OSLa Eirik Welo (ed.) *Indo-European syntax and pragmatics: contrastive approaches*, Oslo Studies in Language 3(3), 2011. 1–10. (ISSN 1890-9639)
http://www.journals.uio.no/osla

INTRODUCTION

EIRIK WELO
University of Oslo

[1] INTRODUCTION

This book presents a selection of papers from the workshop on Indo-European (IE) syntax which was held at the University of Georgia in Athens, Georgia in May 2009. The workshop was organized by the PROIEL project at the University of Oslo and by professor Jared Klein at the University of Georgia.[1]

The aim of this book is not to give a general picture of the syntax of the Indo-European languages nor to propose reconstructions of Proto-Indo-European syntax. Rather, the papers presented here study the interaction of grammar and discourse structure at various levels: word order, the use and historical development of words and grammatical constructions.[2] These phenomena are also at the heart of the PROIEL project itself.

[2] RESULTS

In this section, we present some of the major insights from the papers. While the relationship between grammar and discourse structure can be said to form a common theme for the papers collected here, the authors approach this question from different angles. Some focus on language comparison, relying on translations or text corpora containing material from several languages. Other discuss problems in a single language.

The IE languages show differences in many parts of their grammars. One way of highlighting differences between the grammatical systems of different languages is the use of translations. This method is put to good use in the paper by OLGA THOMASON on the translation of *prepositions* in several old IE Bible translations. Her detailed investigation takes as its starting-point the Greek prepositions ἐν 'in' and εἰς 'into' (from earlier **en-s*). The translation languages Gothic, Old Church Slavic (OCS) and Classical Armenian all possess a reflex of the IE preposition **en* which also underlies the Greek prepositions. In a tidy universe, the Gothic, OCS and Armenian reflexes of IE **en* would be used to translate Greek ἐν/εἰς whenever these occurred. In reality, the reflexes in the various languages are associated with a range of meanings which do not always overlap. Thomason's use of examples shows clearly how the reflexes

[1] Thanks to professor Klein and to the University of Georgia for all practical help and for providing generous hospitality and enjoyable company during the conference.

[2] See Bakker & Wakker (2009) for some recent studies of Classical Greek along similar lines.

of **en* have come to occupy different positions within the grammatical systems of the descent languages. Of course, separate investigations of the prepositional systems of the various languages would ultimately give the same result. The use of translations, however, makes the differences stand out very clearly.

Possessive constructions are another area in which the IE languages show interesting grammatical differences. In JULIA MCANALLEN's paper on these constructions in Old Church Slavic, the fact that the OCS texts are translations from the Greek is again exploited to show up important shades of meaning in the Slavic constructions. McAnallen identifies three distinct ways of expressing predicative possession in OCS:

- a verb meaning 'have'
- a dative NP + the copula verb
- a prepositional phrase (*u* + genitive) + the copula verb

She then looks at the possessive constructions in the Greek Bible text to see which OCS construction is chosen to translate them. Incidentally, New Testament Greek also has several ways of expressing predicative possession:

- a verb meaning 'have'
- a dative NP + the copula verb

McAnallen concludes that while the verb 'have' is at once the most frequent and the most flexible way of expressing predicative possession, the 'dative + NP' construction is used in fixed expressions. The use of the preposition *u* + the copula verb is used actively to emphasize the impermanence of possession.

The comparison with the Greek NT text shows that, given the literal approach to translation evidenced by all the early IE Bible translations, a Greek possessive construction is almost always translated with a similar one in OCS. Apparent divergences between Greek and OCS are in most cases due to idiomatic expressions. The cases involving *u* + genitive are especially interesting in this regard since OCS may express a distinction which is not overtly differentiated in Greek.[3]

The *definite article* provides a third example of a category which (when it exists at all) is used differently in different languages. ANGELIKA MÜTH contrasts the use of the definite article in Greek with its use in the Armenian Bible translation. Again, while there are many overlapping functions between the two languages, there are also clear areas of divergence. The use of the definite article with proper names is a case in point.

[3] Further research may be needed into the ways in which Greek may express different types of possession.

