

Introduction

As research on syntactic change within a broadly generative framework enters its fifth decade, it is possible to look back at the development and accomplishments of this enterprise. Three publications which appeared in the late 1970s, two books and a review, serve as a useful demarcation of its beginning: the collection of papers in Li (1977), David Lightfoot's (1979a) book, and Lightfoot's (1979b) review of the Li volume. The demarcation is rough of course, as Lightfoot's work on diachronic generative syntax dates back to the mid 70s; more to the point, most of the papers in the Li volume might appear to have little to do with generative grammar or even, as Lightfoot (1979b: 381) argues, with syntax. But in retrospect, in the space between the two volumes, mapped out by Lightfoot in the review, we can see the emergence not only of a distinctively generative approach to syntactic change, but of its polar twin. Lightfoot alludes to the latter as he discusses "three features which are typical, not only of this volume, but of much work in diachronic syntax and of what many have come to see as a developing West Coast tradition" (1979b: 382).

The three features that Lightfoot criticizes are the absence of a careful formal description of the synchronic stages referenced in the diachronic analysis (1977b: 383), reliance on assumptions about reconstructed stages of a language (384-7), and a focus on "independent diachronic principles" and "constraints on 'diachronic processes'" (388). The methodology of diachronic generative syntax as it has developed over the past four decades is closely based on Lightfoot's injunctions. Some theoretical assumptions change, but the methodology has remained remarkably consistent. Thus while the chapters in this volume represent a broad theoretical range within the general rubric of a formal approach to language changes, their methodology hews largely to the basic scheme outlined below.

1. The methodology of diachronic generative syntax

In what follows we sketch what has emerged as the basic methodology of generative work on syntactic change, referring back to the considerations that motivated Lightfoot in 1979.

1.1 Formal synchronic description

Lightfoot observes that the papers in Li (1977) "allude to facts or analyses of no less than 235 languages; but in the whole book I have been able to find only 11 formal, synchronic rules, several of which would be impossible in any theory known to me" (1979b: 382-3). A maximally complete formal description of the synchronic stages involved in the diachronic analysis has become the generally accepted starting point for analyses in this field. It is no accident that specialists in diachronic generative syntax have set the standard for the construction of parsed (or otherwise annotated) electronic corpora for historical syntactic research, led by researchers such as those at the University of Pennsylvania and the University of York. Chapters in this volume

draw on parsed electronic corpora created by these researchers for Old English (Taylor, Warner, Pintzuk and Beths 2003) and Middle English (Kroch & Taylor 1995), while still others draw on unannotated electronic corpora for Bulgarian (Vulchanov & Dimitrova-Vulchanova, in progress), Dutch (Postma 2004), English (ch. 4), and Norwegian (ch. 15). The centrality of such corpora controverts the still occasionally encountered characterization of generative syntacticians as relatively uninterested in primary data. In the diachronic syntax field, not just data but analyzed data is the necessary first step for hypothesis construction.

1.2 Confidence in the data

Lightfoot's (1979b) skepticism about claims based on reconstructed data reflects not just a reservation about syntactic reconstruction. It reflects caution about data at some remove of accessibility from the community of researchers. For Lightfoot, this also entails a lack of enthusiasm about claims based on little-known languages, encapsulated in his now famous 'Ebeling Principle': "the more exotic the language, the less need for precise analysis and the less controversy about correct descriptions" (1979b: 383). The basic consideration is the same one discussed in the previous section: in order to build an account of change, the relevant synchronic descriptions must be reliable. Thus is the reason for the relative focus on data from Germanic and Romance languages over the previous four decades of diachronic generative research is not, as is sometimes suggested, a lack of interest in other language families. The point of the research is to determine how change takes place, not to describe syntactic change in as many language families as possible. The former task requires earlier language data that is reliable and well understood. As the synchronic accounts of various language families and their earlier stages have improved, the scope of the field has grown to include them. This is reflected in the chapters on Austronesian by Aldridge and Uto-Aztecan by Haugen in this volume.

