistakes by inept, slavish translators or by incompetent scribes who did not understand a bookish, alien or moribund construction. It is rather left to the intended interpreters to link the datives to adjacent or nearby clauses, to entire passages of neighboring discourse or to the infrastructure of the discourse itself. Therefore, the rules that have been formulated for the absolutes are too narrow. The author follows Andersen (1970:8), according to whom those datives "present a narrated event as subordinate to another narrated event". To avoid confusion with syntactic subordination, this meaning is termed "datives of secondary status" (p. 127). The evidence that a given absolute is independent comes from three case studies: 1) the presence of graphic indications

that the scribe perceived the absolute construction as separate and independent, 2) the absence of another clause that could serve as a matrix on the syntactic level and 3) discourse organization that assigns the absolute to the same or a higher level of structure than its putative matrix clause(s). Furthermore, absolute datives are used in metadiscourse like absolute nominatives. The data consists of translations and not of original Early Slavic compositions. This is due to the nature of the Church Slavonic corpus, for, after the initial translation was made, most of the users of the text would not know or care whether it was translated or not. The author rightly argues that coherent translated passages provide legitimate data for historical-pragmatic research on Early Slavic.

Jared S. Klein (“Negation and polarity in the Greek, Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavic Gospels: A preliminary study”) hints at the opportunities for comparison offered by the Germanic, Armenian and Slavic translations from the Greek NT: He compares negative polarity items using the earliest (or only) attested material which consists of translations of the same text. In his corpus (the Gospels of Matthew 1:1–11:25 and Mark, Chapters 1–9) the basic negative polarity items are: “nobody, nothing”: *ou/mēdeís, ou/mēdén* [Gk]; *ni ... manna/vashun, ni ... waiht* [Goth]; *oč’ ok’, oč’ inč’* (contrast positive *mi omn, imn*) [Arm]; *niktože, ničtože* [OCS]. The modal categories are investigated as well. This is necessary since the functions of these categories are not always the same. For example, the descendant of the Proto-IE optative is used as an imperative in OCS and as a subjunctive in Gothic. Also, the languages employ different means in order to express the functional category future tense: the present indicative (Gothic), the subjunctive (Armenian), the perfective present (OCS) or periphrastic constructions. The negative polarity contexts investigated are simple negative statements, negative commands, questions, negative purpose clauses, negative result clauses, negative conditional clauses, negative causal clauses, negative relative clauses, sequential negation and minor categories, such as bare negatives in a reply, complements of comparatives and clauses of prior circumstance. The investigation reveals an amazing diversity of language-specific variation. Nonetheless, the picture presented is remarkable for its consistency from language to language, which is surely due to the wish to preserve the syntax of the original text. Klein rightly notes that once the full data on negation and polarity in the extant text of the Gospels in all four languages has been analyzed, an important chapter in the comparative grammars of these languages will have been closed.

Julia McAnallen (“Predicative possession in the Old Church Slavic Bible translations”) describes the encoding strategies for predicative possession in OCS: the verb *iměti* “have”, the dative predicative possessive construction (PPC) and prepositional phrases with *u* “near, at” + genitive PPC. Despite the large number of

constructions in OCS that match the NT Greek source, the following divergences occur:

- A. Greek PPC → no PPC in OCS
- B. Greek PPC → different PPC in OCS
- C. No PPC in Greek → PPC in OCS

One important divergence is the change in status from a canonical prepositional phrase to an oblique subject argument, since oblique subject arguments often exhibit control properties normally associated only with direct objects ('arguments') and never with arguments in prepositional phrases. In type C, where a Greek non-PPC is translated with a Slavic PPC, the number of arguments in the construction simultaneously increases. Here, most important is the replacement of a Greek copular or comitative construction with one argument by an OCS PPC with two arguments. As McAnallen concludes, this change suggests that Slavic has come to rely on two-argument constructions such as PPCs, where one-argument constructions are sufficient in the Greek original. However, the dative construction was often used for a possessive meaning that overlapped with the role of recipient or goal, and the *u* + genitive PPC often appears in contexts where possession had a strong locative sense. By far the greatest syntactic and semantic range is documented with *iměti* "have". The rise of HAVE as the primary construction for predicative possession was not only a trend in early Slavic but also in the histories of other Indo-European languages. In Greek, *ekho* "I have" also increases in frequency over time, gradually taking over the territory of the older *esti moi* "it is to me" construction, a trend that continued into Koine Greek of the NT where *ekho* is far more frequent than the dative. This is also true with the Latin *habeo* "I have" construction. This raises questions about the influence of source texts on PPCs in the early Slavic Bible texts.

