

SYNTAXE DES LANGUES INDO-IRANIENNES ANCIENNES

Colloque international - Sitges (Barcelona) 4-5 mai 1993

Organisé par l'Institut du Proche-Orient Ancien
(Université de Barcelone)

Actes édités par E. Pirart



EDITORIAL AUSA

Apdo. 101 - 08280 SABADELL - BARCELONA

Institut del Pròxim Orient Antic

AULA ORIENTALIS - SUPPLEMENTA

Director: G. del Olmo Lete

6

© 1997 by G. Dunkel, A. Hintze, S.W. Jamison, J. Kellens, A. Panaino, G.-J. Pinault, E. Pirart, P.O. Skjærvø, J.-M. Verpoorten, B. Vine, C. Watkins.

© 1997 by Editorial AUSA
Apartado de Correos 101
08280 SABADELL (Barcelona) Spain

ISBN: 84-88810-34-2
Dep. Legal: B-41.356 / 1997
Impreso por COMGRAFIC, S.A.

AVANT-PROPOS

Sans doute n'y avait-il guère plus de différence entre la langue du Mède Dîocès, celle du Perse Téispès et celle de l'Indien Sudās qu'entre la valencien et la catalan central. Le lexique, la morphologie et la syntaxe ne devaient pas avoir divergé à partir du proto-indo-iranien au point de rendre abscons chacun des dialectes aux oreilles des locuteurs des autres, mais, pour nous, les zones d'ombre dans l'analyse de la syntaxe des dialectes indo-iraniens anciens et de leurs prolongements médiévaux sont encore nombreuses.

Les organisateurs du Colloque international de Sitge (Palau Maricel, les 4 et 5 mai 1993)¹ n'avaient d'autres prétentions que celle de favoriser le progrès des connaissances en la matière, mais aussi celle de faire renaître les études d'indo-iranologie ancienne à Barcelone. L'Institut Interuniversitaire d'Études du Proche Orient Ancien exprime sa profonde reconnaissance aux participants du colloque pour leur contribution, leur patience et leur amabilité.

É. Pirart

¹. Organisé avec l'aide du Ministère espagnol de l'Éducation et de la Science, de la Généralité de Catalogne et de l'Université de Barcelone.



Participants au colloque (de gauche à droite): É. Pirart, J. Kellens, A. Panaino, G.-J. Pinault, A. Hintze, B. Vine, A. Watkins, P.O. Skjærø, J.S. Klein, St.W. Jamison, J.-L. García Ramón, G. Dunkel

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

	pag.
É. Pirart, <i>Avant-propos</i>	7
G. Dunkel, <i>Mono- and disyllabic á in the Ṛgveda</i>	9
J.L. García Ramón, <i>Infinitivos y abstractos verbales en indoiranio: las formaciones en - (C)ani en Ṛg-Veda</i>	29
A. Hintze, <i>Parataxis and Hypotaxis in the Avesta</i>	51
S.W. Jamison, <i>Syntactic Constraints on Morphological Change: The Vedic Imperatives bodhi, dehi, and dhehi</i>	63
J. Kellens, <i>Les fonctions du génitif en vieil-avestique</i>	81
A. Panaino, <i>Considerations on the 'mixed fractions' in Avestan</i>	91
G.-J. Pinault, <i>Le substantif épithète dans la langue de la Ṛk-Saṃhitā</i>	111
E. Pirart, <i>Avestique hīm</i>	143
P.O. Skjærvø, <i>On the Middle Persian Imperfect</i>	161
J.-M. Verpoorten, <i>The double negation in the earliest Upaniṣads and in the ancient philosophical Bhāṣya</i>	189
B. Vine, <i>On the Expression of Reflexive Possession in the Rig-Veda: RV svá-</i>	203
C. Watkins, <i>'Throng-lord of throngs': an Indo-Iranian stylistic figure</i>	215

PARATAXIS AND HYPOTAXIS IN THE AVESTA*

Almut Hintze, Freie Universität Berlin

1. As so many terms of our cultural and scientific heritage, the terms parataxis and hypotaxis are Greek. In classical Greek, however, the verbal abstract παράταξις, first attested in Isocrates, who lived in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., is used as a military and a political term denoting the marshalling of a line of battle or of a political party. The term ὑπόταξις, attested from the first century B.C. onwards, is likewise used in military tactics meaning the 'drawing up of light-armed troops behind the phalanx'.

At some stage these military terms were introduced into language studies. The first record of this is found in the second century A.D., when the Alexandrian grammarian Apollonios Dyskolos uses the term ὑπόταξις as a grammatical term denoting the placing of a pronoun or an adverb behind the word to which it refers. As the opposite of ὑπόταξις Apollonios Dyskolos uses πρόταξις 'placing in front'¹. The term παράταξις, however, is not used at all as a grammatical term in Ancient Greek. The dictionaries of Ancient and Byzantine Greek do not record any attestation of these terms in the way they are used in modern syntax. The same situation is found with the Latin translations *coordinatio* and *subordinatio* that underlie the modern terms coordination and subordination: the terms *coordinatio* and *subordinatio* are not used as grammatical terms either in Classical or in Medieval Latin. The technical value of the terms in question in the way they are used today in syntactic studies is therefore probably the artificial creation of a scholar of the renaissance or post-renaissance period who used the Greek language for coining technical terms. More precisely, it seems that these terms were given the technical meaning they have today and were put in opposition to each other not before the nineteenth century. According to DELBRÜCK, *Vgl. Syntax* III 413 it was Friedrich THIERSCHE who introduced the term παράταξις into syntactic studies of clauses in the third edition of his *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialekts* from 1826. Subsequently the term ὑπόταξις was used as the opposite of παράταξις².

