

Achtung!

Dies ist eine Internet-Sonderausgabe des Aufsatzes
„Indo-European Word Order in Main and Subordinate Clauses
in a Diachronic Perspective“
von Jost Gippert (2000).

Sie sollte nicht zitiert werden. Zitate sind der Originalausgabe in
„Analecta Homini Universali Dicata. Arbeiten zur Indogermanistik,
Linguistik, Philologie, Politik, Musik und Dichtung.
Festschrift für Oswald Panagl zum 65. Geburtstag“,
hrsg. v. Thomas Krisch, Thomas Lindner und Ulrich Müller
unter redaktioneller Mitwirkung von
Michael Crombach, Stefan Niederreiter, Helga Panagl und
Ursula Pavičič, Stuttgart: Verlag Hans-Dieter Heinz /
Akademischer Verlag Stuttgart 2004,
48-68 zu entnehmen.

Attention!

This is a special internet edition of the article
“Indo-European Word Order in Main and Subordinate Clauses
in a Diachronic Perspective”
by Jost Gippert (2000).

It should not be quoted as such. For quotations, please refer to the
original edition in
“Analecta Homini Universali Dicata. Arbeiten zur Indogermanistik,
Linguistik, Philologie, Politik, Musik und Dichtung.
Festschrift für Oswald Panagl zum 65. Geburtstag”,
hrsg. v. Thomas Krisch, Thomas Lindner und Ulrich Müller
unter redaktioneller Mitwirkung von
Michael Crombach, Stefan Niederreiter, Helga Panagl und
Ursula Pavičič, Stuttgart: Verlag Hans-Dieter Heinz /
Akademischer Verlag Stuttgart 2004,
48-68.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten / All rights reserved:
Jost Gippert, Frankfurt 2013

Indo-European Word Order in Main and Subordinate Clauses in a Diachronic Perspective

JOST GIPPERT, Frankfurt a/M¹

1. The starting point of every investigation concerning the historical development of word order principles and their interrelationship with the syntactical dichotomy of main and subordinate clauses (MCs and SCs) in Indo-European (I.E.) languages is Eduard Hermann's famous article of 1895 where the position of words, esp. of the verb, was explicitly reckoned among the features that can be used for the distinction of clause types. For easy convenience, I reproduce Hermann's list of characteristic traits of subordinate clauses as appearing in ancient I.E. languages in its English adaptation provided by W.P. Lehmann (1980: 141; explanations given in parentheses are mine, J.G.):

1. special clause-connecting words (special pronouns, conjunctions);
2. shift of person (in *oratio obliqua*);
3. shift of mood (in *oratio obliqua*);
4. shift of tense (in *oratio obliqua*);
5. clause-accent of the clause (SCs enclitic with respect to MCs);
6. tempo (SCs spoken faster);
7. duration of pause between the clauses (shorter);
8. clause arrangement (narrow connection);
9. position of words (esp. of the verb: final in SCs, medial in MCs);
10. clause-accent of the verb ("enclitic" in MCs, "orthotonic" in SCs);
11. method of compounding of the verb (tmesis only in MCs);
12. words which are not clause-connectives that occur only in SCs (Greek σφεῖς, σφῶν).

1.1. In the given context, Hermann also discussed the possibility of seeing a relationship between special features of Old-Indic and (Proto-)Germanic in this respect. He stated that "the accentuation of Proto-Germanic reminds us of the accentuation of the Old-Indic subordinate clause, the method of compounding correlates with that of the Old-Indic main clause" (Hermann 1895, 533; transl. J.G.). Hermann himself remained sceptical, however, as to whether principles of word-order or features of verbal accentuation occurring in the two branches might be regarded as inherited from the common proto-language, mostly because this assumption seemed not to be supported by the data of other I.E. languages to him; his conclusion was that "it seems probable now that neither the word order nor the clause-accent nor the method of compounding of the verb

¹ A preliminary version of this paper was read on the 21st annual meeting of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft (Konstanz, 26. 2. 1999).

served as markers for a differentiation of main and subordinate clauses in Indo-European” (o.c., 535; transl. J.G.).

1.2. The proposal to see a historical relationship between SC structures of Germanic and Old Indic has nevertheless remained attractive ever since, and it seems worthwhile reinvestigating the question on a new theoretical basis. Before we can start with such an investigation, however, it is necessary to clarify some methodological implications the comparison of Old Indic and Old Germanic linguistic material brings about. It is four main dilemmas that have to be taken into account here.

2. The first dilemma consists in the problem of elucidating word order principles in metrical environments. It is a well known fact that metrical texts may dispose of special rules on various levels, and the syntactic features of word order are especially prone to this. In the case of Old Indic, this problem is crucial indeed, given that just the oldest stratum of this language is represented by the hymns of the *R̥gveda-Samhitā* (RV) which are composed in a highly elaborate metrical style; as against this, the oldest non-metrical texts (“Vedic prose”) are much younger and thus much less important for cross-linguistic studies in Indo-European terms. A few examples may suffice to show what bearing the metrical structure of the RV has on questions of word order.

2.1. As a rule, main and subordinate clauses can be differentiated in Vedic texts by the accentuation of the finite verbs they contain: while unaccented verbal forms are met with in MCs only, accented ones regularly appear in SCs². On the basis of Hermann’s assumption about the position of words (item no. 9 in the list reproduced above), we should further expect different placements of the two respective types of verbal forms to be prevalent, to wit, accented verb forms to appear at the end of a given clause, unaccented ones, in the middle. As clause-boundaries in the RV hymns usually coincide with verse boundaries³, we should further expect accented verb forms to be placed at the end of verses rather than their centre. Testing these assumptions for the RV with finite forms of a frequent verb such as *b^hr̥*, the historical equivalent of English “to bear”, we at once realise that our expectation is but partially supported by the attestations.

2.1.1. In the case of the 3.pl.pres.ind.act. with its two variants, *b^haranti* and *b^háranti* “they bear”, we note that the unaccented (“MC”) form appears 3× in a medial position of a given clause and verse as we should expect (RV 5,1,10a; 6,44,20d; 9,74,6d), but 3× it is met with in verse-final position (RV 1,115,5d; 10,102,10c; 10,79,2c), and in the first two of these cases, the verse end coincides

² As a special case, accented verbal forms occur in main clauses when they are placed initially or when a contrast is emphasized.

³ But not necessarily vice versa: A clause may well extend over more than one verse. Cf. Dunkel (1985) for a preliminary study of verse-internal sentence boundaries.

with the end of the sentence in question. For the accented variant, *b^hárantī*, we note 2 attestations in verse-final position as well (RV 1,153,1d; 7,92,2c), but 2× it occurs verse-initially (RV 1,151,8c; 8,100,9c), and 1× in a medial position (RV 2,16,4b).