Mari Johanne Hertzberg ("Classical and Romance usages of *ipse* in the Vulgate") compares the further development of Classical Latin *ipse* within the Vulgate and the Romance languages. While in Classical Latin *ipse* was an intensifier used to add emphasis to a noun or pronoun, in the modern Romance languages this word has developed into a demonstrative pronoun/adjective, a definite article and a third person personal pronoun, depending on the language. In Jerome's Vulgate translation of the NT classical usages of *ipse* still exist. But in nearly half of the examples in which *ipse* functions as an adjunct dependent on a pronoun, the originally intensifying particle *met* is also present. Though *met* does not reinforce the pronoun to a greater extent than *ipse*, contrary to its presence in Classical Latin, this kind of construction, viz. personal pronoun + *met* + *ipse*, develops into the modern Romance forms *même* (French), *mismo* (Spanish), *medesimo* (Italian), etc., "the same", "self", all from a construction consisting of a personal pronoun

(which is eventually reanalyzed as separate, *met*), and a colloquial superlative form of *ipse*, namely *ipsimus*. Functioning as personal pronoun in the Vulgate, this use of *ipse* is due to the Greek original, with *ipse* normally rendering *autos* as a third person personal pronoun. Most commonly, *ipse* is used as a third person subject pronoun and indicates a topic shift. In this function *ipse* resembles most closely the original Classical Latin use of this word. Indeed, when there is no overtly expressed element available for *ipse* to modify, *ipse* is often ambiguous between the old and the new interpretations, both semantically and syntactically. But *ipse* also occurs as direct object occupying mostly the position immediately preceding the verb to which it attaches as a proclitic. Apart from two examples, which both allow for alternative explanations, *ipse* is not found as a definite article in the Vulgate. This is amazing because in the coeval text commonly known as the *Peregrinatio Aetherae* or the *Itinerarium Egeriae* there is abundant use of both adnominal *ille* and adnominal *ipse*. As the author assumes, stylistic factors or diatopic variation within the Latin speaking territory may account for this. The disappearance of *ipse* as an atonic object pronoun/object clitic after the time of the Vulgate is a similar topic.

Olga Thomason's focus ("*En*-phrases and their morphosyntactic and semantic particulars") is on the internal relationship among syntax, morphology, semantics and pragmatics, starting from the observation that cognate correspondences of Greek *en/eis* in Gothic (*in*), Armenian (*i*) and Old Church Slavic (*vŭ*) are frequently translated with other constructions in these languages. The study concentrates on correspondences where a Greek *en/eis* in the canonical Gospels of the NT is matched with a non-PP in the corresponding translations into Gothic, Armenian and OCS. As for morphology, the author points to differences in case governance of \**en* reflexes in Greek, Gothic, Armenian and OCS. While Greek *en* governs Dat and *eis* is combined with nominals in Acc, in Gothic and in Armenian the case assignment for the \**en* reflexes is tripartite: Gothic *in* governs Dat, Acc and Gen, while Armenian *i* takes Loc, Acc and Abl, and OCS *vŭ* governs two cases — Loc and Acc. For the remarkable government of Abl by Armenian *i* the author rightly follows Meillet's proposal (1936), considering *i* + Abl to have the same origin as OCS *isŭ/izŭ* "from". Thus, the unification of *i* + Acc and *i* + Loc with *i* + Abl in Classical Armenian is a result of merger of the three most significant spatial concepts: location, direction and source. Here, the instances where Greek *en* + Dat and *eis* + Acc are translated with non-cognate PPs in Gothic, Armenian and OCS are interesting. In their primary functions (the denotation of location "in" and direction "into" respectively) Gk *en* + Dat is rendered with Gothic *ana* + Dat, Armenian *and* + Acc/Loc and OCS *na* + Loc and Greek *eis* + Acc is translated with Gothic *du* + Dat, Armenian *z-* + Acc and OCS *na* + Acc. Thomason ascribes this mainly to the inventory of the prepositional systems in the respective languages. As can be expected, secondary functions of Greek *en* + Dat / *eis* + Acc are also



translated into Gothic, Armenian and OCS with the help of phrases with non-cognate PPs, such as the comitative function of Greek *en* + Dat with Gothic *miþ* + Dat. Compared with the grammatical reasons for translating Greek *en* + Dat / *eis* + Acc by means other than their cognates, the pragmatic ones are difficult to describe. Interacting components are not only personal preferences, the interpretations of a translator, the pragmatic complexity of a concept and the translator's vision of a certain event, but also the difference between first and second meaning may be relevant, for example in the case of Greek *eis* + Acc and *epi* + Acc. For detecting such fine differences, the author argues for using Construction Grammar, assuming an undivided continuum between form and meaning.