Consider the name 'Jesus' in the New Testament. In the Greek Gospels, Jesus is mentioned by name close to 800 times. In slightly more than half of the cases, his name is accompanied by the definite article: *ho Iêsous*. In the Classical Armenian translation, on the other hand, the name 'Jesus' is always bare (with a single exception). The pattern is repeated with Pilate: in Greek, his name carries the definite article in 80% of the cases. In Armenian, the name is always bare. This is not, however, the whole story about proper names: some Biblical names are never used with the article, neither in Greek nor in Armenian. Clearly, the definite article has a wider range of functions in Greek than in Armenian. More specifically, Greek uses the definite article in several "semantic" functions, e.g. with proper names, unique reference nouns, etc., where Armenian prefers to leave it out. As far as the "anaphoric" use of the article is concerned, Greek and Armenian are more similar to each other.

BRIDGET DRINKA takes a different approach to the role of translations in linguistic development. In her paper, she discusses *periphrastic constructions* in the Greek NT and its old IE translations. While tracing the spread of these constructions, she focuses on their symbolic meaning as part of the Word of God. Preserving the linguistic *form* of a holy text is seen as a way of showing reverence for it. When grammatical constructions are associated with religious meaning in this way, this in turn makes it possible to exploit these constructions in original texts to signal the membership of the author in the Christian community, ultimately giving rise to a Christian style of expression. In her paper, Drinka shows that this process took place at least twice in the history of the NT. First, the evangelists, and especially Luke, consciously adopted features of the language of the *Septuaginta*, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, thereby signalling the continued relevance of the Old Testament for the understanding of their own writings. Secondly, the early translators of the Bible took pains to replicate the periphrastic constructions frequently found in the text of the NT. Finally, the importance of the early translations of the Bible in the various speech-communities of Europe may have contributed to the development of periphrastic present and perfect constructions in the modern European languages.

In his paper, JARED KLEIN explores the syntax of *negation* and *polarity* in the languages of the major old IE Bible translations: Latin, Gothic, OCS and Classical Armenian. Starting out from the Greek NT, Klein investigates the linguistic realization of various aspects of negation, ranging from simple negative statements through negative commands, questions, adverbial clauses (purpose, result, conditional, causal) to relative clauses.

Klein proceeds by discussing the modal categories of the languages. This is important since the functions of the categories are not necessarily 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), or the perfective present or periphrastic constructions (OCS).

The investigation shows some interesting differences between the various translations and the Greek original. In particular, the distinction in Greek between specific/definite 'who' and non-specific/indefinite 'whoever' is not always reflected in the translations.[4]

The picture which emerges from Klein's study is, as he notes in his conclusion, remarkably stable from language to language. Since the wish to preserve the syntax of the original text may be one major source for this similarity, as convincingly illustrated in Bridget Drinka's paper, it should be pointed out that the conclusions based on data collected from comparing a translation with its original ought to be checked against original texts whereever possible.

This method is followed by CHIARA GIANOLLO in her paper on *genitive modifiers* in Greek and Latin. Taking the Vulgate translation of the Greek NT as her starting-point, she further draws on data from other Late Latin texts. Combining data from these two different sources, she is able to conclude that while the word order of genitive modifiers is to a large extent the same in the two languages, this should not be seen just as the result of faithful translation. The evidence from Late Latin non-biblical texts shows that developments in Latin grammar allowed the Bible translators to replicate the NT Greek linguistic structures without doing violence to their own language. A further question, posed but not answered by the author, is whether the parallel development, seen in both Late Latin and in Koine Greek, towards post-posed genitive modifiers should be attributed to language contact and bilingualism or seen as independent of each other.

An important topic concerning the interaction between grammar and discourse structure, viz. *word/constituent order*, is dealt with in SVETLANA PETROVA's paper. In Old High German (OHG) there are two constructions which both function in a similar way to indicate discourse structure: Verb-Subject order and the *tho*-V2 construction. The constructions are similar in that they both involve a subject in postverbal position. In the *tho*-construction, however, the particle *tho* is placed clause-initially, followed by the verb. The author investigates the factors that influence the choice between VS order and the *tho*-V2 construction in Old High German texts. She discusses a set of factors which influence the choice between the two constructions, including:

- argument structure
- lexical semantics
- Aktionsart

[4] Note that in New Testament Greek, this distinction is no longer as clear-cut as in Classical Greek. Thus, the choices made by the translators may also tell us something about their understanding of the Greek text.