2.1.2. The evidence becomes even more contradictory if we consider the case of the corresponding singular form with its variants *b^harati* / *b^háratī* “he/she/it bears”. While it is not surprising that the unaccented form is met with verse-medially only (3×: 1,152,3c; 4,17,9c; 10,138,6d), we should not expect that the same holds true for the accented form; but in fact, the “SC” form *b^háratī* too occurs only in the middle of verses (and clauses) (RV 2,16,2d; 3,55,4c; 4,16,16d; 4,22,4c; 10,87,16c).

2.1.3. It is clear that the behaviour of the verbal forms in question does not speak in favour of the assumption that the dichotomy of clause-medial and clause-final placement of finite verb forms might have been an intrinsic feature of MCs vs. SCs in the oldest stage of Vedic; the picture we observe seems to be rather ruleless instead. For parts at least, however, it can be explained in the framework of Vedic metre. The basic feature of this⁴ is the distinction of long syllables, i.e. syllables containing a long vowel or a diphthong or syllables ending in a consonant (“position”), and short syllables, i.e. open syllables ending in a short vowel, and their sequential arrangement in verses of eleven, twelve, or eight syllables⁵. The distribution of long and short syllables within the three main verse types (named *triṣṭubh*, *jagatī*, and *anuṣṭubh/gāyatrī* verses⁶ in Indian tradition), is by far not consistent; there are some preponderances, however, as to certain parts of the verses. The constellation with the highest consistency is the cadence, i.e. the final part of both “trimeter” (eleven-twelve syllable) and “dimeter” (eight syllable) verses, where short and long vowels come by turns. Another part the consistency of which is noteworthy is the “centerpiece” after the “caesura”, i.e. a break occurring after the 4th or 5th syllable in trimeter verses; this is the only verse element where a sequence of two short syllables is preferred. The typical structures thus indicated may be illustrated schematically in the following way⁷:

⁴ Cf. Arnold (1905) for a detailed survey of metrical structures of the RV; a concise survey of the types is given in Korn (1998: 9 ff).

⁵ Other types of verses (7-syllable, 13-syllable and the like) are only exceptionally met with; cf. Gippert (1999) and (1997) for an evaluation of statistical questions involved.

⁶ Originally, the names given here denote strophe types rather than verse types.

⁷ The symbols denote: ∪: regularly (> 70%) short syllable; −: regularly (> 70%) long syllable; ∩: predominantly (> 50%) short syllable; ∪̂: predominantly (> 50%) long syllable; |: caesura; ×: undistinguished syllable (“anceps”).

due to the verse-initial position), and 1× it is even placed at the end of a *triṣṭubh* verse, thus producing an exceptional cadence structure ∪× (RV 9,94,3ab):

- (1) *pári yát kavīḥ kávyā b^hárāte* *śūro ná rát'o b^húvanāni víśvā /*
 “When the seer carries about (with himself his) prophecies
 like the heroic chariot (carries about) all existences ...”

To account for this unexpected behaviour, we have to state that the hymn in question contains other irregular cadences of this type as well (*iva śúb^hah* 9,94,1a; *ná víśah* 1b), and with three exceptions in 20 verses (≈ 15%) it gives the off-hand impression of having been composed by a poet who did not know (or care for) the rules very well. If this is true, we need not consider the proposal made by H. Grassmann (1873, 957) that we should conjecture the subj. form *b^hárāte* “he is to carry about” instead⁹. This of course would yield a regular cadence (∪—×); cp. the active equivalent of this form, *b^hárāti*, which occurs 2× in just this position (RV 1,180,2c; 5,3,7a).

2.1.5.2. Let us now contrast the case of the 3rd person pres.ind.act. forms of another verb, *d^hā* “to put, to create”, which are different from the present forms of *b^hr* by having a long middle syllable in the singular and a short one in the plural. Of the 21 attestations of the unaccented (“MC”) 3rd sing., *dad^hāti* “he/she/it puts”, the majority (12) are verse-final yielding a regular cadence (RV 1,66,4b; 1,66,7a; 1,125,1a; 1,125,2b; 5,3,10a; 6,10,3d; 7,1,23c; 7,79,3c; 7,95,3c; 9,94,4b; 10,85,19c; 10,120,2b; 10,160,4c) while 9 attestations are verse-internal (RV 1,146,2c; 3,55,17b; 4,20,9d; 5,83,1d; 6,28,2d; 7,32,12d; 10,85,19c; 10,88,19c; 10,109,4d); and it must be noted that in none of these cases *dad^hāti* coincides with the centerpiece. The accented variant, *dád^hāti*, occurs 10× all in all. Most often (8×), it is placed verse-initially in MCs (RV 1,155,3c; 4,12,3c; 7,9,1c; 7,16,12c; 7,75,6d; 9,74,5c; 9,75,2c; 9,86,10c), its accentuation being due to the metrical position. As a SC predicate, *dád^hāti* appears but 2×, 1× in an internal position before the caesura (RV 5,48,4d), and only 1× at the end of a verse forming the cadence (RV 7,38,1d). The plural counterpart, *da/ád^hati* “they put”, behaves quite different from that: Both the accented and unaccented variant appear verse-internally only, coinciding, as we should expect, with the centerpiece of trimeter verses (*dad^hati*: RV 1,55,5c; *dád^hati*: RV 1,169,3d; 3,30,1b; 5,54,2c; 10,91,9c). A special case in this connection is the form *dad^hanti* appearing 1× in verse-final position. According to its formation, we should expect it to represent a 3rd pl.pres.subj.act.; in the given context, however, it contrasts with three present indicative forms, so that K. Hoffmann’s proposal to regard it as an irregular

⁹ Grassmann’s proposal neglects the parallelism of 9,94,3ab with 9,94,1ab which begins with a SC introduced by a preverb (*ád^hi*) + conjunction *yád* as well; the verbal form, *spárd^hante*, which is here placed at the beginning of the second verse, is certainly indicative, not subjunctive.

3rd pl.pres.ind.act. produced *metri causa* seems justified (RV 7,56,19ad; note that all four predicates, albeit in MCs, are placed at the end of the respective verses):

- (2) imé turám marúto **rāmayanti**_ _imé sāhaḥ sāhasa ā **namanti** /
 imé śamsam vanuṣyatō nī **pānti** gurū dvēśo āraruṣe **dadānti** //
 “These, the Maruts (winds), **calm down** the overcoming one,
 these **bend down** the powerful one’s power;
 these **protect** (our) prize from the envious one
 (and) **create** deep enmity against the greedy one.”

The parallelism of the four verses shows that in this case, it was not the metrical requirements alone that were responsible for the reshaping of the form; instead we can see an effect of analogy here which introduced the usual ending of “thematic” 3rd person plural forms, *-anti*, into **dad^hati*. This assumption is further supported by the two 3rd pl. imperative forms of the same present stem. While the “regular” formation, *dad^hatu*, is met with 1× in a trimeter centerpiece (RV 7,51,1d), we find a variant *dad^hantu* 2× verse-finally (RV 7,62,6b = 7,63,6b; both verses are the same); this not only agrees with the cadence structure, but also “rhymes” with the corresponding form of the verb *as* “to be”, *santu*, which is the predicate of the following sentence.