*. I am grateful to Heinrich Hettrich (Würzburg) for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this article.

1. E.g. *De Pronominibus, Grammatici Graeci* II 1, p.116,5; *De Adverbiis, ibid.* p.125,6ff.: Μηδὲ ἐκεῖνό γε παραλείφω, τί δὴ ποτε, εἰ καὶ ἐν ὑποτάξει ἐστὶ τὰ ἐπιρρήματα τοῦ ῥήματος καὶ ἐν προτάξει, ἀπὸ τοῦ προτετάχθαι τὴν ὀνομασίαν ἔλαβε '...if the adverbs are in post-position of the verb and in pre-position, from the posting in front they have acquired their name'.

2. Also the *Oxford English Dictionary*, vol. VII, 1933, p.465 considers the grammatical term *parataxis* as a modern adoption of the Greek παράταξις 'a placing side by side'. It was used by William T. Brande in his *Dictionary of Science, Literature and Art* in 1842. *Parataxis* and *hypotaxis* were first used as a contrasting pair in English literature by B.L. GILDERSLEEVE in *American Journal of Philology* 4, 1883, 420: "Now to make hypotaxis out of parataxis we must have a joint".

Thus, compared to Apollonios Dyskolos's use, the term hypotaxis has acquired a different meaning in modern linguistic theory and in addition is put in opposition to parataxis. Both terms are commonly used today in the syntax of complex sentences to denote the relationship between two clauses, namely between two main clauses or between a main clause and a subordinate clause³.

A paratactic construction means the coordination of grammatical units such as phrases or clauses on an equal status; the speaker adds one element to another on an equal level. A hypotactic construction, on the other hand, is a construction in which phrases or clauses are subordinated to each other. In this construction the speaker puts phrases and clauses into relation to each other and expresses that relation by the way he subordinates one unit to the other. A hypotactic construction, therefore, expresses primarily a relationship. The sentence is only complete when the individual units being put into relation with each other have been formulated by the speaker⁴.

As far as the origin of subordination with conjunctions in Indo-European languages is concerned, it is generally agreed in historical syntactic studies that in most cases it arose out of the relative clause. On a comparative basis it is possible to postulate for the Indo-European period a number of subordinate clauses introduced by a conjunction, as e.g. various types of conditional clauses⁵, final⁶, and explicative clauses⁷. However, studies on the historical and comparative syntax of complex sentences presuppose a detailed investigation into the individual types of subordinate clauses in individual languages together with their formal and semantic characteristics. As far as the Vedic material is concerned, such a study has been made recently by Heinrich HETTRICH⁸. For the closely related Old Iranian branch the relative clause in Avestan has been treated by Hansjakob SEILER in his work *Relativsatz, Attribut und Apposition*, and in the Older Avesta by Jean KELLEN and Eric PIRART in the second volume of their work

3. The terms *coordination* and *subordination* may have in addition a broader meaning, being used not only on the level of clauses but also on the level of word forms. Coordination is used on the morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic level; subordination denotes also the relationship between noun and attribute, predicate and object (BUSSMANN, *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft*. Stuttgart 1990, 424, 752).

4. The subordinate clause may only be defined from its relationship to the main clause. Thus functionally it may represent a part of the main clause, that is subject, object, attribute, or adverb; semantically the subordinate clause may be described as a conditional, consecutive, causal, final, or temporal clause. Or the subordinate clause may be classified from the subordinating conjunction that connects it to the main clause as conjunctive, relative and indirect interrogative clause. The syntactical function of the subordinating conjunction can be described as putting thoughts into relation. On the various definitions of the subordinate clause see HETTRICH, *Hypotaxe* 9-29.

5. HETTRICH, *Latein und Indogermanisch* 263-284.

6. HETTRICH, *KZ* 100, 1987, 219-237.

7. See RIX, *Fs Szemerényi* 730-735.

8. H. HETTRICH, *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen*. Berlin/New York 1988.

*Les textes vieil-avestiques*⁹. Yet subordination with conjunctions in the Avesta has barely been studied.

In this article, however, I intend rather to discuss the question of how far paratactic construction is in use beside hypotactic construction in Avestan. I will concentrate on clauses introduced by a subordinating conjunction rather than on pronominal subordination, and I shall not consider those clauses that are introduced by a relative adverb, as Av. *yaθra* 'where', *yaθa* 'how', etc.

2. Indian and Iranian share a great number of subordinating conjunctions. It is therefore reasonable to assume that they developed in the Indo-Iranian period. Conjunctions that serve as subordinators in Old Iranian and Vedic may be grouped in the following way:

- a) Case forms of the relative stem IE **je/o-*: OAv. *hiiaṭ*, YAv. *yaṭ*, Ved. *yád*; OAv. *yāṭ*, Ved. *yád*, *yásmād* 'since'; YAv. *yahmiia* 'where', OP *yanaiy* 'while, whereby'¹⁰; YAv. *yahmāi* 'until'.
- b) Derivatives from the relative pronoun: OAv. *yaθā*, YAv. *yaθa* 'how', OP *yaθā*, Ved. *yáthā*; OAv. *yaθrā*, YAv. *yaθra*, Ved. *yátra* 'where, to which place'; Ved. *yátaś* 'from where'; OAv. *yadā*, Ved. *yadā* 'when'; YAv. *yaδōiṭ* (< *yaδa* + *iṭ*) 'as far as'; OP *yadā* 'where' (< **ja-dha*); YAv. *yeiḍi* 'if, when', OP *yadiy*, Ved. *yádi*; OAv. *yezṭ* 'if', YAv. *yezi*; OAv. *yāṭ*, Ved. *yád* 'as far as'¹¹; OAv. **yā.tā* 'as far as'¹²; OP *yāṭā* 'until'¹³; OAv. YAv. *yauuaṭ* 'as long, as far as' (also Istr.Sg. OAv. (Y 43.8) *yauuaṭ.ā*, YAv. *yauuata*), OP *yāvā*, Ved. *yávat*, cf. Gk. ἕως 'as long as'.
- c) Subordinating conjunctions not derived from the relative pronoun are not found in Old Iranian. In Vedic there is only the *ca*, *céd* (**ca-íd*) introducing a subordinate clause¹⁴.

It emerges from this list that the range of subordinating conjunctions used in Old Iranian is limited to case forms of the relative pronoun and adverbial derivatives from it. This

9. *Ibid.* p. 53-64; 77-79, 83-84, 87-88, 91-92; 185-6 (*yezṭ*), 187-8 (*hiiaṭ*). In general, complex sentences in IE languages have not been studied extensively. In many cases the grammars of individual IE languages do even not include a syntax. The various grammars of Old Iranian languages are no exception from this. BARTHOLOMAE's "Awestasprache und Altpersisch" in *Grundriß der Iranischen Philologie* I 1, Straßburg 1895-1901, 152-248 does not include a chapter on the syntax, nor does the *Handbuch des Altpersischen* by MAYRHOFER and BRANDENSTEIN, Wiesbaden 1964. An exception is F. SPIEGEL's *Grammatik der altpersischen Sprache*, Leipzig 1867, REICHEL'T's *Elementarbuch* and KENT's *Grammar of Old Persian* which include syntax.

10. Xerxes, Van 22 (cf. KENT, *Old Persian* p.153): *utā ima stānam hauv niyaštāya kantanaṭy yanaiy dipim naiy nipištām akunauš* 'and this niche he gave orders to dig out, while he did not cause an inscription (to be) engraved', see MAYRHOFER, *Indogermanica. Festschrift für Wolfgang Krause*. Heidelberg 1960, 123f. fn.20., who analyses *yanaiy* < **ianā* (Instr.Sg.) + *id*.

11. On OAv. *yāṭ*, ved. *yád* see NARTEN, *YH* 166.

12. See on this NARTEN, *YH* 119-120 and below with fn. 19.

13. According to KLINGENSCHMITT *MSS* 30, 1972, 108 fn.6 adverbial accusative from a stem IE **iaḥ₂nt-*.

14. On IE *-kʷe* introducing a subordinate clause see HETTRICH, *Hypotaxe* p.2 with references and *Latein und Indogermanisch* 279ff. On the function of Vedic *ca* see *Hypotaxe* 250-261.

can be considered as supporting DELBRÜCK's view that in most cases subordination with conjunctions has arisen out of the relative clause.

3.1. More evidence in support of this view emerges, when one looks closer at what types of subordinate clauses occur in the Avestan texts. Based on the lexicon to the texts of the Older Avesta by KELLENS/PIRART it emerges that the only type of subordination with conjunctions that is at all frequent is the clause introduced by *hiiat*. KELLENS/PIRART II 332 list 44 instances of this type. Next in frequency is *yezī*, which goes back to a combination of *ya* and the particle *zī* (< Ir. **iad-žhi*): *yezī* is attested eight times as a subordinating conjunction (KELLENS/PIRART II 293). The third segmental subordinator found in the Old Avestan texts is *yadā* 'when' introducing three times a temporal clause (Y 30.8, 50.9, 31.4) and once an indirect interrogative clause (Y 31.16)¹⁵. Finally, there is *yaθā* being used once to introduce a subordinate clause (Y 44.1: final clause)¹⁶.

Subordinate clauses introduced by a conjunction are even more rare in the Yasna Hap̄tanhāiti: There are only two subordinate clauses and they are both introduced by *hiiat* (Y 35.3, 38.4 according to the index by NARTEN, YH 310)¹⁷.

The other subordinating conjunctions found in the Old Avestan texts function as relative adverbs: *yaθrā* 'where' (nine times)¹⁸, *yauuat* 'how much', *yāt* 'as far as, insofar' Y 32.4 (< **iāh₂nt*), **yā.tā* Y 35.7¹⁹ and the old adverbial ablative of the relative pronoun *yāt* 'since' (Y 36.6)²⁰.

The large majority of conjunctive subordinate clauses are introduced by *hiiat*, but also the number of subordinate clauses introduced by *hiiat* is small compared to the number of relative clauses, which is the only type of subordination really frequent in the texts of the Older Avesta. To give an impression of the proportions: compared to 44 clauses introduced by the conjunction *hiiat* there are 285 relative clauses found in the Older Avesta, according to the lexicon of KELLENS/PIRART²¹.

15. KELLENS/PIRART II 291, however, consider this conjunction to be a univerbation of *hiiat* and *ā*.

16. Y 44.1 d-e (Y 44,12 in KELLENS/PIRART II 290 is a misprint for Y 44,1e, cf. *ibid.* p.88):

(d) *at nā ašā friiā dazdiiāi hākurañā* 'Let friendly fellowships be granted us by truth

(e) *yaθā nā ā vohū jimaṭ managhā* so that one may come to us with good thought.' (HUMBACH, *Gāthās*² I 156).

