Abstract

This study presents empirical data on the historical development of the SOV order. SOV is the neutral/basic and most frequent order for Classical Greek, but it is ungrammatical with full DPs in dT in Modern Greek. I argue that this significant change can be located in Koine Greek and is demonstrated in all registers of this period and not only in the Septuagint – i.e., a translation of an original text written in a VSO language (Biblical Hebrew) – nor only in Biblical Greek. The parameter resetting that affected word orders is related to T-features and dT, that is, to the position of V in T and to the case properties of subjects and objects.

1. Introduction

The aim of this study is to present empirical data on the historical development of the Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) order. SOV is the unmarked/basic word order for Classical Greek (CG); both S and O can appear in domain T (dT) in CG. S and O can also appear in domain C (dC) in CG if S and O are focused and the order is not neutral. The starting point of the study is a significant word order change: SOV not only ceased being the unmarked order for Greek but it also became ungrammatical with non-clitic objects; SOV with nouns is ungrammatical in Modern Greek (ModG) if S and O are not in dC (Roussou & Tsimpli 2006; see Section 3.1).

In Koine Greek (KG), object clitics can appear preverbal, and SOV with clitics becomes the frequent order (but not the neutral/basic order). Instead, VSO\(^1\) and SVO are the unmarked orders for KG; this holds not only for the New Testament (NT), as shown by Kirk (2012), and for Biblical Greek (BG) in general but also for non-Biblical Greek (see Section 2.2).

The new grammar of KG – as demonstrated in the new basic/neutral order (VSO), the very frequent order with the new preverbal object clitics (SOV), and the new status of the early basic order (SOV with nouns), which becomes ungrammatical if subject and object are not focused – is the result of a parametrical resetting in Greek related to T-features and dT. I will argue that this parametric change includes a change in dT (the domain of the grammatical relations) and T head and can account

\(^1\) I will not refer to other properties of word orders in KG, such as partial agreement with postverbal subject orders due to space restrictions. For partial agreement and clauses with postverbal subjects, see Lavidas (forthcoming).
for the development of SOV not only to a marked order (replaced by VSO in the role of the unmarked order) but also to an ungrammatical order with S and O, as full nouns, in dT. I will further show that the development of SOV from a basic to an ungrammatical order of Greek is not an epiphenomenon of translations written in Greek, as evidenced in the Greek Septuagint (LXX), or of the specific register of BG. The comparison of the data from BG to other non-Biblical KG and non-translations of the period reveals similar characteristics for other texts as well (cf. Janse (2002, 2014) who provides a discussion of the translation effects in the LXX as well as of the bilingual situation in the Hellenistic-Roman period). 2

In Section 2, the main properties of basic word orders in CG and KG are presented. Section 2.1 presents SOV and verb-initial orders in CG and shows that verb-final clauses are basic for CG, whereas verb-initial clauses involved movement of V in C. Section 2.2 discusses SOV and the new VSO in KG in detail, with an emphasis on frequencies. Frequencies reveal a clear decrease for verb-final orders and an increase for verb-initial orders. SOV is replaced by SVO and VSO as the basic order in KG not only in the LXX or the NT but also in non-Biblical KG. In Section 3, the parameter resetting that affected word orders in Greek is presented: this parameter resetting is related to T-features and dT and can account for the change in the availability of the basic verb-final orders (SOV and OSV).

2. Word order change in Greek

2.1 SOV in pre-Koine Greek

In this section, I show that SOV is the basic order of pre-KG; however, verb-initial orders are available even in pre-KG, albeit with V in C. The aim of this section is to provide a basis for discussion of the changes in word order that emerge in the following stage of the history of Greek (KG).

CG has been considered (a) as a language with SOV- and SVO-dominant word orders due to their high frequencies (see [1] and Table 1), and (b) as a discourse configurational language (cf., among others, Dik 1995; 2007; Devine & Stephens 2000). For Dik, CG shows the following order of constituents: Setting > Topic > Focus > V > Remaining elements.

KG was in intense contact with other languages, such as dialects of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Latin. I will state the question of language contact as a factor that plays a role in word order change, following Taylor (2008):

“However, when addressing synchronic variation or change over time, in which changes in frequencies are an integral part of the evidence base, the possible effect of contact must at least be considered.” (Taylor 2008, 341–42).