Svetlana Petrova ("Modeling word order variation in discourse: On the pragmatic properties of VS order in Old High German") deals with two functionally related word order patterns in matrix declarative clauses in Old High German (OHG): Verb-Subject order and the *tho*- "then"-V2 construction. Both indicate temporal succession of events and progress in narration, but they function differently, as she shows. In root clauses in the case of verb fronting into the C-domain, pronouns and light adverbs occupy the so-called Wackernagel position, i.e. the left edge of the middle-field, immediately below C<sup>0</sup>. At the same time, no XP-movement to Spec,CP takes place in these cases. Therefore, it can be concluded that filling of the pre-field in matrix declaratives was still optional in OHG. To account for verb-initial declaratives in OHG in accordance with previous research, Hinterhölzl & Petrova (2010, 2011) assume that V1 systematically appears in presentational clauses and existential constructions where their basic function is to introduce new referents to the discourse. With respect to information structure, they lack a topic-comment structure. Rather, the entire clause is in the scope of assertion or in focus. The discourse relation is elaboration, as especially the semantics of the verbs and the context suggest: motion verbs, verbs of saying before citation, phase verbs and transformative/inchoative predicates, as well as discourse-initial contexts. However, the *tho*-V2 construction occurs with existential BE and the verb classes described for V1. Therefore, factors that influence the choice between V1 and *tho*-V2 need to be accounted for. Concerning V1, one of these factors is 'monoargumentality', a phenomenon that appears with strict intransitives, passive and medio-passive constructions and reflexives, as well as predicates which select a clausal argument. As Sasse (1995) has shown, this argument structure is accompanied by a number of lexical classes of predicates, existential verbs, verbs denoting the appearance/disappearance of a referent, psych-verbs, verbs of utterance/emotion, etc. The author argues that OHG is consistent with the situation found cross-linguistically. Furthermore, the aktionsart is a semantic factor that correlates with verb-initial order. In modern languages allowing verb-subject order such as Spanish and Italian, matrix verbs contain one of the features [+Ingressive],

[+Punctual], [+Resultative]. In OHG, verbs in clause-initial position often display the prefix *gi-* as an overt marker of perfectivity or the verb *beginnan* “to begin”. In contrast, the temporal property of referential *tho* in *tho*-V2 constructions, namely reference to a novel, indefinite time interval introduced as the topic time of a new episode, represents new information in the discourse. Another function of *tho* is reference to the situation time of the utterance, which is embedded in the topic time of the previous event or section. Opposing this usage of given *tho* is the position of novel *tho*. Novel *tho* appears post-verbally, thus occurring with V1 on the surface. But in most cases, accessible *tho* behaves like given *tho* (Donhauser & Petrova 2009), a point supported using the Goldvarb X statistical package (Sankoff & Tagliamonte 2005). An important result is that canonical properties of topicality, like reference to a contextually given and identifiable interval, favor the initial position of topics in the clause, whereas novelty and indefiniteness of the time interval referred to by the temporal adverbial *tho* prevent their movement to Spec,CP.

This volume impressively shows the kinds of new insights that can be gained from a comparison of Bible translations for the interaction between grammar and discourse structure. The meticulous analysis of the data allows for verifiable results. Therefore, the comparative method will be strengthened by this kind of research.

## References

- Andersen, Henning. 1970. The dative of subordination in Baltic and Slavic. In Thomas E. Magner & William R. Schmalstieg (eds.), *Baltic linguistics*, 1–9. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Donhauser, Karin & Svetlana Petrova. 2009. Die Rolle des Adverbs *tho* bei der Generalisierung von Verbzweit im Deutschen. In Monika Dannerer, Peter Mauser, Hannes Scheutz & Andreas E. Weiss (eds.), *Gesprochen — geschrieben — gedichtet: Variation und Transformation von Sprache*, 11–24. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- Greenberg, Joseph Harold. 1978. How does a language acquire gender markers? In Joseph Harold Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson & Edith A. Moravcsik (eds.), *Universals of human language*, vol. 1, 47–82. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hinterhölzl, Roland & Svetlana Petrova. 2010. From V1 to V2 in Older Germanic. *Lingua* 120(2). 315–328.
- Hinterhölzl, Roland & Svetlana Petrova. 2011. Rhetorical relations and verb placement in Old High German Tatian. In Christian Chiarcos, Berry Claus & Michael Grabski (eds.), *Saliency: Multidisciplinary perspectives on its function in discourse*, 173–201. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Löbner, Sebastian. 1985. Definites. *Journal of Semantics* 4. 279–326.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1936. *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*, 2nd edn. Vienna: Imprimerie des P.P. Mekhitharistes.

Sankoff, David & Sali A. Tagliamonte. 2005. *Goldvarb X: A variable rule application for Macintosh and Windows*. Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto. <http://individual.utoronto.ca/tagliamonte/goldvarb.htm>.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1995. "Theticity" and VS order: A case study. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 48(1/2). 3–31.

*Reviewer's address*

Rosemarie Lühr  
Indogermanistik  
Friedrich-Schiller-Universität  
Zwätzengasse 12  
D-07743 JENA, Germany  
[rosemarie.luehr@uni-jena.de](mailto:rosemarie.luehr@uni-jena.de)