1.3 Independent diachronic principles

Lightfoot's negative stance toward "independent diachronic principles", "constraints on 'diachronic processes'", "'mechanisms' of change", "universal principles of change" (1979b: 388) is an important legacy of his work in this field. Lightfoot explains his stance clearly: "Writers seem to regard grammars as historically transmittable, a objects floating smoothly through time and space, undergoing no more than minor changes with each generation ... I have claimed ... that this is essentially a mystical view; grammars are discontinuous – created afresh by each language learner, who is influenced only by the data to be mastered and the theory of grammar restricting available hypotheses; he is not influenced by the form of his parents' grammar(s)" (ibid). Of course the allure of a theory of independent principles of language change is not restricted to the "West Coast" approach whose emergence Lightfoot noted. It has proven a powerful attraction for generative researchers on syntactic change as well. The field has seen ongoing debates over the validity of such principles. In general there is a consensus, though,

that principles such as the economy considerations discussed by Roberts & Roussou (2003) should be understood as principles of first language acquisition, not of language change. On this view, it is the child who chooses between two possible derivations associated with a particular piece of primary linguistic data; the fact that one of the derivations happens to be the one incorporated in her caregiver's grammar is irrelevant from the standpoint of acquisition (although interesting to the linguist studying change).

In other respects, however, continued interest in the typology of change is a sign of maturation in the field, in that it is a point of contact with longstanding concerns in the field of historical linguistics. Two chapters in this volume, those by Kiparsky and Garrett, touch on the very longstanding issues of analogical change, grammaticalization, and the bases for syntactic reanalysis. The fact that the field can speak to these issues with confidence is evidence of its progress. Interest in the typology of change is also a natural outgrowth of the empirical breadth of the field: as more cases of syntactic change have been analyzed on the basis of the methodology outlined in this section, the field has developed a growing assurance about what kinds of change happen and some kinds which do not. We review the development of this assurance in the historical overview provided in the next section.

2. Three periods

If Lightfoot's 1979 book, the Li volume, and Lightfoot's reaction to the Li volume mark in some manner the emergence of diachronic generative syntax as a distinct field, the subsequent development of the field may be divided up into three periods: a period of establishing the methodology outlined in the previous section as well as the theoretical foundations of the field; a period of establishing boundaries and relations with other domains of linguistics, in particular with respect to external factors in language change; and a period of re-established contact with the overall field of historical linguistics. These stages are roughly defined, and will not please all practitioners, but they serve to take us through the past 40 years to the current stage represented by this volume.

2.1 Establishing the foundations

In addition to the methodological assumptions reviewed in section 1, Lightfoot (1979a) also firmly established the leading idea that continues to drive the field: that syntactic change (and language change generally) is basically about what happens in first language acquisition. This idea precedes generative grammar, of course, going back at least to Paul (1886), but in diachronic generative syntax work it remains the central idea, driving, for example, the discussion on putative general principles of change in 1.3. Lightfoot hammers home again and again the point that the child has no direct access to the grammar of the previous generation; the task of acquisition (and the crucible for change) is in the getting from the linguistic output

produced by speakers of the previous generation to the construction of a new grammar.

The machinery of the Revised Extended Standard Theory (e.g. Chomsky 1977) provided several possible loci for syntactic change in the grammar. For example, Lightfoot (1979) locates the change associated with the emergence of the English modal auxiliaries in the base (phrase structure rule) component of the grammar. According to this view, the modals develop when the expansion of S in grammar G_1 (1a) is replaced in a subsequent generation by the grammar G_2 (1b).

- (1) a $G_1: [S N^n [_{AUX} Tense] [V^n [V' cunn-/will-...E]]]$
b $G_2: [S N^n [_{AUX} Tense [_{Modal} can/will...]] V^n]$

This was a perfectly reasonable way of describing the facts, given the machinery of REST. But it left open the question: are all representations and derivations in the grammar equally vulnerable to change? Of course the question itself comes dangerously close to the forbidden territory of speculation about constraints on change mentioned in 1.3. The answer at the time was basically yes; given a severe enough deficit of cues in the output data associated with a derivation or representation, it could fail to be acquired, regardless of its status in the grammar. This situation allowed syntactic change to happen in any part of the grammar, and have essentially unrestricted effects on syntactic representations. The next major development in thinking about syntactic change would come from developments in syntactic theory itself.

2.2 Establishing the boundaries

Chomsky (1986) is not a book about diachronic syntax, but the distinction stated in this book between E(xternal)-language and I(nternal)-language has become a fundamental part of the metatheoretic discourse of diachronic generative syntax. The discontinuity between the acquired internal grammar and external language data was already basic to Lightfoot's statement of the change problem, and indeed to generative thinking about language in general. But the E-language and I-language labels made it possible to state just what is methodologically challenging about the diachronic generative enterprise: the enterprise must use E-language data to build hypotheses about I-languages (individual grammars) and how they were learned.