2.2. On the basis of the observations we have made so far, we may conclude that any statistical investigation into word order regularities of the RV (or similar metrical corpora) is worthless if it does not account for the metrical conditions. Given that the treatment of verbal predicates as the ones we have just investigated seems to depend on metrical rather than clause structures, we may even wonder whether we can at all expect to elucidate word order regularities in metrical environments; in other words, the question arises whether there are syntactic rules that prevail over metrical ones.

2.2.1. A well-suited testing case of this is the case of enclitics which form a clearly defined set of words in Vedic. It has for long been accepted that the most appropriate place of these words is the position after the first accented word in a clause or verse; this can be named “Wackernagel position” (“WP”) since the rule was first revealed in J. Wackernagel’s study of 1892.

2.2.1.1. Let us first consider the different types of words that have to be subsumed under the term of “enclitics”. The most notorious case (which is also found in many other I.E. languages) is unaccented forms of personal pronouns such as *me*, *mā* (gen.-dat./acc., 1st ps.sg.); *te*, *tṵā* (gen.-dat./acc., 2nd pers.sg.); *asya*, *asmāi* (gen./dat., 3rd pers.sg.masc./ntr.); *asyāh* (gen., 3rd pers.sg.fem.);

vām (gen.-dat.-acc., 1rd pers.du.); *naḥ* (gen.-dat.-acc., 1rd pers.pl.); *vaḥ* (gen.-dat.-acc., 2nd pers.du.); *eṣām*, *eṣu* (gen./loc., 3rd.pers.pl.masc./ntr.), *āsu* (loc., 3rd.pers.pl.fem.). An adjacent case is the unaccented forms of the pronoun *ena-* which behaves like a variant of the 3rd person pronoun; cf. the case forms *enam* (acc.sg.masc.), *enām* (acc.sg.fem.), *enā* (instr.sg.masc./ntr.); *ene* (nom.acc.du.fem.), *enoh* (gen.loc.du.fem.); *enān* (acc.pl.masc.), *enāḥ* (acc.pl.fem.). A different set of enclitics consists of the various types of unaccented particles which comprise “modal” (*sma* “just”, *ha* “indeed”, *īm* “indeed”¹⁰) and “connective” ones (*u* “as well”, *ca* “and”, *cana* “soever”, *cit* “even, just”, *vā* “or”). For these types of enclitics, the following rules of placement have been generally acknowledged:

- none of them may appear in verse-initial or clause-initial position;
 - the “connective particles” tend to follow the word they belong to
- whereas
- all but the “connective particles” tend to prefer WP within verses and/or clauses (WPV and/or WPC).

2.2.1.2. It is interesting, then, to note that the same rules seem also to be valid for some accented “modal” particles, viz. *hí* “for, namely”, *ít* “indeed”, and *tú* “but”. The question arises whether these particles can be reckoned among the “Wackernagel” candidates although they are accented.

2.2.1.3. In this connection it is worthwhile investigating whether there are internal rules recognisable in the arrangement of the items mentioned. As a first rule, we may note that the forms of *ena-* always follow *u*, *īm*, *sma*, and *te* in WP; thus we find *u enam* in RV 8,23,9c; *īm enam* / *enān* in 1,9,2a; 6,42,2a; 7,103,3a; 8,1,17b; 10,16,1d; 10,16,2b; 10,32,8c; *sma enam* in 4,38,5a; and *te (> ta) enāḥ* in 10,108,5c. As far as *sma* (appearing 108× in RV, including the sandhi variant *śma* and the lengthened forms *smā* and *śmā*) is concerned, this always precedes not only *ena-* but all enclitic forms of personal pronouns. Of the 29 attestations of this constellation¹¹, all but one are met with where WPV coincides with WPC; the only exception is RV 6,44,18d where the sequence *smā + naḥ (> no)* is placed after a finite imperative form which occupies the centerpiece of a trimeter verse, whereas in the first verse of the given stanza, we find the normal arrangement (6,44,18a-d):

¹⁰ *īm* may well have been a form of a personal pronoun (acc.sg.?) originally. — The English translations of Vedic particles given here are tentative throughout and will only for parts be adequate.

¹¹ *sma* before enclitic pronouns: RV 1,15,10c; 1,28,6a; 1,104,5c; 1,127,6f; 1,127,9f; 1,173,12b; 2,31,2a; 4,16,17d; 4,31,8a; 4,38,5a; 4,38,6a; 4,38,8a; 4,38,9a; 4,40,3a; 5,54,6c; 6,12,5a; 6,15,9d; 6,25,7a; 6,44,18a; 6,44,18d; 6,46,10c; 6,46,11a; 6,66,6c; 7,3,2d; 7,21,9c; 7,56,22c; 7,83,5d; 10,95,5a; 10,95,5b.

- (3) *āsú smā no mag^havann indra pṛtsv àsmáb^hyam máhi várivaḥ sugám kaḥ /*
apám tokásya tánayasya jeśá indra sūrīn kṛnuhí smā no ard^hám //

“In these **our** battles, generous Indra, **truly**
 prepare for us a vast area, easy to move on; in the
 gaining of water(s and) bodily issue, Indra, prepare
us a half-share (of) heroes **truly**.”

As the accentuation of the imperative *kṛnuhí* shows, the verse-internal break represented by the caesura must have been regarded as marking the beginning of a new clause here, so that *smā + nah* appear in WPC position¹².

2.2.1.4. Turning to the accented candidates, we may first state that *hí* (662 attestations including lengthened *hī*), *ít* (809) and *tú* (58, including *tū*) always precede *sma*, *īm* and enclitic forms of personal pronouns if immediately followed by them within WP; thus, e.g., we have 30 attestations of *hí + sma* in WP¹³. There is only one exception again in the sequence *smā + hí* we find in RV 4,31,7a, which can easily be accounted for by considering the parallelism which connects this verse with the first verse of the following stanza; cf. 4,31,7-8:

- (4) *utá smā hí tvām āhūr ín mag^hāvānaṃ śacīpate / dātāramāvidīd^hayum //*
utá smā sadyá út pári śaśamānāya sunvaté / purú cin mañhase vásu //
 “Also they do of course call you the generous one, lord of power,
 the giver who does not (hesitate too long,) looking around.
 And also, to the one who is active pressing (Soma), you do always
 donate a lot of good(s) **indeed**.”

Similarly, we find 36 attestations of the sequence of *hí + te*¹⁴, all of which are

¹² It is true that this interpretation remains problematical, esp. with respect to the position of *sūrīn* “heroes”. Instead of this form which is acc.pl., we should expect a gen.pl. as in 2,30,5cd where *ard^hám + kṛ* “prepare a half-share, share by halves” occurs with *gónām* “of cows”. If *sūrīn* represents a gen.pl. form, it may also pertain to the preceding verse, as another object genitive depending from *jeśé* (> *jeśá*) “in the gaining” (cp. the translation of 2,30,5 given in Geldner 1951, 313). On the other hand, the sequence *indra sūrīn* may have been borrowed from 6,17,14c where *sūrīn* is justified as an acc.pl.