We should notice that Bible translations – even though they show examples of both direct and indirect translation effects (Taylor 2008) – constitute a type of a parallel corpus, which is homogeneous with regard to the pragmatic contexts (Gianollo 2011).
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[1] SOV
καὶ ὅλη ἡ ψυχὴ εἰς τὴν βελτίστην φύσιν καθισταμένη τιμιωτέραν ἑξίν λαμβάνει
‘And the entire soul, returning to its nature at the best, attains to a much more precious condition’ (Pl. R. 9.591b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Order</th>
<th>SOV</th>
<th>VSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Word orders in main clauses in Classical Greek based on Fraser (2002, 74); samples from Oresteia, Medea, and Crito

One could reformulate the second characterization (“discourse configurational language”) as a property of a language with multiple possible movements to dC, in contrast to the absence of movement to T, as I would claim for Ancient Greek (AG).

Verb-initial clauses in CG have been described as exceptional/occasional (Viti 2008). Indeed, it appears that V-initial clauses are not neutral orders, as they are in Biblical (NT, LXX) and non-Biblical KG (see Section 2.2), but VSO orders in CG should always be derived with V in C. The following factors, which are almost all related to dC, trigger V-initial clauses in early IE languages and AG (Luraghi 1995; Viti 2008): imperatives; yes–no questions; presentative clauses meaning ‘there is’; clauses after adverbial clauses; short clauses, such as “said X”; and focused verbs that introduce new discourse topics (see [2] and [3]).

[2] VSO
(νὴ Δί’,) ἔφη ὁ Κῦρος
‘(“Yes, by Zeus”), Cyrus said’ (X. An. 1.7.9)

[3] VSO
λύουσι γάρ, ἔφη, οἱ ἕνδεκα Σωκράτη
‘For, he said, the eleven are releasing Socrates (from his fetters)’ (Pl. Phd. 59e)

In a similar manner, Luraghi’s (1995) conclusion on V-initial clauses in AG can be interpreted as an evidence for V-to-C: according to her, verb-initial declarative clauses express textual discontinuity (junctures) or unexpectedness in discourse or in the course of events. Sentences with initial verbs in AG have a discourse function and, therefore, constitute a regular variant of the neutral order SOV. According to this approach, the lower frequencies of VSO in AG can be accounted for, because VSO clauses show unexpectedness – they are discourse ‘organizers’ for focus on discontinuity in discourse.

To summarize, CG shows a clear contrast between a dominant and unmarked SOV and a marked VSO for specific functions with a focused V. This situation is totally reversed in KG: SOV becomes ungrammatical with full nouns and VSO changes into a neutral order for KG. Section 2.2 presents relevant frequency and other data from the registers of BG and non-Biblical KG.

3 Delbrück (1900), among others, calls SOV the “habitual” word order for PIE in contrast to the “occasional” VSO order.
2.2 SOV in Koine Greek

In this section, I analyze frequency facts and show that a significant decrease in use of verb-final orders can be observed for KG. This new grammar, with a change in the basic word order and the development of the early basic SOV order into an ungrammatical order with full DPs, is evident not only in the LXX (probably influenced by the VSO Biblical Hebrew language) but also in the NT as well as in non-Biblical KG texts.

KG has been analyzed as a period of transition in parameters for word order in Greek (Horrocks 1997, 59; Taylor 1994; Lavidas 2013). The Semitic influence has been considered a significant factor for the changes in the Greek word order (see also Section 1). For instance, according to Blass & Debrunner (1961, 471), the neutral order for NT Greek is with the verb immediately after the conjunction and the subject and the object after the verb. For them, these verb-initial orders, especially when occurring in Mark, are due to a Semitic influence (see also Maloney 1979). On the other hand, Horrocks (1997, 59–60) adds an internal explanation for the higher frequency of VS in KG: V appears before S in KG because V moves to the initial position to be adjacent to the clitic, which is attested in the second position.