17. *yaθā* occurs three times (Y 35.6 twice, see below with fn.30; Y 39.4), but only as a relative adverb 'how' correlating in two instances with *aθā*.

18. In Y 31.12 **armaitiš mainiiā* **pərəsaitē yaθrā maēθā* KELLENS/PIRART II 291 consider *yaθrā* as an indirect interrogative. However, it can also be interpreted with HUMBACH, *Gāthās*² I 129 als a relative adverb 'where': 'right-mindedness takes counsel with the spirit where (right-mindedness is) present'.

19. According to NARTEN, YH 120 **yā.tā* is a genitive dependent on *isāmaidē* 'zu wieviel wir imstande sind'.

20. See on this stanza NARTEN, YH 41, 164-167.

21. This number does not include 29 instances, in which the relative pronoun does not introduce a subordinate clause, according to the list given by KELLENS/PIRART II 61-62, such as nominal relative constructions in which an attribute is connected with a noun by a relative pronoun. The relative pronoun may be in the same case form as its nucleus, as e.g. Y 28.9b *manascā hiiat vahištām*; 32.5b *hiiat vā akā managhā yāng daēuuōng akascā mainiiuš* 'because the evil spirit along with evil thought (had lured) you, the Daēvas'; 35.4 *tāiš šīiaoθanāiš yāiš vahištāiš* 'through the actions that (are) the best'; Y 45.8: *viādarasēm ... yām mazdqm ahurēm* 'I have just now

3.2. Also in the Younger Avesta the relative clause is by far the most common type of subordination, and the most common conjunctive subordinator is *yaṭ*. Thus, for instance, in Yt 19 *yaṭ* occurs in 26 instances as a subordinating conjunction in temporal, causal, final and consecutive function; next in frequency comes *yezi*, which occurs four times in Yt 19 to introduce a conditional or a temporal subordinate clause; *yaθa* is attested three times as a causal or final subordinator, and *yaθa yaṭ* once to introduce a consecutive clause. Thus, only *yaṭ*, *yezi* and *yaθa* are used as segmental subordinators in Yašt 19, and among them *yaṭ* is - as in the Older Avesta - by far the commonest²².

A similar situation is found in Yašt 5: here also only the three conjunctions *yaṭ*, *yaθa* and *yezi* are used as subordinators: *yaṭ* occurs 13 times²³, *yaθa* 16 times²⁴ and *yezi* once²⁵. The relatively frequent use of *yaθa* besides *yaṭ* is explained by the recurrent formula *auuat āiiaptəm dazdi mē vaṇhi səuuište arəduuṭ sūre anāhite* 'Give me that boon, o good, strongest Arəduuṭ Sūrā Anāhitā', where the following subordinate clause is introduced indifferently by *yaṭ* or by *yaθa*.

Subordinate conjunctive clauses are even more rare in Yašt 8, although it must be taken into consideration that it is a smaller text: here *yaṭ* is found only twice and *yaθa* once

seen ... him, the Wise Ahura'. The nominal relative group may be a genitive attribute, as e.g. 31.6b *māθrām yim hauruuatātō* 'the formula concerning integrity'; 46.1d *daxiiūš yōi sātārō drəguuāntō* 'the deceitful tyrants of the land'; 46.3a *yōi uxšānō asnəm* 'bulls of the day'; 46.8a *yā vā mōi yā gaēθā dazdē +aēnaghē* 'and if someone aims at my herds to injure (them)'. An example for the relative pronoun being not in the same case form as its nucleus is Y 53.5c *vaēdō.dām daēnābīs +abiiascā ahūm yā vaṇhēuṣ managhō* 'accept with (your) religious view, and in accordance with them, the existence which (is that) of good thought' (all translations by HUMBACH, *Gāthās*²). See on this also HETTRICH, *Hypotaxe* 786ff.; KOCH, *Indogermanisch, Slawisch und Baltisch* 71.

22. Also in the Rig-Veda *yád* is the most common subordinating conjunction, see HETTRICH, *Hypotaxe* 334ff.

23. *yaṭ* introduces a final clause in the formula *auuat āiiaptəm dazdi mē ... yaṭ bauuāni aiβi.vaniid ...* 'give me that boon, ... that I may overcome ...': Yt 5.34, 38, 50 (: *yaṭ vīspanəm yuxtanəm azəm fratəməm θanjaiieni* 'that I may gear the first of all teams'), 54, 58 (*bauuāma*), 73, 82, 109, 113, 117. *yaṭ* introduces an explicative clause in Yt 5.65 *mošu taṭ ās nōit darəγəm yaṭ frāiitaiiat θβaxšəmno aoi qəm ahuraδātəm* 'it was soon, not late, and in an active state, that he came close to the earth created by the Lord...', and 76: *tā bā aša tā aršuxda ... yaṭ mē auuat daēuuiiasnanəm nijatəm yaθa sārəma +varəsanəm barāmi* 'Das ist wirklich nach der Wahrheit, das ist richtig gesprochen ..., daß durch mich so viele Dämonenverehrer zu Boden geschlagen worden sind, wie ich Haare auf dem Kopf trage'. It introduces a causal clause in Yt 5.129 *baβraini vastrā vaṇhata ... yaṭ asti baβriš sraēšta yaθa yaṭ asti gaonōtəma* 'Kleider aus Biberfell hat sie angelegt ..., weil das Biberweibchen am schönsten ist, insofern es am dichtesten behaart ist' (here and in the next footnote all German translations are by OETTINGER).

