

Introduction

2022 marked the centenary of Berthold Delbrück's death. The great Indo-Europeanist is considered the father of historical and comparative Indo-European syntax. In his honour a colloquium was held in Verona from November 9th until 12th 2022 as part of the Project *Particles in Greek and Hittite as Expression of Mood and Modality* (PaGHeMMo), which has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Grant Agreement Number 101018097. As that project focused particularly on moods, modality and particles, three elements profoundly studied by Berthold Delbrück (as can be especially seen in his 1871 *Syntaktische Forschungen I. Der Gebrauch des Conjunctivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen*, but also in later publications of the *Grundbedeutungen* of the Indo-European moods), the conveners considered it highly appropriate to organise the honorary conference as the main outreach event of that European project. An alternative scenario was to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the *Syntaktische Forschungen I* in 2021 but that idea was quickly abandoned because of the start date of the project in May 2021 and because of the ongoing restrictive measures and health emergency caused by the corona-pandemic. This conference was not the first celebratory event for the founding father of historical Indo-European syntax. Already in 1993 a conference was organised to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the publication of the first volume of the *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. As this coincided with the celebration of Holger Pedersen, the acts of that conference were only published in 1997 (edited by Emilio Crespo and José-Luís García-Ramón and published with the same editing company as the current volume). As was the case in 1993, keynote speakers for all language families and for the mother tongue, Proto-Indo-European (PIE), were invited to discuss the current research of the syntax of the specific language and compare this with Delbrück's findings at the time. This approach was also applied to languages that had not yet been discovered, deciphered or had not been sufficiently investigated. Besides the invited speakers, also many other researchers presented their work on historical syntax on one or more Indo-European languages. Although it was not intended this way, the conference turned out to be a mirror of Delbrück's own (initial) language interests with a predominance of presentations on Greek and Sanskrit, with the other language (family)s such as Iranian, Latin, Germanic, Celtic and Balto-Slavic being much less represented.

For the proceedings in this volume we requested the authors to start in their contributions from one or more of Delbrück's viewpoints and apply them to the specific language (family), even if it had not yet been discovered, deciphered or had not been sufficiently investigated (as was done in the 1993 volume as well). They are ranked per language family from older to younger with the ones treating Proto-Indo-European (PIE) at the end. We start and finish with two great Italian Indo-European syntacticians, professors Paola Cotticelli-Kurras and Carlotta Viti, the former describing the evolution of Delbrück as a scholar and providing a discussion of his works and the "birth" of his syntactic thinking, and the latter discussing the notion of the phrase and its establishment in PIE ("The historical development of the phrase"). Unfortunately, we did not receive contributions on all the languages and language families, and therefore this volume lacks treatments of the Italic languages, Germanic, Slavic and the *Kleinkorpussprachen* (for which a syntactic analysis could have been possible) and *Trümmersprachen* (for which a syntactic analysis might have been more difficult).

Already before 1893 Delbrück had devoted many works to syntax, starting with the cases and then proceeding to the verb and finally taking into account the entire sentence. A detailed overview of his works and the evolution of his thinking can be found in the first contribution of the current volume, namely that by **Paola Cotticelli-Kurras**. She first described how he came into contact with the *Leipziger Schule* and discussed his writings on historical syntax. She then delved deeper into Delbrück's predecessors, both in the field of Indo-European linguistics but also in the histor(iography) of linguistics, and into the *Nachleben* and influence of Delbrück among later syntacticians, both Indo-European and broader. She also treated the notions of *sentence*, *phrase* and *subordination* (what

we will also find in Carlotta Viti's final paper). While doing so, she also summarised the previous (1993) volume on Delbrück and indicated which aspects of his studies were discussed by each scholar of that volume. Her article provides the perfect summary of Delbrück's life and work and is thus the ideal starting point for our volume.