¹³ *hí + sma* in WP: RV 1,26,3a; 1,37,15a; 1,128,5d; 1,129,3a; 1,133,7b; 1,169,3c; 1,173,11a; 1,173,12b; 1,180,7c; 1,180,7d; 1,180,8a; 3,30,4a; 4,3,10a; 4,10,7a; 4,29,2a; 4,43,3a; 5,7,7a; 5,23,4a; 5,45,4c; 6,2,2a; 8,1,21d; 8,21,10b; 8,25,15a; 8,27,4a; 8,27,14a; 8,86,3a; 8,92,26a; 9,20,2a; 9,87,6a; 10,12,5c.

¹⁴ *hí + te*: RV 1,8,9a; 1,24,4a; 1,25,1a; 1,30,21a; 1,36,12a; 1,80,3c; 1,114,9c; 1,127,9d; 1,170,3c; 1,173,8a; 1,175,5a; 2,18,6c; 3,32,12a; 3,52,4c; 4,12,4a; 5,79,5a; 6,18,4a; 6,21,5a; 6,65,5a; 7,5,6b; 7,22,6a; 7,32,2a; 8,1,7b; 8,3,18a; 8,13,11d; 8,17,1a; 8,45,12a; 8,45,19a; 8,46,25c; 8,48,6c; 8,53,8a; 8,61,2d; 8,75,16a; 9,78,2c; 10,23,7c; 10,144,1a.

in WPV except for RV 1,36,12a, 1,80,3c, 3,52,4c and 8,17,1a where they occupy WPC after a verse-internal sentence boundary; cp. 8,17,1a:

- (5) *á yāhi suṣumā hí te*
 “Come hither (Indra)! **For** we have pressed (Soma) **for you**.”

It may further be noted that in RV 6,18,4a (and 8,13,11d) *hí* (> *d^hi*) + *te* follows another one of the particles in question, viz. *ít*, in WPV:

- (6) *sád íd d^hi te tuvijātāsya mánye* *sāhaḥ sahiṣṭ^ha turatás turásya /*
 “**For** I regard **your** power as real **indeed**, most powerful one, (the power) of the one born mighty, of the one overcoming with overcoming energy.”

As to *ít* itself, there can be no doubt that it is placed regularly before personal enclitics when it occurs in WP; we find, e.g., 6 attestations of *ít* (> *íd*) + *me*, 17 attestations of *ít* + *te*, and 5 attestations of *ít* (> *íd*) + *nah*¹⁵. The only exception, *nú na íd d^hi váryam* in RV 5,17,5a with *ít* + *hí* (> *íd d^hi*) arranged after *nah* (> *na*), is obviously modelled after *nú na éhi váryam* with the verbal form *á+ihi* “come hither!” in RV 5,16,5a and cannot disprove the assumptions about the regular placement made here.

The same order also prevails where *tú* is involved. Thus we find 18 attestations of *tú* + *nah* all of which¹⁶ are in WPV except for 8,27,14c and 6,48,9cd:

- (7) *asyá rāyás tvám agne raṭ^hir asi* *vidā gād^hām tucé tú nah //*
 “You, Agni (fire), are the charioteer of this wealth; will you find a ford **for our** seed!”

In this way, the assumption that the accented “modal” particles *hí*, *ít*, and *tú*¹⁷ behave like quasi-enclitics in that they prefer WP whenever possible, seems to be well confirmed albeit their special function as “leaders” of sequences of enclitics remains noteworthy¹⁸.

¹⁵ *ít* + *me*: RV 5,56,2b; 7,18,4c; 7,86,3c; 8,26,17c; 10,32,3a; 10,54,5c; *ít* + *te*: 1,9,5c; 1,68,3a; 1,114,9d; 1,131,5a; 1,134,6f; 1,150,3c; 3,30,5d; 7,19,8a; 7,32,14c; 7,100,6a; 8,12,8c; 8,12,25c; 8,12,26c; 8,12,27c; 8,12,28c; 8,12,29c; 8,12,30c; *ít* + *nah*: 1,106,5a; 3,53,13c; 8,92,3a; 8,97,7c; 10,139,5d.

¹⁶ *tú* + *nah*: RV 1,10,11a; 1,29,1c = 1,29,2c = 1,29,3c = 1,29,4c = 1,29,5c = 1,29,6c = 1,29,7c; 1,169,4a; 3,41,1a; 4,1,10a; 4,32,1a; 6,48,9d; 8,7,11c; 8,21,10c; 8,27,14c; 8,81,1a; 9,72,9a.

¹⁷ *vaí* “namely” and, possibly, *nú* if not used verse-initially may be added.

¹⁸ In a recent study, H.H. Hock (1992) investigated the internal arrangement of “clitic pronouns and particles” in Vedic and some other I.E. languages with a view to distinguishing syntactical and phonological factors. Hock also arrived at the assumption of a “fixed

2.2.2. Different from the verbal forms we have treated above, the rules of enclitic placement thus established cannot be regarded as being governed by metrical factors. As a matter of fact, they must even be older than Vedic metre because they can be proved to be inherited into Vedic from an ancestor of this language, given that its closest relative, the Old Avestan language as used in Zoroaster's Gāthās, shows similar conditions to a great extent. Even though there is no indication of word-accent whatsoever in Avestan tradition, we are able to recognise not only the same types of enclitics as in Vedic, but even the etymological cognates of individual candidates. Thus we find the equivalents of the enclitic forms of personal pronouns (*mōi*, *mā* (= Ved. *me*, *mā*, gen.-dat./acc., 1st ps.sg.); *tōi*, *θβā* (= *te*, *tvā*, gen.-dat./acc., 2nd pers.sg.); *nā*, *nā* (= *nah*, gen.-dat./acc., 1st pers.pl.); *vā*, *vā* (= *vah*, gen.-dat./acc., 2nd pers.du.), but also *ī*, *īm* (= Ved. *īm*?), *īš* (acc., 3rd pers.sg./pl.?) and maybe *nā* "one". Besides these, we note "connective particles" such as *ca* (= Ved. *ca* "and"), *cit* (= *cit* "even, just"), *vā* (= *vā* "or"), and possibly *u* (= *u* "and")¹⁹. As a "modal" particle, we may note *mā* as the equivalent of Ved. *sma* albeit this is not easily distinguishable from *mā* (acc.) "me" (the three attestations in Y. 32,9-11 may be taken for granted). Finally, the three Vedic "quasi-enclitics", *hí*, *ít*, and *tú*, find their counterparts in Av. *zī*, *it*, and *tū*. The etymological identity is further supported by identical placement rules. Thus, e.g., *zī* always precedes enclitic forms of personal pronouns in WP, i.e. WPV, just as Ved. *hí* does; cp. *zī tōi* (Y. 51,8a; = Ved. *hí te*); *zī θβā* (29,6c; 43,10d; = *hí tvā*); *zī nā* (48,6a; = *hí nah*); *zī nā* (34,8a; ≈ *hí nah*); *zī vā* (53,4a; = *hí vah*), and also *zī xšmā* appearing in Y. 51,8a contains not an (enclitic) instrumental form of the 2nd person plural pronoun, which would have no counterpart in Vedic, but a (sandhi) variant of *mā* < **sma* equivalent to *sma*, the Vedic sandhi variant occurring regularly after *hi*²⁰. In the same way, *tū* precedes enclitic personal pronouns in WP (WPV); cp. *tū mōi* (Y. 43,10a; ≈ Ved. *tú me*); *tū nā* (41,3c.4e; ≈ *tú nah*); *tū ī* (39,4a). It is true that the etymological identification of Av. *tū* with Ved. *tú* is far from being certain, the former having mostly been considered as an enclitic nominative of the 2nd person singular pronoun "you" instead. If we take the syntactic behaviour into account, however, the question of whether we might have a common etymon here seems worthwhile reinvestigating again²¹.