- information structure

The choice of construction cannot, she argues, be attributed to any single factor. Rather, the factors combine to influence the choice to different degrees. Petrova concludes that e.g. the properties of Aktionsart and Information Structure in particular are closely linked to VS order. She also concludes that the discourse status of *tho* directly affects its position in the clause: when its status is *new* or *indefinite*, it may not be clause-initial, thus precluding the *tho*-V2 construction from appearing.

The distinction between subordination and coordination is another grammatical feature which clearly plays a role in marking discourse structure. DAN COLLINS discusses *absolute constructions* in OCS and old East Slavic texts. The main focus of the paper is on the use of absolute constructions in contexts where they should not be used according to traditional grammar, e.g. when the subject of the absolute construction is coreferential with the main clause subject, or when the absolute construction functions as a main clause in its own right. Collins argues that these cases should not be viewed simply as grammatical mistakes or translation errors. Rather, we should look for the factors which motivate the use of the construction in precisely these contexts. The traditional definition of absolute constructions fails to realize that we need to understand the contextual features which characterize the construction as well as its formal features. The seemingly aberrant uses of absolute constructions should rather be incorporated into the description of the syntactic possibilities of the construction. The use of absolute constructions are often motivated by the need to demarcate discourse structure rather than by purely syntactic considerations.

MARI HERTZENBERG's paper concerns the uses of the demonstrative *ipse* in the Latin Vulgate translation of the Bible. On the basis of Classical Latin texts and the more recent testimony of the Romance languages, it is possible to distinguish between Classical Latin uses and uses pointing in the direction of later Romance languages.

In Classical Latin, *ipse* was used as an intensifier with the meaning 'self'. In the Romance languages, however, *ipse* has developed in several ways:

- demonstrative pronoun/adjective
- definite article
- third person pronoun

Hertzenberg discusses several cases where it it reasonable to interpret *ipse* not as an intensifying adjunct but rather as an unemphatic personal pronoun. Apart from two examples, which both allow for alternative explanations, *ipse* is not found in the Vulgate as a definite article. This is surprising, the author argues, given the usage of other late Latin texts. As an explanation, we may suppose either that *ipse*

was not a definite article in Jerome's grammar, or, on the other hand, that it was, but that he chose to keep his translation closer to Classical Latin with regard to this grammatical feature.

In his paper, BRIAN JOSEPH discusses the meaning and etymology of the Albanian particle *po*. This particle marks progressivity, as shown in (1):

(1) Agimi *po* këndon
'Agim is singing.'

Although the question of the etymology of *po* cannot be settled once and for all, there are several plausible alternatives. The question why Albanian developed this progressive marker in the first place is discussed in the context of language contact. In both the Slavic and Greek neighbouring languages of Albanian, the aspectual notion of progressivity plays an important role in the verbal system, and this may have supported the overt marking of progressivity in Albanian as well. Joseph emphasizes the complex interplay between Indo-European inheritance, contact with other Balkan languages and general linguistic principles, which all have played a part in the development of this grammatical marker towards its present state.

To sum up, the papers selected for this volume cover a wide range of interrelated topics and approaches:

- prepositions
- possessive constructions
- the definite article
- periphrastic constructions
- negation/polarity
- genitive modifiers
- word order/clause types
- absolute constructions
- pronouns
- aspectual particles

All of the topics listed above are important areas in which grammar interacts with discourse. Undoubtedly, future research will deepen our understanding of the precise nature of this interaction, its regularities and limits. We will set yet other ways in which these and other grammatical categories function within the larger structures of discourse. Nonetheless, the categories discussed in the papers in the

following pages are central among the pragmatic resources which languages draw on.