The period thus saw important work on the interaction between grammar change and external factors, particularly in the research of Kroch and his colleagues. These include the patterns of diffusion of a change (Kroch 1989), factors such as language contact, and the proposal that the performance of individual speakers may reflect the interaction of competing multiple grammars (Kroch and Taylor 1997).

The most important developments in thinking about syntactic changes, however, came from developments in syntactic theory. What came to be called Principles and Parameters Theory

eliminated the phrase structure rule component (Chomsky 1981), so that a statement such as (1) became no longer possible as a statement about the rule system. Continuing concerns from REST, basically about structure preservation throughout the derivation, led to a refocus on operations that permute material exploiting existing structure; this in turn led to a refocus on operations such as head movement, in large part neglected since the 1960s. The consequences of this renewed emphasis on varieties of transformational operations proved to be very rich for the field of diachronic syntax. Concretely, Roberts' (1985) treatment of the English modal auxiliaries assumed no change at all in the rule system or the basic syntactic representations generated by grammars spanning the change. Prior to the reanalysis of the modals, they are generated in V and raised to INFL; after the reanalysis, they are base generated in INFL. The importance of this basic model of syntactic change cannot be overemphasized, as I discuss in the next section.

2.3 Establishing the links

The basic paradigm developed by Roberts suggests that word order changes can result from the replacement of movement (conditioned, not always occurring) by base generation in the target position. This made it possible to extend the attention of diachronic generative syntax in a principled way to an area of traditional interest in historical linguistics: word order change. Roberts & Roussou (2003) extend the paradigm to another area of traditional concern: grammaticalization. The reanalysis of modal verbs as modal auxiliaries is exactly a grammaticalization-type change; Roberts & Roussou propose that grammaticalization in general results from raising of a lexical category to a functional head position, followed by base generation (merge) of the category there.

Against this backdrop, studies based on the richer array of dislocation operations studied since the 1980s in the Principles & Parameters framework (movement within the DP projection, movement of the verb and/or the verbal projection to various positions in the T and C domain, the varieties of remnant movement motivated since Kayne 1994) have led to the gradual emergence of a typology of movement-mediated syntactic change. Work on types of syntactic reanalysis apparently not mediated by movement, such as spec-to-head reanalysis (Whitman 2000, van Gelderen 2004a, b) lead to a similar picture: a high degree of structural continuity in grammar acquisition. Restated from the standpoint of first language acquisition: syntactic acquisition is very accurate. Constraints on the protagonists of movement may be relaxed or tightened, but the inventory of landing sites remains constant. Protagonists of movement may come to be base generated (externally merged) in the landing site, but again, the inventory of sites remains constant. The edges of a projection may become fused (specifier reanalyzed as head), but this occurs with minimal structural discontinuity, when the specifier is already a non-branching projection.

The emergence of a sense of what constitutes a natural syntactic change is an important development, not just for diachronic generative syntax, but for historical linguistics. It is potentially comparable to the emergence of a sense of what constitutes a natural sound change in the second half of the 19th century, and of what constitutes a natural phonological process in the first half of the 20th. In both of these instances, the body of work on individual languages preceded theoretical and typological syntheses, and this is the case with diachronic syntax as well. We are very close to the point where we can expect such a synthesis to emerge. The chapters in this volume are a major contribution to the process.

3. The chapters in this volume

The groups of chapters in this volume represent the expansion of empirical coverage and growth in theoretical confidence discussed above. The first two chapters by Kiparsky and Garrett in part I *Grammaticalization and Directionality of Change* touch on the theoretical status of the traditional concepts of grammaticalization, analogy and reanalysis, while the chapters by Battlori & Roca and Willis provide particular instantiations of the formal analysis of grammaticalization.

PAUL KIPARSKY takes the issue of grammaticalization back to its theoretical foundation. Meillet (1912) identified grammaticalization as a third type of change in addition to the two types recognized by the Neogrammarians, regular sound change and analogy. Kiparsky lays out the argument for a reversion to the Neogrammarian position. He does this by examining in detail the types of change that have come to be known as degrammaticalization. These involve change of a functional element to something less functional, or less restricted in its distribution, such as the “deflexion” of the English and Swedish genitive suffixes to become phrasal affixes or clitics (Allen 1997a, Norde 1997). Degrammaticalization poses a challenge for those who insist that change linking lexical to functional status is unidirectional, but Kiparsky makes a more interesting point. He argues that both grammaticalization and degrammaticalization are subtypes of analogical change. He demonstrates convincingly that known examples of degrammaticalization involve analogy of the familiar type: paradigm leveling or proportional analogy. Kiparsky argues that grammaticalization is analogy of a sort closely bound up with the generative conception of language: analogy with exemplars provided by universal grammar. Grammaticalization may thus introduce changes with no model in the surface data of the preceding generation (for example, a modal auxiliary) because this model is provided by UG.