The first language family to be addressed was Anatolian and more specifically Luwian. In his article *Verbal aspect in Anatolian: The function of the Luwian suffix -s(s)a-, with remarks on the suffix -zza- and verbal reduplication*, **Valerio Pisaniello** started from Delbrück's analysis of tempus and aspect, followed Watkins' (agnostic) observations on the analyses of tense and aspect in Anatolian and Indo-European and then discussed in detail the Luwian verb forms in *-s(s)a-*, using the frameworks of Vendler and Bertinetto. He concluded that *there is enough evidence to suggest that the Luwian suffix -s(s)a- expressed imperfective grammatical aspect in all its manifestations* and that the same could be stated for the forms in *-zza-* and the ones with reduplication.

The next language family is Indo-Iranian. Two contributions discuss Vedic Sanskrit. The first one, *New thoughts on Delbrück's Hilfsverben in Vedic* by **Beatrice Grieco**, discussed the auxiliaries (called *Hilfsverben* by Delbrück) in Vedic, with her corpus not only including the *RigVeda* but also Brāhmaṇa-prose (until 600 BC). First, she describes how Delbrück analysed these verbs, then expands the analysis by incorporating new findings on verbal periphrases and grammaticalization and combining this with an analysis of tense and aspect. She combines Delbrück's findings with new insights, identifies new types of *iterative auxiliary verbs* and finishes by proposing additions to Delbrück's *Altindische Syntax*. The second Vedic contribution is by **Götz Keydana**, *Wackernagel enclitics in all the wrong places. A study of naḥ in the family books of the Rigveda*, and deals with word order and more specifically the position of clitics. The author, one of the specialists in Vedic word order and Wackernagel's Law, discusses several instances in which a clitic does not appear in its expected second position but occupies a verse internal slot. His corpus contains Vedic poetry but also prose and thus offers data that cannot be solely conditioned by the metre. He argues that the difference in clitic position, strict 2P and more variable placements, is not the result of a change between Old and Middle Vedic but *that the divide between variable placement and strict 2P is one between metrical and prose texts: optionality, according to this view, simply depends on text sort. Metrical texts are more stylized and thus expected to use more marked constructions* (note of the editors: the issue of the Wackernagel-position is of particular interest as this law was in fact discovered by Abel Bergaigne and Berthold Delbrück and should actually carry *their* names as well). The contribution by **Velizar Sadovski** treats Vedic, Avestan, Old-Persian and Indo-Iranian as a whole and is dedicated to the rich field of research into the poetical syntax of the most ancient Indo-Iranian language documents – the Vedas, the Avesta, the Old Persian royal inscriptions – and its Indo-European perspectives. After an introduction on the study of the large “no man's land” between syntax, stylistics and text linguistics in the times of publication of Delbrück's volumes on Old Ind syntax and on comparative syntax of Indo-European, and in the successive periods, the author gives a survey of three major aspects of the relationship between syntax and poetical structure: (a) the relation between strophic structure and syntactic organization on intra-stanzaic level within a major sub-unit – verse / stanza / strophe – of the poetical text, (b) the concatenation of major strophic-syntactic structures (syntagmata / commata and clauses / cola) on inter-stanzaic level by means of stylistic repetition as an important factor for the text cohesion on the level of the poetical text (hymn / sūkta- litany, ritual catalogue etc.) as a complex unity of multiple stanzas, as well as (c) the methods of creation of such inter-textual cohesion of poetical texts within a text corpus. In the second part of the article, a special case study of interstanzaic text cohesion focusses on the figure of speech designated as *epiplokē / catena*, which has been only scarcely discussed in the scholarly tradition, and on its variants and specifics in the Vedic Saṃhitās, the Avestan liturgies and the royal Achaemenid inscriptions. After Vedic and Indo-Iranian, Iranian was treated and while Avestan and Old-Persian were less thoroughly treated in the *Syntaktische Forschungen*, they were nevertheless discussed in the *Vergleichende Syntax*. The article by **Harald Bichlmeier and Maria Carmela Benvenuto**, *On Predicative Possessive Constructions in Avestan*, starts from