order within 'INITIAL STRINGS'" (47). The case of the accented "quasi-enclitics" is not reflected in the sequence he established for Vedic prose, however (47, (12)).

¹⁹ *u* was assumed by Narten (1986: 112) to be hidden in *taθ.āāādū*. in Y. 35,6 and by Kellens/Pirart (1990: 225) in some other cases; the evidence for this is rather weak, however.

²⁰ Within Avestan tradition, sandhi phenomena have been preserved only when enclitics are involved; the most notorious case is the preservation of word-final -s before an enclitic beginning with *t-* as in *kas* "who" + *tē*. The development of *x-* before word-initial *š* + consonant is regular.

²¹ Cf. Strunk (1975: 321 ff.) for a detailed discussion of the problems involved. Strunk who

2.2.3. As was stated above, Avestan tradition gives no indication of word accentuation itself; and as a matter of fact, it is just the placement rules which permit to establish the classes of enclitics and quasi-enclitics in the way proposed here. In particular, there is no basis to decide whether *zī*, *it*, and *tū* were accented like their Vedic counterparts. Considering the special behaviour of the “quasi-enclitics” which consists in their arrangement in a front position of the enclitic “chain”, we may find a parallel outside the Indo-Iranian branch of I.E. languages though which indicates that their accentuation might be inherited even from Proto-I.E. times. This is the accentuation rule of enclitics in Ancient Greek which E. Schwyzler formulated in the following way (1934: 389, transl. J.G.):

“In a series of enclitics, all leading ones receive acute accent, only the last one remaining unaccented: εἶ πῶς τίς τινά ποι πέμποι. This regulation is late, however; in older times, enclitic pronouns are not affected by acute accentuation in such a series, cp. ἡ νύ σε που E 812” (σε written unaccented in SMGWKN^aK^bU^aX according to Ludwich 1902: 237).

Adopting the essentials of these observations to the case of Vedic (and, correspondingly, to Avestan), we may assume that the preforms of *hí*, *it*, and *tú* were real enclitics in the beginning and that their accented variants which appeared regularly as “leaders” in a series of enclitics, were later generalized. Within Greek, it is particles such as μέν and δέ that might have shared the same fate²². **2.2.4.** If it is true that the accentuation of Vedic “quasi-enclitics” such as *hí*, *it*, and *tú* is inherited from pre-Vedic times and that their placement in the enclitic chain in WP still agrees with the condition under which their accentuation historically emerged, we cannot expect metrical rules to have gained influence on the positioning of enclitics in the RV. It is not surprising, then, that the initial parts of RV verses show less consistency than centerpieces or cadences, for they represent an area where the inherited rules of word order remained stronger than the regulations of poetic wellformedness. Nevertheless, several questions require further investigation in this respect. It would be interesting to know, e.g.,

intended to disprove the existence of an enclitic nom.sg. of the personal pronoun (albeit he had to concede that a “short form” of the 2nd person plural pronoun, *yūš*, existed alongside *yūžəm* ≈ Ved. *yūyám*) left the question open whether the “adversative” particle *tú* might have been related with the 2nd person sing. pronoun in “prehistoric” times (324). It seems to have escaped his notice that Avestan *yūš* also behaves just like an enclitic standing in WPV-WPC in both its attestations (Y. 32,3a / 46,15c).

²² Cf. Strunk (1975: 321 with n. 51) who compared Greek δέ with Ved. *tū* in this respect. I do not see why accented “quasi-enclitics” of this type should be regarded as “tonschwach” as Strunk did; if their accent was generalised in the way indicated here, they may well have been “accented” in a normal way when they occurred in a leading position.

whether verses that do not contain an enclitic chain in WP are more regular in their initial part than other verses; whether the lengthening occurring with “short” quasi-enclitics such as *hí* (> *hī*) and *tú* (> *tū*) can always be explained as being *metri causa*; and how other types of enclitics such as vocatives or unaccented (“MC”) verbal forms behave with respect to the internal order of the enclitic chain and the metre. It goes without saying that a lot of empirical work has to be undertaken before these questions can be answered and their results can be used in cross-linguistic studies.

3. Talking about the development of word order in Germanic, we have to face a second dilemma which consists in the fact that most of the older texts we have at hand for a comparative study are translated from other languages. It can easily be shown that this may be crucial for any conclusions as to the historical processes to be assumed. Let us examine two different translation strategies represented in Old High German (OHG) texts to illustrate the impact of this problem.

3.1. One of the oldest texts available in this language, the *Regula Benedicti*, immediately reveals itself as being a “slavish” word-by-word translation of its Latin original just by arranging the two versions of the text interlinearly. Cp. the following main clause only sentence where the verb is placed in final position in both languages (3,6):

- (8) Alliu faz inti alla eht inti so altarres faz keuuithiu **pisehe**.
Omnia vasa cunctamque substantiam acsi altaris vasa sacrata conspiciat.
 “He **is to care** for all vessels and all content(s) and also the consecrated vessels of the altar.”

In the same way, more complex sentences consisting of main and subordinate clauses can be proved to be structured according to the Latin model; cp. 3,5 where the only deviation of the OHG text consists in the definite article in the phrase *dera suana* (“der Sühne”) reflecting plain Latin *iudicii*:

- (9) Unmahtigero, chindo, kesteo inti armero
Infirmorum, infantum, hospitum pauperumque
 mit eocouelihheru pihucti **ruahha tue** uuizzanti ana zuifal,
cum omni sollicitudine curam gerat sciens sine dubio,
 danta pi deseem allem in tage dera suana rediun **erkebanteer ist**.
quia pro his omnibus in die iudicii rationem redditurus est.
 “With all (necessary) concern he **is to care** for unsafe (people), children, guests and poor (people), knowing with no doubt that for all these he **will have to render** account on the day of atonement.”

3.2. As against this text, the OHG translation of Isidor’s treatise “De fide” is much less slavish although the influence of the Latin original is still perceivable

throughout. Thus we can easily find MCs with comparatively high agreement such as 5,11 (with the verb placed in the middle):

- (10) Nu auur **folghemes** dhera bigunnenun redha.
Nunc uero sequamur debitum ordinem.
 “But now **let us follow** *the necessary order* / the talk we begun.”