24. *yaθa* introduces a final clause in the phrase *auuat āiiaptəm dazdi mē ... yaθa...* in Yt 5.18, 22 (twice), 28 (twice), 30, 42, 46, 50, 54, 69 (: *yaθa azəm auuata vərəθra hacāne yaθa vīspe +aniie +aire* 'daß ich eines so großen Siegs teilhaftig werde wie alle anderen Arier (zusammen)'), 105, 130, 127 (: *hā hē +maidim nīdāzata yaθaca hukərəpta fīstāna yaθaca aṇhən +nīdāzana* 'Sie hat sich die Taille geschnürt, damit die Brüste wohlgeformt (und) damit sie geschnürt seien'), 132 (: *yaθa tē vīspe auruuanta zazuuāgha paiti.jasqn* 'damit alle diese Renner siegreich heimkehren wie...'). *yaθa yaṭ* 'insofar': Yt 5.129 *yaθa yaṭ asti gaonōtəma* 'insofern es (das Biberweibchen) am dichtesten behaart ist' (see end of fn.23).

25. Yt 5.63: *barāni aoi āpəm qəm raghəm* 'I will bring (a thousand libations) to the River Raghā,
yezi jum frapaiemi if I reach alive
aoi qəm ahuraδātəm the earth created by the Lord'.

to introduce a temporal clause; *yezi* is attested twice of which in one instance (Yt 8.43) it introduces a temporal clause interchanging with *yaθa* in the phrase *yezi aēm bauuaiti yaštō* 'when he is being worshipped'; in its other attestation, Yt 8.60, it introduces a conditional clause 'if'²⁶. The most interesting feature of syntactic hypotaxis in Yt 8 - and novel compared to Yt 19 and Yt 5 - are four attestations of a conditional irreal period introduced by *yeidi zī* (Yt 8.11, 24, 52, 56). However, a hypothetic period is also found in Yt 10, one of the oldest Yašts. In that hymn *yeidi zī* introduces in stanza 55 (= 74) a potential or irreal clause. The most common subordinating conjunction in Yašt 10 is *yaθa*, attested in that function 10 times (of which, however, 7 instances are repetitions)²⁷; next in frequency comes *yezi*, attested five times²⁸, then *yaṭ* (three times as a temporal subordinator)²⁹, and finally once *yauuata* 'until' (Yt 10.71). Leaving aside the repeated phrases there are altogether 13 different conjunctive subordinate clauses found in Yašt 10.

3.3. The frequency of subordinate clauses introduced by a conjunction in the Avestan texts examined may be illustrated by the following table:

Subordinating Conjunctions in the Avesta							
	<i>hiiaṭ/ yaṭ</i>	<i>yezī</i>	<i>yadā</i>	<i>yaθā</i>	<i>yaθa yaṭ</i>	<i>yeidi zī</i>	<i>yauuata</i>
Older Avesta							
Gā-thās	42	8	4	1	-	-	-
YH	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Younger Avesta							
Yt 19	26	4	-	3	1	-	-
Yt 5	13	1	-	16	1	-	-
Yt 8	2	2	-	1	-	4	-
Yt 10	3	5	-	10 (7 re.)	-	2 (1 rep.)	1

26. *yaṭ* Yt 8.1 and 9; *yaθa* Yt 8.47; *yezi* Yt 8.43 and 60.

27. *yaθa* introduces a final clause 'so that' in Yt 10.34 (3 rep.). Six times it introduces a causal clause in the repeated formula *yaθa graṇtō upaṭbištō* ... 'since (Mithra), enraged and provoked ...' (Yt 10.39 (twice), 40 (twice), 41, 43), and once, Yt 10.142, a temporal clause 'when'.

28. *yezi* introduces three times a temporal clause (Yt 10.109, 111, 136: *yezi šē zaoθrā baraiti auui šē maēθanəm* 'when he takes his libations to his abode' (GERSHEVITCH)), and twice a conditional clause 'if' (Yt 10.18, 137); on *yeidi zī* see above.

29. Yt 10.1 'when', 101 'when', 68 'as often as' (iterative).

It emerges from this that subordination with conjunctions is rare in the Older Avesta, but it seems to be even rarer in the Younger Avesta, although the range of segmental subordinators being used is wider. Subordination with conjunctions is known to the poets of the Younger Avestan hymns, but they do not make much use of it. They prefer rather either to use relative clauses or to coordinate clauses. Very often they also correlate clauses.

4. Sentences connected with each other by correlatives are extremely common both in the Older and in the Younger Avesta. Thus, for instance, Y 35.6³⁰:

<i>yaθā āt utā nā vā nāirt vā</i>	'As men and women know
<i>vaēdā haiθīm</i>	what is Truth,
<i>aθā haṭ vohū</i>	so they know what is Right.'

5.1. Besides subordination and correlation, coordination is a widespread way of connecting sentences in Old Iranian to express thoughts related to each other. There is a variety of types of paratactic construction. In YAv. the particle *āat* (YH *āt*) is very common. It is used to introduce a new sentence connected logically or temporally with the preceding. Thus, e.g. Vd 2.1 ff.:

<i>pərəsaṭ zaraθuštrō ahurəm mazdqm...</i>	'Zaraθuštra asked Ahura Mazdā...
<i>āat mraoṭ ahurō mazdā...</i>	Then spake Ahura Mazdā...
<i>āat mē aēm paitiiaoxta...</i>	Then he answered me...