The LXX has been also analyzed as a text that shows VSO as the basic order, even though the main question in most studies on the LXX seeks to understand whether word order can constitute a tool in the identification of translation Greek. The hypothesis of a word order for Biblical Greek, which also influenced writers who needed to be scriptural, is repeated in many relevant studies, starting with Moulton & Howard (1920, 478).4

Kirk (2012) demonstrates that VSO and SVO, but not SOV, are significantly present in pragmatically neutral contexts in the NT. For Kirk, NT Greek patterns align better with ModG than with CG: VSO and SVO are the predominant and pragmatically neutral word orders in NT Greek when there is no topic or focus on a particular element. However, there is no consensus on VSO as basic order for KG; this is mainly because previous studies base their results on frequency facts, and frequency is related to other various parameters, such as register or context. Terry (1993, Section 5.3), for instance, disagrees that VSO is a basic order for KG because no VSO is attested in 1st Corinthians. According to him, SOV and SVO are the basic orders for KG, similar to what holds for CG.

On the other hand, many scholars consider VSO, rather than SOV, the unmarked order for KG. For Friberg (1982, ch. 3) and Davison (1989), for instance, SVO and VSO are the basic word orders for KG even though SVO orders sometimes have pragmatically marked (focused or topicalized) subjects. Friberg’s data show that in

4 However, it should be noted that Rife (1933) has presented close frequencies for VSO and SVO in the texts of Deuteronomy, 1 Kingdoms, Tobit, and 1 Maccabees, while VSO appears to be the prevalent order in the texts of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 3 Kingdoms, 4 Kingdoms, and Judith.
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Luke, 27.3% of all clauses with noun Ss, simple noun Os, and indicative verbs are VSO (Friberg 1982, 30–34); furthermore, his data show that the verb is initial in 40.8% of all clauses with a single overt S and a verb (Friberg 1982, 191). Taylor’s (1994) data on word orders in Luke’s gospel contain all tensed clauses (including questions, relative clauses, and embedded clauses) and not only declaratives as in Terry’s or Davison’s data. She also counts nouns and no pronouns but further includes participial subjects, and this may result in a higher frequency for SV than VS (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VSO</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10.92%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50.04%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>verb medial: 63%</td>
<td>81.12% [38/52 SVO = the genealogy list at the beginning of the gospel]</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>45.87%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>verb final: 8%</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>44.85%</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOS</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>verb initial: 31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVS</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>verb medial: 63%</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>17.25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSV</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>verb final: 8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Word orders in the NT

In Figures 1a–b and 2, I present the results of my corpus search in all books of both the NT and the LXX. The purpose of this detailed corpus search is to compare the presence of word orders in KG in different types of registers as well as to search for differences among different types of books of the same register, such as more and less literal books of the LXX. According to Thackeray (1909, 17), for instance, the Pentateuch, Isaiah, and 1 Maccabees represent the Good KG, whereas Judges, Ruth, and Lamentations are completely literal or even unintelligent. Horrocks (1997, 57) agrees that the Pentateuch appears to be the contemporary KG, whereas Lamentations is extremely literal. Taking advantage of the morphological annotated corpus of Gramcord, I searched for all clauses that contain a subject in the nominative, an object in the accusative, and a verb in the indicative mood, in any order, but with no other element interfering among them because of the lack of a syntactically annotated corpus for the LXX. All results of this corpus search were checked manually.

SVO is the most frequent order both in the NT and the LXX. On the other hand, SVO does not appear to be significantly more frequent than the new neutral order, VSO, in the LXX (SVO: 22.60% vs. VSO: 21.57%), but it is significantly more frequent in the NT (SVO: 47.52% vs. VSO: 15.14%). A Pearson chi-square test was performed to assess the relationship between word orders and these texts. The results with respect to the LXX are not statistically significant for the comparison between
SVO and VSO ($\chi^2=.031$, $p=.861$); on the other hand, the results with respect to the NT are statistically significant for the comparison between SVO and VSO ($\chi^2=24.367$, $p<.001$), with an effect size of $\phi=.349$, which is a medium size effect.5

The frequency of VSO is higher in KG than in CG (Figures 1a–b, 2 vs. Table 1) because VSO can be now the result of two derivations: with V in C (as in CG) but also with V in T. The new status of VSO seems to be readily apparent in the translation of the LXX but less evident in the NT, where SVO is present in most of the cases with full DPs. The situation is similar with SOV (and all verb-final orders); the predominance of SVO in the NT does not allow verb-final orders to appear as frequently as in CG; while in the LXX, their presence is not high, but SOV is still the third order in frequency after SVO and VSO.