On the other hand, an increasing amount of deviations has to be noted where analytic verb forms are used. In cases such as the main (interrogative) clause we meet in 5,9, we may indeed suppose the word order of the OHG text, where analytic *uuard ... chiboran* ("was born") replaces synthetic *uenit* "came", to be genuine:

- (11) bihuuu uuard christ in liihhi chiboran?
 cur in carne uenit?
“Why ***came*** Christ incarnated / was Christ **born** in (a human) body?”

The same holds true for more complex syntactical structures such as the following sentence which we find in the immediate context of the one we have just discussed (5,9):

- (12) Chiuuisso **chioffanodom** uuir nu hear dhazs unser druhtin
 Probauimus *dominum nostrum*
 nerrendeo christ after dheru fleiscliihhun chiburdi iu **uuardh chiboran.**
iesum christum secundum carnem iam natum fuisse.
 “We **have proven** / Now we **have** already **revealed** with certainty here that our lord,
Jesus Christ / Christ the Saviour, **was born** ”according to flesh / the fleshly birth.“

At a first glance, the differences we have here consist in the addition of words to match the Latin accusative plus infinitive construction (by providing a subordinate *dhazs* clause) or to render the Latin perfect more adequately. At a second glance, however, we should note that the arrangement of the finite verb, *chiof-fanodom* "we opened, revealed", its subject pronoun, *uuir*, and the clause-initial adverb, *chiuiisso* "for certain", is quite the same as the one we should expect for modern High German ("gewiß offenbaren wir"), and that this cannot be due to an influence of Latin *probauimus*. Similarly we should take it seriously that the arrangement of the parts of the analytic verb form *uuard chiboran* ("was born") in the SC does not match modern usage (cp. "daß ... geboren ward/wurde"), all the more since it does not agree with the elements of Latin *natum fuisse* ("geboren worden zu sein").

3.3. A special case is provided by the language of the Gothic Bible which is the oldest source available within Germanic for syntactic investigations of the type discussed here. Here we have to take two different external factors into ac-

count, viz. the influence of Greek as the language it was originally translated from, and the influence of Latin which was later introduced when the text was adapted to usage in an Italian environment. Considering that the Latin Bible texts were composed after Greek models themselves, it is hardly surprising that we cannot decide which influence we are dealing with in the many cases where the Greek and Latin texts agree. This is true, e.g., for Mt. 6,22 where we have a MC with a nominal predicate in initial position which is well mirrored by the Gothic text:

- (13) **lukarn** **leikis** **ist** augo
 Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματος ἐστίν ὁ ὀφθαλμός
 lucerna *corporis* *est* *oculus*
 "The light of the body is the eye."

3.3.1. The same holds true for Mt. 5,28 where we meet with a more complex structure of main and subordinate clauses:

- (14) **apþan ik** **qīþa** izwis þatei
 ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι
 ego autem *dico* *vobis* *quoniam*
 hazuh saei **saiþiþ** qinon du luston izos
 πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν
 omnis **qui** **viderit** *mulierem* *ad* *concupiscendum* *eam*
 ju **gahorinoda** izai in hairtin seinamma.
 ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.
 iam **moechatus est** *eam* *in* *corde* *suo*
 "But I say unto you, that whosoever **looketh** on a woman to lust after her **hath committed** adultery with her already in his heart."

Here, however, we may note a certain preference for the Latin model in the usage of *hazuh saei saiþiþ* "everyone who sees" which matches with Latin *omnis qui viderit* rather than Greek πᾶς ὁ βλέπων both in its elements (a finite verb vs. a participle) and in their ordering. And in *apþan ik* "but I" which introduces the whole sentence, we may even grasp a proper feature of Gothic, given that both Latin and Greek show the reverse order of elements.

3.3.2. A similar case is *ip jabai* in the beginning of Mt. 6,15 where, by the way, the Gothic text gives a clear indication of depending from a certain branch of the Greek NT tradition²³:

²³ According to Nestle/Aland (1963: 13), the additional phrase "τα παραπτωματα αυτων"

(15)	ip jabai	ni	aftetip	mannam	missadedins	ize
	ἐάν δέ	μη	ἀφήτε	τοῖς ἀνθρώποις	τα παραπτώματα	αυτων
	<i>si autem</i>	<i>non</i>	<i>dimiseritis</i>	<i>hominibus</i>		
	ni þau	atta	izwar	aftetip	missadedins	izwaros.
	οὐδὲ	ὁ πατήρ	υἱῶν	ἀφήσει	τὰ παραπτώματα	υἱῶν.
	<i>nec</i>	<i>Pater</i>	<i>vester</i>	<i>dimittet</i>	<i>peccata</i>	<i>vestra</i>

”But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.”

Here, too, we have to state a divergence of word ordering as against both the Greek and the Latin text, *ip* corresponding to *autem* / δέ and *jabai*, to *si* / ἐάν.

3.4. On the basis of these observations, we come to the conclusion that a reliable argumentation about word order (and other syntactic) principles is possible in translated texts only when there are notable differences as against the presumed models. And indeed, the Gothic Bible reveals some regularities even under these premises. It can, e.g., easily be shown that the sequence *apþan ik* we noted in Mt. 5,28 is the usual correspondant of Greek ἐγὼ δέ or γάρ and Latin *ego autem* or *enim*, appearing 9× in this constellation²⁴; the reverse order, [†]*ik apþan*, is not attested at all, and we may conclude that *apþan* was no enclitic while Latin *autem* / *enim* and Greek δέ / γάρ were. In the same way, *ip jabai* can be proved to be the most regular equivalent of Greek ἐάν or εἰ δέ and Latin *si autem* or *vero*²⁵, but also of *quod si*²⁶; as the reverse order, [†]*jabai ip*, is not attested albeit sentence-initial *jabai* does occur²⁷, we may conclude that neither *ip* nor *jabai* were enclitic.

4. A third dilemma we have to take notice of when dealing with word order regularities in Old Germanic languages is the problem of differentiating ”marked“ and ”unmarked“ structures. In a text like the Old Saxon *Heliand*, which is a versified renarration of the gospels, this may be a problem of poetic rather than translation techniques, given that it is composed in alliterative long lines which seem to have no model outside of Old Germanic. Investigating the

is met with in the cod. Vatic.gr. 1209 (4th century) and several other Greek manuscripts but has no equivalent in the Latin tradition.

²⁴ Mt. 5,22; 5,28; 5,34; 5,44; 2.Kor. 1,23; 12,11; 12,15; 2.Kor.B 1,23; 12,11; 12,15; Gal. 5,11; 2.Tim. 4,6.

²⁵ Mt. 6,15; 6,23; Jo. 10,38; 12,24; Lk. 10,6; 14,34; 20,6; Rom. 7,3; 7,16; 8,9; 13,4; 14,15; 1.Kor. 10,28; 11,6; 15,17; 1.Tim. 3,5; 5,4; Phile. 18.