5.2. A new sentence may also be introduced by an anaphoric pronoun which functions syntactically as a connective. Thus, for instance, Yt 19.1:

<i>paoiriō gairiš ḥqm.hištāt</i>	'The first mountain which arose,
<i>spitama zaraθuštra</i>	o Spitāma Zaraθuštra,
<i>paiti āiia zēmā haraiti barš</i>	on this earth was the lofty Haraitī.
<i>hā hama +pairi.saēte</i>	She lies surrounding both
<i>frāpaiiā daṅhuš ā +upaošaṇ'hāśca</i>	the western and the eastern lands.'

5.3. A third way of coordinating main clauses is asyndetic parataxis. This means that the main clauses related to each other follow each other without being connected by any formal device, such as a particle or a conjunction. Thus, for instance Yt 5.85:

<i>yahmiia ahurō mazdā</i>	'Whereby Ahura Mazdā
<i>huuapō niuuāēdaiiat</i>	of good deeds ordered:
<i>āidi paiti auua.jasaṭ</i>	"Come, come down,
<i>arəduuṭ sūre anāhite</i>	Arəduuī Sūrā Anāhitā,
<i>haca auuatbiiō stərəbiiō</i>	from those stars
<i>aoi zqm ahuraδātqm</i>	to the Earth created by the Lord.
<i>θβqm yazānte auruuāṅhō</i>	The swift lords,
<i>ahurāṅhō daṅhu.pataiiō</i>	the lords of lands,

30. On this verse cf. NARTEN, YH 39, 112f.

<i>puθrāṇhō darju.paitinaṃ</i>	the sons of the lords of lands will venerate you...
And in the story of Pāuruua, Yašt 5.62:	
<i>hō auuaθa vazata</i>	'This one (Pāuruua) was floating (through the air) in that way
<i>θri.aiiarēm θri.xšaparam</i>	for three days and three nights
<i>+paitiša nmānēm yim +x'aēpaiθīm³¹</i>	towards his own house.
<i>nōiṭ aora +auuaoirisiiāṭ</i>	He was not to come down.
<i>θraošta xšafnō θritiiaiā</i>	At the completion of the third night
<i>frāymat ušāṇhēm sūraiā</i>	he came to the dawn of the mighty one ³² ,
<i>viuuaitīm³³ upa ušāṇhēm</i>	to the Dawn shining out.
<i>upa.zbailaṭ arəduuīm sūrām anāhitām</i>	He called unto Arəduuī Sūrā Anāhitā:'

5.4. In this last example the verbal form *+auuaoirisiiāṭ* is the 3.Sg.Subj.³⁴ of the present stem *uruuisiia-* 'to turn', and it occurs in a preterite context. The syntactic function of the subjunctive could be here to denote the intention of the agent. Another example of such a use of the subjunctive is found in Y 9.11:

<i>yō janaṭ aṣim sruuarēm...</i>	'(Kərəsāspa), who slew the horn-bearing dragon...
<i>yim upairi kərəsāspō</i>	Son whom Kərəsāspa
<i>aiiaṇha pitum pacata</i>	cooked his meal in an iron pot
<i>ā rapiθβinēm zruuānēm</i>	around midday.
<i>tafsaṭca hō mairiio x'ṭsaṭca</i>	The villain became hot and started sweating;
<i>fraš aiiaṇhō frasparaṭ</i>	forwards he kicked against the pot,
<i>yaēšiiantīm āpēm +parāṇhāṭ</i>	he wanted to upset the boiling water.
<i>paraš tarštō apatacat</i>	Frightened manly-minded Kərəsāspa
<i>naire.manā kərəsāspō</i>	jumped aside.'

AS HOFFMANN/NARTEN³⁵ point out, in this example the verse *fraš aiiaṇhō frasparaṭ yaēšiiantīm āpēm +parāṇhāṭ* probably means that he kicked against the pot in order to upset

31. GELDNER edits *x'āpaiθīm*. BARTHOLOMAE, *Air. Wb.* 1877 reads with F1 *x'āpaiθēm*. This form, however, does not account for epenthesis of *i*. Furthermore, this would be the only attestation of an adjectival stem *x'āpai-θiia-*. The form transmitted by F1 *x'āpaiθēm* is probably erroneously written instead of *x'aēpaiθīm*, which F1 transmits in stanza 63 and 65 (here *x'aēpaiθīm*).

32. *uṣah- sūraiā* is the name of the third section of the night between midnight and dawn (*AirWb.* 415).

33. *vi-uuaītīm* Akk.Sg.fem. of the present participle active *vi-uuaīt-* (with zero-grade root < **b-ant-* < **b^hh₂-ent-* versus full-grade Ved. *bhānt-*, see KELLENS, *Verbe av.* 89) from the root **bā-*, Ved. *bhāti* 'to shine'.

34. See HOFFMANN/NARTEN, *Sasan. Archet.* 58 fn.78. GELDNER edits with F1 and E1 *auuōirisiiāṭ* (J10 has *auuōi.rišiiāṭ*). BARTHOLOMAE, *AirWb.* 1534 interprets this form as a subjunctive from the present stem *uruuisiia-* from the root *uruuaēs* 'to turn round' functioning here as a preterite: 'er vermochte nicht wieder herunterzukommen', cf. LOMMEL, *Yāšt's* 37 (: 'konnte aber nicht herablenken'). KELLENS, *Verbe av.* 268 proposes either to emend the transmitted *auuōirisiiāṭ* into an indicative *+auuōirisiiāṭ*, or, preferably, to interpret the form as a subjunctive 'consécutif de *vazata*': 'il vola ensuite trois jours et trois nuits en direction de sa maison sans qu'il pût descendre'.