The comparison of orders in the more literal texts of the LXX (Judges, Ruth, and Lamentations) and the texts that represent KG (Pentateuch) presents a complex picture: the Pentateuch shows many VSO clauses, in contrast to what we would expect (VSO: 24.30%), and Judges follows the Pentateuch in this respect (VSO: 24.11%), demonstrating that there is no difference between literal and less literal texts of the LXX in terms of word orders; the frequencies of word orders in Lamentations (for instance, VSO: 17.83%) are more similar to the situation in the NT (VSO: 15.14%) than in the other texts of the LXX (for instance, VSO in the Pentateuch: 24.30%).6

**Figure 1a: Word orders in the LXX (Part 1).**7

5 Due to space restrictions, the discussion of the statistical results will be short (see below).

6 These results are not statistically significant. A Pearson chi-square test was performed to assess the relationship between the different texts and word orders. The results with respect to VSO are not statistically significant for the comparison between: (a) VSO in the Pentateuch and VSO in Judges ($\chi^2=.001$, $p=.975$); (b) VSO in Lamentations and VSO in the NT ($\chi^2=.263$, $p=.608$); and (c) VSO in Lamentations and VSO in the Pentateuch ($\chi^2=1.259$, $p=.262$).

7 For abbreviations of authors and works, see *LSJ* (Liddell, Scott & Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*). [http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsj/01-authors_and_works.html]
**Figure 1b: Word orders in the LXX (Part 2).**

To summarize, the data from KG and the detailed frequency facts present evidence that the word order system has been reversed from pre-KG systems: SOV clauses in KG are significantly less frequent than in CG, and they do not represent the basic/unmarked order because they are only allowed with S and O in dC (see also Section 3). VSO clauses in KG are significantly more frequent than in CG, and they are the basic/unmarked order with S and O in dT. These new facts hold not only for the LXX (a translation of a text written in a VSO language, Biblical He-
brew) but also for other registers of KG as well. Moreover, the variation among more and less literal texts of the LXX does not indicate that the new system of word orders follows the Biblical Hebrew source, with frequencies depending on the literal nature of the text, but rather that it reflects the established new rules of KG. In Section 3, I discuss possible reasons for this new system of word orders and conclude that changes in T and dT in the form of a parameter resetting can be the basis of an explanation of the relevant data.

3. A new grammar: Changes in dT and word order

We have seen that SOV is not the dominant and neutral order in KG and that SOV became ungrammatical with full DPs. In this section, I further compare possible word orders in CG and KG, looking at the changes that affected SOV. I propose that these changes are part of a parameter resetting in Greek and that they are related to the development of the T-features and dT.

KG is similar to aG in terms of the derivations with V in C but not with V in T. With regard to V-to-C, the particle ἄρα has been considered to mark the C-domain; therefore, if V appears before ἄρα, V can be in the C-domain. This is definitely the case for KG: see [4]–[6] for NT Greek (according to Kirk’s analysis) as well as LXX Greek and non-Biblical KG. CG also shows V before the particle ἄρα; see [7].

[4] V-ἄρα:
Εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον
‘I find then the law, that …’ (Ep.Rom. 7:21)

[5] V-ἄρα:
ἱσταίη με ἄρα ἐν ζυγῷ δικαίῳ
‘Let me be weighed in an even balance’ (LXX, Jb. 31:6)

[6] V-ἄρα:
Ἔστιν ἄρα τις ἐμπειρία καθάπερ τοῦ λέγειν οὕτως καὶ τοῦ ἀκούειν;
‘Is there then a skill in hearing also, as there is in speaking?’ (Arr. Epict. 2.24.5)

[7] V-ἄρα:
καὶ ἐνενόησα τότε ἄρα καταγέλαστος ὤν
‘And so in that moment I realized what a ridiculous fool I was’ (Pl. Smp. 198c)