[3] THE PROIEL PROJECT

The papers presented at the Athens workshop deal with many aspects of Indo-European syntax but focus especially on the old Indo-European Bible translations. The idea of using these translations as a starting point for research into the comparative syntax of (some of) the older Indo-European languages is not new in itself,[5] but has been taken up again in a new context through the construction of the PROIEL corpus of Bible translations at the University of Oslo.[6]

The PROIEL database contains the text of the Greek New Testament (NT) combined with translations into Latin (the Vulgate), Gothic, Old Church Slavic and Classical Armenian. The texts of the PROIEL corpus are annotated on various levels:

- lemmatization
- morphology
- syntax (dependency grammar trees)
- givenness (information structure)

The texts are also aligned word by word (the alignment was done automatically). Thus, for every Greek word in the corpus, we have information about its features and syntactic function as well as its relationship to words in the translated versions. Likewise, the non-Greek words contain information about which Greek words of the original NT they translate.

The information added by the annotation is stored in a database which makes it possible to search for complex combinations of features. This opens up new possibilities for detailed (and quantifitative) study of Indo-European syntax. The PROIEL corpus is publicly available and may be used for all kinds of research focusing either on the Bible or on the languages of the NT and its translations.[7]

The PROIEL project itself was motivated by a desire to know how the various old Indo-European languages exploit the resources of their grammatical systems in order to express pragmatic categories like *topic* and *focus* and other elements contributing to discourse coherence. The project starts from the premise that the translation languages try to recreate the structure of the Greek NT text with regard not only to lexical and syntactic structures but also to textual coherence, the project poses the question of how the grammatical systems of Latin, Gothic, OCS and Armenian differ from Greek in their ability to express aspects of textual coherence.

[5] See e.g. the studies by Cuendet (1924, 1929) and Klein (1992a, 1992b).
[6] The corpus is publicly available at `http://foni.uio.no:3000/`.
[7] For further discussion of how the corpus was made, cf. the papers Haug et al. (2009a) and Haug et al. (2009b).

Consider again the example of definiteness marking. We have good reason to believe that Proto-IE, like Classical Latin, did not mark definiteness by means of a definite article. In Greek, on the other hand, such an article developed well before the time when the NT was written.[8] Of the translation languages in the corpus some have a definite article (Armenian) while others do not (Latin, Gothic, OCS). Accordingly, we may use the PROIEL corpus to try and answer the question: how did the Bible translators deal with the Greek article, how did they analyze its functions, and, for the languages which lacked a definite article of their own, what resources of their own grammar did they employ to express the meaning contributed by the definite article in Greek?[9]

Our data on how the Greek definite article is translated throws light also on the development of the definite article in Late Latin and Romance. The Latin Vulgate Bible translation is one important source of information about how the demonstratives *ipse* and *ille* developed into definite articles. As in the case of Classical Armenian, however, the translation also provides information about distinctions in the use of the category in the lanuage of the original.

Another area of grammatical difference is the system of participles. All old IE languages have (inflecting) participles, and some of these may be inherited from PIE. The participles are not, however, used in the same way in every language. In a paper on the use and translation of Greek participles, Dag Haug showed how the participles in Greek fullfil several different discourse functions, and how they are translated differently according to their function.[10]

As we have seen, using translations in linguistic research offers many advantages, chief among which are the fact that we are allowed to see how languages behave in a controlled environment: the original and the translation are in some sense the 'same' text. There are, however, also problems involved in the use of translations, and some of these are specifically related to the use of *Biblical* translations.

One problem is common to all texts which are transmitted over time: the transmission process generates errors. Words are added or left out, misplaced or misspelled. This means that we cannot always be sure that what we read is in fact a grammatical sentence of the lanuage we study. The problem is more acute whenever we are dealing with constructions of low frequency. As far as Greek and Latin are concerned, we are often able to use the vast amounts of other texts as a control. For some of the other languages in the corpus, most notably Gothic and Old Church Slavic, the lack of non-translated texts makes it difficult to evaluate the langauge of the texts that we actually have.

[8] Although Homer does not use the article consistently in his poems, they contain clear indications of the way in which the old demonstrative pronoun would develop into a definite article by the time of Classical Greek.

[9] See the paper by Angelika Müth in this volume.

[10] The paper was given at the Athens conference, but was already scheduled to appear elsewhere. It can be read in Haug (Forthcoming 2012).