35. *Sasan. Archetypus* 58 fn.78.

the boiling water. So here the subjunctive denotes the intention of the subject, too³⁶. The subjunctive in Yt 19.2 *fraoxšiiqn* can also be interpreted in this way:

(Yt 19.1) *paoirīō gairiš hqm.hištaṭ*... 'The first mountain which arose...

paiti āiia zēmā haraiti barš... on this earth was the lofty Haraiti...

(Yt 19.2) *bitiīō zərəḏazō gairiš* ... The second mountain was Zərəḏaza...

ahmaṭ haca garaiīō fraoxšiiqn From there were to grow forth the mountains,

⁺*usaḏā ušidarəno* etc. Usaḏā Ušidarəna...'

The verbal form *fraoxšiiqn* could be seen in relationship to *hqm.hištaṭ* 'arose' from stanza 1 in the sense that from the first two mountains all other mountains were to arise.

The function of the subjunctive in a preterite context has been described on the basis of Rig-Vedic material by K. HOFFMANN³⁷ as a voluntative to denote the intention of the subject. It is connected as a final main clause with the preceding main clause. This is a characteristic feature of a paratactical syntax dating back at least to the Indo-Iranian period.

6. There are many, many more examples of asyndetic coordination of main clauses in the Younger Avesta. Compared with the Gāthās it may even be said that coordination is particularly common in the Yašts. It seems that the style of the Gāthās is more sophisticated, characterized by a great variety of stylistic devices and also by more syntactic subordination, although conjunctive subordination is largely made by only one conjunction, that is *hiiaṭ*. In the Younger Avesta in general a greater variety of different segmental subordinators is found, but in the Yašts they are only occasionally employed. The number of subordinating conjunctions may even be reduced in individual Yašts. Thus, for instance, only the three conjunctions *yaθa*, *yaṭ* and *yezi* are found as subordinators in Yašt 5 and 19.

The Heidelberg linguist Klaus HEGER has formulated the functional difference between paratactic and hypotactic construction as a difference between paratactic accumulation of assertions and asserted hypotaxis³⁸. That means that in a hypotactic construction the assertion may focus on the specific relationship which the speaker sets up between individual clauses or phrases of the sentence, but not on the content of the individual units themselves³⁹. Although this does not apply to all types of hypotactic constructions, it may be said in general that in a large number of hypotactic constructions it is a relationship that is being asserted. In a paratactic construction, on the other hand, the speaker asserts the content of every individual clause or phrase. Thus, paratactic construction allows the speaker to join a series of individual

36. HOFFMANN/NARTEN, *Sasan. Archetypus* 58, fn.78 refer as a further example to Yt 10,92 *frā ... barāt* 'he wanted to confer, in order to confer'.

37. *Der Injunktiv im Veda* 244. He quotes, for instance, RV I 32,5 *āhan vṛtrām ... āhiḥ śayate* 'He slew Vṛtra ... the dragon shall lie'.

38. K. HEGER, "Parataxe und Hypotaxe". *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* 24, 1977, 279-286.

39. This refers to the subordinate clause. Following HEGER, G. BOSSONG, "Typologie der Hypotaxe". *Folia linguistica* 13, 1979, 34-35 calls this phenomenon 'Assertionsblockierung'.

assertions, but it is the hypotactic construction that enables him to assert a relation of individual units in a larger context⁴⁰.

Viewing the syntactic situation of the Yašts just described in the light of HEGER's considerations about the functional difference between paratactic and hypotactic constructions, we may conclude that the poets of the hymns of the Younger Avesta preferred to accumulate a series of individual assertions rather than assert a relationship of a larger context. The syntactic feature of paratactic construction may be connected with a stylistic characteristic observed in the composition of the Yašts: frequently the Yašts employ what might be called a paratactical style or technique of composition, in which one narrative element is added to another⁴¹. It is not that the poets were unable to use hypotaxis. Rather, their preference for paratactic construction may be regarded as part of their poetic technique.

Abbreviations and References

- BARTHOLOMAE, *AirWb.* = Chr. BARTHOLOMAE: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Straßburg 1904.
 Nachdr. (zusammen mit den Nacharbeiten und Vorarbeiten) Berlin/New York 1979.
 BOSSONG, G.: "Typologie der Hypotaxe". *Folia linguistica* 13, 1979, 33-54.
 BRANDENSTEIN, W.: "Kritische Musterung der neueren Theorien des Nebensatzes". *IF* 44, 1927, 117-136.
 BRANDENSTEIN, W.: "Erwiderung zu KZ LVII 118ff.". *KZ* 58, 1931, 270-272.
 BRANDENSTEIN, W. / MAYRHOFER, M.: *Handbuch des Altpersischen*. Wiesbaden 1964.
 DELBRÜCK, B.: *Altindische Syntax*. Halle 1888 (Syntaktische Forschungen 5).
 DELBRÜCK, Vgl. *Syntax* = B. DELBRÜCK, *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. 3 Theile, Straßburg 1893-1900 (= K. BRUGMANN/B. DELBRÜCK, *Grundriß der Vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Bd. III-V).
 GELDNER, (*Avesta*) = F. GELDNER, *Avesta. The sacred books of the Parsis*. 3 vols., Stuttgart 1896. 1889. 1896.