²⁶ Mt. 5,29; Mk. 9,50; Rom. 9,22; 11,12; 11,17; 11,18; 1.Kor. 7,9; 7,11; 7,15; 11,31; 15,17; Gal. 5,15; Phil. 1,22; 2.Thess. 3,14 (also in the ”Nebenüberlieferung“). Besides, *ip jabai* corresponds to *nam si* / εἰ γάρ in Gal. 6,3 (also in the ”Nebenüberlieferung“), *et si* in 2.Kor. 5,16 (also in the ”Nebenüberlieferung“), *si* alone in Rom. 12,20 and 1.Kor. 10,27 and *alioquin* in Jo. 14,11.

²⁷ E.g., Phil. 2,1; Kol. 3,1 (also in the ”Nebenüberlieferung“); Rom. 12,20.

position of finite verbs in this text, we will easily find examples of MCs with a finite verb in the second position, which immediately reminds us of present day German usage; cp. verses 348-350 which also show that sentence boundaries did not necessarily coincide with verse boundaries (for easy convenience, both a German and an English translation are given here):

- (16)
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <i>o̅bar thesa uu̅idon uuerold.</i> | <i>That gibod uuarð gil̅estid</i> |
| <i>[te] allaro burgeo gihuuem.</i> | <i>Uuerod samnoda</i> |
| über diese weite Welt. | — "Das Gebot wurde befolgt |
| in jeder aller Burgen." | (Das) Volk sammelte (sich) |
| allover this wide world. | — "That command was fulfilled |
| at every one of all castles." | People gathered |

Modern German word order is met with in SCs as well, as in the relative clause contained in verses 350-351:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <i>thea fon them kêsur̅a</i> | <i>Fôrun thea bodon o̅bar all,</i> |
| — | <i>cumana uu̅ârūn.</i> |
| die von dem Kaiser | "(Es) fuhren die Boten überall (herum), |
| — | gekommen waren. " |
| who had come from the emperor." | "The messengers travelled around everywhere, |

In the same context, however, we will also note the initial placement of the finite verb, *fôrun*, in the MC, contrasting with both German and English usage. It is a mere suggestion that this placement might be historically related with the phenomenon of a dummy subject *es* appearing in German when the syntactical slot before the finite verb is not filled by either the subject or an adverbial (and the translation given above is intended to illustrate this suggestion). Without further investigation, however, this does not help to elucidate whether the placement in question was marked within Old Saxon and what special function it had.

5. The relative clause contained in the example we have just discussed is well suited to indicate the fourth dilemma that has to be considered when dealing with word order phenomena in a genetic perspective. The question whether the placement of the finite verb in a Germanic SC might be inherited from I.E. times depends to a great extent on the question whether the given clause type itself can be regarded as being inherited; and in the case of a relative clause, it is the relative pronoun which is crucial to this question. As a matter of fact, Old Saxon *thea* (and German *der*, *die*, *das*) do not represent one of the etyma that yielded relative pronouns in other branches of I.E. Here, we find the well-known dichotomy of pronouns descending from (interrogative) **kʷi-/kʷo-* (Latin *quī*, Hittite *kuiš*, Slav. *kъ*- etc., but also Germ. *hw-* in German *wer*, *welcher* and Eng-

lish *who, which* etc.) vs. pronouns reflecting **(H)io-*²⁸ (Indo-Iranian *ya-*, Greek *ὅς*, Armenian *or*, Slav. *i-že* etc.) instead. Although the mutual relationship of these two formations is still far from being clear²⁹, we may state that the etymon of Old Saxon *thea* and its Germanic cognates is not likely to have shared the function of a relative pronoun with them as early as Proto-I.E. times; its usage in the ancestor language must have been restricted to being a demonstrative pronoun still. If this is right, P.I.E. **to-* must have undergone a considerable development on its way leading to Germanic **pa-* in that it became able to introduce and constitute relative SCs. And indeed, Indo-Iranian yields some evidence as to how this might have taken place.

5.1. In RV 7,97,4c, we notice a very peculiar syntactic constellation where the noun *kāmaḥ* (> *kāmo*) "wish, desire" is correlated with the accusative of the demonstrative pronoun, *tām*; the peculiarity consists in the fact that the latter may well depend on the following finite verb, *dāt* "he will give", while the noun, being in the nominative, cannot. The only interpretation possible is that we have a pendent nominative here which is resumed anaphorically by the demonstrative pronoun in the case governed by the finite verb; cp. the following translation which emphasizes the parenthetical character of the clause thus produced:

- (18) *sá ā no yónim sadatu prēṣṭhō* *bṛhaspátir viśvāvāro yó ásti /*
kāmo rāyāḥ suvīryasya tām dāt *pārṣan no áti saścáto áriṣṭān //*
 "This one is to sit down on our lap (as) the most beloved,
 Brhaspati, who is preferred (by) every(body);
 the desire of wealth (consisting) of good men (sons) — **this he will grant,**
 he will lead us unharmed past (our) prosecutors."

²⁸ The question whether there was a laryngeal in this etymon is still debated; it need not concern us here.

²⁹ A reconstructive scenario of Proto-I.E. relative clauses was published by H. Hettrich (1988: 776 ff.), who distinguishes three stages in the development: In the beginning, there were no relative clauses with finite verbs at all, relative participles being used instead; in a second stage, sentences with "anaphoric" **(H)io-* were reinterpreted as appositive relative clauses belonging to the preceding clause, whereas sentences with indefinite **k'i-/k'o-* were reinterpreted as restrictive relative clauses belonging to the following clause; in the final stage, the differentiation of restrictive and non-restrictive relative pronouns as constituted in the second stage was given up again (in post-Proto-I.E. times), **(H)io-* replacing **k'i-/k'o-* in Indo-Iranian and Greek and **k'i-/k'o-* replacing **(H)io-* in Latin, Hittite etc. Hettrich's scenario leaves many questions open, however; e.g., there is no account of the fact that in several Middle Iranian languages (Middle Persian, Parthian, Sogdian) as well as Modern Greek, the former interrogative pronoun adopted the function of a relative pronoun (again?).

5.2. It is interesting, then, to note that this special syntactic arrangement may have been inherited from Proto-Indo-Iranian, given that we find quite a similar case in the Old Avestan Gāthās (Y. 43,13c). Although the context of this verse is much less clear in all its details than the one of the RV verse quoted above, we at once realise the same basic features here: the etymological equivalent of Ved. *kāma-* appears in a different case (gen.sg. *kāmahiiā*) than the anaphoric pronoun *tām* (= Ved. *tām*) resuming it; this, on the other hand, introduces a separate parenthetical clause governed by *dātā* "you will give"³⁰. Cp. the following tentative translation of the complete stanza (Y. 43,13):

- (19) *spəntəm. at.θβā. mazdā. mənghī. ahurā.*
hiiaṭ.mā. vohū. pairī.jasaṭ. manahhā.
arəθā. vōizdiiāi. kāmahiiā. tām.mōi. dātā.
darəgahiiā. yaoš. yām.vā. naēciš. dārəšt. itē.
vairiia. stōiš. yā. θβahmī. xšaθrōi. vācī."

