The surface order of these sentences is the same but the underlying structure is different:

```
  NP
 /   |   \
/     \
/         \
 A N Con N
small lakes and ponds
```

```
  NP
 /   \
/     \
/            \
 AP
|   |   |
A N Con N
small lakes and ponds
```

Underlying syntactic structure includes tree structure (constituency) and parts of speech.

Surface structure includes word order and case marking.

**Reanalysis** involves changing the underlying structure but not the surface structure.

Finnish

```
Miehe-n rinna-lla
man ‘s chest on
```

The locative marker -lla meaning ‘by’ came to mean more figuratively ‘next to’ but no word reordering occurred.
There are no word ordering changes, just internal structure changes.

He will conquer (He wants to conquer)

He will conquer (He will conquer-future)
**Extension** involves changing surface form but not underlying structure.

Old Finnish

näen miehe-m       tule-va-m
I see  the man   (who is)   coming

The accusative case is marked by -m

A phonetic change -m > -n causes accusative and genitive to have same suffix: -n

Modern Finnish:

näen miehe-n       tule-van
I see  the man   (who is)   coming

The genitive and accusative are now both marked by -n so the interpretation is now “I see the coming of the man”

The phonetic change cause a syntactic reinterpretation or extension that went beyond cases caused by the -m > -n change:

Old Finnish

näin   vene-t       purjehti-vat
I saw  the boats   that  sail
-t is the accusative plural

Modern Finnish

näin   vene-iden   purjehti-van
I saw  the boats   that  sail
-iden is genitive plural

Spanish

El   se           peina
he   himself   combs

El   se           entierra en la iglesia
he   himself   buries   in  the church

The reflexive structure has two interpretations for an animate subject:

1-Reflexive: He has himself buried in the church.
2-Passive: He is buried in the church.

The passive interpretation was extended to inanimate subjects.

La comida se vende en la calle
Food itself sells on the street

The only meaning is passive: “Food is sold on the street.”
French (red ts aren't pronounced)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>il</th>
<th>dort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he</td>
<td>sleeps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>il</th>
<th>est</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dort</th>
<th>il?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sleeps</td>
<td>he?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>est il?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is he?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Non-Standard French ‘ti’ is reanalyzed as a question word which is then extended even to verbs with no /t/.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tu</th>
<th>vas</th>
<th>ti?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Les</th>
<th>filles</th>
<th>sont</th>
<th>ti</th>
<th>en train de diner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The</td>
<td>girls</td>
<td>are</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>in the middle of eating dinner?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sort of reanalysis and extension causes grammaticalization

Words for man or boy become masculine morphemes
Words for give become dative morphemes
Words for need, want, go, come, after become future morphemes
Words for sit, stay, live become habitual markers

Postposition became a comitative case marker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10.5: Comparison of Balto-Finnic ‘with’ forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanssa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Postp)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Syntactic Borrowing

English uses progressive tense to express different aspects:

They're eating (right now)
They're coming (next week)
They're getting along well (lately)

Bilingual Spanish speakers may have extended meanings of progressive.

Old English
I want that you come.
They forced that I go.

Latin

COEGERUNT ME IRE
They made me to go

COEGIMOS EOS REMANERE
we forced them to stay

Modern English
I want you to come
They forced me to go

Normal English
Who did you go with?
Which one did you eat out of?

Latin doesn't allow prepositions at the end of sentences. English grammars followed Latin

Stilted English
With whom did you go?
Out of which one did you eat?
Can you do comparative syntax?

(13a) **Finnish:** näin häne-n tule-van [genitive]
I.saw he-Gen come-Part
‘I saw him coming/that he comes’

(13b) **Estonian:** nägin te-da tule-va-t [accusative]
I.saw he-Acc come-Part-Acc
‘I saw him coming/that he comes’

(13c) **Võõre:** näin me:s-sä tuh-va-a te:tä mö [accusative]
I.saw man.Acc come-Part-Acc street along
‘I saw a man coming/who comes along the street’

Compare **Finnish:** näin miehe-n tule-van tietä pitkin [genitive]
I.saw man-Gen come-Part road along
(same meaning)

(13d) **North Saami:** son oia’dna boc’cu-i-d vuol’-ga-m [accusative]
he see reindeer-Pl-Acc leave-Past.Part-Acc
‘he sees that the reindeer have left’

Compare **Finnish:** hän näkee poro-j-en lähte-neen [genitive]
he sees reindeer-Pl-Gen leave-Past.Part
Clitic climbing in Spanish

A quería comprar los
he wanted to buy them

B los quería comprar
them he wanted to buy

The clitic has “climbed” to preverbal position in B

Clitic climbing across time