Delbrück's distinction between genitive and dative to express different types of possessors, focuses on the predicative possessor and applies Delbrück's findings to the Avestan texts, confirming and finetuning what he had argued for: *the genitive expresses a relation of possession already established and/or well-known, while the dative is used to express a relation of possession, which is intended/wanted/seen for the future*. After Indo-Iranian, we have the contributions on other language to which Delbrück paid extensive attention throughout his entire career, namely Greek. In a first article, **Filip De Decker** discussed in detail Delbrück's observations on Homeric verbal morpho-syntax, focusing on the use of the moods, the differences between them, (apparently) special uses and the "rise" of the indicative; the use of the modal particles (MP) in epic Greek; the injunctive and the augment in (Vedic and) Homeric Greek; the use and interaction of tense and aspect; the origins of the "Ionic-epic" iterative forms in $-\sigma\kappa-$ and the origins of subordination, parataxis and hypotaxis. He starts from scholarship preceding Delbrück, treats Delbrück's own viewpoints, then those coming after him, assesses the findings critically, applies them to disputed passages in Homer and concludes that most of his findings can be confirmed but states that he disagrees with the analyses of the tense and aspect and the origins of the Ionic-iterative forms. In the second Greek article, **Anna Dentella and Filip De Decker** discuss the Greek ending $-\phi\iota$, taking a closer look at Homer and occasionally comparing it with Mycenaean and PIE. This article starts from earlier work of Delbrück (as his work on the ablative locative and instrumental was one of his first syntactic publications, an article discussing Greek case syntax is very well suited in a volume honouring him) is another example of an analysis that started from earlier findings and expanded and doublechecked them against newly discovered evidence not yet available to Delbrück. They start with an overview of existing scholarship, distinguishing between pre- and post-1953 scholars (the date of the decipherment of Mycenaean) and then proceed to a detailed analysis of the instances of all the $-\phi\iota$ -forms in Homer, including the ones with disputed meaning. They found that *the suffix is numerus-indifferent, that instances with an unambiguous plural are relatively uncommon, that it appears almost exclusively with inanimate entities, is used predominantly with concrete elements and does not have solely instrumental and / or locative meaning, but that it can also be used with locative-directive and ablative meaning*. The third article on Greek by **José-Luís García-Ramón**, *Mycenaean Syntax: between Indo-European and first millennium Greek. The cases*, in the author's own words *continues (and is complementary with) that of Martín S. Ruy Pérez in the Colloquium Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy and is intended to give an overview of the contribution of Mycenaean to the reconstruction of IE syntax, focusing specially on the case system in the language of the tablets, its prehistory and its continuity in the first millennium* and provides a detailed analysis of the case system of Mycenaean and can thus be seen in the same light as the previous article. After a short introduction on the importance of Mycenaean for the syntax of Greek and PIE, the author provides an in-depth analysis of the case system of Mycenaean. The final contribution on Greek by **Erica Biagetti, Francesco Mambrini and Chiara Zanchi**, *Universal Homeric Dependencies. Annotating Double Accusative Constructions in Homeric Greek and beyond*, treats the double accusative and describes it as used in treebank databases. The article first describes the principles of the *universal Dependencies*, then applies them to Homeric Greek and finally also to Latin and Vedic. It concludes by offering some plans for future developments.

After Greek, Latin is treated (as stated above, there is unfortunately no article on the Italic languages). In his article, *Notes on the morphosyntax of subjecthood in Latin. A comparative-historical approach*, **Eystein Dahl** treated the subject marking and the *subjecthood* in Latin and other Indo-European languages. In his own words, he *attempts to establish the relative complexity of the notion of subjecthood in Latin and to establish to what extent this notion corresponds to analogous syntactic arguments in other, related languages, notably Ancient Greek, Vedic Sanskrit, and Hittite*. He starts by discussing *what constitutes a syntactic argument in general and a subject argument in particular* and uses Delbrück's definitions for that. Then he proceeds to describing and analysing the different strategies of marking the subject and agent with different types of verbs, states that *the central criterion for being classified as a subject property is that a construction singles out the single argument of*

monovalent verbs and the first argument of bivalent verbs. He establishes eight factors to define the subject property in Latin, but adds that only four of them could be traced back to PIE or Core-IE, but as the author himself states [*s*]ince the present discussion of omission under coordination was based on a limited amount of evidence, more detailed and systematic corpus research is a desideratum.