"I have realized thee, Mazdā Ahurā, as (being) holy.

When he surrounds me with good thought,

the goals are to be recognized, (the goals) **of the desire — this you will grant me —**

for a long life, (a desire) which no one has prevented you (from) aiming at,

(the desire) for the preferable existence which is said (to prevail) in thy dominion."

5.2.1. A different interpretation of the given constellation was recently published by H. Humbach (1991: 155) who obviously regarded *tām* as cataphoric rather than anaphoric:

- (20) "I realise that Thou art prosperous, O Wise Ahura,
when one attends me with good thought,
to take heed of the (dutiful) purposes **of (my) desire. This You have imparted to me:**
(the desire) for a long life, which nobody obliges You to agree,
(and) for a desirable possession which is said (to be) in Thy power."

On the basis of the parallelism with RV 7,97,4c, however, the assumption of a parenthetical clause seems well founded, all the more if we consider the position of the genitives depending on *kāmo* in the Vedic verse.

5.2.2. Another difference in the two translations given here consists in the interpretation of the relative clause introduced by *yām* (acc.sg.masc.) which can only refer to *kāma-* again. The crucial point of this is *itē*, an infinitive form of the verb *i* "to go". In the present context, it may suffice to state that the inter-

³⁰ Both for Ved. *dāt* and Av. *dātā* it is not clear whether these are injunctive or subjunctive forms. As we should expect a subjunctive *dātā* to count as trisyllabic (*daata*) in Old Avestan, the former solution seems more probable. For the analysis of the clause type, this is less important.

pretation in the sense of "to strive for, to aim at" proposed here can be justified on the basis of a comparison with Vedic again: Here, we meet with several occurrences of *i* accompanied by *ártʰam* "goal" as its direct object as in 2,30,2d:

- (21) *divé-dive dʰúnayo yanty ártʰam* //
 "Day after day, the roaring ones (Maruts = Winds) go for (their) goal."

And *ártʰa-* can be proven to be closely related by its usage with *kāma-*, just as its Gāthic counterpart, *arəθa-*, is related with *kāma-* depending on it in Y. 43,13. Cp. RV 8,79,5-6 where yet another item of the "Avestan context" appears, viz. *āyus* "life time" (nom.sg., ÷ Av. gen. *yaoš*):

- (22) *artʰíno yánti céd ártʰam* *gácʰān íd dadúšo rātím* /
vavrjyús tʰsyataḥ kāmam //
vidád yát pūrvyám naštám *úd im ʀtāyúm trayat* /
prém āyus tārīd áīrnam //
 "And when the **industrious** go for (their) goal(s),
 they will (with the help of Soma) obtain the giver's present,
 they (even) ought to fulfill the **desire** of the greedy one.
 He (Soma) stimulates the righteous one
 so that he can find what was lost before,
 he should (even) prolong the unpassed **life time**."³¹

5.3. If we can take the assumption for granted, then, that Indo-Iranian disposed of parenthetical clauses introduced by the demonstrative pronoun, we may well suppose that both these and the Germanic relative clauses introduced by the etymologically identical pronoun might have emerged from a common Proto-I.E. prototype. This assumption has an implication about word-order, of course; for if the clauses in question were (parenthetical) MCs, not SCs, we should not expect SC but MC word-order to be represented in them (if these were at all distinct). Unfortunately, the Indo-Iranian examples we can quote so far do not permit to draw final conclusions about the word-order prevailing in them. Even if we do not consider the problematics of establishing word-order principles in metrical contexts as treated above, the given clauses simply are too small to decide whether the finite verbs contained in them are placed "internally" or "finally". One special feature of the "parenthetical" clauses should not be neglected in this context, however: The demonstrative pronoun introducing them is the direct (accusative) object. We cannot tell yet whether this was a marked order of MCs in Indo-Iranian or Proto-I.E.; but it is certainly not marked in a relative clause of the Germanic type.

³¹ A further example of *ártʰam* + *i* is RV 1,113,6a.

Bibliography

- Arnold, E.V. 1905. *Vedic Metre in its historical development*, Cambridge: CUP / repr. 1967. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Dunkel, G.E. 1985. "Verse-internal sentence boundary in the R̥g-Veda: a preliminary overview". In *Grammatische Kategorien: Funktion und Geschichte*, B. Schlerath (ed.), 119-133. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Geldner, K.F. 1951. *Der Rig-Veda*. 1. Tl. Cambridge, Mass.: HUP.
- Gippert, J. 1997. "Laryngeals and Vedic Metre". In *Sound Law and Analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S.P. Beekes on the occasion of his 69th birthday*, A. Lubotsky (ed.), 63-79. Amsterdam / Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- Gippert, J. 1999. "Neue Wege zur sprachwissenschaftlichen Analyse der vedischen Metrik". In *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*, H. Eichner and H.Chr. Luschützky (eds.), 97-126. Praha: enigma.
- Grassmann, H. 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Hermann, E. 1895. "Gab es im Indogermanischen Nebensätze?". In: *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 33: 481-535.
- Hettrich, H. 1988. *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen*. Berlin / New York: de Gruyter.
- Hock, H.H. 1992, "Reconstruction and syntactic typology: A plea for a different approach". In *Explanation in historical linguistics*, G.W. Davis and G.K. Iverson (eds.), 105-121. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins [Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 84]
- Hoffmann, K 1975. *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. Bd. I. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kellens, J. and Pirart, E. 1990. *Les textes vieil-avestiques*. Vol. II. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Korn, A. 1998. *Metrik und metrische Techniken im R̥gveda*. Graz: Leykam.
- Lehmann, W.P. 1974. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin / London: UoT Press.
- Lehmann, W.P. 1980. "The Reconstruction of Non-simple Sentences in proto-Indo-European". In: *Linguistic Reconstruction and Indo-European Syntax. Proceedings of the Colloquium of the 'Indogermanische Gesellschaft', University of Pavia, 6-7 September 1979*, P. Ramat (ed.), 113-144. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ludwich, A.L. 1902. *Homeri Ilias*. Lipsiae: Teubner.
- Narten, J. 1986. *Der Yasna Haptaṇhāiti*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Nestle, E. and Aland, K. 1963. *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*. 25. Aufl. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt.

- Porzig, W. 1923. "Die Hypotaxe im Rigveda. I." In *Indogermanische Forschungen* 41: 210-303.
- Schwyzler, E. 1934. *Griechische Grammatik*. I. München: Beck.
- Strunk, K. 1975. "Horizontale Verkettung und vertikale Flexion in indogermanischen Sprachen." In *Flexion und Wortbildung*, H. Rix (ed.), 296-324. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Wackernagel, J. 1892. "Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung." In *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1: 333-436 / *Kleine Schriften*, 1953, 1-103. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Text quotations are taken from the electronic texts incorporated in the TITUS database (cf. <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/texte2.htm>).