In contrast to CG (see also Section 2.1), V-to-T movement can be claimed for NT Greek as well as for LXX Greek and non-Biblical KG. KG in all its registers meets all criteria for V-to-T languages: (a) it has verbal inflection for all persons and numbers, and it is a pro-drop language (among many others, Bobaljik 2002); and (b) it shows synthetic tense-mood-voice distinctions (Biberauer & Roberts 2010). The second criterion is significant for the relevant difference between pre-KG and post-KG: AG, for instance, presents many cases of voice lability for active vs. passive distinctions; whereas there also exist many examples of expression of mood through particles such as through the particle ὤν. KG and post-KG demonstrate a new T/Asp/
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Voice/Mood system different from the one in AG. For instance, in NT Greek, periphrases, such as periphrases with perfects, emerge, and changes in voice demand mediopassive endings for all verbs in passive constructions and active endings for anticausatives and for all alternating transitives with an accusative object. Notice that, following Biberauer & Roberts (2010), it is not person/number inflection but tense/aspect inflection that is connected to V-to-T movement.

Moreover, V appears before VP-level adverbs in the NT (Kirk 2012). This holds for other BG and non-Biblical KG texts as well, but not always for CG; see [8]–[11]. V can be in dV – after the VP-adverb – in CG. Of course, V is also attested before a VP-adverb in CG because of the possibility of V-to-C; the V-to-C possibility obscures the results for VP-adverbs.

[8]  V-ADV
καὶ ἐνέβλεπεν τηλαυγῶς ἀπαντα.
‘And he saw all things clearly’ (Ev.Marc. 8:25)

[9]  V-ADV
καὶ ἐξετάσωσιν οἱ κριταὶ ἀκριβῶς
‘The judges will look into the situation very carefully’ (LXX, De. 19:18)

[10]  V-ADV
Ὅστις οὖν τοῦτο μέμνηται καθαρῶς ὅτι...
‘Whoever then clearly remembers that …’ (Arr. Epict. 1.28.10)

ἀκριβῶς γὰρ ἐπίσταται καὶ μέμνηται
‘He knows and remembers them with accuracy’ (Pl. Ly. 205b)

Accordingly, VSO clauses are present in all stages of the Greek diachrony (see also Lavidas 2013), but VSO clauses in CG are derived with V in C and not with V in T. This difference has obviously affected the frequencies of word orders, particularly the increase of VSO in post-CG (see Section 2.2).

SOV and OSV (verb-final orders) in ModG are ungrammatical with full DPs if S and O are in dT (the domain of the grammatical relations) and not in the dC (the domain of discourse and information structure). According to Roussou & Tsimpli

---

8 See Moser (2008) for a detailed analysis of the changes in Aspect/Tense.

9 The mediopassive endings block only the accusative case in KG and post-KG (Lavidas 2012). Of course, these changes are also relevant to changes in case (see below).

10 The following evidence also shows the presence of a T head of a different type in AG (mainly in Homer) than in KG or ModG:
   (a) Kiparsky (1996) and Condoravdi & Kiparsky (2001) have shown that no TP is syntactically projected in Homeric Greek; the change to VO from the verb-final orders of CG is the result of the rise of a T node in Greek that can host the finite verb. For Kiparsky, the inflected verb in Homeric Greek belongs to the composite category VT.
   (i) Kiparsky (1996):
      a. CP [VIP [ clitic ... ] ]
         (Homeric Greek)
      b. CP [IP [VP [ clitic ... ] ]]
         (KG)
   (b) Moser (2008; 2009) argues that the three verb stems (present, aorist, perfect) in Homeric Greek are neither tenses nor aspects but “lexical-ontological distinctions” linked to Aktionsart.
OSV in ModG is ungrammatical because of an inflectional requirement to have S in a higher position than O in dT.\footnote{Roussou & Tsimpli (2006, 344):} For Roussou & Tsimpli, the ungrammaticality of the ModG SOV order with nouns (SOV is possible with an object clitic in ModG) is connected to the T-features of ModG.\footnote{Roussou & Tsimpli (2006, 345):}