ANDREW GARRETT's chapter examines the similarly central issue of syntactic reanalysis, from two critical angles. First, Garrett argues that many of the better known examples of reanalysis are simply not; instead they are instances of extension or morphological replacement of preexisting patterns in the language. The central role of reanalysis in diachronic syntax has been criticized before, by Haspelmath (1988) and Whitman (2000), but Garrett's contribution is

signal in that he succeeds in cracking one of the toughest nuts in the reanalysis forest: he shows that the supposed reanalysis of the *for*-PP in English for NP infinitive constructions such as *It was easy for us to solve the problem* in fact involves no syntactic rebracketing at all. Garrett's second argument is that previous analyses of valid cases of reanalysis have focused too narrowly on the syntax, where more careful scrutiny shows that the reanalysis follows naturally from the compositional semantics of the source structure. Highlighting the case of the *be going to* future in English, Garrett sketches the outlines of a semantically motivated account of reanalysis.

MONTSE BATTLORI & FRANCESC ROCA take up the issue of the grammaticalization of *ser* and *estar* in Romance, focusing on Spanish and Catalan. They link the function of these verbs both as locative predicates and as passive and progressive auxiliaries with a surface position in the head of Asp(ect)P. In early Spanish and Catalan, *ser* is moved to this position, while *estar* is base generated (merged) there. The well known expansion of *estar* at the expense of *ser* is the consequence of favouring the merge option over the move one.

DAVID WILLIS gives a minimalist analysis of development of clausal negation in Welsh. Welsh attests the familiar Jespersen's cycle with negation: the Modern Welsh negative marker *ddim* descends from the Middle Welsh noun *dim* 'thing', which co-occurred as a minimizer with the original negative particle *ny(t)* before eventually replacing it. Willis takes on the important question of the apparent gradualness of these developments, always a challenge to acquisition-based accounts of grammatical change. He argues that the "cycle" in fact decomposes into a series of stages, with the crucial stages being those where some children reanalyze *dim* as an adverb, then as a polarity adverb, and finally as the bearer of the uninterpretable [Neg] feature in the clause. The switch in the locus of this feature brings a distinctively minimalist flavour to the analysis of an important diachronic pattern.

The chapters in Part 2 focus on two aspects of change in the nominal domain: change in the function and distribution of referentially dependent items, specifically the reflexives studied by Bergeton & Pancheva and Postma, and change in the internal syntax of DP. Both areas represent expansions in the empirical coverage of diachronic generative syntax. Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Vulchanova's chapter on the article in Old Bulgarian and Guardiano's chapter on the article in Greek address parts of the famous problem of the genesis and development of articles in Balkan languages, at a new level of detail and theoretical sophistication. Crisma's chapter exploits advances in our understanding of DP syntax over the past several decades to clarify the development of DP-internal genitives in English.

UFFIE BERGETON & ROUMYANA PANCHEVA's chapter gives an innovative account of a distinctive property of the reflexive paradigm in English within Germanic: the absence of morphologically simplex reflexives like German *sich*, Dutch *zich*. Bergeton & Pancheva argue

that the complex pronoun+*self* pattern in English originates from the combination of a null pronoun plus the intensifier *pro+self*: [\emptyset [*pro+self*]]. They suggest that the spread of this intensified pattern was propagated through “anti-reflexive” predicates, which pragmatically disfavor reflexive complements, such as *threaten*, *afflict*. Anti-reflexive predicates required intensified reflexives, while corpus searches in Old and Middle English shows that inherently reflexive predicates did not, supporting the claim that *pro+self* pattern spread from the former source.

GERTJAN POSTMA accounts for the factors in the rise of *zich* as the obligatory reflexive in standard Dutch, replacing the third person pronoun *hem* ‘him’ in its reflexive function. *Zich* is a borrowing from German *sich*, but Postma argues that its establishment in Dutch is triggered by an internal change. Key to this argument is a very careful corpus study of 3rd person pronouns in reflexive contexts in Drenthe, a region where Dutch, Frisian, and German linguistic areas are in contact. In earlier Dutch, *hem* was unspecified for number, and could be used for both plural and singular objects. Postma shows that decline in the incidence of *hem* in reflexive contexts is isomorphic with decline of use of *hem* in a plural function. Based on the generalization of Reuland & Reinhart (1995) that pronouns can be used as dependent elements within chains only if they are underspecified with respect to some pronominal feature, Postma argues that the loss of reflexive *hem*, and its replacement by *zich*, was related to the loss of underspecification for number.