40. This does not mean that the speaker could choose freely between para- and hypotactic construction. For Vedic examples, where a main clause could hardly be used instead of a subordinate clause, see HETTRICH, *Hypotaxe* 88ff., 97ff.

41. See on this HINTZE, "Compositional Techniques in the Yašts of the Younger Avesta". *Proceedings of the Second Conference of Iranian Studies held at Bamberg, 30 September - 4 October 1991*. Hrsg. von B.G. Fragner, Gh. Gnoli u.a., Roma 1995, 277-286.

- Grammatici Graeci* II 1-3 = *Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt*. Vol. II 1 edited by R. SCHNEIDER and G. UHLIG, Leipzig 1878; Vol. II 2 ed. by G. UHLIG, Leipzig 1910; Vol. II 3 ed. by R. SCHNEIDER, Leipzig 1910.
- GRAY, L. H.: "Contributions to Avestan Syntax: The Subordinate Clause". *JAOS* 22, 1901, 145-175.
- HARWEG, R.: "Zum Verhältnis von Satz, Hauptsatz und Nebensatz". *ZDL* 38, 1971, 16-46.
- HEGER, K.: "Parataxe und Hypotaxe". *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* 24, 1977, 279-286.
- HERMANN, E.: "Gab es im Indogermanischen Nebensätze?". *KZ* 33, 1895, 481-535.
- HETTRICH, *Hypotaxe* = H. HETTRICH, *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen*. Berlin/New York 1988.
- HETTRICH, H.: "Zur Entwicklung der Finalsätze altindogermanischer Sprachen". *KZ* 100, 1987, 219-237.
- HETTRICH, H.: "Lateinische Konditionalsätze in sprachvergleichender Sicht". *Latein und Indogermanisch*. Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg, 23.-26. September 1986. Innsbruck 1992, 263-284.
- HOFFMANN, K.: *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Heidelberg 1967.
- HOFFMANN/NARTEN, *Sasan. Archet.* = K. HOFFMANN and J. NARTEN, *Der Sasanidische Archetypus*. Untersuchungen zu Schreibung und Lautgestalt des Avestischen. Wiesbaden 1989.
- HUMBACH, *Gāthās*² = H. HUMBACH, *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra and the Other Old Avestan Texts*. In collaboration with J. ELFENBEIN and P.O. SKJÆRVØ. 2 vols., Heidelberg 1991.
- KELLENS, J./PIRART, E.: *Les textes vieil-avestiques*. Wiesbaden. Vol. I: Introduction, texte et traduction, 1988. Vol. II: Répertoires grammaticaux et lexique, 1990. Vol. III: Commentaire, 1991.
- KENT, R. G.: *Old Persian. Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. New Haven, Conn. 1950, 2nd revised edition 1953.
- KENT, R. G.: "The Old Persian Relative and Article". *Language* 20, 1944, 1ff.
- KLEIN, J. S.: *Toward a Discourse Grammar of the Rigveda*. I: Coordinate conjunction, Part 1: Introduction, *ca, utá*. Heidelberg 1985.
- KOCH, Chr.: "Zur Vorgeschichte des relativen Attributivkonnexes im Baltischen und Slavischen". *Indogermanisch, Slawisch und Baltisch*. Materialien des vom 21.-22. September 1989 in Jena in Zusammenarbeit mit der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft durchgeführten Kolloquium. Hrsgg. von B. BARSCHHEL, M. KOZIANKA, K. WEBER. München 1992, 45-88 (= Slavistische Beiträge, Band 285).
- NARTEN, *YH* = J. NARTEN, *Der Yasna Haptanhāiti*. Wiesbaden 1986.
- NEHRING, A.: "Studien zur Theorie des Nebensatzes I". *KZ* 57, 1930, 118-158.
- OETTINGER, N.: *Untersuchungen zur avestischen Sprache am Beispiel des Ardvtsūr-Yašt*. Unpublished typescript, 1983.
- PANAINO, A.: *Tištrya*. Part I: The Avestan Hymn to Sirius. Roma 1990 (= Serie Orientale Roma LXVIII, 1).

- PORZIG, W.: "Die Hypotaxe im Rigveda. Erstes Stück. Die durch das Pronomen *ya-* charakterisierten Sätze und syntaktischen Gruppen in den älteren Büchern des Rigveda". *IF* 41, 1923, 210-303.
- REICHELT, H.: *Awestisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg 1909, 3rd reprint 1978.
- RIX, H.: "Abstrakte Komplemente im Urindogermanischen". *Studies in Diachronic, synchronic, and typological linguistics*. Festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi II, Amsterdam 1979, 725-747.
- SCHMITT-BRANDT, R.: "Vergleich der indogermanischen Nebensatzkonstruktionen". *Indogermanische und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, hrsg. von G. REDARD, Wiesbaden 1973, 125-141.
- SEILER, H.: *Relativsatz, Attribut und Apposition*. Wiesbaden 1960.
- SLOTTY, F.: "Zur Theorie des Nebensatzes". *TCLP* 6, 1936, 133-146.
- SZEMERÉNYI, O.: "Syntax, meaning, and origin of the IE particle **k^we*". *Collectanea Philologica*. Festschrift für Helmut Gipper. Baden-Baden 1985, vol. II, 747-775.