The inflectional requirement for OSV must also be valid for CG, because nouns in CG are not only inflected for case according to their position (subject or object position) in a similar manner to ModG but are also inflected for the genitive, dative, or accusative case depending on the th-role of the object. This difference related to the cases of the objects in CG, as well as the different positions of V in CG than in KG, can account for the availability of verb-final orders as neutral orders in CG but not in ModG. I will briefly refer to the case system of CG as it is distinguished from that of post-KG below. Furthermore, the change in tense and aspect system of KG, as described in Moser (2005, 2008) in detail, can be considered a significant reason for changes in the objecthood and SOV in Greek. According to this approach, CG allows SOV as a neutral word order, with both S and O in dT, because of the different features activated in dT in CG as compared to ModG. The relationship between the subject and T in dT in CG is not as close as in ModG and is not structurally expressed in the same way in CG as in ModG.

With regard to the case system of CG and dT, cases are not structural but inherent in pre-KG.\footnote{The relevant evidence is derived from the distribution of the accusative and the genitive case and the characteristics of determiners (demonstratives) in pre-KG. According to this view, Greek demonstrates a change in the grammatical object role, similar to other Indo-European languages (for instance, English; see van Gelderen 2000; 2011).} The accusative case becomes structural in KG. The accusative, genitive, and dative cases are interpretable in pre-KG; the accusative marks Themes; the dative Goals; and the accusative and the genitive are distinguished in terms of aspect (the genitive expresses Partial Affectedness). Pre-KG marks accusative, genitive, dative case, aspect, and definiteness through an Inner ASP(ect) head (Lavidas forthcoming). Therefore, objects are not able to block the relation between subjects and T in pre-KG,
HOW DOES A BASIC WORD ORDER BECOME UNGRAMMATICAL?

and SOV is a grammatical and neutral order for CG. On the other hand, KG is the stage when Greek acquires a new aspect system and new markers for definiteness. The loss of the genitive and dative cases for marking objects is the result of the change in the case system (and voice system; cf. Lavidas 2009; 2012) and not because of phonological changes. This parameter resetting in the diachrony of Greek is also evident in the development of aspect. Aspect changes from expression of situation-type oppositions to expression of viewpoint aspect oppositions (Moser 2008; 2009; Lavidas 2012).

This parameter resetting can also be shown in the following contrast between pre-KG (CG, for instance) and post-KG (ModG, for instance): the empty D in dT is not necessarily to be lexically filled (see Guardiano 2011, among others), and T properties in CG do not require the presence of a definite article (see [12]). On the other hand, preverbal bare subjects are ungrammatical in ModG. A type of parameter resetting affected both articles and bare nouns and T properties, or, in other words, the feature-matching properties between D and T. For this reason, SOV orders with full DPs are possible in CG in neutral contexts, and orders with preverbal bare subjects (SOV or SVO orders with bare subjects) are attested in CG.

[12] bare SOV:

κηρύκες μὲν ὁδῷ ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἔχευαν

‘Men servants poured water over their hands’ (Hom. Od. 1.146)

To summarize, in this section, I have presented a possible explanation for word order change in Greek. According to this account, a parameter resetting in Greek is responsible for the rearrangement of word orders: SOV (the basic order of CG) changed into an ungrammatical order with full DPs, while VSO (a marked, infrequent order of CG) became the basic order of Greek. This parameter resetting is related to changes in T-features and dT as the presence of V in T and the new (structural) case system demonstrates.

4. Conclusions

I have discussed empirical data on word orders in historical Greek to show how a significant word order change occurred in Greek: the change of SOV from a basic order of CG to an ungrammatical order of KG and post-KG with full DPs. I have shown that this significant change can be demonstrated not only in the LXX, a translation of an original text written in a VSO language (Biblical Hebrew), but also in other texts and registers of Biblical and non-Biblical KG. Evidence for the change is provided in the NT and in texts of non-Biblical KG as well. Change in neutral word orders reflects a parameter resetting related to dT.

14 Cf. ModG in (i).
 [i] a. *(Μερικές/Οι) κοπέλες συνάντησαν τον Πέτρο.

‘(Some/The) girls met Peter’

b. ΦΟΙΤΗΤΕΣ συνάντησαν τον υπουργό.

‘It was students who met the Minister’ (from Roussou & Tsimpli 2006, 341).
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