After Latin (and Italic), we proceed to Celtic. In his article, *Berthold Delbrück: The making of linguistic thought, the comparative syntax, the enigma of Celtic*, **Diego Poli** described, his article being complimentary with that of Paola Cotticelli-Kurras at the beginning of the volume, (the evolution of) Delbrück's thoughts, his place among other linguists of the 19th century and of earlier times, his main non-syntactic publications besides his syntactic achievements and also the problems and questions that the Celtic languages raised. As we stated above, the languages other than Greek and Indic received relatively less attention and one of those was Celtic, although it had been known at the time already and research into the Celtic languages had been performed already and was known to Delbrück himself as well (described in great detail in the article). The author focuses in particular on the position of the verb in Celtic and PIE, on Delbrück and Wackernagel's Law and on Bergin's Law, then describes how he widened his syntactic research to the Germanic languages and points out that, while he is certainly the founding father of IE syntax, his research did not originate *ex nihilo*: [*t*]he application of Delbrück to syntax arises within a research field activated by the Neogrammarians which is more articulated than it is commonly assumed. It seems to have started with a definite interest for the syntax of the relative.

The next language that is treated is Tocharian. In his contribution, *The Syntax of Negation in Tocharian*, **Olav Hackstein** shows how Delbrück's scientific principles and results are valid for and can be applied to a language that had not yet been discovered when Delbrück published his works. The article analyses the negators available in the language with an etymology for them, provides a comprehensive overview of the negation strategies in Tocharian for all the different types of sentences and types of verbal constructions (such as periphrases), discusses the position of the negator in the sentence and at end also treats morphological negation (in compounding). By using evidence and comparing with examples from other IE languages the author concludes that [*r*]egarding the morphosyntactic rules documented in this paper, Tocharian confirms many of the morphosyntactic properties of negation as documented by Delbrück for PIE without having access to the Tocharian evidence. On the whole, the syntax of negation in Tocharian is very similar to that of the Anatolian languages and Tocharian also overlaps with Indo-Iranian and Greek, thus assuming an intermediate position between Anatolian, on the one hand, and the classical Indo-European languages.

In his article, *Complex predicates and light verb constructions in Classical Armenian*, **Daniel Kölligan** discusses the use of light verb constructions in Armenian and analyses their uses and origins. He first describes the uses, then the term *light verb construction*, delves deeper into the origins, either as inherited or as borrowing, arguing that *the poetic device of periphrasis of a simple verb by a cognate and/or synonymous noun + light verb inherited from PIE may have played a role* and that *calques and borrowings from Iranian languages increased the frequency of the construction*, and finally analyses 5 case studies in more detail.

In his contribution, *Reconstructing Old Prussian syntax*, **Daniel Petit** treats Baltic and more specifically Old-Prussian and argues that while Delbrück was indeed the founding father of historical syntax his treatment and knowledge of the different languages and language families was *not uniform*. The article admits that there are not many Old Prussian texts and that the *Enchiridion* (a translation of Luther's *Enchiridion*) might be problematic for investigating syntactic features but the author nevertheless ventures such an in-depth analysis and discusses word order and negation particle, reflexive particle and the syntax of enclisis and the definite article. After a detailed discussion of 63 examples comparing Old Prussian with Germanic and other Baltic languages, the author concludes that the nature of the text still causes problems and hinders a final and unambiguous judgement: [*t*]he problem that Old Prussian philology has to face is to determine the level to which a given feature should be

ascribed, because there may be several explanations at the same time, ranging from textual interference to linguistic interference, internal development or even archaism.