A problem related to comparing translations with their original is that we cannot be sure that the version of the translation we happen to have was made on the basis of the version of the original that we happen to have. As a quick glance at the critical apparatus of any Greek Bible text will demonstrate, the textual transmission of the Greek NT is complicated: there are text families and endless variation in detail. In the case of the Gothic Bible, even though the translation was ultimately made from a Greek original, the translator may have been influenced by Latin versions as well. The Armenian translation of the NT perhaps was first made from a Syriac text and then at a later stage corrected against a Greek text. Naturally, all these facts must be taken into account as possible sources of error affecting the value of the translations for syntactic research.[11]

More directly related to the linguistic side of Bible translation is the question of *literalness*. To what extent were the early Bible translators willing to go beyond the borders of their own grammar in order to replicate the structure of the source text? In this context, we should not forget, as Bridget Drinka convincingly showed in her paper at the conference, that the Greek NT as a text was holy to its readers, and that this holiness extended also to its linguistic form. While this fact is most clearly visible in the case of the word order of the text, we cannot be sure that it did not also extend to other areas, e.g. lexical semantics. In the great majority of cases, the translators did their utmost to preserve the word order of the original text. This creates problems for a linguistic evaluation of the word order of the translations, not least because we may reasonably infer that word order in all the older IE languages was quite free. For Gothic, Armenian and OCS, as we cannot use non-translated texts as a control, it is difficult to use the word order in the Bible translations in these languages as linguistic data.[12] Thus, it is only in the cases where a translation deviates from the word order that we may feel reasonably sure that the translator had a linguistic reason for not replicating the word order of his source.[13]

To conclude, in spite of the limitations discussed above, the old Indo-European Bible translations provide important source material for the comparative study of Indo-European syntax. Above all, the controlled context provided by an original text and its translations allows us to study in detail how grammar, and, more specifically, syntax interacts with discourse structure in order to make texts as cohesive as possible.

The development of electronic text corpora which include rich annotation of

[11] See Metzger (1977) for a detailed presentation and discussion.

[12] In the case of Gothic, we may argue for the grammaticality of some word orders by using data from the other old Germanic languages. In the case of Armenian, we have original texts only slightly newer than the translation of the Gospels, but these all come from a written culture heavily influenced by the Bible translations anyway.

[13] Although, again we cannot be sure that the translation was made from a source with the same word order as the current version of the Greek NT or that the original word order of either the translation or the source text has not been changed in the process of manuscript transmission.

grammatical information promises to make the investigation of these phenomena even more practical, by giving researchers access to complex searches and precise quantitative data. Even though the number of old IE texts available in this format is still small, we may expect a steady growth in the amount of material available for study in the coming years.

REFERENCES

Bakker, Stéphanie & Gerry Wakker (eds.). 2009. *Discourse cohesion in Ancient Greek*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.

Cuendet, Georges. 1924. *L'impératif dans le texte grec et dans les versions gotique, arménienne et vieux slave des Evangiles*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

Cuendet, Georges. 1929. *L'ordre des mots dans le texte grec et dans les versions gotique, arménienne et vieux slave des Évangiles. Première partie. les groupes nominaux*. Paris: Champion.

Haug, Dag. Forthcoming 2012. Open verb-based adjuncts in New Testament Greek and the Latin of the Vulgate. In Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen & Dag Haug (eds.), *Big events and small clauses*, Mouton de Gruyter.

Haug, Dag T. T., Hanne M. Eckhoff, Marek Majer & Eirik Welo. 2009a. Breaking down and putting back together: analysis and synthesis of New Testament Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 9. 56–92.

Haug, Dag T. T., Marius L. Jøhndal, Hanne M. Eckhoff, Eirik Welo, Mari J. B. Hertzenberg & Angelika Müth. 2009b. Computational and linguistic issues in designing a syntactically annotated parallel corpus of Indo-European languages. *Traitement Automatique des Langues* 50(2). 17–45.

Klein, J. S. 1992a. On the independence of Gothic syntax, I: Interrogativity, complex sentence types, tense, mood, and diathesis. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 20. 339–79.

Klein, J. S. 1992b. On the idiomatic nature of the Gothic New Testament: A comparative study of prepositional usage in Gothic and New Testament Greek. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 90. 1–80.

Metzger, Bruce. 1977. *The early versions of the New Testament: Their origin, transmission, and limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.