MILA DIMITROVA-VULCHANOVA & VALENTIN VULCHANOV argue that the article was already distinct from the demonstrative, its etymological source, by the stage of Old Bulgarian (10th-11th century). They assign the demonstrative to Spec, DP, and the article to D; the pattern of noun head followed by enclitic determiner is derived by raising N to D. Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Vulchanov’s analysis will be relevant for the analysis of any language where articles show functional overlap with demonstratives, in particular languages where a demonstrative to determiner analysis is underway. Among the diagnostics they introduce for distinguishing determiner from demonstrative is a difference in discourse function, where articles perform the usual function of cohesion (Halliday & Haan 1976), while demonstratives fulfill what Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Vulchanov call a “recall” function.

CRISTINA GUARDIANO accounts for two changes that distinguish Modern Greek from Ancient (Classical and New Testament) Greek: the requirement in Modern Greek that proper names occur with a definite article, and the rise of an indefinite article. Guardiano argues that these two changes are related. In Ancient Greek, nominal expressions could receive a singular count interpretation with a null expletive D head. The rise of overt indefinite articles indicates that the feature count had come to be grammaticalized (that is, required spellout). Once this

requirement was in place, a null expletive in D became generally unavailable, requiring the overt determiner in D selecting a proper name.

PAOLA CRISMA brings order to the bewildering complexity of genitive placement in DP in Old English. In OE DPs containing a determiner, a genitive, and the head noun, all orders are possible except those with the determiner after the noun. Crisma reduces characterizes the four basic patterns as one structurally comparable to the modern *s*-genitive, one involving an incorporated genitive (as in modern N-N compounds), a postnominal genitive, and a pattern fronting the genitive from postnominal position. The first change in the system is loss of the postnominal genitive. Three subsequent developments are affected by this change: the reanalysis of genitive *-s* in pre-head position as a phrasal clitic, the development of *by*-marking for posthead external arguments, and the development of *of*-marking. Crisma shows that the notion of a prior change “affecting” a subsequent one is complex: in the case of the reanalysis of genitive *-s*, for example, the earlier change does not force the subsequent one, but rather removes a cue that would have otherwise precluded the later change.

Part 3 shifts the focus to change in the clausal domain. The first three chapters deal with basic questions of word order and Old and Middle English.

ERIC HAEBERLI AND SUSAN PINTZUK's chapter examines the distribution of verb raising (VR) and verb projection raising (VPR) in Old English, using the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (Taylor, Warner, Pintzuk & Beths 2003). VR and VPR refer to the operations permuting a clause final tensed verb with the nonfinite verb, and the tensed verb with a verbal projection (e.g. nonfinite verb and object), found widely in West Germanic. Haeberli and Pintzuk show that OE robustly attests both VR and VPR, and shows some of the same distributional tendencies (such as VR and VPR being less common with auxiliary *have*) and constraints (such as a ban on order resulting from permuting the first and second nonfinite verbs in a string of three verbs) found elsewhere in West Germanic. In terms of distribution within OE, Haeberli and Pintzuk find VR and VPR show a stable distribution over time, but considerable variation across author and text.

ANS VAN KEMENADE & TANJA MILICEV apply a variant of the clausal architecture of Rizzi (1997) as developed by Nilsen 2003 to Old and Middle English. On this approach, topical material appears in a projection labeled ΣP above the projection hosting focalized material; the boundary between the two projections is demarcated by monosyllabic adverbs such as *ba* and *bonne*. Van Kemenade and Milicev show that pronouns appear in ΣP , along with other topical material, and provide and account for when they do not. They suggest that in the shift from Old to Middle English ΣP ceased to be exclusively associated with topics.