The last language that has been treated is Albanian. We have two contributions. The first one, *Albanian*, is by **Brian Joseph** and discusses the absence of Albanian material in Delbrück's works. The author first distinguishes between syntactic topics treated in the different *Grundrisse* for which Albanian could not be of interest and those where it could. He also emphasises that Albanian must be treated as an IE language, as a language in the Balkan-context and as a natural language, emphasising that *contact as a driving force in the development of the syntax of Albanian means that all potential additions to Delbrück and the overall Indo-European picture that come from Albanian must be filtered through the lens of the Balkan sprachbund*. The article then treats no less than 9 case studies in which morpho-syntactic features of Albanian are analysed from an IE and contact-linguistics standpoint. His conclusions are that *Albanian offers a range of novel contributions to areas of direct concern to Delbrück and that Albanian shows the interplay between inheritance and innovation and between continuity and change, and gives an indication of the extent to which contact can play a role in that very innovation and change*.

The second contribution on Albanian is by **Dorđe Božović**, *Verb movement in Albanian and syntactic change (from Delbrück to Balkan linguistics)*, and treats word order, the position of the verb and the clitics and the use of Albanian in Delbrück's works. The author starts by describing how Delbrück viewed Albanian and how he and Wackernagel discussed clitic placement. As the author points out himself, *[t]he positioning of pronominal clitics with respect to the verb indeed represents one of the most intriguing syntactic properties of Albanian*. As was the case in the previous paper, this one also treats Albanian within the context of Balkan linguistics and *will provide a formal diachronic analysis of the position of clitics and the verb in Old vis-à-vis Modern Albanian, rooted in more recent Albanological and formal typological literature, in order to examine how this peculiarity of Albanian syntax relates to Delbrück's legacy, both in its Balkan (areal) and Indo-European (genealogical) contexts*. The author discusses the position change of the clitics in the diachrony of Albanian and in the Albanian dialects. The author concludes that some changes are contact-induced (as was argued for in the previous paper as well) but also *that the imperative-clitic orders in Old Albanian show Wackernagel effects, i.e. that they rather belong to the syntax-phonology interface. This is in accordance with Delbrück's original claim that both enclisis and proclisis in Albanian in fact reflect different aspects of Proto-Indo-European word order*.

The final two papers deal with several IE languages at once and/or with the mother tongue, PIE. The first one by **Rosemarie Lühr**, *Redehintergründe in Modalitätskontexten altindogermanischer Sprachen*, discusses the modality in different contexts (predominantly conditional, concessive and main clauses) in several ancient IE languages, such as Hittite, Greek, Vedic and Latin (the Greek part is complementary with the evidence discussed in the paper by Filip De Decker). The author discusses the meaning of optative and subjunctive in Vedic, Greek and Latin, adds a discussion of the aspectual uses in Greek and then compares this with Hittite that only has the indicative, which also complicates the distinction between *irrealis* and *potentialis* in that specific language: *[d]a im Hethitischen eindeutige Kennzeichnungen fehlen, muss der Hörer bei man (mān)-Sätzen, also entscheiden, welche Interpretation die richtig ist, die potentiale oder die irrealen*.

The final paper of the volume is that by **Carlotta Viti**, *The historical development of the phrase*, and contains all the problems that a scholar faces when dealing with syntax and is thus the most suited conclusion of this volume: *this paper discusses the diachrony of the phrase and of syntactic constituency on the basis of the evidence of the early texts of the Indo-European (IE) languages (i.e. what is a phrase, sentence, ... how did they come to be and where subordination comes from)*. Building on her ample research performed on this issue, the author first discusses the terminology, provides an overview of the literature dealing with examples from several ancient IE languages, treats exceptions to expected constituency order, attempts at reconstructing the evolution of the different types of phrases within PIE and then proceeds to discussing passages from Vedic prose and comparing them to other

ancient IE languages, such as Delbrück had done to avoid metrical constraints on the language, and concludes that *[t]he phrase has not yet been established in PIE. On the one hand, fronted positions are inherently related to contextual prominence in IE and beyond and that sociolinguistic factors related to the oral transmission of Vedic texts play a crucial role in strategies of word order, anaphora, and coordination.*

Verona/Ghent, December 2023

Paola Cotticelli-Kurras

Filip De Decker

We thank Anna Dentella and Jelena Živojinović for correcting the English text.