BRADY CLARK develops an account of the placement of NP and pronominal subjects in Old

and Middle English within the framework of Stochastic Optimality Theory. The basic change he accounts for has to do with the placement of both subject types: in OE pronominal subjects precede the tensed verb, while NP subjects can follow it; in ME, NP subjects tend to precede the verb. Clark defines a family of constraints governing possible structural types (e.g., whether pronouns project or not), hierarchical constraints, and alignment constraints governing linear order. An algorithm was used to select the grammar (the best set of constraint rankings) with the best fit to corpora derived from an OE, Early ME, and Late ME text. Clark shows that the reranking of the constraint *CANON-X'*, which forces pronouns to function as full NPs, accounts for much of the change in pronominal subject position.

ANA MARIA MARTINS examines the change that contributes to the extension of inflected infinitives to the complement of Exceptional Case marking verbs from the 16th century on. Prior to that point, inflected infinitives were rare, and originally nonexistent as the complements of ECM verbs. However Old Portuguese allowed inflected infinitives in unembedded domains, typically with an imperative import. Martin shows that contexts conjoining two infinitives, the first clearly embedded under an ECM verb, were ambiguous: they could be interpreted either as the coordination of ECM verb + infinitive with and unembedded infinitive, or coordination with gapping of the ECM verb in the second conjunct. She argues that the availability of the second interpretation contributed to the rise of inflected infinitives as ECM complements.

JOHN SUNDQUIST analyzes the Negative Movement pattern in Norwegian, where as in other Scandinavian languages, objects containing a negative quantifier (e.g. *no books*) must appear to the left of the verb, albeit with a slightly archaic or marginal flavour. The phenomenon is interesting because it can be seen to be a last vestige of OV order. Sundquist motivates the existence of a general operation of Quantifier Movement in earlier Norwegian that applied to quantified objects of all types, including negative objects. As QM was lost, NM came to be the product of a “grammatical virus” (Sobin 1997), a syntactic operation restricted to specific lexical items and syntactic environments. Sundquist demonstrates that Modern Norwegian NM demonstrates the distinctive properties of a grammatical virus, including lexical specificity and insensitivity to general constraints on object shift-type operations.

The two chapters in Part 4 demonstrate the increased range and confidence of the field. Both are on language families that were discussed in the Li (1977) volume; both address topics, polysynthesis and ergativity, that would have been considered largely morphological in 1979. The fact the authors of these chapters are able to discuss polysynthesis and ergativity in terms of a cluster of syntactic properties demonstrates the kind of progress that syntacticians too rarely are allowed credit for.

JASON HAUGEN's chapter discusses the sources for polysynthesis in Nahuatl (Uto-Aztecan).

The criteria for polysynthetic status, largely due to Baker (2001), are both syntactic and morphological. Nahuatl is unusual within Uto-Aztecan in that it fully satisfies Baker's criteria: it has obligatory noun and object agreement noun incorporation. Haugen's account challenges Lightfoot's injunction against reconstructed data, in that it uses previous work on Uto-Aztecan reconstruction to posit four previous stages with regard to polysynthesis in the family. Each, however, is represented by some attested subfamily, and the trajectory of change is interesting. Hopi, and proto-UA had only intransitivizing noun incorporation. A stage represented by Yaqui and earlier (reconstructed) Nahuatl had optional object agreement. Nahuatl represents the full polysynthetic type with incorporation and object agreement. Tohono O'odham represents a stage where noun incorporation has been lost, but object agreement remains. The scenario is far more intricate, and better supported, than such work could have been in 1979.

EDITH ALDRIDGE's chapter also builds on a syntactic account of a phenomenon that 40 years ago had mostly a morphological characterization. She presents a synchronic treatment of ergativity situated within a family of analyses that account for the so-called subject properties of the ergative argument by generating and leaving it in the base position for external arguments. Absolutive is licensed by T in intransitive clauses, *v* in intransitives. Aldridge then develops a model for the development of accusative alignment through the reanalysis of antipassives, distinguishing Malagasy and Indonesian as different stages in such a reanalysis.

One view of syntactic theory over the past fifty years sees it as a succession of theoretical upheavals, with little in the way that nonpractitioners would see as progress, such as expanded empirical coverage or results picked up by allied fields. Work on diachronic generative syntax presents a very different picture, by any objective measure. The field has pioneered a massive expansion of data resources, particularly in the form of analyzed electronic corpora. Topics such as the changes in English word order and the emergence of determiners in the languages of the Balkans have been longstanding objects of study among historical linguists. But a quick comparison, for example, of the chapters by Haeblerli & Pintzuk and Crisma with anything written before 1970, show that the establishment of a theoretical framework has led to closer analyses and better grounding theory building. Diachronic syntax is a field where we know much more than we did in 1970, and where we can expect to know much more still in this century.